ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY

PRODUCED BY THE
INSTITUTUM PATRISTICUM AUGUSTINIANUM

GENERAL EDITOR ANGELO DI BERARDINO

CONSULTING EDITORS
THOMAS C. ODEN AND JOEL C. ELOWSKY

PROJECT EDITOR JAMES HOOVER

Publication of the Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity *has been made possible in part by the generous support of the Green Scholars Initiative.*

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY

Produced by the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum

GENERAL EDITOR

Angelo Di Berardino

CONSULTING EDITORS

Thomas C. Oden

Joel C. Elowsky

PROJECT EDITOR

James Hoover

PRINCIPAL TRANSLATORS

Joseph T. Papa

Erik A. Koenke

Eric E. Hewett

IVP Academic

An imprint of InterVarsity Press

Downers Grove, Illinois

InterVarsity Press
P.O. Box 1400, Downers Grove, IL 60515-1426
Internet: www.ivpress.com
Email: email@ivpress.com

Translated from the Italian Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane, *3 volumes, ©2006–2008 Casa Editrice Marietti, S.p.A., Genova-Milano. Published in the United States of America by InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, with permission from Casa Editrice Marietti.*

InterVarsity Press® is the book-publishing division of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA®, a movement of students and faculty active on campus at hundreds of universities, colleges and schools of nursing in the United States of America, and a member movement of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students. For information about local and regional activities, write Public Relations Dept., InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA, 6400 Schroeder Rd., P.O. Box 7895, Madison, WI 53707-7895, or visit the IVCF website at www.intervarsity.org.

Design: Cindy Kiple

Cover image: Christ and the Apostles (I am the life), *Icon at De Agostini Library. G. Dagli Orti, The Bridgeman Art Library*

ISBN 978-0-8308-9717-9 (digital)
ISBN 978-0-8308-2940-8 (Vol. 1)
ISBN 978-0-8308-2941-5 (Vol. 2)
ISBN 978-0-8308-2942-2 (Vol. 3)
ISBN 978-0-8308-2943-9 (set of 3 vols.)

InterVarsity Press

PROJECT STAFF

Senior Editor/Project Editor
James Hoover

Managing Editor
Benjamin M. McCoy

Copyeditors
Jeffrey A. Reimer
Susan Carlson Wood

Additional Translators
Lewis Berry, C.O.
Jeffrey Paul Orrell
Peter Knuffke
Joshua Furnal
Brother Richard A. Bailey
John Taylor Carr and Lydia Brooke Carr

Editorial & Administrative Assistants
Rebecca Carhart
Allison Rieck
Rachel Neftzer Snavely
Claire VanderVelde

Design
Cindy Kiple

Content Production
Kirsten Pott
Maureen G. Tobey
Jeanna L. Wiggins

Proofreaders
Jeffrey A. Reimer
Michael D. Gibson

InterVarsity Press

Publisher
Robert A. Fryling

Associate Publisher for Editorial
Andrew T. Le Peau

Associate Editorial Director
James Hoover

Production Manager
Anne Gerth

Print Coordinator
Jim Erhart

CONTENTS

Preface to the Second English Edition

A scholarly encyclopedia of Christian antiquity faces the daunting task of drawing together the results of research on a vast field of study. The *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane* (DPAC) was first published from 1983 to 1988 by Casa Editrice Marietti. Soon it became a prevailing resource for patristic scholars. It was evident that it needed to be translated into English. So in 1992 the two-volume *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* (EEC) was published by James Clarke & Co. in Great Britain and Oxford University Press in the United States, translated by Adrian Walford with a foreword and bibliographic amendments by W.H.C. Frend.

The field of patristic studies has grown exponentially in the years since 1992, yet no comparable encyclopedia has appeared in English since that time.

For more than twenty years the 1992 English edition from James Clarke/Oxford remained the standard of the world of patristic studies. An ongoing process of revision by the original collaborators called forth the Italian publication of the second edition of the *Dizionario* in Italian during the years 2006 to 2010—the *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane* (NDPAC); see the preface to the second Italian edition, which follows, for indications of the additions and changes that were made.

This is the English translation of that expanded second edition of the *Dizionario* under the title *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity* (EAC), published by InterVarsity Press. Both the Oxford and IVP editions have been produced by the indefatigable Professor Di Berardino and his colleagues at the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum in Rome. To them a great debt is owed by all who engage in patristic studies now and in the future. A new baseline of competence and information has been set. This new standard is characterized by concise argument, breadth of international scholarship and richness of bibliography. This new edition has been expanded by more than 35 percent, to 3,220 articles, written by 266 contributors from 26 countries. Thirty new articles have been added since the Italian publication at the behest of Professor Di Berardino—apostolic see, Capua, Carmen de synodo Ticinensi, China, cosmopolitanism, death, diakonia/diaconate, Dialogi de sancta Trinitate IV-V, doorkeeper (porter), dynamis/energeia, eternity, forgiveness, freedom/free will, good, Hierotheus, incubatio, infinity/infinitude, libelli miraculorum, love, Mara bar Serapion (letter of), oikeiōsis, old age, presanctified, Serapeion (Serapeum), subdeacon, Theosebia, Triumphus Christi heroicus, Tychon, unity and Virgo Parens—and the article on matristics has been updated.

Nothing like it exists in English. It covers key topics in early Christian studies with special attention to authors, texts and contexts of the first through eighth centuries. Many articles are offered on figures and subjects not found in previous patristic encyclopedias. This edition incorporates a far wider range of entries than its antecedents, more fully embracing archaeological, philosophical, historical, geographic and theological arenas. Art historians, linguistic experts, epigraphers and papyrologists are playing an increasing role in these findings. New insights into Eastern European (Polish, Czech, Bulgarian and Hungarian) and Syriac traditions of patristic studies are better represented than before. New entries have been added from Arabic, Coptic, Armenian and Gothic experts.

The expanded bibliographies alone are priceless for all who might venture into the study of the persons, events and ideas of early Christian thought. Primary sources, texts and commentaries open up a vast theater of reading on any of its subjects. W.H.C. Frend was right to say of the *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* in 1992: "There is no work that can properly be compared with it." This is a more extensive continuation of that work.

The time frame of the *Encyclopedia* encompasses the period from Clement of Rome to Bede and John of Damascus—roughly AD 90 to 750, but with allowance for special cases such as Syria, Ethiopia, Mauretania and Arabia.

The sheer mass of scholarly work on early Christianity is astounding. New studies with new methods have been included. These contributors, along with our English translation editorial team of Joel Elowsky and James Hoover, are offering an unrivaled resource in English for scholars around the world.

The purpose of an encyclopedia is to condense massive information about locations, figures, interpretations and subjects into a suitably concise format commensurable with the importance of the subject. Its goal is succinct summaries of complex data, offering an impartial, fact-based summation of diverse scholarship along with sufficient bibliographies to guide readers further into this vast literature.

—*Thomas C. Oden*

Preface to the Second Italian Edition (2006)

The first edition of the *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane* (DPAC) met with notable success, addressing a felt need for an informed and complete resource on Christian antiquity in general and on the church fathers in particular. Besides the reprint in Italian in 1999, it was translated into various other languages (Spanish, English, French and Portuguese); in recent years publishing houses in Eastern Europe have asked for translations. Twenty-two years after the first edition, therefore, the editors felt the need, not for a simple reprint—of limited value in this field—but for something new and different. Respecting the structure and tone of the first edition, and with the significant commitment of the Italian publisher *Marietti*, we have brought forth this new edition. (In the meantime Marietti, in a spirit of continuity and of service to Christian antiquity, published two large volumes—the fourth and fifth—of the Patrology.) The addition of *Nuovo* (*Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane* = NDPAC) to this edition is intended to indicate continuity with the preceding work, as well as the profound reworking accomplished in the new edition. In fact three possible strategies were considered: a simple revision of the work, correcting any errors; something totally new in a different tone—not easily realizable in the brief time available—or an in-depth revision of the already-existing text, with additions and some rewriting.

We chose the third option, involving various kinds of work: revision of all entries, with correction and updating of the text and bibliography, if possible done by the original author (if still living, of course, and available); new entries to be inserted (around 500 have been added); replacement of many entries with a new article written by a different author. These replacements were sometimes made necessary by new discoveries or the progress of research, or because the previous article was judged to be inadequate. Among those that were replaced, some of the most important are Athanasius, Augustianism, audientia episcopalis, Bardesanes, cathedra, Cosmas and Damian, Germany, gnosis/gnosticism, Gregory the Great, Hippolytus, lay/layman/laity, Lusitania, Mani/Manicheans/Manicheism, mysticism/mystical theology, paideia, world. In recent decades, moreover, so-called apocryphal writings have had a notable development. Rather than a single entry, we chose to offer a brief general treatment and then to insert specific entries for each Christian apocryphal text. The same was done for the popes: previously, only some had a specific entry, while the majority were included in a general entry, "popes." Now many have a brief individual presentation. Christian archaeology, in continual evolution, also required much rewriting and updating. Among the new entries we may note: (accusation of) atheism, autobiography, bishop, crown, dreams and the Fathers, Father/Fathers of the Church (in the Medieval and Renaissance periods), Gothic literature, Homer, (Christian) intolerance, Judaism, Lent, matristics, Mesopotamia, metempsychosis, miracle, panegyric, (Christian) poetry, (apostolic) presbyters, progress, relics, saint and holiness, (Holy) Scripture (ancient versions), seal, ship, suicide, *theologia negativa/via negativa*, (patristic) translations (in Eastern languages).

The insertion of new entries of a certain length and the space given to the apocryphal writings and the popes have significantly increased the size of the work, which is now divided in a more balanced way among three volumes.

A word of thanks is due to the great patrologists who collaborated on the first edition and were extremely generous in their counsel and collaboration, among whom were Jean Gribomont, Charles Pietri, Michele Cardinal Pellegrino, Vincenzo Loi, Achille Triacca, Cyril Vogel, Salvatore Costanza, Henri Crouzel, Carmelo Curti, Irénée-Henri Dalmais, Ivan Dujčev, Umberto Fasola, Paul-Albert Février, Margherita Guarducci, Adalbert Hamman, Richard Hanson, Sandro Leanza, Roger Le Déaut, Joseph Lecuyer, Pierre Nautin, Burkhard Neunheuser, Joseph-Marie Sauget, Victor Saxer, Agostino Trapè.

We offer heartfelt thanks, also on behalf of the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, to the Casa Editrice Marietti, which enabled us to complete the work in two years.

—Angelo Di Berardino

Preface to the First Italian Edition (1983)

The *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane* (DPAC) was born out of the simple recognition of the fact that no such work has existed to date; that is, a tool for the immediate use of those with a certain level of culture who are desirous of ready and precise information on any theme pertaining to the first eight centuries of the history of Christianity. We became aware of this lack during the preparation of the third volume of the Patrology—continuing the volumes of Prof. Johannes Quasten, published by Casa Editrice Marietti—and immediately set to work gathering suggestions and proposals on the structure and tone of the *Dictionary*.

Because of the many scholars of Christian antiquity associated with the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, both as teachers and as participants in the traditional May Meetings, it was clear that this center could assume responsibility for the preparation of the *Dictionary*. Moreover an ample network of associations and friendships allowed for immediate contact with many competent scholars in the various sectors of Christian antiquity, allowing the work to be prepared in a short period of time. To this end it was also necessary to ensure an ample number of collaborators, whether as authors of the articles or as translators in the case of articles written in languages other than Italian.

This wide involvement was achieved: 167 scholars from 17 different countries, from different religious confessions and with various cultural interests. These scholars, each according to his or her expertise, intend to make available to everyone the significant progress in research in the field of Christian antiquity attained in recent decades; in doing so, they bring to the work not only broad scholarly knowledge, but also variety in approach and sensibility in treating the themes. The DPAC, therefore, with its multidisciplinary character, offers a well-documented historical and patristic background to theology, to Christian culture and to the life of the church today, including in the variety of its confessions of faith. The DPAC will thus be useful for a wide and varied public, whether desirous of an initial orientation or the further investigation of a theme, the latter thanks to a select and updated bibliography.

Chronologically, the *Dictionary* covers from the age of Christian origins to the end of the patristic period: for the West until Bede (ca. 673–735), and for the Greek East until John of Damascus (ca. 675–ca. 749). For the other Christian areas (Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopian, Georgian and Armenian), in some cases the chronological criteria have been more elastic due to the way in which evangelization took place, and to the peculiar nature of the writings and translations in those languages.

The articles that the DPAC comprises regard persons, doctrines, cultural currents, Christian sects, historical events, geography, liturgy, monasticism, spirituality, artistic works and archaeological evidence, while not ignoring the social, political, moral and ascetical aspects of the first eight centuries of Christian history.

When possible and considered appropriate, a comprehensive study of some themes was chosen, so as to offer a global and structured discussion of the theme (e.g., apocrypha, cemeteries, churches, wisdom books, etc.). Special priority has been given to prosopography: many personalities, including secondary, have been included for the first four centuries in specific detail; for the subsequent period more selectivity was exercised, because the period was less important for the origin and foundation of Christianity and because of the entry of many new nations with a host of new characters. The *Dictionary*, though not without inevitable lacunae, presents a surprising richness of information, as a quick glance through its pages will show. As an illustration, ancient philosophy in its relation with Christianity is approached from different angles in a variety of entries: in properly theological entries, in regard to some Fathers, and in specific treatments (Aristotelianism, Hellenism and Christianity, philosophy and ancient Christianity, Platonism and the Fathers, Stoicism and the Fathers), in addition to the inclusion of various pagan thinkers of the patristic period and of philosophical currents of the time. Frequently the composition of an article required the contribution of various specialties: for example, "Alexandria" required the contribution of a Coptologist (Orlandi), a patrologist (Simonetti) and an archaeologist (Falla Castelfranchi). In such cases it may prove useful to read the various treatments, inasmuch as they each offer a different approach, complementing the others. An example would be "angel," with an article by a patrologist (Studer) which expounds on patristic theological reflection, and one by an art historian (Carletti) which documents how those reflections found artistic expression through iconography. Themes have also been included that have received little treatment elsewhere:

for example, (patristic) argumentation (Studer), protology (Bianchi and Sfameni Gasparro; this entry offers a different approach to other themes: creation, original sin, marriage, virginity), Paleoslavonic (Dujčev; regarding translations in that language), and so forth.

Heartfelt thanks are due to Fr. Claude Mondésert, director of "Sources Chrétiennes," who graciously hosted us on 12 May 1978 at the offices of Sources Chrétiennes in Lyons to plan the *Dictionary*, with representatives of the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum and some publishing houses present. Special recognition should also be given to Casa Editrice Marietti, who made possible the completion of the work in the brief period of four years.

—Angelo Di Berardino

A Note on Using the Encyclopedia

Several features of the *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity* (EAC) are worth noting at the outset. Extensive, though not exhaustive, cross-referencing has been introduced to point readers to additional articles within the EAC worth exploring in relation to various topics. Such references are indicated by asterisks (*) preceding the approximate names of any additional articles to consult. So long as the referenced entry appears alphabetically within the flow that readers should expect, the form may not be exact. Thus "*celibate" refers readers to the article titled "celibacy of the clergy." Where the appropriate entry would not be found alphabetically in proximity to its expected place, additional information is supplied within parentheses, as in the case of references to "deacon," which take the following form "deacon (*see* *diakonia - diaconate)." Note that the form (*see* * . . .) always points to an article within the EAC. When "see" is in roman type, readers are being directed to a standard outside reference work or to a work cited in the bibliography for the entry.

Readers are cautioned that not all cross-referencing is unambiguous; there are no fewer than seventeen entries for "Eusebius" in the EAC, and while nearly all cross-references in this case are to Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine, readers may need to consult more than one entry to ascertain whether they have identified the proper article. Context should make things clear. Generally, cross-referencing is supplied only at the first mention of a related topic within an article or, in the case of long articles, at first mention within each subsection. Common words that readers would undoubtedly expect to find within the EAC (bishop, priest, pope) are usually not cross-referenced.

Facing the daunting task of reformatting the bibliographies and various elements of classical references to conform to North American standards, we have decided to leave these items essentially as we found them in the Italian edition. Thus readers are likely to find references in the form "Eusebius, *HE* V,16,5" where they might expect "Eusebius, *HE* 5.16.5," following the general European conventions that use commas where North Americans are more inclined to use periods, and vice versa. This means on occasion, though rarely, readers will find periods separating items in a series of page references. Readers should find no difficulty locating sources once they accustom themselves to these conventions. The bibliographies likewise tend to use italics for titles regardless of whether the titles indicate books, chapters within books, or journal articles. We have also adjusted all instances of the feminine *eadem* and its abbreviation to *Id.* (the masculine abbreviation for *idem*). We hope this provides no offense to women scholars, since we have done so in the interests of treating all alike, of avoiding what is a highly uncommon abbreviation, and of precluding unintentional mistakes in gender identification from mere initials.

Given the origins of the EAC, it will come as no surprise that, despite the multiple-languages sources found within them, the bibliographies are nevertheless weighted toward secondary sources in Italian. No systematic effort has been made to supplement them with additional bibliography in English, though this should not pose an obstacle to further research given the wide range of sources provided. Readers will note that frequently, though not universally, important reference works that are available in multiple languages are so noted.

Despite the extensive list of bibliographical abbreviations, readers will still find abbreviations not listed there. As the Italian edition notes, "Approximate abbreviations that can be easily understood are not included in this list," though we have added quite a few as an aid to readers. Occasionally, critical editions or standard reference works are referred to simply by their editors. In referencing Cyprian's letters, we have sometimes inserted *Hartel* following the reference to indicate his numbering of the letters, which differs substantially from the ANF numbering. Frequently, well-known works of ancient authors are referred to by abbreviations either in Latin or in English without further explanation. We have followed the lead of the Italian edition in this regard, allowing Latin to stand as is and translating Italian into English. Occasionally, it has seemed preferable to use an unambiguous Latin title rather than a loose English title.

In the interests of space, we have frequently used abbreviations for common words ("c." for either "century" or "centuries"; "ca." for "circa"; "esp." for "especially"; "acc." for "according"). We trust these will not prove an obstacle to our readers.

It has been a joy to work together in providing readers with this marvelous resource. We hope you will find much of value within it and be spurred to further research.

CONTRIBUTORS

ALAND, Barbara, University of Münster
ALEO, Francesco, Studio Teologico San Paolo, Catania
ALLEN, Pauline, Catholic University, Brisbane
AMATA, Biagio, Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
AMODIO, Mara, University of Naples Federico II
ANGRISANI SANFILIPPO, Maria Luisa, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
APPELLA, Antonio, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
AULISA, Immacolata, University of Bari
BACKUS, Irena, University of Geneva
BAGATTI, Bellarmino (†), Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Jerusalem
BARNEA, Jon (†), University of Bucharest
BEATRICE, Pier Franco, University of Padua
BETTIOLO, Paolo, University of Venice
BIANCHI, Ugo (†), University of Rome "La Sapienza"
BIANCO, Maria Grazia, Libera Universitá Maria SS. Assunta, Rome
BISCONTI, Fabrizio, University of Rome Tre; Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome
BOLGIANI, Franco, University of Turin
BØRRESEN, Kari, University of Oslo
BORZÌ, Salvatore, University of Catania
BOU MANSOUR, Tanios, Holy Spirit University of Kaslik
BRAIDOTTI, Cecilia, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
BRANDENBURG, Hugo, Istituto Archeologico Germanico, Rome
BROCCOLI, Umberto, Rome
BROCK, Sebastian P., Oxford University
BUENACASA, Carles, University of Barcelona
BURINI DE LORENZI, Clara, University of Perugia
CABRERA MONTERO, Juan Antonio, Augustinianum, Rome
CALCAGNINI CARLETTI, Daniela, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
CALTABIANO, Matilde, University of Milan
CAMBI, Nenad, University of Split
CAMPLANI, Alberto, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
CANART, Paul, Vatican Apostolic Library, Vatican City
CANTINO WATAGHIN, Gisella, University of Eastern Piedmont, Vercelli
CAPONE, Alessandro, University of Salento
CARLETTI, Carlo, University of Bari
CARR, Ephrem, Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
CARUSO, Giuseppe, Augustinianum, Rome
CATTANEO, Enrico, Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome
CAVALCANTI, Elena (†), University of Rome Tre
CECCHELLI, Margherita, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
CHAHINE, Charbel, University of Saint Joseph, Beirut
CHUPUNGCO, Anscar, Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome
CICCARESE, Maria Pia, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
CIMOSA, Mario, Salesian Pontifical University; Augustinianum, Rome
CIPRIANI, Nello, Augustinianum, Rome
CLAUSI, Benedetto, University of Calabria
COCCHINI, Francesca, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
CONSOLINO, Franca Ela, University of L'Aquila
CONTI, Marco, Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
COSTANZA, Salvatore (†), University of Messina
COYLE, Kevin J., University of Ottawa
CROUSE, Robert, University of Halifax; Augustinianum, Rome
CROUZEL, Henri (†), Catholic Institute of Toulouse; Augustinianum, Rome
CURTI, Carmelo (†), University of Catania
CUSCITO, Giuseppe, University of Trieste
D'ANNA, Alberto, University of Rome Tre
DAL COVOLO, Enrico, Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
DALMAIS, Irénée-Henri (†), Catholic Institute of Paris
DASSMANN, Ernst, Franz Josef Dölger Institute, Bonn

DATTRINO, Lorenzo, Lateran Pontifical University, Rome
DE ANDIA, Ysabel, Catholic Institute of Paris
DE ANGELIS, Bernardo, Bologna
DE BERNARDI FERRERO, Daria, Polytechnic of Turin
DE LUIS, Pio, Augustinian Seminary, Valladolid
DE NAVASCUÉS, Patricio, San Dámaso, Madrid; Augustinianum, Rome
DE NICOLA, Angelo, University of Pavia
DE PALOL, Pedro, University of Barcelona
DE SIMONE, Russell J., Villanova University, USA; Augustinianum, Rome
DELL'OSSO, Carlo, Istituto Teologico Pugliese, Molfetta; Augustinianum, Rome
DEN BIESEN, Kees, Terni
DERITIOTIS, Lazaros, Archaeological Museum, Larissa
DI BERARDINO, Angelo, Augustinianum, Rome
DI NINO, Antonella, Rome
DÍAZ Y DÍAZ, Manuel C. (†), University of Compostela
DRESKEN-WEILAND, Jutta, University of Regensburg
DROBNER, Hubertus R., Theologische Fakultät, Paderborn; Augustinianum, Rome
DUJČEV, Ivan (†), Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia
DULAEY, Martine, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
DUVAL, Noël, University of Paris IV (Paris-Sorbonne)
EVANS, G. R., University of Cambridge
FAHEY, Patrick, Augustinianum, Rome; Sydney
FALLA CASTELFRANCHI, Marina, University of Salento, Lecce
FARINA, Raffaele, Vatican Library, Vatican City
FASOLA, Umberto (†), Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome
FATTI, Federico, University of Perugia
FÉVRIER, Paul-Albert (†), University de Provence
FILORAMO, Giovanni, University of Turin
FIOCCHI NICOLAI, Vincenzo, University of Rome Tor Vergata; Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome
FITZGERALD, Allan, Augustinianum, Rome
FLORES, Miguel, Madrid
FOLGADO, Segundo (†), Royal University College Maria Cristina, El Escorial; Augustinianum, Rome
FONTAINE, Jacques, University of Paris IV (Paris-Sorbonne)
FORLIN PATRUCCO, Marcella, University of Turin
FREND, William H.C. (†), University of Glasgow
GARRISI, Alessandro, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
GELSI, Daniele (†), Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome
GHILARDI, Massimiliano, Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
GIANNARELLI, Elena, University of Florence
GIANOTTO, Claudio, University of Turin
GIORDANI, Roberto, University of Perugia
GIRARDI, Mario, University of Bari
GIUNTELLA, Anna Maria (†), University of Chieti
GORI, Franco, University of Urbino; Augustinianum, Rome
GRAPPONE, Antonio, Vatican City
GRECH, Prosper, Augustinianum, Rome
GRÉGOIRE, Réginald, University of Pavia
GRIBOMONT, Jean (†), Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
GRISBROOKE, W. Jardine (†), Oscott College, West Midlands, Great Britain
GROSSI, Vittorino, Lateran Pontifical University, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
GROSSMANN, Peter, German Archaeological Institute, Cairo
GUARDUCCI, Margherita (†), University of Rome "La Sapienza"
HAMMAN, Adalbert (†), Augustinianum, Rome
HANSON, Richard (†), University of Manchester
HEID, Stefan, Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome
HEN, Yitzhak, University of the Negev, Beersheba
HONINGS, Bonifacio, Lateran Pontifical University, Rome
IOANNIDIS, Fotios, University of Thessaloniki
IRMSCHER, Johannes (†), Berlin Academy of Sciences
JIMÉNEZ, Juan Antonio, Universidad Central de Barcelona
JIMÉNEZ, Oscar, Augustinianum, Rome
KANNENGIESSER, Charles, Concordia University, Montreal
KINZIG, Wolfram, University of Bonn
KLIJN, Albertus, F.J., University of Groningen
LABATE, Antonio, University of Messina

LADOCSI, Gaspar, Seminary of Esztergom
LAHEY, Lawrence, Tulane University, New Orleans
LAM, Joseph Cong Quy, Würzburg
LAVENANT, René, Sources Chrétiennes, Lyon
LE DÉAUT, Roger (†), Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome
LEAL, Jerónimo, Pontifical University of the Holy Cross, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
LEANZA, Sandro (†), University of Messina
LECUYER, Joseph (†), Lateran Pontifical University, Rome
LENTINO, Francesco, Pontifical Theological Faculty, Naples
LIBAMBU, Michel, Catholic University of Congo, Kinshasa
LILLA, Salvatore, Vatican Apostolic Library, Vatican City; Augustinianum, Rome
LOASSES, Chiara, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
LOI, Vincenzo (†), University of Cagliari
LOMBINO, Vincenzo, Pontifical Theological Faculty, Palermo
LONGOBARDO, Luigi, Pontifical Theological Faculty, Naples
LOUTH, Andrew, University of Durham
LUISELLI, Bruno, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
MALASPINA, Elena, University of Rome Tre; Libera Universitá Maria SS. Assunta, Rome
MALINGREY, Anne-Marie (†), University of Lille
MARA, Maria Grazia, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
MARCHETTA, Antonio, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
MARINONE, Mariangela, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
MARITANO, Mario, Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
MARONE, Paola, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
MATTEI, Paul, University of Lyon; Sources Chrétiennes, Lyon
MAYMÓ I CAPDEVILA, Pere, Universidad Central de Barcelona
MAZZEI, Barbara, Pontifical Commission of Sacred Archaeology, Vatican City
MAZZOLENI, Danilo, Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome; University of Rome Tre
MEES, Michele (†), Augustinianum, Rome
MELONI, Pietro, Bishop of Nuoro
MENDOZA, Mario, Augustinianum, Rome
MILAZZO, Vincenza, University of Catania
MILELLA, Alessandra, Rome
MIMOUNI, Simon-Claude, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
MIRABELLA ROBERTI, Mario (†), University of Trieste
MONACI CASTAGNO, Adele, University of Vercelli
MONTECCHIO, Luca, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
MORESCHINI, Claudio, University of Pisa; Augustinianum, Rome
MUNIER, Charles, University of Strasbourg
NALDINI, Mario (†), University of Perugia
NARDI, Carlo, Pontifical Theological Faculty, Florence
NAUTIN, Pierre (†), University of Paris IV (Paris-Sorbonne)
NAVARRA, Leandro, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
NAZZARO, Antonio, University of Naples
NEUNHEUSER, Burkhard (†), Monastery of Maria Laach; Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome
NOCE, Carla, University of Rome Tre; Augustinianum, Rome
NOCENT, Adrien (†), Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome
NOVEMBRI, Valeria, University of Florence
NUZZO, Daniela, University of Salento, Lecce
ODROBINA, Lázlo, University of Szgeged
OPELT, Ilona (†), University of Düsseldorf
ORBE, Antonio (†), Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome
ORLANDI, Tito, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
OSBORN, Eric, University of Melbourne
PADOVESE, Luigi (†), Pontifical University Antonianum, Rome; Apostolic Vicar of Anatolia
PAINTER, Kenneth, British Museum, London
PALLAS, Demetrios (†), University of Athens
PALMIERI, Mauro, Istituto Teologico Abruzzese-Molisano, Chieti
PANI ERMINI, Letizia, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
PANI, Giancarlo, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
PAPPALARDO, Carmelo, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Jerusalem

PASCHOUD, François, University of Geneva
PASQUATO, Ottorino, Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
PAVAN, Vincenzo, University of Bari
PELEKANIDOU, Elli, Thessaloniki
PELLAND, Gilles, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome
PELLEGRINO, Michele Cardinal (†), Turin
PERETTO, Elio, University of Chieti; Marianum, Rome
PERGOLA, Philippe, Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome
PERRAYMOND, Myla, University of Rome Tre
PERRONE, Lorenzo, University of Bologna
PIERI, Francesco, Fac. Teologica dell'Emilia-Romagna, Bologna
PIETRI, Charles (†), University of Paris IV (Paris-Sorbonne); Augustinianum, Rome
PIETRI, Luce, University of Paris IV (Paris-Sorbonne)
PILARA, Gianluca, Libera Universitá Maria SS. Assunta, Rome
PINELL, Jordi (†), Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome
PIZZANI, Ubaldo, University of Perugia
POLLARD, T. Evan, University of Otago, Dunedin
POLLASTRI, Alessandra, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
PRICOCO, Salvatore, University of Catania
PRINZIVALLI, Emanuela, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
QUAQUARELLI, Antonio (†), University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
RAINERI, Osvaldo, Vatican Apostolic Library, Vatican City
RAMELLI, Ilaria, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan
RAPISARDA, Grazia, University of Catania
RAPONI, Santino (†), Accademia Alfonsiana, Rome
RECCHIA, Vincenzo (†), University of Bari
RICCI, Cristina, University of Bern
RIGHI, Davide, FacoltàTeologica dell'Emilia-Romagna, Bologna
RILLIET, Frédéric, Geneva
ROBERTO, Umberto, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
ROMERO POSE, Eugenio (†), Auxiliary Bishop of Madrid
RONZANI, Rocco, Augustinianum, Rome
RORDORF, Willy, University of Neuchâtel
ROUILLARD, Philippe, Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome
RUBIO, José Fernando, Universidad Externado de Colombia; Pontifical Lateran University, Rome
SALES, Jordina, University of Barcelona
SALZANO, Aniello, University of Salerno
SAMULOWITZ, Stefan, Paderborn
SANTAGATA, Giuliana, Rome
SARDELLA, Teresa, University of Catania
SAUGET, Joseph-Marie (†), Vatican Apostolic Library, Vatican City; Augustinianum, Rome
SAXER, Victor (†), Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
SCHEMBRA, Rocco, Catania
SCORZA BARCELLONA, Francesco, University of Rome Tor Vergata
SEVERIN, Hans-Georg, Berlin
SFAMENI GASPARRO, Giulia, University of Messina
SHERIDAN, Mark, Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum; Augustinianum, Rome
SIMONETTI, Manlio, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
SINISCALCO, Paolo, University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
SMOLAK, Kurt, University of Vienna
SÖLL, Georg (†), Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
SOTOMAYOR, Manuel, Pontifical Faculty of Theology, Granada
SPERA, Lucrezia, University of Rome Tor Vergata; Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
ŠPIDLÍK, Thomas Cardinal, Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome
SPINELLI, Mario, Augustinianum, Rome
STAROWIEYSKI, Marek, University of Warsaw; Augustinianum, Rome
STEAD, George Christopher (†), University of Cambridge
STEWART-SYKES, Alistair, Dorset, Great Britain
STIERNON, Daniel, Lateran Pontifical University, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
STUDER, Basil(†), Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome; Augustinianum, Rome
TESTINI, Pasquale (†), University of Rome "La Sapienza"; Augustinianum, Rome
TIBILETTI, Carlo (†), University of Macerata

TRAPÈ, Agostino (†), Augustinianum, Rome
TREVIJANO, Ramón, Pontifical University of Salamanca
TRIACCA, Achille (†), Salesian Pontifical University, Rome
TUREK, Waldemar, Pontificia Università Urbaniana, Rome
UNGARO TESTINI, Lucrezia, Sovrintendenza Beni Culturali, Rome
UTHEMANN, Karl-Heinz, University of Utrecht
UTRO, Umberto, Vatican Museum, Vatican City; Augustinianum, Rome
VALERIANI, Emanuela, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
VAN ESBROEK, Michael (†), Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome; University of Monaco
VANYÓ, Lazló (†), University of Budapest
VICIANO, Albert, University of Murcia
VILELLA, Josep, University of Barcelona
VOGEL, Cyril (†), University of Strasbourg
VOGT, Hermann, University of Tübingen
VOICU, Sever J., Vatican Apostolic Library, Vatican City; Augustinianum, Rome
WALLRAFF, Martin, University of Bern; Augustinianum, Rome
WEBER, Dorothea, University of Vienna
WIPSZYCKA, Ewa, University of Warsaw
YARNOLD, Edward (†), University of Oxford
ZANGARA, Vincenza, University of Turin
ZINCONE, Sergio, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
ZOCCA, Elena, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
ZUPI, Massimiliano, Gregorian Pontifical University; Saint Anselm Pontifical Athenaeum, Rome

BIBLICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Acts	Acts of the Apostles
Amos	Amos
Bar	Baruch
Bel	Bel and the Dragon
1-2 Chr	1-2 Chronicles
Col	Colossians
1-2 Cor	1-2 Corinthians
Dan	Daniel
Dt	Deuteronomy
Eccl	Ecclesiastes
Eph	Ephesians
1-2 Esd	Esdras
Esth	Esther
Ex	Exodus
Ezek	Ezekiel
Ezra	Ezra
Gal	Galatians
Gen	Genesis
Hab	Habakkuk
Hag	Haggai
Heb	Hebrews
Hos	Hosea
Is	Isaiah
Jas	James
Jdth	Judith
Jer	Jeremiah
Jgs	Judges
Jn	John
1-3 Jn	1-3 John
Job	Job
Joel	Joel
Jon	Jonah
Josh	Joshua
Jude	Jude
1-2 Kgs	1-2 Kings
Lam	Lamentations
Lev	Leviticus
Lk	Luke
1-4 Macc	1-4 Maccabees
Mal	Malachi
Mk	Mark
Mic	Micah
Mt	Matthew
Nah	Nahum
Neh	Nehemiah
Num	Numbers
Obad	Obadiah
1-2 Pet	1-2 Peter
Phil	Philippians
Philem	Philemon
Pr	Proverbs
Pr Azar	Prayer of Azariah
Ps	Psalms
Rev	Revelation
Rom	Romans
Ruth	Ruth
1-2 Sam	1-2 Samuel
Sir	Sirach
Song	Song of Songs
Sus	Susanna
1-2 Th	1-2 Thessalonians
1-2 Tim	1-2 Timothy
Tit	Titus
Tob	Tobit
Wisd	Wisdom of Solomon
Zech	Zechariah
Zeph	Zephaniah

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Approximate abbreviations that can be easily understood are not included in this list.

AA	Archäologischer Anzeiger, Berlin, 1896–
AAAd	Antichità altoadriatiche, Udine 1972–
AAAH	Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam spectantia, Oslo 1962
AAP	Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana, Naples 1832–
AAPal	Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo
AARC	Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana
AAS	Acta apostolicae sedis, Vatican City 1909–
AASS	Acta Sanctorum, ed. Socii Bollandiani, Antwerpen 1643–; Venice 1734–; Paris 1863–
AAT	Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filosofiche, Turin
AATC	Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere "La Colombaria." Florence
AAWB	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin, 1788–
AAWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1942–
AAWW	Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna
AB	Analecta Bollandiana, Brussels
ABAW	Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.–hist. Klasse, Munich
ABR	The American Benedectine Review, Collegeville, MN
ABSA	Annual of the British School at Athens, London
AC	F.J. Dölger, *Antike und Christentum*, Münster i.W. 1929–1950
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, ed. Th.C. Oden, Downers Grove, IL 1998-2010
AClass	Acta Classica: Journal of the Classical Association of South Africa, Pretoria
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, ed. E. Schwartz – J. Straub, Berlin 1914–
ACT	Ancient Christian Texts, ed. Th.C. Oden and G.L. Bray, Downers Grove, IL 2009–
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. Quasten – J.C. Plumpe, Westminster, MD – London 1946–
AD	Archaiologikon Deltion, Athens, 1915–
ADAW	Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1815–
AE	Archaiologikè Ephemerís, Athens
AEA	Archivo Español de Arqueología, Madrid
AEHE, IVe sect.	Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, IVe section, Sciences hist. et philol., Paris
Aevum	Aevum. Rassegna di Scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche, Milan

AFLM	Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, University of Macerata
AFLPer	Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, University of Perugia
AG	Analecta Gregoriana, Rome 1930–
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AHC	Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum, Amsterdam
AHB	Ancient History Bulletin, Calgary 1987–
AHP	Archivum Historiae Pontificiae, Rome 1963–
AIPhO	Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles
AJ	Apocryphon Johannis
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology, New York 1897–
AJPh	American Journal of Philology, Baltimore 1880–
AJT	American Journal of Theology, Chicago 1897-1920
AK	Antike Kunst, published by Vereinigung der Freunde antiker Kunst in Basel, Olten
AKGWG	Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen and Philologisch-Historische Klasse
AKPA	Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophich-Historische Klasse, Berlin
Allen	P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian*, Louvain 1981
ALMA	Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi, Brussels
Altaner	B. Altaner - A. Stuiber, *Patrologia*, Turin ^{7}1977
ALW	Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft, Fribourg 1950–
ANF	Ante-Nicene Fathers (reprint Grand Rapids, MI 1950–)
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Berlin
AnSE	Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi, Bologna 1984–
AnTh	L'Année théologique
AntTard	Antiquité tardive: revue internationale d'histoire et d'archéologie (IV^{e}-VIII^{e} s.), Turnhout 1993–
ARAM	Aram Periodical, Leuven 1989–
AS	Anatolian Studies. Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, London
ASE	Anglo-Saxon England, Cambridge
ASNP	Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa
AST	*Analecta Sacra Tarrconensia*, Barcelona
AugL	Augustinus Lexikon, Basel-Stuttgart 1986–
AugM	Augustinus Magister
BA	Bibliothèque Augustinienne. Œuvres de S. Augustin, Paris 1949–
BAA	Bulletin d'Archéologie algérienne, Algiers
BAB	Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Brussels
BAC	Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Madrid 1954–

BACr	Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana, Rome 1863–1894
BAGB	Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé, Paris
BALAC	Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes, Paris
Bardenhewer	O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, I, 1902 (²1913); II (²1914); III (²1923); IV, 1924; V, 1931
Baumstark	A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922
Baz	Bazmavep, Venice 1943–
BBKL	Biographisch-Bibliographischen Kirchenlexikon, Herzberg
BbM	Banber Matenadarani
BCH	Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Paris
BCLL	M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, with foreword by Proisians MacCanna, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature. 400–1200*, Dublin 1985
BECh	Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, Geneva
Beck	H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich ²1977
Bedjan	*Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (syriace), ed. P. Bedjan, 7 vols., Paris 1890–1897
BEL-Subs.	Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia
Benoit, Sarc.	F. Benoit, *Sarcophages paléochrétiens de Arles et de Marseille*, Paris 1952
Bertolini	O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
Bettiolo, *Lineamenti*	P. Bettiolo, *Lineamenti di patrologia siriaca*, in *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1985, 503–603
BG	Berolinensis Gnosticus 8502
BGPhM	Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Münster
BHG	Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca, ed. Socii Bollandiani, Brussels ³1957
BHL	Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina, ed. Socii Bollandiani, 2 vols., Brussels 1898–1901 (reprint 1949) Supplementum ²1911
BHO	Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis, ed. P. Peeters, Brussels 1910
BIAO	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale, Cairo
BiblPatr	Biblioteca Patristica
BICS	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London
BIEH	Boletín del Instituto de Estudios helénicos, Barcelona
Bieler	L. Bieler, *Ireland and the Culture of Early Medieval Europe*, London 1987
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
BKV	Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, ed. F.X. Reithmayr - V. Thalhofer, Kempten 1869–1888
BKV²	Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, ed. O. Bardenhewer - T. Schermann - C. Weyman, Kempten–Munich 1911–1930
BKV³	Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Zweite Reihe, ed. O. Bardenhewer - J. Zellinger - J. Martin, Munich 1932–1938

Blaise	Albert Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens***.** Turnhout, 1954-1967, ^{2}2005
BLE	Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique, Toulouse 1877–
BLTW	*Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A.A. Hamilton Thompson, Oxford 1935
BO	S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, 3 vols., Rome 1719–1728
Bolton	W.F. Bolton, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature (597–1066)*, vol. 1, Princeton 1967
Bonser	W. Bonser, *An Anglo-Saxon and Celtic Bibliography (450–1087)*, 2 vols., Oxford 1957
Bovini, Sarc.	G. Bovini, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani della Spagna*, Vatican City 1954
BROB	Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek, 1950-2006
Brown, Bede	G.H. Brown, *Bede the Venerable*, Boston 1987
Brunhölzl	F. Brunhölzl, *Histoire de la littérature latine du moyen age*, tr. H. Rochais, 4 vols., Turnhout 1990–
BS	Bibliotheca Sanctorum, Rome 1961–
BSEAA	Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y de Arqueología, Valladolid
BSNAF	Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France, Paris 1871–
BStudLat	Bollettino di Studi Latini, Naples
BT	Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig
BullMusRoyArtHist	Bulletin des Musées royaux d'art et d'histoire, Brussels 1901–
BVAB	Bulletin van de Vereeniging tot Bevordering der Kennis van de Antieke Beschaving, Leiden 1926–
Byzantion	Byzantion. Revue internationale des Études byzantines, Brussels
ByzF	Byzantinische Forschungen, Amsterdam
ByzS	Byzantinoslavica, Prague.
ByzZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift, Munich
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
BzA	Beiträge zur Altertumskunde
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, Berlin 1882–1909
CahSion	Cahiers Sioniens : Revue trimestrielle, Paris 1947–1955.
CALMA	Compendium Auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevii (500–1500), SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo, Florence 2000–
CANT	M. Geerard, *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, Turnhout 1992
CArch	Cahiers Archéologiques. Fin de l'antiquité et Moyen Age, Paris
Cath	Catholicisme, Paris 1948–
CAVT	J.C. Haelewyck, *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*, Turnhout 1998
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington DC 1939–
CCAB	Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina, Bologna

CCAp	Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum, Turnhout
CCC	Civiltà Classica e Cristiana
CCG	Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca, Turnhout 1977–
CCL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, Turnhout 1953–
CCHag	Corpus Christianorum Hagiographies
CCM	Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, Turnhout 1966–
CD	Ciudad de Dios, El Escorial
CE	*The New Catholic Encyclopedia,* New York 1967
CEA	Collection d'études anciennes
Cecchelli, Rabb. Gosp.	C. Cecchelli - G. Furlani - M. Salmi, *The Rabbula Gospel*, Lausanne 1959
CF	Classical Folia. Studies in the Christian Perpetuation of the Classics, New York
CFP	Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini: Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina, Florence 1989–
CGG	*Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Grillmeier - H. Bacht, Würzburg 1951–1954; reprint 1962
Chabot	J.B. Chabot, *La littérature syriaque*, Paris 1935
Charlesworth	J. H. Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* 2 vols., New Haven, 1983–1985
Chevalier, Rep. Hymn.	U. Chevalier, *Repertorium Hynnologicum*, 6 vols., Louvain 1882–1921
ChHist	Church History. American Society of Church History, Chicago
ChQ	Church Quaterly
ChrOr	Christian Orient, Kerala, India, 1980–
CI	Codex Justinianus
CIG	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, Berolini 1828–1877
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Berolini 1869–
CISA	Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia antica, Milan 1972–2002
CivCatt	La Civiltà Cattolica, Naples, then Rome 1850–
CJ	Corpus Juris Civilis, Justinian
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
CLA	E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 12 vols., Oxford 1934–1972
CM	Classica et Mediaevalia, Copenhagen
CMCS	Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire
CMG	Corpus Medicorum Graecorum
Coccia	E. Coccia, *La cultura irlandese precarolina miracolo o mito?*: SM 8 (1967) 257–420
Cod. *Barb. lat.*	Codex *Barberini Latinus*,Vatican
CoeD	Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, Bologna ^{3}1973
Cordiolani	A. Cordiolani, *Les traités de comput du haut moyen âge*: ALMA 17 (1943) 51–72
CORPUS	G. Valenti Zucchini - M. Bucci, *Corpus della scultura paleocristiana bizantina ed altomedievale di Ravenna, II. I sarcofagi a figure e a carattere simbolico*, Rome 1968

CP	Corona Patrum
CPG	M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, Turnhout 1974–
CPG/S	*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, Supplement
CPh	Classical Philology, Chicago
CPL	E. Dekkers - A. Gaar, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, [3]1996 (SEJG 3)
CPPM	Clavis Patristica Pseudoepigraphorum Medii Aevi, Brepols, Turnhout, I, 1990; II, 1994
CPS	Corona Patrum Salesiana, Turin 1934–
CQ	Classical Quarterly, Oxford
CRAI	Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris
Craveri	M. Craveri, *I vangeli apocrifi*, Turin 1969
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Paris-Louvain 1903–
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vienna 1865–
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Bonn 1828–1897
CSt	Cristianesimo nella Storia, Bologna 1980–
CTh	Codex Theodosianus
CTNT	Commentario teologico del Nuovo Testamento
CTP	Collana di testi patristici, Rome 1976–
CUF	Collection des universités des France, Paris 1920–
DA	Dissertation Abstracts, Ann Arbor, MI 1938–
DACL	*Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* Paris 1907–1953
DAFC	*Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi Catholique*, Paris 1909–1931
DAGR	*Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* ed. Ch. Daremberg - E. Saglio, Paris 1877–1919
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible,* Paris 1895–1912
DBF	*Dictionnaire de biographie française,* Paris 1923–
DBI	*Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani,* Rome 1960–
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément,* Paris 1926–
DCB	*Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines,* ed. W. Smith - H. Wace, 4 vols., London 1887
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* Paris 1924–1965
Delehaye PM	H. Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Brussels 1921
Denis	*Concordance grecque des pseudepigraphes d'Ancien testament: concordance, corpus des textes, indices*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1987
DHEE	*Diccionario de Historia eclesiástica de España,* Madrid 1972–1975
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique,* Paris 1909–
Díaz	M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Index Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi Hispanorum*, Madrid 1959
Diehl	E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, 3 vols., Berlin 1925–1931; ed. J. Moreau, [2]1961
Diekamp	F. Diekamp, ed. *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi*, Münster 1907; II ed. magazine, ed. B. Phanourgakis - E. Chrysos, Münster 1981

DIP	*Dizionario degli Istituti di perfezione,* Rome 1974–
DissA	Dissertation Abstracts, Ann Arbor, MI 1938–
Diz. Ep.	Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane
DNP	*Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike,* ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider, Stuttgart 1996–
Domínguez del Val	U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispanocristiana*, 5 vols., Madrid 1997–2002
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Cambridge, MA 1941–
DPAC	*Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane,* ed. Angelo Di Berardino, Casale Monferrato 1983–1988
DPha	*Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques,* ed. R. Goulet, Paris 1989–
DR	Downside Review, Bath, Downside Abbey and Exeter
DS	H. Denzinger - A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, Freiburg-Barcelona [35]1973
DSp	*Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique,* Paris 1933–
DTC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* Paris 1903–1970
Duchesne LP	*Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, 2 vols., Paris 1886–1892; III ed. C. Vogel, 3 vols., 1955–1975
Duchesne, *Fastes*	L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 3 vols., Paris 1910
Duval	R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque*, Paris 1907
EAA	*Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, Classica e Orientale,* ed. R. Bianchi Bandinelli, Rome 1958–1961; Supplements 1970–
EAC	*Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, ed. A. Di Berardino, T.C. Oden, J.C. Elowsky, J. Hoover, 3 vols., Downers Grove, IL 2014.
EApC	Écrits *apocryphes chrétiens*, ed. F. Bovon - P. Geoltrain, Paris 1997
EAEHL	*Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* 4 vols., New York 1975–1978
EAM	*Enciclopedia dell'Arte Medievale,* Treccani, Rome 1991–2002
EB	Estudios Bíblicos, Madrid.
EC	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* Vatican City 1949–1954
EHBS	Epeterís Hetaireías Byzantinon Spoudon, Athens
EHR	English Historical Review
EI	*Enciclopedia Italiana* (Treccani), Rome 1929–1977, and Supplements
EJ	*Encyclopaedia Judaica,* Jerusalem 1971–
Elliott	J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation Based on M.R. James*, Oxford 1993
Emerton	E. Emerton, *The Letters of St. Boniface*, New York 1940
EntAC	Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique, Geneva 1954–
EO	Échos d'Orient, Bucharest
EOMIA	*Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima,* ed. C.H. Turner, 2 vols., Oxford 1899–1934
EPapi	*Enciclopedia dei Papi,* Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Treccani, Rome 2000

EphLit — Ephemerides Liturgicae, Vatican City

EphemMar — Ephemerides Mariologicae

Eranos — Eranos. Acta Philologica Suecana, Uppsala

Eranos-Jb — Eranos-Jahrbuch, Leiden

Erbetta — M. Erbetta, *Gli apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento*, Turin 1966–1981

ES — E. Flórez, *España Sagrada*, Madrid 1747–

Esposito — M. Esposito, *Latin Learning and Medieval Ireland*, London 1988

EstEcl — Estudios Eclesiásticos, Madrid

EtByz — Études Byzantines, Bucharest

EThL — Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, Louvain

EtudTheolRelig — Études théologiques et religieuses, Montpellier

ExcPhilol — Excerpta philologica, Cádiz 1991–

FBSM — Forschungen und Berichte, published by Staatlichen Museen, Berlin

FC — The Fathers of the Church, ed. R.J. Deferrari, New York 1947–

FCh — Fontes Christiani, Freiburg 1990–2001, Turnhout 2002–

Fedalto — G. Fedalto, *Hierarchia ecclesiastica orientalis*, 2 vols., Padua 1988

Ferrua Via Latina — A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba della via Latina*, Vatican City 1960

FHG — Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, Paris 1841–1870

FIFAO — Fouilles de l'Institut Français d'archéologie orientale, Cairo

Fil&Teol — Filosophia e Teologia

FKDG — Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte

Fliche-Martin — A. Fliche - V. Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, It. tr. Turin, I ^{2}1958; II ^{3}1972; III ^{3}1972; IV ^{3}1972; V ^{2}1971

FMS — Frühmittelalterliche Studien, Berlin

FP — Florilegium Patristicum, Bonn 1906–

FR — Felix Ravenna, Faenza

Frend — W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972

FRLANT — Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Göttingen 1903–

FS — Festschrift

FZPhTh — Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie, Freiburg 1954–

Gams — Pius Bonifatius Gams, *Series episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae,* Regensburg, 1873

Garrucci, Storia — R. Garrucci, *Storia dell'arte italiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa*, Prato 1873–1881

Gaudemet — J. Gaudemet, *Conciles gaulois du IV^{e} siècle*, SC 241, Paris 1977

GAZ B.A. — Gazette des Beaux–Arts, Paris

GCS — Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Leipzig–Berlin 1897–

GGA — Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, Göttingen

GGB — *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen*

	Sprache in Deutschland, ed. O. Brunner et al., Stuttgart 1972–1997
GIF	Giornale Italiano di Filologia, Rome
GLNT	Grande Lessico del Nuovo Testamento (trad. del TWNT), Brescia
GNO	*Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, ed. W. Jaeger, Leiden 1952–
Glotta	Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache, Göttingen
GRBS	Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, Duke University, Durham, NC
Grillmeier	A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Freiburg–Basel–Vienna 1979–
Griffe	E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*. 3 vols. Paris 1964–
Grumel, Regestes	V. Grumel, *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, *I*, *1*, Kadikoy–Bucharest 1932
HA	Handes Amsorya, Vienna
Harnack, Die Überlieferung	A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung und Bestand der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Leipzig 1893
Harp	The Harp, a Review of Syriac and Oriental Studies, Kottayam, Kerala, India 1989–
HAW	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Munich 1922–
HDG	Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Freiburg i.Br. 1956–
Hennecke–Schneemelcher	E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, edited by W. Schneemelcher, Berlin ^{4}1968–1971
Herzog	Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike, edited by R. Herzog and P. Lebrecht Schmidt, vol. IV, Munich 1989
Hfl–Lecl	C.J. v. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, tr. H. Leclercq, Paris 1907–1952
Histoire des Saints	*Histoire des saints et de la sainteté chrétienne*, ed. F. Chiovaro - J. Delumeau - A. Mandouze - B. Plongeron - P. Riché - C. Savart - A.Vauchez, 11 vols., Paris 1986–1988
Histoire littéraire de la France	P. Abraham - R. Desne, eds. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 10 vols., Paris 1974–1980
HJ	Historisches Jahrbuch, Münich, 1880–
HLL	Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike
Honigmann	E. Honigmann, *Évêques et Évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^{e} siècle*, CSCO 127, Louvain 1951
HTR	Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, MA
HWP	Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie. ed. Joachim Ritter et al, Basel - Darmstadt, 1971–2007
HWRhet	Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik, ed. Gert Ueding et al., Tübingen - Darmstadt, 1992–
ICL	D. Schaller – D. Könsgen, *Initia carminum latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum*, Göttingen 1997
ICR	G.B. de Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*, Rome 1857–1888; Suppl. fasc. I, ed. I. Gatti, 1915
ICUR	*Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, new series, Vatican City 1922–

IER	Irish Ecclesiastical Record
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae, Belin 1902–
IGCVO	K. Wessel - A. Ferrua - C. Carletti, *Inscriptiones graecae christianae veteres Occidentis,* Bari 1989
IHS	Irish Historical Studies
IJCT	International Journal of the Classical Tradition, New Brunswick, NJ 1994–
ILS	M. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, 3 vols., Berlin 1892–1916 ([3]1962)
Impellizzeri	S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina*, Florence 1975
Instr. Patr.	Instrumenta patristica, The Hague 1959–
IPA	Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, Rome
IstMitt	Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Istanbul 1933–
ITQ	Irish Theological Quarterly, Dublin
Jaffé	Ph. Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, reprint, Graz 1956
James	M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924
JAW	Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Berlin
JbAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Münster 1958–
JDAI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Berlin
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, London
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies, Baltimore 1993–
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History, London 1950–
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies, London
JJP	Journal of Juristic Papyrology
JKPh	Jahrbucher für klassische Philologie
JLW	Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, Münster 1921–
Joannou	P. Joannou, *Discipline générale antique*, Grottaferrata 1962–1963
JÖBG	Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft, Vienna 1951–1968
JÖEAI	Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts, Vienna 1898–
JÖEByz	Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik, Vienna 1969–
Jonkers	E.J. Jonkers, *Acta et symbola Conciliorum quae saeculo quarto habia sunt*, Leiden 1954
JourEthSt	Journal of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa, 1963–
JRH	Journal of Religious History, University of Sidney
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies, London
JRSAI	Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, Dublin
JS	Journal des Savants, Paris
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford
KAV	Kommentar zu den apostolischen Vätern
Kenney	E.F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, I, New York 1929

KfA	Kommentar zu frühchristlichen Apologeten
KLP	Der kleine Pauly, Stuttgart 1964–1976
Krumbacher	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*, Munich ^{2}1897
La MaisonD	La Maison–Dieu, Paris
Labourt	J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'Empire perse sous la dynastie Sassanide* (224–632), Paris 1904
LACL	Lexikon der Antiken Christlichen Literatur, ed. S. Döpp – W. Geerlings, Freiburg ^{3}2002
Lampe	G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexikon*, IV reprint with corrections and additions, Oxford 1976
Lapidge-Sharpe	M. Lapidge, R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*, Dublin 1985
Lauchert	F. Lauchert, *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien*, Freiburg i.Br. 1896 (reprint, Frankfurt 1961)
LCI	Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie
LCL	Loeb Classical Library, London–Cambridge, MA 1912–
Le Blant, Sarc.	E. Le Blant, *Les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule*, Paris 1886
LFC	Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, ed. G.B. Pusey – J. Keble – J.H. Newman, Oxford 1838–1888
Libyca	Libyca. Bulletin des services des antiquités, Algiers
LingBibl	Linguistica Biblica, Bonn-Röttgen, 1970–
Lipsius-Bonnet	R.A. Lipsius - M. Bonnet, eds., *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, Leipzig 1891, reprint 1972
LM	Lutherische Monatshefte
LMA	Lexikon des Mittelalters, Munich–Zürich 1977–
LNPF	A Select Library of Nicene and Post–Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Ph. Schaff – H. Wace (reprint Grand Rapids, MI 1951–)
LP	*Liber pontificalis* (*see* Duchesne LP)
LQF	Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, Münster i.W. 1902–1940; 1957–
LTK	Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, Freiburg i.Br. ^{2}1957–1965; ^{3}1993–2001
Maassen	F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande*, Graz 1870 (reprint Graz 1956)
MAE	Medium Aevum, Oxford
Magi	L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini (VI–VII sec.)*, Rome–Louvain 1972
MAL	Memorie della Classe di Scienze morali e storiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei, Rome
MAMA	Monumenta Asiae minoris antiqua, London 1928–
Manitius	Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, Munich 1923
Mansi	J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (reprint Graz 1960–1962)

Mansilla, *Geografía* I/II	D. Mansilla Reozo, *Geografía eclesiástica de España. Estudio histórico geográfico de las diócesis I y II*, Iglesia nacional Española, Rome 1994
Marienlexicon	Marienlexicon, ed. on behalf of the Institutum Marianum Regensburg by R. Bäumer and L. Scheffczyk, St. Ottilien, 6 vols., 1988–1994
Martínez Díez, *Hispana* IV/V	G. Martínez Díez – F.F. Rodriguey, *La colección canónica hispana*, IV, Barcelona– Madrid 1984; V, Madrid 1992
Maspero	J. Maspero, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises jacobites (518–616)*, Paris 1923
MD	Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici, Pisa 1978–
MDAI(K)	Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Cairo
MDAI(R)	Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Rome
MEFR	Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome
MEFRA	Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hannover–Berlin 1826–
MH	Museum Helveticum. Revue Suisse pour l'Etude de l'Antiquité classique, Bâle
MIL	Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo, Accademia di scienze e lettere. Classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche
MIOF	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung, Berlin
Mirbt	C. Mirbt – K. Aland, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, Tübingen [2]1967
MLatJb	*Mittellateinishces Jahrbuch*, Cologne
MM	Madrider Mitteilungen, Heidelberg
Monceaux	P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1901–1923
Moraldi	L. Moraldi, *Tutti gli apocrifi del NT*, 1–3, Casale Monferrato 1999–2001
Mordek	H. Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankreich*, Berlin 1975
Moricca	U. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*, Turin 1928–1934
MSLC	Miscellanea di studi di letteratura cristiana antica, Cantania 1949–
MSR	Mélanges de Science Religieuse, Lille
MTZ	Münchener theologische Zeitschrift, Munich
MUB	Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph, Beirut
MusAfr	Museum Africum, Ibadan, Nigeria
Muséon	Le Muséon. Revue d'Études Orientales, Louvain
MySal	Mysterium salutis: Grundriss heilsgeschichtlicher Dogmatik
NAC	Ernesto Bernareggi, ed., *Numismatica e Antichità Classiche*, Lugano: Arti grafiche Gaggini-Bizzozero, 1974
NAWG	Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.–hist. Klasse, Göttingen (cf. NGWG)
NBA	Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana. Opere di s. Agostino, Latin–Italian edition, ed. A. Trapè, Rome 1965–
NEAEHL	New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land, 5 vols., New York 1993.
Nestori	A. Nestori, *Repertorio topografico delle pitture delle catacombe romane*, Vatican City 1993

NGWG	Nachrichten (1884–1893: von) der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in (1884–1903: zu) Göttingen, Phil – hist. Klasse 1894–1933 (cf. NAWG)
NH	Nag Hammadi
NHC	The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, Leiden 1972–
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies, Leiden 1971–
Niermeyer	Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon minus, ed. J.F. Niermeyer – C. van de Kieft, Leiden 1993–
NovT	Novum Testamentum. An International Quarterly for New Testament and Related Studies, Leiden
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NP	Der Neue Pauly, Stuttgart–Weimar 1996–2003
NRTh	Nouvelle Revue Théologique, Louvain
NT	New Testament
NTS	New Testament Studies, Cambridge
OC	Oriens Christianus. Hefte für die Kunde des christlichen Orients, Wiesbaden
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta, Rome
OCD	S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary,* Oxford ^{3}1996
OCP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica, Rome
ODB	Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. A.P. Kazhdan et al., 3 vols., New York–Oxford 1991
ODC	The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F.L. Cross, London 1974
OEANE	Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East, ed. E.M. Meyers, New York 1997
OLP	Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica, Leuven
Opitz, A.W.	H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, Berlin–Leipzig 1936–1941
OrChr	Oriens Christianus, Rome
Orlandis, *Concilios*	J. Orlandis – D. Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los concilios de la España romana y visigoda*, Pamplona 1986
OrSyr	Orient Syrien, Paris
Ortiz de Urbina	I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia syriaca*, Rome ^{2}1965
OS	Ostkirchliche Studien, Würzburg
OT	Old Testament
OxP	The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, London 1896–
PAA	Praktikà tes Akademías Athenon, Athens
PAAH	Praktikà tes en Athenais Archaiologikes Hetaireías, Athens
Palazzini	Dizionario dei Concili, ed. P. Palazzini, Rome 1963–1967
PAC	H.I. Marrou et al., *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, 1982–
PAPhS	Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia
Patrologia	*Patrologia.* vol. III. I Padri latini (secoli IV–V), ed. A. Di Berardino, Turin 1978 (Sp. tr. BAC 422, Madrid 1981); vol. IV, Genoa 1996; vol. V, Genoa 2000

PbH	Patmabanasirakan Handes
PBSR	Papers of the British School at Rome, London
PCBE	Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas–Empire, Rome 1982–
PCPhS	Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge
PdO	Parole de l'Orient, Kaslik
Perrone	L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980
PG	Patrologiae cursus completus. J.-P. Migne, Series Graeca, Paris 1857–1866; 1928–1936
PhW	Philologische Wochenschrift, Leipzig
PL	Patrologiae cursus completus. J.-P. Migne, Series Latina, Paris 1841–1864
PLRE	The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Cambridge 1971–1980
PLS	Patrologiae Latinae Supplementum, ed. A. Hamman, Paris 1957–1971
PMS	Patristic Monograph Series
PO	Patrologia Orientalis, Paris 1903–, now published at Turnhout
POC	Proche-Orient chrétien, Jerusalem 1951–
Potthast	A. Potthast, Repertorium fontium historiae Medii Aevi, Rome 1962–
PP	Parola del Passato. Rivista di Studi antichi, Naples
PRIA	Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin
PS	Patrologia Syriaca, ed. R. Graffin, Paris 1894–1926
PSt	Patristic Studies, ed. R.J. Deferrari, Catholic University of America, Washington D.C. 1922–
PTA	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, Bonn 1968–
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien, Berlin 1963–
PWK	Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, ed. G. Wissowa – W. Kroll – K. Mittelhaus – K. Ziegler, Stuttgart 1893–
QC	Quaderni catanesi di studi classici e medievali, Catania 1979–1988.
QDipFLTCl	Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia, Linguistica e Tradizione Classica, Bologna 1995–
QLP	Questions Liturgiques et Paroissales
Quasten	J. Quasten, *Patrologia*, 2 vols., Turin 1967–1969; vol. III, ed. A. Di Berardino, Casale Monferrato 1978
RA	Revue Archéologique, Paris
RAAN	Rendiconti dell'Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti di Napoli, Naples
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Stuttgart 1950–
RAL	Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei, Rome
RAM	Revue d'ascétique et de mystique, Toulouse
RB	Reallexikon der Byzantinistik, Amsterdam 1968–
RBen	Revue Bénédictine, Abbaye de Maredsous
RBi	Revue Biblique, Paris

RBK	Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst, Stuttgart 1966–
RBPh	Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, Brussels
RCCM	Rivista di cultura classica e medievale, Rome
RCT	Revista Catalana de Teologia, Barcelona 1976–
RD	Revue Historique de Droit français et étranger, Paris
RDC	Revue de droit canonique, Strasbourg
RE	Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Leipzig ^{1}1854–1866, ^{2}1863–1888, ^{3}1896–1913
REA	Revue des Études Anciennes, Valence
REArm	Revue des Études Arméniennes, Paris
REAug	Revue des Études augustiniennes et patristiques, Paris 1955–
REB	Revue des Études Byzantines, Paris
RecAug	Recherches augustiniennes (Supplément à REAug), Paris
RecSR	Recherches de Science Religieuse, Paris
RecTh	Recherches théologiques. Faculté de théologie protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg, Paris
REG	Revue des Études Grecques, Paris
REL	Revue des Études Latines, Paris
Rend. Acc. Lincei	Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome
Rend. PARA	Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia; s. III, Rendiconti, Rome
Rep.	G. Bovini – H. Brandenburg – F.W. Deichmann, *Repertorium der christlichantiken Sarkophagen I: Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967
Repertorium	Repertorium Fontium Historiae Medii Aevi, Rome 1962–
RESE	Revue des Études sud-est-européennes, Bucharest
RET	Revista Española de Teología, Madrid
RevPhilol	Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes
RFIC	Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, Turin
RGG^{3}	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Tübingen ^{3}1957–1965
RGG^{4}	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Tübingen ^{4}1998–2005
RHCE	Repertorio de Historia de las Ciencias eclesiásticas en España, Salamanca 1967–1977
RHD	Revue d'histoire du droit, Groningen
RHE	Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, Louvain
RHEF	Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France, Paris
RHL	Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses, Paris
RhM	Rheinisches Museum, Frankfurt
RHPhR	Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, Paris
RHR	Revue de l'histoire des religions, Paris
RHT	Revue d'histoire des textes, Paris
RIA	Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di archeologia e storia dell'arte, Rome

RIL	Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo. Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche, Milan
RIN	Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini, Milan
Riv. lit.	Rivista liturgica, Turin–Leumann
Riv. St. Biz. Neoell.	Rivista di Studi bizantini e neoellenici, Rome
RivAC	Rivista di Archeologia cristiana
RivBib	Rivista biblica, Rome
Riv. Dioc. Mil.	Rivista Diocesana Milanese, Milan
RivStorItal	Rivista storica italiana, Naples 1884
RMAL	Revue du Moyen Âge Latin, Paris
ROC	Revue de l'Orient chrétien, Paris
ROE	Römisches Österreich. Jahresschrift der österreichischen Gesellschaft für Archäologie, Vienna
RomBarb	Romanobarbarica, Rome
RPAA	Rendiconti Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Rome 1921–
RPhL	Revue Philosophique de Louvain, Louvain
RQA	Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte, Freiburg i.Br
RSBN	Rivista di Studi bizantini e neoellenici, Rome 1964–
RSC	Rivista di Studi Classici, Turin
RSCI	Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia, Rome
RSLR	Rivista di Storia e Letteratura religiosa, Florence
RSO	Rivista degli studi orientali, Rome
RSPh	Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, Paris
RSR	Revue de Sciences Religieuses, Strasbourg
RTAM	Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Louvain
RThom	Revue thomiste, Bruges
RThPh	Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne
RTL	Revue Théologique de Louvain, Louvain
SA	Studia Anselmiana, Rome 1933–
SAB	Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philos.–hist. Klasse, Berlin
Sacchi	P. Sacchi, *Apocrifi dell'AT*, 1–2, Turin 1981, 1989, 3–5, Brescia 1997, 1999, 2000
SAe	Scriptores aethiopici (CSCO)
SAW	Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna, Philos.–hist. Klasse, Vienna
SBA	Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Abteilung, Munich
SBF	Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber annuus, Jerusalem
SC	Sources Chrétiennes, Paris 1941–
ScEc	Sciences Ecclésiastiques, Montreal 1948–1967

SCH	Studies in Celtic History, Cambridge
Schanz	M. Schanz (C. Hosius – G. Kruger), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Munich 1907–1920
Schneemelcher	W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 1–2, Tübingen [6]1990–1997
Schneemelcher ET	W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 1–2, ed. R McL. Wilson, Cambridge 1991-1992
ScTh	Scripta Theologica, Navarra 1969–
SDHI	Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris, Rome
SE	Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschappen, Steenbrugge, 1948– (from vol. 38 under the subtitle: A Journal on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity)
SEA	Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum
Sharpe	R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540*, Turnhout 1997
SHAW	Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg
SHHA	Studia Historica. Historia Antigua, Salamanca 1983–
SHib	Studia Hibernica
SIFC	Studi italiani di filologia classica, Florence
SISR	Società Italiana di Storia delle Religioni
Simonetti	M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975
SLH	Scriptores Latini Hiberniae
SM	Studi Medievali, Spoleto
SMGBZ	Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige Augsburg
SMSR	Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni, Rome
SNT	Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Leiden
SNTSMS	Soceity for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SO	Symbolae Osloenses, auspiciis Societatis Graeco-Latinae, Oslo
SP	Studia Patristica (in TU), ed. K. Aland – F.L. Cross, Berlin 1957–, then Leuven
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin.
SPFB	Sborník prací Filosofické fakulty brněnské univerzity
SPM	Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia, ed. C. Mohrmann – J. Quasten, Utrecht–Brussels 1950–
SSR	Studi Storico-Religiosi, University of Rome
ST	Studi e Testi, Vatican City 1900–
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
Starowieyski	M. Starowieyski, ed. *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, 1/1–2; 3, Kraków 2001, 2003
Stegmüller	F. Stegmüller et al., eds. *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi*, 11 vols. (1950-80)
Storia del cristianesimo	*Storia del cristianesimo*, ed. J.M. Mayeur – Ch. and L. Pietri – A. Vauchez – M. Venard, vol. I. *Il Nuovo popolo (Dalle origini al 250)*, Rome 2003, It. tr. (orig. Fr. 2000); vol. II. *La nascita di una cristianità (250–430)*, Rome 2000,

	It. tr. (orig. Fr. 1995); vol. III. *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, Rome 2002, It. tr. (orig. Fr. 1998)
StudAns	Studia Anselmiana, Rome
StudBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature
StudMon	Studia Monastica, Barcelona
StudPhilon	Studia Philonica Annual, Atlanta 1989–
StudRom	Studi Romani. Rivista bimestrale dell'Istituto di Studi Romani, Rome
SVF	Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, ed. Jo. von Armin, 4 vols., Stuttgart 1906
Synoden	J. Orlandis – D. Ramos-Lissón, *Die Synoden auf der Iberischen Halbinsel bis zum Einbruch des Islam (711)*, Paderborn 1981
SVGB	Schriften des Vereins für Geschichte des Bodensees
SZG	Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte, Zürich
TAD	Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi, Ankara 1933–
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Grand Rapids 1964–1976
Théol. Hist.	Théologie Historique, Paris 1953–
ThGl	Theologie und Glaube, Paderborn 1909–
Thiel	Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, Brunsbergae 1868
ThLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig 1900–
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung, Berlin
ThQ	Theologische Quartalschrift, Tübingen
ThRev	Theologische Revue, Münster
ThRu	Theologische Rundschau, Tübingen
ThS	Theological Studies, Baltimore
Tillemont	S. Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols., Paris 1693–1712
TIP	Temi di iconografia paleocristiana, ed. and intro. by F. Bisconti, Vatican City 2000
Torsy	J. Torsy, *Lexikon der Deutschen Heiligen*, Cologne 1959
TPAPA	Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association
TRE	Theologische Realenzyklopädie, Berlin–New York 1976–
TSt	Texts and Studies, ed. J.A. Robinson, Cambridge 1891–
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians, Liverpool
TTZ	Trierer theologische Zeitrschrift, Trier
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Leipzig–Berlin 1882–
Turner	cf. EOMIA
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Stuttgart 1953–
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel 1945–
VChr	Vigiliae Christianae. A Review of Early Christian Life and Language, Amsterdam
VChrS	Vigiliae Christianae Supplements, Leiden

Verzeichnis	H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Siegel*, Freiburg i.Br 1995
VetChr	Vetera Christianorum, Bari
Vies des SS.	J. Baudot et Chaussin, *Vies des Saints et des Bienheureux*, Paris 1935–1959
Vives, *Concilios*	J. Vives, *Los concilios visigodos e hispano–romanos*, Barcelona–Madrid 1963
Volbach–Hirmer	W.F. Volbach – M. Hirmer, *Arte paleocristiana*, Florence 1958
WD	Wort und Dienst
WK	J. Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*, Freiburg i.Br. 1903
WMM	J. Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV bis XIII Jahrhundert*, Freiburg i.Br. 1916
Wp	G. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane*, Rome 1903
Ws	G. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*, Vatican City 1929–1936
WS	Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie und Patristik, Vienna
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
Zahn	T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanon*, 2/1, Leipzig 1892 (Hildesheim 1975)
ZAC	Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum/Journal of Ancient Christianity, Berlin 1997–
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen mörgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, Stuttgart
ZKTh	Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Vienna
ZKWL	Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben, Leipzig
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche, Berlin
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Bonn
ZRGG	Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, Cologne 1948–
ZRG KA	Zeitschrift der Savigny–Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte (Kanonistische Abteilung), Weimar
ZRG RA	Zeitschrift der Savigny–Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte (Romanistische Abteilung), Weimar
ZThK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Tübingen

A

AARON (iconography). The oldest known representation—before 256—is in the *synagogue of *Dura Europos (Kraeling, pl. 60), where Aaron and the tabernacle are depicted (Ex 29).

In early Christian art, Aaron appears in the episodes of *Moses, e.g., on the Servanne *sarcophagus (late 4th c.; Ws 15) bearded, in tunic and pallium—like a sacred figure—among the crowd of men and women, while Moses receives the law (Ex 24:12-18). This basic formula is embellished in the mosaics found in the right aisle of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome (mid-5th c.) in the scenes of the murmuring of the Israelites (Ex 16:1-3), the fall of quails (Ex 16:11-13), the battle with the Amalekites (Ex 18:8-13) and the return of the explorers (Num 13:26-31). Also at Rome, on the 5th-c. door of S. *Sabina (Jeremias, pl. 27), Aaron changes the rods into serpents before Pharaoh (Ex 7:8-13). The image of Aaron is also on ivory objects (very probably, scroll in hand, next to Moses who strikes the rock, on an object dated 420–430, preserved in the British Museum: Volbach, n. 117), in miniatures (*Evangelarium* of Rabbula, 6th c. [by himself in priestly dress]: Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, pl. 3v; the 7th-c. Pentateuch of Ashburnham [in various scenes beside Moses]: von Gebhardt 1883; the 9th-c. codex of *Cosmas Indicopleustes, the prototype of which is from the 6th c. [alone in priestly dress]: Stornajolo, pl. 15). Lost evidence includes that of the meeting between Aaron and Moses present in the decorative cycle of S. Paolo fuori le Mura (see Cod. *Barb. Lat.* 4406), and that of Aaron and Moses before Pharaoh on the right wall of S. Peter's at the Vatican (see Cod. *Barb. lat.* 2733).

BS 2, 465ff.; LCI 1,2ff.; O. v. Gebhardt, *The Miniatures of the Ashburnham-Pentateuch,* London 1883; C. Stornajolo, *Le miniature della Topografia cristiana di Cosma Indicopleuste* (*Vat. gr.* 699), Milan 1908; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956; C.H. Kraeling, *The Synagogue: The Excavations at Dura Europos Final Report* 8, New Haven 1956; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters,* Mainz [3]1976; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom,* Tübingen 1980; D.H. Verkek, *Exodus and Easter Vigil in the Ashburnham Pentateuch:* The Art Bulletin 77 (1995) 94-105; N. Cavallaro, *Aronne* (s.v.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana,* ed. F. Bisconti, Rome 2000, 127.

D. Calcagnini

ABA (mar) (4th c.). Poet and disciple of Ephrem of *Nisibis, Aba is known for biblical commentaries on the OT (Job; Ps 42:9) and the *gospels, and for metrical exhortations in 5-syllable verse. Only some fragments of his literary production remain.

F. Nau, ROC 17 (1912) 69-73; Duval 64; Baumstark 66; Chabot 32; Ortiz de Urbina 86.

J.-M. Sauget

ABA I (mar). *Catholicos of the church of Persia (540-552). The importance of Aba I for the history of Persian Christianity is twofold, acting as he did both at the level of the exegetical and theological culture of the ecclesiastical schools, which he helped to spread, and at the level of the institutional structure of a church long characterized by external tensions and internal divisions. The information we have on his life and the little that is known of his literary production clearly evidence these two aspects of his activity.

Born of a Zoroastrian family, an employee of the *Sassanid cadaster, he converted from Zoroastrianism to the Christian religion and was baptized. At first he attended the famous school of *Nisibis, then went to the *Byzantine lands to study Greek, visiting *Constantinople and other parts of the Mediterranean, including *Egypt. Mar Aba, like his disciple *Thomas of Edessa, was known to *Cosmas Indicopleustes, who left a significant testimony about him (*Topografia Cristiana* II, 2). He then returned to Nisibis as a teacher; it is uncertain whether he also founded a theological school in the capital of the Sassanid Empire, *Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Elected ca-

tholicos (540-552), he undertook the reorganization of the church of *Persia, torn by an internal schism at the time, and traveled with other bishops through the ecclesiastical provinces. The acts of this itinerant synod have reached us thanks to the *Synodicon Orientale,* which also contains the canons of the council organized by Aba in 544: among these, other than the repeated prohibition of consanguineous marriages, common among the Persian aristocratic class, there clearly emerge, on the one hand, the intention of a more stable centralization of power in the hands of the catholicos of Persia, whose explicit authorization was required for the ordination of bishops or *metropolitans; and on the other hand the attempt to bind bishops, *presbyters and deacons (*see* Diakonia - Diaconate) to their respective dioceses. The endemic state of tension with the Zoroastrian clergy and with important functionaries of the Sassanid court brought Aba I persecutions and exile in Azerbaijan, though he was not condemned to death. Even during a later period of imprisonment at the imperial court, he was able to receive visits from his collaborators and direct the life of his church.

His literary work, in large part lost, is thought to have included a Syriac version of the OT, biblical commentaries, ecclesiastical canons, synodal letters (some of which are preserved in the *Synodicon Orientale*), liturgical hymns and homilies ("Abdīšo," *Catalogo di scrittori ecclesiastici*, ch. 58, in BO III, I 74-81). Despite the extensive loss, his literary activity can be reconstructed from the work of his disciples. From their writings we know that he gave significant impetus to a literary genre typical of the Persian church, whose roots can be traced to *Narsai and *Jacob of Sarug: the "explanations" or "causes," treatises aimed at illustrating the rationale for liturgical celebrations, the *sacraments and the underlying theology of the latter—a theology that, being rooted in the liturgy, was more developed in its historical-salvific dimension than in a more technical *christological or *trinitarian dimension. These writings were fundamental for the formation of Persian Christian communities, as is well shown by the *Explanations of the Nativity* of Thomas of Edessa, which seems to rework some of his master's material. Aba's other significant initiative (539-540) was that of commissioning the translation of *Nestorius's *Book of Heraclides* to a group of translators, among whom was *Cyrus of Edessa; this work was Nestorius's apology in defense of his christological doctrine, written a day after reading the *Tome* of *Leo the Great. This text would become ever more decisive in a church like the Persian which, initially influenced by the exegetical and theological formulations of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, increasingly inclined to the more technical christological framework of Nestorius: indeed, the formulas that will eventually dominate in the most conservative—and the most powerful—circles of the Persian church during the following century were more Nestorian than Theodorian.

General presentations: Labourt 162-194; Duval 209-210, and also 53, 72, 165, 175; Baumstark 119-120, 137, 357; Chabot 53-54; Ortiz de Urbina 124-126; P. Bettiolo, *Letteratura siriaca*: Patrologia V, 473-475; W. Stewart McCullough, *A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam,* Chico, CA 1982, 136-139.

On his life: see P. Bedjan, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha, de trois autres patriarches, d'un prêtre et de deux laïques nestoriens*, Paris 1895; BHO 596; P. Peeters, *Observations sur la Vie syriaque de Mar Aba*, in *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientales*, Brussels 1951, 116-163; J.M. Fiey, *Aba, Katholikòs, confessore*, in *Enciclopedia dei Santi. Le Chiese orientali*, Rome 1998, I, 1-4.

On Aba and his world: H. Hainthaler, *Die "nestorianische" Schulbewegung*: Grillmeier, Band 2/3, 257-261; P. Bettiolo, *Scuola ed economia divina nella catechesi della chiesa di Persia - Appunti su un testo di Tommaso di Edessa* (*d. ca.* 542), in *Esegesi e catechesi nei Padri* (*secs. IV-VII*), S. Felici (ed.), Rome 1994, 147-157.

A. Camplani

ABADDON (Heb. ĂBADDŌN). (1) Fearsome lord of the earth, *angel of death, first called Muriêl whose feast is celebrated 13 Hathor; an image of perdition, synonymous with *death and Sheol (Job 26:6; 28:22; Ps 88:11 [87:12 LXX]; Rev 9:11); mentioned in the apocrypha (*Joseph the Carpenter* 24; *Acts of Thomas* 74; *Book of the Resurrection of Christ of the Apostle Bartholomew* 4,15; 7,1), present at the Lord's tomb at the moment of his resurrection, and will have a role in the universal* judgment.

(2) Title of a Coptic *apocrypha, composed of two parts: in the first, the patriarch *Timothy I of *Alexandria (380-385), preaching during the feast of Abaddon (where he was first called Muriêl) in Alexandria, tells how he found this text in Jerusalem. He describes its contents—the main part of the apocrypha—to the faithful: Jesus, asked by the apostles before ascending to heaven, tells them the story of the *creation of the man from the earth, which the earth did not want to allow, fearing the immensity of man's future sins. The angel Muriêl takes some of the earth against its will, and from it God forms the man—but gives him life only through Christ's intervention. After Adam's sin, God gives lordship over the earth to Muriêl, making him the terrible angel of death. Upon Abaddon's request, God assigns him his feast day—13 Hathor. After telling this story,

Jesus commands the apostles to celebrate this feast, then ascends to heaven. The apocrypha, of a gnostic character, is important for an understanding of Coptic anthropology.

CANT 334; E.A. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms . . . in the Dialect of the Upper Egypt*, London 1914, 225-249, 474-493 (with Eng. tr.); Ital. tr. - Erbetta 3, 471-481; T. Orlandi, *Coptic Encyclopaedia* 1,2; C.D.G. Müller, *Die Engellehre der koptischen Kirche*, Wiesbaden 1959, 273-279.

M. Starowieyski

ABANDONED and EXPOSED CHILDREN. The term *alumnus* (*alumna*), among its other meanings, indicates an abandoned or exposed child that has been taken in and raised (foundling). Together with *abortion, abandonment and exposure were common more or less everywhere in antiquity—except in the Jewish world—esp. of deformed or illegitimate babies, or those whose birth was accompanied by unfavorable omens. The two actions were different—although both frequently led to a horrible death of the newborn—in that exposure took place in specific places and with certain precautions (e.g., a medal around the neck) so that the baby might be taken in and raised, whereas abandonment implied greater disinterest in the newborn's fate. Girls were more readily exposed than boys, and even more so the children of slaves. Despite a certain disapproval that slowly gained ground, such behavior was socially and ethically acceptable and was ignored by the law, except in particular cases such as claims of freedom on the part of exposed freeborn children (see *Pliny, *Ep.* 10,65-67). From the time of *Constantine exposure decreased, due in part to the influence of Christian morality, but it never completely ceased. At first Constantine made funds available for the support of needy children (CTh 11,27,1-2), then he authorized the sale of newborns (*Fragmenta Vat.* 34; CTh 5,10,1) and encouraged the taking in of exposed children (CTh 5,9,1 of 331). The sanctioning of the sale of babies, to us offensive, nevertheless often saved them from death. In 374 *Valentinian outlawed (CTh 8,51,2) exposure, but sale was still permitted, including the sale of only the child's labor for a period of years (*Augustine, *Ep.* 10: Divjak). In general, newborns were taken in not so much to be saved but to be raised and used as slaves, for prostitution or in spectacles, as the Christian *Justin Martyr writes: "We have learned that it is characteristic of evil persons to abandon their babies at birth; and especially because we see that nearly all of them end up in prostitution—not only girls, but also boys" (*1 Apol.* 27,1); and "because some of the abandoned would die if not taken in, and then we would become murderers" (ibid., 29,1). In some cases, however, they were taken in to be adopted by childless couples. The phenomenon was more widespread in cities than in the countryside. In periods when there were many slaves, people had no need to take in exposed children. Many pagan and Christian inscriptions mention the infancy of the deceased; pagan inscriptions usually limit themselves to the term *alumnus* (e.g., CIL VIII,410, 11576, 12778, 13238, 22993, 24687, 2394, 2396, 2773, 3002, 3288, 7078, 7754), while Christian inscriptions (DACL 1,1295-1296), in addition to that term, include names indicating the origin of the foundlings: *Proiectus*, *Proiecta*, *Proiecticius*, *Stercorius* (see Diehl 3,128 and 152-153), and also *Copronimus* (in Greek), though not always, as Pomeroy has shown for *Egypt. Some inscriptions manifest sentiments of love and intimacy between the *alumnus*(*a*) and the patron or patronness. The most famous of these foundlings was *Hermas, the Roman Christian writer of the *Shepherd*, who writes of "the one who fed me, who sold me to a certain Rhode, who lives at Rome" (*Pastore*, *Visioni* 1,1). Christians criticized this widespread practice: Justin, *1 Apol.* 27,1; *Athenagoras, *Supplica* 35,5; *Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3,3 and *Strom.* 2,18,92-93; *Tertullian, *Ad nationes* 1,15; *Apologia* 9; *Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 31,4; *Lactantius, *Inst. divinae* 6,20. *Augustine, perhaps referring to the practice of his community of Hippo, says that the babies were taken in by nuns: "Sometimes babies are exposed by merciless parents, to be raised by who cares what kind of person; then they are taken in and brought to baptism by holy virgins" (*Ep.* 98,6).

DACL 1,1288-1306; EC 1,646-648; 5,614-616; L. Annardi, *Ricerche storiche sulla esposizione degli infanti presso gli antichi popoli e specialmente presso i Romani*, Venice 1838; E. Eyben, *Family Planning in Graeco-Roman Antiquity:* Ancient Soc 11/12 (1980/81) 1-81; M. Bianchi Fossati, *Vendita ed esposizione degli infanti da Costantino a Giustiniano:* SDHI 49 (1983) 179-224; S.B. Pomeroy, *Copronyms and the Exposure of infants in Egypt*, in *Studies . . . A.A. Schiller*, ed. R.S. Bagnall, Leiden 1986, 147-162; J.E. Boswell, *The Kindness of Strangers. The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*, New York 1988 (It. tr., Milan 1991); A. Russi, I *pastori e l'esposizione degli infanti nella tarda legislazione imperiale e nei documenti epigrafici:* MEFRA 88 (1986) 855-898; J. Bellemore - B.M. Rawson, *Alumni: the Italian evidence:* ZPE 83 (1990) 1-19; M. Memmar, *Ad servitutem aut ad lupanar. . . :* ZRG KA 108 (1991) 21-93; W.V. Harris, *Child Exposure in the Roman Empire:* JRS 84 (1994) 1-22; G. Nathan, *The Family in Late Antiquity: The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition*, London-New York 2000; B. Stawoska, *Einige Bemerkungen zur Onomastik und Prosopographie christlicher Inschriften für Alumnen*, in *Prosopographica*, L. Mrozewicz - K. Ilski (eds.), Poznan 1993, 247-258.

A. Di Berardino

ABBOT – ABBESS. The Aramaic *abbâ*, "father" (Gr. ἀββᾶς, Lat. *abbas*), is the name by which monks were called, especially the oldest and most venerable, in the first centuries of *monasticism in *Egypt and in the East. Later it came to designate the superior of the monastery *sui iuris.* In the East it remained alongside other terms, such as **hegumen* (from Gk. ἡγεμών) or **archimandrite;* in the West it prevailed over the term *praepositus,* which often continued to designate the second monk in the hierarchy of the *cenobium, immediately below the abbot. During the first centuries of monasticism, where written rules were not in place, the abbot was very often a charismatic personality who gathered the brothers around himself by the prestige of his actions and holiness; later his role became institutionalized and ever more clearly defined. The oldest of the European rules, the *Rule of the Four Fathers,* written probably after the middle of the 5th c., identifies the essence of cenobitism as obedience to the abbot (*Reg. IV Patr.* 1,10, Neufville: RBen 77 [1967] 74). The function of the abbot is the primary interest of the writer of the *Rule of the Master;* the *Rule* of St. *Benedict discusses at length the prerogatives and qualities of the abbot (ch. 2) and provides for his free election by the monks (ch. 64), which, in the earliest times, was followed by episcopal confirmation. Very soon abbots were participating in councils. In the Council of Constantinople in 448, 23 *archimandrites, along with the 30 participating *bishops, condemned the doctrine of *Eutyches.

Abbess is the superior in charge of a female monastery. The Latin name, *abbatissa,* developed in analogy with the masculine *abbas,* and is attested in 6th-c. burial inscriptions and in the writings of *Gregory of Tours.

J. Chapman, *Abbot:* Hastings, Encycl. of Religion and Ethics, I, 1,8-9; J.-M. Besse, *Abbé. Abbesse:* DACL I, 39-42; T.P. McLaughlin, *Le très ancien droit monastique de l'Occident,* Paris-Ligugé 1935; A. de Vogüé, *La communauté et l'abbé dans la Règle de saint Benoît*, Bruges 1961; S. Pricoco, *Alle origini del latino monastico,* in *Il latino e i cristiani,* E. Dal Covolo - M. Sodi (eds.), Rome 2002, 165-184.

S. Pricoco

ABDIAS of Babylon (late 6th c.). Presumed first bishop of Babylon, one of the 72 disciples of the Lord. He is the presumed author of a collection of *apocryphal *Acts of the *Apostles* (Peter, Paul, Andrew, James the Great, John, James the brother of the Lord, Philip, Thomas, Matthew, Simon and Jude). In the conclusion of the biography of Simon or Jude is written: "Abdias, bishop of Babylon, ordained by the apostles themselves (Simon and Jude); he wrote of their deeds in Hebrew. His disciple Eutropius then made a complete Greek version. It was then narrated in its entirety and arranged in 10 books by the African (*Julian)." In reality, the collection of Pseudo-Abdias was composed in Gaul in the 6th-7th c., as it depends on earlier authors (among them *Gregory of Tours), and was later revised.

R.A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum* 2/1, Leipzig 1898, 128-216; AASS at the respective names; EC 1, 56; L. Duchesne, *Les anciens recueils des légendes apostoliques:* Compte-rendu du III Congrès sc. intern. des Catholiques, Brussels 1985, 69-79; L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento,* Turin 1971, II, 1431-1606; Erbetta 2,21-24 (on his character); E. Jounod and J.D. Kaestli: CCAp 2,750-834 (*Virtutes Iohannis*); K. Schäferdiek, Die *"Passio Johannis" des Melito von Laodikeia und die "Virtutes Johannis":* AB 103 (1985) 367-382; M. Brossard-Dandré, *La passion de Jacques le Mineur selon le Pseudo-Abdias et ses sources. Actes apocryphes d'un apôtre apocryphe,* in *Apocryphité. Histoire d'un concept transversal aux religions du livre.* En hommage à P. Geoltrain, S.C. Mimouni et al. (eds.), Turnhout 2002, 229-242.

S.J. Voicu

ABDON and SENNEN. *Roman *martyrs buried at Rome in the catacomb of Pontianus on the Via Portuense. The **Depositio Martyrum*, in the *Roman *Chronography of 354*, commemorates the two martyrs on 30 July: *Abdos et Semnes*, *in Pontiani*, *quod est ad Ursum Piliatum.* In the *Index coemeteriorum vetus* (catalog, 7th c.), the *cemetery where Abdon and Sennen are buried, is called *Cymiterium Pontiani ad Ursum Pileatum Abdon et Sennen via Portuensi.* The itinerary *Notitia ecclesiarum urbis Romae* (7th c.) specifies that Abdon and Sennen lie above ground: *Ascendis . . . Deinde intrabis in ecclesiam magnam.* In the other two itineraries, the *De locis sanctis martyrum qui sunt foris civitatis Romae* (7th c.) and the *Notitia portarum urbis Romae* (12th c., from a source thought to be prior to 682), Abdon and Sennen are simply mentioned among the other martyrs of the Via Portuense. According to the *Passio* they were two Persian princes martyred during the persecution of *Decius. In the cemetery of Pontianus a fresco (5th-6th c.) presents the Lord holding out the crown of martyrdom to Abdon and Sennen, who are identified by their names written vertically (Wp 258). They are wearing mantles and *Phrygian caps. Abdon has a more mature appearance, with a short, rounded beard; Sennen is younger, with a pointed beard. Abdon has been identified with the person depicted on a terra cotta lamp, shown praying in sumptous Persian dress and having a short, rounded beard similar to the man depicted in the fresco at Pontianus.

DACL 1, 42ff.; EC 1, 58ff.; BS 1, 53ff.; LCI 5,4-5; P. Bruzza, *D'una rarissima lucerna fittile sulla quale è effigiato un santo in vesti persiane:* Studi e Documenti di Storia e di diritto 10 (1889) 416ff.; R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma* 2, Rome 1942; G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del medioevo. Secoli IV-X* (with a biographical update by M. Andaloro), Rome 1987.

D. Calcagnini

ABDUCTION. Generally speaking, abduction is the kidnapping of a man or a woman. The specific term refers to a social phenomenon and is intended to indicate the snatching, often violently, of a woman for sexual purposes or for marriage. In ancient writings, it did not always have a negative connotation.

At *Rome from ancient times the practice was known (one should recall the abduction of the Sabine women). However, judging from the literature of the late Republic and of the early centuries of the empire (excluding rhetorical texts that probably referred to fictitious cases), in the Roman-Italian milieu, at least since the beginning of the Principate, the practice was not widespread. Few juridical considerations and few primary sources prior to the pre-*Constantinian age make any earlier assessment uncertain.

There is no unanimity among critical scholars in evaluating whether and in what way during the Republic abduction could be prosecuted as an *iniuria,* that is, as a private crime. The texts of the classical age seem rather to prosecute it in the generic sense as an offense. Later, but it is difficult to say exactly when, "to abduct a woman" (*mulierem rapere*) was prosecuted as a crime.

The *Justinian Digest reports only one passage, inserted under the rubric *ad legem Iulia de vi publica* ("according to the Julian Law on public force"), relating to this crime from a classical jurist (D. 48,6,5,2 = Marcian, *Inst.* 14). However, it is not certain that the crime referred to is abduction. As expected in the Digest, abduction—an accusation also applicable to foreigners, for which the death penalty was prescribed with no diminishing of the crime—does not necessarily refer to a specific law. The many opinions of scholars on how the law concerning abduction emerged are due to the paucity and uncertainty of the sources. The text seems to refer to the prosecution *ex lege Iulia de adulteriis* ("according to the Julian Law on the *adulterers"), and in practice, abduction was prosecuted at times with the accusation of *stuprum* (*rape).

Constantine (CTh 9,24,1, from 318 or 320 or 326) changed the understanding of abduction and furthered its suppression. No resolution following this crime (i.e., marriage and/or a young maiden's declaration of her own consent) exonerated the protagonists (including a woman and any other possible accomplices in the abduction) from very severe punishments. Not prosecuting the crime had as its primary objective that of protecting the family's will in marital choices. This objective was not opposed by the fact that the same family was to be punished if it did not demonstrate that it wanted to stop the crime but that it favored, however, some settlement; moreover, compensations for such a crime—in terms of freedom or Roman citizenship—was established for the slave or the citizen under Latin law who had denounced the crime.

In practice a restrictive interpretation of Constantine's law was affirmed, concerning the nullification of a marriage between an abductor and the one abducted. This posed, however, grave consequences, especially for children. To lower the possible risks in this regard, in 374, it was decreed that juridical actions against abduction or marriage resulting from it had to be taken within five years at most (CTh 9,24,3).

Before Constantine, the ordinances appear to make reference to a crime of which all women, *liberae* ("free") or even *ingenuae honestae vitae* ("those of a noble upright life"), could become victim. *Virgins or *widows were, therefore, included. Nevertheless, the imperial legislation from Constantine onward treated virgins and widows as a specific object of rights that it clarified or reformed. Constantine spoke explicitly only of *virgines* ("virgins") or *puellae* ("young girls"). In 354, *Constantius II further hardened the gravity of the crime and equated the abduction of widows who had chosen a life of chastity with that of consecrated virgins (CTh 9,25,1). Emperor *Julian was perhaps more lenient (*Ammianus 16,5,12 and *Sozomen 6,3); Emperor *Jovian returned to the heavy-handed approach (CTh 9,25,2) when he established the death penalty even for the attempt to convince virgins or widows who were consecrated to God to marriage. With regard for the given circumstances, the crime and the ways of applying punishments were specified also in CTh 11,36,7 (from 344), CTh 9,38,2 (from 353) and CTh 9,2,5 (from 409). *Honorius, in 420, confirmed the earlier laws and added deportation and confiscation of goods for those who were responsible for a failed attempt to abduct a consecrated virgin. **Codex Theodosianus* collected the pertinent laws on abduction in the context of ordinances relating to a multiplicity of crimes.

Subsequently, in the West, Majorian's *Nov.* 6,4 (from 458), concerning the women who had chosen

virginity, refers, in this group, to the preceding laws with some aggravating circumstances (he also punishes attempted abduction) and specifications (the patrimony of the guilty individual is not confiscated but is assigned to the accuser).

For the Eastern empire, however, there is nothing until Emperor *Justinian. With Justinian, notwithstanding the recovery of classical texts, jurists arranged abduction laws according to the forms given by Constantine, with some modifications: women were no longer subjected to punishment in any case whatsoever; protection for slave women and free women was expanded, within certain limits; and he sought to compensate the victim of abduction with patrimonial resources or the establishment of a dowry so that the woman could either live autonomously even without marrying or be helped in finding a husband.

It is difficult to reconstruct the procedures against abduction in the first edition of the **Codex Justinianus,* probably framed according to the model provided by the CTh. The new law, which emanated from Justinian, to which the *Institutiones* made reference, is contained in the *codex repetitae praelectionis* (CI. 9,13,1). This codex completely reworked the entirety of the earlier material and substituted the ordinances, which were first cited both in the title *de raptu virginum seu viduarum* ("on the abduction of virgins or widows") and in the subsequent title *de raptu sanctimonialium* ("on the abduction of consecrated women"). In sum, it established that the crime remained punishable, with the exception of some cases of abduction of slave women or free women who were not widows and *honestae* ("upright women"). Abduction could also take place with regard to a fiancé if it occurred through force (*per vim*); abductors and accomplices caught red-handed must be tried and executed without the ability to appeal; the victim, if she was a free woman, would possess the abductor's goods and would not be able to marry him; *deportatio* was to be inflicted on the parents who did not wish to take action against the guilty individual. As in the case of Constantine's ordinances, the Justinian norms were not implemented in every instance, as shown by the *novellae*.

With respect to the ecclesiastical ordinances on abduction, the first were given by the Council of *Ancyra in 314 (can. 11), which decreed that women engaged to be married and abducted must be restored to their *sponsi* ("spouses"), even if they were violated. In 375, *Basil of Caesarea, in *Cappadocia, repeated the canon and perfected it with the ordinance on the basis of which, if not bound to anyone, she must be restored to her family, which must then decide to give her to her fiancé or at least to the abductor (can. 22, in *Ep.* 199, to *Amphilochius, bishop of *Iconium), and with specifications concerning the punishments (*Ep.* 270).

There are some ecclesiastical sources from the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th c. in favor of the marriage between the abductor and the abducted. Thus, can. 67 of the so-called **Apostolic Canons* concluded that the abductor of a young woman to whom he was not engaged must keep her, and that he should be excluded from communion. This work also made several appeals to the OT (see Dt 22:28-29 but also Ex 22:16), texts to which *Ambrose also referred, *Apol. Dav.* 1,8,42 (ed. Hadot, SC 239, Paris 1977).

Other ecclesiastical canons punish the abductor and the consenting woman if she had made a promise of chastity: thus can. 26 (27) of the *Concilium Arausicanum* ("Council of *Orange") (CCL 148, 85, from the year 441); can. 46 of the so-called *Concilium Arelatense II* ("Second Council of *Arles") (ibid., 123, the years 442–506); can. 104 and some manuscripts of the so-called *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* ("Ancient Statutes of the Church") (ibid., 185, from ca. 475), which imposed excommunication. Especially important was can. 27 of the Council of *Chalcedon (451): in abduction for the purpose of marriage, the guilty and the accomplices are to be punished with excommunication if it pertains to the laity; deposition if it pertains to ecclesiastical officials.

In canon law, abduction is the kidnapping of a woman, including the violent trapping of a woman, for purposes of marriage. It was understood both as a crime—with the purpose of marrying a woman, or having her carnally, with or without her consent—and as a nullifying impediment to marriage.

L. Desanti, *Costantino, il ratto e il matrimonio riparatore:* SDHI 52 (1986) 195ff.; L. Desanti, *Giustiniano e il ratto:* Annali Univ. Ferrara Giur. 1 (1987) 183-201; F. Goria, s.v. *Ratto:* Enciclopedia del diritto, 38, Milano 1987, 707-725; F. Botta, *"Per vim inferre." Studi su "stuprum" violento e "raptus" nel diritto romano e bizantino,* Cagliari 2004.

T. Sardella

ABEL

I. Abel - II. Abel and Cain (iconography).

I. Abel. The NT writings allude both explicitly and implicitly to the story of Abel (Gen 4:1-16); Jesus himself mentions the righteous Abel, whose innocent blood was shed (Mt 23:35). It is also likely that the parable of the murderous vineyard workers (Mt

21:35-39) contains an allusion to the death of Abel. The similarity between Abel's blood that "cries out" to God and the interceding blood of Christ can be noted in the relation between type and antitype in the letter to the Hebrews (Heb 11:4; 12:24).

The figure of Abel offering *sacrifice is as important as that of him as victim of his brother's envy. Abel the shepherd, who sacrifices the firstborn of the flock to God, was considered by the Fathers to be the prefigurement of Christ the *shepherd (*De promiss. et praedic. Dei* I, 6, PL 51, 738). *Ambrose sees the pure sacrifice of Abel as an image of the *eucharistic sacrifice; the *lamb offered to God as the firstfruits of creatures became the archetype of the sacrifice of Christ (Ambr., *De inc. Dom. sacr.* I, 4 PL 16, 819). *Augustine developed this *typology, basing it upon Heb 12:24 (*Contr. Faustum* 12,9-10). The parallelism between the blood that "cries out" and the interceding blood is found in other Fathers also (*Greg. Naz., *Or.* 25,16; *John Chrys., *Adv. Iud.* 8,8). *Paulinus of Nola sees in Abel the figure of the suffering righteous one, i.e., of the suffering Christ in believers (*Ep.* 38,3). For *Cyril of Alexandria, Abel the shepherd is the image of Emmanuel: Abel as the innocent victim signifies the pure sacrifice of Christ, superior to that of the old law (*Glaphyra in Gen.* I, 1,3). In the writings of the Fathers he is also the prototype of the *martyr, of the persecuted righteous one, of the virtue of patience (Cypr., *Ep.* 56; *Exhort. mart.* 5; *De or. dom.* 24; *De bono pat.* 10; *Hom. Clem.* II, 16; Ambr., *Exhort. virg.* 6,36). During the *Arian crisis (4th c.), *Athanasius considered the figure of Abel as the martyr for orthodox doctrine (*De decr. Nyc. Syn.:* PG 25, 432). The Fathers frequently saw Abel as the archetype of the Christian who witnesses to the truth (John Chrys., *In Gen. hom.* 19,6); the firstfruits of justice (Theodor., *Quaest. in Gen.* 45); the type of the righteous, uncircumcised man offering sacrifice (Just., *Dial.* 19,3), whose sacrifice surpasses that of the Pharisees (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 18,3); the example of the righteous one put to death (ibid., IV, 34,4; *Dem.* 17: SC 62, 57). The further development of this typology is found in Ambrose and Augustine. For the former, Cain signifies the Jewish people, while Abel signifies the pagan people converted to Christianity (*Cain et Abel* I, 2,3). For Augustine, Abel represents the city of God, whereas Cain is the image of the city of the devil (*Civ. Dei* XV, 1); thus Abel also becomes the figure of the church in the world as persecuted pilgrim—persecuted, but also consoled by God (*Civ. Dei* XV, 18,2; XVIII, 51,2). The prayer *Supra quae* of the Roman canon mentions the sacrifice of Abel, along with *Abraham and *Melchizedek.

DTC I, 29-35; TWNT I, 6-7; LTK[3] 5, 1126-1127; L. Ruppert, *Genesis,* Forschung zur Bibel 70, Stuttgart- Würzburg 1992; A. Louth, *Genesis 1–11,* ACCS OT I, Downers Grove 2001 (ital. tr. M. Conti, *La Bibbia Commentata dai Padri* AT 1/1, Rome 2003).

L. Vanyó

II. Abel and Cain (iconography). As sons of *Adam and Eve, Abel personifies the righteous one of the OT and the sacrifice of Christ, whereas Cain is the first representative of the moral disorder deriving from their parents' *sin. Abel is the suffering "righteous one," innocently killed by his envious brother, and thus a type of the innocent Christ (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4,18,3; Cyprian, *De domin. orat.* 24); his sacrifice is an image of the eucharistic sacrifice (Ambrose, *De incar.* 1,4). From the 4th c., they are normally represented on *sarcophagi offering their gifts to God (Gen 4:3-4): Abel, a shepherd and guardian of the flock, offers a lamb; Cain, an agricultural offering, the fruits of the earth: at least a sheaf of grain, occasionally a bunch of grapes (Rome, Museo Pio Crist. Vat., sarcophagus 149: middle third, 4th c.). In a sarcophagus at Fermo the sacrifice is offered to Christ-*Logos*, and on a fragment preserved in the garden of the Palazzo Colonna at Rome (first quarter, 4th c.), to the *Trinity. The only known example of *cemetery painting is that of cubicle B (second quarter, 4th c.) of the cemetery of Via D. Compagni, in which Abel and Cain are portrayed, with their characteristic attributes, alongside their sorrowful parents, who are seated on a rock. The two brothers also appear in the Pentateuch of Ashburnham (Paris, Bibl. Nat., fol. 6, 7th c.), in their usual attitude: Abel as guardian of the flock, Cain with a plow, intent on his work in the fields. The latter is also depicted in the same manuscript (Paris, Bibl. Nat., *nouv. acqu. lat.* 2334; 7th c.) in an attitude of despair: one of his seven sins, for which he will be condemned to the seventh generation. In a few scenes Cain is also depicted killing Abel, for example at St. Paul Outside the Walls at Rome, and in the miniatures of the Cotton Bible. Finally, Abel is portrayed by himself, in the act of sacrifice, in St. Vitale (middle 6th c.) and St. Apollinaris in Classe (7th c.) at Ravenna, beside the sacrifices of Melchizedek and Abraham, respectively.

L. De Bruyne - K. Rathe: EC 1, 65; F. Salvoni: EC 3, 302ff.; H. Aurenhammer: LCIK 1, 8-9; G. Henderson: LCI 1, 5-10; Id.: LCI 3, 471-474; Ws II, 229-230; P.H. Michel, *L'iconographie de Caïn et Abel:* CahCiv Médiévale 1 (1958) 194-199; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la Via Latina*, Florence 1990; TIP 91-92.

G. Santagata

ABELITES. *Augustine (*De haer*. 87) describes Abelites as a sect that he knew to be active in the countryside around Hippo but that became extinct in 428 with the conversion of its last followers to the Catholic Church. The distinguishing characteristic of the sect was the *virginity practiced by its members, who lived as couples, though with each couple adopting a boy and a girl who would in turn form another couple upon the death of their adoptive parents, so as then to adopt two more children. Their name, *Abelonii*, which Augustine believed to be of Punic origin, goes back to a Jewish and *gnostic tradition (with a *Manichean influence) according to which Abel lived as a virgin though he was married.

F. Cocchini

ABERCIUS (late 2nd c.), also Avircius. A late anonymous romaticized biography of Abercius, bishop of Hierapolis in *Phrygia during the reign of *Marcus Aurelius, was reported by Simeon Metaphrastes (AASS 22 Oct). Abercius was a great traveler, preaching the gospel and visiting the most illustrious churches of the time. After returning to the city, at age 72 he personally dictated a long inscription, coming to be identified with the person in the inscription discovered by W.M. Ramsay at Hieropolis, the city of Phrygia *Salutaris* (c. 170–200). It is, at least thus far, the most illustrious of the Christian epigraphs, which in 1888 John Baptist de Rossi called *epigramma dignitate et pretio inter Christiana facile princeps.* A marble sepulchral altar has the epigraph on the front face and two relief laurel crowns on the two sides. Two large fragments of the text are preserved, including the left side face, found by Ramsay in 1883 and given to Leo XIII in 1892 on the occasion of his priestly jubilee. First displayed in the Lateran Museum, they are today in the Vatican Museum. The text can be reconstructed almost entirely, thanks to another epigraph from the same place that partially reproduces it and to a series of manuscript codices in the *Life* of Abercius, which pass the famous inscription down to us in its entirety, though not without uncertainties. In the 19th and 20th c. its Christian character was at times unsuccessfully denied; today it is recognized by all. The epigraph consists of the epitaph of Abercius, bishop of Hierapolis, which he had engraved: 22 hexameters, written in a noble style and sprinkled with arcanely ambiguous expressions, according to the taste of the time. Its contents are in brief: vv. 1-2: Abercius thought of his own tomb while still living; 3-6: he is a disciple of Christ, the Good Shepherd; 7-9: he went to Rome at Christ's command; 10-11: he traveled through Syria and beyond the Euphrates; 12-16: everywhere he had the apostle Paul as a spiritual companion and was assisted by the faith and the nourishment of the Eucharist; 17-18: he himself, at 72 years of age, dictated his epitaph; 19: he invites his companions in faith to pray for him; 22-20: he threatens any violators of the tomb.

The importance of the text can easily be seen, including as it does, at such an early date, the main tenets of the Christian faith. Of particular interest are vv. 7-9: (". . . who [Christ] sent me to Rome to contemplate a kingdom and to see a queen in golden vestments and golden clothes. And he saw there a people with a splendid seal"). This is an arcane double-reference: the kingdom is that of Marcus Aurelius, but also that of Christ; the queen is Rome and, at the same time, the church; the seal is that of the empire, but also of faith. Essentially Abercius considers Rome the center of the universal church, an idea shared by many others in the *Asia Minor of that period. Also very important are vv. 12-16, which have preserved for us an example (perhaps the first known to us) of the acrostic Ἰχθύς, as well as a profession of faith: Christ, the mystical Fish (Ἰχθύς), concealed in the Eucharist under the species of bread and wine, is the son of God (πέγέ—"Fount") and of *Mary (Παρθένος ἁγνή—"chaste Virgin")—a strong allusion to the twofold nature, divine and human, of the Redeemer.

J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers,* pt. II, London 1891, I, 498-499 (see 2nd ed. revised by M. Holmes, Leicester 1990); Quasten, *Patrologia,* I, 154-155; RAC 1, 12-42; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca,* Rome 1978, IV, 337-386; Id., *L'iscrizione di Abercio e Roma:* AncSoc 2 (1971) 174-203; Id., *L'iscrizione di Abercio:* AncSoc 4 (1973) 271-279; B. McNeil, *Avircius and the Song of Songs:* VChr 31 (1977) 23-24; W. Wischmeyer, *Die Aberkiosinchrift:* JbAC 23 (1980) 22-47; G. Kretschmar, *Erfahrung der Kirche. Beobachtungen zur Aberkios-Inschrift,* in *Communio sanctorum. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Jacques von Allmen,* Geneva 1982, 73-85; M. Violante, *Il casto pastore dell'iscrizione di Abercio e il Pastore di Erma:* Orpheus 8 (1987) 355-365; D. Bundy, *The Life of Abercius: Its Significance for Early Syriac Christianity*: Second Century 7 (1989-1990); LACL 2; I. Ramelli, *L'epitaffio di Abercio:* Aevum 74 (2000) 191-206.

M. Guarducci

ABGAR. Initially reported by *Eusebius (*HE* I, 13-22; II, 6-7), the name Abgar indicates several kings of the *Osrhoene kingdom (northwestern Mesopotamia), whose capital was *Edessa (today Urfa in Turkey). One king ordinarily referred to is Abgar V, called Ukama (AD 9-46), to whom a legend attributes the evangelization of the city. Afflicted by a terrible illness, Abgar is said to have written the

Lord Jesus a letter asking to be healed; Jesus then left orders to Thomas to send the disciple Addeo (Thaddaeus) after his ascension to heal the king and spread the faith in his city. The purpose of this legend was to trace the beginning of the faith in Edessa back to Jesus himself and to the apostolic era, thus attributing apostolic dignity to its church. The sources of the story, which comes to us through the Greek text of Eusebius (which provides a translation done by him from the original Syriac in the Edessan archives, included in the list of apocryphal texts of the *Decretum Gelasianum*), are (1) two letters between Jesus and Abgar and (2) the account of the arrival of the apostle in the city, the healing of the king and the evangelization of the country—events that Eusebius places in the years 27–28. The accounts are certainly apocryphal, probably from the early 3rd c., at the time of King Abgar IX the Great (179–216)—according to other sources Abgar VIII (**Chronicle of Edessa*)—who, with significant reservation, is considered the first Christian king of Edessa. His conversion is to have taken place after meeting Pope *Eleutherus. The accounts pertaining to Abgar V were clearly written after 174, given the citations of the gospel based on the **Diatessaron* of *Tatian, composed during these years. Another later trace has reached us from the pilgrimage of *Egeria (XIX, 2) who, having visited Edessa (381–384), recounts the stories told her by bishop Eulogius (379–387) about the Christianization of the city, namely, the above-mentioned letters between Abgar and the Lord, and miracles that protected the city from various Persian invasions.

There are thus two Abgars linked to Christian history, the difficulties in establishing their historicity notwithstanding. A third source, chronologically, for this obscure personality is the *Doctrine of Addai* (*Thaddaeus*), another apostolic *apocrypha, more extensive than the previous two (*Addai). Composed ca. 400 and also preserved in Syriac, it includes correspondence between Abgar and Jesus, and other items on the evangelization of Edessa. This source relates how Annanias, messenger of Abgar and hypothetical author of the letter dictated by the Lord, was not only supposed to have been the archivist of Edessa but also to have received a self-portrait from the Lord and taken it to Abgar—an image now venerated in the Byzantine tradition as "the holy face of Edessa." Another apocryphal writing bearing Abgar's name is also based on *The Acts of Thaddaeus*. Other texts and authors of the primitive church make reference to Abgar, among them: *Julius Africanus, *Evagrius of Pontus, *John of Damascus, *Origen and *Augustine. The last two, denying that Jesus would have left anything written, consider these traditions apocryphal.

Today the text of the letters is preserved in Syriac, Armenian, Greek, Latin, Georgian, Arabic, Palaeoslavonic, Coptic and Celtic. The correspondence between Jesus and Abgar, though considered apocryphal and legendary, remains a living tradition of the Syrian (during Lent), Armenian (Nestorian), Malabarese and *Coptic churches.

CANT 88-89, 229; BHG 1702-1704 (I, c, d, e); BHO 9, 24, 1141; Eusebius, HE 1,13-22; Egeria, *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta* XIX, 1-19; J.A. Fabricius, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti,* Hamburg 1703; G. Philips, *The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle, Now First Edited in a Complete Form in the Original Syriac with an English Translation and Notes,* London 1876; R.A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocryphorum,* Leipzig 1891, I, 273-283; M. Erbetta, *Gli Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento,* Casale Monferrato 1975, III, 77-78; J. Rhodes, *The Apocryphal New Testament,* Oxford 1980; J.W. Drijvers, *Addaï und Mani. Christentum und Manichäismus im dritten Jahrhundert in Syrien:* OCA 221, Rome 1983; J. Tixeront, *Les origines de l'Église d'Édesse et la légende d'Abgar,* Paris 1988; W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen II,* Tübingen 1989, 436-437; L. Moraldi, *Gli Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento,* Casale Monferrato 1994, II, 1657-1688; A. Luther, *Die ersten Könige von Osrhoene:* Klio (1991); A. Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus,* Turnhout 1993; J. González, *La leyenda del Rey Abgar y Jesús, orígenes del Cristianismo en Edesa,* Madrid 1995; I. Ramelli, *Edessa e i romani fra Augusto e i Severi: aspetti del Regno di Abgar V e di Abgar IX:* Aevum 73 (1999) 107-143; C. and F. Jullien, *Les Actes de Mar Mari. L'apôtre de la Mésopotamie,* Turnhout 2001; A. Markovic, *Prelude to Constantine,* Frankfurt 2004.

J.F. Rubio Navarro

ABIBUS DOLICHENUS (ABIBUS [HABIB] of DOLICHE) (d. after 435). Bishop of Doliche (Euphratean *Syria), suffragan of *Alexander of Hierapolis. Abibus was deposed from his episcopal see between 434 and 435 for remaining faithful to *Nestorius even after the peace accord between *John of Antioch and *Cyril of Alexandria (433). Signatory and addressee of many collective letters in the *Collectio Casinensis*, Abibus wrote to Alexander of Hierapolis and other bishops of Euphratean Syria about his removal, specifying that he had never sent "libels of refusal" to the *patriarch of *Antioch, and declaring himself ready to continue to fight for the true faith.

CPG 6388, 6408, 6418, 6438, 6445, 6460; Collectio Casinensis, ACO I, 4, 149, 157-159, 162-163; PG 84, 732-733, 743-746, 749-751; Patrologia V, 185.

P. Marone

ABITINA, Martyrs of. In the city of Abitina in 304, modern Chouhoud el-Bâtin (Beschaouch), a group

of 50 Christians was arrested for continuing to meet regularly to celebrate the *liturgy in opposition to the orders of the first edict of *Diocletian. The future martyrs underwent a first interrogation in their city's forum; all having confessed their faith, they were then transferred in chains to *Carthage to be judged by the proconsul *Anulinus. Upon their arrival there they were interrogated again, individually or in small groups, and cruelly tortured, but none denied their first confession. The experiences of the martyrs of Abitina are narrated in a single text, the *Passio Saturnini*, *Dativi*, *Felicis*, *Ampelii et sociorum* (BHL 7492; ed. Franchi de' Cavalieri), which, though not easily interpreted or placed chronologically, is very important for the history of *Donatism and, more generally, of African Christianity. The narrative section recording the events of the arrest and trial (chs. 2-18) is framed between a prologue (ch. 1) and an epilogue (chs. 19-23), in which the behavior of traitors and those in communion with them is stigmatized. In the famous *Appendix,* a strict opposition is expressed between an association of reprobates, the *conuenticula traditorum*, infected by every kind of wickedness (the bishop *Mensurius and his deacon *Caecilian are, among other things, accused of having allowed the martyrs to starve to death in prison, keeping the usual food from being brought them), and a church of the pure who kept themselves free from any sort of defilement, thus earning for themselves (for the first and only time in the surviving Donatist literature) the honorific title of *ecclesia martyrum* (see *Passio Dativi* 22; ed. Franchi de' Cavalieri, 69).

Scholars have long investigated the composite character of this text, its evident polemical quality and the possibilities regarding its date. Monceaux (III, 144) hypothesized that a prologue and an appendix had been added to an original ancient document. These were composed by two different Donatist authors (the author of the *Appendix* being the more violent of the two), both active while *Caecilian, bishop of Carthage, was still alive, and probably during the so-called *persecutio Cecilianensis* (316–321). P. Franchi de' Cavalieri (3-46), however, considering the *Passio* to be a unitary whole, claimed it to be the work of a single author active in the 5th c. He based this conclusion primarily on the fact that in the *Collatio* of 411 (see *Capitula* III, 433, 445-447; Aug., *Brev. cols.* III, 17,32), a text concerning the martyrs of Abitina was presented and read that only with difficulty could have been the same as the one we have. The different positions of the two authors have been taken up again at times, and still today scholars seem equally divided among those who, sustaining a "high" chronology, see the document at the origin of Donatist polemical argumentation (Brisson, Tilley, Saxer, Scorza Barcellona) and those who place the document (at least in its present form) much later, seeing in it the final outcome of a centuries-old debate (Maier, Lazewsky, Zocca).

If it is true, as it seems, that Augustine preached on the occasion of their feast (Lambot), it seems that the martyrs whose experiences are narrated in the document were in any case celebrated equally by both *Catholics and Donatists.

Monceaux III, 140-147; DHGE I, 129-130; Delehaye OC 84-85; Id., *Contributions récentes à l'hagiographie de Rome et d'Afrique:* AB 54 (1936) 293-296; BS 11,682-4; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *La Passio dei martiri abitinesi,* in Id., *Note Agiografiche* 8 (Studi e Testi, 65), Vatican City 1935, 3-71; C. Lambot: RB 50 (1938) 10-15; 67 (1949) 264-265; J.P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine de Septime Sévère à l'invasion arabe,* Paris 1958, 127-129; D. Raynal, *Culte des martyrs et propagande donatiste à Uppena:* Cahiers de Tunisie 21 (1973) 33-72; A. Beschaouch, *Sur la localisation d'Abitina, la cité des célèbres martyrs africains:* CRAI (1976) 255-267; Maier I, 57-92; S. Lancel, *Actes de la conférence de Carthage en 411,* SC 194, Paris 1972, 95-96; C. Lepelley, *Les Cités de l'Afrique Romaine au Bas-Empire,* II: *Notices d'histoire municipale,* Paris 1981 (on Abitina 56-62); Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVᵉ au VIᵉ siècle,* Rome 1982, II, 684-691; Saxer, *Afrique latine,* 60-64; Fontaine, *Littérature narrative sur le martyre et l'ascèse,* 584-585; W. Lazewsky, *Il martirio come lotta spirituale con il diavolo nella letteratura agiografica donatista,* Rome 1983, 14-19; M.A. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa* (Translated Texts for Historians 24), Liverpool 1996, 25-49; M.A. Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World,* Minneapolis 1997, 58; F. Scorza Barcellona, *L'agiografia donatista,* in M. Marin - C. Moreschini (eds.), *L'Africa cristiana. Storia, religione, letteratura,* Brescia 2002, 140-145; E. Zocca, *Dai "santi" al "Santo": un percorso storico linguistico intorno all'idea di santità (Africa Romana secs. II-V),* Rome 2003, 102-106, 185-187; F. Dolbeau, *La "Passion" des martyrs d'Abitina: remarques sur l'établissement du texte:* AB 121 (2003) 273-276.

E. Zocca

ABLABIUS (d. 338). Prefect of the Eastern praetorium. Originally from *Crete and of humble origins, he held high offices within the imperial administration and in 315 was probably in *Italy as the *vicarius Africae*. *Constantine sent him a law, charging him with its promulgation throughout Italy (CTh XI, 27,1). From 326 to 337 Ablabius fulfilled the position of prefect of the Eastern praetorium. In 331 he was consul together with Annius Bassus. In 333 Constantine directed an imperial rescript to him (*C. Sirm.* I) regarding the *episcopale iudicium*. Under *Constantius II he was deposed from the office of praetorian prefect and retired to his possessions in *Bithynia, where he was killed in 338. *Constantine chose

Ablabius's daughter Olympia as the companion of his son *Constans; at the death of the latter, she was given in marriage to Arsaces, king of *Armenia.

PLRE, I, Ablabius 4, 3-4; DNP 1, Ablabius 1, 25; Storia del Cristianesimo 2, 217, 220, 267, 273.

G. Pilara

ABORTION. In the thought of the Fathers, the issue of abortion is set in the context of the proposal of a fundamental choice of civilization made by Yahweh to his people: "Today I call heaven and earth as witnesses against you: I have placed before you life and death, a blessing and a curse. Choose life, that you and your descendants may live, to love Yahweh your God, to listen to his voice and to adhere to him: so that he may be your life and your length of days in the land that Yahweh swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob" (Dt 30:19-20). The earliest writings, the **Didache* and the *Letter of *Barnabas*, following the schema of the two ways, life and death, teaching that the one who walks in the way of life does not kill and, consequently, will not take the life of a fetus by abortion (*phthora*) (*Didache*, 15-17; Barn., *Ep* 19,5). The act of abortion, in addition to being a grave lack of love for one's neighbor, is above all an offense against the law of God, precisely because it destroys one of his creatures. The crime of abortion sets on the way of death not only the woman who has an abortion but also the one who performs it, leading both along the road to eternal punishment (Barn., *Ep* 20).

The *apologists constructed their arguments specifically on the absolute respect of Christians for the life of the unborn. "How can we kill a person," asks *Athenagoras, "we who judge women who use abortive measures to be murderers, and consider them accountable to God for their abortions?" (see Athenag., *Legatio* 35). *Minucius Felix contrasts *pagans and Christians even more sharply in matters of life and death: "There are even women who, drinking certain medications, destroy the beginning of the future person in their womb, committing murder before giving birth. . . . We, on the other hand, are not permitted to take part in murder or to hear it spoken of" (Minuc., *Octavius* 30,2). *Tertullian also, in his concise and at times violent style, accuses the gentiles of practicing abortion: "You have little appetite for human viscera, because you devour them, alive and full-grown; rarely do you lick human blood, because you pour out the blood of the future; rarely do you eat infants, because you sweep away the whole child in advance" (see Tertull., *Ad nationes* I, 15,8). Before the divine commandment—*non occides*—there is no difference between taking the life of one already born and destroying the life of one not yet born: one who will be a person later is already one now (see Tertull., *Apologeticum* 9,8; *De exhort. cast.* 12,5).

For all the Greek and Latin fathers, abortion is morally a sin and legally a crime, because it involves the unjust killing of a human life that is, from its beginning, under the protection of the providential love of God. In his comment on Ex 23:19: "Do not boil a kid in its mother's milk," *Clement of Alexandria concludes that abortion, the killing of a living fetus, turns the mother's womb into a tomb of death instead of a cradle of life as the Creator wills (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 2,18). *Basil of Caesarea leaves no doubt on the matter, considering the distinction between an ensouled and an unensouled fetus a subtlety of philosophers and learned pagans, unacceptable by Christians. As the violent killing of a human life-in-becoming, abortion is always homicide (see Basil., *Ep.* 188,2). Basil judges both those who provide abortive drugs and those who use them to be likewise murderers (ibid.). *Ambrose of Milan considers abortion such a horrendous crime that it must be revoked as soon as the mind becomes aware of it (see Ambr., *Ep.* 60,1). For *Augustine, the cruel lust of some women reaches the point of destroying the fetus in their own womb when drugs to induce sterility have failed; they choose to destroy their offspring before it is born (see Aug., *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, I, 15,17). At the time of the Fathers the moral judgment on abortion was thus strongly negative, because it is homicide. On the juridical question of the crime in the case of abortion prior to animation, appeal to Augustine's judgment is certainly false (see Honings, 79-83).

J.H. Waszink: RAC I, 55-60; M. Roberti, *"Nasciturus pro iam nato habetur" nelle fonti cristiane primitive,* in *Cristianesimo e Diritto Rom.,* Milan 1935, 65-84; E. Nardi, *Procurato aborto nel mondo greco romano,* Milan 1971; B. Sesboüé, *Les chrétiens devant l'avortement d'après le témoignage des Pères de l'Église:* Etudes 139 (1973) 262-283; B. Honings, *Aborto e animazione umana,* Rome 1973; P. Sardi, *L'aborto ieri e oggi,* Brescia 1975; E. Eyben, *Family Planning in Graeco-Roman Antiquity:* AnSoc 11/12 (1980/81) 1-81; D.A. Dombrowski, *St. Augustine, Abortion, and libido crudelis:* Journal of the History of Ideas 49 (1988) 151-156; M.J. Gorman, *Abortion and the Early Church: Christian, Jewish and Pagan Attitudes in the Greco-Roman World,* Downers Grove, IL 1982; J.M. Riddle, *Contraception and Abortion from the Ancient World to the Renaissance,* Cambridge, MA 1992; A. Lindemann, *"Do not let a woman destroy the unborn babe in her belly." Abortion in Ancient Judaism and Christianity:* Studia Theologica. Scandinavian Journal of Theology 49 (1995) 253-271.

B. Honings

ABRAHAM

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. Recalled various times in the NT as among the most emiment personalities of the old covenant, Abraham becomes a typologically rich figure in the early Christian tradition, because of the many interpretations suggested by his whole story. He has *in semetipsum quadruplicem figuram:* of the OT, of the Jewish people, of Christ and of the pagans (Greg. of Elvira, *Tract.* 2). Because of Abraham's faith, *Irenaeus presents him as the "prophet of our faith" (*Adv. haer.* IV, 21,1, based on Gal 3:5-9), as well as calling him one who knows God through the Word, instructed in the prophetic vision of the coming of the Son of God (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 7,1; V, 1,2). *Origen, along the lines of *Philo, interprets his person as a symbol of philosophical ethics (*CCt. prol.* 3,1-16) and his entire experience as an *allegory of spiritual progress (*Comm. Jo.* XX, 67-74); he is numbered among the prophets based on Gen 20:7 (*Hom Hier.* 1,5). The departure from Canaan for the Promised Land is read as an example of the way of *purification necessary for the faithful to reach God (Ambr., *Abr.* 1,2,4; Jerome, *Ep.* 71,2,2; 108,31,1-2; 125,20,5; Greg. Nyss., *Eun.* XII; *Scala Parad.* III); his obedience in following God's invitation (Gen 12:1) is an exemplar of the monastic vocation (Jerome, *Ep.* 31,1; Euch., *De laude eremi* 1); his abandonment of land, relations and his father's house is a sign of the three renunciations to which monks are called (Cassian, *Conl.* III, 6); being led out "of the land of the Chaldeans" (Gen 15:7) is an invitation to abandon astrological beliefs and horoscopes (Orig., *Hom. Hier. lat.* I, 4); the twofold symbolism of sand and stars, by which he is promised an inheritance (Gen 14:16; 15:5), is indicative of the Hebrew people and of Christians (Justin, *Dial.* 120,2); the three animals he sacrifices to celebrate the covenant (Gen 15:9) symbolize the three epochs into which human history is divided: before the law, under the law and under grace (Quodvultdeus, *Liber de prom. et praed.* 12,18); the three men who appear at Mamre (Gen 18:1ff.) are the Logos with two angels (Justin, *Dial.* 56; Origen, *Hom. IV,1 in Gen.;* Hilary, *Trin.* 4,25), or the Logos with Moses and Elijah (Greg. of Elvira, *Tract.* 2,11), or finally the Trinity (Aug., *Trin.* 2,11,20); the age of his body is interpreted as "mortification" (Orig., *Com. Rom.* IV, 7), thus the lack of offspring is due to the practice of continence (Did., *Gen.* 16,1-2); his obedience to God in sacrificing Isaac shows his faith (Clem. Rom., *1Clem.* X, 1-6), which is faith in the resurrection (Orig., *Hom. VIII in Gen.;* Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* V, 5; August., *Civ.* XVI, 32). In sacrificing Isaac, and on the basis of Rom 8:32, Abraham becomes a type of God the Father (Orig., *Hom. VIII in Gen.*; Aug., *Civ.* XVI, 32) and shows himself an example of patience (Cypr., *De patient.* X) and manifests his virtues: wisdom, in believing in God; justice, in rendering to God what he had received; fortitude, in obeying; temperance, in the way he carried out the command (Ambr., *De offic.* I, 119). His prayer of intercession (Gen 18:16-33) is an example of humility (Cypr., *De paenit.* II, 4); his smile when God promised him a son (Gen 17:17) is a sign of wonder, not unbelief (Ambr., *De Abr.* I, 4,32; II, 11,86; August., *Civ.* XVI, 26), as was that of Sarah, to whom he is compared (Prud., *Dittochaeon* IV); his wedding with Keturah shows his ceaseless zeal for doctrine (Orig., *Hom. XI in Gen.*), as well as constituting a proof for *heretics of the possibility of contracting a second marriage (Aug., *Civ.* XVI, 34). At Mamre, Abraham saw an image of the passion of Christ (Chrom., *Serm.* 15), while he himself is depicted in the royal official of Jn 4:46-53 (Orig., *Com. Jo.* XIII, 57-58). The sons that God will raise up to him from stones (Lk 3:8) are the pagans and all those who have a heart of stone (Orig., *Hom Hier.* 4,5). Finally, the expression "bosom of Abraham" (Lk 16:22) indicates the intermediate region between heaven and hell, where the righteous are consoled as they await resurrection (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* IV, 34,10), or the "refuge of eternal peace" (Ambr., *De Obitu Valent.* 72), or the *secretum* where the rich receives the poor (August., *Serm.* 14,4-5), or the hand itself of the poor person for someone who gives him the fruits of his fast (Peter Chrys., *Serm.* 8); those who rest in it are the righteous who "participate in the things revealed to him" (Orig., *Com Jo.* XXXII, 266), believers like him, who was himself a believer (Orig., *Fr. XIV in Jo*).

DSp 1,110; RAC 1, 18-28; TRE 1, 372-382 (with ample bibl.); B. Botte, *Abraham dans la liturgie*, Cahiers Sion 5 (1951) 88-95; J. Daniélou, *Abraham dans la tradition chrétienne*: Cahiers Sion 5 (1951) 160-179; J.R. Lord, *Abraham: A Study in Ancient Jewish and Christian Interpretation*, Duke 1968; BS 1, 89-112; R. Tremblay, *La signification d'Abraham dans l'œuvre d'Irénée de Lyon*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 435-457; F. Cocchini, *Rom 4,19 nell'interpretazione origeniana*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 251-262; E. Norelli, *La sabbia e le stelle. Gen 13,16; 15,5; 22,17 nell'esegesi cristiana dei primi tre secoli*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 285-312; M. Simonetti, *La tipologia di Abramo in Gregorio di Elvira*: Annali della Facoltà di Letters e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari VI (1987) 141-153; *The Sacrifice of Isaac in the Three Monotheistic Religions*, F. Manns (ed.), Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 41, Jerusalem 1995; F. Cocchini, *Omelia VIII: la prova di Abramo*, in *Mosè ci viene letto nella Chiesa. Lettura delle Omelie di Origene sulla Genesi*, E. dal Covolo - L. Perrone (eds.), Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 153, Rome 1999, 81-108; M. Dulaey, *Le sacrifice d'Abraham*, in Id., *Le berger divin*, in "*Des forêts de symboles." L'initation chrétienne et la Bible* (*Ier-VIe siècle*), Paris 2001, 141-155.

F. Cocchini

II. Iconography. 1. With the exception of the fresco representation in the private hypogeum of Via D. Compagni (4th c.) (Ferrua, *Le pitture*, pl. 24,2) and the mosaic of the basilica of St. Maria Maggiore (5th c.), both of which illustrate the vision of Mamre (Gen 18:1-7), and the miniature Genesis cycle of Vienna (6th c.), early Christian art gives particular precedence in Abraham's story to the episode of the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:1-19), even from the earliest times when the formulation of the scene was not yet fixed. This precedence is due to the fact that the biblical event fits perfectly—along with those of *Noah saved from the *flood, the three young Jews saved from the flames (*see* Fiery Furnace) and *Daniel among the lions—into those themes that are paradigmatic of the divine work of salvation (Testini, *Tardoantico,* 121).

2. The sacrifice was painted on a wall of the so-called chapel of the sacraments A3 (Wp 41,2) at St. Callistus (1st half 3rd c.), in a somewhat rare formulation, which depicts—beyond the almost fixed elements of the bundle of sticks, the ram and a tree—Abraham and Isaac in an attitude of prayer, expressing the moment of deliverance that has already occurred. This is repeated in an arcosolium of the anonymous cemetery of the Via Anapo (4th c.) (Wp 146,2). In a painting of the synagogue of *Dura Europos (ca. 244), only the upper part of the human figures is shown; a tent with a person in it is painted in the background, perhaps symbolizing the promise of God to Abraham to multiply his descendents. This peculiarity also appears in a different form, on glass, in the Vatican Library (Garrucci, *Vetri ornati*, 9), and on a funeral relief at Cagliari (Giordani, *Di un singolare rilievo*, 170-171). A painting of the so-called Greek Chapel in the Catacombs of Priscilla (middle 3rd c.; Nestori, 39, n. 27) depicts Abraham about to deliver the mortal blow; in the same cemetery, in the so-called cubicle of the *velatio* (late 3rd c.) (Wp 78,2), Isaac, with a bundle of sticks on his shoulders, approaches his father, who is already at the place of offering. In the course of the 4th c. the scene is enriched with other elements (such as the hand of God, the angel and the servant with the ass), though Abraham's dramatic gesture and Isaac's carrying the wood are given pride of place. A fresco in the church of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter (Wp 108,1) is among the 30 or so known examples, showing Abraham leading his son, who carries a bundle of sticks, to the altar.

3. Unlike cemetery painting, early Christian *sculpture represents the sacrifice according to a virtually fixed schema, showing Abraham as he is about to impart the mortal blow with a *gladium* to his son, who kneels with his hands tied behind his back; the action moves from left to right. While respecting the fixity and brevity of the schema, the scene is frequently enriched by the compositional elements already mentioned in frescoes, with a preference for the altar on which a fire has already been lit, the divine hand and the angel. The episode is sculpted according to the simplest iconographic plan on the oldest *sarcophagus bearing the scene, that of the late 3rd-c. Le Mas d'Aire (Landes) (Ws 65,5). During the tetrarchy, sculptors also introduced Isaac carrying the bundle of sticks—without arriving, however, at the "compromise" solution, typical of frescoes, that combines the two moments in a single scene; the two moments are sometimes depicted separately but juxtaposed in a single context, as often happens with *Jonah. Following this schema are the sarcophagi of St. Marcellus at *Capua (Ws 9,2) and St. Maria dell'Anima at *Rome (Ws 183,1), and a fragmentary one of St. Callistus (Ws 183,5). From the era of *Constantine the schema, by now definitively fixed, is repeated in more than 90 instances, only rarely changing a detail: sometimes Isaac is on the altar—as, for example, on sarcophagi in the Vatican (ca. 340) (Ws 180,2) and in Madrid (380–390) (Ws 11,1)—other times Abraham's clothing varies: either a long tunic and a pallium or a scanty exomis, emphasizing respectively the sacred aspect—see among others the sarcophagus of St. *Ambrose at Milan (late 4th c.) (Ws 189)—and the realistic aspect, e.g., on a sarcophagus in the Vatican (middle 4th c.) (Rep. 42).

4. Besides the painting in the synagogue of Dura Europos, frescoes and *mosaics of the scene decorated church buildings, known to us for the most part from the descriptions of the ancient *auctores.* An Ambrosian *titulus,* prepared for the painting of a church, reads as follows: *Offert progeniem sanctis altaribus Habram / patris ei est pietas caro non parcere nato* (Abraham offers his son on the holy altars / the piety of a father did not spare the flesh of the one born to him); Augustine recalls having seen the sacrifice of Abraham *tot locis pictum* (*Contra Faust.* XXII, 73), and *Paulinus of Nola, in describing the cycle of frescoes he had commissioned for the local martyr Felix, recalls among the others the episode of Isaac carrying the bundle of wood: *Hostia viva deo, tamquam puer offerar Isac: / et mea ligna gerens sequar almum sub cruce patrem* (May I be offered as a living sacrifice like the boy Isaac / and carrying my own wood follow my kindly Father beneath the cross) (*Carm.* XXVII, 616-617). The work attributed to *Elpidius Rusticus (1st half 6th c.) enumerates the stories of the OT and NT through *tituli,* mentioning this episode (PL 62, 543). The sacrifice also occurs in

three frescoes of the necropolis of El Bagawât, in Upper Egypt (4th c.), in one at Saqqarah, and in a mosaic of the synagogue of Beth Alpha in Palestine (6th c.) (Speyart Van Woerden, *The Iconography*, 227ff.). So as not to ignore the so-called minor arts, mention should be made of five pyxes, some decorated glass, gems (ibid., 228) and lamps (Ramieri, *Gruppo di lucerne*, 312), on which the scene is depicted according to the traditional schema.

K. Wessel, RBK 1, 11-22; E. Lucchesi, LCI I, 20-35; R. Garrucci, *Vetri ornati di figure in oro trovati nei cimiteri cristiani primitivi di Roma, raccolti e spiegati*, Rome 1859, 9; J. Wilpert, *Das Opfer Abrahams in der altchristlichen Kunst*: RQA 1 (1887) 216ff.; W. Van Hartel - F. Wickoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, Vienna 1895; A.M. Smith, *The Iconography of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Early Christian Art*: American Journal of Archaeology 26 (1922) 159ff.; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Rome 1956; E. Marec, *Deux interprétations du sacrifice d'Abraham*: Libyca 7 (1959) 159ff.; A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba della via Latina*, Vatican City 1960; I. Speyart Van Woerden, *The Iconography of the Sacrifice of Abraham*: VChr 15 (1961) 274ff.; H.J. Geischer, *Heidnische Parallelen zum frühchristlichen Bild des Isaak Opfers*: JbAC 10 (1967) 127ff.; P. Testini, *Tardoantico e paleocristiano*, in Atti del Conv. *Tardoantico e Altomedioevo*, Rome 1968, 121ff.; L. Pani Ermini, *Frammenti di sarcofagi cristiani inediti*: RivAC 51 (1975) 130-132; R. Giordani, *Di un singolare rilievo funerario cristiano del Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Cagliari*, RivAC 52 (1976) 161ff.; A.M. Ramieri, *Gruppo di lucerne tardoantiche da S. Prisca*, RivAC 54 (1978) 312ff.; B. Mazzei, TIP, 92-95.

F. Bisconti

ABRAHAM bar Dashandad (3rd c.). Nicknamed "the paralytic," monastic author of the second half of the 8th c., born in the region of Beth Sayyade. Abraham taught *exegesis, *liturgy and *Aristotelian *philosophy at the school of Bashosh in Adiabene, founded by *Babai of Gbilta. Among his disciples were the future patriarchs *Timothy I (to whom he taught Greek and Arabic, among other things) and Isho' bar Nun. He retired to the monastery of Mar Gabriel at Mossul, where he died. A letter of his is preserved, addressed to his younger brother John and followed by a brief collection of spiritual counsels, which show the influence of Simeon d-Taybutheh. A commentary on the works of Mark the Hermit, only partially preserved, is attributed to him; it could also be the work of *Babai the Great. Bar Bahlul (10th c.) mentions Abraham in the preface of his great Syriac lexicon, citing him six times; this would seem to indicate that he had done philological studies.

Baumstark, 214; BBKL 18,2-4; BO III/1, 194; DHGE 1, 164; Duval, 380; Patrologia V, 483; E.A.W. Budge, *Thomas of Marga, Book of Governors*, III, London 1893, 4; A. Mingana, *Early Christian Mystics* (Woodbrooke Studies VII), Cambridge 1934, 248-255 (tr. 186-197); H. Ludin Jansen, *The Mysticism of Abraham bar Dashandad*: Numen 4 (1957) 114-126; Krüger, *Überlieferung und Verfasser der beiden Memre über das "geistige Gesetz" des Mönches Markus*: OS 6 (1957) 297-299; Krüger, *Zum theologischen Menschenbild Babais d. Gr. nach seinem noch unveröffentlichten Kommentar zu den beiden Sermones des Mönches Markus über das "geistige Gesetz"*: OC 44 (1960) 46-74.

K. den Biesen

ABRAHAM bar Lipeh (7th c.). Liturgical author, originally from Qatar, he wrote a brief commentary on the canonical office, which seems to be a summary of the commentary on the liturgy of Gabriele Qatraya. Abraham was an exegete at the School of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, where *Timothy the Great (780–823) was one of his disciples.

Baumstark, 201; BO III/1, 196-197; P. Bedjan, *Liber Superiorum seu historia monastica auctore Thoma, episcopo Margensi*, Paris-Leipzig 1901, 148; R.H. Connolly, *Anonymi auctoris Expositio officiorum, Georgio Arbelensi vulgo adscripta, II. Accedit Abrahae bar Lipheh Interpretatio officiorum* (CSCO 29 and 32), Paris 1915, 219-254; J. Mateos, *Lelya-Sapra. Essai d'interprétation des matines chaldéennes* (OCA 156), Rome 1959 (see index).

K. den Biesen

ABRAHAM of Albatanzi. *Armenian *catholicos from 607 to 610/615 (?). During his primacy the *schism between the Armenian and *Georgian churches took place; the latter, headed by catholicos Kyrion, was reconciled with the see of *Constantinople, accepting the *christological formula of the Council of *Chalcedon. The entire event is related by the Armenian historian Ukhtanes (10th c.) in his *Tripartite History.*

DHGE 1, 163; EC 1, 123; M. Brosset, *Deux historiens arméniens, Kirakos de Gantzac, XIII[e] c., Histoire d'Arménie; Oukhtanès d'Ourha, X[e] c., Histoire en trois parties. II*, St. Petersburg 1871; Z. Arzoumanian, *Bishop Ukhtanes of Sebastia, History of Armenia*, II: *History of the Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians*, Ft. Lauderdale 1988.

S.J. Voicu

ABRAHAM of Beth Rabban (6th c.). Third director of the *school of *Nisibis, Abraham directed various courses (which seem to have had nearly a thousand students) from ca. 520–540, when the school was closed because of external accusations. The Syro-*Nestorian *Chronicle of Arbela*, 78 and 80 K., remembers him as the master of the school of Nisibis, "a diligent man, zealous worker, learned in the knowledge of the fear of God and researcher of the divine

writings, friend of mar Narsai," i.e., *Narsai the Great, master at *Edessa and later at Nisibis. Abraham was Narsai's nephew and succeeded him in the direction of the school of Nisibis: for this reason he was called "of Beth Rabban" ("of the house of our Master") and was influenced by Narsai's doctrines. Abraham "directed the school with great diligence," and under his direction "the lectors and masters of the school met, and in this meeting special canons were established for the prefect," the canons of the school of Nisibis. Abraham sent *Paul as a lector to Hnana, bishop of Arbela (510–544), to found a school for youths in *Adiabene to protect them from heretics and Euchites (*Messalians). The Nestorian *Barhadbshabba also speaks favorably of Abraham in the *Cause of the Founding of the Schools*. Abraham should not be confused with the bishop of Beth Rabban, nor is he connected with the homonymous monastery founded by Mshiha-zeka, author of an *Ecclesiastical History* from which the cited *Chronicle* is drawn. His works, mostly of OT exegesis, of which some are identified in his commentary by the single word "Rabban," have been lost. Seeking to preserve contacts with the West, Abraham sent Paul, later bishop of Nisibis, to *Constantinople for the talks of 533. These contacts, however, led to the closure of the school of Nisibis, due to the anti-Greek positions of the *Sassanid king *Chosroes. This closure closely followed that of the school of *Athens, decreed by *Justinian in 529; from that school some philosophers, among them *Damascius and Simplicius, left for Persia, invited by Chosroes. They soon returned (Agazia, *Historiarum libri V*, B 30-31), establishing themselves at Harran and founding the pagan "school of the Greeks" next to the Nisibis Nestorian Christian "school of the Persians." The activity of the school of Nisibis continued in part at *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, thanks to the most famous professor of the school, mar *Aba. One can get an idea of Abraham's teaching from *Junilius's work *De partibus divinae legis libri duo* (PL 68, 15-42), which translates a more extensive work of Paul, a student of the school of Nisibis, whose teaching appears to be dominated by Aristotle's categories, as Teixidor also showed. At the court of Chosroes, Paul wrote a treatise in Syriac on *Aristotelian logic, part of which he translated literally (British Museum, MS 14, 660, ed. Land: "The Text That Paul the Persian Composed on the Logical Treatise of the Philosopher Aristotle, for the King Chosroes"). Through Junilius, the school influenced *Cassiodorus and other late Western works.

J.P.N. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, IV, Paris 1875, 1-32, with Lat. tr.; Barhadbshabba, *Patrologia Orientalis*, IV, 1908, ed. A. Scher, 319-97; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, Louvain 1965; CSCO 266, Subs, 26, 134-210; S.P. Brock, *A Syriac Collection of Prophecies of the Pagan Philosophers*, OCP 14 (1983) 203-246; Agathias, *Historiarum libri V*, ed. R. Keydel, Berlin 1967, 79-82; P. Kawerau, *Die Chronik von Arbela*, Lovanii 1985; CSCO Syri 468 t. 200, 2: 99 n. 8; 105 n. 2; M. Tardieu, *Sabiens coraniques et Sabiens de Harran*, JAs 274 (1986) 1-44: 27; Id., *Les Paysages reliques*, Louvain-Paris 1990, 131; J. Frishman, *The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy: An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai*, Leiden 1992; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Édesse: la première philosophie syriaque*, Paris 1992, 126-131; T.J. Thumpeparampil, *Mar Narsai and His Liturgical Homilies*, ChrOr 13 (1992) 123-34; S.P. Brock, *The Syriac Commentary Tradition*, in *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts*, ed. C. Burnett, Warburg 1993, 3-18; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Nisibis*, in TRE, XXIV, Berlin 1994, 573-576; M. Tamcke, *Paulos von Nisibis, Bischof der Apostolischen Kirche des Osten*, BBKL VII, 37-38; G. Reinink, *Edessa Grew Dim and Nisibis Shone Forth: The School of Nisibis at the Transition of the Sixth-Seventh Century*, in *Centres of Learning*, eds. H.J.W. Drijvers - A.A. Macdonald, Leiden 1995, 77-89; I. Arickappalil, *The Pneumatological Vision of Mar Narsai*, Harp 8-9 (1995-96) 195-208; T. Hägg - Ph. Rousseau, eds., *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2000, ch. 11 (G. Bowersock, on Rabbula); J. Frishman, *Narsai's Christology*, 208-303; I. Ramelli, *Il Chronicon di Arbela*, Madrid 2002, 'Ilu Anejos VIII, 70-72.

I. RAMELLI

ABRAHAM of Beyt Qiduna (or Qidunaya) (4th c. ?). Some old *Syriac manuscripts, going back to the 5th-6th c., have transmitted the *Acta* of Abraham. A critical revision in Greek has been known for some time, inserted in the hagiographical work of Simeon Metaphrastes and attributed to *Ephrem the Syrian (whose authorship is no longer sustained, though he probably wrote some hymns in honor of Abraham). The location of the events narrated in the *Acta* has led to a wide range of interpretations. If Abraham is an actual historical figure and lived in the 4th c., the pages perpetuating his memory seem strongly influenced by a variety of *topoi* abundant in the literary genre of popular hagiography. Born of well-to-do parents, Abraham was promised in marriage as a child and forced to marry the woman chosen. Seven days after the wedding Abraham secretly left his wife, like *Alexius, and took refuge in an isolated cabin at a distance from the city, living there for over ten years in great austerity. At that time the local bishop, who despite everything knew Abraham, at least by reputation, after vain efforts to evangelize the suburb of Beyt Qiduna (near *Edessa; another link with one version of the story of Alexius), sent Abraham there and ordained him priest. The zealous apostle at first employed radical measures (the destruction of the idols of the *pagan *temple), then through patience and perseverance succeeded in gaining the trust of the people, who ultimately embraced the Christian faith. Having completed the

religious education of the neophytes, Abraham returned to the hermit's life, only to leave it once again to rescue his niece Maria, who had wandered into a dissolute life (another frequent theme in stories about holy hermits). In a *Catena Patrum* (8th c.) Abraham's death is listed as 14 December; for this reason Rabban Sliba also commemorates Abraham on this date in his calendar. Abraham is commemorated on different dates in the calendars of the *Jacobite church. The Synaxarion of *Constantinople includes it on 29 October, the Roman Martyrology on 16 March.

DHGE 1, 175-177; BS 1, 113-115. On the hymns of Ephrem: J.P. Botha, *Textual Strategy in a Fourth-Century Syriac Hymn on the Life of the Ascetic Abraham of Kidun*: Acta Patristica et Byzantina 8 (1997) 42-52.

J.-M. Sauget

ABRAHAM of Clermont (d. ca. 477). Born beside the Euphrates during the persecution of Christians by the Persian kings, Abraham left his homeland for Egypt, where he was captured by bandits. Escaping to the West, he became a hermit in Alvernia. Put in charge of the monastery of Saint-Cirgues, near Clermont, he built the church there, which he dedicated to St. Cyrus, patron of Aboukir. He had the gift of miracles. *Sidonius Apollinaris wrote his epitaph; *Gregory of Tours, his biography. His feast is celebrated at Clermont on 15 June.

Sidonius Apoll., *Ep.* 7,17; Gregory of Tours, *Vitae PP.* 3; DHGE I, 161; BS I, 119-120.

V. Saxer

ABRAHAM of Ephesus (Abrahamios) (6th c.). *Archbishop of *Ephesus ca. second half of the 6th c. Probably identical with the *abbot of the same name mentioned by *John Moschus (PG 87, 2956), founder of two *monasteries, one at *Constantinople and another at *Jerusalem. Two of his homilies survive: *In annuntiationem* and *In festivitatem occursus*. The first contains a polemical allusion against *Origen (which dates it at 530–553) that is particularly important for the history of *liturgy, in that it constitutes the earliest evidence of moving the celebration of the Annunciation from before Christmas to March 25.

CPG II, § 7380-81; M. Jugie, *Homélies Mariales Byzantines*: PO 16, 3 (1921) 429-454 [5-30]; on the convent of the Abrahamites at Constantinople: DHGE 1, 189-190.

S.J. Voicu

ABRAHAM of Harran (Mesopotamia), bishop (4th-5th c.). Abraham is known mainly through the chapter on him by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus in his *Historia Religiosa* (History of Syrian monks). Abraham was born in the diocese of Cyrrhus ca. middle 4th c. Whether he was born into a Christian family or converted to Christianity on his own is unknown. He spent a significant portion of his life as a hermit in the Chalcidian *desert; at one point his austerities so reduced his health that his recovery was considered a miracle.

Afterward he went with some companions to the region of *Emesa (modern Homs) to preach the gospel. The pagans there, resistant at first, were ultimately won over by his charity and the austerity of his life. Since they wanted no one else besides him as priest, he was ordained. After three years Abraham tried to return to the desert but was quickly recalled, this time for good, and placed at the head of the diocese of Harran. His reputation for holiness was such that the emperor *Theodosius II called him to *Constantinople to meet him personally. Abraham died there ca. 422. His body was removed from Constantinople to Harran. The Synaxarion of Constantinople commemorates Abraham on 14 February; he is not mentioned in the Syrian calendars.

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Historia religiosa* 17, SC 257, 32-51; DHGE 1, 166-167; BS 1, 115.

J.-M. Sauget

ABRAHAM of Kashkar (al-Wasit), *hegumen (d. 586). After a period of studies at the *Nisibis *school and a trip in *Egypt in the desert of *Scete and on Mt. *Sinai, Abraham at first lived as an *anchorite, then founded, ca. 570, a famous *monastery on *Mt. Izla, near Nisibis, also known as "the Great Convent."

He was significant not only for the reform of Syro-Eastern monasticism but also for its spread: he was responsible for dozens of new foundations, founded by his disciples. In fact, after the activity of *Barsauma of Nisibis and the reforms of the *catholicos Aqaq, Persian *monasticism had regressed significantly both quantitatively and qualitatively, leaving an opening for *Messalian propaganda. Abraham brought a more structured monasticism, anti-Messalian and strongly anchored to both the institutions and theology of the Persian church. The rules he composed have survived, though they were later modified with a stronger doctrinal accent by his first successor, Dadisho'. The reform of the monastic *eskima* may be attributable to him, consisting in the introduction of the monastic crown (*subbara*) in-

stead of the baldness typical of monophysite monks.

General presentations: Chabot 52-53; Duval 168, 169, 212; Baumstark 130; Ortiz de Urbina 135; J. Labourt, *Christianisme perse*, 315-318; J. Habbi, *Abramo di Kaškar, riformatore e fondatore*, in *Enciclopedia dei Santi. Le Chiese orientali*, Rome 1998, I, 26-28.

Editions and translations of the rule: J.B. Chabot, *Regulae monasticae ab Abrahamo et Dadjesus conditae*, Rome 1898; *Abramo di Kaškar, Giovanni il solitario. Nell'umiltà e nella mitezza. Regole monastiche*, St. Chialà (ed.), *Lettera a Esichio*, M. Nin (ed.) (Testi dei Padri della Chiesa, 45), Magnano 2000.

A. Camplani

ABRAHAM of Nathpar (d. 570/575). Probably born early 6th c., of Christian parents, in the village of Beth-Nathpar, *Adiabene. His ancestors were martyrs under Shapor II (309–379) by the work of the latter's brother, Ardashir II (379–383). While still young Abraham dedicated himself to the ascetical life, living in a cave not far from his village. According to the biographical tradition, three years later he went on pilgrimage to *Jerusalem and visited the *Egyptian monks. After this (presumed) journey, he returned to his cave, where he remained for about thirty years, during which time he formed some disciples in the *monastic life: Isaiah, Elisha and Job the Persian. A vision led him to leave both solitude and disciples, moving into the northern mountains, in the region of Beth-Dasen, for a mission of evangelization. His preaching encountered difficulties, but some miracles by him converted the local population, who accepted his God and were baptized. It is said his missionary zeal compelled him toward Azerbaijan, where he died, very probably between 570 and 575; his tomb became a place of healing. His body, being contested, was stolen by his countrymen during the night and solemnly carried into his village church, where it was buried. After some years Job the Persian, having turned the master's cave into a *monastery, moved the body there. The Assyrian Church of the East commemorates him on the fifth Friday after the feast of the Dedication as the founder of the *monasteries in the region of Adiabene. A breviary of the Syro-Western church celebrates him on 13 March.

The texts containing the more or less legendary information on Abraham's life associate the master with his disciple Job. The first biography known to us, now lost, was written ca. 660 by Sabrisho' (called Rostam) of Hrem, a village near Abraham's native village of Beth-Nethpra. The other significant sources on his relationship with *Nestorian monasticism merit close study: some of the information of Isho'dnah (*Liber de castitate*) on Abraham has been poorly interpreted by some scholars, making him a disciple of *Abraham of Kashkar (501–586); but the same early sources, such as the *Liber Turris* and the *Storia Nestoriana,* involve Abraham, in a forced way, in the monastic reform effected by Abraham of Kashkar.

Abraham's literary activity spread very rapidly through the monastic world: at the end of the 6th c. his disciple Job translated his discourses (*mēmrē*), together with the rules of Abraham of Kashkar, into *Pahlavi; that combination, as already noted at the biographical level, is an indication of the esteem given the two Abrahams on the part of renascent Nestorian monasticism. It acknowledged Abraham of Kashkar as the reformer of monastic discipline, and Abraham of Nethpra as the creator of a spirituality destined to be extraordinarily enriched a few decades after his death through its encounter with the Evagrian texts. In the decades following the mid-7th c., another of his countrymen, Henanisho, introduced at the end of the *Book of Paradise*—a highly successful work throughout the monasteries of the East—"questions," "examples" and "discourses " chosen from the writings of Abraham. The manuscript tradition of Abraham's work is somewhat problematic, containing spurious or doubtful texts; those that can be called authentic are often anonymous or attributed to some other author. In fact, while the Syro-Eastern manuscript tradition has no significant errors, the Syro-Western adopted the writings of Abraham, slightly changing the surname (Neptrāyā); by the end of the 8th c., a part was circulated under the name of *Evagrius.

The monastic writings of Abraham appear to be rather archaic, containing the most typical characteristics of the oldest Syrian ascetic literature, particularly *Aphraates and *Liber Graduum*. Marked by a certain moderation and reliance on the Bible, his texts are full of both explicit biblical citations and allusions.

R.-M. Tonneau, *Abraham de Natpar*: L'Orient Syrien 2 (1957) 337-350; Patrologia V, 482; A. Penna, *Abramo di Nathpar*: Rivista degli Studi Orientali 32 (1957) 415-431; F. del Rio Sanchez, *Abrahám de Natpar*: StudMon 42 (2000) 53-63; C.C. Chahine, *Le témoignage de Thomas de Margâ sur les extraits d'Abraham Nethprâïâ dans le livre du Paradis de 'Nânîšo'*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 439-460; C. Chahine, *Abraham de Bēth-Nethprā*, Tesi Augustinianum, Rome 2004.

C.C. Chahine

ABRAHAM of Pbou (d. ca. 580). Superior general of the *Pachomian *monasteries under *Justinian (in particular, resident in the principal convent of

Pbou, now Faw al-Qibli, in the Thebaid). Abraham would not adhere to the confession of *Chalcedon. Summoned to *Constantinople ca. 560, he refused to submit to the emperor's will and was therefore forced to leave his *monastery. He went to the monastery of *Shenoute (region of Athrib) to copy the Shenoutian Rule, founding a new monastic community at Tberkjot (Ar. Farshut), not far from Pbou, according to that rule.

P. Van Cauwenbergh, *Étude sur les moines d'Égypte*, Paris 1914; A. Campagnano, *Monaci egiziani fra V e VI secolo*: VetChr 15 (1978) 223-246; Coptic Encyclopedia 1,11-12.

T. Orlandi

ABRAHAM the Confessor (d. after 463). *Armenian priest, participated in the Synod of Artashat (450–451), which rejected the order of the Persian king Yazdegerd II to the Armenians to embrace Zoroastrianism. He was imprisoned in *Persia and tortured, then exiled in *Mesopotamia with his companion, the priest Coren, who died there (461). Freed in 463, Abraham returned to Armenia. According to the continuator of *Elisaeus, he died in a hermitage; according to *Lazarus of Pharp he was consecrated bishop of Bznunik (northwest of the lake of Van). The date of his death is unknown. The Armenian church commemorates him with Coren on 20 December.

Elisaeus, *La guerra armena e di Vardan*, crit. ed. of E. Ter Minassian, Erevan 1957, 125-153, Fr. tr. by V. Langlois, in *Coll. des hist. anc. et mod. de l'Arménie*, II, Paris 1869, 225-247, Ital. tr. by G. Cappelletti, *Eliseo, storico armeno del quinto secolo*, Venice 1840; L. P'arpec'i, *Storia dell'Armenia*, Venice 1933, 45-56, Fr. tr. Langlois, ibid., 311-318; DHGE I, 167-168; BS I, 124. On the historical value of the account of Elisaeus, see DHGE XV, 232-235. On Abraham as a hagiographer, see L.A. Ter-Petrosian, *"Les martyrs orientaux" d'Abraham le confesseur. Tradition textuelle* (in Armenian), Erevan 1976; M. van Esbroeck, *Abraham le Confesseur (Ve s.), traducteur des Passions des martyrs perses*: AB (1977) 169-179.

D. Stiernon

ABRASAX (Ἀβρασάξ, transcribed by the Latin authors as *Abraxas*). Name of the "head of the heavens" or supreme deity in the *gnosticism of *Basilides. *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 24,3-7) shows that this name was considered to be equivalent, by the numerical value of its letters, to the combination of the 365 heavens that in Basilides's doctrine constitute the divine world formed by a process of emanation from the ungenerated Father. The name Abrasax appears in the formularies of the Greek Magic Papyri (GMP) and on many late gems and intaglios, often together with the name IAO, to characterize various types of figures, usually human with animal heads (rooster, lion, etc.). By extension, the name "Abrasax gems" is given to so-called gnostic gems bearing various symbols and inscriptions, to which magical purposes and meaning are attributed.

A. Dieterich, *Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des spätern Altertums*, Leipzig 1891; H. Leclercq, s.v. *Abrasax*: DACL I, 127-155. A useful bibliographical list of studies on magic, an object of renewed scientific attention in recent decades, P. Brillet - A. Moreau (eds.), *La magie. Bibliographie générale*, Montpellier 2000. The work is a complement, as Volume IV, of the publication of the Acts of an international Colloquium on the theme: A. Moreau - J.-C. Turpin (eds.), *La magie. Actes du Colloque International de Montpellier* 25-27 mars 1999: I, *Du monde babylonien au monde hellénistique*; II, *La magie dans l'antiquité grecque tardive. Les mythes*; III, *Du monde latin au monde contemporain*, Montpellier 2000. In particular, for the significance of magic gems, see A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Atti dell'Incontro di Studio Gemme gnostiche e cultura ellenistica*, Verona, 22-23 October 1999, Bologna 2002.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

ABUNDIUS (or Abundantius) of Como (d. 489). Bishop of Como, elected certainly prior to 450. His biographer is not pre-Carolingian, but makes use of older sources (BHL 15), which believed him to be from *Thessalonica, though no contemporary document confirms this assertion; nor is it certain that he was well-versed in both Latin and Greek (see Mouterde 46), though Pope *Leo the Great did send him to *Constantinople as an ambassador to *Theodosius II and *Marcian to deliver the **Tomus ad Flavianum* (Leo the Great, *Ep.* 69-71); he returned in 451. That same year he added his signature to his metropolitan's synodal letter to the pope. Abundius received another letter from *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (PG 83, 1492). His feast is 2 April; 489 is traditionally considered the year of his death, though there is no certain proof. He is buried in St. Abundius at Como, if the epitaph there is his (CIL 5, 5402). Another Abundius, a martyr under *Diocletian, was venerated at Rome (W. De Grüneisen, *Sainte Marie Antique*, Rome 1911, 503-504; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 16-17).

Verzeichnis 49; PCBE 2, 1, 5-7; BS 1, 23-32; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 978-979; P. Mouterde, *Fragments d'actes d'un synode tenu à Constantinople en 450*: Mélanges de l'Université St. Joseph Beyrouth 15 (1930) 35-50; J.-C. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques*, Rome 1988, 280-283, 597-598.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

ACACIANS (οἱ περὶ Ἀκάκιον). Name given to those Eastern bishops who, in the events of 358–360, took a

moderate position between the radical Arians and the *homoiousians in the *Arian controversy, taking their lead from *Acacius of Caesarea. They are today known as *homoians (from *homoios*).

Socrates, *HE* II, 39-40; Sozomen, *HE* IV, 22-23; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 143-254; Id., *Eastern Attitudes to Rome During the Acacian Schism*, in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, D. Baker (ed.), Oxford 1976, 69-81.

M. Simonetti

ACACIUS. A number of *martyrs bore this name. The first was a confessor under *Decius, erroneously thought to be the bishop of Melitene who took part in the Council of *Ephesus (431) and later in the Council of *Antioch in Pisidia (BHG 2005-2006; *Verzeichnis* 49-50). The second belonged to the group of 10,000 Armenian martyrs crucified on Mt. Ararat, according to a 12th-13th-c. legend that came to be attributed to Anastasius the Librarian (BHL 20-24; LCI 5, 16-21). The third, according to Simeon Metaphrastes, was a centurion of the *Cappadocian army martyred and buried near *Byzantium (BHG 13; BHO 20-21). The fourth was one of the 60 martyrs of *Jerusalem killed by the Agareni or *Saracens under *Leo III the Isaurian (BHG 1217-1218). For the others, see BHG 1189, 1201-1208, 1432 and 2204.

BS 1, 131-146.

S. Heid

ACACIUS of Beroea (d. ca. 433). Born ca. 340, Acacius dedicated himself to the *monastic life and gained honor for his *ascetic virtues. He corresponded with *Basil of Caesarea and encouraged *Epiphanius to write the *Panarion*. As part of a systematic plan to increase his power in *Syria, *Meletius ordained Acacius bishop of Beroea (Aleppo) in 378. Acacius participated with his metropolitan in the Council of *Constantinople of 381, after which he was sent to *Rome to seek, unsuccessfully, a solution to the *schism of *Antioch. Some time after Meletius's death, Acacius ordained *Flavian bishop of Antioch, and for this he was excommunicated by Pope *Damasus; the condemnation, however, had no practical effects. At first a friend of *John Chrysostom, personal differences led to hostility; his tenacious opposition contributed to John's ruin. He was one of the four bishops rejected by Chrysostom as judges at the *Synod of the Oak (403). He was very old at the time of the clash between *Nestorius and *Cyril of Alexandria, and did not participate in the Council of *Ephesus. Due to the great prestige that attached to him, however, he played a decisive mediatory role between Cyril and *John of Antioch in the discussions that led to the pact of union of 433. He died shortly thereafter. Of what must have been a vast correspondence, we have only six letters regarding the Nestorian affair, some only in Latin translation.

CPG III, 6477-6482; PG 77, 100-101; 84, 647-648, 660, 851-854; ACO I, 1,1:7, etc. (see CPG); Quasten II, 485-486; DHGE 1, 241-242; G. Bardy, *Acace de Bérée et son rôle dans la controverse nestorienne*: RSR 18 (1938) 20-44; BBKL I, 15.

M. Simonetti

ACACIUS of Caesarea (d. 365). Successor to *Eusebius in 340 as bishop of Caesarea (Palestine) and heir of the anti-*Nicene and moderate tendencies of his predecessor, Acacius was among the principal representatives of the *Eusebians. We find him at *Serdica (343), and then in 357 at a small pro-*Arian council convened at *Antioch by *Eudoxius. Around 350 he favored the election of *Cyril as bishop of *Jerusalem, but later opposed him, more for reasons of ecclesiastical jurisdiction than doctrine, and had him deposed. In the crisis of 358–359, according to *Constantius's plan he supported the formation of a moderate party, hostile to both radical Arians and *homoiousians, which made its debut with the formula of *Sirmium of 22 May 359. At the Council of *Seleucia (359) he opposed the *homoiousian majority, proposing a compromise formula that defined the Son as like (*homoios*) the Father according to the Scriptures. Though defeated and in the minority, his political and doctrinal direction prevailed with Constantius, who imposed it on his opponents. This was the height of Acacius's influence; he obtained the election of *Meletius as bishop of Antioch in 360. At this time the controversy on the Holy Spirit began, the divine character of whom Acacius denied. The balance of power having changed after the death of Constantius, he was among those in 363 who, with Meletius, accepted the *homoousios* at Antioch; in 364, however, the pro-Arians, supported by the emperor *Valens, were back in power, and Acacius calmly adapted to the new direction. He died ca. 365. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 98), who mentions his work for the preservation of *Origen's library, attributes to him a *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* in 17 books, and 6 books of *Various Questions*, in addition to other works on various unspecified themes. A surviving fragment of an early work against *Marcellus of Ancyra emphasizes the theme of Christ as the image of God, drawing from it the distinction of the two divine *hypostases but also their close affinity and likeness. Of the

great exegetical works cited by Jerome only fragments remain, which show a tendency to the literal interpretation of Sacred Scripture.

CPG II, 3510-3515; Quasten II, 348-349; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Münster 1933, 53-56; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (ST 201), Vatican City 1979, 107-122; J.M. Leroux, *Acace évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341-365)*: SP VIII (TU 93), Berlin 1966, 82-85; J.T. Lienhard, *Acacius of Caesarea 'Contra Marcellum': Historical and Theological Reconsiderations*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 10 (1989) 1-22; BBKL I, 15-16.

M. Simonetti

ACACIUS of Constantinople (Acacian schism) (d. 489). *Patriarch of *Constantinople from 471 to 489, during the brief usurpation of *Basiliscus (475–476). Acacius did not approve of the emperor's pro-monophysite policy and confirmed his adherence to *Chalcedon and the *Tome* of *Leo. After *Zeno was restored to the throne, however, in the face of the spread and combatitiveness of the *monophysites, Acacius advised a policy of compromise to the emperor, which found expression in the publication of the **Henoticon* (482). This document restated the basic positions of the theology of *Chalcedon, affirming Christ as consubstantial (*homoousios) with the Father according to his divinity and with us according to his humanity; by this, Acacius confirmed the integrity of Christ's humanity but was silent on the controversial term "nature." Also, while reaffirming the *Nicene faith (325) confirmed at *Constantinople (381) and *Ephesus (431), he remained silent on the *Council of Chalcedon. The formula, which did not contrast with the basic ideas of a moderate monophysitism, was accepted by many, among them the monophysite patriarchs *Peter Mongus of *Alexandria and *Peter the Fuller of *Antioch, and was imposed on the other bishops in the East, despite the opposition of both Chalcedonians and radical monophysites. At *Rome in 484, however, *Felix III, after a fruitless Roman mission to Constantinople, declared Acacius deposed and *excommunicated following a conciliar decision. Thus began the so-called Acacian *schism between Rome and Constantinople, which lasted until 518, as long as the *Henoticon* remained in force, with attempts at conciliation by the emperor *Anastasius with *Gelasius (ca. 495) and *Hormisdas (515) failing due to the intransigence of the Roman see. With *Justinian's accession (518) the Chalcedonians regained the upper hand, and this time the negotiations reinitiated with Hormisdas were successful (519). Among the conditions imposed in these negotiations was the confirmation of Acacius's condemnation, and his name was removed from the *diptychs.

CPG III, 5990-5994; DHGE 1, 244-248; E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*: ABAW, NF 10 (1934); W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 143-254; Grillmeier, 2/1 (1986) 279-358; BBKL I, 16; LTK 1, 285-286.

M. Simonetti

ACACIUS of Melitene (d. 438/449). Lector of the church of Melitene in Euphratesia, he was charged (ca. 384) with the education of St. *Euthymius the Great. Bishop of Melitene prior to 430, he actively participated in the *Council of Ephesus (431), where he met *Nestorius and preached a homily. He was part of the episcopal delegation charged with instructing *Theodosius II at *Chalcedon, and attended the ordination of *Maximian of *Constantinople. An ultra-Cyrillian to the point that some consider his doctrine as containing "the seed of *Eutychianism," and allergic to any reconciliation with *John of Antioch, from 433 to 436 he conducted a crusade against *Nestorius and against the works of *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Diodore of Tarsus, in correspondence addressed to *Cyril of Alexandria (the first of three letters sent him by Cyril is very important for the history of Cyril's doctrinal position), to the Armenian *patriarch *Sahak (whose reply we possess) and to the Armenians. Died ca. 438, certainly before 449. Venerated 17 April.

BHG 648, 2008; Fr. version of A.-J. Festugière, *Cyrille de Scythopolis. Vie de saint Euthyme*, Paris 1962, 62-63, 87; ACO IV, III, 1, 89; CPG 5792-96 (see 5340, 5368-69); DHGE I, 242-243; BS I, 143-144; CGG I, 177, 224, 232-233, 369; II, 392, 947 n. 48; RGG[4], 1, 95-96; BBKL 1, 15; V. Inglisian, *Die Beziehungen des Patriarchen Proclus von Konstantinopel und des Bischof Akakios von Melitene zu Armenien*: OC 41 (1957) 35-50; G. Winkler, *Die spätere Überlieferung der armenischen Quellen zu den Ereignissen des Jahre bis nach dem Ephesinum*: OC 70 (1986) 143-80; Grillmeier 2/2, 415.

D. Stiernon

ACACIUS of Seleucia (d. 496/497). *Patriarch of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon from 484/5–496/7, Acacius is known for the synod he held at Seleucia in 486, recorded by the **Chronicle of Arbela,* 71 K.: "In the second year of Walash, the king of kings, the *catholicos Aqaq invited all the bishops of the East, according to the usual custom, to a synod he convoked." From the acts—which remain intact, with the signatures of almost all of the bishops of the East—we see that the synod declared *Nestorianism

as *orthodoxy for the East, condemned the other theological doctrines and reserved ecclesiastical *celibacy to monks. Included in the text are six letters exchanged betweeen Acacius and *Barsauma of *Nisibis—like Acacius, a disciple of *Ibas of *Edessa, successor to Bishop *Rabbula and promoter, in the school of Edessa, of the translation of *Theodore of Mopsuestia from the Greek into *Syriac—prior to the *schism in 475 of the Nestorian group of the school of Edessa, which migrated eastward. The sources, particularly Bar Hebraeus, seem to have exaggerated the antagonism between Acacius and Barsauma, creating unreliable caricatures of the two. The schism, Barsauma's invitation of *Narsai to Nisibis during the time of Acacius, and the foundation of the *school of Nisibis and its fervent exegetical activity are also recorded by the Nestorian *Chronicle of Arbela,* 69-70 K.: "Renowned at Edessa was the perfect man mar Ibas, the bishop, who caused orthodoxy to triumph by his labors. . . . After his death, the disciples of falsehood prevailed . . . and expelled from the city all of the Persian disciples. They returned to their lands and founded many schools there. Barsauma of Nisibis invited Narsai, the famous doctor, to visit him, and built a great school, with a large body of brothers; unceasingly he educated renowned sons and and doctors for the church. There he explained all of the divine books, not departing in a single question from the doctrine of the Exegete," i.e., of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was deeply esteemed by the Nestorians. The Nestorian *Barhadbshabba, for example, in his *Cause of the Foundation of the Schools*, expresses enthusiasm for him, Acacius, Narsai and Barsauma.

O. Braun, *Das Buch der Synhodos*, Stuttgart 1900, 59-83; J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse*, Paris 1904, 131-152; Barhadbshabba, PO IV, 1908, ed. A. Scher, 319-397; J.M. Fiey, *L'Elam*, Melto 5 (1969) 128; M. Simonetti, *Note sull'esegesi veterotestamentaria di Teodoro di Mopsuestia*: VetChr 14 (1977) 69-102; P. Kawerau, *Die Chronik von Arbela*, Lovanii 1985, CSCO Syri 468 t. 200, 2: 70-71; J. Frishman, *The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy: Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai*, Leiden 1992; T.J. Thumpeparampil, *Mar Narsai and His Liturgical Homilies*: ChrOr 13 (1992) 123-134; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Édesse: la première philosophie syriaque*, Paris 1992, 126-131; I. Abramowski, *Die Reste der syrischen Übersetzung von Theodor von Mopsuestia*: ARAM 5 (1993) 23-32; A. de Halleux, *Nestorius: histoire et doctrine*: Irénikon 66 (1993) 38-52, 163-177: in *Pro Oriente*, Vienna 1994, 200-215; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Nisibis*, in TRE, XXIV, Berlin 1994, 573-576; for the identification: M. Tardieu, *Barsauma de Qardu*, in *Dict. des Philosophes*, ed. R. Goulet, II, Paris 1994, 84; H.J.W. Drijvers, *The School of Edessa*, in Id. - A.A. MacDonald, *Centres of Learning*, Leiden 1995, 49-59; P. Bruns, *Theodor von Mopsuestia. Katechetische Homilien*, Freiburg 1995; Id., *Den Menschen mit dem Himmel verbinden*, Louvain 1995, CSCO 549, Subs. 89; L. Van Rompay, *La littérature exégétique syriaque*: PdO 20 (1995) 221-235; I. Arickappalil, *The Pneumatological Vision of Mar Narsai*: Harp 8-9 (1995-96) 195-208; J. Frishman, *Narsai's Christology* Harp 8-9 (1995-96) 208-303; I. Ramelli, *Il Chronicon di Arbela*, Madrid 2002, 'Ilu Anejos VIII, 65-66.

I. Ramelli

ACATHISTUS. Hymn, acephalous poem, always called by this name because sung or recited while standing (that is, not sitting, *acathistus,* Gk. *akathistos*), in an act of veneration for the Virgin. Some think the name derives from the fact that it was first sung by priests and people who were standing all night. It belongs to the group of alphabetical songs (*Acrostics). The *Byzantine liturgy recites four strophes during compline of the first four Fridays of Lent; the entire song is sung on Friday evening or Saturday morning of the fifth week. It is also sung at the request of the faithful in public disasters. Composed of 24 strophes, rich in poetic figures and imagery, it develops themes related to Luke's account of the annunciation (Lk 1:26-36) and the Matthean episodes of the *magi and the flight into *Egypt (Mt 2). The first 12 strophes interpret the events recorded of Jesus' infancy, and the last 12 enumerate the benefits of the *incarnation and the work of salvation, in which Mary participates. The literary structure is uniform: after the first and all odd strophes, each treating a theme, follows a litany to the Virgin, meant by the anonymous author to be a more imaginative and poetical representation of the theme treated in the preceding strophe. Even strophes end with the acclamation "Alleluia," which all can sing except Herod (strophe 10). The Synaxarion (PG 92, 1348-1354) records that the hymn was sung by clergy and people to celebrate the liberation of *Constantinople in 626 from the Persian and Avar siege. It also records the extraordinary liberations of *Constantinople from Arab sieges under Constantine IV Pogonatos (677-678) and *Leo III the Isaurian (718). The mention in the Synaxarion is given as a historical reason for a liturgical feast celebrated at the time, but it notes neither the author nor the date of composition. The anonymous author very probably lived in the 5th c. and shows a dependence in strophes 1, 2 and 15 on the *Homily on the Mother of God* by *Basil of Seleucia (d. after 468). The current tendency to attribute it to *Romanus Melodus (late 5th c.–560) or one of his imitators has not gained a consensus. If it were reliable that it was composed and sung to celebrate the liberation of Constantinople in 626 from the siege of the combined Persian and Avar armies, all authors whose literary activity preceded that date would be excluded from consideration. In its present form it seems to allude to other sieges of Constanti-

nople by the Arabs, those under Constantine IV (677) and Leo III (718); it should probably be dated between 677–718.

C. del Grande, *L'inno acatisto*, Florence 1948; Ital. tr. by G. Ferrari, Trani 1976; E. Wellesz, *The Akathistos: A Study in Byz. Hymn.*: DOP 9/10 (1956) 143-174; J.T. Tyciak - W. Lipphardt, *Akathistos*, in *Lex. der Marienkunde*, I, Regensburg 1967, 96-97; E. Toniolo, *Akathistos. Saggi di critica e di teologia*, Centro di Cultura Mariana "Madre della Chiesa," Rome 2000.

E. Peretto

ACCLAMATIONS, Liturgical. Liturgical acclamations are short formulas recited by the assembly in response to readings, admonitions or prayers said by the ministers. They may be responses to the priest's greeting (*Et cum spiritu tuo*) or to litanies (the *Kyrie eleison* in the *Gelasian invocations).

One of the most important liturgical acclamations is the "Amen," which passed into the Christian *liturgy from the *synagogue. According to *Justin Martyr, it expresses the assent of the assembly to the eucharistic *prayer recited in its name by the presider (*I Apol.* 65, 3-4). "Amen" is also a proclamation of the faith of the Christian who receives the *Eucharist; according to *Ambrose: *Non otiose dicis tu Amen, iam in spiritu confitens quod accipies Corpus Christi. Cum ergo tu petieris, dicit tibi sacerdos Corpus Christi et tu dicis Amen, hoc est Verum. Quod confitetur lingua teneat affectus* (You do not causally say Amen, since indeed you confess by the Spirit that you have received the body of Christ. When the priest says to you, "The body of Christ," you say, "Amen"; that is, "It is true." What one confesses with the tongue is held in the heart.—*De Sacram.* IV, 25: SC 25 bis, 116). *Augustine explains the significance of the Amen in various homilies (*Serm.* 272; 334; 362).

Another important acclamation is "Alleluia," described as a heavenly song in Rev 19:1-6, and used in the Roman liturgy as an acclamation at the gospel, except during *Lent. The *Rule of St. Benedict* (ch. 15) indicates that the omission of the Alleluia during Lent is an ancient Roman tradition that those in the East never entirely understood. It is possible that in the Roman context this acclamation was considered Paschal and thus to be omitted during Lent. *Sozomen (*HE* VII, 19: PG 67, 1475) mocked the Roman church for singing the Alleluia only on *Easter Sunday, while John the Deacon (*Ep. ad Senarium* 13: ST 59, 178) claims that it was sung throughout Eastertide. Augustine comments on the significance of the Alleluia in many homilies (*Serm.* 254; 256; 362).

Deo gratias and *Laus tibi*, *Christe* are the acclamations that follow the readings and the gospel, respectively. It seems that the *Deo gratias* owes its origin to the religious culture of the 4th-6th c. The *Rule of St. Benedict* (ch. 66) tells the *porter to reply *Deo gratias* to a guest who presents himself. As a response to the reader's declaration of the end of the reading, *Deo gratias* may be a statement of attention on the part of the assembly (Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia*, I, 537-538). *Laus tibi*, *Christe*, however, is of Gallican origin and inspired by Eastern liturgies. In the Roman *Mass, it was introduced as an acclamation of the assembly in the *Ordo Missae* of 1969: previously it was said only by the acolyte.

The *Sanctus* is essentially a *chant and can be considered an acclamation that concludes the preface and introduces the next part of the eucharistic prayer. *Tertullian (*De Orat.* 3) explains it as an anticipation of our future task of proclaiming the glory of God with the angels. The strictly acclamatory part of the Sanctus, however, is *Hosanna in excelsis,* which precedes and follows the versicle *Benedictus qui venit*, which was added to the *Sanctus* at the time of St. *Caesarius (*Serm.* 72,2: CCL 103, 307), though according to the *Const. Apost.* (VIII, 13) it is recited at the moment of *Communion.

The Vatican II reform introduced an acclamation after the account of the institution in the eucharistic prayer. The formulations vary but are inspired by Scripture (1 Cor 11:26) and focus on the Paschal mystery. This anamnetic acclamation is today one of the best-known liturgical acclamations.

Another important acclamation is the *Kyrie eleison*, seemingly of *pagan origin. *Egeria (*Itiner.* 24) speaks of it in connection with the litanies said after Vespers at *Jerusalem. The *Const. Apost.* VIII, 6 put this acclamation after the readings, as a response of the people to the litanies prior to the sending away of the catechumens. In the Syro-Western, Byzantine and Armenian liturgies, the *Kyrie eleison* is also used, in both the Mass and the office, as a response to the *ektenia,* the litany prayers that come after the readings and before the small entrance *procession in the Byzantine Mass. In the Roman liturgy the *Kyrie eleison* was used as a response to the *deprecatio Gelasii*, i.e., the litanies attributed to Pope *Gelasius (*see* Intercession). In the *Rule of St. Benedict* the litanies with the response *Kyrie eleison* are kept in the morning and evening office, while the *Supplicatio litaniae*, i.e., the *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, *Kyrie eleison* separated by the litanies, is used in other offices (chs. 9, 12). The acclamation *Christe eleison* is of Western origin; *Gregory the Great himself admitted that it was unknown in the East (*Registrum*, IX, *Ep.* 26: MGH *Ep.* 2, 59: PL 77, 956).

Amen: F. Cabrol, DACL 1 (1907) 1554-1573.

Alleluia: L. Eizenhöfer, *Der Allelujagesang vor dem Evangelium*: EphLit 45 (1931) 374-382; A. Martimort, *Origine et signification de l'Alleluia de la messe romaine*, in *Kyriakon*, Festschrift J. Quasten, Münster 1970, 2, 811-834; *Deo gratias and Laus tibi, Christe*: J. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia*, Vienna [5]1962, vol. I (Ital. tr. Turin 1963); P. Salmon, *Les 'Amen' du Canon de la Messe*: EphLit 42 (1966) 496-506.

Sanctus: J. Jungmann, op. cit., vol. II.

Kyrie eleison: P. De Clerck, *La "prière universelle" dans les liturgies latines anciennes* (LQF 62), Münster 1977; T. Klauser, *Akklamationen*: RAC 1 (1950) 216-233; T.E. Gregory, *Vox Populi: Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the 5th Century*, Columbus 1979; J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch. City and Imperial Administration in Later Roman Empire*, Oxford 1972, 208-219; C. Roueché, *Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire: New Evidence from Aphrodisias*: JRS 74 (1984) 181-199; B.D. Spinks, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer*, New York 1991; G. Winkler, *Das Sanctus: über den Ursprung und die Anfänge des Sanctus und sein Fortwirken*, Rome 2002.

A. Chupungco

ACCUSATIONS against Christians. Christianity, little understood by a public often ill-informed and willing to believe any suspicion or accusation, was subject to calumny from the outset. The prejudices of the mob and those of the cultivated class may have differed, but for the most part they issued from a common ignorance, as is clear from both *pagan authors and Christian *apologists. The earliest pagans to write of the Christians were *Suetonius and *Tacitus. Suetonius, writing about *Nero (*Vita Caesarum* 16,3), refers to the punishments inflicted on Christians: "The Christians—people dedicated to a new and mischievous *superstitio*—are consigned to torture." *Superstitio* means a non-Roman, foreign religion, in latent conflict with the gods, which were an integral part of the city. Christianity's novelty became evident at the point when it was no longer confused with *Judaism. More serious for a Roman was its characterization as "mischievous," as Romans deeply feared witchcraft and the like. Tacitus speaks of *flagitia atrocia et pudenda*, a clear reference to Thyestean banquets and Oedipal unions (see Minucius Fel., *Oct.* 9) but does not dwell on these things. Rather, he reports the accusation of *odium humani generis* (*Ann.* XV, 44), the *humanum genus* being the Roman Empire and its citizens.

The apologists primarily relate the accusations that arose at the popular level, often due to the fact that Christians met for worship in private dwellings and not openly with the participation of all citizens, as in the old religions. Partially secret meetings were by definition suspect and viewed negatively. The pagan Cecilius accuses the Christians of *latebrosa et lucifuga natio* (Minucius Fel., *Oct.* 8,4). At the popular level, the *Eucharist was thought to be the sacrifice of a baby, a cannibalistic rite. Mixed meetings in which members called one another brother and sister were interpreted as licentious gatherings ending in rape (Just., *Dial.* 10; *I Rev* 1-13; Athenag., *Leg.* 3; Teof., *Autol.* 3,4). *Tertullian writes: "We are accused as the most wicked of criminals for a supposed rite of infanticide, for the meal that ensues, and for the *incest committed after the dreadful banquet" (*Apol.* 7,1). Among the accusations was that of onolatry. *Fronto writes: "It is said that they venerate the head of an ass, the vilest animal . . . rites dedicated to a man condemned to death in expiation for his crimes, and that on the lethal wood of the cross" (*Oratio* 9; on the graffito on the Palatine, C. Cecchelli, *Mater Christi*, Rome 1948, II, 155-163). Though rejecting these accusations, *Justin Martyr shows the irreducible incompatibility between the God of the Christians and the pagan divinities, which are based on *demons. "We are atheists with respect to these supposed gods" (*I Ap.* 6). The same position can be inferred from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (9, 12). The accusation of atheism—not worshiping the polyadic divinities—was the most serious, in that with this attitude Christians did not contribute to the *pax deorum;* thus, in the pagan mentality, they were considered the cause of public catastrophes and natural calamities (Tertullian, *Apol.* 40,1-2). By the fact that religion and politics were inseparable, nonparticipation in the *sacra publica,* the public rites financed by the city or the emperor, was considered refusal to honor the public gods. The accusation was both religious and political—"You denounce and persecute us as wizards of sacrilege and lese majesty" (Tertullian, *Apol.* 10,1)—and led to *persecution. Atheism as an essential reason for pagan accusation against Christians does not appear, however, until toward the end of the second century; before then, the hostility of pagans was due to a combination of characteristics of the Christians' lives, which both intrigued and annoyed them.

Christianity, moreover, seemed to be an atheist religion in that the Christians had no *temples, altars, images or *sacrifice (Tatian, *Discourse to the Greeks* 27,2; Athenagoras 13,1; Justin, *I Apol.* 6 and 13). The pagan philosopher *Celsus writes: "Why do you Christians have no altars, or statues, or temples? What prevents you from participating in the public festivals?" (Origen, *Against Celsus* 8,17). Linked to the accusation of atheism was that of antisocial behavior (accusations also made against the Jews) and of absenteeism from public life: if God is common to

all, good, and without necessity, then nothing should prevent those devoted to him from also participating in public festivities; if *idols indeed represent nothing, what evil would there be in partaking in public banquets (ibid., 8,24)? The accusation of atheism was thus both a political and religious charge, indistinctly. *Eusebius of Caesarea writes: "[The Christians] were *apostate from the gods of the nation, which gave cohesion to every people and city" (*Prep. ev*. I,2,2: SC 206,105-106).

Celsus attacked Christian doctrine above all, which for him distorted the harmony of the universe. The mystery of the *incarnation and a salvation drawn from fallen humanity were for him inconceivable. Even more, Christianity appeared to him an uncultured doctrine, its Lord a teacher of the miserable, and not the God of superior natures. At the existential level, Celsus reproved the Christians for their civic indifference: they exclude themselves from the city, not participating in the worship that holds it together. By refusing to marry and procreate (an allusion to continence), they do not participate in the realities of life. They lack a civic sense, not taking oaths in the name of the emperor. This last accusation will be taken up again by the pagan aristocracy at the fall of *Rome at the start of the 5th c. *Augustine will respond to it in the *City of God,* when the Romans who had remained faithful to paganism also criticize, as does Rutilius Namatianus, the withdrawn life of monks: "souls tormented by hidden remorse" (*De reditu* 439-452; 515-526). From the fourth century the pagans showed indignation and disgust for the Christian cult of the *martyrs—which they considered mere cadavers—and especially for the transferral of their remains to locations within the city; in doing so, they broke the barrier between the worlds of the living and the dead. The emperor *Julian says that Christianity "filled the world with tombs and graves" (*Contra Galilaeos*, fr. 81 Masaracchia); he also issued some rules against Christian funerals—the edict of 12 February 363 (CTh 9,17,5)—prohibiting them from taking place during the day. Julian sought to purify Daphne, a suburb of *Antioch, of the presence of the martyr *Babylas, a cadaver that he claimed prevented the oracle of Apollo from speaking (*Misopog*. 33 [361bc]; Libanio, *Discorso* 98; see 99; John Chrys., *Discourse on Babylas* 89-91). *Eunapius writes that the Christians "gathered the bones and skulls of criminals executed for numerous crimes after being condemned in court, considering them to be gods, and wallow in their tombs" (*Vitae soph*. 6,11,8); Maximus of Madaura says, "The graves of [the martyrs], even if they are worth remembering, are mobbed by the insane who have abandoned the temples and ignored the spirits of their own fathers" (Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 16,1; see Theodoret, *HE* VIII, 34,69). The case of *Iamblichus is famous, who, returning to the city after having celebrated a sacrifice and conversing about the gods with some of his disciples, suddenly stopped short, cutting off his words, and stared at the sun, having seen from a distance that a funeral train was approaching (Eunapius, *Vitae soph.* 5, 1,13.14 = 12-13 Giangrande).

Even the Christian *forgiveness granted at *baptism or with *penitence incited pagan criticism from Celsus on, because it promises impunity to one who repents (Augustine, *Sermo* 20,4; 352,9; *Enar. in Ps.* 101,1,10; this accusation is taken up again in Magonza 44,6 and 9 [RBen 1993, 317 and 320]) and would thus cause the breakdown of discipline and the destruction of the habits of the human race (Augustine, *Sermo* 20,4). The emperor *Julian speaks of his uncle *Constantine as given over to vice, murder, etc., for which he could easily obtain penitence from the Christians (from Jesus). He writes: "Whoever corrupts, whoever murders, whoever is cursed and rejected by all, comes here confidently, and being washed in this water will be made pure in an instant. And then when he falls again into the same sin, beating his breast and striking his head will again make him pure" (*Caesares* 336AB).

H. Leclercq: DACL 1, 265-307; P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, Paris 1942; A. Hamman, *Chrétiens et christianisme . . .* , in *Forma Futuri*, Misc. Pellegrino, Turin 1975, 94-109; Id., *I cristiani del II secolo*, Milan 1973; L. Rougier, *Celse contre les chrétiens. La réaction païenne sous l'empire romain. Le Discours vrai de C.*, Paris 1977; M. Chiabò, *Premesse all'accusa di "odium generis humani" rivolta ai cristiani*: Vichiana 9 (1980) 104-118; L. Alfonsi, *L'accusa di ateismo ai cristiani in Atenagora e Giustino*, in *Sodalitas, . . . A. Guarino,* III, Naples 1984, 1477-1481; R.L. Wilken, *The Christian as the Romans Saw Them*, New Haven 1984; S. Benko, *Pagan Cristicism of Christianity During the First Two Centuries*: ANRW II,23,2, 1055-1118; A. Barzan, *I cristiani nell'Impero romano precostantiniano*, Milan 1990; J.J. Walsh, *On Christian Atheism*: VChr 45 (1991) 255-277; R. L. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians: In the Mediterranean World from the 2nd c. AD to the Conversion of Constantine,* London 2006; P. Maraval, *Les persécutions durant les quatre premiers siècles du christianisme*, Paris 1992; F. Ruggiero, *La follia dei cristiani. Su un aspetto della "reazione pagana" tra I e V secolo*, Milan 1992; S. Bodelón, *El discurso anticristiano de Cecilio en el "Octavio" de Minucio Felix*: Memorias de Historia Antigua 13-14 (1992–1993) 247-294; M. Rizzi, *Ideologia e retorica negli exordia apologetici. Il problema dell'altro*, Milan 1993; J.M. Blásquez, *La reacción pagana ante el cristianismo*, in D. Ramos-Lissón - M. Merino - A. Viciano (eds.), *El diálogo fé-cultura en la antigüedad cristiana*, Pamplona 1996, 175-198; V. Lozito, *Il corvo. Calunnie, accuse e lettere anonime nei primi secoli dell'era cristiana*, Bari 1996; G. Rinaldi, *La Bibbia dei pagani*, 2 vols., Bologna 1997; F. Bulgarini, "*Scientia puniend*a." *L'accusa di magia nel passaggio dal paganesimo al cristianesimo*: Nuova rivista storica 85 (2001) 215-234; A.A. Nagy, *La*

forme originale de l'accusation d'anthropophagie contre les chrétiens, son développement et les changements de sa représentation au IIe siècle: REAug 47 (2001) 223-249; Storia del cristianesimo, I [2003] 225-259, and II [2000] 156-183; F. Ruggiero, *La follia dei cristiani. La reazione pagana al cristianesimo nei secoli I-V*, Rome 2002.

A. Hamman - A. Di Berardino

ACEDIA. In the *Vita Antonii* 36, PG 26, 896, and in *Origen, the term ἀκηδία retains its classical meaning: negligence, indifference (see *In Ps.* 118,28; *In Is.* 61,3) but is accompanied by terms that point toward its Evagrian meaning: cowardice (δειλία), dejection (κατήφεια), sadness (λύπη), etc. *Evagrius of Pontus seems to have been the first to identify the *demon of acedia with the "midday demon" of Ps 90:6, painting a vivid picture of the monk who succumbs to acedia (*Pract.* 12, SC 171, 521ff.). In *Coptic the term is translated as *pehloped* [discouragement], in Syriac as *qûtâʿ reʿ yânâ* [dejection of spirit]. Later the Latin term *taedium* was used, but *Cassian keeps the Greek word *akēdia* (*Inst.* 10, I, CSEL 17, 173, 20-21). It is difficult to specify the difference between acedia and sadness (λύπη) in the list of the eight deadly sins. The Eastern monastic tradition distinguishes it by emphasizing a specific circumstance: according to Evagrius's definition, acedia is linked to the state of life of the *anchorite and is opposed to perseverance in the *cell and in the solitary life.

DSp I, 166-169, III, 99-104; A. Guillaumont, *Introduction au Traité pratique d'Évagre*, SC 170, 86ff.; L. Giordano, *Moribus acediae. Da Giovanni Cassiano e Gregorio Magno alla elaborazione medievale*: VetChr 26 (1989) 221-243; G. Bunge, *Akédia. La dottrina spirituale di Evagrio Pontico sull'acedia*, Praglia Abbey 1992; T. Špidlík, *Spiritualità dell'Oriente cristiano*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995, 238-239; J.-C. Larchet, *Thérapeutique des maladies spirituelles*, Paris 1997, 207-214; C. Casagrande, S. Vecchio, *I sette vizi capitali, storia dei peccati nel Medioevo*, Turin 2000; J.-C. Nault, *Le saveur de Dieu. L'acédie dans le dynamisme de l'agir*, Rome 2002.

T. Špidlík

ACEPHALI. *Monophysite heretics. In 482 the emperor *Zeno issued the *Henoticon* (Evagr., *HE* III 14) to end the controversies among Catholics and monophysites with a dogmatic formula which—by its lack of precision, recourse to the *christological formulas of *Nicaea and *Constantinople, and implicit condemnation of the Council of *Chalcedon—was intended to unite all of Christianity in a single profession of christological faith. The document, though a political masterpiece, rather than encouraging Christian unity increased division: the Eastern episcopate accepted the imperial decree under the threat of exile, while the *orthodox did not tolerate the implicit condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, nor the silence concerning the *Tome* of *Leo. The monophysites rebelled against *Peter Mongus himself—also a monophysite, whom Zeno and *Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, intended to install as bishop of *Alexandria after the death of the orthodox *Timothy Salofaciolus (June 482)—thus forming a separate party. These more rigid monophysites who, rejecting the acceptance of the *Henoticon* by Peter Mongus (patriarch of Alexandria, 482-490), were not in communion with any of the five *patriarchates, were called ἀκέφαλοι, "without a patriarch" (though not without bishops, as there were always bishops in their ranks), and originated the first notable break among the opponents to the Council of Chalcedon. The principal representative of the acephali was the monk *Severus, who was able to win the favor of *Anastasius (491-518), Zeno's successor, for his companions in *heresy, to the point where in 511 Timothy, a priest belonging to the acephali, was given the *cathedra of Constantinople after the deposition of *Macedonius, who had adhered to the *Henoticon.* In 512 Severus himself was elected patriarch of Antioch. Despite having won patriarchal cathedrae, the acephali continued to be called by this name. Their heresy united the autonomous monophysites of *Egypt, *Syria and *Palestine, where the great majority of monks and their *archimandrites were acephali. There was a multiplication of monophysite sects that remained in existence until the 9th c.: these are discussed by *Ephrem of Antioch (6th c.), *Eulogius of Alexandria (7th c.), *John of Damascus and Theodore the Studite (8th-9th c.).

Hfl–Lecl II, 857-870, 915-926, 1151; DIP 1, 82; DHGE 1, 282-288; LTK 1, 288; J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien: étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcédonie*, Louvain 1909; P. van Cauwenbergh, *Études sur les moines d'Égypte depuis le Concile de Chalcédonie jusqu'à l'invasion arabe (640)*, Paris 1914; J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1923; M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium dissidentium*, V, Paris 1935, 420-437; J.J. Arry, *Hérésies et factions dans l'Empire byzantin du IVe au VIIe siècle*, Cairo 1968; A. Cameron, *Heresies and Factions*: Byzantion 44 (1974) 92-120; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Bd. 2/1, Freiburg 1986, 293-294; Bd. 2/2, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1989, 193, 203, 209, 347, 354; Bd. 2/4, Freiburg- Basel-Vienna 1990, 81; E. Suttner, Ostkirchliche Studien 41 (1992) 3-21.

M.G. Bianco

ACESIUS (d. after 325). *Novatianist bishop of *Constantinople. A participant at the Council of *Nicaea (325), he subscribed to the council's decisions but did

not want to be reconciled with the *Catholics. Reiterating his rigorist position on the sin of *apostasy to *Constantine, the emperor is said to have exclaimed ironically: "Acesius, get a ladder and go up to heaven by yourself!" (Socr., *HE* I,10; Soz., *HE* I,22).

E. Prinzivalli

ACHAIA. Roman and Byzantine administrative district, capital *Corinth, seat of a proconsul (Brandis, 193-194, Mommsen, 233-234, Vailhé, Leclercq, Bon, 2, Konidaris, 44-54). At the start of the 6th c. Achaia included the Peloponnese; eastern Greece as far as and including Thermopylae; Euboea; the islands of the Saronic and Argolic gulfs; Cythera, Zacinthus and Cephalonia among the Ionian islands; Scyros, Lemnos and Imbros in the north Aegean (Hierocles, *Synekd.* 648,6-649,2, Honigmann 16-19). Also known as Hellas (Konidaris, 54-72, Koder-Hild, 50-54), it was attached to the diocese of *Macedonia, capital *Thessalonica, seat of the *Praefectus praetorio per Illyricum* (*Notit. dignit.*, Or. III Seeck, 9). With *Theodosius I the entire region was politically part of the Eastern empire. Achaia suffered *Goth incursions in the second half of the 4th c. (Zos. I, 37, 43, V, 5-6: CSHB 36, 40 and 249-254, Mendelssohn, 26,31 and 221-223, Herzberg, 23-27), resulting in a temporary depopulation (Koder-Hild, 51). 5th- and 6th-c. monuments nonetheless testify to a considerable density of population and economic prosperity; 79 towns are listed in the *Synekdēmos* of Hierocles. With the restructuring of Byzantine administration into themes (*themata*) at the end of the 7th c., the province of Achaia was split into the theme of Hellas, capital Thebes (first mentioned in 695: Theophan., *Chronogr.* a.M. 6187: CSHB 564, de Boor 368), and that of the Peloponnese, with Corinth still as its capital (first mentioned in 811–812: Costant. Porphyr., *Peri themat.*: CSHB 3,52). The region already in part entered a period of obscurity by the mid-6th c., becoming complete from the beginning of the 7th c. (including destruction from earthquakes, depopulation from epidemics, Arab incursions and Slavic occupation).

The first Christian communities date from the apostolic age (*see* Athens; Corinth). The foundation of the church of Aegina also dates to apostolic times (*Const. Apost.* VII, 46: PG 1, 1056; Funk I, 454). The existence of the church of Lacedemone (Sparta) is attested in 170 (Eus., *HE* IV, 23: PG 20, 384; GCS II, 324). According to the patristic tradition, the foundation of the churches of Patras and Thebes also dates to apostolic times. The claim that the mortal remains of the apostle Andrew are kept at Patras, and those of the apostle Luke at Thebes, dates to the early 5th c. (Filost., *HE* III, 2: PG 65, 431; GCS 21, 156 and 157. See Harnack, 788-790; Konidaris, 368-369 and 423-425). Also dating to apostolic times, according to a reliable tradition, is the constitution of the church of Marathon, which spread throughout the demes of Attica. Christianity spread rapidly in Achaia in the 4th c. (Konidaris, 418-430), also developing near the cities (*Athens; *Corinth). In Athens the ancients cults survived until the third decade of the 6th c. Because of the Gothic invasion the Olympic games were no longer celebrated at Olympia in the 4th c. Christianity made great strides in winning over the region in the mid-5th c., when it began to occupy and transform the ancient sanctuaries: Eleusis, Delphi, Epidaurus, Olympia and Delos. Christianity still had to compete with the eastern religions in Achaia, however, especially the Egyptian cults and *Judaism. The ecclesiastical center of Achaia was Corinth, the metropolitan see and meeting place for local synods (Max Herz. z. Sachsen, 15-42; Konidaris, 406ff., 422ff., 515-522). As a province of eastern Illyricum, Achaia was subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of *Rome. The Christian life of the first centuries was very active. *Gnostics were active in the area (*see* Carpocratians), and the cities were visited by *Origen; nevertheless in the controversy over *Easter, Achaia followed the church of Rome, with which it had established relations since the 1st c. Achaia was also immune to *Arianism. Ecclesiastical dependence on Rome lasted until 732 or 733 (on the bishops of Achaia, see Bon, 8-9; Konidaris, 515-522). After the 2nd c., Christianity came to be little known and very sparsely documented in the Greek lands; bishops participated infrequently at councils, with only five bishops from Achaia and *Thessaly present at *Nicaea.

Early Christian remains can be found in both towns and the countryside, especially in the cities mentioned by Hierocles and in all of the old Attic demes. One of the oldest Christian documents from Achaia seems to be the epitaph of Aurelia Zosima in Elis (Pallas, *Investigations*, 3-4, 14). At Methonis, a *cemetery dug into rock is divided into rooms with seats and "cathedrae" for meals for the dead, and its graves—*arcosolia,* tombs dug in the earth, one with a canopy attached to the rock on all sides—recall similar cemeteries in southern Italy and Sicily (Pallas, *Mon.*, 191-192). The most important early church buildings were found at Corinth and Athens. The oldest known, from before the mid-5th c., is the basilica of Epidaurus, with five aisles and a transept (Sotiriou, βασιλικαί, 198-201). Another mid-6th-c. five-aisled basilica was located at Philiatra of Triphi-

lia (Pallas, Ἀνασκαφή, 177-194). The basilicas normally had three aisles divided by colonnades (e.g., the basilica of Sicyon: Pallas, *Mon.* 172-175), very rarely by rows of pillars, as the basilicas of Cranaeum (*see* Corinth), Eleutheris (Stikas, Ἀνασκ. Ἐλευθ., 48-52) and Clausium (Pallas, *Scoperte,* 191-193; *Mon.,* 25). Also rare are basilicas with transverse aisles: Epidaurus, Lechaeum and Cranaeum, Boios in present-day Mariolata (Pallas, *Mon.,* 19), and Clausium. The transverse aisle, or transept, of the basilica of Clausium has an apse at each end (thus a three-apsed basilica); it seems to have been influenced by the architecture of *Epirus, like the basilica of Mariolata. Basilicas with wooden roofs and tripartite, three-apsed vaulted presbyteries begin to appear in the 6th c. (basilica of the acropolis of Sparta: Sotiriou, Ἀνασκαφαί, 107-118; for the dating: Vocotopoulos, Παρατηρήσεις, 273-282). Characteristic of the basilicas of Achaia—with the exception of Corinth—is the position of the ambo, placed north of the building's axis (Sodini, *Note*, 585-588).

C.G. Brandis, PWK I, 190-198, s.v. *Achaia;* Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.* V. Berlin [6]1909; S. Vailhé, DHGE I, 300-304, s.v. *Achaïe;* M. Herzog zu Sachsen, *Das christliche Hellas*, Leipzig 1918; H. Leclercq: DACL 2, 321-340, s.v. *Achaïe*; A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig [4]1924; GA. Sotiriou, Αἱ παλαιοχριστιανικαὶ βασιλικαὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος: AE (1929) 150-248; Id., Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐν τῇ ταλαιᾷ Σπαρτῇ: PAAH (1939) 107-118; E.G. Stikas, Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἐλευθερῶν: PAAH (1939) 44-52; A. Bon, *Le Peloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204*, Paris 1951; G.I. Konidaris, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλλάδος, I, Athenai 1954; D.I. Pallas, *Scoperte archeologiche in Grecia negli anni 1956-1958*: RivAC 25 (1959) 187-223; Id., PAAH (1960) 144-170; Id., *Investigations sur les monuments chrétiens de Grèce avant Constantin*: CArch 24 (1975) 1-19; J.P. Sodini, *Note sur deux variantes régionales dans les basiliques de Grèce et des Balkans: le tribélon et l'emplacement de l'ambon*: BCH 99 (1975) 581-588; P.L. Vocotopoulos, Παρατηρήσες στὴν λεγυμένη βασιλικὴ τοῦ Ἁγίου Νίκωρος, Πρακτικὰ Α' Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακῶν Σπουδῶν, II, Athenai 1976, 273-282; D.I. Pallas, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1959 à 1973*, Vatican City 1977; T.E. Gregory, *The Survival of Paganism in Christian Greece*: AJPh 107 (1986) 229-242; G. Gounaris, *L'archéologie chrétienne en Grèce del 1974 à 1985*, in *Actes du XI[e] Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, III, Rome 1989, 2687-2711; F.R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529*, 2 vols., Leiden 1993-1994; P. Castrén, *Christianity in Athens and Vicinity during the Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, in *The Idea and Ideal of the Town between Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages*, G.P. Bogliolo - B. Ward-Perkins (eds.), Leiden 1999, 211-223.

D.I. Pallas

ACHEIROPOIETA, from ἀχειροποίητος = "not made by human hands," synonym of ἀχειρόπλαστος, ἀχειρόγραφος, ἀχειροτευκτος. Plato defines ἀχειροποίητος (*Phaed.* 30,81c; *Apol.* 32,40c) as the world of the ideas, i.e., the true world, and ἀχειροποίητος came to signify true or eternal (see Cic., *De nat. deor.* 1,820). As a technical term, ἀχειροποίητος meant "prodigious, not made by human hand," and referred to images of Christ, Mary or the saints not composed by human beings. In ancient Greece it was believed that some simulacra, such as the Palladium of Troy and of Athena, Artemis of Tauris, Artemis of *Ephesus and Serapis of Alexandria, were sent down from heaven by Zeus (διοπετής: see Suidas, n. 1187). The most important Christian acheiropoieta are the image of Christ from Kamulia in *Cappadocia (moved to *Constantinople in 574) and that of *Edessa. The image of Kamulia was found by Hypatia, who had made seeing Christ a condition of her belief. The acheiropoietos of Edessa has a more obscure history: Christ is said to have sent a letter with his portrait to the king *Abgar Uchamâ (Eus., *HE* 1,13, attests that the letter is taken from a Syriac text at Edessa), containing a promise to send a disciple to cure him. *Ananias was thought to have been the painter, according to a later legend. The image is claimed to have miraculously turned back an attack of the Persians against Edessa (544). A legend that appeared in 944, when the acheiropoietos was taken to Constantinople, tells the history of the image in much detail. Christ is depicted as suffering, with a beard and long hair, which we know from copies now kept at Laon, Rome and Genoa that have come down to us from the Middle Ages. Among the other acheiropoieta are the Christ known to exist at Memphis in the 6th c.; the Christ of the *Sancta Sanctorum* at the Lateran; and the Veronica of St. Peter's, Rome, mentioned in the 9th c. (i.e., the veil with an effigy of the suffering Christ). An impression of Christ's whole body is on the Shroud of *Turin, venerated since the 7th c. Some acheiropoieta of the Madonna began to be venerated in the same century. The earliest references regard that of the church of Diospolis (Lydda) in *Palestine: one version said the image was produced by the Virgin touching a column, another that it was produced solely by her will.

EC 1, 220-222; RAC 1, 68.71; K. Wessel, s.v. *Acheiropoietos*: RBK 1, 22-28; LTK 1, 112; E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, TU 18, Leipzig 1899; C. Cecchelli, *Le più antiche illustrazioni di N.S. Gesù Cristo*: Illustrazione Vaticana 3 (1932, I) 283-287; G. de Jerphanion, *L'image de Jésus Christ dans l'art chrétien*: La voix des Monuments 2 (N.S.), Rome-Paris 1938, 1-26; M. Papi, *Il volto di Gesù. Storia arte scienza*, Florence 1967; C. Dufour Bozzo, *Il "Sacro VoIto" di Genova*, Rome 1974, with bibliographical appendix (143-153); C. Walter, *Acheropita*: Dizionario Enciclopedico del Medioevo 1, Rome 1998, 12; H. Belting, *Il culto delle immagini. Storia dell'icona dall'età imperiale al tardo Medioevo*, Rome 2001.

M.G. Bianco

ACHILLAS (d. 312). Bishop of *Alexandria, saint. Feast 7 Nov. Successor of *Peter from the end of 311 to June 312. Previously had directed the school of Alexandria (Eus., *HE* VII, 32,30). Consecrated *Arius to the priesthood, forgiving his sympathies for the *Melitians. Succeeded by Alexander.

E. Prinzivalli, *Magister Ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo*, SEA 82, Rome 2002, 33-64.

E. Prinzivalli

ACHILLAS (d. after 324). Arian priest. A follower of *Arius, he appears in the documents of the first Arian controversy; in particular, he is named in the letter sent by *Alexander, bishop of *Alexandria, to the Catholic episcopate in 319 (Socrates, *HE* I, 6; Gelasius of Cyzicus, *Hist. Conc. Nic.* 2, 3), immediately after the Synod of *Alexandria of 318; in it, Alexander specified the charges against the heresiarch and his companions and told of the beginning of the Arian *heresy. Achillas signed the profession of faith addressed by Arius to Alexander of Alexandria in 320 (Opitz, *AW*, 13). In the latter's letter of 324 to Alexander, bishop of Byzantium or *Thessalonica (Theodoret, *HE* 1, 3 and 3, 9), Achillas is cited as one of the leaders of the heresy (Opitz, *AW*, 19-20).

H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, III, Berlin-Leipzig 1936–1941.

G. Pilara

ACHILLEUS (first half 5th c.). In 419, following on the contest in the Roman church between Pope *Boniface I and his (ultimately unsuccessful) would-be usurper *Eulalius, Achilleus was delegated by the court at *Ravenna to perform the *Easter ceremonies at Rome (March 30), since the two contestants had been sent away from the city by the civil authorities. Achilleus built a church at Spoleto *extra moenia,* dedicated to St. Peter, east of the city on the Via Flaminia, depositing some relics of the apostle there. He composed songs for the church, four of which have been preserved; two are certainly his and exalt the primacy of Peter, who is *arbiter* on earth and *janitor* in heaven.

CPL 1484; G.B. De Rossi, ICUR II, 1, nn. 79-82, 113-114; DACL 15, 1639-1640; A.P. Frutaz, *Spes e Achilleo vescovi di Spoleto.* Atti del II Convegno Studi Umbri, Perugia 1964, 352-377; Patrologia III, 300-301; PCBE 2,10-11; M. Maccarrone, *Il vescovo Achilleo e le iscrizioni metriche di S. Pietro a Spoleto*, in Id., *Romana Ecclesia. Cathedra Petri*, Rome 1991, 287-327.

A. Di Berardino

ACHOLIUS (d. 383). Bishop of *Thessalonica. He baptized the emperor *Theodosius (380). In the *Arian controversy he followed a strictly orthodox and Western line and participated at the *Council of Constantinople (381). In two letters (*Ep.* 5-6) on that occasion *Damasus exhorts Acholius and the other *Macedonian bishops to choose a man who would favor peace in the election of the bishop of *Constantinople and to respect the Nicene canon forbidding bishops to change dioceses. Acholius was present at the synod of *Rome (382).

E. Prinzivalli

ACILIUS GLABRIO (ca. 40–ca. 95). *Suetonius reports that *Domitian had Acilius Glabrio, the consul in 91, put to death along with other senators and members of the high Roman aristocracy, *quasi molitores rerum novarum* (as inventors of new things—*Dom.* 10,2). Dio Cassius combines the accusation with that levied against *Flavius Clemens and his wife Flavia *Domitilla: atheism and Jewish customs, adding that of having fought victoriously against a lion, which raised suspicions of *magic (*Hist. Rom.* 67,14,3). Baronius and Ruinart think these accusations amount to a charge of being a Christian and that the death of the consul (in 95) was a *martyrdom. But the supposed sympathy toward the Jews (or the Christians) could have been merely a pretext, such that Acilius Glabrio should not be considered a martyr. In 1888 G.B. De Rossi tried to establish the consul's Christianity with the help of Acillian epigraphs in the so-called hypogeum of the Acilii in the catacomb of Priscilla, where in fact an Acilius Glabrio is buried. The first certainly Christian finds in this portion of the catacomb, however, date only to 3rd/4th c., not to the 1st, and the texts do not present Acilius Glabrio as a Christian. De Rossi's conclusion therefore remains a hypothesis.

PWK 1/1, 257; RAC 4, 106; P. Keretzes, *The Jews, The Christians and Emperor Domitian*: VChr 27 (1973) 1-28; P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen [2]1989, 172.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

ACILIUS SEVERUS (d. after 326). Of Spanish origin, Acilius was the praetorian prefect of *Gaul (12 Dec 322–23 Jan 324) and the ordinary consul together with Vettius Rufinus (323); the laws emanated under his consulate are preserved in the *Theodosian Code* (**Codex Theodosianus*). He was prefect of

Rome from 4 January 325 until 13 November 326. *Lactantius dedicated two books of his *Letters* to him.

PLRE 1, 834; PWK 2A/2, 2003.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

ACOEMETAE or Akoimetoi (sleepless ones). *Monastic community of *Constantinople, founded ca. 425 by St. *Alexander (the Acoemete), an itinerant *monk from the Greek archipelago with ties to *Messalian circles. Backed by the people, by monks (St. *Hypatius) and by the empress *Pulcheria, Alexander changed residence many times, dying ca. 430 at Gomon on the Asian coast of the Bosporus near the Black Sea. His successor, John, moved to the Eirenaion, nearer the city. The most famous *hegumen, St. Marcellus, provided the first monks of the Studite monastery in 463. The characteristic of the acoemetae was continual liturgical *prayer, alternating among three groups (Greek, Latin and *Syriac?). Their *liturgy, but especially their library and culture, had a great influence. They easily resisted their *archbishops and for a long time were allied with Rome in defense of *Chalcedon. They ultimately became suspect because of their defense of the *Three Chapters, diminishing in importance after 534.

G. Dagron, *La vie ancienne de saint Marcel l'Acémète*: AB 86 (1968) 271-286; R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. III. Les Églises et les monastères*, Paris ²1969, 16-17; DHGE 1,272-282; TRE 2,148-153.

J. Gribomont

ACOLUTHIA. Has the same meaning in the *Byzantine *liturgy as the Latin term *ordo, ritus,* and indicates the totality of the rubrics that regulate the celebration of divine worship, the administration of the *sacraments, the recitation of canonical hours, the preparation of the bread and wine before Mass, assistance to the dying, *funeral rites, etc. In the term's interpretation, the profane Greek meaning of "to follow," "to go behind," quickly passed to that of "to follow" in a moral, spiritual and religious sense. The various meanings can be expressed as follows: to follow a discourse, to understand, to follow someone's opinion or judgment, to conform oneself (Plato, *Phaedr.*, 107. 232a; *Crat.*, 437; *Rep.*, 332. 398. 400; Thucyd., *Stor.*, III, 38, 6; Arist., *A Nicom.*, II, 6; Diog. La., *Stor.*, 9, 21). In the OT, when used negatively, it is a technical term indicating *apostasy and *paganism (Dt 4:3; 6:14; Jdg 2:12; 1 Kgs 21:26; Jer 11:10; Hos 1:2; 2:7, 15), identifying it with adultery: Israel follows after its lovers and forgets its spouse. In the contest over Baal, the word is said in reference to Yahweh, regarding the choice between following Baal and Yahweh (1 Kgs 18:21). Jer 2:2, idealizing the relationship between Israel and Yahweh during the forty years in the desert, recalls that Israel followed Yahweh with love and affection. The word is used with a certain reluctance in the OT because of its idolatrous resonance, evocative of the pagan processions behind their images. Outside the religious context, it maintains the descriptive profane meaning of the disciple who accompanies his master as a true and proper servant (see Jdg 9:4, 49; 1 Kgs 19:20-21). While *Philo favored the classical usage (*De Migr. Abr.* 128), rabbinism upheld its association with the imitation of Yahweh. In the NT it can mean an external following, like that of the crowd (Mt 8:10; Mk 3:7), but more frequently refers to the disciple who leaves all to follow the Master, intimately attached to him in a vital relationship (Mt 8:22; Mk 10:28; Lk 5:11; 9:61-62). This "following" puts the disciple in the footsteps of the Messiah, introducing him to the salvation offered by Jesus (Lk 9:61). From the frequent recurrence of the verbal form (90 times in the NT), especially in the Synoptics, the demands of following Christ emerge, along with the typology of one who follows him. Before Easter, Christ, accompanied by the group of disciples he has chosen (Mk 1:16-20 and par.; Mk 3:16 and par.), moves from village to village, preaching the news of the *kingdom of God. To this group is attached the 72 anonymous disciples, anonymous meant as a designation and not as a defining quality of their discipleship (Lk 10:1-12). The third group is the crowd along the way, but these do not follow in the proper sense (Mt 5:24; 11:9; Mk 2:15; 3:7). To embrace Jesus' style of life meant, even before Easter, the renunciation of one's possessions (Mk 10:17-22, 29-30; Lk 10:3; 14:26-27; Mt 10:27-38) and taking up one's cross (Mk 8:34; Lk 14:26-27). Following Jesus is radical; the term has a pregnancy when addressed to individuals and means a call to become his disciples (Mt 8:22; 9:9; 19:21); it also involves a break with Jewish habits and piety, with the law, and with family (Mt 8:18-22; Lk 9:57-62).

In the few references in John—17 in the entire gospel—fully 16 refer to the disciples (Jn 1:37, 38, 40, 43; 8:12; 10:4-5, 27; 12:26; 13:36-37; 18:15; 21:19-20, 22); Jn 6:2 refers to the crowd that followed him because of the works he performed. To the following described in the Synoptics is added the principle of listening (Jn 1:36-42), though *Philip is called to follow Jesus (Jn 1:43). In Jn 12:24-26, following is in view of the cross, and *Peter is told that in his time he will follow the same path as the Lord (Jn 13:36-38).

After Easter Jesus once again calls Peter, who had denied being his disciple (Jn 18:25-27), to follow (Jn 21:19), which will end in death; the disciple whom Jesus loved had already been introduced into post-Easter followership (Jn 21:20). In Johanine theology, union with Jesus and followership coincide: the one who follows him as the "light of the world" does not "walk in darkness" but will have "the light of life" and is saved (Jn 8:12). To accept Jesus and his word means to accept the one who sent him (Jn 13:44ff.). The acceptance of Jesus, the typical Johanine form of followership, effectively means the act of faith, listening to the word of Christ (Jn 10:27). The image of the Good *Shepherd displays this well: he knows his sheep, who listen to his voice and follow him (Jn 10:27). In the NT, with a few exceptions, followership does not have God for its object, but the earthly Jesus and the risen Christ.

The following of Christ in the *Fathers is an argument that had a surprising development from the very beginning. It is used in both the etymological sense of "to follow," with the noematic nuances already indicated, and in the spiritual sense and the sense of testimony to express the concept of the imitation and assimilation of Christ. Here we will give only an indication of the numerous instances of its use. *Clement of Rome establishes, at a distance, an ethical confrontation between the truth, a way to be followed (*Cor.* 35,5) and the precepts of the Lord (*Cor.* 40,4). Christians follow the local customs of the society in which they live, but their way of life is admirable and extraordinary (*Ad Diog.*, 5,4). In the *Testament of Asher* 6,1, to follow the commandments of the Lord in truth is the same as to be coherent. For *Ignatius, what he suffers from the soldiers who guard him is a school for becoming more fully a disciple of Christ (*Ad Rom.*, 5,1.3), imitating him by dying and rising with him (ibid., 6,1.3). To follow includes the concept of being ever more a disciple and imitator of Christ. In *Irenaeus of Lyons, what are followed are God or his Word and the *apostolic tradition. The human being has been taught to follow God without the constraint of the law (*Ad. haer.* 4,13,2.4). The Savior, the light that enlightens and the font of glory (ibid., 4,14,1), saves the one who follows him (ibid., 3,18,4). The Lord (Christ), having surpassed the propaedeutic precepts of Moses, manifested God as Father and taught humanity to follow his Word (ibid., 4,12,5; 16,5). Authentic following only has one true master, and his words are the rule of truth (ibid., 4,35,4; 5, *prol.*). The *Spirit of God gives salvation, based on faith in the one God and the following of his Word (ibid., 4,33,15; 28,2). Christ, present in the prophecies and symbols of the OT, prefigured and foretold the things to come, educating the people of the two covenants in obedience to God, to live as strangers in the world and to follow the Word of God (ibid., 4,21,3). The element of faith characterizes the life of Abraham, making him a model for the believer, who follows the Word; in the footsteps of the Word one becomes a foreigner on earth, so as to become his fellow citizen (ibid., 4,5,3-5; 25,19). Attending to the testimony of the apostles one encounters the truth (ibid., 3,4,1; 9,1; 15,1).

In *Clement of Alexandria the concept "to follow" is rendered both by the forms of the verb ἀκολυθεῶ and by the forms of the verb ἕπομαι; both are very frequent. Regarding the relationship that should be maintained with the Logos, he says that many have not asked themselves if they should "follow" someone, whom and in what way. As the Logos is, so must be the life of the faithful so as to be able to follow God, who from the beginning leads all things directly to their proper end (*Strom.* VII, 100,2.3). This concept is restated in another way: one who obeys the Lord and faithfully "follows" the prophecy given by him will become in the end an image of the master, a "god" going about in a body; obviously, those who do not follow God wherever he leads will not reach these heights (ibid., VII, 101,5). The knowledgeable Christian "follows God" with wisdom, holding fast to the truth (*Protr.* 122, 2; *Paed.* II, 36,2; III, 12,4); he accompanies him, observing his commandments (*Strom.* II, 39,5; 125,4-5), which are so many ways to salvation (ibid., I, 29,3). To follow Christ is "salvation" (*Paed.* I, 27,1; III, 43,1). Following God leads one to become like him (*Strom.* II,100,4). By the term *road* (*Paed.* III, 87,2), which goes toward heaven, Clement expresses the externalization of his vision that all of humanity is on its way to God. Associated with this idea is that of "accompanying" or "following the Lord" (*Strom.* II, 70,1). Sometimes the road is called one, that of faith and knowledge (ibid., I, 38,6; II, 4,2; V, 8,3; VI, 2,3; VII, 94,5; 103,6; *Paed.* III, 87,22; *Quis dives* 1,3), but it is also royal (*Strom.* I, 38,6; IV, 2,3; VII, 73,5; VI, 91,5; *Quis dives* 38,1). There are different roads, appropriate to the people and to individuals, on which we are led to God (*Strom.* I, 27,1; 29,4; 38,6; IV, 45,1; VII, 7,6) *Protr.* 85,1; *Paed.* III, 87,2).

In *Origen's lexicon the term "to follow" ranges from the most obvious and generic meaning of "to follow" to the fuller meaning of following the will of God, following Christ and listening to his word. In *Ex. ad mart.* 12, following is not just to follow the master but also to take up his cross to the point of martyrdom, which is the most perfect image of him

who redeemed humanity with his blood. The cross (denial of self) and followership are the ways to gain eternal salvation, toward which Christ is the guide who walks ahead (*Ex.* 13; 36; 41-44). To follow Christ is a radical choice, requiring renunciation of self and the repudiation of one's past life to the point of being crucified with him (*Com. in Mt.* 12,24; see *Hom. in Jdg.* 9,1). The point of departure for such a drastic decision is the Father's revelation that Christ is justice, holiness, wisdom, peace, truth, the way that leads to him and the true life (*Com. in Mt.* 15, 21-22).

Besides the meanings of succession (*C. Eun.*, 11, *Hom. in Cant.* 13, *Serm. Cat.* 16) and of the paths of life (*C. Eun.* 11: PG 45, 869), for *Gregory of Nyssa ἀκολουθία means, negatively, the consequences of original sin: humanity's banishment from paradise, the deterioration of the beauty of creation and ongoing sin. Positively, it means the way of return to the original beatitude (*Verg.* 12), the progressive salvation and deification of the person attentive to God's commandments (*Hom. in Cant* 5., *Serm. Cat.* 24; *C. Eun.* 2). *John Chrysostom repeatedly uses the image of Christ going before us to make the path easier and to show us that it is possible to observe the commandments (*De fut. vitae ben.*: PG 65, 351; see Augustine, *Sermo* 141, 4).

The following of Christ has a strong ascetical connotation in *Jerome, who sums up the ideal of detachment from possessions with the imperative: "Follow, naked, the naked Christ" (*Ep.* 125,20), and "Follow, naked, the Saving Lord" (*Ep.* 145).

GLNT 1, 567-582; LTK 7, 609-610; B. Reynders, *Lexique compare . . . de l' "Adversus Haereses" de Saint Irénée*, Louvain 1954, at the entry; X. Léon-Dufour, *Seguire*: *Diz. Teol. Bibl.*, Turin 1965, 1050-1052; G.W.H. Lampe, 63; H. Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh [4]1954, 79-82; *Diz. eseg. NT.*, I, Brescia 1995, 129-138.

E. Peretto

ACROSTICS. Poetry in which the first letter of each strophe, verse or word spells out a word or message. One simple form of acrostic is an abecedarian poem, whose verses and strophes begin with the letters of the alphabet, in order from *a* to *z*. In abecedarian poems, the letters of the alphabet are not necessarily the first letter of the strophe—at times they function to distinguish one strophe from another. Most common in ancient and medieval *Latin Christian literature, abecedarian poems not only were easy to memorize, but also displayed the composer's ingenuity. Abecedarian poems differ from acrostics in which the first letter of each verse or strophe combines to form a name, a word or a verse. Acrostics are common in incantations, in the cult of the dead, in poetic oracles and in arcana. Well known among acrostics is the hymn to Dionysius (see **Anthologia Palatina* 9,524; ibid., 9,530, memorization essays). Sacred Hebrew literature contains important examples. The Lamentations of Jeremiah are composed as an abecedarian poem: in the first, second and fourth chapters of Lamentations, the alphabetical form is followed at the beginning of the individual strophes; in the third, the letter of the alphabet is repeated three times in each strophe. For others see Ps 9–10; 25; 34; 37; 111; 112; 119; 145; Pr 31:10-31. The LXX and Latin translations did not preserve the alphabetical form. This literary procedure in its captivating, parenetic, hymnal and memory-enhancing qualities is well established. It was used by *gnostics in investigating the correspondence between the letters of the Greek alphabet, beginning from the extremities of the human body and following its various members. In ancient and medieval Latin Christian literature they were used by (1) *Augustine in the *Psalmus contra partem Donati* and the *Tract. in Joannem* 10, 12, primarily to facilitate memorization; (2) *Commodian, *Instructiones* I, 35; *De ligno vitae et mortis* II, 15; (3) *Sedulius, in the hymn *A solis ortus cardine*; (4) *Hilary of Poitiers, in the hymns *Ante saecula qui manes* and *Fefellit saevam*; (5) *Fulgentius of Ruspe, in the hymn *Domine Redemptor noster;* (6) *Venantius Fortunatus, in the hymn dedicated to bishop *Leontius *Agnoscat omne saeculum*; (7) *Bede, in the hymn for the solemnity of the holy apostles Peter and Paul *Apostolorum gloriam*; (8) Paulinus of Aquileia, in the penitential hymn *Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sidera*. In the Middle Ages themes broadened to include: the eulogy of *Milan (ca. 740); the imprecations against Benevento for the treacherous capture of the emperor Ludwig II (ca. 871); a Venetian cleric inveighing against the pretentions of the *patriarchate of *Aquileia (845). The hymn *Acathistus also belongs to a group of abecedarian poems.

Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 14,3: SC 264 (E. Bellini, Milan 1980); Augustine, *Psalm. c. part. Don.*: CPL 330; PL 43, 23-32; CSEL 51, 3-15; Commodian, *Instr.* I, 35; *De ligno vit.* II, 15: CPL 1470; PL 5, 227-228; CCL 128 (1960), 29-30.54-55; Sedulius: CPL 1449; PL 19, 763-777; CSEL 10 (1885) 163-168; Hilary of Poitiers: CPL 43; PLS 1,274-276; CSEL 65 (1916) 209-214; Fulgentius of Ruspe: CPL 827; CCL 91A (1968) 877-885; Venantius Fort.: CPL 1033; PL 88, 81-82; Bede Ven.: CPL 1372; PL 94, 628-630; CCL 122 (1955) 428-430; Paulinus of Aquileia, in C. Blume - G.M. Dreves, *Analecta hymnica* 50, Leipzig 1961 (rist.), 148-150; A. Kehl, *Beiträge zum Verständnis einiger gnostischer und frühchristlicher Psalmen und Hymnen*: JbAC 15 (1972/1973) 92-119; T. Piatti, *I carmi alfabetici della Bibbia, chiave della metrica ebraica?*: Biblica 31 (1950) 281-315, 427-458; S. Bartina, *Acrostico*: Enc. Bibl., I, Turin 1969, cols. 138-143.

E. Peretto

ACTISTETAE. Members of one of the most extreme sects into which Egyptian *monophysitism was divided in the first half of the 6th c. The *actistetae* considered the body of Christ not only incorruptible—as the *Aphthartodocetae claimed, following *Julian of Halicarnassus—but "uncreated" (Timothy of Constantinople, PG 86, 44), thus eliminating any distinction between the humanity and divinity of Christ. Their spokesman was a certain *Ammonius (Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* 9,31).

J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1923, 192-193; DTC 5,107; 6,1006; 10,2242; LTK[3] 1,803.

F. Cocchini

ACTS AND CANONS, CONCILIAR

I. Origins and propagation - II. Authority of canons.

The Latin term *canon,* borrowed from Greek, originally had many meanings, leading up to its later meaning of law, norm, rule of appraisal or behavior. From the 4th c. it was increasingly used to mean conciliar decisions. The term was also used for papal decretals and νόμοι, imperial edicts on church affairs.

I. Origins and propagation. The African councils—the most technically elaborate of Christian antiquity, esp. those called by *Aurelius of Carthage (391–428)—allow us to observe the formation and diffusion of canons. This process must have been more or less the same for the councils of the other provinces during the same period: (1) first, the president proposed, always in the first person, to the assembly for their approval the measures that seemed called for by the circumstances, his own as well as those suggested by the Fathers. In this way two fundamental principles of conciliar assemblies were respected: a hierarchy of participants and unanimity of decisions. With time, the rigorous protocol of these procedures seems to have gradually diminished, to the point where the president no longer considered the suggestions of the Fathers, after correcting and improving them, but directly solicited the council's approval; still later he set aside even the report and sometimes, assuming unanimous agreement, replied in the first person in the name of all. These minimal changes that occurred over time demonstrate the vitality and spontaneity of the conciliar assemblies, where pastoral care mattered more than legal formality, without, however, ever descending into anarchy. (2) The canonical norm thus voted had to be made known to those it concerned, specifically to all the bishops of the relevant regions, so that they could apply it in their respective churches. The African councils clearly say that the oral tradition played an important role in this (*Breviarium Hipponense,* ch. 2: *Ut ordinatis episcopis vel clericis prius placita concilii conculcentur ab ordinatoribus eorum* . . .[concerning the ordination of bishops or clerics, the agreement of the councils should be consulted first in connection with their ordinations . . .]). This was the practice in Africa until the 6th c., exemplified by the local custom of reading, at the start of each council, large extracts from the decisions of previous councils. Normally too, provincial delegates (*legati per turmam*) returning to their sees took with them a brief account of the conciliar acts, which the primate had to then make known to the local bishops. We do not have the acts of the earliest councils; from some councils we have this or that decision, from others, some canons. From the 5th c. we also have the record of the interventions of some councils. Conciliar records to a certain extent can be considered the work of individual editors, usually someone close to the president.

II. Authority of canons. Conciliar decisions, evidently, were binding on bishops taking part in or represented at the assembly. Their signature to the acts represented their pledge (see Council of Carthage of 345, *in fine*); from that moment any breaches were liable to punishment. The African councils threatened *excommunication to those who broke their laws; the *Arles synodal letter (314) directs everyone to observe its decisions; the councils of Gangra and Laodicea threaten with excommunication those who do not observe the canons. Despite the absence of a well-delineated theory of representation, the principle of ecclesiastical authority was well observed. From this period also dates a certain solution to the problem of canons disagreeing among themselves, in both doctrinal and disciplinary matters. St. *Augustine proposed to apply two criteria: (1) a hierarchy of councils—a general council takes precedence over a local one; and (2) time—a more recent decision can annul an earlier one (*Bapt.* 2, 4,5 and 2, 3,4). For its part, the papacy based the authority of a council on its communion with the see of Rome (Gelasius, *Ep.* 26, 2 and 6). In actual fact, the authority of canons depended on their reception on the part of the Christian communities themselves and their inclusion in canonical collections.

L. Wenger, *Canon in den römischen Rechtsquellen und in den Papyri*, Vienna-Leipzig 1942; J. Gaudemet, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'Église aux IVe-Ve s.*, Paris 1957, 135-

148; *L'église dans l'Empire romain* (*IV^e-V^e s.*), Paris 1958, 451-467; Ch. Munier, *La tradition littéraire des canons africains*: RecAug 10 (1975) 3-22; J.H. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979; H. Chadwick, *Un concetto per la storia dei concili: La ricezione*: CristSt 13 (1992) 475-492; E. Chrysos, *The Synodical Acts as Literary Products*, in D. Papandreu (ed.), *L'icône dans la théologie de l'art*, Chambéry-Geneva 1990, 85-93; V. Peri, *L'ecumenicità di un concilio come processo storico nella vita della chiesa*: AHC 20 (1988) 216-244; G. Routhier, *La réception d'un concile*, Paris 1993; H. Ohme, *Kanon ekklesiasticos. Die Bedeutung des altkirchlichen Kanonbegriffes*, Berlin 1997.

Ch. Munier

ACTS of the COUNCIL of CAESAREA. Four versions of the acts of this supposed Council of Caesarea, on the date of *Easter, are known: version *A,* published by Baluze (*Nova Collectio conciliorum*, Paris 1683, 13-15); version *B,* of Iohannes Noviomagensis, *Bedae opera*, II, Cologne 1537 (in appendix, see PL 90, 607-610; 94, 682-684; PG 5, 1367-1370); version *C,* published by Muratori (*Anecdota Latinitatis* III, 126-129 [PL 129, 1350-1353]); and version *D,* by A. Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia,* Vatican City 1933, 19-27. The acts were supposed to have been composed ca. mid-6th c. (Cordiolani, Rev. Arch., Bibliot., Mus. 62, 1956, 694-695), or at the beginning of the 6th c. in Africa (Wilmart 20 n. 1), while the latest version was composed in Spain (Jones, 88). These *Acts* depend on the *Tractatus de ratione Paschae,* and are also cited by Bede (*De tempum ratione* 47).

CPL 2307; PL 90, 607; 94, 682; 129, 1350; CPPM III/A 722; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlichmittelalterlichen Chronologie*, I, Leipzig 1880, 306-310; A. Cordiolani, *Les traités de comput du haut moyen âge*: Archivium Latinitatis Medii Aevi 17 (1943) 57-88, nos.. XXIX-XXXII (codices); C.W. Jones, *Bedae opera de temporibus*, Cambridge, MA 1943, 87-89; V. Loi, *Il 25 marzo data pasquale e la cronologia giovannea della passione in età patristica*: EphLit 75 (1971) 48-69, in particular 65-68.

A. Di Berardino

ADAM and EVE

I. Patristic exegesis - II. Iconography - III. Apocrypha.

I. Patristic Exegesis. Among OT apocrypha are the following: (1) A *Life of Adam and Eve* (in Latin), included also in the *Apocalypse of Moses* (Greek, Armenian and Slavic), where an account by Eve of the temptation and fall has been added. A Georgian *Book of Adam* and some Coptic fragments go back to this *Life*. (2) The *Struggle of Adam and Eve against Satan* (Ethiopian and Arabic): certainly a Christian writing, 2nd c., composed using Jewish material and centered on the burial of Adam on Golgotha. *Origen and a pseudo-Athanasius knew this source. (3) The *Cave of Treasures* (Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopian, part in Greek), with an account of the creation of Adam and Eve, as in the *Struggle,* a history of their descendants down to Melchizedek, and a summary of the history of the world from the death of Shem to that of Christ. This work, written in Syriac (4th c.) and clearly of Christian inspiration, like the *Struggle,* drew on common Jewish sources. (4) *The Testament of Adam* (Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopian). Some parts of this work, written before the 5th c., go back to the original late Jewish *Book of Adam*. (5) The eight *Books of Adam* (Armenian): Christian writings translated from some 4th-c. Greek originals. (6) The *Book of the Sons of Adam,* known only through the 5th-c. pseudo-Gelasian decree. (7) *The Book of Adam* or *Ghinza* (*Treasure*)*:* sacred book of the Mandaeans. Some of its elements perhaps go back to the beginning of the Christian era, but the book is strongly anti-Christian and anti-ascetic; Adam and Eve do not have an important role in it. (8) The *Apocalypse of Adam:* *gnostic writing, 2nd or early 3rd c., inserted in the fifth position of codex V (NH V, 5, 64-65), composed along the lines of a Jewish *apocalypse, strongly syncretic, summarizing for novices or non-initiates the doctrine of a sect tracing itself back to Seth (*Sethians). *Epiphanius mentions the "gnostic" authors of an *Apocalypse of A.* (*Pan.* 26,8) but does not say whether he has seen this work himself.

The first Christian mentions of Adam and Eve, apart from the apocrypha and NT, are in *Clement of Rome (*I Cor.* 6,3; 29,2; 50,30 and **Ep. Barn.* 6,9; 12,5). In the *Dialogue with Trypho*, *Justin Martyr writes that Adam was circumcised (19); that his body became the dwelling of a soul permeated by God (40); God's words "Let us make" (Gen 1:26) were addressed to his Word (62); Adam did not reach 1000 years of age (81); the virginal birth of Christ was foretold by Eve's coming from Adam's rib (84); Adam's descendants fell under the power of death (88,94); God did not ask Adam where he was because he did not know (99; also see 100, 103, 124, 132). *Melito of Sardis, following *Barnabas,* blames Adam alone for the Fall, and paraphrases Gen 1–3 (*Pass.* 46-71). On the salvation of Adam, see also the *Odes of Solomon* (14) and the *Gospel of Nicodemus.* *Tatian seems to be the only one to deny salvation to Adam (111, 17,4). The *Letter to *Diognetus,* in its conclusion, which is composed of enthusiastic images, says: "Eve is seduced no more but, remaining a virgin, proclaims her faith" (12,8), a confused approximation of Justin (*Dial.* 100,5),

*Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 2,32,1) and *Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 2,4; *De carne Christi* 17). *Theophilus of Antioch, ca. 180, in *Ad Aut.*, presents Adam as an innocent youth in paradise (1,6; 2,24), neither wholly mortal nor wholly immortal (2,24), though he would have become so by his merits (2,27); he recounts in detail the story of the Fall, down to Seth (2,11-13.18-30). *Theodotus the Valentinian offers a well-systemized and structured conception of Adam (*Exc. ex Theodoto*). Irenaeus of Lyons addresses the gnostic challenge in *Adv. haer.* (books 3-5) and in his *Demonstration of the Apostolic Faith*: Adam and Eve are the work of a good God who sees from the beginning the final end of their descendants. Youths, endowed with freedom, seduced but not destroyed, retaught by God through their descendants, made perfect in Christ the new Adam—for Irenaeus, the progenitors signify the universality of the plan of salvation. Tertullian takes this up, explaining in his characteristic Christian Latin all that is taught about Adam and Eve in the Greek Bible, or that is inherited from the *apologists or from commentators on *Scripture such as Justin and Irenaeus. *Cyprian never names Eve; his few allusions to her are never favorable (*Pat.* 18; *Un.* 1); Adam, on the other hand, has a real importance for him (*Vir.* 4; *Test.* 1,8; *Font.* 13; *Pat.* 5 and 11; *Ep.* 64,5).

Taking up various suggestions from *Clement of Alexandria, Origen offers an extremely coherent interpretation on the subject: his *Hom. Gen.* 1,12-15 comments historically and allegorically on Gen 1:26 and 2:7 ("We say that the spirit is masculine, and the soul feminine"). In all his homilies on Genesis, Gen 2:7 is cited only in this passage, at 1,13, precisely to exclude that "in the image" could be applied to the "pattern of the body." In the *Peri Archōn*, Gen 1:26 is invoked to describe humanity's fate from the *eschatological perspective (I,2,6; II, 10,7; 11,3; III, 1,13; 6,1; IV, 4,10). The inbreathing of God in Gen 2:7b, distinguishes the participation of all human beings in the Father from the participation of the saints alone in the *Holy Spirit (I,3,6; see also II,8,1). Adam and Eve, "one flesh" (Gen 2:24), are an allegory of the unity of Christ, Word and flesh (II,6,3). The symbolic aspects of Adam and Eve's sin are well-emphasized (III,2,1; 6,5; IV, 3,1). In reference to Jn 1:1, 4; 4:26-27, 38, see *Com. in Jo.* In the 4th c., *Athanasius, *Apollinaris and *Hilary give great attention to Adam and Eve in their doctrine of salvation. *Ambrose (*De sacram.* 6,17 and *Hex. Hom. IX*) draws inspiration from *Basil. *Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Creation of Man*, transposes the entire commentary on Gen 1:26; 2:7, etc., into the philosophical language of his time. *Ephrem the Syrian offers a lyrical and mystical paraphrase of the story of Gen (*Hymn of Paradise*). *Gregory of Nazianzus dedicates a passage of *Carm.* (2,1,45) to original sin. He also returns to this theme elsewhere: the weak Eve drew Adam into the sin of greed; she aspired to *divinization with youthful haste (on Eve: *Or.* 18,8; 36,5; 38,12; *Carm.* 1,1,8, v. 113; 2,11,7, v. 347. On Adam: *Or.* 2,14, 28, 36, 38, 44; *Carm.* 1,1,8, v. 107; 2,1,11). *John Chrysostom stresses the mercy of God toward Adam, but looks at Eve only from the perspective of the Fall (*Hom. Gen.*). The catecheses of *Theodore of Mopsuestia gather many reflections on Adam and Eve. In the 5th c., the figures of Adam and Eve play a part in the many problems raised by the *Pelagian crisis (see bibliography).

DACL I,512-519; DTC 1,368-386; DBS I,86-101: *Adam et la Bible*; DTC V, 1640-55; EC I, 278-280; LTK³ 1,133-139; TRE 1,414-437. An excellent exposition of the thought of the Fathers, considered in itself, on Eve: DSp IV, 1772-78. Also excellent: Lampe 26-29. On Adam: Enc. Univ. I,218. On various patristic elements: s.v. "Adam": *ODC*, 1997, 15; EP, ¹⁴1937, Index theologicus: s.v. "Homo primigenius" 768 and the four final headings of "Homo."

Apocrypha: A. Böhlig - P. Labib (eds.), *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi*, Halle - Wittenberg 1963; G.W. McRae, *The Apocalypse of Adam. Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5, and VI, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, I and 4* (NH St. XI), Leiden 1979; F. Morard, *L'Apocalypse d'Adam de Nag Hammadi: un essai d'interprétation* in *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, M. Krause (ed.) (NH St. VIII), Leiden 1977, 35-42; *L'Apocalisse di Adamo*, Fr. tr. and commentary: Bibl. copte de NH, Québec 1981; Sacchi 1,543-633; Charlesworth 2,249-295.

Origen: H. Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique d'Origène*, Instr. Patr. VIII, Steenbrugge 1971; reflecting J. Pépin 1954; H. Crouzel 1956; G. Teichtweier 1958; J. Gross - P. Nemeshegyi 1960; M. Rauer 1961; M. Simonetti 1962; M. Harl 1966; H. Rondet 1967.

Augustine: D. Lenfant, *Concordantiae Augustinianae*, Paris 1556, lists under the headings "Adam," "primus homo," "primi parentes," 153 propositions taken from the works of St. Augustine; T. van Bavel, *Répertoire bibliographique de S. Augustin 1950–1960*, Instr. Patr. III, Steenbrugge 1963: *Composé humain*, n. 3052-3066; *Péché originel*, *Concupiscence*, n. 3525-3588, 4414-4429; *Eve-Marie-Église*, n. 4397-4413.

Studies: J.A. de Aldama, *Adam, typus futuri* (*S. Ireneo, Advers. haer. 3,22,3*): SE 13 (1962) 266-280; A. Orbe, *Cinco exégesis ireneanas de Gen 2,17b adv. haer. V, 23,1-2*: Gregorianum 62 (1981) 75-113; G. Anderson, *Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden*: HTR 82 (1989) 121-148; M.E. Stone, *A History of Literature of Adam and Eve*, Atlanta 1992; A. Guindon, *Pour une éthique du vêtement ou de la nudité?*: Laval théologique et philosophique 50 (1994) 555-574; R.J. O'Connel, *The "De Genesi contra Manichaeos" and the Origin of the Soul*: REAug 39 (1993) 129-141; G.-H. Baudry, *La responsabilité d'Ève dans la chute. Analyse d'une tradition*: MSR 53 (1996) 293-319; M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating Adam and Eve*, Leiden 1996; R.M. Jensen, *The Economy of the Trinity at the Creation of Adam and Eve*: JECS 7 (1999) 527-546; G. Bonner, *La figura de Eva en la*

teología de Agustín: Augustinus 44 (1999) 51-64; M. Dulaey, *Adam et Ève*, *Eadem*, in *"Des forêts de symboles." L'initation chrétienne et la Bible* (*I*[er]-*VI*[e] *siècle*), Paris 2001, 213-227.

Ch. Kannengiesser

II. Iconography. The cycle of the first parents in early Christian iconography is usually depicted in four scenes: the creation, the Fall, the giving of the symbols of work and the expulsion from Eden. To these is added the episode of the hypogeum of Via Dino Compagni in *Rome (*unicum*), in which Adam and Eve are shown in an attitude of sorrow with Cain and *Abel, who seem to be moving toward them (Ferrua, pl. 95).

The Creation (Gen 2:7, 21-22). Only seven examples are known: six sculptures and a painting; the latter, from the hypogeum of the Aurelii in Rome, is the oldest (ca. 230–240) and is now destroyed; it is sometimes identified with the scene of the demiurge creating man (Bendinelli, fig. 13; Himmelmann). The most complete scene is that of the so-called dogmatic sarcophagus (Ws 96), ca. 340, which depicts the *Trinity, Eve shown as smaller at the moment of creation and Adam sleeping after the rib has been taken from him.

The Fall (Gen 3:1-13). Among the numerous examples, the oldest is probably that of the baptistery of *Dura Europos (pre-256). Adam and Eve are usually shown beside the tree, with the serpent twisted around the trunk—sometimes the reptile is not shown (e.g., Ws 177, 179, 204,3), probably because it was thought to be superfluous once the temptation had occurred; they cover their nakedness with leaves or with their hands. Though from the beginning the scene was elaborated in terms that would endure, in most cases substantially unchanged (e.g., Rome, Marcellinus and Peter, second half of the 3rd c.: Wp 101), the variety of attitudes of Adam and Eve seems to reflect the desire of authors or patrons, even in the earliest examples, to express the whole episode of the Fall in more detail. Consequently, depending on the act in which Adam and Eve are depicted, one notes, besides the moment after the sin (i.e., Adam and Eve covering themselves) the following: the temptation, the act in which the Fall consisted (Eve picking, holding or eating the fruit; Adam taking the fruit and putting it in his mouth; Adam and Eve seemingly picking the fruit, both with their right arms extended toward the tree), Adam accusing Eve, and Eve perhaps in turn accusing the serpent. Chronologically, in the context of the Fall understood as a completed transgression, Adam accusing Eve is depicted from the first decades of the 3rd c. (Cimitile—with the tree and the serpent: Chierici, fig. 7; Naples, catac. of St. Januarius: Fasola, fig. 15), the act of the Fall at the beginning of the 4th c. (e.g., Ws 190, 1; 19 1,3), Eve blaming the serpent in the first third of the 4th c. (Rome, catac. of Marcellinus and Peter: Kirsch, fig. 4) and the temptation from about the middle of the same century (Rome, hypogeum of Via D. Compagni: Ferrua, pl. 68,2). Other elements begin to appear in some 4th-c. examples, to enrich the basic formulation of the scene: the symbols of work, i.e., the lamb and thorns (Ws 177,2; 92,2; 190), the Logos or the Lord (Ws 186,2; 92,2). At times these elements appear together, as, e.g., in the Vat. collection. It should be noted that some monuments, due to Adam and Eve's attitude, fall outside of the categories of the Fall discussed thus far. On the sarcophagus of Velletri (Ws 4,3) from the early *Constantine period, Eve covers herself with her left hand; Adam is not covered, because his left arm is on Eve's shoulder while he holds her right hand in his (*dextrarum iunctio?*). In a mid-4th-c. fresco in a hypogeum in the Via Latina, Rome, the tree is shown with Adam and Eve beside it; both cover themselves with their left hands, their right arms "indifferently raised" toward heaven (Ferrua, *Un nuovo cubicolo*, fig. 9). On a Roman-Ostian table, ca. 400, Adam and Eve cover themselves with their right hands, their left arms raised with open hand. The scene of the Fall has obvious symbolic value: it contained the concept of the *felix culpa* that made the redemption necessary. This was obviously not understood in the sense of a return of humanity to the material situation of the earthly paradise but of a spiritual rebirth of human nature.

The giving of the symbols of work. This scene is exclusive to sculpture and follows a fixed schema: at the center is the Logos in tunic and pallium, consigning the ears of corn to Adam with his right hand and the sheep to Eve with his left (Ws 40; 218,2). Adam and Eve, having already sinned, cover their nakedness. The scene appears on approx. 30 Roman and provincial manufactured articles, all dated to the first half of the 4th c. In some cases, probably to underscore the significance of the episode, the symbols of work are sculpted at the feet of the Logos as well as in his hands (Ws 93,1). The depictions clearly show the consequences of sin: the sheep and the ears of corn clearly indicate the material condition of humanity after the Fall; the ears, i.e., working the fields, and the sheep, i.e., weaving (the principal occupations of ancient life) indicate the work that human beings are condemned to carry out for their survival on earth. The scene could be considered a visual representation of Gen 3:17.

The expulsion from Eden (Gen 3:23). Somewhat rare in early Christian art, it follows a schema very faithful to the biblical passage: the Lord in tunic and pallium turns toward Adam and Eve, who are about to pass through the gate of paradise. The scene is depicted ca. mid-4th c. at Rome in the hypogeum of Via D. Compagni (Ferrua, pl. 29), on the sarcophagus of Lot (Rep. 188) and, probably, in the so-called chapel of the Exodus at El-Bagawat (Stern, fig. 7). De Bruyne maintains that the episode was also sculpted on the so-called sarcophagus of Balaam (Rep. 176): if true, it would certainly be the oldest example. Adam and Eve also appear on objects in ivory (a late 4th-c. diptych at Florence where Adam appears naked in Eden: Volbach, n. 108), in glass (Fall of Adam and Eve: e.g., Morey, pl. 24,224; 8,47; 33,420), on 6th- and 7th-c. codices (Genesis of Vienna [Fall]: Hartel-Wickoff, pl. 1; Cotton Bible [God presents Eve to Adam, and the temptation]: Lethaby, pl. 69; Ashburnham Pentateuch [Adam and Eve after the expulsion from Eden]: Gebhardt, pl. 3).

Symbolically, the Fall cycle evokes the cause and origin of the redemption, reaffirms the immortality of the human soul and exhorts the faithful to observance of the divine law. This final consideration seems to be included in a particular way in the scene of the giving of the symbols of work and in that of the expulsion, in which the effects of sin are highlighted.

RBK 1,40 ff.; BS 1, 223ff.; LCI 1,41ff.; A. Breymann, *Adam und Eva in der Kunst des christlichen Altertums*, Wolfenbüttel 1893; L. Troje, ΑΔΑΜ *und* ΖΩΗ, *eine Szene der altchristlichen Kunst in ihrem religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge: Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akad. der Wissen.*: Phil. hist. Klasse 17 (1916) 5ff.; Ws 225ff.; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Basse und Märtyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 320ff.; D. Calcagnini-Carletti, *Note su alcune raffigurazioni dei protoparenti a Roma*, in *Miscellanea S. Cipriani*, Brescia 1981; W. Hartel-Wickhoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, Prag-Vienna-Leipzig 1895; W.R. Lethaby, *The Painted Book of Genesis in the British Museum*: The Archaeological Journal (1912) 88ff.; G. Bendinelli, *Il monumento sepolcrale degli Aureli al viale Manzoni in Roma*, Rome 1923; P. Baur, *Les peintures de la chapelle chrétienne de Doura*: GAZ B.A. 75 (1933) 65ff.; G.P. Kirsch, *Cubicoli dipinti nel cimitero dei Ss. Marcellino e Pietro sulla via Labicana*: RivAC 9 (1932) 17ff.; L. De Bruyne, *Sarcofago cristiano con nuovi temi iconografici scoperto a S. Sebastiano sulla via Appia*: RivAC 16 (1939) 247ff.; G. Chierici, *Cimitile*, I: RivAC 33 (1957) 99ff.; C.R. Morey, *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library, with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections,* G. Ferrari (ed.), Vatican City 1959; H. Stern, *Les peintures du Mausolée de l'Exode à El-Bagawat*: Cahiers Archéol. 11 (1960) 3ff.; A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960; *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage.* Ersten Band: *Rom und Ostia*, ed. F.W. Deichmann, G. Bovini und H. Brandenburg, Wiesbaden 1967; R. Giordani, *Considerazioni sul rilievo cristiano del Museo di Velletri*: RivAC 48 (1972) 173ff.; A. Ferrua, *Un nuovo cubicolo dipinto della via Latina*: RPAA 45 (1972-73), 171ff.; N. Himmelmann, *Das Hypogäum der Aurelier am viale Manzoni, Ikonographische Beobachtungen*, Mainz 1973; U. Fasola, *La catacomba di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; W.F. Volbach, *Elfen-beinarbeiten der Spätantike und frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz ³1976; A. De Vita, *L'ipogeo di Adamo e Eva a Gargaresc*, in *Atti IX Congr. Intern. Arch. Crist.*, Vatican City 1978, 199ff.; L. Pani Ermini, *Una mensa paleocristiana con bordo istoriato*: RIA 1 (1978) 70ff.; P. Testini, *Cimitile*: *L'antichità cristiana*, update of the work of E. Berteaux, *L'art dans l'Italie Méridionale*, Rome 1978, 163ff.; J.-P. Pettorelli, *Péché originel ou amour conjugal? Note sur le sens des images d'Adam et d'Ève sur les sarcophages chrétiens de l'antiquité tardive*: RechAug 30 (1997) 279-234; D. Calcagnini, *Adamo ed Eva* (s.v.), in *Temi di iconografia Paleocristiana*, F. Bisconti (ed.), Rome 2000, 96-101.

D. Calcagnini

III. Apocrypha. The persons and fate of the first parents aroused great interest on the part of both Jews and Christians (*orthodox or *heretics). There are many works on this theme, whose existence is confirmed by the *Talmud, by the OT and NT *apocrypha, by ecclesiastical writers—the *Ps.-*Gelasian Decree* a number of times cites writings attributed to Adam—and finally by *Byzantine writers (George Syncellus, Cedrenus). Writings on Adam and Eve and their descendants exist in Greek, Latin, Arabic, Armenian, *Coptic, Ethiopian, Georgian, Slavic and other languages. They are listed with an ample literature in the CAVT and are described by Denis (see bibliography). This immense production can be divided into three parts: (1) *Life of Adam and Eve* and its derivatives; (2) works of the Adam cycle; (3) works on the first descendants of Adam and Eve.

1. The *Life of Adam and Eve* (*LAE*), called by Tischendorf the *Apocalypse of Moses*, was probably written in Hebrew or Aramaic; of the two different existing versions—Greek and Latin—the Greek seems to be closer to the original; the *LAE* also exists completely in Armenian, Georgian, Rumanian and Slavic, and in fragments in Coptic and Arabic. The author was probably a Hellenic Jew; the work was written in the 1st-2nd c., or perhaps later, in the 2nd-4th c. Some fragments of the work seem to show Christian influence. Particularly helpful for reconstructing the original *Life* are the following versions of the *LAE:* Greek (ed. A.D. Bernardi, Paris 1987), Latin (ed. J.M. Mozley, JTS 30 [1929] 121-149), paleo-Slavic and Georgian; fragments of the Coptic version; and the Armenian *Paenitentia Adae*. The work recounts the life of Adam and Eve after their expulsion from paradise and includes an account of the original sin told by Eve. Both are buried near paradise. Some versions of the *LAE* include the story of the tree of the holy cross.

CAVT 1; A.M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 1-2, Turnhout 2000, 3-28; the most important translations: French: A. Dupont-Somer - M. Philonenko, *Ecrits intertestamentaires*, Paris 1987, 1767-1796; Italian: Sacchi, 2, 379-475 (bibl.); Spanish: A. Díez Macho, *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, 2, Madrid 1983, 317-352; English: H.E.D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Oxford 1984, 141-167; M.D. Johnson, Charlesworth 2, 249-295 (Eng. tr. with commentary). Synopsis: M.E. Stone, Atlanta 1994.

2. Many whole and fragmentary texts belong to the Adam cycle. Among the most important of these is the *Cave of Treasures*, written in Syriac by a *Nestorian ca. 500, relying on *Julius Africanus's chronology. We have the Syriac and Arabic versions; there are also versions in Ethiopian, Georgian (*Book of Nemrod*) and Coptic (fragments). The *Cave* contains a summary of sacred history: the creation of the world, the sin and death of the first parents (1-6), the patriarchs before the flood (7-19), Abraham and Moses (20-34), the judges and kings (35-41), the return from exile (43-44), and the history of Jesus the Messiah (44-54). The *Cave of Treasures* profoundly influenced Christian literature and was often inserted into other works: e.g., Syrian chronicles, the *Apocalypse* of ps.-Methodius and the ps.-Clementine literature; it also influenced the Easterm legend of the three *magi, etc.

Other important fragmentary texts include the *Testamentum Adae,* fragments preserved in various languages and versions; the *Struggle of Adam,* in four books, a Christian work attributed to *Epiphanius of Salamis, written in the 5th-6th c. Like the *Cave of Treasures*, which influenced the work, it is a summary of sacred history until the appearance of the star to the magi. The title comes from the description of the temptations of Adam and Eve described in it. The **Decretum* (ps.) *Gelasianum* mentions a *Paenitentia Adae* (5,6,2). The *Vita Adae* is mentioned in the *Chronicle* of George Syncellus. The *Testamentum dei Protoplastarum* is cited by *Anastasius the Sinaite. The *Liber de filiabus Adae* is cited by the *Decretum Gelasianum* (5,4,7). There are versions in various languages of the *Apocalypses of Adam* (e.g., of Nag Hammadi, codex V), which were used by the gnostics (e.g., the Sethians or Barbarians spoken of by Epiphanius): the *Evangelium Evae* (cited by Epiphanius and used by the Sethians) and a group of texts on Adam and Eve in Armenian, Georgian and Slavic, which include the *De Adami compositione et nomine,* the *Historia Adae et nepotorum eius*, the *De chirographo Adae,* the *Mors Adae,* the *Historia paenitentiae Adae et Evae* and many other writings on Adam and Eve, a list of which is in the CAVT.

Interesting legends on Adam can also be found in Christian apocrypha: in the *Liber Bartholomaei de resurrectione* or in the *Responsiones Ioannis* of Cathar origin. According to the *Acts of Pilate* (see part III: *Descent into Hell*), Adam and Eve were saved by Christ when he descended into hell—this scene is often depicted in icons.

CAVT 2-45; A.M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 1-2, Turnhout 2000, 28-54; *Caverna* - CAVT 11; Syr. CSCO 486/Syr 207; Apocalypse of Adam in NH: in editions of the texts of NH; G.W. MacRae, *Apocalypse of Adam*: HeythrJourn 6 (1965) 27-35; C.W. Hedrick, *The Apocalypse of Adam*, Chicago 1980.

3. In books on the first descendants of Adam, the authors were especially interested in two figures, Abel and Seth. Extant are the *Vita Abel,* written by *Symmachus (Syriac); the *Historia occissionis Abel* (Fr. Copt.); the *Historia Abel et Cain, filiorum Adae* (Armenian and Georgian); and two Armenian works on Abel (CAVT 46-50). *Hippolytus (*Refutatio* 5,19-22) cites a *Paraphrasis di Set* used by the Sethians; writings about Seth are in the writings of Nag Hammadi (*Secundus Tractatus Magni Seth and Tres columnae Seth* [both in codex VII] and the *Intelligentia Noreae uxoris Seth* [codex IX]). Also the *Prophetia Seth* (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 26,8,1); the *Liber Seth* in Syriac, now lost; the *Evangelium Seth* in Armenian and Georgian, and a *Liber Seth* in Slavic; the *Liber apocryphus nomine Seth*, *Mons Victorialis*, a Latin abbreviation of which is in hom. 2 of *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* (5th c.); in Syriac the *Tale of the Magi* (4th c.), which among other things recounts the story of the magi, the appearance of the star over Victorious Mountain (in which was the *Cave of Treasures*) and the *baptism of the magi (CAVT 51-59). Legends about Adam were very popular in the various Christian cultures: Armenian, Irish, Slavic, Ethiopian (*Miracles of G.),* in Jewish culture and also in Islamic culture: the Qur'an frequently mentions Adam.

CAVT 1-59 (bibl.); J.B. Frey, DBS 1, 1928, 101-134; BS 1, 1961, 201-226; LCIK 1, 41-70; 5, 30-31; M.E. Stone, *A History of Literature of Adam and Eve*, Atlanta 1992; A.M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéohellénistique*, 1-2, Turnhout 2000, 3-58; G.A. Anderson - M.E. Stone, Atlanta 1994 (synopsis *LAE*); Adam in the legends of the Jews: L. Ginsberg, *Le leggende degli Ebrei*, 1, Milan 1995, 61-108 (bibliography); in Irish legends: M. MacNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*, Dublin 1975, 14-24; in Armenian legends: M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating Adam and Eve*, Leiden 1996.

M. Starowieyski

ADAMANTIUS. Protagonist of the Greek work in 5 books *Dialogue on the True Faith in God,* beginning

with the *Philokalia* considered to be *Origen's and translated from the Latin by *Rufinus with this attribution. The *Dialogue* has the character of a compilation, containing large borrowings from the works of *Methodius of Olympia. Rufinus's translation is somewhat different from the Greek text that has reached us and includes additions sounding like Origen in both tone and content. In the ongoing uncertainty on the nature and date of the original text, whether ca. 300 or after *Constantine, the only settled fact seems to be that the *Dialogue* is a living text, adapted to needs in the course of the 4th c. in both a pro- and anti-Origen sense. The question is further complicated by the fact that *Eusebius of Caesarea, in *Preparation for the Gospel,* cites a long passage from Methodius's *On Free Will*, which is reported with some variation in the *Dialogue,* attributing it however to a work *On Matter* by a mysterious Maximus who lived under *Septimius Severus, thus posing the problem of a possible source prior to Methodius himself. The *Dialogue* opposes the orthodox Adamantius to two *Marcionites, a follower of *Bardesanes and two *Valentinians. In the end the pagan Eutropius, arbiter of the dispute, gives the victory to Adamantius and converts to the Catholic faith. The *Dialogue* is an important source for the history of *gnosticism.

PG 11, 1713-1884; W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen: GCS 4 (1901); V. Buchheit, *Tyranni Rufini librorum Adamantii Origenis adversus haereticos interpretatio*, München 1966: R.A. Pretty, *Dialogue on the True Faith in God. De recta in Deum fide*, tr. with commentary by R.A. Pretty, ed. by G.W. Trompf, Leuven 1997.

E. Prinzivalli

ADAMITAE (Adamiani). *Heretical sect whose members claimed to be the true *Adam and Eve, and their church the true paradise. Likened to moles, they met naked in carefully heated rooms (Epiphanius, *Haer*. 52). A hypothesis has been advanced identifying them with a group of *Carpocratians mentioned by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III,2) that practiced community of goods and sexual promiscuity, but *Augustine says (*Haer*. 31) they renounced marriage, holding that it would not have existed if their progenitors had not sinned and that Adam did not unite with Eve either before or after the expulsion from paradise.

DTC 1,391; L. Ginzburg, *Adamiti, nuovi adamiti nella morale del Seicento francese*: ASE 13/2 (1996) 583-596.

F. Cocchini

ADAMNAN (or Adomnán) (d. 704). Saint (feast 23 Sept.); born Drumhone, Ireland, ca. 624, abbot of Iona in Scotland after 679. A relative of St. *Columbanus, the founder, whose biography he wrote, drawing on both his personal memories and those of others (PL 88; ed. A.O. Anderson - M.O. Anderson, London 1961). Imposed the Roman system of dating Easter on the community. Between 679–688 he also wrote three books *De locis sanctis* (CCL 175-234), based on the recollections of a pilgrim—the Gallic bishop Arculf, who had been in the East and in Rome—and other sources (*Jerome, *Sulpicius Severus, *Juvencus): the work was a source for *Bede, whose *De locis sanctis* is a compilation of Adamnan's. The canons published by L. Bieler (*The Irish Penitentials*, Dublin 1963) are of doubtful authenticity. Adamnan could be the author of the *scholia* to Virgil's *Eclogues* (ca. 700?). Adamnan enjoyed great prestige in Ireland and with king Alfrid of Northumbria. Besides supporting prisoners and women, he helped bring the *Celtic church closer to Roman usage, to which he was converted in 688 by Ceolfrith.

CPL 1134; 2332; P. Grosjean, *Les noms d'Adomnán et de Bréndán*: AB 78 (1960) 375-381; Id., *Pour la date de fondation d'Iona et celle de la mort de S. Colum Cille*: AB 78 (1960) 381-390; J.M. Picard, *The Purpose of Adomnán's Vita Columbae*: Peritia 1 (1982) 160-177; Id., *Bede, Adomnán, and the Writing of History*: Peritia 3 (1984) 50-70; Id., *The Bible used by Adomnán*, in *Irland und die Christenheit. Bibelstudien und Mission*, eds. P. Ní Chatháin - M. Richter, Stuttgart 1987, 246-257; J. MacQueen, *The Saint as Seer: Adomnan's Account of Columba*, in *The Seer in Celtic and Other Traditions*, ed. H.E. Davidson, Edinburgh 1989, 37-51; A.O. Anderson - M.O. Anderson, ed. and tr., *Adomnan's Life of Columba*, 2nd ed. rev. Oxford 1991; T. O'Loughlin, *The Exegetical Purpose of Adomnán's De Locis Sanctis*: CMCS 24 (1992) 37-53; T. O'Laughlin, *Celtic Theology: Humanity, World and God in Early Irish Writings*, London-New York 2000, ch. 4.

J. Gribomont

ADDAI (or Addaeus). Supposed to have been one of the 72 disciples of the Lord. According to a Syriac tradition, Addai was sent by *Jude Thaddaeus or *Thomas to evangelize the city of Edessa. Native of Paneas (Caesarea Philippi). For some scholars, following the Greek and Latin tradition, Addai (or Addaeus) could indicate the apostle Jude Thaddaeus himself, one of the Twelve, supposed to have been sent as a missionary to *Edessa at the request of Jesus, who had received a letter from king *Abgar V. The crux of the story, certainly apocryphal, is in the narration of *Eusebius (*HE* I, 13), who reports the correspondence between Jesus and king Abgar V; both the apocryphal *Acts of Thaddaeus* and the *Doc-*

trine of Addai (or Addaeus) are drawn from Eusebius's account. The protagonist of the narration is Addai or Thaddaeus (according to Eusebius), often identified with the apostle Jude Thomas.

The *Doctrine of Addai* came to light thanks to the publication of a *Syriac manuscript (1864 Cureton and 1876 Philips) similar to the one described by Eusebius, whose author is supposed to have been Labubna, son of Sennak. Differences with the Eusebian narration, which includes only the correspondence and some of the apostle's deeds, are obvious: the Lord does not respond to the letter in writing but orally, and Annanias, Abgar's messenger, is considered the actual author of the text, and brings with him a self-portrait of Jesus. The missionary sent was not Thaddaeus but Addai. The second part of the *Doctrine* treats of Addai the missionary (or Addai, one of the 72) at Edessa: consecration of priests, baptisms, miracles, speeches, establishing Christian worship, building churches, etc. Also included is the story of the discovery of the true cross by Protonice, mother of the emperor *Claudius (a scene that we find in the history of St. *Helena), whose presence serves to chastise the Jews for putting Christ to death. The account ends with the death of Addai and his succession: his disciple Aggai is killed by the son of Abgar, who remained an unbeliever; succeeding him was *Palut, ordained by *Serapion of Antioch, noteworthy in that it connects the church of Edessa with that of Rome. The text also reports that Serapion was ordained by *Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome; the *Doctrine* in this way intends to underscore the legitimate succession of the church of Edessa. The document was certainly written after 384, i.e., after the *Pilgrimage of *Egeria,* which reports the existence of the letters but not of the icon of the Lord—thus late 4th to early 5th c. This notwithstanding, many scholars agree in affirming the antiquity of the tradition of the evangelization of Edessa, back even to apostolic times; others date it late 2nd c. The icon is important in the Byzantine tradition of the *Doctrine:* the transfer of the image of Edessa is still celebrated on 16 August. The *Doctrine* has reached us in Syriac, Armenian, Greek, Latin, Slavic, Coptic and Arabic.

The *Acts of Thaddaeus* (one of the Twelve), mentioned above, are a Greek elaboration of the *Doctrine,* with a different organization of the material. Addai is commemorated by the Syriac church, and even today Jude Thaddaeus is honored on 14 May and 18 October. The Armenians also preserve Addai's memory, claiming that he was martyred by Sanatruk, Abgar's nephew.

Another source in the Christian tradition referring to the name of Addai is the *eucharistic *anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari. One of the three Syro-Eastern anaphorae of the Chaldean church, it is also used by *Nestorians and *Malabarese. Composed in Syriac, it stands out among this type of liturgical document because it lacks the account of the institution, unique among anaphorae; it is also the oldest eucharistic prayer in use among the Eastern churches. According to some scholars it can be dated to the 3rd c. and is closely related to the anaphora of St. Peter the Apostle III, also from this period; the original form is nonetheless difficult to determine because the Syriac manuscripts that have reached us are very late. It is also distingushed by the pronounced presence of traces of the Hebrew liturgy; it is in fact modeled on some easily identifiable Jewish blessings.

Doctrine of Addai: CANT, n. 89; BHO 9,24, 1141; W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa and the Neighbouring Countries, from the Year After our Lord's Ascension to the Beginning of the Fourth Century*, London 1864; G. Philips, *The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle, Now First Edited in a Complete Form in the Original Syriac with an English Translation and Notes*, London 1876; W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ält. Christentum*, Tübingen 1934, 6-48; M. Erbetta, *Gli Apocrifi del NT*, Casale Monferrato 1975, 79-82; J. Tixeront, *Les origines de l'Église d'Edesse et la légende d'Abgar*, Paris 1988; A. Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, Turnhout 1993; A. Desreumaux, *Les titres des oevres apocryphes chrètiennes et leurs corpus: le cas de la doctrine d'Addai syriaque*, in *La formation des canons scripturaires*, Paris 1993; L. Moraldi, *Gli Apocrifi del NT*, Casale Monferrato 1994, 719-722; J. González, *La leyenda del Rey Abgar y Jesús, orígenes del Cristianismo en Edesa*, Madrid 1995; C. and F. Jullien, *Les Actes de Mar Mari. L'apôtre de la Mésopotamie*, Turnhout 2001.

The Acts of Thaddaeus: CANT, n. 229; BHG 1702-1703; C. Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Leipzig 1851, 261-265; R.A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocryphorum* I., Leipzig 1891 (Hildesheim) 273-283; M. Erbetta, *Gli Apocrifi del NT*, Casale Monferrato 1975, II, 575-578; W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* II, Tübingen 1989, 436-437.

Liturgy: (Syriac text and Latin version) Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church (ed.), "Anaphora prima nimirum Anaphora beatorum Apostolorum Mar Addau et Mar Mari, Doctorum Orientis," in *Liturgia Siro Malabarese*, Rome 1955; W. Macomber, *The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*: OCP 32 (1966) 335-371; Lat. tr. in B. Botte: OCP 15 (1949) 261-263; Fr. tr. in B. Botte: OrSyr 10 (1965) 91-93; A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*, Oxford 1992, 48-63; Ital. tr. in *Segno di Unità*, Magnano 1996, 302-306.

J.F. Rubio Navarro

ADEODATUS (372-389/391). Natural son of *Augustine and his unnamed companion of 14 years. Born at *Carthage in 372 (*Conf.* 4,2,2), Adeodatus accompanied his parents to *Thagaste, Carthage,

*Rome and *Milan. When his mother returned to *Africa, he stayed with his father and his grandmother *Monica (*Conf.* 6,15,25). After his father's conversion, he went with him to Cassiciacum and, though very young, took part with him in philosophical disputes (*De b. vita* 6). He was baptized with his father by *Ambrose on 24-25 April 387 (*Conf.* 9,6,14) and was present at the death of Monica at Ostia Tiberina (*Conf.* 9,12,29.31). Returning to Africa, at Thagaste he joined with those who followed Augustine in the experience of common life (Possidio, *Vita di S. Ag.* 3,1-2). He was his father's interlocutor there in the dialogue *De magistro;* the thoughts expressed therein are his at age 16. He died between 389–391 (before his father became a priest). Gifted with great goodness and extraordinary intelligence, he was a source of admiration and even astonishment for Augustine, who had had even more extraordinary proofs of his gifts: *horrori mihi erat illud ingenium* (*Conf.* 9,6,14).

BA 6,9-40; 13,667-669; PCBE 1, 32-34; G. Madec, *Adeodatus*: AugL 1,87-90; W.H.C. Frend, *The Family of Augustine: A Microcosm of Religious Change in North Africa*, in *Atti del Congresso internazionale su s. Agostino 1986*, Rome 1987, 135-151.

A. Trapè

ADEODATUS I (or Deusdedit), pope (615-618). Succeeded *Boniface IV (608–615) on 19 October 615, five months after the death of his predecessor. The reason for the long vacancy was the usual one: the necessity, and at times the difficulty, of obtaining imperial approval. A native of Rome, Adeodatus guided the city and the church in still-difficult times, especially for Italy, which was dominated by the *Lombards and afflicted by famines. The LP gives only two items about him: he transferred some goods from monks to the secular clergy and authorized priests to celebrate two Masses in two different churches (or maybe two Masses per day in the same church: the text is not clear). Adeodatus was the first pope to allow embellishment of his own funeral. He died 8 November 618 and was buried in the basilica of St. Peter.

Jaffé I, Leipzig 1885, 222; LP I, 319-320; AASS, *Novembris*, III, Brussels 1910, 832-834; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, 1933, 517-518; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 300; BS I, 250-251 (I. Daniele); J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 69; LTK[3] 3,115-116 (G. Jenal); EPapi I, (*Deusdedit*) 582-583 (G. Arnaldi).

M. Spinelli

ADEODATUS II, pope (672–676). Native of Rome, a monk in the monastery of St. Erasmus on the Caelian Hill. He succeeded *Vitalian I and was consecrated on 11 April 672. Little is known of his pontificate. The general political climate of those years was characterized by bloody internal fights at *Byzantium and a constant expansion of the Arabs in Asia and Africa. Adeodatus continued to combat *monothelitism. He also granted the privilege of exemption to the monasteries of St. *Martin of Tours and St. Peter at *Canterbury.

AASS, *Iunii*, Antwerp 1709, 155; Jaffé I, 237; LP I, 364-365; J. Harttung, *Diplomatisch-historische Forschungen*, Gotha 1879, 120-121; F. Camombreco, *Il monastero di S. Erasmo sul Monte Celio*: Archivio storico della R. Società di Storia Patria 28 (1905) 272-276; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 364-365; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 76-7; LTK[3] 1,156 (B. Kriegbaum); EPapi I, 609-610 (G. Arnaldi).

M. Spinelli

ADIABENE. Region between the upper and lower Zab, east of the Tigris River, conquered by *Trajan in 116, becoming a Roman province with the name Assyria, but soon reconquered by the Persians. In the 1st c. it was also made a Jewish kingdom under the rule of Queen Helena (d. 50), a convert to Judaism (Flavius Josephus, *Ant.* 20,2-5) whose sons Monobazus II and Izates II were buried at Jerusalem. There is no precise record of the introduction of Christianity into the region (a large part of which, according to the sources, had embraced Judaism), attributed to St. Mari, disciple of Addai. The latter, according to the *Chronicle of *Arbela* (a forgery written in 1907), was supposed to have been the first evangelizer: the document, however, has been shown to be unreliable (see P. Peeters, *Les Passionaires d'Adiabène*, 261-304, and I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Cronaca di Arbela,* 5-32). The Jewish presence facilitated the spread of Christianity. In any event, at the time of the persecutions of Shapur II (309–379) most of the inhabitants were Christian, as *Sozomen attests (*HE* 2,12,4: PG 67, 965). According to Assyrian tradition the first bishop was Pkidha (104–114), consecrated by Mari, and succeeded by Semsoun (120–123), Isaac (135–148) and others. In the 2nd c. *Tatian (d. ca. 180) came from Assyria and was a disciple of *Justin Martyr at Rome. The date of the first bishop at *Arbela (modern Irbil) is unknown, though at that time the bishop resided nearby at Hazza. With Bishop Papa (310–317), Arbela was made *metropolitan see of the country and obtained the fifth position after the principal see of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, capital of the *Sassanid king-

dom. Bishop John ([Iohannon] d. 343) was martyred, as was his successor Abraham (d. 345): the region, theater of many battles—as late as 446 a great many Christians of the Adiabene were martyred—also had flourishing *Nestorian and *Jacobite communities, which built numerous convents. A certain Daniel participated at the synods of 410 and 424. An unnamed bishop of Adiabene participated at *Acacius's synod in 486, about the time when the region embraced monophysitism.

The arrival of the Arabs (mid-7th c.) marked the period of the greatest development of the region, especially artistically (the sources record the founding of many church buildings, especially convents, in the 7th and 8th c.), through the political shrewdness of the metropolitan *Iso'yahb III: at that time Adiabene enjoyed a relative tranquility, until the transfer of the metropolitan see to Mosul (826/827) under metropolitan *Isho'bar Nun (ca. 823–829). The diocese of Arbela had bishops until the 16th c., but citations of Adiabene's capital and of the region itself, from then on generally known as Assyria, would become increasingly rare: among the most important cities were Arbela (the capital), Hadita and Hazza, the latter two also episcopal sees. Of the numerous church buildings mentioned in the sources, especially monasteries, worth noting are the convents of Mar Yonan the Slave, Margana (diocese of Haditha, 8th c.) and Bet Qoqa (7th c.), whose site has probably been identified near the village of Mulla Omar.

P. Peeters, *Les passionaires d'Adiabène*: AB 43 (1925) 261-304; H. Charles, *Le Christianisme des Arabes nomades sur le Limes*, Paris 1936; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Intorno al valore storico della Cronaca di Arbela*: OCP 12 (1936) 5-32; EC 1,305-306; J.M. Fiey, *Assyrie Chrétienne*, Beirut 1965, 37-218; Id., *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO, Subsidia 36, Louvain 1970; J. Neusner, *The Conversion of Adiabene to Christianity*: Numen 12 (1966) 144-150; M.-L. Chaumont, *La christianisation de l'Empire iranien: des origines aux grandes persécutions du IV*[e] *siècle*, Lovanii 1988; J.M. Fiey, *Pour un Oriens Christianus Novus*, Beirut 1993; N. Garsoïan, *L'église armenienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, Lovanii 1999; S.H. Moffett, *A History of Christianity in Asia*, I, New York [2]2001, 70-80; R.L. Mullen, *The Expansion of Christianity: A Gazetter of Its First Three Centuries*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 60ff.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ADIMANTUS the Manichean (3rd c.). One of *Mani's three closest disciples. In *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* (II,xii,41) *Augustine of Hippo reports that he was also called Addas, the name of a disciple of Mani known to us from the *Acts of *Archelaus,* which identifies him as the apostle of *Manicheism to *Scythia. Both this and a Manichean writing in Middle Persian say that Addas (or Addai) was celebrated for his writings and that he was sent by Mani to carry out missionary work (in Egypt, according to the latter source). A Chinese text refers to him as Ato. According to original texts in Coptic and Iranian, he reached the Tigris (Al Madail) and the Nile (Alexandria). His book *Against Moses and the Other Prophets* spurred Augustine to write *Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum* (ca. 394), in which he defended the OT and criticized Manichean biblical interpretation. *Faustus of Milevis identifies Adimantus as the most important Manichean teacher after Mani himself: *solo nobis post patrem nostrum Manichaeum studendo* (the only teacher we have after our father Mani worthy of our attention—Augustine, *Contra Faustum* I,2); *Faustus sic miratur Adimantum ut ei solum praeferat Manichaeum* (Faustus paises Adimantus so much that only Mani is preferred to him—ibid., VI,6). This would indicate that *Manichei discipulum* is to be taken literally: Adimantus was one of Mani's twelve disciples.

CPL 319; PL 42, 129-172; CSEL 25/1, 115-190; BA 17, 196-375; P. Alfaric, *Les écritures manichéennes*, II, Paris 1919, 104-106, 165; F. Châtillon, Adimantus Manichaei discipulus, *Revue du Moyen Age Latin* 10 (1954) 191-203; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 13, 68-69, 97-98; *Idem*, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IV*[e]*-V*[e] *siècles): Étude historique et doctrinale*, Paris 1978, I, 93-105, II, 69-70; H.J.W. Drijvers, Addai und Mani: Christentum und Manichäismus im dritten Jahrhundert in Syrien, in R. Lavenant (ed.), *III*[o] *Symposium Syriacum 1980*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 221, Rome 1983, 171-185; G. Sfameni Gasparro, Addas-Adimantus unus ex discupulis Manichaei: For the History of Manichaeism in the West, in R.E. Emmerick - W. Sundermann - P. Zieme (eds.), *Studia Manichaica*, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderband 4, Berlin 2000, 546-559.

J. Kevin Coyle

ADOPTIONISTS. Modern scholars use this name to refer to the *monarchians, who considered Christ to be a mere man, adopted as the Son of God for his merits (the Lat. *adoptiani* is very late). *Theodotus of Byzantium ("the Tanner") taught this doctrine at Rome in the late 2nd c. He claimed that Jesus was a man born of the Virgin by the will of the Father and lived as other men, though more piously, such that at the baptism in the Jordan the dove descended on him to signify the divine spirit given him, called "the higher Christ." Only from this point did Jesus Christ begin to work miracles. Some adoptionists placed the deification of Jesus at this moment, others after the resurrection. They based their doctrine scriptur-

ally on gospel passages (and biblical passages generally) from which it could be concluded that Jesus was only a man: Dt 18:15; Mt 12:31; Jn 8:40. A student of Theodotus who was also named Theodotus and from Byzantium, called "the Banker," accentuated the merely human character of Jesus, asserting that *Melchizedek was a divine power greater than Christ, who was made in the former's image based on Heb 5:6. Adoptionism was taken up again at Rome between 230–250 by *Artemon, who seems not to have innovated with respect to Theodotus; rather, he emphasized the traditional character of his teaching, claiming that it went back to the apostles and was held at Rome until *Victor's pontificate but that *Zephyrinus, at the beginning of the 3rd c., corrupted the truth with innovations. More developed forms of adoptionism were proposed by *Paul of Samosata (ca. 260–270), to whom *Nestorius was linked, and by *Photinus of Sirmium (mid-4th c.). *Marcellus of Ancyra, who acted as *trait d'union* between Paul and Photinus, can also basically be considered an adoptionist. The ancients considered adoptionism to be a Jewish-type heresy and associated it with *Ebionitism, in that the adoptionists, like the Jews, did not recognize the divine character of Christ, reducing him to a mere man.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884, 609-615; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958, 115-119, 158-160; J.C. Cavadini, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul 785-820*, Philadelphia 1993; G. O'Collins, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical and Systematic Study of Jesus Christ*, Oxford 1995.

M. Simonetti

ADULTERY. With Jews, as with Greco-Romans, the concept of adultery was not reciprocal: a married man who had relations with an unmarried woman was not an "adulterer" (μοιχός), since his wife had no rights over him: from the point of view of Roman law, such acts were classified at most as *stuprum* (φθορά), if carried out with an honest woman, or as *fornicatio* (πορνεία), not punishable by law, if with a prostitute; any extramarital relations on the part of a married woman, however, was adultery, because the woman was the husband's property.

1 Cor 7:3-4, however, attributing to each spouse the same right over the body of the other, began a true and proper revolution, with the consequence of establishing equality with respect to adultery. The Fathers continually stress Paul's thought on this matter, insisting firmly that what is not permitted to the woman is not permitted to the man: they do not speak of this prohibition regarding women, because it was also valid outside of Christianity (i.e., in the culture generally). Two important testimonies, considered "exceptions" (*Basil the Great, *Canonical Letters*, and *Ambrosiaster, *Comm. 1 Cor*), nonetheless show the futility with which the Fathers opposed the inveterate prejudices of the day and with what little effect they diffused Christianity's revolutionary ideas: the discriminatory mentality on adultery changed only very slowly. This change is probably evident in the "modern" variant of Mt 19:9, as opposed to the more archaic conception expressed in Mt 5:32. It seems the Fathers used another term, the Latinized form of the Greek μοιχεία, when the act to be judged did not fall in the usual category of *adulterium:* the words *moechia* and *moechus* are thus used, which seemed less traditional and could therefore serve as comprehensive terms, capable of indicating the behavior of both spouses.

With respect to ecclesial punishments, it seems that some texts must be interpreted in the sense that ecclesial authorites would punish equally both husbands and wives who had sexual relations outside of marriage (*Concilio di Elvira* 7; Ambrose, *De Abraham* 1,4,25; 1,7,59; Augustine, *Quaest. Hept.* 2, *Quaest. Ex.* 71); other passages still show an unequal conception of adultery (Ambrosiaster; Basil, *Letter* 199,21; 199,46; 199,48 and 217,77). Punishment was exclusion from communion for a rather lengthy period (in Basil, *Letter* 217,58, for 15 years; in the *Council of Elvira* 69, for 5 years; at the *Council of Ancyra* 20, for 7 years), during which time one reentered the community gradually, until the end of the prescribed time. The reason for the penitence was kept hidden, to avoid the risk of retaliation (Basil, *Letter* 199,34), given that from the early 4th c. the ancient punishment for adultery—banishment—was elevated to capital punishment (see CTh 9,40,1). When the Fathers began to put other sexual crimes at the same level of adultery—such as *incest (Basil, *Letter* 217,68), bestiality (ibid., 217,63), homosexuality (ibid., 217,62) and the violation of a vow of *virginity (ibid., 217,60; see *Council of the Veneto* 4)—they in effect seemed to equate them with adultery.

H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce*, Paris 1971; A. Arjava, *Women and Law in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 1996.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

AENEAS of Gaza (d. after 518). Born at *Gaza of a fairly high-ranking family (Procopius of Gaza, *Ep.* 82 in Hercher, *Epistol. Graeci* 564, 15-16). It is not possible to establish his exact date of birth, which is probably ca. 450, since he composed his main work,

Theophrastus, shortly after 484, when he must have already reached full maturity (in *Theophr.* 66, 11-67,16 Colonna, PG 85, 1000 A2-1001 B3, the persecution of the orthodox by the Vandal king *Huneric in 484 is presented as a very recent event, see also M.E. Colonna, *Teofrasto* VIII); and in his *Life of Severus,* *Zacharias Scholasticus says that he bore a letter to Zenodorus from Aeneas, the "great and learned sophist" (PO II, 90), between 488–491. Aeneas studied at Alexandria, devoting himself especially to the study and practice of rhetoric. He also pursued philosophical studies extensively at the school of the *Neoplatonist *Hierocles (PG 85, 873 A5-8, 876 A4-5). Aeneas developed a friendship with Sopater—the famous rhetor whose school *Severus of Antioch and *Zacharias Scholasticus frequented (*Ep.* 9 and 16; *Vita Sev.* PO II, 12)—and with *Serapion, the deacon involved in the religious troubles which broke out following the publication of the emperor *Zeno's **Henoticon* (see Zach. Schol. *Hist. eccl.* VI, 1, p. 86, 24; VI, 4 p. 91,1 Ahrens - Krüger). Back in Gaza, he dedicated himself to teaching (*Ep.* 13, p. 9,7-8; *Ep.* 16, p. 11,12-14); he continued to hold discourses in the public theater, according to the custom of the Gazan sophists (*Ep.* 16, p. 11,14-15). He was also an expert in law. *Procopius, in *Ep.* 82 (in Hercher, *Epistol. Gr.* 564-565), describes him as an upright jurist who, appointed superintendent of courts and superprefect by some cities, became an object of the governors' contempt because it was not his practice to lavish them with gifts; he would then lose his position. That Aeneas was in fact a high magistrate and a superprefect seems evident from two letters, *Ep.* 3, in which he enjoins the priest Alphius not to advance claims over a piece of land, and *Ep.* 24, in which he orders the magistrate Marcian to deal with the banditry that infested the city's surroundings.

Zacharias Scholasticus speaks of Aeneas with great respect and in the *Life of Isaiah* (CSCO *Scriptores Syri* 3.25, p. 8,21-29 of the Latin version of E.W. Brooks) says that Aeneas, "sophist of the city of Gaza, a very Christian man, extremely well educated and illustrious in every field of wisdom," would consult Isaiah on certain dubious phrases in *Plato, *Aristotle and *Plotinus; Isaiah would explain to him their thought, pointing out their errors and confirming the truth of Christian teaching. He was in contact with other famous sophists, e.g., Dionysius of Antioch and Zonaeus. But his most important friends were Procopius of Gaza and his brother Zacharias, better known as Zacharias Scholasticus or Zacharias of Mytilene. He died shortly after 518, the year in which the *Life of Severus* was written: in this work Zacharias Scholasticus does not speak of Aeneas in the customary way of speaking of persons already dead (on all this biographical information, see esp. Legier, 349-369).

A collection of 25 letters to students and acquaintances and the dialogue *Theophrastus* are his only surviving works. The *Epistles* are not only sources of precious information on Aeneas's person and activity but also an important testimony regarding Late Antique and Byzantine rhetoric. Richly interwoven with reminiscences of earlier authors (see the *apparatus fontium* of the edition ed. by M.E. Colonna) is his main work, *Theophrastus,* a dialogue that Aeneas imagines took place at Alexandria shortly after the persecution (484) of orthodox Christians ordered by the Vandal king Huneric (66,1-67, 16 Colonna, PG 85,1000 A2-1001 B3). The parties to the dialogue are Aegyptus, Theophrastus and Euxitheos. While Aegyptus is a dull and secondary figure who speaks only at the beginning and then disappears almost entirely, Euxitheos is the dialogue's true protagonist, Aeneas's faithful spokesman: to him are reserved the refutation of philosophical doctrines not consonant with the truth of the Christian faith and the exposition and defense of doctrines held to be perfectly "orthodox." To Theophrastus, however, presented at the beginning as a teacher to whom Euxitheos has turned under the guise of a student desirous to learn, is assigned the enunciation of certain philosophical doctrines and the formulation of objections regarding the content of the Christian faith. The procedure followed in *Theophrastus* thus closely follows that of *Gregory of Nyssa's *De anima et resurrectione.* The main themes are (1) refutation of the two Platonic doctrines of the preexistence of the soul and *metempsychosis; (2) apparent evils and true happiness, providence and the reasons for suffering; (3) reasons for the usefulness of the various stages in the death of human beings; (4) the immortality of human souls; (5) the limited, noninfinite number of the latter; (6) the *creatio ex nihilo,* closely connected with the creation of matter; (7) the origin of the world in time, its consummation and rebirth in a perfect state; (8) the soul's journey in only one human body, the only one destined to rise and enjoy immortality; (9) the denial of the resurrection of animals; (10) the existence of some cases of resurrection already in this life, proof of the future resurrection (see also M.E. Colonna, introd. XIV n. 1 and the *pinax* on p. 1 of his edition).

To S. Sikorski belongs the merit of having shown, in a careful investigation using precise textual comparisons (almost always synoptic), the ample utilization in the *Theophrastus* of philosophical and patristic authors, in particular Plato, Plotinus and Gregory

of Nyssa. The most profound and exhaustive research, however, on the close relation between Aeneas and the Platonic tradition on basic questions such as the idea of God, the Trinity, the creation of the world *ex nihilo,* dependent on the free divine will and occurring at a specific moment, and the world's future preservation is that of M. Wacht, who also examines both Aeneas's position within the patristic tradition with regard to criticism of the Neoplatonic theory of *creatio ab aeterno* and his views on the rebirth of the world—in itself corruptible—after its dissolution. Wacht highlights not only the concordances but also the discrepancies between Neoplatonic theology and cosmology on the one hand and Aeneas's theories on the other; Wacht also brings out the most specifically Christian traits of Aeneas's conception of God (48-50, 55-62), specifying the extent of Aeneas's orthodoxy. Regarding the latter, Wacht's thesis seems unacceptable that Aeneas had not understood the clear *Nicene distinction between *gennēma* and *poiēma,* since he compares the origin of the Son and the *Holy Spirit to the creation of the intelligible essences and the subsequent creation of the sensible world, though affirming the full consubstantiality of the second and third persons (p. 96): in *Theophrastus* 44,10 Colonna (PG 85, 960 A10) Aeneas uses precisely the term *gennēma.*

Theophrastus: CPG 7450; PG 85, 872-1004; Jo. Fr. Boissonade, *Aeneas Gazaeus et Zacharias Mitylenaeus. De immortalitate animae et De mundi consummatione.* Ad codices recensuit Barthii Taurini Ducaei, notas addidit Jo. Fr. Boissonade, Paris 1836, 1-78 (with commentary, 155-316); M.E. Colonna, *Enea di Gaza. Teofrasto*, Naples 1958, 1-68 (with It. tr. and commentary, 69-114, 115-138; on pp. XXXIX-XL is a list of the oldest editions).

Epistles: CPG 7451; R. Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, Paris 1873, 24-32; L. Massa Positano, *Enea di Gaza. Epistole* [Collana di Studi Greek diretta da V. De Falco XIX], Naples 1950, 2-17 (with tr. and comm., 29-80); [2]1962.

Studies: E. Legier, *Essai de biographie d'Enée de Gaza*: OrChr 7 (1907) 349-369; M. Freudenthal, PWK I.1, 1021-1022; V. Grumel, DHGE 15, 458-459; L. Massa Positano, *Ancora sulle epistole di Enea di Gaza*: GIF 5 (1952) 205-207; J.P. Sheldon-Williams, in *Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge [3]1980, 483-486; G. Schalkhaußer, *Aeneas von Gaza als Philosoph*, Erlangen 1898; S. Sikorski, *De Aenea Gazaeo*, Vratislaviae 1909 [BPhA 9.5]; M.E. Colonna, *Zaccaria scolastico. Il suo Ammonio e il Teofrasto di Enea di Gaza*: AFLN 6 (1956) 107-118; R. Loenertz, *Observations sur quelques lettres d'Enée de Gaza*: HJ 77 (1958) 438-443; A.G. Downey, *Gaza in the Early Sixth Century*, Norman 1963, 111-112; H. Herter, *Von Xanthos dem Lyder zu Aineias aus Gaza. Tylon und andere auferweckte*: RhM 108 (1965) 189-212; M. Wacht, *Aeneas von Gaza als Apologet. Seine Kosmologie im Verhältnis zum Neuplatonismus* [Theophania 21] Bonn 1969 (recension of M. Baltes, *Gnomon* 4 [1970] 547-551); A. Garzya, *Varia philologica* VIII, in *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella*, Catania 1972, 253-257; M. Starowieyski, *De vita et operibus Aenal Gazaei*: Meander 28 (1973) 3-22; Id., *Epistulae I-XXV*: Meander 28 (1973) 93-108; E. Gallicet, *Per una rilettura del Teofrasto di Enea di Gaza e dell'Ammonio di Zacaria scolastico*: AOT Classe di sc. mor., stor. and filol. 112 (1978) 117-135, 137-167; Id., *La risurrezione dei morti in Enea di Gaza e in Zacaria scolastico*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 273-278; Id., *Problèmes de chronologie*: Koinonia 10 (1986) 67-80; N. Aujoulat, *Le De Providentia d'Hieroclès d'Alexandrie et le Théophraste d'Enée de Gaza*: VChr 41 (1987) 55-85; A.M. Milazzo, *La chiusa del Teofrasto di Enea di Gaza. Il meraviglioso come metafora*: Sicul. Gymn. 40 (1987) 39-70; Id., *Un tema declamatorio alla scuola di Enea*: Sicul. Gymn. 42 (1989) 241-263; Id., *Dimensione retorica e destinatari nel Teofrasto di Enea di Gaza*, in var. aus., *Retorica della comunicazione nelle letterature classiche*, ed. A. Pennacini, Bologna 1990, 33-71; Id., *I personaggi del dialogo di Enea di Gaza: storicità e tradizione letteraria*, in Σύνδεσμος. *Studi in onore di R. Anastasi* I, Catania 1991, 1-19; S. Lilla, in Patrologia V, 265-274.

S. Lilla

AEON

I. In Greek philosophy - II. In the Bible and patristic literature - III. In gnosticism.

I. In Greek philosophy. *Plato (*Timaeus* 37d) considers αἰών ("eternity") an essential property of the "intelligible living being," i.e., the world of ideas used by the demiurge as a model in the formation of the sensible world (see 28a, 29a-b, 30c-31b); like the ideas, it is identical with itself, immobile and not subject to becoming (38a); and as the sensible world is an image of the intelligible living being formed by the ideas (29b), so time, which is in the sensible world, is the image and imitation of αἰών, which is in the intelligible world (37d, 38a). The same doctrine recurs in Timaeus of Locris, 97d (IV 412, 13-17 Hermann). *Aristotle identifies αἰών with the whole temporal duration, and with its infinity (*De caelo* I 279a 25-27) considers it an essential property of God (*Met.* Λ 1072b 29-30), and explains its etymology by connecting it with the idea of "perpetual existence," ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι εἰληφὼς τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν (*De caelo* I 279a 27-28, see Plotinus, *Enn.* III 7, 4 vol. 374, 42-43 Henry-Schwyzer; *Proclus, *In Tim.* III 9, 32-33 Diehl and III 35,13). *Plotinus—who dedicates an entire treatise, the seventh of the third *Ennead,* to αἰών and time (studied in depth by W. Beierwaltes; see bibl.)—relates αἰών closely with the totality of intelligible beings that form the mind, the second hypostasis emanating from the One: αἰών is for him the immutable existence of all intelligible beings (III, 7,3 [I 372,34-36]); the full, uninterrupted and infinite life, which knows neither past, present nor future, of the totality of these beings (III, 7,3 [I 372,34-38], see III, 7,5 [I 375,25-28]); the radiation which comes from them and which expresses their absolute identity

(III, 7,3 [I 371,23-26]); the revelation and the expression itself of intelligence (III, 7,5 [(I 375,19-22]); and the nature that is near the One, that emanates from it and tends to return to it without departing from it (III, 7,6 [I 375,1-3]). Like Plotinus, the author of treatise XI of the *Corpus Hermeticum* considers αἰών as a product of God and the power that emanates from him (XI, 1, I 147, 10 Nock-Festugière; XI, 3, I 148,7; XI, 4, I 148,17); like Plato and Plotinus, he sees its essential properties as identity and stability (XI, 1, I 147, 12-13,15), but he differs from them in identifying it with the *anima mundi* that embraces the entire sensible universe (XI, 4, I 148,20; XI, 5, I 149,3). Αἰών is also the substance of all things (XI, 3, I 148,7), the wisdom of God (XI, 3, I 148,14) and his image (XI, 15, I 153,6). Proclus reserves to αἰών propositions 52-54 and 87-88 of the *Elements of Theology*, as well as some pages of the *Commentary on the Timaeus* (III, 8ff. Diehl) regarding Plato, *Timaeus* 37d. For him αἰών occupies an intermediate position between the νοητὸν ζῷον of the *Timaeus*—considered by him to be the direct emanation of intelligible life, the second member of the triad composed of absolute being or one-being, intelligible life and intelligible intelligence—and the absolute being: it is superior to νοητὸν ζῷον in that the latter participates in αἰών and not vice versa (III 10, 8-21; 13, 22-26); and it is below absolute being, or one-being (ἓν ὄν), being included in it (III 15,14-19) in that the concept of "existence" is more general than that of "eternal existence" and is therefore superior to it (III 15,22-27; *El. teol.* 87, p. 80, 22-24 Dodds; see the diagram in S. Lilla, *La teologia negative . . .* : Helikon 29-30 [1989-1990] 165 and the accompanying note 749). The αἰών that is hypostatized as an "intellligible God" (*In Tim.* III 13, 22) is such that the inferior intelligent beings contained in the νοητὸν ζῷον remain always identical with themselves (*In Tim.* III 13, 31-32; 15, 32-16,1). For Proclus the two concepts of being and αἰών must not be confused, as did Strato of Lampsacus (3rd c. BC) in his work on being (III 16,3-4).

II. In the Bible and patristic literature. In both the OT and NT, αἰών indicates either a very long temporal extension or eternity; in the NT, accompanied by the terms οὗτος and μέλλων, it indicates respectively the present age and the future age, understood as the *kingdom of God and contrasted with the present (see, e.g., Mt 12:32; Eph 1:21). Already in 4 Macc 18:24 the expression εἰς τοὺς αἰωνας τών αἰώνων appears in close union with the term δόξα; and the same combination—either in the longer form εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τών αἰώνων or in the shorter εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας reappears several times in St. Paul (see, e.g., Rom 11:36; 16:27; Gal 1:5; Eph 3:21; Phil 4:20; Heb 13:21); in patristic homiletic literature it becomes the basic formula of the *doxology that concludes the homily.

A "philosophical" revival of the term αἰών occurs in ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite: like Plato, Plotinus and Proclus he closely relates αἰών to the immutability of being (*Nom. div.* X, 3: PG 3, 937 C12-D1; 937 D 5-6); like Aristotle, he identifies it with the entire temporal extension (*Nom. div.* X, 3, 937 C11,12); and like Plotinus (*Enn.* III 7,6 vol. III 133, 1-3) and treatise XI of the *Corpus Hermeticum* he considers it the product of the first principle, which remains prior to and superior to it (*Nom. div.* X, 3: PG 3, 940 A 9-13).

III. In *gnosticism. Plotinus, Proclus, the Chaldaean oracles, the *magic papyri and implicitly the passage of the *Corpus Herm.* XI, 20 (I 155, 15) all call αἰών "god" (see E.R. Dodds, *Proclus: The Elements of Theology* Oxford [2]1963, 228; A.D. Nock - A.J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I, Paris 1945, 157 n. 8), and αἰών is celebrated as a god at Alexandria and occupies a preeminent place in the cult of Mithras (see F.M.M. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*, Paris 1947, 269 n. 2 with relevant refs.). But esp. in gnosticism it was deified and multiplied into a multitude of divine beings, a process particularly evident in the *Valentinians and in the sects of the so-called *Barbelo-gnostics. In the Valentinian system the αἰῶνες, arranged in groups of two or four, are the 30 (or 28) divine beings that constitute the *pleroma emanating from the original τέλειος αἰών, formed by the couple βυθός-Ἔννοια (also called Σιγή-Χάρις): see Tertull., *Adv. Valentin.* 184,3; 185,15; 185,23; 187,8-9: Kroymann; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I,1,1 (28,75: Rousseau- Doutreleau, SC 264); I, 1,2 (32,106); I, 1,3 (33,120; 34,129); I, 2,1 (37,145; 37,151); I,2,3 (42,186); I,2,5 (44, 207, 210, 212); I, 2,6 (46, 226; 47, 233, 236); Clement Alex., *Exc. ex. Theod.* 7,1 (III 108,1 Stählin); Hippolytus, *Ref. omm. haer.* VI 29,7 (156,18 Wendland), VI 29,8 (156,24), VI 30,2 (157,9), VI 30,4 (157,17), VI 30,6 (157, 23, 25, 26), VI 31,1 (158, 17), VI 32,1, (160, 1, 3). Even the elect, or the *spirituales,* once admitted into the pleroma together with their angels, become "intelligent aeons," αἰῶνες νοεροὶ γενόμενα (Clement Alex., *Exc. ex Theod.* 64 [III 128,18]). This last passage corresponds exactly with the expression αἰὼν γενοῦ of *Corpus Herm.* XI, 20 (I 155, 15). In the *Apocryphon of John,* the most important document of the Barbelo-gnostic sect (preserved in Nag Hammadi codex II), three aeons are

contained in each of the four powers emanating from Christ (55,30-56,28), see Giversen, *Ap. John,* 59-61 and 142; and at the beginning (47,24-25 op. cit., 47) John asks himself about the nature of the aeon into which man is destined to go.

E. Bréhier, *Plotin Ennéades* III, Paris 1925 (*Les belles Lettres*) 123-126; A.D. Nock - A.J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I, Paris 1945, 143, 146, 155 nn. 4-5; 157 n. 8; F.M.M. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*, Paris 1947, 296 n. 2; J. Guitton, *Le temps et l'éternité chez Plotin et S. Augustin*, Paris 1933; H. Weiss, *An Interpretative Note on a Passage in Plotinus'* On Eternity and Time (*III 7,6*), CPh (1941) 230-239; RAC I, 193-204; *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* I, Stuttgart 1953, 197-208; A.M.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismegiste* IV, Paris 1954, 144-199; C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, Göttingen 1961, 209-216; E.R. Dodds, *Proclus, The Elements of Theology*, Oxford ²1963, 227-229, 246; S. Giversen, *Apocryphon Johannis* [Acta Theologica Danica V] Copenhagen 1963, 142; KLP 1, 185-188; W. Beierwaltes, *Plotin über Ewigkeit und Zeit*, Frankfurt am Main 1967 (esp. pp. 35-49); *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, 1, Basel-Stuttgart 1971, 118-119; S. Lilla, *La teologia negativa dal pensiero classico a quello patristico e bizantino*: Helikon 28 (1988) 223-224, 29-30 (1989-1990) 164-165. Addl. bibl. can be found in Nock - Festugière, pp. 143 and 157 n. 8, and in Dodds, 228.

S. LILLA

AERIUS (300–375). Presbyter and ascetic of *Pontus. Though a companion of *Eustathius, collaborating with him in the organization and spread of *monastic life and put in charge of the hospice of *Sebaste, Aerius quarreled with him after Eustathius was named bishop of Sebaste (ca. 357), perhaps in disappointment over not being chosen himself. *Epiphanius reports amply on his preaching (*Haer.* 75): he wanted equality between bishops and priests, since they were called to exercise the same functions and both were ordained with the imposition of hands; he also claimed, based on 1 Cor 5:7, that the celebration of Easter was nonsensical for Christians, and the practice of fasting a return to Judaism: whoever wished to fast could do so, but on days of his own choosing and not according to established days; finally, he did not recognize the value of prayers and offerings for the dead. *Augustine (*Haer.* 53) cites the opinion of some that the Aerians should be classed with *Encratites and *Apostolici, since they admitted to their communion only those who practiced continence and absolute poverty. According to *Filaster they abstained from meat (*Haer.* 72).

H. Hemmer, *Aérius, aériens*: DTC 1, 515-516; A. Lambert, *Apotactites et Apotaxamènes*: DACL 2604-2626; J. Gribomont, *Saint Basile et le monachisme enthousiaste*: Irénikon 53 (1980) 123-144.

F. COCCHINI

AETHICUS of Istria (6th c. ?). Otherwise known as "the philosopher of Istria," perhaps active in *Ireland, he is considered the author of the *Cosmographia,* a work originally written in Greek but reaching us in a 7th-8th-c. version summarized and translated in a rudimentary Latin. It presents, after the creation of the world, a description of the earth and an account of the author's travels, with many digressions on arguments typical of the *quadrivium*.

CPL 2348; T.A.M. Bishop, *Aethici Istrici Cosmographia Vergilia Salisburgens: Rectius Adscripta. Codex Leidensis Scaligeranus* 69 (Umbrae Codicum Occidentalium 10), Amsterdam 1966; V. Peri, *La "Cosmographia" dell'Anonimo di Histria e il suo compendio dell'VIII secolo, in Vestigia*, Studi in onore di Giuseppe Billanovitch, Rome 1984, 503-558; G. Princi Braccini, *Tra folclore germanico e latinità insulare. Presenze del "Liber monstruorum" e della "Cosmographia" dello Pseudo-Etico nel "Beowulf" e nel cod. Nowell*: StudMed 25 (1984) 681-720; W. Stelzer, *Ein Alt-Salzburger Fragment der Kosmographie des Aethicus Ister aus dem 8. Jahrhundert*: Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 100 (1992) 132-149; Patrologia IV, 456-457.

P. MARONE

AETHILWALD (d. after 705). Not to be confused with Aethelbald, king of Mercia, Aethilwald was a disciple of *Aldhelm. When Aethilwald was *abbot of Malmesbury, between 675–705, he sent Adelmo a letter (*Ep. ad Aldhelmum*) which included a small collection of five poetical compositions in eight syllables (*Carmen Aldhelmo datum; Carmen de transmarini itineris peregrinatione ad Wihtfridum; Oratio ad Deum; Carmen in Aldhelmum; Ad Hovam comitem);* these were later erroneously included among the works of *Boniface.

Adelmo, however, wrote Aethilwald (*Ep. ad Aethilwaldum*)*,* encouraging him to reject the pleasures of secular culture and inviting him to dedicate himself solely to sacred reading and religious conversation.

CPL 1340-1341; R. Ehwald (ed.), MGH, AA 15, 495-497, 499-500, 523-537; F. Unterkircher, *Sancti Bonifacii Epistolae. Codex Vindobonensis 751 der öster. Nationalbibliothek* (Codices selecti phototypice impressi 24), Graz 1971, 35v-36v; W. Meyer, *Die Verskunst des Angelsachsen Aethelwald* (Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinische Rhythmik), Berlin 1936, 3, 328-346; I. Schröbler, *Zu den Carmina Rhythmica in der Wiener HS. der Bonifatius-Briefe*: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur Tübingen 79 (1957) 1-42.

P. MARONE

AETIUS Flavius (ca. 390–454). Born at Durostorum in *Moesia; a hostage first of *Alaric, then of the *Huns. In 425 he came with the latter to Italy, later

persuading them to leave Italian territory. He was *comes* and *magister militum* in *Gaul (425–432), and consul for the West three times: 432, 437, 446. A powerful general in the court at *Ravenna, in 435 he became *patricius* and *magister utriusque militiae,* winning several victories over the barbarians; for a while he was the most powerful man in the *pars occidentalis* of the empire. The poet *Merobaudes wrote a *panegyric on him. Aetius was at least formally Catholic: his wife Pelagia was Catholic (Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2,7), and his son Gaudentius was baptized (Merobaudes, *Carm.* IV, 23-29).

PLRE II, 21-29, 865-866; G. Zecchini, *La politica religiosa di Aezio*, in *Religione e politica nel mondo antico*, Milan 1981, 250-277.

A. Di Berardino

AETIUS of Antioch (d. ca. 365). Syrian, humbly born but of considerable intellectual ability, versed in the liberal arts and theology, from 355–365 Aetius was the key exponent of radical *Arianism (*anomoianism). He was initially active at *Antioch, where the Eusebian bishop *Leontius ordained him deacon; and he was friendly with the Caesar Gallus. Forced to leave the city due to popular protest, he was recalled there in 357 when *Eudoxius succeeded Leontius. An able dialectician, he was said to have reduced *Basil of Ancyra and *Eustathius of Sebaste to silence in a public dispute; in the events of 358–360 he was repeatedly accused, however, and was solemnly condemned at the Council of *Constantinople (360), when *Constantius II wanted to strike at the leading radical Arians and *homoiousians, favoring a more centrist tendency. Recalled from exile at the time of *Julian (362), who was especially cordial to him in memory of his brother Gallus, with his disciple Eunomius he again took up his preaching of *anomoian doctrine, organizing a separate church in opposition to the moderate Arianism of Eudoxius and *Euzoius; he himself was consecrated bishop. *Socrates (*HE* II, 35) knew various letters of Aetius to Constantius and others; *Epiphanius (*Panar.* 76, 11) tells us that he wrote 300 doctrinal dissertations and transcribes one of them, the *Syntagmation,* on God generated and ungenerated. By the continual use of dialectical procedures, especially hypothetical syllogisms and dilemmas, Aetius maintains in this work that God, higher than any causality, is also above generation; and if "ungenerated" indicates his nature, a single divine nature could not be both ungenerated and generated. Thus the Son, since he is generated, cannot participate in the substance, and thus the divinity, of the Father.

An anomoian formula of faith is attributed to Aetius and to *Patricius of Nicaea, summarized in the Alexandrian Chronicon called *Historia acephala* 4,36-77: though its authenticity is uncertain, it reflects very well, both in terminology and contents, the essential characteristics of the anomoianism of Aetius and *Eunomius.

CPG II, 3445-3451. Fragments of letters can be found in F. Diekamp - B. Phanourgakis (eds.), *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi, ein griechisches Florilegium aus der wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*, Münster [2]1981; A. Martin - M. Albert (eds.), *Histoire "acéphale" et index syriaque des lettres festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1985 (SC 317,154,8ff.); Athanasius, *The Profession of Patricius and Aetius*, R.P.C. Hanson (ed.), Dublin, 1989; *Studi*: BBLK I, 49-50; LTK 1, 187-188; TRE 3, 711-713; Quasten II 309; G. Bardy, *L'héritage littéraire d'Aétius*: RHE 24 (1928) 809-827; Simonetti 583; J. De Ghellink, *Aristotelismus des Aetius*: RHE 26 (1930) 5ff.; L.R. Wickham, *The* Syntagmation *of Aetius the* Anomean: JTS NS 19 (1968), 532-569; T.A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge, MA 1979, vol. I; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer*, Tübingen 1988, passim; R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford 2000, treats extensively of Aetius in the course of his study, analyzing in some detail the various periods in his life, as well as his relations with Luciano and Arius. He cites the *Epistola ad Mazona*, dubious fr. 2 (Diekamp 311.10,13-14) and claims that the statement attributed there to Aetius, according to which the Son would be the creator θέσει μόνον, is a falsification, and that the statement is rather a Nicene interpretation. At pp. 283-284 Vaggione treats of the mentioned formula of faith, the so-called *Expositio Patricii et Aetii*: what survives of the text is summarized in the Alexandrian *Chronicon* called *Historia acephala* 4,36-77 (SC 317,154,8).

M. Simonetti

AETIUS of Constantinople (5th c.). Presbyter of the church of Constantinople (5th c.), is probably the author of the *Laudatio Iohannis Baptistae,* a *panegyric on *John the Baptist that was proclaimed on the feast of the saint's birth.

CPG 7908; BHG 861; M. Sachot, *Les homélies de Léonce, prêtre de Constantinople*: RSR 51 (1977) 235; C. Datema - P. Allen, *A Homily on John the Baptist Attributed to Aetius, Presbyter of Constantinople*: AB 104 (1986) 383-402; Patrologia V, 134.

P. Marone

AFRICA

I. Administrative divisions - II. Christianity - III. Disappearance of ancient Christianity - IV. Archaeology - V. Recent archaeology.

I. Administrative divisions. Africa was the name given by the Romans to the territory under the control of *Carthage at the time of the *Punic Wars. From the 1st c. AD the civil administration was di-

vided into three regions: (1) Proconsular Africa, which extended from the altar of the Phileni to Annaba/Constantine and was subject to the authority of a proconsul appointed by the Senate, with Carthage as its capital; (2) *Numidia, split off from Proconsular Africa in AD 37, roughly corresponding to the region of Constantine and governed by the legate of the 3rd Augusta Legion, capital Lambaesis; (3) *Mauretania, occupied AD 40, which extended to the Atlantic but was subdivided into two imperial provinces, Caesariensis, capital *Caesarea (Cherchel), and Tingitana, capital Tingis (Tangiers). Roman occupation in Mauretania seems to have been limited to the coastal strip, with local dynasties left intact until the *Vandal invasion. *Diocletian's reform (284–305) modified these administrative divisions. From that point the civil diocese of Africa was composed of the following provinces: (1) Tripolitania, from Cyrenaica to Lake Triton (Chott el Djérid); (2) Byzacena, from Lake Triton to Horrea (Hergla); (3) Proconsular Africa, from Horrea to Thabraca (Tabarka in Tunisia); (4) Numidia, divided into Cirtensis, capital Cirta (later Constantine), and Militaris, capital Lambaesis; (5) Mauretania Sitifensis, capital Sitifis (Sétif); (6) Mauretania Caesariensis, capital Cherchel. The civil government of each province was entrusted to a *praeses* dependent on the vicariate of Africa, the military government to a *praepositus limitum* under the Count of Africa Mauretania Tingitana was made part of the diocese of Spain.

II. Christianity. Into the above administrative framework, Christianity inserted itself.

1. *Christian origins*. There are two opposing theories: some think African Christianity came from the East through *Egypt and *Libya, others through Rome. The arguments do not seem decisive for either theory: it may well have been a combination of influences. Our earliest reliable information is from the late 2nd c. The African church was bilingual at the time: in the *Passio Perpetuae,* the martyr speaks Greek, and Saturus's visions seem to have first been written in Greek; a little earlier *Tertullian published his earliest treatises in Greek, the Latin versions being later. From 180, however, the *Acts of the *Scillitan Martyrs* were in Latin. A Latin version of the Letters of St. Paul is from roughly the same period, and a version of the Bible a little later. After ca. 250 *Cyprian of Carthage used an official version of the Bible in Latin, to which he remained faithful. Also noteworthy are the acts and the passions of the martyrdom of Cyprian (257–258), James and *Marianus (259), Lucius and *Montanus (259), Maximilian (295) (*Bonosus and Maximilian, martyrs), Marcellus (298), the martyrs of *Abitina, *Felix of Thibiuca, and *Crispina (304), which are among the best Latin texts of this genre. Africa was also the cradle of the great Latin Christian literature of Tertullian (2nd-3rd c.), Cyprian (d. 14 Sept. 258) and *Augustine (d. 28 Aug. 430).

2. *Councils*. Cyprian mentions two councils before his time: that of *Agrippinus (ca. 220) on the baptism of heretics (Cypr., *Ep*. 71,4; 73,3), and another which took place under Cyprian's predecessor *Donatus of Carthage and led to the deposition of *Privatus, bishop of *Lambaesis (Cypr., *Ep*. 56,4; 59,10). During Cyprian's time there were seven. The most important were that of May 251, which decided on the problem of the *lapsi* (*Lapsed, Problem of the) during the persecution of *Decius (Cypr., *Ep*. 45, 48, 49), and that of 1 September 256, which prescribed the rebaptism of heretics and schismatics, in opposition to the Roman usage; 87 bishops participated in this council, and the acts have been preserved (*Sent. Ep.:* CSEL 3,435ff.). The acts of councils after Cyprian have reached us through the medieval canonical collections (C. Munier, *Concilia Africae*, CCL 149). The particularly grave problem of *Donatism, a schism provoked by *Diocletian's persecution, was resolved in 411 in a conference debate, the acts of which are published (SC 194, 195, 224). These documents are an excellent reflection of the life of the church and the Christian people of Africa.

3. *Spread of Christianity*. In cases where conciliar acts are preserved with the signatures of the participating bishops, we can get an idea of the geographical and chronological diffusion of Christianity in the country. The Council of Agrippinus, in ca. 220, brought together 70 bishops; 87 were present at the Council of 1 September 256. Toward the mid-3rd c. there were more than 130 bishops, as Y. Duval has demonstrated; at the time of Christianity's maximum diffusion there were about 600. Episcopal sees were geographically divided in a very unequal manner: they were more numerous in the eastern provinces, becoming progressively less so toward the west and the highlands. Nevertheless, some dioceses were present south of Tunisia and Constantine: Capsa, Tamallula, Vescera (Biskra).

III. Disappearance of ancient Christianity. It has been said that Christianity disappeared completely under the blow of the Arab invasion, but this was not the case. Even after the complete occupation of the Ifriquiya (ca. 700), Christian centers survived: the famous Latin calendar of Sinai, a 10th-c. manuscript, is African; the last Latin Christian inscrip-

tion at Kairouan dates to 1076; during the same century the popes maintained relations with five African bishops; and in 1192 Carthage still figures in the *Liber Censuum* of the Roman Church. These were the last flickers, however, of the original Christianity.

PWK 1, 713-715; DACL 1, 576-91; DHGE 1, 709-861; LTK³ 1, 210-211; RAC 1, 173-179; RAC Suppl 1, 134-238; AL 1, 180-219; F. Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IVe-Ve siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale*, 2 vols., Paris 1978; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au bas empire*, 2 vols., Paris 1979-1981; D. Pringle, *The Defence of Byzantine Africa from Justinian to the Arab Conquest*, I-II, Oxford 1981; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVe au VIIe siècle*, Rome 1982-1983; Id., *Densité et répartition des évêchés dans les provinces africaines au temps de Cyprien*: MEFRA 96 (1984) 493-521; J. Durliat, *L'administration religieuse du diocèse byzantin d'Afrique (533-709)*: RSBS 4 (1984) 149-178; P.-A. Février, *Aux origines du christianisme en Maurétanie Césarienne*: MEFRA 98 (1986) 767-809; P.-A. Février, *Approches du Maghreb romain. Pouvoirs, différences et conflits*, 2 vols., Aix-en-Provence 1989-1990; S. Lancel, *Évêchés et cités dans les provinces africaines (IIIe-Ve) siècles*, in *L'Afrique dans L'Occident Romain Ier siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle après J.-C.*, Rome 1990, 272-290; B.D. Shaw, *Rulers, Nomads and Christians in Roman North Africa*, Aldershot 1995; F. Decret, *Le christianisme en Afrique du Nord ancienne*, Paris 1996; *Frontières et limites géographiques de l'Afrique du Nord antique: hommage à Pierre Salama: actes de la table ronde réunie à Paris les 2 et 3 mai 1997*, C. Lepelley and X. Dupuis (eds.), Paris 1999; C. Lepelley, *Aspects de l'Afrique romaine: les cités, la vie rurale, le christianisme*, Bari 2001.

V. Saxer

IV. Archaeology. In the 4th c., present-day Maghreb was divided into a number of provinces: Tripolitania, Byzacena and Africa proper, derived from the old Proconsular Africa, Numidia (briefly divided in two at the start of the 4th c.), Mauretania Sitifiensis and Mauretania Caesariensis. Mauretania Tingitana was part of the civil diocese of *Spain. Ecclesiastical boundaries partially coincided with the provincial borders: ecclesiastical Numidia also included, besides the civil province, cities of the old proconsular province from Hippo Regius to Tebessa, passing through Calama, Madaura and Thubursicu Numidarum. Despite the early Christian presence—attested to by the *Acts of the Martyrs* of the unknown town of Scillium and by those of *Perpetua and Felicitas, and by the work of Tertullian and of Cyprian, and even with the number of bishops known from the middle of the 3rd c. in the eastern part of the country and in Numidia (ca. 70)—there is no certain archaeological evidence from before the 4th c. In particular, none of the simply formulated inscriptions at Carthage can be attributed with certainty to the 3rd c. The same is true at Hadrumetum (Sousse), where the catacombs were in use in the 4th (or 5th) c., as attested by funerary mosaics. A valuable document (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*), an account of a trial held in 320, gives the oldest mention of a church: the curator charged with the investigation at Cirta (Constantina) during the persecution of 303 went *ad domum in qua christiani conveniebant,* finding there the bishop and some of the clergy, a library, a *triclinium* with *dolia* and *orcae;* he then went to the houses of the readers. An inscription at Altava (309) mentions a *basilica dominica,* as well as a *memoria* in honor of persons otherwise unknown; the epigraph specifies that there existed there a *mensa Ianuari martiris*. Here we glimpse a link between a martyr's memorial and a church, and undoubtly a burial ground as well. The earliest surviving monument connected with the cult of the martyrs, however, is at Tipasa. An enclosure in the western necropolis, bounded on the east by a portico, was excavated, under which can be seen masonry beds placed over the tombs, one of which mentions the martyrs *Rogatus and *Vitalis. Nearby was found the epitaph of the martyr Victorinus (d. 315?). Also nearby are what appear to have been the graves of some of the city's bishops, who were later buried *in sedem pulchram* by Alexander, their successor. In this basilica where the bishop is buried a *mensa* for the *funeral banquet is preserved, giving an idea of the importance of these rites in African Christian society. A mosaic recently found in the western necropolis, but at a certain distance from the basilica, confirms the power of these traditions, which *Augustine of Hippo opposed in vain. The inscription there reads *in* (*Christo Deo*) *pax et concordia sit convivio nostro*.

Thanks to Augustine's sermons, some of the places at Carthage where Cyprian's memory is preserved are known; he died in the *ager Sexti* and was interred in the *areae* of *Macrobio Candidiano*. In each place there were *mensae* upon which the eucharistic synaxis was celebrated at the start of the 5th c.; *Victor of Vita refers to two basilicas in each of these places. A mosaic (second half 4th c.) found at Tebessa recorded the names of the martyrs—Heradius, Zebboc, Donatus, Secondianus, Victorianus, Publicia, Meggen—undoubtedly companions of St. *Crispina. Above these was built (late 4th or early 5th c.) a tribolate hall, attached to the great martyrial basilica restored in the 19th c. An old discovery tells us of the five-aisled basilica of El Asnam—*castellum Tingitanum:* in the western counterapse of the nave an inscription provides a date: the cornerstone was laid in the year 285 of the province, 324 of the Christian era. Not until the late 4th–early 5th c., however,

are there sufficiently numerous and precise archaeological remains to give us an idea of the Christian architecture, which perhaps also explains the dearth of older documents. In any event, it explains the beginning of the African church—the vitality of which is attested to by the conflicts between "Catholics" and "Donatists"—and the urban development, of which archaeology has begun to show the effects, i.e., the remodeling of houses, embellished with mosaics.

The study of this late period in Africa is hampered by the fact that those working at Maghreb did not recognize the fundamental necessity of dating basilicas or houses; or, rather, the absence of stratigraphical excavations combined with other persistent prejudices have prevented precise dating. For example, only recent research by J. Christern at Tebessa has disproved the dating of the sanctuary to the *Byzantine era. Conversely, many buildings that are considered old may be later, even 5th c., thought to be a less-active period due to the Vandal presence; this would be to forget, however, that the Vandals were *Arians, and there is nothing that supports the notion of a regression prior to the Byzantine reconquest. On the contrary, capitals preserved in the mosques of Tunis and Kairouan—now studied by N. Harrazi—give the impression of a province open to exchange with the East during the entire 5th–6th c., both before and after the conquest. Similarly, what little can be glimpsed of the commerce in ceramics and merchandise shipped in amphorae leads to the hypothesis of a very complex web of exchange across the Mediterranean. Woven into this architectural history is that of the individual Christian communities, with their various components, along with a history of the city—since the greater part of the known monuments were in cities—an economic history and a history of technical development. In places where the topography of a city can be traced either completely or with sufficient breadth, we find a large number of churches, both in the inhabited areas and in the peripheral necropolises. In Thamugadi (Timgad) there are at least three basilicas, with their baptisteries: one in the center of *Trajan's *colonia;* another very near the original walls, to the northwest; and the third a bit more on the periphery, but still in the inhabited zone.

As for funerary basilicas, these were erected very far from the city to the west, on the Lambaesis road, and to the south. This separation between the place for the dead and that of the living was not always respected, however: from 378, in the northwest quarter at Sétif, during the same period when houses were being built, two basilicas accomodated burials dated to the provincial year. At Sufetula (Sbeitla) in the 5th c., burials were done in an area attached to the original cathedral; likewise at *Hippo Regius (Hippo, today Annaba), in the city not far from the *forum,* and at Haidra. The existence of numerous urban churches is attested to in other cities besides Carthage, where various basilicas have been found (some very near each another, as at Dermech) and where it is known that the city was divided into regions (at least 6); consequently, as at Rome, there was a regional clergy alongside the bishop, not at all surprising in the capital and principal city of Roman Africa. Even in apparently minor towns, such as Oued Rhezel (7), H. Seffan (4) or H. Bou Hadef (5), various churches have been identified. At Cuicul (Djemila) the main monument is clearly the episcopal complex with its two basilicas, but in the original *colonia* there is also a three-aisled basilica set in a block of houses. The discovery of a baptistery beside a basilica does not prove it to be a cathedral, though this is undoubtedly the case at Hippo Regius, where the basilica in the city was identified with Augustine's church. Only one of that city's basilicas has been excavated, with its clergy house—an older house, preserved with its peristyle—and baptistery. In the 5th c., therefore, people were buried in church buildings. Some baptisteries have also been found on the periphery of the urban zone, as in the martyrial basilica of Tebessa, or at a certain distance from the city, like at Hergla or near Kelibia.

In the absence of excavations, we really do not understand well how the Christian communities situated their urban churches. At Timgad one of the basilicas is built on two city blocks and the road separating them. At Hippo Regius a house was bought and demolished, with only the floor mosaics being reused for the new construction; an adjoining house was also bought at the same time. At Mactar, a portion of the baths to the west housed a basilica: its side walls preserve the raised *frigidarium*. Similarly, according to *Quodvultdeus's testimony, the temple of Caelestis was reused to build a Christian sanctuary at Carthage; the temple in use at Sbeitla was also reused, the baptistery placed in the *cella* and the three-aisled basilica occupying part of the porticoed courtyard. Something similar developed at Thuburgo Maius, in the courtyard of the temple at Tipasa, and at Jebel Oust: there the baptistery is again located in the *cella* of the temple, above the cave from which the hot spring fed the baths on the lower level.

An interesting detail of Christian urban topography appears during the Byzantine period. When forts were built, sometimes a small basilica was built

within the walls as an oratory for the garrison. This occurred at Ammaedara (Haidra) and Timgad. In the latter, the area to the left of the apse contained a small baptistery.

The early episcopal complex at Sbeitla has a three-aisled basilica, oriented north to south, undoubtedly due to the plot of land acquired by the church. To the west was a baptistery, a rectangular space bordered by a portico, with a room with the font in the middle. In the mid-4th c. another five-aisled basilica was added to this building, against the wall of the baptistery itself. A new baptistery was then built, to the south of the main apse of this new building, toward the late-5th or early-6th c.

More spectacular is the episcopal complex at Tipassa: on a rocky cliff overlooking the sea, opposite the temple hill where the *forum* was and where the local martyr *Salsa was killed, is a seven-aisled hall, the main aisle being 14 meters wide. North of the apse is the baptistery, near the baths and perhaps also the bishop's house.

The episcopal complex at Cuicul is situated high in the abandoned part of the city, dominating one of the watercourses that borders the inhabited area and the road to Cirta. Two basilicas are juxtaposed, one three-aisled and facing north—the mosaics of which were donated by members of the city's most eminent families at the end of the 4th or early 5th c., the other five-aisled (and undoubtedly tribune), whose mosaics are stylistically more recent. To the east, beside the apses, the steep drop of the terrain allowed for the construction of a long corridor at a level lower than the aisles, off of which open a number of semicircular and square rooms. This crypt seems to be contemporaneous with the oldest mosaics; perhaps this is where the bodies of the *iusti priores,* of whom *Cresconius's inscription speaks, were to be buried. To the northwest of the three-aisled basilica is the circular baptistery, with a circular corridor surrounding the central room, the basin sheltered by a canopy. The floor of this central part is covered by mosaics in marine motifs, while the ambulatory displays many geometric decorations.

One of the buildings dated with greater certainty is the basilica of Tebessa, a place of pilgrimage undoubtedly built in honor of the city's martyrs, Crispina and companions. A rectangular enclosure sets off the group of monuments; a three-aisled basilica is set on an elevated podium, an unusual feature; a tribolate room is joined to it where the saint's cenotaph must have been. In front of the stairs leading to the sanctuary, ornamental pools reflected the porticoes that surrounded the basilica's façade. The monumental entry arches, the quality of the stonecutting, the decorations of the corbels that supported the height of the aisles, all combined to impress the pilgrim. In the corner of the enclosure was a caravansery for sheltering animals, with one for people on the terrace. It is certain that the building dates to the first years of the 5th c., as is indicated by the quality of the workmanship of both the stone and mosaics, as well as by the effort made to enhance a venerated sanctuary.

With the buildings that grew up near the cathedrals, such as martyrial buildings or most of the other church buildings, the usual plan was the basilica. As Augustine says, *oblongam habeat quadraturam lateribus longioribus, brevioribus frontibus sicut pleraeque basilicae construuntur* (*Quaest. in Hept.* 2,177). The buildings have one aisle (Thibilis) or three, sometimes five (Dermech at Carthage, Feriana, la Skhira); frequently the semicircular apse is set in the middle of the side aisles, according to a plan already known in Maghreb, in the civil basilicas of Tipassa and Leptis Magna. Sometimes the side aisles of the church have tribunes, inviting comparison with the civil basilicas of the same cities. Thus from the 4th and 5th c., plans and elevations very common in official architecture were used. From one city to another, or from one neighborhood to another, the dimensions vary: from 61 by 45 meters in the *basilica maiorum* of Carthage or 52 by 45 in that of Tipassa, the dimensions typically become smaller (46/22 at Theveste, 41/18 at Sétif, 37/18 at Hippo Regius). In these basilicas the apse is always raised, sometimes by several steps above the level of the nave, with the exception of some buildings like at Thibilis, or the fortress oratory at Timgad, where the back of the apse is occupied by seats for clergy. In the elevated portion, the side aisles are separated from the central aisle by columns, sometimes by double columns (which in some cases has suggested the existence of tribunes); in other cases pillars or columns backing onto pillars were needed to support the tribunes. The discovery of some fragments permits a reconstruction of the system of arches above the supports. Above them arises a wall with windows, as the funerary mosaic of Tabarka shows, or a tribune gallery (Tebessa, Tigzirt).

The apse, as far as we can judge, was covered by a half-dome, examples of which are perfectly preserved at Le Kef and at Dar el Kous, with beautiful regular masonry. Elsewhere fragments that had fallen to the ground allow us to suppose an apse with a barrel vault. More frequently the nave seems to have been roofed with tresses, as at Lemellef, where the description of *Optatus (*De schisma don.* 2,12) shows assailants removing the tiles to throw

them on the faithful who had taken refuge there. This is also depicted in the Tabarka mosaic. Some evidence exists of collateral vaults, as for example in *Tripoli, in the nave. There are also buildings roofed in a more complex manner. In its final phase the basilica I of Bulla Regia certainly had a dome at each end of the nave: one over the baptistery, the other over the altar. The basilica VI at Sbeitla, dedicated to the martyrs *Silvanus and *Fortunatus, is Byzantine; its nave was covered in the middle by a dome. A third domed building, also Byzantine, is at Iunce (*Macomades minores*): in the vast basilica III a basilica and a cruciform plan are combined, clearly expressed on the outside by the three apses and perhaps by the counterapse.

The Byzantine reconquest seems therefore to have brought with it a renewal of African architecture, at least in some structures. In many basilicas, beginning in the 4th c., the altar is placed in the nave, in front of the apse (El Asnam) or in the center (Sétif, Timgad). The mosaics of the basilica at Tebessa suggest a presbytery toward the east in front of the apse, a counterchoir by the altar to the west, and a corridor joining them; this was from the beginning, since the corridor was later done away with. Noël Duval studied this *liturgical arrangement, as well as the counterapses and counterchoirs frequent in many basilicas. The majority are the result of rearrangements in the 5th (El Asnam) or 6th c. (Haidra I and II, La Skhira I). In some cases only the arrangements opposite the original apse lead to the supposition of an altar—or a secondary altar—used during the same period as the main altar (Mactar II and IV, Sbeitla II, Haidra I, La Skhira I). Sometimes *relics are deposed therein, but there are cases where the counterapse seems to have had only funerary use. From studies, in particular of Haidra and Sbeitla, it has become clear that liturgical arrangements changed over time; it is difficult to establish a coherent chronological evolution. In some cases the entire nave or the greater part of it was reserved to clergy, either because a corridor joined the choir with the part opposite (Tebessa, Iunce III), or because *cancelli* completely closed off the nave (Mactar IV, Thala II, Sbeitla II in its second phase). The faithful in this case were confined to the side aisles and the tribunes where they existed.

Many basilicas have an interesting liturgical arrangement: a crypt beneath the main apse, and sometimes beneath one of the side rooms. This seems to be the case with the room attached east of the basilica of Sétif prior to 389, as well as with the basilica in the old city of Cuicul, where the axial apse was very raised and windows allowed a view of the tomb in the axis of the crypt, which was approached through the side aisles. Other examples of crypts beneath the apse and its annexes are at Timgad and Tiddis. A crypt was also under the main apse of the basilica of El Asnam, but it is not known whether this belonged to a 4th-c. phase. A different arrangement has been noted at Henchir Seffan, where a crypt divided by three orders of pillars has been found in the nave before the apse.

Other solutions with unusual floor plans are worth noting, such as the side apse of the basilica of Sétif, facing east, opposite the site of the altar (before 389), or the analogous arrangement of the great western basilica of Timgad, or also the tribolate room beneath the raised nave at Tebessa, undoubtedly in honor of the martyrs. Many of these basilicas—urban and suburban—have baptisteries attached, whose position, however, varies widely: near the entrance or placed to one side; better still, in an annex of the apse; behind it, and on its axis (Mactar III, Sabratha I, La Skhira I), or on one side (Leptis Magna I). The shapes also vary widely: a simple rectangular room with no ornament but the pool, at times surmounted by a canopy; a room in the shape of an apsed basilica; a cruciform area as at Sabratha I (6th c.); a quadrilobate room at Tigzirt; circular as at Cuicul. At Dermech (Carthage) a small basilica with a reliquary was attached to the baptistery. The baptismal pool also differs in plan or height: it could be flush with the ground or encircled by a low wall as at Timgad (southwest basilica), where the stairs are covered with mosaics. A simple rectangle, hexagon or circle, they become polylobate in 6th-c. renovations or new constructions. Encircling steps—sometimes only on two sides—allow a descent into the pool. Baptisteries are often near baths, which seem to be contemporary.

We have today only a very limited idea of the decoration of these basilicas: what is known are basically floor mosaics and some decorative fragments sculpted in stone. Wall mosaics, painted decoration or stuccos have disappeared almost without a trace.

The basilica of Tebessa has a very homogeneous mosaic decoration, basically geometric in the side aisles and the nave. Some of the columnar capitals have been reused; others are undoubtedly cut by the same artists who made the decorations on the columns supporting the roof timbers (scrolls, rosettes, fish). Very often only the floor decoration is known. The oldest (?) could be that covering the five aisles of the basilica of El Asnam with geometric (esp. stellar) motifs. The site of the altar is marked by vine shoots and a bunch of grapes hanging between two columns. A maze was placed in a span of the left side aisle close to the dedication, dated 324. Also very

homogeneous is the similar floor covering the three aisles of the north basilica of the episcopal complex of Cuicul: the names of donors were written in the center of each motif. In the basilica of Alexander of Tipassa, to geometric motifs—very similar to those of the cathedral—are added very beautiful inscriptions in capital letters recalling the work of the bishop or inviting the faithful to give *alms in memory of the martyrs, and a panel decorated by fish. In the basilica of Rusguniae in its earliest phase the floor of the nave was covered by mosaics of a sea, fish, a flock and a shepherd. These bucolic and marine images were accompanied by inscriptions. The floor of the basilica seems to have been progressively covered by mosaics: this has also been noted in buildings reserved for burials.

Through the years epitaphs have been added, filling in the space: in one of the basilicas at Sétif, the tombs range from 389 to 429, with an inscription added in 471. Inscriptions were also added in the basilica near Kelibia, or at Tabarka; similarly also at Hippo Regius, although things are more complex there, because on the one hand the mosaics of the earlier house were kept, and on the other hand the left side aisle was given a homogeneous decoration, in which tombs were later placed, some underneath the mosaics and others indicated by a marble gravestone. The floors of some basilicas were completely covered with flagstone, as in the church of Melleus at Haidra. Funerary inscriptions were cut in the flagstone, recording burials in the building. In the Byzantine era there was usually a mosaic decoration, either geometric or inspired by floral motifs (Sabratha); perhaps only a simpler ornamental taste and a more restrained color palette is displayed, as at Bulla Regia or at Dermech. In the basilica of Hergla are geometric panels and others with hunting scenes; animals are intercalated between the columns and on the doorsill of the five-aisled basilica at Cuicul.

Another decorative element is stonework, nearly always of local limestone. This decoration is often limited to capitals, which in some regions are very sober, in a form derived from Doric. Sometimes, as at Tipassa or in the mausoleum of Menynx, the capitals are scrolled; more often they are derived from Corinthian, as at Tebessa. A tradition of craftsmanship flourished at Tebessa in the late 4th and early 5th c., of which the capitals and dosserets of Henchir Faraoun are a good example. Similar stylistically were the workshops of Feriana (Thelpte) and Sbeitla. Less sensitive to classical forms are the pillars of Meskiana (Ksar el Kelb?), Zoui, Khenchela and Henchir Seffan. Marble capitals were also imported, particularly from the East, with acanthus leaves: prickly with fine indented leaves (sometimes with animals under the abacus, at other times swollen or blown about by the wind), capitals with medallions, etc. Marble trade throughout the Mediterranean was not new to Late Antiquity: it has been documented from the time of *Augustus at Cherchel and in other places along the coast, as with trade in *sarcophagi from the 2nd–3rd c. These latter seem to be less numerous at Maghreb, however, than in other regions of the West, and not only because of the existence of workshops near Carthage that worked the stone from Chemtou (at Tebessa). The use of mosaic decoration in geometric or figurative themes on tombs may explain the rarity of relief decoration. Examples preserved at Sétif, Tabarka and Kelibia, and at Tenes, Tipassa, Sertei and Hippo Regius in the region of the Enfida, give a very precise idea of funerary mosaics: the essential elements are the inscription, and beside it a decoration, geometric, of either birds or a plant motif. Sometimes the deceased is portrayed. More rarely there is an allusion to his trade (e.g., a boat at Tabarka), a hunting scene or an image borrowed from the OT: Daniel among the lions at Sfax; the three Jews in the furnace at Tipassa. There is very little data based on which such decoration (or the monuments themselves) can be dated to the post-Byzantine period. A few texts nevertheless suggest constructions like the funerary basilica built by the *dux* of *Tigisis* between 641–668 in the southern necropolis of Timgad, or of a *castrum* ("camp") in the region of Batna under Tiberius Constantine or Constantine IV, or a tower at Lemsa under the emperor Maurice.

We are less fortunate with church buildings, and only the numerous alterations of liturgical structures allow us to think of the long-term use of basilicas. This can also be assumed from the fact that the funerary inscriptions of En Ngila, Ain Zana or Kairouan attest to Christian communities until the start of the 11th c. Also, fragments of liturgical manuscripts preserved at Sinai or communities recognized at Jebel Nefusa discount a rapid disappearance of Christian traditions, all the more so because the Arab invasion did not touch the provinces where urban life had regressed. The disappearance of so many Roman towns certainly did not begin with the 7th-c. situation: a certain kind of archaeology is responsible for a negative interpretation of this transitional phase toward medieval Maghreb. In any event, much remains to be done for an understanding of the evolution that determined the transformation of the region.

Two older basic works: P. Gluckler, *Basiliques chrétiennes de Tunisie*, Paris 1913; St. Gsell, *Monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, II, Paris 1901.

For Tripolitania: J.B. Ward-Perkins - R.G. Goodschild, *The Christian Antiquities of Tripolitania*: Archeologia 95 (1953).

See also: N. Duval, *Les églises africaines à deux absides*, 2 vols., Paris 1971-1973. Besides the last work cited, for a recent bibliography and *status quaestionis*, see in particular the acts of the International Congresses of Christian Archaeology VI, VII and VIII (Ravenna 1962; Treviri 1965; Barcellona 1969), and the *Corsi di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina*, Ravenna 1970 and 1972; D. Pringle, *The Defence of Byzantine Africa from Justinian to the Arab Conquest*, I-II, Oxford 1981; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVe au VIIe siècle*, Rome 1982-1983; P.-A. Février, *Approches du Maghreb romain. Pouvoirs, différences et conflits*, 2 vols., Aix-en-Provence 1989-1990; C. Lepelley, *Aspects de l'Afrique romaine: les cités, la vie rurale, le christianisme*, Bari 2001.

P.-A. Février

V. Recent archaeology. Studies done in the last twenty years on the Christian antiquity of Africa, in particular those pertaining to Christian archaeology, have led—through the work of scholars such as Béjaoui, Ghalia, Kadra and others whose research is along the lines of Février and Duval—to the knowledge of a large number of Christian church buildings, clarifying the historical-religious framework of rural areas and giving a better knowledge of the structure of Christianity in the most remote areas of Africa. Attention has been focused, in fact, on the large number of African episcopal sees already known from the list of participants at the Carthage conference of 411—famous for the debate between Catholics and Donatists—which offered an initial framework for the evidence concerning dioceses based in the *saltus,* the *fundi* and the *villae.* This framework has been confirmed by new discoveries regarding rural churches especially, whose populations seem to be concentrated in the provinces of Proconsularis and Byzacena. These rural centers had a dynamic function at both the economic and the religious level, with a fundamental role in the propagation of the faith and local control of ecclesiastical authority in the doctrinal controversies.

These rural churches, stylistically little different from urban churches, were built in response to a real need for a *cura animarum* toward a population of peasants, farmers and landowners living in agricultural areas and in the still-inhabited areas of the old towns. Only epigraphical discoveries, however, give a more reliable reference to basilicas, baptisteries, martyrial shrines and cemeteries indentfied in rural areas, and to episcopal sees still without a permanent location. In this sense, there has been much interest in the archaeological discoveries in Tunisia: rural churches have been discovered by Ghalia at Saadat Mornissa, in the region of Mateur, ca. 60 km (37 mi) from Carthage, and near the old Rucuma (which sent a bishop to the Council of Carthage in 256), by Bejaoui at Ben Saâdane (with a baptistery), by Khanoussi at Henchir Bechouk and at Ain el Assila, with a vast cemetery. A church has been discovered at Segermes, about 1 km west of those already known. The floor of the three-aisled building is completely covered with mosaics in geometric and floral motifs. To the southwest, the building is attached to a baptistery with a cruciform baptismal basin, later made rectangular. In the region of Hammamet, north of the old Province of *Byzacena, new information has been gained from the excavations of the churches at Sidi Jedidi, identified by Beschaouch in ancient Asadi.

There were two worship areas, located at the north and south peripheries of the urban area, which underwent an entire restructuring during the Byzantine period, the result of a hiatus which chronological data attributes to the Vandal persecutions. The first church, to the north, is one of two belonging to the episcopal group; the contruction thus needed a large space, which was available only at the periphery of the city. The floor of the building and that of its baptistery, are entirely covered with mosaic panels. A system of additions, arranged near the façade and around the court preceding the entrance, completes the building. A sarcophagus placed against the south wall of the church, pertaining either to a martyrial cult or the memory of a bishop, indicates the funerary nature of the building. In the reconstruction at the time of the Byzantine reconquest, the first two trusses of the nave were conceived as an autonomous monument, with tombs perfectly organized on a central plan and indicated by flagstones or mosaics. The baptistery was built to a cruciform plan, with the south arm occupying the space generally reserved for one of the sacristies. It is possible that the funerary dedication of the first church led to the construction of the second in the episcopal group, for more general use. This rises 15 m. to the east; the community or an individual made use of an isolated house in its construction, which partially maintained its domestic, productive function. Domestic outbuildings were also built between the two structures, with an oven, an olive press and a mill for grain. Two phases of occupation have been identified for the church, perhaps devotional, on the south side of the urban area: on the one hand, the first, prior to the 5th c., in which the funerary func-

tion is only hinted at, as in the funerary mosaics of the priest Cyprianus and of the simple layman Felix. In the second phase, on the other hand, 6th c. or the beginning of the Byzantine period, the mosaics that cover the nave are of primary importance: the central corridor leading to the liturgical pole of the church was decorated by panels containing decorations of craters and vines, paradisal scenes with palms and birds facing each other. The first span, opposite the apse, had a particularly rich decoration, with a flagstone with an anonymous dedication expressing devotion, encircled by jeweled crosses. These churches seem to indicate a functional differentiation of the Christian churches in the city.

Similar to Sidi Jedidi is the recent discovery in Proconsular Africa at Ad Aquas, north of Hammam Lif, of a three-aisled church, with a choir and baptistery behind the apse, built in the 5th c. along the axis of a street which allowed access to a number of annexes whose arrangement suggests an identification with some *horrea,* like at Demna near Kélibia. A rural church with a baptistery has also been excavated at Chott Menzel Yahia, while on the site of ancient Pupput a number of new funerary mosaics have been discovered.

The city of Haidra (ancient Ammaedara) continues to be a priviliged place of research for a knowledge of the process of Christianization in the towns of the Maghreb. Here Franco-Tunisian excavations have reopened the study of basilica III, built within the citadel against the outer walls; another building east of the citadel has been investigated, perhaps a Christian basilica, though the only certain testimony to this is the funerary inscription of a certain Gemellinus from the Byzantine era. The most important discovery is of a Christian monument (1993) that has been intrepreted as a Byzantine-era sanctuary. With a rectangular plan divided into various areas, it could be a chapel, set to the south of the citadel on a stretch of the ancient road connecting Ammaedara to Thelepte. Many epitaphs have been found in every part of the monument, among them that of Fl. *Cresconius, dated the fourth year of the reign of *Justin II (568–569), and the record of the deposit of the relics of saints *Sebastian and Isidore. At Haidra, along the same road, at least five other churches have been discovered with associated baptisteries, at agricultural centers with olive presses: 'El Gousset, Henchir el Khima and Henchir el Khmira. New excavations have begun in two of the six churches of Thelepte. At Sbeitla (ancient Sufetula), work has been added to Duval's studies on the church built above a temple: new funerary mosaics with inscriptions have been uncovered. At least two phases of occupation have been identified for another five-aisled church along the southwest wall of the Capitolium; also interesting is the so-called church of Servus, with a dozen epitaphs. In the same area, west of Sbeitla in the place called Kasr el Guellal, a church has been investigated that was built at the center of an important site of the production of terra sigillata, with many olive presses. The floor of the apse is completely covered with geometric mosaics. The early Christian complex at Kasr el Baroud (a place that has been identified with the ancient *statio* of Thamaguta, and thus not rural), excavated by Bejaoui between 1988–1991, is composed of an episcopal complex with a cemeterial basilica and a cathedral church with a baptistery. More than 50 funerary mosaics have been uncovered, dating from the 4th–5th c. until the Byzantine period. Many are of members of the clergy, like the special one of Milicus, a bishop and signatory at the conference of Carthage of 411 as the representative of the bishop of Thagamuta, and those of some *monachi,* leading Bejaoui to hypoythesize the existence of a monastery. Duval doubts this, recalling that the title was also borne by clerics not organized in community.

At Henchir Errich, among ceramic, glass and metal shops, a church has been studied with a baptistery whose baptismal basin has the same form as those of Sbeitla and Thamaguta, suggesting that they are all the work of a single regional shop. This is also suggested by a votive formula on a mosaic in the baptistery mentioning an atelier of mosaicists, very rare in Africa: *Ex officina magistri Bictoriana et Victorini / Nartalus et Gallus votum solv*(*erunt*). Other churches have been discovered: at Henchir Snab, with a quadrilobate baptismal basin, at El Ouara, and at Henchir el Ounaissia, where a part of the nave has been excavated, perhaps a counterchoir, its floor decorated with Byzantine-period mosaics. A chronological indication, as a *terminus post quem*, is provided by the epigraph of the deacon Lucilianus, dated 491 and reused in a wall.

A frequently recurring *iconographic plan has the baptismal complex situated behind the apse. This plan is widespread until the Byzantine period, e.g., at Henchir Sokrine near Leptis Minus (Lemta), where two spaces are annexed to the sides of the apse, joined by a corridor behind the *presbyterium;* between them is the baptistery, accessible from the vestibule through an axial entrance behind the apse. In this case the absence (thus far) of episcopal graves renders doubtful the *ecclesia cathedralis* character of this three-aisled building, which is a site also distinguished for the richness of its mosaics. Greater interest, which Duval frequently ex-

pressed hope for, has also been given to annexed buildings and structures attached to cathedrals, or to simple churches, which reveal a well-organized ecclesiastical life with financial competence, organizations for assistance to the poor (*matricula*), places for housing pilgrims (*xenodochia*) and seminaries for the formation of clergy (so-called *monasteri*), a *domus episcopalis,* and the double-churches themselves, which for Duval are the result of an evolution of the episcopal group.

The discovery at Mahrine (region of Thuburbo Maius) of a rural church with an ring-shaped ambulatory, built on private land in the latter half of the 6th c., reopens the question of the origin and date of the introduction of the ambulatory plan in Africa, often in relation to the two symbolic poles of the church building, the baptistery and the martyrium, and in response to the need for the circulation of the faithful or of pilgrims to the venerated spaces. At present the hypothesis of a direct influence from northern Italy (the Adriatic region) seems accepted. Another architectonic element that seems to have been introduced late is the circular or hexagonal plan adopted for some annexes to the church: the function of these annexes is thought to have been baptismal or martyrial, or both, as Février thinks regarding the baptistery of the large church of La Skira, thought to have contained a reliquary related to a martyrial cult. Interesting developments followed Yvette Duval's study on the *loca sanctorum* in Africa: an inscription was discovered near Makthar by Ben Baaziz in the *cella* of a pagan temple probably reused as a Christian chapel: *Hic memoria s*(*an*)*c*(*ti*) *Petri et Pauli,* where the term *memoria* could refer to a reliquary, now lost, that would have been kept in the building. This must also be the interpretation of the discovery near basilica IV of Sbeitla of an epigraphical fragment mentioning the relics of the apostles Peter and Paul. Some anonymous reliquiaries were discovered in a chapel attached to the church of El Gousset; the date of the building is indicated by an inscription of 521, with mention of the 26th year of the reign of the Vandal king Trasamundo.

Archaeological research has not been limited to churches but has also included burial grounds, such as that investigated near Berrouaghia in 1982—partially sacked, with tombs covered by tiles supported by small blocks of stone bordering the graves. This is thought to be a Christian cemetery, though explicitly Christian inscriptions and symbols have not been found. Sarcophagi have been found in the neighborhood of Draa-er-Rahou at Tebessa, as well as graves of those buried in caskets or in a hooded robe. Such situations are often linked to the reuse of elements as *mensae* in decorated rectangular stone, revealing the endurance of the **refrigerium* until a late period. Interesting studies have been done by Bonacasa Carra on the burial ground of Sabratha, in the early Christian complex north of the theater; the cemetery, L-shaped and completely paved with square flagstones of yellow marble, was connected to the atrium of the church by a narrow path to the north, while to the south a flight of stairs led to the *Decumano Massimo*. The scholar hypothesizes that an entire roadbed could have been incorporated into this portion of the early Christian complex and adapted to the new function of a cemetery. The burial of Theodorus, dated 6th c., attests the use of the area even after the Byzantine conquest. Critical review and careful further study have motivated the studies on urban sites already known. Duval has reinitiated study of some double basilicas of North Africa: Djemila, Sbeitla, Bulla Regia and of Sabratha itself, where, in the early-mentioned Christian complex north of the theater, the main church and the original baptistery used some of the walls of the baths. Bonacasa Carra rejects the hypothesis of Ward-Perkins and Goodchild, who attributed the restriction of the earlier baths area to a second phase of the church; she attributes it to the original phase, dating the complex to the end of the 4th c., and moreover thinks the complex was previously a cathedral. Duval does not reject the hypothesis that there may have been basilicas linked to the Donatists. The studies of the Italo-Tunisian team at Uchi Maius have also been renewed, with an inventory of the inscriptions and architectonic elements attributed to a church in the area of some modern buildings.

Ennabli's archaeological mission has led to the detailed study of a basilica in the area of a "supermarket" at Carthage, near the hill of Byrsa. The final phase of the building, with two apses, five aisles and a baptistery, is perhaps early 6th c. Also, a monastery complex has been excavated in the Bigua zone east of the Odeon hill.

A. Mandouze (ed.), *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, *1*, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1982; N. Duval, *L'éveque et la cathédrale en Afrique du Nord*, in *Actes du XI Congrés International d'Archéologie chrétienne*, *Lyon*, *Vienne*, *Grenoble*, *Genève*, *Aoste* (September 21-28, 1986), I-III, Vatican City 1989, 345-403; P.A. Février, *Approches du Maghreb romain*, Aix-en-Provence 1990; N. Duval, *Vingt ans de recherches archéologiques sur l'antiquité tardive en Afrique du Nord*: REA 96 (1994) 583-640; P.G. Spanu - R. Zucca, *Le diocesi rurali della Proconsularis e della Byzacena. Aspetti storici e archeologici*, in *L'Africa Romana*, Atti del XII Convegno di studio, Olbia, December 12-15, 1994, M. Khanoussi - P. Ruggeri - C. Vismara (eds.), Sassari 1998, 401-410; G. Lepelley, *Aspects de l'Afrique Romaine: les cités*, *la vie rurale*, *le christianisme*, Bari 2001; P.A. Février, *L'abeille et la seiche: à propos du décor de Kélibia*: RivAC 60 (1983) 277-292; F. Bejaoui,

Témoignages chrétiens dans la région de Segermes, in *Africa Proconsularis: Regional Studies in the Segermes Valley of Northern Tunisia*, II, S. Dietz - L. Ladjimi Sebai - H. Ben Hassen (eds.), København 1995, 760-767; A. Ben Abed - M. Bonifay - M. Fixot - S. Roucole, *Les basiliques chrétiennes de Sidi Jedidi*: RivAC 76 (2000) 555-587; F. Baratte - F. Bejaoui - Z. Ben Abdallah (eds.), *Recherches archéologiques à Haidra*, *Miscellanea 2* (Colléction de l'École Française de Rome, 17/2), Rome 1999; F. Bejaoui, *Nouvelles données archéologiques à Sbeitla*: Africa 14 (1996) 37-53; F. Bejaoui, *Une nouvelle église d'époque bizantine à Sbeitla*, in *L'Africa Romana*, XII, 1998, 1173-1183; F. Bejaoui, *Une église de la région de Sbeitla: Kasr el Guelal*: Africa 16 (1998) 1-14; N. Duval, *Les églises doubles d'Afrique du Nord*: Antiquité Tardive 4 (1996) 179-188; F. Bejaoui, *Découvertes d'archéologie chrétienne en Tunisie*, in Actes XI CIAC (Lyon 1986), Rome 1989, 1927-1960; F. Bejaoui, *Etat des découvertes d'époque chrétienne des dix dernières années en Tunisie*: Antiquité Tardive 10 (2002) 197-211 with bibliography; F. Bejaoui, *A propos des mosaiques funéraires d'Henchir Sokrine* (*environ de Leptis Minus, en Byzacène*), in *Africa Romana* 9, Atti del IX Convegno di studio, Nuoro, December 13-15, 1991, A. Mastino (ed.), Sassari 1992, 329-336; N. Duval, *Problématique d'une architecture chrétienne au IV^e siècle*: REAug 35 (1989) 308-313; N. Duval, s.v. *Basilique chrétienne africane*, in *Encyclopédie Berbère*, Aix en Provence 1991, 1377; P.A. Février, *Baptistéres, martyrs et reliques*: RivAC 62 (1986) 109-138; T. Ghalia, *L'architecture religieuse en Tunisie aux V^e et VI^e siècles*: Antiquité Tardive 10 (2002) 213-222; K.F. Kadra, *Rapport sur les recentes decouvertes en Algerie*, in XI CIAC (Lyon 1986), Vatican City 1989, 1961-1973; N. Duval, *L'inhumation privilégiée en Tunisie et en Tripolitanie*, Actes de la Table ronde *L'inhumation privilégiée du IV^e au VIII^e siècles en Occident. Créteil 1984*, Paris 1986, 25-42; P.A. Février, *Tombes privilégiées en Mauretanie et Numidie*, Actes de la Table ronde *L'inhumation priviligièe du IV^e au VIII siècles en Occident. Créteil 1984*, Paris 1986, 13-23; R.M. Bonacasa Carra, *Il complesso paleocristiano a nord del teatro di Sabratha: una revisione critica*, in *Actes du XI Congrés International d'Archéologie chrétienne*, *Lyon*, *Vienne*, *Grenoble*, *Genève*, *Aoste* (September 21-28, 1986), II, 1986 Vatican City 1989, 1909-1926; N. Duval, *Les églises doubles d'Afrique du Nord*: Antiquité Tardive 4 (1996) 179-188; M. Khanoussi - A. Mastino (ed.), *Uchi Maius*, Sassari 1997; L. Ennabli, *Carthage*, 1997; L. Ennabli, *La basilique de Carthage et le locus des sept moines de Gafsa. Nouveaux édifices chrétiens de Carthage*, Paris 2000.

A. Appella

AGAPE. Neologism from the classical Greek (ἀγαπάω), initially appeared in the first translations of the OT from the Hebrew: indicated the notions of love and charity (Eccl 9:1). Also used later by *Philo (*Deus* 9), and particularly in the NT (64 times) to indicate the love of God for the Son, and that of the Son for human beings (the church), as well as the fraternal love among believers (1 Cor 1:13). Contrasted with *eros*, which generally designated merely human and natural love (Lk 11:42) and, in the classical tradition, its physical component. Also adopted to indicate the meetings and assemblies of the first Christian communities (2 Pet 2:13; 1 Cor 11:17; Jude 12). Later used by Christians to indicate concrete expressions of fraternal love within Christian communities, e.g., almsgiving and especially the sacred meals.

In light of the NT testimony, the question arises of reference to the Eucharist, which we find increasingly in the Fathers beginning with the subapostolic age until the time when the Eucharist was established as a ritual meal entirely separate from the community's common banquet. The use in the letter of Jude (12) clearly refers to a fraternal meal, whereas the sense of agape in Paul (1 Cor 11:17) is much discussed; there the meal and the Eucharist seem to correspond. Immediately afterward, the text contains the eucharistic account, which is the oldest non-Jewish *anaphoric testimony. Beginning in the 2nd c., the two moments of the Christian community appear separately in various sources, on the one hand the Lord's supper, and on the other the agape, which becomes the fraternal meal par excellence according to a ritual or semiliturgical type. In the first centuries these two practices were frequently so intertwined that they were not easily distinguishable; the agape was always a sort of secondary assembly in which a meal was shared, not just the bread, wine and water. Its close relation with the Eucharist in the 1st-2nd c. notwithstanding, the agape was also linked to the very common custom of meals in pagan religiosity, as well as Jewish. It is thought, therefore, to have been an autonomous custom that evolved with the Christian faith. From the 2nd c. on the practice began of a semiliturgical meeting to share the meal, especially with the most needy, and particularly among the most well-off Christian families, who in this way shared their goods. The specific purpose of the agape was to imitate the love of Christ for human beings in the attainment of fraternal love. In the 4th c. this meal took place at the tombs of the martyrs to honor their memory, without, however, losing the principal, social purpose of helping the most needy and thereby becoming a different practice (*see* Refrigerium). After the 5th c. the agape became rare, with expressions of fraternal help taking different forms, such as almsgiving. The patristic sources attest with little clarity to the practice of the agape, and always as a practice of only some local churches, highly variable with time and place. In Africa, for example, the practice was very widespread (Tert., *Apo.* 29) and was prohibited once abuses were reported; in Egypt the agape remained strictly joined to the Eucharist (Clem. Alex., *Strom* 3,2,10); *John Chrysostom (*Hom.* 54), however, speaks of a fraternal meeting after the Eucharist, where the faithful met to eat. In the Armenian and Georgian churches, the custom remained of a liturgical meal that took place in

the presence of the minister, following the rituals of Jewish meals. With the onset of abuses in the 4th c., the agape was prohibited in various local churches and prohibited by some conciliar canons, even under penalty of excommunication. The first condemnation was issued by the Council of *Gangra (353) (can. 9.11), then reiterated by the Council of *Laodicea (363?) (can. 27.28). Later the prohibition was confirmed at *Carthage in 397, Orléans (535), *Tours (567) and *Trullo (692), preventing its spread; it thus had to assume other expresssions, always maintaining its purpose of charity within the Christian communities. The agape as a practice toward the most needy has never disappeared from the Christian life, though there have been significant changes. The Eastern liturgy preserves it in the form of the *antirodon* at the end of the liturgical functions, and there are various remnants of it in modern liturgies.

Sources. The following passages constitute some of the principal patristic sources: Ignatius (*Smyrn.*), Justin (*Apol.* 65-67), Irenaeus (*Ad. haer*. 29-31), Tertullian (*Apol.* 39; *De ieiu. adv.* 17), Hippolytus (*Trad. Apost.* 26-32), Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 2,2,19;2,10,96; *Miscell.* 1,19,96; *Strom.* 6,4,13), Origen (*Adv. Cel.* 8,33), Cyprian (*Ep.* 63, *Ad Don*. 16). In legislative writings: *Didache* 9,10; *Didasc. Apostol.* 11,26,28; *Epistol. Apostol.* 15,25; *Const. Apostol.* 31. Other authors from the 4th c. onward: John Chrys. (*Hom.* 22,27,54,57), Greg. of Naz. (*Ep.* 1,14), Augustine (*Conf.* 6,2; *Ep.* 22,2; *Mor. eccl.* 74).

Studies. J.F. Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharist*, London 1901; E. Baumgartner, *Eucharistie und Agape*, Solothurn 1909; K. Völker, *Mysterium and Agape*, Gotha 1927; J. M. Hanssens, *L'agape et l'eucharistie*: Ephem Liturg 41 (1927) 525-548; 42 (1928) 545-574; 43 (1929) 177-198, 520-529; B. Reicke, *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos*, Uppsala 1935; A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique et vie sociale*, Paris 1968; Id., *Agape et repas de charité*, Paris 1968; Id., *La vie quotidienne en Afrique du Nord au temps de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1979; E. Mazza, *All'origine dell'eucaristia cristiana*, in *Segno di Unità, le più antiche eucaristie delle chiese*, Community of Bose 1996; A. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharistics: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford 1999.

J.F. Rubio Navarro

AGAPE, CHIONIA and IRENE (d. 304). *Martyrs of *Thessalonica. The Greek passion of Agape, Chionia and Irene, already known through a Latin translation, was published by P. Franchi de' Cavalieri (ST 9, Rome 1902). Victims of *Diocletian's edicts of persecution (304), and the only Christians of their family, Agape, Chionia and Irene withdrew to a mountain near their city of *Thessalonica, taking with them all the Christian writings they owned to keep them from being destroyed. Returning to the city a few days later and found out as Christians, they were brought before the governor of the city, Dulcitius. The principal accusation was their obstinate refusal to eat the food consecrated to the gods (*idolothytes*). Remaining firm in the faith, they were condemned to be burned alive, Agape and Chionia first, then Irene. Their martyrdom took place on 1 April, which is why on or near that date their memory has customarily been included in the Synaxaria and martyrologies of East and West. The Greek passion names three other women with the first three—Cassia, Philippa and Eutychia—and a man, Agatho, but gives no details of their fate. A Latin passion relates the martyrdom of the three sisters to that of *Anastasia and *Chrysogonus, consequently placing it in *Aquileia. A document of this recension inspired the Benedictine nun Rosvita (10th c.) to write her play *Dulcitius* (PL 137, 993-1002).

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri: ST 9, Rome 1902, 3-19; DHGE 1, 876 n. 2; BS 1, 303-304; BHL IV Nov. Supp. 118-119; PG 117, 222-224; LCI 5, 42; *Atti dei martiri*, G. Caldarelli (ed.), Cinisello Balsamo 1985, 664-6764.

J.-M. Sauget

AGAPETI - AGAPETAE. In *Christology, the Greek term *agapētos* indicates the Son on whom God's favor rests. This was extended to *ascetics of both sexes who imitated the Master. It is mostly known, however, for its pejorative use by 4th-c. authors, designating virgins who lived with an ascetic or a celibate cleric: a practice already opposed by *Cyprian of Carthage, by the opponents of *Paul of Samosata (who called them *syneisaktoi*), by the synods of *Ancyra and *Nicaea, by *Aphraates and *Ephrem the Syrian, *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 63,2), Pseudo-Athanasius (*Syntagma*, PG 28, 837), *Jerome (*Ep*. 22,14), *Gregory of Nazianzus, *John Chrysostom, etc.

A. Guillaumont, *Le nom des "agapètes"*: VChr 23 (1969) 30-37.

J. Gribomont

AGAPETUS, deacon (ca. 6th c.). Deacon of the Church of St. Sophia in *Constantinople, he is thought to have been the teacher of the emperor *Justinian I (527–565). Shortly after the latter's ascension to the throne, Agapetus dedicated to him an *Ekthesis kephalaion parainetikon,* also called *Schede basilikè*, i.e., an exposition of the obligations of a Christian prince in 72 mostly brief chapters, ordered *acrostically. In the composition of these *capitula admonitoria,* Agapetus displays a great knowledge of the *Hellenistic rhetorical tradition, drawing on Isocratean and *Platonic models and

combining them with elements of the Christian tradition. Among the moral counsels are the following: respect laws, reprove the sinner, avoid bad company, do not employ dishonest persons in the administration of the state, resist anger toward enemies, don't be swayed by the praise of friends and be of fixed purpose in every action (27-35). Agapetus also offers typically Christian counsels: the emperor has received the scepter from God, needs only God and is the friend and servant of God; he must bear well in mind the passing nature of this world and persevere in the ascent to the good, so as to enjoy the eternal kingdom (61-72). Because of its simplicity, Agapetus's work had a great influence; it was used in scholastic teaching and translated into *Armenian and Old Church Slavonic. It was diffused in the West as an expression of the political pedagogy of humanism.

CPG III, 6900; PG 86, 1, 1153-1186; P. Henry, *A Mirror for Justinian*: *The Ekthesis of Agapetus Diaconus*: GRBS 8 (1967) 281-308; I. Sevcenko, *Agapetus, East and West*: *The Fate of a Byzantine "Mirror of Princes"*: RESE 16 (1978) 3-44; J. Irmscher, *Das Bild des Untertanen im Fürstenspiegel des Agapetos*: Klio 60 (1978) 507-509; W. Blum, *Byzantinische Fürstenspiegel. Agapetos, Theophylakt von Ochrid, Thomas Magister*, Stuttgart 1981; R. Frohne, *Agapetus Diaconus: Untersuchungen zu den Quellen und zur Wirkungsgeschichte der ersten byzantinischen Fürstenspiegels*, Diff. Tübingen, 1985; R. Romano, *Retorica e cultura a Bisanzio. Due Fuerstenspiegel a confronto*: Vichiana 14 (1985) 299-316; S. Rocca, *Un trattatista di età giustinianea: Agapeto Diacono*: Civiltà Classica e Cristiana 10 (1989) 303-328; F. Iadevala (ed.), *Scheda regia*, introduction, critical text, Italian version, notes and indexes, Messina 1995; R. Riendiger (ed.), *Der Fürstenspiegel für Kaiser Iustinianus*, first critical edition, Athens 1995.

C. Dell'Osso

AGAPETUS I, pope (535–536). Son of Gordianus, presbyter of the Church of Sts. John and Paul on the Caelian hill, Agapetus was elected in 535, in part due to the support of the *Byzantine party. This perhaps explains his efforts for the rehabilitation of the antipope *Dioscorus (who was elected and died two years earlier). By this and other initiatives Agapetus contributed to the opposition to the popes' designation of their own successors. In 535 Sicily was controlled by Byzantium. For this reason the Italian king Theodahad, fearing *Justinian's designs for the peninsula, sent Agapetus to *Constantinople as a delegate. The move was ineffective, however, and the Byzantine troops remained in Italy. At Constantinople, despite the opposition of the court, Agapetus deposed the patriarch *Anthimus, a *monophysite, replacing him with the monk-priest Menas. Agapetus also intervened on various doctrinal questions at a synod desired by many monastic superiors who were appealing to the bishop of Rome. Agapetus fell sick while still at Constantinople and died there in 536. His remains were immediately transferred to Rome and buried in St. Peter's. He left seven letters.

CPL 1693; PL 66, 35-80; LP I, 287; DHGE I, 887-890; H.-I. Marrou, *Autour de la bibliothèque du pape Agapit*, Mél. d'Arch. et d'Hist. 1931, 124-169; G.B. Picotti, *I sinodi romani nello scisma laurenziano*, in *Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino Volpe*, II, Florence 1958, 770-771; BS I, 316-319 (I. Daniele - M.C. Celletti); J. Hofmann, *Der hl. Agapet I und die Kirche von Bysanz*, Ostkirchliche Studien 40 (1991) 113-132; LTK[3] 1,223 (J. Speigl); EPapi I, 504-508 (O. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

AGATHA (d. 250). Agatha's name is inserted on 5 February in the *Mart. hier.*, the Calendar of *Carthage, the Gregorian *Sacramentary, the Mozarabic calendars and the Synaxarion of *Constantinople. Various churches were dedicated to her: at Rome, St. Agatha of the *Goths; on the Via Aurelia, *in fundum Lardarium*, the church built by Pope *Symmachus (498–514); *Gregory the Great founded a monastery dedicated to Sts. Maximus and Agatha at *Palermo, and had relics of the saint deposited in St. Stephen at Capri. The acts of her *martyrdom (BHL 133) have no historical value.

Mart. hier., 73; DHGE I, 909-910; BS I, 320-325; G. Consoli, *S. Agata: Vergine e martire catanese*, 2 vols., Catania 1951; L. Brusa, *Gli atti del martirio di S. Agata*: RCCM 1 (1959) 342-367; S. D'Arrigo, *Il martirio di S. Agata nel quadro storico del suo tempo*, 2 vols., Catania 1988; C. Morini, *La Heilagra meyja drápa, 26-28 e il motivo della lapidazione di S. Agata*: Siculorum Gymnasium 42 (1989) 275-286; L. Goosen, *Dizionario dei santi. Storia, letteratura, arte e musica*, Ital. tr. Milan 2000, 3-6; C. Morini, *Una redazione sconosciuta della Passio S. Agatae*: AB 109 (1991) 305-330; *La passione di S. Agata di Aelfric di Eynsham*, C. Morini (ed.), Corsi universitari 13, Alexandria 1993; O. Limone, *Italia meridionale (950-1220)*, in *Hagiographies* II (1996), 43-44; M. Stelladoro, *Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta degli atti greci del martirio di S. Agata*: Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata n.s. 49-50 (1995-1996) 63-89; *Il grande libro dei santi. Dizionario enciclopedico*, C. Leonardi, A. Riccardi, G. Zarri (eds.), 3 vols., Milan 1998, I, 29-30; C. Morini, *La Passio S. Agathae. La tradizione latina tardoantica e medievale*: Cultura e scuola 137 (1996) 94-105; LTK[3] 1, 225; L. Dufour (ed.), *Sant'Agata*, Rome 1996; Id., *La Passio S. Agathae. La tradizione medievale inglese*: RCCM 42 (2000) 49-60.

V. Saxer

AGATHANGELOS (Agatʻangełos) (6th c.). Pseudonym of the author of a chronicle (*Patmowtʻiwn Hayocʻ*) of the conversion of the *Armenians by St. *Gregory the Illuminator. The author claims to be the secretary of King Tiridates (ca. 320) and an eye-

witness of the events. The text is later, however (ca. 490?), as its anachronisms and contradictions show. A rather old (6th c.?) Greek translation was made from the original Armenian, on which depend various reworkings and shorter versions in Greek and the Eastern languages.

Patrologia V, 601-602; G. Ter-Mkrtčʻean - St. Kanayeancʻ, Agatʻangelos, Tʻipʻlis 1909 [crit. ed.]; A. Meillet, *Remarques sur le texte de l'historien arménien Agathange*: JA 16 (1910) 457-481; G. Garitte, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange* (= ST 127), Vatican City 1946; P. Peeters, *S. Grégoire l'Illuminateur dans le calendrier lapidaire de Naples*: AB 60 (1942) 91-130; R.W. Thomson, *The Teaching of Saint Gregory: An Early Armenian Catechism* (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 3), Cambridge, MA 1970; G. Lafontaine, *La version grecque ancienne du livre arménien d'Agathange. Édition critique* (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 7), Louvain 1973; R. Thomson, *Agathangelos: History of the Armenians. Translation and Commentary*, New York 1976; Id., *The Teaching of Saint Gregory: Revised Edition. Translation, Commentary and Introduction* (AVANT: Treasures of the Armenian Christian Tradition 1), New Rochelle 2001; G. Winkler, *Our Present Knowledge of the History of Agat'angełos and Its Oriental Versions*: REArm 14 (1980) 125-141; N.G. Garsoïan, *The Iranian Substratum of the "Agat'angełos" Cycle*: N.G. Garsoïan *et al.* (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Washington 1982, 151-174; A. Hultgård, *Change and Continuity in the Religion of Ancient Armenia with Particular Reference to the Vision of St. Gregory* (*Agathangelos §731-755*), in T.J. Samuelian (ed.), *Classical Armenian Culture: Influences and Creativity* (Armenian Texts and Studies 4), Chico, CA 1982, 8-26; M.-L. Chaumont, *Sur l'origine de saint Grégoire d'Arménie*: Muséon 102 (1989) 115-130; M. van Esbroeck, *Saint Grégoire d'Arménie et sa didascalie*: Muséon 102 (1989) 131-145.

S.J. Voicu

AGATHO, pope (678–681). Born in Sicily, succeeded *Donus (676–678) and consecrated 27 June 678. Shortly after his election the autonomy of the church of *Ravenna came to an end, which was begun in 666 by the bishop *Maurus (instigated by Emperor *Constans II) and continued by his successor *Theodore. In 679 Agatho convoked a Roman council to reconfirm *Wilfrid as the bishop of York, who had been expelled by the king of Northumbria (Mansi 11, 179). He also sent the archcantor John (abbot of St. Martin near St. Peter's) to England to promote the spread of Gregorian chant and the Roman liturgical order. Agatho granted the request of emperor Constantine IV Pogonatos (sent to his predecessor Donus in 678) to send plenipotentiaries to *Byzantium to resolve the monothelite question with the patriarchs of *Constantinople and *Antioch. The pope convened a second council at Rome in 680 for that purpose, reaffirming the condemnation of monothelitism and nominating delegates to the conference of Constantinople. With the presence of 150 fathers, papal delegates and the emperor (who presided at the sessions), the conference was a true and proper ecumenical council—the sixth, Constantinople III, also known as *Trullo I—which registered the definitive rejection of monothelitism, the reconciliation between Rome and the East, and a broad recognition of papal authority (Mansi 11, 666). Agatho died before the end of the council, 10 January 681. We have two letters of his to the emperor on dyothelism forcefully reaffirmed by Rome and destined to be imposed on the universal church. His three letters to the English church are lost; another four are spurious.

CPL 1737; PL 87, 1161-1248; Mansi 11, 179, 234-315, 666 and 747; MGH, Ep. III, 92; LP I, 350-358; Jaffé I, 238-240; Hfl-Lecl 3, 238-40; H. Quentin, *Les originaux latins des lettres des papes Honorius, S. Agathon et Léon II relatives au monothélisme*, Misc. Amelli, Montecassino 1920, 71-76; DTC I, 559-563; DHGE I, 96-98; M. Gibbs, *The Decrees of Agatho and the Gregorian Plan for York*: Speculum 48 (1973) 213-246; S. Kutter, *Implied Reference to the Digest in Pope Agatho's Synod of 679*: ZSR Rom. Abt (1990) 382-384; M. Maccarone, *Romana Ecclesiastica Cathedra Petri* (P. Zerbi - R. Volpini - A. Galluzzi), Rome 1991, 78-95; S. Kutter, "*Auctor noster beatus Petrus Apostolus*": *Pope Agatho on the Papal Office*, Studia in hon. Eminent. Card. A.M. Stickler, Rome 1992; LTK³ 1,227 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 612-616.

M. Spinelli

AGATHONICE and companions (d. 161/180). Bishop Carpus, the deacon Papylus and the voluntary martyr Agathonice died at Pergamum on 15 April of an unknown year—during the reign of *Marcus Aurelius (161–180) according to some who base their views on *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* IV, 15,48), and under *Decius (250) according to those who rely on the Latin *Acts of the Martyrs.* The martyrologies frequently get their names wrong: the Latin Acts always call Papylus "Pamphylus." The essence of the original *Acts of the Martyrs* can possibly be recovered from the text common to the Greek and Latin redactions. Late revisions cite Agathodorus as Agathonice's companion.

Mart. hier., 188; Delehaye PM, 99-102, 293-299; M. Simonetti, *Studi agiografici*, Rome 1955, 97-107; G. Lazzati, *Gli sviluppi della letteratura sui martiri nei primi quattro secoli*, Turin 1956, 131-137; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 109-116; BS 3, cols. 878-880; *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, introduction by A.A.R. Bastiaensen, critical text and commentary by A.A.R. Bastiaensen et al. (eds.), Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Milan 1987, 33-45; LTK³ 5, 1264-1265; V. Saxer, *Atti dei martiri dei primi tre secoli*, Padova ²1989, 135-145; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Agli inizi dell'agiografia occidentale*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, G. Philippart (dir.) (CC. Hagiographies III), Turnhout 2001, 72-74.

V. Saxer

AGATHONICUS of Tarsus (5th c.). Fictitious author of a corpus of brief texts originally written in Greek but surviving only in *Coptic in one complete manuscript and some fragmentary manuscripts. The original version was written in *Evagrian circles in the early 5th c. and was revised and expanded in the course of its trasmission in Coptic. The corpus included (1) a treatise against the anthropomorphytes (a Coptic version from the White Monastery has been altered in favor of *anthropomorphism); (2) a dispute with "Justin the Samaritan" on the resurrection of the body; (3) a dispute with "Stratonicus of Cilicia" on various arguments, especially providence; (4) an "apology" on unbelief. These works are interesting mainly as documentation of the large and small problems that were debated in 5th-c. Egyptian monastic circles, which can be found in *Palladius or *John Cassian, but only with difficulty in texts produced directly by the monks.

W.E. Crum, *Der Papyroscodex Saec. VI-VII . . .*, Strassburg 1915; T. Orlandi, *Il Dossier copto di Agatonico di Tarso*, Fest. Polotsky, Beacon Hill 1981; T. Orlandi, *Agathonicus of Tarsus*, in *Copt. Enc.* I, 68-70; T. Orlandi, *Letteratura Copta e Cristianesimo Nazionale Egiziano*, in A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto Cristiano - Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*: SEA 56, Rome 1997, 52-54.

T. Orlandi

AGDE, Council of. Some 30 bishops from the six ecclesiastical provinces of the kingdom of *Alaric, the *Arian king of the *Visigoths, met on 10 September 506, in the basilica of St. Andrew in Agde, under the presidency of *Caesarius of *Arles. This assembly signaled a clear change in the religious policy of the king toward peace and tolerance; the promulgation some months earlier (winter 505–506) of the Breviary of Alaric had the same significance. The fathers of Agde opened the session with a declaration of gratitude to the prince, who had restored their freedom, and with a fervent prayer to God for the king and the kingdom. The importance of the council is clear from various perspectives: it not only marks the transition from the councils of the Roman period to those of the *Merovingian period, from the Gallo-Roman to the Gallo-Frankish church, but it also assured a wide diffusion of the canonical discipline of Arles. Caesarius of Arles, president of the assembly, wanted the fathers to draw on the canons and laws of the ancient Fathers (can. 1); in fact, many decisions of the Council of Agde refer back to those of early provincial councils (cans. 1-5; 24; 29), to the collection known as "The Council of Arles" (cans. 11, 31, 35) or to the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* (cans. 20, 43-45), while others repeat canons of the Council of *Vannes (461–491), thus representing the legislation of the province of *Tours (cans. 37-42). The council addressed many disciplinary and liturgical problems, especially the conditions required for ordination (cans. 1, 16, 17, 43) and the duties of clerics (cans.. 2, 9-11, 20, 36, 39, 41, 42), insisting on the obligation of continence and good morals. Many of its provisions concerned ecclesiastical goods: it is a sacred duty to give legacies and donations to the church (can. 4); to steal the church's goods is to kill the poor (*necator pauperum*) (can. 4; see cans. 5-7). Generally speaking, ecclesiastical goods are inalienable (can. 22; see cans. 7 and 45); bishops must be convinced that they are not owners but only trustees of their diocese's property (can. 7). Clerics are urged to respect ecclesiastical courts (cans. 8 and 32), and laypeople to respect the law of the indissolubility of marriage (can. 25). Various norms regulated liturgical practices: the blessing of altars (can. 14); the celebration of the divine service (can. 30); Sunday Mass attendance (can. 47); the obligation of Communion at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost (can. 18); fasting (can. 12); and the imparting of the creed (can. 13). Can. 21 recorded that celebrations in chapels had to be regulated in the past so as not to interfere with services in the parishes. At the same council, rigorous norms were also promulgated regarding penitents (cans. 15 and 37), nuns (cans. 19 and 28), monks (cans. 27-28) and Jews (cans. 34 and 40). Finally, noteworthy was the council fathers' interest in protecting *miserabiles personae:* abandoned babies (can. 24) and freed and runaway slaves (cans. 29 and 46). A number of manuscripts attribute 23 canons to the Council of Agde, beyond the 49 authentic ones. These are in fact a private compilation borrowed from various Gallic sources, especially from the Council of Epaon of 517.

CCL 148, 189-228; Hfl-Lecl 2, 973-1002; M. Garnier, *Le concile d'Agde*, Montpellier 1906; Palazzini 1,7-8; LTK 1, 228.

Ch. Munier

AGELIUS of Constantinople (d. after 384). Bishop of the *Novatianist community of *Constantinople, exiled by *Valens ca. 365 for being anti-*Arian. After returning, he collaborated in 383 with the Catholic bishop *Nectarius to obtain *Theodosius's definitive approval of the Catholic faith and the condemnation of radical and moderate Arians and *Macedonians with the antiheretical provisions of 25 July and 3 December 383, and 21 January 384. Theodosius, recog-

nizing the anti-Arian faith of the Novatianists, exempted them from the antiheretical provisions, leaving them undisturbed and allowing them to keep their churches.

DHGE 1, 931.

M. Simonetti

AGILULF (d. 616). *Longobard (Lombard) king. Having been the duke of *Turin, he was elevated in 590 to the throne of the Longobards after marrying *Theodelinda, *Authari's widow (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* II, 35). Agilulf further strengthened royal authority against rebel dukes and vigorously pursued the struggle with the *Byzantines, especially against Romanus, exarch of *Ravenna, who had invaded several towns of Tuscia Romana. Agilulf besieged *Rome in 593; only the intervention of *Gregory the Great and the mediation of Theodelinda ended the siege. The energy and ability of the pope finally led to a truce (603) between Agilulf and the emperor Phocas. Admiration for the work of Gregory and the influence of Theodelinda favorably inclined Agilulf toward Catholicism and the church; it is probable that Agilulf converted to the Catholic religion and at Easter 603 had his son Adaloald baptized. At that point royal energy was directed toward the renovation and building of churches: at Theodelinda's wish, a church was built in honor of *John the Baptist at Monza, and in 612 a Catholic *monastery was founded at Bobbio, entrusted to the leadership of *Columbanus. Upon Agilulf's death in 616, royal power passed to his 13-year-old son Adaloald.

O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, Storia di Roma IX, Bologna 1941, 242-261; S. Gasparri, *I duchi Longobardi*, Studi Storici 109, Rome 1978, 17-21, 45-46; P. Delogu, *Il regno Longobardo*, in *Storia d'Italia*, I, Turin 1980, 34-45, 55, 60, 87-88, 352-354; S. Rota, *La Chiesa di Roma di fronte ai barbari* (*V-VIII secolo*), in L. Pani Ermini - P. Siniscalco (eds.), *La Comunità Cristiana di Roma. La sua vita e la sua cultura dalle origini all'alto Medio Evo*, Vatican City 2000, 159-166.

G. Pilara

AGNELLUS (ca. 486–569). *Archbishop of *Ravenna. Of noble birth, upon the death of his wife he abandoned a military career and was ordained, becoming deacon and *praefectus* of the Church of St. Agatha at Ravenna. On 24 June 557 he was elected archbishop of the city. He initiated major works of restoration and embellishment of churches in his diocese; his marble ambo and silver cross remain in the cathedral of Ravenna. Doctrinally, he firmly opposed the *Arian *heresy, writing an *Epistola de natione fidei ad Armenium,* in which he defended the *trinitarian doctrine of the church against the heresy (PL 68, 381-386). He is credited with reconciling to the Catholic Church the ecclesial communities influenced by the Arianism of the *Goths.

CPL 949; DBI 1, 428; PCBE II, Italie 2, *Agnellus* 3, 59-63; *Agnello, arcivescovo di Ravenna. Studi per il XIV centenario della morte (570-1970)*, A. Torre (ed.), Società di Studi Romagnoli. Saggi e repertori XIV, Faenza 1971.

G. Pilara

AGNES (d. 250). The *Depositio martyrum* is the first document to mention the cult of S. Agnes at *Rome, on the Via Nomentana, 21 January. In 337–351 a basilica was built near the tomb, next to the so-called mausoleum of St. *Constantia, actually that of the founder of the basilica, Constantina. *Ambrose (*De virg*.. I, 2), *Damasus (Ferrua, *Epigr. damas*. n. 71) and *Prudentius (*Perist*. 14) give conflicting versions of her *martyrdom, agreeing only on her age (she had just reached puberty) and on the double merit of the young saint, virgin and martyr. With Peter, Paul and Lawrence, Agnes is a patron of Rome. The passions in Latin (BHL 156) and Greek (BHG 145-6) are romanticized. A cemetery developed around the tomb; many glass works in gold depict her. Her cult traveled to *Africa (Aug., *Serm*. 53; 273, 6; 286, 2; 354-5; *Cal. Carth*.), *Ravenna (St. Apollinare Nuovo), *Gaul and *Germany (liturgical books).

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *S. Agnese nella tradizione e nella leggenda*: RQA, Suppl. 10, Rome 1899; A. P. Frutaz, *Il complesso monumentale di S. Agnese*, Rome 1960; BS 1, 382-407; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 78-80; BHL *Novum Supplementum* (1986), 22-24; *Histoire des saints*, II, 62-70; F.E. Consolino, *Modelli di santità femminili nelle più antiche passioni romane*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 84-113; L. Goosen, *Dizionario dei santi. Storia, letteratura, arte e musica*, Ital. tr., Milan 2000, 6-10; U. Nersinger, *Die Lämmerweihe am Fest der heiligen Agnes. Von der Wolle der Lämmer zum Pallium, dem Würdezeichen des Papstes, der Patriarchen un der Metropoliten*, Klosterneuburg-Vienna 1995; *Il grande libro dei santi. Dizionario enciclopedico*, C. Leonardi, A. Riccardi, G. Zarri (eds.), 3 vols., Milan 1998, I, 38-40; LTK[3] 1, 237-238; LCI 1,69; 5, 58-63.

V. Saxer

AGNOETAE. Followers of a *heresy begun in *Egypt by the deacon *Themistius of *Alexandria (first half 6th c.) as a consequence of the divisions and *schisms of the *monophysites. They are described in the *quaest*. 30 of ps.-*Caesarius. The *agnoetae* carried the doctrine of *Severus of Antioch to its ultimate consequences, preaching on the basis of Mk 13:32, Jn 11:34

and Lk 2:52 that Christ did not have perfect knowledge but, like all human beings, was subject to ignorance (*Leontius Scholasticus—who likens them to the Theodosians, *Sect.* V,6; X,3: PG 86, 1232.1261-1264). *Timothy of Constantinople lists them among the *Diacrinomeni as the fifth group, similar to the Severites (PG 86, 53.57). From *Photius we learn that they were refuted by one *Theodore, a monk of Alexandria (*Bibl.* cod. 108), and by *Eulogius of Alexandria (*Bibl.* cod. 230).

DCB I,62-63; K.-U. Uthemann, *Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe. 2.5. Eine Zwischenbemerkung: Justinians Edikt gegen die Agnoeten*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 44-46 (with bibliography).

F. Cocchini

AGNUS DEI. According to the **Liber pontificalis* (ed. Perovsky, II, 256), Pope *Sergius I, a Syrian, introduced the singing of the *Agnus Dei* into the Roman *Mass. In Eastern *liturgies, from the 6th c., the *fractio* of the bread was considered a symbol of the passion and death of Christ. The liturgy of Western *Syria preserves texts that were used during the *fractio* and which speak of the Lamb of God (Brightman, *Liturgies*, I, 99), alluding to Rev 5:6 and Jn 1:29-36. The singing of the *Agnus Dei* serves as a *confractorium*, i.e., as a song that accompanies the *fractio*. The *Ordo Romanus I* prescribes that the schola sing it while the bread is being broken (Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani*, 101); thus the *Agnus Dei,* with its subdued sacrificial tone, gave an Eastern dimension to the *fractio*. This probably led to an understanding of the *commixtio,* which follows the *fractio,* as a symbol of the resurrection (Amalarius, *Liber officialis*, I, III, c. 33,2: ST 139, 365). In any case the Syrians, who practiced the *commixtio* from the 4th c., saw in it the symbol of the resurrection of Christ, and *Theodore of Mopsuestia explains it as the union of the body and blood of Christ (*Hom. Cat.* 16: ST 145, 533, 557-563). Thus the *fractio* and the *commixtio* of the *fermentum* [lit. leaven—a fragment of the consecrated host sent to the titular churchs for use in their celebration of the Eucharist at the point of the commixtio] in the Roman Mass, which originally had a different symbolism, assume a unified symbolism thanks to the *Agnus Dei:* the *fractio* indicates the death, the *commixtio* the resurrection.

F. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896; B. Capelle, *Le rite de la fraction dans la messe romaine*: RBen 53 (1941) 5-40; M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyenâge. 2. Les textes*, Louvain 1948 (Spicil. Sacrum Lovan., 23); J.P. De Jong, *Le rite de la commixtion dans ses rapports avec les liturgies syriennes*: Archiv f. katholisches Kirchenrecht 4 (1956) 245-278; 5 (1957) 33-79; U. Perovsky (ed.), *Liber Pontificalis*, Rome 1978 (Studia Gratiana, 22); N. Paxton, *Breaking the Bread*, in *The Clergy Review* 9 (1982) 327-332; G. Di Nola, *Monumenta Eucharistica: La testimonianza dei Padri della Chiesa*, vol. 2, Rome 1997, 53-55, 59-60; M. Metzger, *The History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome*, in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 3, Collegeville 1999, 122-125.

A. Chupungco

AGRAECIUS (d. ca. 487). The name is variously written: Agraecius, Agroecius, Agritius. Bishop of Sens, second half 5th c. *Sidonius Apollinaris sent him a letter (*Ep.* VII,5), inviting Agraecius to accompany him to Bourges to reestablish order. He wrote an *Ars de orthographia*. At his death ca. 487 he was buried in the Church of Saint-Léon, a.k.a. Saint-Gervais-et-Protais. Toward the end of the 9th c. his successor bishop Antegisius transferred his relics to the monastery of St. Pierre-le-Vif. Feast 15 June. To be distinguished from the Spanish bishop *Agrestius.

Editions: Ed. of the *Ars de orthographia*, ed. H. Keil, in *Grammatici latini*, VII, Leipzig 1880, 113-125, repr. Hildesheim 1961; another edition: ed. M. Pugliarello in *Collana di grammatici latini*, Milan 1978.

Studies: AAS (1698) Junii, II, 687; DHGE 1 (1912) 1017; DBF 1 (1923) 802-803 (with bibl.); BS 1 (1961) 616 (with bibl.); *Histoire littéraire de la France*, II, Paris 1974, 564; M. Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: "Grammatica" and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 19), Cambridge 1994; E. Pérez Rodríguez, *La cristianización de la Gramática latina* (*ss. V-IX*), in A. Alberte González, C. Macías Villalobos (eds.), *Actas del Congreso Internacional "Cristianismo y tradición latina." Málaga, 25 a 28 de abril de 2000*, Malaga 2001, available also in electronic AnMal n. 6 at: http://www.anmal.uma.es/anmal/numero6/Estrella.htm.

M. Maritano

AGRAPHON. Greek term meaning "unwritten word," used to indicate a saying of Christ (but not a discourse) not contained in the canonical gospels. *Agrapha* of Jesus, i.e., words attributed to him, are found in other books of the NT (see Acts 20:35, quoted in *1 Clem.* II; Rom 14:14; 1 Th 4:16-17); in variants of gospel MSS (see that quoted by D in Lk 6:5); in apocryphal texts (*Evan. Aegypt.*, *Praed. Petr.*, *Evan. Hebr.*, etc.); in apocryphal passages quoted by the Fathers (see Clem., *Exc. ex Theodot.* 2,2; Jerome, *In Ephes*, 5,3-4; *Adv. Pelag.* 3,2); and in numerous patristic texts (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 24,158; Tert., *Bapt.* 20; *De orat.* 26; Just., *Dial.* 35; 47). Research on *agrapha* has been particularly enriched by the discovery of the *Oxyrhyncus papyri (nos. 1 and 654, published 1897 and 1904 respectively, which contain maxims of Jesus introduced by the expression λέγει Ἰησοῦς, and

are thus also called *logia;* others have been added to these: nos. 655; 840; 1224, etc.) and some *Coptic MSS, among these the *Gospel of Thomas,* a genuine collection of sayings of Jesus, which are still being evaluated critically. The most recent studies of the whole body of material seem to lead to the conclusion that *agrapha* were present in the earliest days of Christianity and point to a multiform tradition regarding Jesus that is not included in the canonical gospels, though it circulated throughout the wider church. The difficulty in determining which of these "sayings" are certainly authentic does not rule out the possibility that some may be. Moreover, the works containing agrapha do not intend to alter what is offered by an examination of Christ's words in the canonical gospels. The largest collection of *agrapha,* in the broad sense of the term—i.e., passages cited as scriptural by some ecclesiastical authors but not found in Scripture—is that of S. Resch, *Agrapha Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente*, Leipzig 1906 TU n.s. XV 3/4, a point of departure for further study (see Vaganay, s.v. *agrapha,* DBS I, 159-198).

J. Ruwet, *Les "agrapha" dans les œuvres de Clément d'Alexandrie*: Biblica 30 (1949) 133-160; J. Jeremias, *Gli agrapha di Gesù*, Brescia [2]1975; W.D. Stroker, *Extracanonical Saying of Jesus*, Atlanta 1989; L. Moraldi, *Detti segreti di Gesù*, Milan [2]1989; Erbetta 1/1, 83-110; H. Koester - F. Bovon, *Une production de la communauté chretienne: les paroles du Seigneur*, in *Genèse de l'Ecriture chrétienne*, Turnhout 1991, 23-58; L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento. Vangeli*, Casale Monferrato 1994, 529-572.

M.G. Mara

AGRESTIUS (5th c.). Bishop of Lugo (*Gallaecia). The only thing known of his life is his attempt in 433 to oppose the episcopal election of *Pastor and *Syagrius (Idatius, *Chron.,* ed. Tranoy, SCh 218, Paris 1974, n. 102), adversaries of *Priscillianism. It is not known whether Priscillian sympathies motivated Agrestius's opposition; in any case he probably attracted suspicion in this regard. A short, fragmented poem has recently been attributed to Agrestius, titled *Versus Agresti Ep. de fide ad Avitum Ep*. The content of the work, a didactic letter with a profession of faith regarding esp. the creation ex nihilo fits Agrestius's situation well and could be his response to accusations of *heresy.

CPL 1463a; PLS 5, 400-401; A.C. Vega: Boletín de la Real Academia de la historia 159 (1966) 203-206; K. Smolak: SAW (Phil. Hist. Klasse) 284/2 (1973); A. Di Berardino, *Agrestio*, *Patrologia* III, 310-311; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina ispano-cristiana*, T. II: *siglos IV-V*, Madrid 1997, 70-71.

E. Prinzivalli

AGRICIUS (d. ca. 332). Bishop of *Trier early 4th c., when the city was an imperial capital. As perhaps the successor of St. *Paternus, he would have been sent to Trier by Pope *Sylvester. He took part in the Council of *Arles (314) and signed the conciliar acts after the diocesan bishop who presided at the council, a sign of the importance of his episcopal see. His successor, also, was the second signer of the Council of Serdica (343). *Athanasius, present at Trier in 335/336, mentions the numerous Christian communities and the churches under construction. *Lactantius resided at Trier during Agricius's episcopate as the tutor of Crispus. Feast 19 January (previously 13).

AASS, 1 Jan 773-781 (legendary biography); J. Marx, *Der Biograph des Bischofs Agricius*: Wetd. Zeitschr. für Geschichte und Kunst 12 (1982) 37-50; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épisc.* III, 35; DHGE 2,1014; N. Gauthier, *L'évangelisation des pays de la Moselle*, Paris 1980, 35-47.

A. Di Berardino

AGRIPPA I, or Herod Agrippa (10/9 BC–AD 44). Son of Aristobulus and Berenice, nephew of Herod the Great. Educated at *Rome, where he gained the favor of the emperor *Caligula, who in 37 conferred on him the tetrarchies of Philip (the territories of Batanaea, Ituraea and Trachonitus) and Lysanias (Abilene), and in 40 the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas (Galilee, Perea). Agrippa remained at Rome, however, intervening in favor of the Jewish cause in *Jerusalem and especially opposing the emperor's design to place a statue of himself in the temple. After Caligula's death, he aligned himself with *Claudius, favoring his ascent to the imperial throne. As recompense, Claudius gave him Judea and Samaria (41), thus reuniting the territory of his grandfather Herod. Only then did Agrippa leave the imperial city for Jerusalem to take possession of his territories. After his death in 44 Judea was again reduced to a Roman province. Agrippa was directly responsible for the persecution of Christians (Acts 12:1-3). He died suddenly at *Caesarea in Palestine in 44 (Acts 12:21-23; Flavius Josephus, *Jew. Ant.* XIX, 8,2).

U. Holzmeister, *Storia dei tempi del NT*, Turin 1950, 90-100; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (*175 B.C.-A.D. 135*), I, A new english version revised and edited by G. Vermes - F. Millar, Edinburgh 1973, 442-454; E.M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, Leiden 1976, 194; S. Freyne, *Galilee*, *From Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE*, Edinburgh 1998; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'Impero romano*, Naples 1991, [2]2000, 33-35; G. Filoramo - D. Menozzi (eds.), *Storia del cristianesimo. L'antichità*, Rome-Bari 2001, 26-28.

G. Pilara

AGRIPPA II (ca. 28–ca. 92). Marcus Julius Agrippa, son of *Agrippa I; educated at *Rome. *Claudius did not want to give him the reign of *Judea inherited from his father, Agrippa, considering him too young. At the death of Herod of *Chalcis, Agrippa inherited both his reign and his wife, Berenice, Agrippa's natural sister. He remained for a long time at the imperial court at Rome to secure favors; Claudius took Chalcis from him but gave him the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias in exchange (53). From the new emperor, *Nero, Agrippa obtained control of some cities of Galilee and Perea (55), concessions that were the fruit of Agrippa's absolute fidelity to the Roman Empire: this was esp. manifest during the Jewish revolt of 66, during which Agrippa collaborated with the Romans, who repaid him by enlarging his realm. He was again at Rome on the occasion of *Titus's Jewish victory (70). With his sister Berenice he wanted to hear Paul, who was prisoner at *Caesarea, becoming convinced of his innocence (Acts 25:13; 26:1ff.).

U. Holzmeister, *Storia dei tempi del NT*, Turin 1950, 100-103; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, I, A new english version revised and edited by G. Vermes - F. Millar, Edinburgh 1973, 417-483; S. Freyne, *Galilee, From Alexander The Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE*, Edinburgh 1998; G. Filoramo - D. Menozzi (eds.), *Storia del cristianesimo. L'antichità*, Rome-Bari 2001, 28-29, 70-71.

G. Pilara

AGRIPPA CASTOR (2nd c.). Antignostic author who wrote, probably during the reign of *Hadrian (117–138), a "most effective refutation" of the exegetical works of the *gnostic *Basilides; according to *Theodoret he also refuted *Isidore (*Haer*. 1,4), another gnostic. His work is lost, but *Eusebius of Caesarea offers a brief summary (*Hist. eccl.* 4,7,6-8). *Jerome eulogizes him as a "very cultured and strong" person (*Vir. ill.* 21).

H. Leisegang, *Gnosis*, Stuttgart [5]1985, 198-202; W.A. Löhr, *Basilides*, Tübingen 1996, 5-14.

S. Samulowitz

AGRIPPINUS of Carthage (d. after 220). *Cyprian twice mentions this bishop as his predecessor *bonae memoriae* (*Ep.* 71, 4; 73, 3), and three times mentions the council held by him at *Carthage (ibid.; *Ep.* 70,1) "some years ago" (*Ep.* 73,3). The council is thought to have met ca. 220 and was the first known *African council; it already indicates, with the convocation of the bishops of Proconsular *Africa and *Numidia (Aug., *Ep.* 71,4), the primacy of the bishop of Carthage, due to the antiquity and importance of the city and the prestige of the church. The council may have been linked to the question of the penitence accorded adulterers by pope *Callistus. It also decided that only *baptism conferred by Catholics should be considered legitimate. *Augustine (*Ep.* 3,13,14) says that 70 bishops participated (*Bapt.* 3,13,14 and *Ep.* 70,1; 71,4; 73,3; 93,10,35).

DTC 1, 637-8; L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, I Paris 1906, 422; Hfl-Lecl 1, 154-5; Monceaux 1, 19ff.; Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa* (ed. it.), vol. II, Turin 1972, 133, n. 135; J.-L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine vandale et byzantine*, Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 11, Rome 1973, 253 and passim; F. Decret, *Le christianisme en Afrique du Nord Ancienne*, Paris 1996, 45, 64, 84, 113; J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, in W. Brandmüller (ed.), *Konziliengeschichte*, Paderborn-Munich- Vienna-Zürich 1997, 50-52; 153-157; 159-161; 235; 240ff.; 247; 280ff.

T. Sardella

AGRIUSTIA the African (4th-5th c.). A defender of the calculation of Easter inaugurated by *Augustalis. In the sixteenth year of *Genseric's reign, he wrote *Computus Carthaginensis a. 455* (PL 59, 545ff.). The author presents himself as an anonymous African mathematician; he also opposes Augustalis's critics, among whom was Agriustia, himself the author somewhat earlier of the work *De ratione Paschali,* dedicated to a certain Hilarianus. It is known that Agriustia was born at Municipium Thimidensium Regiorum, i.e., Thimida Regia in Mauretania Caesariensis in Tunisia, modern Sidi Ali el Sedfini. The date of the *floruit* is perhaps also known—late 4th c. (397)—if the Hilarianus to whom the work is dedicated is Quintus Julius *Hilarianus.

Baluze: PL 59, 521C-D; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie. Der 84 jährige Ostercyclus und seine Quellen*, Leipzig 1880, 23ff.; PCBE 1,49-50.

V. Loi - B. Amata

AIDAN of Lindisfarne (d. 651). In his account of the life of bishop Aidan of *Lindisfarne, *Bede recounts that Aidan died twenty years before Bede himself was born. King Oswald of Northumbria, wanting to spread faith in God within his kingdom, appealed to the *monastery at Iona (Lat. Hii)—where he himself was baptized some years earlier, while in exile—for a missionary who would evangelize his subjects (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* III, 5). The rigid preaching of Corman, the apostle sent by the Scots, was nevertheless unable to penetrate the

hearts of the Northumbrian people or to overcome the vigorous pagan resistence of the Angles. Aidan, present at a meeting upon Corman's return from Northumbria, rejected the failed missionary's accusations against the Northumbrians of barbarities, invoking instead a celebrated passage from St. Paul (see 1 Cor 3:2), that they needed to be treated with greater gentleness and persuasion. These words, which displayed Aidan's profound gifts before the entire assembly of the elders, pointed to him as the new missionary. Immediately consecrated bishop (635), he was sent to King Oswald, who accepted him with much goodwill, giving him a small island in the North Sea as a residence, opposite the royal residence of Bamborough, Lindisfarne (later known as the Holy Island); it immediately became a monastery and episcopal see, the primacy of which for ecclesiastical activity in England was recognized by the Synod of Whitby in 664.

In 642, upon King Oswald's death in the battle of Maserfelth at the hands of Penda, pagan king of Mercia, Northumbria was divided into two separate kingdoms: Bernicia, ruled by Oswiu, Oswald's brother, and Deira, ruled by Oswine, son of Osric, king of Deira. Just as Oswald had supported Aidan's difficult missionary work in every way, the bishop also found a faithful ally in Oswine, whose cruel death at the hands of Oswiu—according to Bede (III, 14)—Aidan had predicted and deeply mourned. Only 12 days after that tragic event and after 17 years as a bishop, Aidan died (31 August 651), his place being taken for 10 years by Finan.

Nothing is known of Aidan's birthplace (though it is reasonably proposed that he was Irish), and very little of his youth. Attributed to him, though not without strong dissent, are the *Commentarii in Scripturam* and the *Homiliae et conciones;* in reality, we only know a few of Aidan's sayings, passed down to us by Bede. Apostolic zeal, honesty, abstinence, continence, charity, and love of prayer and the study of Scripture are only a few of the many good points attributed to him, though Bede himself reproved him harshly for not conforming to Roman usage and for remaining attached to *Celtic usage for the celebration of Easter (III, 17). Many miracles were attributed to him, including the instantaneous calming of a storm at his preaching (III, 15), the sudden extinguishing of a huge fire set by Penda at Bamborough (III, 16) through his prayer, and the sudden sacredness of the place where he died, which quickly became a place of pilgrimage. He was buried in the monastic cemetery of Lindisfarne, but his relics were soon transferred to the church dedicated to St. Peter at Lindisfarne; later (664) bishop Colman, successor of Finan, took some of his mortal remains to the monastery of Iona (III, 26).

His feast is 31 August, the annivesary of his death; the Church of Bamborough is consecrated in his name. He is frequently depicted iconographically with a deer at his feet.

Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* III, 3, 5, 14-17; DCB 1, 65-67; DHGE 1, 1106-1107; BS 1, 625-627; LTK 1, 272.

M. Ghilardi

AILERAN the Wise (d. 665). Monk at Clonard (Meath, in Ireland), wrote *Interpretatio mystica progenitorum Christi* and *Rythmus in Eusebii Canones*. The first work, based on *Jerome and other sources, gives the etymology of the names of Jesus' ancestors, which it then relates to Jesus and to ourselves: for example, Abraham means "sublime father": such is Christ (Is 9:6), whereas we must become fathers, i.e., doers, of virtue. The *Rythmus*, in 36 catalectic trochaic *senarii,* deals with the symbolism of the four beasts of the Apocalypse, traditionally identified with the four evangelists.

CPL 1120-1121; PL 80, 327-342; 101, 729; DHGE 1,1146; W. Meyer, *Gildae oratio rythmica*, NGWG 1912, 63-67; E. Coccia, *La cultura irlandese precarolingia. Miracolo o mito?*: StudMed 8 (1967) 332-334; N. Netzer, *Willibrord's Scriptorium at Echternach and Its Relationship to Ireland and Lindisfarne*, in *St. Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner - D. Rollason - C. Stancliffe, Woodbridge 1989, 206-207; Patrologia IV, 451-452.

M. Simonetti

AITHALLA of Edessa (d. 345/348). Aeithalas in Greek, Aithalaha or Ithalaha in *Syriac, Atheghahay in *Armenian, bishop of *Edessa 324–345/348. According to the 6th-c. **Chronicle of Edessa,* he became famous for the construction of a cemetery east of the Mesopotamian metropolis. He subscribed to the Council of *Nicaea. A letter has been attributed to him, preserved in Armenian and published by P.I. Thorossian in 1942, which is considered authentic by A. Vööbus, who employs it to show the use of the **Diatessaron* at Edessa before *Rabbula; this "Letter of Aithalla, Bishop of Edessa" has been examined by M.G. de Durand from a dogmatic perspective. The existence of a synodal letter from the Council of Nicaea would indeed be of extraordinary interest. Its *trinitarian doctrine is highly evolved, whereas its *Christology predates Ephesus. It seems to have in mind esp. the errors of the *Audiani, a sect which began at Edessa ca. 340. The letter could be only late 4th c., or perhaps its

trinitarian doctrine was altered. The letter was recently restudied by Bruns, who considers it an important source of the earliest Syriac theology. Regarding the *Diatessaron,* in fact, the most recent studies seem to acknowledge a use at Edessa before Rabbula. After the Council of *Ephesus (431) it was burned together with the works of *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Nestorius. Some fragments of this work, cited—I believe—by the *Doctrina Addai*, are known to us, not only through *Ephrem the Syrian, who commented on them, but also by *Aphraates (3rd-4th c.) and by a scrap of parchment from *Dura Europos (3rd c.) with a Greek translation of the Syriac text, according to Welles.

P.I. Thorossian, *Aithallae episcopi edesseni epistula ad Christianos in Persarum regione de fide*, Venice 1942, 75; M.G. Durand, *Un document sur le concile di Nicée?* RSPh 50 (1966) 615-627; A. Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, CSCO 128, Subs. 3, Louvain 1951, 40; J.M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 370, Subs. 38, Louvain 1970, 125, note 60; C.B. Welles et al., *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, V/1, New Haven 1959, 73-74; M.E. Boismard, *Le Diatessaron: de Tatien à Justin*, Études Bibliques n.s. 15, 1992; P. Bruns, *Aithallahas Brief über den Glauben. Dokument frühsyrischen Theologie*, OC 76 (1992) 46-73; W. Petersen, *Diatessaron*, in *Anchor Dict. of the Bible*, II (1992) 189-190; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Édesse: la première philosophie syriaque*, Paris 1992, 21, 23 and 123; P. Bruns, *Brief Aithallahas, des Bischof von Edessa (Urhai) an die Christen des Perserlandes über den Glauben*, OC 77 (1993) 120-136; C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron*, Manchester-Oxford 1993, JSS Suppl. 2; T. Baarda, *Essays on the Diatessaron*, Kampen 1994; J.P. Lyon, *Syriac Gospel Translations*, Louvain 1994, CSCO 548, Subs. 88; W. Petersen, *Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, Leiden 1994, VC Suppl. 25; Id., *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, in *The Text of the New Testament*, eds. B.D. Ehrman - M.W. Holmes, Grand Rapids 1995, 777-796; I. Ramelli, *Alcune osservazioni sulle origini del Cristianesimo nelle regioni ad est dell'Eufrate*, in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medioevale*, eds. R.B. Finazzi - A. Valvo, Alexandria 1998, 209-225.

M. van Esbroeck - I. Ramelli

AKSUM (Axum). Town in N *Ethiopia, capital of the first Ethiopian kingdom, founded mid-2nd c. AD or shortly before. From numismatic and epigraphic evidence we can reconstruct the approximate chronology of the Aksumite dynasty—which seems to have ended toward the beginning of the 8th c.—and with it also the chronology of the penetration of Christianity in Ethiopia. The Aksumite period included the first phase of Ethiopian literature (4th-6th c.) in which many works were translated from the Greek.

J.T.B. Bent, *The Sacred City of the Ethiopians*, London 1896; *Deutsche Aksum-Expedition* (4 vols.), Berlin 1913; R. Pankhurst, *The Greek Coins of Aksum*: Abba Salama 6 (1975) 70-83; S.C.H. Munro-Hay, *The Munro-Hay Collection of Aksumite Coins* (Supplement . . . to the Annals 48), Naples 1986; S.C.H. Munro-Hay et al., *Excavations at Aksum: An Account of Research at the Ancient Ethiopian Capital Directed in 1972-4 by the Late Dr Neville Chittick* (Memoirs of the British Institute in Eastern Africa 10), London 1989; S.C.H. Munro-Hay, *Aksum: An African Civilisation of Late Antiquity*, Edinburgh 1991; E. Bernand - A.J. Drewes - R. Schneider, *Recueil des inscriptions de l'Éthiopie des périodes pré-axoumite et axoumite.* Introduction de Fr. Anfray. I: *Les documents*; II: *Les planches*; III: *Traductions et commentaires. A. Les inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1991-2000; D.W. Phillipson, *Ancient Ethiopia: Aksum: Its Antecedents and Successors*, London 1998; R. Fattovich et al., *The Aksum Archaeological Area: A Preliminary Assessment* (Oriental University Institute. Department of studies and research on Africa and the Arab countries. Archaeological Laboratory. Working paper 1), Naples 2000; *Archaeology at Aksum, Ethiopia, 1993-7*, by D.W. Phillipson et al. (Memoirs of the British Institute in Eastern Africa 17; Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London 65), London 2000.

S.J. Voicu

ALARIC I (ca. 370–410). King of the *Visigoths. After commanding the *Goths who lived as *foederati* in *Moesia and *Pannonia, on the death of *Theodosius (395), as king of the Visigoths, he invaded *Macedonia and Greece. The emperor *Arcadius allowed him to live in Illyricum, naming him *magister militum*. A few years later, Alaric tried to invade *Italy but was severely defeated by the supreme commander of the imperial troops, *Stilicho, at Pollentia in Piedmont (402) and at *Verona (403). On the death of Stilicho in 408, Alaric returned to Italy, advancing as far as the gates of *Rome, which he sacked on 24 August 410 (Orosius, *Hist. Adv. Pag.*, 39,1; 40,1). The event made a great impression on his contemporaries, esp. St. *Augustine, who was inspired to conceive the great design of the *City of God* (*Retract.* 2, 43, 1). Alaric then proceeded toward S Italy, intending to go to *Africa, but died shortly thereafter, on the Busento River near the city of Cosenza.

P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris [2]1964, 31-77; E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, 2, *De l'avènement de Dioclétien (284) à l'occupaton germanique de l'Empire romain d'Occident (debut du VI^e^ siècle)*, II, Paris 1979, 451-464; G. Albert, *Goten in Kostantinopel, Untersuchungen zur oströmischen Geschichte um das Jahr 400 n. Chr*, Paderborn 1984; B. Luiselli, *Storia culturale dei rapporti tra mondo romano e mondo germanico*, Rome 1992, 384, 419-421, 556-557; L. Gatto, *Storia di Roma nel Medioevo*, Rome 2000, 56-64.

G. Pilara

ALBAN of Verulamium (d. 303). The first testimony of Christianity in *Britain, with high probability, may be the tradition surrounding the martyrdom of

Alban at Verulamium. Alban, *protomartyr Angliae* according to *Bede's account (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* I, 7) which certainly draws on earlier writers, in particular *Constantius of Lyons and *Gildas, is thought to have been born at Verulamium—modern St. Albans in Hertfordshire—of a well-to-do pagan Roman family. With the outbreak of the persecution of *Diocletian and *Maximian, he is said to have given refuge to a Christian priest in his house; impressed by his doctrine and piety, Alban was *baptized by him. The Roman governor, meanwhile, informed of the presence and preaching of a Christian priest at Verulamium (from the 12th c. considered to have been the cleric Amphibalus), had him sought out. Discovering that he was at Alban's house, he sent soldiers to arrest him; fooled by a disguise, they brought Alban instead. His true identity then discovered, and refusing to offer sacrifice to the pagan gods, he was beaten, imprisoned and decapitated.

Miraculous episodes before the *martyrdom showed Alban's holiness: needing to cross a bridge packed with people who had come to view the supreme sacrifice to reach the place of execution, and so as not to unduly delay his ascent to heaven, he prayed for the waters of the river to part, leaving a dry passage for him and the crowd. The executioner was converted by this miracle and was himself martyred along with Alban. Arriving at the hill designated as the place of martyrdom, recorded in the account as Holmhurst Hill (perhaps identifiable with the modern town of Holywell Hill), and extremely thirsty, he prayed to the Lord for a gush of water to quench his thirst, which happened immediately. Finally, as Alban's severed head lay on the ground, the new executioner's eyes fell out, according to a *topos* common to many other *passiones*.

Bede's date of 303 for the martyrdom is unlikely, since Diocletian's persecution did not extend to Britain, and thus some modern scholars have considered the account to be the fruit of the imagination of ancient *hagiographers, even to the point of denying the saint's existence; many others have tried to place the martyrdom in the 3rd c. In any event, Alban can be considered to have fallen victim to an unknown local persecution of the same time, given that his cult must have existed very early; indeed, there are various attestations long before Bede. In 429, e.g., according to the *Chronicon Integrum* of *Prosper of Aquitaine (PL 51, 595), in a climate of frequent contact between the island and the continental *Gallic world, St. *Germanus bishop of Auxerre and St. *Lupus bishop of Troyes were called to Britain by their brothers to combat the *Pelagian *heresy widespread on the island. After successfully opposing the heretics and before returning to their country, they visited Alban's tomb to give thanks; the visit to the holy place, already the destination of many pilgrimages, was certainly propitious for the two Gallic bishops, who, thanks to the martyr, faced the return trip to *Gaul with absolute tranquility. A few years later Gildas recounts the martyrdom (*De excidio et conquestu Britanniae* 10-11); *Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of *Poitiers, in describing the celestial court mentions Alban as a glorious representative of Britain (*Carmina*, VIII, 3, v. 155); and a *passio* in his honor had already been composed in Gaul in the first half of the 6th c. Well into the Middle Ages, thanks in particular to the writings of Matthew of *Paris, *monachus ecclesiae Sancti Albani* as he called himself, the story of Alban spread widely and his cult reached beyond the British Isles.

A further confirmation of the antiquity of the cult, and a testament to the truth of the martyr's existence, is the fact that Germanus's biography tells us absolutely nothing about him, leaving us to understand that he must have been well known to his readers and required no clarifying information. According to a late medieval tradition considered doubtful by many modern critics, Offa, king of Mercia (d. 796), after the discovery of Alban's relics (forgotten following a supposed destruction of the site by Saxon invaders), founded beside the martyr's church (which already existed at the time of Bede's account, and according to whom was the place of many conversions and miracles of every kind) an excellent *Benedictine *monastery that later developed into the great abbey of St. Albans. Below the present-day cathedral of St. Albans, therefore, are presumed to be the Roman structures of the old martyrial *memoria* of Alban, i.e., the church visited by Germanus in 429 and later recorded by Bede. Archaeological excavations, while not yet having directly documented the existence of the primitive church—probably completely obliterated by the construction of the Norman cathedral—have in fact unearthed a vast late-Roman necropolis which could testify to the presence of the old martyrial *memoria* outside the walls of Verulamium, dedicated to Alban and quickly transformed, at first into a cemetery, according to a well-known custom in the ancient world of the desire of the faithful to be near the venerated saint, and later into a genetic center, from which the medieval city got its origins.

It should also be noted that the saint, depicted iconographically as a Roman soldier armed with sword and cross, or more often as one carrying his own head, is often confused with Albin, a Roman martyr venerated in *Germany; also, the title con-

ferred on him of *protomartyr Anglorum* must be simply accepted as an anachronism, since, as is known, the Angles invaded the territory of ancient Britain only much later.

Analyses of the literary sources and recent bibl. in M. Ghilardi, *Egregium Albanum fecunda Britannia profert. Albano e i primi santi della Britannia romana:* RomBarb 17 (2002) 1-18.

M. Ghilardi

ALBANIA of Caucasus. A territory corresponding to present-day N Azerbaijan and S Dagestan. Strabo and Latin authors speak of a kingdom of Albania, conquered by Pompey in 67/66 BC, but from the 3rd c. under the influence of the *Sassanid kingdom. According to the tradition, Albania knew the Christian religion early: Moses of Outi (ed. C.J.F. Dowsett) specifies that Elisaeus, a disciple of *Thaddaeus, was the region's first bishop, ordained at *Jerusalem, though in fact we have no precise data earlier than the 4th c. Notable among the first *catholicoi* was Gregory, nephew of St. *Gregory the Illuminator (see *Faustus of Byzantium, in Langlois, *Collection*, I, 213). A later bishop of the region was present at the Council of *Seleucia in 421, and still later the Albanians participated at the Council of *Vagharshapat, where they officially embraced *monophysitism. From the time of the conversion of the *Huns to Christianity, due to the work of bishop Israel (late 7th c.), the Albanian church shared the fortunes of the *Armenian church. The sources (Moses of Outi) record, if only with sparse notes, the first church buildings established in the region, including the Church of Amaraz, the *metropolitan see, built by the *catholicos Gregory. Surviving *archaeological evidence, like the sources, is scant: it includes the complex at Supagvlane, with an older, small single-aisled basilica datable to the 5th–6th c., and a similar later building (8th–9th c.); and the basilica of Kum (6th c.), with three aisles divided by pillars and cross-transepts: this building, related to Armenian churches like Tekon and Ereruk (see K.V. Trever, *Osservazioni*, 297ff.), also has specific points of contact with a type of building created in neighboring *Georgia, the so-called three-church basilica (see in particular Zegani, 7th c.). The most important building from the perspective of art history, however, is the church near the village of Lekit in N Azerbaijan, a tetraconch with ambulatory closely resembling Zvant'noc; like Zvant'noc, it also forms part of a vast complex, of which there are considerable remains. It is built of stones from the riverbed, laid in regular courses, a technique used in that region; the outer wall is modulated with blind arcades, similar to Zvartnots and Bana. Unlike Zvartnots, Lekit has two apsed rooms projecting from the NE and SE corners, which is similar to Bana, except that in the latter the (four) rooms are within the perimeter of the building. The complete absence of literary and epigraphic sources is a serious obstacle to a more profound understanding of the building, esp. regarding the date of its foundation and its precise *liturgical functions: the attribution of this building to the time of Juansher, prince of Albania (637–638/680–681), is entirely hypothetical, even if, according to Kleinbauer (*Zvart'noc*, 253-54), there is a clear dependence on Zvartnots, the date of which (641–661) could constitute a *terminus post quem*. For the period in question, the architectural evidence of Albania is truly scant; nevertheless, the surviving documents allow us to specify, with due reserve, the many points of contact with the contemporary artistic cultures of Armenia and Georgia, which bordered and had close relations with Albania, and esp. Armenia, to which the Albanian church was linked for a long time. A particular aspect of Albanian culture is its remarkable silverwork, esp. dishes and amphorae, many of which are dated to the 6th and 7th c. and whose workmanship and decorative repertoire show a solid assimilation of *Sassanid and Bactrian traditions.

V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, Paris 1867 (2 vols.); DTC 1,1888-1968; K.V. Trever, *Osservazioni sulla storia e la cultura dell'Albania del Caucaso* (in Russian), Moscow 1959; C.J. Dowsett, *The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Moyses Dasxuranci*, London 1961; V. Ousseinov, *Storia dell'architettura dell'Azerbaigian*, Moscow 1963 (in Russian); E.W. Kleinbauer, *Zvart'nots and the Origins of Christian Architecture in Armenia*: Art Bulletin 26 (1972) 245-262, in particular 253-254; C. Toumanoff, *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire del Caucasie chrétienne* (*Arménie - Géorgie - Albanie*), Rome 1974; *The Albanians and Their Territories*, ed. by the Academy of Sciences of the P.S.R. of Albania 1985; LTK[3] 1,321; ODB 1,53; N. Garsoïan, *L'église armenienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, Lovanii 1999; Dizionario Enc. dell'Oriente cristiano, Rome 2000, 24; M. Van Esbroeck, *Albanien* (*in Kaukasien*): RAC Suppl. 1/2 (2001) 257-266.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ALBINA (4th c.). Current prosopographical studies distinguish two 4th-c. personages with the name of Albina. The first (d. 393) is, according to *Jerome, a widow originally from an illustrious family of consuls and prefects who dedicated herself to perpetual chastity and the *ascetic life, refusing a second marriage after the death of her husband (*Ep.* 127, 1-4). She is the mother of *Marcella and came to know Jerome at *Rome in 382, quickly winning his confidence, so much so that he thought her worthy of

becoming his spiritual mother (*Ep.* 32, 5). She frequented the circle of women of the high aristocracy who had been converted to Christianity and accompanied Jerome to the Orient in 385. Told of her death, probably at Rome in 393, Jerome wrote a eulogy to her before finishing his *Commentary on Galatians.*

The other Albina (b. before 385, d. 431), whom *Augustine calls *famula Dei* (*Ep.* 124), is the sister of Rufius Antonius Agrypnius *Volusianus and daughter of Ceionius Rufius Albinus (prefect of Rome, 389-391), a pagan. She married a Christian senator, Publicola, son of *Melania the elder; to them was born *Melania the younger. In 400 Albina was convinced by her mother-in-law, who had come to *Italy from *Jerusalem, to live a more radical Christianity. From that moment she began an ascetic life with her daughter, distributing her goods to the poor, especially after the death of her husband in 407. During that year she went to Nola for the celebration of the feast of St. *Felix, where she met *Paulinus, who praised her virtue. With the arrival of *Alaric (410), she went to *Africa with her daughter Melania and son-in-law *Pinianus and had contact with some African bishops such as Augustine of *Hippo, *Aurelius of Carthage and *Alypius of *Thagaste. She used the proceeds of the sale of her property in Africa to benefit the founding of *monasteries, especially the two monasteries of Thagaste. The difficulties that arose during the oath of Pinianus at the basilica of Hippo in spring 411 notwithstanding, Augustine considered her always worthy of respect and affection, writing: "It is right fo me to console rather than to increase the sorrows of your soul (which, as you have written, you are unable to express), in order to cure you of your suspicions—if it is possible for me to do so—instead of further disturbing your holy heart, consecrated to God, by voicing indignation over what I have suffered in this matter" (*Ep.* 126, 1). In 417 she left for *Palestine, making a stop at *Alexandria, where she was received by the bishop *Cyril and listened to the teaching of the abbot Nestoro. She arrived at Jerusalem, from where she informed Augustine on the events regarding *Pelagius; Augustine responded by dedicating to her, Melania and Pinianus the *De gratia Christi.* She distributed what remained of her goods to the poor, dedicating her life to works of charity until her death in 431; she was buried on the Mount of Olives. Albina was part of the generation of the first women of the Roman aristocracy converted to Christianity. One sees in her, as in many other women of the period, how the worldly life was supplanted by the religious life.

PCBE 2, 74-77; T. Špidlík, *Albina*, BS 1 (1961) 719; L. Mirri, *La dolcezza nella lotta: donne e ascesi secondo Girolamo*, Magnano (BI) 1996; P. Laurence, *Jérôme et le nouveau modèle féminin. La conversion à la "vie parfaite,"* Paris 1997; Id., *Albine. La conversion d'une aristocrate romaine au "sanctum propositum"*: CrS 20 (1999) 257-274.

M.W. Libambu

ALDHELM (639–709). The first Anglo-Saxon literary personality. Born ca. 640 into the royal family of Wessex, he studied first with the Irish Maeldubh, then with *Hadrian of Canterbury, then again with Maeldubh. He was a monk, then priest, of the abbey of Mahmesbury, where he became abbot in 676. He was bishop of Sherborne in 705, though retaining direction of the abbey, and died 25 May 709. His writings show his principal interests to have been literary, something exceptional in that age. They include five *carmina ecclesiastica* in hexameters, proposed as inscriptions for the dedication of churches, and *De virginitate,* a topical eulogy of the celibate life written first in verse and then again in prose, and esp. *De metris et aenigmatibus ac pedum regulis,* written ca. 695 and dedicated to King Aldfrid of Northumbria. More than just a work on metric, its complicated and bizarre course is carefully worked out in alternating prose and verse, with alternating subjects. Noteworthy is an ample treatment of the symbolic value of the number 7, an explanation of the prosody of the hexameter, a block of 100 riddles in hexameters of various length, and finally more treatment of metric and prosody. This work is entirely typical of Aldhelm: literary ambition, Irish-derived whimsy, mastery of the written word which becomes a real game of skill and obscure complexity, the prevalent interest in grammar and metric, the considerable cultural and scholarly base, and the desire to display all this knowledge in the most conspicuous way possible. Some of his letters remain, in whose formal complication one sees the *ingenium* of the author and the norm of the genre. One letter defends *Roman customs regarding *Easter and the *tonsure, while the others are literary: in *Ep.* 5 Aldhelm says that *Britain can now produce teachers no less capable than the Irish.

CPL 1331-1339; PL 89, 63-314; MGH, AA, 15; H. Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, London [3]1991, 192-204; A. Orchard, *After Aldhelm: The Teaching and Transmission of the Anglo-Latin Hexameter*: Journal of Medieval Latin 2 (1992) 96-133; Id., *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8), Cambridge 1994.

M. Simonetti

ALEATORIBUS, De. This short work is a sermon against playing dice, considered an idolatrous practice and immoral because of its consequences. The author says that, as a pastor, he is obligated to address the faithful severely: the *sacerdotalis dignitas* includes pastoral responsibility. He justifies the condemnation of the game with biblical and extrabiblical citations; he also rebukes pastors who too easily forgive the faults of sinners. In 1888 Harnack (p. 387) attributed it to Pope *Victor (189–199); later, in 1900, he ascribed it (pp. 112-116) to a *Novatian antipope at *Rome. Koch (pp. 58-67) refers it to an *African bishop ca. 300; Daniélou (pp. 11, 14-15, 59, 93-96, 98) to a bishop of Rome, late 2nd c.; Miodoński to Pope *Miltiades (310–314), etc. The author of *De aleat.* cites the *Shepherd* of *Hermas as Scripture: this is not a certain indication that it precedes the Muratorian *Canon, which excludes the *Shepherd* from the NT canon; it could indicate that in the author's milieu it was considered canonical. Noteworthy is the reference in *De aleat.* 4 to a Latin translation of the **Didache* (15, 3-4): *et in doctrinis apostolorum*. The conflict of the *baptized Christian with the devil is the dominant theme. Other themes include the indwelling of the *Holy Spirit (*De aleat.* 3) and the scandal of returning to a sinful life by a baptized Christian ("We have received the Holy Spirit as a guest in our hearts. Do not sadden the one who dwells in you" *[hospitium]*; *De aleat.* 3). Both this sermon and the *De centesima* cite 1 Cor 3:16: "You are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God lives in you." It is a scandal that a Christian would return to a sinful life (*De aleat.* 5). Related to the discussion of authorship are the questions of time and place. For Daniélou the sermon is one of the first witnesses of the earliest phase of Roman Christian culture in that it provides proofs of old Latin translations or of original texts (p. 94); for other recent scholars (e.g. Marin), the notable convergence with *Cyprian, though occasional, leads to the conclusion that the anonymous author is an *African that lived after Cyprian. The date is usually held to be ca. 300 (see CPPM 2,3228).

CPL 60; CPPM 2,3228 (1,4560); PL 4, 827-836; PLS I, 49; CSEL 3,3 (1871) 92-104; A. von Harnack, *Der pseudocyprianische Traktat* De aleatoribus, *die älteste lateinische christliche Schrift, ein Werk des römischen Bischofs Viktor I* (*saec. II*), TU 5,1, Leipzig 1888; Id., *Zu Pseudocyprian, Adv. Aleat.* 1 (p. 93, 1f., ed. Hartel), in TU 20, 3, Leipzig 1900, 112-116; H. Koch, *Zur Schrift Adversus aleatores*, Festgabe K. Müller, Tübingen 1922, 58-67; M. Pellegrino, *De aleatoribus*: EC 4 (1950) 1250; J. Quasten, *Patrologia*, I, Turin 1971 (repr. 1980), 599; J. Daniélou, *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, London - Philadelphia 1977, 93-98 et passim; *The Oxford Dict. of Christian Church*, Oxford [3]1997, 458; M. Marin, *Problemi di ecdotica ciprianea. Per un'edizione critica dello speudociprianeo de aleatoribus*: VetChr 20 (1983) 141-239; Id., *Citazioni bibliche e parabibliche nel "De aleatoribus " pseudo-ciprianeo*: AnSE 5 (1988) 169-184; T. Carrol Scott, *An Early Church Sermon Against Gambling:* (*CPL 60*): Second Cent 8 (1991) 83-95 (with Eng. tr.).

R.J. De Simone

ALEPPO (Beroea). Caravan city of N *Syria, situated in the province of Syria on the road from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean. With *Damascus, Aleppo is one of the oldest cities known to us. It is mentioned in the Ebla texts. From the archives of Mari and Alalakh we learn that already in the 18th c. BC it was the capital of the kingdom of Jamchad, which included almost all of N Syria. Called Khalbou in hieroglyphic texts, in cuneiform inscriptions it is recorded as Halboun. The Arabic name of the city, Halab, derives from this earliest name. Coming under the *Macedonian rule of Seleucus Nicator (312–281 BC), the city was enlarged and assumed the new name of Beroea, like the Macedonian city. With the arrival of the Arabs, however, it reverted to the original name. The name Beroea appears in 2 Macc 13:4-8 with regard to Menelaus, who had usurped the supreme pontificate and was condemned to death by Antiochus Eupator. In the *Roman period, Beroea became part of the province of Syria (Coele-Syria). Repeatedly conquered by the *Persians (540 and 608–609), it came permanently under Arab rule in 637.

Regarding the Christian presence in Aleppo, the sources go back as far as the 4th c., but there is no doubt that Christianity was established there very early, perhaps even 1st c., following the Christian dispersion after the siege of *Jerusalem. Supporting this possibility is a fact reported to us by *Jerome, in which he mentions the existence of a gospel of Matthew in Hebrew which Jerome himself attests to be in the possession of the *Nazoreans living at Aleppo, from whom he was able to obtain it so as to make a copy (*De vir. ill.* III).

The church of Aleppo is given a clear profile through its first bishop known to us: Eustathius of Side, who governed the community of Aleppo until 323–324, when he was transferred to the patriarchal see of *Antioch. *Monarchian in tendency, he had a central role at the Council of *Nicaea as an intransigent opponent of the *Arians. Caught up in the anti-Nicene reaction, he was exiled. Also notable among the city's ecclesiastical personalities was *Acacius. Born ca. 340, while still young he chose the *monastic life. A correspondent of *Basil of Caesarea and *Epiphanius of Salamis, who wrote the *Panarion* at his request, Acacius at first entertained friendly relations with *John Chrysostom, though for personal

reasons later became his bitter enemy. Ordained bishop by *Meletius in 378, who sent him to Rome to Pope *Damasus to seek a resolution to the schism of Antioch, he participated at the Council of *Constantinople (381). Though very old, he had an essential role in the mediation between *Cyril of Alexandria and *John of Antioch, resulting in the 433 "formula of union."

Succeeding Acacius as bishop was Theoctistus, to whom *Theodoret of Cyrrhus wrote inviting him to receive at Beroea the Christians fleeing the *Vandal invasion of *Africa (*Letter 32* and *135*). Theodoret also tells us in the *History of the Monks* that two noblewomen he knew at Beroea were dedicated to a heroic *ascetical life of enclosure and *penance. According to *Anastasius I (6th c.), Beroea assumed the title of *metropolitan church; it figures in the Council of Constantinople of 536 under this title. Installed at Aleppo during the following centuries were bishops of various confessions and rites which are still present there: *Jacobites, *Melkites, *Armenians, *Maronites, Latins. Bishops known to us are Eustathius, Cyrrhus, Anatolius (363), Theodotus (ca. 374), Acacius (378), Theoctistus (438) and Peter (511).

DHGE 1, 101-116; 8,887-888; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945, 179-181; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monferrato 1994, 110-116; Fedalto 2, 693-699.

L. Padovese

ALEXANDER I, pope (105–115). Succeeded *Evaristus, perhaps in 105 (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 3,3; Eus., *HE* IV, 1; V, 6,4). The LP presents him as *natione romanus,* of the V Augustea region, saying he was *martyred by decapitation (115?) and buried on the Via Nomentana, near the place of his death. The writings attributed to Alexander, among which are some additions to the canon of the *Mass, are apocryphal (Jaffé, 24-30; see DTC I, 709).

LP I, XCI-XCII, 54-55, 127; O. Marucchi, *Il cimitero e la basilica di S. A. al VII miglio della via Nomentana*, Rome 1922; DHGE 2, 708-709 (A. Dufourcq); BS I, 792-801 (E. Josi - G. Lucchesi); LTK³ 1, 367 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 213-15 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

ALEXANDER of Alexandria (d. 17 April 328). Bishop of *Alexandria (312–328), from the outset fought against the schism of the *Melitians of Lycopolis, which broke out at the time of persecution that claimed the life of his predecessor, *Peter I of Alexandria (d. 311). By the time of the first ecumenical council, the Council of *Nicaea (325), this *schism involved almost half of the episcopal sees juridically dependent on Alexander, and priests and deacons of Alexandria itself. Canon 6 of Nicaea reaffirmed the prerogatives of the Alexandrian see over *Egypt proper, the *Thebaid, *Libya and *Pentapolis. It does not seem that the situation changed much by the time of Alexander's death, 17 April 328. It was in this context, moreover, that the *Arian crisis began. Around 318, Alexander was opposed by an ideological party formed in his own church through the work of one of his most influential priests, Arius, to whom he had entrusted the parish of Baucalis. After a period of discussion and debates, the bishop gathered a synod of 100 bishops (319) that excommunicated Arius and five other priests, six deacons and two bishops. The encyclical letter *Henos sômatos*, sent by Alexander after the synod "to the dear and most venerated fellow-ministers of the Catholic church everywhere," reacted against the interference of *Eusebius of Nicomedia and other Eastern bishops in the Arian affair; these had offered support to those excommunicated at Alexandria. Arius himself makes reference to the reason for the conflict in a letter to Eusebius, saying of Alexander: "He has thrown us out of the city . . . because we do not speak as he does in the public declaration where he says: Always God, always Son. Together Father, together Son" (Opitz, *Urkunde* 1). It is difficult to ascertain the exact reason for Arius's outrage. Alexander clearly insisted on the eternity of the divine generation and on the substantial unity of the Son, as another dogmatic letter of his shows, sent to *Alexander of *Thessalonica in 324. It is also certain that Arius reacted by fully confirming his *christological theses, known esp. through extracts of his *Thalia,* a small treatise written at Alexandria prior to his exile that marked a literal and doctrinal innovation in the debate between the parties of Alexandrian theologians, in which Alexander intervened by formulating his doctrine of the Son of God. The excessive originality of Arius's theses gained them no credit with the Eastern bishops, who nonetheless protected him. Alexander's ideas prevailed in the Synod of *Antioch (324), however, and later at Nicaea (325). Anti-Arian details of the Nicene formula of faith were not beyond debate; they are properly understood according to Alexander's theology, though he had never used the word **homoousios*. During this doctrinal debate, which took up the last 10 years of his episcopate, Alexander found a faithful and intelligent ally in his future successor, the young deacon *Athanasius. In the latter's *Against the Arians*, Alexander's essential teaching can be found, without,

however, reversing the roles and attributing to the deacon an active part in writing Alexander's dogmatic letters, as has sometimes been done. Some MS texts attribute to Alexander a sermon, *On the Soul and Body and on the Passion of the Lord*, in *Syriac and *Coptic translation. Its authenticity is strongly contested, or at least it appears dubious; it contains traces of a homily by *Melito of Sardis.

CPG II, 2000-2017; PG 18, 571-582; H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* III, I, 6 (Urkunde 4a); 6-11 (Urk. 4b); 19-29 (Urk. 14); 29-31 (Urk. 15); 31 (Urk. 16); A. Harnack, *Geschichte d. alt. Literatur*, I, Leipzig 1893 (²1958) 449-451; E. Schwartz, *Die Quellen über den melitianischen Streits*, NGWG, 1905, 164-187 = Gesam. Schr. III (1959) 87-116; Id., *Die Dokumente des arianischen Streits bis 325*, NGWG, 1905, 257-299 = Gesam. Schr.III (1959) 117-168; *Das antiochenische Synodal Schreiben von 325*, NGWG, 1908, 305-374 = *partim* Gesam. Schr.III (1959) 169-187; P.H. Kettler, *Den melitianische Streit in Aegypten*: ZNTW 35 (1936-37) 155-193; A. Aranda Lomena, *El Espíritu Santo en los Símbolos de Cirilo di Jerusalém y Alejandro di Alejandría*: ScTh 5 (1973) 223-273; W. Schreemelcher, *Der Sermo "De anima et corpore" ein Werk Alexanders von Alexandrien*, Festschrift f. G. Dehn (1957) 119-143; A. Martin, *Athanase et les Mélitiens (325-335)*, in Ch. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (1974) 31-61; E. Bellini, *Alessandro e Ario. Un esempio di conflitto tra fedi e ideologia. Documenti della prima controversia ariana*, Milan 1974; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; BBKL 1,108-109; N.H. Baynes, *Sozomen "Ecclesiastica Historia," I. 15*: JTS 49 (1948) 165-168; O. Skarsaune, *A Neglected Detail in the Creed of Nicaea (325)*: VChr 41 (1987) 34-54; G.C. Stead, *Athanasius' Earliest Written Work*: JTS 39 (1988) 76-91; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie e l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328-373)*, Paris 1996; M. Vinzent, *Die Entstehung des "Römischen Glaubensbekentniss,"* in *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis*, ed. W. Kinzig et al., Berlin 1999, 185-409; Storia del christianesimo. 2, see Index p. 933.

Ch. Kannengiesser

ALEXANDER of Antioch. Bishop of *Antioch (413–421). Prior to his election he led an *ascetic life. Essentially he ended the long *schism of Antioch by persuading the old partisans of *Eustathius and *Paulinus, who until then had refused any proposal of union, to rejoin the Catholic community; only a small group refused. In a spirit of unity, he also reintroduced *John Chrysostom's name in the distichs. Alexander's election was for this reason also recognized by Innocent of Rome, whom Alexander had asked to intervene against the Cypriots, who wanted to terminate their juridical dependence on Antioch; pope Innocent wrote to the Cypriots on this matter (PL 22, 427).

EC 1, 782; DCB 1, 82; F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antiochie (IVᵉ-Vᵉ siècle)*, Paris 1905, 292ff.; DTC 2,2432-2433.

M. Simonetti

ALEXANDER of Apamea (d. after 434). Suffragan of *John, *patriarch of *Antioch. He participated at the Council of *Ephesus (431) and with *Alexander of Hierapolis sought to delay its opening until the arrival of John of Antioch, against the contrary decision of *Cyril of Alexandria. He was among the signers of the statement against the deposition of *Nestorius and of Cyril's *excommunication. He himself was excommunicated in the fifth session of the council; when representatives of the various parties were sent to *Constantinople, he delegated his powers to Apringius of Chalcis. A brief letter of his of 434 to Alexander of Hierapolis survives in *Latin translation; in it he indicates a desire to meet, perhaps to convince him to enter into communion with John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria.

CPG 6390; PG 84, 746; ACO I, 4 (1922-1923), 89-90; DCB 1, 82-83; Hfl-Lecl II,1 (1908) 296.313-314; DHGE 2, 191.

F. Scorza Barcellona

ALEXANDER of Aphrodisias (2nd-3rd c.). *Aristotelian commentator and Peripatetic philosopher. That he lived between the late 2nd and early 3rd c. AD is evident from the fact that at the beginning of his writing *De fato* (p. 164,3, Bruns) he directly addresses the emperors Severus and Antoninus (i.e., *Septimius Severus and *Caracalla). A disciple of Aristocles and Sosigenes, he was not only Aristotle's most erudite commentator, whom later commentators—esp. Simplicius—referred to and drew on, but also the philosopher who, by developing certain points of Aristotle's thought, also influenced some exponents of *Neoplatonism, such as *Plotinus and Syrianus. (Porphyry, *Vita Plot.* 14,1: 15,13 Bréhier, mentions him as one of the authors read in Plotinus's courses.) His most distinctive original doctrine, to which some modern scholars such as Praechter, Wilpert and Walzer have drawn attention and on which Plotinus's conception of the second *hypostasis in part depends, is that of the active intelligence (νοῦς ποιητικός): combining the Aristotelian doctrines of book Δ of the *Metaphysics*, *De anima* III ch. 5, and *De gen. anim.* B, c. 3, 736b 27-28, Alexander identifies the νοῦς ποιητικός present in man—which Aristotle (*De an.* III c. 5,430 a 10-25) had defined as χωριστός ("separate"), ἀπαθής ("impassible"), ἀμιγής ("uncontaminated"), ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀΐδιον ("immortal and eternal") and in *De gen. anim.* B 736b 27-28 had considered divine and originating from outside—with the first principle, also called νοῦς in book Λ of the *Metaphysics;* only to the first principle are the attributes χωριστός,

ἀπαθής, ἀμιγής, ἀθάνατος, ἀΐδιον appropriate, used by Aristotle in *De an.* III c. 5 regarding human intelligence (see Alexander, *De anima* pp. 88,17–89,22 Bruns). This νοῦς ποιητικός is productive intelligence par excellence, since it is the cause of the existence of all beings (*De an.* 89,9-11). We are thus, on the one hand, very close to the Plotinian concept of νοῦς defined as "cause" (*Enn.* V, 1, 8: vol. V 25,4-26,1 Bréhier; V, 9, 3, vol. V 163, 25-26), and on the other to the Platonic doctrine of νοῦς-αἰτία, present in *Philebus* 30 c-d, and to the Platonic doctrine of the *summum bonum,* cause of the existence of the ideas (*Rep.* VI 509b).

As H. Armstrong has shown (*Les sources de Plotin*, Genève 1960, 408), two other doctrines which Alexander stressed and which also influenced the Plotinian concept of νοῦς are that of the complete identity between the divine thinking mind and the intelligible (see Aristotle, *Met.* Λ 1072b 21; Alexander, *De an.* 87,29-88,2 Bruns; *Mantissa* 108,7-8) and that of the divine mind which thinks itself (see Aristotle, *Met.* Λ 1072b 19-20, Alexander, *Mantissa* 109,4-7). Alexander's influence can also be discerned on a point of the Plotinian doctrine of ideas: both Plotinus and Alexander say that each intelligible being is endowed with mind (see *Enn.* V, 9, 8, vol. V 168,2-4 and Alexander, *Mantissa* 108,16-18). Alexander's surviving writings in the Greek text that have been edited are (1) commentary on the *Metaphysics;* only the commentary on books I-IV is authentic, while that on books E-Λ is spurious and later, perhaps attributable to the 11th-c. Byzantine commentator Michael of Ephesus, who appears in the title of the commentary on book E, present in the Paris codex. gr. 1876 (see Gercke, PWK I, 2, 1454-1455; Hayduck, CAG I, Berolini 1891, V-VII; Praechter in Überweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos*. I, Berlin 1926, 564; the authentic and spurious parts have been edited together by M. Hayduck, CAG I, Berolini 1891); (2) commentary on book I of the *Prior Analytics* (ed. M. Wallies, CAG II, I, Berolini 1883); (3) commentary on *Topics* (ed. M. Wallies, CAG II, II, Berolini 1891; the last four books seem to be a compendium, however, and contain interpolations [see Gercke PWK 1455]); (4) commentary on *De sensu* (ed. P. Wendland, CAG III, I, Berolini 1901); (5) commentary on *Meteorologica* (ed. M. Hayduck CAG III, II, Berolini 1899); (6) *De anima*, also preserved in a 14th-c. Hebrew version, which is in turn based on an Arabic version (see I. Bruns, *Suppl. Aristotel.* II, I, Berolini 1887, XIV-XV; ed. Bruns, op. cit., 1-100); (7) *Mantissa* (ed. I. Bruns, *Suppl. Aristotel.* II, I, Berolini 1887, pp. 181-186); (8) *Dubitationes et solutiones* in three books (ed. I. Bruns, *Suppl. Aristotel.* II, II, Berolini 1892, 1-116); (9) *Problemata ethica* in one book (ed. I. Bruns, *Suppl. Aristotel.* II, II Berolini 1892, 117-163; II Praechter, op. cit., 564, who doubts its authenticity); (10) *De fato*, against the rigid determinism of the Stoics (ed. I. Bruns, *Suppl. Aristotel.* II, II, Berolini 1892, 164-212); (11) *De mixtione* (ed. I. Bruns, *Suppl. Aristotel.* II, II, Berolini 1892, pp. 213-238).

Besides the commentary on books E-Λ of the *Metaphysics* mentioned above, the following are considered spurious: (1) commentary on *Sophistici elenchi* (ed. M. Wallies, CAG II, III, Berolini 1898), which in some codices (e.g. Paris. gr. 1972f. 761r, Vat. gr. 241f. 6r, see Wallies p. V) is attributed to Michael of Ephesus; (2) *Problemata physica* in four books (the first two were edited by I.L. Ideler, *Physici et medici Graeci minores*, I, Berolini 1841, pp. 3-80; the third and fourth by Usener, *Al. Aphrodis. quae feruntur problematorum liber III et IIII . . .* recensuit H. Usener, Diss. inaug. u. Progr. d. Joachimsth. Gymn. 4, Berlin 1859); (3) *De febribus* (ed. I.L. Ideler, *Physici et medici Graeci minores*, I, Berolini 1841, pp. 81-106). On the spurious origin of these three writings see Gercke, PWK I, 2, 1455 and Praechter, op. cit., 564.

On the oldest bibl., see JAW 96 (1899) 72-73 and P. Moraux, *Alexandre d'Aphrodise Exégète de la Noétique d'Aristote*, Liège-Paris 1942, 226-227.

Modern bibl.: C.A. Brandis, *Über die Reihenfolge der Bücher des aristotelischen Organons und ihre griechische Ausleger*, AAWB hist. phil. Kl. 1833, Berlin 1835, 278, 297-299; A. Gercke: PWK I, 2, 1453-1455; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, III, 1, Leipzig [5]1923, 817-831; K. Praechter in Überweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* I, Berlin 1926, 564-565; C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande* I: Berlin 1927, 620-626; P. Wilpert, *Die Ausgestaltung der aristotelischen Lehre vom Intellectus agens bei den griech. Kommentatoren und in der Scholastik des 13 Jahrhunderts*: BGPhM, Suppl. 3 (1935) 447-462; P. Moraux, *Alexandre d'Aphrodise Exégète de la Noétique d'Aristote*, Liège-Paris 1942; E. Montanari, *Per un'edizione del* περὶ κράσεως *di Alessandro di Afrodisia*: AATC 36 (1971) 17-58; B.C. Bazan, *L'authenticité du* De Intellectu *attribué à Alexandre d'Aphrodisie*: RPhL 71 (1973) 468-487; R. Walzer, *Aristotle's Active Intellect* νοῦς ποιητικός *in Greek and Early Islamic Philosophy*, in *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente*, Rome 1974, 428-430; B. Todd, *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics*: *A Study of the De mixtione*, Leiden 1976 (*Philosophia antiqua . . .* 28); R.W. Sharples, *Alexander of Aphrodisia: Scholasticism and Innovation*: ANRW II 36/2 (1987) 1176-1243; G. Movia (ed.), *Alessandro di Afrodisia e la "Metafisica" di Aristotele*, Milan 2003.

On the Arabic versions and their editions see esp. J. Freudenthal, *Die durch Averroes erhaltenen Fragmente Alexanden zur Metaphysik des Aristoteles*, AAWB hist. phil. Kl. 1884, Berlin 1885; A. Badawi, *Aristote chez les Arabes*, Le Caire 1947, 253-308; Id. *La transmission de la philosophie grecque au monde arabe*, Paris 1968, 121-165; Id. *Commentaires sur Aristote perdus en et autres épîtres*, Beirut 1971; J. Finnegan, *Texte arabe du* περὶ νοῦ

d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise, dû à Jshaq ibr Honein IX^e^ *siècle*: MUB 33 (1955) 157-202; *Al-Farabi et le περὶ νοῦ d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise, Mélanges L. Massignon*, Damas 1956-1957; H. Gätje: *Zur arabischen Überlieferung des Alexander von Aphrodisia*, ZDMG 116 (1966) 255-278; Id. *Die arabische Übersetzung der Schrift des Alexander von Aphrodisias über die Farbe*, NAWG philol. hist. Kl. 1967, 10.

On the Latin medieval versions and their editions see esp. C. Thurot, *Alexandre d'Aphrodisias. Commentaire sur le traité d'Aristote De sensu et sensibili édité avec la vieille traduction latine. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale* . . . 25, Paris 1875; L. Labowsky, *William of Mombike's Manuscript of Alexander of Aphrodisias*: MRS 5 (1961) 155-162; P. Thillet, *Alexandre d'Aphrodise De fato ad imperatores. Version de Guillaume de Moerbeke* [Etudes de philosophie médiévale 51], Paris 1963; A.J. Smet, *Alexandre d'Aphrodisias. Commentaire sun les météores d'Aristote. Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, Louvain-Paris 1968.

On the Greek, besides the above-cited editions of the works of Alexander, see also A. Wartelle, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs*, Paris 1963, 183.

S. Lilla

ALEXANDER of Constantinople (d. 337). Probably of peasant origin, bishop of *Byzantium for 23 years, succeeding Metrophanes (306–314). After his victory over *Licinius in 324, *Constantine promoted an oratorical contest between Bishop Alexander and the "Hellenes" of Byzantium, but a miracle silenced the latter (Teofane, *Chronography*, ed. C. de Boor 23,7). Alexander, at that time 86, was not a signatory of the Council of *Nicaea (325). A *Syriac copy exists, however, of the letter he sent at the beginning of that year to the Synod of *Antioch, confirming the canonical sanctions inflicted by Bishop *Alexander of Alexandria on *Arius and his followers (Opitz, *Urkunde* 18); it is known that Alexander of Byzantium remained a faithful follower of Nicaea. Alexander took the title of bishop of *Constantinople in 330 when Constantine inaugurated the new capital. In 335 he refused to readmit Arius to communion, locking himself in the Church of Peace (St. Irene) rather than yield. Arius died suddenly on the eve of his rehabilitation (Athanasius of Alexandria, *Letter on the Death of Arius*). After 330, Constantine enlarged the church of St. Irene and built the Church of the Apostles. Constantine died 22 May 337; Alexander, later the same year. He had designated Paul as his successor, but Paul's rivalry with *Macedonius, then a deacon, had the effect of favoring *Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was elected by a local synod celebrated at the initiative of *Constantius II, Constantine's successor in the Eastern part of the empire. In the *Life of the Fathers Metrophanes and Alexander* (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 256), Alexander is presented, with Alexander of Alexandria, as a hero of Nicaea; after the council, it shows him crossing *Thrace, Illyricum, Greece and the islands to preach the orthodox faith. According to *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Alexander of Constantinople was long considered to be the recipient of Alexander of Alexandria's dogmatic letter of 324 (Opitz, *Urkunde* 14); the letter was actually addressed to Bishop *Alexander of Thessalonica.

Socrates *HE* II, 7; Sozomen, *HE* III, 3; F. Fischer, *De patriarcharum constantinopolitanorum catalogo et de chronologia octo primorum patriarcharum*, Comm. philol. Ienenses 3, Leipzig 1894, 313ff.; W. Telfer, *Paul of Constantinople*: HTR43 (1950) 31-92; F. Winkelmann, *Die Bischöfe Metrophanes und Alexandros von Byzanz*: ByzZ 59 (1966) 47-71; G. Dragon, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; Storia del cristianesimo. 2, see Index, 933.

Ch. Kannengiesser

ALEXANDER of Cyprus (6th c.) Monk of *Cyprus, active probably second half 6th c. under *Justinian (527–565), author of a homily *De inventione crucis* (BHG 410-410 b,c) and of a *Laudatio Barnabae apostoli* (BHG 226). His dates have been disputed in the past: according to Baronius he lived late 5th c. (disputed by Tillemont); Combefis puts him under *Zeno (475–491) or shortly thereafter, while Fabricius, based on the erroneous attribution to him of the life of the *patriarch Nicephorus (806–815), considers him to be not before the 9th c.; others (see Ceillier) incline even to the 12th c. In the discourse *De inventione crucis,* composed for the feast of the exaltation of the cross (14 September), Alexander first expounds on religious events from the creation of the world to *Constantine the Great, interweaving history, legend and theology. An ἐνκώμιον follows on the finding of the true cross, handled according to the pattern of *Byzantine rhetoric. A *Georgian version of the homily is also preserved, as well as an old Russian version and an epitome (BHG 411; BHGn 411 b: PG 87, 3, 4077-4088). The *Laudatio Barnabae apostoli* (PG 87, 4087-4106, gives only the *Latin translation) was probably delivered at Salamis, where relics of the saint had been discovered; its purpose was to uphold the claims of the church of Cyprus to autocephaly. Alexander clearly knew the περίοδοι, a 5th-c. history of the saint's wanderings, and other sources close to the *martyr's own time.

CPG 7398-7400; PG 87, 3, 4015-4076, 4087-4106; AASS Iun. II (1698) 430-452; 3rd ed. 431-447; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 164; H. Delehaye, *Saints de Chypre*: AB 26 (1907) 236-237; P.C. Pennachini, *Discorso storico dell'invenzione della Croce del monaco Alessandro*, Grottaferrata 1913; S. Salaville, *Le moine Alexandre de Chypre* (VI^e^ siècle): EO 15 (1912) 134-137; Id.,

Alexandre: DHGE 2,191-193; Beck, *Kirche*, 399; see P. Allen, *The Sixth-Century Greek Homily: Problems and Approaches*, in *The Preacher and the Audience: Studies in Christian and Early Byzantine Homiletics*, ed. M.B. Cunningham - P. Allen, Leiden 1998; *Hagiographica Cypria: Sancti Barnabae laudatio auctore Alexandro monacho et Sanctorum Bartholomaei et Barnabae Vita e menologio imperiali deprompta*, editae curante P. Van Deun, [. . .] Turnhout 1993; Patrologia V, 243-244.

A. Labate

ALEXANDER of Hierapolis (d. ca. 434). Partisan of *Nestorius, took part in the Council of *Ephesus in 431, where he sided with *John of Antioch and the Eastern bishops. He did not accept the subsequent union of 433 between the those in the East and *Cyril and was exiled to *Egypt, where he died (ca. 434). 23 of his letters relating to the controversy survive.

CPG 6392-6419; PG 84, 659-798; DCB 1,83-85; Hfl-Lecl II 295ff.; BBKL I, 110.

M. Simonetti

ALEXANDER of Jerusalem (d. 250). Bishop of *Cappadocia. During a pilgrimage to *Jerusalem, he was induced by the people to stay as coadjutor and then successor to *Narcissus; it was unusual at that time for there to be two bishops in the same see. A confessor of the faith under *Septimius Severus (202), he died in prison at *Caesarea (Palestine) under *Decius (250). *Eusebius of Caesarea cites some letters to the Antinoïtes, to the Antiochenes (mentioning *Clement of Alexandria) and to *Origen, in which he alludes to his relations with *Pantaenus and Clement. He was friend and protector to Origen, whom he and *Theoctistius of Caesarea invited to preach while still a layman, drawing protest from *Demetrius of Alexandria; again with Theoctistus, he ordained Origen priest ca. 230, arousing a storm of protest against Origen in *Egypt. He established a Christian library at Jerusalem, then called Aelia. Clement dedicated a work to him. Origen, who preached in his presence the homily on the birth of Samuel, says of him: “He excels all of us in grace and kindness.” Feast 18 March in the West, 22 March among the Greeks.

CPG 1698-1701; Eusebius, *HE* VI, passim. Texts in A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung . . .* , Leipzig 1892, 505-507; A. Ehrhard, *Die griech. Patriarchal-Bibliothek von Jerusalem*: RQA 5 (1891) 217ff., 329ff., 383-384; 6 (1892) 339ff.; L. Duchesne, *L'Histoire ancienne de l'Église* I, Paris [3]1923, 438-439, 449, 458ff.; Bardenhewer II, 271ff.; DTC 1, 763ff.; LTK[3] 1,363-364; P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II[e] et III[e] siècles*, Paris 1961, 85ff., 105-137; Id., *Origène: sa vie et son œuvre*, Paris 1977.

H. Crouzel

ALEXANDER of Lycopolis (3rd-4th c.). According to *Photius (*Contra Manichaeos* 1,11), Alexander was bishop of *Lycopolis ([Assiut] Thebaid, *Egypt). In fact he was a *Neoplatonist, sympathetic to Christianity, who wrote ca. 300 an opusculus in 26 chapters titled *Contra Manichei opiniones*, an important source for knowledge of the spread of *Manicheism in Egypt and its methods of propaganda. Nothing in fact is known of Alexander, including whether he was a Christian. From his knowledge of Genesis and the gospels, and not of other texts, it has been conjectured that he was a Christian apostate (Edwards). The author of the work begins by affirming the simplicity of Christianity which, losing touch with its original experience, became embroiled in speculations which gave birth to rival sects and schools, with no possibility of arriving at truth (ch. 1). One of these was founded at the time of the emperor *Valerian by *Mani the Persian, who proposed two principles: God, the good, and matter, evil. Alexander thus considers Manicheism a deviation from Christianity, a *heresy. The two principles of the Manichean system are studied in light of the importance of the sun, the lunar phases and the stars. The Manicheans created an absurd myth: a subsistent matter engaged in a fight against the good, and a good God that, emanating its powers, fought in return; the world will be destroyed by *eschatological fire. Christ is Mind and suffered only in appearance. Alexander shows a good, though incomplete, knowledge of Manicheism. He appreciates Christian *ethics and its influence on simple people.

CPG 2,2510; PG 18, 409-448; A. Brinkmann, *Alexandri Lycopolitani, Contra Manichei opiniones*, Leipzig 1895, Stuttgart 1989; P.W. van der Horst - J. Mansfeld, *An Alexandrian Platonist Against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise “Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus,”* tr. with intro. and notes, Leiden 1974 (with Eng. tr.); A. Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis: Contre la doctrine de Mani*, ed., trans., Paris 1985 (with Fr. tr.); C. Riggi, *Una testimonianza del “kérygma” cristiano in Alessandro di Licopoli*: Salesianum 31 (1969) 561-568; M.J. Edwards, *A Christian Addition to Alexander of Lycopolis*: Mnemosyne 42 (1989) 483-487; A. Villey, *Controverses philosophiques à Assiout à la fin du III[e] siècle*, in *Deuxième journée d'études coptes*, Strasbourg 25 May 1984, Paris 1986, 23-28; G. Stroumsa, *Titus of Bostra and Alexander of Lycopolis: A Christian and a Platonic Refutation of Manichaean Dualism*, in *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, ed. R.T. Wallis & Jay Bregman, Albany, NY 1992, 337-349; P.W. Van der Horst, “*A Simple Philosophy*”: *Alexander of Lycopolis on Christianity*, in *Polyhistor: Fest. J. Mansfeld*, ed. K.A. Algra et al., Leiden 1996, 313-329; M.V. Cerruti, *Il mito manicheo tra universalismo e particolarismi regionali. La testimonianza di Alessandro di Licopodi*: Annali di Sc. Religiose 7 (2002) 225-258.

A. Di Berardino

ALEXANDER of Thessalonica (d. after 335). Bishop of *Thessalonica, first half 4th c. As a basically neutral prelate in the *Arian controversies, he was sent to take part in the Council of *Tyre of 335 (Eusebius, *De vita Constantini* IV,42, PG 20, 1193). During his episcopate he wrote to *Athanasius (*Ep. ad Athanasium*) regarding the case of a certain Arsenius, and to the imperial functionary Dionysius (*Ep. ad Dionysium*) to denounce the conspiracy against the *patriarch of *Alexandria by the Eusebian bishops present at the Council of Tyre of 335.

CPG 2123.18.30; Alexander of Thessalonica, in Athanasius, *Apologia contra arianos* 66 and 80, PG 25, 368 and 393; H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* III,I, Berlin-Leipzig 1934, 145, 160-161.

P. Marone

ALEXANDER SEVERUS (208–235). Son of Julia Mammaea, associated in power with his cousin *Heliogabalus, and left as sole emperor in 222 at approx. 14 years of age. He governed at first under the tutelage of his mother and with the help of a council of senators, including the jurist Ulpian. He gave precendence to civil power over the military, earning him the increasing hostility of the troops: in 235 he was assassinated by soldiers during a campaign defending the Rhine-Danube frontier. Alexander treated Christians benevolently: he even had several in his court and was a friend of Sextus *Julius Africanus, who dedicated his *Intarsi* (κεστοί) to him. The **Historia Augusta* (SHA, *Vita Alex.*, passim) tells us that he venerated a number of divinities, including Christ, in his *lararium*.

M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 239-246; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Rome-Bari 1976; E. dal Covolo, *I Severi e il cristianesimo*, Rome 1989, 74ff.; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; M. Christol, *L'empire romain du III[e] siècle. Histoire politique (192-325 après J.-C.)*, Paris 1997; A. Ziolkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000.

L. Navarra

ALEXANDER the Acoemete (d. ca. 430). Alexander's wanderings are known in some detail, though in some cases precise dates and places are difficult to establish, thanks to the biography written probably by one of his disciples, who has remained anonymous (PO VI, 658-701, ed. De Stoop); his last years are known to us from the lives of *Hypatius and Marcellus the Acoemete. Alexander was born mid-4th c. on an island in the Aegean Sea between Tenedos and Rhodes. After his literary formation at *Constantinople and experience at court during a military career, he left for *Syria (ca. 380) and stayed 7 years in a *monastery directed by an *archimandrite named Elias. Seeking a life even more in conformity with evangelical precepts, Alexander traveled throughout *Mesopotamia, and after various adventures provoked by his apostolic zeal (among them the destruction of pagan idols and a long discussion with Rabbula, the local precept, who in the end converted: this episode is recognized as an interpolation from the life of *Rabbula, bishop of *Edessa), he founded a monastery in an unidentified location on the right bank of the Euphrates, which quickly developed and very soon had 400 monks of various origins and languages (*Syrian, Greek, *Egyptian, *Roman). Again driven by his zeal for evangelization, he left with his most zealous disciples to Christianize Mesopotamia. He then went to *Palmyra and from there to *Antioch (where, according to the *Life*, he had previously been ca. 403 to incite the Christians to rebellion against the intruder Porphyrius). His extreme opinions angered the *patriarch *Theodotus and some civil authorities, and he was quickly expelled from the city. It seems he first took refuge at *Chalcis, then, leaving Syria, stopped at the monastery of Krithénion, where he found some of his old disciples who had remained faithful to the practice of continual *prayer. From there he departed with 24 companions, whom he led to *Constantinople. There, near the church of St. Mennas, he laid the foundations of a monastery where he could finally implement his ideas on the integral practice of evangelical precepts: absolute poverty, rejection of all manual labor, constant charity, the preaching apostolate and above all uninterrupted prayer or perpetual *doxology. This last characteristic earned him and his disciples the name of **acoemetae* (meaning "sleepless ones"; not because the monks went entirely without sleep but because they were divided into several choirs, who alternated so as to celebrate the *Laus Perennis* without interruption). The attractiveness of this new movement, as distinct from more traditional monastic practice, was quick to provoke jealousy, rancor and animosity toward Alexander, who, for his part, spared no criticism against those who did not share his point of view, be they religious or civil authorities. In 426 or 427 the same Theodotus of Antioch and other bishops, meeting at Constantinople, condemned the errors of the Euchites, or *Messalians, in a letter to the church of Pamphylia. Tillemont has related this fact to the trial which ended with Alexander being obliged to return to Syria and his monks to their monasteries of origin. Alexander had just passed the Bosporus and reached the town of Rufiananes when he was ambushed by order of Bishop

*Eulalius. He was taken in and cared for by Hypatius, the *hegumen of the monastery at Rufiananes, and after his recovery protected by the empress, he was able to found a new monastery at Gomon in *Asia, where the Bosporus meets the Black Sea. He died shortly later ca. 430. Alexander's biographer is realistic and objective, clearly articulating his spiritual ideals, his qualities and his virtues without overlooking the defects and excesses which led him to narrow and intransigent conceptions of the practice of the gospel: his biographer thus gives a strong impression of veracity. His document is moreover of great interest and fundamental importance for the information it offers on monastic traditions in Syria and Constantinople, both in the late 4th and the first half of the 5th c., esp. regarding the Acoemete movement.

BHG 47; DHGE 1, 274-282; PO 6, 645-657; BS 1, 766-768. DIP 1, 479-480; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, Louvain 1960, vol. II, 185-192.

J.-M. Sauget

ALEXANDRIA

I. City - II. School - III. Councils - IV. Archaeology.

I. City. The importance of Alexandria for the Christianity of the first centuries can be understood only in relation to the place of the metropolis in *Hellenistic culture and in the social and political life of the *Roman Empire. With *Athens and *Antioch, it was one of the three hubs of Greek-speaking culture and thus a primary center of philological, *philosophical and theological study. Greek-speaking Hebrew culture also arose and developed in Alexandria, producing the Septuagint and the work of *Philo. Socially and politically, Alexandria was a perfectly Greek island, deliberately created within the territory of the old *Egyptian Empire for the purpose (among others) of controlling the exploitation of the latter's agricultural and commercial riches in the best way possible. It was inherited by the Roman government as such, and it also sheltered a strong Jewish colony. Its relations with the Egyptian population of the Nile valley were consequently varied and complex, changing with different historical periods. Clearly Alexandria must have been an early target of Christian propaganda. The tradition (accepted even by Eusebius, *HE* II, 15, 1) ascribes the earliest preaching to *Mark the evangelist, Peter's disciple, but this cannot be confirmed (though, see Oden); in fact, the development of the Christian church is totally obscure until the end of the 2nd c. Beginning with *Demetrius (bishop 188–231), documentation actually becomes abundant (esp. *Eusebius of Caesarea), and we find a well-formed ecclesiastical organization (which must therefore have been in place for some time), and a very important theological (catechetical) school. The silence surrounding origins is conjectured by some as being due to the fact that the Alexandrian church was of a *gnostic character. Not a few gnostic texts in fact must be traced to Alexandria, some of which survive in *Coptic translations of 4th-5th-c. MSS (*see* Nag Hammadi). Other factors tend to exclude this hypothesis (C.H. Roberts, *Manuscripts, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, Oxford 1979). The Alexandrian theological school moved in the world of Late Antique *Platonism (its main exponents being *Clement, *Origen and *Didymus the Blind) and thus of international Greek culture, but recent contributions also identify an influence on some of the *monastic movements that developed beginning late 3rd c., esp. the group of Scete and Kellia, whose principal figures were *Macarius of Alexandria and *Evagrius of Pontus, but also *Anthony himself (see S. Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Anthony: Origenist Theology, Monastic Tradition and the Making of a Saint*, Lund 1990) and the group of the Pachomians (see J. Goehring, *Ascetics, Society and the Desert*, Harrisburg, PA 1999, 137-186). Organizational relations within the Nile valley were rather tortured. Although the bishop of Alexandria was always recognized as the undisputed head of the whole Egyptian church, his behavior also aroused movements of criticism and rejection. The first of these known to us developed during the last great persecution, that of *Diocletian and *Maximian, during which Peter went into hiding and *Melitius, bishop of *Lycopolis (and perhaps his official representative for S Egypt), for a while acted as Peter's substitute without his authorization. Peter condemned Melitius, and a schism began that caused many troubles even for *Athanasius, continuing until the 7th c. The great Alexandrian patriarchs of the 4th and 5th c., Athanasius, *Theophilus and *Cyril, conducted an active ecclesiastical policy toward the other imperial metropolises, dominating the ecumenical councils of *Nicaea (Athanasius took part as *Alexander's secretary), *Constantinople and *Ephesus. They were actively supported by the monks, who both within and without the country acted as something of an assault force for them. The Council of *Chalcedon (451), however, saw the defeat of the Alexandrian bishop *Dioscorus, signaling the decline of Alexandria's dominance. The Egyptian church had to

submit to the sending of "Chalcedonian" bishops named by the emperor of Constantinople and backed by the army; whenever possible they opposed these with their own bishops until, with the Arab invasion (641), the autochthonous (Coptic Orthodox) Egyptian church became the church officially recognized by the state.

T. Orlandi

II. School. Regarding culture as well, the Christian origins of Alexandria are wrapped in obscurity. Apollos, collaborator and rival of *Paul, is for us little more than a name, and there is no serious basis for placing at Alexandria works of unknown origin such as the letter to the Hebrews; attribution of the *Epistle of* (*ps.-*)**Barnabas* to Alexandria is also hypothetical. A Jewish Christian influence over this nascent culture can easily be hypothesized, but it certainly must have been less than in *Asia. The sparse evidence we have does allow us to hypothesize a virtually absolute cultural dominance of the gnostics for a good part of the 2nd c., especially of those who professed more philosophically elaborate doctrines and were also the most Christianized (*Basilides, *Valentinus and disciples); this is not surprising if we consider how the culturally syncretistic tendencies of the gnostics harmonized with the intellectual vivacity of cultured Alexandria and the different influences at work there (Greek philosophical doctrines, Hellenized *Judaism, Eastern religions, apocalyptic literature). Gnosticism presented itself as a kind of superior knowledge with respect to that of the ordinary Christian and thus took hold, esp. among the more cultured and intellectually ambitious of Christian society, who were also those of higher social status. Contact between orthodox and heterodox (gnostic) Christians was a daily reality in such circles, as is shown by the episode of the young Origen, the rich matron and the gnostic Paul in Eusebius (*HE* VI, 2, 13-14).

Only toward the end of the 2nd c. did people emerge from the orthodox community capable of challenging the cultural dominance of the gnostics: *Pantaenus, Clement, Origen. Precisely at this time it is customary to place the foundation of the Christian **Didaskaleion* of Alexandria, intended as a center of higher studies, *exegesis and theology, sponsored and controlled by the local bishop. Little credit is given to *Philip of Side's assertion (PG 39, 329), inferred from Eusebius (*HE* V, 10.1.4; VI,6), that *Athenagoras was the first scholarch, succeeded by Pantaenus, Clement and Origen. It is preferable, rather, to consider Pantaenus and Clement as private teachers (like *Justin Martyr at *Rome), with the true *Didaskaleion* beginning only when Origen, charged with directing the church of Alexandria's catechetical school, divided the teaching into two grades, reserving for himself the higher, to which non-Christians could also be admitted. The primary task of Clement and Origen's teaching (of Pantaenus we know nothing specific) was to oppose the cultural dominance of the gnostics among educated Christians; to achieve this they began to elaborate and examine the data offered by *Scripture and the *tradition by means of systematic recourse to the instruments provided by profane Greek culture: *rhetoric, philology and philosophy.

Though still viewed with suspicion, Greek philosophy was considered an important propaedeutic instrument for approaching the study of Sacred Scripture, and the contribution of the basic concepts and hermeneutical and demonstrative procedures deduced from them was fundamental for the development of Christian *exegesis and theology. Platonistic spiritualism was preferred, assimilated with greater rigor than by certain representatives of Asiatic Christianity. Origen in particular adopted the Platonic distinction of the two levels of reality—one sensible and the other intelligible, the former a faint copy or image of the latter—as an interpretive criteria for every aspect of Christian reality: he took from Clement, and more distantly from the gnostics, the division of Christians into two categories, the simple and the perfect (the latter also called gnostics by Clement: they were not distinguished by nature, however, as with heterodox gnostics, but only by degree of education and application). According to Origen, the simple or beginner adheres to the lower, sensible level of reality, while the perfect tends to the superior, intelligible and spiritual, according to the correlation: simple/perfect = Christ man/Christ God = literal/spiritual, which led to the *allegorical interpretation of Scripture. On this basis, though without achieving an organic doctrinal system, he developed and explored a collection of ideas and principles which long constituted the foundation of Alexandria's Christian culture. Here it suffices to mention (1) an organically allegorical interpretation of Sacred Scripture, (2) the theology of the Logos and the trinitarian doctrine of the three *hypostases, (3) a depreciation of Christ's humanity vis-à-vis his divinity, (4) a dualistic Platonic anthropology, (5) the spiritualization of *eschatology.

The activities of Clement and Origen were decisive in diminishing the gnostic threat and contributed in large part to the penetration of Christianity among educated pagans, which until then had been

minimal. The intellectual commitment and openness to Greek culture provoked negative reactions particularly within the local church, however, which were felt in the crisis that led to Origen's condemnation and expulsion to *Caesarea in Palestine (ca. 232). Nevertheless, while Origen's transfer to Caesarea favored the spread of the new Alexandrian culture in *Syria, *Palestine and *Arabia, the school of Alexandria (directed in the second half of the 3rd c. by *Heraclas, *Dionysius, *Theognostus, *Pierius, *Achillas, Serapion and Peter) does not seem to have modified the orientation established by Origen; only the doctrinal discussions of the preexistence of the soul and spiritual resurrection were abandoned. And given the close relations between school and episcopate (Heraclas, Dionysius, Achillas and Peter became bishops of Alexandria), the cultural approach of the school became the official policy of the church of Alexandria and from there gradually spread throughout Egypt, despite significant resistance (on Dionysius's polemic against *Sabellianism and *millenarism, *see* Dionysius of Alexandria).

Alexandrian culture met an even stronger reaction in its expansion outside of Egypt in regions of Asian culture: the alternating fortunes of this conflict are attested at *Antioch in the second half of the 3rd c. by the events of *Paul of Samosata and *Lucian of Samosata, while the *Apologia* of *Pamphilus (*praef.*) shows the bitterness of the debate in Syria and Palestine at the beginning of the 4th c., by then polarized around the figure of Origen. The *Arian crisis provoked an important modification in the by-then-traditional Alexandrian *trinitarian doctrine, in that Athanasius, in deference to the *monarchian approach of the Nicene Creed (325), abandoned the doctrine of the three hypostases for a more unitarian and egalitarian conception of the Trinity. The prestige of *Didymus, however, scholarch in the second half of the 4th c. after the fleeting Macarius, testifies to the continuing vitality of the Origenian exegetical tradition. Anti-Origenist polemic, revived in the late 4th c. by *Epiphanius of Salamis and encouraged for purely political ends by *Theophilus of Alexandria, marked the effective end of the school (*Rhodo having succeeded Didymus as director). At the same time Antiochene exegetes, who tended toward literalism, thoroughly criticized the systematic Alexandrian allegorism; Cyril of Alexandria (1st half 5th c.) submitted to their influence, falling back on a mixture of literalism and allegorism that distorted the organic unity of Origen's and Didymus's exegesis.

In the field of *Christology, however, the Alexandrian tradition continued to make its influence felt: the subordination of Christ's humanity to his divinity assured the unity of the theandric composition much better than the man/God bipolarity of Antiochene Christology and better met the needs of popular piety. This assured Cyril's success against *Nestorius, but *monophysitism immediately radicalized the characteristic aspects of that Christology still further, and the polemic degenerated into brawling and logomachy. On the one hand, monophysitism, heir to Alexandrian Christology in its extreme radicalization, interpreted the religious sense of vast regions of the East, such as Egypt and Syria, much better than the Christology of Chalcedon; but the revival of native *Syriac and Coptic culture against the hegemony of Hellenistic culture contributed decisively to its success. On the other hand, openness to Hellenism was the most characteristic component of the Alexandrian school's cultural policy, so the triumph of monophysitism, despite its descendence from the traditional Alexandrian Christology, meant the definitive liquidation of the legacy of that policy, which had marked an important moment in the Christianization of the ancient world.

TRE 2, 251-261; LTK 1, 374-375; 377-379; W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Göttingen 1915; Ch. Diehl, *L'Égypte chrétienne et byzantine*, in G. Hanotaux (ed.), *Histoire de la Nation Égyptienne*, Paris, III, 1933, 399-557; G. Bardy, *Aux origines de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*: RecSR 27 (1937) 65-90; Id., *Pour l'histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie*: Vivre et Penser 2 (1942) 80-109; P. Brezzi, *La gnosi cristiana di Alessandria e le antiche scuole cristiane*, Rome 1950; A. Knauber, *Katechetenschule oder Schulkatecumenat?*: TTZ 60 (1951) 243-266; M. Hornschuh, *Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule*: ZKG 71 (1960) 1-25 and 193-214; F. Pericoli-Ridolfini, *Le origini della Chiesa di Alessandria d'Egitto e la cronologia dei vescovi alessandrini dei secoli I e II*, 1962 (RAL 17); A. Méhat, *Etude sur les Stromates de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1966, 62-70; G. Ruhbach, *Bildung in der Altenkirche*: Kirchengeschichte als Missiongeschichte 1 (1974) 293-310; P.L. Donini, *Le scuole l'anima l'impero: la filosofia antica da Antioco a Plotino*, Turin 1982; A. Tuilier, *Les évangélistes et les docteurs de la primitive église et les origines de l'école (didaskaleion) d'Alexandrie*: SP 17/2, Oxford 1982, 738-749; R.L. Wilken, *Alexandria: A School for Training in Virtue*, in P. Henry (ed.), *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, Philadelphia 1984, 15-18; J.A. McGuckin, *Christian Ascetism and the Early School of Alexandria*: Studies in Church History 22 (1985) 25-39; A. Le Boulluec, *L'école d'Alexandrie. De quelques adventures d'un concept historiographique*: Alexandrina. Mél. à C. Mondesert, Paris 1987, 403-417; U. Neymeyr, *Die christliche Lehrer im 2. Jh.* (VChr Suppl. 4), Leiden 1989; R. van den Broeck, *The Christian School of Alexandria in the Second and Third Century*, in J.W. Drijvers – A.A. McDonald (eds.), *Centers of Learning and Locations in Premodern Europe and the Near East*, Leiden 1995, 39-47; M. Rizzi, *La scuola alessandrina. Da Clemente a Origene*, in E. dal Covolo (ed.), *Storia della teologia* I, Rome-Bologna 1995, 81-120; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'église d'Egypte au IV^e siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996; G. Bendinelli, *Il Commentario a Matteo di Origene.*

L'ambito della metodologia scolastica dell'antichità, Rome 1997; A. van den Hoeck, *The "Catechetical" School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage*: HTR 90 (1997) 59-87; B. Pouderon, *D'Athènes à Alexandrie. Études sur Athénagore et les origines de la philosophie chrétienne*, Louvain-Paris 1997; M. Simonetti, *Teologia e cristologia dell'Egitto cristiano*, in A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo antica*, Rome 1997, 11-38; Ch. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*, London 1997; A. Jakab, *Chrétiens d'Alexandrie. Richesse et pauvreté aux premiers temps du christianisme (1er-3e siècles). Essai d'histoire sociale*, Paris 1998; G. Dorival, *Les débuts du Christianisme à Alexandrie*: *Colloque Alexandrie: Une mégapole cosmopolite, Actes*, Paris 1999, 157-174; A. Le Boulluec, *Aux origines encore de l'"école" d'Alexandrie*: Adamantius 5 (1999) 8-36; M. Rizzi, *Il didaskaleion nella tradizione alessandrina. Da Clemente all'*Oratio panegyrica in Origenem, in G. Firpo - G. Zecchini (eds.), *"Magister": aspetti culturali ed istituzionali*, Alexandria 1999, 177-199; T. Camelot, *Les chrétiens à Alexandrie: foyer de culture chrétienne*, in P. Geoltrain (ed.) *Aux origines du christianisme*, Paris 2000, 495-504; A. Jakab, *L'organisation de la communauté chrétienne d'Alexandrie d'après Clément*, in M.A. Vannier, O. Wermelinger and G. Wurst (eds.), in *Anthropos laïkos. Mèlanges Alexandre Faivre*, Fribourg (Switz.), 2000, 131-139; A. Le Boulluec, *Dialogue interreligieux dans l'Alexandrie antique* in *Anthropos laïkos*, 140-151; M. Rizzi, *Scuola di Alessandria*, in A. Monaci Castagno (ed.), *Origene. Dizionario. La cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, Rome 2000, 437-440; J.-Y. Empereur, *Alexandria*, in D.B. Redford (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt*, Oxford 2001, I, 54-56; A. Jakab, *Ecclesia alexandrina. Evolution sociale et institutionelle du christianisme alexandrin (IIe et IIIe siècles)*, Berlin-Bern 2001; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo*, Rome 2002; T. Oden, *The African Memory of Mark*, Downers Grove, IL 2011.

M. Simonetti

III. Councils.

231/232. Bishop *Demetrius convened a council of Egyptian bishops and some priests to judge Origen, accused of having been ordained priest by *Theoctistus of Caesarea without Demetrius's knowledge, on whom Origen was legally dependent. Origen's cultural policy of openness to the contribution of Greek culture was also causing dissension, and some of his doctrines appeared questionable; his very fame aroused Demetrius's suspicion. The council forbade Origen from residing or teaching at Alexandria. Not content with his expulsion from Alexandria, Demetrius, supported by some Egyptian bishops, invalidated his priestly ordination. The condemnation was approved by the bishop of Rome and others, but not in Palestine, Syria, Greece and Arabia.

ca. 305. Athanasius (*Apol. sec.* 59) tells us of a council called by Peter of Alexandria to condemn Melitius of Lycopolis, accused of sacrificing to idols and other crimes. In fact, Melitius was condemned for having gone ahead with irregular episcopal ordinations during the persecution of Diocletian and because he did not approve of Peter's moderate measures toward the *lapsi* of that persecution.

ca. 322. Bishop *Alexander condemned the Alexandrian priest *Arius for spreading a doctrine which held the radical inferiority and heterogeneity of the Son with respect to the Father. Arius continued to spread his ideas, however, so Alexander gathered a council of about 100 bishops of Egypt and Libya that reexamined the case and confirmed the condemnation against Arius and his followers. Some time later Alexander wrote an encyclical letter about this council, signed by him, his priests and his deacons.

ca. 324. Athanasius (*Apol. sec*. 74.75) tells us that *Ossius of Cordoba, charged by *Constantine with settling the dispute between Alexander and Arius, took part in a council at Alexandria that restored Colluthus, who had claimed episcopal rank, to his priestly condition; the ordinations he had performed were declared null.

338. Athanasius, back from the exile (ca. 335-337) to which Constantine had condemned him after the Council of *Tyre, called a council of the bishops of Egypt, *Thebaid, Libya and *Pentapolis to obtain approval and support against the accusations made by the Eusebians. An encyclical to this effect was sent to all the bishops of Christendom.

346. Back in Alexandria from his second exile (ca. 339-346), Athanasius called a council of Egyptian bishops that ratified the deliberations of the Council of *Serdica (343) and took note of the synodal decree of the Council of *Jerusalem, issued sometime earlier, which had welcomed him as he passed through on his way home. The council is mentioned by *Socrates (*HE* 2, 26) and *Sozomen (*HE* 4, 1) but not by the **Historia acephala*, which gives the exact date of Athanasius's return (21 Oct. 346) and contains an excellent record of his movements.

362. Back in Alexandria after his third exile (ca. 356-362) at the death of Constantius, Athanasius called a Council of Egyptian bishops, attended also by some Nicene bishops that *Constantius had exiled in Egypt, among them *Eusebius of Vercelli. The council dealt with all the undecided questions directly or indirectly connected with the Arian controversy, publishing their decisions in a synodal letter (*Tomus ad Antiochenos*): (1) moderate measures against the bishops who had subscribed the pro-Arian formula of *Rimini; (2) invitation to the Antiochenes to end their *schism by reuniting with the Nicene group led by Paulinus; (3) condemnation of those who considered the Holy Spirit a creature; (4) acceptance of formulas which affirmed either only one or three hypostases of the Trinity, as long as they were duly clarified; and (5) minimization of the rising *Apollinarist question by means of a generic compromise formula.

363. In this year Athanasius delivered to the emperor *Jovian at Antioch a synodal letter (this designation, testified to only by the historian *Theodoret, is in fact erroneous, as the document does not have the characteristic element of synodal letters, i.e., the subscriptions) in his own name and in those of the bishops of Egypt, Thebaid and Libya, reaffirming the validity of the Nicene Creed. It was widely held that the letter was published by a council called at Alexandria immediately upon Athanasius's return there after the brief exile he suffered under *Julian (ca. 362-363). The *Hist. aceph*. 12, however, speaks only of a rapid visit to the city, almost incognito, before embarking. We may think of a small council held by Athanasius before returning to Alexandria, or a meeting at Antioch between Athanasius and some bishops who had followed him there. The idea of a council held at Alexandria shortly before or after Athanasius's departure for the East now seems to have been abandoned: on the one hand, it seems to clearly contradict the chronology proposed by the *Historia acephala,* and on the other, it seems pointless given that the principal doctrinal questions had been defined at the Alexandrian council the year before (A. Martin 1996, 577).

ca. 370. A council of ca. 90 bishops of Egypt and Libya, called by Athanasius, wrote a synodal letter to the *African bishops (*ad Afros*) inviting them to beware of those holding the pro-Arian formula of *Rimini and clarifying the anti-Arian doctrine. The council also informs the Africans that the council had written to Pope *Damasus congratulating him on the condemnation of *Valens and *Ursacius, leaders of the pro-Arian party, though expressing surprise that *Auxentius, one of the most important, remained unpunished at *Milan.

399. Theophilus held a council of Egyptian bishops to condemn the errors of Origen. The council's synodal letter, sent to the bishops of Palestine and *Cyprus, has reached us in *Jerome's translation (*Ep*. 92).

430. In the context of the incipient *Nestorian controversy, after Pope *Celestine's condemnation of Nestorius at Rome, Cyril gathered a council of Egyptian bishops in November 430 in the presence of the Roman delegates. The synodal letter, Cyril's third letter to Nestorius, refutes the patriarch of Constantinople's doctrine and orders him to subscribe the 12 anathemata.

452. *Proterius, imposed on Alexandria as successor to the deposed *Dioscorus, called a council of Egyptian bishops to have them approve the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (451). The council also deposed the priest Timothy Ailuros, head of the Egyptian *monophysites, and some of his supporters.

589. *Eulogius, *Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, called a council to examine a controversy regarding Dt 18:15: "The Lord will raise up a prophet from his people" etc. Against the interpretation of the Jews and the *Samaritans, the traditional christological interpretation of the passage was reconfirmed.

LTK 1, 376; *231/232*. Hfl-Lecl 1,156-159; P. Nautin, *Origène*, Paris 1977, 428-431; C.B. Armstrong - B. Drewery, *The Condemnation of Origen: Should It Be Reversed?*: Origeniana Tertia (eds. R. Hanson - H. Crouzel), 1985, 271-277; H. Crouzel, *Origene e l'origenismo: le condanne di Origene*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 295-303.

ca. 305. Hfl-Lecl 1,211-212,488-503; H. Idris Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, Milan 1924, 38-99; A. Martin, *Athanase et les Mélitiens: Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (ed. Ch. Kannengiesser), Paris 1974, 31-61; F. Hernández, *El cisma meleciano en la iglesia egipcia*, Gerion (Madrid), 2, 1984, 155-180; A. Martin, *La reconciliation des Lapsi en Égypte. De Denis à Pierre d'Alexandrie: une querelle de clercs*: RSLR 22 (1986) 263-266; J.A. Fischer, *Die Synode zu Alexandrien im Jahr 306*: Archivium Historiae Conciliorum 18 (1987) 62-70; R. Williams, *Arius*, London [2]2001, 32-41.

ca. 322. Hfl-Lecl 1,349-363; Simonetti 30; F. Hernández, *El impacto del sínodo alejandrino de ca. 320 en el Didaskaleion de Alejandría*: Erytheia. Revista de estudios bizantinos y neogriegos 17 (Madrid 1996) 7-9; G. Fernandez Hernandez, *El Sinodo de Alejandría* (*ca. 320*) *y sus consecuencias*: Carthaginensia 14 (1998) 403-405; R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987, 48-66.

ca. 324: Mansi 2,554-559ff.; DHGE 4,212-213; H. Georg Opitz, *Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streites von den Anfängen bis zum Jahr* 328: ZNTW 33, 131-159; R. Williams, op cit., 48-66.

338. Hfl-Lecl 1,692; Simonetti 141; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV[e] siècle* (*328-373*), Rome 1996, 400-403; Athanasius of Alexandria, *Lettere Festali*; Anonymous, *Indice delle Lettere*, intro., tr. and notes ed. A. Camplani, Milan 2003, 343-344.

346. Hfl-Lecl 1,836; A. Martin, *Athanase*, 451-453; A. Camplani, *Lettere Festali*, 412-414.

362. Hfl-Lecl 1,2,963ff.; Simonetti 359-370; Id., *Il concilio di Alessandria del 362 e l'origine della formula trinitaria*: Augustinianum 30 (1990) 353-360; A. Martin, *Athanase*, 541-565; Id., *Athanase*, 541-565; A. Camplani, *Atanasio e Eusebio tra Alessandria e Antiochia* (*362-363*)*: osservazioni sul* Tomus ad Antiochenos, *l'*Epistula catholica *e due fogli copti* (*edizione di Pap. Berol. 11948*), in E. Dal Covolo - R. Uglione - G.M. Vian (eds.), *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo,* Biblioteca di scienze religiose 133 (Rome 1997) 191-246, esp. 197-219; X. Morales, *La théologie trinitaire d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Thèse presentée pour l'obtention du doctorat, Paris 2000, 304-305; A. Camplani, *Lettere Festali*, 482-483.

363. Hfl-Lecl 1,2,971-972; Simonetti 373-374; A. Martin, *Athanase*, 565-589; A. Camplani, *Atanasio e Eusebio*; A. Camplani, *Lettere Festali*, 483-487; 488 note 3.

ca. 370. Mansi 3,451-454; Simonetti 388; C. Kannengiesser, (*Ps.-*) *Athanasius, Ad Afros Examined*: *Festschrift für L. Abramowski*, Tübingen 1993, 264-280; A. Martin, *Athanase*, 619-635.

399: Hfl-Lecl 2,122; Hier., *Ep. 92* (CSEL 55); *Epistula synodica prima*, ed. J. Declerck, Byzantion 54 (1984) 495-507; A. Guillaumont, *Les "Képhalaia Gnostica" d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, Paris 1962, 55ff.; P. Lardet, *Introduzione* a Saint Jérôme, *Apologie contre Rufin* (SC 303, 1983), 56-59; B. Studer, *Origenismo* (*in Occidente, secs. IV-VI*), Rome 2000, 304.

430. Mansi 4,551-553, 1067-1084; L. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, 177-180; J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology, and Texts*, Leiden 1994, 44-46; 282-293.

452. Hfl-Lecl 2,881-882; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 148ff., 154ff., 160ff.; *Le Chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente* (432-610), ed. L. Pietri, ed. it. ed. E. Prinzivalli, Rome 2002, 120; 161-163; 498.

589: Hfl-Lecl 3,232; P. Goubert, *Patriarches d'Antioche et d'Alexandrie contemporains de saint Grégoire le Grand*: REB 25 (1967) 71-76.

M. Simonetti

IV. Archaeology. Parallel to the growing importance of the episcopal see we find intense activity in the field of religious building, including the oldest examples of the transformation of temples into Christian churches, even before the Edict of *Theodosius. Information on the church buildings of Alexandria comes to us from eccelesiastical historians such as *Socrates and *Sozomen, or *Theodoret of Cyrrhus; in addition to these, local chronicles also contain a mass of information on the Christian monuments of the city, such as the *Chronicle* of *John of Nikiu for the period up to the Arab invasion, and the annals of Eutychus, patriarch of Alexandria in the 10th c., for the following period.

Under the patriarch Alexander (312–328)—on the bishops of Alexandria, see J. Maspéro, *Histoire*—the temple of Saturn was converted into a church dedicated to St. Michael (see John of Nikiu, *Chron.*, 49). He also restored the church of *Theonas, at that time the episcopal church, dedicated to the Virgin; its function was later transferred to the Great Church that arose on the *Caesareum* or *Sebasteum* in the 4th c., and it was destroyed several times. (On this see the similar example of *Oxyrhynchus, where the *Caesareum* was converted into an episcopal church, late 4th c.) This building was rebuilt ca. 368 and from then was used as a cathedral until at least 641, when it was given over to the *Jacobites: in 912 it was destroyed by fire. A Mithraeum was converted into a church at the time of the emperor *Constantius II (see Socr., *HE*, II, PG 67, 763): this phenomenon intensified esp. after the *Edicts of *Milan and *Aquileia against *paganism in 391, when the *Serapeion was converted into a church under *Arcadius (see W.F. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Kirchen*, 105-136). Newly founded churches included the Church of Athanasius, consecrated by the patriarch in 370, where he established his residence; that of Sts. *Cosmas and Damian (see John of Nikiu, *Chron.*, 88); and the Church of Dionysius. The dedications of the churches of Alexandria are those handed down by the sources, which date to the 5th c. at the earliest: it is therefore not possible to ascertain whether they refer to the original dedications or rededications of older Christian buildings. Later the patriarch *Theophilus (395–412) built two churches, one dedicated to the emperor Theodosius and mentioned later by *John Moschus (*Prato Spirituale*, PG 87, 30, 2975), the other to his son *Arcadius (see the similar, contemporary example at *Gaza, where the Marneion was converted into a church [late 4th c.], known as the Eudoxiana since the empress herself sent the plans for it from Constantinople [see H. Grégoire - M.A. Kügener, *Vie de Porphyre*]).

Within the city wall among martyria that should be mentioned is that of St. Mark, built in the area of the port and destroyed by the Arabs in 640 and rebuilt under the patriarch John III (681–689): later (828) Venetian merchants stole the saint's body. These were the urban churches. Among foundations outside the walls, a separate chapter would be needed to treat of the many monasteries that arose, esp. on the outskirts of the city, as the sources attest (e.g. John Moschus and *Sophronius), and the martyrial churches that became venerated sanctuaries, such as those of St. *Mennas and Sts. *Cyrus and John, the latter built at bishop Cyril's expense (412–444). A detailed 7th-c. description of the site, handed down by reliable MSS, shows precise points of contact between the layout of the two sanctuaries: the second was composed of a number of buildings, including, as at St. Mennas, a baptistery.

The principal Christian foundations were built mainly in the 4th and 5th c., the acme of the Alexandrian church—see esp. the periods of Theophilus (395–412), Cyril (412–444) and *Dioscorus (444–451). After the Council of *Chalcedon, primacy over the East passed to the church of Constantinople; the Egyptian church, which had rejected the dogma of Chalcedon, officially embraced *monophysitism, and the *Coptic and *Melkite churches were established. This situation had a particular effect on Alexandria where, in the Arab invasion of 638, the resistance of the Greek element and the troops was concentrated; it thus suffered worse destruction than any other city (many buildings were turned into mosques, and some rebuilt, as the sources attest), whereas the Copts were able to find a *modus vivendi* with the invaders. It is therefore difficult,

given the situation of the Christian buildings—of which nothing remains except references in the sources and in an occasional rare epigraph—to trace the evolution of Alexandrian religious buildings into the proto-Byzantine period: even the location of most of these buildings is unknown (on this, see the topographical plan of Alexandria published by Krause, RBK, s.v. *Alexandria*, 101-102, fig. 1). The same observation can be made regarding architectural decoration of which, at least for Alexandria, little evidence remains.

The case is different with sculpture—esp. due to the presence at Alexandria, as in the major centers of the empire—of some works in porphyry, a material mined in Egyptian quarries reserved for the emperor and his family. The location of the porphyry quarry on *Mons Porphyreticus* (Djebel Dukhan) between the Nile and the Red Sea and the hardness of that material suggest that it was worked *in loco:* thus the main center of the production of porphyry articles (at least until the 5th c., after which it seems that the quarries were no longer exploited) may have been Alexandria; this thesis, though quite plausible, needs further confirmation. Because of its limited use, however, works in porphyry are not much help in dating the region's contemporary sculpture, often improperly called Coptic.

In painting, too, the situation is fragmentary, with significant problems in dating surviving works. Frescoes are preserved in some catacombs, in particular those of Karmoutz near the Serapeion (two apsed rooms with an ambulatory), where the main apse is ornamented with a continual frieze with three scenes difficult to interpret: in the center, Christ enthroned between the apostles Peter and Andrew; on the left the wedding at Cana; on the right the multiplication of the loaves with the people feeding on Christ's *eulogia.* Figures of apostles and saints are distributed on the other walls. The poor state of preservation of the fresco and its isolated position in the tradition of Egyptian painting, as well as the need for a more accurate dating (which oscillates between the 3rd and 7th c.), do not facilitate understanding. In any case, at least regarding this complex, we have a thematically coherent program that must have taken into account the *exegesis of the Alexandrian fathers.

In the so-called minor arts, much of the production of articles in ivory seems to converge on Alexandria, as in some cases the sources themselves testify. Particularly important in this regard is the list of gifts sent by Bishop Cyril to the court of Constantinople, including 14 ivory *cathedrae,* numerous *vela* and ivory objects (see Batiffol, *Présents*, 247-64): these encourage the attribution to Egypt, and esp. to Alexandria, of some of the most notable ivory works extant (e.g. the *cathedra* preserved at Ravenna, see Batiffol, s.v.). The recent attribution of the so-called Ambrosian *Iliade* to an Alexandrian workshop—based on paleographic data (see G. Cavallo, *Considerazioni*, 70-85) and reinforced by stylistic analysis of the miniatures (see R. Bianchi-Bandinelli, *Conclusioni*, 86-96), probably produced well into the 5th c. by pagan cultural circles still active at Alexandria during this period—helps clarify the city's artistic and cultural position in the Late Antique period which, at least regarding pagan commissions, is shown to still be linked (and this consciously) to Hellenistic models. In conclusion, history and the sources testify to the importance of the metropolis of Alexandria in the Late Antique period, even despite the fact that there is practically no surviving architectural evidence: this void is only partially filled by the historical, literary, hagiographical and epigraphical sources. New lines of study, based primarily on historical considerations and on the reexamination of old problems, are trying to restore to the city the prominent place it must have occupied at this significant time, esp. in the 3rd-5th c.

Eutyches, *Annales*, PG 111, 907-1155; DACL 1, 1098-1210; DHGE 2, 289-374; EAA 1, 204-235 Suppl. 27-32; RAC 1, 271-283; M. Krause, voce *Alexandria*: RBK I, Stuttgart 1966; Neroutsos Bey, *L'ancienne Alexandrie. Étude archéologique et topographique*, Paris 1888; P. Batiffol, *Les présents de St. Cyrille à la cour di Constantinople*: BALAC 1 (1911) 247-264; R.H. Charles, *The Chronicle of John Bishop of Nikiu*, Oxford 1916; J. Maspéro, *Les patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1913; H. Grégoire - M.A. Kügener, *Marc le Diacre. Vie de Porphyre*, Paris 1930; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern*: JDAI 39 (1939) 105-36; A.A. Vasiliev, *Imperial Porphyry Sarcophagi*: DOP 4 (1948) 3-26; R. Rémondon, *L'Egypte et la suprème résistance au Christianisme (V-VII s.)*: BIAO 51 (1952) 63-78; G.R. Monks, *The Church of Alexandria and the City's Economic Life in the Sixth Century*: Speculum 28 (1953) 348-362; R. Rémondon, *L'Eglise dans la société égyptienne à l'époque byzantine*: Chronique d'Egypte 47 (1972) 254-277; G. Cavallo, *Considerazioni di un paleografo per la data e l'origine dell' "Iliade Ambrosiana"*: Dialoghi di Archeologia 7,1 (1973) 70-85; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Conclusioni di uno storico dell'arte antica sull'origine e la composizione dell'Iliade Ambrosiana*: *ibid.*, 86-96; var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, Princeton, NJ 1979 (esp. the chart on pieces either from or attributed to Alexandria). CCAB 1981; *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico romano. Studi in onore di Achille Adriani*, 3 vols., Rome 1983-1984; A. Martin, *Les premiers siècles du christianisme à Alexandrie. Essai de topographie religieuse (III^e^-IV^e^ siècles)*: REAug 30 (1984) 211-225; A. Baldini, *Problemi della tradizione sulla "distruzione" del Serapeo di Alessandria*: Rivista Storica dell'Antichità 15 (1985) 97-152; H. Brakmann, "Synaxis catholike," in *Alexandria. Zur Verbreitung des christlichen Stationsgottesdienstes*: JbAC 30 (1987) 74-89; A. Martin, *Topographie et liturgie: le problème des "paroisses" d'Alexandrie*, in *Actes du XI^e^ Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, II, Rome 1989, 1133-1144; Id., *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Eglise d'Egypte au IV^e^ siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996; Z. Kiss, *Les ampoulles des Saint*

Ménas decouvertes à Kom el-Dikka (1961-1981) (Alexandrie, 5), Warsaw 1989; W.A. Daszewski, *An Unknown Christian Complex in Alexandria*, in *Coptic Studies: Acts of the Third Intern. Congress of Coptic Studies*, Warsaw 1990, 87-105; B. Tkaczow, *The Topography of Ancient Alexandria* (*An Archaeological Map*), Warsaw 1993; C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*, Baltimore 1997; EAM 1,352-354.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ALEXANDRIANS, Letter to the. Apocryphal letter of St. *Paul, mentioned in the Muratorian *Canon as a work of the *Marcionites. Neither the Latin nor the Greek text is still extant, though T. Zahn supposes that it is in a lectionary of Bobbio (7th c.) under the title *Ad Colos.*, but there is no element of Marcionite doctrine in the text. Discussion on this text's authenticity remains open.

Zahn 2, 566-592; Elliott 553-554; Erbetta 2,69-70; Moraldi 2, 81, 97, 90 (bibl.); Starowieyski, 3, 54-55, 356 (bibl.); M. MacNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*, Dublin 1975, 104.

M. Starowieyski

ALEXIUS (4th c.). Uncertainty surrounds the events related to this confessor, perhaps 4th c., whose legend originated late-5th c. in *Syria (450–475). The protagonist of the story, a member of a noble *Roman family, fled to *Edessa on his wedding night to lead a life begging in front of churches, preaching and teaching virtue. For his *ascesis and wisdom he is called man of God, Mar Riscia. Shortly before his death he reveals his story to the sacristan of the church where he had lived in poverty. Bishop *Rabbula, hearing of his death, went to the cemetery where he was buried and did not find the body, but only the rags that covered him (BHO, 10-11 n. 36-42). The nucleus of this legend, the first testimony of which is a late-5th/early-6th c. MS, spread widely among the Greeks, the story growing as it spread. The youth's parents, Euphamianus and Aglara, enter the story; he is given the name Alexius; on his wedding night, in a detailed dialogue, he convinces his wife to live in continence, then leaves Rome and disappears. He returns there 17 years later and is received as a beggar by his parents, who do not recognize him, in the very house he had left. His life is exemplary: he accepts every kind of mortification, living beneath a stairwell from where he edifies all, completely unrecognized. The pope himself eventually recognizes him from a document clutched in the saint's rigid hand after his death. In the Greek legend (BHG I, 15-19, nn. 51-56) the pope is Marcianus, who never existed; in the Latin version (BHL I, 48, nn. 286-291; p. 49, nn. 293-295), *Innocent (401–417).

Spreading at *Constantinople and among the *Byzantines from the 6th-9th c., Alexius's story inspired a hymn by *Romanus Melodus; a second version of the text developed in *Syriac regions. Criticism has shown the dependence of some basic elements of the story, such as the flight after the wedding from his father's house and the return, on the model of the *Life of John Calibytus* (Poncelet, 1890); the fact is emphasized that the conversation on the wedding night in which the husband convinces the wife regarding chastity is a topos of ancient *hagiography (De Gaiffier); finally, the reason for the *intactam sponsam relinquens* has been set in a larger context, typical of the 4th and 5th c., regarding the superiority of ascesis to marriage and the transformation of the nuptial bond into a relationship of spiritual friendship, "imposed" either by the husband on his wife or vice versa, with varying success, as well as a further development in the limits of the medieval romance (Giannarelli 1980) and the symmetrical hagiographical uses of characters in the story (see the analogous situation from the woman's perspective in the *Life of Saint Cecilia*).

The Byzantine legend centers on St. Peter's basilica in Rome, where both wedding and funeral are to have occurred (see the *Menologia* of Basil and the *Arab legends documented by *Vatican and Parisian MSS); in the Greek version the marriage takes place at St. Boniface, the burial in St. Peter's; sometimes both Greek and Latin legends concur in locating everything at St. Peter's, obviously to give more value and interest to the saint's life, and esp. to the funeral, which took place 17 March for the Greeks, 17 July for the Latins, the dates of his feast.

In the West the legend seems to have been attested for the first time in *Spain in the first half of the 10th c., and in the region of Burgos (L. Vasquez de Parga; BHL I, 48 n. 289 and De Gaiffier 1944), with some significant additions (the inclusion of an announcement to the Romans about the saint's death *in domum sanctae Mariae*) and some geographic changes (e.g., Laodicea of Syria rather than Edessa).

At Rome the cult and the "history" spread thanks to Sergius, metropolitan of *Damascus, an exile in the Urbe (977) who received from the pope the *monastery of St. Boniface on the Aventine, where the monks began to venerate the saint. Because of the presence there of Alexius's relics, the church added Alexius's name to that of the original patron (986). It was from here that a Latin version devel-

oped, making the beggar a Roman saint in that he was born, died and buried in the city, and giving the pope a central role in events. In acknowledging Alexius's greatness, the pope ratified the asceticism of the laity as superior to marriage, in accordance with a model of life following the church's directives.

In the Middle Ages Alexius became an authoritative saint (Peter Damian preached a sermon on him), loved by the popes (Leo IX dedicated a hymn to him). His *Life* spread in France in the 11th and 12th c. in relation to the reform of Cluny, thanks to the papal legate Leo; it was reelaborated in poetry and in prose, as shown in Italian and French poems and the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus da Varagine.

Alexius is widely present in literature: English, Flemish, German, Polish, Serbian, Russian and even Norwegian. In addition to Rome, his relics are at Montecassino, Prague, Bologna, Bergamo, *Paris and *Cologne. Even at St. Albans in England a chapel was dedicated to him.

*Iconographic depictions show him mainly in pilgrim/mendicant dress (he is their patron), with a staff, a staircase (referring to the stairwell in which he lived) and the letter in his hand by which he was recognized. Besides the pictorial cycle in St. *Clement at Rome, there are the *mosaic of the Cathedral of Monreale, the 12th-c. Stuttgart passionary, the relief of the cathedral of Strasbourg by Hans Himmerer (15th c.), and the painting of A. Carracci at Bologna in the Church of the Mendicants (17th c.). A statue by Caccini adorns the façade of Holy Trinity at Florence, evidence of the saint's extraordinary popularity, enhanced by what his legend suggested to a popular imagination already sensitive, from Greek poetry and tragedy, to scenes of recognition and nonrecognition. It is significant that here the *agnitio* is made not by the father but by the pope, after the protagonist's death, reaffirming the absolute superiority of spiritual affections and the ascetic life over carnal bonds and life in the *saeculum*. All of the events surrounding Alexius can be read as a narrative exegesis on this evangelical position.

Acta SS. Iulii, IV, Venice 1748, 238-270; BHO, 10-11, nn. 36-42; BHG I, 15-19, nn. 51-64h; BHL 286-301; p. 49, nn. 293-295; BS I,823; LCI 2,41; BS 1,820-823; DHGE, 2, 379-381; G. De Luca: Lateranum (1926) 46-73; L. Zambarelli, *SS. Bonifacio e Alessio all'Aventino*, Rome n.d.; G.H.D. Allen, *Two Old Portuguese Versions of the Life of St. Alexis* (*cod. Alber. 36 und 266*), Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 37, 1; Urbana, IL 1953; K. Kunstle, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, vol. II, Freiburg in Br. 1928, 47-48; L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétienne*, vol. III, Paris 1958, 52-54; L. Vasquez de Parga: Revista de Bibliografía Nacional 2 (1941) 245-258; B. De Gaiffier, AB 62 (1944) 281-283; Id., *Sources d'un text relatif au mariage dans la Vie de s. Alexis BHL 289*: AB 63 (1945) 48-56; Id., *Intactam sponsam relinquens. À propos de la Vie de S. Alexis*: AB 65 (1947) 157-195; A.G. Hatoher, *The Old English Poem St. Alexis*: Traditio 8 (1952) 111-158; H. Schommadau, *Zum altfranzösischen Alexiuslied*: Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie LXX (1954) 161-203; G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries*, Vatican City 1957, 78-87; V. Bartalucci Pizzorusso, *Le versioni Otrantine della leggenda di S. Alessio*: Studi medio-latini and volgari 6/7 (1959) 9-24; L. Duchesne, *Notes sur la topographie de Rome au Moyen Âge. VII, 1: Les légendes chrétiennes de l'Aventin*: MEFRA 10 (1980) 269-271, 632-645; E. Giannarelli, *La tipologia femminile nella biografia e nell'autobiografia cristiana di IV secolo*, Rome 1980, 88-94; F. Halkin, *Une légende grecque de s. Alexis*: AB 98 (1980) 241-296; P. Golinelli, *La leggenda di Sant'Alessio in due inediti volgarizzamenti del Trecento e nella tradizione letteraria italiana*, Siena 1987; C. Storey, *An Annotated Bibliography and Guide to Alexis Studies* (*La vie de saint Alexis*), Genoa 1987; C.A. Vega (ed.), *La vida de san Alejo. Versiones castellanas*, Salamanca 1991; S. Cingolani, *I tre più antichi poemetti francesi su sant'Alessio, ovvero: le metamorfosi di un santo circondato di cavalieri*: Hagiographica 1 (1994) 181-205; E. Giannarelli, s.v. *Cecilia*, in *Il grande Libro dei Santi*, vol. I, Cinisello Balsamo 1998, 409-412.

E. Giannarelli

ALLEGORY - TYPOLOGY. Allegory (from Gr. ἀλλὰ ἀγορεύειν, "to say other things") is the poetic and *rhetorical procedure whereby one says one thing to mean another: Dante, writing "wood," means "sin." By extension, this term also means the hermeneutical procedure of attributing to a text an allegorical meaning not intended by the author: e.g., the ancients interpreted the wanderings of Ulysses as an allegory of the vicissitudes of the human soul in search of redemption. The Jews made sparse use of allegory in interpreting the OT: the bride and groom of the Song of Songs were interpreted as symbols of Yahweh and Israel. But the Greeks, beginning in the 5th c. BC and then esp. under the influence of *Stoic philosophy, readily intepreted the Homeric myths and legends as symbols either of supernatural forces or of situations and passions of the soul; they were thus able to render acceptable to an already mature moral sensibility myths that, taken literally, would have been immoral or in any case overly anthropomorphic. This hermeneutical criterion was widely used in Jewish *Hellenistic milieus, esp. by *Philo, to interpret the OT in such a way as to render it compatible with the *philosophical and moral requirements of Greek readers. A similar procedure was used by *Paul to interpret figures and events of the books of the law as prefigurements, symbolic anticipations of Christ and the church. In general he preferred the term *typos* (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6), but in Gal 4:24 he also uses the verb *allegoreuein*. This type of interpretation of the OT was widely accepted and set the usual standard by which Christians, beginning in the 2nd c., read and interpreted those books. *Exegetes, esp. of the *Alexandrian school, added

other types of allegorical interpretation to it, esp. under the influence of Philo and Greek philosophy. Modern scholars designate by the term typology both individual examples of the Pauline hermeneutical procedure, which sees facts and figures of the OT as *typoi* of NT acts and figures, and this kind of scriptural interpretation taken in general. They usually distinguish typology from allegory, in that the former would represent the authentically Christian way of reading and interpreting the OT, whereas allegory derives from *pagan influence and uses arbitrary procedures to find arcane meanings in the letter of *Scripture. They point out esp. that typology is rooted in the history of both the OT (*typos*) and the NT (fulfillment of the *typos*), while pagan-style allegory prescinds entirely from history. It must be pointed out, however, that the ancient exegetes, while they used different terms to indicate the various types of allegorical interpretation of Sacred Scripture (spiritual or *mystical interpretation corresponding to modern "typology," moral interpretation in reference to matters of the soul, etc.), nevertheless used the term *allegory* indifferently to indicate as a whole all types of nonliteral interpretation; more specifically, they did not distinguish *typos* from *allegoria:* in effect, every interpretation that is typological in content (in that it recognizes an OT fact as the *typos* of a NT fact) is necessarily allegorical in hermeneutical procedure (since it gives to that fact a meaning other than the literal one).

H. de Lubac, *Typologie et allégorisme*: RecSR 34 (1947) 180-226; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum futuri*, Paris 1950; R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*, Richmond 1959; L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*, Darmstadt 1973; J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, Paris [2]1976 (bibl.); M.N. Esper, *Allegorie und Analogie bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Bonn 1979; P.B. Rollinson, *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture*, London 1981; M. Simonetti, *Profilo storico dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1981; Id., *Lettera e/o allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985; Id., *Sul significato di alcuni termini tecnici nella letteratura esegetica greca*: *La terminologia esegetica nell'antichità*: VetChr 20 (1987) 25-58; J.-N. Guinot, *La typologie comme technique herméneutique*: *Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères*, Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 2, Strasbourg 1989; M. Simonetti, *Ancora su allegoria e termini affini negli scrittori greci*: ASE 8/2 (1991) 363-384; C. Blömmingen, *Der griechische Ursprung der jüdisch-hellenistischen Allegorese und ihre Rezeption in der alexandrinischen Patristik*, Frankfurt am Main u. a., 1992; D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley 1992; *Die Allegorese des Antiken Mythos*, eds. H.-J. Horn - H. Walter, Wiesbaden 1997; J. Whitman (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory. Antiquity to the Modern Period*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2000, 41-45.

M. Simonetti

ALMACHIUS (or Telemachus) (d. ca. 400). *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*HE* 5,26) relates that an Eastern monk, who had come to *Rome to put an end to the gladiatorial contests, was attacked by the spectators and stoned in the amphitheatre. Pope *Honorius numbered him among the *martyrs. The *Mart. hier.,* on 1 January, tells a similar story, which it ascribes to Almachius, placing it during the prefecture of *Alypius. There are thus two different traditions regarding the date and the martyr's name. It is known, however, that the games ceased after 410; in this context the legend of St. Almachius was able to arise.

Bede, PL 94, 799; Paul the Deacon: PL 95, 947; BBKL 22 (2003) 1332; H. Delehaye, *S. Almachius ou Télémaque*: AB 33 (1914) 421-428; *Mart. hier.*, 21; BS 1,878; DHGE 2,630-631.

V. Saxer

ALMS – ALMSGIVING. Almsgiving expresses an active compassion for the *poor, both in *body and *soul. The root of compassion is in the heart, and the Bible strengthens the reasons for it, considering every person as made in the image of God. Almsgiving, *fasting and *prayer are the three works requested of the Israelite, taken up again by the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 6). The book of Acts provides two examples: *Cornelius for the *pagans, *Tabitha for the Christians. In the first Christian centuries freewill offerings were taken up esp. at the Sunday *Eucharist (see Justin, *Apol.* 67,6), but the faithful were exhorted to help the poor whenever there was a need. The **Didache* recommends almsgiving, as it says in the Lord's gospel (15,4), and suggests it as a practical means for the sharing of goods (1,5-6; see also the *Sherherd* of Hermas, *Mand.* 2,4; Cyprian, *De opere et elem.* 25; Basil, *De avaritia hom.* VI,7-8). Almsgiving is linked to prayer in *2 Clem.* 16,4. Jesus' saying is often cited: "There is more joy in giving than in receiving" (Acts 20:35 = *1 Clem.* 2; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 74,5; *Const. Ap.* V,3,1). The *Shepherd* of *Hermas invites Christians to help one another and to share the things of creation with the poor (*Vis.* 3,9,2), comparing the interdependence between rich and poor to that between the vine and the elm (*Sim.* 2). The Latins transliterated the Greek term (see *Tertullian, *De virg. vel.* 13; *Ad ux.* 2,8; *De pat.* 7); it is also found in *epigraphs. The community in *Carthage took up a monthly collection, and a common fund was set up to assist the indigent (Tertullian, *Apol.* 39,5-6). *Cyprian dedicates a whole treatise to almsgiving: *De opere et eleemosynis,* stressing that it is obligatory, meritorious and a principle of sanctification; he himself made solicitation for the purpose of charity (see *Ep.* 5,1; 7,1).

In the 4th c. the development of communities rendered inadequate the rudimentary forms of assistance of the first centuries. Moreover, deterioration of the economic and social situation, the disproportionate distribution of property and wealth, and the absence or inadequacy of governmental structures moved the Greek and Latin fathers to accentuate the importance of almsgiving, to reawaken the Christian conscience so as to discover the duty to share and to perform charitable social works. *Basil of Caesarea founded a city for the poor and the sick, *Basileiad (see the eulogy of *Gregory of Naz., *Hom 43 in laudem Basilii*, 63), and in his homilies denounced the unjust exploitation of the poor, the immoral enrichment of the well-to-do and the causes of poverty. Basil, *John Chrysostom and *Ambrose put the whole in the light of theology: almsgiving regulates the gifts that come from God and is a duty of justice. "The earth has been given to all, rich and poor," says Ambrose (*De Nab*. 1,2). The rich person is only an administrator of goods and must give an account of them to God. The excess of the rich is destined for the aid of the poor (see Basil, *Sermo de elem*. 3, PG 32, 1158). Poverty is an insult to divine munificence. Almsgiving is a victory over greed, i.e., over the root of all *evil; it remits sins (*Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 22A), brings progress in the spiritual life (Basil, *Gregory Nyssa) and disposes the Judge to clemency (John Chrysostom). The theme recurs continually in St. *Augustine's preaching (PL 46, 272-274: s.v. *eleemosyna*). The poor person is identified with Christ: "Serve the poor and you have served Christ " (Ambrose, *Vid.* 9,54; see also *Chromatius, *Serm*. 11,5; *Peter Chrysologus, *Serm*. 8,4; the famous text of *Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Mart*. 3,3: the poor man to whom Martin gave half his cloak is Christ). Almsgiving brings people together, making them feel as brothers (Gregory Nyssa, *De paup. amand*. 1) and should be given to all without distinction (Chrysostom, *In Eph. hom*. 10,4) but must be the fruit of honest work (Id., *In Mat. hom*. 85,3). Almsgiving is a duty for all. The poor person should often fast so as to be able to give, according to St. *Leo's advice (A. Guillaume). *Monks too are bound to give alms: they must provide for their own needs through work and give to the poor the alms they receive (A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique*, 129-131, 292-295).

The fathers of the church, without demonizing the possession of riches, encouraged interventions of solidarity on behalf of the poor, not to enhance one's prestige or as an individual act of public philanthropy, but because of the common *baptismal and creaturely vocation. "The ecclesiastical economy of almsgiving fulfilled a 'democratic' function that was absolutely foreign to the economy of the (fiscal) State" (S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, II, Rome-Bari 1973, 168).

I. Seipel, *Die wirtschaftsethischen Lehren der Kirchenväter*, Vienna 1907, 209-244; art. *Almosen*: RAC 1, 301ff.; art. *Diakonie*: RAC 3, 909-917; H. Rondet, RAM 30 (1954) 193-231 (Augustine); A. Guillaume, *Jeûne et charité*, Paris 1954; A. Hamman, *Riches et pauvres dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1962 (patristic dossier); Id., *Vie liturgique et vie sociale*, Paris 1968; S. Zincone, *Ricchezza e povertà nelle omelie di Giovanni Crisostomo*, L'Aquila 1973, 101-118 (on alms); B. Ramsey, *Almsgiving in the Latin Church: The Latin 4th and Early 5th Centuries*: Theological Studies 43 (1982) 226-249; A. Fitzgerald, *Almsgiving in the Works of Saint Augustine*, in *Signum Pietatis. Festgabe für C.P. Mayer*, Würzburg 1989, 445-459; B. Leylerle, *John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money*: HTR 87 (1994) 29-47; R. Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, Sheffield 1993; G.G. Christo, *John Chrysostom, On Repentance and Almsgiving*, Eng. tr., FC, Washington D.C. 1998; S.L. Bridge, *To Give or Not to Give? Deciphering the Saying of the Didache 1.6*: JECS 5 (1997) 555-568; C. Corsato, *I volti della carità nell'esperienza dei Padri*, Padua 1997; *Partage avec le pauvre: Cyprien, Augustin*, intr. and tr. by A.-G. Hamman, Turnhout 1998; M.G. Mara, *Nota sulle ragioni della carità nell'antichità cristiana*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 5-19.

M. Maritano

ALOGI. 2nd-c. *heretical group (those who reject the Logos, from the privative *a* + *logos*), begun in *Asia Minor. *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer*. 3,11,9) refers, without naming anyone, to those who deny the existence of the *Paraclete and consequently John's gospel, in which he is spoken of. *Epiphanius of Salamis created the term (*Haer*. 51,3), giving it two meanings: those who deny the Logos and, sarcastically, those "without reason." The *alogi,* according to Epiphanius, in contrast to the *gnostic *Cerinthus and to the *Montanists, denied that Jesus was the eternal Logos (Jn 1:1-14) and rejected the gospel of John and the *Apocalypse, attributing the latter also to John. For more information, see esp. the entry *Gaius.

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 51-52; Eusebius, *HE* 3,28; TRE 2,290-295; C. Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*, Cambridge 1996, 139-141.

A. Di Berardino

ALPHA and OMEGA. First and last letters of the Greek alphabet. Whenever this pairing occurs, it expresses the idea of totality: as much as is contained, symbolically and ideally, in the infinite combination of letters from A to Z. Is 41:4; 44:6; 48:12 sets the tone for successive development with the formulation "I, the Lord, am the first and the last," which

explains how God can act upon and influence historical events, transcending any limit of time and space. This divine attribute appears again in Rev 1:8; 21:6, where God himself says: "I am the alpha and the omega," further specified by what follows, "He who is, who was and who is to come" (Rev 1:8), or additionally "the Beginning and the End" (Rev 21:6). The attribute "Alpha and Omega" is not conceded to Christ on his first appearance; the term "First and Last" (Rev 1:17; 2:8) is preferred, joined to the evocation of his death and resurrection so as to emphasize the infinite power that now belongs to him. In Rev 22:13 Christ receives titles that were formerly those of God: Alpha and Omega, First and Last, Beginning and End, which indicate the power that belongs to him as judge. From the *Apocalypse we infer the work of Christ both in the creation as Word (Alpha) and at the end as judge (Omega). This designation of God and of Christ has analogies with the rabbinic symbol of the Shekinah, which was expressed with the initials *aleph-tau* or *aleph-mem-tau* (= truth). In the Greek alphabet, the letter *mu* is halfway between *alpha* and *omega*, though *mem* is not halfway through in the Hebrew alphabet. In any case, by the letters of the Greek and Hebrew alphabets were represented the three phases—first, middle and last—of infinite duration (Strack and Billerbeck, II, 789). When applied to Christ, this shows that he has a name like the Father's (Rev 1:18), and that he is *Being* par excellence. John, taking a negative attitude toward the Jewish Christians of *Cerinthus and the *Nicolaitans, who attributed a universal and divine power over the world not to Christ but to the series of letters στοιχεῖα (αεηιουω = ΑΩ) (Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* 286), is happy to use symbols familiar in the cultural milieus of Asia Minor, Christianizing their meaning (E.B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse*, 8). The symbolic value of the two letters *alpha* and *omega* was soon appreciated in Christian speculation, both *orthodox (Orig., *Com. in Jo.* I, 34.35; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6, 16, 141; Isid. of S., *Etymol.* 1,3, 8-10) and *gnostic (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1, 14, 1), and in *iconography, where it is frequently combined with the *Chrismon*. It received significant use throughout the Middle Ages. Rabanus Maurus repeats the schema *aleph-mem-tau* (= *alpha-mu-omega*) to recreate the trilogy of beginning, middle and end (*De Laudibus S. Crucis*, PL 107, 154).

E.B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse* (Études Bibliques), Paris 1933, 8; A. Gelin, *Apocalypse*, Paris 1936, 596; J. Bonsirven, *L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean*, Paris 1951, 93; E. Testa, *Il Simbolismo dei Giudeo-cristiani*, Jerusalem 1962, 366-368; Origen, *Com. in Jo.* 1,34.35, PG 14, 80.84; GCS 10,38-39; SC 120 (1966) 162. 164.168.170; Isidore of Seville, *Etymol.* 1,3,8-10, CPL 1186; PL 82, 76; R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig 1904, 286; J. Kremer - S. Egbers, LTK^3 1,1-2; T. Holz, Diz. Esegetico NT, I, 170-172; G. Kittel, GLNT, I, 1-12; E. Lohmeier, RAC, I, 1-4; H. Kosmala, *Anfang, Mitte und Ende*: Annual Swed. Theol. Institute 2 (1963) 108-111.

E. PERETTO

ALTAR of VICTORY. Dedicated by Octavian in the senatorial curia in 29 BC to show that he had received the empire from the goddess Victory. There senators swore fidelity to the emperor and his laws. The first Christian attack on the cult of Victory was by *Constantius II in 357 (see *Amm. Marc.* XVI,10; Symmachus, *Relat.* III,6), though already in 219 *Heliogabalus, priest of the sun god of *Emesa, had installed a large icon in the curia above the goddess's head, depicting him sacrificing to his god. This began, if not properly a replacement of the cult of Victory, at least a loss of its absolute hegemony. The Constantinian era faced the problem of the incompatibility of that *pagan cult with the Christian faith of emperors and senators. The first known law against *sacrificia* is from late 341 (CTh 16, 10,2), and the altar and statue of Victory were removed from the curia in 357. The question of whether only the altar, or both altar and statue, were removed has been resolved by Mazzarino in favor of both, given that pagan worship ideally united both; moreover, Constantius II, *Gratian, *Symmachus and *Ambrose show no sign of making the distinction between statue and sacrifice, work of art and object of worship, that would have been present in the period of so-called Christian humanism (S. Mazzarino, *Antico, tardoantico ed era costantiniana*, Bari 1974, 339-373). The altar was restored to the curia under *Julian, but in 382 Gratian, initiating a policy of repression of paganism, ordered it removed again. Symmachus's repeated protests to Gratian in 382 (*Rel.* III,1.20) and to *Valentinian II in 384 (*Rel.* III), in which he recalls the value of the empire's religious heritage, stressing that the Altar of Victory was a fundamental aspect, were unsuccessful due to the intervention of Ambrose, who promptly refuted the *Relatio* (see *Ep.* 17 and 18). In *Ep.* 17 the bishop of *Milan reminded Valentinian II, drawing more on imagination than on historical fact, what *Valentinian I is supposed to have said when he learned that the Altar of Victory had been newly set up in the Senate. Other requests were made, all unsuccessful, to *Theodosius I in 391 and to Valentinian II in 391–392. Only Eugenius, a tolerant Christian who allied himself with the pagan senators of Rome, allowed the restoration of the altar to the Senate from 393 to 394, until the triumph of *Theodosius. The dispute was still alive in 402, when *Pru-

dentius wrote the *Contra Symmachum* and attributed to *Arcadius and Honorius a treatise against the worship of the goddess in the curia (*C. Summ.* 2).

On Ambrose's dealings with the Roman emperors regarding the Altar of Victory: J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romani*, Paris 1933; L. Malunowicz, *De ara Victoriae in Curia Romana quomodo certatum sit*, Wilno 1937; F. Canfora, *Sulla controversia per l'altare della Vittoria tra pagani e cristiani nel IV secolo*, Bari 1969; R. Klein, *Symmachus*, Darmstad 1971; G. Lo Menzo Rapisarda, *La personalità di Ambrogio nelle Epistole XVII e XVIII*, Catania 1973; D. Vera, *Commento storico alle "Relationes" di Quinto Aurelo Simmaco*, Pisa 1981; M. Sordi, "*Pax deorum*" *e libertà religiosa nella storia di Roma*, in *La pace nel mondo antico*, Milan 1985, 126-134; F. Paschoud, *Le rôle du providentialisme dans le conflit de 384 sur l'autel de la Victoire*: Museum Helveticum 40 (1983) 197-206; Id., *Colloqui genevois sur Symmaque, à l'occasion du mille six centième anniversaire du conflit de l'autel de la Victoire, 1984*, Paris 1986; Id., *L'intolleranza cristiana vista e giudicata dai pagani*, in *L'intolleranza cristiana nei confronti dei pagani*, ed. P.F. Beatrice, Bologna 1990; D. Lassandro, *L'altare della Vittoria: letture moderne di un'antica controversia* (an ample survey), in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, ed. A. Garza, Atti del primo convegno dell'Associazione di studi tardoantichi, Naples 1989, 443-450; F. Lipani, *La controversia sull' "Ara Victoriae"*: Athens and Rome 41 (1996) 75-79; L.F. Pizzolato, *Ambrogio e la libertà religiosa nel IV secolo*, in *Cristianesimo e istituzioni politiche. Da Costantino a Giustiniano*, eds. E. dal Covolo and R. Uglione, Rome 1997, 143-155.

M.G. Mara

ALTERCATIO ADRIANI ET EPICTETI. Anonymous work of the 6th or 7th c. belonging to a group of *monastic writings called **Ioca monachorum,* probably compiled in *Gaul from a Greek original. A number of different recensions and many MSS existed already in the 8th c., showing the popularity of this literary genre. The work, written in a mediocre Latin, is a fictitious dialogue containing questions by the emperor *Hadrian (117–138) and responses by the philosopher Epictetus (d. 130), esp. concerning the Bible.

CPL 1155f.; CPPM II B, 3675a; LMA 5,491-492; W. Suchier, *Das mittellateinische Gespräch Adrian und Epictitus, nebst verwandten Texten* (*Joca Monachorum*), Tübingen 1955, 11-52; 108-14; H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller*, Freiburg [4]1995, 119.147; PLS 4, 917-923.

S. Samulowitz

ALTERCATIO CONTRA EOS. The complete title of this mutilated text, published by Caspari in 1883, is *Altercatio* [S. Ambrosii] *contra eos qui animam non confitentur*. In three MSS it is attributed to St. *Ambrose of Milan, but a judgment regarding this attribution is not easy, given the nature of the text. The argument of this brief treatise is the same as that of the *Dialogus sub nomine Hieronomi* on the origin of the human *soul, but is significantly inferior in both content and depth. The *Altercatio* is in fact only a brief diatribe, interspersed with biblical citations, against those who think differently on the question.

CPL 170; CPPM II,A, n. 52; PLS 1,611-613. P. Courcelle, *Littérature latine d'époque patristique*, in *Actes du premier Congrès de la Féd. Intern des Ass. d'études classiques*, Paris 1951, 287-307 (p. 289); G. Madec, *Saint'Ambroise et la philosophie*, Paris 1974, 262-267; I. Tolomio, *L'origine dell'anima nell'Alto Medioevo*: Medioevo 13 (1987) 51-73 (p. 62).

A. Di Berardino

ALTERCATIO DE ANIMA. Handed down under the title of an *altercatio* ("debate") is a text (the beginning is incomplete) against *traducianism, demonstrating exclusively with OT passages that God created the *soul in the maternal womb. The MSS and John of Seville attribute it to *Ambrose. Referring to details of the biblical version used, Caspari thinks instead that it is by an unknown author and must have been written before 600. According to Madec, who has prepared a new critical edition, Ambrosian authenticity cannot be rejected.

CPL 170; PLS 1, 600, 611-613 (C.P. Caspari 1883); C.P. Caspari, *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota I*, Kristiania 1883, 225-247; O. Faller, EC 1, 930; G. Madec, *S. Ambroise et la philosophie*, Paris 1974, 262-267.

B. Studer

ALTERCATIO ECCLESIAE ET SYNAGOGAE. This anonymous work, variously attributed to *Augustine, *Vigilius of Thapsus and *Severus of Minorca, differs slightly from typical *altercationes*—in which a *Christian and a Jew, or a Christian and a *pagan, or an orthodox and a *heretic, conduct a debate on religious themes—by the fact that the two protagonists are not real persons, but personifications of the church and the synagogue themselves. Under this aspect, the *Altercatio ecclesiae et synagogae* reelaborates a form of dialogue typical of pagan *philosophy.

This work cannot be dated with certainty, but from internal indications it can be supposed with some certainty that it was written between 438–476 by a lawyer or an author expert in *Roman law. From the many biblical citations taken directly from the *Testimonia* of *Cyprian of Carthage, one could hypothesize that it was composed in North *Africa and later transmitted via *Spain. In general the work shows a substantial ignorance of the Jewish religion and seems not to be concerned with the problem of

the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. Rather, it limits itself to constantly emphasizing the inferiority of the Jews relative to Christians.

Editions: J. Hillgarth, *Sacris Erudiri* 36 (1996); CC 69A (1999).

Studies: G. Morin, *Deux écrits de polémique antijuive d'aprés le Cod. Casin. 247*: RHE 1 (1900); M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *De Patrística española*: Revista española de Teología 17 (1957); G. Segui-Vidal, J. Hillgarth, *La "Altercatio" y la Basílica paleocristiana de Son Bou de Menorca*, Palma de Mallorca 1955; J. Amengual i Batle, *Els orígens del Cristianisme a les Balears i el seu desenvolupament fins a l'època musulmana*, 2 vols., Mallorca 1992.

M. Conti

ALTERCATIO HERACLIANI. The *Altercatio Heracliani laici cum Germinio episcopo Sirmiensi* is the account of a public debate at *Sirmium (*Pannonia) on 13 January 366 between the pro-*Arian local bishop *Germinius, supported by the priest Theodotus and by *Agrippinus, and the layman Heraclian, a *Nicene arrested for disturbing the peace. The debate is doctrinal in character, with Heraclian reducing his adversaries to silence. The spectators threaten him with death, but Germinius sends him away unharmed. The document as it has reached us has been retouched by a retractator to make Heraclian stand out at the expense of his adversaries; even so, it is rich in historically important facts.

PLS 1,345-350; Patrologia III, 85-86; M. Simonetti, *Osservazioni sull'Altercatio Heracliani cum Germinio*: VChr 21 (1967) 39-58.

M. Simonetti

ALTERCATIONES. By *altercatio,* Latin *rhetoric means a debate in which the *pro* and the *contra* are set in opposition (see Quint., *Inst. or.* VI,4). Originally a part of discourse, the *altercatio* came to be used also for didactic and *exegetical purposes. In the ancient Christian literature of the West the concept is used primarily for an (imaginary) debate in which a Christian disputes with a Jew, but also an orthodox with a *heretic or a Christian with a *pagan. Thus *Jerome defines the dialogue mentioned by *Origen in *Cels.* IV, 52 between Papiscus and Jason as an *altercatio* (*Com. Gal.* 3,13—cf. Tertull., *Adv. Prax.* 22; *Adv. Marc.* 1,9). An early 5th-c. work titled **Altercatio Ecclesiae et Synagogae* (CPL 577) is attributed to *Augustine or *Vigilius. From the same period, according to *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 50), is the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili,* composed by the Gallic monk *Evagrius (see Sulp. Sev., *Dial.* 3,1), the last early Christian controversy against the Jews (CPL 482). In it, following the model of *Tertullian, *Cyprian, *Gregory of Elvira and others, the divinity of the crucified one is demonstrated exclusively from the OT. From the *Arian controversy we have the *Altercatio Heracliani laici cum Germinio episcopo* (CPL 687), in which *Nicene faith and the confession of *Rimini are opposed (see B. Windau, in LACL 287, bibl.). From the 6th c. are the *Altercationes* of Christian *philosophy against *pagan errors, compiled in *Italy or *Africa based on texts of Augustine (CPL 360). For a literary judgment on these or other *Altercationes,* one must bear in mind the various ancient forms of dialogue, whereas for their theological evaluation one must bear in mind the anti-Jewish and antiheretical traditions.

PWK I/2 (1884) 1692ff.; A.L. Williams, *Adversus Judaeos*, Cambridge 1935; Lexikon der Alten Welt 130; H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld*, Frankfurt 1982; A. Cisek, *Altercatio*: HWRhet 1 (1992) 428-432 (bibl.); LTK[3] 1,445; E. Schulz-Flügel, *Gregorius Eliberritanus*, Fr 1994, 256-301 (bibl.); LACL (2002), 255; 287.

B. Studer

ALYPIUS (d. after 428). Saint, bishop of *Thagaste, fellow citizen, disciple, friend, collaborator and colleague of *Augustine. We know his life from his friend's works, esp. from the *Confessions* (6,9,11-6,10,16) and *Letters* (e.g. 29; 83; 125; 227). Born at Thagaste to parents of high standing (*Conf.* 6,7,11), he was short in stature (*De b. vita* 15) but stout of heart (*Conf.* 9,6,14) and of virtuous disposition (ibid., 6,7,11). A few years younger than Augustine (b. 354), he became his friend (*frater cordis mei;* ibid., 9,4,7) and followed his lectures (ibid., 6,7,11) and his *Manicheism (ibid., 6,7,12), preceeding him to *Rome, where he studied law and, becoming *comes* of distributions for *Italy, gave rare examples of integrity and impartiality (ibid., 6,10,16); he accompanied Augustine to *Milan (ibid., 6,10,16), where he shared his painful return to the Catholic faith (ibid., 7,19,25); he was present at Augustine's *conversion and followed his example (ibid., 8,6,13-8,12,30). Alypius withdrew with Augustine to Cassiciacum, where he participated in the philosophical debates (ibid., 9,4,8); and was *baptized with him by *Ambrose 24-25 April 387 (ibid., 9,6,4). Returning to *Africa, he lived a *cenobitic life with Augustine and other friends, first at Thagaste (Possidio, *Vita di S. Ag.* 3,1-2) then at *Hippo (*Ep.* 22,1). Elected bishop of Thagaste ca. 394, before Augustine, he worked alongside him for nearly 40 years for the rebirth of the African church, esp. in the *Donatist controversy (in the conference of 411 he was one of the 7 Catholic

bishops who participated in the discussion) and in the *Pelagian controversy, which caused him to travel much (*C. duas e Pel.* 1,1,2; *De nupt. et conc.* 2,1,1; Ep. 224,2). Pelagians included him in their dislike of Augustine (*Op. imp. c. Iul.* 1,42; 3,35); Catholics, however, associated him with his friend's merits (Jerome, *Ep.* 202,1, among Augustine's). Died probably 430. Clement X approved his cult.

E. Noris, *Historia Pelagiana*, II,8; Tillemont, *Mémoires . . .* XII,565-580; AASS, *Augusti*, III,202-208; BS I,871-873; PCBE 1,53-65; AugL 1,245-267; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin et la Maurétanie Césarienne: les années 418-419 à la lumière des Nouvelles Lettres récemment publiées*: REAug 30 (1984) 48-59; Id., *La date et le contenu du commonitorium adressé aux évêques Alypius et Peregrinus* (*Ep. 22**): BA 46B (1987) 523-524; M.-E. Berrouard, *Un tournant dans la vie de l'Église d'Afrique: les deux missions d'Alypius en Italie à la lumière des lettres 10*, 15*, 16*, 22* et 23**: REAug 31 (1985) 46-70; M. Marin, *Alipio e la topica della conversione* (*Conf. VI,7,11-12*), in *Le Confessioni di Agostino (402-2002): Bilancio e prospettive*, Rome 2003, 133-147.

A. Trapè

AMA (Amma). Feminine of Apa (Semitic term meaning "father," not to be confused with *abbas* = *abbot), a woman spiritual guide. The Greek derived ἀββᾶ and ἀμμά from the Semitic root, while the Latin has only *abbas* and the feminine *abbatissa*. Ama was not necessarily equivalent to abbess or superior (see the episode in *Vitae patrum* V,18,19)—although normally the superior or abbess was called the "mother" of their monastery—but connotes "spiritual maternity" (see Theodore Stud., *Ep.* 2,68), i.e., one who offered an interior governance tempering authority with fraternity in a love that does not impose greater burdens than can be borne, giving spiritual guidance appropriate to each one's personal situation.

DIP 1,521-522; I. Hausherr, *Direction spirituelle en Orient autrefois*, Rome 1955; repr. 1981 (OCA 144), 251-273; Id., *Le Métérikon de l'abbé Isaie: Etudes de spiritualité orientale*, Rome 1969 (OCA 183), 105-120; M. Kroen, *Das Moenchtum und die Kulturelle Tradition des lateinischen Westens: Formen der Askese, Autoritaet und Organisation im fruehen westlichen* (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, 29), Freiburg (Breisgau) 1997.

M.G. Bianco

AMANDUS (d. 676–684). Bishop of Maastricht, founder and first *abbot of the Abbey of Elnon (now Saint-Amand-les-Eaux), missionary and evangelizer of the Low Countries. Born late 6th–early 7th c., his birthplace is uncertain (poss. Aquitaine, Poitou or Gascony). He first withdrew to the *monastic life on the island of Yeu, then at Bourges, dedicating himself to a rigorous *asceticism. His *peregrinatio* (*see* Pilgrimages) began with a trip to *Rome and continued through all of *Gaul, after his ordination as an itinerant bishop by Dagobert (d. 639). His missionary movements were continual (he went to England to rescue imprisoned slaves, and besides his work in present-day Belgium, where his evangelistic efforts were particularly effective, he also reached the Slavic lands) until he settled at the monastery of Elnon, where he died 6 February sometime between 676 and 684.

He frequently clashed with clergy and with other bishops who could not tolerate his moral rigor, esp. after his election as bishop of Maastricht, or later as bishop of Nantes. The foundation of many monasteries throughout Europe is attributed to him. Some biographies remain, although their relation to each other is unclear, esp. after the recent discovery of a fragment in a MS at Innsbruck (1976), the so-called *Vita antiqua*. According to the traditional hypothesis, the *Vita prima* was written in the second half of the 8th c., perhaps by Gislebertus, abbot of Saint-Amand (diocese of Noyon-Tournai), but it has recently been conjectured that it was written south of the Loire. Milo, monk of Saint-Amand, wrote a *Life* in the mid-9th c., to which is added a supplement containing, among other things, the saint's will, probably authentic at least in its original nucleus, and his correspondence with pope *Martin I. Another *Life* dates to the 12th c., and still another is contained in the *Speculum sanctorale* of the Dominican Bernardo Gui (1329). The cult of St. Amandus (feast 6 February) is particularly widespread in N France and Belgium.

BHL 332-348; MGH *Script. rer. Mer.* 5,395-485; MGH, *Poet. Lat. aev. Car.* 3,561-603; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 3, Paris 1915, 190; E. de Moreau, *Saint Amand, apôtre de la Belgique et du Nord de la France*, Louvain 1927; BS 1 Rome, 1961, cols. 918-923; A. Dierkens, *Saint Amand et la fondation de l'abbaye de Nivelle*, in *Saint Gery et la christianisation dans le nord de la Gaule: V^e^-IX^e^ siècles. Actes du Colloque de Cambrai, 5-7 octobre 1984*, Paris 1986, 325-334; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter* 2, Stuttgart 1988, 48-52; A. Verhulst - G. Declercq, *L'action et le souvenir de saint Amand en Europe centrale. À propos de la découverte d'une* Vita Amandi antiqua, in *Aevum inter utrumque. Mélanges offerts à Gabriel Sanders*, Steenbrugge 1991, 503-526; R.A. Markus, *From Caesarius to Boniface: Christianity and Paganism in Gaul*, in *Le septième siècle: changements et continuités. Actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warbourg Institute les 8-9 juillet 1988*, London 1992, 154-168; G. Scheibelreiter, *Griechisches-lateinisches-fränkisches Christentum. Der Brief Papst Martins I. an den Bischof Amandus von Maastricht aus dem Jahre 649*: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 100 (1992) 84-102; M. van Uytfanghe, *Die Vita im Spannungsfeld von Legende, Biographik und Geschichte* (*mit Anwendung auf einen Abschnitt aus der* Vita Amandi prima), in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, Vienna-Munich 1994, 194-221; B. Abou-el-Haj, *The Medieval Cult of Saints: Formations and Transforma-*

tions, Cambridge 1994; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 102-104.

V. Milazzo

AMANDUS of Bordeaux (4th-5th c.). According to tradition the third bishop of *Bordeaux, succeeding *Delphinus, who raised him, ca. 401–404. The dates of his birth and death are uncertain. As a priest he prepared *Paulinus, *Ausonius's pupil and the future bishop of Nola, for *baptism, and exchanged frequent letters with him: see *Letters* 2, 9, 12, 15, 36 of Paulinus. They show in Amandus a man intent upon *exegetical and theological questions, and a friend to whom Paulinus makes personal confidences. According to Paulinus and *Gregory of Tours, Amandus was a man of extraordinary erudition and morals. Possibly identifiable with the priest of the same name to whom *Jerome sends letter 55, discussing exegetical questions and the case of a remarried divorced person. Elected bishop, he took energetic measures against *paganism and the *Priscillianist *heresy, aided by St. Severinus. According to *Gregory of Tours it was at this time that he left the office of bishop to Severinus, to then take it up again after Severinus's death: this however seems to be legendary.

Gregory of Tours, *In gloria confessorum*, XXV; R. Étienne, *Bordeaux antique*, Bordeaux 1962; H. Crouzel, *Les échanges littéraires entre Bordeaux et l'Orient au IVᵉ siècle*: Revue d'histoire du livre 3 (1973) 316-319; *Gallia Christiana* 2,789-790.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

AMASEA of Pontus (Ἀμάσεια). City of Asia Minor, on the middle Iris (Yesi Irmak); also called Hadrianopolis (*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 101 [1976] 358). Civil (then religious) metropolis of *Pontus (2nd c.); the region was later called Diospontus (*Diocletian) and finally Helenopontus (*Constantine); from the 7th c., a stronghold of the *theme* of the Armeniacoi. Suffered an earthquake in 529 (Malalas, 448 Bonn) and an Arab raid in 712. The *patriarch *Eutychius of *Constantinople was exiled there in February 565 (Grumel, Regestes², 251). A tradition ascribes its evangelization to St. Peter (first bishop, *Nicetus) or St. Andrew. *Hagiography connects Amasea with Sts. *Basil, Philantia and companion, *Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Phocas of Sinope, Hesychius the homologete, *Eutychius of Constantinople and esp. Theodore of *Tyre, extolled by St. *Gregory of Nyssa (BHG 1538) and also honored with a basilica built by the emperor *Anastasius. At the beginning of the 4th c. the city had many churches, and later many *monasteries, under the authority of a *catholicos. Episcopal succession, dating from the 2nd c. and well established in the conciliar era, is dominated by *Asterius and Seleucus. In the first episcopal *Notitia* (7th c.), Amasea occupies the 12th place among the *Byzantine metropolises, with six suffragans.

DHGE II, 964-970; EC I, 974; ODB 1, 74; *Enc. de l'Islam2* I, 444; H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959, 166-167; *Enc. relig. e mon.* (in Greek), II, 263-266; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 1, Paris 1963, 302-303; Rev. des ét. byzant. 32 (1974) 407; R. Boulanger, *Turquie*, Paris 1978, 212-213; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitane*, Paris 1981, 204, 209 and passim.

D. Stiernon

AMASTRIS (Ἄμαστρις). Bishopric of Asia Minor on the Euxine (Black Sea). Civil metropolis of *Ora Pontica,* its bishop *Palmas presided, perhaps as such, over a synod of bishops of *Pontus ca. 190. Birthplace of the *martyr St. Hyacinth (4th c.). In the conciliar period the city was part of Paphlagonia and became the first suffragan see of *Gangra, still its position in the first episcopal *Notitia* (7th c.). Made an independent (autocephalous) *archbishopric ca. 800 at the request of its bishop St. George, who became famous because of an Arab attack (late 8th c.). St. John of the *Goths sought refuge and died there (785). Birthplace of St. Sergius Magister and the empress St. *Theodora (ca. 800). Modern Amasra is in the province of Zonguldak.

P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens du IIᵉ et IIIᵉ siècles*, Paris 1961, 13-32; *Encicl. relig. e morale* (in Greek) II, 266-268; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 1, Paris 1963, 319-320, 440-441; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclusiae Constantinopolitanae*, 209, n. 228 and passim (see index); ODB 1,74-75.

D. Stiernon

AMATORIUM CANTICUM. *Manichean hymn of love to God, the Supreme King. *Augustine of Hippo (*Contra Faustum manichaeum*, XV,5-6) refers to it as a sort of Manichean *Song of Songs. As Augustine reports it, God, crowned with flowers and bearing a scepter, is surrounded by twelve *Aeons or seasons, along with countless inhabitants of his kingdom and angels produced from the king's substance. *Angels specifically named are the Keeper of Splendor, with six (in other sources four) luminous faces; the Great Ruler with his angelic armies; Adamas the Hero, a

warrior armed with spear and shield; the Monarch of Glory, mover of the three subterranean wheels of fire, water and wind; and the Supreme Atlas, who goes down on one knee while bearing the world on his shoulders. The same names are found, in the same order, in a number of *Coptic Manichean texts (where they are identified as the five sons of the Living Spirit).

CPL 727; PL 42, 307-309; CSEL 25/1, 424-428; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 99-100; W. Sundermann, *The Five Sons of the Manichaean God Mithra*, in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Mysteria Mithrae*, Études préliminaires aux Religions orientales dans l'Empire romain, 80, Leiden 1979, 777-788; P. van Lindt, *Adamas, the Belligerent Hero*, in P. Bilde - H.K. Nielsen - J.P. Sørensen (eds.), *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen*, Aarhus 1993, 95-105.

J. Kevin Coyle

AMBROSE (d. ca. 250). Friend and patron of *Origen. A rich *Alexandrian whose intellectual interests led him to the *Valentinian sect, Ambrose was led by Origen back to orthodoxy. Wishing to receive from his teacher the intellectual nourishment, the lack of which had led him into *heresy, he played an important role in Origen's activity as a writer; he put considerable resources at Origen's disposal and continually urged him to write, so much so that Origen called him "God's slave-driver" (*Com. Io.* V,1). Origen continued to have contact with Ambrose at *Caesarea in *Palestine, and they traveled together to *Nicomedia. *Jerome knew Ambrose's letters to Origen, which gave evidence of his acuity (*Vir. ill.* 56). Origen dedicated a siginificant portion of his work to him, esp. the *Ex. mart.,* since Ambrose had been persecuted under *Maximinus Thrax (235). He survived, since the *Contra Celsum* was written at his initiative; according to Jerome he died before Origen. He had a wife, Marcella, and children (PG 11, 85CD).

Eusebius, *HE* VI, passim; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* LVI and LXI. Texts in A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung...*, Leipzig 1893, 328-330; A. Monaci Castagno, *Origene e Ambrogio: l'indipendenza dell'intellettuale e le pretese del patronato*, in *Origeniana octava*, ed. L. Perrone, Leuven 2003, I, 165-193.

E. Prinzivalli

AMBROSE (4th c.). Disciple of *Didymus the Blind. Lived at *Alexandria. The only source on Ambrose is *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 126), who mentions two of his works, both lost: a large volume refuting *Apollinaris of *Laodicea and a *Commentary on Job*, which Jerome had heard of but not seen.

E. Prinzivalli

AMBROSE of Milan (337?-397). Born at *Trier in 339 or 337, according to the different interpretations given by scholars to a passage of *Ep.* 50,4 (see A. Paredi, *S. Ambrogio e la sua età*, 17ff.). Studied *rhetoric and was a professional rhetor in the prefecture of *Sirmium (Paul of Mil., *Vita Ambr.* 5, n. 1-2) and ca. 370 was apponted *consularis Liguriae et Aemiliae,* seated at *Milan. His impartial government is attested to by his election by both *Arians and Catholics to succeed the Arian *Auxentius as bishop of Milan. He was *baptized, and a week later consecrated bishop. Reporting on his election as bishop are Ruf., *HE* 11,11, Socr., *HE* 4,30,1-8, Soz., *HE* 6,24, Theod., *HE* 4,6. Some scholars (Faller 97-112 and Paredi 175) place the date of his consecration on 7 December 374, others (Campenhausen 26, Delehaye 192 and Dudden 68) on 1 December 373. Ambrose compensated for his hurried preparation for episcopal consecration by a systematic, lifelong study of the Bible under the constant guidance of *Simplicianus; *Augustine testified to the intensity and assiduity of this study (*Conf.* VI,3,3-4). His understanding of Scripture was deepened by his knowledge of the writings of the Greek fathers, and of Hebrew and *pagan authors such as *Philo and *Plotinus. Various authors have studied Ambrose's cultural formation, often arriving at different conclusions, among them P. Courcelle, G. Madec, M. Testard, G. Nauroy and more recently H. Savon (*Ambroise de Milan*, Paris 1977), C. Gnilka (*Kultur und Conversion*, Basel 1993) and P.F. Moretti (*Non harundo sed calamus. Aspetti della "Explanatio psalmorum XII" in Ambrogio*, Milan 2000). The study of the classical world and the Fathers, joined to meditation on the Word of God, were the foundation of his theological, moral, *ascetic, *political and social thought, and consequently of his activity as a pastor and preacher.

The Arian problem was a constant preoccupation for Ambrose. During the reign of *Valentinian I (d. 375), remembered by Ambrose as a period of mutual esteem and respect between emperor and bishop, the imperial policy of not intervening in favor of Catholics, maintained by a Christian emperor perhaps as a remnant of the traditional conception of the *pax deorum,* was a check on any intervention by Ambrose (see M. Sordi, "*Pax deorum*" *e libertà religiosa nella storia di Roma*, in *La pace nel mondo antico*, Milan 1985, 126-134). During *Gratian's reign, however, which was initially characterized by a liberal and indulgent policy toward non-Catholics, Ambrose's

anti-Arian interventions increased. In 376–377 Ambrose had to calm the disturbance promoted by the Arian priest *Julian, driven out of Petovium by the Catholic population (*Ep.* 11,3). Also in 376, he intervened to obtain the election of the reliably *Nicene *Anemius as bishop of *Sirmium, despite the pro-Arian activities of the emperor's mother *Justina (for a somewhat hagiographical account, see *Vita Ambr.* 11). His meetings with Gratian at Sirmium (ca. 378) and Milan (379) strongly influenced the emperor's religious policy, to the extent that he abandoned a paternal neutrality for an increasingly antiheretical policy, and became increasingly tied to Catholic positions. Ambrose, who had become almost a counselor to Gratian, dedicated his *De fide* to the emperor, to teach him the true Nicene faith as opposed to the Arian heresy (see *De fide* 4,1). Some scholars make Ambrose the author of the edict of 22 April 380 (CTh 16,5,4), in which sanctions against the Arians were announced, and it was Ambrose who secured the restitution of the basilica, which the Arians had taken possession of (*Ep.* 2,28, *De off.* II,70,136; *De Spir. Sanct.* 1,19-21). In summer 380 Ambrose gave Gratian the three books on the *Holy Spirit, completing the instruction begun by *De fide*. A new anti-Arian intervention with the emperor by Ambrose took place in 381 on the occasion of the Council of *Aquileia (see *Ep.* 9 to the bishops of Gaul; *Ep.* 10, 11, and 12 to the emperors Gratian, *Valentinian II and *Theodosius). *Ep.* 12 and 14, directed to Theodosius and linked to the Council of *Rome (382), are also related to the anti-Arian polemic.

Besides the Arian problem, anti-Catholic opposition arising from many different situations, at times related to the Arian question, worried Ambrose and motivated many of his responses to the empire (see Cracco Ruggini). In 382 Gratian had the *Altar of Victory removed from the senatorial curia, and decrees against the pagans, inspired by Ambrose, followed one after the other (see CTh 16,7,1 and 2; CJ I,7,2). Gratian's murder (383) and the usurpation of his lands by *Maximus marked a pause in this policy. In 384, however, a new pagan attempt to restore the Altar of Victory was unsuccessful (see *Ep. 17, 18*; *Vita Ambr.* 26), a result perhaps not unrelated to the young Valentinian II's gratitude to Ambrose for his peace mission to Maximus. At Easter 386 the Arian bishop *Auxentius asked the court of Justina to assign him a basilica; Ambrose opposed the request and had the basilica Portiana occupied (see *Ep.* 20 to his sister *Marcellina and 21 to Valentinian II; *C. Aux; Vita Ambr.* 13). Ambrosian *chant was born on this occasion (Aug., *Conf.* IX,7). The episode marked an irritation in Ambrose's relations with Valentinian II, precisely at the time when the young emperor's relations with Maximus were deteriorating. This led to a second mission by Ambrose to Maximus, mentioned in *Ep.* 24. Following *Priscillian's execution, decreed by Maximus and Ambrose's subsequent excommunication of the latter (*Vita Ambr.* 19; *In psalm.* 61), their relationship deteriorated.

The tensions with Valentinian II and Maximus and the resulting lack of political relations led Ambrose to intensify his pastoral activity. The invasion of Maximus, the flight of the Milanese court (387), the return of Valentinian II following Theodosius (388), and the defeat and death of Maximus all marked the beginning of another political phase in Ambrose's pastoral activity, who by this time was reconciled with Valentinian II. Ambrose's welcome of Theodosius was prepared by the latter's antiheretical law of 14 June 388 (CTh 16,5,15). Bishop and emperor felt a need to fix their reciprocal spheres of influence in anticipation of events that were not slow in coming. The notorious episode of the synagogue and the Valentinian sanctuary of Callinicum occurred in 388. Theodosius's reaction and the position taken by Ambrose are echoed in *Ep.* 40 and 41. An initial victory by Ambrose in the nonrestitution of the synagogue and another victory in the maintenance of Gratian's decrees for the pagan world led Theodosius to underscore the autonomy of his decisions by banishing Ambrose from the court (*Ep.* 51,2) and by a series of regulations unfavorable to the church (CTh 12,1,121; 16,2,27). Tension between Theodosius and Ambrose increased in summer 390 with the massacre of *Thessalonica (*Ep.* 51), whose remote causes have been given various interpretations (see Palanque 228-229 and Mazzarino 379-380). They were reconciled at Christmas 390 after the emperor satisfied the public penance imposed by Ambrose.

In 392 and 393 Ambrose's interventions were directed to resolving the *schism of *Antioch (without however obtaining *Flavian's abdication in favor of *Evagrius) and to condemnation of the heresy of *Bonosus. Concern for the church's internal life alternated in Ambrose with that for peace among nations and among people. While Ambrose was traveling to *Gaul in 392, sent by Valentinian II to reestablish harmony between the emperor and the general Arbogastes, news reached him of Valentinian's murder (*De obit. Valent.; Ep.* 53). His relations with the emperor's Catholic successor *Eugenius were neither easy nor clear, and were strongly influenced by the difficult relations between Theodosius and Eugenius (*Ep.* 61). After Eugenius's defeat, Am-

brose urged Theodosius to clemency toward the vanquished (*Ep.* 62), with perfect harmony reigning between Ambrose and Theodosius until the latter's death, 17 January 395. Ambrose pronounced the funeral oration in his honor, in the presence of Honorius (*De obit. Theod.*). Ambrose's relations with the general *Stilicho, to whom the young *Honorius had been entrusted, had little impact, an indication of the decline of Ambrose's political influence. His spiritual activity intensified, however. To the finding of the bodies of the *martyrs *Gervasius and Protasius in 386 (*Ep.* 22,1 to his sister Marcellina; for a historical evaluation of the event, see the differing positions of Campenhausen, Meslin) was added that of the martyrs *Nazarius and Celsus, according to the *hagiographical literature accompanied by miracles (*Vita Ambr.* 32-33). Ambrose was also present at the entry of *Paulinus into *Nola and at the creation of new episcopal sees in N Italy and at the appointment of their respective pastors. *Ep.* 63 to the church of Vercelli is considered a treatise on episcopal elections. Ambrose died at Milan 4 April 397 (see L. Cracco Ruggini, *Il 397: l'anno della morte di Ambrogio*, in *Nec timeo mori . . .*, 5-30).

Ambrose's intense pastoral, social and political activity is amply documented by his exegetical, moral, ascetical and dogmatic writings. Discourses, letters and hymns complete his output. In the exegetical works which, with the exception of a systematic commentary on the gospel of Luke, take up OT themes, Ambrose accepts the triple meaning of Scripture, though *allegorical-moral exegesis predominates. His exegetical works include: *Hexaemeron, De Paradiso, De Cain et Abel, De Noe, De Abraham, De Isaac et anima, De bono mortis, De fuga saeculi, De Jacob et vita beata, De Joseph, De patriarchis, De Helia et Jejunio, De Nabuthae historia, De Tobia, De interpellatione Job et David, De apologia prophaetae David, Enarrationes in XII Psalmos davidicos, Expositio Psalmi CXVIII, Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* and *Expositio Isaiae prophetae* (of which only fragments remain, collected by P.A. Ballerini [CCL 14 (1957) 403-408] from *Augustine's citations). Moral and ascetical works include *De officiis ministrorum, De virginibus, De viduis, De virginitate, De institutione virginis* and *Exhortatio virginitatis.* Among his dogmatic works are *De fide ad Gratianum, De Spiritu Sancto, De incarnationis dominicae sacramento, Explanatio symboli ad initiandos, Expositio fidei, De mysteriis, De sacramentis, De paenitentia* and *De sacramento regenerationis sive de philosophia* (of which only fragments remain in Augustine and Claudianus Mamertus).

There are three discourses—*De excessu fratris* (378), *De obitu Valentiniani* (392) and *De obitu Theodosii* (395)—and a *Sermo contra Auxentium de basilicis tradendis* (386). His 91 surviving letters (*Ep.* 23 is considered inauthentic) are one of the most important sources for a knowledge of Ambrose, his activity, and the political and religious situation of his time. Regarding his hymns, Ambrosian hymnology arose out of a very particular historical context. Scholars are unanimous on Ambrose's authorship of only 4 hymns (on the strength of Augustine's testimony): *Aeterne rerum conditor, Deus creator omnium, Iam surgit hora tertia* and *Intende qui regis Israel.* Not all scholars regard 14 other hymns as authentic. Ambrose also left three *epigraphs in distichs: for the tomb of his brother *Satyrus, for the *baptistery of St. *Thecla and for *St. Nazarius. The authenticity of the 21 *tituli* intended as captions to OT and NT episodes is disputed.

Ambrose's intense pastoral activity oriented his literary production more to practical than to speculative themes. There is an abundance of homiletic, hortatory and moral works, whereas there are few treatises or exegetical writings that directly and systematically address theological and doctrinal problems. These latter, moreover, often appear to be responses elicited by particular circumstances. Rather than elaborating new theological ideas, Ambrose preferred to draw on what the Greek fathers had already examined and formulated, adapting it with a fine sensibility to the particular needs of his situation (see L.F. Pizzolato, *La dottrina esegetica . . .*). Ambrose's theological thought appears clearly in his anti-Arian and *christological works (*De fide; De Spirtu S.; De inc. dom. sacr.*), where one notes the influence esp. of *Didymus the Blind and *Basil. Ambrose's *trinitarian doctrine defends the unity of substance and the distinction of persons (*De fide* IV,8,91; *De Spir.* III,5,108; 16,116,117; regarding Ambrose's reluctance to use the term *persona* in this context, see M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana,* 524-525); the Father is *fons* and *radix* of the Son (*De fid.* IV,10,132); the Son is *fons* of the Spirit (*De Spir.* I,15,152). In Christology, esp. in polemic with *Docetists and *Apollinarists, Ambrose maintains a perfect equilibrium that allows him to distinguish two natures and two wills in Christ without detriment to the unity of his person (*De inc. dom. sacr.* V,35; *De fid.* II,7,53-58; *De exc. fr.* I,12. For a survey and discussion of Ambrose's anti-Apollinarist passages, see G. Madec, *Ambroise, Atanase et l'apollinarisme*, in *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1974, 356-376. On Ambrose's Christology, see R. Cantalamessa, *Ambrogio e i grandi dibattiti teologici del suo secolo*, in *Ambrosius Episcopus.* Atti Congresso Internazionale di studi Ambrosiani, ed. G.

Lazzati, I, Milan 1976, 483-539; F. Szabò, *Le Christ créateur chez Saint Ambroise*, Rome 1985). The theme of redemption is dominated by the theory of the satisfaction and expiation of Christ (*In Lc.* III,48; VII,114). From *Origen and *Irenaeus Ambrose takes the idea of the passion and death of Christ as the price paid to the devil for the salvation of humankind (*In Lc.* IV,11-12; VII,114-117; *Ep.* 72). Some of Ambrose's works have as their principal theme the *sacramental theology of reconciliation, *baptism and the *Eucharist (*mysterium sacramentum*). His constant concern for the church (see G. Toscani, *Teologia della chiesa*) led Ambrose to reflect on the figure of *Mary (*In Lc.* and the work on virginity) and her place in salvation history. He considers her life sinless and a model of every virtue but makes no clear statement of her exemption from original sin. Ambrose's works, dominated by pastoral interest, also help us to understand the rites and *liturgy of his time.

CPL 123-165, dubious: 166-168; PL 14-17; PLS 1, 569-619. Various volumes in CSEL. An It. tr. of the *opera omnia* of Ambrose was begun in 1977: SAEMO. Ed. and tr. of various works in SC; FC; LNPF; BKV 2; var. aus., *Cento anni di bibliografia ambrosiana* (1874-1974), Milan 1981; H. von Campenhausen, *Ambrosius von Mailand als Kirchenpolitiker*, Berlin-Leipzig 1929; Delehaye, AB 48 (1930). J.R. Palenque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain. Contribution à l'histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État à la fin du quatrième siècle*, Paris 1933; F.H. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose*, Oxford 1935; A. Paredi, *Sant'Ambrogio e la sua età*, Milan 1941; O. Faller, *La data della consacrazione vescovile di sant'Ambrogio*, in *Ambrosiana*, Milan 1942, 97-112; M. Meslin, *Les ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Ambrogio e le opposizioni anticattoliche fra il 383 e il 390*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 409-449; G. Toscani, *Teologia della chiesa in sant'Ambrogio*, Milan 1974; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, vol. III, Bari 1973; M.G. Mara, *Ambrogio di Milano*, in Patrologia 3, Augustinianum 1977, 135-169; L.F. Pizzolato, *La dottrina esegetica di sant'Ambrogio*, Milan 1978; Id., *Ambrogio e la libertà religiosa nel IV secolo*, in *Cristianesimo e istituzioni politiche. Da Costantino a Giustiniano*, eds. E. dal Covolo and R. Uglione, Rome 1997, 143-155; for Ambrose's trinitarian theology, see Ch. Markschies, *Ambrosius von Mailand und die Trinitätstheologie. Kirchen und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu Antiarianismus und Neunizanismus bei Ambrosius und im lateinischen Westen (364-481 n. Chr.)*, Tübingen 1995; D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene-Arian Conflicts*, Oxford 1995; H. Savon, *Ambroise de Milan*, Paris 1997; A. Bonato, *La figura di Cristo in sant'Ambrogio*: Teologia 22 (1997) 244-290; G. Visonà, *Lo "status quaestionis" della ricerca ambrosiana*, in *Nec timeo mori*, Atti Congresso internazionale di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della death of sant'Ambrogio, Milan 1998, 31-72.

M.G. Mara

AMBROSIAN LITURGY

I. Origins - II. Course of formation - III. Sources and different layers of redaction.

In antiquity the geographical area of *Italy witnessed a flowering of liturgical traditions. Besides *Rome, these included the Campano-Beneventan (see *Paulinus of Nola [d. 431], who according to *Gennadius [*De vir. ill.* 49 (PL 58, 1087; TU 14,79)], composed a sacramentary and a hymnal); the *Aquileian (compare *Fortunatian [d. after 360], who, according to *Jerome [*De vir. ill.* 97]], composed a list of evangelical pericopes "*titulis ordinatis*" [CCL 9,365ff.] with the pastoral and liturgical work of *Chromatius of Aquileia [387–407] [see eds. R. Etaix - J. Lemarié CCL 9A]); the *Ravennan (compare the opisthographic *Rotulus* [ed. L.C. Mohlberg, 1956, and by S. Benz, 1967, LQF 45] with the work of *Peter Chrysologus [ca. 425–451] and *Maximian [546–556], esp. the latter's *Liber Sacramentorum* described by *Agnellus* in the *Lib. Pont. Eccl. Ravvenat.* 2,6 [MGH *Scrip. Rer. Lang.*, eds. Holder-Egger, 332; PL 106, 610]); and the Ambrosian, which, with the Roman, are the only two that survive today.

I. Origins. From the evidence of the *Liber Notitiae Sanctorum Mediolani* (written 1304–1311, eds. M. Magistretti - U. Monneret de Villard, Milan 1917), which used ancient sources, we know that St. *Simplicianus (d. 401) completed the Ambrosian office "*ubi sanctus Ambrosius non impleverat*" (col. 376) and that St. Eusebius (ca. 449–452) composed "*multos cantus ecclesiae*" (col. 120) in imitation of St. *Ambrose (374-397), whose biographer Paulinus attests was the first to introduce "*antiphonae, hymni ac vigiliae*" in the *Milanese church (see *Vita S. Ambr. a Paulino . . . conscripta* PL 14, 31, n. 13). In fact Ambrose did make use of alternating popular liturgical *chant (see Aug., *Conf.* 9,7,15) and composed other liturgical texts (see Wal. Strab., *Rer. eccl.* chs. 22 and 25) such as—perhaps—a *laus cerei* (see Aug., *De Civ. Dei* 15,22).

The name Ambrosian *liturgy is thus given to the liturgy inspired, in fact or merely nominally, by that used by St. Ambrose and which took form in the tradition of *Milan, Ambrose's episcopal see, and in the neighboring or satellite territories of the metropolis. In *De sacramentis* III,5, Ambrose says: "In all things I desire to follow the Roman church, yet we too *hominis sensum habemus*." It should be said, then, that the Ambrosian liturgy has its roots in the Roman liturgy, as Probst, Ceriani, Magistretti, Cagin, Cabrol, Batiffol and Jungmann think. Nevertheless, evidence (chants, antiphons, the system of biblical pericopes for the Eucharist, prayers, etc.) advanced by other scholars (Duchesne, Lejay, Cattaneo, Alzati) suggests an Eastern origin. One thing is certain: the Ambrosian liturgy has a specific quality that must be sought in its particular elements,

such as systems of biblical readings, euchologies, nuances of typical themes, the structure of the *liturgical year, the sanctoral cycle and feasts, and the formation of the liturgical books themselves.

II. Course of formation. The peculiarities of the formation of the Ambrosian liturgy must be sought in both intrinsic and extrinsic factors, principal among these being: (1) The Ambrosian liturgy's profound roots in anti-*Arianism. In fact, in its origin (4th-5th c.), development (6th-7th c.) and establishment (8th-9th c.) the Ambrosian liturgy always had to combat Arianism, whether pure (4th-5th c.) or *barbarian (*Longobard, 6th-7th c.), or the imitators of Arianism (8th-9th c.). This impressed a strong christocentrism on the Ambrosian liturgy, which was strengthened at the time of the *Acacian *schism (484–519), during which the Milanese bishops showed absolute solidarity with the Roman pontiff. After the so-called question of the *Three Chapters, in which theological and political complications led a series of Milanese bishops from *Vitalis (552–556) to *Lawrence (573–592) to adhere to the schism, the Catholic bishops of Milan, faithful to orthodoxy and back from their voluntary exile at Genoa (571–649) to escape the Longobard massacres, gradually reconquered the positions of a Catholicity of faith more genuine than ever; from 670 onward, all spirit of separatism ceased. All this influenced the composition of formulas and formularies of the Ambrosian liturgy, which contain rich reflections on the person of Christ: the incarnation of the Word, his virginal birth, emphasis on his humanity-divinity, and consequently a marked veneration of Mary, Virgin and Mother. (2) Repeated contact between Milan (bearing in mind the city's central location from antiquity, making it a place of cultural and commercial exchange) and other cultural centers. This explains both the hybrid origins of the Ambrosian liturgy and its different stratifications and contaminations. This is not eclecticism, but a testimony to the multifaceted richness present in the Ambrosian liturgy. There are demonstrable exchanges, influences, contaminations and contacts with Rome; with the East through two specific cultural centers, Ravenna and Aquileia; with W *Africa (*Carthage, *Thagaste etc.) and E Africa (*Alexandria); with *Spain; and later with N Europe, through both the *Celtic monks and the so-called Carolingian reform.

III. Sources and different layers of redaction. It is well known that the name Ambrosian given to the church of Milan goes back to a letter of John VIII in 881 (*legatio Ambrosianae ecclesiae:* MGH *Ep. Karol. Aevi* V, n. 269, 237). *Gregory I, however, was already addressing Milanese ecclesiastics with the expression *Sancto Ambrosio deservientibus clericis* (MGH *Epistulae II*, 266). Moreover, it has always been the conviction that in the history of the Milanese church Ambrose was the *primus*, *id est maximus*, *metropolitanam regens cathedram* (Landolfo, *Historia mediolanensis* I,11; IL, 35: MGH *Scriptores VIII*,42,70). Thus Ambrose's expression in his *Sermo contra Auxentium de basil. trad.* 18 (PL 16, 1055) about the inheritance he received from his predecessors—Dionysius, Eustorgius, Mirocles *atque omnium retro fidelium episcoporum*—immediately became, after his death, the inheritance of Ambrose. Nothing that pertained to the church of Milan could fail to be Ambrosian. This explains the effort of scholars to isolate, from MS sources of the Ambrosian liturgy dating from the 9th c. on, whatever can be redactionally dated between the period from Ambrose to the final codification of the period of the Longobard revival and the Carolingian reform. The three major redactional layers demonstrably present in the Ambrosian liturgy and that testify to the ongoing enrichment of Ambrose's primitive nucleus can best be understood in relation to the Ambrosian liturgy's course of formation. The first redaction goes back to the 4th-5th c. and was isolated by the study of Paredi and others. The second redaction had its apogee in the 7th c., according to the studies of Heiming and Triacca. The third redaction was the Carolingian (9th-10th c.), which, according to the studies of Borella, Cattaneo and others, saw a gradual and coercive Romanization of the Ambrosian liturgy. One can thus distinguish within the one Ambrosian liturgy, from the formal point of view, the pure and genuine Ambrosian liturgy attested by the first redaction and in part by the second redaction, and a contaminated Ambrosian liturgy attested especially by the third redaction.

In any case, the expressive and interpretative plurality that developed through the (4th) 5th-9th (10th) c. within the one Ambrosian liturgy–i.e., the one "liturgical tradition," reinvigorated and reclothed in different "liturgical traditions" in the passage from one generation to the next and in the succcession of cultures (first Roman-Italic, then barbarian-Longobard)–did preserve what is perennially related to Christ. In general the sources of the Ambrosian liturgy evidence clear themes on the mystery of Christ in his cosmic-anthropological-salvific centrality, as well as an incisiveness of content that combines conceptual density and theologi-

cally pregnant unitariness with a style that, even where concise, seems overloaded with respect to the *concinnitas romana*.

Useful biographical reviews: Borella-Cattaneo-Villa, *Questioni e bibliografia Ambrosiana*, (Archivio Ambrosiano IL) Milan 1950; P. Borella, *Bibliografia*, in Id., *Il Rito Ambrosiano*, Brescia 1964, 475-492; *Orientamenti bibliografici*, in L. Prosdocimi - C. Alzati, *La Chiesa Ambrosiana. Profili di storia istituzionale e liturgica*, N.E.D., Milan 1980, 69-85; A.J. Schuster, *Notizie sulla liturgia ambrosiana*, in *Storia di Milano*, I, Milan 1953, 443-461; E. Cattaneo, *Storia e particolarità del rito ambrosiano*, in *Storia di Milano* III, Milan 1954, 761-837; M. Huglo - L. Agustoni - E. Cardine - E.T. Moneta-Caglio, *Fonti e paleografia del Canto Ambrosiano* (Archivio Ambrosiano, VII), Milan 1956: P. Borella, in M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia Liturgica*, Milan: IV ([2]1959) 555-620 (= *I Sacramenti nella liturgia Ambrosiana*); III ([3]1966) 615-676 (= *La Messa Ambrosiana*); IL ([3]1969) 838-879 (= *Il Breviario Ambrosiano* 1); P. Borella, *Il rito ambrosiano*, Brescia 1964; A.M. Triacca, *La liturgia ambrosiana*, in *La Liturgia. Panorama storico generale*, ed. M. Salvatore. Casale 1978, 125-130; Id., *Libri liturgici ambrosiani*, in Salvatore (ed.), op. cit., 201-217; E. Cattaneo, *La Chiesa di Ambrogio. Studi di storia e liturgia*, Milan 1984; F. Segala, *Saggio di bibliografia sulla liturgia ambrosiana dal 1950 al 1975*, Verona 1995; C. Alzati, *Ambosianum mysterium: la Chiesa di Milano e la sua tradizione liturgica*, Milan 2000; *Liturgia*, eds. D. Sartore, A.M. Triacca, C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001, 6-46 (rich bibl.).

A.M. Triacca

AMBROSIASTER (d. after 384). Author of the *Commentaries* on the thirteen Pauline letters that were attributed to *Ambrose throughout the Middle Ages. The discovery of the nonauthenticity of that attribution during the Renaissance resulted in the name Ambrosiaster being given to the work's anonymous author. (Erasmus of Rotterdam was responsible for correcting the *communis opinio,* recognizing the nonauthenticity of the entire work [see R. Hoven, *Notes sur Érasme et les auteurs anciens*: L'Antiquité Classique 38 (1969) 169-174]; until recently the term Ambrosiaster has been thought to derive from Erasmus as well, but Lunn-Rockliffe has argued that the term was coined by the Benedictines of St Maur in their 1686-1690 edition of Ambrose's works.) Besides the MSS that contain the *Commentaries* under Ambrose's name, some codices ascribe them to a certain Hilarius; most MSS (including the oldest, the mid-6th-c. *Casinensis CL*) present the work as anonymous. The problem of authorship is still unresolved: many hypotheses attempt to ascribe the work to an author known to us, but none have gained the consensus of scholars. Among proposed authors are the *Luciferian deacon Hilarius, the *Donatist *Tyconius, the Roman priest *Faustinus, the converted Jew Isaac (adversary of Pope *Damasus), the Roman prefect Hilarianus Hilarius, Hilarius of Pavia, *Evagrius of *Antioch, the imperial official Claudius Callistus Hilarius, the Roman prefect Emilianus Dexter (son of *Pacian of Barcelona and a friend of *Jerome), *Niceta of Remesiana and *Maximus of *Turin. Clues in his writings indicate that Ambrosiaster worked at *Rome during the pontificate of Pope Damasus (366–384), though he probably had links with N *Italy and *Spain. The author may have been a convert from *paganism or *Judaism. The *Commentaries,* for the first time in the West, offer a systematic explanation of the Pauline letters, which they include in their entirety according to a Latin text common in *Italy before the Vulgate revision. Their historical-literal *exegesis, averse to *allegory but not ignoring typology, uses biblical citations and rational argumentation to demonstrate theological themes. They include practical applications to the moral life of believers. A not-insignificant problem underlying the exact reconstruction of Ambrosiaster's thought is the existence of more than one recension of the *Commentaries* (three for *Romans,* two for the other letters), at times partially different in doctrinal content: Vogels, who edited the critical edition of the work with reference to the research of Brewer and Souter, considers them successive reworkings by the author himself, naming them α, β and γ, with γ being the last and definitive version.

A problem of different recensions exists with the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, passed down among *Augustine's works but now, following Souter's studies, unanimously attributed to Ambrosiaster. We have three collections which contain, respectively, 127, 150 and 115 treatises. Most of these explain difficult passages of Scripture; others expound the faith in polemic with *heretics, *pagans or Jews; and still others refer to precise historical conditions, such as the *quaestio CI* which rebukes the pride of the Roman deacons.

Some exegetical fragments in the codex Ambrosianus I 101 sup. (8th c.) are also attributed to Ambrosiaster: three fragments on *Matthew 24*, the *Incipit de tribus mensuris* (on Mt 13:33 // Lk 13:21) and *De Petro apostolo* (on Mt 26:52 and Peter's denial) (see A. Souter, *Reasons for Regarding Hilarius* (*Ambrosiaster*) *as the Author of the Mercati-Turner Anecdoton*: JTS 5 [1903-1904] 608-621).

The themes present in Ambrosiaster's work, though mainly related to the biblical texts he comments on, show some of his particular interests: the problem of the unbelief of the Jews (of whose institutions the author has a profound knowledge and whose adherence to Christ he awaits); the relationship between the Mosiac law and faith in Christ and

the question of the Judaizers; the position of the pagans with respect to the Christian message; the presentation of *trinitarian and *christological faith; and the situation of the human creature, sinner and redeemed. Ambrosiaster's treatment of this last theme has often led scholars to comparisons with Augustine and *Pelagius, with differing conclusions. The earliest explicit citation of a text of Ambrosiaster is by Augustine in 420, who introduces a passage of Ambrosiaster's commentary on Rom 5:12 as a work of "sanctus Hilarius," clearly thinking of Hilary of Poitiers (*c. Pelag*. IV,4,7).

CPL 184-188; CPPM IIA 1745-1767; Repertorium biblicum medii aevi (F. Stegmüller) Supplementum VIII A-E (1976) 1248-1262 (for the 5 exegetical fragments n. 1261).

Commentaries: PL 17, 47-536; CSEL 81,1.2.3. *Quaestiones*: PL 36, 2215-2422; CSEL 50. *Frammenti su Matteo*: G. Mercati, *Il commentario latino di un ignoto chiliasta su s. Matteo*: ST 11 (1903) 23-49; C.H. Turner, *An Exegetical Fragment of the Third Century*: JTS 5 (1903-1904) 227-241; PLS 1, 665-670; Eng. tr., Ambrosiaster (ed. G. L. Bray), *Commentaries on Romans and 1-2 Corinthians*, Downers Grove 2009; Id., *Commentaries on Galatians—Philemon,* Downers Grove 2009.

Studies: A. Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*: TSt 7/4, Cambridge 1905; W. Mundle, *Die Exegese der paulinischen Briefe in Kommentar des Ambrosiaster*, Marburg 1919; A. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford 1927; DBS 1, 225-241; C. Martini, *Ambrosiaster. De auctore, operibus, theologia*, Rome 1944; TRE 2, 356-362; Patrologia III, 169-180 (bibl.); A. Pollastri, *Ambrosiaster. Commento alla lettera ai Romani. Aspetti cristologici*, L'Aquila 1977; Id., *Il prologo del Commento alla Lettera ai Romani dell'Ambrosiaster*: SSR 2 (1978) 93-127; Id., *Nota all'interpretazione di Matteo 13,33, Luca 13,21 nel frammento Incipit de tribus mensuris*: SSR 3 (1979) 61-78; Id., *Sul rapporto tra cristiani e giudei secondo il Commento dell'Ambrosiaster ad alcuni passi paolini* (*Gal 3,19b-20; 4,4; Rom 11,16.20.25-26a; 15,11*): SSR 4 (1980) 313-327; L. Speller, *Ambrosiaster and the Jews*: SP XVII/1 (1982) 72-78; J. Chapa Prado, *El comentario de Ambrosiaster a las epistolas de san Pablo* (doctoral thesis directed by C. Basevi), Pamplona 1983; Ambrosiaster, *Commento alla lettera ai Romani* (ed. A. Pollastri), Rome 1984; N. Cipriani, *Un'altra traccia dell'Ambrosiaster in Agostino* (De pecc. mer. remiss. *II,36,58-59*): Augustinianum 24 (1984) 515-525; L. Fatica, Ambrosiaster: *l'esegesi nei Commentari alle Epistole ai Corinzi*: VetChr 2 (1987) 269-292; Ambrosiaster, *Commento alla lettera ai Galati* (ed. L. Fatrica), Rome 1986; W. Geerlings, *Römisches Recht und Gnadentheologie*, in var. aus., *Homo Spiritalis*, Würzburg 1987, 357-377; Ambrosiaster, *Commento alla prima lettera ai Corinzi* (ed. L. Fatica), Rome 1989; Ambrosiaster, *Commento alla seconda lettera ai Corinzi* (ed. L. Fatica), Rome 1989; D.G. Hunter, *On the Sin of Adam and Eve: A Little-Known Defense of Marriage and Childbearing by Ambrosiaster,* HTR 82 (1989) 283-299; M. Pesce, *Il commentario dell'Ambrosiaster alla* Prima lettera ai corinzi. *Alla ricerca della differenza tra esegesi antica ed esegesi storica*: Annali di storia dell'esegesi 7/2 (1990) 593-629; J.B. Valero, *Pera ed Adán: según Ambrosiaster*: EstEcl 65 (1990) 147-191; D. Hunter, *The Paradise of Patriarchy: Ambrosiaster on Woman as* (*not*) *God's Image*: JTS n.s. 43 (1992) 447-469; L. Perrone, *Echi della polemica pagana sulla Bibbia negli scritti esegetici fra IV e V secolo: le* Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti *dell'Ambrosiaster*: Annali di storia dell'esegesi 11/1 (1993) 161-185; O. Heggelbacher, *Beziehungen zwischen Ambrosiaster und Maximus von Turin?*: Freigurger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie 41 (1994) 5-44; A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Augustin commentateur de saint Paul et l'Ambrosiaster*: SE 36 (1996) 17-65; A. Merkt, *Wer war der Ambrosiaster?*: Wissenschaft und Weisheit 59 (1996) 19-33; W. Geerlings, *Das verständnis von Gesetz im Galaterbriefkommentar des Ambrosiaster*, in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche*, Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert, Berlin-New York 1997, 101-113; J. Stüben, *Erasmus von Rotterdam und der Ambrosiaster:* Wissenschaft und Weisheit 60 (1997) 3-22; A. Pollastri, *Escatologia e Scrittura nell'Ambrosiaster*: Annali di storia dell'esegesi 17/1 (2000) 109-132; A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Pauline Exegesis and Ambrosiaster*, in *Augustine Biblical Exegete* (eds. F. Van Fleteren - J. Schnaubelt), New York 2001, 33-54; PCBE 1, 102-104; S. Lunn-Rockliffe, *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, Oxford 2007.

A. Pollastri

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS (ca. 335–400). Latin historian, born at *Antioch to a noble Greek family. As a youth he entered the corps of the *protectores domestici,* for a long time following the *magister equitum* Ursicinus, first at *Nisibis, *Milan and Antioch, then in *Gaul and the East, against the *Persians. After escaping from the siege of Amida (359), he went with Ursicinus to Melitene and from there to Antioch. In 363 he followed the emperor *Julian in the expedition against the Persians and, after Julian's death (26 July 363), retreated to Antioch; after further travels he reached *Rome, where he wrote the *Rerum gestarum libri*. In contact with Roman aristocratic circles, Ammianus became a senator in his final years (Symm., *Ep*. IX, 110), although he was expelled from Rome in 383 on the occasion of a severe famine. He died shortly after 400. Ammianus's work, the *Rerum gestarum libri,* covered the period from Nerva (96) to the death of *Valens (378) in 31 books. The surviving books, XIV-XXXI, include 26 years of history, from 354 (death of Gallus) to 378. While programatically following *Tacitus's *Historiae,* Ammianus dedicated much of his work to describing the historical events of his own time, whose customs, society and cultural trends he carefully described. The presence of a variety of substantial excursuses, the insertion of speeches and the use of an artificial style attest to his taste for the traditions of the genre. His essential *paganism, reflected in his praise of Julian, does not prevent him from detachment and impartiality toward Christianity. Claims of benign religious tolerance (XXII,10,2; XXX,9,5) accompany disapproval of Julian's persecuting zeal (XXII,10,7; XXII,12,7; XXV,4,17-20) and sincere words of admiration for the *martyrs (XXII,11,10). His interest in religious movements was a fruit of the same *curiositas* that caused him to diligently note *miracula* and *signa* (XIX,12,20); he was also well in-

formed, however, about the usage and customs of the church (XIV,9,7; XXI,2,5; XXXI,12,8; XV,7,7), as well as of its internal affairs, such as the clash between *Damasus and *Ursinus (XXVII,3,12-15). His sources remain uncertain and obscure: probably Oribasius, Magnus of Carre, Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, Eutychianus of *Cappadocia, Rufius Festus, Timagenes, Pliny the Elder (these latter for the excursuses). The text is in codex *Vat. lat.* 1873, an exact copy of a 10th-c. codex from Hersfeld now almost completely lost. The *editio princeps* was published at Rome in 1474 by Angelo Sabino.

C.U. Clark, *Ammiani Marcellini rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, Berlin 1915 (= 1963); J.C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, with an English tr., 3 vols., London 1935-39 (= 1982-86); W. Seyfarth, *Ammiani Marcellini rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1978; Id., *Ammianus Marcellinus römische Geschichte*, 4 vols., Berlin 1968-86; E. Galletier - G. Sabbah - J. Fontaine - A.-M. Marié - L.A. de la Beaumelle, *Ammien Marcellin Histoires*, 6 vols., Paris 1968-99; O. Veh - G. Wirth, *Das römische Weltreich vor dem Untergang: sämtliche erhaltene Bücher A. M.*, Zürich 1974 (= Amsterdam 1997); A. Selem, *Le storie di Ammianus Marcellinus*, Turin 1976 (= 1993); J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst et al., *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus*, Groningen 1987-1998; M. Caltabiano, *Ammianus Marcellinus, Storie*, Milan 1989; PWK I, 1845-1852; EI 2, 988-990; EC 1, 1080-1082; KlP V, 302; RAC I, 386ff.; LTK 1, 440; Schanz IV, 1, 93-107; R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, Oxford 1968; L. Angliviel de la Beaumelle, *Remarques sur l'attitude d'Ammien Marcellin à l'égard du christianisme*, in *Mélanges d'Histoire Ancienne offerts à William Seston*, Paris 1974, 15-23; R.C. Blockley, *Ammianus Marcellinus: A Study of His Historiography and Political Thought*, Brussels 1975; N. Bitter, *Kampfschilderungen bei Ammianus Marcellinus*, Bonn 1976; G. Viansino, *Studi sulle Res Gestae di Ammiano Marcellino*, Salerno 1977; G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin*, Paris 1978; N.J.E. Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare: An Investigation into Ammianus' Military Knowledge*, Brussels 1979; E.A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, 1947; V. Neri, *Ammiano e il cristianesimo: religione e politica nelle Res gestae di Ammianus Marcellinus*, Bologna 1985; J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London 1989; var. aus., *Cognitio Gestorum: The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Amsterdam 1991; M. Navarra, *Riferimenti normativi e prospettive giuspubblicistiche nelle Res gestae di Ammianus Marcellinus*, Milan 1994; T.D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca - London 1998; J.W. Drijvers - D. Hunt, *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London - New York 1999; F. Wittchow, *Exemplarisches Erzählen bei Ammianus Marcellinus*, Munich 2002.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

AMMON (4th c.). Bishop of an unspecified see. At the request of a bishop Theophilus, he wrote a letter on *Pachomius and esp. on his favorite disciple Theodore. Ammon knew the latter personally when, from age 17, he spent three years at Pbou (352-355). The letter can be likened in its literary inspiration to *Athanasius's *Life of Anthony* and to the *Lausiac History* of *Palladius: all three provide, by request, a history that is also a eulogy on the *monastic life. Ammon describes Theodore's most outward and marvelous traits, his gift of prophecy and miracles. His evidence must be used with circumspection.

CPG II, 2378; CPGS, 2378.

E. Prinzivalli

AMMON of Adrianople (d. after 394). Late 4th-c. bishop of Adrianople (*Thrace), who participated at the synod of *Constantinople (394) that resolved the *schism between Bagadius and Agapius over the see of Bostra (Mansi III, 851-854). He was again at Constantinople in 399, participating in the meeting of bishops in which Eusebius of Valentinopolis presented his accusation of *simony against Antoninus of *Ephesus. Ammon wrote a *De resurrectione* against *Origen.

CPG II, 2540; CPGS, 2540.

E. Prinzivalli

AMMONAS (4th c.). Feast 26 January (for the Greeks). After 14 years of *monastic life as St. *Anthony's disciple at *Scete and his successor (356) as head of a group of *anchorites at Pispir on the right bank of the Nile, he was consecrated by *Athanasius as bishop of a small unknown center mainly for *monks for whom he was given a certain responsibility more pastoral than legal. He died before 396, since the **Historia monachorum in Aegypto* knew his successor Pithyrion (XV,2). 11 **apophthegmata* are attributed to him (PG 65, 120-124), of which nos. 1, 3, 4, 9 and 11 undoubtedly belong to the original group; nos. 8 and 10, which emphasize his exceptional episcopal mercy toward (even unrepentant) sinners, are also certainly authentic. No. 2, however, is suspect. Less widespread, but of great importance, are the 14 letters attested (6th c.) in a *Syriac version (PO X, 6), some of which are preserved in *Georgian, Greek (PO XI, 4), an Arabic revision (PG 40, 1019-1066) and *Armenian. They give testimony to a very early period of *monasticism, with their citations of Jewish Christian *apocrypha (**Ascension of Isaiah;* **Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) and insistence on an experience of the *Holy Spirit. Other works are less certain. The texts of Ammonas sometimes circulated under the name of *Macarius; texts of *Isaiah of Gaza and even of *Evagrius have also been attributed to him. The names Amoun, Pi-Ammon, etc., are

common in *Egypt; F. Nau has drawn up (PO 11, 4, 393, n. 1) a list of monks the spelling of whose names in documents is uncertain and should not be confused with our author.

CPG II, 2380-2393/CPG Suppl., 2380; F. Klejna, *Antonius und Ammonas. Eine Untersuchung über Herkunft und Eigenart der ältesten Mönchshriefe*: ZKTh 62 (1938) 309-348; DIP 1, 535-536. Fr. tr.: B. Outtier - L. Regnault, *Lettres des Pères du Désert: Ammonas, Macaire, Arsène, Sérapion de Thmuis* (Spiritualité Orientale 42; Bégrollesen- Mauges: Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1985). Eng. tr.: D.J. Chitty, *The Letters of Ammonas: Successor of Saint Antony* (revised and with an introduction by S. Brock), Oxford 1979.

J. Gribomont

AMMONIUS (5th-6th c.). *Aristotelian commentator and son of Hermias and Aidesia (see *Suidae Lexicon*, nn. 79 and 3035, ed. A. Adler, II, Leipzig 1931, 161 and 412; Damascius, *Vitae Isidori reliquiae*, 74, ed. C. Zintzen, Hildesheim 1967, p. 100), who distinguished himself as a disciple of *Proclus at *Athens (Damascius, *Vitae Is*. 79, p. 110) but lived nearly his entire life in his native city of *Alexandria, becoming head of its school. He taught Aristotelian commentators such as *Simplicius, *John Philoponus, and Olympiodorus (see J. Freudenthal, PWK I, 2, 1865), and some *Neoplatonic philosophers, as well as Damascius (see *Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 181, 127a, II 192,5-6 Henry). Damascius (*Vitae Is*. 79, p. 110) and Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 181, 127a, II 192,9-10) tell us of his great versatility in various areas of philosophy, e.g., astronomy and geometry. He was also an exegete of *Plato (Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 181,127a, II 192,8), but dedicated esp. to interpreting Aristotle's works (Damascius, *Vitae Is*. 79, p. 110).

Modern criticism has not endorsed the fame he enjoyed among his contemporaries and among later Aristotelian commentators, considering him unoriginal, pedantic and trivial (see Freudenthal, PWK I, 2, 1864; C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, I, Leipzig 1927, 642). His writings are (1) a commentary on Ptolemy's *Syntaxis*, lost (see Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 181, 127a, II 192,9-10); (2) on Aristotle's god, demonstrating that it was not only the final but also the efficient cause (see Simplicius, *In Phys*. VIII, 10, p. 1363,8-10 Diels), also lost; (3) *De fato* (ed. I.C. Orellius, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis*, *Ammonii Hermiae filii*, *Plotini*, *Bardesanis Syri et Georgii Gemisti Plethonis De fato quae supersunt graece*, Turici 1824; see K. Praechter in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, Berlin 1926, 637); (4) a commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* (ed. A. Busse, CAG IV, III, Berolini 1891); (5) a commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* (ed. A. Busse, CAG IV, IV, Berolini 1895); (6) a commentary on Aristotle's *De interpretatione* (ed. A. Busse, CAG IV, V, Berolini 1897); (7) a commentary on Aristotle's *Prior Analytics,* partly lost (J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota graeca e codd. man. Bibliothecae regiae* I, Oxonii 1839, 239-240, pointed out the presence of a number of *scholia* of Ammonius on the *Prior Analytics* and a treatise by Ammonius on the hypothetical syllogism in frags. 88r and 254r of the Paris codex. gr. 2064; on the treatise on the hypothetical syllogism, see also Freudenthal, PWK I, 2, 1865; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, III 2, Leipzig 1903, 894 n. 1; and C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, I Leipzig 1927, 657 n. 168; the *scholia* contained in frags. 88r-112r of Paris. gr. 2064 were published as a genuine work of Ammonius by M. Wallies, CAG IV, VI, Berolini 1899, 1-36; the so-called treatise on the hypothetical syllogism in frag. 254r of Paris. gr. 2064 was published by Wallies, op. cit., 67-69 along with other *scholia* on the *Prior Analytics* contained in frags. 226r-261r of the same codex, see ibid., 37-76: Wallies seems to consider neither authentic); (8) a commentary on the *Posterior Analytics*, mentioned by John Philoponus (see Wallies, op. cit., V, I) from which a few *scholia* have survived in various codices (see A. Wartelle, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs*, Paris 1963, 184); (9) a commentary on Aristotle's *De generatione et corruptione* on which John Philoponus's surviving commentary on the same is based (see Wartelle, op. cit., 184); (10) a commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica,* referred to by Olympiodorus (see E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, III 2, Leipzig [4]1903, 894 n. 1); (11) a commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo* (see Zeller, loc. cit.); (12) a commentary on Plato's *Gorgias,* cited by Olympiodorus (see Zeller, loc. cit.). Three codices—Paris. gr. 1899, Paris. gr. 1901 and Paris. gr. 1904—contain a commentary on the first six books of Aristotle's *Metaphysics,* attributed to Ammonius (see Wartelle, op. cit., 102-184; H. Omont, *Invent. somm. des man. grecs de la Bibl. nat*., II, Paris 1888, 160-161): in fact, it is not Ammonius's commentary but that of *Asclepius, though dependent on Ammonius's lectures; it was published by M. Hayduck (see M. Hayduck, CAG VI, II, Berolini 1888, p. VI and n. 3 of the same page; Zeller, loc. cit.). The surviving Aristotelian commentaries do not reproduce Ammonius's original words but comprise notes taken by his hearers (see Freudenthal, PWK 1,2, 1864; Wallies, CAG IV, VI, p. VI). At times there are two or three different *scholia* that comment on the same point (see C.A. Brandis, AAWB hist. phil. Kb. 1833, 283; Freudenthal, PWK I, 2, 1864); sometimes there are obvious interpolations (see Freudenthal, loc. cit.); and in some cases the

same work is handed down in the codices in multiple recensions (e.g., the commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*—see no. 4 above—of which there are various recensions, one of which is contained, e.g., in the codices Vat. gr. 1777 frags. 1r-27v, Vat. gr. 2189 frags. 2r-49r, Neapol. gr. III D 37 frags. 1r-14, see Busse, CAG IV, III, XIV and XXIII and P. Canart, *Codices Vat. gr. 1745-1962*, Bibl. Vat. 1970, 112-113).

C.A. Brandis, *Über die Reihenfolge der Bücher des aristotelischen Organons und ihre griechische Ausleger*: AAWB hist. phil. Kl (1833) 283; J. Freudenthal: PWK I, 2, 1863-1865; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* III, 2, Leipzig [4]1903, 893-896; C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, I, Leipzig 1927, 642 and 657, n. 168; G.L. Kustas, *The Commentators on Aristotle's Categories and on Porphyry's Isagoge, Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*, Thessalonica 1973. On the MSS, see in particular A. Busse, CAG IV, III, Berolini 1891, V-XLVI; CAG IV, IV, Berolini 1895, V-XXII; CAG IV, V, Berolini 1897, V-LIV; M. Wallies, CAG IV, VI, Berolini 1899, V-XIV; A. Wartelle, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs*, Paris 1963, 184; H.D. Saffrey, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, I, Paris 1989, 168-169.

S. Lilla

AMMONIUS of Alexandria (6th c.). *Anastasius the Sinaite twice cites in his *Hodegos* (CPG 7745) the work of a certain Ammonius of Alexandria, in which the latter attacks *Julian of Halicarnassus, the founder of *aphthartodocetism. There Ammonius of Alexandria invokes an objection that "the infidel Jewish philosopher *Philo" must have raised against Mnason, a disciple of the apostles: the miracles of the OT were much greater than all of Jesus' miracles, and many NT statements show that Jesus could not be God. Obviously this statement cannot be from *Philo of Alexandria. An influence of the discussion between a *monk and two Jews, Papiscos and Philo, is unlikely, as is the relation, asserted by J.E. Bruns, with the lost dialogue of *Aristo of Pella (CPG 1101). The source is indicated—both in an account "on priestly dignity" (BHG 1322v), originally reaching us in a sermon of Anastasius the Sinaite (CPG 7750) and in an *Erotapokrisis* of the same Anastasius passed down independently (CPG 7746,5)—as the "history of the church of the philosopher *Philo" (CPG 7512), i.e., "Philo the historian." A scholiast mentions *Philo of Carpasia who lived late 4th c.; of his work, however, we have only a commentary on the *Song of Songs (CPG 3810) and a fragment of a commentary on the *Hexameron, cited by *Cosmas Indicopleustes (CPG 7463). Given the above, nothing can be said with certainty other than that neither of Anastasius's citations refer to the exegete Ammonius of Alexandria, who was active 6th c. (CPG 5500-5506). A third *testimonium* present in the *Hodegos*, however, must be from the work "against the heresies of *Eutyches and *Dioscorus" by a certain priest Ammonius of Alexandria.

Editions: (1) *Contra Julianum Halicarnassensem* (CPG 6982): *Anastasii Sinaitae Viae dux,* XIII, 8,23-51; XIII,10,12-79, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, CCSG 8, Turnhout - Leuven 1981, 243-244; 252-254; (2) *Adversus haereses Eutychii et Dioscori*: ibid., XIV,1,1-33, loc.cit., 256-257.

Studies: G. Mercati, *Un preteso scritto di san Pietro vescovo d'Alessandria e martire sulla bestemmia e Filone l'istoriografo*: Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teologiche (1905) 162-180 (Opere Minori II, StT 77, Rome 1937, 426-438); M. Richard, *Les textes hagiographiques du codex Athos Philothéou 52*: AB 93 (1975) 150; 154 (BHG 1322v in a recension of the ps.-Anastasian *Erotapokriseis,* CPG 7746); J.E. Bruns, *The* Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci, *Philo, and Anastasius the Sinaite*: ThS 43 (1973) 287-294; D.T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, Assen-Minneapolis 1993, 210-211; K.-H. Uthemann, *Was verraten Katenen über die Exegese ihrer Zeit?*, in G. Schöllgen - C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum*. Festschrift für E. Dassmann, JbAC, Erg. 23, Münster 1996, 290.

K.-H. Uthemann

AMMONIUS Saccas (2nd-3rd c.). As Dörrie (Hermes 83, 1955, 466) and Schröder (ANRW II 36,1 [1987] 520) observed, the surname Saccas is found only in *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Graec. aff. cur.* VI, 96 (PG 83, 977 B 1-5; SC 57,1 p. 276, 1-4), in the *Lexicon Suidae* (I 145,30-31; IV 151,23-24 Adler) and in Ammianus Marcellinus 22, 16, 16 (I 291,15-20 Seyfarth), where, however, the words *Saccas* and *Plotini magister* are an interpolation and where the Ammonius named with other grammarians is not the *Alexandrian philosopher but a grammarian (see Dörrie, 1955, 467). We have evidence on Ammonius from *Porphyry (*Vita Plot.* 3; 7; 10; 14; 20), *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 19,9-10), *Nemesius of Emesa (*De nat. hom.* 2,19,31; 3,56-60), Theodoret (*Graec. aff. cur.* VI, 96) and *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 214, 172a). *Proclus also alludes to Ammonius's teaching in *Theol. Plat.* II, 4 (II 31,8-9 Saffrey-Westerink): Origen the *Neoplatonist is said to have attended the same school as *Plotinus.

A comparison of the evidence allows us to conclude the following: (1) Ammonius taught at *Alexandria for ca. 50 years, from the time of *Commodus (d. 192) until his own death, ca. 242, the year of Gordian III's *Persian expedition, which Plotinus joined: there is no reason to doubt this, as Dörrie does (1955, 468). That Ammonius had already begun his activity at the time of Commodus is considered very probable by Baltes (Gnomon 56 [1984] 205). (2) As nearly all scholars admit (Dodds, *Les sources de*

Plotin, 31 n. 1; Theiler, *Forsch. zum Neuplat*. 1 and 39; Kettler, *Kerygma und Logos*, 322-323), Origen the Christian studied at Ammonius's school: there is no reason to assert, as do Dörrie (1955, pp. 468-469) and Goulet (RHPhR 57 [1977] 484-488), that Origen the Christian had a Christian Ammonius for a teacher, different from Plotinus's teacher, and that Porphyry had confused Origen the Christian with Origen the Neoplatonist, who did study under Ammonius (that Porphyry would have made such a mistake is highly unlikely, see Kettler, 1979, p. 323). (3) Ammonius was originally a Christian who at some point renounced his faith to embrace Greek *philosophy (see Kettler 1979, 324-325, Baltes: Gnomon 56 [1984] 205); Porphyry, however, wrongly held that Origen the Christian was originally a *pagan, misled by his extraordinary knowledge of Greek philosophy (see Dodds 31 n. 1); it is very unlikely that Ammonius remained a Christian for his entire life, as *Eusebius claims (followed by Langenbeck, JHS 77 [1957] 68-69, AAWG phil. hist. Kl. 69 [1967] 149-151 and his student K.O. Weber, *Origenes der Neuplatoniker*, Zetemata 27, Munich 1962, 38: see Dodds, 27 n. 1 and 31 and S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 225 n. 3). (4) The existence of the treatise *On the Agreement Between Moses and Jesus,* spoken of by Eusebius, might be explained by supposing that it was written either by Ammonius himself in his younger years, before his "apostasy" (see Schröder: ANRW II 36,1, p. 504, where Kettler is cited, in *Epektasis*, Mélanges patristiques offerte à Jean Danielou, Paris 1972, 330), or by a homonymous Christian author, with whom Eusebius confused Ammonius. (This latter hypothesis is favored by Dörrie 1955, 468; Dodds, 31 n. 1; Theiler, 1; and Quasten, *Patrologia* I, Turin 1967, 369; see also S. Lilla, 225 n. 3.) (5) The existence of a written collection of Ammonius's lectures is accepted by von Arnim, RhM 42 (1887) 283-284, Heinemann, Hermes 61 (1926) 3-5 and Theiler, 37-38, though denied by Zeller, *Kleine Schriften* II, 96-97 and *Die Philos. der Griechen* . . . III, 2, 504, Schwyzer, PWK XXI, 1, 478, Dörrie, 467-468 and Dodds, 25. (6) It cannot be ruled out that Ammonius had a strong interest in Eastern religions and esp. Persian religion, which he passed on to at least some of his disciples: the fact that Plotinus and Antoninus, both disciples of Ammonius, were interested in Persian religion does not seem to be pure coincidence. (7) In his lectures Ammonius aimed to reconcile *Plato's thought with that of *Aristotle, thus aligning himself with the "eclectic" tendency of Antiochus of Ascalon and *Middle Platonism, and taken up again by Plotinus and Porphyry. (8) In his lectures, from which the *Enneads* are derived, Plotinus continued to keep Ammonius's teaching in mind: Porphyry's statements have rightly been emphasized by von Arnim, (276), and Heinemann (5). Nor can Theiler's procedure be entirely rejected, i.e., the discovery of precise parallels between Hierocles and Origen the Christian, just as, given the close links that undoubtedly existed between Ammonius and *Pantaenus in the late 2nd and early 3rd c. (see above, 1), it is not entirely illegitimate to think that the numerous parallels observable between *Clement of Alexandria and Plotinus can be traced to the common source of the cultural milieus of Alexandria during that period; see on this R.E. Witt, CQ 25 (1931) 195-204 and S. Lilla, 4 n. 2.

Regarding the first principle, it cannot be established with certainty whether Ammonius identified this first principle with absolute being and intelligence (as Weber, *Origenes der Neuplatoniker*, 160; Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, 10,41; Schwyzer: PWK 21,1 col. 480; Dörrie: TRE 2,470; Lilla, *Clement of Alex.*, 223-224; Baltes: Gnomon 56 [1984] 206-207) or considered it above being-intelligence, anticipating Plotinus (Schwyzer's thesis, *Ammonios Sakkas, der Lehrer Plotins*, Opladen 1983, 76-78, followed by Schröder: ANRW II 36 [1987] 517-522; thus in this new contribution Schwyrer modified his previous position, expounded in PWK 21,1). These two alternative solutions are not without foundation. On the one hand, Origen the Neoplatonist identified the highest principle with being-intelligence, as Proclus attests (*Theol. Plat.* II,4 [II, 31,9-11 fr. 7 Weber]); and according to Porphyry (*Vit. Plot.* 3 [4,24-32 Henry–Schwyzer]), in his treatise *The King Is the Only Maker* he published Ammonius's teaching, setting aside his pact with Herennius and Plotinus according to which the three disciples of Ammonius agreed not to reveal the teacher's doctrine. (Origen the Neoplatonist's conception of the first principle would thus reflect that of Ammonius.) On the other hand, Proclus, in expressing his surprise toward Origen the Neoplatonist, who had attended the same school as Plotinus, seems to consider the latter's doctrine of the One-good as superior to being-intelligence to be an inheritance of Ammonius, from which Origen the Neoplatonist had distanced himself (*Theol. Plat*. II, 4 [II, 31,4-9, 25-28 Saffrey-Westerink]). Moreover in *Vit. Plot.* 3 (5, 33-34 Henry-Schwyzer), Porphyry says that from the outset Plotinus's teaching was based on that of Ammonius. Though a precise position in favor of one or the other thesis is not possible due to a lack of explicit evidence on this point of Ammonius's teaching, it is preferable to suppose, with Dörrie: TRE 2, 470 and

Baltes: Gnomon 56 (1984) 207, that the question of the relationship between the first principle and intelligence-being was debated in Ammonius's school but not resolved in a univocal and definitive way. (That this problem was the object of discussion in the Platonic schools of the time has been rightly shown by Whittaker regarding Origen, *C. Cels.* VII, 38: VChr 23 [1969] 92 = *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, XIII.) Plotinus and Origen the Neoplatonist seem to have taken different directions: while Origen remained more faithful to the letter of Ammonius's teaching without developing its implications, Plotinus seems to have taken to its extreme consequences what may have been implicit, but not yet clearly stated, in Ammonius's doctrine of the first principle (see esp. Dörrie: TRE 2, 470).

J. Freudenthal, PWK I, 2, 1863; H.R. Schwyzer, PWK XXI, 1, 477-481; Id., *Ammonios Sakkas, der Lehrer Plotins*, Opladen 1983; H. von Arnim, *Quelle der Überlieferung uber Ammonius Sakkas*: RhM 42 (1887) 276-285; E. Zeller, *Ammonius Sakkas und Plotin*, AGPh (1894) 295-312 (= *Kleine Schriften* II, Berlin 1910, 91-107); *Die Philosophie der Griechen . . .* III, 2, Leipzig [4]1903, 500-512; F. Heinemann, *Ammonius Sakkas und der Ursprung des Neuplatonismus*: Hermes 61 (1926) 1-27; R.E. Witt, *The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria*: CQ 25 (1931) 195; E. Seeberg, *Ammonios Sakkas*: ZKG 60 (1941) 136-140; H. Dörrie, *Ammonios, der Lehrer Plotins*: Hermes 83 (1955) 439-477 (= *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 324-360); Id.: TRE 2, 453-471; H. Langerbeck, *The Philosophy of Ammonius Saccas*: JHS 77 (1957) 67-74; Id., *Die Verbindung aristotelischer und christlicher Elemente in der Philosophie des Ammonius Saccas*: AAWG phil. inst. Kl. 69 (1967) 146-166; E.R. Dodds, *Numenius and Ammonius*, in *Les sources de Plotin*, Geneva 1960, 24-32; K.O. Weber, *Origenes der Neuplatoniker*: Zetemata 2, Munich 1962, passim; W. Theiler, *Ammonius der Lehrerdes Origenes*, in *Forschungen z. Neoplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 1-45; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 4-5, 223-226; F.H. Kettler, *War Origenes Schüler des Ammonios Sakkas?*, in *Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts à J. Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 327-334; Id., *Ammonius Sakkas und Porphyrius*, in *Kerygma und Logos, Festschrift C. Andresen*, Göttingen 1979, 322-328; R. Goulet, *Porphyrius, Ammonius, les deux Origène et les autres*: RHPhR 57 (1977) 471-495; M. Baltes, recension of Schwyzer, *Ammonius Sakkas*: Gnomon 56 (1984) 204-207; F.M. Schröder, *Ammonios Sakkas*: ANRW II 36,1, Berlin-New York 1987, 483-526 (detailed presentation of the entire question regarding Ammonius, with discussion of the theses of earlier scholars; complete bibl., 523-526). E. Elorduy's works on Ammonius Saccas—whom he identified with ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, a hypothesis that has found no acceptance—are listed by H. Dörrie: Hermes 83 (1955) 440 nn. 2 and 3.

S. Lilla

AMMONIUS the ALEXANDRIAN (5th-6th c.). We know of an Ammonius the *Alexandrian, an exegete who wrote commentaries on the book of Daniel (PG 85, 1364-1381; 1823-1826) and the gospel of John (PG 85, 1392-1524), but the data on him is insufficient for a precise identification. He has tended to be identified with the presbyter and bursar of the Alexandrian church who subscribed a letter to the emperor *Leo in defense of the Council of *Chalcedon against Timotheos Ailurus. In the **catenae* on John he is called "presbyter." Since Ammonius the Alexandrian depends on 4th- and 5th-c. authors, Reuss identifies him with the other *Ammonius of Alexandria (CPG 6982), cited by *Anastasius the Sinaite and thus dated the first half of the 6th c. Others, such as Elorduy, have thought to identify him with the philosopher *Ammonius Saccas, thus 3rd c. rather than 6th c., although this opinion is not commonly accepted. The exegete seems to have lived 5th-6th c. Besides the two books cited, only fragments of other biblical commentaries survive: on the Psalms (PG 85, 1361-1364), on Lk and Acts (PG 85, 1524-1608), on 1 Cor, and on 1 Pet (PG 85, 1608-1609); the fragments on Mt are spurious (PG 85, 1381-1392).

CPG 5500-5509; Th. Zahn, *Der Exeget Ammonius und andere Ammonius*: ZKG 38 (1920) 1-22; 311-336; J. Reuss, *Der Exeget Ammonius und die Fragmente seines Matthäus- und Iohannes-Kommentars*: Biblica 22 (1941) 13-20; Id., *Iohannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, TU 89, Berlin 1965, 196-358; Id., *Der Presbyter Ammonius von Alexandrien und sein Kommentar sum Iohannes-Evangelium*: Biblica 44 (1963) 159-170; R. Devreesse: DBS 1,1137; 1158; 1174; 1203; 1228; Bardenhewer, 83-86; E. Elorduy, *Ammonio en las catenas*: Estudios Ecl. 44 (1969) 383-432; H. Dörrie, *Ammonios, der Lehrer Plotins*: Hermes 83 (1955) 439-477, esp. 471ff.; LACL 29.

A. Di Berardino

AMMONIUS the MONK (4th c.). Our only knowledge of Ammonius is that he was a *Coptic *monk who, returning from a pilgrimage to *Jerusalem, spent several years in the desert of *Sinai, where he was an eyewitness to and also heard further accounts of the massacres of monks at Raithu and in the Sinai committed by the *Saracens, the Blemmyes and other barbarians. He wrote an account, in some ways disturbing, which has reached us in a Greek translation and also in a translation from the Greek into Palestinian Christian Aramaic; there are also *Syriac, Georgian and Arabic versions. He says that these events took place during the *patriarchate of Peter of Alexandria, presumably *Peter II (373–380), and are commemorated 28 December. But they may be the same events (by a comparison of the names: Isaiah, Sabbas, Moses, etc.) that the monks of Sinai and Raithou commemorated 14 January in the Byzantine calendar.

CPG 6088 (for all details of the versions); *Greek*: F. Combefis, *Illustrium Christi martyrum lecti triumphi*, Paris 1660, 88-132;

D.G. Tsami - K.A. Katsani, Τὸ Μαρτυρολόγιον τοῦ Σινᾶ, Thessalonica 1989, 194-235; *Palestinian Christian Aramaic*: A. Smith Lewis, *The Forty Martyrs of the Sinai Desert and the Story of Eulogios*, Cambridge 1912, 1-54 (numbering from the end); C. Müller-Kessler and M. Sokoloff, *The Forty Martyrs of the Sinai Desert, Eulogios the Stone-Cutter, and Anastasia* (A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic III), Groningen 1996. *Translations*: Eng.: (from the Palestinian Christian Aramaic) A. Smith Lewis, op. cit., 1-14 (numbering from the beginning); C. Müller-Kessler - M. Sokoloff, op. cit.; R. Devreesse, *Le christianisme dans la péninsule sinaïtique, des origines à l'arrivée des musulmans*: RBi 49 (1940) 205-223, special. 216-220; P. Mayerson, *The Ammonius Narrative: Bedouin and Blemmye Attacks in Sinai*, in *The Bible World: Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon*, New York 1980, 133-148; I. Shahid, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth Century*, Washington 1984, 303-319; P.-L. Gatier, *Les traditions et l'histoire du Sinai du IVᵉ au VIIᵉ siècle*, in T. Fahd (ed.), *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel*, Leiden 1989, 499-523, esp. 510-517.

A. Louth

AMPHILOCHIUS of Iconium (b. 340/345, bishop 373/374–398/404). A rhetorician at *Constantinople before becoming bishop. Little inclined to theological speculation, he pursued vigorous antiheretical activity, participating at the Council of Constantinople (381) and at some local synods against the *Macedonians (Iconium, 376) and *Messalians (Side, 383). It seems he enjoyed a certain fame after his death, testified to by the *Eraniste* and other old *florilegia, which cite his *christological homilies. Besides some fragments, however, we have only a few works directly from him: a treatise *Contra haereticos* (against the Messalians), an *Epistola synodalis*, a profession of faith, some homilies (IV-VI and VIII-IX in Datema's edition and the *Syriac edition published by Moss) and a short, well-composed didactic poem, the *Iambi ad Seleucum*. A number of spurious works represent a late homage to his fame: homily I (CPG 3231), author unknown; homilies II-III (by *Leontius of Costantinople), a *Coptic homily on Abraham's sacrifice (CPG 3240), a series of virtually unpublished *ascetic homilies (CPG 3250), and a cycle of the life and miracles of St. *Basil (CPG 3252-3254). Attribution to Amphilochius of homilies VII (ps.-Chrysostom) and *In mesopentecosten* is due to a transmission error.

CPG 3230-3254; PG 39; DHGE 2, 1346-1348; DTC 1, 1121-1123; BS 1, 1182-1183; C. Datema, *Amphilochii Iconiensis opera . . .* (CCG 3), Turnhout-Leuven 1978; C. Moss, S. *Amphilochius of Iconium on John* 14, 28 . . . : Muséon 43 (1930) 317-364; E. Oberg, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Iambi ad Seleucum* (PTS 9), Berlin 1969; E. Oberg, *Das Lehrgedicht des Amphilochios von Ikonion*: JbAC 6 (1973) 67-97; M. Breydy, *Vestiges méconnnus des Pères Cappadociens en syriaque. Deux fragments oubliés de la profession de foi d'Amphiloque*: PdO 11 (1983) 349-361; H.R. Drobner, *Die Karsamstagspredigt des Amphilochius von Ikonium* (*CPG II 3235*). *Einleitung, rhetorische Textanalyse und Übersetzung*: S.-T. Teodorsson (ed.), Greek and Latin Studies in Memory of Cajus Fabricius (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia), Göteborg 1990, 1-23; B. Gain, *Note sur l'*Epistula Synodalis (CPG, *t. II, No 3243*) *d'Amphiloque d'Iconium*: SE 27 (1984) 19-25; H.R. Drobner, *Bibliographia Amphilochiana*: Theologie und Glaube 77 (1987) 14-35, 179-196; K. Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern*, Tübingen-Leipzig 1904 [repr. Darmstadt 1969]; G. Ficker, *Amphilochiana*. I, Leipzig 1906; H. Gstrein, *Amphilochios von Ikonion. Der vierte "Grosse Kappadokier"*: JÖBG 15 (1966) 133-145; S.J. Voicu, *L'edizione di Anfilochio nel CChG*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 359-364; Id., *Dieci omelie di Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Studi sull'oriente Christian 5 (2001) 1, 165-190 [hom. II-III]; Id., *Tracce origeniane in uno Pseudocrisostomo Cappadoce*, in *Origene e l'alessandrinismo cappadoce* (*III-IV secolo*). Atti del V Convegno del Gruppo Italiano di ricerca su "Origen and la tradizione alessandrina" (Bari, 20-22 September 2000), eds. M. Girardi and M. Marin, Bari 2002, 333-346 [hom. VII]; J. Wortley, *An Unpublished Legend of an Unworthy Priest and Saint Basil the Great*: AB 97 (1979) 363-371; M. Bonnet, *La pécheresse dans la IVème homélie d'Amphilochios d'Iconium*, in *Figures du Nouveau Testament chez les Pères* (Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 3), Strasbourg 1991, 197-208; M. Bonnet, *Les Psaumes dans les homélies d'Amphilochios d'Iconium*: Le Psautier chez les Pères (Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 4), Strasbourg 1994, 135-165 [mixes spurious and authentic texts]; J.H. Barkhuizen, *Amphilochius of Iconium: Homily 1 "On the Nativity"*: Acta Patristica et Byzantina 12 (2001) 1-23.

S.J. Voicu

AMPHILOCHIUS of Side (d. 458). Bishop of Side (or Sida) in Pamphylia from at least 426–458; participated in the Council of *Ephesus (431), in which he caused some decrees against the *Messalians to be issued. While he was clear on the condemnation of *Nestorius, his position on the question of *Eutyches wavered. Favorable toward Eutyches during the "*latrocinium* of Ephesus" of 449, he retracted his own ideas at the Council of *Chalcedon (451). He wrote many letters, among them an *Epistula ad Leonem Imperatorem* (PG 77, 1515-1516; PG 86, 1841b, to *Leontius of Byzantium), of which we have only fragments, and in which he again changed his mind and described himself as against the Council of Chalcedon; translations are preserved in *Syriac (cited by Michael the Syrian, see J.-B. Chabot, *Chronica minora*, Paris 1901, vol. II, 145-148) and Ethiopian (see H. Zotenberg, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, vol. 24/1, Paris 1893, ²1935).

CPG 5965; J.B. Lightfoot, DCB 1, 107, n. 2; Patrologia V, 31-32; C.R. Henry, *The Chronicle of John Bishop of Nikiu*, London 1916, 110-111.

K. den Biesen

AMPHION of Epiphania (d. after 325). Also known

as Alerion or Amphitryon, bishop of Epiphania in *Cilicia, saint, feast 12 June. He particpated at the Councils of *Ancyra, *Neocaesarea (314) and *Nicaea (325) as a defender of orthodoxy. He wrote anti-*Arian works (Athan., *Ep. Aeg. Lyb.*, PG 25, 557). Not to be confused with *Amphion of Nicomedia.

E. Prinzivalli

AMPHION of Nicomedia (d. after 338). Twice successor of *Eusebius as bishop of *Nicomedia; the first time, at the end of 325 (Socr., *HE* I, 14; Soz., *HE* 1,21) after Eusebius's deposition, until ca. 328; the second, after Eusebius was elected bishop of *Constantinople (338).

E. Prinzivalli

AMULETS. In Greek *phylaktērion* ("something that protects") or *periamma* or *periapton* ("something hung within"—around the neck or arm or leg), in Latin *phylacterium* or *amuletum*. According to the belief of those who used them, an amulet was an object endowed with a power—in our terms a magic power—which protected from misfortune, sickness, the evil eye and evil spirits. Ordinarily they were used to protect people; some, however, were thought to protect a house or even a city. Amulets were produced primarily by specialized artisans out of a variety of materials: hard stone, amber, coral, metals, wood, animal bones, fragments of clay pottery, parchment and papyrus. Magic power was attributed to some of these materials themselves (e.g., agate, coral, amber). Other than the material, what made amulets effective were images carved or painted on them (gods or demons, often zoomorphic), and esp. inscriptions containing, besides apotropaic formulas, meaningless series of letters and/or names of gods.

Amulets were used from time immemorial, in various cultures. Many pious Jews, respecting the law prohibiting the depiction of human beings or animals or pronouncing of the name of God, would wear as an amulet a small sack or box containing a piece of parchment or papyrus with biblical verses written on them. The *Talmud mentions the practice of wearing amulets, esp. while at prayer, on the forehead and on the inside of the left arm, at the level of the heart. In the period of the *Roman Empire, texts carved or painted on pagan amulets often contained elements taken from the Jewish religion—names of God and of archangels, angels and seraphim. This was because in antiquity the Jews were known as powerful magicians.

In a special category of amulets were so-called *gnostic gems. These amulets were made of jasper (esp. green jasper with vivid red marks) or hematite (so-called bloodstone). Images of demons and gods, clearly syncretistic, were carved on their surface, as well as inscriptions, mostly in Greek, containing meaningless words and the names of gods. Often the God of the OT is mentioned by the name Iao (a Gr. spelling for YHWH) or Sabaoth, or there is a depiction of the Egyptian god Khmun in the form of a serpent with a lion's head, or Hecate, or Serapis accompanied by Cerberus. The relationship of these gnostic gems with gnosticism itself is often unclear.

The ecclesiastical authorities, synods and fathers of the church disapproved of the use of amulets. Many Christians used them regardless, continuing a centuries-old tradition. Used esp. were amulets with biblical verses written on them (passages of psalms, esp. Ps 90; Is 6:3; the prologue of John's gospel, the Our Father [*see* Lord's Prayer]). Often (but not necessarily) magic signs, names of demons, etc. were inserted within a verse. The presence of these elements makes it difficult in many cases to establish whether a particular amulet was used by a pagan, a Jew or a Christian.

Large numbers of amulets consisting of pieces of parchment or papyrus with writing on them have been found in Egypt, not because the use of this type of amulet was a specifically Egyptian practice, but because Egypt's climate favored the preservation of these materials.

The link between amulets and magic notwithstanding, the fact that many Christians wore pieces of parchment or papyrus with biblical verses can be considered a manifestation of a personal devotion not opposed to the Christian faith. The boundary between religion and magic was blurred in such cases.

B. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor 1950; F. Eckstein - J.H. Waszink, RAC 1 (1950) 397-411; J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Paris 1976; M. Naldini, *Testimonianze cristiane negli amuleti greco-egizi*, Augustinianum 21 (1981) 179-188; J.G. Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, New York - Oxford 1992, 218-282.

E. Wipszycka

ANACLETUS (or Cletus), pope (76–88). *Irenaeus of Lyons and *Eusebius of Caesarea, citing the oldest list of the bishops of *Rome (*Adv. haer.* III, 3; *HE* V, 6. 1; see III, 2 and 4), name Anacletus as Peter's second successor, after *Linus and before *Clement. His pontificate is thought to have been from 76–88, but the

dates are uncertain. The complicated question concerning the identification of Anacletus with Cletus—that is, whether it is one or two persons—goes back to the *Roman Martyrology*. That document separates them, putting Anacletus's feast on 13 July and Cletus's on 26 April; both are presented as *martyrs. Baronius agrees with this interpretation and these dates. More recently the historical basis for their identification has been demonstrated (L. Duchesne), based on the testimony of Irenaeus and Eusebius. For the LP, Anacletus was a Greek, born at Athens, and was possibly Peter's coadjutor in the government of the Church of Rome. In 79 he was an eyewitness to the eruption of Vesuvius. He suffered under *Domitian's persecution, dying a martyr 13 July, and was buried near Peter's tomb, which Anacletus himself had built and embellished in Peter's honor.

LP I, 125; Caesar Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, I, Rome 1588, 639 and 684 (Cletus); II, ibid., 1590, 20 and 48 (Anacletus); LTK³ 1, 573-574; BS I, 1032-36 (F. Caraffa - D. Valori); EPapi I, 197-199 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

ANAMNESIS (Gk ἀνάμνησις). This term, which originally meant "memory, commemoration," in *liturgical use assumed the technical meaning of a commemoration of the great moments of Christ's saving passion, in reference to the charge given to the disciples at the Last Supper—according to 1 Cor 11:24-25 and Lk 22:19—"Whenever you do this, do it in memory of me." With K. Rahner (*Petit dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, fr. ed. 1970, 24), we can technically define anamnesis as: "a celebration that makes present an event of salvation history, so as to take hold of the hearts and minds of those participating in the rite." The oldest surviving liturgical formulary, that of the **Apostolic Tradition,* had already clarified the two essential moments of this salvific work—death and resurrection—so as to directly link them to the offering of the bread and chalice as "thanksgiving" (*eucharistia*), that we might be admitted to the fulfillment of a priestly service (ἱερατεύειν, a term somewhat weakened in the Latin rendering, *ministrare*). The Roman canon, attested from the late 4th c. by Ambrose's *De Sacramentis* (IV, 27), also mentions the *descent into hell and the glorious *ascension. Some see a Syrian origin in these developments, as with the reference to the *passion* rather than the death. In any case, it was in fact in *Syria that these formularies had their greatest development. The old *Mesopotamian *anaphora of the apostles (*Addai and Mari) evoked "this great, terrible, holy, living and divine mystery of the passion, death, burial and resurrection of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." In the last decades of the 4th c. the compiler of the **Apostolic Constitutions* substituted a long anaphora for the sober scheme of the *Apostolic Tradition,* unfolding all of the steps of the economy of salvation, beginning with creation. The account of the institution of the Eucharist ends with the Pauline declaration: "Every time you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until he comes." The formula of the anamnesis continues: "Mindful of his passion, death, resurrection from the dead, return into heaven and future second coming, when he will reappear with glory and power to judge the living and the dead, rendering to each one according to his works, we offer to You, King and God, in conformity with your commandment, this bread and this chalice; we thank you, through them, for considering us worthy to stand before you and exercise the priesthood" (*Apos. Con.* VIII, 38). The emphasis given here to the *eschatological perspective is also found in the various recensions of the Jerusalem anaphora of St. James, and subsequently in all the *Syriac and Egyptian anaphoras, as well as in some Spanish "Post Pridie's."

A more or less explicit response to Christ's instruction to renew the essential acts of his last meal in his memory (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν), the formularies that have been called "anamnesis"—in fact rather late—risk focusing our attention too exclusively. In fact it is the entire eucharistic rite, and more particularly the great prayer in the form of thanksgiving (*eucharistia*)—the anaphora as it is understood in Eastern liturgies—which constitutes the *memorial,* in all the semantic richness of the biblical Hebrew terms *azkarah* and *zikkaron*. The first designates the sacrificial offering of flour, oil and incense, "that the priest will burn on the altar as a memorial" (Lev 2:1-2). The latter term characterizes the passover celebration: "This day shall be for you a memorial" (Ex 12:14). The resonances of this Passover memorial have been continually enriched, now encompassing the whole breadth of the plan of salvation. The fact is certainly not without significance that the Greek liturgical tradition has preferred the term θυσία (literally: "what goes up in smoke") to indicate the sacrificial character of the eucharistic celebration, and that Syrian Christians would call it *corban,* i.e., "oblation." The anaphoras of *Alexandria (St. *Mark, Gk, and St. Cyril, *Coptic), *Jerusalem (St. James and its Syrian derivatives) and *Cappadocia (St. *Basil of Caesarea and its various recensions) were elaborated within the global perspective of this plan of salvation, beginning from the work of creation and moving, through the various stages of the old cov-

enant, toward its decisive manifestation in the *incarnation of Christ and his sacrificial offering on the *cross, which accomplished his passing-over (*pascha*) to the Father, the firstfruits of what will be definitively fulfilled by the ecclesial community at the time of the final coming (*see* Second Coming of Christ). It is thus the whole formulary of the anaphora that should be considered an anamnesis in the full sense of the word. The patristic commentaries, esp. those in Greek, love to draw out the vastness of these perspectives. In the West, until the contemporary liturgical reform, attention has generally been given to those aspects of the anamnesis referring to Christ, whereas the biblical conception of the "memorial" as an actuation of the plan of salvation, at least in its most characteristic moments, has been too little emphasized. During and since the Middle Ages, deplorable translations have been derived from it which have weighed heavily on the sacrificial interpretation of the Eucharist. It will remain one of Odo Casel's greatest merits, even if some of his interpretations are not entirely convincing, to have collected and commented on the principal patristic and liturgical evidence.

DACL 1, 1880-92; O. Casel, *Das Mysteriengedächtnis der Messliturgie im Lichte der Tradition*: JLW 6 (1926) 113-204 (Fr. tr. 1962); J.M. Hanssen, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus*, III, Rome 1932, 1316-1322; C. Giraudo, *L'eucaristia per la Chiesa*, Rome-Brescia 1989; LTK³ 1,589-593; 4,338-339; B. Neunheuser, *Memoriale*, in *Liturgia*, eds. D. Sartore, A.M. Triacca, C. Cibien, Cinisello B. 2001, 1163-1179.

I.H. Dalmais

ANANIAS (apocryphal). *Damascus Christian who healed St. *Paul (Acts 9:10-19; 22:12-16). A *Byzantine tradition makes him one of the Seventy and presents him as the first bishop of Damascus and evangelizer of Euleutheropolis, where he was stoned (1 Oct 70). The **Apostolic Constitutions* make him a layman (VIII,46,17), *Oecumenius, a deacon (PG 118, 169), *Augustine, a priest. Symeon Metaphrastes recounts his life and martyrdom (PG 114, 1001-1010).

F. Bovon - E. Zachariades-Holmberg, *The Martyrdom of the Holy Apostle Ananias* (BHG 75y), in F. Bovon et al., *The Apocryphal Acts of Apostles*, Cambridge, MA 1999, 309-331 (versio graeca); Codex apocryphus and manuscriptis Ucraino-Russicis collectus, I. Franko, 1-5, Lvovi 1896ff., 3, 214-217 (two Slavic versions); L. Clugnet, DHGE 2 (1914) 1431-1432; BS 1 (1961) 1037; LCIK 5 (1973) 129, F. Halkin, *Ananie de Damas*: Dyptycha 4 (1986) 178-184.

M. Starowieyski

ANANIAS and SAPPHIRA (iconography). The pair is rarely depicted (Acts 5:1-11). On the mid-4th-c. Brescia reliquary (Kollwitz, pl. 2), Peter sits on the left in tunic and pallium, interrogating Sapphira, who stands; a sack of money is between them; on the right four young men carry Ananias's corpse. On the basis of this depiction, the scene may be identifiable on a fragment of a *sarcophagus of Callisto (ca. 370–400; Ws 145,2). The scene also appears on a fragment preserved in the Calvet Museum at Avignon (Ws 145,3), on which two youths are depicted (only one remains) carrying a dead body.

DACL 1, 1896ff.; EC 1, 1143ff.; LCI 1, 166 (s.v. *Petrus*); J. Kollwitz, *Die Lipsanothek von Brescia*, Berlin-Leipzig 1933; F.W. Deichmann, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*. Erster Band: *Rom und Ostia*, (eds.) G. Bovini and H. Brandenburg, Wiesbaden 1967; A. Monachesi, s.v. *Anania e Saffira*, in *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, (ed.) F. Bisconti, Rome 2000, 104-105.

D. Calcagnini

ANANIAS of Shirak or Anania Shirakatsi (d. 670). *Armenian author, born in the region of Shirak ca. 600 and died 670; in the Armenian tradition is also called Anania Anetsi, from Ani, the name of the old chief city of Shirak. Renowned for his mathematical and philosophical knowledge, gained at Theodosiopolis, *Constantinople, Trebizond and elsewhere, he wrote numerous works on mathematical and astronomical questions. Thus he is also known as Metzn (the Great) Anania or Anania Hamarogh (the Mathematician). The *catholicos Anastasius (662–667) charged him with drawing up a new calendar, a reform not realized until the 12th c. He also wrote an autobiography, a chronicle and some brief theological treatises. The geographical description of the world previously attributed to *Moses of Khorene is now attributed to him.

DHGE 2, 1432-1433; Gr. Patcanian, St. Petersburg 1877: editions of the surviving works; F. Conybeare published a tr. of *Sulla manifestazione di nostro Signore e Salvatore a Natale ed Epifania* in Expositor (1896) 311-337, and of *Sulla Pasqua del Signore* in ByzZ (1897) 572; G. Zarphanalian, *Histoire de l'ancienne littérature arménienne du IVe au XIVe siècle*, Venice 1897, 456-465 (in Armenian); G. Broutian, "Persian and Arabic Calendars as Presented by Anania Shirkatsi [sic]," Tarikh-e Elm 8 (2009) 1-17.

K. den Biesen

ANAPHORA

I. Introduction - II. The families of anaphoras - III. Pattern of the Syro-Eastern anaphora - IV. Pattern of the Antiochene or Syro-Occidental anaphora - V. Pattern of the Alexandrian anaphora - VI. Observations.

I. Introduction. In the etymology of anaphora we

find the *double meaning* of announcement, to bring news to someone, and that of an offering lifted up (ἀνὰ-φέρω) for the benefit of the community. The term was used by both Christians and non-Christians. The Christian sense, as in Heb 13:15 and 1 Pet 2:5, indicates the offering of a religious sacrifice. Anaphora includes four principal meanings: (1) the act of offering the *Eucharist; (2) the formulary employed in the eucharistic act; (3) the material offered in the Eucharist (equivalent to προσφορά); and (4) the *liturgical veil that covers the eucharistic species. The meaning most used in a technical sense in liturgical language is anaphora as the priestly eucharistic prayer. Christian antiquity found the term so incisive that liturgies celebrated in languages other than Greek did not translate it. *Syrians, *Copts and *Ethiopians, while using Semitic words like *qûddāsā* or *qûrbānā*, continued to use *annafūtra* or *anfûra,* a sign of continuity of archaizing terminology. The eucharistic formularies of the Syro-Occidental church call anaphora that part of the Eucharist from the kiss of peace until Communion. The Ethiopian church, having a particular and eclectic tradition, designates the entire eucharistic liturgy anaphora. For the others, the anaphora extends from the kiss of peace until the final doxology of the eucharistic prayer proper. The term *anaphora* emerged historically as a substitute for early Christian terms such as Eucharist, *eulogia* and "breaking of the bread," and it deepens the idea of the offering as a sacrifice. In the verb *anapherō* eucharistic theology emphasizes the idea of elevation-ascension (*Apos. Con.* 2,58; Funk 161), as the sacrificial moment to be lived in the fear of God: "Let us stand with devotion, let us stand with fear, mindful to offer in peace the holy oblation," as in the admonition immediately before the anaphora of St. *John Chrysostom. Before the 9th c., when the priest pronounced this introduction he would stress its importance by raising the great veil placed over the paten and chalice. In a homily St. John Chrysostom refers incidentally to the importance of this anaphoric moment: "The moment is solemn and grave, which is why we are asked to look our best, as befits men who are before God in fear and trembling" (*Hom. IV contra Anom*., PG 48, 734).

II. The families of anaphoras. The fixing of the priestly eucharistic prayers occurred late, with the free improvisation of the archaic period being succeeded by the fixing of a normative text, more or less invariable. The increase of *heresies and fear that the tradition would be altered were important factors in the constitution and evolution of anaphoras. Their great number, richness and variety of content show that they come from times of liturgical freedom and creativity; this process did not culminate in anarchy but in the unity of inspiration of the great anaphorical compositions. Anaphoras form liturgical families, not to be confused with the homonymous institutional or confessional families: e.g., the *Alexandrian or St. *Mark anaphora is virtually unused in the *patriarchate of *Alexandria; the churches of the *Byzantine branch use the anaphora of St. *Basil of Caesarea and St. John Chrysostom, *Antiochene in structure; the Ethiopian church currently uses the Syriac anaphora adopted during the medieval liturgical reforms carried out under the influence of the Syrian church. The most commonly accepted classification includes three families: (1) Syro-Eastern (improperly called Chaldean), (2) Antiochene (or Syro-Western) and (3) Alexandrian.

Other classifications have been proposed by L. Ligier and H. Fuchs. L. Ligier: (1) anaphoras with simple structure, which lack the celebration of the being of God and consider essentially the economy of Christ (*Traditio Apost*., anaphora of St. *Epiphanius); (2) anaphoras with complex structure on a line evolving from celebratory praise to the historical *anamnesis of salvation, a pattern related to that of St. *Justin Martyr, where the eucharistic prayer included the *ainos*, *doxa*, *hymnoi* and *pompai* directly joined to the *eucharistiai*, without the interruption of the *sanctus*. H. Fuchs, in the introduction to *Die Anaphora des monophysitischen Patriarchen Johannan* I (LQF 9, Münster 1926, IX-LXXVI), prefers a complex classification by author, almost all pseudepigraphical: (1) *Greek:* from the 6th-7th c. (**Testimony of the Twelve Apostles;* St. *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Severus of Antioch etc.), from the 8th-10th c. (Pope St. Celestine, Pope St. Julius etc.) and after the 10th c. (St. Mark the evangelist, St. Peter prince of the apostles, etc.); (2) *Syrian:* pre-11th c. (*Jacob of Sarug) and post-11th c. (Dionysius bar-Salibi, John XIV the Scribe, John of Haurân, etc.).

III. Pattern of the Syro-Eastern anaphora. (1) Dialogue and theological oration before the *sanctus;* (2) hymn of the *sanctus* with related introduction and response of the people aloud (*Qanona);* (3) prayer after the *sanctus* with proper doxology (*Qanona*) and response, "Amen"; (4) account of the eucharistic institution (NB: this is lacking in some old documents such as the anaphora of Addai and Mari and in the remains of the 6th-c. anaphora in the MS of the Brit. Mus. Add. 14669); (5) intercession, i.e., offering and commemoration of the liv-

ing and the dead; (6) anamnesis; (7) epiclesis; (8) final doxology.

Of this type are the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari, of St. *Theodore of Mopsuestia, of *Nestorius, the *Malabar version of the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari, and the *Maronite anaphora of St. Peter the apostle. The oldest is in the archaic nucleus of the anaphora of Addai and Mari, in which the basic model is the Jewish ritual meal, with the intercessions-commemorations grouped together, not after, but before the epiclesis. The problem of the absence of the account of institution can be explained analogously: it is found in the anaphora of the same family (Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia) and is used in the historical practice of the Nestorian church. From medieval liturgical commentaries we deduce that it was obligatory to say it. B. Botte advances the hypothesis of recital from memory by celebrants. The theology of the divine name predominates, associated with the *oikonomia/ dispensatio* of Christ; the result is a general interpretation of the Eucharist, not so much a *gnostic-type onomatological speculation as a glorification of the name. Later redactions add *trinitarian clarifications, esp. in the doxologies. There is no specific sacrificial terminology, but the concept of memorial of the mystery (*raza*) turns on Christ's passion; in Addai and Mari the eucharistic memorial is called *typus* in accordance with the sacrificial implication of the Jewish memorial, i.e., an invocation of God, his name and his deeds in the hope that they would be repeated: "And we also, O Lord, your frail, weak and infirm servants, who are gathered in your name and stand before you at this moment, we also have received the type [τύπος] that comes from you, rejoicing to glorify, exalt, commemorate and celebrate this great, terrible, holy, life-giving and divine mystery of the passion, death, burial and *resurrection of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (*Prex euch.* 380).

IV. Pattern of the Antiochene or Syro-Occidental anaphora. (1) Dialogue, theological prayer of praise and thanksgiving with introduction to the *sanctus;* (2) *christological prayer after the *sanctus* with the account of institution and the praeceptum; (3) anamnesis; (4) *epiclesis; (5) intercessions; (6) doxology.

Belonging to this type are (1) the texts preserved in the liturgical commentaries of the 4th and 5th c. (*mystagogical *catecheses of St. *Cyril of Jerusalem, 6th mystagogical catechesis of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Testamentum Domini, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite); (2) the Byzantine anaphoras of St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, St. James and St. *Epiphanius of Salamis; (3) the Syro-Antiochene anaphoras of the 12 apostles, St. James brother of the Lord, St. *Timothy of Alexandria, *Severus of Antioch, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. *Ignatius of Antioch, John of Bostra, Pope St. *Clement, Pope St. *Julius, *Eustathius of Antioch; (4) the Maronite anaphoras of St. *Sixtus and of the Holy Roman Church; (5) the Armenian anaphoras of St. *Athanasius of Alexandria, St. *Gregory of Nazianzus, Sahag (James), St. *Cyril of Alexandria, St. James brother of the Lord; (6) the Egyptian anaphoras of St. Basil and of St. *Gregory of Nazianzus. In various anaphoras the initial dialogue is based on the greeting taken from 2 Cor 13:13: "The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ . . ." and marks the idea that the eucharistic communion signifies union with the Holy Trinity. The prayer before the *sanctus* presents a true *theologia*, i.e., a dense discourse celebrating the holiness of the works of God the Father. The language is both cataphatic (praise, blessing of the one true God) and apophatic; the anaphora of St. Basil is the absolute masterpiece of apophatic theology, recognizing its incapacity to expound the divine marvels (διηγήσασθαι πάντα τὰ θαυμάσιά σου, *Prex euch.* 230) because God has no comparison with human models; he is without beginning, invisible, incomprehensible, illimitable, immutable (ἄναρχος, ἀόρατος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερίγραπτος, ἀναλλοίωτος, *Prex euch.* 232). The christological part after the *sanctus* celebrates the association of the people with the angelic, celestial liturgy. With overtones of wisdom language and anti-*Arian or pneumatological doctrinal clarifications (some of which are later interpolations), the redemption hinted at in the theological prayer before the *sanctus* is made plain, brought about by the only-begotten Son, who must bear witness in the world to the surpassing love of God. The explicit mandate (ἐντολή) of this economy, contained in the narration of the institution, is lacking in the anaphora of St. John Chrysostom, which instead inserts it in the anamnesis in indirect speech. The economy of Christ is realized in the Holy Spirit; the anaphora of St. James extends the institution as far as this idea: "Having shown the chalice to you, God and Father, he gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, *filled with the Holy Spirit* . . ." (*Prex euch.* 248). The anamnesis proper sums up all the preceding anamneses, setting them before the gifts offered and present (προκείμενα); besides the various moments of the sacred triduum and the *parousia, the anaphora of Timothy of Alexandria also commemorates the eternal generation of the Son by the Father and the birth according to the flesh (*Prex euch.* 279). The epiclesis asks for the coming of the Spirit, first on

the present faithful, then on the gifts. The invocation of the Spirit is a right (διὰ τοῦτο) deriving from the eucharistic celebration, according to the anaphora of St. Basil (*Prex euch*. 236), despite the unworthiness of all, including ministers. In the Holy Spirit the bread and the wine are revealed as the true icon (ἀντίτυπον, *Prex euch*. 236) of the Son; for the church a new Pentecost is brought about and the fullness of the kingdom is proclaimed under the sign of judgment (epiclesis of the anaphora of St. John Chrysostom, *Prex euch* 226). The intercession adds the dimensions of *anthropology and *eschatology to the progression *theology–*Christology–*pneumatology. The *ecclesiology expressed in the initial dialogue and in the idea of human unworthiness is joined to the sacrifice of Christ in the near certainty of not being rejected. The Eucharist performed in the church reshapes the visible church, which by concentric circles is joined to the invisible church, with Mary the Mother of God and with the saints. The thanksgiving, praise and intercession culminate in the final doxology: "And allow us to glorify and sing hymns with one voice and one heart to your most honorable and magnificent name, Father, Son and Holy Spirit" (anaphora of St. John Chrysostom, *Prex euch*. 229). The impetus to offer petitions is transformed into total praise, reaching here its logical completion.

V. Pattern of the Alexandrian anaphora. (1) Dialogue and prayer before the *sanctus;* (2) commemoration of the saints, the dead and the living; (3) *sanctus* with introduction; (4) prayer after the *sanctus* with introduction to the epiclesis (or first epiclesis); (5) account of institution; (6) anamnesis and offering of the gifts; (7) epiclesis (proper, or second epiclesis); (8) doxology.

To this type belong: (1) the Greek Egyptian anaphora of St. Mark the evangelist, and that also of St. Mark in papyrus fragments Strasburg gr. 254 and Manchester *J. Rylands Libr*. 465, the Dêr Balyzeh fragment and those of the *Euchology* of Serapion; (2) the Coptic anaphora of St. Cyril of Alexandria, the Louvain fr. Copt. 27, the Coptic *ostrakon* of the British Museum 4; (3) the Ethiopian anaphora of the holy apostolic fathers, our Lord Jesus Christ, St. John Boanerges, Mary the Virgin (Horicos of Bahnesa), the 318 orthodox fathers, St. Athanasius the apostolic, St. Epiphanius of Salamis, St. John Chrysostom, St. *Cyril of Alexandria (1a), *Dioscorus of Alexandria, Our Lady Mother of God (Abba George). Compared with the *Antiochene type, the Alexandrian anaphora gives an impression of dispersed order. Trinitarian doctrine and Christology are well developed. Here and there one notes echoes of Alexandrian Jewish and humanistic wisdom language, in concepts such as the pure sacrifice of Mal 1:11 (θυσία καθαρά), spiritual sacrifice (λογικὴ θυσία), and the themes of Christ as light and wisdom. The description of creation stresses the element of water, important in Egypt (seas, springs, rivers, lakes; *Prex euch*. 102). There is a notable development of the prayer of intercession, conceived of as a single great prayer, recapitulated in a few final requests. The introduction to the *sanctus* contains a special mention of the divine name. The epiclesis, to which a veiled allusion is made in the intercessions in the listing of the acceptable sacrifices of the OT, is divided into two moments: (1) transitional epiclesis: a general request before the institution to complete the salvific epiphany of Christ through the divine blessing of the sacrifice by the insertion-descent (ἐπιφοίτησις/*adventus*) of the Holy Spirit: "Heaven and earth are truly full of your holy glory through the manifestation of our Lord God and Savior Jesus Christ. Perfect also this sacrifice, O God, with your blessing, through the visitation of your most Holy Spirit" (*Prex euch*. 113); (2) specific epiclesis: close correlation between anamnesis and epiclesis, with a formal epicletic request referring to the creation (the Paraclete in the anaphora of St. Mark is proclaimed the source of divine charisms, *Prex euch*. 115); the purpose of the offering of the material gifts is the spiritual and corporeal benefit of humankind. Both the last part of the epiclesis and the concluding doxology effectively emphasize the glorification of the Name, the true motive of worship and the object of human gratitude (*Prex euch*. 115).

VI. Observations. The eucharistic formulas and patterns of the early centuries (**Didache*, St. Justin, *Trad. Ap.*) show a continuity and identity of forms inherited from the *Jewish Christian world. It is an acknowledged fact that the roots of the Christian anaphora are in the Jewish liturgy, preserving its essential vocabulary (semantic group *brk-ydh*, εὐλογέω-εὐχαριστέω) and two-poled mode of the *berakot* of meals (*theological mode:* blessing of the divine name; *economic mode:* distribution of the mystery of salvation in God's creative and redemptive work). Thanksgiving evolves into supplication before being transformed into doxology. The same literary form can thus be seen running from the OT *todah,* through the Jewish *berakah,* to the Christian anaphora, with the same structural elements, though differently related. The three-part structure remains basic and is easily identified: (1) theological part: a preamble on the Father, blessing directed to

God, full of praise and thanksgiving proclaimed by directive verbs like αἰνεῖν, ὑμνεῖν, δοξολογεῖν; (2) christological part: fairly extensive development of the preceding, centered on Christ in an indicative anamnetic discourse that gives thanks for the economy of salvation in its various stages; (3) pneumatological-ecclesiological part: epicletic discourse in the imperative or optative, so the gifts offered by the church would be sanctified by the Holy Spirit such that those who communicate would receive the eschatological fruits of the redemption; almost everywhere it is followed by a supplication for the living and the dead, introduced by a μνήθετε ("remember") of the type *zkr,* with which God is reminded of the covenant. These sections are not always rigorously separated; it is possible to find anamnetic moments in the theological part (see *Laus-gratiarum actio* of the anaphora of St. Mark, *Prex euch.* 103) or also applied to the specific economy of the Holy Spirit (see epiclesis of the Greek anaphora of St. James, *Prex euch.* 251; epiclesis II of the anaphora of St. Mark, *Prex euch.* 115). Although the various phases can be clearly distinguished (praise–thanksgiving–sacrificial prayer), the anaphora forms a single, fully cohesive action and prayer: the bread and cup of the Eucharist represent both creation and salvation. The sacrifice is essentially λογικὴ θυσία because it is consecrated by the Spirit, who in turn transforms people into the firstfruits of the transfiguration. The interceding church is associated from this point on with the praise of the saints. Every epiclesis inevitably concludes with a moment of total doxology, the true end of Christian eucharistic worship.

G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London 1945; B. Botte, *L'anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres*: OCP 15 (1949) 259-276; J.P. Audet, *La Didachè, instruction des apôtres*, Paris 1958; J. Lécuyer, *La théologie de l'anaphore selon les Pères de l'école d'Antioche*: OrSyr 6 (1961) 385-412; L. Ligier, *Anaphores orientales et prières juives*: OCP 13 (1963) 3-20, 99-113; B. Botte, *La tradition apostolique de St. Hyppolite. Essai de reconstitution*, LQF 39, Münster 1963; Id., *Problèmes de l'anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari*: OrSyr 10 (1965) 89; W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford ²1965; J.P. Audet, *Genre littéraire et formes cultuelles de l'eucharistie*: EphLit 80 (1966) 353-385; W.F. Macomber, *The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*: OCP 32 (1966) 335-371; L. Ligier, *De la cène du Seigneur à l'anaphore de l'Église*: La MaisonD. 87 (1966) 7-51; Id., *Célébration divine et anamnèse dans la première partie de l'Anaphore ou canon de la Messe orientale*: Gregorianum 48 (1967) 225-252; L. Maldonado, *La plegaria eucarística. Estudio de teología bíblica y litúrgica sobre la Misa*, Madrid 1967; E. Lanne, *La relazione dell'anafora eucaristica alla confessione di fede*: Sac. Dott. 47 (1967) 383-396; Id., *Liturgie et vie spirituelle dans les Églises chrétiennes: liturgie eucharistique en Orient et en Occident*: DSp 9, 884-889; L. Bouyer, *L'eucharistie. Théologie et spiritualité de la prière eucharistique*, Tournai ²1968; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex eucharistica*, Fribourg 1968; M. Arranz, *L'économie du salut dans la prière Post-Sanctus des anaphores de type antiochéen*: La MaisonD. 106 (1971) 46-75; A. Tarby, *La prière eucharistique de l'Église de Jérusalem*, Théol. Hist. 17, Paris 1972; I.H. Dalmais, *L'Esprit Saint et le mystère du salut dans les épiclèses eucharistiques: Le Saint Esprit dans la Liturgie*: Bibl. Eph. Litg. 8, Rome 1977, 55-64; H.J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie. Glaubenszeugnis und Symbolgestalt*: Sophia 5, Trier ²1980; A. Houssiau, *Les moments de la prière eucharistique*: in *L'expérience de la prière dans les grandes religions* (ed. H. Limet - J. Ries), Louvain-la-Neuve 1980, 325-334, C. Giraudo, *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucaristica*, Rome 1981; var. aus., *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident*, vols. I and II, Paris 1970 (B. Bobrinskoy, 197-240; R. Bornet, 241-264; B. Botte, 7-24; R.G. Coquin, 51-82; I.H. Dalmais, 175-196; W. Rordorf, 65-82); G.J. Cuming, *The Anaphora of St Mark: A Study in Development*: Muséon 95 (1982) 115-129; var. aus., *Anàmnesis*, 3/2: *La liturgia eucaristica*, Casale Monferrato 1983; J.L. Bamdrés, *The Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles: Historical Considerations*: Proche-Orient chrétien 36 (1986) 6-13; R.F. Taft, *The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer*: OCP 56 (1990) 5-51; E. Mazza, *L'anafora eucaristica. Studio sulle origini*, Rome 1992; G. Panicker, *West Syrian Anaphorae*: The Harp. A Review of Syriac and Oriental Studies 6 (1993) 29-40; Id., *La structure de l'anaphore alexandrine et antiochéenne*: Irénikon 67 (1994) 5-40; E. Mazza, *La celebrazione eucaristica. Genesi del rito e sviluppo dell'interpretazione*, Cinisello B. 1996; P.J. Fedwick, *The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into Their Common Origin*, Rome 1992; *Segno di unità. Le più antiche eucaristie delle chiese*, the monks and nuns of Bose (eds.), under the direction of E. Mazza, Bose-Magnano 1996 (the most complete collection); G. Filias, *L'épiclèse eucharistique dans les liturgies de Basile le Grand et de Grégoire de Nazianze*: NRTh 119 (1997) 37-48; var. aus., *Scientia liturgica*, vol. III: *L'eucarestia*, Casale Monferrato 1998; S. Muksuris, *A Brief Overview of the Structure and Theology of the Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari*: Greek Orthodox Theological Review 43 (1998) 59-83; A. Verheul, *La prière eucharistique de Addaï et Mari*: Questions liturgiques 80 (1999) 348-357; B. Dupuis, *Quel est l'auteur de l'Anaphore de Nestorius?*: Istina 46 (2001) 155-159; E. Mazza, *La celebrazione eucaristica*, Bologna 2003.

D. Gelsi

ANASTASIA (d. 303?). Protagonist of one of the longest and most romanticized "Roman Passions," a group of epic passions composed ca. 5th c. The account (the *Passio sanctae Anastasiae,* or *Passio sancti Chrisogoni et sociorum*) is of the daughter and wife of obstinately *pagan Roman aristocrats, living in *Rome at the time of *Diocletian. Her difficult marriage—a kind of preamble to *martyrdom—with Publius, a pagan hostile to her choice of life and behavior, made of her a model for married women at a time when *virginity was coming to be regarded as the highest value to which a Christian is called. In the literary text her events are tied to those of *Chrysogonus; to the three martyrs *Agape, Chionia and Irene; and to Theodotus and her three sons, and

they take place in the most disparate places of the empire, from Rome to *Aquileia, *Thessalonica to *Nicaea. Originally written in Latin, the account is the result of the combination—in an altogether external way—of at least four different *hagiographical texts about Anastasia, the noble wife and then widow who gives evidence of her charity by successively caring for the individual martyrs.

The figure is entirely legendary, very probably composed to lend a quality of sanctity to the foundress of a **titulus* (the *titulus Anastasiae*). It is assimilated to Anastasia of *Sirmium, whose cult is attested at *Constantinople—her *relics were transferred there from Sirmium mid-5th c.—and at Rome, where as mentioned there was a *titulus Anastasiae*. The church, already important for its location within the city, was dedicated in the late 5th or early 6th c. *Leo the Great (440–461) preached his homily against *Eutyches and the *monophysites in the *titulus Anastasiae;* at the time of *Gregory the Great (594–604) three Christmas Masses were celebrated in the church, the second dedicated to Anastasia and presided over by the pope. In the *Notitia ecclesiarum urbis Romae* (7th c.) the church is in the third position, after the Lateran basilica and that of St. Maria Maggiore. Feast is 22 December at Constantinople, 25 December at Rome.

BHL 401-403; DACL 1/2,1919-1924; H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936, 151-171, 221-249 (Latin text), 250-258 (Gk. tr.); BS 1,1042-1109; F.E. Consolino, *Modelli di santità nelle più antiche Passioni romane*, in *L'agiografia latina nei secoli IV-VII. XII Incontro di studiosi di antichità cristiana*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 83-113; A. Simonetti, *Le fonti agiografiche di due drammi di Rosvita*: Studi Medievali, s. III, 30 (1989) 661-695; K. Cooper, *Of Romance and Mediocritas: Re-reading the Martyr Exemplum in the* Passio Sanctae Anastasiae, in *Modelli di santità e modelli di comportamento. Contrasti, intersezioni e complementarietà*, Turin 1994, 107-123; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 115-118.

V. Milazzo

ANASTASIANA. Grouped under this title are many works unduly attributed to *Anastasius the Sinaite. (1) *In Hexaemeron libri XII,* a commentary on the work of the six days (Gen 1), partially published in a Latin version (PG 89, 851-1071). J.D. Baggarly, who prepared the edition of the Greek text, considers this work to postdate the 10th c. (CPG 7770). (2) *Contra Monophysitas* (PG 89, 1180-1190) appears as a series of citations of heresiarchs (*Arius, *Aetius, *Eunomius) and 4th- and early 5th-c. fathers (*Eustathius of Antioch, *Apollinaris, *Basil of Caesarea, *Ambrose, *Athanasius, *Antipater of Bostra, *Ephrem of Antioch, *Proclus, *Amphilochius and *Olympiodorus), none of which is otherwise preserved. This compilation is also considered a fraud of undetermined date (CPG 7771). (3) *Disputatio adversus Iudaeos,* a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew (PG 89, 1204-1281) which cannot have been written before the 9th c. (CPG 7772). (4) *Sermo de tribus quadragesimis* (PG 89, 1389-1397), datable to the 12th c. (CPG 7773). (5) *De haeresibus et concisa et perspicua fidei nostrae notitia*, works attributed to a Sinaite monk Anastasius, a theologian of an unknown period (CPG 7774-7775). (6) *De liturgiis in quadragesimo die pro defunctis*, *Doctrina de temporibus*, *Capita poenitentialia et Precatio*, works attributable to a certain Anastasius the Sinaite, a 9th- to 11th-c. canonist (CPG, 7776-7779). (7) *Homilia in ramos palmarum,* an unpublished homily attributable to a certain priest Anastasius, an allegorist (CPG 7780). (8) *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi,* a very important Greek theological *florilegium, literally titled: "Speeches (*Logoi*) of the holy fathers or selection of quotations by which we wisely learn all of the doctrine of the apostolic church and also the kerygma of theology and the discourses of the divine economy and the exactness of the other right dogmas of the church." In the first part (ch. 1-32) the texts are ordered systematically (*trinitarian theology, esp. *christological) and constitute a patristic arsenal against *monophysitism and *monothelitism. Interspersed with citations borrowed from the heterodox, the Greek fathers (from *Ignatius of Antioch to *Maximus the Confessor) most frequently named are the *Cappadocians and *Cyril of Alexandria. *Ambrose and *Leo the Great are mentioned among the Latin fathers. Some authors, e.g., Eubulus of Lystra, and some texts are known only through this collection. The second part (ch. 32-45) forms a kind of supplement, with no systematic order that responds with citations (fathers, heretics) and various passages to many questions about the Christian faith and errors. The whole is datable to the late 7th or early 8th c. Its author is disputed.

Fr. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des siebenten und achten Jahrhunderts*, Münster 1907; CPG 7781; Fr. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*. 2. Auflage mit Korrekturen und Nachträgen von B. Phanourgakis, hrsg. von E. Chrysos, Münster 1981.

D. Stiernon

ANASTASIUS (d. after 658). Disciple of St. *Maximus the Confessor, secretary to the empress Eudoxia (wife of *Heraclius). In 617 he became the

spiritual son of Maximus, to whom he remained connected for 37 years until his death, following him to the monastery of Chrysopolis (617–630), to *Africa (630–645) and to *Rome (645–652). He shared the outrage of Maximus's two trials at *Constantinople (656, 658) and, though separated for a period, also his imprisonments and exiles. Anastaius died the last half of July 662 at or on his way to the *castrum* of Souanias. He likely wrote the *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (PG 91, 287-353). Many pieces have been attributed to him regarding the above-mentioned trials and afflictions; only the letter to the monks of Cagliari is his, however (PG 90, 133B–136C). The letter sent to him by Maximus 19 April 658 (BHG 1232) survives, to which Anastasius added a postscript exhorting the Romans to stand firm in the faith (PG 90, 113-114).

BHG 1231-1236; BHL 5841-5844; CPG 7725; J.-M. Garrigues, *Le martyre de saint Maxime le Confesseur*: Revue Thomiste 76 (1976) 410-452 (Fr. tr. of the acts of the trial and the final drama); BS IX, 41-47; W. Brandes, *"Juristische" Krisenbewältigung im 7. Jahrhundert? Die Prozesse gegen Papst Martin I. und Maximos Homologetes*: Fontes Minores 10, ed. L. Burgmann, *Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. D. Simon, Band 22, Frankfurt a.M. 1998, 141-212; P. Allen - B. Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris spectantia* (CCSG 39), Turnhout-Leuven 1999; P. Allen - B. Neil, *Maximus the Confessor and His Companions: Documents from Exile* (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford 2002.

D. Stiernon

ANASTASIUS, emperor (d. 518). A promonophysite, born at Durazzo (431), who became emperor in 491, marrying the widow of his predecessor (*Zeno). He had to promise the *patriarch *Euphemius, however, to do nothing against the faith or the canons of *Chalcedon. A good administrator and diplomat, Anastasius implemented some reforms. His reign (491–518) was much disturbed by circus factions and riots over political-religious questions. The *Acacian *schism continued under him. He ignored Pope *Gelasius's letter announcing his election (492), deposed Euphemius in favor of Macedonius II (493) and did not recognize Pope *Symmachus (498), favoring the antipope *Laurentius. From then on he favored *monophysitism with increasing openness: *Severus, who was elected patriarch at Antioch, condemned the Council of Chalcedon in 513 at *Tyre; at *Constantinople, monophysite monks added *qui crucifixus est pro nobis* to the *Trisagion,* the orthodox were persecuted and Macedonius II was deposed. Riots broke out in the stadium and the official Vitalian rebelled. Anastasius then sought to conciliate Pope *Hormisdas but broke off discussions when he again had control of the situation. His successor *Justin (518) reestablished orthodoxy.

DHGE II, 1447-1457; Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa* IV, Turin 1970, 375-397; Stein-Palanque, *Hist. du Bas Empire* II, Amsterdam 1968, 77-217; C. Capizzi, *Anastasio I, Studio sulla sua vita, la sua opera e la sua personalità*, Rome 1969.

A. De Nicola

ANASTASIUS, poet (6th c.?). A famous *kontakion* sung for dead priests has the *acrostic Ἀναστασίου τοῦ ταπεινοῦ αἶνος and was cited in the old euchologies (e.g. Goar, *Euchologion*, Venice 1730, repr. Graz 1960, 561-575); the first troparion is still used on Saturdays of abstinence (ἀπόκρεω) and of the dead (ψυχοσάββατον). J.B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra* I, 242-249, published a critical edition. It has been attributed to the quaestor Anastasius the Stammerer (9th-10th c.), to *Anastasius the Sinaite and to an otherwise unknown monk who lived before *Romanus Melodus, who was influenced by it.

DHGE 2,1477; Bardenhewer 5,165; Beck 446; LTK 1,491; W. Christ - M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum*, Lipsia 1871 (repr. 1963), XXXV and CIIf.

A. De Nicola

ANASTASIUS I, pope (399–401). LP considers him a *Roman, son of Maximus. Esteemed by *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 20) and *Jerome (*Ep.* 127, 10; 130, 16), in part because he was more sensitive than his predecessor *Siricius (384–399) to the *ascetical movements, which appealed to Paulinus and Jerome. Anastasius's name is esp. linked to the *Origenist controversy, which exploded in the West during his pontificate, after the Latin translation and diffusion of the *Peri archōn* by *Rufinus of Aquileia. Despite the latter's attempt to amend some passages of Origen's text, Anastasius, yielding to anti-Origenist pressure (including that from Jerome), condemned the *Alexandrian teacher and his doctrines, and with him *Simplicianus, bishop of *Milan. Rufinus defended himself and Origen in the *Apologia contra Hieronymum* (CCL 20, 29-123), sending it to Jerome and Anastasius, who in fact had not explicitly included the Latin version of the *De principiis* or its author in the condemnation. In 401 Anastasius also moved against *Donatism, encouraging the bishops of N *Africa in that direction. He also confirmed the decrees of the Council of *Toledo (400), restoring to their respective sees bishops who had dissociated themselves from *Priscillianism and denouncing the *Manichees at Rome. Anastasius's letters manifest a sense of responsibility for the

*orthodoxy of all the churches (see *Ep.* 9, 5), but that this consciousness and expression of primacy was accepted by the African bishops does not appear to have been fully the case according to *Theophilus of Alexandria, who sees in Anastasius's condemnation of Origen primarily the bishop of Rome's adherence to Alexandrian decisions (see Justinian, *Liber c. Origenem*: PG 86, 967).

Anastasius, *Epistulae*, PL 20, 65-80; PL, Supp. I, 790-792; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20, CSEL 29 (G. de Hartel), 142-149; Jaffé I, Leipzig 1885, 42-43; LP I, 218-219; Rufinus, *Apologia ad Anastasium*, CCL 20, 19-28 (M. Simonetti); Id., *Apologia contra Hieronymum*: CCL 20, 29-123 (M. Simonetti); Jerome, *Ep.* 95, 97, 127 and 130: CSEL 55-56, 1 (J. Hilberg); Id., *Apologia contra Rufinum*: CCL 79 (P. Lardet); E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papstums* I, Tübingen 1930, 285-287, 291-292; M. Villain, *Rufin d'Aquilée. La querelle autour d'Origène*: RSR 27 (1937) 5-37; P. Paschini - V. Monachino, *I Papi nella storia*, I, Rome 1961, 60-65; DHGE 2, 1471-1473 (J.-P. Kirsch); BS I, 1065-1066 (F. Caraffa); LTK³ 1, 602 (G. Schwaiger); Dizionario storico del Papato, ed. Ph. Levillain, I, Milan 1996, 42-43; EPapi I, 381-385 (A. Pollastri).

M. Spinelli

ANASTASIUS I of Antioch (d. 598/599). *Patriarch whose *Palestinian origin is dubious, as is his status as a *monk on *Sinai. *Apocrisarius of the patriarch of *Alexandria at *Antioch, he succeeded Domninus III as patriarch of Antioch in 559. In 565 he opposed the edict of *Justinian regarding *aphthartodocetism; the emperor considered exiling him, but died before carrying this out (565). The successor, *Justin II, deposed Anastasius (570) and sent him to *Jerusalem. He was an intimate friend of *Gregory the Great who, on becoming pope, got him restored (593) to his see, where Anastasius remained undisturbed until his death (598/599).

Of his polemical-dogmatic writings only the *De orthodoxa fide orationes V* have survived intact: (1) *De Sancta Trinitate* (which treats the eternity of the Word, his consubstantiality with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the procession of the latter also from the Son, the unity of the divine nature and operations against the *tritheists and *John Philoponus); (2) *De incircumscripto* (which argues that God, by his nature and preserving energy, is everywhere and continually present in creation); (3) *De divina incarnatione* (which discusses the reason for the *incarnation of the Word, the *hypostatic union of the two distinct and unmixed natures, the consubstantiality of his assumed human nature with our own, scriptural proofs); (4) *De passione et impassibilitate Christi* (which sets forth cleary the *communicatio idiomatum*); (5) *De resurrectione Christi* (which discusses the real death of Christ, the *descent into hell, the resurrection's not involving destruction of the corporeal substance but only a change in its qualities, the *ascension, the final *parousia). Of his other writings we know only the titles and some fragments: his clear and almost "scholastic" exposition had a considerable influence on later *Byzantine theologians. Of his sermons, recognized as authentic by all are those on the (second) enthronement (*Oratio pacificatoria*) and *On Lent* (fragment); there is some dispute concerning the sermons *On the Annunciation* (two, the first of which justifies the date of the feast: 25 March), *On the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple, On Easter* and *On the Transfiguration*.

Evagrius Scol., *HE* 4,39ff.; 5,5; 6,24; Gregory the Great, *Ep.* (passim): CPG III 6944-6969: PG 89, 1289-1408; S.N. Sakkos, *Anastasioû . . . hapanta . . . erga*, Thessalonica 1976; Bardenhewer IV, 146-149; Beck 380-381: Altaner 549-550; S.N. Sakkos, *Perì Anastasioû Sinaitoû*, Thessalonica 1964; G. Weiss, *Studia Anastasiana I. Studien zum Leben, zu den Schriften und zur Theologie des Patriarchen Anastasius I von Antiochien*: Miscellanea Byzant. Monacensia 4, Munich 1965; E. Chrysos, *Neôterai ereunai perì Anastasioû Sinaitoû*, I (1969) 121-124; Patrologia V, 206-213 and index of names; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, vol. 2, Rome 1988, 70-79.

A. De Nicola

ANASTASIUS II, pope (496–498). *Son of a Roman presbyter, elected to succeed *Gelasius I 27 November 496. During his brief pontificate (two years: died 19 November 498) Anastasius made efforts to reconcile *Rome with *Constantinople and end the *Acacian *schism. Upon election he wrote to the emperor *Anastasius about this, expressing regret for the separation and his openness to recognizing consecrations and *baptisms administered by Acacius, though without confirming his orthodoxy. Recognizing this first attempt as ineffective, Anastasius sent a delegation to the emperor, reiterating his conciliatory disposition (Jaffé, 748). This effort was also unsuccessful, due to the emperor's demand that the pope subscribe to the **Henoticon* (the Edict of Union), which the latter had rejected. Anastasius's open and hopeful disposition toward the *Byzantines, moreover, provoked a negative reaction among his own clergy (LP I, 258), who accused Anastasius of *heresy and after his death promoted the Laurentian schism (*see* Lawrence; Symmachus). His relations with the West in general were more constructive and better articulated. Anastasius sent the bishops of *Gaul a letter condemning *traducianism, i.e., the opinion that the parents generate the human soul (Jaffé, 751). Perhaps the most positive and significant event of Anastasius's pontificate was the conversion of the Frankish king *Clovis to Catholi-

cism under the influence of his wife Clotilde; the sovereign was bapitized after defeating the Alemanni at Tolbiacum (modern Zulpich). Anastasius was buried in the atrium of St. Peter's basilica.

Jaffé I, Leipzig 1885, 95-96; *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae* [. . .], I, ed. A. Thiel, Brunsbergae 1868, 82ff., 614ff.; LP I, 258-259; H. Grisar, *Roma alla fine del mondo antico*, II, Rome 1930; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 31-32 and 46ff.; P.A.B. Llewellyn, *The Roman Clergy During the Laurentian Schism (498–506): A Preliminary Analysis*: Ancient Society 8 (1977) 245-275; LTK 1, 602-603 (G. Schwaiger); DHGE 2, 1473-1475 (J. P. Kirsch); BS I, 1071 (P. Burchi); EPapi I, 462-464 (P. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

ANASTASIUS II of Antioch (d. 609/610). *Patriarch who succeeded *Anastasius I in 599. He communicated his election to *Gregory the Great, who replied (*Ep*. 7,48) exhorting him to put an end to *simony. He died a martyr in 609/610 at the hands of the Jews who sacked *Antioch in reaction to the emperor Phocas's imposing conversion to Christianity on them. They captured the patriarch, mutilated him and threw him to the flames. In the Roman Martyrology his feast is 21 December. His writings are either lost or are of very doubtful attribution; lost also is his translation of the *Regula pastoralis* of Gregory the Great (*Ep*. 12,6 Hartmann).

CPG III, 453: *Anastasius Sinaita, nota*; Bardenhewer V, 150; Beck 401; DHGE II, 1460-1461; BS I, 1052-1053; Altaner 550.

A. De Nicola

ANASTASIUS MAGUNDAT (d. 628). *Persian cavalry officer, from a Zoroastrian family of Rashuoni in the Razekt region, i.e., Beth Raziquayē, the region of Ray SE of Teheran. His father, Baw, was a Zoroastrian priest. With his brother he took part in Sharvaraz's conquest as far as *Chalcedon, which included the conquest of *Jerusalem and the deportation of the Holy *Cross after 614, provoking reflection in the young Anastasius. He was presented to the *patriarch *Modestus through the mediation of Elias of St. Anastasia, was *baptized and entered the *monastery of St. Anastasia, whose name he took in 620. After seven years of monastic life he had a night vision; telling his desire to his superior, he went to Diospolis, Mt. Gerizim and then to *Caesarea, where some Persian companions recognized him. Tried by the Persian Marzipan, Anastasius not only refused every compromise offered him but also asked to be taken before the tribunal of *Chosroes II Aparwez himself. Some months before Chosroes's own fall, Anastasius was put to death with 70 other Christians 22 January 628 at Dasquarta of Malka, six miles from Beth Saloen, a little upriver from *Seleucia. Heraclius's troops were already very near, having celebrated Christmas at Kerkuk. The Gk. passion was published in a critical edition by Bernard Flusin with a volume of commentaries on the 7th-c. context. One sees esp. that this *martyrdom was possible only because the saint was born a Zoroastrian priest. Many Christians have followed Anastasius's example in adoring the power of the Spirit. In the 8th c. *Bede the Venerable introduced a eulogy in his honor in the West. Rome possesses the relics of his head at Aquas Salvias. *Constantinople dedicated a *martyrion* to him in that of Philemon at Strategion.

J.M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, Subs. 36, Louvain 1970, 98; AASS Decemb., Brussels 1940, 31; BS 1, 1054-1055; B. Flusin, *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e^ siècle*. T. I Les Textes. T. II Commentaire, Paris 1992.

M. van Esbroeck

ANASTASIUS of Thessalonica. *Archbishop of *Thessalonica (ca. 432–452), successor of *Rufus shortly after the Council of *Ephesus (431), corresponded with popes *Sixtus III and *Leo I from 435 to 449. He was represented at the Councils of *Ephesus II (449) and *Chalcedon (451) by Quintillus, bishop of Heraclea, who did not subscribe to the canon on the privileges of the see of *Constantinople. The Latin recension of the acts of Chalcedon, which suggested the hypothesis of Anastasius's death during the council (L. Petit), cannot prevail against the general tradition. The letters addressed to him by the popes and that of Sixtus III to *Proclus of Constantinople about him are important for the history of *Roman jurisdiction over *Illyricum through the "Apostolic Vicar" of *Thessalonica.

Jaffé 393-396, 403, 404, 409, 411, 440; C. Silva Tarouca, *Epistolarum Romanorum Pontificum ad vicarios per il lyricum aliosque episcopos collectio Thessalonicensis*, Rome 1937, 36-43, 53-63; *Acta Romanorum Pontificum*, I, Vatican City 1943, 172-183; ACO I, 1,7, 143-145; Tillemont, *Mémoires* XV, 443-445; L. Petit, *Les évêques de Thessalonique*: Echos d'Orient IV (1900-1901) 142-143; DHGE II, 1444-1445; P. Batiffol, *Le Siege Apostolique*, Paris 1924, 406-407; EC I, 1158; Fliche Martin-Frutaz ²IV, 287, 332; D. Staffa, *Le delegazioni apostoliche*, Rome 1958, 10-17; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana Recherches* . . . , Rome 1976, 1143-1147.

D. Stiernon

ANASTASIUS the Apocrisarius (d. 666). Saint, papal *apocrisarius at *Constantinople, a disciple, with the *monk and *martyr St. *Anastasius (d. 24

July 662), of St. *Maximus the Confessor (d. 13 August 662). He was arrested at *Rome with Maximus by order of *Constantius II, who favored *monothelitism, and taken to Constantinople. Anastasius was exiled first to Trebizond (Trapezous) and then to Mesembria (655) and then brought back to the capital (662) and condemned by a council; his right hand and tongue were cut off. He was then exiled to Thusum near Lazica in the Caucasus, where he died 11 September 666. Of him we possess (1) the account of Maximus's trial at Constantinople (*Relatio motionis*); (2) the account of Maximus's debate with his opponents at Bizya and at Rhegium (*Acta in primo exilio*); (3) a long letter to the presbyter Theodosius of Gangra, describing the sufferings of Maximus and his two disciples and adding evidence from the Fathers on the two wills in Christ; in it are eight texts attributed to Hippolytus, bishop of Porto (once known only in the Latin translation of Anastasius the Librarian, this letter was published by R. Devreesse, AB 73 [1955] 10-16); (4) a diatribe defending Maximus against the Constantinopolitans (*Invectiva a quodam monacho pro s. Maximo*); (5) a letter to the Ascalonite monks, only partially published (*incipit* and two fragments), explaining the philosophical terms that recur in *Christology. Also proposed, among others, as author of the *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi* published by F. Diekamp, Münster i. W. 1907 (CPG III, 7781).

CPG III, 7733-7740; PG 90, 109-129, 136-172, 173-194, 201-205; PG 89, 1191; Bardenhewer V, 35-36; DHGE II, 1462; EC I, 1150-1151; LTK 1, 491; Beck 442; Altaner 561; Patrologia V, 129-131; M. Simonetti, *Un falso Ippolito nella polemica monotelita*: VetChr 24 (1987) 113-146.

A. De Nicola

ANASTASIUS the Sinaite (640–700). Saint (21 April). The Menaea call him the New Moses, since as the *abbot of *Sinai he guided a great number of *monks. His life is largely unknown. A polemicist, he debated the many *heretics (*monophysites, Severians, Theodosians, *aphthartodocetists, *monothelites) who swarmed in *Syria, *Palestine and *Egypt. He was at *Alexandria, a den of *heresies, shortly before 640 and again between 678–689, at the time of the monophysite patriarch *John III; he was still alive twenty years after *Constantinople III (680–681). His principal work was the *Hodegos,* which combats in 24 chapters the various forms of monophysitism. Though he condemns Greek *philosophy (PG 89, 49b. 108ab. 121bc. 140a. 148b. 265b.), he often appeals to *ratio theologica;* after listing the necessary qualities of a controversialist (ch. 1), he gives the theological definitions inherent in the theme (ch. 2), then expounds the arguments in favor of the dogma and resolves the objections of heretics. The work was written in the middle of the desert, when the author was in ill health and lacked books: some of its patristic citations are therefore inexact. Other dogmatic and polemical works are *Capita VI contra monothelitas* and *Capita XVI contra monophysitas*. The *Quaestiones et responsiones* on *exegetical, dogmatic and moral themes include a number of later additions. Nine discourses are his: *De creatione hominis* (three), *De sacra synaxi* (veneration of the *Eucharist; important details on the *liturgy; observations on the habits of the faithful), *In VI Psalmum, In defunctos, De Transfiguratione, In passione Jesu Christi* (Good Friday) and *In novam dominicam et in Thomam apostolum* (fragment). The *Narrationes* (edifying stories) are in part his. Among works no longer attributed to him are *In Hexaemeron 11. XII* (allegorical interpretation: Christ and the church); however, he has been suggested as the probable author of the *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi.*

CPG III, 7745-7769 (certain works) and 7770-7781 (*anastasiana incertae originis*); PG 89, 1-1288; Bardenhewer 5,41-47; EC 1,1157-1158; DTC 1,1167-1168; DHGE 2,1482-1483; DSp 1,546-1,547; BS 1,1059-1061; Beck 442-446; Altaner 561-562 and 590; S. Impelizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina*, 196-197 and 425-426; Patrologia V, 321-339 and index of names.

A. De Nicola

ANATHEMA. Meant "to set aside." With respect to the divinity it took on the meaning of a votive gift: "to consecrate," in Latin *devotio* or to devote a person, city, etc. to the deity, which meant it was no longer used for normal purposes. A city devoted to the gods, e.g., was destroyed. Applied to persons it came to mean to be forbidden from remaining in the community, in office, etc., i.e., to be "put out" (1 Cor 12:3; Gal 1:8). In ancient Christianity *anathema* meant principally banishment from the community. The Council of *Elvira (ca. 306) provides the oldest anathema, which then became normal practice, esp. regarding *heretics. Still famous are the 12 anathemas of *Cyril of Alexandria against *Nestorius and his followers in 431 (Council of *Ephesus). The penalty for those anathematized is sometimes specified in the collections of heresies from the 4th-5th c. (*Epiphanius, *Panarion;* *Filaster of Brescia, *Divers. haereseon*; Aug., *De haeresibus*; Arnobius, *Praedestinatus* esp. II, c. 19; 59; 64). From the 6th c., anathema was distinguished from *excommunication, reserving to the latter the punishment of exclusion from the *sacraments and from participation in the *lit-

urgy, whereas anathema meant complete separation from the church (*Decretum Gratiani* II, can. 106).

L. Brun, *Segen und Fluch im Urchristentum*, Oslo 1931.

V. Grossi

ANATOLIUS of Constantinople (d. 458). Born at *Alexandria, ordained deacon by St. *Cyril and sent as *apocrisarius to *Constantinople. Anatolius retained this post when *Dioscorus became *patriarch of *Alexandria; with the latter's support he was elected patriarch of Constantinople at the death of *Flavian, during the *latrocinium* of *Ephesus (449). Pope *Leo the Great thus wanted to ascertain his *orthodoxy and demanded of him a declaration of faith and the condemnation of *Nestorius and *Eutyches, which he gave. He worked for the acceptance of the **Tomus ad Flavianum* and played an important part in the Council of *Chalcedon, approving the deposition of Nestorius. Leo the Great praised his zeal for orthodoxy, but at times lamented him, esp. regarding his support for canon 28, which sanctioned the primacy of Constantinople in the East, for his deposition of archdeacon Aetius in favor of the Eutychian Andrew, and for the favor accorded two Eutychian priests Atticus and Andrew. He died 458, while negotiating this last case with the pope. M. Jugie judges him severely ("an opportunist by temperament"). The Greek church venerates him as a saint.

CPG III, 5956-5961; PL 54, 854-856, 952-960, 959-965, 976-984, 1082-1084 (= ACO II, 4, XLV-XLVI; II, 1, 3, 116-118; II, 4, 52-54; II, 4, 168-169; II, 5, 24-26); PG 95, 73c. M. Jugie, EC 1, 1161; DHGE 2, 1497-1500; R. Janin, LTK 1, 497; G. Eldarov, BS 1, 1883-1884; Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa* 4, Turin [3]1972, 311-315, 396-397, 411-415.

A. De Nicola

ANATOLIUS of Laodicea (d. ca. 280). Native of *Alexandria, active in the last decades of the 3rd c., was very learned in scientific matters and therefore appointed by the *Alexandrians to the chair of *Aristotelian *philosophy. *Theotecnus of Caesarea in *Palestine consecrated him bishop to make him his coadjutor, but when Anatolius was passing through *Laodicea the local Christians elected him successor to their late bishop *Eusebius, a charge he fulfilled from 270–280. He wrote *Easter Canons,* of which *Eusebius of Caesarea, from whom we have almost all of our information on Anatolius, provides extracts (*HE* VII, 32,14-19), and 10 books of *Introductiones arithmeticae,* of which we have some fragments (PG 10, 232-236).

DHGE 2, 1493-1494; T. Nicklin, *The Date and Origin of Ps.-Anatolius De ratione paschali*: Journal of Philology 28 (1901) 137-151; BBKL I, 160; Patrologia IV, 480-481.

M. Simonetti

ANATOLIUS of Laodicea (pseudo). A text titled *De ratione paschali* (*Ps.-Anatolius*) passed down in eight MSS which, though significantly corrupt, are traced directly or indirectly to *Ireland, presents some *Easter tables. First cited by *Colombanus (603) and *Cummineus and used in the Council of Whitby of 664 (Bede, *HE* 3,25); *Bede uses it both in the *De temporum ratione* and in the letter to Wicthede, in a redaction by then already corrupt (*libellum Anatolii in aliquibus latinorum exemplaribus esse corruptum*, par. 11), considering it to be of Anatolius of Laodicea. The author follows an Easter cycle of 19 years and puts the spring equinox at 25 March, meaning Easter cannot be celebrated before that date, only after it, on a Sunday. Recently in their critical edition, McCarthy and Breen supported with solid arguments the existence of a Latin archetype going back to ca. 400, already used by *Rufinus of Aquileia and translated by someone in his circle. This text must be the translation from the Greek original which goes back to the second half of the 3rd c. and was written by a Christian knowledgeable in mathematical and astronomical sciences and linked to the *Alexandrian church. That person could have been none other than Anatolius of Alexandria, who later became bishop of Laodicea in *Syria and died ca. 282.

CPL 2303; CPG 1620; CPPM III/A 626; Kenney 54; BCLL 320. PG 10, 207-232 (cols. 221ff., study of Bucherius); F. Cabrol, H. Leclercq, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, I, Paris 1912, 148-152; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig 1880, I, 311-328.

Studies: A. Anscombe, *The Paschal Canon Attributed to Anatolius of Laodicea*: EHR 10 (1895) 515-535; C.H. Turner, *The Paschal Canon of "Anatolius of Laodicea"*: EHR 10 (1895) 699-710; T. Nicklin, *The Date and Origin of Ps.-Anatolius De ratione paschali*: Journal of Philology 28 (1901) 137-151; C.W. Jones, *The "Lost" Sirmond Manuscript of Bede's Computus*: EHR 52 (1937) 204-219; Id., *Bedae Opera de Temporibus*, Cambridge, MA 1943, 82-85 (important); A. Cordoliani, *Les computistes insulaires et les écrits Ps.-alexandrins*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 106 (1945-46) 5-34, esp. 7-21; W.M. Stevens, *Scientific Instruction in Early Insular Schools*, in *Insular Latin Studies*, ed. M. Herren, Toronto, 1981, 83-111; D.O Cróinín, *Rath Melsigi, Willibrord, and the Earliest Echternach Manuscripts*: Peritia 3 (1984) 17-42, esp. 26-28; F. Wallis, *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, Liverpool 1999, LVI-LVIII; D.P. McCarthy, A. Breen, *The Ante-Nicene Christian Pasch De ratione paschali: The Paschal Tract of Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea*, Chippenham 2003 (crit. ed. and Eng. tr.).

A. Di Berardino

ANAZARBUS ('Ανάζαρβος or 'Αναζαρβά). From 525, after *Justin I: *Iustinopolis* or *Iustinianopolis;* today ruins are at Aïn-Varza or Aïn-Zarba or Aïn-Navzer. City of Cilicia II, birthplace of the doctor Dioscorides and the didactic poet Appian. Referred to by *Arius, who mentions its bishop in the letter to *Eusebius of Nicomedia (see Theodoret, *HE*, I, 4). Veneration of the *martyrs Taracus, Probus and Andronicus (see Delehaye OC, 194), all natives of Anazarbus, and of St. Julian, also born there (his body was at *Antioch at the time of *John Chrysostom), attests to the presence and vitality of Christianity in the city. The following bishops are known: Athanasius, Maximinus (431–433), Valerius (445), Stephen (449), Cyrus (451), Orestes (458), Antarchius (exiled in 518), John (550), Aetherius (553), Stephen (580–581) and Isidore (692). A regional council was held in Anazarbus in 433, in which all the bishops of Cilicia II participated except *Meletius of Mopsuestia; Maximinus presided, the bishop of Anazarbus who at the Council of *Ephesus (431) was in the party that opposed *Cyril of Alexandria. Even with clear aversion to Cyril on the part of the bishops of the province, the council decided for reconcilation between the church of Antioch and that of *Alexandria, a peace already anticipated at Ephesus; Maximinus ultimately accepted the treaty of union between the two churches.

Mansi V, 1179-1180; Hfl-Lecl II, 1, 416; DHGE I, 1504-1506; Palazzini 1, 35.

C. Nardi

ANCHORITE. The *anachōrēsis* was the flight of insolvent debtors deep into the desert to avoid repayment (often to live as brigands). *Moses and *David fled in this way from Pharaoh and Saul, and the term was applied to them. *Origen (*Hom. Jer*. 14,16 and 20,8) makes a religious model of Jeremiah's *anachōrēsis*. The word was applied by *Athanasius to St. *Anthony and became common in Greek in the sense of detachment from the world, even if only in habits and interests (St. *Basil of Caesarea, e.g.). *Jerome and *John Cassian latinized it, but it was reserved for the more prestigious forms of eremitic life and has passed with this meaning into modern languages.

J. Gribomont

ANCIENT LISTS of CANONICAL BOOKS and APOCRYPHA. From patristic literature and from the early Middle Ages come a certain number of lists of canonical and noncanonical books. They exist autonomously, or added to the texts of synods, or inserted in the works of writers such as *Cyril of Alexandria, *Augustine and *Cassiodorus. Listed in them are the books of the OT and NT, but often also other works or *apocrypha. The titles are often commented upon, e.g., expressing doubts regarding some canonical books or giving the names of *heretics who used the apocryphal works. The reason for these lists was entirely practical: a list of canonical books had not yet been well defined, there were a large number of apocrypha in use by heretics and use of texts in the liturgy required complete orthodoxy: the case of *Serapion of Antioch and the *Gospel of Peter* is typical (Eusebius, *HE* 3,31). These lists have great value for the history of the canon of Scripture and of the use of apocrypha. We will indicate the main lists below chronologically.

**Muratorian Canon.* NT; Latin text translated from Greek (?); second half 2nd c., Rome, lacks the initial part (Zahn 1-143; Grosheide 6-11).

*Canon of *Origen* (d. 254). OT, NT; Greek text. In various places in his works Origen lists the books of the OT and some apocrypha, but he does not give a proper list. See Eusebius, *HE* 6,25,4-12; Origen, *In Lc* 1,1; *Hom. in Ps 1*, PG 12, 1084 (Zahn 172-180; Grosheide 12).

The catalog of the Codex Claromontanus. OT, NT; Latin text, ca. 300. Inserted between Philem and Heb in the codex with the letters of St. Paul; gives the relative number of the stichoi (Zahn 143-156; Grosheide 16-17).

*The catalog of *Eusebius of Caesarea* (d. 339). *HE* 3,25, OT, NT; Greek text; lists some apocrypha (Grosheide 14-15).

Codex Mommsenianus. OT, NT, Latin text, ca. 360; contains 24 canonical books; modeled on the 24 elders of the *Apocalypse (4:10). The name comes from T. Mommsen, who discovered it (Zahn 143-156; Grosheide 17-18).

*Festal Letter of St. *Athanasius of 367.* Greek text; OT, NT (Zahn 203-212; Grosheide 19).

*Apostolic Constitutions. OT, NT; Greek text; ca. 380. II,57; VI, 16 (SC 320, 312-314; 329, 344-346; Zahn 180-184).

*85 *Apostolic canons*. OT, NT; Greek text (Zahn 184-193).

Canon of Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 350). OT, NT; Greek text; in the *Catechesis* 4,35-36 (Zahn 172-180; Grosheide 15).

**Council of Laodicea, can. 85* (late 4th c.). OT, NT; Greek text. P.P. Joannou, *Discipline générale antique*, 1/2, Grottaferrata 1963, 51-53 (Zahn 193-202).

**Gregory of Nazianzus* (d. ca. 390). Greek text. *Carm.* I,12, *De veris Scripturae libris*, PG 37, 471-474,

OT, NT. Poetical text (Zahn 221-217; Grosheide 20).

Amphilochius of Iconium (d. 396). *Iambi ad Seleucum*, v. 251-313, Greek text; OT, NT (Zahn 217-219; Grosheide 20-21).

**Filaster of Brescia* (4th c.). Latin text, *Haeres.* 40; 88-89; gives some information on the apocrypha (Zahn 233-239).

**Epiphanius of Salamis* (d. 402). Some information (Zahn 219-226).

Ps.-John Chrysostom. Greek text, *Synopsis SS.*, PG 56, 313-386 (description of the individual books of the OT); NT: 317 (Zahn 226-233).

**Rufinus of Aquileia* (d. 410/411). Latin text; explicating the third article of the creed, he offers a list of the books of the OT and NT: PL 21, 373-375 (Zahn 240-244).

**Innocent I* (405). *Letter to Exuperius of Toulouse* (*Epist.* 6,7 PL 20, 501); Latin text; OT, NT, a list of apocrypha with an official condemnation (Zahn 244-246).

Brevis Statutorum Hipponensium *36, PL 56, 428-429*. Latin text; legislation of the Councils of *Carthage 397, 419; OT, NT. A similar list is in Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* 2, 8,12-13 (Zahn 246-253; Grosheide 21-22).

Ps.-Athanasius (4th-5th c.). *Synopses of the SS* (CPG 2249, PG 28, 284-289, 432); Greek text; OT, NT, a list of apocrypha and *antilegomena* (ibid. 432; Zahn 302-318).

**Turibius of Astorga* (ca. 447). *Epistola ad Idatium et Ceponium;* Latin text, PL 54, 693-695. A list of some apocrypha used by the *Priscillianists.

**Leontius of Byzantium* (5th-6th c.). *De sectis* II,4, PG 86, 1203, Greek text; NT (Zahn 293-295).

Timothy the Presbyter (6th c.). Greek text; a list of apocrypha used by the *Manichees, PG 86/1, 21.

**Cassiodorus* (d. 580). Latin text; *Institutiones* 12 (according to *Jerome), 13 (according to Augustine), 14 (according to the *Septuagint*), PL 70, 1123-1126; OT, NT (Zahn 269-284).

Ps.-*Decretum Gelasianum. Latin text; OT, NT, a long list of apocrypha; PL 59, 157-164; E. von Dobschütz: TU 8[38], 3/4, 1912-1913 (Grosheide 23-24).

Bobbio Codex (6th-7th c.). OT, NT; Latin text (Zahn 284-289).

**John of Damascus* (d. 749). *De fide orthodoxa* 4,17, PG 70, 1123-1126; Greek text; NT books with *Canons of the Holy Apostles* (Zahn 295).

Patriarch Nicephorus (ca. 850). *Chronography;* Greek text, with the respective number of lines of each book included; NT, *antilegomena,* apocrypha (Zahn 295-301).

The Samaritan list (13th c.). Gives a list of 35 apocryphal gospels; J. MacDonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle n. II*, Berlin 1969.

T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1-2, Erlangen-Leipzig 1890-1892 (repr. Hildesheim 1975), vol. 2: cit. as Zahn; F.W. Grosheide, *Some Early Lists of the Books of the New Testament*, Leiden 1948: cit. as Grosheide; T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 1-8, Leipzig 1881-1927; J. Leipold, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1-2, Leipzig 1907-1908 (repr. Leipzig 1974); M.J. Lagrange, *Histoire ancienne du Nouveau Testament*, Paris [2]1933; M. Grant, *La formation du Nouveau Testament*, Paris 1969; H. von Campenhausen, *La formation de la Bible chrétienne*, Paris 1971; I. Frank, *Der Sinn der Kanonbildung*, Freiburg 1971; K.H. Ohling, *Die theologische Begründung des neutestamentlichen Kanons in der alten Kirche*, Göttingen 1972; *Das Neue Testament als Kanon*, ed. E. Käsemann, Göttingen 1979 (collective work); S. Amsler et al., *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament*, Geneva 1984; B.M. Metzger, *The Canon of the NT, Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Oxford 1987 (It. tr. Brescia 1997); C.N. Haneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Developement of Canon*, Oxford 1992; L.M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, Peabody, MA 1995.

M. Starowieyski

ANCYRA (Ἄγκυρα). Metropolis initially of Galatia (*diœcesis Pontica*) then, from the late 4th c., of Galatia I. In the 7th-8th c. was an integral part of the *Byzantine *themes* of the Opsikion and Buccellari, today Ankara. Christianity developed very rapidly in this region. Ancyra's *martyrology is substantial: ca. 30 names ranging from the "apostle" Crescentius (under *Trajan) to the famous *Hypatius (4th c.). At a later period, the monks *Leontius and *Nilus were famous. From the subapostolic age Ancyra entered history because of its struggle against the *Cataphrygians (*Eusebius, *HE*, V, 16,4). Soon a conciliar city, it was contested during the century of *Arianism by its bishops *Marcellus and *Basil, who were succeeded by *Athanasius. Except for *Constantinople I (381)—certainly because of the occupation of the see by the Arians—its metropolitans were present at the ecumenical councils (at Constantinople II through a representative), with a varying number of suffragans. According to the *Synekdemos* of *Hierocles (527–528), the province of Ancyra included seven cities (ed. E. Honigmann, Brussels 1939, 34-35, nn. 696-697). In the first known episcopal *Notitia*, that of ps.-Epiphanius (7th c.), Ancyra was the fourth metropolis and had seven suffragan bishops (J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae*, 204, n. 9; 207, nn. 123-130), a position it always maintained (ibid., 216, n. 4; p. 220, nn. 142-149). Temporarily occupied by the *Persians, from 620–626, and by the Arabs in 654, it was sacked by the latter in 806 and in 838.

DHGE II, 1540-1609; XIX, 717-723; V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 1, Paris 1963, 239-243; V, 2; ibid., 1965, 455, n. 336 bis; Cl. Foss, *Late Antique and Byzantine Ankara*:

Dumbarton Oaks Papers 31 (1977) 27-87; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Paris 1981.

D. Stiernon

ANDREW, apostle. Born at Bethsaida Julia in Galilee (Jn 1:44) and a fisherman like his brother Simon, later called *Peter (Mt 4:18), his name is Greek in origin, though certainly not in deference to the *Hellenistic culture fairly widespread in the region E of the Lake of Tiberias. Initially a disciple of John (Jn 1:40), then of Jesus, to whom he brought his brother (Jn 1:41-42), he was part of the first group of Jesus' followers (Mt 4:19; Mk 1:16; Lk 6:14) and present at Jesus' first miracle at Cana (Jn 2:1-2). Luke's account (5:1-11) of the call of the first group of Jesus's followers, comprising Peter, James and John, does not name Andrew, though his presence with his brother in the boat from which Jesus taught must be assumed. The omission can be explained by the fact that everything in the account is centered on the miraculous catch of fish and the person of Peter, who expresses his own amazement and that of James and John, spectators of the scene. Once the number of apostles was fixed at twelve, Andrew's name appears in the second (Mt 10:2; Lk 6:14) and the fourth position (Mk 3:18; 13:3; Acts 1:13), depending on the structure of the list. Though part of the small group that had more direct contact with Jesus (Jn 6:8; 12:22), he was unaccountably not present at the transfiguration. After the mention in Acts 1:13, there is no reliable historical information from which to reconstruct his activity after *Pentecost. While the indication in the *Muratorian fragment (10-15) that he exhorted John to write his gospel seems without historical basis, more acceptable is what *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* III, 1) recounts, based on *Origen, of the field of his apostolate being in *Scythia. Later sources mention Colchis, *Epirus (*Greg. Naz., *Or.* 33), *Achaia (*Jerome, *Ep.* 59); Greece (*Theodoret, *In ps.* 116); *Cappadocia, *Galatia and *Bithynia, Scythia, Greece and *Byzantium (Niceph. Callist., *HE* II, 39). At Patrae (Achaia), by now old, he is said to have been condemned by the governor Aegeas to die on a decussate, or St. Andrew's, cross. In a text of ps.-Hippolytus (ca. 800), it expressly says that Andrew was crucified "upright on an olive tree" (TU 31/3, 1907, 247). The Basilian *menologion* just mentions a tree. The image of Andrew on a trunk with two branches at an acute angle may have suggested a cross. According to *Faustus the *Manichean, the brothers Peter and Andrew died in the same way (Aug., *C. Faustum man.* 14,1). Eusebius counts the *Acts of Andrew* (*HE* 3, 25,6) among *heretical inventions, and *Epiphanius of Salamis attests their use by various sects: among *Encratites in general and in particular among *Origenists and *Apostolici (*Panarion* 47,1; 61,1; 63,2). Manicheans and *Priscillianists also valued them (*Filaster of Brescia, *Haer.* 88). The problem of their historicity remains open. The information regarding the areas of evangelization reached by Andrew seems historically worthy of consideration, as also his *martyrdom at Patrae by crucifixion. In 356/357 emperor *Constantius had the apostle's mortal remains transferred to the Church of the Holy Apostles in *Constantinople; in 1208 they were transferred to Amalfi by Cardinal Pietro of Capua, and since 1462, during the pontificate of Pius II, they have been in St. Peter's Basilica at the *Vatican. His feast is 30 November.

Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* III, 1,25 (CPG 3495; PG 20, 216. 269); Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 33 (CPG 3010; PG 36, 228); Theodoret, *In Psalm.* 116 (CPG 6202; PG 80, 1805); Nicephorus Callistus, *Hist. Eccl.* 2,39 (PG 145, 860); Jerome, *Ep. 59 ad Marcellam* (CPL 620; PL 22, 589); Epiphanius, *Panarion* 47,1; 61,1; 63,2 (CPG 3145; PG 41, 852.1040.1064); Filaster of Brescia, *Haer.* 88 (CPL 121; PL 12, 1200; CL 9,256); Pseudo-Hippolytus, TU 31/3 (1907) 247; Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 14,1 (CPL 321; PL 42, 295; CSEL 25.1,402-404); Erbetta II, 395-399; E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, II, [2]1975, 390-425; B. Mariani - E. Tosi - E. Peterson, *Andrea, apostolo, santo*: EC I, 1183-1188; G.D. Gordini, *Andrea, apostolo, santo*: BS I, 1094-1100; F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge, MA 1958, 138-299; LTK[3] 1, 625-626; R. Pillinger, *Der Apostel Andreas: ein Heiliger von Ost und West im Bild der frühen Kirche*, Vienna 1994.

E. Peretto

ANDREW, apostle (apocryphal). Andrew, brother of *Peter, appears in the lists of the *apostles, always in the first group. In the canonical gospels he is often associated with *Philip. According to the *Muratorian Canon he encouraged John to write his gospel. According to *Eusebius of *Caesarea (*HE* 3,1), Andrew carried out his *apostolate in *Scythia. There is ample apocryphal literature concerning Andrew, one of the most popular of the apostles, which can be subdivided into two parts: (1) *Acts of Andrew* and (2) texts connected to them and other texts about the apostle.

1. *Acts of Andrew*, one of five major acts of the apostles, written in Greek 2nd/3rd c., probably in *Achaia or perhaps Asia Minor. The *Acts* have been lost, and only fragments are preserved. They are divided into two parts, his travels and his *martyrdom. It is very difficult to reconstruct the part regarding his travels through the cities of Asia Minor—*Amasea, Sinope, *Nicaea and others—and through the Greek cities of *Philippi, *Thessalonica, *Corinth and Patrae, and the miracles done in those places;

the principal source is the *Latin translation, abridged by *Gregory of Tours (d. 594). The second part, the martyrdom, begins in the city of Patrae. After converting a large number of people, including Stratocles and Maximilla, Andrew was condemned to death by Aegeates. He says a long prayer at the cross before being bound to it and then preaches from the cross for three days. After his death he was buried at Patrae (30 November). This part is better-preserved thanks to the Greek and Armenian texts. The entire text of the *Acts* has been reconstructed by J.M. Prieur based on the following texts: Greek, *Coptic (two papyri), Latin (text of Gregory, letter of the deacons of Achaia) and *Armenian; and from patristic citations (*Augustine, Euodius of Uzala and others). The text has a clearly *Encratite character and reflects the spiritual atmosphere of the period (*gnostic, neo-Pythagorean and *Platonic influences). The *Acts* were used by *Manicheans and *Priscillianists, and for this reason were often condemned during the patristic period, whereas Gregory's version was purged of any heterodox influences.

2. Another group is composed of other texts about Andrew: that of book III in the account of ps.-*Abdias—the *Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Man-Eaters*, and the *Acts of Peter and Andrew*, which form one work. There are many *Acts* in Eastern languages: the *Martyrdom of St. Andrew* (Coptic and Ethiopian), the *Acts of Andrew and Paul*, the *Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew* (Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopian and an unpublished Greek text), the *Acts of Andrew and Philemon* (Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopian). All of these texts transmit different versions of Andrew's legend from that of the *Acts*. There was also a *Gospel of Andrew* (*ps.-Gelasian Decree* 5,3,2).

St. Andrew's feast was already confirmed in the 4th c. by *Gregory of Nazianzus and in *Africa. His relics were carried from Patrae to *Constantinople in 357 (with those of Luke and Timothy); the translation is commemorated on 9 May.

This variety of traditions became the source of medieval legends, such as that of his apostolate in the Ukraine at Kiev, or the Germanic legends (*Andreas);* Andrew as *prōtoklētos* (Gk. "the first called") played an important role in theological discussions on the role of the see of *Constantinople. Many churches have been built under his name: at *Ravenna, *Aquileia and *Rome.

CANT 225-240; BHG 93-110c; BHL 428-442; BHO 48-57. Basic Ed.: J.M. Prieur, CCAp 5-6, 1989, with ample historical, critical and theological introduction. Other Greek and Latin texts ed. by Lipsius-Bonnet II,1; *Vita di Andrew* by Epiphanius monk: A. Dressel, Leipzig 1843; PG 120, 216-260; *Matteo e Andrea*, D.R. MacDonald, Atlanta 1990. Eastern texts: Arabic: A. Smith Lewis, *Acta mythologica Apostolorum*, Studia Sinaitica 3-4, London 1903; Ethiopian: E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles*, 1-2. London 1899-1901 (Amsterdam 1976); Armenian in Fr. tr.: L. Leloir, CCAp 3, 1986, 191-265.

Translations: Eng. - Elliott 231-302; D.R. MacDonald, op. cit.; Fr.: CCAp, op. cit.; EAC 879-972; It.: Erbetta 2, 393-449; Moraldi 2, 429-507, 543-574, 689-694; Ger.: J.M. Prieur, in Schneemelcher 2, 93-137.

Studies: BS 1, 1961, 1094-1113; LCIK 5, 138-152; Lipsius 1, 543-622; J. Flamion, *Les Actes d'André et les textes apparentés*, Louvain 1911; F. Blatt, *Die lateinische Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthaei apud Anthropophagos*, Giessen 1930; I. Sickenberger, *Apokalyptik*: RAC 1, 504-510; F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge, MA 1958 (trans. in various languages); J.M. Prieur, *Les Actes apocryphes de l'apôtre André: présentation des diverses traditions apocryphes et état de la question*: ANRW II,25,6 (1988) 4384-4414; D.W. Pao, *The Genre of the Acts of Andrew*: Apocrypha 6 (1995) 179-202 (bibl.); A.J.N. Bremmer (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew*, Leuven 2000 (collection of articles, bibl.).

M. Starowieyski

ANDREW of Caesarea (6th c.). Bishop of *Caesarea in *Cappadocia, second half 6th c., wrote a commentary on the *Apocalypse shortly after that of Oecumenius, which to our knowledge was the first such commentary written in Greek. Andrew still felt the need to defend the sacred inspiration of the work, which had been contested in various ways in the East, with an appeal to the authority of the ancient fathers. Following contemporary practice, Andrew's commentary had abundant and at times extensive citations of earlier authors, esp. *Irenaeus, *Hippolytus, *Methodius and *Gregory of Nazianzus. He also makes significant use of Oecumenius without naming him, debating his positions more than once; there is no trace in Andrew of the *Origenism so present in Oecumenius. Andrew, who maintains the traditional division of world history into seven ages and expects the world to end soon, offers an *allegorical reading of the Apocalypse, stressing *ecclesiology and *eschatology more than did his predecessor.

CPG III, 7478; PG 106, 216-457; J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes I*, Munich 1955; J. Schmid - A. Monaci Castagno, *Il problema della datazione dei Commenti all'Apocalisse di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea*: AAT 114 (1980) 223-246; A. Monaci Castagno, *I Commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: due letture divergenti dell'Apocalisse*: AAT, series V, vol. V (1981) 305-426; BBKL I, 168; Eng. tr., W.C. Weinrich (tr. and ed.), Oecumenius and Andrew of Caesarea, *Greek Commentaries on Revelation,* Downers Grove 2011.

M. Simonetti

ANDREW of Crete (ca. 660–740). Among the most representative homilists and ecclesiastical poets of the 7th- and 8th-c. Born ca. 660 into a powerful Christian family of *Damascus, as a youth he was taken to *Jerusalem, where he became a *monk in the *monastery of Church of the Anastasis (Holy Sepulchre); for this reason those in the East call him Andrew of Jerusalem. In 685 he was part of a delegation sent to *Constantinople to express the adherence of the Church of Jerusalem to the decisions of the 6th ecumenical council; he remained in the capital, where he exercised the *diaconate, responsible for asylums for orphans and the elderly. He was nominated by the emperor ca. 700 as *archbishop of Gortyna on the island of *Crete. Forced to subscribe to a confession of *monothelite faith under the emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–713), he withdrew his subscription immediately upon the emperor's death and returned to orthodoxy. He founded charitable institutions and a Marian shrine, and supported resistance to the Islamic invasion. He died 740 on the island of Lesbos upon returning from a trip to Constantinople, where he had gone to ask for help in the plague and famine that menaced Crete. The Eastern church venerates him as a saint. Famous as the creator of a *liturgical canon widely popular in *Byzantium and throughout his sphere of influence (Irmscher in DPAC 192-193).

Mariology occupies a special place in Andrew's reflections. For him *Mary is God's elect, the dwelling of the divine wisdom that the world cannot understand and collaborator in Christ's work of salvation. Although the gospels did not speak of Mary's assumption, Andrew denies the corruptibility of her body, insisting emphatically on her holiness.

CPG III, 8170-8228 (of which 8220-8228 are spurious); PG 97, 789-1444; Th. Nissen, *Diatribe und Consolatio in einer christlichen Predigt des achten Jahrhunderts*: Philologus 92 (1937) 177-198; H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich [2]1977, 500-502; A. Olivar, *La predicaciòn cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991, 225ff.; M. Auzepy, *La carrière d'André de Crète*: ByzZ 88 (1995) 1-12 (for the life and works); G. Pons Pons (ed.), *Homilías marianas. Introducción, traducción y notas*, Madrid 1995; A. Giannouli, *Die Kommentartradition zum Grossen Kanon des Andreas von Kreta: einige Anmerkungen*: JÖByz (Jahrbuch der Oesterreichischen Byzantinistik) 49 (1999) 143-159; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, vol. 2, Rome 1988, 391-481.

C. Dell'Osso

ANDREW of Samosata (d. after 444). Bishop of Samosata (today Samsat in E Turkey) at the start of the *Nestorian crisis, he and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus were asked by *John of Antioch to refute *Cyril of Alexandria's 12 anathemas. Part of his refutation is reconstructed from Cyril's response (PG 76, 315ff.), whereas almost nothing is known of another anti-Cyrillian work of his, of which the *Hodegos* of *Anastasius the Sinaite has preserved a fragment. Andrew looked for contradictions in Cyril's thought, accusing him of repeating the errors of *Apollinaris and *Arius. He did not participate at the Council of *Ephesus due to illness and was later among those who refused to subscribe to the pact of union of 433 because, though recognizing Cyril's orthodoxy, he did not want to accept the condemnation of Nestorius; he did subscribe to it at a later date, however. He was still alive in 444. We have some of his letters, which contain important information on events following the Council of Ephesus.

CPG 3, 6373-6385; PG 84, 649-720; ACO I, 1, 7,33-65; DHGE 2, 1604-1606; P. Evieux, *André de Samosate. Un adversaire de Cyrille d'Alexandrie durant la crise nestorienne*: REByz 32 (1974) 253-300; Grillmeier 1, 700-707.

M. Simonetti

ANEMIUS (d. 382/391). Bishop of *Sirmium. Fervent anti-*Arian, at the death of *Germinius (ca. 376) he was imposed by *Ambrose as bishop of Sirmium, in the context of a coordinated fight against the last Arian centers of *Illyricum and despite the opposition of the empress *Justina (Paulinus, *Vita Ambr*. 11). He always acted in accord with Ambrose, participating at the Council of *Aquileia (381) and the *Roman synod (382). He died before 391 and was succeeded by Cornelius.

E. Prinzivalli

ANGEL

I. Angelology - II. Iconography.

I. Angelology. The English term *angel,* with the respective words in the other Western languages, comes from *angelus,* which from the late 2nd c. (*Vetus Latina,* Tertull.) was adopted in Latin as a loan translation of the Greek word ἄγγελος. Initially these two terms expressed primarily a function, that of the messenger of God (see Aug., *En. ps*. 135,3: "Hence, they are much more correctly called Angels, which in Latin is Nuntii; for by the name of their office, not their substance, we may plainly understand that they desire us to worship that God whom they announce." See also Tertull. *Carn*. 14; Aug., *En. ps*. 103,3; 7,5; and other texts in DSp 1,581 and RAC 5,115). Gradually, however, *angelus* and

ἄγγελος came to be the exclusive name for those beings that, according to the Jewish Christian tradition, exist between God and human beings, thereby becoming terms for nature; in scriptural usage (see Mt 25:41, Rev 12:9), they were thus applied also to evil spirits, i.e., *demons. Good angels, however, are never called demons (see Aug., *Civ. Dei* 9,19 and other texts in RAC 9,716-9,717). The passage of *angel* from the name of a function to a term used for a category of special beings is highly significant, indicating a development from a primarily *soteriological reflection, interested mainly in the relationship of angels with divine *providence, the mysteries of Jesus, the missionary work of the church and the daily lives of individual believers, to a deeper reflection on the origin and essential characteristics (*apatheia,* immortality, incorporeality, knowledge, freedom) of such heavenly beings. This long and difficult development has solid foundations in the biblical world. Almost every aspect of Christian angelology that has been accentuated through the centuries—the angels as the heavenly court; eternal adorers; ministers of Christ, Savior and head of the universe; mediators between God and human beings; protectors of the faithful and of peoples; models of intimate union with God; executors of the divine judgments—is solidly based on numerous testimonies of Sacred Scripture and the writings of later *Judaism. However, Christianity's conflict—and earlier that of Judaism's—with Greco-Roman antiquity undoubtedly conditioned the development of patristic doctrine on angels, and this not only at the predominantly negative level of the defense of the Jewish Christian heritage but also on the positive level of the reinterpretation of the traditional data in light of *philosophical thought and *pagan devotion and imagination. But external influences must not be exaggerated. The basic affirmation of the superiority of the one creator-God and the primacy of Christ with respect to the angels completely separates the Jewish Christian heritage from Hellenistic traditions (see RAC 5,115).

This complex evolution of Christian angelology, conditioned by the ever-changing cultural situations of the churches, can be explained in particular by the following factors: first of all, one must bear in mind the strong persistence of Jewish traditions in the Christian *apocrypha of the OT and NT. The frequent reading of these writings, especially of the **Ascension of Isaiah*, the **Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *II Book of Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Paul* and the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (recognized by many as quasicanonical; see Vis. III, 4: the first reference to a hierarchy), kept alive the ancient *traditions on the origin of the angels and their role in the universe and in human life, described as descent and ascent (see Daniélou, I, 139-145; HDG 23-26). Not less important was the apologetic context of the 2nd c. Having not only to explain the incisive fact of the idolatry present everywhere but also to find a reason for the unjust persecution of so many faithful and to respond to the crucial accusation of atheism by the people, the *apologists, in particular *Justin Martyr, specified scriptural beliefs more precisely. On the one hand they said that demons, considered by the Jewish tradition as apostate angels, were behind the cult of idols and also caused the sufferings of the just, as they had always done (see Daniélou 2, 391-397). On the other hand, they noted that Christians themselves venerated, not only the *Father, the Son and the *Holy Spirit, but also the angels (Just., *Apol.* 1,6; Athenag. *Leg.* 10). Also notable is a certain reaction of the apologists against the excessive Jewish veneration of angels (Aristides, *Apol.* 14,4). In any case, according to the *Acts of the *Martyrs* the angels lead the martyrs into heaven, where their choir sings the *trisagion* (*Pass. Perp.* 11-13).

In the second half of the 2nd c. the polemic against *gnostic speculation gave the authors of the great church—in particular *Irenaeus of Lyons, who for the first time presents a detailed doctrine on angels (see HDG 28-31; TRE 600-601)—the occasion to emphasize the biblical truth that all angels are creatures of the one God, not demiurges and emanations from superior *aeons as the gnostics claimed, following *Platonic traditions (see Iren., *Adv. haer.* 11, 30,6-9). The representatives of Christian gnosis, led by *Origen, inserted these by then-traditional angelological convictions into a theological system, central to which were the problems of the origin of multiplicity and esp. of *evil (Orig., *C. Cels.* IV, 65), doctrines also taken up later in the anti-*Manichean polemic (see HDG, 45-46). Indeed, the first systematic theologian admitted among spiritual beings, as distinct from the *Trinity which alone is incorporeal, a privation that descends, in conformity with the gravity of the primordial sin, from the archangels, through angels and human beings, to demons (see Orig., *De Princ.* 1,8; *C. Cels.* 8,25). According to *Origen, angels are present everywhere in the universe: in nature, in nations and in the lives of individuals, with the purpose of combating demons (see Daniélou 2, 397-403).

Later discussions of Origen's system led in the 4th c. to a more exact determination of the difference of the angels with respect to both Christ and the Holy Spirit. Clearly associating the Word with

God the creator, the anti-*Arian theologians also confirmed on the level of *being* the *Pauline doctrine, so dear to Irenaeus (see *Adv. haer*. III, 16,6), of Christ, head of the angels, thus eliminating any risk of the so-called angel-Christology, which, inspired by Jewish ideas, preferred to present Christ as an angel of the Lord (see RAC 5,148-5,149). Similarly *Basil of *Caesarea, following the *Nicene tradition, made it clear that the Holy Spirit was not to be numbered among the "ministering" spirits, i.e., the angels created by God as his ministers, but must be considered a "lordly" Spirit, indeed to be adored with the Father and the Son as Lord of all things, including angelic spirits (see the Constantinopolitan Creed that follows Basil: DS 150). For the bishop of *Caesarea, in fact, the angels were not only created by the Word but also perfected by the Holy Spirit (Basil. *Hom*. 32,4; *De Spir*. 16,38, see RAC 5,149).

Still in the 4th c., a period during which the Christian *liturgy was adapted more openly to the ideas and expressions of the mystery religions, bishops and preachers, esp. *Cyril of Jerusalem, *Ambrose, *John Chrysostom and *Theodore of Mopsuestia, delighted to emphasize the active presence of the angels in the liturgy itself, the *mysterium tremendum* (see TRE 601, and esp. Peterson, with Chrysostom, *Hom. In Seraph*. 3). The presence of the angels in the Christian liturgy has its roots, however, in earlier traditions (Clem. Alex., *Exc. Thdt*. 27,2; Origen, *Or.* 31,5; *Apos. Trad.* 4,36). Simultaneously, as the *monastic movement was spreading from *Egypt and *Palestine to all the churches of the *Roman Empire and beyond, the traditional views on the role of the angels in the ascetic struggle and in the spiritual *ascesis of the faithful was strongly reaffirmed. Indeed, the life of perfection began to be explicitly compared with angelic life, thus exalting consecrated virginity, constant vigilance and continual praise of God, as practiced by the *monks (see Frank, Cramer).

In the following two centuries, the closer encounter between Christianity and *Neoplatonism, by then the common *philosophy, stimulated *Augustine and ps.-*Dionysius to deepen the traditional doctrine on the nature and salvific functions of angels.

Augustine based his reflections on faith, attested by the Bible (*En. Ps.* 103,1,15: "We know by faith that angels exist, but we also read of their many appearances in Scripture and thus we hold that their existence is not to be doubted.") He is prudent in his investigation of the biblical data (see *Ench*. 58; *Trin*. III 1,5) but does offer further reflection on biblical angelology (see AugL 304). In particular he introduces a new problem, previously neglected, which will determine the whole later development of Western angelology (HDG 46ff.). Treating of angels esp. in the context of the *exegesis of Genesis (*Gen. Lit*. IV) and in that of the beginning of the history of the *Duae Civitates* (*Civ. Dei* XI), he focused his attention not only on the question of the moment of the angels' creation (Gen 1:1 or 1:3) but also on the problem of angelic knowledge. For Augustine, the angels have a triple knowledge of created things: they know them in the clear light of day before their creation, in the light of evening after their creation, and in the light of morning, in themselves and in their relation to the Word (*Gen. Lit*. IV, 22,39-24,41). In this context Augustine also shows his understanding of the sin and blessedness of the angels. Set over all corporeal creatures, angels either ascribe their knowledge of things to the glory of the Word, thus remaining in the light, or, overcome by pride, they turn to themselves, take pleasure in themselves and become darkness (see *Gen. Lit*. IV, 23,40-41). Though not arriving at a clear idea of the incorporeity of the angels (see RAC 5,121), Augustine, by uniting angelology with his analysis of intellectual knowledge in this doctrine of *illumination, i.e., of the spirit as a capacity to understand God, decisively influenced the direction of scholastic thought.

Not less decisive, though for different reasons, was the influence of ps.-Dionysius's angelology. Recognizing with *Proclus the angels as pure spirits (ὑπερκόσμιοι), this unknown early 6th-c. author divides them into nine choirs, constituting a scale of beings between God and humanity. According to this idea of hierarchy—to which he dedicated a special work, the *De caelesti hierarchia*—the superior beings (seraphim, cherubim and thrones), on the one hand, are nearest to the divinity; principalities, archangels and angels, on the other hand, more directly help the human hierarchy to raise itself to God. Finally dominions, virtues and powers form the intermediate orders. This whole celestial hierarchy exists in a double movement of descent and ascent. A cascade of light pours from above to below, reaching as far as humanity. The inferior orders, however, with human beings, raise themselves through purification, illumination and union toward the superior, reaching as far as the deity. This is the first systematic attempt to link angelology with the spiritual life of Christians. Through *Gregory the Great and *Maximus the Confessor (the latter, however, putting the Christ-man above all the angelic orders), this universal vision would become one of the bases of medieval angelological speculation.

Besides the Neoplatonic influences taken up by Augustine and ps.-Dionysius, also noteworthy are

two perhaps secondary but nonetheless important facts. On the one hand, the development of the cult of *Mary, the Mother of God, led to placing her above the angels, who until then were considered nearest to God. In *Byzantine preaching, in fact, esp. in homilies on the annunciation and on the death of the Madonna, the angels themselves serve Mary and sing her praises (see John Dam., *Hom. Dorm.* I, 11-12 - RAC 5,153ff.; TRE 603). On the other hand, the iconoclast controversy gave to Byzantine theologians, and thus to the 2nd ecumenical Council of *Nicaea (787), the occasion to pronounce on the question of the incorporeal nature of angels. To justify angel images a certain corporeity was attributed to them, without however definitively resolving the problem (see HDG 59). Thus toward the end of the patristic era the statements of the primitive tradition on the place of the angels in salvation history, and their ministry in the life of Jesus and in that of the church, took on more precise contours. At the same time their nature was better defined. Though only a relative incorporeity was generally accepted—in relation to human beings, not to God—it was considered a doctrine of faith that the angels were spiritual beings which, contrary to evil spirits (the apostate angels), had freely decided for God (see the texts summarized by John Dam., *Expos.* 17-18 (II, 3-4), and Theod. Stud., *Or. in ss. Angelo*s: PG 99, 729-747).

To better understand this long and tortuous evolution of patristic angelology, determined by factors both internal and external to the Christian faith, it is helpful to bear in mind the angelological criteria that theologians gradually elaborated in their reflections on the scriptural and traditional data. In the first place, the principle of the *canonicity of the Sacred Scriptures that governs all theological work is particularly valid in angelology. Augustine says this explicitly, writing: "But we, following Scripture, according to which we are Christians, have learned that some of the angels are good, some bad, but never have we read of good demons" (*Civ. Dei* IX,19). More concretely, this means that angelology is principally based on faith in divine *revelation. This fundamental principle not only imposed reservations on pagan demonology but also required that certain, overly arbitrary opinions of the Jewish tradition be submitted to criticism. Thus the opinion of a carnal sin of the angels, based on Jewish exegesis of Gen 6:1-4 (see the texts in HDG 43, esp. Augustine, *Civ. Dei* XV,23), was gradually eliminated. Likewise the names of the archangels were reduced to the three mentioned in the canonical writings, in particular discarding the name of Uriel (see RAC 5,182-188, and the catalog of angelic names in RAC 5,206-239). In line with biblical faith, patristic angelology took especially seriously the absolute transcendence of God the creator.

This theological principle, operative esp. in the antignostic controversy, led theologians not only to expand the already-accepted doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo,* applying it also to the angels, as well as excluding that certain angels were created evil, but also to assert that the existence of evil spirits is to be explained as due to their completely free *apostasy. They also specified the veneration that could be given to angels (see Orig., *C. Cels.* VIII, 13; Aug., *Ver. rel.* 55,110), distinguishing them from the Word and from the Spirit, who alone constitute, with the Father, the incorporeal Trinity, the source of angelic life. Within the framework of the same cosmology another principle was brought forth having clearly biblical roots, but whose application was favored by extrabiblical, esp. *Platonic traditions, i.e., the principle of the hierarchy of all created beings. On this principle it was accepted that there are angels nearer to God, considered as his court and messengers, and at the same time beings who are above human beings and created before them. By the same principle of gradation it was also held that angels are corporeal in relation to God, but incorporeal in relation to human beings. Another no less fundamental principle played a similarly decisive role in this vexing problem of the corporeity of angels: the fact that angels appeared to the patriarchs, and still appear at times today, presupposes that they must in some way be corporeal beings (see RAC 5,121).

Finally, the idea that angels are superior to human beings and yet constitute, as God's creatures, a community among themselves, has guided all considerations on the relation between angels and human beings. On the one hand, inspired by some biblical suggestions (see Mt 18:10; 22:30), Christian authors quickly understood the angelic life as the ideal of evangelical existence, comparing first the martyrs (see the references to the Apostolic Fathers in HDG, 20) and then the monks to the angels, not without at times exaggerating the idea of the spiritualization of the perfect person, as, e.g., in the Origenist tradition. On the other hand, the conviction that the angels, though superior to human beings and not redeemed by Christ as they were, are nevertheless their relations and friends, engaged with them in the same battle between good and evil, led the Fathers to develop reflections on the ministry of the angels, both in service to the individual believer, esp. at the crucial moment of death, and as protectors of peoples and nations (see esp. Origen, *Hom. Lk* 34). Indeed, this persuasion, rooted so pro-

foundly in the Bible itself, is at the basis of Augustine's doctrine of the *Civitas Dei*—composed of the good angels and humanity, the latter taking the place of the rebellious angels—and of ps.-Dionysius's speculations on the hierarchical universe.

DSp 1,580-625; 3,141-238; RAC 5,53-322 (bibl.); RAC 9,546-797 (bibl.); J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, Bonn 1941; R. Roques, *L'univers Dionysien*, Paris 1954; E. Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln*, Munich 1955; J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (1), Tournai 1958 (It. tr. Bologna 1974); B. Lohse, *Zu Augustins Engellehre*: ZKG 70 (1959) 278-291; J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux II^e^ et III^e^ siècles* (2), Tournai 1961 (It. tr. Bologna 1976); K.S. Frank, *Angelikos Bios*, Münster 1964; O. Lechner, *Idee und Zeit in der Metaphysik Augustins*, Munich 1964; W. Cramer, *Die Engelvorstellungen bei Ephräm dem Syrer*, Rome 1965; G. Tavard, *Die Engel*: HDG II/2b, Freiburg 1968 (bibl.); P. Agaësse - A. Solignac, *Genèse au sens littéral*: BA 48/9, Paris 1972; G. Tavard, *Engel*: TRE 9 (1982) 580-615, esp. 599-604; G. Madec, *angelus*: AugL I (1994) 303-315; LTK[3] 3, 648-649; RGG[4] 2 (1999) 1279-1290, esp. 1281-1282; A. Monaci Castagno: Orig. Diz. (2000) 6-15 (bibl.).

B. Studer

II. Iconography. There is no fixed *iconography for representing angels in the figurative repertoire of the oldest Christian art. At least until the 5th c. the figure of the divine messenger does not seem to show specific individual traits, instead being distinguished by the role and position it occupies in given figurative contexts. Where we can detect their presence with certainty, angels appear in generic terms, no different from those in which sacred persons in general are depicted: they are shown as young, androgynous figures without wings or nimbus, usually beardless and dressed in tunic and pallium. Angels are depicted thus in some OT themes in which, like the biblical narratives, they form an integral part of the figurative context: in scenes of the sacrifice of Isaac, the angel restrains Abraham's arm, which holds a knife (Rome, *sarcophagus of the Studio Canova, 4th c., Ws pl. 184,2); in the episode of the three young Jews in the furnace of Babylon the angel is among the flames, representing the divine intervention that renders the fire ineffective (Ws pls. 181,3; 201,2; Wp pls. 137,1; 231,1); in the depiction of *Daniel in the lions' den the angel brings him a basket of loaves signed with a cross (Rome, "dogmatic" sarcophagus, Ws pl. 96); in the scene of Balaam the angel is on the ass (Rome, hypogeum of via D. Compagni: Ferrua, pl. 104). A final example of wingless angels appears in the cemetery of St. Sebastian, formerly called the cemetery of Vigna Chiaraviglio, where, in a triumphal iconographic context on the wall of an arcosolium, two angels (identified by the inscription *angelus*) are positioned on two registers to the right of a scene depicting Christ on the throne flanked by two apostles (Estivill 1997, 6-7).

Only toward the end of the 4th c. do some specific elements gradually begin to appear, such as wings, nimbus and long garment, that will later become characteristic of the *iconography of angels (an early example of disputed date: two angels holding a crown with christogram on the Sarigüzel sarcophagus at Constantinople: D. Talbot Rice, *Arte di Bisanzio*, Florence 1959, pl. 9. One of the oldest examples is on the Pignatta sarcophagus at *Ravenna: see most recently, P. Testini, FR 1977, 321ff.). Such attributes, taken from the Nike and winged cupid of classical art (M. Sannibale - P. Liverani, *The Classical Origins of Angel Iconography*, in A. Duston - A. Nesselrath [eds.], *Angels from the Vatican: The Invisible Made Visible*, Catalogo della Mostra, Alexandria 1998, 62-71), consistently recur only from the late 5th and early 6th c. In the 5th and 6th c., directly linked to patristic exegesis, the figure of the angel is at times depicted with red clothes and flesh, signifying their nature of ethereal fire (Kirschbaum, *L'angelo rosso*, 213-215): thus they appear in the triumphal arch of St. Mary Maggiore at Rome (5th c.) and in St. Apollinaris Nuovo at Ravenna (6th c.). In the great decorative cycles of churches, angels occupy a place of preeminence with respect to other sacred figures: they precede the saints and are placed immediately next to the enthroned Christ (Ravenna, St. Vitale, 6th c.) or the triumphal cross (Parentium, Euphrasian basilica, 6th c.). They often hold a long *baculus,* marking them as *ostiarii* of the church, more rarely a thurible (Bawit, chapel of St. Apollo, 6th c.) or an orb (Kiti, church of the Panaghia Angelikistos, 6th-7th c.). Of the angelic hierarchies, Christian iconography depicted only two types: archangels and cherubim. The first, in the persons of Michael, Raphael and Gabriel, are characterized by the dress of court dignitaries and are depicted as guardians of the presbyterial area of the church; sometimes, as in the mosaics of St. Vitale at Ravenna (6th c.) and of the church of the Dormition at *Nicaea, they carry a standard with the "trisagion" of the Greek *Mass. In the West the cherubim are given the appearance of the four living creatures of Rev 4:6-7; in the East, the four heads and four wings of Ezek 1:10.

G. Stuhlfauth, *Die Engel in der altchristlichen Kunst*, Freiburg 1897; E. Kirschbaum, *L'angelo rosso e l'angelo turchino*: RivAC 17 (1940) 209-249; Th. Klauser, *Engel* (*in der Kunst*): RAC 5, 258-295; Engel: LCI I, 626-642; D.E. Estivill, *La imagen del angel en la Roma del siglo IV: estudio de iconología*, Rome 1994; D.E. Estivill, *Un contributo per lo studio dell'iconografia*

degli angeli nel secolo IV: Arte Cristiana 85, 778 (Jan.-Feb. 1997) 3-10; R. Giuliani, s.v. *Angelo*: TIP 106-109; EAM 1,629-638; G. Peers, *Subtle Bodies: Representing Angels in Byzantium*, Berkeley, CA 2001.

C. Carletti

ANGERS, Council of. Under the presidency of *Eustochium, bishop of *Tours, seven bishops who had come to Angers for the episcopal ordination of *Thalassius (4 October 453) promulgated twelve disciplinary canons, mainly on the duties of clerics.

CCL 148, 137-139; Hfl-Lecl 2,2,883-886; Palazzini 1,37s.

Ch. Munier

ANIANUS (Aignan) of Orléans (d. after 451). Various ancient sources, such as *Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep*. VIII, 15), the *Vita s. Ariani,* the *Vita s. Genovefae* 42 and *Gregory of Tours (*Franc.* II, 7), tell us of Anianus, noted esp. for having organized the defense of his episcopal city of Orléans against *Attila, contributing to his defeat. Gregory attributes the salvation of Orléans to the prayers sent up to God by Anianus until the arrival of Aetius with his army. Feast 7 December.

A. Loyen, *Le rôle de saint Aignan dans la défense d'Orléans*: CRAI, Paris 1969, 64-74; G. Renaud, *Les traditions de l'Église d'Orléans sur ses saints évêques Euverte et Aignan. Vies, miracles, cultes*: AEHE, IVe sect., Paris 1973 (Extrait des positions de thèses); Cath 1,1239f.; BS 1,1258.

S. Zincone

ANICETUS, pope (155–166). Born at *Emesa in *Syria to a certain John, according to the LP (I, 134). The same source, citing *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* III, 3, 3), says his pontificate lasted 3 years. Anicetus is thought to have been bishop of *Rome from 155–166. The Roman church must have been very lively during his pontificate, given the presence and visits of various important personages: *Justin Martyr, *Tatian, *Hegesippus (Eus., *HE* IV,11,7; IV,22,3). *Polycarp was also at Rome to discuss with Anicetus the question of the date of *Easter. The two talked at length, calmly and without rigidity on the part of either. No agreement was reached, but Polycarp departed from Anicetus in peace and friendship nonetheless (Iren., *Epist. ad Vict.*, in Eus., *HE* IV,15; V,24,14-17). Polycarp also met with various *heretics during his stay, leading them back to orthodoxy (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III,3,4). Anicetus also fought heresies vigorously, especially the *gnosticism of *Valentinus and *Marcion, in Rome at the time to spread their doctrines (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III,4,3; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I,19). According to the LP, Anicetus authored some disciplinary decrees. *Martyred during the persecution of Antoninus 17 April.

P. Hinschius, *Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni...*, Leipzig 1862, 120-122; LP I, 58-59 and 134; G. Bardy, *L'Église romaine sous le pontificat de saint Anicet*: RSR 17 (1927) 496-501; DHGE 3, 280-281; BS I, 1259-1263 (F. Caraffa); N. Brox, *Le conflict entre Anicet et Polycarpe*: Concilium 71 (1972) 35-42; LTK3 1, 678; EPapi I, 222-224 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

ANICIA JULIANA (d. 528). *Valentinian-Theodosian princess, born and lived at *Constantinople ca. 463–528. Noted in late-ancient *Roman, *Byzantine and early Christian history for three main reasons: (1) the exceptional nobility of her ancestry, family and relatives; (2) her commitment to defending the church's unity and *Chalcedonian orthodoxy; (3) her intensive construction activity, especially Christian buildings.

On her father's side Anicia Juliana descended from the *gens Anicia,* one of the earliest families of the Roman patriciate. She was the only daughter of Flavius Anicius Olybrius, the fourth-last emperor of the West. The dignity of *primicerius* (or *domesticus*) was conferred on another family member, Maximus, by the *Goth Theodatus, cousin of Amalasuntha and king of Italy (534–536). In 541 Anicius Faustus Albinus Basilius would become in his turn the last ordinary console nominated by *Justinian. Her mother's side was of still higher nobility: she was the daughter of Placidia the Younger, descendant of no less than five of the most illustrious emperors: *Valentinian III (Anicia Juliana's grandfather), *Theodosius II, *Constantius, *Arcadius and *Theodosius I. Not by chance did complacent Byzantine poets of the day exalt the most noble Anicia Juliana as daughter, granddaughter and great-granddaughter of Roman emperors West and East (see *Anthologia Palatina*, I,10,7; ed. Watz, I [Paris 1928], 16).

As mentioned, Anicia Juliana was also famous as an outstanding representative of Christianity in the late Roman period and early *Byzantine Empire. The Anici family was among the first and most notable *pagan senatorial familes to embrace the Christian faith; regarding the Christian merits of this *gens,* it is not insignificant that a personage of the importance of Severinus *Boethius (Anicia Juliana's contemporary) belonged to one of its many branches. Beyond the Anici family, two other of Anicia Juliana's relatives noteworthy in a religious

sense were *Theodosius I, who with the Edict of *Thessalonica defended *Nicene *orthodoxy with great authority and efficacy, and St. *Pulcheria (daughter of the emperor *Arcadius and herself empress: 450–453), who opposed *Nestorians and *monophysites and brought an austere morality to the court. Following in their wake, Anicia Juliana was also a fervent Christian and champion of orthodoxy. In 519 she authoritatively backed the composition of the *Acacian *schism, promoted from a *Chalcedonian, antimonophysite and pro-Roman perspective by pope *Hormisdas and the emperor *Justin I, who was advised in that direction by his nephew, the future emperor *Justinian.

Anicia Juliana also continued the pious imperial tradition of her ancestors—including *Galla Placidia, *Eudoxia and Licinia Eudoxia, her maternal aunt—as a generous promoter and financer of Christian religious buildings. At least the following construction works (all at *Constantinople) were hers: she carried out or completed decoration of the Church of St. Euphemia, building a *monastery next to it; she had the Church of St. Polyeuktus rebuilt and decorated; she built the Church of the Theotokos on the Asiatic coast of the Bosporus; and she very probably also built St. Stephen in Zeugma, near the *Constantinianae* quarter.

A. Premerstein, *Anicia Juliana im Wiener Dioskorides-Kodex Med. gr. 1*: Jahrbuch der Kunsthist. Sammlungen des allerhochsten. Kaiserhauses 24 (1903) 105-124; H. Grégoire, *Saint' Euphémie et l'empereur Maurice*: Muséon 59 (1946) 300; C. Bertelli, *Anicia Giuliana*: Diz. dell'Arte Antica I (Rome 1958) 394-396; C. Mango - I. Sevecenko, *Remains of the Church of St. Polyeuktos at Constantinople*: Dumbarton Oaks Papers 15 (1961) 243-247; 21 (1967) 276; C. Capizzi, *Anicia Giuliana (463 ca.–528 ca.). Ricerche sulla sua famiglia e la sua vita*: Studi Bizantini and Neoellenici n.s. 4/XIV (1968) 191-226; R.M. Harrison, *The Church of St. Polyeuktos in Constantinople: An Excavation Report*, in *Akten des VII. Internationalen Kongresses für christliche Archäologie, Trier 5-11 September 1965*, Vatican City-Berlin 1969, 543-549; C. Capizzi, *Anicia Giuliana e il suo intervento nell'unione ecclesiastica del 519*, in *Atti del I Congresso Internazionale sulle Relazioni fra le due Sponde Adriatiche* (*Brindisi-Lecce- Taranto 15-18 ottobre 1971*), Lecce 1973, 49-86; Id., *L'attività edilizia di Anicia Giuliana*, in *Collectanea Byzantina* (OCA 204), Rome 1977, 119-146; P. Speck, *Juliana Anicia, Konstantin der Grosse und die Polieuktoskirche in Konstantinopel*: Poikila Byzantinà 11/ Varia III (Berlin 1993), 111-147; C. Capizzi, *Giuliana: la committente* (*ca. 463–ca. 528*), Milan 1997.

M. Spinelli

ANICIA JULIANA, widow (4th-5th c.). Wife of the consul and senator Olybrius, daughter-in-law of Anicia Faltonia Proba, famous as the mother of *Demetrias. After her husband's early death in the sack of *Rome at the hands of the *Goths (410), she fled to *Carthage, where she distinguished herself by charitable works. There her daughter Demetrias created a stir by renouncing a brilliant marriage and consecrating herself to God. Letters of congratulations written on this occasion to Anicia Juliana by Pope *Innocent I (PL 20, 518-519) and *Augustine (*Ep*. 150, CSEL 44, 380-382) have reached us; *Jerome, in the letter *Ad Demetriadem,* calls her "holy mother" (*Ep*. 130, CSEL 56/1, 177). Augustine dedicated the *De bono viduitatis* (CSEL 41,303-343) to her, and later wrote a letter (*Ep*. 188, CSEL 57,119-130) warning her of *Pelagius's short treatise *Ad Demetriadem,* which was circulating anonymously. Two notes from *John Chrysostom (*Ep*. 168-169, PG 52, 709) have also reached us, one to Anicia Juliana and the other to Faltonia Proba.

PLRE I, 468; G. Mariani, *Sant'Agostino guida spirituale. Lettere del vescovo di Ippona a Proba, Giuliana e Demetriade*, Rome 1982.

G. Pani

ANIMA MUNDI. Even in the pre-Socratic tradition, there are indications of the notion of an *anima mundi,* based on an analogical relation between microcosm (man) and macrocosm (world). But the only clear, organized theory of the doctrine of the cosmic soul, as the universal principle of harmony and the life of the All, is offered by *Plato in the *Timaeus,* which depicts the cosmos as "living, animated and intelligent" (30 b), being composed of a body endowed with a *soul and an intellect, perfect in all its parts because it is the best possible image of the transcendental level of the ideas. The universal soul, prior to the cosmic "body," participates in rationality and harmony; endowed with a circular movement, it is the principle of knowledge, the intermediary between intelligible and sensible reality. This notion was received and elaborated in the later *Platonic tradition, with various results, until arriving at *Plotinus's formula of the third principle, after the One and *Nous,* being the universal soul which, in its mediating function between the intelligible and sensible worlds, originates the cosmic soul and individual souls, through which it exercises its function of ordering matter to produce sensible beings. This Platonic doctrine, which likely used suggestions and themes already present in Pythagorean circles, is at the basis of a wide and varied speculative tradition with strong religious connotations. In fact, linked to the notion of the divine character of the heavenly bodies, inasmuch as they too are endowed with a soul, as is explicitly expressed in the

Epinomis, it developed into intense forms of "cosmic *mysticism." The harmony of the cosmos, a reflection of the ordering action of the divine soul, offers itself to the devout contemplation of the wise person who thereby attains to knowledge of the divinity, conceived sometimes as transcendent but more often as immanent to the Great All, precisely as its soul. In *Stoicism, the doctrine of *Logos* and *Pneuma* as the divine principle of rationality, immanent in the cosmos and bond of the All, was sometimes expressed in Platonic terms as equivalent to the notion of an *anima mundi.* This notion is also present in other philosophical contexts; e.g., Philodemus called the *Logos* "world soul," and Plutarch closely linked this universal soul to the *Nous,* saying that to be able to order and hold united the great body of the cosmos, it must participate in intellect, *logismos* and harmony (*De animae procreat. in Tim.* VI, 1014 E). *Philo of Alexandria's doctrine of the *Logos* blended biblical elements (Wisdom as intermediary and instrument of creation), Platonic doctrines (intelligible model of sensible reality) and the Stoic notions of *Logos* and *Pneuma*. From the latter, Philo's *Logos* derives its character of universal "bond" (*desmos*), i.e., the element of cohesion and harmony of cosmic reality (see *De fuga et inv.* 112; *De plant.* 8).

The process by which the attributes of the Stoic *Logos* and *Pneuma* were transferred to the originally Platonic *anima mundi* and also Philo's doctrine of the *Logos,* which saw Stoic and Platonic categories assumed into a biblical context, helps us understand the position of those 2nd-c. Christian authors who transferred this complex of notions to the person of the Son-*Logos,* often in the framework of a particular symbolism of the *cross. Thus *Justin Martyr, explicitly citing *Tim.* 30 b-c, declares that the Greek philosopher speaks of the Son-*Logos* when he describes the X shape of the *anima mundi* (*I Apol.* 60,1). Recalling the bronze cross raised by *Moses (Num 21:8), a figure of the cross of Christ, the apologist says that the Greek *philosopher, misunderstanding the biblical text, "expresses the theory that the second virtue after God, the first principle, was arranged as an X in the universe." With implict reference to the Platonic doctrine, an analogous symbolism of the cross as a figure of the universal presence of the Word of God is developed in a passage of *Irenaeus's *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching,* which says that he "in an invisible form is diffused in us and in the whole world, whose length and breadth and height and depth he encompasses, since by God's Word everything is administered and governed, and in these the Son of God was crucified, imprinted on the universe in the form of a cross" (ch. 34, tr. by E. Bellini, Milan 1979, 502). The notion of the cross of Christ as cosmic bond is also presented in some *apocryphal texts (*Martyrdom of Andrew,* ch. 14; *Acts of John,* ch. 99), confirming that the idea was widespread in primitive Christianity. *Gnosticism also developed its own symbolism of the cross, understood as a "limit" between the level of the pleroma and that of the cosmos. This notion is also derived from the *Timaeus,* where the cosmic soul assumes the appearance of an X, since it is made up of the intersection of the two spheres, that of the planets and that of the fixed stars on the ecliptic.

A.-J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, II, *Le dieu cosmique*, Paris 1949; J. Moreau, *L'âme du monde de Platon aux Stoïciens*, Paris 1939; repr. Hildesheim-New York 1971.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

ANISIUS (d. 410). Bishop of *Thessalonica, disciple and successor of *Acholius, saint. Feast 30 December. The letter of *Siricius of *Rome was addressed to him (*Ep.* 4, PL 13, 1148-1149), in which it was established that, in the case of internal conflicts among the bishops of *Illyricum, the final decision belongs to the bishop of Thessalonica: he will later be considered by Pope *Leo the Great as a precedent of the apostolic vicariate. Anisius looked to *Ambrose of Milan, who in turn esteemed Anisius greatly (*Ep.* 15-16). Ambrose, in a letter that has also been attributed to Siricius (*Ep.* 9, PL 13, 1176-1178), stresses Anisius's role in the Synod of *Capua (391/392) against *Bonosus. Anisius, though condemning Bonosus, confirmed the ordinations performed by him, a concession later revoked by *Innocent I. Anisius was also a friend of *John Chrysostom, actively supporting him in the West (John Chrys., *Ep.* 162-163). Died ca. 410.

R. Aignain, DHGE 3,909-910; BS 1,1267-1268; E. Cavalcanti, *Siricio, santo*, in EPapi I, 375-381.

E. Prinzivalli

ANNIANUS, chronicler (4th-5th c.). The little information we have on Annianus (Ἀννιανος, Ἀνιανος) and his chronographic work, now lost to us, is provided by the 9th-c. *Byzantine historian George Syncellus in his *Chronography* (see ed. Venice 1729, 59-61). E. Honigmann identifies Annianus with the deacon of Celeda. An Egyptian *monk who lived early 5th c. under the emperor *Arcadius and the pontificate of *Theophilus of *Alexandria, Annianus composed a chronographic work that went from Adam to the 22nd year of the episcopate of *Theophilus at Alexandria (ca. 407), and was later

extended to 412. Syncellus attests that Annianus criticized inaccuracies in *Eusebius of Caesarea's chronology; from Syncellus we also learn that Annianus put the birth of Jesus in the year 5501 from the creation; that he began the year on 1 January and not with the spring equinox, as did *Anatolius of *Laodicea (d. 258), or 29 August, as did the Alexandrian chronology from 304 on; and that he put the passion on 23 March, fifteenth day of the moon, in conformity with the synoptic chronography, and the resurrection on 25 March (of 5534)—25 March is also the date of the creation— the date that became traditional in *Byzantine chronography. Annianus's chronography also included an *Easter cycle of 532 years, with commentary. George Syncellus praises Annianus for his conciseness, diligence and fidelity to the apostolic and patristic *tradition.

CPG 5537; see G. Dindorf, *Georgius Syncellus et Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus*, CSHB, Bonn 1829, vol. 1, 61.3-5, 62.2-5, 19, 64.15, 66.1-2, 597.12; L. Dindorf, *Chronicon Paschale*, CSHB, Bonn 1832, vol. 2, 112-116; E.W. Brooks, *Eliae Metropolitae Nisibeni opus chronologicum*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 3,7, Paris 1910, 16-17, 26-28 (Syriac text), 7-8, 15-16 (Eng. tr.); J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, Paris 1899, vol. 1, 2-5, 9, 17, 35, 56, 61, 89, 116; vol. 2, Paris 1901, 358 (Fr. tr.); E. Bratke, *Zwei Fragmente aus Annianos und der Anfang des Weihnachtsfestes in Aegypten*: Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie 1 (1902) 110-154; P. Bedjan, *Abu'l-Faradj Barhebraeus, Chronicon Syriacum*, Paris 1890, 3, 14-17, 25, 36, 37 = *Chronography, English Translation* by E.A. Wallis Budge, London 1932, 3, 13, 15, 16, 19, 25, 39, 40; K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Munich ²1897, 338, 340, 341, 405; P. Batiffol, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes. La littérature grecque*, Paris 1897, 226-227; DHGE 3,282; E. Honigmann, *Annianus Deacon of Celeda (415 A.D.)*, in *Patristic Studies*, ST 173, Vatican City 1953, 54-58; Id., *Le prétendu "moine Athénée" en réalité le chronographe Annianos*: Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie de l'histoire orientales et slaves 12 (1952) = PAGKARPEIA *Mélanges H. Grégoire*, vol. 4, Brussels 1953, 177-180 n. 3; V. Grumel, *Traité d'Etudes Byzantines*, I, *La Chronologie*, Paris 1958, 92-94; W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26, Washington D.C. 1989, 72-105; Patrologia V, 346.

V. Loi

ANNIANUS of Celeda (d. after 419). "Anianus in MSS"; deacon of an unidentified place. Shortly after 418 (Primmer 285) Annianus translated two works of *John Chrysostom into *Latin: the 7 homilies *De laudibus s. Pauli apostoli* (CPG 4344) and perhaps all of the *Homiliae in Matthaeum* (CPG 4424; only homilies 1-25 survive). In his dedicatory epistles to these two translations, one to Evangelius the presbyter (PG 50, 471-472) and the other to bishop Orontius (Primmer 279-282; see PG 58, 975-978), Annianus makes clear his opposition to *Augustine's *traducianism. Chronology and theological positions coincide with *Jerome's accusation of *Pelagianism against him in 419 (*Epist.* 143: CSEL 56, 293; see PL 22, 1181), though Annianus did not distort his translations toward Pelagianism. It is not proven that Annianus translated other works of Chrysostom or the homily *Ad neophytos* (CPG 4467) used by *Julian of Eclanum. The hypothesis that Annianus composed the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* seems doubtful.

CPL 771-772; PCBE 2,141f.; DTC 1,1303-1305; Patrologia III, 464-465; H. Musurillo, *John Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew and the Version of Annianus*: Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten, I, Münster 1970, 452-460; R. Skalitzky, *Annianus of Celeda: His Text of Chrysostom's "Homilies on Matthew"*: Aevum 45 (1971) 208-233 (with the crit. ed. of *Hom* 17); A. Primmer, *Die Originalfassung von Anianus' Epistula ad Orontium*: Antidosis. Festschrift für Walther Kraus, Vienna . . . 1972, 278-289; A. Piédagnel, *Jean Chrysostome, Panégyriques de s. Paul* . . . (SC 300), Paris 1982, 98-99 n. 5; S.J. Voicu, *Le prime traduzioni latine di Crisostomo*, in *Cristianesimo Latino e cultura Greca sino al sec. IV*. XXI Incontro di studiosi dell'antiquity cristiana, Rome, 7-9 May 1992 (SEA 42), Rome 1993, 397-415 (406-407); F.W. Schlatter, *The Author of the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*: VC 42 (1988) 364-375; K. Cooper, *An(n)ianus of Celeda and the Latin Readers of John Chrysostom*: SP 27, Louvain 1993, 249-255 (doctrinal differences between Annianus and the *Opus imperfectum*).

S.J. Voicu

ANNUNCIATION (iconography). Scenes of the annunciation appeared in the Christian iconographical repertoire in the mid-3rd c. at a time when theological reflection on the mystery of the *incarnation was particularly active in the church of *Rome (E. Dal Covolo, *Tematiche cristologiche nell'età dei Severi*: Bessarione 6 [1988] 71-87); the artistic depictions were almost a figurative "translation" of the larger theological discussion. Attributed to that date is the pictorial decoration of a cubicle of one of the oldest nuclei of the catacomb of *Priscilla on the Via Salaria, now more accessible because of recent restorations (Nestori, 24 n. 15; B. Mazzei, *Il cubicolo dell'Annunciazione nelle catacombe di Priscilla. Nuove osservazioni alla luce dei recenti restauri*, in RivAC 75 [1999] 233-280). At the center of the vault is the image of the Virgin seated on a throne; at her right hand with his arm extended to her stands the archangel Gabriel, without wings according to the earliest *angelic *iconography. A similar scene reappears in two other later catacomb frescoes, one from the first decades of the 4th c. in the catacomb of Via Dino Compagni (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, 42, pl. III), also recently restored making the details more discernible, and the other, almost contemporary, in the catacomb of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter on the Via Labicana (Nestori, 50

n. 17). With these two pictures, however, unlike that of Priscilla, the depiction is inserted in cyclically conceived decorative contexts, the first with Marian themes and the second *christological. In the former, in fact, it is the insertion of the scenes into a Marian cycle in the anonymous hypogeum of Via Dino Compagni—a cycle that includes a depiction of the adoration of the *magi and probably one of the testing of the bitter waters, as a rereading of the frescoes after restorations suggests—that recommends its interpretation as a scene of the annunciation and not simply a scene of prophecy. All three cases lack any material descriptive element: the scene is extremely synthetic, as is for that matter the description of the episode in Luke's gospel (1:26-38), the only NT source that refers to it. These are the only examples of the annunciation in the iconographic repertoire of *cemetery painting.

In the early 5th c. a scene of the annunciation appears in the decoration of a *sarcophagus at *Ravenna called the "sarcophagus of Elisha the prophet" or the "Pignatta sarcophagus" (P. Testini, *Su una discussa figurazione del sarcofago detto del profeta Eliseo o Pignatta*, in FR 113-114 [1977] 321-327, fig. 2); unlike the images painted in the catacombs, the scene is replete with details that contribute to its interpretation. *Mary is seated, spinning purple cloth that she draws from a wicker basket at her feet. Beside her is the angel—winged, in one of the earliest examples in Western iconography of this feature. The depiction is inspired by the account of the annunciation given in the apocryphal gospels of the infancy, and esp. the **Protevangelium of James* (XI,1-3), a Greek text perhaps of *Coptic origin, ca. 200. The *apocryphal narrations of the *Protevangelium of James,* as later those of the gospel of Pseudo-Matthew (IX,2) and the *Armenian gospel of the infancy (V,3), describe Mary in her house at the moment of the angel's annunciation, intent on spinning purple for the temple. For the annunciation, as with other scenes of the cycle of the *infantia Salvatoris,* because of the conciseness of the canonical text, the artists almost always used details from the apocyrphal gospels, which circulated widely beginning esp. from the 4th c. (see J.E. Weis-Liebersdorf, *Christus und Apostelbilder. Einfluss der Apokryphen auf die ältesten Kunsttypen*, Freiburg im Br. 1902; F. Bisconti, *Letteratura patristica ed iconografia paleocristiana*, in *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1989, 405ff.; E. Jastrzebowska, *Bild und Wort: Das Marienleben und Kindheit Jesu in der christlichen Kunst vom 4. bis 8. Jh. und ihre apokryphen Quellen*, Warsaw 1992). Their influence was even felt in the mosaic decoration of the triumphal arch of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome, a votive construction promised by Pope *Sixtus III (432–440). In that mosaic Mary, dressed in garments of gold and arrayed with jewels like a basilissa (queen), sits before a building (the temple or Joseph's house?) intent on spinning purple, surrounded by a guard of four angels, three standing beside her and one flying and pointing out a dove (the *Holy Spirit) who descends from heaven (C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, pls. XLIX-LII). The same apocryphal sources also inspired, among others, the scene depicted in the mosaic of the Euphrasian basilica of Parentium, ca. mid-6th c., in which the annunciation seems to take place in front of a basilica (that of Nazareth, built over the site of Mary's house?) (Wellen, *Theotokos*, pl. 6c), and that on the reredos panel of the ivory cathedra of *Maximian at Ravenna from the time of *Justinian: in this depiction Mary is shown against the background of a tympanic building, perhaps her house, seated on a high wicker seat with footrest, spindles in hand and a basket of wool at her feet; before her, in an attitude of *adlocutio,* is the announcing angel with a rod in his left hand, symbol of his authority (C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avorii romano-orientali*, Rome 1936, 151-154, pl. XXII).

Between the 5th and 6th c. the episode of the annunciation to Mary intent on spinning purple for the temple appears among the frescoes of Bawit in Egypt (G. Roquet, *La réception de l'image et du texte à motifs d'apocryphes dans les chrétientés d'Egypte et de Nubie*: Apocrypha 2 [1991] 181-215) and, in more concise forms, in a long series of works of ivory linked to Eastern culture: including the Etschmiadzin gospelbook (W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1976, n. 142, pl. 75), the so-called Diptych of St. Lupicinus (Volbach, op. cit., n. 145, pl. 77), the Berlin Pyx (Volbach, op. cit., n. 174, pl. 88) and that of Cleveland (Volbach, op. cit., n. 184, pl. 92), all datable to the 6th c. The same iconographic scene also appears in some jewelry, including a medallion of the State Museum of Berlin (A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography. A Study of its Origin*, Princeton 1961, fig. 247) and the two gold amulets, found at Adana, of the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul (Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, fig. 248); in small works of metallurgy, such as some small ampoules, datable to ca. mid-6th c., from Bobbio and Monza (A. Grabar, *Ampoules de Terre Sainte* (*Monza, Bobbio*), Paris 1958, pls. 5, 6, 48, 49, 50, 51), and two 7th-c. Syro-Palestinian bronze censors (A. St. Clair, in *Age of Spirituality*, ed. K. Weitzmann, New York 1979, nn. 563, 564); and in woven decoration, as a

fragment of silk at the Sacred Vatican Museum (Grabar, *Christian Iconography,* fig. 249). The theme of the annunciation also frequently appears among scenes depicted in illustrated codices: some of the oldest examples are in the Rabbula gospel-book (Cod. Syriac 56) in the Laurentian Library at Florence, dated 586 (H.L. Kessler, *Rabula Gospel*, in *Age of Spirituality*, 495ff.), and in the Syriac Bible of the National Library of Paris (Cod. Syriac 33), also 6th c. (H. Omont, *Miniatures des plus anciens manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale du IVe au XIVe siècle*, Paris 1929).

The apocryphal theme of the annunciation to Mary intent on spinning purple was certainly more common in the East; it still appears in the West in the 7th-8th c., included with other episodes from the life of the Virgin in the frescoes of S. Maria *foris portas,* at Castelseprio (Varese) (K. Weitzmann, *The Fresco Cycle of S. Maria di Castelseprio,* Princeton 1951), probably done by Egyptians or Syro-Palestinians, and among those of the Church of S. Maria Antiqua at Rome, where the theme of the annunciation appears in the decoration of the apse—on the walls of the so-called palimpsest, in a layer dated between the last decades of the 6th or first decades of the 7th c. (M. Andaloro, in G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo*, Rome 1987, 249-250), and on a pillar on which two depictions of the annunciation, perhaps of the same iconographic scheme, succeeded one another between the 7th and early 8th c. (Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo*, 100-102).

The *Protevangelium of James* (XI,1-3), *Pseudo-Matthew* (IX,1-2) and the Armenian *Gospel of the Infancy* (V,1-8) also have an annunciation at a well where Mary has gone to draw water; though rare, there are also depictions of this episode (Bisconti, *Letteratura patristica ed iconografia paleocristiana*, 406). It is perhaps already present—but the interpretation of the scene is very uncertain—in the decoration of the cover of the mid-4th-c. sarcophagus of Adelphia, found in the cemetery of St. John at Syracuse, in which the well is personified by a bearded head (S.L. Agnello, *Il sarcofago di Adelfia*, Vatican City 1956, fig. 27); in the early 5th c. it appears in a small ivory plaque of the Victoria and Albert Museum of London (Volbach, op. cit., n. 118, pl. 62), then in an ivory *diptych of the Treasury of the Duomo of Milan, second half 5th c. (Volbach, op. cit., n. 119, pl. 63) and in a terracotta tondo in the Monza Treasury, mid-6th c. (Grabar, *Ampoules de Terre Sainte*, pl. 31).

DACL 1, 2255ff.; G. Millet, *Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Evangile*, Paris 1916, 67ff.; G.A. Wellen, *Theotokos. Eine ikonographische Abhandlung über das Gottesmutterbild in frühchristlicher Zeit*, Utrecht-Antwerpen 1961, 37ff.; J.H. Emminghauus, s.v. *Verkündingung an Maria*: LCI IV (1972), cols. 422-437; A. Ghidoli, s.v. *Annunciazione*, in *Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale*, II, Rome 1991, 40-46; F.P. Massara, TIP 111-113.

M. Marinone

ANOINTING. For the first Christians, the "Anointed One" by antonomasia was *Jesus Christ, the Crucified One, the Risen One: *christos, messias.* "God anointed him with the *Holy Spirit and with power" (Acts 10:38). He said of himself: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; for this reason he has anointed me" (Lk 4:18). Within these expressions, a readily understood metaphor reappears in the culture of the ancient Mediterranean world, and especially that of the Jewish-*Hellenistic world. Anointings were commonly performed not only in secular contexts "to cure physical maladies, to alleviate them or bring restoration," but also in the religious sphere for the consecration of objects and for the appointment of individuals to important offices (PWK 17,2 [1998] 2454-2474). The symbolic meaning of the gesture was also well known. This also held for the OT: Saul and *David were anointed kings; *Aaron and his sons, priests. In the translated sense, the infusion of the Spirit into the prophets was referred to as an "anointing" (DACL 6/2, 2777). All of this found its fulfillment in the "anointed one" par excellence, Jesus the Messiah, the Christ (*christos*). His anointing by the Spirit was therefore conferred upon all Christians (see 2 Cor 1:21ff.). In the NT only the symbolic meaning was directly considered. Later this is rather clear in *Ephrem the Syrian's hymns that were dedicated to the theme of oil (*De virgin.* IV, 8 and 7). Nevertheless, the disciples truly did anoint the sick with oil (Mk 6:13), and we learn from the anointing of the Lord by the sinning woman and the woman in Bethany how it could be considered something that was generally practiced. But above all, in Jas 5:14-16 mention is made of an anointing of the sick with oil in the name of the Lord for their healing and deliverance from sin. Here, at the very least, one finds the embryo of what would become after a long historical process the "sacrament of the anointing of the sick." We do not have information with respect to other anointings in the NT. Nevertheless, in agreement with the OT and Hellenistic use, the apostolic image of the anointing in the Spirit very early on could have also come to crystallize the practice of Christian initiation in the anointing with oil. The first testimony to this is in the writings of *Tertullian (*De baptismo* 7: "Having emerged from the font, we are thoroughly anointed with a blessed

unction according to the original teaching"), according to the schema of the priestly anointings recorded in the OT and in memory of the anointing from which Christ derived his name.

Chapter 21 of the *Apostolic Tradition* has been the object of extensive discussion by modern scholarship. In particular, it seems problematic to interpret the meaning of the postbaptismal anointing and anointings. It seems that there were not many problems for *Africans in recognizing (Tertullian, *Bapt.* 7-8, *De res. car.* 8; *Cyprian, *Ep.* 70,2; 73,9; 74,5) the existence of a postbaptismal anointing, an imposition of hands with an *epiclesis and at times a *signatio* of the *baptized person. A similar line can be traced in the *Roman context of *Hippolytus's *Commentary on Daniel,* in which he acknowledges a postbaptismal anointing as a *pneumatological mark. It seems that, moreover, a type of bond could be established between the presbyterial anointing attested to in the *Trad. Ap.* 21,19 and the Roman and African tradition of a postbaptismal anointing. Instead, it was only at Rome (*Trad. Ap.* 21,22) in the 5th c. that there was an attestation to the second postbaptismal anointing reserved for the bishop: an anointing that subsequently would be designated by the name *myron.* The entire *Third Mystagogical Catechesis* attributed to *Cyril of Jerusalem is dedicated to this anointing with *myron*. There Cyril says that through the anointing those who are about to be baptized become "coheirs and participants with Christ, who was anointed with the spiritual oil of gladness, that is, the Holy Spirit" (3, 2). The *myron* is the reflected image of the Holy Spirit, "the free gift of Christ and the power of the Spirit through the presence of his divinity" (3, 3); the anointing of the soul with the invisible Holy Spirit corresponds to the visible anointing of the body (3, 3). With this anointing the candidates finally became worthy of the name "Christian" (3, 5). The sacramental effects here emphasized by Cyril always remain connected, in Eastern theology, with the anointing with *myron;* it pertains properly to what in the West is called "chrism" (B. Neunheuser, *Taufe und Firmung,* 104; [2]137). The *Syriac baptismal *liturgy assumes a special position, the *Didascalia siriaca* (second half of the 3rd c.) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (end of the 4th c.). According to these texts, before the true and proper baptismal washing, the forehead and the entire body is anointed "just as the priests and the kings were anointed, as a sign of a spiritual baptism" (*Apos. Con.* III, 16,3 e 4: Funk 211). Although an anointing with the *myron* was performed even after baptism, the prebaptismal anointing was especially emphasized. This is confirmed by *Theodore of Mopsuestia's catechetical homilies, according to which in the first anointing, as in an "exordium of the sacrament," the candidate is "marked," with a *consignatio,* as a sheep of Christ's flock and as a soldier of the heavenly King. The second anointing pertains to the entire body of the *catechumen, who is undressed in order "to be able to be reclothed with the garment of immortality . . . through the power of the Holy Spirit" (Neunheuser, *Taufe im Geist,* 278ff.). The *consignatio* (or the *signatio*) after baptism is only mentioned in passing. Ephrem expressed himself along the same lines: "The anointing precedes [baptism], the Holy Spirit soars upon its wings . . . the oil remits sin" (*De virg.* VII, 2-15: CSCO 124, 25-29). Anointing and washing are here connected in a special way with the unitary action of "baptism in the Spirit." According to *Cyril of *Alexandria, however, the Holy Spirit is unmistakably infused with the anointing with *myron,* after the baptismal washing (*III Cat. myst.*). In the West, the second anointing after baptism was not especially emphasized. *Ambrose only recognized one *signatio,* without anointing, although Pope *Innocent I attached one anointing to it (Ep. ad Decent. 3,6: PL 20, 555A = DS 215). Until the Venerable *Bede and *Isidore of Seville, the situation remained practically unchanged, although from that time onward the anointing gradually achieved a place of primary importance (*In Act.* 8: PL 92, 961B; *Hom. in Theoph.*: PL 94, 63D; Isid., *Etym.* 6,19,50-54: PL 82, 256C; *Eccl. off.* 2,26; 27,1-4: PL 83, 23, 826A).

All of this is also confirmed by the *Sacramentarium Gelas. V.* After a prebaptismal anointing (n. 421) with the "exorcised oil" (*oleum exorcizatum*), once baptism in water had been performed, the second anointing with chrism (*chrisma*) followed, first by the presbyter, then by the bishop, with the laying on of hands and the anointing of the forehead accompanied by the words: *Signum Christi in vitam aeternam* (*Gelas. V.*, 452). The anointings of the altar, the church and the king (Pepin) were less important (Hofmeister, 195-200; 206; 169). Instead, the anointing with oil, according to Jas 5, was practiced widely. In the East, because of its close connection to the remission of sins, it was placed in close relationship with penance and reconciliation (Hofmeister 180-185). In the West, it continued to be practiced as a remedy in times of sickness, which was administered by the priests, but requested by the believers themselves. Pope Innocent I stated the following: "It is permissible not only for priests but also for all Christians to apply the oil of chrism from the bishop in their own time of need or in that of those closest to them" (*Ep. ad Decent.* 8,11: PL 20, 559A-560A = DS 216). The pope refers to it as a *genus sacramenti*

(ibid.); only the later scholastic theology would explain its theological meaning.

Ph. Hofmeister, *Die hl. Öle in der morgenländischen und abendländischen Kirche*, Wunzburg 1948; W. Dürig, *Die "Salbung" der Martyrer. Ein Beitrag zur Martyrentheologie der Liturgie*: SE 6 (1954) 14-47; B. Neunheuser, *Taufe und Firmung*, Freiburg 1956; ²1983 (French trans. *Baptême et Confirmation*, Paris 1966); Id., *Taufe im Geist*: Arch. f. Lit. wiss. 12 (1970) 268-284; H. Vorgrimler, *Busse und Krankensalbung*, Freiburg 1978, 215-234; TWNT 1, 230-232 (GLNT 1, 617-626); 4, 807ff. (GLNT 7, 639-646); 9, 482-573; DACL 6, 2777-2791; 12, 2116-2130; DSp 11, 788-819; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, Milan 1953, IV, passim; L.C. Mitchell, *Baptismal Anointing*, London 1966; C. Ortmann, *Le sacrement des malades*, Paris 1971 (It. trans. Turin 1971); E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, London ²1970; new ed. 2003; G. Winkler, *The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications*: Worship 52 (1978) 24-45; G. Winkler, *Das armenische Initiationsrituale*, Rome 1982; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle*, Spoleto 1988; M. Dudley - G. Rowell (eds.), *The Oil of Gladness: Anointing in the Christian Tradition*, Collegeville, MN 1993; M.E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*, Rome 1995; W. Kinzig - C. Markschies - M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis*, Berlin 1999; P.F. Bradshaw, M.E. Johnson, L.E. Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition*, Minneapolis 2002; RAC 21, 915-965. See also the bibliography for the entry "Oil" in this encyclopedia.

B. Neunheuser - P. de Navascués

ANOMOIANS – ANOMOIANISM (Anomoeans - Anomoeanism). After an interval of approximately 30 years (325–355) following the condemnation pronounced at the Council of *Nicaea during which the supporters and followers of *Arius left off the most radical propositions of their teacher's doctrine in favor of more or less moderate formulations, those propositions were taken up again and systematically developed, beginning ca. 355, first by *Aetius and then esp. by *Eunomius of Cyzicus; with their followers, they were immediately dubbed anomoians by their adversaries, since they considered the Son to be unlike (*anomoios*) the *Father, an affirmation that in fact does not appear in the anomoian texts that have reached us but can be deduced from their doctrine. The doctrine affirms the absolute transcendence of the Father, whose qualifying attribute is that of alone being ungenerated; the Son, therefore, as generated, is different from the Father by *hypostasis and substance, and inferior to him, not existing *ab aeterno* like him. Rejecting Arius's most scandalous statement, Eunomius said that the Son was not created from nothing but, by the will of the one who made him, is the only generated being created directly from the Father, to be his minister in the creation of the world, which he carried out by the Father's will. The Son participates in the Father's prerogatives, perfections, light, life and power, but at a subordinate level, since the Father is ungenerated light, life and power, whereas the Son is generated light, life and power. He can therefore be considered like the Father only in operation and not in substance. While the Son is God, though at an inferior level vis-à-vis the perfect divinity of the Father, Eunomius denies this status to the *Holy Spirit, which he considers to be only the most sublime of the creatures created by the Son according to the Father's will. Given that the three divine hypostases are not only subordinate one to the other but also different in substance (= nature), the concept of the divine *Trinity is essentially foreign to Eunomius, and it is not by chance that this term does not appear in his writings. His followers, therefore, who were divided into various conventicles, baptized not in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but in the name of the Lord.

M. Albentz, *Zur Geschichte der jung arianischen Kirchengemeinschaft*: Theologische Studien und Kritiken 82 (1909) 205-278; J. de Ghellinck, *Quelques appréciations de la dialectique d'Aristote durant les conflicts trinitaires du IVe siècle*: RHE 26 (1930) 5-42; Simonetti 584; L.R. Wickham, *The Syntagmation of Aetius the Anomean*: JTS NS 19 (1968) 532-569; T.A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge, MA 1979, vol. I; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer*, Tübingen 1988, passim; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988; M.R. Barnes - D.H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflict*, Edinburgh 1993; R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford 2000.

M. Simonetti

ANONYMI CHILIASTAE IN MATTHEUM 24 FRAGMENTA. We have five anonymous fragments of a commentary on the gospel of Matthew. The first three (*Orate ne fiat fuga vestra hieme vel sabbato, De adventu Domini Christi, De die et hora nemo scit*) deal with Mt 24:20-44. The *De tribus mensuris* comments on Mt 13:33, and the last fragment (*De Petro*) on Mt 26:31-34, 69-75. Attribution to *Ambrosiaster or *Victorinus of Petovium does not seem possible.

CPL 186-188; PLS I, 655-670; CPPM II A 1762-7. 2972; A. Pollastri, *Nota all'interpretazione di Matteo 13,33, Luca 13,21 nel frammento incipit de tribus mensuris*: SSR 3 (1979) 61-78; H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller*, Freiburg ⁴1995, 150.

S. Samulowitz

ANONYMOUS (or Antoninus) PLACENTINUS. An anonymous author composed, ca. 560–570, an *Itinerarium,* in which, invoking the protection of the holy *martyr Antoninus, patron of Piacenza, he re-

counts a *pilgrimage made with several companions in *Syria, *Palestine, *Sinai and *Mesopotamia. There are two recensions of the work, as shown by J. Gildemeister: the first is shorter, while the second is richer in detail and written in better language. (This latter recension also exists in abbreviated form.) The second recension is a reworking of the original text, done after the reform begun by Pepin the Short and continued by Charlemagne and Alcuin; its purpose was to correct the genuine text and restore it to a normalized Latin.

CPL 2330; PL 72, 899-918; CSEL 39,159-218; CL 175,127-174; J. Gildemeister, *Antonini Placentini Itinerarium im unentstellten Text mit deutscher Übersetzung*, I Berlin 1889; H. Grisar, *Zur Palästinareise des sog. Antoninus Martyr*: ZKTh 26 (1902) 760-770; Id., *Nochmals das Pilgeritinerar des Anonymus von Piacenza*: ZKTh 27 (1903) 776-780; P. Piacenza, *De itinerario Antonini Placentini*: EphLit 17 (1903) 338-348; G.F.M. Vermeer, *Observations sur le vocabulaire du pèlerinage chez Egérie et chez Antonin de Plaisance*, Nijmegen 1965; F. Mian, *L'Anonimo Piacentino al Sinai*: VetChr 9 (1972) 267-301; C. Milani, *Aspetti fonetici del ms. Sang. 133* (*Itinerarium Antonini Placentini*): RIL 108 (1974) 335-359; Id., *Problemi di morfologia e sintassi nell'Itinerarium Antonini Placentini* (ms. Sang. 133 and C ms. Rhen. 73): RIL 108, 360-416; Id., *Itinerarium Antonini Placentini. Un viaggio in Terra Santa del 560-570 d.C.* (ed. sinottica con tr. della *recensio altera*), Milan 1977; Id., *Un esempio di nornalizzazione linguistica: la recensio altera dell'Itinerarium Antonini Placentini*: Scritti in onore di S. Pugliatti, Milan 1978, 679-703.

S. Zincone

ANONYMOUS ANTIMONTANIST. *Presbyter (bishop?) of the province of *Asia, active between the 2nd-3rd c., author of a work in 3 books against the *Montanists, dedicated to Avircius Marcellus, identified by some with *Abercius, bishop of Hierapolis. Only 10 fragments of the work remain (CPG 1327), cited by *Eusebius of *Caesarea in *HE* V,16,2–17,4. The second and third books seem to have been written about a year apart (13 and 14 years after the death of the prophetess Maximilla), in very different historical contexts: an absence of *persecution in the first case (V,16,12-15.18-19), numerous and recent murders of Christians, both *orthodox and *heretics, in the second (V,16,20-22). One could also deduce a chronological link with the return of persecution under *Septimius Severus, though it would be difficult to fix a precise date.

The work is an important source on Montanism. The fragments contain data on the origins of the movement and on the first ecclesiastical condemnations (V,16,6-10). A strong *eschatological expectation is evident (V,16,18-19), and the claim to exclusive possession of the Christian prophetic charism (V,16,12; 17,4). Montanist ecstasy is described as a psychosis (V,17,2). The oracle 16 (Aland) is included (V,16,17).

*Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 37; 39) identifies the anti-Montanist with *Rhodo, author of a work *Against Montanus, Prisca and Maximilla*, in which another anti-Montanist, *Miltiades, is mentioned, just as in the anonymous author mentioned by Eusebius.

P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme*, Fribourg-Paris 1913, XX-XXVIII; W. Kühnert, *Der antimontanistische Anonymus bei Eusebius*: TZ 5 (1949) 436-446 (proposes identification with Polycrates of Ephesus); C. Trevett, *Montanism*, Cambridge 1996, 30; M. Wünsche, *Der Ausgang der urchristlichen Prophetie in der frühkatholischen Kirche*, Stuttgart 1997, 264-297; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism*: JEH 50 (1999) 1-22.

A. D'Anna

ANONYMOUS APOLLINARIST TEXTS. Early in the 5th c. various writings originating in *Apollinarist circles circulated under the name of Pope *Julius I (6 Feb. 337–12 Apr. 352). *Leontius of *Byzantium gives information on these, *Adv. fraudes Apoll.*, proem.: PG 86, 1948B. The problem of these counterfeits has been studied by H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 158-163. In particular, no author has been suggested for a text in the form of an encyclical letter, preserved in the Greek text, a *Syriac version, a Latin fragment corresponding almost completely to the Greek text, an Arabic fragment and some *Armenian fragments. A critical edition of the Greek text of this *encyclion* (among the works of Julius I: PL 8, 876 A-B) is in H. Lietzmann, 292-293; for the textual tradition, see ibid., 158. For the editions of the fragments in other languages, see CPG II, 3735.

Besides the *encyclion,* also indicated as anonymous, are a series of texts of disputed attribution (CPG II, 3736-3740), as well as a certain number of fragments: 185 (Syriac); 186 (Latin, Syriac, Armenian); 187 (Syriac) and 188-191 (Arabic), in the numbering of Lietzmann's collection: J. Fleming - H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaristische Schriften. Syrisch mit den griechischen Texten* (AGG, N.F. 7,4), Berlin 1904.

In addition to Lietzmann's work and the CPG, see DTC VIII, 2, 1917; E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, in Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, XXXII B., 6 Abhandlung, Munich 1927, 8, 96; CPG II, 3735-3741.

E. Cavalcanti

ANONYMOUS ARIANS. Under this rubric CPG II, 2080-2085 lists the following works: (1) n. 2080: *Pseudo-Athanasian Homily* (ed. Scheidweier, ZKG 67 [1955-56] 132-140) on the deceptions of the devil, who inspires false and idolatrous cults. The conclusion has been seen as subordinationist, hence the *Arian attribution, but the text at that place is in too bad a state to allow sure conclusions. The homily appears to have been written first half 4th c. (2) n. 2081: anonymous homily (ed. Amand-Moons, RBen 63 [1953] 18-69; 211-238) on *virginity, addressed to fathers of families, that they would bring up their children to this ideal. Has seemed Arian due to the lack of *trinitarian and *Nicene ideas, but the argument is insubstantial, and all the more so if, with Vööbus (OC 40 [1956] 69-77), we consider the Greek text a translation of a 4th-c. *Syriac original. (3) nn. 2082.2083: two pseudo-Chrysostomic homilies (ed. Liébaert, SC 146) by an unknown Arian author, preached during the octave of *Easter, respectively on Act 2:22-24 and 4:5-10. They are later than 431, since the author knows of *Nestorius's heresy (Liébaert groundlessly considers this passage an interpolation). (4) n. 2084: anonymous homily (ed. Leroy, *Epektasis*. *Mélanges J. Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 343-353) on the *annunciation (Lk 1:31-44). The author, who openly attacks *Marcellus of Ancyra, offers a trinitarian doctrinal approach resembling that of the Antiochene formula of 341: he is thus anti-Nicene, though not necessarily Arian. (5) n. 2085: fragments from an unknown Arian historian are taken from Theophanes's *Chronicon paschale* and elsewhere, which continued *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronicle* until the death of *Valens (ed. Bidez, GCS, Philostorgius, CLI-CLXIII; 202-241).

CPG 2, 2080-2085 (with bibl.); M. Simonetti, *Note su due omelie ariane pubblicate recentemente*, in *Studi in onore di Q. Cataudella*, II, Catania 1972, 417-423.

M. Simonetti

ANONYMOUS GALLUS (5th-6th c.). Disciple of *Faustus of Riez, perhaps an *abbot of SW *Gaul ca. 500. Postulated by O. Seebass as the author of most of the 17 *Instructiones* (PL 80, 229-260), previously attributed to *Colombanus, though some go back to Faustus himself. G. Morin later noticed a strong similarity of expression between the *Instructiones* attributed to the Anonymous Gallus and two fragments contained in *ms o 212 Sup. Ambrosianus,* concluding that the author was the same. The two fragments are a sermon for the *ascension and a succinct exposition of the mystery of the *Trinity.

CPL 978; G. Morin, *Deux pièces inédites du disciple de Fauste de Riez auteur des soi-disant Instructiones Columbani*: Revue Charlemagne I (1881) 161-170.

E. Prinzivalli

ANONYMOUS of VERONA. 11 homilies go by this name, written probably at Verona mid-6th c. 10 homilies are contained in the *Codex Veronensis LIX* (57) and are attributed either to ps.-Augustine (*serm. 118, 237-239, Mai 171-173*) or ps.-Maximus of Turin (*tractatus 3 de baptismo*). The eleventh homily is identical to ps.-Augustine's *Sermo 109*. The homilies appear to have been written by a well-educated, pastorally zealous preacher; they address the *baptismal creed, baptismal rites, repentance, the judgment of the dead, the mystery of Christmas and 2 Cor 5:10.

CPL 222. 368 (*s 109*). 809; CPPM I A, 894. 903. 1022-1024. 1117-1119. 1780-1782; C. Lambot, *Le florilège augustinien de Vérone*: RB 79 (1969) 70-81; J.P. Bouhot, *Note sur trois "Sermons anonymes"*: REAug 20 (1974) 135-142; G. Sobrero, *Anonimo Veronese: omelie mistagogiche e catechetiche*: Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Collectio "Subsidia" 66 (1992) 85-155; H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller*, Freiburg [4]1995, 174.

S. Samulowitz

ANONYMOUS SICILIAN. Early 5th-c. author, a layman of *Roman origin, trained in *rhetoric and theology. "Converted" in Sicily by an "exceptionally bright woman" (*Ep.* 1,1), this author sought to spread an authentic and *ascetic *Pelagian-style Christianity, particularly characterized by the irreconcilability of riches and Christian faith, marriage and chastity. Six works have been preserved, written probably 411–416: two collections of letters, *De divitiis, De malis doctoribus et operibus fidei, De possibilitate non peccandi* and *De castitate*.

LACL 38; C. Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den letzten zwei Jahrhunderte des kirchlichen Altertums*, Berlin 1964 ([1]1890) 3-167; PLS, 1, 1330-1505, 1687-1694; PLS 2, 1375-1380; M. Winterbottom, *Pelagiana*: JTS 38 (1987) 106-129 (corrections); B.R. Rees, *The Letters of Pelagius and His Followers*, Woodbridge 1991 (Eng. tr.); A. Kessler, *Reichtumskritik und Pelagianismus*, Fribourg 1999; M.R. Rackett, *Anxious for Wordly Things*: SP 33 (1977) 229-235.

K. den Biesen

ANONYMOUS VALESIANUS. Name indicating two Latin fragments of different origin and time, published by H. de Valois—hence the name—in an appendix to his edition of *Ammianus Marcellinus in 1636; also called the *Excerpta Valesiana*. The two fragments were published together only because

they were in the same MS. The first (*Pars prior*) was edited by Mommsen with the title *Origo Constantini imperatoris* (ch. 1-35) and the other *Chronica Theodoriciana* (*Pars posterior*) (ch. 36-96). The *Origo Constantini* is a brief biography of the emperor from 305 to 337, written some decades after his death and before 390. The author uses good sources; *Orosius also drew on them. The author ignores the political and religious reforms of the first Christian emperor, instead narrating the events of war, esp. during the first period (305–324). References to Christianity are interpolated, taken from Orosius's *Historia contra paganos*. The *Pars posterior* was written ca. 550 by an anti-*Arian Catholic who was nonetheless sympathetic to the Arian king, who promoted peace and was benevolent toward Catholics. Written in a very poor Latin, it covers the period from 474–527, treating esp. of King *Theodoric and events in *Italy.

MGH, AA 9, *Chronica Minora* I, 7-11 (*Pars Prior*); 306-328 (*Pars Posterior*). Repertorium 2,362f.; Eng. tr. J.C. Rolfe, LCT [3]1958, 509-569; J. Moreau, *Excerpta Valesiana*, Leipzig 1968; J.N. Adams, *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle* (*Anonymus Valesianus II*), London 1976; W. Bracke, *L'Anonymus Valesianus II*, Ch. 79-96, texte et commentaire, Bologna 1992; I. König, *Origo Constantini*, Einführ., Text & Komm, Trier 1987; T.D. Barnes, *Jerome and the Origo Constantini imperatoris*: Phoenix 43 (1989) 158-161; É. Aussenac, "*L'Origo Constantini*": *rétroaction et approche d'une datation*: Latomus 60 (2001) 671-676; V. Neri, *La legittimità politica del regno teodericiano nell'Anonymi Valesiani Pars Posterior*, in *Teoderico e i Goti fra Oriente e Occidente*, ed. A. Carile, Ravenna 1995, 313-340; S.N.C. Lieu - D. Montserrat (eds.), *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views, A Source History*, London 1996, 39-62 (*Origo*); I. König (ed.), *Aus der Zeit Theodorechs des Grossen, Einleitung, Uebersetzung und Kommentar einer anonymen Quelle*, Darmstad 1997; V. Aiello, *Aspetti della fortuna di Orosio. Il caso della pars prior degli Excerpta Valesiana*, in *Ad contemplandam sapientiam*. Studi S. Leanza, Soveria Mannelli 2004, 5-29.

A. Di Berardino

ANTERUS, pope (235–236). Bishop of *Rome between 235 and 236, for only 40 days (LP I, 147). Besides its extreme brevity, this period also partly overlapped with the final phase of the pontificate of his predecessor, *Pontianus, exiled in Sardinia by Alexander Severus and the antipope Hippolytus. It does not appear that Anterus was *martyred. He is buried in the *cemetery of St. *Callistus; the church's *liturgy remembers him 3 January.

BHL I, Brussels 1898-1899 (Subsidia hagiographica 6), 90; Eus., *HE* VI, 29, 1-2; Jaffé 90, 15 (apocryphal epistle); LP I, LXV-LXXVI, XCI, XCV-XCVI, C-CI, CCXLVII-CCXLVIII, 4 and 5, 62-4, 65, 145 and 147; II, 63-64; III, 74; P. Allard, *Storia critica delle persecuzioni*, II, Florence 1935, 190-195; DTC I, 2, 1366-1367; DHGE 3, 520-521 (J.-P. Kirsch); BS II, 51-52, 52-56 (M.V. Brandi - M.C. Celletti); LTK[3] 1,718-719 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 263-265 (F. Fatti).

M. Spinelli

ANTHIMUS of Constantinople (d. after 548). Bishop of Trebizond (Pontos Axeinos or Black Sea) from 518. In the spring of 532 he took part at Constantinople in a dispute between *orthodox bishops (of whom he was one) and Severians. He had resigned and retired to an *ascetic life when, through the influence of the empress *Theodora, the emperor *Justinian I promoted him to the *patriarchate of *Constantinople in June 535, after the death of *Epiphanius (5 June 535). At the time of his installation he recognized the fourth ecumenical council. Theodora, however, put him in touch with *Severus of *Antioch, with whose theological position he seems to have agreed immediately. The opposition of the clergy, equivocal statements in the patriarchal acts and the opposition of Pope *Agapetus, present at Constantinople (March 536), forced his resignation. On 13 March 536 Agapetus, with the emperor's consent, consecrated his successor *Menas, who had given a dyophysite profession of faith, in the basilica of St. Maria. He was excommunicated for his *monophysitism by the synod (May-June 536)—a decision confirmed by imperial edict (6 August 536); he then lived as an ascetic in the palace. After Theodora's death (548), he was reconciled with the *basileus*. The date of his death is unknown.

We have Greek fragments of a letter of his to Justinian in which he defends the one energy and will in Christ (Mansi, XI, 440-441; Van Roey-Allen 61-63). We also have in *Syriac, handed down by the *Ecclesiastical History* of ps.-*Zacharias the Rhetor, a synodal letter to Severus and another synodal letter to *Theodosius of *Alexandria in which he accepts the first three councils, i.e., he upholds the *Henoticon.

CPG 7085-7088; V. Grumel, *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, Kadiköi-Bucarest I, 1, 1932, 228-231; Mansi 11,440f.; 517: Letter to Justinian; the others written by Zacharias the Rhetor 9,21 and 25; Bardenhewer V,52; Beck 392f.; J.P. Land (ed.), *Anecd. syr.* 3, Leiden 1870, Nachdruck Osnabrück 1989, 299f.; DHGE III, 531 n. 8; E. Honigmann, *Anthimus of Trebizond, Patriarch of Constantinople*, in *Patristic Studies*, Vatican City 1973, 185-193; EP 1,504-508; S. Brock, *The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian* (532): OCP 47 (1981) 87-121; L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e Patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 122-124; LTK 1, 719-720; RGG[4] 1, 518-9; Grillmeier 2/2, 345-378; A. Van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century* (OLA 56), Louvain 1994, 61-63.

B. Studer - D. Stiernon

ANTHIMUS of Nicomedia (d. 303). Bishop of *Nicomedia during the reign of *Diocletian, Anthimus was put to death, according to *Eusebius of *Caesarea (*HE* VIII 6,6; 13,1), shortly after the promulgation of the first Diocletian edict of persecution (24 February 303; Lact., *De mont. pers.* 13-14). Behind the killing of Anthimus and numerous other faithful was a fire that broke out in the imperial palace of Nicomedia, which *Galerius accused the Christians of starting. In the *Martyrologium Hier.* the *dies natalis* of Anthimus is 27 April, in the *Martyrologium Syr.* 24 April and in the *Byzantine church 3 September. A late, legendary *passio* attributed to Simeon Metaphrastes (PG 115, 172-184) describes in detail his life, virtues and death. The numerous Sts. Anthimus in the *hagiographical tradition have led to a possible identification (supported by Delehaye and Mara) of the St. Anthimus of the Via Salaria with St. Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia.

G. Mercati, *Anthimi Nicomediensis episcopi et Martyris de sancta Ecclesia*: ST 5, Vatican City 1901, 87-98; DHGE 3,530; H. Delehaye, *Propylaeum AASS Decembr. Martyrologium Romanum*, Brussels 1940, 184; Id., OC 148-50; M.G. Mara, *Contributo allo studio della "Passio Anthimi,"* Rome 1964; *I Martiri della Salaria: Antimo, Massimo, Basso, Fabio, secondo gli Acta SS. Anthimi et sociorum eius: Il Paleocristiano in Bassa Sabina*, Rome 1980, 11-27; BBKL 1, 189.

M.G. Mara

ANTHIMUS of Tyana (d. after 379). A contemporary of St. *Basil, known only from his relations with the bishop of *Caesarea. Cited by Basil in friendly terms in *Ep.* 58, Anthimus was among the 32 bishops that in 372 subscribed to the letter addressed to those of *Italy and *Gaul, at Basil's initiative (*Ep.* 92), asking help from the West in the struggle and *schism being stirred up and exacerbated in the East by the pro-*Arian policy of the emperor *Valens. In the complicated general situation, relations between Anthimus and Basil quickly fell apart: when Valens divided the civil province of *Cappadocia in two, Tyana became the capital of Cappadocia II, which included the W and S parts of the old province, including the crossing points to the Taurus region where the church of Caesarea had extensive property. Anthimus, upholding the parallel between civil and ecclesiastical subdivisions, claimed to be *metropolitan of the new province and laid claim to jurisdiction over several of Basil's suffragan sees, maintaining his position vigorously and harshly. In response, Basil set up new episcopal sees, e.g., *Nyssa and esp. the small town of Sasima, on the roads connecting with the Taurus. As is well known, Basil asked his friend *Gregory of Nazianzus to assume this burden, but he did not feel up to the task; it does seem, though, that Gregory did mediate a certain peace (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 43; *Ep.* 47-50; *Carm.* II). Conflict resumed over the *Armenian priest Faustus: Basil, on whom the Armenian church depended, refused to consecrate Faustus bishop at the wish of King Bab, who had deposed the previous bishop. Anthimus asserted his metropolitan claims and consecrated him (Basil., *Ep.* 120-122). Nevertheless, Basil's *Ep.* 210 once more mentions Anthimus in friendly terms.

S. Tillemont, *Mém.* IX, 174ff.; 196ff.; DCB I, 119-120; G. Bardy, in Fliche-Martin III, 333-338; H.F. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie*, Paris 1910, 491; R. van Dam, *Emperor, Bishops, and Friends in Late Antique Cappadocia*: JTS NS, n. 37 (1986) 53-76; M.-M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors v. Naz.*, Bonn 1960, 25f.; R. Pouchet, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: une stratégie de communion*, Rome 1992, passim.

E. Cavalcanti

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA. Fundamental collection of minor Latin poems, from the beginnings until the 6th c., which had no previous suitable edition. Includes many poems by Christian authors. It is divided into two parts: the first, edited by Riese, comprises poems found in codices; the second, edited by Buecheler, comprises poems found in *epigraphs. In 1982 the first volume of the new edition was published, prepared by D.R. Shackleton Bailey.

F. Buecheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina, sive poesis latinae supplementum*, Leipzig 1894-1906, con il suppl. di E. Lommatzsch (1926; repr. Amsterdam 1972); D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina I. Carmina in codicibus scripta. Fasc. I. Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina*, Stuttgart 1982.

E. Prinzivalli

ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA. A collection of ca. 4500 poetic compositions, the work of more than 350 authors from a period of 16 centuries. The collection was collated in 980 by an anonymous author from previous anthologies: those of Constantine Cephalas (9th-10th c.), Agathias (6th c.), Philip of *Thessalonica (1st c. AD) and Meleager (early 1st c. AD). The anthology was discovered only at the end of the 16th c. in the codex Palatinus 23 of Heidelberg, hence the name Palatina. The contents of the 16 books into which it is subdivided are (1) Christian epigrams (4th-10th c.); (2) description of the statues in the Gymnasium of Zeusippus of *Constantinople, by Christodorus of Coptos (5th-6th c.); (3) epigrams from the bas-reliefs of the temple of Apollonis, mother of Attalus and Eumenes, at Cyzicus; (4) the

real beginning of the anthology which connects the proems of Meleager, Philip and Agazia to their respective collections; (6) dedicatory epigrams; (7) funerary epigrams; (8) Christian epigrams by *Gregory of Nazianzus; (9) descriptive epigrams; (10) protreptic epigrams; (11) convivial and satirical epigrams; (12) Juvenilia of Strato of Sardis; (13) epigrams in various meters; (14) arithmetical, enigmatic and riddling epigrams; (15) miscellanea. A book XVI, added by moderns and called *Appendice Planudea,* gathers 388 new epigrams taken from the *Anthologia Planudea.* That anthology is similar to the *Anthologia Palatina* and takes its name from the *Byzantine *monk Maximus Planudis (13th-14th c.), whose autograph is in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice. Its seven books largely correspond to the first seven of the *Anthologia Palatina,* from which it is derived. Planudis, by his own declaration, made use of two sources: the first probably the *codex Palatinus* or a copy of it, the other an independent, abbreviated edition of Cephalas.

PWK I, 2380ff.; EI III, 543-544.

Editions: H. Stadtmüller, *Anthologia graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*, Leipzig 1894/1906; W. Paton (ed.), *The Greek Anthology*, vols. I-V, 1916-1918; H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca*, vols. I-IV, Munich 1957-1958 (1956-²1967); *Les Belles Lettres*: t. I: books I-IV, ed. P. Waltz, 1928, ²1960; t. II: book V, eds. P. Waltz - J. Guillon, 1928, ²1990; t. III, book VI, ed. P. Waltz, 1931; t. IV: book VII, 1-363, ed. P. Waltz, tr. by A.M. Desrousseaux, A. Dain, P. Camelot, E. Des Places, 1938, ²1960; t. V: book VII, 364-378, ed. P. Waltz, tr. E. Des Places, M. Dimitrescu, H. La Maître, G. Soury, 1941, ²1960; t. VI: book VIII, with the epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus, ed. P. Waltz, 1944, ²1960; t. VII: book IX, 1-358, ed. P. Waltz, with tr. by G. Soury, 1957; t. VIII: book IX, 359-827, ed. P. Waltz, tr. G. Soury, with the collaboration of J. Irigoin and P. Laurens, 1974; t. X: book XI, ed. R. Aubreton, with the collaboration of F. Buffière and J. Irigoin, 1994; t. XII: books XIII-XV, ed. F. Buffière, *Anthologia planudea*, t. XIII, ed. R. Aubreton, 1980; *An Index to the Anthologia graeca, Anthologia palatina and Planudea. Fasc. 1*, Amsterdam 1985; D.L. Page (ed.), *The Epigrams of Rufinus*, Cambridge 1978; D.L. Page (ed.), *Further Greek Epigrams, Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources Not Included in "Hellenistic Epigrams" or "The Garland of Philip."* Revised and prepared for publication by R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle, 2 vols., Cambridge 1981; P.A. Hansen (ed.), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII-V a.Chr.*, Berlin-New York 1983; P.A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculi IV a. Chr.*, Berlin 1989; P. Maréchaux (ed.), *La muse adolescente. Choix d'épigrammes érotiques tirées du Livre XII de l'Anthologie grecque / Straton de Sardes. Textes choisis, traduits, annotés et préf.*, Paris 1995; A. Bernabe (ed.), *Anthologia Graeca Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta. Pars I.* Ed. corr. Stuttgart 1996; K. Rexroth (ed.), *Poems from the Greek Anthology*, introduction by D. Mulroy, Ann Arbor 1999; G. Galán Vioque - M.Á. Márquez Guerrero (eds.), *Epigramas eróticos griegos. Antología Palatina* (*Libros V y XII*), Madrid 2001.

Italian translations: F.M. Pontani, 4 vols., Turin 1978-1981; G. Paduano (ed.), *Antologia Palatina, epigrammi erotici: libro V e libro XII*, Milan 1989; G. Guidorizzi (ed.), *Epigrammi di Meleagro*, Milan 1992; *Epigrammi erotici,* ed. Meleagro, tr. M. Coco, with critical comments by F. Bornmann and N. Casiglio, Manduria 1981.

Resources: V. Citti, E. Degani, G. Giangrande, G. Scarpa (eds.), *An Index to the Anthologia Graeca: Anthologia Palatina and Planudea*, 4 vols., Amsterdam 1985-1990; V. Citti, *An Index to the "Griechische Vers-Inschriften"* (ed. W. Peek, Berlin 1955), Amsterdam 1995.

Studies: The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams, ed. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, 2 vols., Cambridge 1965; *The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, ed. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, 2 vols., Cambridge 1968; P.A. Hansen, A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993; E. Degani, *L'epigramma. Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* I 2, Rome 1993, 197-233; M.G. Albiani, *La poesia ellenistica ed epigrammatica*, in U. Mattioli (ed.), *Senectus. La vecchiaia nel mondo classico*, 1: *Grecia*, Bologna 1995, 277-359; B. Baldwin, *Notes on Christian Epigrams in Book One of the Greek Anthology*, in P. Allen - E. Jeffreys (eds.), *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, Brisbane 1996; E. Degani, *Anthologie*: NP 1, 734-737; D. Gall, *Anthologia Graeca*, in O. Schütze (ed.), *Metzler Lexikon Antiker Autoren*, Stuttgart-Weimar 1997, 49-51; J. Irigoin, *L'Anthologie grecque*: *Tradition et critique des textes grecs*, Paris 1997 (Histoire 36), 89-103; G. Guidorizzi, *L'epigramma*, in *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina* II, Turin 1998, 181-224; K.J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley 1998.

M. Perraymond - C. Noce

ANTHOLOGIA SALMASIANA. A collection of Late Antique poetry, compiled in *Africa first half 6th c., passed down to us in the 8th/9th-c. *cod. Parisinus* 10318, and named after the French humanist C. Saumaise, who discovered it. Contains various kinds of poetry by a variety of authors, mostly African: Virgilian centos, highly complex distichs, epigrams by the noted poet and grammarian Luxorius (Riese 287-375), poetic compositions by Faustus Felix, Vespa, Coronato, Cato (also a grammarian and poet at the time of the *Vandal king Huneric, 477–484, whom he extols in some of his works), Symposius (rather than Symphosius), author of about 100 very popular riddles, each in three hexameters. Other poets were active after the Vandal king Trasamundo. The arguments are various: celebration of the powerful, description of buildings, epithalamia, satire, etc. Some of the poets, certainly *Luxurius and Calbulus, were Christians. Calbulus wrote a composition recalling his own *baptism (*Anth. lat.* n. 378), an epigram in three verses which would become an inscription in a basilica (n. 380), and some distichs praising the cross (n. 379).

CPL 1517; ed. F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia latina* I,1, Leipzig 1894, 33-221; ed. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina*, I: *Carmina in codicibus scripta*, Fasc. I: *Libri Salmasiani*

aliorumque carmina, Stuttgart 1982; R. Shackleton Bailey, *Towards a Text of "Anthologia Latina,"* Cambridge 1979; M. Spallone, *Il Par. lat. 10138 (Salmasiano): dal manoscritto altomedievale ad una raccolta enciclopedica tardo-antica*: Italia Medievale and Umanistica 25 (1982) 1-71; G. Focardi, *Il carme del "Pescatore" sacrilego (Anth. Lat. 1,21 Riese) e una sua recente edizione*: Orpheus 5 (1984) 1-31; A.J. Baumgartner, *Untersuchungen zu Anthologie des Codex Salmasianus*, Zürich 1981 (with ed. and tr. *Anth. Lat.* 199, Vespa and 82): P. Mastrandrea, *Lettori cristiani di Seneca filosofo*, Brescia 1988; G. Cupaiolo, *Note ai Miracula Christi (A.L. 879 R.)*, in *Polyanthema*. Studi . . . offerti a S. Costanza, II, Messina 1989, 1-22; K. Vössing, *Die Anthologia Salmasiana, das vandalische Karthago und die Grenzen der Stilanalyse*, in *Der Stilbegriff in den Altertumswissenschaften: Universität Rostock Institut für Altertumswissenschaft*, Rostock 1993, 149-155; J. Pizarro Sánchez, *Estructura y tipología de los "Aenigmata Symphosii"*: CFC(L) 16 (1999) 239-246.

A. Di Berardino

ANTHONY (6th c.). *Hagiographer of *Simeon Stylites the elder (the first of three of that name, the *senior*), who lived on a column near *Antioch, and died at nearly 100 (d. 459). The author of Simeon's life calls himself Anthony and claims to be Simeon's disciple and an eyewitness of the events he narrates (ch. 7). In fact the Greek life of Simeon, transmitted also in *Latin translation in many codices, seems to be the work of a hagiographer who knows *Theodoret's work (*Hist. mon.* 26) but has no direct experience of the country, background or traditions of the place. It can be conjectured that this "counterfeit" was composed early 6th c. at *Constantinople by a certain Anthony, to validate the authenticity of Simeon's supposed relics. The emperor *Leo I (ca. 411–474) had ordered their translation from Antioch to Constantinople, but we have no certain knowledge that the order was carried out, since the inhabitants of Antioch opposed it; if the translation occurred, it was probably only partial.

CPG III, 6724; BHG 1682-1685m; PL 73, 325-334; H. Lietzmann, *Das Leben des hl. Symeon Stylites* (TU 32,4), Leipzig 1908, 20-78 (Gr. and Lat. text); H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites* (Subs. hagiogr. 14), Brussels 1923, II-XXXIV; P. Peteers, *St. Syméon stylite et ses premiers biographes*: AB 61 (1943) 29-71; R. Doran, *The Lives of Symeon Stylites*, Kalamazoo 1992, 85-100.

M.G. Bianco

ANTHONY, abbot (251–ca. 335). The most famous of the fathers of *anchorism, considered its founder by a substantial branch of the tradition that goes back to *Athanasius's *Life of Anthony*. Born 251, at age 20 he adopted the *ascetic life, first in a village (under the direction of an old man), then in a tomb dug out of a mountainside near the Nile, then in abandoned ruins in the middle of the *desert. Later a system of small *monasteries arose around him, a community of which he was the "father." Still later he moved toward the Red Sea to a place where the monastery dedicated to him still stands and where he spent most of his life until he died (ca. 355). His interventions in *Alexandria seem to have been at the time of *Diocletian's persecution (Maximinus), and later during the *Arian controversy, to register his support for Athanasius, whose *Life of Anthony* makes him an example of monastic life, fully describing his *ascesis, way of life, his struggles with demons in the desert and his spirituality. A corpus of letters is attributed to Anthony himself, varying in number and reaching us in various languages. A corpus of seven letters, the original Greek lost, has reached us in *Georgian, *Latin, and partially in *Coptic and in *Syriac. A corpus of twenty letters has reached us in Arabic, generally hortatory in character but inspired by doctrines typical of the *Platonism of the *Origenian school, as recently shown by Rubenson. Also attributed to him is a letter to *Theodore of Tabennesi, a series of rules and some twenty sermons. Only the corpus of seven letters and the letter to Theodore appear authentic.

BHG 140-141h; CPG 2330-2350; Letters, PG 40, 977-1000; G. Garitte, *Lettres de S. Antoine*, version géorgienne et fragments coptes, Louvain 1955 (CSCO 148-149); B. Steidle (ed.), *Antonius Magnus Eremita*, Rome 1956 (SA 38); S. Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Anthony: Origenist Theology, Monastic Tradition and the Making of a Saint*, Lund 1990 = Bibliotheca Historico-Ecclesiastica Lundensis, 24; Coptic Encyclopedia 1,149-151; C. Corsato, *Sant'Antonio abate (251-356)*, Verona 2002.

T. Orlandi

ANTHONY of Choziba (d. after 630). *Monk of the Palestinian *laura of Choziba in the Wadi-el-Kelt between *Jerusalem and Jericho. Disciple of St. George, monk of that monastery (d. 625 ca.), whose life he wrote (BHG 669), in which he describes his own *conversion and desire to withdraw to Raithu, his relationship with his master, and the dispersions of the monks of Choziba at the time of the *Persian invasion (620)—the one datable event in this biography replete with exhortations that he attributes to his heroes. Anthony is also the author of a collection, *Seven Miracles That the Theotokos (Mary) Worked at Choziba* (BHG 1071). He must have died after 630.

CPG 7985; DHGE III, 781; BS VI, 534-536; A.N. Athanassakis - T. Vivian, *The Life of Saint George of Choziba and the Miracles of the Most Holy Mother of God at Choziba*, San Francisco 1994; L. di Segni, *Nel deserto accanto ai fratelli. Vite di Gerasimo di Giorgio di Choziba*, Bose 1991, 83-125.

D. Stiernon

ANTHROPOLOGY

I. Biblical origins - II. Extrabiblical origins - III. Anthropological developments of Gen 1:26; 2:7; and of Paul.

I. Biblical origins. The key OT texts are Gen 1:26 and 2:7; Wis 2:23; Sir 17:1-4. In Gen 1:26, on the one hand, the human being (= man-woman) is the fruit of the divine counsel, created "in the image and likeness" of God, i.e., in "appearance" the human is the image-likeness of a divine being, as a copy is to the original. The two terms *image* and *likeness* do not indicate two different aspects, but exterior (image) and interior (likeness) aspects of the same reality. The human beings are the completion of creation, over which they have "dominion" which gives value to their life that, for this reason, cannot be violated with impunity (Gen 9). The Gen 2:7 account (the human made from clay), on the other hand, emphasizes human earthly nature and kinship with the world, complementing Gen 1:26 (kinship with the heavenly world). Wisdom literature introduces two additional concepts: that of incorruptibility and therefore immortality as the human end; and that of the eternity or essence of God of which humans are the image. A fundamental category of OT humanity is that of dependence on God, which cannot be ignored without compromising the root of human nature.

In the NT, whereas the gospels emphasize human value over that of other goods and institutions, in Paul we see the beginning of an anthropological reflection according to Jewish and *Hellenistic categories. Paul's basic texts are 1 Thess 5:23 (human beings as body-soul-spirit); 1 Cor 15:45-49 (carnal and spiritual humanity; the first Adam and the last Adam, i.e., the grafting of anthropology onto *Christology); Rom 7–8 (the stages of human fulfillment). Paul's categories are "flesh and spirit": "flesh" (*sarx*) is that which excludes God and opposes the "spiritual" (*pneuma*). The "spirit" represents for Paul the sphere within which humanity can enter into dialogue with God, who constitutes the vital level of human existence. "Flesh" and "spirit" indicate decisional stages: the "carnal" and the "spiritual." Intermediate stages are those of *sōma* ("body"—1 Cor 15:44), *psychē* ("soul"—1 Cor 2:14; 15:45) and *nous* ("intellect"—Rom 7:23; 12:2; 1 Cor 14:14-15), which can have a positive role since they may lead to the spiritual person. In Paul the "psychical" person precedes the spiritual. The risen Christ, in 1 Cor 15:45 called the "last and second Adam," dwells within the spiritual person; indeed, he is a "life-giving spirit," i.e., he gives life to human beings just as Yahweh breathed life into the "first Adam." Anthropology is thus interconnected with Christology: persons are what they become in the strength of the risen Christ. The *eikōn* ("originating image") of the human is God according to Gen 1:26, but concretely, that *eikōn* is Christ. For Paul the principle of continuity between humanity's present and future condition ("spiritual" in the risen "life-giving spirit") is corporeity (*sōma*), a position that sets Paul against every *Platonizing anthropology. Paul's anthropology is also an *eschatological anthropology, rather than the protological anthropology of *gnosticism.

II. Extrabiblical origins. The cultural context with which Paul's anthropology was in constant dialectic was the thought of *Philo of Alexandria and of the rabbis, Greeks, and gnostics. Philo, accepting and contrasting Gen 1:26 and 2:7, proposed the distinction between a heavenly person (Gen 1:26) who exists prior to the earthly (Gen 2:7), and the actual person who corresponds to Gen 2:7, whose exemplar idea is Gen 1:26, identified with *nous* and which properly defines humanity (*Leg. all.* 1,31-32; *Opif. mundi* 134). The rabbinical conception gave priority to *Adam in paradise as God's image; despite Paul's criticism, it entered Christianity through the ps.-Clementines and *Irenaeus.

Hellenism, since it had no term *anthrōpologia*, and the corresponding terms *anthrōpologein* and *anthrōpologos* meant only "to represent in human form," developed the subject in treatises "on human nature." It substantially accepted the central thesis of *I Alcibiades* that the human structure is constituted by a divine element or *soul (particularly the *nous*, "intellect") as its noblest part, capable of reaching God through knowledge. On this basis, a constant of Greek thought was the inseparability of anthropology from theodicy (thesis of the *syngeneia* or *divine kinship*, appropriated by Christianity), defining human nature not in relation to the human body or its composite but by the soul alone (*Alcib.* 129e-130e).

For non-Christian gnosticism (*Hermeticism), historical humanity is the fruit of the union between archetypal humanity and nature (CH, *Poimandres* 1,15 and 17); the Christianized gnosticism of the *Valentinians divided humanity into three classes: hylic, psychic and spiritual. Only the last will escape destruction; the psychic can either become spiritual or return to the hylic state. They also distinguished between humanity made in the image of the demiurge and humanity made in his likeness ("psychic humanity"). In Gen 1:26 they understand the hylic human of Gen 2:7, into whom had been breathed that breath of life (the spiritual seed) that, through

gnosis, would be rejoined to the divine (Iren., *Adv. haer*. 1, 5,5 and 6-7, 1).

III. Anthropological developments of Gen 1:26; 2:7; and Paul. There were basically two developments of biblical anthropology in Christian antiquity: one on the lines of Gen 1:26, the other on Paul's line of an anthropology anchored to Christology. The simple statement of the Apostolic Fathers that the human being of Gen 2:7, formed of clay, is the same as the human being of Gen 1:26, made in God's image and likeness, led to two developments. The Greek body-soul dichotomy, though generally accepted, never became an absolute dualist separation because of the common faith of Christians in the incarnation of the Word and resurrection of the body. Starting from the fundamental unity of the human being derived from the biblical creation account, Christian anthropological thought took two directions: either stressing human rationality (the *Alexandrian and Western tradition), or the *plasis* or formation of the human body (the *Asiatic and *Antiochene tradition). The Alexandrians sought to define the person by his essential constituent, *nous,* described for them in Gen 1:26: humanity in the image and likeness of God, the spiritual and perfect human who, in concrete existence, must experience the limitation of the earthly humanity of Gen 2:7, a limitation from which the perfect person must be freed by continual *ascesis. Christ did not absorb the earthly into himself; he merely became the *ethical model to which the latter must aspire, indeed, the way of return to what humanity truly is. This approach measured itself particularly against Platonism, delineating a metaphysical anthropology that gave little attention to historical humanity. Its last expression, in the Christianity of the 16th-18th c., was the anthropological hypothesis of the "purely natural" human.

The Asiatic-Antiochene approach gave first place to the historical human made of clay, whose whole being, not just part of it (the soul), is God's image. The incarnate Word is not just a human ethical model but the true human, the image of God. In this scheme, Christology became the hermeneutical principle of anthropology. As *Irenaeus expressed it: "God will be glorified in his *plasma* made conformable to and like his Son" (*Adv. haer*. 5, 6,1). Similarly the Antiochene *Diodore of Tarsus, in open polemic with the Alexandrians: "Some have thought that the creation of the human being as image of God refers to the invisibility of the soul. They have not understood that even *angels and *demons are invisible. In what sense then is the human being the image of God? Because he has dominion" (*In Gen*. 1,26; PG 33, 1564). Not just the human intellectual faculty but also the entire self in all its bodiliness is the image of God, i.e., bears witness to a principle (God) that transcends it. The original fact of creation is common to all beings; what distinguishes and sets them apart is their different destinies. In other words this school understood Gen 1:26 under the influence of belief in the incarnation of the Word in the context of Gen 2:7. God's image in humanity must therefore be referred to the whole person, including the body. To this end Irenaeus made a distinction not present in the biblical text, understanding "image" as referring to the human constitution, and "likeness" to life in the Spirit. Christ, from an anthropological perspective, represents the concrete person, the "image and likeness," who becomes the way for human beings to become the "image and likeness" of God. The Spirit, though not constitutive of the person, enables humans historically to become what they are meant to be. Thus Irenaeus says three elements constitute the human: flesh, soul and spirit (*Adv. haer*. 5, 9,1). This is a conception of anthropology on a dynamic-historical level: persons are not just what they were made; rather, persons are what they will become; they are not just "God's work" in the sense of having been created by God, but above all a "pledge" (Tertull., *De resurr. carnis* 6,5), indeed, according to Irenaeus, a "pledge of the Spirit" (*Adv. haer*. 5, 8,2).

Within the great schools of early Christianity, particularly the Alexandrian and Asiatic, we find personalities who epitomize virtually the entire development of Christian anthropology: *Justin Martyr forms the juncture between biblical and Greek anthropology; *Athanasius, as heir to the Alexandrian and Asiatic tradition, occupies a position between Christian East and West; *Augustine, antiquity's last great thinker, definitively disjoins anthropology from cosmology, and holds that persons must interrogate themselves directly to discover who they are, filtering the whole of reality that they encounter, including God, through themselves. We will examine the principal contributions of each.

*1. The *apologists*: *Justin*. The Christian apologists, while sharing Empedocles's definition of human nature as a microcosm encapsulating the four elements (Diels, *Die Frag. der Vor*., I, fr. 6,8,9; 112-148), tried to surpass the Greek conception of humanity as pure rationality, stressing the presence of the divine spirit within that makes a person like God and which is opposed to the "material spirit" (Tat., *Orat*. 12,1 and 4,2). With them, anthropology began that dialectic of continual "approach" and "distancing" between biblical and Hellenistic elements. Justin developed a

Logos-anthropology that distinguished a *Logos spermatikos* (the seminal logos, the divine reality: originally a *Stoic expression) and a *sperma* ("seed") of the Logos (the human reality, according to Holte; for Waszink, the Logos-Christ is the category of truth, while the *Logos spermatikos* is the presence of this truth in humanity). His Logos is a synthesis of Platonic **nous,* Stoic **pneuma* and Jewish **wisdom*, using the three terms as equivalents to explain the cosmos and human nature. The creaturely link between humanity and the Logos takes concrete form for Justin in the incarnate Word, who teaches us how to return to God as human destiny (*Apol.* 1, 10,4; 2, 15,5; 2, 10,1; *Dial.* 93,3). In the incarnate Word each person has a model and, illumined by him, becomes a mediation between God and the cosmos as its priest (*hiereus*). To fulfill this task, humanity is given freedom (*Apol.* 1, 43,3 and 8).

2. The Asiatic tradition: Irenaeus. This tradition reflects on anthropology in terms of the salvation of the whole person, body, soul and spirit (Iren., *Adv. haer.* V, 6,1 and 9,1). It asks: in what sense can a human being, including the bodily component, be called God's image as in Gen 1:26? Irenaeus sees the incarnate Word as the subject of that image, thus making an essential connection between Christology (Christ incarnate as image of God) and anthropology (humanity as the image of Christ) and extending the "image of God" of Gen 1:26 beyond human rationality to embodiedness. Human flesh is God's image in view of the flesh of the Word incarnate. To explain this Irenaeus was the first to introduce into the understanding of the sacred text the distinction (which is not original to the text) between image (human creatureliness in history) and likeness (what humanity becomes by the power of the Spirit)(*Adv. haer.* 5, 1,3 and 28,4). This is Irenaeus's *somatic anthropology* which, against the gnostics and Platonizers in general, who denied any possibility of salvation to corporeity, gave the human image the very lineaments of the incarnate Word. *Tertullian wrote: "In the slime that took on form was the thought of Christ who would become human" (*Resurr.* 6,3).

3. The Alexandrian eikōn-anthropology. The Alexandrian anthropology of the image is grafted onto the *Middle Platonism of Philo, the basic points of which were (1) the soul's kinship with God and (2) the capacity of the human *nous* (image of God) to relate to God to the extent of becoming like him (*homoiōsis*). Therefore the Alexandrians made *nous* (the soul's highest faculty) the seat of the divine image and the defining human characteristic (Clem. Alex., *Paedag.*, 3, 1,1; Orig., *C. Cels.* 4,83). The human of Gen 2:7, humanity as image, historical humanity, is in tension with the human of Gen 1:26, humanity as likeness. Christ is the human person as likeness of Gen 1:26, the concrete model or *didaskalos* of every human being who, by practicing *virtue, must imitate and follow him: in this way every human realizes himself and becomes like God (*homoiōsis*) (Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 5, 88,1-3). *Origen, developing the Philonian conception of humanity's double creation, saw in Gen 1:26 the true human, the original human who must be recovered, and in Gen 2:7 the fallen human, a *nous* subjected to a coat of skins (*In Gen. hom.* 1,13; *In Io.* 20,22). The human image is only in the soul's *nous,* but precisely as image of the Logos, hence Christ always remains the paradigm of the recovery of the true human image. Athanasius developed this school's doctrine of human recovery through the Word, by being *logikos*, i.e., capable of relating to divine and intelligible realities (*De incarnatione* 3,3). The role of the incarnate Word is to restore to humans the possibility of relating with him and thus with their own image (*De inc.*, 13,7 and 20,1). The *Cappadocian fathers, esp. *Basil (*Hex.* 9, homilies on Gen 1:26) and *Gregory of Nyssa (*De hominis opificio* and *Ep. ad Arm.* in PG 46, 237-249), were the Alexandrian school's last great continuers of referring the image to the Logos; but they also understood it as *hypostasis, which was their innovation on the theme. Image was thus used as a distinction or hypostasis in the *Trinity, with the consequence that not only the Word but the Trinity itself was thought of as an analogy for the human image, and the image of the human soul in particular (*Hom. Adtende tibi* 81, 3). The Antiochene school, however, followed Irenaeus in placing the divine image in the whole person, not just in rationality; its polemical context, however, was more christological than anthropological. Latin Christendom, except for Tertullian, who was anchored to the Asiatic tradition, gravitated to Christian Platonism and the unity of the divine persons as human image as such. Humanity is made in the image of the whole Trinity, not just of one divine person (*Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine). In the reflections of the following centuries, this approach forever broke the link between anthropology and Christology.

4. Augustine. With Augustine, anthropology, previously linked to the doctrines of *creation and Christology, was used to clarify every other problem. Humanity is no longer a "microcosm" in a cosmological scheme; the cosmos itself, and even God, become known by passing through humanity. Augustine's anthropocentrism passed into textbooks as Augustinian interiority; in the manuals of the Or-

thodox Church, as the reduction of theology to anthropology. For Augustine, to confront the question of "humanity" means not so much to resolve it (*Conf.* 4, 4,9; 10, 8,15) as to understand the nature and significance of the questions, and the authority capable of instructing us about them, i.e., Scripture (*Corr. et gratia* 1,1). Rather than define humanity, therefore, Augustine describes human nature in relation to its end, which is God: his anthropology, consequently, never leaves God out of consideration. In the human composite of soul and body—one of the wonders of the human mystery (*Civ. Dei* 21,10)—he distinguishes and emphasizes the diversity and roles of each (*De cont.* 12,26; *Ser.* 154, 10,15) without devaluing them on Platonic lines (*Civ. Dei* 13,16 and 24; *De Gen. ad litt.* 7, 27,38). In connection with the Pelagian polemic, Augustine developed the anthropological problem as freedom and image of the Trinity. In *Civ. Dei* he emphasized the human capacity for God—our greatest capacity—(12, 1,3), and in *De trinitate* our need for God—our greatest need—(14, 4,6 and 8, 11), which only God can fill (*Conf.* 1, 1,1). In this way Augustine recovered Origen's sense of "image" as a tendency toward the archetype, explaining it in a trinitarian way in that humanity, in composition as *mens-notitia-amor* or *memoria-intelligentia-voluntas,* is the image of the triune God. *Mens* implies relation to the *Father, *intelligentia* or *notitia* to the Son (Word-Truth), *amor* or *voluntas* to the Spirit (*Trin.* 15, 3,5). Augustine also introduced the theme of image, linked to the theology of creation, into the category of history, i.e., of Adam and Christ as roots of humanity, thus linking the protological aspect of human creation (Gen 1:26 and 2:7) to *soteriology and *eschatology. To recover one's "image" means for Augustine to rediscover the way (Christ incarnate) and the possibility of traveling it, which in Augustinian anthropological terms is equivalent to restoring to human freedom, healed by the grace of Christ, the capacity to relate to God (theme of *De gr. et lib. arb.* and *Corr. et gratia*). Grace and freedom pertain equally for him to God and to humanity, who walk together as friends in mutual help. Grace is understood as an *auxilium,* rather than rival, to freedom. This approach opposed the *Pelagian conception of human autonomy (humanity before God, not with God) and the Platonic anthropology that held the soul alone to be the essential constituent of the human, and the body an element from which the human must be freed. After Augustine the model of grace as help of freedom was more and more replaced by the Pelagian model of freedom and grace facing each other, which led to the *predestinationist theory that God decides human destinies. The theme of humanity as image of the Trinity, however, found a place in *mysticism, as the communication of the soul with the Trinity.

H. Schmidt, *Die Anthropologie Philons von Alexandria*, Würzburg 1933; L. Bieler, *Theios Aner. Das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" im Spätantike und Frühchristentum*, Vienna 1935 (I), 1936 (II); G. Quispel, *La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne*: Eranos-Jb 15 (1947) 249-286; H. Karpp, *Probleme altchr. Anthropologie*, Bad Godesberg 1950; H. Merki, *Homoiosis Theo*, Freiburg i.d. Schw. 1952; R. Holte, *Logos spermatikos . . .* : STh 12 (1958) 109-168; var. aus., J. Jerveli, *Imago Dei* (*Gen 1,26*) *im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, Göttingen 1960; E. des Places, *Syngeneia. La parenté de l'homme avec Dieu: d'Homère à la patristique*, Paris 1964; J.H. Waszink, *Bemerkungen zu Justins Lehre vom Logos Spermatikos*, Mullus (Festschr. Th. Klauser), Bonn 1964, 380-390; G. Mathon, *L'anthropologie chrétienne en Occident de s. Augustin à Jean Scot Erigène*, Lille 1964 (diss.); G. Giannini, *Il problema antropologico. Linee di sviluppo storico-speculativo dai presocratici a S. Tommaso*, Rome 1965; A. Orbe, *Antropología de san Ireneo*, Madrid 1969; J. Pépin, *Idées grecques sur l'homme et sur Dieu*, Paris 1971; R. Morissette, *L'antithèse entre le "psychique" et le "pneumatique" en 1Cor 15,44 à 46*: RSR 46 (1972) 97-143; *L'uomo nella Bibbia e nelle culture ad essa contemporanee*, Brescia 1975; J. Roldanus, *Le Christ et l'homme dans la Théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Leiden 1977; U. Bianchi (ed.), *La "doppia creazione" dell'uomo negli alessandrini, nei cappadoci e nella gnosi*, Rome 1978; U. Bianchi (ed.), *Archè e Telos. L'antropologia di Origene e di Gregorio di Nissa. Analisi storico-religiosa*, Milan 1981; M. Perrin, *L'homme antique et chrétien. L'anthropologie de Lactance (250-325)*, Paris 1981; J. Léal, *La antropología de Tertulliano* (SEA 76), Rome 2001. On Augustine: E. Dinkler, *Die Anthropologie Augustins*, Stuttgart 1934; R.J. O'Connell, *S. Augustine's Early Theory of Man A.D. 386-391*, Cambridge MA 1968; V. Grossi, *L'antropologia agostiniana. Note previe*: Augustinianum 22 (1972) 457-467; Id., *La crisi antropologica nel monastero di Adrumeto*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 103-133; Id., *L'antropologia cristiana negli scritti di Agostino* (*gr. lib. arb.; corr. gratia*): SSR 4 (1980) 89-113; Id., *A proposito dei testi agostiniani sulla libertà*, Congresso Internazionale su St. Augustine. Atti II, Rome 1987, 281-293.

V. Grossi

ANTHROPOMORPHISM. In its religious sense, the term refers to imagining God in human form and conceiving his actions *ad extra* on the basis of human experience. The concept involves an obvious ambivalence: on the one hand, since human beings can only know in a human way (see Aug., *Civ. Dei* 16,6,1), anthropomorphism has a fundamentally positive sense; since, however, the person always risks forgetting the distance that separates divine realities from what is understood and said of them, anthropomorphism can also have a negative sense. This double sense is reflected in the language adopted by the Fathers on the theme. Ἀνθρωπομόρφος, ἀνθρωποειδής and other similar words are used in both senses (Lampe 139f.), whereas ἀνθρωπομορφῆται, a term probably created by *Origenist *monks to

brand their opponents who were too attached to the letter of the Bible, and later adopted by the Latins (ThLL II/1,164), is obviously negative.

In the Fathers we meet both positive and negative senses, for reasons that lie in the Bible itself. In it we find themes, such as humanity as the image of God (Gen 1:26) and Christ as image of the invisible God (Col 1:15; 2 Cor 4:4), that provide the basis of a doctrine on the human means of knowing God. Other texts warn against any too-human, or even bodily, representation of God. Thus Jn 4:24: "God is spirit," and all the passages that confirm the impossibility of seeing God, the ineffability of his name, the inaccessibility of his dwelling, etc. In the 2nd c. theological reflection on anthropomorphism was largely negative. Guided by biblical faith in a completely transcendent God, but also by the *Hellenist polemic against pagan mythology (see *Philo of Alexandria), the *apologists fought against the too-human ideas of poytheism and idolatry (RAC 1,449). But *Origen, faced with the errors of his time, and esp. because Celsus had used a method like that of the apologists to criticize the anthropomorphic language of the Bible, was led to work out a positive theory of anthropomorphism, regarding both knowledge of God in general (*Princ.* I,1,7)—including the "spiritual senses"—and biblical hermeneutics (*Princ.* IV, 2-3: see Crouzel, SC 269, 1738). He justified the theory based on the divine condescension that culminates in the *kenosis* of the Word (*Jo* 6,5,29). He offered some provisos, however: confirming that Gen 1:26 refers to God's image in the soul, he ruled out any bodily representation of God (*Cels.* 6,63; *Hom. in Gen.* 1,13; *Sel. in Gen.*: PG 12, 93-96; against *Melito, etc.) and insisted on the need to go beyond "carnal" knowledge of God to reach a spiritual knowledge of him.

He thus developed a mainly spiritual *exegesis, though not without using Hellenistic methods (Gögler, *Theologie*). The position he took against both the "simple" and *Marcionites remained decisive for the whole of patristics, including Latin. During the 4th c., however, strong opposition to Origenist exegesis arose in certain monastic circles, whom Origen's adherents called *anthropomorphitae*. The rejection of *allegorism is explained in part as a criticism of *Evagrius of Pontus's doctrine of "pure prayer" (Guillaumont, *Kephalaia Gnostica*). It appeared esp. in the disputes between *John of Jerusalem and *Epiphanius (Jerome, *C. Joh.* 11) and between *Theophilus of Alexandria and the Origenist monks (Guillaumont, op. cit., 59ff., with sources), in *Cyril of Alexandria's *Adv. Anthropomorphitas* (CPG III, 5383) and in *John Cassian (*Coll.* X, 2f.). The anthropomorphite monks should not be confused with the so-called *Audiani—a confusion probably due to *Augustine (*Haer.* 50; RAC 1,450), who also mentions the anthropomorphites elsewhere (*Ep.* 148,4,13; *Epist. fund.* 23,25).

Finally, two further developments of anthropomorphism are noteworthy: in the East, arguments used in the 4th- and 8th-c. iconoclast controversies recall the same theology of God's image disputed in the conflict between "simple" and "allegorizers"; and in the West Augustine, while rejecting the "anthropomorphites" and any bodily knowledge of God, developed his famous psychological theory of the Trinity. Going beyond the *vestigia* and *similitudines* in creation and in human interior life, he finally sees in the triad of *memoria Dei, intellegentia Dei, amor in Deum* the most perfect image of the Christian God (*Trin.* 14). Also noteworthy is Augustine's reflection on the Bible's "anthropomorphic" language (*Trin.* 1,1,2).

G. van der Leeuw, *Anthropomorphismus*: RAC I, 446-450; H.C. Puech, *Audianer*: RAC I, 910-915; W. Schneemelcher, *Epiphanius*: RAC 5, 909-927; A. Favale, *Teofilo di Alessandria*, Turin 1958; A. Guillaumont, *Les "Kephalaia Gnostica" d'Evagre le Pontique*, Paris 1962; R. Gögler, *Zur Theologie des biblischen Wortes bei Origenes*, Düsseldorf 1963; HWP 1 (1971) 376-378; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome*, London 1975; C. von Schönborn, *L'icône du Christ*, Fribourg [2]1976; RGG[4] 1 (1998) 524-529, esp. 527f.; B. Studer, *Zur Bedeutung der heiligen Schrift in Augustin's De Trinitate*: Augustinianum 42 (2002) 127-147, esp. 144f.

B. Studer

ANTICHRIST. A Christian variant of God's adversary in the last days, already present in Jewish *apocalyptic literature. The antagonist is Satan or the Dragon, either directly or through the human figure of a persecuting tyrant or a false prophet, a corrupter of good people. The word *antichrist* appears in the NT only in 1 Jn 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 Jn 7. Except in the case of 1 Jn 2:18, the term is always in the singular. It is a creation of the *Presbyter, or he takes it from a prior tradition; the term is certainly not used before the late 1st c. in Christian contexts, as it is unknown to the earlier Christian apocalyptic literature. Among the Apostolic Fathers it is found only in *Polycarp (7,1), who takes it from 1–2 Jn and applies it to those who deny the *incarnation of Christ. The antichrist is distinguished from the the devil and Satan, from whom he comes and to whom he belongs. Satan and the Antichrist are identified in *Orac. Sib.* 3, 63-74. The expectation of the adversary of God as a human being facilitated the identification of the antichrist with the πλάνοι (2 Jn 7), which in turn led to the plural "antichrists" of 1 Jn 2:18. The figure also ap-

pears in 2 Th 2:1-12 and Rev 13 and 17, with different characteristics. The antichrist is a political figure. His external power and ability to seduce, which 2 Th presents as united in the same figure, in Rev 13 are divided between the antichrist and the false prophet. In 2 Th, the antichrist is an individual figure; in Rev 13, it is equally the emperor and the *Roman Empire. In 1 Jn 2:18-22, the teachers of error are seen as a number of antichrists. *Did.* 16,3-4 follows the NT, presenting the antichrist as an adversary of the Son of God, a corruptor with a universal dominion. *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* V, 25-30) tries to deduce the term "antichrist" from the number 666 of Rev 13:18, describing his *apostasy and his claim to be worshiped as God. *Hippolytus writes on the antichrist between 197 and 202, probably prompted by the persecution of *Septimius Severus, when many Christians thought that the last days had arrived and that the antichrist himself would soon appear (see Eus., *HE* VI, 7); he maintains that the antichrist cannot enter the scene before the fall of the Roman Empire. The *antichrist* and the *afterlife,* which in the NT are only marginal elements of the expectation of the *parousia, are the two main themes of Christian apocalyptic literature from the mid-2nd c. In various writings (*Orac. Sib.* 3,63-74; 5,28-34.214-27; *Ascens. Is.*) the antichrist, Belial and the resurrected Nero of the legend are combined; this disappears by the 3rd c., however, and with it the identification of the antichrist with a concrete political figure; the antichrist begins to be seen as a figure of the Jewish pseudo-Messiah, corruptor of the world (Hipp.; *Testam. Dom.*; *Apoc. Eliae*; Commod., *Carmen apol.*; Lact., *Div. inst.* 7,14). A Latin apocryphal fragment (M.R. James, TS 2,3, Cambridge 1893, 151-158) offers a description of the antichrist identical to that of the *Syriac *Testam. Dom.* and related to that of the *Coptic *Apoc. Soph.*, written perhaps late 2nd c. since it was cited by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* V, 11, 77). From the 4th c. the antichrist is again put forth as a figure of the fall of the Roman Empire. *Ev. Nic.* 9(25) describes the final confrontation of Enoch and Elijah with the antichrist, as described in Rev 11:3-13.

W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des NT und der alten Kirche*, Göttingen 1895; A. Jeremias, *Der Antichrist in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Göttingen 1930; B. Rigaux, *L'Antéchrist*, Gembloux-Paris 1932; G. Strecker, *Der Antichrist. Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund von 1 Joh 2,18.22; 4,3 und 2 Joh 7*, in T. Baarda et al. (eds.), *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, Kampen 1988, 247-254; A. Baumgarten, *Antichrist among Jews and Gentiles*, in *Jews in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman, Oxford 1998, 113-133.

R. Trevijano

ANTIDICOMARIANITAE. *Epiphanius discusses this group amply in *Haer*. 78, reporting the letter he wrote about them to the church of *Arabia, where he locates their origin. The Antidicomarianitae confessed only the human nature of Christ and denied the virginity of *Mary in that, after Christ's birth, she is said to have had other children with Joseph. *Augustine first mentions them (*Haer*. 56) as denying the perpetual virginity of Mary, and then again (*Haer*. 84), identifying them with the Helvidians, followers of the Roman *Helvidius, who preached the same doctrine, and against whom *Jerome wrote *De perpetua virginitate beatae Mariae.*

H. Quilliet, *Antidicomarianites*: DTC 1,1378-1382; G. Bardy, *Le "De Haeresibus" et ses sources*: Miscellanea Agostiniana 2 (1931) 411-412.

F. Cocchini

ANTILEGOMENON. Word used by *Eusebius of *Caesarea (*HE* III, 25,3) and later by other authors to indicate those OT and NT writings whose inspiration or *canonicity were not agreed on. In contrast to those accepted by all (*homologoumena*), NT *antilegoumena* were Heb, 2 Pet, Jas, Jude, 2–3 Jn and Rev. By introducing the distinction between books considered canonical by all and those about which there was debate and dissent, Eusebius calls attention to the fact that not all agreed on the latter. Regarding the OT, *Melito of Sardis (Eus., *HE* IV, 26) and *Origen (ibid., VI, 25) prefer to list the protocanonical books, which suggests they were faithful to the Hebrew canon, which did not accept the deuterocanonical books (*antilegoumena*). *Cyril of Jerusalem qualifies the deuterocanonical books of the OT with the epithet *incerti* (Lat. "uncertain"; Gk. *amphiballomena* "disputed"—*Catech.* IV, 33-35). Eusebius grasped the situation better than any other ancient author: besides the books universally recognized as inspired (*homologoumena*), he cites two series of contested books: those under discussion, cited above, and those considered spurious (*Acts of Paul, The Shepherd* of *Hermas, the *Apocalypse of Peter,* the *Epistle of *Barnabas,* the **Didache*, the Apocalypse, accepted by some but not by others). He then adds another list of *heretical books that no writer of the ecclesiastical tradition invokes in support of doctrine (*HE* III, 25,3-7). Those sacred books classified by the ancient Christian tradition as *antilegoumena* were first called deuterocanonical, the term now used in treatises on the inspiration of Scripture, by Sixtus of Siena (d. 1569).

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. Eccl.* III, 25,3-7; IV, 26,14; VI, 25,2;

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* IV, 33-35; G. Ruwet, *De Canone* (De S. Scriptura in universum, I), Rome [6]1951, 126-130, 154-159; G. Perrella, *Introduzione generale alla sacra Bibbia*, Turin [2]1952, 132-144, 152-156; H. Höpfl, *Introductio generalis in S. Scripturam*, Naples-Rome [6]1958, 154-159, 170-176; F. Spadafora, *Il Canone* (Il Libro sacro, I. Introduzione generale), Padua 1958, 24-27, 36-37; A. Zigenaus, *Kanon. Von der Väterzeit bis zum Gegenwart* (HDG 1/3°, 2), Freiburg 1990.

E. PERETTO

ANTIOCH in Caria, Council of. In 366 or 367, 34 *homoiousian bishops from the province of *Asia and adjoining regions met in this city of Asia Minor (Soz., *HE*, VI, 12). Unlike the homoiousian Council of *Tyana, which had gathered mainly bishops from the internal regions of Asia Minor and *Syria and at which the *Nicene **homoousios* was accepted, they rejected this formula and reaffirmed the Antiochene formula of 341, which they ascribed to *Lucian of Antioch. *Sozomen (*HE* VII, 2) mentions another council at Antioch of Caria in 378, which condemned the *homoousios* and reaffirmed the *homoiousios,* but he is probably confusing it with the earlier one. *Socrates (*HE* V, 4) puts this second council at *Antioch in Syria, based on the same confusion.

Hfl-Lecl 1,2,979; Simonetti 398-399.

M. SIMONETTI

ANTIOCH of Syria

I. History - II. Councils - III. Schism - IV. Liturgy - V. School - VI. Archaeology.

I. History. ***Sociocultural context.*** Capital of W *Syria or Coele-Syria, founded in 300 BC by Seleucus I Nicanor, son of Antiochus, from whom it received its name and the epithet "royal." Capital of the Seleucid monarchy, it was also an imperial residence. Enviably situated near the river Orontes and the Silpius and Stauris Mountains, a city both fertile and commercial, Antioch had sumptuous buildings, baths, theaters and hippodromes, and a library. In the 4th c. there were still 8 pagan temples; the village of Daphne was 6 km (3.7 mi) away. Syria was one of the 5 divisions of the prefecture of the East; seat of the *comes* of the East, the city enjoyed a moral-cultural supremacy rather than a political-administrative one. One of the largest cities of the Roman world (4th-c. population 500,000-800,000), second or third after *Rome and *Alexandria, Antioch was home to one of the most important communities of the Jewish diaspora (C.H. Cräling, 130-160). Cosmopolitan, it was Greek in spirit and culture; its official language was Greek, though *Syriac was the popular tongue. There was a large middle class between rich and poor (Chrys., *In Matth. hom.* 66.3: PG 58, 630; *In Gen. serm.* 8,2: PG 54, 619), with a notable inequality separating large landowners, small shopkeepers, artisans, beggars and slaves. The people themselves were volatile and restless. In the 7th c. Antioch fell with Syria to the Arabs (638–969) (J. Kollwitz, *Antiochia am Orontes*: RAC [1950] 1, 461-463).

Christianity until the 7th century. *1. Origins.* *Hellenist Jewish Christians from *Jerusalem, arriving from Cyprus and Cyrenaica, preached the gospel there, with many converts. Here the disciples were first called Christians (Acts 11:19-26) (by *pagan authorities, the populace, the Christians themselves?). With the triumph of the *Pauline thesis of the noncircumcision of converts from paganism and the overcoming of the "incident at Antioch" between *Peter and *Paul (Gal 2:1-14), the Christian community of Antioch became more settled. Antioch's authority derived from the role it assumed in the mission to the pagans and from the organizational model for the new churches (Ch. Pietri, 94). It had a particular role in *theology and *apologetics (*Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, see R.M. Grant). Christianity penetrated the rural zones only with difficulty in Syria, due to the presence of Semitic divinities, reinterpreted according to Greek *mythology. It also clashed with Jewish Christian sects and Jewish proselytism, as shown by the **Didascalia Apostolorum* (3rd or 4th c.) (see H.J.W. Drijvers, *The Persistence of Pagan Cults and Practices in Christian Syria*, in *East of Byzantium*, Washington 1982, 35-43). The *Ad Autoycum* of Theophilus (169–188) attests the link, still strong, between *Judaism and Christianity (R.M. Grant, *Theophilus of Antioch ad Autolycum*, Oxford 1970, XVIII). Antioch was distinguished in the 3rd c. along with Alexandria: episcopal synods presided over by its bishop, e.g., *Paul of Samosata (261–272), indicated its ecclesiastical-political importance. Paul of Samosata was *excommunicated and deposed (268–269), accused of *adoptionism (the Logos did not have a personal substance) and for practices of the old Syriac and Jewish Christian tradition (alternate choirs sang the refrain of hymns, see J. Gélineau, 1960).

2. Persecution and the peace of Constantine. Antioch survived the crisis of the *persecutions, even those of *Diocletian and *Licinius, recovering through *Constantine's favor (306–337). There was also a violent persecution under *Valens (364–378), who resided at Antioch and favored the *homoians: Bishop *Meletius was exiled for the third time,

Catholic churches were requisitioned and "*Nicene" Christians harassed by the emperor. Meletius was proposed by *Theodosius (379–395) as president of the Council of *Constantinople (381) but died in the first months of that year. The literary polemic of *Libanius and the emperor *Julian was opposed at Antioch with public demonstrations. In 362 Julian accused Christian teachers, who commented on classical pagan works, of teaching what was contary to their beliefs. They should instead explain Matthew and Luke in the "Galilean" [i.e., Christian] churches and refrain from teaching classical culture (*Ep*. 36; see H.-I. Marrou, 422-424) and proceeded to establish an alternative church with a creed, prayers, a sacrament (*baptism) and charitable works. He alienated the Christians, writing the *Misopogon,* that is, "The Beard-Hater," against them. His project was interrupted by his death in battle against the Persians (363): "You won, O Galilean!" (*Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *HE* III, 20; see Soz. *HE* VI, 2). In 390 *John Chrysostom considered Antioch almost completely Christian (*Adv. Jud*. 1,4: PG 48, 849), with few pagans and a strong Jewish community (Theod., *HE* III,9-12: PG 82, 1101-1108). The increase in the number of faithful in the city and the evangelization of the countryside modified the structure of the local episcopal church: new churches were built, esp. after the peace of *Constantine (313), including the splendid "Great Church," with octagonal central plan and gilded dome, begun by Constantine, finished by *Constantius II (337–361) and dedicated in the presence of the many bishops of the council "in Encaeniis" (341) (Theod., *HE* III, 8: PG 82, 1099). Surrounded by attached buildings in the new city, Chrysostom preached there regularly (the cathedral?). The "Old Church" (Palaia) in the old city, rebuilt after a persecution and finished by Bishop *Philogonius (319–324), was contested by the various religious groups. On the periphery was the sanctuary of the Maccabees; another church was that of Romanus and Drosis; others were dedicated to saints in the 5th c. (W. Eltesten, *Die Kirchen*, 286). The developments in Christianity beginning in the 4th c. are also confirmed by the density of episcopal sees: 80 bishops of the civil dioceses of the East were present at the Council of *Nicaea, 130 at *Chalcedon (R. Devreesse, 1945). New construction was carried out outside of Antioch in the 5th c. (G. Dagron, 1978, 58-63). Nevertheless, in the late 4th c. there was still a pagan and Jewish minority of approximately 10 percent (J.H.W.G. Liebeschütz, 1972, 224-241; J. Kollwitz, *Antiochia am Orontes*: RAC [1950] 1, 463-468).

3. *Patriarchate: origin and evolution*. The organization of the vast civil diocese of the East, of which Antioch was administrative capital, for a long time followed the model of political organization. Antioch was considered the mother church (P. Maraval, *Storia del Cristianesimo*, 841; on the bishops of Antioch, see ibid., 842). The **Didascalia Apostolorum* describes the separation between clergy and faithful in the ecclesial community, in which the offices of ecclesiastics depended on the bishop, whose qualities were listed (F. Nau, *La Didascalie*, 1912, ch. IV, 39-44): he is his community's presbyter, as well as its prophet, head, guide and sovereign (ibid., ch. VIII, 75). Below the bishop are presbyters with nonpriestly functions, acting as the bishop's advisors (ibid., ch. IX, 88); the deacons in the bishop's service are his ears, mouth and heart (ibid., c. IX, 88), intermediaries with the laity (ibid., c. IX, 84), about whose needs they must keep him informed (ibid., ch. XVI, 135-137); next are the inferior ministries (ibid., ch. XVI, 134-135). The *Traditio Apostolica,* on the one hand, presents a hierarchy in an embryonic state; the *Didascalia,* on the other hand, presents the growing predominance of the bishop (A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hierarchie*, 1977, 170). Can. 6 of the Council of Nicaea (325) reconfirmed Antioch's privileges, along with *Alexandria, *Rome and *Jerusalem, implying that the bishop of Antioch was also a supermetropolitan: from this grew the *patriarchates, influenced in their development by geographic-political-economic centrality, cultural importance and the apostolic origin—the "Petrine principle"—of the see itself. Antioch dared not protest can. 3 of the Council of Constantinople (381) (primacy of honor to Constantinople—the "new Rome"—with the old Rome next on the list). The council reconfirmed the Nicene privileges in Antioch's regard, as principal see of the "diocese" of the East; *Boniface I (418–422), however, formulated the subordination of Antioch (and Alexandria) to Rome (*Ep*. 14,1). *Severus of Antioch and the Severians, intransigent *monophysites (*Eutychians), rejected the formula of the Council of Chalcedon (451) as Nestorianizing. Monophysite candidates succeeded to the patriarchal sees, including *Peter the Fuller (470-471) at Antioch, under whose influence an imperial edict condemned the Chalcedonian Creed and the Dogmatic Epistle of *Leo I; 500 bishops were obliged to assent. Against Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria preferred to defend themselves without the pope. The patriarch of Antioch (482) accepted the **Henoticon,* prepared by *Acacius and promulgated by *Zeno. The national (Nestorian) church of *Persia detached itself from the patriarchate of Antioch under Metropolitan Babaj of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon

(497–503), who took the title of *catholicos (patriarch). Cyprus had already detached in 488, having demonstrated its apostolic origin (the supposed tomb of *Barnabas), a principle which Rome always held to: relations between Rome and the patriarchates, always tense, are one of the most pronounced features of church history. Pope *Hormisdas (514–523) wrote the emperor, exhorting him to work for unity of faith at Antioch (and at Alexandria). *Justinian (527–565) himself acknowledged Antioch as in the fourth position, after Rome, Constantinople and Alexandria. *Isidore, archbishop of Seville (600–636), for whom a patriarch was one who held an apostolic see, cites Rome, Antioch and Alexandria as such (*Etymol.* 7,12,5). From Antioch we have the first effective systematic collection of canon law, now titled *Collectio LXXVIII capitum*. The first *Nomocanon* (or "of the fifty titles"), containing ecclesiastical-imperial law, seems to have been composed here (late 5th c.). The *Notitia Antiochena* seems to date from the second half of the 6th c.

4. Arab domination. The patriarchate of Antioch, weakened by dissensions, fell under Arab rule in 637, followed by Jerusalem (638) and Alexandria (642).

5. Monasticism. *Monasticism flourished in the 4th c. at Antioch, as had *Encratism in the 2nd c. Theses maintaining that poverty and complete abstinence derived exclusively from Persian or *Manichean influence, on the one hand, or that the primitive Syrian church derived exclusively from an *ascetical movement, on the other hand, are unsustainable. An autonomous origin of Syrian eremitic life is possible; it received Egyptian influence in the post-Constantinian era (*Athanasius's *Vita Antonii*). Many hermits and monks lived in the mountains N and W of Antioch (Amanus and Silpius). It seems *anchorism was the first form of monastic life, its various forms sharing a common trait: the extreme rigor of *ascesis. Rigorous monasticism, at times bizarre in its expression, assumed forms of eremitism, including stylitism and anchorism, as on Antioch's periphery. Monasticism was respected, at first having no cultural interests and establishing itself through social-charitable and missionary action, for the most part with respect for the ecclesiastical hierarchy. *Chrysostom invited the monks to evangelize; when he was bishop of Constantinople, Syrian monks offered themselves for a mission in Phoenicia. In 387 monks took part in the anti-imperial rebellion at Antioch and were reproached for it by *Theodosius I (379–385), who forbade them to live in the city (CTh XVI, 3,1; IX, 40,16). *Nestorius lived in a monastery near Antioch. The distinctive sign of monks vis-à-vis the laity, for Chrysostom and others, was not the pursuit of perfection, an obligation common to all, but *celibacy: beyond evangelical perfection, monasticism was an *eschatological sign of the kingdom of God. A promoter of monasticism in the West was *John Cassian, previously a deacon at Constantinople with Chrysostom and then a priest at Antioch. Antimonastic lay currents at Antioch (4th-5th c.) considered the monks corruptors of youth, enticing them to the desert.

6. Charity. The fervent preaching at Antioch was made credible by charitable works, directed by a deacon and assisted by deaconesses and widows, in response to enormous needs. Chrysostom provides us with a 4th-c. example: 3000 virgins and widows assisted daily. Hospitals and hospices aided prisoners, the sick, convalescents and foreigners (*In Matth. hom.* 66,3: PG 58, 630). Financial resources (ecclesiastical goods) were supplemented by the not-very-generous offerings of the faithful. Chrysostom considered alms a first duty of the faithful, in proportion to one's wealth justly acquired; his aim was social solidarity, according to a Christian social "utopia." Only a few rich people gave (private) *agape to the poor (*In 1 Thess. hom.* 11,5: PG 62, 468). Chrysostom criticized euergetism, by which one squandered his fortune to finance spectacles, only for popular acclaim (*Inan. glor.* 4-7).

7. Missionary activity. Converts increased under Bishop Theophilus at the end of the 2nd c. (*Ad Autol.* I-III), and already in its first half in Osrhoene, E Syria and *Edessa (*Addai and Haggai); they also increased between *Nisibis and the Euphrates (see the inscription of *Abercius). A synod was held at Edessa (Eus., *HE* V, 23,4). Antioch was also involved in this movement: Bishop *Palut of Edessa was consecrated at Antioch (190). From Edessa the missionary movement spread to the surrounding countryside, as far as Mesopotamia.

The 3rd c. saw internal consolidation and external development, and the "school of Antioch" flourished. Antioch became an active missionary center (for central Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia and Persia). 22 bishops from W Syria went to Nicaea (325), 2 of them *chorbishops in the countryside. At the start of *Diocletian's persecutions (303), Syrian prisons "were everywhere full of bishops, presbyters and deacons, lectors and *exorcists" (Eus., *HE* VIII, 6).

At the beginning of the period spanning the 4th-6th c., most of Syria's rural population was Christian, as archaeological (G. Tchalenko) and epigraphical (L. Jalabert) evidence shows. During the Council of Chalcedon the patriarchate of Antioch had 130 episcopal sees (R. Devreesse). Chrysostom notes the persistence of pagan practices and mindsets, and the

attraction of Judaism (M. Simon, 1964, 356-363; R.L. Wilken, 1983), as also outside Antioch, like at Apamea and Harran, near Edessa (R. Trombley, 1993, 123-129). Monks were active in evangelization and social assistance (e.g., the stylites). Antioch evangelized the Arab nomads in E Syria (a bishop of the Arabs was at the Synod of Antioch of 363). From Syria, evangelization spread to N India, with the religious assistance of the communities of S India. Cyprus was declared autonomous from Antioch (Council of *Ephesus 431). Laypeople were expected to play a significant missionary role, as witnesses: "There would be no pagans left if we were true Christians" (Chrys., *In Ep. ad Tim. hom.* 10,3; PG 62, 551). We can conclude that "the local episcopal churches sustained the mission in the territories of the empire" (K. Baus, *Storia d. Chiesa*, II, 233).

The period from the 7th to the 9th c. saw Christianity under Islamic rule. Byzantine Syria fell under Islam in 636. The treaty with the Christians of S Arabia was also valid for Syria, and ecclesiastical life went on in relative freedom; it became difficult under the Caliph Abd-al Malik (685–705). The imperial church lost vast territories, including Antioch. Two divisions were created: the *"orthodox" church coincided with the imperial church, and vast areas of the *monophysite and *Nestorian churches coincided with the lands conquered by Islam. Islam recognized the Byzantine emperor as a protector of the Christians, and he in turn, for obvious reasons, flaunted this role over the *Melkite patriarchates of Syria and Egypt, which were unable to assert their own rights over Islam.

DHGE 3,563-703; DACL 1,2359-2427; EC 1, 1455ff.; *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Fr. tr. F. Nau, *La Didascalie des douze apôtres*, Paris 1912; A. Harnack, *Missione e propagazione del Cristianesimo nei primi tre secoli*, Milan 1906; H. Dieckmann, *Antiochien, ein Mittelpunkt urchristlicher Missionstätigkeit*, Aachen 1920; S. Bouchier, *A Short History of Antiochia*, Oxford 1921; J. Schmidlin, *Manuale di storia delle missioni cattoliche*, I, Milan 1927, 17-126; W. Eltester, *Die Kirchen Antiochias in IV. Jahrhundert*: ZNTW 36 (1937) 251-286; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche, depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie, Essai sur la génèse, la forme et l'usage liturgique du culte chrétien en Syrie du III^e siècle à la comquête musulmane*, Paris 1947; G. Haddad, *Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic Roman Period*, Chicago 1949; J. Kollwitz, *Antiochia am Orontes*: RAC [1950] 1, 461-469; G. Downey, *Ancient Antioch*, Princeton, NJ 1968; J.A. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne*, Paris 1969; J.H.W.G. Liebeschütz, *Antioch, City and Imperial Administration in the Late Roman Empire*, Oxford 1972; G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton NJ ³1974; A. Momigliano (ed.), *Il conflitto tra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel secolo IV*, Turin 1975; O. Pasquato, *Gli spettacoli in S. Giov. Crisostomo. Paganesimo e cristianesimo ad A. e Costantinopoli*, OCA 201 (Rome 1976); K. Baus, *Storia della Chiesa*, II, Milan 1977, 129-244; Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III/2, Turin ³1977, 711-729, 399-417; W. A. Meeks, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries*, Missoula, MT 1978; R. Brändle, *Matth. 25,3-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomos*, Tübingen 1979; A. Natali, *Église et évergetisme à Antioche à la fin du IV^e siècle d'après Jean Chrysostome*: SP 17/3, Oxford-Paris 1982, 1176-1184; R.L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983; O. Pasquato, *Eretici e cattolici ad Antiochia in Giovanni Crisostomo: eresia ed eresiologia nella Chiesa antica*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 833-852; R. Brändle, *Christen und Juden in Antiochien in den Jahren 386/87. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte altkirchlicher Judenfeindschaft*: Judaica 43 (1987) 142-160; A. Vööbus, *History of Ascetism*, III, Louvain 1988, 227-278; G.M. Columbás, *Il monachesimo delle origini*, 1, Milan 1990, 137-169 (Syrian monasticism); L. Cracco Ruggini, *Poteri in gara per la salvezza di città ribelli: il caso di Antiochia (387 d.C.): Hestiasis. Misc. S. Calderone*, Messina 1991, 265-290; R.A. Krupp, *Shepherding the Flock of God: The Pastoral Theology of John Chrysostom*, New York 1991; F. Van de Paverd, *St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction* (OCA, 239) Rome 1991; P. Brown, *Body and Society,* New York ²2008; J.H.W.G. Liebeschütz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom*, Oxford ²1992; J.-N. Guinot, *L'Homélie sur Babylas de Jean Chrysostom: la victoire du martyr sur l'hellénisme*, in *La narrativa cristiana antica* (SEA 50), Rome 1995, 323-341; P. Klosvogt, *Leben zur Verherrlichung Gottes. Botschaft des Johannes Chrysostomos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pastoral "Hereditas,"* Bonn 1992; L. Zappella, *Introduzione a: Giovanni Crisostomo, Le catechesi battesimali*, Milan 1998, 9-125; J.-M. Salamito, *Cristianizzazione e vita sociale [312–430]*: Storia del Christianity, 2, 633-672; O. Pasquato, *I laici in Giovanni Crisostomo. Tra Chiesa, famiglia e città*, Rome ²2001; B. Flusin, *Lo sviluppo del monachesimo orientale*: Storia del Cristianesimo, 3, 531-544; A. Miranda, *Ministero presbiterale e autorità spirituale in Giovanni Crisostomo. I fondamenti e lo spazio ideale del presbitero nella Chiesa tra IV e V secolo*, in *Historiam Perscrutari*. Miscellanea di studi offerti al prof. Ottorino Pasquato, ed. M. Maritano, Rome 2002, 793-813; P. Maraval, *La Siria*: Storia del Cristianesimo, 1, 485-488.

O. Pasquato

II. Councils

1. From 268 to 389.

268. A number of bishops (the sources give 70 or 80; the synodal letter has 16 signatures) from *Syria, *Palestine and *Asia Minor met at Antioch to judge the local bishop Paul of Samosata, accused of *heresy and immorality. Previous attempts to bring accusations against him had failed. This time the council fathers, including *Helenus of Tarsus, *Hymenaeus of Jerusalem and *Theotecnus of Caesarea (Palestine), entrusted the accusation to the priest *Malchion, who convicted Paul of *monarchianism; he was condemned and deposed. Eusebius (*HE* VII, 27-30), our main source, read the synodal letter and gives extracts, and the account of the debate between Paul and Malchion—of which we have only fragments—not all certainly authentic, though doctrinally very important.

324–325. During the *Arian controversy, when

*Constantine had already convoked the ecumenical council at *Ancyra (later transferred to *Nicaea), many Eastern bishops (the synodal letter has 59 signatures) from Palestine, Syria and Asia Minor met at Antioch (late 324 to early 325) under the presidency of *Ossius of Cordoba. They confirmed the condemnation that *Alexander of Alexandria had earlier inflicted on the Arians, published a formula of anti-Arian faith and provisionally suspended from their communion *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Theodotus of Laodicea and *Narcissus of Neronias, who had refused to subscribe to the formula, while demanding that the problem be settled at the next ecumenical council. We know this council only from the Syriac translation of the synodal letter, whose authenticity, long doubted, now seems beyond dispute.

ca. 327. The anti-Nicene reaction, encouraged by Constantine himself, began immediately after the Council of Nicaea ended. In ca. 327 a council met at Antioch, presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea and attended by bishops hostile to those supporting the Nicene decisions; probably on the same occasion (the course of events cannot be exactly reconstructed) they deposed *Eustathius of Antioch (accused of immorality) and *Asclepas of Gaza (accusation unknown). This same council, or one held shortly after it, promoted 25 disciplinary canons because of the confusion provoked by the succession to Eustathius; these canons clarified relations between deacons, priests and bishops within the same diocese and between dioceses.

338. *Eusebius of Nicomedia and some bishops of his party met (1) to repeat the arguments already variously adopted against *Athanasius, (2) to highlight the irregularity of his return to Alexandria upon Constantine's death and (3) to provide him a successor, who—after the refusal of Eusebius, future bishop of Emesa—was chosen in the person of *Gregory of Cappadocia. *Constantius undertook to install him at Alexandria with the help of the army.

341 (*in Encaeniis*). In autumn 341, on the occasion of the dedication of the Great Church at Antioch, 97 Eusebian Eastern bishops met under *Flaccillus, bishop of Antioch, to respond to accusations made against them by the Council of *Rome some months earlier. Four professions of faith have reached us in connection with this council. The first, short and general, rejects Julius of Rome's charge of Arianism. The second formula, the council's official creed and much longer, is silent on the Nicene **homoousios,* adopts *Origen's doctrine of the three divine *hypostases, condemns the propositions of radical Arianism and strongly emphasizes the divinity of the Son, though slightly subordinate to the Father. The text attempts to exclude radical Arianism without adhering to the Nicene Creed; it probably repeats (we do not know how literally) an earlier text of *Lucian of Antioch. The third formula, presented by Theophronius of Tyana, general like the first, was perhaps presented as a guarantee of his *orthodoxy. The fourth formula was not properly published at the council but presented a year later to Constans, at *Milan, by a commission of Eusebian bishops trying to attenuate the dispute between East and West. It seems to be an abbreviation of the second formula.

357. *Eudoxius, pro-Arian bishop of Antioch, convened a council of those of his orientation, including *Acacius of Caesarea and *Uranius of Tyre. The council approved the formula of *Sirmium published shortly before, which proscribed the terms *homoousios* and **homoiousios*.

360/361. A few months after *Meletius's election as bishop of Antioch (he having openly declared himself anti-Arian), a council of pro-Arian exponents, promoted by *Constantius, deposed him on disciplinary charges and replaced him with *Euzoius, Arius's old friend.

ca. 362. Euzoius gathered a small council of nine pro-Arian bishops to rehabilitate the radical Arian *Aetius, who was condemned at the Council of *Constantinople of 360 and who shortly before then had been consecrated bishop by radical Arian bishops like himself.

363. During the anti-Arian reaction that followed Constantius's death (362), Meletius convened at Antioch some 20 homoiousian and *homoian bishops from Syria and Palestine. They accepted, *pro bono pacis,* the Nicene Creed of 325, but in the letter communicating this decision to the emperor *Jovian they gave the term *homoousios* a wide interpretation, in the sense that the Son, generated from the Father's *ousia,* is like him in *ousia*. In this way *homoousios* was taken in the sense of *homoiousios*. At this council were, among others, Acacius of Caesarea and *Eusebius of Samosata, *Basil of Caesarea's good friend.

379. In autumn of this year Meletius gathered ca. 150 Eastern bishops, among them *Gregory of Nyssa, to reply to the West's refusal to recognize the validity of his episcopal election. The council fathers, all pro-Meletian, rejected Pope *Damasus's demand that Meletius resign his see to *Paulinus; but, to lessen the tension, they published a formula of faith (lost), and subscribed to some anti-Arian and anti-*Apollinarian documents sent to them by the West.

ca. 380. We know that ca. 380 *Eunomius and various exponents of radical Arianism, including *Theophilus the Indian, met at Antioch to reorganize

their party after the death of *Valens, who had persecuted them. But the promulgation of Theodosius's anti-Arian edicts (27 February 380 and 10 January 381) put an end to their plans.

383. A council under *Flavian of Antioch condemned the *Messalians for the excesses of their *Encratite tendencies.

389. A provincial council forbade the sons of Marcellus of Apamea, killed by pagans while directing the destruction of one of their temples, to avenge his death.

268: G. Bandy, *Paul de Samosate*, Louvain 1929, 283-352; H. de Riedmatten, *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate*, Fribourg 1952; J.A. Fischer, *Die antiochenischen Synoden gegen Paulus von Samosata*: AHC 18 (1986) 9-30; H.C. Brennecke, *Zum Prozess gegen Paul von Samosata: die Frage nach die Verurteilung des Homoousios*: ZNTW 75 (1984) 270-290; V. Burrus, *Rhetorical Stereotypes in the Portrait of Paul of Samosata*: VChr 43 (1989) 215-225; L. Perrone, *L'enigma di Paolo di Samosata: dogma, Chiesa e società nella Siria del III secolo; prospettive di un ventennio di studi*: Cristianesimo nella storia 13 (1992) 253-327; M. Simonetti, *Per la rivalutazione di alcune testimonianze su Paolo di Samosata*, in Id., *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo*, Rome 1993, 238-271; S.K. McCarthy, *Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition*: JTS, n.s., 45 (1994) 545-568.

324–325: E. Seeberg, *Die Synode von Antiochien im Jahre 324/325*, Berlin 1913; Simonetti 38-41; A. Harnack, *Die angebliche Synode von Antiochia im Jahre 324/5*: Id., *Kleine Schriften zur alten Kirche*, Bd. 2 (= Opuscula 9/2), Leipzig 1980, 1-15; 16-40; T.E. Pollard, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Synod of Antioch (324/5)*, in Fr. Paschke (ed.), *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (= Texte u. Unters. Z. Gesch. D. alchristlich. Lit. 125), Berlin 1981, 459-464; H. Chadwick, *Ossius of Cordova and the Presidency of the Council of Antioch, 325*, in Id., *History and Thought of the Early Church* (= Variorum reprints), London 1982, nr. 13; L. Abramowski, *The Synod of Antioch 324/5 and Its Creed*, in Id., *Formula and Context: Studies in Early Christian Thought*, London 1992; A. Logan, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325 Antioch, Ancyra and Nicaea*: JTS 43 (1992) 428-446.

ca. 327: Hfl-Lecl 1,641-647; F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, Paris 1905, 37-41; Simonetti 105-107.

338: Simonetti, 143.

341: Hfl-Lecl 1,702-733; Simonetti, 153-159; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 284ff.; M. Tetz, *Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien 341 und Marcellus von Ancyra. Zu der Glaubenserklärung des Theophronius von Tyana und ihren Folgen*: *Oecumenica et Patristica. Festschr. F.W. Schneemelcher*, Stuttgart 1989, 199-218; G. Feige, *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner*, Leipzig 1991, 135-138; W. Schneemelcher, *Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien 341*, in Id., *Reden und Aufsätze. Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte und zum ökumenischen Gespräch*, Tübingen 1991, 94-125; K. Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, Berlin 1994.

357: Hfl-Lecl 1,2,903; Simonetti, 237.

360/361: Hfl-Lcl 1,2,903; Simonetti, 344-345.

362–363: Hfl-Lecl 1,2,972-973; Cavallera, 123-125; Simonetti, 357-358, 374-375; G. Feige, *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra*, 156-158; A. Camplani, *Atanasio e Eusebio tra Alessandria e Antiochia (362-363): osservazioni sul* Tomus at Antiochenos, *l'*Epistula catholica *e due fogli copti* (*edizione di Pap. Berol. 11948*), in E. Dal Covolo - R. Uglione - G.M. Vian (eds.), Rome 1997, 191-246; J. Zachhuber, *The Antiochene Synod of AD 363 and the Beginning of Neo-Nicenism*: Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 4 (2000) 83-100.

379: Hfl-Lecl 2,29-30; Cavallera, 212-214; Simonetti, 446-447; R. Staats, *Die römische Tradition im Symbol von 381 und seine Enstehung auf der Synode von Antiochien 379*: VChr 44 (1990) 209-221.

ca. 380: Simonetti 453.

383: Mansi 3,651-662; C. Stewart, "*Working the Earth of the Hearth*": *the Messalian Controversy in History, Texts and Language to AD 431*, Oxford 1991; R. Staats, *Messalianer*: TRE 22 (1992) 607-613.

389: Hfl-Lecl 2,75.

M. Simonetti

2. *From 424 to 565.*

424. Condemnation of *Pelagius (Mansi IV, 474; Hfl-Lecl II/1, 214).

432. Pseudo-council (Mansi V, 1147-1150; Hfl-Lecl II/I, 382).

432. *John of Antioch convened the bishops favorable to *Nestorius, hoping for a reconciliation. The attempt to subscribe to at least one of the six propositions (not heretical, but misunderstanding Nestorius's position as legitimate) failed, and the bishops who signed Nestorius's deposition resumed *communion with Rome and the East (433) (Mansi V, 1055-1060; Hfl-Lecl II/I, 387; 398).

435. The works of *Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, orthodox in themselves but susceptible to heretical interpretations (as in fact was the case with the Nestorians), were examined but not condemned (Mansi V, 1081-1086; see O. Pasquato, *Teodosio di Mopsuestia: Introduzione ai Padri della Chiesa*, *Secoli IV e V*, Turin 1995, 394-396).

440 (according to Theophane). John of Antioch held a second council to defend Theodore of Mopsuestia against the accusations of *Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople. He sent letters praising Theodore to Proclus, Theodosius and *Cyril of Antioch (Mansi V, 1201-1202; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat,* 54).

445. Under John's successor *Domnus, archbishop of Antioch, Bishop Athanasius of Pena (Euphrates), self-reelected after dismissal for appropriation of ecclesiastical goods, was deposed as contumacious (Mansi VI, 465-466; VII, 274-275; Hfl-Lecl II/1, 479-480; R. Devreesse, 287).

447 or 448. Domnus and other bishops met to

judge *Ibas of Edessa, who had succeeded *Rabbula and was accused of Nestorianism and appropriation of ecclesiastical goods. The accusation failed because two of the four deacons of Edessa accusing him fled to Constantinople and were therefore *excommunicated (Mansi VI, 495-496; VII, 219, 271; Hfl-Lecl II/1, 490; R. Devreesse, 57).

471. The monk of St. Bassa at Chalcedon, the self-elected first *monophysite patriarch of Antioch after *Martyrius's forced resignation, was condemned to exile. He held, against Chalcedon (451), that Christ's human and divine natures were natural coprinciples (Mansi VII, 999-1000; Hfl-Lecl II/2,907; R. Devreesse, 65, 118).

478. *Peter the Fuller was deposed after two years as patriarch of Antioch. *John of Apamea was elected but was replaced after three months, as a monophysite sympathizer, by Stephen (Mansi VII, 1017-1018, 1176).

482. John Cadonatus was elected to succeed Stephen, martyred by the monophysites, but *Acacius of Constantinople, following *Zeno's instructions, chose the loyal Calendio, who held a synod at Antioch which recognized him as the legitimate bishop (Mansi VII, 1023-1024; Hfl-Lecl II/2, 915).

485 (*illegitimate*). After the **Henoticon*, Acacius broke with Pope *Felix III, who deposed him. He in turn deposed the orthodox Calendio and reinstalled the *Apollinarist Peter the Fuller, who called an illegitimate council which condemned Chalcedon and added to the trisagion: *Qui crucifixus est pro nobis* (Mansi VII, 1165; R. Devreesse, 67).

508–509 (conciliabulus). At an illegal council, *Flavian, archbishop of Antioch, signed the equivocal text of the *Henoticon,* which approved the Councils of Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381) and Ephesus (431) but did not mention Chalcedon (451); the council condemned the works of *Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia and drew up four propositions (attributed to Acacius) apparently conflicting with Chalcedon (Mansi VIII, 347; Hfl-Lecl II/2, 1004; R. Devreesse, 68).

542. *Ephrem, bishop of Antioch (527–545), urged by the complaints of orthodox monks harassed by *Origenist monks, wrote a synodal letter condemning some of Origen's principles. At the urging of the Origenists, *Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem, removed Ephrem's name from the diptychs (Mansi IX, 23; Hfl-Lecl II/2, 1178).

565. *Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, and 195 bishops opposed *Julian of Halicarnassus's *aphthartodocetism (Christ's sufferings were real only by a miracle of his will), imposed by *Justinian (527–565) with a dogmatic edict. They wrote to Justinian (died 14 November 565), and circular letters were sent to the Nestorians against the heresy (Mansi IX, 767).

Mansi; Hfl-Lecl II/1-2; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche*, Paris 1945; Palazzini 51-56.

O. Pasquato

III. Schism. When Eustathius of Antioch was deposed and exiled during the anti-Nicene reaction (ca. 327), some of his loyal partisans separated themselves from the rest of the community, at that time headed by bishops directed by Eusebius of Caesarea, and for some decades constituted a small *schismatic community. They maintained their position even when in 360 Meletius, recently elected in place of the pro-Arian Eudoxius, who had been transferred to Constantinople, took an anti-Arian position and was himself immediately deposed and exiled. By the time Meletius returned from exile in 362, the controversy had become embittered because Lucifer of Cagliari, passing through Antioch, ordained as bishop the priest Paulinus, leader of the schismatic Eustathian community. There were now three Christian communities in Antioch, with three bishops: an Arian minority under Euzoius, an anti-Arian and Nicene minority under Paulinus, and an anti-Arian but not-Nicene majority under Meletius. Meletius's subsequent exile under Valens (ca. 365) did not change the situation; when he finally returned to his see (378), this time for good, unsuccessful attempts were made to address the schism, which had become a cause of division among anti-Arians, since the East supported Meletius, whereas Egypt and the West supported Paulinus. When Meletius died during the Council of Constantinople (381), *Gregory of Nazianzus's attempt to get Paulinus recognized as sole Catholic bishop of Antioch failed, and the council fathers substituted Flavian, who had been Meletius's right arm and was thus not recognized by Egypt or the West. When Paulinus died soon thereafter, the schismatics replaced him with *Evagrius, while Flavian resolutely refused to submit to a judgment called for by *Ambrose and the West. Finally in 398 Flavian was recognized by the West, Theophilus of Alexandria having recognized him some years earlier. But the schismatics, deprived of a bishop by Evagrius's death, did not give up; only after 413 did bishop Alexander succeed in reuniting them to the Catholic community, except for a small obstinate group, which remained in schism until ca. 482, when Calendio was bishop of Antioch.

F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, Paris 1905; Simonetti, 584;

A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, 541-565; A. Camplani, *Atanasio e Eusebio tra Alessandria e Antiochia (362–363): osservazioni sul* Tomus at Antiochenos, *l'*Epistula catholica *e due fogli copti (ed. di Pap. Berol. 11948)*, in E. Dal Covolo - R. Uglione - G.M. Vian (eds.), Rome 1997, 191-246, esp. 197-219; J. Zachhuber, *The Antiochene Synod of AD 363 and the Beginning of Neo-Nicenism*: Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 4 (2000) 83-100.

M. Simonetti

IV. Liturgy (i.e., orthodox, not *Jacobite). From the 13th c. it merged with the *Byzantine rite.

1. From origins to the 5th c. In apostolic times the Christian community of Antioch celebrated the *liturgy in Greek (Acts 9–11; Letter of Ignatius), which passed to Jerusalem and was there translated into Aramaic. Even modified, it inspired other Eastern rites. As Antioch's influence increased (150 suffragan bishops at Nicaea, 325), its liturgy, not oral but textually fixed, spread to the other churches (patriarchate of Antioch). The homilies of John Chrysostom at Antioch (386–397) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) prove that this liturgy had taken form by the end of the 4th c. (Brightmann; F. Van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia* [OCA 187], Rome 1970, 468-536). The modern-day liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, however, was not composed by him; work still needs to be done on its origins. Antiochene influences entered the Byzantine liturgy through Chrysostom, who lived at Antioch before going to Constantinople. *Mark is said to have introduced the Antiochene rite into Egypt (= Alexandrian rite). *Theodoret of Cyrrhus treats of the divine office (*Hist. rel.*, PG 82, 1283-1496). Diodore of Tarsus and Flavian, as deacons, introduced antiphonal *chant. Besides the morning and evening synaxis, the **Apostolic Constitutions* (4th c.), book VIII, present the formulary of the *Mass: readings from the OT, from the epistles, from the gospel and a homily by the bishop; departure of the *catechumens and public *penitents; prayer of the faithful, *kiss of peace and bishop's salutation, washing of hands, offertory, *eucharistic prayer, preface and *sanctus,* account of the eucharistic institution, *anamnesis, *epiclesis; prayer for the church, for the living and the dead, prayers of preparation for communion, *sancta sanctis,* Communion and thanksgiving after Communion; bishop's final blessing. From Jerusalem (see A. Renoux [ed.], *Le codex arménien Jerusalem 121.I. Introduction aux origines de la liturgie hierosolymitaine. Lumières nouvelles*, Turnhout 1969), to which the Antiochene liturgy owes much, the liturgy of St. James spread to the patriarchate of Antioch, later to be included in the Byzantine rite.

2. From 451, Council of Chalcedon, to the 7th c. With the separation of the monophysites a dissident patriarchate was set up at Antioch, but monophysites and Syrian Catholics both used the Antiochene rite. With the ecclesiastical supremacy of Constantinople in the East, the Byzantine rite came to be used more; the Antiochene was used only by the Jacobites. Then arose the Melkite rite, more closely related with that of the Byzantine Empire, in which *Romanus Melodus (6th c.) had great success with his *kontakia,* which imitated the Syriac poetry of St. *Ephrem and the rhythmical Greek homilies; these supplemented or replaced the homily. The so-called Syro-Occidental rite (= Antiochene rite) is opposed to the Syro-Eastern rite, which made itself independent of Antioch and coincides with the regions of *Mesopotamia and Chaldea. Those who passed from Nestorianism to orthodoxy are called Chaldeans. The Indian Malankar rite derived from the Syro-Occidental; the *Malabar rite is of Syro-Eastern origin. Both are a result of evangelization from Antioch. The language changed from Greek to Syriac (4th-5th c.), which flourished again in the 10th-15th c.

3. Feasts of the liturgical year. *Easter was preceded by *Lent, which differed in the various local churches but became more uniform in the 4th c. At Antioch it was for eight weeks of five days. John Chrysostom informs us about the 4th-c. catechumenate (see *Huit Catéchèses baptismales inédites*, ed. A. Wenger, SC 50). Information on *baptism comes to us from the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (see V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du II^e au IV^e siècle*, in Settimane di Studio [. . .] XXXIII, Spoleto 1987 [repr. 1982], 217-218; see O. Pasquato, *Catecumenato-Discepolato*, in DPAC I). Holy Week was crowned by the Sacred Triduum (*Apos. Con.* V, 18). The Easter cycle closed with the feast of *Pentecost 50 days later. In the 4th c. were added the feasts of Christmas (origin uncertain) and *Epiphany (Eastern origin) (J. Leclercq, DACL V, 197). Also, Sunday replaced the Jewish Sabbath.

4. Divine office. The day was punctuated by hours of *prayer in church: prayer before the cock's crow, matins, terce, sext, none, evening and night prayers. Monks and clerics were obliged to keep them. We have abundant information for the 4th c. (*Apos. Con.* 1,2,59; ed. Funk, 171-173; ibid., VIII, 34,1-7; op. cit., 541; Counc. Laod., can. 1,8; ed. Johannou, 1,2,137, Rome 1963; Hfl-Lecl, XII/2, 1965-1966). Laypeople were also present (Chrys., *De Anna Sermo* 4,5: PG 54, 668); but one could pray anywhere if they were unable to go to a church during the day (ibid., 4,5: PG 54, 667). At the start of the day everyone had to praise God in church: Ps 62 was sung (Chrys., *In ps.* 140,1: PG 55, 427). In the evening all returned to the

church to ask pardon: Ps 140 and other suitable psalms were sung (ibid.: PG 55, 427). Common propitiatory prayers were recited.

5. *Cult of the martyrs.* This underwent intensive development in the 4th c., favored by numerous *cemeteries: the cemetery (of the laity?) on the Daphne road, with the supposed *relics of St. *Ignatius (*Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 16: PL 23, 635), St. Babylas prior to his translation to Daphne, Domnina, Berenice and Prosdoce, Drosis, Juventinus and Maximinus. The celebration began with a nocturnal vigil with psalms, prayers and biblical readings; it included a pangeyric and celebration of the *Eucharist.

F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Const. Apostolorum*, Paderborn 1905; F.E. Brightmann, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, Appendix C.: *The liturgy of Antioch from the writings of J. Chrysostom*, 470-481; F. Cabrol, *Fêtes Chrétiennes (Les)*: DACL V/1, 1403-1452; A.A. King, *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*, 2 vols., London 1950; M.H. Sheperd Jr., *The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy*: DOP 15 (1961) 25-44; E.E. Finn, *Antiochene Rite, Liturgy of*: CE I, 629; P. Rentinck, *La cura pastorale*, 17-153 (*iniziazione cristiana*; *liturgia* e *culto*); J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins: Development and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (OCA 228), Rome 1987; A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991; Th.J. Talley, *Origins of the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville, MN [2]1991 (It. tr. 1991); P. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, London 1992; J.-P. Cattenoz, *Le baptême mystère nuptial. Théologie de Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Venasque 1993; P. Benoît - Ch. Munier, *Le Baptême dans l'Église ancienne. Ie-IIIe*, Berne 1994; J. Chrysostom, *Le catechesi battesimali*, ed. L. Zappella, Milan 1998; M.-Y. Perrin, *La diffusione delle reliquie*: Storia del Cristianesimo, 2, 566-568; P. Allen, *Severus of Antioch and Pastoral Care*: SP 35, Louvain 2001, 353-368; Id., *Severus of Antioch as a Source for Lay Piety in Late Antiquity*, in *Historiam Perscrutari.* Miscellanea di studi offerti al prof. Ottorino Pasquato, Rome 2002, 711-721; I. Oñatibia, *"Mens concordet voci" en la catequesis de san Juan Crisóstomo*, ibid., 815-827; M.A. Schatkin, *Advocate of Biblical Literacy*, ibid., 829-838.

O. Pasquato

V. School. This collective name is given to a group of exegetes and theologians, some of great importance (*Diodore of Tarsus, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *John Chrysostom, *Theodoret), active in Antioch in the last decades of the 4th c. and first decades of the 5th. The term *school* does not indicate a unified scholastic institution with an organized program of study supported by the local bishop, like the school of *Alexandria; it was, rather, a number of masters teaching in a personal capacity but sharing, both within their own circle and with culturally qualified exponents in the larger setting, the same basic approach to *exegesis and *theology. *Lucian of Antioch (second half 3rd c.), whose literalist approach clashed with Alexandrian *allegorism, is often considered the founder of the exegetical school, but the little we know of him does not justify this supposition. Indeed, the remote assumptions of the Antiochene school should be seen in the evident tendency of Asiatic learning both to a literalist exegesis, though not exclusively so, and to the full evaluation of the human component in Christ, along with the divine. In the encounter between Asiatic and Alexandrian cultures, so different in these respects, the greatest point of friction was at Antioch, as the episodes of *Paul of Samosata and Lucian of Antioch in the second half of the 3rd c. demonstrate: in the conflict the Antiochene tendencies hardened into an anti-Alexandrian polemical stance. *Eustathius of Antioch represents this well at the beginning of the 4th c., both by his exegetical polemic against *Origen, and in his anti-*Arian (= anti-Alexandrian) approach to *Christology, insisting on the integrity of the human nature assumed by the Logos, as professed by Arius. Eustathius represents the *trait-d'union* between Asiatic culture and the Antiochene school, but we cannot speak of a true and proper Antiochene school until toward the end of the 4th c., with Diodore. Literalists in exegesis, the Antiochenes considered Alexandrian exegesis excessive and arbitrary; while not denying that some OT passages should be interpreted allegorically as *typoi* and prophecies of Christ and of the church, they strictly limited their number and rejected the typically Alexandrian hermeneutical procedures (symbology of numbers, animals, plants etc., etymology of Hebrew names, real and presumed incoherences in the literal sense) so prominent in allegorical exegesis. Theodore, Diodore, and also Chrysostom were all rigid literalists; Theodoret, on the other hand, gave more room to a typological reading of the OT. Theologically, the Antiochenes shared the anti-Arian *trinitarian doctrine of *Nicaea, as elaborated by *Basil of Caesarea, which had spread throughout the East by the late 4th c. Their *Christology, however, displayed typical traits, once again opposed to that of Alexandria. The latter traditionally emphasized the divinity of the Logos, relegating his humanity to a subordinate position; the Antiochenes, rather, in polemic with Arians and *Apollinarists, exalted his humanity so high as to consider it another subject alongside the Logos, with the risk of compromising Christ's unity. Theodore of Mopsuestia was aware of this danger, but his repeated declarations of Christ's indivisibility, assured by the coming together of the two natures in a single **prosopon* did not satisfy the Alexandrians, who in turn seemed to the Antiochenes to be heirs to the errors of

Apollinaris. Hence the clash between *Nestorius and *Cyril of Alexandria and all that followed from it. It revealed the weakness of the pure Antiochene position (that of Nestorius and the early Theodoret); but even when the Antiochenes, out of conviction or necessity, abandoned it and fell back on the more moderate position of *Chalcedon, they found themselves in the minority in the larger Syrian world, by now dominated by the *monophysites, who carried Alexandrian Christology to its extreme consequences. The school declined, with no really significant representatives after Theodoret (first half 5th c.): its decline was also that of Greek culture in the face of reviving autochthonous Syrian forces. In the field of exegesis, the encounter with the Alexandrians was less dramatic and less unfavorable. It is true that allegorical exegesis, esp. of the OT, continued to be widely practiced; but the literalist tendency was no less widely practiced and in particular made its influence felt on allegorical exegesis, whose representatives, as a rule, learned to make more moderate use of their favorite hermeneutical tool. A typical example of the attitude that sought to blend the claims of the letter and those of allegory was Cyril of Alexandria himself, the great enemy of the Antiochenes.

A. Vaccari, *La teoria esegetica antiochena*: Biblica 15 (1934) 93-101; J. Guillet, *Les exégesès d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche. Conflit ou malentendu?*: RSR 34 (1947) 257-302; F.A. Seisdedos, *La "teoría" antioquena*: Estudios Biblicos 11 (1952) 31-67; P. Ternant, *La theoria d'Antioche dans le cadre des sens de l'Ecriture*: Biblica 34 (1953) 135-158, 354-383, 456-486; A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne*, Paris 1959; R.A. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian*, London 1961; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, London 1965, 243-270; 329-452; G.W. Ashby, *Theodoret of Cyrrus as Exegete of the Old Testament*, Grahamstone 1972; C. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Bonn 1974; B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégese. I: Les Péres grecs et orientaux*, Paris 1980, It. tr. Rome 1990, Eng. tr. Petersham, MA 1991; M. Simonetti, *Note sull'esegesi veterotestamentaria di Teodoro di Mopsuestia*: VetChr 14 (1977) 69-102; D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East*, Cambridge 1982; G.W. Ashby, *The Hermeneutic Approach of Theodoret of Cyrrus to the Old Testament*: SP 15, Berlin 1984, 131-135; M. Simonetti, *Interpretazione delle rubriche e destinazione dei Salmi nei "Commentarii in Psalmos" di Diodoro*: ASE 2 (1985) 79-92; Id., *Lettera e/o Allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985, 156-201; Id., *La tecnica esegetica di Teodoreto nel Commento ai Salmi*: VetChr 23 (1986) 81-116; L. Fatica, *I commentari a Giovanni di Teodoro di Mopsuestia e di Cirillo d'Alessandria: confronto tra metodi esegetici e teologici*, Rome 1988; S. Zincone, *Studi sulla visione dell'uomo in ambito antiocheno. Diodoro, Crisostomo, Teodoro, Teodoreto*, L'Aquila 1988; J.N. Guinot, *La typologie comme technique herméneutique*: *Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères*, Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 2, Strasbourg 1989; M. Simonetti (ed.), *Origene, Eustazio, Gregorio di Nissa. La maga di Endor*, Florence 1989; D. Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible: A Study on his Old Testament Exegesis*, New York 1989; J.N. Guinot, *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, Paris 1995; A. Viciano, *Das formale Verfahren der antiochenischen Schriftauslegung. Ein Forschungsüberblick*, in G. Schöllgen - C. Scholten, Stimuli. *Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik im Antike und Christentum. Festschr. f. Ernst Dassmann*, Münster 1996.

M. SIMONETTI

VI. Archaeology

Introduction. Excavations since 1932 by Princeton University have brought to light the extent and importance of the monuments of Antioch, a center of artistic activity. The *Roman conquest, following Greek rule, coincided with the city's architectural development, which continued into the Christian era but ceased, along with the Christian civilization itself, with the Muslim invasion of 637. Antioch measured 7 by 6 km (4.3 by 3.7 mi). "A city splendid and eminent for its public works" (*Expositio* 158), it has been called the Paris of the East for its beauty, and the Vienna of the 4th c. for its composite culture. An imperial see several times, it was one of the two poles, with *Edessa, of the Roman strategic system, and a meeting place of commercial routes. Lacking wood, the only construction material was stone (basalt); thus lacking beams and lintels, arches counterbalanced by external buttresses were used to sustain the stone ceiling slabs.

Christian church buildings. *1. Urban.* The "Great Church," a sumptuous octagon set in large grounds in the new city, on the island in the Orontes near the imperial palace (Eus., *Vita Const.* III, 50), is attested by a floor mosaic (5th c.) discovered at Yakto (Daphne) in 1932 (in *Antioch on the Orontes* I, 114-128). It was built on two levels, with splendid interior (Eus., *De laud. Const.:* PG 20, 1109), gilded flooring, and cupola and inlaid walls (Theophane, *Chronogr.:* PG 108, 111). It was dedicated to Christ (341) with an altar facing W [*sic*!] (Socr., *HE* V, 22; PG 67, 642). The "Old Church," or *Palaia,* was in the old city near other churches, such as those of the *Theotokos (built by *Justinian); St. Peter; St. Stephen; Sts. Cosmas and Damian; St. Thecla; the Holy Maccabees; St. Barlaam; St. Romanus; St. Leontius; St. Simeon; and the church where *Paulinus officiated in the time of bishop *Meletius (Socr., *HE* III, 9; PG 7, 404).

2. Extraurban. Church of St. Babylas, indentified by Lassus at Kaoussié near the Orontes, cruciform with four equal arms (25 x 11 m), continuations of a central area 16 m square: Bishop Meletius had it built in 381 and Babylas's relics, already brought by Julian to the cemetery of Antioch when they had silenced the oracle of Daphne, were placed there; Bishop Meletius was buried in the same *sarcophagus (Chrys., *De S. Babyla:* PG 50, 544). The floor was ornamented

by Bishop Flavian (387). Other churches were: St. Julian martyr; St. John, with baptistery, in the vicus Tiberinus; St. Martha; St. Michael; St. Paul Outside the Gates, discovered in 1936, with three naves, mosaic floor and narthex (D. Levi, *Antioch Mosaic*, 368); St. Simeon Stylites (late 5th c.) on the Aleppo Road (see W. Eltester, *Die Kirchen Antiochias*, 251-286; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires,* passim). Cemeterial monuments, though amply documented in texts, have few remains. The calendar of martyrial feasts can be reconstructed from the *Syriac martyrology (411) and the *Mart. hier.* We know one extraurban cemetery, on the Daphne road, with relics of many *martyrs (Chrys., *In coem. appl.*: PG 49, 393; 541), including *Ignatius, Bishop Babylas, Juventinus and Maximinus (Chrys., *In Juv. et Maxim:* PG 50, 571), and the virgin Drosis (Id., *De Dros.*: PG 50, 685). In a second cemetery outside the Porta Romanesia, Bishop Meletius had the bodies of the martyrs translated into a monument (Chrys., *In Ascens.* I: PG 50, 442). Beyond St. Paul's Gate many Christian tombs covered with mosaics have been discovered, facing a 5th c. church. There were also hospitals, hospices and monasteries.

Artistic monuments. *1. Introduction.* Antioch, birthplace of the Syro-Palestinian artistic style, was the cultural capital of Asia Minor. Decorative motifs of Antioch's mosaic floors recur in various miniatures, a sign of the influence of the Antiochene *scriptoria*. Antiochene influence is not improbable in the mosaics and inlays of the Orthodox baptistery at *Ravenna (C.R. Morey). Excessive ornamentation, tending toward polychromy using drills and a variety of materials, makes some scholars (e.g., C. Cecchelli) see Antiochene influence on the capitals of St. Mark's Venice, stolen by the Venetians from overseas.

2. Mosaics. The border of a splendid mosaic, with a symbolic bust of *Megalopsychia* in the center and forming part of the "Yakto complex," depicts buildings whose captions identify them as those of Daphne, including the "private bath" of Ardaburius, *magister militum* at Antioch in 459 at the time of the anxious translation of the body of St. Simeon Stylites into the city (Evagr., *HE* I, 13). We can make out the two springs of Pallas and Castalia, a semicircular *nymphaeum,* the Olympic stadium, the *ergasterion* of the martyrium, private houses near the "promenade," booths, rectangular houses of one or two floors in late Syrian style and scenes of daily life. One of the buildings can perhaps be identified with one of the early Christian three-aisled basilicas (H.C. Butler, *Early Churches,* 58, fig. 55). The transition from Late Antique to Early Medieval is attested by motifs of geometrical decoration, *pagan or otherwise, with an abundance of allegorical scenes, floors as if carpeted, interspersed with Persian motifs (ribbons or goats' heads). Of two mosaics decorated like carpets of rose petals, one has "a border of vine-shoots with birds, animals and grape-clusters, and, in the center of one long side, we note two superb peacocks flanking a basket of grapes, a decoration favored by a great many early Christian churches" (D. Levi, *Antiochia,* 427). The many mosaics attest the superstitions, religion, literary and philosophical tastes, and daily life of the Antiochenes, but almost exclusively that of the pagan, not the Christian, city.

3. Sculpture. A few sculptures and products of the minor arts, esp. silver, allow us to evaluate Antiochene sculpture. As for the famous "Antioch Chalice," adorned, like so much sculpture of the first *Byzantine golden age, with embossed decoration, discovered in 1910 and now in New York, both its Antiochene provenance and its date are disputed (from AD 50/70 to the 6th c., for de Jerphanion). The mosaic discovered at Habr Hiram is part of the same artistic tendency.

Christian epigraphy. A mosaic in the N aisle of the cruciform church of Kaoussié records Bishop Flavian of Antioch, who consecrated *John Chrysostom to the priesthoood in 386 and, in the revolt against the imperial statutes, hastened to beg Theodosius I to spare the city (L. Jalabert - R. Mouterde, *Inscriptions* III/1, n. 774). We possess the dedicatory inscription on the door of *Constantine's Great Church, the golden church depicted on the Yakto mosaic (ibid., n. 998).

1. Greetings. "Christ be with us" (ibid., n. 877). On a portico at Refâdi: "Lord (κύ[ριε]) bless our coming in (εἴσοδον) and our going out (ἔξοδον). Amen" (13/VIII/510) (in H. Leclercq, *Antioche,* 2404).

2. Professions of faith. On the road to Daphne a keystone of white marble reads on the lower side: "One God (εἷς θεός) and his Christ (ὁ χριστός) . . ." (L. Jalabert, III/1, n. 991; cf. ibid., nn. 810, 814, 815, 869, 985, 991, 1030, 1078). At Kôkanâya, the inscription (368/369) on the arcosolium of Eusebius, one of two in a hypogeum, reads, "+ To Eusebius, + Christian + / Glory (Δόξα) to the Father (πατρί) and to the Son (υἱῷ) and to the Holy Spirit (ἁγίῳ πνεύ[μα]τι)" (ibid., II, n. 598; see also Jalabert, II, nn. 595-597). A Refâdi (439): "Ἰ(ησοῦς) χ(ριστὸς) θ(εοῦ) υ(ἱὸς) σ(ωτήρ) (Jesus Christ God's Son Savior)," the same at Khirbet Hâss (no date), on both door-lintels of an ancient house (in H. Leclercq, loc. cit.). In the same place (516): "Jesus (Ἰησ[οῦς]) the Nazarene, born of Mary (ἐκ Μαρίας γεννηθ[εί]ς), Son of God (ὁ υ[ἱὸ]ς τοῦ θ[εο]ῦ)" (ibid., loc. cit.); and on the lintel of a small house: "Jesus Christ God's Son Savior (ἰχθύς) is the

beginning (ἀρχή) of the new creation (τοῦ νεοκτιστοῦ) . . ." (Jalabert, II, n. 425).

3. Profession of faiths—invocations. On the village of Qâtoûra (331): "Jesus Christ (Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ), have mercy (βοήθ[ει]), / there is but one God (Εἷς Θεὸς μόνος)" (Jalabert, II, n. 443). E of Antioch, on a door-lintel, the "trisagion": "Ἅγιος ὁ Θεὸς, ἅγιος ἰσχυρὸς, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, . . . , ελεύσον ἡηᾶς"; after ἀθάνατος are the (theopaschite) words (σ)τα(υ)ροθ(εὶ)ς δι' ἡηᾶς "crucified for us," added by the *monophysite bishop of Antioch *Peter the Fuller, ca. 470 (in H. Leclercq, *Antioche,* 2403).

H. Leclercq, *Antioche* (*archéologie*), DACL 1/2 (1907) 2359-2427; H.C. Butler, *Early Churches of Syria*, Princeton 1925; W. Eltester, *Die Kirchen Antiochias im IV Jahrhundert*: ZNTW 36 (1937) 251-286; J. Lassus, *L'église cruciforme-Antioche-Kaoussié*: *Antioch-on-the-Orontes* II, Princeton 1938, 5-44; J. Lassus, *Le mosaïque de Yakto*: *Antioch-on-the-Orontes* I-III, Princeton 1934-1941; D. Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*, 2 vols., Princeton 1947; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947; E. Josi, *Antiochia di Siria*: EC 1 (1948) 1456-1460; D. Levi, *Antiochia*: EAA I, Rome 1958, 426-428; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1958, 515, 718-723; L. Jalabert - R. Mouterde, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* I-V, Paris 1929-1959; R. Martin, *Commentaire archéologique de l'Antiochikos*, in A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne . . .*, Paris 1959, 38-61; G. Traversari, *Gli spettacoli in acqua nel teatro tardo antico*, Rome 1960; J. Rougé (ed.), *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, SC 124, Paris 1966; P.-M.T. Canivet, *I complessi cristiani del IV e del V secolo a Huarte* (N Syria): RivAC 56 (1980) 147-172; M. Piccirillo, *Note di viaggio in alta Siria nei villaggi di Zubbet Es-Shih e Hawwa*: RivAC 57 (1981) 113-125; G. Degeorge, *Syrie. Art, Histoire, Architecture*, Paris 1983; H.J.W. Drÿvers, *East of Antiochia: Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*, London 1984; Id., *History and Religion in Late Syria*, Aldershot 1994; P. Donceel-Voute, *Les pavements des églises byzantines de Syrie et du Liban. Décor, archéologie et liturgie*, Louvain 1988; J.H.G.W. Liebschütz, *From Diocletian to the Arab Conquest*, London 1990; A. Naccache, *Le décor des églises de villages d'Antiochène du IVe au VIIe*, Paris 1992; G. Tchalenko, *Églises de village de la Syrie du Nord*, 3 vols., Paris 1979-1990; B. Pouderon, *La genesi dell'arte cristiana*: Storia del Cristianesimo 1, 819-823 (821: Syria).

O. Pasquato

ANTIOCHUS CHUZON (5th c.). An Eastern praetorian prefect of the gens Flavius. Praised by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus for his political conduct (*Ep.* 95, PG 83, 1289-1290), after the Council of Ephesus (431) he communicated to *Nestorius the heresiarch the manner of the trip that was to take him back to *Antioch (*Ep. Antiochi Praef. Praet. ad Nestorium*). In 429 he seems to have suggested to the Eastern part of the empire the establishment of a commission to collect and publish, in the so-called **Codex Theodosianus,* all of the laws after 312 that were of general interest.

CPG 5674, 5682, 6306, 8748; PG 84, 618-620, 640-641; PO 9, 555-556; ACO I,I,7, 71; PLRE II, 103-104.

P. Marone

ANTIOCHUS of Ptolemais (d. after 404). Bishop of Ptolemais (Acco or St. John of Acre, Phoenicia). With *Theophilus of Alexandria and *Severian of Gabala he was a bitter opponent of *John Chrysostom, and with them condemned Chrysostom at the Synod of the Oak and then brought about his second exile. Ancient writers judged him severely for this. Some called him *chrysostomos* for his skillful oratory. He died not after 408. His works *Advensur avaritiam* and *In curatione caeci qui a Salvatore illuminatus est* (*Gennadius, *De vir. ill.* 20) are lost; some passages of his *Homily on the Nativity* and fragments cited by ancient authors remain.

CPG II 4296f.; Bardenhewer 3,363; DHGE 3,709f., EC 1, 1479f.; Quasten, *Patrologia* 2, 486f.; Altaner 343f.

A. De Nicola

ANTIOCHUS Strategius (d. after 620). Born near *Ancyra in *Galatia, became a *monk of the Great Laura of St. Sabbas, with the name Antiochus. Composed (ca. 620) some *Pandecta* in 150 *Kephalaia* (CPG 7843), a spiritual florilegium of biblical citations and patristic extracts, with many rare sources such as *Ignatius, the *Shepherd* of *Hermas, ps.-Clement *ad virgines,* *Evagrius and *Diadochus. Even today this compilation has some surprises. Also attributed to him is a letter to *Eustathius and a confession (CPG 7842 and 7844). Since the latter is in the narrative of the *Persian capture of *Jerusalem (614) written by Strategius, monk of St. Sabbas (preserved in Georgian and Arabic, ed. G. Garitte, CSCO 202/203, 340/341, 347/348, Louvain 1960, 1973, 1974), N. Marr has proposed identification of the two authors, but without general support.

Patrologia V, 303f.

J. Gribomont

ANTIPATER of Bostra (5th c.), saint. Elected bishop of Bostra (*Arabia) shortly after the Council of *Chalcedon (451). The emperor *Leo I asked him and other eminent ecclesiastics their opinion on the council: his response is lost. He was a friend of St. *Euthymius (d. 473) and wrote a *Refutation* (*Antirrhesis*) *of Eusebius of Caesarea's Apology for Origen,* acknowledging *Eusebius's merits but mis-

trusting his theological sense and quietly but firmly condemning *Origen's errors. We have the opening of the work, cited at *Nicaea II (787), and some fragments in *Leontius of Byzantium and *John of Damascus (PG 85, 1792-1796; 86, 2, 2045. 2053.2077; 96, 468.488-505). The *Homily on St. John the Baptist* and *On the Annunciation and Visitation* were preached on two consecutive Sundays, probably before Christmas. Also surviving is an entire homily in Greek *On the Epiphany* and another *On the beginning of the Fast* (unpublished); fragments of *On the Woman with the Issue of Blood*, cited at Nicaea II; and *On the Cross,* cited by *Anastasius the Sinaite. The homily *On the Assumption of Mary* is preserved in Latin; and the four *On the Nativity of Christ,* in Armenian.

CPG III, 6680-6698; PG 85, 1763ff.; Bardenhewer 4, 304-307; DHGE 3,713f.; BS 2, 70f.; G. Roschini, *Mariologia* I[2], Rome 1947, 128; *Maria nella storia della salvezza* I, Isola Liri 1969, 317; Patrologia V, 258f.; Marienlexicon 1,173-174.

A. De Nicola

ANTITHESIS. Like other figures, antithesis can be of word or thought. Spoken of until Late Antiquity were *schemata lexeos et dianoeas* (Don., *Ars. Gramm.* 3,4,5 Keil 4, 397), the former the concern of the grammarian, the latter of the rhetor. The example repeated *ad nauseam* by grammarians was the use of *olli pro illi* with the definition *Antithesis est litterae pro littera immutatio* (Prob., *Ult. Syll.* 18,12,13: Keil 4, 264). Greek rhetors used the terms σύγκρισις, ἀντίθεσις and ἀντίθετον indifferently for antithesis, but Latin rhetors discussing the figures of Greek *rhetoric more often referred to ἀντίθετον and ἀντίθεσις. The rhetor Julius Rufinianus (*Fig. sent. eloc.* 37: Halm 47) also speaks of σύγκρισις. Latin rhetors cited Cicero's example: *Domus tibi deerat? At habebas, pecunia superabat et egebas* (*Orat.* 67,223). The definition of the figure is repeated as follows: *haec figura constat ex eo quod verba pugnantia inter se paria paribus opponuntur* (Aquil. Rom., *Fig. sent. eloc.* 22: Haim. 29-30). Julius Rufinianus shortens the definition: *comparatio rerum atque personarum inter se contrariarum.* *Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* 1,36,21) adds that beauty of expression comes from the juxtaposition of contraries: *antitheton ubi contraria contrariis opponuntur et sententiae pulchritudinem reddunt.* Another term that appears in the version of Latin rhetors is *contentio* or *contrapositum*. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4,15,21) has: *contentio est cum ex contrariis rebus oratio conficitur*; Quintilian: *contrapositum vel, ut quidam vocant, contentio* ἀντίθετον *dicitur* (*I.o.* 9,3,81). Antithesis as a rhetorical figure makes two consecutive images stand out strongly, but the actual crux of the contrast must be grasped. Antithesis at a philosophical or legal level is something else. One of the tactics of a master of rhetoric like *Tertullian is to examine the elements that contradict the thesis he wants to demonstrate: in speaking of patience, e.g., he considers the evils of impatience (*Pat.* 5,3-4: J.G. Ph. Borleffs CCL 1,303). *Cyprian of Carthage resorts to the same principle in *De bono patientiae* (20: C. Moreschini CCL 3A, 129). The *Symposium* of *Methodius of Olympus, inspired by the Song of Songs, proceeds with rigorous logic in antitheses to demonstrate that if man inclines toward corruption, he becomes corruptible and thus subject to death; if, rather, he inclines toward incorruption, he becomes incorruptible and thus immortal (*Symp.* 3,7,66-68: G.N. Bonwetsch GCS 27, 34). Antithesis is often used in the popular Christian literature of the early centuries. "Correct one another not in anger, but in peace, as you read in the gospel," exhorts the **Didache* (15,3-4 W. Rordorf - A. Tuilier SC 248, 194). ps.-Barnabas ends his work with the antithesis of the two ways: "The ways of teaching and freedom are two: that of light and that of darkness. Great is the difference between these two ways. Over one are set the light-bearing angels of God; over the other, the angels of Satan. The one is Lord from eternity to eternity; the other is the prince of this time of iniquity" (18,1b-2: P. Prigent - R.A. Kraft SC 172, 194-196). The darkness covering the earth that arrests human physical activity is the negation of the life given by the light. Light and darkness form an antithesis that is fundamental for both the OT and NT. Jesus himself is the light of the world, and the one who follows him will not walk in darkness but will have the light of life (Jn 8:12). For St. *Paul, once people have been freed from darkness (Col 1:13) they have become children of the light. The Christian, having put off the old works of darkness, puts on the armor of light (Rom 13:12). The antithesis of light and darkness can also be extended to other religions.

Early Christian authors found in antithesis a congenial medium of expression. For St. *Augustine (*Civ.* 11,18: B. Dombart - A. Kalb CCL 48,337) this figure is based in the nature of things, which is why it is often used by Sacred Scripture; he gives the example of St. Paul (2 Cor 6:7-10). Opposed contraries, Augustine concludes, make speech pleasing and beautiful, like the beauty of the world, which is formed of the eloquence of contrarities in nature. He cites Sir 33:14-15: "Against evil is good, against death is life: so is the godly against the sinner. Consider, therefore, all the works of the Most High: two

by two." Again in *De civitate Dei* (9,20: CCL 47,267-268), the fulcrum of the two cities is provided by the opposition between humility and pride: the pride of demons and the humility of Christ. The third part of the *Pastoral Rule* of *Gregory the Great concerns the art of the guide of souls in adapting himself to the various antithetical situations: how to exhort servants and masters, sick and healthy, quiet and talkative, meek and irascible, married and celibate, etc., to evangelical principles (PL 77, 49-126).

Better than the written page, *iconography reveals states of mind and spiritual attitudes in a summary form developed only through figures. On a *sarcophagus at Tipasa (Ws 67,5) lions are carved on the right and left, and in the center the Shepherd with two sheep in symmetry. The antithesis is provided by the contrast between the shepherd and sheep, symbol of peace and humility, and the lions, symbol of the *oppositae qualitates* of pride and oppression. The iconography of the *cross and the dragon also contains an antithesis: the cross symbolizes human redemption; the dragon, damnation. The opposition of these two symbols can be considered over a vast horizon, unlimited by space or time; moreover, the metaphors remain obscure if the antitheses are disjoined. Finally, the scene of *oppositae qualitates* on the mosaic of the early Christian basilica of *Aquileia should be seen as an antithises.

R.A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, Berkeley, CA [2]1991; *Historische Wörterburch der Rhetorik*, ed. G. Ueding, Darmstadt 1992ff., 1,722-750; *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S.E. Porter, Leiden 1997.

A. Quacquarelli

ANTITRINITARIANISM. During the *Arian controversy it became common to set true faith in the *Trinity in antithesis to *Judaism and *paganism (see Greg. Nys., *Or. catech.* 3). All who cast doubt on the divine Trinity—*Noetus, *Sabellius, *Marcellus of Ancyra—were thus considered on a par with Jews, whereas *gnostics and Arians were likened to pagans. This reductive view certainly had a historical basis and, as unitarian tendencies had their roots in Jewish *monotheism, so theologians accused of *tritheism departed from the Greek model (doctrine of the *hypostasis). In any event, this pattern embraced all of the antitrinitarian opinions in the early period of Christianity. This was particularly true of the former (unitarian) tendency, which accepted only a triple divine action in the economy of salvation but ruled out any trinity in the eternal (immanent) life of the divinity. In a certain sense this can also be said of the gnostics and esp. of extreme Arians, who "first" set God above the Son and the *Spirit, radically excluding the Trinity. Thus the modern history of dogma reduces ancient antitrinitarianism to *monarchianism, distinguishing *adoptionism (*Paul of Samosata, *Lucian, the Arians) and modalism (*Praxeas, Sabellius, Marcellus, *Photinus and also *Priscillian). Our concern here is not to compare the antitrinitarianism of modern times with dynamic and modalistic monarchianism. Rather, we should bear in mind that behind primitive Christianity's rejection of trinitarian errors, both Judaizing "exemplifications" and Hellenizing "technologies," lies the concern to preserve the paradox of faith, the "Trinity that is one God" (*Augustine).

EC 1,1506-1510; TRE 3,168-174 (modern); LTK³ 1, 776f.; F. Mali, in *Lexikon der christlichen Antike* (Stuttgart 1999), 18f.; RGG⁴ 1 (1998) 574f. (modern).

B. Studer

ANTONINUS PIUS (86–161). *Roman emperor, reigned 138–161. Succeeded *Hadrian, who had designated him his successor. He earned the title "Pius" for his defense of his predecessor's memory before the Senate. His long reign, untroubled by wars, was marked by his goodness, wisdom and rectitude: he rebuilt destroyed cities and improved the condition of slaves. Respectful of the official religion, he was tolerant of other cults: he promoted Eastern religions (*Magna Mater*), and established that Christians should not be unjustly sought out. (There were some instances of violence, however, e.g., the execution of *Polycarp of Smyrna.) He died at age 75, after building a temple in the Forum to his wife Faustina. He was succeeded by his adoptive son *Marcus Aurelius.

L. De Regibus, *A. Pio*, Rome 1946; F. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Roma e il suo impero*, It. tr., Bari-Rome 1992; A. Ziolkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

ANULINUS (first half 4th c.). Proconsul of *Africa. Recipient of *Constantine's ordinance of 312 restoring to the Catholic church all of its confiscated property (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* X, 5, 15-17). Anulinus's name appears in some documents related to the beginning of the *Donatist schism (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, X,6,4; 7,1-2). On 15 April 313 the Donatists, through Anulinus, presented a petition to the

emperor, clarifying their position with respect to Bishop *Caecilian and asking for the arbitration of the bishops of *Gaul (*Augustine, *Ep*. 88, 2).

PCBE 1, Afrique, *Anulinus* 2, 80-81; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford 1952, [2]1971, 145-148; *Storia del Cristianesimo* 2, 178, 196, 211, 228.

G. Pilara

APAMEA. On the River Orontes, in W Syria (*Syria Secunda*). Pharnake was the first name of this very ancient center, which seems to have been inhabited in prehistoric times (4000 BC). Populated by Macedonian colonists, the city took the name of Pella in memory of Alexander's homeland (4th c. BC). Seleucus I Nicator (281 BC) later called it Apamea in honor of his wife Apama, and still later Claudia Apamea. This urban center constituted a tetrapolis with *Antioch, Laodicea and Seleucia, and was chosen as the headquarters of the Seleucid monarchy, with military training schools. When Pompey annexed Syria to the *Roman Empire (64 BC), the city put up a futile resistance. Apamea was a massive city, as is shown by the census ordered by Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, governor of Syria (AD 6); an inscription confirms that only the city's free men were included, numbering 117,000. The overall population could thus be estimated at approximately 500,000, including women, children, slaves and foreigners.

In the conflict that opposed *Zenobia of Palmyra to the Aurelian emperor (271), the city sided with the latter. Repeatedly devastated by earthquakes, in 540 Apamea suffered the invasion of *Chosroes. It seems, however, that the invasion was not particularly destructive, since the author of the *Antonine Itinerary,* visiting the city ca. 560/570, spoke of it as a "very splendid city, where all the Syrian nobility lives" (46,8). From 813–816 it fell again into *Persian hands, followed by Arab domination.

The name Apamea remains linked to some of its most illustrious citizens. The earliest was the Stoic philosopher Posidonius (140/130–51/50 BC). A man of encyclopedic knowledge, he combined *Stoic thought with the scientific advances of his time. He taught at Rhodes, where Cicero was among his students. Also native to Apamea was *Numenius, a neo-Pythagorean philosopher who lived during the second half of the 2nd c.; *Origen mentions him respectfully (*C. Cels.* IV 51). Among the city's pagan thinkers was the *Neoplatonic philosopher *Iamblichus, who, though born at *Chalcedon (ca. 250), taught for many years at Apamea.

The Christian presence in this important center is historically verified from the first years of the 3rd c. A group of *Elkesaites seems to have lived at Apamea. Faithful to the Mosaic law and circumcised, they opposed *Paul and considered Christ to be a common person, born like everyone else. Because of the *metempsychosis professed by the sect, they claimed that Christ would make himself present in every era. The presence of an episcopal see at Apamea is attested by the lists of bishops present at the synods of *Neocaesarea (314) and *Nicaea (325). In both, the Christian community seems to be led by Alphaeus. Iamblichus's theurgical doctrine must have been widely approved at Apamea, since it became the center of a hardened *theurgical and anti-Christian Neoplatonism. Mosaics have been found under the cathedral which suggest that Iamblichus's school was there; the mosaics' motifs are inspired by *Julian, with a didactic program impregnated with wisdom and moderation, but opposed to Christianity. In the 4th c. the increasing tension between Christians and *pagans erupted in violence: the destruction of the citizen temple of Jupiter by the Christians was followed by the murder of Bishop Marcellus. Among his successors was Polychromius (d. 430), brother of the great *Theodore of Mopsuestia and like him one of the most important exegetes of the *Antiochene school. Under *Theodosius II (408–450) Apamea assumed the rank of *metropolitan see. Bishop *Photius, according to the inscription (with the names of the presbyter and some deacons, in a nearby village, Huarte), had a large basilica built, its floor covered with mosaics. The inscription recording the execution of the central mosaic in 383 is preserved, with two other inscriptions marking the lateral mosaics (484 and 485). The church was built over a 4th-c. church. There was also a church dedicated to St. Michael—its mosaic dating from 487—with a baptistery nearby. The conspicuous presence of *monks and *hermits in the surrounding area lent importance to the see: we are told of them by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*History of the Monks* III 4), who himself became a monk (423) and was later recalled to occupy the episcopal see of Cyrrhus.

An important monastery was built near Apamea in the mid-5th c., dedicated to the hermit Maro. The monks who lived there, called *Maronites, were among the most vigorous 6th-c. defenders of the definition of Chalcedon. With the onset of the Arab invasions they settled in Lebanon, where, from 939, they established their spiritual center. Even today the remains of ancient Apamea, under continual restoration, speak to us of the city's glorious past. The city's *cardo,* 1,850 m long with a large colonnade, partially reconstructed, is worth mentioning; along

side it were businesses, shops and public buildings. The cathedral and episcopal residence were SE of the city. Probably built as a *martyrium, the church, with a double-quatrefoil plan with ambulatory, became the cathedral before 540; a relic of the cross is supposed to have been kept there. The museum, at the foot of the city, has collected many mosaics from the churches of the region.

J. and J.Ch. Balty, *Apamée de Syrie, archéologie et histoire I: Des origines à la Tetrarchie*: ANRW II 8, 103-134; M.T. Canivet - P. Canivet, *I complessi cristiani del IV e del V secolo a Huarte* (*Siria settentrionale*): RivAC 56 (1980) 147-172; J. Balty - J.Ch. Balty, *L'Apamène antique et les limites de la Syria Secunda*, in *La géographie administrative et politique d'Alexandre à Mahomet*, Leiden 1981, 41-75; Id., *Un programme philosophique sous la cathédrale d'Apamée. L'ensemble néo-platonicien de l'empereur Julien*, in *Texte et image*. Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly, Paris 1984, 167-176; P. Canivet - M.T. Canivet, *Huarte, sanctuaire chrétien d'Apamène* (*IV-VI s.*), Paris 1987; P. Canivet, *Le christianisme en Syrie des origines à l'avènement de l'islam*, in *Archéologie et histoire de la Syrie*, II, Saarbrücken 1989, 117-146; B. Brenk, *Die Umwandlung der Synagoge von Apamea in eine Kirche: eine mentalitätsgeschichtliche Studie*, in *Tesserae: Festschrift J. Engemann*, Münster 1991, 1-25; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monferrato 1994, 37-42; A. Agosti, *The Poikilia of Paul the Bishop*: ZPE 116 (1997) 31-38; I. Peña, *Lieux de pèlerinage en Syrie*, Milan 2000; J.Ch. Balty, "*Claudia Apamea*": *données nouvelles sur la topographie et l'histoire d'Apamée*: CRAI 1 (2000) 459-481; Fedalto 775-776.

L. Padovese

APATHEIA. Two aspects of ἀπάθεια were distinguished in Greek thought, one theoretical and one ethical. In the theoretical sense ἀπάθεια is the state that characterizes the divine intelligence, and human intelligence when the latter fulfills its noetic function. This idea was already clearly formulated in Anaxagoras—who calls ἀπαθής the divine νοῦς, its highest principle (pl. 56 Diehl)—and was received in its entirety by *Aristotle, who reserves this attribute to both human intelligence in its actions (*An.* III 430a 17-18,24) and the divine intelligence (*Met.* Λ 1073a 11). Ἀπάθεια, clearly set forth by *Plato, *Phaedo* 82c—where the philosopher is portrayed as entirely free from bodily pleasures and indifferent to life's evils—later became the supreme ethical ideal in the earliest *Stoicism: that of *Zeno, Cleanthes and Chrysippus (see, e.g., SVF I 205-208 regarding the passions; III 443, 444, 447, 448, 449, 450 regarding the absence of passions in the wise). Replaced in the middle Stoicism of Panetius and Posidonius and also in Antiochus of Ascalon (1st c. BC) by the μετριοπάθεια (or simple moderation of the passions) of Plato's *Republic*, the ancient Academy and the Peripatetic school, ἀπάθεια was revived and came to represent ethical perfection in *Philo, in the *Neoplatonism of *Plotinus and *Porphyry, and in *Clement of Alexandria: in all these authors μετριοπάθεια is not rejected but relegated to an earlier ethical state, while *apatheia* occupies the highest level and merges with the "*purification" (κάθαρσις) of Plato's *Phaedo* and with the formula ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν (Plato, *Theaetetus* 176b), whose explanation it goes on to illustrate, God being completely ἀπαθής (see the relevant material and the discussion regarding Antiochus of Ascalon in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 99-112).

In Neoplatonism one sees a strict combination of the ethical and theoretical aspects of ἀπάθεια. Only one who has arrived at complete purification—total detachment from the body and the higher ethical level represented by the elimination of the passions (which originate in the body and in the irrational soul)—possesses the theoretical virtues, the highest class of human virtues, and can thus exercise the natural function of his intelligence which is already ἀπαθής: the contemplation of the transcendent realities present in the divine νοῦς, which is by its very nature ἀπαθής (the ethical ideal of the ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ consists precisely in this; see Plotinus, *Enn.* I,2,3 [67,19-21], I,2,4 [68,19], I,2,6 [70,12-13], Porphyry, *Sent.* 32 [25,8-9, 27,8-9, 28,3-4]).

*Origen, like Clement and Philo, also excludes any passion from God (the so-called wrath of God is not a πάθος but only the means God uses to teach sinners; *C. Cels.* IV 72, I: Koetschau 341-342) and sees in ἀπάθεια ethical perfection (*Comm. on John* VIII 36: Preuschen 376, 24-28; *Comm. in Matt.* I 398,27: Klostermann; fr. 64, III: Klostermann 41).

*Gregory of Nyssa, speaking through *Macrina, considers the total elimination of the passions in this life as damaging, since it would deprive the soul of the desire for God and of the weapons needed to combat the enemy of the good (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 65 A-B); only after death does ἀπάθεια reflect the condition of the completely pure soul that, by now in possession of the good and having become similar to it, can rid itself of every desire (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 96A); noteworthy in this last passage of Gregory is the combination of the idea of likeness to God with that of the absence of passions characteristic of Neoplatonism and Clement. In *On the Beatitudes* I and II, Gregory considers only contentment to be possible for human beings, not the total elimination of the passions, which remains beyond the reach of human nature; he also excludes the possibility of a complete imitation of the divine nature—which is per se not subject to the passions—and thus any kind of arrival at a true likeness to God (GNO VII, 2: pp. 82,24-28, 95,22–96,2, 96,11-16). This condi-

tion, however, represents for him only a preliminary ethical stage, that of the μετριοπάθεια. In homily V he says that "thanks to purity, we draw near to what is pure" (GNO VII, 2: p. 124,9), and he returns more than once in his writings to the reconquest of the original purity and beauty of the "divine image" impressed on the human *soul by God at the moment of creation; he also mentions this idea in a famous section of homily VI *On the Beatitudes* (GNO VII, 2: pp. 142,15-22; 143,4-13, 16-23; 143,28–144,4; 144,9-13). Ultimately, then, the two stages μετριοπάθεια-ἀπάθεια found in Philo, Clement, Plotinus and Porphyry are found in Gregory too.

Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite attributes to angelic essences a "pure and impassible contemplation" (*Cel. hier.* II, 4 [14,14]), making his own the Anaxagoran, Aristotelian and Neoplatonic doctrine of the strict interdependence between ἀπάθεια and noetic activity. Regarding thrones he says that they "receive divine illumination in a state of total absence of passions" (*Cel. hier.* VII,1 [28,10]). Regarding human beings, the blessed after resurrection "will partake of the light lavished upon their impassible and immaterial intelligence" (*Div. Nam.* I, 4 [115,1]); and it is precisely the impassible soul that enjoys visions (*Ep.* IX,1 [198,8-9]). Ἀπάθεια is also present, at least to a certain degree, in the newly *baptized (*Eccl. hier.* II,8 [78,12]); and above all in one who rises to the highest degree of perfection (*Eccl. hier.* III,7 [86,15]).

Völker's studies (see bibl.) have shown how ἀπάθεια is an essential component in the ethical systems not only of Philo, Clement, Origen and ps.-Dionysius but also in later authors such as *Maximus the Confessor and *John Climacus, who dedicates to it the 29th degree of his *Ladder of Divine Acsent* (PG 88, 1148-1152). Regarding the presence of ἀπάθεια in these and other late authors, the article of Bardy in DS is still instructive (see bibl.).

G. Bardy DS I, 727-746; P. De Labriolle: RAC I, 484-487; M. Forschner, LTK 1, 801; A. Schmekel, *Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa*, Berlin 1892, 219 and 272-273; M. Pohlenz, *Das dritte und vierte Buch der Tusculanae*: Hermes 41 (1906) 321-335; K. Gronau, *Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*, Leipzig 1914, 252-256; B. Strache, *Der Eklektizismus des Antiochos von Askalon*, Berlin 1921, 31, 37; *Philo von Alexandreia*, NGA phil. hist. Kl. 1942, 460-461; *Klemens von Alexandreia und sein hellenisches Christentum*, NGA phil. hist. Kl. 1943, 125 and 166ff.; *Die Stoa*, Göttingen 1959, I, 150-153, 155, 199-202, 236-252, 376-397, 411-421; II, 199; T. Rüther, *Die sittliche Forderung der* apatheia *in den beiden ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten und bei Klemens von Alexandrien*, Freiburg 1949; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 99-112; Id., *La teologia negativa*: Helikon 22-27 (1982-1987) 215 (Anaxagoras), 228 (Aristotle), 241 (Philo); 28 (1988) 254-255 (Plotinus), 278-279 (Porphyry); W. Völker, *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrien*, TU 49.1, Leipzig 1938, 262-268; Id., *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, TU 57, Berlin 1952, 524-540; Id., *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen 1931, 153-158; Id., *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, Wiesbaden 1955, 259-264 (It. tr. ed. C.O. Tommasi, Milan 1993, 228-233); Id., *Kontemplation und Ekstase bei Ps. Dionysius Areopagita*, Wiesbaden 1958, 56-67; Id., *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1965, 410-423; Id., *Scala Paradisi: Eine Studie zu Johannes Climacus und zugleich eine Vorstudie zu Symeon dem neuen Theologen*, Wiesbaden 1968, 247-254.

S. Lilla

APELLES (2nd c.). Disciple of *Marcion, first lived at *Rome with his master; he then separated, going for a while to *Alexandria of Egypt, then returning to Rome. Apelles wrote a large volume of *Syllogisms* to demonstrate the unreliability of the OT; *Ambrose preserved a great number of passages from it in his *De Paradiso*. Nothing remains of his book titled *Revelations,* in which Apelles divulged the visions of the prophetess Philomena, probably his disciple. Under the emperor *Commodus he had a public dispute with *Tatian's disciple *Rhodo (see Eus., *HE* V,13,1-7). According to *Eusebius of Caesarea, it seems Apelles distanced himself from *Marcion's doctrine on many important points. In particular, first, he repudiated his explicit dualism, admitting one, good God, who created the angelic world; one of the angels, the demiurge, then created the lower world of matter in the image of the higher world. Second, Apelles eliminated Marcion's *docetism: Jesus was no longer a ghost but had a real body and was sent by God to correct the demiurge's work. However, Apelles went well beyond his master in rejecting the OT, which he considered not only a book having no religious value whatsoever but also fraudulent, full of contradictions and altogether unreliable.

A. von Harnack, *De Apellis gnosi monarchica*, Leipzig 1874; Id., *Sieben neue Bruchstücke der Syllogismen des Apelles*, Leipzig 1890, 111-120 (TU 6,3); Id., *Unbeachtete und neue Quellen zur Kenntnis des Häretikers Apelles*, Leipzig 1900, 93-100 (TU 20); Id., *Marcion*, Leipzig [2]1924, 117ff.; G. Quispel, *Die Reue des Schöpfers*: TZ 5 (1949) 157-158; J.P. Mahé, *Sources Chrétiennes* 216, vol. I, Paris 1975, 59-61; K. Rudolph, *Die Gnosis. Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion*, Leipzig 1977, 338-339; H. Savon, *Saint Ambrise devant l'exégèse del Philon le Juif*, Paris 1977, vol. I., 25-54; E. Junod: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 113-133.

C. Gianotto

APHRAATES (Aphrahat) (270?-345?). First father of the *Syrian church. The moniker "the wise Persian," given him by the *tradition, indicates that he was a subject of the Persian Empire. Beyond this we

know nothing of his life: the approximate dates listed above are deduced from his works. From them we also know that Aphraates was one of the ascetics who at the time were called “the sons of the covenant” (b^{e}nay qyâma). Syriac scholars have reached no agreement on the exact meaning of “qyâma.” “Resurrection” has been proposed instead of “covenant,” or, in reference to the Semitic root meaning “upright position,” the term could evoke the idea of vigilance in battle. The most recent French translation (see bibl.) renders the expression “members of the order.” In any case, it is certain that the “b^{e}nay qyâma” were not *monks in the modern understanding of the term. There is no mention of monastic vows, properly speaking, in their regard. They were *ascetics who remained in the world but who even before receiving *baptism had decided to remain celibate; with baptism, this resolution became a de facto obligation. An in-depth study of their ascetical practices has never been done. Besides being a “son of the covenant,” it seems that Aphraates was also an important dignitary of the Persian church, perhaps a bishop, though this is not clear. He was at least the superior or spiritual father of a community of “sons of the covenant,” as a great part of his work is addressed to them. It is certain that he was not the superior of a *monastery, as a late (14th-c.) tradition claims. His work has come down to us in its entirety, with every desirable guarantee of authenticity. It is composed of a collection of 23 *Treatises, Letters* or *Homilies*, which in the manuscripts (5th-6th c.) bear the title “Demonstrations” (tahwiâthâ). There were originally supposed to have been 22, each beginning with a letter of the Syriac alphabet; the 23rd was added later by the author. These Demonstrations were not all written at once: the first ten (written 337) develop classical themes of *theology and Christian asceticism. The other 13 (written 342–345) are primarily dedicated to anti-Jewish polemic. Demonstration 14 is in the form of a letter addressed to a synod of bishops; in it the author denounces the grave abuses committed by some members of the clergy. The 23rd Demonstration, the last of the series, was written during winter 344–345, at the start of Shapur II’s bloody *persecution of the Christians.

All scholars agree in emphasizing the exclusively scriptural character of Aphraates’s doctrine; it shows no influence of Greek *philosophy. The author professes himself to be solely a disciple of the Sacred Scriptures. His *trinitarian doctrine and his *Christology, while thoroughly *orthodox, ignore the Council of *Nicaea, at which the Persian church was not represented. His theology on the *Holy Spirit as a person is not very explicit. Other points could be mentioned to show the “primitive” character of Aphraates’s theology. This is beside the point, however, in that the originality of his theology is in the fact that it is based entirely on biblical *symbolism, enriched by contributions from the *targumic traditions handed down by the first *Jewish Christian communities of Mesopotamia, before the break between church and synagogue.

Until now, the symbols pertaining to Christ, the apostles and the church have been the most studied. At the same time, there has been great interest in research on the influence exerted by rabbinic exegetical methods in order to clarify the origins of the first Christian communities of *Persia and *Mesopotamia. Without entering into the merits of developments in this regard, we can note the benefit the churches of the Greek and Latin world would have gained from a deeper knowledge of the first *Syriac fathers, such as Aphraates and *Ephrem, for the elaboration of their later theological syntheses. A less-intellectual theology, better integrating the symbol and “myth” of the Scriptures, would have perhaps helped avoid a crisis like the iconoclast crisis, and today we would not be facing the problem of a rationalist “demythologization,” destructive of mystery.

Another aspect of Aphraates’s work concerns the anti-Jewish polemic, with its classic themes: circumcision, the divinity of Christ, the sabbath, the election of Israel, etc. The calm, moderate tone with which Aphraates presents his arguments is admirable; his writings are free of the bitterness that characterizes Ephrem’s writings against the Jews. His ascetical theology is contained primarily in the first Demonstrations addressed to the “sons of the covenant.” The doctrine is classical and, in this case as well, entirely traceable to the Sacred Scriptures. The following points can be considered characteristic: (1) the primacy of charity, which has for its object the three divine persons, and grows with the inhabitation of the soul by the Spirit of Christ, (2) the perfection of charity as a function of the renunciation of marriage, (3) the absolute necessity of love of neighbor, (4) faith as the foundation of the entire structure and (5) insistence on the virtue of humility, a trait which will remain the fundamental characteristic of Syriac spirituality.

Aphraates’s is a spirituality imbued with optimism, surrounded with an atmosphere of gentleness and peace. “If one had to define it in a few words, one could say that it is the doctrine of peace through faith, brought about by the love of God” (I. Hausherr, DSp 1, 751).

N. Antonelli, *Sancti Patris nostri Iacobi episcopi Nisibeni Sermones*, Rome 1756, new ed. Venice 1765 (the author attributes the 23 Demonstrations to James, bishop of Nisibis, an error that is explained by the fact that Aphraates also bore the name of James); W. Wright, *The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage*, London 1869; PS 1, II (1-489); CSCO 382 Arm. 7 and 383 Arm. 8; Bardenhewer IV, 327-340; DSp I, 746-752; Ortiz de Urbina 4849; G. Garitte, *La version géorgienne de l'Entretien VI d'Aphraate*: Muséon 77 (1964) 301-366; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition*, Cambridge 1975, 369-376; J.-M. Sauget, *Le dossier éphrémien du manuscrit arabe Strasbourg 4226 et ses membra disiecta*: OCP 42 (1976) 426-458 (in fact the texts of "Ephrem" without exemplar, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, correspond to Demonstrations 2, 3, 4, 9 and 6; see AB 96 [1978] n. 5 and Muséon 92 [1979] 61-69); A. Guillaumont, *Un midrash d'Exode 4, 24-26 chez Aphraate et Éphrem de Nisibe*, in *A Tribute to A. Vööbus*, Chicago 1977, 89-95; G. Nedungatt, *The Authenticity of Aphraat's Synodal Letter*: OCP 46 (1980) 62-88; M.-J. Pierre, *Aphraate le Sage Persan. Les Exposés*, 1, Exposés I-X, SC 349 (1988); 2, Exposés XI-XXIII, SC 359 (1989) (with copious bibl. and an important introduction); P. Bruns, *Das Christusbild Aphrahats des Persischen Weisen*, Hereditas 4, Bonn 1990; J. Botha, *A Comparison Between Aphrahat and Ephrem on the Subject of Passover*: Acta Patristica et Byzantina 3 (1992) 46-62; N. Koltun-Fromm, *Psalm 22:17 in Light of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemic*: JECS 6/1 (1998); Id., *Yokes of the Holy-Ones: The Embodiment of a Christian Vocation*: HTR 94/2 (April 2001); M.-J. Pierre, *Aphraate, le Sage perse*, in *Dictionnaire des miracles et de l'extraordinaire chrétiens*, ed. P. Sbalchiero, Paris 2002, 44-45.

R. Lavenant

APHTHARTODOCETISM. Extreme doctrine that arose out of *monophysitism, in *Egypt, in the first half of the 6th c., through the work of *Julian of Halicarnassus. (Thus his followers were called Julianists, in addition to Phantasiastae.) Professed the incorruptibility of Christ's body from his birth. In particular regarding the passion of Christ, it denied the real possibility of his sufferings, accepting the fact that he did suffer by explaining it as a miracle willed by him and not because his body was by nature subject to pain. *Justinian converted to this doctrine (*Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* IV,39; *Leontius Scholasticus, *Sect.* V) and sought to impose it on the entire East, provoking opposition especially at *Antioch. *Leontius of *Byzantium described its principal points, opposing them from the perspective of the plan of salvation (*C. Nest. et Eut.* II). They were also known as Gaianitae, after *Gaianus, the first bishop to lead their separate church.

R. Draguet, *Julien d'Alicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ*, Louvain 1924; M. Jugie, *Julien d'Alicarnasse et Sévère d'Antioche*: Echos d'Orient 24 (1925) 129-162; 265-285; Id., *L'empereur Justinien a-t-il été aphtartodocète?*: Echos d'Orient 34 (1932) 399-402; L. Perrone, *Il 'Dialogo contro gli aftardoceti' di Leonzio di Bisanzio e Severo di Antiochia*: Cristianesimo nella storia 1 (1980) 411-442; F. Carcione, *L'aftardocetismo di Giustiniano: una mistificazione strumentale del dissenso politico-religioso*: Studi e ricerche sull'Oriente cristiano 7 (1984) 71-78; K.-U. Uthemann, *Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe. 4.2. Justinians letztes Edikt—ein ungelöstes Rätsel*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 79-83 (with bibl.).

F. Cocchini

APIARIUS of Sicca (d. after 425). The priest Apiarius of Sicca Veneria (El Kef, Tunisia) was *excommunicated in 418 by his bishop Urban for offenses, the particulars of which are not known but which caused *non leve scandalum* in the *African church (CCL 149,157). He appealed to *Rome and was absolved by Pope *Zosimus, who conveyed his decision to the Africans through a *Commonitorium* and a legation headed by the authoritarian *Faustinus, bishop of Potenza in Piceno. The case was discussed in a plenary council in May 419 at *Carthage. Admitted to the clergy of Thabraca (Tabarka, Tunisia), Apiarius, recidivist, was again excommunicated. He again appealed to Rome and was rehabilitated by *Celestine I, who again sent Faustinus to Africa as his legate. This time, however, he admitted his guilt and was definitively excommunicated (September 425). These episodes nearly led to a clash between the African church and the Roman see, which had recently been looking to extend its primacy to countries traditionally outside its control. The African church used the occasion to put together a corpus of conciliar decrees aimed at laying legal foundations for the age-old African particularism. The move was facilitated at the time by Rome's difficulties over Zosimus's succession, but the Africans quickly found themselves in even worse difficulties with the *Vandal invasion. The question of Apiarius was thus the last manifestation of the autonomy of the African church.

L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, III, Paris 1910, 242-257; DTC 15,2307-2312; C. Munier, *Codex Apiarii causae*, CCL 149, 79-149; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana* II, Rome 1976, 1250-1275; PCBE 1,82-83; 2,750-752; J. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine*, New Haven-London 1997, 111-135; 182-199.

V. Saxer

APION (2nd c.). The only source on Apion is *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* V,27), who records his name and a treatise on the **Hexameron*, mentioning him with other *orthodox writers of the late 2nd c., authors of antignostic works; we may infer that Apion's *Hexameron* also had antignostic content.

E. Prinzivalli

APOCALYPSE. The Christian tradition of the first centuries attributes the Apocalypse of John (Rev 1:1, 4, 9; 21:2; 22:8) to the apostle St. *John, except for *Gaius, who like the *alogi attributes it to *Cerinthus; *Dionysius of Alexandria, who refers it to another John; and *Eusebius of Caesarea, who doubted its Johannine authorship (Eus., *HE* III,28,1-3; VII,25,1-27). *Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 9 and *Chron.*) considers the *millenarists *Justin Martyr and *Irenaeus of Lyons its interpreters, but in fact they never wrote commentaries on the Apocalypse. Irenaeus, *Clement of Alexandria, *Methodius of Olympus, *Tertullian, *Commodian and *Lactantius explained only some passages. *Melito of Sardis's *On the Devil and John's Apocalypse* is known only by report (Eus., *HE* IV,26,2). Traces of *Hippolytus's lost commentary (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 61) are preserved in his other writings and in the *Syriac apocalypse of Dionysius bar Salibi. *Origen outlined a commentary, as we see from the Latin fragment of his *Comm. in Math.*, XXIV; the anonymous Greek MS discovered by Diobouniotis—according to Harnack, an incomplete commentary by Origen—contains, among other things, select passages from Origen. All of these writers take care to keep alive the secrets of the last days contained in the Apocalypse. They tend to a literal interpretation of the text, mingling it with *apocryphal literature and the book of *Daniel. They give ample space to *Christology and the theme of the *Antichrist. They defend the idea of the millennium, except for Clement and Origen with him. *Symbolism, which favors the use of spiritual *allegory, does not provide them with an interpretive key. The isolated explanation of particular passages obliges them to ignore the context. The first real commentary on the Apocalypse was that of *Victorinus of Petovium, preserved in Jerome's recension, based on which J. Haussleiter was able to recover the original. Influenced by Origen, Victorinus adopted allegorical *exegesis without abandoning millenarist literal exegesis. He was the first to make use of the theory of *recapitulation, already present in previous authors, to arrive at a unitary understanding of the work: the Apocalypse does not describe a continuous series of events, but every image or vision is simply a repetition and representation of the same reality: e.g., what is announced in Rev 7–8 (seven trumpets) is repeated and completed in ch. 16 (seven cups). Victorinus found christological elements in the Apocalypse and, according to Asiatic and *Alexandrian traditions, what has happened or will happen to the saints in history (*Ecclesiology). The beast, in light of the tradition of *Nero redivivus,* who will reappear as the Antichrist, represents *Nero. The four animals symbolize, as in Irenaeus, the Evangelists. The two witnesses are *Elijah and Jeremiah and not, as often claimed, Elijah and Enoch. Victorinus's millenarism is mitigated and less marked than in *Cerinthus, *Papias, Justin, Irenaeus, Methodius and Tertullian: he interprets Rev 20–21 literally, though without rejecting spiritual interpretations. The commentary par excellence on the Apocalypse was that of the *Donatist *Tyconius, who influenced all later exegesis on the theme. All the lost parts of the original can be recovered from authors who copied him and from the Catholic recension attested by the Turin *fragments*. His exegesis is faithful to the hermeneutical principles of the *Liber Regularum,* whose application perfects the theory of recapitulation. The great prophecy of Scripture is the revelation of God about Christ and his body, the *ecclesia* (*Reg.* I, II, VII). With good reasoning, the exegete can discern what is said personally of Christ and what regards the church. Each vision of the Apocalypse reveals the totality of the church, differently represented. It belongs to the interpreter to discover—without undervaluing the time factor—whether past, present or future is meant, and when reference is made to the real church (Rev 1–3) or to the ideal church (Rev 4–8). Each verse conceals ecclesiological content; they explain the authentic church (right) and that of the hypocrites (left); the internal struggle and the final struggle; the great separation. The traditional strong christological coloring is all reduced to ecclesiology in Tyconius. He breaks with millenarism and literalism. The two witnesses are the two Testaments. The Antichrist is the totality of the powers hostile to Christianity, protected by the city of the devil; persecutions are a manifestation of him. Tyconius accepts the number 616 (Rev 13:18) rather than 666 like Irenaeus. Jerome's commentary, a recension of Victorinus's, incorporates the prologue to Anatolius, corrects literal interpretations, introduces others, rejects millenarism and the Neronian explanation of the beast, and keeps a balance between Victorinus and Tyconius. *Augustine, in line with Tyconius, is content to comment only on some passages (*Civ. Dei*, XX). *Primasius's commentary and *Cassiodorus's brief notes, relying on Augustine, concentrate and purify Tyconius. *Caesarius's interpretations are a more literal summary of Tyconius. Apringius's Apocalypse shows the influence of Tyconius, *Gregory of Elvira, *Commodian and St. *Benedict; its exegesis of Rev 1–5, 7 is preserved; the rest is completed by that of Victorinus (Jerome). *Bede in his *Exp. Apoc.* follows the interpretations of Tyconius and Primasius together with the opinions

of other Fathers, as does Ambrosius Autpertus, who blends Tyconius, Victorinus (Jerome) and Primasius with fragments of, among others, *Ambrose, Augustine, *Isidore of Seville, *Ildefonsus and *Gregory the Great. *Beatus of *Liébana copies, in a sort of *catena, the commentaries of Victorinus (Jerome), Apringius and esp. Tyconius, interwoven with passages of Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, *Fulgentius, *Gregory the Great, Isidore and Gregory of Elvira. The Greek tradition is less rich than the Latin. *Nestorians and *monophysites did not acknowledge the Apocalypse as canonical. Notable among Greek commentators were *Andrew of Caesarea—who followed Irenaeus and Hippolytus, though eliminating millenarism—*Oecumenius and *Aretas of Caesarea. There is also a catena from the mid 10th c. called Σύνοψις σχολική that combines fragments of Andrew of Caesarea's commentary with parts of Oecumenius's.

Origen: C. Diobouniotis - A. Harnack, *Der Scholien kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis*, TU 38,3; *Vittorino di P. e Girolamo*: CPL 80 - PLS 1, 102-174; ed. J. Haussleiter, CSEL 49, 12-154; M. Dulaey, *Jérôme "éditeur" du Commentaire sur l'Apocalypse de Victorin de Poetovio*: REAug 37 (1991) 199-236. *Tyconius:* CPL 710 - PLS 1, 621-652; ed. F. Lo Bue, TSt VII, Cambridge 1963. *Primasius:* CPL 873 - PL 68, 793-936; PLS 4, 1208-1220; CC 92 (1985) Adams. *Cassiodorus:* CPL 903 - PL 70, 1406-1418. *Caesarius:* CPL 1016 - PL 35, 2417-2452; ed. G. Morin, *S. Caesarii opera omnia*, Maredsous 1942, II, 209-277; A.G. Hamman (ed.), *L'Apocalypse expliquée par Césaire d'Arles*, in *Les Pères dans la foi* 37, Paris 1989. *Apringius:* CPL 1093, ed. M. Férotin, Paris 1900, I; A.C. Vega, Escorial 1940. *Isidore:* CPL 1221, PLS 4, 1850-1863, ed. Lo Menzo Rapisarda, Catania 1967. *Bede:* CPL 1363 - PL 70, 1406-1418; G. Bonner, *Saint Bede in the Tradition of Western Apocalyptic Commentary*, in *Bede and His World* (The Jarrow Lectures I), Aldershot 1994, 153-183. *Ambrosius Autp.:* ed. R. Weber, CCM 27 and 27A (Greg. 58 [1977] 768-770). *Beatus of Liébana*: ed. E. Flórez, Madrid 1770; ed. H.A. Sanders, Rome 1930 (repr. by Edilán, Madrid 1975) (see Boll. dei Clas., Accad. dei Lincei 1 [1980] 221-231). *Oecumenius*: ed. H.C. Hoskier, Ann Arbor 1928; M. De Groote, *Die* Qaestio Oecumeniana: SE 36 (1996) 67-105; M. De Groote, *Die Scholien aus dem Oecumenius-Kommentar zur Apokalypse. Kritische Herausgabe*: SE 37 (1997) 111-131. *Andrew and Aretas of Caesarea.:* PG 106, 215-486, 1387-1412, ed. Schmid 1955; A. Monaci Castagno, *Il problema della datazione dei Commenti all'Apocalisse di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea*: AOT 114 (1980) 223-246; A. Monaci Castagno, *I commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: due letture divergenti dell'Apocalisse*: AOT, series V, vol. V (1981) 305-426. *Dionysius bar Salibi:* CSCO 101, 1-22 (see EC 4,1670f.); W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, Göttingen [6]1906, 49-72; H.J. Vogel, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Apocalypsenübersetzung*, Düsseldorf 1920; E.B. Allo, *Saint Jean. L'Apocalypse*, Paris 1921, CCXVII-CCXL; U. Vanni, *La struttura letteraria dell'Apocalisse*, Rome 1971, 255-259; P. Prigent, *Hippolyte, commentateur de l'Apocalypse*: TZ 28 (1972) 391-412; P. Prigent - R. Stehly, *Les fragments de l'Apocalypse d'Hippolyte*: TZ 29 (1973) 313-553; Quasten I, 451. *Victorinus of Petovium.:* C. Curti, *Il regno millenario in Vittorino di Petovio*: Augustinianum 28 (1978) 419-433; E. Romero Pose, *Símbolos eclesiales en el comento a Ap 1, 13-3, 22 de Ticonio* (diss. MS P.U.G.), Rome 1978; G. Morin, *Le commentaire homilétique de S. Césaire sur l'Apocalypse*: RB 45 (1933) 43-61. *On Andrew of Caesarea, Aretas and Oecumenius:* see bibl. Altaner 554; Σύνοψις σχολική: M. De Groote, *Die* Σύνοψις σχολική *aus dem Kommentar des Oecumenius zur Apocalypse*: SE 32 (1991) 107-119; M. De Groote, *Die* Σύνοψις σχολική *zum Apokalypse-Kommentars des Arethas*: SE 34 (1994) 125-134. *Eng. tr.:* W. C. Weinrich, *Latin Commentaries on Revelation* (Victorinus, Apringius, Caesarius, Bede), Downers Grove, IL 2011; Id., *Greek Commentaries on Revelation* (Oecumenius, Andrew of Caesarea), Downers Grove, IL 2011.

E. Romero Pose

APOCALYPSES (apocryphal). Christian apocalyptic literature derived from Jewish apocalyptic literature, which played a very important role in late Jewish culture. Apocalyptic was also born out of the expectation of the Lord's imminent return in the first centuries and influenced people's way of thinking during that period. We find apocalyptic fragments in the NT (e.g., Mt 24 or Mk 13); the *Apocalypse of St. *John (the question of authorship is still unresolved) is the only complete NT apocalypse: from its opening words, "Revelation (apocalypse) of Jesus Christ," comes the technical term *apocalypse*. The apocalypse in the **Didache* comes from the 1st/2nd c., the *Apocalypse of Peter* (mentioned in the Muratorian *Canon) and the **Ascension of Isaiah* come from the 2nd c. The *Apocalypse of Paul*—from which derives a later apocalypse, that of Mary—probably comes from the 3rd c. The Christianization of the Jewish apocalypses began at the same time, e.g., that of Esdras or of the *Sibylline Books,* the latter only partially Christianized, with the particulars of Christian and Jewish influence easily identifiable. We thus have Christian and Christianized apocalypses; apocalypses were also used by the *Gnostics. (There are some in the texts of *Nag Hammadi.) Themes of the apocalypses were the punishment of sinners (often expressed by terrible curses against them) and the end of the world, with the two often linked. Some apocalypses contain descriptions of the sufferings of condemned sinners, others stories of biblical personages who, visiting the hereafter, see the punishments of the various types of sinners (giving a picture of the moral state of the society and a valuation of sins). Apocalyptic also gives us an interesting picture of the Christian *eschatology of this period.

Apocalyptic was not, however, a literary genre per se: we have apocalypses in poetry and prose, in letters, dialogues, revelations, sermons etc. As with other *apocrypha, the apocalypses are published under the name of celebrated NT or OT personalities: e.g., Esdras; the apostles: *Peter, *Paul, John, *Thomas and

others (e.g., apocalypse of ps.-Methodius). The symbolic language (images, numbers, *antithesis of darkness and light) in the apocalypses is usually from the OT and the Jewish world, but there are also folkloric elements. The difference between Christian and Jewish apocalyptic was in the Messiah's role: awaited by the Jews, already come (in Jesus) for Christians. The interpreting angel, who could also be Christ, plays an important role in apocalyptic.

Apocalypses played an important role in Christian antiquity, and even more so in the *Byzantine and Slavic worlds; we find them in all the languages of Christian antiquity. The apocalypses were nevertheless considered as suspect by the church, because of the use made of them by heretics and the prophecies expressed therein; some apocalypses (Lat. *revelationes*) were condemned by the **Decretum Gelasianum* (5,5). This was also the reason for the late acceptance of John's Apocalypse in the canon of Scripture and for the relative scarcity of commentaries on it. In any case, apocalypses strongly influenced Christian culture, esp. popular beliefs, and flourished in the Middle Ages and the Byzantine world.

The collections of NT apocrypha of Elliott, Schneemelcher (vol. 2), EAC, Erbetta (vol. 3), Moraldi (vol. 3), Starowieyski (vol. 3) give a selection of apocryphal apocalypses with introductions; likewise for the great collections of OT apocrypha (Diez Macho, Sacchi, Charlesworth, see Denis) and the collections of the texts of Nag Hammadi (gnostic apocalypses). *Apocalissi apocrife*, A.M. di Nola, Milan 1993; M.C. Lucca, Milan 2000. Most of the works cited below deal with Jewish and Christian apocalyptic. K.H. Schwarte: TRE 3, 1978, 189-289; P. Vielhauer - G. Strecker, *Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*: Schneemelcher 2, 491-516 (bibl.); F.C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, London 1913; S.J.D. Seymour, *Irish Vision of the Other World*, London 1930; J.M. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, Neukirchen 1969; K. Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*, Gutersloh 1970; L. Morris, *Apocalyptic*, Grand Rapids 1972; W. Perkins, *Function of Gnostic Apocalypses*: CBQ 38 (1977) 382-395; *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*: Semeia 14 (1979); L. Gruenwald, *Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*: ANRW II, 19,1 (1979) 89-118; J.H. Charlesworth, *A History of Pseudepigrapha Research: the Reemerging Importance of Pseudepigrapha*: ANRW 2,19,1 (1979) 54-88; M. Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*, Philadelphia 1983; G. Filoramo, *Apocalissi gnostiche*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 123-129; J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introducton to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*, New York 1984; D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and Near East*, Tübingen 1985 (acts of the congress in Uppsala); *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*: Semeia 36 (1986); M. Delcor, *Studi sull'apocaliptica*, Brescia 1987; A. Yarbro Collins, *Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature*: ANRW II, 25, 6 (1988) 4664-4771; R.J. Bauckham, *The Conflict of Justice and Mercy: Attitudes to the Damned in Apocalyptic Literature*: Apocrypha 1 (1990) 181-196; J.J. Collins - J.H. Charlesworth, *Mysteries and Revelations*, Sheffield 1991; *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Its Period*, FS, B. Otzen, eds. K. Jeppesen, K. Nielsen, B. Rosendal, Aarhus 1994; *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, eds. J.C. VanderKam - W. Adler, Assen, Minneapolis 1996; J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenic-Roman Judaism*, Leiden 1997; A. Norelli, *Pertinence théologique ou canonicité: les premières apocalypses chrétiennes*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 147-164; R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, Leiden 1998.

M. Starowieyski

APOCATASTASIS. *See* *APOKATASTASIS

APOCRISARIUS (or aprocrisiarius). In the *Byzantine era, an official entrusted with missions and bearer of official responses (*apocriseis*). There were civil, military and—particularly important—ecclesiastical apocrisarii: *clerici* sent by their bishops to the *metropolitan. The institution became official under *Justinian, who ordered bishops not to present themselves at court unless formally invited, but to have members of their clergy represent them. Particularly notable was the power of patriarchal apocrisarii (representatives of the great sees of *Alexandria, *Antioch and *Jerusalem at the court of *Constantinople) and pontifical apocrisarii (sent to court by the church of *Rome): *Gregory the Great and Pope *Vigilius had been permanent legates at Constantinople. The pontifical *apocrisarius,* a plenipotentiary, was different than a legate sent on specific occasions and had a certain autonomy of initiative; he could be compared with the modern nuncio.

P. Pargoire, *Apocrisaire*: DACL 1, 2537-2555; L. Chevailler - J.-C. Genin, *Recherches sur les Apocrisaires: Contribution à l'histoire de la représentation pontificale* (*Ve-VIIIe s.*), in *Studi Grosso*, Turin 1969, vol. III, 359-461; Niermeyer 1,65.

M. Forlin Patrucco

APOCRYPHA. The meaning of the term *apokryphos* ("secret") seems to come not from Jewish but from *gnostic and *pagan literature, where it often indicated a doctrine or "secret" teaching (see *Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I,13-20; see 20.1, where it says that gnostic followers of Marcus the magician introduced a number of spurious and apocryphal scriptures "that they wrote themselves"; see also Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III, 29.1). In the *Gospel of Thomas*, a mid-2nd-c. gospel used among gnostics, we read: "These are the *secret* words that the living Jesus said, and that Didymus Judas Thomas wrote down. And he said: 'The one who finds the interpretation of these words will not taste death.'" For gnostics, therefore, the term *apocrypha* indicated a book, the reading of which was reserved for initiates. More-

over, utmost secrecy was required regarding the teaching contained in the various gnostic writings, as well as regarding any doctrines learned. Only two ancient writings—part of the writings of *Nag Hammadi containing gnostic doctrine—have an *apocryphal* (i.e., secret) character declared in the title: *Apokryphon Iohannis* and *Apokryphon Iacobi.* The former, thanks to evidence from Irenaeus, is dated ca. 150, whereas the latter is thought to be mid-2nd to early 3rd c.

In the *Gospel of Thomas*, the frequently recurring expression "Jesus said" indicates—as with many other so-called apocrypha—a claim to refer to a proclamation of the Lord himself. Such claims may stem from a desire to convey ancient traditions, or those believed to be so, handing them down as "sayings" of Jesus; or from the desire to fill in the silence of the by-then canonical gospels on the thirty years of Jesus' hidden life; or to enrich the known and accepted data of faith with clarifications helpful for popular understanding; or to put forth one's own doctrine with words attributed to Jesus, secretly revealed to the initiates of a particular group.

Precisely for this last reason the term *apokryphos*—used to indicate writings accepted in some churches even into the 2nd and 3rd c. and later recommended for private (i.e., secret) reading rather than public reading as done with the Bible (already a practice in the Jewish world)—later became, in the church at large, a synonym for "falsification." This change in the evaluation of apocryphal literature—the negative connotation given to many writings, very different from each other in literary genre and content, and due also to the continual comparison of this literature with what had become "canonical" (to the extent that from the 17th c., with Fabricius, one spoke of "NT apocrypha")—has led, esp. in the last 30 years, to a new approach to the literature known until now as "NT apocrypha." Many studies (see J.D. Kaëstli, Norelli, Jounod, Gori and Di Berardino, among others) have led to the recognition of the appropriateness of calling these writings "*pseudepigrapha," or "texts of ancient Christian literature," or better, "ancient Christian apocrypha," indicating the need to consider writings so different from one another not as a block but as writings that each require their own particular study, and to the extent possible not always conditioned by comparison with the canonical writings. This procedure may in fact influence the reading, interpretation and use of some "apocryphal" writings that, from a historical perspective, could become "important fragments of the early Christian message" [*parcelles importants du message chrétien primitive*] (L. Leloir, *Utilité ou inutilité de l'étude des apocryphes:* RTL 19 [1988] 70), enriching our knowledge of the canonical writings themselves. Canonicity does not depend on the greater or lesser antiquity of the texts; there are other reasons (ancient and apostolic tradition, authenticity, doctrine), not all known to us, which led the first Christian communities to consider certain specific writings to be inspired and others not. Some of these so-called apocrypha, whose authors did not have the intention of creating false or heretical works, may in fact preserve ancient traditions on Christ the preacher or Christ preached, in harmony with the canonical writings with regard to the essence of the truth of the faith, but differently transmitted, according to the geographical or cultural environment in which those traditions were received and transmitted. Some apocrypha could have had an important role in the transmission of cultural and religious traditions (see C. Paupert, *L'Apocryphe, fable catéchétique:* Apocrypha 7 [1996] 249-251).

In the research and analysis of ancient Christian apocrypha one must also bear in mind—and not undervalue—the judgment of ancient Christian writers on the various works, distinguishing in each case preunderstanding from prejudice.

We have seen how Irenaeus, on a number of occasions when indicating particular aspects of gnostic doctrine, emphasizes their character of error and falsehood. *Tertullian (*Resurr. Mort.* 63,6), addressing the *Marcionites and Valentinians, accuses them of having added "the secret doctrines of the apocrypha, blasphemous fables" to the Word of God. By this Tertullian shows that he has made a comparison between the Word of God and the writings he calls apocrypha. Between the late 2nd and early 3rd c., these so-called apocrypha were considered to be part of a literature that was not included in the list of the sacred books, which, as the late-2nd-c. Muratorian *Canon itself shows, was still in formation and not yet definitively closed.

In the fathers of the church the following are called apocrypha: writings whose origin is unknown and attribution to this or that author is false (Jerome, *Ep.* 107; Aug., *Civ. Dei* XV, 23; *Faust.* XI, 2); writings that contain doctrinal errors alongside useful information (Orig., *Prol. In Cant.*; *Comm. in Mt. Serm.* 28; Aug., *Faust.* XI, 2); writings not admitted to public reading in churches because not canonical (Ruf., *Symb.* 38; Jerome, *Ep.* 96; *Prol. in Gal.*); heretical writings or those used by heretics (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1, 20; Tertull., *De resur.* 63; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 1, 15; III, 4; Hipp., *Philos.* VII, 20).

In *Origen the term *apocrypha* is primarily used

to indicate writings not approved by the church and that use names of OT figures. He presents a canon of 22 books of the first revelation. Origen does not use the concept of apocrypha univocally; at times he judges some writings to be apocryphal because he thinks elements of truth can be found in them; at other times he openly declares the heretical character of other apocrypha.

A first classification between OT and NT apocrypha is based precisely on the text's title, which may refer to an OT or NT figure. Normally OT apocrypha were composed by Jews, though there are instances of Christian interpolation (see the citations referring to the *incarnation in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,* the *Apocalypse of Esdras* etc.), whereas Christian apocrypha were those that made explicit reference to the NT. OT apocrypha were usually divided into two large groups: those of Palestinian and those of *Hellenistic origin (J.B. Frey, DBS). The Fathers refer to some of these apocrypha, but their evaluations of them differ. The *Book of Enoch* is cited as Sacred Scripture in *Barn.* 15-16 and Origen (*Princ.* I,3,3; IV,4,8; *Hom. in Num.28,2*). The *Ethiopian church accepts it as a scriptural text, whereas the **Apostolic Constitutions* (6,16) explicitly condemn it (R.H. Charles, *Apocrypha* . . . , 163-281). Origen knows an *Assumption of Moses,* which he says is cited in Jude 9 (*Princ.* III 2,1). The **Ascension of Isaiah* is known to *Justin Martyr, Tertullian, *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ep.* 74,9), Origen, *Commodian, *Lactantius, *Hilary of Poitiers, *Ambrose, *Jerome etc. (see E. Tisserant, *Ascension* . . . , 62-74, and the study of E. Norelli, *L'Ascension of Isaiah. Studi su un apocrifo al crocevia dei cristianesimi*, Bologna 1994); the *III Book of Esdras* (on the canonicity of which some Fathers seem favorable) is cited by Justin (*Dial.* 72), *Theophilus of Antioch (*Autol.* III, 25), *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I,21,124), *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 23), *Dionysius of Alexandria (in Athan., *Dion.* 25), *Basil of Caesarea (*Eun.* 5, 4) and *Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, XVIII, 36). Uncertainties remain on patristic references to the *Apocalypse of Esdras* or *IV Esdras* (see Jerome, *Praef. in Ezech.*: PL 28, 1403), which seem to be attested in *Barn.* 12,1 and Justin (see G. Otranto, *Esegesi biblica e storia in Giustino*, Bari 1979, 123-136). The *Slavic Book of Enoch* appears certainly only in a citation of Origen (*Princ.* I,3,2). The Christian literature of the first centuries passed down various fragments of an apocrypha of Ezekiel (*1 Clem.* 23,2-3; Clem. Al., *Quod dives* 40,2; *Paed.* I,10; Tertull., *De res. carn.* 23; Athan., *Vita Ant.* 16; Epiph., *Haer.* 64, 70).

Regarding NT apocrypha, the first major division is based on literary genre. We have apocryphal gospels, acts, epistles and apocalyptic. Apocryphal gospels are those extracanonical writings that deal with the earthly teachings of Jesus, his life and that of his family. Origen (*Hom. 1 in Lk.*) listed a number of gospels that did not enjoy the same authority in the various churches as did the four canonical gospels. These writings were in turn divided into three groups: synoptic-type apocryphal gospels, those containing heterodox teaching and those that use imagination to fill in the gaps in the canonical gospels. The first group contains the gospels used among Jewish Christians (for the problem of the *agraphon,* see entry). Included are: the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, already mentioned in *Ignatius of Antioch (*Smyrn.* 3, 12). Numerous references to this text are in the works of other fathers: Orig., *Jo.*, 12, 87; *Hom. 15,4 in Jer.; Comm. in Mt.* XV, 14; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* II, 9,45; V, 14,96; Eus., *HE* III, 25, 5; 27, 4; 39, 17; IV, 22, 8; VI, 17; Jerome, *In Mt.* I; *Vir. ill.* 3; *Adv. Pelag.* III, 2; *In Ezech.* 18, 7; the way the various fathers refer to it indicates that the text must have been used without qualms in orthodox Jewish Christian communities. Quite different is the *Gospel of the Ebionites,* used by Jewish Christian communities that, according to Irenaeus, did not accept St. *Paul (*Adv. haer.* I, 26; Eus., *HE* III, 27) and had an inexact knowledge of the Lord (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 11), whose genealogy in Matthew they had suppressed (Epiph., *Haer.* XXX, 13,2; 14,3). Some passages of this gospel are found in *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* III, 39; IV, 22) and in *Epiphanius of Salamis (*Haer.* XXX, 3,7; 13,2.4.6.7). The *Gospel of the Nazarenes* was used in orthodox Jewish Christian communities. It is thought to be the *Hebrew Gospel* frequently mentioned by Jerome (*Comm. I in Mt.* 6,11; 12,13; *Comm IV in Mt.* 23,35; 27,16; *Comm. in Is. 18 praef.*) and also mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* XXIX 9,4) and *Theodoret (*Haer.* II 1; II 2). The *Gospel of the Egyptians,* mentioned by Origen (*Hom. 1 in Lk.*) and a few fragments of which are given in Clement (*Strom.* III, 9,63.64; 13,92), seems dominated by *Encratism. The *Gospel of Peter,* an incomplete account of the passion, death and resurrection of Christ found in the Akhmîm MS in 1887, is mentioned by Origen (*In Mt. comm.* X, 17) and Eusebius (*HE* VI, 12,2). The affinities between this text and other patristic writings (Ign.; *Barn.*; Polyc., *Ep.* 7,1; Just., *I Apol.* 33,5; *2 Clem.* 5; etc.), esp. *Melito of Sardis's *Peri Pascha,* have been fully studied, as have its historical and theological position (M.G. Mara, *Évangile* . . .; and Id., *Gospel* . . .; for the *Gospel of Peter, see* Apocrypha Petrine).

Another group is composed of clearly heterodox gospels, in which either an important NT person is entrusted with imparting heterodox teaching or the

founder of a heretical tendency uses Scripture, reworking its data to present it as a confirmation of his position. According to *Hippolytus (*Philos.* V, 7,20), the Naassenes made wide use of a gospel attributed to Thomas; this is confirmed by Origen (*Hom. 1 in Lk.*) and Eusebius (*HE* III, 25,6). According to *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* IV, 36; VI, 31) the authors of this gospel were *Manichees. The discovery in 1945, among the *Coptic texts of Khenoboskhion, of the *Gospel of Thomas,* previously known only in a few fragments, allows us to identify it as a gnostic text. A gospel of which Clement cites several fragments is attributed to the apostle *Matthias (*Strom.* II, 9,45; IV 6,35; VII, 13,82; 17,108). According to Hippolytus, the followers of *Basilides claimed to have received secret teachings from a revelation of the Lord to Matthias. Other gnostic gospels are the so-called *Pistis Sophia,* mentioned by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I,31) and Epiphanius (*Haer* XXVI, 13), and the *Gospel of Judas,* mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* XXXVIII, 1). The *Gospel of Marcion* is amply cited by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* IV 2,4, etc.) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 42, 9, 1-3).

The apocrypha concerned with supplying wider information on the lives of Jesus and his family are very different. This literature provides a history of Christ's childhood, rich in detail, from his birth to the flight into Egypt and the miracles worked there and at Nazareth. The *Arabic Infancy Gospel* is the most characteristic text of this cycle, often using the **Protevangelium of James,* not only for its information on Jesus' birth and childhood, but also for its information on *Mary, from the story of her birth to her role in her Son's early years. Further information on Mary is given in the work which seems to close the cycle dedicated to her: the **Transitus Mariae.* Both the *Protevangelium of James* and the *Transitus* have found their way into the *liturgy, esp. in the East, not based on any attribution of canonicity to the texts but simply based on their devout and simple popular religiosity. References to the *Protevangelium* seem to be present in Justin (*Dial.* 5), Clement (*Strom.* VII, 93) and Origen (*Comm. in Mt.* X, 17). An apocrypha is also dedicated to the life and death of Joseph: the *History of Joseph the Carpenter*. The cycle dedicated to Pilate (*Gospel of Nicodemus* or *Acts of Pilate*) recounts Jesus's trial, passion, death and resurrection in detail. Popular interest in the mysteries of the afterlife was richly satisfied by its account—told by once-dead, now-risen eyewitnesses—of Jesus' *descent into hell to save the just.

We owe the apocryphal *Acts* largely to the wish to know more about the lives, journeys and preaching of the apostles. Some of these, however, are attributed to heretical circles and their aim was to confirm heterodox opinions: the *Acts of Andrew, John* and *Paul* seem to have circulated among the Manichees and *Priscillianists (Eus., *HE* III, 25); that of *Thomas* among the Encratites (Epiph., *Haer.* XLVII, 1), Manichees (Aug., *Contr. Faust.* 22,79) and Priscillianists (Turibio, *Epist. Idacio*: PL 54, 694). Harnack (*Altchristiche Lit.*, 116ff.; on the apocryphal *Acts* see var. aus., *Les Actes Apocryphes des Apôtres,* Geneva 1981) gives a vast picture of the presence of the apocryphal *Acts* in the Fathers. Not to dispel curiosity but to avoid the dangers of heterodoxy, from the 4th c. on the apocryphal *Acts* were expurgated and rewritten so they could be accepted and read by believers. This occurred, e.g., with the *Acts of Paul* (cited from the 3rd c. by Tertull., *Bapt.* 17; Orig., *Princ.* I 2,3; *Comm. in Jo.* XX, 12; *Pas.* 36-37, 1; on this last reference see F. Bovon, *Une nouvelle citation des Actes de Paul chez Origène*: Apocrypha 5 [1994] 113-117), the *Acts of Peter* (see L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Pierre*, 110ff.), of *Thomas* (M.R. James, *Apocrypha anecdota*, II, 28-45) and of *Andrew* (see P.M. Peterson, *Andrew . . .*). Another group of apocryphal *Acts* that deal with the adventures of a single apostle (*Acts of Philip, Barnabas, Thaddaeus*) or of two apostles together (*Acts of Andrew and Matthias, Peter and Andrew, Paul and Andrew, Andrew and Bartholomew*) appears clearly as edifying literature from the late 4th c.. Worthy of special note are the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies,* whose "author" and hero is no longer an apostle but *Clement of Rome (see O. Cullmann, *Le problème . . .*). There are also apocryphal Pauline letters like the *III Epistle to the Corinthians*, the *Epistle to the Laodiceans* and *To the Alexandrians* (see the bibl. in L. Vouaux, *Les actes de Paul*). Under the title of *kerygma* or *predicatio,* fragments have reached us attributed to the preaching of Peter and Paul (see E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, II; for the *Kerygma Petri* see M.G. Mara, *Kerygma Petrou . . .*).

Among apocryphal *Apocalypses,* setting aside a significant number of texts that have not survived except in title, Eusebius calls the *Apocalypse of Peter* a "falsification" (*HE* III, 3,2; 25,4), while *Methodius of Olympus calls it an inspired text (*Symp*. II,6); according to *Sozomen (*HE* VII,19), the text was read on Good Friday in some Palestinian communities. Various scholars have claimed to see an influence of the *Sibylline Oracles* in Theophilus, Clement and in the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* of ps.-*Justin (on this work and its problems see A. Pincherle, *Gli oracoli . . .*).

In summary we can say: (1) in some ancient documents, called apocrypha, the desire emerges to fix

in writing what oral traditions in various regions ascribed to Christ and his disciples; (2) other apocrypha respond—by the free and imaginative use of scriptural data and information, answering the needs of local communities—to the demands of popular curiosity about human destiny, about Jesus and about his family; (3) still other apocrypha seek to legitimate heresy through the manipulation of canonical texts; (4) late apocrypha mirror the apologetic or dogmatic problems of the time when they were written. Besides this, apocrypha were responsible for fixing a form of preaching and *catechesis which, differing in part from the canonical, nevertheless exercised considerable influence on literature, art, devotion and *liturgy. It is enough to recall that the names and information about Mary's parents, her presentation in the temple, Jesus' birth in a cave with ox and ass, the names and number of the *magi, and many other details entered the history of Christian devotion through these texts. Also, in the field of liturgy, some parts of the Mass *pro eligendo Pontifice* are taken from the *III Book of Esdras*. The first publication of an apocrypha at Basel in 1552 was followed by collections guided by increasingly scientific criteria, the most complete and philologically sound being that of J.A. Fabricius (1703–1719), even if conditioned by comprehensive judgments on the apocrypha. The first translation into a modern language was by J. Jones (18th c.) From the 19th c. to our own day, interest in the analysis, critical edition and translation of apocrypha has continually grown.

Even if apocryphal literature seems to add nothing to our knowledge of biblical revelation, it is also true that the historical value of apocrypha is considerable, and sometimes irreplaceable, for our knowledge of the moral and religious currents of early Christianity or broad strata of it. At times the apocrypha complete or correct what we have from other sources; at other times they make up for their silence. That this historical value was considered secondary by the majority of the Fathers shows that their primary interest in these apocrypha was to collect and transmit the revelation contained in Scripture. This explains (1) the concern of some fathers (Iren., *Haer.* 3,1; Orig. *Praef. in Lk.*) from the 2nd c. on to denounce some writings as apocryphal; (2) the drawing up of the so-called Muratorian fragment (*Antiquitates Italicae Medii aevi* III, 851-854), which divides books into sacred, disputed and apocryphal; (3) Eusebius's four-part list (books accepted by all the churches, disputed books, adulterated but not heretical books, heretical books) (*HE* III,25); and (4) the official lists of the Great Church (from the 5th-6th c. on), in which texts are classified as canonical, disputed and apocryphal. The fullest list of NT apocrypha is in the so-called **Decretum gelasianum* (Mansi VIII, 150-151). Some writings are declared apocryphal in the letter *Consulenti tibi*, sent 20 February 405 by Pope *Innocent I to *Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse (*Ep.* 6 PL 20, 501-502). Three Greek catalogs should be mentioned: the *Stichometric Catalog of Nicephorus,* *patriarch of Constantinople 806–818 (PG 100, 1055-1060); the *Pseudo-Athanasian Catalog* (*Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*, PG 28, 431); and the anonymous catalog published by Montfaucon Cotelier Pitra (see Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici graecorum Historia et monumenta*, Rome 1864, vol. I, 100).

J.B. Frey, *Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament*: DBS, I, 354-460; E. Amman, *Apocryphes du Nouveau Testament*: DBS 1, 460-533; G. Bardy, *Apocryphes à tendance encratite* (*Actes des Apôtres*): DSp 1, 752-765; J.A. Fabricius, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2 vols., Hamburg 1703-1719; C. Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum apocrypha*, Leipzig 1851-1903 (latest ed. edited by R.A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet); *Evangelia apocrypha*, Leipzig 1852 ([2]1876); *Apocalypses apocryphae*, Leipzig 1866; M.R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, TSt, 1893-1897; A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, I, Leipzig 1893; E. Tisserant, *Ascension d'Isaïe*, Paris 1909; L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul*, Paris 1913; R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, New York 1914; L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Pierre*, Paris 1922; A. Pincherle, *Gli oracoli sibillini giudaici*, Rome 1922; O. Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudoclémentin*, Paris 1930; P.M. Peterson, *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter: His History and His Legends*, Leiden 1958; E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, *Apokryphen des NT*, Tübingen [4]1968; M.G. Mara, *Il Kerygma Petrou: Studi in onore di A. Pincherle*, Rome 1967; Id., *Evangile de Pierre*, SC 201, Paris 1973; M. Erbetta, *Gli apocrifi del NT*, 4 vols., Turin 1966-1981; var. aus., *Les Actes Apocryphes des Apôtres*, Geneva 1981; F. Bovon, *Canonical and Apocryphal Acts of Apostles*: JECS 11 (2003) 165-194; F. Gori, *Gli Apocrifi e i Padri*, in *Complementi di Patrologia*, Rome 1989; E. Junod, *Apocryphes du Nouveau Testament: Une appellation erronée et une collection artificielle*: Apocrypha 3 (1992); A. Di Berardino, *Gli apocrifi cristiani e il loro significato*, in *Storia della Teologia* I, Casale Monferrato 1993; an exhaustive bibl. in L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento*, 3 vols., Turin 1994; E. Norelli, *L'Ascensione di Isaia. Studi su un apocrifo al crocevia dei cristianesimi*, Bologna 1994; J.-D. Kaëstli, *Les écrits apocryphes chrétiens. Pour une approche qui valorise leur diversité et leurs attaches bibliques*, in J.-D. Kaëstli - D. Marguerat, *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue*, Geneva 1995; the journal *Apocrypha*, published annually since 1990.

M.G. Mara

APOCRYPHA, PETRINE

I. *Gospel of Peter* - II. the *Kerygma Petrou* - III. *Apocalypse of Peter* - IV. *Acts of Peter.*

Several apocryphal Christian writings are collected under the name of Petrine apocrypha. They occur in a variety of literary genres, have the name Peter in common, and are dated between the 2nd

and 4th c. We have a variety of evidence concerning them.

I. *Gospel of Peter.* An untitled, incomplete narration of the passion and resurrection of the Lord attributed to Peter was found in a 8th-9th-c. Greek parchment discovered in the Christian necropolis of Akhmîm (Upper Egypt) in 1886–1887. The name *Gospel of Peter* given it by scholars derives from the testimony of *Serapion of Antioch, mentioned by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VI,12.2); *Origen, reported in the *Comm. in Matth.* X,17; *Jerome, present in the *De viris illustribus* 41 (testimony based on Eusebius); *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who, in the *Haereticorum fabulorum compendium* II.2, tells us that the "Nazarites" used the gospel called *According to Peter*. Two brief fragments attributed to this writing have been found in the P. Oxy. 2949 and the P. Oxy. 4009, thought to be 2nd c. The Akhmîm fragment is not divided into verses and chapters.

The content of the 14 chapters and 60 verses into which scholars have divided the narrative contained in the fragment is as follows: (1) Conclusion of the trial; attitude of Pilate and Herod (vv. 1-2); (2) Joseph of Arimathea, even before the crucifixion, asks that the Lord's body be given him for burial; attitude of Pilate and Herod (vv. 3-5); (3) the passion: the Lord is handed over to the Jews, who begin the derision and insults (vv. 6-9); (4) the crucifixion between two criminals; dividing of the garments; one of the criminals acknowledges him as the "Savior of mankind" (vv. 10-14); (5) death and exaltation of the Lord; the darkness; the mixture of gall and vinegar; the veil of the temple torn (vv. 15-20); (6) deposition from the cross and burial; details accompanying the deposition; the funeral rite by Joseph of Arimathea (vv. 21-24); (7) attitude of the Jews and of the Lord's disciples (vv. 25-27); (8) the tomb guards (vv. 28-33); (9) the resurrection: the "crowd" from Jerusalem's testimony of the sealed tomb; the apparition to the soldiers of two "young men" who descend from heaven to the tomb (vv. 34-37); (10) apparition to all the tomb guards; the "three men" whose height reaches to heaven; the walking cross; a voice questions; the cross responds (vv. 38-42); (11) new apparition: a "personage" descends from heaven and enters the tomb; the guards, having agreed together on what to do, go to Pilate; request of the Jews that silence be imposed on the soldiers (vv. 43-49); (12) Mary Magdalene and friends set out for the tomb (vv. 50-54); (13) discovery of the empty tomb: the "young man" seated at the tomb, his questions and message (vv. 55-57); (14) after the Feast of the Unleavened Bread: attitude of the disciples; probable beginning of the apparition of the Lord to Peter in Galilee (vv. 58-60).

Various problems have been raised concerning this text: the place and date of composition; its relation with the canonical gospels and the Christian literature of the first centuries; the presence or not of *docetist elements; the presentation of the Lord's passion-death-resurrection-glorification according to a formulation considered popular or heterodox.

A few scholars (e.g., Völter) have proposed *Egypt as the place of origin of the *Gospel of Peter.* The letter of *Serapion, bishop of *Antioch in the late 2nd and early 3rd c., to the community of Rhossos, however, makes clear that the *Gospel of Peter* had already been read for some time in that community and perhaps had penetrated or been read in docetist circles (see Eusebius, *HE* VI,12,2). *Syria is thus to be favored as the location where the text was written. This thesis has been further strengthened by the fact that Origen made allusion to the *Gospel of Peter* after his time at *Antioch, and by the considerable dependency on the *Gospel of Peter* shown by the *Syriac Didascalia* and *Aphraates. The close relationship with other texts of the Syro-Asiatic region, such as the *Perì Pascha* of *Melito of Sardis, the *fragment IV on Easter* of *Apollinaris of Hierapolis and the homily *In S. Pascha* of the 2nd-c. anonymous Asiatic lead to a placing of the text in the Syro-Asiatic area. In fact the affinity of the *Gospel of Peter* with the *Easter homilies, as well as with the Eusebian text, have led many scholars to date the text toward the mid-2nd c.

Regarding the relation of the *Gospel of Peter* and the canonical gospels, our author's episodic narration harmonizes with the synoptic gospels and his theology with the gospel of John and the *Apocalypse.

A certain tendency to diminish the reality of the Lord's sufferings seems to be present in some verses of the *Gospel of Peter,* suggesting that the text should be located, either as to its origin or its use, in docetist circles. There are, however, numerous passages that contradict this tendency. The text seems concerned to emphasize that the *kyrios* who suffers and dies on the cross is still the Lord of glory. This concern leads the author to present the passion-death-resurrection-glorification of the *kyrios* in such a concentrated fashion as to give the impression of diminishing the historicity of the individual details. In fact this is not the case: the passion and death of the *kyrios* are not ignored; rather, according to the Johannine perspective that associates the lifting up on the cross with glorification, the *recapitulation in glory of the passion and death of the *kyrios* is stressed.

Another fact of particular interest is the presence in the *Gospel of Peter* of two traditions regarding the Lord's resurrection: one that describes the exit of the *kyrios* from the tomb in the presence of Jews and Gentiles, all witnesses to the event; and the other the same as in the canonical gospels, which entrusts the testimony of the Lord's resurrection first to the empty tomb and then to the apparitions to the disciples. The theophany of the risen Lord seems to be the fruit, not of a desire for the spectacular, but of the recovery of a tradition, also attested by other texts; this tradition proclaims the same faith in Christ died and risen, but in a different setting in which the doctrine and images of apocalyptic literature are familiar.

Among the numerous trans., see the most recent of L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento. Vangeli*, Casale Monferrato 1994 and, under the direction of F. Bovon - P. Geoltrain, *Ecrits apocryphes chrétiens*, Paris 1998. Beyond the numerous eds., trs. and studies, see esp. L. Vaganay, *L'Evangile de Pierre*, Paris 1930; M.G. Mara, *Evangile de Pierre*, Paris 1973; J. Denker, *Die theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Doketismus*, Bern-Frankfurt 1975; W.J. McCant, *The Gospel of Peter: Docetism Reconsidered*: NTS 30 (1984); R.E. Brown, *The Gospel of Peter and Canonical Gospel Priority*: NTS 33 (1987); J.D. Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*, San Francisco 1988; F. Bovon - P. Geoltrain, *Ecrits apocryphes chrétiens*, Paris 1998; E. Norelli, *Situations des Apocryphes Pétriniens*: *Apocrypha* 2 (1991a); M.G. Mara, *Il Vangelo di Pietro*, Bologna 2003.

II. The *Kerygma Petrou* or the *Preaching of Peter.* Ten fragments that have reached us through *Clement of Alexandria, principally in the *Stromateis,* though there are some explicit references to passages of the *Kerygma* in the *Prophetic Extracts*. Our text is also referred to in the *Letter to *Diognetus*, in *Theophilus and in *Origen, who says the text was cited by *Heracleon (*Comm. in Jo.* XIII, 17). Affinities have been noted between the *Kerygma Petrou,* the *Apology* of *Aristides and the **Ascension of Isaiah*. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* III, 3.2) counts the *Kerygma* among the ps.-Petrine writings. The fragments, which from the outset make reference to Peter, who in his preaching proclaimed the Lord to be "law" and "word," recall a missionary discourse of Peter, who exhorts his listeners to recognize "that there is only one God," creator of all things through the Son, and to adore him not as Greeks and Jews do, but in a new way, "through Christ," as do Christians, who are called the "third branch." The anti-idolatry and anti-Jewish polemic seems to be aimed not primarily at *pagans and Jews but at *catechumens or Christians needing consolation in their faith and needing to be made aware of the novelty this faith involves. Most scholars consider *Egypt to be the source of the fragments. The presence of the *Kerygma* in 2nd-c. writings and the reference to the use of some fragments by Heracleon suggest a dating of the *Kerygma Petrou* not after the middle of the 2nd c.

E. Bobschutz, *Das Kerygma Petri kritisch untersucht* (TU XI,I), Leipzig 1893; E. Klostermann, *Reste des Petrus evangeliums. Der Petrus apokalypse und des Kerygma Petri. Apocrypha* I, Bonn 1933; M.G. Mara, *Il "Kerygma Petrou"*: Studi and Materiali di Storia delle Religioni 38 (1967) 314-342; P. Nautin, *Les citations de la "Prédication de Pierre" dans Clément d'Alexandrie, Strom. VI,V, 39-41*: JTS 25 (1974) 89-105; P. Paulsen, *Das Kerygma Petri und die urchristliche Apologetik*: ZKG 88 (1977) 1-37; E. Norelli, *Situations des Apocryphes Petriniens*: Apocrypha 3 (1992) 63-71; M.G. Mara, *Note sulla "Predicatio Petri,"* in *Atti VI Simposio su Paolo Apostolo*, Rome 2000, 147-154.

III. *Apocalypse of Peter.* One of the earliest references to the *Apocalypse of Peter* is in the Muratorian *Canon (ca. 200), where it says: "We also accept only the apocalypses of John and of Peter," noting that some Christians preferred that the latter not be read in church. Until the 4th c. (see *Codex Claromontanus*) it was still listed among the NT canonical books. *Clement of Alexandria cites it multiple times (*Ext. Proph.* 41; 48-49), considering it Sacred Scripture. The *Apocalypse of Peter* was used by *Methodius of Olympus and mentioned by Eusebius and *Macarius of Magnesia. In the Greek MS of Akhmîm, discovered in 1886–1887, besides the *Gospel of Peter* was a piece of an anonymous apocalypse that, based on its affinity with a citation of Clement of Alexandria, has been identified as the *Apocalypse of Peter.*

In 1910 Grébaut found and translated an *Ethiopian text of the *Apocalypse of Peter,* more extensive than that in the Akhmîn MS and considered by some to be earlier (see Norelli). In both versions the basic theme is the *revelation to Peter of the last judgment, of "how the righteous and sinners will be separated, how it will be for the upright of heart, and how the wicked will be uprooted for all eternity." The text of the Ethiopian version opens with the scene of the Lord seated on the Mount of Olives, being asked by Peter and the disciples about the signs of his second coming and of the end of the world. The Lord, warning the disciples against false prophets, tells how unexpected his coming will be; as a sign from which the disciples can learn to recognize his actions at that time, he mentions the parable of the fruitful fig tree (Mt 24:32; Mk 13:28ff.) and that of the barren fig tree (Lk 13:6-9), which refers to Israel, where an *antichrist will appear in the last days and where there will be many *martyrs. Christ then describes in detail to Peter the punishments that will be meted out to 17

categories of sinners; the fate of the righteous is stated with a few words: "Then I will give to my elect and my righteous ones the salutary bath. . . . The righteous will then be adorned with flowers and I will go to rejoice with them . . . and I will give them the promised eternal happiness with my heavenly Father." After inviting the disciples to follow him "on the holy mountain," the Lord shows Peter "the host of the fathers," "their rest" and *Moses and *Elijah, resplendent: the scene records Jesus' transfiguration.

The variations of the Ethiopian version vis-à-vis that of the Akmîm MS have already been indicated (see Norelli): in the Greek version, Peter and the disciples do not see Moses and Elijah, but some of the "righteous brothers"; Peter sees hell, but the punishments awaiting sinners are not described. Some scholars think it probable that the Ethiopian version preserves the original form of the text, even if from ch. 18 to the conclusion at ch. 36 there are obvious later additions. The date of the work is proposed as 2nd c.; Egypt, as the place of composition. Regarding the relation between the *Apocalypse of Peter* found in the MS of Akhmîm and the text of the *Gospel of Peter* of the same MS, it does not seem as though they come from a Petrine school or from Peter's followers, or even from the same geographic area (see D.H. Schmidt, *The Peter Writings: Their Redactors and Their Relationships,* Illinois 1972). The placing of the two texts in the same MS in the tomb of a *Coptic *monk in the necropolis of Akhmîm can probably be explained as an anthological collection of passages on the mystery of the afterlife.

M. Erbetta, *Gli apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento, III. Lettere e Apocalissi*, Turin 1969, 208-233; L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento, III. Lettere, Dormizione di Maria, Apocalissi,* Casale Monferrato 1994, 319-368; D.D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened: A Study on the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter*, Atlanta 1988; E. Norelli, *Situation des Apocryphes Pétriniens*: Apocrypha 3 (1992) 31-83; Id., *Pertinence Théologique et canonicité: les premières apocalypses chrétiennes*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 147-164; P. Marrassini, *L'Apocalisse di Pietro*, in *Studi in onore di Lanfranco Ricci*, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples 1994; R.J. Bauckham, *The Apocalypse of Peter: An Account of Research*, in W. Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 2.25/6 (Berlin-New York 1988); Id., *The Apocalypse of Peter: A Jewish-Christian Apocalypse from the Time of Bar Kokhba*: Apocrypha 5 (1994) 7-111.

IV. *Acts of Peter.* Written originally in Greek perhaps in Syria toward the end of the 2nd c., the Acts are in large part lost, with the exception of a text in which Peter's *martyrdom is narrated and a *Coptic fragment in which is reported the episode of the healing of his daughter of the paralysis that came upon her to save her from Ptolemy. The *Latin version of the *Vercelli MSS*, dated 4th-6th c. and considered the text closest to the original, has preserved most of the *Acts of Peter*. Various ancient testimonies (Muratorian fragment, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus), today considered unreliable, refer to details of Peter and his family. Only from the 3rd c. do we have citations that with a high probability depend directly or indirectly on the *Acts of Peter*. The *Acts of Peter* seem also to have been known perhaps by *Origen, who tells of Peter's crucifixion with his head down; and certainly, in the first half of the 3rd c., by the author of the **Didascalia*, who in *Didasc.* 6,7-9 relates a passage with some details present in *Acts of Peter* 4; 5; 32. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* III,2.25) does not name the *Acts of Peter* among the ps.-Petrine writings he cites, though some of his data does seem to depend on them. From the 4th c. on, possible references to our text by ecclesiastical writers multiply: see *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* VI, 14-15); *Arnobius of Sicca (*Adv. gent.* 2,12); *Commodian (*Carmen apol.* vv. 624-626, 629-630); *Jerome (*Adv. Iovin.* 1,26; *Comm. in Gal.* 1,18; *De vir. ill.* I). It is probable that *Ambrose (see *De interp. Iob. et David*, I,1; *In Ps. 118*, *Sermo* 21; *In hexaemeron* 4,8) had direct knowledge of the *Acts of Peter* through the *Vercelli MSS*. The *Vercelli MSS* open with three paragraphs dedicated to Paul's departure from *Rome for *Spain, then narrate the arrival of Simon Magus at Rome, his preaching and Peter's being sent by the Lord from Jerusalem to Rome to refute Simon there as he had at *Jerusalem. Peter's preaching and miracles cause Simon to flee Marcellus's house, where he had been staying. The confrontation between Simon Magus and Peter began with Simon's denial of the real birth and crucifixion of Jesus. After correcting Simon's *Christology, Peter works various resurrection miracles in the name of Jesus Christ. Exhorted by the crowd to do the same, Simon cannot; Peter then saves him from the wrath of the crowd. Trying to regain the crowd, Simon, after attracting them with false prodigies, tries to levitate, but falls to the ground and is definitively defeated by Peter. The following text narrates Peter's martyrdom (MSS P).

L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Pierre. Introduction, textes, traduction et commentaire*, Paris 1922; var. aus., *Les Actes Apocryphes des Apôtres*, Geneva 1981, 299-301; A. Leloir, *Ecrits apocryphes sur les Apôtres*, I, Turnhout 1986 (for the Armenian texts); P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen [2]1989; W. Schneemelcher, *Petrusakten*, in W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apoktyphen II: Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, Tübingen [5]1989, 252-253; *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento. Atti degli Apostoli*, ed. L. Moraldi, Casale Monferrato 1994, 41-104; var. aus., *The Apocry-*

phal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 3), Louvain 1998, ed. J.N. Bremmer; the most recent redaction is by G. Poupon, *Les Actes de Pierre et leur remaniement*: ANRW II, 25,6 (1988) 4363-4383; E. Norelli, *Sur les Actes de Pierre: à propos d'un livre récent*: Apocrypha 11 (2000) 227-258, prefers, to Poupon's thesis of a primitive text and a redactor, that of a composite work from different sources, not well-integrated in the text; Chr. Thomas thinks of the *Acts of Peter* as a mixture of written and oral data, see in *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives*, ed. R.F. Stoops, *Canon and Antitype: The Relationship Beetween the Acts of Peter and the New Testament*: Semeia 80 (1999) 185-205.

M.G. Mara

APOCRYPHA IN EASTERN LANGUAGES. Apocrypha also had a very important role in ancient Eastern literature. A large number were translated from the Greek, with the pattern of translation usually being *Greek-*Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopian; or Greek-*Syriac-*Armenian-*Georgian; some Georgian texts were translated from Syriac; some apocrypha were also written in Eastern languages. The texts translated from the Greek often contain many interesting variations. The translations are usually paraphrases, often with a strong accent on local customs and other local elements. We will limit ourselves here to a bibliographical summary of Muslim and Christian apocrypha in the most important languages of the Christian East.

An introduction to Eastern apocrypha: F. Haase, *Literararkritische Untersuchungen zur orientalischen-apokryphen Evangelienliteratur*, Leipzig 1913; information on apocrypha in M. Albert, R. Beylot, R.G. Cocquin, B. Outtier, Ch. Renoux, A. Guillaumont, *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993; Starowieyski 1/1, 842-845.

Muslim apocrypha: Texts on Jesus and Mary can be found in a Persian writer, Tabarî (839-923) in *La Chronique*, *Histoire des prophètes et des rois*, tr. H. Zotenberg, 1-5, Paris 2001, vol. 1, 86-121. On Christ and Mary in Islam, see D. Sidersky, *Les origines des légendes musulmanes dans le Coran et dans les Vies des Prophètes*, Paris 1933, 136-150 (Qur'an and the apocrypha); J.M. Abd-el-Jail, *La vie de Marie selon le Coran et l'Islam*, in *Maria, Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 1, Paris 1949, 183-211; F.F. Bruce, *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the NT*, London 1974, 167-186; R. Arnaldez, *Jésus, fils de Marie, prophète d'Islam*, Paris 1980; A.J. Wensinck - P. Jonstone, *Maryam*, in *Encyclopèdie d'Islam*, 6, Leiden 1986, 613-617 (bibl.); G. Rizzardi, *Il fascino di Cristo nell'Islam*, Milan 1989.

Gospel of Barnabas: See Barnabas.

Muslim agrapha: ed. M. Asín y Palacios, PO 13,3, 1916; PO 19,4, 1926, edition with Latin tr.; R. Dunkerley, *The Muhhamedan Agrapha*: Expository Times 39 (1927-1928) 167-171; 230-234.

Christian apocrypha: Arabic: M. Dunlop Gibson, *Apocrypha Arabica* (Studia Sinaitica 8), London 1901; Gospels: the Arabic infancy gospel. Ed.: CANT 58; BHO 619; H. Sike, *Traiecti ad Rhenum* (Utrecht 1697, commentary); J.C. Thilo, *Codex apocryphus NT*, 1, Leipzig 1832, 66-131; E.A. W. Budge, *A History of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the History of Likeness of Christ*, 1-2, London 1899; M.E. Provera, *Il vangelo arabo dell'infanzia secondo il Ms. Laurenziano orientale (n. 387)*, Jerusalem 1973 (introd., theology). Trans.: Fr. - P. Peeters, *Evangiles apocryphes*, 2, Paris 1914, 1-65; C. Ganeguaud: EAC 1,207-238; Lat. - Tischendorf 181-209; Ger. - Schneider 174-195; It. - Erbetta, 1,2, 102-123; Moraldi 1, 281-311; A. di Nola, *Vangeli apocrifi. Natività e infanzia*, Parma 1986 (TEA). G. Messina, *I Magi di Betlemme e una predicazione di Zoroastro*, Rome 1933. G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, 1, Vatican City 1944, 224-257; R.G. Coquin, et al., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 53f.; G. Levi della Vida, *Leggende agiografiche cristiane nell'Islam*, in *Acts del convegno internazionale sul tema: L'Oriente cristiano nella storia di civiltà*, Rome 1964, 139-151 (Lincei, Quaderni 62); Starowieyski 1,405-439. Arabic Gospel of John: CANT 44; J. Galbiati, *Ioannis Euangelium apocryphum arabice*, 1-2, Mediolani 1957 (in CANT, a concordance of fragments with the Ethiopian *Miracles of Jesus*). Trans.: Swed. - O. Löfgren, Stockholm 1967; It. - L. Moraldi, Milan 1991. O. Löfgren, *Ein unbeachtetes apokryphes Evangelium*: Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 4 (1943) 153-159; Id., *Zur Charakteristik des apokryphen Johannesevangeliums*: Orientalia Suecana 10 (1961) 147-154; E. Peretto, *Cristo e la Vergine nel Vangelo Arabo di Giovanni*: Marianum 25 (1963) 99-139; M. van Esbroeck, *À propos de l'Évangile apocryphe arabe attribué à S. Jean*: Mélanges de l'Université S. Joseph 49 (1975-1976) 597-603; L. van Rompay, *Les manuscrits éthiopiens des "Miracle de Jésus," comprenant l'Evangile apocryphe de Jean et l'Evangile de l'Enfance selon Thomas Israélite*: AB 93 (1975) 133-146; W. Witakowski, *The Miracles of Jesus: An Aethiopian Apocryphal Gospel*: Apocrypha 6 (1995) 279-298. *Transitus*: M. Enger, *Ioannis Apostoli de transitu Beatae Mariae Virginis liber*, Eberfeld 1854. Joseph the Carpenter: A. Battista, B. Bagatti, *Historia Iosephi fabri lignarii*, Jerusalem 1978. Apocryphal Acts: A. Smith Lewis, *Acta mythologica Apostolorum* (Horae Semiticae 3-4), London 1904.

Aramean: See A. Desremaux, *Les œuvres de la littérature chrétienne en araméen christo-paléstinien*: Bulletin de AELAC 9 (1999) 9-14.

Armenian: Gospels: Ed.: Mechitaristes 1-2, Venice 1898-1904. Infancy Gospel: ed.: CANT 59; BHO 617f.; E. Dayeci, 1, Venice 1898, 127-235; trans.: Fr. - P. Peeters, *Evangiles apocryphes*, 2, Paris 1914, 66-286; It. - Erbetta 1,2, 124-185; Craveri 149-213; Pol. - Starowieyski 1,1, 440-541. N. Marr, *Iz letniej pojezdki w Armeniju*: Zapiski Wostoczniego Otdielienija Impieratorskogo Russkogo Archieoğogičeskogo Občšestwa 6 (1892) 135-145 = Hamdes Amsorya 6 (1892) 232-235; S.J. Voicu, *Gli apocrifi armeni*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 161-180 [174]. *Acts*: *Ecrits apocryphes sur les Apôtres. Traduction de l'édition arménienne de Venise*, ed. L. Leloir, OSB, CCAp 3-4, 1986 (tr. from the Mekhitarist ed.). See M.E. Stone, *The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition*: Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities 4 (1969) 59-78 (OT apocrypha); Id.: Apocrypha 1 (1990) 303-311; S.J. Voicu: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 161-180; Ch. Ronoux, in var. aus., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 129 n.; L. Leloir, *Les citations évangéliques dans la version arménienne des Actes apocryphes*, in R. Gryson (ed.), *Philologia sacra*, FS, H. Frede, W. Thiele, 2, Freiburg 1993, 364-377; V. Calzolari, *Réecriture des textes apocryphes en arménien, l'exemple de la légende de l'apostolat de Thadée en Arménie*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 97-110; B. Outtier, *Paralytique et Resuscité* (*Cant 85 et 62*). *Vie des apocryphes en arménien*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 111-120; V. Calzolari - J.D. Kaëstli - B. Outtier, *Apocry-*

phes arméniens, traduction, création, transmission, iconographie, Lausanne 1999.

Coptic: E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1913. See W. Grosouw, *De Apocriefen van het Oude en Nieuve Testament in de koptische Letterkunde*: Studia catholica 10 (1933/1934) 434-446; 11 (1934/1935) 19-36; T. Orlandi, *Gli apocrifi copti*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 57-71; F. Morard, *Notes sur le recueil des actes apocryphes coptes*: RThPh 113 (1981) 403-413; A. Perez: Coptic Encyclopaedia 1, 161-169 (bibl.); R.G. Coquin, in var. aus., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 190f.; M. Rassart-Debergh, *Littérature apocryphe et l'art copte*: Apocrypha 7 (1996) 253-259. See also the texts of Nag Hammadi.

Ethiopian: Gospels and Transitus: M. Chaine, *Apocrypha de Beata Maria Virgine*: CSCO 39-40/Aeth 1-2, 1909 (1961); S. Grébaut, *Les miracles de Jésus*: PO 12,4 (1919); 14,5 (1920); 17,4 (1924); ROC 16 (1911) 255-265, 356-367; 21 (1918/1919) 73-87, 94-99, 100-103, 190-203, 204-213; E.A.W. Budge, *One Hundred and Ten Miracles of Our Lady*, London [2]1933; Id., *Legends of Our Lady Perpetual Virgin and the Mother Hanna*, London [2]1933; E. Cerulli, *Il libro etiopico dei Miracoli di Maria e le sue fonti nelle letterature del Medio Evo latino*, Rome 1943; V. Arras, *De Transitu Mariae Apocrypha Aethiopice*: CSCO 342,351/Aeth 343,352 (1973-1974); M.A. van den Oudenrijn, *Gamaliel äthiopische Texte zur Pilatusliteratur*, Fribourg 1959. *Acts*: E.A.W. Budge, *The Contendings of Apostles*, 1-2, London [2]1935 (repr. Amsterdam 1976); R. Basset, *Les apocryphes éthiopiens traduits en français*, 1-11, Paris 1893-1909. See E. Cerulli, *La letteratura etiopica*, Florence [3]1968; E. Hammerschmidt, *Das Pseudo-apostolische Schrifttum in äthiopischer Überlieferung*: Journal of Semitic Studies 9 (1964) 114-121; P. Piovanelli, *Les aventures des apocryphes en Ethiopie*: Apocrypha 4 (1993) 197-224; R. Beylot, in var. aus., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 237-239; ANT 615 n.

Georgian: Ed.: C. Kurcikidze, Tbilisi 1959. *Georgian Infancy Gospel*: unpubl.; Pol. tr. G. Peradze, in Starowieyski 1/1, 204-229. See M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, SeT 185, Vatican City 1955; M. van Esbroeck: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 57-91; B. Outtier in var. aus., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 279.

Syriac: Ed.: W. Wright, *Contribution to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*, 1-2, London 1865; M. Dunlop Gibson, *Apocrypha Sinaitica* (Studia Sinaitica 5), London 1896; E.A.W. Budge, *The History of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Likeness of Christ*, London 1899; A. Smith-Lewis, *Apocrypha Syriaca: The Protevangelium Iacobi et Transitus Mariae* (Studia Sinaitica 11), London 1902. *Acts*: W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of Apostles*, 1-2, Edinburgh 1871 (repr. Amsterdam 1968); E. Meščerskaja, *Apokrifičeskie dejania apostołow. Nowozawetnye apokrifi w sirijskoj literaturie*, Moscow 1997 (anthology of Syrian texts in Russian tr.). See A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia Syriaca*, Rome [2]1965; H.J.W. Drijvrs, *Apocryphal Literature in the Cultural Milieu of Osroëne*: Apocrypha 1 (1999) 231-246; J. Texidor, *L'apôtre d'après la littérature syriaque*: Apocrypha 1 (1999) 267-277; M. Albert, in var. aus., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 318-320; A. Desremaux, *Remarques sur le rôle des apocryphes dans la théologie des Églises syriaques: l'exemple de "Testimonia" christologiques inédits*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 165-177.

M. Starowieyski

APOCRYPHA of the OT, Christian and Christianized. In most cases OT apocrypha—i.e., regarding persons of the OT, also called intertestamentary writings—are of Jewish origin. A certain number of these apocrypha, however, are of Christian origin, or have been more or less Christianized. Alongside the Christian elements we find others: *gnostic, Bogomil and *pagan.

The number of purely Christian OT apocrypha is quite limited. Among them are some works of the Esdras cycle: the *Apocalypse of Esdras*, the *Vision of Esdras*, the *Revelation of Esdras* and the *Apocalypse of Sedrach*. These works are most often from the High Middle Ages.

There are apocrypha in which Christian authors have reworked, more or less thoroughly, the Jewish material, as with the legend of the death of Isaiah in the *Ascension of Isaiah* or *Lives of the Prophets*, where the Jewish material was profoundly reworked and put to use by Christians.

A separate case are the *Sibylline oracles*, a work composed of various elements: the pagan substrate was Judaized, and the Jewish material was then Christianized by Christians. Some of its books are entirely Jewish (III) or entirely Christian (VI), and some are *Jewish Christian (VII); gnostic, Jewish Christian and even Bogomil elements can be found in the other books.

Many OT apocrypha—like the *apocalypses—enjoyed a certain popularity among Christians and were therefore Christianized, which took place in various ways and at different levels. Some works had only a very limited number of passages inserted, whereas others were more or less profoundly reworked. Some have Christian additions only in certain versions. Finally, some Jewish apocrypha were influenced by a Christian spirit, such as the *Apocrypha of Ezekiel*.

There are also non-Christianized apocrypha that have points of contact with the NT: they are cited, like the *Book of Enoch* in the *Epistle of Jude* (14-15); the same book has points of contact with Colossians and Hebrews—the latter knows the legend of the death of Isaiah (11:37). The author of the *Testament of Adam* knows the NT apocrypha, etc. Intertestamentary writings are cited by the fathers of the church, such as *Clement of Alexandria and *Origen. Some know these writings from their own reading, others through Flavius Josephus or *Philo. Jewish historians and poets are esp. cited; the OT apocalypses enjoyed a certain popularity among ecclesiastical writers.

On OT apocrypha see CAVT; the great collections like those of Diez Macho, Sacchi or Charlesworth; introductions like

Denis or R. Rubinkiewicz, *Wprowadzenie do Apokryfów Starego Tstamentu*, Lublin 1987; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*, Harrisburg [2]1998 (esp. 79-90: *The Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*).

M. Starowieyski

APOKATASTASIS (apocatastasis). In general the term means "restoration, reestablishment, return"; astronomically it means the time required for a planet to complete its orbit. In the first Christian centuries the word assumed various meanings that can only be fully understood in light of its previous history. Its was used in medicine, law and politics, and was linked to the astronomical theory of the Great Year; it appears in Jewish thought, in the NT and often in *gnostic writings. The noun appears in *Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 134,4); with somewhat greater frequency the so-called Apostolic Fathers and other *apologists use the corresponding verb ἀποκαθίστημι. Sometimes the idea of a return to a previous moment is accompanied by that of fulfillment, the arrival at a better state, which presupposes the changing of events rather than the restoration of a state already known (see, e.g., Ign., *Smyrn.* 11,2). At other times the two terms indicate properly Christian notions: Justin uses them to indicate the idea of *redemption, *Tatian (*Or. ad Gr.* 6,2) alludes to bodily *resurrection, as does *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* V, 3,2), who elsewhere uses them to touch on humanity's new foundation in God through Christ (*Adv. haer.* V, 12,1) or on the Lord's *parousia (*Adv. haer.* IV, 58,9). Nonetheless, these authors do not exclude from the meanings of ἀποκατάστασις and ἀποκαθίστημι the idea of the restoration of a primitive state. After the use made of it by *Clement of Alexandria, *Origen gives considerable emphasis to the notion of ἀποκατάστασις: it is generally held that he links the term to the doctrine of restoration to the primitive state, i.e., the restoration at the end of time of all rational creatures, without exception, to the state of primitive happiness. Some of his texts support this opinion, whereas others express otherwise; in particular the *Letter to His Friends at Alexandria* rejects the idea that the devil would be saved. (For a discussion of this, see E. Prinzivalli, in Origen, *Dizionario*, cited in bibl., 24ff.). The term appears in many later authors, sometimes in connection with anti-Origenist polemic.

Oepke: TWNT I, 386ff.; Chr. Lenz: RAC I, 510ff.; J. Daniélou, *L'apocatastase chez saint Grégoire de Nysse*: RecSR 30 (1940) 328-340; A. Méhat, *Apocatastase. Origène, Clément d'Alexandrie, Act 3,21*: VChr 10 (1956) 196-214; G. Muller, *Origenes und die Apokatastasis*: TZ 14 (1958) 174-190; P. Siniscalco, Ἀποκατάστασις *e* ἀποκαθίστημι *nella tradizione della Grande Chiesa fino ad Ireneo*, SP III (= TU, 78), Berlin 1961, 380-396; G. Bien - H. Schwabl, *Apokatastasis*: Hist. Wörterbuch der Philosophie 1 (1974) 440-441; A. Mehat, Ἀποκατάστασις *chez Basilide*: *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à H.Ch. Puech*, Paris 1974, 365-373; H. Crouzel: *L'apocatastase chez Origène*: Origeniana IV (1985/87) 282-290; A.P. Pauw, *Origen's Doctrine of the Apokatástasis Pántōn*: Studia Biblica et Theologica 14 (1986) 37-50; G. May, TRE X, 302ff., s.v. *Eschatologie*; H.U. von Balthasar, *Apokatastasis*: TTZ 97 (1988) 169-182; W. Breuning: LTK[3] 1, cols. 821-824; J.R. Sachs, *Apocatastasis in Patristic Theology*: ThS 54 (1993) 617-640; E. Prinzivalli, Origen, *Dizionario*, Rome 2000, 24-29, s.v. *Apocatastasi.*

P. Siniscalco

APOLLINARIS the Elder (d. after 362). *Socrates and *Sozomen give information on the father of *Apollinaris of Laodicea. Born at *Alexandria, a Christian and a grammarian by profession, he taught first at Berytus (Beirut), then at Laodicea in Syria (Latakieh), where his son Apollinaris was born between 300 and 315. He was a priest during *Theodotus's episcopate (332–335) and his son a lector; both of them taught, the father grammar, the son *rhetoric. They attended the lectures of the *pagan rhetor Epiphanius, which provoked various prohibitions on the part of Bishop Theodotus, reaching the point of a period of excommunication for the two clerics. The excommunication was repeated by Bishop George, Theodotus's successor. Sozomen, however, gives a complex interpretation of this second excommunication: *George of Laodicea's measures were a sign of his opposition to the strong *Nicene attachment of the two Apollinarises, and to their friendship with *Athanasius who, passing through Laodicea on his return from exile in 346, was a guest at their house. In 362 the law of *Julian the Apostate aimed at removing Christian professors from schools by prohibiting the explanation of Christian authors led the elder Apollinaris to draw up an adaptation of the Pentateuch in hexameters; he is said to have done the same for the other historical books of the OT in 24 poems. It is said he titled this vast Homeric-style poem the *Jewish Archaeology*. Still, according to Socrates and Sozomen, Apollinaris the father also drew subjects for lyric and dramatic compositions from the sacred books, in the manner of Pindar and Euripides. Nothing remains of his work.

Socrates, *HE* II, 46; III, 15-16: PG 67, 361-364; 417-424; Sozomen, *HE* V, 18; VI, 25: PG 67, 1269-1272; 1630-1631; DCB I, 133-134; DHGE III, 961-962; DB I, 773; P. Batiffol, *La littérature grecque*, Paris 1901, 288-289; J. Dräseke, *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (TU VII), Leipzig 1872, 3-4; 7-9; 15-17; 63-80; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 1-3; 9-10; 44-46; 150-152; P. Allard, *Julien l'Apostate*, II 369-371.

E. Cavalcanti

APOLLINARIS of Hierapolis (2nd c.). Bishop of Hierapolis in *Phrygia during the reign of *Marcus Aurelius (161–180) (see Eus., *Chron. ad an.* 170; *HE* IV, 21; 26.1), Claudius Apollinaris carried out an intense apologetic and antiheretical literary activity, almost none of which has survived. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* IV, 27) provides a list of Apollinaris's works that had reached him, mentioning in particular an *Apology* to the emperor Marcus Aurelius, a work *To the Greeks* in five books, two books *On Truth* and two *To the Jews;* he also mentions in a general way writings against *Montanism, which was just beginning to spread. Apollinaris's anti-Montanist work was commended in *HE* V, 16.1. However, the attribution to Apollinaris of the anti-Montanist work cited by Eusebius in *HE* V, 16.2-22 is unfounded; the same attribution had previously been made by *Rufinus in his version of *HE* V, 16.2-5. *Serapion of *Antioch testifies to the importance of Apollinaris's work against the *cataphrygian *heresy; Serapion used it as an ideal document for showing the unified position of the church toward Montanism (Eus., *HE* V, 19.1-2; see CPG 1333). Regarding the *Apology,* already mentioned by Eusebius in *HE* IV, 26.1, it may well be Apollinaris's work in which a Christian interpretation was offered of the account of a thunderstorm that miraculously intervened to save Marcus Aurelius's army during the military campaign of 172 against the Marcomanni (see Eus., *HE* V, 5.3-4). From the *Chron. Pasch.* (PG 92, 80C-81A) we know that Apollinaris was the author of a work *On Easter;* the two fragments reported there put him among the promoters of the Johannine chronology of Jesus' death, 14 Nisan; it is uncertain, however, whether Apollinaris celebrated Easter according to the *quartodeciman or Roman usage. *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 14), in addition to his works *To the Greeks* and *On Truth,* read Apollinaris's work *On Piety,* which may have to be identified with the *Apology* to Marcus Aurelius. *Theodoret, who mentions Apollinaris as an anti-Montanist writer (*Haer.* III, 2), also mentions him as a polemicist against the Severian *Encratites (*Haer.* I, 21). From *Socrates (*HE* III, 7.5) it seems that Apollinaris, with *Irenaeus, *Clement of Alexandria and Serapion of Antioch, asserted the presence of the human soul in the incarnate Christ. The Apollinaris that *Jerome (*de Vir. ill.* 18) mentions, with Irenaeus, as a *millenarian, should be identified with *Apollinaris of Laodicea. Baronius inserted Apollinaris's anniversary in the Roman Martyrology, 8 January.

CPG 1103; P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme*, Fribourg (Switz.)-Paris 1913, XXII-XXIV; Id., *La crise montaniste*, Paris 1913, 151-155, 570-571; G. Laiti, *Acqua e sangue nel frammento pasquale di Apollinare di Gerapoli*, in *Atti della Settimana Sangue e antropologia nella letteratura cristiana*, ed. F. Vattioni, Rome 1983, 931-937; R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, London 1988, 83-90.

V. Zangara

APOLLINARIS of Laodicea (d. 392) – **APOLLINARIANISM**. Apollinaris was born at Laodicea ca. 315. His father, an *Alexandrian and also named *Apollinaris, taught grammar at Berytus (Beirut) before starting a family at Laodicea in Syria. He was a priest and his son a lector in the local church when, in 335, both attracted the anger of the local bishop, *Theodotus, because they attended the lectures of the Sophist Epiphanius (Socr., *HE* 2,46; Soz., *HE* 6, 25,9-11). *Athanasius stayed with them in 346, on return from his second exile; their relations with Athanasius, as with his closest collaborater, *Serapion of Thmuis, were deep and lasting. Father and son were also excommunicated by Theodotus's *Arian successor, *George of Laodicea (Soz., *HE* 6,25,12). At the Council of *Constantinople of 360, George was deposed and replaced by *Pelagius, candidate of the *homoian party led by *Acacius, against whom Athanasius turned the whole weight of his influence. During these events it seems that Apollinaris was chosen as bishop responsible for the Nicene community of Laodicea. Likewise, though in an even more turbulent situation at the nearby metropolis *Antioch, *Paulinus led the Nicenes, also called Eustathians, from his predecessor's name, as distinct from the larger community guided by *Meletius, whom Acacius's party put forward in 360. These two bishops, both favorable to *Nicaea, sent delegates to the Synod of Alexandria, convoked by Athanasius in 362. Paulinus was represented by two deacons; Apollinaris, by some monks. The two delegations used the same language in *trinitarian matters; the terms **ousia* and **hypostasis* were considered the same. This was essentially the doctrine bequeathed by *Eustathius and, practically speaking, also that of Athanasius himself. Nonetheless, between these allies who formed a common front against those they considered "Arians," there was friction when it came time to specify their *christological terminology. No. 7 of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos,* drawn up during that synod and presented under Athanasius's name, openly attests this. At about the same time, when the emperor *Julian decided to ban Christians from teaching the classics, the two Apollinarises accepted the challenge; the father composed Homeric poems inspired by the OT, and the son composed evangelical dialogues in the manner of contemporary rhetors.

In 363 Apollinaris presented Julian's old officer *Jovian (Lietzmann 250-253) with his profession of faith, in perfect order like the other regional bishops. While Athanasius, also present at Antioch, confined himself to handing over a copy of the Nicene formula with a short commentary, Apollinaris felt it his duty to give that formula a wholly personal cast—which shows that the basic ideas of *heretical Apollinarianism were already clearly defined in his thought. On the level of church politics, he immediately scored some important points. It is probable that ca. 372 one of his disciples, *Timothy, for whom he had obtained a letter of recommendation from Athanasius, was recognized at *Rome by Pope *Damasus. Similarly in 375 another disciple, *Vitalis, a deserter from Meletius's party, obtained a certificate of *orthodoxy from Damasus. In 376, however, the pope attempted to impose on Vitalis a form of union with Paulinus. Vitalis's election as bishop must have occurred in that year, and this risky undertaking turned Apollinaris's friend *Basil of Caesarea, and Damasus himself, against him. Probably in 377, Timothy was censured at Rome; at that time *Jerome was still following Apollinaris's courses at Antioch. The Roman censure, however, extended to Apollinarianism as such, was confirmed at Antioch in 379 and at Constantinople in 381 (can. 1). While the Apollinarists organized synods of their own, first at Antioch in 379 and certainly in 382 at Nazianzus (Greg. Naz., *Ep*. 101), where they also enthroned one of their own as bishop (Greg. Naz., *Ep*. 125), a Roman synod in 382 repeated the condemnation with greater force. In the same year *Gregory of Nyssa became acquainted with Apollinarianism during a trip to *Jerusalem, and soon after returning to *Cappadocia undertook to refute it in his *Antirrheticus,* though he had never met Apollinaris personally. In 387 *Gregory of Nazianzus begged Bishop *Nectarius of Constantinople to exhort the emperor *Theodosius to resist by force the Apollinarists, who were trying to place one of their own men in the see of Nazianzus, where Gregory had provisionally replaced the late bishop. He had made a similar request in 385 or 386 to *Theophilus of Alexandria. The first imperial decrees against the Apollinarists were issued in 388 (CTh XVI, 5, 14, 15), without, however, Vitalis losing his episcopal see. Apollinaris died before 392. The Apollinarist community of Antioch rejoined the orthodox only in 425 (Theod., *HE* V, 38,2); traces of this heresy remained in the East until the second half of the 5th c. Apollinaris's writings, saved from destruction thanks to literary falsifications (denounced from earliest times), occupy 50 numbers of the CPG (II, 3645-3695); they are essentially dedicated to the theological formulation of the dogma of the *incarnation of God. Some of Apollinaris's apologetic works, such as his 30-vol. treatise against *Porphyry and his apology against Julian and the Greek *philosophers, have been completely destroyed. Numerous citations of his biblical *exegesis have been preserved in *catenae. Jerome mentions commentaries on Eccl, Is, Hos, Mal, Ps, Mt, 1 Cor, Gal and Eph. Exegetical extracts on Pr, Song, Is, Ez, Dan and Lk have been published. Critical editions have verified the fragments on the Octateuch, Ps, Mt, Jas and Rom. There are also fragments on Job and Jer.

The most recent critical study of Apollinaris's whole work is that of E. Mühlenberg, who has also edited the fragments on the Psalms; the first part of this essay owes much to his notable summary in TRE of Apollinaris and his school. The formula *mia physis tou theou logou sesarkōmenē* is the most striking expression in the whole of Apollinaris's doctrine (Lietzmann 206,28, 251, 1). *Cyril of Alexandria, deceived by some writings of Apollinaris transmitted under the name of his predecessor St. Athanasius, attributed them to the latter and interpreted them. In doing so he prepared the way that, from the 5th c., would link *monophysitism to Apollinaris's initial insights. Firm on the notion of *physis,* these insights departed from the identity of *ousia* and *hypostasis,* an identity preserved intact by both Apollinaris and Athanasius in the sphere of trinitarian doctrine. While he developed his theory on the relationship between the Father and the Son departing from a keen perception of their unity, Apollinaris reflected primarily on the *essential unity* of the Word made flesh, thinking of the theology of the incarnation. A long period of theoretical reflection, not yet well studied, preceded the explicit structure of his whole system. The recent identifcation of three Easter homilies of Apollinaris by E. Cattaneo sheds light on this first period of his curriculum. Directly following Athanasius, the position of nascent Apollinarianism has likewise been clarified by careful study of the (ps.-?) Athanasian third treatise *Against the Arians* (Hübner, Kannengiesser). Moreover, a genuine philosophical rigor, whose presuppositions, *Aristotelian or otherwise, have been the object of several studies, guided the final exposition of Apollinaris's Christology. Finally, the polemical context of the struggle against *Arianism also played a role in his Christology's final structure. Formulating Christ's unity as his *hypostasis,* Apollinaris conceived the composite being of the Word made flesh as a substantial integration of the flesh with the Word. From Christ's being he therefore excluded reason (*nous*),

or the higher soul, since this is a subject capable of self-determination. In the most rigorous sense he defined Christ as "God incarnate," without yet possessing the idea of the hypostatic union of his two natures, which was not defined until later. In this way he provoked the doctrinal crisis at the end of which the great christological councils of *Ephesus (431) and *Chalcedon (451) defined the church's faith once and for all. After Apollinaris's death his disciples broke up: Vitalis of Antioch and Timothy of Berytus remained fairly close to the Great Church; *Polemon and Julian radicalized the notion of the Word as the sole subject of Christ's volition and action. Fully condemning the heresy that deprived Christ's humanity of a true soul, Cyril of Alexandria, *Philoxenus of Mabbug, *Severus of Antioch and the monophysites in general were only minimally influenced by Apollinaris.

CPG 3645-3700.

Indispensable studies: TRE 3, 370-371 (with bibl.); H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris v. Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen (1904) - Hildesheim (1970); E. Mühlenberg, *Apoll. v. L. zu ps.* 1-150: *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung* 1, PTS 15 (1975) 1-118.

Studies: G. Voisin, *L'Apollinarisme. Étude historique, littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IVe siècle*, Diss. Louvain-Paris 1901; G. Furlani, *Studi apollinaristici* I. *La dottrina trinitaria di Apollinare di Laodicea*: Riv. trim. di St. filos. rel. 2 (1921) 257-285; II. *I presupposti psicologici della cristologia di Apoll. di L.*: ibid. 4 (1923) 129-146; E. Raven, *Apollinarianism*: *An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church*, Cambridge 1923; M. Richard, *L'introduction du mot "hypostase" dans la théologie de l'incarnation*: MSR 2 (1945) 5-32, 243-270 (Opera Minora II, n. 42); H. de Riedmatten, *La christologie d'Apoll. de L.*, SP 2, TU 64 (1957), 208-234; R. Cadiou, *Apollinaire et l'Isaïe de Qûmran*: RHR 171 (1967) 145-148; E. Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*, Göttingen 1969; C. Kannengiesser, *Une nouvelle interprétation de la christologie d'Apollinaire*: RSR 59 (1971) 27-36; R. Hübner, *"Gotteserkenntnis durch die Inkarnation"*: Kleronomia 4 (1972) 131-161; P. Jay, *Jérome auditeur d'Apollinaire de Laodicée è Antioche*: REAug 20 (1974) 36-41; B. Kramer, *Protokoll eines Dialog zwischen Didymos dem Blinden und einem Ketzer*: ZPE 32 (1978) 201-211; R. Hübner, *Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius* (*Panarion*, *haer.* 65) *über Paulus von Samosata*: *Ps Athanasius*, *Contra Sabellianos*: ZKG 90 (1979) 55-74; E. Cattaneo, *Trois Homélies pseudo-Chrysostomiennes comme œuvre d'Apollinaire de Laodicée*, Th. Hist. 58, Paris 1980; F.R. Gahbauer, *Das Anthropologische Model*, Würzburg 1984, 127-224; E. Cattaneo, *Le Traité d'Apollinaire "Contre Photin" et les "Homélies pascales" pseudochrysostomiennes*: OCP 60 (1994) 233-237; R.M. Hübner, *Ps-Athanasius, "Contra Sabellianos." Eine Schrift des Basilius von Caesarea oder des Apollinarius von Laodicea?*: VChr 41 (1987) 386-395; K. McCarthy Spoerl, *Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition*: JTS 45 (1994) 545-568; Id., *The Liturgical Argument in Apollinarius: Help and Hindrance on the Way to Orthodoxy*: HTR 91 (1998) 127-152; LACL 48-50.

Ch. Kannengiesser

APOLLINARIS of Ravenna (2nd-3rd c.). Legendary first bishop of *Ravenna and the city's first and only known *martyr. His episcopate is dated from the late 2nd to the early 3rd c. According to the *Passio s. Apollinaris* (which is of doubtful historical value), he arrived at *Rome with *Peter; from there the apostle sent him as a missionary to Ravenna, where he worked for nearly twenty years until, ca. 75, he died from blows received from a group of *pagans in revolt. His cult is attested in ancient times by the *Mart. hier.* (23 July); *sermo* 128 of *Peter Chrysologus, archbishop of Ravenna in the 5th c. (424–451); and by an epigraph at Classe from the 6th c. indicating the place of his burial (basilica of S. Apollinare in Classe). The church of S. Apollinare Nuovo later also claimed possession of the body, the remains supposedly having been removed there during the time of the *Saracen incursions. These events, which in the 12th c. produced an opposition between the two religious entities, led to the drafting of two *hagiographical texts, each claiming possession of the saint's body for their respective basilica (the *Historia translationis beati Apolenaris* linked to S. Apollinare Nuovo and the *Tractatus domni Rodulfi venerabilis prioris Camaldulensis de inventione corporis beati Apolenaris* linked to S. Apollinare in Classe). The *Passio,* one of the sources of Agnellus's **Liber pontificalis,* was composed, perhaps based on a preexisting text, in the mid-7th c. at the time of Archbishop *Maurus (together with the false diploma of *Valentinian III, which concedes to the diocese of Ravenna metropolitan rights over 14 suffragan churches), with the intent of claiming the apostolicity of the see of Ravenna and its autocephaly with respect to Rome. Apollinaris is the patron of Emilia Romagna and Ravenna. Other than at Ravenna, his cult is attested to at Rome from the time of Pope *Symmachus (498–514) and in *Italy, esp. in the *Longobard territories and along the via Flaminia and the via Amerina. At Dijon, France, *Clovis had a church built in his honor; from the 14th c. in Germany, at Remagen, S of Bonn, the local mount of St. Apollinaris became a place of pilgrimage.

BHL 623-632; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 737-748; E. Will, *Saint Apollinaire de Ravenne*, Paris 1936; G. Lucchesi, *Note agiografiche sui primi vescovi di Ravenna*, Faenza 1941; BS 2, 239-248; G. Orioli, *La "Vita sancti Apolenaris" di Ravenna e gli antecedenti storici dell'organizzazione ecclesiastica ravennate*: Apollinaris 59 (1986) 63-108; G. Binazzi, *Orso, Cassiano, Apollinare. Appunti sulla diffusione dei culti al seguito delle milizie*: RomBarb 9 (1986-87) 5-24; E. Morini, *Santi orientali a Ravenna*, in *Storia di Ravenna*, 2/2: *Dall'età bizantina all'età ottoniana. Ecclesiologia, cultura e arte*, Venice 1992, 283-303; G. Ropa, *Agiografia e liturgia a Ravenna tra alto e basso Medioevo*, in *Storia di Ravenna*, 3: *Dal Mille alla fine della signoria polentana*, Venice 1993, 341-393; R. Benericetti, *Il*

Pontificale di Ravenna. Studio critico, Faenza 1994; G.D. Gordini, *Giovanni Lucchesi agiologo*, in *Mons. Giovanni Lucchesi nel decimo anniversario della morte*, Faenza 1994; P. Golinelli, *Antichi e nuovi culti cittadini al sorgere dei Comuni nel nord-Italia*: Hagiographica 1 (1994) 159-180 (esp. 169ff.); G. Arrighi, *Il culto di sant'Apollinare in Lucca*: Torricelliana 46 (1995) 155-157; N. Orchard, *The Medieval Masses in Honour of St Apollinaris of Ravenna*: RBen 106 (1996) 172-184; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico*, 1, Turin 1998, 198-200.

V. Milazzo

APOLLINARIS of Valence (d. after 523). Brother of *Avitus of Vienne, related to *Sidonius Apollinaris and perhaps to the emperor Avitus (455), Apollinaris became bishop of Valence (*Gaul) shortly before 492. Participated at the councils of Epaône (517) and *Lyons (516–523); died after that date. Feast 5 October. His *Life* (BHL 634) dates from the Carolingian period but may preserve reliable information.

L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 1, Paris 1907, 210-218; DHGE 3,982-986; *Vies des SS.*, Paris 1952, vol. 10, 114-117; BS 2,249-250; M. Heinzelmann, *Clovis dans le discours hagiographique du VI^e au IX^e siècle*, in *Clovis chez les historiens. Études réunies par O. Guyotjeannin* (= Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 154 [1996]), 87-112.

V. Saxer

APOLLONIA (d. 249). In *HE* 6,41,7, *Eusebius of Caesarea mentions a letter of *Dionysius, bishop of *Alexandria, to *Fabius of *Antioch. It tells of the violence suffered by the city's faithful in the wake of a sudden anti-Christian revolt that broke out a year before the persecution of *Decius. It gives particular attention to Apollonia, a woman "already advanced in age," who, threatened with being burned alive "if she did not proclaim impious words with them," spontaneously threw herself into the flames, shocking the bystanders.

Her cult is first attested in the East, then in the West, where a legend spread that she was the daughter of a *Roman senator and victim of *Julian the Apostate. She is represented in *iconography with a pliers holding a tooth, in reference both to Dionysius's account (Apollonia, before throwing herself into the fire, was repeatedly struck on the jaw until she lost all her teeth) and to the legend that Julian the Apostate himself tortured her by pulling out her teeth. Her feast is 9 February in the Roman Martyrology.

BHL 638-642d; DHGE 3, 1008; BS 2,258-267; M.P. van Buijtenen - A.K. de Meijer, *Westbroeks heiligen in polderperspectief*, Nijmegen 1981; M. Natoli, *L'agiografia come disciplina storica: introduzione per un discorso sui santi di Ariccia*: Atti dell'Accademia degli Sfaccendati 3 (1997) 48-54; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 200-201.

V. Milazzo

APOLLONIUS (d. ca. 185). *Martyr and perhaps *apologist. According to the *Acts* regarding him, which contain reliable information, Apollonius appeared at* Rome before the praetorian prefect Perennes, ca. 185. In a second audience, after defending himself in the presence of senators and educated people, he was condemned to death by virtue of a senatorial decree that denied legal existence to Christians. Died 11 April. An adaptation of the *Acts* makes Perennes a proconsul of *Asia and confuses the martyr with the Apollos of Acts 18:24. *Eusebius of Caesarea reports a summary of the *Acts* of his martyrdom in *HE* 5,21,2-5. He was almost certainly a philosopher, perhaps a senator, who during his interrogation at Rome defended himself with arguments like those of the apologists. The entire *hagiographical dossier (also complicated by the presence of numerous other Apolloniuses) raises many historical, legal and literary problems, esp. concerning the involvement of the Roman Senate, before whom Apollonius was supposedly called to defend himself by Perennes. Also discussed is the drafting of a true and proper *Apology* by Apollonius, supposedly combined with other documents in the martyrium.

BHG 149; BHO 79; Eusebius, *HE* 5,21; Rufinus, *HE* 5,21,2-5; Delehaye PM, 92-99; G. Lazzati, *Gli sviluppi della letteratura sui martiri nei quattro primi secoli*, Turin 1956, 39-42; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 145-157; E. Griffe, *Les Acts du martyr Apollonius et le problème de la base juridique des persécutions*: Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique 53 (1952) 65-76; C. Tibiletti, *Gli "Atti di Apollonio" e Tertulliano*: Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Turin, cl. mor., 99 (1964-1965) 295-337; V. Saxer, *Martyrium Apollonii Romani: analyse structurelle et problèmes d'authenticité*: Rend. PARA 55-56 (1982-1984) 265-298; V. Saxer, *L'Apologie au Sénat du martyr romain Apollonius*: Mélange de l'Ecole française de Rome, Antiquité 96 (1984) 1017-1038; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 201-204.

V. Saxer - V. Milazzo

APOLLONIUS of Ephesus (late 2nd-early 3rd(?) c.). Author of an anti-*Montanist treatise, probably in one book, cited by *Eusebius (*HE* V, 18,2.3.4.5.6-10.11), in which he deeply examines Montanist prophecies to prove their insubstantiality (Eus., *HE* V, 18,1) and denounces the reprehensible morals that he attributes to exponents of the movement. Apollonius wrote 40 years after Montanus had started preaching (Eus., *HE* V, 18,12), which according to

Eusebius was in 172–173: thus Apollonius wrote in 212. This date seems late given the vigor with which Apollonius opposes the sect's leaders, esp. a prophetess who seems to be *Maximilla (Eus., *HE* V, 18,6-10). Perhaps the figure of 40 years is erroneous, or perhaps Apollonius argued with Maximilla as though she were still alive. According to *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 40), *Tertullian wrote book VII of his lost treatise *On Ecstasy* against Apollonius.

P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme*, Paris-Fribourg 1913, 78-82; DHGE 3, 1013-1014; Cath 1,710; LTK[3] 1, 831.

F. Scorza Barcellona

APOLLONIUS of Tyana (4–96). Neo-Pythagorean philosopher (1st c. AD), known to us through a sometimes-romanticized biography written by Flavius Philostratus at the request of Julia Domna, wife of *Septimius Severus and mother of *Caracalla. Studied at *Tarsus, traveled to Babylon and India and was then at *Rome, from where he was expelled by *Nero. Returning to *Italy, he died under Nerva. Apollonius believed in a supreme transcendent god, clearly distinguished from the minor deities. Famous as a *magician: the *pagans considered him sent by God, a kind of pagan Christ to whom miracles and prophecies were attributed. *Temples were built to him, and he was honored as a god. Christian writers (*Ambrose, *Augustine, *Sidonius Apollinaris) speak of him with respect.

D. Ghezzi, *A. di Tiana nella storia e nella leggenda*, Rome 1910; M. Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana*, Rome 1986; V. Longo, *Apollonio di Tiana: taumaturgo o ciarlatano?*: AALig 54 (1997) 413-422; A.M. Reimer, *Miracle and Magic: A Study in the Acts of the Apostles and the life of Apollonius of Tyana*, Sheffield 2002.

L. Navarra

APOLOGISTS – APOLOGETIC (general characteristics)

I. The Greek and Latin apologists - II. Common characteristics - III. The two tendencies.

I. The Greek and Latin apologists. Name given to the writers who defended Christianity against accusations coming from various parts of non-Christian society, which at times erupted in *persecution. Today their work would be considered "fundamental theology." Similar Jewish writings (*Philo, *Contra Apionem*) were models of the early Christian "apologies," since up to a certain period *pagan aversion to Christianity was simply part of their aversion to *Judaism. The apologies in a certain sense substituted for the forensic defense that *Roman authorities did not allow to *confessors and *martyrs; the literary model was often *Plato's *Apology of Socrates*. Apologetic literature in the territory of the *Roman Empire flourished in the 2nd-3rd c. but also continued after the "*Constantinian revolution." The apologists recalled the right of the *philosopher to *parrēsia* with respect to the emperor and had in mind always not only the defense of the faith *ad extra,* i.e., the instruction of non-Christians (in the case of a petition to the emperor, in the hope of its publication by the imperial chancellery in the portico of *Trajan's baths), but also *catechesis *ad intra*, i.e., the encouragement of the faithful, such that many apologetic arguments are found in other genres of Christian literature: homilies, legends about the martyrs, etc.

The first authors of apologies, from the 2nd c., are *Quadratus (125-126; CPG 1060), *Aristides (between 124-140; CPG 1062) and *Justin (153-155; CPG 1073), *Miltiades (under *Marcus Aurelius: Eusebius, *HE* 5,17,5), *Apollinaris of Hierapolis (under Marcus Aurelius: ibid., 4,26,1), *Melito of Sardis (171-172 or 176: CPG 1093,1-2) and *Athenagoras (*Supplicatio pro Christianis,* 177; CPG 1070). The *philosophical backdrop of these authors was *Middle Platonism. The proliferation of apologies under Marcus Aurelius is an indication of the increasingly hostile policy of the Roman authorities toward the new religion, which seemed to be causing the decline of the empire. This spawned a literary polemic (*Lucian of Samosata, *De morte Peregrini*; *Fronto of Cirta [ca. 162–164]; esp. the first systematic criticism of *Celsus, *Alethes Logos* [176–180 or early 3rd c.?]), to which the Christians responded. They no longer addressed the emperors, but pagan society ("To the Greeks"). The protagonists were *Tatian, Justin's disciple (*Oratio ad Graecos*, held in Rome 165–172 or in Athens 176/77; CPG 1104), *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolycum* after 180; CPG 1107), the anonymous author of the *Letter to *Diognetus* (200?; CPG 1112), *Clement of Alexandria (various writings late 2nd c.; CPG 1375-1377), ps.-*Justin (*Oratio ad Graecos*, first half 3rd c.; CPG 1082), *Hermias (*Gentilium philosophorum irrisio*, ca. 200; CPG 1113), *Tertullian (*Ad nationes/Apologeticum*, 197; CPL 2, 3), *Minucius Felix (*Octavius* after 197 [depends on Tertullian's *Apologeticum*]; CPL 37), *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ad Donatum*, ca. 245; CPL 38; *Ad Demetrianum*, 253; CPL 46), ps.-Cyprian (*Quod idola dii non sint*, ca. 350; CPL 57), *Commodian (*Instructiones* and *Carmen apologeticum* ca. 251-260 in N *Africa or at Rome (?); CPL 1470-1471) and *Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 245-248; CPG 1476). *Porphyry the *Neopla-

tonist, who knew Origen of Caesarea Maritima, wrote antiquity's most intense anti-Christian polemic, probably after 270 in Sicily (*Contra Christianos*). Against him wrote the Greeks *Methodius of Olympus (CPG 1818), *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Apollinaris of Laodicea (CPG 3672) and *Diodore of Tarsus, and the Latins *Arnobius of Sicca (*Adversus Nationes,* ca. 302–305; CPL 93), *Lactantius (*Divinae Institutiones;* CPL 85), *Firmicus Maternus (*De errorum profanarum religionum;* CPL 102), *Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*; CPL 313) and *Pacatus (410–430; CPL 1152a).

From the early 4th c. various propagandistic writings justify the anti-Christian measures of the emperors (Fiedrowicz 79-81). A new type of apology appeared in this period, more systematic and complete: Lactantius (*Div. Inst.*, 304-311), Eusebius (various writings, esp. *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica;* CPG 3485-3488), *Marcellus of Ancyra (*Cohortatio ad Graecos,* ca. 312–322; CPG 1083), *Athanasius of Alexandria (*Contra Gentes* and *De incarnatione Verbi,* before or during his exile at Trier 335–337; CPG 2090-2091) and Firmicus Maternus (*Err.*, 346 c.) describe the truth of the Christian religion, which is no longer prohibited, in the context of the pluralism of the traditional religions. *Julian the Apostate (361–363), seeing in the Christians only a barbarous sect, tried to restore the traditional cults with Neoplatonic arguments, provoking with his *Contra Galilaeos* a new series of apologies written by *Ephrem the Syrian (*Contra Iulianum* 363; CSCO 174/175), *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 4-5 *contra Iulianum,* 364–365; CPG 3010), *Theodore of Mopsuestia (a reply, ca. 380), *John Chrysostom (*De Babyla contra Iulianum et gentiles*, 378/379; CPG 4348) and *Cyril of Alexandria (*Contra Iulianum* between 423–428; CPG 5233). Also noteworthy is *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's refutation of *Hellenism (*Graecarum affectionum curatio,* 420-423; CPG 6210). In the late 4th c. at Rome the pagan opposition was led by the aristocracy; well known are the interventions of *Symmachus and *Ambrose (and later of *Prudentius) in the controversy over the Altar of Victory in the curia. The last phase of apologetics was fomented by the sack of Rome in 410 and the presumed "failure" of the Christian religion. Apologies then responded to the question, why couldn't the Christian cult guarantee the well-being of the city? On the matter, Augustine (*De Civitate Dei,* 413–426; CPL 313) and *Orosius (*Historiae adversum paganos,* 416-417; CPL 571) developed a vast interpretation of world history on theological bases.

II. Common characteristics. Apologetic literature documents the effort of a group of Christian intellectuals to defend their religion from attacks by cultured pagans, popular accusations and persecutions by imperial or local authorities. Their cultural level is generally that of their time. On the whole, these texts present to us a Christian community animated by sincere faith, whose best-educated elements enthusiastically and courageously take on the defense of calumniated and persecuted fellow believers, with the more or less clear intention of gaining "those who are far off" from the gospel. The sincerity, morality, religiosity and political loyalty of the Christians are used as arguments, as well as the philosophical rationality, originality, antiquity and missionary success of Christianity, which are all based on the unique human-divine character of Jesus Christ.

III. The two tendencies. The apologists are distinguished according to the different attitudes they assume vis-à-vis the policies and culture of the pagan world they oppose by both defense and debate. Aristides, Melito, Justin and Athenagoras among the Greeks, and Minucius Felix among the Latins, seek to build a bridge with pagan institutions and culture, in which they acknowledge elements of truth which they attribute to the intervention of divine *providence. Conversely Tatian, Hermias, Tertullian and Arnobius of Sicca are unsparing in their attack on every aspect of paganism. Lactantius, while consciously rejecting philosophy, takes another tone. Each author displays a different culture, interests and style while making use, with more or less success, of the means of expression of the classical tradition in which they were formed.

RAC 19, 801-873; LACL 3, 50-51; M. Schanz - C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Munich [3]1922, 245-260; M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* 1-3, Jerusalem 1974-1984; W.J. Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity*, Rome 1978; G. Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium. Primo contributo per un indice delle citazioni, dei riferimenti e delle allusioni alla Bibbia negli autori pagani, greci e latini, di età imperiale*, Rome 1989; P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron kreitton. Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*, Tübingen 1990; Quasten 1, 166-223; S. Krauss - W. Horbury, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy* 1, Tübingen 1995; O. Limor - G.G. Stroumsa, *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*, Tübingen 1996; H.R. Drobner, *Patrologia*, Casale Monferrato 1998, 123-147; K. Schneider, *Studien zur Entfaltung der altkirchlichen Theologie der Auferstehung*, Bonn 1999; Ph.F. Esler (ed.), *The Early Christian World,* 2, London-New York 2000, 840-889; J. Lehnen, *Zwischen Abkehr und Hinwendung. Äußerungen christlicher Autoren des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts zu Staat und Herrscher*, in R. von Haehling (ed.), *Rom und das himmlische Jerusalem*, Darmstadt 2000, 1-28; K. Rosen, *Von der Torheit für die Heiden zur wahren Philosophie.*

Soziale und geistige Voraussetzungen der christlichen Apologetik des 2. Jahrhunderts, ibid., 124-151; M. Fiedrowicz, *Apologie im frühen Christentum*, Paderborn 2000; H.E. Lona, *An Diognet*, Freiburg 2001; L. Tanganagba, *Miracle comme* argumentum fidei *chez saint Augustin*, Bonn 2002.

M. PELLEGRINO - S. HEID

APONIUS (6th c.). Passed down under this name, thought to be *Roman, is an *Expositio in Canticum Canticorum*. The author's exact biographical data are unknown. There are allusions in the texts to military invasions. The author shows an interest in *monastic life. Allusions to *Chalcedonian faith indicate the work cannot have been composed before 450; comparison of his interpretation of Song with 6th-c. exegesis recommends a dating after 500. Inspired by previous models (*Origen, ps.-*Hippolytus) and based on a fair level of theological and philosophical education, Aponius's commentary merits study, both from the perspective of the history of *exegesis (concept of salvation history; spiritual vision of union between Christ and the soul) and regarding its *Christology, according to which Jesus' soul, definitively united to the Word at the moment of crucifixion, found an eminent place (see esp. Lib. IX, with Song 6:8-11). It also contains a pneumatology (*Holy Spirit) of some interest. The work's influence cannot have been great, however. *Gregory the Great and *Bede the Venerable knew the work; in the 9th c. a shortened form of 12 homilies was produced.

CPL 194 (bibl.); CCL 19; SC 420, 421, 430; LTK³ 1, 887; LACL (2002) 54; B. Jaspert, "*Stellvertreter Christi" bei Aponius, einem unbekannten "Magister" und Benedikt von Nursia*: ZThK 71 (1974) 219-334 (bibl.); A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, I, London ²1975, 384-388 (bibl.); P. Hamblenne, *Peut-on dater Aponius?*: RTAM 57 (1990) 5-33; B. Stubenrauch, *Der heilige Geist bei Aponius*, Freiburg 1991; H. König, *Die Auslegung zum Lied der Lieder*, Freiburg 1992; P. Hamblenne, *Le monde d'Apponius*: Euphrosyne 20 (1992) 211-230; 25 (1997) 171-205; Id., *Deux métaphores apponiennes:* (*In Cant. III, l. 92 s. et IX, l. 110-112*): SE 39 (2000) 21-35; Id., *Apponius: le moment, une patrie*: Augustinianum 41 (2001) 425-464.

B. STUDER

APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM. The *apophthegmata,* or *Paterika,* of the Fathers are collections of reflections and anecdotes that are the fruit of the spiritual experience in the desert. The number of collections, their rapid spread from the 4th c., their continual enrichment, their translation first into *Latin, *Coptic and *Syriac; then into *Armenian and *Georgian; and finally into Arabic, Ethiopian and Palaeoslavonic has thus far rendered vain any attempt at genealogy. Basic work has been done in some fields of research; others remain almost entirely unexplored, even at the MSS level. The first attempt at a classification was by W. Bousset (*Apophthegmata. Studien zur Geschichte des ältesten Mönchtums*, Tübingen 1923). Since then the bibliography has reached considerable size. Due to space, we will limit ourselves to indicating the main publications, by language.

Greek: alphabetical collection. According to PG 65, 76-440, to be supplemented by the collection of MS Coislin Greek 126, published by F. Nau in a series of articles in the "Revue de l'Orient Chrétien" from 1907–1909, supplemented by J.C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum,* Brussels 1962, who distinguishes, among other things, between the systematic collection and the derived collection. Also Coislin 127, which contains the largest collection known to date. Also important are *Palladius's *Historia Lausiaca,* ed. Dom Cuthbert Butler, Cambridge 1904; the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto,* ed. A.J. Festugière, Brussels 1961; the *Scala Paradisi* of *John Climacus, PG 88, 677-781; the *Pratum spiritualis* of *John Moschus, PG 87, 3,2852-3112; the *Spiritual Works* of *Dorotheus of Gaza, ed. L. Regnault, Paris 1963 (SC 92); and finally the huge compilation of *Paulus Evergetinos,* published at Athens in 4 vols., 1957–1968. The sayings are rearranged and modified in every collection.

Latin. Though old, Rosweyde's compilation, *Vitae Patrum,* Anvers 1628, remains exhaustive. Reproduced in PL 73, its 10 parts are attributed to *Jerome, *Rufinus, *John Cassian, *Pelagius, *John (deacon), *Paschasius of Dumium, *Palladius, *Theodoret and *John Moschus, plus appendixes. A critical edition of Paschasius's collection was produced by J.G. Freire, *A versão latina por Pascasio de Dume dos Apophthegmata Patrum*, 2 vols., Coimbra 1971; the collection is from the 7th c. That of Paschasius and John is derived from the Greek systematic collection. Finally, Freire found a 5th-c. Latin collection: *Commonitiones sanctorum Patrum. Una nova colleção de apotegmas*, Coimbra 1974.

Syriac. Three types of collections have been brought together by P. Bedjan in vol. 7 of the *Acta Martyrum* (Paris 1897), fully used by Bousset. The oldest testimonies have been classified in two works published by R. Draguet: *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon syriaque d'Abba Isaïe*, CSCO, v. 189, 290, 293 and 294, script. Syri 120-124 (Louvain 1968); *Les formes syriaques de la matière de l'Histoire Lausiaque*, CSCO, v. 389, 390, 398 and 399, script. Syri 169, 170, 173 and 174 (Louvain 1978).

Coptic. A. Guillaumont, *L'ascéticon copte de l'Abbé Isaïe*, Cairo 1956. The complete Coptic and Syriac

sayings have been studied for over a century: Coptic text and Fr. tr. in É. Amélineau, *Histoire des monastères de la Basse-Égypte. Vies des saints Paul, Antoine, Macaire . . .*, Paris 1894; M. Chaîne, *Le manuscrit de la version Copte . . . Sahidique des "Apophthegmata Patrum,"* Cairo 1960; with intr., Coptic text and It. tr. Paolo di Tamma, *Opere*, ed. T. Orlandi, Rome 1988; for the life and fragments of *Pachomius in Coptic: Appendix, *La Règle de St. Pachôme, fragments coptes*, in *Pachomiana Latina*, eds. A. Boon - L. Lefort, Louvain 1932; *Les vies coptes de St. Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs*, ed. L. Lefort, Louvain 1943; *Oeuvres de St. Pachôme et de ses disciples*, ed. Id., Louvain 1956, CSCO Coptici 23-24; *Le vie de St. Pachôme selon la tradition copte*, ed. A. Veilleux, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1984 (Greek lives edited by F. Halkin, Brussels 1932, SH 19; Pachomius's Athens corpus in BHG 1396a, 1399a and 1397, Geneva 1982). For the Syriac versions: E. Budge, *The Paradise of the Holy Fathers*, I-II, 1907, repr. Washington 1984; Id., *The Syrian Version of the "Apophthegmata Patrum" by 'Ânân Îsho' of Bêth-'Âbhê*, Oxford-London 1924; R. Draguet, *La Vie primitive de St. Antoine conservée en syriaque*, Louvain 1980 (CSCO 418), 104-112; L. Abramowski, *Vertritt die syrische Fassung die ursprüngliche Gestalt der* Vita Antonii*?*, in *Mélanges A. Guillaumont*, Geneva 1988, 47-56; R. Lorenz, *Die griechische* Vita Antonii *des Athanasius und ihre syrische Fassung*: ZKG 100 (1989), 77-84.

Armenian. The Mekhitarists of Venice published two volumes of compilations in the last century, which have been translated into a literal Latin by L. Leloir, *Paterica armenica a PP. Mechitaristis edita (1855) nunc latine reddita*, in CSCO, vols. 353 and 361 (Louvain 1974 and 1975). Urgently needed investigation of the MSS has not yet begun. There are some collections that were not used in 1855, e.g., at the end of the *Girk^c Tghtoc^c* (Tbilisi 1901), 510-525.

Georgian. Several types of collections have been published by M. Dvali in *Šua saukunet^{c}a novelebis jveli k^{c}art^c uli t^{c}argmanebi*, vol. 1 (Tbilisi 1966), vol. 2 (Tbilisi 1974).

Arabic. The Arabic tradition of the letters of St. *Anthony (already published in PG 40, 972-1066 and translated by A. Louf, *Saint Antoine, Lettres*, Abb. Bellefontaine 1976) has been studied by S. Rubenson, *The Arabic Version of the Letters of St. Antony*, in *Actes du deuxième congrès international d'études arabes chrétiennes*, Rome 1986 (OCA 226) and M. El-Maskîne, *St. Antoine ascète selon l'Évangile, suivi de les vingt Lettres de st. Antoine selon la tradition arabe*, Abb. Bellefontaine 1993.

In the last quarter-century scholars have also researched the rich spirituality of the desert fathers (and mothers) from different angles, with publications on the theme multiplying, whether scientific—as those of J. Pollok, *The Present State of Studies on the Apophthegmata Patrum*, in *The Spirituality of Ancient Monasticism*, Krakow 1995, 79-89, F. Dodel, *Das Sitzen der Wünstenväter: eine Untersuchung anhand der Apophthegmata Patrum*, Freiburg 1997, Paradosis 42, or B. Müller, *Der Weg des Weinens: die Tradition des "Penthos" in den Apophthegmata Patrum*, Göttingen 2000, Forschung zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 77, containing among other things a rich bibliography—or more popular but also rigorous such as that of M. Driot, *Les pères du désert. Vie et spiritualité*, Paris 1991, It. tr. Cinisello B. (Mi) 1993, and the collections of L. Mortari, *Vita e detti dei Padri del Deserto*, I-II, Rome 1985, [3]1990, or L. Cremaschi, *Vita di Antonio, Apoftegmi, Lettere*, Cinisello B. (Mi) 1984; Id., *Detti inediti dei Padri del deserto*, Bose 1986; Id., *La Parola e la preghiera nei Padri del deserto*: Parole di Vita 2 (1989), 48-55, or of H. Hanakam, *Antonios der Grosse, Stern der Wüste*, Freiburg i.B. 1989, besides the new critical editions of the texts, among which stands out the systematic collection of sayings with French translation edited for Sources Chrétiennes by J.-C. Guy, *Les Apophtegmes des Pères: collection systématique. Chapp. I-IX*, Paris 1993, SC 387. In the same series is also a recent critical edition with French translation of the *Vita Antonii* of St. *Athanasius (already in PG 26, 835-978 and translated into German in the Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 31, Munich 1917, and by A. Gottfried, Athanasius, *Vita Antonii*, Graz 1987; the anonymous Latin version has been critically edited and translated in *Vita di Antonio*, intr. C. Mohrmann, ed. and comm. G.J.M. Bartelink, Milan 1974): Athanase d'Alexandrie, *Vie d'Antoine*, ed. G.J.M. Bartelink, Paris 1994, SC 400, ed., prefaced and prepared by Id., *Die literarische Gattung der* Vita Antonii*: Struktur und Motive*: VC 36 (1982) 38-62. See A. de Vogüé, *La Vie de St. Antoine*, in *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, I, Paris 1991, 17-80; Id., *The Specificity of Christian Monasticism: The Life of St. Antony:* Monastic Studies 19 (1991) 23-32. Other works of individual fathers have been edited and translated in the SC, e.g., those of Cassian (already in PL 49-50): Jean Cassien, *Institutions*, ed. J.-C. Guy, Paris 1965, SC 109; *Conférences*, ed. E. Pichéry, Paris 1955–1959, SC 42-54-64, or of Evagrius: Evagre le Pontique, *Traité pratique ou le moine*, eds. A. and C. Guillaumont, I-II, Paris 1971, SC 170-171; *Le gnostique*, ed. Id., Paris 1989, SC 356. On Evagrius, published in German are Evagriuss Pontikos, *Briefe aus der Wüste*, ed. G. Bunge, Trier 1986, Sophia 24, and *Über die acht Gedanken*, ed. Id., Würzburg 1992. The

Centurie of Callistus and Ignatius, the Greek text of which are in PG 147, 635-812, have been translated by A. Rosenberg, *Das Herzensgebet . . . die Centurie der Mönche Kallistus und Ignatius*, Munich-Planegg 1955. We have now the critical text of Palladius's *Historia Lausiaca* of G.J.M. Bartelink, with It. tr. and intr., Milan [4]1990, besides the translation by J. Laager, Zürich 1987. Useful are the lexicographic tools of P. Miquel, *Lexique du désert*, Abb. Bellefontaine 1986, and *Le vocabulaire de l'expérience dans la tradition patristique*, Paris 1989. V. Arras published the Ethiopic collections in CSCO, 238, 239 and 277, 278 (Louvain 1963, 1967). Finally W. Veder began a better classification of the Slavonic collections, later completed by M. Capaldo, *L'azbučnoierusalimskij Paterik*: Polata k'nigopic'naja 4 (1981) 26-75. A coherent genealogical tree of all the translations, including the Sogdian version, still awaits.

Les Apophtegmes des Pères du désert, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1966; P.F. Anson, *Partir au désert*, Paris 1967; S. Frank, *Mönche im frühchristlichen Ägypten*, Düsseldorf 1967; Abbé Isaïe, *Recueil ascétique*, intr. L. Regnault, Abb. Bellefontaine 1970; *Les Sentences des Pères du désert*, II-III, eds. L. Regnault - Moines de Solesmes, Solesmes 1970-76; Athanase, *Vie et conduite de notre père st. Antoine*, intr. G. Couilleau, Abb. Bellefontaine 1979; G. Vannucci, *Le parole dei Padri del deserto*, Florence 1979; I. Hausherr, *Solitude et vie contemplative d'après l'hésychasme*, Abb. Bellefontaine 1980; Palladius, *Histoire Lausiaque*, Paris 1981; N. Russell, *The Lives of the Desert Fathers*, London-Oxford 1981; E. Brunner, *Die Kopten*, Cologne 1982; H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs*, II: *Pachomius*, Würzburg 1983; B. Outtier et al., *Lettres des Pères du Désert*, Abb. Bellefontaine 1985; *Les Sentences des Pères du désert. Série des anonymes*, ed. L. Regnault, Abb. Bellefontaine and Solesmes 1985; F.S. Pericoli Ridolfini, *Il lavoro nelle più antiche fonti monastiche* (*Vita di Antonio e fonti pacomiane*), in *Spiritualità del lavoro*, ed. S. Felici, Rome 1986, 141-150; B. Miller, *Weisung der Väter. Apophthegmata Patrum*, Trier [3]1986; *Spiritualität des frühen Mönchtums*, Erlangen 1988; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Les rapports entre le monachisme égyptien et l'épiscopat d'Alexandrie*, in *Alexandrina. Mélanges C. Mondésert*, Paris 1987, 365-379; G.M. Colombo, *Il monachesimo delle origini*, Milan [2]1990; L. Regnault, *La vie quotidienne des pères du désert*, Paris 1990, It. tr. Casale Monferrato 1994; S. Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Anthony*, *Origenist Theology*, *Monastic Tradition*, Lund 1990; T. Špidlík, *East Syrian Asceticism*, in *East Syrian Spirituality*, ed. A. Thottakkara, Bangalore 1990, 129-142; L.W. Barnard, *Asceticism in Early Syriac Christianity*, in *Monastic Studies*, II, ed. J. Loades, Bangor 1991, 13-21; H. Brunner, *Die Weisheitsbücher der Ägypter*, Zürich-Munich 1991; *Les chemins de Dieu au désert. Collection systématique des apophthegmes*, ed. L. Regnault, Solesmes 1992; H. Holz, *Erfahrung und Theologie im frühen Mönchtum*, Göttingen 1992; S. Abouzayd, *Ihidayutha: A Study of the Life of Singleness in the Syrian Orient*, Aram, Oxford 1993; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Les apophthegmes des pères*, VC 47 (1993) 390-397; D. Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert*, New York-Oxford 1993; G.E. Gould, *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community*, Oxford 1993; H. Holze, *Schrifterfahrung und Christuserkenntnis im pachomianischen Mönchtum*: TZ 49 (1993) 54-65; K. Koch, *Geschichte der ägyptischen Religion*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Cologne 1993; P. Miquel *et al.*, *Déserts Chrétiens d'Égypte*, Nice 1993; K. Rudolph, *Das frühe Christentum in Ägypten*: Riggisberger Berichte 1 (1993) 21-31; P. Sloterduk, *Weltfremdheit*, Frankfurt a.M. 1993; K. Vogt, *Ascétisme féminin en Égypte aux IV[e] et V[e] siècles*: Le Monde Copte 21-22 (1993) 107-113; E. Dassmann, *Christusnachfolge durch Weltflucht. Asketische Motive im frühchristlichen Mönchtum Ägyptens*, in A. Gerhards - H. Brakmann, *Die Koptische Kirche*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Cologne 1994, 28-45; *The Spirituality of Ancient Monasticism*, ed. M. Starowieysky, Krakow 1995, 163-181; G.G. Gould, *The Influence of Origen on IV[th] Century Monasticism*, in *Origeniana VI*, Louvain 1995, 591-598; S.H. Griffith, *Asceticism in the Church of Syria*, in *Asceticism*, ed. W.L. Wimbush, New York 1995, 220-248; H. Holze, *Anapausis in anachoretischen Mönchtum*: ZKG 106 (1995) 1-17.

I. Ramelli

APOSTASY – APOSTATES. Early Christians were accused of apostasy against Jewish and pagan society. As deniers of Jewish religion and classical *paideia*, before the edict of *Constantine they were considered a *tertium genus* between Jews and *pagans, i.e., those who had burned their bridges with the *mos maiorum* of both. Alongside this meaning of *apostasy*, common in early *apologetic literature (*adversus iudaeos* and *adversus paganos*), there was also an application within Christianity itself: those who denied the Christian faith or the discipline of the Christian life. Thus the *lapsi* (*lapsed) were considered apostate, i.e., those who had failed in the struggle for the faith, divided in 3rd-c. *Africa into three categories: *sacrificati* (who offered a cup of wine as a libation); *thurificati* (who offered incense to the gods); and *libellatici* (from *libellum* = certified or attested as having complied with orders—many such certifications have been discovered, including in Egypt). In some cases attestation was sought even by those who were not publicly apostate. A fourth category was added during the persecution of *Diocletian, **traditores* (from *tradere* = to hand over, i.e., those who handed over the sacred books to the authorities). A focus of attention during the *donatist polemic, *traditores* were equated with murderers and fornicators (*moechi et adulteri* in *Tertullian's *De pudicitia*) regarding their readmission to ecclesial *communion. The question of apostates was thus tied closely to *penitential discipline—whether or not to readmit them and how. Later, the term meant more generally the abandonment or public denial of Christianity and adherence to a *heretical sect.

S. Hübner, *Kirchenbusse und Exkommunication bei Cyprian*: ZKTh 84 (1962) 49-84, 171-215; M. Simon, *Verus Israel*, Paris [2]1964; A. Portolano, *Il dramma dei lapsi nell'epistolario di Cipriano*, Napoli 1972; Ch. Mohrmann, *Tertium genus* (= Études IV), Rome 1977, 195-210.

V. Grossi

APOSTLE – APOSTOLATE
I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. The Greek term in general means "one who is sent," a messenger; its specifically Christian use obviously referred to one who announces a religious message. Clearly the concept of "apostle" had a particular connotation within Christian parlance. If the historical expansion of the church must be attributed to the apostles, then the term must be applied to a wide group of missionaries, of whom many are little more than a name and many completely anonymous.

Initially this term was linked to the world of the apocalyptic representations of the primitive community (see Mt 19:28; Lk 22:28-30), where the Twelve represent the true Israel of the righteous, in symbolic contraposition to the twelve tribes of Israel (Rev 21:14). It seems that by the time of *Paul's frst trip to *Jerusalem to visit the "apostles" (Gal 1:17ff.), the institution of the Twelve was already in existence. Confirming this are the lists of the Twelve (Mt 10:2-16; Mk 3:16-19; Lk 6:14-16; Acts 1:13), which present historical problems of difficult resolution (Bienert 11). The fact that Judas the traitor originally belonged to the Twelve ("one of the Twelve": see Mt 26:14; Mk 12:10, 20, 43; Lk 22:3; Jn 6:71)—according to Luke's account he was replaced by Matthias (Acts 1:26)—is inescapable evidence in G. Klein's view that the group of the Twelve arose only after Easter. Moreover, the continuity between the pre- and post-Easter communities with Jesus Christ is a true symbol of the elect of the people of God in the last days. From then on this circle had a primary place in apostolic office (Bienert 11-12). At the same time the role of the apostles in the founding of the church will remain connected to the function of the Twelve companions of Jesus. The identification of the apostles with the Twelve attests the interest in rooting the activity of the church in the ministry and intention of Jesus (see Brown 474-480).

The formula "the Twelve" is used particularly by Mark to indicate the closest circle of Jesus' disciples; it is also found in the other Evangelists, including John (see Jn 6:67-71). The Lukan conception of the twelve apostles (Lk 6:13; Act 1:21-22) is the result of a long evolution; its presuppositions are the apostolate attested by Paul and the picture of the Twelve offered by Mk 3:13-19; 6:7-13. An apostle in the strict sense recalls the necessary connection between the paschal event and the prepaschal community of Jesus; thus Luke was unable to designate his beloved and venerated Paul an apostle in this sense (except in Acts 14:4, 14). The connection between the primitive Christian apostle and the *prepaschal community of Jesus* finds its most clear expression in the notion of the *twelve apostles,* as though there were an unbreakable link between the concepts "apostle" and "the Twelve." Originally, the two elements seem to have been independent. Paul clearly distinguishes them (1 Cor 15:5-7), and lets it be understood that not every witness of the risen one is also an "apostle" (Bienert 11). Mark presents the Twelve to the missionary church (Mk 13:10; 14:9) as an archetype of missionary preachers (Mk 1:16-20; 3:13-19; 6:6b-13) (see Guenther).

Jesus, therefore, linked the disciples to a mission. He did not recruit them as the rabbis did, but made them charismatic leaders, inspired prophets and itinerant philosophers (see Bovon). We hold Jesus' choosing of the Twelve and their mission in Galilee to be historical fact, though contemporary exegesis disputes it. The group existed at least prior to Paul's conversion (1 Cor 15:5; Act 6:2), which gives us a first characteristic—though varied—overall vision of primitive Christianity. All of this indicates that the concept was not yet precisely fixed and that Paul had received it from the earlier tradition (Gal 1:17, where he mentions the apostles before him). In this context, the apostles at Jerusalem gathered around Cephas/Peter (Gal 1:18-19) represent an already-defined group. In Paul, one can distinguish three levels of meaning. The first level is as delegates of the community (Phil 2:25; 2 Cor 8:23). Second, another specifically Christian concept, but without precise demarcation, is that of "preachers of the gospel," charged by the risen one or by the *Holy Spirit and endowed with special gifts (1 Cor 9:5; cf. Acts 14:4, 14) to work in the world as missionaries. Among these are the so-called super-apostles (2 Cor 11:5; 12:11) and Paul himself, who insistently opposed their claims; in this sense the fraternal relations of Rom 16:7 also assume a positive meaning. It also refers to prophets called and sent by God who speak and work as commissioned by God, with divine powers. We do not know what relation these prophets had with the Jerusalem community or with the earthly Jesus. It is probable that the concept of an apostle as a primitive Christian missionary derived from *Hellenistic Jewish circles. In its later evolution "apostles" and "prophets" came to be considered as on the same level (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 2:20; 3:5; 4:11; Lk 11:49; *Did.* 11,3-6); Third, with this distinction and the preeminence of the apostles one sees the tendency to limit the apostles to the church's origin and to a specific circle of witnesses of the risen Lord (1 Cor 15:1-11). In Paul, a personal encounter with the risen Lord becomes the most important criterion (1 Cor 9:1; 15:8) (Bienert 9-11).

Decisive for Luke (see Acts 1:21-22) is the fact that an apostle had accompanied the earthly Jesus from his *baptism by John until the *ascension. He would certainly also be a witness to his *resurrection, as Paul claims; but Luke does not speak of a mandate on the part of the risen Lord. Clearly Luke's interest is that a close group of eyewitnesses, without gaps, would represent historical certainty; with this idea Luke limits the concept of apostle to a particular historical period (Bienert 12-13). Regarding his readers, Luke's objective with the term ἀπόστολος is not so much a clear definition or numerical limitation of the circle of persons thus designated but the knowledge that, in this circle's narrative-kerygmatic capacity, there is a faithful testimony of historical facts and a personal credibility (see Haacker 9-38). Luke's merit is to have raised to a literary level a tradition that until then was only oral and popular. He had received a twofold inheritance: the Petrine tradition of foundation, and the Pauline tradition of mission (see Bovon 240). Beyond the sharply differing concepts offered by Luke and Paul of the concept of an early Christian apostle, the term is found only rarely in the NT, though with distinctive accents. The prescriptions of 1–2 Pet are similar to the Pauline and deutero-Pauline. 2 Pet 3:2 also mentions "your apostles," without further specification. 2 Pet 3:15 already indicates an effort, continued by *1 Clem* 5 and Ign. *Rom.* 4,3 to present Peter and Paul together as the two most important apostolic authorities. Heb 3:1 offers a unique accent, designating only Christ himself as an "apostle" and not speaking of the others (Bienert 13).

The notion that an apostle of Jesus Christ can only be one who has seen the risen Lord (1 Cor 9:1; 15:7-9; Gal 1:15-17) later came to prevail, to the point of eliminating the earlier concept of itinerant preachers sent by the communities (found in Acts 14:4, 14). In the post-Pauline period, Paul's idea of an apostle prevailed completely in the conception of the Twelve as apostles to the *pagans (Mt 28:18-20; Acts 1:8). Eph 2:20 and Rev 21:14 find their echo in Luke.

Did. 11,3.4.6. also knows of itinerant apostles, called to mission by the Spirit and legitimated only by their message and conduct. *1 Clem.* and *Polycarp know the apostle only as an institution of the past. *Barn.* (5,9-10; 8,3-4) presupposes the establishment of the apostolate in Jesus' lifetime, but without limiting it to the Twelve. For *Hermas (*Vis.* III, 5,1) the apostles already belong to the past; except in *Sim.* IX, 17,2 he always cites them together with teachers—thus an open conception of an apostle, not limited in number. Thus, in the 2nd c. there were three ways of understanding the apostles: (1) *Jewish Christian, according to which the apostles come to be, after Jesus himself, the point of departure of a chain of tradition (*Papias, Polycarp, *Polycrates). *Irenaeus would later systematically express the idea of an apostolic tradition. (2) Hellenizing, which tends to a spiritual vision of the apostles as "divine men," wanderers and wonderworkers. This conception flourished esp. in the apocryphal *Acts,* producing ecclesiastical traditions at the local level. The Gentile church turned the twelve disciples whom Jesus sent to Israel into apostles to the pagans. *Ascens. Is.* 3,13-14; *Keryg. Petr.* (*Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 43,3); *Aristides (*Apol.* 2); and *Ep. Apost.* (ca. 30, *Coptic) describe them as missionaries to the world. (3) For *gnostics, the apostles are the initiates of God the revealer. After Christ, they became revealing divinities, opening the way of return to the divine sphere. With the defeat of gnosticism, ecclesiastical tradition on the apostles was not limited to popular stories; not all the stories of the apostles can be dismissed as legend or anecdote. The *parenetic or *kerygmatic tradition was interested in the apostles and in the early communities from the beginning (1 Th 1:9; 1 Cor 15:3-8). According to the ancient ecclesiastical representation, the apostles were not only the guarantee of a trustworthy transmission of the church's ways and doctrine but esp. *bearers of the mission* and models in their life and death. The gnostic *Heracleon tells that four of the disciples did not die as *martyrs (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 71,3) and that this fact prevented the places of apostolic activity from being venerated as the tombs of the apostles (see Tertullian, *praescr. haer.* 36,1). The missionary charge was from the beginning constitutive of apostolic office, and not only for Paul. The NT missionary mandates (Mt 28:19f.; Lk 24:47f.; Acts 1:8; 10:42) are collected and transmitted by the primitive Christian literature (*Didaskalia syriaca*; TU 25/2 [1904] 77; *Ep. Apost.* 30). One should note the peculiar position of the people of Israel within the mandate understood universally (Mt 19:28//Lk 22:30; *Barn.* 8,3), which was differently expressed through history, highlighting in Jewish Christian circles the preeminence of Israel, and among the pagans the meaning of the apostolic mission; the *Kerygma Petrou* relates the two stages in this way (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI 5,43). The image was thus spread of the division of the world into twelve parts by the apostles (*Acts Thom.* 1; *Did. Syr.*); *Origen's *Comm. Gen.* (Eusebius, *HE* III,1) says they did this by drawing lots, mentioning only five (*Thomas/the homeland, *Andrew/*Scythia, *John/*Asia [dying at *Ephesus after a long time there], Peter according to 1 Pet 1:1 reaching *Rome, and Paul according to Rom

15:19 martyred at Rome). The first mention of Thomas and Andrew is in *Pistis Sophia* ca. 136. *Eusebius of Caesarea's information is completed by *Rufinus of Aquileia (*HE*, I, 9f.), with the addition of *Matthew/*Ethiopia and *Bartholomew/Hither India. Thomas was in India according to *Acts Thom.* (Bienert 19-20). From the 2nd c. "the apostles" became the decisive point in Christian consciousness for the historical passage from Jesus Christ to his church.

GLNT 1, 1063-1196; TRE 4,430-466; H. von Campenhausen, *Le concept d'apôtre dans le Christianisme primitif*: STh 1 (1947/48) 96-130; E. Lohse, *Ursprung und Prägung des christlichen Apostolates*: TZ 9 (1953) 259-275; E.M. Kredel, *Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese*: ZKTh 78 (1956) 169-193, 257-305; W. Schmithals, *Das kirchliche Apostelamt*, Göttingen 1961 (Eng. tr. Nashville 1969); L. Cerfaux, *La mission apostolique des douze et sa portée eschatologique*, in Mél. Tisserant, I, Vatican City 1964, 43-66; F. Bovon, *L'origine des récits concernant les apôtres*: RThPh 17 (1967) 345-350; R. Schnackenburg, *L'apostolicité: état de la recherche*: Istina 14 (1969) 5-32; *Mysterium Salutis*, vol. VII, Brescia 1972, 605-613; G. Frizzi, *L' ἀπόστολος delle tradizioni sinottiche*: RivBib-Ital 22 (1974) 3-37; A. Kirk, *Apostleship Since Regenstorf*: NTS 21 (1974) 249-264; S. Brown, *Apostleship in the New Testament as an Historical Problem*: NTS 30 (1984) 474-480; J. Dupont, *Le Douzième Apôtre (Actes 1,15-16)*, in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of B. Reicke*, I, Macon, GA 1984, 139-145; H.O. Guenther, *The Footprints of Jesus' Twelve in Early Christian Traditions*, New York 1985; L. Cerfaux, *Pour l'histoire du titre Apostolos dans le Nouveau Testament*: RecSR 48 (1960) 76-92 = *Recueil L. Cerfaux*, III. BETL 71, Louvain 1985, 185-200; F.H. Agnew, *The Origin of the NT Apostle-Concept: A Review of Research*: JBL 105 (1986) 75-96; W. Horbury, *The Twelve and the Phylarchs*: NTS 32 (1986) 503-527; W.A. Bienert, *Das Apostelbild in der altchristlichen Überlieferung*, in W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. II. *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, Tübingen [5]1989, 6-28; F. Bovon, *Révelations et Écritures. Nouveau Testament et littérature apocryphe chrétienne*, Geneva 1993; G. Klein, *Die zwölf Apostel*, Göttingen 1961.

R. Trevijano

II. Iconography. The earliest figurative evidence of the apostles appears in the pre-*Constantinian era with depictions of the apostolic college arranged around Christ—images of the heavenly court deliberately and polemically opposed with the imperial court. Their *iconography closely follows the type of the ancient philosopher and is essentially undifferentiated: only *Peter, *Paul and *Andrew have individual characteristics.

The oldest examples of the apostolic college date from the time of the tetrarchy. From the beginning they were depicted in a fixed scheme—in three (Christ, Peter and Paul) or in twelve—which remained substantially unchanged. In the frescoes of the *Roman *cemetery of Pietro e Marcellino (Wp pl. 96) and of the anonymous cemetery of Via Anapo (RivAC 5 [1928] fig. 19 = J.G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Anonima di via Anapo,"* no. 8), Christ the "teacher" sits on a cathedra with footrest, his right hand in the gesture of *adlocutio* ("word"), surrounded by his disciples in a semicircle; some decades later, on the front of an arcosolium of the cemetery of S. Ermete at Rome (Wp pl. 152), the twelve disciples, like Christ, are seated on cathedrae, to emphasize the concept of *missio apostolorum*.

On *sarcophagi, the theme of the apostolic college appears in the wake of the Peace of the Church. The original pattern, as in the cemetery paintings, occurs sporadically; an artistically important example is that of the sarcophagus of Concordius (Arles, late 4th c., Ws 34, 3), in which the inscriptions carved on the books and scrolls carried by Christ and the apostles include the expression *dominus legem dat* and the names of the four Evangelists, representing the **traditio legis* entrusted to the whole apostolic council. Only from the late 4th c. were the apostles shown standing and acclaiming Christ, who is royally seated on a draped throne, as on the sarcophagus of Mantua, dated 395–408 (Ws pl. 30).

Still in the 4th c. the theme of the apostolic college penetrated the mosaics of churches in solemn, monumental compositions. In S. Aquilino, *Milan (4th c.), following the oldest pattern, the apostles are seated around Christ *magister;* in S. Pudenziana, Rome (early 5th c.), together with other figures, they symbolize the church triumphant; in the Orthodox baptistery at *Ravenna (5th c.) they stand above the prophets as witnesses to the *concordantia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*.

Where individuation was desired, images of the apostles were accompanied by their names; not the traditional list of Mt 10:2-4 and Mk 3:16-19 (in inverted order) but the so-called popular list in which Paul replaces Matthias, Mark replaces Thaddaeus and Luke replaces James, as in Theodoric's mausoleum at Ravenna or the Barletta relief (the oldest example of this list).

From the late 4th to early 5th c. the apostles were also represented symbolically: as doves in a fresco of the cemetery of Commodilla, Rome (RivAC 34 [1958] 9ff. = J.G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Commodilla." Repertorium der Malerein*, no. 5), as lambs in the apse mosaic of Sts. Cosmas and Damian at Rome, and as *volumina* in the apse of St. John the Evangelist at Ravenna. From a passage of *Eusebius of Caesarea (*De vita Const.* 3,38: PG 20, 1097) we learn that Constantine had 12 columns set up symbolizing the apostles in the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre at *Jerusalem.

At times the apostles are shown individually in

scenes from Christ's public life: in these cases it is the narrative context and the presence of particular attributes or gestures that allow their identification. Thus Thomas can be recognized putting his finger in the wound in Christ's side in the episode of unbelief (Ravenna, relief, National Museum: *Corpus della scult. paleocr. altomedioevale di R.*, n. 6; Como, sarc. of Celsus: Ws pl. 243,3), and a figure hanging from a tree, as in the Brescia Reliquiary (4th c.), is obviously *Judas Iscariot.

J. Ficker, *Die Darstellung der Apostel in der Altchristlichen Kunst*, Leipzig 1887; G. De Jerphanion, *Quels sont les douze apôtres dans l'iconographie chrétienne?*: La voix des monuments 1 (1930) 189-200; K. Künstle, *Ikonographie der Heiligen*, Freiburg i.Br. 1926; P. Testini, *Osservazioni sull'iconografia del Cristo in trono fra gli apostoli*: RIA 11-12 (1963) 230-300; J. Myslivec, s.v. *Apostel*: LCI I, 150-170; J.G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Anonima di via Anapo." Repertorium der Malerein*, Vatican City-Münster 1992; J.G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Commodilla." Repertorium der Malerein*, Vatican City 1994; M. Minasi, s.v. *Apostoli*: TIP 124-126.

C. Carletti

APOSTLES. Feasts in the Greek church 30 June and 4 January.

I. Apocrypha on the Apostles – II. Lists of the Apostles – III. Legal-liturgical and dogmatic texts of the Apostles – IV. Homilies on the Apostles – V. The cult of the Apostles – VI. Apostolic Fathers.

There is a wide literature on the apostles in Greek, Latin and the Eastern languages. This regards the apostles, often called the Twelve (with *Matthias, *Paul and often also *Barnabas; *Judas was excluded), the Evangelists, and the disciples of the Lord or of the apostles (the 70 or the 72). This literature can be divided into the following categories.

I. Apocrypha on the Apostles. The most important group of writings on the apostles are the *apocrypha, which can be subdivided into (1) apocryphal *Acts* of the individual apostles, (2) collections of *Acts of the Apostles* and (3) other apocrypha regarding the apostles.

1. Acts of the Apostles (Periodoi, Praxeis, Virtutes). 5 great *Acts* of the apostles were written in the 2nd-3rd c.: of *Peter, *Paul, *John, *Andrew and *Thomas; the first four are preserved partially, the *Acts of Thomas* in their entirety (in two versions: Greek and *Syriac). These texts were ascribed to the *gnostics Leucius and Charinus, or to Leucius-Charinus (a thesis now abandoned). Each work is subdivided into acts (*actus, praxeis*), whereas the whole is composed of a description of their activities (travels, miracles, preaching) and *martyrdom—this latter was often incorporated into the *liturgy. There are important poetic passages in the *Acts of Thomas* and the *Acts of John*. These *Acts* include some *gnostic elements; some (*Acts of Andrew*) are preserved in a version censured by *Gregory of Tours. From the 4th c. until the *Byzantine period an ample production of apocryphal *Acts* developed, in which motifs from the above-mentioned *Acts* were developed, along with the lives and martyrdom accounts of the other *Acts.* Normally the *Acts* deal with one apostle, but there are some that treat of two, e.g., Peter and Paul or Andrew and *Matthias. There is an ample body of work on some apostles (Peter, Andrew), very sparse on others (James, Judas). This later literature is increasingly characterized by fantastic elements (exotic countries, strange miracles, etc.). Some *Acts* open with a description of the apostle's field of activity. These works are preserved in various versions and paraphrases, some *orthodox, some composed of gnostic or *heretical elements. Apocryphal *Acts* of the apostles were used by gnostics, *Manichees and heretics (e.g., *Priscillianists), but the texts cannot be generally classified as heretical. The *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* were written in Greek, Latin and the Eastern languages, but the Eastern texts are generally translations or paraphrases of the Greek. These apocryphal texts were a source of legends on the apostles for the medieval collections of *hagiographical legends and are an important source for the *iconography of the apostles. Besides these *Acts,* there are gnostic texts of *Nag Hammadi regarding the apostles, such as the *Acts of Peter and of the Twelve Apostles* (codex VI).

CANT 190-299. Principal editions of the texts:

Greek and Latin: R.A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 1-2,2, Leipzig 1891, 1898, 1903 (Darmstadt 1959, 1976).

Arabic: A. Smith Lewis, *Acta mythologica apostolorum* (Horae Semiticae 3), *The Mythological Acts of Apostles* (Horae Semiticae 4), London 1903; see I. Guidi, below.

*Armenian: K. Èerakian, Venice 1904 (Armenian text only); Fr. tr. L. Leloir: CCA 3-4, 1988. See L. Leloir, *Rapporte entre les version arménienne et syriaque des Actes apocryphes des apôtres*, in Symposium Syriacum: OCA 205 (1978) 137-148; V. Calzolari, *La Bible et les textes apocryphes dans l'Arménie*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 81 (2001) 38-48.

*Coptic: O. von Lemm, *Koptische apokryphe Apostelakten*: Mélanges Asiatiques 10 (1890) and Bulletin de l'Accadémie des Sciences des St. Péterburg 33 (1890), 37 (1894), 10 (1892); E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1913 (with Eng. tr.); W.H.P. Hatch, *Three Hitherto Unpublished Lives from Manuscript of the Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha in*

Bohairic, in *Coptic Studies in Honour of E.W. Crum*, Boston 1950; I. Guidi, *Gli apocrifi degli apostoli nei testi copti, arabi ed etiopici*, Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, notes I-VII, vol. III, 1887, 1, part 2; II, parts 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, vol. IV, 1888, 1, part 2; Id., *Gli Atti apocrifi degli Apostoli nei testi copti, arabi et etiopici*: Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana 2 (1888) 1-66 (translation).

Ethiopian: S.C. Malan, *The Contendings of the Holy Apostles*, London 1871; E.A.W. Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles*, 1-2, London 1899-1901 (repr. Amsterdam 1976).

*Georgian: C. Kurčikidze, Tbilisi 1959 (only in Georgian).

*Palaeoslavonic: in the large collections of Tichonravov, Franko and others.

Syriac: W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, 1-2, London 1971 (Amsterdam 1968). See L. Leloir, *Rapport entre les version arménienne et syriaque des Actes apocryphes des apôtres*, in Symposium Syriacum: OCA 205 (1978) 137-148.

Translations: Eng. - Schneemelcher; Eng. 2 - Elliott; It. - Erbetta 2, Moraldi 2; Ger. in Schneemelcher 2; Fr., in EAC 1.

R.A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 1-2,2, and Ergänzungsband; Braunschweig 1883-1890 (Amsterdam 1976); E. Plümacher, *Apokryphe Apostelakten*, PWK 15, 11-70; R. Söder, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike*, Stuttgart 1932 (1969); M. Blumenthal, *Formen und Motive in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*: TU 48/1 (1933); A. Hamman, "*Sitz im Leben*" *des actes apocryphes de NT*: SP 8 (1966) 62-69; P. Nagel, *Die apokryphen Apostelakten in der manichäischen Literatur*, in *Gnosis und NT*, ed. W. Tröger, Berlin 1973, 149-182; F. Morard, Coptic Encyclopaedia 1, 58-61; D.M. Parrot, ibid. 61-63; var. aus., *Les Actes apocryphes des Apôtres*, Geneva 1981; E. Junod - J.D. Kaëstli, *L'histoire des Actes apocryphes du III^e au IX^e s.*, Lausanne 1982; F. Bovon et al. (eds.), *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, Cambridge, MA 1999.

2. *Collections of the Acts of the Apostles*. A collection of the *Acts of the Apostles* was composed in the 6th-7th c. in *Gaul: attributed to *Abdias, bishop of Babylon, written in Hebrew, translated into Greek by Eutropius and into *Latin by *Julius Africanus (Introd.; see 6,20). The work is in 10 books and contains lives of the Twelve, except Matthias and Judas (the traitor), and that of Paul. A collection of the apocrypha probably existed in *Coptic. In the 12th c. an Ethiopian collection was composed of the *Acts of the Apostles,* of the Evangelists and of the disciples of the Lord, also containing some lists of the apostles. This collection contains elements not contained in the Western texts (Latin and Greek).

Ps.-Abdias: CANT 256; J.A. Fabricius, *Codex apocryphorum NT*, Hamburg [2]1719. It. tr.: Erbetta 2 (in chapters on the individual apostles); Moraldi 2, 511-682; Polish: E. Nowak, M. Starowieyski, Kraków 1995. Lipsius 1, 117-178; Ergänzungsband 5-11; G. Besson, *La collection du Ps. Abdias. Un essai de définition à partir de l'étude des manuscrits*: Apocrypha 11 (2000) 181-194; M. Brossard-Dandré, *La collection du Ps. Abdias. Approche narrative et cohérence interne*: Apocrypha 11 (2000) 195-205; D. Alibert, *Vision du monde et immaginaire dans quelques textes de la collection dite du Pseudo-Abdias*: Apocrypha 11 (2000) 207-226; Ethiopian collection: E.A.W. Budge, *The Contendings of Apostles*, 1-2, London [2]1935 (Amsterdam 1976).

3. *Other apocrypha on the apostles.* There are other apocryphal writings on the apostles, i.e., the letters of some of the apostles (e.g., the famous letters of Paul and *Seneca, the apocryphal letters of St. Paul, the letter of ps.-Titus, **Epistula Apostolorum*), and the *Lives* of the apostles, such as that of *Epiphanius the Monk (*Life of Andrew*) and anonymous stories of John the Evangelist. Many writings are published under the name of an apostle or all of the apostles, such as the **Protevangelium of James,* the *Apocalypses of Peter,* the **Epistula Apostolorum* and a few *Gospels of the Twelve* or *Gospels of the Apostles,* either preserved in fragments or of which we know only the titles (one of these texts is a modern falsification, see Starowieyski 1/1, 120); all of theses writings are more or less linked to an apostle. There are, moreover, the *Sortes Apostolorum* and *Lusa Apostolorum* condemned by the *Ps.-*Gelasian Decree* (5, 6, 8f.), but of them we know nothing more.

II. Lists of the Apostles. Another group of writings on the apostles consists of various types of lists of the apostles. The most numerous are lists containing a brief biography of each apostle. The most important are those of ps.-Epiphanius, ps.-Hippolytus, ps.-Dorotheus (Greek) and the **Breviarium Apostolorum* (Latin). The oldest work is that of ps.-Epiphanius (700–750). In some lists, Paul comes after Peter and, to keep the number to Twelve, Matthias is excluded. The work of ps.-*Isidore of Seville, *De ortu et obitu Patrum,* includes the lives of the apostles, and of the disciples of the Lord (68–86). Some lists contain the etymologies of the apostle's names, information on their places of birth, the names of their relatives, explanations of who was baptized and by whom, and definitions of faith proclaimed by them, e.g., some articles of the creed. Some are written in verse. Their large number in every language of the ancient world show their popularity. They are generally the products of the *Late Antique and *Byzantine eras, and their historical value is rather negligible. Poetic lists of the apostles can be found in the poets, e.g., *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* 19, PL 61, 513-515).

BHG 150-160 (1957) completed by the *Auctarium* (1969) and *Novum Auctarium* (1984); BHL 648-654 (1898) completed by the *Novum Supplementum* (1986); T. Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices Apostolorum*, Leipzig 1907; F. Dolbeau: AB 104 (1986) 299-314; Id.: Revue d'histoire des textes 16 (1986)

83-139; Id.: AB 108 (1990) 51-70; Id.: Apocrypha 3 (1992) 259-279 (Lat.); Id.: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 91-107; M. van Esbroeck, *Neuf listes d'Apôtres orientales*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 199-109; T. Schermann, *Propheten und Apostellegenden*, Leipzig 1907.

III. Legal-liturgical and dogmatic texts of the Apostles. Another group of writings attributed to the name of the apostles are legal-liturgical and dogmatic texts, such as the **Didache,* the **Apostolic Constitutions,* the **Didascalia Apostolorum,* the **Apostolic Canons* and other texts, often very ancient, extremely important for the history of canon law and the *liturgy. To this category can be added the *Apostles' Creed; in some versions the individual articles of faith are ascribed to the individual apostle.

CPG 1, 1983, 1730-1743 (bibl.). Creed: J. de Ghellinck, *Histoire de symbole des Apôtres*, in Id., *Patristique et Moyen-Age*, 1, Gembloux 1946; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, Oxford 1950, [2]1972. A. Di Berardino, *Letteratura canonica, penitenziale e liturgica*, in *Res christiana, temi interdisciplinari di paristica*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1999, 279ff.

IV. Homilies on the Apostles. Although there is a significant number of homilies of the Fathers on the individual apostles, homilies on the apostles in general are rather rare in the patristic era: a text of *Ephrem, some of ps.-John Chrysostom; others are from the Byzantine period, such as those of Gennadius II (Georgios Scholarios—d. after 1472) and in particular those of Nicetas of Paphlagonia (d. after 910), who left a collection of homilies on all of the apostles. Of particular value are the lives of the apostles of Symeon Metaphrastes (d. 982/987) and the first chapters of book II of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Nicephorus Callistus (d. 1335 ca.). A theological synthesis of the number Twelve is in *Rabanus Maurus (PL 107, 891).

BHL, BHG, BHO, see above.

V. The cult of the Apostles. In the early church the cult of the apostles was collective in character, because of the dignity of the mandate given them. The first church built in honor of the apostles, the Apostoleion at *Constantinople, was the work of *Constantine, later rebuilt by *Justinian. The commemoration of the apostles was constituted at Rome under Byzantine influence. Churches in honor of the apostles were built in the 4th-5th c. at *Milan, Lodi, Como, *Aquileia, Concordia, Verona. Sts. Peter and Paul enjoyed special honor, and later Andrew. Feasts were later created in the Latin liturgy for Sts. James and *Philip, St. John in Porta Latina and the other individual apostles.

A.P. Frutaz, *L'origine del culto liturgico degli Apostoli*, Scuola Cattolica 1936, 213ff.; E. Vida, *Il culto agli Apostoli nell'Italia settentrionale alla fine del IV sec.*, Ambrosius 1957, 245ff.; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, 2, Milan 1969, 448-466.

VI. Apostolic Fathers. Finally, from 1672, with the publication by J.B. Cotelier of *Sanctorum Patrum, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt*, the term "Apostolic Fathers" was used, indicating a group of the first Christian writers who lived in the first half of the 2nd c., or some anonymous writings of that period.

All of this clearly shows the importance of the apostles in ancient and Byzantine Christianity.

BS 2, 278-317; LCIK 1, 150-176; 5, 236-239; F.X. Pötzl, *Die Mitarbeiter des Weltapostels Paulus*, Regensburg 1911; F. Haase, *Apostel und Evangelisten in den orientalischen Übeliefrungen*, Münster 1922; V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, Vatican City 1938; P.L. Spatling, *De apostolicis, pseudo-apostolicis, apostolinis. Dissertatio ad diversos vitae apostolicae conceptus saeculorum decursu elucidandos*, Munich 1947; O. Hopham, *Die Apostel*, Luzern 1946; J. Blinzler, *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu*, Stuttgart 1967; W. Wiemer, *Der Apostel und seine Mitarbeiter*, Wuppertal 1987; P. Jounel, *Le culte des Apôtres à Rome*, in *Saints et sainteté dans la liturgie*, ed. A. Triacca et al., Rome 1987, 167-187; *Légendier apostolique anglo-normand*, ed. D.W. Russel, Montréal-Paris 1989; J. Texidor, *L'apôtre d'après la littérature syriaque*: Apocrypha 1 (1990) 269-277; W. Schneemelcher, *Apostolische Pseudepigraphen*, in Schneemelcher 28-34; Id., *Apostelgeschichten des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts*, in ibid. 2,71-81.

M. Starowieyski

APOSTLES' CREED (for professions of faith in general, *see* Creeds and Confessions of Faith). According to some ancient sources the twelve apostles composed the first creed of faith, the Apostles' Creed or the *Symbolum Apostolorum.* It was cited for the first time in a letter to *Ambrose (*Ep.* 42, 5) sent by Pope *Siricius to the Synod of *Milan (390). *Rufinus of Aquilea (*Comm. in symb. apost.* 2) recounts that the apostles "established . . . a unanimous norm for their future preaching . . . granting each one a contribution that he regarded better." Rufinus is in agreement with another document from the same era titled the *Explanatio symboli ad initiandos*, which was based on St. Ambrose's speech and the **Apostolic Constitutions* 6,14.

The account of the composition of the Apostles' Creed enjoyed a consensus during the entire Middle Ages. It thus also found expression in the figurative arts as, e.g., in the *Liebfrauenkirche* of Trier, which was constructed between 1235 and 1260, where the twelve columns that support the ceiling were adorned during the 15th c. with representations of the apostles and their articles of faith.

The apostolic origin of the creed was criticized by Lorenzo Valla and Reginald Pecock, but the first scholar was forced to retract and the second renounced his episcopal see in 1458. These criticisms, however, returned in the 17th c. with Voss and Usher. Starting from the Reformation the historical account of the composition of the creed was considered apocryphal by all scholars.

Throughout the NT one finds the phenomenon of teaching that was imposed and transmitted with authority. Then, in the *baptismal questions and answers of the first three centuries, although the formulas were very simple, a declaration of faith was always present. In the second half of the 2nd c., Catholic circles took for granted that the **regula fidei* went back to the apostles, a type of schematic summary of Christian teaching for *catechesis and other objectives. Although the rule of faith and the Apostles' Creed were not the same thing, the relationship between the two was very close. Very specific traces of this *regula fidei* can be found in the writings of *Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I, 6,2; I, 65,3; I, 13), *Ignatius of Antioch (*Magn.* 13, *Trall.* 9, *Smirn.* I, 1-2), the **Didache* (7), *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. Haer.* I, 10,1-2; III, 4,1), *Tertullian (*Apol.* 47, *Praescr.* 21 and 37) etc., and all these testimonies speak of it as having been transmitted by the apostles.

Modern-day scholarship tends to affirm that the account of the assembly of the twelve apostles to compose the Apostles' Creed was most likely a pious invention, but the ancient conviction that the *regula fidei* went back to the apostles contains an element of truth.

J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London 1972; F.E. Vokes, *Apostolisches Glaubensbekenntnis* I: TRE, 528-554; H.M. Barth, *Apostolisches Glaubensbekenntnis* II: ibid. 554-566; H. Schröer, *Apostolisches Glaubensbekenntnis* III: ibid. 566-571; L.H. Westra, *Apostles' Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries*, Turnhout 2002; M. Vinzent, *Der Ursprung des Apostolikums im Urteil der kritischen Forschung*, Göttingen 2006.

J. Leal

APOSTOLIC CANONS, The 85

I. The 85 canons - II. The appendix to can. 50.

I. The 85 canons. The **Apostolic Constitutions* end with 85 disciplinary canons (8, 47), concerning esp. sanctions to be adopted against clerical offenses; they also deal with *baptism, *divorce, ordinations, the *liturgy, the laity, marriage of clergy and laity, fasting, participation in Jewish feasts, etc. Schwartz has maintained that these were not the work of the editor of the *Apos. Con.*, but his hypothesis is unfounded inasmuch as they present many basic parallels and similarities in form with the parts that are by the editor of that work and also reflect the same mode of composition: the author used the apocryphal letter of *Clement to *James and the canons of the Councils of *Antioch and *Laodicea as canvases on which to insert additions of all kinds, dictated by his own spirit. There is therefore no reason to deny the authorship of the 85 canons, in the form in which they are preserved in the *Apos. Con.*, to the editor of that work: they were composed in Cilicia by *Julian the Arian shortly after 381. The Council of *Constantinople of 394 already refers to them by the name *Apostolic Canons*.

Because the 85 canons were thought to be of apostolic origin, separate copies of them were very soon produced, and they were included in collections of conciliar canons, e.g., at the beginning of *John III Scholasticus's *Synagoge*, the basis of Greek church law. The council *In *Trullo* of 691 also lists them at the beginning of its list of authoritative canons (ch. 2). They were translated from the Greek into most of the languages used in the Eastern churches, and into *Latin by *Dionysius Exiguus, who put them at the head of his collection of conciliar decrees, though stopping at the end of canon 50 (number 49 in Dionysius's list). The **Decretum Gelasianum* (*De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*), unduly attributed to Pope *Gelasius and actually the work of a 6th-c. Provençal cleric, lists them among the *apocrypha because they contradicted the tradition of the Latin church on a number of points; this did not prevent Popes John VIII and Leo IX, and great canonists such as Ivo of Chartres and *Gratian, from explicitly referring to them.

II. The appendix to can. 50. One of these separate copies of the *Apostolic Canons* gave canon 50 a long theological appendix of *pneumatomachian tendency (text preserved in the Syriac Clementine Octateuch; retroversion in Schwartz 14-15; tr. in Nau, 123-124), which was not in the *Apos. Con.* Its unorthodox character doubtless led Dionysius to end his translation just before reaching it. *John Scholasticus kept it but reworked it to make it orthodox (text in Joannou 33-35).

Editions: CPG 1740; Mansi 1, 29-48; 49-57 (the 50 in Dionysius Exiguus's translation); PG 137, 36-217 (with commentary by Balsamone, Zonara and Aristeno); Hfl-Lecl 1, 2, 1216-1220; F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et constitutiones apostolorum*, Paderborn 1905 (repr. Turin 1979), vol. I, 564-592; M. Metzger, *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, SC 336, Paris 1987, 274-311 (ed. and Fr. tr.); H. Tattam, *The Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles in Coptic with an English Translation*, London 1848 (repr. New York 1965); Winand Fell, *Canones apostolorum aethiopice*,

Leipzig 1871 (with Latin version; Eng. tr. by H. Schodde in Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis [1885] 63-72; the Ethiopic collection is composed of 57 canons, some of them having been combined); Syriac tr.: F. Nau, *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clément*, Paris 1913, new ed., ed. P. Ciprotti, Milan 1967; E. Gabidzashvili, *Didi Sadzuliskanoni*, Tbilisi 1975; V. Hakobian, *Kanonenagirk' Hayoc'*, I, Ereven 1964; C.H. Turner, EOMIA, Oxford 1899-1913, I,1, 1-34; 1,2, 32n-32nn; E. Hauler, *Didascaliae apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia latina. Accedunt Canonum qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum reliquiae*, Leipzig 1900, 93-101; E. Tidner, *Didascaliae apostolorum, Canonum ecclesiastorum, Traditionis apostolicae versiones latinae*, Berlin 1963; P.P. Joannou, *Discipline générale antique*, I,2, Grottaferrata 1962, 1-55 (with Fr. and Lat. tr.); A. Vööbus, *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Louvain 1975, CSCO 367, 58-72; CSCO 368, 72-83 (Eng. tr.); F. Boxler, *Die sogenannten Apostolischen Constitutionen und Canones*, Kempten 1874 (Ger. tr.); A. Roberts - J. Donaldson, *The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*: Ante-Nicene Fathers, 7, 391-505 (Eng. tr.; canons 500-505). Edition of an Armenian version: H. Ghedighian, *Collectio canonum Ecc. Armenae*, I, *Canones Apostolici*, Venice 1941, 42-72. It.: D. Spada - D. Salachas, *Costituzioni dei Santi Apostoli per mano di Clemente*, Urbania Univ. Press, Rome 2001, *Canoni Apostolici* 244-261.

Studies: H. Leclercq, DACL 2, 1910-1950; F. Nau, DTC 2, 1605-1626; G. Bardy, DDC 2, 1288-1295; Coptic En. 2, 451-453; E. Schwartz, *Über die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen*: Schriften der wiss. Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 6, Strassburg 1910, 17-27 (*Gesamm. Schriften*, V, Berlin 1963, 214-245); B. Steimer, *Vertex traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 87-94.

P. NAUTIN

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS. A great late 4th-c. canonical-liturgical work in eight books. Its author took various earlier works and rewrote them, keeping some sentences or phrases of the earlier text and making additions or modifications of varying importance: the whole is presented as "Injunctions" (*diatagai* or *diataxeis*) addressed by the "apostles and presbyters to all believers scattered among the nations" (I prol.; VIII, 4,1) and transmitted by *Clement of Rome (VI, 18, 11; VIII, 46, 13; 47, 85).

The basis of books I-VI is the **Didascalia Apostolorum,* adapted to the evolution of institutions and with some prescriptions mitigated.

Book VII comprises three parts: (1) chs. 1-32, an amplification of the **Didache;* (2) chs. 33-38, five prayers of praise to God, seemingly modeled on Jewish prayers; (3) chs. 39-45, a Christian initiation ritual with echoes of the baptismal ritual of the **Apostolic Tradition,* here much more developed. The book ends with various appendixes (46-49): a list of the bishops ordained by the *apostles; short prayers for morning (*Gloria in excelsis Deo* like that of the Roman Mass), evening and meals.

Book VIII also has three parts: (1) chs. 1-2, a treatise on charisms, certainly based on that preceding the *Trad. Apost.*; (2) chs. 3-46, a rearrangement of the *Trad. Apost.,* developed in detail except for the baptismal ritual already dealt with in book VII; these chapters are sometimes called the "Clementine liturgy"; (3) ch. 47, the 85 **Apostolic Canons,* using the apocryphal Clementine letter to James and a conciliar collection known elsewhere which contained the canons of *Nicaea (325), *Ancyra, *Neocaesarea, *Gangra, *Antioch and *Laodicea (these two used in more detail), and *Constantinople (381).

Traces of *Arianism in the text (*Bibl.*, 112-113) were already noticed by *Photius. The name of this Arian was recently discovered. In 1973 D. Hagedorn edited an unpublished Arian commentary on Job and proved by numerous indisputable parallels that the same author, an *anomoian named *Julian, wrote the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the pseudo-Ignatian letters. I believe that he was bishop of Neapolis near Anazarbus and can thus be identified with Julian, the Cilician bishop and partisan of *Eunomius mentioned by *Philostorgius. However, at the time he wrote the *Apostolic Constitutions* he no longer openly attacked the **homoousios* as in the commentary but confined himself to opposing the doctrinal consequences to which the *homoousios* seemed to lead, such as that Christ was ungenerate and without beginning. He also kept his distance from Eunomius, rejecting baptism by single immersion, clearly because of its condemnation by the Council of Constantinople of 381. The modification of his position is explained by circumstances. After the accession of *Theodosius I in 379 and the council of 381, the creed became the rule of the empire; no one could risk contradicting it. So the *Apostolic Constitutions* are after 381 but before the Council of Constantinople of 30 October 394, which refers to book VIII, 47, 74. Besides complete copies of the *Apostolic Constitutions,* there were soon many partial copies, some just of book VIII: one such constitutes books IV-VIII of the *Syriac collection known as the "Clementine Octateuch"; the Greek document usually called the *Epitome of book VIII* or *Constitutions of Hippolytus* is also an abridged copy. Others contain just the 85 canons which end book VIII, known as the *Apostolic Canons.* Canon 2 of the Council in *Trullo of 692 repudiated the *Apostolic Constitutions* as containing heterodox passages but allowed the *Apostolic Canons,* since they already had a place in the conciliar collections. With these canons, Julian's work exercised a certain influence on the history of ecclesiastical law in East and West, but it seems to have had little importance in the evolution of liturgy.

CPG 1731; PG 1, 509-1156 (Lat. tr. by J.B. Cotelier, 1724); F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, 2 vols., Paderborn 1905 (repr. Turin 1962); P.A. de Lagarde, *Constitutiones apostolorum*, Leipzig 1862 (repr. Osnabrück 1962); M. Metzger, *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, SC 320 (1985); 329 (1986); 336 (1987).

Translations: Lat.: PG 1, 557-1155; important intr. by Cotelier; Funk (above); Fr.: Metzger, above; Ger.: F. Boxler, *Die sogenannten Apostolischen Constitutionen und Canones*, Kempten 1874 (BKV 17-333); Eng.: J. Donaldson, *The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*: Ante-Nicene Fathers, 385-505; It.: D. Spada and D. Salachas, *Costituzioni dei Santi Apostoli per mano di Clemente*, Urbaniana Univ. Press, Rome 2001.

Studies: DACL 3, 2732-2748 (bibl.); DTC 3, 1520-1537; DDC 4, 453-459 (bibl.); Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 451-453; F.X. Funk, *Die apostolischen Konstitutionen*, Rottenburg 1891; E. Lanne, *Les ordinations dans le rite copte, leurs relations avec les Constitutions apostoliques et la Tradition de s. Hippolyte*: OrSyr 5 (1960) 81-106; D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobcommentar*, Berlin 1973, XXXVII-LVII; J. Magne, *Tradition Apostolique sur les charismes et Diataxeis des saints Apôtres*, Paris 1975, 107-192; P. Sigal, *Early Christian and Rabbinic Liturgical Affinities: Exploring Liturgical Acculturation*: NTS 30 (1984) 63-90; D.A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to Be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Chico, CA 1985; A. Enermalm-Ogawa, *Un langage de prière juif en grec. Le témoignage des deux premiers livres des Maccabées*, Stockholm 1987; D.A. Fiensy, *The Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers: One Hundred Years of Discussion*: Journal Stud-Pseud 5 (1989) 17-27; Th. Kopecek, *Neo-Arian Religion: The Evidence of the Apostolic Constitution*, in R.C. Gregg, *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, Philadelphia 1985, 153-179; B. Steimer, *Vertex traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 114-133; M. Metzger, *La fidélité dans le mariage selon le témoignage des Constitutions Apostoliques*: RDC 44/2 (1994) 1-15; P.F. Beatrice, *Traditions apocryphes dans la Théosophie de Tübingen*: Apocrypha 7 (1996) 109-122; E.M. Synek, *"Diese Gesetz ist gut, heilig, es zwingt nicht . . . ," Zum Gesetzsbegriff der Apostolischen Konstitutionen*, Vienna 1997; A.H.B. Logan, *Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Syria: The Evidence of Ignatius, the "Didache" and the "Apostolic Constitutions"*: JTS 49 (1998) 92-108; E.M. Synek, *Oikos. Zum Ehe- und Familienrecht der Apostolischen Konstitutionen*, Vienna 1999; M.E. Bottecchia Dehò, *Nota a un testo delle Costituzioni Apostoliche, Libro VIII, capitolo 46*: OCP 66 (2000) 173-183; M. Metzger, *Pages féminines dans les Constitutions Apostoliques*, in *Crossroads of Culture. Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*, H.-J. Feulner et al. (eds.), Pont. Oriental Inst., Rome 2000, 515-541; J.G. Mueller, *L'ancien Testament dans l'ecclésiologie des Pères. Une lecture des Constitutions Apostoliques*, Turnhout 2004.

P. Nautin

APOSTOLIC SEE. The syntagma *apostolic see* is one of the expressions by which, from the 4th c., the see and the ministry of the bishop of Rome have been customarily named. The expression, however, is not a Roman creation, but was often employed during the first four centuries, together with the more common *ecclesia apostolica*, to designate other episcopal sees, those traditionally linked to the memory of the apostolic generations and those founded later. Specified by an ample series of adjectives, including *apostolikos-apostolicus*, the terms *thronos* and *sedes* were used to indicate the sees most conspicuous for their civil importance and their links with the Christian origins (*Rome, *Antioch, *Alexandria, *Jerusalem and later *Constantinople: Lampe, 655), as well as other particular churches of apostolic origin, such as *Corinth, *Philippi, *Thessalonica, *Ephesus (*Tertullian, *De praescr.* 36,1), *Cyprus (*Alexander of Cyprus, *Barn. laud.*, CCG 26,692) and, finally, also for sees of minor importance. The Latin *apostolica sedes* appears in a letter of *Paulinus of Nola in reference to the particular church of *Thagaste (*Ep.* 3,1, CSEL 29,14,7), and *Augustine uses a similar expression in the plural, *sedes apostolorum*, to point out that *communion with the most important sees is a sure guarantee of *orthodoxy (Augustine, *Ep.* 118,32 CSEL 34, 696,15-16). From the 4th c., making reference to a special Petrine heritage of the Roman Church, the documents of the bishops of Rome begin to constantly use the expression *apostolic see* as a synonym for the more archaic *cathedra Petri* and *sedes Petri*. The expression is attested for the first time in a letter of 354 by *Liberius to *Eusebius of Vercelli (*Ep.* 6, PL 8,1350B); *Athanasius also uses it (*apostolikos thronos*) to refer generally to the apostolicity of the episcopal see of the Urbe, but describing, significantly, precisely the difficulties of Liberius during the *Arian crisis (Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.*, 35,2). The use of the formula is widely attested in the documentation of *Damasus, to whom is unanimously attributed a decisive role in the development of the doctrine of primacy. The syntagma *apostolic see* was increasingly understood as a title *par excellence* of the Roman see and, in these terms, the expression and the underlying doctrine were used by the Roman synod of 378 (PL 13,575-584), and contested by the Arians condemned at *Aquileia in 381 (*Scolies ariennes*, SC 267,306). The expression is widely attested in the documentation produced by Damasus's successors, but also in non-Roman Western texts between the 4th and 5th c. (*Priscillian, *Lib. ad Dam.*, CSEL 18, 34,11; *Rufinus of Aquileia, *Anast.*, 4, PL 21,625; Augustine, *Ep.* 1,5,1, CSEL 88, 6,7; Id., *Ep.* 20,12,4, CSEL 88, 101,16; Id., *Ep.* 22,5,3, CSEL 88, 115,23; *Facundus of Hermiane, *Def. trium capit.*, CCL 90A, 123,20; 125,78-79; 155,289; 252,65; Id., *Moc.*, CCL 90A, 403,101; 404,118.122; 414,505; 412,423; *Conciliae Galliae*, CCL 148, 105,4; and numerous other attestations). At the council of Ephesus of 431 the syntagma was usually attributed exclusively to the bishop of Rome, obviously in Roman and Western documentation (*Celestine, *Ep.* 17, PL 50,503; *Capreolus of Carthage, ACO I,I,2, 53,12-21), but also

in Eastern (*sedes* is rendered both as *thronos* and as *kathedra*; see the many recurrences in ACO I,I,8, *Indices vol. primi*, 44). The doctrinal content attached to Rome in this formula is expressed in a statement of the presbyter Philip, Roman legate to Ephesus, and passed down by the Greek version of the *Gesta Ephesina* (ACO I,I,3, 60,25-35). At Rome the expression is used by *Leo the Great and by *Arnobius the Younger in *Praedestinatus* (I,88, CCL 25B, 51,2), and esp. in the *Conflictus* in which the author presents himself as *sedis apostolicae defensor* (*Conflict.* 1,1), since, after the Ephesian synod of 499, he intervened in the *christological debate to defend the pronouncements of Leo and the authority of the Roman see. With *Felix III and *Gelasius I the doctrinal and disciplinary content of the formula was further specified in reference to the Petrine heritage of the church of the Urbe and the responsibilities of its bishop. During the *Acacian schism Roman documentation uses the traditional syntagma along with that of *prima sedes*—first, that is, among the four main churches mentioned in cans. 6 and 7 of *Nicaea (Rome, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem); whereas, because of the conflict with Constantinople at the time, the order of the sees established at the council of 381 was explicitly rejected (E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, 17,31-37). The expression *prima sedes* is sometimes also attested in Eastern texts, both ecclesiastical and imperial (Mansi XI, cols. 684CD; 716B; XII, 1082C-1083D). After nearly three centuries of elaboration, the sense of an orthodox see *par excellence*, heir of the testimony of the apostle Peter, was firmly attached to the expression *apostolic see*, (Hormisdas, *Exempl. libell.*, CSEL 35, 521,4). The *Libellus fidei* of *Hormisdas can be considered the point of arrival of the doctrinal elaboration that accompanied this expression and that would remain constant, in the successive centuries, in the language of the Roman chancellery and of those who would address or make reference to it (*Gregory the Great, *Ep. ad Leandrum*, CSEL 143, 1,2; Bede, *H. eccl.*, 4,1,1, SC 490, 192,14; 5,11,1, SC 491, 62,3-4). Although the expression *apostolic see* with other equivalents occurs only infrequently before 680-681 in the language and in the official titles given to the bishop of Rome by the prelates of the Eastern sees and by the imperial chancellery, other references related to the Petrine heritage are not lacking (*De episcoporum ordinatione* of *Valentinian III of 445, *Leges nouellae*, 17,102-103; *Codex Iustinianus* I,1,8,8; 6th-c. letters of the *Collectio Auellana*, CSEL 35, 322, 8.13.18; 323, 19-20; 324, 22.23.24; 652, 4; 658, 3-6; 660,4; 710,14-15; 713, 10; Constantinopolitan synod against Anthimus: ACO 3, 153,30; letters of Menas: ACO 3, 182,2; CSEL 35, 232, 2-3; *libellus* of the three Eastern patriarchs of 553: ACO 4, 1, 16-22; an *inscriptio* of Constantine IV: Mansi XI, 720A).

E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma,* Munich 1934; Lampe, s.v. *apostolikos*, 210-211; *thronos*, 655; G. Bareille, *Apostolicité*, DTC 1/2,1621-1622; P. Batiffol, *Le Siège Apostolique* (359-451), Paris 19243; Id., *Cathedra Petri. Études d'Histoire ancienne de l'Église,* Paris 1938 (Unam Sanctam, 4); M. Maccarrone, *Vicarius Christi e vicarius Petri nel periodo patristico*: RSCI 1 (1948)1-32; Id., *Vicarius Christi. Storia del titolo papale,* Rome 1952; Id., *Apostolicità, episcopato e primato di Pietro,* Rome 1976; Id., *Sedes Apostolica-Vicarius Petri. La perpetuità del Primato di Pietro nella sede e nel vescovo di Roma (sec III-VIII): Il primato del Vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio. Ricerche e testimonianze,* ed. M. Maccarrone, Vatican City 275-362; Id., *La concezione di Roma città di Pietro e di Paolo da Damaso a Leone I: Romana ecclesia. Cathedra Petri.* M. Maccarrone, I-II, eds. P. Zerbi - R. Volpini - A. Galluzzi, Rome 1991 (Italia sacra, 47-48),175-206; P. Stephanou, *Sedes Apostolica, Regia Civitas:* OCP 33 (1967) 563-582; P. Nautin, *Félix III (II),* DHGE 16, Paris 1967, cols. 889-895; Id., *La lettre de Félix III à André de Thessalonique et sa doctrine sur l'Église et l'empire,* RHE 77 (1982) 5-34; Id., *Gélase,* DHGE 20, Paris 1984, cols. 283-294; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie, de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440),* II, Rome 1976; Id., *Damase évêque de Rome: Saecularia Damasiana. Atti del Convegno internazionale per il XVI centenario della morte di papa Damaso I* (Città del Vaticano-Roma, 11-12-384-10/12-12-1984), Vatican City - Rome 1986, 31-58; Id., *La conversion de Rome et la primauté du Pape (IV-VIe): Il primato del Vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio. Ricerche e testimonianze,* ed. M. Maccarrone, Vatican City 1991, 219-243; C. Carletti, *Damaso, EPapi* I, Rome 2000, 349-372; E. Morini, *Roma nella Pentarchia: Roma fra Oriente e Occidente,* II, Spoleto 2002, 833-939.

R. Ronzani

APOSTOLIC TRADITION. Preserved partially in Latin, Sahidic and Bohairic *Coptic, *Ethiopian and *Arabic, and some fragments in Greek, from which the original text must be reconstructed, this "church order" has been widely regarded, starting from the beginning of the 20th c., as a work composed by *Hippolytus. On that basis it has had a heavy influence on the 20th-c. liturgical reforms.

After a brief preface, in which the author affirms that the purpose of the work is that of supporting the tradition in response to what the author perceived as the ignorance of those who were leading the churches, the document proceeds with the descriptions of the rules for the elections and the ordination of a bishop (including the *anaphora that the bishop might recite at his ordination, with prayers for the offering of other foods in addition to bread and wine), for the election and ordination of presbyters, deacons and other offices. Afterward, the rules for the rites of initiation are described,

from the initial selection of the catechumens to the communion of the newly baptized. And last there is a collection of material that governs the various aspects of religious ministry, ritual meals, private prayer and study, and the provision and administration of a cemetery.

The attribution of the work to Hippolytus has been rigorously questioned of late, and most recently Bradshaw and others, who, though recognizing the possibility of a nucleus in the work that dates back to 2nd-c. *Rome, posit that the document was widely interpolated in the 4th c. Stewart-Sykes, however, building on the work of Brent, has reaffirmed the traditional attribution in a more nuanced way, suggesting that the redactional effort that the document appears to have undergone took place within the context of Hippolytus's school. He maintains that an ancient Roman order, which contained instructions on *baptism and ritual meals, was expanded with the addition at the beginning of directions on ordinations, with other interpolated material on prayer and instruction in the section pertaining to ritual meals, and that this text was further expanded when the school of Hippolytus united with other Roman Christian communities before the death of Pope *Pontianus. In any case the work is "living literature" and should not be uncritically considered a description of the 3rd-c. Roman liturgy. If Brent and Stewart-Sykes are correct, however, it is nonetheless a vital document for understanding the emergence of the Roman episcopate in the late 2nd and early 3rd c., in that between the lines of the work the establishment of a monepiscopate may be recognized, with the consequent redefinition of the role of a presbyter from that of patronage to that of teaching under the authority of the bishop. At the same time, due to the use of an ancient *Grundschrift*, the work may be seen to contain liturgical information of an antiquity even greater than that imagined before.

Editions: SC 11bis; B. Botte, *La Tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte: essai de reconstitution*, Münster 1963.

Studies: E. Jungklaus, *Die Gemeinde Hippolyts*, TU 46.2; Leipzig 1928; G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*, London 1904; H. Duensing, *Der aethiopische Text der Kirchenordnung des Hippolyt*, Göttingen 1946; W. Till - J. Leipoldt, *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*, TU 58, Berlin 1954; J.M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte. Ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son caractère*: OCA 155, Rome 1959; E. Tidner, *Didascaliae apostolorum, canonum ecclesiasticorum, traditionis apostolicae versiones Latinae*, TU 75, Berlin 1963; G. Dix (H. Chadwick rev.), *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, Ridgefield, CT 1968; R. Tateo, *Ippolito di Roma: Tradizione Apostolica*, Rome 1972; P. Nautin, *Patristique et histoire des dogmes*: AEHE, Ve sect. 86 (1977-78) 33-35; J. Magne, *Tradition apostolique sur les charismes et Diataxeis des saints apôtres*, Paris 1975; E. Mazza, *Omilie pasquali e Birkat ha-Mazon: fonti dell'Anafora di Ippolito?*: EphLit 97 (1983) 409-481; A. Stewart-Sykes, *Hippolytus on the Apostolic Tradition: An English Version with Introduction and Commentary*, Crestwood, NY 2001 (bibl.); P.F. Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*, Minneapolis 2002 (bibl.).

A. Stewart-Sykes

APOSTOLICI. Also called Apotactites. In the early church the term was used of a sect in Asia Minor derived from the *orthodox *Encratite tradition, which rejected marriage, condemned all private property and promoted a type of *ascetic life after the example of the apostles, in poverty and chastity. They had different *sacraments than the *Catholic church and did not accept all the OT books, preferring some *apocrypha. The sect was known to *Basil of Caesarea (*Ep.* 188,1; 199,47) and *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 61); the other sources, such as *Augustine (*Haer.* 40), *Ammonius of Alexandria (*Exp. in ev. Jo.* 1) and *John of Damascus (*Haer.* 61), all derive from Epiphanius. From 381–383, *Theodosius I persecuted the sect and condemned it as similar to *Manicheism (CTh XVI, 5,7. 11). Other groups that were part of the *apostolici* were the *saccofori* (distinguished by their irregular clothing) and the *hydroparastatae* (who celebrated the Eucharist with water).

DACL 1,2604-2626; G. Blond: RSR 32 (1944) 157-210; J. Gribomont, *Saint Basile. Évangile et Église. Mélanges* 1, Bellefontaine 1984, 3-20; 26-64.

S. Samulowitz

APOSTOLICITY. The ancient patristic tradition distinguished apostolicity of ecclesiastical office from that of doctrine. A ministry is apostolic because (1) it has the task of building on the foundation of the apostolic gospel; (2) in the accomplishment of this task it follows certain norms established, based on the gospel, by the apostolic witnesses of the first generation (see Roloff 363-379); and (3) the church that considers itself apostolic is convinced of its continuity in mission and succession from the first apostolic generation.

One notes throughout the entire apostolic and postapostolic period the strong consciousness of all the faithful of belonging to the one church of Jesus Christ (see Hahn 76-94). Paul's incorporation into the recognized and normative apostolic tradition is among the most important decisions made by the early church. The church's path to this incorporation builds from Luke-Acts through the so-called deutero-

Paulines, the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Pet, to arrive at *1 Clem.*, in which the two great *martyrs Peter and Paul are thought of together (*1 Clem.* 5), a notion from which will derive, among other things, the special position of the apostolic foundation of *Rome (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* III, 3, 2; Tertullian, *Praescr. haer.* 36). Paul's incorporation finds its peculiar expression in the church's canonization of the Pauline and deutero-Pauline writings (Bienert 16-17). *1 Clem.* (42, 1; 43, 3-4; 44, 1-2) bases the apostolic office on the link with the apostles and with Christ, using the Judaic theory of succession.

Episcopal office and the succession to it of "proven men" were ancient, and this, for *1 Clem.*, meant apostolic right. Apostolicity represented the organic link between the head of the church and the historical church, in both discipline and teaching. *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 27; III, 3, 1-3) makes episcopal succession go back to the apostles. *Tertullian (*Praescr.* 2 1,4; 37,1) and *Cyprian (*Ep.* 37, 15) went back to the origin of the church and its founder through the doctrine and discipline transmitted by the apostles. Faced with *schismatics whose beliefs were uncontestable, Cyprian (*Ep.* 8,1; 59,5; 69,5) turned to the episcopate as the principle of unity in the church: bishops occupied the place of the apostles, succeeding them in a direct line and, like them, were instituted by the Lord: the apostles themselves were the first bishops. Cyprian sees the institution of the bishops in Mt 16:18-19; Jn 20:21-22 (*De unitate eccl.* 4). The authority of a series of anonymous "Ecclesiastical Constitutions" were also made to depend on the supposition that they were of apostolic origin (*Did.*, *tit.*; *Apos. Con.*, *tit.*, *I*, *inscr.*; II, 26,7; 28,4; 39,1, etc.). *1 Clem.* 44 appealed to the apostolic origin of the episcopal office when disputes arose over removing those who occupied it.

*Polycarp (*Ep.* 3,2; 6,3; 9,1) did the same regarding the validity of doctrine in dispute. The apostolicity of transmitted doctrine was seen as the criterion for settling doctrinal differences within the church, and for avoiding the *gnostic peril, a criterion suitable for both ecclesiastical *pseudepigrapha and *heretical *apocrypha (Eus., *HE* III, 25,6). *Justin Martyr (*1 Apol.* 42,4) referred his theology to the preaching of the apostles, which he claimed was the same everywhere: it was they who recorded everything about the Savior (*1 Apol.* 33,5), and their authority extended to their written memories (*Dial.* 103,8). By turning to the beginnings of the faith as the only sure guarantee, one arrived at the conviction that Christianity had had a single originating figure (*Ep. Apost.* 1, Ethiop.). Both *2 Clem.* (14,2) and *Hermas (*Sim.* IX, 15,4; 16,5; 17,1; 25,2) appealed to the authority of the apostles to guarantee their different theologies. The author of *Diogn.* (11,1.6) claims to be a disciple of the apostles in the church that preserves their tradition. Irenaeus (*Haer.* I, 10,1-2; III, Praef.; 3,1-3; 4,1) stresses that the universal church received its faith from the apostles and from their disciples and that, for its proper explanation, one must go back to the oldest churches, where they had worked. Tertullian too (*Apol.* 47; *Praesc.* 21,37) spoke of the rule of faith that comes from Christ and was transmitted by his disciples. The conviction that the "rule of faith," believed in and taught in the Catholic church, had been inherited from the apostles gave origin to the legend that the twelve apostles compiled the *Symbolum Apostolorum* (a formula which came to us from the ancient Roman baptismal creed; *see* Apostles' Creed). The title is found in *Ambrose (*Ep.* 42,5) and the account in *Rufinus (*Comm. in symb. apost.* 2). The 4th-c. creeds and professions of faith (*Alexander of Alexandria, *Nicaea-*Constantinople, *Damasus, *Epiphanius, *Const. App.* VII, 41) include the character "apostolic" as a mark of the church.

G.L. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole and Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche*, Breslau [3]1897 (Hildesheim 1962); P. Meinhold, *Geschehen und Deutung im ersten Clemensbrief*: ZKG 58 (1939) 82-129; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christians Creeds*, London [2]1960; Id., *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1960; A. Benoit, *L'apostolicité au second siècle*: Ver Caro 15 (1961) 173-184; W. Schneemelcher, *Zur Entstehung pseudoapostolischer Literatur*, Hennecke - Schneemelcher 2, Tübingen 1964, 8-10; M. Hornschuh, *Die Apostel als Träger der Überlieferung*, ibid., 41-52; J.N. Bakhuizen, *Tradition and Authority in the Early Church*, SP VII, TU 92, Berlin 1966, 3-22; F. Hahn, *Das apostolische und das nachapostolische Zeitalter als ökumenisches Problem*, in *Exegetische Beiträge zum ökumenischen Gespräch. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1, Göttingen 1986, 76-94; K. Haacker, *Verwendung und Vermeidung des Apostelbegriffs im lukanischen Werk*: NovT 30 (1988) 9-38; W.A. Bienert, *Das Apostelbild in der altchristlichen Überlieferung*, in W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. II. *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, Tübingen [5]1989, 6-28; J. Roloff, *Die Apostolizität der Kirche und das kirchliches Amt nach dem Zeugnis der Heiligen Schrift*, in *Exegetische Verantwortung in der Kirche. Aufsätze*, Göttingen 1990, 363-379.

R. Trevijano

APOTHEOSIS. Term coined in the *Hellenistic age to express the concept, already widespread, of the divinization of a mortal being after death. Aspired to by the founders of cities, great conquerors and sovereigns, it tended to be identified with state religion and was attached to the concept of the divine origin of the king's authority. Alexander the Great was one of the first, if not the first great man, to be divinized. While in Greece and Egypt the culture

favored the development of the idea, its appearance and acceptance at *Rome were laborious and involved a considerable effort at adaptatation to Roman religious tradition. It was not by chance that this occurred at the time of the crisis of the republic, a historical-religious crisis of the Roman ethos. This crisis precipitated a turning aside from the native traditions— upheld by the Senate and the *auspices*—to the new formula of the heavenly exaltation of the well-deserving by the *res publica,* at first after death and later already in this life (see Suetonius, *Domitian* 13). After the Senate's decree conferring apotheosis on Julius Caesar, Augustus took a cautious attitude to proposals of divinization before death, refusing to be numbered among the gods. He did, however, manage to fuse the two Latin notions of *numen* and *genius* with the Greek forms of the victorius general, creating a mystique surrounding his own figure. In the provinces, esp. in the East, temples were erected in honor of the emperor and of Rome. The apotheosis decreed by the Senate meant not only the construction of temples but also the creation of a priestly class to serve them and of appropriate festivals to honor them. One manifestation was the specific and honorific title of *Divus* given to all the emperors numbered among the gods after their death. Though a part of Augustus's monarchical revolution, to which he wanted to give a charismatic image, it nevertheless seems extraordinary when we reflect on the traditional Roman aversion to recognizing even the remote possibility of a man being *Divus* (see Seneca, *Divi Claudii apocolocyntosis*). Drusus's gesture in dedicating an *ara Romae et Augusti* at *Lyons on 1 August 12 BC has more the flavor of a good omen than of emperor-worship and was in fact followed by the expedition to conquer Germany to the Elbe (12-9 BC). Apotheosis was at its most intense in the 3rd c., together with the idea that the emperor personifies and represents the divinity on earth. With the gradual establishment of Christianity it declined, disappearing completely with *Gratian. The basic idea survived, however, in the notion of a sovereignty that separated and distanced king from people.

Herodian (*History of the Empire from the Death of Marcus*) describes the apotheosis of Septimius Severus (IV, 2); K. Prümm, *Apotheosis*: LTK 1, 766-767; E. Breccia, *Apoteosi*: EI 3,716-719; N. Turchi, *Apoteosi*: EC I, 1699-1700; L. Koep (A. Hermann), *Consecratio II*: RAC III, 284-294; M. Adriani, *Deificazione*: Enc. d. Relig. 2,619-622; R. Bloch, *La religione romana*, Bari 1976, 198-199.

E. Peretto

APRINGIUS of Beja (mid-6th c.). Spanish exegete, author of an unoriginal *Commentary on the Apocalypse.* Influenced by *Tyconius, the commentary tends to lighten the eschatological tension of the Johannine text, referring it to the whole time of the church, not just the last days. Compared with other authors of this tendency, the anti-Roman animus of the Apocalypse is not entirely removed: the woman sitting on the beast is *Rome, and the fall of Babylon is the fall of Rome. On the other hand, the *millenarian points are eliminated: the first resurrection of the righteous is that of *baptism *per fidem,* and the thousand years of this resurrection signify the entire time of the church.

CPL 1093. Díaz 14; PLS 4,1221-1248; DHGE 3,1072; M. Férotin, *Apringius de Beja*, Paris 1900; A. del Campo Hernández (ed.), *Comentario al Apocalipsis de Apringio de Beja*, Estella (Navarra) 1991; J. van Banning, *Bemerkungen zur Apringius von Beja-Forschung*: Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum 3 (1999) 113-119; W.C. Weinrich, tr. - ed., *Latin Commentaries on Revelation,* Downers Grove 2011, 23-62.

M. Simonetti

AQUARIANS. The use of water instead of wine in the Eucharist is mentioned in apocryphal texts (*A. Petr. c. Sim.* II,1; *A. Thom.* 120.152.158); Filaster (*Haer.* 77; Aug., *Haer.* 64) calls those who celebrate the Eucharist in this way *aquarii.* *Irenaeus attributes this practice to the *Ebionites and interprets it theologically: it derives from a refusal to believe in the union of God and man in Christ, hence they continue to wait for the Son of Man and believe they are still in the condition of the "old Adam" (*Adv. haer.* V,13). For *Clement the *aquarii* are the *Encratites (*Paed.* II,2,32; *Strom.* I,19). *Cyprian condemns the celebration of the Eucharist with water without identifying its practitioners (*Ep.* 63); *Theodoret (*Haer.* I, 20) knows them as disciples of *Tatian under the name "Hydroparastatae" or "Encratites" (see also Epiph., *Haer.* 30,16). Identified with the *Manichees (Leo the Gr., *Serm.* 42,4), they are condemned by various laws (CTh XVI,V,7.9.11.65).

RAC 1,574-575; DACL 1,2622; 1,2648-2654; C. Bareille, *Aquariens*: DTC 1,1724-1725; P. Lebeau, *Le vin nouveau du Royaume*, Paris-Bruges 1966; W.H. Bates, *St. Cyprian and the "Aquarians"*: SP 15,1 (1984) 511-514; C. Tampwo Maleya, *L'acqua come materia eucaristica in san Cipriano*: Ricerche Teologiche 9 (1998) 373-386 (see REAug 45 [1999] 414).

F. Cocchini

AQUILA, Acts of. A brief 11th-12th-c. *apocrypha with no great historical or literary value. The first

part is composed of biblical data; the second recounts the travels and *martyrdom of Aquila.

BHG 162; BS 1,326-328; LCIK 5,239; J. Ebersolt, *Les Actes de Jacques et les Actes d'Aquilas*, Paris 1902, 47-55; Slavic text: *Codex apocryphus e manuscriptis Ucraino-Russicis collectus*, I. Franko, 1-5, Lvovi 1896ff., 3, 313f.; Polish tr.: R. Rumianek: Studia Thelogica Varsav. 22 (1984) 259-266.

M. Starowieyski

AQUILEIA

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Council.

I. Origins of Christianity. Tradition indicates St. *Mark as the founder of the church of Aquileia; he is said to have consecrated its first bishop, Hermacoras, *martyred with the deacon Fortunatus. This information is first noted—faintly—only with Paul the Deacon (786) and is developed in the *Passio sanctorum martyrum Hermagorae et Fortunati,* an echo of which is in the acts of the Council of Mantua of 827. This tradition, unknown to the writers of Christian antiquity (*Chromatius, *Jerome, *Rufinus, *Venantius Fortunatus), can be explained by Aquileia's undoubted liturgical links with the church of *Alexandria in *Egypt (of which St. Mark was considered the founder), favored by strong commercial relations. Although a protobishop, Hermacoras's name—which was handed down to us in the late episcopal catalogs (11th c.), of which, unfortunately, we do not know the sources—can be accepted along with other names, like those of his two successors Hilary and Chrysogonus (whose names attest to a notable presence of Easterners in Aquileia). In any case, if we consider the question of early Aquileian Christianity qualitatively and focus on the spiritual level, the Aquileian Creed passed down to us by Rufinus seems to testify, precisely by its peculiarities, an especially notable *Jewish Christian conceptual inspiration, which would place it chronologically in the very beginnings of evangelization. The known martyrs are recognized in their *relics—Cantius, Cantianus and Cantianilla—or in other evidence, such as Protus, Chrysogonus, Hilary and *Tatian. The cult of Felix and Fortunatus is attested by Bishop Chromatius (*Sermo* VII) and Venantius Fortunatus (*Carmina* VIII, 3). *Theodore was the fifth bishop among those listed in the episcopal catalogs; his name is in two epigraphs in the oldest church buildings known in Aquileia (and in the Po Valley) and is among the bishops who subscribed to the acts of the Council of *Arles (314). The church must be ascribed to a similar date: 37.4 × 67.5 meters, it contains three rooms arranged in a U-shape (one for instruction, the parallel one for worship and one connecting them—a *consignatorium*?); there are also a baptistery and other rooms (living quarters?). The two parallel rooms have an exceptional mosaic floor, in which the forms of a culture founded on sculptural and color values (various animal and plant decorations) coexisted with the *Constantinian taste for lively, but formally rigid, narrative (portraits, the story of Jonah, marine background). The mosaic is nearly intact in the S basilica (more than 700 sq. m.), but only partly in the N. Built over the Theodorian basilicas, which arose near the walls of functional buildings near the city wall (and over a noble Roman *domus*), were others: the "post-Theodorian" basilica, mid 4th c., tripartite (31 × 72 m.), with geometrical mosaic, baptistery (hexagonal stellar font) and atrium, over the area of the N basilica and supposed *consignatorium* (the S basilica remained in use and perhaps held the Council of 381); the "Chromatian" basilica, early 5th c., 29 × 65 m., over the S basilica, with octagonal baptistery on the axis. Over it (after a post-Attilan restoration) are the Carolingian basilica and that of the patriarch Poppo (1031). Other suburban basilicas are: to the NE, that of Monastero (early 5th c.), with an almost intact geometrical mosaic floor (19 × 58 m.) with the inscriptions of many Eastern donors; it also shows successive early Christian and early medieval phases (and now houses the Early Christian Museum); that of the *fondo Tullio*, perhaps the *Apostoleion,* cross-shaped with a large ambulatory around the apse, and a floor mosaic with 12 lambs among vine volutes, located beside the Via Giulia Augusta, as was that over the tomb of Sts. Felix and Fortunatus, demolished in the late 18th c. (the first cemetery of the Aquileian church?)

Around these basilicas were *cemeteries, not yet properly investigated, containing numerous 4th- and 5th-c. epigraphs (the oldest from 336). Also noteworthy are the octagonal chapel recognized on the spot where St. Hilary was probably arrested, a trichorate cell near the port warehouses and the apsed rooms with mosaics of symbolic subjects (Good Shepherd, Good Shepherd in singular dress, fishing), thought to be private oratories. Besides inscriptions, often with delightful representational graffiti (esp. those with scenes of *baptism and **refrigerium*), we should mention the following: a relief with the heads of Peter and Paul, various *sarcophagus fragments (one with the **traditio legis*), a large circular bronze lampstand with two orders of arms (12 and 7) supported by bronze chains (a great hanging bronze christogram is

now at Modena), a distinctive monogrammatic cross (now at Vienna), two silver spoons with *chrismon*, two gilt glasses, many typical lamps and figured Samian ware. Aquileia is complemented by S. Canzian d'Isonzo, on the Via Gemina, with remains of a 4th-c. rectangular memorial dedicated to St. Protus and elements of a 4th-6th-c. basilica over the tomb of the Cantian saints, martyred in 304.

K. v. Lanckoronski, *Der Dom von Aquileia*, Vienna 1906; var. aus., *La basilica di Aquileia*, Bologna 1933; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Considerazioni sulle aule teodoriane di Aquileia*, in *Studi Aquileiesi offerti a G. Brusin*, Padua 1953, 209-244; G. Brusin - P.L. Zovatto, *Monumenti paleocristiani di Aquileia e di Grado*, Udine 1957; S. Tavano, *Aquileia cristiana*, Udine 1972 (AAAd 3); G. Biasutti, *Aquileia e la Chiesa di Alessandria*: AAAd 12 (1977) 215-229; G. Cuscito, *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977; S. Tavano, *Aquileia, guida dei monumenti cristiani*, Udine 1977; var. aus., *Da Aquileia a Venezia*, Milan 1980; G. Cuscito, *Cromazio di Aquileia (388–408) e l'età sua*, Aquileia 1980; Id., *Fede e politica ad Aquileia: dibattito teologico e centri di potere (secoli IV-VI)*, Udine 1987; Id., *Martiri cristiani ad Aquileia e in Istria. Documenti archeologici e questioni agiografiche*, Udine 1992; R. Bratz, *Il cristianesimo aquileiese prima di Costantino fra Aquileia e Petovio*, Udine 1999; var. aus., *Aquileia romana e cristiana fra II e V secolo*, Trieste 2000 (AAAd 47); var. aus., *Aquileia e il suo patriarcato. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio*, Udine 2000; G. Cuscito, *Orientalità del primo cristianesimo aquileiese. Problemi e ipotesi*: VetChr 39 (2002) 223-233; Id., *Il cristianesimo ad Aquileia dalle origini al ducato longobardo*: AAAd 54 (2003).

M. Mirabella Roberti

II. Council. The plan to convoke a general council, attributable essentially to the initiative of the emperors at the end of 380, was modified a few months later because *Theodosius decided to hold a separate council of Eastern bishops at *Constantinople, and *Gratian accepted *Ambrose's proposal to hold a council for the West in the metropolis on the upper Adriatic because of its geographic location, and perhaps also because of Bishop *Valerian's vigorous stand for *orthodoxy after the ambiguous attitudes of his predecessor Fortunatus. Thus on 3 September 381, two months after the close of the first Council of Constantinople, 32 bishops met at Aquileia under Valerian's presidency to confirm the consubstantiality and coeternity of the Father and the Son, according to *Nicene faith, and to condemn the last followers of Illyrian *Arianism: the bishops *Palladius of Ratiaria (now Arcer, Bulgaria) and *Secundanius of Singidunum (Belgrade), and the presbyter Attalus, a follower of Julianus Valens, Arian bishop of Petovium who had failed to turn up at the council and continued to support the Arian party in N Italy. Since the accused claimed not to recognize Arius as the author of their faith, but to profess the original faith founded on the Scriptures, Ambrose judged it opportune to submit to them the letter Arius had written to his own bishop *Alexander of Alexandria ca. 322 which, softening as it did his earlier extremism, had been the manifesto of Arian doctrine. Thus the essence of the conciliar debate was the verification of Arius's statement solely on the basis of Scripture, to which both parties appealed as the supreme rule of faith. Ambrose demolished one by one all the texts cited by his opponents and adduced as counterproof passages affirming the eternity, immortality, uncreated wisdom and equality of Jesus Christ, considered in his divine nature, with the Father. The Arians did not yield to the evidence or disavow Arius, however, and had recourse to pretexts: they denied the assembly's competence to pass judgment on their faith and, if it was to be a trial rather than a council, demanded arbitration outside ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Ambrose indignantly rejected the proposal and, recognizing the futility of relying on a discussion of biblical texts, decided to end the debate and pronounce sentence: deposition from the episcopate. The conciliar acts, copied by Ambrose's orders, are punctuated by anathemas that, though adding nothing new to *christological and *trinitarian reflection, specify in terse formulas the doctrinal nucleus defended by the Nicenes. The weight of the accusation was sustained by Ambrose and aided by *Eusebius of Bologna, with interventions by others being rare; those of *Sabinus of Piacenza were nearly always procedural. The text of the debate has reached us through a small number of MSS dependent on the copy of a precious codex from the first half of the 5th c., *Parisinus* 8907, in whose margins are recorded Arian comments and observations, last edited by R. Gryson. Thanks to the incomparable evidence thus handed down, it must be recognized that the Council of Aquileia, unlike that of Constantinople I, which was indissolubly tied to the formula of the creed, left room for an open confrontation between the parties and, beyond its at times judicial appearance, was a timely moment of maturation on the doctrinal and organizational level.

PL 16, 16-939 = PL 62, 433-455; PL 16, 980-990 (the three synodals to the emperors); *Scolies ariennes sur le concile d'Aquilée*, intr., texte latin et notes par R. Gryson, SC 267, Paris 1980 (the council's *Acts* in appendix); M. Zelzer, CSEL 82/3 (crit. ed. of the *Acts*); var. aus., *Il concilio di Aquileia del 381 nel XVI centenario*, Udine 1980; var. aus., *Atti del colloquio internazionale sul concilio di Aquileia del 381*, Udine 1981 (AAAd 21); Y.M. Duval, *La présentation arienne du concile d'Aquilée de 381*: RHE 76 (1981) 317-331; G. Cuscito, *Il concilio di Aquileia (381) e le sue fonti*: AAAd 22 (1982) 189-253.

G. Cuscito

AQUINCUM. Town located in Pannonia Inferior, in Valeria Ripensis after *Diocletian. Under *Trajan the 2nd legion *Adiutrix* founded the *castrum* of Aquincum in the territory of Obuda, now a quarter of Budapest; it was later made a *colonia* by *Septimius Severus. *Valentinian II was proclaimed emperor (376) in its *castrum militare*. From the 5th to the 10th c. Aquincum was depopulated. The city's dominant religion was the cult of the *Sun/*Mithras. No Christian remains have beeen found from before *Constantine, and very few after the mid 4th c., almost all from cemeteries. More recently, six Christians buildings have been found in Aquincum: four early basilicas, two in the city, one in the military quarter (a private house transformed for Christian worship) and a *basilica coemeterialis;* also a *trichora* cell and a clergy house near one of the basilicas.

PLRE 2, 333; L. Nagy, *Pannonia Sacra*, Budapest 1938, 62-64; J. Szilágyi, *Aquincum*, Budapest 1956.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

ARABIA

I. Evangelization - II. Council - III. Language and literature - IV. Archaeology.

I. Evangelization. The term *Arabia* is vague: the first meaning of "Arabs" was "nomads." There was a *Syrian province called Beth Arabayé, centered on *Nisibis, which the Greeks called Arabia. Southern *Palestine, the area north of Mt. Sinai and east of *Damascus in Haurân bore the name "province of Arabia." Finally, Arabia Felix was Aden or Yemen, Eden or even "India Felix," according to *Eusebius of Caesarea, who placed *Bartholomew's *apostolate there, though there is no other evidence for this (*HE* V,10,3). Eusebius also mentions *Beryllus of *Bostra (VI, 20) and a synod of many bishops held at Bostra in Haurân (VI, 20), ca. 240. R. Devreesse has summarized what little is known about the arrival of Christianity in Arabia. Philippopolis, in Haurân (today Shahba), owes its name to the emperor *Philip the Arab (224–249), who seems to have been, if not Christian, at least favorable to Christianity. Pharân in the Sinai peninsula was already a *monastery in 330 according to *Jerome; *Ammonius's account seems apocryphal. In the Negev (a Nabataean kingdom centered on Petra until 106, then a Roman province), *Sozomen (*HE* VI, 38) relates the sending of a bishop Moses to the queen of Phoinikon and the conversion of the phylarch Zokom, recognized by Nöldeke as a name of the Ghassanids of Dagva'ma: this is to have occurred ca. 375–380 (see R. Devreesse, *Le Christianisme dans la province d'Arabie*: Vivre et Penser [1942] 112-113; Id., *Le Christianisme dans la péninsule sinaïtique*: RBi 49 [1940] 205-223; Id., *Le Christianisme dans le sud Palestinien*: RSR 20 [1940] 235-251). In the NE, Hîra was a bishopric from 410, and some, though not all, Arab princes were Christians (see G. Rothstein, *Die Dynastie der Lahmiden in al Hira*, Berlin 1899, 18-40 and 139-143). In S Arabia a bishop, *Theophilus the Indian, was sent by the emperor *Constantius to the cities of Yemen. He built churches at Cofar Aden and Hormuz. This mission seems to be confirmed by the disappearance of the names of the kings of Mârib from the pagan temple in 378 or 384. Malkîkarib or his father T'aran seems to have been the phylarch converted by Theophilus (J. Ryckmans, *Le Christianisme en Arabie du Sud préislamique*, in *L'Oriente Cristiano nella storia della civiltà*, Rome 1964, 413-454; Fr. Altheim's objections in *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*, v. 4, Berlin 1967, 306-317 are unconvincing). The entire history of Arabia until *Heraclius has been taken up again in an extremely interesting series of volumes, in which the political role of the Arab princes and their titles are rightly paralleled with the most illustrious dignitaries of *Byzantium (I. Shahîd, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth Century*, Washington DC 1984; Id., *Byz. and the Ar. in the Fifth Century*, Washington DC 1995). This opus is today indispensable for any student of Christian Arabia, even if its theses on the 4th c. are not unanimously agreed upon; the bibliography is very thorough, and the epigraphical sources represent a leap forward.

M. van Esbroeck

II. Council. In Arabia Petraea (Ἀραβία, *Arabia*) a council was called between 246 and 250 (or 244–249) to correct some errors on the survival of the soul: Eusebius (*HE* VI, 37) says that, according to the *arabici,* as *Augustine later called them (*De haer*. 83), the soul dies with the body and returns to life at the resurrection (hypnopsychism). Meetings were held in which some bishops of Arabia took part: 14 according to the *Libellus synodicus* (unreliable). The meetings had little effect in convincing the *arabici* until the arrival of *Origen, who, according to Eusebius, dispelled the error with his doctrinal knowledge.

Eusebius, *HE* VI, 37; Augustine, *De haer*. 83; Nicephorus Call. V, 23; Mansi I, col. 790; Hfl-Lecl I, 1, 163-164; DHGE 3,1165-1166: Palazzini 1,78; see Origen, *Dial. Cum Heracl.*: SC 67, 76-110; see 17.19-21.37-46.

C. Nardi

III. Language and literature. Christian Arabic does not differ substantially from the koine of the Qur'an. The orthographical notations of the hamza never existed, and vocabulary was influenced by the original language. J. Blau wrote a *Grammar of Christian Arabic* (CSCO, 267, 276 and 279, Louvain 1966, 1967) based on 9th- and 10th-c. MSS. Arabic script, though derived from Nabataean, also resembles *Syriac; both derive from Aramaic. The inscriptions of Zebed (512) and Harrân (568) are both Christian (see A. Grohmann, *Arabische Paläographie*, v. 2, Vienna 1972, 7-34). I. Shahîd thinks that the letter sent ca. 520 by the inhabitants of Najrân, written in their language and translated into Syriac by an interpreter, was written in Arabic (see I. Shahîd, *The Martyrs of Najrân: New Documents*, Brussels 1971, 242-250). Adiyy ibn Zaid al-Ibâdi (d. 604) could read Arabic and was *Chosroes Aparwez's translator. Yaqût gives the text of the funerary inscription of Hind, daughter of Hârith ibn Amr (554–570). Ibn Qutaiba (d. 889) cites an excellent Arabic translation of Gen, apparently translated before him. Arabic MSS of the Bible are numerous in the 9th c.; their text has the division of pericopes characteristic of the pre-Byzantine rite. All these arguments make possible, but do not prove, the existence of a pre-Islamic Arabic version of the Bible, see J. Henninger, NZMW 17 (1961) 206-210. G. Graf's monumental work *Geschichte der Christlichen arabischen Literatur,* published in 4 vols. in *Studi e Testi* 118, 133, 146 and 147 from 1944–1951, remains the irreplaceable summary in the field of Christian Arabic literature, though it has been surpassed and improved on many points. The "Bulletin d'Arabe Chrétien," directed since 1976 by K. Samir, tries to extend its bibliography.

The wealth and quantity of Christian Arabic literature derive from its position in the development of four centuries of Christianity and in the transmission of the traditions of Greek science and philosophy, which it contributed to introducing, in several stages, into Arab-Muslim philosophy and science. The oldest MSS, which bear the colophons of Anthony of Baghdad, 885, translate Greek *ascetic and *hagiographical texts. They are in the archaic language, less touched by classicism than later writings. Other texts have been translated from Palestinian Aramaic, others from Syriac (up to a very late date), and finally a large number have been translated from *Coptic, when that language began to lose ground. Continuity was increased, in the Syriac field, by the *Karshuni* script, which wrote Arabic with Syriac characters to preserve the tradition, at least in the form of the alphabet. In studying the first translations, which include all the literary genres of the time, we note that more than once the Arabic has preserved details lost in our surviving Greek models. An example shows this well: *Cyril of Scythopolis's *Life* of St. *Cyriacus, a 6th-c. classic of Greek hagiography, has in its Arabic version a paragraph on the mission of a certain Thomas, sent by the bishop of *Jerusalem to *Ethiopia. This paragraph was censured in the Greek, at the time when Ethiopia was separated from official orthodoxy, but is in a 13th-c. Arabic codex. This Arabic text served as a model for a Georgian version in an 11th-c. MS. It follows that we must postulate numerous lost ancient Arabic MSS (see G. Garitte, *La vie géorgienne de Saint Cyriaque et son modèle arabe*: Bedi Kartlisa 28 [1971] 92-105).

Observations of this kind can be extended to hundreds of anonymous Christian Arabic texts from the early period. To this first layer of literature belong the biblical, patristic, canonical, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings reviewed in the 696 pages of Graf's first volume. The literature of translation was succeeded by autonomus activity in which several genres are represented. Among the *Melkites, patristics continued with Theodore Abu Qurra and an anti-Islamic apologetic literature, and with a series of chroniclers and historians: one of the most accurate was undoubtedly Yahya ibn Yahya of *Antioch, to whom all of the historians of the years 938–1027 refer. Particularly among the *Nestorians, the tradition continued that of Hina. Hunain ibn Ishaq (born 808), the most celebrated of the translators, translated the main Greek scientific works from the Syriac. He was surrounded by a pleiad of predecessors and imitators. The Jacobite Yahya ibn Adi (893–974) founded a school frequented by renowned Muslim philosophers and various Christians; his works fill pp. 239-249 of Graf's vol. II, and many of his works have been published today, by E. Platti, Samir Khalil Samir and others. The numerous works of Sidney H. Griffith on Theodore Abu Qurrah (*The Reformation of Morals* of Yahyā ibn ʿAdī, Provo, UT 2002, with Arabic text completely vocalized) have recently gained significant ground for students of the language. The controversial literature has been developed, esp. under the impetus of Samir Khalil Samir, with the magazine *Islamocristiana* as its outstanding organ. Monographs have also appeared, such as G.B. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade avec ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Hašimī à Jérusalem vers 820*, Rome 1986. On the Coptic side, until the 15th c. the mass of sometimes anonymous authors and commentaries is no less extensive. The history of the patriarchs of *Alexandria, commonly transmitted under the name of Severus

(Sawirus) ibn al-Muqaffa, will always be the basis of all monographs on the Coptic church. G. Graf's last two volumes are dedicated to authors from the 15th to the 19th c., reviewing them systematically as Arabic-speaking Melkites, Maronites, Syrians, Copts and even Armenian Catholics. This literature is linked to the evolution of each church, reflecting its preoccupations, *liturgy, law and theological thought. It is not possible to enumerate here such a vast collection; it is enough to point out that Graf's index, which appeared in 1953, contains nearly 10,000 proper names.

J. Henninger, *Arabische Bibelübersetzungen vom Frühmittelalter bis zum 19 Jahrhundert*: NZMW 17 (1961) 201-224; R.G. Coquin, *Langue et littérature arabes chrétiennes*, in M. Albert et al., *Christianismes orientaux*, Paris 1993, 35-106; F. Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, I-IX, Leiden 1967-1984; D.V. Proverbio, *Le versioni arabe dei Vangeli*, in *I Vangeli dei Popoli*, ed. F. D'Aiuto et al., Vatican City 2000, 67-70; R.G. Hoyland, *Arabia and the Arabs: From the Bronze Age to Coming of Islam*, New York 2001.

M. van Esbroeck

IV. Archaeology. Archaeological research has made it clear that the *Byzantine period was the province's most active, with the presence of churches and *monasteries in cities, villages and on the eastern steppe. The mosaic floors found are related in some way to the mosaic school that flourished at Madaba. Moving from S to N, the first center after Arnon is Diban, famous for the discovery of the stele of Mesha. Prior to excavation a small church was visible on the W side of the hill, later destroyed to use its stones for new buildings. Excavations have brought to light a large three-aisled, single-apsed church on the site of the ancient Nabataean temple, with an oratory on the N side, also apsed. Another church is located at the S city gate: its baptistery, with square basin, is preserved. Christian architraves of houses are preserved, one with a cross inscribed in a circle. To the NW is Machaeron, the place of St. John the Baptist's beheading. No church has been found on the hill where the fortress is located, called Mishneqah; however, at the village at its E foot, Mukawer, there are three churches: one in the W sector of the ruins was built over a crypt and had a floor mosaic, done in 602; another was at the center of the village and the few remaining letters of the dedicatory inscription report the name of Malechios, bishop in the first half of the 7th c.; further N has been found an apsed chapel, which must have been part of a larger complex (Piccirillo, *Le antichità*: SBF 45 [1995] 293-318). Nearby to the SE, the village of Koriatha, inhabited in the first centuries by Jews, has the remains of a church.

E of Diban are the ruins of Umm al-Rasas which, thanks to excavations underway since 1986, has been definitively identified with the biblical town of Mephaath (Jos 13:18; 21:37; 1 Chr 6:64; Jer 48:21). Excavations of what had to be the Roman *castrum* recorded in the *Notitia Dignitatum* and the urban area to its N have brought to light some churches adorned with floor mosaics of notable quality. The most monumental ecclesiastical complex is that of St. Stephen. Composed of a series of sacred buildings, it is at the extreme N of the urban area and was developed from the 6th to the 9th c. At the center of the complex is the church dedicated to the Proto-Martyr; its floor mosaic represents nine cities of the Transjordan—including Kastron Mefa'a itself, eight cities of Palestine and twelve of the Nile delta (Piccirillo-Alliata, *Umm al-Rasas I*). Notable among the other excavated buildings (still in the quarter N of the *castrum*) is the Church of the Lions, whose mosaic has another representation of the city of Kastron Mefa'a; the Church of St. Paul and the nearby Chapel of the Peacocks; the Church of the Tabula Ansata with the contiguous Church of the Priest Wa'il near the NW corner of the city wall; and the twin churches within the *castrum*, built into the wall in the SE corner.

Halfway between Umm al-Rasas and Madaba is the village of *Nitl*, where an ecclesiastical complex has been excavated, in all probability linked to the Bani Ghassan, the Arab Christian tribe allied with the Byzantines who controlled this part of the Limes Arabicus (Piccirillo, *The Church of Saint Sergius at Nitl*: SBF 51 [2001] 267-284; Shahîd, *The Sixth-Century Church Complex at Nitl*: SBF 51 [2001] 285-292).

*Madaba has become a famous center mainly for the geographic mosaic that adorns the floor of the Church of St. George: the work was executed in the 6th c. and portrays the Promised Land seen by Moses from the top of Mt. Nebo. Excavations have delineated (1) the city's urban plan, with churches and other buildings, (2) the order of the bishops of Madaba, known almost solely by the inscriptions, and (3) the territorial extent of the diocese.

Mt. Nebo comprises two hills: one to the S called *el-Mukhayat,* on which arose the ancient city of Nebo; the other to the W, called *Siyagha,* from which Moses traditionally viewed the Promised Land. Both have churches with mosaics and inscriptions. Monastic buildings and churches have been found on the slopes of the mountain near the "springs of Moses" (*Ayun Musa*) and the spring *Ayn al-Kanisah* (see Saller-Schneider, *Memorial of Moses;* Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo;* Piccirillo-Alliata, *Nebo New*).

A village of the diocese of Madaba is Ma'in (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 227; Piccirillo, *Madaba*, 226-253; Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 195-204), where the ruins of four churches have been found, with capitols of excellent quality (Vaccarini, *I capitelli di Ma'in*: SBF 39 [1989] 213-242). One of the churches preserves mosaics done in 719 containing representations of Palestinian cities. A *xenion* for pilgrims has also been found. The village of Abu Sarbut, where the ruins of three churches have been found, probably also belonged to the diocese of Madaba. In the same diocese was Zizia, a town where a church has recently been discovered with an unusual N-S orientation, in whose mosaic flooring one reads the dedicatory inscription from 559 (Piccirillo, *La chiesa del Vescovo Giovanni a Ziziah - Madaba*: SBF 51 [2001] 368-372).

Esbous/Esbounta, now Esban, has been explored in recent years, and three churches have been discovered with mosaic floors: one on the Acropolis and one at the N foot of the hill. In the latter was found a marble reliquary with silver theca still *in situ*. Also, part of this diocese must have been the village of Massuh, 3 km (1.9 mi) E of Esbous. Two churches have been found there: one on the E slope of the ruins that had two flooring levels in mosaic, another to the N more recently discovered (Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 252-254; Piccirillo, *Una nuova chiesa nel villaggio di Massuh - Madaba*: SBF 50 [2000] 494-498).

Philadelphia-Amman: the city, the Ammonite capital Rabath Ammon, saw the death of many Christian martyrs (Bagatti, *Antiche chiese di Filadelfia*: SBF 23 [1973] 261-285). Traces of six churches remain: a church and a chapel on the Acropolis; one perhaps below—probably the cathedral—where the great Ommayade mosque is; a church dedicated to St. George (as shown by an inscription found among the ruins mentioning Bishop Polyeuctos). Another church was on the Gerasa Road, its plan known to past explorers but now destroyed, and probably dedicated to the martyr Aelianus (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 225f.). A funerary chapel has been found on the *Jabal al-Akhdar*.

Near ancient Philadelphia to the S is the village of Quweismeh, with two churches: one was three-aisled until an 8th-c. restoration, when it was made two-aisled; it has a floor mosaic with depictions of two churches and of animals, Greek inscriptions and a Syriac inscription, from which we know that the building was renovated in 717–718; the other church, only partially excavated, was dedicated to St. Cyriac (Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 262-270). Still to the S, in the village of Yadudah, there was a church of which remains only the transcription of a Greek inscription dated 502–503. On the road going S another church has been excavated at Kh. al-Suq. To the W, at Suwayfiyeh, a small church has been found with grape harvest scenes on its mosaic floor and a mention of old Thomas. To the NW is Kh. al-Kursi, where there is a chapel with many mosaics. At Khildah, N suburb of Amman, a church has been excavated with two aisles and two apses, the S apse with two flooring levels; inscriptions indicate that the church was dedicated to St. Varus, and that the upper mosaic was done in 687. In the town of Jubeiha, near the university, a church was found. Also at Yajuz, a town approx. 10 kms NE of Amman, two churches have been found, one of which was dedicated to St. Theodore.

Further N, in Gerasa, more than any other city, it is possible to follow the development of the Christian community and the installation of churches in its urban zone (Piccirillo, *Arabia*, 115-135). Eighteen churches have been found. The cathedral is datable to the 5th c. The fountain there is where *Epiphanius of Salamis's story probably should be located, according to which every year water is changed into wine in memory of the miracle at Cana. Nearby is the Church of St. Theodore, and the Church of the Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, likewise datable to the 5th c. The 6th c., and esp. *Justinian's reign, was a period of renewed splendor for the entire province of Arabia.; many of Gerasa's ecclesiastical buildings are from that period. Particularly noteworthy are the three Churches of St. George, St. John the Baptist, and Sts. *Cosmas and Damian, built side by side between 529–533. In the central-plan church dedicated to the Baptist, the mosaic floor has, among other things, figures of donors and a representation of the months. Still in the first half of the 6th c., Bishop Paul built the Church of *Procopius and that of Sts. Peter and Paul, and even had a *synagogue transformed into a church. The building activity continued throughout the 6th c. and into the first decades of the 7th; the church built by Bishop Genesius is from 611. Beyond the N gate of the city, a cemetery with an octogonal-plan church has recently been discovered (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 225; 269-289; Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 271-300; Michel, *Les Églises*, 224-274). NE of Gerasa rises the sanctuary of St. Elijah, or *Mar Liyas,* on a hill near the ruins of Lesteb/Tisbeh, thought to be the prophet's birthplace (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 223). Archaeological excavation has uncovered the Byzantine basilica already known to explorers of the region (Piccirillo, *Arabia*, 104).

E of Gerasa, along the route of the Via Nova Traiana, previously in the diocese of Bostra, is Khirbet al-Samra (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 225; Piccirillo,

Mosaics, 304-309; Humbert - Desreumaux, *Fouilles de Khirbet al-Samra*, 27-62), where a number of cemeterial inscriptions have been found: some are in Christo-Palestinian Aramaic, others in Greek, and they give many names of inhabitants. Excavation of the ruins has brought to light eight churches, including those of St. John the Baptist, St. George and St. Peter. At Rihab, at least 15 churches built from 534 to 686 have been identified, dedicated to St. Sophia, St. Peter, St. Stephen, St. Basil (martyr of Scythopolis), St. Menas, St. Isaiah, St. Mary, St. Paul and St. Constantine, St. John the Baptist, St. Sergius, and St. George. In the inscriptions are found many names of inhabitants, both clergy and laypeople, and those of Polyeuctos, Theodore and George, 7th-c. metropolitans of Bosra. Halfway between Rihab and Kh. al-Samra is *Khayan al-Mushref*, where five churches have been found.

Still further N is Jaber (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 223), which has yielded architraves with crosses and an inscription from 531–532 that adds the name of a bishop, Agapius, to the list of bishops of the nearby city of Adraa (Mittmann, *Beiträge*, 190-194).

Not far away Umm al-Jimal, surrounded by walls, had 15 quite well-preserved churches (Saller-Bagatti, *Nebo*, 224; Michel, *Les Églises*, 166-182). Graffiti in the defensive tower echo the Bible, esp. the Psalms. Further E is Umm al-Quttain, in which seven churches are preserved.

All of these places are in Jordan, whereas the dioceses of Haurân are today in Syrian territory. For early Christianity the latter was the area of Kaukabe, recorded by St. *Epiphanius as the central see of the Hebrew Christians, both *Nazarenes and *Ebionites. Notable are the Christian remains reused in the architraves of Sahel el-Jaulan, and pillars used in the *michrab* of Sheikh Sa'ad (Bagatti, *Ricerche*: SBF 11 [1961] 292-295). In this area should be located the traditions surrounding Job, collected by Eusebius in the *Onomastikon,* passed down by Christian pilgrims from *Egeria and taken up again by Muslim sources. Even today in the village of al-Markaz there is a *Maqam Ayyub,* a small sanctuary containing a cenotaph in memory of Job (Piccirillo, *Arabia*, 111-112). The sources record various dioceses in the region: Ere, Neapolis, Eutimia, Neela, Canatha, Maximianopolis (today Shaqqa), Philippopolis (today Shahba), Dionysias (today Suweidah), Constantia, Zorava and Phaena. Due to lack of excavations, research has often stopped at the results of surface surveys done in the 19th c. The many Christian inscriptions were collected and studied initially by W.H. Waddington (*Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie*, Paris 1870). Regarding Maximianopolis, Devreesse—based on an inscription from the year 71, which he believes to be crypto-Christian—holds that Christianity developed very early. In the region of Leja, W of Haurân, the best-known city is Zorava, today Ezra, where two churches are still in use: one dedicated to St. George, an octagonal apsed plan with four large niches in the corners, dated 515, and the other to St. Elijah, cruciform with a jutting apse (Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 142, 148). Further N, *Der Jauni* has a church covered with arches and stone slabs (Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 53), also dedicated to Elijah; at Phaena (today Mismiyeh) the Tycheion is the prototype of Syrian churches in a cruciform plan (Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 143f.). Regarding Rima (today Rimet el-Lohf) to the SE, Devreesse records (*Le Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 240) an inscription with an acrostic *ichthus* accompanied by three crosses that suggests a quite ancient Christianity.

W.H. Waddington, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie*, Paris 1870; H.C. Butler, *Early Churches in Syria*, Princeton 1929; S. Saller - H. Schneider, *The Memorial of Moses on Mount Nebo*, Jerusalem 1941-1947; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947; S. Saller - B. Bagatti, *The Town of Nebo*, Jerusalem 1949; B. Bagatti, *Ricerche su alcuni antichi siti giudeo-cristiani*: SBF 11 (1961) 292-295; Id., *Le antiche chiese di Filadelfia-'Amman*: SBF 23 (1973) 261-285; E. Testa, *Il simbolismo dei giudeo-cristiani*, Jerusalem 1962; S. Mittmann, *Beiträge zur Siedlungs- und Territorial-Geschichte des nördlichen Ostjordanlandes*, Wiesbaden 1970; G. Vaccarini, *I capitelli di Ma'in*: SBF 39 (1989) 213-242; M. Piccirillo, *Chiese e mosaici della Giordania settentrionale*, Jerusalem 1981; Id., *Chiese e Mosaici di Madaba*, Jerusalem-Milan 1989; Id., *The Mosaics of Jordan*, Amman 1993; Id., *Le antichità cristiane del villaggio di Mekawer*: SBF 45 (1995) 293-318; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata (eds.), *Umm al-Rasas - Mayfa'ah I. Gli scavi del complesso di Santo Stefano*, Jerusalem 1994; J.-B. Humber - A. Desreumaux (eds.), *Fouilles de Khirbet es-Samra en Jordanie*, Turnhout 1998; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata (eds.), *Mount Nebo: New Archaeological Excavations 1967–1997*, Jerusalem 1998; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata (eds.), *The Madaba Map Centenary 1897–1997*, Jerusalem 1999; M. Piccirillo, *Una nuova chiesa nel villaggio di Massuh - Madaba*: SBF 50 (2000) 494-498; Id., *The Church of Saint Sergius at Nitl: A Centre of the Christian Arabs in the Steppe at the Gates of Madaba*: SBF 51 (2001) 267-284; Id., *La chiesa del Vescovo Giovanni a Ziziah-Madaba*: SBF 51 (2001) 368-372; I. Shahîd, *The Sixth-Century Church Complex at Nitl, Jordan: The Ghassanid Dimension*: SBF 51 (2001) 285-292; A. Michel, *Les églises d'époque byzantine et umayyade de Jordanie (Provinces d'Arabie et de Palestine) V^e-VIII^e siècle. Typologie architecturale et aménagements liturgiques* (*avec catalogue des monuments*), Turnhout 2001; M. Piccirillo, *L'Arabia cristiana*, Milan 2002; B. Hamarneh, *Topografia cristiana ed insediamenti rurali nel territorio dell'odierna Giordania nelle epoche bizantina ed islamica V-IX sec.*, Vatican City 2003.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

ARABIAN HERESY. *Augustine (*Haer.* 83) found this heresy in *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VI,37), but

not the name of its founder. Certain "Arabs" preached the doctrine of the real death of both body and soul, and the resurrection of both at the end of time. The heresy was propogated in Arabia from 244–249, when it was definitively condemned by a synod of the whole region, in which *Origen participated (*Dial.* 10,19-21; Eusebius, *H.E.* VI,37).

G. Bardy, *Le "De Haeresibus" et ses sources*: Miscellanea Agostiniana 2 (1931) 411; P. Nautin, *Origène*, Paris 1977, 94-96; B. Clausi, *Dialogo con Eraclide*, in *Origene. Dizionario*, ed. A. Monaci Castagno, Rome 2000, 111-114.

F. Cocchini

ARATOR (d. ca. 550). 6th-c. poet, born perhaps at *Milan, lived 490–550. What little we know of him is from some *Dictiones* of *Ennodius, *Cassiodorus's *Variae,* and from his own letters. He was first educated by his father, a well-educated man; after his father's death he completed his studies thanks to the patronage of Bishop *Lawrence of Milan, first under *Ennodius, then under Deuterius. When Ennodius was elected bishop of Pavia (ca. 513), Arator moved to *Ravenna, where he became close friends with his contemporary Parthenius and broadened his cultural horizons by reading Caesarius (*Ep.* to Parthenius vv. 39ff.), some Ambrosian hymns, the work of one Decentius (whom Ebert identifies with *Dracontius and Manitius with *Sedulius) and esp. some compositions of *Sidonius Apollinaris. The influence of other poets can also be detected in his work, such as *Prudentius, Claudian and paraphrastic poetry in general. After achieving considerable fame as a lawyer, in 526 he took part in a Dalmatian ambassadorial mission to *Theodoric, who was impressed with his skillful oratory (as was Theodoric's successor Athalaric), and he was called to court as *comes domesticorum* and *comes privatorum*. At some time during *Justinian's *Gothic war (535–554) he moved to *Rome, where he was ordained subdeacon by Pope *Vigilius, who commissioned him to compose and read publicly in S. Pietro in Vincoli the *De actibus apostolorum,* a poem in 2326 hexameters in two books. The reading was done over 40 days beginning on 13 April 544. The work, centered on the life of the apostles Peter and Paul, is preceded by two short letters in elegiac distichs addressed to Florianus and to Pope Vigilius; it ends with another letter in 51 distichs to his friend Parthenius. These letters—and esp. the one to Parthenius—are of considerable importance, as they explain the poetic intentions that led Arator to choose a theme with no parallels in paraphrastic poetry. Uncertain—as he says in the letter to Parthenius, vv. 69-78—whether to compose hymns after the manner of *Ambrose or a paraphrase of Genesis, Arator opted for Luke's Acts of the Apostles, whose theological substrate perhaps seemed to him to be the point of encounter between the OT and NT. He paraphrased its material faithfully in some places, while in other places he gave much room to *allegorical interpretation, following a precise poetic program, which he clarified in vv. 20-22 of the letter to Vigilius. Leaving out the epic element present in *Avitus's paraphrases and taking Sedulius's tendencies to their extreme consequences, Arator provided much room for the mystical-*allegorical element, which explains the poem's popularity in the Middle Ages, attested, e.g., by *Bede the Venerable and the anonymous 11th-c. author of a short biblical poem in old French dialect, which expressly cites Arator as its source.

Editions: PL 68, 63-252; A.P. McKirlay, CSEL 72; A.P. Orbán, *Ein anonymer Aratorkommentar in Hs. London, Royal MS. 15A V*: Editio princeps, Teil 1 (Arator, *Ad Florianum* 1 - *Historia apostolica* 1, 514), "Sacris Erudiri" 38 (1998-1999), 316-351; Id., *Ein anonymer Aratorkommentar in Hs. London, Royal MS. 15A V*: Editio princeps, Teil 2 (Arator, *Historia apostolica* 1, 515–2, 1250), "Sacris Erudiri" 40 (2001) 131-229.

Studies: A. Ansorge, *De Amatore veterum poetarum latinorum imitatore*, Breslau 1914; R. Anastasi, *Dati biografici su Amatore in Ennodio*: MSLC (1947) 145-152; A. Hudson-Williams: VChr (1953) 89-97; K. Thraede, *Arator*: JbAC 4 (1961) 187-196; F. Châtillon, *Arator déclamateur antijuif*: RMAL 19 (1963) 5-128; 197-216; 20 (1964) 185-225; S. Blomgren, *Ad Aratorem et Fortunatum adnotationes*: Eranos 72 (1974) 143-155; R.J. Schrader, *Arator*: *Revaluation*: CF 31 (1977) 64-77; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975, 53-55; 72-74; 93-97; P.A. Deproost, *L'apôtre Pierre dans une épopée du IVe siècle: l'Historia apostolica d'Arator* [Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 126], Paris 1990; J. Schwind, *Arator-Studien*, Göttingen 1990; R. Hillier, *Arator on the Acts of the Apostles: A Baptismal Commentary*, Oxford-New York 1993; J. Schwind, *Sprachliche und exegetische Beobachtungen zu Arator*, Stuttgart 1995; B. Bureau, *Lettre et sense mystique dans l'*Historia apostolica *d'Arator. Exégèse et épopée* [Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 153], Paris 1997; P.A. Deproost, *Ficta et facta. La condamnation du mensonge des "poètes" dans la poésie latine chrétienne*: REAug 44 (1998) 101-121.

S. Costanza

ARBELA. Capital of Adiabene, today Irbil, in Iraq, 50 km (31 mi) NE of Mosul. The bishop first lived at Hazza, near Arbela, which under Papa (310–317) became the country's metropolitan see, taking the fifth place after the principal see of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, capital of the *Sassanid kingdom; Bishop John ([Iohannon] d. 343) and his successor Abraham (d. 345) were *martyred. The *catholicos extended his authority over a vast territory (Assyria). In the 6th c. *Paul of Nisibis (d. 571), *Nestorian exegete and

theologian, founded a Christian school there. In the 9th c. the see of Hazza-Arbela lost its metropolitan role to Mosul (826/827). Arbela's bishops are attested to more or less continually until the 15th c. The oldest church recorded in the sources seems to be that of St. Hanania (6th c.), but information on it and other Christian buildings at Arbela is rather opaque.

J.-M. Fiey, *Assyrie Chrétienne*, Beirut 1965, 37-218; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, CSCO 266, Louvain 1965, 170-172; J.-M. Fiey, *Pour un Oriens Christianus Novus*, Beirut 1993, 78-80.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ARBELA, Chronicle of. Original work or falsification composed by the orientalist Arbela Mingana, perhaps after the pattern of a medieval compilation, and published by him in 1907 under the title *Ecclesiastical History of Msiha-Zha* (6th c.), a work known to us only through Abdisho (16th c.). All of the many works based on this source must therefore be reconsidered (see also, e.g., M.G. Raschke, ANRW II, 9,2 [1976]).

J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310 (Sub. 36), Louvain 1970, 10; S.P. Brock, *A Classified Bibliography*, *ad hoc* and Ortiz 210-211 (for the other sources, *see* Persia); J.-M. Fiey, *Auteur et date de la "Chronique d'Arbèles"*: OrSyr 12 (1967) 265-302; Patrologia V, 422-423; C. and F. Julien, *Propositions pour la fin d'une controverse*: OC 85 (2001) 41-83.

F. Rilliet

ARCADIUS, emperor (377–408). Eldest son of *Theodosius, educated by the *pagan philosopher Themistius and by the Christian *Arsenius. Appointed Augustus as a child (383), he ruled the empire in the East during Theodosius's campaign against *Eugenius (394). On his father's death he inherited the Eastern part of the empire (Illyria, *Thrace, *Pontus, *Asia, Egypt), and his younger brother, *Honorius, the West. From this point the empire, though nominally one, would remain definitively divided. *Alaric, king of the *Visigoths, constituted a major threat to Arcadius's kingdom, which he was able to allay temporarily by naming the barbarian leader *magister militum* of Illyricum. In religious matters, Arcadius continued the policies of Theodosius, aimed at affirming the *orthodoxy established at *Nicaea and *Constantinople. From some evidence we know that Arcadius wanted to reserve imperial judgment as a discretionary power over all ecclesiastical matters, attributing to himself the right to intervene, ultimately, even over conciliar decisions. In 398 he issued a constitution (CI 1, 4, 7) that also bore his brother Honorius's name, in which the sphere of application of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was restricted, and immediately afterward a constitution in which powers of legal intervention in the Jewish ethnarch were specified (CTh II, 1, 10). Arcadius died 1 May 408; his son *Theodosius II succeeded him.

J. Straub, *Parens principum. Stilichos Reichspolitik und das Testament des Kaisers Theodosius*: NClio 4 (1952) 94-115; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, I, fr. ed. J.-R. Palanque, Amsterdam 1968, 219-252; J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom*, Oxford 1990; A. Cameron - J. Long, *Barbarians and Politics at the court of Arcadius*, Berkeley 1993.

G. Pilara

ARCADIUS of Cyprus (d. ca. 640). *Archbishop of *Constantia (dates of his episcopacy unknown) on the island of *Cyprus; died ca. 640 (Van de Ven, *La vie ancienne*, 101-102). Involved in the first disputes regarding *monothelitism. Author of the *Laudatio S. Georgii* (BHG 684), handed down in many MSS, edited by Krumbacher-Ehrhard (who used only Paris. Coisl. 146), which, among other things, invokes the saint's intervention to free the church from Arab and Persian oppression. The *laudatio* of St. John Vladimir (BHG 2195) is an adaptation of this text, and the old Russian ἐγκώμιον of Nicetas, attributed to Arcadius, is a copy (simply replacing George's name with that of the *martyr Nicetas); the text can be read in cols. 1208-1213 of the volume for 14-24 September (St. Pétersburg 1869) of *Velikija Minej âetij sobranyja vserossijskim metropolitam Makariem* (Noret, *Deux avatars*, 166, 169). The attribution to Arcadius of the *Vita Symeonis stylitae iunioris in monte Mirabili* (BHG 1689), found by M. Papadopoulos-Kerameus in MS 108 of St. Sabas at *Jerusalem, is doubtful; the work is also contained in other MSS: see AB 14 (1895) 334. The βίος of the same Simeon derives from it, composed late 10th to early 11th c. by Nicephorus Uranos, magistrate of *Antioch. *John of Damascus, citing a fragment, attributes the *Life* to Arcadius (PG 94, 1393): doubts about the attribution remain, however, for chronological reasons.

CPG 7983-7984; PG 94, 1393-1396; K. Krumbacher, *Der heilige Georg in der griechischen Überlieferung*, Munich 1911, 78-81; P. Van de Ven, *La vie ancienne de S. Siméon Stylite le Jeune*, I, Brussels 1962; R. Aigrain: DHGE 3, 1494-1495; Beck, *Kirche*, 461-462, 577-578; H. Delehaye, *Les saints Stylites*, Brussels-Paris 1928, LXII-LXIV, 238-271; J. Noret, *Deux avatars du panégyrique de S. Georges par Arcadius de Chypre*: AB 92 (1974) 165-170; Patrologia V, 244.

A. Labate

ARCHAEOLOGY, CHRISTIAN
I. Definition and aims - II. History - III. Present situation and outlook.

I. Definition and aims. Christian archaeology as a historical science studies the monuments and material culture of early Christianity from its origins to the end of the ancient world (ca. 600). It reconstructs within the framework of ancient culture the life of Christian communities as expressed in the evidence of material culture. Christian archaeology is thus a discipline of its own within broader archaeological studies, and not a mere "tool of historical theology" (Kaufmann); nor is its main task to "provide church history with the materials of historical evidence" (Andresen). Like the other historical sciences, esp. that closest to it, i.e., classical archaeology, it must take the results of neighboring fields into account in its own research, esp. those of classical archaeology, ancient history, classical philology, Byzantine studies, Jewish antiquities, early church history, *liturgy and *patristics; in turn, Christian archaeology makes the material it has scientifically studied and examined available to these other fields. If Christian archaeology has attained the character of a modern historical discipline, this is the result of a long phase of evolution which began with the first archaeological investigations in the Christian field in the 16th c.; this characterization, however, is not entirely accepted, esp. by some Protestant and Catholic scholars of historical theology, who understand Christian archaeology as an auxiliary science of early church history and patrology, ignoring its art history dimension.

II. History. Christian archaeology had its beginnings in a specific historical situation: the European Renaissance and the resulting cultural and religious changes which gave a new direction to thought in general. The new historical interest that came into being, particularly the study of antiquity—including its artistic and monumental aspects—led to a rediscovery, initially hesitant and almost fortuitous, of the early Christian monuments of antiquity. Cyriac of Ancona, who bore the title of "antiquarius," copied Christian and other inscriptions with particular scientific interest during his trips to Greece and the Greek islands in 1435–1438 and 1444–1448. Andrea Fulvo, in the final chapter of his *Antiquitates Urbis Romae* (1525), described the city's early Christian churches, while Onofrio Panvinio (1529–1568) wrote a treastise on Christian antiquity (*De ritu sepeliendi mortuos apud veteres christianos et de eorumdem coemeteriis*, Louvain 1522). Significantly, of 43 *cemeteries listed from literary sources, Panvinio knew only three firsthand. This notwithstanding, his epitaph in S. Agostino, *Rome, could rightly praise him as *vir ad omnes et Romanas et Ecclesiasticas Antiquitates e tenebris eruendas natus* (a man born to rescue all antiquities, both Roman and Ecclesiastical, from darkness).

This interest in antiquities received new impetus and direction from the turmoil of the 16th-c. Reformation and Counter Reformation. Learned Protestants and humanists, in their rejection of the church's forms of worship, particularly condemned the cult of the saints and *relics, appealing to the way of life and teaching of the primitive church. Thus arose the first great works of ecclesiastical history, e.g., the *Historia ecclesiastica secundum centurias* of the "Studiosi et pii viri in urbe Magdeburgica" (1559ff.), in which early Christian monuments were cited polemically for the first time. Against this justification of Protestantism through an appeal to primitive Christianity, the Counter Reformation also appealed to the history of the primitive church; besides literary records, monuments now also acquired importance by reason of their undeniable objectivity as evidence of early Christian life and faith. The spiritual center of this tendency can be considered to be the Oratory of S. Maria in Vallicella, Rome, founded by St. Philip Neri, which produced the founder of ecclesiastical *historiography, Cesare Baronio (Baronius). In his monumental work *Annales ecclesiastici* (1588–1607), which responded to Protestant ecclesiastical historiography on the church's behalf (the original title was, significantly, *Historia ecclesiastica controversa*) and which became a fundamental work for future ecclesiastical historiography, Baronius made use of the monuments of early Christianity, not only citing them as proof, but reproducing them. Baronius also describes the sensational chance discovery of a catacomb on the Via Salaria with paintings and numerous inscriptions, which made a great stir at the time: though certainly not the first discovery of its kind, it came at a moment when the spiritual climate was ripe for its full appreciation. A Fleming, Philipp de Winghe (d. 1592), copied the catacomb's paintings before its destruction (Biblioteca Vallicelliana, codex 6), as did the Dominican Alfonso Ciacconio (Cod. Vat. Lat. 5409).

During the same period Philip Neri frequented the catacombs of St. *Sebastian, the only ones known to him, for spiritual exercise and *prayer. In the spiritual climate of the time, antiquarian interest in the early Christian monuments combined with religious and apologetic interest in the same monuments spurred by the Counter Reformation. In this

spirit and influenced by the humanist Pompeo Ugonio and the Oratory, the Order of Malta's representative at Rome, Antonio Bosio, began exploration of the catacombs. He was the first to visit them systematically, particularly from 1590–1600, study them, take reliefs, prepare plans and copy paintings. His research, esp. the identification of individual cemeteries, presupposes a truly unique knowledge of the sources (index cards in the Oratory Library, Bibl. Vallicelliana, Rome). He set down the results of his research in *Roma sotterranea,* an extensive description of the catacombs (those already known and those discovered by him), as well as paintings, *sarcophagi, lamps, gold-glass and other objects found therein. The work, published posthumously in 1632, had a great effect on his contemporaries. The scientific exploration of the catacombs effectively began with him, and with it Christian archaeology became a scientific discipline.

Nevertheless, the theological-apologetic interest that had led to the rediscovery and study of the catacombs assumed a dominant role and determined the direction of research, placing the catacombs in a particular light that limited their evaluation and concentrated historical research on cemeteries and related monuments, adduced against Protestant scholars as proof of the continuity of the church's doctrine from the beginning until modern times. The resulting romantic vision of *martyrdom and the martyrs is unfavorably evident in imitators who were not up to the level of a Baronius or a Bosio, and the study of monuments came to a standstill until almost the end of the 17th c. The various editions of Bosio's *Roma sotterranea* are an index of the enormous interest aroused by this fundamental work (Lat. tr.: Rome 1650; reprinted Cologne 1659 and Paris 1671); the material prepared by these was now worked on by others, including Bosio's friend the Fleming Jan l'Hereux (Johannes Macarius), whose *Hagioglypta sive picturae et sculpturae sacrae antiquiores*, *praesertim quae Romae reperiuntur, explicatae* can be seen as a first study of Christian *iconography (publ. 1856 at Paris by R. Garrucci). Also in response to confessional disputes, to the discussion over sacred images and to the iconoclastic tendencies of the Reformation, we find the *De picturis et imaginibus sacris liber unus tractans de vitandis circa eas abusibus et de earum significationibus* of Johannes Molanus, professor at Louvain (Louvain 1570; [4]1771) and the *Discorso delle immagini sacre e profane* of Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti (Bologna; Lat. tr.: Ingolstadt 1794), as well as some treatises written by Protestant theologians as late as the 18th c. (among others Friedrich Sponheim d.J., d. 1701).

The extent to which the theological controversies harmed objective research is evident from the first systematic exposition of Christian archaeology, the Strasbourg theologian Balthasar Bebel's *Antiquitates ecclesiasticae* (Strasbourg 1679). This praiseworthy work takes no account of the basic results reached by Bosio in his study of the catacombs. The same is true of the work of another erudite Protestant, Joseph Bingham's *Origines ecclesiasticae or the Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London 1708–1722). But even at Rome the study of these monuments came to a halt. The excavations made in the catacombs during this period were not based on scientific methods but were carried out by private citizens or monasteries in search of martyrs and relics. The resulting destruction aroused such criticism that the popes Urban VIII, Alexander VII and Clement XI instituted the position of custodian of relics and cemeteries to look after the catacombs. The custodian Raffaele Fabretti published Greek and Latin inscriptions from the catacombs in volume VIII of his *Inscriptionum antiquarum explicatio* (Rome 1699; 1702). His successor Marcantonio Boldetti continued this study and discovered new cemeteries, and after more than thirty years of research published his *Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de' santi martiri ed antichi cristiani di Roma* (Rome 1720). This was the first extensive collection of new material since Bosio, but without the latter's system or method, finds were not accurately described, nor their provenance indicated. Protestant critics (*Acta eruditorum*, Leipzig 1° Nov. 1722) rightly pointed out the prevalent apologetic tendency of the work, which tried to confirm the *fides cipporum;* indeed, the work's main intention was to answer criticisms, both Protestant and Catholic, of the search for relics and martyrs in the catacombs (see, e.g., H. Dodwell, *De martyrum paucitate in primaevis Christianorum persecutionibus. Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, Oxford 1686). Having to uphold the confessional dispute and justify the cult of the martyrs, the work was not so much a scientific analysis of the catacombs as a canonical treatise on the relics of the saints. At any rate Boldetti proposed to Pope Clement XI the setting up in the Vatican of a collection of Christian epigraphy, thus laying the foundation for a Christian archaeological museum; even minor collections of inscriptions from the catacombs (now in various Roman churches, including what remains of a collection in the atrium of S. Maria in Trastevere) are due to his initiative. In 1736 G.G. Bottari was charged by Clement XII with preparing a new edition of the Bosio's *Roma sotterranea* (*Sculture e pitture sagre estratte dai cimiteri di Roma* 1/3, Rome 1737–1754). The work, still influenced by the antiquarian tradition of

the Roman Counter Reformation, presents Bosio's engravings accompanied by a text that contributes nothing to the knowledge of the catacombs.

Very useful, on the other hand, are some catalogs of finds from the turn of the 18th c., which tell us of objects now lost: Bartoli, *Le antiche lucerne sepolcrali figurate raccolte dalle cave sotterranee e grotte di Roma* (Rome 1691); Ciampini, *Vetera monumenta in quibus praecipue musiva opera illustrantur* (Rome 1690, 1699); Id., *De sacris ædificiis a Constantino Magno constructis* (Rome 1693); Buonarroti, *Osservazioni sopra alcuni frammenti di vasi antichi di vetro ornati di figure, trovati ne' cimiteri di Roma* (Florence 1716). Characterized by greater historical rigor were the works of L.A. Muratori (d. 1750): *Novus thesaurus veterum inscriptionum* (Milan 1739–1742); *Antiquitates Italicae medii ævi* (Milan 1738–1742). Nonetheless, the study of monuments lost its importance until the mid-19th c. Many works in the tradition of the French *Encyclopaedia* took early Christian monuments into account, e.g., C.O.F. Clarac, *Musée de sculpture* II (Paris 1841), in D. Raoul-Rochette, *Sur l'origine . . . des types imitatifs qui constituent l'art du christianisme* (Paris 1834) and *Tableau des catacombes de Rome* (Paris 1837). The detailed description of the city of Rome edited by C. Bunsen and E. Platner (Stuttgart 1830–1842) included early Christian basilicas and catacombs. During this period, however, no direct research was done on the Roman catacombs; in fact it was the catacombs of Naples which now attracted scholarly attention (C.F. Bellermann, *Über die ältesten christlichen Begräbnisstätten und besonders die Katakomben Neapels*, Hamburg 1839), and interest in Christian monuments was growing outside Rome (F. von Quast, *Die altchristlichen Bauwerke von Ravenna*, Berlin 1842), where until that time research had almost exclusively been concentrated, impelled by confessional controversies.

The reaction in Romanticism to the prevailing classicism in contemporary art brought a new appreciation of the Christian Middle Ages as opposed to Classical Antiquity. The monuments of early Christianity were consequently rediscovered, and their study was no longer strictly tied to theological aspects. In this context of a nascent science of art history in Germany, early Christian art was discovered and defined for the first time, e.g., by C.F. von Rumohr (1785–1843) and F. Kugler (1808–1858). From this new interest in Late Antique and early Christian art arose the first architectural studies (Valentini, *La patriarcale basilica Lateranense*, Rome 1832, 1834; Id., *La basilica Liberiana*, Rome 1839; Id., *La basilica Vaticana*, Rome 1845; H. Hübsch, *Die altchristlichen Kirchen*, Karlsruhe 1862; F. von Quast, *Über Form*, *Einrichtung und Ausschmückung der ältesten christlichen Kirchen*, Berlin 1853), paralleled by studies of medieval churches made in France, Germany and England. At the same time we see in these countries a spread of neo-Gothic art, followed in sacred art by neo-Romanesque and the imitation of early Christian architecture (see the lively debates on the reconstruction of the basilica of S. Paolo fuori le Mura at Rome after the fire of 1823: E. Pallottino, *Revival paleocristiani (1764–1870). Architettura e restauro. L'interpretazione delle basiliche di Roma,* Rome 1995).

Toward the mid-19th c. the study of the Roman catacombs received new impetus. The Jesuit father P. Marchi resumed systematic study of the catacombs, departing from Bosio's results and topographical method. His student was the young G.B. de Rossi (1822–1894), who applied a rigorous scientific method to the study of the catacombs, thus becoming not just the promoter of this methodology but also the founder of Christian archaeology as a modern historical science for the study of the monumental evidence of early Christianity. To him we owe the discovery in 1849 of the crypt of the popes in the catacombs of S. Callisto, which he had discovered some years earlier. For the first time all available factors—formation of terrain, geological structure, excavating technique, epigraphs, paintings, graffiti, etc.—were methodically used to obtain reliable data. From 1863 the results of his research were published rapidly and in exemplary fashion in the *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana,* founded for that puporse, and presented in the fundamental work *Roma sotterranea* (Rome 1864–1877), still valuable today. Thanks to de Rossi's basic research, Christian archaeology shared, in methodological approach and objectives, in the progress and enthusiasm that the historical sciences, esp. the study of antiquity, aroused in the 19th c.

The impetus he gave and the general reawakening of ancient studies and archaeology in this period favored the renewed scientific analysis of Christian monuments outside Rome, which up to that time had been the center of attention. F. Bulic began the important excavations of Manastirine/Salona in *Dalmatia, while in France E. Le Blant brought together in great corpora the *sarcophagi and early Christian inscriptions of *Gaul (*Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, Paris 1856–1865 and 1892; *L'épigraphie chrétienne en Gaule*, Paris 1890; *Études sur les sarcophages chrétiens antiques de la ville d'Arles*, Paris 1888; *Les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule*, Paris 1886). Interest now

turned to the Christian monuments of N *Africa and the East. Count M. de Vogüé published his monumental works, still indispensable today, on *Les églises de la Terre Sainte*, Paris 1860, and on the Christian monuments of *Syria (*La Syrie centrale*, Paris 1865–1877). P. Delattre and St. Gsell studied the monuments of *Carthage and Algeria. The German architect Salzenberg examined in 1854 the church architecture of the Eastern capital (*Altchristliche Baudenkmale in Konstantinopel*). The importance of early Christian art in the Eastern *Roman Empire was rightly emphasized by the Viennese scholar J. Strzygowski (1862–1941), who passionately maintained the superiority of the early Christian art of the *pars orientis* of the empire. Strzygowski thus initiated the hoary "East or Rome" controversy (1901), which died down only in the 1930s when it gave way to a more balanced view of the problems. The results of these studies are set down in works on the art of *Asia Minor (*Kleinasien, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte*, Leipzig 1903; *Amida*, with a contribution by G.L. Bell, *The Churches and Monasteries of the Tur Abdin*, Heidelberg 1919; *Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa*, Vienna 1918) and on *Coptic art (*Catalogue général XII*, *Musée Le Caire*, Vienna 1904). The early Christian monuments of Asia Minor have also been explored by the English NT scholar W.M. Ramsay (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Glasgow 1895–1897).

Postclassical Greece now too began to be considered by historians: in 1936 G. Droysen, by the discovery of the *Hellenistic world and the overcoming of the classicist conception of historiography, opened the way to a new understanding of the final period of antiquity. This new approach is evident in A. Mommsen's *Athenae Christianae* (Leipzig 1863). But this tendency found its most important expression in two fundamental works by the Viennese school which, by stressing those aspects that concerned the history of art, led to a new evaluation of the art of *Late Antiquity, no longer seen as just a product of the decline of Classical Antiquity: F. Wickhoff, *Wiener Genesis,* Vienna 1895, and A. Riegel, *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie,* Vienna 1901.

Research after de Rossi, however, was not influenced by these innovative works, nor by the extension of studies to the Christian and Late Antique monuments of the Roman Empire as a whole. In this field, in fact, we find mainly works of an encyclopedic type, such as the *Storia dell'arte cristiana nei primi otto secoli della chiesa* of R. Garrucci (Prato 1873–1880), and later the large, excellent collections of J. Wilpert (*Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom 4. bis zum 13. Jh.*, Freiburg 1916; *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms I-II*, Freiburg 1903; *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*, Freiburg 1929–1936). These works are still an indispensable collection of material, though their scientific analysis, which, esp. in the iconographic part, essentially comes down to an interpretation of the paintings—tinged with a certain apologetical tendency—could already be considered out of date at the time of publication.

It seems clear that its lack of respect for the results of the history of Late Antique art and its concentration on mainly iconographical questions of a theological-hermeneutical nature led archaeological research on the early Christian period into a state of sterile isolation. Because of the lack of a proper chronological structure and the failure to insert Christian monuments into the artistic and cultural history of Late Antiquity, these monuments lost their real value, esp. regarding their theological interpretation as evidence of the primitive church.

Research into the history of Late Antique art, which received a strong impetus esp. in the 1930s (e.g., Rodenwaldt, Delbrueck, L'Orange), provided a new basis for situating and evaluating early Christian monuments in terms of art history. It was thus that F. Gercke clarified the chronology of 3rd- and early 4th-c. Christian sarcophagi, by starting from Roman-pagan ones, while L'Orange's study of the relief decorations of the arch of *Constantine succeeded in attributing some Christian sarcophagi to the same workshop, thus making an important contribution to 4th-c. Christian plastic art. J. Kollwitz, in an excellent work, studied the Late Antique and early Christian sculpture of the Eastern empire in terms of art history.

Our picture of Christian art in antiquity is continually being modified, in part by excavations, which often bring to light evidence of the primitive church as part of a wider context. The first excavations aimed at finding a Christian monument were those made in 1835 and 1850 in the transept of S. Paolo fuori le Mura, Rome, in search of the apostle's tomb. Excavations in Trier cathedral in 1848–1858 also pertained to Christian archaeology, whereas activity at Rome remained essentially limited to de Rossi's important exploration of the catacombs. Important contributions to the knowledge of early Christian art and architecture were provided by the French excavation campaigns in N Africa (Delattre, Gauckler, Gsell), Egypt (Cledat, Quibell, Kaufmann), Asia Minor (Ephesus by Heberdey; Korykos and Meriamlik by Guyer, Herzfeld) and in the Adriatic region (Salona by Bulic; Aquileia by Swoboda, Niemann, etc.).

20th-c. excavations have produced an unexpected increase in archaeological materials, providing an important contribution to the study of Christian antiquity. Excavations have been made in nearly all the provinces of the Roman Empire: N Africa (Algeria, Tunisia and Libya), Palestine (Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Gerizim etc.), Syria (Antioch, Haurân, Gerasa, Qualat Seman etc., by Morey, Krenken, Naumann, Lassus, Tschalenko, Kraeling etc.), Asia Minor (Church of St. John of Ephesus by Keil, Hörmann; hippodrome, Hagia Sophia, Imperial Palace at Istanbul by Talbot Rice, Schneider, Brett), Spain (Tarragona), S France, the Rhineland, N Italy (Milan, Ravenna), Greece (Macedonia, Epirus, Thessaly, Attica by Orlandos, Soteriou, Lemerle, Pelekanides and others).

III. Present situation and outlook. Among the most important discoveries were those made during the excavations by Yale University and the Académie des Inscriptions in the 1920s and 30s at *Dura Europos, a Roman garrison town on the Euphrates. The ruins of a *synagogue were unearthed, as well as those of the only known example of a Christian church in a private house, which is also the oldest known Christian church building: both are from the first half of the 3rd c. The walls of the two buildings had extensive painted decorations (now preserved at Damascus and Yale) with OT and NT scenes; they are the oldest Jewish and Christian paintings known to us (C.H. Kraeling, *Excav. at Dura Europos*, Final Report VIII, 1, *The Synagogue,* New Haven 1956; C. Kraeling, *Excav. at Dura Europos*, Final Report VIII, 2, *The Christian Building,* New Haven 1967). The new problems flowing from this important discovery have resulted, esp. in the last decades, in debates (Weitzmann, Strauss, Gutmann, Brandenburg, Stichel) on the problem of the origin of early Christian art, its possible derivation from older Jewish art, the beginnings of ancient miniature painting (Geyer) and its role in the evolution of early Christian iconography.

Particularly important are the excavations done in the 1940s at the direction of Pius XII beneath the basilica of St. Peter in search of Peter's tomb, which the tradition located there; these excavations are clear evidence of the link of Christian archaeological research to that of classical archaeology. Parts of a Roman necropolis with rich sepulchral buildings were found (Von Hesber, Mielsch, Gärtner), and in the middle of these a simple construction of modest dimensions dating from AD 160. This evidently circumscribed the point at which the tradition of the Christian community of the second half of the 2nd c. located the tomb of the prince of the apostles: the explorations thus made accessible the evidence of a nearly 2000-year-old Christian cultic tradition that is also a moment of fundamental importance for universal history (B.M. Apollonj Ghetti, A. Ferrua, E. Josi, E. Kirschbaum, *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di S. Pietro in Vaticano,* Vatican City 1951; Ward-Perkins, Toynbee; Thümmel). Other excavations carried out in the city of Rome (Krautheimer, Josi, Perrotti, Prandi, Deichmann, Tschira, Stettner, Brandenburg), esp. during the preparatory work for the Holy Year 2000 (Cecchelli, Guidobaldi, Pronti), have clarified the architectural history of early Christian churches and cemeteries; they also led to the discovery of a new cruciform basilica (Fiocchi Nicolai) and various previously unknown baptisteries (5th-6th c.) of urban churches (S. Cecilia, S. Marcello, S. Clemente, S. Croce etc.).

This improved knowledge of the architecture of the first Roman churches has led to new discussions and attempts at reconstruction of early church furnishings and *liturgical rites (DeBlaauw, Guidobaldi, Brandenburg). Knowledge of the catacombs and their painted decoration has been notably enriched by the discovery and consequent protection by the Pontifical Commission for Sacred Archaeology (which oversees the exploration and preservation of the Christian catacombs) of a private catacomb, almost completely painted, near Via Latina (A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960; Tronzo; Camiruaga). Architectural research of classical archaeology has given new impetus to the study of the catacombs, which we have begun to explore and study as architectural monuments, and seeking to clarify their origins. Helpful in this sense are the research of L. Reekmann on the region of Lucina, Gaius and Eusebius in the catacomb of St. Callisto (1967 and 1988), F. Tolotti on the catacomb of St. Priscilla and Pretestato (1970, 1977, 1980), Fasola in the catacomb of St. Thecla (1970), Pergola in the catacomb of Domitilla (1985/86) and Guyon in the catacomb of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus (1987). The results of these and numerous other studies, conducted with modern archaeological criteria in the subterranean cemeteries and on the venerated tombs of the martyrs, provide a new framework regarding the origin of the catacombs (Brandenburg, Reekmans), their development and function (V.F. Nicolai, F. Bisconti, D. Mazzoleni, *Le catacombe cristiane di Roma. Origini, sviluppo, apparati decorativi, documentazione epigrafica,* Regensburg 1998) and their decoration (A. Nestori, *Repertorio topografico delle pitture delle catacombe*

romane, Vatican City 1975; Deckers, Mietke, Weiland). The explorations and excavations carried out in the Neapolitan catacomb of St. *Januarius (It. Gennaro) by U. Fasola have brought surprising results and substantially increased the pictorial and mosaic heritage of the catacombs (1975). These studies have made an essential contribution to clarifying the history of the cult of the martyrs, to which individual works based largely on archaeological material (see V. Saxer) are also dedicated.

The enormous growth of material through the explorations and excavations at Rome and in the regions of the Roman Empire now permit a comprehensive view of the development of Christian art, its related iconography and the material culture of the primitive church; but it urgently needs collection and systemization. (A very useful summary is given by Testini's manual and esp. by his *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani* [1966].) Nearly a century ago Kautzsch had already attempted to clarify the evolution of Late Antique capitals by a systematic study (*Kapitellstudien*, Berlin 1936). In the 1930s R. Krautheimer and his collaborators began a systematic architectural study of Rome's early Christian churches (*Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, Vatican City 1937–1977). Another work by R. Krautheimer (*Early Christian Architecture,* Harmondsworth 1975) is the first attempt at a systematic exposition of early Christian architecture. The available material is enormous, all the more so since a collection "in corpus" of Christian church buildings in the individual regions of the empire (e.g., Syria: Tchalenko, Lassus; Algeria: Christern; Egypt: Grossmann; Aquileia, Noricum: Menis) exists only in outline. The same is true for mosaic floor art, whose survey by regions has long been postulated by the science, even though the whole of the material is impossible to survey because of its immense size, which increases annually (e.g., Greece: Spiro, Pelekanides, Atzaka; Syria-Lebanon: Donceel-Voute; Jordan: Piccirillo; Cyprus: Michaelides; Israel: Ovadiah; Rome: Guidobaldi; Ravenna: Farioli; burial mosaics: Duval). Early Christian sarcophagi have been partially published in new regional collections (Spain: Sotomayor; Ravenna: Kollwitz, Herdejürgen) and are also comprehensively collected in the *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage* (I, Rom/Ostia, Wiesbaden 1967; II, Italien, Dalmatien, Museen der Welt, Mainz 1998; III, Frankreich, Algerien, Tunesien, Mainz 2003; IV, Konstantinopel, Griechenland, Kleinasien, Syrien, Mainz 2004; G. Koch, *Frühchristliche Sarkophage. Handbuch der Archäologie*, Munich 2000). Renewing an earlier collection of Christian inscriptions by de Rossi and Silvagni, A. Ferrua published *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae*, Vatican City 1956–1980. Regional collections have been published in recent decades for, among others, Greece (Bees, Bandy), Syria (Jalambert, Mouterde), Africa (Février, Duval etc.), Spain (Vives), the Rhineland and Gaul (Gose, Boppert, Gauthier etc.). Some classes of minor arts have also been published (works in ivory: Volbach; goldglass: Morey, Engemann, Pillinger), while the enormous quantity of lamps is being slowly made public in catalogs of collections and excavations. The study of Late Antique pottery has also made tremendous progress in recent decades, providing useful data on Late Antique centers of production and commerce and on the history of settlements (through dating of the pottery), as well as providing an indispensable method for the dating of stratigraphic excavations (Hayes, Salomonsen, Mackensen and others). The study of architectural ornaments (capitals, bases, etc.), in the wake of Kautzsch's work, is setting itself similar tasks; the modification of forms, methods of manufacture and production in specific centers, the preference for marble from Eastern quarries in Late Antiquity and the frequent reuse of elements of ancient architectural decoration (remains) in new architectural contexts, esp. in churches (Pensabene, Brandenburg), give an idea of the passage from the ancient world to the Medieval and *Byzantine world (Deichmann, Sodini, Herrmann, Zollt, Strube, Pensabene).

Dedicated to this problem of the passage from pagan antiquity to the Christian Middle Ages—a central problem of modern research—are not only some comprehensive studies, e.g., that of E. Kitzinger, *Byzantine Art in the Making,* London 1977, but also particular studies conducted from new perspectives, such as (1) town-planning in the cities of the Late Antique city period and their transformation into Christian cities (Février, Duval, Reekmans; R. Krautheimer, *Rome*, *Profile of a City*, Princeton 1980 etc.), (2) the problem of the continuity, or lack of it, of urban life and the urban infrastructure until the early Middle Ages, (3) the decentralization of ancient urban town planning and the new centers of Christian worship (N. Duval, *Les premiers monuments chrétiens de la France,* Paris 1995–1996) and (4) the change of burial practices (burial in cities and in places of worship) (Harris, Ward-Perkins, Paroli, Delogou, Meneghini, Santangeli Valenzani and others). Further examples are the recent excavations at Rome (Imperial Forum, Crypta Balbi, etc.); the origin of centers of pilgrimage and monasteries as nuclei of Christian settlement (Tchalenko, Reek-

mans, Christern, Weitzmann, Grossmann, Korol, Lehmann and others); studies indicative of compact areas of settlement with their structural implications of economy and settlement, the development of religious centers, church buildings and secular architecture (Syria: Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord*, Paris 1953–1958; Strube, Ulbert); the in-depth study of the monuments of a Christian city (F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna*, Baden-Baden-Wiesbaden 1958–1974; T. Ulbert, G. Brands, *Resafa I-VI*, Mainz 1986–2002) or territory (province) as, e.g., Raetia (W. Sydow, *Kirchenarchäologie in Tirol und Vorarlberg. Die Kirchengrabungen als Quellen für Kirchenund Landesgeschichte vom 5. bis in das 12. Jh.*, Vienna 2001). These examples show the process of Christianization of the cities and give an overall view of ecclesial organization almost entirely missing in the written sources.

These studies, which have made an essential contribution to the understanding of Christian antiquity and the beginnings of medieval Christendom, are characterized by the indispensable interweaving of Christian archaeology with the study of Late Antiquity. This mutual penetration, now typical of modern research that applies modern methods of excavation and research (architectural reliefs, photogrammetry, dendrochronology, etc.; Sforz, Cramer, Brandenburg), allows us to reconstruct the transitional phases of the ancient world and to identify the role played by Christianity as the dominant force in ancient society from the 4th c. on. This new, modern approach to Christian archaeology is demonstrated by a variety of great displays that present the results of investigations into Late Antique and Christian culture in exhaustive catalogs (*Age of Spirituality, Late Antique and Early Christian Art*, New York 1977–1978; *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt 1983–1984; *Aurea Roma, dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, Rome 2000; *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia*, *Mus. Naz. Rom. Crypta Balbi*, Milan 2001; *Christiana loca. Lo spazio cristiano nella Roma del primo millennio*, Rome 2002). These studies also show how Christian archaeology has changed from its beginnings in theological (*Kontroverstheologie*) and apologetic controversy to become a modern historical science, using archaeological discoveries to delineate a history of art and culture in the final phase of the ancient era. At the same time this material is put at the disposal of the theological and historical sciences, which use it to reconstruct the history of the primitive church, its institutions and forms of worship, as well as the beginnings of medieval Christian Europe.

Manuals—history of Christian archaeology: F.X. Kraus, *Über Begriff, Umfang, Geschichte der Christlichen Archäologie*, Freiburg 1879; O. Marucchi, *Eléments d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, Rome ²1906; H. Leclercq, *Manuel d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, Paris 1907; C.M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*, Freiburg ³1922, 3-48; V. Schultze, *Grundriss der Christlichen Archäologie*, Gütersloh ²1934, 1-3; F.W. Deichmann, *Ausgrabungen im Raum dem Alten Kirche*: RGG³ 1 (1957) 762-765; K. Wessel, *Archäologie, Christliche*: RGG³ 1 (1957) 585-587; E. Coche de la Ferté, *A.C.*: EAA 1 (1958) 557-561; P. Testini, *Armellini, Mariano*: DBI 4 (1962) 233-234; G. Soteriou, *Christianike kai Byzantine Archaiologia*, Athens 1962; A. Pincherle, *Baronio, Cesare*: DBI 6 (1964) 470-478; E. Schaefer, *Kunst*, II *Christliche Kunst* (Topographie, Museen): Lexikon d. Alten Welt, Zürich 1965, 1641-1644; N. Parise, *Bosio, Antonio*: DBI 13 (1971) 257-259; G. Pignatelli, *Bottari, Giovanni Gaetano*: DBI 13 (1971) 409-416; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, I, Bari 1973, 268-269; A. Effenberger, *Frühchristliche Kunst und Kultur*, Berlin 1986; G. Koch, *Frühchristliche Kunst. Einführung*, Stuttgart 1995; F.W. Deichmann, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Rome 1993; H. Brandenburg, *Paleocristiana, Arte*: EAA suppl. IV (Rome 1994) 210-215.

Journals and publications with bibliography and accounts: American Journal of Archaeology; Annales du Service des Antiquités de Syrie; Archaeological Reports; Archeology Medievale; Acts Congressi Internazionali di Archeology Cristiana; Boreas (Münster); Bulletin de l'association internationale pour l'étude de la mosaïque antique (AIEMA); Bulletin Correspondance Hellénique; Byzantinische Zeitschrift; Byzantion; Cahiers Archéologiques; Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate and Byzantine (Ravenna 1955ff.); Deltion tes Christianikes Archaiologikes Hetaireias; Dumbarton Oaks Papers; Ephemeris Archaiologiki; Fasti Archaeologici; Gesta; Israel Exploration Journal; Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum (JbAChr); Journal of Early Christian Studies; Journal of Roman Archaeology; Karthago; Mitteilungen zur Christlichen Archäologie (Vienna); Mitteilungen zur Spätantiken Archäologie und Byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte (Munich); Oriens Christianus; Palestine Exploration Journal; Praktika tes en Athenais Archaiologikes Hetairias; Qadmoniot; Revue Biblique; Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique; RivAC; Römische Quartalsschrift für christliche Altertumskunde; Syria; Theologische Literaturzeitung; Theologische Rundschau; Vetera Christianorum; Vigiliae Christianae; Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum; Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche.

Encyclopedias: Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et liturgie (DACL); Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique (DHGE); Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, Classica and Orientale (EAA); Enciclopedia d'arte medievale (EAM); Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum (EACh); Reallexikon zur Byzantinischen Kunst (RBK).

H. Brandenburg

ARCHAEUS the African (2nd c.). Among the many literary finds of Cardinal Angelo Mai published at Rome in the 10 volumes of his *Spicilegium Romanum* from 1839–1844 is a fragment that he attributes to Archaeus, identified as bishop of Leptis in *Africa in the second half of the 2nd c. The text (*Spic. Rom.* III, Rome 1840, 707), taken from an Arabic codex, is

a clear exaltation of Sunday as the day of the Lord's *resurrection and therefore the only day on which Christians can and must celebrate Easter. H. Jordan, however, has made a convincing claim for its having been written by *Irenaeus of Lyons.

PG 5, 1489-1490; CPL 2275; ZNTW (1912) 157-160.

V. Loi - B. Amata

ARCHBISHOP (ἀρχιεπίσκοπος). Title arising in the 4th c., used to designate the bishops of the great sees (*Alexandria, *Antioch, *Constantinople, *Jerusalem and *Rome) that would later constitute the five *patriarchates. In some cases, however, it was also applied to metropolitans and to bishops of important episcopal sees (*Ephesus, *Caesarea in Palestine, *Thessalonica, *Seleucia-Ctesiphon and so on). The term had no particular legal significance. The Council of Constantinople of 869 (can. 19) distinguishes archbishops from *metropolitans. In the West the term spread slowly, in general not indicating a precise hierarchy. *Isidore of Seville divides bishops into four categories: bishops, metropolitans, archbishops and patriarchs. The archbishop was called the *princeps episcoporum* or "chief of the bishiops" (*Etym.* 7, 12,10); thus he *praesidet tam metropolitanis quam episcopis ceteris* (ibid., 7, 12,6); that is, "he presides over both metropolitans and the rest of the bishops," but the reality was often different. Only later did the term become a synonym for metropolitan. For the ancient period, the term *archbishop* is commonly used to indicate the metropolitan.

DACL 1,2731f.; DDC 1,927-934; ODB 1,155-156; Lampe 237; 238f. (*archiereus*); RAC 1,602-604; LTK³ 4,849f.; Coptic Encyclopedia 1,160f.; Nyermayer, 75; C.H. Turner, *Metropolitans and Their Jurisdiction in Primitive Canon Law*, in *Studies in Early Church History*, Oxford 1912, 71-96; E. Herman, *Appunti sul diritto metropolitico nella Chiesa bizantina*: OCP 13 (1947) 522-550; N. Tomadakis, *I titoli "vescovo, arcivescovo e proedro" della Chiesa Apostolica Cretese nei testi agiografici*: OCP 21 (1955) 321-326; H. Grotz, *Die Hauptkirchen des Ostens von den Anfängen bis zum Konzil von Nikaia* (325), OCA 169, Rome 1964; G. Orioli, *Gli arcivescovi maggiori, origine ed evoluzione storica fino al secolo settimo*: Apollinaris 58 (1985) 615-627; L. Örsy, *The Development of the Concept of "Protos" in the Ancient Church*: Kanon 9 (1989) 83-97.

A. Di Berardino

ARCHDEACON (ἀρχιδιάκονος). The title and exact function were coined in the 4th c. Optatus of Milevis first used the term to indicate *Caecilian's office at *Carthage before his episcopate (*De schism. Donat.* 1,16: PL 9, 916); a few decades later *Athanasius is called archdeacon of *Alexandria (Gelasius of C., *HE* 2,7,44: PG 85, 1244A). The archdeacon was the *senior* deacon, but since his office was of considerable importance, he was not elected by the other deacons but appointed by the bishop, regardless of his age (Anatolius of CP, *Ep.* 132,2 [among the letters of *Leo the Gr.]; Theod., *HE* 1,26,3; Soz., *HE* 6,30; 8,9; Pall., *Vita Chr.* 2). Both the term and the institution of the archdeacon appeared and developed in the course of the 4th and 5th c., in both East and West. While the number of deacons varied in each church—*Rome remained faithful to the number seven—there was only one archdeacon: "Every church has one bishop, one archpriest, one archdeacon" (*Jerome, *Ep.* 125,15). When the bishop wanted to get rid of him, *sub honoris specie,* he promoted him to the presbyterate (Jerome, *Comm. ad Ez.* 14,48: PL 25, 484; Leo the Gr., *Ep.* 111,2). The archdeacon had a *liturgical role: at Alexandria he read the gospel; at *Constantinople he could delegate another to do so (Soz., *HE* 7,19,6). He was the bishop's closest collaborator (*Const. apost.* 2,57,16; Pall., *Vita Chr.* 2: PG 47, 9); for this reason, besides being head of the deacons, he was responsible for the *ecclesiastica negotia* (see Leo the Gr., *Ep.* 112,1), indeed, of the *dispensationem totius causae et curiae* (Leo the Gr., *Ep.* 111,2), and esp. the organization of all of the community's charitable work (Counc. of Carth., 398, can. 17; Isid. of P., *Ep.* 1,29: PG 78, 200C; *Statuta Ec. ant. 7*, ed. Munier; Gelas., *Epist. Fr.*: PL 59, 100). He oversaw discipline (Optatus of M.: *De sch. don.* 1,16; Leo the Gr., *Ep.* 111,2); controlled ordinations and looked after young clergy (*Statuta Ec. ant. 94*, ed. Munier); stood in for the bishop in his absence (Counc. of Chal. ACO II, 1,2 p. 42, 8); and could represent him even in councils, where he could also speak (Mansi VI, 568; 569; 616; . . . VII, 404; 433). For this reason—esp. at Rome—he was often the bishop's successor.

DACL 2733-2736; DDC 1,948-1004; EC 4,1538-1544 (deacon and archdeacon); J. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, 1778, II 287-301; LTK³ 4,178-181; LTK³ 1,947f.; Lampe, 237; Coptic Encyclopedia 1,191; Diehl, Indice 321; Du Cange 1,364-365; Nyermayer, 75.

A. Di Berardino

ARCHDEACON, ROMAN. To an anonymous Roman archdeacon (5th c.), perhaps of African origin, are attributed the *Postulationes III de reconciliandis peccatoribus*. These are *liturgical addresses in which, on the occasion of the reconciliation celebrated on Holy Thursday, the orator asks the bishop and the Roman faithful to readmit the *penitents. Two other discourses on the same argument are attributed to the same author

(CPPM 1402 and 1403). The rite, probably very simple, is unknown.

CPL 238; CPPM 1,1401; F. Heylen (1957); CCL 9, 349-363 (with a preface by the translator); Patrologia III, 536; LACL 57.

B. Studer

ARCHELAUS of Carcara (3rd c.). Bishop of Carcara (Mesopotamia), second half 3rd c. Protagonist of a victorious debate with *Mani at the time of the emperor Probus (AD 277), reported in the form of two successive dialogues in the so-called *Acts of Archelaus,* which have reached us in *Latin translation and of which some Greek fragments remain in *Epiphanius of Salamis (*Haer.* 66,6-7; 25-31). *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 72) attributes the work to Archelaus himself, who is supposed to have written it in *Syriac. In fact its author was *Hegemonius, as we see from the evidence of *Heraclian of Chalcedon, cited by *Photius (*Bibl.* 85), and from the subscription of a MS of the Latin version. The acts are from the mid-4th c.

CPG II, 3570.

E. Prinzivalli

ARCHIDAMUS (4th c.). Roman priest who, with the priest *Philoxenus and the deacon *Pontius, represented *Julius I at the Council of *Serdica (343) (Mansi III, 66).

DHGE 3, 1548.

E. Prinzivalli

ARCHIMANDRITE. From the Greek *archos* and *mandra*, lit. "head of the sheepfold," in a spiritual sense the head of a group of *monks, the *monastery being "a spiritual flock" (PG 79, 496D). The superior of one or more monasteries. Could be a *presbyter, a *deacon or sometimes a simple monk. Among the oldest testimonies are (1) the letter sent to *Epiphanius by "Acacius presbyter and Paul presbyter, archimandrites" (Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.*, *Ep.*: PG 41, 156B); (2) *Nilus, who corresponded with 13 archimandrites; and (3) *Palladius in *Historia Lausiaca* (ca. 410). Various letters of *Isidore of Pelusium (d. 440) are addressed to an archimandrite. The term originated in Syrian monasticism and was common in Greek-speaking circles. The archimandrite was always an ordinary superior of a community but sometimes ranked higher than the *proestos* or the *hegumen. According to time and place the term could also indicate different functions in the monastery and could also be synonymous with *abbot or hegumen, or indicate the title of an office conferred by the bishop or patriarch on an unmarried presbyter (Mansi 7,61C-64C). There were many archimandrites at *Constantinople (Cyril Al., *Ep.* 2: PG 64, 229; Mansi 4,1428B); the condemnation of the archimandrite *Eutyches, on 22 November 448, was subscribed to by 23 archimandrites (Mansi 6,752); Pope *Leo addressed a letter to 17 monks, called archimandrites (Mansi 6,88); archimandrites were also present at ecumenical councils (Mansi 4,1101; 5,1232; 6,617D, 621C etc.).

DACL 1,2739-2761; DIP 1,789-790; ThLL 2,462; ODB 1,156; Coptic Encyclopedia 1,192-194; Nyermayer, 75f.

A. Di Berardino

ARCHONTICS. (Archontici). According to *Augustine, *De haer.* 20: "The Archontics take their names from the archons; they hold that the universe that God created is the work of the archons. They also practice a certain immorality. They deny the resurrection of the flesh." In fact, the Archontics (Gk. Ἀρχοντικοί, Lat. *Archontici, Archontiaci*) were a 4th-c. *gnostic sect, widespread in *Palestine and *Armenia, which took its name from the seven archons, lords of the seven planetary spheres. *Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, is the principal source of information on the *arcontici* (*Pan.* 40,2; *Anaceph.* 40), based on his firsthand knowledge of the sect. The other Greek (e.g., Theodor., *Haer. fab. comp.* 1,16: PG 83, 360D-361D), Latin (as, e.g., the cited passage from Augustine, as well as his comments in *Praed.* 20) and *Syriac sources (such as Theodore bar Koni, *Lib. Schol.* 11) are all dependent on him. According to Epiphanius, the Archontics were founded by a Palestinian priest, Peter of Cabarbaricha, who, deposed from the priesthood during the *Arian controversy (mid-4th c.), took refuge in an *Ebionite community. Around 360, already advanced in age, he lived an eremitic life in poverty in a cave near *Jerusalem, where he transmitted his doctrines to Eutactus (no better known than he was), who spread them in Armenia. Epiphanius, consecrated bishop in ca. 365, excommunicated Peter. Among the sacred writings of the Archontics (lost) were, according to Epiph., *Pan.* 40,2,1.3, the small and large *Symphonia,* perhaps a "harmony" of the celestial spheres or a work dedicated to the goddess Symphonia who reigns above the planets; books attributed to Seth which relate the Archontics to the gnosis of the Sethians, who considered themselves descendants of Eve's third son, Seth, and professed a rigid dualism between the lower world, the kingdom of evil and

the work of a demiurge, and the higher, to which only the souls—and not the bodies—of a few can ascend through knowledge.

Other writings of the Archontics were the so-called *allogeneis* books, probably similar to writings like the treatise of *Nag Hammadi titled *Allogenes* (NHC XI, 3, see *Allogenes*, tr. J.D. Turner - O.S. Wintermute, in *The Nag Hammadi Library*, ed. J.M. Robinson, San Francisco ²1990); the Ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαΐα (*Pan*. 40,2,2), which, like the **Ascension of Isaiah*, describes a celestial journey, that of the soul after death; and the visions of Martias and Marsianus, two prophets caught up into heaven, also mentioned in other sources. The Archontic system has traits in common with the Sethians described by Epiphanius in *Pan*. 39 and, more generally, with the treatises of Nag Hammadi connected with "Sethian gnosis." At the summit of the divine world are the Father of All—the good God, ineffable and incomprehensible power—and the Luminous Mother. The heavens are divided into an ogdoad (eight) and a hebdomad (seven): the eighth is the seat of the Mother, while the seven heavens are the dominion of the seven archons, who are helped by their creatures the angels, caretakers of souls, and ruled by the sovereign or tyrant of the seventh heaven, Sabaoth, God of the Jews. This latter is not good like the supreme God, but neither is he evil like his own son, the devil or Satan, who, fallen to earth, now exercises his power there. According to Epiphanius's summary, the Archontics held that the demon, in rebellion against paternal authority, united with Eve and generated Abel and Cain, and from them humanity. After Cain killed Abel, Eve united with Adam, generating Seth. To prevent Seth also from being killed by Cain, the Luminous Mother caught him up to the divine world, from where he later descended to announce the cult of the ineffable power and to reveal the inferiority of the demiurge and his archons. In this way, Seth founded the race of the elect, which extended as far as Jesus, considered by the Archontics to be Seth's incarnation. Souls must tend to the attainment of knowledge (gnosis) to escape the evil power of Sabaoth.

Everything turns on knowledge: thus the soul of the gnostic, which has recognized its true spiritual origin, is capable, after death, of crossing the 7 archontic spheres unharmed, thanks to passwords (ἀπολογίαι) that let him avoid being engulfed by the various archons, thus returning for eternity to the heavenly homeland. The Archontics practiced a life of rigorous *ascesis, *fasting frequently and keeping to poverty; consistent with their theoretical dualism, they denied the resurrection of the body, but not of the soul, and condemned the *sacraments (μυστήρια), esp. *baptism, which they considered to be introduced by the tyrant Sabaoth to imprison souls. It seems that the Archontics were also linked to the sect of the *Ophites, thus named because they saw in the serpent (ὄφις) the possessor of knowledge (gnosis). The Ophites' mythology seems to have been very complex, with a marked dualism: in his perennial battle with Darkness, the divine Light, during his descent, ends by being imprisoned in matter, from which he wants to escape; the divine Redeemer is Christ, seemingly not identified with Jesus of Nazareth. Dualism, the themes of light and knowledge, and the hierarchy of reality characterize both tendencies.

A. Resch (ed.), *Agrapha. Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente. Gesammelt und untersucht und in zweiter völlig neubearbeiteter durch alttestamentliche Agrapha*, Leipzig ²1906, 380-384, the *Preghiera di Giuseppe* (*Logia* 2, 3a) derives from one of the Archontic sects; see ibid. 295ff., on *Logion* 2. A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I, 2, Leipzig 1958 (repr.), 845-865. H.Ch. Puech, *Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse d'Allogène*, in *Mélanges Cumont*, Brussels 1936, 935-962; Id., art. *Archontiker*, RAC 1,633-643; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica e suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei monumenti*, Bari 1973 (Quaderni di VetChr 7); F.T. Fallon, *The Enthronement of Sabaoth: Jewish Elements in Gnostic Creation Myths*, Leiden 1978 (Nag Hammadi Studies 10); G. Filoramo, *Luce e gnosi*, Rome 1980 (SEA 15); S. Pétrement, *Le Dieu séparé: les origines du gnosticisme*, Paris 1984; H.A. Green, *The Economic and Social Origins of Gnosticism*, Atlanta, GA 1985 (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertations 77); I.S. Gilhus, *The Nature of the Archons*, Wiesbaden 1985; G. Filoramo, *L'Attesa della fine: storia della gnosi*, Rome-Bari 1987, with bibl. 291-304; K.L. King, *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism*, Philadelphia 1988; G. Filoramo, *La Grande Madre e la Gnosi*, in *Il risveglio della gnosi ovvero diventare Dio*, Rome-Bari 1992, 113-121 (art. of 1989); W. Wink, *Cracking the Gnostic Code: The Powers in Gnosticism*, Atlanta 1993 (Society of Biblical Literature Monographs 46); *Apocalittica e gnosticismo: atti del Colloquio internazionale, Roma, 18-19 giugno 1993*, ed. M.V. Cerutti, Rome 1995; W.A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1996 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 83), with bibl. 338-382; G. Casadio, *Vie gnostiche all'immortalità*, Brescia 1997 (Letteratura cristiana antica 4); *Marsanès* (*NH X*), ed. tr. W.P. Funk - P.H. Poirier - J.D. Turner, Québec-Louvain-Paris 2000 (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi. Études 27); *Gnosticism and Later Platonism*, eds. J.D. Turner - R. Majercik, Atlanta 2000 (SBL symposium series 12).

On the connections of the Archontics with the Ophites, and esp. with the Sethians: H. te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion: A Study of His Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion*, Leiden 1967 (Probleme der Ägyptologie 6); A.F.J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature*, Leiden 1977 (NTSuppl 46); G.W. McRae, *Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions*, SBL 177 Seminar Papers, Missoula 1977, 17-24; B.A. Pearson, *Egyptian Seth and Gnostic Seth*, SBL 1977 Seminar Papers, Missoula 1977, 25-43; *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II, *Sethian Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, Leiden 1981; J.D. Kaëstli, *L'interprétation du serpent de Genèse 3 dans quelques textes gnostiques et la question de la gnose "ophite,"* in *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique*, eds. J. Ries

- Y. Janssens - J.M. Sevrin, Louvain 1982, 116-130; *Le deuxième traité du Grand Seth: NH VII*, 2, ed. tr. L. Painchaud, Québec 1982 (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Textes 6); J.-M. Sevrin, *Le dossier baptismal séthien: études sur la sacramentaire gnostique*, Québec 1986 (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Études 2); J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History*, in W. Hedrick - R. Hodgson, *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, Peabody, MA 1986, 55-86; G. Casadio, *Antropologia gnostica e antropologia orfica nella notizia di Ippolito sui Sethiani*, in *Sangue e antropologia nella teologia*, ed. F. Vattioni, III, Rome 1989, 1295-1350; S.T. Carroll, *The Apocalypse of Adam and the Pre-Christian Gnosticism*, VC 44 (1990) 263-279; *Gnostic Dualism in Asia Minor During the First Centuries A.D.*, I, publ. J.C. Gieben 1993 (The Light and the Dark: A Cultural History of Dualism 8), ch. IV: *Seth's Progeny*; ch. V: *The Serpent and Its Retinue: The Ophites and Related Sects*; M. Broze, *Les aventures d'Horus et Seth dans le papyrus Chester Beatty I: mythe et roman en Égypte ancienne*, Louvain 1996 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 76); G. Hanratty, *Studies in Gnosticism and in the Philosophy of Religion*, Dublin 1997; H.W. Attridge, *Valentinian and Sethian Apocalyptic Tradition*, JECS 8 (2000) 173-211; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, Québec-Louvain-Paris 2001 (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Études 6), with bibl. 761-788.

On the *Ascension of Isaiah*, cited as Ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαΐου by Origen, *Ep. ad Africanum*, Epiphanius, *Haer.* XL 2, LXVII 3, Jerome, *In Esaiam*, LXIV 4 and others in Fabricius, *Cod. Vet. Test.*, I, 1086ff., and variously dated from the mid 1st to the early 3rd c., discovered and published by Lawrence in 1819, see the editions *The Amherst Papyri, Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney . . . at Didlington Hall, Norfolk*, by B.P. Grenfell - A.S. Hunt, I-II, London 1900-1901, and esp. *Ascensio Isaiae*, I, testi in etiopico, greco, copto, latino e slavo antico con tr. it. di P. Bettiolo *et al.*; II, commenti di E. Norelli, Turnhout 1995 (CC, Apocrypha 7-8).

I. Ramelli

ARCHPRIEST. Initially the *senior* *presbyter, without any specific authority; with the growth of the *presbyterium* his function became that of head of the presbyters, and he filled in for the bishop in ordinary pastoral activities when the latter was absent (whereas the *archdeacon filled in for administrative and financial matters). There was one archpriest for every local church: "Every church has one bishop, one archpriest, one archdeacon" (Jerome, *Ep*. 125,15). In Merovingian *Gaul, however, there were the *archipresbyteri vicari* (of the village) (see Council of *Tours, 567, can. 20), priests in charge of parishes with other clergy.

DDC 1,1004-1026; Nyermayer, 76.

A. Di Berardino

ARETHAS (6th c.). The city of Nagran was conquered in 523 by Du Nuwas, king of the Jewish *Himyarites, who massacred those inhabitants who would not renounce Christianity. Among them was Al-Harith, whom Greco-Latin texts call Arethas. Du Nuwas related a summary of the events in a letter to the king of the Arab Himyarites. Present at its reading were bishops George of Rusafah and Simeon of Bet-Arsham; the latter wrote a letter (BHO 99), the former a passion (BHO 105), to pass on what they had learned. The original *Syriac of the passion was translated into Greek (BHG 166-167) and *Latin (BHL 671). The Latin version was made at *Naples, where it seems there was a church in honor of the *martyr, renamed Santa Reta in the 17th c.

Vies des SS., Paris 1952, 10, 810; DHGE 3, 1650-1653; LTK 1,892; BS 2,401-403; J. Ryckmans, *La Persécution des chrétiens himyarites*, Istanbul 1956, 18ff.; BBKL 1,207-208; LTK 1, 832.

V. Saxer

ARGUMENTATION, PATRISTIC. Ever since later Christian generations began to look back at the primitive community (see 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3), Christian life has been guided by *tradition, the normative principle inherited from *Judaism and reinterpreted in the light of the religious and cultural traditions of Greco-Roman antiquity. Defended ca. 200 under the aspect of *apostolocity (*Irenaeus, *Tertullian) (see TRE 3 [1979] 445-466), the ecclesiastical tradition was gradually associated with individual leaders endowed with authority: *presbyters (Irenaeus), bishops considered to be fathers of the faith, "ecclesiastical fathers" (*Eusebius of Caesarea) and especially with the members of synods, above all the "318 fathers" of *Nicaea (see Sieben, *Konzilsidee*). Thus during the 4th c., principally in the context of the *Arian controversy (see Simonetti, Tetz), there developed what is called patristic argumentation, i.e., the theological method which rested on the authority of the *Fathers, not only through a general appeal to their ancient faith, in conformity with the Scriptures and the apostolic tradition, but also from memory citing precise passages, of greater or lesser length, with the name of the respective author and work (even down to book and chapter). This new form of theological proof obviously resembles that of the by-now-familiar scriptural **testimonia,* found from the *apologists on, especially in various **tractatus adversus Iudaeos* (*Justin, Tertullian, *Cyprian). There is no doubt, however, that the development of patristic argumentation was influenced not just by the Jewish traditions but also by the classical culture of its promoters: by literary commentaries on renowned authors, by the philosophers' custom of transmitting the heritage of the

great teachers in anthologies, and by jurisprudence which interpreted laws by appealing to the authority of famous jurists of the past (Chadwick). Particularly noteworthy is the familiarity of Christian authors with ancient methods of intepretation of literary, philosophical and legal texts: they explained the texts or discussed the *quaestiones* they generated, not only *secundum rationem* but also *secundum auctoritatem* (see Lütcke, in AugL I,498-510, with Cicero, *Topica* 73; 77f.).

The evolution of patristic argumentation was marked above all by three theologians: *Basil of Caesarea (d. 379), *Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) and *Augustine (d. 430). Basil, in order to defend the divinity of the *Holy Spirit against the **pneumatomachi,* argued first on the authority of the Nicene faith, then on *baptismal faith and *liturgical practices—and finally on the ancient evidence of individual authors. Attributing to these latter the unwritten tradition—an expressly justified concept—Basil calls them "witnesses and defenders of this word" (σύν in the *doxology), the "old saints" and "our fathers," and characterizes their doctrine as a "paternal inheritance" (*Spir. Sanct.* 29,71). He lists some of them, citing specific passages (*Dionysius of Alexandria, *Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Eusebius of Caesarea, *Origen, *Julius Africanus, *Athenagoras [?]), while others he mentions only by name (*Gregory the Great, i.e., the Thaumaturge, particularly esteemed, *our* *Firmilian, *Meletius [*Spir. Sanct.* 29,72ff.]). Thus Basil may be considered the first to have developed patristic argumentation (Pruche), and not without a certain methodological reflection. In a similarly polemical context, Cyril of Alexandria began, ca. 428, to develop patristic argumentation with a view to a right interpretation of the faith of Nicaea. Given that the authority of this council was recognized by everyone of his time (see Sieben), he defended his *christological position, more or less centered on the contested term θεοτόκος, by interpreting the second article of Nicaea on Jesus Christ our Lord, true God and truly incarnate for our salvation, in line with its great defenders such as *Athanasius, doing so in his letter to the Egyptian *monks, in his *Apologies* against the Easterners, in the documentation he sent to *Rome and in his letter to *Andrew of Samosata (see Nacke). In these documents, Cyril expresses his concept of "Fathers": they include the defenders of Nicaea, but in a wider sense they include all bishops, known for their life and doctrine, who in the end died in the Lord. He himself is convinced that he lives in the succession of these holy doctors (see also *Theodoret, *Ep.* 89). Probably under his influence, the Council of *Ephesus (431) supplemented its *synodal* argumentation with patristic argumentation, evaluating the disputed arguments of Cyril and *Nestorius not only compared with the Nicene faith but also with the *sententiae Patrum* (see Vincent of L., *Comm.* 30f., and the acts of the council). Clearly this authoritative use of patristic argumentation was decisive for posterity. In any event, after the council this method was accepted by both Alexandria and *Antioch (Richard), as well as in the West (*Leo the Great). Whether in support of or disputing the conformity of Cyril's Christology with *Chalcedonian faith, theologians proposed *florilegia from both *monophysites and *dyophysites, also critically examining the authenticity and pertinence of the *testimonia* presented by their adversaries (Studer, in Stor. Teol. I,585ff.).

In the West patristic argumentation appeared above all in Augustine's literary work. He had already used it prior to the Council of Ephesus, though to a different purpose: in the *Donatist controversy, he was obliged to discuss the authority of *Cyprian, invoked by the Donatists along with that of the *African synods (see BA 28,68, bibl.). While he shared his adversaries' esteem for the most eminent witnesses of the African tradition, he did not fail to emphasize their inferiority with respect to the divine authority of Sacred Scripture. When, after the condemnation of the Donatists in 411, new difficulties provoked by *Celestius and *Pelagius disturbed the church of *Carthage, in the third book of his first anti-Pelagian writing Augustine defended African baptismal practice, appealing not only to the Bible but again to Cyprian, who spoke with certainty, "departing from the ancient and indubitable rule of faith" (*Pecc. mer. III*, 5,10f., with *Ep.* 64). To confirm his *exegesis of Rom 5:12-18, Augustine also referred to two texts of *Jerome, "so renowned for fame and dedication in ecclesiastical letters" (*Pecc. mer.* III 6,12–7,13). He did not, however, simply base his conclusions on the judgment of this or that author as though they had canonical authority but rather demonstrated that the exegetes themselves had constantly kept the church's faith (see Serm. 294,20,19). At about the same time, Augustine discussed in two letters the problem of the vision of God (*Ep.* 47f.). In the first he confirmed his interpretation of the biblical texts using the judgment of two men with excellent biblical knowledge: *Ambrose, whose texts he discusses at length (see esp. *Ep.* 147,6,17f.), and Jerome, of whom he only cites two brief passages (*Ep.* 147,23.53). In the second letter Augustine does not discuss biblical passages at length, instead giving much space to patristic argumentation, presenting a

florilegium of eleven texts, taken from four Latin and Greek ecclesiastical authors: Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius and Gregory (?) (*Ep*. 148,2,6-4,14). In 415 Augustine took a position against the work *De natura,* composed by Pelagius before 414 and sent to Augustine by two friends. The Breton monk added a patristic florilegium to the biblical *testimonia* in defense of his opinion (see *Nat. Gr*. 61,71), a procedure which Augustine did not reject, but criticized, seeing the texts as *testimonia media,* i.e., ambiguous (*Nat. Gr.* 61,71). For their correct evaluation they must be compared with clear biblical passages—which are always the most authoritative—or with the context of the patristic *testimonia* (*Nat. Gr.* 61,71-67,81, see esp. *Nat. Gr.* 67,80f., with the discussion of Augustine's own texts—see also *Ep*. 180,3; 5). Moreover, Augustine would later have to admit that he was deceived by a text attributed to Pope *Sixtus (see *Retract.* II,42). After the promulgation of *Zosimus's *tractoria,* Augustine composed, in the summer months of 418, the *Grat. Chr. et pecc. orig.*, concluding both books with patristic argumentation. In the first book he cites Ambrose (I 42,46-50,55), whom Pelagius himself recognized as a testimony to Roman faith (I 43,47), though Augustine interpreted Ambrose more accurately, based on the context and on clearer Ambrosian texts (see I 47,52–49,54). In the second book, in which he defends the much-debated doctrine of the *tradux peccati,* Augustine again used texts of Ambrose (II 41,47f.). Similarly, in the *C. Ep. Pel*., Augustine defends the Roman church, attacked by the Pelagians, this time citing not only Ambrose (IV 11,29-31) but many texts of Cyprian, also one of Pelagius's teachers (IV 8,21-10,28, see esp. IV 8,21: *notissimum . . . ipse . . . Pelagius cum debito certe honore commemorat, ubi Testimoniorum librum scribens eum se asserit imitari* [Even . . . Pelagius . . . himself mentions (the most blessed Cyprian) with the honor that is certainly due him . . . when, writing a book of testimonies he asserts that he is imitating him]—see also *Nupt. et conc*. II 39,51). In Augustine's works written after 421 against *Julian of Eclanum, he takes up patristic argumentation not so much to defend the traditions of Carthage and Rome but to refute the accusation of being a *Manichean and an innovator (BA 23,776f.). While Julian tends to reduce the authority of the ecclesiastical writers to that of men distinguished by *ratio, eruditio* and *libertas* (*C. Iul.* II,36ff.), Augustine was careful to cite authors of different eras and regions as *scriptores et tractatores* who, from within the community of the church, had always proposed authentic biblical doctrine (see *C. Iul.* I 3,5; I 7,32ff.; II 10,33-37 [basic text]; *C. Iul. imp.* I,6; IV,122: discussion on the authority of Cyprian and Ambrose).

Augustine thus made use of patristic argumentation from the beginning of the 5th c. There is little value, however, in identifying later phases of an increasingly perfected patristic method: given that Augustine constantly argued *ad hominem*, it is more useful to give attention to the historical circumstances of his recourse to the Fathers. In any case, he always held to the principle of the higher authority of Sacred Scripture vis-à-vis all human authorities (see *Pecc. mer.* III 7,14; *Nat. Gr.* 61,71). Moreover, his reason for appealing to the authority of the ecclesiastical writers was twofold. On the one hand, Augustine wanted to uphold the traditions of Carthage and Rome, and he thus had recourse above all to Cyprian and Ambrose. On the other hand, he sought to confirm his interpretation of the biblical texts under discussion (esp. Rom and Gal), with Jerome being his principal witness on this level (see *Pecc. mer.* III 6,12; *C. Iul.* II 10,33). He thus refuted the patristic *testimonia* alleged by Pelagius and Julian, and added other *testimonia* in favor of his position. To strengthen his argument, he referred to authors who lived prior to the controversy and were thus unprejudiced witnesses (see *C. Iul.* II 10,33). He also discussed writers (esp. Eastern) because they had been cited by his adversaries. It is especially noteworthy that his critique—attention to the author of a cited work, to the consensus of writers (see Maschio), to the context of the *testimonia,* to the clearest passages—resembles his biblical hermeneutic, expounded in *Doct. chr*. (see *Ep*. 148,4,15; *Grat. Chr. et pecc. orig.* 49,54; *C. Iul.* I 7,34; II 10,33f.). Nevertheless, Augustine never presented a theory of patristic argumentation, though he in a certain sense summed up his ideas by calling the saints and famous bishops of God *Ecclesiae catholicae filii discendo, patres docendo* (*C. Iul. imp.* IV,112). Two other things are clear. First, Augustine was moved to recourse to Christian writers especially by Pelagius, who in *De natura* had applied the term *testimonium,* used by Cyprian, to patristic proofs (see BA 23,824f.). Second, Augustine was always disposed to learn from others (see *Retract.* I 23,1; *Trin*. I 4,7; *C. Iul.* VI 23,70). That patristic argumentation was quite common, at least by 415, is also confirmed by the fact that Augustine developed this method at the same time when, in the composition of his apology *De civitate Dei,* he felt the need to present his knowledge of profane authors (see Lütcke, *Auctoritas,* 39-46). Under Augustine's influence, but also that of Greek *theology and in particular of the general classicist climate of the time (*see* Jerome; Pelagius), patristic argumentation continued to spread in the West (*see* *Prosper of Aquitaine; *John

Cassian). Indeed, it found its first theorist in *Vincent of Lérins who, following Augustine's principles, established as a criterion of *orthodoxy the *consensio ecclesiae antiquae et universalis* (see Sieben, *Konzilsidee*, 154) and who, in view of the *antiquitas* that he preferred to the *consensio universalis* emphasized by Augustine, mentions especially the evidence of the Fathers (*Comm.* 30f.; see *Excerpta* I,1: PLS 3,25; **Decretum Gelasianum* 4,3).

Finally, from the 5th c., patristic argumentation developed both in the East, along with the reception of the Nicene faith, and in the West, especially in the Pelagian controversy, in which the traditions of the churches of Carthage and of Rome were in question, as well as the correct interpretation of the biblical texts under discussion. Criticism of patristic texts, like that of biblical texts, was further reinforced after the Council of *Chalcedon. On the other hand, esteem for patristic theology increasingly centered in the East on the acceptance of Cyril of Alexandria, and in the West on the reception, somewhat critical, of Augustinian theology (see Studer, in Stor. Teol. I,584-590). In this sense both *Byzantine and Latin theology would become patristic (against Graumann, 13).

M. Tetz, *Zum Streit zwischen Orthodoxie und Häresie an der Wende des 4. zum 5. Jh.: Anfänge des expliziten Väterbeweises*: Evang. Theol. 21 (1961) 354-368; E. Nacke, *Das Zeugnis der Väter in der theologischen Beweisführung Cyrills von A. nach seinen Briefen und antinestorianischen Schriften*, Diss. Münster 1965; W.D. Connor, *St. Vincent of Lerin and St. Augustine*, Diss. Gregoriana, Rome 1964; H. Jaeger, *La preuve judiciaire d'après la Tradition rabbinique et patristique*, *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, Brussels 1964, 514-594; B. Pruche, *Basile de C.*, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*: SC 17bis, Paris 1968; H. Chadwick, *Florilegium*: RAC 7 (1969) 1131-1160; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* (Stuttgart 1975), 275-278; J. Fellermayr, *Tradition und Sukzession im Licht des römisch-antiken Erbdenkens*, Munich 1979; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979: G. Blum, in TRE 3 (1978) 445-466; G. Maschio, *L'argomentazione patristica di s. Agostino nella prima fase della controversia pelagiana*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 459-479; E. Dassmann, *Ambrosius*: AugL I/1-2 (1986) 270-285; B. Studer, in Storia Teologia I (1993) 458-461; 583-598; K.H. Lütcke, *Auctoritas*: AugL I/4 (1990) 498-510; E. Dassmann, *Cyprianus*: AugL II/2 (1996) 196-211; St.G. Hall, in TRE 33 (2002) 97-106; B. Neuschäfer, *Florilegium*: LACL[2] 270f.; T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter: Vätertheologie und Väterbeweis in den Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)*, Tübingen 2002 (bibl.). See also the respective notes in NBA 17-19 and in BA 21-24.

B. Studer

ARIOMANITAE (Ἀρειομανῖται). Name disparagingly applied to the *Arians from the start of the controversy by *Eustathius, *Alexander and then by *Athanasius (PG 25, 488; 26, 940C) and others. The term was based on the affinity between Areios and Ares, the god of war and homicidal rage: from *areimanēs* (possessed by Ares's frenzy) was coined *areiomanitēs* (possessed by Arius's frenzy).

See Lampe 224.

M. Simonetti

ARISTEAS, Letter of. Jewish document intending to explain how the Law was translated from Hebrew to Greek by 72 sages of *Jerusalem, summoned to the Museum of *Alexandria by Ptolemy Philadelphus in the mid-3rd c. BC. The author tries to lend a sacred character to a simple Greek translation of the Pentateuch, made for the internal needs of the Alexandrian community and for propaganda among the *pagans; his objective was to convince the Jews to accept Greek culture. In the letter *Hellenistic culture is presented as *monotheistic, with no effort to point out its moral and religious depravity. *Judaism, however, is presented as a monotheistic philosophy without historical and national dimensions: the Torah should be written in a universal language, Greek. Some accept the historical basis of the legend and attribute the translation to the initiative of the first monarch, to allow Greek officials a means of access to the legislation proper to the Jewish ethnic group. The letter, however, contains obvious anachronisms which show the historical background to be fictitious. Its composition must be put between the period of the presumed sponsor, Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 BC) and Flavius Josephus (AD 37–110?); the latter paraphrases the text. The author presents himself as a pagan Greek but in fact was a Hellenized Jew. The legend was enriched over time with elements aimed at stressing the inspired character of the Septuagint. The one fantastic part of Aristeas's account is that the translation was done in 72 days. *Philo (*Vit. Mos.* II, 37) sees divine inspiration in the miraculous agreement among the translators. At the end of the 2nd c. the bishop of Lyons, St. *Irenaeus (*Haer.* III, 21,2; see Eus., *HE* V, 8, 11), emphasizes the same purported miracle, despite the precautions taken by Ptolemy to prevent the translators from consulting one another. The Scriptures were thus translated, according to him, under divine inspiration (*Haer.* II, 21,4). *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I, 148) specifies that the Seventy translated the Law and the Prophets. He claims to know that the translators were kept separate from one another and considers the work a sort of prophecy in

Greek. According to *Julius Africanus (*Ep. ad Origenem*: PG 11, 45A), the translation included the whole OT. *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cath.* IV, 34) also emphasizes the agreement among the translators, who were kept apart, to affirm as well that the translation was done under the inspiration of the *Holy Spirit. *Epiphanius (*Mens.* 3: PG 43, 242) attests to the whole legend in its final development. *Jerome rails against the various elements added to the account of Aristeas and Josephus (*Praef. in Pent.*: PL 28, 150-152), insisting that the translation included only the Pentateuch (*Quaest. in Gen.*: PL 23, 985; *Comm. in Ezech.* 5,12: PL 25, 57C; *Comm. in Michaeam* 2: PL 25, 1227D). All this notwithstanding, he respected the Greek translation, which he considers infallible through the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and does not doubt Aristeas's account. The explanation proposed by the author (*Arist.* 143-169) regarding some of the Jewish law's dietary precepts (Lev 11) is one of the first examples of *allegorical *exegesis in Judaism. The author selects precepts which, understood symbolically, allow him to introduce an exhortation to justice and an admonition against abuse of power. The *Letter* thus strips the theme of justice of its traditional prophetic quality to clothe it anew in moralizing popular philosophy. By the simple introduction of the idea of a sovereign God, his message became acceptable to both Jews and Greeks.

R. Tramontano, *La lettera di Aristea a Filocrate*, Naples 1931 (text and tr.); A. Pellettier, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*, SC 89, Paris 1962; G. Delling, *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur (1900–1965)*, TU 106, Berlin 1969, [2]1975; A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights*, Tübingen 1985; N. Fernández Marcos, *El "sentido profundo" de las prescripciones dietéticas judías* (Carta de Aristeas, 143-169), in D. Muñoz León (ed.), *Salvación en la Palabra. Tárgum - Derash - Berith. En memoria de prof. A. Díez Macho*, Madrid 1986, 553-562; D.L. Balch, *Attitudes Toward Foreigners in 2 Maccabees, Eupolemus, Esther, Aristeas, and Luke-Acts*, in A.J. Malherbe - F.W. Norris - J.W. Thompson (eds.), *The Early Church and Its Context: Essays in Honor of E. Ferguson*, Leiden 1998, 22-47.

R. Trevijano

ARISTIDES (2nd c.). With *Quadratus, Aristides is among the earliest *apologists. The sources call him an Athenian. His *Apologia* is addressed to *Hadrian (117–138) or to *Antoninus Pius (138–161) in the first years of his reign. The work, as we can reconstruct it today, is divided into 17 chapters. After stating the case for *monotheism and speaking of God as creator and preserver of the universe, Aristides divides humanity into four categories, based on their religion—barbarians, Greeks, Jews and Christians—the comparison of which allows him to criticize the polytheism and fetishism of the barbarians, disapprove of the absurdities of Greek *mythology, charge the Jews with exteriority and certain superstitious customs (though approving their idea of God), and finally highlight the true knowledge of the divine nature possessed by Christians and show the purity of their behavior. The *Apologia,* mentioned by *Eusebius of Caesarea (see *HE* IV, 3,3; *Chron. ad an. Abr.* 2140-2142 = 124-126 AD), survives (1) in an *Armenian fragment (containing the first two chapters) discovered by the Mechitarists of Venice in 1878, (2) in a *Syriac version of the entire text discovered by J. Rendel Harris in 1889, and (3) in two Greek papyrus fragments published in 1922 and 1923 (containing chs. 5,3–6,1 and 15,6–16,1). The Syriac version allowed us to ascertain that we already possessed the Greek text, in a free revision, in chs. 26 and 27 of the *Life of *Barlaam and Joseph,* a pious romance attributed by the manuscript tradition to *John of Damascus (ca. 675–749?). Chapters 15 and 16 of Aristides's *Apologia* have been compared, with some justification, to chs. 5 and 6 of the *Letter to *Diognetus*. Recent studies have shed light on certain lines of the textual tradition little studied until now (in particular that of the papyri) and highlighted the use made of the *Apologia* by some later writers (esp. by Epiphanius).

For Syriac and Greek texts: J.R. Harris - J.A. Robinson, TSt 1,1, Cambridge [2]1893. For papyrus fragments: B.P. Grenfell - A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyr. Papyri*, XV, London 1922; H.J.M. Milne: JTS 25 (1924) 73-77. On the inauthenticity of the homily on Lk 23:42f. (see J.B. Pitra, *Anal. Sacra*, IV, Paris 1883, 6-11 and 282-286) cited under Aristides's name, together with an equally spurious fragment *ex epistula Aristidis*, see P. Pape, TU 12,2, Leipzig 1894. Translations: Eng.: D.M. Kay, ANF 9, 263-279; It.: C. Vona, Rome 1950; C. Burini, Rome 1986; C. Alpigiano, Florence 1988; Sp.: D. Ruiz Bueno, BAC 116, Madrid 1954; Ger.: R. Raabe, TU 9,1, Leipzig 1892; J. Schönfelder: ThQ 74 (1892) 531-557; K. Julius, BKV 12, Kempten 1913;. L. Alfonsi, *La teologia della storia nell'Apologia di Aristide*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 37-40. Further bibliography in Quasten I, 171f.; B. Altaner - A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*, Freiburg i.B. 1978, 64f.; H.J. Desterle, *Zur Apologie des Aristides*: ZDMG 130 (1980) 15-23; C. Alpigiano, *L'Apologia di Aristide e la tradizione papiracea*: Civiltà classica and cristiana 7 (1986) 333-357; K.G. Essig, *Erwägungen zum geschichtlichen Ort der Apologie des Aristides*: ZKG 97 (1986) 163-188; R. Van den Broek, *Eugnostos and Aristides on the Ineffable God: Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*, Leiden 1988, 202-218; C. Scholten: LTK[3] 1, 973; J. Dummer, *Epiphanius von Constantia un die Apologie des Aristides: eine quellenkritische Untersuchung*: Philologus 138/2 (1994) 267-287; H.R. Drobner, *Patrologia*, It. tr., Casale Monferrato 1998, 127f.

P. Siniscalco

ARISTION (1st-2nd c.), "Disciple of the Lord," according to *Papias in the prologue to his *Explanations of the Lord's Sayings* (see Eus., *HE* III 39,4; see also *Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 18). The interpretation of the titles and functions of the various people listed by Papias as sources of his work, however, is disputed, although we know that Aristion was frequently mentioned in it (see Eus., *HE* III 39,7). Papias may have thought that Aristion was still alive: the prologue speaks of him and of the *presbyter John in the present, but of others in the past. In Eusebius's citations and paraphrases of Papias, Aristion's name is always associated with John's (*HE* III 39,4.5.7.14). It is doubtful that Aristion was the homonymous first bishop of Smyrna mentioned in *Apos. Con.* VII 46,8. The Roman Martyrology records Aristion on 22 February as the bishop of Salamis in Cyprus. Isolated and unconfirmed early evidence attributes to Aristion the account of the miracle of Joseph Barsabbas the Just cited by Papias (see Eus., *HE* III 39,9) and the ending of *Mark's gospel (Mk 16:9-20): recent attributions to Aristion of the Johannine pericope on adultery (Jn 8:1-10) or the letter to the Hebrews are both hypothetical and unfounded.

DBS 1, 619-621; DBS 6, 1104-1009 (*Papias*); EC 1, 1908-1909; BS 2, 421-424; LTK³ 1, 973; ODC³, 101; J. Chapman, *Aristion, Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, RBen 22 (1905) 50-64; J.F. Bligh, *The Prologue of Papias*: ThS 13 (1952) 234-240; U.H.J. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis*, Göttingen 1983, 122-129.

F. Scorza Barcellona

ARISTO of Pella (2nd c.). Christian writer active in the mid 2nd c. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* IV 6,3) cites him as a source for his account of the repression of the Jewish revolt led by Bar Kokhba (AD 132–135) and the consequent interdiction of *Jerusalem imposed by *Hadrian on the Jews. In the 6th c. *John of Scythopolis, in a scholium to ps.-*Dionysius (*Myst.* 1,3; see CPG 6852), cites a *Dialogue [dialexis] between Papiscus and Jason,* in which mention is made of the "seven heavens"; he attributes it to Aristo, in contrast with *Clement of Alexandria, who attributed it to St. *Luke. The reliability of John of Scythopolis's attribution has been and is still debated, since the work, lost to us, is known as an anonymous writing in the testimonies of the *pagan *Celsus and *Origen (see *Contra Cels.* IV 52-53), who calls it a *Dispute* (*antilogia*), and of the Christian *Celsus, who translated the work into *Latin perhaps in the 3rd c., probably in *Africa. Among the ps.-Cyprianine writings there is a letter in which Celsus dedicated his translation to a bishop Vigilius (see CPL 67): the translated work is called a *scriptura concertationis* (*Ad Vig.* 8). *Jerome, who read the work in the original Greek version and cites it as an **altercatio,* also did not know how to attribute authorship (*Quaest. Hebr. Gen.* 1,1; *Comm. in Gal.* 3,14). The work can be located at the origins of Christian anti-Jewish apologetic literature, which particularly made use of the forms of dialogue. According to the evidence of the work's translator, Celsus, the debate ended with the complete victory of Jason, a "Jewish Christian," over Papiscus, a "Jew of *Alexandria," who was then converted and baptized. Against the disparaging criticism of the pagan Celsus, Origen acknowledged the scant value of the exegetical argumentation adopted in the *dispute,* but he also appreciated the Jew's proud consciousness of the dignity of his convictions. The subject of the dispute was esp. the applicability of the OT prophecies about Christ to Jesus. Jerome was interested in the work because, with regard to Gen 1:1 and Deut 21:23, it provided further evidence of the difference of the Greek versions from the Hebrew biblical text. In support of the work's anonymity, the hypothesis has been put forward that it reproduces the rapid transcription of a public discussion that perhaps occurred at Alexandria. The main argument in favor of a coincidence of the dispute with Aristo's work referred to by Eusebius is based on the reuse of the historical data of the sending away of the Jews from *Jerusalem in anti-Jewish polemical works (see Tert., *Ad Iud.* 13,3-4), according to an apologetic and polemical model that Aristo would in fact have already experimented with. An alternative to this hypothesis is the proposal that recognizes in the source cited by Eusebius the author of a historical work; this is also suggested by Late Antique and Medieval evidence, such as *Moses of Khorene, *Hist. Arm.* 2,60, and Nicephorus Callistus, *Eccl. Hist.* 3,24, although they depend on Eusebius. The information referred by the **Chronicon Paschale* to the year 134, according to which Aristo submitted an apology to Hadrian, is probably the result of a contamination of Eusebius's information regarding Aristo and Eusebius, *HE* IV 3,3.

CPG 1101; E. Schürer, *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo (175 a.C.–135 d.C.)* I, Brescia 1985, 68-71 (orig. ed.: Edinburgh 1973); H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)*, Frankfurt a. Main - Bern ⁴1999, 180; J. Wehnert, *Die Auswanderung der Jerusalemer Christen nach Pella - historisches Faktum oder theologische Konstruktion?*: ZKG 102 (1991/2) 231-255 (esp. 254-255); G. Otranto, *La "Disputa tra Giasone e Papisco sul Cristo" falsamente attribuita ad Aristone di Pella*: VetChr 33 (1996) 337-351.

V. Zangara

ARISTOLAUS the Tribune (5th c.). In 432 sent by the emperor *Theodosius II to bishops *John of Antioch and *Cyril of Alexandria in an attempt to overcome the differences that had come about in the Eastern church following the declaration of *Nestorius as a *heretic.

CPG 5359-5360, 6333, 8810-8812; PG 77, 323-326, 1457-1461; PG 84, 656-658, 806-807, 835-836; ACO I,4, 92, 206, 230; PLRE II, 146-147.

P. Marone

ARISTOTELIANISM. Aristotle did not enjoy the same veneration among the Greek fathers as did *Plato (see A.J. Festugière, *Aristote dans la littérature grecque chrétienne*, in *L'idéal religieux des grecs et l'Évangile*, Paris 1932, 222-223; J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique*, Tournai 1961, 123). Though some Christian authors did accept some elements of the Aristotelian-Peripatetic *philosophy, a number of its points appeared unacceptable to early Christianity: (1) the exclusion of divine *providence from the lowest part of the universe (see E. Zeller, *Die Philos. der Griechen* II, 2, Leipzig [3]1879, 468 n. 1, Diogenes Laertius V 32, *De mundo* 397b-30-398b 6); (2) the tendency to make happiness partly depedent on external goods (*Et. Nic.* 1099a 31-32); (3) the doctrine that the fifth element, ether, was God's body, while God himself was practically identical with the *anima mundi* that moves the universe (*Sulla filosofia*, fr. 26 Walzer; see G. Lazzati, *L'Aristotele perduto e gli scrittori cristiani*, Milan 1938, 69-73; Daniélou, op. cit., 123); (4) the doctrine that the universe is coeternal with God (*De caelo*, II 283b 26-30, Philo, *De aet. m.* 10, see E. Zeller, *Die Lehre des Aristoteles von der Ewigkeit der Welt*, *Vortr. und Abh.* III, Leipzig 1884, 1-36); and (4) the propensity to assert the mortality of the human *soul, considered as the mere ἐντελέχεια of the body, from which it could not be separated, and to reserve immortality to the νοῦς alone (*De an.* II, 412a 27-28, 412b 5-6, 413a 3-5; III 430a 17-18, 22-25; in his youthful dialogue *Eudemus* [fr. 6 Ross = fr. 33 Bekker, V, 1480a], Aristotle had favored the immortality of the soul). The Greek fathers' knowledge of the Aristotelian-Peripatetic philosophy was derived partly from the syncretistic Platonism of the first two centuries AD or from *Neoplatonism (also syncretistic), partly from doxographical collections or scholastic compendiums and partly from direct reading of at least some of the texts of Aristotle or later exponents of his school.

*Tatian charges Aristotle with confining divine providence to the world above the lunar sphere, and with the two doctrines of the happiness and mortality of the human soul (*Apol.* 2: Schwartz p. 2,23-25; 3,4-10; *Apol.* 25: p. 27,2-3), and he points out that the Greek philosophers often contradict themselves (*Apol.* 25: Schwartz p. 27,5). *Athenagoras criticizes the Aristotelian conception of God as a being composed of ether and of a rational faculty which is the *anima mundi* and cause of the universe's movement (*Apol.* 6: Schwartz p. 7,14-20; see Daniélou, op. cit., 123), and rejects Aristotle's idea of providence (*Apol.* 25: Schwartz p. 33, 25-26). Describing his own wanderings through the various Greek philosophical schools, *Justin Martyr says that one of his teachers was a Peripatetic (*Dial.* 2: Otto II 8,25–10,4); in the same dialogue (ch. 5: Otto II 24,12) he rejects the conception of an eternal and ungenerated universe, characteristic not just of those Platonists who did not interpret the *Timaeus* to the letter but also of the Peripatetics; and in *Apol.* I 28 (Otto I 198,2-7) he charges with impiety anyone who denies the manifestation of divine providence toward humanity. That all of these criticisms of Aristotelian philosophy by the apologists are derived from "*Middle Platonism" is proven by their presence in Atticus (fr. 2,2 Des Places and 2,3 on happiness; fr. 7,12-13 on the mortality of the soul; fr. 5 on the ether; fr. 3,9 on providence; fr. 4,7 on the eternity of the universe). On Justin Martyr's attitude to the Peripatetic school and his dependence on Middle Platonism, see C. Andresen, *Justin und der mittlere Platonismus*: ZNW 44 (1952-1953) 160-161.

The author of the *Cohortatio ad graecos,* wrongly attributed to Justin Martyr but probably 3rd c. (see Quasten I, 183), knows Aristotelian philosophy well: in chs. 5 and 36 (Otto I 26,1-18; 102,1-4) he cites and rejects the doctrine that God has his seat in the fifth element, the ether (see Athenag., *Apol.* 6: Otto I 7,14f.); at the end of ch. 6 (Otto I 30,3-4) he rejects the doctrine of the soul as ἐντελέχεια of the body; at the beginning of ch. 7 (Otto I 30,7-8) he accuses both Plato and Aristotle of contradicting themselves (see Tat., *Apol.* 25: Schwartz 27,5); and in chs. 35 and 36 (I 98,6-7; 102,4-5; 102,8) he criticizes the stylistic elegance of the ancient philosophers. Credit is due to L. Alfonsi (*Traces du jeune Aristote dans la Cohortatio ad gentiles faussement attribuée à Justin*: VChr 2 [1948] 65-88) for showing that the Aristotle attacked in the *Cohortatio* is largely the young Aristotle of *On Philosophy* and the *Protrepticus;* the contradictions he fell into would be evident in *On Philosophy* (fr. 26 Walzer) and, more generally, in the difference between the λόγοι ἐσωτερικοί and the λόγοι ἐξωτερικοί (Alfonsi, op. cit., 66-67); the

charge of affected style would also refer to his youthful dialogues (ibid., 68-69; Daniélou, op. cit., 124, refers to Alfonsi).

Another work falsely attributed to Justin Martyr is the *Confutatio quorumdam Aristotelis dogmatum* (PG 6, 1492-1564)—65 chapters refuting various Aristotelian theses taken from the *Physica* and *De caelo*. In each chapter the criticism is preceded by a citation of the Aristotelian passage to be refuted. The author shows a direct knowledge of both works. The brief account of Aristotelian philosophy given by *Hermias, *Irrisio gent. philos.* 11 (Diels, *Dox. gr.* 653,31–654,3) is clearly doxographical in origin, like the rest of his work. The two fundamental principles for Aristotle would be the active and the passive. While the active is identified with the ether, the passive—matter—is endowed with four qualities: dry, wet, hot and cold. Here we have the young Aristotle's conception of God as ether, already observed in Athenagoras and in the *Cohortatio ad gentes* (see also Alfonsi, op. cit., 71 and 79).

The same conception of God as ether recurs in the ps.-Clementine *Recognitiones* (VIII, 15): *Aristoteles enim quintum introducit elementum quod acatonomaston, id est incompellabile nominavit, sine dubio illum indicans, qui in unum quattuor elementa coniungens mundum fecerit* [For Aristotle also introduces a fifth element which he called *akatonomaston*, i.e., that which cannot be named, without a doubt indicating that One who made the world by joining the four elements into one] (p. 226,1-5 Rehm; Diels, *Dox. gr.* p. 251). S. Mariotti (Athens and Rome 8 [1940] 50-51) regards the words from *sine dubio* to *mundum fecerit* as an interpretative addition by the author of the Greek text translated into Latin by *Rufinus; but the presence of the same doctrine in Athenagoras, the *Cohortatio ad gentes* and Hermias casts doubt on this hypothesis (also skeptical is E. Bignone, Athens and Rome 8 [1940] 169-170).

In *Clement of Alexandria we can see a critical approach to Aristotle as well as the acceptance of motifs from his early work or some of his philosophical doctrines. Clement's criticisms are those of the apologists: Aristotle identifies the supreme God with the *anima mundi* and does not allow for divine providence in the sublunar sphere; his disciple Theophrastus also tends to identify God with the sky (*Protr.* 66,4: Stählin I, 58,28-31). The same criticism of the Aristotelian conception of providence is repeated in *Strom.* V 98,3 (Stählin II 385,19-20): Aristotle's represents a misunderstanding of Ps 35:6. The fact that the passage of *Protr.* 66,4 should be related to Cicero, *De nat. deor.* 113,33 (= Aristotle, *On Philosophy* fr. 26 Walzer) has already been noticed by H. Diels, *Dox. gr.,* 131 (see also Alfonsi, VChr. 2 [1948] 71-72, Daniélou, op. cit., 125 and by S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 48 n. 1). Other points in which Aristotle's *On Philosophy* recognizably influences Clement have been noted by J. Daniélou, op. cit., 126-127.

As Quasten (I, 289) has noted, Clement's *Protrepticus* is part of the literary genre of "exhortations" inaugurated by the young Aristotle with his *Protrepticus* and continued in other similar works by Epicurus, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Poseidonius and Cicero (in the 4th c. AD, Iamblichus would also write a *Protrepticus*).

That Clement kept Aristotle's *Protrepticus* in mind while composing his own is now beyond doubt after the research on the subject by E. Bignone, *Nuove testimonianze e frammenti del Protreptico di Aristotele*, RIFC n.s. 14 (1936) 230; G. Lazzati, *L'Aristotele perduto*, op. cit., 9-34; Q. Cataudella, *Clemente Alessandrino. Protreptico ai Greci*, Turin 1940, XXVI-XXXI; and J. Daniélou, op. cit., 124-125. The main proof of Clement's dependence on Aristotle is the account of the punishment inflicted by the Etruscan pirates on their prisoners, present in Clement, *Protr.* 7,4 (Stählin I 8,1-6) (see E. Bignone, *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro* I, Florence 1936, p. 80 n. 1, RIFC n.s. 14 [1936] 230; and Cataudella, op. cit., XXVI-XXVII; this passage of Clement, with two analogous passages of Iamblichus and *Augustine, has been rightly recorded as fr. 10b of Aristotle's *Protrepticus* by R. Walzer, *Aristotelis dialogorum fragmenta*, Florence 1934, 44-45). For his part, S. Mariotti (Athens and Rome 8 [1940] 58-60) with good reason also extends the influence of Aristotle's *Protrepticus* to two passages of Clement's *Paedagogus*: *Paed.* I 28,1 (Stählin I 106,29-30), where the etymology of ἄνθρωπος ("man") is said to derive from φῶς ("light"), and *Paed.* III 99,2-3 (I 290,9-16).

As for Clement's acceptance of Aristotelian doctrines, we must note the following points: (1) The doctrine of virtue as μεσότης—also present in Philo and Middle Platonism—seems to be echoed in *Paed.* II 16,4 (I 166,2-4) (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria,* 64-65). (2) In *Strom.* V 89,5 (II 385,5-8) Aristotle is mentioned with Plato and the *Stoics as maintaining the absence of quality and form in prime matter (see, e.g., *Phys.* I 191 a 10). (3) Conceiving, like Philo and the Middle Platonists, the supreme deity as a νοῦς (see S. Lilla, op. cit., 223-224), Clement agrees not only with the Plato of the *Timaeus, Philebus* and book X of the *Laws* but also with the Aristotle of *Metaphysics,* book Λ: in all probability Clement remained faithful to the teaching of Pantaenus—for

whom God is a νοῦς since he possesses will (see fr. 48 Stählin, III, 224)—and *Ammonius Saccas, who sought to reconcile Plato with Aristotle (see S. Lilla, op. cit., 223-224). (4) In *Strom.* IV 155,2 (II 317,11) and V 73,3 (II 375, 18, 19), the divine νοῦς is called by Clement χώρα ἰδεῶν (see S. Lilla, op. cit., 201): this doctrine, though present in Philo (*De Cher.* 29), Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, in the last analysis goes back to Aristotle, who in *De an.* III 429a 27-29 used similar terms regarding the thinking human νοῦς. (5) In *Strom.* VI 137,4 (II 501,22), God is defined not only as ἀπαθής but as ἀπροσδεής: the idea of God's impassibility and self-sufficiency goes back to Aristotle, *Met.* Λ 1073a 11, *Et. Eud.* 1244b 8-9 and 1249b 16, though it reappears in Philo (*De spec. leg.* II 38 and 174, *De virt.* 9) and Plotinus, *Enn.* VI, 9,6 (Bréhier VI[2] 179,17-18; 184,24-26). (6) In agreement with Aristotelian teaching, virtue is conceived of as the result of the combination of φύσις, μάθησις, and ἄσκησις or ἔθος (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria,* 66-67, with relevant references to Clement, Aristotle, Philo and Middle Platonism). (7) The part of Aristotelian philosophy on which Clement drew most was undoubtedly the logic: the so-called book VIII of the *Stromata* is not an epitome of the original text written by Clement, as Zahn thought (*Forsch. zur Gesch. des neutest. Kanons,* III, *Suppl. Clem.*, Erlangen 1884, 104-130) but a scholastic collection of logical-epistemological doctrines, both Peripatetic and Stoic (see I. von Arnim, *De octavo Clementis Stromateorum libro,* Rostock Progr. 1894), used by Clement himself at various points of the *Stromata* (see W. Ernst, *De Clementis Alexandrini Stromatum libro octavo qui fertur*, Diss. Göttingen 1910; S. Lilla, op. cit., 120 n. 3).

Clement uses this Peripatetic material to construct his doctrine of *pistis* understood as the acceptance both of the principle of a demonstration and its conclusions; apropos of this last type of *pistis,* Aristotle is explicitly named with approval in *Strom.* II 15,5 (II 120,25-26; see, e.g., *Rhet.* 1355a 5-6, *Et. Nic.* 1139b 33-34; on the whole complex question of *pistis* in Clement and its relation to Aristotelian epistemology, see S. Lilla, op. cit., 118-142). It was precisely the presence of copious Aristotelian logical material in the so-called eighth book of the *Stromata* that led H.J. Reinkens (*De Clemente presbytero Alexandrino homine scriptore philosopho theologo,* Wroclaw 1851, 300 and 309) to consider Clement an Aristotelian philosopher (a one-sided and unacceptable conclusion, however). Finally it must be said that the words of *Strom.* V 88,1 (II 384,4), καθάπερ Πλάτων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁμολογοῦσιν, regarding the divine origin of the human νοῦς, are in all probability an interpolation of some erudite scribe or reader (see S. Lilla, op. cit., 14 n. 1): as regards Aristotle, the interpolator must have had in mind a doxography based on *De gen. an.* B 736b 27-28.

*Origen, like Clement, rejects some Aristotelian doctrines and accepts others. Among Aristotelian and Peripatetic doctrines, he rejects the idea of providence (*C. Cels.* I 21 [Koetschau I 72,11-12], II 13 [I 142,8-9], III 75 [I 266,27-29]); the theory—present in *De interpr.* 16a 27-28—that names are not derived from the nature of the things they refer to (*C. Cels.* I 24 [I 74,12], V 45 [II 48,10-11]); the doctrine of ether as the fifth element (*C. Cels.* IV 56 [I 329,11-15]); the idea of human happiness (*C. Cels.* I 10 [I 63,8-10]); the failure to accept the Platonic ideas, which Aristotle called τερετίσματα (*C. Cels.* I 13 [I 66,6]); and the completely negative attitude toward magic, which Epicurus and Aristotle's followers called πρᾶγμα ἀσύστατον (*C. Cels.* I 24 [I 74,22-23]). In *C. Cels.* II 27 (I 156, 8-10) the Peripatetics, together with the Epicureans, are called "an accusation against philosophy" (on Origen's judgments on Aristotle, see also H. Crouzel, *Origène et la philosophie*, Paris 1962, 31-35). This tendency to associate Peripatetics and Epicureans originated with Middle Platonism, as is shown by its presence in *Atticus, fr. 3,7-9 des Places. Similarly criticisms of the doctrines of providence originate in Middle Platonism, as do those of the ether and human happiness, and the rejection of the Platonic ideas (see Atticus fr. 3,9 on providence; fr. 5 on the ether; fr. 2,2-3 on happiness; fr. 9 on the rejection of the Platonic ideas; see also H. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis*, *Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus*, Berlin-Leipzig 1932, 268-274; Koch, 273, rightly notes that Atticus fr. 9,1, like Origen, *C. Cels.* I 13, cites the term τερετίσματα used by Aristotle *An. post.* 83a 33 to designate the Platonic ideas).

As for the presence of Aristotelian doctrines in Origen, the following points deserve particular attention: (1) For Origen, as for Clement, God is a mind: *et mens ac fons* (sc. Deus) (*De princ.* I 1,6 [21,13 Koetschau]; see above regarding Clement, n. 3). (2) Nonetheless Origen, like Plotinus, admits the possibility that God is above νοῦς (*C. Cels.* VII, 38 [II 188,11-12]). This possibility was also admitted by Aristotle (Περὶ εὐχῆς fr. 46 Rose [Bekker V, 483a 27]): ὁ θεὸς ἢ νοῦς ἐστιν ἢ ἐπέκεινά τι νοῦ (God is mind or something beyond mind). (3) Origen's God thinks himself (*De princ.* IV 4,8 [360,6-7]) just as does the God of Aristotle (*Met.* Λ 1072 b 19-20) and *Alexander of Aphrodisias (*Mantissa* 109,4-7). (4) Also for Origen, as for Clement, God is completely

self-sufficient and without needs (*Comm. in Jo* XIII, 34 [259,20-21]; see above regarding Clement, n. 5. (5) Origen makes the Aristotelian doctrine his own—which would become fundamental in the theology of *Gregory of Nyssa—that what is infinite cannot be known (see *Phys.* I 178b 7, III 207a 25-26, *Rhet.* III 1048b 27-28): in order to demonstrate that God's power is not infinite—a conception opposed to that of Plotinus and ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite (see S. Lilla: JTS 31 [1980] 100 n. 3)—he says (*De princ.* II 9,1 [164,5-6]), "If the divine power [θεία δύναμις] were indeed infinite, it would not even be able to know istelf, since the infinite is incomprehensible by nature" (see IV, 4,8 [359,17]: "Indeed the infinite by its nature cannot be comprehended"). (6) The human mind has been joined to the body (*De princ.* 11,6 [22,13]; cf. *C. Cels.* III 80 [I 270,25-28]; Aristotle *De gen. an.* B 736b 27 28). (7) The human mind has an affinity with God (*De princ.* I 7 [24,18-19]; cf. Aristotle, *De an.* I 408b 29; *Eth. Nic.* X 1177a 13-15; *De gen. an.* B 736b 27-28 [but also see Plato, *Tim.* 41c 7; Philo, *Quis rer. div. her.* 64, *De somn.* I 34]). (8) The human mind does not need the body for its operations (*De princ.* I 1,6 [23,1; 24,14-16]). Aristotle had said that only νοῦς is completely detached from the body, has no relation to it, and must be distinguished from the rest of the soul (see esp. *De an.* II 413b 24-27, III 429a 24-25, 429b 5, 430a 17-18). (9) The human mind is immortal (*C. Cels.* III 80 [I 270,25-26]; *De princ.* IV 4,9 [363,4-5]; cf. *De an.* II 413b 27, III 430a 23). (10) The human mind uses the bodily members as instruments (*De princ.* II,6 [23,12]; on the body or its parts as instruments, see *De gen. anim.* 716a 24-25; *De part. an.* 642a 11; *De an.* II 412b 12). (11) Matter is the basis of bodies, which exist thanks to it (*De princ.* III,4 [109,22-23]; cf. IV, 4,7 [357,30-31]; the first of these two passages can be compared with *Phys.* I 192a 31; cf. also *Met.* Λ 1022a 18-19). (12) H. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis,* 255, observes that in *Comm. in Io.* I, 18 (22,14-20) Origen distinguishes τὸ ἐξ οὗ, i.e., matter, from τὸ καθ' ὅ, equivalent to εἶδος, in accordance with Aristotelian teaching. (13) As E. de Faye has noted (*Origène, sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée*, I, Paris 1923, 218 n. 2), Origen in *C. Cels.* VI 62 (II 132, 16-17) gives a definition of φωνή which recalls the Aristotelian definition of the echo (see *Probl.* XI 901b 16-18, 904b 27-29). (14) According to H. Koch (op. cit., 175, 284-285, 289), Origen based his doctrine of free will on Aristotle's ethics, while also taking into account Middle Platonism, Epictetus and Alexander of Aphrodisias. (15) Finally we should mention (see also de Faye, op. cit., 218 n. 2) that in *C. Cels.* VII 3 (II 154,25-28) Origen says Aristotelian and Peripatetic doctrines can be used to refute the *oracles of the Greek religion (Koetschau, app. ad loc. rightly refers us to *De mundo* 395b 26-30). E. de Faye, op. cit., 218, holds that Origen knew directly at least Aristotle's *De anima* and *Nicomachean Ethics;* we should not forget that at the beginning of the 3rd c. Origen frequented Ammonius Saccas's school at Alexandria, where the study of Aristotle's works must have had great weight.

Clearly doxographical in origin is the information on Aristotelian philosophy given by *Hippolytus, *Epiphanius and *Theodoret. Hippolytus dedicates book I, ch. 20 (Wendland 24-25) and book VII, chs. 14-19 (Wendland 191-195) of his *Refutatio omnium haeresium* to Aristotle. Ch. 20 is a summary exposition of Aristotelian philosophy, very similar to that of Arius Didymus and Diogenes Laertius, as is shown by the similarities pointed out by Wendland (24 app.). Though not without appreciation (Aristotle raised philosophy to an art and was "more logical," 24,1-2), Hippolytus mentions two unacceptable doctrines, the mortality of the soul (24,15-17; 25,5) and the dependence of happiness on external goods (24,21-24). In book VII, chs. 14-19 he again expounds Aristotelian philosophy in order to show it as the source of the *heresy of *Basilides; he recalls the difference between the sublunar region, not governed by providence, and that above the moon, where order and providence reign (194,4-8), and calls obscure the Aristotelian doctrines of the soul and of God, respectively set forth in *De anima* and the *Metaphysics*.

Epiphanius's account of Aristotelian philosophy is found in *Panarion* 7,1-2 and in *De fide* 9,35 (see Diels, *Dox. gr.* 588,7 and 592,31). In *Panarion* 7,1-2 (Holl I, 186) the Peripatetics—associated with the Pythagoreans—are reproached with, among other things, the doctrines of the mortality of the soul (186,5) and of the identity between God, the sky and the stars (186,8-10): this latter was the young Aristotle's doctrine already noted by Athenagoras, in the *Cohortatio,* in Hermias, in the *Recognitiones* and in Clement. Recalled in *De fide* 9,35 (Holl III 508,4-9) are the two conceptions of the universe divided into supralunar and sublunar regions, and of the soul as ἐντελέχεια of the body (this latter passage coincides perfectly with Hippolytus, *Ref.* VII, 19: 194,4-8 and 194,23-195,1).

Theodoret names Aristotle in at least five places in his *Graecarum affectionum curatio*: book IV mentions the Aristotelian doctrine of the ether as the constitutive element of the stars and the celestial sphere (PG 83, 904 C 6-7, D 4-8) in a doxographical context, in which he reviews the cosmological theories of the Greek philosophers; a passage in book V

(PG 83, 993B4-5) mentions the doctrine of the mortality of the soul; also in book V (PG 83, 940C11–941A 3) he stresses the antithesis between Plato and Aristotle on the two questions of the mortality of the soul and divine providence (Aristotle is far inferior to Plato, PG 83, 940D4); book VI—dedicated to proving the existence of providence in human affairs—repeats the usual critique of the Aristotelian theory of providence (PG 83, 957A11–B3); finally, book XI gives a critique of the doctrine of happiness (PG 83, 1097C3-10).

*Eusebius of Caesarea refutes Aristotelian philosophy in book XV chs. 3-13 of his *Praeparatio evangelica* (VIII, 2: Mras 349-378), using long citations of Atticus, a work on the soul attributed to Plotinus and a work by Porphyry, also on the soul. As Festugière has shown (op. cit., 257-258), Eusebius criticizes the doctrines of happiness (chs. 3-4), providence (ch. 5), the eternity of the world (ch. 6), the ether (ch. 7), the nature of the heavenly bodies (ch. 8), the mortality of the soul (ch. 9), the soul as ἐντελέχεια of the body (chs. 10-11), the *anima mundi* (ch. 12) and the rejection of the Platonic ideas (ch. 13). The work most used in this refutation is that of Atticus (the writings attributed to Plotinus and Porphyry occupy only chs. 10 and 11: Mras 372-375): in fact, this section of the *Praeparatio evangelica* is our main source of knowledge of this Middle Platonist philosopher.

Regarding *Basil the Great, G. Lazzati (*L'Aristotele perduto*, op. cit., 34-43) considers his *Discourse to the Young on the Utility of Greek Literature* (ed. F. Boulenger, Paris 1935; PG 31, 564-589) to be influenced by Aristotle's *Protrepticus:* "protreptic" motifs—also present in Iamblichus's *Protrepticus*, in *Pap. Ox.* 666, and in Cicero's *Hortensius, Tusculanae* and *De finibus*—include its insistence on the vanity of material goods, the comparison between the procedure of dyers and the way to approach the study of sacred texts, the superiority of the soul with respect to the body, the polemic against Sardanapalus, and the soul's liberation from the prison of the body by philosophy. But Basil's dependence on Aristotle is evident above all in the famous nine *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* (ed. S. Giet, Paris 1968, SC 26 bis; PG 29, 4-208), which deal with questions of cosmology, geography and natural science (see Giet, op. cit., 61). Credit is due to K. Müllenhof, *Aristoteles bei Basilius von Caesarea:* Hermes 2 (1867) 252-258 and P. Plass, *De Basilii et Ambrosii excerptis ad historiam animalium pertinentibus*, Marpurgi Cattorum 1905, 21ff. for showing, by precise textual comparisons, the ample use Basil made esp. of Aristotle's *Historia animalium* and *Meteorologica;* Giet's notes to his edition of the *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* are also very instructive in this regard. Giet (61) also emphasizes the importance in Basil (see e.g. *Hom.* V 47E: Giet 314, 8, PG 29, 113A1-2) of the Aristotelian axiom "none of the works of nature exist by chance; everything obeys an end" (see *De part. anim.* I 645a 23-25).

Basil also makes use of Aristotle in his refutation of *Eunomius: against the latter's thesis, which saw the absence of generation regarding the Father as a consequence of his preexistence with respect to all things, and a proof of the difference between his substance and that of the Son, Basil observed that the lack of generation, precisely because it is an external, accessory consequence, cannot constitute part of the Father's intimate nature (*C. Eunom.* I,5: SC 299. 176,79-81, 178,89-91, 180,115-117; I,15: SC 299. 226,27-28). Basil's argument here is ultimately based on the Aristotelian doctrine that excludes accidents (συμβεβηκός) from substance (οὐσία) (*Met.* Δ, 1025a 30-32; see S. Lilla, *L'Oriente greco*, in *Storia della Teologia*, I, ed. E. Dal Covolo, Rome 1995, 270 with n. 32).

*Gregory of Nyssa's interest in Aristotle, undervalued by F. Diekamp (*Die Gotteslehre des heiligen Gregor von Nyssa*, I, Münster 1896, p. 34), is given its proper weight by K. Gronau (*De Basilio Gregorio Nazianzeno Nyssenoque Platonis imitatoribus*, Göttingen 1908, 2 n. 1). An examination of the *apparatus fontium* and index of authors in H. Langerbeck's *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (*Gregorii Nysseni opera . . .* ed. W. Jaeger, VI, Leiden 1960) gives an idea of the wealth of Aristotelian echoes present in his work. E. Mühlenberg (*Die philosophische Bildung Gregors von Nyssa in den Büchern Contra Eunomium*, in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*, Leiden 1971, 234, 236, 240) has brought out Gregory's use of Aristotelian logic in his arguments against Eunomius; other points in which Gregory's dependence on Aristotle is evident have been brought to light by S. Cavarnos (*The Relation of Body and Soul in the Thought of Gregory of Nyssa*, in *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*, Leiden 1976, 61-78) and M. Alexandre (*L'exégèse de Gen. 1.1-2a dans l'In Hexaemeron de Grégoire de Nysse*, ibid., 159-192). Here we cannot make an analytical examination of Gregory's *In Hexaemeron* and *De hominis opificio,* which would clearly show, similar to what has been observed regarding Basil, the extent of Gregory's dependence on Aristotle, as well as on Stoicism; we will merely call attention to some particularly significant points of Gregory's thought, of which his *trinitarian doctrine is an integral part.

(1) God is unknowable because he is infinite (see, e.g., *Contra Eun.* II, Jaeger II, 246,16-22; *Quod non*

sint tres dii, Müller 52,15-20; on this basic doctrine of Gregory's theology, see E. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 1966, in particular 102-103): unknowability as the effect of infinity is a typically Aristotelian doctrine (see *Phys*. I 187b 7, III 207a 25-26; *Rhet*. III 1048b 27-28). (2) Gregory's God is absolute beauty, loved by all beings (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 97A 1-8; *De virg*, Cavarnos 289, 25-26, 296,14-20 [this last passage faithfully follows Plato, *Sympos*. 211a]: the identification of the supreme principle with the beautiful, loved and desired by all beings goes back to Aristotle (*Met*. Λ 1072a 25-28). (3) Gregory's God, like in Aristotle, Περὶ εὐχῆς fr. 46 Rose, is superior to νοῦς, *In cant. cant*. V (p. 157,15; see above, Origen n. 2 and Langerbeck, app. font., 157). (4) Gregory (see, e.g., *In hexaem*: PG 44, 77 D 9-12 ed. Alexandre, op. cit., 171) knows the Aristotelian distinction between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια (see, e.g., *De an*. II 412a 9-10; *Phys*. I 191b 28-29; *Met*. Θ 1049b 5 and the other passages cited by Alexandre, op. cit., 171; Alexandre rightly notes that the same distinction is found in Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism). (5) The well-known Aristotelian doctrine of virtue as a just mean—also present, as we have seen, in Philo, Middle Platonism and Clement—is found, e.g., in *In eccl*. hom. VI (PG 44, 697C 10-12), *In cant. cant*. hom. IX (PG 44, 972A 7-8; Langerbeck 284,5-6), *De virg*. 7 (PG 46, 353B 13-14; Cavarnos 282, 25-26): see also Gronau, op. cit., 2 n. 1. (6) the close connection, Aristotelian in origin, between matter and substrate (see above Origen n. 11) is found, e.g., in *In Hexaem*.: PG 44, 101A 14-15 (see Alexandre, op. cit., 182). (7) The soul is the cause of the life of the living being, *De hom. opif.*: PG 44, 236 D 8; cf. Aristotle, *De an*. 415b 8 (Cavarnos, op. cit., p. 65). (8): The Aristotelian distinction between vegetative, sensitive and intellectual life (see, e.g., *De an*. II 415a 17; *Et. Nic*. I 1098a 1-2) is also present in Gregory (*De hom. opif.*: PG 44, 144D 11–145A 9 (Cavarnos, op. cit., 73-74). (9) The definition of demonstration (*Contr. Eun*. I: Jaeger I 90,11-14) goes back in the last analysis to Aristotle: Jaeger, app., 90, refers to *An. Post*. I 71a 1; *Met*. Z 1029b 3-12 (but it should be noted that very similar definitions are found in the so-called book VIII of Clement's *Stromata;* cf. S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria,* 132, with relative observations). On Gregory's dependence on Aristotle in his use of method, see also Mühlenberg, *Die philos. Bildung,* 234. (10) The pleasure experienced in learning increases still further the desire to learn (*In cant. cant*. I: 31,6-8): H. Langerbeck (app., 31) rightly refers to Aristotle, *Eth. Nic*. VII; 1153a 22-23. (11) The importance Gregory attributes to the προαίρεσις (*In cant. cant*. II [50,8-9]) is brought out by Langerbeck (app., 50) to *Eth. Nic*. III, 7: see above, Origen n. 15. (12) Gregory affirms the impossibility of virtue and vice coexisting simultaneously in the same subject (*In cant. cant*. IV [103,5-8]): Langerbeck (app., 103) refers to *Met*. Γ 1011b 15-22. (13) The doctrine of contraries, according to which the absence of a particular property results in the presence of its contrary, is found in Gregory, *In cant. cant*. IV (103, 13-14): on its Aristotelian origin (*Met*. Z 1032b 3) see Langerbeck, app., 103. (14) Virtue is voluntary, free and not subject to constraints (*In cant. cant*. V [160,17-161,1]): Langerbeck (app., 161) refers us to *Eth. Nic*. III 1113b 3-5; *Et. Eud*. II 1222b 14. (15) H. Langerbeck notes the respective dependence of *In cant. cant*. III (79,1-3) and IV (111, 7-10) on *Hist. anim*. 613a 14 and 609b 21ff.: see app. 79 and 111. (16) The difference between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις specified in the brief treastise passed down as *Ep*. 38 in Basil's correspondence, but in fact composed by Gregory of Nyssa, as shown by Hübner (*Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. Ep. 38 des Basilius*, in *Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 463-490)—see esp. *Ep*. 38, 2-3: Courtonne I, 81,1–84,47—is to be referred to the Aristotelian-Peripatetic doctrine of the πρώτη and δευτέρα οὐσία present in *Cat*. 2a 11-19, 2b 7-10. While the abstract οὐσία neither increases nor decreases (*Cat*. 3b 33-39, 4a 1-3), is general in scope (*Ep*. 38, 2: Courtonne 81,1-4) and corresponds fully to the genus (γένος) of the δευτέρα οὐσία (*Cat*. 2a 16-17, 2b 7-8), the ὑπόστασις, which designates a quite specific reality (*Ep*. 38, 2: Courtonne 82, 17-19; *Ep*. 38, 3: Courtonne 82,8–83,12), is, in a certain sense, comparable to the species (*eidos*) of the δευτέρα οὐσία (Cat. 2a 14-16, 2b 7) but must be more properly referred to the πρώτη οὐσία, which represents the full expression of an individual reality (*Cat*. 2a 11-14—cf. Hübner, op. cit., 469-479, 484, taken up again by Lilla in *Storia della Teologia*, I, 285—where one nonetheless reads: "The *ousia* corresponds to the genus of the *deutera ousía*; the *hypostasis*, on the other hand, corresponds to the *prōte ousia* and to the species [εἶδος] of the *deutera ousia*"). According to Hübner, op. cit., 470, for this purpose Gregory must have used some scholastic manual of logic rather than Aristotle's text itself and perhaps even Porphyry's *Isagoge.* (17) Like Basil (see above), Gregory also denies that the Father's lack of generation pertains to his essence (*Contra Eunom*. I [214,21-25], II [405,3-4, 406,3-5], where Basil is cited explicitly [*Contra Eunom*. I, 15: SC 299.226, 27-28; see Lilla, op. cit., 293, n. 254]). Gregory also specifies that the association of the Father with the cause and the Son with the effect is an indicator, not of a difference of nature, but only of

mode of existence: the substance (οὐσία) must be distinguished from the mode (πῶς) (*Quod non sint tres dei* 56, 1, 11-17, 19-22; see Lilla, op. cit., 293, n. 255). Here also we have a Peripatetic doctrine: the mode (πῶς) regards not the substance (οὐσία) but the accident (συμβεβηκός) (see Porphyry, *Isag.* 3,18-19; 17,11-12; 21,10 and *above* regarding Basil).

*Gregory of Nazianzus renews the usual criticisms against Aristotle regarding his views on providence, the soul and a "too human" morality (*Or.* 27: PG 36, 24C1-2, see Festugière, op. cit., 260); at the same time he applies to God the Aristotelian doctrine—already noted in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa—of unknowability as a direct effect of infinity (*Or.* 38,7: PG 36, 317B9-10, C13–D1). E. Bignone (RFIC n.s. 14 [1936] 227-230) sees in *Or.* 40 echoes of Aristotle's *Protrepticus:* he esp. calls attention to passages in ch. 5 (PG 36, 364C1-5) relating to the derivation of the term "man" from "light" (see above, on Clement's *Paedagogus*); in ch. 13 (PG 36, 376A1-8) regarding the superiority of the soul vis-à-vis the body; in ch. 17 (PG 36, 380CD) exhorting both young and old to baptism.

*Nemesius of Emesa, in ch. 2 of the *De natura hominis* (PG 40, 537A 6-8; Matthaei 68, 10-11), first mentions the Aristotelian definition of the soul as ἐντελέχεια of the body(*De an.* II 412a 27-28, b 5-6), together with other philosophers' opinions on the soul; then he repeats (PG 40, 560B11–564A5; Matthaei 92,11–96,1)what Aristotle says in *De anima* II, 1 (412a-413a), adding his own critical observations (564A6–565B; Matthaei 96,1–98,14) and rejecting the Aristotelian definition (565A9-10; Matthaei 98,5-7). In ch. 44 (797A1-6; Matthaei 348,5-9) he mentions and criticizes the Aristotelian conception of providence. In chs. 29-34 (Matthaei 263-288; PG 40, 717-741) his examination of the concepts of ἑκούσιον, ἀκούσιον, προαίρεσις, βούλευσις and δύναμις is conducted along the lines of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. A detailed examination is not possible here; a study of the sources of this work can be found in W. Jaeger, *Nemesios von Emesa,* Berlin 1914.

Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite also shows traces of Aristotelian doctrines, handed down through Gregory of Nyssa or Neoplatonism: (1) Like Gregory of Nyssa he considers the unknowability of God to be directly dependent on his infinity (*Div. nom.* I, 1 [588A1-9]; I, 2, [588C10-12]): see S. Lilla, JTS n.s. 31 (1980) 101-103. (2) Also like Gregory of Nyssa he identifies God with absolute beauty, desired by all beings (*Div. nom.* IV, 10 [708A 6-7, 11-12]; IV, 4 [700B2-3,4-8]): see above, Gregory of Nyssa, n. 2. (3) In agreement with Aristotelian teaching (*Met.* A 994b 9, Λ 1072 a34-b2) he identifies the οὗ ἕνεκα with the final cause (τέλος) and the first principle (*Div. nom.* V, 10 [825B 2]. (4) In *Div. nom.* IV, 4 [697B 3-4, 146,14-15] he refers to the sky as not increasing nor diminishing and completely changeless (ἀναυξοῦς καὶ ἀμειώτου καὶ ὅλως ἀναλλοιώτου . . . οὐσίας: see Aristotle, *De caelo* 270a13-14, a33-35, b1-2). (5) An echo of the Aristotelian doctrine of contraries is in *Div. nom.* IV, 20 [720C 12-13]: see Aristotle, *Met.* Z 1032 b4-5.

*John Philoponus was a profound Aristotelian scholar, not limiting himself to commenting on his various works but accepting or rejecting various Aristotelian doctrines. It is thus worthwhile to distinguish: (1) Philoponus's activity as a commentator; (2) his unreserved acceptance of the Aristotelian-Peripatetic doctrine of the οὐσία and of the distinction between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια; and (3) his criticism of some theories of Aristotelian physics.

1. Among Philoponus's commentaries on Aristotle, we should mention those on the *Categories,* the *Prior Analytics,* the *Posterior Analytics,* book I of the *Meteorologica,* the *De generatione et corruptione,* the *De anima* and the *Physica;* we have information on a commentary on the *Sophistici elenchi,* whereas a commentary on the *Metaphysica* is spurious (see S. Lilla, in *Patrologia* V, 369-370).

2. Philoponus's *monophysitism and *tritheism, respectively, depend on the reception of the doctrine of the πρώτη and δευτέρα οὐσία and on its application—pushed to its ultimate limits—in the *christological and *trinitarian spheres. If it is true that the general δευτέραι οὐσίαι have only theoretical and abstract existence and can concretely exist only in the πρῶται οὐσίαι, which alone designate single individuals, it is likewise true that with respect to Christology, the most general φύσις—which corresponds to the δευτέρα οὐσία—can subsist only in the individual ὑπόστασις, corresponding to the πρώτη οὐσία. This means that the μία ὑπόστασις of the Son become man is practically identical to his μία φύσις. The μία φύσις of the Son become man is of course the result of the combination of two essences or natures (δευτέραι οὐσίαι or φύσεις), the divine and the human, which nonetheless subsist in it only as δυνάμει and not ἐνεργείᾳ, since they come together in Christ to form a single nature. (For more detail see Lilla, op. cit., 374-376, where the references to Philoponus's *Arbiter* and to Aristotle's *Categories* can be found.) Also because of the impossibility of the existence of the abtract δευτέρα οὐσία outside of the concrete, individual πρώτη οὐσία, the divine οὐσία can concretely exist only in the three divine hypostases which, precisely because divine, can be called "three gods" (for the

various references, see Lilla, op. cit., 378-379).

3. Philoponus's physical theories at times anticipate Renaissance and modern theories, and depart specifically from a detailed criticism of Aristotle. Here we can only mention briefly the theories of the universe as not coeternal with God, impulse and movement, velocity in a vacuum, space as three-dimensional extension, natural motion, matter as created by God and from the beginning provided with three-dimensionality, the ether, the sun, and light (see esp. R. Sorabji, *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, Ithaca, NY 1987, 6-31, taken up and summarized by Lilla, op. cit., 373-374; additional bibliography in Lilla, op. cit., 384-386 §2b).

Appeals to Aristotelian doctrines were made in the 7th and 8th centuries by *Anastasius the Sinaite, *Maximus the Confessor, authors of patristic *florilegia and *John of Damascus. The Aristotelian doctrines are not drawn directly from Aristotle's writings but from commentaries, scholastic compendiums or earlier patristic authors (as, e.g., *Nemesius of Emesa).

Anastasius the Sinaite, in his *Viae dux,* makes extensive use of axioms that go back to Aristotle: we mention here only the definition of ὅρος (PG 89, 52C14-15), which is compared with Aristotle, *Met.* Δ 1039a 19-20; and the identity between φύσις, οὐσία, γένος and μορφή (PG 89, 57A2-3, see *Met.* Δ 1014b35-36, Λ 1070a9-11, *De part. anim.* B 646b1, *De an.* II 412a6-8). The terms κατάφασις and ἀπόφασις (PG 89, 80D, 81A) are also Aristotelian.

Aristotelian doctrines can also be found in Maximus the Confessor: the contraposition established between the function of νοῦς and that of αἴσθησις in *Quaest. ad Thalass.* 58 (PG 90, 596D) and *Cent.* IV (PG 90, 1304C) is compared with Aristotle, *De an.* III 429a16-18. The definitions of βούλησις (*Ad Marinum:* PG 91, 13B 2-3; see Aristotle, *De an.* III 433a 23-24) and προαίρεσις (*Ad Marinum:* PG 91, 16C-D; see *Eth. Nic.* III 1113a 9-11) are also Aristotelian, as is the equivalency between οὐσία and φύσις (*Definit.*: PG 91, 149B), already noted in Anastasius the Sinaite. Moral maxims attributed to Aristotle are cited in the *Loci communes* (see, e.g., PG 91, 817B1, 825D3-6, 872A9-11, 952B5-10). The patristic florilegium known as *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi,* composed in the 7th c. and attributed by its editor F. Diekamp, though only hypothetically, to Anastasius the Sinaite (*Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi*, Münster 1907, LXXXVI-LXXXVII), has Aristotelian material in chs. 6 and 28: in ch. 6 (Diekamp 35-47) the equivalency between φύσις and οὐσία is asserted (see above regarding Anastasius the Sinaite); in ch. 28 (Diekamp 198-204) the Aristotelian concepts of δύναμις, ἐνέργεια, ἕξις and στέρησις are treated, based on the two Aristotelian commentators Elijah and Stephen.

In his *Dialectica* in 68 chapters (ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* I [PTS 7] Berlin 1969; PG 94, 521-676), *John of Damascus makes extensive use of Aristotelian doctrines, esp. those contained in the *Categorie* and *De interpretatione*. As G. Richter has shown (*Die Dialektik des Johannes von Damaskos*, Ettal 1964 [Studia patristica et byzantina 10], 235-242), we cannot speak of a direct knowledge of Aristotle: his most distant sources are the Aristotelian commentators of the Alexandrian school, in particular David, Elijah and Stephen of Alexandria (ibid., 236); his most direct sources are compendiums including Aristotelian material and compiled in a patristic milieu, such as the *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi* (ibid., 238). The Bodleian codex *Auct. T.* 1-6 contains an analogous collection of Aristotelian material, edited by Kotter in the appendix of the first volume of his edition of John of Damascus; its relation to John of Damascus's *Dialectica,* Nemesius of Emesa and Maximus the Confessor have been accurately studied by G. Richter, op. cit., 23-39.

In the succeeding centuries* Byzantine Aristotelianism underwent a number of revivals with *Photius, Michael Psellus, Michael of Ephesus, George Pachimera, George Scholarius and Leo Magentinus, but these authors are beyond the chronological limits of the present encyclopedia.

For specific bibliography pertaining to the individual arguments, see the references included in the article.

General works: J.L. Stocks, *Aristotelianism*, Oxford 1925; W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, Berlin 1955; W.D. Ross, *Aristotle*, London [5]1956; I. Düring - G.E.L. Owen (eds.), *Aristotle and Plato in the Mid-Fourth Century*, Göteborg 1960; I. Düring, *Aristoteles: Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens*, Heidelberg 1966; P. Moraux (ed.), *Aristoteles in der neueren Forschung*, Darmstadt 1968; Id., *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias* I, Berlin-New York 1973; II, 1984; III, 2001 (It. tr. with preface and introduction by G. Reale and Th. Szlezák, Milan 2000); J. Barnes, *Aristotle: A Bibliography*, Oxford 1977; R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, Ithaca, NY 1990; C. Mueller-Goldingen, *Aristoteles. Eine Einführung in sein philosophisches Werk*, Hildesheim 2003.

S. Lilla

ARIUS – ARIANISM. Alexandrian, born ca. 260, Arius was for a time a disciple of *Lucian of Antioch, or at least in contact with him. At the time of *Peter of Alexandria (300–311) he initially adhered to the

*Melitian *schism, then returned to the Catholic Church. Around 320, as an influential priest in charge of the church of Baukalis, he began to spread his own ideas about the *Trinity, provoking controversy, the intervention of bishop *Alexander, a public debate and finally Arius's condemnation, endorsed some time later by a council of *Egyptian bishops. To this phase of his activities we can refer fragments of the *Thalia* (*Banquet*), an exposition of his doctrine in verse (and in prose?), and two letters to *Eusebius of Nicomedia and Alexander of Alexandria. (Some years later he also sent a profession of faith to *Constantine.) We know his doctrine from these texts and from those of his partisans (*Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Asterius the Sophist, etc.)

Arius's point of departure was the *Origenian trinitarian doctrine traditional to *Alexandria, which considered the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as three *hypostases (i.e., individual subsistent realities) distinct from and subordinate to one another, though participating in one divine nature. He stressed this *subordinationism radically, probably in reaction to *Sabellianism and certain overly materialistic conceptions of the Son's generation from the Father. According to Arius, the Father is a monad, absolutely transcendent in relation to the Son, who is distinctly inferior to him, other than him by nature and by hypostasis: God, yes, but of inferior rank, authority and glory. Whereas Origen, and Alexander after him, asserted the Son's coeternity with the Father—his source ontologically but not chronologically—Arius was convinced that for the Son to be coeternal with the Father he must, like him, be ungenerated. Since there cannot be two ungenerated beings, the Son, though existing before all times and all creation, came after the Father, from whom he derived his being: there was a time when the Son did not exist. Neither did Arius accept the Son's generation from the Father's substance (= nature), since this would imply the division of the divine monad: initially (in a letter to Eusebius) he claimed that the Son was created from nothing by the Father's work; later he avoided this expression as too scandalous, and spoke of the Father's generation of the Son, though he continued to think of this generation as a creation: the Son is the only creature (*ktisma, poiēma*) created directly by the Father, while the whole rest of creation is the direct work of the Son by the Father's will. Arius, who paid little attention to the Holy Spirit, supported his doctrine with a number of passages of Sacred Scripture which, in referring to the Son, use expressions such as *make, create* and the like (Pr 8:22; Acts 2:36; Col 1:15).

Condemned at Alexandria, Arius found supporters in the East outside Egypt in some bishops who had been Lucian's disciples, among them the influential Eusebius of Nicomedia, and in others like *Eusebius of Caesarea who, while not sharing Arius's radical subordiantionism, held an intermediate doctrinal position between him and Alexander. This led to a bitter controversy, which Constantine tried to end through his envoy *Ossius of Cordoba. This mediation failing, he summoned, perhaps on the advice of Ossius and Alexander, an ecumenical council at *Nicaea in Asia Minor in spring 325. Some months before, a local council at *Antioch presided over by Ossius condemned Eusebius of Caesarea and other partisans of Arius. At the Council of Nicaea, which was attended by more than 250 bishops, nearly all from the East, Arius's few supporters were overwhelmed by the coalition of moderate Origenians, led by Alexander, and *monarchians of the Asiatic tradition, led by *Marcellus of Ancyra and *Eustathius of Antioch. A formula of faith was imposed in which the fundamental Arian positions were condemned and the Son was defined as **homoousios* ("of the same substance, consubstantial") with the Father. Almost everyone accepted and subscribed the profession, with the exception of Arius and two Libyan bishops, who were condemned and exiled to Illyria. Soon after, Eusebius of Nicomedia and *Theognis of Nicaea, who continued to support Arius's partisans, were deposed and exiled to *Gaul.

The Nicene *Creed stressed Christ's unity with the Father to the maximum degree: *homoousios,* given the many meanings of **ousia,* could mean that the Son is not only of the same nature as the Father but also of the same *hypostasis,* a claim so contrary to the doctrine of the three hypostases prevalent in the East as to be considered Sabellian. The formula thus met the aspirations of monarchians like Marcellus and Eustathius halfway, but was not agreeable to many others, anti-Arian but also antimonarchian, who had subscribed only because of Constantine's pressure. This discontent favored the reaction of Arius's supporters, esp. when in ca. 328 Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea were recalled from exile and reinstated: Eusebius had influential support in the imperial family, and Constantine himself, convinced that religious peace could be assured only by a broad concentration of moderate elements, was as averse to some of Arius's more radical opponents as he had been to the radicalism of the Arians. Already in 327 a council at Antioch presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea had condemned and deposed Eustathius, for reasons not clear to us but certainly disciplinary rather than doctrinal. He was exiled to *Thrace, and we hear no

more of him. Eusebius of Nicomedia's return from exile intensified this policy, which aimed to remove Arius's best-known opponents through deposition and exile under various accusations but without reopening the doctrinal question. Minor characters like *Asclepas of Gaza and *Lucius of Adrianople were attacked, along with *Athanasius of Alexandria, Alexander's successor since 328, and Marcellus of Ancyra. Athanasius, hard-pressed by the Melitian schismatics, fell prey to their collusion with the pro-Arians headed by the two Eusebiuses and, at the Council of *Tyre in 335, was condemned for violence against the Melitians; Constantine had him exiled to Gaul. Marcellus of Ancyra was accused of *heresy and condemned in 336 at *Constantinople because of his radical monarchianism, which was assailed by Eusebius of Caesarea. Arius, who had returned from exile some time before but had not been admitted to Alexandria, sent a general profession of faith to Constantine and was rehabilitated shortly after Athanasius's condemnation but died before reentering Alexandria. Constantine's death (337) and the division of the empire between *Constans (West) and *Constantius (East) fundamentally altered the political situation, with strong repercussions on the course of the controversy.

At first the bishops exiled in the West, including Athanasius and Marcellus, were authorized to reenter their sees; but Constantius took up a position in favor of Eusebius of Nicomedia and the anti-Nicene (rather than specifically pro-Arian) establishment then dominant, again forcing those bishops to leave their sees and take refuge in the West. Here *Rome, which under Constantine had been denied any chance to interfere in the conflict, sided with the exiles: in fact the Nicene Creed caused no difficulties at Rome, given the traditional Roman sympathies for monarchianism; Athanasius and Marcellus therefore easily convinced Pope *Julius that their Eastern adversaries were all genuine Arians. Accepting this simplistic presentation of the Eastern situation, in 341 a Roman council cleared Athanasius and Marcellus of all charges and accused the Easterners of being Arians. They responded with a council at Antioch later in the same year which rejected the imputation of Arianism, confirmed the condemnation of Arius's radical theses and approved a formally *orthodox formula of faith which ignored the Nicene *homoousios,* reaffirmed the doctrine of the three hypostases and strongly emphasized Christ's divinity.

This formula remained dominant in the East until 357, and Eusebius of Nicomedia assembled a wide front around it, ranging from a traditional Origenian-type orthodoxy to a disguised Arianism. The reaction against Roman encroachment, ill-tolerated in the East, also favored the designs of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who died soon after the Council of 341. The ecumenical Council of *Serdica (now Sofia in Bulgaria) in 343, which Julius had intended to reach an understanding, ended in complete failure, with Easterners and Westerners reciprocally *excommunicating each other; while the former confirmed the Antiochene creed of 341, the Westerners published a document of belief with clear monarchian tendencies, asserting a single hypostasis of Father and Son. A long formulation of faith (*Ekthesis makrostichos*) presented to Constans at *Milan in 345 by an Eastern delegation was not well received; and though in 346 Constantius, pressed by Constans, authorized Athanasius to return to Alexandria, where he was triumphantly received, the situation remained static both politically and doctrinally. It was reopened when, following the murder of Constans (350) and the defeat of the usurper Maximus (351), Constantius reunited the whole empire under himself and thought to unify it religiously as well as politically. Councils held at *Arles (353), Milan (355) and *Béziers (356) compelled the Western episcopate to condemn Athanasius, with the exception of a few bishops who were deposed and exiled (*Eusebius of Vercelli, *Lucifer of Cagliari, *Hilary of Poitiers and some others): even Pope *Liberius, who protested these decisions, was exiled to *Thrace; in early 356 Athanasius was forced to abandon Alexandria and find refuge among the *monks of the desert. Meanwhile, ca. 355, doctrinal activity was resumed: while Athanasius reintroduced the Nicene *homoousios* as a distinctive term of Catholic belief in Christ's perfect divinity and his equality and unity with the Father, *Aetius and then Eunomius, protected by *Eudoxius of Antioch, systematically proposed the thesis of radical Arianism, earning the name *anomoians since they considered the Son unlike (*anomoios*) the Father. In their judgment the Father, being ungenerated, is the only supreme God, while the Son, not participating in this prerogative, is extraneous to him by nature and radically inferior, a minor god created by the Father to provide for the creation of the world.

As a result of these events, in 357 *Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum and *Germinius of Sirmium, pro-Arian Illyrian bishops and inspirers of Constantius's religious policy, met at *Sirmium with a few others and published a formula of faith that, without clearly asserting the anomoian theses, passed over them in silence and instead proscribed the use of *homoousios* (and of **homoiousios,* a term

then starting to be discussed), in a doctrinal context that stressed the Son's inferiority and thus denied his unity with the Father. This formula (*blasphemia Sirmiensis*) aroused violent reactions in both West and East. In fact many bishops, esp. those of Asia Minor, worried by the resurgence of radical Arianism in its anomoian dress, were already seeking a middle way between this doctrine and that of the Nicene *homoousios,* which they considered Sabellian. In spring 358 a small council at Ancyra published a long synodal letter under the names of *Basil of Ancyra, Marcellus's successor, and *George of Laodicea, affirming the Son to be coeternal with the Father, really generated by him and therefore fully God; they defined him as *homoiousios,* i.e., like the Father according to substance (*ousia*), thinking that this formula avoided the risk of Sabellianism which they saw in the *homoousios,* and safeguarded the full divinity of the Son. The homoiousian reaction had immediate success with Constantius, who was also worried by anomoian propaganda: a small council at Sirmium (358), where the emperor was then residing, sanctioned the Antiochene formula of 341, interpreted in the light of homoiousian theology, and deposed many pro-Arian bishops, including Eudoxius; for his part the emperor decided to summon a new ecumenical council to bring definitive peace to Christianity. After various uncertainties, this council was called for summer 359: the Westerners were to meet at *Rimini, the Easterners at Seleucia in Caria. Constantius, meanwhile, distanced himself even from Basil and supported a group of Eastern bishops, incl. *Mark of Arethusa and *Acacius of Caesarea, who sought a more neutral formula of faith around which to gather assent from various directions.

Thus at Sirmium, 22 May 359, a new formula of faith was published which was to serve as a basis for the work of the impending councils: the term *ousia* was proscribed and the Son defined in general terms as like the Father in everything and according to the Scriptures. (The defenders of this formula are known as *homoians, from *homoios,* "like.") The Council of *Seleucia opened on 27 September 359: after a few days of bitter discussion the homoiousians prevailed and again imposed the Antiochene formula of 341 on a homoian and pro-Arian minority led by Acacius and Eudoxius, who had proposed a formula like that of Sirmium a few months before.

The Council of Rimini, on the other hand, opened at the end of May with an initial preponderance of supporters of the Nicene *homoousios,* still greatly in vogue in the West. Despite this, long and confused events inspired by Valens and Ursacius and favored by the emperor resulted in the council approving a formula of faith that defined the Son as like the Father according to the Scriptures, and proscribed as unscriptural the use of *ousia* in doctrinal contexts. All of the bishops present at Rimini were forced to subscribe to this formula. It was confirmed by a new council held at Constantinople early in 360, which saw the deposition and exile of all the main homoiousian proponents and the triumph of Acacius and Eudoxius. Shortly thereafter Eudoxius was transferred to Constantinople and replaced at Antioch by *Meletius, a friend of Acacius. The radical Arians (anomoians) were also attacked in a show of the winning party wishing to distance itself from any extremism, whether Arian or anti-Arian. The imprecision of the formula of Rimini meant that it could be approved in part by everyone, but it took no account of the theological intrigue that had taken place on all sides during those years: its fortunes were tied to those of Constantius, and he died soon afterward, in 362.

Constantius's successor *Julian, being a *pagan, had no interest in the dispute, so he recalled all those whom Constantius had exiled for religious reasons. While this measure gave the anomoians freedom of action, it also gave it to the anti-Arians, both homoousian and homoiousian, the latter being much stronger than the former. In the West, where the Arians were very weak and the anti-Arians strong and united in observance of the Nicene faith, the reaction began in Gaul under Hilary's leadership and quickly prevailed everywhere, helped by the moderate measures taken against the many bishops who had yielded to pressure at Rimini: they were required only to subscribe to the Nicene formula and condemn Arianism.

*Valentinian I, emperor from 364, was not interested in the religious aspect of the controversy, which made it possible for the Arians to keep several positions they had already acquired. At Milan, e.g., the Arian *Auxentius remained bishop until his death (374), despite an attempt by Hilary to expel him (364): his successor, however, was the Nicene *Ambrose. Similarly, upon *Germinius of Sirmium's death (376), Ambrose imposed Anaemius, another Nicene, as his successor. At this time in the West the Arians controlled only a few Illyrian sees.

In the East things went differently, not so much because the Arians were stronger (though divided between moderates, with Eudoxius and *Euzoius, and radicals, with Eunomius), but above all because the anti-Arians were even more divided. In 362 Athanasius called a council at Alexandria which, as Hilary had done, approved moderate measures against the

many who had yielded to the Arians through fear or political interests, and again proposed the Nicene *homoousios* as a formula of faith around which to unite all the anti-Arians. In 363 a small group of homoiousians and homoians, meeting at Antioch around Meletius, subscribed to the Nicene formula but interpreted *homoousios* in the sense of *homoiousios*. But the anti-Arians at Antioch were divided into two communities: a small group of Nicenes led by *Paulinus were opposed by a more numerous community with homoiousian or at least more moderate leanings, led by Meletius. He had connections with Acacius and circles still hostile to Athanasius, and despite the acceptance of the *homoousios,* he avoided any settlement with the Alexandrian bishop, who consequently entered into communion only with Paulinus's small Nicene community. This aggravated the schism of Antioch, since the West followed Athanasius's example and favored Paulinus, while the whole of the East except Egypt stood firm for Meletius.

The divisions among the anti-Arians were complicated by the rise, ca. 360, of the question of the Holy Spirit: the problems previously limited to the Father/Christ relationship were gradually extended to this as well. Homoousians and anomoians had no doubts: the former considered the Holy Spirit *homoousion* with the Father and the Son, God with them, equal in power and dignity; the latter considered the Holy Spirit inferior to both Father and Son, not God but a creature. The homoiousians, however, found themselves in difficulties: many of them did not consider the Holy Spirit to be God in the same way as the Father and the Son, but didn't know how to define it; others considered the Spirit only a creature: these were initially called **pneumatomachi* and then *Macedonians from Macedonius, a homoiousian who was bishop of Constantinople ca. 360 and whose connection with the question of the Holy Spirit remains obscure. This politico-religious picture was further complicated by a number of personal questions. Faced with the situation, Valentinian's brother *Valens—who took command in the East in 364—partly influenced by Eudoxius, took a stand in favor of the moderate Arians and was merciless, with new depositions and exiles, toward homoousians and homoiousians: Meletius and Athanasius were both banished from their sees. The homoiousians, who at Lampsacus in 364 had reaffirmed the Antioch formula of 341 and were especially targeted by Valens's measures, sent a delegation to Rome to seek help and solidarity from Pope *Liberius, but he would not receive them into communion until they subscribed to the Nicene Creed (365/366). A council of homoiousians at Tyana in *Cappadocia in 366 ratified the delegation's actions, but a group of them disagreed: meeting at Antioch in Caria, they rejected the *homoousios* and once more reasserted the Creed of Antioch of 341.

This confused situation began to clarify between 370–378 thanks to the work of *Basil of Caesarea in Cappadocia. On the political level he sought to reunite all the Easterners around Meletius: for this he risked a falling out with the West, where Pope *Damasus and Ambrose supported Paulinus. On the doctrinal level he sought a conciliatory formula between the Nicene *homoousios* and the trinitarian doctrine of the three *hypostases,* assuming *ousia* ("substance") to mean the substance or divine nature common to the three subsistent and mutually distinct hypostases. Thus, one *ousia* and three *hypostases:* this formula, parallel to the Western formula of "one divine nature (or substance) in three persons," prevailed at the Council of Constantinople of 381, when the accession of the Nicenes *Gratian and *Theodosius I to the leadership of the empire resulted in the triumph everywhere of the Nicene faith, supplemented in the Creed of Constantinople by a clause on the divinity of the Holy Spirit and accepted in the East according to the Basilian interpretation. In the East, tenacious conventicles of Arians, though divided among themselves, remained active beyond the mid-5th c. but presented no real problem. In the West, however, where the Council of Aquileia of 381 seemed to have liquidated the remains of Arianism, it took on renewed vigor with the barbarian invasions. The Christian *Goth Ulfilas had spread the Christian faith among them in the form of radical Arianism, and they sought to preserve this faith as a distinctive mark of their nationality when they installed themselves as rulers of the West. At the same time, in the late 4th c. and the first decades of the 5th, we witness a flowering of Arian Latin literature and exegesis (*Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum, Tractatus in Lucam* etc.), tending to radicalism. The impact of the Arian invaders on the Catholics was particularly violent in the *Vandal invasion of Africa, where Catholics were persecuted, at times ferociously, under *Genseric (428–477), *Huneric (477–484) and Thrasamund (496–523); elsewhere the relationship was much less violent. But the final conversion of all the barbarians to Catholicism did not come about until the end of the 6th c. (and even later for the *Longobards).

CPG II, 2025-2042 (writings on Arius): H.G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*, Berlin 1934; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur S. Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936; E. Boularand, *L'hérésie d'Arius et la foi de Nicée* I-II, Paris 1972-1973; *Alessandro e Ario: un esempio di conflitto tra fede e ideologia. Documenti della prima controversia ariana*, It. tr. ed. E.

Bellini, Milan 1974; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; R. Lorenz, *Arius judaizans? Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius*, Göttingen 1979; M.L. West, *The Metre of Arius' Thalia*: JTS 33 (1982) 98-105; H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius*, II, *Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin-New York 1984; M. Simonetti, *Ancora sulla datazione della* Thalia *di Ario*: SSR 4 (1984) 349-354; W.A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien: Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Bonn 1986; R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987, ^{2}2001: contains an appendix surveying studies since 1987; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988; A. Martin, *Les relations entre Arius et Melitios dans la tradition alexandrine. Une histoire polémique*: JTS 40 (1989) 401-413; A.M. Ritter, *Arius redivivus? Ein Jahrzwölf Arianismusforschung*: Theologische Rundschau 55 (1990) 153-187, bibliography of recent works on Arius; B.M. Palumbo Stracca, *Metro ionico per l'eresia di Ario*: Orpheus n.s. 12 (1990) 65-83; L. Perrone, *Da Nicea (325) a Calcedonia (451). I primi quattro concili ecumenici: istituzioni, dottrine, processi di ricezione*, in G. Alberigo (ed.), *Storia dei Concili Ecumenici*, Brescia 1990, 19-45; K. Metzler, *Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der "Thalia" des Arius (mit einer Neuedition wichtiger Bezeugnungen bei Athanasius)*, in K. Metzler - F. Simon, *Ariana et Athanasiana: Studien zur Überlieferung und zu philologischen Problemen der Werke des Athanasius von Alexandrien*, 1991, 11-45; A. Pardini, *Citazioni letterali dalla* ΘΑΛΕΙΑ *in Atanasio, Ar. I,5-6*: Orpheus n.s. 12 (1991) 411-428; M.R. Barnes - D.H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth-Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, Edinburgh 1993; R.D. Williams, *Arius, Arianismus*: LTK^{3} 1, 981-989; G.Ch. Stead, *Arius in Modern Research*: JTS 45 (1994) 24-36; M.F. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*, Oxford 1996; M. Simonetti, *Teologia e cristologia dell'Egitto cristiano*, in A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo antica*, Rome 1997, 11-38; H.C. Brennecke, *Arius/Arianism*: RGG^{4}, I, Tübingen 1998, 738-743; G.F. Hernández, *El Sinodo de Alejandría (ca. 320) y sus consecuencias*: Cathaginensia 14 (1998) 403-405; G.C. Stead, *Philosophy in Origen and Arius*: *Origeniana Septima*, Louvain 1999, 101-108; H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen 1999; A. Camplani, *Studi atanasiani: gli* Athanasius Werke, *le ricerche sulla* Thalia *e nuovi sussidi bibliografici*: Adamantius 7 (2001) 115-131.

M. Simonetti

ARLES

I. The city - II. Christian origins - III. The church of Arles - IV. The primacy of Arles - V. Councils.

I. The city. Arles (*Theline, Arelate, Arelatensis Urbs*) was established at the crossing of the Rhone by the E-W road called Via Aurelia on the Italian side and Via Domitia on the Spanish side. The ancient and medieval town of Arles arose on a small limestone hill (23 m. above sea level) on the left bank of the main branch of the Rhone (the *Grand Rhône*). The oldest evidence concerning the town is from the 6th c. BC. From the 2nd c. BC, the Rhone's course seems to have been controlled (or split into a canal) in such a way as to allow the site to develop its double role as a maritime and river port. At Caesar's initiative, in 46 BC Nero Tiberius established a colony of veterans there; a surrounding wall was built at that time, now only minimally identified. Only the city center seems to have had an orthogonal urban plan, whereas later extensions included areas beyond the Rhone on the right bank in the Trinquetaille quarter (a medieval name). *Augustus made it a great commercial city, its importance confirmed by the associations of riverboatmen (*nautae Druentici, utricularii corporati Arelatenses, nautae Atrici et Ovidis*) and sailors (*navicularii marini Arel.*). This importance was ratified by *Constantine, who established a mint there in 313 (which continued in operation through the 5th c.) prior to that of Ostia, and by his successors; from 328 it was called *Constantina. From the late 4th c., certainly from 418, the see of the Praetorian Prefecture of the *Gauls was moved there from *Trier. Ausonius called it *Arelate Gallula Roma*. Arles later became *Visigoth (476–480), and *Ostrogoth with *Theodoric (508); it was besieged by the Franks, who conquered it only in 536, with the whole of Provence.

II. Christian origins. Legends of the evangelization of Arles arose in the 5th c., linked to the apostolate of St. *Trophimus, claimed by unreliable legends to be a disciple of St. Peter, and during the 11th c., in connection with the saints of Bethany (Mary Magdalene, Martha and Lazarus), a *Life* (BHL 5488/5492) of whom places Magdalene's tomb at Arles. These legends reflect later beliefs.

The reality is quite different. It is possible that Trophimus was the city's first bishop (first half 3rd c.) and that St. *Genesius was *martyred there 25 August 250. It is certain, on the other hand, that there were some *apostates at Arles during the persecution of *Decius (250), since Bishop *Marcian (the city's first trustworthily attested bishop, accused of *Novatianism by *Cyprian of Carthage) refused them reconciliation (Cypr., *Ep.* 68,1 and 5). The church of Arles enters history with him.

III. The church of Arles. The names of the bishops are known with gaps for the 4th c., and systematically from the 5th to 8th c. (beginning from Bishop *Patroclus [412–426]): the list was compiled by J.-R. Palanque. The importance of the local church is demonstrated by the wealth of literary sources and by urban and suburban archaeological evidence, including the famous *cemeteries of the Alyscamps and Trinquetaille, which have yielded the richest

collection of Christian *sarcophagi in the West, after Rome. The city's first cathedral (4th c.), in the tower quarter called "of the Nuns" (*des Mourgues*), has been under excavation (2003). It was moved, probably by Bishop *Hilary (d. 449), near the law courts to the site of the present cathedral, now dedicated to St. Trophimus but originally established as the *basilica beati ac primi martyris Stephani*. The primitive cathedral was converted into a woman's *monastery by the celebrated bishop *Caesarius (500–543), who put his sister *Caesaria in charge of the community. Caesarius attached a monastic cell and a house for the sick to the new cathedral. The life of the Christian community has been reconstructed based on the sermons of St. Caesarius and monastic life based on the rules he drew up (*Regula ss. virginum,* 523; *Recapitulatio,* 534; *Regula ad monachos,* undated). Information on Christian worship and the saints is available from the same sermons, from the *Passio s. Genesii* (BHL 3304/5) and from the lives of Sts. Hilary (BHL 3882) and Caesarius (BHL 1508-1509). Including churches and monasteries, the sources attest eight Christian sanctuaries within the urban zone and four outside the walls.

IV. The primacy of Arles. Arles owed its eminent role among the churches of *Gaul to Constantine, who called a council there in 314 to put an end to the *Donatist problem in *Africa. Bishops from the Gauls, Brittany, Spain, Italy, Dalmatia and Africa participated, also discussing the date of Easter, **traditores,* letters of ecclesiastical communion (*litterae formatae*), the ministry of deacons, excommunication and ordinations. Struggling with Vienne for the primacy of *Viennensis,* after the execution of the heresiarch *Priscillian, Arles also took a position in the Felician *schism within the Gallic church, which was ended not by the Council of *Nîmes (394) but by that of *Turin (398). Having failed to obtain the primacy, the bishop of Arles saw Pope *Zosimus (417) confer on him metropolitan rights over the old Narbonensis and a certain authority over the churches of Gaul. Subsequent popes did not renew the latter privilege, and Hilary (430–449) had difficulties with Rome because he wanted to retain it. It was renewed for St. Caesarius (502–542) by Pope *Symmachus, however, who conferred on him the *pallium* and the apostolic delegacy for Gaul, and the Roman dalmatic on his deacons (514)—privileges renewed by *Vigilius, *Pelagius and *Gregory the Great. With the Arab invasion (711–732) Arles began to decline, as it entered the Middle Ages.

DACL 1,2889-2916; L.A. Constans, *Arles*, Paris 1928; J. Hubert, *La topographie religieuse d'Arles à l'époque paléochrétienne*: CArch 2 (1947) 17-27; J.H. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France During the Sixth Century*, Rome 1950; F. Benoît, *Topographie monastique d'Arles au VIe s.*, Étud. mérov-ing., Paris 1953, 13-17; var. aus., *Villes épiscopales de Provence*, Aix 1954; J.-R. Palanque, *Le diocèse d'Aix-en-Provence*, Paris 1975 (covers the history of the diocese until its suppression in 1790). An important monograph is included in the "Collection" of the Ecole Française de Rome, ed. M. Heijmans—a doctoral dissertation presented at the University of Aix-en-Provence in 1997: Duplex Arelas. *Topographie historique de la ville d'Arles et de ses faubourgs de la fin du IIIe jusqu'au IXe siècle*. We refer also to the most recently published texts, which contain the whole bibliography of the last few decades: P.-A. Février, *Arles, Topographie Chrétienne des Cités de la Gaule*, III, *Provinces Ecclésiastiques de Vienne et d'Arles* (*Viennensis et Alpes Graiae et Poeninae*), Paris 1986, 72-84; M. Heijmans, *La topographie de la ville d'Arles durant l'antiquité tardive*: Journal of Roman Archaeology 12 (1999) 142-167; J. Guyon - M. Heijmans (eds.), *D'un monde à l'autre. Naissance d'une chrétienté en Provence* (*IVe-VIe siècle*), *Catalogue de l'exposition*, Arles 2001; J. Guyon - A. Jegouzo, *Les premiers chrétiens en Provence. Guide archéologique*, Luçon 2001.

P. Pergola - V. Saxer

V. Councils. A great number of Western bishops, convened expressly by Emperor *Constantine, met at Arles on 1 August 314 under the presidency of Chrestus of *Syracuse to reexamine the *Donatist question. *Caecilian of Carthage and his accusers were present; the latter were unable to prove their accusations. The Council of Arles fully endorsed the decisions of the Council of *Rome of 313 (Hfl-Lecl 1,272), recognized Caecilian's innocence and condemned or deposed his accusers.

In addition to the Donatist question, this council ruled on various important disciplinary points. To facilitate the celebration of Easter on the same date, the council recommended that the pope fix a single date for all of Christendom (can. 1). Regarding the *baptism of *heretics, they preferred the Roman position to the African one formerly defended by *Cyprian in his controversy with Pope *Stephen I (can. 9) and then taken up by the Donatists. Against the latter, the council declared ordinations conferred by *traditores* to be valid (can. 14).

Other rulings regarded the duties of clergy, who were forbidden to change churches (cans. 2 and 21) under penalty of deposition; they were also forbidden to make loans at interest (can. 13).

The Fathers deposed *traditor* clerics (can. 14), forcibly reduced the pretensions of the Roman deacons (can. 18), and requested eucharistic hospitality for bishops on their way to Rome (can. 19). They made the presence of seven, or at least three, bishops mandatory for episcopal consecration (can. 20), and forbade deacons to celebrate the *Eucharist (can. 16).

Regarding the laity, Christians were forbidden to exercise the professions of charioteer (can. 4) or actor (can. 5), or to exercise municipal or public functions without the permission of the bishop (can. 7). Those who refused or deserted military service were threatened with excommunication (can. 3).

Finally, the Council of Arles specified the conditions for admission to the *catechumenate at the point of death (can. 6), and for the reconciliation of apostates (can. 22). It regulated the use of letters of communion (can. 10) and recommended young abandoned husbands not to remarry as long as the adulterous spouse was alive (can. 11).

Because of the variety of the questions addressed, this council provides an excellent view of the pastoral and disciplinary problems of the church on the morrow of the peace of Constantine. Many of the council's decisions were renewed by the Council of *Nicaea.

CCL 148,3-25; Turner: EOMIA 1, 371-416; Hfl-Lecl 1,275-298; Gaudemet, SC 241, 35-67; Palazzini 1,83; J. O'Donnell, *The Canons of the First Council of Arles, 314 A.D.*, Washington 1961; A. Méhat, *Le Concile d'Arles (314) et les Bagaudes:* RSR 63 (1989) 47-70; F. Ruggiero, *Su un aspetto della controversia donatista al I Concilio Arelatense: il Canone 3 e la Militia dei cristiani*, in *I Concili della Cristianità occidentale (secoli III-V)*. XXX incontro di studiosi dell'antiquity cristiana (Rome 3-5 May 2001), SEA 78, Rome 2002, 363-377; M. Paternoster, *Il contributo del Concilio di Arles nello sviluppo della dottrina sul battesimo degli eretici*, *ibid.*, 379-391.

In 353, pressed by the emperor *Constantius, a large number of bishops met in council at Arles and subscribed the condemnation of *Athanasius. Only *Paulinus of Trier dissented.

CCL 148, 30; Hfl-Lecl 1, 869-870; Gaudemet, SC 241, 81-83; Palazzini 1, 83-84.

Several canonical collections entitled "II Council of Arles" hand down some 50 canons taken from various councils, specifically those of Arles (314), Nicaea (325), *Orange (441) and *Vaison (442). It is apparently a private collection composed between 442–506 for some bishops dependent on the *metropolitan of Arles.

CCL 148, 111-130; Hefl-Lecl 2, 460-476.

Between 449 and 461, a council presided over by Bishop Ravennius was celebrated at Arles to settle the dispute between the *monastery of *Lérins and Bishop Theodore of Fréjus.

CCL 148, 131-134; Hfl-Lecl 2, 886-887; Palazzini 1, 84-85.

In ca. 463, by the order of Pope *Hilarus, *Leontius of Arles called a council at Arles to examine the question of the irregular ordination for the bishopric of Die made by Archbishop Mamertus of Vienna.

Jaffé 556-559; Hfl-Lecl 2, 901-902; Palazzini 1, 85.

In ca. 470–475 some 30 bishops met at Arles under the presidency of Bishop Leontius and condemned the *predestinationist error professed by the priest *Lucidus.

CCL 148, 159-160; Hfl-Lecl 2, 908-911; E. Griffe II, 231; Palazzini 1, 85-86.

Ch. Munier - G. Pilara

ARMENIA

I. Christian origins - II. Architecture - III. Sculpture and painting.

I. Christian origins. The oldest Christian sources attribute the evangelization of Armenia more or less to the 2nd c., under the impetus of the dynasty of *Edessa: the apostle Thaddaeus—or rather *Addai, a Syrian disciple sent to Edessa to cure *Abgar—is said to have evangelized S Armenia, *Bartholomew the N: in any case, ca. 200, numerous Christian *foyers* are recorded in the region, as *Tertullian attests (*Adv. Jud.* 7,4). The first evangelizers thus came from *Syria, a fact that explains the derivation of part of the Armenian *liturgy from that of the Syrian, even to the use of the same terminology. The definitive conversion of Armenia, according to the first Armenian historians, was the work of St. *Gregory the Illuminator (Grigor Lousaworič, d. 325) during the reign of Tiridates III (252–330). Some useful information on this is contained in the *Life* of St. Gregory, of which we have numerous redactions—the most important are the so-called Armenian *Agathangelos and Greek Agathangelos; see G. Garitte, *Documents*: these sources, esp. the so-called *Historia Agathangeli* and *Vita Gregorii,* also provide precise information on the Armenian baptismal liturgy which, as Winkler has recently clarified (*The Oldest Armenian Sources,* 38-41) was partly modeled on the *Syriac liturgy.

Later *Caesarea of *Cappadocia, the city where Gregory settled after having been ordained bishop by *Leontius there, became the major pole of attaction of the Armenian church, whose bishops long continued to be appointed by its metropolitan: *Nersetes, e.g., was ordained by the famous *Eusebius, with magnificent ceremonies (see *Faustus of Byzantium, *Bibliothèque Historique* IV, 4, in V. Langlois, *Collection*, I, 238ff.), and organized the Armenian church on the model of the Cappadocian. This

period coincides with the division of the country (387) between Romans and *Sassanids, and broadly with the episcopate of St. *Sahak the Great (d. 439), a relative of St. Gregory the Illuminator. During the same period—ca. the beginning of the 5th c.—the Armenian alphabet was created by *Mesrob, showing an influence of Persian, Greek, Syriac, Hebrew etc., a fact which reflects the region's geopolitical situation, contested between Parthians and Romans, Romans and Sassanids, Byzantines and Arabs. The influence of all of these peoples emerges from an analysis of Armenian artistic culture: the impact of these multiple linguistic contributions led gradually, and with a precise logic, to the full formulation of a genuinely Armenian artistic language, well differentiated from the contemporaneous *Byzantine culture. This can be partly imputed to the situation of the Armenian church, separated from the Byzantine by its declared opposition to the Council of *Chalcedon, made official from 491 (Council of *Vagharshapat) and confirmed by the Council of *Dvin in 527 (date disputed). The situation started to change in the 7th c., esp. from the time of *Heraclius, a period which saw a temporary rapprochement with the Greek church: under Arab rule there were numerous attempts at reconciliation, all short-lived. At the same time Armenia saw a multiplication of *heresies, including the so-called *Paulician, which may have exercised an influence on *baptism in Armenia. The difficult period ended in the 9th c. with the accession of the Bagratid dynasty: although relations between the Armenian and Greek churches were still difficult, medieval Armenia was born out of this context.

II. Architecture. In this melting pot of cultures in continual osmosis, the unifying and distinguishing element—Armenian architecture—consisted of a powerful wall structure: a curtain of squared blocks filled with rubble composed of tufaceous material and mortar (also used for roofing), which conditioned specific choices, both theoretical and formal. The origin of this structure, once attributed to Syria—in fact the systems are antithetical—is local Urartian (see F. de' Maffei, *Rapporti,* 275-286). We should also point out that Armenian buildings have no substructure, but rise on a stepped platform. This constitutes a solid belt of foundations: an architecture thus conceived lacks the column as a load-bearing element, for obvious reasons; it is always replaced by the pillar. The dimensions of buildings were in general rather limited, defined by a compact disposition of masses, one of the peculiarities of Armenian architecture. The few openings provide little light; there is no *matroneum* or atrium. Even the narthex, a characteristic element of "early Christian" architecture, is unheard of in Armenian religious architecture; rather, in the Middle Ages there appears the *gavit,* a sort of small domed portico in front of the façade, limited to the entrance area, whose functions have not yet been sufficiently clarified.

The sources contain information on the oldest Armenian buildings: the martyria built on the place of *martyrdom of Sts. Gaiane and Rhipsime and a church, probably episcopal, at Vagharshapat, whose plan, according to Agathangelos, Christ suggested to Gregory the Illuminator in a dream (early 4th c.). Khatchatrian has dated to the second half of the 4th c. some funerary complexes divided into three elements—cells, hypogeum and stele—as, e.g., the mausoleum of Aghtz: a distant Syrian model has been identified with such complexes, though the Armenian solutions have worked out their own linguistic code which differs from that of the prototypes. Surviving evidence for this period is extremely rare: single-aisled buildings of limited dimensions, some of them published by Gandolfo (*Chiese e cappelle armene*); to such buildings at a later date, usually around the 6th c., a small apsed room was added along the S side (see village church of Garni), whose liturgical functions are still obscure—perhaps functions relating to baptism. Gandolfo has also specified that the common function of such churches was usually martyrial. The most important building of this period was undoubtedly the cathedral of Etchmiadzin—whose present version dates partly from the 5th c.; however, underneath remains have been found belonging to the original 4th-c. building—and with it the three-aisled church of Qassaq, despite the reconstruction carried out in the following century. The same considerations can be advanced for the Church of St. Sergius at Tekor, with three aisles and polygonal apse, whose primitive 4th-c. nucleus was modified several times over the centuries. Foundations attributed to the 5th c. are more common: among them a particular place is occupied by the Church of Ererouk on the Turkish border, three-aisled with apse enclosed in a straight wall and framed by pastophories. Built using the Armenian mural technique, in plan and elevation the basilica shows precise parallels with contemporary Syrian architecture, both in the presence of two rooms near the façade and the so-called Syrian band (which in Syria generally surrounds the entire building like a belt, while in Armenia it emphasizes the openings), and in the pilaster strips that punctuate the outside walls and the small tympanated door-

ways (see Qalb Loze in N Syria, ca. 460). The external porticos, however, belong to the Armenian tradition and are found, e.g., in the more or less contemporary buildings of Dvin cathedral and Tekor, three-aisled with one apse: this plan seems to have been prevalent in the 5th c., as we infer from the analysis of buildings of this period such as the basilica of Tsitsernavank, three-aisled with apse enclosed in a straight wall.

Toward the end of the 5th c. came the use of the oldest dome in Armenia, as the remains of the cathedral of Etchmiadzin tend to demonstrate, specifically the phase of Vahan Mamikonian (post-480); this new tendency in Armenian architecture found expression in the 6th c. with the domed basilicas of Ptghni and Aroutch. The dome, a structure peculiar to the Armenian tradition, is always set over a square bay (an element of probable Sassanid origin; see Sarvistan and Firuzabad) and, at least until the early 7th c., the transition from the square to the circle of the dome is marked by the use of Armenian squinch, Strzygowski's so-called *trischernische,* later replaced by the pendentive. In this period, besides buildings on the basilica plan, variously interpreted and often combined with a dome, a growing number of circular buildings appear, beginning in fact with the cathedral of Etchmiadzin, probably a tetraconch, a floor plan that was particularly popular in Armenia. The so-called domed basilicas of the 6th c. include that of Ptghni near Yerevan, one of the oldest and most complete examples of this type and the prototype of many 9th- and 10th-c. churches. The 6th c. still continued the archaic type of longitudinal three-aisled basilicas, though in limited numbers: e.g., the Tsiranavor (red) basilica of Achtarak, built probably by Catholicos Nersetes II (548–557), and the similar basilica of Eghvard, built by Catholicos Moses of Eghvard (574–603).

At the turn of the 6th and 7th c., the church of Odzoun represents an important step in the evolution of the domed basilica (its dome is set on an octagonal drum) and heralds the more mature buildings of the 7th c.: the greater antiquity of this building is given away partly by the lateral porticos, which no longer appear in buildings of the full 7th c. This was the golden age of Armenian artistic culture which, partly thanks to the pro-Greek *catholicos Nersetes III "the Builder" (641–661), reached high formal levels: at a time when Byzantium, constrained between Arabs and Slavs, was going through perhaps the darkest moment in its history, Armenia marked its apex, esp. in architectural production—more than ever independent of Byzantine tradition—which evolved by exploring and devoloping its own ancient traditions, in a primarily historical perspective and with a "modern" mentality. Armenian artistic culture, esp. its 7th-c. output, should thus be seen as a sort of historical island in the sea of the great crisis that the East and West were both going through at that moment, indeed, the very crisis that marked the transition from the ancient to the medieval world. It was in this period that Armenia's unique lingustic code was elaborated, a code that would constitute the background of medieval artistic manifestations after the crisis that afflicted the region—the scene of many battles between Arabs and Byzantines in the 8th and 9th c. The symbol of this happy period, characterized in architecture by a wide variety of floor plans (e.g., T'alinn cathedral, triconch with dome, the small Greek-cross buildings of Achtarak—the so-called Karmnavor church—St. Stephen at Lmbat etc., the tetraconchs of Mastara, Bagaran and Artik, numerous polygonal buildings and more domed basilicas like Aroutch and Bagavan), is the Church of Zvartnots at Vagharshapat, whose liturgical functions have recently been discussed by Kleinbauer (see *Zvart'nots,* 245-262), who pronounced it a theophanic, not sepulchral, martyrium of St. Gregory, which simultaneously functioned as the palace church of the Armenian catholicos. A tetraconch, with exedras opened by columns—except for the E exedra, surrounded by an ambulatory and with a rectangular room projecting E—the building rises on the spot where, according to legend, the angels (in Armenian *Zvartnots,* the "Watchful Forces") appeared to St. Gregory; built by Nersetes III, it is the point of arrival—and simultaneously the point of departure—of certain Armenian building experiments.

The tetraconchal floor plan was employed in Armenia, where it was particularly popular, from the late 5th c. for Etchmiadzin cathedral: it was probably derived from Syrian architecture, specifically that of N Syria, where this type of building was extremely common (see Apamea, Seleucia Pieria, Aleppo, Resafa, Homs, all episcopal churches). That this floor plan was imported is also demonstrated by the use of columns; for reasons of equilibrium, Armenian buildings always used the pillar: in this case, after repeated collapses the intercolumnar spaces were filled in with masonry. The building has rich bas-relief decorations, sculptures in the pendentives—which appear for the first time in Armenia—probably representing the builders of the church, numerous basket capitals (a Byzantine tradition) with Nersetes's monogram, inner and outer walls modulated by blind arcades on half-columns (probably a Sassanid

motif). The construction of Zvartnots was probably an event of great historical importance, as indeed the sources (Sebeos and Stephen Asołik) attest, so much so that in the same years other similar buildings were begun, such as the churches of Ischchan in Tayk, Nersetes III's birthplace (of which only one conch remains, incorporated into a 10th-c. structure), Bana, dated to the 9th and 10th c. but recently assigned to the age of Nersetes III, Lekit in modern Azerbaijan, and perhaps the "ghost" building of Dvin: still later Zvartnots was the exact prototype for the Church of St. Gregory of Gagik at Ani (late 10th c., confirming the validity of the architectural formulas tried out in the 6th and 7th c., which became the presuppositions of the artistic language of medieval Armenia).

With the dearth of significant discoveries in the area of the artistic and architectural production of early Christian Armenia, the publication of volumes and essays—e.g., those edited by Paul Cuneo in 1988, which include a thorough listing of surviving Armenian monuments from the 4th to the 19th c.—has contributed to a deeper knowledge of Armenia's Late Antique and medieval art, in particular of its architecture and its typological and technical evolution. As is well known, the surviving pictorial evidence from the 4th to the 7th c. is truly sparse, and the sculpture is a function of architecture. In particular, in recent years the origin and development of the "classical" Armenian basilica has been studied—three-aisled with barrel ceiling, in brick—which represents the most homogeneous and peculiar group of the Armenian Christian architecture of the first period, from the Etchmiadzin cathedral of the first half of the 4th c. on. A peculiar element of these buildings, which determined specific solutions regarding the elevations and the internal space, is the barrel vault, partially resting on T-pillars and partially on the traverse arches, and marking the spatial articulation of the reservoirs. These primitive buildings had a single apse and no pastophories. Also recently confirmed is the typological and formal continuity between some basilicas and rectangular audience halls, with wooden ceilings supported by columns with monumental capitals which divide the space into three aisles—e.g., the hall of the palace of Dvin—whose models must be found in Sassanid culture. From the Urartian period, however, it is the local culture that played a primary role in the formation of early Christian Armenian architecture, both in the typologies adopted and with respect to certain technical and formal solutions. In the course of the second phase of the formative period (6th-7th c.), contemporaneous with the religious unification of the country, after the councils of *Dvin of 525 and 552, which sanctioned the independence of the Armenian church from the Byzantine, the central role of the domed church in its most important variants was reemphasized—free cross, tetraconchs, corolla, domed longitudinal plans. The other peculiar aspect of the period was the building of important civil residential (e.g., Aruć) and patriarchal complexes (at Dvin and Zvartnots), with plans of Sassanid origin.

III. Sculpture and painting. Sculpture is almost exclusively architectural and mostly confined to decorating window arches; motifs include vines, clusters, branches, palmettes and birds. The human figure sometimes appears in the decoration of some steles (see the double stele of Odzoun, 7th c.), in the surviving pendentives of Zvartnots and Dvin, in some capitals from Dvin showing the Virgin and child, and Christ between angels in a window arch opening onto the S wall of the church of Ptghni, with busts of Christ and saints. At Mren, the tympanum of the W door of the cathedral shows Christ between Sts. *Peter and *Paul and the donors, an *iconography very widespread in Armenia. All these are bas-reliefs, with the human figure usually summarily treated, but always vigorous and expressive.

Pictorial evidence of early Christian Armenia is very rare: there are remains of frescoes in the apse vault of the Church of St. Stephen at Lmbat (7th c.) and there are the apses of the contemporary churches of T'alinn, Mren and Talich, where sparse fragments of a theophanic vision painted in the background remain. The largest fragment is preserved at Lmbat, with Christ enthroned amid a tetramorph. Only two folios of miniatures are known from this period, with four full-page miniatures on recto and verso in the Etchmiadzin evangelary of 989 (Yerevan, Matedanaran 2374), depicting the announcement to Zechariah, the *Annunciation, the adoration of the *magi and the Baptism, attributed to the 7th c. based on exact comparisons with contemporary monumental painting (see Lmbat) and sculpture. Stylistically such images show a syncretism between an archaizing trend, recognizable in the details, and a predominant Eastern trend.

Regarding the scant pictorial evidence, noteworthy is Mathews's contribution on the four oldest miniatures of the Etchmiadzin evangelary (Mat. MS 2374, *olim* 229), confirming an early date (late 6th–early 7th c.) and the eclecticism of the models, which underscore the refinement of Armenian figurative culture in the period before Arab domination. With regard to sculpture, which was said at this time to be

a function of architecture—which emphasized a further peculiarity with respect to Byzantium, i.e., the attention, from the beginning, to the external decoration of buildings—esp. noteworthy are some studies on a group of capitals, datable to around the 7th c., in the arcades of the tetraconch churches of Bana and Ishkhani (in present-day Turkey), some of which imitate the basket capital with ionic volutes, while others have stylized vegetative ornamentation, Iranian in origin: this is an autochthonous creation that falls outside of the classical orders.

V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, Paris 1867 (2 vols.); G. Garitte, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange*: ST 127, Vatican City 1946; A. Khatchatrian: RBK, s.v. *Armenien*, Stuttgart 1966; var. aus., *Architettura medievale armena*, Rome 1968; A. Khatchatrian, *L'architecture arménienne du IVe au VIe siècle*, Paris 1971; E.W. Kleinbauer, *Zvart'nots and the Origins of Christian Architecture in Armenia*: Art Bulletin 26 (1972) 245-262; A. Tchakmaktian, *L'art décoratif de l'Arménie médiévale*, Leningrad 1971; F. de' Maffei, *Rapporti tra l'architettura armena e l'architettura urartea*: CCAB 20 (1973) 275-286; F. Gandolfo, *Chiese e cappelle armene a navata semplice dal IV al VII sec.*, Rome 1973; N. Thierry, *La peinture médiévale arménienne*: CCAB 20 (1973) 397-408; F. Gandolfo, Propil Kunst Gesch., Spätantike und Frühes Christentum, *Armenien*, Berlin 1977; var. aus., *Ererouk*, Documenti di Architettura armena 9, Milan 1977; G. Winkler, *The Oldest Armenian Sources Concerning the Rite of Initiation: A Reflection on the Earliest Shape of Baptism in Armenia and Its Origins*, Byzantine Studies Conference, Abstract of Papers, New York 1977, 38-41; M. Falla Castelfranchi, *Armenia*, aggiornamento all'Encicl. Univ. Arte, Rome 1978, 320-324; Id., *I battisteri e la liturgia battesimale in Armenia dal IV all'VIII sec.*, in *Baptisteria. Studi sui più noti battisteri dell'Oriente*, Rome 1980, 84-96; F. Gandolfo, *Le basiliche armene, IV-VII secolo*, Rome 1982; T.F. Mathews, *The Early Armenian Iconographic Program of the Ečmiadzin Gospel* (*Erevan Matedanaran MS 2374, olim 229*), in *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, eds. N. Garsoïan - T.F. Mathews - R.W. Thomson, Washington 1982, 199-212; F. Gandolfo - A. Zarina, *Ptghni/Arudtch*, Milan 1986; P. Donabédian, *Le portail dans l'architecture arménienne du Haut Moyen Age*: REArm 20 (1986-87) 337-380; P. Cuneo (ed.) et al., *Architettura armena, dal quarto al diciannovesimo secolo*, Rome 1988; D. Piguet Panayotova, *Les chapiteaux de Zvart'noc'*: Atti del V Simposio Int.le di Arte armena, Venice 1988 (1992) 279-291; M. Hasratian, *La coupole dans l'architecture arménienne aux IVe-Ve siècles*, ibid., 197-213; D. Piguet Panayotova, *Recherches sur les tétraconques à déambulatoire et leur décor en Transcaucasie au VIIe siècle*: OC 73 (1989) 170-174; P. Cuneo, s.v. *Armenia, architettura*: EAM II, 478-486; M.A. Lala Comneno, s.v. *Armenia, scultura*: ibid., 486-488; P. Donabédian, *Les thèmes bibliques dans la sculture arménienne préarabe*: REArm 22 (1990-1991) 253-314; D. Piguet Panayotova, *The Capitals of Iškhani*: Akten des XII Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, II, Bonn 1991 (Münster-Vatican City 1995), 1107-1113; A. Kałantarian - N. Hagopian - A. Djamgocian - K. Ghafadarian, *Armenische und Sasanidische Bautätigkeit in Dvin*: Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran 25 (1992) 239-333: A. Kałantarian, *Dvin. Histoire et archéologie de la ville médiévale*, Neuchâtel-Paris 1996; M.A. Lala Comneno, s.v. *Mren*: EAM VIII, 602-603; V. Nersessian, *A Bibliography of Articles on Armenian Studies in Western Journals, 1869–95*, New York 1997; A. Zarian - A. Ter Minassian, *Vałaršapat*, Milan 1998; M.A. Lala Comneno, s.v. *T'alin*: EAM XI, 70; M.A. Lala Comneno, s.v. *Zvart'noc'*: EAM XI, 860-861; N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, Louvain 1999; M. Bais, *Albania Caucasica. Ethnos, storia, territorio attraverso le fonti greche, latine e armene*, Milan 2001; K. Stopka, *Armenia Christiana* (*IV-XV*), Krakow 2002; A. Khazinedjian, *L'Église arménienne dans l'Église universelle. De l'évangélisation au concile de Chalcédoine*, Paris 2002.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ARMENIAN LANGUAGE and LITERATURE. Indo-European language, the first written literary and epigraphical evidence of which dates from the first half of the 5th c. Fragments of an earlier, even pre-Christian, oral epic literature have occasionally been transmitted by later historians.

Alphabet. After a failed attempt by Daniel the Monk (ca. 350?), the present alphabet, inspired by the Greek, was composed ca. 400 by St. *Mesrob.

Golden age (before 451?). Mesrob gathered around himself a group of disciples who probably translated some Greek fathers (*Cyril of Alexandria, *John Chrysostom, *Basil of Caesarea, *Eusebius of Emesa and *Severian of Gabala) and historical works, such as *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronicon* and *Ecclesiastical History*; *Ephrem the Syrian and *Aphraates were translated from the *Syriac. The first examples of an original literature are from the same era: *Eznik's *De Deo* and *Koriun's *Life of Mesrob*. The Bible was also translated: the Armenian "vulgate" depends on Greek models, but at least for the gospels, there are traces of another version, perhaps older, derived from the Syriac **Diatessaron*.

Silver age (2nd half 5th c.?). From this phase, in which the language gradually moved away from the "classical" models of the previous period, are the *Histories* of *Lazarus of Pharp, the so-called *Agathangelos and perhaps the first draft of *Moses of Khorene. Liturgical texts (Jerusalem Lectionaries, Anaphora of Basil) and canonical treatises were translated from the Greek, as well as ps.-Callisthenes, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Hesychius of Jerusalem (*In Iob*) and *Athanasius (*Vita Antonii*).

Hellenophile age (2nd half 6th c.). This age is characterized by the literalism of translations, applied rigorously esp. to philosophical or rhetorical texts (*Porphyry, *Aristotle, Dionysius Thrax) but also to other authors, such as *Irenaeus or *Philo. The reasons for the use of this translation technique are not clear, and its results must have often been incomprehensible to the Armenian reader (although there were "parallel" translations from the Syriac from roughly the same period). The fact that the most literal translations were of philosoph-

ical, rhetorical and scientific texts suggests a scholastic milieu, whose conventions were then applied to other types of translation. The philosophical translations are at the origin of an incipient Armenian philosophical school, in which *David the Philosopher stands out with his *Commentary on Porphyry's Categories*.

Theological thought. In the 2nd half of the 6th c. the Armenian church's anti-*Chalcedonianism was embodied in a polemical literature represented esp. by the treatise *On the Council of the *Dyophysites* and the letters of Vrthanes K'erdoł (550–617). Abraham of Albatanzi's correspondence tells us of the subsequent secession of the church of *Georgia. The dates of doctor *Elisaeus, though much disputed, must go back to the 6th c. At the start of the 7th c. the *phantasiastae* sect took root in Armenia, a *Eutychian group that denied the reality of Christ's *incarnation. John of Otzun's (*catholicos 718–729) treatise *Adversus phantasiastas* tells us about the group, which had already been attacked by the *Seal of faith* (ca. 630). 7th-c. authors include Sebaeos, author of a *History of Heraclius,* and the polymath *Ananias of Shirak (ca. 600–670), who composed some mathematical treatises, notable among them the *Geography* (*Ashkharhatsoyts*), passed down under the name of *Moses of Khorene.

The dates of many works traditionally attributed to the classical period are today contested: see *John Mandakuni, *Mambre Vercanol, doctor *Elisaeus and *Moses of Khorene. In the literary traditions of the East, Armenian was often used as an intermediary between Greek originals and Georgian versions. The *Agathangelos* and the **Narratio de rebus Armeniae* were translated into Greek from Armenian originals. The Armenian migrations of the Middle Ages resulted in the differentiation of two dialects: Eastern (spoken in the Armenian Republic) and Western (in *Cilicia and the Western diaspora). The political vicissitudes of the Middle Ages caused the loss of considerable portions of the Armenian literary heritage.

Patrologia V, 575-607; K. Sarkissian, *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*, London 1965; P. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, Paris 1947; M. Abegjan, *Istorija drevnearmjanskoj literatury* I, Erevan 1948; H. Thorossian, *Histoire de la littérature arménienne*, Paris 1951; V. Inglisian, *Die armenische Literatur*, Armenisch und kaukasische Sprachen (Handbuch der Orientalistik I, 7), Leiden-Cologne 1963, 157-250; K. Sarkissian, *A Brief Introduction to Armenian Christian Literature*, London 1960; G. Bolognesi, *La tradizione culturale armena nelle sue relazioni col mondo persiano e col mondo greco-romano*, in *La Persia e il mondo greco romano . . .* , Rome 1966, 569-603; Ch. Renoux, *La littérature arménienne*, in M. Albert et al., *Christianismes orientaux: introduction à l'étude des langues et des littératures* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris 1993, 107-166; R.W. Thomson, *A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 AD*, Turnhout 1995; V.N. Nersessian, *A Bibliography of Articles on Armenian Studies in Western Journals, 1869–1995* (Caucasus World), Richmond (Surrey) 1997.

Alphabet: C. Gugerotti, *L'invenzione dell'alfabeto in Armenia: teologia della storia nella* Vita di Maštoc' *di Koriwn*: C. Moreschini - G. Menestrina, *La traduzione dei testi religiosi. Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento . . . 1993* (Religione and Cultura 6), Brescia 1994, 101-126; J.R. Russell, *On the Origins and Invention of the Armenian Script*: Muséon 107 (1994) 317-331.

Translations: G. Zarbhanalean, *Matenadaran Haykakan t'argmanowt'eanc' naxneac'* (Library of Armenian translations), Venice 1889; P. Sukias Somal, *Quadro delle opere di vari autori anticamente tradotti in armeno*, Venice 1825; S. Weber, *Ausgewählte Schriften der armenischen Kirchenväter.* III, Munich 1927; J. Muyldermans, *Répertoire de pièces patristiques d'après le catalogue arménien de Venise*: Muséon 47 (1934) 265-292; M. Morani, *Situazioni e prospettive degli studi sulle versioni armene di testi greci con particolare riguardo agli storici*, in M. Pavan - U. Cozzoli (eds.), *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali* (Acta Encyclopaedica 5), Rome 1986, 39-46; J.J.S. Weitenberg, *The Language of Mesrop: l'arménien pour lui-même?*, in *Armenia and the Bible: Papers Presented to the International Symposium held at Heidelberg . . . 1990* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 12), Atlanta 1993, 221-231; J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Eusebius of Emesa and Armenian Translations*, in J. Frishman - L. Van Rompay, *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 5), Louvain 1997, 163-170; A. Ouzounian, *Le discours rapporté en arménien classique* (Bibliothèque des cahiers de l'Institut linguistique de Louvain 63), Louvain-la-Neuve 1992; L. Ter-Petrosian, *Ancient Armenian Translations . . .* , New York 1992, 1-46 (also in French); G. Bolognesi, *Studi e ricerche sulle antiche traduzioni armene di testi greci* (L'eredità classica nel mondo orientale. Serie monografica 1), Alexandria 2000; R. Sgarbi, *Traduzioni armene di testi greci fra linguistica e filologia*, in *Autori classici in lingue del Vicino e Medio Oriente*. Atti del VI, VII and VIII Seminario sul tema: "Recupero di testi classici attraverso recezioni in lingue del Vicino and Medio Oriente" (Milan, 5-6 October 1987; Naples, 5-6 December 1988; Bologna, 13-14 October 1989), ed. G. Fiaccadori . . . , Rome 2001, 115-122.

Bible: J.-P. Mahé, *Traduction et exégèse: réflexions sur l'exemple arménien*: *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont. Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux* (Cahiers d'orientalisme 20), Geneva 1988, 243-255; Ch. Burchard, *Armenia and the Bible: Papers Presented to the International Symposium held at Heidelberg . . . 1990* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 12), Atlanta 1993; V. Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, Los Angeles [London] 2001. *OT:* C.E. Cox, *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*, Chicago 1981; S.P. Cowe, *The Armenian Version of Daniel* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 9), Atlanta 1992; J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Parallel Aligned Text and Bilingual Concordance of the Armenian and Greek Versions of the Book of Jonah*, Amsterdam 1992; S.P. Cowe, *Problematics of Edition of Armenian Biblical Texts*, in H. Lehmann - J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Armenian Texts: Tasks and Tools* (Acta Jutlandica 69:1. Humanities Series 68), Aarhus 1993, 26-37. *NT:* S. Lyonnet, *Les origines de la version arménienne et le Diatessaron*, Rome 1950; L. Leloir, *Citations du Nouveau Testament dans l'ancienne tradition arménienne.* I, A-B: *L'Évangile de Matthieu* (CSCO 283-284/subs. 30-31), Louvain 1967; B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament . . .* , Oxford

1977, 153-181; S. Ajamian - M.E. Stone, *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament: Papers Presented to the Conference on the Armenian New Testament May 22-28, 1992* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 13), Atlanta 1994; G. Uluhogian, *I Vangeli in Armenia*, in *I Vangeli dei Popoli. La Parola e l'immagine di Cristo nelle culture e nella storia*, eds. F. D'Aiuto - G. Morello - A. Piazzoni, Vatican City 2000, 53-59.

Hellenophile school: Ch. Mercier, *L'École hellénistique dans la littérature arménienne*: REArm 13 (1978-79) 59-75; A. Terian, *The Hellenizing School: Its Time, Place and Scope of Activities Reconsidered*, in N.G. Garsoïan et al. (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Washington 1982, 175-186; V. Calzolari - M. Nichanian, *L'école hellénisante*, in M. Nichanian, *Âges et usages de la langue arménienne*, Paris 1989, 110-142; J.J.S. Weitenberg, *On the Interpretation of Postclassical Armenian Linguistic Data*, in H. Lehmann - J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Armenian Texts: Tasks and Tools* (Acta Jutlandica 69:1. Humanities Series 68), Aarhus 1993, 65-74; J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Linguistic Continuity in Armenian Hellenizing Texts*: Muséon 110 (1997) 447-458; R. Sgarbi, *Questioni di traduttologia armena in prospettiva interlinguistica*, in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale. Il "Romanzo di Alessandro" e altri scritti.* Atti del Seminario internazionale di studio (Rome-Naples, 25-27 September 1997), eds. R.B. Finazzi and A. Valvo (L'eredità classica nel mondo orientale 2), Alexandria 1998, 273-279.

V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie* I-II, Paris 1869; G. Dédéyan, *L'immigration arménienne en Cappadoce au XI^e siècle*: Byzantion 45 (1975) 41-117; C. Mutafian, *La Cilicie au carrefour des empires* I-II (CEA 113), Paris 1988; H. Kaufhold, *Die armenischen Übersetzungen byzantinischer Rechtsbücher* I: *Allgemeines*; II: *Die "Kurze Sammlung" ("Sententiae Syriacae")* (Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 21), Frankfurt a. M. 1997; C. Hannick, *La chronographie grecque de l'antiquité tardive et sa réception dans l'historiographie arménienne*, in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale. Il "Romanzo di Alessandro" e altri scritti.* Atti del Seminario internazionale di studio (Rome-Naples, 25-27 September 1997), eds. R.B. Finazzi - A. Valvo (L'eredità classica nel world orientale 2), Alexandria 1998, 143-155; W. Belardi, *Lingua e scrittura alle origini della cultura armena cristiana*: Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei f. 9, 12 (2001) 181-220.

S.J. Voicu

ARMENIAN RITE. Akin to the old *Antiochene rite (ancestor of the present *Byzantine rite), the Armenian rite preserves original developments and influences from other sources (*Jerusalem, the *Syriac churches) from the *liturgy's formative period (4th-6th c.?); elements from Western liturgies were incorporated at the time of the crusades.

Eucharistic liturgy. Only one formulary is now in use, that of St. *Athanasius (so-called), but there are 10 more in the MSS, whose *anaphoras are similar to the Byzantine. Unleavened bread and wine unmixed with water are used, and Communion is distributed only under one species. Liturgical vestments are similar to the Byzantine, although priests regularly wear the coronet.

Liturgical year. Includes some noteworthy characteristics: there is no celebration of Christmas on 25 December; rather, it is celebrated on 6 January, i.e., joined to *Epiphany. (Consequently the circumcision of Jesus, the presentation in the temple and the Annunciation are all out of step with the other Christian churches.) Despite the existence of a synaxarion similar to that of Jerusalem, commemoration of the saints has no fixed dates, changing with the days of the week from year to year.

Ecclesiastical architecture. The general structure of churches is similar to the Byzantine, but the altar is on an elevated podium, and it is separated from the rest of the church not by an iconostasis (though this is found in some old churches) but by a veil. One type of altar is not imposed with absolute rigor; walls are generally sparsely decorated.

The sacrifice (*matał*) of a chicken or a lamb was preserved in the ritual (*Maštoc'*) until recently, esp. in commemorations of the dead.

EC 1, 1976-1980; Ch. Renoux, *Un bilan provisoire sur l'héritage grec du rite arménien*: Muséon 116 (2003) 53-69; A.A. King, *The Rites of Eastern Christendom* II, Rome 1948, 521-646; A. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121* I-II (= PO 35,1 and 36,2), Turnhout 1969-1971; C. Renoux, *Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie: Le Čašoc'* I-II (PO 44, 4; 48, 2), Turnhout 1989-1999; Y.V. Catergian [Gat'rčean] - Y.V. Dashian [Tašean], *Srbazan Pataragamatoyc'k' Hayoc'* . . . (Armenian Sacred Liturgies . . .), Vienna 1897; F.E. Brightmann, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, 412-457; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex eucharistica. Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti* (Spicilegium Friburgense 12), Fribourg 1968, 319-346; A. Renoux, *L'anaphore arménienne de saint Grégoire l'Illuminateur*: Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident, II, Paris 1970, 83-108; F.C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum, Being the Administration of the Sacraments and the Breviary Rites of the Armenian Church* . . . , Oxford 1950; N. Adontz, *Les fêtes et les saints de l'Église arménienne*: ROC 26 (s. 3, 6; 1927-28) 74-104 and 225-278; Ch. Renoux, "*Les fêtes et les saints de l'Église arménienne*" *de N. Adontz*: REArm 14 (1980) 287-305; G. Bayan, *Le synaxaire arménien de Têr Israel* (= PO 5, 6, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21), Paris 1910-1930; L.M. Froidevaux, *Grigoris Aršarouni, Commentaire du lectionnaire* (= Bibliotheca Armeniaca 1), St. Lazare 1975; G. Winkler, *Das armenische Initiationsrituale. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche und liturgievergleichende Untersuchung der Quellen des 3. bis 10. Jahrhunderts* (OCA 217), Rome 1982; Ch. Renoux, *Office du matin et lectionnaire*: REArm n.s. 23 (1992) 13-25; Ch. Renoux, *Les commentaires liturgiques arméniens*, in A.M. Triacca - A. Pistoia, *Mystagogie: pensée liturgique d'aujourd'hui et liturgie ancienne. Conférences Saint-Serge. XXXIX^e semaine d'études liturgiques* (Bibliotheca EphLit Subsidia 70), Rome 1993, 277-308; Ch. Renoux, *Initiation chrétienne.* 1. *Rituels arméniens du baptême* (Sources liturgiques 1), Paris 1997; C. Gugerotti, *La liturgia armena delle ordinazioni e l'epoca ciliciana. Esiti rituali di una teologia di comunione tra Chiese* (OCA 264), Rome 2001.

S.J. Voicu

ARNOBIUS of Sicca (3rd-4th c.). *Apologist. After many years as a teacher of *rhetoric at Sicca Venaria in *Numidia and an adversary of Christianity, and at an advanced age, Arnobius converted—probably in the first years of the 4th c., at the time of *Diocletian's persecution—and composed an apologetic work in seven books, the *Adversus Nationes*. *Jerome, who tells us something of him (see *Chron. ad an.* 2343; *De vir. ill.* 79 and 80; *Ep.* 58,10; 70,5), asserts that the composition of Arnobius's only surviving work was requested by his bishop as proof of the sincerity of his conversion. Died probably 327. The *Adversus Nationes,* passed down in a single 9th-c. codex, the *Parisinus latinus* 1661, begins by refuting the accusation—already known to *Tertullian (see *Ad Nat.* I, 9,3; *Apolog.* 40,1f.) and *Cyprian (see *Ad Demetr.* 2)—that the cause of every disaster to come upon the world was the Christians; it continues by rejecting the charge that they worship a man, and a crucified one at that. A fiery polemic then follows, in part directed at *pagan *philosophy (Arnobius rejects the *Platonic conception of the immortality of the soul—book II) and Greco-Roman religion, with its *anthropomorphism (book III), its improbable or shameful images of the gods (book IV), the ceremonies and fables of the mystery cults (book V), its temples, idols (book VI), and *sacrifices—in short its string of erroneous ideas or superstitions which show the limits of pagan thought on the deity, which Arnobius contrasts with the Christian notion and experience of it.

His high-flown style smacks of rhetorical tricks and scholastic influence, though it is occasionally effective because of its vehemence and vividness. Jerome, in a short, severe compendium on the style of Christian authors before him (*Ep.* 58), judges Arnobius rather negatively as uneven and confused, with no order or precision in his writings. Scholars have identified many of Arnobius's sources: among pagans he cites *Plato, *Aristotle, Sophocles, Posidippus, Varro and an extract of the *Orphica;* he alludes to Hermes Trismegistus (*see* Hermeticism); he seems to use the Chaldaean *oracles, the *magic papyri of the *liturgies of *Mithras, Zoroaster, Ostanes; also *Plotinus, Cicero and Lucretius. Regarding his conception of the deity and the divine, some critics have noted an Epicurean influence; others have recently explained it in terms of late 3rd-c. *African heterodoxy. As for Christian sources, the almost complete absence of scriptural citations is surprising, as is the lack of any explicit mention of ecclesiastical authors, though he seems to have used them: from *Clement of Alexandria to Tertullian and *Minucius Felix. (A common source has been supposed for the points of contact between Arnobius's work and *Lactantius's *Divinae Institutiones.*)

Some of Arnobius's doctrinal opinions have attracted the attention of historians by the fact that they do not correspond to the main lines of Christian *theology, even *Latin theology, which at that time was becoming more organized: God is conceived of as an absolutely transcendent being, without contact with creatures and incapable of anger (in contrast with Lactantius's *De ira Dei*); the pagan gods are not always denied but are thought of as inferior gods; nor are they identified with *demons, according to the widespread idea of earlier apologists. Arnobius says that the *human soul is corporeal, weak and inconstant, such that God cannot have been its creator; it is perhaps the work of a demiurge, inferior to God (whose character seems to be influenced by *gnosticism). Moreover, the human soul for Arnobius is corporeal and not by nature endowed with immortality, which it can nonetheless attain through knowledge of the true God (an idea already proposed, with different characteristics, by *Tatian or *Origen). On the whole, Arnobius's thought oscillates between conflicting positions, seems to be in search of itself, and is hard to systemize coherently and univocally. Certainly it reflects the disturbed and unquiet atmosphere of the late 3rd and early 4th c., and perhaps it attempts to reconcile pagan religious and philosophical elements with *orthodox and heterodox Christian elements in a vision that reflects its author's enigmatic personality.

The overarching characteristic of Arnobius's work is the anguished search for truth that pervades it and which expresses itself in the search for the *truth about God*, the *truth about human nature* and the *truth about the cosmos*. Impeding this search, however, are prejudices common to both ordinary people and the learned, calumnies against all that seems new, esp. regarding religion, and a visceral hatred of those who neither know nor want to know even the basic ideas of the emerging doctrine. Arnobius explains both the subjective criteria, essentially religious, that must motivate intellectual assent and the objective criteria capable of allowing one to overcome the stage of doubt in the conscious effort to construct a system of total truth. Insisting on the mediation of faith as a fundamental dimension of finding and adhering to truth, he is able not only to recover the values of the human *ratio* but also the dialectic significance of the relations that historically link humanity with the forces of nature (*Nat.* II, 46). Certainty, both subjective and objective can be reached even in the absence of absolutely convinc-

ing arguments: practically speaking, this implies action according to the precepts of a truth-risk, in which one assents precisely *sine ratione* (*Nat.* II, 78). To a blind faith in the philosophers, Arnobius counterposes a luminous faith in Christ.

In particular the concept of *medietas* seems to best express the thought of Arnobius: *philosophus medius,* a philosopher who chooses the middle way, knows the laws of his profession (rhetoric) and puts them to use as a theologian, as his new condition as a convert requires. He thus makes use of the *mediocritas sermoni*—a style neither too elevated nor too humble—and the *examinatio momentorum parium*—a balanced evaluation of the arguments for and against—to arrive at a theological judgment (*Nat.* VI, 8: *ut mediocriter dicatur*).

With the laws of logic and philosophical dialectic and recourse to the principles of evidence, contradiction, causality and, esp. regarding God, the apophatic way, Arnobius questions the pagan cultural inheritance and the *Stoic division of physics, ethics and logic (*Nat.* I, 2,7,8,18,20,65; II, 57; III, 29; IV, 15,19,27; V, 8,16,26,39; VII, 27). His convictions can be summed up in the axiom that only God is the highest being—*summae qualitatis*—and therefore only he belongs to the realm of necessity and certainty, whereas the rest (inferior gods and demons, if they exist, human beings, animate and inanimate creatures, if the latter also in some sense have perception) are *mediae qualitatis,* i.e., in an in-between state, thus belonging to the realm of the contingent, the relative and the doubtful, inasmuch as they receive being and existence, and perhaps immortality, from God (*Nat.* I, 28). In this sense Arnobius's work is a hymn to the true God, a pious homage, *obsides pietatis,* as Jerome significantly called it, and an invitation to accept his lordship.

Editions: CPL 93; PL 5, 718-1288; CSEL 4 (1875); Corpus Script. Latin. Paravianum 62 ([2]1953).

Translations: Ger.: F.A. v. Besnard, Landshut 1842; J. Alleker, Trier 1858; Eng.: G.E. MacCracken. ACW 7-8, Westminster, MD - London 1949; It.: R. Laurenti, Turin 1962.

L. Berkowitz, *Index Arnobianus*, Hildesheim 1967; P. Monceaux, *Histoire litt. de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 3, Paris 1905, 241-286; F. Gabarrou, *Arnobe. Son œuvre*, Paris 1921; E. Rapisarda, *Arnobio*, Catania 1945; G. Bardy: RAC 1, 709-711; P. Courcelle, *Les sages de Porphyre et les "viri novi" d'Arnobe*: REL 31 (1953) 257-271; P. Kraft, *Beiträge zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Älteren Arnobius*, Wiesbaden 1966; A. Sitte, *Mythologische Quellen des Arnobius*, Vienna 1970 (diss.); M. Jufresa, *La divinidad y lo divino en Arnobio*: BIEH 7,1 (1973) 61-64; H. Le Bonniec, *Tradition de la culture classique. Arnobe témoin et juge des cultes païens*: BAGB 1974, 201-222. Further bibliography in B. Altaner - A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*, Freiburg i.B. [8]1978, 183-185 and 584; E. Gareau, *Le fondement de la vraie religion d'apres Arnobe*: CEA 11 (1980) 13-23; O. Gigon, *Arnobio. Cristianesimo e Mondo Classico*, Rome 1982, 87-100; R. Laurenti, *Il platonismo di Arnobio*: Stud. Filos. 4 (1981) 3-54; B. Amata, *Problemi di antropologia Arnobiana*, Rome 1984; O.P. Nicholson, *The date of Arnobius'* Adversus gentes: SP 15 (=TU 128), Berlin 1984, 100-107; W. Schmid, *Christus als Naturphilosoph bei Arnobius*: *Ausgewählte philologische Schriften*, eds. H. Erbse - J. Kueppers, Berlin 1984, 562-583; A. Viciano, *Retórica, filosofía y gramática en el Adversus Nationes de Arnobio de Sicca*, Frankfurt a. M.- Bern 1993; F. Mora, *Arnobio e i culti di mistero: analisi storica del V libro dell'Adversus Nationes*, Rome 1994; M.B. Simmons, *Arnobius of Sicca: Religious Conflict and Competition in the Age of Diocletian*, Oxford 1995; Updated bibliography in Arnobius, *Difesa della vera religione*, ed. B. Amata, Rome 2000, 57-78.

P. Siniscalco - B. Amata

ARNOBIUS the Younger (d. after 455). There is no ancient mention of Arnobius, called the Younger to distinguish him from *Arnobius of Sicca; we know of him from works attributed to him in the manuscript tradition. According to this information, Arnobius was a *monk, perhaps *African, who lived at *Rome from ca. 430 until his death after 455. His first work seems to be the so-called *Praedestinatus*. The work—written under *Sixtus III in ca. 435 and which, according to Gori, is authentic (see, on the other hand, CPL 243)—contains three parts: a catalog of 90 *heresies in which the author, recognizing the Catholic faith of Rome, sets up his polemic against *Augustinianism; a predestinationist *libellum* containing the ideas on *grace and *predestination which at the time were known as Augustinian; and a refutation of the predestinationist heresy. Though he knows some of *Augustine's works, he depends primarily on *Pelagian sources and takes a middle road in rejecting early *heretical Pelagianism, though he defends the doctrine of *Julian of Eclanum. Also attributed to him are the *Commentarii in Psalmos,* a spiritual interpretation of the psalms, of great interest for the history of the Roman *liturgy, and esp. that of public *penitence; the *Expositiunculae in Evangelium,* a series of *Scholia* on the gospels of Mt, Lk and Jn; and the *Liber ad Gregoriam,* a *consolatio* to a Roman noblewoman in a difficult marriage. His most famous work was perhaps the *Conflictus Arnobii cum Serapione,* containing the transcript of a discussion on the agreement of Roman *christological traditions with those of *Alexandria, and a reflection by the author himself. It has two parts, the first dealing principally with *trinitarian faith, the second with esp. the *incarnation (Mary: *Sitte, *Mythologische Quellen des Arnobius theotokos* or *anthropotokos*?). Of particular interest is the patristic documentation supporting his positions. Since the author assumes *Chalcedonian faith, he must have

written it after 451, thus in the time of *Leo I. Finally, it cannot be ruled out that Arnobius edited some *hagiographical legends, esp. the *Acts of Sylvester*.

CPL 239-243; Frede 193f. (bibl.); CCL 25; 25A; F. Gori, CP 14: *Conflictus*.—LTK[3] 1, 1020f.; RGG[4] 1 (1998) 790; LACL 64 (bibl.). - H. von Schubert, *Der sog. Praedestinatus*: TU 24,4, Leipzig 1903; G. Morin, *Étude d'ensemble sur Arnobe le Jeune*: RBen 8 (1911) 154-190; M. Monachesi, *Arnobio il Giovane ed una sua possibilità agiografica*: Boll. Stud. Stor. relig. 2 (1922) 66-125; H. Diepen, *La pensée christologique d'Arnobe le Jeune*: RThom 59 (1959) 535-564; S. Leanza, *L'esegesi di Arnobio il Giovane al libro dei Salmi*: VetChr 8 (1971) 223-239; C. Piffaré, *Arnobio el Joven y la cristología del confl.*, Montserrat 1988; F. Gori, *Il Praedestinatus di Arnobio il Giovane*, Rome 1999 (bibl.).

B. Studer

ARSACIUS (d. 405). Patriarch of *Constantinople, brother of *Nectarius. After the deposition of *John Chrysostom he was imposed by the empress *Eudoxia as his successor, though already eighty years old (consecrated 27 June 404; according to Palladius he was bishop for 14 months). A creature of the imperial party and of weak character, he did not oppose the bloody persecution of Chrysostom's followers, who had refused him obedience (Soz., *HE* VIII, 23). Not even the imperial edict of 18 Nov. 404 (CTh XVI, 4,6), confirming his authority and threatening opposing bishops with exile, strengthened his position; the pope and the West never recognized him. Died 11 Nov. 405; succeeded by *Atticus.

DCB 1, 171-172; DHGE 4, 742.

E. Prinzivalli

ARSENIUS of Hypselis (d. after 335). Bishop of Hypselis (*Egypt), instrument of *John Arkaph, leader of the *Melitians, in the struggle against *Athanasius. In 333, exploiting the circumstance of Arsenius's flight from the confinement imposed on him by the Catholic bishop Plusianus of Lycopolis, the Melitians accused Athanasius of having killed him. Arsenius was hidden in a *monastery in the *Thebaid and then at *Tyre, but both times Athanasius managed to find him, thwarting the Melitians' effort to frame him and clearing up the affair, first before *Constantine's half-brother Dalmatius, and then at the Council of *Tyre (335). Arsenius himself was reconciled with Athanasius.

Socrates, *HE* I, 27-29; Sozomen, *HE* II, 23-25; Athanasius, *Ap. c. Arian.* 69; Simonetti 113-114.

E. Prinzivalli

ARSENIUS the Great (d. ca. 449). The barbarian invasion of 407 dealt a heavy blow to the primitive organization of the famous *monastic center of the desert of *Scete. Due to a combination of different circumstances, monastic life during the 5th c. became more *cenobitic. With Poemen, Arsenius is one of the most illustrious figures of this period of transition. Daniel, a young disciple of the elderly Arsenius, summed up his life in an apophthegm (PG 65, 105-108, Arsenius 42). It should be particularly emphasized that Arsenius was distinguished among his fellows both by social origin and by education (he had been tutor to *Arcadius and *Honorius at the court of *Byzantium) and in this sense is the typical example of "flight from the world" to the *desert to find God. According to a *catechesis of Theodore the Studite, he began his stay at Scete as a disciple of John Colobos (PG 99, 853-854). It is very difficult to date the different periods of his life precisely. Of J.C. Guy's attempted chronology, we can ascertain his arrival at Scete at least ca. 394 and his death at 95, ca. 449. The alphabetical collection of **Apophthegmata Patrum* preserves a long series of 44 *logia,* or anecdotes, attributed to Arsenius (PG 65, 87-107), to which J.C. Guy has added a new part. G. Garitte found and published a Georgian version of a letter of Arsenius; there is no decisive argument against its authenticity. Arsenius is commemorated in the *Alexandrian *Coptic *Synaxarium* on 13 Basan (8 May in the Julian calendar).

CPG 5545-5554; BHG 167-169; J. Forget, *Synaxarium Alexandrinum* II (CSCO 90, Scriptores arabici, 13, versio), Louvain 1926, 117-118; G. Garitte, *Une "Lettre de S. Arsène" en géorgien*: Muséon 68 (1955) 259-278; J.C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum* (Subs. hagiographica, 36), Brussels 1962, 20; Id., *Le centre monastique de Scete au IV[e] et au début du V[e] siècle. Prosopographie et histoire*, Thèse de doctorat dactylographiée, Rome 1963, 154-158; L. Regnault, *Troisième recueil et tables*, Solesmes 1976, 202-204; Id., *Les Sentences des Pères du désert. Collection alphabétique*, 1, Solesmes 1981, 23-26, 329; M. Van Parys, *La lettre de Saint Arsène*: Irénikon 54 (1981) 62-86.

J.-M. Sauget

ARTAXATA (Artashat). Ancient capital of *Armenia, on the River Arax, founded in 166 BC by Artashes and described by Strabo and Plutarch as a splendid city; *Nero renamed it Neroneia. It was destroyed by the Romans more than once and rebuilt by Trdat I (Tiridates). Here began Trdat III's (252–330) persecutions of *Gregory the Illuminator who, *Agathangelos records, was thrown into a pit in the castle of Artaxata (now the *monastery of Khor Virap). During this period the Arsacid king Chosroes II (331–338) moved his residence from Artaxata

to *Dvin, a naturally more favorable position, and many inhabitants of the city emigrated there (see *Faustus of Byzantium, in Langlois, *Collection*, I, 216; and *Moses of Khorene, *Ib*. II, 136-137). In 449/450 a synod was held there in response to the Persian king Yazdegerd II, who had ordered his subjects to convert to Zoroastrianism (Garsoïan 126-127). 18 bishops participated from almost all of Armenia, including Roman Armenia.

V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, Paris 1867 (2 vols.); S. Der Nersessian, *The Armenians*, London 1969, 28-29; A. Khatchatrian, *Inscriptions et histoire des églises arméniennes*, Milan 1974, 30-31; Z. Khachatrian, *Artaxata, Capitale dell'Armenia antica, II s. a.C.– IV s. d.C.*, in *Ai piedi dell'Ararat: Artaxata e l'Armenia ellenistico-romana*, ed. A. Invernizzi, Florence 1998, 95-158; N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, Louvain 1999.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ARTEMON (or Artemas) (3rd c.). *Adoptionist *heretic at *Rome, ca. 235. *Eusebius of Caesarea cites a fragment of an anonymous work against Artemon (*HE* V, 28) which had been attributed to *Hippolytus, an attribution now discarded thanks to P. Nautin. The Artemonites claimed that their doctrine—that Christ was a mere man—was the most ancient in the church and that the truth had been corrupted at the time of *Zephyrinus. They undertook textual criticism of Scripture based on rationalistic presuppositions. Their works are all lost.

R.H. Connolly, *Eusebius HE V, 28*: JTS 49 (1948) 73-79; P. Nautin, *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton*, Paris 1953, 115-120.

E. Prinzivalli

ARTHEMIUS (d. 362). Prefect of *Egypt under *Constantius, favored the *Arians and was the secular arm of *George of Alexandria, the Arian bishop and antagonist of *Athanasius. He persecuted the *Catholics, esp. *monks. He also treated the *pagans fiercely, destroying their temples, including the *Serapeion. Accused by the *pagans before *Julian, he was beheaded and his goods confiscated (summer 362). Venerated as a saint by the Arians, his cult also became established among Catholics as a result of the acts written by the 9th-c. monk John of Rhodes (AASS oct. VIII, 856-885), on which Simeon Metaphrastes drew (PG 115, 1160-1212).

BS II, 488-490; R.W. Burgess, *The Passio S. Artemii, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke*: AB 121 (2003) 5-36.

E. Prinzivalli

ARTOTYRITAE. Our most precise information seems to be from *Augustine, who lists them after the Pepuziani or Quintilliani (*Haer.* 28), with whom he claims *Epiphanius confused them (*Haer.* 49). Their main peculiarity regarded worship: they offered bread and cheese, considering them the basic foods of early humans, who used only the fruits of the earth and of husbandry.

F. Cocchini

ASARBUS (d. 385). *Priscillianist condemned to death and executed at *Trier with Priscillian and others of his followers. The first of the Würzburg treatises cites him as coauthor of a *libellus,* with Tiberianus and others.

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976, 47, 144ff.; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, 78, 198 n. 138.

S. Zincone

ASCENSION. Acts 1:9-11 describes the ascension of Jesus 40 days after his *resurrection, on the Mount of Olives (Acts 1:3, 12). The church of the first centuries, which celebrated the death, resurrection and glorication of the Lord together at *Easter, did not have a feast of the ascension (see *Ep. Barn.* 15,9). The ascension as a specific feast of the return of Christ to the Father, fixed on the fortieth day after Easter, goes back to the late 4th c. In the East the first testimonies are (1) the **Apostolic Constitutions,* which report, ca. 380, the first distinct celebration of the ascension on the fortieth day after Easter, whereas *Pentecost became the feast of the *Holy Spirit; (2) *Gregory of Nyssa in 388 (CPG 3178); and (3) *John Chrysostom 386–397 (CPG 4342). The first testimonies in the West are *Chromatius of Aquileia, before 408 (CCL 9A, 33-37), and *Filaster of Brescia, 380–390 (CCL 9, 304). *Augustine still calls the feast *Quadragesima Ascensionis:* his sermons (*Serm.* 261-265) attest to the liturgical usage of *Hippo, undoubtedly also that of *Carthage. The first evidence for *Jerusalem is the Armenian lectionary (417–ca. 438); for *Rome, *Leo I, 444–445 (CPL *Tract.* 73-74); the euchological formularies of the *Sacramentarium Leonianum* are the oldest in the Roman *liturgy. The *Visigothic *Liber Commicus* may preserve the primitive system of *Mass-readings of the Hispanic liturgy, which are: 2 Kgs 2:1-15; Acts 1:1-11; Lk 24:36-53. The last two readings are common to the *Byzantine liturgy. With the Carolingian reform the use of these two readings

seems to have become general. In the 7th c. the feast was given a vigil, in the 11th c. an octave. Brescia: before 391; Aquileia: before 408; Jerusalem: ca. 450; Rome: before 461.

CPG vol. 5, 150-151; RAC 15, 218-219; LMA 5, 24-26; LCI 2, 268-276; RBK 2, 1224-1262; H. auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 1, Regensburg 1983; G. Schiller, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst* 3, Gütersloh [2]1986, 141-164.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

ASCENSION of ISAIAH (apocryphal). The *Ascension of Isaiah* is a *Jewish Christian text (probably not Jewish), influenced by *apocalyptic; the existence of a Jewish legend is supposed, perhaps linked to *Qumran, and cited by Heb 11:37. The text was written in the late 1st and early 2nd c., probably in *Palestine (Judea) or at *Antioch. The original text was in Greek, but only fragments of it remain; the entire work exists in an *Ethiopian version and *Coptic versions, and fragmentarily in *Latin; the text was used by the Cathars. Alongside the *Ascension of Isaiah* there is a Greek legend that derives from a different version. The *apocrypha is divided into two parts: the first (chs. 1-5), a *hagiographical midrash (perhaps an elaboration of a Jewish legend), speaks of the death of the prophet Isaiah, cut in two by a wooden ax at the order of the wicked King Manasseh, incited by the prophet Bekira. The second part (chs. 6-11), Isaiah's vision, recounts his ascension to the seventh heaven, where he participates in the divine *liturgy and accompanies Christ (the Beloved) in his *descent—unrecognized by the spheres—to sheol; this fragment recounts the earthly life of Jesus (11,2-22). *Docetist tendencies are evident in the text. Jesus then ascends to heaven in full glory. The text has some *gnostic elements; the Son and the Spirit are subordinated to the Father. The text was known and used by the *fathers of the church.

CANT 315-316; BHG 957-958, see 958bff.; B. Bettiolo - A.G. Kossova - C. Leonardi - L. Perrone, CCAp 7-8, 1995: edition of all the texts and commentaries (It. tr.); E. Norelli, Turnhout 1993, Apocryphes 2 (Fr. tr.); M.A. Knibb, in Charlesworth 2, 143-146 (Eng. tr.); Erbetta 3, 175-208 (It. tr.); C.D.G. Müller, in Schneemelcher 2, 547-562 (Ger. tr.); S. Kur, in Starowieyski 3, 134-168; A.M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 1-2, Turnhout 2000, I, 633-657; M. Pesce, *Isaia, il Diletto e la Chiesa*, Brescia 1983 (acts of the congress); A. Acerbi, *Serra Lignea*, Rome 1984; Id., *L'Ascensione di Isaia*, Milan 1989; E. Norelli, *Ascensione di Isaia*, Bologna 1994 (collection of articles).

M. Starowieyski

ASCESIS – ASCETIC

I. The term and Greek education - II. Eastern dualisms and Buddhist ascesis - III. Bible and Judaism - IV. Jesus - V. Paul - VI. The primitive church - VII. Monasticism.

I. The term and Greek education. The verb ἀσκεῖν refers to the training of an athlete or soldier; since the time of Herodotus and Xenophon it was also applied to *virtue. A long tradition, renewed by Epictetus, considered φύσις, μάθησις and ἄσκησις (natural gifts, abstract teaching and systematic exercise) as complementary, each playing its part in success. This humanistic aspect, focused on the human measure in education, is specific to *Hellenistic culture and quite different from the Jewish view of trust in God. Another very Greek aspect is the cult of the hero and thus the tendency to a forced ascesis, capable of forming a class of supermen. Among the Cynics, ascesis could tend to a paradoxical life, disdaining the convictions of the city. Even *Stoic ascesis and its aspiration to ἀπάθεια (elimination of the passions) could be pushed too far. Those in the *Platonic tradition could err through a certain contempt of the body.

II. Eastern dualisms and Buddhist ascesis. Persian rule in the East, Alexander's conquests as far as India, and active trade via land and sea may easily suggest an influence of Eastern asceticism on late Judaism or early Christianity, though our texts fail to reveal any. At the same time, radical *dualism and indifference to the appearances of the sensible world could not fail to be deeply criticized by a religion of *creation, *redemption and *resurrection, though incentives to *purification and spiritual life could play a positive role. There is not space here to examine, with the requisite nuance, the different Eastern forms of ascesis and their influence on the *Syrian, *Coptic and Greek worlds.

III. Bible and Judaism. Those who define ascesis as a pessimistic contempt of the world will find it neither in the OT nor the gospels. Such a definition, however, is far from accepted. The ideal of the *desert—of close intimacy with God—at the time of Hosea or the exodus or of the liberation from Babylonian captivity, along with that of the forty days of fasting and vision on Sinai or Horeb and the old Rechabite and Nazirite traditions, were suited to austerity and led to the secluded life of *Qumran or to *John the Baptist, the new Elijah.

IV. Jesus. If some texts contrast the Baptist's austerity with Jesus' familiarity with the table of sinners (Mt 11:18; Mk 2:16) or with certain women (Mk 15:41), other traditions emphasize his continuity with the witness of the Baptist and esp. the radical demands of the *kingdom (Mk 8:34). The ascetics of the early centuries could appeal to numerous *logia,* which in fact do not refer to "counsels" but to a choice that imposes itself—though without legalism (Mt 19:21)—and to the example of the *cross. The gospel context is strong enough to overcome any pessimism or dualism and to combat any pretense of being better than sinners or any masochism that could disturb the prospect of a life of freedom in brotherly love.

V. Paul. In his communities, esp. at Corinth, Paul encouraged the struggle of the Spirit against the *flesh, even to the subduing of the *body (1 Cor 9:27), putting himself forward as an example. His praise of *celibacy is, perhaps, more than antiquity recognized, a way of resisting an exaggerated ascetic tendency (1 Cor 7:2, 20, 25, 29). At any rate, Col 2:18-23 and 1 Tim 4:1-4; 5:14 provide a polemic against such a tendency.

VI. The primitive church. *Justin Martyr and *Athenagoras spoke of *virgins of both sexes who were the glory of the church; earlier *1 Clem.* 38,2 and *Ignatius *Pol.* 5,2 were careful to put ascetics of this sort on guard against insubordination to the bishop or the community. The *Encratite movement tended to condemn marriage. The NT *apocrypha—the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Gospel of Thomas, and apocryphal Acts of the Apostles—make virginity or the breaking of conjugal ties the clearest point of the new morality. Extremist practices may have been foreign to the great church, but most of these texts well represented a popular *Catholicism. In Syria and *Egypt, however, certain practices that the West considered excessive were allowed. The *gnostics, then the *Manichees, at times had a rigorist doctrine, a pretence of great spirituality, but those who would become angels often become beasts. *Clement of Alexandria opposed the gnostics (esp. v. *Strom.* I and III), while *Origen established a theological interpretation of ascesis (for a summary see esp. *Hom. Num.* 27).

VII. Monasticism. The terminology of "ascesis" and its philosophical content entered early *monasticism in various ways. The philosophical tradition (esp. *Stoic) combined with scriptural interpretation beginning with *Philo of Alexandria, who interpreted the figure of Jacob as an "athlete" and "ascetic" who struggled against vice (Esau) to acquire virtue, and in the end receive the gift of *apatheia* and the new name Israel (Gen 32), interpreted ascesis etymologically in the sense of the contemplative life (one who sees God). This interpretation is taken up by Origen along with the Pauline struggle (see above) and is transmitted to early monasticism through various authors, including *Anthony, *Evagrius of Pontus and *John Cassian, for whom it becomes the binomial of practical/ascetical life (*bios praktikos*) and contemplative life (*bios theoretikos*). The terminology (*askesis*) also enters through *Athanasius's *Vita Antonii* (more than 40 times), whose influence on the formation of the monastic and *hagiographical tradition was considerable.

The arrival of monasticism disciplined Eastern ascesis and gave it an honorable place in the church, while leaving outside certain sects in which the scale of values was not discreetly respected. The prestige of this ascesis and of these forms of prayer characterized all Christian people. *Lent, abstinence from meat or other foods, continence within marriage, and severity of morals were essential to the strength and freedom of the church of the Fathers, and favored works of charity and the communion of hearts.

J. Bergman - A. Markert - J. Maier - J. Gribomont et al., *Askese*: TRE 4, 195-259; R. Arbesmann, *Fasten*: RAC 7, 447-524; H. Chadwick, *Enkrateia:* ibid. 5, 343-365; K.S. Frank, *Askese und Mönchtum in der Alten Kirche*, Darmstadt 1975; K. Niederwimmer, *Askese und Mysterium*, Göttingen 1975; var. aus., *Etica sessuale e matrimonio nel cristianesimo delle origini*, Milan 1976; A. Guillaumont, *Aux origines du monachisme chrétien*, Bellefontaine 1979; P. Hadot, *Esercizi spirituali e filosofia antica*, Biblioteca di cultura filosofica 50, Turin 1988; M. Sheridan, *Jacob and Israel: A Contribution to the History of an Interpretation*, in Mysterium Christi*: Symbolgegenwart und theologische Bedeutung. Festschrift für Basil Studer*, Studia Anselmiana 116, Rome 1995, 219-241.

J. Gribomont

ASCETERIUM. The term appears in *Athanasius's *Vita Antonii* (ch. 4) and generally indicates the place where the young *Anthony began his life of ἄσκησις. *Palladius (*Hist. laus.* 14,3) also seems to indicate a seat of hermits by this term. *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 43,62), presenting *Basil of Caesarea's work, calls him the founder of two distinct things, *asceteria* and *monasteries. The term *asceterium* was created on the pattern of μοναστήριον, later becoming synonymous with it; it is used in this way by *Socrates (*HE* 3,23), *Nilus (*Ep.* 2,290) and *John of Damascus (*De haer.* 102), who speaks of *heretical

monasteries. *Asceterion* seems to be inserted as a gloss on μοναστήριον in the text relating to art. 14 of the Council of *Chalcedon (Mansi 7,316f.). The term is now used only in literature.

DACL 11,1845. 1847; Lampe, ἀσκητήριον; DIP 1,917; M. Kroen, *Das Mönchtum und die kulturelle Tradition des lateinischen Westens: Formen der Askese, Autorität und Organisation im frühen westlichen Zönobitentum* (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, 29), Freiburg (Breisgau) 1997.

M.G. Bianco

ASCITAE – ASCODRUGITAE. *Augustine (*Haer.* 62) derives their name from ἀσχός, "wineskin," since members of the sect considered themselves to be the new wineskins filled with the new wine spoken of in the gospel (Lk 5:38); they wandered everywhere "like Bacchantes," carrying an inflated wineskin. *Filaster attributes a similar practice (*Haer.* 75) to the *Ascodrugitae,* members of a sect that flourished in *Galatia; but their more exact name seems to be *Tascodrugitae,* given by *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 48,14), who likens them to *Cataphrygians, probably because of the closeness of their place of origin.

DCB I, 175-176; RAC I, 731-735; G. Bardy, *Le "De Haeresibus" et ses sources*: Miscellanea Agostiniana 2 (1931) 405 n. 2.

F. Cocchini

ASCLEPAS of Gaza (d. after 343). Opponent of *Arius; during the anti-*Nicene reaction after 325, he was deposed (charge unknown) in 327 in a council at *Antioch presided over by *Eusebius of Caesarea. Exiled, he returned to *Gaza in 337 after *Constantine's death and sought to reoccupy the see, provoking tumults and violence. Forced to again abandon it, he took refuge at *Rome; in 341 we find him at *Constantinople supporting Paul, the deposed local bishop, who tried to reenter the city after the death of *Eusebius of Nicomedia. In 343 he was at *Serdica, and the Westerners restored him. *Socrates (*HE* II, 23) and *Sozomen (*HE* III, 24) mention a return to Gaza in 346 on the occasion of *Athanasius's return to *Alexandria, perhaps the one in 337.

DHGE 4,901-902; Simonetti 585; G. Fernández, *La deposición del obispo Asclepas de Gaza*: Studia Historica. Historia Antigua 13-14 (1995-1996) 401-404.

M. Simonetti

ASCLEPIAS of Antioch (d. 218). Ninth bishop of *Antioch (Syria) from 211/212–218, succeeding *Serapion. Confessor of the faith during the persecution of *Severus. As bishop he was praised by *Alexander of Jerusalem, who may have been in prison (Eus., *HE* VI, 11,4-5). Succeeded by Philetus (Eus., *HE* VI, 21,2).

P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II^e et III^e siècles*, Paris 1961, 114-117.

E. Prinzivalli

ASCLEPIODOTUS (or Asclepias). *Adoptionist at *Rome in the time of *Zephyrinus (198–217), disciple of *Theodotus of Byzantium (the Tanner). The anonymous anti-Artemonite (Eus., *HE* V, 28,8) recounts the attempted corruption by Asclepiodotus and *Theodotus the Banker of the confessor *Natalius, whom Zephyrinus finally pardoned.

E. Prinzivalli

ASCLEPIUS. *African bishop in 480. According to *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 74 [73]), he was bishop in *territorio Baiensi* (in *Numidia ?)—according to other codices *Gabaensi, Vagensi.* He wrote against *Arians and *Donatists and achieved great fame as an extempore preacher. Died mid-5th c.

P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1912, IV, 101; PCBE 1, 195.

E. Romero Pose

ASHTISHAT. One of the oldest cities of Greater *Armenia, on the left bank of the Euphrates, NW of Lake Van and in the W part of the province of Taron, today the Turkish village of Derik. A *pagan center with many temples; sun-worship flourished there (Ashtishat = place of many gods). According to the sources, these temples were destroyed and the earliest Christian buildings constructed on their sites. *Agathangelos records that *Gregory the Illuminator himself, whose family was from Taron, brought *relics of St. John the Baptist and St. Athenogenes to Ashtishat, built a martyrium in their honor and at the same time ordered the destruction of many pagan temples. Ashtishat was very early on an episcopal see: a certain building activity is attributed to Bishop Daniel in the mid-4th c., mentioned by *Faustus of Byzantium; ca. 365, the catholicos Nersetes I (353–373) held there the first *Armenian synod, to establish order and uniformity in the churches and to set up charitable and assistance works. In 439 the catholicos of Armenia St. *Sahak the Great (Isaac), the last descendent of Gregory the Illuminator, was buried there.

A. Khatchatrian, *Inscriptions et histoire des églises arméniennes*, Milan 1974, 2-4; N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, Lovanii 1999; R.L. Mullen, *The Expansion of Christianity. A Gazetteer of Its First Three Centuries*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 137.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ASIA

I. Province - II. Diocese.

I. Province. The province of Asia, created on the territory of the old kingdom of the Attalids, included Hither Asia to the border of *Bithynia in the N and *Lycia in the S, and to *Galatia and the mountains of Pisidia in the E; it included Rhodes and the other small Aegean islands. Greek colonization went as far as the lower valleys of the major rivers, Hermus and Maeander; the dynasties that succeeded Alexander founded or refounded centers in the interior. The first organization of 129 BC gave way to the Sullan constitution of 84 BC, which divided Asia into 44 districts. Under *Augustus the province was governed by a proconsul, ordinarily for one year. The entire province was represented in a *concilium* (*koinon*), which organized the imperial cult. With more urban centers than any other province in the empire—most of them predating Roman rule (only a few were founded by *Tiberius and *Hadrian)—its prosperity was based on the general prosperity of numerous modest-sized cities, often divided by municipal rivalries. The title of provincial metropolis belonged to Pergamum but from the beginning was held by *Ephesus, seat of the governor, although he traveled to the various centers for administration. *Smyrna, Sardis and Cyzicus vied with Ephesus: some orations of the 2nd-c. rhetor of Prusa in Bithynia Dione, called Chrysostom, deride these rivalries, which were an object of scorn to the Romans, who often profited from quarrels between cities to consolidate their own power at the expense of local autonomy. At the end of the 3rd c. *Diocletian divided Asia into seven smaller provinces: Asia Proconsularis (capital: Ephesus), Hellespont (Cyzicus), Lydia (Sardis), Phrygia I (Laodicea), Phrygia II (Eukarpia), Caria (Aphrodisia) and Insularum provincia (with 53 islands).

II. Diocese. Diocletian's reorganization of the Roman provincial structure created smaller territorial units and divided the provinces among five dioceses: Asia, *Pontus, *Thrace, the East and *Egypt. Following the decision at the Council of *Constantinople of 381, these essentially bureaucratic and administrative divisions were recognized as ecclesiastical boundaries, superimposed on the old division of episcopal sees by province. The council also sanctioned Constantinople's hierarchical supremacy over the other metropolises, ensuring that the dioceses of Asia and Pontus would be subordinated to that of Thrace. The civil capital of the diocese of Asia remained at Ephesus, the capital of the old province, which now also exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the territory of 11 provinces: Asia I and II, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia I and II, Lydia, Hellespont, Bithynia and Phrygia I and II. But, however important, Ephesus was not a powerful enough center of church life to be able to oppose Constantinople; while *Caesarea, already capital of *Cappadocia and now seat of the vicar of the diocese of Pontus, was not geographically central and suffered competition from *Ancyra, as well as from *Chalcedon, *Nicomedia and *Nicaea, all naturally favored by their closeness to the court. The Council of Chalcedon of 451 sanctioned a similar subordination of the dioceses of Asia and Pontus to that of Thrace: can. 28 established that the *metropolitans of Asia and Pontus, together with the bishops of their provinces, should ordain local bishops, but the metropolitans themselves should be ordained by the bishop of Constantinople. The various regions of the province and diocese of Asia were the first parts of the Roman Empire to be Christianized, from the time of the apostles; the process of *evangelization was varied, however, complicated by the extreme variety of peoples, traditions, greater or lesser degree of *Hellenization, and social and political differences: there was an enormous difference, e.g., between urban Christianity (in thoroughly Hellenized cities with a lively cultural and social life) and that in the rural areas of the interior (think of Phrygia). Christian origins must therefore be sought and verified from case to case according to specific local situations.

V. Chapot, *La province Romaine d'Asie*, Paris 1904; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire*, Oxford [2]1971, 28-94; A.D. Macro, *The Cities of Asia Minor under the Roman Empire*: ANRW II,7,2, Berlin-New York 1980, 658-697; Th. Pekáry, *Kleinasien unter römischen Herrschaft*: ANRW II,7,2 (1980) 596-657; S.R.F. Price, *Ritual and Power in Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, 1984. For the ecclesiastical aspects: G. Bardy, *Asie*: DHGE 2,941-1027; F. Blanchetière, *Le Christianisme asiate aux IIe et IIIe siècle*, Strabourg [2]1997; Fedalto 1,112ff.; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Men, Land, Gods in Asia Minor*, Oxford 1993.

M. Forlin Patrucco

ASIA MINOR (archaeology)
I. Diocese of Asia - II. Diocese of Pontus - III. Sculpture, painting and minor arts.

I. Diocese of Asia. A great enthusiasm for building animated the cities of the empire, not least those of the diocese of Asia which, in *Diocletian's division, comprised the provinces of Hellespont to the N, *Phrygia to the E, Pisidia and Lycaonia to the SE, Lycia and Pamphylia to the S, Caria to the SW, Lydia in the center and Asia proper to the W. Every *civitas* had its own bishopric, a rule confirmed by an edict of *Zeno (CI I, 3, 36, *De episcopis* . . . ca. 474–484) regarding certain questions of competence of the bishops of Tomis in Scythia and Leontopolis in Isauria. The two largest cities were, in the E, Ephesus, the old capital of the province of Asia, and *Constantinople, developed under *Constantine. *Ephesus naturally lost much of its importance with the creation of the "new *Rome," but though its authority and prestige diminished, it long remained a center of primary influence. We cannot doubt that immediately after the "edict" of *Constantine's peace, Ephesus and other important cities of Asia Minor built a cathedral and a bishop's residence (as happened, e.g., at *Aquileia). This ancient complex has not yet been identified, however. The great cathedral of Ephesus, made famous by the Council of 431, must have been built immediately after 380; of colossal dimensions, it was made—unusual for the time—by modifying part of a secular building, the *apodyterium* of the "port baths." Many elements, such as doorjambs and architraves, were reused, incl. probably the columns, which were all later removed. This suggests that Ephesus's commercial hegemony had suffered from the competition of *Constantinople, esp. leading to a reduction in the number of travelers and sailors for whom the baths, the largest in the city, were intended; hence the decision to liquidate them and use them for the grandiose new cathedral. The basilica (*Forschungen*, IV, 1 p. 16f.) had two aisles and a nave, twice their width, which ended in an apse, semicircular inside; each aisle ended in a straight wall, the same height as the triumphal arch, with a door giving access to an almost square room. According to Knoll (*Forsch*., fig. 3), the aisles were separated by columns (of which nothing has been found) linked by arches; there was no *matroneum*. But the church, as we shall see, did not occupy the whole extent of the very long *apodyterium*. The basilica must have had a wooden roof, except for the semidome of the apse and the presumed cross-vaults in the two side-rooms. It was preceded by a narthex and a colonnaded quadriportico with a semicircular W wall enlivened by niches. Later, when the city had shrunk enormously after the Arab conquest and sack, the building was divided into two separate churches, one after the other, the first domed, the second with pillars. The baptistery, reached from the N side of the quadriportico, was circular inside with twelve unequal sides outside; an ambulatory surrounded it, enclosing it in an almost square perimeter; inside, the pool was circular with ramps for descent and exit, typical in Asia Minor. Behind the apse area of the church were found (F. Fasolo, *La basilica,* 1-30) small private baths and a house with rooms around a hypostyle courtyard, presumably for clergy.

A second church (F. Miltner, *Grabungen*, p. 12f.) of more modest dimensions was excavated on the opposite side between the port of Magnesia and the so-called East Gymnasium; it followed a hypostyle, basilica plan, with the nave ending in a circular apse inside and a straight wall outside (typical of many basilicas in Asia Minor) with remains of *synthronon*. Still at Ephesus, there is a small single-aisled church, E of the square called Verulanum; it is a simple rectangular room ending in a semicircular apse.

Outside the walled city, along the slopes of the Panayil Dag, was an important *cemetery: the grotto of the Seven Sleepers, where, according to legend, seven young men fled to escape the persecution of the emperor *Decius (249–251) and awoke to find Christianity triumphant under *Theodosius II (423–450). A group of tombs, some going back to the 2nd c., are arranged around a large vaulted room, partly dug into the rock and partly constructed, with arcosolia: at one end of it was a square-plan church built between the mid 5th and 6th c. (*Forschungen*, IV, 2). To the E the vaulted room ended in a barrel-vault which faced a semicircular apse in the center and a rectangular niche to the S, both part of a straight wall. As a result of the veneration, other burial rooms with arcosolia and family mausoleums developed in the immediate vicinity. A recent proposal based on the style of the surviving pavement mosaics would date the complex to the time of *Theodosius I (379/80–395) (see W. Jobst, *Zur Bestattungskirche den Sieben Schläfer in Ephesos*: JÖAI 50 [1972–1975] Beiblatt 17-80). But the most famous building, some distance from the ruins of Ephesus, is the martyrium over the tomb of St. *John the Evangelist, on the hill of Ayasoluk: a vast cruciform edifice with six domes, already existing in the 5th c. (but perhaps even earlier, since it is mentioned by the late 4th-c. pilgrim *Egeria) but rebuilt by *Justinian and *Theodora in the mid 6th c.; striking ruins remain of it (see RBK s.v. Ephesos). The mar-

tyrium is at the center of a vast group of buildings, only partly excavated: among them is a vast octagonal baptistery with ambulatory, recently dated to the early 5th c., i.e., before Justinian's reconstruction (see M. Falla Castelfranchi, *Il battistero di S. Giovanni ad Efeso* [Ayasoluk], Actes du XV[e] Congrès International d'Études byzantines, Athénis [1981], 129-142), and a *secreton* mentioned in a Greek inscription (ibid.).

From the 4th c. on, the churches of the other cities of Asia Minor were generally hypostyle basilicas, since marble columns were abundant in the East due to the many state quarries and the ease of recovering material from earlier *pagan buildings. At the end of the 4th c. the changed political conditions of the empire forced urban alterations, in which many pagan buildings and public works were doubtless eliminated.

During the long period of *pax romana,* many cities of Asia Minor lived without military concerns and without walls, quietly dedicated to commerce and useful civic activities. At the end of the 4th c. the climate of insecurity created by the presence of the *Goths on the one side and the rebel Isaurians on the other obliged, as we see from the relevant law (CTh 16,1,34), the construction of city walls and local defenses, which sometimes involved the elimination of entire quarters, monuments and tombs. The large amounts of material generated by this demolition were largely made available to the religious authorities. Notable sacred buildings have been found in Pamphylia, a small region, but rich in agriculture and maritime commerce. The two main cities, *Side and Perga, have remains of important churches. Sacked by the Arabs, these centers were soon reduced to miserable villages and later abandoned, so their ruins can be excavated and studied without the impediment of modern buildings. The cathedral of Side (A.M. Mansel, *Ausgrabungen,* 50-57) had five aisles and a transept, the nave ending in an apse, semicircular within and three-sided without; attached on the N side was the baptistery, almost a freestanding pavilion, square and apsed like its pool, which had steps and side basins. It was flanked by two symmetrical rectangular rooms with niches: the three rooms were preceded by a rectangular atrium apsed at each end. On the opposite side was the bishop's residence: its various rooms included a small private chapel for the bishop and a large triconch room. Later the church was reduced to three aisles.

This phenomenon of reduction is common to nearly all the basilicas of Asia Minor; after the first sack by the Arabs, the depopulated cities were rebuilt on a smaller scale, and the churches too were adapted to the new requirements. At Side are the remains of a grandiose urban hypostyle church built in the 6th c., when Justinian destroyed all the remaining great pagan sanctuaries. On the S point of the gulf were two twin peripteral temples, partly demolished. Some of the columns are preserved *in situ* in the atrium; others were transferred to the adjacent basilica, which had three aisles and an apse, semicircular inside and polygonal outside. The side aisles ended in a plain wall, to which two chapels or *pastophories* were attached. The atrium, whose two side walls are curiously embellished with niches both inside and outside, was never finished. This likely long interruption of the work was due to the consequences of Islamic expansion (A.M. Mansel, *Die Ruinen,* 163-164). Other unexcavated basilicas at Side include a three-aisled church with a single apse and transept (A.M. Mansel, *Die Ruinen,* 165).

The other Pamphylian metropolis, Perga, has ruins, noted by Rott (*Kleinasiatische,* 48-53), of two basilicas: one perhaps the cathedral, with five hypostyle aisles, nonprojecting transept, apse between two pastophories, and small quadrangle; the other had three aisles with a cross-transept, two pastophories at the sides of the apse. The second had "wraparound" aisles and a vast atrium. On the hill outside the walls, Prof. Mansel's Turkish archaeological mission excavated the remains of a 6th-c. building with the characteristics of a martyrium: a vast domed room attached to an apsed chapel. Remains of hypostyle basilicas are found in Pisidia at Sagalassos, a city famous for Alexander the Great's assault, but a mountain center that obviously could not vaunt the opulence of the Pamphylian metropolises. The churches, published by Lanckoronski (*Die Städte,* 150-152), had three aisles and projecting central apses, one polygonal (ibid., fig. 126), the other semicircular with projecting transept (ibid., fig. 123). Miletus preserves two basilica complexes, quite modest considering the importance of the Greek and Roman city: its importance probably led to its being severely sacked in the 3rd and 4th c. The first excavations (Th. Wiegand, *Südmarkt*, pl. 25) uncovered a basilica preceded by a 3rd-c. *propylaea* and a quadriportico. It had three aisles, separated by columns and monolithic pillars with core and half-columns; the nave ended in an apse, and the aisles in large doors led to an ambulatory. The quadriportico had a long corridor at one side ending in a round chapel with five niches built into the thickness of the wall. N of the quadriportico was a square domed baptistery with a corridor on three sides.

This 6th-c. complex was in the center of the city, in a corner of the S *agora,* next to the *nymphaeum* (G. Kleiner, *Die Ruinen,* 135-137). Early in the 7th c. a second basilica was dedicated to St. Michael (the cult of the angels developed from the 5th c.; on Miletus, see esp. W. Müller-Wienci, *Die "Grossekirche" [sog. Bischofskirche] in Milet*, IstMitt 23-24 [1973–1974] 131-134; O. Feid, *Zur kunstgeschichtlichen Stellung den "Grossenkirche,"* ibid., 135-137; var. aus., *Milet 1973–1975*, IstMitt 27-28 [1977–1978] 93-125); it had three aisles, architraved columns, an apse and pastophory with straight end-wall (G. Kleiner, *Die Ruinen,* 137). Despite its modest dimensions, it is interesting to make out the presence of the *synthronon* in the apse and the ambo in the center of the church. It was preceded by a narthex and very likely a quadriportico. N of the basilica rose a presumed bishop's residence; S was a square baptistery with circular pool (G.K. Kleiner, *Grabungen,* 121-122; M.J. Mellink, *Archaeology,* 1-343). Finally, an enigmatic building, a circle inscribed in a square, with eight columns inside and four small niches and a domed central covering (G.K. Kleiner, *Die Ruinen,* 138-139).

Phrygian Hierapolis was undoubtedly rich in Christian buildings (D. de Bernardi Ferrero, *Le chiese di Hierapolis dopo gli scavi*: CCAB 30 [1983] 87-92). Most important is the cathedral with attached baptistery in the N zone inside the late 4th-c. city walls—a basilica with *matronea* over the aisles. The nave ended in an apse, curved inside and polygonal outside, and the aisles originally ended in straight walls (apsidioles were added later). It was preceded by a narthex with an atrium in front, hypostyle only on two sides with columns aligned with those inside. S of the narthex was the baptistery with annexes and a circular pool with steps and adjacent basins, originally built probably late 4th or early 5th c. At an unspecified time the cathedral was reduced to a nave with two small side-chapels and the baptistery transformed into an apsed chapel without a baptismal pool (P. Verzone, *Hierapolis,* C.N.R., 460-464). Above the theater was a basilica with a similar plan but more modest proportions: no quadriportico, an externally straight apse with side pastophories, hypostyle *matronea;* it was later given pillars instead of columns and finally reduced to a single nave. Its hypostyle structure indicates a 5th-c. date (ibid., 466-468). S of the Arch of Frontinus (ibid.), touching the N wall of the "plateia," a small chapel with one apsed nave was built, almost as if to defend the city. Two more churches, not yet excavated, can be seen among the ruins: a chapel NE of the city and a three-aisled church SE of the theater (ibid.). Grandiose basilicas and baptisteries rose in the great episcopal centers; the cult of the martyrs led to the building of martyria and cemeterial churches outside the city walls. Some of these worship centers were instituted by laws (CTh 9, 17,6-7; CI 1,2,3; 3,44,14). The oldest buildings, dating from the late 4th c., had monumental dimensions: crowds of *pilgrims rested under the porticos on feast days and took part in **agapes* and commemorative functions. Hence these buildings assumed a particular structure, generally a central plan covered by a dome, an arrangement singularly suggestive for Christians because of the celestial symbolism of the dome.

The two main martyria of Asia Minor were naturally those in honor of the two apostles, who were also considered the protectors of the Byzantine Empire. At Ephesus the martyrium of St. John arose ca. the late 4th c. on the hill overlooking the temple of Artemis of the Ephesians, the greatest pagan sanctuary of Asia. Of the primitive sanctuary, largely revealed by the excavations of the Austrian mission, we recognize a building with a central nucleus, square-planned and domed, and four arms in the form of a *cross; each arm had three aisles and some had external porticos, as foundations and pavement mosaics show (J. Keil, *Forschungen*, IV, 3). Soon afterward a large octagonal baptistery with circular pool was added to the N. The main building was later rebuilt with much larger dimensions, but keeping the primitive cross-shaped votive chapel. A great three-aisled basilica with projecting transept arms was planned, but the nave of this phase was never built and the whole was then incorporated into a large vaulted structure built by Justinian (P. Verzone, *Le fasi della basilica*). The grandiose new building kept the walls of the transept and apse and, so as to create a massive structure with pillars and columns, reused great quantities of marble obtained by the demolition of the nearby temple of Artemis, as well as column shafts prepared for the hypostyle basilica. Justinian's building had six domes over the nave and transept, cross-vaults on the aisles and a *matroneum.*

At Hierapolis, the martyrium of St. Philip (Verzone, *Le primitive disposizioni;* D. Cottica, *Unguentari tardo antichi*), excavated by the Italian mission like all this city's buildings, was also built on a hill overlooking the city in the late 4th or early 5th c., seemingly on a plan sent by the imperial architects at Constantinople, as at Ephesus. The central nucleus consists of an octagon from which radiate eight rectangular chapels, in such a way that the pillars become visibly thicker toward the outside. The four chapels corresponding to the main axes are preceded by square areas with niches, in some of which

were drinking fountains (cavities for lead pipes are still preserved in the walls). Beside these entrances were bays enclosing the stellar octagon in a square perimeter with sides of ca. 60 m. The chapels on the diagonal axes originally faced onto four triangular courtyards created by the inclusion of the octagon in the square. The eight chapels each opened into the octagon via three arches supported by pillars and two intermediate columns on each side with rough composite capitals in marble, the work of local sculptors (P. Verzone, *Hierapolis,* C.N.R., 448-457). Inside the thick pillars, made lighter by barrel-vaulted corridors communicating between the chapels, were more chapels, heptagonal with three apses. The radial chapels had mosaic floors; the octagonal room, one of marble slabs. This octagon was covered by a light wooden dome with lead plates on the outer surface and mosaic on the inner. For the date of this building see Otto Feld's scheme in *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte, Spätantike und Frühes Christentum,* Berlin 1977. A martyrium similar to the two of Asia Minor was the cruciform one at *Antioch with a central domed square, dedicated to St. *Babylas (J. Lassus, *L'église cruciforme,* 55ff.).

An analysis of the monuments from the late 5th and early 6th c. reveals two new developments: (1) the reuse of secular buildings and the transformation of pagan sanctuaries into churches, and (2) the prevalence of buildings with thick pillars and domes, evidently influenced by martyria.

Reuse of secular buildings. In the course of the 5th c. at Hierapolis, after the fire and abandonment of the martyrium on the hill, the *calidarium* of a large public bath was converted into a church by the construction of internal pillars and domes, considered more fitting for its new sacred function (P. Verzone, *Hierapolis,* C.N.R., 457-460). It was probably still dedicated to St. Philip. At any rate it had an apse and presbytery; the atrium was in a smaller room parallel to the *calidarium*. At Priene the first hypostyle cathedral was created in a room of the gymnasium (M. Schede, *Die Ruinen von P.,* 108; P. Verzone, *Cattedrale di Priene,* 261-265) by adding two rows of columns. The city, then in decline, could not support the expense of a new building. Similarly at Assos in the Troad, a hypostyle church was set up inside the gymnasium, part of the courtyard becoming the quadriportico (J.T. Clarke - F.H. Bacon - R. Koldewey, *Investigations at Assos,* 185). Here, however, the archaic temple at the top of the rise was spared. In the *agora* at Pergamum a three-aisled church was built with a semicircular apse, narthex and quadriportico (late 4th or early 5th c.—W. Dörpfeld, *Bauwerke,* 33-35).

Transformation of temples. Famous pagan sanctuaries suffered various fates. The most famous of all, the *Artemision* of Ephesus, was razed to the ground, but others became churches and to this owe their preservation (F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Kirchen,* 128-130). The temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias became a cathedral (L. Crema, *Monumenti*, cols. 179ff.; *Die spätantike Stadt,* see index), keeping nearly all its columns *in situ* and adding perimeter walls and a central apse flanked on both sides by a double room. Next to it was the bishop's residence, also with a fine trichorate room (K. Erim, *Aphrodisias*, TAD [1966] I, pp. 60-61; II, pp. 57-58; [1969], II, fig. 21). A 6th-c. painting of St. Michael has been discovered in the theater of Aphrodisias (R. Cormack, *The Wall-Painting*). The sanctuary of Aetani also became a church, but hardly anything of the changes involved in the transformation can be made out among the walls of the cella. Still in the 6th c., an important complex was created within the cella of the temple of Apollo at Didyma: it comprised a medium-sized hypostyle church with projecting polygonal apse and narthex, and a small square baptistery with three small niches (Th. Wiegand, *Didyma,* 29ff., pl. 58-80; atl. pl. 3-5). *Hadrian's great temple of Serapis at Pergamum became a three-aisled cathedral dedicated to St. Paul (L. Crema, *Pergamo,* 69ff.; O. Bayatli, *Bergama,* 46ff.).

Churches with pillars. At the center of Hierapolis in the first half of the 6th c. arose a longitudinal-plan church with pillars for strong piers and columns for light ones (P. Verzone, *Hierapolis,* C.N.R., 462-466); in front was a narthex and atrium; this was probably the new church dedicated to St. Philip when his cult was transferred to the city for security reasons. The churches of Philadelphia and Sardis must also have had pillars and ribbed vaults (G. Foss, *Byz. Sardis*). The mountainous region of Lycia had many modest-dimensioned pillared churches, nearly all of stone. They have been visited, but we possess only preliminary accounts of them (T.A.B. Spratt - E. Forbes, *Travels,* passim; R.M. Harrison, *Churches L.,* 117-151). These basilica-plan pillared buildings have naves ending in an apse—semicircular inside and polygonal outside (Alakilise, Sura), or semicircular also outside (Arneai, the five churches of Andriake)—or in a triconch spanning the three aisles (Karabel, Abacahissar), and nearly always have a narthex in front. Rebuilt later, probably after the Arab invasions, they preserve decorative architectural elements (capitals, architraves, portals) typical of the 6th c. and of the Constantinople area (R.M. Harrison, *Note on Sculpture,* 187-197). Relatively recent excavations at Xanthos have revealed a three-aisled church with mo-

saic floor like that of St. John of Studios at Constantinople (E. Kalinka, *Xanthos,* 94; H. Metzger, *Fouilles,* 1970, 171; 1973, 119-120; *Campagne* 1974, 133-134; 1977, 64-65).

Important for the style and chronology of the churches of Lycaonia and Isauria are the Alahan Monastir complex and the church of Dag Pazari. Alahan was a monastic sanctuary consisting of two churches with a baptistery between, joined by a great portico. The first church is a hypostyle basilica with interesting sculptures of the Evangelists, the archangels and Christ in glory; church no. 3 was a domed church with transverse arches on the nave and aisles, and portals decorated with marvelous vine foliage and intertwining fish. The finely indented acanthus-leaf capitals are in the style of the late 5th-c. workshops of Proconnesus (P. Verzone, *Alahan;* G.H. Forsyth, *Architectural,* 218ff.). Here too, as in so many sites that suffered from the Arab invasion, church no. 1 was later reduced to a single nave: M. Gough excavated it, destroying the additions (*Reports* 1962, 173ff.; 1963, 105ff.; 1964, 185ff.; 1967, 37ff.; 1968, 159ff.). The small church of Dag Pazari has three aisles dominated by a square domed bay about 8 m. on each side, and with an apse semicircular inside and outside (M. Gough, *Emperor Zeno,* 203-209, figs. 3 and 4; G.H. Forsyth, op. cit., 233ff.). The walls are made of accurately squared stone blocks, and the capitals are similar to those of Alahan. The building clearly shows what the dominant building characteristics of the early 6th c. were, which is of value for dating other churches in the area.

The group traditionally known as Binbirkilise comprises religious buildings, nearly all of modest dimensions, divided among two centers: Madensehir and Degile, the latter a fortified acropolis. The most important three-aisled basilica is no. 1, at Madensehir (nave 27.50 x 6 m. [90.2 x 19.7 ft.]), divided by monolithic pillars with their original stone barrel-vaults and preceded by a two-storied narthex. The others are smaller basilicas of stone blocks, similar or simpler in form and of various ages, the more recent naturally having rougher masonry; current dating spreads them over the 6th to the 10th c.; those of Degile in particular postdate the sack of the lower city by the Arabs in the 8th c.; the epigraphist Ramsay (W.M. Ramsay - G.L. Bell, *The Thousand and One Churches,* 519-558) drew these conclusions not just from the style, which he regarded as rougher than that of the important churches of the plain or other artistically or culturally linked sites, but also because of the stone used, which did not allow fine cutting, and from a minute study of the epigraphy. The floor plans are varied: (1) basilicas with three aisles separated by pillars, vaulted roof, single usually horseshoe-shaped apse, horseshoe arcades and archivolts of windows (indicating relatively late date), narthex with two rooms at the ends (churches 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 21, 29, 31, 34 and 42), sometimes projecting (no. 32); (2) Latin cross (nos. 11, 24, 37); (3) Greek cross (nos. 12 and 34); (4) polygonal (no. 10: 14 sides with ambulatory); and (6) single nave with apse. The dating of the churches of this group is controversial (J. Strzygowski, *Kleinasien,* passim; Ramsay - Bell, op. cit., passim; R. Lienhardt, *Church* n. 1, 300-303; P. Verzone, *Turchia*, cc. 204-205; R. Krautheimer, *Early Architecture*, pp. 123-124; S. Eyice, *Karadag*, pass.; M. Restle, *Binbirkilise*: RBK 1,690-719). Churches nos. 1, 6, 7 and 21 are the oldest and constitute a *terminus post quem;* but the whole group has no decorations to compare with those of Alahan and Dag Pazari.

II. Diocese of Pontus. The diocese of *Pontus comprised the province of *Bithynia to the W; Paphlagonia, Diospontus and Pontus Polemonianus to the N; *Galatia and *Cappadocia to the S; and Armenia Minor to the E (A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, passim, and Mape II). *Gregory of Nyssa (*Ep.* 2,9) said that the region was rich in churches. In Cappadocia, the largest partly surviving church (probably 5th c.) is that of Kayseri (*Caesarea), of which a stretch of wall existed until a few years ago (A. Gabriel, *Monuments,* pl. XXVII, 1). Windows and doors were framed by a band of several contours vaguely recalling the decoration of *Qalat Seman. Caesarea, a thriving city, was razed by the Turks in the 11th c.; the ruins of a *monastery remain. Unfortunately the great ancient churches of this area were destroyed in the ebb and flow of Arabs and Byzantines from the 7th to the 12th c., and our evidence of them is limited to capitals and sporadic pieces (G. Jacopi, *Commagene,* 18) reused in mosques or preserved in local museums. Capitals, often of finely indented leaves like those of Alahan, Dag Pazari etc. (A. Gabriel, *Monuments* II, pls. L and LI), attest the existence *in situ* of great buildings of this type. Surviving churches, though, are small and must have belonged to sparsely populated centers; the sketchiness of decorative elements such as corbelled cornices, windows—often small—and horseshoe arches means they must be dated after the 7th c. (var. aus., *Cappadoce,* passim; M. Restle, *Kappadokien*: RBK 4,68-1115; Id., *Studien,* passim), i.e., beyond our period. The churches of Eski Andaval, near Nidğe, and some buildings in rock such as those of Maçan or St. John the Baptist at Čavuşin date to an

early period. Monastic complexes of a later period also survive, dug out of rock, such as those at Uenasa and Zelve. The Ihlara Valley (Peristrema), untouched by the sacks of the 7th and 8th-c. Arab invasions, were an oasis of monasticism, which was widespread and flourishing there until the 14th c. There are still ca. 150 churches and various monasteries in the valley between the villages of Ihlara and Selime, a distance of 14 km (8.7 mi). Bithynia also escaped affliction by the Arabs. St. Sophia at *Nicaea (5th c., rebuilt several times from the 8th c.) had a basilica plan, three aisles separated by columns, projecting apse (three-sided externally) and narthex in front (N. Brunow, *St. Sophie,* 471-481). At Triglia (F.W. Hasluck, *Bithynica,* 285-290) the church of St. Stephen (rebuilt on an earlier one in the 8th c.) has deep-cut capitals, typical of the Constantinople era, betraying a 6th-c. origin. At *Ancyra, capital of *Galatia, we find a church installed *ab antiquo* in a pagan building; the cella of the well-known temple was transformed into a three-aisled basilica by adding a rectangular apse (G. Perrot - E. Guillaume - J. Delbet, *Exploration,* 296-297, pl. 12 and 14; D. Krencker - M. Schede, *Den Tempel,* pl. 21); the pronaus formed a pseudonarthex. The type of masonry in the apse, using material from the old building, is 5th c. (G. Foss, *Ankara,* 65; M. Restle, *Ankyra,* RBK 1,71-172), but the insertion of a basilica in an important pagan temple suggests 6th c., while the masonry of polychrome bands has a counterpart in Justinian's martyrium of St. John at Ephesus.

The church of Yürme, ancient Eudoxia, has five aisles divided by pillars and a rectangular apse (an evocation of the church of Ancyra?). The pillars, unlike those of Cappadocia, had the longer side set lengthwise, an indication of greater antiquity. Its attribution is to the 5th (J.W. Crowfoth, *Notes,* 91-94) or 6th c. (M.H. Ballance, *Galatia,* RBK 4,608-613).

The picture of the region thus far considered is just a sketch of a once-flourishing Christian civilization that vanished centuries ago. The important cities of the Byzantine era were mostly on the coast and were destroyed by the Arabs; only a part of them survives. Those in the interior, less important because of their smaller economic potential, were already of secondary importance, and the majority of them, e.g., Lycian Laodicea, have not been excavated or else have been built over and the old ruins buried under Islamic dwellings. Archaeological excavations will undoubtedly make a major contribution.

G. Perrot - E. Guillaume - J. Delbet, *Exploration archéologique de la Galatie et de la Bithynie, d'une partie de la Mysie, de la Phrygie, de la Cappadoce et du Pont*, I, Paris 1872; K.G. Lanckoronski, *Die Städte Pamfilien und Pisidien*, Vienna 1890-1892, 2 vols.; W.M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170*, London-New York-Toronto 1892; W. Dörpfeld, *Die Bauwerke im Bericht über die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1900–1901*, Athens 1902; J.T. Clarke - F.H. Bacon - R. Koldewey, *Investigations at Assos*, London-Cambridge-Leipzig 1902-1921; J. Strzygowski, *Kleinasien, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte*, Leipzig 1903; F.W. Haluck, *Bithynica*: ABSA 13 (1906-7) 285-298; H. Rott, *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien and Lykien*, Leipzig 1908; T. Wiegand, *Sechster vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königlichen Museen in Milet u. Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen,* ADAW 1908, 28-32; W.M. Ramsay - G. Bell, *The Thousand and One Churches*, London 1909; E. Kalinka, *Xanthos*: *Tituli As. M.*, II, Vienna 1920, 94ff.; N. Brunow, *L'église de Sainte Sophie à Nicée*: EO 104 (1925) 471-481; A. Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*, 2 vols., Paris 1931-34; *Forschungen in Ephesos*, IV, 1: E. Reisch - F. Knoll - J. Kell, *Die Marienkirche*, Vienna 1932; F. Miltner, *Vorläufige Berichte über die Grabungen in Ephesos*: JÖAI 28 (1933) 12-15; G. Jacopi, *Dalla Paflagonia alla Commagene. Relazione sulla prima campagna esplorativa (1935)*, Rome 1936; D. Krencker - M. Schede, *Der Tempel in Ankara*, Berlin-Leipzig 1936; *Forschungen in Ephesos*, IV, 2: F. Miltner - H. Gerstinger - C. Praschniker, *Das Coemeterium der Sieben Schläfer*, Vienna 1937; G. Jacopi, *Esplorazioni e studi in Paflagonia e Cappadocia. Relazione sulla seconda campagna esplorativa (1936)*, Rome 1937; J. Lassus, *L'église cruciforme*: Ant Or 2 (1938) 5ff.; L. Crema, *Pergamo*: Palladius 2 (1938) 69ff.; G. Jacopi - L. Crema, *Gli scavi della Missione Archeologica Italiana ad Afrodisiade nel 1937*: MAL 38 (1939) cols. 179ff.; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern*: JDAI 54 (1939) 128-130; Th. Wiegand, *Didyma*, I, Berlin 1941; O. Bayatli, *Bergama Tarihinde*, n. p. 1951; *Forschungen in Ephesos*: G.A. Sotiriu - J. Keil - H. Hörmann - F. Miltner, *Die Johanneskirche*, Vienna 1951; A. Harnack, *Missione e propagazione del Cristianesimo nei primi tre secoli*, It. ed. [3]1954; F. Fasolo, *La basilica del Concilio di Efeso. Con alcune note sull'architettura romana della valle del Meandro*: Palladio n.s. 5 (1956) 1-30; P. Verzone, *Un monumento dell'arte tardo-romana in Isauria, Alahan Monastir*, Turin 1956; G.H. Forsyth, *Architectural Notes on a Trip through Cilicia*: DOP 11 (1957) 218ff.; M. Gough, *Reports on Alahan Monastir*: AS 12 (1962) 17-31; 13 (1963) 105ff.; 14 (1964) 185ff.; 17 (1967) 37ff.; 18 (1968) 159ff.; A.M. Mansel, *Die Ruinen von Side*, Berlin 1963; R.M. Harrison, *Churches and Chapels of Central Lycia*: AS 13 (1963) 117-151; A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, Oxford 1964; M. Schede, *Die Ruinen von Priene*, Berlin 1964; R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, Harmondsworth 1965, [4]1986 (It. tr. *Architettura paleocristiana e bizantina*, Turin 1986); R. Lienhardt, *The Great Basilica n. 1, at Bin Bir Kilise in Anatolia*: JSAH 24 (1965) 4, 300-303; K. Enim, *Aphrodisias 1965 Campaign*: TAD 15, 1 (1966) 60-61; Id., *Aphrodisias 1966 Campaign*: TAD 15, 2 (1966) 57-58; Id., *The ninth Campaign of excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria*: TAD 18, 2 (1969) fig. 21; G. Kleiner, *Die Ruinen von Milet*, Berlin 1968; Id., *Die Grabung in Milet im Herbst 1970*: TAD 19, 1 (1970) 121-122; H. Metzger, *Fouilles du Létoon et de Xanthos en 1970*: TAD 19, 1 (1970) 171; Id., *Fouilles de 1971 au Létoon et à Xanthos*: TAD 20, 1 (1973) 119-120; Id., *Campagne de 1972 au Létoon et à Xanthos*: TAD 21, 2 (1974) 133-134; Id., *Campagne de 1975 au Létoon et à Xanthos*: TAD 24, 2 (1977) 64-65; var. aus., *Arts de Cappadoce*, Geneva-Paris-Munich 1950; S. Eyice, *Karadağ (Binbirkilise) ve Karaman*, Istanbul 1971; R.M. Harrison, *A Note on Architectural Sculpture in Central Lycia*: AS 22 (1972) 187-197; M. Gough, *The Emperor Zeno and Some Cilician Churches*: AS 22 (1972) 203-209, figs. 3 and 4; S. Hill, *The Early Christian Church at Tomarza*: DOP 29 (1975) 149-164; A.M. Mansel, *Bericht über Ausgrabungen u. Untersuchungen in Pamphylien in den Jahren*

1957-1972: AA 90 (1975) I, 50-57, Abb. 4; C. Foss, *Late Antique and Byzantine Ankara*: DOP 31 (1977) 61-65; P. Verzone, *Hierapolis di Frigia nei lavori della Missione archeologica italiana*: La ricerca scientifica 100, Q. C.N.R. 1978, 448-470; M.J. Mellink, *Archaeology in Asia Minor*: AJA 83 (1979) 243, ill. 2; J.W. Crowfoot, *Notes upon Late Anatolian Art*: ABSA 4 (1897-98); M. Restle, *Studien zur frühbyzantinischen Architektur Kappadokiens*, 2 vols., Vienna 1979; Id., *Kappadokien*: RBK 4,968-1115; Id., *Binbirkilise*: RBK 1,690-719; Id., *Ankyra* RBK 1,170-177; Id., *Ephesos* 2,164-198; Id., *Kommagenes, Kilikien, Isauria*: RBK 5,182-357; Id., Lykanonien: RBK 5,818-854; Id., Lykien: RBK 5,856-902; Id., *Mysien und Hellespont*: RBK 6,839-867; M. H. Ballance, *Galatia*: RBK 4, 608-615; P. Verzone, *Le fasi della basilica giustinianea di S. Giovanni di Efeso*, Rend. PARA 51/52 (1978/1979) 213-235; Id., *Le primitive disposizioni del Martyrium di Hierapolis*: Proceedings of the 10th Inter. Congress of Classical Archaeology, ed. E. Akurgal, Ancyra 1978, 1057-1062; Id., *L'editto "cunctos populos" del 380 e la propagazione dei vescovadi in tutto l'impero*, in Festschrift Deichmann, Bonn 1986, 149-162; C. Foss, *Ephesus after Antiquity: A Late Antique, Byzantine and Turkish City*, Cambridge 1979; A.D. Macro, *The Cities of Asia Minor under the Roman Empire*: ANRW II,7,2 (1980) 658-697; Th. Pekáry, *Kleinasien unter römischen Herrschaft*: ANRW II,7,2 (1980) 596-657; C. Foss, *Ankyra*: RAC 1985 Suppl. Lief. 3, 448-465; L. Rodley, *Cave Monasteries of Byzantine Cappadocia*, Cambridge 1985; J. Lafontaine-Dosogne, *Histoire de l'art byzantin et chrétien d'Orient*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1987; J.-P. Sodini, *Les groupes épiscopaux de Turquie (à l'exception de la Cilicie)*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, I, Rome 1989, 405-427; *Costantinopoli e l'arte delle province orientali*, eds. F. de' Maffei, C. Barsanti, A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Rome 1990; V. Ruggieri, *Byzantine Religious Architecture (582-867): Its History and Structural Elements*, OCA 237, Rome 1991; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, Oxford 1993; F.R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529*, 2 vols., Leiden 1993-1994; R. Cormack, *The Wall-Painting of St. Michael in the Theater*, Aphrodisias papers 2, R.R.R. Smith - K.T. Erim (eds.), Ann Arbor, MI 1991, 109-122; C. Foss, *The Lycian Coast in the Byzantine Age*: DOP 48 (1994) 1-52; Gary J. Johnson, *Early-Christian Epitaphs from Anatolia*, Atlanta 1995; V. Ruggieri, *L'architettura religiosa nell'Impero Bizantino (fine VI-IX secolo)*, Soveria Mannelli 1995; H. Hellenkemper, *Frühe christliche Walfahrtsstätten in Kleinasien*, in *Akten des XII. Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, I, Münster 1995, 259-271; *Arte profana e arte sacra a Bisanzio*, eds. A. Iacobini - E. Zanini, Rome 1995; C. Foss, *Cities, Fortresses, and Villages of Byzantine Asia Minor*, Aldershot 1996; P. Guinea Díaz, *Nicea, Estudio de una ciudad en la Bitinia Romana*, Sevilla 1997; E. Zanini, *Introduzione all'archeologia bizantina*, Rome 1998; J. Durand, *L'art byzantin*, Paris 1999; D. Cottica, *Unguentari tardo antichi dal "martyrion" di Hierapolis, Turchia*: MEFRA 112 (2000) 999-1021; N. Thierry, *La Cappadoce de l'antiquité au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout 2002; *Die spätantike Stadt und ihre Christianisierung*, eds. G. Brands - H.-G. Severin, Wiesbaden 2003. See also the various volumes *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*, Vienna: Bd. 2: *Kappadokia, Charsianon, Sebasteia und Lykandos*, 1981; Bd. 4: *Galatien und Lykaonien*, 1984; Bd. 5: *Kilikien und Isaurien*, 1985; *Phrygien und Pisidien*, 1990; Bd. 9: *Paphlagonien und Honorias*, 1996; Bd. 10: *Aigaion Pelagos (Die nördliche Ägäis)*, 1989; EAM 3,517-536; 4,222-229; EAA2 4,612-629; ODB (various entries).

D. De Bernardi Ferrero

III. Sculpture, painting and minor arts. The plastic work of Asia Minor in the Late Antique period is of great importance especially for sculpture in the round, since it was here that the idiom that would later characterize Byzantine sculpture proper was born and developed. The majority of the Late Antique sculptures now in the museums of Istanbul, Selçuk, Vienna, New York etc. came from the great metropolises like Ephesus and Aphrodisias, the best-known examples being the reliefs on the base of the obelisk of *Theodosius I and the head of *Arcadius (all probably executed by artists trained in Asia Minor), and the statue of *Valentinian II (Istanbul, Arch. Mus.) from the baths of Aphrodisias. In this new conception of the human figure, great importance is given to the face, esp. the eyes, while the body is hidden by the drapery, generally flattened. Gone are naturalistic observations: the idealized portrait and, in historical reliefs, the so-called moral perspective prevail. The praying figures in the so-called Rotunda of *Galerius at *Thessalonica (mid-5th c.) are in my opinion a clear transposition of this idiom into painting, emphasizing the acceptance of the idiom not just in Asia Minor and new Rome but also in important centers of the empire like Thessalonica in particular, geographically close to the capital and a historical link between East and West.

This idiom did not begin *ex abrupto* in Asia Minor in the 4th-5th c.: rather, Late Antique work represents the point of arrival of a process that matured in this area, signs of which can already be seen in 2nd-c. works and whose most important evolutionary steps can be traced. In my opinion, an exhibition at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (October 1981), part of the material excavated at Ephesus, allows us, by considering the pieces chronologically, to reconstruct the phases of this process, which came about by degrees, in a coherent diagram. An important moment in this process is probably the tetrarchical reliefs of Hadrian's temple at Ephesus (see B. Brenk, *Die Datierung der Reliefs,* 238-258), which anticipate certain "Theodosian" sculptures. Though sometimes assigned to the mid-4th c. (see A. Bammen - R. Fleischer - D. Knibbe, *Führer durch Ephesos,* 78ff.), I would accept the attribution of these reliefs to the period of the tetrarchy. The example of Ephesus was certainly not isolated, as is demonstrated by the surviving statues of Aphrodisias in particular and also of the other main centers of Asia Minor (see the catalogs of Y. Inan and E. Alföldi Rosenbaum of Roman and Byzantine portrait sculpture from Turkey).

Pieces belonging to the period between Theodosius I and Theodosius II provide precise terms of comparison which allow us to assign to this period

certain portraits usually classified as Justinianean, e.g., the splendid female bust from Istanbul now in the Metropolitan Museum, which Harrison, at the 16th Int. Cong. of Byzantine Studies (R.M. Harrison, *Anicia Juliana's Church of St. Polyeuktos*: JÖByz 32 (1982) 435-442), arbitrarily identified with Princess Juliana Anicia (d. 527). In addition to stylistic data, the hairstyle, which lacks a diadem, differs from that of Anicia's portrait in the opening miniature of the so-called Vienna Dioscorides, or the so-called Theodora in the Musei Civici of Milan Castle. A heightened stylization, sometimes impaired by a low level of quality, separates the output of Asia Minor in the 4th and 5th c. from later, generally Justinianean, work, such as the Ephesus statues attributed to this period (see Y. Inan - E. Rosenbaum, *Portrait Sculpture*, pl. CLXXXV-VI) in which the hairstyle has become pure ornamentation, and the similar head from Çanakkale, now at Istanbul Arch. Mus.; in both cases the overall conception is prevalently decorative.

The output of architectural decoration, partly summarized—esp. as regards slabs decorated in bas-relief from the 9th to the 10th c.—by Ulbert, is also very rich and is part of the wider idiom of the Mediterranean koine (prevalent motifs: losenges, crosses, facing animals, plant motifs and so on). Some ambos of the 5th-6th c. have a certain interest, e.g., that of Priene, decorated with plant motifs, in a typology peculiar to Ionia and Caria (see O. Feld, *Spätantike,* 168). In this wide and varied picture it is possible to distinguish work belonging to the most important regional schools, such as Isauria and Cilicia, esp. in the period of the Isaurian emperor *Zeno (474–491). Both were characterized by the use of local stone—marble pieces are rare—decorated with plant and symbolic motifs, often aniconic. In these works the decoration generally occupies the whole surface, in a sort of *horror vacui:* see the altars and architectural decorations of Alahan Monastir and, to cite the most interesting examples, the cylindrical altar from Tomarza, now in Kayseri Arch. Mus. (see M. Restle, *Studien*, figs. 210 and 212, and p. 165). Similar decorations occur in the builders' yard of *Qalat Seman (N Syria), also from the time of Zeno, who was *magister militum per Antiochiam* before becoming emperor.

As for capitals in particular, Ionic impost capitals are very common, esp. in the great centers (see F.K. Yegül, *Early Byzantine Capitals from Sardis,* 265-274), while acanthus-leaf capitals are found esp. in the great 5th-c. foundations (e.g., the pre-Justinianean basilica of St. John at Ephesus, the martyrium of St. Philip at Hierapolis, Meriamlik etc.). Small local museums are important mines of material: there are superb little-known marble pieces in the museums of Afyon Karahisar, Iznik, Amasya and so on, to say nothing of the many museums of eastern Turkey. The work of these regions, though prevalently autochthonous (the idiom is different, as we have seen, around metropolises like Ephesus and Aphrodisias), is often informed by metropolitan tendencies, esp. if linked to "court" commissions (see, e.g., the capitals of Alahan Monastir, which transpose into local stone the type of the marble capitals of St. John of Studios, ca. 450). Even the idiom of the particular decorations of St. *Polyeuctos finds an echo in the regions of Asia Minor, e.g., in my opinion, some capitals of the so-called Čumanin Camii at Antalya in Lycia. In general we are faced with a varied and multivalent output, which, esp. in the course of the 5th c., touches the greatest heights: this century is in fact revealed to art-historical examination as a period of lively experimentalism in contrast with the "standardization" of the time of Justinian.

Work from the 7th and 8th c., the "dark" centuries of the Byzantine Empire, is, for historical and political reasons, extremely fragmentary. With the restoration of images and the rise to power of the Macedonian dynasty, we see in Asia Minor as well a certain artistic revival (though some situations were definitively compromised and the great centers of *Late Antiquity reduced to little more than villages), though it is far from the notable work of the proto-Byzantine period.

Painting and mosaics. Early Christian frescoes are rare in Asia Minor. The most interesting find is a burial chamber on the hill of Čaltepe near Izmir (see N. Firatli, *An Early Byzantine Hypogeum,* 919-932), excellently preserved: side walls decorated with plant and bird motifs alternating with panels imitating *opus sectile;* barrel vault painted with a coffer motif; main wall with a *cantharus* between two facing peacocks; and Constantine's monogram high up in a tympanum. These 4th-c. frescoes have points of contact with certain hypogea in Asia Minor (e.g. *Sardis and Izmit) and with that of Silistria (lower Moesia).

Mosaics, esp. pavement mosaics, abound in the great centers of Asia Minor such as Ephesus (see W. Jobst, *Mosaiken*), using the most traditional Late Antique motifs, i.e., geometrical, plant, *emblemata* etc. Early Byzantine churches generally prefer geometrical motifs: at Ephesus, the floor of the Seven Sleepers, recently assigned to the time of Theodosius I (see W. Jobst, *Zur Bestattungskirche,* 271ff.), and those of the Churches of St. John and St. Mary. The most interesting work is that of Cilicia, for historical-geographical reasons close to the Antio-

chene artistic milieu (Cilicia depended on the *patriarchate of Antioch), esp. mosaics at *Mopsuestia, probably a *synagogue, with scenes from the life of Samson (see E. Kitzinger, *Observations,* 133-144), mosaic with Noah's Ark also at Mopsuestia (see H. Buschhausen, *Die Deutung des Archenmosaik,* 57ff.), that at Karlik (see M. Gough, *The Peaceful Kingdom,* 411-419), etc. This work, which often reveals deep symbolic meanings, extends over the 4th-6th c. (see L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken*) and stylistically has particular points of contact with Antioch and sometimes with *Palestine. Wall mosaics are rather rare, at least judging from surviving works (apart from the splendid mosaics of the destroyed Church of the Dormition at Nicaea, attributed to Constantinopolitan artisans: date contested). In a room at Ephesus interesting mosaics in brightly colored glass stones were found with scenes of grape harvest and busts, including Bacchus and Ariadne (late 4th or early 5th c., see W. Jobst, *Mosaiken,* figs. 110-124, who has compared them, among others, with those of S. Costanza, Rome). Those in Christian buildings include scanty fragments in the *diaconicon* of the church of Dereağzi in Lycia, ca. 20 km (12 mi) NW of Myra, now in Antalya Arch. Mus., probably fragments of a *theophany inspired by Isaiah or *Ezekiel, with a wheel surrounded by flames (a scene that sometimes appears in early Cappadocian cycles and the oldest Georgian apses); also the remains of a figure, including sandaled feet and part of a tunic (predominant colors: green—in various shades—white, turquoise, yellow and red). Like the church itself—a building of great artistic interest—they are generally dated to the 9th c. (post-843); but having examined them closely at Antalya, I would bring them forward to the mid 6th, or at most 7th, c. on the basis of technical and stylistic considerations. The fragments show a grainy connective tissue and linear rendering of clothing as in numerous old Byzantine mosaics; in posticonoclast work the design is generally more precise and compact, as we can see by comparing these with the post-843 images of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (or the late 8th-c. ones in Hagia Sophia, Thessalonica). A further fragment of wall mosaic, hardly legible, was found in the apse of a small room at Anemurium in *Cilicia, with remains of a Greek inscription (see Rosenbaum - Huber - Ourkan, *Survey in Cilicia*).

So-called minor arts. Of numerous silver liturgical objects, the most interesting pieces are probably the so-called Kumluca treasure from Lycia, now partly in Antalya Arch. Mus., partly in the United States (see N. Firatli, *Trésor,* 523-525). Plates decorated with a cross, chalices, perforated plates for candlesticks and a censer with scenes of Christ's life are perfectly preserved: made in the time of Justinian, whose monogram is impressed in several places, under Bishop *Eutychianus, mentioned in Greek inscriptions engraved on several pieces. The Isaurian silver reliquary from Çirga, now in Adana Arch. Mus., is older, depicting the local saints Conon and *Thecla and other saints, with busts of *Helena and *Constantine on either side of the cross (see H. Buschhausen, *Spätrömische Metallscrinia,* 190). The piece is dated to the 5th c. (see M. Gough, *A Fifth Century Reliquiary,* 244-250) and the 4th c. (Buschhausen). The 4th c. date seems to me more convincing, esp. since Helena's hairstyle is the same as that attested on coins, which seems improbable in the 5th c.

Judging from silver and bronze pieces in Turkish and foreign museums, the output of metal objects was abundant, esp. in the 4th-6th c., the most significant centuries of the artistic history of this area.

General works: Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, London 1928ff.; articles on the most important regions and centers so far published in RBK; *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte*: O. Feld, *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt-Berlin-Vienna 1977; G. Macchiarella, s.v. *Bizantino*, additional volume of the *Enciclopedia Universale dell'Arte*, Rome 1978; var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, Washington 1979 (indexes relating to pieces from A. M.); entries in ODB.

Sculpture: N. Thierry, *Notes sur l'un des bas-reliefs d'Alahan Monastir en Isaurie*: CArch 13 (1963) 43-47; O. Feld, *Bericht über eine Reise durch Kilikien*: IstMitt 14 (1964) 88-107; J. Inan - E. Rosenbaum, *Roman and Early Byzantine Portrait Sculpture in Asia Minor*, London 1966; C. Mango, *Isaurian Builders*, in Polychronion (Festschrift F. Dölger), Heidelberg 1966, 358-365; B. Brenk, *Die Datierung der Relief am Hadrianstempel in Ephesos und das Problem der Tetrarchischen Skulptur des Osten*: IstMitt 18 (1968) 238-258; T. Ulbert, *Studien zur dekorative Reliefplastik des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes*: Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 10, Munich 1969; Id., *Untersuchungen zu den Byzantinischen Reliefplatten des 6 bis 8 Jahrhunderts*: IstMitt 19-20 (1969-1970) 339-357; P. Verzone, *La cattedrale di Priene e le sue decorazioni*: FR (1970) 261-275; W. Oberleitner, *Zwei Spätantike Kaiserköpfe aus Ephesos*: Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Vienna 69 (1973) 127-165; U. Peschlow, *Fragmente eines Heiligensarkophags in Myra*: IstMitt 23-24 (1973) 225-231; A. Bammen - R. Fleischen - D. Knibbe, *Führer durch das Archäologische Museum in Selçuk Ephesos*, Vienna 1974; W. Deichmann, *Spätantike Bauplastik in Ephesos*, Mélanges Mansel I, Ancyra 1974, 549-570; F.K. Yegül, *Early Byzantine Capitals from Sardis: A Study on the Ionic Impost Type*: DOP 28 (1974) 265-274; O. Feld, *Christliche Denkmäler aus Milet und seiner Umgebung*: IstMitt 25 (1975) 197-209; S. Hill, *The Early Christian Church at Tomarza, Cappadocia: A Study Based on Photographs Taken in 1909 by G. Bell*: DOP 29 (1975) 151-164; Y. Inan - E. Alföldi Rosenbaum, *Römische und Frühbyzantinische Portraitplastik aus der Türkei*, Neue Funde, Mainz 1979; M. Restle, *Studien zur Frühbyzantinischen Architektur Kappadokiens*, Vienna 1979; N. Firatli, *La sculpture byzantine figurée au Musée archéologique d'Istanbul*, Paris 1990; *Hierapolis. Scavi e ricerche*, 2 vols., ed. T. Ritti, Rome 1985; C. Mango, *Byzantine Architecture*, London [2]1986; Id., *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-*

1454: Sources and Documents, Toronto-London 1986; *Hierapolis: scavi e ricerche*, III, ed. G. Bejor, Rome 1991.

Materials and centers of production: E. Atalay, *Antiker Marmorsteinbruch bei Ephesos*: OJh 51 (1976-1977) 59-60; D. Monna - P. Pensabene, *Marmi dell'Asia Minore*, Rome 1977; N. Asgari, *Roman and Early Byzantine Marble Quarries of Proconnesus*: Acts X Congresso Int. Archeology Classica, Ancyra 1978, 467-480; A. Pralong, *Trouvailles dans une carrière phrygienne inconnue: une inscription rupestre et un sarcophage "in situ"*: RA 2 (1980) 251-262; J.B. Wand-Perkins, *Nicomedia and the Marble Trade*: PBSR 48, n.s. (1980) 23-69; *Arte profana e arte sacra a Bisanzio*, eds. A. Iacobini - E. Zanini, Rome 1995; E. Concina, *Le arti di Bisanzio: secoli VI-XV*, Milan 2002.

Painting and mosaics: E. Rosenbaum - G. Huber - S. Ourkan, *A Survey of Coastal Cities in Western Cilicia*, Ancyra 1967; J. Morgenstern - R.E. Stone, *The Church at Dereagzi: A Preliminary Report on the Mosaics of the Diaconicon*: DOP 23 (1969-70) 383-393; L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien*, 2 vols., Recklinghausen 1969, 1972; H. Buschhausen, *Die Deutung des Archenmosaik in der Justinianischen Kirche von Mopsuestia*, JÖByz 21 (1972) 57ff.; E. Kitzinger, *Observations on the Samson Floor at Mopsuestia*: DOP 27 (1972-1974) Bbl. 271ff.; N. Firatli, *An Early Byzantine Hypogeum Discovered at Iznik*: Mélanges Mansel II, Ancyra 1974, 919-932; M. Gough, *The Peaceful Kingdom: An Early Christian Mosaic Pavement in Cilicia Campestris*, ibid. I, 411-419; E. Kitzinger, *A Fourth Century Mosaics Floor in Pisidian Antioch*, ibid., 385-395; W. Jobst, *Römische Mosaiken aus Ephesos* I, Forschungen in Ephesos VIII, 2, Vienna 1977; S. Campbell, *The Corpus of Mosaic Pavements in Turkey*, 3, *The Mosaics of Aphrodisias in Caria*, Toronto (Ont.) 1991; L. Van de Put, *The Architectural Decoration in Roman Asia Minor*, Turnhout 1995; A.J. Wharton, *Art of Empire: Painting and Architecture of the Byzantine Periphery: A Comparative Study of Four Provinces*, London-Philadelphia 1988; *Costantinopoli e l'arte delle province orientali*, eds. F. de' Maffei - C. Barsanti - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Rome 1990; M. Acheimastou-Potamianou, *Byzantine Wall Painting*, Athens 1994.

So-called minor arts: N. Firatli, *Un trésor du VI^e trouvé à Kumluca en Lycie*: Akten VII Int. Kongress für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City 1969, 523-525; H. Buschhausen, *Die Spätrömischen Metallscrinia und frühchristlichen Reliquiare*, Wiener Byzantinische Studien IX, Vienna 1971; *Early Christian and Byzantine Art: Textiles, Metalwork, Frescoes, Manuscripts, Jewellery, Steatites, Stone Sculptures . . . from the Fourth to the Fourteenth Centuries*, ed. R. Temple et al., Shaftesbury (Dorset)-London 1990; RBK 5,721-741.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

ASIATIC CULTURE. This term indicates the cultural *facies* characteristic of the Christianity of Roman Asia, but also branching out into other regions, in the 2nd and 3rd c. It characterizes a type of Christian culture different from, and in many aspects opposed to, that of *Alexandria. It lacked the compactness and homogeneity of Alexandrian culture: e.g., Alexandrian scriptural *exegesis systematically used the *allegorical method, whereas Asiatic exegetes were either literalist or allegorist or indeed both, according to the passage being interpreted. Alexandrian *trinitarian doctrine was the theology of the Logos, which stressed the Son's personality vis-à-vis the Father, while for the Asiatics, besides this doctrine (*Justin Martyr, *Theophilus), there was a strong *monarchian tendency, both *orthodox (*Irenaeus) and heterodox (*Noetus, the two *Theodotuses); the Alexandrians rigidly identified OT Wisdom with the Logos, while the Asiatics also attest an identification of Wisdom with the *Holy Spirit (Irenaeus, Theophilus). At the level of methodology and technique, Asiatic culture was less rigorous in research and less unified in direction.

But despite its lesser homogeneity, certain widespread characteristics gave Asiatic culture some common features that distinguished it from Alexandrian culture. A marked materialism prevailed among Asiatics that mixed at various levels popular influences, including those of Jewish origin, and intellectual influences, such as *Stoicism. Even a declared *Platonist like Justin had a *millenarian, i.e., materialist, *eschatology. This materialism was reflected in various areas, in opposition to the more rigid Alexandrian spiritualism of Platonic derivation. Thus, while the Alexandrians undervalued the human component of Christ vis-à-vis the divine, the Asiatics allowed it much more significance: as man, Christ is the image of God (Col 1:15) and the mediator between God and humanity (1 Tim 2:5). Whereas the Alexandrians viewed humanity platonically as a *soul with a *body, the Asiatics drew on *Aristotle's conception of human nature as a synthesis of soul and body; therefore, while the Alexandrians distinguished humanity as the image of God (Gen 1:27: soul) from the humanity made of clay (Gen 2:7: body), the Asiatics identified the two, to the extent that some of them (*Melito) conceived of God as having human features (*anthropomorphism). Asiatic eschatology was largely millenarian, whereas Alexandrian was antimillenarian. The whole relationship between God and human beings was conceived of more spiritually by the Alexandrians (a direct relationship of the Logos with the *human soul, *mystical tendencies, etc.). In a different context the *quartodeciman observance of *Easter was typically Asiatic in the strict sense, showing the influence of a Jewish element less prominent at Alexandria.

The cradle of this cultural tendency was Roman Asia, where Christian culture and literature flourished in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. alongside a similar flourishing of *pagan culture. Asiatic culture, however, spread immediately to culturally less-developed areas, such that the term "Asiatic" must be understood culturally rather than geographically: *Theophilus at Antioch and *Tertullian at Carthage are both "Asiatic."

During the 3rd c., Asiatic culture spread widely in the West. Typically Asiatic elements can be seen in *Lactantius, *Victorinus of Petovium, Potamius of Lisbon and in 5th-c. *Gaul. However, the Asiatics' best work had already been done by the end of the 2nd c. In the 3rd c. they encountered and were influenced by the Alexandrians, as can be seen in *Methodius of Olympus, in whom Platonic and *Origenian influences mix with typically Asiatic traits (materialist eschatology). The Council of *Nicaea (325) saw a momentary Asiatic doctrinal victory, owing to conflict among the Alexandrians (*Arius against *Alexander); but the anti-Nicene reaction that followed swept away the last real representatives of this ancient cultural tradition, *Eustathius of Antioch and *Marcellus of Ancyra. Only at Antioch did Asiatic influences continue to remain vital in both exegesis and *Christology, forming the soil that fed the flourishing of the Antiochene school in the late 4th c. and first decades of the 5th c.

M. Simonetti, *Alle origini di una cultura cristiana in Gallia*: *La Gallia romana* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, quaderno 158), Rome 1973, 117-129; Id., *Teologia alessandrina e teologia asiatica al concilio di Nicea*: Augustinianum 13 (1973) 369-398; Id., *Modelli culturali nella cristianità orientale del II-III secolo*: *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes, I: Antiquité tardive et Christianisme ancien (III^e-VI^e siècles)*, in *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine*, Paris 1992, 381-392.

M. Simonetti

ASSEMBLY. The first Christians, who were often on the move, preferred to define their meetings with a verb rather than a noun: συνάγειν, whence συναγωγή; the verbs συνέρχομαι, in Latin *coire, convenire, congregare,* sometimes qualified by ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, *in unum* (Acts, *Paul, *Ignatius). The gathered people were called ἐκκλησία, transliterated into Latin as *ecclesia,* which at first meant the meeting, later also the place (*domus ecclesiae*). The Greeks preferred σύναξις (*Origen, *Cyril of Jerusalem). Though continuing to frequent the temple, the first believers held their meetings in the upper room of a private house. The meetings are described in Acts: "They devoted themselves to the preaching of the apostles and the fellowship, to the breaking of the bread and to the prayers" (2:42). To the elements of Jewish *synagogue meetings (readings, songs, prayers, perhaps a homily), Christians added the *fractio panis,* the *sacrament of the Lord who was invisibly present to those who gathered in his name. The meeting was sometimes still called συναγωγή (Jas 2:2; Ign., *Pol.* 4,2), but Christians preferred the term *ecclesia,* to indicate the community of a city: structured, hierarchical, with regular meetings to express its unity (1 Cor 11:17) and its permanent state of "being on the move." The church thus continued the OT liturgical assemblies, called *qahal*. The assembly visibly expressed the bond and unity of Christians, who, even when dispersed, formed "one heart and one soul," one body, as was symbolized by the one loaf made up of many grains (*Didache* 9,10). The assembly was so essential for Christians that the *pagan *Pliny the Younger could describe them as "people who meet on a set day, before dawn, to raise their hymn together to Christ as to a god" (*Ep.* X, 96). In the evening too "they meet again to take an ordinary, innocent meal" (ibid.). Pliny may also have been interested in the mixed character of the meetings, with no clear distinction between men and women. *Justin Martyr describes the various assemblies to the emperor more eloquently. First, how the *catechumen, having received *baptism, goes to join the "united brothers," who welcome him with the *kiss of peace. With baptism, he enters the assembly of the new covenant. Every Sunday, the day of the *resurrection, the brothers flock from city and countryside. To accentuate their unity, they send the eucharistic gifts to those who are absent through the deacons. The assembly itself has the elements described in Acts: biblical readings, a homily, collective prayer, the presider's prayer in the name of the assembly, who approve it with a resounding *amen,* and finally, Communion (*1 Ap.* 65 and 67). *Tertullian (*Apol.* 39) says that the assembly is vital for Christians: *Corpus sumus . . . Coimus in coetum et congregationem*. The emperor *Diocletian struck at the church's heart by suppressing the holy books and prohibiting liturgical gatherings. The local proconsul reproached *Saturninus for having celebrated the Lord's Supper. Asked why he had done it, the future martyr responded: "We cannot live without celebrating the Lord's Supper" (*Acta Sat.*).

Regarding the components and rhythm of the Christian assembly, the main characteristic was its being a movement toward a locus of encounter. At certain points during the celebration, the assembly changed the physical direction of their prayers. But more important than the place were the people. *Clement of Alexandria says that the church is not so much a place as "the assembly of the elect" (*Strom.* VII, 29,4). *Augustine too specifies that the beauty comes from the living stones, not from the architecture. The assembly gathers the faithful of a given geographical area, who represent the whole church, whatever their language, occupation, social position, sex or age might be. It was not a select group or an elite, but a multitude, bringing together the baptized—

good, mediocre or bad. *Lactantius, comparing the Christians to the *pagans, says that they are *spiritu fratres, religione conservi,* not admitting the normal social distinctions (*Div. inst.* 5,16). It was a mixed multitude, as Augustine repeats—an assembly gathered to share in the word and the *bread, that it might radiantly "flourish in [active] charity." Out of this arose the social works (*agape, offerings, *diaconia*) inspired by the fraternity lived in the assembly. *Origen, in response to the pagan *Celsus, compared the peaceful, orderly Christian assemblies to tumultuous civic gatherings. He adds: "Every person endowed with reason will admire the one who had the will and power to cause the churches of God to arise in each city, which parallel the assemblies of the people in each city. Likewise, comparing the council of God with each city's political assembly, you could make clear that some members of the church's council are worthy, if there exists a city of God in the universe, to exercise their authority" (*C. Cels.* 3,30).

Whether held in the morning or evening, every day or once a week, with or without the *Eucharist, the assembly was convoked and directed by the hierarchy (Clem., *1 Clem.* 40-41; Ign., *Magn.* 7,1; *Phil.* 4 and *Tral.* 3,1-3). It consisted of a biblical reading, often commented upon as did Origen at Caesarea, psalms and prayers (Tertull., *Apol.* 39,3-4; *Didasc.* 13; *Trad. ap.* 31,35). *Prayer was more effective for being commonly employed (Ign., *Eph.* 13,1; Orig., *De or.*, 31,4): Origen explains this particular grace by the invisible presence of Christ, the angels and saints. The quality of the assembly was connected to its frequency (Heb 10:25). Ignatius (*Eph.* 5,3), the **Didascalia* 12 (ed. Nau) and many Fathers exhort the faithful to assiduousness, lamenting neglect. Origen insists that the homily not be omitted (*Gen. hom.* 10,1; *Ex. hom.* 12,2). The meeting must generate unity: separate conversations, discrimination, and personal likes and dislikes should be avoided. Origen reproves the older faithful who look down on new converts (*Comm. in Mt.* XV, 26). Various texts report exhortations to not disturb liturgical meetings with chatter or other noise during the preaching, as, e.g., Origen: "Why do I bother about those who are absent? Even you who are present here in church are not attentive, but usually engage in mundane chitchat" (*Gen. hom.* 10,1). Sometimes when a large number were present, the preacher's voice could not be heard well, and the crowd would gather around him, standing. Applause was not uncommon when the listeners were pleased. On some occasions the popular consensus was also manifested by popular *acclamations. In some cases, although only in the first part of the *liturgy, pagans attended, as for instance we see in Augustine's discourse recently discovered by Dolbeau (*Dolbeau 25*: NBA 35/2, 566ff.). In a coercive measure, the emperor *Licinius required a separation between men and women: men could not participate in liturgical assemblies with women (*Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 1,53,1). Gradually, however, especially in the East, the assemblies themselves established a spatial separation between men and women. The arrangement of the various categories of Christians in the worship space is also ancient: *catechumens, *fideles,* *penitents, *widows and *virgins, clergy. However, the assembly knew no organized separation of social classes: in theory, all were *fratres*. On *domenica in albis* the newly baptized officially entered the community; says Augustine: "With today's solemn rite your departure from these transennae takes place, which, as spiritual children, separated you from the other faithful" (*Sermo* 260/C,7); "Those who have been baptized in Christ and regenerated, after the solemn celebration of the sacraments, must mingle with the rest of the people of God" (*Sermo* 224,1).

From the 4th c. on liturgical structures became fixed, and East and West diverged from each other. Church buildings multiplied, often modeled on civil basilicas. The forms and texts of the great liturgies were fixed. Feasts of martyrs and pilgrimages were now added to the earlier meetings. We can distinguish between sacramental assemblies (baptism and Eucharist), of which the eucharistic celebration was the summit and most perfect form, and nonsacramental assemblies, which were no less liturgical and required the presence of the hierarchy. These latter always included sacred reading, singing, and prayers of the people and celebrant.

*Egeria punctuated the stages of her pilgrimage with liturgical meetings in the churches she visited, in company with priests, where three elements always recurred: biblical reading, psalmody and prayer (*Itin. Eger.* 10,33; 14,4; 20,14; 24,4, etc.). A theology of assembly was born in which meeting was seen as "an epiphany of the church" (J. Hild). Each synaxis released an evangelical, apostolic and missionary power. It was the place of dialogue between Christ and the church, i.e., Christ's body, the "two in one flesh," as Augustine loved to say in the *Enarrationes* (*In ps.* 85 etc.). Every assembly had *eschatalogical significance, as already announced in the *Apocalypse, and a concept expressed moreover in the hymn *Caelestis urbs Jerusalem*. As architecture and iconography demonstrate, it anticipated in the obscurity of faith the church of the new *Jerusalem.

H. Chirat, *L'assemblée chrétienne à l'âge apostolique*, Paris 1949; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Westminster 2001 (¹1945); C. Vagaggini, *La preghiera nella Bibbia e nella tradizione patristica e medievale*, Rome 1964; L. Bouyer, *La vie de la liturgie*, Paris 1956; A. Hamman, *La prière*, 2 vols., Paris 1959-1964 (It. tr.); var. aus., *L'assemblée liturgique*, Rome 1977; C. Andresen, *Ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici*, in *Mélanges Krause*, Berlin-New York 1982, 103-121; N. Adkin, *A Problem in the Early Church: Noise During Sermon and Lesson*: Mnemosyne 38 (1985) 161-163; A. Monaci Castagno, *Origene predicatore*, Milan 1988; A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991; N. Duval, *Architecture et liturgie*: REAug 42 (1996) 111-157; *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homilies*, eds. M. Cunningham - P. Allen, Leiden 1998; N. Duval, *Les relations entre l'Afrique et l'Espagne dans le domaine liturgique: existe-t-il une explication commune pour les "Contre-Absides" et "Contre-choeurs"?*: RivAC 76 (2000) 429-476 (extensive critique of the volume: C. Godoy Fernández, *Arqueología y liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas [ss. IV al VIII]*, Barcelona 1995); La Maison Dieu, nn. 20 (1949); 40 (1954); 57 and 60 (1959); 193 (1993); 194 (1994); 215 (1998); *Storia del cristianesimo* I, 414-462; *Itin. Eger.*: CCL 175, 37-90.

A. Hamman

ASSUMPTION. A technical term indicating the glorification of the Virgin *Mary, body and soul, in heaven at the end of her earthly life. For Catholics, the assumption became a Marian dogma with Pius XII's definition (1 November 1950). Between the Councils of *Nicaea and *Ephesus the death of the Virgin was spoken of as a natural event. Timothy the priest (*Leontius of Constantinople's pseudonym) in the 5th c. was the first to speak of Mary's nonmortality (*Hom. in Simeonem et Annam*). The idea must not have been unique, since the priest *Hesychius, who died after 451 (*Hom. de S. Maria Deipara*), and his contemporary *Chrysippus (*Or. in S. Mariam Deiparam*) seem to allude to it. *Epiphanius, a collector not only of *heresies but of otherwise impossible-to-find information, reviewed in detail the situation current in his time in informed ecclesiastical circles: no one knew how Mary's earthly life ended (*Haer.*, 78,24). This idea remained unchanged until the 6th c., after which date one notes the coupling of the empty tomb and the assumption into heaven of Mary's glorified body in some homilies, esp. *Byzantine. The *apocrypha had also stressed the importance of the correlation "empty tomb—assumption of Mary," elaborating certain facts transmitted only by them and proceeding to significant connections. The *Transitus Mariae* of ps.-Melito 17,1 (recension B) links Mary's resurrection to her virginity, in line with a current already found in the 2nd c. in the assumptionist prototype of Leucius, a disciple of *John the Evangelist against whom ps.-Melito argued in the 4th-5th c. The prototype exists in an *Ethiopian text titled *Book of Exequies,* and reflects a *Jewish Christian community of exemplary *orthodoxy, in line with the NT data. The text documents and verifies what theologians in the 1950s called the "subterranean historical tradition" of the assumption that seemed to come to an end at the beginning of the 3rd c. It presents the end of Mary's earthly life in the light of the paschal mystery, on the lines of the gospel. Its salient moments are Mary's death, understood as the separation of soul from body, the immediate glorification of her soul, the burial of her body at Gethsemane, the assumption and reanimation of her body in paradise and her participation in the glory of the Son, seated at his right hand.

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 78,24 (PG 42, 737); Timothy, *Hom. in Sim. et Annam*: PG 86, 1237-1252; Hesychius, *Hom. de S. Maria Deip.*: PG 93, 1464-1465; Chrysippus, *Or. in S. Mariam Deip.*: PO 19, 336-343; *De Transitu Mariae Apocrypha Aethiopice*: CSCO vols. 342-343; Erbetta I, 2, 407-649 (with bibl.); M. Jugie, *La mort et l'Assomption de la S. Vierge, Étude historico-doctrinale*: ST 114 (1944); B. Bagatti, *Le origini della "tomba della Vergine" a Getsemani*: RivBib 11 (1963) 38-52; Id., *Le due redazioni del "Transitus Mariae"*: Marianum 32 (1970) 277-287; Id., *Nuove scoperte alla tomba della Vergine a Getsemani*: Lib. Annuus 22 (1972) 236-290; Id., *Ricerche sulle tradizioni della morte della Vergine*: Sac. Dottr. 18 (1973) 185-214; Id., *La morte della Vergine nel testo di Leucio*: Marianum 36 (1974) 456-459; Id., *Ricerche sull'iconografia della Koimesis* o *Dormitio Mariae*: Lib. Annuus 25 (1975) 225-253; Id., *La morte e la sepoltura di Maria secondo i nuovi dati*, in Acts VIII Conv. Bibl. Franc. It. Assisi 1977, 261-265; L. Cignelli, *Il prototipo giudeo-cristiano degli apocrifi assunzionisti*, in Studia Hier. in onore di P.B. Bagatti, Jerusalem 1975, 259-277; F. Manns, *Le récit de la dormition de Marie* (*Vatican gr., 1982*), *Contribution à l'étude des origines de l'exégèse chrétienne* (Franciscan Coll. Maior 33), Jerusalem 1989; S.C. Mimouni, *Dormition et Assumption de Marie. Histoire des traditions anciennes* (Théol. Hist. 098), Paris 1995.

E. Peretto

ASTERIUS of Amasea (bishop 378/395–400/431). Little is known of his life: young at the time of *Julian the Apostate, he was the pupil of a Scythian slave at *Antioch. Dependent literarily on the *Cappadocians, he also displays Antiochene influence. His surviving works (at least 16 homilies) are of good quality; his encomium of St. *Euphemia of *Chalcedon is noteworthy. Little inclined to dogmatic or exegetical speculation, most of his homilies are festive or moral. Manuscript tradition sometimes mixes him up with *Asterius the Sophist, occasionally with *Gregory of Nyssa. An encomium of St. *Basil of Caesarea (BHG 240) also goes under his name, but its authenticity is disputed.

CPG 3260-3265; PG 40, 164-389; BS 2, 514-516; Bardenhewer 3,

228-230; C. Datema, *Asterius of Amasea, Homilies I-XIV: Text, Introduction and Notes*, Leiden 1970; A. Bretz, *Studien und Texte zu Asterius von Amasea* (= TU 40,1), Leipzig 1914; E. Skard, *Asterios von Amaseia und Asterios der Sophist*: SO 20 (1940) 86-132; W. Speyer, *Die Euphemia-Rede des Asterios von Amaseia. Eine Missionsschrift für gebildete Heiden*: JbAC 14 (1971) 39-47; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Textkritisches zur sechsten Homilie des Asterius von Amasea*: Glotta 53 (1975) 242-244; C. Datema, *Les homélies XV et XVI d'Astérius d'Amasée*: SE 23 (1978-79) 63-93; M. Veronese, *L'esegesi di Asterio di Amasea*, in *Origene e l'alessandrinismo cappadoce (III-IV secolo)*. Acts del V Convegno del Gruppo Italiano di ricerca su "Origene e la tradizione alessandrina" (Bari, 20-22 September 2000), eds. M. Girardi - M. Marin, Bari 2002, 299-331.

S.J. Voicu

ASTERIUS of Ansedunum. Bishop of Ansedunum (4th-5th c.), he figures in *ms. Veron.* 93 as the author of a *libellus,* still unpublished, titled *Liber seu epistula ad Renatum monachum de fugiendo monialium colloquio et visitatione*. G. Morin has published a few fragments. The work denounces the abuses arising from the cohabitation of virgins with monks and priests. The MS calls Asterius a disciple of *Jerome. The current state of research does not allow the determination of Asterius's identity with certainty; he is otherwise unknown, as is Ansedunum.

CPL 642.

E. Prinzivalli

ASTERIUS of Arabia (*Petra) (d. after 362), saint (10 June). Took part in the Council of *Serdica (343), during which he broke with the (Eastern) *Arians and joined the (Western) *Nicenes. *Constantius exiled him to Upper *Libya; recalled in 362, he took part in the *Alexandrian synod convoked by *Athanasius and was asked to carry the synodal letter to *Antioch (*Tomus ad Antiochenos*). But his mission to reunite that church failed because of the arrival of *Lucifer of Cagliari.

Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III, Turin [3]1972, 249-251; EC 2,218; Simonetti, 170, 187, 360, 372; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Rome 1996, passim.

A. De Nicola

ASTERIUS the Sophist (4th c.). Native of *Cappadocia, pupil of *Lucian of Antioch, he supported *Arius from the first: with Arius he was the major theoretician of first-generation Arianism. We know that he had *apostatized during *Diocletian's persecution, and his opponents often brought this up against him. We know little of his movements during the Arian controversy, however; we last see him at the Council of *Antioch of 341. The fact that we have some of his homilies has caused some to think that in his last years he was elected bishop (of an unknown see). He wrote two works on the controversy: a *Syntagmation,* a summary of Arian doctrine, and a somewhat later work, dated right after the Council of *Nicaea. *Athanasius preserves fragments of the former, *Marcellus of Ancyra of the latter; while the former presents Arian doctrine in its radical form typical of Arius before Nicaea, the latter offers a more attenuated *subordinationism: here the Son is defined as the image, without difference from the Father in divinity, substance and power—an expression little compatible with early Arianism. *Philostorgius (*HE* II, 15) rebukes Asterius for moderating his initial Arianism. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 94) mentions Asterius's commentaries on the psalms, the gospels and Romans. There was no trace of these works until Richard and Skard ascribed 31 homilies to Asterius, 29 of them on the psalms (not all of certain authenticity, however), and fragments of a commentary, also on the psalms. W. Kinzig attributes these exegetical works to another person called Asterius the Homilist, an author active in the late 4th and early 5th c. at Antioch or nearby. On the whole, the *exegesis is traditional in its *christological reading of the OT text and seems deliberately to avoid doctrinal investigation, apart from generically *orthodox expressions (Christ generated from the Father *ante saecula,* etc.), evidence of a certain detachment in the late Asterius from the issues of the Arian controversy.

Editions: CPG II, 2815-2819; Quasten II, 196-200; G. Bardy, *Astérius le Sophiste*: RHE 22 (1926) 221-272; W. Kinzig, *Asterios Homilet*: LTK[3] 1,1101; Id., *Asterios, Sophist*: LTK[3] 1, 1102; *Oxford Dict. of the Christian Church* (1997), 118; W. Kinzig, *Asterius der Homilet*: LACL (1998) 56-57; Id., *Asterius der Sophist (von Kappadozien)*: ibid., 57-58. *Edizioni e traduzioni*: M. Vinzent (ed.), *Asterius von Kappadokien. Die theologischen Fragmente: Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1993; W. Kinzig (ed.), *Asterius, Homilie 31 (Richard), Neuedition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*: VChr 50 (1996) 401-415; Id. (ed.), *Psalmenhomilien/Asterius: eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert*, Stuttgart 2000, 2 vols.

Studies: G. Bardy, *Astérius le Sophiste*: RHE 22 (1926) 221-272; S. Giversen, *Liber Asterii and the New Testament*: Studia Theologica 19 (1965) 47-54; J. Duplacy, *L'Homélie II d'Astérius le Sophiste, homélie de l'Octave Pascale?*: Muséon 86 (1973) 275-282; G. Gelsi, *Kirche, Synagoge und Taufe in den Psalmenhomilien des Asterios Sophistes*, Vienna 1978; M.P. Ciccarese, *Un retore esegeta: Asterio il Sofista nell'om. 13 sul Salmo 7*: ASE 2 (1985) 59-69; M.F. Wiles - R.C. Gregg, *Asterius: A New Chapter in the History of Arianism?*, in R.C. Gregg (ed.), *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, Philadelphia 1985, 111-151; M.P. Ciccarese, *La composizione del "corpus" asteriano sui Salmi*: ASE 3 (1986) 7-42; W. Kinzig, *Erbin Kirche: die Auslegung von Psalm 5,1 in den Psalmenhomilien des Asterius und in der Alten Kirche*, Heidelberg

1990; Id., *In Search of Asterius: Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms*, Göttingen 1990; Id., *Asterius Sophista oder Asterius Ignotus? Eine Antwort*: VChr 45 (1991) 388-398; Id., *Bemerkungen zur Psalmenexegese des Asterius*, in J. van Oort - U. Wickert (eds.), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, Kampen 1992, 104-131; M. Vinzent, *Gottes Wesen, Logos, Weisheit u. Kraft bei Asterius und Markell von Ankyra*: VChr 47 (1993) 170-191; Id., *Die Gegner im Schreiben Markells von Ankyra an Julius von Rom*: ZKG 105 (1994) 285-328; Id., *Ps. Athanasius,* Contra Arianos IV. *Eine Schrift gegen Asterius*, Leiden 1996.

M. Simonetti

ASTERIUS TURCIUS RUFUS (d. after 494). Roman patrician and a Christian (2nd half 5th c.). From 476–483 his name was inscribed on a seat of the Flavian amphitheater. He was *comes, praefectus Urbi* and consul in 494. An educated, expert and passionate man of letters, during the year of his consulate he collated a manuscript of Virgil's *Eclogues,* which he published 21 April that year. Asterius included some of his own verses in this edition, which he says he completed despite the distraction of organizing the consular *ludi*. Shortly later (perhaps still in 494) Asterius published Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* (CSEL 10, VII: *[libri] recolliti adunatique sunt a Tuscio Rufo Asterio . . . editore librorum*). The Christian poet, in an epigram dedicated to Asterius, praises the editor's work, *cuius ope et cura* the five books of his *Carmen edita sunt populis*.

Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*: CSEL 10 (ed. J. Huemer), VII and 307; PLRE 2, Cambridge 1980 (J.R. Martindale), 173, *Asterius* 11; PCBE 2 (dir. C. Pietri and L. Pietri), *L'Italie chrétienne* (313-604), Rome 1999, 210, *Asterius* 13.

M. Spinelli

ASTROLOGY. Discipline which presumes to deduce foreknowledge of human destiny from observation of the movements and relative positions of the heavenly bodies. The concept of the divine nature of the celestial bodies, which gives astrology a specifically religious connotation, can be traced to the *Mesopotamian world and its notion of the relationship between some important divinities and the stars. In Greece it assumed a scientific character by the use of astronomical calculations using arithmetic and geometry. But the essence of astrology remains the certainty of the influence exercised on cosmic and human life by the heavenly bodies, in which divine personalities and wills operate. Besides *Mesopotamia ("Chaldean" astrology), astrology flourished in *Egypt, giving rise to a rich literature during the *Hellenistic period under the names of Nechepsos and Petosiris, or attributed to the revelation of the god Thoth, identified with the Greek *Hermes, called Trismegistus. The notion of the divinity of the celestial bodies is present in ancient Pythagorean circles and was formalized in the *Epinomis,* a late work of *Plato or of his disciple Philip of Opus. Prominent among authors of astrological works in Greek and Latin were Ptolemy (*Tetrabiblos*) and Manilius (*Astronomicon*). Many sources indicate the importance that astrologers and mathematicians had assumed in the Roman Empire in the first centuries AD. Many went to them to consult their "horoscope," i.e., a knowledge of the astral combinations which governed the person's life.

Christian writers sharply opposed and criticized the idea of astral influences determining human destiny—which was often expressed as a genuine fatalism—and the use of divination and *magic to know this destiny. *Tatian's *Address to the Greeks* argued fiercely against astral fatalism, which he saw as the most characteristic expression of the devil's dominion over humanity. *Ignatius of Antioch (*Ep. ad Eph.* 19) and later *Tertullian (*De idol.* 9) interpreted the gospel episode of the *magi to mean that, with the birth of Jesus, astrology had been defeated. Even the *gnostic Valentinians asserted that, with the new economy inaugurated by the Savior, destiny and the astral powers had lost all efficacy (*Exc. Theod.* 68-79). Yet despite the Fathers' polemic against astrological and divinatory practices, these penetrated even Christian circles. Their considerable spread among the more popular classes led to the intervention of the imperial authorities, who issued several decrees condemning such practices.

A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'Astrologie grecque*, Paris 1899; F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and the Romans*, New York 1912; A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I. *L'Astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris [3]1950; R. Caballero (ed.), *Homo Mathematicus. Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre astrólogos griegos y romanos* (*Benalmádena, 8-10 de octubre de 2001*), Málaga 2002. The new magazine "MHNH. Revista Internacional de Investigación sobre Magia y Astrología Antiguas" (Málaga), vols. 1-3 (2000-2003), offers an updated overview of research on the theme of astrology; var. aus., *Les Pères et l'astrologie*, coll. Les Pères dans la foi, Paris 2003.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

ASYLUM, Right of. The concept of asylum (from the Greek ἄσυλος, "inviolable") as a recognized place of refuge in case of need derives both from a system of values and from religion. It implies the right of immunity for a refugee pursued for a crime by the authorities, receiving and protecting the person in a sacred place; it was this special quality of the place that guaranteed the safety of the one who took ad-

vantage of it. For this special quality to be respected by the civil or military authorities, however, it had to be accepted in conscience by all involved, and hence its transgression involved consequences of various kinds, as, e.g., the fear of committing sacrilege because of the sacredness of the place. The term *asylum* (*asylon*) was traditional among *pagans and was used by the pagan historian *Zosimus; it was used very rarely by Christians, who preferred the expression *ad ecclesiam confugere* or others like it (DACL 4,1556; *ad domum ipsius fidei confugerant* [Aug., *Ep.* 1,3: Divjak]; *adiutorium in ipsa domo fidei requirebant* (Aug., *Ep.* 250,1). Among the Jews (temple; city of refuge), Greeks, Egyptians and Romans some sanctuaries enjoyed the right of refuge, but there were also other ways to obtain protection: kneeling before certain persons, altars or deities, or before the emperor's statue. In this last case the sacredness and protection derived from the statue, which represented the emperor's majesty. *Tacitus speaks of a woman who had an image of *Tiberius in her hand and could thus engage in insults against a Roman senator; nothing was done to intervene for fear of committing sacrilege against the emperor (*Annales* 3,36). Only with *Theodosius was asylum at statues recognized, with the concession of 10 days of immunity; the practice was abolished by *Justinian (CTh 9,44,1 of 386: CI 1,25,1).

Closely connected with asylum was the practice of *intercessio,* which consisted in an intervention with the authorities by the bishops on behalf of someone in difficulty (as distinct from a simple recommendation, which also occurred frequently); this was born out of the Christian concept of forgiveness, in view of the reformation of the guilty party. *Intercessio* and asylum were different practices but were often connected; in fact, asylum normally included an *intercessio* with the authorities on behalf of the refugee.

The first known case of asylum among Christians is that of Felix of Cirta (Numidia), who, pursued by the imperial authorities for having written a *libello* against the emperor *Maxentius, took refuge with Bishop *Mensurius (before 312; see Y. Duval); the second is that of *Martin of Tours, ca. 326 (Sulpicius, *Vita Martini* 2,1-3). The Council of *Serdica of 343, which speaks of asylum in a church, in the same can. 7 also addresses *intercessio,* seeking to regulate the practice: "It happens often that certain people who merit mercy take refuge in a church; they have been condemned for their crimes, either to imprisonment or to confinement on an island, or punished for some other reason; they should not be denied help, but pardon must be asked for these people with the civil authorities without delay or hesitation." A person who took refuge in a church might also be innocent, in which case the period of protection was useful for proving their innocence. The first official request we know goes back to the Council of *Carthage of 27 April 399, in which two bishops, Epigonius and Vincent, were entrusted with the task of going to court to obtain a law that no one would dare to remove someone who had taken refuge in a church (*confugientibus ad ecclesiam*) (Munier, *Concilia Africae,* CCL 149, Turnhout 1974, 194,393). The intervention of the Council of Serdica, which sought to regulate a de facto practice of taking refuge in churches (*saepe contingit*), means that the practice had already arisen, and the intention of the intervention was to oblige bishops to take the refugee's fate to heart. The church, which for Christians already had a sacred character as a place of Christian worship, was now acquiring a sacred character in the common mentality, a character that also had to be respected by the civil and military authorities. The text does not specify whether the refugees were Christians or pagans: all could have recourse to the practice. The sacred character of the buildings was recognized by the imperial authorities only in 395 (CTh 16,2,29; see 16,2,31). Legally churches could be violated, since there was no law protecting them, and they sometimes were violated: we know of too many such cases. Churches therefore did not offer an absolute guarantee (see *Ammianus 26,3,3: the charioteer Hilarinus, who took refuge *ad ritus Christiani sacrarium,* was taken and decapitated; Ammianus 15,5: Silvanus the usurper, who took refuge in a church, was taken and killed). Generally the sources mention asylum to recount instances of its violation (*Stilicho, who had *Cresconius removed from a church). During the sack of *Rome of 410, *Alaric respected the right of asylum, even for pagans who had taken refuge in Roman churches (*Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 1,7; *Orosius 7,39,10). Augustine's insistence that taking refuge in a church was accepted and respected by both Romans and Barbarians indicates a change in mentality.

In 392 *Theodosius intervened on a number of occasions to limit *intercessio* and asylum. CTh 9,40,15 (13 March): he did not allow churchmen to impede the carrying out of sentences through appeal or removal of the condemned; CTh 11,36,31 (9 April): he did not allow *intercessio* by clergy for a condemned person or a confessed criminal; CTh 9,45,1 (18 October): public debtors were not allowed asylum in churches, nor could their debts be paid by bishops (the first law regulating the matter); CTh 9,45,2 (17 June 397): Jews were prohibited from feigning conversions so as to claim asylum; CTh

9,45,3 (27 June 398): slaves and debtors were deprived of the right of asylum, nor could their debts be paid by the church; CTh 9,45,2 (17 June 397): through *Eutropius's influence asylum was not granted for the crime of lese majesty, which could be understood broadly (see 9,14,3,2 of 4 September 397). Eutropius himself took refuge in a church a year later, and *John Chrysostom's intervention did not prevent his death. The first formal recognition of asylum in churches was in 419 (*Sirmondiana* 13). An allusion to this law can be found in Augustine (*Ep.* 22,3: Divjak, 420), who observes that, on the whole, it could only be used by a few: "So it happens that we, at most, can do very little to help and defend those who take refuge in a church." The right was regulated in more detail with the law of 23 March 431 (CTh 9,45,1) and that of 432 (CTh 9,45,5). The *Codex Theodosianus* reports only a passage from the law of 431, while other sources preserve it entirely (Mansi 5,437-445). Sometimes the limits within which asylum was effective were marked around the church (see DACL 4,1555f.). The Council of *Orange of 441 created some norms regarding asylum in churches (can. 5 and 6); in the East the emperor *Leo intervened (CI 1,12,6 of 466). At Constantinople *Justinian constituted a board to evaluate the situations of those who sought asylum in St. Sophia (slaves, debtors, those accused of homicide).

L. Wenger, *Asylrecht*: RAC 1,836-844; A.D. Manfredini, *"Ad ecclesiam confugere," "ad statuas conferre," nell'età di Teodosio I*: AARC 6 (1986) 39-58; G. Freyburger, *Le droit d'asile à Rome*: Les études class. 60 (1992) 139-151; A. Ducloux, *Ad ecclesiam confugere. Naissance du droit d'asile dans les églises (IVe-milieu du Ve s.)*, Paris 1994; Y. Duval, *Les Gesta apud Zenonophilum et la "paix de Maxence" (Gesta f 22b)*: Antiquité Tardive 3 (1995) 55-63; M. Dreher, *Das Asyl in der Antike von seinen griechischen Ursprüngen bis zur christlichen Spätantike*: Tyche 11 (1996) 79-96; K.J. Rigsby, *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley, CA 1997; R. Gamau, *Ad statuam licet confugere. Untersuchungen zum Asylrecht im römischen Prinzipat*, Frankfurt 1999 (see IURA 50 [1999] 251-265); L. Giordano, *Gregorio Magno e il diritto di asilo*: VetChr 37 (2000) 391-406; G. Görisch, *Kirchenasyl und staatliches Recht*, Berlin 2000; T. Baccini, *Una nuova Bulla del Collegio degli Ekklesiekdikoi di S. Sofia*: Byzantion 71 (2001) 263-266.

A. Di Berardino

ATARAXIA. *Plato clearly alluded to *ataraxia* in speaking of the confusion produced in the *soul by the *body (*Fed.* 66a and 66d, where the two terms ταράττειν and ταραχή appear) and of the consequent necessity for the philosopher who wants to contemplate *truth to distance himself from the body (*Fed.* 66a). With ἀπάθεια, with which it has much in common, *ataraxia* was the supreme ethical ideal of ancient *Stoicism (see, e.g., SVF III 449). *Aristotle similarly combined *ataraxia* with control of the passions (*Eth. Nic.* IV, 1125b 33-34: βούλεται γὰρ ὁ πρᾶος ἀτάραχος εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἄγεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους—"for the gentle person desires to be ἀτάραχος [at peace] and not to be led by his passions"). Epicurus also thought highly of *ataraxia:* see, e.g., Usener fr. 191 (cited by *Marcus Aurelius, *In semetipsum* IX 41,1) and Usener fr. 519 (cited by Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 24,10). The term, with the corresponding adjective ἀτάραχος, was revived by Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. In book II, discourse 2—titled περὶ ἀταραξίας (Schenkl 107-110)—Epictetus identifies *ataraxia* with the interior freedom of the philosopher, which no external event can destroy (Socrates is the living example of this); and the same concept is found in Marcus Aurelius, *In semetipsum* IX, 31 (Schenkl 116,25-26). The two terms ἀπάθεια and ἀταραξία are mentioned together in Epictetus, *Diss.* III 15,12 (250, 13-14), see *Ench.* 29,7 (Schenkl 444,33) and *Diss.* III 26, 13 (Schenkl 309,10); the two adjectives ἀπαθής and ἀτάραχος appear together in *Diss.* II 8,23 (126,25) and II 17,31 (163,8-9). Marcus Aurelius says that one who has no need of the external world is also ἀτάρακτος or ἀτάραχος (*In semetipsum* IV, 24 [38,23], IV, 37 [42, 10-11], VII, 16 [80,11-14]). *Clement of Alexandria also considers *ataraxia* as the end to which human ethics tends: in *Paed.* II 58,3 (Stählin I 192, 15-16) he relates it to the words εἰρήνη σοι of 3 Jn 15; in *Strom.* VI, 24,10 (II 441, 22) he cites with approval Epicurus's phrase δικαιοσύνης καρπὸς μέγιστος ἀταραξία ("the fruit of righteousness is great ἀταραξία [inner peace]") (Usener fr. 519); and in *Strom.* IV, 55,4 (II 273,31–274, 1), like Epictetus, he mentions together ἀπάθεια and ἀταραξία. *Origen celebrates *ataraxia* as one of the requirements of the *martyr (*Exhort. ad martyr.* IV [Koetschau 5,25–6,1]). *Plotinus shows that he knows the Stoic doctrine that makes right living consist in *ataraxia* (*Enn.* I, 4, 1 [I 80,28]).

M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, Göttingen 1959, I, 331; II, 163 (It. tr. Florence 1967); Enciclopedia Filosofica I, Florence 1967, 557; M. Giusta, *I logografi di etica*, Turin 1967; *Stoici antichi. Tutti i frammenti*, ed. R. Radice, Milan 1998 (see index).

S. Lilla

ATARBIUS (d. ca. 381). Bishop of *Neocaesarea in *Pontus from 368 (death of Musonis) to ca. 381. He delegated the lector Cyril to the Council of *Constantinople. A relative of *Basil the Great, he opposed him, condemning his *monastic and *liturgical innovations, and followed a *trinitarian line closer to that of *Marcellus of Ancyra. He boasted

of his loyalty to the tradition of *Gregory Thaumaturgus. Basil's *Ep.* 54, 204, 207, 210-211, among others, concern this tension, which sheds considerable light on the ecclesiastical politics of the time. J. Daniélou sought to clarify this in RecSR 54 (1968) 61-66.

R. Pouchet, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: une stratégie de communion*, Rome 1992.

J. Gribomont

ATHANASIUS GAMMAL (d. 630/631). *Jacobite patriarch from 594/595 to 630/631 and a native of Samosata. Athanasius was a *monk of a *monastery at Qennesre. As patriarch he chose to live at the convent of Mar Zakai, near Callinicum. In 616 at Ennaton, he was reconciled with the sister *monophysite church in *Egypt. In 630 he took part, at the head of a group of a dozen bishops, in unsuccessful theological discussions with the emperor *Heraclius at Mabbug/Hierapolis; the emperor then appointed a *monothelite bishop of *Antioch. Michael the Syrian cites some of his letters; he also wrote a *Life of Severus of Antioch,* entirely preserved in Ethiopic. A certain Daniel, described as bishop of Aleppo or of *Edessa, wrote his life, under patriarch Theodore (649–667) at the earliest. If this was Daniel of Aleppo, he should perhaps be identified with a Daniel ordained by patriarch Cyriac (793–817). Unfortunately the text of the Berlin MS is incomplete; the *Life* summarized by Michael the Syrian may be inspired by it.

Baumstark 185-186; E. Sachau, *Verzeichnis der syrischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Berlin 1899, 523-524; Michel le Syrien, *Chronicon*, ed. Chabot, Paris 1900, 388.

M. van Esbroeck

ATHANASIUS of Alexandria (295/300–373).
I. Biography and most important works - II. Thought.

Athanasius of *Alexandria imposes himself on the civil and religious history of the 4th c. as both an emblematic and a problematic figure in the relationship between church and empire, in the development of the structures of Egyptian Christianity, which despite divisions reached full maturity under him, in the strategic battles among opposing groups of bishops and between Christian communities of different ideological orientation, and in the evolution of theological thought.

I. Biography and most important works. Athanasius was elected bishop of Alexandria 8 June 329, a little over a year after the death of his predecessor *Alexander (17 April 328), in a situation of acute ecclesial tension. The condemnation of *Arianism at the Council of *Nicaea (325) did nothing to resolve the doctrinal conflict: one of Arius's most avid supporters, *Eusebius of Nicomedia—destined to assume the leadership of the anti-Nicene and anti-Athanasian front—had returned from exile and was free to act. Nor did the *Meletian *schism find in the Nicene canons a solution to its institutional problems. The attempts at reconciliation under Alexander had not brought the desired results, so much so that a third, if not half, of the Meletian bishops on the list given by Meletius to Alexander had broken the reconciliation. The election of Athanasius appeared problematic to every ancient source that mentions it. Designated by Alexander, who valued his abilities in dialectic, according to the synodal of the Egyptian bishops of 338, Athanasius was elected too young (under 30) and through a surprise move that according to other sources he himself organized. Athanasius was instantly a divisive figure who sharpened the ecclesial crises that seemed to have been subsiding. From the events of this disputed election one can see the hard-line approach adopted by the Alexandrian church toward the Meletian church: the subordination, prescribed by the Council of Nicaea, of the Meletian bishop to the Alexandrian bishop of the same diocese, in the eyes of Alexander's church necessarily led to the logical consequence that the Meletian church had no right to participate in the election of the bishop of Alexandria; it seems probable that it was Athanasius who promoted this strategy. Athanasius's attitude throughout the following years leads to the conclusion that he lived the investiture received from Alexander as though it were an expression of the divine will, the transmission of a long theological and ecclesial tradition, that of the "fathers," incarnated in the succession of the bishops of the metropolis, which Athanasius understood in a completely unilateral way.

After the election, while the situation of conflict with the Meletian church continued to deteriorate, Athanasius began his numerous visits to inland *Egypt to strengthen the church he had inherited from Alexander. His first trip (330) was to the *Thebaid, a region in which the Meletian schism had spread with greater success; its purpose was to strengthen the bishops and *monasteries of the area against this danger, as in fact a not-insignificant portion of the monastic world had followed the schism, and some fringe groups had relations with Arianism. The trip to the *Pentapolis of 332 was mainly anti-

Arian in motivation. *Constantine's letter to Athanasius should probably be dated 330/331: the letter threatened to remove him from Alexandria if he did not accept those who wished to enter the church (*Rev. Sec.* 64). The letter was an expression of the policy of pacification that Constantine was pursuing after the council, aimed at removing sources of conflict and marginalizing extremists. The letter was preceded by the protests of a Meletian delegation to the emperor, to which Athanasius had already responded in a letter to the emperor, defending himself. In late 331 Constantine moved from threats to action, summoning Athanasius to Psamathia, near *Nicomedia, to respond to some rather serious accusations by the Meletian bishops: Athanasius allegedly had forced the Egyptians to provide the church with linen tunics (imposition of the provision of clothing was considered licit only by the army) and had corrupted an imperial official. Upon Athanasius's arrival, the Meletian delegation raised again the question of the validity of his election and accused one of Athanasius's clergy, *Macarius, of breaking the eucharistic *chalice of Ischiras, priest of Mareotis and a follower of *Colluthus, a schismatic stripped of priestly dignity by a council of the Alexandrian church prior to the Council of Nicaea. Ischiras had continued to celebrate the *Eucharist despite the judgment of condemnation on his head and for this was denounced to Athanasius, who sent one of his best priests, Macarius, to resolve the question, probably violently. Athanasius defended himself successfully, and the emperor sent him back to Alexandria. Faithful to his iron-fisted policy, he took advantage of the brief peace to force Ischiras to denounce the Meletian bishops who had led him to make accusations against Athanasius and to request in writing communion with the Alexandrian church.

The most spectacular accusation against Athanasius, however, in the 2nd half of 332, was that of having *Arsenius, bishop of Hypselis, killed—an accusation presented by no less than the new leader of the Meletians, *John Arkaph. Probably because of his sympathy for the Meletians, Bishop Arsenius had been the target of violence on the part of Plusianus of Lycopolis, a Nicene father, fervent anti-Meletian and the Catholic bishop in Meletius's episcopal see, a region where the conflict between the two churches had a particularly high profile and where uncertain or sympathetic positions like Arsenius's could not be tolerated. Having escaped from the house in which Plusianus had imprisoned him, Arsenius disappeared without a trace and was believed to be dead: from this the suspicion arose that Athanasius himself must have been responsible for the death, supported by someone's circulation of the hand from a cadaver, claiming that it was Arsenius's. Athanasius, helped by some deacons, succeeded not only in finding out who had hidden the bishop but also in capturing Arsenius himself, alive. This earned Athanasius not only a new and more fervent letter of support from Constantine—disgusted with the behavior of the Meletians and of John Arkaph—but also a public apology from the latter. In the meantime Athanasius had Ischira, who had again gone over to the Meletians, arrested and tried for charges of lese majesty, for which the expriest was imprisoned.

Shortly before *Easter 334, Athanasius received from Constantine the call to a council to be held in *Caesarea of Palestine: the council was probably desired by Eusebius of Nicomedia and his pressure group, and Athanasius refused to attend. This refusal was thrown in Athanasius's face during the Council of *Tyre and surely diminished his favor with Constantine, precisely at the moment when the emperor was beginning to work out the idea of making the celebration of his *tricennalia* a symbol of the peace in the church. All modern historians, even those less sympathetic to Athanasius, consider the Council of Tyre to have been a partisan council (335), the basic purpose of which was to condemn and depose a bishop who had the double defect of being a strict adherent to Nicaea and of exercising power, with a considerable sense of his authority, over a vast ecclesiastical region (he had 100 dioceses under him). The state of confusion and violent reaction of the party linked to Athanasius against the Meletian clergy on the eve of the Synod of Tyre is shown by a papyrus note, *P. Lond.* VI 1914. Athanasius was to depart for Tyre on 11 July 335, accompanied by 48 bishops, some ex-Meletians among them, all of them nonetheless refused seats at the council. The acts of the council, which was composed largely of bishops close to Eusebius of Nicomedia, have not reached us but are summarized by *Sozomen. The accusations by the Meletians have already been noted: Ischiras's broken chalice and the violence to which the priest had been subjected after retracting the contents of the letter of repentance extorted from him by Athanasius; the expulsion and imprisonment of many Meletian bishops; and Athanasius's irregular election, protracting the schism. Athanasius responded by attacking his accusers, and his defense must have seemed particularly impassioned and convincing, since the council decided to send a delegation to Mareotis to better investigate the question of Ischiras. But the delegation, returning to Tyre in early September, brought an unfavorable re-

port concerning Athanasius: the bishops proceeded to his condemnation (he was probably present at the session) and deposition, while the Meletian clergy—including Ischiras, who would shortly become a bishop in Mareotis—were restored to their functions. The participants of the council then left for *Jerusalem, where they celebrated the feast of the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which Constantine had wanted to be celebrated in peace. For this reason he requested of the bishops present the restoration of Arius, whose doctrine seemed orthodox to him; the bishops ratified the request, but Arius died shortly thereafter. In the meantime Athanasius went to *Constantinople, intending to ask Constantine for a review of his trial: after weeks of waiting, when Constantine reentered the city on horseback on 30 October 335, Athanasius presented himself to the emperor, demanding justice and asking to be judged by the bishops of Tyre in the emperor's presence. This bold act resulted in an imperial letter to the bishops who had participated at the Council of Tyre, calling for a convocation to review the terms of the condemnation. But in the meantime (6 November) a group of Eusebian bishops arrived from Jerusalem, bringing with them the acts of the Synod of Tyre with the report on the investigation in Mareotis. Confronted with a judgment of condemnation with all the formalities in order, Constantine had no choice but to exile Athanasius to *Trier (7 November) in *Gaul, near his son Constantine. Athanasius added that the Eusebians had formulated a new accusation rather than dealing with the one that, according to him, was the basic issue at the Council of Tyre, i.e., that he had claimed that he was able to prevent the supply of grain from Alexandria from reaching Constantinople, an action which could bring the death penalty. The question of whether the episode actually occurred, or whether it was defensive propaganda on the part of Athanasius, is not easily resolved. In the meantime the emperor also exiled John Arkaph, in line with his policy of eliminating the extremists of the two parties to the conflict. Moreover, he did not replace Athanasius on the see of Alexandria, waiting for the time when the animosity between the parties would cool.

We lack even approximate dates for Athanasius's early literary production. This is true esp. for the most demanding theological work of his young phase, the double-apology *Contra gentes—De incarnatione Verbi,* which has been attributed to the most diverse stages of Athanasius's career. *Festal Letter* X for Easter 338 helps us to restrict the period of time during which the double theological treatise could have been written, since it contains significant theological parallels with the treatise; but it also includes, for the first time, an explicit anti-Arian polemic, which is absent from the double-apology, which must therefore precede 338. The dependence on some works of Eusebius, whose ideas are partially corrected, and a general and implicit anti-Arian theological position lead to ruling out the period before Arius's first condemnation. The reference to the lack of books in *Contra gentes* 1 may fit well with Athanasius's time at Trier, but this interpretation is not unanimous among scholars, for whom the most likely date for the work's composition runs from the Council of Nicaea to the exile in Trier. With *Festal Letter* X, written upon his return from exile in Trier, begins a long period of anti-Arian works by Athanasius, whose *Discourses Against the Arians* I-II were his most demanding work.

Constantine's death on 22 May 337 signaled an at-least-temporary turn in Athanasius's fortunes. The bishop does not cite the formal act with which the emperor's successors decided upon his return but prefers to present a letter of *Constantine II addressed to the church of Alexandria. In it are clear indications of Athanasius's version of the facts, made known to Constantine II by the Nicene bishop *Maximinus of Trier, who had become Athanasius's friend: indeed, the emperor declares that his father had exiled the bishop to save him from his enemies (the Eusebians) and that it had been his firm intention to restore him to the see of Alexandria. By now it is clear that Athanasius's defensive and propagandistic approach had succeeded in penetrating imperial circles. Receiving word of the end of his exile, the bishop did not return to Alexandria by the most direct route, but took a wide swing through the East, a move that would later be denounced by the Eastern bishops meeting at *Serdica (343). In fact, after the Council of Tyre, Athanasius meant to reestablish friendships in the East and in some way help those who had been removed: *Lucius was reinstalled at Andrinopolis, *Marcellus at Ancyra and *Asclepas at Gaza. The return trip was also extremely important politically. The face of the empire changed radically with Constantine's death: it was subdivided among his three sons, Constantine and *Constans for the western part, *Constantius for the eastern part. Athanasius met with Constantius at Viminacium during the summer of 337 and in *Cappadocia shortly later, either before or after his return to his metropolis. One of the problems addressed with Constantius must have been the ordination of Pistus, a priest who had been condemned as an Arian, as bishop of Alexandria by

Bishop Secundus of Ptolemais: the Eusebians, meeting in the winter of 337–338, had also recognized Pistus as the legitimate bishop of Alexandria, informing Pope *Julius of this. During the succeeding years, their campaign became ever more intense. Letters were sent to the emperors in which Athanasius was accused not only of the illegitimacy of his reentry to Alexandria, which had been accompanied by violence and uprisings, but also of having sold, for his own gain, the grain set aside for the *widows of Egypt and Libya—a capital crime, as Athanasius himself insisted more than once during 338–339. It should be noted that this accusation grew out of the situation of conflict between Athanasius's followers and the Arians: the latter—esp. Bishops Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarica, who had recovered their sees after 335—had a claim to a part of this grain which Athanasius, upon his return, may have refused to the Arian dioceses in the name of *orthodoxy.

The council of the whole Egyptian church organized by Athanasius during 338, in which the *monk *Anthony may have participated, responded to these attacks with an encyclical, asserting the invalidity of Pistus's election (though he was not mentioned by name) and appending a series of documents favoring Athanasius. Thanks to this letter and the competence of the Egyptian Catholic delegation entrusted with presenting it to Julius of Rome, the pope promised Athanasius that he would convoke a council to rule justly on the matter. The reaction of the Eusebians, however, was immediate. Exploiting Constantius's presence at Antioch because of the war against the Persians, and forming a sort of permanent council around him, the Eusebians, reiterating the accusations of a few months earlier and the condemnation of Tyre, abandoned Pistus and elected a new bishop, Gregory of Cappadocia, who, shortly afterward, was imposed on Alexandria by public force in a climate of violence and intimidation, referred to ominously by Athanasius in his *Encyclical epistle*. After a month of resistance during Easter 339, Athanasius left Alexandria for Rome.

Meanwhile, under the harsh government of Gregory of Cappadocia, aided by the prefect Philagrius, the situation of the pro-Athanasian Egyptian church was collapsing: many Egyptian clergy had to leave, and the exiles were replaced. Athanasius's stay in Rome was an opportunity for forming new alliances and establishing important cultural and social contacts, such as those with Marcellus of Ancyra and with Roman aristocratic circles. The council called by Julius (winter 340–341 or spring-summer 341) released him from the condemnation of the Council of Tyre; it also released Marcellus of Ancyra, though he still had a condemnation for *heresy hanging over him, very different from the charge against Athanasius. The Eusebians, whose contact with Julius during the years leading up to these events went beyond merely correspondence, had apparently been defeated on the Western front, whereas in the East their power was strengthened. During this phase Athanasius wrote the *Discourses Against the Arians* I-II, which were enriched by the dossier of the Arian Asterius perhaps thanks to Marcellus, who had written a work against the brilliant theologian.

In the East, however, the situation was not going well for Athanasius. The Council of *Antioch of 341, organized by Eusebius of Nicomedia—who had been promoted to bishop of Constantinople with Constantius's full support—drew together and strengthened the Eastern bishops, and not just the Arians and Eusebians. At this point the theological discussion was reopened and deepened, to the point of producing or inspiring the production of three creeds, with a fourth added a year later. The second in particular was put forth as the official one: its silence on the Nicene *Creed and the technical terminology that characterized it, its insistence on the theology of the three **hypostases,* and its condemnation of the radical aspects of Arianism, but also of the *Sabellianism that many saw reawakened in Marcellus of Ancyra, make it an important document, capable of winning the consensus not only of moderate Arians but also of vast sectors of the Eastern non-Arian episcopate of Origenian cultural tendency. The council also proudly reiterated its authority over its own territory, claiming to no longer tolerate external interference: this was an unequivocal reference to the Roman council organized by Julius, which had interfered in taking up the defense of two Eastern bishops, Athanasius and Marcellus. Eusebius of Nicomedia died a few months after the council, the great leader of the front of Eastern bishops opposed to Athanasius.

An event of exceptional importance during Athanasius's Roman exile was the Council of Serdica of 343, which displayed the first symptoms among the Mediterranean bishops of the division between West and East that was destined to occur centuries later. The council, desired by Constans as part of his pressure on Constantius, was an enormous failure, in that the two delegations, Western and Eastern, that were supposed to meet in the council, not only did not meet but also launched reciprocal *excommunications. The Western delegation again took up the defense of Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra and

their reinstatement in their churches. An extremely archaic creed, confessing only one *hypostasis,* was circulated during the council's sessions. Athanasius rejected it in 362, when he saw that it, having become the standard-bearer for the followers of *Eustathius of Antioch, prevented useful dialogue with the followers of Meletius of Antioch.

Gregory's death on 26 June 345 attenuated the hostility toward Athanasius on the part of Constantius, who yielded to Constans's pressure to restore the exiled bishops. Athanasius was called by Constans to Trier. Then, perhaps passing through *Aquileia, he returned to Rome, where Julius gave him a letter inviting him to resume the see of Alexandria. Having been invited more than once by letter to meet Constantius himself, he finally met him at Antioch. Constantius reestablished all the privileges of the clergy linked to Athanasius and sent a letter to the Christians of Alexandria, exhorting them to live in peace. On his return, Athanasius passed through *Syria, *Phoenicia and *Palestine. At *Laodicea he met and entered into communion with the priest *Apollinaris. At Jerusalem he was accepted by bishop Maximus, who organized a council supporting him. Finally, he was welcomed triumphantly at Alexandria, 21 October 346. Athanasius's fortunes seem to have reached their peak, with over four hundred Mediterranean bishops in communion with him. Shortly he would receive the letter of repentance of *Ursacius and *Valens, Illyrian Arian bishops who had been his enemies. This apparently peaceful situation would not last: his traditional opponents and especially the imperial power would destabilize even this period at Alexandria which had begun so triumphantly.

While ecclesiastical events seemed to again assume an unfavorable tendency for Athanasius, his theological production was very active. After 338, as we saw, he began writing a wide-ranging treatise, which, after various additions and at a date unknown to us, would take the form of the *Discourses Against the Arians* I-II. The Roman years may have been an opportune time for his gradually producing this work, perhaps in more than one draft. The composition of the *Discourse Against the Arians* III could also be attributed to the years after his return in 346. The work shows differences from the first two: it treats different themes, such as the concept of the will of the Father and the gospel verses that present a suffering, thirsty, hungry Christ (exploited by the Arians to diminish the divinity of the Logos), but in particular the *pars construens* of the *trinitarian and *christological discourse is decidedly more emphasized. Another work composed after the return, *The Decrees of the Council of Nicaea,* proposes for the first time a deeper reflection on the ecumenical council's creed, in particular on the term **homoousios:* this was a genuine relaunching, in grand style, of an expression that for many years had been abandoned in the reflection of Western theologians and that of Athanasius himself, and was destined from this point to have significant repercussions on the course of the Arian crisis. Various dates have been proposed for the work, from 347 to 357. Besides doctrinal clarification, Athanasius's purpose was to move the debate from his personal problem of a bishop deposed by a council (Tyre in 335) to the theological problem: in fact, the bishops who objected that *homoousios* was not scriptural coincided in large part with the circles that considered his presence at Alexandria illegitimate. Profoundly related to this work stylistically, lexically and thematically is the brief work titled *The Opinion of Dionysius,* written against those who held that *Dionysius of Alexandria's thought was closer to Arian thought than to the Nicene *homoousios*.

Constans died 18 January 350, assassinated by Magnentius's rebels. On 28 September 351 Constantius defeated Magnentius at Mursia, the city of the Illyrian Arian bishop *Valens, who had foreseen the emperor's victory. With Constantius now the sole emperor, the Eusebians had the opportunity to resume hostilities against Athanasius, in line with the imperial will of reestablishing the religious unity of the empire. Some 30 bishops met in early 350 at Antioch and ruled that Athanasius be replaced by the Arian *George of Cappadocia. A letter to this end was sent to Pope Julius before April 352: the accusation against Athanasius was of criminal lese majesty and treason, for having provoked the discord between Constans and Constantius and for having had relations with the usurper Magnentius. But Julius died 12 April 352. He was succeeded by *Liberius, who in the summer of 353 called a council at Rome to respond to the Eastern bishops' letter. The pope invited Athanasius to attend in person but, given the new political situation resulting from Constans's death, Athanasius thought it better to remain at Alexandria and sent a synodal letter signed by 80 Egyptian bishops, in which he defended himself from the accusations. It has been proposed that the *Second Apology Against the Arians* is that synodal letter. The polemical work's genesis can be found in Athanasius's reaction to the pressure he had lived under since a few years after his return from the second exile. In the letter he collects further testimonies in his favor, beyond those attached to the synodal letter of 338. Among the many testimonials is

the *retractatio,* sent to him in 347 by *Paulinus of Trier, of his two historical enemies, the Illyrian bishops *Ursacius and Valens: this became, in the general plan of the work, the focal point on which he built his defense. Despite its relatively limited historical value, the *retractatio* played an indispensable role in Athanasius's purpose, that of hiding the fact that no council of Eastern bishops had ever reopened the discussion of the condemnation of Tyre.

Athanasius still thought he could defend himself before Constantius, who was at *Milan, and sent a delegation of bishops to him, without success. It was clear by then that Constantius had decided to apply against Athanasius the condemnation of the Council of Tyre and of the later Eastern councils. The imperial official Montanus carried a letter of the emperor to Athanasius, inviting him to present himself at court, probably at *Arles, where the emperor planned to celebrate his *tricennalia* on 8 November 353. But Athanasius refused, realizing that to leave Alexandria meant to leave an opening for George of Cappadocia. At Arles Constantius forced a succession of Gallic bishops to condemn Athanasius. Liberius, following the failure of the additional legates sent to Arles, asked Constantius to convene a more representative council, which was held at Milan in 355. Contrary to the pope's intention, it was used by Constantius to have Athanasius condemned by the largest number of bishops possible. The council closed by exiling *Eusebius of Vercelli, *Dionysius of Milan and *Lucifer of Cagliari, but also with the capitulation of a large number of Western bishops. Nothing remained for the emperor but to carry out Athanasius's condemnation by removing him from Alexandria. Things proved to be far from easy for the notary Diogenes, who was charged with the difficult task. Despite various attempts over a period of months, the imperial official had to leave the city without result. It was probably during this period, as the situation was coming to a head, that Athanasius wrote the *Apology to Constantius,* defending himself from the accusations that had dogged him since the Council of Tyre, and especially against a series of new charges of lese majesty, compromising relations with the usurper Magnentius, and the unauthorized building of churches. After the notary Diogenes's departure, the situation came to a head on 6 January 356, when the *dux* Syrianus entered Alexandria with troops; on 8 February he attacked the Church of Theonas, though without finding Athanasius, who had probably been warned. It was in this context that Athanasius wrote the *Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya,* probably during the summer of 356: in it Athanasius offers a summary of the anti-Arian polemic of the *Discourses Against the Arians* and exhorts the bishops not to sign any profession of faith different from that of Nicaea, the only valid profession of faith. Also written in this phase of the beginning of exile was the *Life of Anthony,* in which Athanasius indicates the ideal model of the monk and the Christian, dedicated to *asceticism and *orthodoxy in faith. At this point Athanasius lived for some years as a fugitive between Alexandria and the Egyptian desert.

This period saw important events from an ecclesiastical and theological point of view. The small council held at *Sirmium in 357 by Valens, Ursacius and *Germinius, the three Illyrian bishops favored by Constantius, proposed a creed which manifested an openness to the proposals of Arianism that had never been seen in Eastern creeds since 341. During the same period, radical Arianism was born with the theologians *Aetius and *Eunomius. The most important success attained by the pro-Arian bishops was the condemnation of Athanasius by the exiled *Liberius and the stepping down of *Ossius of Cordoba. Nevertheless, the united front of the Eastern episcopate began to show large cracks. Some of the bishops, who had gradually detached themselves doctrinally from pro-Arian tendencies in two councils, Ancyra and Sirmium (358), bitterly criticized the formula of the Council of Sirmium of 357. This current, though maintaining a suspicious attitude toward the Nicene Creed and the *homoousios,* proposed the concept of likeness according to substance, strongly emphasizing this by using a new technical term, **homoiousios*. In this context Constantius decided to gather a great council—in two different sessions, one for the Westerners and one for the Easterners—capable of reestablishing religious peace, on the model of Constantine's council at Nicaea. It was anticipated by a small council at Sirmium in May 359, also desired by Constantius and charged with creating a formula on which the largest possible number of bishops could agree: the resulting formula contained the generic expression "alike in everything" (*homoios kata panta*). The two councils of *Rimini and *Seleucia of 359, confirmed by that of Constantinople of 360, went according to the desires of Constantius and those of Bishop *Acacius of Caesarea, by now the emperor's favorite, against the Western *homoousian* majority and the Eastern *homoiousian* group. Shortly later, however, Constantius's death brought an unexpected turn of events.

These were very important years in Athanasius's apologetic and theological production, during which he showed some openness to other trinitarian formulations. If in the bitter, acerbic *History of the*

Arians we find a rereading of the events of the period 335–357 in the light of the break with Constantius—supporter of Arianism and by now judged to be the antichrist—in *The Synods of Rimini in Italy and Seleucia in Isauria* Athanasius, despite harsh criticism of the many Eastern creeds he reports, gives indications that he understands the new developments that had taken place within the until-then largely unified Eastern episcopate. He thus sought to draw near to the theological positions of the *homoiousians—despite the fact that they held the theology of the three *hypostases*—and especially to those of *Basil of Ancyra. Moreover, with the *Epistles to Serapion* I-IV, Athanasius began a deeper reflection on the *Holy Spirit, the first of a certain weight since *Origen, and a reflection he would repropose in all of his trinitarian works from then on. It grew out of a dogmatic concern, posed by *Serapion of Thmuis to Athanasius when the latter was in the desert: in some circles that accepted the Nicene Creed, full divinity was denied the Holy Spirit, with the risk of making him a creature, created *ex nihilo*.

After Constantius's death (3 November 361), followed immediately by the lynching (24 December 361) of the Arian bishop of Alexandria, George of Cappadocia, by a mob that included pagans, Athanasius returned from his third exile on 21 February 362, thanks to a decree of *Julian. At Alexandria he organized the famous council of 362, in which he discussed with the bishops faithful to him and two non-Egyptian representatives, *Asterius of Arabia and Eusebius of Vercelli, the problem of clergy who had gone over to Arianism. Adopting moderate disciplinary measures—a sign of the need to reunite a church strongly divided after the persecutions—he tried, through the writing and sending of the *Tome to the Antiochenes,* to propose a solution to the divisions afflicting the Christian community of Antioch. That city's bishop, *Meletius, future president of the Council of Constantinople (381)—with theological positions close to the homoiousians' and exiled for having taken a position against Arianism—had gathered around himself a strong consensus. But there were two other communities present in the metropolis: the Arian community and that of the heirs of Eustathius of Antioch, headed by the priest *Paulinus, anchored in the Nicene Creed and closed to any theological dialogue with those who held the theology of the three *hypostases.* Athanasius, however, was by then able to see the possible orthodoxy of that theology, and said so openly in his writings. He also discouraged the Eustathians' use of the Western formula of Serdica, while simultaneously inviting Meletius's followers to join with Paulinus. Paulinus's irregular ordination as bishop of Antioch by Lucifer of Cagliari, however, meant the defeat of the plan for doctrinal reconciliation, since Athanasius was unable to fit it into an adequate ecclesiastical policy.

Athanasius was exiled for the fourth time at Julian's orders, between late 362 and the first months of 363. He learned of the emperor's death (26 June 363) only at the end of August, while still in exile in S Egypt. With *Jovian proclaimed emperor, Athanasius left on 6 September to meet him at Hierapolis, obtaining from him recognition as the legitimate bishop of Alexandria. The protests of the Arians of Alexandria, led by Lucian, did nothing to alter the emperor's decision. In October or November of 363, Meletius of Antioch, also back from exile, presented to the emperor Jovian a text approved by a large number of Eastern bishops, among them some of Athanasius's old enemies such as Acacius, which contained the Nicene Creed with a doctrinal clarification concerning the *homoousios*: the distinguishing term of the Nicene Creed, in addition to being mentioned and accepted, was clarified with the concept of "likeness according to substance *[ousia]*." But the most serious episode of Athanasius's trip to Antioch was his failed attempt at communion with Meletius, perhaps due to the latter's diffidence regarding Paulinus's irregular ordination as bishop a few months earlier, but also due to his ambition to become the new leader of the Eastern anti-Arian bishops. This event, truly traumatic for Athanasius, radically changed his way of seeing Eastern ecclesiastical matters and fixed his negative attitude toward Meletius until his death. The pleas of *Basil of Caesarea for a reconciliation between those he considered to be the champions of anti-Arian orthodoxy had no effect. Athanasius was by now on the margins of the doctrinal controversy. In fact, in a letter addressed to Jovian, which also contained the Nicene Creed, Athanasius implicitly took a position against the exegesis of that creed given in the council organized by Meletius.

The edict of exile against those bishops who had originally been exiled by Constantius, but were later allowed to return to their sees by Julian, was issued at Valens's initiative on 5 May 365. On the night of 5 October, Athanasius was forced to flee to a villa in the Alexandrian suburbs. He reentered Alexandria in February 366, also by Valens's order. While in the East the situation of the anti-Arian clergy, in particular Meletius of Antioch, remained critical for many years, this last return to Alexandria concluded Athanasius's exiles: from then on he was left in peace by the imperial authorities and gave himself to the con-

struction of a new church. Lucian's attempt to conquer the episcopal throne in 367 met with a humiliating defeat. In this context Athanasius, after his silence following the Antiochene events of 363 to which he had succumbed, again took up his literary activity with some significant works, though of uncertain date. In *Festal Letter* 39 for Easter 367, Athanasius proposed the canon of Scripture for the Alexandrian church. In the *Epistle to the African Bishops* (368/371), he once again stressed the importance of the Nicene Creed and its sufficiency as the basic foundation of orthodox faith, while his trinitarian language no longer showed the openness of certain chapters of *The Synods* or the *Tome to the Antiochenes* to the theology of the three *hypostases;* he returns to basing himself on more traditional and customary trinitarian expressions. The work, which knows of *Damasus's election as pope, is interested primarily in events in the West, in particular the presence at Milan of a pro-Arian bishop like *Auxentius (successor of the exiled *Dionysius), who according to Athanasius must be deposed as soon as possible. Finally, in the *Epistle to Epictetus,* Athanasius takes a position regarding certain extreme conclusions of the Christology of his friend Apollinaris, whom he does not mention by name.

II. Thought. Athanasius essentially subscribed to the Alexandrian theological tradition, though he altered it radically in trinitarian matters with the abandonment of the doctrine of the three *hypostases;* in anthropological, exegetical and spiritual matters, however, he elaborated the tradition, adapting it to the times. The depiction of the original man that we read in his youthful double-apology *Contra gentes—De incarnatione Verbi* still has echoes of the Origenian anthropological perspective, despite its lack of the doctrine of the preexistence of the *noes*. With time this depiction would undergo considerable changes, due to a greater consideration of the effects of the *incarnation on the believer's interiority and on humanity in general, and to the deepening of some themes, such as that of the adoption of human beings as children of God, and, already with the *Discourses Against the Arians,* that of the role of the Holy Spirit.

The distinctive trait of Athanasius's representation of God is its strong *soteriological emphasis, which prevails to such a degree as to profoundly influence the christological and trinitarian discourse. Starting from the double-apology *Contra gentes—De incarnatione Verbi,* for Athanasius the saving act par excellence—that without which there would be no salvation for humankind—is the incarnation (*enanthrōpēsis*) of the Logos: his assumption of a body, his offering of himself as an instrument (*organon*) by which the person created according to the image (*kat' eikona*) is not only restored but also profoundly renewed and recreated through union with the incarnate Logos. For salvation to occur, it was necessary that God's Logos possess the essential trait of divinity, a consequence of his real sonship with respect to God the Father. If this dimension were removed from the Logos, he could not effect in human beings—weighed down by sin, corruption and death—the effects of incorruptibility, immortality, divinization and the renewed consciousness of God which are the chief elements of salvation. There is thus an unbreakable binomial in Athanasian thought that remains substantially unchanged, even if its forms and lexicon evolve according to the new historical situations and the theological debate that marked the long course of the bishop's literary production: the salvation of historical humanity, immersed in sin and in the kingdom of death, could derive only from a perfectly divine being, the Logos, Son of the Father, and from his assumption of a real body, perfectly alike in this to all of humanity. Human beings, following the fall and its consequent sentence of death—pronounced because of human orientation to the disordered movements of the soul and to the passions of the body, which now turn them in on themselves—are no longer capable of knowing God, of contemplating him in creation or of grasping him through the words of the prophets. The Logos, assuming a body, appears to them as a man, with a body like their own that falls immediately under their senses; before their eyes he conquers sin, corruptibility and death, precisely in the body; he is at the same time the image (*eikōn*) of the Father, through which humanity can once again know God. The effects of immortality, incorruptibility, impassibility, knowledge and divinization, assumed by the human being with the incarnation, do not however translate into a change in nature; in Athanasius, much more than in Origen, the profound gulf that separates human beings, in their condition as creatures, from God and from his Logos remains firm. Moreover, for Athanasius there is no *theology without the incarnation (which is its epistemological basis), or the sensible image of the incarnate Logos, or his manifold acts, or the evidence of his death on the cross and resurrection, or the gospel accounts. These latter are the depiction of events which contain in themselves, in clear form, the truths about God and especially about the Logos who reveals the Father: his human and divine dimensions, his body and the divinity that transcends

the limits of a creature destined to return to nothing.

However, Athanasius's terminology stressing the divine unity, esp. in the three *Discourses Against the Arians*, is not balanced by terminology highlighting the distinction of persons. This doesn't make of him a theologian who favors the trinitarian formulations of Eustathius of Antioch or Marcellus of Ancyra. With respect to the latter, in particular, Athanasius is distinguished by the decisive weight he gives to the idea of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father prior to the incarnation. Moreover, in *The Synods* and in the *Tome to the Antiochenes* he draws near to conceptions typical of the theology of the three *hypostases,* which of course are part of his own cultural background, but he does not accept the most technical and distinctive formulations, considering them to be compromised with Arianism. Indeed, precisely in these works, as also earlier in *The Decrees of the Council of Nicaea,* Athanasius insists on the use of the term *homoousios*—not understood in the sense of numerical unity but in that of the derivation of the Son from the Father's substance—as the sign of the orthodox faith of Nicaea and a bulwark against the Arian heresy.

As we have already had occasion to emphasize, Athanasius's works present problems of dating and of attribution. The most well-known regards the authenticity of the *Discourses Against the Arians* III, contested by C. Kannengiesser based on real differences in vocabulary, style and argumentation (although not properly in theology) with respect to the *Discourses* I-II. Nevertheless, as has been proposed by Strutwolf, these differences could be due to the fact that Athanasius, at the point when he passed from the *pars destruens* of his anti-Arian discourse (*Discourses* I-II) to the *pars construens* (*Discourse* III), depends on Eusebius, esp. on his *Proof of the Gospel* and *Ecclesiastical Theology:* in constructing a positive theology, opposed to Arianism but also aware of the Sabellian character of certain propositions of Marcellus of Ancyra, Athanasius drew on the vocabulary and conceptions of Eusebius, establishing with them a subtle dialectic of acceptance and criticism. The authenticity of the *Epistle to the African Bishops* has also recently been defended with good historical and theological arguments.

In recent decades research on Athanasius has focused on his pastoral, ascetical and spiritual writings. His works on virginity and the festal letters, i.e., the messages sent annually to all the Egyptian dioceses to announce the time of Easter, but which also contained a rich antiheretical and antischismatic catechesis, show a bishop interested in a variety of problems and themes: the lifestyles of the Christian communities (monasticism and married life), the cult of the *martyrs, the canon of Scripture, the sins of ordinary believers, the value of human sexuality, irregular ordinations, the proper celebration of Easter, the meaning of *fasting, the promise of eternal life.

A still-open problem in the research is that of the relationship between Athanasius and Origen. Despite studies dedicated to individual passages or works, the whole of Athanasius's work has yet to be explored from this perspective. This could lead to a more precise perception of continuity and discontinuity on many levels—exegesis, anthropology, but also that of the representation of the divine.

Bibliographies: Ch. Butterweck, *Athanasius von Alexandrien: Bibliographie* (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 90), Opladen 1995; A. Camplani - G.M. Vian, *La ricerca italiana su Atanasio e sugli scritti pseudoatanasiani*: Adamantius 4 (1998) 34-48; J. Leemans, *Thirteen Years of Athanasius Research (1985-1998): A Survey and Bibliography*: Sacris Erudiri 39 (2000) 105-217; A. Camplani, *Studi atanasiani: gli* Athanasius Werke, *le ricerche sulla* Thalia *e nuovi sussidi bibliografici*: Adamantius 7 (2001) 115-131; A. Camplani - A. Jakab - M. Maritano - L. Perrone - S. Tampellini - C. Zamagni, *Pubblicazioni recenti su Origene e la tradizione alessandrina*: Adamantius, from 1995.

Lexicon: G. Müller, *Lexicon Athanasianum*, Berlin 1952.

Collected works: PG 25-28, Paris 1884-1887; *Athanasius Werke*, I, Erster Teil: *Die dogmatischen Schriften*, hrsg. von der Patristischen Arbeitsstelle Bochum der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, unter der Leitung von M. Tetz. 1. Lieferung: *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*, vorbereitet von K. Metzler, besorgt von D.U. Hansen und K. Savvidis, Berlin-New York 1996; 2. Lieferung: *Orationes I et II contra Arianos*, vorbereitet von K. Metzler, revidiert und besorgt von K. Savvidis, Berlin-New York 1998; 3. Lieferung: *Oratio III contra Arianos*, vorbereitet von K. Metzler, revidiert und besorgt von K. Savvidis, Berlin-New York 2000; *Athanasius Werke*, II. Hg. im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften von H.-G. Opitz, Berlin 1934-1941; Bd. 2: *Die Apologien*; P.P. Joannou, *Discipline générale antique* (*IV-IX s.*) vol. 2: *Les canons des Pères grecs*, Grottaferrata-Rome 1963 (Letter to Amun; Letter to Rufinianus); *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, ed. C.H. Turner, Oxford 1899, 654-662 (epistle of the Council of Serdica).

Editions of individual works and philological commentaries: Sancti Athanasii Archiepiscopi Alexandriae Contra gentes, introd., critical text, tr. and ed. by L. Leone, Naples 1965; *Athanasius:* Contra Gentes *and* De Incarnatione, tr. and ed. by R.W. Thomson, Oxford 1971; *Athanase d'Alexandrie. Sur l'incarnation du Verbe*, tr. and ed. by C. Kannengiesser (SC 199), Paris 1973; *Athanase d'Alexandrie. Apologie à l'Empereur Constance. Apologie pour sa fuite*, tr. and ed. by J.-M. Szymusiak (SC 56) Paris 1958; *Athanase d'Alexandrie. Vie d'Antoine*, tr. and ed. by G.J.M. Bartelink (SC 400), Paris 1994; *Athanasius von Alexandrien. De Sententia Dionysii*, Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar von U. Heil (Patristische Texte und Studien 52), Berlin-New York 1999; *Athanasius von Alexandrien. Epistula ad Afros.* Einleitung, Kommentar und Übersetzung von A. von Stockhau-

sen (Patristische Texte und Studien 56), Berlin-New York 2002; G. de Jerphanion, *La vraie teneur d'un texte de saint Athanase rétablie par l'épigraphie:* L'Epistula ad Monachos: RecSR 20 (1930) 529-544; W. Cureton, *The Festal Letters of Athanasius*, London 1848; R. Lorenz, *Der zehnte Osterfestbrief des Athanasius von Alexandrien*, Berlin-New York 1986; L.T. Lefort, *S. Athanase. Lettres festales et pastorales en copte* (CSCO 150-151), Louvain 1965; R.- G. Coquin - E. Lucchesi, *Un complément au corpus copte des* Lettres festales *d'Athanase* (*Paris, B.N., Copte 176*): Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 13 (1982) 137-142; R.-G. Coquin, *Les* Lettres Festales *d'Athanase* (*CPG 2102*). *Un nouveau complément: le manuscrit IFAO, Copte 25* (*Planche X*): Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 15 (1984) 133-158; E. Lucchesi, *Un nouveau complément aux* Lettres festales *d'Athanase*: Analecta Bollandiana 119 (2001) 255-260; A. Camplani, *Atanasio e Eusebio tra Alessandria e Antiochia* (*362-363*)*: osservazioni sul* Tomus at Antiochenos, *l'*Epistula catholica *e due fogli copti* (*edizione di Pap. Berol. 11948*), in *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, eds. E. dal Covolo - R. Uglione - G.M. Vian (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 133), Rome 1997, 191-246; G.M. Vian, *Testi inediti dal commento ai Salmi di Atanasio* (SEA 14), Rome 1974. On Athanasius's life, the edition of the following two texts is fundamental: *Histoire "acéphale" et Index syriaque des Lettres Festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. A. Martin - M. Albert (SC 317), Paris 1985. For the versions of Athanasius's works in other languages and for the fragments, see CPG.

Studies on the tradition of some works: H.-G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* (AKG, 23), Berlin-Leipzig 1935; A. Camplani, *Le lettere festali di Atanasio di Alessandria. Studio storico-critico*, Rome 1989; K. Metzler, *Kontamination in der Athanasius-Überlieferung*: Revue des Études Byzantines 48 (1990) 213-232; K. Metzler - F. Simon, *Ariana et Athanasiana. Studien zur Überlieferung und zu philologischen Problemen der Werke des Athanasius von Alexandrien* (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 83), Opladen 1991.

Recent presentations of the historical figure of Athanasius: D.W.H. Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*, Notre Dame, IN 1991; L.W. Barnard, *Studies in Athanasius' Apologia Secunda* (European University Studies, Series XXIII, Theology, 467), Bern-Frankfurt 1992; T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, MA - London 1993; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328-373)* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 216), Rome 1996.

Recent general introductions to the bishop and his thought: Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie, ed. C. Kannengiesser (Théologie historique 27), Paris 1974; M. Tetz, *Athanasius von Alexandrien*: TRE 4 (1978) 333-349; K. Anatolios, *Athanasius: The Coherence of his Thought*, London-New York 1998; A.-L. Pettersen, *Athanasius* (Outstanding Christian Thinkers), London 1995.

Anthropology, asceticism and spirituality: P. Merendino, *Paschale Sacramentum. Eine Untersuchung über die Osterkatechese des hl. Athanasius von Alexandrien in ihrer Beziehung zu den frühchristlichen exegetisch-theologischen Überlieferungen*, Münster 1965; J. Roldanus, *Le Christ et l'homme dans la théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie. Étude de la conjonction de sa conception de l'homme avec sa Christologie*, Leiden 1968; G. C. Stead, "The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy," in *Platonism und Christentum,* Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie, ed. H.-D. Blume - F. Mann (JbAC.E. 10), Münster 1983, 245-257; D. Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Ascetism*, Oxford 1995; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie: l'Église d'Égypte et les moines: à propos de la Vie d'Antoine*: RSR 71 (1997) 171-188; D. Brakke, "*Outside the Places, within the Truth": Athanasius of Alexandria and the Localization of the Holy*, in *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*, ed. D. Frankfurter (Religions in Graeco-Roman World 134), Leiden-Boston-Cologne 1998, 445-481; Id., *Jewish Flesh and Christian Spirit in Athanasius of Alexandria*: JECS 9 (2001) 453-481; N. Kwok-kit Ng, *The Spirituality of Athanasius: A Key for Proper Understanding of This Important Church Father* (European University Studies. Series XXIII: Theology, 733), Bern u.a. 2001; A. Camplani (intro. and tr.), *Atanasio di Alessandria, Lettere festali. Anonimo, indice delle lettere festali* (Letture cristiane del primo millennio, 34), Milan 2003.

Trinitarian theology: A. Laminsky, *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen. Der Beitrag des Athanasius von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des Trinitärischen Dogmas im vierten Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1969; M. Tetz, *Über nikänische Orthodoxie. Der sog. Tomus ad Antiochenos des Athanasius von Alexandrien*: ZNTW 66 (1975) 194-222; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (SEA 11), Rome 1975; G. C. Stead, *Divine Substance*, Oxford 1977; C. Kannengiesser, *Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain. Une lecture des traités* Contre les ariens (Théologie Historique 70), Paris 1983; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988; C. Kannengiesser, *Le Verbe de Dieu selon Athanase d'Alexandrie* ("Jésus et Jésus-Christ" 45), Tournai 1990; P. Widdicombe, *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius*, Oxford 1993; H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen 1999; X. Morales, *La théologie trinitaire d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, École pratique des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses (thèse), Paris 2002.

Exegesis: G.M. Vian, *Il "De Psalmorum Titulis": l'esegesi di Atanasio tra Eusebio e Cirillo*: Orpheus n.s. 12 (1991) 93-132; G. C. Stead, *Athanasius als Exeget*, in *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, eds. J. van Oort - U. Wickert, Kampen 1991, 174-184; J.D. Ernest, *Athanasius of Alexandria: The Scope of Scripture in Polemical and Pastoral Context*: VigChr 47 (1993) 341-362; C. Kannengiesser, *Athanasius von Alexandrien als Exeget*, in *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum*. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann, eds. G. Schöllgen - C. Scholten (JbAC.E. 23), Münster 1996, 336-343; K. Metzler, *Welchen Bibeltext benutzte Athanasius im Exil? Zur Herkunft der Bibelzitate in den Arianerreden im Vergleich zur* Ep. ad Ep. Aeg. (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 96), Opladen 1997; P.F. Bouter, *Athanasius van Alexandrië en zijn uitleg van de Psalmen. Een onderzoek naar de hermeneutiek en theologie van een psalmverklaring uit de vroege kerk*, Zoetermeer 2001.

Athanasius and the Origenian tradition: A. Ferrari, *Il significato dell'apologia cristiana nel prologo dell'*Oratio contra Gentes *di Atanasio di Alessandria*: Annali di Scienze Religiose 1 (1996) 261-283; C. Kannegiesser, *Das Vermächtnis des "fleissigen" Origenes zur Theologie des Athanasius*, in *Origeniana septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, eds. W.A Bienert - U. Kühneweg, Louvain 1999, 173-184; K. Anatolios, *Theology and Economy in Origen and Athanasius*, in *Origeniana septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, eds. W.A Bienert - U. Kühneweg, Louvain 1999, 165-171; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo* (SEA 82), Rome 2002.

Questions of authenticity: G. C. Stead, *Athanasius' Earliest Written Work*: JTS 39 (1988) 76-91; D. Brakke, *The Authenticity of the Ascetic Athanasiana*: Orientalia 63 (1994) 17-56; C. Kannengiesser, *Die Sonderstellung der dritten Arierrede des Athanasius*: ZKG 106 (1995) 18-55; *Athanasius: Die dritte Rede gegen die Arianer.* I (Kapitel 1-25): Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar; II (Kapitel 26-58): Übersetzung und Kommentar; III (Kapitel 59-67), Übersetzung und Kommentar und Theologiegeschichtlicher Ausblick von E.P. Meijering, Amsterdam 1996, 1997, 1998. See also "Trinitarian theology" and "Editions of individual works and philological commentaries."

A. Camplani

ATHANASIUS of Anazarbus (4th c.). This bishop of Anazarbus (Cilicia) supported *Arius from the first. He did not take part in the Council of *Nicaea (325), perhaps having found a way to avoid it, but was obliged to subscribe to the **homoousios*. According to *Philostorgius he was later *Aetius's teacher. We have a few fragments from him, affirming the most radical theses of Arian doctrine.

CPG 2, 2060-2061; D. de Bruyne, *Deux lettres inconnues de Theognius*: ZNTW 27 (1908) 107-110; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur s. Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936, 204-210; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 41-43.

M. Simonetti

ATHANASIUS of Ancyra (d. 369/370). Succeeded *Basil in 360 as bishop of *Ancyra and leader of the *homoiousian party. Elected by the Council of *Constantinople and consecrated by *Acacius of Caesarea in *Palestine, his origins were suspect. He was represented at the Council of *Antioch (363) and took part in that of *Tyana (367). Nevertheless *Basil the Great tried to effect a reconciliation with him and with his father, a rhetor of some authority (*Ep.* 24-25); at his death (369, or soon after 370) Basil wrote a rather conventional eulogy of him (*Ep.* 29). *Gregory of Nyssa (*C. Eun.* I, 37) praises his love of truth and uses his testimony against Aetius.

J. Gribomont

ATHEISM, Accusation of. Accused of "atheism" in the Greco-Roman world were those who, for various reasons, refused to acknowledge the existence of the gods and their benevolent intervention in human life in this world and, behaving accordingly, assumed attitudes contrary to the common religious beliefs and refused to offer to the gods the prescribed worship. Given the deeply rooted public dimension of *pagan religion, the accusation of atheism meant, besides moral disapproval, an explicitly "political" censure that could lead to extreme punishments like exile or condemnation to death. Atheism was perhaps the most important result of the great scientific and spiritual revolution that took place in the Greek world in the 5th c. BC. The rejection of the traditional gods was affirmed as the logical consequence of Sophist political doctrines on the conventional character of religion and of the physical theories on the material nature of the heavenly bodies introduced by Anaxagoras. The law of Diopeithes the seer sought to check the spread of these dangerous innovations. Besides Socrates, who was condemned under the accusation of not acknowledging the city's gods, the most famous "atheists" of antiquity were Diagoras of Melos and Theodore of Cyrene (ample collection of sources ed. by M. Winiarczyk, *Diagorae Melii et Theodori Cyrenaei reliquiae*, Leipzig 1981). The Epicureans, who denied providence and were critical of the traditional cults, were likewise accused (*Lucian, *Alexander or the False Prophet* 25).

Lucian's text also attests that, besides the Epicureans, the accusation of "atheism" was leveled at the Christians during the mid-2nd c., and in fact this accusation was clearly documented for the first time during that period, in *Justin Martyr's *Apol.* (6,1; 76,1-2) and in the *Mart. Polyc.* (3,2 and 9,2). A few years later it reappears in the events of the *martyrs of *Lyons of 177 (Eus. *HE* V,1,9-10). *Tatian tells how, to the pagans, the Christians were "atheists to the highest degree" (*Ad Graec.* 27,1), and *Athenagoras devotes many chapters of his *Presbeia Concerning the Christians* (4-30) to arguing precisely against this accusation, which was in some sense much more serious than the other widespread accusations of cannibalism and *incest. The pagan Cecilius, portrayed by *Minucius Felix in *Octavius* (8,2), compares the atheism of the Christians to the well-known atheism of Diagoras of Melos and Theodore of Cyrene.

Jews were also categorized as "atheists," in the pagan meaning of the term, for their rigid *monotheism that rendered them misanthropic (thus Apollonius Molon according to Flavius Josephus, *C. Apion* II,15). Atheism and Jewish practices were the reason for Flavius Clement and Flavia *Domitilla's condemnation under *Domitian, according to Cassius Dio's account (LXVII,14,1-3). *Julian the emperor cites the wickedness of the Jews as the real source of the atheism of Christians (*C. Gal.* 43 B).

Still in the early 4th c., the accusation of atheism was an integral part of the polemical baggage used by pagans against Christians, as the convergent testimonies of *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Praep. evang.*

I,2,2) and *Arnobius of Sicca (*Adv. nat.* I,29; III,28; V,30; VI,27) show. Arnobius (*Adv. nat.* I,26,3) and Eusebius (*Praep. evang.* III,13,4) also refer to a similar accusation by pagans (*Porphyry certainly among them) against Christians, that of being "profane" (*bebēloi*), i.e., unitiated in the mysteries. For the *Neoplatonist *Iamblichus, their contemporary, "atheists"—among whom Christians were certainly numbered—deny the divinely inspired value of oracular divination and of *theurgy (*De myst.* III,31).

The Christian *apologists broadly rejected the accusation of atheism, not only by emphasizing the strictly monotheistic character of their faith but also by turning this accusation against their polytheistic opponents. In Christian parlance, in fact, the accusation of "atheism" was used to stigmatize the traditional "polytheism" that kept pagans from accepting the Christian revelation of the one true God. The Jewish *Philo of Alexandria had already defined Egyptian idolatry as atheism (*Leg. ad Gaium* 25; *Post. Caini* 2). Beginning with the letter to the Ephesians (2:12), the Christian tradition was unanimous in attributing all pagan religious and moral perversion to their atheism. According to *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* 2,4; 3,2-3 and 6-7), the Greek philosophers had taught the atheism that was the cause of the aberrant behavior of pagans. *Origen returns more than once to the paradoxical expression "atheist polytheism" or "polytheistic atheism" (see *Exh. mart.* 5 and 32; *C. Cels.* I,1; III,73). At the school of *Caesarea, where all Greek philosophers and poets were intensively studied, the writings of atheist philosophers who, like the Epicureans, denied providence, were rigorously excluded (see *Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Thanksgiving to Origen* 13). A special mention is due here to the contributions of Justin Martyr and *Clement of Alexandria. The former admits that the pagan accusation of atheism is valid only in the sense that Christians do not recognize the supposed gods of the traditional pantheon (*Apol.* 6,1), but adds that for Christians, since they worship the one true God, the accusation of atheism—which, like Socrates, led to their death—is unjust (*Apol.* 5,3-4). For Justin, all those who, like Socrates, Heraclitus and others, lived according to the *logos* are Christians in every respect, even if they were considered atheists by the pagans (*Apol.* 46,3). Their atheism was judged positively from a Christian perspective, since it arose from the reasoned rejection of polytheism.

This reevaluation of the atheism of the pagan philosophers, first proposed by Justin, was then taken up and developed by Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* II,24,2). For him, the pagan philosophers who had denied the existence of the gods, while they had not grasped the *truth in its fullness, had at least the merit of suspecting the error of polytheistic belief. In this sense they were the precursors of the true religion, sent by God to enlighten the darkened spirits of the Greeks, just as the prophets were sent to the chosen people to prepare the way for the gospel.

A. von Harnack, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten* (TU 28, NF 13/4), Leipzig 1905; A.D. Simpson, *Epicureans, Christians, Atheists in the Second Century*: TPAPA 72 (1941) 372-381; W. Nestle, *Atheismus*: RAC I (1950) 866-870; E. Fascher, *Der Vorwurf der Gottlosigkeit in der Auseinandersetzung bei Juden, Griechen und Christen*, in O. Betz - M. Hengel - P. Schmidt (eds.), *Abraham unser Vater. Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel.* Festschrift für O. Michel (AGSU 5), Leiden-Cologne 1963, 78-105; N. Brox, *Zum Vorwurf des Atheismus gegen die Alte Kirche*: TTZ 75 (1966) 274-282; M. Winiarczyk, *Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?*: Philologus 128 (1984) 157-183; M. Winiarczyk, *Methodisches zum antiken Atheismus*: RhM 133 (1990) 1-15; J.J. Walsh, *On Christian Atheism*: VChr 45 (1991) 255-277; P.F. Beatrice, *L'accusation d'athéisme contre les Chrétiens*, in M. Narcy - É. Rebillard (eds.), *Hellénisme et Christianisme*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2004, 133-152 (with additional bibliography).

P.F. Beatrice

ATHENAGORAS. Between 176 and 180 he wrote a defense of the Christians, addressed to the emperors *Marcus Aurelius and *Commodus and titled *Presbeia* ("embassy, address, supplication") *of Athenagoras, Christian philosopher in Athens, Concerning the Christians.* All we know of Athenagoras is from the title: that he lived at *Athens and was a professional philosopher. The *Presbeia* may have been written on the occasion of the visit of the two emperors to Athens in September 176; in any event it is almost contemporary with the persecution at *Lyons in 177. There has recently been a great effort (B. Pouderon) to reevaluate, despite its chronological errors, *Philip of Sides's information that Athenagoras had initially directed the **didaskaleion* of *Alexandria. Scholars are skeptical, but it cannot be entirely ruled out that Philip received a tradition that spoke of a period of teaching by Athenagoras at Alexandria, like those of *Justin Martyr and *Valentinus at Rome. In the *Presbeia,* Athenagoras refutes one after another the three classical accusations against the Christians: *atheism, *incest and the cannibalism of babies. The first charge is discussed much more fully and leads to an exposition of the *Trinity (ch. 10). Toward the end (ch. 37), Athenagoras announces a treatise *On the Resurrection*. And in fact, *Paris. gr. 451,* the oldest manuscript of the *Presbeia,* is followed by a work on the resurrection, whose title says that it is "by the same"

author. The condition of the text and the style of the two works have led (R.M. Grant, W.R. Schoedel, N. Zeegers, E. Gallicet, H.E. Lona) to the hypothesis of a late copyist being responsible for the attribution to Athenagoras, and for their consequent combination in a single MS. Pouderon has argued incisively in favor of Athenagoras as the author, and his counterarguments seem solid. Less likely is his conjecture that Athenagoras specifically addressed his work to a *gnostic audience rather than a generally *pagan one. *On the Resurrection* is divided into two parts: the first refutes the usual objections regarding the impossibility, injustice and unworthiness of the resurrection of bodies, using exclusively "scientific" and rational arguments (the author does not consider scriptural arguments) in support of the concluding, fideistic argument that nothing is impossible with God. The second part argues positively that, since the human being is composed of *soul and *body, both parts are responsible for human choices and must be rewarded or punished together.

E. Schwartz, TU 4, 2, Leipzig 1891; W.L. Schoedel, Oxford 1972; B. Pouderon, SC 379, Paris 1992; R.M. Grant, *Some Errors in the Legatio of Athenagoras*: VChr 12 (1958) 145-146; L.W. Barnard, *Athenagoras*, Paris 1972 (with bibl.); T.D. Barnes, *The Embassy of Athenagoras*: JTS n.s. 26 (1975) 111-114 (on the title and date); P. Nautin, *Note critique sur Athénagore*, *Legatio*, *16,3*: VChr 29 (1975) 271-275; M. Marcovich, *On the Text of Athenagoras, De resurrectione*: VChr 33 (1979) 375-382; B. Pouderon, *L'authenticité du* De resurrectione, in Id., *D'Athènes à Alexandrie. Etudes sur Athénagore et les origines de la philosophie chrétienne*, Québec 1997, 71-144 (with prior bibliography); N. Zeegers - V. Vorst, *Adversaires et destinataires du* De resurrectione *attribué à Athénagore d'Athènes*: Salesianum 57 (1995) 75-122; 199-250; 415-442; 611-656; *Athenagorae qui fertur "De resurrectione mortuorum,"* ed. M. Marcovich, Leiden 2000.

P. Nautin - E. Prinzivalli

ATHENODORUS (3rd c.). Bishop in *Pontus, saint. Feast 18 October in the West, 7 November in the East. From *Eusebius of Caesarea we know that Athenodorus was at *Origen's school in *Caesarea for five years, with his older brother Theodore. Eusebius says that Theodore was the famous *Gregory Thaumaturgus: this identification, for a long time undisputed, is now called into question. The fact remains nonetheless that, according to Eusebius, Athenodorus and Theodore were elected bishops of Pontus while still young (*HE* VI,30; VII,14). With his brother, Athenodorus took part in the first synod against *Paul of Samosata (*HE* VII,28).

DHGE 5, 43-44.

E. Prinzivalli

ATHENS. The Christian community of Athens was founded by the apostle Paul (Acts 17:15-34) at a time when, after its destruction under Sulla (86 BC), Athens had entered a phase of reconstruction and rebirth (Broneer; Travlos, Πολεοδομική 93-94). Allied to *Rome—*civitas libera et foederata*—it expanded under *Hadrian and was enriched in the 2nd c. with new public buildings and villas. It kept up this splendor until 267, when it was destroyed by the Heruli (Travlos, 96-124). A city in the classical mold, it manifestly preserved its tendency to the old way of life. The heart of its social life was the Agora. Under *Hadrian and *Marcus Aurelius the philosophical schools of Athens were expanded and transformed into state institutions (Gregorovius, 54-57; Konstantinidis, 89-92 and 174-176). At Athens Christianity gained adherents from both upper and lower classes (*Dionysius the Areopagite; Damaris; Harnack, 560 and 593). According to tradition Dionysius the Areopagite was the first bishop (Eus., *HE* III 4,10 and IV 23,2: PG 20, 221 and 384; GCS II, 1,194 and 374). In the 2nd c. the Christian community was very strong, producing *apologists such as *Quadratus, *Aristides and *Athenagoras, and men active in other Christian communities such as popes *Anacletus (son of the philosopher Antiochus) and (probably) *Hyginus, *Clement of Alexandria and later perhaps Pope *Sixtus II. It was also one of the Christian communities persecuted under Marcus Aurelius (Eus., *HE* IV 26,10-11: PG 20, 396; GCS II, 1,386). In ca. 170 the church of Athens risked dissolving as a result of the *martyrdom of its bishop *Publius, but it recovered under his successor Quadratus (Eus., *HE* IV 23,3: PG 20, 384; GCS II 1,374; Max, 46-51; Harnack, 216 and 455). Before the mid-2nd c. *Gregory Thaumaturgus studied at Athens (Socr., *HE* VI 32: PG 57, 536), and *Origen wrote some of his works there (Eus., *HE* VI 23,4 and 32,2: PG 20, 576 and 592; GCS II,570 and 586). Origen praised the church of Athens for its firmness of faith and the peace that reigned in it (Orig., *C. Cels*. III, 30: PG 11, 957; GCS I, 227).

After the devastation of Athens by the Heruli, the habitable area decreased by 90 percent (Thompson, *Athenian Twilight,* 61-66; Travlos, 125-129). The old Agora remained uninhabited until the late 4th c. (Thompson, 65-66), but the city continued to offer teaching through its schools, attracting young men like *Julian, *Basil the Great and *Gregory of Nazianzus (Max, 65-67; Geffcken, 101 and 117ff.). In 398, however, *Synesius of Cyrene was disappointed both by the quality of Athenian teachers and by their training, both in the city and in the surrounding area (Sin., *Ep*. 272: PG 66, 1524 = Fitzgerald n. 136).

Renewed building activity, begun in the mid-4th c. and continuing throughout the 5th c., restored Athens to its size under Hadrian. This work of reconstruction was supported by the favor of Herculius, eparch of Illyricum (Thompson, 66-68; Travlos, 129-134). The philosophical schools, active everywhere, were also represented by Christian teachers such as *Prohaeresius (2nd half 4th c.). But they retained their predominantly *pagan cult as part of the old religious tradition, as seen in the famous *Neoplatonic academy headed by *Proclus (d. 485). The last pagan philosophers, isolated nostalgics surrounded by a popular Christianity, were expelled by *Justinian in 529 (Gregorovius, 54-57; Konstantinidis, 118 and 174-185; Geffcken, 202ff.). The philosophical schools seem to have been concentrated in the Agora and its neighborhood, and on the Acropolis (Frantz, *Pagan*; Id., *From Paganism* 191-193; Travlos, 130-134).

Among the ancient cults, the Eleusinian mysteries disappeared after *Alaric destroyed the temple of Eleusis in 396. Within the city of Athens, the Panathenaic processions on the Acropolis are attested until the 5th c. (Frantz, *From Paganism,* 193). The Parthenon ceased to be a pagan temple when its chryselephantine statue of Athena was removed and taken to *Constantinople (before 485: Frantz, 200-201 and 204). In the 4th c. Christian worship had its own churches in the city (Greg. Naz., *In laud. Basil. Magni* 21: "Two ways appeared before us: one principal and more honorable, the other secondary and of less value; the first leads *to our sacred buildings* and to the doctors who teach in them, the other to those who were trained outside": PG 36, 524), but they were probably in the suburbs.

Christianity seems to have established itself in the city center in the early 5th c., with the founding of a building of four cupolas inside Hadrian's Library. Though this is disputed, this building seems to have been a cathedral church built with the support of the empress *Eudoxia of Athens (Karivieri, 899f.). The basilica identified within the Roman Agora is certainly early Christian (Lazaridis, 96), though its exact date is unknown. At the end of the 5th c., but perhaps later, the temple of Asclepius, which had been in use until shortly before 485, was turned into a church (Frantz, *From Paganism,* 194-195 and 202; Travlos, *Athens,* 362-363; Spieser, 310). We have no precise date for the conversion of the Parthenon into a church: it was probably mid-6th c., and reused all of the building's annexes: the choir and altar were set on the spot of the altar of Asclepius, the nave in the temple itself; the place of incubation became the N aisle; the sacred spring was put to use by the church (Travlos, *Athen,* 357-358; Karivieri, 898). The Erechtheum must have been converted in the late 6th or 7th c.; the Hephaisteion (Theseion), at the foot of the Acropolis facing the Agora, in the 7th c. (Frantz, *From Paganism,* 202-203; Travlos, *Athens,* 365-366; Spieser 310-311). Outside Hadrian's city walls, the basilica of the Ilissus, dedicated to the Corinthian *martyr Leonidas, was probably built after the destruction of the church of that name in *Corinth (550–551) (Pallas; for information on other early Christian monuments: Travlos, *Athens,* 356-378).

In its years of greatest decline, the city's life went on within its existing walls, restored under Justinian (Travlos, Πολεοδομική, 144-155 and 149ff.). Yet the city did retain its splendor. It was visited in 662–663 by the emperor *Constans II, who granted it revenue. In the 7th c. it seems still to have been a cultural center (Gregorovius I 99; Runciman, 294; Cameron). Politically, Athens belonged to the province of *Achaia until this was divided into two themes; ecclesiastically, it depended on the metropolitan of Corinth. In the 8th c. Athens was promoted to metropolis.

F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1889; G. Kostantinidis, Ἱστορία τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ Γεννήσεως μέχρι τοῦ ἔτους 1821, Athens ²1894; H. Leclercq: DACL I 2 (1924) 3039-3104 (s.v. *Athènes*); G.A. Sotiriou, Εὑρετήριον τῶν μεσαιωνικῶν μνημείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Α', Athens 1927; R. Janin: DHGE V (1931) 15-42 (s.v. *Athènes*); I. Travlos, Πολεοδομική ἐξέλιξις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, Athens 1960; Id., RBK 1, 350-389 (s.v. Athens); J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, Heidelberg ²1929; G.I. Konidaris, Πότε προήχθησαν αἱ Ἀθῆναι εἰς μητρόπολιν: PAA 10 (1935) 285-292; St. Runciman, *Byzantine Civilisation*, London ²1936; V. Laurent, *L'érection de la métropole d'Athènes et le statut ecclésiastique de l'Illyricum au VIIIᵉ s.*: EtByz 1 (1943) 58-72; O. Broneer, *Athens, "City of Worship"*: Bibl. Archaeologist 21 (1958) 2-28; H.A. Thompson, *Athenian Twilight: A.D. 267-600*: JRS 49 (1959) 61-72; P. Lazaridis, Μεσιωνικὰ Ἀθηνῶν Ἀττικῆς: AD 19 (1964): chron. 96-99; A. Frantz, *From Paganism to Christianity in the Temples of Athens*: DOP 19 (1965) 185-205; A.D.E. Cameron, *The Last Days of the Academy at Athens*: PCPhS 195 (1969) 7-29; A. Frantz, *Pagan Philosophers in Christian Athens*: PAPhS 119 (1975) 29-38; J.-M. Spieser, *La christianisation des sanctuaires païens en Grèce*: Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern, ed. U. Jantzen, Tübingen 1976, 309-320; D.I. Pallas, *Corinthe et Nikopolis pendant le moyen âge*: FR 114 (1979); I. Travlos, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen*, Tübingen 1971; T.E. Gregory, *The Survival of Paganism in Christian Greece*: AJPh 107 (1986) 229-242; J. Irmscher, *La politica religiosa dell'Imperatore Giustiniano contro i pagani e la fine della scuola neoplatonica ad Atene*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 11 (1990) 579-592; A. Karivieri, *The So-Called Library of Hadrian and the Tetraconch Church in Athens*, in *Post-Herulian Athens*, ed. P. Castrén, Helsinki 1994, 89-113; A. Karivieri, *The Christianization of an Ancient Pilgrimage Site: A Case Study of the Athenian Asklepeion*, in *Akten des XII. Intern. Kongresses f. christ. Archäologie*, II, Münster 1995, 898-905; P. Castrén, *Christianity in Athens and Vicinity During the Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, in *The Idea and Ideal of the Town Between Late An-*

tiquity and Early Middle Ages, eds. G.P. Bogliolo - B. Ward-Perkins, Leiden 1999, 211-223.

D.I. Pallas

ATHLETA CHRISTI. The comparison of the Christian with the athlete and the Christian life with a battle occurs frequently in Scripture (1 Cor 4:9; 9:24-26; 2 Tim 2:5; 4:6-8), an influence of philosophical ethics. The *martyrs are the athletes of Christ par excellence, also because authentic martyrs, esp. those who were killed in the amphitheater or the circus, were considered as such (*Passio ss. Perpet. et Felic.*). The *Byzantine church especially, in its homilies (*John Chrysostom, the *Cappadocians, *Severus of Antioch, *John of Damascus), in the *Passiones* (read during the *liturgy) and in the synaxaries, evokes the metaphor of the martyr-athlete and sees in the feasts of the martyrs the new Christian "spectacles." *Augustine follows the same line in his preaching in honor of Sts. *Perpetua and Felicity, replacing the *pagan spectacles with the *spectacula christiana* (*see* Spectacles). The circular Roman basilicas may reflect the metaphor of the *athleta Christi,* which is why the Fathers very often described the church of a martyr as a stadium. From the peace of *Constantine on, the agonistic metaphor was extended also to *ascetics, *virgins and bishops.

DACL 1, 3105-3111; TWNT 1, 134-140; 166-167; F. Rütten, *Die Victorverehrung im christlichen Altertum. Eine kulturgeschichtliche und hagiographische Studie*, Paderborn 1936, 16-36; F. di Capua, *La concezione agonistica del martirio nei primi secoli del cristianesimo e l'introito della messa di S. Agata*: EphLit 61 (1947) 229-240; G. Lomiento, Ἀθλητής τῆς εὐσεβείας: VetChr 1 (1964) 113-128; R. Merkelbach, *Der griechische Wortschatz und die Christen*: ZPE 18 (1975) 101-148; A. Bandura, *Athleta Christi nella patristica latina dei primi quattro secoli*, Diss. Pontificia Universitas Lateranensis - Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, Rome 1994; E. La Rocca, *Le basiliche cristiane "a deambulatorio" e la sopravvivenza del culto eroico*: S. Ensoli - E. La Rocca (eds.), *Aurea Roma. Dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, Florence 2000, 204-220.

S. Heid

ATTICUS (d. 425). Patriarch of *Constantinople from early March 406 to 10 October 425. He restored relations with *Rome, which had been broken by the condemnation of *John Chrysostom, and asked *Cyril of Alexandria to replace John's name in his church's *diptychs. He expelled *Pelagius's friend Celestius from Constantinople and corresponded with *Augustine; a letter to him attributed to the head of the Armenian church is spurious (see CPG 5660). His generosity to the poor of *Nicaea is famous. Among his acts are preserved fragments of a dogmatic letter to Eupsychius on the divinity of Christ.

CPG 5650-5660; CSEL 88, Vienna 1981, 32-38, see LVILVII; DHGE 5, 161-166; ODB 1, 230; LTK 1, 1165-1166; Marienlexikon 1,266; Grumel, *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, Kadiköi-Bucharest I, 1, 1932, 35-48; J. Lebon, *Discours d'Atticus de Constantinople sur la sainte Mère de Dieu*: Muséon 46 (1933) 167-202; M. Brière, *Une homélie inédite d'Atticus, patriarche de Constantinople (406-425)*: ROC 29 (1933-34) 160-186; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, passim; M. Geerard - A. Van Roey, *Les fragments grecs et syriaques de la lettre "Ad Eupsychium" d'Atticus de Constantinople (406-425)*, *Corona Gratiarum*. Miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligio Dekkers O.S.B. . . . oblata, Brugge 1975, vol. 1, 69-81; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie, de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)*, Rome 1976 (passim, see index); G. Madec, *Du nouveau dans la correspondance augustinienne*: REAug 27 (1981) 59-60; M.F. Berrouard, *Les lettres 6e et 19e de saint Augustin*: REAug 27 (1981) 264-277; F.J. Thomson, *The Slavonic Translation of the Hitherto Untraced Greek "Homilia in nativitatem Domini nostri Jesu Christi" by Atticus of Constantinople*: AB 118 (2000) 5-36.

D. Stiernon

ATTILA (ca. 400–453). King of the *Huns. Son of Mundzuk, brother of Octar and Roas (Jordanes, *Hist. Goth.* 35), he settled in 434 in the region of the vast Hungarian plain and from there began his great expansion eastward, conquering S Russia and the entire Danube basin. At the death of his brother Bleda he remained the sole leader of the Huns. From 441–447 he engaged in a great military campaign against the *Byzantine Empire: he invaded the Balkan peninsula and pushed through Greece as far as Thermopylae, withdrawing from there in exchange for major concessions on the part of the emperor *Theodosius II. He maintained cordial relations with *Rome thanks to the mediation of the general Aetius but, emboldened by his power, made ever more insistent demands of the emperor *Valentinian III, who refused them. In spring 451 he crossed the Rhine with a huge army and invaded *Gaul as far as Orléans, sowing terror and destroying many cities, including Metz. The Roman army, led by *Aetius and helped by a large group of *Visigoths led by King *Theodoric I, attacked the Huns at the Catalaunian Fields, or *Campus Mauriacus,* between Châlon-sur-Marne and Troyes, stopping Attila's advance and forcing him to retreat to Pannonia (Jordanes, *Hist. Goth.* 36). In 452 Attila moved from the Danube region into *Italy, destroying the cities of *Aquileia, *Milan and Pavia. Pope *Leo I met him on the River Mincio near Mantua before he could reach the gates of Rome, to beg him in God's name to spare the city of *Peter and *Paul. The impression of his encounter with the

pope, which has become popular legend, and the condition of his army, tired and decimated by sickness, led Attila to accept the emperor's peace proposals, and he withdrew from the Italian peninsula to return to his domains in Hungary. He died unexpectedly in 453. His death meant the end of the kingdom of the Huns, which broke up rapidly due to rivalry between his sons.

F. Altheim, *Attila und die Hunnen*, Baden-Baden 1950; E.A. Thompson, *A History of Attila and the Huns*, Oxford 1948, It. tr. Florence 1963; E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, 2. *De l'avènement de Dioclétien (284) à l'occupaton germanique de l'Empire romain d'Occident (début du VI[e] siècle)*, II, Paris 1979, 522-557; *Attila* Flagellum Dei?, *Convegno internazionale di studi storici sulla figura di Attila e sulla discesa degli Unni in Italia nel 452 d.C.*, S. Blason Scarel (ed.), Studia Historica 129, Rome 1994; P. Howarth, *Attila, King of the Huns: Man and Myth*, London 1994; E.A. Thompson, *The Huns*, Oxford 1996; A. Arecchi, *Attila e Teodorico. L'impero finisce a Pavia*, Pavia 1997.

G. Pilara

AUDENTIUS (d. ca. 395). Predecessor of Asturius (Ildef., *De vir. ill.* 2) in the see of *Toledo (385–395). According to *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 14) he wrote *De fide adversus omnes haereses,* against the *Manichees, *Sabellians, *Arians and esp. the *Photinians (*Bonosiani*). The *heresies or deviations of *Priscillian and his followers were included. Audentius wrote against the Priscillianists at the height of their influence, but without citing them; his work is lost. A.G. Vega believes to have identified Audentius's *De fide* in *Augustine's sermon 233, a booklet *On Faith,* which coincides with the profession of faith of the first Council of Toledo. Audentius's *De fide* would be the primitive text of the Toledan Creed. Our Audentius should not be confused with *Auxentius, who appears in the first Council of *Saragossa (380).

A.C. Vega, *De Patrología Española*: Bol. R. Acad. Hiat. 169 (1972) 263-325; H. Chadwick, *Priscilliano de Avila*, Madrid 1978, 278; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura española*, 4 vols., Madrid 1997, II, 25.

E. Romero Pose

AUDIANI. Rigorist *monastic sect founded in *Syria by Audius, a deacon of *Edessa. *Epiphanius considers them *heretical, describing them in *Panarion*, ch. 70. In particular he attributes the *anthropomorphite theory to them, according to which the divine form is literally the same as the human form. While the sect's activity seems to have been confined to Syria and later to Scythia (where *Constantine outlawed it), the anthropomorphite theory turns up in 4th-5th-c. Egyptian monastic circles, perhaps independent of the *audiani,* and esp. among those circles most opposed to the theories of *Origen and therefore of *Evagrius of Pontus. *Socrates mentions them (*HE* VI, 7), as do two *Coptic texts (Life of Aphu of Oxyrhynchus; ps.-Agathonicus of Tarsus).

Hfl-Lecl 1, 479-488; EC 2, 389-390; RAC 1, 910-915; bibliography in A. Guillaumont, *Les "Kephalaia gnostica" d'Évagre le Pontique*, Paris 1962, 59-61; H.Ch. Puech, *Enquête sur la Gnose*, I, Paris 1978, 271-300.

T. Orlandi

AUDIENTIA EPISCOPALIS

I. Ecclesiastical constitutions and secular legislation - II. Canonical sources and ecclesiastical authors.

I. Ecclesiastical constitutions and secular legislation. St. *Paul, developing the gospel precept (Mt 18:15), exhorted Christians to resolve their disputes within the community, using one of themselves as judge (1 Cor 6:1-8). This procedure, inspired by Jewish models, was adopted in Christian communities, and with the gradual institutionalization of the Christian religion the role of arbitrator and reconciler was naturally assumed by the bishop, who had authority and, more often than not, the legal knowledge necessary for this task. The **Didache* (XV) and the **Apostolic Constitutions* (II, 5,46.47.49) confirmed the apostle's proposal, stressing the need for Christians to have recourse to the bishop's tribunal rather than appealing to civil authorities. This kind of judgment by the religious authorities, though confirmed by the sources, was of course neither regulated nor sanctioned by any imperial law: the *audientia episcopalis* remained something within the church and responded to purely religious demands. In judging, the bishop based himself on the *lex christiana,* which complied with a series of disciplinary moral rules that followed from gospel precepts. From the time of the proclamation of religious peace, *Constantine officially recognized the *audientia episcopalis,* affirming the principle in the constitution of 23 June 318 (CTh I, 27, 1), which was further specified in the imperial rescript of 333 (*C. Sirmondiana* 1). The emperor thus rendered the college of bishops *licitum* in every respect, and in particular attributed to the bishop the authority to decide, without limitation, *ratione materiae et personae*. Whenever one of the two litigants in a private dispute requested recourse to the bishop's tribunal, the imperial judge was obligated to accept the proposal without hesitation: the *provocatio* to the bishop had to be accepted even without the other party's consent; finally, the bishop's verdict had full

force and could not be appealed. Bishops could judge in both civil and penal cases; they could accuse and judge a *pagan, a *heretic or a schismatic; the civil authority in effect kept only the simple executive function. The imperial power was not slow in reconsidering these privileges, and in 376 the emperors *Valens, *Gratian and *Valentinian signed a constitution (CTh XVI, 2, 23) with which they reserved penal cases to secular tribunals and limited the application of the *episcopale iudicium* only to civil cases. A new intervention (398) by the emperors *Arcadius and *Honorius introduced the consent of both parties as a necessary prerequisite for moving a case to the bishop's tribunal (CI 1, 4, 7). The following year Honorius, with the specific intention of limiting episcopal power, which as the sources show had increased tremendously (Augustine, *De opere monachorum* XXIX, 37; *Ep*. XLVIII, 1; *Enarratio II in Psalmum* XXV, 13; *Confessioni* VI, 3, 3; Ambrose, *Ep*. LXXXII; John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio*, III, 17), ordered that all cases in matters of faith were to be submitted to the bishop's judgment, whereas in civil and penal cases, Roman law and the will of the imperial judge had to be respected (CTh XVI, 11, 1). With the constitution of Arcadius, Honorius and Theodosius (CI I, 4, 8 = CTh 1, 27, 2: year 408), there was a return to a greater autonomy for ecclesiastical tribunals: the legislator conceded the possibility of recourse, in an appeal, to the episcopal tribunal for whoever requested it, confirming the authority of the ecclesiastical *cognitor* and that his verdict could not be appealed. Emperor *Valentinian III introduced a new constitution, recorded as *Novella XXXV* of 15 April 452, in which he confirmed the need for consent between the parties in order to defer the case to a religious tribunal, whether the litigants were clergy or laity, thus excluding recourse to the *privilegium fori*. Valentinian's *Novella XXXV* was abrogated in 460 by the emperor Majorian with *Novella XI*. The *audientia episcopalis* was again considered by jurists under *Justinian in the writing of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* (*Codex repetitae praelectionis* I, 4: *De episcopali audientia et de diversis capitulis*). In line with the constitutions of 398 and 408, the possibility of recourse to the bishop's arbitration based on the agreement of both parties was confirmed; in particular, the question was treated in *Novellae LXXXIII* and *LXXXVI*, published in 539: the legislator allowed recourse to the episcopal tribunal for both civil and criminal cases, when the latter regarded crimes in ecclesiastical matters, and when one of the two litigants was not fully satisfied with the judgment of the secular tribunal. Extremely important was *Novella CXXIII* of 546, in which the *Byzantine emperor, respecting the institution of the *privilegium fori*, esp. in cases where a bishop was a plaintiff or defendant, made episcopal verdicts subject to appeal, offering both clergy and laity the full right to a civil tribunal, either to confirm or enforce the bishop's decision or to defer the case to a local judge.

II. Canonical sources and ecclesiastical authors. The conciliar acts we have (*Conc. Carthag.* III [397], can. IX: Mansi III, 882; *Conc. Chalced.* IV [451], can. IX: Hfl-Lecl II, 2, 791-797) and the ample written evidence of the fathers of the church allow us to assert that recourse to the institution of the *audientia episcopalis* was a practice rooted in the life of the various Christian communities, especially in the period following Constantine's legislation. In some of his works St. *Augustine, bishop of *Hippo, attests how burdensome his judicial tasks were to him, saying that almost all of his time was taken up in settling disputes between believers; he also tried to specify the legitimacy of his legal power, confirmed by the tradition as well as by the imperial provisions that had placed bishops' verdicts absolutely beyond appeal (*De opere Monachorum* XXIX, 37; *Enarratio II in Psalmum* XXV, 13; see also Possidius, *Vita S. Agostini* XIX). An important text that addresses the problem of ecclesiastical tribunals, and that to a certain extent also explains the *modus agendi* in civil cases, is the letter sent by *Ambrose, bishop of *Milan, to Marcellus (Ambr., *Epistolarum Classis* II, *Ep*. LXXXII). We have various evidence concerning Ambrose's legal activity (Ambr., *Ep. Classis I; Ep.* XXI, 2; Aug., *Confessionum Libri* VI, 3, 3; Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV, 6). We also have much evidence from the Eastern church. *Basil of Caesarea (*Regulae fusius tractatae, interrogatio* XLIX; *Epistolarum Classis III, Epistula* CCCVII), *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Oratio* XLIII, 34) and *John Chrysostom (*De sacerdotio* III, 17) give evidence of repeated involvement in disputes among the faithful.

P. De Francisci, *Per la storia dell'episcopalis audientia fino alla Novella 35 di Valentiniano*, "Scritti O. Scavalcanti." Annali della Facoltà di Giurisprudenza di Perugia 30, Rome 1918, 47-75; A. Pugliese, *Sant'Agostino giudice. Contributo alla storia dell'episcopalis audientia*: "Studi dedicati alla memoria di Paolo Ubaldi." Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, serie 5°, 16 (1937) 263-299; G. Vismara, *Episcopalis audientia. L'attività giurisdizionale del vescovo per la risoluzione delle controversie private tra laici nel diritto romano e nella storia del diritto italiano fino al secolo nono*, Milan 1937; V. Bušek, *Episcopalis audientia, eine Friedens- und Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit*: ZRG 28 (1939) 453-492; B. Biondi, *Il Diritto Romano Cristiano: Orientamento religioso della legislazione*, I, Milan 1952, 374-384, 445-461; W. Selb, *Episcopalis audientia von der Zeit Konstantin bis zur Nov. XXXV Valentinians III*: ZRG 53 (1967) 162-217; O. Diliberto, *Paolo di Tarso, I ad Cor. VI, 1-8, e le origini della gi-*

urisdizione ecclesiastica nelle cause civili: Studi Economico-Giuridici 39 (1979) 183-219; C.G. Mor, *I poteri temporali dei vescovi in Italia e in Germania nel Medioevo*, "Annali dell'Istituto storico italo germanico," Quaderno 3, Bologna 1979; F.J. Cuena Boy, *La "Episcopalis Audientia,"* Valladolid 1985; G. Vismara, *Ancora sull'episcopalis audientia* (*Ambrogio arbitro o giudice?*): Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris 53 (1987) 55-73; C. Gebbia, *Sant'Agostino e l'*episcopalis audientia, in *L'Africa romana.* Acts del VI Convegno di Studio (Sassari, 16-18 December 1988), Sassari 1989, 683-695; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain* (*IVe-Ve siècles*), in *Histoire du Droit et des Istitutions de l'Église en Occident*, Paris [2]1989, 330-340; M.R. Cimma, *L'episcopalis audientia nelle costituzioni imperiali da Costantino a Giustiniano*, Turin 1989; G. Crifò, *A proposito di episcopalis audientia. Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'Empire romain au IVe siècle ap. J.C.*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 159, Rome 1992, 397-410; G. Vismara, *La giurisdizione civile dei vescovi, secoli I-IX*, Milan 1995; P. Maymò, *La* episcopalis audientia *durante la dinastia teodosiana. Ensayo sobre el poder jurídico del obispo en la sociedad tardorromana*, *Congreso Internacional La Hispania de Teodosio*, 1, Salamanca 1997, 165-170; Id., *La legislació constantiniana respecte a l'*episcopalis audientia: Pyrenae 30 (1999) 191-203; G.L. Falchi, *La diffusione della legislazione imperiale ecclesiastica nei secoli IV e V*, in *Legislazione imperiale e religione nel IV secolo*, eds. J. Gaudemet - P. Siniscalco - G.L. Falchi, Rome 2000, 148-151; O. Huck, *A propos de CTh 1,27,1 et Csirm 1. Sur deux textes controversés relatifs à l'Episcopalis audientia constantinienne*: ZRG 120 (2003) 78-105; G. Pilara, *Sui tribunali ecclesiastici nel IV e V secolo*: StudRom 52, 3-4 (2004) 353-378.

G. Pilara

AUDITE OMNES AMANTES. Alphabetical hymn in rhythmic trochaic septenarii in praise of *Patrick, *apostle of *Ireland. Included in the *Antiphonary of Bangor* (folios 13-15) with the title *Ymnum Sancti Patrici* for use in liturgical settings, it is now thought to be the work of Colman Alo (d. 611), whereas it was traditionally considered a work of *Secundinus (Sechnall, d. 447), son of the "Lombard" Restituto and Patrick's sister and perhaps one of the clerics who came to Ireland from the continent in the 5th c.; he is commemorated locally as a saint on 27 November.

Sharpe 1605; Lapidge-Sharpe 573; Kenney 87; CPL 1101; BS 11,805-807.

Editions and translations: PL 53, 837-840; 72, 590-592; W. Stokes, *The Tripartite Life of St. Patrick,* London 1887, II, 382-384; C. Blume, *Analecta hymnica Medii Aevi* 51, Leipzig 1908, 340-346; L. Bieler, *The Hymn of St. Secundinus*: PRIA 55C (1953) 117-127; E. Malaspina, *Gli scritti di san Patrizio. Alle origini del cristianesimo irlandese*, Rome 1985, 140-143.

Studies: L. Bieler, *St. Secundinus and Armagh*: Seanchas Ardmhacha 2 (1956) 21-27; A. Orchard, Audite omnes amantes*: A Hymn in Patrick's Praise*, in D.N. Dunville et al., *St. Patrick AD 493-1993*, Woodbridge 1993, 153-173; M.W. Herren, *An Early Irish Precursor of the "Offiziendichtung" of the Carolingian and Ottonian Periods*: Euphrosyne 22 (1994) 291-300.

E. Malaspina

AUGUSTALIS the African. The first ecclesiastical author to leave an aid for the computation of *Easter was Augustalis. He composed a *Laterculus*, i.e., an Easter table, giving the date for the celebration of Easter from 213–312. He used an 84-year Easter cycle; the custom of indicating on every 1 January the age of the moon (*Epact*) and the day of the week perhaps goes back to him. He also proposed the *saltus lunae* every 14 years. His work is lost, but its basic instructions can be deduced from information in the anonymous **Computus Carthaginensis, a. 455*, written in the 16th year of King *Genseric (CPL 2296; see B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, I, 279-297). Since he was eulogized as *sanctissimae memoriae* (I, 8), he was probably bishop of an *African see; he is also called *litterarum . . . scientia praeditus et calculationis arte peritus*. Augustalis's cycle, widely used in Africa until the late 4th c., was continued and revised by Agriustia; the church of *Rome must also have used it until the end of the 3rd c.

CPL 2273; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, I, Leipzig 1880, 5-23, 138, 150; DHGE 5, 414; DTC 11, 1953; CPPM III/A 630.

V. Loi - B. Amata

AUGUSTINE of Aquileia (408–434). Successor to St. *Chromatius as bishop of *Aquileia. His activity is known to us only because of the *Pelagian *heresy. He seems in fact to have been the recipient of a *Libellus fidei* of a group of northern Italian bishops and clergy, protesting against certain measures that Augustine, the metropolitan of Aquileia, took in deference to orders of the court of *Ravenna and to the document (*Tractoria,* 418) in which Pope *Zosimus denounced the Pelagian heresy and clearly set forth *Catholic doctrine. There are doubts about who the *Libellus fidei* is addressed to, but it is very probable that, just as the Pelagians of southern *Italy turned to *Rufus of Thessalonica, those of the north tried to win over the metropolitan of Aquileia.

G. Cuscito, *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 193-194 (with bibl.); PCBE 2,223.

G. Cuscito

AUGUSTINE of Canterbury (d. 604). Prior of the *monastery of St. Andrew on the Caelian Mount, was chosen by *Gregory in 596 as the leader of the mission to evangelize the Anglo-Saxons of England. On reaching Provence, the missionaries lost heart

and returned to Rome, but Gregory encouraged them and sent them out again. Augustine landed ca. Easter 597 at the mouth of the Thames in Kent, whose king *Ethelbert was married to the Frankish princess Bertha, a Christian. This circumstance facilitated Augustine's work; within a short time he could report to Gregory the *baptism of 10,000 Angles. *Bede (*HE* 1,33) tells us of the baptism of the king a few months after Augustine's arrival, but this is not certain. Informed of these successes, Gregory sent Augustine the archiepiscopal pallium, along with new instructions and reinforcements of every kind. The intention was that the ecclesiastical province being formed would in the future be divided into two provinces centered in London and *York, but it was some time before this plan could be realized. In the meantime Augustine, now *archbishop of *Canterbury near London, extended the range of his activity into southern England, where he introduced the *Benedictine rule, and beyond the Thames, among the eastern Saxons. His contacts (602 or 603) with the British of Wales were unsuccessful; they were for the most part already Christianized, but followed *Celtic practices that conflicted with Rome on several points. Some British bishops had talks with Augustine, but mistrusting him in part because he worked among the Anglo-Saxons, bitter enemies of the British Celts, they did not want to recognize him as primate of England, much less accept the Roman rite for the celebration of Easter and baptism. He died there soon after, 26 May, 604.

DHGE 5,427 432; HF. Bing, *St. Augustine of Canterbury and the Saxon Church in Kent*: Archaeologia Cantiana 62 (1949) 108-129; I. Wood, *The Mission of Augustine of Canterbury to the English*: Speculum 69 (1994) 1-17.

M. Simonetti

AUGUSTINE of Hippo (354–430)
I. Life - II. The man - III. His thought.

I. Life. What we know about his life derives from his "first confessions" or *Dialogues* of Cassiciacum (*De b. vita* 4; *C. Acad.* 2,2,3-6; *De ord.* 1,2,5; 1,10,29; 2,10,52; *Solil.* 1,1,2-6); from the *Confessions*, his most famous work, of definite value autobiographically, as well as theologically, philosophically, mystically and literarily; from his "last confessions" or *Retractations,* written toward the end of his life (426–427), rich in documentary, theological and autobiographical information. His *Discourses* 355 and 356 tell us of the daily life that he conducted in the *domo episcopi*. *Possidius's *Life of St. Augustine* describes Augustine's "life" and "habits" as a bishop with historical sense and a sober style. What we know of his writings derives from the *Retractations,* an original work containing an examination of conscience or critical revision of all his works (*opuscula in libris*), of which he indicates the theme, chronological order, corrections to be made or interpretation to be given (he did not have time to review the *opuscula in epistolis* [letters] and the *opuscula in tractatibus* [sermons]); from Possidius's *Indiculum,* incomplete and here and there imprecise, but invaluable; and from the manuscripts themselves, which have nearly all survived, despite their quantity and size.

From these sources we can reconstruct his life and record his writings.

From birth to conversion (*354–386*). Born at *Thagaste (Numidia), 13 November 354, the son (perhaps eldest) of *Patricius, a small landowner and town councilor, and of *Monica, a very pious Christian. Had a brother, *Navigius, and a sister, name unknown. He was Roman in language, culture and feeling, if not by descent; he studied at Thagaste, Madaura and *Carthage.

Augustine taught *rhetoric at Carthage, then at *Rome and *Milan. He mastered *Latin language and culture, but did not know Greek well, and understood little or no *Punic. Given a Christian education, in intention he always remained a Christian. At 19, reading the *Hortensius* of Cicero, he converted to the love of wisdom, which, disappointed with the Scriptures, he sought shortly thereafter with the *Manichees, for three basic reasons: for the wisdom that they promised to teach by reason alone, without recourse to the authority of faith; for their adherence to Christ, whose disciples they claimed to be; and for their radical solution to the problem of *evil. In a matter of days he became a fierce anti-Catholic and a faithful Manichee. Though not without reservations, he accepted Mani's method, piety and metaphysical presuppositions: materialism, *dualism and *pantheism. Discovering after nine years the weakness of the Manichean system, he turned to skepticism: his movement of separation from the *Catholic faith, begun on rationalist pretexts, thus ended with an act of distrust in reason. His road of return began at Milan, aged 32. *Ambrose's preaching restored his trust in Catholic teaching on the interpretation of Scripture and revealed to him the spiritual notion of the soul and of God. He overcame skepticism, recognizing its error in method (not reason *or* faith, but reason *and* faith) and accepting the *authority of the church, guarantor and interpreter of Scripture, as the "north star"

to which to entrust himself. He overcame materialism by discovering, with the help of the *Platonists, the interior light and the true notion of evil. He overcame naturalism—and resolved the new problem that had arisen for him, that of mediation—by reading St. *Paul and recognizing in Jesus Christ the Mediator of *grace and the Redeemer. With that, his return to the Catholic faith was complete. With the restoration of faith, however, the problem that first arose at 19 reasserted itself, of the concrete way to live out the search for wisdom, or to live—by now the same thing for Augustine—the Christian ideal. After hesitation and struggles, he decided to abandon every earthly aspiration, including marriage, and to consecrate himself totally to that ideal (*Conf.* 8,6,13–12,30). Augustine's conversion has been much discussed during the past century. From these studies I believe it must be concluded, if one wishes to remain faithful to the sources, that: (1) the *Confessions* also have historical value, though in them the narrative facts (which are different from those in the *Dialogues*) must be distinguished from the judgment of the narrator, who is Augustine, by now a bishop; (2) the conversion was to the Catholic faith, or rather a return to it, seen not in contrast but in harmony with the goal of wisdom indicated by the Platonists; (3) that adherence to the characteristic motif of the faith and the authority of the church took place prior to his reading of those philosophers, even though its content was still "vague and fluctuating beyond any reasonable measure of doctrine" (*Conf.* 7, 5, 7); (4) the reading of the *Platonicorum libri* in spring 386 led to Augustine's discovery of *Neoplatonic spiritualism, which allowed him to overcome the materialistic conception of God and the soul, as well as the notion of a substantive evil he inherited from his Manichean experience. But it was his later reading of St. Paul, with valuable clarifications by the priest *Simplicianus, which led him to know Christ's divine and human nature and the *soteriological significance of his sacrifice. His conversion to Christ was completed, then, at the beginning of the month of August, when he decided to consecrate himself completely to Christ, renouncing worldly hopes and marriage.

From conversion to priesthood (*386–391*). The academic year being over, Augustine finally found the time and the means to read books by Christian authors such as *Marius Victorinus and Ambrose, which helped him to deepen his Christian faith, as is shown by the dialogues written at Cassiciacum (probably modern Cassago) in the last months of the year. In March 387 he left his retreat at Cassiciacum to return to Milan, where he followed Ambrose's *catechesis and was *baptized by him on the Holy Saturday night, 24–25 April. He decided to return to *Africa with his family to put into effect there "the holy purpose" of living together in the service of God. His mother died at Ostia during the trip and he returned to Rome, where he stayed for 8-10 months, taking interest in the *monastic life, leaving again for Africa after July or August 388 (death of the usurper Maximus), establishing himself at Thagaste, where "with those united with him, he lived for God . . . and taught those present and absent with discourses and books" (Possidius). He wrote numerous books at Cassiciacum, Milan, Rome and Thagaste, all but two on Christian *philosophy. The arguments are on the following topics: certainty (*Acad.*), blessedness (*Beat.*), the order of things and evil (*Ord.*), the immortality of the soul (*Solil.* and *Immort. an.*), the greatness of the soul (*Quant. an.*), evil and free will (*Lib.*), an encyclopedia of the liberal arts (*Disc.*), which concluded the *De grammatica* (lost) and the *De musica* (on rhythm). He also wrote two works against the Manichees: a comparison between Catholic and Manichee doctrines on morals (*Mor. eccl. cath. et de mor. Man.*) and an *allegorical interpretation of Genesis (*Gen. Man.*). Later, ca. 390, he wrote the short masterpiece on true religion, *De vera religione*, which contains in seminal form many ideas of the *City of God*.

From priesthood to episcopate (*391–396*). In 391 he went down to *Hippo to "look for a place to found a *monastery and to live with my brothers" (*Serm.* 355,2) and was there surprised by the priesthood, which he accepted reluctantly so as to not oppose the divine will. He founded a monastery and lived there according to plan, as a priest and *monk, in *asceticism and study "according to the manner and the rule established at the time of the apostles" (Possidius, 5). By the bishop's will, and contrary to African practice, he carried out the task of preaching (*Ep.* 21). In 395, or 396 according to others, he was consecrated coadjutor bishop, and by 397 had sole direction of the diocese. He then left the *monastery of the laymen,* which became a "seminary" of priests and bishops for all of Africa (Possidius, 11), and withdrew *in domo episcopi,* which he made into a monastery, the *monastery of the clerics* (of Hippo) (see *Serm.* 355 and 356). To complete his theological formation, which he recognized as imperfect (*Ep.* 21), he immersed himself in the study of Scripture and the Fathers. He confronted the problem of the credibility of the Catholic faith (*Util. cred.*), gave an important address on faith and the creed before a council of *totius Africae* (*Fide symb.*), concerned himself with morality and biblical spirituality (*Serm.*

Dom.) and also, with little success, with Pauline soteriology (*Exp. Gal., Ep. Rom. inch.*) and Genesis (*Gen. imp.*). In the meantime he continued the Manichean controversy through the dispute with *Fortunatus (*Fort.*) and two works: *De duabus an.* and *Contra Adimantum Man.;* he also entered the *Donatist controversy with a popular song (*Psal. Don.*) and a lost work: *Contra Ep. Donati* (see *Retract.* 1,21).

From episcopate to death (396–430). Augustine's pastoral and literary activity increased with the episcopate, as did his understanding of Christian doctrine. His pastoral activity concerned (1) the church of Hippo, to which he belonged and felt attached: preaching (twice a week—Saturday and Sunday—and often for more days in succession, even twice a day), the **audientia episcopalis* which could last the entire day, care of the poor and orphans, formation of clergy, organization of monasteries of men and women, administration of ecclesiastical goods (a task not loved but tolerated), visits to the sick; (2) the African church: participation at annual councils, frequent trips at the invitation of colleagues or to respond to ecclesiastical needs; (3) universal church: dogmatic controversies, replies to enquiries, book after book on the widest variety of questions proposed to him and imposed on him. As bishop he continued the controversy with the Manicheans: he refuted the prologue of Mani's so-called fundamental letter (*Fund.*); disputed with Felix on creation and on the origin of evil (*Fel. Man.*); wrote on the ontological goodness of things (*Nat. bon.*); responded to Faustus on the harmony between the OT and NT (*Faust.*), to *Secundinus on the immutability of God, the nature of evil and creation *ex nihilo* (*Secund.*), which Augustine thought to be his best anti-Manichean work (*Retract.* 1,10). He also continued the Donatist controversy, demonstrating the historical and theological inconsistency of the *schism and responding to its defenders: *Parmenian (*Parmen.*), *Petilian (*C. litt. Petil.*), *Cresconius (*Cresc.*); he clarified the validity of *baptism administered by *heretics (*Bapt.*); proved the universal unity of the church with biblical texts (*Unit. eccles.*); was the soul of the great Catholic-Donatist debate of 411, summarizing its *Acts* afterward (*Brev. coll.*) and launching an appeal to the Donatists for unity (*Don.*, a "great" work, written "with much care," the best of all: *Retract.* 2,40); wrote a manual for count *Boniface on the history of Donatism, the intervention of imperial laws, the goodness of the church that calls back and receives those in error (*De corrept. Donatistarum* = *Ep.* 185). If success smiled on his labors, it was because "he knew what he wanted and had recourse to the necessary means; he knew how to enlist the necessary allies and to draw them after him in the victorious campaign of which he was the soul" (Monceaux).

The Donatist controversy was not over when the *Pelagian controversy began. Augustine was not the first or only to intervene, but his "stringent, positive, persevering" criticism was decisive for the fate of Pelagianism (De Plinval). The controversy naturally divides into two periods, one expository, the other polemical. In the former, the tone is calm and friendly, without mention of names or, if mentioned, with expressions of esteem; in the latter the tone is sharper, especially toward the end. The first, fundamental work, expounds the theology of redemption and baptism, of original sin and grace, and responds to the Pelagians' difficulties (*Pecc. merit.*)*;* the second, also fundamental, explains the relations between the law (letter) and grace (spirit) and clarifies the concept of Christian freedom (*Spir. litt.*). He then responded, without naming him, to Pelagius's *De natura,* demonstrating that, so as not to render vain the cross of Christ, not only must nature be defended but also the grace that heals and frees nature (*Nat. grat.*); he also responded to Caelestius's *Definitiones,* denying the *impeccantia* and maintaining the imperfection of human justice, even among saints (*Perf.*). After Pelagius's absolution by the Synod of *Palestine, Augustine, the *Acts* in hand, wrote a work (*Gest. Pelag.*) in which he showed that Pelagius had been absolved but Pelagianism condemned. Shortly thereafter he intervened to clarify the equivocation by which the Pelagians spoke of grace and original sin (*Grat. Chr.*). He also wrote 4 books to clarify the errors of the young bishop Victor and to defend his own oscillation between creationism and spiritual *traducianism (*An. orig.*). With the condemnation of Pelagianism by *Zosimus's *tractoria,* the polemical phase began, which lasted from *Contra duas Ep. Pel.* and *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* to the two responses to *Julian of Eclanum: the 6 books of *Contra Iulianum* and the 6 of *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem,* the latter work unfinished because of his death.

Another controversy related to the Pelagian controversy arose among the monks of *Hadrumetum (Africa) and *Marseille (*Gaul), on the questions of grace/freedom and *predestination. Augustine responded to the first question with *De gratia et libero arbitrio,* in which he showed from Scripture the need to hold firm two truths, freedom and grace; and with *De correptione et gratia* (a key work in the Augustinian system), in which he treats of the themes of predestination and the efficacy of grace, different before and after original sin. To the second he responded with *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono*

perseverantiae, in which he demonstrated that the beginning of faith and final perseverance are gifts of God. Besides these controversial works there were many others: exegetical, moral, pastoral, philosophical-theological. Among the exegetical works: *De doctrina christiana,* important for the principles of hermeneutics and sacred preaching and the dogmatic synthesis based on *uti* ("use") and *frui* ("enjoyment"); *De bono coniugali* and *De sancta virginitate* on the relation between the goodness of marriage and the excellence of consecrated virginity; *De catechizandis rudibus,* a manual of *catechesis rich in pedagogical insight; *De fide et operibus,* on the relation between faith and works; *Contra mendacium,* on the inadmissability of lying; *De cura pro mortuis gerenda,* on the veneration of the dead; *De opere monachorum,* on the duty of manual labor for monks not occupied with study or the priestly apostolate, etc. Among the philosophical-theological works, other than the manual of dogmatics (*Enchiridion ad Laurentium*) and the treatises on the vision of God (*De videndo Deo* = *Ep.* 147) and the presence of God (*De praesentia Dei* = *Ep.* 187), his three famous works were *Confessions, De Trinitate* and *City of God.* Less celebrated but no less important was *De Genesi ad litteram.* It has been said of Augustine's most famous work, the *Confessions,* that it is fascinating not only because of its autobiographical and literary value but also for its reflections on evil, the creation, time, grace and the soul's journey to God. *De Trinitate,* Augustine's main dogmatic work, has exercised a decisive influence on Western *trinitarian theology. For theological and spiritual purposes it expounds the biblical doctrine, the theory of relations, the "psychological" explanation of man as the image of the *Trinity, the personal properties of the *Holy Spirit, the love and communion of the Father and the Son. The *City of God,* his masterpiece, is an apologetical and dogmatic work in 2 parts, 5 sections and 22 books. Augustine responds to *pagan accusations by expounding the Christian doctrine on the beginning, progress and eternal destinies of the two cities, which are founded on two loves—of self and of God—that are mingled in the historical process but separated in the eternal abode. Finally, the 12 books of *De Genesi ad litteram,* important for the explanation of the first three chapters of Genesis, as well as for its anthropological doctrine (books 6, 7, 10), the theory of simultaneous creation and that of seminal ideas. To these works should be added his correspondence (on the most varied arguments: philosophical, theological, exegetical, historical, spiritual, autobiographical; the Maurist edition includes 270 *Letters* [52 to Augustine and 9 from him included in the *opuscula in libris*]; later another 6 were published, and more recently another 29 [in CSEL 88]); also discourses, in three groups: *Tractates on the Gospel of John* (124 treatises on the gospel, 10 on 1 John); *Expositions of the Psalms* (a huge work rich in spiritual doctrine, the only complete patristic exposition of the Psalms); the *Sermons* proper, the fruit of almost 40 years of preaching, with biblical, *liturgical, *hagiographical and other content. Of perhaps three or four thousand, only ca. 570 survive, including new discoveries. Augustine died at Hippo 28 August 430.

II. The man. In evaluating this prodigious activity we must bear in mind that Augustine was at once a philosopher, theologian, mystic, poet, orator, polemicist, writer and pastor, qualities which complemented one another and made of him a man "to whom no one, or certainly very few, can be compared among those who have flourished from the beginning of the human race until today" (Pius XI). He is a philosopher, indeed the creator of Christian philosophy, but not a cold thinker: he knows the ways of the spirit and describes them with depth and passion; a theologian who brought about great progress in understanding Christian dogmas—trinitarian, *christological, soteriological, *ecclesiological, *sacramental, *eschatological—but who possesses a profound sense of the *tradition and full submission to the *Catholica;* a mystic who is also a pastor; a master who considers himself a disciple, indeed, a codisciple of Christ with the faithful; with a hunger to know Scripture, *all* of Scripture, *quae Christum narrat et dilectionem monet* (*De cat. rud.* 4,8): after reading it in and according to the church's living and praying tradition, he desires to expound it faithfully and clearly, intent on saying nothing of his own, convinced that to do so would be to speak falsehood (*De Trin.* 15, 28, 51; *In Jo. Ev. tr.* 5, 1). He loved to debate within the church, where the only victory must be that of *truth (*ubi victoria veritas: Civ. Dei* 2, 29, 2), debating "with holy humility, with Catholic peace, with Christian charity" (*Bapt.* 2, 3, 4). The Catholic Church has always considered Augustine one of its greatest doctors. *Celestine I defended his memory, numbering him among the "greatest teachers," as have many other popes to our day. Many councils—*Orange, Trent, Vatican I and Vatican II—have drawn widely on his doctrine and on his words themselves, showing that the doctrine was not Augustine's but the church's, and thus the church recognizes it as its own. Theologians—not least St. Thomas Aquinas—have always given great attention to his teaching. It is true he has been inter-

preted variously, but this is less a sign of obscurity than of interpreters being guided by the interests of the moment or of the objective difficulty of the problems. Augustine is not an obscure author, but neither is he an easy one, for many reasons: depth of thought, quantity of works, diversity of language, the unsystematic nature and evolution of his doctrine. Only those who manage to overcome all these difficulties will find the *real Augustine*, who is always alive in his works (Possidius, *Life* 31,8). In any case, the teaching of the Catholic Church, of which he wanted to be a humble interpreter (*Quid sum? Numquid Catholica ego sum?. . . Sufficit mihi ut in ea sim*: *Enarr. in ps.* 36, s. 3,19), remains the best key for understanding his thought.

III. His thought. Even a rapid synthesis would be impossible in this setting. A few lines must suffice, under three headings: philosophical, theological, spiritual.

Philosophical. The first problem that Augustine studied and resolved was that of the relation between reason and faith, the two "forces" that lead us to knowledge (*Acad.* 3, 20, 43; *Ord.* 2, 9, 26; *Mor. eccl. cath.* 1, 2, 3). The solution is summed up in the dual maxim: *crede ut intellegas* and *intellege ut credas* (*Serm.* 43,9). The first is based on the difficulty and multiplicity of the problems that must be resolved in order to give life a sure and wise orientation; the second, on the fact that no one believes "unless he has first thought that he must believe" (*Praed.* 2, 5), and indeed it is reason that shows us "who we must believe" (*Ver. rel.* 24,45). Assured of the collaboration between reason and faith, he studied the great themes of human thought, which he reduced to two—God and man (*Solil.* 1, 2, 7)—and created "Christian" philosophy (*C. Iul.* 4, 14, 77), which is both philosophy and something new: new with respect to the philosophy of the Platonists, whom he preferred (*Acad.* 3, 20, 43; *Ver. rel.* 4,7; *Civ. Dei* 8,5; 11,5), but whose "great errors" he opposed (*Retract.* 1, 1, 4), esp. those regarding *creation (*Civ. Dei* 11,4-5; 12,15-20), the preexistence of the *soul (*Gen. litt.* 10, 15, 27; *Ep.* 164 and 166), the unnatural and violent union of the soul with the *body (*Trin.* 15,7,11; *Gen. litt.* 7,27, 38; *An. orig.* 4, 2, 3), and the cyclical and *metempsychotic theory of history (*Civ. Dei* 10,30; 12,26) that he considered the *magna deliramenta* of these great philosophers (*Serm.* 241,6). Certain scriptural teachings touching on reason also served to stimulate his philosophical research: the creation of things and of man in God's image (Gen 1:1; 1:27; Jn 1:3); the notion of God as subsistent being (*Ego sum qui sum*: Ex 3:14); the knowability of the Creator through creatures (Rom 1:20). Augustine has three principles: (1) interiority, on which he insists in order to affirm the perception of truth by the mind ("truth lives in the inner man": *Ver.. rel.* 39,72) and guarantee certainty (*Si fallor, sum*: *Civ. Dei* 11,26); (2) the participation from which he derives creation ("Every good is either God or proceeds from God": *Ver. rel.* 18,35) and divine exemplarism ("Individual things have been created according to their particular ideas": *Div. quaest.* 83, q. 46,2); (3) immutability, which distinguishes creatures from the Creator, since "the only true, genuine, authentic being is immutable being" (*Serm.* 7,7; *Conf.* 7, 11, 17), the *ipsum esse* (*Trin.* 5, 2, 3), everything changeable is created: "The heavens and the earth proclaim that they have been created, *mutantur enim atque variantur*" (*Conf.* 11, 4, 6).

Enlightened by these principles Augustine studied the themes of God and humanity, the former so as to understand the latter ("God is the cause of being, the light of knowledge, the source of love": *Civ. Dei* 8,4), and the latter so as to understand the former. Indeed, he ascended to God starting from the human, who is, thinks and loves (and therefore through a threefold way: of being, knowledge and love), and illustrated the mystery of the Trinity by studying its image in human nature (*Trin.* 8-15). Human nature is "the great abyss," whose depths he scrutinizes (*Conf.* 10, 8, 10-17, 26), and "the great problem," esp. because of the presence of evil, the solution to which he seeks through reason and, not finding this complete or satisfactory, through faith. His point of departure is the composition of soul and body, which is profound (*Gen.litt.* 7, 27, 38), even mysterious (*Ep.* 137, 3, 11), and constitutes humanity. In general the great problems of *Augustinian philosophy, imposed by human nature, are three, with three great solutions: creation, *illumination and *beatitude. Augustine develops and defends these against the errors of the Platonists: (1) creation *ex nihilo* and freedom (in time), (2) illumination (not recollection) that gives ideas their certainty and universal value, (3) beatitude that, by its nature (if it is not eternal, it is not beatitude), excludes the cyclical idea of the Platonists.

Theological. Augustine's theological thought follows a method that includes adherence to the magisterial authority of Christ, the desire to know the content of the faith (*intellectum valde ama: Ep.* 120, 3, 13), the sense of mystery ("better a faithful ignorance than a rash knowledge": *Serm.* 27,4), and the conviction of the originality of Christianity, i.e., of the *depositio fidei* which must be preserved and, if necessary, defended. The authority of Christ, then, is manifested (1) in Scripture, which is the soul of the-

ology; (2) in the tradition, which is apostolic if universal and ancient (*Bapt.* 4, 24, 31); and (3) in the church, which fixes the canon of Scripture ("I would not believe in the gospel if the authority of the Catholic Church did not lead me to so do": *C. Ep. Man.* 5,6; *Faust.* 28,2), transmits the tradition and interprets both.

Guided by this method Augustine deepened his understanding of the Christian mysteries, bringing about a great advance in *dogma. As we cannot summarize all of his thought here, we will focus on ecclesiology and soteriology, two mysteries to the understanding of which his contribution was greatest. In the Donatist controversy and in the *City of God* he developed the notion of the church as (1) a community of the faithful built on the foundation of the apostles; (2) a community of righteous pilgrims in the world, from Abel until the end of time; and (3) a community of the predestined, living in blessed immortality. The first is the *communio sacramentorum* in which, under the guidance of the bishops (*Serm.* 146,1), the councils (*Ep.* 54,1) and the *Sedes Petri* (*Ep.* 43,7), the good and the bad are united, the holiness of the former not being contaminated by the latter, although the *sacraments, by their christological nature, are also valid, though not fruitful, outside the true church. The second is the *communio iustorum,* which was also present before Christ, but not without Christ, in eschatological tension. The third is the *communio praedestinatorum*, consisting of those who constitute God's glorious kingdom, but "also now, the church is the *kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven" (*Civ. Dei* 20, 9, 1).

In the Pelagian controversy he developed the theology of *redemption, *justification and actual grace, as well as that of *death, concupiscence, infant baptism and human solidarity (with Adam and with Christ). The key to understanding his doctrine is the *cross of Christ, the significance and efficacy of which he wanted to defend: *ne evacuetur crux Christi* (1 Cor 1:17). Of redemption, which is *necessary* because without Christ the Redeemer no one has been or ever would be freed; *objective* because it does not consist only in an example but also in the expiation of sins and reconciliation with God; *universal* from the fact that all without exception have been redeemed, he deduces the universality and the nature of original sin, which does not consist in imitation, as the Pelagians claimed, but in propagation, and is transmitted to all with human nature itself, which is in a state of decadence because of the sin of the first man (*Pecc. merit.* 1, 9, 9-10). For this reason all people need to be justified in Christ. Justification brings about the remission of sins, which is *plena et tota, tota et perfecta* (*Pecc. merit.* 2, 7, 9), and interior renewal, which begins here on earth and becomes perfect after the resurrection, when not only sin but also "mortality" and "infirmity" will cease (*C. duas Ep. Pel.* 3, 3, 4-5). But to attain justification and persevere in it, we need divine grace, which consists not in creation, even if this can be called grace, nor only in the divine law or the remission of sins, but "in the inspiration of charity by which we do with love what we know we ought to do" (*C. duas epp. Pel.* 4, 5, 11). Augustine defends the necessity, efficacy and gratuity of grace understood in this way. He teaches us to defend freedom and grace because Christ, according to the Scriptures, is both Savior and judge; he insists that we must hold both of these truths even when we we don't see their harmony, which is a difficult question for all and understandable by few; he points to the "sweet liberality of love" as the way to reconcile them: grace is not irresistible to the will but helps the will to resist *temptation.

Finally, on the mystery of predestination, the depth of which he appreciates, he highlights the gratuity of salvation, of which the shining example is the Savior himself, the man Christ Jesus (*Praed.* 15,30; *Persev.* 24,67): both the beginning of faith and final perseverance are gifts of God. Regarding those who are not saved he holds (1) that sins are the object of divine foreknowledge, not of predestination (*An. orig.* 1, 7, 7; *Praed.* 5. 10, 19); (2) that Christ died for all, including those not saved; (3) that "God does not abandon if he is not abandoned" (*Solil.* 1, 1, 5; *Conf.* 4, 9, 14; *Nat. gr.* 26,29; *Civ. Dei* 13, 15; etc.); (4) that if God, in whom there is no iniquity (Rom 9:14), can save everyone without merit, he cannot condemn anyone who does not deserve it (*C. Iul.* 3, 18, 36; *Ep.* 194, 6, 30; *Civ. Dei* 12,27). To understand the Augustinian doctrine of predestination one must consider all its aspects, including pastoral, and view it apart from the Scholastic disputes, which considered it under a different paradigm.

Spiritual. Augustine influenced our understanding of the Christian life no less than theology, in a deep and ongoing manner: he defended its foundations (theology of grace), developed its contents, showed its relation to the Christian mysteries and described its goal. The content can be summed up in the following arguments: universal vocation to holiness; charity as the soul, center and measure of perfection; humility as the indispensable condition for the growth of charity; *purification or ascetism as the law of interior ascents; *prayer as a duty and a need, the means and end of spiritual life; gifts of the Holy Spirit; imitation of Christ; love for and medita-

tion on Scripture. Regarding the vocation to holiness he showed a doctrinal balance between the goodness of marriage and the excellence of consecrated virginity: regarding the states themselves, the latter is superior to the former *iure divino* (*Virginit.* 1, 1). Regarding all the Christian virtues taken together, a married person can be more perfect than the consecrated virgin. Regarding charity he highlighted three aspects: vitality, gratuity, centrality; he distinguished between servile fear or fear of punishment, which is opposed to charity, and the chaste or filial fear that accompanies charity and increases with it. His chapter on prayer is important, explaining its nature and defending its necessity (linked to the necessity of grace), interiority, usefulness for others, even "for those who have not yet been called, that they might be" (*Persev.* 22,60), its "christocentricity," since it is Christ who "prays for us, prays in us, and is prayed to by us" (*Enarr. in ps.* 85,1). Regarding the mysteries, he illustrates our relationship with the Trinity, the "recollection, contemplation and love" to which the Christian's worship and love is oriented (*Trin.* 15, 20, 39); with Christ the way and homeland, and therefore the Christian's entire life; with the church, love for which is the measure of perfection ("Everyone possesses the Holy Spirit in the measure in which he loves the church": *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 32, 8); with justification, which beyond remission of sins is the progressive restoration of the image of the Trinity in the person (*Trin.* 14-15); with eschatology, where there will be *concors differentia* (*Virginit.* 29); and in general with Scripture, hearing and meditating on which nourish the spiritual life (*Conf.* 11, 2, 2). He then describes the degrees of the spiritual life (*Quant. an.* 33,73-76), which correspond to those of charity (*Nat. grat.* 70, 84) and to the gifts of the Holy Spirit (*Serm. Dom.* 1, 1, 3-4, 12; 2, 5, 17-11, 39). He describes the nature of contemplation as a great mystic (*Conf.* 9, 10, 23-26; 10, 40, 65; *Enarr. in ps.* 4 1, 9-10), without neglecting its relation to the pastoral life (*Serm.* 103; 104; 179, 4-5), which involves an equilibrium between *caritas veritatis* and *necessitas caritatis* (*Civ. Dei* 19,19), an equilibrium which is one of the great merits of Augustinian spirituality.

CPL 250-386. Critical editions: Maurini (1679-1700), the best overall and the only complete, reprinted many times (Paris, Venice, Naples) and reproduced by J.P. Migne, Patrologia Latina (PL) 32-46; Corpus Vindob. (CSEL) from 1887; Corpus Christianorum (CCL) from 1954.

Bilingual editions: BA (Fr.) from 1948; BAC (Sp.) from 1951; NBA (It.) from 1965; Ger.: Sankt Augustinus - *Der Lehrer der Gnade* (anti-Pelagian works) from 1955.

Translations: *The Fathers of the Church*, New York from 1948; *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the Twenty-First Century*, J. Rotelle (ed.), Hyde Park, NY 1979–. For the individual works in the various languages see Patrologia III, 338-379.

Studies: See *Augustinus Lexikon*, Basel 1986–; *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids 1999. The literature being immense, I will limit myself to citing:

(1) *Bibliographies:* E. Nebreda, *Bibl. Augustiniana*, Rome 1928; *Bulletin de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, Mont César-Louvain 1929ff.; R. González, *Bibl. Agustiniana del Centenario*: Religión y Cultura 15 (1931) 461-509; M.F. Sciacca, *Augustinus*: Bibl. Einführungen in das Studium d. Phil., Bern 1948; *Bulletin Augustinien*: AnThA 1949-1953 and then REAug of 1955; E. Lamirande, *Un siècle et demi d'études sur l'ecclésiologie di St. Aug. Essai bibliographique*: REAug 8 (1962); T. van Bavel, *Répertoire bibliographique de St. Aug.* (1950-1960), Steenbrugge 1963; A. Rigobello, *Studi agostiniani in Italia nell'ultimo ventennio*: Cultura e Scuola 32 (1969) 73-84; C. Andresen, *Bibliographia Augustiniana*, Darmstadt 1973; R. Lorenz, *Zwölf Jahre Augustinusforschung* (*1959-1970*): Theol. Rundschau 38-40 (1973-75); *Fichier Augustinien*: Inst. Ét. Aug., Paris 1972; E.S. Lodovici, *Agostino*: Questioni di Storiografia Fil., I, Brescia 1975, 445-501; T.L. Miethe, *Augustinian Bibliography 1970-1980*, Westport, CT 1982; A. Moda, *Bibliografia per uno studio di S. Agostino*: Nicolaus 22 (1995) 179-239. For the individual works, see the ample bibliography in the NBA.

(2) *General Studies*: *Enciclopedie*: C. Boyer, *S. Agostino*: EC I, 519-567; A. Casamassa, *Agostino*: EI I, 913-923; E. Portalié, *Augustin*: DTC I, 2268-2472; M.F. Sciacca, *Agostino*: Enc. Fil., I, 8-111, Milan-Venice 1957; A. Trapè, *S. Agostino*: BS I, 428-596; Id., *Patrologia*, III, 325-434 (with ample bibliography and indication of the eds. and trs. of the individual works).

(3) *Miscellanea: Miscellanea Agostiniana*, I, Rome 1930 (*S. Aug. Sermones post Maurinos reperti*), II, Rome 1931 (Studi); *Miscellanea Augustiniana*, Nijmegen 1930; *Mélanges Augustiniennes*, Paris 1931; *Études Augustiniennes*, Paris 1951; *Recherches Augustiniennes*, Paris 1958ff.; var. aus., *S. Ag. Nel XV centenario della morte*, Milan 1930; *La Ciudad de Dios* (special issue), 2 vols., El Escorial 1954; H.I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris ²1949 (It. tr. Milan 1987); A. Trapè, *Agostino. L'uomo, il pastore, il mistico*, Fossano 1976 (Rome 2001); C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine*, 2 vols., Paris 1979-1981; *Les lettres de saint Augustin découvertes par Johannes Divjak*, Paris 1983; A.-M. La Bonnardière (ed.), *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, Paris 1986; var. aus., *Atti del Congresso int.le su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della sua conversione*, 3 vols., Rome 1987; A. Trapè, *S. Agostino. Introduzione alla dottrina della grazia*, 2 vols., Rome 1987-1990; M. Merino (ed.), *Verbo de Dios y palabras humanas en el XVI centenario de la conversión cristiana de San Agustín*, Pamplona 1988; A.J. Springer, *Augustine's Use of Scripture in His Anti-Jewish Polemic*, Louisville, KY 1989; G.P. Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule*, Oxford 1990; *Collectanea Augustiniana: Augustine*, *Second Founder of the Faith*, J.C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fleteren (eds.), Bern 1990; F. Thélamon, *Destruction du paganisme et construction du royaume de Dieu d'après Rufin et Augustin*: CrSt 11 (1990) 523-544; G. Madec, *La patrie et la voie*, Paris 1989 (It. tr. Rome 1993), ²2001; J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier sur le donatisme*, Berlin 1987-1989; E. Roll, *Der platonisierende Augustinus*, Stuttgart 1990; *San Agustin en Oxford*, X Congreso Internacional de Estudios Patrísticos, J. Oroz Reta (ed.), Madrid 1991; *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian*, ed. J. McWilliam et al., Waterloo, ON 1992; "*Augustinus minister et magister*": *homenaje al profesor*

Argimiro Turrado Turrado, O.S.A., 2 vols., Madrid 1992; N. Cipriani, *Le fonti cristiane della dottrina trinitaria nei primi Dialoghi di S. Agostino*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 253-312; G. Madec, *Petites études augustiniennes*, Paris 1994; D. Marafioti, *Sant'Agostino e la nuova alleanza: l'interpretazione agostiniana di Geremia 31, 31-34 nell'ambito dell'esegesi patristica*, Brescia 1995; G. Madec, *Le Dieu d'Augustin*, Paris 1996; Id., *La philosophie de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1996; P.-M. Humbert, *Gloria gratiae. Se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce*, Paris 1996; M.A. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa*, Liverpool 1996; Id., *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World*, Minneapolis 1997; J.M. Rist, *Agostino: il battesimo del pensiero antico*, It. tr. Milan 1997; M. Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus vox totius Christi: Studien zu Augustins "Enarrationes in Psalmos,"* Freiburg 1997; E. TeSelle, *Living in Two Cities: Augustinian Trajectories in Political Thought*, Tonawanda, NY 1998; *Augustinus in der Neuzeit: colloque de la Herzog August Bibliothek de Wolfenbüttel, 14-17 octobre 1996*, K. Flasch - D. de Courcelles (eds.), Turnhout 1998; *Augustin prédicateur (395-411)*, Paris 1998; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Agostino: tra etica e religione*, Brescia 1999; *San Agustín en Oxford*, XII Congreso Internacional de Estudios Patrísticos, J.J. Oldfield - J. Anoz (eds.), Madrid 1999; N. Cipriani, *La precettistica antica e la regola monastica di S. Agostino*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 365-380; L. Alici, *L'altro nell'io: in dialogo con Agostino*, Rome 1999; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999; P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, New ed. with an epilogue, Berkeley, CA 2000; *Augustine and Liberal Education*, K. Paffenroth -K. Hughes (eds.), Aldershot 2000; *Augustine and His Critics: Essays in Honour of Gerald Bonner*, ed. R. Dodaro - G. Lawless, London - New York 2000; B. Kursawe, *Docere-delectaremovere: die officia oratoris bei Augustinus in Rhetorik und Gnadenlehre*, Paderborn 2000; P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches de chronologie augustinienne*, Turnhout 2000; R.W. Dyson, *The Pilgrim City: Social and Political Ideas in the Writings of St. Augustine of Hippo*, Woodbridge 2001; C. Simonelli, *La resurrezione nel* De Trinitate *di Agostino: presenza, formulazione, funzione*, Rome 2001; G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino: ermeneutica e retorica della grazia dalla crisi alla metamorfosi del "De doctrina christiana,"* Brescia 2001; "*L'adorabile vescovo di Ippona*": Atti del Convegno di Paola (24-25 May 2000), F.E. Consolino (ed.), Soveria Mannelli 2001; F. Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique, mise à jour bibliographique, 1996-2000*, Paris 2001; *Augustinus Afer: Saint Augustin, africanité et universalité*, O. Wermelinger et al. (eds.), Fribourg 2003.

A. Trapè

AUGUSTINIANISM. The continual reference to *Augustine in the West in the generations after him created Augustinianism (term coined by Franz Ehrle in 1889), or better "Augustinianisms," given the variety of interpretations of his thought in the theological, philosophical, spiritual and political spheres. If, on the one hand, the polymorphous interpretation of Augustine reflects the indubitable richness of his writings, it also indicates, on the other, their difficulty, so much so that Augustine himself felt the need to assist his readers. To this end he wrote his *Retractationes* three years before his death (427), the first book containing annotations to his writings before his episcopate (396/97), the second regarding his writings as bishop. In the consciousness of transmitting the faith contained in the Sacred Scriptures and handed down by the Roman Church (*Ep.* 194,1), he suggested criteria for reading his work, three in particular. (1) Bear in mind his progressive growth in knowledge of the Christian faith. If, for example (wrote Augustine), one reads his writings from before his episcopate, he will see that Augustine himself had been *Pelagian, thinking that faith originates in human beings and is not a gift of God; in fact he had already changed his opinion on this matter in the two books written to *Simplicianus (*Praed.* 4,8). (2) On many questions he was only able to indicate in some cases how far he was from understanding the question, in other cases only its complexity, and in still others only a sketch of a possible approach to a response (*Trin.* 1, 1,3; *Retract.* 2,53; *Corrept.* 1,1). Thus to read Augustine by extrapolating texts and contexts without also taking into account the chronology of his writings, one can refer to him without really grasping his thought. (3) One must even consider the necessity of continually validating the results of his research, not ruling out the possibility of error (*Persev.* 21,55). Thus he counseled his readers to attend to his writings once he had amended his life, and not to fall into the errors into which he may have fallen (*Trin.* 1, 3,5). Augustine also thought that not everyone could follow some of his writings, and when this was the case he advised either leaving off reading (as in *Trin.* 1, 3,5), or repeated reading accompanied by prayer, considering it a grace of God to be able to understand them in some way (advice given the *monks of *Hadrumetum on the understanding of the coaction of God's grace with human freedom [*Grat. lib. arb.* 24,46; *Corrept.* 1,1]).

The problems that confront scholars with respect to Augustine's legacy concern above all the Augustinian truth of the various Augustinianisms. Today, development of the methods of scientific criticism allows us to better distinguish Augustine's thought from perspectives that derive from readings of his writings which occurred in contexts of concerns different from those of the original context. We will give a brief historical summary of these readings, ignoring, however, interpretations given to his thought while he was still alive, related esp. to the polemic with *Julian of Eclanum and with the monks of *Marseille (on the latter, *Ep.* 225-226 inter augustinianas; and the *Ep. Ruf.* 5,6: PL 51, 77-90).

After his death, interpretation of Augustine went in two directions, in two different periods: the first, from his death (430) to the Council of Trent (1563),

transmitted through *florilegia and four of his principal writings (*Confessions, De Trinitate, De civitate Dei, Enarrationes in Ps.*), though modulated by the Church of Rome; the second, which developed after the Council of Trent, according to the varying directions of the theological schools (the controversialists and that of the *Augustinenses*), the Augustinian movement at Louvain (Baius and Jansen), Paris (Port-Royal and the spiritual school of De Berulle - Pascal), and 19th-c. Italian spiritualism (V. Gioberti and A. Rosmini) and 20th-c. philosophy.

First period (*from Augustine's death to the Council of Trent*). The beginning of Augustinianism was marked negatively for Augustine by the *libelli* of double *predestination (to eternal life and death), drawn in some way from two Augustinian writings, *De correptione et gratia* and *De praedestinatione sanctorum*. These were read pessimistically, accusing Augustine of having sacrificed human freedom to God's grace and considering humanity as a *massa damnata* or *damnationis*. These interpretations, already noted by Augustine during his lifetime (426–427) in the *Ep. of Prosper to Rufinus* (PL 51, 77-90), we also find after his death (431–435) in the following works: *Prosper of Aquitaine's *Pro Augustino responsiones: ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium* (PL 51, 155-174, also in PL 45, 1833-1844), *ad capitula obiectionum Vincentiarum* (PL 51, 176-186, also in PL 45, 1843-1850), and *ad excerpta Genuensium* (PL 51, 187-202, also in PL 45, 1849-1858); the Pseudo-Augustinian *Responsio VI de praedestinatione* (to be dated not after 435), contained in *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos vulgo Libri Hypognosticon* (PL 45, 1611-1664, ed. J.E. Chisholm, Fribourg 1980, II, 191-208), which addressed the theme of predestination in 8 chapters, summarizing them in the *Praedestinatio ad vitam* and in the *Praedestinatio ad mortem;* *Arnobius the Younger's *Praedestinatus* of 432–435 (PL 53, 583-672; ed. F. Gori CCL 25B). After 435 the question reappears in writings titled *De praedestinatione et gratia* (*divina-animae-gratiae*) *qui intitulatur de voluntate Dei* (PL 45, 1677-1680) with the theme *incommutabilis voluntas omnipotentis Dei* (1,1), an interpretation that captivated all later predestinationists until Calvin, and those who speak of a "rigorous, extremist and pessimistic Augustinianism."

The reaction to such a reading of Augustine was immediate, both by the Church of Rome—Augustine had always spoken in a way consistent with the Roman Church, e.g., regarding *trinitarian faith (*Trin*. 1, 4,7) and original sin: *fides ipsa nobiscum Romanae Ecclesiae* [our faith is that of the Roman Church itself] (*Ep*. 194,1)—and by his other readers. The Church of Rome paid tribute to Augustine's *auctoritas* until the Council of Trent by officially recognizing him as a doctor: *Celestine I decreed to the bishops of *Gaul (431): *Augustinum sanctae recordationis virum pro vita sua atque meritis in nostra communione semper habuimus, nec unquam hunc sinistrae suspicionis saltem rumor adspersit: quem tantae scientiae olim fuisse meminimus, ut inter magistros optimos etiam ante a meis semper praedecessoribus haberetur* [We have always had in our communion Augustine of sacred memory, a man known for both his life and merits; there has never even been a hint of a rumor of any sinister suspicion: we remembered how he had such great knowledge in those days having always considered him to be among the best teachers more so than any of my predecessors] (*Ep*. 21, 2,3; PL 50, 530). The following confirm this position. Gelasius I (492–496): *Hieronymum atque Augustinum ecclesiasticorum lumina magistrorum . . .* [Jerome and Augustine were the luminaries of the teachers of the churches] (*Ep*. 7; PL 59, 40 B-C); the **Decretum Gelasianum* (early 6th c.): *de opusculis sanctorum patrum, quae in ecclesia catholica recipiuntur . . . item opuscula beati Augustini Hipponeregiensis episcopi* [Concerning the *opuscula* of the holy fathers which have been received in the catholic church there are . . . likewise those of the blessed Augustine, Bishop of Hippo Rhegius] (IV, 2, 189-190; ed. Dobschütz TU 38/4, Leipzig 1912, 36-37); Pope Hormisdas (520) (*Ep*. 70,5 [*Ad Possessorem*]: PL 63, 493A); Boniface II (531) (*Ep*. 1 [to bishop *Caesarius of Arles]: PL 65, 31-32, in connection with the Council of Orange in 529); Martin I (pope 649–655) (*Mansi* X, 798-799; in PL 87, 119-121 on the consanguinity of the faith of the African Church with that of the Roman Church, made possible by the common source in Augustine). It should be noted how Martin I's testimony went well beyond a simple defense of Augustine's orthodoxy in questions regarding the grace of God and free will. Augustine's *auctoritas* is also present in *Leo the Great regarding *Chalcedonian *Christology, and consequently also in the synods of the Greek Church.

Regarding other readings of Augustine, positive florilegia for the Bishop of Hippo were begun by *Prosper of Aquitaine in the style of "sentences" (*Sententiae ex operibus S.A.*, in PL 51, 427-496) and also as epigrams (*Epigrammata ex sententiis S.A.*, in PL 51, 497-532), in which he was imitated by *Vincent of Lérins (PLS III,23-45 other *excerpta*). There are also the *excerpta* of *Eugippius (*Excerpta ex operibus S.A.*, in PL 62, 561), which, beyond their frequent use, opened the way for the genre of the *Testimonia divinae scripturae et Patrum* of *Isidore

of Seville and of the collections of phrases of various authors that resulted in the medieval *Libellus Scintillarum* (PL 88, 597-718 and PLS IV,218-2124). The Carolingian period esp., with its taste for collections, paved the way for the *sententiae* of the medieval masters who, in their teaching, did not have the original texts available to them, but collections of texts, called *Tabulae* or *Auctoritates,* which included an explanation. After Augustine's death, Prosper, on the one hand, rejected the attribution to Augustine of a predestination *ad mortem* and, on the other hand, defended the Augustinian perspective on the relationship between God's grace and the good done by the person. With him, however, the "predestination" problem began to be considered not so much in the Augustinian context of the grace of Christ but in the philosophical vision of the conception of God as the cause of everything. In this can be seen the first step toward the conception of predestination elaborated a century later by *Fulgentius of Ruspe (d. 533). Fulgentius nevertheless spoke of a "Catholic" reading of Augustine that of course went beyond any possible meaning that can be given to his statements (*Ad Monimum* I,28,1-5: 28,1: *dictorum sancti Augustini . . . quid catholicus habeat intellectus de his quos ad interitum praedestinatos audemus* [We have heard of the statements of Saint Augustine . . . which the catholic intellect holds concerning those who are predestined to destruction]). Until the 9th c. (the Carolingian Renaissance), the positive reception of Augustine continued in *Caesarius of Arles, regarding the theology of grace and free will (Council of Orange of 529); in *Cassiodorus for the liberal arts; in Eugippius, who made a synthesis of Augustine's works, having to some extent collected the library of Hippo; in Boethius for Augustinian trinitarian and christological themes; in the Victorine school for scriptural *exegesis; in Alcuin for the elaboration of a program of studies that united the liberal arts and the gifts of the *Holy Spirit; and in Anselm of Canterbury for theology united with philosophy (*fides quaerens intellectum*).

The low Middle Ages knew theological Augustinianism through Peter Lombard, compiler of the theological manual of the *Sententiarum libri,* the scholastic text most commented on by the great masters of the period, 90 percent of which was composed of sentences from Augustine. Through that text Augustine became the undisputed master of the medieval theological schools, including the masters of the Franciscan school (e.g., Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure of Bagnoregio) until Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, the masters of the Dominican school—in particular Albert the Great—until St. Thomas, and the masters of the University of Paris (e.g., Henry of Ghent). In the English context things reached the point in 1277 where the theologians R. Kilwardby and J. Peckham condemned the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas in the name of those of Augustine. With St. Bernard came the spiritual Augustinianism of grace and free will, of the primacy of the love of God (*De diligendo Deo*) and of progressive *ascetism (degrees of humility). If the 13th c. saw the establishment of Thomistic Aristotelianism, Scotism, Ockhamism, etc., the 14th c. knew the Augustinianism of the theological school of the Hermits of St. Augustine (OESA or OSA). Founded by Giles of Rome—together with Giles of Viterbo, Augustinus Triumphus, Alexander of San Elpidio, William of Cremona, Ugolino of Orvieto, Simone Fidati and the Englishman Thomas Bradwardine (d. 1349)—they developed that "School of Augustine/ Augustinsschule" that Gregory of Rimini called the *via Augustini*. They emphasized the will (the *theologia cordis*) over knowledge (the *ratio*)—and thus the superiority of theology over philosophy—the theory of *illumination, the absolute gratuity of *gratia sanans,* prescinding from any merit *de condigno* of human freedom. In the area of *ecclesiology, the school maintained the spiritual primacy of the church over the worldly political power, which developed into "political Augustinianism," according to Arquillère's famous formula.

Humanism took up Augustine with Petrarch (*Secretum*), Cusanus (*Docta ignorantia*), Marsilius Ficinus (*De Christiana religione*) and the Spanish humanist J.L. Vives, who wrote a celebrated commentary on the *City of God*. Italian humanism in particular knew a recovery of *Platonism through the Augustinian convent of the Holy Spirit at Florence in its phase of "Augustinization," whereas German Christian humanism emphasized evangelical categories (*devotio moderna*).

Second period (*from the Council of Trent, 1563, to Vatican II, 1965*). With Luther's much-discussed reading of Augustine, post-Tridentine Augustinianism lost its unified character, modulated by the Church of Rome, and fragmented into the Augustinianisms of the Catholic theological schools: the controversialist theologians; the school of the *Augustinenses* (E. Noris, Gianlorenzo Berti, Belelli); the Augustinianisms of Louvain and Paris (the first more theological, the second more spiritual: De Berulle, then Bossuet, Fénelon, Pascal, Malebranche, Blondel, Marcel); the Italian Augustinianism of Vico, Gioberti, Rosmini and, in more recent times, 20th-c. philosophy; the Augustinianisms linked to the Protestant Reformation (Augustine's authority was invoked against the

legitimate authority of the Catholic Church) and with the Catholics Michael Baius and Jansen - Port-Royal, condemned by the Roman Curia.

Luther's (1483–1546) anthropology of the human being as *peccator* (the *iniustitia hominis,* being unable to overcome this, can only be covered by the *iustitia Christi*) led to the identification of *peccatum originis* with *concupiscentia,* considering the latter not only *fomes peccati* but also sin, the equivalent of the Pauline *lex membrorum* or *lex peccati;* these theses were condemned by the Tridentine decrees *De iustificatione, de peccato originali* of 1547. Luther's reading of the *homo peccator* was accredited to St. Augustine. Later with Baianism and Jansenism, after Rome's condemnation of some of their propositions, a genuine mistrust set in regarding the reading of Augustine's writings; from that point he came to be considered by many, esp. by the controversialists, more a weight from which to be freed than a Catholic author to be followed. The principal writings proposing a reading of Augustine contrary to that of the Catholic Church were Luther, *Commentary on the Letter to the Romans* ("Ad romanos," vol. VII, ed. Weimar 1931); Baius (1513–1589), *De prima hominis iustitia* (1564); Jansen (1585–1638), *Augustinus, seu doctrina S.A. de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adv. Pelagianos et Massilienses* (published posthumously in 1640). Following are two texts giving the tone of the difficulties such authors provoked in Christian people and among theologians. Luther wrote: "It is impious to assert that after the sin (of Adam) the natural assets remained intact, whether in human beings or in angels" [*impie qui asseruerunt naturalia mansisse post peccatum integra, tam in hominibus quam daemonibus*] (*quarta disputatio, De loco Rom*. 3,28, Weimar 1926, vol. 39, n. 14, p. 55); Jansen later wrote: "The grace of Adam issued from the fact of being created; it was due to his nature in its healthy and integral state" [*Gratia Adami est sequethe creationis, et erat debita naturae sanae et integrae*] (in *DS* 2435). The Church of Rome intervened in this context to condemn a proposition of the Jansenist movement that invoked Augustine even to the disregard of papal bulls: *Ubi quis invenerit doctrinam in Augustino clare fundatam, illam absolute potest tenere et docere, non respiciendo ad ullam Pontificis Bullam* [Where there is found a clear foundation for doctrine in Augustine, we hold and teach it with absolute authority, without regard for any papal bull] (Alexander VIII, *Decreto del S. Officio* [7 Dec. 1690]: *Errores Iansenistarum*, in *DS* 2330).

Augustinianism passed through its most difficult period in the 17th and 18th c. Today Augustinianism, more than reflecting a theological or spiritual system, is broadly present in postmodern attempts to rethink the human person rather than in a precise, conscious reflection.

John Paul II, in the preface of the apostolic letter *Augustinum Hipponensem,* issued on the occasion of the 16th centenary of St. Augustine's conversion (386–1986), summarizes the role of Augustine's presence in the church and suggests new perspectives: "Augustine of Hippo, from the time when, one year after his death, he was numbered by my ancient predecessor Celestine I among the 'best teachers of the Church,' has continued to be present in the life of the Church and in the mind and culture of the entire West. To other Roman pontiffs then . . . I also added my voice to that of my predecessors, expressing the deep desire that 'his philosophical, theological and spiritual doctrine be studied and disseminated, such that he would continue . . . his magisterium in the Church, a magisterium, I added, both humble and luminous, that speaks above all of Christ and of love.'" In conclusion John Paul II reaffirmed: "In some way all of us in the Church and in the West feel ourselves to be disciples and sons [of Augustine]. . . . May the magisterium of such a doctor and pastor continue in the Church and in the world, to the benefit of culture and of faith."

First period. (1) H. Marrou, *S. Augustin et l'augustinisme*, Paris 1955; J.T. Lienhard, *The Earliest Florilegia of Augustine*: Augustinian Studies 8 (1977) 21-31; J. Madoz, *Excerpta Vincentii Lerinensis*, in PLS III,23-45; V. Grossi, *La recezione "sentenziale" di Agostino in Prospero di Aquitania. Alle origini delle frasi sentenziali attribuite ad Agostino*, in A. Zumkeller - A. Krümmel (eds.), *Traditio Augustiniana. Studien über Augustinus und seine Rezeption* (*Festgabe W. Eckermann*), Augustinus Verlag-Würzburg 1994, 123-140; V. Grossi, *L'auctoritas magisteriale di Agostino e la Chiesa Romana* (*sec. V-VIII*), in *Memoriam Sanctorum venerantes* (Miscellanea in onore di mons. Victor Saxer), Ed. PIAC 48, Vatican City 1992, 491-502; Id., *L'auctoritas di Agostino nella dottrina del "peccatum originis" da Cartagine* (*418*) *a Trento* (*1546*): Augustinianum 31 (1991) 329-360; P. Brezzi, *Considerazioni sul cosidetto "agostinismo politico"* (*altomedievale*): Augustinianum 25 (1985) 235-284; R. Arbesmann, *Der Augustiner-Eremitenorden und der Beginn der humanistischen Bewegung*, Würzburg 1965; F. Stegmüller, *Gratia sanans. Zum Schicksal des Augustinismus in der Salmantizenserschule*, in M. Grabmann - J. Mausbach, *Aurelius Augustinus . . .* , Cologne 1930, 395-409; D. Trapp, *Augustinian Theology of the Fourteenth Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Booklore*: Augustiniana 6 (1956) 146-274; A. Zumkeller, *Die Augustinertheologen Simon Fidati von Cascia und Ugolin von Orvieto und Martin Luthers Kritik an Aristoteles*: ARG 54 (1963) 15-37. (2) A. Bergvall, *Augustinian Perspectives in the Renaissance*, Uppsala 2001 (Psychology, Epistemology, Semiology, Politics, The Two Kingdoms); D.C. Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz: An Essay in the Intellectual Origins of the Protestant Reformation*, Durham NC 1980; L. Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'œuvre de Jean Calvin I: Étude de critique littéraire*, Assen 1957.

Second period. (1) E. Stakemeier, *Der Kampf um Augustin. Au-*

gustinus und die Augustiner auf dem Tridentinum, Paderborn 1937; V. Grossi, *Agostino d'Ippona e il Concilio di Trento*, in G. Alberigo - I. Rogger (eds.), *Il Concilio di Trento nella prospettiva del Terzo Millennio*, Brescia 1997, 313-341; Id., *Indicazioni sulla recezione-utilizzazione di Agostino d'Ippona nella teologia post-tridentina*: Lateranum 62 (1996) 221-251; on the Augustinianism of the 16th-17th c., the issue on the theme *Le siècle de saint Augustin*, of the journal: XVII[e] siècle 34 (1982) 99-241; P. Stella, *Agostinismo in Italia e cultura patristica europea tra sette e ottocento*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 173-203; M. Lamberigts (ed.), *L'augustinisme à l'ancienne faculté de Théologie de Louvain*, Louvain 1994; C. Senofonte, *Baio - Giansenio - Arnauld*: Augustinianum 36 (1996) 255-270; L. Ceyssens, *Autour de la Bulle Unigenitus. La déclaration, dèrnière illusion et ultime désillusion de Louis XIV*: RHE 84 (1989) 5-29; L. Ceyssens, *Le "Saint Augustin" du XVII[e] siècle: l'édition de Louvain (1577)*: Revue XVII[e] siècle 135 (1982) 103-120; A. Vanneste, *Pour une relecture critique de l'Augustinus de Jansénius*: Augustiniana 44 (1994) 115-136; B. Neveu, *Augustinisme janséniste et magistère romain*: Revue XVII[e] siècle 34 (1982) 191-209. (2) On the school of the *Augustinenses* in particular, W. Bocke, *Introduction to the Teaching of the Italian Augustinians of the 18th Century on the Nature of Actual Grace*, Louvain 1958; B. Van Luijk, *Le controversie teologiche nei secoli XVII-XVIII e gli Agostiniani*: Augustiniana 13 (1963) 201-225; Id., *Gianlorenzo Berti agostiniano (1696-1766)*: Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia 14 (1960) 235-262; 383-410; M.K. Wernicke, *Kardinal Enrico Noris und seine Verteidigung Augustins*, Würzburg 1973; A. Trapè, *De gratuitate ordinis supernaturalis apud theologos augustinenses litteris encyclicis "Humani generis" praelucentibus*: Analecta Augustiniana 21 (1951) 217-265; H. de Lubac, *Augustinsme et théologie moderne* (Th. 63), Paris 1965; J. Rupp, *Pour le dialogue entre l'église et le monde moderne: l'indispensable Augustinisme*: L'Ami du Clergé 76 (1966) n. 7 97-103; J. Morán, *Presenza di S. Agostino nel Concilio Vaticano II*: Augustinianum 6 (1966) 460-488; B. Neveu, *Pour une histoire de l'Augustinianisme*, in K. Flasch - D. De Courcelles (eds.), *Augustinus in der Neuzeit*, Brepols 1997, 175-201.

V. Grossi

AUGUSTINUS HIBERNICUS (7th c.). Irish exegete; we know almost nothing of his life. He was active in 655. His name recurs esp. in regard to spurious works of *Augustine. Attributed to him are three books: *De mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, a 7th-c. exegetical work on the most extraordinary events and miracles related in Scripture, and also perhaps a *Commentary on the Catholic Epistles,* written in the 7th c. in *Ireland and used by ps.-Hilary (see M. Esposito: JThS 21 [1920] 316-318; B. Bischoff: SE VI [1954] 269-270; CPL 1123 a [1995]).

PL 35, 2149-2202; M. Esposito, in *Proceed Roy. Irish Acad.*, XXXV, 1919, 189-207; B. Bischoff: SE VI (1954) 189-281 (esp. 223-274); P. Grosjean, *Quelques exégètes irlandais du VII[e] siècle*: SE VII (1955) 67-98; Patrologia 3, 381; M. Simonetti, "*De mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae." Un trattato irlandese sui miracoli nella S.S.*: RomBarb 4 (1979) 225-251; J. Kelly, *Hiberno-Latin Exegesis and Exegetes*: Annuale Mediaevale 21 (1981) 46-60; CPL 1123 (1995); CALMA 1, 506.

M. Spinelli

AUGUSTUS, emperor (63 BC–AD 14). First *Roman emperor; Jesus was born during his reign (Lk 2:1-2). During the first centuries the idea that God had invested the unknowing Augustus with the mission of creating a political situation of unity and peace favorable to Christ's redemptive work was discreetly affirmed: *Melito of Sardis (cit. by Eus., *HE* IV, 26) stressed that Christianity and empire developed together in a providential design; *Origen (*Cels.* II, 30) held that God had given the Roman Empire a unifying task so as to eliminate obstacles to the propagation of the gospel; in line with Origen, *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Dem. ev.* III, 2,37; III, 7,30ff.) observed the connection between the universal empire pacified by Augustus and Jesus' birth; *Orosius, in the *Hist. adv. paganos* VI, 20, gave Augustus a divine consecration, considering his empire to be in every way prepared by the grace of Christ who was to come, and intepreting in that sense a prodigy that occurred at the start of the Augustan monarchy. The *Byzantine *John Malalas's late 6th-c. *Chronicle* even attributed to Augustus, with the legend of the Capitoline vision, a knowledge of the birth of Jesus Christ during his reign.

A.H.M. Jones, *Augustus,* New York 1970; P. Siniscalco, *L'idea dell'eternità e della fine di Roma negli autori cristiani primitivi*: StudRom (1977) 1-26; G.G. Belloni, *Le "Res Gestae Divi Augusti." Augusto, il nuovo regime e la nuova urbe*, Milan 1987; E.S. Ramage, *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' Res Gestae*, Stuttgart 1987; J. Burian, *Die Errichtung des Prinzipats und der Tatenbericht des Augustus*: Klio 73 (1991) 420-431; A.B. Bosworth, *Augustus, the "Res gestae" and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis*: JRS 89 (1999) 5-18; A. Giardina - A. Schiavone, *Storia di Roma*, Turin 1999; A. Ziolkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

AUNACARIUS of Auxerre (b. before 540/d. before 605). Aunacarius, or Aunarius, descendent of a noble Orléans family, became bishop of Auxerre 31 July 561. He held a diocesan synod in 585 or 592, whose 45 canons concern mainly liturgical and disciplinary questions (CCL 148A, 264-272). He took part in the councils of Paris (573) and Mâcon (581/3, 585), and produced a new recension of *Mart. hier.,* the only one surviving. An *Instructio de rogationibus et vigiliis* (CPL 1311) that regulates eucharistic celebrations for the whole diocese is his. Also preserved are two letters sent by Pope *Pelagius II (CPL 1707) to Aunacarius, which show a certain influence of the bishop on the politics of the time, and a letter of Aunacarius sent to the African priest Stephen (CPL 2083), asking him to write a Life of St. *Germanus (lost) and St. Amatrius, his predecessors. Auna-

carius is probably the author of the prologue of *Caesarius of Arles's *Regula Monachorum*. He died on a 25 September before 605, the day on which he is commemorated by the *Mart. Rom*.

BHL 805-806; *Verzeichnis* (41995) 305; BS 2, 592-593; LMA 1, 1238-1239; 6, 357-361; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* 2, Paris 1899, 446; H. Atsma, *Klöster und Mönchtum im Bistum Auxerre*: France 11 (1983) 1-96; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul*, Leiden 1995, 97-100.

S. Samulowitz

AURASIUS of Toledo (d. 615). Preacher who headed the church of *Toledo from 603–615. *Ildefonsus describes him as a good and moderate man (*De vir. ill.* 4). In the Synod of Toledo of 610 he obtained a decree from King *Gundemar, confirming the metropolitan dignity of the see of Toledo and making the city the capital of the ancient province of Carpentania. Of him we have only a brief, violent letter of *excommunication sent to the judaizing Frogan, count of Toledo, who had dared to rebel against the king (*Ep. ad Froganem Toleti comitem*).

CPL 1296; Díaz 81; MGH Ep. 3, 689; PLS 4, 1593-1596; J. Gil, *Miscellanea wisigothica*, Sevilla 1972, 45 and 48; DHGE 5, 494-597; L.A. García Moreno, *Prosopografía del reino visigodo de Toledo*, Salamanca 1974, 113; A. González Blanco, *El Decreto de Gundemaro y la historia del siglo VII*, in *Los Visigodos* III, Murcia 1986, 159-169; U. Dominguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 466ff.

P. Marone

AURELIAN, emperor (d. 275). Lucius Domitius Aurelian, emperor from 270–275; fought successful wars against the barbarians on the Rhine and Danube, and in the East against Zenobia, queen of Palmyra. He reformed the coinage and built the still-existing wall around Rome. A fervent devotee of the gods, in 274 he had a temple built in the city to the sun god, whose worship he made obligatory. For this reason he intended to resume *persecution of the Christians, to whom he had not previously been hostile; he had intervened in the dispute between *Paul of Samosata and *Domnus over the see of *Antioch, ruling that the church should be handed over to the bishop recognized by the Roman pontiff and the other Italian bishops (Eus., *HE* VII, 30)—a de facto admission of a Roman supremacy. According to *Eusebius of Caesarea, Aurelian intended to persecute the Christians (*HE* 7,30,20-21), though *Lactantius speaks as though the persecution began only once the emperor had been assasinated.

L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma e del mondo romano*, VI, Turin 1961; R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: (A.D. 100-400)*, New Haven CT 1984; It. tr., *La diffusione del cristianesimo nell'Impero romano 100/400*, Rome-Bari 1989; M.H. Dodgeon - S.N.C. Lieu, *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars, AD 226-363*, London-New York 1991; V. Cubelli, *Aureliano imperatore: dalla rivolta dei monetieri alla riforma monetaria*, Florence 1992; E. Cizek, *L'empereur Aurélien et son temps*, Paris 1994; M. Christol, *L'Empire romain du IIIe siècle. Histoire politique (192-325 après J.-C.)*, Paris 1997; A. Watson, *Aurelian and the Third Century*, London 1999; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

AURELIAN of Arles (523–551). Son of Sacerdos, bishop of *Lyons in 541; appointed bishop of *Arles in 546 at only 23; at the request of Childebert I, Pope *Vigilius appointed him vicar of the apostolic see in *Gaul, with the *pallium* (Jaffé 912, 913, 918). He had good relations with the court, which aided him to the benefit of the church of Arles. He founded the *monasteries of Sts. Peter and Paul for men and St. Mary for women. He wrote the rules for the two monasteries, broadly inspired by the rules for *monks and nuns written by *Caesarius of Arles. He took part in the Council of Orléans (549); he wrote Pope Vigilius regarding his position on the question of the *Three Chapters. We have the pope's response (PL 69, 41; Jaffé 925). Died at Lyons and was buried in the family tomb in the Church of St. Nicesius. His feast is 16 June.

CPL 1055, 1844-1846; PL 68, 405 (Ep. ad Theobertum; extract); 71, 1164 (idem); PLS 4,1203-1206; MGH Ep. 3,124; CCL 117, 426-428; A. Schmidt, *Zur Komposition der Mönchsregel des heiligen Aurelian von Arles*: Studi Monastici 18 (1976) 17-54; W.E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles. The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Cambridge 1994, 262-264; CALMA 1,550.

A. Hamman

AURELIUS of Carthage (d. 427). Little is known of his life; *Paulinus (*Vita Ambr*. 54) mentions a brother, *Fortunatus, a deacon in ca. 411. *Augustine, returning to Africa in 388, found Aurelius a deacon at *Carthage, and their friendship began then. From Augustine we know of his charity (*Civ. Dei* 22, 8,3), of his opposition to paganistic rites that Christians celebrated at the tombs of the martyrs and to the holding of **agapai* in church (Aug., *Ep*. 22,4; 29,10). Aurelius was elected bishop between 390–393 (probably 391–392). *Cyprian's fame and Carthage's position as the capital of *Africa had increased the responsibility attached to this position; Aurelius himself spoke of these burdens at the council of 397 (Mansi, III 746, 929).

Only a few of his writings and speeches survive: the circular letter *De damnatione Pelagii atque Caelestii* of 419 (PL 20, 1009-1014) and the brief interventions at various councils (Mansi, III 699-843). His pastoral activity involved the problem of protecting Christian morals against the return of idolatry; Augustine praises his wisdom and vigor in this (*Serm.* 311,5). Often having to leave Carthage to attend councils, he entrusted preaching, previously the exclusive task of the bishop, to priests (Aug., *Ep.* 41, 1-2). He introduced psalmody into the Mass for the formation of the faithful (Aug., *Retract.* 2,11). Facing tensions that arose among *monks who refused to work, judging it inferior to prayer, he turned to Augustine, who ca. 400 dedicated to him *De opere monachorum* (*Retract.* 2,21). Aurelius had to guide the Christian community of Carthage at a time when it faced two schismatic movements: the *Donatists, led by *Primian, and a dissident Donatist group led by *Maximian.

Aurelius was a constant presence at the many African councils held mainly against the Donatists and *Pelagians from the late 4th c. through the first decades of the 5th c. In 416, presiding at an African provincial council, he signed the first synodal letter addressed to Pope *Innocent I against Pelagianism (Aug., *Ep.* 175; Mansi, IV, 321-324); Innocent's response was addressed to him (Mansi, III, 1071-1074; Aug., *Ep.* 181). Innocent and Aurelius had other contacts on the Pelagian problem, mediated by Augustine (Mansi, III, 1049.1078-1080). His position toward Pope *Zosimus, whose sympathies Pelagius and *Celestius had won, was less cordial (Mansi, IV, 350-359). The replies of the African episcopate, presided over by Aurelius, were ignored, both at the Council of Carthage of 1 May 418 (Mansi, IV, 366-367; 377-380), and in the two councils in late 418 and 25 May 419 (Mansi, III, 830-844). Still on the Pelagian problem, *Honorius and *Theodosius II asked Aurelius to preside over three more councils: 421 (Mansi, IV, 447-452), 424 (Mansi, III, 839-844) and 426 (Mansi, IV, 517-528). He died at Carthage in 430.

Aurelius made no special theological contribution: he was overshadowed by Augustine, with whom he was in perfect sympathy throughout his life, and whose advice he always relied upon. Augustine also dedicated *De Trinitate* and *De Gestis Pelagii* to him. Pastorally, his wisdom and his skill as a mediator seem to have made him a focal point of the African bishops and people (Possid., *Vita Aug.* 8; Aug., *Ep.* 41,2; *Serm.* 355,4; 111). *John Chrysostom (*Ep.* 149) also declared his profound esteem for Aurelius. *Orosius names him among the great defenders of the faith (*Apol.* 1), and *Fulgentius of Ruspe puts him among the great doctors of the church for his vigilance against *heresies (*De verit. praedest.* 2,22,42). The *Mart. hier.* commemorates him 20 July.

CPL 393-396; PL 20, 752-756; 1009-1014; 56, 418; 50, 423-427; DHGE 5, 726-738; BS 2, 609-612; PCBE 1, 105-127; F. Refoulé, Datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagiens et du "libellus fidei" de Rufin: REAug 9 (1963) 41-49; Ch. Munier, La tradition littéraire des canons africains (345-525): RecAug 10 (1975) 3-22 (see 7-10).

M.G. Mara

AUSONIUS (d. ca. 395). Decimus Magnus Ausonius, born at Bordeaux ca. 310, died there ca. 395, was first a professor and poet of that famous school, then the future emperor *Gratian's tutor at Trier, a courtier loaded with titles and honors (364–385); then, all his influence lost, he returned to his native town to cultivate his thought games and word games, esp. those of his 20 years at Trier. He taught *Paulinus before his *baptism (390) and vainly tried to dissuade him from the *ascetic life (395). He wrote Christian poems during his time with Gratian; his daily poems (*Ephemeris* and *Domestica* 2-3) may be a poetic transposition of his pre- and postbaptismal *catechetical instructions. There is nothing Christian in some of his other poems (*Bissula, Cento nuptialis,* prayers without biblical references, etc.). He remained in the antechamber of Christianity: an erudite but amiable rhetorician, ambitious but good, a singer of Janus and of Jesus. His bookish muse was inspired by contemplation of nature (*Mosella*), but never by biblical *laus Dei*. Yet his *Parentalia* were not indifferent Christians: his widowed sister Julia Dryadia, always avid for truth and ardent in charity (12,5-8), was a source of joy in their paternal home (12,9-12); his aunt Julia Cataphronia lived humbly in virginal *chastity and voluntary *poverty (26); his aunt Emilia Hilaria, a lover of consecrated *virginity, was as solicitous in charity as Christian *virgines devotae* (6); his uncle Clemens Contemptus lived a poor and solitary life *in terra Rutupina*. The equal distance from paganism and Christianity that led Ausonius to joke even about the *Tris Deus Unus* (*Griph.* 88) does not seem foreign to his captious mentality.

Ch. Guignebert, *Les demi-chrétiens et leur place dans l'Église antique*: RHR 88 (1923) 65-102; Patrologia 3, 264-266; J.R. Hussey, *Ausonius and the Concept of the Worthwhile Life,* Tufts University 1974; F. Benedetti, *La tecnica del vertere negli epigrammi di Ausonio,* Florence 1980; E. Di Lorenzo, *Ausonio. Saggio su alcune componenti stilistiche,* Naples 1981; G.J. Fisher, *Studies in Fourth and Fifth Century Latin Literature with Particular Reference to Ausonius,* Southampton 1981; Ch.-M. Ternes, *Ètudes ausoniennes,* Luxembourg 1986; A. Alvar Ezquerra, *Estado actual de los estudios sobre Ausonio: biblio-*

grafía crítica 1960-1987: Estudios clásicos 33 (1991) 53-96; F. Della Corte, *Storia (e preistoria) del testo ausoniano,* Rome 1991; M.J. Lossau (ed.), *Ausonius,* Darmstadt Wiss. 1991; V. Messana, *L'ironia di Ausonio e il suo sentimento religioso,* in *Polyanthema: studi di letteratura cristiana antica offerti a Salvatore Costanza,* Messina 1991, 75-108; L. Mondin, *Storia e critica del testo di Ausonio: a proposito di una recente edizione:* BStudLat 23 (1993) 59-96; H. Sivan, *Ausonius of Bordeaux: Genesis of a Gallic Aristocracy,* London 1993; N.G. Davis, *Cupid at the Ivory Gates: Ausonius as a Reader of Vergil's Aeneid*: Colby Quarterly 30/3 (1994) 162-170; G. Guttilla, *Ausonio e Paolino: rapporti letterari e umani:* Impegno and dialogo 10 (1994) 177-189; L. Mondin, *Dieci anni di critica ausoniana:* 1984-1993: BStudLat 24/1 (1994) 192-255; J.F. Drinkwater, *Re-Dating Ausonius' War Poetry:* AJPh 120/3 (1999) 443-452; L. Mondin, *Qualche novità sul "Technopaegnion" di Ausonio, con un saggio inedito di Dante Nardo:* Lexis 17 (1999) 319-344; G. Polara, *Tra "ars" e "ludus": tecnica e poetica in Ausonio,* in G. Mazzoli - F. Gasti (eds.), *Prospettive sul tardoantico: Atti del Convegno di Pavia (27-28 novembre* 1997), Como 1999, 31-47; M. Skeb, *Subjektivität und Gottesbild: die religiöse Mentalität des Decimus Magnus Ausonius:* Hermes 128/3 (2000) 327-352.

C. Riggi

AUSPICIUS of Toul (d. 487/490). A person of vast culture, appointed bishop of Toul ca. 472. *Sidonius Apollinaris, his friend and correspondent, praises him in a letter to *Comes* Arbogastes of *Trier (see *Ep.* 7,17,3), and wrote a letter to Auspicius himself (*Ep.* 7,11,10) from exile in 475/476. We have an *Epistula metrica* of Auspicius's, one of the first significant examples of the genre; it is addressed to Arbogastes between 475/480 and gives him a program of Christian behavior (how to avoid cupidity and avarice) and government (respect bishops). The letter's perspective is pastoral; the style is somewhat elegant and varied, characteristically aristocratic. Auspicius died ca. 487/490 and was buried at St. Mansuy, where his body was rediscovered in 1107. His feast is 26 February (originally 8 July).

Editions: CPL 1056; PL 61, 1005-1008; MGH, Ep. 3,1 (1892) 135-137; repr. in CCL 117 (1957) 442-447; MGH, Poetae latini 4,2, 614-617; Fontes 4, 338-340 (ed. and bibl.).

Studies: AAS (1739) Julii, VI, 561-562; W. Brandes, *Des Auspicius von Toul rhythmische Epistel an Arbogastes von Trier,* Berlin-Wolfenbüttel 1905 (13, 16f., 24); Schanz, 4/2 (1920) 378f.; W. Meyer, *Die rhythm. Jamben des Auspicius*, in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittelalterlichen Rytmik III*, Berlin 1936, 1-42; DHGE 5 (1931) 781; Torsy (1959) 63; BS 2 (1962) 626f.; LexdesMitt 1 (1977) 1249; LTK[3] 1, 1268-1269; Patrologia 4 (1996), 289-290; BBKL 21 (2003) 44 (with bibl.).

M. Maritano

AUTHARI (560 ca.–590). Third king of the *Longobards (Lombards), *Arian, he succeeded his father, Cleph, in 584 after ten years' interregnum. His wise and ordered administration was favorable to the *Romans who, directly subjected to the Longobards in payment of tribute, were no longer vexed by arbitrary spoliation, so that relations between both parties moved toward a balanced normalization. Authari took the title *Flavius* to win popular favor and as an ideal link of legitimacy with the Roman Empire: all later Longobard kings imitated him. He tolerated the Catholics but, for fear of undermining loyalty to their Arian kings, forbade the Longobards from having their children baptized according to the Catholic rite; for this he was little loved by *Gregory the Great (see *Epist.* I, 17). He drove the Greeks out of the Exarchate and routed the Franks. He married *Theodelinda, Catholic daughter of duke Garibald of Bavaria. He died at Pavia, 15 November 590, and was succeeded by Agilulf. The historian Paulus Diaconus judges him favorably, on the whole.

Paulus Diaconus, *Historia Langobardorum*, III, 16-18; III, 27-35; G. Pepe, *Medioevo barbarico*, Turin 1941; G.P. Bognetti, *L'età longobarda*, II, Milan 1967; P. Delogu, *Il regno longobardo*, in G. Galasso, *Storia d'Italia*, I. *Longobardi e Bizantini*, Turin 1980.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

AUTHORITY, Ecclesiastical

I. The evidence of the early church - II. The functions of authority.

I. The evidence of the early church. Evidence tells us much about the structure of the first communities and of the authority exercised by their leaders and responsible men. One thing that modern criticism has brought out well is the diversity of constitutional forms adopted and the variety of functions exercised in the community, the traditions supporting it and the doctrines expressing its ecclesial consciousness (Dias 34-165).

It is beyond dispute that the Christian communities were from the start ordered bodies, in which the various functions (pastoral, liturgical, charitable, etc.) were carried out by appropriate ministers. The early church knew a wealth of *charisms, whose beneficiaries, esp. prophets, evangelists and teachers, enjoyed great prestige. Yet they remained subject to the judgment of community leaders, who could, with more or less latitude, admit them to governing offices. Rather than irreducibly opposing charisms and ministries, they were seen as complementary in their immense variety, under the guidance of the *Holy Spirit. Far from being slaves to charismatic or democratic anarchy, the early communities, following synagogue, priestly, Essene or other traditions,

formed organizations—churches—under the direction of responsible leaders, invested with appropriate authority.

Even a cursory discussion of authority in the early church must bear in mind the three complementary realities just mentioned (constitutional forms, ministers and charisms, ecclesiological doctrines), situating them as precisely as possible in time and space. It is not enough to list the types of institution and the sociological models that emerge from the ecclesiastical structures of the first three centuries: one must call attention to how the very concept of authority was transformed under the influence of the context. The Christian tradition recognized above all else divine authority, the foundation of doctrinal and moral truth (Tertull., *Cast.* 4,6; *Adv. Marc.* IV, 4,5; see Aug., *Civ. Dei* I, 26); the authority of Scripture (Tertull., *De pudicitia* II, 10; *Adv. Praxean* XI, 9; *Apol.* 19,1; see Aug., *Civ. Dei* XII, 11); that of the rule of faith (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* IV 12,3); and of the apostles, privileged witnesses and guarantors of this faith (Tertull., *De praescr. haer.* XXI, 4). The function of apostolic authority is to ensure the unaltered transmission of the doctrine received from Christ—and Christ, from God—explains *Tertullian; episcopal succession is the tangible evidence of this tradition. It guarantees the authenticity of faith and the permanence of apostolic authority in the church (*De praescr. haer.* XXI, 1; *Adv. Marc.* IV, 2,1). *Cyprian explains Tertullian's position with the doctrine of the local church, bearer of apostolic authority and of the authentic *tradition, but does not confine the origin of the authority that developed within the church to this tradition: he also stresses the role of the *martyrs (*Ep.* LXI, 2), identical to that of the Fathers and of the bishops met in council (Ring, 102-107). Beginning with Cyprian, the authority usually discussed is that of bishops and priests (*Ep.* LIX, 4, 13; cf. Leo the Gr., *Ep.* VI, 2), but from a twofold perspective. These in fact invested, on the one hand, with the authority derived from their position in the church, also, on the other hand, have a personal stature that is all their own and which confers on their actions a wholly particular authority. This latter authority is expressed as *dignitas, gravitas, sanctitas,* etc. At the beginning *auctoritas* was not confused with *potestas.* Cyprian notes with great precision that the episcopal power necessary for the exercise of this function derives from the authority that comes to the bishop in virtue of this function—*pro episcopatus vigore et cathedrae auctoritate* (*Ep.* III, 1). Later, the two terms were increasingly confused, all the more easily the more the bishop's powers were modeled on those of Roman magistrates. Pope *Gelasius, however, distinguished *auctoritas sacra pontificum* from *regalis potestas* (Jaffé 632); medieval canonists no longer made this distinction and credited the Roman pontiff with *plenitudo potestatis.*

II. The functions of authority. Leaving aside the forms of government of the apostolic and post-apostolic communities, it is a fact that from the 2nd c. the monarchical episcopate was imposed on all the Christian churches. Ignoring the modest beginnings of this institution and the stages of its development, we will describe its various aspects at the time when the episcopate displayed its whole potentiality. The texts of the 2nd and 3rd c. amply illustrate the nature of this authority, which was always held to be of divine origin. They agree perfectly on this principle and see in the bishop's election neither the delegation of the community nor a transfer to the bishop of rights and powers originally possessed collegially by the college of prebyters. Still less do they speak of the co-opting of sacred rights and powers, originally held by the "people of God," to the bishop's advantage. For *Hippolytus of Rome, through ordination the Holy Spirit descends on bishops who are the successors of the apostles, high priests, doctors, pastors and responsible leaders in the church (*Philos.* I, 1,6). In the **Apostolic Tradition,* the prayers of ordination attest that the essence of the rite consists in the transmission of this sacred authority through the laying on of hands (chs. 2-3; ed. Botte, 5-11). Here we see the beginning of the later classical elements of the doctrine of the power of orders and the power of jursidiction. Moreover, in the power of jurisdiction and in the pastoral office, the Fathers included the power of the magisterium so as to ascribe to the bishop Christ's threefold dignity as priest, prophet and king. With these formulations, inspired more by Scripture than by a legal analysis of the functions exercised and powers really held by bishops, they expressed the convinction that the bishop's authority extended to all areas of church life: in a word, the bishop is free to administer the church as he will and is accountable only to God. Cyprian forcefully summed up this opinion: "Everyone must recognize that the bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop; if anyone is not with the bishop, neither is he in the church" (*Ep.* LXVI, 8,3). Cyprian was also the first to employ the concept of *collegium* to indicate the communion among the bishops (*Ep.* LXVIII, 3); indeed, he emphasized that apart from this universal college a bishop on his own has neither

power nor dignity (*Ep.* LV, 24). Authority was affirmed in the church in three principal ways: (1) by formulating laws, (2) by exercising justice and (3) by suppressing errors.

Legislative power. This was held through the various jurisdictional elements, understood as mutually constituting a whole for the good of the churches. Chronologically, this power was first exercised (1) at the level of the local church by the bishops; then (2), in the broader framework of conciliar legislation (from the 2nd half of the 2nd c.); and finally (3), at the level of pontifical legislation, which tended to universalize itself, as did that of ecumenical councils.

1. No episcopal legislation survives in the form of episcopal statutes (or synodals), which prevailed only from the early Middle Ages. But such legislation certainly existed from the beginnings of the monarchical episcopate, though exercised under the more modest forms of oral prescriptions, practical directives and every kind of regulation for the good of the community. Traces of it remain in the rich anonymous literature that appeals to the apostles (from the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles to the voluminous 4th-c. compilations **Apostolic Constitutions, Testament of Our Lord,* **Octateuch* of Clement etc.). The immense variety of subjects dealt with in these writings attests the vast powers held by the bishops in the community's daily life: morals, canon law, social organization, education, assistance; all the sectors of Christian life, personal, family and social, were subject to their authority. But how was it actually exercised? We can imagine this exercise, at every level, as ranging from a kindly paternalism to the most rigid authoritarianism.

2. Conciliar legislation is the richest and theoretically most elaborate, starting from the 4th c., though it soon found itself in competition with pontifical legislation. In this area certain problems arose. First, that of the range of application of conciliar canons. Though the universal validity of ecumenical councils was not legally contested (nor the validity of local councils for provincial decisions), in fact (and in law) it was difficult, and often impossible, to define the territory affected by the canons of a council of bishops from different places but which did not reach ecumenicity (Gaudemet 2,15). Only *Africa constituted a unity, inasmuch as the presence of all its provinces at a plenary council guaranteed the application of canons to the whole and to every region. But could the same be said for the local councils of *Italy, *Gaul or *Spain? And what was their legislative power based on? The bishops, taken individually, certainly had this power over their own churches; they could therefore use it in council and make decisions together, which their respective flocks were bound to observe. But what if they had not approved the decision? Did the approval of the majority bind them also? And by what right, if it were true that all bishops had the same charism? The same problem also applied to absent and unrepresented bishops. In these cases, were not bishops required to give their *consensus* to conciliar decisions to whose elaboration they had not contributed, or which they had not explicitly approved at the time of their formulation?

This self-discipline appears to have been essentially moral rather than legal and was justified by the need for a common standard within Christian society. In the early church, where doctrine and tradition, action and teaching, *sacraments and *dogma were inextricably bound up, a bishop could not, of his own will, modify a tradition accepted everywhere, nor esteem above its accepted value a particular rite that was not essential or had only a local character, since "it is right that the whole should prevail over the different parts," as St. *Augustine says (*Bapt.* 2, 9,14). We must therefore take account of two external factors that played an important role in the acceptance of conciliar canons: on the one hand, the Fathers threatened the gravest sanctions (deposition, *excommunication etc.) against bishops who refused to observe them; and, on the other, a time came when the emperor consecrated the decisions of a council (which he had summoned for well-defined ends) as secular laws, accompanying them with sanctions. If this imperial act did not confer on the canons their authority, it could not contribute to ensuring their observance. From the time under examination (4th-5th c.), legislation came to form a hierarchy based on the prestige of the various conciliar assemblies, a phenomenon linked to various factors: number and origin of participants, fame of the bishops present, the will of the prince. We must also take account of literary tradition and changes in textual transmission. Augustine formulated some principles on this delicate matter: canons of general councils prevail over those of local councils; more recent decisions could abrogate earlier decisions of equal authority (*Bapt.* II, 3,4). In the 5th c. the papacy made the authority of a council rest on its *communion with the see of *Rome (Leo the Gr., *Ep.* CXLVII-CXLIX). For *Gelasius, *male gesta synodus* was what was contrary to Scripture, the doctrine of the Fathers and ecclesiastical norms, what the whole church had not accepted and, above all, what Rome had not approved (*Ep.* XXVI, 6).

3. From the start of the 3rd c. the papacy intervened in disciplinary matters, but it is not yet possible to determine exactly the areas to which these

rulings applied (certainly Rome; probably central and S Italy and the islands of which Rome was the capital; but other regions?). Cyprian's correspondence attests Africa's autonomy with respect to discipline. The 4th c. shows progress in this area, with the issuing of decretals. *Siricius's letter to *Himerius seems a response or a rescript styled on the model of the *relatio,* in accordance with the practice of the imperial chancellery, but this was not the Roman pontiff's only form of intervention. He could transmit the decisions of the Roman synod to the bishops of a province or reply to a bishop's queries or establish new principles by virtue of his own authority. This direct legislation developed continually from the time of *Innocent I (401–407), reaching its height with *Leo the Great, Gelasius and *Hormisdas. The Roman pontiffs justified their legislative power by their authority in doctrinal and disciplinary matters; they appealed to their primacy, based on the *Tu es Petrus;* and they invoked the necessity of disciplinary authority as a condition and sign of unity of faith.

In the first decretals, the popes were very prudent; far from imposing their directives authoritatively and threatening violaters with sanctions, they invited to observance through fraternal exhortation and unceasing prayer (e.g., Siricius to Himerius: Jaffé 255; Siricius to the bishops of Africa: Jaffé 258; Innocent I to *Victricius of Rouen: Jaffé 286). They took extreme care to respect the tradition, citing Scripture abundantly and appealing to the customs and decisions of the Fathers (i.e., of the bishops met in council and of their own predecessors on the chair of Peter: Gaudemet 223). Under the great 5th-c. pontiffs, firm defenders of Roman primacy, the normative character of decretals was reinforced. The reply inviting observation of a provision became a legislative rule of more universal and permanent import, which could never be put in question.

Judiciary power. There were three instances of this power: the pope, the council and the bishop. The first two were exceptional instances, exercised in grave cases and mainly in matters of doctrine. Only at a late stage did the pope and the council become courts of appeal and revision. The ordinary instance of this power was that of the bishop, the **audientia episcopalis*.

Penal justice. As the responsible head of his community, the bishop had a right to adjudicate to suppress errors (doctrinal deviations, disciplinary lapses). Such a system, however, appropriate for the small communities of the early church, soon showed itself inadequate; tribunals were thus needed to judge the bishops. From the 4th c. a more complex system appeared. Penal jurisdiction was no longer entrusted to special tribunals but ensured through different legal proceedings, the competence of which was not well defined in all cases, as the principle of hierarchy tended to prevail. Bishop, metropolitan, council, primate and pope could judge what penalties to apply. For this reason there were also various degrees in the conciliar proceedings, from the local or regional council to the ecumenical. In the 5th c., the advances in Roman primacy expanded the procedure for appealing to Rome.

RAC 1,902-909 (Auctoritas); 2,394-407 (Bischof); 10,360-492 (Gerichtsbarkeit); TWNT 2,595-619; U. Gmelin, *Auctoritas, römischer Princeps und päpstlicher Primat*, Stuttgart 1937; Th. Klauser, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte*, Krefeld 1949; J. Brosch, *Charismen und Ämter in der Urkirche*, Bonn 1951; W.H. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts I*, Vienna 1953, 51ff., 343ff. (It. tr. Milan 1963); M. Kaiser, *Die Einheit der Kirchengewalt nach dem Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments und der apostolischen Väter*, Munich 1956; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IVe-Ve s.)*, Paris 1958; B. Botte, *La collégialité dans le Nouveau Testament et chez les Pères apostoliques*, in *Le concile et les conciles*, Chevetogne 1960; K. Rahner - J. Ratzinger, *Episkopat und Primat*, Freiburg i.Br. 1961; O. Perler, *L'évêque représentant du Christ selon les documents des premiers siècles*, in *L'Episcopat et l'Église universelle*, Paris 1962; H. v. Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen 1963 (Eng. tr. London 1969); H. Lütcke, *Auctoritas bei Augustin*, Stuttgart 1968; P. Zmire, *Recherches sur la collégialité épiscopale dans l'Église d'Afrique*: RecAug 7 (1971) 3-72; P.V. Dias, *Kirche in der Schrift und im 2. Jahrhundert*, HDG III, 3a, Freiburg i.Br. 1974 (Sp. tr. Madrid 1979); O. Heggelbacher, *Geschichte des frühchristlichen Rechts bis zum Konzil von Nizäa 325*, Freiburg 1974, 23-69; Th.C. Ring, *Auctoritas bei Tertullan, Cyprian und Ambrosius*, Würzburg 1975; LTK 1, 1298-1303; TRE 5, 17-32; N. Schiffers, *Autorität/Macht*: Neues Handbuch Theologischer Grundbegriffe 1, 96-109; B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*, Lund 1977; L.I. Scipioni, *Vescovo e popolo. L'esercizio dell'autorità nella chiesa primitiva (III secolo)*, Milan 1977; P.F. Fransen, *Authority in the Church*, Louvain 1983; Ch. Munier, *L'autorité de l'Église et l'Autorité de l'Esprit d'après Tertullien*: RSR 58 (1984) 77-90.

Ch. Munier - G. Pilara

AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Greco-Roman antiquity produced an abundant and diversified literature, which manifested a strong interest in autobiography. Only rarely, however, did it produce autobiographical works with the principles and formal structure of a genuine literary genre, comparable in richness and precision to biography.

Setting aside the scant autobiographical information present in archaic Greek poetry (Hesiod and the lyric poets), in which one at times encounters the poet's self-conscious personal expression and inner feelings, we must acknowledge that a true and proper

interest in introspection and the retrospective reflection that allows one to evaluate and narrate, in the present, the events of one's own past life emerges only in the 4th c. BC, in the context of the crisis of the *polis* and the emphasis on individual personality that resulted from it. This explains the development of autobiography in the centuries of *Hellenism and of the *Roman Empire, in the most varied forms and for the widest variety of motivations. Autobiography responded to a variety of needs, such as defending one's actions in the face of criticism and accusation (apologetic motivation); celebrating and explaining one's political, military or intellectual activity; narrating travels or explorations; showing, for edification and propaganda purposes, one's inner walk and the personal experiences of religious conversion; etc. Kings, politicians, historians, sophists, philosophers and poets all made use of autobiography, in literary forms such as aretalogical inscriptions, funerary epigraphs, letters, orations, novels, diaries, treatises and poetry. It is enough to cite as examples Isocrates's *On Exchange of Estates;* Plato's letter VII; the aretalogical inscriptions of Ptolemy I Evergete and Antiochus I; the *Autobiographies* of Nicolaus of Damascus, Flavius Josephus and Libanius; the confidences and personal memories scattered throughout *Philo of Alexandria's biblical commentaries and in the writings of the emperor *Julian; elegy IV,10 of Ovid's *Tristia;* memoirs of wars and travels, from Xenophon's *Anabasis* to the *Commentarii* of Julius Caesar; conversion stories like Apuleius's *Metamorphosis*, the *Hieroi logoi* of Aelius Aristides; etc.

Significant autobiographical fragments are not lacking in Christian authors of the first centuries: one thinks, e.g., of the letters (Gal and 2 Cor) in which Paul defends (apologetic motivation) the legitimacy of his apostolic vocation in polemic with his rivals the false apostles, and of the so-called *Wir-Stücke* [we sayings] of the Acts of the Apostles. *Abercius's epigraph contains precious autobiographical information on his life. The information provided by various texts, e.g., the first chapters of *Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho,* the diary of the *martyr *Perpetua transcribed by the author of the *Passio,* Gregory Thaumaturgus's *Thanksgiving to Origen,* Cyprian's *Ad Donatum,* the *Praefatio* to Commodian's *Instructiones,* the introduction to the *De Trinitate* of *Hilary of Poitiers, and the *Vision of Dorotheus* and the *Praefatio* of *Prudentius represent important acquisitions insofar as these authors succeed in harmoniously combining information on the events of their life with a personal self-awareness of the experience of "conversion," whether "intellectual" or "moral."

Expressions of the states of the soul found in some prophetic texts (esp. Jeremiah) and in some psalms of praise or supplication played no small role in the origin of Christian autobiography. The characteristic element of Christian autobiography, however, regardless of the literary form employed, is the interaction of the "I" with the external world in the decisive context of God's saving intervention. Only at the end of the 4th c., nearly contemporaneously with the pagan rhetor *Libanius's autobiography (374-390), did Christian autobiography fully come into its own with *Gregory of Nazianzus and *Augustine.

Gregory often speaks of himself and of his personal experiences—family, cultural and ecclesiastical—in some prayers (e.g., 2, 9, 10, 12, 36, 42, 43) and in many poems. Section II.1 of PG 37 contains 99 compositions *de seipso*. Standing out among these for length and vigor is the poem *De vita sua* in 1,949 iambic trimeters, written immediately after the funeral oration for *Basil of Caesarea (382) and the first autobiography in verse in the Greek language. In it, mainly to console himself, Gregory responds to the accusations arising from the envy of his opponents—for Gregory, a kind of literary redemption of the defeat dealt him by events.

With Augustine's *Confessions* (397–400), Christian autobiographical discourse becomes even more complex and attains to depths previously unexplored. In his account the ordered chronological presentation of the external data mixes seamlessly and is enriched with the description of his intellectual and religious development and of his moral conversion leading to the radical choice of *asceticism. In the work, the author's earlier meditations on the mystery of original sin and divine election elaborated in *Ad Simplicianum,* and the new approach to the Scriptures just presented in the first two books of *De doctrina christiana,* find their appropriate autobiographical application. The story's plot, which reserves ample space for introspection and biblical *exegesis, nonetheless contains lacunae and obscurities which suggest the author's intention to offer an "authorized" interpretation of his own life. From the 5th and 6th c., a more or less clear influence of the *Confessions* can be observed in *Paulinus of Pella's *Eucharisticos* and *Ennodius of Pavia's *Eucharisticum de vita sua*. The autobiography of *Patrick, apostle to Ireland, bears the title *Confessio*.

A. Sizoo, *Autobiographie*: RAC I (1950) 1050-1055; P. Courcelle, *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire. Antécédents et postérité*, Paris 1963; Chr. Jungck, *Gregor von Nazianz. De vita sua*, Heidelberg 1974; G.A. Benrath, *Autobiographie*: TRE IV (1979) 772-789; E. Giannarelli, *La tipologia femminile nella biografia e nell'autobiografia cristiana del*

IV secolo, Rome 1980; K. Berger, *Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament*: ANRW II.25,2, Berlin-New York 1984, 1031-1432, here 1271-1274 (bibl.); M.F. Baslez - Ph. Hoffmann - L. Pernot (eds.), *L'invention de l'autobiographie d'Hésiode à saint Augustin* (Études de littérature ancienne 5), Paris 1993; A. Marcone, *Tra paganesimo e cristianesimo: gli sviluppi dell'autobiografia nel IV secolo d.C.*, in *Cristianesimo latino e cultura greca sino al sec. IV* (SEA 42), Rome 1993, 7-18; I. Gallo - L. Nicastri (eds.), *Biografia e autobiografia degli antichi e dei moderni*, Naples 1995; C. White, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems* (Cambridge Medieval Classics 6), Cambridge 1996; var. aus., *L'autobiografia nel Medioevo*, Spoleto 1998; M. Hinterberger, *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz* (Wiener Byzantinische Studien 22), Vienna 1999.

P.F. Beatrice

AUTUN. *Augustodunum,* a *Roman colony, later *Civitas Eduorum* (4th c.). A flourishing city in the early empire, it declined after the Batavian sack of 269 and the attack of the *Franks in 532. Its first reliably attested bishop is *Reticius (Duchesne, *Fastes*, II, 176), present at the Councils of Rome (313) and *Arles (314). A Christian community probably existed there before the 4th c., although *Pektorius's inscription may be of the 4th c. (DACL I, col. 3196), and the *Life of Symphorianus* (BHL 7967-7968), a local *martyr, a version of which was already known to *Gregory of Tours (*Gloria Conf.*, 77), is not earlier than the 5th c. The stages of the expansion of this church, situated in the feudal dependency of *Lyons, are marked by the episcopates of Euphronius (mid 5th c.) (CPL 988), *Syagrius, who took part in the councils convoked by King Guntram (from 570-585), and finally *Leodegar (St. Léger, 663-680), known from a 7th-c. *Life* (BHL 4850; CCL 117, 527ff.) that relates his struggles with the Frankish king Childeric II (673) and with Ebroin, and finally his execution. The next attested bishop after *Reticius is *Cassian, followed by *Hegemonius, Simplicius (346?), Simplicius II (418?), all mentioned in *Mart. hier.,* like Euphronius (452-475 . . .), Flavian, Pragmatius (517 . . .), Agrippinus (533 and 538) and Nectarius (549 . . .). After Syagrius (561–599) possibly a Leifastus, then Rocco (614 . . .), Babo (627 . . .), Ferreolus (contemporary of King Dagobert 629–639) and Ragnobert (660 . . .). *Leodegar was succeeded by Hermenarius, *abbot of St. Symphorianus and Ansbert (693 . . .); the only known 8th-c. bishop was Iddo (762). The episcopal complex includes, besides the *ecclesia* (dedicated to St. Nazarius and attested beyond doubt from the 6th c.), a *domus,* baptistery (7th c.) and, doubtless SE of the present cathedral, a basilica of St. Croix, located in the fortified *castrum* inside the old urban area, where two *monasteries are attested (6th c.). But it is mainly in the environs of the *cemetery to the east (St. Pierre de l'Etoffe) that oratories, basilicas and monasteries were established, esp. the basilica of St. Symphorianus, attested in the 5th c., St. Peter's (5th c.?) and St. Stephen's (5th c.).

L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, II, Paris 1910, 174-181; J. Berthollet, *L'évéché d'Autun*, Autun 1947; M. Chaume, *Recherches d'histoire chrétienne et médiévale*, Dijon 1947, 57ff.; Ch. Pietri, *Autun*, in *La topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule*, Paris 1974, 9-17; A. Ferrua, *L'epigrafia cristiana prima di Costantino*, in *Atti del IX Congresso di Archeologia cristiana*, Vatican City 1978, 583-613; C. Sapin, *Autun, cité mérovingienne*: Dossier d'Archéologie (May 1981) 32-38; Ch. Pietri (additions by J.-Ch. Picard), *Autun*, in *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII[e] siècle. IV. Province ecclesiastique de Lyon* (Lugdunensis Prima), Paris 1986, 37-45.

Ch. Pietri

AUXENTIUS of Durostorum (d. 386). *Arian bishop of Durostorum in *Moesia near Scythia, he had to leave his see as a consequence of *Theodosius's anti-Arian measures (ca. 380). Some time later (ca. 382) he was at *Milan, protected by the empress *Justina, and was appointed bishop of the Arian community there (not to be confused with the earlier *Auxentius, bishop of Milan from 355–374); he clashed with *Ambrose on the question of handing over basilicas to the Arians (385). A pupil of Ulfilas, he wrote the letter *De fide vita et obitu Ulfilae,* contained in the *Dissertatio Maximin contra Ambrosium.*

CPL 691; PLS 1, 703-707; SC 267, 236-251; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 44-58, 439; BBKL I, 305; Y.-M. Duval, *La convocation du concile d'Aquilée de 381*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V. XXX Incontro di Studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma 3-5 maggio 2001*: SEA 78 (2002) 421-437.

M. Simonetti

AUXENTIUS of Milan (d. 374). A native of *Cappadocia, *Arian, he was a priest at *Alexandria under *Gregory the Cappadocian (339–345). In 355 he was ordained bishop of *Milan to replace the deposed *Nicene *Dionysius. He may have attended the Council of *Rimini. In 364 *Hilary, *Eusebius of Vercelli and a few other bishops tried to expel Auxentius from his see, but he appealed to *Valentinian, to whom he gave a written document appealing to the decisions of the Council of Rimini, declaring that he never knew Arius, expounding a very vague profession of faith and accusing his enemies of causing disorder in Milan by their interference. Valentinian de-

cided for him and expelled his accusers. Later Auxentius repelled a similar attempt by *Filaster.

PL 10, 617-618; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 439; Simonetti 585; BBKL I, 305; C. Alzati, *Un cappadoce in Occidente durante le dispute trinitarie del IV secolo: Aussenzio di Milano*, in *Ambrosiana ecclesia. Studi sulla chiesa milanese e l'ecumene cristiana fra tarda antichità e medioevo*, Milan 1993, 45-95; M. Durst, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis des Auxentius von Mailand. Historischer Hintergrund - Textüberlieferung - Theologie*: JbAC 41 (1998) 118-168.

M. Simonetti

AVE PHOENICE, De (early 4th c.). A crypto-Christian protreptic epyllion in 85 elegiac distichs that presents serious interpretive difficulties regarding origin, date and the philosophical-religious doctrine it contains. It is not mentioned by *Jerome, but by *Gregory of Tours (582) and by the manuscript tradition attributed to *Lactantius, who compare it with a certain *millenarian aspiration and precise textual parallels. The elegant poem, considered by turns *pagan or Christian in character, addresses a theme popular in the literature and figurative arts of *Late Antiquity: the myth of the Phoenix arising from its ashes. The mythical bird, which already for the *pagans symbolized the world that continually renews itself, was taken up by Christian artists and writers (beginning with *Clement of Rome), who exploited its allegorical potential as a symbol of *resurrection and eternal *life. For Fontaine, who interprets the poem politically and is inclined to date it at 326, it was addressed to syncretist pagans of the imperial court who were familiar with the political import of the effigy of the phoenix that appeared on some *Constantinian coins.

Editions: PL 7, 277ff., CSEL 27, 2, 1 (1893), 135-147; E. Rapisarda, *Il carme "De ave Phoenice" di Lattanzio*, Catania [3]1959 (with text and It. tr.); U. Boella, Florence 1973 (It. tr.); A. Anglada Anfruns, Barcelona 1984 (text, Sp. tr. and comm.).

Studies: J. Fontaine, *La letteratura latina cristiana* (It. tr., ed. S. D'Elia), Bologna 1973, 69-70; R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*, Leiden 1972 (with bibl. from 1876 to 1960); F. Bisconti, *Aspetti e significati del simbolo della fenice nella letteratura e nell'arte del Cristianesimo primitivo*: VetChr 14 (1979) 21-40; S. Isetta, *Il "De ave Phoenice" attribuito a Lattanzio*: Civ.Cl.Cr. 1 (1980) 379-409 (thorough bibl.); J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 53-66; W. Kirsch, *Textimmanenz und Texttranszendenz bei Interpretation literarischer Kunstwerke, am Beispiel des* Phoenix-*Gedichts des Laktanz*: WZRostock 34 (1985) 26-28; A. Wlosok, *Die Anfänge christlicher Poesie lateinischer Sprache. Laktanzens Gedicht über den Vogel Phoenix*, in P. Neukam (ed.), *Information aus der Vergangenheit. Dialog Schule-Wissenschaft, klassische Sprachen und Lit.*, Munich 1982, 19-67; Id., *Wie der Phoenix singt*, in *Musik und Dichtung*, FS V. Pöschl, Frankfurt 1990, 209-222; D. Cerullo, *Il carme* De ave Phoenice *di Lattanzio*, in M. Rossi Cittadini (ed.), *Presenze classiche nelle letterature occidentali*, Perugia 1995, 343-365; M.G. Moroni, *Note testuali al carme* De ave Phoenice: Boll. St. Lat. 25 (1995) 105-110; E. Delbey, *L'élégie* De ave Phoenice: *une poétique nouvelle de la métamorphose pour une esthétique du decus chez Lactance*: REL 76 (1998) 216-225.

A.V. Nazzaro

AVITUS of Braga (d. after 418). Priest of *Braga in Portugal, lived at *Jerusalem from 409. There he exhorted his friend, the priest *Lucian—who following a vision had discovered the relics of St. Stephen at Kefar Gamala (Caphargamala), N of Jerusalem—to write an account of his discovery (ca. 415–416). Avitus translated into *Latin the Greek text of this *Epistula de inventione corporis S. Stephani martyri* (PL 41, 805ff.), and in 416 sent it with some of the saint's *relics and a dedicatory letter to Palchonius, bishop of Braga, by the hand of *Orosius. The narration's content seems suspect (cf. the Gelasian Decree in PL 59, 177—if, however, the *Apocalypse of Stephen* is identifiable with Lucian's account), as does the genuineness of the relics, which never reached their destination but were divided between the faithful of Minorca and *Uzalis in *Africa. *Augustine tells us of the spread of their cult in Africa (*Serm.* 316-324; *Civ. Dei* 22,8). At Jerusalem Avitus and Orosius took part in talks with Bishop *John regarding *Pelagianism (25 July 415). He is probably *Jerome's correspondent in *Ep* 79; 108; 124. Gennadius mentions him in the *De viris illustribus* (ch. 48).

Editions: CPL 575; PL 41, 805-808; E. Vanderlinden: REByz 4 (1946) 178-217 [181-183 (MSS), 188-189 (*Epistula Aviti*) 190-216 (Latin version)]. See also BHL 7850-7856.

Studies: DHGE 5 (1931) 1201-1202 (with bibl.); B. Altaner, *Avitus von Braga. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte*: ZKG 60 (1941) 456-468 (= TU 83, 450-466); P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*, Brussels 1950, 50-58; J. Martin, *Die "Revelatio s. Stephani" und Verwandtes*: HJ 77 (1958) 419-433; B. Altaner, *Avitus of Braga: A Contribution to the History of Ancient Christian Literature*: Classical Folia 22,1 (1968) 105-120; J. Vilella, *Biografía crític a de Orosio*: JbAC 43 (2000) 94-121 (on Avitus: passim).

M. Maritano

AVITUS of Piacenza (d. ca. 457). Eparchius Avitus (former emperor), born of a senatorial family ca. 395 at Clermont (Aventicum, *Gaul). Having many important relatives, he began a military career under *Aetius. It seems he was first made *magister militum,* then praetorian prefect in Gaul ca. 439–440, during which time he had to deal with the *Visigoths, filling military and civil offices simultane-

ously. Retired from public life, he won the support of the Visigoths against *Attila's Huns. He then retired to private life again, near Clermont. In 455 he was appointed *magister militum praesentalis* by the emperor Petronius Maximus and sent as ambassador to the Visigoths to confirm their status as *foederati*. At Maximus's death (12 May 455) the Visigoth king *Theodoric urged him to assume the imperial purple, and he was acclaimed emperor at *Arles (9/10 July). He was recognized by the Roman Senate and went to *Italy (the *Vandals of *Africa had sacked *Rome), and on 1 January assumed the consulship in the capital; his son-in-law, *Sidonius Apollinaris, proclaimed the *panegyric (carmen 7). Later *Maioranus, *comes domesticorum,* and Ricimer rebelled and defeated him at Piacenza, 17 October 456, but spared his life. Eusebius, perhaps bishop of *Milan, consecrated him bishop of Piacenza (*quem vitae reservatum Eusebius episcopus ex imperatore episcopum facit*, *Prosper of Aquitaine, *Cronaca s. a.* 456). He died in 457 under unclear circumstances; his body was taken to Brioude.

PCBE 2,196-198; PCBE 2,229f.; R.W. Mathisen, *The Third Regnal Year of Eparchius Avitus: The Interpretation of the Evidence*, in *Studies in the History, Literature and Society of Late Antiquity*, Amsterdam 1991, 163ff.; Id., *Agrestius of Lugo, Eparchius Avitus, and a Curious Fifth-Century Statement of Faith*: JECS 2 (1994) 71-102.

A. Di Berardino

AVITUS of Vienne (d. 518). Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, born ca. 450 of a noble family at *Vienne, where he succeeded his father as bishop ca. 490. The political moment was delicate since the *Burgundians, in whose realm Vienne was, feared Frankish expansionism; being *Arians, after *Clovis's conversion to Catholicism they doubted the loyalty of their Catholic clergy, not without some justification. Avitus nonetheless maintained good relations with King Gundobad, though he failed to convert him. He had a primary role in the conversion to Catholicism of Gundobad's successor *Sigismund; in 517 he presided over the the Council of Epaon, which confirmed the Burgundians' transition to Catholicism.

Avitus wrote in prose and in verse. His prose was collected in two corpora, one in 9 books of letters, the other in a single book of homilies. The letters, which largely survive, are written in the mannered and elaborate style typical of learned men of the time. They address various topics, some trivial, in the tradition of Sidonius, but many others linked to Avitus's pastoral activities, take up organizational, disciplinary and doctrinal questions. In *Ep.* 34 he forcefully stresses the primacy of the bishop of *Rome. The letters which open the corpus are doctrinal in character: *Ep.* 1 includes the *Dialogi cum Gundobado rege,* of which large fragments remain; in it, Avitus shows himself well acquainted with the arguments of anti-Arian *trinitarian theology. He is much less at ease in *Ep.* 2-3, *Contra Eutychianam haeresim libri II,* a *monophysite treatise written ca. 512 in connection with the *Acacian *schism: his information is scanty and he confuses the contrasting *heresies of *Nestorius and *Eutyches. In *Ep.* 4, *De subitanea paenitentia,* he refutes, without naming him, a letter in which *Faustus of Riez had maintained that *penitence at the point of death was insufficient to make up for a whole life of sin.

Only three of his sermons remain, plus fragments: two deal with *rogations, a ceremony of *expiation recently introduced at Vienne which would spread throughout the West. Avitus, who was highly educated and had a very aristocratic conception of the literary vocation, seems, like *Caesarius, to have been unconcerned with communicating at a popular level: his preaching is almost as elaborate and refined as his letters, with no concern for accessibility. Avitus's literary vocation is most evident in his poetry: his epigrams are lost, but we have 5 books *De spiritualis historiae gestis,* and the poem *De virginitate,* all in hexameters, written—as the author makes known in his introductory letter—as befits a Christian poet, who must put factual truth before ornateness of form. The first of the two works is in the genre of biblical paraphrase and aims to make the sacred text more accessible to educated people who were accustomed to the affectation of classical poetry. It presents episodes from Gen and Ex: the creation, the first sin, the flood, the crossing of the Red Sea. Avitus displays a good capacity for description and all the stylistic and metrical skill learned from the excellent instruction he had received.

CPL 990-997; PL 59; MGH *AA*, 6,2; H. Deninger, *Alcimas Ecdicius Avitas, évêque de Vienne (460-526) et la destruction de l'arianisme en Occident*, Geneva 1890; H. Goelzer, *Le latin de S. Avite*, Paris 1909; A. Roncoroni, *L'epica biblica di Avito di Vienne*: VChr 9 (1972) 303-329; M. Simonetti, *Letteratura antimonofisita d'Occidente*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 522-532; G. Simonetti Abbolito, *Avito e Virgilio*: Orpheus 3 (1982) 49-72; S. Isetta, *Rassegna di studi avitani (1857-1982)*: Bollettino di Studi Latini 13 (1983) 59-73; P. Flury, *Juvencus und Alcimus Avitus*: Philologus 132 (1988) 286-296; BBKL I, 311; *Letters and Selected Prose*, eds. D.R. Shanzer - I. Wood, Liverpool 2002.

M. Simonetti

AXIOPOLIS (Hinog, Cernavoda, Romania). A *Roman, then Romano-*Byzantine, city in the for-

mer province of *Scythia Minor, situated on a small plain on the right bank of the Danube, ca. 3 km (2 mi) S of the head of the great Cernavoda railway bridge, opposite the isle of Hinog. Martyrologies record several *martyrs at Axiopolis, headed by *Cyril*, *Kyndeas* and *Dasius* (*Tasios*). This is confirmed by a Greek epitaph (first half of the 4th c.), discovered by chance in 1947, bearing these three names. It specifies that *Dasius was martyred at Axiopolis, from where his *relics were transported to Durostorum and from there to Ancona in *Italy, probably following the Avar and Slav invasions at the end of the 6th c. The epitaph of the *sarcophagus in Ancona cathedral, mentioning the "holy martyr Dasius brought from Dorostoron," confirms this date for the translation. Archaeological excavations begun in 1898–1899 led to the discovery, near the N door of the fortress of Axiopolis, of a cemeterial basilica; on its S side was a small rectangular cell, within which was found a gravestone bearing the name "Anthusa, daughter of the great *comes* Gibastes." The epigraph with the martyrs' names was found in 1947 in the ruins of the basilica. The 1899 excavations, almost at the center of the old city, uncovered a rectangular room (8 × 12 m) with a brick floor; its SE corner was a cruciform pool, 0.5 m deep. The room is thought to be the baptistery of a Christian church. Numerous ceramic objects (amphorae, lamps, lids) were also found during the 1898–1899 excavations, all marked with a *cross.

There is one discovery of particular importance among those which, during the last twenty years, have advanced the archaelogical panorama of ancient Axiopolis. While it is true that there is no lack of remains of the first Christian basilicas built in this important city of Scythia Minor—in which a bishop certainly resided after the 5th-c. reform that saw *Tomis (the provincial capital) elevated to the rank of metropolitan see—it is also true that what best expresses the approach to worship among the early faithful are the private burial places. In the context of these, a Christian spirituality developed that was perhaps deeper, more authentic and more immediate.

An example of these, probably a family tomb in the chamber style, is a long rectangle with an E-W orientation. The interior, with its unusual brick barrel vault, is plastered and painted with one coat of red and decorated by alternating crosses and trees (extremely stylized) of different sizes; on the W wall, a cross whose arms extend to the edges is framed by two trees, one on each side; on the N and S walls, three trees each; on the E wall, a cross and a tree on each side of the entrance. Painted in red at the entrance to the tomb are two Greek letters (O and Y), a cross and a tree. Immediately to the right of the entrance, a small tree in a red frame; to the left, a cross in a rectangular frame. Above is painted the Greek letter Θ, an abbreviation of Θ(εοῦ). The cross-tree combination could easily be a symbol of the Tree of Life.

Considering the number of burials in the monument and their composition (two men, two women and a child), it is very likely that this was a family tomb. *Iconographic and stylistic criteria allow it to be dated from the late 5th c. to the early 6th c.

Except for a wooden box and a knife, the funeral trousseau includes very personal objects: a small gold cross, mounted with rolled and welded gold leaves and with a stone set in the center, and two earrings, both simple circles, one large and one small. Jewelry of this kind was quite common throughout Scythia Minor, and exact parallels can be found in all the coastal cities. On the skeleton on the S side of the tomb was found a rectangular bronze buckle, also of a production and type common in the province.

The only possible dating for the tomb is the first half of the 6th c. The reuse of a limestone slab to close off the only entrance to the tomb—a slab that in all probability belonged originally to a presbytery—does not necessarily have to be linked to the destruction of a church (even if this link might be suggested by the Avar destruction of 587); at the present state of research, lacking precise and relevant local comparisons, it is not possible to better specify the reasons for this reuse.

Unfortunately the rapidity with which the excavation had to be carried out did not allow for the examination of other similar monuments in the area around the tomb. This type of monument, however, is widespread throughout Scythia Minor, with the only peculiarity being the vault in brick rather than entirely in ston. But even this has at least a comparison in the funeral complex of Galatz.

R. Netzhammer, *Die christlichen Altertümer der Dobrudscha*, Bucharest 1918; Em. Popescu, *Inscrip iile grecești și latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite în România*, Bucharest 1976; I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; Id., *Christian Art in Romania*, 1, Bucharest 1979; A. Suceveanu - I. Barnea, *Contributions à l'histoire des villes romaines de la Dobroudja*: Dacia n.s. 37 (1993) 159-179; BS 4,483f.; LTK³ 3,31f.; R. Pillinger, *Das Martyrium des Heiligen Dasius*, Vienna 1988; A. Rădulescu - V. Lungu, *Le christianisme en Scythie Mineure à la lumière des dernières découvertes archéologiques*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, 1984, III, 2561-2615; *Provincie Romane: Scythia Minor*, in EAA, Secondo Supplemento, 1994.

I. Barnea - A. Garrisi

B

BAALBEK ORACLE. The *Oracle of Baalbek* is a 6th-c. AD Greek oracular composition contained in a 12th-c. MS of Mt. Athos, part of the broad stream of the Sibylline tradition. The Oracle is a "rewriting" of an older oracle attributed to the *Tiburtine Sibyl, composed in the 4th c. AD and reaching us in *Latin translation. Its name derives from its probable authorship by an unknown author from the Syrian city of Baalbek—renamed Heliopolis after Macedonian colonists settled there (3rd c. BC)—seat of a famous sanctuary of the local Baal, identified with Zeus and later with Jupiter and thus known in the Greco-Roman world as Zeus/Jupiter Heliopolitanus. The Sibylline author seems to indicate the founding of the sanctuary in a passage mentioning the sacred buildings erected by "three sovereigns, Antiochus, Tiberius and Gaius" (Alexander 1967, 13, lin. 76-80). The oracle consists in the interpretation by the Sibyl of a dream of 100 Roman senators, as part of an exposition of the course of human history in the light of God's salvific action in Christ. The author freely elaborates his source's data, lengthening the sixty years after *Constantinople's founding it had predicted as the date of the end of the world, and inserts a whole range of post-4th-c. historical information. This shows how the Sibyl, by now for centuries transformed from a *pagan prophetess to an authoritative spokesperson of the revelation of the one God of the Jews and the Christians, was capable of adapting its message, rich in apocalyptic content, to changing historical situations.

P.J. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek: The Tiburtine Sibyl in Greek Dress*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies X, Washington, DC 1967; P.F. Beatrice, *Das Orakel von Baalbek und die sogenannte Sibyllentheosophie*, RQA 92 (1997) 177-189; I. Cervelli, *Questioni sibilline*: Studi Storici 4 (1993) 895-1001; Y. Hajjar, *Baalbek, grand centre religieux sous l'Empire suivi d'un appendice: Supplément II au corpus des documents iconographiques et épigraphiques héliopolitains*, in ANRW II, 18, 4, Berlin-New York 1990, 2458-2508; H.W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, New York 1988, It. tr. Genoa 1992; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *La Sibilla voce del dio per pagani, ebrei e cristiani: un modulo profetico al crocevia delle fedi*, in I. Chirassi Colombo - T. Seppilli (eds.), *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari. Mito Storia Tradizione*, Atti del Convegno Macerata-Norcia settembre 1994, Pisa-Rome 1999, 505-553.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

BABAI bar Nesibnaye the Less (d. 628/629). Biographical information on this monk is known only from a biography of the Berlin MS published by F. Nau and Seert's *Chronicle*. Combining these sources, we know that Babai was born in 563 to a Persian family that was exiled to *Nisibis by Shapur. He gave himself to worldly pleasures until he was 22, when (585) he did three years of spiritual exercises with *Abraham of Kaskar on Mt. *Izla. When Abraham died (588), Babai became a hermit in a cave near Ati in *Adiabene, receiving *Communion at the *monastery of Mar Ishozeka. His lengthy prayers foiled the attacks of *demons. Mar Abda and the future *catholicos Sabnis withdrew with him; at this time he healed bishop Jacob of Hodata. Urged by a revelation, he then returned to Mt. Izla and there built a monastery for over a thousand monks on the site of a ruined monastery founded by a certain Samuel. He is thought to have died at 75-and-a-half, in 628/629, although Seert's *Chronicle* tells of his last miracle, the prophecy of the sickness and death of Shiroè, one of the last of the *Sassanids, who died in 630—clearly the basis of Babai's reputation as a thaumaturge. We have several of his liturgical lauds and two sermons on *penance.

F. Nau, *Histoire d'Abraham de Kaskar et de Babai de Nisibe*: ROC 21 (1918) 161-168; A. Scher, *Chronique de Séert*, in PO 13, 4 (1918) 454-456; Baumstark 132; S.P. Brock, *Notulae Syriacae. Some miscellaneous identifications*: LM 108 (1995) 69-78; BBKL 20,83-85.

M. van Esbroeck

BABAI of Gbilta. A reformer of the sacred music of the Eastern church, Babai was originally from

Gbilta in the diocese of Tirhan. He founded numerous schools of sacred music in the dioceses of *Adiabene and Marga (24; 60 according to other sources), which he directed and visited annually from the oldest of the schools at Kephar Uzel. According to Thomas of Marga, he lived during the patriarchate of Salibazeka (714–728). Author of *mēmrē*, didactic writings and letters, in particular he left many poetic compositions for liturgical use, traces of which are still present in the *liturgy of the hours.

Baumstark, 212-213; BO III/1, 177-181; E.A.W. Budge, *Thomas of Marga*, *Book of Governors*, III, London 1893, 1-3.

K. den Biesen

BABAI the Great. *Hegumen (d. 628). Born at Beth 'Aynata in Beth Zabday, after the customary period at the theological school of *Nisibis, he entered the Great Convent of Mt. *Izla, founded by *Abraham of Kaskar. Returning to his own region, he there founded a *monastery and a school. Returning again to the Great Convent, he became its third hegumen (after Abraham and *Dadisho), during a difficult period in which, by will of the emperor, the *Persian church was without a *catholicos. After *Chosroes II's death (628) he was designated catholicos but refused the position and died shortly thereafter.

He was important for the Persian church at various levels. First, he affirmed *Nestorian *orthodoxy more explicitly than the hegumens who preceded him, so much so that it was officially sanctioned, in the formula of the two **hypostases* and a single **prosōpon,* by a meeting of bishops in 612; noteworthy in this regard is his polemic against *Henana, rector of the school of Nisibis, who seemed to have introduced some troubling novelties in the areas of scriptural *exegesis—abandoning *Theodore of Mopsuestia's literalism—and esp. *Christology, with the at least partial revision of the Christology of the two *hypostases* and a single *prosōpon*. Babai also strengthened order and discipline in the *monastic world, though not without harshness, to the point that some older monks abandoned the community of Mt. Izla as a result.

Abdisho of Nisibis in his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers* (ch. 66, in Assemani, *Biblioteca Orientalis*, III, I 88-97) attributes more than 80 works to Babai, the majority of which are lost. Noteworthy among those we possess are the commentary on the *Centuries* of *Evagrius of Pontus; some treatises on Christology (the *Book of the Union* and other writings); *hagiographical writings (esp. the *Acts of the Martyrdom of the Priest George,* a Persian who converted to Christianity and was martyred under Chosroes II in 615); and monastic rules.

General presentations: J. Labourt, *Christianisme perse*, 280-287; Duval 73, 135, 212, 213, 223; Baumstark 137, 139; Chabot 60-61; Ortiz de Urbina 139-141; P. Bettiolo: Patrologia V, 476-477, 480-481.

Editions and translations: Story of the martyr George: P. Bedjan, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha*, *de trois autres patriarches*, *d'un prêre et de deux laïques nestoriens*, Paris 1895, 416-571. Commentary on the *Centuries* of Evagrius: W. Frankenberg, *Euagrius Pontikus*: AKGWG n.s. 23/2 (1912) 8-471. The *Book of Union* and other treatises: CSCO 79-80, ed. A. Vaschalde, Louvain 1953. Rules: A. Vööbus, *Syriac and Arabic Documents Regarding Legislation Relative to Syrian Ascetism*, Stockholm 1960, 176-184.

Studies: L. Abramowski, *Die Christologie Babais des Grossen*, in *Symposium syriacum 1972* (OCA 197), Rome 1974, 219-245; Id., *Babai der Grosse: christologische Probleme und ihre Lösungen*: OCP 41 (1975) 289-343; G. Chediath, *The Christology of Mar Babai the Great* (Oriental Institute of Religious Studies 49), Kottayam 1982; M. Tamcke, *Der Katholikos-Patriarch Sabrîšô' I. (596-604) und das Mönchtum* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/302), Frankfurt–Bern–New York–Paris 1988; G. Chediath, *La contribution théologique de Mar Babai le Grand*: Istina 40 (1995) 83-94; P. Bruns, Finitum non capax infiniti: *ein antiochenisches Axiom in der Inkarnationslehre Babais des Grossen († nach 628)*: OC 83 (1999) 46-71; G.J. Reinink, *Babai the Great's Life of George and the Propagation of Doctrine in the Late Sasanian Empire*, in *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity*, *Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, ed. J.W. Drijvers - J.W. Watt (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 137), Leiden-Boston-Cologne 1999, 171-193; BBKL 1,316.

A. Camplani

BABYLAS of Antioch (d. 251). Martyr. According to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VI,29,4 and VI,39,4), Babylas should be listed in the series of the bishops of *Antioch of the 3rd c., between Zebennus (d. 240 c.) and *Fabius. He died during *Decius's persecution, in 251, probably on 24 January, the date he is commemorated in the 4th-c. Syrian calendar. The same source in Eusebius tells us that Babylas died in prison after confessing the faith; it is to this death in chains that *Severus of Antioch alludes in his homily honoring the martyr 24 January 513 (ed. Fr. Graffin, PO 38,2, 369-389). A century earlier, *John Chrysostom had claimed that Babylas was decapitated (PG 50, 527-534); he also attributes to Babylas the episode recounted by Eusebius (*HE* VI,24) of the bishop who demanded a public confession of the emperor Philip the Arab (244–249) before admitting him to the Easter vigil liturgy, placing this event at Antioch. Babylas was first buried in the Christian cemetery at Antioch, *extra portam Daphniticam,* but ca. 351 the Caesar Gallus had his body moved (the first official translation of relics of which we have record) to a

church built in the martyr's honor in the suburb of Daphnè, to suppress the cult of Apollo there. *Julian the Apostate (362) had Babylas's relics moved elsewhere; not long afterward, Bishop *Meletius (d. 381) had a new basilica built for them, where Meletius himself was also buried, as John Chrysostom tells us (PG 50, 515-520). Already Severus of Antioch, in the text cited, alludes to the three children said to have been martyred with Babylas and remembered in some calendars. An echo of this tradition is in *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Francorum* I,30) and in the Roman Martyrology on 24 January. In the Eastern church he is commemorated on 4 September. His remains were moved to Cremona in the Middle Ages.

BHG 889-893; PO 38, fasc. 2, 369-389; PG 50, 527-534; PG 50, 515-520; DHGE 6, 33; BS 2, 679-680; W. Eltester, *Die Kirchen Antiochias im IV. Jahrhundert*: ZNTW 36 (1937) 251-286; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945, 109-111; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947, 123ff.; J. Mécérian, *Expédition archéologique dans l'Antiochène occidentale*: Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph 40 (1964) 1-144; H. Crouzel, *Le christianisme de l'empereur Philippe l'Arabe*: Gregorianum 56 (1975) 545-550; J. Chrysostome, *Discours sur Babylas*, SC 362, Paris 1990; LTK³ 1, 1334.

J.-M. Sauget

BACCHYLLUS. Late 2nd-c. Bishop of *Corinth, and one of the most notable personalities of his time. In the *quartodeciman controversy he supported the Roman custom, sending a letter to Pope *Victor (196) that *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* V,23,4) says was written in his own name, but *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 44) says it was written in the name of all the bishops of *Achaia.

DHGE VI, 52; P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des IIᵉ et IIIᵉ siècles*, Paris 1961, 87-90.

E. Prinzivalli

BACHIARIUS (d. 425). 4th-5th-c. monk from *Gallaecia (Genn., *Vir. ill.* 24). Went to *Rome to defend himself against the accusation of *Priscillianism, expounding his theological position in the *Libellus de fide,* which was accepted. He returned to *Spain and died in 425 (Mundó, against Lapôtre and Duhr). His writings are the *De lapso* and the *Libellus de fide;* we have two drafts of the latter, a writing that exercised a great influence in the Middle Ages and was used by John of Fécamp (*Confessio fidei*). G. Morin also attributes two letters to him (RBen 40 [1928] 289-310), a thesis shared by Mundó, whereas Fischer is more reserved (*Verzeichnis*). Some effort has been made to identify Bachiarus with the *Peregrinus episcopus,* editor of the apostolic canons of Priscillian. The hypothesis appears difficult to sustain for D. de Bruyne, not impossible for A. Lambert. In the *Libellus* Bachiarus expounds the main truths of the faith; a highly learned man, he knew the Bible perfectly and overused *allegory. His taste for Orphism and astrology is troubling.

CPL 568-570; FL 20, 1237-1262 (*De lapso*); FL 20, 1019-1062 (*De fide*): ed. Madoz: RET 1 (1940-41) 457-488. The letters: ed. Morin: RBen 40 (1928) 289-310 - PLS I, 1035-1045, the first also in MGH Ep. 3, 714; A. Lapôtre, *La coena Cypriani et ses énigmes*: RecSR 3 (1912) 497-596; G. Morin, *Pages inédites de l'écrivain espagnol B.*: BALAC 4 (1914) 117-126; Id., *Pages inédites de deux Pseudo-Jérôme des environs de l'an 400*: *Deux lettres mystiques d'une ascète espagnole*: RBen 40 (1928) 289-310; D. de Bruyne, *Études sur les origines de la Vulgate en Espagne*: RBen 31 (1914/1919) 373-401; J. Duhr, *Le De fide de B.*: RHE 24 (1928) 5-40; 301-331; Id., *Aperçus sur l'Espagne chrétienne du IVᵉ siècle ou le De lapso de B.*, Louvain 1934; Id., DSp 1, 1187-1189; Id., *Une lettre de condoléance de B.*: RHE 47 (1952) 530-585 (*Ep. ad Tarasium*); A. Lambert: DHGE 6, 58-68 (excellent treatment); F. Cavallera, *Le De fide de B.*: BLE 39 (1938) 88-94; J. Madoz, *La nueva redacción del libellus de fide de B.*: EstEcl 17 (1943) 201-211; A. Mundó, *Prolegomena in B. editionem criticam*, Tesi Pont. Un. Greg. Rome 1950; Id., *Preparando la edición critica de B.*: Bracara Augusta 8 (1957) 88-97; Id, *Estudios sobre el De fide de B.*: StudMon 7 (1965) 247-303 (with bibl.); RHCE 1, 27-29; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, Oxford 1976; J.P. Bouhot, *La tradition manuscrite du De fide de Bachiarius*: REAug 25 (1979) 73-84; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique*, Paris 1991, I, 193-199; Domínguez del Val 1, 26-49.

A. Hamman

BAETICA. Province of Hispania created by Augustus (27 BC) and reorganized by *Diocletian (ca. AD 297). The following episcopal sees are documented in the 4th and early 5th c., confirmed by the presence of their bishops at councils: Corduba (Cordoba), Hispalis (Seville, metropolitan see), Illiberis (Granada), Ipagrum (Aguilar de la Frontera? Cordoba), Malaca (Málaga), Urci (near Pechina? Almería) and Tucci (Martos, Jaén). Evidence of other possible episcopal sees comes from the presence at councils of presbyters, sometimes recorded as representing their bishops: Acinipo (Ronda la Vieja, Málaga), Aiune (Arjona? Jaén), Alaro (Iluro? Alora, Málaga), Astigi (Ecija, Seville), Ategua (near Espejo, Cordoba), Carbula (Almodóvar del Río? Cordoba), Drona (Brona? Cadiz), Espora foederatorum (Montoro, Cordoba), Igabrum (Cabra, Cordoba), Iliturgi (near Mengibar? Jaén), Ossigi Latonium (Mancha Real? Jaén), Segaluinia (Selambinia? Salobregna, Granada), Singili Barba (near Antequera? Málaga), Solia (Alcaracejos? Cordoba), Ulia (Montemayor, Cordoba) and Urso

(Osuna, Seville). To these must be added the sees of Elipa (Niebla, Huelva) and Italica (Santiponce, Seville), known from 589, and that of Asido Caesarina (Medina Sidonia, Cadiz), first mentioned in 619. Baetica had a great *monastic tradition, documented by the coenobia of Cadiz (Gades; Nono and Benedicta, founded by Fruttuoso ca. 650), Igabrum, Illiberis, Italica and Asido Caesarina.

The Councils of *Seville I (590) and Seville II (619) met at Baetica. Meriting special mention is the so-called Council of *Elvira, known from the Hispanic Canonical Collection (7th c.) and the *Epitome Hispanica* (6th/7th c.). The traditional chronology dates it 300/305, although after Meigne's studies, some scholars are inclined to consider it a canonical collection. The author divided the 81 canons of the Hispanic recension into three groups: A (can. 1-21); B (63-75); C (the remainder). The similarity of these acts with the canons of other councils, the disordered presentation of the canons beginning from numbers 20/21 and their unusual number (81) lead to the rejection of the notion of a unitary redaction of this text. Meigne does not rule out the possibility that a council was celebrated in Illiberis and that the 19 bishops and 24 presbyters mentioned at the beginning of the acts existed at the time. What can be verified of the chronology of these 43 names strongly suggests that the council was held ca. the 3rd decade of the 4th c. The most important religious personages of this province were *Ossius of Cordoba (1st half 4th c.); Gregory of Illiberis (2nd half 4th c.); *Leander of Seville (2nd half 6th c.); *Severus of Málaga (last quarter 6th c.) and *Isidore of Seville (1st half 7th c.).

Early Christian *sarcophagi made at Rome (4th c.) are very interesting archaeologically. Some are from the 1st half of the 4th c., such as the sarcophagi of Cordoba, Martos (Jaén), Castillo de Locubín (Jaén), Berja (Almería), Italica and Los Palacios (Seville); the rest, those of Cadiz and Jerez de la Frontera (Cadiz), are from the 2nd half of the 4th c.; later, locally made sarcophagi are from Alcaudete (Jaén), Écija and La Peñuela (Huelva). Early Christian basilicas have been found at Gerena (Seville), three-aisled with a tripartite presbytery, with a late 4th-c. narthex and baptistery; La Vega del Mar (Málaga), with two apses, one to the E and one to the W, two entrances at the N and S, and a tripartite end (like the following), and El Germo (Cordoba), probably a private church, with two apses and an apsidal room connected to the baptistery. From the *Visigoth period are the churches of Alcalá de los Gazules (Cadiz), the complex of the Villa de la Dehesa de la Cocosa (Badajoz), Burguillos (Seville), Alcaracejos (Cordoba) and Valdecebadar (Badajoz). The existence of other churches is indicated by the presence of baptismal pools (Alcáceres Reales of Seville or El Guijo, Cordoba) and epigraphical evidence (Vives, num. 301, 303-310, 313, 316, 322-326, 328, 333-335, 338-339, 354, 360, 561, 569): Usagre (Badajoz), Cabra, Málaga and Niebla, and in the provinces of Seville (Jerez de los Caballeros, Facialcázar, Dos Hermanas, Ginés, La Morera, Italica and Carmona), Granada (Granada and Loja), Cadiz (Medina Sidonia, Vejer de la Frontera, Zahara and Bornos) and Jaén (Alcalá la Real, Martos and Porcuna). Of note are inscriptions regarding the deposition of Bishop Pimenius of Ecija's relics (Vives, 304-306, 309). The sources also attest the existence of churches, such as the small basilica dedicated to Felix at Cordoba or the Church of *Jerusalem at Seville.

J. Vives - T. Marín, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos*, Madrid 1963; var. aus., *Actas I reunión Nacional de Arqueología paleocristiana hispánica*, Vitoria 1967; P. de Palol, *Arte hispánico de la época visigoda*, Barcelona 1966; Id., *Demografía y arqueología de los siglos IV-VIII*: BSEAA (1966) 5-66; Id., *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; Id., *Arqueología cristiana hispánica de tiempos romanos y visigodos*: RAC, Miscell. Josi, II (1967) 177-232; J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*, Barcelona 21969; D. Iturgaiz, *Baptisterios paleocristianos de Hispania*, Barcelona 1970; P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana romana y visigoda*: DHEE, I (1972) 96-113; A. Recio, *Tapas romanas de sarcófagos paleocristianos en Hispania*: Atti VIII Congr. Int. Arch. Crist. Vatican City-Barcelona 1972, 409-430; A. Recio, *Fragmentos de sarcofagos romano-cristianos en Andalucía*: Antonianum 48 (1973) 357-359; M. Sotomayor, *Datos históricos sobre sarcófagos romano-cristianos de España*, Granada 1973; L.A. García Moreno, *Prosopografía del reino visigodo de Toledo*, Salamanca 1974; R. Puertas, *Iglesias hispánicas (s. IV al VIII). Testimonios literarios*, Madrid 1975; M. Meigne, *Concile ou collection d'Elvire?*: RHE 70 (1975) 361-387; A. Recio, *Baetica paleocristiana y visigoda*: RivAC 54 (1978) 23-82; H. Schlunk - Th. Hauschild, *Hispania Antiqua. Die Denkmäler der frühchristlichen und westgotischen Zeit*, Mainz am Rhein 1979; M. Sotomayor, *Historia de la Iglesia en España, I. La Iglesia en la España romana y visigoda* (dir. García Villoslada), Madrid 1979; var. aus., *Actes II reunió d'Arqueologia paleocristiana hispànica*, Barcelona 1982; L.A. García Moreno, *Historia de España visigoda*, Madrid 1989; J.L. Ramírez, *La inscripción de Torrebaja (Pueblo Nuevo del Guadiana, Badajoz), original modelo de la epigrafía cristiana*: Antigüedad y Cristianismo 8 (1991) 89-98; F. Salvador, *Aspectos sociales en las reglas monásticas de la Bética*: La sociedad de la Bética. Contribuciones para su estudio, Granada 1994, 495-515; F.J. García de Castro, *Sociedad y poblamiento en la Hispania del siglo IV d.C.*, Valladolid 1995; C. Godoy, *Arqueología y liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII)*, Barcelona 1995; E. Gozalbes, *Aspectos de la crisis del Bajo Imperio romano en la comarca del Campo de Gibraltar*: III Jornadas de Historia del Campo de Gibraltar (La Línea de la Concepción 1994), Almoraima 13 (1995) 109-116; F.J. García de Castro, *La sociedad bética del siglo IV d.C. a través de las fuentes epigráficas*: Mainake 17-18 (1995-1996) 193-205; F. Salvador, *Prosopografía de Hispania Meridional, III: Antigüedad Tardía (300-711)*, Granada 1998; var. aus., *Acta Antiqua Complutensia, I: Complutum y las ciudades hispanas en la Antigüedad Tardía* (eds. L.A. García Moreno - S. Rascón), Alcalá de Henares 1999;

H. Gimeno - M. Miró, *Carmina para Honorato, obispo de Hispalis: La polémica inscripción del sucesor de San Isidoro*: AEA 72 (1999) 241-257; F. Salvador - A. Jesús, *Propuesta de topografía monástica meridional en época hispano-visigoda*: Florentia Iliberritana 12 (2001) 351-363; J. Vilella, *Las iglesias y las cristiandades hispanas: panorama prosopográfico*, in *La Hispania del siglo IV. Administración, economía, sociedad, cristianización*, ed. R. Teja, Bari 2002, 117-159; J. Vilella - P.E. Barreda, *Los cánones de la Hispana atribuidos a un concilio iliberritano: estudio filológico*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale. Secoli III-V* (SEA 78), Rome 2002, 545-579.

J.A. Jiménez

BALAAM (iconography). Mesopotamian seer (Num 22–24) charged by King Balak of Moab with cursing the Hebrews for camping on his lands. When the donkey carrying him refused to stay on the road, the seer, instead of cursing, blessed Israel three times. The blessing has been interpreted by Christians as a prophecy of Christ's birth. Balaam appeared quite early in Roman *cemeteries, characterized by the presence of a star (see Num 24:17). The oldest depiction of Balaam may reflect this prophecy: Balaam (if it is actually him depicted in the scene) points to a star (cemetery of Priscilla, next to *Mary with the Child, first decades 3rd c.; Museo Pio Crist. Vat., epitaph of Severa, 3rd c., associated with the scene of the *magi; cemetery of Ss. Pietro e Marcellino, 4th c.; cemetery of via D. Compagni, mid-4th c.; cemetery of Ciriaca, 2nd half 4th c., where a Christogram replaces the star). Regarding funerary reliefs, Kirschbaum cites numerous other representations in which the image of the prophet may be recognizable together with other persons. From the 4th c. the scene also spread in which Balaam beats the donkey while the angel of the Lord appears to the donkey, stopping it with a bloody sword, as in Num 22:21-23: this episode appears on a *sarcophagus of the cemetery of S. Sebastiano (early 4th c.) and in the scenes painted in cubicles B and F of the cemetery of via D. Compagni (2nd quarter 4th c.).

E. Kirschbaum: EC 2, 717ff.; H. Aurenhammer: LCIK I, 276-280; J.J. Timmers: LCI I, 239; Wp 184ff.; Wa III, 49; L. de Bruyne, *Sarcofago cristiano con nuovi temi iconografici scoperto a S. Sebastiano sulla via Appia*: RivAC 16 (1939) 247-270; E. Kirschbaum, *Der Prophet Balaam und die Anbetung der Weisen*: RQA 49 (1954) 129-171; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la Via Latina*, Rome 1990; F. Bisconti, *Il cubicolo dell'Esodo nel cimitero dei Giordani. Ultime manifestazioni pittoriche nelle catacombe romane*, in *Domum Tua Dilexi*, Misc. A. Nestori, Vatican City 1998, 81-108; TIP 132-134.

G. Santagata

BALAI. Syrian poet (1st half 5th c.). We know nothing of his life, except that he was probably *chorbishop in the region of *Aleppo. The only chronological point of reference is provided by five hymns written in honor of a bishop Acacius, usually identified with the homonymous bishop of Aleppo (Beroea, today Aleppo), died c. 432. Balai also composed a long series of poems in pentasyllabic verse, many of which are included in the liturgical books of the *Jacobite and *Maronite churches, and an important poem for the dedication of the Church of Qenneshrin (Chalcis)—one of the few texts of primitive *Syriac literature attesting the conception of an invisible church, hidden in the hearts of believers (Murray); in it the angelic liturgy of Is 6 is explicitly linked to the Christian *liturgy.

General presentations: Duval 335; Baumstark 61-63; Chabot 35; Ortiz de Urbina 91-93; P. Bettiolo: Patrologia V, 457-458.

Transmission of the poetic work, edition, translations and studies: M. Zetterstéen, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der religiösen Dichtung Balai's*, Leipzig 1902; J.J. Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae episcopi Edesseni, Balaei, aliorumque opera selecta*, Oxonii 1865, 251-336. On the poem for the dedication of the Church of Qenneshrin, see R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition*, Cambridge 1975, 262-274; R. Graffin, *Poème de Mar Balaï pour la dédicace de l'Église de Qennešrin*: PdO 10 (1981/1982) 103-121; K. McVey, *The Soghita on the Church of Edessa in the Context of Other Early Greek and Syriac Hymns for the Consecration of Church Buildings:* Aram 5 (1993) 329-370; E. Vergani, *Isaia 6 nella letteratura siriaca. Due autori del V secolo: Balai e Giovanni il Solitario*: Annali di Scienze Religiose 7 (2002) 169-192.

A. Camplani

BALEARI. Archipelago in the W Mediterranean near the Iberian Peninsula, of which the Late Antique sources cite Maiorica (Majorca), Minorica (Minorca), Ebusus (Ibiza) and Capria (Cabrera). Conquered by the *Romans (123 BC), they became part of Tarraconensis, then Carthaginiensis (ca. AD 297); ca. 385 the Balearic province was created. Sacked by Gunderic's *Vandals (Ydatius, *Chron. ad. a.* 425; Isidorus Hispal., *Hist. Wand.* 73), after *Valentinian III's death (455) the Baleari were integrated into the *Vandal province of Sardinia (Victor. Vit., *Hist. Pers.* 1, 13), and a Vandal military leader replaced the *praeses insularum Balearum* (*Notit. Dign.*, *Occ.* I, 105; XXI, 15). Apollinarius conquered it for the *Byzantines (534) and was its governor (Procopius Caes., *De bello Vand.* 4,5,7-9). They were part of *Mauretania II (Georgius Cypr., *Descr. orbis Rom.* 673-674) until the arrival of the Muslims (707).

Although the tradition assumed that Paul's planned missionary trip to Hispania (Rom 15:24, 28) actually occurred (Jerome, *Ep.* 65,12; 71, 1; 120,9; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Interpr. Epist. II ad Tim.* 4,17),

the presence of Christianity is only attested with certainty by the letter of Bishop Severus (*Ep. De conu. Iud.;* datable to early 418) and Consentius's critical note (*Ep.* 12*, 4; 419/420). Severus tells us of his recent consecration as bishop of Iamona (Ciudadela), the arrival at Mahón of the relics of St. Stephen and their deposition in the local church, the large-scale conversion to Christianity of the influential Jewish community, and the burning down of the synagogue by the Christians and its replacement with a church which the Jews themselves then occupied. Based on archaeological evidence which dates the initial phases of the known Christian basilicas, such as Son Bou, to the 4th c., the most splendid period was the 5th-6th c.

Known in the *Vandal period are the titularies—forced by the Vandal king *Huneric to be present at the dispute with the *Arian bishops at *Carthage (1 February 484; *Not. Prou. et ciu. Afric., Sard.* 4)—of three episcopal sees, probably the only ones: Helias of Maiorica; Macarius of Minorica and Opilio of Ebusus. Known from the *Byzantine period are the letter of bishop *Licinianus of Carthago Nova (Cartagena) to his colleague Vincent of Ebusus, correcting him for accepting a judaizing text as canonical (Licinianus Carthag., *Ep.* 3); *Victor of Tunnuna's exile in the Baleari (Victor Tunn., *Chron., ad. a.* 555,2); and the intervention of *Gregory the Great (603) to resolve the problems of the *monastic community—probably located on the reef of Es Clot des Guix on the island of Capria (Gregory the Great, *Reg.* 13; *Ep.* 47). Possibly from the same period is the inscription of the presbyter Bas[sus] (Sa Carrotja), identified by some with a homonymous Roman of the *titulus sancti Pudentis,* still living in 595. In the 5th-7th c. the Balearian church does not seem to have had contact with the *Visigothic church, since it was present at no peninsular council.

The Christian archaeology of the Baleari has been much studied following the chance finding (1883) of the basilica of Cas Frares (Llucmajor, Maiorca). The four Majorcan architectural complexes are particularly noteworthy: Son Peretò and Sa Carrotja (Manacor), Son Fadrinet (Campos) and Cas Frares (Llucmajor); and the five Minorcan: Es Formàs de Torelló (Mahón), S. Bou (Alaior), Es Cap des Port (Es Mercadal), Illeta del Rei and Illeta d'En Colom (yet to be studied). To these are added the Christian buildings documented by the sources at Mahón (418): a church *extramuros* containing the relics of Stephen, the church *intramuros* built by the Jews on the cite of their earlier synagogue, and perhaps the structures of a small monastic community (Severus Minor., *Ep. de conu. Iud.* 20,4; 4,2; 12,2-3, 20,4).

These complexes knew their maximum splendor in the 5th-6th c. and clearly show North African influence, as is evident from the planimetric design of the buildings and from the arrangement of the space. All have baptisteries except Cas Frares; that of Son Peretó has two contiguous pools. The buildings are for the most part three-aisled, some on a rectangular plan (Cas Frares and Sa Carrotja), or with attached rooms (Son Peretó, Son Bou, Es Formás de Torelló, Illeta de Rei); others very probably had a counter-choir (Son Peretó, Cas Frares and Es Cap des Port). The complex of Es Cap des Port stands out for the architectural complexity of its plan. There are less explicit remains of these complexes as well, for the most part architectural material, movable art for use in *liturgy, and in urban and rural necropolises—Sanisera (Sanitja), the forum of Pollentia (Alcúdia), Hort d'Es Palmer (Ibiza), carrer Aragó (Ibiza), etc.—which point to the existence of associated basilicas. Until now no church has been discovered at Ibiza, but other evidence has come to light, such as the gold ring of Vifredus, decorated with a cross (Ibiza, 7th c.).

Also significant are the funerary inscriptions of the first Balearian Christians known by name: Honoria (Sa Carrotja, late 5th c.), Arguta (Pollentia, 5th/6th c.), and Marcus and Baleria (Son Peretó, mid-5th c.). Christian mosaic decoration—sparse on the peninsula and completely lacking at Sa Carrotja (only with mosaic *laudae*), Son Bou and Es Cap des Port—is a characteristic element of the Balearian complexes.

A. Lambert, *Baléares*: DHGE VI, Paris 1932, 364-379; È. Vanderlinden, *Reuelatio Sancti Stephani*: REB 4 (1946) 178-217; G. Seguí Vidal, *La basílica descubierta en Son Bou y los orígenes del cristianismo en Menorca*: Studi sulla church antica and sull'umanesimo, Rome 1954, 79-92.; P. de Palol, *Basílicas paleocristianas en la isla de Menorca*: Festschrift Friedrich Gerke, Baden-Baden 1962, 39-53; J. Camps Coll, *Primeros hallazgos arqueológicos en las islas de Cabrera y Conejera*: VII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología, Saragossa 1962, 188-190; P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana: siglos IV-VI*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; Id., *Arte paleocristiano en España*, Barcelona 1968; P. de Palol - G. Rosselló - Bordoy - A. Alomar - J. Camps, *Notas sobre las basílicas de Manacor, en Mallorca*, Valladolid 1968; J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*, Barcelona 1969; C. Veny, *La cristianització de les Balears*: Randa 5 (1977) 43-51; E. Demougeot, *L'évêque Sévère et les juifs de Minorque au Ve siècle*: Majorque, Languedoc et Roussillon, Actes du LIII Congrès de la Fédération Historique de Languedoc Méditerranéen et du Roussillon, Montpellier 1982, 13-34; E.D. Hunt, *St. Stephen in Minorca: An Episode in Jewish-Christian Relations in the Early 5th Century AD*: JTS 33 (1982) 106-123; J. Vilella, *Relacions comercials de les Balears des del baix imperi fins als àrabs*: Les Illes Balears en temps cristians fins als àrabs, Ciudadela 1988, 51-58; R. Zucca, *Insulae Baliares. Le isole Baleari sotto il dominio romano*, Rome 1998; J. Amengual, *Els orígens del cristianisme a les Balears*, I-II, Palma

de Mallorca 1991-1992; C. Ginzburg, *La conversione degli ebrei di Minorca (417/418)*: Quaderni Storici 27 (1992) 277-289; J. Amengual, *Vestigis d'edilícia a les cartes de Consenci i Sever*: III Reunión de Arqueología Cristiana Hispánica, Barcelona 1994, 489-497; N. Duval, *La place des églises des Baléares dans l'archéologie chrétienne de la Méditerranée occidentale*: III Reunión de Arqueología Cristiana Hispánica, Barcelona 1994, 203-211; J.C. de Nicolás i Mascaró, *Sigillates paleocristianes ataronjades i grises a l'Illa de Menorca (Balears)*: III Reunión de Arqueología Cristiana Hispánica, Barcelona 1994, 311-320 (esp. 320); C. Godoy, *Arqueología y liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII)*, Barcelona 1995; B. Ferrer, *Jueus i cristians a* Hispania *durant l'Antiguitat Tardana (417/418-654): aproximació als motius del conflicte*: AIEG 38 (1996-1997) 1245-1264 [= Hispània i Roma: d'August a Carlemany. Congrés d'Homenatge al Dr. Pere de Palol, III]; M. Orfila - F. Tuset - T. Ulbert, *Informe preliminar de los trabajos en el conjunto paleocristiano de Son Fadrinet (Campos, Mallorca)*: V Reunión de Arqueología Cristiana Hispánica, Barcelona 2000, 237-243; J. Vilella, *Las relaciones eclesiásticas de Hispania con África en época vándala (a. 429-533)*: Augustinianum 42 (2002) 445-468.

C. Buenacasa - J. Sales

BAPTISM

I. Baptism in the Fathers - II. Iconography - III. Baptismal controversy.

I. Baptism in the Fathers. Baptism, the act of immersing oneself or being immersed in water, is not a Christian creation. It was practiced by numerous sects in the time of Jesus, and by the Jews for admitting proselytes. By metonymy, the word signified the whole sacramental procedure by which the *catechumen broke with sin and the seductions of the devil, entered a new relationship, through faith, with the triune God and was joined to the people of the new covenant. We find the first specific information in Acts 8:37, then in **Didache* 7, which already adapts to different situations, and in *Justin Martyr (*1 Apol.* 61); it is the first ritual in the **Apostolic Tradition* 21, attested by the Verona *palimpsest. The first Fathers (*Irenaeus, *Origen) speak more of *theology than *liturgy. *Tertullian's *De baptismo* is the first complete treatise, an echo of the baptismal *catechesis.

Other than the common biblical texts (Ex 14:15-31; Mt 3:13-17; Lk 3:21-22; Mk 1:4, 9-11; Jn 1:31-34; 1 Cor 10:1-2; 1 Pet 3:21), it can be easily shown that the Fathers more commonly used Pauline baptismal theology (Rom 6:2-6; 1 Cor 12:12-13; Gal 3:27; Col 2:11-13; Tit 3:5-7). There is a strongly Johannine line of interpretation (Jn 3:18), however, represented by the churches of *Armenia and *Syria but also by other groups such as the *gnostics.

The baptismal liturgy was well-fixed by the 4th c. but with some variation regarding the day on which it was celebrated. Most of the Fathers give us catecheses at once doctrinal and liturgical (*Cyril of Jerusalem, *John Chrysostom, *Ambrose, *Augustine, *Theodore of Mopsuestia), allowing us to describe its development and clarify what is common and what is peculiar to the various rites and liturgical milieus in the patristic golden age. In the first place, baptism is not a magical act: the condition of its efficacy is faith. Consequently, its administration begins with the renunciation of the devil and confession of the Christian faith. The renunciation is done facing west, the region of darkness; Cyril begins his *mystagogical homilies with it (I, 9). The renunciation of the *pompa diaboli,* sometimes spitting on the ground, is done by responding to three questions (evil, seduction, works: Tertullian). The confession of faith is made with hands outstretched, facing east; it is attested by Cyril and by the *Apos. Con.* VII, 41. The threefold *trinitarian confession of the *Trad. ap.* 35 is not attested by the Latin version, but it seems to have mirrored the Eastern custom; the use of the first-person singular stresses the individuality of the practice. In *Africa in Augustine's time, the two acts seem to have been carried out in the baptismal water. In the East, Cyril and Theodore attest a prebaptismal anointing of the whole body with oil. (The ancients covered themselves with oil before bathing, to protect the body.) The oil was blessed by the bishop or priest (*Apos. Con.* VII, 42), for remission of sins and preparation for baptism. Ambrose also speaks of a rite of anointing, of the *mysterium apertionis* of *Ephphetha,* celebrated by the bishop on Holy Saturday. The anointing was to strengthen the candidate in his final battle with the Adversary and hence had exorcistic value (Cyril, *Cat.* 20,3). It should be noted that the Syrian church knew no postbaptismal anointing before the 5th c.

As for the rite itself, to judge from Western baptisteries and from *iconography, the baptized entered the pool up to his or her waist and either received a jet of water or the celebrant poured water on him. Baptism by infusion (pouring) was already attested by *Did.* 7,1. The ternary rite is meant to be a confession of the Trinity (Tertullian, *Hippolytus). Theodore (*Hom. cath.* 14,16) reports the impersonal formula: "NN is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." John Chrysostom (*Catech. bapt.* 2,26) and the later Syrian rituals say the same. This detail of the rite shows that in Syria the accent was on the primary role played by Christ in baptism: it is death and resurrection, and thus a participation in the whole paschal mystery, from the passion to the resurrection. It is moreover a new exodus, a crossing of the Red Sea and the Jordan and entry into the promised land. For Cyril, the

saving water is both a tomb and the maternal womb (*Cat.* 20,4). The fecundity of the waters recalls the maternity of the church, often evoked in inscriptions in baptisteries and in the baptismal exhortations of *Zeno of Verona. The church, the new Eve, becomes the mother of the living. The *epiclesis of the bishop makes the Spirit descend into the waters and brings about new birth in the Spirit, an extension of Mary's virginal motherhood (Didymus, *Trin.*11,13); with this the water acquires its virtue, at once purificatory and sanctificatory. Tertullian distinguishes three rites: anointing, signing of a cross on the forehead, and laying on of a hand or hands (Tertullian, *Bapt.* 1). For Tertullian, Hippolytus and Augustine the anointing is part of the baptismal ritual and expressed the admission of the baptized into the priestly, royal and prophetic people. The Latin texts do not allow us to find the origin of *confirmation in baptism. *Sphragis,* or *consignatio*, the imposition of the sign of the cross on the forehead, is of apostolic origin according to *Basil of Caesarea (*De Sp. Sancto* 27,66); there is much variation in the rite. Theodore knows two *consignationes:* one before and one after the baptism, but he does not mention salt or perfumed oil (*Hom.* 14,27). For Ambrose and Augustine the *consignatio* seems to take place between the anointing and the imposition of the hand. The problem remains of the *chrismatio,* or anointing with holy oil, in the name of the Spirit or of the Trinity (Cyril, *Cat.* 21,3; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Catech. bapt.* 3,8), which Ambrose mentions after "the bath of water in the Spirit." From the 4th c. in the East the *chrismatio* with *salt, blessed by the bishop, with the formula "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit" is meant to signify the gift of the Spirit (Cyril, *Cat.* 21; Serapion, *Euch.* 25; *Const. Ap.* VII,22,2). After the anointing, the neophyte puts on a white tunic, which seems to have still been unknown to Hippolytus and which became general practice in both East and West during the 4th c. (Cyril, *Cat.* 22,8); the garment symbolizes purity of heart and the incorruptibility of the body. The Fathers saw in it the recovery of the integrity of Eden (Ambrose, *Gregory of Nyssa), likeness with the transfigured Christ and an *eschatological sign (Theodore, *Hom. catech.* 14,26). In the 5th c. the West added *light to these rites (ps.-Ambrose, *De lapsu virg. cons.* 5); the East knows a *crown, perhaps Jewish Christian in origin (*Odes of Sol.* 7 and 9).

P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Église*, Uppsala 1942; J. Daniélou, *Traversée de la mer Rouge et baptême aux premiers siècles*: RecSR 33 (1946) 402-430; O. Cullmann, *Le baptême des enfants et la doctrine biblique du baptême*, Neuchâtel 1948; W.M. Bedard, *The Symbolism of the Baptismal Font*, Washington, DC 1951; R. Roques, *Le sens du baptême selon le Pseudo-Denys*: Irénikon 31 (1958) 427-449; A. Stenzel, *Die Taufe*, Innsbruck 1958 (It. tr. Alba 1962); L. Villette, *Foi et sacrement, I. Du Nouveau Testament à saint Augustin*, Paris 1958; J.Ch. Didier, *Le baptême des enfants dans la tradition de l'Église*, Tournai 1959; C.I.K. Story, *Justin's Apology I. 62-64: Its Importance for the Author's Treatment of Christian Baptism*: VChr 16 (1962) 172-178; A. Hamman, *L'initiation chrétienne*, Paris 1963 (texts); V. Grossi, *Battesimo dei bambini e teologia*: Augustinianum 7 (1967) 323-337; J. Jeremias, *Le baptême des enfants dans les quatre premiers siècles*, Lyon 1967; E. Koslic, *El acontecimiento salvífico del bautismo según Tertuliano*, Vitoria 1967; A. Hamman, *Le baptême et la confirmation*, Paris 1969 (bibl.; Sp. tr. Barcelona [1]1970, [2]1977, [3]1982); P.A. Gramaglia, *Il Battesimo dei bambini nei primi quattro secoli*, Brescia 1973; G. Venturi, *Problemi dell'iniziazione cristiana. Nota bibliografica*: Ephem Liturg 88 (1974) 241-270 (ample bibl. survey); H.M. Riley, *Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of J., J. Chrysostom, Theodore of M. and Ambrose of M.*, Washington, DC 1974; G.W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, London [2]1976 (orig. ed. London 1956); R. de Latte, *Saint Augustin et le baptême. Étude liturgico-historique du rituel baptismal des enfants chez saint Augustin*: Questions liturgiques 57 (1976) 41-55; G. Kretschmar, *Nouvelles recherches sur l'initiation chrétienne*: La MaisonD. 132 (1977) 7-32; E. Nagel, *Kindertaufe und Taufaufschub*, Frankfurt 1980; B. Neunheuser, *Taufe und Firmung*, Freiburg 1983 (Fr., Eng. and Sp. tr.); A. Houssiau, *Le baptême selon Irénée de Lyon*: EThL 60 (1984) 45-59; C. Nardi, *Il battesimo in Clemente Alessandrino*, Rome 1984; W.H. Alla, *Le baptême des enfants dans la tradition de l'Église copte d'Alexandrie*, Fribourg 1985; J.-P. Longeat, *Les rites du baptême dans les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*: Questions liturgiques 66 (1985) 193-202; D.F. Wright, *The Origins of Infant Baptism—Child Believers' Baptism?*: Scottish Journal of Theology 40 (1987) 1-23; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du II^{e} au VI^{e} siècle*, Spoleto 1988; Ch. Munier, *Rites d'onction, Baptême chrétien et Baptême de Jésus*: RSR 64 (1990) 217-234; E.R. Tura, *Il battesimo sacramento pasquale in S. Cirillo di Gerusalemme*, Rome 1990; K. McDonnell - G.T. Montagne, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, Collegeville 1991, 83-333; J.-C. Larchet, *Le baptême selon saint Maxime le Confesseur*: RSR 65 (1991) 51-70; T.M. Finn, *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate, I. Italy, North Africa, and Egypt, II. West and East Syria*, Collegeville 1992 (texts); J.-P. Cattenoz, *Le baptême, mystère nuptial: théologie de Jean Chrysostome*, Venasque 1993; P. Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200–c. 1150*, Cambridge 1993, 9-129; V. Grossi, *La catechesi battesimale agli inizi del V secolo*, Rome 1993; A. Benoît, *Le baptême dans l'église ancienne (I^{er}-III^{e} siècles)*, Bern 1994; A. Hamman, *Le baptême d'après les Péres*, Paris 1995 (texts; orig. ed. 1962); M. Modemann, *Die Taufe in den Predigten des hl. Maximus v. Turin*, Frankfurt 1995; C. Aubin, *Les enjeux christologiques de la date du baptême*: La MaisonD. 210 (1997) 67-96; L. Hartman, *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus: Baptism in the Early Church*, Edinburgh 1997; D.A. Smith, *Irenaeus and the Baptism of Jesus*: ThS 58 (1997) 618-642; W. Harmless, *Bautismo*, in A. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Diccionario de San Agustín*, Burgos 2001, 161-172 (orig. ed. *Augustine through the Ages*, Grand Rapids 1999, 84-91).

A. Hamman - M. Flores Colín

II. Iconography.

1. The earliest depictions of baptism. Depictions of

baptism belong to the earliest motifs of early Christian art and indeed appear with greater frequency precisely at the beginning. The Roman catacombs preserve baptismal scenes in cubicles A 2 (WK 39), A 3 (WK 27, 3) and perhaps also A 5 (H.L. Hempel, *Die Bedeutung des Alten Testamentes für die Programme der frühchristlichen Malerei* [diss.], Mainz 1956, 33) of the so-called crypts of the Sacraments in St. Callisto; on the ceilings of cubicles III (WK 73) and 54 (J. Wilpert, *Ein Cyclus christologischer Gemälde aus der Katakombe der Heiligen Petrus u. Marcellinus*, Freiburg i. Br. 1891), in rooms A (pl. I and III; WK 57; 58,1), If (RivAC 44 [1968] 61; fig. 26), and in the crypt of the teaching Christ (RivAC 9 [1932] 29ff.; fig. 8) of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus; in arcosolia 42 and 77 of *Domitilla (Fausone 97-105); perhaps also in the "Greek" chapel of Priscilla (Hempel 166). Also the scene in arcosolium 3 of St. Hermes (*Basilissa*), until now interpreted as the healing of the possessed man, probably depicts the baptism of a catechumen, and a scene in the catacomb of *Ponziano* the baptism of Christ (Fausone 126-39). In the 4th c. baptismal scenes became increasingly rare and by the end of the c. completely disappeared from the figurative plans of catacomb painting.

The same evolution can be seen in *sarcophagus reliefs: in the earliest ones, depictions of baptism are quite frequent. Noteworthy are the sarcophagi of Via della Lungara (Rep 777), St. Maria Antiqua (Rep 747) and—despite some doubt—Le Mas d'Aire (H. Kaiser-Minn, *Die Erschaffung des Menschen auf den Spätantiken Monumenten des 3. u. 4. Jh.* = JbAC Erg.Bd. 6, Münster 1981, 29), and the sarcophagus fragments of the Museo Pio Cristiano (Rep. 150) and the Wollmann Collections (Ws 19,4). These reliefs are datable to ca. the late 3rd c. Baptismal scenes disappear from sarcophagi much earlier than from funerary painting (Gerke 145ff.) and seem to be definitively excluded from the rich figurative inventory of the friezes of Constantinian sarcophagi.

The content and meaning of baptismal depictions are variously interpreted by iconographical research. The normal depiction consists of a small naked figure immersed in water, while a larger male figure lays hands on his head; the scene is completed by a *dove hovering overhead; streams of water sometimes surround the baptizand or descend upon him. Departing from this scheme is a fresco in the region of Lucina in the catacombs of St. Callisto (WK 29,1), where a man is depicted standing on dry ground, his hand held out to help another enter or leave the water. The depiction may not have a properly baptismal significance, however, but penitential (J. Fink: Theol. Revue 50 [1954] 172). The dress of the baptizer varies. For Wilpert (*La fede,* 90), the *exomis* is the dress of the prophets, typical of *John the Baptist, and thus identifies a baptismal scene as the baptism of Christ; the long tunic and dalmatic refer (also for Wilpert) to the liturgical vestments of an ecclesiastic, and mark the scene as the baptism of a catechumen. It is doubtful, however, whether such formal differences can justify such a diversity of content. The earliest baptismal scenes, even when the baptizer must be identified as John, do not represent the historical episode of the baptism in the Jordan, but baptism as a permanent sacramental event. The meaning of any baptismal scene in a sepulchral context, we may assume, was what popular belief, instructed by the church's teaching, hoped for as a gift of the sacrament of baptism and saw represented in the baptism of Jesus. Moreover, the majority of baptismal scenes emphasize the significance assumed by the sacrament in the 3rd c. as preparation, acceptance and confirmation (J. Kollwitz, *Das Christusbild des dritten Jahrhunderts,* Münster 1953, 22-26).

2. *Indirect depictions of baptism.* Alongside images of baptism proper, various depictions occur, neutral or biblical, which are understood as iconographical expressions of baptism. The fisherman, mentioned as alluding to baptism already in *Clement of Alexandria's suggestions of iconographical themes for ornamenting rings (*Paed.* 3, 11, 59, 2: GCS 1, 270, 7-11), as well as deer and other animals who quench their thirst at the waters (Corblet 514-523) is neutral, for example. Biblical motifs include, in the earliest period, the healing of the paralytic, Moses's miracle of the spring, the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well and Noah.

In the 4th c., among iconographical depictions of Peter that were fashionable in the Constantinian era, Moses's miracle of the spring was transformed into Peter's miracle of the spring; also introduced was the new motif of the Israelites crossing the Red Sea. The baptismal meaning of these depictions is not always cogent and may from time to time be derived from their use in contemporary literature (esp. in baptismal catechesis) or from the place occupied in the iconographical program. Three important aspects must be emphasized in indirect depictions of baptism: (1) they increase the presence of baptismal elements in early Christian art; (2) they accent the baptismal message of individual decorative programs—the healing of the paralytic, e.g., would allude to the remission of sins and preservation of baptismal grace, according to Jesus' words to him, "Sin no more, that nothing worse befall you" (Jn 5:14); (3) they express the idea of baptism when di-

rect depictions of baptism are absent from the iconographical program of sepulchral art. Moreover, the crossing of the Red Sea attests the close connection between theology and iconography; indeed, the scene is present even in the earliest Christian art, so much so that in the 4th c. the Fathers refer amply to Pauline baptismal theology, interpreting the Easter baptismal rite as the Exodus of Passover (van Moorsel 90-100).

3. *Later iconographical evidence* (*from the 5th c.*). When explicit depictions of baptism reappear in the 5th c., their forms and content differ perceptibly from those of the earlier era. The scene appears on a column base in the Istanbul Archaeology Museum, enriched by the addition of two draped angels (Volbach-Hirmer 76). In the dome mosaic in the Orthodox baptistery at *Ravenna (430/58), the Jordan pays Christ royal honors, its hands veiled according to court ceremony (Volbach-Hirmer 141); in the dome mosaic of the *Arian baptistery (ca. 500) the river is shown approving the baptismal gesture (Volbach-Hirmer 149). In Maximian's cathedral at Ravenna (545/53) the figure of the Jordan appears fleeing, or rather turning its shoulders in terror (Volbach-Hirmer 232), a clear reference to the crossing of the Jordan by the Israelites (Josh 3; Ps 114:3). Even if the personification of the Jordan alludes to the actual river and so to the biblical account of Jesus' historical baptism, the majority of baptismal scenes, including those not mentioned here, possess an epiphanic character. Thus the cosmological elements of sun and moon, sometimes introduced (6th-c. ivory relief: Schiller, fig. 360), signify the hand of God, dispenser of light (codex of Rabbula, Florence: Schiller, fig. 356), and the apostles in adoration (e.g. Ravenna). Contemporary liturgical use of the baptismal pericope also emphasizes the depiction's epiphanic significance (Jerphanion 172-183). Thus the *christological aspect of the baptism in the Jordan, already present in the gospels but which had acquired a sacramental connotation in 3rd-c. Christian theology, now appears in full, warding off the danger of *adoptionist, *Jewish Christian and *heretical *gnostic abuses. Following the dogmatic clarification of Christology between *Nicaea and *Chalcedon, baptismal scenes could escape from the ambiguous situation (baptism of Jesus and baptism of catechumens) of the earlier period and distinguish the two unequivocally. Apart from the depiction of a baptismal font in the form of a cup on a child's tombstone in *Aquileia, 2nd half of the 4th c. (Kötzsche-Breitenbruch 198ff.), the oldest early medieval scenes show the baptism of believers being administered in various forms of baptismal fonts (Mielke 246). *Byzantine baptismal scenes with a cross in the water of the Jordan probably derive from the memory of *pilgrims to *Palestine who had seen a cross planted on the place of Jesus' baptism (Jerphanion 169-172).

J. Corblet, *Histoire dogmatique liturgique et archéologique du sacrament du baptême*, 2 vols., Paris 1882; J. Strzygowski, *Iconographie der Taufe Christi. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der christlichen Kunst*, Munich 1885; A. de Waal, *Die Taufe Christi auf vorkonstantinischen Gemälden der Katakomben:* RQA 10 (1896) 335-349; H. Leclercq, *Baptême de Jésus*: DACL 2 (1925) 346-380; G. de Jerphanion, *Épiphanie et Théophanie. Le baptême de Jésus dans la liturgie et dans l'art chrétien:* La Voix des monuments, Paris 1930, 165-188; G. Wilpert, *La fede della chiesa nascente secondo i monumenti dell'arte funeraria antica*, Collezione "Amici delle catacombe", Vatican City 1938; F. Gerke, *Die christlichen Sarkophage der vorkonstantinischen Zeit*, Berlin 1940, 142-148; L. de Bruyne, *L'imposition des mains dans l'art chrétien ancien:* RivAC 20 (1943) 113-278; W.M. Bedard, *The Symbolism of the Baptismal Font in Early Christian Thought*, Washington, DC 1951; L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'Art Chrétien*, vol. II/2, Paris 1957, 296-310; W.F. Volbach - M. Hirmer, *Frühchristliche Kunst*, Munich 1958 (It. tr. Florence 1958); Th. Klauser, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der christlichen Kunst* IV: JbAC 4 (1961) 128-145; G. Ristow, *Die Taufe Christi*, Recklinghausen 1965; P.P. van Moorsel, *Rotswonder of Doortocht door de Rode Zee*, 's-Gravenhage 1965; G. Schiller, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, vol. I, Gütersloh 1966, 137-152 figs. 344-388; U. Mielke, *Taufe:* LCI 4 (1972) 244-247 (bibl. 247); ibid., *Taufe Jesu* 247-255 (bibl. 255); E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 99-103; 348-372; A. Nestori, *Repertorio topografico delle pitture della catacombe romane* = Rome Sotterranea Cristiana 5, Vatican City 1975; L. Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Das Elfenbeinrelief mit Taufszene aus der Sammlung Maskell im British Museum:* JbAC 22 (1979) 195-208; A.M. Fausone, *Die Taufe in der frühchristlichen Sepulkralkunst. Eine archäologisch-ikonologische Studie zu den Ursprüngen des Bildthemas*, Studi di Antichità Cristiana 34, Vatican City 1982; D. Scortecci, *Il tema iconografico del battesimo di Cristo nella cultura cristiana del III secolo a Roma*: AFLPer 33 n.s. 9 (1985/86) 257-275; J.G. Deckers et al., *Die Katakombe "Santi Marcellino e Pietro." Repertorium der Malereien*, Roma Sotterranea Cristiana 6, Vatican City 1987; L. Heiser, *Die Taufe in der orthodoxen Kirche. Geschichte, Spendung und Symbolik nach der Lehre der Väter*, Trier 1987; *Battesimo e battisteri*, ed. R. Iorio, Florence 1993.

E. Dassmann - H.R. Drobner

III. Baptismal controversy. The *Novatian *schism raised the question of whether those who had received Novatianist baptism should be rebaptized upon being reconciled with the church (Eus. *HE* VI, 43), which led to the baptismal controversy (255–257). The Novatianists rebaptized all those who passed over from the *Catholic church to themselves (Eus., *HE* VIII, 8; Cypr., *Ep.* 73,2 to Jubaianus, of 256). A certain Magnus had asked *Cyprian whether "those who come from the Novatianists" should be baptized again in the Catholic church. Cyprian replied (*Ep.* 69 to Magnus [255]) that since *heretics had no power to baptize, the baptism of

those who turned from heresy was not a second baptism, but a first. From this perspective, Cyprian did not assert the existence of a new baptism as such, since he did not consider any baptism possible outside the church (Cypr., *De unit.* 11, against Novatian); he associated the validity of the sacrament with the rectitude of the minister. He submitted a similar question to 18 *Numidian bishops at the fifth council of *Carthage (first baptismal council: PL 3, 1035-1044) in spring 255 (Cypr., *Ep.* 70), which concluded: "No one can be baptized outside the church" (ibid. 1). Quintus, a bishop from *Mauretania, disagreed with Cyprian and reminded him that he and his colleagues were aware of an ancient custom in favor of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics; the Mauretanian bishops seem to have been more consonant with *Rome. Cyprian replied to Quintus (*Ep.* 71, 3-4 [255]): "One must not prescribe from custom, but conquer by reason." He also appealed to his predecessor in the see of Carthage, *Agrippinus, and to the first council of Carthage (ca. 220), which had held the baptism of heretics to be invalid (Cypr., *Ep.* 72,3; 71,4). According to *Vincent of Lérins, Agrippinus had initiated the practice (PL 50, 645-646), which after him spread. In the spring of 256, 71 bishops of the provinces of Proconsular *Africa and *Numidia met at the sixth council of Carthage (second baptismal council: PL 3, 1044-1050) and confirmed the decisions of the preceding council. The decision was communicated to Pope *Stephen by Cyprian's synodal letter (*Ep.* 72, of 256), which concluded: "We do not wish to establish any law, because each bishop is responsible before God for his actions" (ibid. 3). The pope's letters are lost, but he seems to have threatened *excommunication (Cypr., *Ep.* 75,24: Firmilian to Cyprian, 256) and refused to receive legates from Africa (ibid. 25). In *Ep.* 73 to Jubaianus (256), a Mauretanian bishop who disagreed with him, Cyprian held that the Novatianist practice of rebaptizing had no relevance to new baptism in the church, since Novatian, in claiming to associate the one baptism with himself, was only imitating what the church did (ibid. 2). On 1 September 256 Cyprian succeeded in aligning the whole African episcopate with his positions: he obtained the unanimous consensus of the bishops present (*Sententiae episcoporum numero* LXXXVII) at the seventh council of Carthage (third baptismal council: PL 3, 105 1-1078). For the bishop of Carthage he says that schismatics and heretics do not possess baptism, and therefore they must be baptized with the only valid baptism when they want to enter the Catholic church; his thought is expounded in letters 69-75. All that remains of Stephen's pontifical rescript is the central expression cited by Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,1, to Pompeius (256): *Nihil innovatur nisi quod traditum est* (Eus., *HE* VII, 3,1; Novat., *Ep.* 30,8, before the schism: *nihil innovandum putavimus*). Pope Stephen insisted that one must only lay hands, as a sign of *penitence, on those who had returned from heresy (Cypr., *Ep.* 74,1). Stephen's action on the question of the baptism of heretics was not limited to N Africa. He wrote to the churches of Asia Minor—*Cilicia, *Cappadocia, *Galatia and neighboring provinces—asking them to renounce the practice of rebaptizing, and threatening excommunication (DS 111: *Ep., fragm. ad episcopos Asiae Minoris*, a. 256 = Cypr., *Ep.* 75,18; Eus., *HE* VII, 5,4-5). *Firmilian, bishop of *Caesarea in Cappadocia, sided with Cyprian and blamed Stephen for the division between Rome and the East (Cypr., *Ep.* 70). Stephen appealed to Mt 16:18. The baptismal controversy between Rome and Carthage ended unexpectedly with Stephen's death (257) and Cyprian's martyrdom (14 September 258). *Dionysius of Alexandria, who followed Roman custom, worked to placate the contending parties (Eus., *HE* VII, 5,3-6; VII, 9,1 and 6), although different traditions remained in different regions.

The Council of *Arles (314) recognized the baptism of heretics as valid (can. 9 [8]: DS 123), but the practice had by then assumed different dimensions with the advent of *Donatism. The Donatists rebaptized against the exponents of the Catholic church. In the 4th c. the custom of rebaptizing in the African church was practiced by the Donatists for those who came from the Catholic church; for them every baptism administered by heretics or by unworthy persons (the **traditores* of *Diocletian's persecution), or by those who had been consecrated by them, was invalid. While the Council of *Nicaea of 325 on the one hand recognized the baptism of the Novatianists, on the other hand it did not accept those of the *Paulinians (followers of *Paul of Samosata), perhaps due to trinitarian doctrine (can. 8; 19); according to *Athanasius, however, their rite was correct (*Or. 2 contra Ar.* 44-45: PG 26, 236-240; cf. BA 29, 598-599). The case of the conversion of *Arians also posed the problem of their acceptance in the church; some priests wanted to rebaptize those already baptized within Arianism. Pope *Siricius, based on Scripture and on the canons, on the *decreta generalia* of Pope *Liberius, and on the tradition of the Eastern and Western churches, rejected this practice (*Ep.* 1,2: PL 13, 1134). In the course of the 4th c. a sacramental theology was elaborated, beginning with *Optatus of Milevis, which established a distinction between a heretic and a schismatic, and then by Augustine, who

venerated St. Cyprian but rejected his theory (*Contra Cresconium* 2,32). He founded the validity of the sacraments on the correct form established by Christ, the true minister: *in ista quaestione de baptismo non cogitandum quis det, sed quid det* (on the question of baptism, let us consider not who gives but what he gives—*Bapt.* 4,10,16[17]); *Petrus baptizet, hic est qui baptizat; Paulus baptizet, hic est qui baptizat; Iudas baptizet, hic est qui baptizat* (Peter may baptize, but it is [God] who baptizes; Paul may baptize, but it is [God] who baptizes; Judas may baptize, yet it is still [God] who baptizes—*In Ioh. Evang.* 6,7). The intervention of Augustine and of other bishops was accompanied and rendered effective by a severe imperial legislation which condemned anyone who was rebaptized. Baptism also caused controversies during the Protestant Reformation, when appeals were made to the Fathers to demonstrate the decadence of the church from its original purity.

Cyprian, *Ep.* 69-75 (CSEL 3, 2, 749-827); CPL 50; *Concilia Carthaginensia*: PL 3, 1011-1102; G. Bardy, *Baptismale* (*Controverse*): Cath 1, 1232-1234; L. Villette, *Foi et sacrement*, Paris 1959; L. Campeau, *L'origine de la querelle baptismale*: Science et Esprit 21 (1969) 329-356; 22 (1970) 19-47; H. Gülzow, *Cyprian and Novatian*, Tübingen 1975; J. Patout Burns, *On Rebaptism: Social Organization in the Third-Century Church*: JECS 1 (1993) 367-403; P.G. Caron, *"Ne sanctum baptisma iteretur"* (*CTh. 16.6; CI. 1.6*): AARC 6 (1986) 166-180; E. Contreras, *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 407-421; S.G. Hall, *Stephen of Rome and the One Baptism*: SP 17, 2 (1982), 796-798; Id., *Stephen I of Rome and the Baptismal Controversy of 256*, in Miscell. Historiae Eccl., ed. B. Vogler, Brussels-Louvain 1987, 78-82; H. Pietras, *Il fondamento ecclesiologico della posizione di Dionigi di Alessandria nella controversia battesimale*, in *Recherches et Tradition*, Mélanges H. Crouzel, Paris 1992, 199-210; M. Labrousse, *Le baptême des hérétiques d'après Cyprien, Optat et Augustin: influences et divergences*: REAug 42 (1996) 223-242; F. Morgenstern, *Die Kaisergesetze gegen die Donatisten in Nordafrica* (*im Zusammenhang mit dem antidonatistischen Wirken des Augustinus von Hippo*): ZRG 110 (1993) 103-123.

R.J. De Simone

BARBARUS SCALIGERI. Name given to an anonymous *Alexandrian Greek chronicle, translated into very poor *Latin ca. AD 700. Its title reflects both the nature of the Latin—replete with Gallicisms—and the identity of the humanist—Giuseppe Giusto Scaligero—who discovered and published the uncial manuscript (*Parisinus*, *Bibl. Nat.* 4884 [7th-8th c.]) in which it was transmitted. A fragment of the original Greek text, reaching us in a single sheet of illustrated papyrus (P. Berol. 13296) from the early 5th c., shows a close relation of this chronicle to the **Chronographus anonymus*, preserved in the illustrated papyrus discovered by W. Goleniscev.

The Barbarus Scaligeri, also known as *Excerpta Barbari*, is a universal chronicle that begins with Adam and has three parts: the history of the world until Cleopatra's death (31 BC); select passages from lists of kings, including Persian and Assyrian; and a list of Roman consuls from Julius Caesar to Valentinian Augustus III and Eutropius (AD 387), with a gap from *Domitian to *Diocletian. The final section, containing a list of emperors until *Anastasius I (512), is probably not authentic. The chroncler's sources included *Hippolytus and *Eusebius, but the main source is Sextus *Julius Africanus. Barbarus Scaligeri was in turn probably used by later chroniclers such as *John Malalas, though the latter does not acknowledge it as a source.

Based on the similarity between the sheet of papyrus containing the only fragment of the Greek original of the Barbarus Scaligeri and the papyrus of the *Chronographus* discovered by Goleniscev, we can hypothesize that the Barbarus Scaligeri is a revision of a lost Alexandrian chronicle, which was the direct source of the Goleniscev papyrus. The illustrations in the single sheet of the Berlin papyrus may also point to older elements: they seem to have been painted for a wide use, which would fit well with examples of encaustic and with the vascular decorations of the first *Coptic period.

Editions: CPG 5539; ed. Princeps J.J. Scaliger, *Thesaurus temporum*, Leiden 1606, 44-70; a better edition in: A Schoene, Berlin 1875; Latin text with Greek retranslation in: C. Frick, *Chronica Minora* 1, Leipzig 1892, 183-371; T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, MGH AA IX, Berlin 1892, 272-298 (excerpts only).

Studies: H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*; 2. *Die Nachfolger des Julius Africanus*, Leipzig 1885; repr. New York 1967, 316-329; Bauer-Strzygowsky, *Eine alexandrinische Weltchronik, Text und Miniaturen eines griechischen Papyrus der Sammlung W. Goleniscev*, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften Phil.-histor. Klasse 51, Bd. 2, Vienna 1905; F. Jacoby, PWK 6,6 (1909) 1566-1576; L. Bréhier, DHGE 6 (1932) 593; R. Klein, *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 4 (1989) 156; E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott, *Studies in John Malalas*: Byzantina Australiensia 6, Sydney 1990, passim; ODB 1, 253; D. Stiernon, DPAC 1, 474.

P. Allen

BARBELO-GNOSTICS. 2nd-c. *gnostic sectarians whose name derived from the female *aeon Barbelo, who occupied a central place in their mythology. It is difficult to specify the nature and functions of this aeon or to fix the details of the complex mythological system founded on her, because our sources (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 29,1-4; Epiph., *Panarion* 25,2-5 and 26,1-19; Theodoret, *Haeret. fabul. compendium* 1,13) disagree on particulars. Barbelo is the feminine

element at the origin of all things. The invisible Father manifested himself to this aeon, and it became the mother of all the living, which derive from her through successive pairs of aeons. It is also Barbelo's task to free the divine element imprisoned in matter and reestablish pleromatic unity. A *Coptic text of cod. BG 8502, the *Apocryphon of John* (also present, in various diverse recensions, in the *Nag Hammadi library: NHC II,1; III,1; IV,1), shows surprising analogies—as well as differences—with the system described by *Irenaeus concerning Barbelo. Unlike Irenaeus, *Epiphanius (who calls them Barbeliots) describes at length their customs and rites, during which they abandoned themselves to the most unbridled excesses, sacrilegiously parodying the sacred mysteries of Christianity. The confused information given by the heresiologists and the similarities of this system with others known under different names (see, e.g., the identical functions of Barbelo and of Sophia Prunikos among the *Ophites; Iren., *Adv. haer*. I, 30) prevent us from identifying a precise sectarian group or a coherent doctrinal system under the name Barbelo-gnostic.

W. Foerster, *Die Gnosis*. I.: *Zeugnisse der Kirchenväter*, Zürich 1969, 133-161; H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, Leipzig 1924; E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et gnosticisme*, Paris 1925, 379-412; L. Cerfaux, *Barbelognostiker*: RAC I, 1176-1180; A. Böhlig, *Gnosis und Synkretismus*, I, Tübingen 1989, 289-311.

C. Gianotto

BARCELONA

I. History - II. Councils.

I. History. Ancient Barcino, in the province of Tarraconensis (*Spain). Roman presence there goes back to 218 BC, during the *Punic Wars. In 263 Spain was devastated by German bands, and in 415 the *Visigothic king Athaulf established his residence there. In 714 it fell under Muslim rule and was reconquered in 801. The earliest reference to Christianity in Barcelona is in *Prudentius, who mentions St. Cucuphas as the glory of the city (*Perist*. IV, 33-34); his legendary *passio* is from the 7th c. Information on Sts. Eulalia and Severus is unreliable. The first known bishop of Barcelona, Praetextatus, appears only mid-4th c., when he accompanied *Ossius of Cordoba to the Council of *Serdica (343). The most illustrious prelate was St. *Pacian, who brought theological prestige and importance to the city, esp. with his doctrine on *penance. Less splendid in Barcelona's history was Bishop Nundinarius, whose behavior in nominating Irenaeus, bishop of Terrassa, as his successor brought harsh criticism from Pope *Hilarus (465). At Barcelona, suffragan diocese of *Tarragona and seat of two councils (540 and 599), St. *Paulinus of Nola was made to accept ordination from Bishop Lampius (394). The 5th-c. arrival of *Goths, Visigoths, and the *Arian faith gave rise to a double hierarchy, one Catholic and the other Arian, which lasted until the III Council of *Toledo. Catholic bishops: Praetextatus (ca. 343), Pacian (379–391), Lampius (394–400), Sigisarius (ca. 415), Nundinarius (d. 465), Agricius (ca. 517), Nebridius (ca. 540), Paternus (ca. 546), Ugnas (589–599), Emila (600–633), Oya (634–638), Quiricus (640–666), Idalius (666–689), Laulfus (689–703).

II. Councils.
540, provincial. Metropolitan Sergius of Tarragona presided, with six other bishops present. We have 10 shortened canons on *liturgy, clergy, monks and the infirm.

599, provincial. Metropolitan Asiaticus of Tarragona presided, with 11 other bishops present. The most important of the four canons is the third, on the procedure for the ordination of bishops. Others prohibited accepting money for conferring holy orders and excommunicated consecrated virgins and penitents who married.

J. Mas, *Notes historiques del bisbat de Barcelona*, Barcelona 1906, 13; S. Puig y Puig, *Episcopologio de la sede Barcinonense*, Barcelona 1929; Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 146-147; A. Pladevall, *La introducció i difusió del cristianisme a Catalunya a l'epoca romana*, Barcelona 1994; DicHistEclCat I (A-C), Barcelona 1998, 199ff.; E. Flórez, ES 29; Vives, *Concilios*, 53-54; 163-185; Orlandis, *Concilios*, 120-124; 244-246.

P. de Luis

BARDESANES (Bardaisan) of Edessa (154–222). Bardesanes of *Edessa (Bar Dayṣan = "son of the river Dayṣan"), philosopher, astrologer, ethnograph and Christian theologian, an intellectual situated halfway between Aramaic culture and Greek philosophical culture and an outstanding figure in the development of the various forms of Syrian Christianity. We known little with certainty of his life: born in 154 (*Chronicle of Edessa*), he died in 222; *Julius Africanus (d. 240) says that he saw him at the court of *Abgar VIII, of Edessa's ruling dynasty. *Moses of Khorene tells of his emigration to *Armenia following Edessa's definitive Romanization (216). According to *Porphyry, Bardesanes met an Indian delegation on mission to the emperor Elagabalus in 218. The other Greek, Syriac, Armenian and Arabic sources offer accounts generally influenced by heresiological stereotypes; consequently, the only thing

certain is Bardesanes's activity among the elite of Edessa in the court circle of the local king. For an understanding of the cultural situation, we must bear in mind that in the 2nd and 3rd c. the city was characterized by *Hellenistic and Eastern artistic and literary cultures and by a great variety of religions: Christianity was not yet structured in an ecclesiastical hierarchy (which came about only in the early 4th c.) but was divided into different streams such as Bardesanism, *Jewish Christianity, those Christians who formed the nucleus of future *orthodoxy—still a minority in the 2nd-3rd c. and called Palutians after their leader *Palut—*Marcionites, who came into conflict with Bardesanes and his school, and various kinds of *gnostics (Quqiti, *Audiani, *Valentinians, *Sethians). Bardesanes's surviving work shows us his great attention to Greek philosophy (*Platonic, *Aristotelian, *Stoic, atomist), astrology and ethnography. We have a few fragments of his on astral conjunction; Porphyry offers two citations from a work dedicated to Indian customs; Moses of Khorene says that Bardesanes was his source for some information on the history of *Armenia. His works indicate that he founded a cultural circle of elites, or perhaps a philosophical school, in which questions of astrology, cosmology, morality and religion were freely debated. The circle would prove enduring: only in the 5th c. would Bishop *Rabbula succeed in rooting it out at Edessa, though he would not prevent its spread to the East. *Ephrem the Syrian alludes to the poetic works of Bardesanes's son, who, according to *Sozomen, was named *Harmonius and introduced metric hymns into *Syriac.

The main sources for a knowledge of Bardesanes's thought and that of his disciples are the following: (1) The *Book of the Laws of the Countries* (*Liber legum regionum;* hereafter BLC), was written in Syriac and partially cited according to an old Greek version by the ps.-*Clementine literature and by *Eusebius of Caesarea; it is presented in the form of a dialogue between Bardesanes and some of his disciples, one of whom, Philip, may well be the author, though some scholars do not rule out the possibility that Bardesanes himself wrote the dialogue. (2) The polemical works of Ephrem, and in particular the *Confutations in Prose* (CP) and a certain number of *Hymns Against Heresies* (HAH), paraphrase and cite texts, in prose and poetry, of Bardesanes, his disciples and his son, on cosmogony, anthropology, *soteriology, philosophy, the meaning of names and astrology. Singularly effective among these is HAH 55, where poetic verses are cited that allude to gnostic mythological figures destined to enter into the *Manichean pantheon: the Father and the Mother of life, who generate the Son of life; the *Holy Spirit, a feminine figure, who generates two daughters; the young Spirit, destined for marriage, who pronounces with some modification the words of Christ on the cross (Mt 27:46); again the Father and the Mother of life who, through sexual union, generate paradise and the astrological elements; the two are compared to the sun and the moon. (3) The four cosmological traditions transmitted by Barhadbshabb Arbaya (late 6th c.), *Theodore bar Konai (8th c.), Moses bar Kepha (10th c.) and John of Dara (early 10th c.) paraphrase, and at times cite, the myth of the origins of the cosmos and of the ordering intervention of a divine being. (4) A multiplicity of later heresiological references, written in Syriac and Arabic by Christian and Muslim writers simplify Bardesanes's complex speculations into a *dualism similar to that of the Manicheans, or they take up and enrich the mythology expounded in Ephrem, HAH 55 (Agapius of Mabbug).

Analysis of these sources allows us to reconstruct part of the Bardesanite system. The BLC has as its basic theme the relationship between free will and fate. The character "Bardesanes" distinguishes, in the course of his conversation with the students, two realities in human life: (1) nature (*kyānā*), that is, a person's natural dispositions (birth, growth, reproduction, aging, death); and (2) destiny (*ḥelqā*), the contingencies that may favor or diminish the potentialities of nature (deformities, riches, poverty). Human beings, who undergo in their bodies the action of nature and fate, as the image of God also possess free will (*ḥērutā*), the possibility of carrying out positive and negative actions. Its seat is in the intelligence, according to a philosophical perspective with hints of *Stoic influence, but esp. *Aristotelian (a comparison with *Alexander of Aphrodisias's *On Fate* is possible), Jewish and Christian. To demonstrate this, "Bardesanes" offers the discourse that gave the work its Syriac title, in which he describes, starting from the East, the "laws"—that is, the moral and religious customs of peoples (including Jews and Christians)—showing how they depend on fate. The discourse ends by saying that even fate and its components received a small portion of power from the divinity, which they exercise, poorly or well, until the time when that mixture through which God linked natures—i.e., the original beings, when they were mutually damaged by one another—is purified. This reciprocal violence, as we shall see, is understandable only from the perspective of Bardesanian cosmogony.

Ephrem (CP) and the four cosmological tradi-

tions allow us a knowledge of the Bardesanian representation of the world's origins. Unfortunately Ephrem's attribution of the same fragments in some places to Bardesanes and in others to his disciples prevents us from establishing with certainty, except in very rare cases, what should be attributed to the master and what to the school. Four beings existed from eternity: light, wind, fire and water (different, therefore, from the classical model of the four elements), distributed over the four cardinal points. They existed in a state of indeterminacy according to *Theodore bar Konai, who seems to allude to a Bardesanian verse containing a reference to the *tohu wabohu* of Gen 1:2. According to Bardesanes's disciples, these beings were collections of atoms. Above the beings is God, the Lord of all things, and underneath them darkness. For a reason that varies according to the tradition, or perhaps according to the evolution of the school—i.e., either the wind that blows over the fire, or an event (*gedšā*), or pure chance (*šegmā*)—the four beings collide with and combat one another, provoking the darkness that assails them, hiding and partially contaminating them. The Logos, or "Word of thought" (*mēmrā d-tar'itā*), or the "Power of the originary word" (*ḥaylā d-mēmrā qadmāyā*), is sent by the supreme divinity to separate the darkness from the beings; the Logos constitutes the true and proper creation apart from that which remains contaminated by the darkness, and this then becomes an instrument for the gradual purification of the universe. Theodore bar Konai makes reference also to the sending of a Spirit "from above," which could coincide with the Spirit that appears in Ephrem (HAH 55). Still, according to Ephrem, we learn that for some disciples it is not the Logos that was sent but atoms of intellect, power and thought. Ephrem and other sources insist on the sending of life, which is a sort of element of animation of the human intellect, which could perhaps depend on the Logos. That life, according to Ephrem (CP), descends from on high, above the moon, to be poured out on the cosmos; according to Agapius of Mabbug it comes from the Father of life through the Mother of life.

Ephrem says that the human body is the result, on the one hand, of the image of God or of his wisdom and, on the other hand, of the work of the archons (linked to fate). The body is destined to dissolution, and thus there is no resurrection. Joined to the body are the soul—corporeal but light in weight—and the intelligence, of divine provenance and a fragment of the breath of the divinity in the cosmos. True resurrection is only spiritual and consists in reaching God with the superior part (soul and intellect), to be united to him in the wedding chamber of light (*gnōn nuhrā*, a common expression in primitive Syriac literature): this is possible for those who overcome the celestial spheres in which souls were enclosed by Adam's sin until the arrival of the Savior. The Bardesanian Christ is the one who announces the truth, allowing those who keep his word to overcome the spheres (Jn 8:51-52).

Mani was aware of the importance of the Bardesanian community in *Osroene, as one of his works, the *Book of the Mysteries,* attests. From the titles passed down to us by An-Nadim, we can deduce that he polemicized against Bardesanes's doctrine of the soul. Besides this polemic, we can note some differences between the two systems: Manichean dualism (darkness and light) was much more radical than that of Bardesanes in that the initial event is born of the attack of the darkness against the light in Mani, whereas in Bardesanism it is produced by a chance occurrence through which the elements, colliding, provoke the partial mixture of the darkness with them. In Bardesanism the body enjoys a less negative status than in Manichean doctrine; free will, granted not only to human beings but also to the elements in Bardesanism, is a notion absent in Manichean doctrine. Nonetheless, on some points the two currents draw near each other, to the extent that it is arguable that Mani knew and appreciated some Bardesanian proposals: (1) in both there is a doctrine of the three ages: the primordial age, the age of the commingling of light and darkness, and the age of their definitive separation; (2) in contrast to what occurs in gnostic doctrines, where the created world is the negative result of the process of the degradation of the divinity, in Bardesanism and Manichaeism it is intentionally created by the supreme divinity as an instrument of liberation of the original elements (Bardesanes's four elements or Mani's light) from the negativity of darkness; (3) both elaborate a soteriological physics; (4) in Mani also the figures of the Father and the Mother of life appear, although in Bardesanes their status is not entirely clear; (5) in both, the vital function of the sun and moon is stressed.

The most important question for the interpretation of the writings, more or less fragmentary, that have reached us from antiquity is whether Bardesanes and his school can be considered gnostics. We must bear in mind that the sources can be classified, according to the greater or lesser dualism of their ideological tendency, into three groups: the BLC, more moderate and little inclined to dualism (even if there is some reference to the fundamental motif of the clash between the elements); the majority of the frag-

ments transmitted by Ephrem and esp. by later heresiology; and HAH 55, which seems to be oriented toward gnosticism. Some have offered an interpretation that takes into account esp. the position of BLC and a portion of the second category of writings, discounting the evidence of HAH 55. Others have stressed the difference between the sources, taking esp. HAH 55 as their reference point: the difference would be due to different authors, who have in some cases mitigated the original dualism and in other cases accentuated the gnostic sense. The problem is still unresolved and, despite the abundance of studies, further clarification is still possible. Certainly the question of the relationship with gnosticism should be stated with greater clarity: can the surviving fragments necessarily be situated within gnosticism, if by gnosticism we mean that doctrine which asserts a crisis within the divine world (the myth of Sophia or others like it)? The evidence gained from a complete analysis of the texts allows one to distinguish Bardesanian from gnostic dualism. In most of the Bardesanian texts the idea is rejected of a clash within the divinity: of a sin, a passion or a rupture, as in the Valentinian myth of Sophia. The idea prevails, rather, of an incident occurring in his eternal creation (the four beings), which at a second moment induces the divine intervention. We must bear in mind that one of the basic problems faced by Bardesanes and his disciples was the presence in Edessa of Marcionism, with its idea of an absolute contraposition between the creator God and the foreign God of Jesus Christ, who in Bardesanism seem rather to coincide. In summary, it seems that Bardesanism can be situated within the dualisms of the Late Antique period, without however coinciding with any of them: profoundly influenced by Greek philosophy, it could be placed alongside minor forms of 2nd-c. dualism, such as that of *Hermogenes, attacked by *Tertullian in the same period.

The main reference work on Bardesanes and his work, with bibliography, history of the studies and editions of the sources, remains H.J.W. Drijvers, *Bardaiṣan of Edessa*, Assen 1966. After 1966 other heresiological texts were published or translated, or those already published underwent a philological revision: see G. Vajda, *Le témoignage d'al-Māturidī sur la doctrine des Manichéens, des Daysanites et des Marcionites*: Arabica 13 (1966) 1-38, 113-128; W. Madelung, *Abu ʿisa al-Warraq über die Bardesaniten, Marcioniten und Kantäer*, in *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des vorderen Orients. Festschrift für Bertold Spuler*, ed. H.R. Roemer and A. Noth, Leiden 1981, 210-224; A. Camplani, *Note bardesanitiche*: Miscellanea marciana 12 (1997) 11-43. On the citations drawn from Porphyry by a work of Bardesanes on India, see F. Winter, *Bardesanes von Edessa über Indien. Ein früher syrischer Theologe schreibt über ein fremdes Land*, Innsbruck 1999.

For a general presentation of the debate on Bardesanian thought, see A. Camplani, *Rivisitando Bardesane. Note sulle fonti siriache del bardesanismo e sulla sua collocazione storico-religiosa*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 19 (1998) 519-596. On the *Book of the Laws of the Countries,* see esp. the following studies: A. Dihle, *Zur Schicksalslehre des Bardesanes*, in Id., *Antike und Orient. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, eds. V. Pöschl - H. Petersmann, Heidelberg 1984, 161-173, 220; I. Ramelli, *Linee generali per una presentazione e per un commento del* Liber Legum Regionum *con traduzione italiana del testo siriaco e dei frammenti greci*: Istituto Lombardo. Rendiconti Lett. 133 (1999) 311-355; T. Hegedus, *Necessity and Free Will in the Thought of Bardaisan of Edessa*: Laval théologique et philosophique 59 (2003) 333-344. Besides Drijvers, other scholars have sustained the unitary, nondualistic character of Bardesanian thought: E. Beck, *Bardaisan und seine Schule bei Ephräm*: Muséon 91 (1978) 271-333; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Edesse. La première philosophie syriaque*, Paris 1992. Favoring a gnostic interpretation are: T. Jansma, *Natuur, lot en vrijheid. Bardesanes, de filosoof der Arameër en zijn images*, Wageningen 1969; B. Ehlers (Aland), *Bardesanes von Edessa— ein syrischer Gnostiker*: ZKG 81 (1970) 334-351; G. Widengren, *Bardesanes von Edessa und der syrisch-mesopotamische Gnostizismus. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Manichäismus*, in *The Many and the One*, Essays on Religion in the Graeco-Roman World Presented to Herman Ludin Jansen on His 80th Birthday, Trondheim 1985, 153-181; Id., *Aramaica et Syriaca II. Textes concernant Bardésane d'Édesse*: Orientalia Suecana 33/35 (1984/86) 479-486; P.O. Skjærvø, *Bardesanes*, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. E. Yarshater, London - New York 1989, vol. 3, 780-785.

A. Camplani

BARHADBESHABBA. Disciple of the famous *Henana at the school of *Nisibis in the 2nd half of the 6th c., he later became bishop of Halwan. As bishop participated in the Synod of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 605. Of his literary work only the treatise on the *Cause of the Foundation of the Schools* has survived, composed between 581–604, half theological and half historical in character, published by A. Scher. With A. Baumstark, we must be careful to distinguish between the bishop of Halwan and a homonymous and contemporary native of Beth Arbaya, mentioned by Habdisho of Nisibis in his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers,* author of an ecclesiastical history titled *History of the Holy Fathers Who Suffered Persecution for the Truth*, published by F. Nau. Barhadbeshabba also wrote commentaries on Mark's gospel and on the Psalter, a *Book of Treasures,* and controversial treatises.

ʿAbdīšoʿ, *Catalogus Librorum*, ch. 93 in: Assemani, BO 3, 1, 169; Duval 72, 204, 411; Baumstark 136, 349; Chabot 59; F. Nau, PO IX, 449-631 (II part), XXIII, 177-343 (I part); Ortiz de Urbina, 132-133; E. Herman, DHGE 6, 791-792; A. Scher, PO IV, 317-404.

J.-M. Sauget

BARLAAM (d. 303?). Martyr of *Antioch. The antiquity and importance of the cult of Barlaam are

attested not only by the different dates in the *Byzantine and Eastern calendars but also by at least three homilies or *panegyrics in his honor: by *John Chrysostom (PG 50, 675-682), by *Severus of Antioch (PO 12, 90-96) and one anonymous (PG 31, 484-489). The latter text, attributed to *Basil of Caesarea in *Cappadocia, is the origin of the confusion which makes of Barlaam a martyr of that city, a tradition echoed in the Roman Martyrology's mention of 19 November.

While the period near 1 June seems the most acceptable among the various commemorations of the calendars (Severus's homily was given between 1–14 June 515), the exact date of Barlaam's martyrdom is not known with certainty, all the more so because it has not been established whether or not he died immediately from the tortures inflicted upon him, aimed at persuading him to deny his faith; in any case he was considered worthy of the title of martyr. Barlaam's torments were unique enough to be recounted: forced to extend his hands over a *pagan altar on which coals and incense were burning, if the pain had caused him to turn his hands the gesture would have been considered a sacrifice contrary to the Christian faith. Barlaam courageously let his hands be burned rather than yield to the intense pain, as his persecutors had hoped.

Barlaam was buried in a suburban cemetery of Antioch. John Chrysostom proclaimed the mentioned panegyric over his tomb; Severus gave his homily in a church of the city where the 40 martyrs of *Sebaste were also venerated.

Other Eastern cities, such as *Constantinople and *Edessa, have a church dedicated to Barlaam.

BHG 221-223; H. Delehaye, *S. Barlaam martyr d'Antioche*: AB 22 (1903) 129-145; DHGE 6, 812-813; *Vies des SS.* II, 656-659; BS 2, 786-787.

J.-M. Sauget

BARLAAM and JOSEPH, Life of (8th c.). The so-called romance of Barlaam, whose Greek edition (PG) was long attributed to *John of Damascus but must be later, though it may come from the circle of his monastery of St. Saba (Volk), tells the story of Joseph, the son of an Indian king, who converted to Christianity against his father's will after being instructed by the monk Barlaam; after abdicating his rule, Joseph become a monk. The very large volume, in which parts of the legend of Buddha as well as entire Christian works such as *Aristides's *Apology* are condensed, can be understood as a guide to the monastic life. As such it is important evidence of *Byzantine spirituality.

CPG III (1979) 8120 (with notes on the history of the textual tradition and many versions): PG 96, 860-1240 (J.P. Boissonade, 1832) and LCL 34 (1967), with an introduction by D.M. Lang. - F. Dölger, *Der griechische Barlaam-Roman. Ein Werk des hl. Johannes von Damaskos*, Ettal 1953; D.M. Lang, *St. Euthymios the Georgian and the Barlaam and Ioasaph Romance*: Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies 17 (1955) 306-325; B. Studer, *Jean Damascène, 4. Le roman de Barlaam*: DSp 8, 464ff.; E. Chintibidse, *Ekwtime Atoneli, der Verfasser der griechischen Version von "Barlaam und Joasaph"*: Wissenschaftl. Zeitschrift der F. Schiller Universität, Jena, 26 (1977) 29-41; TRE 17 (1988) 131-32; P. Bádenas de la Peña, *La Historia de Barlaam y Josafat. Redacción bizantina anónima*, Madrid 1993; LTK³ 2, 8 (bibl.); LACL (2002) 387ff.

B. Studer

BARNABAS (1st c.). The nickname—interpreted as "son of consolation" (or "exhortation"), but probably meaning "son of prophecy" or "son of Nabas/Nabi"—given in Acts 4:36 by the *apostles to Joseph, a Levite from *Cyprus, who sold a field and gave them the proceeds. His activity is largely linked to *Paul, whom Barnabas presented to the apostles (Acts 9:27). Sent to *Antioch, Barnabas observed the successes in converting the Gentiles and brought Paul there from *Tarsus (Acts 11:22ff.), returning with Paul to *Jerusalem to deliver the collection taken on the occasion of the famine (Acts 11:30). They were joined by John Mark (Acts 12:25), Barnabas's cousin (Col 4:10), and when Paul and Barnabas were chosen to go out to preach the gospel, John Mark accompanied them on this first missionary journey (Acts 13–14) but abandoned them at Perga. At Lystra, the crowd took Barnabas and Paul for Zeus and Hermes, wanting to offer sacrifice to them (Acts 14:8-18). Back at Antioch, Barnabas and Paul were sent to Jerusalem to settle the controversy that had arisen at Antioch over circumcision and together bore a letter back to Antioch with the apostles' response (Acts 15:1-35). Leaving for a second missionary journey, Barnabas wanted to take John Mark, against Paul's advice: he therefore parted with Paul and embarked for Cyprus with his cousin (Acts 15:37ff.). The reason for this break may in fact have been Barnabas's ambiguous attitude at the time of the so-called Antioch incident (Gal 2:11-13), if we date the split after the events of Acts 15:1-35. We hear no more of Barnabas after the departure for Cyprus; presumably he died, since Paul, back in contact with John Mark—perhaps a sign of an earlier reconciliation with Barnabas as well (see also the eulogy of Barnabas in 1 Cor 9:6, where we learn that Barnabas

supported himself by manual labor)—makes no further mention of his inseparable cousin (Col 4:10; Philem 24). The late legend of the *Acts and Martyrdom of Barnabas at Cyprus* (5th c.) recounts Barnabas's death at Salamis at the hands of the Jews. Chronologically, it is impossible that Barnabas could have written the *Epistle of* *Barnabas; *Tertullian (*Pudic.* 20) attributes the book of Hebrews to him. A "gospel of Barnabas" is cited as apocryphal in the **Decretum Gelasianum* (5th-6th c.) and in the *Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books* (6th-7th c.), but must be considered lost. The Italian *Gospel of Barnabas,* whose present form probably dates from the 14th c., is a work of Muslim propaganda, thought to rework literary traditions whose earliest nucleus may go back to the lost *Gospel of Barnabas*. A brief maxim under Barnabas's name (PG 2, 781-782) has no counterpart in the *Epistle of Barnabas* or in our Italian *Gospel of Barnabas*.

DB 1, 1461-1464; DHGE 6, 847-849; EC 2, 863-866; BS 2, 798-816; LTK³ 2, 17-18; ODC³ 159; RAC 1, 1207-1212; *Acta et passio Barnabae in Cypro*, ed. Bonnet, *Acta Ap. Apoc.* II, Leipzig 1903; L. Cirillo, *Evangile de Barnabé. Recherches sur la composition et l'origine*, Paris 1979 (with It. text and Fr. tr.).

F. Scorza Barcellona

BARNABAS, apostle (apocryphal). Barnabas, native of *Cyprus, called "apostle" by *Clement of Alexandria and the apocryphal *Acts of Barnabas,* mentioned frequently in the Acts of the Apostles as a convert to Christianity, active in *Antioch and companion of *Paul on the first apostolic journey. Two other works also speak of his activity: Mark's *Acts of Barnabas* (5th c.) and Alexander's *Panegyric of St. Barnabas* (6th c.). The first work describes his travels with Paul, the conflict with Paul over Mark, his apostolate in Cyprus and his death (burned by the Jews). In the first part of the *Panegyric* the author describes Barnabas's activity in Cyprus and his death (by stoning), in the second part Cyprus's struggle for autocephaly and the discovery of St. Barnabas's body with a copy of the gospel of St. Matthew. The ps.-Clementines (4th c.) speak of Barnabas's stay and apostolate at *Rome. Finally, the *Historia Datiana* (11th c.) speaks of Barnabas's activities at *Milan, where he went from Rome; this work is connected to Milan's 11th-c. struggle for supremacy in N *Italy. The lists of the apostles also mention Barnabas's sojourns at Milan and Rome, but a century earlier the N Italian church fathers say nothing of them. An apocryphon also speaks of the travels and passion of Sts. *Bartholomew and Barnabas. Often attributed to Barnabas the apostle is the *Epistle of* *Barnabas,* a writing of the Apostolic Fathers that was sometimes inserted in the lists of the books of the canon of the NT. *Tertullian considers Barnabas the author of the canonical Letter to the Hebrews (*De pudicitia* 20). In the **Decretum* (*Ps.*-)*Gelasianum* (5,3,2) a *Gospel of Barnabas* is condemned; in Italian and fragmentarily in Spanish there is a *Gospel of Barnabas,* clearly Muslim in character and with *Jewish Christian elements; we do not know if there is a connection between these two works.

CANT 46, 285-286, 264; BHG 225-226; BHL 983-990; LCIK 5, 316-320; BS 2, 798-817; Lipsius 2,2, 270-320; O. Braunsberger, *Der Apostel Barnabas*, Mainz 1876; A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 421-423.

Ed. *Gospel of Barnabas* - L. Cirillo - F. Frémaux, Paris 1977 (intr., text and Fr. tr., commentary); E. Giustolisi - G. Rizzardi, Milan 1991 (It. tr.). Trans.: Eng. - D. Sox, London 1984; Sp. - L.F. Bernabé Pons, Granada 1998; Ger. - S.M. Linges, Bonndorf 1994. Acts and Panegyric: Lipsius - Bonnet 2,2, 292-302; P. van Deun, CCG 26,1993; It. - Erbetta 2, 594-600 (acts); Pol. - M. Starowieyski: Analecta Cracov. 23 (1991) 391-413 (acts). *Historia Datiana*: A.C. Colombo, *De vita civitatis Mediolani, de adventu Barnabae apostoli*, Bologna 1951, 14-21; Sp. text: T.J.E. Fletcher, *The Spanish Gospel of Barnabas*: NT 18 (1976) 314-321.

J.D. Burger, *L'énigme de Barnabas*, MH 3 (1946) 180-193; M. Philonenko, *Une tradition essenienne dans l'Évangile de Barnabas*, in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à H.Ch. Puech*, Paris 1974, 191-195; J.M. Magnin, *En marge de l'ébionitisme. L'évangile de Barnabé*: OrChr 29 (1979) 44-64; R. Stichel, *Bemerkungen zum Barnabas-Evangelium*: Byzantinoslavica 43 (1982) 189-201; L.F. Bernabé Pons, *El Evangelio de San Bernabe. Un Evangelio islámico español*, Alicante 1995 (bibl.); *see also*: *Apocrypha in Eastern Languages: Muslim.

M. Starowieyski

BARNABAS, Epistle of. Included among the so-called Apostolic Fathers, a theological treatise in highly conventional epistolary form, limited to general initial and final greetings (but with no title), though with frequent appeals to interlocutors in the course of the argument. *Barnabas* can be divided into two distinct parts: chs. 2-16 and chs. 18-21,1, framed by the introduction (ch. 1) and by first and second conclusions (chs. 17; 21,2ff.). In the introduction the author proposes to write "not as a teacher" (*Barn.* 1,8; cf. 4,9), so that his audience might have perfect knowledge along with faith (*Barn.* 1,5). The first part, more theoretical, consists of an anti-Jewish polemic and illustrations of OT prophecies and prefigurations. The polemic turns on the basic idea that the Jews have never been able to understand God's will—being uncircumcised in heart and ears or misled by an evil angel (chs. 9-10)—and thus all the religious practices by which they thought to establish a relationship with God were simply the fruit of misunderstanding: sacrifices and fasting (*Barn.*

2,4ff.; 3), circumcision and dietary prohibitions (*Barn.* 9-10), the sabbath and the temple (*Barn.* 15-16). There was never actually a divine covenant with the historical Israel: the Sinai covenant was broken with the tablets of the law, thrown down by Moses when he learned of Israel's idolatry in his absence (*Barn.* 4,6-9; 14). The true covenant is that of Jesus, sealed in the hearts of those who hope and believe in him (*Barn.* 4,8).

This negative judgment on Israel excepts only the patriarchs and prophets, to whom a spiritual understanding of the divine will was granted (see in particular chs. 9-10). This understanding is the same as that of Christians, who are circumcised in heart and ears and thus can understand the true sense of the divine commands expressed in Scripture. The only key to the OT, therefore, is one that seeks a spiritual sense in clear opposition to the carnality of the Jews (and to a literal interpretation of Scripture): hence an "*allegorical" *exegesis (in a broad sense), or more precisely and in most cases, a *typological exegesis, is the way in which the scriptural prophecies and prefigurations of Christ's redeeming death at the hands of those who had persecuted the prophets are to be read (*Barn.* 5; 6,5-7). Christ is the stone rejected by the builders which became the cornerstone (*Barn.* 6,1-4). Israel's entry into the Promised Land is a symbol of faith in Christ manifested in the flesh (*Barn.* 6,8ff.); the passion was foretold in the rites of the day of fasting and the scapegoat (*Barn.* 7), and in the lustral aspersion with water and the ashes of a sacrificed heifer (*Barn.* 8). Jesus and the cross are adumbrated in the 318 servants circumcised by Abraham, since in the Greek alphabet 18 = IH, the initials of Jesus' name, and 300 = T, symbol of the cross (*Barn.* 9,7-9). *Baptism and the cross are prefigured in the trees planted by streams of water spoken of in Ps 1 and Ezek 20:6 (*Barn.* 11); the saving cross, in Moses's prayer with open arms (Ex 17) and the bronze serpent of Num 21 (*Barn.* 12,1-7). Jesus was foretold as Son of God, not son of man (*Barn.* 12,8ff.); the preeminence of the new people of God, the Christians, over the older Jews was prefigured in the superiority of Jacob over Esau and Ephraim over Manasseh (*Barn.* 13).

The epistle is not lacking in *apocalyptic ideas, esp. in chs. 2,1-3; 4, which refer to Dan 7. In *Barn.* 15 the notion of a cosmic week of 7000 years is proposed, followed by an eighth millennium, which is the beginning of a new creation. The second part expounds the moral instruction of the "Two Ways," presented as "other knowledge and doctrine," in a form independent of the analogous elaborations of the **Didache* and the **Didascalia Apostolorum*.

The disproportion between the two sections of the epistle and the nonlinear succession of arguments in the first part led in the past to the thesis that *Barnabas* was a composite text, the fruit of successive interpolations of an original text, variously identified. Modern criticism tends rather to attribute these features to the scant development of the sources—collections of *testimonia* (Prigent) or of catechetical documents (Wengst)—by the author of an essentially unitary work.

Chronology rules out the traditional attribution to the Barnabas of Acts: the epistle postdates the destruction of the temple in 70 (see *Barn.* 16,3-4). If the foreseen reconstruction of the temple is that of the temple of Capitoline Jove, built by *Hadrian on the ruins of the temple of *Jerusalem in 131, the epistle must postdate this; the interpretation of the passage is controversial, however, and could refer to either an eventual rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem or to the building of the temple in the hearts of the faithful. The epistle is ordinarily dated in the first three decades of the 2nd c.; Carleton Paget, however, indicates a probable date of composition between 96–98, under Nerva, hinted at in the obscure reference of *Barn.* 4,4-5 to the succession of kingdoms symbolized by the horn of the beast of Dan 7:7-8, 19-24. The epistle's place of origin is debated: *Alexandria has been proposed, not so much perhaps due to the kind of exegesis, broadly "allegorical," it contains but by the fact that the first to cite it was *Clement of Alexandria, who did so repeatedly; this is now the prevalent opinion (Carleton Paget, Prostmeier). Other scholars, however, have considered Syria-Palestine (Prigent) or Asia Minor (Wengst), because of a series of points of contact with theological traditions more easily associated with those regions.

In the 4th-c. Sinaiticus codex, the epistle is included among the books of the NT, after John's Apocalypse; *Origen (*C. Cels.* I 63) calls it a "Catholic epistle," but *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* III 25,4) already numbered it among controversial works (see Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 6). We also have the epistle in an old Latin version (late 2nd or 3rd c.) which ends with ch. 18, omitting the "treatise of the Two Ways" and the second conclusion.

RAC 1 (1950), 1212-1217. For an exhaustive bibliography of editions and studies see that of F.R. Prostmeier's edition, cited herein. The most recent editions include those of J.M. Heer, *Die Versio latina des Barnabasbriefes und ihr Verhältnis zur altlateinischen Bibel*, Freiburg 1908 (with the old Latin version); P. Prigent - R.A. Kraft, *Epître de Barnabé*, SC 172, Paris 1971 (with Fr. tr.); F. Scorza Barcellona, *Epistola di Barnaba*, CP I, Turin 1975 (with It. tr.). K. Wengst, *Schriften des Urchristentums: Didache, Barnabasbrief, zweiter Klemensbrief, Schriften an Diognet*, Darmstadt 1984, 101-202 (with Ger. tr.); A. Lindemann - H.

Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, Tübingen 1992; F.R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief, übersetzt und erklärt*, Göttingen 1999. Only the translation in H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Handbuch zum NT. Ergänzungsband: Die Apostolischen Väter III, Tübingen 1920 (ample commentary); Erbetta III, Turin 1969, 11-36; O. Soffritti, *La lettera di Barnaba*, Rome 1974. Specific studies: J.A. Robinson, *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, London 1920; J. Muilenburg, *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Marburg 1929; J.A. Robinson (ed. R.H. Connolly), *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache*: JTS 35 (1934) 113-146; P. Meinhold, *Geschichte und Exegese im Barnabasbrief*: ZKG 59 (1940) 255-303; G. Schille, *Zur urchristlichen Tauflehre. Stilistische Beobachtungen am Barnabasbrief*: ZNTW 49 (1958) 31-52; A. Hermana, *Le Pseudo-Barnabé est-il millénariste?*: EThL 35 (1959) 849-876; P. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le christianisme primitif. L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources*, Paris 1961; L.W. Barnard, *Studies on the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*, Oxford 1966; Kl. Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*, Berlin 1971; E. Robillard, *L'Épître de Barnabé: trois époques, trois théologies, trois rédacteurs*: RBi 78 (1971) 184-209; J.P. Martín, *L'interpretazione allegorica nella Lettera di Barnaba e nel giudaismo alessandrino*: SSR 6 (1982) 173-183; P. Richardson - M.B. Schukster, *Barnabas, Nerva and the Yavnean Rabbis*: JTS 34 (1983), 31-55; K.K. Chandler, *The Rite of the Red Heifer in the Epistle of Barnabas VIII and Mishnah Parah*, in W. Scott Green (ed.), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, Chico, CA 1985, 99-114; P.F. Beatrice, *Une citation de l'Évangile de Mathieu dans l'Épître de Barnabé*, in J.M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in the Early Church*, Louvain 1989, 231-245; J. Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, Tübingen 1994; J.A. Draper, *Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache revisited*: JSNT 58 (1995) 89-113; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Le norme veterotestamentarie sulla purità nell'Epistola di Barnaba*: ASE 13 (1996) 95-111; R. Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, Tübingen 1998.

F. Scorza Barcellona

BARSABAS of Jerusalem (2nd c.). Wrote a treatise *On Christ and the Churches*, preserved only in a *Georgian translation, against *Ebionite *Christology.

M. van Esbroeck, *Barsabée de Jérusalem, Sur le Christ et les Églises* (PO 41,2), Turnhout 1982.

K. den Biesen

BARSANUPHIUS (d. after 540) **and JOHN of Gaza** (d. 542). We have no historical information on Barsanuphius, except that he was born in *Egypt in the 5th c., where he led a *monastic life in the *Scete tradition. During the first half of the 6th c. we find him as a recluse in the *cenobium of Thavatha, near *Gaza; he was guided by the *hegumen Seridos, who served as intermediary between Barsanuphius, the monastic community and the outside world. His fame as a charismatic, reader of souls, and a person of balanced and sure judgment were such that monks, clergy and laity all went to him for counsel and help; nevertheless, he communicated with his correspondents only in writing. We have no treatises of spirituality from Barsanuphius, only a collection of 850 letters of various length (two of which have reached us only in a *Georgian version), mixed together with those of another famous *ascetic, John "the prophet," Barsanuphius's disciple and friend who was once hegumen of the monastery of Merosaba and later withdrew in solitude near his friend, assuming with him spiritual direction of the cenobium. The letters are in the form of "questions and answers," *erotapokriseis*. Barsanuphius remained outside of the theological disputes of the time and was critical of the *Origenist or *Evagrian currents widespread in Palestinian monasticism in the first half of the 6th c. Among Barsanuphius's disciples should be mentioned *Dorotheus of Gaza and *Dositheus. Upon John's death (ca. 540), Barsanuphius withdrew in complete isolation and presumably died shortly thereafter. According to a local tradition his *relics were transported, ca. 850, to Oria (Brindisi), where he is still venerated. This explains his memoria in the Roman Martyrology 11 April; the *Byzantine calendars celebrate him on 6 February. Barsanuphius's spirituality was nourished by meditation on Scripture and by the great monastic (esp. *Egyptian) tradition, the main idea being that of following Christ, proposed through a constant invitation to the "cutting out" of one's personal will in unreserved obedience to one's spiritual father—a living, divine oracle to the one who subjects himself to his guidance.

CPG 7350; eds. D.J. Chitty (PO 31,3); F. Neyt - P. de Angelis-Noah - L. Regnault (SC 426-427, 450-451, 468); translations: *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza. Correspondance*. Recueil complet traduit du grec par L. Regnault ou du géorgien par B. Outtier, Solesmes, [2]1993; *Barsanufio e Giovanni di Gaza. Epistolario*, eds. M.F.T. Lovato - L. Mortari, Rome 1991; DSp 1, 1255-1262; BS 2, 839-840; S. Vailhé, EO (1904) 268-276; 8 (1905) 14-25; 154-160; Derwas J. Chitty, *The Desert a City*, Oxford 1966, 132-140; F. Neyt, *Les lettres à Dorothée dans la correspondance de Barsanuphe et de Jean de Gaza* (diss. Louvain), 1969; Id., *Citations "Isaïennes" chez Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza*: Muséon 89 (1971) 65-92; S. Tugwell, *Ways of Imperfection*, London 1984, 83-92; L. Perrone, Εἰς τὸν τῆς ἡσυχίας λειμῶνα. *Le lettere a Giovanni di Beersheva nella corrispondenza di Barsanufio e Giovanni di Gaza*, in *Mémorial Dom Jean Gribomont (1920–1986)*, Rome 1988, 463-486; B. Bitton-Ashkelony - A. Kofsky, *Gazan Monasticism in the Fourth-Sixth Centuries: From Anchoritic to Cenobitic*: POC 50 (2000) 14-62; L. Perrone, *Palestinian Monasticism, the Bible, and Theology in the Wake of the Second Origenist Controversy*, in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, Louvain 2001, 245-259.

J.-M. Sauget - L. Perrone

BARSAUMA (d. 458). Syrian *archimandrite, de-

fender of *Eutyches and ally of *Dioscorus of *Alexandria. Strong in the religious and political influence that Eastern *monasticism had acquired, at *Theodosius II's invitation he participated at the Council of *Ephesus (449) as representative of the archimandrites (Mansi VI, 593) and played a decisive and tumultuous part in the condemnation of *Flavian of Constantinople, who died three days later, perhaps due to ill-treatment. At the Council of *Chalcedon (451), Barsauma was accused of having provoked Flavian's death and, failing to subscribe to Eutyches's condemnation within three days, was anathematized and exiled. The *monophysites considered him a saint.

E. Wipszycka, *Storia della Chiesa nella tarda antichità*, Milan 2000; S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-religiosi in Oriente nella tarda antichità: il II Concilio di Efeso (449)*, Madrid 2003, passim.

E. Prinzivalli

BARSAUMA of Karka of Beth Slok (d. after 630). Bishop of Susania (Bēt Ḥuzāyē, in present-day S Iran) and author of *mēmrē,* liturgical prayers and a theological treatise titled *Book of the Liver,* he also composed some innovative funeral discourses. The Chronicle of Seert preserved the Arabic translation of two of Barsauma's letters, one public and the other secret, addressed to Patriarch *Isho'yahb II (628–643/644). Barsauma was part of a group of bishops that criticized Isho'yahb II for the profession of faith he presented to the emperor *Heraclius in 630, which they considered a betrayal of the theological tradition of the Eastern church.

Baumstark, 196; BBKL 21, 73s.; BO III,1, 173; A. Scher, *Histoire Nestorienne II/2* (PO 13,4), Paris 1918, 562-576 (Arabic text of the two letters).

K. den Biesen

BARSAUMA of Nisibis (415?–490/496). Bishop Barsauma of *Nisibis's activity took place at one of the crucial moments of the *Persian church, during a time—the last quarter of the 5th c.—when it was beginning to assume its clearest features, both on the institutional level, with a more solid structuring of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and a better alignment of the episcopal internal workings within the Persian Empire, and on the theological level, with the progressive marginalization of *monasticism and the *monophysite clergy, and an increasingly clear orientation toward *dyophysitism. Barsauma is significant for a number of reasons: the bishop called attention to and opposed the centralization, taking place at the time, of ecclesiastical power in the hands of the *catholicos of the imperial capital, *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, favoring rather a more democratic model of the church (and perhaps more ancient in Persia), which would give space to ancient ecclesiastical sees like his own; he also promoted a profound distinction between secular clergy, for whom marriage and societal commitment were recommended, perhaps even obligatory, and monasticism, which was pushed to the edges of the cities; finally, he played a decisive role in the moving of the dyophysite theological school from *Edessa to Nisibis, putting it under the direction of the theologian-poet *Narsai, who had to emigrate to the East after the closure of the school of Edessa (489). This manifold activity caused the earliest monophysite tradition (e.g., *Simeon of Beth Arsham) to consider him as among the worst of powerful men, a bloody persecutor of his ecclesiastical enemies; the *Nestorian tradition as well, esp. catholicos Timothy, had considerable reservations concerning him, esp. regarding *ecclesiology.

Born in the first quarter of the 5th c., probably Syriac-speaking, he also learned Greek at Edessa and Persian upon his emigration to the Persian Empire. He received his theological education at the theological school of Edessa, when the bishop of that city was Ibas (435–457), *Rabbula's successor and the director of the Qiyor school; both were important figures for the translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia's writings into *Syriac. After this period of strictly dyophysite theological training, Barsauma had the function of preacher at Nisibis: his eloquence and learning were such that he was proclaimed bishop of the city immediately upon the see becoming vacant. This episode is not easily dated: in 435, as the Nestorian tradition tells us, or in 457, after the death of *Ibas of Edessa; or perhaps even later, but certainly some years before 489, when the school of Edessa was closed. In addition to his functions as bishop, Barsauma was charged by King Pērōz of Persia, or more probably by some of his officials, with carrying out local diplomatic activity. The split between Barsauma and catholicos Baboway (457–484) took place in the 480s. Barsauma stirred up a rebellion of bishops critical of the monarchy and of the behavior—not above suspicion of *simony and misadministration—of the catholicos: the group met in council at *Beit Lapat (Gundešapur) in 484; the acts can be reconstructed indirectly. Among the various canons regarding simony and other matters of ecclesiastical discipline is the strong affirmation of the importance of *Theodore of Mopsuestia. It is unclear whether marriage for clergy was authorized at

this council or a dispensation of the vow of chastity was made for monks who desired it. Baboway and other bishops reacted by anathematizing the accusers, but events took a bitter, unexpected and dramatic turn with the sentencing of Baboway to death by the Persian emperor, for presumed treason. The reasons for the rebellion lessened for a time, and in a small synod held at the village of Beit Adrai, Barsauma made an act of submission to the authority of the new catholicos—Aqaq, his old school companion—and effectively annulled the decisions of the Council of Beit Lapat. Barsauma did not participate in the synod organized by Catholicos Aqaq in 486 at Seleucia-Ctesiphon (Barsauma's few letters in response to Aqaq's pressing invitations are all that remain of his production), at which canons regarding the marriage of clergy were issued and the doctrine of the dual nature of the divinity and humanity of Christ was affirmed. In the meantime, Barsauma married a virgin ascetic. After this council, in circumstances and for reasons that are not entirely clear and that may have been doctrinal, Barsauma began a new battle against the catholicos, which only ended with the nearly contemporaneous deaths of both, before 496.

'Abdiso', *Catalogus librorum*, c. 54, in BO 3, 66-70; J. Labourt, *Christianisme perse*, 131-152; G. Bardy: DHGE 6, 948-950; Duval: LS 165, 343; Baumstark 108-109; Chabot 50; Ortiz de Urbina 118-120.

Fundamental is the monograph of S. Gero, *Barṣaumā of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the Fifth Century* (CSCO 424, Subsidia 63), Louvain 1981.

A. Camplani

BARTHOLOMEW, apostle. Named among the Twelve (Mk 3:18 par.). The proper name of *Bartholomaios* (*Bar Talmai*) may have been Nathanael. Favoring this identification—unknown in the Christian literature of the first centruies and first known in the *Syrian church, but contested by *Augustine (*In Ps*. 65, 4: PL 36, 788-789)—could be Jn 21:2 and Philip's link with Nathanael (Jn 1:45-46) and with Bartholomew in the lists of the Twelve. In *gnostic discourses Bartholomew is one of Jesus' interlocutors (*Sophia J. C.; Pistis Sophia* 136; *Libri di Jeu* A 1-3), as also in the *Quaest. Barth.* (where he interrogates Jesus after the *resurrection, and Mary regarding the *incarnation). Allusions to a *Gospel of Bartholomew* in antiquity and the Middle Ages are so infrequent that the existence of the *apocrypha was doubted until the first fragment was published in 1835. The first mention and a citation are found in ps.-*Dionysius, the second in *Epiphanius. The so-called *Book of Hierotheos* gives another citation, and *Jerome alludes to this gospel; it is unclear whether the *Decretum Gelasianum* alludes to this work. The legend of Judas's thirty coins, a group of writings contained in a 12th-c. poem and attributed to St. Bartholomew, could be from this apocrypha. Later identified as the *Gospel of Bartholomew* was a text preserved in Greek, Latin and Slavic, in the Slavic manuscripts titled *Questions of Bartholomew,* a title which accords with the literary genre of the text and is confirmed by another Latin MS. Another work, titled *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ According to Bartholomew,* has reached us in *Coptic. These two texts are not two different recensions going back to one original; nor is their account as brief as it is sometimes said to be, and they have few elements in common. The *Questions* contain many elements characteristic of *apocalyptic literature. In the *Acta Thom.*, Bartholomew is one of the eleven apostles who draw lots to divide the regions of the world for preaching. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* V, 10,3) tells of a tradition according to which *Pantaenus is said to have met some Christians on his trip to India, where Bartholomew had preached and left behind a Hebrew gospel of Matthew. The *Acta Barth*. purports to describe his martyrdom in India, though according to the *Acta Andr*., Bartholomew was a missionary with Andrew along the coast of the Black Sea; according to the *Acta Phil.* he was Philip's companion at Hierapolis and Lycaonia. Later traditions describe his martyrdom in *Armenia (flayed and beheaded according to some, crucified according to others). His *relics were venerated at Daras, Mesopotamia (Theod. Lect. 2,57: PG 86, 211), on the island of Lipari (Greg. of Tours, *Gloria Mart*. 1,34), at Benevento and at *Rome.

Acta Barthol., in R.A. Lipsius - M. Bonnet, *Acta Apost. Apoc*., Leipzig 1888, II/1, 128-150; Erbetta II, 581-591; BS 2, 852-862; see P. Cherchi, *A Legend from St. Bartholomew's Gospel in the Twelfth-Century*: RBi 91 (1984) 212-218; F. Scheidweiler - W. Schneemelcher, *Bartholomaeusevangelium*: W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apocryphen*, I, Tübingen [5]1987, 424-440; J.-D. Kaëstli, *Où en est l'étude de l' "Évangile de Barthélemy"?*: RBi 95 (1988) 5-33; L. Cirillo, *Le baptême, remède à la concupiscence, selon la cathéchèse ps.-clémentine de Pierre:* Hom. *XI 26* (Rec. *VI 9; IX 7*), in T. Baarda et al. (ed.), *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, Kampen 1988, 79-90; J. Irmscher - G. Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen*: Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, II, Tübingen [5]1989, 439-488; R.E. Van Woorst, *The Ascent of James: History and Theology of a Jewish-Christian Community*, Atlanta 1989; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Adam and the True Prophet in the Pseudo-Clementines: History and Religion in Late Antique Syria*, Aldershot 1994, XIV, 314-323; F.S. Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71,* Atlanta 1995; M. Viel-

berg, *Klemens in den Pseudoklementinischen Recognitionen. Studien zur literarischen Form des spätantiken Romans*, Berlin 2000; D. Côté, *Le Thème de l'opposition entre Pierre et Simon dans les Pseudo-Clémentines*, EAug SA 167, Paris 2001.

R. Trevijano

BARTHOLOMEW (patristics and apocrypha). The name of the apostle Bartholomew figures in all three lists of the *apostles in the NT; he is also identified with Nathanael (Jn 1:45-51). We have no further information on Bartholomew. The *Arabic Gospel* (ch. 30) has him miraculously healed by the Virgin as a baby. His apostolate is located in various places: India, with Matthew (Eusebius, *HE* V,10), Lycaonia (ps.-John Chrysostom, *Ephrem), *Armenia, oasis in *Egypt, *Mesopotamia and Parthia and in the regions of the Black Sea, where he is said to have accompanied Andrew; according to other apocrypha he accompanied Philip in Lycaonia (Hierapolis). His death is variously described: stoning, burning, crucifixion, flaying, etc. There are two groups of writings on Bartholomew: works in which Bartholomew himself speaks, and others linked to his name. Writings include the unpublished Greek *Acts of Bartholomew,* a Latin passion, book VIII of ps.-*Abdias, and some Eastern texts (Armenian [Fr. tr. CCAp 4, 479-530]; *Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew* in Arabic, Coptic and Ethiopic). The Latin *Passio* speaks of his passion in India; another group of texts, in Armenia, where he met Thomas, Jude and Thaddeus. His body is said to have been at Martyropolis in the 4th c., then at Daras and finally transported to Lipari (6th c.), and from there to Benevento, then to Rome. There are a few Greek (Theodore the Studite, Nicetas of Paphlagonia) and Latin sermons on this apostle.

A *Gospel of Bartholomew* was condemned by the **Decretum* (*Ps.-*)*Gelasianum* (5,3,6) and by *Jerome (*In Mt prol.*). A *Book of Mysteries,* the existence of which is confirmed by ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite (*Theologia mystica* 1,3) and by the *Book of Hierotheos* (of Stephen Bar Sudaili? 6th c.), preserves some sentences ascribable to Bartholomew himself. The *Questions of Bartholomew* exists in Latin and Greek, and the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ of Bartholomew* in *Coptic. The first text is a dialogue between Jesus and the apostles, with Bartholomew playing a prominent role. At Bartholomew's request, Jesus reveals the mysteries of his death, miraculous conception and *descent into hell, and those of Satan and of hell. The *apocryphon, divided into four scenes and an appendix and based on the Bible, is from the 7th to the 8th c., but probably contains fragments from the 2nd c.; it circulated widely in Ethiopia and in the Slavic world. The *Book of the Resurrection,* preserved in large Coptic fragments (perhaps for liturgical use), speaks mainly of facts related to Christ's resurrection. Here Bartholomew also has an important role, but less so than in the previous work.

BS 2, 1962, 852-878; Lipsius 2,2,54-108; CANT 258-264, 63, 80; BHG 227-232; BHL 1001-1014; BS 2, 852-878; LCIK 5, 320-334; M. v. Esbroeck, *La naissance du culte de S. Barthélemy en Arménie*: ReArm 17 (1983) 171-195; Id.: AB 80 (1962) 425-429; Id.: Muséon, 106 (1993) 98-99; J.D. Kaëstli, *Où en est l'étude de l'"Evangile de Barthélemy"?*: RBi 95 (1988) 5-33; J.D. Kaëstli - P. Cherix, introduction, see below.

Acts: Lipsius-Bonnet 2,1,128-150; (Lat.); CCAp 4, 429-530 (Armenian passion, Fr. tr.).

Questions: Ed.: CANT 63; trans.: It. - Craveri 423-444; Erbetta 1/2, 288-319, II, 581-591; Moraldi 1, 749-800; Ger. - F. Scheindweiler, in Schneemelcher 1, 424-440; Fr. - J.D. Kaëstli - P. Cherix, *L'Évangile de Barthélémy*, Apocryphes 1, Turnhout 1993, 27-142; J.D. Kaëstli, in EApC 1, 257-356; Eng. - James 166-181; Schneemelcher ET 1, 539-553; Sp. - Santos Otero 530-566; Starowieyski 1/2, 753-776.

Book of the Resurrection: Ed.: CANT 80; E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1913, 1-48 (with Eng. tr.). Trans.: Eng. - W. Crum, in R. de Rustafjaell, *The Light of Egypt from Recently Discovered Predynastic and Early Christian Records*, London 1909, 110-136; Fr. - J.D. Kaëstli - P. Cherix, *L'Évangile de Barthélémy*, Apocryphes 1, Turnhout 1993, 143-241; J.D. Kaëstli, EApC 299-356 (trans.); It. - Erbetta 1/2, 301-319; Moraldi 1, 801-805 (summary); Ger. - W. Schneemelcher, in Schneemelcher 1, 437-440 (summary).

M. Starowieyski

BASIL, archimandrite (d. after 434). *Antiochene, deacon and *archimandrite at *Constantinople, follower of *Cyril of Alexandria. With the monk and lector *Thalassius (whom PG 91, 1471-1480 confuses with the friend of St. *Maximus the Confessor), he was the first to accuse *Nestorius of *heresy and violence before the emperor *Theodosius II (ca. 430) (Mansi 4, 1101-1108); he was ill-received, however. After the Council of *Ephesus (431), he gave Patriarch Proclus (434–446) a **libellus* (preserved in Latin) for the condemnation of the works of *Theodore of Mopsuestia (PG 65, 851-856; Mansi 9, 240-242). *Liberatus (PL 68, 991) mentions a second *libellus* and a treatise against *Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore (both lost).

CPG III, 5774-5775; DHGE 6, 1078; Bardenhewer 4, 211-212.

A. De Nicola

BASIL, Liturgy of Saint (CPG 2905/CPG Suppl. 2905). The liturgical collections of the *Byzantine *liturgy, starting with the euchological *Barberini* 336 (AD 795), give three *anaphorae (eucharistic formularies), one of which is attributed to St. *Basil. It is very beautiful, but rarely used today due to its length (ed. F.E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* I, Oxford 1896, 308-345; M.I. Orlov, *Liturgia Sv. Vasilija Velikago*, Petersburg 1909; P.N. Trempelas, *Ai treis Leiturgiai*, Athens 1935). There is also a shorter *Alexandrian anaphora of St. Basil (PG 31, 1629-1677) in Greek, *Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic (v. J. Doresse - E. Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de s. Basile*, Louvain 1960, and W.F. Macomber: OCP 43 [1977] 308-334). The *Syriac, *Armenian, *Georgian and *Palaeoslavonic versions and an Arab version follow the Byzantine recension, in places in a form earlier than that of the Greek MSS. P.H. Engberding, *Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie*, Münster 1931, after critically treating the entire documentation, suggested that the Alexandrian recension was the (*Antiochene) text inherited by Basil, and the Byzantine form was a revision due to his initiative. B. Capelle, in the appendix to the publication of a Coptic MS by Doresse-Lanne (see above), supports this theory by numerous observations. Engberding himself, however, returning to the argument in *Das anaphorische Fürbittegebet der Basiliusliturgie* (OrChr 47 [1963] 16-52; 49 [1965] 18-37; cf. Muséon 79 [1966] 287-313), was reticent. Even if the Byzantine formula adds traits reflecting Basil's influence, nothing guarantees that it contains no further additions. In any case this must be admitted for the prayers that frame the anaphora: if they bear Basil's name, like other prayers of the ritual or in the *Mystagogical History* (CPG 8023), it is because of the similarity to the anaphora.

Of the numerous translations, see the Italian, with notes, of P. Scazzoso, *Introduzione alla ecclesiologia di S. Basilio*, Milan 1975, 144-170; J.R.K. Fedwick, *The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into their Common Origin*, Rome 1992.

J. Gribomont

BASIL and EMMELIA (4th c.). Parents of *Basil the Great and *Gregory of Nyssa, both from aristocratic *Cappadocian families. Basil, a lawyer and literary scholar, taught rhetoric at *Neocaesarea in Cappadocia and was the son of wealthy Christians with landholdings spread throughout *Pontus and Cappadocia; during *Diocletian's persecution they were forced to hide in the mountains. Emmelia, an orphan whose father may have died in *Licinius's persecution, married young. Nine of the couple's children survived, including—in addition to Basil and Gregory—*Peter, bishop of *Sebaste, and *Macrina. *Gregory of Nazianzus speaks of Basil in the *Oratio* XLIII, 9,11 (PG 36, 503ff.), praising his virtue. Basil died in 350 and, with her daughter Macrina, Emmelia withdrew to Annesi near the River Iris (Pontus). She died ca. 373 and was buried next to her husband in the Church of the Forty Martyrs at Sebaste. Feast 30 May.

Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Macrinae*: PG 46, 963-966; Gregory of Nazianzus, *In laudem Basilii*: PG 36, 499-512; DHGE 15, 429; BS 2, 949; R. van Dam, *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003, 77-78; R. van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

L. Navarra

BASIL of Ancyra (4th c.). Ordained bishop of *Ancyra to replace *Marcellus, deposed in 336. Previously a doctor, he had had a good literary training. He stood out among the more representive elements of the Eusebians, both at *Serdica (343) and esp. at *Sirmium in 351, when he brought the charge that led to *Photinus's deposition. *Athanasius counted him among his adversaries. But faced with the revival of radical *Arianism (335 c.), Basil, who until then had esp. opposed the *monarchianism of Marcellus and Photinus, developed his doctrine in a clearly anti-Arian direction. He was the leading figure of the *homoiousian reaction of 358, through the Council of Ancyra and through influence on *Constantius, which led to the ephemeral triumph of the Council of Sirmium of 358 against the Arians. In the period leading up to the councils of *Rimini and *Seleucia, however, he was persuaded to subscribe to the (anti-homoiousian) Sirmian formula of 22 May 358. He added some personal clarifications to make it compatible with homoiousian doctrine, but the gesture weakened his prestige, and at the Council of Seleucia (359) he played only a secondary role. He was deposed at the Council of *Constantinople of 360, which sanctioned the defeat of the homoiousians in favor of the *homoians and moderate Arians. Regaining freedom of action after Constantius's death, he was one of the homoiousians who wrote to *Jovian in 363 against the final decisions of Rimini and Seleucia and in favor of a new council. This is our last glimpse of him. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 89) says he was the author of several works, naming a *Contra Marcellum* and a treatise *On Virginity,* the latter very probably identified in a work *On True Purity in Virginity,* wrongly attributed to *Basil of Caesarea. We have Ba-

sil's Ancyran synodal of 358 (also under the name of *George of Laodicea) and a subsequent doctrinal clarification, both basic documents of homoiousian theology.

CPG II, 2825-2827; Quasten II, 203-205 (bibl.); F. Cavallera, *Le De virginitate de Basile d'Ancyre*: RHE 6 (1905) 5-14; Simonetti 586; BBKL I, 406; T.D. Barnes, *The Crimes of Basil of Ancyra*: JTS 47 (1996) 550-554.

M. Simonetti

BASIL of Caesarea in Cappadocia (Basil the Great) (ca. 330–379)

I. First publications - II. Episcopate. Activity at Caesarea - III. Ecumenical activity - IV. Canonical activity - V. Hellenic culture - VI. The liturgy - VII. Minor and spurious works - VIII. Death and funeral eulogies.

Aristocratic in culture, sense of responsibility and in the ownership of immense landed estates in *Pontus and *Armenia, Basil, born ca. 330, was a brilliant student of *rhetoric (including philology, *philosophy and administration) at *Caesarea, *Constantinople and *Athens, where he became close friends with *Gregory of Nazianzus. From childhood he had received a solid Christian formation, esp. from his grandmother, the elder Macrina. After his father's death in 358, he renounced a career, sold his property, requested *baptism and retired to a family property on the Iris at Annesi with his mother and his sister *Macrina; his elder brother Naucratius had preceded him there, and to a certain degree his younger brother, *Gregory of Nyssa, shared this way of life until his marriage. Though Gregory of Nazianzus's more contemplative ideal was not satisfied by this, he did stay for some time at Annesi and contributed to Basil's formation. Beginning in 340 a radical evangelical movement arose from *Armenia to Constantinople, deeply at odds with the state church; *Eustathius of Sebaste, the movement's inspiration, visited Annesi and enjoyed great authority there, though Basil was not unaware of the ambiguous social and psychological motives mixed in with these religious aspirations.

I. First publications. After a journey of reflection to the nascent centers of *monasticism in *Syria and *Egypt, Basil composed a "dossier" of 1500 NT verses, the *Moral Rules,* a compendium of Christian duties related to the crisis of his time. He and Gregory of Nazianzus also studied *Origen during this period, drawing from his work an exegetical and philosophical methodology, the **Philocalia*. He also had some knowledge of *Eusebius of Caesarea, though the very clear anti-*anomoian position that Basil adopted after 360 made him wary of a certain *subordinationist Origenism. Shortly before 364 he wrote three books *Against Eunomius,* the bishop of Cyzicus whose *Apologia* gave a strong impetus to this tendency, inducing Eustathius and his colleagues at the Synod of *Lampsacus to align themselves with the *Nicene groups, send a delegation to *Rome and finally to subscribe to the **homoousios*. Despite permanent tension with the bishop of Caesarea, Basil was raised to the priesthood and acquired great authority thanks to his exceptional *ascetic and charitable activity. His preaching was as severe—especially toward the rich—as it was brilliant. After retiring to Annesi to accommodate the bishop, the latter called him back to stand up to the emperor *Valens, and Basil found himself in an even stronger position. The ascetic communities, which predated and were relatively independent of him, supported and were supported by him. They asked for his response to their questions on the interpretation of the gospels, and a first collection of his answers, the *Asceticon,* was published when these institutions were still in mid-development. This recension is preserved only in *Latin and *Syriac versions that attest its early circulation; it is called the *Little Asceticon* to distinguish it from the Greek editions, twice as long, which superseded it and which suppose more structured fraternities. This *Great Asceticon* is difficult to date, since Basil does not appeal to his episcopal authority for support; nonetheless it is likely that he continued to respond to such queries until the end of his life. Only a few letters, notable for their elegance, survive from this period; other more simple ones, and doubtless numerous homilies, must have been lost.

II. Episcopate. Activity at Caesarea. Bishop Eusebius's death (370) unleashed strong opposition to Basil among the episcopate and clergy, but the people wanted him and he set out to win over the electors with an energy that rather scandilized Gregory of Nazianzus, more drawn to *contemplation and *poetry. The help of *Eusebius of Samosata and *Meletius of Antioch, from somewhat of a distance, effectively sustained the Nicene reforming party. Basil was quick to align himself with *Athanasius, who had appreciated his actions and had confidence in him; in return, the deacon Sabinus gave him a pledge of the communion of the West. Basil's ascetic and charitable activity intensified, thanks to the funds at his disposal, with the building of *Basiliad, a hospice town which was to become the center of modern Caesarea. From Sebaste, *Eustathius sent a

group of disciples to organize everything as it had been done in his own see. Basil continued to preach, but it is hard to discern which of his moral homilies and his homilies on the Psalms date from his priesthood and which from his episcopate. The nine homilies on the *Hexameron,* preached during *Lent, must be assigned to his last years; they have an evident tendency to replace the *Platonic and *Stoic vision of the world with an ambitious *exegesis, and their attack on the abuse of *allegory in exegesis could certainly apply to his brother Gregory's as yet unpublished doctrine. (It is certain that his successors and friends, the other Cappadocians, published their writings after his death more so than during his lifetime, with the clear intention of supplementing his more rigorously biblical doctrine; he seems to have encouraged them to reflect rather than to publish.) The homilies *On the Creation of Man* and *On Paradise* are posthumous, edited by a disciple; if a genuine piece completes the *Hexameron,* it is the homily *Consider Yourself*. Basil anticipated the Middle Ages in placing himself at the helm of his city against the government, as a powerful *prostatēs*. Much of his correspondence reflects this social mission, and we often see him intervening on behalf of an impoverished aristocracy. He left little written trace of his administration of the local church; we have some correspondence with the *chorbishops, responsible for the vast countryside of a diocese in which inhabited centers were rare. The two books *On Baptism,* whose authenticity has recently been questioned, provided catechists with pastoral directives for a fairly exacting preparation, in reaction against the easy baptism of a lax church. In the end, the support that Basil received against imperial pressure and the veneration that followed his death prove his popularity; especially those who opposed his election seem to have understood that they had everything to gain by rejoining his ranks.

III. Ecumenical activity. Basil was always actively concerned with the wider unity of believers, against the *Arian court and philosophy and for an evangelical reform that would give a wide berth to the ascetic ideal but without yielding to uncontrollable excesses. His idea of the church hinged on the group of bishops led by *Meletius of Antioch, who was suspect to the old Nicenes; in fact, from 374, the West would incline more and more toward *Paulinus of Antioch's "little church," anticanonical in origin, which Basil considered *schismatic if not *heretical. (What Basil says about it in *Ep.* 214 to a high official friendly to the West and to the Nicenes is rather tendentious and does not harmonize with the whole of his theology.) Throughout his life Basil tried, by long correspondence and numerous embassies, to get the West to send a mission that could observe the situation on the spot and renew links with the church of Antioch. He was conscious of being in communion with the universal church, including the West (*Ep*. 204,7), and of being qualified to restore unity; his disappointment with *Damasus's pride and refusal to be informed (*Ep*. 259,2) made no change in this persevering will to unity. His friends, continuing his policy after his death, managed to completely rehabilitate Meletius at the Council of Constantinople in 381. In a more limited geographic area, Basil also tried to end disputes among the bishops of Asia Minor. He upheld a fairly moderate dogmatic formula which guaranteed the expression of faith, without imposing on the different traditions more than Scripture required: confession of the *Nicaenum* and a break with those who reduced the *Holy Spirit to a creature, without imposing a newer and more positive formula. His *Ep.* 113 and 114 are a splendid document, showing how, through common charitable work, one could grow in faith on the basis of an agreement so conceived. It was impossible, however, to maintain communion in this spirit with bishops who mistrusted each other: Eustathius and his friends, Theodotus of Nicopolis (linked to Meletius), and *Atarbius of Neocaesarea. In 373, despite several days of friendly and detailed talks at Sebaste, which had momentarily succeeded in reaching agreement on the unity of veneration of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Eustathius withdrew his concessions and in turn accused Basil. After two years of silence, Basil felt obliged to proclaim the breach, publishing his *Treatise on the Holy Spirit* and a series of pamphlets (*Ep.* 223, 224, 226, 244). As a result, his friends (and subsequent biographers) systematically omitted any mention of Eustathius, despite the evidence attested by the documents. Chs. 10-27, the central nucleus of the *Treatise,* form a dialogue so coherent and respectful of its opponents' objections that Dörries has rightly seen in it a direct echo of the visit to Sebaste, and the argument that succeeded in obtaining the old ascetic's adherence before he finally joined the ranks of the *pneumatomachi,* or *Macedonians. Ecumenical undertakings were complicated by a minor administrative conflict: in 372 the creation of a civil province, Cappadocia II, gave the bishop of *Tyana an occasion to claim metropolitan rights over the whole west of the region. The struggle that followed is symptomatic of the tensions that disturbed ecclesiastical structures in their adaptation to imperial administrative frameworks. It was in these circumstances that Basil, to multiply the number of sees under his jurisdiction,

imposed the see of Sàsima on Gregory of Nazianzus, that of Nyssa on his brother Gregory and so on. Outside his province he was more successful, making his disciple *Amphilochius metropolitan of Iconium, in Lycaonia. Besides the authority of his character and the support of the people, Basil drew political strength from the influence of the see of Caesarea in Armenia, beyond the frontier. If *Valens's internal policy, and esp. the praetorian prefect Modestus and the vicar of Pontus Demosthenes, tended to put obstacles in his way, the general responsible for the Armenian border, Terentius, a Westerner and Nicene, honored him with his confidence and supported him.

IV. Canonical activity. Wishing to follow in his own episcopal activities the path traced by Basil, his favorite disciple, *Amphilochius of Iconium, to whom the *Treatise on the Holy Spirit* and a series of precise theological letters had been addressed, asked him for a written account of the canonical traditions to be respected. Three *Epistles* (188, 199, 217) enumerate 84 canons, partly pre-Basilian (and at times, in his judgment, unsatisfactory) and partly retouched or created by Basil. The contrast with the *Asceticon,* and even with the *Homilies,* shows how the once-intransigent ascetic had become aware of a bishop's possibilities.

V. Hellenic culture. In his ascetic works, or in his book *On Baptism,* aimed at a public with little education, Basil willingly employed a simple style. Texts aimed at a refined audience, on the other hand, e.g., some homilies and esp. some letters, could be of great elegance. Only with difficulty can such differences be attributed to chronological evolution, though we can understand how some youthful works might bear the imprint of the brilliant spirit of Athens. Thus *Ep.* 2, an open letter to Gregory of Nazianzus, is a defense of the ascetical ideal in universities. The famous *Address to Young People on Hellenic Culture* takes the same line: on the pretext of guiding his nephews, Basil explains how Athenian philosophy and *paideia* may lead to an attitude not unlike Christian asceticism. Both works systematically downplay biblical justification—of supreme authority for Basil—and confine themselves to preparing minds accustomed to other models. The Renaissance, happy to find a justification for ancient literature, gave a great welcome and a new purpose to these works of Basil.

VI. The liturgy. Basil's concern for the prayer life (and working life) of monastic communities, and later with the edification of the Caesarean church, explain his presence in the liturgical movement. *Ep.* 2 and *Great Rule* 37 expound a program for sanctifying the day; *Ep.* 207, 3 responds to the criticisms of more conservative churches; *Homilies* on Psalms 1 and 28, on *Thanksgiving,* and many others develop the theme of divine praise. Echoes of euchological formulas can be seen in the *Great Rule* 2. A beautiful Byzantine eucharistic formulary bears Basil's name; it also exists in *Syriac, *Armenian, *Paleoslavonic and Arabic. A similar, but shorter and more archaic, *Alexandrian formulary survives in Greek, *Coptic and Arabic (*see* Basil, Liturgy of Saint).

VII. Minor and spurious works. The ascetic corpus has reached us through various traditions: one from Basileias of Caesarea, attested by the Armenian version; one, obviously, from the Studite tradition; one dependent on the *Hypotyposis ascetica,* a collection sent by Basil in his last years to some communities of Pontus. This *Hypotyposis* included the *Moral Rules* (some think, without foundation, that it is a revised edition) with its original prologue *On the Judgment of God* and a new prologue *On Faith* (seemingly before 373); and the *Great Asceticon,* with a prologue. The Basileias collection had a supplementary prologue and a list of *Epitimia* (penances assigned to certain faults): writings certainly not from Basil's hand, but perhaps contemporary. Ascetic manuscripts add other, later prologues, and esp. the *Monastic Constitutions* (Palestine?), which left room for Egyptian anchorism and had great success in the Slavic world and in *Byzantine monasticism. Some homilies are not authentic: *On the Creation of Man; On Paradise; Second Homily* on Psalm 28; *Homilies* on Psalms 37 and 132 (Eusebius of Caesarea); on Barlaam; *On the Holy Spirit; On Penitance* (Eusebius of Emesa); *On Free Will* (ps.-Macarius); *Ne dederis somnum; Third Homily on Fasting; On Mercy*; *Consolation to a Sick Person* (Basil of Seleucia?); and others recently published or promised by M. Aubineau. The *Commentary on Isaiah,* written in Cappadocia in the 4th c., is generally considered inauthentic. The treatise *On Virginity,* not authentic, has been attributed by F. Cavallera to *Basil of Ancyra. Many letters in the traditional collection are not Basil's: 8 (*Evagrius of Pontus); 93 (*Severus of Antioch); 10, 16, 38, 189 (Gregory of Nyssa); 47, 166, 167, 169-171, 321 (Gregory of Nazianzus); 39-45, 50, 197 § 2, 335-359 (or 346-359?), 360, 365, 366 are to be rejected.

VIII. Death and funeral eulogies. In 378 Basil's activity seems to have been greatly reduced; he died (according to his liturgical anniversary) 1 January

379. The brilliant funeral eulogies of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa had an excessive influence on *hagiography, and are far from corresponding to the facts that emerge from an analysis of his writings.

Editions: CPG 2835-3005; CPG/S 2835-3008.

Translations: [also listed in CPG/S] PG 29-32; SC 7, 26; It. - *Opere ascetiche*, eds. U. Neri - M.B. Attioli, Turin 1980; Fr. - B. Pruche, *Traité du Saint-Esprit*, SC 17; Letters: Fr. - Courtonne, Paris 1957-1966; Eng. - R.J. Deferrari, London 1926-1934; S.A.C. Way, Washington, DC 1965-1969; It. - A. Regaldo Raccone, Alba 1968.

Studies: M.G. Murphy, *St. Basil and Monasticism*, Washington, DC 1930; S. Giet, *Les idées et l'action sociales de saint Basile le Grand*, Paris 1941; E. Amand, *L'Ascèse monastique de saint Basile*, Maredsous 1949; G.L. Prestige - H. Chadwick, *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, London 1956; H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*, Göttingen 1956; T. Špidlík, *La Sophiologie de S. Basile*, Rome 1961; S.A.C. Way, *Saint Basil, Exegetic Homilies*, Washington D.C. 1963; B. Pruche, *Autour du traité sur le Saint-Esprit de saint Basile de Césarée*: RecSR (1964) 204-232; J. Gribomont, *Esotérisme et tradition chez S. Basile*: Œcumenica. Annales de recherches œcuméniques 1967, Neuchâtel 1967; J. Gribomont, *Histoire du texte des Ascétiques de S. Basile*, Louvain 1953; Y. Courtonne, *Un témoin du IVe siècle. Saint Basile et son temps d'après sa correspondance*, Paris 1973; E. Cavalcanti, *Il problema del linguaggio teologico nell'adv. Eunomium di Basilio Magno*: Augustinianum (1974) 527-539; E. Cavalcanti, *Studi eunomiani*, Rome 1976; Th.A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, 2 vols., Philadelphia 1979; P.J. Fedwick, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*, Toronto 1979; J. Cazeaux, *Les échos de la sophistique autour de Libanios*, Paris 1980; P.J. Fedwick (ed.), *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, 2 vols., Toronto 1981; P. Maraval, *La date de la mort de Basile de Césarée*: REAug 34 (1988) 25-38; R. Pouchet, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: une stratégie de communion*, Rome 1992; Ph. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, Berkeley, CA 1994; P.J. Fedwick, *Bibliotheca Basiliana Universalis: A Study of the Manuscript Tradition of the Works of Basil of Caesarea*, 4 vols., Turnhout 1993-2000; W.-D. Hauschild, *Basilius von Caesarea (ca. 329–379)*: TRE 5, 301-313; Basilius Caesar., *Discorso ai Giovani*, with a Latin version by L. Bruni, Florence 1984; Basil of Caesarea, *Lettere - I*, It. tr. by M. Forlin Patrucco, Turin 1983; Basil of Caesarea, *Le regole*, It. tr. by L. Cremaschi, Magnano 1993; S.J. Voicu, *Cesaria, Basilio (Ep. 93/94)* and *Severo*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 697-703.

J. Gribomont

BASIL of Cilicia (first half of 6th c.). *Presbyter at *Antioch, then bishop of Irenopolis in *Cilicia. Wrote 16 books, 13 in dialogue form, including a vigorous polemic against the *Neochalcedonian theologian *John of Scythopolis, whose works he criticized in three books titled *Against the Nestorians*. Ignoring personal insults, he then energetically defended the position of the school of Antioch, for which he was charged with being a *Nestorian. The patriarch *Photius knew Basil's pamphlet (Cod. 107) and his ecclesiastical history (Cod. 42), both now lost. The latter work, prolix and muddled but based on rich documentary sources, dealt with the mid-5th to mid-6th c. The *Suidas (or Sudas), which compares Basil with the more important *Basil of Caesarea, knows another unknown polemical work against the presbyter Archelaus.

PWK 3, 54ff. Photius's summaries, with Fr. tr. and comments, ed. René Henry, vols. I and II, Paris 1959/60.

J. Irmscher

BASIL of Seleucia. In Isauria (bishop from 444/448; d. after 468). Little is known of his life, except his participation at the Synod of *Constantinople of 448, at the *latrocinium* of *Ephesus (449) and at the Council of *Chalcedon (451). Despite his inconstancy—he oscillated against, for and once more against *Dioscorus—his profession of faith of 448 (a commentary on *Cyril of Alexandria's *Formula of Union* of 433; CPG 5339) was incorporated into the dogmatic definition of Chalcedon; he later remained faithful to the Chalcedonian party. About fifty of his homilies remain, revealing him to be a moderate follower of the *Antiochene school; most still await a critical edition and an examination of authenticity. It has been shown that some of his homilies are revisions of works by other authors and that they, in turn, are the source of later hymns, esp. those of *Romanus Melodus. Two homilies, attributed in the manuscripts to *Basil the Great and thought by some to be of *Proclus of Constantinople (CPG 5834-5835), should perhaps be attributed to Basil of Seleucia. The *De vita et miraculis s. Theclae* (CPG 6675), attributed to Basil, is a spurious work by a priest of Seleucia whom Basil himself had excommunicated.

CPG 6655-6675 and 5834-5835; PG 85, 27-474; DHGE 6, 1156-1157; B. Marx, *Der homiletische Nachlaß des Basileios von Seleukia*: OCP 7 (1941) 329-369; M. van Parijs, *L'évolution de la doctrine christologique de Basile de Séleucie*: Irénikon 44 (1971) 493-514; K. Mitsakis, *The Hymnography of the Greek Church in the Early Christian Centuries*: JÖByz 20 (1971) 31-49; M. Aubineau, *Homélies pascales* (SC 187), Paris 1972, 167-277; A. de Halleux, *La définition de Chalcédoine*: RTL 7 (1976) 3-23; 155-170; G. Dagron, *Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle* (Subs Hag 62), Brussels 1978; J.M. Tevel, *De preken van Basilius van Seleucië. Handschriftelijke overlevering - Editie van vier preken*, Utrecht 1990.

S.J. Voicu

BASIL the Great (pseudo). The *Tractatus de consolatione in adversis,* a short work composed probably in *Gaul on the occasion of the epidemic of 580, seems to have been written to console its readers, exhorting them to accept their sorrows in the light of Christ's redemptive work. It was previously identified with the consoling letter sent by *Victor of Cartenna to a certain Basil (CPL 854) about his son's death.

CPL 999; PG 31, 1687-1704; DTC 15, 2876-2877; F. Görres, *Der echte und falsche Victor von Cartenna*: Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 49 (1906) 484-494.

P. Marone

BASILIAD. Name given by *Gregory of Nazianzus to the "new city" (*Or.* 43,63) founded by *Basil the Great just outside the walls of his episcopal see of Caesarea for receiving and caring for *lepers, the injured, the sick, the *poor and *pilgrims. Named for Basil, the city was an application of the evangelical principles of poverty and charitable openness to the poor and needy, an openness born out of an intrinsic demand of being followers and imitators of Jesus Christ. Basil's city exercised such an attraction on the people that the old city was gradually abandoned, and the city-hospice of St. Basil kept the name "new city" even after a century.

M.M. Fox, *The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great as Revealed in his Works*, Washington, DC 1939; Ph. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, Berkeley, CA 1994; A. Holmes, *A Life Pleasing to God: The Spirituality of the Rules of St. Basil*, London 2000.

M.G. Bianco

BASILIDES (2nd c.). According to information from *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VII, 106,4), the *gnostic Basilides lived and taught at *Alexandria during the time of the emperors *Hadrian (117–138) and *Antoninus Pius (138–161). Basilides claimed the derivation of his teaching from a secret tradition going back to the apostle *Matthias (Hip., *Ref.* VII, 20,1-5); he also invoked Glaucias, Peter's interpreter, as his teacher. *Hegemonius's claim (*Act. Arch.* 67,4) that Basilides also taught in *Persia is confirmed by no other source. *Twenty-Four Books on the Gospel* are attributed to Basilides (Eus., *HE* IV, 7,7); he is accused by *Origen of having himself written a gospel (*Hom. I in Lc.*). Origen also said that Basilides wrote a book of *Odes* (*In Job.* 21,11; Pitra, *Anal. S.* II, 368). Interpretation of Basilides's thought is complicated not only by the nature of the sources (exclusively heresiological) but also by their lack of homogeneity: there is esp. a great difference between the full and detailed exposition of *Hippolytus, and those less extensive of *Irenaeus, Clement and Hegemonius. According to Hippolytus, Basilides held that from the "nonexistent" (οὐκ ὢν) God was derived the seed of the world, which contained all things in itself. From it, through successive generations, the world and a whole series of beings came about. Irenaeus does not mention the seed of the world, describing rather the series of successive emanations that, from the ungenerated Father, arrive at the angels, who in turn give origin to the 365 heavens: the angels of the last heaven created the world. Irenaeus also refers to Basilidian *Christology, which has traits typical of gnostic *docetism: the intellect sent by the Father was not crucified, but rather a certain Simon of Cyrene. Another description—more decisively *dualistic—of Basilides's thought is offered by the *Acta Archelai* (4th-c. anti-*Manichean writing). The passage, taken from the "thirteenth book of his treatises," is reported in a way that presents Basilides as a precursor of *Mani in the doctrine of the opposition between light and darkness. A critical judgment on this is particularly difficult, however, because here Basilides does not expound his own thought but reports that of others. Other aspects of Basilides's thought—more clearly anthropological—are reported by Origen (from whom we learn that Basilides accepted the doctrine of the transmigration of *souls) and by Clement of Alexandria, whose fragments on *evil, the intrinsic sinfulness of the soul and the consequent need for *expiation reveal Basilidian pessimism.

Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 24,3-7; Hippolytus, *Ref.* VII, 20-27; Clement Al., *Strom.* II, 113,3–114, 1; III, 1,1–3,2; IV, 81,1–83,1; 86,1; VI, 53,2-5; *Act. Arch.* 67,4-12; Origen, *Com. Rom.* V, 1; G. Quispel, *L'Homme gnostique. La doctrine de Basilide*: Eranos - Jb 16 (1948) 89-139; A. Orbe, *Los "apéndices" de Basilide* (*Un capítulo de filosofía gnostica*), Gregorianum 17 (1976) 81-107, 251-284; R.M. Grant, *Place de Basilide dans la théologie chrétienne ancienne*: REAug 25 (1979) 201-216; S. Pétrement, *Le Dieu separé.* Les origines du gnosticisme, Paris 1984, 459-473; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, Milan 1993, 134-179; Marienlexikon 1,387.

A. Monaci Castagno

BASILIDES of Pentapolis (3rd c.). Bishop of *Pentapolis, known as the addressee of a letter of *Dionysius of Alexandria (*Ep. canonica ad Basilidem episcopum*) on the length of *Lent and on the appropriate comportment for approaching the *Eucharist.

CPG 1569; PG 10, 1271-1290; J.B. Pitra, *Iuris ecclesiastici graecorum historia et monumenta*, I, Rome 1864, 541-545; P.P. Joan-

nou, *Fonti. Fascicolo IX. Discipline générale antique (IIe-IXe s.)*, II: *Les canons des Pères grecs*, Grottaferrata (Rome) 1963, 4-14.

P. Marone

BASILISCUS. Emperor of the eastern Roman Empire (January 475–August 476), consul in 465 and 476, as *magister militum* moved against the *Goths from *Thrace, perhaps at the request of his sister Verina, wife of the emperor *Leo I (457–474); in 468 was supreme commander of a large expedition, organized by Leo I with the Western empire, against the *Vandals. Given Basiliscus's ineptitude, large-scale corruption and treacherous plots, the military campaign ended with the annihilation of the *Byzantine fleet by the Vandals. Basiliscus did save himself, and by Verina's intercession obtained a pardon from the emperor. A conspiracy with generals Illus and Theodoric Strabo led to *Zeno's fall (474/475) and put Basiliscus on the throne; he crowned his wife Zenonis queen, and his son Mark caesar. He ruled only twenty months: the usurper thought to consolidate his power by attacking the resolutions of the Council of *Chalcedon and allowing *Timothy Aelurus to return from exile; the latter was received with honor at *Constantinople by the emperor, but not by the Patriarch Acacius. Timothy requested of Basiliscus the encyclical (*enkyklion*) in which only the councils of *Nicaea, Constantinople I and *Ephesus were recognized as valid, with Pope *Leo's **Tomus* and the definition of Chalcedon explicitly rejected. Patriarch Acacius reacted immediately, stirring up clergy, monks and people, thus forcing Basiliscus to promulgate an antiencyclical by which he revoked the earlier encyclical—the last act of his theological adventures. In the meantime a fire destroyed much of the city; clergy, artisans and merchants were instigated to revolt against the emperor because of his tax policies; Verina became upset over the removal of her lover Patricius. General opinion thus moved against Basiliscus, and Zeno, who had been imprisoned by Trocondus and Illus in a mountain fortress, was able with the connivance of his guard to return to Constantinople. Basiliscus entrusted himself to the church's protection but was handed over by the patriarch and transferred to *Cappadocia with his wife and son, where he died of hunger in prison.

PWK, 3, 101ff.; I.E. Caraghiannopoulos, *Historia Byzantinous kratous*, Thessaloníki 1978, 300-304; E. Dovere, *L'*Enkyklion Basiliskon. *Un caso di normativa imperiale in Oriente su temi di dogmatica teologica*: SDHI 51 (1985) 153-188; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, Brescia 1996, 329-343.

J. Irmscher - C. Dell'Osso

BASSIANUS of Ephesus (mid-5th c.). A priest of *Ephesus, Bassanius had a *ptocheion* with 70 beds built for the poor and sick; he was proud of this work and became popular because of his charitable works. Out of envy his bishop, Memnon, with force and even blows, ordained him bishop of Euaza ca. 431 (Mansi 7, 273ff.), but he refused to go. Memnon was succeeded by Basil, who allowed Bassianus to remain in the city, and on Basil's death the people elected him as their bishop, the choice being accepted by the emperor *Theodosius II. In 448 a rival group elected *Stephen. The 11th and 12th sessions of the Council of *Chalcedon dealt with the contest between Bassianus and Stephen, deciding that neither were fit to govern the Ephesian church and requiring them to resign with a substantial pension, to be paid by the church of Ephesus.

Mansi 7, 273-300; DHGE 6, 1274-1275; DCB 1, 298-299; D.J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, New Brunswick, NJ 1968.

L. Navarra

BASSIANUS of Lodi (d. 409). Bishop of Lodi (*Laus Pompeia*) from ca. 373 to 409; an anti-*Arian, he participated at the Council of *Aquileia in 381 (he was one of the bishops who condemned the Arian *Palladius), and in 393 at the provincial Council of *Milan that accepted the condemnation of *Jovinian by Pope *Siricius. Mentioned as a friend of *Ambrose (in *Ep*. 4 and in *Paulinus, *Vita Ambr*. 47), Bassanius had a church built in honor of the *apostles (*basilica apostolorum*) outside the city walls on the road to *Rome; it was consecrated by Ambrose ca. 387 (PL 16, 889). Patron of the diocese of Lodi, his identification (by Savio) with *Pacian, who took part in the Roman synod of 372, has been rejected by Lanzoni (*Le diocesi d'Italia, II*, Faenza 1927, 994).

F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia. La Lombardia II*, Bergamo 1932, 156-161; G. Baroni, *S. B. nella storia religiosa e civile, nell'arte, nelle lettere e nella legislazione*, Lodi 1938; var. aus., *San Bassiano vescovo di Lodi. Studi nel XVI centenario della ordinazione episcopale 374-1974*, Lodi 1974; Diocesi di Lodi, eds. A. Caprioli *et al.*, Brescia 1989, passim; PCBE 2,269–2,270.

L. Navarra

BAUDONIVIA (late 6th–early 7th c.). Nun of the Monastery of the Holy Cross, *Poitiers, ordered by the abbess Dedimia to write an enlargement of *Venantius Fortunatus's *Vita S. Radegundis*—not to repeat him, but to add *ea quae prolixitate praetermisit.* Baudonivia admits her lack of literary skill and uses barbarisms common in Merovingian Latin but rises

above the common run of *hagiographers. Venantius's *Life* then became known as the first book, and Baudonivia's prologue and 28 chapters the second book of St. *Radegund's biography. Her text presupposes that of Venantius and develops as an autonomous narrative with references to significant episodes. The association of Radegund and St. *Helena with respect to the acquisition of the wood of the cross is unique and has the purpose of elevating the importance of the *monastery (thus Baudonivia's *Life* has been understood as a "Klostervita," a biography to be used in convents). In any event Radegund is a perfect nun with regal qualities that she maintains even within the convent, something not mentioned by Fortunatus.

CPL 1053; PL 72, 663; DHGE 6, 1357-1360; C. Leonardi, *Fortunato e Baudonivia*, in *Aus Kirche und Reich. Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter. Festschrift F. Kempf*, Sigmaringen 1983, 23-32; R. Aigrain, *Sainte Radegonde*, Poitiers 1987; V. Labande-Mailfert, *Vie de sainte Radegonde pour la moniale Baudonivie. Traduction:* Lettre de Ligugé 239 (1987) 9-32; F.E. Consolino, *Due agiografi per una regina: Radegonda di Turingia tra Fortunato e Baudonivia*: Studi Storici 29 (1988) 143-159; J. Leclercq, *La sainte Radegonde de Venance Fortunat et celle de Baudonivie*, in *Fructus centesimus. Mélanges offert à G.J.M. Bartelink*, Steenbrugge 1989, 207-216; C. Leonardi, *Baudonivia la biografa*, in *Medioevo al femminile*, ed. F. Bettini, Rome-Bari 1989, 31-40; E.G. Whatley, *An Early Literary Quotation from the "Inventio S. Crucis": A Note on Baudonivia's "Vita S. Radegundis,"* (BHL 7049): AB 111 (1993) 81-91.

L. Navarra

BEATITUDE

I. Greek Fathers - II. Latin Fathers - III. Augustine.

When beatitude, or happiness, is spoken of in patristic literature and *spirituality, it usually refers in a fairly general way to the joyful state that results from contact or union with the supeme Good: an intellectual, volitional, loving and *mystical possession, fully attained only at the resurrection. From this it follows that happiness in this life—the fruit of *contemplation, possession, love or mystical union with God—is always an imperfect anticipation-participation of what we hope for. The *Platonic ideal of happiness, consisting of unity with the One—accessible only to a minority through an ascending process of gradual intellectual interiorization (the realm of union with the supreme Good)—is corrected by the conception of the Christian fathers: all people and the whole human being, with all its powers, can attain full and final happiness in the enjoyment and "pleasure of the truth," which is God (Aug. *Conf.* 10, 20-23: NBA 1, 324-330). One thus understands why, for beatitude or happiness, the Greek fathers chose the term *markariotēs* (rejecting *eutychia* or *eudaimonia*) and the Latin fathers similarly *beatitudo* rather than *felicitas*.

I. Greek Fathers. In Greco-Christian authors the theme of happiness is continually mingled with eschatological ideas, and their main emphasis is on the happiness promised at the end, in the world to come. We will cite here only those authors offering thematic continuity on this problem. *Hermas, in his inspired and lyrical language, says that "all will be equal for the elect . . . ; the promises made to them" will be fulfilled "with great glory and delight" (*Shep. Vis.* I,3,4: SC 53,86). *Ignatius of Antioch knows that martyrdom will allow him to "reach God" (*Theou epitychein*: *Rom.* 4,1: PG 5, 690); he thus implores the faithful of *Rome not to hinder his death, by which he will obtain the contemplation and enjoyment of the "blessed light": *katharon phōs* (*Rom.* 6,2: PG 5, 692). *Theophilus of Antioch assures Autolycus that these, having laid aside the corruption of the body, will attain the joyful vision of God, according to the merits acquired in life (*Ad Autol.* 1,7: PG 6, 1036). For *Irenaeus of Lyons, "Those who see God are in God and . . . are made partakers of life. . . . And this participation consists . . . in the enjoyment of his goodness" (*Adv. haer.* 4,20: PG 7, 1032). As for the *Alexandrians, *Clement relates Christian beatitude to baptismal enlightenment, thanks to which "one perceives" (*epopteuetai*) the holy and saving light that brings one into the blessed, face-to-face vision of God (*Paedag.* 1,6: PG 8, 280 and 292). For *Origen perfect happiness, conceived in intellectual and mystical terms, is reached in eternal life (*De prin.* 2,11: SC 252, 394-412), when the just will understand the meaning of things; when fully perfect, as pure intelligences, they will directly contemplate rational essences. In this state of absolute stability and fullness of happiness—their appetites satisfied—human wills remain unalterable, attracted by the knowledge and contemplation of divinity, just as with the Son (*Comm. in Rom* 5,10: PG 14, 1048-1056; *Comm. in Ev. Joh.* 1,16: PG 14, 49-51).

As for the *Cappadocians, *Basil likens the peace and joy of the elect in the contemplation of God to the moments of *ecstasy that his presence already produces in this life (*Hom. in Ps.* 14,1: PG 29, 250-253; *Hom. in Ps.* 32,1: PG 29, 324-325; *Hom. in Ps.* 33,11: PG 29, 376-377). Thus Basil, like other Fathers, without denying the predominantly eschatological interpretation of happiness or beatitude, insists on the possibility for good Christians of receiving an "unceasing joy" and an "uninterrupted gladness" already in this life. The basis of this spiritual—though

still earthly—joy is *hope, as we read later: "In another passage Paul urges us . . . to rejoice in hope. It is hope, therefore, that makes joy the inseparable companion of the fervent man" (*Hom. de grat. act.* 1-3: PG 31, 217-225). For *Gregory of Nyssa one tastes perfect happiness in the next life. Nevertheless, given the distance between the infinity of the beatifying object (God) and human limitation, it is impossible that human beings will ever arrive at full contemplation and possession; eternity will be an infinite process of drawing near to the fullness of contemplation-possession-union-beatitude (*De anim. et res.*: PG 46, 155). This theory allows for various interpretations: for some the person is completely happy in the various stages of this drawing near; for others this happiness bears an essential existential anguish because the person, conscious of being limited, will never reach the desired goal. *Gregory of Nazianzus is more confident of full eternal enjoyment: "Every good soul . . . , freed of the body, arrives immediately at enjoyment . . . of the good he awaits. . . . He enjoys a wonderful joy and exults . . . , advancing happily toward his Lord and enjoys the glory that he already contemplates" (*Laud. fun. pro Caes. fr.* 21: PG 35, 781-784).

In any event perfect happiness consists in the vision of God, even if the blessed, according to *John Chrysostom, will not be able to comprehend the divine essence (*De beato Philog.* 6,1: PG 48, 749; *In Ioh. hom.* 15,1ff.: PG 59, 97). Since the union of the elect with the Lord is indissoluble, adds *Cyril of Alexandria (*Comm. in Mt.* 4: PG 72, 372-373), our intelligence will be filled with an ineffable light, and earthly knowledge will yield to a "clearer knowledge" that corresponds to the contemplation of the divine nature (*Comm. in Ioh. ev.* XI, 16,25: PG 74, 461-464); this "perfect knowledge of God" will fill us with happiness (*Comm. in Ioh. ev.* IX, 14,4: PG 74, 185-188).

II. Latin fathers. The Latin fathers present a more descriptive vision of the perfect happiness of the blessed, proportionate to each one's merits (see, e.g., Hilary of Poitiers, *Tract. in Ps.* 64,5: PL 9, 415-416; Ambrose *Ep.* VII, 11: PL 16, 946; *Exp. ev. Luc.*, *prol.*: PL 15, 1610-1611; ibid., IV, 37: PL 15, 1707; ibid., V, 61: PL 15, 1738). In *Ambrose, moreover, we find the statement that total possession of eternal light, immortal glory and happiness is reached only by a gradual process (*Exp. ev. Luc.* V, 61: PL 15, 17). For some Latin fathers, beyond *essential* beatitude there is an *accidental* beatitude, which consists for *Cyprian of raising and strengthening oneself with bonds of friendship and family relations (*De mort.* 26: PL 4, 624); *Augustine shares this opinion (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 29: PL 49, 797). For *Boethius beatitude is the state in which the person reaches perfection: *status omnium bonorum aggregatione perfectus* (*De cons. phil.* III, 2: PL 63, 724). *Gregory the Great, finally, discerns an inequality in eternal beatitude, in that the object known is the same for everyone, but the more- or less-perfect knowledge of that object will differ among the blessed (*Hom. in ev.* 19: PL 76, 1155-1157).

III. Augustine. Anticipating a systematic relation between Scripture and the ancient philosophers, on the one hand, and theologians (who would later work out a coherent doctrine on this theme), on the other, Augustine in the study of happiness reached a greater philosophical density and degree of maturity. In his vast literary output he fully and clearly expounds the foundation and starting point of happiness, the concept of happiness, the conditions of happiness as a state, the true object in which it consists, the beatifying act, false happiness, the way to reach happiness, earthly happiness and perfect beatitude (DTC I, 505). Overcoming the *Stoic ethic's "soteriology of perfect knowledge," centered on self-possession and self-enjoyment, the main theme Augustine develops in his early *De beata vita* (PL 32, 958-976) is that the happy life consists in the perfect knowledge of God (*Retract.* I, 2: NBA 2, 12). Happiness does not consist, therefore, in the possession or enjoyment of a created good, but only in the possession or enjoyment of the absolute and perfect Good. The happy life on earth is possible only in hope, and its complete attainment even on this earth points to the other life. The relationship between wisdom, truth and measure leads Augustine back to the very source of perfect happiness: "The blessed life consists in knowing by whom you are led to the truth, by what truth you are made happy and by what principle you are united to the Perfect Measure" (*De beata vita* 4,35: CCL 29, 84). Consequently, the attainment of happiness is centered on the knowledge of the truth in the interiority of soul, knowledge that is at the same time possession and enjoyment of God (*Conf.* 10,22: NBA 1, 328). "He is happy who possesses God" (*De beata vita* 2,11: CCL 29, 72). Elsewhere (e.g., *De lib. arb.* II, 13,35: CCL 29, 261) Augustine insists on the fact that the wisdom that gives us happiness consists in an *amplecti frui delectari* of God himself, infinite truth and object of our happiness (*En. in ps.* 4,3: NBA 25, 36; *Conf.* 13,8: NBA 1, 456-458). In fact our supreme good is God, immutable Goodness. Thus our moral perfection, and our happiness will consist in knowing and loving this *summum bonum,* who makes us blessed (*Tract. in*

Ioh. 26,5: NBA 24/1, 600; *Trin.* 8, 4-8: NBA 4, 336-356), and which is the happiness of the angels and human beings in heaven, their true home (*Civ. Dei* 9,15: NBA 5/1, 650-654; 10, 1-3: NBA 5/1, 680-690; 12, 1: NBA 5/2, 146-150). The first joy of the city of God will be to praise the Creator: "He will be the goal of our desires, who will be seen without end, loved without boredom and praised without growing tired. This gift, this effect, this activity will be, like eternal life, common to all" (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 30,1: NBA 5/3, 414). For the elect, eternal life is like a sabbath without evening, an eternal rest not just for the spirit but also for the body. "There we shall rest and see; see and love; love and praise. This is the essence of the end that never ends" (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 30,5: NBA 5/3, 420), our final and complete happiness.

F. Worter, *Die Geistesentwicklung des hl. A. Augustinus bis zu seiner Taufe* (*Der Dialog* De beata vita), Paderborn 1892, 103-118; P. Alfaric, *L'évolution intellectuelle de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1918, 66-69, 429-431; Ch. Boyer, *Christianisme et néo-platonisme dans la formation de S. Augustin*, Paris 1920; R. Jolivet, *Oeuvres de S. Augustin. IV. Dialogues philosophiques . . .* , Paris 1939; H.U. von Balthasar, *Présence et pensée. Essai sur la philosophie religieuse de Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris 1942; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique. Essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de Saint Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris 1944; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1977, 459-489 (Fr. tr. Paris 1968; It. tr. Bologna 1972); Gran Enciclopedia Rialp (GER) 9, 815-817; R. Holte, *Béatitude et sagesse*, Paris 1962; DTC 1, 504-508; DSp 1, 1297-1298 (J. De Blic); EC 5, 1381-1386 (*Fine ultimo*: C. Fabro); EC 12, 1485-1493 (*Visione beatifica*: A. Piolanti); A. Heilmann - H. Kraft, *La teologia dei Padri*, It. ed. G. Mura (ed.), tr. by G. Corti and M. Spinelli, I, Rome 1974, 244-258; III, Rome 1975, 182-188; IV, Rome 1975, 323-338; V, Rome 1976, 438; LTK 4, 757-761 (*Glück*, *Glückseligkeit*: G. Bien, G. Greshake, G.W. Hunold, Th. Laubach, [3]1995); LTK 9, 437-442 (*Seligkeit*: W. Beinert, L. Scheffczyk, J. Sudbrack, 2003).

S. Folgado Flórez - M. Spinelli

BEATITUDES. Earthly life is an ascent toward the blessedness of the kingdom of heaven. All people aspire to happiness, and God promises unending happiness to all. The beatitudes announced by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount proclaim happiness above all for the *poor, the afflicted, the persecuted (Mt 5:3-12; Lk 6:20-26). To believers of the first Christian communities, the beatitudes were a sign of recognition of the Messiah, who had come to inaugurate the time of joy for the disinherited and to manifest in his human heart the tenderness of the heart of God. Thus *Origen: "All the beatitudes he announced in the gospel, Jesus confirms by his example, and he proves his teaching by his witness. He says: Blessed are the meek, and he adds something personal to this: learn of me, who am meek (Mt 11:29). Blessed are the peacemakers: and who is peaceable like my Lord Jesus, who is our peace, who has done away with hatred, destroying it in his flesh? (Eph 2:14-16). Blessed are those who are persecuted for justice; no one has undergone persecution for justice like the Lord Jesus" (*In Lc.* 38).

The theophanic announcement becomes ethical. The person is invited to choose true blessedness: "All people in fact seek happiness, but most do not know how to reach it" (Aug., *In Ps.* 118,1,1). The beatitudes become the heart of Christian *anthropology: the person who lives them discovers the secret of joy and simultaneously proclaims that Jesus is God. The rarity of their presence in the first Christian writings is a sign that their proclamation has its own vitality and clarity. The message of each of the beatitudes is directed to their overall meaning. For the **Didache,* "Blessed are the meek" sums up all the beatitudes and all the virtues (3,7-9). *Polycarp of Smyrna, by joining the first and last beatitudes, means to recommend them all: "Blessed are the poor and those persecuted for justice" (*Phil.* 2,3).

The Sermon on the Mount responds to humanity's widespread aspiration to *justice, called by the philosophers "the most sublime of the *virtues" (Cic., *Nat. deor.* 12,4). Christians consider it a divine gift, to be realized in earthly life with one's gaze fixed on "eternal justice." *Gregory of Nyssa, recalling the classical definition of justice as the art of "giving to each his due," exclaims: "Considering the loftiness of the divine legislation, I believe that in this justice one must understand something greater. . . . It seems to me that the Lord, in the discourse on virtue and on justice, would present himself to the desire of his listeners" (*Beat.* IV, PG 1236 A–1245 C). The beatitudes indicate "the perfect Christian lifestyle" (Aug., *Serm. in monte* 1,1,1). Their literal and spiritual meanings are woven together to make up the total meaning. The words "blessed are the poor" and "blessed are the hungry" in Luke seem at first to be a literal invitation to poverty and fasting (Tertull., *Marc.* IV 14,9-13; *Ieiun.* 15,6; cf. *Ap. Petri* [fr. Akhmim] 1-3; *Ep. Ap.* 38-40; *Ev. Th.* 68-69; *Act. Th.* 94; Nov., *Cib.* VI 3). The words "blessed are the poor in spirit" and "blessed are those who hunger for justice" of Matthew are echoed by *Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who in turn inspire all of the Fathers: if Christ is in fact poor, the poor who receive from him the riches of God already live in "poverty of spirit" (Clem. Al., *Ecl.* 11,2-14,4; *Quis div.* 17,4; *Strom.* IV 25, 1-4 and V 70,1; *Paed.* I 101,1-2; *Protr.* X 99,4; Orig., *Comm. Mt.* 5,10, Caten. 89; *In Lc.* 33; *In Jo.* XXXII 11,127; *Princ.* II 11,2-3; *In Gen.* 10,3; *In Ex.* 11,2).

Human beings have the right to food and justice. Jesus is present in the poor: "When a poor person is

hungry, it is Christ who hungers." In every poor person "there are two people who hunger: one hungers for bread, the other for justice" (Aug., *In Jo.* 8,9). The poor are blessed if they hunger for virtue, otherwise they remain "without God, and moreover without human riches, incapable of tasting the justice of God" (Clem. Al., *Quis div.* 17,4; cf. Greg. Nys., *Beat.* IV, PG 44, 1236). The poor not only should expect material and spiritual bread from the community but should also possess a treasure that they can bestow on others—they also enact justice by "distributing what is due" (Greg. Nys., *Beat.* IV, PG 44, 1233 D). If God prefers the poor, it is because he trusts that they, more easily than the well-to-do, feel hunger for his word that calls to soldarity: "One who is hungry suffers with others who are hungry; he gives, and so becomes just" (Ambr., *In Lc.* 5,65). Jesus, who is "living justice," invites all to "feed on justice" (Orig., *In Jo.* XXXII 11,127; Aug., *In Jo.* 13,5). Mary, Martha's sister, becomes the exemplar of the person who hungers for Christ: *ipsum manducabat quem audiebat* (Aug., *Serm.* 179,5). For Augustine: "God is everything for you. If you are hungry he is your bread, if you are thirsty he is your water" (Aug., *In Jo.* 13,5).

Life is an ascent on the "ladder" that leads to happiness. The one who follows the seven steps of the beatitudes encounters the *Holy Spirit with his seven gifts, who raises him to the summit of perfection (Aug., *Serm. in monte* I, 3,10). This is the itinerary of the beatitudes: the one who lives in poverty is blessed if he weeps for his sins, his heart is docile, he hungers and thirsts for justice, is merciful, prepares to see God with a pure heart, is a peacemaker; upon reaching the highest step, he will certainly encounter persecution for justice: "There are seven beatitudes that lead to perfection: the eighth illumines and manifests the perfection attained" (ibid. I, 4,12). The "palm of the beatitudes" is martyrdom, and to pour out one's blood for the gospel is the highest form of evangelization: "To give one's life means to proclaim the resurrection of the flesh for eternity" (Ambr., *In Lc.* 5,59; cf. Aug., *Civ. Dei* 22,9). There is also a daily martyrdom: to live the beatitudes is a "witness" of faith and charity through which many Christians "are already martyrs in the secret of their conscience, ready to pour out their blood for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Orig., *Hom. Num.* X, 2).

"True happiness is to be persecuted for the Lord" (Greg. Nys., *Beat.* VIII, PG 44, 1293 C). The person that "offers love for enmity, benevolence for hatred, good wishes for curses, help to the persecuted" will always live "in the furnace of tribulations" (Ambr., *In Lc.* 5,73); if he suffers because of members of his community who should love but rather mistreat him, God himself "sweetens the sufferings" in him, transforming them into "beatitude" (Aug., *In Ps.* 93,27). The eighth beatitude is a hymn to joy in the time of suffering: the martyr Stephen "rejoices, struck everywhere by the stones and eagerly accepting in his body, like a sweet dew, the snowfall of stones, one after the other, repaying his murderers with blessings" (Greg. Nys., *Beat.* VIII, PG 44, 1296 B).

D. Buzy, *Béatitudes*: DSp 1, 1298-1310; F. Hauck - G. Bertram, μακάριος, μακαρίζω, μακαρισμός: TWNT 4, 365-373; H. Cazelles - G. Bardy - G. Rabeau, *Béatitude*: Cath 1, 1342-1355; R. Holte, *Béatitudes et sagesse. Saint Augustin et le problème de la fin de l'homme dans la philosophie ancienne*, Fr. tr. Paris 1962 (Stockholm 1958); J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes*, I-II, Paris [2]1969; III, Paris [2]1973; A. Becker, *L'appel des béatitudes. A l'écoute de Saint Augustin*, Paris - Fribourg 1977; P. Meloni, *"Beati gli affamati e assetati di giustizia". L'interpretazione patristica*: Sandalion 2 (1979) 143-219; Id., *"Beati i perseguitati per la giustizia." L'interpretazione patristica*: Sandalion 3 (1980) 191-250; M. Spinelli, *Le Beatitudini nel commento dei Padri Latini*, Rome 1983; Y. de Andia, *La beatitudine dei miti* (Mt V,5) *nell'interpretazione di S. Ireneo*, IX Conferenza di Studi Patristici, Oxford 1983, 275-286; P. Meloni, *Le Beatitudini nei Padri della Chiesa*: Parola, Spirito and Vita 21 (1990) 221-240; Id., *Le Beatitudini nei Padri della Chiesa*: Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica 7 (1994) 258-284.

P. Meloni

BEATUS of Liébana (8th c.). monk of the Asturias. His late anonymous biography (PL 96, 887-894) is unreliable; the information of Elipandus (PL 96, 859-882) and Alcuin (PL 101, 33-303) is quite vague. The partial facts of his life are based on conjecture. He probably entered the Monastery of St. Martin of Liébana (Valcovado, St. Turibius of L.) during the reign of Florius I and Mauregatus (756–768). His writings all pertained to his intervention in the *adoptionist controversy against Elipandus. Two survive: *The Apologeticum,* or *Adv. Elipandum 1. II,* and the *Commentary on the Apocalypse*. The first is a letter in response to a first attack of Elipandus (PL 96, 918-919), which was in turn provoked by another lost writing of Beatus (PL 96, 918 C). Beatus and his disciple Aetherius wrote the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* (PL 96, 894-1030) in 785/786, which is the best-known and most important work for the history of *exegesis in the Latin world. Its 12 books, preceded by an ample *praefatio,* contain the commentaries of *Victorinus (*Jerome), *Tyconius and *Apringius, supplemented in turn by continual cross-references to Jerome, *Augustine, *Ambrose, *Fulgentius, *Gregory the Great, *Gregory of Elvira, *Irenaeus, *Isidore and *Bachiarius. From Beatus's *Commentary* it is possible to recover lost texts (of Tyconius) and

complete the authors used by Beatus; it also sheds light on the obscurity of 8th-c. *Spain.

CPL 710, 1752a, 1753: *Adv. Elipandum*, ed. P. Stevartio, Ingolstadii Typ. Ederiana 1616; PL 96, 895-1030 (ed. Galland); *Testo e fonti del Contra Elipando*, ed. S. Orfeo, Rome 1966 (diss., Univ. Rome); *Beati in Apocalypsin*, ed. H.A. Sanders, Rome 1930 (repr. Madrid 1975); M. Alamo, *Los Comentarios de Beato al Apocalipsis y Elipando* (Misc. Mercati): ST 122 (1946) 16-33; R. Abadal i V., *La batalla del Adopcionismo en la desintegración de la Iglesia visigoda*, Barcelona 1948; I.M. Gómez, *El perdido comentario de Ticonio al Apocalipsis* (Misc. Ubach), Montserrat 1953, 387-411; A. Pincherle, *Sant'Ambrogio in Beato di Liébana*: RSLR 1 (1965) 99-107; O.K. Werckmeister, *Pain and Death in the Beatus of Saint Sever*: SM 14 (1973) 565-626; A. Pincherle, *Note sulla tradizione indiretta della "Expositio evang. sec. Lucam" di S. Ambrogio*, Forma futuri (Misc. Pellegrino), Turin 1975, 1097-1110; Id., *Tre notarelle*, Paradoxos Politeia (Misc. Lazzati), Milan 1979, 500-506; M. Mentré, *La miniatura en León y Castilla en la Alta Edad Media*, León 1976; *Actas del Simposio para el estudio de los códices del "Comentario al Apocalipsis" de Beato de Liébana*, Madrid 1978 (cf. J. Fontaine, REAug 23 [1977] 413-421); M.D. Verdejo Sánchez, *Comienzos de la disputa adopcionista*: Bracara Augusta 33 (1979) 207-213; V. García Lobo, *El Beato de S. Miguel de la Escalada*: Archivos Leoneses 33 (1979) 205-270; E. Romero Pose, *Gregorio de Elvira en el Comentario al Apocalipsis de S. Beato de Liébana*: Burgense 20 (1979) 289-305; Id., *Una nueva edición del Comentario al Apocalipsis de S. Beato de Liébana*: Accad. N. dei Lincei, Boll. dei Class. 1 (1980) 221-231; J.F. Rivera R., *El adopcionismo español (s. VIII)*, Toledo 1980; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura española*, Madrid 1997, V, 1-191.

E. Romero Pose

BEDE the Venerable (d. 735). Born in 672/673 in Northumbria, at age 7 Bede was entrusted by his parents to the Benedictine monks of Sts. Peter and Paul at Jarrow, where his main teachers were St. *Benedict Biscop (d. 690) and St. Coelfrid (d. 716). He received an excellent classical and religious education, facilitated by the seriousness of the convent library. Ordained deacon at 19 and priest at 30 (according to the canonical norms of the time), Bede remained his whole life a man of study and prayer, faithfully observing the *Rule* and the local cloistral statutes. Devoted to the Fathers of the church, esp. St. *Augustine and St. *Isidore, he prepared a *florilegium of patristic texts, intended as an aid in the interpretation of Scripture. To the same end he applied himself to Latin and Greek, while his rather elementary notions of Hebrew were partly taken from works of St. *Jerome (d. 420). He also knew classical literature and the *Latin Christian poets. His conception of history displays a didactic and theological purpose: in spirit Bede was an *Augustinian. For him, history is a contrast between the transitoriness of human affairs and the unmoving eternity of the heavenly homeland, between finite time and eternity. In this way the learned monk of Jarrow is a link between Augustinian historiography and the *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus* of Otto of Freising (d. ca. 1070; ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH, *Ss. rer. germ.*, 44, 1912). In inserting various documents, episcopal lists and doctrinal controversies into his grandiose *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum,* Bede follows the model of *Eusebius of Caesarea, for whom the motive force of history was *providence. Unlike Eusebius, however, Bede did not turn history into *apologetic, or, like other medieval writers, into *hagiography.

Bede is a fair representative of Early Medieval Latin monastic culture, perhaps the most learned precursor of the Carolingian renaissance. In 55 years of monastic life he never left his monastery except for a few literary journeys. *Semper aut discere, aut docere, aut scribere dulce habui* (learning, teaching or writing has always been my delight—*Hist. eccl. gentis Anglorum* V, 24): this autobiographical aside emphasizes his zeal and perseverance. A certain lack of originality and theological imprecision prevent him from being numbered among the great theologians of the Latin church. A monastic mentality shaped by the *liturgy, and *prayers included in his works, give him great significance for the English church. Bede died at Jarrow 25 May 735; his body was transferred to the cathedral of Durham between 1020/1030. The fame of his learning and holiness made him, with Alcuin and the school of *York, one of the pedagogues of medieval civilization. The Council of Aquisgrana (836) proclaimed him *doctor admirabilis* (MGH, *Conc.* II, 759), and Leo XIII gave him the title "Doctor of the Church" in 1899.

His literary activity is attested by the variety of subjects he dealt with, though much of his output is lost. His interests were almost encyclopedic: sciences of the *trivium* and the *quadrivium,* biblical *exegesis, dogmatic theology, morals, history. The best description and analysis of his works is by I. Cecchetti (BS 2, 1006-1074). In exegesis, his various commentaries and homilies show his use of the methodology of the traditional meanings (literal, moral, *allegorical), without suggesting any particular attraction to one or other of these interpretations; his was thus a monastic and wisdom theology. Bede was a man of the Bible: *omnem meditandis Scripturis operam dedi*, he claims in the autobiographical note that introduces an incomplete list of his works (*Historia eccl. gentis Anglorum*, loc. cit.). In these treatises we find the essence of the Fathers—*Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, *Gregory the Great—but he is no repetitive compiler, rather elaborating with critical sense a personal reading of the sacred and theological texts. Philological annotations are

not lacking: for the 8th c., Bede was a textual critic, esp. in his suggestive comparison of the various biblical recensions. He commented on nearly all the biblical books, or at least their most important passages. A number of works attributed to him are apocryphal: the list, with related manuscript tradition, is given by Fr. Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi*, II, Madrid 1950, nos. 1598-1646, 1 (for ps.-Bede, nos. 1647-1688).

The following works are certainly authentic: *Super Acta Apostolorum expositio* (after 709): PL 92, 937-997; *Libellus retractationis in Actus Apostolorum* (between 715–725): PL 92, 995-1032; *De nominibus locorum quae leguntur in libro Actus Apostolorum:* PL 92, 1033-1040; PL 23, 1297-1306 (among the works of St. Jerome); *De locis sanctis*: PL 94, 1170-1190. Bede rewrote the homonymous essay by the monk *Adamnan (d. 704); the work was very famous in the Middle Ages. CCL has produced a critical edition of other authentic exegetical works: *In Genesim* (118 A, ed. Ch.W. Jones), *In primam partem Samuhelis libri IIII* (119, D. Hurst), *In Regum librum XXX quaestiones* (119, D. Hurst). In vol. 119 A, D. Hurst has given us *De tabernaculo, De templo, In Ezram et Neemiam*; in vol. 120, *In Lucae evangelium expositio, In Marci evangelium expositio*. Other works can be read in PL 90-94. Two books of homilies are now in CCL 122 (ed. D. Hurst). Among the *ascetic writings, noteworthy is a cento intended for meditation, *Collectio psalterii* (PL 94, 515-527; J. Fraipont, in CCL 122, 452-470). Two works, though famous, are dubious: *De meditatione Passionis Christi per septem diei horas* (PL 94, 531-576) and a *De remediis peccatorum* (PL 94, 567-576).

Bede is famous above all for his historical works: *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*: ed. B. Colgrave, R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1969; *Historia Abbatum* (or *Vita sanctorum abbatum*): a history of the monasteries of Wearmouth-Jarrow (PL 94, 711-730); *Chronicon minus* (*ad an.* 703), which concludes *De temporibus liber* (PL 90, 288-292: the *De temporibus* is now in CCL 124 C, 585-611, ed. Ch.W. Jones); *Chronicon maius* (*ad an.* 725), which concludes *De ratione temporum* (PL 90, 520-578; for *De ratione temporum*, CCL 123 B, Ch.W. Jones). His hagiographical activity is important: a *Vita S. Cuthberti* (d. 687) in prose (PL 94, 729-790) and verse (id., 575-596; cf. BHL 2020-2021); a *Vita S. Felicis Nolani* (PL 94, 789-798; BHL 2873); a *Vita et passio S. Anastasii* has not been traced. For the martyrology attributed to Bede, see Ch.W. Jones, in CCL 123, 565-578. Various minor didactic works (*De orthographia, De arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis*) are published by Ch.W. Jones, C.B. Kendall and M.H. King in CCL 123 A, with other writings of doubtful authenticity (though they nonetheless ensured Bede considerable fame). Less important are his poetic works: 12 sacred poems (CCL 122, 412-438, ed. J. Fraipont), a poem *De die iudicii* (id., 439-444), 13 distichs forming an *Oratio ad Deum* (id., 445-446), three paraphrases of psalms (id., 447-450), a *Hymnus virginitatis* or *Hymnus sanctae Edilthridae* (d. 679; ed. G.M. Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, 50, 98-100; cf. BHL 2633). Of his letters, only 16 and some fragments remain (PL 94, 655-710; in CCL 123 C, Ch.W. Jones has published three letters to Pleguina, Helmwald and Wicthed). Quite important is a letter to *Egbert, archbishop of York, on the occasion of his episcopal ordination: Bede draws a programmatic portrait of a Merovingian-era bishop.

For editions, see Verzeichnis, 201-207. Beyond the bibliography compiled by I. Cecchetti, BS 2, 1006-1074, the following titles should be mentioned: P. Hunter Blair, *The Historical Writings of Bede*, in *La storiografia altomedievale*, I, Spoleto 1970 (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, XVIII), 197-221; G. Musca, *Il Venerabile Beda storico dell'Alto Medioevo*, Bari 1973 (with bibl. 391-399; 400-436: A century of study on Bede the historian); G. Bonner, *Bede and Medieval Civilization*: ASE 2 (1973) 71-90 (shows the patristic theological dimension of Bede's thought, and his ignorance of Greek theological theory on the two natures in Christ); J.T. Rosenthal, *Bede's Use of Miracles in "The Ecclesiastical History"*: Traditio 31 (1975) 328-335; P. Hunter Blair, *The World of Bede*, London 1970, ed. review, Cambridge 1990; BBKL I, 453-454; Patrologia IV, 380-404; H.J. Higham, *An English Empire: Bede and the Early Anglo-Saxon Kings*, Manchester-New York 1995; A. Padit - J. Pelagio, *The Doctrine on Prayer in Saint Bede*, Rome 2001; G. Caputa, *Il sacerdozio dei fedeli secondo San Beda: un itinerario di maturità cristiana*, Vatican City 2002.

R. Grégoire

BELISARIUS (ca. 500–565). Byzantine military leader, originally from *Germana* in present-day W Bulgaria, ordered by *Justinian to lead the reconquest of *Africa (533); his wife, Antonina, accompanied him on the campaign, in which he captured the *Vandal king Gelimer. Antonina also accompanied him during the reconquest of *Italy: landing in Sicilia (535), Belisarius led a brief campaign in Africa to suppress military revolt and then made war against the *Gothic king Theodahad. Belisarius occupied *Rome (9 December 536), which was then besieged by Witigis; he then deposed Pope *Silverius, accused of favoring the Goths, and had him replaced with the deacon *Vigilius. After reconquering *Ravenna (538), Belisarius was recalled to *Constantinople (540). Soon he was sent to oppose the Persian king *Chosroes but returned again (544) to Italy to fight *Totila. Returning to Constantinople

(549), he was ordered by Justinian and *Theodora to induce Pope Vigilius to condemn the *Three Chapters, sanctioned by the Second Council of Constantinople (553). After a victorius campaign against the *Huns, who were threatening the city, out of envy Belisarius was accused of treachery and died in 565.

PLRE IIIA, 181-224; PCBE 2/1, 279-281; L.M. Hartmann: PWK III/1, 209-240; L.M. Chassin, *Bélisaire, généralissime byzantin (504–565)*, Paris 1957; G. Downey, *Belisarius, Young General of Byzantium*, New York 1960; R. Browning, *Belisar in Italien*: AW 12/2 (1981) 45-54.

E. Malaspina

BELISARIUS Scholasticus (5th c.). In the appendix of G. Huemer's edition of *Sedulius* (CSEL 10, 309-310) and in the *Anthologia Latina* pars I, 2, ed. E. Riese (Lipsia 1906, repr. 1972, 49-50), are two 16-verse poems in hexameter, whose *acrostics and telestichs form *Sedulius antistes*. They are very probably by the same author: Belisarius Scholasticus, who lived ca. 500. In some codices the second poem follows the first immediately; in some it is attributed to Liberatus Scholasticus. Both compositions celebrate *Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* allegorically, and indeed somewhat obscurely.

Bardenhewer 4, 647; U. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura cristiana latina*, 3, 1, Turin 1932, 56; EC 2, 1181.

A. De Nicola

BELLATOR. Mid-6th-c. priest, friend of *Cassiodorus, at whose request he wrote a commentary on Ruth; he also wrote commentaries, all lost, on Tobit, Esther, Judith, Maccabees and Wisdom. He also translated two books of *Origen's homilies on Ezra (Cassiod., *Inst. div.* 1,5,6).

S. Zincone

BENEDICT I, pope (575–579). Successor of *John III (561–574), elected in 574 but consecrated the following year. A native of *Rome, son of a certain Boniface, with the Roman people Benedict suffered the first *Longobard (Lombard) invasions and a harsh famine. In 579 he asked *Justin II for military help to defend Rome from the Longobards but was refused. It seems, though, that on that occasion Justin gave the pope the gold, jeweled cross reliquiary still kept in the treasury of St. Peter. Benedict approved the canons of the 5th ecumenical council, *Constantinople II. The few letters attributed to him are inauthentic. Benedict died at Rome 30 July, while the city was besieged by the Longobards; he was buried in the sacristy of the Constantinopolitan Basilica.

LP I, 308; H. Grisar, *Roma alla fine del mondo antico*, Rome 1930, II 175-176 and 254-255; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, Tübingen 1930, 348, 350-352 and 777; DHGE 8, 7-9 (F. Baix), O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 224-225; A. Saba, *Storia dei Papi*, Turin 1966, I 211ff.; LTK 2, 204 (H. Zimmermann); EPapi I, Rome 2000, 539-541 (O. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

BENEDICT II, pope (684–685). Roman, son of Giovanni Savelli, was educated at the *schola cantorum* founded by *Gregory the Great for the formation of clergy. Benedict was elected immediately after the death of his predecessor *Leo II (July 683) but was not consecrated until 26 June 684, after ratification by the exarch of *Ravenna. With this pope, in fact, the practice of waiting on the confirmation of the pontifical election from Byzantium ended, being transferred by imperial concession to the exarch of Ravenna—a sign of the improved relations between *Rome and *Constantinople (court and church) after the 6th ecumenical council; from then on, the period between election and ratification was never more than two months. Benedict did his utmost to spread and apply the decrees of the 6th ecumenical council (Constantinople III), which condemned *monothelitism. To this end, and thanks also to the diplomatic efforts of the Roman notary Peter, in November 684 he succeeded in gathering all the Spanish bishops at the 14th Council of *Toledo to accept the decisions of the recent ecumenical council; we have a letter on this by the pope *ad Petrum notarium*. Benedict also intervened in the situation of the church in England, arranging *Wilfrid's reinstatement as bishop of *York. Economically, he helped the clergy, charitable institutions run by the monks, and those responsible for the care of and services in churches. He also ordered restorations and embellishments at St. Peter's, St. Lorenzo in Lucina, St. Valentino and St. Maria *ad martyres* (Pantheon). Benedict died 8 August 685 and was buried in St. Peter's.

CPL 1739; PL 96, 423-424; Mansi 2, 1085-1086; LP I, 363-365; Jaffé I, 241-242; Hfl-Lecl 3, 550-551; DTC 2, 648; DHGE 8, 9-14 (F. Baix); DBI 8 (1966) 325-329 (O. Bertolini); M. Strohm, *Der Konflikt zwischen Erzbischof Julian von Toledo und Papst Benedikt II. Ein Faktum von oekumenischer Bedeutung*: AHC 15 (1983) 249-259; M.E. Bertoldi, *S. Lorenzo in Lucina*, Rome 1994, 29; LTK 2, 204 (G. Schwaiger); Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae, III, Rome 1996, 183-185; EPapi I, 621-625 (O. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

BENEDICT BISCOP (ca. 628–690), saint. Biscop Baducing, a native of Northumbria, spent several years at King Oswin's court before his desire to deepen his knowledge of doctrinal truths led him to *Rome in 653 and 665. He returned to Kent with Theodore of Tarsus, who appointed him *abbot of the Monastery of Sts. Peter and Paul, *Canterbury (669). After a third journey to Rome (670–672), in 674 he founded the *monastery of Wearmouth, and that of Jarrow in 681. Benedict made two other trips to Rome, bringing back a large number of books which he installed at Jarrow (678–679, 683). He died after a long illness on 12 January 690. His greatest achievement was to make the monasteries authentic centers of propagation of Latin culture in *Britain. His many imported codices became the basis of Jarrow's rich library. He also made an important contribution to the Romanization of the English church. He is considered a patron of the Benedictines; *Bede wrote his biography (CPL 1378, PL 94, 713-730).

G. Mongelli, BS 2, 1212-1216; I. Cecchetti, EC 2, 1295-1296; C. Silva Tarouca, EI 6, 607; LTK 2, 180; Fr.W. Bautz, BBKL I, 494; T. Bucherer, *Benedict Biscop als Pioner römisch-christlicher Kultur bei den Angelsachsen*, Heidelberg 1923; M. Gretch, *Die Regula sancti Benedicti in England und ihre altenglische Übersetzung*, Munich 1973.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

BENEDICT of Nursia (ca. 480–ca. 560). Our primary source of information on the *patriarch and legislator of Western *monasticism is *Gregory the Great, who dedicated the whole of book II of his *Dialogues* to Benedict. Born in the territory of Nursia to a well-to-do family, Benedict's date of birth, traditionally fixed ca. 480, could be as late as 490–500. Sent to *Rome to complete his literary education, he soon abandoned the corrupt atmosphere of the city to retire to a solitary life near Subiaco, following a brief sojourn at Affile. He briefly headed a monastery near Vicovaro; later, the number of his disciples growing, he founded 12 monasteries in the Aniene Valley, each with 12 monks under the authority of their own *abbot. Following plots against him he left Subiaco, perhaps ca. 529, and settled at Montecassino, where he founded a monastery on the site of an ancient pagan temple and wrote, at least in its present form, the *Rule* for his cenobites. His fame grew continually; King *Totila, wishing to meet him, went looking for him at Montecassino. He died probably ca. 560.

Benedict's fundamental work is the *Rule,* whose prologue and 73 chapters sum up the spiritual journey of return to God through obedience (ch. 5), under the guidance of Christ, to whose love nothing must be preferred (chs. 4 and 72). There is a notable emphasis on humility, which gives complete freedom to conform one's will to God's. The cenobitic community devised by St. Benedict is founded on the authority of the abbot, with the monks under him, bound to their monastery by a vow of stability. Essential parts of Benedictine spirituality are the celebration of the divine office and a balanced synthesis of prayer and work, esp. manual labor, but also intellectual work, centered on the reading of sacred texts (ch. 48). The sources of the Benedictine *Rule* can be found in Scripture, but also in *Pachomius, *Basil, the **Vitae Patrum,* *Augustine and *John Cassian; its relation to the *Regula Magistri* remains open; traditional opinion held the latter to be later, but scholars now seem to have settled on a dependence of Benedict's *Rule* on the *Regula Magistri*. In any event, a novelty of the Benedictine *Rule* with respect to the *Regula Magistri* is that every monk is considered responsible for the entire community. An essential trait of the Christian communal life, according to the Benedictine *Rule,* is the response of love for a personal God who has first loved us. The presence of Christ in each person gives an eternal value to fraternal relations. The principal merit of Benedict's *Rule* seems to have been its elaboration of a synthesis of previous monastic experience, showing great wisdom, moderation and balance in the organization of cenobitic life.

CPL 1852; PL 66, 215-930; CSEL 75; SC 181-186bis (with Fr. tr. and commentary by A. de Vogüé). Among other editions we cite those of B. Linderbauer (Metten 1922, with philological commentary, and Bonn 1928, FP, fasc. 17), C. Butler (Friburgi Brisgoviae [3]1935), G. Penco (Florence, I repr. 1970, with It. tr.), S. Pricoco (*La Regola di san Benedetto e le Regole dei padri*, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1995). There are many translations of the Benedictine *Rule* into modern languages: we note those in German of P. Bihlmeyer (BKV2, Band 20, Kempten-Munich 1914, 231-325) and of B. Steidle (Beuron 1963); in French of Ph. Schmitz (Maredsous 1962, with a study on Benedict's language, ed. Ch. Mohrmann), in addition to the previously cited edition of A. de Vogüé; in Spanish of J. Aranguren (BAC 406, Madrid 1979). Among Italian translations, beyond that already cited of G. Penco, we note those of the Benedictine fathers of Subiaco (Rome 1975) and of A. Lentini (Montecassino [2]1980). There is a vast bibliography on St. Benedict and his *Rule:* very useful is the "Bulletin d'histoire bénédictine," along with RBen, which has continual biographical updates on the life, personality and work of St. Benedict; also noteworthy is the "Internationale Bibliographie zur Regula Benedicti" in RBS 11 (1973) and ff. Among studies we note: *Benedictus, der Vater des Abendlandes, 547-1947*, ed. H.S. Brechter, Munich 1947; Ch. Mohrmann, *La latinité de saint Benoît. Étude linguistique sur la tradition manuscrite de la Règle*: RBen 62 (1952) 108-139; *Commentationes in Regulam S. Benedicti*, ed. B. Steidle: SA 42, Rome 1957; S. Pawlowsky, *Die biblischen Grundlagen der Regula Benedicti*, Vienna 1965; G.

Turbessi, *Ascetismo e monachesimo in S. Benedetto*, Rome 1965 (with ample bibl.); A. Linage Conde, *La antropología de la Regla de san Benito*: Asclepio 20 (1968) 135-163; G.M. Widhalm, *Die rhetorischen Elemente in der Regula Benedicti*, RBS Suppl. II, Hildesheim 1974; A. Linage Conde, *San Benito y los Benedictinos*, Braga 1991; A. de Vogüé, *Saint Benoît. Homme de Dieu*, Paris 1993; C. Schütz, *"Le Christ - Seigneur" dans la règle de saint Benoît*, Irénikon 72 (1999) 42-72; A. Böckmann, *Der Mensch nach der Regel Benedikts (RB) auf dem Hintergrund ihrer Tradition, besonders der Regula Magistri (RM)*, RBS 20 (1999) 35-58; M. de Dreuille, *La règle de saint Benoît et les traditions ascétiques de l'Asie à l'Occident*, Vie monastique 38, Bégrolles-en-Mauges 2000.

S. Zincone

BENEVOLUS (late 4th c.). Secretary (*magister memoriae*) of *Valentinian II. While still a *catechumen, he left the court of *Milan and withdrew to Brescia, so as to not have to compile (*dictare*) the decree, requested by the empress *Justina, regarding the transfer of the basilicas in the time of *Ambrose in 386. *Gaudentius of Brescia says that he refused to "promulgate decisions against the *Catholic churches" (*Tract.* 1,1-6). The writing of the law was his official responsibility, and in any event was published (CTh 16,1,4) in favor of the *Arians at Milan. This shows that the writing of a law could create problems of conscience, as in the case of Benevolus, responsible for the *scrinia,* who wrote petitions addressed to the emperor. An important personage at Brescia, Benevolus could not take part in the *Easter services due to illness; Gaudentius sent him 10 Easter sermons, ca. 404 (*Praef.* of the sermons: CSEL 68,3-4).

Rufinus, *HE* 11,16; Sozomen, *HE* 7,13,5-7; PCBE 2, 298-299; cf. W. Ensslin, *Memoriales* PW 15, 1931, 657; Seeck, *Scrinium* PW 2, 1991, 893; L. De Giovanni, *Il libro XVI del Codice Teodosiano*, Naples 1985, 37ff.; R. Lizzi, *Vescovi e strutture ecclesiastiche nella città tardoantica (L'Italia Annonaria nel IV-V secolo d.C.)*, Como 1989, 113ff.; J. Harries, *The Roman Imperial Quaestor from Constantine to Theodosius II:* JRS 88 (1988) 148-172 (Benevolus, 162-163).

A. Di Berardino

BENJAMIN of Alexandria (d. 665). Anti-*Chalcedonian patriarch of *Alexandria from 626 to 665, he lived in the period of *Egypt's decisive political and religious crisis: the end of *Byzantine rule and the Persian (619–626) and Arab (from 639) invasions. The Byzantine patriarch and prefect of Alexandria, Cyrus Muqauqas, forced him to live hidden in Upper Egypt from 631 to 644. After this date the Arabs allowed him to occupy the see of *Alexandria, and his relations with them seem to have been marked by substantial mutual respect. We have a homily by Benjamin on the wedding at Cana, delivered probably in Sahidic *Coptic and surviving in Bohairic Coptic, which describes at length his stay in Upper Egypt; a fragment of an encomium of *Shenoute; and a fragment of a festal letter (642) against *heretics, in Arabic translation. His biography, in the form of an encomium, seems to have been written by his successor Agatho, who also wrote a homily celebrating Benjamin's consecration of a new church at *Scete in honor of St. *Macarius.

CPG 7941-7944; C.D.G. Müller, *Die Homilie über die Hochzeit zu Kana und weitere Schriften des Patriarchen Benjamin I. von Alexandrien*, Heidelberg 1968; G. Daoud Girgis, *Abba Benjamin. The Coptic Patriarch in the 7th Century*, in Piotr O. Scholz - R. Stempel (eds.), *Nubia et OC. Festschrift Müller*, Tübingen 1987, 17-27; C. Römer, *Osterfestbrief des Patriarchen Benjamin I (?)*, in *Kölner Papyri* Bd. 5 (Papyrologica Coloniensia 7), Opladen 1985 (= Nr. 215), 77-106; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 375-377; BBKL 20, 116-121.

T. Orlandi

BERYLLUS of Bostra (d. after 240). Bishop of *Bostra (in modern Jordan), accused of *heresy in a council held at Bostra ca. 240. The assembly's acts are lost, but *Eusebius of Caesarea read and summarized them (*HE* VI, 33,1-3). The bishops present first questioned Beryllus, then *Origen talked with him and gave an exposition of *dogma that convinced him. According to Eusebius, Beryllus held that Christ had not existed as a being (reality) distinct from the Father and that he had no divinity of his own, only that of the Father that dwelled in him. It is unlikely that Beryllus expressed his thought in this way; rather, it seems that Eusebius described it based on Origen's questions to him. Eusebius also found other letters of Beryllus addressed to Bishop *Alexander of Jerusalem (*HE* VI, 20.2). *Jerome's information on Beryllus (*De vir, ill.* 60) is based exclusively on Eusebius.

P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II-III^e s.*, Paris 1961, 135-136; 209-219.

P. Nautin

BESA (d. 474). Disciple of *Shenoute and his successor as head of the community of Athrib (the White Monastery). Like his master, Besa wrote prolifically in the national language, *Coptic, and left many letters (sent to dependent *monasteries), monastic *catecheses and a biography of Shenoute. These works are the only source regarding his life: from them we can deduce that he remained as head long

after Shenoute's death (ca. 455), probably ca. 20 years. He was succeeded by Zenobius, who had previously been Shenoute's secretary. It seems that—unlike his terrible teacher—Besa's character was peaceful and mild, both toward the monks and toward the *pagan communities that survived near the monastery.

K. Heinz Kuhn, *A Fifth-Century Egyptian Abbot, I-III*: JThS ser. II, 5 (1954) 36-48, 147-187; 6 (1955) 35-48; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, II/4, Freiburg 1990, 235-241; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 378-379.

T. Orlandi

BESANÇON, Council of. Celebrated probably 444. Presided over by *Hilary of Arles; *Germanus of Auxerre took part. The council deposed Chelidonius, the irregularly ordained bishop of Besançon; Pope *Leo protected him, however, and invalidated the sentence of the Gallic bishops.

CCL 148, 105; Hfl-Lecl 2, 476-478; Palazzini 1, 173-174.

Ch. Munier

BETH ADRAI, Council of. In 485 at the *Syrian town of Beth Adrai, a council was held that marked a stage in the gradual detachment of *Persian Christianity, which supported *Nestorianism, from the *Byzantine church, then predominantly *monophysite. The Persian king Peroz (457–484) had condemned Baboway, *catholicos of Seleucia, to death, accusing him of working secretly with Byzantium. Baboway's relative and fellow student at the school of *Edessa, *Acacius, was then elected to the see of Seleucia. Acacius sought a rapprochement with *Barsauma, bishop of *Nisibis, who supported Nestorianism and enjoyed the king's favor. At Beth Adrai, Barsauma submitted to Acacius; the council also decided to convene a general council for the following year to treat unresolved dogmatic and disciplinary questions. This council met in 486 at *Seleucia-Ctesiphon; Barsauma was not present, however, writing many letters offering some true and but also some fictitious reasons for his absence.

Synodicon orientale, 532ff., ed. J.B. Chabot, in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et d'autres bibliothèques* 37, Paris 1902; J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide* (224–632), Paris 1904, 114; G. Bardy, *Le Chiese di Persia e d'Armenia nel V secolo*, in Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, ed. A.P. Frutaz, IV, Turin 1972, 408-409.

C. Nardi

BETH LAPAT, Council of (or Bêt Lapat; in Persian *Gundaisabur* or *Gondisapor*). *Persian city founded between 256–260 by *Shapur I (242–272), it quickly became an episcopal see and from 410 a *metropolitan see. In April 484 a synod was held there by *Barsauma, pro-*Nestorian bishop of *Nisibis, and other bishops who, like him, deplored the pro-*Byzantine Baboway, *catholicos of Seleucia. At Beth Lapat the catholicos was deposed and ecclesiastical celibacy abolished for the church of Persia. Their conclusions on the doctrine of the *incarnation were clearly contrary to *Zeno's **Henoticon,* increasing the split between the Christianity of the Persian Empire, oriented toward Nestorianism, and that of the Byzantine Empire, where *monophysitism prevailed. According to Michael the Syrian's *Chronicon* (ed. Chabot, 427), Barsauma had advised King Peroz (457–484): “Unless we proclaim a different dogma in the East from that of the Roman Empire, your Christian subjects will never be sincerely loyal to you. Give me some soldiers and I will make all the Christians of your empire Nestorians.” The source for this advice, though, is monophysite; however, the climate of antimonophysite reaction and detachment from Byzantine influence had already been prepared for some time. The *Synodicon orientale* does not report the council's acts, considering it schismatic. Barsauma's personality, however, enjoyed great prestige, and many statements of the Council of Beth Lapat were accepted by the Council of *Seleucia in 486.

Synodicon orientale, ed. J.B. Chabot, in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibl. Nat. et d'autres bibl.* 37, Paris 1902; DHGE 8, 1233-1235; J.M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310 sub. 36, Louvain 1970, 114 and 124; G. Bardy in Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, Turin 1972, IV 408.

C. Nardi

BETHLEHEM. In the early centuries Bethlehem suffered the same fate as *Jerusalem; the traditional Grotto of the Nativity of the Lord was confiscated by *Hadrian (Testa, *Grotte dei Misteri*: SBF 14 [1964] 46, 71-78, 113-114). *Constantine built a basilica there, five-aisled with a polygonal, perhaps octagonal, apse (Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims,* 152) and a dominant altar. *Justinian rebuilt it (6th c.), enlarging it with great *trichorae* and in this way providing two new avenues of access to the venerated grotto. The original floor was decorated in mosaics with geometrical motifs, birds and grape branches; the floor of the second church was of marble *crustae,* later removed to decorate mosques. In the Shepherds' Field at Deir er-Rawat, a venerated grotto

had mosaic floors and was later enclosed by two churches which succeeded each other. Other *monasteries preserve *Byzantine remains. Recently along the road from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, about three miles from Jerusalem, an octagonal church was found dating to the 5th c. and identifiable as the Kathisma, the place where according to apocryphal tradition the Virgin Mary rested (Avner, *The Recovery of the Kathisma Church*).

B. Bagatti, *Gli antichi edifici sacri a Betlemme*, Jerusalem 1952; V. Corbo, *Gli scavi di Kb. Siyar el-Ghanam* (*Campo dei Pastori*) *e i monasteri dei dintorni*, Jerusalem 1955; E. Testa, *Le "Grotte dei Misteri" giudeo-cristiane*: SBF 14 (1964) 46, 71-78, 113-114; J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster 1977; *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in Holy Land* 1, Jerusalem 1993, 203-210; R. Avner, *The Recovery of the Kathisma Church and Its Influence on Octagonal Buildings*, in *One Land—Many Cultures. Archaeological Studies in Honour of Stanislao Loffreda OFM*, Jerusalem 2003, 173-186.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

BÉZIERS, Council of. Called early 356 by *Saturninus of Arles, in agreement with *Constantius's two pro-*Arian advisers *Ursacius and *Valens. *Hilary of Poitiers made every effort to rehabilitate *Athanasius, but in vain, and was exiled to *Phrygia for his stance.

CCL 148, 31; Gaudemet, SC 241, 85-89; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, I, Paris [2]1964, 161-164, 224-228; Palazzini 1, 175-176.

Ch. Munier

BIAGIUS. We have only legendary passion accounts (BHG[3] 276-277, BHL 1370-1380) of this martyr of *Caesarea in *Cappadocia. Traditions differ regarding his anniversary: 11 February for the Greeks, 15 February for Ado, 3 February for Usward and the Roman Martyrology.

AASS Feb. I, 331-353; *Syn. Eccl. CP.* 457; AASS Prop. Dec. 47; *Vies des SS.* 2, 62-37; BS 3, 136-137; BHG3 276-277; BHL 1370-1380.

V. Saxer

BIBIANA (4th c.). The only certain information we have on the martyr Bibiana seems to be in the *Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne I, 249-250): that Pope *Simplicius (468–483) consecrated, near the Licinian palace on the Esquiline at *Rome, the basilica "of the blessed martyr Bibiana, where her body rests" (probably meaning some *relics). This shows the existence of a cult of Bibiana from the 5th c. A *Passio* (not earlier than 6th c.) makes her a *Roman virgin scourged under the emperor *Julian after the rest of her family was martyred; her death is 2 December, the day of her feast in two codices of the *Mart. hier.* (AASS Nov. [1931] II, pars post., 631), in the martyrology of Ado (PL 123, 409) and thus in the Roman Martyrology (ed. H. Delehaye [1940] 559). The church of St. Bibiana was restored numerous times and finally rebuilt by Bernini, who placed a sculpture depicting the martyr there.

BHL 1322, 1323; D. Fedini, *La vita di S. Bibiana vergine, e martire romana*, Rome 1627; BS 3, 177-181; H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936, 124-143; E. Donckel, *Studien über den Kultus der hl. Bibiana*: RQA 43 (1935) 23-33; Id., *Der Kultus der hl. Bibiana in Rom*: RivAC 14 (1937) 125-135; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 297-299. Per l'aspetto topografico: *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* I, Rome 1993, 194-195.

A. Pollastri

BIBLE

I. Semantics - II. Veneration.

Many other articles in the encyclopedia treat of bibical themes, esp. Antilegomenon, Apocrypha, Apocalypses, Exegesis, Liturgy and Bible, Scripture, patristic interpretation of the most important biblical books (Revelation, Song of Songs, Exodus, Genesis, Prophets, Psalms, Wisdom books, the gospels, Paul), the principal biblical personages in the Fathers and in iconography, and translations (under various headings).

I. Semantics. The singular term *Bible* is derived from the Greek neuter plural τὰ βιβλία, diminutive of βίβλος ("papyrus"). Initially the diminutive singular τὸ βιβλίον meant a strip of *papyrus, then the writing contained in the papyrus, and finally a document, writing, book. In *Greek Christian literature it had other meanings in addition to the basic one of "written document": the phylacteries of the Jews (John Chrys., *Hom. 72,2 in Mt.*), dictionary (Theodoret, *Quaest. 74 in Reg. et Par.*), act of accusation (Pallad., *Vita Chrys.* 14), letter (Theoph. *Exc. de Leg. Gent.* 6) and certificate (Marcus Diac., *Vita Porph.* 6). Other specialized meanings pertaining to the meaning "book" can be traced: a section or part of a book (Tat., *Or.* 36; Orig., *In Joh.* 10,4), individual books of Scripture (Just., *Dial.* 75; Athan., *Ep. Enc.* 4; John Chrys., *Hom. 42,1 in Jo.*). The plural (*ta biblia*) meant the OT as Christian Scripture (*2 Clem.* 14,2), as Jewish Scripture (Orig., *Hom. 14,12 in Jer.*; John Chrys., *Hom. 47,3 in Mat.*) or simply as an inspired book (Orig., *in Jo.* 6,8; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 19,5; John Chrys., *Hom. 47,3 in Mat.*), and the NT as text of the new covenant (John Moschus, *Prat.* 134), bearing

witness on oath (John Chrys., *De stat.* 15, 5) and/or the whole of the inspired books (John Chrys., *Hom. 32,3 in Jo.*). In the *Testament of Abraham* 10 (Rec. B) and in the Revelation to John, the plural term designates the books of the divine judgment (Rev 20:12); in the monk *Callinicus it means simply a magic book (*Vita Ipatii*, ed. Teub. 90). Such meanings of the term *to biblion* occur with some secondary variants in the LXX and NT. Worth mentioning are the two expressions of 1 Macc. 12:9 ("the sacred books") and 2 Macc. 8:23 ("the sacred book"). Paul asks Timothy to bring with him to *Rome the papyrus rolls (*ta biblia*) and the parchments (2 Tim 4:13; cf. Jn 21:15). From the 13th c. the Greek plural was interpreted as a Latin feminine singular, and it passed into the Romance languages in that form.

Lampe, s.v. βιβλίον; S. Zarb, *De sacrorum librorum natura et variis eorundem nominibus illustrata*: Angelicum 9 (1932) 422-448; EC 2, 1545; C.M. Martini - P. Bonatti, *Il messaggio della salvezza*. I. *Introduzione generale*, Turin-Leumann [4]1976, 5-6; R. Fabris, *Introduzione alla Bibbia* (Logos), Leumann (TO) 1994; G. Schrenk, GLNT II, 262-280; H. Balz, I DENT, I, 574-577; P. Waiberger, NBL I, 1991, 291-293.

II. Veneration. Because of its divine origin, the Bible is studied and venerated more than any other book among Jews and Christians. Held to be the depository of the Word of God, his message to all people, it is venerated and considered the most proximate norm of faith and life. The Jews express this veneration by the expression that it infects the hand of whoever touches it and by the practice of hiding worn out texts in the *genizah* to protect them from possible profanation. To this exterior aspect must be associated the more important aspect of the use of the Bible in the *liturgy, first that of the *synagogue and later that of the church. The practice of reading its books as individual compositions or as parts of the biblical corpus is very ancient and must be interpreted as a gesture of veneration toward the text considered most apt for expressing human thoughts and feelings toward God. In synagogues, the volume of the Law was and is kept in an appropriate case. Emblematic of the Christian attitude is the custom of the *Byzantine liturgy, which gives the book of the gospels honors equal to those given to the *Eucharist; from the 5th c., the custom spread in councils of putting it at the center of the room on a seat of honor, as a point of reference. The declaration of the Council of Trent that Scripture and *Tradition must be accepted and venerated with equal piety (DS 1501) was echoed by Vatican II, which heard in the Bible the voice of the *Holy Spirit come down to speak with humanity (*Dei Verbum*, n. 13.21).

G. Ricciotti: EC 2, 1570-1574; S. Marsili, *ibid.*, 1578-1580; J. Ratzinger, *Interpretazione del decreto del Concilio di Trento sulla tradizione* (Quaestiones disputatae), Brescia 1970, 53-73; R. Latourelle, *La Costituzione dogmatica sulla divina Rivelazione*, in *I libri di Dio*, Turin 1975, 264-265.

E. Peretto

BINITARIANISM. *Trinitarian formulas were in use in the church from the very earliest times: one thinks of Mt 28:19 and of the triple *baptismal immersion in the name of the *Father, Son and *Holy Spirit. But *liturgical usage had no adequate corresponding doctrinal understanding: from the 2nd c. on, theological reflection concentrated on exploring the Father/Christ relationship, ignoring the Holy Spirit, who was an object of study only from ca. 360, in the context of the last phase of the *Arian controversy. Before then, only a few authors had included the Holy Spirit in some way in their theological reflection: *Athenagoras, *Irenaeus, *Tertullian, Hippolytus in *Contra Noetum* and esp. *Origen. By binitarianism, therefore, we refer to theological reflection on the Trinity which fails to organically include the Holy Spirit alongside the Father and the Son: examples of this reflection are, e.g., in ps.-Hippolytus's homily *In sanctum Pascha,* in *Hermas, *Tatian, *Hippolytus of Rome, *Lactantius, *Victorinus of Petovium, the Western profession of faith of *Serdica (343), and Hilary's *Comm. in Mat.,* before his exile. In some of these authors, the Holy Spirit is identified with Christ's divine component. Besides these texts, binitarian in a strict sense, we must bear in mind that other authors, though treating specifically of the Holy Spirit, do not succeed in including him organically alongside the Father and the Son, since they do not apply to him, explicitly or even implicitly, the concept of person: *Justin Martyr, *Clement of Alexandria, *Novatian, *Hilary in *De trinitate*.

M. Simonetti, *Note di cristologia pneumatica*: Augustinianum 12 (1972) 226-232; M. Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo*, Rome 1993, spec. 46-52.

M. Simonetti

BIOGRAPHY. When Christians began to write biography, the literary genre of *bíos* (the word *biographia* is first attested at the end of the 5th c. in *Damascius's *Vita Isidori;* cf. *Photius, *Bibl.* Cod. 181 and 242) already had a long history behind it in Greco-Roman civilization. Already in the 6th c. BC the first traces of the genre are found in Theagenes and in Scylax, but it is esp. from the 4th c. BC that,

under the combined impulse of the rhetorical encomium (Gk. *enkōmion*) and Socratic philosophy, Greek biography took the autonomous form that established itself in the centuries of *Hellenism: it is enough to think of Isocrates's *Evagoras* or Xenophon's *Agesilaus*. Decisive for the genre's development was the interest it created in the area of Hellenistic culture characterized by antiquarian erudition and the ethical and psychological canons of the *Aristotelian school.

Hermippus the peripatetic, Antigonus of Caristus, Satyrus of Alexandria and Aristoxenus of Tarentum are the most famous names of Greek biography that *Jerome cites in the prologue of *De viris illustribus*, along with the Latins Varro, Santra, Cornelius Nepos, Hyginus and Suetonius Tranquillus, as models to follow in drawing up the lives and literary profiles of Christian authors. The material, however—which could not have been otherwise—comes from the information reported in *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*, or from the works themselves of the Christian authors he treated. The genre of Christian "literary biography," of which Jerome should be considered the initiator, found important practitioners in the following centuries and in notably diverse cultural settings, such as *Gennadius of Marseille, *Isidore of Seville and *Ildephonsus of Toledo.

Historical-political biography, also widely practiced in the Greco-Roman world (Nicholas of Damascus, Suetonius, Tacitus, Plutarch, the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*) with ever more markedly encomiastic and propagandistic tendencies, found a sensitive Christian interpreter and intelligent innovator in Eusebius of Caesarea: his *Life of Constantine* is a typical imperial *panegyric with a strongly idealizing and propagandistic drive, in some way a *hagiographical biography though not without significant documentary value. (For all the questions raised by this difficult Eusebian work, see the translation with commentary edited by Averil Cameron and S.G. Hall.)

The genre of dialogue biography, present in Christian works such as *Palladius of Helenopolis's *Dialogue* on the life of *John Chrysostom, *Sulpicius Severus's *Dialogues* on St. *Martin of Tours and the *Dialogues* of *Gregory the Great (whose book II is the sole and fundamental biography of *Benedict of Nursia), also went back to Hellenistic precedents, as *P. Oxy*. 1176, with its fragment of Satyrus's biographical *Life of Euripides*, shows.

The most conspicuous and original part of Christian biography, however, apart from the gospel accounts of the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth, are the lives of the saints, whose study is a legitimate part of hagiography. The lives of the Christian saints of *Late Antiquity were in objective competition with *pagan Greek biographical output on the lives of the "divine men"—the sophists and the philosophers—to such an extent that the Christian ideal of holiness was defined as a sort of *philosophy. *Lives of the Sophists* were written by Philostratus, author of the famous *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, and by Eunapius; *Lives and Doctrines of the Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius; *Porphyry and *Iamblichus each wrote a *Life of Pythagoras;* the *Life of Plotinus*, written by Porphyry as an introduction to his edition of the *Enneads*, began a series of *Neoplatonist biographies.

Also within this literary and philosophical context should be placed the 6th book of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*, dedicated to the biography of *Origen. In these pages, through a tested technique of silences and omissions, Eusebius sets forth an apologetic-encomiastic—and therefore tendentious—portrait of a Christian intellectual who appears to have been unjustly accused of mingling with paganism. Eusebius performs this operation so skillfully that he led the great majority of scholars, from Valesio in the 17th c. until our own day, into the unfortunate error of distingushing this Origen, clearly Christian, from the other Origen spoken of in the Neoplatonic sources. (For a criticism of this perspective and favoring a recovery of the identity of the one Origen, see my contributions in the *Origeniana Quinta, Sexta* and *Septima*.) But this biographical doubling that has been disastrous for the study of Origen, with profoundly negative consequences for the understanding of his personality and the correct interpretation of his work, is an extreme case generated by the unique complexity of this extraordinary personality and by his difficult involvement in the tortured events of the relation between Hellenism and Christianity.

Christian biography, with its main purposes of spiritual edification and ideological-religious propaganda, was organized around the two fundamental and complementary experiences of martyrdom and monastic *ascesis, and was a continuation of the first hagiographic sketches constituted by the *Acts* and *Passions* of the martyrs. Precisely for this reason the inspiration of Christian biography, in contrast with Greco-Roman biography, which for the most part focused on political, military and intellectual greats of the past, was not constrained by the limits imposed by social extraction or by the genre. Under certain conditions, biographies also focused on members of the middle-lower classes and women. Moreover, Christian biography normally did not portray people who lived in a more or less remote past, but looked at contemporary society by describ-

ing the lives of men and women who had died recently or who in some cases were still living (as with *Sulpicius Severus's biography of *Martin of Tours). This focus on recent subjects also accounts for the documentary importance of biography for the social, economic and cultural history of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

*Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses* clearly requires a separate treatment. With recourse only to **theoria,* he in fact succeeds in recounting a *historia* within his discourse on Christian virtue and perfection, thus radically altering the meaning and importance of the prestigious philosophical model offered by *Philo of Alexandria (see Geljon's exhaustive study). There is, moreover, no lack of sensational hagiographical falsifications, such as the *Acta Pauli* (the 2nd-c. work of a presbyter in Asia Minor) or the *Passio Hermagorae* (a 7th-c. Roman-Gradese counterfeit on St. Mark's activity at *Aquileia). These texts intended to influence present-day historical-ecclesiastical situations through recourse to fantastic accounts of the lives of "apostolic" personages. (Some methodological observations on the theme can be found in my contribution in *Alvarium*. Festschrift Chr. Gnilka, Münster 2002, 39-51.) The theological implications of Christian hagiographical biography can be measured esp. on the level of the biblical stylization of narrative and plot, and the prizing of miracles as privileged signs of the protagonist's sanctity.

The *Vita Cypriani,* written by the deacon *Pontius after the saint's martyrdom in 258, is intended to contrast with the early *passiones* of laypeople and *catechumens by celebrating the *martyrdom and life of the bishop of *Carthage. This work, which in a strict sense is the earliest Christian hagiographical biography, was in turn the prelude to the writing of other lives of holy bishops in the 4th and 5th c., such as Sulpicius Severus's *Vita Martini,* *Paulinus of Milan's *Vita Ambrosii* and *Possidius of Calama's *Vita Augustini*. But an even stronger influence on these last biographies was the *ascetic or *monastic hagiographical biography elaborated in *Athanasius of Alexandria's *Vita Antonii* (357). Also from *Egypt came numerous Greek and *Coptic recensions of the *Life of Pachomius*. From the end of the 4th c. a rich output of biographies flourished in both East and West, such as the *Vitae* composed by Jerome (*Vita Pauli*; *Vita Malchi*; *Vita Hilarionis*), Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Macrina* and *Life of Gregory Thaumaturge,* *Gerontius's *Life of Melania Iunior,* *Callinicus's *Life of Hypatius,* *Zacharias Scholasticus's *Life of Severus,* *Eugippius's *Vita Severini,* *Jonas of Bobbio's *Vita Columbani* etc. Also belonging to the genre of monastic biography are the numerous descriptions contained in hagiographical collections such as *Palladius of Helenopilis's *Lausiac History,* *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Religious History,* *Cyril of Scythopolis's *Lives* of the Palestinian monks, Gregory of Tours's *Liber vitae Patrum* and *John Moschus's *Prato spirituale*. Finally, it is also useful to mention the Roman see's collection of the biographies of bishops mentioned in the **Liber pontificalis* and various biographies in verse such as the poems of *Paulinus of Nola on St. Felix, or *Venantius Fortunatus's hexametrical paraphrases of the *Vita Martini*—a list that could be extended.

Each of these works should be analyzed in its historical-literary context to specify their communication techniques, compositional methods, doctrinal themes, and political-ecclesiastical orientation, and in this way to identify the particular message it wishes to convey. Such analysis would also make possible an evaluation of their divergence from the historical reality they claim to represent. As an illustrative example (among many), one could point out how the depiction of a Roman Catholic and anti-Arian Columbanus by his official biographer, Jonas of Bobbio, conveniently ignores the Irish monk's adherence to the schism of the *Three Chapters and his brusk attitude toward the Roman see.

G. Luck, *Die Form der suetonischen Biographie und die frühen Heiligenviten*, in Mullus. Festschrift Th. Klauser, Münster 1964, 230-241; W. Bauer, *Die Severus-Vita des Zacharias Rhetor*, in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Strecker, Tübingen 1967, 210-228; H. Kech, *Hagiographie als christliche Unterhaltungsliteratur. Studien zum Phänomen des Erbaulichen anhand der Mönchsviten des hl. Hieronymus*, Göttingen 1977; M. Fuhrmann, *Die Mönchsgeschichten des Hieronymus. Formexperimente in erzählender Literatur*, in var. aus., *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'Antiquité Tardive en Occident* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 23), Vandœuvres-Genève 1977, 41-89; E. Giannarelli, *La tipologia femminile nella biografia e nell'autobiografia cristiana del IV secolo*, Rome 1980; P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Transformation of the Classical Heritage 5), Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983; C.E. Stancliffe, *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*, Oxford 1983; B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'œuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris 1983; K. Berger, *Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament*: ANRW II, 25,2, Berlin-New York 1984, 1031-1432, here 1231-1245 (bibl.); A. Spira (ed.), *The Biographical Works of Gregory of Nyssa* (PMS 12), Cambridge, MA 1984; E.A. Clark, *The Life of Melania the Younger*, New York-Toronto 1984; R. Albrecht, *Das Leben der heiligen Makrina auf dem Hintergrund der Thekla-Traditionen. Studien zu den Ursprüngen des weiblichen Mönchtums im 4. Jahrhundert in Kleinasien* (FKDG 38), Göttingen 1986; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, I: *Von der Passio Perpetuae zu den Dialogi Gregors des Großen* (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 8), Stuttgart 1986; M. Van Uytfanghe, *Stylisation biblique et condition humaine dans l'hagiographie mérovingienne (600–750)*, Brussels 1987; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im*

lateinischen Mittelalter, II: *Merowingische Biographie. Italien, Spanien und die Inseln im frühen Mittelalter* (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 9), Stuttgart 1988; W.D. McCready, *Signs of Sanctity: Miracles in the Thought of Gregory the Great* (Studies and Texts 91), Toronto 1989; var. aus., *Gerolamo e la biografia letteraria*, Genoa 1989; A. Ceresa-Gastaldo (ed.), *Biografia e agiografia nella letteratura cristiana antica e medievale*, Trento 1990; E. Mühlenberg, *Les débuts de la biographie chrétienne*: RThPh 122 (1990) 517-529; R.A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, Cambridge 1992; P.F. Beatrice, *Porphyry's Judgment on Origen*, in R.J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (BETL 105), Louvain 1992, 351-367; A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography*, Expanded Edition, Cambridge, MA 1993; I. Gallo - L. Nicastri (eds.), *Biografia e autobiografia degli antichi e dei moderni*, Naples 1995; S. Swain - M. Edwards (eds.), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1997; var. aus., *La biographie antique* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 44), Vandœuvres-Genève 1998; A. Cameron - S.G. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*, Oxford 1999; T. Hägg - Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Transformation of the Classical Heritage 31), Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2000; M. Van Uytfanghe, *Biographie*: RAC, Suppl. Band I (2000), 1088-1364 (with vast bibl.); P.F. Beatrice, *Hermagorica novitas. La testimonianza di Colombano sullo scisma dei Tre Capitoli*, in *Aquileia e il suo Patriarcato*, eds. S. Tavano - G. Bergamini - S. Cavazza, Udine 2000, 75-94; A.C. Geljon, *Philonic Exegesis in Gregory of Nyssa's "De Vita Moysis"* (Brown Judaic Studies 333 = Studia Philonica Monographs 5), Providence, RI 2002; Th. Böhm, *Origenes-Theologe und (Neu-) Platoniker? Oder: Wem soll man mißtrauen-Eusebius oder Porphyrius?*: Adamantius 8 (2002) 7-23.

P.F. Beatrice

BIRTH. The biblical exegesis of the Fathers on both the OT and NT (see *Lk* 1:13) considers marital fecundity to be a good and a gift of God (Clem. Al., *Strom.* II, 83,142,1-2; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* IX, 15; Ambr., *Exp. Lc.* 1,29; John Chrys., *Anna* 1,4). Conversely, the church considered *Encratite movements, which condemned marriage and generation, to be heretical (already *1 Tim* 4:13; Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,24,1; 1,28,1; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* 1,29,2; *De car. Chr.* 4,2). *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III, 45-72) does not hesitate to state polemically that abstention from marriage is the impiety of those who wish to suppress generation, God's work (*Strom.* II, 23,142); the birth of children is a good (*Strom.* II, 23,142,2); "for those who are married, the aim is procreation; the goal—offspring" (*Paedag.* II, 10,83,1-2; cf. *Strom.* II, 11,71,4; III, 15,96,2). For *Origen, prayer obtains from God the birth of children (*Orat.* 13,2). *Augustine celebrates the divine providentiality of the birth of children (*Civ. Dei* XII, 23).

Against *abortion and any impediment to the development of the new life, the Fathers unanimously affirm the sacredness of life and its belonging to God (Tertull., *Apol.* 9,8; *Exhort. cast.* 12,5; *Philosophumena* IX, 12; Jerome, *Ep.* 22,13; *conc. Illib.* a. 306, can. 63; *conc. Ancír.* a. 314, can. 21; *conc. Trull.*, a. 692, can. 91). Nonetheless, to exalt virginity, as a virtue and a state, many Christian authors emphasize physical and psychological aspects of the phenomenon of human birth that are quite debatable, and while not openly condemning generation, they seem only to tolerate it, since it is subject to every kind of sorrow and is almost a prelude to death (Jerome, *Ad Helvidium* 20; *Ep.* XXII, 19; Ambr., *Virg.* 1,25; Greg. of Nyss., *Virg.* 3,5; John Chrys., *Hom. in Mt.* 8,3). *Theophilus of Antioch says that the woman's pains in childbirth are a proof of human sin (*Ad Autol.* II, 23), and much of the patristic tradition, echoed in the *liturgy, expressed the perdurance in Christian circles of the OT conception of the physical and ritual impurity of childbirth, such that not only the mother but even the midwife had to be ritually purified before approaching the *sacraments (*Can. Hipp.*, can. 18: the mother, for 40 days if she gave birth to a boy, 80 for a girl; the midwife 20 days for a boy, 40 for a girl; cf. also *Novella* 17 of the emperor Leo, in K.E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Ius Graeco-Romanum* 3,89).

Origen (*Hom. Lev.* 8,3) comments on the instructions of *Leviticus* as proof of the impurity contracted in childbirth, which thus also extended to the newborn (ps.-Prosp., *Proem.* I, 4). Some Christian authors say that at the moment of birth, a good spirit (*angel) and an evil spirit (*demon) draw near the child (Hermas, *Mand.* 6,2; Orig., *Hom. Lc.* 12; Clem. Al., *Strom.* VII, 127,4; Eus., *Praep. Ev.* XIII, 13,59). In particular, in the 4th-5th c. the conviction spread that at the moment of birth the child was possessed by an impure spirit that had to be driven out by *baptism (Aug., *Symb.* 1,2; *Optatus of M., *De schism.* IV, 6); this is the reason for the rites of *exorcism of the newborn included in the rituals.

More than physical birth, however, the interest of Christian writers focused on the spiritual birth brought about by baptism, a "washing of regeneration [*palingenesias*] and renewal [*anakainōseōs*]," as the letter to Titus calls it (3:5). Neophytes are called "newborn infants," *artigennēta brephē* (1Ptr 2:2). Baptism can therefore be called and thought of as a "second birth" or a "spiritual birth," a "regeneration" (*anagennēsis* or *palingenesia*: see Just., *1 Apol.* 61,3; 66,1; Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,21,1; Clem. Al., *Ecl.* 7; John Chrys., *In Gal.* 4,22; Orig., *Com. Mt.* XV, 23; Cyr. of Jer., *Procat.* 16; Eus., *HE* 10,4.34); among the Latins "second *nativitas*" (Tertull., *Exhort. cast.* 1,4; *De an.* 41,4; Cypr., *Ad Don.* 4; Novat., *Trin.* XXIX, 169) or *spiritalis nativitas* (Aug., *Nupt. et conc.* II, 34,58).

Baptism or the baptismal water can be thought of as the maternal womb which opens for the birth of God's children (Clem. Al., *Strom.* IV, 160,2; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* I, 2; XX, 4; Aug., *Symb.* 4,1). This analogy was suggestive for removing the less pleasant aspects of childbirth from the real to the symbolic level (Clem. Al., *Paedag.* I, cc. 34-52); in particular, the pains and anxiety of physical birth were contrasted with the serenity and joy of birth as children of God (Zeno of Ver., II, 30; John Chrys., *Catech. bapt.* 4,1). In the context of the 2nd-3rd c. antidocetist debates, the real birth of Jesus via the normal physical process was decisively affirmed, even though he was virginally conceived (Ign., *Trall.* 9,1; *Eph.* 18,1; Just., *Dial.* 45,4; Orig., *C. Cels.* IV, 73; *Philosophumena* VII, 31; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* III, 9,2-3; *De car. Chr.* 1,2-3; 4,3-4; Novat., *Trin.* X, 52-53).

RAC 9, 128-170; DSp 11, 24-34; F. Bolgiani, *La tradizione eresiologica sull'encratismo, I, Le notizie di Ireno*: AAT 91 (1956-1957) 343-419; *II, La confutazione di Clemente Alessandrino*: AAT 96 (1961-62) 537-664; H. Crouzel, *Virginité et mariage selon Origène*, Paris-Bruges 1963; J.P. Broudéhoux, *Mariage et famille chez Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1970; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Enkrateia e antropologia. Le motivazioni protologiche della continenza e della verginità nel cristianesimo dei primi secoli e nello gnosticismo*, IPA, 1984; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Rome 1983 (Fac. lettere e filosofia, Univ. Macerata n. 15); Gregory of Nyssa (St.) - John Chrysostom (St.) *La verginità*, ed. S. Lilla, 2, Rome 1990; Ch. Munier, *Matrimonio e Verginità nella Chiesa Antica*, It. tr., Turin 1990; A. Sicari, *Matrimonio e verginità nella rivelazione. L'uomo di fronte alla "Gelosia di Dio,"* Milan 1992.

V. Loi - B. Amata

BIRTHDAY (*dies natalis*). The *pagans celebrated the anniversary of birth; a deceased person's family often continued the celebration, but not always on the day of birth (ἡμέρα γενέθλιος = day of birth and memorial of death). Christians celebrated only the anniversary of death, which they called (ἡμέρα, i.e., day of the memorial of death (*Mart. Polyc.* 18,3). *Tertullian thus mentions masses for the dead: *oblationes pro defunctis*, *pro nataliciis annua die facimus* (*Cor.* 3,3). *Cyprian recommends noting the dates of the deaths of the martyrs (*Ep.* 12,2), so on the anniversary the eucharistic sacrifice could be celebrated in their memory (*Ep.* 39,3). The Latin translation *dies natalis* suggests the interpretation of the memorial of the deceased as a memorial of his spiritual birth to eternal life—a hope that, in the strict sense, regarded only the martyrs. Thus the *dies natalis* is the day of a martyr's death. The **depositio martyrum* of Rome begins the series of the *dies natales* with the feast of the Lord's birth. From the 4th c., there is the celebration of the anniversary of the introduction of the bishop of Rome, *Natalis papae* (RAC 7, 760-761). Of course Christians too celebrated the birth and occasionally also the anniversary of birth. In the **Sacramentarium gelasianum* there is an *Oratio in natale genuinum;* this mass was probably solemnly celebrated on the first birthday.

F.X. Kraus, Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer 2 (Freiburg 1886) 483-484; RAC 9, 230-239.

S. Heid

BISHOP

I. 1st c.: New Testament norm and first historical evolution - II. 2nd c.: Birth of the monarchical episcopate - III. 3rd c.: Strengthening of the monarchical episcopate - IV. 4th and 5th c.: The bishops in the imperial church - V. 5th-7th c.: The bishops leading the churches in the Germanic countries.

The first Christian communities immediately established their ecclesiastical offices, which were considered necessary for guaranteeing the operation and development of the church. The primary duties of these offices or ministries were the celebration of the religious service, the preaching of the true doctrine and the direction of the community's charitable activities. Christians drew inspiration for this from the names and the structures of the Jewish *synagogue communities and the phenomenon associated with *Hellenism. But the swiftness and the uniformity with which this process was completed in all the Christian communities demonstrates that the Jewish or the Hellenistic model did not internally influence the church's organizational structures; instead, they developed starting from the church's theological self-awareness. Just two generations after Jesus and the *apostles—later, in the second half of the 2nd c. (around 170)—the formation of the threefold ministry of bishops, *presbyters and deacons (*Diakonia - Diaconate) was already essentially delineated, and no one called into question the belief whether this ordination corresponded to God's will and demonstrated full continuity with the *apostolic tradition.

I. 1st c.: New Testament norm and first historical evolution. The gospels, to make reference to those responsible for the mission and the governing of the community, used the term which in the Greek language was very rarely used to name this type of duty: διακονία. In the Synoptic gospels this term is connected with Jesus himself, who desired that the authority of his disciples not be carried out by means of force (Mk 10:44) or knowledge (Mt 23:8-11), but only

by one's disposition to service. Starting from this characteristic, which was very important but generic, a historical process was put into effect through the progressive realization of the formation of the ecclesiastical office. At first, the Christian communities were governed by a college of leaders, which was formed in a different manner according to geographic areas or missionaries. The Christian community of *Jerusalem and the communities of *Palestine, in continuity with the Jewish institution of the "council of elders," were led by "the most elderly" or the "presbyters"—πρεσβύτεροι (Acts 15:22; 20:17-28; Jas 5:14; 1 Pet 5:1-4). On the other hand, the Pauline communities knew of no institution of "presbyters"; rather, those who were chief among them stood as the "presiders" or the "leaders" (Rom 12:8; 1 Th 5:12), or rather the "bishops"—ἐπίσκοποι—and the "deacons"—διάκονοι (Phil 1:1), the latter terminology ("bishop" and "deacons") lasting over the centuries. The phenomenon associated with Hellenism made use of the term ἐπίσκοπος to refer to the governors of various groups, but in all these cases it had as a common denominator the meaning of "overseer" and "administrator." The organizational structure of the bishops and the deacons was soon confused with that of the presbyters (Acts 14:23; 20:17-35; 1 Tim 3:1-13; Tit 1:5-9). Moreover, in *Syria and especially in Palestine, alongside this organizational structure, a triad of "apostles," "prophets" and "teachers" coexisted throughout the entire 2nd c. (1 Cor 12:28-29; Eph 4:11; *Didache* 13 and 15); these were itinerant charismatics, in contradistinction to the presbyter-bishops and deacons, who instead remained established in one place and were chosen by the community.

At the time of the composition of the text titled *Prima Clementis* (i.e., the First Epistle of Clement—ca. 96), the communities of *Rome and Corinth were directed by a college of presbyters, who were likewise called "bishops"; *1 Clem.* attests to—as do the Pastoral Epistles, which were almost contemporary—a fusion of the episcopal with the presbyteral ministry. Among the chief duties of the presbyter-bishops was the "offering of the sacrifice" (*1 Clem.* 44,4), which can be understood in the sense of the eucharistic celebration. The chief theological argument for the author of *1 Clem.* consists in presenting this form of authority at the head of the Christian communities as established on divine ordination, by which not only the cosmos but also the entire history of salvation was ordered: the cosmic order, the cultic forms of the OT, and the organization of the presbyter-bishops and deacons in the church show that the organization of the Christian communities corresponds to an order established by God (*1 Clem.* 40,41 and 43,1-6); in fact, the presbyter-bishops and the deacons are presented as successors of the apostles (*1 Clem.* 42,1-5 and 44,1-2), and therefore the authority of the presbyter-bishops and deacons goes back, through the apostles and Jesus, to God himself. The Pastoral Epistles of the NT reflect the growing importance of the ecclesiastical duties as guarantors of a faithful continuity of the evangelical message (1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:12-14). These offices were granted by the laying on of hands—χειροτονία—of the "presbyters" (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6; cf. Acts 13:3; 14:23). In the Pastoral Epistles, deacons were also mentioned alongside bishops and presbyters; but an explanation is not given as to the relationship between these two offices—excluding for that time the possibility that it was hierarchical. The bishop was asked for an exemplary life, fidelity in the transmission of the gospel, and the ability to teach "sound doctrine" (1 Tim 3:1-7; Tit 1:7-9).

II. 2nd c.: Birth of the monarchical episcopate. In the 2nd c., the collegial form of government was disappearing; this phenomenon did not appear suddenly or simultaneously in every place. The type of organization that prevailed in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. consisted of a community governed by one sole bishop, who was assisted by presbyters and helped by deacons. One of the first testimonies to the monarchical episcopate and the hierarchical gradation between bishops, presbyters and deacons are the letters of *Ignatius of Antioch, whose dating varies between 110 and 160/170. According to Ignatius's typological thought, ecclesiastical organization and harmony are the image of the celestial organization and harmony: the bishop occupies the place of God (*Magn.* 6,1) and is the image of the Father (*Trall.* 3,1); the presbyters, deacons and the rest of the community must be subject to him (*Magn.* 2-3; *Eph.* 5,3; *Smyrn.* 8,1). Baptism, the Eucharist and charity can only be accomplished under his direction (*Smyrn.* 8,1-2). "Where the bishop is, there is the community, just as where Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church" (*Smyrn.* 8,2). Ignatius discerned the foundation of the bishop's authority not in apostolic succession, nor in the creation of the episcopal office by Jesus Christ, but solely in the will of God, who desires that the bishop be the head of the administration of his house (*Eph.* 6,1). It is the bishop's duty to guarantee the unity of the Christian community; the bishop who, assisted in his functions by the presbyters and the deacons, presides over the eucharistic celebration (*Philad.* 4; *Eph.* 20,2), is the sacramental sign through whom the force of the *liturgy and the heavenly hierarchy spiritually produces the unity of

the Christian community. The chronological list of bishops of *Rome presented by *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* 3,3,3) around the year 185 is significant. Irenaeus traces the list of Roman bishops back to *Linus, who was ordained as a bishop by the apostles *Peter and *Paul; the names that Irenaeus lists from Linus to *Anicetus must correspond to noteworthy individuals of the presbyteral college that governed the Roman church in those years. The objective of this list was to demonstrate the authentic origin and the faithful transmission of the apostolic preaching in the church in contrast with the heretical teachings of the *gnostics; in this light, it is very clear how apostolic succession in the person of the bishop guaranteed the continuity of faith. *Tertullian (*De praescr.* 21,4 and 32,1-3), around the year 200, insisted on the same form of argumentation used by Irenaeus.

Various theological and sociological factors converged in the quick spread of the monarchical episcopate: (1) bishops were able to resolve divisive conflicts within the communities, as the letters of Ignatius clearly emphasize (*Magn.* 10,1-3; *Philad.* 4; 7,2; 8,1; *Eph.* 20,2); (2) the Pastoral Epistles demanded from the bishop the ability to teach doctrine (1 Tim 3:2; 6:20; 2 Tim 4:2-5; Tit 1:9) and, for this reason, in the case of a controversy involving various opinions within the community, the word of the bishop was considered determinative because the apostolic teaching was presented as a closed deposit that was transmitted through the entrusted hands of the bishop; (3) in continuity with the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 3:15), the Christian community was presented in Ignatius's letters as the "house of God"—οἶκος θεοῦ—in which the bishop worked as the "paterfamilias"—οἰκοδεσπότης—or the "administrator"—οἰκονόμος—of the community; and (4) according to a sociological norm of human behavior, within the collegial government an eminent representative of this collegiality assumed the function of a spokesman or an overseer.

III. 3rd c.: Strengthening of the monarchical episcopate. This institution reached its full formalization in the 3rd c., as one learns from the *Traditio Apostolica* (**Apostolic Tradition*—ca. 215) and *Cyprian of *Carthage (d. 258) in the West and the **Didascalia* (mid-3rd c.) in the East. The *Traditio Apostolica (*3,3-5) records the prayer of the bishop's ordination with which the oversight of the community is clearly conferred, because this prayer invokes the "chief Spirit," *Spiritus principalis,* that Christ gave to the *apostles so that they would establish the church everywhere; with this spirit the bishops had the duty of leading their assigned community by serving God, offering the church's sacrifice, forgiving sins and entrusting the necessary duties to competent ministers. Cyprian presented the church as an episcopal church: "The bishop is in the church and the church is with the bishop; and if someone is not with the bishop, he is not in the church" (*Ep.* 66,8 Hartel). Cyprian strengthened the authority of the bishop in the administration of the forgiveness of sins because, on account of the controversy over the reconciliation of the *lapsed (*lapsi*), he attributed the full power over *penance only to the bishop and did not accept the idea that the *confessors of the faith appropriated this ability with their letters of peace. Cyprian discerned the foundation of the bishop's authority, the primary guarantor of ecclesiastical unity, in the promise made by Christ to *Peter (*Ep.* 3,1 and 66,8 Hartel) and in Christ's conferring of authority to the apostles (*Ep.* 69,11; 73,7; 75,16 Hartel). The *Didascalia,* returning to *Ignatius of Antioch, bears witness to the heavy influence of the OT in its portrayal of the bishop, who must be honored as if he were God (*Didasc.* 2,20,1), because he occupies his place (*Didasc.* 2,28,9); according to the *Didascalia,* the episcopal offices were liturgical, disciplinary-penitential and magisterial.

The establishment of the episcopal office under the form of the monepiscopacy, just as its theological foundation and its institutional strengthening, should be considered as one of the most important events of the postapostolic development of the church. The episcopal office established its theological foundation, as one can gather from the literary sources of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd c., on various principles: (1) the principle of succession, because the bishop is considered to be a successor of the apostles, who in turn were instituted by Jesus Christ or by God; (2) the principle of the image, because the bishop is considered to be the image of God, inasmuch as he serves the community in God's place, or rather as an earthly priest who works as the image of the heavenly high priest (Jesus Christ); and (3) the assumption of governing functions as a priest, pastor, teacher, judge in potential questions and director or administrator of charitable works. With respect to the appointment of bishops, the bishop was elected by the community (*Trad. ap.* 2) and subsequently ordained by other bishops through the laying on of hands, or the χειροτονία, and the prayer of consecration (*Trad. ap.* 3). At the end of the 2nd c. the custom developed of gathering either local or regional episcopal syndods, something which contributed to the growth of the κοινωνία (Lat. *communio*) between the bishops and the local churches.

IV. 4th and 5th c.: The bishops in the imperial church.

1. Theological aspects. From the theological point of view, the principle was strengthened, which was already present in the first three centuries, according to which the monarchical episcopate corresponded to God's will, his institution through Jesus Christ and the laying on of hands through the *apostles. This theological explanation placed the order of the Christian priesthood in relation to the action of Jesus Christ, so to speak, with his preaching and promises, the Last Supper and the institution of the *Eucharist, with the granting of the power to forgive sins, with the election of the disciples, to whom he entrusted the mission and with the sending of the *Holy Spirit. The contention that the theological foundation for the origins of the episcopate must be historically traced back to Jesus Christ himself is explained starting from the form of thought, proper to that time, which maintained that what was in place at that time was so since the beginning. With *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Dem. Ev.* 4,15,20) a distinction began to be made in the priestly action, the (threefold office) *munus triplex* of Christ—regal, sacerdotal and prophetic—in which the bishops fully participated. The theological vision on the priesthood presented by *Jerome was also important: he opposed the attempts of several deacons who dared to place themselves above the presbyters and affirmed that they could not consecrate the Eucharist, in contradistinction to the bishops and the *presbyters (Ep. 146). In the treatise *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, written by ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, the bishop is placed at the apex of a holy hierarchy, which is a reflection of the celestial hierarchy; this work, thanks to the supposed apostolic authority of the author, heavily contributed to strengthening the hierarchical conception of the Christian priesthood, at the apex of which was the bishop.

2. Spiritual aspects. From the viewpoint of spiritual theology, this period included the birth of literature on priestly spirituality. In addition to the lost work of *Theodore of Mopsuestia's *De sacerdotio*, three works of patristic literature have been preserved, which are known by the generic name of the "priestly trilogy": *Gregory of Nazianzus's *Oratio* II, *John Chrysostom's treatise *De sacerdotio* and *Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis.*

3. Juridical aspects. From the juridical point of view, various aspects must be taken into consideration. (1) Starting from the 4th c., the local church was not restricted to the city but extended to rural areas, with the logical consequence of a new principle of organization that was no longer only urban: the "dioceses"; this term drew its origin from the political administration of the empire, with the difference that the civil diocese consisted of various provinces. (2) The appointment of the bishops continued to follow the practice of previous centuries: election through the clergy with the approval of the community and ordination by means of a neighboring bishop (can. 4 of the Council of *Nicaea decreed that the bishops should be ordained by at least three others). An exception to this norm was the appointment of the bishop of *Constantinople, an appointment which was subject to the emperor's authority; moreover, the emperors approved the election of the bishops—or they deposed them—in the case of the episcopal sees of greater importance. (3) The transfer of a bishop to another diocese was prohibited (can. 15 and 16 of Nicaea and can. 5 of *Chalcedon); the biblical foundation for the prohibition of episcopal transfers was the indissolubility of marriage: according to an allegorical interpretation it was held that, just as Christ was the husband of the church (Eph 5:25-33), so too the bishop was spiritually wed to his diocese, sealing a union that only death could dissolve. (4) Starting from the 4th c., the practice of sexual continence among the clergy began to spread; the Christian West, starting from can. 33 of *Elvira (*Illiberis*) (ca. 306), imposed this type of continence upon bishops, presbyters and deacons; the East, on the other hand, starting from the Council of Nicaea (*Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,11), kept alive the traditional practice, according to which clerics who married before ordination could live a married life without restrictions; nevertheless, the emperor *Justinian demanded celibacy of the bishops, which was subsequently made obligatory for the *Byzantine church in canons 12, 13 and 48 of the Synod of *Trullo in the year 692. (5) In the rural areas the χωρεπίσκοπος ("*chorbishop") was instituted, with pastoral duties in common with the city's ἐπίσκοπος ("bishop"), although some limited episcopal privileges were restricted, such as the administration of confirmation and holy orders, which remained reserved to the city's bishop. (6) The bishops of the dioceses of *Rome, *Alexandria, *Antioch, *Jerusalem and Constantinople were elevated to the level of patriarchs (can. 6 of the Council of Nicaea, can. 3 of the first Council of Constantinople and can. 28 of the Council of Chalcedon), to the point of acquiring authority over the other bishops of the patriarchate. Some Byzantine theologians, such as *Maximus the Confessor and Theodore the Studite, found a legitimate foundation for the authority of the five patriarchs in Mt 16:19, reuniting them under the sole concept of "pentarchy." Moreover, the diocese of *Carthage became the unquestioned *metropolis of Proconsular

*Africa, and for this reason the bishop of Carthage would reclaim the function of being "the first of all Africa," *primus totius Africae*; the diocese of *Milan was converted into an ecclesiastical center of great influence in N *Italy; and in the rest of the empire influential episcopal sees acquired and lost their metropolitan status on the basis of their political importance or decline. The institution of "apostolic vicars" at *Thessalonica (in the year 412 by Pope *Innocent I) and at *Arles (in the year 417 by Pope *Zosimus I) guaranteed the unity of the church and the influence of the bishop of Rome in the Eastern and Western parts of the empire.

4. Political-social aspects. From the political-social point of view, it is necessary to emphasize how, starting from the so-called Constantinian turn (313), there began a process of social "sacrilization" of the clergy and, more concretely, of the bishops. There is no doubt that, at the ontological level, every priest was a sacred person, but the public and official recognition of this reality is another question; in fact, the NT, when it treats the priesthood of Christ, does not allude to this external dimension of social status. Christian bishops were recognized officially and publicly as holders of the status of sacred persons starting from the 4th c. This new social position of Christian clergy was framed within the categories of thought proper to a Roman religiosity: God guaranteed prosperity and well-being to the state if proper adoration and worthy worship were offered to him. From the moment *Constantine chose the God of the Christians as his protector, he as a result also took on the responsibility of this God's worship. For this reason, Christian priests received from Constantine a series of civil privileges (*privilegium immunitatis* and *privilegium fori*). Dispensed thereby from specific civil services, priests were better able to fulfill their own clerical duties so that no impediment would interfere in the completion of the worship owed to the divinity (see *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. eccl.* 10,7,2). Moreover, in the year 318 the **audientia episcopalis* was granted to the bishops, through which juridical status in the matter of civil law, but not in penal law, was granted. Nevertheless, it came about that the bishops began to obtain duties proper to imperial officers such as those of governors or social assistants; thus, for example, *Basil, the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea in *Cappadocia was at the same time the exarch of the political diocese of *Pontus. This awareness of clerical status, which was increasingly more influential within society, became external in the liturgical vestments and other external forms that emphasized the privileged position of the bishops; *John Chrysostom, however (In *Ep. II ad Cor.* 20,2), was opposed to the idea of putting on a clerical garment, condemning the cassock as a luxury that failed to demonstrate one's solidarity with the poor and that was incompatible with the generosity of almsgiving. One cannot determine with certainty whether the bishops were elevated by Constantine to the noble rank of *viri illustres* ("famous men"), something which would have allowed them to adorn themselves with the honorary insignia proper to this social status; it is certain that some elements of the liturgical attire and the episcopal rite went back to the models of the Late Antique civil nobility, but this does not indicate an official appointment by Constantine, which does not appear either in the literary or juridical sources. The office of social promotion and assistance for the poor and those in need, to whom the bishops were committed, was noteworthy and higher than the assistance which in the 2nd- and 3rd-c. Christian communities had supplied needy brethren; the bishops of Late Antiquity assumed the responsibility of supplying the population with food that it did not receive from the state food administration, which by that time was not functioning well. The social prestige of the bishops grew enormously for a number of reasons: they were responsible for the religious life in every place; they were members of the old city's elite and administrators of charitable works for the poor; for this reason, the bishop's authority was recognized as a *pater populi* ("father of the people"), *pater civitatis* ("father of the citizenry"), *pater urbis* ("father of the city") or *pater patriae* ("father of the homeland").

V. 5th-7th c.: The bishops leading the churches in the Germanic countries. After the stabilization of the Germanic peoples for the entire 5th c. in the empire's territories, the ecclesiastical structures of the Western empire underwent significant transformations. Because of the social disorder caused by the invasions of the Germanic peoples, the prohibition of transferring bishops weakened to the point that more than one bishop was removed with force from his see; it seemed fitting for the good of the church that any bishop who was impeded in his functions be transferred to another see. Just as had occurred with the emperors of the Roman Empire, the king of each Germanic nation was the leader and guarantor of the religious life of his people; therefore, the Germanic kings labored to maintain the unity of the religious faith as a guarantee of national unity. To this end they frequently called together the bishops so that they would gather in national synods, and the kings were the ones that confirmed and implemented the decisions of these councils. Even the

pope's decisions were applied in each nation only after the cautious authorization of the king. In this way one can explain the fact that the kings progressively appropriated the right to appoint bishops.

J. Neumann, *Bischof* I: TRE 6 (1980) 653-682; J. Zizioulas, *Épiskopè et Épiskopos dans l'Église primitive: bref inventaire de la documentation*: Irénikon 56 (1983) 484-502; R.M. Hübner, *Die Anfänge von Diakonat, Presbyteriat und Episkopat in der frühen Kirche*, in A. Rauch - P. Imhof (eds.), *Das Priestertum in der Einen Kirche*, Aschaffenburg 1987, 45-89; A. Faivre, *Ordonner la fraternité*, Paris 1992; E. Dassmann, *Entstehung und theologische Begründung der kirchlichen Ämter in der Alten Kirche*, Bonn 1993; A. Weiser - H.J. Pottmeyer, *Bischof*: LTK[3] 2, 481-486; C. O'Donnell - S. Pié-Ninot, *Diccionario de eclesiología*, Madrid 2001, 780-789; K.S. Frank, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn [3]2002, 100-113, 309-320; E. Elm, *Die Macht der Weisheit: das Bild des Bischofs in der* Vita Augustini *des Possidius und anderen spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Bischofsviten*, Leiden 2003; A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church. The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, MA - London 2004.

A. Viciano

BITHYNIA and PONTUS. Region of Asia Minor that at its greatest extension spread from the Hellespont on the Propontis (Sea of Marmara) to the SE extremity of the Pontus Euxinus (Black Sea), also including Honorias and Paphlagonia. Bithynia Pontus was the name of the province established in 65–64 BC, after the Roman conquest (Tacitus, *Annals* I, 74). The witnesses to the apostolic glossolalia on the day of *Pentecost included inhabitants of Pontus; Aquila was also from there (Acts 2:9; 18:2). The rapid expansion of Christianity in that region is attested by 1 Pet, addressed to the "exiles [= Christians] of the diaspora in Pontus and Bithynia." 1 Pet alludes to a state of persecution not unlike that referred to by *Pliny the Younger, governor of the province in 112 (*Ep*. 96), in his letter to *Trajan; the letter is certainly later than *Nero, perhaps datable to 80–95 (DBS, VII, 1444-1453). In Pontus, the progress of the gospel is attested by the work of *Gregory Thaumaturgus. In Bithynia, the era of the martyrs culminated in the massacre of *Nicomedia, the imperial residence from the time of *Diocletian, which occasioned *Lactantius's conversion. The first ecumenical council (325) and the last of the patristic era (787) met at *Nicaea, rival of *Nicomedia (where *Constantine was baptized) as capital of Bithynia. The first phase of *Arianism brought the episcopate of Bithynia into prominence due to *Eusebius of Nicomedia. *Chalcedon was the seat of the fourth ecumenical council (451), which confirmed Nicomedia's precedence and, in can. 28, extended the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of *Constantinople to *Pontus, a region made illustrious by the *Cappadocians and from which *Evagrius of Pontus took his name.

In the first *Notitia episcopatuum,* that of ps.-Epiphanius (7th c.), Bithynia was divided into three ecclesiastical provinces, listed in seventh, eighth and ninth place in the *Taxis*. The first had Nicomedia as metropolis, with eight suffragans; the second, Nicaea, with three suffragans; the third, Chalcedon, with none (Darrouzès 204, 208); Pontus was divided in two: Helenopontus with its metropolis *Amasea, and Pontus Polemoniacus with its metropolis *Neocaesarea, with five suffragans including Trebizond (ibid., 204-205; 209). *Monasticism developed admirably in Bithynia (in the diocese of Chalcedon alone, 40 *hegumens signed the Synod of Constantinople of 536: Mansi, VIII, 1013-1081), esp. in Olympus, and in Pontus in the region of Trebizond. Altogether there were ca. 150 church buildings and more than 250 *monasteries (OCP XXXI [1975] 319), mostly from the patristic era, dominated by the *Saccudion* (St. Plato and St. Theodore the Studite) and by the monastic federation of Altroa (St. Peter).

DHGE IX, 20-27, cf. IV, 968-988; DB V, 538-542; EC II, 1681-1682; ODB 1,292; 3,1697; R. Janin, *Les Églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (*Bithynie*, . . . *Trébizonde* . . .), Paris 1975; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Paris 1981.

D. Stiernon

BLANDINA (2nd c.). The most famous of the martyrs of *Lyons of 177. "In her, Christ showed that what to human eyes is without beauty, form or value is in God's eyes worthy of great glory, for the love its bears him" (Eus., *HE* V, 1,17). Bound to a stake as to a cross, to her companions in martyrdom she appeared to be the very image of Christ (ibid., 41), because "she had put on the garments of the great and unconquered athlete, Christ" (ibid., 42). She died after sending all of her companions ahead of her to God, and went to martyrdom "as to a wedding feast" (ibid., 55); "the pagans themselves admitted that never among them had a woman borne so many and such harsh torments" (ibid., 56). Feast 2 June, with the other martyrs of Lyons.

Eusebius, *HE* V, 1, 17-56; DHGE 9, 130; BS 3, 202; *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, intr. by A.A.R. Bastiaensen, critical text and commentary, eds. A.A.R. Bastiaensen et al., Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Milan 1987, 59-95; *Histoire des saints*, II, 74-82; W.H.C. Frend, *Blandina and Perpetua: Two Early Christian Heroines*, in *Les martyrs de Lyon* (*177*). *Lyon 20-23 septembre 1977* (Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 575), Paris 1978, 167-177; M.L. Guillaumin, *Une jeune fille qui s'appelait Blandine. Aux origines d'une tradition hagi-*

ographique, in *Epektasis. Mélanges offerts au card. J. Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 93-98; A. Valerio, *Le figure femminili negli atti dei martiri del II secolo*: Rassegna di Teologia 22 (1981) 35-37; U. Mattioli, *Astheneia e andreia: Aspetti della femminilità nella letteratura classica, biblica e cristiana antica*, Rome 1983, 146-147; P.A. Gramaglia, *Interpretazioni e personificazioni. Personificazioni e modelli del femminile*, Atti del Nono Colloquio sulla Interpretazione (Macerata, 6-8 aprile 1987), ed. G. Galli, Genoa 1988, 103-105; C. Mazzucco, *Figure di donne cristiane: la martire*, in *La donna nel mondo antico.* Atti del II convegno nazionale di studi (Turin 18-20 aprile), ed. R. Uglione, Turin 1989, 167-195; F.E. Consolino, *La donna negli Acta martyrum*, in *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, ed. U. Mattioli, Genoa 1992, 95-117; E.G. Hinson, *Women among Martyrs*: SP 25 (1993) 423-428; V. Saxer, *Atti dei martiri dei primi tre secoli*, Padua ²1989, 57-71; LCI 5, 415.

V. Saxer

BLASTUS. This martyr, buried in the cemetery *ad clivum cucumeris* on the *via Salaria antica,* is listed on 17 June in the *Mart. hier.*, and also mentioned in the 8th-c. *Itineraria.* We know nothing with certainty of him or of his martyrdom. If we believe the inscription of Paschal II (817–824) in S. Prassede, his body was brought to Rome from somewhere else.

Mart. hier. 322-323; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 37-38; BS 3, 204-205; AASS nov. 2, 2, 322ff.; DHGE 9, 161ff. (F.O' Brian); *Lexicon f. Theologie und Kirche*, Freiburg-Basel-Rome-Vienna 1994, 2, col. 523 (M. Stark).

V. Saxer

BLASTUS (2nd c.). A Roman schismatic about whom we have little information; he may have been a *presbyter during *Victor's pontificate. Four independent and discordant ancient sources speak of him. According to ps.-Tertullian (*Adversus omnes haer.* 8: CSEL 47,225) he was a *quartodeciman; *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 5, 15) speaks of him in the context of the *Montanists, but this does not make him one, since the historian was following a chronological order. *Pacian of Barcelona considered him a Montanist (*Ep.* 1,1: PL 13, 1053B); *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, a Valentinian heretic (*Haer. fab*. 1,23: PG 83, 3). *Irenaeus of Lyons wrote him a letter (lost), the contents of which are unknown (Eusebius, *HE* 5, 20,1).

DHGE 9,161; LTK³ 2, 523; P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste*, Paris 1913, 276-277.

A. Di Berardino

BLESILLA (2nd half 4th c.). Saint, feast 22 January. Daughter of the Roman noblewoman *Paula and sister of *Eustochium. Widowed young, at age 20 after a grave illness, she embraced the *ascetic life at the encouragement of *Jerome; she followed her mother to Bethlehem, where she died four months later (383). Disturbances broke out at her funeral, as the people attributed her death to the excessive austerity of *monastic practices. Jerome wrote a letter to Paula comforting her over the loss of her daughter, whose intellectual and spiritual virtues he attested (*Ep*. 39).

BHL 1367; AASS. Ian. II, Venice 1734, 416-417; PCBE 2, *Blesilla*, 310-311; Ch. Krumeich, *Hieronymus und die Christlichen feminae clarissimae*, Bonn 1993; G. Jenal, *Italia ascetica atque monastica, Das Asketen-und Mönchtum in Italien von den Anfängen bis zur Zeit der Longobarden* (*ca. 150/250-604*), in Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 39, 1-2, Stuttgart 1995.

G. Pilara

BLESSING

I. Origin - II. Development - III. Types - IV. Ministers of benediction.

I. Origin. In the OT, blessing (v. *barāk, eulogeō*; n. *barākâh*, *eulogia*) refers both to public confession of God's power and generosity and to the favor God grants to human beings when he gives them good fortune (Léon-Dufour 38-39). Things (e.g., fields, property) are blessed insofar as they are good for people worthy of blessing. Human beings may bless, but the source of every blessing is God: thus its non-magical character. For the person who blesses, blessing is immutable: once given, only God, its source, can withdraw it (Bauer I, 71-73). The NT emphasizes the spiritual aspect of blessing, which will have its *eschatological fulfillment on the last day (Mt 25:34). Blessing in the NT is centered on Christ, in whom "we have been blessed with every spiritual blessing" (Eph 1:3). The church has received the faculty to bless to the extent that Christ has given it the Spirit, with its gifts of regeneration, fruitfulness, renewal, life, peace, joy and unity; but the Spirit, God himself, is blessing par excellence, manifesting in himself all the great OT themes of blessing. In Mt 14:19; 26:26; Lk 24:30; 1 Cor 10:6, blessing indicates the ritual action that effects divine favor.

II. Development. It is not surprising that the first common Christian blessings were Jewish or Pauline in inspiration—as in the letters of *Ignatius of Antioch (DACL 2/1, 672)—or connected with the eucharistic elements and with ordination/designation for liturgical and/or ecclesial service. The oldest developed formulas of blessing are in *Hippolytus's *Traditio Apostolica* (3rd c.), where blessing is di-

rected not just at ordination/designation but also at objects connected with initiation (water, oil) and liturgical use, a practice already alluded to by *Tertullian (*Bapt.* 4,4). Tertullian situates the theology of blessing in the sphere of *sacramentum* and gives two types, *conversationis sacramentum* and *disciplinae sacramentum* (*De Test. anim.* 2: PL 1, 611); the latter refers to liturgical blessing, esp. during the *Eucharist, a practice found in the *Traditio Apostolica* and mentioned by *Augustine in a letter to Paulinus (PL 33, 636). The classical definition of blessing is that of *Ambrose: *benedictio est sanctificationis et gratiarum votiva collatio* (PL 14, 707). God is always its source, blessing is the work of the Spirit, and the power to bless resides in the church, which has inherited it from the priesthood of Aaron (*Apos. Con.* I, 2,57: cf. DTC 2, 632). The old medieval liturgical sources, *Veronense, Gregorianum, Gelasianum* and *Hadrianum-Gregorianum,* all show ample development both of the formulas of blessing and its objects. The *Supplementum Anianense* (9th c.) of the *Hadr. Greg.* contains a fairly complete list of episcopal blessings *super populum*, which take place during the Eucharist between the Lord's Prayer and Communion. The blessings themselves are of Gallican origin and reflect theological development and liturgical erudition (EC 2, 1300).

III. Types. Blessing considered in itself can be *constitutive* or *invocative*. Constitutive blessing is that which confers a permanent consecration for divine service: e.g., the blessing of liturgical vestments. A more solemn type of blessing uses, e.g., oil of consecration, as in the blessing of a church. In invocative blessing, the person or object is not permanently changed: e.g., the blessing of the sick, which implies the church's intercession on their behalf (CE 2, 164). Blessings can also be considered in reference to persons or things.

1. Persons. Of the various blessings, the principal ones are those of ordination (sometimes called consecration) of bishops, *presbyters, deacons (*see* Diakonia - Diaconate), *subdeacons and for minor orders, and those designating *widows and *virgins (Martimort 684-685). *Catechumens were blessed before being dismissed from the eucharistic assembly and various times during the catechumenate. The assembly was blessed before being dismissed and sometimes during the Eucharist. The *Euchology of Serapion* (c. 350) contains a blessing for the sick (Deiss, 189), as does the *Gelasianum* (ed. Mohlberg, n. 1543), which also contains episcopal blessings given upon entering a house (nos. 1544-1547). Special categories of blessing are (1) *super populum:* there are 15 of these in the *Gelasianum* (nos. 1273-1287), 13 of which are reproduced in the *Fränkische Gelasianum* (nos. 1569-1581). The *Supplementum Anianense* of the *Hadr. Greg.* gives 51 fully developed texts under the title "Episcopal Blessings," composed for the seasons and feasts of the *liturgical year (*Le Sac. Grégorien*, nos. 1738-1788). (2) *Nuptial blessings:* *Ignatius of Antioch (d. ca. 107) mentions the bishop's action in relation to Christian marriage, though his reference is rather obscure (*Ad Polyc.:* PG 5, 723), while *Tertullian refers to the nuptial blessing ratified by the heavenly Father (*Ad Ux.*: PL 1, 1415; cf. *De Pud.*: PL 2, 1038; Ambr., *Ep.* 19: PL 16, 984; Cyr. Al., *In Joann.*: PG 73, 223). The *Gelasianum* (nos. 1451-1454) cites nuptial blessings pronounced after the Lord's Prayer at mass, and again after Communion (see Martène 127-144 for other formulas). (3) *Abbots and abbesses:* the oldest formula is in the *Gregorianum* (Lietzmann n. 216) and consists of a simple prayer. The *Sacram. Gellonense* (8th c.) reproduces the prayer of the *Greg.* with additional formulas (Martimort 739-740). A more complex ritual developed in the postpatristic era.

2. Things. The oldest significant references are to objects connected with the Eucharist, the **agape* and Christian initiation. Gifts of oil, cheese, olives, fruit and flowers offered to the bishop were blessed, as were the cup and bread of the *agape,* lamps for evening prayer and oil for initiation (*Traditio Apos.* passim). The *Gelasianum* contains the blessing of the Easter candle and the font, as do all the other major later *sacramentaries, together with the solemn blessing of the oils (*Gel.* 382-452 passim). In this phase we find the introduction of objects connected with worship, such as altar, chalice and paten. At the time of the *Supplementum Anianense* the range of objects to be blessed was greatly extended under the influence of *monasticism, and included places such as the refectory, dormitory, scriptorium, kitchen, granary, etc.

IV. Ministers of benediction. The **Apostolic Constitutions* warn that blessing is a task of bishops and presbyters and must not be usurped by deacons or laity, a principle that was followed faithfully in the patristic era (DACL 2, 674). The *Traditio Apostolica* makes an exception, saying that hands are laid on the catechumen by his guide (teacher), whether cleric or lay person (n. 19).

DACL 2, 670-685; DTC 2, 629-640; CE 2, 613; EC 2, 1300; *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, London 1967, 35-39; *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology* I, ed. J. Bauer, London 1970, 69-75; E. Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, II, Antuerpiae 1763, 127-144; *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, ed.

H. Lietzmann (LQF 3), Münster 1921; *Sacramentarium Veronense*, ed. L. Mohlberg, Rome 1966; *La Tradition Apostolique de Saint Hippolyte*, ed. B. Botte, Münster 1967; *Springtime of the Liturgy*, ed. L. Deiss, Collegeville 1967, 183-208; *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, ed. L. Mohlberg, Rome 1968; *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien*, ed. J. Deshusses, Fribourg 1971; *Das Fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, ed. L. Mohlberg, Münster 1939 (LQF 1/2); A.G. Martimort, *La Chiesa in preghiera*, Rome 1966, 716-732 and 739-740; A.M. Triacca, *Le benedizioni "invocative" in genere e su "persone," e su "realtà cosmiche,"* in I. Scicolone et al., *Anamnesis*, vol. 7, Genoa 1989, 111-166; *Liturgia*, eds. D. Sartore, A.M. Triacca, C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001, 239-256.

P. Fahey

BLOOD. In the extreme variety of meanings and religious values attributed to blood in various historical and cultural contexts, its relationship with that of a being's living force is one of the most widespread and fundamental. It is well known how in the OT tradition there exists an identification between blood and *soul (*anima*), from which derives the prohibition of the consumption of the blood of animals. In relation to sacrificial rites, it performs an important function in the same tradition, and it has multiple significations as a means of expiation and purification, while it represents one of the chief ritual elements that converges in the stipulation of the covenant between God and the people (see Ex 24:6-7).

In the Christian perspective, the blood of Christ acquired a central role in salvation, in its expiatory function, and in its impact on the sacramental level of the *eucharistic rite. With respect to the *evangelists, it was primarily *John who insisted on the relationship of the continuity between the Passover sacrifice and the death of Christ, which comes to be likened, therefore, to the new Passover (Jn 19:31-37). It was simultaneously placed as the "founding" of the new people of God, the church, whose chief *sacraments (*baptism and Eucharist) were prefigured in the blood mixed with *water flowing from the side of the crucified one. These essential themes provided the basis for the theological and mystical meditation of Christian authors on the value and meaning of Christ's blood as an instrument of redemption.

EC 10, 1778-1780; *Dizionario enciclopedico di spiritualità*, II, Roma 1975, 1657-1658; var. aus., *Sangue e antropologia biblica*, ed. F. Vattioni, I-II, Rome 1981; var. aus., *Sangue e antropologia biblica nella Patristica*, ed. F. Vattioni, I-II, Rome 1982; vol. III, Rome 1983; var. aus., *Sangue e antropologia nella liturgia*, ed. F. Vattioni, I-III, Roma 1984; var. aus., *Sangue e antropologia nella liturgia*, ed. F. Vattioni, I-III, Rome 1987; var. aus., *Sangue e antropologia nella teologia*, ed. F. Vattioni, I-III, Rome 1989.

S. Sfameni Gasparro

BODY. It is precisely in antiquity that the cult of the body became widespread, but this euphoria concealed a deep nostalgia. The body was disparaged as the "enemy" of the soul. In the Bible, however, the body indicated the person in his key states: the state of nature and of sin, consecration to Christ, life in glory. While the OT uses the same term (*basar*) for both flesh and body, the Greek of the NT uses two different terms: σάρξ and σῶμα, a distinction which acquires its full value in the light of faith.

The confrontation in this area between the Bible and philosophical thought was not easy: traces of *dualism persist longer in *anthropology than in cosmology. The orthodox reaction against the dualism of the *heretics was decisive for the historical development of the conception of the body. For the *gnostics, says *Irenaeus, "since the body was derived from the earth, it is impossible for it to be saved" (*Adv. haer*. V, 27,9: SC 153, 112). But such a condemnation of the body implies a misunderstanding of the compexity of the Christian mystery: *creation, *incarnation, *redemption. And the Fathers, while leaning heavily on *Plato, clearly maintain that the body is an integral part of human nature. It is "capable of being immortal," says Irenaeus in his reply to the gnostics (*ibid*., V, 12,4,154).

But at the same time the patterns of Greek thought raised many problems for the spiritual life, such as the relation between soul and body, which in the last analysis derived from the idea that the heteronomous being/essence was mysteriously united by divine wisdom. After the fall, this union acquired an essentially dialectical character: it was an opposition which grew or diminished according to the person's degree of *spirituality. In the severe *ascesis of the monks, expressions that could indicate the Christian experience of the "lust of the flesh," which struggled against the spirit and had to be dominated, were mingled, in a proportion hard to determine, with a radical mistrust of the body, in which we would be tempted to see the influence of Platonism. One thing is certain: in this field, expressions can never be understood outside of their context, since their value depends on the author, the circumstances in which they were pronounced, their purpose, their audience, whether they were an exposition of the Christian faith or an exhortation to renunciation. More frequently than in systematic treatises, the Fathers express their thought in maxims, often non-Christian in origin, which found their justification in the context. The most frequent were the following: the body is a prison, a tomb of the soul; the soul must be wrested from the "chains of the flesh," from bondage to a corpse; the flesh is

like a mire in which the soul can only be defiled and degraded; the body is a "coat of skin," a "horrid mask"; the body is not the same as my essence, but it is my first "good"; we must despise, maltreat, kill the body; we must distrust this "ungrateful friend who weaves snares." Positive aphorisms are more rare: the body is the "instrument of the spirit," like the flute under the flutist's fingers, "the soul's companion in work."

Although the theory of the human body may seem complex, in practice spiritual authors were fully aware of the two imperatives so well emphasized by *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 2,17: PG 35, 425ff.): we must fight temptation, the demon in the body, but at the same time we must spiritualize the body and through it the whole visible cosmos.

DSp 2, 2338-2378; 7, 496-514; J. Daniélou, *Les tuniques de peau chez Grégoire de Nysse* in *Glaube, Geist, Geschichte. Festschr. für Ernst Benz*, Leiden 1967, 355-367; T. Špidlík, *L'ascesi nella Chiesa Orientale*: Rivista di vita spirituale 31 (1977) 496-514; and in *Ascesi cristiana*, ed. E. Ancilli, Rome 1977, 163-181; Id., *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*: OCA 206, Rome 1978, 111ff., 358ff. (bibl.); E. Bellini, *Il corpo e la salvezza dell'uomo nella riflessione dei Padri*: Communio 54 (1980) 18-26; F. Bottomley, *Attitudes to the Body in Western Christendom*, London 1979; J. Fantino, *L'homme image de Dieu chez saint Irenée de Lyon*, Paris 1986; P. Brown, *The Body and Society*, New York 1988 (It. tr., *Il corpo e la società*, Turin 1992); E. Musatto, *Il problema del corpo in S. Agostino*, Rome 1990; D.B. Martin, *The Christian Body*, New Haven 1995; D. Montserrat, *Changing Bodies, Changing Meaning: Studies of the Human Body in Antiquity*, London 1998; *Cultura e promozione umana. La cura del corpo e dello spirito nell'antichità classica e nei primi secoli cristiani. Un messaggio ancora attuale?*, eds. E. Dal Covolo - I. Giannetto, Rome 1998.

T. Špidlík

BOETHIUS (d. ca. 525). Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boethius (Torquatus may have been a later addition) was born at *Rome between 475–480. He lost his father—Flavius Narsetes Manlius Boethius, consul in 487—while still young and was taken in by the family of the nobleman Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, where he received his early education. The cognomen Boethius may indicate Greco-Byzantine roots. His paternal grandfather was Flavius Boethius, praetorian prefect, whom the emperor *Valentinian III had put to death along with general Aetius in 454 for reasons still not entirely clear. Both his natural family, the Anicii, and his adoptive family, the Symmachi (whose ancestors included the famous *Symmachus who a century earlier had petitioned the emperor to restore the *Altar of Victory), had long been Christian, and there is no reason to doubt that he received sound religious instruction. His higher education, however, has been much disputed.

A supposed stay in Greece at the school of *Athens is no longer believed, despite its being attested by *De disciplina scholarium* (PL 64, 1232 B: *annis duobus de viginti Athenis convalui*), a work no longer attributed to Boethius by anyone, and a mention in *Cassiodorus (*Var.* I, 45,3: *sic enim Atheniensium scholas longe positus introisti*), on whose erroneous interpretation the false information of *De disciplina* is presumably based. On the basis of more concrete indications—the possibility of identifying Boethius's father with the Boethius who was prefect of *Alexandria from 475–477, and the supposed presence of the exegetical works of Ammonius Hermiae among the sources of many Boethian writings—the hypothesis of a more or less direct contact with the school of *Alexandria has been formulated. Today, however, the Ammonian influence, repeatedly upheld esp. by Courcelle, is contested on all sides, and scholars no longer credit the theory of an Alexandrian apprenticeship unconditionally.

While still young he married Symmachus's virtuous daughter Rusticiana, and his technical knowledge (in singular contrast with the purely theoretical character of his surviving work) quickly attracted the attention of King *Theodoric who, even before his election as ordinary consul *sine collega* (510), honored Boethius with many prestigious tasks such as choosing a *citharoedus* to send to *Clovis, king of the Franks, overseeing the work of the *Arcarius praefectorum,* who seemed to be minting underweight coins, and finally (though perhaps some years after his consulate) supervising the construction of two clocks, one solar and one hydraulic, to be sent to the *Burgundian king Gundobad. We know little or nothing of Boethius's activity in the decade following his consulate, but he presumably held the office of *Praefectus urbis*. A much higher post, that of *Magister officiorum*, a kind of general superintendent of affairs of court and state, was entrusted to him from 522, the same year in which his two sons assumed the dignity of consul. With such huge successes, Boethius seemed to have reached the apex of his political career and his fortune, but within two years he was completely and utterly ruined. We learn from Boethius's *Consolatio* (1, pr. 4) and from the so-called *Anonymus Valesianus* that the cause of his downfall was his support of the senator Albinus who, according to the king's informer Cyprian, was guilty of secret agreements with the Eastern emperor against Theodoric. The accusation was confirmed by three false witnesses (Basil, Opilione and Gaudentius) and aggravated by the charge, perhaps more

serious, of *magic. Boethius's great friend and patron Symmachus also met the same fate a year later. Condemned and exiled to Pavia in the much-discussed and disputed *Ager Calventianus,* he was put to death by Theodoric on a date that oscillates, according to scholars' reconstructions, between 524 and 526. His bones rest in the crypt of the church of S. Pietro in Ciel d'oro at Pavia, where Boethius, following a decision of Leo XIII, is officially venerated as a saint.

Apart from the reasons just mentioned—the only ones given by the sources—many scholars have supposed that behind Boethius's condemnation lay a religious motivation. It has been hypothesized that in condemning Boethius—whose theological treatises made him a spokesman for the most orthodox theses in *trinitarian and *christological matters—the *Arian Theodoric in some way meant to react against the anti-Arian measures taken at that time by the emperor *Justin. There are objective difficulties, however, with the chronological succession of events, to the extent that even the inverse thesis—i.e., that the condemnation of persons such as Boethius and Symmachus had stimulated, if not provoked, those measures—cannot be excluded a priori. The fact remains incontestable that the failure of Pope *John I's mission to the East to achieve Theodoric's wishes, and the consequent irreparable break, both political and religious, between the *Gothic king and the emperor, were events that, esp. if considered in their immediate and remote causes, abundantly explain the climate in which the drama of Boethius matured and reached its tragic conclusion.

Boethius's work has various aspects of differing importance for ascertaining his place in the patristic tradition. The publication in 1877 of a fragment of Cassiodorus commonly known as the *Anecdoton Holderi* has finally settled all doubts about the authenticity of the so-called *Opuscula sacra* (which are at least partially mentioned in that fragment) and consequently about Boethius's adherence to Christianity. The singular aporia, however, that gave rise to those doubts is still open to discussion: the fact that Boethius's famous *Consolatio philosophiae,* composed in exile at Pavia in the certain expectation of imminent death, does not contain a single explicit profession of Christian faith. The prevalent "lay" character of the greater part of Boethius's writings is incontestable. It is commonly agreed that at the beginning of his work must be placed the four treatises of the so-called *quadrivium,* a term coined by Boethius himself to designate the four mathematical disciplines of the encyclopedic canon: arithmetic, *music, geometry and astronomy. Only the first two survive, but convincing evidence seems to confirm that he completed the whole project. At this point, a comparison with the precedent set by *Augustine—the projected adaptation of Varro's *Disciplinae,* partially realized in the lost *Liber de grammatica* and the six books *De musica*—would seem to suggest itself, but the two surviving treatises (of which the first, on arithmetic, is a translation of Nicomachus and the second, on music, is a complex compilation from Greek sources, esp. Nicomachus and Ptolemy) contain not the least hint at that precedent or at even vaguely Christian problems.

The same is true, and with more reason, of the logical works that constitute the most imposing part of Boethius's output and in which we must distinguish between translations (*Porphyry's *Isagoge*; *Aristotle's *Categories, De interpretatione, Prior analytics, Topics, Elenchi sofistici*), commentaries (on Porphyry's *Isagoge* [in two redactions], *De interpretatione* [also in two redactions]; Aristotle's *Categories;* Cicero's *Topics*) and independent treatises (*De divisione, Introductio ad syllogismos categoricos* or *Antipraedicamenta, Introductio in categoricos syllogismos, De hypotheticis syllogismis, De differentiis topicis*). With the complex problems of textual criticism, authenticity, source criticism and nomenclature that this vast production involves, scholars of the caliber of Courcelle, Minio Paluello, Shiel, De Rijk, De Vogel, Stumpf—to cite only the greatest—have been occupying themselves for years, but there are still many problems to be resolved and much material to investigate. All are aware that this whole output, inspired by the grandiose project (see *In de int*. II, 79,9 M.) of translating and commenting on the whole of Plato and Aristotle in order to demonstrate the essential identity of their views, presents no explicitly Christian ideas. Based on his logical training, Boethius in the *Opuscula sacra* confronts the complex problems of the Trinity and Christology, presumably out of concern for controversies arising at the time on the margins of resurgent *theopaschism and the *Acacian schism, but also to define his own personal metaphysic. While in the first treatise, *De Trinitate,* based on Augustine's homonymous work (explicitly mentioned in the *proemium*), the relation between unity and Trinity in God is illustrated through the Aristotelian category of relation, and in the fifth, *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium,* the orthodox thesis of the coexistence of two natures and one person in Christ is developed through a full and subtle discussion of the two concepts of nature and person, the third treatise, *De hebdomadibus,* confronts a theme of primary importance for later speculation, that of the relation

between *esse* ("essence") and *id quod est* ("existence"), resolving it with a metaphysical construction of which some aspects are original, through the important and controversial concept of participation. The relation to contemporary theological discussions is evident, esp. in the fifth treatise, which has clear references to *heresies and to the theopaschite controversy, but the treatment is exclusively logical-theoretical, without the least reference to biblical texts. The same is true of the second treatise, *Utrum Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus de Divinitate substantialiter praedicentur,* which is simply a brief resumé of the theme of the first, but not the fourth, the controversial *De fide catholica,* a sort of salvation history on the basis of Scripture. For this reason and for stylistic ones, variously judged and evaluated, the *De fide catholica* continues to be considered inauthentic by a significant number of scholars, despite the initial profession of trinitarian faith which seems to connect it, at least formally, with the first two.

What has been said of the definitely authentic theological treatises attenuates, at least in part, the contrast with the *Consolatio* and with the absence, in that work also, of any explicit or certain reference to Scripture. Conceived in the form of the *satura menippea* (a mixed composition of alternating prose and verse), this work, the spiritual testament of the still young Boethius, is in the form of a long conversation between the philosopher and philosophy, which appears to him in his prison in the form of a *mulier reverendi admodum vultus* (a very reverent-looking woman) and discusses, in largely philosophical terms, the great themes of the inconstancy of fortune, the true nature of the *summum bonum,* providence, free will and the perpetuity of the world. Even medieval exegetes noted that not only does the work lack any explicit reference to the Christian faith but here and there it also puts forward ideas that are not entirely orthodox; we cannot doubt, however, Boethius's faith in the great truths which Christianity shares with the Platonic strand of ancient thought to which he primarily seems to be connected, though through an extremely complex and still much-disputed cultural mediation. Whether the Christian faith played a part in this mediation is something that, even recently, not a few scholars have investigated, and the basic problem of Boethius, the lack of explicit Christian profession, remains open to the most divergent and contrasting solutions. In addition to numerous versions of Platonic, Aristotelian and Hippocratic works, throughout the Middle Ages *De unitate et uno* and *De disciplina scholarium* (which contains the false information concerning his stay at Athens) were falsely attributed to Boethius.

CPL 878-894; PL 63, 537-1439; PL 64; CSEL 48 (*In Porph. isag. comm.*); CCL 94 (*Philos. consolatio*); this work was also published in CSEL 94. There are numerous editions of the *Consolatio*, the most recent being *De consolatione philosophiae; Opuscula theologica*, ed. C. Moreschini, Munich 2000. Trans.: *Consolazione della filosofia*: Fr.: Paris 1937; Eng.: Oxford 1900; Cambridge, MA and London 1918 (numerous reprintings); Baltimore 1969; P.G. Walsh, New York 1999; It.: Florence 1942; Rome 1946; Catania 1961; Rome 1968; Boezio, *La consolazione della filosofia. Opuscoli teologici*, ed. L. Obertello, Milan 1978; C. Moreschini, Turin 1994; Sp.: Mexico 1945; Madrid 1964; L. Pozzi, Boezio, *Trattato sulla divisione*, Padua 1969; *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii "De divisione liber,"* critical ed., trans., prolegomena, and commentary by J. Magee, Leiden 1998; L. Pérez Gómez, Torrejón de Ardoz 1997. *De institutione musica*, ed. G. Marzi, Rome 1990 (It. tr.); Boethius, *Fundamentals of Music*, trans. with intr., notes by C.M. Bower, New Haven 1989; *Boèce, Traités théologiques*, trans., chronologie, bibliographie et notes par A. Tisserand, Paris 2000; *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii De arithmetica*, cura et studio H. Oosthout et I. Schilling, Turnhout 1999; *Codices Boethiani,* 1, *Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland*, ed. M.T. Gibson and L.J. Smith, London 1995.

Complete bibl. of L. Obertello, *Sev. Boezio*, Genoa 1974, 2 vols.; ample bibl. also in *Dizion. biografico degli italiani* 11, 142-164; Patrologia IV, 202-217; J. Gruber, *Boethius 1925-1998*: Lustrum 39 (1997) 307-383; 40 (1998) 199-259; *Atti del Congresso di studi Boeziani*, Rome 1981; H. Chadwick, *Boethius*, Oxford 1981 (It. tr.: *Boezio: la consolazione della musica, della logica, della teologia e della filosofia*, Bologna 1986); *Atti del congresso internazionale di studi boeziani*, Rome 1981; Casey Gerard, *An Explication of the de Hebdomadibus of Boethius in the Light of St. Thomas' Commentary*: Thomist 51 (1987) 419-484; C. Micaelli, *Studi sui trattati teologici di Boezio*: Speculum, Contrib di filol. class., Naples 1987; G. D'Onofrio, *Dialectic and Theology: Boethius' Opuscula Sacra and Their Early Medieval Readers*: Stud. Mediev. 27 (1986) 45-67; Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, *Die theologischen Traktate*, tr. and comm. ed. M. Elsalsser, Hamburg 1988, Boèce, *Courts traités de théologie. Opuscula sacra*, ed. H. Merle, Paris 1991; U. Pizzani, *Le lettere di Teoderico a Boezio e la mediazione culturale di Cassiodoro*: Cassiodorus 4 (1998) 141-161; C. Micaelli, *Dio nel pensiero di Boezio*, Naples 1995; C. Schlapkohl, *Persona est naturae rationabilis individua substantia: Boethius und die Debatte über den Personbegriff*, Marburg 1999.

U. Pizzani

BONIFACE (ca. 675–754). Wynfrith—his baptismal name—was born in Wessex. A monk at Nuthschelle, he spent some years teaching: some writings on grammar and metric, as well as verse riddles, testify to these quiet years. At about age 30 he felt a call to the apostolate among the *pagans of the Continent and left for Friesland. Undiscouraged by early setbacks, in 719 he received directives and investiture at *Rome from *Gregory II, who changed his name to Boniface. From this date until 25 June 754, the day on which he and his companions con-

fessed their faith in blood in the wake of a pagan incursion into Friesland, he dedicated himself to an exceptional missionary activity, esp. in central Germany (Hesse, Thuringia, Bavaria), displaying great organizational ability and promoting the foundation of several *monasteries, including Fulda. He was deeply committed, in agreement with Pepin, to promotion of the reform of the corrupt Frankish clergy, esp. through regional councils. Rome always supported his activity: *Gregory III sent him the pallium, insignia of archepiscopal dignity, sanctioning his authority over all of Germany. A copious correspondence, in which offical and pastoral letters alternate with more relaxed ones to correspondents in Britain, is of fundamental importance since it not only provides a wealth of important historical facts but also and especially reveals the man's character, his inflexible will and his awareness of his capacities, but also his moments of discouragement and the enormous difficulties of the task he had undertaken. Another important source is Boniface's *Life,* rich in information, written by his disciple Willibald some years after his death.

MGH, ES 1; CCL 133 (*Aenigmata*); *St. Bonifatius. Gedenkgabe zum 1200. Todestag*, Fulda 1954; H. Löwe, *Pirmin, Willibrord and Bonifatius*, in *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'Alto Medioevo*, Spoleto 1967, 217-261; O. Bertolini, *Il dramma di Bonifacio*: Boll. Ist. St. Ital. Med. 78 (1967) 21-44; BS 2, 308-319; BBKL I, 684-687.

M. Simonetti

BONIFACE I, pope (418–422). At the death of Pope *Zosimus (417-418), part of the Roman clergy elected as his successor the archdeacon *Eulalius, backed by the court of *Ravenna and the powerful prefect *Symmachus. The next day (28 December 418) the majority of the clergy chose Boniface, who was more popular with the people. Eulalius had recourse to the emperor *Honorius, who ordered Boniface to leave *Rome. In the confusion and disturbances that followed, a synod held at Spoleto enjoined both to stay away from Rome until the situation was clarified. The reaction of Eulalius and his supporters was so negative and intransigent that Honorius deposed him and confirmed the election of Boniface. So as to avoid any such future occurrences, on his return to Rome Boniface presented a petition to Honorius, invoking his support of the church. In his rescript the emperor established that in the case of a double-election, the bishop of Rome would be chosen by a second consultation with the entire community (Jaffé 353). The decision, which remained a dead letter, nevertheless pointed to a heavy interference of the political power in the election of the pope and in the ecclesial sphere more generally.

Boniface fulfilled his ministry with energy and responsibility, remedying some of his predecessor's uncertainties and imprudences. In particular he revoked the primacy conceded by Zosimus to Bishop *Patroclus of *Arles, thus granting the requests of the *Gallican *metropolitans and restoring the old metropolitan order (Jaffé 362). In 419 Boniface intervened against the *Pelagians, whom Honorius had condemned (Prosp. of Aquit., *Contra collat.* 21, 57: PL 45, 1831); on this occasion *Augustine dedicated to him the *Contra duas epist. Pelagianorum*. But the most important aspect—and event—of Boniface's pontificate concerned the defense and affirmation of Roman primacy in the face of some tendencies and positions of the Greco-Eastern Church. In 421 the bishops of *Thessaly solicited an edict from the emperor *Theodosius II, based on which all controversies among the Illyrican churches were to be submitted to the bishop of *Constantinople, since the city now had the prerogatives of ancient Rome. Writing to Rufus, bishop of Constantinople, and taking up the positions and language of *Innocent I (401–417), Boniface recognized the privileged rank of the great Eastern churches—*Alexandria, *Antioch and Constantinople—but reaffirmed the superior authority of the see of Rome over the whole church, including the Illyrican communities and all the churches of the East (*Ep.* 15,5), "members" of the ecclesiastical body whose "head" was exclusively the Church of Rome (*Ep.* 14,1). Boniface's pontificate was thus a fundamental step in the historical configuration and dogmatic definition of the universal primacy of the bishop of Rome.

Boniface, *Epistulae*, PL 20, 745-792; Innocent, *Ep.* 23, PL 20, 546-547; Celestine, *Ep.* 3, PL 50, 427-429; Prosp. of Aquit., *Contra collatorem*, PL 51, 213-276; Socrates, *HE* VII, 36: PG 67, 820; Jaffé 52-54; LP I, LXII, 86-89 and 227-229; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, Tübingen 1930, 359-364; P. Paschini - V. Monachino, *I papi nella storia*, I, Rome 1961, 81-87; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, I-II, Paris 1964-1966, *passim*; LTK 2, 578 (P. Duckers - M. Wojtowytsch); P.J. Carefoote, *Pope Boniface I, the Pelagian Controversy and the Growth of Papal Authority*: Augustiniana 46 (1996) 261-289; Dizionario storico del Papato, ed. Ph. Levillain, I, Milan 1996, 195-197; J.N.D. Kelly, *Vite dei Papi*, Casale Monf. [2]1997, 76-78; EPapi I, 398-404 (A. Pollastri).

M. Spinelli

BONIFACE II, pope (530–532). Archdeacon at *Rome, was designated pope by his predecessor *Felix IV (526–530). Part of the Roman clergy refused to recognize him, however, and elected the antipope *Dioscorus in his place. With the death of

the latter on 14 October 530, Boniface finally assumed the fullness of his powers, also winning the support of the clergy who had opposed him. Boniface nevertheless committed the same imprudence as Felix, nominating a successor, *Vigilius. The initiative provoked a similar opposition among the clergy, and Boniface withdrew his proposal. The event highlighted the situation of uncertainty and lack of transparency that still characterized the fragile moment of pontifical succession, also because of the interference of senators (in fact a Senate consultation prohibited them from giving or receiving money in support of a candidate to the papal throne) and of King Athalaric, who reserved to himself the confirmation of elected pontiffs. Boniface endorsed the canons of the Council of *Orange (529) against the semi-*Pelagians and in favor of *Augustine's theology on *grace and *free will. The tension between Rome and the East continued under this pope: in 531 Boniface presided over a council at Rome in which he declared that the churches of the Illyricum were dependent on him and in which he rejected the claims of *Epiphanius, patriarch of *Constantinople, who had deposed *Stephen, the bishop of Larissa and metropolitan of *Thessaly.

CPL 1691; PL 45, 1790ff.; 65, 31-42; Mansi 8, 729; *Collectio Thessalonicensis*, ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, Rome 1937, 1-16, n. 1623 (*Acta* of the Roman Synod of 531); LP I, 283ff.; DHGE IX, 897-898 (G. Bardy); Fliche-Martin IV, It. tr., 1972, 528-531 (on the Council of Orange); A. von Harnack, *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Kirche*, II, Leipzig 1980, 655-673; J. Speigl, *Das Religionsgespräch mit den severianischen Bischöfen in Konstantinopel im Jahre 532*: AHC 16 (1984) 264-285; V. Grossi, *L'*Auctoritas *di Agostino nella dottrina del* peccatum originis *da Cartagine (418) a Trento (1546)*: Augustinianum 31 (1991) 329-360 (341-342); LTK 2, 578 (P. Duckers); EPapi I, 492-495 (P. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

BONIFACE III, pope (607). Succeeded *Sabinian after a year of the see being vacant, because of the interference and vetoes of the emperor Phocas. Boniface was bishop of *Rome for less than nine months, from February to November 607. We know little of his pontificate; he convened a council at Rome to decree that the successor to a pope or a bishop could in no way be designated while they were still alive. Like his predecessor Boniface, he had also been apocrisarius at *Constantinople during the pontificate of *Gregory the Great, who held him in very high regard. In that capacity he obtained from Phocas the emanation of an edict recognizing the primacy of the Roman see vis-à-vis all of the other churches, including that of *Constantinople (LP I, 316).

LP I, 316; Hfl-Lecl 3, 247; H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter*, I, Freiburg i.B. 1901, 201; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 517-518; A. Saba, *Storia dei Papi*, I, Turin 1939, 235-237; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 290-291, 300 and 309; DHGE 9, 898 (G. Bardy); LTK 2, 578-579 (H. Zimmermann); EPapi I, 577-579 (P. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

BONIFACE IV, pope (608–615). Succeeded *Boniface III (607) and consecrated pope 15 September 608 after ten months of the see being vacant, awaiting the emperor's approval. Born at Veleria, in Marsica, and son of a doctor, John, he ruled the *Roman see and the universal church in difficult times (hunger, plagues, floods, barbarian violence), sustaining them with charitable works and assistance. Boniface asked and obtained from Phocas the conversion of the Roman Pantheon into a church, consecrated to Mary Most Holy, Ever-Virgin and All Martyrs on 13 May 609 (or 610); the emperor sent splendid gifts to Rome for the occasion. The pope also turned his own house into a *monastery and greatly favored church construction in the Urbe. Boniface kept the church of England close to his heart, which was recently evangelized by the monk and missionary *Augustine of Canterbury, sent by *Gregory I; the first bishop of London, *Mellitus, participated at the Roman synod of 610. The last echoes of the *schism of the *Three Chapters, not yet resolved at *Milan and *Aquileia, took place during this pontificate. The *Longobard (Lombard) king *Agilulf urged *Columbanus, the monk of Bobbio, to intervene in the dispute; the latter wrote Boniface a letter, inviting his attention and urging more caution than, in Columbanus's opinion, Boniface's predecessor *Vigilius had used. We have two letters from this pope, both dated August 613. One is addressed to the Frankish king Theodoric II, the other to *Florian, bishop of *Arles; both concern the bestowal of the honor of the pallium on the prelate. Boniface died 8 May 615 and was buried in St. Peter's basilica.

CPL 1724; MGH, *Ep.* 3, 453-456; Mansi 10, 503-508; PL 80, 104-106 (letters of Boniface); C. Silva-Tarouca, *Nuovi studi sulle antiche lettere dei papi*: Gregorianum 12 (1931) 47; H. Ashworth, *Did St. Gregory the Great Compose a Sacramentary?*, SP 2, Berlin 1957, 3-16 (Boniface possible author of liturgical prayers); LP I, 318; DHGE 9, 898-899; DBI 12, 1970, 136-140 (P. Bertolini); Jaffé I, 220-222; S. D'Amato, *"De civitate Valeria." Papa S. Bonifacio IV*: Bull. della Dep. abruzzese di storia patria 79 (1989) 121-196; F. Michetti, *S. Bonifacio IV e il suo pontificato*, Avezzano 1992; P.T.R. Gray - M.W. Herren, *Colombanus and the Three Chapters Controversy*: JTS 45 (1994) 160-170; LTK 2, 579 (H. Zimmermann); EPapi I, 579-581 (P. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

BONIFACE V, pope (619–625). Native of *Naples, consecrated pope 23 December 619, more than a year after his predecessor *Adeodatus I's death (615–618), due to the usual delay for obtaining imperial ratification of the election. Like his immediate predecessors, Boniface gave attention to the young church in England, born of *Augustine of Canterbury's mission. Boniface may be responsible for various norms concerning ecclesiastical testamentary law, the right to *asylum of churches and the faculties of acolytes, who were prohibited from administering *baptism in the Lateran basilica; it is likely these norms were the result of a synod. We have three of his letters (Bede, *HE* II, 8,10-11): one was to Justo—former bishop of Rochester and successor to *Mellitus as archbishop of *Canterbury—in which he confers on him the dignity of the pallium, in part for having contributed to the conversion of King Adelvado. The other two are addressed to Edwin, king of England, and his wife Ethelburga (at Easter 627 the sovereign solemnly announced his own conversion, encouraged by his wife). Boniface died 25 October 625 and was buried in the Vatican basilica.

CPL 1725; PL 80, 435-440 (of Bede); Mansi 10, 547-554; PL 80, 439-440 (a fourth letter of Boniface, apocryphal); LP I, 321-322; Jaffé I, 222-223; DBI 12 (1979) 140-142 (P. Bertolini); P. Hunter Blair, *The Letters of Pope Boniface V and the Mission of Paulinus to Northumbria*, in *Anglo-Saxon Northumbria*, London 1984; EPapi I, 583-585 (P. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

BONIFACIUS, *primicerius notariorum*. Pope *John I in 525 turned to Bonifacius, *primicerius notariorum,* and to Bonus *secundicerius* to fix the date of Easter 526. They consulted the Scythian monk Dionysius, who in a letter recommended adoption of the *Alexandrian cycle of 19 years, fixing Easter 526 at 19 April. In the letter *Ad Iohannem papam de ratione paschali* (PL 67, col. 513ff.), Bonifacius suggested that the pope conform to that cycle.

CPL 2286, 2289; B. Krusch, *Papsttum und Kaisertum*. Forschungen P. Kehr - A. Bruckman, Munich 1926, 48-58; DTC 11, 1963; PCBE 2, 331.

V. Loi - B. Amata

BONIFACIUS Comes (d. 432). Native of *Thrace, we have no information on his date of birth but much on his public life, because of a solid military background and the political events in which he was protagonist; he was killed in *Italy in 432. Soldier and strategist under the emperors *Honorius and *Valentinian III, he was appointed general in 414 against the *Goths; particularly notable was his clash with Ataulf during the battle of *Marseille, in which Bonifacius wounded the barbarian leader. He fought against the *Vandals in *Spain before being transferred to *Africa, where he remained for a year (417–418). Finally, in 423 he was sent as *magister utriusque militiae* to subdue the rebellious tribes, later receiving the high position of *comes Africae.*

He applied imperial laws against the *Donatists with rigidity and displayed a strong spirit of collaboration with *Catholic bishops such as *Augustine and *Alypius, with whom he corresponded and established friendships. The death of his wife strengthened his intention to abandon public life and withdraw to a *monastery but, dissuaded by Augustine, he stayed faithful to his duties in defense of the imperial cause. His marriage in 426 with Pelagia, a Goth of *Arian faith, for political reasons, caused a change in Bonifacius's soul, as Augustine recounts (*Ep.* 220). In 427, the plots of *Aetius and *Galla Placidia, the mother of Valentinian III, led to Bonifacius's summons to the court of *Ravenna to give account to the emperor for his choices in managing the imperial patrimony. He was found guilty at the end of the same year and returned to Africa as a rebel. His attitude toward the barbarians was not clear, such that more than once he was accused of aiding the *Vandal invasion; doubts still exist on the matter (Prosp. Aquit., *Chron.* 1294; Procop., *Bell. Vandal.* 1,3; Zecchini 148-150). He remained in Africa until 432, at which time, once again on the peninsula, he faced Aetius, who defeated and killed him. He was succeeded as *magister militiae* by his son-in-law Sebastian, who had filled in for him as *comes* during his absence in 426–427.

Augustine's letters are an important source for information on Bonifacius's life (*Ep.* 220), on the compatibility between military and Christian life (*Ep.* 189), on military and administrative activity (*Ep.* 185 A; 17*), and on Bonifacius's works in favor of the church of *Hippo (*Ep.* 7*). Augustine himself wrote the *De correctione Donatistarum liber* (= *Ep.* 185; *Retr.* II, 48), addressed to Bonifacius in ca. 417, when the latter had reassumed the position of tribune of *Numidia. An anonymous Cadurci, cantor of the *comes Africae* Bonifacius, wrote a *panegyric reported by *Sidonius Apollinarius (*Carm.* IX, 289-295; Consolino, 183).

Augustine, *Ep.* 185, 185 A, 189, 220, 7* and 17*; Sidon. Apoll., *Carmina* IX, 279-280 (PL 58, 702); Prosper Aquit., *Chronicon* 1294 (MGH 9, 471-472); Procopius, *Bell. Vandal.* 1,3 (ed. G. Wirth, 317-324); DHGE IX, 924-931; PLRE II, B. 3, 237-240; PCBE I, *B.* 13, 152-155; R. Gentili, *La rivalità tra Ezio, Felice e*

Bonifacio e l'invasione dei Vandali nell'Africa, in *Il mondo classico*, 1955, 363ff.; J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, London 1923, 196, 223, 243-247; H.J. Diesner, *Die Laufbahn des* Comes Africae Bonifatius *und seine Beziehungen zu Augustinus*, in *Kirche und Staat im spätrömischen Reich*, Berlin 1963, 100-126; Id., *Forschungen und Forschritte*, t. 35, 281 with ample bibl.; A. Lippold, *Der Kleine Pauly Lexikon der Antike* I, Stuttgart 1964, 926-927; O. Seeck, *Pauly Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 5, III, 1, 698-699; Id., *Geschichte des Untergangs der Antiken Welt*, VI, Stuttgart 1966, 54, 89-90, 105-117; V. Paronetto, *Nota sulla datazione dell'epistolario agostiniano* (*Ep. 220; 229; 230; 231*): Augustinianum 14 (1974) 363-367; R. Delmaire, *Contribution des nouvelles lettres de saint Augustin à la prosopographie du Bas-Empire romain*, in *Les lettres de saint Augustin découvertes par Johannes Divjak*, Paris 1983, 83-86; G. Zecchini, *Aezio: l'ultima difesa dell'Occidente romano*, Rome 1983, 141-165; F.E. Consolino, *Poesia e propaganda da Valentiniano III ai regni romanobarbarici* (*secc. V-VI*), in *Letteratura e propaganda nell'Occidente latino da Augusto ai regni romanobarbarici*, Rome 2000, 183-184.

M. Mendoza

BONO PUDICITIAE, De. Authorship of the work on the "value of chastity" has provoked discussions summarized by B. Melin; G.F. Diercks has studied the manuscript tradition. It is today attributed to *Novatian, who is to have written it while bishop. This encomium to *chastity depends on the similar treatises of *Tertullian and *Cyprian. It presents the virtue of chastity as a difficult conquest, the prerogative of noble natures and the condition for attaining interior freedom.

CPL 69; CPPM 3227; PL 4, 819-828; CSEL 3,3,13-25; CCL 4, 103-127; J. Martin, *Zu Novatians "De bono pudicitiae"*: Wochensch. f. klass. Philol. 30 (1919) 239ff.; B. Melin, *Studia in Corpus Cyprianeum*, Uppsala 1946; Patrologia 1, 574-575; P. Mattei, *Deux notes sur mariage* (*divorce*) *et virginité dans Novatien*: RSLR 29 (1993) 357-365.

V. Saxer

BONOSUS (d. ca. 390). Late 4th-c. bishop of *Serdica in Illyricum, founder of the sect of the *Bonosianis*. We know of him from a letter sent to Archbishop *Anisius of *Thessalonica and the other Illyrican bishops shortly after the synod of *Capua in winter 391–392 and the Council of *Milan of 392 (*De Bonoso*). The letter, sometimes attributed to *Ambrose (F. Cavallera, *La lettre sur l'évêque Bonose est-elle de saint Sirice ou de saint Ambroise?* BLE 21 [1920] 141-147) or to Pope *Siricius (Jaffé 261), states that a bishop named Bonosus was denounced at the Synod of Capua because he held that *Mary was the mother of other children besides Jesus, rejecting her perpetual virginity (Ambr., *Inst. virg.* 35, 65; *Ep.* 56a). M. Mercatore's edition of the work, *Sardicensis Bonosus. Appendix ad contradictionem XII anathematismi nestoriani*, n. 15 (PL 48, 924), confirms Bonosus's existence. His identification remains uncertain, but he might be indentifited with Bonosus of Naissa (Aug., *Ep.* 292), who did not acknowledge Mary's virginity after Christ's birth (on this point see the contrasting opinions of J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1918 and of Hfl-Lecl). Beyond the Marian *heresy, some also attribute to Bonosus the denial of Christ's divinity (M. Mercatore). On this point, later evidence against the *Bonosiani* is more explicit (Alc. Avit., *Ep.* III; Isid., *Vir. ill.* 32; *Simbolo XI concilio di Toledo*); they were also sometimes accused of a *trinitarian heresy (Genn., *Eccl. dogmat.* 52; Greg. M. *epist.* 67).

DTC 2, 1027-1031; J.A. de Aldama, *La carta ambrosiana "De Bonoso"*: Marianum 25 (1963) 1-22; M.S. Meo, *La verginità di Maria nella lettera di papa Siricio al vescovo Anisio di Tessalonica*: Marianum 25 (1963) 447-469; K. Schaeferdiek, *Bonosus von Naissus, Bonosus von Serdika und die Bonosianer*: ZKG 96 (1985) 162-178; Marienlexikon 1, 538.

M.G. Mara

BONOSUS and MAXIMILIAN, martyrs. A late *Passio,* preserved in Latin, describes the martyrdom of two soldiers, Bonosus and Maximilian, at *Antioch—it mentions their bishop *Meletius, at the time of the emperor *Julian (d. 363), 20 September. There is no ancient evidence of their cult at Antioch, nor any other historical evidence of them. Historians differ not only on the genuineness of the account but also on the existence of the two martyrs. The episode of the *comes* Julian, who must have been the emperor's maternal uncle, asking them to remove the Christian monogram from the *labarum* seems to reflect the facts. The removal of the Christian symbol from the insignia is also present in the martyrdom of Juventinus and Maximinus, commemorated by *John Chrysostom on 29 January (*In Iuventinum*: PG 50, 574-578; Theodoret, *HE* 3,11; Malalas, *Chron.* 13,19). Finally, Wood asserts the authenticity of the martyrdom, even if the *Passio* has been embellished with fantastic elements.

BS 2, 352-353; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Martiri e confessori dell'età di Giuliano l'Apostata: dalla storia alla leggenda*, in *Pagani e cristiani da Giuliano l'Apostata al sacco di Roma*, ed. F.E. Consolino, Soveria Mannelli 1995, 53-83; D. Woods, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Deaths of Bonosus and Maximillianus*: Hagiographica 2 (1995) 25-55.

A. Di Berardino

BOOK. Between the 1st and 8th c. AD the material production of the book underwent considerable modifications linked to fundamental cultural changes. The classical Greco-Roman book had been a *papyrus scroll. From the pith of *cyperus papyrus*, a marsh plant, now extinct, but at that time particularly abundant in the Nile delta, narrow strips were cut and superimposed in two layers perpendicular to each other to form a leaf 20-30 by 15-25 cm (7.9-11.8 by 5.9-9.8 in), a certain number of leaves pasted end to end formed the scroll, whose length could vary from a few to 10 or even 15 m. To write or read, the scroll was unrolled from left to right. Copyists wrote with a reed whose point was sharpened and cut in two (pen), and an ink prepared from lampblack diluted in water and thickened with gum arabic; until the early Middle Ages scribes wrote almost exclusively while kneeling: the use of wooden tablets and then tables became generalized later and only in the West. Scribes arranged their texts in relatively narrow parallel columns, calculating their alignment and spacing by eye. The scroll, normally written only on the inside face, was wound around a wooden cylinder with a tag indicating the author and title. Papyrus, a more solid material than is often realized, produced in great quantities in Egypt and exported everywhere, underwent sporadic competition from leather (skin treated with tannin) and parchment (skin washed, dressed and dried under tension): the Jews in particular used leather for the scrolls of the Torah.

From the end of the 1st c., the scroll began to be replaced by the codex, first of papyrus, then of parchment. The substitution was slow and gradual among the *pagans, sudden and general among the Christians: a deliberate innovation, whose reasons remain more or less hypothetical. Whatever these were, by the end of the 4th c. the codex had practically overtaken the scroll; from the 4th to the 8th c., parchment was progressively substituted for papyrus. The codex was made of leaves folded in two and inserted into each other in fascicles; the number of double leaves varied at first but, from the 4th c., fascicles of four or five were the general rule. Sewn together, the fascicles formed the body of the book, which was protected by a cover, usually of soft leather or, later, of wooden tablets covered with leather. On each side of the leaf (recto and verso), the copyist wrote one or two (rarely more) columns; on parchment his hand was guided by lines traced dry beforehand, whose peculiarities may provide clues as to provenance or date. The copyist himself or a colleague often numbered the fascicles; rarely, and only in the first centuries, the leaves and pages. Initial letters, titles and ornaments marking the beginning and ending of works or chapters were very sober until the end of the patristic age; only in the last centuries did the copying centers of *Britain and *Ireland develop the ornamentation of title pages and initials, using tracery and zoomorphic motifs with amazing virtuosity. Luxury books were in a category of their own, in which the Scriptures and liturgical collections predominated (as well as a collection of homilies by *Gregory of Nazianzus): besides illustrated scenes (miniatures), *Eusebius of Caesarea's NT concordance tables (Eusebian canons) were richly decorated from the 5th c.; there are also a certain number of manuscripts copied on purple-tinted parchment with gold or silver ink.

The book of the early centuries was the product either of personal transcription by scholars or of specialized copying ateliers working for the author, for a more or less wealthy client, or for a publisher-bookseller. The role of the latter, well attested in classical *Rome, was still important for the secular book of *Late Antiquity, aimed at the higher social classes. The Christian book, more modest or even shabby in appearance, arose and circulated in humbler circles: local communities and *monasteries. Philosphers and theologians ensured their production and propagation. The triumph of Christianity, the division of the empire and the collapse of the West led to a differentiation in book production. In the West, the copying centers, working for a restricted aristocratic circle, gradually disappeared before the monastic scriptoriums, small cultural islands in a society in which the book, for many, had been transformed from an instrument of communication into an object of worship. Besides the scriptoriums cited in regard to writing (*palaeography), we note here some of the great Western copying centers: *Vivarium, Nonantula and *Verona (diocesan centers) in *Italy; *Tours in *Gaul; *Seville (diocesan center) in *Spain; Reichenau in *Germany; and St. Gall in Switzerland. In Ireland and Britain, numerous copying centers flourished and extended their influence onto the Continent, but they cannot be identified with certainty before the 9th c. In the East, the role played by official milieus (emperor and imperial administration, bishops, large monasteries) was much more important than in the Latin world, but it is much less easy to distinguish copying centers with well defined characteristics.

G. Battelli, *Lezioni di paleografia*, Vatican City [3]1949 and B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters* (Grundlagen der Germanistik 24), Berlin 1979. On the material production of the book, see the series *Codicologica*, eds. A. Gruys - J.F. Gumbert, Leiden 1976ff.; E.G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex*, Univ. of Pennsylvania

1977. On the cultural milieu and the circulation of the book, see two useful collections of important articles: G. Cavallo (ed.), *Libri, editori e pubblico nel mondo antico*, Rome-Bari 1975; Id., *Libri e lettori nel Medioevo. Guida storica e critica*, Rome-Bari 1977; see also T.C. Skeat, *Early Christian Book Production: Papyri and Manuscripts*, Cambridge History of the Bible, II, Cambridge 1969, 54-79 (It. tr. *La produzione libraria cristiana delle origini: papiri e manoscritti*, Florence 1976); C.H. Roberts, *Manuscripts, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, London 1977; D. Diringer, *Hand-Produced Book: The Book Before Printing: Ancient, Medieval and Oriental*, New York 1982; C.H. Roberts - T.C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex*, London 1983; A. Hamman, *L'epopée du livre. Du scribe à l'imprimerie*, Paris 1985; J. Glénisson (ed.), *Le livre au moyen âge*, Turnhout-Paris 1988; *The Role of the Book in Medieval Culture*, 2 vols., Turnhout 1988; O. Weijers (ed.), *Vocabulaire du libre et de l'écriture au moyen âge*, Turnhout 1989; A. Blanchard (ed.), *Les débuts du codex*, Turnhout 1989; *Le livre au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout 1988; G. Cavallo - P. Fedeli, *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, 5 vols., Rome 1989; M. Capasso, *Volumen. Aspetti della tipologia del rotolo papiraceo antico*, Naples 1995; M. Caltabiano, *Litterarum Lumen. Ambienti culturali e libri tra il IV e il V secolo*, Rome 1996; M. Maniaci, *Terminologia del libro manoscritto*, Rome 1996; A. Di Fazio, *Retractationes: uno sguardo nel laboratorio di scrittura di Agostino*: Nicolaus 23 (1996) 359-383; H.Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*, New Haven, CT [2]1997; E. Puglia, *La cura del libro nel mondo antico. Guasti e restauri del rotolo di papiro*, Naples 1997; *Calligrafia di Dio. La miniatura celebra la parola*, ed. M. Giordana Canova, s.l. 1999; *Codex*: AL 1, 1022-1038.

P. Canart

BOOK OF ARMAGH. Compiled ca. 807 in the *Irish archdiocese of Armagh, the Book of Armagh is a work written in Latin and ancient Gaelic which contains almost the whole NT, some ecclesiastical texts, but esp. some documents regarding St. *Patrick (c. 373–461) and his mission: two *Lives,* an incomplete collection of "memoirs" (*Dicta Patricii*), in part ascribable to *Tírechán, and an abbreviated version of the *Confessio,* written by the then-aged Patrick to thank God and explain the meaning of his episcopate, in some ways closely following *Augustine's *Confessions*.

CPL 1100, 1104 and 1105; R.P.C. Hanson - C. Blanc (eds.), *Saint Patrick, Confession et Lettre à Caroticus* (SC 249), Paris 1978; J. Gwynn, *The Book of Armagh*, Dublin 1913, XLV-LXIII, 17-30, 453-454; L. Bieler, *Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh* (Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 10), Dublin 1979, 124-162; E. MacNeill, *Dates of Texts in the Book of Armagh Relating to St. Patrick*: JRSAI 58 (1928) 85-101; L. Bieler, *The Notulae in the Book of Armagh*: Scriptorium 8 (1954) 89-97; L. de Paor, *The Aggrandisement of Armagh*: Historical Studies 8 (1971) 95-110; D. Powell, *St. Patrick's Confession and the Book of Armagh*: AB 90 (1972) 371-385; A. Gwynn, *The Problem of the Dicta Patricii*: Seanchas ardmhacha 8 (1975–1977) 69-80; J. Stevenson, *Literacy in Ireland: The Evidence of Patrick Dossier in the Book of Armagh*, in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge 1990, 11-35.

P. Marone

BOOK OF LIFE. Man's destiny is written in the rolls in heaven. This was the religious sense of the ancient peoples, while civil communities compiled lists of citizens, indicating their name at birth and canceling it upon death. The Bible introduces the possibility that the names of the just would not be canceled but remain eternally written in the "book of life." This is the spiritual book in which are written the names of the members of God's family, as the names of the descendants of each family were written in the "book of the genealogy" (Ps 69:28 [68:29 LXX]; Phil 4:3; Rev 21:27 et passim; cf. Ex 32:32-33; Is 4:3; Ez 13:9; Dan 12:1; Heb 12:23 and, for the genealogies, Gen 5:1; Mt 1:1-17). The "name" wishes well to its bearer. The name is life. It is God who keeps the "book of the living." Christ will open it on the judgment day to announce the citizens of heaven (Rev 5:1-5; 20:12; cf. Lk 10:20).

In the Christian tradition *baptism was inscription in the "book" by the gift of grace: "If you are inscribed in the people of God, heaven is your homeland and God your lawgiver" (Clem. Al., *Protr.* X, 108,4; cf. Tertull., *Bapt.* 17,2; Basil., *Bapt.* 13,7; Greg. Nyss., *Bapt.*: PG 46, 417; *Apos. Con.* VII, 39,4). To remain inscribed is the fruit of perseverance in justice (Clem. *Rom.* 45,8) and a life of *penance and *ascesis (Hermas, *Shepherd, Vis.* I, 3,2; *Mand.* 8,6; *Sim.* 2,9). *Origen says that the "book of the living" is "the knowledge of God, from which are excluded those who do not have a pure heart" (Orig., *Sel. in Ps.* 68,29; cf. Basil., *In Is.* 136; Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 14,30; *Apos. Con.* VIII, 9,3; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 20,15 and *In Ps.* 68,2,13). Jesus' census becomes a symbol of the "book" (Orig., *In Lc.* 11; Ambr., *In Lc.* 2,36). The *pagan tradition of inscription into Roman citizenship, obtained as a gift and kept by merit (Tertull., *Cor.* 13,1; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 19,15; Paul. Nol., *Ep.* 13,15), contributed to the appearance of baptismal registers in churches. The liturgical *diptychs, with real and symbolic value, attested membership in the churches and indicated the communion between the earthly communities and the heavenly community. Good wishes for the deceased were often written on Christian tombs with: "God knows his name."

F. Cabrol, *Diptyques* (*Liturgie*): DACL 4/1, 1045-1094; G. Schrenk, *βιβλίον*: TWNT 1, 615-620; L. Koep, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum*, Bonn 1952; Id., *Buch* (*himmlisch*): RAC 2, 725-731; J. Campos, *El "libro de la vida"*: Helmantica 21 (1970) 115-147, 249-302; U. Burkard, *Livre de vie*: DSp 9, 942-947.

P. Meloni

BOOK on the INFANCY (Latin), *apocryphal. Its proper title was probably *Books of the Birth of the Sav-*

ior and of the ostetrica, mentioned in the *Decretum (*Ps.-*)Gelasianum* (5,4,2). This is a Latin text discovered by James in two manuscripts (Arundel and Hereford, chs. 59-97) and called by the most recent editors in CCAp "a special source"; the best-preserved text is in the Irish apocrypha (*Liber Flavus Fergusiorum* and *Leabhear Breac*). The text probably comes from the *Jewish Christian circles of the first centuries and has a fragment similar to that of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* cited by Sedulius Scottus; it is conjectured to belong either to the *Gospel of the Hebrews,* the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* or the *Gospel of Peter*. The apocryphal work narrates the trip to *Bethlehem and offers a very picturesque description of the *nativity (with *docetist elements), emphasizing in a particular way the role of Joseph, less so that of *Mary.

CANT 53; BHL n 3445m.; CCAp 13, 64-134; 14, 619-880; It. tr.: Erbetta 1/2, 206-217; Moraldi 1, 228-261; Fr.: CCAp 14; Pol.: Starowieyski 1, 317-330; J. Gijsel, *Les Évangiles de l'Enfance de M.R. James*: AB 94 (1976) 289-302; J.D. Kaestli, *Recherches nouvelles sur les Évangiles latins de l'enfance et sur le récit apocryphe de la naissance de Marie*: EtudTheolRelig 72 (1997) 219-234.

M. Starowieyski

BORBORIANI. *Gnostics, also called *borboritae* or *barbelitae*. Radical antinomianism, common to other gnostic sects, led the borboriani to an extreme form of immorality. The name derives from βόρβορος, meaning "mud": it was probably coined by *Epiphanius (*Haer*. 26,3) as a metaphor for their impurity. An imperial law was promulgated against the borboriani and other *heretics in 428 (CTh XVI, 5,65). Other sources on the borboriani: Philaster, *Haer*. 73; Theodoret, *Haer. fab*. I, 13.

E. Prinzivalli

BORDEAUX
I. City - II. Council.

I. City. The meaning of the city's name (*Burdigala*) is obscure. Its population was 60,000 at the beginning of the 3rd c., but in 276 it was destroyed by the barbarians. Later fortified, in the 4th c. it regained a notable vitality, both culturally and otherwise. Almost nothing is known of the city's Christian origins: the first solid "Christian" date is 314, when the first attested bishop of Bordeaux, Orientalis (who built the basilica of St. Andrew), participated at the council of *Arles with his deacon Flavius. Among his successors were *Delphinus (predecessor of *Amandus), known for his opposition to *Priscillian (Councils of *Saragossa 380 and Bordeaux 384), who had won over Eucrocia, a noble Bordelaise, and her daughter Procula. The event of the great bishops Amandus and Severinus in the 5th c. is legendary, but it is certain that the king of the *Visigoths persecuted the bishop of the Gallican city. Merovingian rule and its accompanying religious peace led to a great Christian flourishing under bishops Leontius I and II. 4th-c. Bordeaux is minutely described by *Ausonius, though he does not speak of its church, founded a few years earlier by Orientalis. Already in the 4th c. there was a large Christian necropolis outside of the city walls, evidence of Christianity's spread. *Paulinus, future bishop of Nola, and *Sulpicius Severus are known authors, as is Ausonius's grandson *Paulinus of Pella—all were natives of Bordeaux. Also from the city or its surrounding region were the monk Apodemius, who visited *Jerome; Hedybia and Algasia, recipients of Jerome's *Ep.* 120 and 121 in response to their many exegetical queries; and *Rusticus, whom Jerome exhorted to continence in *Ep.* 122.

R. Étienne, *Bordeaux antique*, Bordeaux 1962; J. Coupry - M. Gauthier, *Sous les allées de Tourny, sauvetage archéologique à Bordeaux*: Arch 47 (1972) 8-17; R. Duru, *Aux origines chrétiennes de Bordeaux. Les fouilles de Saint-Seurin*: Arch 47 (1972) 18-24; R. Étienne, *Défense et illustration de Bordeaux antique*: Arch 47 (1972) 37-43; H. Crouzel, *Les échanges littéraires entre Bordeaux et l'Orient au IVe siècle*: Revue d'histoire du livre 3 (1973) 301-326; D. Barraud - L. Maurin, *Bordeaux au Bas-Empire: de la ville païenne à la ville chrétienne (IVe-VIe siècles)*: Aquitania 14 (1996) 35-53.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

II. Council. A council convoked by *Maximus, proclaimed emperor by the army in *Britain in 383, met in 385 and condemned the *Priscillianists. *Instantius was deposed and deported; Priscillian refused to recognize the council's competence and appealed to the emperor. Taken to *Trier and accused of *magic and immorality before the prefectorial tribunal, he was condemned to death and executed with six partisans, including a woman, Eucrocia. This proceeding, in which bishop Itacius of Ossonuba acted as prosecutor, aroused protests from many bishops (*Martin of Tours, *Hyginus of Cordoba, *Ambrose of Milan), who appealed to the *princeps,* and led to the Felician *schism.

Hfl-Lecl 2, 385; Gaudemet, SC 241, 113-116; Palazzini 1, 190.

Ch. Munier

BOSTRA (BOSRA)
I. City and council - II. Archaeology.

I. City and council. The etymology of the city's name is uncertain. Perhaps it is from *Be'esterah* ("house of Astarte"). Its name appears in 1 Macc 5:25-28 in connection with the expedition beyond the Jordan of Judas Maccabeus (164–161 BC) to protect the Jewish communities there. In the pre-Roman period Bostra was a fortress in the Nabataean kingdom, whose capital was *Petra.

Due to its location at the intersection of transportation routes and the fertility of the surrounding plain, Bostra was the most important urban center S of *Damascus. With the end of the Nabataean kingdom in AD 106 Bostra, now called Nova Traiana Colonia, became the administrative center of the province of *Arabia and, probably after 132–135, headquarters of the III Cyrenaica Legion. Through the work of the Syrian emperors, esp. *Alexander Severus (222–235), the city saw an accelerated development and embellishment, interrupted, however, by the devastation of the Palmyran queen *Zenobia's (269) battle with the *Roman Empire. With the division of Arabia into two provinces a few decades later, Bostra remained the principal city of Arabia, while ancient Petra was chosen as capital of Palaestina Tertia or Palaestina Salutaris. In 634 Bostra came under Arab control.

Unlike other Syrian cities, information on the Christian community at Bostra is abundant, leading to the conclusion that already by the 2nd c. it had been evangelized by the church of *Alexandria. *Eusebius mentions how in 215 the governor of Arabia (capital Bostra) sent letters to Bishop *Demetrius of Alexandria and to the prefect of *Egypt, asking them to send *Origen because of his doctrinal prowess. The mission completed, Origen returned to Alexandria (*HE* VI 19,15; 19,33; 19,37).

The first known bishop of the church of Bostra was *Beryllus, author "of various revelatory works of noble intelligence." This information is from *Eusebius of Caesarea, who adds that Beryllus was "bishop of the Arabs around Bostra" (*HE* VI 20,2), leading to the conclusion that Christianity had also spread among the nomadic Arab tribes encamped in the region. This area, called Auranitis by the Romans, must have had bishops quite early if, ca. 240, a synod was held at Bostra to judge Beryllus's doctrine; Origen also participated, and convinced Beryllus to abandon the thesis denying Christ's preexistence before the *incarnation. A second synod at Bostra in 248, also participated in by Origen, rejected the doctrine of those bishops who asserted the mortality of the *soul; at stake in the conflict was not *orthodoxy but two anthropological conceptions, Semitic and Greek.

Steeped in Semitic categories is an extremely precious mid-3rd-c. text, composed presumably at Bostra and known as the **Didascalia Apostolorum*. Written in Greek, it concerned the duties of ordained ministers, liturgical and doctrinal themes, and questions about the Christian life. The abovementioned link between Origen and the church of Bostra seems to have been even more intense under Bishop *Hippolytus, who appears to have succeeded Beryllus and should be identified with that Hippolytus who gave a homily "in which he claims to speak in church in the presence of Origen" (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 61).

The community of Bostra ca. 264 was governed by *Maximus, who took part in the Synods of Antioch of 264 and 268, which culminated in the condemnation of the local bishop, *Paul of Samosata. About a century later there were uprisings in the city between Christians and pagans, stirred up by Emperor *Julian's (361) intention to revive *paganism. The dispute degenerated into such violence that the emperor himself sent a *Manifesto* to the citizens. On this occasion Julian accused Bishop *Titus of sedition, and in a letter to the citizenry the emperor requested that he be sent away from the city. It does not seem that this actually occurred, since Titus remained in his see also under *Jovian, Julian's successor. In the 5th c. the community of Bostra was governed by *Antipater (after 451), of whom the emperor *Leo I asked a judgment on the Council of *Chalcedon. The anti-Origenist spirit that moved him took form in Antipater's *Confutation* of the *Apology* written by Eusebius of Caesarea in defense of the Alexandrian master. From the 6th c. *monophysitism began to spread, esp. among the Arab tribes. The city had a *Melkite metropolitan and, in the 6th c., also a parallel *Jacobite hierarchy with a resident bishop.

G.W. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia*, Cambridge, MA 1983; M. Sartre, *Bostra, des origines à l'Islam*, Paris 1985; J.M. Dentzer, *Hauran. Recherches archéologiques sur la Syrie du Sud à l'époque hellénistique et Romaine*, 2 vols., Paris 1985-1986; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monf. 1994, 55-60; Fedalto 2, 744; RAC II, Supp. 2003, 98-149.

L. Padovese

II. Archaeology. In the 3rd-5th c. the diocese that had benefited from Origen's doctrine boasted bishops of significant doctrinal stature: Beryllus, Titus, Maximus and Antipater, of whom there remains a beautiful inscription praising his zeal for the cult of the *Theotokos. Despite the fact that its various churches have been studied for some time, the results of archaeological research to date must still be

considered partial (Butler, *Early Churches*, 119, 124-126; Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 145, 151). Recently Italian and French excavations have sought to bring to light the ancient Roman plan of the city and to complete the study of various buildings (Cerulli, FR 109-110 [1975] 163-239; Sartre, *Bostra*, 88-97; Dentzer, OEANE 1, 350-353; Sartre, RACSuppl 9, 98-149). The urban plan has the typical characteristics of a Roman city, with a long E-W colonnaded axial road that departs from an oval plaza to the E and intersects at least three perpendicular roads. The theater is well preserved. The churches generally have a rectangular plan, though the church thought to be the cathedral—the church of Sts. Sergius, Bacchus and Leontius, dedicated by Bishop Julian in 512–513 (Farioli, *Bosra*, 173-178)—and the so-called "new cathedral," identified in the SE part of the city E of the Nabataean arch, have a central plan. The church dedicated to the Theotokos is from the late 5th c., with the beautiful inscription in honor of the metropolitan bishop Antipater. The building period that is best documented epigraphically is that during the time of Emperor *Justinian. A church dedicated to St. Job should be attributed to Bishop Jordan, in office from 518–539. Numerous churches have been found in the territory of the diocese of Bostra, recovering splendid mosaics and allowing the completion of the list of the bishops of Bostra until the mid-7th c. (*see* Arabia). Preserved in the museum of the castle are, among other things, the mosaics of the church of Deir el-Adas, depicting camel drivers and peasants harvesting grapes from a vine leaning against a tree (Hermas, *Shep., Sim.* 2); the mosaic is dated 621 (Balty, *Mosaïques*, 148-151). The church was dedicated to St. George, and the inscriptions give the names of some inhabitants of the village situated in the Hauran.

M. Sartre, *Bostra*: RAC 9, 98-149; M.C. Butler, *Early Churches in Syria*, Princeton, NJ 1929; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947; S. Cerulli, *La cattedrale dei ss. Sergio, Bacco e Leonzio a Bosra*: FR 109-110 (1975) 163-239; J. Balty, *Mosaïques antiques de Syrie*, Brussels 1977; M. Sartre, *Bostra des origines à l'Islam*, Paris 1985; R. Farioli Campanati, *Gli scavi della chiesa dei ss. Sergio, Bacco e Leonzio a Bostra*: Berytus 33 (1985) 61-74; R. Farioli Campanati, *Relazioni sugli scavi e ricerche della missione Italo-Siriana a Bosra 1985, 1986, 1987*, in *XXXV Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina* (Ravenna 22-24 marzo 1988), Ravenna 1988, 45-92; R. Farioli Campanati, *Bosra. Chiesa dei ss. Sergio, Bacco e Leonzio: I nuovi ritrovamenti (1988-1989)*, in *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam. VII^e-VIII^e siècles*, Damas 1992, 173-178; J.-M. Dentzer, *Bostra*: The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East 1, 350-353, New York - Oxford 1997; M. Piccirillo, *L'Arabia cristiana*, Milan 2002.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

BRAGA (Portugal)

I. City - II. Councils.

I. City. Ancient *Braccara* in Hispania Citerior; capital of the province of Gallaecia after *Diocletian's division. At the beginning of the 5th c. with the Germanic invasions, Braga was incorporated into Suevian territory as the capital of the Suevian kingdom. In 456 it was taken temporarily and sacked by the *Visigoth Theodoric II and was under Visigothic rule from 585 to the Muslim invasion. In the mid-3rd c. a flourishing Christian community existed in neighboring Astorga, suggesting that Christianity had already arrived in Braga as well. The tradition that the apostle James preached the gospel in Braga after landing in a neighboring town is pure legend. The first concrete information we have attests the presence of Christianity ca. 400, at which time there was already an organized community, since the city's bishop, Paternus—consecrated by the *Priscillianist Symposius of Astorga, whose faith he too professed but abandoned after reading *Ambrose—attended the I Council of *Toledo, which allowed him to keep his see. Priscillianism was still causing problems at the I Council of Braga (561). Famous Bragans were Paul *Orosius, historian and friend of *Augustine, and the two Aviti, travelers and importers of Christian, esp. *Origenist, culture in the late 4th and early 5th c. From the mid 6th c. Braga was metropolitan see of the province, a privilege shared for some time with Lugo, due to the enlargement of the territory by Suebi's conquests to the south. Braga flourished esp. under its bishop St. *Martin. When the abbot-bishop of Dumium was called to the see of Braga, he remained bishop of both sees. Bishops: Paternus (400); Balconius (contemporary of Pope *Leo I); Profuturus (ca. 538); Lucretius (d. 561); St. Martin (572–580); Pantardus (580–589); Julian (633–638); Potamius (653–656, the year in which he was deposed); Fructuosus (656); Leodegisius Julianus (675); Liuva (681); Faustinus (687–693); Felice (693); Fidesind (d. 745, but always resident at Lugo).

II. Councils. *561, provincial.* Held by order of the Suevian king Ariamirus. Metropolitan Lucretius presided over seven other bishops and other representatives of the clergy. They published 17 doctrinal and disciplinary *anathemas directed against Priscillianism and 22 canons; some of the canons refer to clergy, and the rest attempt to give uniformity to liturgical discipline.

572, provincial. Presided over by St. *Martin of Dumium. 5 suffragan bishops of Braga attended,

along with Nitigisius, metropolitan of Lugo and 5 other suffragans. They read the acts of the first council of Braga and a text of 1 Pet, and issued 10 canons on economic matters, the reputation of clerics and liturgical rules.

675, provincial. Metropolitan Leodegisius presided over 7 other bishops. After reciting the *Nicene-Constantinopolitan *creed with the addition of the **filioque,* they issued 8 canons to correct a series of abuses, esp. liturgical, among higher clergy.

Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 149-152; 192-212; 217-221; J. Augusto Ferreira, *Fastos episcopales da Igrejia primacial de Braga*, Braga 1950; E. Flórez, ES 15; Vives, *Concilios*, 65-67; 78-106; 370-379; Orlandis, *Concilios*, 138-159; 391-395.

P. de Luis

BRAULIO of Saragossa (d. 651). Bishop of *Saragossa from 631–651, highly educated, friend of *Isidore and among the most renowned literati of the *Visigothic "renaissance." His *Life* of St. Aemilianus, a well-known Spanish *hermit, based on oral sources and mostly dedicated to miracles, seeks to present a model of Christian perfection and is marked by the obvious literary pains taken by its author, who crowns his labors with an elegant hymn in the saint's honor in iambic *senarii*. His letters—44, of various length, including some from correspondents—remind us of those of the 4th and 5th c., because of their variety of argument, refinement of form, taste for friendship and exchange of courtesy. They are one of the most evident and symptomatic signs of the Visigothic renaissance and an important source of knowledge of Spanish history of the period. *Ep.* 3-8, between Isidore and Braulio, provide interesting information on the composition of Isidore's *Etymologiae*. Braulio also took a leading part in church politics: he helped compile the Visigothic code and wrote to Pope *Honorius I in the name of the Council of *Toledo of 638 to rebut his charge that the faith of the Spanish bishops was lukewarm.

CPL 1230-1233; PL 80; *Epist.*, ed. J. Madoz, Madrid 1941; C.H. Lynch, *St. Braulio*, Washington 1939 (Sp. tr. Madrid 1950); A. Robles Sierra, *Braulio de Zaragoza testigo de una espiritualidad hispana*: Teología espiritual 30 (1986) 119-140; M.L. García Sanchidrián, *Las proposiciones completivas en las cartas de Braulio de Zaragoza*: Excerpta Philologica 6 (1996) 145-154.

M. Simonetti

BREAD. The use of the term "bread" (Gk. ἄρτος, Lat. *panis*) is extremely vast in patristic writings, in conjunction, moreover, with its frequency in biblical texts, where different meanings are applied to the word (for the NT see GLNT I, 1267-1272). One can distinguish the following meanings given to bread by ancient Christian authors.

1. Bread as indicative of any food and all bodily necessities (Orig., *Com. in Jo.* X, 17,100; *De or.* 27,4; Greg. Nyss., *Or. dom.* 4; Aug., *Serm.* 57,7,7) and as daily nourishment, often in relation to Mt 6:11 and Lk 11:3 (*see* Lord's Prayer).

2. Bread in the eucharistic sense: "the bread of God" is "the flesh of *Jesus Christ from the line of *David" (Ign., *Rom.* 7,3); bread is the necessary element for the *Eucharist (Just., *1 Apol.* 65-67; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I, 14,3; *Trad. ap.* 21 [ed. Botte]; Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 22,3,6; 23,20). The use of ordinary bread is an expression of divine condescension to human customs (John of Dam., *De fid. ort.* IV, 13), but this becomes the body of Christ (Greg. Nyss., *Bapt. chr.;* cf., Orig., *C. Cels.* VIII, 33) as soon as it is consecrated with the *epiclesis (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 18,5; Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 19,7; 21,3; 23,8; Theod. of Mops., *Hom. cat.* 15,12) or consecrated with the words of the Lord Jesus (Ambr., *De sacr.* IV, 14.23). Christ calls bread his flesh because it can be eaten (Theod. of Mops., *Jo.* 6,31ff.). The eucharistic bread is the memory of the *incarnation (Just., *Dial.* 70,4) and demonstrates its reality (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* V, 8,3). *Irenaeus inserts a discussion of the eucharistic bread in a polemical, antignostic context: one can be certain that the bread offered in the Eucharist is the body of the Lord only if one recognizes in him the Son of the one who created bread (*Adv. haer.* IV, 18,4; cf., IV, 33,2). According to *Macarius of Magnesia (*Apocr.* III, 23), Christ has the ability of working upon bread inasmuch as he is the creator of the earth from which are derived bread, the human body and his own body. The eucharistic bread makes a person immortal (Ign., *Eph.* 20,2; Theod. of Mops., *Hom. cat.* 15,12) and incorruptible (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 18,5; V, 2,2-3; Aug., *Tract. Jo.* 26,17). In the history of mankind it has put an end to death (Cyr. of Alex., *Ador.* III), and it bestows life (Hilar., *In ps.* 128,10), not temporal but eternal (Aug., *Ep.* 186,2; *Tract. Jo.* 26,15), because it remits sin (Ambr., *Ben. patr.* 9,38). Patristic authors also saw the eucharistic bread as the *sacrament of unity, often in connection with 1 Cor 10:17: as one sole bread is formed from many grains (Did. 9,4; Cypr., *Ep.* 63,13; 69,5; John Chrys., *Hom.* 24,2 *in I Cor.;* Aug., *Serm.* 272), thus those who receive it, though being many, become one sole bread, that is, one sole body of Christ (Aug., *Serm.* 227; Serm. *Guelferb.* 7,1-2). This bread is the source of peace and an *eschatological sign of the society of

the saints (Aug., *Tract. in Jo.* 26,14.17); but it is also a sign of a unity already actualized—the unity of faith (Faustus of R., *Serm.* 16,10-11), the unity in the body of Christ accomplished by *baptism (Ful. of R., *Ep.* 12,11,24)—and when it is offered, the entire people is signified in it (Ambrosiast., *In I Cor.* 11,20). Finally, with regard to the preparation of the bread for the Eucharist, it seems that during the patristic era the churches used both unleavened bread and leavened bread and that both customs can be traced back to an ancient *tradition (see J. Parisot: *Azyme*: DTC 1, 2653-2664; F. Cabrol, *Azymes*: DACL 1, 3254-3260; A. Penna - M. Jugie, *Azimo*: EC 2, 578-580).

3. Bread of *blessing or blessed bread or *eulogy (or ἀντίδωρον in the *Byzantine liturgy) seems to have designated the bread *offered* by the faithful for the Eucharist, which was blessed and distributed to *catechumens or to those who did not receive *Communion. This unconsecrated bread was distinguished from the consecrated bread used for the Eucharist (*Trad. ap.* 26). In some Eastern churches, perhaps in relation to 1 Cor 10:16, the consecrated bread and the *wine were called εὐλογία (*Act. Thom.* 50; Orig., *Hom.* 19 [18],13 *in Jer.;* Cyr. of Alex., *Ador.* XIII; *Jo.* IV, 2; *Nest.* IV, 5). It then came to indicate also the bread or any gift sent by the priests to their bishops or friends as a symbol of fraternal communion (Paul. of N., *Ep.* 3,6; 4,5; 7,3; Aug., *Ep.* 31,9) (see DACL 5, 733-734; LTK 3, 1180-1181).

4. Bread in a metaphorical sense: the bread is Christ (Orig., *Cant.* II [on Song 1:12]; Prud., *Cat.* 9,61; Aug., *Serm.* 130,2), inasmuch as he is life, as the bread is life (Tertull., *De or.* 6,2). He is the Logos, the Word of God (Orig., *Com. in Jo.* X, 17,99; XXXII, 24,310; *De or.* 27; *Mt. ser.* 85; Greg. Nyss., *V. Mos.* II, 140; Aug., *Serm.* 56,6,10; *In ps.* 95, s. II, 6; for the relation between the divinity of Christ and his being bread, see John Chrys., *Hom.* 45,2 *in Jo.*); he is wisdom (Athan., *Ep. fest.* 7,5.8; Greg. Nyss., *Hom.* 5 *in Eccl.*). Bread is the *Scripture (Aug., *Serm.* 95,1), the Mosaic law (Ambrosiast., *Quaest.* 47,3; Aug., *In 83 quaest.* 61,1), the teaching of Christ (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* IV, 7,6) and *faith in him (Jn. Chrys., *Hom.* 46,1 in Jo.), the *preaching of the NT or the work of the *Holy Spirit (Aug., *In 83 quaest.* 61,4; cf., *Serm.* 95,2), the knowledge of the *Trinity (Aug., *Serm.* 105,4; cf., *In ps.* 102,10), charity (Aug., *Serm.* 105,6), and the martyr (Ign., *Rom.* 4,1). (For other meanings of the term *bread,* see Greg. Great, *Moral.* XXIII, 49.) In patristic texts, the "bread of *angels" of Ps 78:25 (77:25 LXX) has special prominence, identified by some with material *manna, by others with the Logos, true manna and supersubstantial bread, with Christ the living bread. *Augustine, in particular, affirms that the Word of God, bread of the angels, was made flesh so that man might be able to eat the bread of angels (see G. Madec, "Panis angelorum selon les Pères de l'Église, surtout s. Augustin," in *Forma futuri. Studi in onore di M. Pellegrino,* Turin 1975, 818-829).

5. One frequently finds Old Testament types related to bread in the writings of ancient Christian authors, often in explanation of Jn 6:31-33; 49-51, the comparison between manna and Christ with his gifts (Cypr., *Ep.* 69,14; Hilar., *In ps.* 57,9; Ambr., *De myst.* 8,47-49; Ambrosiast., *Quaest.* 95,3; 20,2; John Chrys., *Hom.* 46,2 *in Jo.; Hom.* 47,1 *in Jo.;* Aug., *Tract. in Jo.* 25,13; 26,12-13; Cyr. Alex., *Jo.* IV,2-3; *Glaph. Ex.* II, *mann. et coturn.*). The manna, bread which is not produced from earth, is a figure of the Word, who shows himself to every person in the aspect that corresponds to one's needs, just as the manna had the ability to satisfy every taste (Wis 16:20-21) (Greg. Nyss., *V. Mos.* II, 137-140). Christian authors primarily interpreted the liturgical uses of bread mentioned in the OT in a typological sense. The twelve pieces of showbread (Lev 24:5-9; cf., DBS 6, 973ff.) prefigured the eucharistic bread (*Trad. ap.* 41; Jerome., *In Tit.* 1,8-9; Cyr. of Alex., *Jo.* IV, 4), which now replaces them (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 22,5), and the Word that came down from heaven (Eus., *Ps.* 33,6-8). For *Origen, at the level of the literal sense, the showbread represented the twelve tribes of Israel, which should have been a memorial and an intercession before the Lord, but, he observes, according to "the greatness of the *mystery," the sole memorial that makes God propitious to human beings is that bread of which Christ speaks when instituting the Eucharist, the one who is the bread come down from heaven and the giver of life and the showbread because God set him forth as a propitiation through faith in his blood (*Hom.* 13,3 *in Lev.*). For some authors, moreover, the showbread represents the word of the twelve *apostles (Orig., *Hom.* 9,4 *in Ex.;* Procop. of Gaza, *Lev.:* PG 87, 779ff.) or the twelve months of the year (Jerome, *Ep.* 64,9). Even the unleavened bread which the Hebrews ate during the Exodus (Ex 12:8) and subsequently every year during the feast of unleavened bread (Ex 13:5-10) undergoes a typological interpretation in relation to the Eucharist (see especially *Ephrem, *Hymns on the Unleavened Bread* 6,1-6; 17,5; 19,1-3; see also *Hymns. cruc.* 2,5). These were also understood in a moral sense in reference to the elimination of sin (Greg. Nyss., *V. Mos.* II, 126; Chromat., Serm. 17A; Greg. Great., *In evang. hom.* 22,8). Finally, the bread offered by *Melchizedek was commonly interpreted as a figure of the Eucharist (Gen 14:18) (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 25,161,3; see: J.L. Ska, *Melchisédech*: DSp 10, 969-972).

6. The ancient Christian authors mention the use of bread in the *Mithraic cult (Just., *1 Apol.* 66,4; Tertull., *De praescr.* 40,4), among the *heretics (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 19,96,1; Epiph., *Pan.* 30,16), in the *gnostic rites (Clem. Alex., *Exc. Ex Theod.* 82) and among the *Manicheans (Aug., *C. Faust.* 20,13).

In addition to the texts cited, see TRE 1, 229-278 (bibl.); LTK³ 2, 703-706. For the presence of the term *bread* in ancient Christian authors, see A. Blaise - H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Strasbourg 1945, 591; Lampe 231-232; for the presence of the term *bread* in Augustine, see PL 46, 484-485. For the countless times in which bread was used in a eucharistic sense, see J. Solano, *Textos eucarísticos primitivos*, BAC 88 and 118, Madrid 1962 and 1964 (especially the index of vol. II, 846-847 and 887); *L'Eucaristia nei Padri della Chiesa*, "Dizionario di spiritualità biblico patristica," Rome 1998. For the interpretation of the bread of Mt 6:11 and Lk 11:3, see also the entry on the Lord's Prayer. For the use of the breaking of bread in the liturgy, see: DACL 5, 2103-2116; EC 5, 1564-1565.

A. Pollastri

BRENDAN (6th c.). Brénainn of Clúain Ferta, called Brendan of Clonfert or Brendan the Navigator, was a 6th-c. *Irish abbot: in 558/564 he founded the Church of Clonfert. He died between 577/583. This biographical information is in the Annals of Ulster and of Inisfallen and derives from an ancient Irish chronicle (lost). These texts, enriched by annalistic data, have handed down certain legendary accounts of the history and myths of Brendan's tribe, accounts transferred in the *hagiographical *Lives* to Brendan himself, such as the legends of the *cynocephali* and the Atlantic sea voyages, e.g., the *Navigatio s. Brendani*. The paternity attributed to him in one *Life,* earlier than the *Navigatio,* is the oldest evidence of the spread of his cult. Feast 16 May in Irish calendars.

J.B. O'Riordan, *Brendan: Saint and Navigator*, Dublin n.d.; P. Grosjean, *Vita S. Brendani*: AB 48 (1930) 99-123; Id., *Notes d'hagiographie celtique*: AB 78 (1960) 375-381; DHGE 10, 533-534; BS 3, 404-409; *Navigatio S. Brendani*, ed. C. Selmer, Notre Dame, IN 1959; C. Selmer (ed.), *Navigatio s. Brendani Abbatis*, Notre Dame, IN 1959, repr. 1989 (Varese 1968 n. ed. G. Orlandi); Brun-hölzl 2, 524-528; *The Early Church in Western Britain and Ireland*. Studies presented to C.A. Ralegh Radford (ed. S.M. Pearce) (BAR British Series 102), Oxford 1982, 306-328; L.M. Bitel, *Isle of the Saints: Monastic Settlement and Christian Community in Early Ireland*, Ithaca - London 1990, 31, 34, 38, 66, 91-93, 113, 129-130, 153, 168, 189, 202, 205, 212; LTK 2, 672 (U. Kindermann); T.M. Charles-Edwards, *Early Christian Ireland*, Cambridge 2000, 277; 283-284; T. O'Laughlin, *Celtic Theology: Humanity, World and God in Early Irish Writings*, London - New York 2000, ch. 9; E. Doris, *The Celtic West and Europe: Studies in Celtic Literature and Early Irish Church*, Bodnein 2001; J.M. Wooding, *Fasting, Flesh and Body in the Brendan Dossier*, in *Celtic Hagiographies and Saints' Cults*, ed. J. Cartwright, Lampeter 2003, 161-176.

V. Saxer

BREVIARIUM APOSTOLORUM. Written ca. 600 by an anonymous author and based on the ancient *Byzantine* or *Apostolic Catalogues*, the *Breviarium Apostolorum,* which was often appended to the *Martyrologies,* tells of the apostles, from the etymology of their names to their death and burial, focusing on the missions of *Peter and *Paul at *Rome, James in *Spain, Philip in *Gaul and *Matthew in *Macedonia. Moreover, as the oldest evidence of the preaching of James on the Iberian Peninsula, the *Breviarium Apostolorum,* besides being the principal source of the *De ortu et obitu patrum* of *Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636), is a document of extraordinary importance for Spanish ecclesiastical history.

L. Duchesne, *Les anciens recueils de légendes apostoliques*: III Congrès Scientifique International des Catholiques 1894, V sect., 67-79; *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, eds. G.B. De Rossi - L. Duchesne, Brussels 1894, LXXV-LXXXI; B. de Gaiffier, *Le "Breviarium Apostolorum"*: AB 81 (1963) 89-116.

P. Marone

BREVIARIUM HIPPONENSE. Contains the decisions and canons of the Council of *Hippo, presided over by *Aurelius of *Carthage (8 October 393), called by *Possidius *Plenarium totius Africae concilium* (*Vita Aug.* 7) and held in the *secretarium* of the *Basilica Pacis*. *Augustine, not yet a priest, gave a discourse in the bishops' presence, on which is based the work *De fide et symbolo*. On the occasion of the later council of 13 August at Carthage (397), the bishops of the province of *Byzacena sent a sort of résumé (*Breviatio or Breviarium*) of the decisions taken at Hippo: it contained a *Latin version of the *Nicene Creed. On 28 August the collection was accepted by other bishops of Proconsular *Africa and *Mauretania who had not participated in the previous session. Two series of canons followed: the first, of 4 canons, laid down that Easter should be celebrated in conformity with the church of Carthage; the second, of 39 canons, regarded disciplinary rules for the different grades of clergy, from lectors to bishops. These canons laid the foundations of ecclesiastical discipline in Christian Africa. The document from 13 August, with two additional canons, was included in the *Quesnelliana* and many others; the second document, of 28 August 397, was included in the *Hispana*. The *breviarium* was taken up again by the *Registri ecclesiae Carthaginensis excerpta*.

CPL 1764 and 1770; PL 56, 411-433; CCL 149,30-53; H.Th. Bruns, *Canones Apostolorum et conciliorum saecc. IV-VII*, Berlin, I, 1839, 134-139; Hfl-Lecl 2, 1, 82-91; F. Maassen, *Gesch. d. Quellen und d. Litter. des Canonisch. Rechts in Abenlande*, Graz 1956, nos. 139-140 (repr.); DDC VII, 434-436; G. Bardy, *Conciles*

d'Hippone au temps de saint Augustin: Augustiniana 5 (1955) 441-458; Ch. Munier, *Cinq canons du concile d'Hippone du 8 octobre 393*: RDC 18 (1968) 16-29; Id., *La tradition manuscrite de l'Abrégé d'Hippone et le canon des Écritures des églises africaines*: SE 21 (1972/73) 43-55; B. Neunheuser, *"Cum altari adsistitur semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio." Canon 21 de Konzils von Hippo 393, seine Bedeutung und Nachwirkung*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 105-119; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999, 229-231; J.-A. Sabw Kanyang, *Episcopus et plebs, l'évêque et la communauté ecclésiale dans les conciles africains (345-525)*, Bern 2000.

L. Dattrino - A. Di Berardino

BREVIARIUM IN PSALMOS. Compilation on the psalms whose origin remains obscure; it depends on the commentaries on the psalms of *Ambrose, *Hilary and esp. *Jerome. The original texts are often mixed, mutilated or interpolated. Thus far there has been no methodical study of this work. Various hypotheses have been advanced regarding authorship and date of composition. Some attribute it to a certain John, a *Roman deacon (CPL 950), perhaps the same person later elected pope with the name *John I (522–526) (L. Brou, *Où en est la question . . .* , SP 2, 18). Others consider a Gallic or an Irish author possible, at some time between 450 and the 7th-8th c. (CPL 629). The incipit *Proxime cum Origenis psalterium . . . legeramus* indicates the occasion of the composition; the actual incipit reads: *Beatus vir qui non adiit.*

CPL 592, 629, 950; PLS 2, 76-78; CPPM 2,2357; Lapidge/ Sharpe 343; DHGE 11, 1380, n. 9, s.v. *Cassiodore*; L. Brou, *Où en est la question des "Psalter collects"?*: SP 2 = TU 64 (1957) 17-20; H. Ashworth, *The Psalter collections of Pseudo-Jerome and Cassiodorus*: Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 45 (1963) 287-304.

L. Dattrino

BREVIARIUM SYRIACUM (or *Martyrologium Syriacum*). A poor *Syriac translation, done at Edessa in 411, of a *Greek original composed ca. 360 at *Nicomedia and considered to be the oldest martyrology extant. It was included in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (5th c.). First it lists the Western martyrs from 26 December to 24 November, then martyrs known only in Syria, divided into groups: bishops, priests, deacons, religious clerics and laity.

PO 10,5-26; B. Mariani, *Breviarium Syriacum*, Rome 1956.

S. Samulowitz

BREVIARIUS DE HIEROSOLYMA. A guide to the churches of *Jerusalem, perhaps composed by a Latin *pilgrim in the first decades of the 6th c. The brief description, in rather rough language, survives in two recensions (see the two juxtaposed examples in Weber, ed., 109-112). The brief *Iter,* one of the first **itinera* to appear, offers very precious topographical information for the period prior to *Justinian's reign (527–565) (Wilmart, 1928, 101). The opening takes the reader straight into the subject: *Incipit breviarius quomodo Hierosolyma constructa est.* It should in fact be called an itinerary rather than a description.

CPL 2327; CSEL 39, 151-155; CPPM 2,2185; R. Weber CCL 175, 105-112; Schanz-Hosius IV, 1, 404; A. Wilmart, *Un nouveau témoin du "Breviarius de Hierosolyma"*: RBi 37 (1928) 101-106; J. Wilkinson, *Christian Pilgrims in Jerusalem During the Byzantine Period*: Palestine Exploration Quarterly (1976) 75-101; J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims Before the Crusades*, Warminster [2]2002 (with Eng. tr.); Th. O'Loughlin, *The Date of the "De situ Hierosolyma" of the Ps. Eucherius*: RBe 105 (1995).

L. Dattrino

BRIGID of Kildare (5th c.). As has been wisely noted, because of the tendency, typical of *Celtic *hagiography, to multiply saints, it is easy to find homonymous saints in Ireland; Brigid, with her more than 25 projections, is no exception to this phenomenon. All of these figures can with high probability be considered simply the product of local cults honoring Brigid; the same is true for the apocryphal Brigid of Fiesole.

According to what the various legendary redactions of the *Vitae* of Brigid tell us—albeit at times with completely conflicting details—she was born in the mid-5th c. at Fochart (Faughard), near Dundalk, from the illegitimate union of a man from Leinster named Dubtach or Dubtoch, and a slave named Broiccseach or Broicsech, the sister of St. Ultan of Ardbraccan. After refusing numerous offers of marriage and obtaining through repeated prayers the partial disfigurement of her beautiful face, in 467 Brigid took her vows under Bishop Macchille at Usny Hill (Westmeath); after many *pilgrimages, she later moved to the plain of Magh Life, where, near a centuries-old oak tree, she founded the famous *monastery of Cill-Dara (Kildare), becoming its abbess and spiritual guide. Many legends surround her life; she was called "the Mary of Ireland" or "the Mary of the Gael," and it is not always easy to separate purely historical data from fantastic accounts, though the picture of her that such legends seem to offer is of a woman full of humanity and of love for people and animals. She died 1 February 523 (or 525) and was buried—according to her late biography written by a 8th-9th-c. monk, Cogitosus (or Cogitus)—together with Bishop Con-

laedh in a splendid tomb near the altar of the cathedral of Kildare, which quickly became a place of pilgrimage. Following the frequent Scandinavian invasions her *relics were transferred (ca. 878) to Downpatrick, where they were deposed together with the mortal remains of St. Patrick. On 9 June 1186 Brigid's remains were again moved to the cathedral of Downpatrick, in the presence of Cardinal Vivian, 15 bishops and numerous abbots and religious.

She is ordinarily depicted in the dress of an abbess, in white habit and black veil, candle in hand, a flame over her head and with a crosier. Sometimes, being the patron saint of milkmen, she is depicted in a housewife's clothes ready to churn butter, or in a peasant woman's dress leading animals into the fields. Her feast is 1 February.

DCB 1, 337-338; DHGE 10, 717-719; F. O'Brian, *Saint Brigid of Ireland: Her Legend, History and Cult*, Louvain-London 1938; BS 3, 430-437; LTK 2, 692-693; T.M. Charles-Edwards, *Early Christian Ireland*, Cambridge 2000.

M. Ghilardi

BRITAIN

I. Christian origins - II. Councils.

I. Christian origins. The Christian origins of Britain are still unclear, and certainly no credit can be given to the legends, circulating widely in the Middle Ages, according to which the evangelization began with the missionary voyages of Sts. *Peter and *Paul and of at least four other *apostles; the legendary presence of *Joseph of Arimathea, who supposedly brought some drops of the blood of Christ and planted the sacred grove at Glastonbury, encountered just as much success already in ancient times, and this gave rise to numerous stories which flourished in the Middle Ages. Anyone who speaks of a Christianity widespread among the Britons in the 1st. c. AD is exaggerating; for it must be acknowledged that until the earliest years of the 4th c., although one may accept in principle the existence of individual believers, the absence of certain archaeological and literary evidence does not permit postulating the existence of conspicuous communities of believers on the island.

Also completely without foundation is the report, given in good faith by the Venerable *Bede, but found by him in a passage of the **Liber pontificalis,* of a letter sent toward the end of the 2nd c. AD by a British king named Lucius, otherwise unknown and strangely characterized by his name as not of local origin, to Pope *Eleutherus (175–189), in which he requested missionaries to facilitate his own conversion and to evangelize the pagan populations who inhabited the island. Equally fantastic, therefore, is the affirmative response of the pontifex but, as is easy to understand, an abundant and improbable literature was born in the course of time around these letters. A much more solid testimony, but to be considered not yet definitive for proving the existence of a substantial British Christian community, could be that of the *Carthaginian apologist *Tertullian who, writing at the beginning of the 3rd c., surprisingly describes Britain as a Christian stronghold. Also in the first decades of the 3rd c. there is the testimony provided for us by the *Alexandrian exegete *Origen who, in his writings, three times refers to Christian Britain, one time even considering the new faith as a unifying force among the Britons.

The literary and historical sources and the archaeological evidence, however, do not help us to understand with any precision when Christianity became important on the island, and it is difficult to understand how it really reached there, apart from missions and the spontaneous diffusion brought by the army or by merchants. Many modern scholars have maintained, without adequate literary or archaeological evidence, that Christianity reached Britain through the exiles from the *Gallic community of *Lyons that in 177—as we learn from the *Martyrium Lugdunensium* transmitted to us by *Eusebius of Caesaraea—underwent a very harsh persecution in which not even the bishop *Pothinus, over 90 years old, was spared, expiring in prison after two days of atrocious tortures. Even if the martyrdom of *Alban, and therefore the existence of Christian believers in Britain, is generically attributed to the time of the *Diocletian persecution, the first certain testimony of the presence of a conspicuous Christian community on the island can be assigned to 314. At the anti-*Donatist Council of *Arles three British bishops, as well as a priest and a deacon, appear among the signers: *Eborius episcopus de civitate Eboracensi provincia Britannia, Restitutus episcopus de civitate Londiniensi provincia suprascripta. Adelphius episcopus de civitate Colonia Londiniensium. Exinde Sacerdos presbyter, Arminius diaconus.* This is an evident confirmation of an ecclesiastical apparatus organized into a hierarchy and subdivided into territorial dioceses (with the borders adapted to the territorial division imposed by Diocletian?) depending on urban sees.

Despite *Pelagius himself being a Briton—for he was born in an unknown locale in Britain around 354—it is difficult to establish how much his ideas circulated among the population of the island; we know, however, from the *De laude sanctorum* of

*Victricius, bishop of Rouen between 385 and 410, that around the year 403 a Catholic mission guided by himself was sent to the island to check the spread of the Pelagian fever, and in 429 and later in 444–445, as Bede testifies (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* I, 17, 21), the bishops of the island had to seek again the help of the Gallic bishops, who sent them *Germanus of Autissidorum (Auxerre) and *Lupus of Tricassium (Troyes) to confront the extremely numerous followers of the doctrine of Pelagius.

In 597 Pope *Gregory I, having noticed the serious departure of the island from the faith, sent into Britain a group of *monks from the Monastery of St. Andrew on the Caelian, among whom were *Augustine and *Lawrence, to convert the Anglo-Saxon tribes. The monks' work of conversion began from Kent (where the Romans too had disembarked some centuries before), whose pagan king *Ethelbert—who would later by converted by Augustine—had married, certainly before 588, the *Frankish princess Bertha (daughter of the Merovingian king of *Paris Charibert I), who was of the Christian faith, which doubtless favored the efforts of the missionaries. The religious relationships with the continental world, after the supposed two-century pause of the 5th and 6th c., in reality were never interrupted, but these relationships directly excluded the influence of Rome, linking instead in a privileged manner with the Frankish world, which in that period was certainly the fulcrum of the Western barbarian world. Furthermore it should be emphasized that the approach itself of the Roman missionaries was not able to do without Frankish mediation: the very presence of Queen Bertha at the court of King Ethelbert of Kent is an eloquent testimony of that, and furthermore, Bede, our privileged source, reports to us that the contacts between the evangelizers and the local sovereign were possible only thanks to the presence, suggested by the pontiff himself, of Frankish-speaking interpreters (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* I, 25). The Northumbrians, who lived in the northern zones of the island, were converted in 627 by *Paulinus, one of the companions of Augustine, but a pagan invasion of those regions—culminating in 633 with the death of the Christian king Edwin in the battle of Haethfelth (Hatfield Chase) at the hands of Caedwalla of Wessex and Penda of Mercia—partially destroyed his work, later taken up with great zeal by *Aidan of Lindisfarne.

D. Watts, *Christians and Pagans in Roman Britain*, London-New York 1991; D.N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England*, Woodbridge 1992; K. Rainsbury Dark, *Civitas to Kingdom: British Political Continuity 300–800*, Leicester 1994; C.F. Mawer, *Evidence for Christianity in Roman Britain: The Small Finds* (BAR British Series 243), Oxford 1995; D. Watts, *Religion in Late Roman Britain: Forces of Change*, London-New York 1998; K. Hylson-Smith, *Christianity in England from Roman Times to the Reformation*, I, *From Roman Times to 1066*, London 1999; M. Ghilardi, Egregium Albanum fecunda Britannia profert. *Albano e i primi santi della Britannia romana*: RomBarb 17 (2002) 1-18.

II. Councils. The first important *council of the British church was held, according to what we learn from the detailed testimony of *Bede (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II, 2), around the year 603 (the precise date is uncertain) in the place called, in the language of the Angles, *Augustines Ac* ("Augustine's Oak," today Worcester), near the River Severn, in southwestern Britain. Augustine, with the collaboration of the king of Kent, Ethelbert, had called the representatives of the British dioceses to discuss the method of celebrating Easter and to try to persuade them to adopt the *Roman ecclesiastical traditions: they were celebrating Easter in the Jewish *Quartodeciman manner, from the fourteenth to the twentieth day of the lunar month, with a calculation based on a cycle of 84 years. After long discussions and consultations, the British bishops and doctors refused to accept the Roman tradition, since—just as had been predicted to him by a wise hermit consulted before the council began—Augustine had remained seated at their arrival at the synod, a gesture interpreted as proof of the disdain which he had for them. Again Bede informs us (III, 25) that after many years, in 664, to put an end to the delicate and controversial paschal question, but also to discuss other important questions concerning ecclesiastical usages, it was decided—under the presidence of the king of the Northumbrians Oswiu and of his son Alhfrith—to convoke a new council (in reality it must not have been a council according to the canonical norms) in the *monastery of Streanaeshalch (Whitby), at that time held by the noble abbess Hilda. The protagonists were *Colmanus, bishop of Lindisfarne, for the Scots, and Wilfrid, abbot and later bishop of Eboracum, for the English. King Oswiu, having reminded *Wilfrid with the help of a passage of the gospel of Matthew (Mt 16:18-19) that it was Christ who conceded to Peter the keys to the kingdom of heaven, decided in favor of the Roman traditions. Colmanus and his supporters retreated to *Scotland (III, 26) and from that moment began the predominance of the Roman traditions in English Christianity.

Two years after the death of King Oswiu—who died of an incurable disease at the age of 58 on 15 February 670—in September of the year

672, the archbishop of Doruvernis (Canterbury), Theodore, convoked an imposing council (the first regular council which was held in England according to the canonical norm) at Herutford (Hertford), confirming the *Roman rites in opposition to the *Celtic ones and formulating the request for more bishops for England, indicating thus the way for an extension of the influence of Canterbury (Beda, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* IV, 5).

The same Theodore in 680—apparently to discuss and refute the *monophysite *heresy of *Eutyches, but in reality to obey the will of Pope *Martin, who, against the *monothelite tendencies of the *Constantinopolitan emperor *Constans, wanted local councils united in all the regions of the Occident, which would confirm his attitudes—called at Haethfelth (Hatfield) a new council of the British dioceses (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* IV, 17) and confirmed at that time the adherence of the English bishops to the councils of *Nicaea, *Constantinople (I), *Ephesus, *Chalcedon, *Constantinople (II) and the Lateran synod of 649.

Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II, 2; III, 25 and 26; IV, 5 and 17; D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, I, London 1737; A.W. Haddan - W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, I-III, Oxford 1869-1878; M. Deanesley, *The Pre-Conquest Church in England*, London 1961; C.R. Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils c. 650–c. 850*, Leicester 1995.

M. Ghilardi

BRITAIN and IRELAND

I. Architecture - II. Manuscripts - III. Sculpture and carving - IV. Metalwork

I. Architecture.

1. Churches in Roman Britain. No direct contemporary testimonies are known, either from history or inscriptions, for any of the paleo-Christian churches in Britain. It should be presumed that three types of cult edifices existed, according to the analogy of other provinces: urban churches, cemeterial or martyrial churches in the periphery, and domestic churches installed in villas outside the cities.

Urban parochial churches: (1) Caerwent (*Venta Silurum*): An apsed structure built in the course of the 5th c. above the south part of the forum baths has suggested (but without certainty) a church. (2) *Canterbury (*Durovernum Cantiacorum*): Here, more than in any other *Roman British city aside from London, there is a certain continuity of use. The remains of an urban church might be identified with the basilica which is said to have been restored by *Augustine and dedicated, as *Bede informs us (*HE* I, 33), to the Holy Savior. It is generally agreed that it was on the site of the present cathedral, even if the reconstruction after 1067 must have removed every trace. (3) Lincoln (*Lindum*): Excavations in the area of Flexengate have revealed traces of a building with various construction phases, one of which is from the 4th c., oriented east-west, with an apse at the east and a portico or a nave to the north; the central zone preserves a mosaic with black, red and white tesserae as at Silchester. At present it seems to be the best example of an urban church. (4) Richborough (*Rutupiae*): Wall remains discovered in the northwest part of the Roman fort of *Rutupiae* have been convincingly interpreted as the foundations of a hall for religious use oriented east-west, probably with an apse to the east. The discovery, a little distant from the remains, of a brick structure of hexagonal form with the internal walls covered in hydraulic mortar, reinforcing the interpretation of the religious use of the building, has been interpreted as a baptismal pool of the hypothetical annexed baptistery. (5) Silchester (*Calleva Atrebatum*): In May 1992 the remains of a small edifice with a rectangular central area, side rooms, narthex and small eastern apse (4th c., used also in the 5th) were discovered in a small *insula* to the south of the central forum. At the eastern end are the squalid foundations of a possible baptistery. (6) St. Albans (*Verulamium*): In the southern part of the city, a building has been discovered that is oriented east-by-northeast–west-by-southwest, with rooms along the side and quadrangular extensions at both ends.

Suburban cemeterial churches: (1) Canterbury: Bede (*HE* I, 26) notes that in 597 Bertha, Christian queen of Kent of Frankish origin, had the habit of praying in a church *prope ipsam civitatem ad orientem*. This was probably the basilica known until the Middle Ages as "St. Martin." Otherwise, it would have been the church of St. *Pancras, today in the foundations of the abbey of St. Augustine, with a vast late Roman burial *cemetery on the southwest side. (2) Colchester: Of the three sites which might be hypothesized here as suburban churches, two, to the south of the city, are connected with cemeteries and near Roman roads. (3) Icklingham, Suffolk: A building with solid evidence for being considered a church with attached funeral areas and perhaps a baptistery constitutes an aspect of a Roman settlement whose status remains unclear. Probable date: end of the 4th c. (4) London: The presumable Christian presence in the capital of Roman Britain is indicated by certain suburban churches, known for being built directly on Roman buildings. St.

Bede's in Fleet Street and St. Andrew's at Holborn can be mentioned among those associated with Roman cemeteries. (5) St. Albans: The date of the martyrdom of St. *Alban being uncertain, the probable identification of the locale and the martyrium visited by *Germanus and *Lupus in 429, like the later church to which Bede alludes (*HE* I, 7), remains the slope of the hill occupied by the present abbey, where the tombs discovered from time to time could belong either to a burial cemetery or to an area which had developed around the martyrium and the tomb of St. Alban. We have here the most certain evidence from Roman Britain for a continuity of worship.

Private churches: (1) Lullingstone, Kent: In the center of a vast and rich country villa, whose owners became Christians in the 2nd half of the 4th c., a group of rooms on the ground floor were adapted for worship. This consisted of a portico, an external room with mural paintings of Christograms and a rectangular room with similar paintings on two walls; on the short wall to the west was a frieze painted with human figures, similar to **orantes*. At the beginnings of the 5th c., a fire put an end to the building. (2) Frampton and Hinton St. Mary, Dorset: Various late Roman villas of southern Britain contain mosaics which presumably belonged to Christian owners. The mosaics of Frampton and Hinton St. Mary are on the floors of connecting rooms and have Christian themes combined with pagan subjects. These mosaics, together with the high level of the decoration of Lullingstone, appear in contrast with the sparse decoration of the Roman British churches identified at Silchester and Lincoln, so that Frampton and Hinton St. Mary could represent atypical rooms within the villa, sometimes used for Christian worship. (3) No private urban churches have been identified in Britain. Certain scholars have proposed one at Caerwent and one at Colchester, without any proof.

2. Irish churches. The ancient Irish churches were made of wood and therefore have not survived: the description given by *Cogitosus of the Church of Kildare (7th c.) is the best source of information about them (PL 72, 788D-789). The Church of Kildare, in wood, hung with draperies and decorated with pictures, seems to have been much larger than the oldest stone churches known to us, given that the *monastery hosted a bishop with a school of clerics and an abbess with her virgins and widows, not to mention, presumably, those attached to the monastery, since Cogitosus speaks of a layman attached to the church.

The surviving stone churches are very simple, especially the oldest ones, but they do not seem to be older than the 9th c.: in fact, the first example is at Kells, if Columcille's House is the church which the annals say was completed in 814. The simplicity of the architecture, however, is notable in itself, given that the Irish certainly knew the plans of Continental churches. *Adamnan, in his small, dark building on Iona, probably passed in review some plans and certainly described a certain number of Eastern *basilicae* (*Adamnan's De locis sanctis*, ed. D. Meehan, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae, III, Dublin 1958). Despite this, the architecture of the Irish churches offers no signs of the influence of foreign models.

3. Irish monasteries and hermitages. (1) Nendrum: The ancient monasteries are well-known, especially in remote and often panoramic locales, but a convincing date that goes back to the 6th or 7th c. can be given for none of them. Two, however, have yielded ceramic which may indicate a use of the site in the 7th c. One of these, Nendrum, was a three-walled circular enclosure, and the other, Armagh, was an enclosure before being employed for cultural use. At Nendrum the existence of a stone church with a round tower demonstrates that the monastery had a long history, which the excavations have not clarified. It seems probable, however, that the cells of the monks were in the form of circular buildings of dry-wall stone probably with beehive roofs. The presence of crucibles and of a stone mold among the other objects found here shows the importance of artistic metalwork to make *chalices, reliquaries and *book covers.

(2) Church Island, Valencia: The rocky island of Church Island, Valencia, County Kerry, gives an interesting parallel to the layout of Ardwall Island. On Church Island a primitive oratory made of wood with tombs was replaced with a larger edifice in stone, also with burials. But the central characteristic element of the island was a circular house made of stone at a diameter of just 5 m, which presumably could at the most house a *hermit and two or three disciples. Later a rectangular building was built on the extreme edge of the island, which seems to have been a house for guests rather than a building for the community. A sepulcher with aligned flagstones, with an inscribed cross, closely resembles the description by Bede of the hermitage of St. *Cuthbert at Farne Island.

(3) Clonard: Nothing seems to survive today of the church or the cells of Clonard, which between monks, students and pupils contained about a thousand people.

(4) Skellig Michael: When the number of monks in a monastery grew, rather than build a larger

church it seems that they preferred to multiply the number of little churches within the wall. In many places these were certainly not of stone, but of oak, covered in reeds in the Irish manner (Bede, *HE* III, 25), and none of them has reached us, nor have excavations revealed much about them. On the islands far from the western coast, nonetheless, where many of the first seekers after solitude founded their monasteries, wood and reed covering were not easy to obtain, and the buildings were in stone. Eight miles beyond the promontories of southwestern Ireland, the Great Skellig, a pyramid of naked rock, culminates in a peak over 200 m above the Atlantic. Near the highest peak, the body of an ancient monastery, that of Scelig Mhichíl (or Skellig Michael), nestles on a rock terrace next to a 150-m precipice. The most ancient buildings consist of six rectangular beehive cells and two little oratories. The monastery was dedicated to St. *Michael the Archangel and existed at the beginning of the 9th c.

(5) Inishmurray and other sites: On the island of Inishmurray, off the coast of Sligo, the ruins of a massive perimeter wall remain, within which are the remains and traces of beehive cells and of many small churchs in stone. In the Midlands there are remains of great earthen embankments, which once marked the more or less circular boundary walls of various monastic institutions: Inchleraun, Durrow, Moyne (County Mayo) and Seir Kieran, Clonmacnoise, County Offaly, founded near the Shannon in 544, and Armagh, where St. *Patrick set up his principal church, developed into a monastic city, with a large population and renowned centers for teaching and craftsmanship. Glendalough in Wicklow Hills was founded by St. Kevin in the 6th c. Through the fame of his sanctity, after his death the place became a center for *pilgrimage and the monastery one of the principal ecclesiastical centers of the region. The Irish monasteries of the 6th and 7th c., however, were not very imposing to look at: a circular boundary wall, within which were some rectangular wooden buildings covered in reeds or of wooden tiles, and a group of round cabins of woven reeds with perhaps an imposing and rude slab of wood or stone at the gate of the church as the central and distinctive sign of the monastery, even without the tomb of a founder to justify it.

4. Dalriada, kingdom of the Scots. A tradition records that, in the 5th c., the three sons of Erc—Fergus, Loarn and Angus—set sail with 150 men from Dál Riata, a district of County Antrim, in northern Ireland, to invade the north of *Scotland. Whatever the historic truth may be, a limited migration of *Scotti* (Irish) certainly took place, and the kingdom of Dalriada, Irish in speech, was established along the Argyll coast and its islands. Its most important fortress was Dunadd, which was occupied from the 5th to the 9th c.

Columcilla, or *Columba, arrived at Dalriada with his companions in 536 to support his own faith and those of the accompanying *Scotti* through the foundation of a monastery at Iona, a tiny island beyond the southwestern point of Mull. Other Irish monks founded monasteries further up the western coast and in the northern isles, which in turn served as a support for the Atlantic voyages of their followers. An important evangelization effort was undertaken from Iona among the Picts, and it was from Iona that *Aidan went to establish in 634–635 the monastery of Lindisfarne (another islet off the coast of Northumbria), after the return to power of the Northumbrian king Oswald, who had been in exile among the Scots of Dalriada. Both Lindisfarne and Iona would later succumb to the attacks of the Vikings, and at the beginning of the 9th c. the majority of the monks of Iona took refuge at Kells in Ireland, while others went east to Dunkeld. Little is known of the monastery of St. Columba at Iona, although it has been suggested that the foundation stone of a cabin on the rock which surfaced at Torr Abb, in front of the current abbey, is that of St. Columba himself. Besides the proof of Christianity given by the class II tile-crosses of the Picts, little is known of the ancient church of the Picts. It is certain that elements from Northumbria are found in the art of the Picts, and this might be the context in which the Book of Kells was conceived and executed among this group.

5. Northern Britons. The British kingdom which had developed to the south of Forth and Clyde in the late Roman period fell under the Anglo-Saxons of Northumbria before or during the 7th c., with the exception of Strathclyde. Little is known of the archaeology of the 5th-6th c. in Lothians and the Borders.

A small number of tombstones from the 5th-6th c., but of Roman tradition, with Latin inscriptions and simple crosses or Christograms, are found scattered between southern Scotland and northern England. One of these stones at Whithorn, near Wigtown, raised by *Borrovadus* for Latinus and his young daughter, dated to the 5th c., was found in the cemetery next to a small oratory of stone whose walls have traces of white plaster. It might well be the *Candida Casa,* the "White House" which gave its name to Whithorn. It is traditionally said that the chapel was built by St. *Ninian, who was bishop here

for a certain time at the beginning of the 5th c. Heading from Whithorn along the coast to the east, to Ardwall Island, part of a small monastic settlement from the 6th-8th c., which is similiar to that of the Irish monks, has been excavated.

A site in Ireland, of considerable importance for having offered elements which can be dated, based on carbon 14, to around 660, is Carnsore, County Wexford. The site of Ardwall Island, like that of Church Island, began as a rural cemetery, and its position in the area of Whithorn suggests that it was in use during the 6th c. or at most in the last part of the 5th c.

6. Wales and Ireland. The archaeological finds of Wales are extremely limited, aside from a large group of ancient Christian commemorative stones and some settlements. Traces have been found of a possible chapel made of wood, as at Ardwall and Church Islands, on the island of Burry Holms, at the N end of the Gower peninsula, in S Wales. Here, under a small and ancient stone church, which was itself enlarged in the 11th and 12th c., appear four successive cavities, indicating a more ancient chapel in wood, on a different axis. The site has an oval boundary wall, and there seem to have been burials there at different periods. The contemporary Irish settlement of Wales could have begun during the 4th c. but was certainly in existence during the 5th c. Around fifty inscriptions in the *ogham* dialect, known from Wales, represent the principal archaeological testimony of the presence of an Irish settlement, together with the stones which offer commemorative Latin inscriptions of people with typically Irish names; in some of these the inscriptions are arranged vertically in the manner of the *ogham* writing.

A commemorative stone of Aberdaron in Gwynedd reads: “Senacus, priest: he lies here with a multitude of brethren,” which attests to the presence of a monastery. Commemorative stones and documentary notices are therefore the only witnesses for the location of the ancient churches in Wales, such as Llantwit Major on the south coast, or the great monastic center of Bangor. Very little is known of pre-Norman monasteries and chapels in Wales, and there are no ruins on the terrain.

7. Southwestern Britain. During the late Roman period in southwestern Britain, the kingdom of Dumnonia appeared, which included Cornwall, Devon and Somerset, but which gradually shrank between the 6th c. and the beginning of the 10th c., under the pressure of the Anglo-Saxon expansion toward the west.

On the eastern borders of Dumnonia are two hill forts from the Iron Age, of larger size than any other fortification in use in the post-Roman period. Both are called Cadbury, one situated near Congresbury, the other, Cadbury Castle, near South Cadbury. Both have provided material, including imported Mediterranean ceramic, which reveals a new occupation in the 5th-6th c. Cadbury Castle is notable not just for its exaggerated dimensions but also because its bastions, with a circumference of 1095 m, were entirely refortified in this period. The identity of the financier of this massive work is unknown, but one could reasonably hypothesize that no one is more apt than Arthur. In southwestern England, Christianity survived the departure of the Romans untouched by the Anglo-Saxon *paganism, and here would be the bridgehead of monasticism coming from the Continent. It has been maintained that Tintagel, in Cornwall, is the oldest known British monastery (end of the 5th c.), but the hypothesis has been challenged in recent decades. The same debate concerns the ancient occupation of the ridge of Glastonbury Tor (worldly or monastic settlement?), while excavations in the abbey of Glastonbury have revealed traces of structures which would later become an Anglo-Saxon monastery of exceptional importance. A little group of commemorative stones of eastern Cornwall and western Devon suggest an Irish settlement in Dumnonia: some of these have Irish *ogham* inscriptions, and others commemorate, in Roman script, people with Irish names.

8. Anglo-Saxon churches. Christianity was not unknown in England before the arrival of *Augustine. In the North and West a *Celtic church was active, founded when the Romans were still governing the region. Missionaries of this church traveled from Scotland and Ireland toward the Continent, apparently abandoning the Saxon invaders to their gods and beliefs, even if they joined in the general process of conversion, when the mission of Augustine gained ground and culminated in the conversion of King Edwin of Northumbria in 626.

Little has survived of the pre-Augustinian Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England: from churches or remains of churches used in the period between the departure of the Romans and the mission of Augustine there remains that of St. Martin at Canterbury, where a part of the choir might have belonged to the old church which queen Bertha had used before the arrival of Augustine. One of the principal sites of the conversion has been discovered by the excavations at Yeavering, Northumberland. It was the seat of one of the palaces of the convert of Paulinus, King Edwin of Northumbria. Buildings have been found on the site which can be interpreted

as churches, while one of these could have been a pagan temple later adapted to Christian worship. The churches built in Kent and in Essex after the arrival of the Augustinian mission in 597 constitute an easily recognizable group: they are built in stone, according to the Roman tradition, and possess common characteristics. A triple arch separated the short rectangular nave from the apse, flanked to the north and south by rooms or porticos which connected through narrow doors with the main body of the church, whose angles were reinforced with robust buttresses. The constructions were in wood, stone, brick or involved two or three of these materials. Even if we know from literary sources the existence of churches in wood (e.g., Lindisfarne, Glastonbury and Chester-le-Street), today a single wooden church from the Anglo-Saxon period remains, that of the 9th c. at Greensted in Essex. Traces of wooden churches have been found at North Elmhan, Norfolk; Pottern, Wiltshire; Rivenhall, Essex; St. Mary (formerly St. Bertelin), Stafford; St. Michael, Thetford; Wharram Percy, Yorkshire; and probably at Yeavering.

A certain number of churches, either complete or preserved only partially, can be dated with sound arguments, such as that of Sts. *Peter and *Paul at Canterbury, begun during the life of Augustine and completed shortly after his death (604–609); part of the present-day church of Monkwearmouth, consecrated in 674; and perhaps certain elements surviving in the twin church in Jarrow (684).

9. Anglo-Saxon monasteries. From the literary sources it is known that hermitages of Celtic type were found in Northumbria (e.g., the residence of *Cuthbert and Inner Farne), but the only probable location of a hermitage is Burgh Castle, Suffolk, organized some years after 630 by an Irish monk named Fursa. A cemetery was found there in 1960, and several cabins were attached, perhaps monastic cells. In the Anglo-Saxon period there were a variety of monastic buildings there. Only with the monastic renaissance of the 10th c. did the claustral order become normative. Among the Anglo-Saxon monasteries, Tynemouth, Whitby, Hartlepool, Glastonbury, the Old Minster at Winchester and the Monastery of St. Augustine at Canterbury have left some rather insignificant information on accessory buildings. But in the two monasteries of Bede, at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, buildings have been discovered regularly aligned with the church. Associated with these stone buildings were less-solid cabins, one of which, at Jarrow, was almost certainly used as a workshop. Archaeological digs in the central nucleus of the two sites have certified that in 716 more than 600 people were in the two monastic houses, and not all could be housed in the buildings thus far brought to light; but these were rich and famous places.

II. Manuscripts.

1. The "Cathach" of St. Columba. This is the most ancient Irish manuscript, written probably in Ireland in the first part of the 7th c. (It cannot be much later than the death of the saint, in ca. 597.) The importance of the "Cathach" is that it shows the degree of decoration of manuscripts before close links were developed with the continent and before the development of the scriptoriums of Northumbria.

2. The Evangeliarium of St. Augustine. Augustine disembarked in Kent in 597. He and his companions brought books with them, and other books were sent from Rome with those who, like St. *Paulinus, came in the following years. One of these, believed to belong to St. Augustine and preserved as a *relic at Canterbury in the Middle Ages, an illuminated copy of the four gospels, is still preserved at Corpus Christi College of Cambridge.

3. The Book of Durrow. Dated around 675, the Book of Durrow is the first manuscript decorated in an elaborate way; but the writing, the rigor of the ornamentation and some other details show its adherence to a tradition already elaborated by the Irish scribes. Preserved for a long time in the Monastery of St. Columba at Durrow, County Offaly, it was written in Northumbria.

4. The Codex Amiatinus. We have a small group of manuscripts of which the most important, aside from the Lindisfarne Gospels, are the Codex Amiatinus and the Evangeliarium of Echternach, produced around 700 in the insular tradition of the Book of Durrow. The Codex Amiatinus, preserved at Florence, was one of the three copies of the gospels executed on the order of Ceolfrith (d. 716), first abbot of Jarrow, and was modeled on one of those brought from *Italy by *Benedict Biscop. Entirely Italianate in the characters and the ornamentation, the text is written in insular uncial "capitals," which is found only in the group of manuscripts from Wearmouth-Jarrow. The model for the Amiatinus was the Codex Grandior, one of the Bibles copied in Italy in the *Vivarium of *Cassiodorus in Calabria, preceded by a portrait of Esdra, which was used as a model for a portrait of an evangelist in the Codex Amiatinus.

5. Lindisfarne Gospels. Written in Latin around 698, in the monastery of Lindisfarne, situated on Holy Island, close to the coast of Northumberland, this is one of the greatest masterpieces of miniature. It is probably connected with the translation of St.

*Cuthbert (d. 687), which took place 20 March 697. The Latin text of the gospels is that of the Vulgate of St. *Jerome: the exemplar almost certainly was a book of the gospels brought to the monastery of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow from southern Italy. The texts of the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Codex Amiatinus and the Gospel of John of Stonyhurst form together one of the most important sources for the ancient form of the text of the Vulgate. The decoration consists of a series of illuminated pages and of other less decorated capitals. There are no manuscripts of the 7th-8th c. of certain Irish extraction which can equal the exceptional virtuosity of the great manuscripts of Northumbria, among which the Lindisfarne Gospels are the best documented and also the most complete.

6. *The Book of Kells.* This is the richest in decoration of all the insular books, and the initial pages reach the highest point of a development which began with the humble initials of the "Cathach" of St. Columba. Beyond the intrinsic quality and the amplitude of the ornamentation, the Book of Kells distinguishes itself from the other insular evangeliariums by the use of an organic decorative plan, by the miniatures inserted in the text and by the use of the so-called Beast Canon Tables: characteristics which could indicate just as much a totally new model (or more models) used by the artists of Kells, as an intermediate development (as yet unknown) in the insular miniature between the beginning and the middle of the 8th c. As for the date, it should probably be placed between the St. Petersburg Bede of 746 and the Evangeliarium Mac Regol of 822; but Northumbria, Pictland and Iona, just like Ireland, have been suggested recently as possible places of production. It is certain, however, that the manuscript was at Kells at the beginning of the 9th c.: it was probably written at Iona and transferred to Kells when Iona was sacked by Vikings in 806.

III. Sculpture and carving.

1. *The Reculver cross.* The most expert school of Anglo-Saxon sculpture in the 7th-8th c. seems to have been that of Northumbria. Traces of Anglo-Saxon sculpture in northern England belonging to the most ancient period are apparently rare: the only example of great importance is the Reculver cross (7th c.). With a round shaft built out of drums, there are five fragments, very worn but finely sculpted and decorated with images, foilage wreaths and ornamental motifs: among the sculpted figures the representations of the *ascension and of the *apostles. When complete it was 4.19 m high, including the base. As for the date, it seems older than the Saxon church of Reculver, founded in 669 by King *Egbert; it is nevertheless a unique sculpture, perhaps from the time of Theodore (archbishop of Canterbury, 668–690) or perhaps from the time of *Augustine himself. When it arrived in the church of Reculver, the cross was placed in front of the balustrade of the presbytery: a position which has no parallels, either in England or the Continent.

2. *Breedon-on-the-Hill.* Evidence of decorated churches for the most ancient period is rare: the panels were sometimes inserted in a wall, sometimes alone, sometimes as part of a decorative scheme. The best examples are at Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire, where a *monastery dating to ca. 700 (Bede, *HE* V, 23) preserves thirty fragmentary sculptures in styles different from any other product of continental Europe (probably historically datable to the 8th c.). The sculpture consists principally of friezes, around 20 cm (8 in) high, for a total length which exceeds 18 m (59 ft), with geometrical motifs, phytomorphs, zoomorphs and human figures. Fragments coming from other parts of Mercia have led to the hypothesis of Peterborough as the center of this school of sculpture. Beyond the friezes there are single panels, one of which, 61 cm (24 in) high, contains a figure of Christ which recalls the Book of Cerne, also painted in Mercia around 820, while another panel, ca. 90 cm (35.4 in) high, shows an angel stylistically connected with the best Carolingian sculpture.

3. *The crosses of Ruthwell and of Bewcastle.* The double monastery of *Bede at Monkwearmouth (consecrated in 674) and at Jarrow (consecrated in 684) was founded by *Benedict Biscop, who sent for artists from the Continent and reintroduced to Britain the arts of masonry and stoneworking. Around 2,000 fragments of Anglo-Saxon sculpture are known in England and in southern Scotland: a large part of these are crosses or tombstones. The large stone cross, around 5 m (16.4 ft) high, which we find especially in the north of England, must have been used to indicate spots for preaching, funeral monuments and meeting points. The cross, 5.5 m (18 ft) high, in red sandstone, of Ruthwell (Dumfriesshire) should be put into the same chronological context, around 700, as the Lindisfarne Gospels. The four arms of the cross originally bore portraits of the *evangelists (only two remain); below the summit of the cross, different Christian scenes; on the sides of the shaft, decorations of animals and birds and a translation in runic characters of one of the most beautiful Anglo-Saxon poems, *The Dream of the Rood*. The cross of Bewcastle in Cumbria, which is 20 km (12.4 mi) to the east of the cross of Ruthwell,

has lost its top portion. The shaft remains are of gray sandstone, 4.42 m (14.5 ft) high on a pedestal, decorated with sacred figures, in particular St. John on the western side. The most ancient Ibernico-Saxon sculpture in Northumbria should be considered as a direct reflection of monastic culture, and therefore the crosses of Ruthwell and Bewcastle seem to reflect the public worship of a monastic community together with the devotional themes based on written texts such as *The Dream of the Rood*. It is possible to hypothesize close contacts with *Rome for many centers in Northumbria, on the basis of the life of St. *Wilfrid (643–709), closely connected with the churches of Ripon and York. St. Wilfrid stands out as a cosmopolitan ecclesiastic, an important missionary invested with authority at the hands of the pope; he was responsible for the vigorous substitution of the Roman* liturgy for the *Celtic uses in northern England and Benedictine monasticism for Celtic monasticism.

4. The crosses of Ahenny. One of the most noteworthy phenomena of Irish art of this period is the application of refined schemes of gold-working and bronze-working to sandstone sculptures. In Ahenny, County Tipperary, two large crosses survive which show the characteristics of metalworking. They rise on massive pyramidal bases, have shafts and arms with oblong cross section, and an ample and massive open ring at the intersection of shaft and transverse arm. No crucifixion is painted, nor are there sculpted figures: on the base, however, animals and plants are seen, a hunting scene, the funeral of a decapitated man and groups of ecclesiastics. The practice of raising monumental crosses in correspondence with monastic settlements was an insular peculiarity of the time, and the monuments of Ahenny are the most ancient true monumental crosses in Ireland. Their form derives from the crosses in wood covered in metal of northern England and southern Scotland.

5. The cross-slab of Aberlemno. Scotland (north and east of Northumbria [Angles], Dalriada [Scots-Irish] and Strathclyde [Britons]) was governed by the Picts, until the Norwegian incursions and settlements of the 9th c., which followed the weakening and substitution of the Pictish sovereigns and their supporters at the hands of the Scots in 843. Toward 400, St. *Ninian, from his Celtic monastery of Whithorn, evangelized the southern Picts, and so the land of the Picts was gradually absorbed into the sphere of the Celtic church until the Pictish nation, in 710 (Bede, *HE* V, 21), adopted the orthodox Roman form of organization, discipline and liturgy. The symbolic stones constituted for a long time the only significant indication for identifying Pictish artwork. Their origin was in a *pagan context, but not necessarily earlier in any event to the 7th c.: they are unhewn boulders and slabs carved with a series of symbols uniformly stylized: animals and a group of abstract symbols. The stones might have been commemorative, and the symbols could describe death. The symbols, if pagan and religious, must be considered as necessarily older than the end of the 7th c. Examples: the Glamis stone (at Glamis, Angus) and stone 5 of Meigle (Penthshire), both of which bear Pictish symbols, while on the other side a cross sculpted in relief has been added. On both of these stones the cross is a secondary addition. The successive class (class II) of Pictish sculpture, however, bears the cross in relief as its principal characteristic while the symbols play a secondary role. The cross-slab in sandstone in the cemetery of Aberlemno, Angus, 2.29 m high, belongs to the Ibernico-Saxon style of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The reverse shows a group of sculptures similar to those which are found on the side of the Glamis Manse cross-slab.

*6. The *sarcophagus of St. Andrews.* While the cross-slab of Aberlemno could be considered in relationship with the Lindisfarne Gospels, the sculpted figures of Sts. *Anthony and *Paul, at the top of the cross-slab of Nigg (2.36 m high: cemetery of Nigg, Ross-shire) can be linked with the figures of the Book of Kells. The sculpture of David on the reverse of the slab is important despite being mutilated, because it is related to a group of monuments, including the sarcophagus of St. Andrews (St. Andrews, Fife: length 1.75 m). The sarcophagus depicts David among animals at the center of the front and displays a cruciform decoration on the end panels. The animals are represented in the form of serpents solidly interlaced, like the roughly contemporaneous animals sculpted on the cross of Rothbury in Northumbria, generally considered to date to ca. 800. The iconographic analogies suggest assigning the work to Northumbria and make the sarcophagus of St. Andrews a masterpiece of European art, beyond a contribution of the Picts to the Carolingian renaissance.

7. The casket of Frank. Two examples of carving in Northumbria, the casket of Frank and the coffin of St. Cuthbert, form a special case, apart from the art of monument sculpture. The first is a casket in whalebone, carved on four sides and on the cover with scenes taken from pagan and classical legends, from Roman history and from Christian tradition. Executed in the 8th c., perhaps for a high-ranking patron, it bears on each side one or more inscriptions in Old English, inscribed in Anglo-Saxon-style runes. On the rear panel, part of the inscription is in

Latin, carved in a mix of runic and Latin letters. The carving of the figures of the Ruthwell cross and of the sculptures on the chest of St. Cuthbert, far from the slightly barbarizing classicism of the portraits of the evangelists at Lindisfarne, could have arrived in France via a pilgrim, given that it formerly belonged to the Church of St. Julien de Brioude, one of the ancient Christian centers of the Auvergne.

8. The coffin of St. Cuthbert. The coffin of St. Cuthbert, the *levis theca* (Bede, *Vita Cuthberti*, ch. 42) in which the saint was placed in 698, is the only sculpted wooden object of any importance surviving from Anglo-Saxon England. It is a coffin made of oak, 1.98 m long, with a double cover. On the external cover a figure of Christ is carved with symbols of the evangelists at the four corners; at the narrower end of the coffin are the archangels Michael and Gabriel, and at the wider end a representation of the Virgin with child. On one of the long sides the twelve *apostles are arranged in two rows, each with his own name; on the other long side are another five archangels, among whom Raphael and Uriel appear. The artist who decorated the reliquary-coffin combined two different sources, a literary and a figurative one. It is not possible to trace all the iconography of the coffin to a single source. A greater unity is clear in the liturgical program than in the iconography, but this is the result of a peculiar artistic interpretation: in fact, however, prayer and art seem to be fused here in a profound unity. A litany is a means for invoking the aid and protection of the saints; the litanies were cited on the biers containing their relics, which became bier-reliquaries, precisely to ensure this kind of protection. The representation of the celestial custodians on the bier of St. Cuthbert was not therefore a simple decoration or a pure recitation of prayers, but the creation, by the monks of Lindisfarne, of an immanent and perpetual fulfillment of this protection.

IV. Metalwork.

1. The Walesby pool. In Britain eighteen fragmentary lead basins, all from the 4th c. and likely used in baptismal ceremonies, have been found with some Christian symbols. One fragment, found at Risby Manor, Walesby, near Market Rasen, Lincolnshire (the full basin measured ca. 1 m [3.3 ft] in diameter and 50 cm [20 in] in depth) offers a scene probably distributed on three horizontal panels separated by four columns. The right panel shows three standing masculine figures, in mantel and tunic, a scene probably repeated in the lost left panel. The central panel represents a naked woman between two other richly veiled and draped women. The columns probably mark the inside of the baptistery. According to the most convincing interpretation, the central panel shows a *baptism in progress and the point of view is that of the officiating cleric or bishop, who is quite close to the font, in front of the candidate, who is receiving baptism within the basin, accompanied by the godmothers. There was scanty knowledge of leaden pools until the excavations of 1974 at Icklingham, Suffolk, where four were found, and the site was revealed to be a Christian cemetery, used roughly between 350 and 400–420, with two important structures: a small Christian church and a baptismal pool.

2. The Mildenhall treasure. The importance of Icklingham as a *Roman Christian center was made even more evident by its proximity to the ancient hoard of silver treasure found by accident at Mildenhall, Suffolk (only 8 km [5 mi] away), in 1942. There were more than thirty pieces of silverwork. The biggest plate (diameter 60 cm [24 in], weighing more than 8 kg [17.6 lb]) is the most beautiful object surviving from Roman Britain. The style dates it to the 4th c., and together with the other objects it must have been hidden around 360. Among the spoons, five have Christian inscriptions: one with *Papittedo vivas,* another with *Pascentia vivas,* and three with the Christogram between alpha and omega. The biggest plate and two of the large plates bear Dionysiac scenes, which should be interpreted in a Christian sense, as also the marine symbolism of the ocean in the center of the biggest plate.

3. The Traprain Law treasure. This mass of silver, deliberately broken into fragments, except for a spoon and a small triangular cup, came to light during excavations in 1919 within a natural fortified hilltop beyond the imperial frontier, 32 km (20 mi) E of modern Edinburgh. It weighed more than 24 kg (53 lb) and included pieces belonging to more than 150 different objects. The treasure was buried at the end of the 5th c. Many of the objects are silver plates, but Christian pieces are not absent, perhaps the remains of a cross, and objects coming from a woman's dressing room and from the clothing of an official. A gilded silver flask is decorated with four scenes from the OT and the NT: *Adam and Eve, the adoration of the three kings, *Moses who strikes the rock, and a fourth, identified as the betrayal of *Judas or an episode in the life of Moses, perhaps the miracle of the quails in the desert. A second flask has the Christogram, *alpha and omega, and an inscription. A small colander bears a bowl perforated in the shape of the *chi-rho*, with other holes under the edge which make the words *Iesus Christus.* Two of the spoons have the Christogram in the bowl, another on the handle.

4. *The Water Newton treasure.* This is a silver treasure hoard which is Christian in a particular sense, because it was perhaps property of a church or of a Christian community. Found in 1975 at Durobrivae near Peterborough, Huntingdonshire, the treasure includes about thirty objects, on fifteen of which the Christogram appears, while two vases and a triangular plaque bear long Latin inscriptions related to the Christian liturgy. The group belongs to the 4th c. Its importance consists in the fact that it might be one of the most ancient collections of silver church plates in the entire Roman Empire.

5. *The Sutton Hoo ship burial.* Redwald, king of East Anglia, died in 624–625 and was buried with a great treasure in a ship at Sutton Hoo, Suffolk, covered with earth. Despite the pagan system of burial, there are indications here that he was Christian. The inscription "Saul" and "Paul" on two *Byzantine silver spoons indicate the baptism of the royal convert. A group of ten silver cups with cruciform ornaments, of probable Christian significance, was placed next to the spoons in the burial deposit and closed in a sheath also decorated with Christian motifs in the form of the cross. The most notable Christian object of the group was the great golden buckle (length 13 cm [5.1 in], weight 414 g [14.6 oz]). The buckle was not functional but is an empty cavity; the rear plate is joined to a hook. Doubtless made in England, its function was to contain Christian sacred *relics: a reliquary therefore made for a king by an English artist according to the design of *Frankish buckles.

6. *The pectoral cross of St. Cuthbert.* St. Cuthbert died in 687 in his hermitage on Farne Island. In his tomb, in Durham cathedral, five objects approximately contemporaneous with St. Cuthbert were found: the pectoral cross of the saint, a portable altar, a comb, a gospel book and the wooden coffin. The pectoral cross (length 6 cm [2.4 in]), made of gold and decorated with garnets in settings with a circular garnet at the center and a ring-loop, is hollow and perhaps contained a relic. Other crosses made with this technique are known from Wilton and Ixworth, and a small hanging cross, made of gold with a central garnet, appears in the necklace of Desborough. Considered as a group, these objects show that there was no immediate change in the art of gold-working with the arrival of Christianity: slight differences in style in the cross of St. Cuthbert suggest nonetheless that it is a product of Saxon craftsmanship in the north of England, destined for the court environment and for the church of Northumbria in the 7th c.

7. *The chalice of Ardagh.* The *chalice (height 15 cm [5.9 in]), the most important liturgical object found in 1868 near Ardagh, County Limerick, in Ireland, is made of silver, bronze and gold, with glass and rock crystal insets. It is part of one of the richest groups of ancient Christian objects found in Ireland: a silver chalice, a chalice in bronze and four decorative pins. The treasure hoard must have been the property of a rich monastery. Only partially decorated, on the main body it shows friezes, braids and geometrical and zoomorphic traceries; in the lower part, in contrast, rings of applied filigree and a rock crystal located in the center. Under the horizontal line of golden filigree on the cup the names of the apostles stick out in relief on a clear background in a strip incised with points. The writing is in the elegant characters of the Lindisfarne Gospels. On that basis, the Ardagh chalice is dated around 700, a little after the Lindisfarne Gospels and before the Book of Kells.

8. *The Derrynavlan group.* The group, found in 1980 at Derrynavlan, County Tipperary, a monastic settlement founded by St. Ruadhan of Lorrha in the 6th c., which flourished in the 8th and 9th c., is another of the richest groups of precious Christian objects found in Ireland. It consists of a silver chalice, a silver paten, a circular support for the paten, a gilded bronze strainer and a bronze cup. The silver chalice (height 18 cm [7.1 in], diameter 17 cm [6.7 in]), very similar to the chalice of Ardagh but with differing proportions, is made up of three principal elements: a bowl with a simple projecting edge, a decorated stem and a high base or foot. Like the Ardagh chalice, it is decorated with a strip of filigreed panels just under the edge, separated by seven mountings of amber drops; on the handles, large shields decorated with amber and filigree; on the stem, golden decorations combined with filigreed panels; on the side under the base, geometrical and zoomorphic motifs. Different filigree techniques were used, datable to the early decades of the 800s. All the objects coming from Derrynavlan can be associated with liturgical service like that of the *mass recorded in the Missal of Stowe in the 8th c. (*see* *Celtic liturgy).

9. *The treasure of the island of St. Ninian.* The group, found in 1958 on the island of St. Ninian, Shetland Islands, includes twenty-eight pieces in decorated silver and a porpoise jaw closed in a larchwood box. The group, in provenance from a Pictish environment, was set aside toward the end of the 8th c., even if certain pieces could have been in use for some time. Stylistically the group's character suggests the asymbolic art of the Picts, and comparisons lead to a date subsequent to the Lindisfarne Gospels, perhaps toward the middle of the 8th c. It is debated whether this group should be attributed to a Celtic

church or not. In any case, it represents the profane section of a rich hoard, whose most ancient object, a silver cup designed for hanging, cannot be earlier than 700, while the most recent date no later than the last quarter of the 8th c. This collection must date back therefore to ca. 775.

10. The reliquary belt of Moylough. Found in 1943 at Moylough Townland, County Sligo, Ireland, the reliquary belt of Moylough is made of two bronze strips belonging to a leather belt which most likely belonged to a saint. Various texts mention relics of this kind preserved in the monasteries. The exterior bronze plate bears a series of mountings with yellow and red enameled decorations and panels of blue and white millefiori. There are no decorations with animal traceries and engravings, and therefore the belt reliquary is earlier than the chalice of Ardagh, perhaps around 700.

11. The reliquary of Monymusk. This is a box-shaped reliquary 10 cm (3.9 in) long, made of wood decorated with inserted bronze plates; the back side is covered with engraved silver and also decorated with medallions. The decorative details recall the finds from the island of St. Ninian and the decorations of the Lindisfarne Gospels. This reveals influences from Northumbria before the 8th c. in the Pictish region, to whose craftsmanship the work belongs. The reliquary of Monymusk, today at Edinburgh, seems never to have been lost. It is sometimes called "Brecbennoch of St. Columba." It is said to have been carried in the Battle of Bannockburn (1314), and it is mentioned in documents concerning land grants from the beginning of the 16th c.

12. The brooch of Hunterston. The brooch (diameter 10 cm [3.9 in]), found in Scotland around 1830, belongs to the pseudo-penannular decorated type of brooch. The brooch "of Tara" (which gave its name to the type) and the brooches of Westness, Dunbeath and Hunterston belong stylistically to the period of the Lindisfarne Gospels and beyond, to around the first quarter of the 8th c. The brooch of Hunterston is the most ancient remaining from the series, datable to shortly after 700, and since the conjunction between the extremities is decorated with a cross, in the lost prototype this element was almost certainly a reliquary. In fact this is an important piece of Hiberno-Saxon art and in general of Christian antiquity.

13. The treasure of Hoxne. In November of 1992, near the village of Hoxne in Suffolk, the largest and richest treasure hoard ever found in the entire island was uncovered by accident. It consists of 565 golden *solidi* (principally from Arcadius and Honorius), 60 *miliarenses,* 14,000 silver *siliquae* and more than 200 objects in gold and silver, on many of which signs of Christian belief appear. The hoard can be dated to between the middle of the 4th and the first decade of the 5th c.

G. Baldwin-Brown, *The Arts in Early England*, 6 vols., London 1903-1937; A. Mahr (ed.), *Christian Art in Ancient Ireland*, I, Dublin 1932; E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 12 parts, Oxford 1934-1971; T.D. Kendrick, *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900*, London 1938; J. Raftery (ed.), *Christian Art in Ancient Ireland*, II, Dublin 1941; E.H. Alton - P. Meyer - G.O. Simms, *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Cennanensis: Introduction and Facsimile*, 3 vols., Bern 1950-1951; R.B.K. Stevenson, *Pictish Art*, in F.T. Wainwright (ed.), *The Problem of the Picts*, Edinburgh 1955, 97-128; C.F. Battiscombe (ed.), *The Relics of St. Cuthbert*, Oxford 1956; T.D. Kendrick et al., *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis*, 2 vols.: I, facsimile, Bern 1956; II, Commentary, Bern 1960; R.B.K. Stevenson, *The Chronology and Relationship of Some Irish and Scottish Crosses*: Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland 86 (1956) 84-96; A. Grabar - C. Nordenfalk, *Early Medieval Painting from the Fourth to Eleventh Century* ("Book Illumination," ed. C. Nordenfalk), New York 1957; M. & L. De Paor, *Early Christian Ireland*, London 1958; E.A. Lowe, *English Uncial*, Oxford 1960; J.M.C. Toynbee, *Art in Roman Britain*, London 1962; Id., *Art in Britain under the Romans*, Oxford 1964; R.J. Cramp, *Early Northumbrian Sculpture*, Jarrow upon Tyne 1965; F. Henry, *Irish Art in the Early Christian Period to A.D. 800*, London 1965; H.M. & J. Taylor, *Anglo-Saxon Architecture*, Cambridge 1965; R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford, *The Reception by the Anglo-Saxon of Mediterranean Art Following Their Conversion from Ireland and Rome*: XIV Settimana di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1967; S.S. Frere, *Britannia: A History of Roman Britain*, London 1967; I. Henderson, *The Picts*, London 1967; M.W. Barley - R.P.C. Hanson (eds.), *Christianity in Roman Britain, 300–700*, Leicester 1968; T.J. Brown, *The Stonyhurst Gospel of St. John*, Oxford 1969; R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford, *The Art of the Codex Amiatinus*: Journal of the British Archaeological Association, 3rd series, 32 (1969) 1-25; D.J. Smith, *The Mosaic Pavements*, in A.L.F. Rivet (ed.), *The Roman Villa in Britain*, London 1969, 71-126; R.J. Cramp, *Decorated Window-Glass and Millefiori from Monkwearmouth*: Antiquaries Journal 50 (1970) 327-335; M. Swanton (ed.), *The Dream of the Rood*, Manchester 1970; R.B.K. Stevenson, *Sculpture in Scotland in the 6th-9th Centuries AD*, in V. Milojčić (ed.), *Kolloquium über Spätantike und Frühmittelalterliche Skulptur* 2, Mainz 1971, 65-74; T.J. Brown, *Northumbria and the Book of Kells*, in P. Clemoes (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon England*, I, 1972, 219-246; A. Small - C. Thomas - D.M. Wilson, *St. Ninian's Isle and Its Treasure*, Oxford 1973; R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford, *Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology*, London 1974; R.B.K. Stevenson, *The Hunterston Brooch and Its Significance*: Medieval Archaeology 18 (1974) 16-42; R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial*, 1: *Excavations, Background, the Ship, Dating and Inventory*; 2: *Arms, Armour and Regalia*, London 1975-1978; R.J. Cramp, *Window Glass from the Monastic Site of Jarrow*: Journal of Glass Studies 17 (1975) 88-96; D.M. Wilson (ed.), *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England*, London 1976; K. Hughes, *Early Christian Ireland*: *Introduction to the Sources*, Cambridge 1977; J.P.C. Kent - K.S. Painter, *Wealth of the Roman World, A.D. 300-700*, London 1977; K.S. Painter, *The Mildenhall Treasure*, London 1977; Id., *The Water Newton Early Christian Silver*, London 1977; J.J.G. Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts, Sixth to Ninth Century*; *A Survey of Manuscripts Illustrated in the British Isles*, I, London 1978; R.T. Farrel (ed.), *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England* (British Archaeological Re-

ports 46), Oxford 1978; D.M. Wilson, *The Art and Archaeology of Bedan Northumbria*, in ibid., 1-22; R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial: A Handbook*, London 1979; P. Brown, *The Book of Kells*, London 1980; H. Richardson, *Derrynavlan and Other Early Church Treasures*: Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland 110 (1980) 92-115; M. Ryan, *The Derrynavlan Hoard*: Ireland Today, Dublin (April 1980) 2-5; J. Backhouse, *The Lindisfarne Gospels*, London 1981; P. Salway, *Roman Britain*, Oxford 1981; A.C. Thomas, *Christianity in Roman Britain to A.D. 500*, London 1981; D.M. Wilson, *The Anglo-Saxons*, London [3]1981; R. Kozodoy, *The Reculver Cross*: Archaeologia 108 (1981); G.W. Meates, *The Roman Villa at Lullingstone, Kent*, I, Kent 1979; M. Redknap, *The Christian Celts*, Cardiff 1991; D. Watts, *Christians and Pagans in Roman Britain*, London-New York 1991; D.N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England*, Woodbridge 1992; L. Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands: A History of the Churches of the Celts, Their Origin, Their Development, Influence and Mutual Relations*, Dublin 1992; B. Lehane, *Early Celtic Christianity*, London 1994; C. Tedeschi, *Osservazioni sui formulari delle iscrizioni britanniche dal V all'VIII secolo*: RomBarb 13 (1994) 283-295; Ch. Thomas, *And Shall These Mute Stones Speak? Post-Roman Inscriptions in Western Britain*, Cardiff 1994; C.F. Mawer, *Evidence for Christianity in Roman Britain: The Small Finds* (BAR British Series 243), Oxford 1995; Th. Taylor, *The Celtic Christianity of Cornwall*, Felinfach 1995; C. Tedeschi, *Osservazioni sulla paleografia delle iscrizioni britanniche paleocristiane* (*V-VII sec.*): Scrittura e civiltà 19 (1995) 67-121; A.M. Luiselli Fadda - É. Ó Carragáin (eds.), *Le isole britanniche e Roma in età romanobarbarica*, Roma 1998; Ch. Thomas, *Christian Celts: Messages and Images*, Stroud 1998; D. Watts, *Religion in Late Roman Britain: Forces of Change*, London-New York 1998; K. Hylson-Smith, *Christianity in England from Roman Times to the Reformation. I. From Roman Times to 1066*, London 1999; Th.M. Charles-Edwards, *Early Christian Ireland*, Cambridge 2000; D. Edel, *The Celtic West and Europe: Studies in Celtic Literature and the Early Irish Church*, Dublin 2001; M. Ghilardi, Egregium Albanum fecunda Britannia profert. *Albano e i primi santi della Britannia romana*: RomBarb 17 (2002) 1-18; Id., *Le pitture della villa di Lullingstone. Quaranta anni dopo lo scavo: note per una rilettura*: RivAC 79 (2003) 289-312.

K.S. Painter - M. Ghilardi

BROTHER/SISTER The term *brother/sister* is used with multiple meanings in the Greco-Roman world: compatriot, friend, colleague, every man (especially in *Stoicism); furthermore, it assumes a religious meaning—as coreligionist—already in the Greek confraternities and in the mystery religions; later in the NT, especially in the Synoptics, the Acts of the Apostles and in the Pauline letters, it designates every member of the Christian community. The expression *brother/sister* expresses several ideas at the same time. First, it expresses the suppression of every differentiation of race, age, condition and sex. Second, it expresses the new bonds, stronger than those of blood, created by the spiritual unity of those who fulfill the will of God (see Mk 3:35). And third, it expresses the common *baptism, which renders the Christian, on the one hand, a child of the heavenly Father and, on the other, a brother/sister in the faith to every member of the Christian community, coheir of the same hope, ready to recognize in every person the image of God. The term continued in the first Christian writers to indicate the faithful (*Clement of Rome, **Didache*, the *Apologists; even Lucian, in *Mort. Peregr.* 13, makes use of it to indicate the Christians; *Justin in *Apol.* 1,65 writes that the neophyte is led to the "brethren"). At the same time, with baptism Christians have a more vivid awareness of the universal brotherhood (Ignatius, *Eph.* 10,3; Justin, *Dial.* 96,2; Aristides, *Apol.* 15,6; Clement Al., *Strom.* 7,14,85; Tertullian, *Apol.* 39,8). The term is deepened christologically: Christ, who has become our brother and the firstborn, leads us to God the Father and makes us participants in the fraternity of a new birth (Origen, *Orat.* 15,4; Athanasius, *Or. c. Arian* 2,62; Gregory of Nyssa, *Ref. conf. Eun.* 80-82; *Contra Eun.* 3,10,1). The *pagans, interpreting such terms viciously, accused the Christians of sexual promiscuity and incestuous unions, accusations amply refuted by the *Apologists (Athenagoras, *Leg.* 32,4-5; Theophilus Ant., *Ad Aut.* 3,13; Minucius, *Octav.* 9 and 31).

The use of the term is less frequent in the 3rd c. We find it again in Hippolytus's *Philosoph.* and in the Acts of Pionius. *Cyprian uses it in the *Letters* and at the beginning of the *De lapsis*. It appears in epitaphs until the 4th c. (DACL 5, 2580-2585). At the same time a progressive restriction of its application is visible: it is reserved to monks and the clergy. *Constantine uses it for the bishops (Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3,24). The bishops apply it to the clerics (Augustine, *De cat. rud.* 1), but also to the faithful, especially in preaching. Furthermore, some Fathers continue to use such terms without any restriction to indicate the brotherhood of all the Christians (Optatus, *C. Parmen.* 1,3-4; 4,2; Augustine, *En. Ps.* 48,8; 127,12; John Chrys., *In Hebr.* 25,3; *In Mt* 79 [80],1) and to indicate that all persons are equal before God (Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* V, 6,12; V, 15,2-3; Augustine, *Ep.* 23,1). The term is in use particularly among monks, nuns and between them (Basil, *Reg. brev.* 104; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 17; Jerome, *In Hier.* 4, praef.; Egeria, *Itiner.* 10,3). Brotherhood, based on the creation of every person in the image of God and reinforced in Christianity by baptism, is nevertheless also a task to be realized concretely in history.

DACL 5 (1923) 2578-2585; RAC 2, 631-640 (bibl.); Cath 4 (1956) 1568-1970; *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin [5]1958, 30-32; Lampe (1961) 29-30; DSp 5 (1964) 1141-1167; LTK[3] 2, 710-711.

A. Hamman - M. Maritano

BURGUNDIANS. A people of Scandinavian origin—the name of the Baltic island of Bornholm (Burgundarholm in the Middle Ages) is linked to them—settled in the 1st c. BC in the plains between the Oder and the Vistula. Around the mid-3rd c., during their migration south, the Burgundians clashed with the Gepidae and were then driven back by Emperor Probus and later by Emperor *Maximian. At the end of the century, however, we find them established in the region of the Main and allied with the *Romans against the Alamanni. In 406, after the *Vandals, Suebi, Alans and other barbarian peoples, they broke through the Rhine *limes* and settled in *Gaul, where they supported (411) the election of the Gallic nobleman *Jovinus as Roman emperor and, as *foederati,* obtained (413) from the Romans the concession of a territory on the left bank of the Rhine, centered at Worms. According to *Orosius the Burgundians converted to Catholicism during this period, but many scholars think it more likely that they converted to *Arianism. Following an attempted expansion into the province of Belgica, they were severely defeated (436–437) by *Aetius and the *Huns; Aetius, however, established them (443) in Sapaudia, the region around Geneva, as *hospites*. In 455, led by King Gundioc, they and the Gallo-Roman nobility supported the election of *Avitus as emperor, whom they then followed in the military campaign in *Spain against the Suebi. But then, at odds with Roman power over the deposition of Avitus and the election of Majorian, they occupied *Lyons, *Vienne and the surrounding regions: the provinces of Lugdunensis I and the Viennensis. After Majorian was killed, the Burgundians strengthened their position by supporting Ricimer; King Gundioc married one of Ricimer's sisters and was named *magister militum Galliarum,* an office conferred also on his successors. Gundioc's eldest son, Gundobad, the most important of the Burgundian kings, always maintained good relations with the Romans and was often their ally. The *lex Burgundiorum* was promulgated during his reign (502); the most Roman of the barbarian laws, it explicitly proclaimed parity of condition between Romans and Burgundians. Gundobad, though an Arian like his father, was strongly influenced by the bishop of *Vienne, Alcimus Ecdicius *Avitus, and allowed his son *Sigismund to convert to Catholicism. When the latter took power on the death of his father (516), Burgundy became a national Romano-Burgundian kingdom, united under the authority of a Catholic king who was a *patricius* of the Eastern Roman emperor *Anastasius. Sigismund encouraged the spread of Catholicism in the Burgundian kingdom under the guidance of Avitus, who in 517 convoked the Council of Epaon to assert the priority of the Roman Catholic Church over the Burgundian Arian Church. In 523 the country was invaded by the *Franks, and Sigismund was killed, but his brother Godomar managed to defend the kingdom. In 532 the Frankish kings finally occupied Burgundy, which was integrated into the Merovingian realm in 534.

A. Mentz, *Schrift und Sprache der Burgunder*: Zeit. f. deut. Alter. 85 (1954) 1-17; E.A. Thompson, *The Settlement of the Barbarians in Southern Gaul*: JRS 46 (1956) 65-75; M. Beck, *Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des ersten Burgunderreiches*: SZG 13 (1963) 433-490; R. Guichard, *Essai sur l'histoire du peuple burgonde*, Paris 1965; O. Perrin, *Les Burgondes. Leur histoire des origines à la fin du premier royaume (534)*, Neuchâtel 1968; L. Musset, *Les invasions: les vagues germaniques*, Paris [2]1969; G. Chevrier - G. Pieri, *La loi romaine des Burgundes*: Ius Romanum Medii Aevi, Milan 1969; E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, I, Paris 1969, II, Paris 1979; S. Mazzarino, *Aezio, la "Notitia Dignitatum" e i Burgundi di Worms*, Atti Conv. Lincei: Conv. intern. *Renania Romana* (April 1975), 23, Rome 1976, 297-317; B. Saitta, *I Burgundi (413–534)*, Catania 1977; R. Soraci, *Roma e i Burgundi*, Atti Conv. Lincei: Conv. intern. *Passaggio dal mondo antico al medioevo. Da Teodosio a s. Gregorio M.* (May 1977), Rome 1980, 477-513; H. Rosenberg, *Bishop Avitus of Vienne (c. 493–517) and the Burgundian Kingdom*: Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval-Renaissance Association 3 (1982) 1-12; J. Favrod, *Histoire politique du Royaume Burgonde (443–534)*, Lausanne 1997.

C. Braidotti

BYZACENA, Councils of. Fulgentius Ferrandus's canonical collection (CCL 149, 284-311) refers to various councils celebrated in Byzacena in the 5th and 6th c. but never specifies their dates. Only the acts of the Council of *Thela (or Thelepte), celebrated in February 418, survive.

CCL 149, 54-65; Palazzini 1, 182-183.

Ch. Munier

BYZANTINE LITURGY

I. Origin and geographical areas - II. Present-day situation.

I. Origin and geographical areas.

The *liturgy today known inclusively as "Byzantine" is the result of a long process of encounter and evolution of multiple local traditions in the Eastern Christian empire, concluding in a *Constantinopolitan synthesis. To reach the beginning of this process, we must take into account several geographical areas that were particularly creative in this field.

1. Jerusalem and Palestine. A cosmopolitan re-

gion, a center of constant *pilgrimages and densely populated with *monasteries characterized by conciliar *orthodoxy. From the 4th c. a cathedral liturgy marked by the presence of the holy places developed here, attested in *Egeria's *Peregrinatio,* in the *Armenian lectionary (5th c.) and in the *Georgian lectionary (7th c.). Great monasteries such as the *Laura of St. *Sabas or the *Cenobium of St. Theodosius produced and reformed their particular monastic traditions, formed between the 4th c. and the Persian (614) and Arab (638) invasions. The most important sediment left by *Jerusalem in the Constantinopolitan liturgy is to be found in the *liturgical year (Great Lent, feasts of dedication), in the divine office (*agrypnie* or vigils) and in the *anaphora of St. James, which in turn influenced *Antiochene eucharistic texts that later emigrated to Constantinople.

A. Baumstark, *Denkmäler der Entstehungsgeschichte des byzantinischen Ritus*: OrChr 24 (1927) 1-32; J. Mateos, *La vigile cathédrale chez Egérie*: OCP 27 (1961) 281-312; G. Bertonière, *The Historical Development of the Easter Vigil and Related Services in the Greek Church*: OCA 193, Rome 1972; A. Tarby, *La prière eucharistique de l'Église de Jérusalem*, Théol. Hist. 17, Paris 1972.

2. *Antioch and Cappadocia*. Byzantium-Constantinople, precisely in the period in which it was consolidating its ecclesiastical structure (4th-5th c.), came under the direct influence of hierarchs and theologians of *Antiochene and *Cappadocian origin such as *Gregory of Nazianzus (379), *Nectarius of Tarsus (381–387), *John Chrysostom (398) and *Nestorius (428–431). During this period the liturgy of St. James was introduced at Constantinople, which enjoyed almost universal use in the Syrian East until the 6th-c. *monophysite crisis. Constantinople introduced, from the Cappadocian East, the *anaphora attributed to St. *Basil, which had condensed a more abundant and complex primitive source, perhaps with distant *Egyptian roots, and remained normative until it was replaced—with 10 exceptions annually—by the so-called anaphora of St. John Chrysostom, directly related to the Syrian anaphora of the twelve *apostles. Among works of Antiochene derivation that left a deep mark in the field of liturgical theology and of certain rites, we should also mention ps.-*Dionysius's *Ecclesiastical Hierarchies* (5th-6th c.).

3. *Constantinople*. Imperial capital and patriarchal see, it was able more than once to integrate the contributions of the distant provinces into its own local tradition, created around the cathedral of Hagia Sophia and the Byzantine *monasteries, from which the group of Studite cenobia emerged. From the 5th c. the Byzantine liturgy gradually acquired a cosmopolitan dimension, to which political expansion and missionary activity gave a pan-Byzantine and orthodox imprint.

The line of this evolution is contained in the history of the *Typikon* (a book with the system of rubrics and their interpretation, and the calendar with *hagiographical and topographical information), the highest authority for regulating celebratory life. The Byzantine Church produced various *Typika,* but three were the most important: (1) the *Typikon* of the Great Church of Christ (Hagia Sophia of Constantinople), (2) the *Typikon* of St. Sabas (Palestinian) and (3) the *Typikon* of Studion (Constantinopolitan). Each of these represents a local tradition based on other liturgical books, which had also developed gradually according to time and place (book of hours, lectionary, psalter, euchology, various hymnals for Propers). The Byzantine liturgical tradition is therefore quite diverse in its origins, since the various geographical areas had the freedom to observe their own *Typika*. Historical vicissitudes led to the encounter, fusion or respective elimination of the *Typika,* resulting in the creation of a fairly uniform liturgy in the orthodox world from the end of the Middle Ages. The reform of these three *Typika* took place in the context of political-social catastrophes that interrupted liturgical life, followed by a work of reconstruction and completion of the lost heritage: (1) at Jerusalem, the Persian invasion of 614 and the devastation under Caliph Hakim in 1009; (2) at Constantinople, the iconoclastic crisis (726–843) and the Latin conquest of the city (1204–1261).

These reforms involved the reorganization, enrichment or reduction of the daily-weekly cycle and the movable *Easter cycle. They are connected with anonymous liturgists, or with great Palestinian names like St. *Sabas, St. *Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 638), St. *Andrew of Crete (d. 726), St. *John of Damascus (d. 749) and St. *Cosmas of Maiuma (d. 760); or with Constantinopolitans like patriarchs *Anthimus (536) and St. *Germanus (d. 733), St. *Theodore the Studite (d. 826), and St. Joseph of Thessalonica (832). The manuscript tradition attests the state and diffusion of the *Typika* according to periods and regions, so much so that it would be more correct to speak in the plural of Sabaite and Studite *Typika*. While Studite *Typika* were quite widespread until the 12th c. and then were increasingly confined to Mt. Athos and Byzantine S Italy (palaeo-Calabrian, Calabro-Sicilian and Apulian families), the Sabaite *Typika* took definitive root at Constantinople from the 13th c. and so became, at a late date, the present *Typikon* of the Great

Church, homonymous with the archaic one. Thanks to the invention of printing (first ed. Venice 1546), this Constantinopolitan modification of the *Typikon* of St. Sabas became the normative book of the liturgy of Byzantium and the churches in communion with it (Eastern Chalcedonian patriarchates) or born from its missions. In Russia, its gradual adoption began in the 15th c., becoming definitive with the three 17th-c. editions. Expert 19th-c. Russian liturgists such as A. Dmitrievskij, I. Karabinov, I. Karataev, A. Nikolskij and M. Skaballanovich studied, collected and published its liturgical MS source, throwing much light on this complex evolution and showing, according to M. Arranz, that "the myth of Byzantine liturgical immobility is precisely that: a myth."

Dimanche. Office selon les Huit Tons (intr. N. Egender and C. Hannick), Chevetogne 1972; *La prière des Heures Horologhion* (intr. N. Egender), Chevetogne 1975; M. Arranz, *Les grandes étapes de la liturgie byzantine*, XXIII^e Sem. Lit. St. Serge, Rome 1976.

II. Present-day situation.

1. The movable and fixed cycles of the liturgical year.

(*a*) *Movable cycle*. Arose as a development of the feast of Easter, center of the liturgical year. It comprises a period of four Sundays before *Lent, six weeks of Lent, Palm Sunday and the Great Week (Holy Week). The Propers for this time are contained in the *Triodion*. Then follows the period that begins with the Easter Vigil and concludes with All Saints' Sunday (first Sunday after *Pentecost); the Propers are contained in the *Pentecostarion,* also called the *Triodion of Flowers*. The Sundays of the movable cycle are often named after the gospel read at their eucharistic liturgy (e.g., Sunday of the Prodigal Son, of Thomas, of the Samaritan Woman), or after particular events or people, e.g., Carnival Sunday (end of rich foods at the beginning of Lent), Orthodoxy Sunday (reestablishment of the cult of icons on the first Sunday of Lent, 843), Sunday of St. John Climacus, of St. Mary the Egyptian, etc.

(*b*) *Fixed annual cycle*: regulated by the Byzantine civil calendar, it begins on 1 September and ends on 31 August. The Propers for each day are in the *Menaia,* i.e., 12 monthly volumes, one for each month of the year. They also contain the Propers for the great fixed feasts, i.e., the Nativity of the Mother of God (8 Sept.), the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 Sept.), the Entrance of Mary into the Temple (21 Nov.), the Nativity of the Savior (25 Dec.), Epiphany (6 Jan.), Jesus' Encounter with Simeon, or *Hypapante* (2 Feb.), the Annunciation (25 March), the Transfiguration (6 Aug.), the Dormition of the Mother of God (15 Aug.). Palm Sunday, the Resurrection, the *Ascension and Pentecost fall in the movable cycle. Every day of the year has a *memoria* of one or more saints, some of which have a particularly festive character: St. George, St. Nicholas, St. Demetrius, the Nativity and Beheading of St. John the Forerunner.

(c) Fixed weekly cycle: each day of the week has, besides the texts provided by one of the two cycles, a particular coloring that brings out certain aspects of the economy of salvation. Sunday: continual celebration of the victorious resurrection. Monday: the angels recall the eternity and glory of the Word. Tuesday: St. John the Baptist, the most illustrious and immediate precursor of the Messiah. Wednesday and Friday: meditation on the cross and on the passion in union with Mary. Thursday: celebration of the *apostles' missionary activity and that of St. *Nicholas of Myra, the most popular of the hierarchs. Friday: commemoration of the cross. Saturday: commemoration of the absent faithful, i.e., all saints and the dead. The texts corresponding to the various daily offices are contained in the important book of the Eight Tones (*Oktoichos,* cycle of eight weeks). Their form, always hymnic, goes back to very different times and authors, some of them famous and particularly inspired, both theologically and poetically: St. *John of Damascus, St. *Cosmas of Maiuma, St. Theodore the Studite, St. Theophane Graptós, St. Joseph of Syracuse, etc. They have different technical names according to their style of metrical composition or their position in the hours of the office (*sticheron, troparion, apolytikion, kathisma, kontakion, ikos, anavathmos, irmos*).

At one time the hymns were dispersed among different collections according to their liturgical genre: *irmologion* (for the poetic canons of matins), *kontakarion, kathismatarion*. The book of the Eight Tones, in its present form, is a collection of short poems, full of ecstatic and pneumatic beauty; esp. in those of Sunday, the idea emerges of the liturgy as a feast celebrated in the Lord's vestibules, by a church that wishes to be a new and optimistic garden of paradise, planted by the new Adam: "By your cross you destroyed death, gave paradise to the thief, changed the lament of the woman bearing perfumes into joy, and commanded the apostles to announce the joyful news that you are risen, O Christ of God, giving your great mercy to the world" (*Apolytikion,* i.e., final troparion for Sunday of the 7th tone).

(d) Fixed daily cycle: the day is divided into periods of time, interrupted by moments of liturgical prayer but conceived as parts of a single structure—

whence the name "acoluthia" (following) given to the divine offices. The day always begins with vespers; then follow compline, midnight office (almost everywhere joined to matins or omitted), matins (after which may be celebrated the divine eucharistic liturgy; *see* Anaphora), prime, terce, sext, none and typics (an appendix of purely monastic origin). The evolution of the office began in the 4th c., when cathedral-urban and monastic elements began to mutually influence one another. The invariable parts (psalms, ecclesiastical prayers and blessings) are in the *Horologion,* or book of hours, for the use of the lectors; the priestly parts of these are also in the *Hieratikon* or the *Euchologion;* and rubrics indicate the variable parts to be taken from the *Oktoichos* or the *Menaia*. The multiplication of the Hours, an indication of a preponderant monastic influence, is today undergoing a process of regrouping and anticipation, both in parishes and in monasteries.

2. *Liturgical books*. Besides those mentioned, we should add that the *Euchologion* also contains the formularies for the priestly celebration of the *sacraments, with an abundant appendix for offices and various blessings (funerals, inaugurations, thanksgivings, propitiations, blessings etc.). There are also the *Apostolos* (for Epistles and Acts, without the Apocalypse); the *Evangeliarion,* liturgically subdivided; the Psalter divided into 20 *kathismata,* or sections for vespers and matins; and the *Typikon,* with the rubrics for combining the various liturgical books among themselves for every day of the year. Today synthetic liturgical books are starting to be published, with different names and circulations like the *Anthologion,* the *Synekdimos* or various prayer books. The books of chant also have proper names (*Anastasimatarion, Sbornik* etc.).

3. *Some characteristics*. Architecture and iconography form an external framework that is intimately linked to the unfolding of the celebration—a contribution that should not be undervalued. The building, exactly like the liturgy, develops the idea of paradise on earth, where the community raises itself toward the heavenly Jerusalem; liturgical commentators such as Germanus of Constantinople, Nicholas Cabásilas and others strongly encouraged this interpretation. Icons, on frescoes or tablets, gradually covered the sacred building; the celebration has incorporated them through prayers, processions, censings and other acts of veneration laid down by the rubrics. Just as with the *Eucharist or other moments of the office, they are a potent reminder of the value of *eschatology and of the transfiguration of the cosmos: liturgical veneration of the human *typos* represented in a state of sanctification (Christ, Mary, saints) directs the faithful—through the incarnation and salvation—to the divine *prototypos.*

In the Byzantine liturgy, cultural elements of the *Hellenism of the late Roman period (*gnostic-speculative terminology) mix with proto-Byzantine elements (idea of hierarchy, taste for classification, sense of the splendor of imperial ceremony); the theological ideas of the councils and the Fathers; and Eastern lyricism, *symbolism and *mystagogy. The texts combine the biblical data through the method of negative theology, dear to the *Cappadocians, which safeguards the mystery of God's absolute transcendence and celebrates the divine *doxa* through a confession of the inadequacy of language (the incomprehensible, incommensurable, inexpressible God). *Dogma is presented by a constant liturgical illustration, without tying itself to exclusively rational definitions, rather rising above itself in numerous occasions of charismatic chant, full of cosmic ambition: "We, who mystically represent the cherubim and sing to the life-giving Trinity the thrice-holy hymn, lay down all cares of this world to welcome the king of the universe, invisibly escorted by angelic hosts, to whom we sing: alleluia! alleluia!" (Hymn *"Cheruvikón"* for the Great Entrance of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom).

A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée*, Chevetogne ³1953; H.G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959; J.M. Sauget, *Bibliographie des liturgies orientales*, Rome 1962; H. Hunger, *Reich der neuen Mitte*, Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1965; R. Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VIIᵉ au XVᵉ siècle*, Paris 1966; S. Janeras, *Bibliografia sulle liturgie orientali*, Rome 1969; E.F. Fortino, *Liturgia greca*, Rome 1970; F. Heilen, *Die Ostkirchen*, Munich-Basel 1971; J. Mateos, *La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine*; OCA 191, Rome 1971; H.J. Schulz, *Liturgie, Tagzeiten und Kirchenjahr im byzantinischen Ritas*, in *Handbuch der Ostkirchenkunde*, eds. E. von Ivanka - J. Tyciak, Düsseldorf 1971; A. Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, New York ²1975; R.F. Taft, *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom:* OCA 200, Rome 1975; D. Guillaume (tr.), *Parakletike. Triode. Pentecostaire. Evangéliaire. Menée de Janvier*; *Août*; *Décembre. Akàthiste et Paraclisis. Baptême. Mariage. Funérailles. Profession monastique*, Rome 1977–1982; A. Nélidow, *Euchologe ou rituel orthodoxe*, Bousquet d'Orb 1979; H.J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie. Glaubenszeugnis und Symbolgestalt*, Trier ²1980; V. Peri, *La "Grande Chiesa" bizantina*, Brescia 1981; L. Clougnet, *Dictionnaire grec-français des nomes liturgiques en usage dans l'église grecque*, Paris 1985; H.-J. Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy: Symbolic Structure and Faith Expression*, trans. by M.J. O'Connell, New York 1986; K. Onasch, *Lexikon für Liturgie und Kunst der Ostkirche unter Berücksichtigung der Alten Kirche*, Berlin-Munich 1993; P. Day, *The Liturgical Dictionary of Eastern Christianity*, Turnbridge 1995; Th. Pott, *La reforme liturgique byzantine. Étude du phénomène et l'évolution non spontanée de la liturgie byzantine*, Rome 2000.

D. Gelsi

BYZANTIUM – BYZANTINES. Though prepared by *Diocletian's administrative reforms (284–305) and by *Constantine's transfer of the capital to Byzantium (330)—renamed *Constantinople after its new founder—the Byzantine Empire really began with the division of the *Imperium Romanum* in 395. In its political ideology it retained the empire's universalistic aims, calling its subjects Romans (Ῥωμαῖοι); in its cultural perspective it amalgamated Christian *orthodoxy and the classical tradition, esp. that of Greece. While in its first phase of development, Byzantium was still characterized by elements of the old models of production; in the 7th-9th c. some traits typical of feudal society gradually asserted themselves, finally leading, from the 12th c., to identification with Western models. The Byzantine Empire, whose population at the end of the 4th c. has been estimated at 65 million, was always a state with a high population density. In 395, beyond Greeks, Romans, Illyricans and Thracians, the empire included infiltrated Germanic elements; the variegated ethnic mix of Anatolia; and Armenians, Syrians, Jews, Arabs and Egyptians. The invasion of the Slavs, who from the 6th c. on spread throughout the Balkans as far as the Peloponnesus, introduced profound changes. They were followed in the 7th c. by the Turkic, but rapidly Slavicized, Protobulgars; later came Petchenegs, Uzes and Cumans. With the Crusades and the Latin occupation of 1204, the importance of the Romance component increased. In the 10th and 11th c. the Byzantine army included Varangians, Russians, Petchenegs, Uzes, Cumans etc.; in the 13th and 14th c. Seljuk Turks as well. All these nationalities were integrated into the Byzantine state, whose official and everyday languages were both Greek and Latin until the 6th c., then just Greek. Christianity was Byzantium's dominant religion in every period, in the form established by the Councils of *Nicaea (325) and *Chalcedon (451). The councils condemned deviations in *Christology, under which were often concealed the separatist tendencies of the peoples annexed to the empire; particular separate churches were formed under various circumstances. *Justinian fought against the remains of *paganism by state repression; the veneration of saints, the cult of *relics and other religious practices were purified of any residual anti-Christian form. Church and ecclesiastical structure were grafted completely onto the state apparatus and were thus closely tied to the ruling class. This amalgam did not eliminate conflicts between emperor and patriarch, however, or between state officials and clergy. Various forms of *monasticism, as well as sects inimical to the church, esp. the *Paulicians in the mid-7th c., arose to denounce the abandonment of early Christian ideals. The iconoclastic struggle penetrated deeply into the life of the people, in whom the cult of icons had long been rooted. Esp. in the 9th and 10th c. the Byzantine church fostered an intensive mission, coordinated with the empire's foreign policy. It came into competition with similar papal attempts and was unsuccessful in the kingdom of Great Moravia, but successful in Byzantium itself, in Bulgaria and in Russia. The universalistic pretensions of the two churches led to the clash with *Rome, the schism of 807 and the definitive break of 1054, which has perpetuated the division between the two churches until our times. The Byzantine tradition survives in the Russian, Romanian, Serbian, Macedonian, Bulgarian and Greek churches, but also in the Eastern and national churches of the Caucasus.

N.H. Baynes - H.St.L.B. Mosa, *Byzanz, Geschichte und Kultur des Oströmischen Reiches*, Munich 1964; H. Hunger, *Reich der neuen Mitte. Der christliche Geist der byzantinischen Kultur*, Graz 1965; St. Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization*, London 2004 (new ed.); H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich [2]1977; J. Irmscher, *Byzantinisches Reich*, in Enziklopädie zur Frühgeschichte Europas. Arbeitsmaterial, Konzeption, Musterartikel, Berlin 1980, 73-85; J.F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, Cambridge 1990; M. Gallina, *Potere e società a Bisanzio*, Turin 1995; F. Conca - S. Mannelli (eds.), *Atti del V congresso nazionale di studi bizantini, Milano 19-22 ottobre 1994*, Milan 1996; M. Grant, *From Rome to Byzantium: The Fifth Century AD*, New York 1998.

J. Irmscher

C

CAECILIAN (4th c.). Central figure in the outbreak of the *Donatist schism at *Carthage, ca. 311. He was first *archdeacon, then bishop of Carthage. As archdeacon he showed himself a disciplinarian. In ca. 300, he rebuked *Lucilla, a wealthy Spanish member of his congregation, for kissing the bone of an "unauthorized" martyr (*necdum vindicatus*) before receiving Communion (Opt., *De schismate* I, 16). During the great persecution of 304, he was accused of using brutal methods to keep food from reaching the confessors of *Abitina in their prison at Carthage (*Acta Saturnini* 17). On Bishop *Mensurius's death in 311, Caecelian was elected bishop of Carthage (Opt., *De schismate* I, 19), but his election aroused immediate opposition. Discontent coalesced around the *Numidian bishops who had arrived in Carthage to take part in his consecration but found him already consecrated by three bishops, two from near Carthage, but one, *Felix of Aptunga, from the neighboring province of *Byzacena (see Opt., *De schismate* I, 19 and Aug., *Psalmus contra partem Donati*, vv. 42-49). Lucilla's chaplain, *Maiorinus, was consecrated bishop in opposition to Caecelian (ca. 312), and a rumor was spread that Felix of Aptunga was a **traditor* (i.e., had handed over the Scriptures to the authorities during the great persecution) and so could not validly officiate at a consecration. In winter 312–313 after his victory over *Maxentius, *Constantine supported Caecelian's cause but allowed his opponents to state their case against him before a tribunal presided over by Bishop *Miltiades of Rome, himself an *African. Caecelian was vindicated there (2 October 313), again at the larger Council of *Arles of 1 August 314 and, finally, by the emperor himself (10 November 316). But he never won over his fellow countrymen, and on Maiorinus's departure from the scene (summer 313), he was faced with the much more formidable Donatus. Caecelian took part in the Council of *Nicaea in 325 but thereafter disappears from the scene. Date of death unknown.

Optatus of Milevis, *De schismate Donatistarum* (ed. C. Ziwsa, CSEL 26) I, 16-27 and appendixes; *Acta Saturnini* 17-20 (PL 8, 699-703); Eusebius, *HE* X, 5-6; Augustine, *Ep*. 88. For the audience at Rome, see Optatus I, 23-24; for the Council of Arles, see J. Gaudemet (ed.), *Conciles Gaulois du IV^e^ siècle*, Paris 1977 (SC 241), 35-65; Monceaux IV, ch. 1; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, chs. 1 and 11; PCBE 1, 165-175; T. Caputo, *Il processo a Ceciliano di Cartagine: indagine storico-giuridica sulla prima fase della controversia donatista (312-316)*, Rome 1981; B. Kriegbaum, *Caecilianus Carthaginensis episcopus*, in Augustinus-Lexikon, I, Basel 1986-1994, 686-688; Id., *Zwischen den Synoden von Rom und Arles. Die donatistische Supplik bei Optatus*: Archivium Historiae Pontificiae 28 (1990) 23-61.

W.H.C. Frend

CAEDMON (7th c.). Northumbrian poet. *Bede attests his poetic activity (*Hist. eccles.* IV, 24), telling how Caedmon, an illiterate cowherd at abbess Hilda's (d. 680) *monastery of Streanaeshalch (Whitby), began to write verse after receiving a vision from God. Made a monk, he put into verse parts of the OT, including Genesis and Exodus, and the life of Christ. His one certainly authentic composition is a poem in praise of God the creator, written in Northumbrian dialect but surviving in a *Latin translation by Bede, whose erudition affected it both in form and content. Other poems, all preserved in the codex *Junius* XI at Oxford's Bodleian library (also known as "Caedmon MS."), are now ascribed to different authors. Closest to Caedmon's hymn, esp. in the antiquity of its language, is *Genesis* (A); at v. 234, 617 verses of another poem (*Genesis* B), a translation of a 9th-c. Saxon poem, have been interpolated. Caedmon has a heroic vision of Christianity, dwelling on violent episodes such as the *descent into hell and Christ's temptations; we see little of the gospel message of charity and love. The first to publish all the poems was Franciscus Junius (Amsterdam 1655), who in all probability made them known to John Milton, who was undeniably influenced by them in *Paradise Lost*. Venerated as a saint, Caedmon's feast is 11 February.

Poesie, Wülker, Bibl. der Angelsäch., II, Leipzig ²1894; *Genesis A*, Heidelberg 1914 (Holthausen); *Genesis B*, Heidelberg 1913 (Klaeber). Translation of all the poems: C.W. Kennedy, *The Caedmon Poems*, London 1916; A.H. Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, Exeter ²1990 (London ¹1933); W. Jaager, *Bedas metrische Vita sancti Cuthberti*, Leipzig, 1935; LTK 2, 870; F.W. Bautz, BBKL, I, 841-842; G. Princi Braccini, *L'inno di Caedmon e la sua leggenda: una bibliografia annotata*, Florence 1988; G. Gollancz, *The Caedmon Manuscript*, Oxford 1927; Fr.P. Magoun, *Bede's Story of Caedmon: The Case History of an Anglo-Saxon Oral Singer*: Speculum 30 (1955) 49ff.; C.L. Wrenn, *The Poetry of Caedmon*, in *Essential Articles of Old English Poetry*, Hamden 1968; D.W. Fritz, *Caedmon: A Traditional Christian Poet*: MedSt 31 (1969) 334ff.; U. Schwab, *Caedmon*, Messina ²1989 (¹1972); B. Luiselli, *Beda e l'inno di Caedmon*, StudMed 14 (1973) 1013-1036; C.L. Wrenn, *A Study of Old English Literature*, London ²1975; W. Barnstone, *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*, New Haven-London 1993, 180ff.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

CAENA CYPRIANI. A late composition which tells of a banquet organized by the Eastern king Joel, with various OT and NT figures as his guests, suitably attired to partake of a rich meal. One by one, however, each guest is given a different dish than the others. At the end there is a burglary which shocks the guests; the guilty party is identified as Achan, son of Carmi (as in the book of Joshua; in Chronicles, Achar). The work is certainly not by *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258). The hypothesis has been rejected of a mnemonic game for learning biblical characters; it is rather thought of as a sacramentary schema (marriage, reconciliation, *Eucharist, extreme unction). It has a playful tone—even more marked in John Immonide's 9th-c. version—perhaps suggesting a connection with the rite of *risus paschalis*; in the Middle Ages the *Easter celebration was accompanied by performances aimed at concretely eliciting the joy of Christ's resurrection. Irreverent jocosity, however, is almost absent from the *Caena Cypriani*; it is rather a game of names, a nursery rhyme with its characters evoked through biblical references. For example, the sufferings inflicted to identify the guilty party are those actually undergone by the various biblical figures (Adam is expelled, Abel killed, Zechariah struck dumb with fear, John beheaded, Jesus crucified, Paul flogged etc.), with biblical allusions but with no concern for chronological order. This may have contributed to the didactic value of the *Caena Cypriani*.

CPL 1430; CPPM 2, 2148; 2, 2159; PL 4, 1007-1014; MGH *Poet. Lat.* IV, 2, 1, 872-898; DACL XII, 2, 2339-2343; A. Harnack, *Drei wenig beachtete cyprianische Schriften . . .* : TU 19, 3, Leipzig 1899; A. Lapôtre, *Le souper de Jean Diacre*: MEFRA 21 (1901) 305-385; Id., *La "Caena Cypriani" et ses énigmes*: RecSR 3 (1912) 497-596; H. Wass, *Studien zum Heptateuchdichter Cyprian . . .* , PhW (1914) 517; R. Krestan: RAC 3, 477-481 (Cyprianus Gallus); Quasten I, 601-602; III, 298; C. Modesto, *Studien zur Cena Cypriani und zu deren Rezeption*, Tübingen 1992; R.F. Glei, *Ridebat de facto Sarra*: *Bemerkungen zur Cena Cypriani*, in W. Ax - R.F. Glei (eds.), *Literaturparodie in Antike und Mittelalter*, Trier 1993, 153-170; *Coena Cypriani*, intr., text and It. tr., ed. A. Fontana, Sotto il Monte 1999; F. Mosetto Casaretto, *Cipriano e il suo doppio: Giovanni Immonide di fronte al problema attributivo della* "Cena": WS 115 (2002) 225-250.

A. Di Berardino

CAESAREA in Cappadocia
I. The city - II. Council.

I. The city. Civil and religious metropolis of *Cappadocia in Asia Minor, reduced to a *Roman province by Tiberius in AD 17 (whence the name Caesarea [Καισάρεια]; originally Mazaka); then, under *Valens (ca. 370), of Cappadocia Prima. Its ruins are at Eskisehir, SW of Kayseri (central Turkey), which perpetuates its name. Evangelized in apostolic times, it had its *martyrs: *Mamas, Gordius, Julitta, etc. Its first known bishop was Alexander, arrested by *Decius (ca. 250). *Gregory Thaumaturgus received episcopal ordination there. Other bishops, *Firmilian and esp. St. *Basil the Great, gave luster to the see, which extended its jurisdiction over the whole "diocese" of *Pontus. In virtue of this almost patriarchal authority, the metropolis, after the creation of the patriarchate of *Constantinople (451), had first place and the title of *protothronos,* and its titular that of archbishop, a precedence repeated in all the *Notitiae episcopatuum,* in the first of which Caesarea has five suffragan sees, including *Nyssa. In the 6th-7th c. it produced the religious writers *Theodore Askidas, *Andrew of Caesarea and *Gregory.

PWK III, 1289-1290; DHGE XII, 199-201; EC III, 696; KLP III, 48-49; LTK 2, 876-877; E. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romana*, II, Rome 1961, 14; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, Paris 1963, XXX, 171; F. Hild, *Das byzantinische Strassensystem in Kappadokien*, Vienna 1977; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Paris 1981, 204 n. 6; 206 n. 73; 216 n. 1; 219 n. 88, etc.; F. Hild - M. Restle, *Kappadokien*, Vienna 1981, 193-196; B. Gain, *L'Église de Cappadoce au 4ᵉ siècle*, Rome 1985; Id., *Kaisareia I* (*in Kappadokien*): RAC 19/152 (2001) 992-1026.

D. Stiernon

II. Council. According to Lebon, a council was held here immediately after that of *Ancyra (314), during the summer; five of the bishops present were also at *Neocaesarea. Canons 20-25 of this council, which deal with punishments to be imposed for certain faults, actually belong to Ancyra—the close temporal and geographic connection caused the combining of the two collections. An *Armenian translation preserves ten canons, of which six (1, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9)

are part of the Council of Neocaesarea (corresponding to canons 20-25).

CPG 8503; J. Lebon, *Sur un concile de Césarée*: Muséon 51 (1938) 89-132; E. Honigmann, *Two Alleged "Bishops of Great Armenia" as Members of the Synods of Ancyra (314) and Caesarea in Cappadocia*: PSt, ST 173, Rome 1953, 1-5; P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils*, Crestwood 1996, 208f.

A. Di Berardino

CAESAREA in Mauretania. The *Punic port city of Iol was named Caesarea by Juba II (25 BC–AD 23); when it came under Roman rule in AD 40 it became the capital of the province of *Mauretania Caesareana (*Mauretania Caesarea*); under *Claudius it was called *Colonia Claudia Caesarea*. Today it is called Cherchel (Algeria). Only *archaeology and *hagiography cast some light on the Christian origins of this city. Possibly Christian, from a period prior to the peace of the church, are a *sarcophagus with the inscription (*I*)*n Domino,* some epitaphs ornamented with an anchor, olive and dove (in one of which the expression *Memoria Amandae* appears). Certainly Christian are the inscriptions of the priest Victor and the *clarissimus* M.A.I. Severianus (CCL VIII 9585-9586), the latter remade in the 4th c., both from the *cemetery area W of the city. Some 4th-c. sarcophagus fragments include a lid with the fiery furnace and the adoration of the magi. In the W part of the city an apsed room with two fine mosaics was found, but this is little for a city of perhaps 40,000 inhabitants. Local *martyrs include the standard-bearer Fabius (BHL 2818); the virgin Marciana (AB 24, 261-264), who appears in the *Mart. hier*. on 11 July; Arcadius, named by *Zeno of Verona (PL 11, 450-455); and Theodora and her children.

As for bishops, Fortunatus took part in the Council of *Arles (314); Clement lived at the time of Firmus's rebellion (371) and was recommended by the *pagan Symmachus to his brother, *vicarius Africae*; Deuterius was at the conference of *Carthage (411) with the learned and intelligent *Donatist Bishop Emeritus (Augustine, *Ep.* 87), with whom *Augustine, in 418, was unable to arrange a public debate in the city's main church; Apocorius took part in the conference called at Carthage by *Huneric (484). Perhaps we should add two more names: the Evelpius who appears in the inscription of M.A.I. Severianus (but the possibility of identifying these two is dubious), and the *sacerdos* (i.e., bishop), priest for the previous 18 years, of inscription CIL VIII 21417, whose name is not preserved. Augustine, together with *Alypius, *Possidius and other bishops, went to Caesarea and the surrounding area in 418, sent by Pope *Zosimus, on unspecified ecclesiastical business. At the will of Pope *Boniface I, he returned there upon the death of Bishop Deuterius, for the choice of his successor, opposing the transfer to Caesarea of Bishop *Honorius of the territory of Cartennae (Ténès), who occupied another see. Unsuccessful, in 420 Augustine sent the case back to the pope for a solution.

PWK 3, 1294-1295; DACL 3, 1269-1281; LTK^3 2, 877; Ph. Leveau, *Caesarea de Maurétanie. Une ville romaine et ses campagnes*, Rome 1984; S. Lancel, *S. Augustin et la Maurétanie césarienne: les années 418-419 à la lumière des nouvelles lettres récemment publiées*: REAug 30 (1984) 48-59; Id., II: *L'affaire de l'évêque Honorius (automne 419-printemps 420) dans les nouvelles lettres 22*, 23* et 23*A*: REAug 30 (1984) 251-262; I. Gui - N. Duval - J.-P. Caillet, *Basiliques chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord*, Paris 1992, vol. I, 16 f.; T.W. Potter, *Towns in Late Antiquity: Iol Caesarea and Its Context*, Oxford 1995.

V. Saxer

CAESAREA in Palestine

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. Origins of Christianity. Caesarea in Palestine, or Maritime Caesarea (Καισάρεια παράλιος), was the civil and religious metropolis of *Romano-*Byzantine *Syria-*Palestine. The immense excavated area, one of the most important in the state of Israel, extends along the Mediterranean shore (H. Qeisari) halfway between Tel Aviv and Haifa, N of Hadera. In 9 BC the ancient Tower of Strato was transformed into the *Hellenistic city of Herod the Great, who named it Caesarea in honor of Augustus. *Iudaeae caput,* it was the residence of the Roman procurators from AD 6 to 66 and thus also of Pontius Pilate. It was quickly touched by the apostolic preaching (ca. 35) of the deacon Philip who settled there (Acts 8:40; 21:8); there *Peter *baptized the centurion Cornelius and the first *pagans in ca. 43 (Acts 10:1-47; 11:11-17; cf. 12:11); Paul passed through in ca. 37 and ca. 52 and was imprisoned and tried there in 58–60 (Acts 23–26). The first bishop known to us is *Theophilus (135). A century after him, *Origen founded a famous school there. Later enlarged by *Pamphilus, its students included *Gregory Thaumaturgus and *Eusebius, later bishop of the city and a historian attentive to events in his own country and to the *martyrs of Caesarea (*Mart. Palaest.* I, 2-5; III, 4; IV, 2-14; VI; VII, 7,12; VIII, 3-13; IX, 7; X, 3; XI, 29-30; *HE*, passim). Caesarea's precedence in Palestine was sanctioned by canon 7 of *Nicaea (325) and then integrated into the patriarchate of *Jerusalem (451), under which the metropolis of Caesarea had jurisdiction over 28 suffragans (Palestine

Prima). Other important personalities were *Acacius, *Procopius of Gaza and the other *Procopius, *Gelasius, John Grammaticus, and John Khozibita. The city's slow decline was marked by the sack of the churches and massacre of the Christians by the Samaritans in 556, the *Persian occupation (619), and the Arab invasion (638), during which the library was destroyed.

PWK III, 1291-1294; DB 456-465; EC 3, 1347; DHGE 12, 206-209; Beck 154, 197-198; LTK 2, 877; RGG⁴ 2, 5-6; A. Frova - A. Negev, *Missione archeologica milanese. Scavi di Cesarea marittima*, Milan 1965; KLP III, 48-49; M. Avi-Yonah, *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, I, London - Jerusalem 1975, 270-285; L.I. Levine, *Caesarea under Roman Rule*, Leiden 1975; J. Ringel, *Césarée de Palestine. Étude historique et archéologique*, Paris 1975; C.T. Fritsch, *The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima*, I, *Studies in the History of Caesarea Maritima*, Missoula 1975; L.Y. Rahmani, *Un autel funéraire romain à Cesarée Maritime*: RBi 85 (1978) 268-275; *Le port hérodien immergé*: ibid. 412-415; R.J. Bull, *The Eighth Season of Excavation at Caesarea Maritima*: American Journal of Archaeology 84 (1980) 198-199.

D. Stiernon

II. Archaeology. Though largely submerged by the encroachment of the sea, the Roman, Byzantine and Crusaders' town walls and various buildings have been identified. S of the Crusaders' wall was found a badly damaged statue of the Good Shepherd, in a Byzantine-period room. The mosaic floors of this building contain Christian inscriptions, two of which take up the passage Rom 13:3, while others name officials of the imperial treasury (Lehman - Holum, *Inscriptions*, 96-102), suggesting that the building, rather than being Origen's library, had an administrative function (*Enc. Arch. Excavations* 1, 280; *New Enc. Arch. Excavations* 1, 285). The excavations have shown that in the Byzantine period in the city center, on the site of the temple, an octagonal-plan church was built, of which the foundation remains (*New Enc. Arch. Excavations* 1, 285). Outside the walls to the NE are the remains of a large building with mosaic floors with animal designs. It seems to be a church, but the space is large and there are no traces of roof supports (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 44 f.). There is also a cruciform building which preserves remains of paintings with crosses: a treasure was found in it, containing a gold medallion with the Annunciation on one side and Solomon on horseback on the other, and various pendants (Frova, *Scavi*, 235-244). Many inscriptions repeat biblical verses or mention individual believers (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Samaria*, 186-194; Lehman - Holum, *Inscriptions*). Recently the identification of a chapel has been proposed, probably dedicated to St. Paul, in a building in the warehouse district (Patrich, *A Chapel of St. Paul at Caesarea Maritima?*: SBF 50 [2000] 363-382).

Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land 1, Jerusalem 1970, 270-285; A. Frova, *Scavi di Cesarea Marittima*, Milan 1965; A. Ovadiah, *Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holy Land*, Berlin 1970; B. Bagatti, *Antichi villaggi cristiani di Samaria*, Jerusalem 1979; L.I. Levine - E. Netzer, *Excavations at Caesarea Maritima 1975, 1976, 1979 - Final Report*, Jerusalem 1986; *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* 1, Jerusalem 1993, 270-291; C.M. Lehmann - K.G. Holum, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima*, Boston 2000; J. Patrich, *A Chapel of St. Paul at Caesarea Maritima?*: SBF 50 (2000) 363-382; L. Di Segni, *A Chapel of St. Paul at Caesarea Maritima? The Inscriptions*: SBF 50 (2000) 383-400.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

CAESARIA the Elder (ca. 465–524). We know two Caesarias. The first is Caesaria the Elder, sister of *Caesarius of Arles, born ca. 465 near Châlon-sur-Saône, sent by her brother to the *monastery of S. Salvatore at Marseille, at that time the only female community in *Gaul. There Caesaria would be formed in the *ascetic life, according to the will of her brother, bishop of *Arles from 502. She was destined to guide the first monastery of religious at Arles. The monastery, however, was destroyed in 508 during the war between the *Franks and *Burgundians, even before it was finished. Later Caesarius had another monastery, dedicated to St. John, built on the same site (dedicated 26 August 512), and he put his sister in charge, who moved there from Marseille. Caesarius wrote a rule for this community, based on the renunciation of personal possessions, total separation from the world, exemption from episcopal jurisdiction and obedience to the *abbess (*mater*). Caesaria led the monastery for ten years and had many followers. For security reasons, the monastery was later moved into the city, near the cathedral. Here, Caesarius also had a three-aisled basilica built, dedicated to St. Mary (dedicated 6 June 524), where he and the nuns of St. John would be buried. Caesaria died and was buried the same year (or the next). Honored as a saint already in the time of *Venantius Fortunatus, she is mentioned in the Roman Martyrology on 12 January.

AASS *Ian.* I, Venetiis 1734, 729-737; *Vita Caesarii* 1, 28 and 35, ed. Morin, 306-307, 310; Caes. Ar., *Reg. ad Virg.* 2,50,59 and 70; A. de Vogüé - J. Courreau, *Césaire d'Arles, Œuvres monastiques*, I, = SC 345, Paris 1988, 21ff., 440ff.; Venan. Fort., *Vita S. Radegundis*, III, 39-40, PL 88, 267; DHGE 12, 212-215 (G. de Plinval); BS 3, 1146 (G. Bataille); LTK 2, 878 (R. Nürnberg); P. Riché, *Éducation et culture dans l'occident barbare*, Poitiers 1962, 161; K.F. Stroheker, *Der Senator. Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübin-

gen 1948, repr. 1970, 157; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Munich 1988, 77; T. Sardella, in Patrologia IV, 295-297.

T. Sardella

CAESARIA the Younger. Succeeded *Caesaria the Elder in directing the monastery. Probably unrelated (according to others, though, Caesaria the Elder and *Caesarius of Arles were her aunt and uncle). Under her leadership the community grew enormously, with nearly 200 religious in the mid-6th c. Caesarius's *Testamentum* is addressed to her and to the clergy of *Arles. It was she who insisted that five of Caesarius's companions in faith write his biography after his death.

Vita Caesarii 58, ed. Morin, 296 and 320; A. de Vogüé - J. Courreau, *Césaire d'Arles, Œuvres monastiques,* I, = SC 345, Paris 1988, 21-30; 440-468; LTK 2, 878 (R. Nürnberg); K.F. Stroheker, *Der Senator. Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, repr. 1970; T. Sardella, in Patrologia IV, 295-297.

T. Sardella

CAESARIUS of Arles (ca. 470–543). Born ca. 470 to a middle-class family at Châlons-sur-Saône in the Burgundian kingdom, he became a cleric, then a monk, at *Lérins, but he left the *monastery after a few years, exhausted by the *ascetic life. At Arles he was deacon (*see* *Diakonia - Diaconate), priest, *abbot of a monastery and finally bishop (ca. 500). His long episcopate was characterized by his full availability to all, esp. the most needy. It was a delicate political time due to conflicts between *Goths, *Franks and *Burgundians. Being born a Burgundian did not help him as bishop of a city ruled by the Goths: twice he was accused of treason but emerged unscathed. He presided over the Council of *Agde (506) and that of *Orange (529), which marked the end of so-called semi-*Pelagianism. Died 27 August 543. A typical example of a bishop wholly dedicated to his duties, his fame was always great.

His literary activity was all at the service of his pastoral duties. His minor works include *De mysterio sanctae Trinitatis* and *Breviarium adversus haereticos,* two short summaries of *trinitarian theology against the *Arians (the Goths were Arian); *De gratia,* which maintains the radical *Augustinian thesis that the *grace necessary for salvation is conceded only to those *predestined independent of merit according to an inscrutable divine judgment that human beings cannot criticize; and two very rigid *Rules,* one for monks and one for nuns, the oldest to survive from Gaul. Also attributed to him is the ps.-Augustinian *Expositio in Apocalypsim,* a collection of homilies explaining this difficult text, attenuating the *eschatological tension and eliminating anti-*Roman traces and millenarian passages: the thousand years of Christ's earthly reign indicate the whole reign of the church in the world; the *resurrectio prima* of the just is a symbol of *baptism; the new *Jerusalem descending from heaven to earth symbolizes the church spread throughout the earth.

Caesarius was above all a preacher, and the collection of his *Sermones* is among the most important works of his time. Given his habit of drawing on other authors, the homilies were nearly all dispersed, often confused among *Augustine's sermons. G. Morin has identified and published them after many years' labor, 238 in number (not all certainly authentic), on various subjects: admonitions to the faithful, celebrations of saints and feasts and interpretation of scriptural passages. Some are addressed to monks. Caesarius understood the great importance of preaching to a mass of ignorant and barbarous people, to impart that minimum of instruction indispensable for the practice of the Christian religion. For this reason he not only preached assiduously but also collected his preaching in corpora, which he circulated for the use of other clergy less able than himself and inclined to neglect preaching, a matter in which he constantly appealed to bishops and priests. This primary need to spread the word gave rise to Caesarius's characteristic and effective preaching style: he adapted his language to the modest level and needs of his listeners, aiming to be brief, comprehensible and interesting. To this end he unhesitatingly used the material of others, esp. of Augustine, duly evaluated and adapted to his own ends. To capture and hold his audience's interest, he loved to proceed by questions and answers, and he used similes, sometimes very extended, to present his concepts visually, always choosing images from everyday life and scenes familiar to his hearers. Above all, he insistently admonished his rough audience, recalling them to a minimum of Christian commitment and to the struggle against all sorts of vices: ignorance, drunkenness, intemperance, persistence in *pagan practices. His interpretation of Scripture is mostly *allegorical. Easily accessible doctrinal themes are not lacking. Soon after his death, some disciples wrote his biography, rich in information, one of the most important texts of Gallic *hagiography.

CPL 1008-1019a; G. Morin, *S. Caesarii opera omnia*, I, Maredsous 1937 (= CCL 103-104), II, Maredsous 1942; SC 175.243 (*sermones*); P. Riché, *Césaire d'Arles*, Paris 1958; S. Felici, *La catechesi al popolo di S. Cesario di Arles*, in *Valori attuali della catechesi patristica*, Rome 1979, 169-186; W.E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Cambridge 1994; K. Berg, *Cäsarius von Arles. Ein Bischof des sechsten Jahrhunderts erschliesst das lit-*

urgische Leben seiner Zeit, Thaur-Vienna-Munich 1994.

M. Simonetti

CAESARIUS of Nazianzus (ca. 335–369). Younger brother of *Gregory of Nazianzus; object of *Or.* 7, recipient of *Ep.* 7 and 20, and mentioned in *Ep.* 29, 30 and 80, of Gregory; and in *Basil, *Ep.* 26 and 32. After studies at *Alexandria he became a doctor at *Constantinople, remaining celibate. He remained in office under *Julian, not without scandal to his family. He survived the earthquake of 368 but died soon after, leaving large debts. An inauthentic dialogue with Gregory (CPG 7482; PG 38, 852-1189) is attributed to him. R. Riedinger has studied it at length and is preparing a critical edition.

M.M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, Bonn 1960, 48-50.

J. Gribomont

CAESARIUS of Nazianzus (pseudo) (d. ca. 550). Under Caesarius of Nazianzus's name are four books of *Quaestiones et responsiones* on various subjects, theological, philosophical and natural. The unknown author, having adopted the name of *Gregory of Nazianzus's brother (d. 568/569), found it necessary to use earlier sources. Literary, doctrinal and historical considerations date the works to the mid-6th c., after Theodora's death (548). The author is thought to have been a monk of the *Acoemete convent, where religious from different countries assembled: this would explain his very extensive geographical knowledge. He is a very important source for our knowledge of historical geography, the customs of the imperial court of *Constantinople and the religious life of the time.

CPG 7482; PG 38, 852-1189; O. Seeck, PWK 3 (1899) 1299-1300; H. Dörries, RAC 6 (1966) 355-356; R. Riedinger, *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Verfasserfrage*, Munich 1969; Patrologia V, 158; I. Dujčev, *La versione paleoslava dei dialoghi dello Pseudo- Cesario*: Studi Bizantini and Neohellenici 9 (1957) 89-100; R. Riedinger, *Neue Quellen zu den Erotapokriseis des Pseudo-Kaisarios*: JÖByz 19 (1970) 153-184; Id., *Akoimeten*, TRE 2 (1978) 148-153; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 2/2, London 1995, 374-379.

F. Scorza Barcellona

CAESAROPAPISM. A political-religious system in which civil and religious power are united in a single authority, that of the emperor. More specifically, the identification of state and church power in one person, who assumes in himself alone the functions and power of emperor and pope in their respective spheres.

"Caesaropapist" theory or practice attributed to the Christian emperor at least part of the following functions and powers (Alivisatos): (1) protection of the faith and concern with other ecclesiastical questions as a basic duty of the state, considering belief a state problem; (2) special care and preservation of church property; (3) giving legal status to ecclesiastical canons; (4) guaranteeing episcopal authority by means of state authority; (5) regulating and supervising liturgical functions; (6) regulating and monitoring the moral life of clergy and the life and rule of monks; (7) to the emperor belong clerical privileges, power to set up bishoprics, archbishoprics and metropolitan sees, to transfer bishops, and to punish clerics and laypeople guilty of lèse-majesté with spiritual penalties.

The term is recent (Boehmer, *Caesaropapia*) and is not the aptest for defining a theory and practice which, *historically*, has never fully corresponded to the concept described above. The term is anachronistic and antihistorical because it refers to a power of the bishop of *Rome (who took exclusive use of the name *pope* only from the 6th c.) usurped by the emperor, a power which never existed in the exact way it is described; the term is also ill-adapted to express a reality similar or analogous to that defined above, yet too complex and extended in time to be constrained by definitions. Nevertheless, it has been consecrated by use, and as such we accept it (while acknowledging the note of contempt that unfortunately often accompanies its use, even by some historians).

This system, in its general lines, was *theorized and given a theological foundation by* *Eusebius of Caesarea. It was *practiced* only partially by the Christian emperors of antiquity, and they assumed it mainly *de facto*, with some claims *de jure*; in the eyes of ecclesiastical authorities, it was at times legitimate and at times illegitimate. The roots of caesaropapist theory and practice go back to primitive and subsequent culture which, until the coming of Christianity, identified religion and public power. On these distant foundations, and much more on the *Hellenistic theory of kingship, which he Christianized, *Eusebius of Caesarea constructed Christianity's first political theology, which seems the most apt to be called "caesaropapist" (bearing in mind the terminological clarifications made above). This was absorbed in the following centuries as the "flesh and blood" (Berkhof) of the *Byzantine Empire and church. The history of the "caesaropapist" practice (within the limits and according to the criteria mentioned above) of the emperors from *Constantine to

*Justinian can be summarily traced in the contributions cited below by Berkhof, Ensslin, Lietzmann, Schneemelcher, Kartaschow, Wolf, Alivisatos, Ziegler, Sansterre and Capizzi. The positions taken on these questions by historians of Roman institutions and law are important, esp. those regarding Justinian (Biondi, Crifò).

J.H. Boehmer, *Jus ecclesiasticum protestantium*, I, Halle [4]1738, 10-11, § XV; C. Baur, *Die Anfänge des byzantinischen Cäsaropapismus*: Arch. f. kath. Kirchenrecht 111 (1931) 99-113; A.C. Jemolo, *Stato e Chiesa*: Dizionario di politica, vol. I, Rome 1940, 464-466; H. Lietzmann, *Das Problem Staat und Kirche im weströmischen Reich*: Kleine Schriften, vol. 1, Berlin 1958, 215-224; H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser*, Zürich 1947, 83-104; A. Kartaschow, *Die Entstehung der kaiserlichen Synodalgewalt*: Kirche u. Kosmos, Studienhefte 2, Witten 1950, 137-152; E. Wolf, *Zur Entstehung der kaiserl. Synodalgewalt*: ibid., 153-158; B. Biondi, *Il diritto romano-cristiano*, vol. I, Milan 1952, 135-165; 185-188; 189-230; 242-252; 349-357; vol. III, 1954, 367-374; A.W. Ziegler, *Die byz. Religionspolitik u. der sog. Cäsaropapismus*, Munich 1953, 3-19; W. Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Theodosius*, Sitzungsber. d. Bayer Ak. d. Wiss., philos.-hist. Kl., Jahrg. 1953/2, 5-28; W. Ensslin, *Staat u. Kirche v. Konst. d. Gr. bis Theodosius*, Internat. Kongr. f. Byz. Studien 2, Athens 1956, 404-415; A. Piola, *Cesaropapismo*: Nov. Digesto ital. 3, Turin 1959, 136; H.S. Alivisatos, *Caesaropapismus in den byz. kirchl. Gesetzen u. den Canones*, Akt. d. XI. Internat. Byzant. Kongr., Munich 1960, 15-20; R. Farina, *L'Impero e l'Imperatore crist. in Eusebio di Ces.*, Zürich 1966; C. Schmitt, *Politische Theologie* 2, Berlin 1970, 68-88; W. Schneemelcher, *Kirche u. Staat im 4. Jahrh.*: Bonner Ak. Reden 37, Bonn 1970; J.-M. Sansterre, *Eusèbe de Cesarée et la naissance de la théorie "césaropapiste"*: Byzantion 42 (1972) 131-195; 532-594 (other bibl. in notes 2-4, p. 590, and in note 2, p. 593); C.L. Ottino, *Cesaropapismo*: Dizionario di politica, Turin 1976, 153; M. Meslin - J. Gouillard, *Césaropapisme*: Encyclopaedia Universalis, vol. IV, Paris 1980, 86-90; J. Meyendorff, *Byzanz*: Theol. Realenzykl., vol. VII, 1981, 501f.; G. Podskalsky, *Cäsaropapismus*: LMA II, 1366-1367; C. Capizzi, *Giustiniano tra politica e religione*, Soveria Mannelli 1994; Id., *Giustiniano: fu un Cesaropapista?*: Civiltà Cattolica 145 (1994/2) 37-50; G. Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin*, Paris 1996; Ch. Pietri, *La politique de Constance II: un premier "césaropapisme" ou l'Imitatio Constantini?*, in *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997, 281-346; G. Crifò, *Chiesa e Impero nella storia del diritto da Costantino a Giustiniano*, in *Chiesa e Impero da Augusto a Giustiniano*, ed. E. dal Covolo - R. Uglione, Rome 2001, 328-355.

R. Farina

CAINITES. 2nd-c. *gnostics (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 31,1; Hipp., *Refut.* VIII, 20; Epiph., *Haer.* 38) characterized by a radical opposition to the OT God, in whom they saw a malevolent and inferior power, enemy of the superior and good God, Sophia. They consequently exalted Yahweh's enemies, from Cain to Esau to Judas (whom they honored for making possible Christ's saving death). They also repudiated the Mosaic law and practiced unscrupulous and immoral conduct. They made wide use of *apocrypha, including the *Gospel of Judas* and *Ascension of Paul*. Like the *Ophites and Naassenes, their gnostic approach systematized the anti-Jewish and antinomian tendencies already attested in some NT writings.

E. Prinzivalli

CAIUS (or Gaius), pope (283–296). Succeeded *Eutychianus (275–283) in 283 and died in 296, though *Eusebius of Caesarea attributes to him a pontificate of 15 years (*HE* VIII, 22,1). According to the Liber pontificalis Caius was related to the emperor *Diocletian, like him of *Dalmatian origin. The same source attributes to him the definitive order of accession for the inferior orders of the episcopate (LP I, 161). This information is unfounded, or at least inexact, since other lists of these orders, more or less complete, appear later. It does not seem that he died a *martyr, though he is named in the *Acts* of Sebastian and those of Susanna. Caius was buried in the *cemetery of St. Callisto; in the 19th c., G.B. De Rossi found some fragments of his funerary inscription.

Eus., *HE* VI, 43,11; VII, 32,1; VIII, 22,1; LP I, XCVIII-XCIX, CCIX-CCXVII, 64-65, 68-69, 70-73, 148, 154 and 161; II, 63-64; P. Hinschius, *Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramn . . .*, Lipsiae 1863, 214-218; G.B. De Rossi, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana*, II, Rome 1867, 114-120; ICR n.s. IV (G.B. De Rossi - A. Ferrua), Vatican City 1964, 9516, 9543 c, 10584; DHGE 9, 237-238 (G. Bardy); BS 3, 646-649 (A. Amore - I. Belli Barsali); DCB 1, 386-387 (W. Smith - H. Wace); L. Reekmans, *Le complexe cémétérial du pape Gaius dans la catacombe de Callixte*, CV, 1988; LTK[3] 4, 263 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 300-303 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

CALCIDIUS (4th c.).*Neoplatonist philosopher and Latin translator, as he himself says, of the *primas partes Timaei Platonis* (*Ep. ad Os.*) as far as 53C, furnished with a commentary abounding in citations of previous authors. Some have thought him a *pagan or a Jew, but he seems to be a Christian because he cites the NT and refers to *Origen's commentary on Genesis (Waszink, JbAC, 236). The recipient of the work was a Christian named *Ossius, thought perhaps to be the bishop of Cordoba of that name. Waszink, rather, proposes Ossius to be a Milanese patrician of the late 4th c., a date confirmed by internal analysis of the text. The text was much used in the Middle Ages from the time of John Scotus Eriugena and until the 12th c. was one of the main sources of knowledge of ancient philosophy.

CPL 578f.; J.H. Waszink, *Plato Latinus* IV: *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, London - Leiden [2]1975;

PLS 1, 196f. (*Epist. ad Osium*); Id., *Calcidius*: JbAC 15 (1972) 236-244; CE 1, 1057; A.C. Vega, *Calcidio, escritor platónico español del siglo IV*: Ciudad Dios 152 (1936) 145-164; 154 (1943) 219-241; P. Courcelle, *Ambroise de Milan et Calcidius*: Studia Waszink, Amsterdam 1973, 45-53; E. Mensching, *Zur Calcidiusüberlieferung*: VChr 19 (1965) 42-56; E. Jeauneau, *L'héritage de la philosophie antique durant le haut moyen âge*, in *La cultura antica nell'Occ. latino*, Spoleto 1975, I, 17-54; E. Des Places, *Platonismo e tradizione cristiana*, Milan 1976, 222; Patrología III, Madrid 1981, 677; Calcidio, *Commentario al Timeo*, ed. C. Moreschini, Turin 2003; *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, ed. Herzog, Paris 1993, 405-407; Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques, Paris 1994, 156f.; M. Bertolini, *Aspetti letterari del Commentarius di Calcidio al Timeo:* Koinonia 14 (1990) 89-112; B. Bakhouche, *Anges et démons dans le "Commentaire au Timée" de Calcidius* (*IVe siècle de notre ère*): REL 77 (1999) 260-275; RAC, Supp. 2003, 203-300.

A. Di Berardino

CALDONIUS. This bishop's name turns up a dozen times in *Cyprian's letters (*Ep.* 25; 26,1; 27,3; 41; 42; 44,1; 45,1,4; 48,2,4; 57; 70). Cyprian recommended his church to Caldonius when he left *Carthage to escape *Decius's persecution (January 250–April 251). At the time of the schism of *Felicissimus, Caldonius, who fully shared Cyprian's positions, was sent to Rome to gain information about Pope *Cornelius's election. He affixed his signature to the synodal letter of 255 but not to the acts of the council of 1 September 256; doubtless he died during the interval. His see remains unknown, and the insertion of his name in the list of the bishops of *Braga (Portugal) is pure imagination.

ASS Feb. 2, 57; DHGE 11, 376-378; BS 3, 668-669; J.-L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine vandale et byzantine*, Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 11, Rome 1973, 272; J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, in W. Brandmüller (ed.), *Konziliengeschichte*, Paderborn-Munich-Vienna-Zürich 1997, 170ff.; 179; 185; 203; 237.

V. Saxer

CALENDAR

I. Origins of the Christian calendar - II. The early Christian calendars.

The Christian calendar is the list, month by month and day by day, of the feasts observed in the church, and only these. We distinguish the *temporal* (Sundays, Easter, Christmas etc.) from the *sanctoral* (feasts of the martyrs and saints). Here we will not speak of the temporal (Harnoncourt - Auf der Maur 9-63; *Handbuch der Ostkirchenkunde* 2, Düsseldorf 1989, 182-191), or of the controversy over *Easter (A. Strobel, *Texte zur Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Münster 1984; s. v. *Pasqua*) or of the dependence on the Jewish calendar (S. Safrai - M. Stern [eds.], *The Jewish People in the First Century* 2, Assen 1987, 834-864), but only of the sanctoral.

I. Origins of the Christian calendar. The oldest known anniversary celebrated is that of *Polycarp of Smyrna, *martyred 23 February ca. 156–167. *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ep.* 12,2; 39,3) and *Gregory of Nyssa (*V. Greg. Thaum.*) attest that it was a local custom to keep a sort of register of martyrs and bishops so as to celebrate their feast on the proper day, just as families preserved the memory of their dead (Tert., *Exh. cast.* 11,1; *Cor.* 3,3). Each church had a calendar of its own martyrs and bishops different from that of the neighboring churches (Soz., *HE* 5,3). Lists (nonliturgical) of bishops appear from the 2nd c. as proof of the apostolicity of an episcopal see (for Rome: Hegesippus [Eus., *HE* 4,22]; Iren., *Adv. haer.* 3,3,3). At *Byzantium the *diptychs contained the list of the dead and esp. the list of the succession of bishops, to be pronounced during the liturgy. For S *Italy see F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 27-29.

II. The early Christian calendars. (1) The oldest preserved examples of a Christian calendar are the **Depositiones episcoporum* and *martyrum,* drawn up at *Rome and inserted in the **Chronography* of 354 (RAC 19, 1177-1191). (2) The *Calendarium Syriacum* of 411, actually a Greco-*Arian calendar of *Nicomedia from ca. 360–362 (AASS Nov. 2,1, LII-LXV). (3) The fragmentary *Gothic calendar, ca. 400, a document attesting the Gothic presence in Italy (ZNTW 1, 308-335; AB 31, 274-291; P. Heather - J. Matthews, *The Goths in the Fourth Century,* Liverpool 1991, 128-130; Patrologia IV, 492-493). (4) The *Calendarium Turonense,* written by *Perpetuus of Tours (d. 491), whose general lines are in *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 10,31). (5) The *Calendarium Carthaginense,* ca. 505, actually a martyrology from the 2nd half of the 4th c. (6) The calendar of *Oxyrhynchus, 535–536 (AB 42, 83-99). (7) The *Coptic calendar of *Alexandria, 6th c. (DACL 8, 654-657). (8) The marble calendar of Carmona in Andalusia, 6th-7th c. (9) The *Martyrologium Hieronymianum,* compiled in N Italy shortly after 431, of which the Gallican archetype of Auxerre is datable to 592. (10) The calendar of Corbie, 7th c. (11) The calendar of *Willibrord, first decade of the 8th c. (CPL 2037). (12) The *Martyrologium* of the Venerable *Bede (d. 735), from which must be reconstructed the calendar that he used. (13) The *Calendarium Sinaiticum,* which seems to have been compiled in *Africa in the 8th c. (14) The *Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae,* 8th c., of the Irish saints. (15) The *Calendarium Anglicum,* 8th c. (16) The calendar of Ratisbon, 8th c. (17) The cal-

endar of Mainz, 781. (18) The *Calendarium Rhenaugiense*, which is actually from Nivelles, 8th-9th c. (19) The Montecassino calendars, 8th-9th c. (20) The Irish calendar, 821–831. (21) The Bologna calendar, 9th c. (22) The marble calendar of Naples, 840–850.

CPL 2028-2046b; Repertorium 6, 589-595; DACL 8, 624-667; LACL 3 419-420; J.P. Kirsch, *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalender im Altertum*, Münster 1924; E. Mahler, *Handbuch der jüdischen Chronologie*, Hildesheim 1967; A. Cappelli, *Cronologia, Cronografia e Calendario Perpetuo dal principio dell'èra cristiana ai nostri giorni*, Milan [7]2002; Th. Klauser, *Ein Kirchenkalender aus der römischen Titelkirche der heiligen Vier Gekrönten*, in Id., *Gesammelte Arbeiten zur Liturgiegeschichte, Kirchengeschichte und Christlichen Archäologie*, Münster 1974, 46-70; Ph. Harnoncourt - H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 2,1, Regensburg 1994, 9-63, 136-144; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, Brussels [2]2000, 13-31, 404-405; for the synoptic tables of the Roman calendars from the *Depositio martyrum* on see J.P. Kirsch, *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalender im Altertum*, Münster 1924, 221-237; Harnoncourt - Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit*, 298-299, 300-319; W. Geerlings (ed.), *Der Kalender. Aspekte einer Geschichte*, Paderborn 2002; A. Di Berardino, *Liturgical Celebrations and Imperial Legislation in the Fourth Century*, in B. Neil et al. (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* 3, Everton Park 2003, 211-232.

S. Heid

CALIGULA (12–41). Gaius Julius Caesar Germanicus, *Roman emperor (37–41), son of Germanicus and of Vipsania Agrippina, nicknamed Caligula by his father's soldiers, whom he imitated from childhood by wearing military boots (*caliga*). *Tiberius had demanded that the Senate designate as his successor either Caligula or his own grandson Gemellus: in 37 the Senate chose Caligula. An absolute monarch, he had himself worshiped as a living god, and his abuses of power made him unpopular with the Senate. He was killed by conspirators led by Chaerea. Scholars do not accept the tradition, originating with the Senate, that his political behavior was caused by madness, but rather that his behavior was consistent with his policy of affirming and consolidating absolute power.

A. Garzetti, *L'impero da Tiberio agli Antonini*, Bologna 1960, 83-109 and 598-602; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 31-33 and 420 (bibl.); Id., *I Cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

CALLATIS (Mangalia, district of Constanta, Romania). Greek colony founded in the 6th c. BC, it had a final flowering in the 4th-6th c. AD. Casual finds have uncovered various vestigia, including a Christian funerary stele, in Greek, which mentions a jurist of *Syrian origin (4th-5th c.); a limestone cross on which is incised the name of the local Bishop Stephanus (6th c.), the first bishop attested in *Tomis, another town of *Scythia Minor; and a fragment of architrave with the name of the emperor *Justinian, "lover of buildings" (φιλοκτίστης).

Unsystematic archaeological excavations have found the ruins of a Christian basilica abutting on the N side of the city wall. Built in the 4th-5th c. and probably rebuilt during the reign of *Anastasius I (491–518), the basilica consisted of a rectangular hall, oriented N-S, with the entrance in the middle of the long E side, where originally there was a lateral courtyard, in the Syrian fashion, later transformed into a sumptuous atrium with four porticoes. At the S end of the hall was the presbytery, with no apse because of a road along that side. The main entrance opened from the road onto the atrium and from there to the basilica, to the W, and to the partially excavated building to the E, which probably functioned as a bishop's palace (*episcopium*). Among the ruins of the basilica were found numerous pieces of architectural sculpture, including two ram's-head capitals.

In the W part of the city was a large early-Christian *cemetery; about a fifth of its total area has been excavated, with ca. 400 tombs (4th-6th c.).

Among the numerous Christian monuments discovered in the last two decades at Callatis, some are significant for understanding some aspects of the socioeconomic panorama of the city at the time of the important development it underwent between the late 4th and late 6th c. Among these, particularly important is a tomb with a *dromos* ("corridor"), found during an emergency excavation. The tomb, built in small limestone blocks, comprises a room with vaulted ceiling: it is reached by a corridor, 3 m long, which descends by a series of stairs to at least a meter below ground level. There is a cross painted in red on each wall of the corridor and above the entrance to the room: in the latter position there is also a salvific inscription, also painted in red, which reads: Κύριϵ βοήθϵ μοῦ κϵ λυτρώτϵ μοῦ ("Lord help me and purify me").

Inside the room, a similar cross painted in red appears on each wall, but on the W wall there is also a second inscription: ΟΥ ΦΟΒΗΘϹΟΜΕ ΚΑ + ΚΥΡΙΕ + ΚΑ ΟΤΙ ϹΥ ΜΕΤΕΜΟΥ ("I will not fear, Lord, because you are with me").

The state of the monument at its finding gave evidence of at least two phases of usage; the second is attested by some interventions both in the corridor and in the room. To the first phase are attributed the

11 burials in earthen graves in the corners of the room: in one of these graves was a precious gold reliquary. In the second phase, eight niches were opened in the walls of the room, the vault and walls were plastered, and the two inscriptions painted. Ceramics for domestic use accompanied the nine burials. A small bronze vase found in the room may have been used for illumination, since near it the plaster shows signs of soot.

The tomb fits perfectly into the extremely common *Romano-*Byzantine type of tombs with corridor, but it must have belonged to a well-to-do family, willing to incur some expense for the burial of its family members. Though it is impossible to date exactly the (at least) two periods of usage, the tomb fits well into the time of Callatis's flourishing from the 5th to the late 6th c.

A second chance find, near the walls at the S limits of the old city, uncovered a piece unique at Callatis and extremely rare in all of Scythia. This is an ampulla, egg-shaped and very small, of the kind worn hanging from the neck (easily visible on the sides are pierced handles for a small chain or a string), decorated on both sides by an identical cross with the ends slightly visible. On the body of the cross is a decorative motif of concentric circles. This object is like the well-known devotional ampullae linked to *pilgrimages of the faithful to holy places. Considering the position of the city and its consequent intense relations with the East, the presence of such an ampulla at Callatis is not surprising: nevertheless, it remains an extremely rare piece in the archaeological-artistic panorama of the region.

Em. Popescu, *Inscripţiile greceşti şi latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite in România*, Bucharest 1976; I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; Id., *Christian Art in Romania*, 1, Bucharest 1979; C. Preda, *Callatis. Necropole romano-bizantina*, Bucharest 1980; N. Duval, RA 2, Paris 1980, 322-326; A. Rădulescu - V. Lungu, *Le christianisme en Scythie Mineure à la lumière des dernières découvertes archéologiques*, in Actes du XI Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne, 1984, III, 2561-2615; M. Ionescu - I.I.C. Opris, *O ampullă din Asia Minor recent descoperită la Callatis* (*A pilgrim flask of Asia Minor recently discovered at Callatis*): Thraco-Dacica 19 (1998) 167-170.

I. Barnea - A. Garrisi

CALLINICUS (d. after 450). Monk of the *monastery of the Rufiniani near *Constantinople after 426 at the latest, a disciple of the founder St. *Hypatius, whose biography he wrote soon after his death, i.e., ca. 447–450. This work remained unpublished until it was retouched and circulated in the next generation. G.J.M. Bartelink has published the *Life of Hypatius* (SC 177, Paris 1971) and studied its language, literary form (with affinities to the *Life of Anthony*) and relation to ps.-*Macarius's spirituality.

CPG 6042; CPG/S 6042; BS 7, 860-861; BHG 760; A. J. Festugière, *Les Moines d'Orient* II, Paris 1961, 13-82; Patrologia V, 39.

J. Gribomont

CALLINICUS (Nicephorium). Now near Raqqa, Callinicus was a fort on the left bank of the Euphrates, a station on the way to Commagene, N Mesopotamia and *Dura Europos (Ammianus 23,3,7). The founding of the city goes back to Alexander the Great, who named it Nicephorium. Under Seleucus II Callinicus (265–225 BC) the name was changed to Callinicus. Annexed to the Parthian kingdom, in AD 35 it came under the rule of Tiridates III, and at the time of the Flavii under the direct rule of *Rome. Its character as a large commercial center and the rapid expansion of Christianity in this area of ancient *Mesopotamia lead to the assumption that the city had a Christian community very early. *Eusebius of Caesarea confirms this indirectly when he says that the land of the Parthians, of which Callinicus was then a part, was assigned to the evangelistic work of the *apostle *Thomas (*HE* III 1,1).

In the war between *Julian and the Persian king Sapor, the city hosted the Roman emperor (363), who arrived with a grand display of arms and offered it military support. Callinicus achieved notoriety again in 388 because of the religious riots there. On the occasion of the feast of the Maccabees, some local monks set fire to a chapel used by the *Valentinians, a Christian sect at Callinicus that went back to the 2nd c. At the same time a local *synagogue was burned down at the instigation of the bishop, destroying some precious objects. The *comes Orientis,* in sensitivity to the influential Jews, informed *Theodosius, who reproved him for not punishing the arsonists and requiring the bishop of Callinicus to rebuild the synagogue at his own expense. *Ambrose of Milan intervened in the affair, obtaining from the emperor the revocation of the two measures, but he had to suffer the consequences of what to Theodosius seemed an undue interference.

In the age-old war between the Byzantines and *Persians and because of its strategic position, Callinicus was fortified by the *Byzantine emperor *Leo I (457–475), who changed its name to Leontopolis. About sixty years later (531), the Byzantine armies led by *Belisarius were defeated on the plain of Callinicus by the Persians, who razed the city to the ground in 542. The clashes between Byzantines and Persians

continued even after the truce concluded between *Justinian and *Chosroes (545); only a few years later Callinicus was the theater of another battle between the two armies (583). With the Arab invasion of 639 the city changed the ancient name to Raqqa.

By the will of the emperor and for the purpose of settling the disputes between *Chalcedonian Christians and *monophysites, in 567 the city hosted a meeting of bishops of the two groups, which resolved absolutely nothing. At this time there were numerous recluses living near the city; also nearby was the Monastery of Mar Mattai, famous for theological studies. In his chronicle the historian Michael the Syrian reports the names of 20 monophysite bishops who succeeded one another at Callinicus from the mid-8th to the end of the 12th c.

DHGE 11, 412-414; R. Mouterde - A. Poidebard, *Le limes de Chalcis*, I, Paris 1945, 127-129; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945, 295; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monf. 1994, 61-63; M. Al-Khalaf - K. Kohlmeyer, *Untersuchungen zu ar-Raqqa - Nikephorion/ Callinicum*: Mitt. des deutschen archäol. Instituts, Damaskus 2 (1985) 133-162; H. Savon, *Ambroise de Milan*, Paris 1997, 251-264; Fedalto 2, 809.

L. Padovese

CALLINICUS I, patriarch. Patriarch of *Constantinople (693–705), was first presbyter and *skeuophylax* of the Church of St. Mary in Blachernae, Constantinople, then succeeded Paul III in the patriarchal see (Niceph., *Chronogr. brev*. 68 f., PG 100, 1048 cd, cf. Theoph., *Chron*. A.M. 6186, PG 108, 744). He opposed *Justinian II's (685–695 and 705–711) violence and oppression against his subjects and the church; e.g., he refused to compose a prayer for the demolition of a church on whose site the emperor wished to (and did) build a fountain and a headquarters for the Blue party (Theoph., *Chron*. A.M. 6185, PG 108, 748 ab). The emperor seems to have decided to rid himself of his patriarch violently, so Callinicus took part in *Leontius's plot and uprising which led to the fall of Justinian, who was mutilated and exiled to Chersona (695; Niceph., *De rebus post Maur. gestis*, PG 100, 937-940; Theoph., *Chron*. A.M. 6187, PG 108, 750ff.). But when Justinian regained the empire in 705, he had Callinicus blinded and exiled to *Rome, where he died (Niceph., *De rebus post Maur. gestis* PG 100, 944 c; Theoph., *Chron*. A.M. 6198, PG 108, 760 c). Basil II's *Menologion* adds that he died walled up alive in a vaulted room (PG 117, 600 cd); the anonymous 10th-c. menologion relates rather that the patriarch was found alive after 40 days and lived for another four days, and that the pope, after an apparition of the *apostles, had Callinicus buried in St. Peter's (Latyshev, *Menol. Anon. Byz.* II, St. Petersburg 1912, 339-341). The Greeks venerate him as a saint (*memoria* 23 August).

AASS Aug. IV, 645-647; BHG n. 288 f.; DHGE 11, 415; Fliche-Martin, *Storia d. Ch.* V, 241-242; LTK 5, 1262; BS 3, 673-675.

A. De Nicola

CALLINICUS of Pelusium. Bishop of *Pelusium (Egypt), follower of *Melitius and enemy of *Athanasius, whom he, with Ision of Athribis and Eudaemon of Tanis, accused of violence against Ischyras and unjust taxation of the Egyptians (Athan., *Ap. c. Arian.* 60; Socr., *HE* I, 27) before Emperor *Constantine. At *Tyre (335) one of the charges against Athanasius was that he had deposed and maltreated Callinicus (Soz., *HE* II, 25). Callinicus was present at the Council of *Serdica (343).

M. Simonetti, see index; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Egypte au IVe siècle* (*328-373*), Rome 1996.

E. Prinzivalli

CALLISTUS I, pope (217–222). Of servile condition, after occupations scarcely honorable, at least according to *Hippolytus of Rome (his main biographical source: *Haer.* 9,1-12; 10,27), Pope *Zephyrinus appointed him deacon of the *cemetery on the Via Appia, now famous as the "catacombs of St. Callisto." Elected bishop (see Eusebius, *HE* 6,21,1-2), he intervened in current theological controversies, *excommunicating *Sabellius for *heresy. Despite this clearly antimonarchian stance, Hippolytus accused him of being a *patripassian himself. Hübner, who stresses the similarities between Callistus's *trinitarian doctrine and that of *Noetus, considers Hippolytus's criticisms to be well founded. Hippolytus also accused him of moral laxity, since he had too lightly readmitted to the community those guilty of indecency and had allowed marriages between noblewomen and slaves; in any case his position was an important step in the history of *penitence. His refusal to depose clergy, perhaps guilty, is also of some interest. It is still disputed whether Callistus was the author of the *Edictum peremptorium,* mentioned by *Tertullian (*Pud.* 1, 6) (cf. Brent, who defends his authorship). It is very probable, however, that he died a *martyr. The **Depositio martyrum* of 354 puts his *memoria* on 14 October at Trastevere, where his tomb is still venerated.

Hippolytus, *Haer.* 9,12,16-18; 10,27,3-4; AASS Oct. VI (1868)

401-448; BHL 1523ff.; DHGE 11, 421-424; BS 3,680-689; J. Gaudemet, *Sociétés et mariages*, Strasbourg 1980, 104-115; St.G. Hall: TRE 7 (1981) 559-563 (fundamental); LTK[3] 2, 891; A. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century*, Leiden 1995; R.H. Heine, *The Christology of Callistus*: JTS 49 (1998) 56-91; H.J. Vogt, *Die Trinitätslehre des Papstes Kalixt I*: ThQ 179 (1999) 195-209; RGG[4] 2, 13f.; R.M. Hübner: LACL (2002) 422ff. (bibl.).

B. Studer

CANDIDIANUS Comes. Commander of the guard of Emperor *Theodosius II, sent in 431 to *Ephesus to maintain order in the sessions of the ecumenical council there; he also kept bishops from returning to their sees before the council's work was concluded and kept laypeople and curious monks away.

CPG 6257, 8668, 8687, 8688, 8689; PG 84, 595-597, 648-649; ACO I,4, 31-33, 86; ACO I,I,I, 120-121; PLRE II, 257.

P. Marone

CANDIDUS the Arian (4th c.). Among the *African rhetor *Marius Victorinus's anti-*Arian works are two letters to him from an otherwise unknown Arian named Candidus: in the first, Candidus expounds Arian doctrine on the basis of *Platonic philosophy; in the second he sends Victorinus the texts, in *Latin, of two letters by Arius and *Eusebius of Nicomedia. Various modern scholars think that Candidus was a literary fiction of Victorinus, who used him to present his refutation of Arian doctrine more clearly and effectively.

CPL 680-681; SC 68, 106-124, 176-182; P. Nautin, *Candidus l'Arien*, in *L'homme devant Dieu* I, Paris 1964, 309-320; P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris 1971, 272-275; J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, Berlin 1994, 244-263.

M. Simonetti

CANDIDUS the Valentinian (3rd c.). *Jerome read a dialogue by *Origen on the Son's generation from the Father, which involved a division of substance (*probolē*) and the perdition of the devil because of his wicked nature. Was Candidus the *heretic who, according to Origen's letter "to his friends at *Alexandria" (cited by *Rufinus), debated with Origen at *Athens and falsified the minutes of it? This seems to follow from Jerome's text, which cites another passage from the same letter before speaking of Origen's dialogue with Candidus: in any case, more information would be helpful.

Jerome, *Apol. adv. lib. Ruf.* II, 18-19; FL 23, 440-443; Rufinus, *De adult. lib. Orig.* 7, CCL 20, 11-12.

H. Crouzel

CANON, MURATORIAN (Muratorian Fragment). The Muratorian Canon is the oldest list of the sacred books of the NT; it is not known whether the list of NT books was preceded by a list of the canonical books of the OT. The Muratorian Canon is named for the Italian scientist L.A. Muratori (d. 1750), who discovered it in an 8th- c. manuscript of Milan's Biblioteca Ambrosiana and published it in 1740. It includes 85 lines; the beginning is lost, and it begins with the last sentences on the gospel of St. Mark, followed by the gospel of St. Luke and the books of the NT, except Heb, Jas, 2 Pet and 3 Jn. It lists two *Apocalypses*: of John and of Peter; some did not want the latter read in church. The *Book of Wisdom*—according to the author—was written by Solomon's friends; the *Shepherd,* a very useful book, cannot be read officially in the church. It mentions the *Letters to the Laodiceans* and *to the Alexandrians* as Marcionite works. It rejects the works of Valentinus of Arsinoe, Miltiades, *Basilides (Asiatic founder of the *Cataphrygians) and the authors of the *Book of Psalms* of Marcion (the last lines, containing this information, are difficult to understand). The text comes from an unknown author and was written probably at *Rome in the 2nd half of the 2nd c.: he speaks of Pope *Pius (ca. 142–155) as a contemporary, but the date remains disputed. It is possible that the original was written in Greek. The Muratorian Canon is the first list of the texts of the Bible and is one of the most important texts for the history of the NT canon.

Zahn 1-143; H. Lietzmann, *Das muratorische Fragment*, Bonn 1933; *Enchiridion Biblicum* nr. 1. G. Bardy, DBS 5, 1957, 1394-1408; TRE 6, 22-48; Ger. tr.: Schneemelcher 1, 27f.; B.M. Metzger, *Il canone del NT*, Brescia 1997, 169-178; T. Zahn, *Hippolytus, der Verfasser des muratorisches Kanon*: NeuKirchlZeit 33 (1922) 417-436; G.M. Hanemann, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Developement of the Canon*, Oxford 1992; J.P. Henne, *La datation du Canon de Muratori*: RBen 100 (1993) 54-75; J.D. Kaestli, *La datation du Canon de Muratori*: Cristianesimo in the storia 15 (1994) 609-634; V. Verheyden, *The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute*, in *The Biblical Canons*, J.-M. Auwers, H.J. De Jonge (eds.), Louvain 2003, 487-556.

M. Starowieyski

CANON, ROMAN. The *Roman eucharistic prayer is called *canon actionis* by the old Gelasian *sacramentary (Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum*, 183). The *Eucharist is an action regulated by a canon. The Roman Canon has preserved the expression *infra actionem* for the parts known as *Communicantes*

and *Hanc igitur*. The idea of observing a canon as the norm of action in the celebration of the Eucharist was formulated by St. *Augustine: *Totum illum agendi ordinem . . . quem universa per orbem servat Ecclesia* ("He [the Apostle] prescribed in its entirety the order observed by the universal church throughout the world" (*Ep*. 54,6: PL 33, 203); Pope *Vigilius, in a letter to *Profuturus of Braga, gives the name *canonica prex* to the unchangeable part of the Roman eucharistic prayer.

The 6th-c. *Ordo Romanus I* speaks of the canon without a preface (Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani*, 95), a practice which contradicts the oldest tradition. For *Cyprian, the preface and the rest of the eucharistic prayer form a unity: *Ideo et sacerdos ante orationem praefatione praemissa parat fratrum mentes dicendo: sursum corda, ut dum respondet plebs: habemus ad Dominum, admoneatur nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere* [Thus also the priest, by way of the preface before his prayer, prepares the minds of the brothers saying: "Lift up your hearts," so that when the common people respond "We have [lift] them to the Lord," let him be admonished that he himself ought to be thinking nothing other than about the Lord (*De dom. orat*. 31: CSEL 3, 289, 14-17)]. The change could have been caused by the fact that, from the 4th c., only the prefaces became interchangeable, while the rest of the canon, except for certain embolisms, remained fixed. On this, in 538 Pope Vigilius wrote to Profuturus of Braga: *Ordinem quoque precum in celebritate missarum nullo nos tempore, nulla festivitate significamus habere divisum, sed semper eodem tenore oblata Deo munera consecrare. Quoties vero paschalis, aut ascensionis domini, vel pentecostes, et epiphaniae, sanctorumque Dei fuerit agenda festivitas, singula capitula diebus apta subjungimus, quibus commemorationem sanctae solemnitatis, aut eorum facimus, quorum natalitia celebramus: cetera vero ordine consueto prosequimur* [As to the arrangement of prayers in the celebration of the mass, we intend to have no difference for any time, nor any feast; rather, we mean always to consecrate the gifts offered to God in the same way. Whenever the feasts of Easter, or the Ascension of the Lord, or Pentecost and Epiphany, and the saints of God festivals are to be observed, we add distinct paragraphs appropriate to those days by which we celebrate the commemoration of a holy solemnity, or we celebrate the anniversaries of the saints: we continue with the usual order for the other observances (PL 69, 18)].

The origin of the Roman Canon is an open question, although scholars tend to date it to the time of Pope *Damasus I. The language of the canon displays the rhythm and language proper to pre-4th-c. Roman discourse, without the *cursus* that we find in later orations, esp. at the time of Pope *Leo I. The primitive *epiclesis also shows the canon's ancient origin, i.e., before the Eastern *pneumatological specifications. The earliest traces of the text are in a partial citation by St. *Ambrose in *De Sacramentis* (IV, 21-27), which begins with *Fac nobis hanc oblationem scriptam* [Make for us this written offering] and ends with *quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Melchisedech* [which is what your High Priest Melchizedek offered]. It can be assumed that Ambrose also knew a form of a preface and a petition, since in *De Sacram*. (IV, 14) he states: *Laus Deo defertur, oratio petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro caeteris* [Praise is offered to God, prayer is requested for the people, for kings, for the rest]. The present text of the canon is virtually that of St. Gregory (Botte-Mohrmann, *L'ordinaire de la messe*, 15-25).

Patristic citations of parts of the Roman Canon shed light on its history and theology. At the *Te igitur,* according to St. Leo, the church and its leaders are remembered: *De fratribus vero quos et epistolis tuis et legatorum nostrorum relatione communionis nostrae cupidos esse cognovimus . . . pacis et communionis nostrae unitate laetentur. . . . De nominibus autem Dioscori, Juvenalis, et Eusthatii ad sacrum altare recitandis dilectionem tuam hoc decet custodire, quod nostri ibidem constituti faciendum esse dixerunt, quodque honorandae S. Flaviani memoriae non repugnet, et a gratia tua Christianae plebis animos non avertat* [But concerning the brothers whom we learn from your letters and from the delegates report desire to be in communion with us . . . they may be heartened by their unity of peace and communion with us. . . . However, concerning the recitation of the names of Dioscorus, Juvenal and Eustathius at the sacred altar, it behooves you, beloved, to hold to that which our brothers who were present said ought to be done and which is not incompatible with the honorable memory of St. Flavian and will not turn the souls of the laity away from you (*Ep*. 80: PL 54, 913-915)]. In his letter to *Justinian (*Ep. 4 ad Just*., 2: PL 69, 22), Pope Vigilius cites the *Te igitur* with the words *pro Ecclesia quam adunare, regere, custodire digneris* [You have been deemed worthy to unite, to rule, to defend on behalf of the church]. The practice of naming bishops in this part of the Mass should be seen in the context of the doctrinal controversies of that time, when communion with a group of bishops assured orthodoxy of faith.

In the 4th c. the practice arose of reading the names of those the Mass was being offered for during the canon. The deacon read the names (*diptychs)

aloud, and the priest then continued with *quorum tibi fides cognita est.* . . . *Jerome criticized this practice in *In Ezech.* 6, 18: *Publiceque diaconus in Ecclesiis recitet offerentium nomina: tantum offert illa, tantum ille pollicitus est, placentque sibi ad plausum populi, torquente eos conscientia* [The deacon in the churches publicly recites the names which are presented: all those offered are presented, and they seek approval for themselves and bend their consciences to the applause of the people (PL 25, 175)] and *In Hierem.* 2, 108: *At nunc publice recitantur offerentium nomina et redemptio peccatorum mutatur in laudem: nec meminerunt viduae illius in evangelio, quae in gazophylacium duo aera mittendo omnium divitum vicit donaria* [But now the names of those offered are publicly recited, and the forgiveness of sins exchanged for praise; but they do not remember the widow in the gospel who placed her two mites into the treasury triumphing over all the donations of the rich (PL 24, 784)]. Pope *Innocent I, however, approved the practice and ordered the bishop of Gubbio, who followed the custom of reading the diptychs before the canon, to observe the Roman practice *inter sacra mysteria* (*Ep.* 25: PL 20, 553).

The addition of the names of the saints in the *Communicantes* was done by Pope Vigilius. The pope speaks in *Ep.* 2, cited above (PL 69, 18), of special *capitula* for Easter, *Ascension, *Pentecost and *Epiphany: those for Christmas, Epiphany and Ascension nonetheless seem of Leonine origin. The memory of the Blessed Virgin, introduced into Eastern *anaphorae after the Council of *Ephesus, was in the Roman Canon from the time of Pope Gelasius.

The *Quam oblationem* presents a problem. Ambrose ends it with the words *quod est figura Corporis et Sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi* (*De Sacr.* IV, 21: CSEL 73, 55, 2), an expression which recalls the ancient *imago* and *similitudo* used by *Gelasius in his letter to *Eutyches (*Tract. III*, *De duabus naturis in Christo*, 14: Thiel I, 451). The Gregorian text leaves out the term *figura* and introduces the causative particle *ut,* indicating in this way the independence of the epiclesis from the account of institution. In the Ambrosian text, however, the *quod est figura* is necessary for entering into the account of the institution, which according to *Ambrose is properly consecratory: *Consecratio igitur quibus verbis est et cuius sermonibus? Domini Iesu. Nam reliqua omnia, quae dicuntur in superioribus, a sacerdote dicuntur . . . Ubi venitur, ut conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, iam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit sacramentum* [With whose words and sayings, therefore, is the consecration given? Those of our Lord Jesus. For all of the other words which are spoken previously are said by the priest. . . . When we arrive at the preparation of the venerable sacrament, the priest no longer uses his own words; rather he uses the words of Christ. Therefore the word of Christ accomplishes this sacrament (*De Sacram.* IV, 4,14: CSEL 73, 52, 10-16; the question of the epiclesis is treated under its own entry)].

Commemoration of the dead must have been introduced into the Roman Canon by some 3rd-c. Christian funerary prayer, as is shown by the text: its Latin recalls that of the catacombs. *Augustine attests to the practice of reading the names of the dead in the eucharistic prayer, writing in *Serm.* 172, 2: *Ut pro eis qui in corporis et sanguinis Christi communione defuncti sunt, cum ad ipsum sacrificium loco suo commemorantur, oretur, ac pro illis quoque id offerri commemoretur* [Prayers should be offered for those who have died in the communion of the body and blood of Christ; whenever their names are commemorated at the sacrifice in the usual place, it should be announced that the sacrifice is offered for them (PL 38, 936)]. The final doxology of the Roman Canon, with the formula *in unitate Spiritus Sancti,* seems to be later, since it employs a fully developed *trinitarian doctrine. Ambrose's doxology, however, seems much older (*De Sacram.* VI, 5,24: SC 25 bis, 152). Both lack the perspective of ps.-Hippolytus, of the church in which the doxology is offered to the Father and to the Son with the *Holy Spirit (*Tr. Ap.*: LQF 39, 55).

L. Eizenhöfer, *Canon Missae Romanae* (Rer. Eccl. Doc., s. minor, subs. stud. I, VII): Pars prior: Traditio textus (Rome 1954); pars altera: Textus propinqui (Rome 1966); F. Cabrol, *Canon*: DACL 2, 1847-1905; E. Bishop, *On the Early Texts of the Roman Canon*: *Liturgia historica*, Oxford 1918, 77-115; B. Botte, *Le canon de la messe romaine*, éd. critique, intr. et notes, Louvain 1935; A. Baumstark, *Das Problem des römischen Messkanon*: EphLit 53 (1939) 204-244; M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen-âge. 2. Les textes*, Louvain 1948 (Spicil. Sacr. Lovan. 23); B. Capelle, *Innocent Ier et le canon de la messe*: RecTh 19 (1952) 236-247 (= *Travaux Liturgiques* . . . , 2, 236-247); B. Botte - Ch. Mohrmann, *L'ordinaire de la messe*, Paris 1953; B. Capelle, *Problèmes du "Communicantes" de la messe*: Riv. Lit. 40 (1953) 187-195 (= *Travaux liturgiques* . . . , 2, 269-275); Id., *L'évolution du qui pridie de la messe romaine*: RecTh 22 (1955) 5-16 (= *Travaux liturgiques* . . . , 2, 276-286); Id., *L'intercession dans la messe romaine*: RBen 65 (1955) 181-191 (= *Travaux liturgiques* . . . , 2, 248-257); A.G. Martimort (ed.), *L'Église en prière*, Tournai 1961 (It. tr. Rome [2]1966); P. Borella, *Evoluzione letteraria del canone romano*, Riv. Lit. 53 (1966) 523-561; L.C Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum romanae aecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, Rome 1960, [2]1968 (Rer. Eccl. Doc. 4); A.G. Martimort (ed.), *The Church at Prayer*: *The Eucharist*, Shannon 1973; J. Jungmann, *The Mass*, Collegeville 1976; A. Keifer Ralph, *The Unity of the Roman Canon*: *An Examination of Its Unique Structure*: Studia Liturgica 11 (1976) 39-58; F. Manns, *Origine judeo-chrétienne de l'*Unde et memores: EphLit 101 (1987) 60-

68; M.J. Moreton, *Rethinking the Origin of the Roman Canon*: SP 26 (1991) 63-66; E. Mazza, *L'anafora eucaristica. Studi sulle origini* (BELS 62), Rome 1992; G. Di Napoli, Communicantes and Nobis quoque. *Un'ipotesi sulla loro origine e funzione*: EO 8 (1997) 435-436; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex eucharistica*, Fribourg 1998, 423-477; E. Mazza, *The Eucharist in the First Four Centuries*, in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 3, Collegeville, MN 1999, 52-55; G. Di Napoli, *Il lento processo di formazione del canone romano*: EO 17 (2000) 229-268; C. Cibien, *Preghiere eucharistiche*, in *Liturgia* (Dizionari S. Paolo), Cinisello B. 2001, 1523-1524.

A. Chupungco

CANONES ADOMNANI (7th c.). An anonymous collection, though attributed to *Adamnán, of 20 hygienic canons on pure and impure foods, along the lines of Mosaic legislation.

CPL 1792; Kenney 80; BCLL 609. *Editions:* PL 88, 815-816; PL 96, 1324-1325; F.W.H. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, Giessen 1874, rev. ed. Leipzig, 1885, 120-123; L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*, Dublin 1963, 176-181; J.T. McNeill - H.M. Gamer, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal 'Libri Poenitentiales' and Selections from Related Documents*, New York 1938 ([2]1965; [3]1979), 131-134; H. Sauer, *Zur Überlieferung und Anlage von Erzbischof Wulfstans Handbuch*: Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 36 (1980) 341-384.

A. Di Berardino

CANONES HIBERNENSES (mid 7th c.). This name indicates a collection of six Irish texts of ecclesiastical and civil laws, four of which are attributed to synods. According to Bieler's order they are: (1) *De disputatione Hibernensis synodi* (29 canons); (2) *De arreis* (12 canons in two recensions: a list of commutations of penances); (3) *Synodus sapientium* (*Sic de decimis disputant*) (8 canons on tithing); (4) *Synodus Hibernensis* (9 canons on penance or legal fines); (5) *De iectione ecclesiae graduum ab hospitio* (11 canons on fines for those who refuse hospitality or who kill an ecclesiastic); and (6) *De canibus synodus sapientium* (4 canons on restoration of damages caused by dogs).

CPL 1884; Kenney 78; BCLL, 602-608.

Editions: F.W.H. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, Giessen 1874, rev. ed. Leipzig 1885, 136-144; PL 96, 1326; P. Ciprotti, *Penitenziali anteriori al sec. VII*, Milan 1966, 3-8; L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*, Dublin 1963, 160-175.

Translations: J.T. McNeill - H.M. Gamer, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal "Libri Poenitentiales" and Selections from Related Documents*, New York 1938 ([2]1965; [3]1979), 118-130.

Studies: L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*, Dublin 1963, 20-26 and 277-283; E. Coccia, *La cultura irlandese precarolina miracolo o mito?*: SM 17 (1943) 351-352; M.P. Sheehy, *The Collectio Canonum Hibernensis: A Celtic Phenomenon*, in *Die Iren und Europa im frühe Mittelalter*, ed. H. Loew, Stuttgart 1982, 525-535; G. MacNiocaill, *Christian Influences in Early Irish Law*: ibid., 151-156; D. Ó Corráin - L. Breatnach - A. Breen, *The Laws of the Irish*: Peritia 3 (1984) 382-438; C. Vogel, *Il peccatore e la penitenza nel Medioevo*, enlarged ed., ed. C. Achille Cesarini, Leumann [2]1988, 70 f., 82; T. O'Laughlin, *Celtic Theology: Humanity, World and God in Early Irish Writings*, London - New York 2000, ch. 6.

A. Di Berardino

CANONICAL - CANON. These terms, derived from Greek *canon,* which originally meant the stem of a cane and, by extension, any long, straight stick of wood. Since the ancients used canes for measuring, *canon* also came to mean measure, rule and, by metonymy, measured or ruled. This sense, which reflects the Greek ideal of measure, is present in 2 Cor 10:13, 16, where Paul claims to keep his apostolate to the field that has been "measured" to him. The nominative form designates a priest who is part of the chapter of a cathedral or collegiate church, as well as other religious institutions which arose in the Middle Ages and later; it can be an honorary title. The adjective *canonical* distinguishes ecclesiastical legislation from civil, esp. from the 12th c., and indicates that which is in conformity with the norms established by the ecclesiastical legislator: canonical age, canonical impediments, canonical visits, canonical hours. Toward the mid-4th c. there were canonical cantors employed in the service of the church and inscribed in its official register.

In opposition to noncanonical books and distinguished from them, it designates those books which form the Bible, i.e., that are considered inspired, comprising the official list of the church and endowed with an intrinsic capacity to infallibly regulate faith and morals. The term was used in this latter sense by *Origen (*In Cant. prol.*) and by *Jerome between 389–390 (*Praef. in lib. Salom.*). Between Origen and Jerome was the Council of *Laodicea (ca. 360), which in canon 59 clearly distinguishes the canonical books from the noncanonical, not allowing the recitation of the latter in church (*Ench. Bibl.*, Rome 1954, 5). *See also* *Ancient Lists of Canonical Books and Apocrypha.

Basil, *Ep*. 188 (PG 32, 673); Hfl-Lecl 1/2, 1008; H. Leclercq, *Chanoines*: DACL III/1, 247-248; P. Torquebiau, *Chanoines*: DDC III, 471-488; Ch. Dereine, *Chanoines*: DHGE XII, 353-405; Höpfel H., DBS I, 1022-1045.

E. Peretto

CANONICAL BOOKS. *See* *ANCIENT LISTS of CANONICAL BOOKS and APOCRYPHA.

CANONICAL COLLECTIONS

I. Eastern collections - II. Western collections up to the 8th c.

The canonical collections bring together the disciplinary rules enacted by the ecclesiastical authorities. They are distinguished by their provenance into general and particular (collections of conciliar decisions or collections of decretals); by the quality of the documents composing them into authentic and apocryphal collections; by the authority of their compiler into private and official (or authentic) collections; and by their ordering principle into chronological and systematic collections. The NT writings do not just hand down the evidence of the primitive church's belief; they also contain the moral and disciplinary precepts that determine the church's basic institutions and the essential principles of Christian living and are thus in a way the basis of all later canon law and of the first canonical collections. As the Christian communities developed, the need to organize them became more and more compelling; their leaders, naturally appealing to *apostolic authority whose succession they had inherited, took the decisions that seemed to them useful for the good functioning of the churches. This procedure, attested to by the pastoral and canonical epistles, remained valid until the 4th c. and gave rise to a great number of writings called apostolic *apocrypha, whose influence on the canonical collections was considerable. The peace of *Constantine allowed the church to strengthen its hierarchical structures and to fix, through agreed legislation, prescriptions relating to faith and discipline; *councils became a public and general institution; the popes were entreated more and more to pronounce on particular problems, and they replied with rescripts or decretals. These documents form the primitive nucleus of the first canonical collections properly so-called, which appear first in the East, then in the West, from the 4th c.

I. Eastern collections. We are still far from being able to define the origin of the first Eastern canonical collections.

1. Chronological collections: according to E. Schwartz, the first collection of this type was compiled at Antioch under Bishop *Meletius, between 362–381. It is called *Syntagma canonum* and contains in chronological order the most important particular councils (*Ancyra, 314; *Neocaesarea, 314–325; *Gangra, ca. 341; *Antioch, 341; *Laodicea, 343–380). It seems to have been widely circulated in the East, since the Council of *Chalcedon refers to its first canon and cites it more than once. (Its canons were numbered as a continuous series.) The Antiochene *Syntagma,* supplemented by the canons of the general councils (*Nicaea [325] first, because of its dignity; *Constantinople, 381; Chalcedon, 451), became the primitive nucleus of the majority of the Eastern collections, and particularly those of the *Byzantine church. In the 6th c. the canons of *Ephesus (431), the 133 canons of the Council of *Carthage of May 419 and those of the Council of *Serdica (343) were added to them. The imperial chancellery polished them up in order to have a collection that brought together the canon law current in all the churches of the *oecumene*. From 501, the Antiochene *Syntagma* was translated into *Syriac for the church of Hierapolis (Mabbug). There are also very old *Coptic translations for the church of *Alexandria, which in turn transmitted them to that of *Ethiopia.

The Council *in *Trullo,* which met at Constantinople in 691 (or 692), fixed the official list of the sources of the canon law of the Byzantine church: to the documents of the *Syntagma* were definitively added the 85 canons of the Apostles, the canon of the Council of Constantinople under *Nectarius (394), the canons of the Fathers of the Eastern church (*Dionysius of Alexandria, *Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Peter of Alexandria, *Athanasius, *Basil of Caesarea, *Gregory of Nyssa, Timothy, *Alexander of Alexandria, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Amphilochius of Iconium, *Gennadius of Constantinople), those of *Cyprian (on second *baptism of heretics), and finally 102 disciplinary canons of the Council *in Trullo* itself.

2. From the 6th c., for obvious practical reasons, the Eastern canonists composed *systematic collections,* arranging the material of the chronological canonical collections by subject under as many rubrics, thus making it easier to use the text to find what was wanted. In some cases these collections brought together only the conciliar canons; in other cases the imperial laws enacted on ecclesiastical matters (*nomoi*), and in some cases both (nomocanonical collections). Of the first type, the most important include the canonical collection in 50 titles by *John III Scholasticus (patriarch of Constantinople 565–577), who also composed another canonical collection of 87 chapters, starting from Justinian's *Novelle*. The principal nomocanonical collections are those in 50 titles, a fusion of the last two mentioned collections into one, composed at the end of the 6th c. and several times enriched by a supple-

ment, and the Nomocanon in 14 titles (9th c.). The main commentators on Byzantine canon law are Theodore Prodromos (8th c.), Zonara, Aristenes and Balsamon (12th c.).

II. Western collections up to the 8th c. It is hard to specify the origin and tenor of the first Western canonical collections. Each region gradually prepared codes of current canon law, bringing together documents that built it up (local or general councils, decretals, imperial laws, etc.).

1. The Church of *Rome seems to have possessed, from the 4th c., a small collection comprising the canons of Nicaea, to which had been added, under the same name, those of *Serdica. *Innocent I (Jaffé, 292) and *Zosimus (Jaffé, 347) seem to refer to it. In the West, in the 4th and 5th c., many other *Latin translations of the canons of Nicaea circulated, to which certain canons of the Greek councils of the Antiochene *Syntagma canonum* (Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople) were added, in whole or in part. Various recensions (Isidoriana, Prisca or Italica, Gallo-Hispanic, etc.) were also preserved which, from the 4th to 6th c., were joined to other canonical documents to form local canonical collections.

2. *African canonical legislation was abundant from the 4th c., thanks to the decisions of the Councils of *Carthage (345 and 390). A number of canonical collections were issued in this province under *Aurelius, primate of Carthage (391–427/430), in particular the *Epitome* of the Council of *Hippo of 393, composed in 397 by the bishops of *Byzacena (Munier, *Concilia Africae*, XXI), which offers a substantial summary of the *African canon law of that time. Its provisions were observed in all the provinces of the region and reconfirmed by the plenary councils that met at Aurelius's instigation and under his presidency. The affair of *Apiarius, which set the Africans against Roman claims regarding appeals to Rome, provided a good reason for the formation of ample dossiers justifying the point of view of the Council of Carthage of May 419. To prove that their canons were in agreement with those of Nicaea, the Africans composed a brief collection of 40 (33) canons, known to historians as *Canones in causa Apiarii* (Munier, 98ff.). On the same occasion they sent to Rome ample extracts from the acts of their councils (from 393 to 418); from all these, at the end of the 5th c., *Dionysius Exiguus made a collection of 100 canons, called *Codex canonum ecclesiae africanae* (Munier, 173ff.). After this golden age the African church, exhausted by the *Vandal invasion, produced little in the way of canons; just two compilations contained all the legislation of that time: the *Epitome* of the deacon *Ferrandus (523/546) and *Cresconius's *Concordia canonum*.

3. To the common elements of the collections (canons of local councils, canons of the Greek councils, decretals), from the 5th c. the Gallo-Roman churches added two particular collections that circulated widely all through the early Middle Ages: the so-called collection of the II Council of *Arles, a private collection composed between 442 and 506; and particularly the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua,* thought to have been compiled by the priest *Gennadius of Marseille (ca. 475/485). With the passing of time, this code was considered to be that of the IV Council of Carthage of 398. It is a vast composition in three parts: a profession of faith for the bishop being consecrated; a compendium of canon law in 102 canons, taken from the Eastern and local councils; and a small ritual for ordination. From the 6th to the 9th c. the *Gallican churches composed their canonical collections as best they could, bearing in mind the political events that continually built up and destroyed kingdoms (*Franks, *Burgundians, *Visigoths). In this way many canonical collections appeared, more or less closely resembling each other, whose provenance and area of application are very difficult to ascertain. Among the best known are the collections of Corbie, Cologne, Toulouse-Albi, Lorsch, *Lyons, Reims, Pithou, St. Maur, St. Amand and Burgundy (Maassen, 556-642). The most widespread was the *Vetus Gallica,* once called the Angers canonical collection, a small systematic collection of 400 canons distributed under some 60 titles. Its latest editor claims to distinguish three stages of elaboration: Lyons, ca. 600; Autun, ca. 675; Corbie, early 8th c. (Mordek 95ff.).

4. From the 6th c., *Spain possessed two canonical collections: the Novara collection, whose first nucleus may go back to 550, and the *Epitome* (late 6th c.) and *Capitula* of *Martin of Braga (ca. 563). But these canonical collections were quickly overshadowed by the *Hispana*, the official canonical collection of the churches belonging to the *Visigothic kingdom of Toledo. The *Hispana* stands out for the excellent quality of its components, borrowed from sound sources (Greek, African, Gallic, Spanish councils) and classified regionally and chronologically, with the addition of 103 decretals and pontifical documents from *Damasus to *Gregory the Great. Though it may have had several authors, the *Hispana* reached *Gaul from the 8th c. and was used there to compile the ps.-Isidorian collections.

5. To complete this description of the regional canonical collections, we must return to Rome,

whose first steps in this area were very modest. In the course of the 5th c., thanks to material received from Africa and the East, during the affair of Apiarius they finally managed to compose better-furnished canonical collections. The *Acacian *schism (476–519) and the double pontifical election of 498 led to the composition of many canonical collections, whose exact relations are still to be clarified. In this crowded but qualitatively diverse output, we may distinguish three groups of canonical collections. The first contains those before Dionysius Exiguus: the Freising collection, very concerned to bring out the rights of the Roman see (Munier, *La Tradition,* 49-53), and the *Quesnelliana,* very rich in documents of a theological nature (profession of faith, *Pelagian dossier) and in St. Leo's letters. These canonical collections were overshadowed by those of the Scythian monk Dionysius, who arrived in *Rome after Pope *Gelasius's death (496).

Dionysius's work was of decisive importance for the history of the canonical collections. He gathered into well-ordered collections the legislative texts originating from the different churches of Christendom (Eastern and African councils; decretals, from *Siricius to *Anastasius II, interesting for universal law). Thanks to the prefaces to his canonical collections, we know that Dionysius left three redactions of his conciliar canons and one collection of decretals (Maassen 422ff.). In 774 Pope Hadrian gave Charlemagne a copious recension of the *Dionysiana* and the *Hadriana* (the *Dionysio-Hadriana*), thus ensuring an extraordinary circulation for the Roman canonist's work. Following the agitation over the election of Pope *Symmachus (498), several minor canonical collections were issued in *Italy. They seem to have been composed by (Roman) clerics who, in one way or another, took part in those debates, well described by the Symmachian apocrypha. Among the most characteristic, we may cite that of St. Biagius, that of the Vatican, and the supplement to the *Dionysiana* (Maassen 445ff.; 504-526); to these we owe the formulation of the principle: *Prima sedes non iudicabitur a quoquam*.

DDC 4, 1446ff.; LTK 6, 254ff.; F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts in Abendlande* I, Graz 1870; A. van Hove, *Commentarium lovaniense, in CJC*, I Prolegomena, Mechliniae - Rome 1945; A.M. Stickler, *Historia iuris canonici latini I, Historia fontium*, Taurini 1950; Ch. Munier, *Les Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, Paris 1960; Id., *Concilia Galliae a. 314-505*, Turnholti 1964; Id., *Concilia Africae a. 345-525*, Turnholti 1974; Id., *La tradition littéraire des dossiers africains*: RDC 29 (1979) 41-52; A. García, *Historia del Derecho canónico* I, Salamanca 1967; H. Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform in Frankenreich. Die Collectio Vetus Gallica*, Berlin 1975; Patrologia IV, 497-514; Patrologia V, 659-675; J. Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église en Occident du II*[e] *au VII*[e] *siècle*, Paris 1985; C. Van de Wiel, *History of Canon Law*, Louvain 1992; Ch. Munier, *Vie conciliaire et collection canoniques en Occident, IV*[e]*-XII*[e] *siècles*, London 1987; P. Landau, *Kanones und Dekretalen. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Quellen des kanonischen Rechts*, Goldbach 1997-1996; B.E. Ferme, *Introduzione alla storia del diritto canonico,* I, Rome 1998; L. Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages* (*ca. 400-1140*)*: A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscript and Literature*, Washington, DC 1999; J. Detlev - H. Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, Washington, DC. 2001; LACL[3] 428-437.

Ch. Munier

CANONS, NICENE (pseudo). The *Council of *Nicaea of 325 published 20 canons. The Arabic translation enlarges the collection in two versions which are substantially the same and differ only in the arrangement of the canons. One version has 80 canons (Mansi 2, 947-982), the other 84 (Mansi 2, 982-1010). They were discovered in the West in the 16th c. by Giovanni Battista Romano and were immediately translated into *Latin; the translation of the second collection goes back to Abraham Ecchellensis. They come from the *Melkite church and were later accepted by the *Coptic and Chaldean churches (Maruta of Maipherqat).

CPG 8523; Hfl-Lecl 1, 511-523; W. Riedel, Die *Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien*, Leipzig 1900; G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, Rome 1930, vol. 1, 586-593; J.B. Darblade, *La collection canonique arabe des Melkites* (XIII[e]-XVII[e] siècles), Vatican City 1946; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1789-1790; D. Ceccarelli Morolli, *I canoni Arabo-Niceni e la loro probabile relazione con la Nubia Cristiana*: Utrumque Ius 26 (1994) 534-550.

A. Di Berardino

CANONS of HIPPOLYTUS. These 38 canons are preserved only in Arabic, which R. Coquin has shown to be a translation from Sahidic *Coptic, in turn translated from Greek. The author used a document which modern historians usually call the **Apostolic Tradition* but which is in fact the fusion of two different works. It is this document, which was and still is in the canonical collections, that the author of the 38 canons translated, omitting many details and making some additions, in this way attempting to reconcile various traditions: the reworked document preserves a ring of antiquity and authority in both its old and new parts. The profession of faith, the theme of canon I, is inspired by the *Nicene Creed: the work is therefore not earlier than the 4th c. The reasons advanced for dating it before 385 (Botte) or in the years 336/340 (Coquin, 329 [31]) are not decisive. They were composed in *Egypt—according to some at *Alexandria, accord-

ing to others in some small city; Kretschmar (1970, 166; 1977, 58 n. 2) thinks it was in Asia Minor. The *Canons of Hippolytus* deal with ordinations, the clergy, Christian initiation, marriage, women etc., in no precise order. The author highlights the importance of *presbyters: "The presbyter is equal to the bishop all except for the see (episcopal) and ordination" (can. 2). The *Canons of Hippolytus* have had an independent circulation, without being integrated into larger collections, though they have been joined to them; they circulated only in the Coptic church.

CPG 1742; D.B. von Haneberg, *Canones S. Hippolyti Arabice e codicibus Romanis*, Munich 1870 (ed. and Lat. tr.); H. Achelis, *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, I, *Canones Hippolyti*, Leipzig 1891 (Lat. tr.); W. Riedel, *Die kirchenrechtlichen Quellen Patriarchats Alexandrien*, Leipzig 1900 (repr. Aalen 1968), 193-230 (Ger. tr.); R. Coquin, *Les canons d'Hippolyte*, in PO 31,2 (Paris 1966 [better translation]). Eng. tr.: *The Canons of Hippolytus*, ed. P.F. Bradshaw, tr. by C. Bebawi, Nottingham 1987; Jap.: A. Laplante, *Hipporyutos no kihanshu*, Major Seminary, Fukuoka 1988; DACL 2, 1942-1949; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 458f.; A. Baumstark, *Kanones des Hippolytus oder Kanones des Julius*: OrChr 2 (1902) 191-196; B. Botte, *L'origine des Canons d'Hippolyte*, in *Mélanges Andrieu*, Strasbourg 1956, 53-63; J.-M. Hanssens, *L'Édition critique des canons d'Hippolyte*: OCP 32 (1966) 534-544; G. Kretschmar, *Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche*, in *Leiturgia* V, Kassel 1970; G. Kretschmar, *Nouvelles recherches sur l'initiation chrétienne*: La MaisonD. 132 (1977) 7-32; H. Brakmann, *Alexandreia und die Kanones des Hippolyt*: JbAC 22 (1979) 139-149; B. Steimer, *Vertex traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 72-79.

P. Nautin

CANTERBURY. City of SE England (*Durovernum Cantiacorum*), with good probability was one of the first emplacements aimed at by the *Romans after their landing on the coast of Kent in AD 43. Three important arterial military roads, from Rutupiae (Richborough), Dubris (Dover) and Lemanis (Lympne), converged at Canterbury, from whence departed—and ran in a straight line—the main road to Londinium (London): this convergence of communication routes sealed the site's strategic importance, already recognized and valued by the autochthonous communities.

After the Roman period, Canterbury had great importance at the time of *Augustine's mission of evangelization, initiated by *Gregory I. In 597, monks from the Roman *monastery of St. Andrew on the Caelian Mount, after landing on the beaches of Kent, found a genuine support in the powerful local king *Ethelbert of Cantia, whose wife Bertha, daughter of the Merovingian king of Paris Charibert, was a Christian. The pope had wanted the metropolitan see for S England to be established at London but, after the king's conversion, and considering the repeated and kind concessions he had bestowed on the missionaries, *Augustine decided for Canterbury. Following this choice, as *Bede recounts in detail, Augustine decided to restore an ancient church built in Canterbury in Roman times, dedicating it to the Savior (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* I, 33); this valuable circumstance allows us to hypothesize—contrary to the archaeological data and the silence of the literary sources—the existence of a primitive Christian community at Durovernum Cantiacorum. Also with the king's help, Augustine built—though the consecration took place only with his successor *Lawrence—a monastery not far from the city with an attached church dedicated to the *apostles *Peter and *Paul, near the portico in which he was later buried (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II, 3). On the death of Deusdedit (14 July 664)—Augustine's fifth successor after Lawrence, *Mellitus, *Justus and *Honorius—the local bishopric remained vacant for a long time; to correct this dangerous situation, *Egbert, king of Kent and son of Earconbert, and Oswy, king of Northumbria, sent the priest Wighard, a highly regarded English religious, to Rome for the purpose of having him ordained archbishop by Pope Vitalian. In this way they sought to fix the precarious situation and organizational gaps of the English churches. Wighard's death of plague at Rome, however, gave the pope the chance to send a person of his own choice to manage that difficult land, an outsider who had not been conditioned by the environment. After a long search the choice fell to a *Cilician monk, Theodore of *Tarsus, whose episcopal activity as Deusdedit's successor proved decisive for the radical and definitive reorganization of the churches of England. He conformed to the Synod of Whitby (664), adopting Roman rites instead of *Celtic and, visiting the whole country, founded numerous new churches, strengthened the church's unity and consolidated the primatial role of Canterbury. In the 7th c. many churches and monasteries were built in Kent, contributing to the consolidation of Canterbury's supremacy, while in the following century the city's importance was threatened by the domination of King Offa of Mercia. Archbishops: Augustine, 597–604; Lawrence, 604–619; Mellitus, 619–624; Justus, 624–627; Honorius, 627–653; Deusdedit, 655–664; Wighard, ca. 665; Theodore, 668–690; Berthweald, 693–731; Tatwine, 731–734; Nothelm, 735–739; *Cuthbert, 740–760.

DACL 2, 1999-2027; DHGE 11, 785-812.

M. Ghilardi

CANTICLE of CANTICLES. *See* *SONG of SONGS

CAPPADOCIA
I. The region - II. Council.

I. The region. Roman province created ca. AD 17 under *Tiberius upon the death of its last king, Archelaus: it was under the jurisdiction of a procurator of equestrian rank who, when needed, was to receive military help from the governor of *Syria. Our main source for Cappadocia's administrative organization, which remained unchanged after its annexation to the empire, is Strabo (XII, 1-2, 540C). It was centralized and bureaucratic, perhaps modeled on that of *Egypt: the territory was divided into ten smaller units called *strategiae,* to which Pompey had added part of *Cilicia to make an eleventh. The country was organized along feudal lines: the system went back to the pre-Seleucid era and had long endured in a territory which had never been conquered in depth or really *Hellenized; the lower orders lived in small villages under the rule of local lords; there was also a multitude of slaves who were exported, through commercial channels, in large numbers as far as *Rome, as several sources attest. Under *Vespasian, Tiberius's equestrian procurator was replaced by a consular legate, who also ruled *Galatia, Paphlagonia, Pontus Galaticus and Polemoniacus, and Armenia Minor. *Trajan left Armenia Minor and the districts of Pontus under the jurisdiction of the *consularis* of Cappadocia, while Galatia and Paphlagonia had a separate governor: this system remained unchanged until *Diocletian's reorganization of the provinces in the late 3rd c., which divided Cappadocia in two, in line with the general policy of breaking up the larger provinces into smaller units. The W part continued to be called Cappadocia: the smaller E part was briefly joined to Armenia Minor, but before the end of the 4th c. it became a separate province called Armenia Secunda.

Christianity arrived very early in Cappadocia, already in the 1st c. (see1 Pet 1:1), using, as occurred elsewhere, the network of the synagogues. In the 3rd c. it was already an important Christian center; its bishop, *Firmilian, had numerous contacts. *Origen went to *Caesarea for a certain period, teaching there (Eusebius, *HE* 6,27-28). There were various *martyrs during the persecutions of Diocletian and his successors, including Gordius and the 40 martyrs of *Sebaste, Ierone and the martyrs of Melitene. In the 4th c., Cappadocia produced the celebrated *Basil of Caesarea, *Gregory of Nazianzus and *Gregory of Nyssa, the so-called Cappadocian fathers, to whom we may add Basil's cousin *Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. During the first four centuries, the metropolitan of Caesarea exercised a sort of supremacy over the N and NE provinces of Asia Minor, with the title of exarch; even later he retained first place after the patriarch of *Constantinople. By the mid-4th c., Christianity appears to have spread widely in the province, not only in the cities but also in the rural areas, as is proven by the presence of *chorbishops (rural bishops) alongside the bishops; a good ten bishops of Cappadocian cities were present at the *Council of *Nicaea. Even in the 2nd-3rd c., we know the names of some, such as Primianus, *Theoctistus and Firmilian of Caesarea (Gams, *Ser. episc*., 440). Church buildings were built everywhere.

R. Teja, *Die römische Provinz Kappadokien*, ANRW, II, Prinzipat, 7, 2 (1980) 1083-1124 (with bibl.); RAC 2, 861-891; C. Jolivet-Lévy, *Les églises byzantines de Cappadoce: le programme iconographique de l'abside et de ses abords*, Paris 1991; N. Thierry, *La Cappadoce de l'antiquité au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout 2002; R. van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia,* Philadelphia 2002; Id., *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003; Id., *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Council. The emperor *Valens had divided Cappadocia into two civil provinces, with capitals at *Caesarea and *Tyana. *Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, took advantage of this to claim full metropolitan rights over his city. *Basil disagreed, claiming that civil divisions were irrelevant to ecclesiastical organization. A synod, held in 372 in an unspecified place, accepted this thesis and admitted the possibility of creating new episcopal sees. Basil then consecrated his friends as bishops of small towns in Cappadocia Secunda, including *Gregory of Nazianzus for the isolated village of Sasima.

Mansi 3, 453-454; Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccl.*, Venice 1722, vol. 9, 174-182; Basil, *Ep.* 58, 92, 120-122, 210; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 47-50; N. Thierry, *La Cappadoce de l'antiquité au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout 2002.

A. Di Berardino

CAPREOLUS. Succeeded *Aurelius as bishop of *Carthage during the difficult time of the *Vandal conquest of *Africa (427–437); he had to struggle against their encroaching *Arianism. We have two of his letters, one to the Council of *Ephesus (431), where he was represented by a deacon, the other to

the Spanish bishops Vitalis and Tonantius; both letters concerned the *christological problems of the day (PL 50, 843-858). Some ps.-Augustinian sermons are attributed to him.

PWK 3, 1548; DHGE 11, 959-961; Cath 2, 517; LTK³ 2, 936 (B. Kriegbaum); J.-L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine vandale et byzantine*, Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 11, Rome 1973, 274; A. Isola, *I cristiani dell'Africa Vandalica nei 'Sermoni' del tempo (429-534)*, Milan 1990, 87; PCBE 1, 189-190.

V. Saxer

CAPSA. Now Gafsa (Tunisia). Considered a key position in ancient *Africa: *oppidum magnum* (Sall., *Jug.* 89, 4). Destroyed by Marius and rebuilt in the course of the 1st c. AD, it embraced Christianity very early. In 256 its bishop Donatulus signed, in 69th place, the *Sent. epp.* of the council of that year. *Cyprian addressed *Ep.* 57 to him and five other bishops, who were meeting to elect a seventh. *Fortunatus attended *Gratus's council (345/348); *Quintasius was at the council of the *Maximianists, an extreme wing of *Donatism, held at Cabarsussi (Mansi 2, 845-8). At the Conference of *Carthage (411), Fortunatus represented the *Catholics and Celeres the *Donatists. Vindemialis was summoned by *Huneric to the conference of 484: his name appears in the *Passio 7 bb.mm. Caps.*; according to *Gregory of Tours (*HF* 2, 3), he raised the dead. The bishop of Capsa still figures in the list compiled by the emperor Leo VI the Wise in 883.

PWK 3, 1553; DHGE 11, 965-968; J.-L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine, vandale et byzantine*, Neuchâtel 1973, 122; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1981, 2, 281-282; Encyclopédie berbère, 12, *Capsa-Cheval*, Aix-en-Provence 1993, 1757-1911.

V. Saxer

CAPUA
I. History - II. Council.

I. History.
The ancient city. The territory of ancient Capua, today St. Maria Capua Vetere (Caserta), N of Naples, had been occasionally inhabited since the Recent Neolithic Age and even in the Bronze Age (4th millennium BC and 10th c. BC) but gives evidence of stable human occupation only from the Iron Age. From its origins it assumed a strategic importance, being at the center of an especially fertile region near the Volturno River, and a natural route of travel between Latium and Campania. In archaic times, an initial Etruscan hegemony was progressively supplanted by the Campano-Samnite element. Some extraurban sanctuaries were active in the Samnite period, including the very famous one of Diana Tifatina. Capua was Romanized from 59 BC with Caesar's dedication of a colony of veterans (*Concordia Iulia Felix Capua*). The city's extraordinary economic flourishing was arrested by the construction of the Via Domitiana, from Pozzuoli to Sinuessa, which routed most of the commercial traffic around the area, leading to the gradual abandonment of the river port of Casilinum on the Volturno. However, Capua's resurgence and prestige—which took place in the 4th c. AD when the city was the capital of the *provincia* of Campania and see of the *consularis*, such that the poet Ausonius numbered it among the eight greatest cities of the Roman Empire (*Ordo nobil. Urb.* 8)—is well known. In the course of the 5th c., a period of general crisis for Campania, the city began a gradual decline; in 456 it was sacked by *Genseric. The old city survived in the center of St. Maria Capua Vetere, and in the second half of the 9th c. it once again flourished, with the name of Capua, a new city on the site of the ancient river port of Casilinum.

The Christian city. From the origins of Christianity the community of Capua certainly had an important role, but other than the traditional information on the consecration of the protobishop Priscus by *Peter, before the 4th c. the literary and archaeological sources tell us little. Amply attested, however, is the strong connection with *Rome, not only through the frequent contact of the prelates of the two sees, but also for the widespread cult of the *apostles Peter and *Paul, alongside indigenous *martyrs. The *Prologus Paschae* of 395 refers to the letters (lost) of a *Cyprian, probably bishop of *Carthage, to Augustine and Felicita, martyred *apud ciuitatem Capuensem* under *Decius (MGH AA, IX, *Chronica minora*, I,738).

In the 4th c., in close connection with its role as a civil metropolis, Capua played an important role in ecclesiastical politics: its titular, Proterius, participated in the synods of *Rome of 313 and *Arles of 314, and his church, with that of Naples, was one of the only two in all of S Italy to benefit from a direct intervention by the emperor *Constantine, who built a basilica dedicated to the Apostles *intra urbe Capua* (LP I,185-186). The episcopal see of Capua played a leading role during the *Arian crisis, as a mediator between Rome and the Eastern episcopates. Its bishop, Vincent, perhaps to be identified with the *presbyter who represented *Sylvester of Rome at the Council of *Nicaea, is cited twice in the *Apologia* of *Athanasius to *Constantius (PG 25,595-641). He participated at the Council of *Serdica of

343; in 344 he was sent on a mission to *Antioch to Constantius to mitigate the emperor's anti-Nicene measures; in 353 he was present as a Roman legate at the Council of Arles, where he was forced to subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius, and in 357 Liberius, during his exile at Terracina, asked him to intervene with the emperor on his behalf.

The name of the bishop of Capua who, in 391 or 392, hosted the council convoked to discuss the *Melitian *schism and the doctrine of *Bonosus of Serdica, remains unknown. In this period, the size of the Christian community is attested by the large subdial funerary areas in the zone of St. Prisco and St. Agostino, which perhaps preexisted the *Constantinian era and were certainly connected with the burial of the bodies of the Capuan martyrs Priscus, Augustine and Felicita.

The city began a slow decline at the start of the 5th c. connected with *Alaric's incursions, and the only new construction of which we have evidence were religious buildings. Among these were a church dedicated to Mary (now S. Maria Maggiore) by Bishop *Symmachus (ca. 424–439), as attested by a mosaic which has now disappeared: *Sanctae Mariae Symmachus episcopus*. The same bishop probably also built the church of St. Prisco, on the site of an earlier, more modest *memoria* of the martyr. Symmachus should perhaps be identified with the bishop of the same name who, in 431, visited and celebrated the *Eucharist for the dying *Paulinus of Nola who, in his time, had eulogized the importance of the Capuan church in a letter to Bishop *Delphinus of Bordeaux (*Ep.* 14,4: CSEL 29,109). From after Symmachus until the end of the 6th c. there are gaps in the list of bishops, and we have no information on any significant building projects undertaken by them. Among certainly attested bishops are Tiburtius, who participated at the Roman synod of 465 (Mansi 7,965-966), Constantine, who subscribed the synod of 501 (Mansi 8,234) and Probinus (CIL X,4517).

A figure of undoubted importance among the bishops of the first decades of the 6th c. was *Germanus (d. 541: CIL X,4503), cited in two well-known episodes of the *Dialogues* of *Gregory the Great (4,50; 2,35): the apparition of the soul of the Roman deacon *Paschasius, freed by Germanus's prayers from expiatory sufferings, and the postmortem apparition of Germanus himself to his friend St. Benedict and to *Sabinus of Canosa. Germanus, of a noble Capuan family, was a member of the delegation that Pope *Hormisdas sent in 519 to the emperor *Justin I to settle the *Acacian schism. Archaeological research has shown intense building activity by Germanus, especially regarding the basilica where the *relics of St. Stephen were to be deposited upon the return of the mission to *Constantinople. This church (today replaced by the modern S. Maria delle Grazie) functioned as the cathedral from the end of the 7th to the middle of the 9th c., and again, for a brief period, during the Capuan schism of 879, when Pope John VIII (872–882) made it the see of one of the two contending bishops (Erchempert, *hist. Langob. Beneu.*, 46). This is why the site of Germanus's basilica has more than once been identified as the location of the ancient Constantinian basilica, with a central-plan baptistery (the so-called *Catabulum*) situated nearby (though susceptible to other interpretations—perhaps thermal baths).

At the beginning of the *Longobard (Lombard) period, the correspondence of Gregory the Great attests the departure of the local clergy for the *Byzantine territories and the intervention of the pope himself, who consecrated the Roman subdeacon *Festus for the see of Capua. Coming into conflict with the clergy and later forced to abandon the see, Festus died at Rome in November 594, and Gregory appointed Bishop Gaudiosus of Nola as *visitator* (*Ep.* V,13-14: MGH I,293-294; CSEL 140,279-280). From the Gregorian correspondence we know that the activity of Festus's successor Basil, attested in 598–602, centered mainly on the *Byzantine area, in Sicily and at Rome, giving the impression that he was in exile (*Ep.* MGH IX,72, CSEL IX,73; X,4; XI,15; MGH XIII,4, CSEL XIII,2). Of Basil's two successors, Gaudiosus participated at the Roman council of 649 (Mansi 10,865-866); Decoroso, perhaps involved in the foundation of Montevergine, translated the relics of St. Rufinus and was one of the main protagonists of the evangelization of the southern Longobards (BHL I,2117). Even if Paul the Deacon still mentions Capua, with Naples and Salerno, as among the most important cities of Campania (*hist. Lang.* 2,17), between the 8th and 9th c. it was reduced to a series of inhabited areas around the major churches of the ancient city. The *Chronicon Salernitanum* indicates the presence at Capua in 787 of Charlemagne, there to claim *Frankish sovereignty over the Duchy of Benevento (*chron.* 11). In 841, following internal battles and the military intervention of Duke Anastasius of Naples, the Longobardian counts decided to transfer the citizens first to a more secure site, near Triflisco (Bellona), where they founded Sicopoli, in honor of the Beneventan prince Sico (d. 832), and later, in 856, to the site of the ancient river port of Casilinum, where the episcopal see was also soon moved.

The ancient city: DHGE 11,888-907; DACL 2,2064-2084; J. Heurgon, *Recherche sur l'histoire, la religion et la civilisation de*

Capoue préromaine des origines à la deuxième guerre punique, BEFAR 154, Paris 1942; A. de Franciscis, *Il santuario di Diana Tifatina*, Naples 1957; Id., *Capua*, EAA 2, Rome 1959, 335-336; *Capua preromana*, 1-6, Florence 1965-1994; W. Johannowsky, *Capua*, EAA Supplemento 1, Rome 1970, 180-182; Id., *Capua antica*, Naples 1989; F. Cassola, *La conquista romana. La regione fino al V secolo d.C.*: *Storia e civiltà della Campania. L'Evo antico*, ed. G. Pugliese Carratelli, Naples 1991, 203-217; V. von Falkenhausen, *La Campania tra Goti e Bizantini*: *Storia e civiltà della Campania. Il Medioevo*, ed. G. Pugliese Carratelli, Naples 1992, 7-35; C. Albore Livadie, *Capua*, EAA Supplemento 2, Rome 1994, 875-879; *Il Museo archeologico dell'Antica Capua*, Naples 1995; L. Melillo Faenza, *S. Maria Capua Vetere*: *Bollettino di Archeologia* 22 (1998) 73-76; V. Sampaolo, *Organizzazione dello spazio urbano e di quello extraurbano a Capua. La forma della città e del territorio*: *Atlante tematico di Topografia antica*, Supplementi 5 (Atti dell'Incontro. S. Maria Capua Vetere, 27-28 novembre 1998), Rome 1999, 139-146; *La Via Appia. Iniziative e interventi per la conoscenza e la valorizzazione da Roma a Capua*, eds. L. Quilici-S. Quilici Gigli, Rome 2002; F. Guandalini, *Il territorio ad ovest di Capua*: *Carta archeologica e ricerche in Campania, 2. Comuni di Brezza, Capua, S. Prisco*, eds. L.Quilici-S. Quilici Gigli, Rome 2004, 11-66; V. Bellelli, *La tomba "principesca" dei Quattordici Ponti nel contesto di Capua arcaica*, Rome 2006; *Lungo l'Appia. Scritti su Capua antica e dintorni*, eds. M.L. Chirico-R. Cioffi-S. Quilici Gigli-G. Pignatelli, Naples 2009.

The Christian city: Erchempertus Beneuentanus, *Historia Langobardorum Beneuentanorum*, MGH, *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*, ed. G. Waitz, Berlin 1878, 231-264; Anonymous, *Chronicon Salernitanum*, ed. U. Westerberg, Stockholm 1956; G. Jannelli, *Serie cronologica dei vescovi dell'antica Capua, Sicopoli, Capua Nuova e Berolasi e degli arcivescovi capuani*, Caserta 1872; G. Chierici, *Contributo allo studio dell'architettura paleocristiana nella Campania: Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia cristiana* (Ravenna, 25-30 settembre 1932) Rome 1934, 203-217; G. Chierici, *L'elemento romano nell'architettura paleocristiana della Campania: Atti del III Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* (Roma 22-27 aprile 1933), Bologna 1934, 207-214; A. De Franciscis, *Cimitero presso la chiesa di S. Agostino in S. Maria Capua Vetere*: RivAC XXV (1949), 133-145; N. Cilento, *Le origini della signoria capuana nella Longobardia minore*, Rome 1966; G. Bovini, *Mosaici paleocristiani scomparsi di S. Maria Capua Vetere e di S. Prisco: Il contributo dell'arcidiocesi di Capua alla vita religiosa e culturale del Meridione* (Atti del Convegno nazionale di studi storici promosso dalla Società di Storia Patria di Terra di Lavoro, Capua-Caserta-S.M. Capua Vetere 26-31 ottobre 1966), Rome 1967, 51-64; W. Johannowsky, *Capua*: *Aggiornamento a É. Bertaux, L'Art dans l'Italie Méridionale*, IV, ed. A. Prandi, Rome 1978, 149-151; M. Pagano-J. Rougetet, *Il battistero della basilica costantiniana di Capua (cosiddetto "Catabulum")*, MEFRA 96 (1984/2) 987-1016; A. De Franciscis, *La basilica Apostolorum nell'antica Capua*: *Archivio Storico di Terra di Lavoro* IX (1984-1985) 85-104; G. Otranto, *Le origini del Cristianesimo nell'Italia Meridionale: Storia del Mezzogiorno*, I,2, *Il Mezzoggiorno Antico*, Naples 1991, 277-322; G. Fiaccadori, *Il Cristianesimo. Dalle Origini alle invasioni barbariche*: *Storia e civiltà della Campania. Il Medioevo* ed. G. Pugliese Carratelli, Naples 1992, 145-170; D. Korol, *Zum frühchristlichen Apsismosaik der Bischofskirche von Capua Vetere* (*SS. Stefano e Agata*) *und zu zwei weiteren Apsidenbildern dieser Stadt* (*S. Pietro in Corpo und S. Maria Maggiore*): *Boreas* 17 (1994) 121-148; S. Palmieri, *Duchi, principi e vescovi nella Longobardia meridionale*: *Longobardia e longobardi nell'Italia meridionale. Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche*, Milan 1996, 43-99; *Germano di Capua (+ 541 ca), ambasciatore ecumenico a Costantinopoli e modello di santità per il Cassinate: ricerche storiche sul personaggio, sulla fortuna del suo culto e su aspetti particolari del medioevo locale*, ed. Filippo Carcione, Venafro 1999; S. De Caro, *Dati recenti sul tardoantico nella Campania settentrionale*: *L'Italia meridionale in età tardo antica* (Atti del XXXVIII Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 2-6 ottobre 1998) Naples 2000, 223-242; C. Martorelli, *L'architettura dei battisteri di Napoli, Capua e Marcellianum*: *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi* (Atti dell'VIII Congresso Nazionale di Archeologia cristiana, Genova et al., 21-26 settembre 1998), I, Bordighera 2001, 1037-1056; L. Melillo Faenza, *Capua. Indagini archeologiche in piazza S. Pietro*: *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia* (Atti del VII Congresso Nazionale di Archeologia cristiana, Cassino, 20-24 settembre 1993), II, ed. E. Russo, Cassino 2003, 632-637; N. Ciavolino, *Capua. Indagini per il ritrovamento della catacomba di S. Agostino*: *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, cit., 638-643; A. Aulisa, *Capua nel Martirologio geronimiano*: *VetChr* 41 (2004) 225-258; G. Bova, *Sulle orme di Pietro. La basilica di S. Pietro Apostolo nell'antica Capua*, Naples 2004; G. Cera, *Alcune considerazioni sul cosiddetto Catabulum di Santa Maria Capua Vetere*: *Atta* 17 (2008), 73-89; S. Episcopo, *La cristianizzazione di Capua: nuove prospettive per una ricerca archeologica: La cristianizzazione in Italia tra Tardoantico ed Altomedioevo*, eds. R.M. Bonacasa Carra-E. Vitale (Atti del IX Congresso di Archeologia Cristiana, Agrigento 20-25 novembre 2004), Palermo 2007, 1017-1040; Id., *La cristianizzazione di Capua tra III e IX secolo: i riflessi nell'insediamento, i monumenti, i nuovi personaggi "eccellenti": Lungo l'Appia. Scritti su Capua antica e dintorni*, eds. M.L. Chirico-R. Cioffi-S. Quilici Gigli-G. Pignatelli, Naples 2009, 83-92.

II. Council. In the winter of 391–392 a synod met at Capua of which the acts have not survived. The assembly, which seems to have aroused some interest, to the point of being called *plenaria* by the *Excerpta* of the *Registrum ecclesiae Cartaginensis* (can. 48: Mansi, 3,738; CCL 149,187), addressed and failed to provide real solutions to two questions: the *Melitian *schism that still divided the church of *Antioch, and the doctrine on Mary's virginity of *Bonosus of Serdica (d. ca. 390). It also reiterated the traditional condemnation of the repetition of *baptism and ordinations, and the prohibition of the transfer of bishops. The *council was convoked by *Siricius, who did not participate; *Ambrose of Milan played a large part in its preparation and decisions.

The Antiochene schism. The Antiochene schism after the death of *Paulinus (d. 388), adversary first of Meletius and then of *Flavian of Antioch, was perpetuated with the episcopal consecration of *Evagrius, done in opposition to the canons since the elect was consecrated without the agreement of other prelates of the ecclesiastical region and because he was directly designated by his predecessor. His opponent, Flavian, favored by neither *Rome nor *Alexandria, was elected during the Council of *Con-

stantinople of 381. Prior to that, *Ambrose and the Council of *Aquileia (381) had proposed that the Eastern bishops meet to discuss the question and had advanced the proposal that, upon the death of one of the two contenders, the other would remain the only legitimate bishop. The Eastern bishops declined the invitation and responded by dryly inviting their colleagues to accept the decisions of Constantinople. In the Synod of Rome of the following year, the Western bishops reiterated their support for Paulinus and condemned those who consecrated Flavian (*Diodorus of Tarsus and *Acacius of Beroea), but neither *Gratian nor *Theodosius were interested in reopening the case and the Roman condemnations remained ineffective. Ten years later, Paulinus's death reopened the question, and the bishops meeting at Capua invited Flavian to present himself to the council, but the Antiochene prelate, enjoying the favor of Theodosius and the Eastern episcopate, excused himself from going to Capua for his poor health and the danger of traveling in winter. Nothing remained for the Western bishops but to make a general appeal to the parties for harmony and, through Ambrose, *Theophilus of Alexandria and the *Egyptian bishops were charged with reaching a solution, which the bishop of Rome would then have to ratify (Ambr., *Ep.* 70, 6-7: CSEL 82,5-6). Theophilus convoked the parties, but Flavian, strongly supported by Theodosius, did not appear. The schism—despite enduring dissent in the Antiochene community—was definitively concluded with the death of Evagrius, in 382, before he was able to consecrate a successor.

Bonosus of Serdica. The council also took up the doctrine of Bonosus of Serdica. We are informed of his doctrine by a synodal letter, written probably by Ambrose or by *Siricius (Ambr., *Ep.* 71: CSEL 82, 7-10). Bonosus denied the perpetual virginity of Mary, whom he claimed had other children besides Jesus. The synodal letter reveals that the Council of Capua had delegated the bishops *finitimi* (neighboring bishops), particularly the *Macedonians, and *Anisius of Thessalonica, Roman plenipotentiary with supermetropolitan powers over Illyricum, to judge the dispute between Bonosus and his accusers. Bonosus's condemnation is attested by the correspondence of *Innocent I, who on various occasions concerned himself with the validity of the ordinations conferred by the bishop of Serdica (PL 20,519-21; 531-535; 619).

The Antiochene schism: Mansi, 3,683-686; *Concilia Africae*, CCL 149,187; Ambrosius, *Ep.* 70, CSEL 82/3, 3-6; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 5,23, GCS 5, Berlin 1998, 321-324; C.H. Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, II,1, Paris 1908, 80-82; F. Hommes Dudden, *The Life and Time of St. Ambrose*, II, Oxford 1935, 398-403; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, SEA 11, Rome 1975, 548-550; *XVI Centenario del Concilio di Capua, 392-1992* (Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi mariologici, Capua 19-24 Maggio 1992), eds. G. Liccardo-F. Ruotolo-S. Tanzarella, Capua 1993; F. Trisoglio, *Sant'Ambrogio e il Concilio di Capua: I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V* (XXX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 3-5 maggio 2001), SEA 78, Rome 2002, 471-483.

Bonosus of Serdica: Ambrosius, *Ep.* 71, CSEL 82/3, 7-10; DTC 2,1027-1031; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1918, 344-351; F. Cavallera, *Le letter sur l'évêque Bonose est-elle de saint Sirice ou de saint Ambroise*: BLE 21 (1920) 141-147; M. Zelzer, *Prolegomena*: CSEL 82/3 XXX-XXXI.

Rocco Ronzani

CARACALLA (186–217). Marcus Aurelius Severus Antoninus, emperor 212–217, son of *Septimius Severus and Julia Domna, nicknamed Caracalla from his Gallic dress. When his father died in *Britain in 211, Caracalla and his brother Geta succeeded him. The following year Caracalla had his brother and many of his supporters killed, so as to reign alone. To gain the support of the soldiers, he greatly increased their pay, placing an excessive burden on the state finances. He introduced Eastern cults into *Rome, esp. that of the Sun. He was relatively tolerant to the Christians: *Tertullian, writing in Caracalla's lifetime, hinted that he had a Christian nurse, saying that Caracalla was *lacte christiano educatus* (*Ad Scap.* IV, 5). In his reign we know only of the *martyrdom of a Bishop Alexander in Latium (AASS Sept., VI, 230-235; BS 1 [1961] 789-790), some hostile acts against the Christian inhabitants of *Osroene, including *Bardesanes, and the continuation of the persecution in *Africa by the proconsul Scapula, against whom Tertullian wrote *Ad Scapulam,* denouncing his violence and threatening him with God's punishment. Caracalla's most important legislation was the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of 212, which extended Roman citizenship to free inhabitants of the empire who did not yet have it. He began the construction of his baths at Rome, attempted military operations against the Germans and Parthians, and was assassinated in 217 near *Edessa by the prefect Opellius Macrinus.

P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1901; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 233-237; P. Keresztes, *The* Constitutio Antoniniana *and the Persecutions under Caracalla*: AJPh 90 (1970) 446-459; M. Sordi, *I Cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; A. Ziolkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000.

L. Navarra

CARMEN ad Deum post conversionem et baptismum suum. Anonymous poem in 120 distichs on the theme of *conversion and *baptism, wrongly attributed to *Paulinus of Nola by Mai, who discovered it in the Vatican Library (*Urb. lat.* 533). It may be the work of a 5th-c. Gallic poet using the verse *Sermo* of *Orientius titled *Commonitorium*. Confession of human moral weakness in the face of God's perfection (vv. 49-58; 81-89) is followed by continual theological references to the mystery of the *Trinity (vv. 197-240) (*Sancte Deus, Lucis lumen . . .*). The work praises God's greatness in the creation of the world and in the intimate life of the spirit, as seen in the *penitence of the convert and the joy of divine forgiveness.

CPL 1469; CPPM 2,1376; PLS 3,1129-34; CSEL 30 (1894) 350-356, carmen III; M.G. Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza. Il carme anonimo Sancte Deus lucis lumen concordia rerum* (intr., critical text, tr. and commentary), Rome 1990.

L. Dattrino

CARMEN ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum (incipit: *Qui[s] mihi ruricolas optabit*). 406-hexameter poem by an unknown author, seemingly in the 5th c. in *Africa; anciently attributed to *Tertullian and *Cyprian, then to *Verecundus of Junca on the basis of *Isidore of Seville (*De vir. ill.* 7). Miltner-Zurunic points out similarities with the work of the poet *Dracontius, also an *African, while for Dando the *carmen* could be by *Avitus of Vienne. If the recipient of the *carmen* was the African poet who lived under the *Vandal king Thrasamund, then it must be dated ca. 500 (see PLRE II, 462).

After an introductory description of nature and a digression describing the work of creation and the initial events of the human race, so that people may *poenas aeternas evadere flammae* (v. 40), the author colorfully and fully describes the last things: the final resurrection and God's judgment.

CPL 869, 1463; CPPM II, A n. 545; PL 2, 1147-1156; PL 4, 1055-1060; CSEL 3,3, 308-325; J.H. Waszink, Bonn 1947; H. Miltner-Zurnic, *De carmine ad Flavium Felicem misso, quod inscribitur De resurrectione mortuorum*: WS 48 (1930) 82-97; M. Dando, *Alcimus Avitus* (*c. 450–c. 518*) *as the author of the De resurrectione mortuorum . . .* : CM 26 (1965) 259-266; J.H. Waszink, *Alcune osservazioni sul testo del Carmen de resurrectione mortuorum et de iudicio Domini*: SicGymn 29 (1976) 449-459; Id., *Einige Bemerkungen über den Text des Carmen de resurrectione mortuorum et de iudicio domini*, in Fest. A. Stuiber 1982, 79-85; S. Isetta, *Carmen ad Flavium Felicem. Problemi di attribuzione e reminiscenze classiche*: VetChr 20 (1983) 111-140.

A. Di Berardino

CARMEN ad quendam senatorem (late 4th c.?). The anonymous composition—wrongly attributed to *Cyprian and published among his spurious works—is an invective in 85 hexameters, directed at a senator with a good literary and philosopical education (vv. 3-4: *Quia carmina semper amasti / carmine respondens properavi scribere versus*; and v. 48: *Philosophum fingis*). The Christian ex-consul had embraced the religion of the Great Mother. With a series of pressing *interrogationes* (rhetorical device frequently used in antipagan *pièces*), the poet asks the *apostate how is it possible that an ex-consul could be a priest of Isis without covering himself in shame. The god's effeminate priests, who walked the streets of *Rome wagging their hips (v. 11-12: *per urbem leniter incedunt*), did not escape the poet's sarcasm: using the motifs of contemporary Roman satire against the Eastern cults, he stigmatized the most repugnant aspects of their life. The poet exhorts the apostate to mend his ways and to correct his sin by faith (v. 83: *Corrige delictum fidamine; fidamine* is a neologism, as is *vericolae* in v. 43).

CPL 1432; CPPM 543, 1623, 2163.

Editions: PL 2, 1163-1166; CSEL 3/3 (1871) 302-305; CSEL 23 (1891) 227-230; F. Buecheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina* 1, 2, Leipzig 1906, n. 689b (ed. anast.: Amsterdam 1972, 163-165).

Studies: Patrologia III, 299-300; RAC, Supp. Lief. 10, 2003, 319ff.; H. Bloch, *La rinascita pagana in Occidente alla fine del secolo IV*, in A. Momigliano (ed.), *Il conflitto tra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel IV secolo*, Turin 31975, 199-224; L. Vidman, *Isis und Sarapis*, in *Die orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich*, Leiden 1981, 96-120; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 216-217; R.B. Begley, *The* Carmen ad quendam senatorem: *Date, Milieu, and Tradition*, diss. dact., Chapel Hill 1984; A. Bartalucci, *L'antica esegesi virgiliana e una citazione dell'Eneide in un carme anonimo cristiano: qualche ipotesi sulla problematica del carme* Ad senatorem quendam: Studi classici and orientali 42 (1992) 127-145; M. Cutino, *Sul rapporto fra il cosiddetto* Poema ultimum (*CSEL 30 Hartel*) *e il* Carmen ad senatorem (*CSEL 23 Peiper*): Emerita 67 (1999) 46-64; W. Wischmeyer, *Bemerkungen und Beobachtungen zu Ps. Cyprian, Carmen ad quendam senatorem*, in *Vielseitigkeit des AT*, Frankfurt a.M. 1999, 335-343; M. Corsano, *Un incontro problematico: cristiani e pagani in tre carmi adespoti*: Orpheus 21 (2000) 26-43.

A.V. Nazzaro

CARMEN adversus marcionitas. A composition of 1302 verses in five books, wrongly attributed to *Tertullian. The subject is in the title: "Against the followers of *Marcion." Book I speaks of the origin of Marcion's doctrine; books II and III confirm the relationship between the OT and NT; books IV and V expound the theories of the Marcionites. The author is completely unknown. Müller dates it before

the *Council of *Nicaea (*Untersuch. z. Carmen adv. Marc.*). K. Holl dates it between 475–525, placing the author in *Gaul or *Africa, not *Italy or *Spain (*Gesamm. Aufsätze*, 12-25). R. Willems dates it not before the 5th c. (*Tertulliani opera*, 1420). Frede dates it after *Commodian, but not before the 5th c., probably in Gaul, following *Isidore of Seville in attributing it to a certain Victorinus (*De viris ill.* 8: PL 83, 1088A). The fact that Tertullian wrote a work against Marcion explains the false attribution of the *carmen*.

CPL 36; CPPM 2, 1621a and 2, 1218; PL 2, 1110-1146; RAC 5, 1016-1017; R. Willems CCL 2 (1954) 1421-1454. Eng. tr.: S. Thelwall, ANL 18, 318-384; ANF 4, 102-165. K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* 3 (1928) 13-53; M. Müller, *Untersuch. zum "Carmen adv. Marcionem,"* Ochsenfurt 1936; C. Rambaux, *Un "locus non desperatus": Carmen adv. Marcionem, IV, 105*: REAug 18 (1972) 43-45; A. Font Jaume, *Studia tertullianea: el Carmen adv. Marcionem*, Barcelona 1986; K. Pollmann, *Das Carmen adversus Marcionitas. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Göttingen 1991; C. Micaelli, *"Carmen adversus Marcionitas": ispirazione biblica e sua ripresa nei centoni "De lege" e "De nativitate,"* in *Poesia tardoantica e medievale*, ed. M. Salvadore, Alexandria 2001, 171-198; F. Stella, *Poesia e Teologia. L'Occidente tra IV e VIII secolo*, Milan 2001, 139-145.

L. Dattrino

CARMEN adversus paganos. Datable between 376, the year of the death of Quintus Aurelius *Symmachus's father, and 409, the year of the Pompeianus's murder, this anonymous composition, handed down on the last three pages of the codex Par. Lat. 8084, a 6th-c. manuscript of *Prudentius, is an invective, in 122 hexameters, against senators who worship the gods of the ancient religion (vv. 1-24) and, in particular, against a *praefectus urbis,* variously identified with Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (Morel, De Rossi, Mommsen, Musso), Vettius Agorius Praetextatus (Ellis, Moricca, Cracco Ruggini, Fontaine, Puglisi, Vera, Bartalucci), Gabinius Barbarus Pompeianus (Manganaro) and Symmachus's father (Mazzarino) (vv. 25-122). In the style of Christian *apologetic, the Christian poet derides the *pagans for their obscene love stories: Jove's marriage to his sister Juno; Venus's love for Adonis; Apollo's lying oracle; Jove's transformation into a swan, a shower of gold and a bull; the expulsion of Saturn; Venus's lament over the dead Adonis. The fanatical prefect, who for three months had subjected *Rome to purification rites, paid for his misdeeds with a slow death. An initiate in many rites (of Bacchus, Serapis, Cybele, Saturn, Bellona) and a believer in nymphs, satyrs and Pan, the deceased was held responsible for the apostasy of Christian senators through the scandalous offer of honors and positions. The poet concludes with an insulting invitation to the prefect's wife to stop weeping over her husband suffering from dropsy, whom she hoped would be cured by the Latian Jupiter. The variegated picture of *paganism with its rites and myths, marked by an absolute lack of charity on the part of the Christian author toward the deceased, makes the short poem, which on many points is obscure due to the density of the satirical expression, a historical document of great importance.

CPL 1431; CPPM 1584.

Editions: PLS I, 780; Th. Mommsen, Hermes 4 (1870) 350-363; F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina,* Leipzig 1894, I, 1 n. 4 (ed. anast.: Amsterdam 1973, 20-24); G. Manganaro, *Il poemetto anonimo* Contra paganos. Testo, traduzione e commento: Nuovo Didaskaleion 11 (1961) 23-45; F. Roncoroni, *Carmen Codicis Parisini 8084*: RSLR 8 (1972) 58-79; *"Contro i Pagani."* Carmen cod.: Paris. Lat. 8084. Intr., testo critico, tr. e commento di A. Bartalucci, Pisa 1998 (with an exhaustive bibliography).

Studies: L. Cracco Ruggini, *Il paganesimo romano tra religione e politica (384-394 d.C.): per una reinterpretazione del "Carmen contra Paganos,"* Rome 1979; B. Adamik, *Das sog. Carmen contra paganos*: Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hungariae 368 (1995) 185-233; R. Romano, *L'ultimo pagano. Flaviano nello specchio del "Carmen contra paganos,"* Palermo 1998; A. Fraschetti, *La Conversione. Da Roma pagana a Roma cristiana*, Bari 1999, 70-74; M. Corsano, *Un incontro problematico: cristiani e pagani in tre carmi adespoti*: Orpheus 21 (2000) 26-43.

A.V. Nazzaro

CARMEN de ingratis (429–430). In this polemical-doctrinal poem, *Prosper of Aquitaine (d. after 455) deals in verse with the subject of the theology of *grace, against the new theory of the semi-*Pelagians treated in the *Epistula ad Rufinum* (426–427). The *carmen* consists of 1002 hexameters, preceded by a preface of 5 elegiac distichs, which contain the *propositio* and an appeal to the reader to obtain from the reading of the poem a sure and convinced doctrine of grace, and by an introduction of 11 hexameters, in which the poet declares himself to be moved by love for the church and by the need to oppose the spread of the resurrected Pelagian *heresy. The title Περὶ ἀχαρίστων, *id est de ingratis,* attested by the MSS, was probably given by the author himself (along the lines of *Prudentius), but in the preface he translates the Greek expression: *adversum ingratos falsa et virtute superbos / centenis decies versibus excolui* (to oppose the enemies of grace and men proud in their false virtues/I have composed a thousand verses) (vv. 3-4). The term *ingrates,* to be understood both as "ungrateful" and "those who lack grace," designates

the Pelagians and their rejection of God's prevenient grace.

The poem, characterized throughout by an insistent religious intolerance, is divided into four parts. In the first (vv. 1-225), after quickly outlining the history of Pelagianism, condemned by unanimous decrees of the church beginning with the see of *Rome (vv. 39-42: *pestem subeuntem prima recidit / sedes Rome Petri, quae pastoralis honoris / facta caput mundi, quidquid non possidet armis / religion tenet* [when the pestilence appeared it was cut off first/ by Rome, the seat of Peter/who was honored as chief among the pastoral offices of the whole world; what she does not possess by force of arms/she holds with her religious authority]), the poet identifies this heresy with semi-Pelagianism, whose followers demand, as an act of justice, either condemnation or admission into the church. In the other three parts the poet expounds semi-Pelagian doctrine, dwelling on its similarities and differences with Pelagianism. In this versification of a theological controversy, influenced by the works of *Augustine, to whom he offers enthusiastic praise (vv. 92ff.), Prosper demonstrates a good knowledge of *pagan poetry (Virgil, but also Lucretius and Ovid).

Editions: PL 51, 91-148; Ch.T. Huegelmeyer, Washington 1962 (text, Eng. tr. and comm.).

Studies: M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1891, 203-210; S. Colombo, *La poesia cristiana antica*. Parte I. *La poesia latina*, Rome 1910, 164-165; A.V. Nazzaro, *Prospero di Aquitania*: Enc. Virg. IV, Rome 1988, 327; C. Braidotti, *Prefazioni in distici elegiaci*, in G. Catanzaro - F. Santucci, *La poesia cristiana latina in distici elegiaci*, Assisi 1993, 76-78.

A.V. Nazzaro

CARMEN de passione Domini. Short poem of 80 Latin hexameters in which Christ crucified speaks to human beings, recalling how much he has done for them—becoming incarnate, working, suffering, dying on the cross—and exhorts them to profit from his saving action. Ignatius first attributed it to *Lactantius in the Aldine edition of his works (1515); Heumann (1729) considered it much later. Manitius subsequently assigned it, if not to Lactantius himself, at least to some unidentifiable early Christian poet. The most likely solution seems to be that of S. Brandt, who firmly denies Lactantius's authorship; he puts it between 1495 and 1500 and makes its author an anonymous Italian versifier who, at about that time, edited a short miscellany of Latin sacred poetry (*opusculum* preserved in the Munich Academy Library, which had escaped previous scholars). The compiler, copying models of the poets in the collection (Philomusus, Cantalicius, Zavenzonius) and also borrowing from Virgil, Prudentius, Orientius, Paulinus of Périgueux and Venantius Fortunatus, clumsily composed the *carmen* and included it in the collection.

CPL 1457; CPPM II/A n. 546; PL 7, 283-286; CSEL 27, I, 148-151; A. Roncoroni, *Sul* De passione Domini *pseudolattanziano*: VChr 29 (1975) 208-221.

L. Navarra

CARMEN de Providentia. Reflecting on the carnage wrought by the barbarian invasions at the start of the 5th c., people asked: "But what have innocent boys done, what have girls done, who committed no evil during their short life? Why were God's temples allowed to be ravaged by fire? The honor of consecrated chastity did not protect the virgins, nor sentimental love the widows" (vv. 43-48). In 415–416, when the barbarians had occupied the country for ten years, the poet of the *Carmen de Providentia*, author of other works, tried to answer these anguished questions in 46 elegiac distichs and 876 hexameters (the long reply). He used Scripture widely to show that God is the wise creator of the world and of humanity. By the devil's temptation, human beings have fallen into sin, but there have always been just people. God has always cared for the world and for people and has written his law in their hearts. Christ became incarnate, and with his help one can easily observe God's law; human beings enjoy free will, so that all suffer the same temptations and difficulties; but whereas for the good, misfortune is the crown of virtue, for the wicked it is a punishment. The charge of *Pelagianism has weighed on this important poetic composition, which sought to give theological answers to situations experienced by its contemporaries. Some scholars have erroneously attributed it to *Prosper of Aquitaine.

CPL 532; PL 51, 617-638; M.P. McHugh, Washington 1964 (critical ed. with Eng. tr.); L. Valentin, *Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine*, Toulouse-Paris 1900; C. Tibiletti, *Note sulla teologia del "Carmen de providentia Dei"*: Augustinianum 30 (1990) 453-476; J.F. Drinkwater - Hugh Elton (eds.), *Fifth-Century Gaul: Crisis of Identity?*, Cambridge 1992, 101-106; W.E. Klingshirn, *The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Cambridge 1994.

A. Di Berardino

CARMEN de synodo Ticinensi. A rhythmic composition passed down by two 7th-8th-c. witnesses of Bobbio, *Ambrosianus* C 105 *inf.* and *Ambrosianus*

E 147 *sup*., the latter textually superior to the former and thus preferred by editors (on the codices, see eds. Bethmann, 189, and Strecker, 728; CLA, I,26b; CLA, III,323b). The work, commissioned by the *Longobard (Lombard) King Cunipert (680–700), son of the Catholic Perctarit of the Bavarian branch of the descendants of the Lethings, celebrates the synod held at Pavia in 698 which ended the *schism of the *Three Chapters, a schism promoted for political reasons by the Longobards themselves, separating some churches of N *Italy from *Rome for more than a century and a half. The *carmen* does not limit itself to reviewing the facts of the schism and its resolution but is also a glorification of the dynasty, meant to reinforce its legitimacy internally, marked by various movements of revolt, and to promote a royal ideology in imitation of *Byzantine imperial dignity. The composition is also the only testimony of the abandonment of *Arianism by the Longobards, which took place under Aribert I, Cunipert's grandfather, unmentioned by Paul the Deacon, who gives us little information (including about the end of the Three Chapters schism), which does not always agree with the poem's account. Affinities have been highlighted between the text and the inscription dedicated to the three sovereigns Aribert, Perctarit and Cunipert for their common tomb in S. Salvatore at Pavia (MGH, *Poëtae latini aevi Karolini*, 4,2, 726). B. Oltrocchi and others maintain that the author of the *carmen* was the grammarian Felix, uncle of Flavian, Pavesian preceptor of Paul the Deacon, an attribution accepted until O. Holder-Egger who, preferring to draw the author's name from the double acrostic formed by the initial letters of the verses, proposes the author as one Stefanus m(a)g(ister). P. Lehmann, however, without attributing a value to the final strophe beginning with the letter *G,* resolved the acrostic as Stefanus m(onachus), almost necessarilly implying a changing of the place of composition from Pavia to the nearby monastery of Bobbio.

CPL 1540; D. Schaller -E. Könsgen, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum*, Göttingen 1977, nr. 15726; B. Oltrocchi, *Ecclesiae Mediolanensis historia ligustica in Romanam, Gothicam, Langobardicam tribus libris distribuita . . .*, II, Mediolani 1795, 534-536, 579-580, 625-627; S. Bofisio, *Concilia Papiensia*, Papiae 1852, 1-2; C. Troja, *Codice diplomatico longobardo dal DLXVIII al DCCLXXIV*, vol. 3, Naples 1853, 330, 353, 363; A. Joppi, *Ritmo o cantilena barbarica in elogio dei re longobardi Ariberto I, Bertarido e Cuniberto, colla notizia dei sinodi di Pavia e di Roma nei quali avvenne la riunione della chiesa scismatica di Aquileia alla comunione della chiesa romana*: *Archeografo Triestino*, Nuova serie, 1 (1869-1870) 85-87; A. Reifferscheid, *Sitzungsberidite der Wiener Akad.*, 1871; *Carmen de synodo Ticinensi*, ed. L. Bethmann, MGH, *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI-IX*, Hannoverae 1878, 189-191; *Rythmus de synodo Ticinensi*, ed. K. Strecker, MGH, *Poëtae latini aevi Karolini*, 4,2, Berolini 1881, 728-731; W. Meyer, *Die Spaltung des Patriarchats Aquileja*, Berlin 1898, 4-9; on the composition's meter: Id., *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik*, I, Berlin 1905, 212; G. Ferrara, *Il Carmen de Synodo Ticinensi. Contributo alla storia della ritmica latina*: *Rendiconti del Regio Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettee*, Ser. II, vol. 37 (1904) 500-518; M. Manitius, I, 199-200; O. Bertolini, *I papi e le relazioni politiche di Roma con i Ducati longobardi di Spoleto e Benevento*: RSCI 8 (1954) 1-22; D. Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*, Stockholm 1958, 111-112; P. Lehmann, *Stefanus magister?*: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 14 (1958) 469-471; G.P. Bognetti, *S. Maria Foris Portas e la Storia Religiosa dei Longobardi*: *L'età longobarda*, II, Milan 1966, 458-474; F. Ermini, *Storia della letteratura latina medievale*, Spoleto 1960, 557-559; P. Bertolini, *Cuniperto*: *DBI*, 31, 384-388; P. Radiciotti, *Flaviano*: *DBI*, 48, Rome 1997, 295-296; M. Kamptner, *Scripsi per prosa* (*Stephanus*, Rhythmus de Synodo Ticinensi, *MGH Poet. IV/2, pp. 728-731*): *Poesia dell'alto medioevo europeo: manoscritti, lingua e musica dei ritmi latini. Poetry of Early Medieval Europe: Manuscripts, Language and Music of the Latin Rhythmical Texts*, ed. F. Stella, Florence 2000, 187-195; F. De Rubeis, *Le epigrafi dei re longobardi*: *Poesia dell'alto medioevo europeo*, cit., 223-240, here 227-228; Id., *La tradizione epigrafica in Paolo Diacono*: *Paolo Diacono. Uno scrittore tra tradizione longobarda e rinnovamento carolingio*, ed. P. Chiesa, Udine 2000, 139-162., here 148; F. Lo Monaco, *Stefanus*. *Rythmus de synodo Ticinensi*: *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo. Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission*, *Te.Tra.*, I, eds. P. Chiesa-L. Castaldi, Florence 2004, 411-414; B. Dumézil, *Les Racines chrétiennes de l'Europe. Conversion et liberté dans les royaumes barbares, v^{e}-viii^{e} siècles,* Paris 2005, 346-349.

Rocco Ronzani

CARMEN FIGURATUM. The *carmen figuratum* is an extremely artificial poetic form, the characteristic of which is to include a visual aspect of the text; the effect of this "visual" poetry is obtained either because the written poem (sometimes polymetric) is in the shape of an image, or because the individual letters, using different colors, depict a geometrical design, symbolic letters or an object (the so-called *carmina cancellata*) and in this way convey a metatext. Letters highlighted in this way, when read continuously, like so-called *versus intexti,* also constitute a paratextual statement (which usually provides a guide to the reading): to figure out the relation of its contents with the main text is a challenge for the reader. "Technopaegnia" of this type in the form of poems which reproduce a shape were first produced in the *Hellenistic period (Simmias of Rhodes, Theocritus, Dosiades of Crete: *Anth. Pal.* 15,21; 22; 24-27); among the Romans this tradition must have been inherited, ca. 100 BC, from Laevius, who composed a figurative poem modeled on Simmias (*Pterygium Phoenicis*: fr. 22 Morel). Thanks to the most important ancient representative of the genre, Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius (4th c.), the

form of the *carmen cancellatum* was introduced; it exercised a lasting influence on the technopaegnia of Late Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period. In the Merovingian period *Venantius Fortunatus (6th c.) introduced it and used it from then on also in combination with acrostics and telestichs, as the bearer of a resolutely Christian message; his *carmina cancellata,* composed in honor of a fragment of the *cross, usually form the figure of the cross. The cross remains the main motif to be represented until beyond the Late Antique period: in the early 9th c. Rabanus Maurus composed 28 figurative poems (*De laudibus sanctae crucis*), in which he used various techniques for depicting a cross. With Alcuin, who puts himself in conscious continuity with Optatianus, Giuseppe Scotus, Theodulf of Orléans and Paul the Deacon, the *carmen figuratum* of the Carolingian era experienced in a renewed form a link with *panegyric, as was indicated by Optatianus.

B. Bowler, *The Word as Image*, London 1970; G. Pozzi, *La parola dipinta*, Milan 1981; U. Ernst, *Zahl und Maß in den Figurengedichten der Antike und des Frühmittelalters. Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung tektonischer Bauformen*, in *Mensura. Maß, Zahl, Zahlensymbolik im Mittelalter*, ed. A. Zimmermann, Berlin - New York 1984 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 16, 2), 310-332; J. Adler - U. Ernst, *Text als Figur: visuelle Poesie von der Antike bis zur Moderne* (*Ausstellung im Zeughaus der Herzog-August-Bibliothek vom 1. September 1987 bis 23. Mai 1988*), Weinheim [2]1988; G. Polara, *Le parole nella pagina: grafica e contenuti nei carmi figurati latini*: VetChr 28 (1991) 291-336; U. Ernst, *Carmen Figuratum. Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Cologne - Weimar - Vienna 1991; Id., *Permutation als Prinzip in der Lyrik:* Poetica 24 (1992) 225-267.

D. Weber

CARPOCRATES (2nd c.). *Irenaeus informs us of Carpocrates's doctrine but tells us nothing about his life; *Clement of Alexandria informs us not so much about him as about his son Epiphanes, and says that Carpocrates was an Alexandrian, while his wife, Alexandria, was from Cephalonia. Carpocrates was active in the 1st half of the 2nd c. From Irenaeus we learn that the *heresy of the Carpocratians also spread at Rome at the time of *Anicetus (mid-2nd c., by a certain *Marcellina). According to Irenaeus, Carpocrates taught that the world was created by inferior angels; above them is the ungenerated God, to whom souls, held prisoner by the archons of the world, tend to return. To help souls escape the archons, God sent a power, Jesus, different from other men only in that he has a more just soul. Souls succeed in freeing themselves from slavery to the body only after a series of transmigrations into other bodies, which ends when the soul has undergone every kind of experience, in this way attaining freedom. A consequence of this theory is the conviction that there are no good or bad actions as such, but they only appear so in human eyes: salvation in fact depends on faith and love. Irenaeus also hints at the use of *magic arts, charms and magic potions by the Carpocratians. Given that what Clement tells us of Epiphanes is not particularly *gnostic in character, it may be that Irenaeus's information reflects later developments in the Carpocratian sect rather than the thought of Carpocrates himself.

Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I, 25; Clement Al., *Strom.* III, 5-9; Tertullian, *De Anima* 23-35; Hippolytus, *Ref.* VII, 32; Eusebius, *HE* IV, 7,9; Origen, *C. Cel.* V, 62; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 27; H. Liboron, *Die Karpokratianische Gnosis*, Leipzig 1938; H. Kraft, *Gab es einen Gnostiker Karpokrates*: TZ 8 (1952) 434-443; S. Pétrement, *Le Dieu separé. Les origines du gnosticisme*, Paris 1984, 474ff.; P. Lampe, *Karpokratianer*, in Id., *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten: Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte*, Tübingen 1987, 269-270.

A. Monaci Castagno

CARPOPHORUS, M. AURELIUS (2nd-3rd c.). A Christian freed from *Commodus's household. The future Pope *Callistus was his slave. *Hippolytus's account (*Philos.* IX, 2,12), unfavorable to Callistus, is that Carpophorus had entrusted Callistus with the running of a bank: Callistus went bankrupt and Carpophorus condemned him to the treadmill, but later freed him. When Callistus disturbed a *synagogue meeting and was taken before the prefect, Carpophorus tried to save him from being condemned as a Christian.

E. Prinzivalli, s.v. *Callisto I, santo*: Epapi I, 237-246.

E. Prinzivalli

CARTERIUS (late 4th c.). One of the 12 bishops present—the 11th signatory—at the 1st Council of *Saragossa (380), held against the *Priscillianists at the time of Pope *Damasus; his see is unknown. No other Bishop Carterius is known after that council. He may be the Carterius mentioned by *Jerome in 397 (*Ep.* 69, *ad Oceanum*) and by *Braulio of Saragossa in 651 (*Ep.* 44, *ad Fructuosum*). According to Madoz—but not Gams—Jerome and Braulio allude to the same person. According to Braulio, Carterius was from *Gallaecia. He wrote a treatise (lost) against *Helvidius and *Jovinian.

Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, II/1, Regensburg 1864 (Graz 1956), 471; J. Madoz, *Epistolario de S. Braulio de Zaragoza*, Madrid 1941, 205; J. Vives, *Concilios visigóticos e*

hispano-romanos, Barcelona - Madrid 1963, 16; L. Riesco Terrero, *Epistolario de San Braulio*: Anal. Univ. Hisp. 31, Seville 1975, 180, 182; M. Alamo, *Carterius*: DHGE 11, 1147; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura española*, Madrid 1997, II, 25-26.

E. Romero Pose

CARTHAGE

I. History - II. Christian origins and antiquity - III. Christian topography - IV. Bishops - V. Councils.

Carthage is situated at the end of an irregular peninsula, between the sea and two salt lakes. The city is centered on the hill of Byrsa (63 m), extending around it in a vast quadrilateral ca. 1200-1300 m in length, bounded by the Julian enclosure.

In ca. 425 the city was enclosed by a semicircular wall (whose exact course is unknown), on the side overlooking the sea on the NE and SW.

I. History. Kart-hadschat, the "new city" of the Phoenicians, was founded in ca. 814 BC. Destroyed by Scipio Africanus in 146, rebuilt by Caesar and *Augustus, taken by surprise by *Genseric 19 October 439, reconquered by *Belisarius in 534, it fell into the hands of Hassan Ibn an-Nu'man, who destroyed it in 698. A small Christian community under a bishop survived until the arrival of the Almohads (12th c.). The French king St. Louis camped outside the city from 7 July to 25 August 1270, the day of his death.

II. Christian origins and antiquity. We do not know when Christianity took root at Carthage: the first Christians we meet, in 180, were not from Carthage but from Scilli, an unidentifiable place in Proconsular Africa. In 203, *Perpetua and her companions seem to have been from Carthage or nearby, not from Thuburbo Minus, as has been said: the deacons Tertius and Pomponius, the Bishop *Optatus and the priest Aspasius appear in their passion account. The first known African writer, *Tertullian, published his treatises at Carthage roughly between 197 and 217. Cyprian was bishop 249–258, during the persecutions of *Decius and *Valerian, and was a victim of the latter; he presided over seven councils, ruling on the question of the *lapsi* (*see* *lapsed, problem of the) in 251, on the *baptism of *heretics in 256. *Donatism started here in ca. 313, linked to the question of the **traditores* of *Diocletian's persecution (304). It was settled in 411 by a conference-debate between *Catholics and Donatists. *Augustine studied and taught at Carthage (371–383) and, as a bishop, returned nearly every year (395–430). With the *Vandal invasion, *Arianism took root, with endemic persecution. The *Byzantine conquest drew Carthage into the turmoil of the *christological controversies. Muslim rule not only despoiled the city of its monuments, to the benefit of Tunis, but also led to the disappearance of Christianity.

III. Christian topography. Our knowledge of Carthage's Christian topography comes from literary sources and primarily concerns *cemeteries, which in the 4th c. were largely incorporated into the urban organization of the Carthaginian church. The division of the city into seven ecclesiastical regions, each seemingly with its own parish church, doubtless goes back to the same era. The following catalog lists churches alphabetically, Catholic first, then non-Catholic. After each proper name, the term *basilica* should be understood, unless accompanied by another term.

Catholic. Agilaei: *Conc. Carth.* 525; Fulg. Ferr., *V. Fulg.* 56; Mansi 8, 636. Bigua monasterium: *Pass. 7 bb. mm. Caps.* 16. Celerinae: Aug., *En. Ps.* 99; *Serm.* 48, 174. Cypriani in Mappalibus: *A. Cypr.* 5, 6; Aug., *Denis* 11, 22; *En. Ps.* 32, 35; *Serm.* 311, 313, 330; Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr. prov.* 1, 16. Cypriani mensa in agro Sexti: *A. Cypr.* 5, 2; Aug., *Denis* 14, 15; *En. Ps.* 38, 80; *Serm.* 8, 13, 49, 114, 131, 154, 169, 305, 309, 310, 313; *Frangip.* 1, 5; *Morin* 15; Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers.* 1, 16; Cypriani memoria: Aug., *Conf.* 5, 8; Procop., *Bell. vand.* 1, 21, 17-18. Fausti: *Sent. epp.* 31; *Conc. Carth.* 418, 419; Aug., *In Jo. ev. tr.* 51; *Serm.* 23, 101, 134, 261; Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers.* 1, 25; 2, 18,48; 3, 24. Gratiani: Aug., *Serm.* 156. Honoriana: Aug., *Serm.* 163; Ps.-Prosp. Aq., *Lib. de prom. Dei* 3, 38, 44. Iuliani Antioc.: Leont., *V. Greg. Agrig.* Maiorum: Aug., *Morin* 12; *Serm.* 16A, 34, 165, 294; CIL VIII 25038. Monasterium ad pontum Mandracium: Proc., *Aedif.* VI, 5,2. Novarum: *Sent. epp.* 30; Opt. of Mil., 1, 19; Aug., *Brev. coll.* III, 25,13; *Denis* 61; *Guelf.* 30; *Serm.* 14, 37; Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers.* 1, 9, 25. Pauli Reg. VI: Aug., *Serm.* 119. Petri, Reg. III: Aug., *Serm.* 15. Reg. II: PL 43, 814. Scillitanorum: Aug., *Serm.* 48, 155. Stephani monasterium: Ps.-Prosp. Aq., *Lib. de prom. Dei* 6. Tertull.: *Sent. epp.* 16. Tricliarum: Aug., *Serm.* 29, 53. *Non-Catholic.* Tertullianistarum (church of the followers of Tertullian): Aug., *Haer.* 86. Theoprepia (main Donatist church): Aug., *Ep.* 139. Thrasamundi (469–523, Vandal Arian church): Fel., *Anthol. lat.* 1, 213, vv. 5-6. Only two of these churches have been identified by excavation: the *basilica Maiorum* at Mcidfa, thanks to the inscription commemorating the martyrs Perpetua and companions; and the *monasterium S. Stephani*, E of the Theodosian wall. The question of the location of St. *Cyprian's basilicas remains open: C. Lepelley, *Les Cités de l'Afrique Romaine au Bas-Empire*, II: *Notices d'Histoire municipale*, Paris 1981, 11-53; H. Hurst, *Cartagine, la nuova Alessandria*, in A. Momigliano - A. Sciavone (eds.), *Storia di Roma*. 3. *L'età Tardo Antica,* II, *I luoghi e le culture*, Turin 1993, 327-337; J.B. Rives, *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage from Augustus to Constantine*, Oxford 1995; Institut National d'Archéologie et d'art Tunisie and British Academy Carthage Committee, v. 1/1: *Excavations at Carthage: The British Mission,* Sheffield 1984; LTK³ 5, 1271-1275; N. Duval, *L'état actuel des recherches archéologiques sur Carthage chrétienne* (*études d'archéologie chrétienne nordafricaine, XXV*): Ant Tard 5 (1997) 309-350; L. Ennabli, *Carthage. Une métropole chrétienne du IVᵉ siècle à*

la fin du VII[e] siècle (Études africaines), Paris 1997.

IV. Bishops. List of known bishops: 1. Optatus (?) (203). 2. *Agrippinus (ca. 220). 3. Donatus (before 249). 4. Cyprian (249–258). 5. *Lucian (?) (after 259). 6-7. *Carpophorus and Cyrus (no date). 8. *Mensurius (303–311). 9. *Caecilian (311). 10. *Gratus (342–345/348). 11. *Restitutus (ca. 350). 12. Genetlius (ca. 390). 13. *Aurelius (ca. 392–427). 14. Capreolus (427–ca. 437). 15. Quodvultdeus (437–454). 16. *Deogratias (454–457). 17. *Eugenius (481–505). 18. *Boniface (523–535). 19. Reparatus (535–563). 20. Primosus (563–565). 21. Publicius (565–589). 22. Domenicus (594–601). 23. Victor (ca. 646). 24. Stephen. 25. James (990). 26. Thomas (1053). 27. Cyriac (1073–1076). The gaps in the 5th c. are due to the *Vandal persecution, which left the see vacant; the others are due to the state of the evidence in our possession.

PWK 10, 2150-2243; DACL 2, 2190-2230; DHGE 11, 1140-1233; LTK 6,1-4; Cath 2, 602-604; RBK 3 (1978) 1158-1189; J.L. Maier, *L'episcopat de l'Afrique Romaine, vandale et byzantine*, Rome 1973; A. Mandouze, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, I: l'Afrique (303-533)*, Paris 1982; S. Lancel, *Évêchés et cités dans les provinces africaines (III[e]-V[e] siècles)*, in *L'Afrique dans l'Occident Romain*, École Française de Rome 1990, 273-290.

V. Saxer

V. Councils. *Augustine often mentions a *council called at Carthage by Agrippinus, a predecessor of *Cyprian. This council examined *baptism conferred by *heretics and declared it invalid: *Un. bapt.* 13, 22; *Bapt.* 2, 7, 12; *Ep.* 93, 10, 35, etc. Its date is unknown, but was certainly around 220–225; the number of bishops is also unknown. Cyprian refers to certain conciliar decisions earlier than himself, esp. that which forbade clerics to become guardians or trustees (*Ep.* 1, 1-2): it is valid to think that this decision was taken by Agrippinus's council. The passage in Cyprian's *Ep.* 55, 21 (cf. Tertull., *Pud.*, passim) on Agrippinus's leniency, in the name of his fellow bishops, toward remarried divorcees, may refer to the same council.

DHGE II, 1039-1043; Hfl-Lecl I, 155; Palazzini 1, 248.

Under Cyprian's immediate predecessor, Donatus (hence before 248), an assembly of *African bishops, probably at Carthage, *excommunicated Bishop *Privatus of Lambaesis. Cyprian's council of May 252 refused to review this decision.

Cyprian, *Ep.* 59 (55), 10, 1; 57 (54).

Cyprian presided over seven councils at Carthage. We have only fragmentary information on them. The first four (spring 251, May 252, late 253, late 254) were occupied with the question of the *lapsi* (*Lapsed, Problem of the); the last three (255, spring 256, 1 September 256) with the baptism of heretics.

That of 251 was held soon after *Easter. Cyprian informed the assembly of Pope *Cornelius's letter notifying them of his election (*Ep.* 45 [42]). Two bishops, *Caldonius and *Fortunatus, were sent to *Rome to obtain exact information on the *Novatianist *schism, and a definite pronouncement on it was deferred to their return (*Ep.* 44, 1). The council was relatively indulgent toward *lapsi,* pardoning *libellatici* and subjecting *thurificati* and *sacrificati* to canonical *penance (*Ep.* 49 [46] and 48 [45]); Pope Cornelius was consulted on these measures. The council confirmed the excommunication of the deacon *Felicissimus of Carthage and the five priests of his party.

On 15 May 252, a council of 42 bishops met at Carthage under Cyprian. Its synodal letter confirmed the pardon of *lapsi* who had done penance but banned them from future admission to the priesthood.

In 253, a council of 66 bishops from Africa and *Numidia criticized Bishop Terapius of Bulla for admitting the priest Victor to communion too soon, without having first imposed the penance he deserved, but it did not annul the reconciliation. It approved the custom of baptizing newborns without waiting for the eighth day and sent a letter (*Ep.* 64 [59]) congratulating Pope *Lucius on his return from exile.

The council of 254 counted 37 bishops from Proconsular Africa. Its synodal (*Ep.* 67 [68]) approved the deposition of the renegade Spanish bishops *Martial of Mérida (Emerita) and *Basilides of Léon and Astorga (Legio-Asturica), and the election of their successors. It also rebuked Pope *Stephen, who had been taken in by these two prelates.

The council of autumn 255, with 31 Proconsular bishops, replied unanimously to a question from 18 *Numidian bishops that they should maintain the African tradition of rebaptizing heretics, "because no one can be baptized outside the church, since there is only one baptism and this is in the church" (*Ep.* 70).

In spring 256, a council of 71 Proconsular and *Numidian bishops confirmed this, notified Pope Stephen of its decision and expressed a hope of obtaining his approval; it was also decided that clerics who reentered the church from heresy could only be admitted as laymen (*Ep.* 72).

On 1 September 256, after Stephen had ordered the Africans to conform to the Roman custom under

pain of excommunication, Cyprian called 87 bishops, more than 50 from Proconsularis, 30 or so from Numidia and some from Mauretania, to Carthage. The acts of this council survive, titled *Sententiae episcoporum LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis* (CSEL 3, 1, 435-461). First they read Bishop Jubaianus's letter to Cyprian on the baptism of heretics and the latter's reply (*Ep.* 73); then Jubaianus's second letter accepting Cyprian's opinion. The bishop of Carthage then asked each bishop present to express his opinion freely on the question, which they did in hierarchical order, Cyprian being the last to speak. All declared that baptism administered by heretics was invalid and that those so baptized must be rebaptized before being admitted into the church.

Hfl-Lecl I, 165-191; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III^e siècle*, Vatican City 1969, 13-20; Palazzini 1, 248-252; J.A. Fischer, *Die Konzilien zu Karthago und Rom in Jahr 251*: Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum 11 (1979) 263-286; E. Contreras, *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 407-421; M. Marin, *Le Sententiae episcoporum LXXXVII*: Invigilata Lucernis 11 (1989) 329-359; G. Dunn, *The Carthaginian Synod of 251: Cyprian's Model of Pastoral Ministry*, in *I Concili della Cristianità occidentale* (*secoli III-V*). XXX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana (Rome 3-5 May 2001), SEA 78, Rome 2002, 235-257.

Sometime between 345 and 348, the Catholic bishops of the African provinces met at Carthage under the presidency of Bishop Gratus, Caecilian's successor. They rejoiced at what they thought was the end of the *Donatist schism—the emperor *Constans had decreed the enforcement of the law of 316, ordering that schismatic communities be dissolved, their property handed over to the Catholics and recalcitrants exiled—and issued several disciplinary regulations. Some of these concerned Donatism: forbidding rebaptism of heretics and schismatics who returned to the church (can. 1), or the honoring of *suicides as *martyrs (can. 2). To raise the moral level of the clergy, the Fathers impressed on them the obligation of chastity (cans. 3-4), stability (cans. 5 and 7) and disinterest (cans. 5, 8-9, 13). They asked bishops not to usurp their neighbors' rights but to respect their commitments, esp. concerning the dividing up of places contested between different dioceses (cans. 10 and 12).

CCL 149, 2-10; Hfl-Lecl II, 839-841; Monceaux III, 221-226; IV, 349-351; Palazzini 1, 254.

On 16 June 390, Genetlius of Carthage presided over a general African council at Carthage, which promulgated 13 canons. These, in effect, repeated the decisions of Gratus's council on clerical chastity (can. 2) and on the procedure for judging higher clergy (can. 10). The council also made important clarifications of priests' rights: they were forbidden to consecrate chrism, bless virgins or reconcile penitents, though for this latter item they could obtain express authorization from the bishop (can. 3). The council forbade the formation of new bishoprics (can. 5) and declared that the primate's assent was necessary to institute a new bishop (can. 13). It excommunicated anyone who had received in his church someone excommunicated in another church (can. 7) and was very anxious to avoid any dissent (cans. 8 and 9). Finally, it provided for the exclusion of anyone who would not observe its ordinances (can. 13).

CCL 149, 11-19; Hfl-Lecl II, 76-78; Palazzini 1, 255; Ch. Munier, *La tradition du II^e Concile de Carthago* (*390*): RSR 46 (1972) 193-211.

During the episcopate of *Aurelius (390–430), many provincial (Proconsularis) or plenary (all the African provinces) councils were held at Carthage. Ample extracts survive, thanks to the dossiers sent to Rome by the Africans over the affair of *Apiarius (418–424), justifying their actions. These documents, which give us intimate knowledge of the African church's legislation in the 5th c., are the *Codex Apiarii causae* (CCL 149, 79-172) and the *Registri Ecclesiae Carthaginensis Excerpta* (= RC; CCL 149, 173-247), which *Dionysius Exiguus inserted in the second recension of his canonical collection. The Council of *Hippo of 393 had settled that an African plenary council should meet annually. On 26 June 394 a council met at Carthage under Aurelius, but we cannot establish whether it was general. Its acts are lost; all we know is that it designated delegates for the Council of Hadrumentum in Byzacena (CCL 149, 183).

Hfl-Lecl II, 98-100; Palazzini 1, 256; J. Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église en Occident du II^e au VII^e siècle*, Paris 1985, 81-83.

In 395 and 396 the general insecurity, due to Gildo's revolt, prevented the regular celebration of councils. Only in 397 could the African general council meet. Augustine attended as bishop of Hippo. The conditions in which it was held were rather curious. The bishops of Byzacena had arrived at Carthage much earlier than the other delegations, esp. the Numidians, and did not seem at all disposed to wait for the council's opening, fixed for 27 August. It is likely that this attitude was inspired by a thorny problem of precedence: did not the province of Byzacena, once part of Proconsularis, have precedence over Nu-

midia? The Numidians might well have replied that their province was older than Byzacena and that consequently their primate had the right to second place, immediately after the primate of Carthage. We do not know if the question was ever resolved—in any event, it is strange to see it reemerge in 525 after the long *Vandal intermission (CCL 149, 259-262). In 397, however, it was more lively than ever, so much so that the bishops of Byzacena, by withdrawing before the opening of the council and thus not sitting with the Numidians, would have avoided either provoking an incident or creating a precedent. In their defense, we must point out that they did a useful work by compiling the **Breviarium Hipponense* (CCL 149, 22-44), which they pledged to observe in their province.

At the end of the conciliar session, 28 August 397, the bishops of Byzacena having returned to their own sees, some 40 prelates from Proconsularis, Numidia and Mauretania approved the *Breviarium* (CCL 149, 143). They also defined many provisions on matters of discipline: forbidding rebaptism, reordination and transfer of bishops (RC 48); requiring three bishops to be present at the consecration of another bishop (RC 49); specifiying that the date of Easter was to be announced by the primate of Carthage (RC 50); announcing that no new dioceses could be created (RC 53); demarking provisions against bishops who usurped the rights of others (chs. 54 and 56). An exception was made for the primate of Carthage, who was authorized by custom to provide for the needs of churches who requested it, for the ordination of candidates to the episcopate, and for the clerics of all the dioceses of Africa (RC 55).

CCL 149, 20-53; Hfl-Lecl II, 100-102; Palazzini 1, 256; M. Krámitz, *La prescrizione del canone della Scrittura nel Concilio di Cartagine (397)*, in *I Concili della Cristianità occidentale (secoli III-V)*. XXX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana (Rome 3-5 May 2001), SEA 78, Rome 2002, 259-267.

The year 398 was too turbulent to hold a plenary council at Carthage: Gildo had passed on to open revolt against the emperor. We should not believe, therefore, the Spanish canonical collection known as the *Hispana,* which dates an imaginary IV Council of Carthage to 8 November 398: this is actually the Provençal compilation called *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* (ed. Ch. Munier, Paris 1960). After the return of peace, the African bishops met on 27 April 399, a date earlier than that of the annual meeting, in the *secretarium* of the *Basilica restituta* of Carthage. The Fathers delegated two bishops to ask emperor Honorius to allow churches the right of asylum, conceded to temples by the law of 29 January 399 (CTh XVI, 10, 15).

CCL 149, 193-194; Hfl-Lecl II, 120-121; Palazzini 1, 256.

In 400 no council was held at Carthage, perhaps because of the tensions between Christians and *pagans aroused by the law of 399. In 401, however, there were two councils. On 15 June the bishops of Proconsularis met. Aurelius submitted for approval the petitions he thought should be presented to the authorities overseas (CCL 149, 194-198). He renewed a suggestion of the Council of Carthage of 397, which would have enabled him to admit some converted Donatists to major orders (RC 47: CCL 149, 186). Consulted previously about this, the churches of *Rome and *Milan rejected it. Aurelius proposed to make another attempt to convince *Anastasius, the new pope, and *Venerius, the new bishop of Milan, of its necessity and legitimacy, bearing in mind the distressed circumstances of the African churches (RC 57: CCL 149, 145). The legation was also to ask the emperor for a group of provisions against the idols, temples and banquets of the pagans (RC 58 and 60), and against the entertainments offered on *Sundays and Christian feast days (RC 60). It was also to ask for various regulations to strengthen the authority of ecclesiastical tribunals (RC 59 and 62), to ensure protection for converts (RC 63) and to proceed to the freeing of slaves in churches (RC 64).

CCL 149, 194-198; Hfl-Lecl II, 125-126; Palazzini 1, 257.

The plenary council of 401 met at Carthage on 13 September. Meanwhile, Pope Anastasius's reply, exhorting the bishops to continue the struggle against Donatism, had reached Africa. Eager to restore the unity of the churches and not wishing to offend the majesty of the pope, the Fathers resolved on a final effort to restore religious peace (RC 66 and 69). The assembly also issued various disciplinary canons: it particularly reminded the higher clergy of their obligations of continence (RC 70) and stability (RC 71). It forbade trustee bishops' misappropriation of vacant sees (RC 74). It reactivated some old rules, such as obliging bishops to attend councils (RC 76) and forbidding them to leave their goods to pagans or heretics (RC 81). It also forbade their affiliating a foreign monk to their dioceses or entrusting the direction of a *monastery to such (RC 60). It prescribed the baptism of children whose baptism was in doubt, particularly those ransomed from barbarians (RC 72). It laid down how much respite should be allowed to condemned clergy to make arrangements for appeal (RC 79). The delegates to the imperial

court were entrusted with the question of *manumissio* (RC 82), that of the *defensores ecclesiae* (RC 75), and that of the struggle against paganism (RC 84). Finally, the council set up a commission of 20 bishops to restore order in the church of Hippo Diarrytus (Bizerta) and replace *Equitius (RC 78).

CCL 149, 198-205; Hfl-Lecl II, 126-128; Palazzini 1, 257.

In 402 the plenary African council was held at Milevis in Numidia. In 403 one was held at Carthage on 25 August. It decided to continue the effort to bring the Donatists back to the unity of the Catholic faith, particularly by inviting them to take part in public conferences, like debates. To avoid and detect chicanery, invitations would be made by local magistrates, so that formal proof of the facts should be in the public archives (RC 91-92).

CCL 149, 208-211; Hfl-Lecl II, 154-155; Palazzini 1, 257-258.

The council held at Carthage in June 404 concluded that the policy of religious pacification had failed. A delegation was sent to the court of *Ravenna to ask for imperial protection against the violence of the Donatists (RC 93). The council demanded the restoration of penalties against heretics who had performed ordinations and a restriction on their rights to make wills. These suggestions, aimed at avoiding physical punishments, came from Augustine (*Ep*. 185, 7, 29: CSEL 57, 24). But the sight of the Donatists' victims made such an impression on the emperor that, from 12 February 405, he issued severe laws against them and ordered religious unity to be restored in all African cities in favor of the Catholics (CTh XVI 5,38; 6,3-6). It was then that the state resolved to suppress the dissident church, if necessary by direct coercion.

CCL 149, 211-214; Hfl-Lecl II, 155-156; Palazzini 1, 258.

The plenary council of 23 August 405 sent a delegation to thank the emperor for his measures against the Donatists, which had brought about religious unity at Carthage; the judges were entrusted with the task of promoting it in the other provinces as well (RC 94).

CCL 149, 214; Hfl-Lecl II, 156; Palazzini 1, 258-259.

In 406 there was no plenary council, but the African bishops met at Carthage on 13 June 407. They decided that, from then on, councils of all the African provinces would be held only in cases of serious matters that affected all (RC 95). The Fathers also fixed many rules on ecclesiastical jurisdiction (RC 104), appeal procedures (RC 96), the creation of new episcopal sees (RC 98), the maintenance of returned Donatist bishops (RC 99), formulas of prayer (RC 103), divorcées (RC 102), journeys of bishops to the imperial court (RC 106), excommunicated clerics (RC 105). They also wrote to Pope *Innocent I, inviting him to put an end to their dispute with the church of *Alexandria (RC 101), and sent a delegation to the emperor, requesting all necessary measures against Donatism (RC 97). This was not without effect: on 15 November 407, Honorius issued a new law against Donatists, *Manichees, *Priscillianists and pagans (CTh XVI, 5, 43; 10, 19), which aroused a violent reaction and provoked bloody public disorders (Aug., *Ep*. 91: CSEL 34, 2, 432).

CCL 149, 214-219; Hfl-Lecl II, 156-158; Palazzini 1, 259.

The councils that met at Carthage in June and October 408 both sent legations to the court of Ravenna, *contra paganos et haereticos*.

CCL 149, 219; Hfl-Lecl II, 158-159; Palazzini 1, 259-260.

The same was done in 410. The end of all these efforts was the calling of the conference of Carthage of 1-8 June 411, which saw the rout of Donatism.

CCL 149, 220; Hfl-Lecl II, 159, 168, 180, 183; Palazzini 1, 260.

From this date, the disciplinary activity of the African councils seems to have slowed, but other problems soon engaged their attention: the *Pelagian controversy and the affair of *Apiarius. From 411–412 an ecclesiastical tribunal under the presidency of Aurelius excommunicated *Celestius. In summer 416 the bishops of Proconsularis confirmed this sentence and sent Pope Innocent a detailed synodal to inform him of the "intrigues" of the "enemies of grace." This was echoed by the Numidian bishops, meeting at Milevis. Finally, five bishops (Aurelius, Alypius, Augustine, *Evodius and *Possidius) addressed their concerns to the pope. Rome's reply was clear: Pelagius and Celestius were put outside the communion of the church until they acknowledged their faults, as were all those who obstinately upheld their ruinous doctrines (Aug., *Ep*. 181, 9; 182, 6). How the intrigues of Celestius and his Roman partisans soon led the new Pope *Zosimus to question these sentences is well known.

A new council, urgently convoked at Carthage at the end of 417, made a strong protest to Rome. Its acts are lost, but their essence can be reconstructed from scattered references in Augustine's writings (*C. ep. Pel.* II, 3, 5; *De gr. et pecc. or*. II, 7, 8; *Ep*. 215, 3) and

in Zosimus's reply (*Ep. Quamvis patrum*: PL 20, 676). The latter, dated 21 March 418, reached Carthage on 29 April. Two days later, 1 May 418, the plenary council of the African episcopate opened: more than 200 bishops proclaimed the Catholic doctrine of original sin and its transmission (cans. 1-3); the role and necessity of grace (cans. 4-6); and the possibility of avoiding sin (cans. 7-9) (CCL 149, 67-78). They also ruled on a number of disciplinary questions connected with the reintegration of the Donatists (RC 117-121, 124). They defined certain points of procedure (RC 122) and issued sanctions against negligent bishops (RC 123-124). They authorized priests, deacons and minor clergy to appeal to the primate of their province and to the general council of the African provinces (RC 125), but forbade them to appeal overseas, on pain of excommunication which would pursue them through all the territory of Africa. Having adopted these measures, they concluded the affair of Celestius, while that of Apiarius, in the same year, would demonstrate just how well-founded the Fathers' apprehensions were.

CCL 149, 220-228; Hfl-Lecl II, 190-195; Palazzini 1, 262.

Several councils were occupied with the case of Apiarius, a priest of Sicca Veneria in Africa Proconsularis who, excommunicated by his Bishop Urbanus for various misdemeanors, took his case to Rome. Pope Zosimus received him favorably and, during the summer of 418, sent a legation to Carthage charged with his instructions on this and on various points of discipline (CCL 149, 90-93): he openly asked that, in cases regarding bishops, recourse to Rome should always be possible, in accordance with the provisions laid down by the Council of *Nicaea on the matter of appeals, and that, in cases concerning priests and deacons, appeal should be made to neighboring bishops. In support of these requests, the pope produced texts which he thought were Nicene, but which were in fact two canons of the Council of *Serdica. The Africans reacted with determination to Rome's demands: they reaffirmed their veneration for the decisions of Nicaea but put forward very clear reservations about Zosimus's texts, of which they found no trace in the Greek copies of that council. In all probability, Zosimus never saw this reply: he died on 27 September 418, and not until April 419 could his successor Boniface send messengers to Carthage to inform Zosimus's delegates about events at Rome and to confirm his predecessor's mandate to them.

The general council of the African provinces met in May 419 and finally put an end to the question of Apiarius, in agreement with the Roman legates. After asking pardon, he was readmitted to church communion but removed from the clergy of Sicca Veneria. The debates over Apiarius were essentially about Rome's demands in the matter of appeal. *Alypius suggested a procedure that could establish the "Nicene" authenticity of Zosimus's canons: the obtaining of a duly certified copy of the Nicene canons from the great sees of the East: *Constantinople, *Antioch and *Alexandria (CCL 149, 160). The Eastern bishops' reply arrived the same year and fully confirmed the Africans' reservations (CCL 149, 162-163). The plenary council of May 419 brought together 217 bishops; its final session (30 May) laid down numerous procedural rules which over the centuries became laws, since they were taken up indefatigably by the medieval canonical collections. In particular, excommunicates (RC 128), slaves, freedmen and *infames personae* (RC 129) were excluded from making accusations in ecclesial courts. The council also laid down rules about the admission of witnesses (RC 131) and enjoined bishops not to inflict excommunication lightly (RC 132-133).

CCL 149, 229-234; Hfl-Lecl II, 198-201; Palazzini 1, 263-264; W. Marschall, *Karthago und Rome*: Päpste und Papstum 1 (1971); C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, 2, Rome 1976, 1250-1275; M. Wojtowytsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I.*: Päpste und Papsttum 17 (1981) 254-264, 368-369.

The affair of Apiarius, seemingly settled, bounced back several years later. Admitted to the clergy of Tabarka, the sad hero of this story gave himself up to new excesses. Excommunicated again, he once again sought refuge at Rome, where Pope Celestine admitted him to communion. A new Roman legation was sent to Carthage, headed by the same *Faustinus of Potenza (in Picenum) who had presided over that of 418–419. He insisted on Apiarius's reinstatement and made a great noise about the privileges of the Roman church. But events quickly took an unexpected turn: Apiarius, of his own accord, made a genuine confession, and Faustinus had no option but to apologize. In the letter they sent to Pope Celestine, the Africans summed up all these disputes in a council of Carthage, which must be placed around 424 (CCL 149, 169-172). They reaffirmed the principles of their legislation on ecclesiastical procedure and excommunication and asked the Roman pontiff to be willing in the future to respect them in their entirety, since they were in perfect agreement with the canons of Nicaea. And finally, they begged him to abstain from any untimely intervention in local affairs through his legates. The single canon published by this council clearly manifests the Africans' exasperation: *Ut*

nullus ad romanam ecclesiam audeat appellare (CCL 149, 266). On 13 June 421 a general council of Africa was held at Carthage, but its acts are lost.

CCL 149, XXXIV-XXXV; Hfl-Lecl II, 213-214; Palazzini 1, 264; Ch. Munier, *Un canon inédit du XX*[e] *concile de Carthage*: RSR 40 (1966) 113-126.

The Vandal invasion put an end to conciliar activity in N Africa. It did not revive until the early 6th c., and then only briefly. On 5 February 525 Boniface of Carthage gathered, at Carthage, some 60 bishops from Proconsular Africa, Numidia and Tripolitania, and some from Mauretania Caesareana and Sitifiana; only those of Byzacena could not come, though they were invited. The question of precedence among the African provinces occupied much of the debate. Afterward, Boniface ordered the reading of the Nicene *Creed and a whole series of canons issued by the earlier African councils, judging them useful for the instruction of the new bishops (CCL 149, 254-272). The next day, 6 February, the council dealt with particular affairs, specifically the conflict between *Liberatus, primate of Byzacena, and the abbot Peter.

CCL 149, 254-282; Hfl-Lecl II, 1069-1074; Palazzini 1, 265; J. Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église en Occident du II*[e] *au VII*[e] *siècle*, Paris 1985, 104-105.

The Council of Carthage of 536 recalled the provisions made in 525 in favor of monasteries, primarily that when monasteries requested the ordination of clerics for the service of the monastery itself or the oratories attached to it, this must be done by the local bishop, but this did not give him any particular right over the monastery.

CCL 149, 283; Hfl-Lecl II, 1136-1139; Palazzini 1, 265-266.

Ch. Munier

CARTHAGINENSIS. Province of Hispania created by *Diocletian (ca. 297) from territories previously belonging to Baetica and Tarraconensis which, ca. 385, included the Balearic Islands. The following episcopal sees are documented in the 4th and early 5th c., attested by the presence of their bishops at councils: Acci (Guadix, Granada), Basti (Baza, Granada), Castulo (Cazlona, Jaén), Complutum (Alcalá de Henares, Madrid), Eliocroca (near Lorca, Murcia), Mentesa Bastetanorum (La Guardia, Jaén) and Toletum (Toledo, metropolitan see during the *Visigothic era). Evidence also remains of other possible sees, from the presence of presbyters at councils, sometimes noted as representing their bishops: Baria (Vera, Almería) and Carthago Nova (Cartagena, Murcia, metropolitan see of Byzantine Spania). In the 6th c. we find the sees of: Ercauica (Castro de Santaver), Oretum (Granátula, Jaén), Oxama (Osma, Soria), Saetabis (Játiva, Valencia), Segobia (Segovia), Segobriga (Cabeza de Griego, Cuenca), Segontia (Sigüenza, Guadalajara), Valentia (Valencia), Valeria (Cuenca), Bigastrum (Bigastro, Alicante), Elo (near Elche, Alicante) and Palentia (Palencia). In the 7th c.: Beatia (Baeza, Jaén), Dianium (Denia, Alicante), Ilice (Elche, Alicante). A *cenobium is attested at Baecula (Bailén, Jaén).

Among its most famous religious personalities are *Justinian (1st half 6th c.), bishop of Valencia, promoter of the cult of *Vincent, and the writers *Licinianus, bishop of Cartagena (late 6th–early 7th c.), *Eutropius, bishop of Valencia (late 6th–early 7th c.) and *Julian, bishop of *Toledo (late 7th c.), who convoked four councils in his see. Numerous councils were held in Carthaginensis: Toledo I (400), Toledo II (527), Valencia (546), Toledo III (589), Toledo (597), Toledo IV (633), Toledo V (636), Toledo VI (638), Toledo VII (646), Toledo VIII (653), Toledo IX (655), Toledo X (656), Toledo XI (675), Toledo XII (681), Toledo XIII (683), Toledo XIV (684), Toledo XV (688), Toledo XVI (693), Toledo XVII (694) and Toledo XVIII (703, without acts).

Archaeologically, noteworthy are early Christian *sarcophagi of Roman importation (4th c.). Some go back to the 1st half of the 4th c., e.g., those of Elo, Erustes (Toledo), Layos (Toledo), Toledo and Yecla (Murcia); the rest, those of Valencia and Hellín (Albacete), are from the 2nd half of the 4th c. Locally produced sarcophagi are later, such as that of La Puebla Nueva (Toledo), from the Theodosian period. Also from the 4th c. are the mausoleums of La Alberca (Murcia), Vegas de Pedroza (Segovia) and Las Vegas de Puebla Nueva (Toledo). At Alcalá de Henares are the remains of a martyrium dedicated to Justus and Pastor, linked to a metropolis of the *Visigothic period. From the 2nd half of the 7th c. is the old Visigothic villa of Pla de Nadal (20 km [12.4 mi] NW of Valencia).

Among early Christian basilicas are those of Elche (initially a *synagogue), rectangular with three aisles and semicircular apse toward the E, with floor mosaics dated from between the 4th c. and the Visigothic period; a church at Elo, rectangular with apse, built in two phases (the first horseshoe shaped, between the 4th and 5th c.); Aljezares (Murcia), church with three aisles, with apse and abutting circular-plan baptistery (late 4th c.); Segobriga, church with three aisles with semicircular crypt, wide transept and important decoration (5th-7th c.). From

the Visigothic period are the churches of Almenara (La Plana Baixa, Castelló), rectangular with three aisles and central apse (6th c.); Recopolis (Zorita de los Canes, Guadalajara; ca. 578), cruciform with apse rectangular outside and circular inside (6th c.); Tolmo de Minateda (Hellín, Albacete), basilica with three aisles, apse toward the E and baptistery to the W, and lateral entrances (late 6th–early 7th c.); Las Tamujas de Malpica de Tajo (Toledo; 7th c.) and San Pedro de Mata (Toledo; 7th c.). The most important examples are from the second half of the 7th and early 8th c.: crypt of San Antolín (cathedral of Palencia), perhaps from the time of Wamba; Santa Maria de Quintanilla de las Viñas (Mambrillas de Lara, Burgos), with three aisles, transept and figurative decorations. The archaeology of Toledo is poorly known, despite it having been the capital of the Visigothic kingdom. Epigraphy (Vives, n. 307, 312, 317-319, 327) allows us to suppose the existence of Christian basilicas at Bailén (Jaén), Guadix, Cehegín (Murcia), Denia (Alicante) and Játiva (Valencia), traditionally situated under the hermitage of St. Philip; notable is the fragment of the Toledan inscription which reproduces a part of the *Credo* (Vives, n. 552). Also very important is the treasure of Guarrazar (period of Recesvinto) discovered in the 19th c. near Guadamur (Toledo), composed of a group of votive crowns and richly decorated crosses.

The best-known early Christian complex is that of Valencia (excavated from 1985), where the cult of the *martyr Vincent gave origin to the creation of a series of rooms linked to his passion (known from his *Passio* and from *Prudentius). The church of Roqueta, where the martyr was first buried, has been located; related structures of an important monastic community at Punta de l'Illa, probably founded by Bishop Justinian and destroyed at the end of the 6th c., have been documented. Excavations done in the area of Almoina have brought to light a 4th-c. necropolis—a handmade glass article with biblical scenes has been found there, part of a child's funeral trousseau (late 4th c.)—and a small church probably with three aisles and horseshoe apse, at the lower levels of which are the remains of a 3rd-c. administrative building, which has been interpreted by its excavators as the place where the martyrdom occurred; the most famous find here is a marble altar intact in one piece. The cathedral is from the Visigothic period, a basilica with three aisles and central apse. Two buildings are attached to the cathedral at its extreme N and S: the latter is called "St. Vincent's Prison," though it is actually a bishop's funerary church, cruciform with square apse, also containing a second grave (dated to ca. 560); the building to the N is also cruciform, perhaps a baptistery or another funerary environment. The complex and the deposition of St. Vincent's *relics there have been traditionally attributed to Justinian, but more recent studies seem to attribute it to Anesius, another bishop of the city.

J. Vives - T. Marín, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos*, Madrid 1963; var. aus., *Actas I reunión nacional de Arqueología paleocristiana hispánica*, Vitoria 1967; P. de Palol, *Arte hispánico de la época visigoda*, Barcelona 1966; Id., *Demografía y arqueología de los siglos IV-VIII*: BSEAA (1966) 5-66; Id., *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; Id., *Arqueología cristiana hispánica de tiempos romanos y visigodos*: RivAC Miscell. Josi, II (1967) 177-232; J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*, Barcelona [2]1969; D. Iturgaiz, *Baptisterios paleocristianos de Hispania*, Barcelona 1970; P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana romana y visigoda*: DHEE, I (1972) 96-113; A. Recio, *Tapas romanas de sarcófagos paleocristianos en Hispania*: Atti VIII Congr. Int. Arch. Crist., Vatican City - Barcelona 1972, 409-430; M. Sotomayor, *Datos históricos sobre sarcófagos romano-cristianos de España*, Granada 1973; L.A. García Moreno, *Prosopografía del reino visigodo de Toledo*, Salamanca 1974; R. Puertas, *Iglesias hispánicas (s. IV al VIII). Testimonios literarios*, Madrid 1975; E. Llobregat, *La primitiva cristiandat valenciana. Segles IV al VIII*, Valencia 1977; H. Schlunk - Th. Hauschild, *Hispania Antiqua. Die Denkmäler der frühchristlichen und westgotischen Zeit*, Mainz am Rhein 1979; M. Sotomayor, *Historia de la Iglesia en España, I. La Iglesia en la España romana y visigoda* (ed. García Villoslada), Madrid 1979; F. Fernández, *Aportación al estudio de Recópolis*: AEA 55 (1982) 119-136; var. aus., *Actes II reunió d'Arqueologia paleocristiana hispànica*, Barcelona 1982; L. Olmo, *Arquitectura religiosa y organización litúrgica en época visigoda. La basílica de Recópolis*: AEA 61 (1988) 157-178; A. Méndez - S. Rascón, *Los visigodos en Alcalá de Henares*, Alcalá de Henares 1989; L. Caballero - J. Bueno, *De nuevo a propósito de la basílica de Recópolis*: AEA 62 (1989) 283-291; L.A. García Moreno, *Historia de España visigoda*, Madrid 1989; J. Corell, *Inscripción del obispo Anesio, atribuida erróneamente a Justiniano*: Saitabi 39 (1989) 63-72; V. Escrivá - R. Soriano, *El área episcopal de Valentia*: AEA 63 (1990) 347-354; M.I. García - M. Roselló, *Late Roman Unguentarium: Ungüentarios cristianos de la antigüedad tardía procedentes de Punta de L'Illa de Cullera, Valencia*: AEA 66 (1993) 294-300; J. Corell, *La inscripció del primer bisbe històricament conegut de València*: Estudis Castellonencs 6 (1994) 383-390; F.J. García de Castro, *Sociedad y poblamiento en la Hispania del siglo IV d.C.*, Valladolid 1995; L.J. Balsameda, *El tesoro perdido de Guarrazar*: AEA 68 (1995) 149-164; C. Godoy, *Arqueología y liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII)*, Barcelona 1995; S. Rascón, *La ciudad hispanorromana de Complutum*, Alcalá de Henares 1995; L. Caballero - S. Feijoo, *La iglesia altomedieval de San Juan Bautista en Baños de Cerrato (Palencia)*: AEA 71 (1998) 181-242; B. Gamo, *La Antigüedad Tardía en la provincia de Albacete*, Albacete 1998; J. Vilella, *Las primacías eclesiásticas en Hispania durante el s. IV*: Polis 10 (1998) 269-285; var. aus., *Acta Antiqua Complutensia, I: Complutum y las ciudades hispanas en la Antigüedad Tardía*, eds. L.A. García Moreno - S. Rascón, Alcalá de Henares 1999; S. Gutiérrez - B. Gamo, *Excavación de una basílica visigoda en el Tolmo de Minateda (Hellín, Albacete, España)*: Bulletin de l'Association pour l'Antiquité Tardive 8 (1999) 51-56; var. aus., *Los orígenes del cristianismo en Valencia y su entorno* (coord. A. Riera), Valencia 2000; L. Abad - S. Gutiérrez - B. Gamo, *La basílica y el baptisterio del Tolmo de Minateda (Hellín, Al-*

bacete): AEA 73 (2000) 193-221; J. Vilella, *Las iglesias y las cristiandades hispanas: panorama prosopográfico*, in *La Hispania del siglo IV. Administración, economía, sociedad, cristianización*, R. Teja (ed.), Bari 2002, 117-159.

J.A. Jiménez

CASSIAN of Imola. His cult is attested in the early 5th c. by *Prudentius (*Peristephanon* 9), who, traveling from *Spain to *Rome, tells how he stopped at the *Forum Cornelii* at the saint's tomb: on its sides were depicted the events of the *martyrdom of Cassian, a teacher of *ars notaria* who was struck down by his students bearing stilettos (the Berna MS, Burgerbibliothek 264, transmits Prudentius's poem with numerous illustrations). A Carolinian-era *Passio s. Cassiani* by Ubaldus of Saint-Amand puts Prudentius's account into prose.

Cassian's mention on 13 August in the *Martyrologium hieronymianum* attests his cult in the 1st half of the 5th c.; at *Milan in 451 there was a votive chapel in his honor; at *Rome Pope *Symmachus (498–514) dedicated an altar to him in the *Vatican basilica. According to a tradition, *Peter Chrysologus, the Imolese bishop of *Ravenna (424–451), went to Imola to render homage at St. Cassian's tomb and died there. The tomb became a site of the bishop's palace and quite famous. The tomb was in use at least from the beginning of the 11th c. until 1132, when the *Castrum s. Cassiani* was destroyed and the saint's *relics were deposited in the cathedral dedicated to him inside the city. The 12th-c. *Vita et gesta Cassiani, Ingenuini et Albini* is evidence of St. Cassian's cult in the Tyrol, at Säben and at Brixen.

BHL 1625-1629; F. Lanzoni, *Le leggende di S. Cassiano d'Imola*: Didaskaleion, n.s. 3 (1925) 1-44; BS 3, 909-912; F. Dolbeau, *Passion de s. Cassien d'Imola composée d'après Prudence par Hucbald de Saint-Amand*: RBen 87 (1977) 238-256; M. Bless-Grabher, *Cassian von Imola. Die Legende eines Lehrers und Märtyrer und ihre Entwicklung von der Spätantike bis zur Neuzeit*, Bern - Frankfurt - Las Vegas 1978; A. Meluzzi, *S. Cassiano martire imolese:* Studi Romagnoli 29 (1978) 419-422; E.J. Beer, *Überlegungen zu Stil und Herkunft des Berner Prudentius-Codex 264*, in *Florilegium Sangallense. Festschrift J. Duft*, St. Gallen - Sigmaringen 1980, 15-70; G. Binazzi, *Orso, Cassiano, Apollinare. Appunti sulla diffusione dei culti al seguito delle milizie*: RomBarb 9 (1986-87) 5-24; I. Deug Su, *La "Vita Rictrudis" di Ubaldo di Saint-Amand: un'agiografia intellettuale e i santi imperfetti*: StudMed s. III, 31 (1990) 545-582 (esp. 553ff.); C. Lambert, *Fonti letterarie e archeologia. L'esempio della basilica tardoantica di S. Cassiano di Imola*: RSLR 30 (1994) 39-55; P. Golinelli, *Città e culto dei santi nel Medioevo italiano*, Bologna 1996, 24-28; R. Copeland, *Dissenting Critical Practices*, in *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 1996, 1-23; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 379-380.

V. Milazzo

CASSIODORUS (Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus), senator (ca. 490–ca. 585). Our biographical information comes from Cassiodorus himself, esp. the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum* and the *Variae*. Born at Scyllacium (Calabria) ca. 485–490. His family, probably *Syrian in origin, had in three generations achieved fame and wealth; his father, *comes sacrarum largitionum* under *Odoacer, then a faithful subject of *Theodoric, was later praetorian prefect; between 501 and 507 he achieved the rank of patrician. Cassiodorus could vaunt illustrious relatives like the Symmachi and, by marriage, the noble Anici family, to whom belonged *Boethius. From the autobiographical *Ordo gen. Cassiod.*, discovered by A. Holder and published by H. Usener in 1877 under the title *Anecdoton Holderi,* we learn that, as a youth, Cassiodorus recited a *panegyric of Theodoric and was rewarded with the post of quaestor, which he held until 511. In 514 he was appointed ordinary consul, a purely honorific title. This was followed, as in the case of his father and grandfather, by that of *corrector Lucaniae et Bruttionum*. He took no active part in the settlement of the Laurentian *schism, to which he alludes in the *Chronicon* (*ad a. 514: Senator v.c. cons. Me etiam consule in vestrorum laude tempore adunato clero vel populo Romanae Ecclesiae rediit optata concordia*). Theodoric was suspicious of the reconciliation between pope and emperor and, to consolidate his power constitutionally, asked the Italian "collaborators" for conspicuous expressions of approval. Cassiodorus thus dedicated to the king's general Eutharic Cillica a *Panegyric,* surviving in fragments, and a *Chronicon* from Adam to AD 519, whose sources range from Livy to *Jerome, Aufidius Bassus to the **Chronicon Paschale,* *Prosper of Aquitaine to *Eutropius. In 523 Cassiodorus succeeded Boethius as *magister officiorum*; in 533 he was praetorian prefect, a post he held until 536, in which year *Gothic society suffered a serious breakdown in the war against *Justinian's *Byzantines. During this long period, Cassiodorus skillfully maneuvered through court intrigues, sincerely favoring political cohesion between Romans and *Goths, to whom, in his *Historia Gothorum,* he ascribed a Roman genealogy (*Var.* IX 25: *originem gothicam historiam fecit esse romanam*). A loyal friend of Theodoric, he became his intimate adviser, encouraging his intellectual ambitions. After his retirement from public life, ca. 537–538, Cassiodorus put together all the documents connected with his chancellery activity. This heterogeneous work is titled *Variae* and consists of 12 books; books VI and VII contain legal formulas, the others official letters written by Cassiodorus either in his own name or,

more often, in that of the Gothic kings. A vital source for the history of a barbarian kingdom, these letters are written in a style refined to the point of preciosity, always adapted to their various recipients, as the author himself says: *quia necesse nobis fuit stilum non unum sumere qui personas varias suscepimus admonere*.

Another historical work of this period was the lost *Historia Gothorum,* in 12 books, written at Theodoric's order. Besides numerous allusions to it in the *Variae,* we have a summary, the so-called *Getica,* made in 551 by the Goth Jordanes. Its chief source was Ablabius's Gothic history (*Var.* X 20,2), and it is among the first national histories of barbarian peoples which flourished in the Middle Ages.

After the fall of the Gothic kingdom, Cassiodorus felt called to dedicate himself to God. In 536 he and Pope *Agapetus tried to found at *Rome a university of theological studies with an attached library on the model of those already flourishing in the East, but the attempt failed because of the pope's death and the renewal of the *Byzantine war. The first work of this period is *De anima,* appended to the *Variae*. In its final prayer, Cassiodorus reveals the emotion of his conversion: *ex servis filii, ex impiis iusti, de captivis reddimur absoluti*. Then follows, modeled on *Augustine, the *Expositio Psalmorum,* a complete commentary on all the psalms, composed probably at *Constantinople, where Cassiodorus lived for ten years and found means to uphold Pope *Vigilius's ecclesiastical policy and to influence the Byzantine emperor in favor of *Italy.

Returning to his possessions in Calabria at the age of 70, in ca. 550 he founded the *monastery of *Vivarium. Many monks responded to a wholly particular calling: besides manual labor, time was set aside for the study of sacred and profane texts, transcription of which was considered a form of tribute to God. In this center, where both *cenobitism and *anchorism were allowed, there was as yet no precise rule: the monks were left free to follow *tam patrum regulas quam praeceptoris proprii iussa*. For monks intent on intellectual work, Cassiodorus composed the *Institutiones divinarum litterarum,* continually revised until the end of his life, a sort of introduction to sacred and profane literature and a rudimentary catalog of books, most of which were at Vivarium. Surviving translations of Greek works made in the scriptorium include the *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita,* the *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri XXII* and the *Adumbrationes in Epistulas Canonicas,* all carefully supervised and corrected by Cassiodorus himself. But Gaudentius's *De musica* and some of *Origen's homilies are lost. At the age of 90, aware of the grave linguistic crisis that now gripped the land of Italy, Cassiodorus composed his last work, *De orthographia*. After his death in ca. 580, Vivarium survived for some decades, but by the 7th c. its famous library was being dismembered and dispersed.

As a man, Cassiodorus had no particularly prominent characteristics. In the years dedicated to serving the Gothic kings, he attempted a far from clear justification of the barbarian presence in Italy; the intuitions of the period *post conversionem* were soon overtaken by the *Benedictine rule. His works, purged of their stylistic excesses, exercised a great influence on medieval Latin prose; his *Institutiones* formed a basis for the cataloging of many medieval libraries.

CPL 896ff.; PL 69-70; L. Traube, *Orationum reliquiae*, MGH AA XII (1894) addit. tert., 457-484; Th. Mommsen, *Chronica*, ibid., 109-161; Th. Mommsen, *Variae*, ibid.; S.J.B. Barnish, *The Variae of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator*, Liverpool 1992; A.J. Fridh, *Variae*, CCSL 96, Turnholti 1973; J.W. Halporn, *Cassiodorus's Liber de Anima: Introduction and Critical Text*: Traditio 16 (1960) 39-109; Id., CCL 96; L. Helbling, *Vom Adel des Menschen*, Einsiedeln 1965; H. Usener, *Anecdoton Holderi*, Leipzig 1877; M. Adriaen, *Expositio Psalmorum*, CCL 97-98, 1958; P.G. Walsh, *Cassiodorus: Explanation of the Psalms*, 3 vols., Mahwah, NJ 1990-91; R.A.B. Mynors, *Institutiones*, Oxford 1937; W. Jacob - R. Hanslik, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, CSEL 71, 1952; H. Keil, *De orthographia*, Gramm. Lat. VII, 143-210. Cf. Repertorium 2, 149-153. For the bibl. on Cassiodorus until 1959, A. Momigliano, *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1960, 219-229; until 1972, A.J. Fridh in the ed. of the *Variae*; until 1979, A. Momigliano, *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, s.v.; PWK III, 1671; EI 9, 337; RAC 2, 915; W. Eder, NP II, 1004-1007; P. de Labriolle, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Paris [3]1947, 673ff.; A. van de Vyver, *C. et son œuvre*: Speculum 6 (1931) 244ff.; Id., *Les institutiones de Cassiodore et sa Fondation à Vivarium*: RBén 53 (1941) 59ff.; H.I. Marrou, *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris 1938-1949; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident. De Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris [2]1948, 318ff.; L.W. Jones, *The Influence of Cassiodorus on Middle Age Culture*: Speculum 20 (1945) 433ff.; Id., *An introduction to Divine and Human Readings by Cassiodorus S.*, New York 1946; A. Josefsson Fridh, *Études critiques et syntaxiques sur les Variae de Cassiodore*, Göteborg 1950; Id., *Terminologie et formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore Études sur le développement du style administratif aux derniers siècles de l'antiquité*, Stockholm 1956; Id., *Contributions à la critique et à l'interprétation des Variae de Cassiodore*, Göteborg 1968; S. Lundström, *Zur Historia tripartita des Cassiodor*, Lund 1952; A. Momigliano, *Cassiodoro*, PBA 41 (1955) 207ff.; Id., *Cassiodorus and the Italian culture of his time*, London 1956; KLP I, 1067-1068; G. Wille, *Musica Romana. Die Bedeutung der Musik im Leben der Römer*, Amsterdam 1967, 700ff.; G. Ludwig, *Cassiodor: Über den Ursprung der abendländischen Schule*, Frankfurt a.M. 1967; F. Weißengruber, *Cassiodors Stellung innerhalb der monast. Profanbildung des Abendlandes*: WSt n.F. 1 (1967) 202ff.; A. Ceresa Gastaldo, *Contenuto e metodo dell'Expositio psalmorum di Cassiodoro*: VCh 5 (1968) 61ff.; J. Svennung, *Zu Cassiodor und Jordanes*: Eranos 67 (1969) 71ff.; D. Briesemeister, *Cassiodor*, in K. Fassmann, *Die Großen der Weltgeschichte*, II, Zürich 1972, 779ff.; M.L. Angrisani, *Iord. "Get." 266 e Cassiod. "inst." I 28*: RomBarb 4 (1979) 5-11; J.J. O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1979; L. Vis-

cido, *Studi cassiodorei*, Soveria Mannelli 1983; G. Vide, *The Roman Chancery Tradition: Studies in the Language of Codex Theodosianus and Cassiodorus's Variae*, Göteborg 1984; M. Simonetti, *La produzione letteraria latina fra Romani e barbari* (*sec. V-VIII*), Rome 1986; V.A. Sirago, *Gli Ostrogoti in Gallia secondo le Variae di Cassiodoro*: REA 89 (1987) 63-77; S.J.B. Barnish, *The Work of Cassiodorus after His Conversion*: Latomus 48 (1989) 157-187; R. McPherson, *Rome in Involution: Cassiodorus's Variae in Their Literary and Historical Setting*, Poznan 1989; S. Leanza, *Cassiodoro: dalla corte di Ravenna al Vivarium di Squillace*, atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Squillace 25-27 October 1990, Soveria Mannelli 1993; A. Stüven, *Rechtliche Ausprägungen der "civilitas" im Ostgotenreich. Mit vergleichender Berücksichtigung des westgotischen und des burgundischen Rechts*, Frankfurt a.M. 1995; J. Moorhead, *Cassiodorus on the Goths in Ostrogothic Italy*: RomBarb 16 (1999) 241-259; C. Rohr, *La tradizione culturale tardo-romano nel regno degli Ostrogoti - il panegirico di Ennodio a Teoderico*: RomBarb 16 (1999) 261-284; P. D'Alessandro, *Agostino, Claudiano Mamerto, Cassiodoro e i Disciplinarum libri di Varrone*, in *Mousa. Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli*, Bologna 1997; A. Soby Christensen, *Cassiodorus, Jordanes and the History of the Goths: Studies in a Migration Myth*, Copenhagen 2002; G. Hafner, *Cassiodor: ein Leben fur kommende Zeiten*, Stuttgart 2002.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

CASTING LOTS for JESUS' CLOTHING (iconography). The gospel account of the soldiers who played a game for Christ's tunic (Mt 27:35; Mk 15:24; Lk 23:34; Jn 19:23-24; see Ps 22:18) does not appear in ancient Christian art before the *Constantinian peace, the moment that, alongside other scenes from the passion, it was introduced to recall one of the steps that marked Christ's victorious earthly journey. The scene was represented for the first time, according to A. Ferrua (*Le pitture,* 74-75, pls. 72-73; Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katacombe,* 42-45), on a painting from the catacomb of the Via Dino Compagni at *Rome, which is datable to the 2nd half of the 4th c. Two soldiers depicted on the sides of an instrument used for games, made up a sort of framework that maintained a rotating urn in the form of a vessel from which emerged two small discs; in the background, a building is represented, perhaps the sepulcher of Christ, with two shields on the sides. The iconographic schema, entirely similar to the one that reappears on miniatures and early medieval ivories (E.T. De Wald, *The Illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter,* Princeton, NJ 1942, 13-14, pl. XIX; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der Zeit der karolingischen und sächsischen Kaiser. VIII-IX Jahrhundert,* I, Berlin 1914, 20, 66, nn. 31 and 132 a, pls. XV, LVII), makes very probable the identification of the scene proposed by A. Ferrua. In the Eastern world, the episode was found for the first time in a miniature of the Evangelary of *Rabbula from the year 586 (Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.,* 69-71), on an iconography very different from the Western one: three soldiers, seated under the cross, are in the act of playing a game of *morra* for the tunic (i.e., an Italian game in which one guesses the number of fingers held up simultaneously by another player, similar to the American game of odds and evens). The same figurative schema—evidently characteristic of the Eastern world—appears, substantially the same, on early and late medieval *Byzantine icons, one of which is preserved in the convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, which can be dated to the 8th c. (K. Weitzmann - M. Chatzidakis - K. Miatev - S. Radojčić, *Frühe Ikonen. Sinai, Griechenland, Bulgarien, Jugoslawien,* Wien-München 1966, LXXIX, n. 6).

A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di Via Latina*, Città del Vaticano 1960, 74-75, pls. 72-73; E. Lucchesi Palli, s.v. *Morraspiele*: LCI 3, 281-282; L. Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe an der via Latina in Rom. Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie der alttestamentlichen Wandmalereien*: JbAC 4 Erg.-Bd., Münster 1976, 42-45; D. Goffredo, s.v. *Soldati che si giocano le vesti di Cristo*: TIP, 279-280.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

CATAPHRYGIANS. Followers of *Montanus, so called from the place where this heretical movement began, between Mysia and Phrygia. According to the *Muratorian fragment (4), they had writings through which they spread their doctrines. The sect was founded in the 2nd c.: the name "Montanists" was much later (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech*. XVI, 8; Did. Alex., *Trin.* III, 18; CTh XVI, 5, 48), but it survived and became definitive. Earlier writers used the circumlocution "heresy according (*kata*) to the *Phryges*" (Euseb. *HE* V, 16,1; VI, 20,3), further shortened to "according to the *Phryges*" (Epiph., *Haer*. XLVIII, 1; XLIX, 1) and thus "Cataphrygians" (John Dam., *Haer*. LXXXVII). The movement, particularly widespread in Asia and active under various names, disappeared toward the 6th c., though there is still evidence of them in the 7th c., when the emperor *Leo the Isaurian still sought their conversion. Its doctrinal cornerstones were the prophetic revelations of *Maximilla and Prisca, marked by a severe *ascesis conceding nothing to human nature, repudiation of the role of the hierarchy, identification of the Father with the Son, imposition of celibacy, and a claim to the discernment of spirits.

Eusebius, *Vita Costant*. III, 64-65; P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme*, Fribourg 1913, repr. New York 1980; T.D. Barnes, *The Chronology of Montanism*: JTS 21 (1970) 403-408; D. Powell, *Tertullianists and Cataphrygians*: VChr 29 (1975) 33-54; F. Blanchetière, *Le montanisme originel*: RSR 52 (1978) 118-134; 53 (1979) 1-32; A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten*, Berlin 1980, 10-64; 222-291; Ch. Trevett, *Montan-*

ism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy, Cambridge 1996; Id., *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, Macon, GA 1997; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism*: JEH 50 (1999) 1-22.

E. Peretto

CATECHESIS

Introduction - I. Etymology and meaning - II. First and second centuries - III. Third century - IV. Fourth and fifth centuries - V. Sixth century - VI. Seventh century.

Introduction. We will confine ourselves to elementary oral religious instruction, especially as it was imparted during *initiation into a worshiping community. The recipients are, in the first place, the initiates themselves and/or the parents, their sponsors (R. Turcan, *Initiation*: RAC 18, 87-159; P.-M. Gy, *La notion chrétienne d'initiation,* in Id., *La liturgie dans l'histoire,* Paris 1990, 17-39). Initially elementary instruction coincided with the missionary message (the *kērygma*) and was not strictly distinguishable from it (see, e.g., Acts 8:12; 18:8). In its later development it became baptismal instruction on faith, on the conduct of one's life and on the *sacraments of initiation (*prima fidei rudimenta*: Hilar. Arel., *vit. Honorat*. 5 [SC 235, 82]); this was divided into: (1) the catechumenate (M. Metzger et al., *Katechumenat*: RAC 20 [2003] 497-574) and postbaptismal *mystagogy (see Cyril of Jer., *Cat*. 18,33); (2) preparation of parents and godparents for the *baptism of babies; and (3) the ongoing daily element of catechesis in the Late Antique and Early Medieval *liturgy of communities and *monasteries. Catechesis thus understood is distinguished from normal education and scholarly formation (*enkyklios paideia*); within Christianity it is distinguished by its purpose (and not necessarily by its form and name) from ordinary *Sunday, daily and festal homilies (M. Sachot, *Homilie*: RAC 16, 155-175), though candidates for baptism were usually among the hearers of these latter homilies. At the same time, baptized persons also listened to catechesis and to mixed forms of catechesis and homily. We will not address here the teaching given to Christian officeholders or catechesis within monasticism.

I. Etymology and meaning. Etymologically, *katēchēsis* derives from *katēchein,* "to instruct orally" (= to give/receive information); against the meaning "to resound deeply" (e.g., from the stage; cf. G. Schneider, "κατηχέω": ExegWbNT 2 [1981] 673-674, with A. Knauber, *Zur Grundbedeutung der Wortgruppe* κατηχέω—*catechizo*: Oberrhein. Pastoralblatt 68 [1967] 291-304, 294.299); according to Knauber (299) it is to allow the elementary presentation to "resound in the ear and the heart." The verb and its derivatives are late, are not in the LXX, and are rarely found in *Hellenistic Jewish writers (Josephus, *vit.* 65; Philo, *leg. ad Gai.* 198). The verb *katēchein* appears eight times in the NT, two of these with the ordinary meaning of "communicate/tell" and in the passive "be instructed /come to know" (Acts 21:21, 24); six times in a more technical sense of "instruct/teach" (Lk 1:4; Acts 18:25; Rom 2:17-21; 1 Cor 14:19; Gal 6:6 [Lat. *catechizare*]; H.W. Beyer, "κατηχέω": ThWbNT 3 [1928] 639): in Paul it becomes a technical term for Christian instruction; A. Knauber (302-303) is skeptical: in no place does catechesis have the modern meaning. The term therefore has multiple meanings (polisemy) and takes on a religious meaning according to its object, in this way finally evolving into the Christian meaning (A. Turck, *Katēchein et Katēchēsis chez les premiers Pères*: RSPhTh 47 [1963] 360; A. Knauber, 295-304).

Katēchein was used to mean "ecclesiastical instruction" for the first time in *2 Clem.* 17,1 (A. Turck, 360; G. Schneider, 673; also A. Knauber, 360; G. Schneider, 301: early concretization). *Irenaeus uses *katēcheito* (*Adv. haer*. 3, 12,7 [SC 211, 208; ancient Lat. tr.: *audierat*]; cf. Rom 2:18: *katēchoumenos ek tou nomou*); but more often *kēryssein, didaskein* and *paradidonai*. The apocryphal acts of the *apostles frequently use *katēchein* in reference to "faith" and "baptism" (*Act. Barn.* [AAA 2,2,296]; *Act. Paul. et Thecl.* 39 [1,265]; further documentation: A. Turck, 364-366). The noun *katēchēsis* "(oral) instruction," but also "rumor," appears first (Dion. Hal. [1st c. BC] Demosth. 50; Cic. *Att.* 15,12; cf. Orig. *C. Cels.* 3,40; further documentation: A. Knauber 300-301) and is extended, with "catechumenate," to become a technical term for elementary ecclesiastical instruction in the developed liturgy of Christian initiation (see O. Pasquato - H. Brakmann, *Katechese [Katechismus]*: RAC 20 [2003] 444: Jerusalem). The above-cited writings from the discourses of Cyril of Jer. (RAC 20, 442-443) are later scribal additions (A.A. Touton; PG 33, 152). *John Chrysostom still usually calls his catecheses *didaskalia* or *logos,* and *katēchēsis* only once (T.H. Finn 60-61). At the end of the *Late Antique period, in *Antioch and *Constantinople, in particular the discourses (now once a year) of the bishop to the candidates for *baptism are called catechesis or *theiai katēchēseis*. The term *katēchēsis* has been borrowed in *Coptic to indicate religious dis-

courses by ecclesiastical authorities, even those not aimed at baptismal preparation (Pachom. *cat.* 1 [CSCO 159/Copt. 23,1]; Horsies. *cat*: therein, 66; Ps-Pet. I Alex. *hom. in Christ. bapt.* [T. Orlandi, *Omelie copte*, Turin 1981, 30]).

As translations from Greek into Latin we find *catechesis* and *catechizare* in the *Vetus Latina* (Acts 18:24; Gal 6:6; Aug. *C. Cresc.* 1,11,14) and *Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4,29,10; *Cor.* 11,4; *Idol.* 10,6: the teacher, *qui de idolis catechizat* [40 Waszink / van Winden with comm.; ibid., 197: "a 'heathen catechumenate'"]). *Origen, *Rufinus and *Jerome translate *katēchein* as *instruere, docere,* rarely *catechizare* (see Eger. *Peregr.* 46: *cathecisis*). A catechesis of *Theodore of Mopsuestia is cited by Mario Mercator (5th c.) as a *sermo catechismi* (ACO 1,5,176; cf. Paulin. Med. and Possid.: O. Pasquato, *K.*: RAC 20, 458.467). Later *catechizare* refers to catechumenal action and thus to liturgical practice, and no longer to instruction (A. Knauber, 294).

II. First and second centuries.

1. New Testament: early Christian preaching, kerygma and catchesis of the apostles. Already characteristic of *baptism (Mt 3:7-12; Lk 3:7-18) is the prophetic-eschatological preaching of John the Baptist (J. Ernst: RAC 18, 522). Christianity is presented at *Pentecost (30?) with the *kerygma or first (Christian) apostolic preaching of *Peter (Acts 2:14-36), concluding in AD 70, when it detached itself from *Judaism. The official kerygma of Christ, died-risen-ascended-approved by the Father (Acts 2:32-33), aims at arousing in *pagans a comprehensive faith in the one God, in Christ (G. Groppo, *Predicazione apostolica*: J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Catechetica,* 508; C.H. Dodd, *La predicazione apostolica e il suo sviluppo*, Brescia 1978). A primitive Christian catechism with a fixed scheme (A. Seelberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, Leipzig 1903 [repr. Munich 1966]) cannot be identified. Both a dogmatic and an ethical component are always present (two ways, golden rule, two commandments, decalogue and beatitudes).

Formulas of confession and the *creeds of the early church form the **regula fidei*. The mission, like Christ himself, is open to all (Mt 28:19; cf. U. Luz, *Das Ev. nach Matthäus 4*: EvKathKommNT 1,4 [2002] 429-458 [bibl.]). The kerygma is addressed first to Jews, then to *pagans (Acts 4:15-17; 17:16-34: Paul at the Athenian Areopagus), with references to *Stoic *philosophy and *Hellenistic *mysticism. In a fragment of the famous *Kerigma Petri* (100–120), it says that Christians worship God in a new way, as a *tertium genus* (H.-I. Marrou, "*Geschichtsphilosophie*": RAC 10, 765: *tertium genus*). By this elementary catechesis the Christians came to be recognized as a new group which clearly distinguished itself from "Jews" and "Greeks" (Gal 3:28). 1 Pet (late 1st/early 2nd c.) seems to be a primitive baptismal catechesis (N. Brox, *Der 1 Petrusbrief*: EvKathKomm 21 [1979] 19-22). Then came a more structured instruction, taking its cue from salvation history (OT) in Christ (C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, London 1952, 126-127). Later, the forms of the kerygma and catechesis were adapted to the addressees (see C. Bissoli, *Tracce catechistiche negli scritti del NT*: Historiam Perscrutari, 467-481 [bibl.]; B. Maggioni, *Gesù comunicatore della fede*, ibid., 513-520; G. Leonardi, *Il metodo educativo della comunità ebraica e di Gesù con i suoi discepoli. Continuità e innovazioni*, ibid., 483-511 [bibl.]; G.P. Peron, *Seguitemi! Vi farò pescatori di uomini* (*Mk 1,17*), Rome 2000 [bibl.]). Later, the communities prayed the Our Father, as an initiation in prayer (Gal 4:1-7: here 6 and Rom 8:5-17; S. Sabugal, *Il Padre nostro*, Rome [4]1994, 28-36: Lk and Mt).

2. Apostolic Fathers. The *Didache (K. Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*: KommApostVät 1 [1989]; H. van Sandt/D. Flusser, *The Didache*: CompRerIudNT 3,5, Assen 2002) has links with both Judaism and *paganism. "This catechetical, liturgical and disciplinary manual, intermediary between the NT and the apostolic Fathers, appears between 50/70" (J.-P. Audet, *La Didaché. Instruction des Apôtres*, Paris 1978, 219), or later. It is addressed to a disciple, perhaps pagan. It includes the decalogue; chs. 11-13, on the *apostles, prophets and teachers, may go back to Syrian *Antioch (ibid.), to a pagan community (*see* Bishop; Diakonia - Diaconate). The eschatological part (ch. 16) goes back to Jewish tradition. The teaching of the two ways (ch. 1), ethical-wisdom (OT) and nondualistic, takes up a Jewish model (Dt 30:15), enriching it with the commandment to love (S. Giet, *L'énigme de la Didaché*, Paris 1970, 56-71) and with elements of the Sermon on the Mount. The *didaskaloi* have a role similar to that of Jewish *didaskaloi* (ibid., 29-30). The "two ways" owe to the *Manual of Discipline* (3,15-22) of Qumran "the whole framework of their development" (J.-P. Audet 159), animating it with love of God and neighbor (Mt 5:3–7:27; Lk 6:20-49; A. Sand, "*Goldene Regel*": LTK[3] 4,821-822). The result is something like a set of notes following the primitive—catechesis. A treatise on *virtues and vices, an essential "catechetical space," prior to baptism, something like catechesis for new converts (V. Saxer, *Les rites*, 37-40; G. Schöllgen, Art. *Didache*: LTK[3] 3, 207-208).

The model of the two ways continues in the *Epis-*

tle of Barnabas (ca. 130) (*Ep. Barn.* 18,1–21,1): the true covenant is sealed with Jesus in the hearts of believers. Postbaptismal catechesis receives special emphasis (*Ep. Barn.* 2–17) (F.R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*: KommApostVät 8 [1999] 77-78). The *Epistle of Barnabas* attests the presence of *testimonia* (Jewish and Christian) in catechesis (P. Prigent).

2 Clement (140–150) also has links to Judaism, with the Jewish-Qumranic two ways, but with references to the redemption (*Christological hymn*: 1,4-8) as the grace of light (4a), an allusion to baptism as illumination, which *Justin will call *phōtismos*. From baptism is derived the "homologia" (*confessio,* 3,4) for preserving one's baptism (E. dal Covolo, *Custodire il battesimo [. . .]. 2CL*, in *La cristologia nei Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1993, 160). There is a link with paganism: the earthly Christ as "Father" gives new life in baptism (second creation), a second *zōē* in contrast with the first *bios* (F. Bergamelli, *Il Cristo della 2CL [2Clem. 1,4-8; 9, 5-10] e il Cristo di Antiochia [Eph. 7,2]*, 141). It is a homily which comments on the liturgical biblical texts (19,1; 15,2; 17,3); it seems to be *mystagogical catechesis, read to neophytes during the Easter season (A. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*: HNT 17 [Tübingen 1992]).

At the end of this period (140/150) the *apocalyptic genre appears with the *Shepherd* of *Hermas, imitating *4 Esdras* (N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas, Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern* 7, Göttingen 1991, 476-485). The *Shepherd* is a catechesis of postbaptismal *conversion/penitence (A. Hilhorst: RAC 14, 685) in which the difficulty of abandoning pagan ways is evident (*Vis.* III, 15,3). Candidates to baptism and neophytes must avoid a priori every sin after baptism (*Mand.* 4,3,3-6; *Sim.* 9,18,1-2). It contains other charismatic functions: itinerant missionaries (*apostoloi*), teachers (*didaskaloi*) (*Vis.* 3,5,1; *Sim.* 9,15,4; 16,5), numerous prophets. The theme of the two ways reappears (*Mand.* 6,1), personified in the two angels (*Mand.* 6,2,1-9). *Penitence is the heart of the *Shepherd:* there is only one remission of sins, through baptism (*Mand.* 4,3,1-2; R. Joly, *Le milieu complexe du Pasteur de H*: ANRW 2,27,1; 524-551; P. Henne, *L'unité du Pasteur de H. Tradition et rédaction*, Paris 1992 [bibl.]).

3. Apologists. Justin (d. 165?) became a Christian (*Acta Iustini* 2,3) in the mid-2nd c., ca. 130 (Eus. *HE* 4,18,6; S. Heid, Art. *Iustinus Martyr* I: RAC 19, 813). He ran a school of Christian philosophy at *Rome (*Acta Iustini* 2,3); this was not a catechetical school (Ph. Bobichon). The first evangelization (prebaptismal catechesis) of a pagan was done by a layperson; a school of formation followed (*1 Apol.* 61,2). Justin's catechesis was addressed to Jews and pagans; with Trypho the Jew, he argues that the OT prophecies have been fulfilled in the NT in Christ (*Dialogue with Trypho*). With pagans his catechetical strategy is different. He says that the "Word . . . gives the seed" (*spermatikos logos*) (*1 Apol.* 5,4; 46,2.4); worship of the gods is worship of the devil (*2 Apol.* 5,3-4; S. Heid 837.842). He rejects the pagan myths (*1 Apol.* 54,1-4; 54,8), which he takes from pagan and Jewish writings (*1 Apol.* 54,8: Perseus; *Dial.* 70,1: Mithras). The facts about Jesus do not parallel the pagan myths. The pagans have imitated the Christian mysteries (*1 Apol.* 62,1: baptism; *1 Apol.* 66,4). The teaching of Christ and of the prophets does not derive from Greek ideas (*1 Apol.* 23,1-6). For Justin, baptism is the washing for a new birth through the remission of sins (*1 Apol.* 61,6-13; 66; *Dial.* 13), by which the person, who before trusted in idols and *magic, is now consecrated to God (*1 Apol.* 14,2-3).

Baptism is the terminal point, "illumination" (*phōtismos*)*:* the newly baptized is "illuminated" (*1 Apol.* 65,1), having left the darkness of paganism and Judaism. Christian symbolism refers to Christ, "the light of the world" (Jn 1:9), through baptism (Clem. Al., *Paed.* 1,26.32). "This washing is called illumination" (*1 Apol.* 61,12-13), which, in contrast with pagan mystery baptisms, produces an ontological/supernatural transformation (R. Turcan 141-143; G. Filoramo, *Luce e gnosi. Saggio sull'illuminazione nello gnosticismo*, Rome 1980; Id., *Il risveglio della gnosi ovvero diventare dio*, Rome - Bari 1990). Finally, in Justin, prayer "opens the doors of light" (*Dial.* 7). He was the first to describe the baptismal and Sunday eucharistic celebrations: the *dies solis* becomes in a Christian sense the day of light, of the *resurrection of Christ, arisen from the East (Lk 1:78): "We gather everyone together on the day of the sun" (*1 Apol.* 67,3). "In this way our life arises on Sunday" (*Ignatius, *Magn.* 9,1).

*Theophilus of Antioch (2nd half of 2nd c.) wrote the treatise *Ad Autolycum* which, though apologetic, is also catechetical/missionary (V. Monachino), not by its use of the term, but for its catechetical character: "Try . . . to meet with me more frequently, so that *listening to the spoken word* you can accurately learn the truth" (2,38). Its aim is the conversion of the pagan Autolycus, a catechumen in the broad sense, being a "rudis"—one to be instructed in the rudiments of the faith. It is an essential, not an exhaustive, catechesis, using an enculturated missionary strategy. The objects of Theophilus's catechesis are biblical/Jewish/Christian monotheism (as against pagan polytheism) and conversion to faith as the condition for "seeing" God "with the eyes of the soul" after purification from sin. Like the blind, "you also,

O man, have the eyes of your soul veiled by the cataracts [*hypokechymenous*: from *hypocheomai,* a medical term] of your sins and by your wicked deeds" (1,2). Unlike in the Bible, the theme of vision predominates (G. Kittel, "ἀκούω": ThWb 1 [1933] 216-227). A second image in Theophilus's catechesis is "the mirror of the soul": purity of *soul allows one to see God (1,2). A third image he uses is a "visual therapy" regarding conversion: "Entrust yourself to the physician (God) and he will operate [*parakentēsei,* from *parakenteō:* remove the cataracts from your eyes] on the eyes of your soul and your heart. . . . If . . . you live in a pure, holy and just way, you can see God" (1,7) (F. Bergamelli, *Il linguaggio simbolico*, 74-79; E. Kunz, "*Glaubenslicht*": LTK[3] 4,718-719); he uses images to express trust (peasant/earth, navigation/boat, patient/doctor: 1,8). The dogma of the *resurrection of the body, unacceptable to a Greek, is proposed by Theophilus with proofs arranged in an ascending "climax" from the inanimate world (seasons/days/nights), to the animate world (seeds/fruits), to the heavenly world (the moon, which decreases/dies/rises), to the human being (sickness/healing) (1,3): the whole universe bears the imprint of the resurrection, based for him on the biblical/Jewish/Christian concept of creation; the resurrection is a re/creation (2,26): "Do you not believe, O Autolycus, that the God who created you could also make you again?" (1,8) (on the creed in Theophilus, S. Sabugal, *Io credo,* 166-169).

4. Irenaeus. The context of his *Adversus haereses* (2nd half of 2nd c.) is the church's fight against *gnosticism. The work also aims to render neophytes firm in the faith and immune to the seductions of *heresy (N. Brox, *Irenäus v. Lyon*: RAC 18, 828). In his most recently discovered *epideixis* (RAC 13, 828-829) *Irenaeus presents his work *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (*Epideixis tou apostolikou kērygmatos*) to Marcian (the work is indirectly addressed to the public) as *orthodox teaching against heretics (*Epid*., 99), "much material . . . in a few pages" containing "the basic lines of the body of truth," so he would have "in hand the proofs of the divine realities" (*Epid*., 1) (see E. Peretto, *Ireneo di Lione, Epideixis. Antico catechismo degli adulti*, Rome 1981, 25-26). The work's first part (3b-42a) treats, in connection with the *regula fidei,* the themes of *creation, fall, the beginning of salvation history, *incarnation and Christ's saving work. The second part (42b-97) presents a series of scriptural prophetic proofs for the preexistence of the Son of God, his birth as a man, his miracles, sufferings and glorification in view of a new people taken from among the pagans. The metaphor of the two ways also appears (*Epid.*, 1). The work uses types of apologetical and catechetical texts (N. Brox: RAC 18, 829; G. Kretschmar, *Katechumenat/Katechumenen* I: TRE 18 [1989] 1-5). It is an "ancient adult catechism" (E. Peretto: subtitle) or a "catechism of primitive Christianity"; to call it the "oldest catechesis of the church" in a technical sense (P. Drews) seems exaggerated (N. Brox, *Einleitung zur Epideixis*: Fontes Christ. 8,1 [1993] 26-27 with notes 27). "We probably have here a daily catechesis" (ibid., 28). Moving from the gospel, catechesis has now become a *narratio,* a simple genre (Acts 7:2-53; 10:34-43), esp. in the Christian initiation of catechumens. It is based, with an anti-*Marcionite and antignostic objective, on the Bible's typological meaning, which assures the unity of OT and NT. Irenaeus refers the baptizand to the *regula veritatis,* which he receives from the church (V. Grossi, *Regula veritatis e narratio battesimale in sant'Ireneo*: Augustinianum 12 [1972] 437-463). The baptismal *narratio* explains that God wants to reestablish in each person the prototype of the first man; it extends from the creation to the resurrection (Irenaeus, *Epid.* 19-20.22-24.77.93-96). The Christian vision and catechesis are also distinguished from gnosis (G. Filoramo, *Le scuole catechistiche,* 559-585). Basic elements of baptism are light-darkness, life-death, truth-ignorance and error (O. Pasquato, *Ireneo*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 360-361). From the end of the 2nd c., preparation for baptism led to an organized and demanding catechumenate (O. Pasquato, *K.*: RAC 20, 437; M. Metzger - W. Drews - H. Brakmann, *Katechumenat*: RAC 20, 497-574) in which, with penitence, *fasting and various rites, catechesis played a principal role. The creed and the rite of *traditio* and *redditio* developed from the baptismal *narratio* with its three questions to the baptizand on faith in the *Trinity (see O. Pasquato, *Catechese* [*Katechismus*]: RAC 20, 463).

III. Third century.

1. In the East.

**Clement of Alexandria* (A. Knauber, *Ein frühchristl. Handbuch* [1972] 311-334; R. Turcan, 150). The theme of Clement's *Stromata* is the formation and education of youth (*Strom.* 6,1,3), i.e., the conduct of life (*politeia*), "as it is awakened by *katēchēsis,* together with *pistis,* and makes the soul fit for the beginning of 'gnostic knowledge.'" In *Strom.* 6 he describes the gnostic's conduct. By *katēchēsis* Clement means "guidance in *ascetical fomation for a religious-moral orientation of life" (A. Knauber, 317). This basic instruction prepares one for an initiation into the mysteries of salvation and baptism. The *Paedagogus* is addressed to candidates for baptism (*Paed.* 1,1,1.12-24). Clement refers to Rom 10:17 and develops the

biblical and classical motif of "listening" (10,96,2; 10,104,4). To believe and understand are a new way of hearing (ibid.), the basis of an instruction which, through Christ, infuses spiritual food for eternal life (*Paed.* 1,35,3; 1,36,4). Catechesis is elementary instruction which at the same time renders visible the Savior who is preached (*kēryssōn kai katechōn: Paed.*, 5,6,37). At first, the terms *katēchein* and *katēchēsis* had a more limited meaning: we call "fathers" those who have instructed us in religion (*hoi katēchesantes*: *Strom.* 1,1,3).

Both prebaptismal catechesis (spiritual fasting and prayer; C. Nardi, *Il battesimo in Cl. Aless.*, Rome 1984, 142) and baptismal catechesis can be recognized in Clement. It is not possible to believe and arrive at baptism without catechesis (*Ecl.* 28,3). Then follows the teaching of true gnosis (*Ecl.* 16,1). Key for Clement is the role of Christ as a break with idolatry and pagan customs (*Protr.* 8,77,1–12,123,2). Christ, the new *Orpheus, frees the catechumen from *evil (1,3,2). The *Protrepticus* transforms the deep dispositions of the catechumen (1,7,1-3); the word of the *Paedagogus* has the task of healing the passions and must result in a transformed life (*Paed.* 1,3,1-3): it is the stage between conversion-catechumenate and the perfect life (1,3,3). The purpose is to restore the person to likeness with God (1,9,1). But the personal level opens out onto the communal: the baptized form a new people (1,15,2). Baptism is perfection: "We attain perfection *[teleioumetha]* when, having received the Head, Christ, we are the church" (1,18,4). The whole process culminates in the *divinization of the person (1,98,3), who responds to God's love (*philanthrōpia:* 1,63,1.3) with love (*antagapan:* 1,9,1). The imitation of Christ now guides the spiritual growth of the baptized (1,98,2-3). V. Saxer, 65-99; O. Pasquato, *Cl. Aless.*: L. Boriello et al. (eds.), *Diz. di Mistica*, Vatican City 1998, 312-315; on the divinization of the Christian in the Fathers, see O. Pasquato, *Padri*: 365; on the meaning of "mystery" see Id., 959-964. On the so-called school of Alexandria, see W. Liebeschütz, *Hochschule*: RAC 15, 898-900 and C. Scholten, *Die alex. Katechetenschule*: JbAC 38 (1995) 16-37.

Origen (ca. 185–253). At *Caesarea, *Origen taught philosophy in its moral sense (Greg. Thaum., *Discorso a Origene*, ed. H. Crouzel: SC 148 [1969]). In Origen we find two levels of teaching (cf. Rom 14:2; 1 Cor 3:2) and two categories, the "simple" and the "perfect" (*Com. Jo.* 13,33.37; *In Lev. hom.* 1,4 [SC 286, 80]; *In Num. hom.* 27,1,2 [SC 461, 272]), with the lower level (literal exegesis) for the simple, and the higher level (spiritual or typological exegesis) for the perfect (*In Lev. hom.* 1,1.4 [SC 286, 66-70. 78-84]). The Bible is comparable to light and solid food (*In Num. hom.* 27,1 [SC 461, 270]; *In Jos. hom.* 9,9 [SC 71, 264]; *In Hes. hom.* 7,10 [352,272]; *In Ez. hom.* 7,10 [SC 71, 264]; M. Simonetti, *Origene catecheta:* S. Felici [ed.], *Valori attuali*, 93-95; Id., *Origene*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 474-475). A differentiated teaching also existed among the gnostics. In homilies to the people of Caesarea, Origen considered himself a presbyter/homilist: *presbyter nominor et verbum Dei videor praedicare* (*In Jesu Nave, hom.* 7,6 [SC 71, 212]). He had a podium set up from which he spoke to the faithful, "the perfect and the simple," the baptized and catechumens (*In Lev. hom.* 6,2 [71, 262-266]); *In Ez. hom.* 6,5 [SC 352, 224-226]; *In Lc. hom.* 8,2 [SC 87, 164-166]).

In the prebaptismal context, Origen gives to *katēchēsis* and *katēcheō* the usual meanings (*C. Cels.* 3,40; *Or.* 2,4 [GCS Orig. 2, 301-303]); esp. for baptismal *katēchēsis: In 1 Cor comm.* & 63 [JTS 10 (1909) 38,2.5]. In Origen the first phase of catechesis is moral, to believers and catechumens, and seems to take place in the daily morning homilies (*Expos. in Ps.* 118 [SC 189, 184]: *ta stoicheia [elements], stoicheō, stoicheiōsis*; *In Lev. hom.* 6,2 [SC 286, 274]: "Root out your habitual vices and extinguish your barbarian practices"). In light of the criteria of initiation and the Christian catechumenate, pagan life (*ton ethnikon bion*) should be abandoned, along with the mystery cults (H. Crouzel: SC 87 [1962] 294, note 2), gnostic tendencies and other gods in order to love our God alone (*In Ex. hom.* 8,4 [SC 321, 254-256]; *Exhort. ad mart.* 17 [GCS Orig. 1, 15-16]). Knowledge of the initial kerygma is deepened (*C. Cels.* 3,15; M. Dujarier, *Breve storia*, 40-43) in accordance with the precept "do not sow among thorns" (Jer 4:3), which Origen commends to those who teach (*tois didaskousi*) "so that they do not entrust the words of Scripture [*ta legomena*] to hearers before they have broken up the uncultivated soil of their souls" (*In Jer. hom.* 5,13 [SC 232, 310-304]; cf. *In Num. hom.* 11,3 [SC 442, 28-34]). Daily catechesis should lead catechumens to decide for a perfect moral life (*In Jer. hom.* 4, 3 [SC 232, 262-266]). Origen then expounds the basic content of Christianity connected with the creed (*Princ. praef.* 2-4 [SC 252, 70-74]). But his catechesis aims above all at the discernment of Scripture (*In 1 Cor comm.* & 63 [JTS 10 (1909) 38]: "Those who distinguish among different texts in Scripture [cf. 1 Cor 14:7] are no longer called catechumens but believers"). Origen advises not to be content with "being washed, as some are, but not unto salvation. They have received the water, but not the Spirit" (*In Ez. hom.* 6,5 [SC 352, 224-226]). Baptism for Origen has a visible face (water-sign: *symbolon*) and an

invisible one (Holy Spirit/reality: *mystērion*) (H. Crouzel, *Origene et la structure du sacrement*: BLE 63 [1962] 82-83). Baptism (immersion/emergence) is the sacramental repitition of Christ's death/resurrection, reproducing its effect (*In Ex. hom.* 5,3 [SC 321, 156-160]; *In Jer. hom.* 19,4 [SC 238, 186-188]; cf. Rom 6:3-5). Sunday, celebration of Christ's Pasch, is the day of baptisms (R. Cabié, *Le dimanche*, 52). Finally, a distinct catechesis for neophytes does not seem to be identifiable in Origen.

Ps.-Clementines. The "romance" recounting the adventures of *Clement of Rome's journeys with Peter is divided into two genres, *Homiliae* (H) and *Recognitiones* (R) (B. Rehm, *Clemens Romanus* II: RAC 3, 197-206; M. Vielberg, *Klemens in den ps.-Klement. Rekognitionen*: TU 145 [2000]). The work as a whole seems to elaborate on Eastern catecheses of the first centuries. The Tripoli homilies (*PsClem. Rom. hom.* 8-11; *Recogn*. 4-6) combine the preaching of *monotheism with the polemic against pagan idolatry, emphasizing the need for baptism (B. Rehm, 200-201). The baptismal catechesis provides *katēchein, parainein* (A. Di Donna, *La catechesi nelle Ps-Clementine*, Diss., Rome 1992, 29 n. 77). The catechesis is divided into (1) admission into the Christian community (H 1, 15-16; R 1, 12-13); (2) the content, which is salvation history as a *traditio/redditio* (R 3, 3-4); in the central part, the *Tripoli Trilogy* with catechetical schema, Peter invites the pagans to lay aside their dirty garments to "take refuge in God" (H 8,22,2–8,23,3; 9,10-11; R 4,17). Pagan catechumens have need of persistent instruction (*adsiduis disciplinis*) to receive the word of truth (H 11,2,1-3; R 6,2,2-5). The *Ps.-Clementines* are an instruction manual for an educated pagan in search of truth, and his initiation into Christianity; they present in elementary categories the faith that the great church expounded in theological categories, thinking of converts in the manner of Jewish proselytes, and subjecting pagans to a longer initiation due to polytheism and idolatry (H 3,3-4).

2. In the West.

Tertullian (ca. 155–after 220). For *Tertullian, the presupposition for admission to baptism is a basic knowledge of the faith (G. Schöllgen, *Ecclesia sordida?*: JbAC ErgBd. 12 [1984] 279-280; A. Hoblaj, *Catechesi ai catecumeni negli scritti di Tertulliano*, Diss., Rome 1984). There is a demanding catechumenate (*tirocinia adultorum: De paen*. 6,17) of three years: *Fiunt, non nascuntur christiani* (*Apol.* 18,4; E. Bickel: *Pisciculi*, Festschr. F.J. Dölger [1938] 54-61). To accompany the Jew or pagan as they become *christianus* is the aim of the guide of catechumens (*teacher*), usually a priest (A. Hoblaj, art. *Tertulliano*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 636-637). The catechumenate takes place on the margins of the community's worship. Catechesis is gradual (*Bapt.* 18,1): at the precatechumenal stage, for Jews there is the law of Moses; for pagans, the axiom *anima naturaliter christiana* (*Apol.* 17,6); in the second stage the catechumen is initiated in the faith; baptism requires a perfect faith (*Bapt.* 18). "We are not submerged in the water to put an end to our sins, but because we have put an end to them, we are already washed, morally" (*De paen*. 6,17). After baptism at Easter, for a week the neophytes receive mystagogical catechesis. In *De baptismo,* a synthesis of homilies/catechesis and a type of future mystagogical catechesis, Tertullian refutes the *Cainite heresy, i.e., that faith is enough for salvation, without matter (water), which is evil (*Traité du baptème* [SC 35, 11]). The treatise focuses on the water: "On the mystery of the water of our baptism, . . . this little book will certainly not lack value." "We little fishes *[pisciculi],* after the manner of our *Ichthys,* Christ, are born in the water, and we are not saved without remaining in the water" (*Bapt.* 1,1-3a). In the first chapters, personal faith plays only a background role (P.A. Gramaglia, *Tertulliano. Il battesimo*, Rome 1979, 10). In the water, of itself of little account, God works with power: thus the sacramental theology of water. The idea is added of liberation (from the devil) through Christ (9,1). Tertullian has a double schema for baptismal typology: (1) water/fecundity (creation): Spirit/regeneration (baptism) (3,1; 5,7), with Stoic influences. Through the *epiclesis the water is the vehicle of the Spirit, the church is the ark (8,4) and the mother of the baptized (20,5), and through a man (the priest) we are reconciled with God. (2) Water/destruction: baptism/liberation (see 1 Cor 10:1-13): baptism is the symbol of Christ's victory over the *demons. Tertullian also associates baptism with the idea of a military oath (*De scorp*. 4,5; *signaculum fidei*). Finally, in *De oratione* (CCL 1,257-274) the *Our Father* (*Lord's Prayer) is the text/basis of initiation in prayer (*De orat.* 1,1; 29,1; V. Severus, *Gebet* I: RAC 8,1235). The *Our Father* becomes a baptismal rite for Tertullian as well (S. Sabugal, *Il Padrenostro*, 42-43; V. Grossi, *Il contesto battesimale,* 205-220). We turn to God as to a "Father" (V. Grossi). The *traditio/redditio* of the *Our Father* stands alongside that of the creed. Tertullian's *De orat.* will be a model for later Latin commentaries, esp. that of *Cyprian (O. Pasquato, *Katechese*: RAC, 20, 439-440).

Traditio apostolica. *Hippolytus of Rome (d. ca. 235) situates catechesis in a quite demanding catechumenate, between two examinations (C. Scholten,

Hippolytus II [*v. Rom*]: RAC 15, 524-526), in which the catechumen (*audiens*) hears catechesis for three years (*cathecumeni per tres annos audiant*), given by lay teachers (*didascali*) or clergy (ch. 17, ed. Botte; V. Saxer, 221-232); prayer follows the catechesis. The context seems to be that of the morning liturgy of the Word, before work, with the faithful, but in a special room (A.G. Martimort, TA: DS, fasc. 99/101 [1991] 1136-1146).

IV. Fourth and fifth centuries. With the *Constantinian change and the peace of the church, the new Christian regime brought new pastoral problems. Catechumens, even children, were considered Christians by civil law (H. Karpp, *Christennamen*: RAC 2, 1135; A. Stenzel, art. *Kindertaufe*: LTK² 6, 158-160). Despite the urging of bishops, not a few, even those in Christian families, delayed baptism, not infrequently to the end of life ("clinical baptism"): "One desires not so much to be a Christian, as to feign being one" (Aug., *De cat. rud.* 5,9); "It is not enough to be conceived, one must be born to reach eternal life" (Aug., *Ad Simplic.* 1,2,29). "The ancient catechumenate disappears as a pastoral structure, yielding its place to a catechumenal 'status' more or less definitive" (G. Groppo, *Catecumenato antico*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 135). Preparation for baptism was concentrated in a "mini catechumenate" of *competentes* (= *phōtizomenoi*; at Rome: *electi*), or adult candidates, during *Lent. The same external forms now hid different realities—yet it is the golden age of catechesis (M. Sachot, 161-163). Within the unity of the catechumenal way, a threefold catechesis developed: dogmatic, with commentary on the creed (A. Sabugal, *Io credo*, passim) and the *Our Father* (Id., *Il Padrenostro*, passim); moral catechesis, the oldest (one's behavior is confronted with the Christian faith); mystagogical catechesis in Easter week, with explanation of the rites of the three sacraments received: baptism with laying on of hands, anointing or confirmation, Eucharist (J. Daniélou, *La catechesi*, 168-184; Ch. Jacob, "*Arkandisziplin*," *Allegorese, Mystagogie. Ein neuer Zugang zur Theologie des A. v. Mailand*: Theophaneia 32 [1990] 119-280). Rites multiplied, offering richer material to *typology and *mystagogy. A relation was established between mystagogical catechesis and the novelty of the creed: what mystagogy unveils in the rites, the creed expresses in words; typology predominates.

The place of teaching in this period—in which, esp. due to the increase in infant baptism, the institution of a catechumenate disappeared—became the family and the church, with catechumens and faithful together both in the liturgy and in celebrations of the word. Language in the West was simplified (*sermo humilis*) in response to the needs of catechesis. The sociocultural context, however, was *pagan. The division between East and West was accentuated, while the axis of Christendom moved from the Mediterranean to the north; dialogue between Greeks and Latins was replaced by dialogue between Romans and Germans. A dual-focused structure was established: church/emperor, in dialectic tension. From the 4th c. differences between the Eastern and Western liturgies were introduced, within the diversity of language and culture. Catechesis was only for adults: instruction on the truths of faith and morality for the unbaptized. There is no catechesis of children until the end of the 6th c. Parental catechesis takes place in the Christian family (see, among others, J. Chrysostom, *De inani gloria* [SC 188]; tr. and comm. by M. Gärtner, *Die Familienerziehung*: RAC 6, 547; O. Pasquato, *I laici in G. Crisostomo. Tra Chiesa, famiglia e città*, Rome ²2000, 129-132; 145-147). The splendid catecheses of the 4th c. took place in this context.

1. In the East.
Jerusalem: catechesis of the basilica. In the martyrium of the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre, *Cyril of Jerusalem, as bishop (348–387), held protocatechesis and the 18 baptismal catecheses for the *illuminandi* (*phōtizomenoi*); in the rotunda of the Anastasis he, or his successor John II (386–417), held the five mystagogical catecheses for neophytes (*neophytoi*) (CPG 3585-3586, 3622; RAC 17, 709 [bibl.]; A.J. Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem Mystagogue: The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses*, Washington, DC 2001; W. Slenczka 75-143). Nearly contemporary sources are the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (ca. 381–384) (RAC 17, 707) and the 4th-5th-c. Jerusalem Lectionary (RAC 17, 707), with a double canon of biblical readings which from time to time preceded pre/postbaptismal catechesis; the catechesis was based on the theme of the pericope selections. For Cyril of Jerusalem, the catecheses are a well-organized combination of many teachings, a systematic instruction on rebirth through baptism (*Procatech.* 1,5). His dogmatic catechesis (*Cat.* 6-18) comments on the Creed of Jerusalem with references to biblical prototypes, which all meet in Jesus Christ (*Cat.* 10,8.12). Moral catecheses are aimed at transforming pagan customs into Christian conduct (*Cat.* 1-5); mystagogical catecheses after Easter at Jerusalem lead from signs to the light of biblical typology, and from the liturgical rites (including that of the *Our Father*) to the mysteries. The psychological effect of surprise is valued, and a magical interpretation, proper to the pagan

mysteries, is avoided (F.J. Dölger). Symbolism causes an explosion of reality (P.-Th. Camelot). It is a comprehensive catechesis of the Spirit: "You were called 'catechumen,' surrounded by an exterior sound [*periēchoumenos*]. . . . Now it is no longer an exterior but an interior sound that echoes [*enēchē*] within you, because the Spirit, who dwells within you, makes of your soul a divine dwelling" (*Procat.* 6; F. Bergamelli, *Cirillo di G.*: J. Gevaert (ed.), 156; O. Pasquato, *Cirillo di G.*: L. Boriello et al., *Diz. di Mistica*, 306-310).

According to Egeria (*Peregr.* 46,1-47,5), the *cathecisis* of baptizands, lasting several hours, included instruction on all the Scriptures, and esp. on the resurrection and on faith, in the sixth and seventh weeks of Lent; finally, the explanation of the creed, here also both *carnaliter* and *spiritualiter*. In the octave of Easter, all of the mysteries of the initiation which had just taken place were explained to the neophytes (W. Slenczka 99-104; V. Saxer, *Cirillo e Giovanni di Gerusalemme, C. prebattesimali e mistagogiche*, Milan 1994, 159 n. 22. For Gregory of Nyssa: M. Naldini, *Introduzione a Gregorio Niss., La Oratio Catechetica Magna,* Rome [2]1990, 6-9).

*Antioch: *John Chrysostom.* As a presbyter at Antioch on the Orontes (386–398), Chrysostom took part in the catechesis of initiation. Besides the famous catechesis to candidates for baptism (*Homilies on Statues; Cat. II*, more properly *On Statues* 21 [a. 387]; CPG 4464), we know of other homilies: in 388 he gave the catechetical lecture, parallel to *In Gen. hom.* 1-32 (SC 433) for the community, *Cat.* I 1-3 (ClavisPG 4460/2) in preparation for baptism. The homily to the community on Easter night *Eulogētos ho Theos* (*Cat.*, I 4 = III 3; ClavisPG 4467) also served as an "admonition specifically to those who were earlier considered worthy of baptism" (*In Gen. hom.* 33,1 [PG 53, 305]; *Cat.* I 4 = III 3); it was soon translated into Latin, and Augustine already had a secondary, reworked version (J.-P. Bouhot: REAug 17 [1971] 27-41; W. Wenk, *Zur Sammlung der 38 Homilien des Chrysostomus Latinus*, Vienna 1988] 12-13). *In Act. princ. hom.* 1-4 (PG 51, 65-112; *hom.* 5 lost), was also given to a mixed public; in 388, it constituted or replaced the usual catechetical lectures of the octave of Easter. In one of the following years Chrysostom gave the lectures of the so-called series IIIa (CPG 4468-4472), during the pre-Easter penitential time (*Cat.* III 1-2), in the community feast on the eve of Easter (*Cat.* III 4), and in Easter week to neophytes and to the community (*Cat.* III 5/8). Antiochene practice at this time differed from that of Jerusalem, esp. in the customary combining (it seems) of postbaptismal catechesis with the community homily, and in the explanation to "baptizands" already before (but near) baptism, to deepen their faith, certainty and experience (see *Cat.* III 2,22-27 [SC 50 bis, 145-149]). Chrysostom's preaching, dogmatically based, has value especially for the conduct of life (O. Pasquato, *Catechesi dottrinale e catechesi morale in GC.*: F. Vattioni [ed.], *Sangue e antropologia. Riti e culto*, 2, Rome 1987, 1039-1111). The discourses are biblical-liturgical (M.L. Guillaumin). They are called "catecheses" because their content "must leave a lasting echo within the listeners" (*Cat.* II, 1 [PG 49, 231]). The most important baptismal figures are spiritual marriage (J.-P. Cattenoz, *Le baptême mystère nuptial. Théologie de s. J. Chr.*, Venasque 1993) and the enlistment of soldiers (*stratologia*; W. Slencka, 211-218).

Catechesis is structured in accordance with relationship of faith-sacrament-life. Faith is necessary "for pagan and Jewish catechumens." It is expressed in *Apotaxis and Syntaxis* (*Cat.* III 2, 18-20 [SC 50 bis, 143-145]). The sacrament is an action of Christ based on divine condescension (R. Brändle: RAC 18, 467-468). In baptism, God responds to faith, not to the water (*Cat.* III 2,26 [SC 50 bis, 147-148]). John Chrysostom sees in Christ the mystagogue who initiates into the mysteries. He privileges sight: only "the eyes of faith" recognize the nature of baptism. He is unclear on original sin (*Cat.* III 3,6 [SC 50 bis, 154]). Having become a child of God, the newly enlightened possesses a new light always, becoming "faithful" (*Cat.* I [SC 366, 167]; O. Pasquato, *La priorità dell'educazione morale in GC.*: S. Felici [ed.], *Crescita dell'uomo nella catechesi dei padri* (*età postnicena*), Rome 1988, 191-199). From Christ's side flowed water and blood: the first a symbol of baptism, the second of the Eucharist (*Cat.* III 3,16 [SC 50 bis, 160]); Christ formed the church from his open side. There is a close relation between Eucharist and church (O. Pasquato, *Eucaristia e Chiesa in GC.*: EphLit 102 [1988] 240-258). In postbaptismal catecheses he reveals not mystagogy but morality. "If, then, the gifts are spiritual, so must our works also be (*Cat.* III, 4, 27 [SC 50 bis, 196]; O. Pasquato, *Rapporto*, 58-61). In 388 or 390 at Antioch, Chrysostom commented on the *Our Father* (*In Matth. hom.* 19, 4-6 [PG 57, 277-282] and *Orat. dom.* [PG 51, 44-48]; S. Sabugal, *Il Padrenostro*, 46; Id., *Abbà*, 93-94; J.-P. Cattenoz, *Le baptême mystère nuptial. Théologie de s. Jean Chrys.*, Venasque 1993; O. Pasquato, *Cris. Giov.*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 629-631; Id., *Giov. Cris.*: M. Sodi - A.M. Triacca, *Diz. di Omiletica*, 232-238; Id., *I laici in Giov. Cris*; P. Allen, *Severus of Antioch as a Source for Lay Piety in Late Antiquity*: Historiam Perscrutari 711-721; Ph. De Roten, *Baptême et mystagogie. En-*

quête sur l'initiation chrétienne selon S. Jean Chrisostome [= LQF, 91], Münster 2005).

*Antioch: *Theodore of Mopsuestia.* (P. Bruns, *Den Menschen mit dem Himmel verbinden. Eine Studie zu den katechet. Homilien des Theodor v. Mops.* = CSCO 549/Subs. 89, Lovanii 1995; S. Gerber, *Theodor v. Mops. u. das Nicänum. Studien zu den katechet. Homilien*, Leiden 2000; W. Slenczka, 255-271). From Theodore, *presbyter at Antioch from 383 and from 392–393 bishop of Mopsuestia (died 428), we have 16 catechetical homilies, discovered in a *Syriac version (1932), published in the original by R. Tonneau - R. Devreesse (ed.), *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mops.* = ST 145, Vatican City 1949. They are divided into two parts: *De fide* (*Hom.* 1-10) and *De mysteriis* (*Hom.* 11-16), including the explanation of the *Our Father* (*Lord's Prayer) (*Hom.* 11). Of these, only homilies 15 and 16 (on the Eucharist) are postbaptismal and post-Easter. The published text is based on manuscripts reworked (P. Bruns 35) for an educated public, as a guide for catechesis. Starting from the ecclesiastical creed, Theodore explains the Christian faith to pagan listeners using philosophical concepts and categories (P. Bruns 36); he offers a more than rudimentary introduction to the Christian faith. His explanation of the sacramental actions rarely employs *allegory. For him, Christian theology is not below pagan philosophy—which he in general considers of little value—but rather introduces its listeners to the world to come (*Hom.* 1,3-4). The primary object of catechesis is God, one and triune: he is one (against polytheism: 9,3 and 16) and is Father; the Son is consubstantial with him (against the Arians: 2,14-15); and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father (against the *pneumatomachi). He distinguishes between *Christus/in carne* and *Christus/in Spiritu:* in the former, the human is mortal and changeable; in the latter, immortal and immutable. (*Ephesus and *Chalcedon prefer the reality of being [which is more Greek] to the historical sense [which is more biblical] [J.M. Lera].) Christ is the perfect man (against *Docetism: 13,8). The human being is the image of God (N. El-Khoury, *Der Mensch als Gleichnis Gottes: eine Untersuchung zur Anthropologie des T. von M:* OC 74 [1990] 62-71), a free spirit (against Greek fatalism), destined for *divinization. Baptismal regeneration becomes a *typos* of the eternal birth of the resurrection of the dead (against the pagans). The Eucharist is linked to baptism (S. Zincone). For Theodore, in the liturgy there is an exchange of visible and invisible realities (O. Pasquato, *T.*: M. Sodi - A.M. Triacca [eds.], *Diz. di Omiletica*, 1548-1552).

For catechesis in *Constantinople, *Mesopotamia, *Alexandria and *Egypt, see H. Brakmann: O. Pasquato- Id., *Katechese* (*Katechismus*): RAC 20, 451-457.

2. *In the West.*

*N Italy: *Ambrose.* (B. Paredi, *La C. di S. Ambrogio*, Milan 1957; E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosius v. M.*, 1965; V. Monachino, *S. Ambrogio e la cura pastorale a Milano nel sec. IV*, Milan 1973; Ch. Jacob, *"Arkandisziplin"*; C.A. Satterlee, *Ambrose of Milan's Method of Mystagogical Preaching*, Collegeville, MN 2002). A catechumen until 374, when he was named bishop, Ambrose imposed catechesis for all: there was a partial catechesis for *competentes* (candidates for baptism) and the baptized, available through the celebration of the liturgy throughout the year via homilies, usually based on the biblical readings of the day. A fuller, more complete instruction of catechumens on the faith took place in a private setting, which might be led by prepared laypersons. *Competentes* received special catecheses as a group from the bishop on moral teachings, episodes of the patriarchs and precepts of the book of Proverbs (*Myst.* 1,1), and before Easter an explanation of the creed (with prior dismissal of catechumens) (*Ep.* 76 [20], 4 [CSEL 82,3,109]). Following baptism at Easter were mystagogical catecheses for the neophytes, who also at times received instruction addressed to them in post-Easter homilies to the entire community.

Among Ambrose's writings relating to catechesis are the *Explanatio Symboli, De sacramentis* and *De mysteriis*. The *Explanatio Symboli* (SC 25 bis, 46-58) is an anonymous MS of an assembly of Ambrose's *traditio symboli:* an introduction by the bishop on the name (*conlatio: summary*) and origin of the creed; first recitation of it by the bishop and clergy with a general explanation on the *Trinity and *incarnation; the catechumens join in the second recitation (*dicamus Symbolum*) with a detailed explanation of each article; a third recitation follows, with the articles grouped in fours; the catechumens must learn it by memory, never write it, nor communicate it to the uninitiated: we are in the late 4th c., with the Roman Creed. The tradition of the creed is linked to that of *De sacramentis*. Concerning *De sacramentis* (Botte, SC 25 bis, 22-23), Botte (*Expl. Symb.* 1-9: SC 25 bis, 46-58) follows the excellent ed. of O. Faller (CSEL 73,7 [1955]). The date is from 380–390. Mystagogical catechesis by Ambrose is found in two works: *De sacramentis* offers a reworked shorthand MS, unpublished, of six genuine homilies from an Easter week between 387–391 (F. Probst, *Die Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Münster 1893, 232-239, fol-

lowed by other scholars). Its authenticity is demonstrated by O. Faller (CSEL 73,7, Prol. 20-21; Botte agrees [SC 25 bis, 14]). *De mysteriis* is a free reworking of the material of *De sacramentis,* resulting in an almost completely new work. The two works must be a few years apart. The initiation to prayer and to the *Our Father* remain unpublished (see *Cain et Ab.* 1,9,35). Post-Easter homilies with special attention directed to neophytes are in *De Isaac vel anima* (E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit*, 197; Id. [ed.], *Ambrosius v. M.: Über Isaak oder die Seele - De Isaac vel anima*: Fontes Christiani [in print]; Id., *Die Christusfrömmigkeit des Bischofs Ambrosius v. M.:* Historiam Perscrutari 653-672).

As for Ambrose's method, he recommends that catechists pay attention to the dispositions of the listeners. With pagans, the catechist must draw inspiration from *Paul's discourse at the Areopagus (see *Katechese* (= *K.*): RAC 20, 425); for Jews, from the Bible (*In Lc* 6,104-106 [CCL 14, 211-213]). To catechumens before baptism, and to listeners or readers, Ambrose speaks of sacraments only with veiled hints (Ch. Jacob 121-129), using sacramental allegory (ibid., 147). He descibes figures and events of the OT and NT, on the one hand, as prefigurations of Christ and the church and, on the other hand, as type and figure of the sacraments. The biblical *typoi* of the sacraments offer the basic framework for the presentation of the prophetic and mystical meaning of the OT and NT (Ch. Jacob 188; F. Bergamelli, *Ambrogio di M.*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 29-30).

*N Italy: *Zeno*. From the bishop of Verona (an African?) are 90 *Tractatus* in two books (CCL 22). Some of these were used in a liturgical context; some are baptismal/Easter or moral homilies (C. Truzzi, *Zeno, Gaudenzio e Cromazio. Testi e contenuti della predicazione cristiana per le chiese di Verona, Brescia e Aquileia*, Brescia 1985). Zeno's exegesis is typological. His homilies are rich in references to baptism, esp. for candidates to baptism and neophytes. In the liturgy of the Easter Vigil Zeno presents the *sacramentum Passionis* with many OT figures, and the *sacramentum resurrectionis,* prefigured by the paschal lamb and by Jonah. Zeno's catechesis refers to OT typlogies of baptism, esp. the crossing of the Red Sea (1,46; 2,26; cf. Ambrose, *De sacr*. 1,6,20). The new vine is a figure of the *ecclesia mater,* whose neophytes are *novellae vites* (tender shoots); the bishop, the *rusticus* (farmer; 1,11,3), who with his workers (*presbyter*; 1,41,3) cares for the catechumens with frequent preaching (1,37,10; Ambr. *Ep*. 20,14), esp. during Lent (1,19,2). The favorite theme is baptism as a new birth resulting from the marriage between Christ and the church (1,3,3)—in the light of liturgical symbolism, the womb is the church (1,55), the bosom is the church (*gremium ecclesiae*) (1,3,7) and the church is the *alveum genitale* (the generative canal) (1,49), the tomb and place of life (see Cyr. of Jer., *Cat*. 20,4; J. Plumbe, *Mater Ecclesia*, Washington 1943, 94-97). Hence the effects of baptism: regeneration and divine sonship; the neophytes become brothers, members of a people (1,24), they form the *corpus Christi* (1,55) and have begun an eternal life (1,46,3). Baptism is essentially a paschal mystery; initiation culminates with catechesis on the Eucharist (2,13,187; G. De Paoli).

Aquileia: Chromatius. (V. Cian, *La catechesi aquileiese nel IV secolo*, Trieste 1993). *Chromatius was an eminent representative of catechesis at *Aquileia (bishop 388–407/8; for his *Sermons* and *Treatises,* see Lat. text, tr., ed. G. Banterle, Bibl. Ambr., Milan 1989, 1991; S. Tavano: RAC Suppl. 1, 542-544; S. Döpp, art. *Italia* II: RAC 18, 1329-1330; D. Gorgnali, *Il mistero pasquale in Cr. d'Aq.*, Udine 1979; G. Trettel, *Mysterium e sacramentum in s. Cr.*, Trieste 1979; C. Truzzi, op. cit.; M.V. Pasian, *Il cristiano secondo Cr. d'Aq.*, Udine 2000; G. Trettel, *Linee di ecclesiologia nel pensiero di Cr. d'Aq.*: Historiam perscrutari 673-687). Among the homilies (CCL 9A, 3-182) of Ambrose's friend, besides some for the community with baptismal and Easter themes (*Serm.* 34 [Epiphany] and 16-17A [Easter homilies]), mixed in here and there is catechesis for "catechumens" (*Serm.* 15 on Jn 13), *competentes* (*Serm.* 18 on Jn 3; *Serm.* 40 [*expos. orat. dominicae*]; cf. *Katechese*: RAC 20, 481) and neophytes (*Serm.* 14 on Jn 5; cf. *Serm.* 50A: RevBénéd. 91 [1981] 225-230: present. and text). The conflict with pagans and Jews is lively (extremely harsh against the latter) (S. Tavano, 542-543), the language vivid, direct and rich with figures. Exegesis of the biblical texts is *secundum litteram* (*Serm.* 1,1; 15,2; 29,3), as well as *iuxta allegoricum sensum* (*Serm.* 1,1; cf. 11,2; 12,4; 24,3). The baptismal theology is traditional: *ablutio peccatorum nostrorum et renovatio . . . vitae salutaris* [the washing away of sins and the renovation . . . of the life of salvation] (12,40). After baptism the baptized must preserve baptismal grace (*servare gratiam baptismi*) (*Serm*. 14,4; 19,2), letting himself be transformed by the grace of Christ: *de immundo mundus, de profano fidelis, de impudico castus, de haeretico catholicus* [from worldly to unwordly, from unfaithful to faithful, from unchaste to chaste, from heretic to Catholic] (*Serm*. 2,5) (Chr. of Aq., *Catechesi al popolo. Sermoni*, ed. G. Cuscito, Rome 1979).

*Aquileia: *Rufinus*. The *Expositio symboli* (CCL 20, 133-182), attributed to Rufinus (d. 411; S. Döpp, 1330-1331) and written at the request of a Bishop Lau-

rentius for the use of bishops and presbyters, explains the creed used in his homeland of Aquileia, highlighting the passages in which it differed from the Roman Creed (*Symb.* 3-5.16.41). The *symbolon* is a *conlatio,* a summary of the preaching of the apostles (A. Merkt, *Symbolum:* RQA 95 [2000] 27; cf. Ambrose, *Symb.* 3 [*K.*: RAC 20, 459]; John Cassian, *Inc. c. Nest.* 6,3 [CSEL 17, 328]), the standard and *signum* or *indicium*—orthodox preaching—by which Christians were recognized; it was not to be written down, but memorized (*Symb.* 2); in its simplicity it was a model of catechesis (*Symb.* 1-2). The liturgical *traditio* and *redditio symboli,* as used at Rome (Aug., *Conf.* 8,2,5), defend the faithful against heterodox teachings that fall outside the letter of the Christian message, and from falsifying additions (*Symb.* 2-3). The above-mentioned purification texts are "for the instruction of those who are young in Christ" and are beginning the life of faith (*Symb.* 1; cf. 18.36): *ad instructionem eorum, qui prima fidei elementa suscipiunt,* openly referring back to their catechesis (see 14: *o fidelis auditor*). The work uses scriptural prophecies about Christ as proof against the Jews (9,17). Pagan myths are ridiculed (9), but he mainly combats the accusation of the absurdity of the Christian faith (see H. Brakmann, *K.*: RAC 20, 455). The *Expositio* was later transcribed more than once, esp. in *Gaul by *Venantius Fortunatus in his *Expositio symboli* (MG AA 4,1, 253-258). (M. Villain, *Rufin d'Aquilée commentateur du Symbole des Apôtres*: RecSR 32 (1944) 129-156; C. Riggi, *Rufino catecheta*, in *Rufino di Concordia e il suo tempo* 1, Udine 1987, 169-193; M. Simonetti, *Rufino. Spiegazione del credo*, Rome [3]1993, 29-32.)

Near Aquileia: A ps.-Augustinus (Anonimo Veronese). G. Sobrero [(ed.) *Anonimo Veronese: Omelie mistagogiche e catechetiche*, ed. critica e studio, Rome 1992] places near Aquileia and in the second half of the 5th c. a large number of ps.-Augustinian catechetical homilies from N Italy at the time after the Council of *Chalcedon. B. Capelle (*Travaux Liturgiques* 3, Louvain 1967, 82-91), dates them about 550; A.G. Martimort (*rec. Sobrero*: BLE 94 (1993) 155) suggests Verona, not Aquileia or Milan. For other Italian homilists (Gaudentius of Brescia; Maximus I of Turin; Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna), see H. Brakmann, *K.*: RAC 20, 464-465).

Dacia: Here Bishop *Niceta of Remesiana (d. ca. 414) wrote six books of baptismal catecheses for *competentes* (Gennad., *Vir. ill.* 22 [70 Bernoulli]; A.E. Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana: His Life and Works*, Cambridge 1905; C. Riggi, *Niceta di Remesiana. Catechesi preparatorie al battesimo*, Rome 1985; J.-P. Bouhot, *L'"Instructio ad competentes" de Nicetas de Rémésiana*, in *De Tertullien aux mozarabes*, Festschr. J. Fontaine 1, Paris 1992, 281-290). Known as *Instructio ad competentes,* the work is lost except for some fragments and the present *Explanatio symboli* in the second redaction (Aquileia; 6th-7th c.; J.-P. Bouhot [287] reduces the certain part of the text with respect to the ed. of A.E. Burn and K. Gamber: CPL 647). As themes of the individual books, Gennadius presents (1) how candidates should prepare for baptism (*competentes: ad baptismum electi*) (*frg.* 1s. 6 [6f Burn]), with an explanation of their *exorcism; (2) *de gentilitatis erroribus* (*frg.* 4, 41 [8 Burn]), against the veneration of heroes; (3) *de fide unicae maiestatis,* praise of the one God against the polytheists, perhaps with a defense of the consubstantiality of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (lost); (4) against genealogies (lost), clearly on fatalism (fate) and astrology (horoscope); (5) *de symbolo* (*frg.* 5,4 and 7 [8.53 Burn]) and *Explan. symb.* [38-50 Burn], a homily to *competentes* on the *redditio symboli,* with an exposition of the *Apostles' Creed; (6) *de agni paschalis victima* (lost, certainly a catechesis for neophytes; see Gaudenz. *Tract.* 2 [CSEL 68, 24-32]). Niceta's work constituted not so much a collection of homilies to *competentes* as a kind of manual for catechists of converts from paganism, esp. barbarians (see *frg.* 1 [PLS 3, 189-190]). Niceta recommends against the pagans examinations, exorcisms and knowledge of the profession of faith in God the Father, and against the Jews, knowledge of Scripture (*Expl. symb.* 9 [47 Burn]).

Spain. Bishop *Pacian of Barcelona (d. before 392; RAC 15, 659-660) battled an enduring paganism in Spain. His homily *De baptismo* (SC 410, 148-164) is important, treating, to a mixed audience of baptized and competents (*Bapt.*, 1,1; cf. *De paenit.* 2,2; *Tract.* 11,1), of the new birth in baptism, with the purification of the baptized from the original guilt of Adam, by whom they had been subjected to death (*Bapt.* 1,3). The new birth implied a break with the habits and sins of paganism: *idolatria, crudelitas, fornicatio, luxuria,* etc. (*Bapt.*, 6,5), and produced freedom from eternal death unto eternal happiness (*Bapt.*, 6,6-7). (J.M. Núñez Moreno, *Il De baptismo di Paciano di B.*, in S. Felici [ed.], *Esegesi e catechesi nei Padri*, 2, IV-V c. Rome 1994, 105-112; C. Granado: SC 410 [1995] 32-34, 297-306.)

Africa. At the time of *Augustine, the N *African church counted only "a few pagans" (*Cons. ev.* 1, 14, 21.20, 29.25, 39; *Serm.* 302, 19). Besides the baptized, the Christian communities were in part composed of catechumens (*cathecumeni = audientes:* Aug. *Serm.* 132,1). Baptism of children was practiced, and not just in sickness or mortal danger. Others were accepted as infants or as children with particular

rites, esp. with the first *signatio crucis* and the administration of salt among catechumens, though their baptism took place later (Aug. *Conf.* 1, 11, 17; *De anim.* 1, 12). Instruction, therefore, took into account: (1) pagan and Jewish converts; (2) candidates for baptism, including children (*Symb.* 1,1), from Christian families; and (3) baptized *infantes* (S. Poque, *Un souci pastoral d'Augustin, la persévérance des chrétiens baptisés dans leur enfance:* BLE 88 [1987] 273-286).

a. Augustine. The catechetical manual *De catechizandis rudibus* (CCL 46; *cathecismi liber unus*: Possid. *Indic.* 10 3, 7 [ed. A. Wilmart: *Misc. Agostiniana* 2, Rome 1931, 179]), written between 400–405 at the request of the deacon *Deogratias, a catechist, is composed of two parts: (1) catechetical advice (*De cat. rud.*, 5-22) and (2) two models for introducing catechesis (*primis instructionis sacramentis*: *Conf.* 8, 2, 4), a longer (for an *idiota urbanus*) and a shorter, "if haste is required" (*De cat. rud.* 24-50.51-55). It is aimed at *rudes*—new arrivals (*accedentes*), esp. pagan, among whom many, perhaps even half, were educated, the rest "illiterate"—who after the usual examination of their motives (*De cat. rud.* 9-10) and an introductory instruction by means of appropriate rites (*exsufflatio, signatio, donatio salis*; ibid., 13,50), were accepted into the catechumenate. Phases of the catechesis were as follows: account (*narratio*), the opening to hope (*cohortatio*) and the acquiring of joy (*hilaritatis comparatio*). Account (*narratio*): the whole of salvation history is presented using a comprehensive historical approach (*narratio plena*), highlighting essential facts (*mirabiliora*) and noting secondary facts only rapidly (3,5; P. Siniscalco, *Christum narrare et dilectionem monere. Osservazioni sulla narratio del* "*De cat. rud.*": Augustinianum 14 [1974] 605-623; L. Perrone, *Confessio et narratio. Introduzione al De cat. rud. di s. Agostino*: Salesianum 65 [2003] 161-172). Thus emerge the key moments of salvation history (*articuli temporis*), principal among them being the "Christ event"; the others are summarized, with emphasis on the continuity between OT and NT: "The OT veils the NT, and the NT manifests the OT" (4,8). The aim of *revelation and of the *narratio* is *charitas,* such that "your listeners, hearing would believe, believing *hope, and hoping love" (ibid.). The opening to hope (*cohortatio*): the "hope of the resurrection" (7,11). Salvation history thus goes from the creation to the resurrection (against the pagans). The connection between catechesis and life is established, the horizon widening to include universal history (19,31). The hope of the *rudis* is the risen Christ, the mover of history. Acquire joy (*hilaritatis comparatio*): joy, in place of ennui, is necessary to the catechist and the catechized. Augustine lays out six elements that oppose joy and six remedies (10-15) (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 466; J.-P. Belche, *Die Bekehrung zum Christentum nach des hl. Augustinus Büchlein, "De cat. rud."*: Augustiniana 27 (1977) 26-69; 28 [1978] 255-287; 29 [1979] 247-279; 32 [1982] 42-87, 282-311; O. Pasquato, *Agostino*: J. Gevaert [ed.], 23-25; M. Payà Andrés, *Contenidos de la catequesis agustiniana*: Augustinus 43 [1998] 383-396).

Augustine's catechetical homilies were catechesis in action. In the Africa of Augustine's time, the place where catechumens properly so-called, *per omne tempus,* were instructed, *quae fides et qualis vita debeat esse christiani,* was through the reading of Scripture in the liturgy and through the homilies *ad populum* that were part of the "mass," up to the dismissal of the catechumens = *audientes* (Aug., *De fid. et op.* 6,9; see *Serm.* 212,2: *per scripturas et sermones ecclesiasticos*; *Serm.* 214,1; on the *missa catechumenorum,* see *Serm.* 49,8). Every year before Easter they were invited to inscribe their name for baptism (*nomendatio ad baptismum*; *In Joh. tract.* 10,10; 11,1.5). Candidates were then told that, after their profession of faith and baptism, not only would they listen to Scripture, but they would also understand its meaning (*Serm.* 132,1,1). After this communication the *competentes* (definition: *Serm.* 216,1) were catechized, exorcised and scrutinized (*catechizantur, exorcizantur, scrutantur: De fid. et op.* 6,9). Topics of instruction included the creed and moral catechesis. Augustine's *Serm.* 228,3 (PL 38, 1102) informs us of the catalog of catecheses to *competentes* linked to the liturgy, including outside of the usual liturgical service: (1) *sacramentum symboli* (*quod credere debeant*), (2) *sacramentum orationis* (*quomodo petant*), (3) *sacramentum fontis et baptismi*. Mainly instructed on (4) *sacramentum altaris,* however, were the *infantes,* neophytes who had just entered. (For an overview of Augustine's Lenten homilies and those during the octave of Easter, see SC 116, 352-365; cf. H. Brakmann, *K.*: RAC 20, 469-470; for the bibl. on (1), (2), (3) and (4) see Id., 470-472).

More specifically, catechetical praxis of various kinds can be found in these sermons. Directed to beginners, as seen above, are two examples in *De cat. rud.*, 16-25; 26-27. Directed to *catechumens* are the sermons on the creed (*traditio symboli; Serm.* 212,1; 214,12) containing "briefly . . . all that you believe" (*Serm.* 212,1): *Symbolum est breviter complexa regula fidei* (*Serm.* 213,1); finally, against the pagans, *finis sine fine erit resurrectio carnis* (*Serm.* 213,9). The creed having been explained, memorized and written on the heart ("secret of the *arcanum*"), it is ren-

dered, i.e., recited (*redditio Symboli*) before the bishop (for the *De fid. et symb.* [ed. J. Zycha: CSEL 41 (1990) 1-32], cf. E.P. Meijring, *Augustine: "De fide et symbolo,"* Amsterdam 1987). To *competentes* was imparted moral catechesis so as to replace pagan behavior with Christian: "We scatter the seeds of the Word, you yield the fruits of faith" (*Serm.* 216,1), *ut competentes competenter adolescite in Christo, ut in virum perfectum iuveniliter accrescatis* (*Serm.* 216,7). Directed to *neophytes* (*infantes, nati a Christo: Serm.* 228,1), who have received the three sacraments, is mystagogical catechesis; they are told the history of the bread and wine (*Serm.* 227,13). Augustine comments 7 times on the *Our Father* to the *competentes* and the *fedeli,* an initiation to Christian prayer that replaces pagan prayer to the gods: after the *redditio Symboli* they receive the *oratio dominica* (*traditio Or. dom.*), during the first eucharistic celebration. Augustine also comments on the *Our Father* elsewhere (see S. Sabugal, *Il Padrenostro*, 46-47; Id., *Abbà*, 96-104; S. Poque: SC 116 [1966] 65-69). In the African church the *Our Father* developed in close relation with the creed and became a baptismal rite (*Serm.* 228,3). How one must pray (*traditio/redditio*: *Or. dom.*; V. Grossi) corresponds to what one must believe (*traditio/redditio*: *Symboli*). Added now to the combination faith-sacrament-life is that of faith-prayer-life. Augustine also encourages neophytes and faithful through mystagogical catechesis (O. Pasquato, *Eucaristia e Chiesa in Agostino*: EphLit 102 [1988] 46-63). For the *faithful* Augustine offers post-baptismal or ongoing catechesis, through discourses and with *De agone christiano l.1*, a manual for the faithful, in which he explains the creed and moral precepts, mentioning 18 errors against the faith, written in *humili sermone,* containing *regulam fidei et praecepta vivendi* (*Retract.* 2,3; J. Gliscinski, *Doctrina de comunicatione interpersonali eiusque applicationes in arte catechizandi rudes apud s. Augustinum*, Diss., Rome 1979).

b. Quodvultdeus. Some ps.-Augustinian catecheses to *competentes* are today attributed to *Quodvultdeus, bishop of *Carthage until 439 (P. Langlois, *Africa II*: RAC Suppl. 1, 202-203; *Sermones* 1-3 *de Symbolo ad catechumenos* [CCL 60, 305-334]); given after the great exorcism of the Easter eve examination, they are instructions on orienting one's life, with an explanation of the creed. Other catechetical homilies from Quodvultdeus include one given on Easter, *Contra Iudeos, paganos et Arianos* (CCL 60, 225-258); *De accedentibus ad gratiam 1* (= *competentes*; CCL 60, 441-458), in which he polemicizes against pagans, Jews, *Arians and *Manichees; and one on the *sacramentum fontis et baptismi,* along with that of *De cataclysmo* (CCL 60, 409-420). (On the audience composed of faithful and candidates for baptism, see T.N. Finn, *Quodvultdeus: The Preacher and the Audience: The Homilies on the Creed*: SP 31, Louvain 1997, 42-58; H. Brakmann, *K.*: RAC 20, 472.) Finally, attributed to Quodvultdeus, only from 1964 (R. Braun), is *The Book of Promises and Predictions* (It. ed.: L. Dattrino [ed.], Rome 2003), a catechetical aid for the preparation of catechumens for baptism presenting a baptismal narrative from creation to the end of time (see Aug., *De cat. rud.*), written in 439 during his exile in Campania.

V. Sixth century. In the West, with the increasing general Christianization of countries and the large-scale baptism of barbarian populations (Germanization), the pastoral problems again changed and the history of ancient education ended (P. Riché, *Le scuole e l'insegnamento nell'Occidente cristiano dalla fine del V secolo alla metà dell'XI secolo*, Rome 1984 [Fr. orig. 1979] 17-51). "Pagan" is synonymous with "barbarian," excluded from the city of God and from urban civilization (see *Cod. Theod.* and Orosius, *Historiae adversus paganos*, I, *prol.* 9; P. Chuvin - P.F. Beatrice - J.-P. Massaut - M.-E. Henneau [eds.], *La christianisation des campagnes* 1, Brussels 1996, 9-35). Catechesis was ever more rarely directed at adult baptismal candidates, and ever more frequently at already baptized Christians, who, as godparents or parents, were responsible for the Christian formation of those baptized as infants. King *Clovis himself, before his baptism on Christmas Day at the end of the 5th c., was catechized by his wife *Clotilde and by Bishop *Remigius of Reims (Greg. of Tours, *Hist. franc.* 2,31) and formally accepted among the *competentes* (K. Schäferdiek, *Germanenmission*: RAC 10, 535-536). To Jews who wanted to convert, the Council of *Agde (506) imposed a catechumenate of eight months (*can.* 34 [CCL 148, 107]). Jews baptized by force without ecclesiastical catechesis were given obligatory additional instruction (Greg. Gt., *Ep.* 1,45 [CCL 140, 59]; R. Manselli, *Gregor d. Gr.*: RAC 12, 939-940).

1. Gaul. *Caesarius of Arles (d. 542) preached often, almost daily during Lent and Eastertide. His "sermons" were directed to a mixed audience, i.e., to those baptized as infants, to adult candidates for baptism and to Jews (*Conc. Agath.* a. 506 *can.* 34 [CCL 148, 207-208]; P. Mikat, *Caesarius v. Arles und die Juden*: VortrDüsseldorf G 345 [1996]), as well as to parents and godparents; and on the eve of Easter or on other solemn vigils, even to child catechumens. To these latter, it was the responsibility

of the godparents, instructed by the bishop's catechesis, to explain the creed and the *Our Father* privately, i.e., in family catechesis (*Serm.* 13,2, 130,5; 200,6; 204,3; 229,6 Morin). Adult candidates (*competentes*) still received catechesis for the most part in the preparation for Easter and for baptism (*Ordo legitimus baptismi*: *Serm.* 200, 5). The *Expositio orationis dominicae* (*Serm.* 147) is a reworking of Augustine's *Serm.* 59 (*K.*: RAC 20, 470). Catechesis is purely trinitarian and christological, the language deliberately plain (*sermo humilis*: *Serm.* 4,26).

H.G.J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France During the 6th Cent.*, Rome 1950, 161-164; 167; 185; S. Felici, *La catechesi al popolo di Cesario d'Arles*: Salesianum 41 (1979) 375-392; Id., *L'integrazione fra esegesi e catechesi in Cesario d'Arles*, in Id. (ed.), *Esegesi e catechesi*, 2, Rome 1994, 183-197.

2. Spain. In *De correctione rusticorum,* *Martin of Braga transmitted to Bishop Polemius of Astorga a catechesis (*praedicatio*) for people who were already baptized but certainly not strong in the faith ("preaching to the peasants": C.P. Caspari, *Martin v. Bragas Schrift De correctione rusticorum*, Christianae 1883, XLIX; M. Naldini, *Martino di Braga, Contro le superstizioni. Catechesi al popolo*, Florence 1991; RAC 15, 672-673 [bibl.]; M. Simonetti, *Longus per divinas scripturas ordo dirigitur. Variazioni altomedievali su un tema catechetico agostiniano*: RomBarb 6 [1981-1982] 313-320; E. López Pereira, *Cultura, relixión e supersticóns na Galicia Sueva. Martiño de Braga "De correctione rusticorum,"* La Coruña 1996; A. Lopez Calvo, *La catequesis en la Galicia medieval, Martín Dumiense y el De correctione rusticorum*: Estudios mindonienses 13 [1997] 509-523). The mentalities, feasts and customs of a persistent paganism should be abandoned and replaced with the faithful observance of the covenant concluded with God (*pactum cum Deo*), esp. the observance of Sunday. The preparation for baptism having been insufficient, he sought to make up the lack with later catechesis. Martin also worked to revive catechesis for baptizands: 20 days before their baptism the "catechumens," as prescribed by the "ancient canons," received exorcism and instruction on the creed (*Conc. Bracc. II, can.* 2 [81 Vives]). (*De corr. rust.* 15-19 was later used as catechesis for godparents in view of the baptism of children [C.P. Caspari, op. cit., CXXIII-V].)

VI. Seventh century. In the period of transition to the Middle Ages, baptism and catechesis took place under differing conditions. While in Christian lands practically the only people left to be baptized were infants born to Christian families (see P.-M. Gy, *Du baptême pascal des petitis enfants au baptême Quamprimum*, in *Haut M.A.*, Festschr. P. Riché, La Garenne 1990, 353-365), the problem of conversion and baptism following the forcible entry of pagan peoples into the Roman Empire persisted elsewhere; at the same time missionary activity was being extended beyond the limits of the empire. The widespread practice of the baptism of children led to a simplification of the baptismal rites.

1. Spain. In early medieval Spain, despite infant baptism, there remained a considerable number of young people and adults to prepare for baptism (J.M. Hormaeche Basauri, *La pastoral de la iniciación cristiana en la España visigoda*, Toledo 1983). Prebaptismal and postbaptismal catechesis was therefore directed both to those responsible for the baptism and formation of children, and to converts from paganism. According to *Isidore of Seville the catechumen learns to abandon idolatry and to acknowledge only one Lord; the candidate is instructed on the sacraments, the *regula fidei,* baptism, confirmation and laying on of hands (*De offic.* 2,21-27 [CCL 113,95]). The silence on the preparation for baptism of Jewish converts is an indication that the new situation of forced baptisms did not allow the ancient tradition of baptismal preparation to be applied in these cases (W. Drews, *Juden u. Judentum bei Isidor v. Sevilla. Studien zum Traktat. De fide catholica contra Judaeos* [2001] 267-297, 529-530). On children and adolescents, see A. Sancho Andreu, *Ritos de la infancia y la adolescencia en el antiguo rito hispánico*: Psallendum, Festschr. J. Pinell i Pons = SA 105, Rome 1992, 221-229.

2. In general. Catechesis in the proper sense was increasingly directed at those already baptized: children and adults. The administration of the sacraments and instruction took place increasingly outside of episcopal churches, by rural parish priests (O. Pasquato, *Parrocchia e liturgia nella tradizione*: Riv. lit. 78 [1991] 183-236). Linked with catechesis, as in the East, was the catechetical role of images (O. Pasquato, *Biblia pauperum*, in F. Lever et al., *La comunicazione. Il dizionario di scienze e tecniche*, Rome 2002, 107-108; Id., *Chiesa e immagini*, in ibid., 191-195; G. Lange, *Bild u. Wort. Die katechetische Funktionen des Bildes in der griech. Theologie des 6. bis 9. Jh.*, [2]1999). Formation in the family established itself as essential for the transmission of the faith, esp. by the parents, to whom was recognized a *pastoris officium* (Jonas Aurel., *Inst. laic.* 2,16 [PL 106, 197-199]). Ecclesiastical catechesis of children, together with their parents, continued in church in the Sunday liturgy, through the homily heard by all. Memorized formulas were important; godparents were required

to know the *Our Father* and the creed. Homiliaries collected Late Antique baptismal catechesis, giving us knowledge of it.

3. Mission to the pagans. The catechesis of catechumens, for the most part illiterate, whose languages were unfamiliar to Irish-Scottish, Anglo-Saxon and *Frankish missionaries, could not have been more than a *Grundkursus*, a minimal *Katechismus* (A. Läpple, *Kl. Geschichte der Katechese*, 1981, 66-67; L. Csonka, *Educare*, 3, Zürich 1964, 90-92). The barrier between the liturgy and the language of the people favored a magical understanding of the liturgy. Mass baptisms followed on the conversion of the king. Instruction and formation were left to communitarian life after baptism (J.A. Jungmann, art. *Katechumenat*: LTK² 6, 53). *Columbanus the Younger, abbot of Luxeil and of Bobbio, catechized (610–612) a Roman-Germanic population near Lake Constance. His penitential book attests a severe catechesis for laypeople, in opposition to pagan customs (see C. Vogel, *Il peccatore e la penitenza nel medioevo*, Leumann [To] ²1988 [Fr. orig. 1969] 60-70). His disciple Gallus uses Augustine and esp. Martin of Braga as a model in preaching. Also dependent on these, besides Caesarius of Arles, is *Pirminius of Reichenau (d. 753) in *De libris canonicis scarapsus,* a kind of catechism (M. Simonetti, *Longus*, 322-327,331-338), with instructions to the newly converted. The Carolingian reform brought some reorganizations (O. Pasquato, *Quale tradizione per l'iniziazione cristiana? Dall'età dei padri all'epoca carolingia*, in *Iniziazione cristiana degli adulti oggi*, Rome 1998, 75-105; S. Keefe, *Carolingian Baptismal Expositions: A Handlist of Tracts and Manuscripts*, in U.R. Blumenthal [ed.], *Carolingian Essays*, Washington, DC 1983, 169-237; Id., *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire*, 1/2, Notre Dame, IN 2002), as did the Spanish mission and that of the Jesuits in the modern period, with the institution of the so-called catechumenate houses. In the East, despite the spread of infant baptism, the basic lines of the ancient ecclesiastical preparation through catechesis survived in the regular liturgy (see P. Braido, *Lineamenti di storia della catechesi e dei catechismi. Dal "tempo della riforma" all'età degli imperialismi*, Leumann [To] 1991, 25-38).

G. Bareille, v. *Catéchèse*: DTC 2, 2 (1905) 1877-1895; J. Zerndl, v. *Firmung*. II: LTK 3, 1299; G. Bardy, *L'enseignement religieux aux premiers siècles*: Rev. Apolog. 66 (1938) 641-655; 67 (1938) 5-18; O. Perler, v. *Arkandisziplin*: RAC 1, 667-676; A. Turck, *Évangélisation et catéchèse aux deux premiers siècles*: Parole et mission 3, Paris 1962; T.M. Finn, *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity*, New York 1997; Id., *The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John Chrysostom*: Stud. in Christ. Antiquity 15, Washington 1967; J. Daniélou, *La catechesi nei primi secoli*, ed. R. Du Charlat, Leumann (To) 1969 (Fr. orig. 1968); G. Kretschmar, *Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche*: Leiturgia 5 (1970) 145-273; E. Dassmann, *Schriftverständnis u. religiöse Erkenntnis nach dem hl. Augustinus*: Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift 87 (1978) 257-274; F. Bergamelli, *Il linguaggio simbolico delle immagini nella catechesi missionaria di Teofilo di A.*, in S. Felici (ed.), *Valori attuali della catechesi patristica*, Rome 1979, 67-91; V. Grossi, *Il contesto battesimale dell'Or. dominica nei commenti di Tertulliano, Cipriano, Agostino*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 205-220; O. Pasquato, *Catechesi ecclesiologica nella cura pastorale di G. Cris.*, in S. Felici (ed.), *Ecclesiologia e catechesi patristica*, Rome 1982, 123-172; Id., *Rapporto tra catechesi e liturgia nella tradizione biblica e patristica:* Riv. lit. 72 (1985) 39-73; Id., *Catecumenato antico* (*sec. II-IV*). *Punti nodali e qualità pastorale*: Lateranum n.s. 60 (1994) 323-341; Id., *Quale tradizione per l'iniziazione cristiana? Dall'età dei Padri all'epoca carolingia*, in *Iniziazione cristiana degli adulti oggi*, Rome 1998, 75-105; Id., *Spiritualità e preghiera nelle catechesi battesimali di Cirillo di G.*: Riv. lit. 86 (1999) 375-392; Id., *Quale iniziazione per pagani, gnostici e giudei?*: Salesianum 53 (2001) 497-520; O. Pasquato - H. Brakmann, *Catechese* (*Katechismus*): RAC 20, 156, 422-496; M. Dujarier, *Breve storia del catecumenato,* Leumann (To) 1984 (Fr. orig. 1980); G. Groppo, entry *Patristica* (*catechesi*): J. Gevaert (ed.), *Diz. di catechetica*, Leumann (To) 1983, 482-485; M. Naldini, *Catechesi patristica nel IV secolo*: CCC 6 (1985) 57-76; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle*, Spoleto 1988; A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991; Ch. Jacob, *Zur Krise der Mystagogie in der alten Kirche*: Theologie und Philosophie 66 (1991) 75-89; M. Metzger - W. Drews - H. Brakmann, *Katechumenat:* RAC 20, 157, 497-574; G. Filoramo, *Le scuole catechistiche e la gnosi*, in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, 1/3, Rome 1994, 559-585; J. Knupp, *Das Mystagogieverständnis des Joh. Chrysostom*: Benediktbeur. Stud. 4 (1995); G. Laiti, *La catechesi nel catecumenato antico*, in *Iniziazione cristiana e catecumenato*, ed. G. Cavallotto, Bologna 1996, 63-90; L. Zappella (ed.), *Giovanni Crisostomo, Le catechesi battesimali,* Milan 1998; W. Slenczka, *Heilsgeschichte u. Liturgie. Studien zum Verhältnis von Heilsgeschichte u. Heilsteilhabe anhand liturgischer u. katechetischer Quellen des 3. u. 4. Jh.*: Arb. zur Kirchengesch. 78 (2000); M. Pellegrino - A.M. Triacca, *Padri e liturgia*, in D. Sartore et al., *Liturgia*, Cinisello B. (Mi) 2001, 1404-1426; St. Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus. Prima catechesi cristiana*, NBA 7/2, ed. P. Siniscalco, Rome 2001, 127-291; M. Dujarier, *Devenir disciple du Christ. Cathécuménat et "discipulat"*: Historiam Perscrutari, Misc. O. Pasquato, Rome 2002, 521-537; J.-P. Bouhot, *La tradition catéchétique et exégétique du 'Pater noster'*: REAug 33 (2003) 3-18.

O. Pasquato

CATECHUMENATE – DISCIPLESHIP

I. Catechumenate or discipleship? - II. Catechumenate/discipleship in its historical development: 1st c. - III. Catechumenate/discipleship is situated in the heart of the church's pastoral efforts: 2nd-3rd c. (before 313) - IV. Later evolution and changes: a catechumenate/discipleship of recovery: 4th-5th c. - V. In the national churches and in the barbarian kingdoms: 6th-7th c. - VI. Concluding summary.

I. Catechumenate or discipleship?
Anachronism of the term "catechumenate." It is generally thought that the term *catechumenate* goes back to the church's origins. It can be demonstrated historically, however, that in the first centuries the reality of an intense preparation of adults for *baptism was not referred to as the *catechumenate,* even if the terms *catechesis* and *catechumen* are frequent (see A. Hamman, *Catecumeno* [*catecumenato*], in DPAC I [1983], 627-629). Only from the Renaissance was *catechumenate* used in works on initiation to baptism in the early church. This emphasis on terminology is not insignificant; rather, it reflects a profound reality, very well expressed by a specialist on the subject, M. Dujarier: "the formation of converts was never perceived as coming from a particular institution, and even less from a marginal organization. It was in fact in her very womb that the Church-Mother had always exercised her maternity. Growth in faith does not come about *in vitro*. It is the work of the whole community, which proposes the Good News, forms new believers and receives them into her own life" (*Devenir disciple du Christ. Catéchuménat et "discipulat"*: Historiam Perscrutari. Misc. O. Pasquato, Rome 2002, 521-537; here 521).

The particular emphasis that we, following the Fathers (as documented by Dujarier in his study cited here), want to give the term *discipleship,* as opposed to the usual term *catechumenate,* aims, first, to restore to ancient Christian initiation its true nature, i.e., that of a preparation for the three *sacraments of Christian initiation which takes place in the heart of the ecclesial community, and not mainly in the context of a different structure, i.e., an institutionalized catechumenate. This does not change the fact that for ancient Christian initiation there were, as we will show, particular moments and rites, but they were not the substance, so to speak, of the preparation itself. Second, the idea of discipleship adds the perspective of the Fathers, who see Christian initiation in the light of the biblical category of discipleship, which faithfully includes (and surpasses) the content covered by the category *catechumenate*. The category *discipleship* thus assures a faithfulness both in content and regarding the term itself. Third, it should be noted that *discipleship* refers also to the time "after baptism," when the neophyte is still a disciple, whereas *catechumenate* refers to nothing beyond baptism. In fact, all of life is lived as discipleship of Christ: the catechumenate is only a preparation to enter that life (ibid., 537; G.P. Peron, *Seguitemi! Vi farò diventare pescatori di uomini* [*Mk 1,17*], Rome 2000).

Presence and meanings of the category "discipleship" in the NT. Following M. Dujarier (op. cit.), we note how the verb *mathēteuō* means 'to be a disciple' (see Mt 27:57); in the transitive, it means to 'make disciple[s]' (Mt 28:19; Acts 14:21): it is a true initiation, resulting from knowledge and from a vital commitment to follow someone. In the passive, it means 'to be made a disciple': in the present, it means one who is becoming a disciple ('novice,' 'beginner'); in the past, one who has become a disciple (Mt 13:52). The active meaning of *mathēteia* (*discipulatus,* "discipleship") is the formation (training) of the disciple and the state of being a disciple (discipleship). It is more often used in the active sense, to form disciples (making disciples) (Dujarier, 524).

Presence and meanings of the category "discipleship" in the Fathers. Again referring to M. Dujarier (524-537), whose precise documentation attests to the perdurance of the idea of discipleship in the writings of the Fathers from the 2nd to the 5th c., by which he concludes historically that this was a true and proper Christian initiation, the catechumenate is understood as a period of initiation into discipleship, in which one takes on a way of life that involves the whole person. This could only happen in the midst of the church community, and necessarily had to continue after baptism: the baptizand is called to become what he has begun to be. The catechumenate has introduced him into discipleship, which must continue its development according to the Spirit throughout his life, so as to become ever more a child of the Father (ibid., 537).

II. Catechumenate/discipleship in its historical development: 1st c. *1. Descriptive definition of catechumenate/discipleship as a traditional category within discipleship.* By *catechumenate*, from the neo-Latin *catechumenatus* and its modern derivation from *catechumenus* (*katēchoumenos*), is meant the process of formation in the church's *forma vitae*; in the ancient church it pertained to the reception of the three sacraments of Christian initiation, in view of Christian discipleship. At the conceptual level, *catechumenate* comes from the verb *katēchein:* in the active, "to instruct," in the passive "to listen." Moreover, the presence of the terms *audire, audientes* (*akroaomai, akroōmenoi*) indicates the class of catechumens (*credentes*) prior to their enrollment for baptism (*nomendatio, onomatographia*) and of one of the levels of penitence (B. Poschmann: RAC 2, 814). This set in motion a distinction of the class of the *competentes* (*phōtizomenoi* or *illuminandi*), members of the preparatory phase closest to baptism, through which they become *fideles* (*neophytoi*). Catechesis (*katēchēsis*) is clearly identified within

this formative way of the community as a fundamental dimension (see O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 424-425), but as accompanied by the basic requirements of *conversion, *penitence, *ascesis and the respective rites (M. Metzger, *Katechumenat*, RAC 20, 497-498; for the pagan and Jewish parallels, see W. Drews, RAC 20, 498-506).

Initiation (typical of every religion) in primitive Christianity was aimed at introducing persons coming from *paganism or *Judaism to Christian discipleship, receiving the three sacraments of initiation, i.e., *baptism, *confirmation and *Eucharist. The catechumenate was a basic part of Christian initiation (D. Borobio, *Catecumenato*, in *Liturgia*, Cinisello B. [Mi] 2001, 361). The early church's effort in selecting and preparing candidates for baptism was substantial: a process of initiation, growth and apprenticeship through which the whole person was transformed, orienting his life in a radically new way toward the God of Jesus Christ and the church community (see B. Maggioni, *Gesù comunicatore della fede* . . . : Historiam Perscrutari, 513-520). The formation of converts was seen by the Fathers as taking place mainly in the bosom of the church-mother (M. Dujarier, *Devenir*, 521). The catechumenate/discipleship springs from the life of the church, whose maternity precedes the catechumenal organization and where the indispensable need to initiate new members is primary (Id., *La funzione materna*, 125-126). Born of a spontaneous movement of the community's life and considered a requirement of the church's mission, catechumenate/discipleship found its most typical forms in a process of adaptation to the various sociocultural and ecclesial situations, which moreover situated it among the paradigmatic expressions of the enculturation of the faith; it had little or nothing in common, however, with the forms of initiation to the pagan *mysteries. The Christian community's catechumenate/discipleship found seeds of inspiration in Jewish practice (G. Leonardi, *Il metodo educativo della comunità ebraica e di Gesù* . . . : Historiam Perscrutari, 483-491), but its contents were Christian.

2. *At the roots of the catechumenate/discipleship* (*1st c.*)*: the earliest Christian preaching* (*ca. 30–70*). The NT does not offer a true and proper preparation for baptism and discipleship, but it does offer a content, a catechumenal process as lived truth; "the primitive Church admitted no one without preparation, without criteria, without assurances" (A. Laurentin - M. Dujarier, *Il catecumenato*, 68; C. Bissoli, *Tracce catechistiche negli scritti del NT*: Historiam Perscrutari, 467-481). Christianity was first presented on *Pentecost around the year 30 with the *kerygma or first apostolic (or Christian) preaching of *Peter (Acts 2:14-36). The initial kerygma is considered to have ended with the destruction of *Jerusalem (AD 70) and the distancing of Christianity from Judaism (G. Groppo, *Predicazione apostolica*: J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Cat.*, 507). The first official message or kerygma had as its object Christ, died, risen, ascended and approved by the Father (Acts 2:32-33), with the aim of provoking in the nonbeliever an overall faith in God, revealed in Christ, through the word of witnesses to the *resurrection. The kerygma was first directed to Jews, then to pagans (by *Paul) (Acts 14:15-17; 17:16-34): this was the first stage of *evangelization. This was followed by further, deeper instruction according to various didactic methods (instruction or catechesis, hortatory discourse, narration of OT salvation history and of the facts or sayings of Jesus) focused on the moral life in connection with OT salvation history read in a christological perspective (C.H. Dodd), with the aim of introducing to discipleship the *sequela Christi*. Moral aspects were related to their doctrinal foundations; in this way the trinitarian-christological *creeds came about, from the perspective of salvation history. Moral instruction from Jewish roots, organized around the schema of the two ways (*Didache* 1,1; 5,1; *Ep. of Barnabas*, 18-20), later interacted with ethical teachings coming from *Hellenized Judaism, such as the so-called household codes (Eph 5:22–6:9; Col 3:18–4:1), and were completed by the sayings (*logia*) of Jesus. These approaches were developed in the 2nd c., an example of which may be *Irenaeus of Lyons's *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (O. Pasquato, *Ireneo*: J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Cat.*, 360-361; A. Orbe, *Il catecumeno ideale secondo Ireneo*, in S. Felici [ed.], *Cristologia e catechesi patristica* 2, Rome 1981, 15-24). After AD 70 a period of transition began which lasted until the mid-2nd c., which saw the first attempts at enculturation of the faith in a Hellenistic milieu, with the 2nd-c. *Apologies* and the edifying literature of the *apocrypha. Here we encounter criteria for admission to baptism: the church demanded specific qualities, making use of periods of verification which included listening to the judgment of the community. Thus, e.g., the choice of the first deacons (Acts 6:2-6), that of *Timothy as a preacher (Acts 16:2-3), of the bishop (1 Tim 3:2-7), the deacon (1 Tim 3:8-10; *see* *diakonia - diaconate), *widows (1 Tim 5:9-11). Admission to baptism, therefore, required not only faith in God the creator (as for the pagans) or in the God of the OT (as for the Jews), but also in the God of Jesus Christ (1 Th 1:9-10). The account of the baptism of the Roman centurion gives us a glimpse of

the steps to baptism already at the end of the 1st c. (Acts 10:1–11:18): questiniong by the person in charge (Peter) (Acts 10:21), followed by the candidate's response (Acts 10:22), who asks to be admitted to catechesis (Acts 10:33). The request rests on assurances from sponsors (Acts 10:4, 22): only then does catechesis take place (Acts 10:34-43), focused on Christ, the one Lord (Acts 10:36-42). The aim of catechesis is to arouse an unconditional faith in Christ, in view of baptism (Acts 10:43). The authenticity of faith is attested by God, who sends the Spirit (Acts 10:44). Only then does Peter baptize Cornelius and the brothers: "And he ordered that they be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 10:48; V. Saxer, *Les rites*, 27-33).

III. Catechumenate/discipleship is situated in the heart of the church's pastoral efforts: 2nd-3rd c. (before 313). *Preamble.* It should be noted that the practices described were, not rarely, more ancient than the evidence we have of them. In any case, we note that admission to *baptism was more cautious than in the NT period. In fact, in this period, as an antidote to the moral decadence of the Christian communities and to cases of *apostasy in the period of *persecution, there was the introduction of a twofold examination, the first in the initial phase of orientation toward Christianity, the second at the act of enrollment for baptism. The phase of preparation for baptism was designed to last 2-3 years. The rejection of other religions by candidates for baptism was more clearly required, along with a personal renunciation (*apotaxis, abrenuntiatio*) of Satan. Since *pagan cults and rites were rejected en bloc, it is not possible to hypothesize the assumption by Christianity of extraneous religious rites during that period: words and figures borrowed from the pagan mysteries expressed different spiritual realities for Christians (R. Turcan, RAC 18, 142). The Christians explain possible similarities with foreign rites that entered into Christian worship as the inheritance of a common culture, or even as the work of *demons, though the greater antiquity of the Christian rites was asserted (Justin, *1 Apol.* 62,1; Tert., *Bapt.* 5,3; cf. M. Metzger, RAC 20, 509-510).

1. 2nd c.: at the origins of the catechumenate/discipleship: the first witnesses (*2nd half of 2nd c.*). This was the first, and most authentic and serious, phase of catechumenate/discipleship. It is documentable from the 2nd half of the 2nd c., at the level of pastoral practice more than that of institutions, by the work of individual Christians engaged in an evangelization "of the surrounding area," "door-to-door." In the last decades of the 2nd c. we see a serious commitment on the part of the Christian communities to recruit candidates for baptism: the idea of training developed, combined with sponsors for those who intended to enroll in the catechumenate/discipleship to receive the three sacraments of Christian initiation: thus arose the tradition of godparents (M. Dujarier, *Le parrainage*, 37-39). At *Rome, ca. 140, a catechumenal way is documentable in the *Shepherd* of *Hermas, with indications of specific baptismal requirements: some candidates, represented by the rocky ground of the parable, hearers of the word of God and desirous of being baptized, as soon as they reflect on the holiness baptism requires, return to their evil passions (*Vision* III, 7,3). *Justin, a layman (ca. 100–ca. 165), in his *1 Apologia* alludes to an instruction prior to baptism: "Those who are convinced and believe in the truth of the teachings expounded by us, and give promise of being able to live according to these maxims, are taught to pray, and to ask God with fasting for the remission of sins; and we too pray and fast with them" (61,2). The 1st-c. criteria for admission to baptism persist: repentance, since baptism is a "washing for the remission of sins" (66,1), faith in the church, a transformed life (66,1). The candidates are accompanied by the community, which prays and fasts with them (61,2); in this way they are introduced to communitarian worship, up to the rite of baptism and participation in the Eucharist (65-66). (For Irenaeus, see O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 430-432; Id., *Ireneo*, *Diz. di Cat.*, 360-361.) At *Alexandria in *Egypt ca. 190–200, *Clement of Alexandria gives us glimpses of a preparatory period of at least three years from enrollment as catechumens (*Strom.* II, 96,1-2; cf. VI, 130,1: *neokatēchētos*; *Paed.* 1, 36, 2: *ho neosti katēchoumenos*). Preparation of the hearers of the word contributes to the enculturation of the faith: *Clement's Greco-Hellenistic culture must serve the instruction of catechumens (*Strom.* VI, 19,4). Prebaptismal catechesis is likened to milk, as the first nourishment of the spirit; postbaptismal contemplation to more solid food (*Strom.* V, 10,66). For him, catechumens (who are carnal) have the will to live as Christians, whereas the faithful (spiritual) have received the capacity to do so through the sacrament (*Strom.* II, 26,4-5). In both East and West, the requirement arose of a preparation and of a serious discernment of a *conversion that would transform one's life (Origen, *In Lc. hom.* 21), so as to be able "to gain access to faith, to enter into faith and to seal faith" (*accedere, ingredi, obsignare*) (Tertullian, *De idol.* 9,11; 24,3).

2. The golden age of the catechumenate/discipleship (3rd c.). In the West, a transition from private forms of preparation to a preparation in the midst of the church

took place to such an extent that the catechumenate/discipleship was already structured at the beginning of the 3rd c., as attested at Rome ca. 215 by *Hippolytus's *Traditio apostolica* (B. Botte, *La tradition apostolique de S. Hippolyte*, 5th ed. [LQF 39, 1989]; SC 11 bis; C. Scholten, v. *Hippolytus II [v. Rom]*: RAC 15, 524-526; Ch. Markschies, *Wer schreibt die sog. "Traditio Apostolica"?*, in W. Kinzig - Ch. Markschies - M. Vincent, *Tauffragen u. Bekenntnis* [1999] 1-74 with bibl.). There is a conviction that conferral of the sacrament required adequate dispositions and sure guarantees; particularly required was a faith capable of transforming life so as to become true disciples of Christ. Here the catechumenate/discipleship is understood as one of the main and most serious duties of the church.

Following are the various stages of the catechumenate/discipleship in the *Traditio apostolica*. *Entrance* involves a first examination before those responsible, in which the godparents, responding to a threefold series of questions, must demonstrate the fitness of the postulants. The first series pertains to the motives of the conversion; the second to state of life, i.e., to family situation (married or no) and social condition (slave or free) (*Tr. apost*. 15); the third to trades or professions, which must be abandoned if they are incompatible with the Christian mysteries and which are at the root of the three capital sins (idolatry, homicide, impurity—this was the case, e.g., of one who ran a brothel, of sculptors or painters of idols, actors, prostitutes and homosexuals (16). *The catechumenal period* lasted three years, but less for the diligent (*spoudaioi*). In it the catechumens (*katēchoumenoi*) listened to catechesis (we have no indication of the program) given by *didascalia* (presbyters or laypersons) (19: *sive clericus est qui dat doctrinam, sive laicus*) with a mandate from the community or the bishop. The teachers were entrusted with the task of preparing and instructing the catechumens, beginning with prayer and the imposition of hands. They were also the guarantors of the moral conduct and dignity of the catechumens (18-20). It seems that the catechesis of these latter, also called *credentes,* took place during the liturgy of the word (*audire evangelium; audire verbum:* 20) with the faithful in the morning before work (41), in a reserved place (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 440); the preparation was called "hearing of the Word" (*Tr. apost*., 15.17.20; Botte: this is the most important purpose). If there was a eucharistic celebration, they took part in the first part, receiving only a bread of exorcism, *eulogia* (26); the "prayer of the believers" and the kiss of peace were prohibited them (18.27). An appropriate amount of time was dedicated to initiation to prayer. The meetings closed with laying on of hands by the teacher (18-19) and with special prayers. *Election* was preceded by a second examination, at the beginning of *Lent, regarding their moral conduct (including assistance to the poor and care for the sick) during the catechumenal period, assessed by the didascalia and the godparents. The elect were chosen for a second type of catechesis, the hearing of the gospel, accompanied daily by laying on of hands for exorcism (20). In this way they were introduced into the immediate preparation for baptism, with admittance to the baptismal liturgy (20). *The baptismal period* seems to have coincided with the week prior to *Easter: in a place separate from the catechumens, the elect receive a daily laying on of hands and an exorcism; on Thursday they bathe; on Friday and Saturday they *fast. They are called by the bishop, who exorcises them, breathes on their face, signs them with the *cross on the forehead, ears and nostrils (20). On Saturday night they keep vigil with Bible readings and catechesis. At the cockcrow, the rite proceeds with the renunciation of Satan (*diabolus, pompa, angeli eius*) (*apotaxis*), anointing with *oil for exorcism (21), threefold question of faith (parents respond for infants), and the administration of baptism by triple immersion (J. Jüthner, s.v. *Bad*: RAC 1, 1140-1141). The bishop administers confirmation, followed by the entrance of the neophytes into the waiting assembly of the faithful, for common participation in the Eucharist (V. Saxer, *op. cit*., 109-119: *Tr. Ap*.) (for the councils, see RAC 20, 517).

At *Carthage, ca. 200, *Tertullian's *De poenitentia* and *De baptismo* (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 438) present the order of baptism (E. Dekkers, *T. en de geschiedenis der Liturgie*, Brussels 1947, 164-173; A. Holbaj, *Catechesi ai catecumeni negli scritti di T.*, Diss., Rome 1984; Ch. Munier [ed.], *Tertullien. La pénitence* [SC 316 (1984) 37-51]: penitence and catechumenate). Here we seem to find echoes of the Roman catechumenate. The Christian community is composed of the bishop, presbyters, deacons, lectors, widows and virgins; the laity is composed of the *fideles* (baptized) and the *audientes* (catechumens), who, at the time of Tertullian and of Cyprian, did not constitute a distinct group. The community was divided into two categories: the *ordo ecclesiae* (ecclesiastical *ordines*) and the laity, simple believers (*plebs*). The doctrinal and disciplinary treatise *De baptismo* provides information on Christian initiation and the baptismal liturgy at the beginning of the 3rd c. Liturgical practice was the theological place of doctrinal reflection. The church of Carthage, faced with many converts, opened the catechumenate/discipleship or "novitiate" (*tirocinia adultorum*)

(Tertullian, *De paen.* 6,17). Access to the Christian mysteries required a careful preparation at least comparable to that of initiation to the demonic cults. A perfect faith is required for baptism (ibid.). "We are not immersed in the water to put an end to our sins, but since we have put an end to them, we are already washed morally" (ibid.). Demanding from the outset, the catechumenate/discipleship required a prior examination, attested by *Hippolytus (*Tr. Ap.* 16), to know the real intentions of postulants, *novicioli* or beginners. A rapid instruction on the great Christian truths and on basic moral requirements followed. Only then did the postulant become a *catechumenus* (catechumen), taken from the Greek (*De praescr.* 41; *De cor.* 2,1), or *auditor* and *audiens* (*De poen.* 6,14-15. 17.20; 7,1). For catechesis, there was the Christian *doctor* ('teacher')(*De praescr.* 3,5; 14,2); since not all *doctores* ('teachers') were presbyters (G. Schöllgen, *Ecclesia sordida*?: JbAC ErgBd. 12 [1984] 281), instruction must have also taken place outside of the liturgy. The catechumenate/discipleship took place for the most part on the margins of the community's worship: initiation into the mysteries of Scripture and systematic catechesis on the Christian truths, documented for us by the **regulae fidei* present in Tertullian, criteria of *orthodoxy and symbol of ecclesiastical communion, aimed at making explicit the concise articles of the faith, wrongly interpreted by *heretics. There is no information on the dismissal of the catechumens, but it is supposed to have taken place after the homily (Ch. Salzmann). The number of catecheses depended on multiple factors (*Bapt.* 18), but we do not know their frequency or length. Catechumens had to recite prayers continually during Lent and confess their sins (*Bapt.* 20,1). Immediately before baptism catechumens were called *ingressuri baptismum* (ibid.); *inituri aquam* (*De cor.* 3,2); *ante sunt perfecti cathecumeni quam edocti* (*De praescr.* 41,4), and indeed they could then already be called *christiani* (*Pass. Perp.* 3,2 [SC 417, 106-108]). Regarding admission to baptism, Tertullian admonishes leaders, with Mt 7:6 (H.-J. Loth, v. *Hund*: RAC 16, 810-812) and 1 Tim 5:22, not to confer it prematurely (*Bapt.* 18, 1-6). For children, *parvuli,* celibates and widows of uncertain future, it is more useful (*utilior*) to confer it (*Bapt.*18, 1-6); also important is the baptism of blood (*Bapt.*, 16,1-2) and of necessity (*Bapt.*18,14; *Pass. Perp.* 3,5) (F.J. Dölger). The date of baptism is Easter, and later Pentecost, though any time is appropriate, because all time belongs to the Lord (*Bapt.* 19). The *apotaxis* took place *aliquanto prius* before the bishop: renunciation of the pomps of the devil and his angels (pagan ceremonies, political dignities, applause of the masses, perjury, political fame, linked with idolatry) (*De cor.* 13,7; 3,3; *De spect.* 4,1.13; cf. J.H. Waszink, *Pompa diaboli*, in Id., *Opuscula selecta*, Leiden 1979, 288-316). After Easter baptism, to which Tertullian makes the first clear reference (*Bapt.* 19), the neophytes listen to a week of mystagogical catecheses, of which *De baptismo* provides a splendid example.

In the East (*Egypt and *Palestine), *Origen (ca. 240–250) says of himself that initially he was a daily catechist (Eus. *HE* 6,3,1). He distinguishes between entrance to the catechumenate/discipleship and the catechumenal stages. For beginners admitted to catechesis, *entrance to the catechumenate/discipleship* seems to have included the examination, as in Hippolytus: "At the beginning, when you wanted to be catechized, it was right to say to you: 'If you would like to serve the Lord, choose today whom you will serve.' And the catechist *said to you*: 'As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord!' [Josh 24:15]. And about your attitude toward God, you responded in turn to your catechists: 'We will serve the Lord our God and obey his voice'" (*Exhort. ad mart.* 17). The commitment assumed at the beginning of the catechumenate/discipleship was thus patterned on the dialogue of Joshua with the Hebrews at the time of the covenant of Shechem (Josh 24:14, 24), though Origen does not report the precise form of the rite. He confirms the examination: "The Christians, to the extent possible, begin by testing the souls of those who want to listen to them, and by forming them in private" (*Contra Celsum* 3, 51).

Regarding *the catechumenal stages,* Origen, who sees in the Israelites' crossing of the desert a figure of the life of the Christian, also sees symbolized there the catechumenal way from conversion to baptism, likened to the departure from Egypt: "When you abandon the darkness of idolatry, because you aspire to arrive at a knowledge of the divine law, you begin to leave Egypt." Entrance to the catechumenate/discipleship is seen in the crossing of the Red Sea: "When you are joined to the crowd of catechumens and have begun to observe the church's commandments, you have crossed the Red Sea." Finally, baptism is symbolized by the crossing of the Jordan to enter the Promised Land, which is the kingdom of God: "But when you arrive at the spiritual spring of baptism, . . . then, having crossed the Jordan, . . . you will enter into the Promised Land, that land where Jesus, after Moses, accepts you and becomes your guide in the new life" (*In Jesu Nave, hom.* 4,1).

From his homilies we can gather other texts on the catechumenate/discipleship, articulated in three phases. In the first phase, the catechumen is called to

abandon pagan life and other gods to love only our God (*In Ex. hom.* 8,4): the catechumen is faced with a very specific demand (ibid.). He is accompanied by believers, perhaps the godparents (M. Dujarier, *Le parrainage*, 289-290). He is called to fear of God; only later is he admitted to community meetings, like athletes enrolled for a race (*In Jer. hom.* 3,3). It seems that these initial instructions are the daily teachings of the community, of the kind held before work in the morning, without the Eucharist, at Caesarea (*In Gen. hom.* 10,3 [SC 7 bis, 262-264]; *In Jos. hom.* 4,1 [SC 71, 148]; P. Nautin, *Origène*, Paris 1977, 391). To enter the catechumenate/discipleship and obey the ecclesiastical precepts is to cross the Red Sea and enter the desert, to listen to God's law every day (*In Jesu Nave, hom.* 4,1). He also explains the **regula fidei* (*Contra Celsum* 1,7), following a practice different from that at *Rome, since he speaks frequently to the catechumens (*In Luc. hom.* 7). The daily instruction leads catechumens to a decision for a perfect life, a true discipleship (*In Jer. hom.* 4,3): baptism will thus be fruitful. In the second phase, Origen notes a progress in the catechumens, while the guarantors/sponsors of the baptism (Origen mentions relatives, neighbors or friends, who test those who will later enter; godparents derived from this practice [M. Dujarier, *Parrainage*, 218-236]) offer their guarantees/assurances (*C. Cels.* 3,51). In the third phase, the presbyter asks the spiritual fruits of penitence of those who want to receive baptism: charity, joy, peace, patience, goodness etc. (*In Lc. hom.* 22). For the first time, moral catechesis (*nomos*) is offered, in which context Origen also makes pastoral remarks, e.g., regarding the nonprogress of catechumens (*In Ez. hom.* 6,7), the return of many to sin after baptism: this is during the long period of peace after the persecution of *Severus. He longs for the authenticity of faith typical of the 2nd c.: "At that time the faithful were few, but truly faithful" (*In Jer. hom.* 4,3; M. Dujarier, *Breve storia*, 40). The soteriological priority, however, is on dogmatic catechesis (*Logos*), including the rejection of idols (*In Ex. hom.* 8,4 [GCS Orig. 6, 223, 14-16]), adherence to God the creator (perhaps the *apotaxis* follows), faith in the Messiah. There are indications of a longer preparation (*In Jer. hom.* 5,13 [SC 232, 310-311]; *In Joh. comm.* 6, 144 [SC 157, 144-145]). Origen makes a comparison to farmers, who await the fruits of the earth for three years (*In Jer. hom.* 5,13 [SC 232, 310-312]; *In Lc. hom.* 22,8 [SC 87, 306]). Thus the hearers (*hoi akroatai*) must submit to a three-year test of the stability of their conversion if they want to be accepted for the final preparation for baptism. They must root out habitual vices and restrain barbarian practices to receive the *Holy Spirit (*In Lev. hom.* 6,2 [SC 286, 272-278]; *venite catechumeni, agite poenitentiam*: *In Lc. hom.* 21,4 [SC 87, 295]). Thus a pedagogy (*eisagōgē*) for a deeper understanding of the kerygma itself is enacted, followed by frequent instruction (introduction to the Bible, to the *regula fidei*, i.e., creation, divine mysteries, *Christology, *anthropology) (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 434-436). In a second phase, after the regular commitment to the long instructions, the catechumen receives the "creed of purification" (*C. Cels.* 3,51), i.e., he must preserve the purity of that truth which will bring him to perfect purification through baptism, i.e., initiation into teaching on the *Trinity (*In Jer. hom.* 4,3). Origen relates Lenten preparation to abstention from sins, malice, luxuries, bad words and shameful thoughts (*In Lev. hom.* 10,2 [SC 287, 138]) (H.J. Auf der Maur - J. Waldram, *Illuminatio verbi divini-confessio fideigratia baptismi. Wort, Glaube u. Sakrament in Katechese u. Taufliturgie bei O.*, in Festschrift P. Smulders, Assen 1981, 41-95; V. Saxer, op. cit., 109-194; G. Cavallotto, *Catecumenato*, 57-69; M. Metzger, RAC 20, 511-512).

In summary, we note that the limited evidence of the 2nd-3rd c. present catechesis, from the late 2nd c., as essential, even if it is not yet clearly distinguished as catechesis aimed specifically at catechumens. The plan of the catechumenate/discipleship is clear: examination of candidates, apposite offices, exorcisms; but a certain autonomy of the individual churches led to a variety of rules, such as the rebaptism of *heretics and *apostates. The rigor of the catechumenate/discipleship did not prevent a vast apostasy during the persecution of *Decius.

IV. Later evolution and changes: a catechumenate/discipleship of recovery: 4th-5th c. *The new historical context and its impact on the catechumenate/discipleship.*

1. In general. With the "Constantinian turn" of the peace of the church (313), Christianity became first a sanctioned religion (already from 311 with *Galerius), then a privileged one with *Constantine and, finally, the religion of the state with *Theodosius I's edict *De fide catholica* (380). In a Christianized empire, in which it was easy, even for children, to become (registered) catechumens and faithful, the catechumenate/discipleship spread, but as a catechumenal *status* that often lasted until shortly before death. Not infrequently the catechumen wanted the title of Christian but not to become one: there were many catechumens, few converts. The reasons: the alliance between state and church led a catechumen to be considered (and called), for civil purposes,

a Christian (only a baptized person was a "faithful") (Aug., *Serm.* 47, 17; Ambr., *In Ps.* 118, 20, 48-49; Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 17, 35-36); the severity of the catechumenate/discipleship inspired fear and put it in crisis: so, "one desires not so much to become a Christian, as to pretend to be one" (Aug., *De cat. Rud.* V, 9); "it is not enough to be conceived, one must be born to reach eternal life" (Aug., *Quaest. ad Simplic.* 1,2,2). On the other hand, preparation for baptism became less demanding, as can be seen from the reminder of the Council of *Nicaea (325) that for "the catechumen himself there is need of time and of a longer trial after baptism" (*can.* 2 and 14). The catechumenal institution was profoundly transformed; a two-stage formative path replaced the earlier demanding formation. The first was a preparation of some years (not infrequently until death) of evangelization. This formation was catechetical, via the Sunday homily during the eucharistic celebration, from which catechumens were dismissed at the end of the liturgy of the Word. The phase of conversion and entry into the faith was clearly reduced over time for the catechumenate/discipleship. One who desired baptism gave his name to be enrolled by the bishop in the church's register (in the West, *nomendatio*; in the East, *onomatographia*): this corresponds to the 3rd-c. rite of admission. *Egeria (4th c.) notes at *Jerusalem an examination of candidates' moral conduct by the bishop, involving their neighbors (Eger., *Peregr.*, ch. 45). Those enrolled for baptism are called *illuminandi* in the East, *competentes* (i.e., those who petition together or proceed together) or *electi* in the West. The second step, more circumscribed and decisive, provided for a brief but intense period of formation, during Lent, of those enrolled for baptism. It included a prominent catechetical dimension, with apposite catecheses, complemented by the common Lenten homilies. The scripturally based instruction conveyed a moral-dogmatic catechesis, and not infrequently the explanation of the *Our Father/*Lord's Prayer*, as initiation to prayer (see S. Sabugal, *Il Padrenostro nella catechesi antica e moderna*, Rome [4]1994). The ascetical/penitential dimension was composed of *fasts, *vigils and *prayers, various abstinences, confession of sins, and charity toward the poor. Everything was aimed at the fight against the devil and the reform of habits (G. Cavallotto, *Catecumenato*, 275-277). A notable component of the liturgical dimension was the rite of exorcisms, for the most part daily, the battle against Satan, and the gifts of God. Exorcisms were sometimes dramatic and followed the daily Lenten instruction addressed to all the faithful (Aug., *Serm.* 216): the candidate, wearing only a gown, fasting, shivering from the night cold, unwashed, barefoot, on his knees, bows his head under the imprecations launched against the devil, and the exorcist breathes on his face (V. Saxer, op. cit., 99). Augustine reminds the neophytes of the scene: "You were as though ground up by the humiliation of the fast and by the sacrament of exorcism" (*Serm.* 227). For the West, *Niceta of Remesiana tells of a solemn exorcism, i.e., the *scrutinium,* the rite of *purification and examination, repeated three times at *Milan and at Rome on the Sundays of Lent (see V. Saxer, op. cit., 377). Toward the end of Lent, on different Sundays depending on the place, there was an explanation or *traditio* of the *creed by the bishop, recited then by memory in public by the candidate (*redditio*) (Eger., *Peregr.*, 46; Aug., *Conf.* VIII, 2,5). Likewise, in various churches there was a "handing over" and "return" of the *Our Father*. This ended the preparation phase of the catechumenate/discipleship: the candidates were now initiated into the mysteries.

During the Easter Vigil there was a celebration, usually presided over by the bishop, of baptism, confirmation and participation in the Eucharist. The prebaptismal rites came first: the *ephphatha*; the renunciation of Satan and adherence to Christ, with the double gesture of turning to the *East toward the *light, as adherence to the faith, and turning one's back on the West, the place of darkness (Theod. of Mops., *Cat.* 13, *intr.*; Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 19,9); the *anointing with perfumed or blessed oil over the whole body; the blessing of the *water for the baptism. Then came the rite of baptism by triple immersion, accompanied by the formula in the threefold rhythm of the baptizand's adherence of faith to each of the persons of the *Trinity. In the pool, the baptizand participated in the mystery of the death and resurrection of Christ: "The salutary water was for you both tomb and mother" (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat. mist.* II, 5). The postbaptismal rites followed, variable according to the different traditions (Eastern, *African, *Roman, *Ambrosian, *Gallican, *Spanish, etc.): the laying on of hands together with anointing with chrism; the rites of the washing of the feet; the white vestment (for the bath); the lighted candle; the readings or songs, spectacular so as to make one understand the invisible effects and hidden meaning of baptism and confirmation. The lighted candle held by the neophytes as they entered the eucharistic hall suggested *eschatology, i.e., the "luminous procession that will lead you to meet the Bridegroom" (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 45). With participation in the Eucharist the neophytes are fully inserted into the ecclesial community. Finally, the *mystagogical catechesis of Easter week intro-

duces them, passing from the rites to the mystery they contain, to an understanding of what they had seen during the Easter Vigil. On Sunday initially *in albis* the neophytes leave aside their white vestments and their reserved places in the church to join the other faithful. The path continues with the mystagogical catecheses for the neophytes for one or more weeks after Easter, aimed at explaining and commenting on the rites celebrated in the Easter Vigil, opening the eyes of faith to the mystery hidden (the *arcanum*) beneath the rites, experiencing faith and the encounter with the believing community (D. Borobio, *Catecumenato*, 354).

With these structural changes, lay ministries diminished; they no longer spoke of the *doctores audientium*, as in the 3rd c., but of the great catechist-bishops (see O. Pasquato, *I Padri educatori*, 74ff.), of the deacons and presbyters who cared for the catechumens—a clericalization of the ministries attached to the catechumenate/discipleship. Moreover, what we can observe in the 4th c. attests that the bishops reproposed the principles of the *tradition, involving the link between faith and sacrament and life: the sacrament only saves one who has a life-transforming faith: "Faith receives its perfection from baptism, but baptism is based on faith" (Basil, *On the Holy Spirit* 18,28). "Simon Magus also drew near the washing: he was bathed in it, but not enlightened. His body was immersed in the water, but he did not open his soul to the light of the Spirit" (Cyr. of Jer., *Protocat*. 2). Despite the efforts of pastors, the true catechumenate/discipleship no longer existed. This is shown by a comparison of the archetype of the *Trad. ap.* and its later reworkings (between the 4th and 5th c.) with their archetype, Book 8 of the **Apostolic Constitutions:* a gradual process of maturation of the initial decision of faith passed to a liturgical-pastoral institution, certainly useful, but of a clearly inferior quality (G. Groppo, *Catecumenato*, 136). However, if now the anxiety to gain neophytes seemed to predominate among pastors, this in turn provided a strong encouragement to baptism (rather than delaying it) for those whom they had prepared with an in-depth catechesis during the brief but intense Lenten period. The framework in which everything took place was faithfulness to the principle of two stages, one of catechumens, the other of *illuminandi* or *competentes*. The bishops, in any case, relied on an intensive prebaptismal preparation: a Lenten period or a mini-catechumenate. This was an attempt at a recovery of the formation process, which in the past was completed over two or three years (see R. Cabiè, *L'iniziazione cristiana*, 27-120). But if the catechumenate/discipleship had declined, catechesis itself was in its golden age. At the end of the period, the decline of the catechumenate due to infant baptism was already in evidence. Even during this period, due to the relative autonomy of the individual churches, the evidence of the catechumenate of one church is not valid for others; its history is that of the individual ecclesiastical provinces. Moreover, it remains uncertain whether the particular rituals actually existed or if they were simple interpretations of biblical texts (M. Metzger: RAC 20, 518).

2. *In detail.* In the East, in the area of Jerusalem, the main sources are the prebaptismal catecheses of Bishop *Cyril (mid-4th c.) and the *Peregrinatio* of Egeria (381–384; O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 442-445; M.E. Johnson, *Reconciling Cyril and Egeria on the Catechetical Process in 4th Cent. Jerusalem*: P.F. Bradshaw [ed.], *Essays in Early Eastern Initiation* = Grove Litug. Stud. 56, Bramcote 1988, 18-30, with bibl.; C. García del Valle, *Jerusalén. La liturgia de la iglesia Madre*, Barcelona 2001, 162-196 with bibl.). The catechumenate phase is the first phase. The catechumens participate in community liturgical meetings and receive a blessing before their dismissal (Eger., *Peregr*. 24,2.6-7). They are excluded (for the *disciplina arcani*: O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 459; *Arcanum, Discipline of) from the celebration of baptism and the Eucharist (Eger., *Peregr*. 25,2; 46,6; 47,2), but observe the periods of fasting (Cyr., *Catech*. 4,27). Egeria does not speak of special catecheses for them; they hear the homilies addressed to baptized and nonbaptized (Sunday, fast days, Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent), ordinarily preached by the bishop and by a number of priests (Eger., *Peregr*. 25,1; 26; 27,6). The baptizand phase—the members are called *baptizandi*, *phōtizomenoi*, *competentes*: "once you were a catechumen" (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 1,4)—is the second phase, of 40 days (Cyr. of Jer., *Protoch*. 4). At the vigil of the beginning of Lent, a presbyter notes the names of those requesting baptism; the following Sunday before the bishop, presbyterate and other clergy, each (with sponsor, *pater* or *mater,* according to sex) undergoes the examination of their state of life and motives; if found without reproach, the bishop enrolls the catechumen's name (*onomatographia*); otherwise he is exhorted to return when he has reformed (Eger., *Peregr*. 45,1-4). The preparation that follows is presented as purification, penitence (fasts, works of charity), confession of sins and *illumination (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech*. 2, passim). The prebaptismal catecheses (*cathecisis*, Eger., *Peregr.* 46,2) take place during the first seven weeks of Lent; the eighth and final week (*septimana paschalis/maior*) is linked with Holy Week and Easter (Eger., *Peregr.*

27,1). During the exorcisms the baptizands' faces are veiled (for recollection: Cyr. of Jer., *Protoch.* 9). During the daily catechesis (of three hours) they sit in a semicircle around the moveable cathedra of the bishop in the nave of the church, which is closed, with the sponsors and other baptized present (Eger., *Peregr.* 46). The bishop explains the Scriptures for 40 days, starting from Genesis, first with literal *exegesis, then spiritual (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 443); he also speaks of the resurrection (Eger., *Peregr.* 46,2). In the sixth week, when the creed is to be explained (*primum carnaliter et sic spiritualiter*: ibid., 46,3), the bishop does so privately (*traditio simboli: accipient simbolum*; cf. Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 5,12). At the end of the seventh week the creed is "recited" from memory (*redditio symboli*) by the candidates and godparents before the bishop's throne and his presbyterate (ibid., 46,5). The bishop concludes with an exhortation on baptism and to participation in the mystagogical catecheses of Easter week, which reveal its secret (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 18,33). At the beginning of the Easter Vigil, in the atrium of the baptistery, baptizands renounce Satan and express adherence to Christ, turning to the West and to the East (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech. myst.* 1,2-11; 3,10). The neophytes are also initiated into the Lord's Prayer (ibid., 5,11-18) (cf. M. Metzger: RAC 20, 520-523; F. Bergamelli, *Cirillo di G.*: J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Cat.*, 155-156).

Continuing in the East, in the area of *Antioch, our sources are the **Apostolic Constitutions* (c. 380) (SC 320, 329: M. Metzger [1986] 89-97: Christian initiation; 336), the *Catecheses* of *John Chrysostom, presbyter (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 447-449), and of *Theodore of Mopsuestia (RAC 20, 449-451; F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia u. Konstantinopel gegen Ende des 4. Jh.*: OCA 187, Rome 1970; TH.M. Finn, *Liturgy*, 25-85; P.W. Harkins, *Pre-baptismal Rites in Chrysostom's Baptismal Catecheses*: SP 8: TU 93 [1966] 219-238; R. Kaczynski, *Joh. Crysostomus. Catecheses baptismales* 1: FCh 6, 1 [1992] 73-82: Christian initiation in Antioch; A. Cañizares Llovera, *El catecumenado según Teodoro de Mops.*: Estudios [= dei padri mercedari] 32 [1976] 147-193).

In the catechumenate phase, baptism is conferred on adults and minors (Chrys., *Catech.* III, 3,6 [SC 50 bis, 154]); deathbed baptism is sarcastically criticized (clinical baptism: Chrys., *Catech.* I 1,3-4 [SC 366, 118-122]) also because it offers *pagans grounds for objection against Christians (Chrys., *In Act. hom.* 1,7 [PG 60, 23-24]); the children of Christians, presented immediately to the presbyters and signed with the sign of the cross, were considered catechumens (Chrys., *In 1Cor. hom.* 12,7 [PG 61, 106]). The catechumens, like foreigners, were separated from the faithful (*pistoi:* "baptized"), but also called "our new brothers" (Chrys., *Catech.* I, 1,1 [SC 366, 112]). Recently converted candidates were called *amyētoi* (Chrys, *Catech.* I, 2,8 [194]); those near baptism *phōtizomenoi*. They cannot turn to God as his children (Chrys., *In Mt. hom.* 19 [PG 57, 280]). In church they occupy a place far from the altar (Chrys. *In 2 Cor. hom.* 2,5 [PG 61, 399]). Before the *oratio fidelium* and the Eucharist, they are dismissed with a special blessing (Chrys., *In Mt. hom.* 4,7.71,4 [PG 48, 666]; F. van de Paverd, op. cit., 139-164; *Apos. cons.* 8, 8,1-6). Instruction on the faith to the uninitiated (*amyētoi*) comes for the most part from frequent homilies in Lent during the community liturgical celebration, but also outside of the liturgy by godparents, as "spiritual parents" to their "spiritual children" (Chrys., *Catech.* III 2,15-16 [SC 50 bis, 141-142]; Theod. of Mops., *Hom.* 12, 14-16]). Catechesis normally lasted three years but could be less in cases of exemplary conduct (*Apos. Cons.* 8, 32, 16). Guides of the new candidates are at first deacons, then presbyters and the bishop (*Apos. Cons.* 8,32). The criteria of examination for entrance into the catechumenate/discipleship are mostly those of the *Tr. Apost.,* though with modifications (see M. Metzger: RAC 20, 524-525).

Next we come to the baptizand phase. At the beginning of Lent the catechumens (including soldiers) are enrolled for baptism individually (Theod. of Mops., *Hom.* 12, 14) in the church's book (which corresponds to that of heaven), after examination of the candidate and the confirmation by the sponsor. The 30-day period of preparation leading up to baptism is described like that of a gymnasium, a battle against immoral habits such as obscene speech, attachment to luxury, entertainments (Chrys., *Catech.* I, 1,16-22 [SC 366, 144-160]; O. Pasquato, *Gli spettacoli*, 211-249: entertainments and moral life); a daily period of instruction in the morning (Chrys., *Catech.* III, 2,12 [139-140]); of exorcisms (barefoot, without tunic, listening to terrifying words, asking for liberation from evil) (Chrys., *Catech.* I, 1,7; 2,6 [SC 366, 124.188-190]); learning of the creed (Theod. of Mops., *Hom.* 12,25); rite of the *apotaxis,* renunciation of Satan and his pomps, and of the *syntaxis,* adherence to Christ, by which each baptizand concludes a pact (*synthēkē*) with Christ (registered in heaven) at the ninth hour on Good Friday; prayer with raised hands; and recitation of the creed (*redditio symboli*) (Chrys., *Catech.* I, 3,4-6 [SC 366, 226-234]). Immediately follows the anointing on the forehead by the bishop with the sign of the cross, with perfumed oil (*myron*), the mark of a soldier of Christ and a spousal sign, protection against Satan

(Chrys., *Catech.* I, 3,7 [SC 366, 234]; RAC 20, 524) (see M. Metzger: RAC 20, 523-528; V. Saxer, op. cit., 241-296; G. Cavallotto, *Catecumenato*, 115-140; O. Pasquato, *Crisostomo Giovanni*: J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Cat.*, 185-186; *Teodoro di Mopsuestia*, ibid., 629-631). For *Cappadocia and *Constantinople; *Syria (*Aphraates, *Ephrem, *Narsai); and *Alexandria and Egypt, see H. Brakmann: RAC 20, 528-536.

Moving to the West, in the area of *Milan our sources are *Ambrose's *De Abraham I* (CSEL 32/1 [1897] 499-564), *Explanatio symboli* (CSEL 73 [1955] 1-12), *De sacramentis* (CSEL 73, 13-85), *De mysteriis* (CSEL 73, 87-116; cf. O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 457-462) and texts from his other writings. In the catechumenate phase, instruction is basically the community liturgical instruction of the faithful, except for an introductory catechesis and that leading up to baptism. Documented also in the West is the dismissal of catechumens before the prayers of the faithful and the eucharistic liturgy (Ambr. *Ep.* 76, 4 [CSEL 82,3,109]). Ambrose's preaching is mainly moral (F. Bergamelli, *Ambrogio di Milano*: J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Cat.*, 29-30). Here also, as in the East, many catechumens deferred baptism for fear, in the case of a grave sin, of incurring the severe penalties of penitential discipline. Ambrose invites reception of baptism beginning on Epiphany Sunday (*nomen [suum] dare*: *Sacr.* 3,2,12; Aug., *Conf.* 9,6,14: *Augustine with his son *Adeodatus and friend *Alypius; W. Harmless, *Augustine and the Catechumenate in Milan*, Collegeville, MN 1995, 79-96; cf. M. Metzger: RAC 20, 537). Enrollment for baptism corresponds to Jesus' miracle of the healing of the man born blind (Jn 9:6-7): it is an invitation to do *penance for one's sins (*Sacr.* 3,12).

Ambrose, like Chrysostom, presents the baptizand (*competentes, electi*) phase as an athletic contest (*De Hel.* 21,79 [CSEL 32, 2, 460]): the athlete (training, anointing with oil, suitable food, keeping chastity) is the model for the *competente*. The foundation and aim of catechesis is: "Every day we treated the issue of morality when we read the history of the patriarchs and the maxims of Proverbs so that, formed and instructed by them, you would become accustomed to enter the way of the Fathers and follow the path in obedience to the divine precepts so that, renewed through baptism, you would lead the kind of life that befits those who have been purified" (*Myst.* I,19). Traces of these biblical readings are in the early medieval liturgical books of the *Ambrosian rite (Milanese) (J. Claire, *Le rituel quadragésimal des catéchumènes à Milan*, in *Rituels*, festschr. P. Gy, Paris 1990, 131-151). Ambrose speaks of scrutinies (*scrutamina*) regarding bodily impurity, related to exorcism in view of the *purification of body and soul (*Symb.* 1 [SC 25 bis, 46]). On Palm Sunday in the *basilica baptisterii,* the *traditio symboli* took place along with the catechesis of the profession of faith (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 458-459); Ambrose does not mention the *redditio symboli*; the *traditio e redditio* of the *Lord's Prayer were not practiced. On the day of baptism he recalls the *abrenuntiatio,* preceded by the rite of the *ephphatha* (*Sacr.* 1,2), to open the ears (to hear the question) and the mouth (for the response).

Moving to Rome and the surrounding area, *Marius Victorinus's statement about his memorizing the creed according to Roman usage and reciting it from a raised place before the whole community remains isolated (Aug., *Conf.* 8,2,5; S. Poque, *Au sujet d'une singularité romaine de la "redditio symboli"*: Aug 25 [1985] 133,135-136). We have more information from papal documents on the celebration of baptism at the time of Easter and Pentecost, according to Roman custom (40 days after enrollment), of preparation for baptism with exorcisms, prayers, fasts (Siricius [384-398], *Ep. ad Imerium episc. Tarraconensem* [385]; prebaptismal exorcisms and anointings, three *scrutinia* (Siricius [?], *Ep.* 10,2,10-11); basic elements in Leo I, *Ep.* 16 (to the bishops of Sicily) (PL 54, 702). At Rome in the *Tituli,* the most original and ancient churches of Rome, the presbyters are the ministers of baptism and of its preparation but are limited to the urban zone (*Lib. Pont.* [Duchesne] I, 74, 164: life of Marcellus [308-309] and of Simplicius [468-483]; see M. Metzger, *Évolution de la liturgie à Rome autour des 5^e^ et 6^e^ s.*, in *Liturgiereformen*, Festschr. A.A. Häussling 1= LQF 88, 1 [2002] 200-202, cit. by Id., RAC 20, 540).

For *Africa our main sources are Augustine and *Quodvultdeus (bishop of *Carthage, 437–439; for Augustine: O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 467-469 [bibl.]; for Quodvultdeus: H. Brakmann, RAC 20, 472-473 [bibl.]; W. Rötzer, *Des hl. Augustinus Schriften als liturgiegeschichtliche Quelle* (1930); V. Saxer, op. cit., 382-389; W. Harmless, *Augustine and the Catechumenate*, 107-299; cf. *Africa II* (*literaturgeschichtlich*), *C. Christlich*: RAC, Suppl. - Band I [2001]: *A. e l'Africa*, 188-196 (154-203: from Tertullian to Quodvultdeus).

First is the catechumenate (*audientes*) phase. In *De cat. rud.* the recipients are *rudes,* newly arrived (*accedentes*), especially pagans, including some highly educated, others (about half) *illiterati,* who after the usual examination of motives (*De cat. rud.* 9-10) and an introductory instruction by means of suitable rites (*exsufflatio, signatio, donatio salis*: *De cat. rud.* 13, 50) are accepted into the catechumenal

way if after questioning they respond that they believe and want to conform their life to the Christian faith (*De cat. rud.* 26,50; V. Saxer, *Les rites*, 382-384). Augustine himself was accepted after his birth as a catechumen with the sign of the cross and with *salt (*Conf.* 1,11,17), as was the practice. His mother *Monica, the daughter of Christian parents who herself was baptized late, deferred his baptism, even after his serious illness as a youth (ibid.). Instruction of the *audientes* came from biblical readings and from the homily during the liturgical celebration, in which they took part until their dismissal, before the beginning of the eucharistic liturgy (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 469; Aug. *Serm.* 359B [Dolbeau 2], 6: REAug 38 [1992] 66). In Augustine catechumens were also called "Christians" (*Serm.* 294, 13 [PL 38, 1343]), nearer now to the faithful (baptized), since they were consecrated with the sign of Christ and prayer with lifted hands, but they were still slaves, not sons (*In Joh. tract.* 11,3-4 [CCL 36, 111-112]; É. Lamirande, *La signification de "christianus" dans la théologie de s. A. et la tradition ancienne*: REAug 9 [1963] 228-233; Id., *"Fidelis" et l'ecclésiologie de s. A.*: Aug 41 [2001] 169-200). Augustine, who recalls the "discipline of the arcanum," refers it primarily to baptism and to the Eucharist (*En. in Ps.* 103, 14) as a stimulus to receive these sacraments (see M. Metzger: RAC 20, 541).

Next is the baptizand phase. Augustine calls them *competentes,* i.e., "those who together seek and aspire to the same thing" (*Serm.* 216,1,1 [PL 38, 1077]). Like Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine (*Serm.* 205, 1 [PL 38, 1039]) and Quodvultdeus (*Symb.* 1,1,3 [CCL 60, 305]) liken this period, close to baptism and begun with the sign of the cross, to a gestation in the church's womb for a new sacramental birth. Among the baptizands were also children (Aug., *Contra Julianum op. imperf.* 4,7 [PL 45, 1343]), persons of the city (*Hippo and Carthage) and its surroundings; these latter had to go to the city and stay there for 40 days until Easter. Preachers exhorted the hesitant to have their names enrolled (Aug., *Ep.* 258,5 [CSEL 57, 609-610]). *Competentes* prepared with severity (*monastic influence?) for baptism, with a daily fast until nine (Aug., *Ep.* 54,9 [CSEL 34, 168]) and abstinence from wine, meat, baths and, for spouses, intercourse. Positively recommended were prayer, almsgiving, nocturnal vigils (*Serm.* 229A [Guelf. 7], 2 [PL Suppl. 2, 555]) and the hair shirt. On Holy Thursday they bathed, also for hygienic reasons (Aug., *Ep.* 54,10 [168]). On feast days the baptizands were the object of exorcisms and scrutinies aimed at freeing them from evil spirits (Aug., *Serm.* 216,6,6 [PL 38, 1080]). According to Quodvultdeus (*Symb.* 3,1,3 [CCL 60, 349]), the same rigor was employed at Carthage as at Hippo. Augustine also held a moral catechesis on the Christian's duties: "We scatter the seed of the word, you produce the fruits of faith" (*Serm.* 216,1), *Ut competentes competenter adolescite in Christo, ut in virum perfectum iuveniliter accrescatis* (*Serm.* 216, 7). He summarizes the catechesis to *competentes*, reminding them of his having explained to them the sacrament of the creed to be believed, that of prayer, and that of baptism; these all have been handed over to them (*Serm.* 28,3 [PL 38, 1102]). Two or three weeks before Easter he explains the creed (*pactum fidei: Serm.* 212,1; 214,12) (*traditio*), containing "*breviter* . . . all that you believe" (*Serm.* 212,1; *Symbolum est breviter complexa regula fidei* [*Serm.* 213,1]), which they must memorize within eight days in order to recite it (*redditio*); the same occurs for the "handing over" and "recitation" of the *oratio dominica* (O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 469-470). At the baptismal vigil each recites the creed before the whole community (*Serm.* 58,1,1 [PL 38, 393]). For Carthage, Quodvultdeus's *competentes*, perhaps in the Easter Vigil, are led before the whole community, barefoot and in penitential garments; a scrutiny (*examen*) is carried out, invoking Christ; in this way the devil, whom they had earlier spit upon, is cast out (*Symb.* 1,1,4-6 [CCL 60, 305]). Then comes the *aversio* of the devil (*apotaxis*) and the *conversio* (*syntaxis*) to God. Parents or others stood in for children and the dying (M. Metzger: RAC 20, 543; O. Pasquato, v. *Agostino*: J. Gevaert (ed.), *Diz. di Cat.*, 23-25). In summary, in this period the communal liturgies were of primary importance, to which was added particular instruction, including that by lay teachers: from this derived the primacy of listening for catechumens. Penitential rites (e.g., the taking off of the tunic of skins, which was then placed under one's feet) were added for *competentes* in Lent, and scrutinies against the power of *demons. Catechesis varied from place to place, although the creed was always explained in secret. The consignment of the Lord's Prayer could take place before baptism, or during the octave of Easter (V. Saxer, op. cit., 381-416; G. Cavallotto, *Catecumenato*, 164-194).

V. In the national churches and in the barbarian kingdoms: 6th-7th c. The 6th c. saw the increasing division between *Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, between the Eastern and Western churches, but it also saw the establishment of links between the institutions of the ancient church and those of the medieval church. With the barbarian kingdoms, the national churches were established, in which the catechumenate/discipleship gradually ceased as an in-

stitution, remaining almost solely as a collection of rites, which expanded and tended to be in close relation with the celebration itself of the sacraments of Christian initiation, conferred not only at Easter but also on other solemnities and on the feasts of the saints. The majority of those baptized were children, to whom the term *catechumenus* is often referred, leading to the new figure of the "godfather," who is no longer the guarantor of the baptizand's conversion but is his closest teacher. The godfather, therefore, had to know the *credo*, the *Pater* (*Lord's Prayer) and the Christian virtues (G. Groppo, *Patristica* (*catechesi*): J. Gevaert [ed.], *Diz. di Cat.*, 485). Instruction for catechumens was addressed to all the faithful in the community liturgy. The ancient prayers, including some passages of catechesis, were collected in sacramentaries or collections of blessings.

In Africa, at the end of the 6th c., ps.-Fulgentius, in *Serm.* 78 (PL 65, 950: *Ad competentes post traditum symbolum*), compares the battle against demons of the *initiatio Christiana* to the ten plagues which forced Pharaoh to free Israel from Egypt (Ex 12:29). The first nine pertain to the *competentes*: enrollment of the name, daily prayer, fasts, nocturnal vigils, fearful exorcisms, prayers of the presbyters, *traditio* of the creed, *orationis dominicae informatio,* and renunciation of Satan and of the fallen angels. The tenth pertains to the profession of faith. African preaching (ps.-Chrys., Lat. coll. Morin, *Serm.* 30 [PL Suppl. 4, 825-831]) documents the rare practice of the *traditio* of Ps 23 (22) to candidates for baptism (to be memorized), with a solemnity comparable to that of the *traditio* of the *symbolum* and *Pater* (H. Brakmann: RAC 20, 473).

In *Gaul, *Caesarius of Arles (503–542) attests to a brief preparation for baptism with enrollment of the name, raising of hands and anointings (*Serm.* 200, 2 Morin). More often this is directed to *competentes* (those who ask together), who must pray to leave a place of the devil so as to enter God's temple (*Serm.* 200, 1-2). *Conversio morum* is stressed; with regard to baptism of children (*infantuli*), the parents must stand in for them (enrollment for baptism at the beginning of Lent, raising of the hands, anointing, regular attendance at liturgy, especially the week prior to baptism). Eight days before Easter is the *traditio symboli* to the *competentes publice in ecclesia* (*Conc. agath.*, a. 506, *can.* 13 [CCL 148, 200]): the *fideiussores,* responsible to God for the formation of their (spiritual) children, must teach them the creed for the *redditio,* which the candidates do alone, if they are able; otherwise the *fideiussores* stand in for them (*Serm.* 130,5). The date of the baptism is normally the eve of Easter. As for Jews, the Council of *Agde (before 506) established a normal catechesis of eight months outside of the church (can. 34). The ps.-*Germanus of Paris (6th-7th c.) attests to the catechumenate/discipleship of pagans and Jews, linking it to the rites of the ancient church (*Expos. liturg.* 1,15; M. Smyth, *La liturgie oubliée. La prière eucharistique en Gaule antique et dans l'Occident non romain*, Paris 2003, 195; V. Saxer, *Les rites,* 505-525; cf. M. Metzger: RAC 20, 561-562).

In *Spain, the books of the "Mozarabic" liturgy are often a source: the *Homilary* of Toledo (mid-7th c.; CPL 3a. 1997; O. Pasquato: RAC 20, 482); the *Antiphonarium* of Léon (L. Brou - J. Vives, *Antifonario visigótico mozarábe de la catedral de León* = Mon. Hisp. Sacr. Ser. litúrg. 5,1, Barcelona 1959; cf. D. Borobio, *Iniciación cristiana en la Iglesia Hispana de los siglos VI al X*: Salmanticensis 42 [1995] 29-61, with bibl.); the treatises *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (CCL 113) of *Isidore of Seville and *De cognitione baptismi* (PL 96, 11-172) of *Ildefonsus of Toledo. They distinguish catechumens (*audientes*), *vicini fidelium, non fideles,* from *competentes* (who) *iam petunt, iam accipiunt, iam catecizantur* (Isid. Hisp., *Eccl. off.* 2,22,1-2; cf. RAC 20, 562). From these sources we know (1) the catechumens were dismissed before the *Offertorium*; (2) 20 days before Easter, from *dom. vicesima* (= 4th Sunday of Lent), the explanation of the creed (*traditio*) took place, as well as the exorcisms, insufflations, the offering of salt and anointings, with the public invited, on the previous Saturday, for the enrollment to baptism (*nomendatio*). Ildefonsus tells of a solemn and menacing exorcism (*in tuba victoriae*) by the bishop, the *effetatio* (*De cogn. bapt.* 25; 27-29); the procession over sackcloth of the penitent catechumens (*De cogn. bapt.* 21). Mentioned are the memorization of the *regula fidei* (*Apostles' Creed), to be recited daily (*Homil. Tolet.* 22 [PL Suppl. 4, 1950-1951]), the *redditio symboli,* personally for adults, through the parents and godparents for children, on Holy Thursday, and the *traditio orationis dominicae,* immediately after baptism (V. Saxer, *op. cit.*, 531-557).

In and about Rome, a catechesis (*catechizatio*) for children (*catechumeni, competentes* or *electi*) takes up the traditional rites, including three *scrutinia, traditio* and *redditio symboli*; renunciation of Satan; and *aperitio* of the ears and nose: the children, who do not understand, are saved by the adults, who profess for them, just as they were damned by another's fault (according to the deacon John to the *comes Senarius* of *Ravenna: *Ep. ad Sen.* 7). A special importance is assumed here by the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum vetus* (containing the traditions of the city of Rome from before 680, with mid-6th-c. Greek texts)

regarding preparation for baptism in Lent (see M. Metzger, *Les sacramentaires = Tipologie des sources du M.A. occidental 70*, Turnhout 1994, 81-106). Attested there are the formularies of the *Mass *pro scrutiniis electorum,* with a *memento* for the godparents to be named individually, just as with the reading of the names of the *electi* (*competentes*) in their own *Hanc igitur*. It begins with the announcement of the scrutinies (*denuntiatio pro scrutiniis*), which, occurring on the Monday of the 3rd week of Lent, proves that they were now done on weekdays (A. Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien*, Paris 1958, 159). The rites for the baptismal preparation of children are described; but there are also adult converts of Christian parents (*ad caticuminum ex pacano faciendum*: *Sacr. Gelas. vet.* 599 [93]), called indiscriminately *catechumeni* and *electi* (there was now therefore only one degree of preparation!); also, the *symbolum* was recited first in Greek, then in Latin. Adaptation of the liturgy to infant baptism is visible in the *ordo* of the Lenten readings of the city of Rome (A. Chavasse, *Liturgie de la ville de Rome du 5e au 8e s.* = StudAnselm 112, Rome 1993, 51-52; see P.M. Gy, *Du baptême pascal des petits enfants au baptême quamprimum*, in *Haut Moyen Âge: culture, éducation et société*, Mélanges P. Riché, Nanterre 1990, 353-365).

The traditions collected in the *Gelasianum vetus* and the new *ordo* of readings pass to the 7th c. in the *Ordo romanus* 11 (*olim* VII), which distributes the ritual for the preparation for infant baptism over seven *scrutinia* (during the weekdays of the 3rd, 4th and 5th weeks of Lent, with the last scrutiny on Holy Saturday morning). But if the regulation of baptism and the preparation for it in the West as far as Narbonne and Tarragona was influenced by the traditions of the city of Rome (A. Angenendt, *Der Taufritus im frühen Mittelalter*: Sett. StudAltMed 33/1, Spoleto 1987, 275-321; cf. RAC 20, 566-567), liturgical anarchy arrived at the beginning of the 8th c., compromising relations with Rome. This led to *Gregory II's interventions (716) in the churches of Bavaria, those of *Boniface (719 and 747 in the Council of Cloveshoe), and of his disciple Chrodegang, bishop of Metz (d. 766), who proposed the reform desired by king Pepin, and then those of Charlemagne (789: baptism *secundum morem romanum*), culminating in his inquiry to the metropolitans (811–812). Charlemagne's unitary plan for baptism failed, however, with a splintering of the rites of Christian initiation (O. Pasquato, *Quale tradizione*, 75-105; here 92-95).

VI. Concluding summary. Between the catechumenate/discipleship of the church and the pagan and Jewish milieu there are a few points in common (secret of the arcanum, a quality of acceptance, influence of the philosophical schools etc.), but they are of a different nature. The religious formation of the young in the family does owe something to Jewish practice. The 4th-c. Christian sources do not speak per se of catechumenate/discipleship as an institution, but concretely of catechumens and elect, instruction, rites (*signatio,* exorcisms, anointings etc.). The absence of an organic conception of all these individual parts indicates the nonexistence of a true and proper catechumenal institution. Gradually, however, "with the peace of Constantine the flood of new initiates demanded a stable organization, whose structure was defined in the course of the 4th c., the great age of catechesis" (A. Hamman, s.v. *Catecumeno* [*catecumenato*], *Diz. patr. a.C.*, 627: the title of the entry is significant, in support of our opening position on "discipleship" drawn from M. Dujarier). A neutral term would be preferable, such as "time" (*tempus* [*chrónos*] *audiendi verbum: Tr. apost. 17* [ed. Botte]). Regarding the length of the catechumenal period, a widespread negative judgment on its brevity should probably be reevaluated, given that candidates for baptism, both children and adults, often from Christian families, lived in an environment that was already less marked by paganism. This is true also for Jewish candidates, esp. from the 6th c. (see G. Scimé, *Giudei e cristiani nei sermoni di S. Pietro Crisologo*, SEA 89, Rome 2003; M. Metzger: RAC 20, 568-569; cf. M. Rubellin, *Battesimo*: Diz. Enc. del Medioevo, I, dir. da A. Vauchez - C. Leonardi, Rome 1998, 209-211).

G. Bareille, Catéchuménat: DTC, II,2, 1968-1987; P. de Puniet, *Catéchuménat*: DACL II, 2, 2579-2621; B. Botte, *Aperitio aurium:* RAC 1, 487-489; Id., *Competentes*: RAC 3, 266-268; K. Thräde, *Exorzismus*, RAC 7, 44-117 (esp. 76-100); R. Turcan, *Initiation*, RAC 18, 87-159; B. Capelle, *L'introduction du catéchuménat à Rome*: RTAM 5 (1933) 129-154; R. Busch, *De initiatione christiana secundum s. Augustinum*: EphLit 32 (1938) 159-179; 385-480; A. Chavasse, *Le carême romain et les scrutinia*: RecSR 55 (1948) 325-381; M. Dujarier, *Le parrainage des adultes aux trois premiers siècles de l'Église . . .* , Paris 1962; Th. Mertens, *Histoire et pastorale du rituel du catéchuménat et du baptême*, Bruges 1962; A. Stenzel, *Il battesimo*, Alba 1962; A. Turck, *Aux origines du catéchuménat*: RSPh 48 (1964) 20-31; A. Hamman, *Le baptême et la confirmation*, Paris 1969; I. Oñatibia, *Actualidad del catecumenado antiguo*: Phase 64 (1971) 325-334; P.-M. Gy, *La notion d'initiation chrétienne. Jalons pour une enquête*: La MaisonD. 132 (1977) 33-54; G. Kretschmar, *Nouvelles recherches sur l'initiation chrétienne*, La MaisonD. 132, 7-32; G. Groppo, *L'evoluzione del catecumenato nella Chiesa antica dal punto di vista pastorale*, in S. Felici (ed.), *Valori attuali della catechesi patristica*, Rome 1979, 29-49; J. Pijuán, *La liturgia bautismal en la España romano-visigoda*, Toledo 1981; M. Dujarier, *Breve storia del catecumenato*, Leumann (To) 1984; O. Pasquato, *I Padri educatori alla fede, pastori e guide del popolo di Dio*: Credereoggi 3 (1984) 74-95; J. Gevaert (ed.), *Dizionario di Catechetica*, Leumann (To) 1986; R. Cabié, *L'iniziazione cristiana*,

in A.G. Martimort (ed.), *La Chiesa in preghiera. Introduzione alla liturgia*, III, Brescia 1987, 27-120; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du Ier au Ve siècle . . .*, Spoleto 1988; Th.M. Finn, *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria*, Collegeville, MN 1992; Id., *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: Italy, North Africa, and Egypt*, Collegeville, MN 1992; K. McDonnell - G.T. Montague, *Iniziazione cristiana e battesimo nello Spirito santo. Testimonianze dei primi otto secoli*, Rome 1993; C. Floristán, *Il catecumenato*, Rome 1993; P. Benoît - Ch. Munier, *Le baptême dans l'Eglise ancienne. Ier-IIIe siècle*, Berne 1994; Ch. Munier, *Die Taufe in der alten Kirche*: Traditio christiana 9, Bern 1994; O. Pasquato, *Catecumenato antico (sec. II-V): punti nodali e qualità pastorale*: Lateranum 60 (1994) 323-341; A. Laurentin - M. Dujarier, *Il catecumenato. Fonti neotestamentarie e patristiche. La riforma del Vaticano II*, Rome 1995, 49-129; G. Cavallotto, *Catecumenato antico. Diventare cristiani secondo i Padri*, Bologna 1996; M. Dujarier, *La funzione materna della Chiesa nella pratica catecumenale dell'antichità*, in *Iniziazione cristiana e catecumenato . . .*, ed. G. Cavallotto, Bologna 1996, 123-145; G. Laiti, *La catechesi nel catecumenato antico*, in Cavalotto, op.cit., 63-90; V. Saxer, *I riti del catecumenato e dell'iniziazione cristiana nell'antichità*, in Cavalotto, op.cit., 91-121; D. Borobio, *Catecumenado para la evangelización*, Madrid 1997; O. Pasquato, *Quale tradizione per l'iniziazione cristiana? Dall'età dei Padri all'epoca carolingia*: *Iniziazione cristiana degli adulti oggi*, Rome 1998, 75-105; P.F. Beatrice, *Symbolum Fidei: Baptism and Creed in Early Christianity*, in P. Allen et al. (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, 2, Brisbane 1999, 43-65; M.E. Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation*: Alcuin Club Coll. 76, Collegeville, MN 1999; W. Slenczka, *Heilsgeschichte u. Liturgie*: Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 78 (2000); D. Borobio, *Catecumenato*, in *Liturgia*, eds. D. Sartore et al., Cinisello B. (Mi) 2001, 361-377; M. Dujarier, *Devenir disciple du Christ. Catéchuménat et 'Discipulat'*, in *Historiam Perscrutari. Miscellanea*, O. Pasquato, Rome 2002, 521-537; C. Bissoli, *Tracce catechistiche negli scritti del Nuovo Testamento*, in *Historiam Perscrutari. Miscellanea*, 467-481; G. Leonardi, *Il metodo educativo della comunità ebraica e di Gesù con i suoi discepoli. Continuità e innovazioni*, in *Historiam Perscrutari. Miscellanea*, 483-511; B. Maggioni, *Gesù comunicatore della fede. Indicazioni neotestamentarie per una nuova evangelizzazione*, in *Historiam Perscrutari. Miscellanea*, 513-520; G. Laiti, *Il discepolo spirituale interprete delle Scritture (Ireneo, Contro le Eresie IV, 33)*: in *Historiam Perscrutari. Miscellanea*, 539-556; O. Pasquato - H. Brakmann, *Katechese (Katechismus)*: RAC 20 (2003) 422-496; M. Metzger - W. Drews - H. Brakmann, *Katechumenat*: RAC 20, 497-574.

O. Pasquato

CATENAE, BIBLICAL

I. Greek catenae - II. Eastern catenae - III. Latin catenae.

This term designates collections of exegetical passages on a book of Scripture put together by later compilers, who drew these passages from earlier, generally lost, exegetical works. Essentially anthologies of biblical exegesis, thanks to them we know, though only in fragments, the interpretations given by the Fathers on various texts of Scripture, interpretations which would not have reached us without the catenae. Biblical catenae are to be distinguished from the dogmatic and *ascetical-moral collections—which were also called catenae, incorrectly, as they were more properly *florilegia—and are much more akin to the collections of the *scholia* of classical and juridical works. But the term *catena* is also inappropriate for anthologies of biblical *exegesis; to those works the first compilers gave the more correct name of ἐκλογαί, ἐξηγητικαὶ ἐκλογαί, συναγωγὴ or συλλογὴ ἐξηγήσεων, παραγραφαί, in Latin *excerpta* or *collectanea*.

I. Greek catenae. In Greece, the first biblical catenae appeared at the end of the patristic era, after a period of intense production in the field of scriptural exegesis; the first compilers had an abundant quantity of material to choose from. The founder of the genre may be considered the rhetor *Procopius of Gaza, who in the mid-6th c. composed catenae of the Octateuch, the books of Kings, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the *Song of Songs. For the Octateuch, he collected such an immense amount of material that he himself made a compendium for it: he selected only one interpretation when the opinions of the various exegetes agreed, whereas, when they differed, he reworked them into a kind of continuous interpretation which included the words of all of them (τὰς ἀπάντων . . . φωνάς). Notable among Procopius's successors was Nicetas, metropolitan of Heraclea in *Thrace (11th c.), who composed catenae of *Job, *Psalms, the major prophets, the gospels and Paul's Epistles. For many other catenists we know only their names, without being able to specify the period in which they worked or the sacred books they chose; for most of them, we don't even know their names, as the large number of anonymous manuscripts testify.

Based on their format, the Greek catenae can be divided into three classes: marginal, two-column and alternate. The first class is the most common: the biblical text, written in larger letters, is at the center of the page, flush with the inner margin; around it are arranged, in the three outer margins, the exegetical extracts—more rarely, the extracts fill all four margins and the scriptural text is perfectly centered on the page. In two-column catenae, the sacred text and the extracts face each other in two symmetrical columns. In alternate catenae, the biblical text, which is set off by diple marks that are repeated in the margin of the manuscript, is followed by the exegetical extracts, uninterrupted on the entire page. Similar to the marginal class is a type of catena which is constructed within a commentary in another already-existing catena. For example, MS *Reg. 44*, at the center of the page, attests a commen-

tary of Hesychius on the Psalms, and in the margins, a catena of fragments on the same biblical text; the beginning of *Palat. 20,* at the center of the page, contains a catena on Luke, and in the margins fragments of Nicetas on the same gospel. In the oldest catenae, the authors of the extracts are generally indicated, usually in red or in more conspicuous characters, their names wholly written out or sometimes abbreviated, which can here and there lead to errors. Double or triple attributions are also frequent, which demands of the editor of catenae texts a detailed and patient investigation to determine to which of the two or three exegetes the fragment should be assigned—or perhaps even that it belongs to none of them. The same process of verification must frequently also be applied to texts attributed to a single author, esp. in cases in which the various catenae differ as to origin; but even for a univocal attribution it is always wise to raise reasonable doubts. The catena tradition, in fact, much more so than the direct tradition, is exposed to manipulation and forgery. Over time, the early diligence in indicating the name of the author gradually diminished to the point where compilers and amanuenses omitted it entirely, creating difficult problems of attribution for editors. An evolution also occurred regarding the authors drawn upon. Early on, only two (or at most three) were chosen, one from the *Alexandrian school and the other from the *Antiochene, almost as if to offer the two senses, *allegorical and literal. Gradually, however, the number of authors increased, while at the same time the total number of extracts chosen decreased.

II. Eastern catenae. These catenae are in the *Syriac, *Armenian and *Coptic languages, translated from the Greek or compiled based on (or in additiona to) indigenous authors. A Syriac catena of the whole Bible was composed in the 9th c. by the monk Severus. We know of an even older catena (7th c.), of which the Syriac manuscript 852 in the British Museum is a copy; it is anonymous, like the later one known by the title *Gannat būssāmē* or "Garden of delights" (12th c.).

III. Latin catenae. This type of compilation was less popular among the Latins. Before the Carolingian renaissance we know of a St. *Victor of Capua (d. 553), author of *Scholia,* and of a Roman deacon John who, shortly later, composed an *Expositum in Heptateuchum*. With the Carolingian era came the formation of biblical commentaries using exegetical extracts from the Fathers, but even then the work of selection was carried out less carefully than by the first Greek catenists. There were few compilers, in fact, who, like Rabanus Maurus, took the care to systematically note the authors of the individual extracts. With the direct return to the Fathers that characterized the profound renewal of scholarship in the 12th c., like that of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* in dogmatic theology, so glosses circulated for the study of Scripture: a type of marginal or columnar catena, which also included brief explanations between the lines (*glossa interlinearis*). Peter Lombard himself composed glosses on the Psalms and on the Epistles of *Paul, using *Ambrose, *Ambrosiaster, *Jerome, *Augustine, *Cassiodorus etc. The most important of the glosses was the *Glossa ordinaria* in which, thanks to the school of Anselm or Ansellus of Laon (d. 1117), glosses by different compilers were brought together. As with Greek catenae, much work remains to be done on glosses. This is a huge work, though it is generally not as fruitful, since the Greek catenae generally bring to light unknown texts, whereas we possess the complete texts of the extracts from which the glosses are composed.

G. Karo - I. Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*, Göttingen 1902; R. Devreesse, *Chaînes exégétiques grecques*: DBS 1, 1084ff. (which includes a detailed bibl.): these two works remain even today the most complete general resource. See also M. Geerard, CPG IV, Turnhout 1980 and Supplements; E. Mühlenberg, *Katenen*, TRE 18 (1989) 14-21; C. Curti, *Eusebiana I. Commentarii in Psalmos*, Catania 1982 (various earlier articles); G. Dorival, *Des Commentaires de l'écriture aux chaînes*, in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris 1984, 321-383; Id., *Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les psaumes: Contribution a l'étude d'une forme littéraire*, Tomes 1-4 (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense - Études et Documents 43-46), Leuven 1986; Patrologia V, 609-655 (ample treatment with rich bibl.). For the glosses: B. Smalley, *La Glossa ordinaria*: RecTh 9 (1937) 365-400; E. Bertola, *La "glossa ordinaria" biblica ed i suoi problemi*: RecTh 45 (1978) 34-78; J. Châtillon, *La bible dans les Écoles du XII*[e] *siècle*, in *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible*, eds. P. Riché - G. Lobrichon, Paris 1984, 163-198; LMA 2,44-45 and 50-51.

C. Curti

CATHEDRA

I. The *cathedra Petri* - II. The episcopal cathedra - III. The location and function of the cathedra in church buildings - IV. Examples of Christian cathedrae - V. The funerary cathedra.

Throughout antiquity the term *cathedra* meant the "sitting position"; *cathedra* in the sense of a "place to sit" is found only in *Hellenism and, more frequently, in the imperial era, without any particular meaning. The terms *cathedra* and *throne* and are often used as synonyms, with no difference in the meaning of the two terms.

I. The *cathedra Petri.* From the 3rd c. on one notes an evolution, beginning with *Cyprian of Carthage, which sees the cathedra as an expression or instance of apostolic or episcopal authority. According to Cyprian, the episcopal power (*episcopatus vigor*) and the authority of the cathedra (*cathedrae auctoritas*) authorize the bishop to take measures against those subject to the church who have behaved erroneously (*Ep.* 3,1,1 [CCL 3B, 9]; see also 17,2,1 [97]: *honor sacerdotii . . . et cathedrae*; *Laps.* 6: *derelicta cathedra* [from the bishop]). Cyprian also speaks explicitly of the *cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata* (43,5,2 [205]). *Cornelius became bishop of *Rome at a time when—because of *Fabian's death—the *locus Petri et gradus cathedrae sacerdotalis* (55,8 [265]) was empty, and despite grave hostility he sat without fear on the *sacerdotalis cathedra*. The episcopal cathedra of Rome is the *cathedra Petri,* the *ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est* (59,14,1 [CCL 3C, 361]; G.W. Clarke, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage* 3 [New York 1986] 257f. [bibl.]).

Cathedra Petri is also the name of a liturgical feast. It is not entirely clear under what guise *Peter was proclaimed, during the feast on 22 February, *natale Petri de cathedra*. The date of the feast goes back to the *pagan feast of the *Cara cognatio,* which ended with a six-day meal in commemoration of the dead, the *Parentalia*. For this reason it is rightly held that the feast *cathedra Petri* originated as a *funeral banquet in memory of the apostle, which probably caused the date of his death to be forgotten. The feast is documented in the calendar of 354, and in two 5th-c. homilies (ps.-Leo Gt., *Or.* 14 [PL 54, 505-508; CPL3 1658] and ps.-Augustinus [D.G. Morin, *Notes d'ancienne littérature eccl.*: RBen 13 (1896) 343/6; CPL3 369]), as well as in complaints at the *Council of *Tours of 567 about the mishaps that occurred during the celebration of the feast (can. 23 [CCL 148A, 191, 458/67]; see also P.-A. Février, *Natale Petri de cathedra*: CRAI [1977] 514-531; H. Merkel, *Feste u. Feiertage*. IV: TRE 11 [1983] 117). In the 6th c., the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* distinguishes between the feast of 18 January, when Peter's taking possession of the cathedra of Rome is celebrated, and the feast of 22 February, which refers to his cathedra at *Antioch (l.c. 162 with reference to Gal 2:11). The liturgical texts attribute a different character to the feast according to region: esp. in *Gaul there was the idea of a primacy of Peter in the sense of a preeminent position in the whole church; there was also a celebration of Peter's episcopate, limited to Rome (Klauser, *Cathedra* 165-172). *Perpetuus of Tours calls the feast *Cathedra Petri*: *natale sancti Petri episcopatus,* which may mean "day of the remembrance of the episcopate of St. Peter" (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 10,31,6 [MG Script. rer. Mer. 1,1,530]). A less convincing opinion comes from Gussone 114, who refers to the hypothesis of D. Balboni (*Natale Petri de cathedra*: EphLit 68 [1954] 97-127), already refuted by Klauser, *Cathedra* 205-206: the feast commemorated Peter's ascent to the throne. (For other hypotheses on the origin and meaning of the feast, see Gussone 113.)

II. The episcopal cathedra. The idea of the conferring of the cathedra on the apostles led to the use of the term *cathedra* to indicate both the seat of bishops and presbyters, and their office. In this context there is no difference between cathedra and throne. The term *cathedra* as a seat of the clergy is first attested in the so-called *Muratorian fragment, usually dated to the late 2nd c.: *sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo* (l. 75f; S. Ritter, *Il frammento Muratoriano*: RivAC 3 [1926] 253); here it is already used in a figurative sense. A seat covered with linen fabric is documented after the mid-3rd c. as an honorific right of the bishop (Pont., *Vit. Cypr.* 16, 6 [Pellegrino 172]).

III. The location and function of the cathedra in church buildings. According to the **Didascalia apostolorum* 2,57,4 (Funk 160), the bishop's throne had to be located on the E side of the meeting hall, in the midst of the presbyters' seats. A cathedra can be used by the bishop in the *secretarium* (Sulp. Sev., *Dial.*, 2,1,3). The cathedra is located in the apse (Paulin. Med., *Vit. Ambr.* 48,1). In conformity with canon 2 of the IV Synod of Carthage (398) (C. Munier, *Les Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua,* Paris 1960, 79; F.J. Dölger, *Die Heiligkeit des Altars u. ihre Begründung im christl. Altertum*: AC 2 [1930] 161f), the bishop must sit *in ecclesia et in consessu presbyterorum sublimior,* while *intra domum . . . collegam se presbyterorum esse cognoscat,* which means, according to Stommel 28, that bishops were prohibited from setting up a throne or throne room outside of the church. Augustine (*En. in ps.* 126,3 [CCL 40, 1858]) explains that bishops have a raised seat so as to watch over and care for the people (*ut ipsi superintendant et tamquam custodiant populum*). In a church at Uzala in *Africa, the relics of the martyr Stephen were placed *in loco absidae super cathedram velatam,* as related in the *Mirac. Steph.* 3 (PL 41, 835; CPL3 391) from the early 5th c. When the temple of Caelestis at Carthage was turned into a Christian church in 399, the cathedra was put in the place of the god's image (Quodv., *Prom.* 3,44 [CCL 60, 185]; R. Oehler, art. *Karthago*: PW 10 [1919]

2199; F.W. Deichmann, *Carthago. Heiligtum der Caelestis*: JDAI 54 [1939] 136 nr. 86; J. Christern, art. *Karthago*: RBK 3 [1978] 1164 nr. 13). The location of the cathedra could change, according to the *liturgy, from the apse to the center of the church, as described in the *Peregrinatio Egeriae*. *Basil of Caesarea sat in the church behind the curtain, and it was unusual that someone would be admitted to that area (Theodoret, *HE* 4, 19, 11). The *Testamentum Domini* (1,19) prescribes that the bishop's throne be set on the E side; beside it should be the seats (or benches) for the presbyters, with their space separated by a veil. When the patriarch *Macarius of Antioch was deposed during the third council in 680/81, his seat of honor (*thronus*) was thrown out (*Lib. pontif.* 1, 354 Duchesne; Gussone 87).

IV. Examples of Christian cathedrae. The oldest preserved Christian cathedra was found at Karapinar (Bekilli) in Phrygia, in an unspecified archaelogical context; it is dated to the 3rd c., based on the inscription on its front (W.F. Buckler - W.M. Calder - W.K.C. Guthrie, *Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia* [Manchester 1933] nr. 320 Taf. 65; A. Strobel, *Das hl. Land der Montanisten* [1980] 70f. 116f.). Very often Greco-Roman seats were reused in Christian contexts; the seats originally functioned as the place of honor in theaters. One of the few cathedrae produced in the early Christian period is the "Seat of St. Mark," made of alabaster in a 6th-c. Eastern workshop. A cavity under the seat and the two side-openings indicate that the "seat" functioned as a reliquary (E. Dinkler - E. Dinkler von Schubert, *Art. Kreuz* I: RBK 5 [1991] 131); its size suggests that it was also used as throne for the gospel book. Based on the monogram on the front, the ivory cathedra preserved in the Museo Arcivescovile at *Ravenna is attributed to *Maximian, bishop of Ravenna, and dated to the period of his episcopate (545–553; Volbach, *Elfenbeinarb*. nr. 140 Taf. 72/4; F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna, Geschichte und Monumente* [Wiesbaden 1969] 1, 75f). As various mentions in the written sources suggest, the cathedra of Maximian was not necessarily an *unicum*. *Cyril of Alexandria made gifts of valuable ivory cathedrae to maintain sympathy for his role after the Council of *Ephesus of 431 (*Collectio Casinensis* 294: ACO 1, 4 [1922/23] 224f.). The ivory cathedra preserved in Bernini's bronze throne in the choir of St. Peter's, which was venerated as St. Peter's cathedra, has been almost unanimously recognized as the gift of Charles the Bald to Pope John VIII on the occasion of his coronation as emperor (M. Maccarrone et al., *La cattedra lignea di S. Pietro in Vaticano* [= MemPontAc 10, Vat. City 1971]; a different opinion is by M. Guarducci, *Il trono di Massimiano Erculio e la cattedra di S. Pietro*: BollArt 73 [1988] 52, 1-12).

V. The funerary cathedra. On the basis of the written sources, Klauser (43-60) formulated the hypothesis that, in funerary cult, the cathedra was the seat of the deceased person during the funeral banquet (ibid., 56); representation of the banquet of the deceased would have been the main idea behind the location of cathedrae (ibid., 57). In the sources cited by Klauser, an explicit relation between cathedra, funeral banquet and the deceased is postulated only by *Hesychius and *Photius; the cathedra is therefore documented only in texts from the 6th and 9th c. The burial cathedrae collected by Klauser are primarily from the Roman catacombs and are centuries earlier than the written sources, placed in ordinary cubicles and in the martyrs' tombs in the 2nd half of or late 4th c. They can probably only be interpreted as a symbolic reminder of the ancient custom of the funeral banquet near the tomb, since the catacombs, lacking light and ventilation, did not allow gatherings of visitors for this purpose. The funerary function of the cathedra is limited to a few monuments, and thus its role in the cult of the dead can be considered of little importance.

Th. Klauser, *Die Cathedra im Totenkult*, Münster 1927; N. Gussone, *Thron u. Inthronisation des Papstes von den Anfängen bis zum 12. Jh.* (Bonner hist. Forsch. 41), Bonn 1978; J. Dresken-Weiland, *Kathedra*: RAC 20 (2003–2004) 600-644, 656-682.

J. Dresken-Weiland

CATHERINE of Alexandria. The *passio* of which the saint is the protagonist lacks any historical basis, but it is the basis of the extraordinary spread of her cult. Written in Greek between the 6th and 8th c., it was translated into *Latin in the 9th c., and later into the various European languages. The account is set in the 4th c. and, along with the most trite *hagiographical commonplaces—noble birth, beauty, resistance to the most horrific tortures, miraculous liberation from her torturers, mass conversions, miracles of punishment—it contains some unique elements: the victorious debate of the learned girl with 50 wise *pagans, whom she converts and for which, in the Middle Ages, she was named patronness of students and philosophers (in particular of those at the University of Paris). According to the legend, after her decapitation, her body was transported by angels to Sinai (on a height called Gebel Katherin), then, on an unknown date, translated

into the *monastery dedicated to her at the foot of that mountain. Later hagiographical texts introduce additional elements, e.g., some episodes regarding her childhood and her mystical marriage to Christ. Catherine has been correlated to a historical figure, the *pagan philospher *Hypatia, also an *Alexandrian, but who died at the hands of Christians.

In *iconography she is represented with one or more cogwheels, recalling the tortures to which she was condemned in the *passio,* by the emperor *Maxentius (piercing by large wheels with sharp points), from which she emerged miraculously unharmed; with a sword (in reference to her decapitation) or with a book, indicating her doctrine. Her feast is 25 November.

BHG 81-83b; BHL 1657-1700; BHO 26. A.P. Orban (ed.), *Vitae sanctae Katharinae*, Turnhout 1992, 2 vols. (CM 119-119A); E. D'Angelo (ed.), Pietro Suddiacono Napoletano, *L'opera agiografica*, Florence 2002, 117-146; BS 3, 954-978; G.B. Bronzini, *La leggenda di S. Caterina d'Alessandria. Passioni greche e latine*: Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, s. VIII, 9 (1960) 257-416; Ph.B. Roberts, *Stephen Langton and St. Catherine of Alexandria: A Paris Master's Sermon on the Patron Saint of Scholars*: Manuscripta 20 (1976) 96-104; A.M. Valente Bacci, *Sviluppo e diffusione della "Passio" di S. Caterina di Alessandria nell'area tedesca medievale*: Quaderni Catanesi 6 (1984) 435-463; ibid., 7 (1985), 77-134; M. Ciai, *L'iconografia di S. Caterina d'Alessandria negli affreschi di Pietro Coleberti da Piperno a Roccantica (1430)*: Alma Rome 30 (1989) 115-142; K.A. Winstead, *Capgrave's St. Katharine and the Perils of Gynecocracy*: Viator 25 (1994) 361-376; *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 381-383; K.J. Lewis, *The Cult of St. Katharine of Alexandria in Late Medieval England*, Woodbridge – Rochester - New York 2000.

V. Milazzo

CATHOLIC. Noun and adjective meaning "universal." When referred to the church, the term specifies one of its most prestigious characteristics, that it is not national or local by foundation, but open to all. Believers in Christ who acknowledge the bishop of *Rome as the supreme authority are called Catholic. The same term designates the doctrine and rites promoted by the Church of Rome, distinguishing them from those of other Christian communities, which are called by particular names: the Greek Church, Russian Church, Coptic Church etc. In classical Greek, "catholic" already had the meaning of universal, total, general; from the 2nd c. it was used in a Christian sense by *Ignatius (*To the Smyrnaeans* 8,2), *Polycarp (*Martyrdom* 8,1; 16,2; 19,2), and in the 4th c. it became definitive, though *Cyril of Jerusalem still insisted on the geographical concept of catholocity (*Catechesi* XVIII). This ancient title, preserved by Christians who adhere to the form of faith proposed by Rome, derived from their consciousness of Christianity's originality, its overcoming of ethnic limitations and its offer of salvation to all without distinction.

As a designation for the universal church (Eus., *Hist. Eccl.*, 4,15,15.39; 5,16,9; 6,43,3.11 etc.) the term is inexhaustibly rich, with a vast application: the benefits of divine providence are universal or particular (Clem. Alex., *Strom* 6,16,148; Orig., *Hom. 3, 1 in Jer.*; Proc. of Gaza, *Ex.* 4,11). It is a synonym for *orthodoxy, correct Christian doctrine, as opposed to *schism (Adam., *Dial.*, 2,22; *Counc. Nic.*, can. 19; Athan., *C. Ar.*, 1,4; *Syn.*, 2,11; *Apol. sec.*, 25; Eus., *Hist. eccl.*, 7,30; 10,6,1), and to *heresies from the 2nd c. (Clem. Alex., *Exc. Theod.*, 46; Hipp., *Haer.*, 5,16). It is used of orthodox Christians (*Mart. Pionii*, 19,4) as opposed to heretics (Epiph., *Haer.*, 73,21). From the 4th c. it combines the two meanings of universal and orthodox faith, in the sense of the Catholic truth common to all those who had correct faith (Ambr. Aug., *Ver. Rel.*, 5,9-6,10; *Parm.*, 3,4,24; passim). In an *eschatological sense it refers to universal *judgment and universal *resurrection (Theoph. Ant., *Aut.*, 1,13; Just., *Dial.* 81,4; Orig., *Apoc.*, 30b; Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, 4, 36, 4).

DS 86; A. García Diego, *Katholikè Ekklesìa* (El significado del epíteto "catholica" aplicado a la Iglesia desde San Ignacio de Antioquía hasta Orígenes), México 1953; P.M. Brek, *De vocis "catholica" origine et notione*: Antonianum 38 (1963) 263-287; J.N.D. Kelly, *"Catholique" et "Apostolique" aux premiers siècles*: Istina 14 (1969) 33-45; K. Wenzel, *Katholisch*, LTK 5, Freiburg i.Br. 1996, 1345-1346; *Storia della Teologia*, I. *Epoca Patristica*, eds. A. Di Berardino - B. Studer, Casale Monf. 1993, 307-320, 451.

E. Peretto

CATHOLICOS (*Katholikos*). Title of the supreme ecclesiastical authority in some Eastern churches. Among *Nestorians, Chaldeans and *Georgians it is synonymous with *patriarch, but in the Gregorian (Orthodox) Armenian church it is superior to patriarch. The Armenian church counts two catholicosates, that of Etchmiadzin (in Armenia) and that of Antelias (in Lebanon, where the ancient see of Sis in Cilicia was transferred); the patriarchates of *Jerusalem and *Constantinople are considered of lower rank.

M. van Esbroeck, *Primauté, patriarcats, catholicossats, autocéphalies en Orient*, in M. Maccarrone (ed.), *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio: ricerche e testimonanze*. Atti del symposium storico-teologico, Roma, 9-13 ottobre 1989 (Atti and documenti 4), Vatican City 1991, 493-521.

S.J. Voicu

CAVERN of TREASURES (CAVERNA THESAURORUM). A *Syriac *apocrypha whose present form comes from *Nestorian circles. It was written ca. 500 and from the 11th c. falsely attributed to St. *Ephrem. The work's nucleus probably derives from 4th-c. *Jewish Christian circles and is a reworking and Christianization of Jewish material. The text contains a summary of sacred history: creation of the world, creation of Adam and Eve, their sin and death, history of the patriarchs before the flood, history of Abraham and Moses, the judges and the kings, return from exile, and the Messiah. The text deals with various subjects, and the author has drawn on various sources and material. The title derives from the account itself, in which the first parents put gold, incense and myrrh taken from Paradise—the gifts of the three *magi—in the cave where Adam and the patriarchs went to pray, and where Adam's grave was located; his body, after the flood, was buried under Golgotha and purified by the Savior's blood.

The text is preserved in Syriac, *Coptic (fragments only), Arabic (two versions of the Syriac text, each different, probably redone by the *monophysites ca. 750), Ethiopic, *Armenian, *Georgian (from the 11th c.) and probably also in Greek.

The *Cavern of Treasures* is a text linked to other works of the Adam cycle, in particular with the *Conflict of Adam and Eve* and with ps.-*Clementine literature. The text was very popular and often used in chronicles and in other Syriac works. It was known by *Byzantine writers (John Syncellus, Cedrenus, Michael Psellos) and by Byzantine *apocalyptic (ps.-Methodius).

Editions: Su-Min Ri, CSCO 486-487/Syr 207, 1987; C. Bezold, *Die Schätzhöhle*, Lepzig 1888 (Arab version I); M.D. Gibson, *Apocrypha arabica* (Studia Sinaitica 8), London 1901; A. Battisti - B. Bagatti, *La Caverna dei Tesori*, Jerusalem 1979 (Arab version II, introd.); S.E. Robinson, *The Testament of Adam*, Chico, CA 1982 (Armenian version); C. Kourcikidzé - J.P. Mahé: CSCO 526-527/Iber 23-24, 1993.

Translations: Eng.: E.A.W. Budge, *The Book of the Cave*, London 1927 (from Syriac); Fr.: Su-Min Ri, op. cit.; J.P. Mahé, op. cit. (from Georgian); S. Grébaut: ROC 16 (1911) 72-84, 167-175, 225-233; 17 (1912) 16-31, 133-144 (from Ethiopic); It.: A. Battista - B. Bagatti, op. cit. (from Arabic); Ger.: C. Bezold, *Die Schätzhöhle*, Leipzig 1883; = in P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*, Heidelberg 1928 [1979] 942-1013, 1325-1326 (from Syriac).

Studies: A. Götze, *Die Nachwirkung der Schätzhöhle*: Zeitschrift Semitistik 2 (1923) 51-94; 3 (1924) 53-71, 153-177; Id., *Die Schatzhöhle. Überlieferung und Quellen*, Heidelberg 1922; J.B. Frey, DBS 1, 1928, 111-117; B. Bagatti, *Note sull'iconografia di "Adam sotto il Calvario"*: Liber Annuus 27 (1977) 5-32; Denis 1, 30-36.

M. Starowieyski

CECILIA, martyr. According to the purely legendary *passio* (dated to the late 5th c., since it depends on Victor of Vita), Cecilia was a *Roman virgin of the noble family of the Caecilii. She was beheaded together with her fiancé Valerian and his brother Tiburtius, but we do not know under which emperor. She was buried in the catacomb of Callistus in a crypt *retro sanctos* of the 4th c., behind the crypt of the popes. It is certain that there was a **titulus* in Trastevere, whose foundress was a certain Cecilia; the author intends to write a history of this title, identifying a certain Cecilia from the catacomb, believed to be a *martyr, with the foundress of the church in Trastevere. All this is not easily explained; the mention in the *Mart. hier*. (*Romae Caeciliae* [*virginis*]) perhaps indicates the day of the dedication of the *Titulus Caeciliae,* where in 545 Pope *Vigilius celebrated Cecilia's *dies natalis* (Duchesne LP 1, 297). 7th-c. *pilgrims visited the tomb of the virgin *martyr on the Appian Way (CCL 175, 308, 317, 337). In the 8th c. the *cantantibus organis Cecilia virgo soli Domino decantabat* of the legend, describing her wedding, entered the *liturgy as an antiphon: thus Cecilia became the patron of sacred music. Cecilia enjoyed great popularity; a number of Roman churches were dedicated to her. The oldest depictions of Cecilia are in the mosaics of S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna and in the Euphrasian basilica at Poreč; another is in Santa Maria Antiqua at Rome.

BHL 1495-1500; BHG 382; *Verzeichnis* 55; BS 3, 1064-1086; BBKL 1, 840-841; LCI 2, 456-463; LMA 2, 1343-1345; W. De Grüneisen, *Sainte Marie Antique*, Rome 1911, 514-516; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926 (repr. Rome 2000); F. Lanzoni, *I titoli presbiterali di Roma antica nella storia e nella leggenda*: RivAC 2 (1925) 195-257; H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936 (repr. 1968), 73-96; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 144-156; B. Kuhn-Forte, *Handbuch der Kirchen Roms* 4, Vienna 1997, 279-346; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, Brussels [2]2000, 149-150; 284-285.

S. Heid

CECROPIUS of Nicomedia (d. 358). *Homoiousian bishop of *Nicomedia; perhaps present at the *Council of *Sirmium of 351 which deposed *Photinus. One of the recipients of the synodal letter of the Council of *Ancyra of 358. Died in the earthquake which razed Nicomedia to the ground, 24 August 358.

DHGE 12, 41-42; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer*, Tübingen 1988; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988.

M. Simonetti

CELESTINE I (d. 432). Elected pope 10 September 422 in a quick election. During the ten years of his pontificate Celestine carried out a very intense activity. At *Rome he intervened decisively against the *Novatian Bishop Rusticus. He had the basilica of S. Maria in Trastevere restored, while on the Aventine S. Sabina was built with the financial backing of the Illyrian priest Peter. The Petrine ministry, based on the Roman interpretation of the canons of *Serdica, became even more important, though, as in the renewed case of *Apiarius, priest of Sicca Veneria, not always with happy results (v. Mirbt, n. 425). Above all Celestine tried to impose Roman influence on Narbonese and Viennese *Gaul, taking a stand against a hierarchy dominated by the monks of *Lérins and other *monasteries. As for the *ascetic party at *Arles, it was not a question of *Pelagianism but rather a rigorism incompatible with ecclesiastical discipline. Trying to recover his influence over the church of Marseille, in 431 he opposed the monks of that city, accused by *Prosper and *Hilary of a false doctrine of *grace, and defended *Augustine's authority on that subject (*Ep.* 21). The so-called *Capitula Caelestini,* added to this letter in the collections of decretals, were only composed after Celestine's death, probably by Prosper (DS 238-249). The sources exaggerate the importance of Celestine's missionary activity, but, by sending *Palladius to Ireland in 431, he did begin evangelization beyond the imperial frontiers. The *Nestorian controversy broke out during his pontificate. Consulted by both *Nestorius, whom he had previously answered about Pelagians who had taken refuge in the East (*Ep.* 6-7; 13), and *Cyril of Alexandria, he sided with the latter. In the Roman synod of 430 he condemned Nestorius's errors and instructed Cyril to take the necessary measures against him (*Ep.* 11-14). At the Council of *Ephesus, called by *Theodosius II for June 431, Celestine was represented by three legates who, arriving late, approved in his name the decisions taken under Cyril's leadership. Celestine himself, evaluating the synod's work in his letters to the East, declared that Peter had not abandoned them in their need (*Ep.* 25,9; cf. 22,6). No Roman bishop before him had so clearly affirmed the supreme authority of the apostolic see.

Died 27 July 432. Buried in the cemetery of Priscilla. Two spurious *Coptic homilies, *In Gabrielem arch.* (ed. Worrell, *Coptic Manuscripts*, New York 1923) and *In Victorem* (ed. Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms*, London 1914, 49-73), are attributed to him.

CPL 1650-1654; PL 50, 417-458 (Coustant, 1721); PLS III, 18-20; ACO I/1, 7,125-137, 142-143; I/2,5-101. Other sources: Prosper of A., *Epit. Chron.*: PL 51, 594-595 and CPL 516-527; M. Mercator, *Comm.*: ACO I/5, 1,5-25; AASS Apr. 1 (1737) 543-547; DHGE 12,56ff.; BS 3, 1096-1100; L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, esp. 149-205; H.J. Vogt, *Papst Cölestin und Nestorius,* Festschrift H. Tüchle, Paderborn 1975, 85-101; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975, 244-253; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, 1026-1043; 1347-1397; LTK[3] 2, 1246; RGG[4] 2, 413; LACL (2002) 135.

B. Studer

CELESTIUS (1st half of 5th c.). The main source of information on Celestius (also Caelestius, Coelestius) besides *Jerome (*Ep.* 133,5) and *Augustine (*Gratia Christi* 2,13), is *Marius Mercator. A jurist (*auditorialis scholasticus*) of the Roman aristocracy, perhaps like *Pelagius a British native (ODC) or like *Julian from Eclanum (?) (Marius Mercator), a eunuch from birth, he was one of the main spokesmen of the ideas of the Pelagian movement after the fall of *Rome in 410. Having fled to *Carthage after the occupation of *Rome in 410, he was accused before the Carthaginian clergy by the deacon *Paulinus of Milan on six points (in Aug., *De gestis Pelagii* 11,23; Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium adv. haer. Pelagii* 2; *Commonitorium super nomine Coelestii* 1, in changed order; PL 45,1681 and 1686-1687; *Concilia Africae*: CCL 149): (1) on the nature of death, whether it is natural or a result of Adam's sin; (2) on the *traducianism of Adam's sin in the human race, equating it to the *resurrection of Christ for the human race; (3) on the law which, like the gospel, allows one to reach the kingdom of heaven; (4) on the birth of babies in the situation of Adam prior to his sin. In Africa this last question led to two further issues: (5) a challenge to the *baptism of infants for the remission of sins, which contributed to the development of the *dogma of original sin (Aug., *De peccatorum meritis et remissione deque baptismo parvulorum*); and (6) the possibility or not of living without sin (Aug., *De spiritu et littera; De perfectione iustitiae hominis*). Celestius was condemned (Aug., *Ep.* 157, 3,22; *De gestis Pelagii* 62), a permanent condemnation which hung over him and the Pelagian movement in general. Every subsequent judgment on his work, as with those concerning Pelagius, in fact, went back to the Synod of *Carthage of 411, in which Augustine did not participate (*Retr.* 2,33).

Subsequent interventions regarding Celestius and his followers, besides those pertaining to the Pelagians, were the Council of *Diospolis of 415, two African councils of 416, the intervention of Pope *Zosimus, at first favorable but then against, in 417–418, the definitive condemnation at *Ephesus in 431 (cans. 1 and 4). After the condemnation of Carthage of 411, Celestius, unconvinced (Aug., *Ep.* 175,1; 176,4),

perhaps went to *Syracuse to a certain Hilary (Aug., *Ep.* 157,3,22); in 413 he was at Ephesus where he seems to have been accepted among the *presbyters (Aug., *Ep.* 175,1 and 176,3), in 416 at *Constantinople and again at Rome in 418. Of his writings, besides a *libellus brevissimus* which spread rapidly, the most important attributed to him was the anonymous work titled *Liber Definitionum* or *Definitiones* (Aug., *Ep.* 157, 3,22; *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*; *De gestis Pelagii* 22,46; *De pecc. orig.* 22,25). Present studies allow us to attribute to Celestius a role perhaps equal to that of Pelagius in the Pelagian controversy between 411–418, and a capacity for dialectic (seen in the *Definitiones*) which led to the later rationalization of the Pelagian version of Christian teaching by Julian of Eclanum. The available evidence in fact speaks of the Celestians and the Pelagians, i.e., of two different strands of the same movement. Although his thought has not yet been entirely identified vis-à-vis that of Pelagius, he can be considered to be more rationalizing, and thus more logically organized. The emperors *Honorius and *Theodosius II sent a letter of warning to the bishops favorable to Celestius (Aug. *Ep.* 201,2).

Paulinus of Milan, *Libellus Paulini diaconi adversus Caelestinum Zosimo episcopo datus*, CSEL 35/1, 108-111; M. Mercatore, *Commonitorium super nomine Coelestii*: ACO I, 5/1, 65-70; Id., *Commonitorium adversus haeresim Pelagii et Coelestii*: ACO I, 5/1, 5-23; Y.-M. Duval, *La date du* De natura *de Pélage. Les premières étapes de la controverse sur la nature de la grâce*: REA 36 (1990) 257-283, puts it between 405–406 as a terminus ad quem. A dating which reproposes a reexamination of the text attributed to Celestius: A. De Veer, *Le Dossier Célestius*: BA 22 [Paris 1975] 691-692; G. Honnay, *Caelestius, Discipulus Pelagii*: Augustiniana 44 [1994] 271-302; G. Bonner, *Caelestius*: AugLex 693-698; and the *Liber de fide* attributed to Rufinus the Syrian (G. Bonner, *Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism*: Augustinian Studies 1 [1970] 31-47, in which is reexamined the article of D. Refoulé, *Datation du prémier concile de Chartage contre les pélagiens et du "Libellus fidei" de Rufin*: REA 9 [1963] 41-49; E. TeSelle, *Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy*: Augustinian Studies 3 [1972] 61-95); R. Dodaro, *Note on the Carthaginian Debate over Sinlessness, A.D. 411-412:* Augustinianum 40 (2000) 187-202.

V. Grossi

CELIBACY of the CLERGY. Until the start of the 4th c. no one mentions continence or celibacy imposed on deacons (*Diakonia - Diaconate), *presbyters or bishops by ecclesiastical law. But the opinion that the discipline of continence was introduced in the West only under Popes *Siricius and *Innocent does not seem well-founded. The roots of this ideal can be found at the time of the *apostles, when the ideal of *virginity and celibacy was already widespread; also according to *Tertullian (*Exh. cast.* 13,4), numerous members of the clergy chose this kind of life. The fact that the decretals of Popes Siricius and Innocent were accepted is itself a sign of this apostolic origin and of the great spread of the practice of continence among clerics in both West and East, though we have more evidence of it in the West.

At the origin of this precept is the evangelical and Pauline doctrine of celibacy, along with the influence exercised by Greek, *Platonic and *Stoic philosophy: in fact, continence was held in great esteem by the *pagans. With *baptism, Christians felt themselves better able to dominate their instincts. With respect to clerics, we must also bear in mind cultic continence, very widespread in many religions, esp. those of Greece and Rome, which obligated one to continence before performing the cultic acts. This ideal, therefore, already present in apostolic times, was increasingly strengthened and institutionalized to the point of becoming the norm.

A step in this process of institutionalization was the prohibition of *digamy, i.e., of a new marriage after widowhood. In accord with 1 Tim 3:2, 3:12 and Tit 1:6, a widowed member of the clergy could not remarry, and a remarried person could not be ordained. If we may believe the criticisms directed in the *Philosophumena* 9,12,22 against Pope *Callistus, this rule was not always observed. From the 4th c. many councils reaffirm it, sometimes extending it to subdeacons and even to lower clergy, as well as to women, who must be virgins when they marry members of the clergy. The Council of *Valence of 374 considers as remarried those who married for the first time as pagans; the 17th apostolic canon (*Apos. con.* 8,47,17), rather, takes into account only those marriages contracted after baptism. *Jerome (*Letter* 69,9) speaks of a bishop, already married as a pagan and remarried after baptism, and adds, doubtless exaggerating, that the "world is full of bishops in similar situations." Not all agreed with this line of conduct, however: according to *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus in their *exegesis of 1 Tim 3:2 and Tit 1:6, the apostle did not forbid a second marriage to members of the clergy but asked them to be examples of fidelity to their spouses; we know that in *Syria in the 4th c. there were remarried bishops.

From the 4th c., other requirements were added to the above ideal. The Council of *Ancyra of 314, can. 10, allows the marriage of a celibate deacon only if he declared his intention of marrying at the time of his ordination; the Council of *Neocaesarea (ca. 314–325), can. 1, expels from the clergy a priest who marries. The Council of *Elvira (early 4th c.), can. 33,

requires higher clergy married before ordination to observe continence with their wives. This rule was then imposed on the whole West at the end of the 4th c. by the decretals of Popes Siricius and Innocent, and repeated by numerous councils; texts differ, however, as to whether clergy may or may not cohabit with their wives. In the East, *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 59,4) sees continence as the normal state of the higher clergy (incl. subdeacons), even if married, but adds that "this is not the case everywhere." *Synesius of Cyrene, elected metropolitan of Ptolemais in Cyrenaica against his will, knows that he must separate from his wife (*Ep.* 105 to his brother). *Justinian, partly for economic reasons—to save church property—obliges bishops to remain celibate or put their wives in convents, and priests and deacons to live in chastity. The Council of *Trullo (691), accepting the preceding legislation on celibacy almost in its entirety, adds a novelty with can. 13: "Priests and deacons must abstain from relations with their wives only during times of ceremony," while absolute continence is explicitly forbidden. Bishops, on the other hand, must live without a family. This would be the point of departure between Eastern and Western practice. At the origin of this laxity may be the circumstance that, because of the nondaily celebration of Mass in the East, deacons and priests did not have to abstain permanently from their wives; in the West, such a rule could not have been introduced without the simultaneous elimination of the daily celebration of Mass.

R. Gryson, *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique*, Gembloux 1970; H. Crouzel, *Le célibat et la continence dans l'Église primitive: leurs motivations*, in J. Coppens (ed.), *Sacerdoce et célibat*, Gembloux 1971, 333-371; C. Cochini, *Origines apostoliques du célibat sacerdotal*, Paris-Namur 1981; R. Gryson, *Dix ans de recherches sur les origines du célibat ecclésiastique*: RTL 11 (1981) 157-185; H. Crouzel, *Mariage et divorce, célibat et caractère sacerdotaux dans l'Église ancienne. Études diverses*, Turin 1982; C. Tibiletti, *Teologia pelagiana su celibato/matrimonio*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 487-507; R. Cholij, *Clerical Celibacy in East and West*, Herefordshire 1989; P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York 1988 (It. tr. Turin 1992); S. Heid, *Zölibat in der frühen Kirche: die Anfänge einer Enthaltsamkeitspflicht für Kleriker in Ost und West*, Paderborn 1997; B. Lang, *Einsamkeit als Charisma: zum Ursprung religiös motivierter Ehelosigkeit im Christentum*, in A. Assmann - J. Assmann (eds.), *Einsamkeit*, Munich 2000, 173-188.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

CELL. The old Latin word (from the verb *celo*) had many meanings: grotto, tomb, the individual openings in a beehive, small and usually poor room, servant's room, prison cell, wine- or grain-store. The term is found in Greek papyri from the 2nd c. AD (*Papyr. Florent.* 10, 7; *Papyr. Lips.* 102, II, 1; *Papyr. Wessely*: WS 24 [1902] 35; *Papyr. Oxyrh.* III 502, 55, 224). In *monastic language, starting in *Egypt, this Latin term was used to express one of the most characteristic elements of this way of life, the solitary but hospitable place in which the monk sought recollection, prayer, life with God (Ruf., *H. mon.* 1; Cass., *Conl.* 6, 15; Caes. of Ar., *Reg.* 23; Bened., *Reg.* 1. 22. 36. 53. 58). The singular fact that a Latin term should be used for a creation of Egyptian origin is explained by reflecting on the popular level of monasticism and on the popular value and content of that term.

ThLL 3, 759ff.; DIP 2, 744-745; ODC 311; LMA 9, 520-521; LTK 2, 987.

M.G. Bianco

CELLANUS of Perrona (d. 706). *Abbot of *Perrona Scottorum* (Picardy). A native of Ireland, he entered the *monastery of Perrona, where the incorrupt body of St. Fursey was kept (Bede, *HE* III, 19). We have some of his verses and a letter to Aldhelm of Malmesbury, later bishop of Sherborne, expressing homesickness for his native land (PL 89, 99).

CPL 1127; PLS IV, 2191; Kenney 306 (i); BCLL 643-644; W. Levison, *Zu den Versen des Abtes Cellanus von Péronne*: ZCP 20 (1933-6) 382-90 [repr. in *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit*, Düsseldorf 1948, 551-556]; Coccia, La cultura 318-320; Patrologia IV, 453-454.

E. Prinzivalli

CELSUS (2nd c.). Eclectic *Platonist philosopher, perhaps of *Egyptian origin, who wrote under *Marcus Aurelius. He lived at *Rome and got to know the contemporary movements of ideas, composing ca. 178 his *True Discourse,* the first anti-Christian polemical work. The work is lost; we know it only through the numerous textual citations, of unequal length, in *Origen's *Against Celsus*. Modern historians like Andresen have tried to free Celsus from Origen's image of him. The work first develops the attacks of a Jew against Christ (I-III, which perhaps uses a Jewish anti-Christian work), then attacks *Judaism, Christianity's source (IV-V). Celsus then accuses the Christians of having copied the sages of Greece (VI-VII), and finally criticizes the political stance of Christians, who exclude themselves from the city (VII, 62–VIII). Celsus opposed both Judaism and Christianity with "the ancient doctrine" in a traditional sense, that which "from the beginning has been known by the wisest people,

by cities and by men" (Orig., *C. Cels.* I, 14).

He reproved Christianity for its novelty, which disturbed this tranquil inheritance. He accused Christians of attaching themselves to a faith they could not rationally justify, and of totally lacking any critical sense. In particular he considered Christ's *incarnation a contradiction of divine transcendence and the order that rules the world. Celsus's sources of information were obscure and limited. He knew fragments of Scripture and may have been replying to *Justin Martyr (Andresen; Q. Cataudella disagrees). For J. Schwartz, he influenced *Lucian and the *Letter to *Diognetus*. J.M. Vermander researched traces of him in the *apologists, *Tertullian (*Apolog.* 21), *Minucius Felix (*Octavius* 10-12) and *Theophilus (*Ad Autol.* III), which seemed to be replying to the *True Discourse*.

O. Glöckner, Bonn 1924; R. Bader, Stuttgart-Berlin 1940; W. den Boer, Leiden 1948; Critical bibl. in SC 225, 141-198; L. Rougier, *Celse ou le conflit de la civilisation antique et du monde chrétien*, Paris 1925; W. Völker, *Das Bild vom nichtgnostischen Christentum bei Celsus*, Halle 1928; Q. Cataudella, *Celso e gli apologisti cristiani*: NDid 1 (1947) 28-34; C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos*, Berlin 1955; J. Schwartz, *Du Testament de Lévi au Discours de Celse*: RHPhR 40 (1960) 126-145; J.M. Vermander, *De quelques répliques de Celse dans l'Apologétique de T.*, REA 16 (1970) 205-225; E.V. Gallagher, *Divine Man or Magician? Celsus and Origen on Jesus*, Chico, CA 1982; F. Mosetto, *I miracoli evangelici nel dibattito tra Gesù e Celso*, Rome 1986; M. Fédou, *Christianisme et religions païennes dans le "Contre Celse" d'Origène*, Paris 1988; Celso, *Il discorso vero*, ed. G. Lanata, Milan 1987 (It. tr. and commentary); G. Watson, *Celsus and the Philosophical Opposition to Christianity*: ITQ 58 (1992) 165-179; J. Granger Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Graeco-Roman Paganism*, Tübingen 1999; J.W. Hargis, *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*, New York 1999.

A. Hamman

CELSUS (3rd c.). We have a long letter from a Celsus, not better identified, to a recently ordained bishop named Vigilius (*Ad Vigilium episcopum de giudaica incredulitate*). The author translates into Latin the *Dialogue Between Jason and Papiscus* of *Aristo of Pella (lived mid-2nd c.), of which both the Greek original and the *Latin translation are lost. He makes the translation out of a concern for Jewish incredulity; in the letter, he addresses the possibility and conditions of their conversion through faith in Christ. He uses the testimonies of the *magi and of Simeon (ch. 3) and OT texts (chs. 4-6) to demonstrate that Christ is the awaited Messiah. Celsus's dedicatory letter is important for a knowledge of the content of Aristo's work, which relates how the "Christian Jew" Jason defeats the "*Alexandrian Jew" Papiscus in debate. Characteristics of the archaic Latin biblical text used suggest an *African origin; the frequent reference to *martyrdom supposes a period of *persecution, thus the 3rd c. Celsus asks Vigilius, who knows both languages, to correct his translation and to remember *puer tuus Celsus*.

CPL 67; CPPM II, 552; PL 6, 49-58; CSEL 3,119-132; cf. V. Saxer, in *Storia del cristianesimo*, ed. L. Pietri, Rome 2003, I 581.

A. Di Berardino

CELTIC. The Celtic language, Indo-European in origin, had its own evolution. In the Celtic lands in antiquity there were two vernacular linguistic groups: Gaelic (Irish, Scottish and Manx [from the Isle of Man]) and Brittonic Celtic, whose members were closely related, including the inhabitants of Wales and Cornwall, and the Bretons. The tribal groups that spoke these languages became Christian before or during the patristic age.

Very little evidence remains of the pre-English Christianity of *Britain or of the Christian practices of the Welsh, Breton, Cornwall, Pict and "Scottish" churches. It seems probable that during the *Roman occupation, Christianity was confined to the lowest classes, although it spread beyond the borders of Roman Britannia and among the more wealthy and military classes in the course of the 4th c. In the "Celtic" regions, the churches and *monasteries were able to stay autonomous in a way that was impossible for the churches under the centralized authority of *Rome. Their inspiration, pre-Benedictine, was based on the *Desert Fathers; *Martin of Tours also exercised a considerable influence. The heads of monasteries were typical *presbyter-*abbots (not bishops) who strongly prioritized missions. Their independence led to some eccentricities and to a strong attachment to their traditions. Both *Bede and *Aldhelm observe that the Celtic clergy considered the English to be *excommunicates, refusing to eat with them.

British delegates participated in the ecclesiastical councils of the period of Roman occupation (the Synod of *Arles in 314 and that of *Rimini of 359), but this participation ceased in the 5th and 6th c.

During the time of the Roman occupation of Britain, Roman missionaries converted Wales, which became thoroughly Christian through the work of Celtic missionaries in the following three centuries. Accounts of a *pilgrimage to *Palestine center on St. Teilo, bishop of Llandaff in the 6th c. St. Deiniol lived during this century and was considered the first bishop of Bangor. Also in the 6th c., St. Asaph became a disciple of Kentigern while exiled in Wales

and later became head of the monastery and bishop of Llanelwy, later called St. Asaph. St. David (d. 601) was certainly a disciple of Iltut, a Breton soldier of fortune in the service of the king of Glamorgan, converted after meeting the Christian hermit Cadoc. David distiguished himself as the founder of monasteries in the tradition of the Egyptian desert. He may have participated in the Synod of Brefi in ca. 520, and it is said that he called a council at Caerleon (*Lucus Victoriae*) in 569, of which no texts survive. The Celtic bishops met *Augustine of Canterbury in ca. 603, but submission of the Welsh churches to the see of *Canterbury came about slowly a few centuries later. They remained turned toward the past, with strong regional characteristics, until the Norman conquest. For example, they did not adopt the general practice of the celebration of Easter, or other aspects of ecclesiastical discipline, until 768.

Christianity seems to have arrived in Scotland in the late 4th c. with the mission of St. *Ninian, who was influenced by Martin of Tours. St. *Colomba, also a Scot, came from *Ireland on a mission, using the island of Iona as a center (563–597). In the 7th c. his monks, guided by St. *Aidan, established a center at Lindisfarne to evangelize the N of England. The church of the Picts united under a single bishop not before the 9th c. The British church came to Brittany with the Christian refugees, whom *Gildas describes as fugitives from the country. Breton Christians had contact with the Irish from the 6th to the 9th c., esp. through *Columbanus. Only two late-Breton hymns are preserved from British, Welsh or Breton sources. A fragment of *Caedmon (pastoral poetry from the 7th c.) is preserved by Bede. *Allegories of animals were popular in the monastic tradition, as was *poetry on nature and on the monastic life (Mungo at Glasgow). The early Christian writers of *Ireland, much more significant for both quantity of production and influence, are treated individually in their respective entries. The vernacular tradition of the Irish church is extremely complex, and its importance is twofold: first, myths, sagas and poems have a strong *pagan flavor; and second, there is a literature connected to the rather important Hiberno-Latinity, which partially coincides with the Christian Latinity of Ireland.

Patrologia IV, ch. VI; M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*, Dublin 1985; F. Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law*, Dublin 1988; R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540*, Dublin 1997; Th.O. Clancy - G. Márkus, *Iona: The Earliest Poetry of a Celtic Monastery*, Edinburgh 1995; B. Luiselli, *La storiografia dell'Irlanda tardoantica e altomedievale: dalle tradizioni orali dei druidi alle tradizioni scritte degli intellettuali cristiani*: Cassiodorus 3 (1997) 153-174; J. MacKillop, *Oxford Dictionary of Celtic Mythology*, Oxford 1998; B. Luiselli, *La formazione della cultura europea occidentale*, Rome 2003, 76-108; 137-156; 223-236.

G.R. Evans

CELTIC LITURGY. Under the name "Celtic *liturgy"—some scholars treat it together with the *Gallican rite—we find the liturgical sources (codices or fragments) produced or reproduced in Ireland during the 7th and 8th c. Actually, these documents do not represent a liturgy in the proper sense, i.e., they do not correspond to a fully defined and organized local rite. One of the main sources, the *Bangor Antiphonary,* copied in the late 7th c., reproduced a type of monastic office remotely inspired by the structure of the *Ambrosian office, with locally produced hymns, antiphons and prayers. Another characteristic source, the so-called *Stowe Missal* (late 8th c.), contains an ordinary of the pre-Gregorian Roman Mass, into which some distinctive litanies are inserted; then follow three formularies, for the feasts of the saints, for penitents and for the dead, corresponding to the *Gallican-*Hispanic structure of the eucharistic celebration. The last part of the manuscript—the slightest expression of a ritual—comprises an *ordo baptismi* and an *ordo ad infirmum visitandum*. The coordination of the Irish liturgical documents becomes still more difficult if we consider the Munich palimpsest to be among them: a *sacramentary composed with Gallican texts and some texts of Spanish origin, copied in Ireland in the mid-7th c., but to which was added a distinctive rewriting of the part of the Mass corresponding to the account of institution, and a strange *post mysterium* inspired by the *apocryphal *Acts of St. Thomas*. It seems difficult to sustain J. Hennig's thesis that the primitive Irish liturgy consisted of the ordinary of the Mass from the *Stowe Missal,* a vestige of the Roman liturgy brought by Bishop *Palladius, sent to Ireland in 431 by *Celestine I. Study of the liturgical sources and literary-doctrinal analysis of the texts, even those contained in small fragments, lead to a very different conclusion. The Irish church failed in its attempt to create its own liturgy—as was being done in the various Western churches—for lack of authors sufficiently expert in the use of Latin or learned in Mediterranean Christian literary culture. More than in euchological texts—the prayers of the *Bangor Antiphonary* are of some interest in content—the Irish church found its identity in the composition of hymns, in which their authors found a way to apply, even in Latin, the rhetorical canons of their traditional poetry.

F.E. Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, Oxford 1881 (2nd ed., ed. J. Stevenson, Woodbridge 1987); Id., *Antiphonary of Bangor*, H. Bradshaw Society, London 1895; G.F. Warner, *The Stowe Missal*, H. Bradshaw Society 32, London 1915: E. Franceschini, *L'Antifonario di Bangor*, Padua 1941; J. Hennig, *Studies in the Liturgy of the Early Irish Church*: The Irish Ecc. Records 75 (1951) 318-332; A. Dold - L. Eizenhöfer, *Das irische Palimpsestsakramentar im Clm 14429 der Staatsbibliothek München*, Texte u. Arb. 53-54, Beuron 1964; K. Gamber, *Libri liturgici celtici*: Codices Liturgici Latini Antiquiores, Spic. Friburg. Subsidia 1, Freiburg [2]1968, I, 130-152; J. Pinell, *Anámnesis y epíclesis en el antiguo rito galicano*: Didaskalia 4 (1974) 1-130; Id., *La liturgia celtica*, in Anámnesis 2, Turin 1978, 67-70; M. Curran, *The Antiphonary of Bangor and the Early Irish Monastic Liturgy*, Dublin 1984; M. Lapidge, *Columbanus and the "Antiphonary of Bangor"*: Peritia 4 (1985) 104-116; D.N. Power, *Celtic Liturgy*: Studia Liturgica 27 (1997) 1-32.

J. Pinell

CEMETERY

I. Origin - II. Typology - III. Development and organization of cemeteries - IV. Archaeological research.

In the ancient world the use of this word (*coemeterium,* κοιμητήριον) to mean a place of burial of the dead was proper to and characteristic of Jews and Christians. That it was alien to the *pagans is shown by the very rare literary texts in which it means a bedroom, or by the circumlocution used in pagan documents to describe Christian burial-grounds: "the so-called cemeteries" (τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια) (Euseb., *HE* VII, 11,10 and 13). But in early Christian literature the term is customary and its etymology, from κοιμάω, to go to sleep, expressing faith in the resurrection of the dead as the certain waking from sleep, is often commented on (see, e.g., John Chrys., PG 49, 393). Various pagan poets also compare death to sleep, and sleep is symbolized in the decorations of some funeral monuments, but with no hint of the temporariness of this repose, which is obvious in the word *dormitory*. The early Christians expressed the same concept in the other frequent term *depositio,* a provisional depositary for the corpse awaiting restoration. Also, *cemetery* was not the only word for a Christian burial place. In *Africa the common Roman term *area,* or *accubitorium,* synonymous with cemetery, was used. At Rome and in the West generally, *coemeterium* almost always meant the whole burial ground, whereas in Greece and Asia Minor it could mean the individual tomb.

In regions where the type of ground made it possible, there were also underground Christian necropolises, now usually called *catacombs*. This name, first found at *Naples in the 9th c., originally belonged to a single Roman Christian cemetery on the Via Appia in the place called *ad catacumbas,* it seems because of a natural depression that can still be noted between the circus of *Maxentius and the present basilica of St. Sebastiano. The extension of the term "catacomb" to all Christian underground cemeteries took place esp. in the 16th and 17th c., when they were gradually rediscovered, whereas the galleries of St. Sebastiano had been accessible all through the Middle Ages. At the same time the strange belief began to spread that the catacombs had been the Christian communities' place of worship, of organization and even living place in the early centuries, when they were forced to hide by *persecution. Some literary documents, such as the imperial prohibition against entering the cemeteries (*Acta proconsularia S. Cypriani* 3: PL 3, 1498) or references to popes living in them (Duchesne LP I, 161, 207, 227, 305-306)—obviously meaning the attached sanctuaries above them—misled famous scholars of the past, and even today the legend is firmly rooted in the popular mind. Even without this fascination, the catacombs and early Christian funerary monuments in general are among the most important and often unique sources for our knowledge of the hierarchy, organization, beliefs, private life and public life of the primitive Christian communities.

I. Origin. Use by Christians of surface or underground *areae* for the burial of only the faithful, to the exclusion of others, goes back only to the last decades of the 2nd c., or at least only from that time do we have sure proofs of their existence. Our earliest literary reference is in *Tertullian (*Ad Scap*. 3), who speaks of the *areae sepulturarum nostrarum* that had aroused the hostility of the *pagan mob. The same author (*Apolog*. 39, 5-6) shows how the faithful financed the burial of the poor through a common fund fed by voluntary monthly offerings. Nor do any monuments go back to an earlier time: in fact, the progress of studies has modified the 1st-c. and early 2nd-c. dates frequently assigned in the past to products of early Christian funerary art. Even the recent discoveries of 1st-c. *Palestinian ossuaries displaying signs of Christianity (objects of lively debate by archaeologists) have not revealed the existence of community cemeteries of that era, but at most of individual Christian burials in common *areae*. At first this was the usual practice of Christians in all parts of the empire. At *Rome, it is well documentable in the necropolis beneath the *Vatican basilica, where the *apostle *Peter was laid, followed by other believers within or next to the mausoleums of pagan families. One of these families, the Julii, once converted, transformed their small funerary chamber by decorating it with Christian mosaics. St. *Paul was also buried in a

pagan cemetery on the Via Ostia; the tomb of the Christian *Telesphorus was found in the pagan necropolis of Porto.

Sure signs of Christianity, though not yet made explicit in *epigraphy or artistic expressions like those formed in the course of the 3rd c., are identifiable in various tombs housed, from the time of *Trajan, in *pozzolana* quarries and on the slopes of the deep depression under the basilica of St. Sebastiano near the Via Appia. The most characteristic of these signs is the symbol of the fish, in Greek ΙΧΘΥΣ, whose letters form the acrostic Ἰ(ησοῦς) Χ(ριστὸς) Θ(εοῦ) Υ(ιὸς) Σ(ωτήρ), i.e., Jesus Christ, God's Son, Savior. In the Appia burial ground, the acrostic was scratched with a T-cross added between the first two letters, in a lower cell of the pagan mausoleum "of the *Innocentiores*," and sculpted or painted, with an anchor, in various epigraphs in nearby tombs. The fact that the Christians of the first two centuries dealt with the problem of burial by taking their dead to the common *areae* makes it hard to establish the origin of the Christian community cemeteries in many places. In particular, surface cemeteries were inserted into and quickly replaced pagan necropolises, and at first the typology of the tombs was no different. Even in underground cemeteries we can no longer see the clear division from the pagan world that was imagined by earlier archaeologists. Originally non-Christian family nuclei have been identified, e.g., in the catacomb of *Domitilla at Rome.

In the difficult study of the origin of the Christian cemeteries, we must doubtless take private charity into account. Wealthy converted landowners must soon have offered a way of resolving the burial problem of a church that, from the outset and in all countries, had chosen inhumation as more fitting their belief and their sensibility (Min. Fel., *Oct.* 34) rather than the easier and more economical method of cremation. To bury a large community's dead with dignity meant using a great deal of space, and we know that *areae* near great cities had high costs. G.B. de Rossi, the founder of Christian archaeology, showed that many Roman catacombs were originally tombs belonging to one family, showing signs of enlargements and uses that could be justified only if intended for the community. The very names preserved by some cemeteries—Domitilla, Priscilla, Commodilla, Maximus, Praetextatus, Traso, Ottavilla, Bassilla etc.—are hard to explain except by an initial possession by these people, or by their charitable free donation of the *areae*. Sometimes such an origin is expressly testified, as in the famous epigraph of the *area* of Evelpius at Cherchel (Caesarea) in Algeria. But certainly not all cemeteries were created in this way: many, esp. outside Rome, were clearly communal from the start. Even in the Roman catacombs, some very old nuclei are made up of a network of galleries originally with no rooms for family burials, hence created expressly for the community. Such, e.g., are the whole series of "comb" galleries reached from stair X in the catacomb *ad duas lauros* on the Via Labicana; the use of a vast *pozzolana* quarry in the cemetery of Priscilla; the nucleus "of the Flavii Aurelii" in the cemetery of Domatilla; and in the catacomb of Callistus, the nucleus which de Rossi called *area prima,* consisting of two long parallel galleries linked by transverse corridors. In a polemical work against Pope *Callistus (217–222), this last is called τὸ κοιμητήριον (*Philosoph.* II, 12,44): its collective ownership by the church is attested, as is its management by the pope through one of his deacons and its greater importance than the other cemeteries. Pope *Zephyrinus (199–217) was already buried there, as nearly all the popes of the 3rd c. would be. In this century the concept and practice of the community cemetery were definitively established, and at Rome, where the catacombs have preserved an abundance of pre-Constantinian regions and funerary monuments, it is possible to follow its sometimes grandiose developments and its organization.

The church, though not recognized by the civil authorities, profited from the Roman legislation that gave everyone, even slaves and executed criminals, the right of burial. In this way even Christian cemeteries were legalized, as is proven by the decrees of their confiscation during *Valerian's persecution in 258 and those of restitution by his son *Gallienus. Recognition by the civil authorities of the existence of Christian community cemeteries at the start of the 3rd c. can probably be seen in the reference given above by the author of the *Philosophoumena,* and in *Tertullian's reference (*Ad Scap.* 3) to the cry of the Carthaginian mob: *areae non sint,* "let the Christians have no cemeteries." Use of the community cemetery by the faithful, however, did not become strictly obligatory, though it was strongly recommended, as can be argued from *Cyprian, who deplored those who buried their children in pagan burial ground. While staying away from the latter, some families preferred, even after the peace of *Constantine, to have their own family tombs, not managed by the church authorities. The most famous example of this type of private burial was discovered in 1956 on the Via Latina in Rome. Begun in the first decades of the 4th c., it belonged to a small group of well-to-do families who wanted these ar-

chitecturally elegant underground rooms, covered almost entirely with paintings. The many biblical themes chosen, esp. from the OT, are unknown in community catacombs, or treated in a way independent of the usual models. There are even scenes from pagan mythology, perhaps on tombs of unconverted family members, a liberty inconceivable in a 4th-c. cemetery dependent on the church authorities. These private hypogea are more numerous than was once thought. Besides the luxury and originality of their architecture and decoration, they are characterized by their antechambers, their small number of burials, and the absence of those religious arrangements or funerary utilities connected with the cult of the martyrs which would transform the community cemeteries from the 4th c. on.

II. Typology. Obviously Christians had to keep within the laws that regulated *funeral services in the *Roman world. Above all, tombs had to be outside inhabited areas, whose boundaries were legally fixed by an ideal line called a *pomerium*. In great cities like Rome this was enlarged more than once, so that earlier burials can be found within the line of a later *pomerium*. From the latter half of the 4th c., this very old law was often transgressed in provincial cities: entire Christian necropolises are found, esp. in *Africa, in the middle of inhabited centers.

The characteristics of the early Christian cemeteries are more marked and more easily recognizable in the catacombs. While the majority of *sub divo* ('open-air') cemeteries have been destroyed, underground funerary rooms, even when robbed, show an architecture, typology of tombs and often great wealth of decoration that clearly distinguish them from other monuments. We should not be astonished that the Christians developed subterranean excavation to such a degree. It occurred only in places where the nature of the ground allowed it, i.e., in volcanic regions or those rich in easily worked calcareous rocks. In such places the excavation of underground rooms for various uses long predated the coming of Christianity: as tombs among the Etruscans, very often for hydraulic or military use in Latium, and often created as cool places for recreation called cryptoporticos. Especially favorable for this purpose was "tufa," a soft clay that becomes hard as stone on drying, easily worked yet strong enough for quite large rooms. The majority of the catacomb galleries are dug in this tufa, which had no commercial value. The theory that Christian underground cemeteries were implanted in earlier chambers excavated for other purposes is totally unfounded. Only rarely did this happen, e.g., setting up tombs in abandoned hydraulic chambers, either unmodified, as in the catacomb *ad vicesimum* near Morlupo, or enlarging the passages, as in the central gallery of St. Giovanni at Syracuse. Another quite frequent use was that of *arenariae,* old *pozzolana* quarries which, esp. around Rome, extended over an immense distance. Either finding them in abandoned areas, or having them put at their disposal by landowners, the Christians dug tombs in them, though the curved and irregular walls did not really lend themselves to the rational and ordered use of space that could be attained from galleries dug specifically for the purpose. Sometimes the beginning of an early Christian cemetery in an *arenaria* or other unsuitable place was caused by the presence of a martyr's tomb, put there in time of emergency; such, e.g., at Rome, were the origins of the cemetery of Commodilla around the tomb of Sts. *Felix and Adauctus, the cemetery of Cyriaca near the tomb of St. *Lawrence and various cemeteries of the *orbis christianus,* created in stone or sand quarries, or, on the surface, in pagan *areae* as at *Corinth, or in poor districts.

Sometimes the type of rock in which underground cemeteries were opened has led to the supposition of preexisting quarries, as in the catacombs of St. Gennaro at *Naples, which have wide tunnels almost like those produced by the extraction of building-stone. But close study of the relative chronology of the various zones of the catacombs, and esp. of the way in which the rooms were cut in the rock, reveals that the intention was funerary from the beginning, while not ruling out commercial use of the resulting material. In more than one place this appears to have been extracted not haphazardly, but cut in large square blocks, from which smaller blocks suitable for building could be obtained.

Created by the Christians, the subterranean cemeteries reveal a typology that we may call characteristic, though not exclusive. Analogies occur in Etruscan tombs, where the known funerary rooms were often supplemented by short galleries with tombs set into the walls; a small cemetery with ambulatories just like those of the Christians has been found at Anzio, with objects dating it to the 3rd c. BC; Jewish catacombs have *locules* and *arcosolia* like the Christian ones we will now describe. Besides, the need for space would easily suggest the solution of underground galleries with tombs dug into the walls. Access was by a ladder or, more rarely, an entrance dug in the side of a hill. The ladder, called in *epigraphy and literary documents *descensus, catabaticum, scala,* generally had high and awkward steps, but better access did exist, esp. during the period of peace near venerated tombs, called *introitus*

ad martyres, when great crowds of *pilgrims began to frequent the cemeteries. Such were, e.g., the grand staircase of the cemetery of Calepodius, that of the anonymous basilica of the Via Ardeatina, and that of the small hypogeum basilica of SS. Marcellinus and Peter. The width of the galleries dug at the foot of the entrances is proportionate to the nature and hardness of the rock: in the fragile tufa of Rome and Latium, it is generally from 80 to 150 cm.; elsewhere, as at Naples, Sicily and Malta, it reaches greater widths. In small catacombs in the country or in minor centers, the advance of the ambulatories is disorderly and without prearranged design, while in the necropolises of the great cities the galleries are straight and arranged to form various types of networks. The most common systems from the 3rd c. on are in the shape of a comb or a gridiron. In the former, a gallery was dug at the foot of the entrance, following its direction or at right angles to it; from this—the *decumanus,* as it were, of the necropolis—numerous galleries branch off at right angles on each side like *cardines*. In the gridiron system, ambulatories were dug corresponding to the confines of the land possessed above ground and were then joined by transverse galleries so as to exploit the whole area (the law permitted excavation only under the property). The galleries, called *cryptae* by the ancients, were initially two or three meters high, with ceilings generally flat but sometimes arched. The tombs were rectangular cavities in the walls, one above another, the same length as the bodies they were to receive and more or less deep.

This very simple tomb was called a *locus,* τόπος, nowadays a locule, and defined as *monosomus, bisomus, trisomus, quatrisomus* or *polyandron* according to the number of bodies it contained. A series of superimposed locules was called a *pila,* and generally contained tombs of the same length. The *pilae* of childrens' locules were by preference put at the angles of the galleries, for reasons of equilibrium. These little tombs are very numerous because of the high infant mortality and perhaps also because of the charity of the church, which took in exposed babies. In the 3rd c. the *pilae* were generally ordered, the *loculi* large and the spaces between them quite wide. In the 4th and 5th c., the use of the spaces was often chaotic, due to the accumulation of tombs and the insertion of childrens' bodies between already existing locules. The body was placed in the locule wrapped in a sheet, in whose folds lime was sometimes spread as an economical form of embalming. The locule was then closed with tiles or with one or more marble slabs carefully made fast with lime. In Jewish cemeteries it was more common to close them with a small wall, often plastered on the outside. A layer of plaster on the enclosing slabs is also often found in Christian catacombs, especially in the country. The name of the deceased was incised on the marble or painted with red lead or charcoal, or even just scratched in the lime. But most tombs remained uninscribed. To recognize them, relatives frequently embedded in the tomb the base of a cup, a fragment of a plate, a coin, an ivory figurine, a toy, a piece of pottery. Often they put a vase of spices or a clay oil lamp, corresponding to the flowers and lamps of modern cemeteries.

A richer form of burial is the arcosolium. In an arcosolium the enclosing slab is not vertical but horizontal and is surmounted by an arched niche (in earliest times, sometimes rectangular). Very often the arcosolium was decorated with frescoes. This type of tomb was used especially in *cubicula,* small rooms opening onto the sides of the galleries as family or corporate tombs, like family funerary chapels in modern Italian cemeteries. In some regions they were closed with doors and bolts, traces of which remain. Cubicles have the most varied forms: square, rectangular, apsed, round, polygonal. They seem to imitate surface mausoleums. They may be double (*cubiculum duplex*), sometimes even triple or quadruple. They have flat or domed ceilings (deep or shallow), cross vaults, barrel vaults. Often they are embellished with columns at the corners, with niches for lights, decorative cornices, shelves for the offerings and funeral meals. These meals were called **refrigeria* and were characteristic of the cult of the dead among the pagans as well. In the cemeteries of various regions we find rooms set up for such commemorative rites: benches for the guests, wells and water channels, special round tables in the center of the rooms as at Malta, *cathedrae* as in the Coemeterium Maius of Rome, symbol of the invisible presence of the deceased at the meal celebrated in his honor.

Going underground allowed the development of huge cemeteries. Even when the *areae* possessed were still restricted, as in the 3rd c., space could be multiplied by deepening the galleries, which reached 5 or 6 meters in height, or by creating other levels above or beneath the original. The first choice was in fact made for the best layer of tufa, not that most close to the surface. For ventilation and light, vertical shafts were opened, called *luminaria,* which could pass through several levels and illuminate several rooms at once through bold embrasures. These light inlets impressed visitors, as we can read in the pages where *Jerome relates his youthful visits to the Roman cemeteries (*Comm. in Ezech.* XII, 40: PL 25,

375) or *Prudentius's verses in his description of the cemetery of St. *Hippolytus (*Peristeph.* XI, 153-168: PL 60, 547-548). Particular types of tombs in the underground cemeteries include oven tombs with locules dug perpendicular to the wall so that only the short side is visible; shaft tombs with a large number of tombs in the walls and often in the base of a shaft dug in the ground; the funerary dormitories of St. *Thecla at Rome, filled with hundreds of "capuchin" tombs one over another up to the ceiling and then walled up; the polysomous arcosolia characteristic esp. of Sicily, with as many as 20 or more arches side by side under a vault like a gallery; the "baldacchino" tombs of the island of Malta and E Sicily outside *Syracuse, made of a *sarcophagus dug from the rock and joined to the vault of the cubicle or of the ambulatory by four small columns at the corners; the window tombs very frequent in Malta and very rare elsewhere, which are little rooms with arcosolia or funeral benches inside, accessible only by a window about half a meter square, blocked after each deposition by a stone slab. There was also a great variety of tombs in surface cemeteries, which existed above every catacomb and functioned together with them or, more frequently, were the only type of necropolis in lands where the ground was unsuitable for excavation. Unfortunately the majority of surface cemeteries have been destroyed, and we know them more from literary or epigraphical sources than from surviving monuments. They were surrounded by an enclosure or marked out by boundary stones; they generally had graves dug in the ground (*formae*), often connected in a close network and deep enough to hold a dozen bodies on top of each other, separated by earthenware slabs, flat or sloping. More distinctive burials were those in terracotta, stone, marble, lead and, in some places, wooden sarcophagi. The decoration of marble sarcophagi was the beginning of early Christian sculpture. They were lined up along the enclosing walls, often under a roof (*sub teglata*), or in shrines, or in the mausoleums that are the characteristic buildings of *sub divo* cemeteries. During the period of peace, they formed extensive complexes attached to the cemeterial basilicas of the *martyrs. Special types of tombs in some regions are the vast fields of "capuchin" tombs as at Timgad, the stone chests once embellished with mosaics and inscriptions as at Tipasa, the semicylindrical masonry coffins (*cupae, cupellae*), or the humble burials inside pieces of amphora as at Tarragona.

III. Development and organization of cemeteries. One of the causes that most contributed to developing the Christian cemeteries and leading to profound changes in them was the cult of the *martyrs buried during the persecutions. The search for places nearest to the venerated grave, as if to guarantee protection and salvation, caused the opening of new galleries and cubicles in underground cemeteries, and the accumulation of mausoleums and tombs in cemeterial basilicas *sub divo* (i.e., in the open air). Such devotional tombs were called *retrosanctos*. For the less fortunate, more distant additions were made to the catacombs, also made necessary by the ever-growing numbers of the Christian population.

This period saw the assumption of great importance by the *fossores*, a corps of gravediggers first explicitly mentioned in 303, in the acts of requisition of the church of *Cirta but which must have existed from the beginnings of the community cemeteries, as appears from, e.g., ps.-Hippolytus (*Tr. Apost.* 40). They dug the underground chambers, laid out the *areae* above ground, and created and decorated the various types of tombs. They were specialized in their work and so were divided into categories; from the 4th c. they appear in the ecclesiastical hierarchy alongside *ostiarii*, custodians of churches and cemeteries. In the latter half of the 4th c., in necropolises with venerated tombs they arrogated to themselves the privilege of distributing the most sought-after places in exchange for payment: we have epigraphical evidence of this at *Rome and elsewhere, with contracts and even purchase prices. This abuse lasted into the first decades of the 5th c., but—the custom of underground burial finally ceasing at that time, probably through the intervention of church authorities—the *fossores* ceded their powers to other administrators whom inscriptions and literary sources call *mansionarii*, *praepositi* or *presbyteri*. At Rome, where there is a greater wealth of evidence, we see a return to that organization of the funeral service which, in its broad outlines, seems to go back to the pontificate of Pope *Fabian (236–250). The community was organized into districts called *tituli* (modern parishes), grouped in turn into seven ecclesiastical regions. To each region corresponded a particular extramural funerary region with some cemeteries. By the 5th c. many of these had become real sanctuaries. Profound changes had been made to ease access to the pilgrims who, since the pontificate of *Damasus (366–384), an enthusiastic promoter of the *martyrs, had begun to flock there. New entrances and *luminaria* were opened; roads built; oratories and basilicas built on the surface; and sometimes services such as hospices, baths and custodians' houses provided. The *Gothic wars in *Italy and political and military upheavals elsewhere contributed to making burials in cemeteries far

from cities increasingly rare but did not disrupt the flow of pilgrims to the sanctuaries created in those places. Popes and bishops continued to restore them and encourage devotion. Guides were even written for visitors from distant lands: 7th- and 8th-c. examples of these survive in the itineraries of the Roman sanctuaries. These topographical documents are very valuable to archaeologists, because in the 9th c., after repeated sacks by the *Longobards (Lombards) and *Saracens, the sanctuaries were gradually abandoned and the relics of the martyrs translated within the city walls. That marked the end for all the catacombs and for some of the *sub divo* cemeteries: the churches above ground, no longer restored, gradually crumbled, and the entrances to the galleries disappeared under rockfalls and vegetation. A few decades after the last translation, the very existence of most of these places, once so famous and so frequented, was unknown.

IV. Archaeological research. In the Roman catacombs we can see signatures of sporadic visitors already in the 15th c., including those of the fellows of the famous Academy of Pomponius Leto. Systematic research was prompted by the chance discovery in 1578 of the cemetery of Via Anapo, near the Via Salaria, which aroused great enthusiasm among the learned. The paintings were copied and published, creating a desire to find more. Antonio Bosio (1575–1629) was the leader of these searchers; he alone discovered some 30 catacombs and, in particular, established the basis of scientific study by topographical analysis of monuments in the light of documentary evidence. Unfortunately, 17th- and 18th-c. archaeologists did not follow Bosio's topographical method: they started removing epigraphs and *sarcophagi to museums and churches and opened a great number of tombs as they searched for presumed bodies of *martyrs, whom they believed could be recognized by the presence of a vase with traces of vermillion. Local vinedressers completed the work of destruction by removing building material. Vast cemeterial regions then assumed the aspect of devastation in which today's visitor sees them. In the 19th c., G.B. de Rossi (1822–1894) resumed scientific research and traced the main outlines of Christian archaeology. His studies aroused a ferment of research, gradually extended to other parts of the ancient world. Today in all the nations of Europe, Mediterranean Africa and the Near East, the research and study of early Christian cemeteries makes up a very important part of archaeological excavations and publications.

Of the immense biography, we prefer to indicate works that provide an orientation, and which include further bibliographical indications: G. Ferretto, *Note storico-bibliografiche di archeologia cristiana*, Vatican City 1942; G. Bovini, *Rassegna degli studi sulle catacombe e sui cimiteri "sub divo,"* Vatican City 1952; U. Fasola, *Scoperte e risultati degli studi compiuti nel campo dei cimiteri cristiani antichi dal 1954 ad oggi*: *Atti VI Congr. Intern. Arch. Crist.*, Vatican City 1965, 13-33; P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma*, Bologna 1966; Id., *Archeologia Cristiana*, facs. ed. with analytic index and bibliographical appendix, Bari 1980. Valuable bibliographical indications in the article by E. Josi in EC III (1949) 1617-1637. On pre-Constantinian cemeteries: U.M. Fasola - P. Testini, *I cimiteri cristiani*, in *Atti IX Congr. Intern. Arch. Crist.*, I, Vatican City 1978, 103-157, 189-210. On *fossores:* E. Conde Guerri, *Los "fossores" de Roma paleocristiana*, Vatican City 1979. On recent studies and excavations in the cemeteries of the various countries of the *orbis christianus:* exhaustive bibliography in the 1980 facs. ed. of the cited volume of P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, 802-813, ed. L. Pani Ermini: *Topografia cimiteriale.* In addition: F. Tolotti, *Influenza delle opere idrauliche sull'origine delle catacombe*: RivAC 56 (1980) 7-48; U.M. Fasola, *Indagini nel sopratterra della catacomba di S. Callisto*, RivAC 56, 221-278; A. Ferrua, *Cimitero di S. Callisto*: RivAC 57 (1981) 7-24; Id., *Cimitero ad X della via Latina*, RivAC 57, 24-31; P. Saint-Roch, *La région centrale du Cimetière connu sous le nom de "Cimetière des saints Marc et Marcellien et Damase,"* RivAC 57, 209-251; M. Salvatore, *Un sepolcreto altomedievale in agro di Rutigliano* (*Bari*). *Notizie preliminari*, RivAC 57, 127-160; G.N. Verrando, *Note di topografia martiriale della via Aurelia*, RivAC 57, 255-282; H. Brandenburg, *Überlegungen zu Ursprung und Entstehung der Katakomben Roms*, in *Vivarium. Festschrift Theodor Klauser zum 90. Geburstag*, Münster-Westfalen 1984, 11-49; L. Reekmans, *Spätrömische Hypogea*, in *Studien zur spätantiken und byzantinischen Kunst Friedrich Wilhelm Deichmann gewidmet*, Mainz 1986, 11-37; J. Guyon, *Le cimetière aux deux lauriers. Recherches sur les catacombes romaines*, Vatican City 1987; F.W. Deichmann, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Rome 1993, 51-69; H. Brandenburg, *Coemeterium. Der Wandel des Bestattungswesens als Zeichen des Kulturumbruchs der Spätantike*: Laverna 5 (1994) 206-232; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Strutture funerarie ed edifici di culto paleocristiani di Roma dal III al VI secolo*, in *Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano. Materiali e contributi scientifici per una mostra epigrafica*, Vatican City 1997, 121-141; Ph. Pergola - P.M. Barbini, *Le catacombe romane. Storia e topografia*, Rome 1997; V. Fiocchi Nicolai - D. Mazzoleni - F. Bisconti, *Le catacombe cristiane di Roma*, Regensburg 1998; D. Nuzzo, *Tipologia sepolcrale delle catacombe romane. I cimiteri ipogei delle vie Ostiense, Ardeatina e Appia*, Oxford 2000; var. aus., *Catacombes romaines et italiennes* (= Dossiers d'Archéologie, 278), Quétigny 2002; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Elementi di trasformazione dello spazio funerario tra tarda antichità ed altomedioevo*, in *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, L, Uomo e spazio nell'alto medioevo*, Spoleto 2003, 921-969; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, s.v. *Katakomben*: RAC, 20, 342-422 (with ample bibl.).

U. Fasola

CENOBIUM – CENOBITE (also Coenobium – Coenobite). From the Greek words κοινόβιον and κοινοβιώτης (κοινός + βίος = *in commune viventes* according to Isidore, *Orig.* 7,13,2, who derives it from Jerome, *Ep.* 22, 34). Cenobitic life was closely linked

to *ascetic life. In the first three Christian centuries, but esp. after the ending of the *persecutions, Jesus' teaching and his invitation to vigilance, renunciation, death to self, taking up the cross after him, voluntary poverty, and virginity led to the birth and development of a significant spiritual movement, asceticism, first in the form of eremitism (*anchorism), and then of cenobitism, which spread everywhere from *Mesopotamia to *Gaul to *Ireland. Though recognizably influenced by the contemporary philosophical-spiritual atmosphere, it undeniably involved an authentic evangelical experience and a desire to return to primitive Christian ideals (see Acts 4:34ff.). If *Anthony (ca. 250–356), though not the first to seek solitude in the *desert, was the father of anchorism, *Pachomius was the first legislator and founder of *cenobia* (320, Tabennesi in the *Thebaid), the father of the *koinonia*, who found a balance between the individualism of the first Desert Fathers and a severely regimented community life. In the 4th c., *monasticism in *Egypt knew the anchorism practiced in the north (Nitria, Desert of the Cells (Kellia), where ascetics lived in individual cells and were bound together almost as a corporate institution), cenobitism in the south (Thebaid), which also served as a preparation for anchorism (Jerome, *Ep.* 22,36; Cass., *De inst. coenob.* 2,3,2), and some solitaries still further south, living a very austere life. Egyptian monasticism was a school for numerous visitors (*Eustathius, *Basil, *Jerome, *Rufinus, the two *Melanias, *Paula, *Palladius etc.), who spread its practices everywhere. The *Cappadocians had considerable influence in the ascetic and cenobitic movement of their time. Basil's mother, Emmelia, on the advice of her daughter *Macrina, retired to the family property of Annesi in Pontus (351) and there led a common life with noble ladies and their maids. Basil, basing his conception of life on the precept of charity, saw cenobitic life as the place where a synthesis could be made between βίος ἐρημικός and βίος τοῦ μιγάδος (see Greg. Naz., *Or.* 43,62). The *Regula Magistri* (1,2) and the *Rule* of Benedict (1,2) consider cenobites the *genus primum* of monks, the *genus monasteriale* almost par excellence, i.e., *militans sub regula vel abbate*, following a classification directly inspired by *John Cassian, who saw life together in submission to an *abbot as the full imitation of Jesus, who came to do the will of him who sent him (*Regula M.* 1,50-52).

Cenobium did not just mean a physical site of monastic life—like the term *monasterium*, which simply meant a habitation of monks, or even of just one monk or of those particular groups of monks called Sarabaites (Cass., *Conl.* 18,10)—but designated a type and a way of practicing monastic ascesis together with others who lived in the same place. Cenobites, then, were those who professed the highest, best and most complete form (*de optimo genere monachorum*) of monastic life and who trained in those gymnasia—the *cenobia*—to aspire to the heights of anchoritic discipline (Cass., *Conl.* 18,11) in a well-tried realism and realization of virtue.

A. Boon - L.Th. Lefort, *Pachomiana latina. Règle et épître de s. Pachôme. Épître de s. Théodore et "Liber" de s. Orsiesius*, Louvain 1932; Pl. de Meester, *De monachico statu iuxta disciplinam byzantinam*, Vatican City 1942; L.Th. Lefort, *Œuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples* (CSCO 159), Louvain 1956; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, II, Louvain 1960 (CSCO 197); A. de Vogüé, *La communauté et l'abbé dans la Règle de s. Benoît*, Paris 1961; J. Leroy, *Le cénobitisme chez Cassien*: RAM 43 (1967) 121-158; DIP 2, 761-764; A. de Vogüé, *Vie commune et vie solitaire*: La Règle de s. Benoît, t. VII, commentaire doctrinal et spirituel, SC 186 bis, Paris 1977, 75-99; S. Pricoco, *L'isola dei Santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Urbino 1978; DIP 7, 1420-1428 (A. de Vogüé, *Regole cenobitiche dell'occidente*: DIP VII, Rome 1983, 1420-1428); var. aus., *Dall'eremo al cenobio. La civiltà monastica in Italia dalle origini all'età di Dante*, Milan 1987; P. Tamburino, *Koinonia. Aspetti ecclesiologici del cenobitismo Pacomiano nel IV secolo*, Rome 1989; T.G. Kardong, *The Monastic Practice of Pachomius and the Pachomians*: StudMon 32 (1990) 59-78; G. Jenal, *Italia ascetica atque monastica, Das Asketen- und Mönchtum in Italien von den Anfängen bis zur Zeit der Longobarden (ca. 150/250-604)*, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1995; E. Wipszycka, *Contribution à l'étude de l'économie de la congrégation pachômienne*: JJP 26 (1996) 167-210; A. de Vogüé, *Cenobita, Cenobitismo*: Dizionario Enciclopedico del Medioevo 1, Rome 1998, 375; M. Migallah Dirias, *La koinonía pacomiana come itinerario formativo alla vita comunitaria. Attualità dei principi educativi testimoniati negli scritti di Pacomio e dei suoi discepoli*, Rome 2002; S. Pricoco, *Il monachesimo*, Rome-Bari 2003, 39-43, 57-63, 85-97.

M.G. Bianco

CENTESIMA, SEXAGESIMA, TRICESIMA, De. ps.-Cyprian sermon from *Africa, late 2nd to mid-3rd c. (for some scholars, early 4th); handed down in a small corpus of *Donatist writings in the 9th-c. codices Wirceburgensis theol. f. 33 and Monacensis 3739. Contains an *allegorical-moral exposition of the parable of the sower (Mt 13:3ff. and par.), in particular a spiritual *exegesis of the three numbers 100, 60 and 30, explained respectively as the prize of *martyrdom, of *virginity and of continence in marriage.

Martyrdom appears in a dual dimension: "imitation" of Christ's example and "spiritual combat" against flesh and blood, understood as demonic powers; but *ascetics imitate the six angels co-created with the Son of God, and they too fight against flesh and blood in a sort of "spiritual martyrdom." The just who intend to live according to their baptismal

rebirth are shown the way of continence.

The hierarchical distinction of martyrs, *virgins and the continent was an integral part of a commonly held conception of the Christian life in the first half of the 3rd c., including in *Syria and *Egypt, as *Origen's valuable testimony, *Com. Rom.* 9,1 (on Rom 12:1-2), shows. This conception has archaic *Encratite connotations, which were accompanied by the frequent use of *apocryphal texts or of altered biblical citations, and familiar reference to theological ideas of clear *Jewish Christian derivation: e.g., a strongly *subordinationist angelomorphic *Christology which made God's Son one of the seven angels created from fire and subsequently raised to the dignity of Son; the martyrological exegesis of the parables of the drachma and the lost sheep, against which *Tertullian had earlier argued (*Pud.* 9,1-3 and 21-22); a pessimistic antisomatic anthropology, linked with the idea that the *delictum primae nativitatis* is canceled in baptismal remission. This latter is the earliest Western formulation known to us of the doctrine, based on the biblical *testimonium* of Ps 51:5, of sin contracted by each person at birth, which will become Augustine's *originale peccatum* (see P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati*, 271-273).

CPL 67; *Editio princeps di R. Reitzenstein, Eine frühchristliche Schrift von den dreierlei Früchten des christlichen Lebens*: ZNTW 15 (1914) 60-90; PLS I, 53-67; J. Daniélou, *Le traité "De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima" et le Judéochristianisme latin avant Tertullien*: VChr 25 (1971) 171-181; Id., *Les origines du christianisme latin*, Paris 1978, 64-87; P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milan 1978, 271-273; Id., *Martirio ed ascesi nel sermone pseudociprianeo "De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima": Paradoxos politeia*, Studi in onore di G. Lazzati, Milan 1979, 3-24; Id., *Il sermone "De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima" dello Ps. Cipriano e la teologia del martirio*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 215-243; Id., s.v. Perfezione: *Il triplice frutto della perfezione cristiana in età patristica*: DIP VI, Rome 1980, 1146-1150; PLSI, 53-67; J. Daniélou, *Les origines du christianisme latin*, Paris 1978, 64-87; P.F. Beatrice, *Martirio ed ascesi nel sermone pseudo-ciprianeo "De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima,"* in R. Cantalamessa - L.F. Pizzolato (eds.), Paradoxos politeia. Studi patristici in onore di G. Lazzati (SPMed 10), Milan 1979, 3-24; Id., *Il sermone "De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima" dello Ps. Cipriano e la teologia del martirio*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 215-243; Ph. Sellew, *Five Days of Creation? The Origin of an Unusual Exegesis* (*Ps.-Cyprian De centesima §26*): ZNTW 81 (1990) 277-283; J. Doignon, *Pseudo-Cyprien, "Sermo de centesima, sexagesima, tricesima,"* in R. Herzog - G. Nauroy (eds.), *Restauration et renouveau. La littérature latine de 284 à 374 après J.-C.* (Nouvelle Histoire de la Littérature Latine 5), Turnhout 1993, 472-474 (bibl.); Ph. Sellew, *The Hundredfold Reward for Martyrs and Ascetics: Ps.-Cyprian, "De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima,"* in M.F. Wiles - E.J. Yarnold (eds.), SP 36, Louvain 2001, 94-98.

P.F. Beatrice

CENTO. Latin term indicating a cloth sewn with pieces of fabric of different colors; as a literary genre, it meant a poetic composition made up of words, hemistichs and verses of another poet, reordered to express something different from the original. They were composed esp. with the works of Homer (*Homerocentones*) and Virgil (*Virgiliocentones*). *Tertullian writes: "Today we see a totally different tale issue from Virgil, in which the material is adapted to the verse and the verse to the material. Thus Osidius Geta has completely puffed up Virgil's tragedy *Medea*. And a relative of mine has, among other literary pastimes, expounded Cebe's *Table* in the words of the same poet. Those who, following centonical usage, unite in a single work many pieces taken here and there from Homer's poems are called *Homerocentos*" (*De praesc. haer.* 39,3-5). Centos were not so much works of art as works of technique and memory; the author's ability was shown by his restraint in interposing his own thoughts. Learning by memory had great importance in ancient education, and the *centonists* knew their models well.

Other Christian centos are known besides that of *Proba. According to *Isidore of Seville (*Etymol.* 1,39,26: PL 82, 121), a certain *Pomponius composed a short poem titled *Tityrus* in honor of Christ; in fact we possess a dialogue between the Christian *Tityrus* and the *pagan Meliboeus (*Versus ad gratiam Domini*: CPL 1481). Then there is the incomplete *De verbi incarnatione* (CPL 1482) by a 5th-c. imitator of Proba. The 116-verse *De ecclesia* (CPL 1483) is a short address to the faithful in church, perhaps by a certain Mavortius. There are Greek *Homerocentos* attributed to the empress *Eudoxia (d. 460) (see CPG 6025 with bibl.), and many short centos. The most famous is *Byzantine: the *Christus patiens,* of 2640 iambic trimeters (PG 38, 131-338), attributed to *Gregory of Nazianzus, a tragedy on Christ's passion in the style of Euripides, as the author writes in the prologue.

CSEL 16, 1 (1888) 609-616 (Pomponius); 615-620 (*De verbi incarn.*); 621-627 (*De ecclesia*); *Centons homériques*, SC 437, Paris 1998. Other editions: see Patrologia III, 259. F. Ermini, *Il centone di Proba e la poesia centonaria latina*, Rome 1909; A. Tuilier, *La datation et l'attribution du* Χριστὸς πάσχων *et l'art du centon*, Actes VI Cong. Int. Ét. Byz. I, Paris 1950-1951, 403-409; R. Lamacchia, *Dall'arte allusiva al centone* (*A proposito di scuola di poesia e di poesia di scuola*): Athens and Rome 3 (1958) 93-106; Patrologia III, 259 (ample bibl.); LACL 143-144; R. Lamacchia, *Centoni*: Enciclopedia Virgiliana, vol. I, Rome 1984, 733-737; J.L. Vidal, *La technique de composition du Centon virgilien Versus ad Gratiam Domini sive Tityrus* (*Anthol. Lat. 719a Riese*): REAug 29 (1983) 233-256; J.-M. Poinsotte, *Les Juifs dans les centons latins chrétiens*: RecAug 21 (1986) 85-116; A.M. Alfieri, *La tecnica compositiva nel centone di Eudocia Augusta*: Sileno 14 (1988) 137-156; G. La Bua, *Esegesi virgiliana e poesia*

centonaria: A&R 38 (1993) 99-107; *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in età tardoantica*, ed. C. Moreschini, Naples 1995; G. Polara, *"I centoni,"* in G. Cavallo - P. Fedeli - A. Giardina (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica. 3: La ricezione del testo*, Rome, 1998, 245-275; G. Carbone, *Il centone De alea*. Introduction, text, translation, critical notes, commentary and appendix, Naples 2002.

A. Di Berardino

CEOLFRITH (642–716). Born in 642 in Northumbria of a noble English family, in 674 he was *abbot of the Monastery of St. Peter at Wearmouth and later, from 682, also of the twin Monastery of St. Paul at Jarrow. Ceolfrith worked to bring the Irish and Scots to the observance of Roman doctrine, also writing to the king of the Picts (*Ep. ad Naitanum*, in Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* V, 21: PL 95, 271-280) so that he would adhere to Roman Easter practice and preserve, with his people, the unity of the Catholic church. At Rome in 678 he found a large quantity of codices, among them a copy of the Vulgate, which he then had reproduced in England in three copies, two for the libraries of the *monasteries under him and one, very probably made at Wearmouth or Jarrow under Bede's oversight, to bring personally as a gift at the Confession of St. Peter. Died 716 at Langres as he was going to Rome with the third copy of the Vulgate (*Codex Amiatinus*).

CPL 1377; E.A. Lowe, *English Uncial*, Oxford 1960, Pl. VIII; B. Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter*, Freiburg 1985, 9-21; K. Corsano, *The First Quire of the Codex Amiatinus and the Institutiones of Cassiodorus*: Scriptorium 41 (1987) 3-34; R. Marsden, *The Survival of Ceolfrith's Tobit in a Tenth-Century Insular Manuscript*: JTS 45 (1994) 1-23; I. Wood, *The Most Holy Abbot Ceolfrid*, The Jarrow Lecture 1995 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1996).

P. Marone

CERDO. *Gnostic *heretic, active at *Rome in the mid-2nd c. According to *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 27,1), Cerdo arrived in the capital under Pope *Hyginus (138–142) and there taught *heretical doctrines, according to which the creator God, just and knowable, revealed in the law of Moses and the Prophets, is distinguished from the Father of Jesus Christ, good and unknowable. Still, according to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* III, 4,3), Cerdo, agreeing to do *penance and feigning repentance, was initially restored to the community but secretly continued to spread his teachings; again found guilty, he was finally definitively excluded from the community. This information, and a link of Cerdo with the Simonian heresy, are substantially confirmed by *Hippolytus (*Ref.* VII, 10,37; X, 19), who depends on Irenaeus. Irenaeus's attribution to Cerdo of the main doctrines of *Marcion, whom he makes merely Cerdo's disciple and continuator, with no originality of his own, seems more suspect and may be the result of a confusion, perhaps in Irenaeus's sources, or of an error in relating the list of the bishops of Rome to the appearance of individual heretics in the capital (see Harnack and Peterson). *Epiphanius (*Pan.* XLI, 1) and *Filaster (*Haer.* 44) say that Cerdo was a native of *Syria. Epiphanius attributes *docetist doctrines to him; ps.-Tertullian (*Adv. omnes haer.* 6) even attributes Marcion's NT canon to him. According to Agapius (*Universal History*, in PO VII, 511), Cerdo stated that the world was created by various divinities coming together, and denied the resurrection.

A. Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium von fremden Gott*, Leipzig 1924 (Beilage II: "Cerdo und Marcion," 31-39); G. Bardy, DHGE, 12 (1953), col. 162-163; E. Peterson, *Cerdone*: EC III, 1313-1314; J. Quasten, *Patrologia*, vol. I, Turin 1975, 237; G. May, "Markion und der Gnostiker Kerdon," *Evangel. Glaube und Geschichte*, Festschrift G. Mecenseffy, Vienna 1984, 233-284; R.J. Hoffmann, *Marcion and the Restitution of Christianity*, Chico, CA 1984, 41-44; BBKL III, 1384-1385 (1992).

C. Gianotto

CEREALIS. Bishop of Castellum Ripense in *Africa, present at the dramatic debate ordered by the *Vandal king *Huneric between *Catholic and *Arian bishops in February 484. Wrote a *Libellus contra Maximinum arrianum,* in which various questions put by the Arians are resolved by the Catholics on the basis of the anti-Arian *trinitarian doctrine by now codified by long tradition and fully exploiting citations taken from Scripture, according to a polemical procedure typical of this era in Africa.

CPL 813; PL 58, 757-768; Moricca III, 1, 749-750, 968; PCBE 1, 207.

M. Simonetti

CERINTHUS – CERINTHIANS (1st-2nd c.). According to the *Epistula Apostolorum* (early 2nd c.), Cerinthus and *Simon Magus were considered among the pseudo-apostles (1 [12] and 7 [18]). Another old tradition says that the apostle *John fled from the baths at *Ephesus when he heard that Cerinthus was present in the building (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 3,3,4 and Euseb., *HE* 3,28,6). This came from the idea that Cerinthus was an astute *heretic who worked in Asia Minor, trying to undo the work of the apostles. At first Cerinthus was depicted as a typical *gnostic who held that the world was not created by God but by inferior forces, that Christ

descended on the man Jesus and that the *angels were responsible for the law (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,26,1; Hipp., *Philos.* 7,33,1-2; ps.-Tertull., *Adv. omn. haer.* 3). When, in the 2nd c., John's Apocalypse was suspect in some circles for its millenarian ideas, the *orthodox writer *Gaius claimed that the Johannine writings were originally written by Cerinthus. Though *Hippolytus did not accept this idea (according to Dionysius bar-Salibi, d. 1171), subsequently it was generally held that Cerinthus had millenarian ideas. This was due esp. to *Eusebius (*HE* 3,28,1-6), based on his contemporary Dionysius. Eusebius was also the first to say that Cerinthus was the head of a group called the Cerinthians. *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 28) emphasized the tradition of Cerinthus's first appearance as a pseudo-apostle. According to him, Cerinthus should be held responsible for Paul's difficulties with the Jews and *Jewish Christians, since it was supposed that Cerinthus lived according to the Jewish law. This image of Cerinthus was followed by *Filaster (*Div. haer. liber* 26), who also knew the tradition that there was a law held to be given by angels (Iren.) and followed by the Cerinthians (Epiph.). *Augustine (*De haer.* 8), however, writes of Cerinthus as a Jewish Christian with millenarian ideas. This characterization was adopted by all who made use of Augustine.

Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, Erlangen 1888-1892, I, 1 (1888), 220-262; II, 2 (1892), 973-991, 1021-1022; RBi 30 (1921) 344-373; A.F.J. Klijn - G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian Sects*, Leiden 1973, 3-19; LTK[3] 5,1402; B.G. Wright, *Cerinthus apud Hippolytus: An Inquiry into the Traditions About Cerinthus' Provenance*: Second Cent 4 (1984) 103-115; BBKL 3, 1387-1388.

A.F.J. Klijn

CHAD (Ceadda) (d. 672). Probably Northumbrian by birth, Chad—often confused with his brother Cedd—was educated and made his vows in the *monastery of Lindisfarne under the attentive guidance of *Aidan but spent part of his youth in *Ireland, where he studied with St. *Egbert (not to be confused with Egbert, archibishop of *York) in the monastery of Rathmelsige. Returning to his homeland, he helped his brother Cedd found the monastery of Laestingaeu (now Lastingham in Yorkshire), becoming its *abbot in 664. The same year, the priest *Wilfrid—appointed bishop of Northumbria with his see at *York after the death of Bishop Tuda of Lindisfarne—was sent to *Gaul to be regularly consecrated (incorrect observance of Easter and the chronic lack of bishops made a regular ordination impossible), but since he delayed his return, the king Oswiu decided to intervene personally, sending Chad to Archbishop *Deusdedit of Doruvernis to be ordained bishop in order to fill the vacant see. Deusdedit having died, however, Chad was appointed bishop by Wine of Wessex (pastor of the western Saxons of whom *Bede recounts episodes of simony; *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* III, 7), coadjudicated by two Breton bishops of the *Celtic faction. Upon his return Wilfrid, now regularly ordained bishop according to *Roman custom, did not want to deprive Chad of his authority, as the latter was administering his diocese with great missionary zeal and exemplary conduct. However, during the apostolic visit to the whole of England by *Theodore—appointed new archbishop of Canterbury by Pope *Vitalian in place of the deceased Deusdedit—the irregularity became evident, and Chad voluntarily withdrew, with great humility, to the monastery of Laestingaeu, leaving the leadership of the diocese to the legitimate bishop. The same year, on the death of Bishop Iaruman of Mercia, the king of that province, Wulfhere, son of the *pagan Penda, asked Theodore to give him a new bishop for himself and his people; Theodore did not want to ordain a new bishop and appointed Chad as Iaruman's successor, after personally reordaining him according to correct Roman tradition.

Chad transferred the diocesan see to Licidfelth (Lichfield, "field of cadavers," so-called because according to an ancient tradition the remains of 1,000 British Christians, killed in a *persecution of *Maximian, were there) and built the episcopal church there; with seven other monks, he lived there as a monk to the end of his days. He died 2 March 672, and Theodore ordained Winfrith as his successor, who was a deacon during Chad's episcopate. His tomb at Licidfelth, first in the church dedicated to the Virgin and later transferred to the Church of St. Peter, quickly became a popular *pilgrimage destination because of the many healings and miracles which, according to Bede, occurred there. At the time of the Protestant Reformation his *relics were rescued by the Catholics and translated to the cathedral dedicated to him in Birmingham. A privileged source on his life and work is certainly Bede, who was instructed in Sacred Scripture by Trumberht, one of the monks who had been Chad's disciples.

Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* III, 23,28; IV, 2,3; R.H. Warner, *The Life and Legends of St. Chad*, London 1872; DCB 1, 426-429; DHGE 12, 33-34; Vies des SS. 3, 31-34; BS 3, 1058-1059; LTK 2, 984.

M. Ghilardi

CHALCEDON

I. Historical outline - II. Council.

I. Historical outline. Bithynian city (Chalkedon, Kalchedon, today Kadiköy) on the Bosphorus opposite *Constantinople, founded by colonists from Megara in 685 BC (see Strabo, XII, 4, 2,563 C). It came under the *Persians in 387 and was later liberated by Alexander. Situated in a highly favorable position, it drew prosperity and well-being not so much from its own territory as from commercial traffic on the Bosphorus (which is why it paid a huge tribute to *Athens). It became a *Roman city in 74 BC when King Nicomedes IV of Bithynia bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. It was severely sacked by the Scythians in the reign of *Valerian. Dionysius of Byzantium described the city's site (*Geogr. Graeci Minor*. II, 93, fr. 67). It had a bishop very early: a late Greek tradition says that its first bishops were *Paul's disciples Crescens and Tychicus: but the first known bishop is one Theocritus, 2nd-3rd c. After the *council of 451 it became an ecclesiastical *metropolis, though without suffragans; previously it had been dependent on *Nicomedia. *Monastic institutions flourished there: at the council of 536, ca. 40 monasteries were recorded, under the authority of Bishop Photinus. Bishops: Theocritus, Maris (325–362), Theodulus (at Constantinople, 381), Cyrinus (Socr., *HE* VI, 15), Philotheus, Eulalius (430), Eleutherus, Heraclian (500), Marcian (518), Photinus (536), Constantine (553), Nicetas, Probus (591), John (680–692).

A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford [2]1971, 148-152 and 164-165; R. Janin, *Chalcédoine*: DHGE 12, 270-277. On the episcopal list, see M. Le Quien, *OC*, I, Parisiis 1740, 599-612; in particular, on the tradition regarding the first bishops, see J. Pargoire, *Les premiers évêques de Chalcédonie*: EO 3 (1899) 85-91, 204-209; 4 (1900) 21-30, 104-113; Fedalto 1,98 f.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Council. This, the fourth ecumenical council (451), was summoned by the emperor *Marcian, who had just succeeded *Theodosius II, on 14 May 451 for the following autumn. It was to resolve the arguments raised by the spread of *monophysitism, which had triumphed at the Council of *Ephesus of 449 but through proceedings so irregular as to arouse violent reactions, especially, but not only, in the East (i.e., at *Antioch) and from *Leo the Great. Leo was represented by a delegation presided over by *Paschasinus of Lilybaeum.

The council was originally convened at *Nicaea but was then transferred, at the emperor's wish, to Chalcedon, nearer to *Constantinople, and opened on 8 October in the church of St. *Euphemia, in the presence of more than 500 bishops and some representatives of the emperor. Paschasinus, who had been made president of the assembly at Leo's request, immediately brought a charge against *Dioscorus and other protagonists of the Council of Ephesus of 449. After the reading of that council's acts came the rehabilitation of *Flavian of Constantinople, its main victim, and a proposal to depose Dioscorus, *Juvenal of Jerusalem and other bishops with monophysite leanings. At the session of 10 October, in the absence of Dioscorus, the other accused and the *Egyptian bishops, the imperial commissioners proposed that debate be opened on the doctrinal questions and that a new formula of faith be reached. The proposal aroused perplexity, since Leo himself had requested that this question not be touched, and the Council of Ephesus of 431 had forbidden the use of formulas of faith other than that of Nicaea of 325. It was also clear that the assembly's opinions on the subject were very conflicting. Faced with the commissioners' insistence, they began by reading the documents relating to the christological controversy, including *Cyril of Alexandria's texts and Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum,* while Cyril's anathemata were passed over in silence. On 13 October they again took up the charge against Dioscorus, who was unanimously condemned and declared deposed. On 17 October they returned to the discussion of doctrine: they solemnly confirmed the Nicene Creed of 325, completed by that of Constantinople of 381, Cyril's letters to *Nestorius (only the second) and *John of Antioch of 433, and Leo's *Tome*; and rejected objections put forward by Egyptian bishops and monophysite monks. Juvenal of Jerusalem and the other accused bishops went over to the majority, abandoning Dioscorus to his fate. The doctrinal question was resumed amid great difficulties on 22 October, and after laborious discussions a new formula was approved: influenced by both the formula of union of 433 and by Leo's *Tome,* it was *dyophysite in approach and proclaimed that in Christ, in a single **prosopon* and a single **hypostasis,* the divine and human natures coexist, entire and complete, without mixture, transformation, separation or division, so that Christ is *consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity and consubstantial with us according to his humanity. On 25 October this formula was solemnly promulgated in Marcian's presence.

In subsequent sittings, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and *Ibas of Edessa, condemned at Ephesus in 449, were restored, and problems over the relations between the different Eastern patriarchates were dis-

cussed. It was in this context that can. 28 was approved, which confirmed that Constantinople, the new Rome, took second place after Rome, despite the protests of the Roman delegates, to whom the ranking seemed detrimental to effective Roman primacy: in fact Leo would not subscribe to this canon. On these discussions the council closed, 1 November, once more in the emperor's presence.

ACO II; DTC 2, 2190-2208; Hfl-Lecl 2, 649-888; CGG 1, 243-418; R.V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, London 1953; P.Th. Camelot, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine*, Paris 1962; L.R. Wickham, *Chalkedon*: TRE 7 (1981) 668-675; A.J. Festugière, *Actes du concile de Chalcédoine. Sessions III-VI*, intr. by H. Chadwick, Geneva 1983; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. 2/1. Das Konzil von Chalkedon (451). Rezeption und Widerspruch (451–518)*, Freiburg – Basel - Vienna 1986; J. Vogt, *Ephesus. Konzil u. Synoden*: LTK³ 3, 706 f.; E. Reichert, *Nestorius*: BBKL 6 (1993) 629-633; Id., *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church,* London 1991, nr. 18; R. Kirchschläger - A. Stirnemann (eds.), *Chalkedon und die Folgen. Festschr. Z. 60. Geburtstag v. Bisch. Mesrob K. Krikorian*, Innsbruck-Vienna 1992; A. de Halleux, *Nestorius. Histoire et doctrine*: Irénikon 66 (1993) 163-177; L. Perrone, *L'impatto del dogma di Calcedonia sulla riflessione teologica tra IV e V Concilio Ecumenico*, in A. Di Berardino - B. Studer (eds.), *Storia della teologia*, I, Casale Monf. 1993, 568ff.; W. Breuning, *Chalkedon 2. Das Konzil von Chalkedon:* LTK³ 2, 999-1002; J.W Need, *Human Language and Knowledge in the Light of Chalcedon*, New York 1996; P.-Th. Camelot, *Storia dei concili II: Efeso e Calcedonia*, It. tr., Vatican City 1997; J. van Oort - J. Roldanus (eds.), *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität,* Louvain 1997; M. Fedou, *Chalcédoine (Concile), 451*, in J.-Y. Lacoste (ed.), *Dictionnaire critique de théologie,* Paris 1998, 266ff.; A.M. Ritter, s.v. *Chalkedon, Konzil von 451*: RGG⁴ 2, 92ff.; A.M. Ritter, s.v. *Chalcedonense, christologische Definition,* ibid., 93ff.; A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, in C. Andresen - A.M. Ritter (eds.), *Handbuch der Dogmen und Theologiegeschichte,* I, Göttingen ²1999, 261-270; K.-H. Uthemann, *Zur Rezeption des* Tomus Leonis *in und nach Chalkedon. Wider den dogmenhistorischen Begriff "strenger Chalkedonismus,"* SP 34, Louvain 2001, 572-604.

M. Simonetti

CHALCIS (Chalcis ad Belum). The settlement of Qenneshrin ("eagle's nest") was renamed Chalcis—a clear reference to the homonymous Greek city of Eubea—due to the Hellenizing colonial policy of Seleucus I Nicator (d. 281 BC). The city gave its name to the surrounding region (Chalkidiki) and is referred to by Pliny as "Chalcis ad Belum." Located at the center of a fertile area, the city acquired a certain splendor, as attested by the right conceded it to mint coins (AD 92?). The name Chalcis remains linked to that of the *Neoplatonist philosopher *Iamblichus, born there ca. 250. A disciple of *Porphyry, Iamblichus, recognizing the impossibility of attaining union with God through philosophy, broadly pursued *theurgy and *pagan religious practices as alternatives.

The history of Chalcis came to the fore when *Belisarius (d. 565), Emperor *Justinian's general, began the war against the Persians from there. Some years later, during the conflict between the *Byzantine emperor Phocas and the Persian *Chosroes II, the city fell into the latter's hands but was spared sacking upon payment of 200 pounds of gold.

The first information we have on the Christian presence at Chalcis goes back to the 4th c.; given its nearness to *Aleppo and *Antioch, however, it can be supposed that the new religion reached the city quite early. We know that Chalcis was an episcopal see from the mid-4th c., since its Bishop Magnus took part at a synod in Antioch (363). A letter of *Basil of Caesarea to the city's clergy (375) informs us that they opposed the pro-*Arian orientation of the emperor *Valens (*Letter to the Chalcidians*). During these same years (374–376), *Jerome stayed in the Chalcidian desert, studying Greek and Hebrew while practicing a harsh *ascesis. According to *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, various monks lived in the area. *Rabbula was from Chalcis, born there in the mid-4th c. After a *pilgrimage in the holy land, he left possessions and family to dedicate himself to the *monastic life but in 411 was called to lead the Church of *Edessa.

Noteworthy in the list of the bishops of Chalcis known to us is *Apringius, who took part in the Council of *Ephesus (431). His name is linked to that of Anthony, a *chorbishop of his who preached the *theopaschite *heresy at Antioch. News about a bishop from the *chōra* ("countryside") accords well with what we know of this area, where urban centers were very few relative to rural towns. Apringius was succeeded by Romulus, who subscribed to the encyclical of the Council of *Chalcedon, which does not seem to have been accepted by the whole Christian community of Chalcis: we know that during those years a *monophysite hierarchy arose alongside the *orthodox hierarchy. In fact the small city of Chalcis became an important *monophysite center, and the local *monastery offered a number of bishops to the church.

DHGE 12, 279-280; P. Canivet, *Le monachisme syrien selon Théodoret de Cyr*, Paris 1977, 185 f.; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale M.to 1994, 65-67; Fedalto 2, 701.

L. Padovese

CHALICE. A particularly important religious element in the Jewish Passover meal (*Pes.* X, 1; *Pes.b.* 108b), a chalice is present in the NT texts relating Jesus' words at the Last Supper and from then on be-

came part of every *eucharistic *liturgy. According to various witnesses (Athenag., *Legatio* 11; Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 13,2; Tertull., *Pud.* VII, 10), chalices were normally of glass, but also of silver (Duchesne LP I, 143; Aug., *En. in Ps.* 113, *Ser.* 2,6) and gold (John Chrys., *In Matth.* I, 3). In the interpretations of the Fathers, the chalice is closely linked to the eucharistic wine: it is a symbol of the communion of the faithful with the *Holy Spirit (Ps. Hipp., *Hom. in Pasch.* 2, SC 27,119-121) and of their partaking of eschatological joy (Did., *Com. Zach.* III, 219). For *Ambrose, the rock out of which water flowed when touched by Moses's staff is a figure of the chalice touched by God's Word, which brims with water welling up to eternal life, of which God's people drink (*Sacr.* V, 3). For *Jerome, based on Mt 20:22; 26:39 and Ps 115:13, the chalice indicates Christ's passion (*In Matth.* III, 20,22), but this comparison is already found in *Mart. Polycarp* 14,2 and in Clement, who distinguishes between the chalice drunk by Christ, bearer of salvation, and that drunk by the *apostles and the faithful after them, a symbol of sufferings for the sake of the church (*Strom.* 4, 751-752; *Paed.* 1,46). For *Origen, the expression "chalice of salvation" is equivalent to "*martyrdom" (*Mart.* 29; 38).

P. Lebeau, *La signification ecclésiologique de la coupe eucharistique d'après les Pères*: SP 10 (1967) 366-373.

F. Cocchini

CHANT and ANTIPHON. In his treatise *De Anima* 9,4 (CCL 2, 792), *Tertullian writes: *Prout scripturae leguntur, aut psalmi canuntur, aut allocutiones proferuntur aut petitiones delegantur*. In the old *liturgy, then, at least at *Rome, singing was limited to the psalms. It is unclear, however, whether the whole psalm was sung. In *Augustine's time and in that of *Leo the Great, the lector read the psalm after the epistle and the people would sing a refrain taken from the psalm itself. This explains Augustine's words: *Legenti respondentes cantavimus* (*In ps. 40 enarr. Sermo ad plebem I*: CCL 38, 447). The psalm after the first reading seems to have been considered a reading. But gradually the need was felt to respond to the reading, and so the psalm became one of the many forms of responsorial chant. Other forms consisted of a simple acclamation, a poetic composition or a biblical canticle, esp. in the liturgy of the Word during the Easter Vigil.

The use of responsorial psalms was common in the time of Augustine and *Athanasius (Lodi, *Enchiridion . . . Clavis*, 70, 101-102). The antiphonal chanting of psalms was introduced in the 4th c. at Rome and *Milan from the Eastern liturgies. The psalm was divided between two choirs and was introduced and concluded by an antiphon drawn from the psalm itself. Later, the antiphon was also recited in the course of the psalmody. Benedict's *Rule* (ch. 14) speaks of antiphons *ad ipsum diem pertinentes,* which shows the existence of a collection of antiphons for the various liturgical feasts. The Roman liturgy has its collections of antiphons for Mass (*antiphona ad introitum, antiphona ad offertorium* and *antiphona ad communionem*), which indicates that psalms were sung at those moments of the Mass (Martimort, *The Church at Prayer,* 80-81, 113, 188-189).

An abbreviated form of responsorial psalm was the *responsorium,* which corresponded to the particular readings of the liturgy of the hours. Benedict's *Rule* (chs. 9-11) alludes to readings *cum responsoriis suis,* i.e., collections of *responsoria* drawn from the psalms and harmonized with the readings. In the 9th c. other forms of *responsoria,* not taken from the Psalms, appear: they were often "historical" in the sense that they commented on the feast and were taken from Scripture and from *hagiographical legends.

Outside the Roman liturgy the use of nonbiblical compositions of a poetic nature began earlier. Some Pauline epistles contain fragments of these liturgical hymns (see Wellesz, *The Earliest Example*). *Gnostics and *Arians used new compositions to propagate their own doctrines. *Ambrose composed several liturgical hymns in opposition to those of the Arians (Lodi, op. cit., 61). Because of the danger of *heresy, Rome remained reluctant until after the 11th c. to accept hymns into the liturgy, making an exception for the oldest hymns, such as the *Gloria in excelsis* and the *Te Deum*.

Benedict used the *Ambrosian hymns for the liturgy of the hours, though in 563 the Council of *Braga had condemned the use of hymns in the liturgy (Leclercq, *Hymnes*, 2911). The West had other renowned authors of hymns besides Ambrose: *Prudentius, *Sedulius and *Venantius Fortunatus (see Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns*).

In the East, hymnology flourished from the 4th c. Among the main composers were *Ephrem of Edessa and *Severus of Antioch. In the 6th c. the Byzantine liturgy introduced other forms of hymns, such as Kontakia and Canons, many of which were composed by *Romanus Melodus, *Andrew of Crete and *John of Damascus.

Th. Lamy, *Sancti Ephraem Syri hymni et sermones*, 4 vols., Mechliniae 1882-1902; H. Leclercq, *Hymnes*: DACL 6, 2 (1925) 2826-2928; E. Wellesz, *The Earliest Example of Christian Hym-*

nodie: Ch. Quart. Review (1945) 34-45; P. Maas - C. Trypanis, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica, Cantica genuina*, Oxford 1963; S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns*, Hildesheim 1966; W. Christ - M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum*, Leipzig 1971; A. Martimort, *The Church at Prayer, the Eucharist*, Shannon 1973; E. Lodi, *Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum*, Rome 1979; Id., *Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum. Clavis methodologica cum commentariis selectis*, Bologna 1979; F. Rainoldi, *Il canto come dinamismo della parola*: Bible and Liturgia 3, Padua 1993, 121-150; A.M. Triacca, *Canto-musica e celebrazione. Riflessioni teologico-liturgiche per l'approfondimento della loro relazione*: Not 30 (1994) 633-647; J.M. Joncas, *Musical Elements in the* Ordo Missae *of Paul* VI, in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 3, Collegeville 1999, 210-212, 238-239; E. Costa, *Canto e musica*, in *Liturgia* (Dizionari S. Paolo), Cinisello B. 2001, 302-328.

A. Chupungco

CHARISMS. In the NT the term χάρισμα, besides meaning in a general way a "gift" or "present" of χάρις, i.e., of divine *grace (Rom 5:15-16; 6:23; 1 Cor 7:7; 2 Cor 1:11; 1 Pet 4:10), acquired a more precise technical meaning in Rom 12:6 and 1 Cor 12–14, where it came to designate the distinctive gifts of the Spirit to the Christian communities. Without going into details on the number and description of the charisms indicated by *Paul (for this, see Allo 320-339), suffice it say that they, though all in the same way gifts of the Spirit, can be divided into two categories: truly extraordinary gifts, not corresponding to any precise hierarchical function in the community, such as "speaking in tongues," working miracles and healing; and gifts enabling their recipients to govern, assist, teach etc. This distinction helps us understand the subsequent developments of Christian reflection on charisms.

Texts relating to charisms in the Apostolic Fathers are few; like the *apostles, they claimed to speak through the *Holy Spirit (*1 Clem.* 63,2; Ign., *Philad.* 7,1). *Ignatius wrote to the Christians of *Smyrna that they "lack no charism" (*Smyrn.*, intr.). More interesting are the observations in the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (*Mand.* 11,7-9) and the **Didache* (11,7,12), where we start to see the problem of the distinction between true and false charisms, esp. with respect to *prophecy.

Among the *apologists, *Justin Martyr maintains, like Ignatius, that the Christians lack no charism and that the προφητικὰ χαρίσματα have been transferred from the Jews to the Christians (*Dial.* 82,1); a little further on he observes that "even today it is possible to see among us women and men who possess charisms of the Holy Spirit" (*Dial.* 88,1). *Irenaeus develops the theme of charisms, esp. in polemic against *gnostics and *Montanists. The use of charisms by the gnostics was contested both because it did not occur according to the methods admitted by *orthodoxy (*Adv. haer.* I, 13,4; II, 31,2), and because gnostics derived their powers not from God but from *magic arts. Similarly he refutes the Montanists because they considered themselves the exclusive trustees of the charism of prophecy and exercised it outside the church (*Adv. haer.* III, 11,9). Irenaeus also seems to consider the *charisma veritatis,* which the church has received from the apostles and handed on to their successors, as a gift of God, whose recipients can be recognized by their exemplary and spotless life (as earlier in the *Didache* and in Hermas's *Shepherd*). *Apollonius—a contemporary of Montanus, cited by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* V, 18,1-14)—maintained the falsity of the Montanist prophecies, not because he doubted the existence of this charism, but because they exercised it in untraditional ways (i.e., reveling in ecstasy or accepting cash rewards, as the anonymous author cited by Eusebius, *HE* V, 16,7, maintains).

In short, the 2nd-c. Fathers attest to the belief in the presence of charisms in the church of their time (see also Tertull., *Apol.* 23; *Ad Scapul.* I, 2-4; *Exhort. Cast.* 4) but, under the inducement of antiheretical polemic, they seek to establish the limits and conditions on the basis of which orthodox charisms may be distinguished from those claimed by *heretics.

Later, reflection on charisms developed in several main directions: (1) Charisms (esp. those in the first category mentioned above) came to be seen more and more as a *privilegium ecclesiae primitivae*. *Origen, e.g., while maintaining against the Jews the persistence of miracles among the Christians (*C. Cel.* II, 8), also maintains that the signs of the Spirit, numerous in Jesus' time and after his *ascension, seem to have become less frequent later (*C. Cel.* VII, 8). *Gregory of Nazianzus (*In Iob* XXIV, 2) expresses doubts on the existence of charisms in the church of his time. For *John Chrysostom (*In Inscrip. Actuum Apost.* 2: PG 51, col. 80) and then *Gregory the Great (*Hom.* XXIX, 4: PL 76, col. 1215), these manifestations of the Spirit belong to the apostolic church, but with the spread and success of Christianity they had exhausted their function. (2) The charisms whose existence continued to be admitted were those relating to service, possessed by persons belonging to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. (3) Where charisms were not identified solely with service and its distinct functions, there was a tendency to see *monasticism (with particular reference to the *virtutes* of the *viri Dei*) as the privileged locus of their manifestation.

A place apart in the conceptual elaboration of charisms belongs to *John Chrysostom, who does

not consider charisms an exclusive privilege of the ecclesiastical hierarchy or of *monasticism, maintaining—esp. on the basis of 1 Cor 12:7—that each Christian has been given a particular gift of the Spirit.

M. Lauterburg, *Der Begriff des Charisma und seine Bedeutung für die praktische Theologie*, Gütersloh 1898; H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen 1953, [2]1963; G. Hasenhüttl, *Charisma. Ordnungsprinzip der Kirche*, Freiburg 1969 (It. tr. Bologna 1973); A.M. Ritter, *Charisma im Verständnis des Johannes Chrysostomos und seiner Zeit*, Göttingen 1972; J.R. McRay, *Charismata in the Second Century*, SP XII (TU 115), Berlin 1975, 232-239; D. Grasso, *I carismi nella chiesa. Teologia e storia*, Brescia 1982; M.A. Williams, *The Life of Antony and the Domestication of Charismatic Wisdom,* in Id., *Charisma and Sacred Biography,* Chambersburg 1982, 23-45; B.N. Wambaq, *Le mot charisme*: NRTh 97 (1975) 345-355.

A. Monaci Castagno

CHARITO. Born at *Iconium (Lycaonia), *confessor of the faith under *Aurelian (270–275). On *pilgrimage in *Palestine, he was captured by brigands, who died soon afterward, enabling him to found (330) in their cave the *laura of Pharan near Jericho, with the attached church, which he dedicated under Bishop *Macarius I of Jerusalem (314–333); then that of Duka in the *desert of Jericho; and finally that of Suka near Bethlehem. His life was characterized by labors, psalmody, hospitality, rigorous *fasting (a single meal with bread soaked in water and a little salt) and many miracles. Died ca. 350. The anonymous biography (shortly after the mid-6th c.), based entirely on oral traditions, was used with few changes by Simeon Metaphrastes (PG 115, 900-917).

G. Garitte, *La vie prémétaphrastique de S. Chariton*: Bull. de l'Inst. hist. belge de Rome 21 (1941) 5-50; DHGE 12, 421-423; LTK 2, 1030; Beck 203, 467; BS 3, 791-792.

A. De Nicola

CHASTITY. According to *Isidore of Seville's etymology (*Et.* 10,33), *castus* is the term indicating those *qui perpetuam libidinis abstinentiam pollicebantur*. The virtue of chastity is not exclusive to a particular state of life, but is an element of every state: *virginity, marriage, celibacy. Its value was appreciated in the ancient Greco-Roman world (which knew virgins and celibates: the Vestals, the priests of Eastern religions in Asia Minor, philosophers dedicated to the study of wisdom), in Buddhism and in ancient *Judaism (the Essenes were celibate, according to *Philo, *Josephus and *Pliny the Younger). The NT teaching (Mt 19:11-12: chastity for the kingdom of heaven) and Pauline preaching (chastity as an undivided heart to please God, 1 Cor 7:34) made chastity a significantly attractive force in the first centuries of Christianity, distinguishing it from the concept held by the highest moral philosophy.

In the 2nd c. the invitation to a radical chastity was present in ecclesiastical preaching and in *Encratism and gnosis, though the latter were in danger of abandoning St. *Paul's balance between flesh and spirit, between marriage, virginity and celibacy. *Athenagoras's *A Plea for the Christians* presents virginity as one of the finest realities of the Christian life ("There are many men and women who have grown old without marrying in the hope of belonging more to God," 33), and marriage as the place of the reproduction and defense of life (*Suppl.* 35), being so convinced of its indissolubility that remarriage is a "respectable adultery" (*Suppl.* 33). *Clement of Alexandria defends marriage against the *gnostics, elevating it beyond sexual union and procreation to a spiritual and religious union between husband and wife, who are united by God (*Strom.* III, 10,68). To overcome the passions, *Origen asks for perpetual mortification of the flesh and renunciation of marriage, though he does not reject it entirely (*In Num. hom.* 24,2). *Novatian, proclaiming the benefits of chastity (*De bono pudicitiae*), states that whoever practices it "has restored his own freedom" (11). *Tertullian, influenced by *Montanism, seems to consider marriage as a legitimate vice against which he exalts virginity and continence. *Ambrose (*De vid.* 4, 23) distinguishes a triple virtue of chastity: the first conjugal, the second widowed, the third virginal; to talk of and exhort to one of these does not exclude or imply inferiority in the others. *Augustine presents models of these different "types" of chastity: Joseph, Susanna and Mary (*Serm.* ed. Mai 136,2); and *Jerome offers *Paula as a model in his own time of married and widowed chastity (*Ep.* 108,15). Chastity is "remaining in Jesus Christ in the flesh and in the spirit" (Ign., *Ad Eph.* 10,3); it must be guarded, leaving no room for evil desires (Hermas, *Mand.* 4,1,1); it makes us "neighbors" of God (Orig., *Hom. in Levit.* 11,1; John Moschus, *Prat.* 152). It requires a will that strives and obtains from God the gift of chastity through a seriously dedicated life (Jerome, *In Mt.* 3,19,11), in a struggle with the devil and the passions to conquer the person's very nature (John Clim., *Scal. par.* 15). The warning not to make chastity an occasion for pride pervades all the writings of the Fathers over the centuries (from *1 Clem.* 38, 2 to Jerome, *Ep.* 22, 3 and Aug., *Virgin.* 37, 38).

From the start, *monasticism saw chastity as an incontestable and universal reality against which

the devil's temptations are focused; chastity is the way to obtain ἀπάθεια, but without God's gift and humility, not only does it benefit no one, but it is even harmful to those who practice it. It is a virtue in continual growth, and the monk, receiving it as a gift from God, makes daily progress until he reaches maturity in it (Cass., *Conl.* 11,7; 12,7). Chastity makes the soul the place where God dwells, such that there is no good work that is not born of a chaste heart (Greg. Gt., *Mor.* 21,12,19). In Alcuin (d. 804) (*De virtut. et vit.* 18) we find this same broad meaning of chastity as a virtue to be applied to all states and all moments of human life (*omnibus enim castitas semper necessaria est*).

DIP 2, 644ff.; P.T. Camelot, *Les traités "De virginitate" au IV^e siècle*: EtCarm 31 (1952) 273-292; E. Metz, *La consécration des vierges dans l'Église romaine, Étude d'histoire de la liturgie*, Paris 1954; M. Aubineau, *Les écrits de S. Athanase sur la virginité*: RAM 31 (1955) 140-173; M. Bernards, *Speculum virginum. Geistigkeit und Seelenleben der Frau in Hochmittelalter*, Cologne 1955; J.G. Ziegler, *Die Modifizierung der Tugend der Jungfräulichkeit unter dem Einfluss der Antiken Philosophie*, Würzburg 1959; M. Agterberg, *Ecclesia-Virgo. Étude sur la virginité de l'Église et des fidèles chez saint Augustin*, Louvain 1960; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Turin 1969; V. Grossi, *La verginità negli scritti dei Padri. La sintesi di S. Ambrogio: gli aspetti cristologici, antropologici, ecclesiali*, in *Il celibato per il Regno*, Milan 1977, 131-164; P. Pisi, *Genesis e phthorà: le motivazioni protologiche della verginità in Gregorio di Nissa e nella tradizione dell'enkrateia*, Rome 1981; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Rome [2]1983; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Enkrateia e antropologia. Le motivazioni protologiche della continenza e della verginità nel cristianesimo dei primi secoli e nello gnosticismo*, SEA 20, Rome 1984; Ch. Munier, *Matrimonio e Verginità nella Chiesa Antica*, It. tr. Turin 1990; P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York 1988, It. tr. Turin 1992; S. Elm, *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 1994; T.M. Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity*, Minneapolis 1998.

M.G. Bianco

CHILD. In ancient Christian literature this word was used in two senses: on the one hand to express a theological idea, and on the other according to the everyday meaning of the times. As a theological expression it indicated the first period of humanity's history or of the church's earthly life and was also a symbol of the perfect person. In the Greco-Roman world the division of human history into seven parts was well known, and it was compared to a human life by the *Stoics. Some 4th-c. *Fathers were inspired by these two conceptions and spoke of salvation history in more or less the same way. Thus *Gregory of Nyssa (*Or. in Chr. res.*: PG 46, 672), *Jerome (*Comm. in Ez.* 38, 1), *Ambrose (*Ep.* 18, 21) and esp. *Augustine (*Gen. Man.* I, 32,35; *Civ. Dei* XV-XVI). *Tyconius (*Doctr. Christ.* III, 35, 51) provided the idea that inspired Augustine, who divided human or salvation history into seven epochs, according to the phases of a human life; the first, which is like childhood, lasted from the creation until Noah and included two parts, infancy and childhood (*Civ. Dei* XVI, 43). Conversely, in *Clement of Alexandria the end of humanity's earthly life—that is, the epoch of the church—is like childhood, because Christians are clothed with the new man (Eph 4:24) and live in the springtime of eternal life (*Paed.* I, 5,20,4).

The child as a model of the perfect man is suggested in the words of Jesus (Mt 18:3) and in Paul's letters (Gal 4:7), but childhood does not have a positive sense in Pauline theology (1 Cor 13:11): it does not express the perfect, mature man, as previously in *Philo (Gnilka, *Aet. spin.*, 208). This idea was highly favored in *gnostic texts and in Clement of Alexandria's theology. According to the *Gospel of Thomas,* "an old man does not hesitate to ask a baby of seven days about the place of life" (*Gos.Thom.*, log. 4). In gnostic thought the child generally represents a person who is a complete stranger to sensual temptations, without earthly ambition, and for whom sexual difference is no longer important; such a person could be considered a monad, androgynous. A very similar expression is in the *apocryphal Psalter: "The elderly with grey hair are instructed by children. Six-year-olds teach old men of 60" (*Psalt.* 192,2-3); a similar formula is in the *Ophites (Hipp., *Haer.* V, 7,20), or in the *Manichees (Alex. of Lycopolis, *De plac. Man.* 24).

Clement of Alexandria also valued this idea, but changed it, removing the gnostic character. In his theology childhood as the model of perfection has two aspects: (1) before God the person must always remain a child in simplicity, humility and complete abandonment (*Paed.* I, 5,16-17); the theme of spiritual childhood in relation to God has remained one of the central themes of Christian spirituality; (2) having commented on the passages from Paul, Clement distinguishes between the child and the youth. The child is one who is led by the law, and so Paul wrote: "when I became a man, I put aside childish things" (1 Cor 13:11); the youth is one who is fed by Christ. Youth in Christ is perfection (*Paed.* I, 6,34,2-3); it does not mean a lack of intelligence and knowledge (*Paed.* I, 3,16,2; I, 6,21,1), but as young people are nourished on milk, so Christians are nourished on Christ (the final hymn of *Paed.* III). Another idea common in both Christian and *pagan antiquity for illustrating perfect human behavior was the so-called *puer-senex,* according to which a

young person's value depended on the maturity of his or her habits and virtues. An observation from Tobit in the Vulgate illustrates this: *nihil tamen puerile gessit in opere* (Tob 1:4). The inspiration for this idea in the Christian context were the exemplary youths of the Bible: David, Daniel, Tobias; in the pagan world it was the heroes of Greco-Roman literature: Telemachus, Drusus. The idea of *puer-senex* was well known in the classical authors (Cic., *Cato* 71; Corn. Ruf., *Ep.* 4,17,6; Plin., *Ep.* 6,26,1), or in funerary inscriptions; it was equally rich in the Christian context: in *hagiography (Athan., *Vita Ant.* 1), in the moral works of the Fathers (John Chrys., *Hom. in Hbr* 7,3; Ambr., *Hom. in Ps.* 36,59), esp. in the literature on *monasticism (Pall., *Hist. Laus.* 17,2), and in Christian epitaphs (Greg. Naz., *Epit.* 6,15). The concept of *puer-senex* applies only in a broad sense to the word *child* and is rather more linked to the second phase of human life, adolescence.

The line between childhood and adolescence was set by the Stoics at 14 years, although the first period of a human life was divided into two parts: (1) the first seven years, when the child does not participate in the Logos, the principle of rationality, whereas in the second part of this period, (2) from the seventh to the fourteenth year, this principle of rationality develops. In the first period the child is entrusted to the mother or nurse and the pedagogue. In these first steps of its education, the difference between pagan and Christian children amounts to nothing more than the fables and stories used, prayers, and particular customs. In the 4th c. the great pastoral Fathers counsel parents and educators on the formation of children (John Chrys., *De inan. gl.* 19,1; 73,2-3).

In antiquity the first seven years were unimportant for education, except in some exceptional cases: Plato thought elementary education should begin at six years (*Leg.* I, 643), Aristotle at five (*Pol.* 7,1336), Chrysippus at three (in Quintilianus I,1,16). Elementary studies normally began at seven, whether in private or public schools or in the family. Instruction and education were not joined in antiquity. The first was delegated to the teacher, the second to the nurse and the pedagogue, who accompanied his little master to school and helped him in his studies. Poor children had little possibility of studying and could not attain highly qualified positions: e.g., *Eunomius the *Arian was the son of a peasant, and to avoid being one himself he was able to learn stenography, becoming the secretary of Bishop *Aetius (Greg. Nys., *C. Eun.* 1,50); or they could raise themselves with the help of a benefactor, like *Augustine, who continued his studies thanks to the wealthy *Romanianus (*C. Acad.* II, 2,3). The children of slaves could study according to the needs or intentions of the master. In methods of teaching and study there was little difference between Christians and non-Christians: Christian professors followed *pagan programs both before and after *Constantine, with Christian elements gradually being added, e.g., prayers at the beginning and end of lessons (Hymns of Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* III, 34). In this regard we have a very important archaeological find: the notebook of a young Christian student of 4th-c. *Egypt, different in nothing from a *Hellenistic manual of the same period or of previous centuries: the same mythological names, the same sentences and moral anecdotes, but with unmistakable Christian signs: the invocation "Blessed be God" placed at the top of the first page and a monogram *cross carefully traced at the beginning of each page. We can suppose that Christian teachers in elementary schools were numerous before Constantine (*Apos. Trad.* 16; Tert., *De idol.* 10); well known among them were *Origen's father, *Leonides, and Origen himself, who started a grammar school at age 17 (Euseb., *HE* VI, 2,15).

Children's games in antiquity were simpler than those of today; nor did ancient educators have any concern for articulating a theory of education. Toys found in the tombs of Christian or pagan children are the "perennial games" in which the youngster uses up excess energy, discovers and disciplines his motor reactions, and imitates in his own way adult activities: trinkets, dolls, horses, little place settings for snacks or tools for gardening, carts, balls.

The life and circumstances of children depended on their parents and masters; no law explicitly defended them. Christianity sought through its moral influence to eliminate inhuman practices against children, radically defending human life both before and after birth (*Didache* 2,2; *Ps.-Barn.* 19,5; *Apos. Con.* VII, 3,2; Athen., *Leg.* 35,6; Tertull., *Ap.* 9,6-8); it raised its voice against the cruelty of parents or masters (Eph 6:4), helping out where possible. Christians opposed the practice, widespread in antiquity, of exposing children: if one did not want to raise a newborn, the child was exposed in a particular spot in the city, at Rome on the banks of the Tiber or near the *Columna Lactaria* in the Forum Holitorium, where anyone could pick him up and use him for their own interests, either educating or selling him as a slave. In ancient Christian literature, *Hermas wrote that this had happened to him (*Vis.* I,1,1). Christians took in these exposed children to save them, though often they could do nothing more than bury them, as the tombs of many children and inscriptions in the catacombs attest (Diehl II,142-

143); in some cases consecrated virgins (Aug., *Ep.* 98) or benevolent wealthy families educated them. They were called *alumnus, proiectus, stercorius, kopron, threptos*. After Constantine, laws began to protect these abandoned children, defending them as free persons (CJ VIII, 52,3-4). Later it was largely *monasteries that assumed the burden of educating these children, establishing conditions for their admission to a convent; orphans were accepted unconditionally (Basil, *Reg. Maior*, 15).

In the *oblatio,* which appeared in the 4th c., for a variety of reasons—poverty, religious motives, difficult situations—parents offered their children to God's service, the biblical precedent being the story of the young Samuel (1 Sam 1:1–3:21). At the beginning of the Middle Ages the most common way of educating exposed or abandoned children was begun: in 787 Dateus, archpresbyter of *Milan, donated a house near the church of S. Salvatore to protect them: the first *brephotrophium*.

From the 2nd half of the 4th c. the Fathers encouraged monastic education for all youths, at least for a few years, to strengthen them in virtue prior to their secular career. Monastic education was different from ancient education and was typically Christian; in it we can see the foundation of our modern form of education. Like today, instruction and human formation were inseparably woven together, the teacher and the spiritual director being the same person.

Oblatio: DACL 12, 1857-1877; M.F. Berrouard, *Enfance spirituelle, III. Les Pères de l'Église*: DSp 4, 696-714; E. Josi, *Alumni*: EC 1, 946-948; G. Vitetti, *Brefotrofio*: EC 3, 51-53; V. Maconi, *Esposti*: EC 5, 614-615; Id., *Infanzia abbandonata*: EC 6, 1930-1932; A.P. Frutaz, *Oblati*: EC 9, 22-26; H.I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*, Paris [6]1965; A. Luneau, *L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Église. La doctrine des âges du monde*, Paris 1964; Ch. Gnilka, *Aetas spiritualis*, Bonn 1972; W.A. Strange, *Children in the Ancient World, the New Testament, and the Early Church*, Carlisle 1996; J.-P. Pettorelli, *Péché originel ou amour conjugal? Note sur le sens des images d'Adam et d'Eve sur les sarcophages chrétiens de l'antiquité tardive*: RecAug 30 (1997) 279-334; T.S. Millar, *The Orphans of Byzantium: Child Welfare in the Christian Empire*, Washington, DC 2003.

G. Ladocsi

CHILPERIC I, king (530–584). King of Neustria on the death of his father *Chlothar I (561), he quickly conceived expansionist projects against his brothers Charibert, Guntram and Sigebert. A strong and unscrupulous personality, he was nevertheless dominated by Fredegund, the notorious concubine he married after the strangling of his wife Galaswinth, daughter of the *Visigothic king Athanagild. The misdeed provoked the armed intervention of Sigebert, brother-in-law of the murdered woman, which ended with Sigebert's murder. According to the black picture painted by *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* VI, 46), Chilperic renewed the atrocities of *Nero and *Herod. Particularly irritating were his ambitions in speculative theology, which led him to compose a short treatise on the *Trinity, displeasing to the *Frankish episcopate even in its appearance of *orthodoxy. He even dared to forbid, by edict, the naming in prayers of the three divine persons; he made baptism compulsory for Jews. He thought himself diminished, both in power and in property, by churchmen, which explains his aversion to them, and which nonetheless—given a certain cultural education which even *Venantius Fortunatus recognized in him (*Carm.* IX, 1), and his own conviction of being a poet—did not prevent him writing some sacred hymns (on St. Médard, Advent, contempt of the world etc.), after the manner of *Sedulius but in verses betraying a grave ignorance of classical meter. Though a nonconformist by nature, through this literary activity he aligned himself with some contemporary monarchs and aristocrats who attached equal importance to ecclesiastical and to secular culture. He also attempted phonetic innovations, which he imposed on schools, intending to reconcile the written and spoken languages, which increasingly diverged and led to the appearance of new neo-Latin idioms. He was murdered after a hunting party by a killer hired by Fredegund or by her rival Brunhild, Sigebert's widow.

CPL 1520-1532a; MGH *Poet. lat.* IV, 2; C. Meunier, *Grégoire de Tours et l'histoire morale du centre ouest de la France*, Poitiers 1946; B. Vetere, *Strutture e modelli culturali nella società merovingia*, Galatina 1979, 155-164 and passim; J.W. George, *Poet as Politician: Venantius Fortunatus' Panegyric to King Chilperic*: Journ. of Med. Hist. 15 (1989) 5-18; LMA, 1825.

L. Navarra

CHINA. *Arnobius of Sicca, around AD 300, attests that the Christian message had been preached in China; *Cosmas Indicopleustes attests again to this later (6th cent.). But much earlier than Arnobius himself, *Bardesanes of Edessa, in the *Liber legum regionum* composed in the 1st half of the 3rd cent. AD, suggests that in his day there were Christians among the Seres, that is, the Chinese. For he says that Christians are in every land he has described, and that of the Seres is among these, farther than *Persia and Kushan, where, as he overtly states, there were Christians in his day. Indeed, Bardesanes's description of the Seres' customs is highly positive, just like

his description of the Brahmans: "The Seres have as laws not to kill, not to fornicate, and not to worship idols. And in their whole land there are no idols, no prostitutes, no one who kills a man, nor anyone who is killed." This is also why Bardesanes could not include China in the list of the countries in which Christians avoided the abominable deeds of non-Christians ("Neither do our brothers who are in Gaul marry men, nor do those who are in Parthia take two wives . . . nor do our sisters who are among the Gelians or the Kushan have intercourse with strangers, nor do those who are in Persia marry their own daughters, nor do those who are in Media flee from their dead, or bury them while they are still alive, or give them as food to dogs, nor do those who live in Edessa kill their wives who commit fornication, or their sisters, but they separate themselves from them and hand them to God's judgment. Nor do those who live in Hatra stone thieves, but in whatever land they are, and in whatever place, local laws cannot separate them from the law of their Christ"); for in China, in his own description, non-Christians did not commit abominable acts. But his words are quite inclusive: "The new race of us, the Christians, whom Christ established in every land and in all regions," of which Bardesanes has just spoken, beginning precisely from China. If the *Liber* reflects Bardesanes's words faithfully, seeds of Christianity might have entered China by the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd c. AD (Bardesanes died in AD 222). A tradition, mentioned by Ebedjesus, even connects the first evangelization of China with St. *Thomas, the *apostle of Parthia and India, related with Edessa. While this legend cannot be verified, the Eastern *Syriac matrix of the evangelization of China is attested with certainty for the 7th c.

Before treating the sources for the 7th c., however, it is worth observing that archaeological evidence suggests that Christianity in fact entered China much earlier, between the 1st and the early 3rd century, under the Eastern Han dynasty (AD 25–220). These discoveries still need further study, but if confirmed they would strongly support Arnobius's statement and even Bardesanes's hint; the end of the Eastern Han dynasty and the death of Bardesanes coincide almost perfectly. One archaeological datum is that in Luling (China), during the Ming dynasty, under Emperor Hongwu (1368–1398), a big iron cross came to light with verses carved on it and a precise date: "the ninth year of Chi-wu, Eastern Wu," corresponding to AD 246. This refined Christian handicraft and poetry suggests that Christianity had been present for some time in China at that date.

Moreover, several carved stones going back to the Eastern Han period show apparently Christian motifs, such as (possibly) the Nativity with the *Magi, twice in two distinct carvings, and clearly the association of a lamb and a fish—neither of these frequent in traditional Chinese iconography—or of a lamb and a phoenix, or of two phoenixes and a fish, symbolizing the *resurrection and Christ. The decorative stele with the phoenixes and the fish is dated to AD 86. Other representations seem to concern the story of *Adam and Eve, and the depiction of heaven and hell: the tree of life with two phoenixes and, below, two serpents enchained. There are also other separate representations of serpents enchained or imprisoned. These portraits are very different from the traditional positive description of dragons in Chinese art and culture. A bronze vessel with the clear representation of two fishes and five loaves of bread, associated with the Chinese word for "offering" or "sharing," also belongs to the Eastern Han period and was probably used for the Eucharist. Many more stone carvings from the same period are extant in China and might hold further surprises.

If, as the archaeological evidence analyzed so far and Arnobius (and perhaps Bardesanes) indicate, the Christian message had reached China already in the 2nd c. (or even at the end of the first, as the stele with the phoenixes and the fish may suggest), then it is probable that it did so through a Syriac mission, on the Silk Way, and that the gospel it brought was that of Matthew, the only one for which the patristic tradition explicitly attests an original composition in Hebrew or Aramaic and the only one that recounts the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem. This is also the same gospel that *Pantaenus is reported by *Eusebius of Caesarea to have found already present in India when in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD he went there from *Alexandria, upon the request of some Christians who were already established in India, but wanted a more perfect instruction by that learned teacher. If germs of Christianity were in India at the very least by the end of the 2nd c., this makes it more probable that the Christian message was first preached in China under the Eastern Han dynasty.

Furthermore, a tradition, per se unverifiable, of the Chinese of Chang'an, is in line with the probably Christian artifacts of the Eastern Han period. It relates that in AD 64 (while *Nero was reigning in the Roman Empire and *persecuting the Christians in *Rome) the Chinese emperor Ming-ti sent envoys to the West to learn more about a great prophet who had appeared there. The envoys met two Christian missionaries who were exactly on their way to the

Chinese court and remained at court for six years until their death. During their stay there, they left a writing and Jesus' logia. The latter, again, is a description that is very close to that of the primitive Semitic Matthew in 2nd-c. Christian tradition.

Sure evidence of Christianity in China, however, emerges only in the 7th c. The gap between the 3rd and the 7th c. might be explained by the obstacle posed by the Sassanids in Persia meanwhile, and by the closure of the trade rout through Turkestan. Christians in China could not keep in contact with the Syriac church, which very probably was the mother church of Chinese Christianity. This is manifest in the 7th c.: the evidence for Christianity in China comes from the Eastern Syrian Church, traditionally but infelicitously called "*Nestorian." It is probable that it depended on the patriarch of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the so-called *catholicos. A three-meter stone slab, improperly known as "Nestorian Stele," discovered in 1625 and now kept in the Provincial Museum of Xi'an, was erected in the capital of the Tang empire, Chang'an (the ancient name of Xi'an), in AD 781. It bears a bilingual inscription, in Chinese and Syriac, titled "Memorial of the spread of the Luminous Religion [*Jing Jiao*, the Chinese name for Christianity] coming from Syria into China," which describes how Christianity spread and flourished throughout China in the 7th and 8th c. In AD 635, under the patriarchate of catholicos Yeshuyab II, after the Tang had conquered Turkestan, thus opening again the old trade route to the West, the Eastern Syrian monk Alopen headed a Christian mission that reached the Tang capital. The inscription lists the names of a great deal of Persian (Eastern Syrian) missionaries and includes a compendium of the doctrines of the Syriac church. This shows that the Syriac church of the East was the mother church of Chinese Christianity.

The emperor T'ai-tsung, or Taizong (627–649), studied the Christian Scriptures that Alopen had brought, realizing "their propriety and truth and specifically ordered their preaching and transmission." He wanted them translated into Chinese; he deemed Christianity "excellent, vivifying," and "indispensable," and allowed its diffusion in China. The stele reads as follows: "The Persian monk Alopen, bringing a scriptural religion, has come to present it in our capital city. If one studies the meaning of his religion, it is mysterious, wonderful, immediate, producing understanding, establishing essentials, for the salvation of creatures and the benefit of humanity. It ought to spread throughout the empire." A church and a monastery were built in Chang'an at the expenses of the court. A portrait of the emperor in the church indicated that it was under imperial protection. The church is still mentioned in the *Chronicle of Chang'an* in 1076, when it probably still existed. Many manuscripts discovered in northwestern China speak of Christianity in China in the 7th and 8th centuries. In one of these, stemming from ca. 800, is a hymn addressed to the Christian *Trinity. After the Arabs invaded Persia in 636, many Persians of high rank, even the emperor, fled to China. Christian missionaries from the eastern Syrian church accompanied Arab embassies to China on Arab sea and trade routes as interpreters and advisers.

The following emperor, Kao-tsung, or Gaozong, continued his predecessor's policy of support to Christianity and allowed Christian churches to be built in every province of China. Christian doctrine was adapted to the philosophical language of Confucianism, just as in the Greco-Roman world it had mainly adopted the language of *Platonism (and, partially, *Stoicism). The so-called Sutra of Jesus Christ endeavored to present Christianity to the Chinese, highlighting that Christianity was in perfect harmony with the ancient Chinese traditions, since it endorsed filial piety and loyalty to the state. After Kao-tsung's death, one of his wives, favorable to Buddhism, persecuted Christianity (690–705). The stele also alludes to this period. Peace returned to the church under Hsuan-tsung (712-756).

It seems that Christianity, likewise, is attested in Tibet from the 5th to the 7th c. Indeed, in the 8th c. the catholicos *Timothy I described the Christian community in Tibet as one of the most important of the Syriac church of the East and established that the election of another bishop was necessary for it.

Between 712 and 781 new missionaries arrived, *monasteries were restored, and the name for Christianity was changed from "the Persian religion" to "the Syrian [Ta-ch'in, or Dachin] religion" by imperial order. This was a strategic move, aimed at liberating Christianity from any association or even confusion with other "Persian" religions such as Zoroastrianism or *Manicheism, and also from any idea of affiliation to an extraneous political power. Christian missions to China indeed had arrived from the Syrian, and Syriac-speaking, Church of the East, represented by the *patriarch-catholicos of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Just as in Edessa, *Mesopotamia, and Persia, in China, too, the liturgical language of Christianity was Syriac. Notably, it was also the liturgical language of Christianity in India, which seems to have had the same matrix.

However, also because of the hostility of Buddhist, Confucian, and Taoist leaders to Christianity,

and the interruption of the connection between Christianity in China and its mother church in Mesopotamia, in 845 the emperor Wu-Zong forbade Christianity as well as all extraneous religions, such as Buddhism and Zoroastrianism. The fact that the state confiscated the considerable properties of these religious groups suggests that the decision was also taken for financial reasons, given that it was a period of severe economic crisis. It seems that one Christian community resisted in China even after 845 and kept its own patriarch. In 986 a monk reported to the catholicos that Christianity was extinct in China and there was only one Christian left. This may be an exaggerated statement; however, it indicates a grave crisis. Christianity would flourish again in China in the 13th/14th century, when the Chinese church depended again on the east-Syrian catholicos. The names of important Christian leaders were also Syriac: a Chinese was elected patriarch with the Syriac name of Yaballaha III (1281), and close to this time a monk called Rabban bar Sauma traveled from Beijing to Rome to support the project of a crusade of Chinese and Mongolians against the Mamelukes.

J. Foster, *The Church of the T'ang Dynasty*, London 1939; S. Brock, *The "Nestorian" Church: A Lamentable Misnomer*, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 78 (1996) 23-36; Lupus Roh, *Research into the First Christian Evangelization of China*, Augustinianum, Rome 1999; Wang Wei-fan, *Christian Spirit in Ancient China*, in *Jinling Theological Review* 2 (2001), 25-27; Wu Liuhua, *Xuzhou Han Stone Carvings*, Beijing 2001; I. Ramelli-C. Dognini, *Gli Apostoli in India*, Milano 2002; P. Jenkins, *The Lost History of Christianity: The Thousand-Year Golden Age of the Church in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, and How It Died*, New York 2008, 64–68; I. Ramelli, *Bardaisan of Edessa*, Piscataway 2009; Id., *Early Christian Missions from Alexandria to India*, in *Augustinianum* 51 (2011) 221-231; Id. (ed.), *Bardaisan on Free Will, Fate, and Human Nature*, forthcoming from Tübingen.

Ilaria Ramelli

CHLOTHAR I, king (d. 561). Youngest of the four sons of *Clovis I and *Clotilde. In the division of the Frankish kingdom following Clovis's death (in 511), his portion was the territories and cities of N *Gaul, with capital at Soissons. An ambitious man, on the death of his brother Chlodomer he annexed part of his kingdom (*Tours and *Poitiers) and was often in conflict with his other two brothers. In 534, with his brother Childebert, he conquered the Burgundian territory; in 556 he took Provence from the *Ostrogoths. On the deaths of Theudebald I (555) and Childebert (558), he became the sole king of the Franks, reigning from Trier. Chlothar forced Bishop *Nicetius of Trier into exile, but he was able to return to his see after the king's death (561). Chlothar had his rebellious son, Chram, killed; feeling guilty for this, he went to Tours to ask pardon at the tomb of St. *Martin but died soon after. In 531 he had married the pious *Radegund, who some years later withdrew to Poitiers and founded a *monastery there, between 552 and 557.

M. Oldoni, *Gregorio di Tours, La storia dei Franchi,* Milan 1981 (Latin text and It. tr.); DHGE 18, 15-17; LMA 2, 1869-1870; G. Palermo, *Venanzio Fortunato, Vite dei santi Ilario e Radegonda di Poitiers*, Rome 1989; I. Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms (450-751)*, London 1994; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751*, Leiden 1995; *Franks and Alamanni in the Merovingian Period. An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. I. Wood, Woodbridge 1998.

A. Di Berardino

CHLOTHAR II, king (584–629). Son of *Chilperic I (d. 584) and Fredegundis, who had Bishop Praetextatus of Rouen killed by a hit man. Only 4 months old at his father's death, he reigned under the tutelage of his mother and his uncle Guntram, king of the *Burgundians, in the NW part of *Gaul (Neustria), while in the E his cousin Childebert II ruled over the territory which began to be called Austrasia; in 595 Childebert died, poisoned by Fredegundis. Defeated by Childebert's sons in 599/600, Chlothar II had to cede part of his territory, which he partially reconquered some years later. He later became sole king of the *Franks (613), except for S Gaul, which was in the hands of the *Visigoths; he thus reconstituted *Clovis's kingdom. *Desiderius, future bishop of Cahors (630), for a time served at his court as chaplain and archdeacon. In 614 Chlothar II convoked an important council at Paris, the most important of the Merovingian period, in which 77 bishops from throughout his kingdom participated (SC 355, 509-525). Following their deliberations, on 18 October he published a decree reproving and modifying some of their decisions, though recognizing episcopal jurisdiction; he ended unjust taxes. In 626/627 another council met at Clichy (SC 355, 524-547), which considered itself the continuation of that of Paris of 614. Chlothar II died at Paris on 18 October 629 and was buried in the Church of St. Vincent, which would later become Saint-Germain-des-Près.

Ps. Fredegar, *Chronicon*, MGH, SS Rerum Merovingiarum 2, 1888, 1-193; DHGE 13, 17-20; LMA 2, 1870-1871; O. Pontal, *Histoire des conciles mérovingiens*, Paris 1989; I. Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms (450-751)*, London 1994; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481-751*, Leiden 1995; *Franks and Alamanni in the Merovingian Period: An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. I. Wood, Woodbridge 1998.

A. Di Berardino

CHORBISHOP (chorepiscopus). Literally "bishop of the *chōra,*" i.e., the countryside, thus a suburban bishop (in villages, in suburbs, among nomadic populations). The ancient city, including during the time of the *Roman Empire, retained some characteristics of the city-state, with a more or less vast territory dependent on it; bishops normally resided only in the inhabited centers recognized as cities, and the entire extraurban territory was under him, without subdivision of the diocese. In the larger dioceses the pastoral figure of the chorbishop arose from the late 3rd c. in Asia Minor, but it also spread to other regions, such as *Syria, *Mesopotamia, *Arabia, *Egypt and *Armenia, i.e., in regions where the municipal system was less extensive.

The first known chorbishop is Zoticus, of the village of Comana (Pamphylia), called "village bishop" (Eusebius, *HE* 5,16,17); next was the *martyr Athenogenes during *Diocletian's persecution in 303, in the *Cappadocian village of Pedachtoe. Some 15 chorbishops were present at the Council of *Nicaea, all from Asia Minor and Syria. Since this ministry varied according to place and time, it has long been discussed whether the chorbishop was always a bishop, or only sometimes, or never. Current opinion holds that he was a bishop who could exercise all of the related functions but who in reality was limited by canonical legislation, which in the course of the 4th c. intervened increasingly to specify their functions, subordinating them to the bishops of the cities. The Council of *Ancyra of 314 establishes: "A cleric must not be ordained by a chorbishop without the consent of the bishop. Chorbishops may not ordain presbyters or deacons, but neither can presbyters of the city without the written permission of the bishop of each diocese" (can. 13). Not long after, the Council of *Neocaesarea in *Pontus (can. 14) mentions them but does not further specify their function. That of *Antioch of 341 (can. 10) delimits their function at length and says: "Though they have received the ordination proper to bishops," they can ordain subdeacons, *exorcists and lectors. At the Council of *Serdica of 343, ordination of bishops is prohibited in villages where a presbyter would suffice (can. 6). *Basil of Caesarea had some 50 chorbishops in his dependency, spread throughout his vast diocese of Cappadocia, to whom he writes a letter on the selection of clergy and their requirements (*Ep.* 54; for the number, see Gregory of Nazianzus: PG 37, 1060). The canons of *Laodicea are from these years, and they establish that "bishops must not be installed in villages or in the countryside, but only visitors. Regarding bishops already established in those areas, they must not do anything without the consent of the bishop of the city. Likewise, presbyters cannot do anything without the consent of the bishop [of the city]" (can. 57). Therefore, though the chorbishop had episcopal powers, his authority was reduced to a dependency on the bishop of the city, i.e., he was like a **periodeuta.* The two institutions, chorbishop and *periodeuta,* responded to the same needs of a vast diocese in which there were Christian villages. From the 5th c., chorbishops decreased in number, but they were present at the ecumenical Councils of *Ephesus (431) and *Chalcedon (451). *Nicaea II (785) allows them only the ordination of lectors (can. 2), with express authorization. There were chorbishops among the *Nestorians until the 13th c., and in the Orthodox Church of Syria and among the *Maronites they still exist.

In the West we do not have the term, but something like it exists; e.g., Antoninus of Fussala, ordained by *Augustine, exercised that ministry, since the territory of the diocese of *Hippo was quite vast and in some villages *Punic was spoken. The prescription of the Council of Serdica, that in the countryside a presbyter was sufficient (can. 6), was adhered to; thus bishops should not be ordained for small centers (Leo Gt., *Ep.* 12,10: PL 54, 654). The letters of Popes *Damasus (Jaffé 244) and *Leo the Great, which speak of chorbishops, are from a later period. In the early 5th c., an Eugraphus is chorbishop at Manastirine (Salona; DACL 3,1444); in *Gaul the first known case is from the Council of *Riez of 439, when a bishop was downgraded and given that title (DACL 3,1443). The ministry of the chorbishop flourished esp. among the *Franks, since the dioceses were very vast and chorbishops became very important. *Willibrord and *Boniface had chorbishops for missionary service. In the early Middle Ages they appear as auxiliary or coadjutor bishops. In the East, e.g., among the *Coptic Christians and other confessions, the chorbishop did not have episcopal character; in the large dioceses he was a collaborator of the bishop, but could be ordained bishop later.

Joannou, Index, cols. 61-62; Hfl-Lecl 1,1197-1220 (= DACL 3,1423-1452); DDC 3, 686-695; LTK[3] 2,1090-1092; LMA 2,1884-85; F. Gillmann, *Das Institut der Chorbischöfe in Orient*, Munich 1903; Th. Gottlob, *Der abendländische Chorepiskopat*, Bonn 1928, repr. 1963 (rec. of Fr. Gillmann: AKKr 108 [1928] 712-723); R. Amadou, *Chorévêque et periodeutes*: L'Orient Syrien 4 (1959) 233-240; M. Clément, *La collégialité de l'épiscopat dans l'Église maronite*: POC 15 (1965) 307-332; A. García y García, *Historia del derecho canónico*, I, Salamanca 1967, 373-375; R. Kottje, *Isidor von Sevilla und der Chorepiskopat*: Deutsches Archiv 28 (1972) 533-537; G. Dagron, *Entre Village et cité: la bourgade rurale des IV[e] siècles en Orient*: Koinonia 3 (1979) 29-52 (esp. 44-47) (now in *La romanité chrétienne en Orient*, London 1984, n. VIII); O. Bucci, *Episcopato*

delle campagne e corepiscopi: Atti dell'Acc. Costantiniana, IV, Perugia 1981, 97-163; D. Feissel, *L'évêque, titres et fonctions d'après les inscriptions grecques jusqu'au VII^e siècle*: Actes du XI^e Congrès inter. d'archéologie chrétienne, Rome 1989, I, 801-828; P. Maraval, *La passion inédite de S. Athénogène de Pédachthoé en Cappadoce* (BHG 197b), Brussels 1990; C. Scholten, *Der Chorbischof bei Basilius*: Zeit f. Kirch 103 (1992) 149-173; O. Bucci, *Il Corepiscopato nella storia della Chiesa*, Rome 1993.

A. Di Berardino

CHOSROES, kings
I. Chosroes I - II. Chosroes II.

I. Chosroes I (Chusro, Χοσρόης) **Anosharvan** ("of the immortal soul"). King of the *Persians (531–579). After the Mazdakite insurrections under his father Kavadh, Chosroes, appealing to the nobility and clergy, introduced sound reforms to consolidate political power. In the interests of the nobility, he imposed rigid differentiation of social classes, sanctioned by religious authority. An administrative reform based on centralization strengthened royal power; a new tributary organization, in connection with *Diocletian's fiscal reform, served the same end. A new military organization was based on the cavalry, supported in case of necessity by the structures of the state. Mazdakism was suppressed and the Zoroastrian church was restored; at the same time Christianity spread increasingly. A significant *Byzantine influence was followed by an Indian one. When *Justinian closed the Academy of *Athens in 529, its members were welcomed at the court of Ctesiphon. The "perpetual" peace concluded between Chosroes and the Byzantine emperor in 532 was broken in 540 by the Persians, who advanced as far as *Syria, reaching the Black Sea via the Caucasus. By paying high tributes, *Justinian obtained a truce and finally, in 562, a 50-year peace treaty.

II. Chosroes II Aparwez (Aparviz) (591–628). Nephew of Chosroes I, he may have been a Christian. With Byzantine help he eliminated his rivals in the Persian aristocracy and consolidated his power, which led to exceptional results against Byzantium. In ca. 604 he began his advance on Syria and *Egypt; in 616 he conquered the Nile valley, which remained under Persian rule for ten years. More than once the Persian armies reached the outskirts of *Constantinople, until in 627 *Heraclius annihilated them near Nineveh. Chosroes was then toppled by a palace plot, tried and condemned to death. His execution inaugurated a period of anarchy.

A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhagen ²1944 (repr. Osnabrück 1971), 363-496; S. Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity*, London 1992; D. Brodka, *Das Bild des Perserkönigs Chosroes I. in den "Bella" des Prokopios von Kaisareia*, in *Studies of Greek and Roman Civilization*, J. Styka (ed.), Krakow 1998, 115-124; P. Riedlberger, *Die Restauration von Chosroes II*, in *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World*, E. Dabrowa (ed.), Krakow 1998, 161-175; var. aus., *Storia del Cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, 3, Rome 2002, 1013-1035.

J. Irmscher - C. Dell'Orso

CHRISTIAN – CHRISTIANITY. "Christian" was the name first given to Christ's followers at Syrian *Antioch (Acts 11:26; cf. 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16): it designates anyone who professes the doctrine proclaimed by Jesus Christ. As an adjective it describes whatever has any bearing on the person and work of Jesus Christ, and the rites, symbols and institutions deriving therefrom. Though the reason for the name assumed at Antioch remains unclear and its meaning uncertain, two facts seem evident: the followers of Jesus of Nazareth appeared to *pagan eyes as a group distinct from the Jews, and the name "Christ" was raised in popular consideration to a common name, blotting out its original sense as a title. Yet on the lips of the Antiochenes it probably did not have a very positive sound. At *Rome its sense was certainly pejorative (Tacitus, *Annales* XV, 44; Suetonius, *Claudius* 25). While in the canonical and some subapostolic writings the Christians are called "saints, elect, faithful," in the *Acts of the Martyrs* to declare oneself a Christian was a profession of faith and the name had become current. Since from the name "Christian" the *apologists drew positive expositions of the connection between the philological meaning of the word "good, beneficent" and their style of life, *Marcionite gnosis was not slow to propose a tendentious interpretation: "Christians" were the adherents of the "good" God (i.e., the Marcionites), in contrast with the *orthodox, who in *Syria were called *Nazarenes, adherents of the Jewish messianism connected with the one from Nazareth.

P. de Labriolle, *Christianus*: ALMA 5 (1929-1930) 69-87; A. Ferrua, *Christianus:* CivC 1933, II, 552ff.; III, 13ff.; Id., Christian: EC IV, 909-910; H. Leclercq, *Chrétien*: DACL 3, 1464-1478; E. Peterson, *Christianus*, in Miscell. Giov. Mercati, I (ST 121), Vatican City 1946, 355-356; O. Montevecchi, *Nomen christianum*, in *Paradoxos politeia. Studi patristici in onore di Giuseppe Lazzati*, Milan 1980, 485-500; I.N. Bremmer, *Christianus sum: The Early Christian Martyrs and Christ*, in *Eulogia, Mélan. Bastiaensen*, Steenbrugge 1991, 11-20; Ch. Pietri, *L'usage de "Christianos" dans l'épigraphie*, in *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997, 1583-1602.

E. Peretto

CHRISTIANITY and CLASSICAL CULTURE

1. The Christian message, first propagated in the cultural milieu of *Palestine—scarcely open to Greco-Roman culture—soon came into contact with that culture through Jews of the Diaspora who maintained links with Palestine and through the journeys of evangelists to Asia Minor, Greece and *Rome. Some of the best-known missionaries came from *Hellenized regions, esp. *Paul of Tarsus. His letters contain occasional citations of *pagan poets and judgments on their religious and moral attitudes (Rom 1:18-32; 1 Cor 1:17–2:16; 3:18-20; 15:33; Col 2:8; Tit 1:12) and speeches (Acts 14:15-17; 17:16-34). We will not attempt here to investigate possible influences of Greek thought on Paul and other NT writers, such as *James and *John.

2. The earliest, biblically inspired Christian literature (the so-called Apostolic Fathers; NT *apocrypha; compositions of an ecclesial, homiletic or poetic nature) contains only rare, weak traces of or references to classical culture.

3. This culture is strongly present, however, in varying degrees and with differing assessments, in the 2nd-c. Greek *apologists. The *Preaching of Peter,* while chiding the Greeks for their ignorance of God, insists on concepts familiar to *Stoicism and *Platonism. *Aristides (writing in the reign of *Hadrian, 117–138, or *Antoninus, 138–161), reviewing the religious beliefs of barbarians, Greeks, Jews and Christians, has confidence in the power of reason and the achievements of *philosophy and, while condemning its religious errors and moral disorders, appreciates Greek culture as a whole. The philosopher and *martyr *Justin, writing in the mid-2nd c., cites poets and philosophers (primarily Plato) who deeply influenced him and extols philosophy, his conception of which is deeply religious. He sees the presence of the Word in the form of "seed" in the best pre-Christian and even contemporary philosophers, which explains (together with their "borrowings" from the Bible) their consonance with the Christian message. Justin's disciple *Tatian refers frequently to classical culture, condemning it totally in all of its expressions, while fully exploiting the stylistic resources provided by traditional schooling. *Athenagoras, writing ca. 177, cites numerous pagan writers (mostly, it seems, secondhand) and shows their influence here and there. While recognizing the limitations of the poets' and philosophers' religious ideas, he sees in them "a certain conformity [*sympatheia*] with divine inspiration," which explains their considerable achievements in the domain of truth and their nearness to Christian thought. *Theophilus, bishop of *Antioch (ca. 180), frequently cites *pagan authors in his three books *Ad Autolycum,* rejecting with contempt all aspects of their culture. The *Letter to *Diognetus,* however, despite its negative judgment on pagan philosophy, proposes Christian/pagan relations on a plane of peaceful coexistence, with Christians accepting the social reality of which they formed a part and which they were called to leaven with the yeast of the gospel.

4. With *Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–ca. 230), Christianity took a decisive step in its relations with classical culture. Clement knew it profoundly and was able to engage it with pioneering ardor, moderation, openness to human values, and literary ability, putting contemporary culture, primarily philosophy, at the service of the Christian word in his *Protrepticus, Paedagogus* and *Stromata*. The work of *Origen (ca. 185–ca. 254) extends to much wider fields than those we are considering here. His attitude to pagan culture, of which he had a profound knowledge, is particularly evident in the apologetic *Contra Celsum,* and in the more properly theological *De principiis* (i.e., "of the fundamental truths of faith"), where he attempts to elaborate revealed data with the help of philosophy, not without some risk to *orthodoxy.

5. The number and stature of the *Fathers of the 4th c., the golden age of *patristics, obliges us to concentrate on a few outstanding figures. *Basil of Caesarea (ca. 330–379) addresses this theme in his *Address to the Young on the Way to Draw Profit from Pagan Literature,* where, drawing on Plato and Plutarch, he points out the elements of that literature which can serve the education of the young. His friend *Gregory of Nazianzus (ca. 329–390), who studied classical culture for a long time, esp. at *Athens, shows his appreciation of classical culture particularly in his attentive care for literary form in his *45 Orations* and in his poetry and letters. Basil's younger brother *Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 332–394) sees the disciplines which constituted the cultural heritage of his time as having a propaedeutic function for the understanding of the Christian word, drawing especially on philosophy in his attempts to speculate on revealed data.

6. In the Latin world, where relations with classical culture matured more slowly, we find attitudes similar to those encountered in *Greek Christendom, despite the differences in environment and in individual personalities. In the mentality of the Latins, more attentive to concrete problems (including the institutional aspects of Christianity) and to historical events, attitudes to classical culture were deeply influenced by three centuries of *persecution and opposition by pagan society. We see this in *Tertullian, who shows implacable hostility to every aspect of

pagan culture, especially in the effects of social life. Fearing that a conciliatory attitude might be seen as approval of the idolatrous worship that pervaded every aspect of pagan life, he (unlike the *Letter to *Diognetus*) advocated for Christians an isolation that became ever more difficult as they increased in number. In the doctrinal field, his *De testimonio animae* proclaimed the uselessness of the attempts made by most of the earlier apologists to show the consonance between the natural theology of Christianity and the doctrines of pagan poets and philosophers, claiming that openness to Christianity was something spontaneous, innate to the *soul not led astray by prejudice. This did not prevent him using, with all his originality and vigor, all the means of expression taught by the schools, the common heritage of contemporary culture.

In *Minucius Felix the contents of Christian belief crop up only in a few hints, while in his theodicy and natural ethics he makes wide use of philosophical elements, drawn esp. from Cicero and Seneca. These are also his preferred models, not uninfluenced by the archaism then in vogue in literary form. We see the same conformity to formal tradition in *Cyprian, the rhetor who, converted to Christianity and made bishop of *Carthage (248–258), was completely taken up with the needs of his pastoral ministry and uninterested in cultural problems. *Arnobius of Sicca (d. ca. 327) took a different attitude: in the seven books of his *Adversus nationes,* rich in information from good sources on pagan belief and worship (esp. in *Africa), he gives considerable prominence to philosophical currents, esp. Platonism, contesting their value, since reason is incapable of reaching the *truth. He too molded his literary style on the traditions of the schools, with a profuse, emphatic style not lacking in vigor and originality. *Lactantius lived in an age (ca. 250–320) when Christianity, by now widespread even in intellectual circles, had to measure itself against pagan culture. In his *Divinae institutiones* he sought to defend his religion systematically, with constant use of rational investigation, in polemic against philosophy. He was called the “Christian Cicero” for his perfect style, modeled on the best authors and cultivated in the firm conviction that in this way he was helping the Christian cause. Between his death and that of *Leo the Great (461), Christian literature reached its greatest splendor in both East and West. It was marked by, among other things, a more serene openness of the Christian consciousness to the values of classical culture, which, even amid the lingering residues of traditional diffidence, began to be distinguished from the religious content of paganism. We should bear in mind that, in the East and in the West, young Christians and pagans were formed in the same cultural environment, since there were no schools run by Christians or for Christians (except for the *catechumenate, which was strictly religious in scope). Here we can only give quick glimpses of a cultural movement that was growing broader and deeper, with the emergence of personalities of great importance in the Christian world.

Poetry did not hesitate—with *Marius Victorinus (born ca. 300), *Hilary of Poitiers (ca. 315–368), *Ambrose (ca. 340–397), *Prudentius (born 348), *Paulinus of Nola (ca. 359–431)—to take as its model the language, imagery and meters of the classical tradition, enlisted to express a new conception of life. Classical culture left visible traces in Ambrose, in certain veins of *Neoplatonist philosophy and above all in his effort to imbue with a Christian spirit his presentation of a morality owing a large debt to the dictates of ancient wisdom, integrated with and elevated to the teaching of the Bible. *Jerome (ca. 347–420), while dedicating his whole work as a writer to the service of the Christian cause, shows the imprint of the culture he had deeply assimilated and then consciously renounced, in his references to the classics and especially in his mastery of literary form. The speculative elaboration of revealed data reached its apex in *Augustine (354–430), finding nourishment in the study of philosophical problems, which had earlier helped him in the difficult journey toward Christian faith. The history of the pagan world, primarily the Roman, offered him the subjects for meditation, in the light of faith, in the *City of God*. Not forgetting the art of the word, in which he had been trained so well and which he had taught, he recognized the importance of this discipline for one who proclaims the Christian message, though he bent his style to the demands of his thought.

Still later, the fascination of classical culture made itself felt in writers more concerned with formal elaboration, especially the poets. Three authors deserve mention for their conscious activity in this field. *Boethius (ca. 480–524) was the most distinguished continuator of the classical tradition cultivated in a Christian spirit, in translations, commentaries and original works of various kinds. Classical erudition and study of the Bible and Christian tradition engaged the activity of *Cassiodorus (ca. 485–ca. 580). *Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636) is considered as marking the end of the patristic age and opening a new page of cultural history. He assiduously collected and ordered secular and religious elements, contributing in large measure

to the transmission to posterity of the patrimony of ancient culture in its various expressions.

7. Even a cursory examination of the relations between classical culture and Christianity should take account of aspects other than the literary, though this is obviously of prime importance and better known. The field of behavior, for example, in which Clement of Alexandria shows considerable interest in the *Paedagogus,* and especially that of the moral life, which particularly concerned pastors of souls: in the 5th c., *Salvian of Marseille contrasted the rampant corruption of morals among "Roman" Christians with the *virtues practiced by the barbarians. And the figurative art of the Christians could be profitably investigated to examine the influence of the classical tradition on it. These subjects would require a development beyond the scope of this article, but it seems opportune here to give an overall view of the subject, pointing out its basic lines and touching on some of the more important problems (see final bibl.).

The documents of Greek and Latin *patristics faithfully mirror the stages through which reflection on the Christian message passed during this period, not just in its internal clarification and articulation, but also in its relationship to the society in which the Christians lived and operated, in varying numerical proportions at different times and places. The more Christianity spread beyond *Palestine, the less could its conception and presentation fail to be influenced by contacts with the Greco-Roman world, making use of whatever cultural categories seemed compatible. At first the pagan world was present to educated Christians as a religiously different and opposed reality, though as yet they took no conscious stand in comparing its ideas and life with their own ideas and program of life. Literary form carried on the genres and style of the Bible, not without sporadic influences from *Hellenism. The Greco-Roman world, to which the great majority of men who left a trace in the culture of the first centuries belonged, presented the young religion with a heritage of thought and literary form accumulated through centuries, *humus* in which the new civilization was destined to grow. With the Apologists, who generally came from the pagan intellectual class, Christianity confronted Roman and Hellenic culture not just as belief and moral practice but also as a vision of the world which tried to elaborate the data of revelation in a rational way. It involved a necessarily polemical position, but one which took very different attitudes in different writers, from implacable repudiation of every aspect of pagan culture to attempts to recognize, salvage, purify and develop the values of which it was the bearer. This process would continue, profiting from a deeper knowledge of classical culture, esp. philosophy, and a refinement of method, in the writers of the 3rd, 4th and 5th c. While persisting in polemic against the philosophy and rhetoric of the pagan world on which they willingly drew, they presented themselves as perpetuators of a literary tradition that they intended to use as a vehicle for the new word; and the experience acquired by some, in long familiarity with the classics and in patient scholastic exercise, enabled them to appear as heirs of a cultural heritage which they considered, duly purified, as still valid and relevant. In the final period some Latin writers were particularly engaged in collecting and transmitting the elements of classical culture, not without comparing them with Christian values.

8. Judgments differ on the interpretation of the relations between classical culture and early Christianity. For some scholars, from the moment when the Christian message was accepted by men educated in Greek philosophy, it began to undergo a process of Hellenization that would draw off its innermost meaning and finally distort it, as happened in Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Others reduce this influence to essentially external factors, maintaining that under the identity of terms and formal motifs is concealed an essentially different thought; or that, at any rate, the effort to present Christian concepts according to philosophical categories—for apologetic ends and through the natural need for scientific systemization—left intact the awareness of the originality of Christian content. While it seems we must reject the thesis of a radical Hellenization of Christianity, we must take into account for each author not just his explicit declarations but also his whole attitude, without always pretending to a perfectly ascertainable consistency. Even among those who decisively denied any value whatsoever to pagan thought, some were undeniably influenced by it, e.g., Tatian for his whole metaphysical system, *John Chrysostom for the Stoic-Cynic motifs present in his conception of moral life. There were particularly enlightened Fathers who took care to separate those elements of the pre-Christian (or even contemporary) heritage they considered acceptable from those they decisively rejected; think, e.g., of Justin, Basil, Ambrose and Augustine. Then there was a formal aspect, which, after the very earliest expressions of Christian literature, it can be said that no writer escaped; the degree of influence was measured by each one's education, opportunities and zeal, but the models were the same for all. Finally,

we should not forget that fund of values common to any form of true humanism, however imperfect, on which it was not difficult to reach agreement; Christianity, accepting these values, worked to purify and develop them.

For fuller assessment, see the conclusion of *Letteratura greca cristiana*, 3rd ed., Nuova Un. St. 29, Rome 1978, 183-206, also taking Latin patristics into account (as in *Letteratura latina cristiana*, 4th ed., Rome 1973). The relations between classical culture and early Christianity have been studied in those Fathers who are among the most important in this aspect. Bibliography can be found in the articles on these Fathers. I cite here two exemplary works: H.-I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris 1938, with "*Retractatio*," 1949 (It. tr. Milan 1994); J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne Wisigothique*, 2 vols., Paris 1959. General works include: C.N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, Oxford 1940; H.-I. Marrou, *Storia dell'educazione nell'antichità*, tr. from Fr., Rome 1966 (2nd ed.); H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics*, Göteborg 1958. F.J. Dölger's periodical, "Antike und Christentum," Münster in Westfalen 1950 (6 vols. and supplement) is dedicated to this problem. It is continued under Th. Klauser's direction in "Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum," from 1958, and its supplements. But the most important undertaking is that of Th. Klauser in the "Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum," Stuttgart (more than 20 volumes have come out since 1950).

RAC 2 (1954) 346-362; TRE 3, 50-99; LMA 1, 710-715; LTK[3] 1, 755-759; H.-I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris 1938; H. Frohnes - U.W. Knorr (eds.), *Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte* 1, Munich 1974, 247-310; J. Daniélou, *Messaggio evangelico e cultura ellenistica*, Bologna 1975; A. Grillmeier, *Mit ihm und in ihm. Christologische Forschungen und Perspektiven*, Freiburg 1975, 423-488; E.A. Judge, "*Antike und Christentum*": *Towards a Definition of the Field. A Bibliographical Survey*: ANRW 2, 23, 1 (1979) 3-58; M. Simonetti, *Cristianesimo antico e cultura classica*, Rome 1982, [2]1990; P. Steinmetz, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt*, Wiesbaden 1982; A. Quacquarelli (ed.), *Complementi interdisciplinari di Patrologia*, Rome 1989, 185-221; G. d'Onofrio (ed.), *Storia della teologia nel medioevo* 1, Casale Monf. 1996, 37-105; E. Valette-Cagnac, *La lecture à Rome. Rites et pratiques*, Millau 1997; B. Studer, *Schola Christiana. Die Theologie zwischen Nizäa und Chalcedon*, Paderborn 1998; M. Fiedrowicz, *Apologie im frühen Christentum*, Paderborn 2000; W. Geerlings - C. Schulze (eds.), *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter*, Leiden 2002; G. Hafner, *Cassiodor - ein Leben für kommende Zeiten*, Stuttgart 2002; L. Pietri (ed.), *Storia del Cristianesimo* 1, Rome 2003, 766-825.

M. Pellegrino - S. Heid

CHRISTIANS and JEWS

I. The process of separation - II. The controversy between Jews and Christians - III. Imperial legislation and Judaism - IV. The Byzantine period and Judaism.

I. The process of separation. Born in a Jewish environment, Christianity could not remain there forever. *Jewish Christians, faithful to the law and the observances, soon found themselves in an ambiguous situation: their conscience forbade them to deny their faith in Jesus Christ, while the religious leaders of the nation condemned that faith and classified Jesus' followers as *minim*. (For orthodox Judaism, *minim* are the followers of any sectarian movement, guilty of grave lapses against the moral or ritual law, or betrayers of the hope of Israel.) The Jerusalem Christians took no part in the Jewish war; according to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* III,5,3), they had earlier abandoned the city, to settle in an area of Peraea called Pella. Some of them settled there permanently; but what was the reception of those who returned to the Holy City after those events? It is a fact that in ca. 90, Patriarch Gamaliel II inscribed the *Nazarenes as first among the *minim,* in the prayer of the 18 petitions (Goppelt 157). Hence they were even excluded from the public prayer recited in the name of the whole assembly, though at first they could take part privately and in silence. Many Talmudic texts (difficult to date) attest the presence of Jewish Christians expelled from the synagogal offices or classified as *poshe Israel* (rebellious Jews). The Second Jewish war (132–135) certainly aggravated the rift that had been created between Judaism and Jewish Christianity. After the triumph of the church, the situation of Jewish Christians became even more precarious: rejected by their ethnic brethren, they were considered heretics by members of the great church (Simon 233-239), the majority of which consisted of elements converted from *paganism, and whose break with Jewish orthodoxy was total from the end of the 1st c. For their part the Jewish authorities organized a vast struggle, mainly throughout their Diaspora, to combat this dynamic and enterprising rival, which presented itself as the true heir to the promises of Israel. Jewish proselytism exerted itself to neutralize the effects of the Christian mission (see Mt 23:15). Strong in their privileged legal status, the Jews invited the Christians too to escape the pressures by rejoining the synagogue (*Passio Pionii*, 13) but do not seem to have gone so far as to provoke or favor the persecution of the Christians by the Roman authorities (Munier 153-156).

II. The controversy between Jews and Christians. From the 2nd to the 4th c. this controversy was conducted on theological and biblical levels. A wealth of literature attests to its intensity. It is composed of various literary genres: treatises, homilies, collections of *testimonia,* debates etc. The greater part of these writings unite apologetic and doctrinal exposition of the Christian religion with criticism of Judaism. Chronologically, however, one notes a certain evolution: the defensive genre prevails up to the 3rd c.; the authors of the 3rd and 4th c. write more to prove the superiority of the Christian faith; finally come works containing invectives against the irreducible obduracy of the Jews. For the pre-*Nicene period we should mention, above all, the *Epistle of *Barnabas*; *Aristo of Pella, *Dialogue Between Jason and Papiscus About Christ*; *Miltiades, *Against the Jews*; *Apollinaris of Hierapolis, *Against the Jews*; *Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*; *Hippolytus (?), *Demonstration Against the Jews*. To the golden centuries of *patristics belong *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Proof of the Gospel* (CPG II, 3487; Quasten 2, 344); *Eusebius of Emesa, *Against the Jews* (see Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 91, lost; Quasten 2, 352); *Diodore of Tarsus, *Against the Jews* (lost; Quasten 2, 403); *Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion* (CPG 3745; Quasten 2, 391; it lists Judaism and its various sects among the heresies); *John Chrysostom, *Eight Homilies Against the Jews* (CPG II, 4326 and 4327; Quasten 2, 471 and 455-456); *Severian of Gabala, *Against the Jews on the Bronze Serpent* (CPG II, 4207; Bardenhewer 3, 364); *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Against the Jews* (lost, Quasten 2, 550; the fragment of CPG 6212 is not his); *Nestorius, *Homily Against the Jews* (CPG II, 5695, fragments); *Basil of Seleucia, *Against the Jews* (CPG III, 6656, 38 is not genuine: Quasten 2, 531); ps.-Eusebius of Alexandria, *On New Moons and Sabbaths and on Not Listening to the Voices of Birds* (CPG III, 5516; Bardenhewer 4,88); ps.-Gregory of Nyssa, *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos* (CPG II, *3221*; PG 46,193-233); ps.-John Chrysostom, *Against the Jews, Gentiles and Heretics* (CPG II, 4506; PG 48,1075-1080); and some homilies of *Aphraates (PS vol. I, Paris 1894).

It goes without saying that the works of the *Fathers are rife with anti-Jewish polemic. But we must not confuse, as is too often done, theological argument aimed at demonstrating the error of Judaism and the truth of Christianity with anti-Semitism proper and "training in contempt of the Jews" (Simon 488-495). Among the themes that nourished this controversy, the main one was *Christology, the essential element of Jewish-Christian dialogue. Rabbinic Judaism professed a strict *monotheism, while Christian theology, from the apostolic age, affirmed and professed the divine sonship of Jesus. The opposition of the two faiths on this point is decisive, and it would be useless to try to minimize it. The second theme debated between Jewish scholars and Christians was that of salvation, which for Jews lay in the necessity of the law and of the observances. From the apostolic age, Christians professed that the death and *resurrection of Jesus Christ had freed humanity from sin and inaugurated a new religious order; this claim was irreconcilable with orthodox Judaism's scrupulous veneration of the Torah. The disputes concerning the true Israel were no less hard-fought. While the first Christian generation saw God's new people born through the aggregation of the gentiles to the Jews, the *Apologists considered this increasingly as a substitution, which would eventually oust the one in favor of the other (Justin, *Dial.* 123,7). The writers of the great church expressed ever more strongly that its members were the true Israel, which received the inheritance of the old Judaism, now rejected because of the infidelity of its members and because of the death of the Just One.

III. Imperial legislation and Judaism. Detached from paganism, the empire joined the church closely with itself and put the power of the state at the service of *orthodoxy. The growing imperial favor toward *Catholicism had its counterpart in a progressive alteration of the status of Judaism. From official neutrality, the state passed rapidly to discriminatory measures: curbing of Jewish proselytism, protection of Jews converted to Christianity (CTh 16,8,1), interdiction of mixed marriages (between Christians and Jews), exclusion of Jews from some public offices, restrictions occasioned by patriarchal jurisdiction etc.

This phenomenon grew vigorously in the 5th c. Controls and restrictions by the civil power multiplied (Simon 155-162), thus encouraging abuse and violence against the persons of Jews and the goods of their communities (Simon 264-274).

L. Goppelt, *Les origines de l'Église, Christianisme et Judaïsme aux deux premiers siècles*, Fr. tr. Paris 1961; M. Simon, *Verus Israël, Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire romain (135-425)*, Paris [2]1964; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain*, Paris 1979, 145-168; H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)*, Frankfurt a. M. [3]1995; P.C. Bori, *Il vitello d'oro. La radice della controversia antigiudaica*, Turin 1983; R.L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1983; A. Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*, Detroit 1987; *Cristianesimo e Giudaismo, eredità e confronti*: Augustinianum 28 (1988) 5-460; D. Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, Jerusalem 1988 (It. tr. *Il Giudaismo e le origini del Cristianesimo*,

Genoa 1995); A.M. Rabello, *Giustiniano, ebrei e samaritani alla luce delle fonti storico-letterarie, ecclesiastiche e giuridiche*, 2 vols., Milan 1987-1988; J. Dunn, *Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London - Philadelphia 1991; F. Blanchetière - M.D. Herr, *Aux origines juives du christianisme*, Jerusalem 1993; L.H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World, Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton 1993; *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith*, C.A. Evans - D.A. Hagner (eds.), Minneapolis 1993; M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1994; S.G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.*, Minneapolis 1995; L.V. Rutgers, *The Jews in the Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*, Leiden 1995; M.S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*, Leiden 1995; *Early Christian Thought in Its Jewish Context*, J. Barclay - J. Sweet (eds.), Cambridge 1997; L.V. Rutgers, *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*, Louvain 1998; P. Schäfer, *Judeophobia: Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, MA 1998 (It. tr. *Giudeofobia: l'antisemitismo nel mondo antico*, Rome 1999); *Giudaismo e Antigiudaismo*: Annali di storia dell'esegesi 16/2 (1999); R. González Salinero, *El antijudaismo cristiano occidental* (*siglos IV y V*), Madrid 2000; J. Neusner - B. Chilton, *Jewish and Christian Doctrines*, London - New York 2000; *Verus Israel: nuove prospettive sul giudeocristianesimo*, atti del colloquio di Turin (4-5 novembre 1999), eds. G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto, Brescia 2001; G. Scimè, *Giudei e cristiani nei sermoni di san Pietro Crisologo*, Rome 2003.

Ch. Munier

IV. The Byzantine period and Judaism. The Byzantine period counts numerous writings against the Jews. Two historical events in particular called the Greeks' attention to them. In the Persian wars, followed immediately by the Arab conquest, the Jews appeared as an ethnic group, which gave serious reasons to suspect their loyalty to the empire: hence the forced conversions of Jews to Christianity, against which especially *Gregory the Great reacted. Then followed the polemic against iconoclasm, which found cordial support among the Jews. We should mention ps.-Gregentius, *Dispute with Herbanus the Jew* (CPG III, 7009; Bardenhewer 5,25; Beck 386 and 407); ps.-Leontius of Byzantium, *Book on the Heresies*, Action II (CPG III, 6823: attributed to Leontius Scholasticus; Beck 375-376; Altaner 547); *Leontius of Neapolis, *Five Discourses Against the Jews* (CPG III, 7885, fragments; Bardenhewer 5, 139; Beck 456); *Anastasius the Sinaite, who wrote against the Jews, but the *Dispute with the Jews* is not his (CPG III, 7772; Bardenhewer 5, 43; Beck 443); *Jerome of Jerusalem, *Dialogue on the Holy Trinity Between a Jew and a Christian* (CPG III, 7815: fragments; Bardenhewer 5,47; Beck 447-448); *John of Damascus, *Reply to the Jews* (CPG III, 8092; Beck 479); *Theodore Abu Qurra, *Dispute with a Jew* (PG 97, 1529-1533 *opusc.* X; Bardenhewer 5,65; Beck 488); and Nicephorus II, patriarch of Constantinople, who wrote a book against the Jews, probably lost (R. Janm, DTC 11,454; Beck 490). To this period also belong some anonymous and pseudonymous works: the *137th Question of ps.-Athanasius to Duke Antiochus* (CPG III, 7795: little more than a collection of *testimonia*), *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus* (CPG II, 2301), *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (CPG III, 7794: set in Alexandria at the time of patriarch Cyril), *Doctrine of the Newly Baptized James* (CPG III, 7793: set in *Carthage: the Jew James, forcibly baptized at the time of *Heraclius, embraces Christianity interiorly after long and exhaustive talks with other truly converted Jews; Beck 447), *The Trophies of Damascus* (CPG III, 7797; composed toward the end of the 7th c. in Arab-ruled Damascus; Beck 448), *Dialogue of the Jews Papiscus and Philo with a Monk* (CPG III, 7796; this dialogue was used by ps.-Anastasius the Sinaite, cited above; Bardenhewer 5,47).

For the following Byzantine centuries, the most representative anti-Jewish polemical works are from Arethas, bishop of *Caesarea (9th/10th c.; Beck 593; the *dialexis* is in *Arethae scripta minora,* ed. L.G. Westerink, Lipsiae 1968, I, 27 1-278); Nicetas Stetatus (11th c.; M.Th. Disdier, DTC 11,483; Beck 537; unpublished); Simeon the Euchaite (11th-12th c.; J. Gouillard, DTC 14, 2940; Beck 643; unpublished); Theophylact the Bulgar (11th-12th c.; R. Janin, DTC 15,537; Beck 651; unpublished); Nectarius of Casole (12th–13th c.; Beck 670; unpublished); Theophanes III of Nicaea (14th c.; M. Jugie, DTC 15,514-515; Beck 746; largely unpublished).

There are many more unpublished texts (also for the patristic era, e.g., CPG III, 7799-7802 and CPG *Supplementum*, 7793-7804), so that it is not possible to give a summary of all this literature. Yet the themes dealt with are always the same: to demonstrate to the Jews, through citations from the OT, that Jesus is the Messiah predicted by Scripture and the true Son of God, but without this affirmation's destroying Jewish monotheism; that the whole economy of Christ (including his second *parousia) conforms to the prophecies; that consequently Jewish worship has come to an end, and the church is the true people of God and heir of the messianic promises. Naturally not all the works cited cover all these points: the homilies in particular develop only a few of the themes. The most complete treatments are found in the dialogues, which were the literary form most cultivated but whose characters are generally of little importance. The dialogue quite often concludes with the conversion of the Jew, who asks for baptism and further insight into Christian truth. The scriptural texts cited are many, and some of

them recur frequently: the connections between them sometimes lead us to postulate collections of *testimonia* or dependence of one work on another. Moreover the innumerable biblical passages, always cited at length, have considerable importance of their own for the history of the text of the LXX or of the NT; the interpretation made of them makes its contribution to the history of *exegesis.

Patrologia V, 339-340; H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus Judaeos: Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1-11 Jh.)*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 23, Teologie, Bd. 172, Frankfurt a. M. [3]1995.

A. De Nicola

CHRISTOLOGY. Jesus' messiahship was immediately understood by the newborn church as going beyond the dimension of the Messiah foretold by Jewish tradition ([the Lord's] anointed, Χριστός, Christ) in the sense that, though in his real humanity he could suffer and die, he was also revealed in that transcendence by which he was considered a partaker in the same reality—as the Son of God, himself God (Paul, John, Hebrews)—by which the world was not only redeemed but also created. From this conviction two questions arose: if Christ is God, how is his divinity reconciled with that of God the Father, given the traditional *monotheism inherited from *Judaism? And how are the divine and human dimensions reconciled in his person? These questions were ignored only by certain groups of radical *Jewish Christians who, in the light of traditional messianism, considered Christ a mere man endowed with particular divine charisms, the true prophet (**ps.-Clementine*). Called *Ebionites, they were already considered *heretics in the 2nd c.

Other circles, strongly influenced by Jewish Christianity, tried to express Christ's transcendence by depicting him (and the *Holy Spirit) in angelic form, sometimes with the traditional traits of the archangels *Michael and Gabriel. We should note, however, that "in fact the word *angel* has an essentially concrete value and designates a supernatural being who manifests himself. But the nature of this supernatural being is not determined by the word itself, but by the context. The term [*angel*] represents the Semitic form of the designation of Christ and the Holy Spirit as spiritual substances, 'persons'" (J. Daniélou, *La teologia del giudeo-cristianesimo*, 217). In these contexts, in which as a rule Christ tended not to be defined as Son of God in the strict sense, he was, in fact, though closely associated with the Father's transcendence, made into a divine being of lower rank. In circles in which Jewish influence mingled with that of *Hellenism, Christ's transcendence could be presented through the concept of spirit (*pneuma*), understood not just in the (*Stoic) sense of a divine substrate or substance in which Father, Son and Holy Spirit participated but also as a personal name of Christ qua *deus*, identified at times with the Holy Spirit (*Hermas). Finally, in other texts, Christ is considered the real Son of God *tout court* and the name *Logos* is sporadically attributed to him (ps.-Barnabas, *Ignatius). In the late 1st c. and first decades of the 2nd c. all these themes appear, sketched rather than systematically developed, and at times mingled somewhat incoherently (Hermas).

*Gnostic reflection advanced research on this point: behind the mythological trappings and the tendency to multiply divine beings (aeons) in relation to their functions (so that *Valentinians divided Christ's functions between five *aeons: Nous, Logos, Man, Christ, Savior), we can see in the most Christianized forms of gnosis (Valentinians, *Basilideans) the concept of Logos, preexistent Christ, emanated by the Father and hence inferior to him, crafter of all later development and of the history of the divine and human worlds.

The dualistic mentality of the gnostics denied any possibility of salvation of the material world and hence to the human body. Consequently, on the basis of the conviction that Christ assumed only what he redeemed, the gnostics denied that he assumed a real body in the *incarnation: some considered his body a mere appearance; others allowed it more substance (the Valentinian "economic Christ") but ruled out any real materiality (*docetism).

The definition of Christ qua *deus* as Logos of God, put to such good use by the gnostics, was picked up by the various Catholic theologians active between 160 and the end of the 2nd c. And if *Irenaeus, writing against the gnostics, voluntarily abstained from "reckless" speculations on the deity, *Justin, *Tatian, *Theophilus and *Athenagoras felt no such restraint and, while avoiding the mythologizing excesses of the gnostics, like them felt the influence of the *Middle Platonism of the time, which put a minor deity (sometimes several) as intermediary between the supreme and transcendent God and the world. They conceived the divine Logos (which is also the Wisdom and image of God: Pr 8:22-25; 1 Cor 1:24; Col 1:15—though, like the gnostics, Irenaeus and at times Theophilus identified Wisdom with the Holy Spirit) as *ab aeterno* impersonally immanent in God and generated by him *ante tempus* to provide for the creation and government of the world. As proceeding from the Father, he is the Son of God and himself

God, even though inferior to the Father, and is personally distinct from him (though the term *persona* was not yet used in a technical sense) but not separate from him. He sums up in himself the whole relationship between God and the world: he created it, rules it providentially, redeems it and will finally judge it. His redeeming action is not confined to the *incarnation but unfolds gradually and progressively through the economy of the OT, from the very moment of Adam's sin (Irenaeus). In this sense Justin, Irenaeus and the others mentioned above consider the Logos to be the subject of the OT *theophanies, God's appearances to the patriarchs and to *Moses in human, angelic or other form, and this conception remained dominant until after the mid-4th c. The theophanies of the Logos culminate in the incarnation, which the Logos-theologians conceive in a completely real way, in polemic against gnostic *docetism. They share with the gnostics the concept that Christ, becoming incarnate, assumed all that he saved; and since he saved man's body as well as his spirit and soul, he must have assumed a real body as well as a human spirit and soul (Irenaeus, *Tertullian, *Origen). These theologians present the redemptive function of the incarnation under various aspects, not mutually exclusive but often complementing each other: Christ taught; he offered himself as a model for imitation; by the accessibility of his assumed human form he accustomed men by degrees to make contact with his divinity; he became man so that man could become God (Irenaeus). As Adam united—that is, *recapitulated in himself all of humanity in sin—so Christ *recapitulated, united all in himself in *redemption ("physical" theory of redemption). The specific act of redemption was Christ's death, a *sacrifice *expiating the sins of all people, often seen as a *ransom paid to the devil, who held humanity in slavery because of sin. Even among Catholics (Origen) we find sporadic echoes of the gnostic presentation of Christ's death as a trick played on the devil: the Logos concealed his divinity in human appearance so that the devil, not knowing his true nature, should put him to death and, through death, be deprived of the dominion he exercised over humanity.

The Logos-Christology continued to develop in the late 2nd and the 1st half of the 3rd c. (*Hippolytus, Tertullian, *Clement of Alexandria, Origen), in polemic against the *monarchians. The latter accused their opponents of introducing a genuine ditheism derived from Greek philosophy and sought to safeguard the monotheistic conception of God, considering Christ either as a mere man, albeit endowed with exceptional divine gifts, assumed as Son of God after the resurrection (*adoptionists) or as a mode of manifestation and operation of the Father who, in the aspect of a Son, became incarnate and suffered on the cross (*patripassians, *Sabellians). In dispute with these opponents, Hippolytus, Tertullian and, later (mid-3rd c.), *Novatian explored the terms of the Logos-Christology, making clear that the distinction between Father and Son did not compromise the divine unity, conceived by Tertullian as a single divine substance in which Father, Son and also Holy Spirit participated. The distinction within the unity was brought out by the use of the term *prosōpon* (Hippolytus), *persona* in Latin (Tertullian, Novatian), attributed to the Father and the Son and, by Tertullian, to the Holy Spirit. This christological approach was developed further by Origen. Against the *monarchians, he further stressed the distinction between the Logos and the Father, which he brought out by using the term **hypostasis* (= "individual subsistent reality"); he avoided portraying the unity as deriving from a divine substance in which the divine *hypostases* participated, because he saw the danger of conceiving the divine generation as a division of the divine substrate into two parts, and preferred to speak of a dynamic unity of Father and Son, a unity of willing and acting; he presented the Father's generation of the Logos as an eternal and continuous generation, by which, from eternity, the Son incessantly receives divine life from the Father. In presenting the Logos-Christ's teaching activity, Origen took up and developed the traditional themes of Jesus' death as expiation and ransom while stressing in a completely new way the presence of the Logos in the heart of every person, particularly every Christian; in this sense he saw the Logos as continually adapting to each person's ever-changing spiritual conditions, so as to be always able to act on him in the most effective way, persuading and never coercing his freedom, using his assumed humanity to prepare human beings to approach his divinity. To bring out this changeable relationship and, more generally, the different ways in which Christ operates in the world, Origen made able use of the many scriptural names traditionally attributed to him: Logos, Wisdom, Image, Justice, Life, Light, Shepherd, Way, Door etc.

The Logos-theologians, while vigorously affirming, against the gnostics, the integrity of the human nature assumed by Christ, were less concerned with examining the manner in which divinity and humanity were united in him: Tertullian spoke of two substances united but not confused in Christ's person, such that each substance keeps its own properties and Christ acts both as man and as God (*Adv.*

Prax. 27,11-12). Origen, who platonically considered human *souls, including Christ's, as preexistent to their respective bodies, to which they were united at the moment of their creation, conceived such a close union, in Christ, of divine Logos and assumed humanity (first soul, then body) that he formulated the principle of *communicatio idiomatum:* by virtue of the union, the characteristics of the divinity can be predicated of the man, and the characteristics of the humanity can be predicated of God: "In fact we say that the Son of God died by virtue of that nature which could taste death" (*Princ.* II,6,3).

The conflict between monarchians and Logos-theologians continued in the East in the 2nd half of the 3rd and early 4th c.; the latter predominated, but polemical requirements sometimes led them to stress the inferiority of the Logos to the Father (*Dionysius of Alexandria), even more than Justin, Tertullian and Origen had done. On the occasion of an important episode in this conflict, the deposition of the adoptionist *Paul of Samosata from the see of *Antioch (268), we catch our earliest glimpse, among Paul's mainly Origenian opponents, of the christological conception known as *Logos/sarx* ("flesh"), according to which the Logos was incarnate in a human body without a soul, the functions of the soul being assumed by the Logos itself. The origin of this christological conception is obscured by lack of evidence: given the rapid reaction of *Alexandrian circles against the Origenian doctrine of the preexistence of souls (and so also of Christ's) before bodies, it is possible that this was carried so far as to deny even the presence of a soul in Christ. In any case, there is no doubt that the roots of this doctrine lay in the undervaluing of the importance of Christ's humanity compared to his divinity, which was a constant of Alexandrian (= Origenian) Christology. In fact the *Logos/sarx* Christology spread in the areas dominated by Alexandrian influence (*Egypt, *Palestine, part of Asia Minor), while in *Syria and elsewhere it came into conflict with the Christology of Asiatic origin which attributed great significance to Christ's human component (Irenaeus); in the West it remained unknown.

In polemic against monarchianism and against certain materialistic conclusions of Asiatic Christology, *Arius (ca. 320) stressed the *subordinationist tradition of the Logos-theology to the point of making the Logos a God distinctly inferior to the Father, extraneous to his nature and created by him for the sake of the subsequent creation of the world. To uphold this doctrine, Arius also relied on the results of the *Logos/sarx* Christology; indeed, the absence of a human soul in Christ allowed him to attribute *tout court* to the Logos the human passions that the gospels attest in Christ—anguish, fear etc.—and therefore to consider his divine nature as being of lower rank than that of the Father, the one supreme God. Among his opponents, only *Eustathius of Antioch, heir to the Asiatic Christology, criticized his *Logos/sarx* model, affirming the presence of a human soul in Christ: in fact those anti-Arians who were formed at Alexandria (*Alexander, *Athanasius) shared Arius's christological approach, even if only implicitly. *Athanasius never formally denied the presence of a human soul in Christ, but he could not assign any function to it, and he attributed all of Christ's human characteristics to the body, to *sarx,* alone. The Arian controversy gradually moved away from its initial christological dimension to a more broadly *trinitarian one, so that its outcome (one divine substance articulated in three hypostases of equal eminence and dignity) does not directly concern us here. We need only say that, to contest Arian statements about the passibility of the Logos's divine nature, their opponents tended to distinguish clearly, in Christ's actions, between what belonged to the weakness of his humanity and what was derived from the power of the Logos. Especially in the area influenced by Antioch, where the integrity of the man assumed by the Logos was traditionally affirmed, the distinction, anti-Arian in function, between Christ's divine and human components was particularly stressed (*Diodore of Tarsus), with the risk of distinguishing in him two subjects, the man and the Logos, and therefore two Christs.

This danger was noticed especially by *Apollinaris of Laodicea (last decades of the 4th c.), who realized its implications for *soteriology: by distinguishing too clearly between the man Jesus and the Logos, we exclude the latter from the death on the cross, i.e., from the supreme redemptive act, whereas Athanasius had maintained against the Arians that only God could redeem humanity from Adam's sin. To obviate the risks inherent in this divisive Christology, Apollinaris went back to and developed the *Logos/sarx* type of Christology: the Logos, by assuming a humanity without soul (or, more precisely, without *nous,* the soul's rational faculty) and using it as an inert instrument (*organon*), achieved a single nature in the union, i.e., a single principle of willing and acting: the nature of the incarnate God-Logos is one. In this way the divine Logos was intimately united to the human body in its passion and death, though per se incapable of suffering and death. Apollinaris preached Christ's unity to the detriment of his assumed humanity, and the criticisms of his opponents (*Epiphanius, *Diodore, *Gregory of Na-

zianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa) focused on this point. They objected, on the basis of the axiom "Christ assumed all that he redeemed," that to redeem the complete person, body and soul, from sin, Christ must have assumed a humanity complete in soul and body; and to the one nature which Apollinaris derived from the union, they opposed the distinction of two natures, united but not confused. In the Antiochene area of influence, toward the end of the 4th c., *Theodore of Mopsuestia in particular sought to investigate the question, clearly distinguishing Christ's two natures against Apollinaris but seeking to formulate their unity more precisely than had been previously done in his milieu. He spoke of two whole and complete natures that were united without being confused in a single *prosōpon,* or person. (To evaluate this formula, we must bear in mind that the Greek *prosōpon* had never lost its original meaning of "form, external appearance.") In fact Theodore, despite this unitive formula, continued to distinguish too clearly between the divine and human operations in Christ, in effect predicating in him two subjects, corresponding to the two natures.

Apollinaris's doctrine was condemned at *Constantinople in 381, and the condemnation forced the Alexandrian theologians to renounce the *Logos/sarx* christological model. But from *Cyril of Alexandria's works predating the *Nestorian crisis (428), we can see that this detachment was more apparent than real: Cyril speaks of Christ's whole humanity but continues, in the post-Origenian Alexandrian tradition, to subordinate it to the Logos so that it is still just the passive instrument through which the latter operates in the world. The Apollinarist crisis aroused only marginal interest in the West, where the christological formula that predicated two complete natures of Christ united but not confused in a single person, used earlier by Tertullian, was imposed without too much difficulty (see the episode of *Leporius and *Augustine).

When the Antiochene priest Nestorius was elected bishop of Constantinople (428), the Antiochene and Alexandrian Christologies had for some decades been confronting each other from very distant positions: the one gave significance and autonomy to Christ's human nature to the point of de facto predicating two subjects in him, compromising his unity; the other ensured his unity by making the Logos the sole subject, with the result of reducing the humanity to a passive instrument of the Logos. Nestorius continued Theodore's formula predicating a single *prosōpon* in Christ, but in fact he held the two natures so distinct as to not admit the *communicatio idiomatum* affirmed by Origen: hence his aversion to the title Mother of God (**Theotokos*), traditionally given to Mary, and preference for the title Mother of Christ (*Christotokos*). Cyril considered the union of natures in Christ according to *prosōpon* too weak and extrinsic, and substituted for it a union according to *hypostasis,* a much stronger term to indicate the unity of the subject; he spoke of a unity of nature in Christ and adopted the formula "one single nature of the incarnate Logos," claiming that we can speak of two natures in Christ only before the union, i.e., only in theory, because the union produced a single nature, corresponding to a single *hypostasis,* i.e., a single subject and center of will and activity. In this single nature resulting from the union, Cyril kept the properties of the divinity and of the humanity very distinct, but this was not enough to make his formulations acceptable to the Antiochenes, who considered them Apollinarist in tone. In fact the pact of union of 433, which reconciled Cyril with the Antiochenes after the condemnation of Nestorius at Ephesus in 431, was just a compromise, to which Cyril submitted only for political reasons, sacrificing the most characteristic points of his doctrine: the formula affirmed the union in Christ of two natures, without confusion, in a single *prosōpon*, and defined Mary as Mother of God.

*Eutyches's resumption (448) of *monophysite formulations (a single nature of Christ resulting from the union) reopened hostilities, which this time saw the active intervention of the West, in the person of *Leo the Great, to support the Antiochene *dyophysites: the pope's **Tomus ad Flavianum* was the basis of the formula of *Chalcedon (451), which affirmed two natures in Christ, united but not confused, whole and complete, so that Christ is *homoousios* with the Father according to his divinity and *homoousios* with human beings according to his humanity. The union of the two natures is in a single *prosōpon* and a single *hypostasis*. The formula met the demands of the Antiochenes to safeguard the integrity of the two natures in the union and of Cyril to bring out the unity of subject resulting from the union by the use of *hypostasis* and not just *prosōpon*. As such it was accepted in the West and by the Antiochenes, but rejected by the monophysites, who considered the affirmation of two natures in Christ after the union to be Nestorian.

The progress of the conflict saw the monophysite doctrine articulated in variant forms, many of which effectively sacrificed the integrity of Christ's human nature in the union. The most important (*Severus of Antioch) recovered the radical aspects of Cyril's doctrine, affirming that in Christ a single

nature resulted from the union and that only in theory could one speak of two natures before the union; but in this one nature the characteristic properties of divinity and humanity continued to subsist without confusion, so that Christ is *homoousios both with the Father and with human beings. This doctrine, essentially orthodox while refusing to admit two natures resulting from the union (verbal monophysitism), brought out better than the Chalcedonian formula the presence of a single subject in Christ and therefore the participation of the Logos in his passion and death, without actually suffering and dying in the divine essence. In any case, the distance between the two formulations was not great, and if the dispute was not made up it was because it was by now too complicated by political, cultural and national factors.

In the first decades of the 6th c., under *Justinian and partly through his initiative, the Catholics worked out a variant of the Chalcedonian doctrine (*Neochalcedonianism) which sought to meet monophysitism halfway, not just for political reasons but also out of awareness of a need to bring out Christ's unity still more than the balanced symmetry of the Chalcedonian formula had done. So into that formula was inserted the expression *unus de Trinitate passus est,* circulated by the Scythian monks at the beginning of the 6th c. Though interpreted in a Chalcedonian sense (the Son suffered in the flesh), this formally drew attention to the participation of the Logos in Christ's passion; and above all the Chalcedonian formula was interpreted in the light of the most characteristic aspects of Cyril's doctrine, thus also admitting the formula "a single nature of the incarnate Logos," obviously with due clarifications to make it compatible with the affirmation of the two natures, which neither could nor would be renounced (*John Maxentius, *John of Caesarea, *Justinian, *Leontius of Jerusalem).

The claims of Neochalcedonian Christology were accepted at the Council of Constantinople of 553 and so imposed on all Catholic Christendom, even in the West, where Chalcedonian doctrine in the strict sense clearly received greater consent; but they were insufficient to disarm monophysite hostility. The last attempt to meet the monophysites halfway was the doctrine of *monoenergism and monothelitism (1st decades of the 7th c.): since the monophysites affirmed in Christ one *hypostasis,* one nature, and one will and operation, this doctrine, while affirming two natures in Christ, made his willing and acting originate not from the two natures but from the *hypostasis,* i.e., the subject, which is single, so that a single will and a single operation, divine and human, originate from it. This doctrine was opposed not just by the monophysites but also by many Catholics, who saw it as too great a concession to monophysitism. Meanwhile the political motivations that had decisively influenced the various Catholic attempts to reach an understanding with the monophysites decreased when *Egypt and *Syria, the strongholds of the *heretics, passed under Arab rule. The condemnation of monoenergism and monothelitism at the Council of Constantinople of 680–681 put an end to the christological controversies, confirming the decisions of 451 and 553, expressions of a Christology which had sought to harmonize the conflicting demands of safeguarding both the integrity of Christ's divine and human components and his unity of subject, demands considered nonnegotiable for a right understanding of the Christian message of salvation.

J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, Bonn 1941; CGG I-III; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958 (It. tr. Bologna 1972); A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition,* I: *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*, London - Oxford 1975; Id., *Mit ihm und in ihm. Christologische Forschungen und Perspektiven*, Freiburg 1975; P. Smulders, *Dogmengeschichtliche und lehramtliche Entfaltung der Christologie*, in *Mysterium salutis* III/1, Einsiedeln 1970 (It. tr. vol. 5, Brescia 1971, 493-597); J. Liébaert, *L'Incarnation. Dès origines au concilie de Chalcédoine*, Paris 1966; J. Daniélou, *La teologia del giudeo-cristianesimo*, Bologna 1964; M. Simonetti, *Note di cristologia pneumatica*: Augustinianum 12 (1972) 201-232; L. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il Concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974; A. Orbe, *Cristología gnóstica*, I-II, Madrid 1976; E. Bellini, *Su Cristo. Il grande dibattito nel quarto secolo*, Milan 1977 (collection of texts); TRE 16, 726-772; 17, 1-42; J. Gnilka - A. Schilson, *Christologie*: LTK 2, 1164-1174; *Christology*: ODC 336-338; R.A. Norris, *The Christological Controversy*, Philadelphia 1980; J. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. 2/1: Das Konzil von Chalkedon (451). Rezeption und Widerspruch (451-518)*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1986 (It. tr. vols. 1-2/1, Brescia 1982-1996); G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, Berlin ²1981; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988; A.J. Hultgren, *New Testament Christology: A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography*, New York 1988; A. Gilg, *Weg und Bedeutung der altchristlichen Christologie*, Munich 1989; J. Grillmeier - T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, cit., II/2: *Die Kirche von Konstantinopel im 6. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1989; J. Grillmeier - T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, cit., II/4: *Die Kirche von Alexandrien mit Nubien und Äthiopien nach 451*, Freiburg - Basel - Vienna 1990; A. De Halleux, *Nestorius. Histoire et doctrine*: Irénikon 66 (1993) 163-177; M. Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo*, Rome 1993; M.O. Boulnois, *Le paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique*, Paris 1994; J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology and Texts*, Leiden 1994; A. Orbe - M. Simonetti (eds.), *Il Cristo.* I, *Testi teologici e spirituali dal I al IV secolo*, Milan ³1995; M. Simonetti (ed.), *Il Cristo.* II, *Testi teologici e spirituali in lingua greca dal IV al VII secolo*, Milan 1990; R. Sturch, *The Word and the Christ: An Essay in Analytic Christology*, Oxford 1991;

A. Orbe, *La teologia dei secoli II e III. Il confronto della grande chiesa con lo gnosticismo*, It. tr., Rome 1995; C. Vidal Manzanares, *El judeo-Cristianismo palestino en el siglo I*, Madrid 1995; G. Uríbarri Bilbao, *Monarquía y Trinidad. El concepto teológico "Monarchia" en la controversia "monarquiana,"* Madrid 1996; B. Meunier, *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie. L'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite*, Paris 1997; M. Simonetti, *Teologia e cristologia dell'Egitto cristiano*, in A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo antica*, Rome 1997, 11-38; S.C. Mimouni, *Le Judéo-christianisme ancien. Essais historiques*, Paris 1998; M. Simonetti (ed.), Hippolytus, *Contro Noeto, Introduzione*, Bologna 2000.

M. Simonetti

CHRISTOPHER, martyr. Christopher's existence may be admitted because of the antiquity of his cult, attested by *Mart. hier.,* and on the basis of the inscription of the deposition of his *relics in the church dedicated to him in Bithynia (at *Chalcedon) in 452 (AASS Nov. 2, 2, 396). His feast is 9 May in *Synax. Eccl. CP*, 24 July in the *Naples calendar, 25 July in *Mart. hier*. (*in Licia civitate Samon natale sancti Christofori*), which is the basis of his other attestations in the West. According to the *Mart. hier.,* the cult originated in *Lycia. The *Passiones* from the 8th c. and later are a collection of unlikely events. Reprobus, a supposed giant cynocephalus, was baptized at Samos and from then on was called Christopher (regarding human giants in antiquity, see Phlegon, *De mirabilibus,* 11-19). After many tortures Christopher died a martyr whose life would not be forgotten. In the 13th c. the etiological legend of the "Christ-bearer" developed in German lands. Some have mistakenly wanted to see in Christopher the christianization of the *pagan cult of Anubis, or even of Heracles, who carried Eros.

BHG 308-311; BHL 1764-1780; BHO 190-192; Díaz 431; BS 4, 349-364; BBKL 1, 1012-1014; LCI 5, 496-508; Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens 2, 65-75; W. De Grüneisen, *Sainte Marie Antique*, Rome 1911, 516-517.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

CHRISTUS PATIENS. This drama in freely constructed iambic trimeters, modeled on Euripides and considered "the Christian tragedy par excellence" (Tuilier), is a *cento. Long thought almost unanimously to be a late *Byzantine (12th-c.) work, it is now attributed with good reason to *Gregory of Nazianzus. In the manner of ancient theater, the action unfolds in a dramatic trilogy: Christ's passion and death, burial, *resurrection. Analysis of the work brings out the author's *orthodoxy, clearly anti-*Apollinarist, and his ability to express distinct speculative-theological positions in dramatic language. Besides Christ, the most prominent protagonist is *Mary, his mother, heroically participating in the Son's saving *sacrifice. An elaboration, in an apologetic tone, of a literary genre and texts of *pagan antiquity, the *Christus Patiens* is "the adaptation and the work of a thinker, a theologian and an artist" (Tuilier).

PG 38, 133-338; Grégoire de Nazianze, *La Passion du Christ. Tragédie*, SC 149, Paris 1969; Gregorio Nazianzeno, *La Passione di Cristo*, F. Trisoglio, Rome 1979; V. Cottas, *Le drame de Grégoire de Nazianze Christos Paschon*, in *Le Théatre à Byzance*, Paris 1931, 197-249; F. Trisoglio, *La Vergine Maria come protagonista del Christus patiens*: Marianum 41 (1979); Id., *Forme e sviluppi del monologo nella tragedia classica e nel Christus patiens*: Civiltà Classica and Cristiana 1 (1980) 7-48; I. Giudice Rizzo, *Sul Christus Patiens e le Baccanti di Euripide*: SG (Siculorum gymnasium) 30 (1977) 1-63; F. Trisoglio, *L'uomo di fronte a Dio nella tragedia greca e nel "Christus Patiens,"* Genoa 1983; G.J. Swart, *A Historical-Critical Evaluation of the Play Christus patiens, Traditionally Attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus*, Univ. of Pretoria 1990; F. Trisoglio, *San Gregorio di Nazianzo e il Christus Patiens: il problema dell'autenticità gregoriana del dramma*, Florence 1996; *Kentron* 13/1-2 (1997) with some of the papers given at the international colloquium on the "Christus patiens," Caen, June 1989; K. Pollmann, *Jesus Christus und Dionysos: Überlegungen zu dem Euripides-Cento Christus Patiens*: JÖByz 47 (1997) 87-106; F. Trisoglio, *Ricchezza di "humanitas" nel "Christus patiens"*: Orpheus 18/1 (1997) 80-111; Id., *La Theotokos quale "signora" nel Christus patiens*: Sileno 23 (1-2) (1997) 225-241; A. Tuilier, *Grègoire de Nazianze et le Christus Patiens: à propos d'un ouvrage récent*: REG 110/2 (1997) 632-647.

M. Naldini

CHRODOBERT, duke (d. 674). Bishop of *Tours from 653 (or 664) to 674. We know little of him: he may have been referendary to Dagobert I in 630 and a high court official. Audonius of Rouen sent him a draft of the *Vita Eligii* of Noyon for him to correct, with a letter showing that the three were friends. Chrodobert also wrote a letter to the *abbess Boba dealing with the case of an adulterous nun, invoking ecclesiastical legislation (probably the Council of Orléans of 541) and the *auctoritas* of Scripture. The letter is important evidence not only of the customs of the time but also of the "prehistory," before the 8th c., of the cult of Mary Magdalene in France.

CPL 1307; PL 54, 1424-1426; MGH, *Leges, sect. V*, *Formulae*, 494-496; CCL 117, 496-502. R. Sprandel, *Der merowingische Adel und die Gebiete östlich des Rheins*, Freiburg 1957, 16; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Munich - Vienna 1965; V. Saxer, *Les origines du culte de sainte Marie Madeleine en Occident*, in *Marie Madeleine dans la mystique, les arts et les lettres.* Actes du Colloque international, Avignon 20-21-22 juillet 1988, Paris 1989, 33-47 (esp. 39-40); S. Sato, *Chrodebert concéda-t-il le premier privilège épiscopal pour Saint-Martin de*

Tours? Une problématique méconnue, in *Haut Moyen Âge. Culture, éducation et société. Études offertes à Pierre Riché*, Paris 1990, 171-182; Patrologia IV, 350.

V. Milazzo

CHROMATIUS of Aquileia (335/340–407). From ca. 370 a member of the clergy of *Aquileia, one of the most important junctions of transit between East and West. As a close collaborator of Bishop *Valerian he took part in a local synod in 381, directed by *Ambrose, which condemned so-called Western *Arianism (Illyricum). Bishop of Aquileia from 387, he was very active pastorally and worked for the peace of the church, e.g., in the controversy between his old friend *Rufinus and *Jerome, and in the matter of *John Chrysostom. Before his death in 407 he experienced the terrors of the Gothic invasion. The written deposit of his preaching, which came to light only in 1975, includes more than 40 sermons and 61 homilies on the gospel of Matthew. In exegetical texts Chromatius demonstrates a profound knowledge of the Bible and of the African tradition. The homilies on Matthew were not composed for liturgical use but for spiritual formation in *ascetical circles. They seem to be influenced by ps.-Jerome, *Expositio quattuor evangeliorum*. Since the discovery of Chromatius's considerable literary heritage, there have been many studies of him, of his exegetical method and of his references to the *liturgy of Aquileia.

CPL 217-219; A. Hosté, CCL 9 (1957), 371-447; R. Étaix - J. Lemarié, CCL 9A (1974); 9A suppl. (1977) (cf. J. Doignon, RSPh 63 [1979] 241-250); SC 154 and 164; G. Banterle, *Op. Ambr.* Milan 1990; J. Lemarié, *Italie. Aquilée*: DSp 7, 2162-2165; D. Corgnali, *Il mistero pasquale in Cromazio di Aquileia*, Udine 1979; G. Cuscito, *Cromazio di Aquileia e l'età sua*, Padua 1980; *Chromatius Episcopus 388-1988*, Trieste 1989; C. Jäggi, *Aspekte der städtebaulichen Entwicklung Aquileias in frühchrist. Zeit*: JbAC 33 (1990) 158-196; LTK[3] 2, 1184; M.A. Mascari. *Zeno, Gaudentius and Chromatius: The Dynamics of Preaching in Northern Italy*, Washington, DC 1996; R. Rapisarda, *Continuità tra Antico e Nuovo Testamento*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 291-302; LACL (2002) 147; D.J. Font i Palma, *La relación "Pascua-primavera" en Zenón de Verona, Gaudencio de Brescia y Cromacio de Aquileia*, Rome 2003.

B. Studer

CHRONICLE of Edessa. Anonymous work of obvious Edessan origin covering from 132/131 BC, when *Edessa became capital of the new kingdom of *Osroene, until AD 540. Shortly after the latter year, the chronicle was continued by a *Chalcedonian author of *dyophysite tendencies. For the earliest period it is generally limited to brief information, whereas from 303 (the destruction of the walls of Edessa) it becomes more detailed. The chronicler seems to base himself primarily on the sources, both ecclesiastical and secular, of the archives of Edessa; he often allows us to date events with great precision, which confers a great historical value on the small work. He also used some literary works, e.g., the chronicle attributed to *Joshua the Stylite.

Baumstark 99-100; BO I, 388-417; Duval 178-179; Patrologia V, 422; L. Hallier, *Untersuchungen über die Chronik von Edessa*, Leipzig 1892 (text with German tr.); Guidi, *Chronica minora I* (CSCO 1), Paris 1903 (facs. ed., Louvain 1955), 1-13; W. Witakowski, *Chronicles Edessa*: Orientalia Suecana 33/35 (1984/1986) 487-498.

K. den Biesen

CHRONICON PASCHALE. Name commonly given to a document titled in the sole MS (*Vatican. gr.* 1941, X *c.*) "Epitome of the years from Adam . . . to the 20th year of the reign of *Heraclius . . . and of Heraclius, the new *Constantine, his son in the 18th year of that reign, third indiction" (= 630). The prologue (1st half of the 7th c.) deals with the theological basis for determining the date of *Easter in conformity with the *Alexandrian tradition and with the decisions of the Council of *Nicaea and, reviewing the different festive cycles, announces a mathematical method for making theological truth coincide with historical accuracy, as a demonstration of the harmony between faith and history. Then follow the chronological tables, furnished with historical notes, from the creation of the world to the year 628 (the work, rewritten in more than one place, is thus mutilated). The computations are by Olympiads, consular *fasti* and indictions. The anonymous author must be considered the coiner of the so-called proto-*Byzantine era.

L. Dindorf, Bonn 1832; PWK III, 2460-2477; DACL 3, 1553-1555; V. Grumel, *La chronologie* (Traité d'études byzantines 1), Paris 1958, 26-232 (p. 78, reproduction of *Trochos* IV); J. Beaucamp - R. Bondoux - J. Lefort - M.-Fr. Rouan - I. Sorlin, *Temps et Histoire. I. Le prologue de la Chronique pascale*: Travaux et mémoires 7 (1979) 223-301 (Fr. tr. of the prologue 228-258; in appendix, ed. of *trochoi* I and II, judged heterogeneous, and the letter of Theophilus of Alexandria to Theodosius I added to the original work); M. Whitby - M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD* (TTH 7), Liverpool 1989; Patrologia V, 63, 105, 107-108, 346, 409; RGG[4] 2,344.

D. Stiernon

CHRONOGRAPHUS ANONYMUS. In the late 19th c., the noted Egyptologist W. Golenischev acquired an illustrated papyrus from a Gazan antiquarian; the papyrus, probably copied in a *monastery of Upper *Egypt during the first half of the 5th c.,

contains a *Chronographus anonymous*. This work shows strong similarities to the Greek model of the **Barbarus Scaligeri*.

Unfortunately we have only a brief fragment, contained on a single sheet of illustrated papyrus (P. Berol. 13296), of the original Greek of the *Barbarus Scaligeri*; nonetheless, based on the text and the illustrations present in both papyri, a surprising similarity between the two works has been noted. The depictions of saints and of the walls of *Constantinople in the Greek fragment of the *Barbarus* are similar to the descriptions of the months; of the places and figures of the OT; of emperors, kings and patriarchs; and of John the Baptist and Christ in the Golenischev papyrus. Also, the *exemplum* of the *Barbarus* was about sixty pages in length, like the text of the Golenischev papyrus. On the basis of this affinity, it can be hypothesized that the direct source of the *Chronographus anonymous* was a lost Alexandrian chronicle, to which the original text of the *Barbarus* also referred.

Editions: CPG 5540; A. Bauer - J. Strzygowsky, *Eine alexandrinische Weltchronik, Text und Miniaturen eines griechischen Papyrus der Sammlung W. Golenischev*, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-histor. Klasse 51, Bd. 2, Vienna 1905.

Studies: H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*; 2. *Die Nachfolger des Julius Africanus*, Leipzig 1885, repr. New York 1967, 316-329; Bauer - Strzygowsky, op. cit.; F. Jacoby: PWK 6,6 (1909) 1566-1576; L. Bréhier: DHGE 6 (1932) 593; R. Klein: LMA 4 (1989) 156; E. Jeffreys - B. Croke - R. Scott, *Studies in John Malalas*: Byzantina Australiensia 6, Sydney 1990, passim; ODB 1, 253.

P. Allen

CHRONOGRAPHY – CHRONOLOGY. The term *chronography* designates a historical narration in chronological order and, more rarely, the study of chronology. *Chronology* indicates (1) the discipline that considers historical events in their temporal relations and seeks to fix their exact position in the sequence of time, (2) the temporal order in which particular facts happen, and (3) a work that recounts events using the criterion of temporal succession. To discern the meanings of these two words in modern languages will help us to better understand the way in which the Christians of the first centuries saw both the order and the doctrine of time.

Among the oldest evidence is that of *Theophilus of Antioch. In book 3 of *Ad Autolycum* (24-28), written soon after 180, the author, following the method of Jewish *apologists, aims to demonstrate the antiquity of the Christian religion and esp. of the sacred books received from the *synagogue. To this end he expounds a chronology of world history from creation to the death of *Marcus Aurelius (180), over an arc of time calculated as 5695 years, 6 months and 15 days. For the Christian point of view, Sextus *Julius Africanus's five books of Chronicles (Χρονογραφίαι), written after 221 and surviving only in fragments, must have been of great importance. In them, biblical events and events from Greek and Jewish history were arranged in parallel, from the creation to the fourth year of *Heliogabalus (221). Following an already established opinion, he held that the world would last 6,000 years before its final phase—which would be the millennium of Christ's reign—and that at the time of Christ's birth 5,500 years had passed. In the same period and on the basis of similar computations, *Hippolytus wrote his *Chronicles* (Χρονικῶν βίβλιοι), which seem to have been inspired by Julius's work and by the chronological section of *Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* (I,109-136). It is interesting to note that Hippolytus too composed his work in response to *eschatological and *millenarian expectations, aroused in various Christian communities by just such chronological calculations.

At the start of the 4th c. (or perhaps earlier) *Eusebius of Caesarea wrote his *Chronicon:* though lost, we can reconstruct it from a 6th-c. *Armenian translation, *Jerome's *Latin version and many excerpts transcribed by later chronographers. In the first part (Χροναγραφία), Eusebius expounds the chronological systems of the Chaldeans, Assyrians, Hebrews, Egyptians and Greeks. In the second, he presents a series of synchronous tables (Χρονικοὶ κανόνες) in parallel columns, giving the most important events of universal history, including those of sacred history, with references to different *computi* (years from Abraham, whose birth was fixed at 2016–2015 BC; Olympiads; years of Rome, dynastic dates). His work was distinguished from its predecessors by the good quality of his chosen sources, a more marked philological and historical sensibility (he no longer began with Adam but with historically ascertainable persons and events) and a more prudent eschatological vision (abandoning millenarism). Less than a century later, while staying in *Constantinople in ca. 380, Jerome discovered it, understood its importance and translated it into Latin, partially rewriting and expanding it: indeed, after translating the first part he introduced many new facts into the later parts, especially relating to the West, for which his work was intended; he also brought the *Chronicon* up to date as far as 378, the date of *Valens's death. Thus there developed in early Christian literature, both Eastern and Western, the historical narrative in which events were registered

simply in order of succession: a minor literary genre, but one which constituted the necessary skeleton for more complex historical narrative. (Not by chance did Eusebius, on the basis of his own *Chronicon,* construct his *Historia ecclesiastica* for the centuries after Christ's coming.) Later times thus found basic models to which they could look when compiling universal chronicles and indispensable points of reference for the broad delineation of humankind's past (e.g., the *Chronicles* of *Sulpicius Severus, *Prosper of Aquitaine, *Hydatius, *Marcellinus *Comes*, and again *Cassiodorus, *Victor of Tunnuna, *Marius of Avenches, *Isidore of Seville and *Bede, for the West; and for the East, the universal chronicles of *Panodorus and *Annianus, *Hesychius of Miletus and *John of Antioch, or of *John Malalas or George Syncellus).

At this point we must put in better perspective the character and significance of the many ancient works *de tempore* by recalling an important collection of sources and acts, known as the **Chronography of 354* from the year in which it was completed, though some of its constituent texts were immediately continued and brought up to date. This work, illustrated and probably compiled by Furius Dionysius *Philocalus, Pope *Damasus's calligrapher, comprises a series of different historical-chronographical elements, some of them non-Christian in character: a list of consuls—faithful and complete—up to 354; an *Easter canon, calculated from 321 to 412; a list of prefects of Rome from 254 to 354, with the consular *fasti* relating to the same period; a list of Roman martyrs, with date, name and usually the place where each one was laid or where his liturgical station was celebrated (**Depositio martyrum*); a list of the commemorative days of the Roman bishops from *Lucius (254) to *Julius (352), giving the place where each one's liturgical station was celebrated (**Depositio episcoporum*); the list of bishops of *Rome from *Peter to *Liberius (for whom only a date of consecration [352] is given) (*Liberian Catalogue*); the consular *fasti,* cited in two versions; a universal chronicle—composed in 334—with continual reference to biblical history (*Chronicon Horosii*), a revision and continuation of Hippolytus's *Chronicle*; a chronicle of Roman kings, dictators and emperors up to *Licinius (d. 325); and a description of Rome by districts. The book's usefulness to citizens, and no less to visitors, of the *Urbs* is evident; it still has considerable historical, erudite, topographical and antiquarian importance, and it was widely used and very popular with many ancient writers. In some ways it can be considered a precursor of the medieval chronicles with their marked interest in the minute exposition of particular facts, which distinguish them from the universal chronicles mentioned above.

To these we must now turn to evaluate their contribution to the formulation of the new Christian *historiography. They constituted the preliminary work which allowed Christian historians to explain to the *pagans the scriptural vision of history, to demonstrate the antiquity (and novelty) of the religion they professed, and to correlate the facts of secular history with those of *historia salutis*. But the Christian chronographies also allowed ecclesiastical teachers to delineate with greater certainty, particularly for *simplices* and *rudes,* the grandiose course of the divine providential plan for humanity (see the two examples of historical exposition in *Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus* [16,24ff.]). As Momigliano notes, "Unlike pagan chronology, Christian chronology was also a philosophy of history," so that "the convert, in abandoning paganism, was compelled to enlarge his historical horizon: perhaps for the first time, it occurred to him to think in terms of universal history." Moreover, in what we may call a total vision, the end of the world was also considered along with secular events. "Chronology and eschatology were conflated to form a single whole" (A. Momigliano, *Il conflitto tra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel IV secolo*, It. tr., 95-96). The same matrix gave rise to systems of chronological computation connected with new historiographical theories. The requirement was that of gathering and illustrating the history of salvation, which broke through the horizons of local histories even while becoming incarnate in historically determined facts and events. Suffice it to recall here the theory of the age of the world and its link with chronological calculations. It took many forms but had one intention. Taking the days of creation (Gen 1:1) to represent the time of the world, many ancient authors spoke of six periods, to be followed by a seventh, which for some authors was the millennium of Christ's reign, for others eternal life (each period would last 1,000 years, according to Ps 90:4: "A thousand years in [the Lord's] sight are but as yesterday"). Elsewhere four ages were emphasized (of idolatry, of the law, of the gospel, of the *parousia) in the light of a progressive and ordered dimension of God's plan; or else two ages, assuming the earthly *incarnation of the Word to be the center of history.

Still more ways of calculating time and scanning the periods of human history were developed in the first centuries. Among them was that which, well-known in the pagan world, took its name from a particularly important historical event. In this case the term "era" was used (from late Latin *æra*, "num-

ber," "figure"). Years were counted from this event, so that earlier or later facts could be ordered chronologically. The expression "era of *Diocletian" was particularly popular in the East: facts were ordered from the start of Diocletian's reign (284). It was used in *Egypt, where it particularly established itself, by *Cyril of Alexandria (in his Easter tables), but it also occurs in the West, in *Ambrose (*Ep.* 23) or, later, in *Bede. From the 7th c. it became the "era of the martyrs," in memory of the Christians who suffered the last and cruelest persecution under Diocletian. Much more famous and lasting was the "Christian" or "vulgar" era, introduced by the Scythian monk *Dionysius Exiguus (d. ca. 545). In compiling the table of Easter cycles which he made to continue Cyril of Alexandria's work beyond 531, he computed the years no longer from Diocletian but from the birth of Jesus Christ (which he fixed, erroneously, as 25 December in the year 753 from the foundation of Rome)—a choice which clearly expressed an essential moment of the previous models. This way of summing up chronology gradually spread, first among chroniclers, then in public documents from the 7th c., in imperial documents from the 9th c., in pontifical acts from the mid-10th c. To mention just one more, the "*Byzantine era" had considerable popularity from the 7th c., throughout the East and in S Italy. Roughly following a calculation known from earliest times, it fixed the creation of the world at 5508 BC, making 5509 the first year of the new era.

A dating method starting from 38 BC was common in *Spain; it became general in the 6th-7th c., in the Western provinces, through the *Visigoths, who also used it in *Africa and the part of *Gaul which they occupied; for this reason it was called Gothic, but it is better known under the name Hispanic (Spanish or Caesar) era. It was used by *Hydatius and by *Isidore of Seville; it disappeared in the 13th-14th c.

Indication on editions of Latin works *de tempore*, in CPL 2249-2323, 502-518; Altaner 170-171; 232-238. For Eastern chronographies, see ibid., C. Traselli: EC 4, 1010-1011, s.v. *Cronologia*; C. Traselli - A. Pratesi: EC 5, 462-64, s.v. *Èra*; *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano, Oxford 1963 (It. tr. Turin [2]1971 [the essay cited in the text is titled *Storiografia pagana e cristiana nel secolo IV d.C.*]); A. Luneau, *L'Histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Église. La doctrine des âges du monde*, Paris 1964; *Mito e storia tra paganesimo e cristianesimo. Le età del mondo in fonti antiche*, ed. P. Siniscalco, Turin 1976 (all the contributions cited above contain copious bibliographical information); R.S. Bagnall, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta, GA 1987; W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, Dumbarton Oaks 1989; S. Muhlberger, *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, Leeds 1990; B. Croke, *Christian Chronicles and Byzantine History, 5th-6th Centuries*, Aldershot 1992; R.W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, with the assistance of W. Witakowski, Stuttgart 1999; P. Siniscalco, *Un modulo storiografico fortunato: le età del mondo dall'epoca patristica al Medioevo*, in var. aus., *Il Battistero di Parma. Iconografia, iconologia, fonti letterarie*, ed. G. Schianchi, Milan 1999, 321-350; W. Adler - P. Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, Oxford 2002.

P. Siniscalco

CHRONOGRAPHY of 354. Title given to a vast and luxurious illustrated codex written at *Rome in 354 by Pope *Damasus's calligrapher Furius Dionysius *Philocalus, who compiled and illustrated more than a dozen preexisting documents, each with its own history. It was dedicated by the author to a wealthy Christian named Valentinus (whose name appears on the frontispiece). A copy of it was made in the Carolingian period, from which others were made in the 16th and 17th c.; the richness of the illustrations made the copying task difficult. The codex can be divided into two sections: the first, illustrated, contains texts regarding Roman civic life (Christian elements are lacking); the second, with no illustrations, contains texts on aspects of imperial Roman civic and Christian life. (Typically *pagan elements are omitted, though some historical and legendary references are made.)

Its essential content includes: (1) a list of the *Natales Caesarum,* which begins with the month of January and includes emperors beginning with *Augustus; (2) an *astrological section, i.e., on the signs of the *zodiac; (3) the official calendar of the city of *Rome: the individual months with indications of the days, imperial anniversaries, feasts, spectacles, lucky and unlucky days, *ludi* and *circenses,* and the astrological week; (4) a complete, accurate list of the consuls up to 354, indicating the year according to the Varronian system, with suppression of the names of usurpers; (5) an *Easter table from 312 to 411, based on *Hippolytus's lunar cycle of 84 years; (6) a list of the urban prefects from 254 to 354; (7) the *Depositio episcoporum* for the years 255–335 (from Pope *Lucius to Pope *Sylvester), i.e., the days and places of commemoration of the bishops of Rome; two other names were added to this list: Mark, 7 October (336), Julius, 12 April (352); (8) the **Depositio martyrum:* a list of *martyrs commemorated at Rome with the date, name and place of burial or that where the liturgical station was celebrated; *Callistus is the oldest martyr recorded, and the list begins with the feast of Christmas, 25 December; (9) the list of the bishops of Rome from Peter to Liberius (*Liberian Catalog*)—

for the latter, only the year of consecration (352) is given; (10) other documents, whose inclusion in the original copy is uncertain: a *Notitia* of the regions of the city of Rome, a universal chronicle (*Liber generationis*) and a chronicle of the city of Rome (*Chronica Urbis Romae*).

T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* 1, 13-148; A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae*, 13: *Fasti et elogia*, fasc. 2: *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani*, Rome 1963 (best ed.); T. Mommsen, *Über den Chronographen vom Jahre 354*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, 7, Berlin 1909, 536-579; J. Strzygowski, *Die Calenderbilder des Chronographen*, Berlin 1888; R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, 2 vols., Rome 1942; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damsiana*, Rome 1942, 21-35; PW 3/2, 2477-2481; H. Stern, *Le Calendrier de 354. Étude sur son texte et ses illustrations*, Paris 1954; Id., *Les calendriers romains illustrés*: ANRW II, 12,2 (1983), 431-475; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana*, Rome 1976; M.R. Salzman, *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354*, Berkeley 1990; RAC 19, 1177-1191; G. Binder, *Der Kalender des Filocalus. Eine illustrierte Ausgabe des römischen Festkalenders aus dem 4. Jahrh. n. Chr.*, in *Der Kalender*, ed. W. Geerlings, Paderborn 2002, 61-83.

A. Di Berardino

CHRYSIPPUS (ca. 410–479). Native of *Cappadocia, educated in *Syria, with his brothers Cosmas and Gabriel he went to *Palestine in ca. 428 to make up the first group of disciples who created the *laura of St. *Euthymius. After having been its bursar, he and Gabriel were ordained priests of the Anastasis at *Jerusalem, ca. 456; in 466 he replaced Cosmas, now *metropolitan of *Scythopolis, as *Staurophylax* (keeper of the relics of the Holy Cross). For these details see *Cyril of Scythopolis's *Life of Euthymius*, Schwartz's index, p. 280. A homily by Chrysippus on the Virgin has been much studied (CPG 6705, ed. M. Jugie, PO 19, 336-343; cf. R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega*: Marian Library Studies 3, Dayton 1971, 211-226); three more homilies survive, on St. John the Baptist, St. Michael and St. Theodore (CPG 6706-6708), which show him to be a follower of *Hesychius. His *Christology is *Chalcedonian, but not very firmly (see L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 227-228).

A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991, 168-169; Patrologia V, 259-260; Marienlexikon 2,59; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. G. Gharib, I, Rome 1988, 602-609.

J. Gribomont

CHRYSOGONUS, martyr. The historical martyrologies put this saint on 24 November at *Rome, the manuscripts of *Mart. hier.* at Rome or at *Aquileia. Chrysogonus was in fact a *martyr of Aquileia; we know only his name, though his cult is attested very early in that city. The Roman feast, also included in the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian *Sacramentaries, probably commemorates the dedication of the *Titulus Chrysogoni* at Trastevere, which already existed in the 5th c. The founder of this Roman **titulus* was made into a martyr by adapting the *Passion* of Chrysogonus of Aquileia to him, and 24 November became the date of his death. According to the legend of Anastasia, Chrysogonus instructed that saint in the faith and was beheaded at Aquileia under *Diocletian. The churches of Rome, *Ravenna (mosaic of S. Apollinare Nuovo) and *Milan include Chrysogonus among the martyrs of the canon of the *Mass. In the 8th c. the *Frankish king *Pepin the Short considered Chrysogonus his personal protector.

BHL 1795-1797; AB 102 (1984) 176; BS 4, 306-308; LCI 5, 511-512; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 866-871; F. Lanzoni, *I titoli presbiterali di Roma antica nella storia e nella leggenda*: RivAC 2 (1925) 195-257; M. Mesnard, *La basilique de saint Chrysogone à Rome*, Vatican City 1935; H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936 [repr. 1968], 151-171, 221-249; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938, 20-23; V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, Vatican City [2]1963, 136-138; V. Saxer, *L'hagiographie ancienne d'Aquilée*: MEFRA 92 (1980) 373-392; J.-C. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques*, Rome 1988, 580-582; B. Kuhn-Forte, *Handbuch der Kirchen Roms* 4, Vienna 1997, 365-401.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

CHRYSOSTOM. *See* *JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

CHURCH and EMPIRE. Though the first term, *church,* is clear—indicating the society founded at the beginning of our era by Jesus Christ, which unites communities of Christians around the same faith—the second, *empire,* can be understood in either a broader (to the extent of becoming synonymous with the ancient world) or a narrower sense, equivalent to *state* (to use a modern term not applicable to antiquity, for which words like *civitas* or *res publica* would be more correct). The relationship may also be considered either on the level of political doctrines or on that of historical facts. Here we will confine ourselves to outlining some of the major fault lines of what is undoubtedly a vast and complex problem. The distinction between "political" and "religious"—a distinction which does not imply any conflict or incompatibility between these two spheres—can be traced to the teaching of Jesus (Mt 23:15ff.). Paul, in a famous passage in Romans (Rom 13:1ff.; see also 1 Pet 2:13ff.), told Christians to submit to the established authorities, "for there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have

been established by God"; Jesus, when Pilate pointed out his power of life and death over him, replied: "You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above" (Jn 19:11). Christians, therefore, affirmed their loyalty and recognized the rights of authority, which make up the very basis of the society in which human beings, by God's design, find themselves; but at the same time they observed a precise hierarchy of values, which saw authority as being at God's service for the good of people (Rom 13:4). This vision, constantly repeated and followed during the very early centuries (as the 2nd- and 3rd-c. *apologists clearly show), provoked a series of reactions by imperial authorities and *pagan society. To understand this reaction we must remember that, by this proposal, Christianity rejected the religious and social customs on which the ancient world was founded; it did not follow the *mos maiorum,* the *veterum instituta,* and by doing so it refused to acknowledge the sacred character of the *civitas,* seat of the gods who protected it, and rejected its worship, which was both a civil and religious function, exercised by the magistrates in their capacity as priests.

Besides disavowing the *nomos* (a term designating the recognized principles, foundation of a venerable and glorious tradition), the Christians appeared also to be enemies of the *logos,* opposers of the *paideia,* in which so much of the wisdom handed down by the ancients resided, and followers of an uncritical and irrational faith. Hence arose the oldest accusations leveled against them, of being a race of people who followed a new and detestable *superstitio,* wicked and immoderate (see, e.g., *Tacitus, *Annales* XV, 44,4ff.; *Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* X, 96,8), and who with a stupidity bordering on madness spread an unreasonable belief (see *Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* 11,3). To illustrate this deep and serious conflict, we need only compare works like *Celsus's *True Discourse* (Ἀληθὴς Λόγος) and *Origen's *Contra Celsum.* (Celsus's work is lost, but Origen gives many citations from it.) The danger constituted by the new religion provoked at least three types of reactions by the pagans: (1) the attempt to reabsorb those who were outside the patterns of a world rich in glory and tradition through dialogue, confrontation and persuasion; (2) the effort to marginalize the adversaries who opposed the status quo, through contempt, irony, sarcasm or accusations of all sorts; and (3) at times repression by the public authorities, to the extent of arrest, torture, trial and execution of Christians, at other times indulgence or compromise, as if to signal the ineffectiveness of the other methods. Hence the alternation of periods of persecution with periods of toleration and the intensification and radicalization of the *persecutions at times when change loomed in the attitude toward the Christians of a "culture" shared by the general public: the first general edict especially attacking Christians goes back to the time of *Decius (249). (A passage in the *Historia Augusta* ascribing a similar provision to *Septimius Severus in the early 3rd c. [Spartianus, *Sept. Sev.* 17,1] is rejected by some critics.)

Beginning in the mid-2nd c., Christians responded to the pagans on the cultural level by apologetic, represented by *Quadratus, *Aristides, *Justin, *Tatian, *Athenagoras, *Theophilus, and later, *Clement of Alexandria and Origen, all writing in *Greek; and *Tertullian, *Minucius Felix, *Cyprian and *Arnobius of Sicca in *Latin. On the existential level, they replied by nonviolence (to use a modern expression): the faithful witnessed to Christ by sacrificing their lives. A real *spirituality was born, with two strong points: negatively, the rejection of idolatry in any form; positively, the *sequela* of Christ, "the faithful witness" (see Rev 1:5), as shown clearly by the acts and passions of the *martyrs (with due caution as to their age and historical reliability) or the exhortations to martyrdom.

With the Edict of *Galerius—published 30 April 311—and then with *Constantine and his successors, the situation changed radically: Christians were allowed freedom to meet and worship; their properties, confiscated by the imperial treasury or acquired by others, were returned. Furthermore, from the first years of his reign, Constantine issued a series of legislative provisions favoring the Christian communities, which gradually tended to confer a special status on them. Particularly significant were those (from 319 on) introducing moral requirements along the lines of the gospel message into Roman law, without ruling out the influence of older pagan legal traditions. This was one sign, among others, of the change which took place over a very few years in the church-empire relationship; another sign was imperial donations, which often took the form of largesse to individual churches.

*Eusebius of Caesarea interpreted and theorized the Constantinian change in an ingenious way: in the relationship between the Father and the Logos—seen in the light of *subordinationism—he saw the image of the relationship between the Christ-Logos and the emperor, suggesting a link between Christ's work, preparing the final kingdom for the Father, and the emperor's contribution to the growth of Christ's kingdom on earth. He pointed out that, from its foundation, the Roman Empire had exercised a providential function to the benefit of Chris-

tianity, and he emphasized a continuity between Augustus and Constantine (an idea expressed in previous centuries: e.g., by *Melito of Sardis [in Eusebius, *HE* IV, 26,7] or by Origen [*Contra Celsum* 2,30]). Eusebius was convinced that the Roman-Christian Empire was an image of both heavenly Christian society and the pilgrim church—i.e., that the empire, becoming Christ's kingdom on earth, and Christianity, becoming a universal church, would give rise to a substantial unity (though this would involve a distinction of duties: bishops in the religious sphere, magistrates in the civil sphere). Responsibility for and care of the church was therefore incumbent on the emperor (see, e.g., Eusebius, *Laus Constantini* 2,5). Eusebius thus proposed a political theology which, variously judged, remains an indispensable point of reference for understanding the history of church-empire relations in the following centuries.

Apart from *Julian's brief reign (361–363), which marked the full restoration of a political paganism, most of Constantine's successors followed the path he had traced, starting with *Constantius II, an *Arian who tried forcibly to impose his belief on all the Christian communities, persecuting whoever opposed his designs, orthodox or pagan: more than ever, the emperor was arbiter and judge in church affairs. This led to a reaction by some bishops (Dionysius, Eusebius, Lucifer, Paulinus), who admonished him that the empire did not belong to him but to God, who had given it to him, and exhorted him not to mix the things of the *civitas* with those of the church. In this way they distinguished *causa civilis* from *causa religionis*. In subsequent decades *Gratian (375–383) and *Theodosius I (379–395), both Catholics, took many measures in favor of the orthodox against the Arians and pagans. Gratian abandoned the imperial title (traditional since Augustus) of *pontifex maximus*; Theodosius, by the edict of February 380, enjoined his subjects to profess the Catholic religion. Through the troubled events of those times, which are impossible to follow here, a line previously represented by *Athanasius, *Hilary of Poitiers, or *Basil of Caesarea and now revived, e.g., by *Ambrose of Milan, came to be held more consistently in the church: in matters of faith, the bishops must judge the emperors and not vice versa, and the church cannot submit to the *res publica*. This prevalent (though not unanimous among Christians) line claimed the church's freedom and independence to exercise its own functions, and, indeed, in due course—in ever clearer opposition to Eusebius's principles—demanded the subordination of the sovereign to the church in spiritual matters. We see particular affirmations of this by Popes *Felix II (483–492) and *Gelasius (492–496). At the start of the 5th c. *Augustine, too, with his criticism of the *pax Augusti* in *De civitate Dei,* aligned himself against the political theology of which Eusebius had been the greatest architect. This did not mean the historical disappearance of this vision, still less the end of its concrete realization, as is shown by the history of the Roman Empire in the East, established after Theodosius's death in 395 and destined, unlike the Western empire, to live on for another thousand years. There, Eusebius's conception found its most coherent and radical manifestation in *Justinian (527–565): one empire, one church, led by one emperor. In this light, the earthly *basileia* was the image of the heavenly kingdom; the sovereign was the image of the Father and vicar of the Christ-Logos king; and his function was that of earthly representative and interpreter of the God who rules the universe with justice and goodness. The fate of the Christian West was very different, in a historical scene dominated by the rapid disintegration of the social, economic, bureaucratic and military fabric in the storm unleashed by the barbarian invasions. The West seems indeed to have been influenced by a form of *apocalyptic Judaism which opposed the king to the prophet; nor had it likely forgotten the pagan senatorial criticism of the imperial cult: so there is nothing surprising in the pope's opposition to the emperor or even in the rise of the theory of the two powers, which, though not the only one to hold the field, remained alive all through the Middle Ages.

Leaving aside the treatment of the problem outlined in histories of the church and of Christianity, specific bibliography is very abundant. Our choice here is necessarily limited and does not satisfy many aspects of a wide and complex question: R.W. - A.J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West* I, Edinburgh - London [2]1927 (It. tr. Bari 1967); E. Peterson, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Theologie im Imperium Romanum*, Leipzig 1935; K. Voigt, *Staat und Kirche von Konstantin dem Grossen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit*, Stuttgart 1936; J.A. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*, Stuttgart 1939; P. Brezzi, *Cristianesimo e Impero Romano*, Rome [2]1944; W. Durant, *Cäsar und Christus. Eine Kulturgeschichte Roms und des Christentums von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 325*, Bern 1949; H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'Empire Romain*, Brussels 1951; O. Cullmann, *Der Staat in Neuen Testament*, Tübingen 1956; J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme dans l'empire romain*, Paris 1956; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain* (*IV[e]-V[e] siècle*), Paris 1958; *Kirche und Staat*: *Staatslexikon der Görresgesellschaft*, IV, Freiburg i.B. 1959, 991ff.; H. Rahner, *Kirche und Staat im Frühen Christentum. Dokumente aus acht Jahrhunderten und ihre Deutung*, Munich [2]1961 (It. tr. Milan 1970); W.H.C. Frend, *The Roman Empire in the Eyes of Western Schismatics During the Fourth Century, A.D.*, in Misc. Historiae Ecclesiasticae (= Bibl. de la Revue d'Hist. Ecclés. 38), Louvain

1961, 9-22; G. Pilati, *Chiesa e Stato nei primi quindici secoli. Profilo dello sviluppo della teoria attraverso le fonti e la bibliografia*, Rome 1961; M. Sordi, *Il Cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965; W. Affeldt, *Die weltliche Gewalt in der Paulus Exegese. Röm. 13, 1-7 in Römerbriefkommentaren der lateinischen Kirche bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen 1969; J. Speigl, *Die Römische Staat und die Christen. Staat und Kirche von Domitian bis Commodus*, Amsterdam 1970; var. aus., *La fine dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 1978; K. Aland, *Das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat in der Frühzeit*: ANRW II, 23, 1 (1979) 60-246; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire romaine (IIe-IIIe siècle). Église e cité*, Paris 1979; L. De Giovanni, *Chiesa e Stato nel Codice Teodosiano. Saggio sul libro XVI*, Naples 1980; M. Sordi, *I Cristiani e l'Impero romano*, Milan 1984; var. aus., *L'Église et l'Empire au IVe siècle*, Fondation Hardt 34, Geneva 1989; M. Hadas-Lebel, *Jérusalem contre Rome*, Paris 1990; var. aus., *L'Impero romano-cristiano. Problemi politici, religiosi, culturali*, ed. M. Sordi, Rome 1991; H. Inglebert, *Les Romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome*, Paris 1996; G. Jossa, *I Cristiani e l'Impero romano. Da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Rome 2000; P. Siniscalco, *Il cammino di Cristo nell'Impero romano*, Rome - Bari [4]2000; L. De Giovanni, *L'imperatore Costantino e il mondo pagano*, Naples 2003.

P. Siniscalco

CHURCH BUILDINGS

I. Historical account - II. Description of the basilica - III. Liturgical arrangements in the church - IV. The baptistery - V. Various annexes - VI. Particular forms of church building.

I. Historical account.

1. The names of the church building. The first Christian meeting places, up to the peace of the church (312–313), are little known. The allusions of 1st- and 2nd-c. texts undoubtedly refer to private premises, more or less prepared in advance, to which we conventionally give the name *domus ecclesia.* From the 3rd c. more specific terms appear: *ecclesia* (which meant an assembly before designating a meeting place), *basilica* (a Greek term, originally "royal building," used from the end of the Republic to designate large rooms used for legal hearings and other activities near the forum), *aula* (courtyard, later a large covered room: the term *aula regia* was the emperors' audience chamber on the Palatine, whence the term "aulic," applied to whatever concerned imperial ideology or ceremonial). African documents relating to *Diocletian's persecution show that in 303 the Christians possessed *basilicae* at Aptunga and Cirta. Christian terminology sometimes distinguished *ecclesia* from *basilica*. In *Gregory of Tours, e.g., in the 6th c., *ecclesia* systematically designates the bishop's church in the city, while *basilica* refers to cemeterial churches outside.

2. The first meeting places. Concrete evidence from before the period of *Constantine is rare. In the 19th c. it was believed that the first Christians met in the catacombs, but it is certain that places of worship present there are late and stem from the development of *pilgrimages to the *martyrs buried there. Searches were later made beneath the urban churches of *Rome, called *tituli* and distinguished by a personal name in the genitive (e.g., *Titulus Equitii*), and some thought they could identify churches set up in the houses of those persons who had donated their property to the church (Kirsch's theory). In fact the earlier buildings beneath these churches vary greatly and have no specific layout; so this theory has now been abandoned (see esp. Ch. Pietri). The one building clearly attributable to a Christian community and datable with certainty, since the town was destroyed in 256 by the *Sassanid Persians, is the "house of the Christians" at *Dura Europos on the Euphrates frontier of the empire: a large room with no specific form was used for meetings, but we can already recognize a baptistery with a font surmounted by a canopy and a symbolic mural decoration. In the region of the "limestone massif" of N Syria, we can also follow, at Qirq-Bize, the progressive transformation of a dwelling into a Christian church.

3. The Constantinian period: appearance of the "Latin basilica." From the peace of the church, places of worship, now public, rose everywhere, sometimes architecturally daring, esp. when the emperor was financing the construction, as at Rome (episcopal church of the Lateran, martyrial churches of St. Peter in the Vatican and St. Paul's Outside the Walls) or in the Holy Land (reliquary churches of the holy places of Christ's life at Bethlehem and *Jerusalem). Hence the hypothesis of the sudden birth of a new type called the "Latin" or "Constantinian basilica," epitomized by St. Peter's, known to us from plans and elevations made at the time of its destruction and replacement by the present building (and from partial excavations conducted inside the Confessio), or by St. John Lateran, whose structures are partly preserved despite modernization. The first basilica with an exact date, 324, is that partly excavated in the 19th c. at Orléansville (now El Asnam on the Chéliff in Algeria): it has five aisles but is provided with two apses at the extremities of the central aisle, though these are not contemporary; so it does not represent the ideal type (see N. Duval, *Basiliques à deux absides*). Another very old monument, built by a Bishop Theodore who attended the Council of *Arles in 314, but not precisely datable, is the episcopal church of *Aquileia in N Italy, consisting of two rectangular rooms, parallel and divided into three aisles by a small number of supports but with no

apse: here too the type of building is not the classical basilica, and the two-roomed complex raises the problem of the origin and raison d'être of double churches (see below). Also attributed to the Constantinian period are many churches associated with the mausoleum of a martyr or a member of the imperial family in the Roman cemeteries: S. Agnese near S. Costanza, S. Lorenzo, SS. Pietro e Marcellino, the *Basilica Apostolorum* beneath the present S. Sebastiano. These great three-aisled buildings are called "circiform," since the side aisles are extended around the apse like the tiers of seats at the rounded end of a *circus,* and it has been asked whether the central aisle was covered. We see that at the start of the 4th c. the typology of Christian buildings was not at all rigid.

4. The problem of origins: the civil basilica. The architects of the Renaissance, who first raised the question of the origin of the Christian basilica, were unaware of this variety. They naturally thought to derive it from the Roman civil basilica. This theory was later refuted, since for a long time no civil basilicas transformed into churches—indisepensable for a demonstration—were found. In the last 50 years such reutilizations have been found, e.g., at Leptis Magna and Sabratha (Libya), Tipasa (Algeria), Bolsena (Italy) etc.; but in any case they are late since, save to avoid destruction, there was no reason to modify the function of these buildings, which were indispensable for municipal life.

5. The Hellenistic-Roman house. The great excavations of Pompei and Herculanum drew attention to the Hellenistic-Roman house, and the fashionable theory at the beginning of the 20th c. maintained, under the pretext that the Christians first met in private houses, that churches were derived from the Roman house (atrium or peristyle + *tablinum* [main axial room] and *alae* [lateral annexes] = atrium + three-aisled hall; or else atrium = nave and main room = apse). Though we know many cases of churches installed in rooms of aristocratic houses at Rome (e.g., the "basilica" of Junius Bassus) or in the provinces (e.g., Qirq-Bize, see above; Mactar in Tunisia), it is evident that the transformation from private house to public building is not a natural procedure for the architect; moreover, on the technical level the typology is completely different.

6. Pagan and Jewish places of worship: the "funerary basilica." Meanwhile, since the classical Greco-Roman temple, intended to house the divine statue rather that the whole congregation, could not be a prototype (though, after being abandoned, large temples were often used as churches and small ones as baptisteries), attempts were made, in the name of the kinship of all Eastern religions, much studied between the two world wars, to compare the Christian basilica to the meeting places of the *mystery religions, which sometimes have a vaguely basilical form: the *mithraea* of the Persian god *Mithras, long a rival of Christianity, or the Roman *hypogeum* of Porta Maggiore, attributed by J. Carcopino to a Pythagorean sect. But their dimensions, uses and technical characteristics differ profoundly. Knowledge (esp. since Sukenik's work) of Palestinian *synagogues, which sometimes show a basilical plan (e.g., at Capernaum), led some to ask whether the synagogue might not have influenced the Christian meeting place through Jewish-Christian mediation; but the dates of these buildings have since been brought forward and, to the extent to which they are contemporary with well-characterized churches, the influence may turn out to be in the opposite direction. At the time of the Second World War, C. Picard's discovery of the "basilica of the *Juvenes*" at Mactar in Tunisia and the Danish architect Dyggve's study of the martyrial churches of Salona in Dalmatia and the *pagan *heroon* of Calydon in Greece made fashionable the theory of derivation from the pagan funerary basilica, a theoretical monument in which a number of tombs would be exposed to the veneration of visitors. From the example of Marusinac at Salona, Dyggve hypothesized an evolution from the sacred tomb preceded by a porticoed courtyard (*basilica discoperta*) to the classical basilica, a theory demolished by the reexamination of the Salona building (undoubtedly a classical basilica) and one which seems hard to accept on the technical level (transition from an uncovered space to a covered building). As for the Mactar "funerary basilica," this is a late church, perhaps installed in the main room of a house: the tombs served as an altar base and were brought there by Christians (see N. Duval, *Églises à deux absides*).

7. The imperial palace—city and camp. Also fashionable at the same time (and still) was the idea of a Constantinian initiative, related to the growing interest (probably caused by the rise of totalitarian ideologies) in the theory of imperial power. The hypothesis was that Constantine might have given his architects his own house as a model to accommodate the king of heaven. The inexact etymology given by *Isidore of Seville in the 7th c., who derived the term *basilica* from a royal dwelling, seems to agree with this theory. Since then some have sought to find the origin of the Christian basilica in a standard plan of the imperial palace of the late empire, which they thought to recognize in Diocletian's retirement residence at Salona (Split) in *Dalmatia, in that attributed to *Maxi-

mian (or his son *Maxentius) at Piazza Armerina in Sicily, in *Theodoric's palace at *Ravenna as reconstructed by E. Dyggve on the basis of the famous mosaic of S. Apollinare Nuovo, and in various other secondary monuments, since the plan of the great residential palaces is not known for *Constantinople, *Milan, *Nicaea, *Antioch, and only very partially—if the identification is exact—for *Trier and *Thessalonica. It has been ascertained that this standard plan is a myth. We have objected that the split plan did not contain a reception room in the axis of the "peristyle" (*basilica discoperta,* according to Dyggve) and that court ceremonies had no raison d'être there (*Urbs*, 1961-62). I have demonstrated that the Ravenna mosaic, like many images of the time, showed the palace under the aspect of a Christian basilica, a fact that is now reversing the theory of derivation (*Cahiers archéologiques*, 1965). And the villa of Piazza Armerina was certainly not built for an emperor. Other theories related to the previous ones deserve only a mention, since they are even more unlikely: the theory that, on the pretext that the church was sometimes evoked as the heavenly Jerusalem, it derives from a town plan in which the imperial residence was situated at the end of an axial boulevard, or the theory that likens the basilica to the arrangement of a military camp, where the praetorium was placed at the end of the main avenue.

8. Conclusion: the Christian basilica in contemporary Roman architecture. In fact all these theories seem pointless: the Roman architect of the 4th c. already had available to him a type of building intended for assemblies, i.e., the basilica, which was commonly adapted to other uses and was not just an annex of the forum. All that was needed was to modify the plan and in particular to arrange it on an axis, with a focal point provided by the altar or sacred tomb, to suit the requirements of worship (whereas the prototype required no special orientation). The only hesitation would have been between two methods of roofing. As well as the trussed basilica, there had been built in at least one isolated instance—the basilica of Maxentius or of Constantine at Rome—a large vaulted hall of the type commonly used for the *frigidara* of public baths. This type of roofing, requiring competent engineers and skilled labor, was adopted by Christian architecture for large buildings only very late and with a different plan. Who took the initiative of choosing and modifying the plan? The clergy or the emperor? It is hard to say. But to the extent that the great Constantinian foundations utilized public or legally protected lands (e.g., the Vatican cemetery) and required considerable imperial financial subsidies, intervention by court architects is likely, at least for the main cities and in the Holy Land. Yet we have seen that the buildings constructed in that period were of various types in Rome itself, and the differences are even more marked from one region to another (see below).

II. Description of the basilica.

1. The quadratum populi. If we keep to the theoretical model, the nucleus of the Christian church building, from the peace of the church, was a rectangular hall generally with three aisles, completed by an apse which was originally of the same width as the main aisle and had the main entrance opposite it. Sometimes the main hall is given the name *quadratum populi*. The largest churches had five aisles (e.g., the great Roman basilicas) and sometimes even more (up to seven or nine for some phases of the great churches of *Carthage and *Tipasa in *Africa). The number of aisles depended not just on the dimensions but also on the strength of the supports used. In N Africa, for example, there were many relatively small five-aisled churches (e.g., that of Orléansville). Various small single-aisled churches are also known, esp. in eastern Europe. The nave was normally much wider than the aisles (the ideal proportion is 2:1), but regional schools show many variations. The supports, resting either on a continuous sill (stylobate) or on separate foundations (surmounted by a flat stone, called an "underbase," under the base), were ordinarily columns, often reused, esp. at Rome. But there are some regions where pillars, either constructed of cut stone or sometimes monolithic, were substituted for columns. Many variations are known: columns attached to pillars (e.g., the type of *Tebessa in N Africa), double columns (very frequent in Tunisia), columns of stuccoed brick, columns made from stacked pieces etc. The column was surmounted by a classical capital, often reused. Specific types were subsequently created, adapted for arches on columns by the addition of an "abacus" or "superabacus," then the monolithic "impost-capital" and then the pyramidal capital. Above the columns the architrave of classical architecture (retained where numerous decorative trabeations were available, at Rome and Constantinople) was normally replaced by the arch, in brick or stone, which allowed wider spacing of the supports and resisted vertical pressure better (transmitting it to the supports).

Roofs of basilicas were generally trussed: beneath a double-sloping roof, an extra story was added to the nave by building walls above the supports; these walls were pierced by windows permit-

ting direct illumination of the nave, hence the name "clerestory." The arrangement of the trusses is clear from the imprint of beams in the walls, where they are preserved (e.g., in Syria and Asia Minor) by the 6th-c. trusses still *in loco* in the Church of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai and by graphic evidence, like the cross sections of Old St. Peter's at Rome. In these we can see that each pair of side aisles was covered by one single-sloping roof, but in other five-aisled churches a clerestory above the outer colonnades is possible: in such cases we may suppose that the ceiling was masked (e.g., when texts allude, as at S. Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna, to the "gilded sky"). The ceiling was sometimes, in N Africa and *Spain, made of terracotta slabs forming coffers, a great many examples of which have been found. The roof itself was normally made of tiles arranged in the Roman style, flat tiles with their edges covered by semitubular tiles, terminating toward the outer margin in antefixes, sometimes decorated with relief motifs (known in Africa and Gaul). Some prestigious buildings were, like some temples, covered with lead or bronze (hence the allusion to golden roofs). It is practically certain that, in regions where timber was rare and the climate suitable (e.g., N Africa), some parts were covered with a terrace of masonry or terracotta bricks. We also know in Syria, and probably in the Negev, a series of basilicas covered by great stone slabs. On the short sides of the hall, the roof of the nave ended in a triangular pediment which could be emphasized by *acroteria* at the corners and center, as in temples, or by a cross. Above the side aisles some churches had galleries open toward the nave and accessible by inside or outside stairs (see below: *matroneum*).

2. *Orientation*. The position of the apse determined the orientation of the whole building. On this point we find great regional variations. At Rome and in proconsular Africa—Byzacena and Tripolitania (Tunisia and part of Libya)—many of the oldest buildings have the apse at the west. Orientation seems to have been imposed on N Africa in the Byzantine period, at which time various churches saw their liturgical arrangements reversed. (This was sometimes the cause of a second apse being built: see below.) Elsewhere eastern orientation is far more frequent and is the rule in the E Mediterranean, but in Cyrenaica—an intermediate zone—basilicas facing west are as numerous as those facing east, for no apparent reason. Finally there are anomalous orientations, e.g., north-south, where buildings were adapted to topographical situations.

3. *The apse*. The apse was generally semicircular inside (actually a semicircle completed by flat segments). In the case of simple rooms of small dimensions, it could be rectangular. We find, esp. in Egypt, some cases of trilobate apses. For some (e.g., at Concordia Sagittaria in N Italy) it was a case of extending, by adding aisles, an originally detached tribolate building which served as a martyrium. Finally we note some examples of internally polygonal apses (e.g., S. Bertrand-de-Comminges in France). Externally the form differs considerably according to region. In Italy and Greece the apse generally projects outward, but it can also be enclosed in a quadrangular block, externally semicircular or even polygonal, something which becomes frequent from the 5th c. in N Italy, on the Adriatic and all over the E Mediterranean and is typical of Constantinopolitan architecture. In some regions of Syria, N Africa and sometimes in Spain, a rectilinear "chevet" plan (at ground level, not raised) prevails, in which the apse is framed by two secondary rooms, connecting with it or not, which complete the rectangle. These rooms are often given the name "pastophories": sometimes a distinction is made between the *diakonikon* (service room for clergy) and the *prothesis* (premises for collection of offerings). This terminology corresponds to an Eastern liturgy, confined in time and space, and cannot always be extended to this tripartite plan, whose justification is primarily architectural. Indeed, the side rooms did not have a fixed function: in N Syria the righthand room was frequently turned into a martyrium; in N Africa and Spain the baptistery was sometimes put there. We must distinguish this tripartite "chevet"—single apse and side rooms—from another tripartite type, later and particularly Eastern, with three projecting apses corresponding to three aisles. This type recurs in early medieval Western architecture. The height of the apse also varies according to region, depending on liturgical needs and architectural uses. In Italy, Spain, Greece, Lebanon and Cyrenaica, the floor is on a level with the aisles or slightly raised. The discrepancy is made up by steps at the front or at the two sides and is much greater in N Syria and in Africa. Beneath the apse, esp. when the difference in height is considerable, are sometimes crypts, whose purpose can vary (cult of martyrs, funerary, sometimes even baptistery). This custom would become general in the West in the Carolingian era (see below). The wall of the apse, which in N Africa is generally windowless, in Greece, Italy and Syria is pierced by windows, which sometimes form a genuine clerestory, as at S. Giovanni Evangelista, Ravenna. The roof of the apse is usually a semidome made of concrete, of squared shaped stones, or of light materials (vaults of terracotta tubes embedded and

bound together by plaster at Ravenna, Rome, Grado, in Sicily and in N Africa), resting on an arch often called a "triumphal arch," which in turn rests on two great side columns, or in a wall-partition supported by four columns with three unequal arches. The vault may be protected by a roof or, as often happens in Africa, simply coated outside with a layer of whitewash like the domes of Muslim mosques.

Some (mosaic) images exist which show towers framing the apse. At Aquileia and in a whole series of churches in the N Adriatic area, there is no apse at all (see below).

To these elements, essential to the makeup of the Christian basilica, other parts may be added whose existence depends on regional customs or particular requirements.

4. Avant-corps: vestibule, narthex, atrium. The façade of the basilica generally has one or more main entrances; in small buildings a single opening is possible, but more often we find a door corresponding to each aisle; the façade is provided with windows and oculi high up, which are sometimes the only source of direct illumination for the side aisles when the sides have no windows. Some churches of Greece, Syria and Asia Minor have preserved their façades entire, and it is possible to observe such apertures. In some cases in Syria, and perhaps in the Balkans, we find a monumental façade outlined by two corner towers, whose exact height cannot now be determined (e.g., Qalb Lozé) and whose use may vary (decorative, defensive or even staircase towers to reach the galleries, e.g., a single tower in front of the façade of the church of the Byzantine citadel of Haidra in Tunisia). Some Roman façades—S. Maria Maggiore and SS. Giovanni e Paolo—seem to have been open with arcades at ground level, doubtless because preceded by a vestibule. In some regions, e.g., N Syria, the main doors may be at the side because of the existence of a lateral courtyard (see below).

Many churches are preceded by a simple porticoed façade or by a vestibule or by a transverse room integrated into the body of the building. In, e.g., N Africa the vestibule and the portico are much more frequent than the atrium. In the E Mediterranean, esp. in the Balkans, at Constantinople and in Asia Minor, at the entrance to the church we frequently find a transverse room which often connected via a large subdivided opening (*tribelon*) with the *quadratum populi*. The narthex may have had a liturgical function in these regions, since it was there that the unbaptized (catechumens) took part in the divine office. The term *narthex* must not be applied to mere vestibules existing in the same place in other regions. It sometimes happens that this transverse room is double: in such cases we distinguish the exonarthex, which may be a mere vestibule, and the esonarthex, or narthex proper. The ends of the narthex or vestibule sometimes have the form of an apse, as also in civil architecture. In at least two cases, on the island of Brae in Dalmatia and at Apollonia in Cyrenaica, one of these apses is provided with sedilia and so undoubtedly had a liturgical role.

The great churches of Rome and Italy, Greece and the Balkans, Asia Minor and Palestine, often have a frontal courtyard or atrium, an uncovered space surrounded by porticoes, sometimes with an extra story. But the frontal atrium is exceptional in Syria (in one region of N Syria the courtyard is at the side) and rare in N Africa (except for the great churches of Carthage which had them in their phase of maximum development). The quadriportico is the ideal, but the peristyle may be incomplete, without E or W side. The E side, in front of the façade of the church, may be distinguished by being at a higher level (i.e., that of the basilica) or by a more monumental character (larger columns), as in the so-called Rhodian peristyle in houses, or by being partly enclosed in sections of wall which restrict passage, in which case it plays the role of a vestibule and is commonly given the name "exonarthex, contested by, e.g., P. Lemerle. The uncovered space may be protected, at least partially, by gates barring the intercolumnar spaces. In the center there was often a fountain or pool like those in the center of house peristyles, the best-known example being the pool with a column crowned with a pinecone in the center of the Vatican atrium (*cantharus*). It could be laid out as a garden, like the peristyles of Roman houses, whence the name *paradisus*. We know some cases of an atrium (Philippi, Stobi in Macedonia) whose W side was a monumental nymphaeum, a cascade of water like that found in contemporary houses (e.g., at Stobi, Syrian Apamea, Ostia). Some atria are not quadrangular but, like that of Damous el Karita at Carthage or the Lechaion at Corinth, end in a semicircular portico in front of the church. The atrium may even be preceded by another courtyard or by monumental propylaea, as existed, e.g., at the Vatican, at Gerasa in Jordan and at Tebessa in Algeria.

5. The transept. Between the aisles and the apse is sometimes inserted a transverse element, which exists in the great churches of Rome and is called a transept. With respect to the totality of known early Christian buildings, its geographical distribution is very limited, though in the 19th c. it was thought, on the model of Old St. Peter's, to be an intrinsic element of the Latin Christian basilica. It was much

more widespread in the East, esp. in Aegean architecture, than in the West. It is important to distinguish the transept proper from the cruciform plan, which will be examined separately. In its plan, the transept may stop at the lateral façades or, more frequently, go beyond them. It generally ends in a straight wall but, esp. on the Adriatic coasts (as at Dodona and Paramizia), we know a number of cases where the arms of the transept end in apses. Generally we can distinguish three types of plan: (1) the "undivided" or "continuous" transept, where the colonnades stop at the height of the transverse aisle and where no architectural division is involved; (2) the "compartmental" (generally tripartite) transept, where partitions, organized in various ways (resting on massive pillars or on a colonnade of different rhythm from that of the aisles), extend as far as the apse, the division of the *quadratum populi* into compartments; and (3) the "enveloping" or "cross" transept, where the colonnades carry on, enclosing the central space and extending the aisles around the enlarged nave. Then the junction of the roofs poses various problems. The first type normally involves a double-sloping transverse roof. In the other two there may be a raised central element at the crossing, such as a lantern with trusses or sometimes a cupola (see below). The tables of comparative models in A. Orlando's handbook may be consulted on this point. The raison d'être and function of the transept have aroused endless debate but seem to vary according to cases. At the Vatican and in the great martyria, it may be connected to the need of pilgrims to circulate in order to approach the holy tomb or *relics. But it also existed in urban churches. In Greece the arms of the transept seem in some cases to have replaced (with suitable alterations) the service rooms for the clergy or for the collection of offerings. It is better to conclude with P. Lemerle that the transept corresponds more to an occasional amenity than to an actual necessity, but analysis remains open.

III. Liturgical arrangements in the church. The main difference between contemporary meeting rooms and Christian basilicas is due to liturgical needs influencing internal layout rather than to architectural technique. Yet here too the variety of local customs meant the absence of a single type of layout.

1. The position of the altar. The main element of a church intended for community meetings for the eucharistic synaxis was the altar (which was of course inside the building, while the pagan altar of sacrifice was in front of the temple), but altars very soon appeared also in cemeterial churches or churches dedicated to a martyr. Alternatively, the custom of placing the relics of one or more saints in or near the altar of an urban basilica also spread quickly, particularly in Africa. This deposition of relics became an essential element, no doubt at first the only element, of the dedication of churches, which explains why the patronage of saints replaced more neutral designations: *ecclesia* or *basilica* or sometimes an adjective taken from the builder's name. In a church devoted to the cult of a martyr, the altar was linked with the position of the tomb or cenotaph, whose vicinity was sought (sometimes by supposition), as in the Vatican basilica. In an urban basilica, the position was in principle freer and depended on the desired relationship between clergy and congregation. We observe great regional variety and, contrary to what was held at the time of the liturgical reforms of Vatican II, the usage of the early Christian period can provide no rule either for layout or for orientation, since in one and the same region we note that the priest sometimes turned his back on the congregation and sometimes faced them, at least in the few cases where his position is confirmed by sure material evidence. In general the altar was rarely, as it has been in Western churches until recently, in the apse, which usually accommodated the clergy, whence the name *presbyterium* (see below). The only exceptions are represented by small chapels and by two or three regions: NW Syria, where the altar was often in the raised apse, sometimes against the back wall; Spain, where the altar was situated, at least in the 5th c., at the center of the apse, which was generally not raised; and sometimes Dalmatia. The most frequent position, esp. in the Aegean, the Balkans, Syria, Palestine and Italy, was in line with the apse or slightly forward of it, on a podium, at the same level as the apse or in a small enclosure connected to it. In N Africa and sometimes in the N Adriatic, the altar could be in the middle of the nave in an enclosure which was either separate or connected to the apse by a corridor, but in time we notice in Africa a tendency to bring it closer to the apse, as in the previous type.

2. The form of the altar and the ciborium. It is quite clear that the Christian altar is directly derived from the Roman dining table. Its appearance is often so similar that it is difficult to distinguish them in museums and archaeological repositories without a sure place of origin or specific sign and inscription. The most common form was the rectangular marble slab with molded margins (thus the surface was not flat), nearly always resting on four feet, sometimes more in the case of large tables, at an average height of one meter. But other forms were also used, like those adopted in late dining rooms where couches

were arranged in a semicircle: the semicircular or circular form. This form has wrongly been named "Coptic," because the first examples found were still in use in the churches of Egypt. Examples have now been found throughout the Mediterranean. One particular category, which may or may not have been an altar, was decorated with sculpted motifs on the border. Another had molded lobes on the upper part, forming something like fixed plates (a custom perpetuated in a series of Romanesque altar tables in SW France). These marble slabs nearly always rested on small columns of the same material, with base and (simple) capital carved in the same stone, fixed on a base of masonry or stone or in the floor. The execution of these tables and their accessories was carried out in the great imperial quarries of the E Mediterranean (Proconnesus, Thasos etc.) and were widely exported as far as the extreme West. Besides this common form, we find altars with one foot, resting, e.g., on a column shaft (a type preserved esp. in medieval Spain). There were also "block altars," in which the table rested on a stone chest which could enclose relics, generally open on one side to allow them to be seen and, if necessary, touched. A variant of this type was in common use in the 6th c. at Ravenna and in the N Adriatic. There could also be "cippus altars," where the table was supported by a massive stone block (sometimes with a niche cut out for a reliquary). It often happened that pagan *cippi* and funerary altars were used as bases, e.g., in S Gaul or at Mactar in Tunisia. Finally we should mention the "tomb altar," where the flat surface was placed directly over a sarcophagus, as sometimes in the catacombs. The altar was usually covered by a light structure, a ciborium or canopy, which generally also protected the priest's place (which can thus be determined). It often happens that altar bases and supports are found, generally on a square plan. Upper parts are known only in the form of fragments but can be inferred from the form of the coping (flat, conical, pyramidal) of the early medieval ciboria of Italy or Dalmatia.

3. Relics: crypt, loculus, confessio, martyrium. We have said that the altar could surmount or mark the position of one or more holy tombs or of a mere cenotaph (commemorative monument). This was above all the case of St. Peter's in the Vatican and the majority of martyrial buildings. In N Africa burials are often found under or in proximity to the altar: in most cases we cannot say whether the tomb motivated the construction of the altar or vice versa (burial *ad sanctos*). It was soon sought to make the burial accessible to sight and touch, either through a simple conduit (at the Vatican) or in a pit under the altar (often called a confessio) or in a room beneath the apse, when there would be built, to make possible at least the sight of it, an opening provided with a grill of metal, wood or stone, often called *fenestella confessionis:* some inscribed and decorated examples of these have been found. At Rome and in Italy, crypts intended to permit direct pilgrimages to the holy tomb, flanking the foundations of the apse (annular crypt), do not seem to predate the 6th c. (St. Peter's), but earlier crypts have been found, esp. in Africa, which seem to be intended for venerated burials (Dougga in Tunisia, Djemila in Algeria) and sometimes organized for pilgrimages with a complex route (Djemila). But in general the relics, which were rarely bones but more often "material" mementos like earth or an impregnated cloth, and which were enclosed in one or more caskets (generally a box of precious material enclosed in a coffer of stone, marble or terracotta), were under the altar slab (not inside it, as has been the case since the Middle Ages). The position varied according to the type of altar and the region. The coffer might be inside the molds in block altars, inside the support in one-footed and cippus altars, usually in the base (often in Africa), but sometimes under the base in an inaccessible cavity (sometimes in a column shaft or a stone hollowed out to receive it). The cavity was larger and became a "relic pit," which could have a stair for access (though not for the public), mainly in Dalmatia, Greece, Constantinople, Asia Minor and Palestine. It sometimes took on the appearance of a baptismal font (esp. cruciform) and may be confused with it (e.g., at Iunca in Tunisia).

In contrast to the modest-sized casket, originally not visible, at least not entirely, was the reliquary in the form of a sarcophagus, called an "oil reliquary," sometimes of large dimensions and made to be exposed and accessible to the public. It had either a single hole at the top for the introduction of *brandea* (strips of cloth to be impregnated) or one hole at the top and one at the side, which allowed the circulation of liquid (usually oil), which was collected after passing over the relics and taken away in containers (*ampullae-eulogiae*). These great reliquiaries were particularly frequent in Syria and were separate from the altar: they were exposed in a room specially set aside as a martyrium, to the right of the apse in the limestone massif of NW Syria, to the left in Apamene. The same arrangement sometimes seems to be found in Asia Minor, Lebanon, Palestine and as far as Cyrenaica, where we see reliquiaries exposed to the public (e.g., in niches) in the rooms or lateral apses of the

presbytery. The veneration of relics in places further from the apse involves analysis of the functions of annexes (see below).

4. The sedilia of the clergy. Even in cemeterial churches, celebrations supposed the collective presence of a fairly numerous clergy, for whom fixed sedilia were created at least from the 5th c. and doubtless even before. These were generally one or more benches, arranged in ascending tiers as in a theater, above footrests, and commonly called *synthronos* or *synthronon*. The bishop, who could also be provided with a throne outside the cathedral church and his episcopal city, sat on a prominently placed cathedra, higher and made of more sumptuous material, which could be integrated with the collective sedilia. The most common type was the semicircular *synthronos* backing onto the wall of the apse and dominated by an axial cathedra. It was much more frequent than was once thought since, when made of light material, sometimes largely of wood, it has left few traces, e.g., mere slots in the wall for beams (in Cyrenaica). For a numerous clergy or when a raised chair occupied an unraised apse, the steps could reach a great height and were sometimes provided with an empty space or a service corridor which allowed circulation under the benches (well-preserved example in St. Irene, Constantinople).

In Greece and neighboring regions, but also sporadically in Syria-Palestine and once in Africa (Sbeitla), the steps were sometimes arranged on a rectangular plan, in front of the apse and at the sides of the altar. This "rectangular type" seems older than the semicircular type from the observations made both in Greece and at Sbeitla, where the two forms coexisted or succeeded each other.

In N Syria, where the main altar was in the apse, the clergy could not be placed there; they sat on a semicircular platform surrounded by a sedile usually connected to a pulpit, in the center of the nave, sometimes at a great distance from the apse and facing it. It is wrong to give this particular type of bema (tribune) the name of "Syrian ambo" (J. Lassus, G. Tchalenko), even if it partly played the role of an ambo: it was essentially a *synthronos* taken out of the apse and turned back to front. In Spain, another region where the altar was in the apse, the clergy were grouped in a *presbyterium* outside the apse. According to liturgical texts and archaeology, this was an enclosure in front of the apse, but no fixed sedilia have been found. In the areas dependent on the patriarchate of Aquileia or influenced by that metropolis (N Adriatic, E Alps, Salona in Dalmatia), churches were long built without apses. Near the back of such churches we find semicircular sedilia, either separate or connected to the altar enclosure. These "free sedilia" are known mainly from traces of foundations. Whether they were completed by a light vault, a sort of internal apse, we do not know. Sedilia or fragmentary benches are also found in apses (e.g., at Iunca in Tunisia). *Synthronoi* can be found in chapels attached to churches, in side apses (e.g., at Iunca) and in apses at the ends of the narthex (see above). Esp. in Greece and the Balkans, we often recognize benches along the walls of the aisles or in the rooms. But in this case they were no longer intended for the clergy.

5. The ambo. For preaching and reading, some regions of the Christian world used a raised tribune or ambo, placed in the middle of or facing the congregation, which may also be called a *bema* (platform, a term sometimes also applied to the altar platform or to that on which the priests sat), *pulpitum* (pulpit, reading table), etc. In any case the ambo was unknown in Africa W of Tripolitania, where the bishop seems to have spoken from the apse, and in Spain, where the clergy were in the enclosure in front of the apse. It was rare in Syria-Palestine, in the classical sense of the term, but in N Syria its function was linked to that of the *presbyterium* in the semicircular exedra of the nave, generally given the name of "Syrian ambo" (see above).

The ambo's place in the nave and its distance from the altar enclosure varied. It could be on the axis of the nave, sometimes far forward. This was so in Hagia Sophia (central plan), where a gallery joined it to the choir (see below, *solea*), and other churches in Constantinople, Asia Minor and the Greek islands. This arrangement occurs sporadically also in the West (Boppard, Trier, Geneva, Lavant in the Tyrol etc.). In other regions it was out of the axis, either irregularly (Tripolitania) or consistently, as, e.g., J.P. Sodini has established for the Balkans; in S Greece (Achaia), it was more often to the N of the nave (i.e., to the left in an oriented church); in the N Balkans, it was generally to the S (i.e., to the right). In Palestine and Cyrenaica too, we find ambos connected to the altar enclosure and projecting from it slightly or not at all. Finally, we know some cases of double ambos, either probably successive (e.g., Philippi in Macedonia, where we often see a small ambo linked to the choir and another external ambo, of classic type), or contemporary (e.g., one on each side of the "choir," as would frequently happen in medieval Italy); it seems that in some buildings the ambo could be replaced by one or more lecterns (e.g., the double table at the entrance to the choir in S Palestine and W Galilee).

The ambo could be a small platform, sometimes

monolithic and very slightly raised, with two or three access steps. The most common Greek type was an oval platform (sometimes supported by small columns), enclosed by *cancelli* (see below) and completed by two access stairs to the W and E. The Ravenna type was much taller, thus allowing important sculptural decoration on one or two faces of the "body." At *Thessalonica and in *Macedonia we find a rare "fan" type with raised and curved tribune, completed by two stairways, also round (an example famous for its sculpture is St. George's in the Istanbul Museum). A round, monolithic and more soberly decorated type exists in Asia Minor. The plinths cited in the West, the only ones preserved, are also semicircular or almost circular. The pulpits of medieval or modern churches differ little in role and in form from ancient ambos, but the latter generally consisted of marble slabs joined together. These slabs, like those of *cancelli,* were mass-produced in specialized marble quarries, esp. those of Proconnesus and Thasos, and widely exported.

6. Enclosures and barriers, choir, cancelli and solea. The great variety of liturgical arrangements described implies differences in the internal organization of the churches: it was a matter of protecting the places reserved for religious objects: main altar, venerated tomb, sometimes another center of worship, e.g., a martyrial altar; places for those who performed the service, i.e., the clergy, and, if necessary, for other privileged categories of the congregation; and of ensuring a connection between them that was protected from the movements of the crowd. If necessary, these spatial partitions involved differences in level (raised or unraised apse, altar platform, ambo). The specialized literature speaks fairly indifferently of the raised parts of the bema, which may refer to the apse, the altar table or the ambo. The protection sometimes added to the raised part generally consisted of a barrier one meter high called a *cancellus,* but it could assume a monumental character, particularly in the façade of the choir, and consist of a colonnade (generally of posts with or without a monolithic baluster, with arcades or newels or an architrave). It was this type of façade, which could be supplemented by hangings, that the Greeks called *templon* and the Italians *pergola* (well represented in N Italy or in medieval Dalmatia); it was the ancestor of the Orthodox iconostasis. When the barrier was low, it could be of wood (generally, except in Egypt, only the imprints remain) or metal or stone. The most common type was made of newels with various terminations (spheres, balls, cones, cubes etc.) and with a system of panels, decorated or not, slotted in. The same type served as a balustrade in the tribunes. The decoration of the marble slabs, mass-produced in the eastern quarries (Proconnesus, Thasos etc.), was stereotyped in the 5th and 6th c., and numerous examples remain *in loco* (Constantinople, St. Mark's in Venice) or in museums. More decorative models are known, e.g., esp. the openwork panels preserved in the Museo Nazionale di Ravenna. The barriers were interrupted naturally by entrances closed by doors, generally of metal, or by chains. There were upright *cancelli* in the apse, esp. when this was raised, and around the space reserved for the altar. The most common type was a quadrangular enclosure the width of the apse and set in front of it, with an axial opening (generally to W) and two side openings permitting passage across. But this enclosure could be separate from the apse and very far away when the altar was in the center of the nave. In this case a corridor, protected by two barriers, would provide a link. This type of enclosure is usually called a "choir," from the name given to the group of cantors (*chorus*) who took part in the liturgy—which is ambiguous since the choir sometimes occupied an enclosure distinct from that of the altar (e.g., in Spain)—or sometimes a "sanctuary" (a name also given by some to the apse). A corridor, generally called by Italian specialists a *solea* (from the name given at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, to the bridge joining the enclosure wall to the ambo) sometimes led off from the altar enclosure. In effect, there was sometimes a corridor which ensured the link between the choir and an ambo in the axis. But a short corridor might be intended only to protect the axial entrance to the choir, while a long corridor could ensure the link either with the main door for processions (a case not archaeologically proven) or with a second center of worship (see below: double apses). Finally, there are cases of double enclosures, the second one of equal length (examples in Lebanon) or slightly less wide than the altar enclosure. This secondary type is well attested in Roman churches and is usually called *schola cantorum,* since the clerics responsible for the sung part of the *liturgy were placed here from the early Middle Ages on. The organization of the church could be much more complex still. It often happened that the altar was protected either inside the choir by a second enclosure (between the columns of the *ciborium*) or outside the choir; other enclosures delimited sectors perhaps reserved for privileged categories (an African inscription speaks of *cancellus virginum*: for consecrated virgins?); in Africa, Greece and Spain, we also see *cancelli* completely cutting off the aisles from the nave, which seems reserved for the movements of the clergy.

7. Distribution of the congregation in the church. Tribune and matroneum. There has been much discussion of the distribution of the congregation in the church, particularly concerning the *cancelli* and tribunes or galleries (see above). The texts are uncertain and too vague and mostly list categories of clergy or of those associated with them (consecrated virgins and widows), perhaps implying a material division. Many authors admit a separation between men and women, adducing material evidence for it, e.g., the existence of two decorated side doors of different size in some N Syrian churches; the presence of tribunes said to be reserved for women as in the ceremonial of Constantinople and for this reason called *matronea*; or the multiplication of *cancelli*. These indications are insignificant. Tribunes were unequally distributed: frequent in Greece and Asia Minor, they were rare elsewhere and appeared in Rome only in the 6th c. In some cases, as in the citadel of Haidra (Tunisia), they may have had the purpose of increasing the capacity of a small building or one in which much of the nave was occupied by liturgical enclosures. Some multiple *cancelli* were due to the complexity of liturgical requirements (see above) or are simply inventions based on badly interpreted evidence (e.g., Dermech I at Carthage). Study of the distribution of burials in churches (e.g., at Haidra) does not allow us to confirm any division of the congregation by sex.

8. Secondary installations. Besides the essential elements listed above, the texts (*Liber pontificalis* for Rome) and archaeological finds show how the layout of churches could, from a relatively late date, involve several altars (see below: double apses) or at any rate secondary installations such as offering tables. (Discovery of numerous fragments of different tables is frequent.) Some funerary churches can contain *mensae martyrum,* in Africa, or simple funerary *mensae,* tables accompanied by benches for the **agape* (in Africa and the Balkans). We must not forget that the church building could serve many uses: place of refuge, of banquets held for the poor, or seat of councils and synodal assemblies. We may also mention some rare cases of holy water stoops or alms boxes (to which some texts give the erudite and uncommon name of *gazophylacium*).

9. Votive offerings—lighting. Literary (*Liber pontificalis* again) and iconographical evidence and archaeological finds also allow us to describe the utensils, either purely votive and decorative or for the lighting that hung from ceilings and vaults. The usual instrument for lighting early Christian churches was the "crown of light" (*corona lucis, polycandelon*) which consisted of a series of lamps (usually glass bowls) supported by one or more metal circles (see the lamps of mosques or Orthodox churches). These utensils, sometimes of precious metal, could be combined with or supplemented by votive crowns, Christian symbols or metal inscriptions.

IV. The baptistery.

1. Baptistery and cathedral. In the primitive church, *baptism was reserved to the bishop and was generally given to adults at an advanced age, sometimes at the point of death (the famous case of Constantine), and was generally by immersion. Often, in consequence, some have wanted to identify a cathedral by the discovery of a baptismal font. This conclusion has now been superseded. The multiplication of rival sects each led by a bishop explains how more than one "cathedral" could be found in the same city. (Rivalry is particularly well attested in the East, the Balkans, Italy and Africa for the *Arian heresy, and Africa for *Donatism.) It also seems that, very early on, numerous urban churches belonging to the same community, cemeterial or monastic churches, and rural churches (e.g., in Spain), may have simultaneously had baptisteries.

2. Position of the baptistery. The baptismal font was not generally in the church, as it was from the Middle Ages. The few exceptions (e.g., Bulla Regia in Tunisia) must be explained by a particular evolution of the church building, though in certain regions we recognize the very early use of small portable fonts (e.g., in Spain). Normally the baptismal rite implied the nudity of the *catechumen and so supposed privacy. But the position in relation to the church varied greatly. The baptistery might be a place directly attached to the church and could then be near the façade (association with the narthex is frequent in the Balkans) or near the apse (e.g., in a "sacristy" in the vicinity of the apse, or behind the apse and on its axis in a series of African buildings) or on one side.

When the baptistery was a separate building, its position varied: ideal models include behind the apse and on its axis (e.g., Siagu in Tunisia), beyond the atrium but still on the axis (Aquileia or Parentium in the Adriatic), and between two parallel churches (Grado). A direct or indirect link with the cathedral church was normal since the rite supposed the immediate participation of the baptizand in the synaxis.

3. Form of the baptistery. When the baptistery was a room attached to the church, its form could be neutral (a simple rectangle). Sometimes an apse was added, which could contain the bishop's chair or an altar (see below). The ideal form of the separate baptistery (e.g., the Lateran), sometimes also of that at-

tached to a church, was a central plan, inherited from the common forms of mausoleums, baths or palace vestibules: square, circular, polygonal, polygon inscribed in a square (with corner niches), tetraconch, triconch, etc., with the pool occupying the center. The central part of the room could be raised; i.e., it could have a row of internal columns supporting a lantern or the drum of a dome and separating the pool from a peripheral ambulatory (as in the baptisteries of Provence). At a later date Christian symbolism was applied to earlier forms: particularly often cited are *Ambrose's verses for the octagonal baptistery of *Milan, which seems to have been imitated, esp. in N Italy, from the end of the 4th c. For the geographical distribution of these different forms, see Khatchatrian's table of inventories.

4. Form of the font. The baptismal pool was a basin derived directly from those of the thermal bath or the pools of peristyles. Their form, dimensions and depth varied according to time, the dimensions of the room and the baptismal rite. In general we observe an evolution from simple forms (circular or square) to complex symbolic forms (cruciform and quadrilobate), passing through polygonal forms (esp. hexagonal and octagonal). The polygonal form is well attested from the end of the 4th c. in N Italy in baptisteries which are also polygonal. Cruciform shapes were used esp. in the Byzantine era (6th c.). Almost exclusive to N Africa is a series with more than four lobes (6, 8 or 12), also of Byzantine date, which should perhaps be compared with polylobate altar tables on account of the link between the altar and the baptismal font, both instruments of *redemption.

In Spain, complex but less regular forms also exist, made up of several fonts (see below). The majority of fonts were dug into the floor and consisted of a brick or stone nucleus, covered by a waterproof layer that might be decorative (mosaic, marble). They often had a projecting parapet and inner and outer steps for descending and ascending. (Sometimes the steps went around the entire font.) The average depth varied between 1 meter and 1.30 meters but could also be much less, not allowing the complete immersion of an adult. Few had an arrangement for filling; more had a hole for draining, which suggests that their users were often content with a symbolic quantity of water, or with aspersion (or sprinkling). A series of fonts in limestone countries (Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Rhodes, Minorca) are monolithic. Like the altar, the font was often surmounted by a ciborium, generally square or rectangular but sometimes circular or polygonal, related to the form of the pool.

5. Double fonts—evolution of the baptismal rite. Cases are known in various regions of double baptismal fonts, generally of different depths and dimensions. In some cases they represent two successive phases. At S. Pereto in Majorca (Baleari), P. de Palol supposes that two cruciform fonts may have been used together. When a small font is joined to a large pool, some have thought in terms of a basin for preliminary ablutions, for the oil of anointing, for baptism of children; the question remains open. In Spain, some composite fonts made up of a main pool and minor additional fonts suggest, according to Th. Ulbert, an evolution which a study of the liturgical texts seems to confirm; there may have been a change from immersion to effusion (pouring) and then back to immersion, and the age for baptism changed. Composite fonts would have been made for the immersion both of adults and of the newborn and would be late (6th c.). In any case the different dimensions and depths according to times and regions point to a great variety of rites.

6. Secondary installations, annexes, crossings. The baptistery itself might contain a table (for placing oil used for anointing) or even an altar, sometimes in a small apse (e.g., Grado in N Italy, Casa Herrera in Spain). Sometimes this apsidiole seems intended rather for the episcopal cathedra (see above). It quite often happened, esp. in Africa, that a room or an apsed chapel provided with a presbyterial bench or an altar (Dermech at Carthage) was added to the baptistery. Some think, without proof, that this installation was intended for the preliminary education of the catechumens (*catechumeneum*), or for the anointing of the newly baptized by the bishop (*consignatorium*). Some baptisteries were supplemented by a thermal installation, esp. in Africa, and by rooms with no particular furnishings (sometimes benches), thought to be changing rooms or waiting rooms for catechumens (Spanish texts call them "sheepfolds"). The arrangement of the different rooms, connected to each other and to the church, and the arrangement of the doors or of the steps for entering and leaving the pool, allow us in some cases to recognize the route of the processions of catechumens and clergy during the ceremony (attempts by E. Dyggve for Salona, N. Duval for Africa, Th. Ulbert for Spain).

V. Various annexes.

1. Funerary chapels, martyria attached to the church. We see in the early Christian era the rise of the custom, widespread in the Middle Ages, of surrounding church buildings with "chapels" or secondary sanctuaries. Some were intended to accommodate relics

and could have the form of a martyrium, e.g., the triconchs near the apse at Grado and Parentium (Adriatic) or at the sides (Tebessa in Algeria). Their role might differ little from that of a counterapse (see below). Others, particularly in cemeterial churches, contained family or privileged tombs and might even have a monumental aspect like the mausoleums of the imperial family attached to St. Peter's or to the Christian churches of S. Agnese and the Via Labicana (Rome). As an example of radiating plans formed by this circlet of chapels, we may cite the church near Kelibia (Tunisia) or the *Basilica Apostolorum* of the Via Appia at Rome. It could happen that the funerary chapels too contained liturgical installations.

2. *Other annexes. The episcopal palace*. The church building was rarely isolated in the early Christian era: it was often surrounded by various annexes and installations added to the baptistery. But the study of these groups is possible only where the ruins are well preserved and unencumbered by later buildings (N Africa, Syria, Asia Minor, sometimes the Balkans), and it has only just been initiated by archaeologists, who are still mainly interested in monumental architecture. We can cite examples like those of Geneva, Sbeitla in Tunisia, Djemila and Tipasa in Algeria, Mampbis-Kurnub and Shivat (Negev), Gerasa (Jordan), some centers in N Syria, Side (Pamphilia), Nea Anchialos, Philippi (Greece), Stobi (Macedonia), Heraclea (Macedonia), Caricin Grad (Serbia), and Salona (Croatia). In some cases we can make out utilitarian installations (granaries, storerooms and distribution rooms, like the *auges* rooms in Africa and the Negev) and dwellings, sometimes sumptuously decorated like contemporary houses (Heraclea Lynkestis), called episcopal palace or *episcopium*. Great monastic complexes (e.g., Qalaat Seman in Syria) or places of pilgrimage (Tebessa complex in Algeria?) also cover a vast area and sometimes show an even greater variety of buildings.

VI. Particular forms of church building.

1. *Double apses and double choirs.* Mainly in Africa and Spain, we know a series of churches with two opposed apses (beginning with Orléansville, already cited). In Africa, N. Duval's detailed study of the series has demonstrated that the two apses are not contemporary. The erection of a second apse at the front (inside or outside) may have been due to the need to reverse the orientation of the churches originally facing west. It seems more often to have been related to the creation of a center of a martyrial cult inside the building, a center which elsewhere might be placed near the apse (N Syria) or in an annexed building. In Spain we know at present, in the S, four churches provided with apses apparently contemporary with the construction of the church. These churches, generally very small, show a common typology, with side entrances preceded by galleries parallel to the building. According to Th. Ulbert, the second apse would also have a martyrial function. The form with two opposed apses recurs twice in the Mozarabic period (10th c.). As well as those double apses we find, in both Africa and Spain, cases of "double choirs," where the second center of worship was confined to a platform or enclosure near the front. The arrangement with two apses or two choirs generally supposed a circulation between the two centers of worship, ensured by an axial corridor (Spain, Iunca in Tunisia) or by a lateral protection of the whole central aisle (Sbeitla in Tunisia). It was also connected with a rearrangement of the entrances to the church (see above for Spain). In another part of the West (Rhineland, N and E Gaul) we see a series of churches with double apse or double presbytery in the Carolingian era, a tradition that would be maintained in the Romanesque period, esp. in Rhineland. We may ask ourselves whether, despite the absence of early Christian evidence in *Gaul, a Western tradition does not exist.

The role played by the opposed apse could also be entrusted to a lateral apse or an annexed building juxtaposed at right angles (triconch martyrium of Tebessa in Algeria).

2. *Double churches.* In the West, particularly in N Italy, E Gaul and Germany, but also in Africa (Sbeitla, Iunca in Tunisia, Sabratha in Tripolitania, Djemila in Algeria), Greece (Aliki on Thasos) and elsewhere, we know a quite prominent series of double churches consisting of two parallel churches sometimes separated by a space, in some cases containing a baptistery. This arrangement is deliberate, and the two churches are contemporary (already from the 1st half of the 4th c., at Aquileia and Trier in the Rhineland). We give such groups (two churches and a baptistery) the name "cathedral group" or "episcopal group." But the use of the two halls is still disputed: place of synaxis and room for education of catechumens? Bishop's church and "parish" church? Men's and women's churches? Summer and winter churches? And so on. Medieval names sometimes provide a clue. One of the churches is often dedicated to St. Peter or St. Stephen, another to St. Mary (Trier and Paris), and the baptistery to St. John. In many cases (Sbeitla in Tunisia, Sabratha in Tripolitania, Aliki on Thasos) we notice that the two churches are not contemporary. At Sbeitla, it is evi-

dent that the larger church was built on a site near the first. Plurality of sanctuaries in a single enclosure was frequent in medieval episcopal and monastic complexes. Extension by the addition of lateral but joined sanctuaries would also be practiced in the middle Byzantine era at Constantinople and in Greece. Sometimes the two churches are arranged one behind the other rather than side by side: this is the case at Heraclea Lynkestis (Macedonia), Gerasa in Jordan and perhaps Paris. (The question is once again open.)

3. *Central plans*. The central plan used for baptisteries and some mausoleums annexed to churches was also used separately, esp. to hold a relic or a memorial of Christ's life. (Famous examples are the Anastasis of Jerusalem and the Church of Bethlehem.) The forms, inherited from Roman funerary, thermal or palatine architecture, were not new: they were mainly round, polygonal, tetraconch, triconch, or these same forms inscribed in a square. Yet we know little of any value about large central-plan buildings in early Christian architecture. The cathedral of Antioch seems to have belonged to this category, and S. Lorenzo at Milan is now dated to the mid-4th c. Great tetraconchs may have played the part of cathedrals in the Balkans (church of Hadrian's library in Athens, Ohrid in Macedonia) and in Syria (Apamea, Resafa, Bostra). The development of central-plan architecture is datable to the moment when roofing techniques were mastered and when the use of the vault for large spaces prevailed, beginning in the East. We see at first, in a series of classical-plan basilicas in Greece and Asia Minor, a use of the cupola to crown all or part of the sacred building (e.g., Philippi B in Macedonia and St. John's at Ephesus). Subsequently the predominance of central plans prevailed at Constantinople and Ravenna in the time of *Justinian (SS. Sergius and Bacchus, S. Vitale, and Hagia Sophia); it would be maintained throughout the entire development of Byzantine architecture.

4. *Cruciform plan*. A small number of ancient buildings adopted this particular plan, whose symbolic meaning is emphasized by, e.g., Ambrose. We must distinguish first between the plans of martyria where, starting from a central nucleus housing a reliquary or *memoria,* four small naves were inserted, the E one of which could be used as a sanctuary: examples are the martyrium of Kaoussié at Antioch, the pre-Justinian church of St. John at *Ephesus, two stylite sanctuaries (with the column in the central nucleus) at Qalaat Seman and Mons Mirabilis in Syria, and the sanctuary of Shechem, according to Arculf. "Free cross" cruciform churches (i.e., with the cruciform plan visible externally) were deliberately built—it would seem—at Milan from the second half of the 4th c. (SS. Apostoli and S. Simpliciano) and perhaps at Constantinople from the time of Constantine (*basilica Apostolorum*). A type with the four arms terminating in apses appears in the recent excavations of S. Lorenzo at Aosta, comparable to the *basilica Probi* in Classis (Ravenna) and Church III of Iunca (Tunisia). The cruciform plan with a "free cross" or an "inscribed cross" (i.e., inside a rectangle) became quite popular in the Adriatic area. At Ravenna the church dedicated to the cross (S. Croce) has a clearly cruciform plan. The reasons for the choice of this plan do not seem to be related to the dedication to the *apostles, as was once believed on the examples of Constantinople, Milan and Gerasa (Jordan), since other *basilicae Apostolorum* do not adopt it. These cruciform churches must be clearly distinguished from churches with transepts (see above) or with lateral annexes, quite widespread in the early Middle Ages in E Gaul and the Alps.

Origins: Ch. Delvoye, *Recherches récentes sur les origines de la basilique chrétienne*: AIPho 14 (1954-1957) 205-228; N. Duval, *Les origines de la basilique chrétienne. Etat de la question*: L'Information d'Histoire de l'Art 7 (1962) 1-19; E. Langlotz, *Der architekturgeschichtliche Ursprung der christlichen Basilika*: Rheinisch-Westfaliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge, Opladen 1972 (derived from the RAC article); accounts by B.M. Apollonj and N. Duval in *Atti del IX Congresso internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana*, Rome 1975, Vatican City 1978. To be supplemented by N. Duval's observations, *Urbs*, 1961–1962, 67-95; CArch 15 (1965) 207-254; CCAB 25 (1978) 93-122 and 26 (1979) 41-51; FR 115 (1978) 29-62, followed by Ch. Pietri: REAug 1978; P. Testini, *"Basilica," "Domus Ecclesiae" e aule teodoriane*: Antichità altoadriatiche 22 (1982) 369-398; F.W. Deichmann, *Archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1993, 71-87; A. Nestori, *Riflessioni sul luogo di culto cristiano precostantiniano*: RivAC 75 (1999) 695-709. *The architecture of the basilica*: A. Orlandos, Ἡ ξυλόστεγος παλαιοχριστιανικὴ βασιλική, 3 vols., Athens 1952-1957; P. Testini, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 547ff.; C. Mango, *Architettura Bizantina*, Milan 1974 (last ed. Paris 1981); articles by Ch. Delvoye, in RBK; to be supplemented by the congresses of Byzantine studies and Christian archaeology, esp. *Atti del IV Congresso internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana*, Rome 1938, dedicated to the basilica; R. Krautheimer and S. Ćurčić, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, New Haven CT [4]1986; J.C. Picard, *L'atrium dans les églises paléochrétiennes d'occident*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste 21-28 septembre 1986), Vatican City 1989, I, 505-553; N. Duval, *L architecture cultuelle*, in *Naissance des arts chrétiens. Atlas des monuments paléochrétiens de la France*, Paris 1991, 186-219; W.E. Kleinbauer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture: An Annotated Bibliography and Historiography*, Boston 1992; F.W. Deichmann, *Archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1993, 89-104; H. Brandenburg, s.v. *Basilica*, in *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, Classica e Orientale. Secondo Supplemento 1971-1994*, I, Rome 1994,

616-629; F. Guidobaldi, *Sull'originalità dell'architettura in età costantiniana*, in *Ricerche di archeologia cristiana e bizantina. XLII Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina, Ravenna, 14-19 maggio 1995*, Ravenna 1995, 419-441.

Particular aspects: Internal arrangements: O. Nussbaum, *Der Standort des Liturgen am christlichen Altar*, 2 vols., Bonn 1965; G. Tchalenko, *Bêma. Églises de villages en Syrie du Nord*, Paris 1980; J. Lassus: DACL, s.v. *Syrie*; G. Roux, *Tables chrétiennes en marbre*: Salamine de Chypre 4 (1973) 133-196; Articles on N Italy and the Adriatic in *Aquileia Nostra* and *Antichità alto adriatiche*; by J.P. Sodini in BCH, Athens; specialist articles in RAC and RBK and see also N. Duval, *Les Églises africaines à deux absides* Paris 1971-; Th. Ulbert, *Frühchristliche Basiliken mit Doppelapsiden auf der iberischen Halbinsel*, Berlin 1978. The cathedral: H. Geertmann, *Forze centrifughe e centripete nella Roma cristiana. Il Laterano, la Basilica Iulia e la Basilica Liberiana*: Rend. PARA 59 (1986-87) 63-91; B.M. Apollonj Ghetti, *Le cattedrali di Milano ed i relativi battisteri. Nota sulla basilica di San Lorenzo Maggiore*: RivAC 63 (1987) 23-89; P. Piva, *La cattedrale doppia*, Bologna 1990. A definitive revision with regard to different geographical contexts in *Actes du XI^e Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste 21-28 septembre 1986), I, Vatican City 1989. Baptisteries: A. Khatchatrian's collection of plans, *Les baptistères paléochrétiens*, Paris 1962, very incomplete and often erroneous. See also the congresses of Christian archaeology, esp. the *Actes du V^e Congrès International d'archéologie chrétienne*, Aix 1954, partly dedicated to baptisteries, and Th. Ulbert, op. cit.; M. Falla Castelfranchi, s.v. *Battistero*: EAM 3, Rome 1992, 214-227; S. Ristow, *Frühchristliche Baptisterien*, Münster 1998; the most recent acquisitions in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi. Atti dell'VIII Congresso Nazionale di Archeologia Cristiana* (Genova, Sarzana, Albenga, Finale Ligure, Ventimiglia 21-26 settembre 1998), I-II, Bordighera 2001. Double apses: N. Duval, *Les églises africaines à deux absides*, II, Paris 1973; Th. Ulbert, *Frühchristliche Basiliken mit Doppelapsiden auf der iberischen Halbinsel*, Berlin 1978 and N. Duval's recension: JbAC 1981. Double churches: J. Hubert, *Les cathédrales doubles et l'histoire de la liturgie*, article reprinted in *Arts et vie sociale de la fin du monde antique au Moyen Âge*, 1977, 87-96; volume soon to be published by J.P. Sodini. Martyria, central plans: A. Grabar, *Martyrium*, 3 vols., Paris 1946-1948, to be supplemented by the most recent studies, esp. the accounts of J.B. Ward Perkins, R. Krautheimer, P. Verzone in *Atti del VI Congresso internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana*, Ravenna 1962 and *Akten des VII internationales Kongress für christliche Archäologie*, Trier 1965. Buildings in distinct geographical contexts: An extremely rich picture emerges esp. from the various contributions in *Actes du XI^e Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste 21-28 septembre 1986), II-III, Vatican City 1989; *Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae* (Split - Poreč, 25 settembre–1 ottobre 1994), II-III, Vatican City-Split 1998. Italy: F. Cecchini, *La basilica paleocristiana di Fermo*: Atti VI Cong. Naz. di Arch. Cristiana, Florence 1986, 443-455; M. Mirabella Roberti, *La basilica paleocristiana di Concordia*, in *Rufino di Concordia e il suo tempo*. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Concordia-Portogruaro 18-21 settembre 1986, 2, Udine 1987, 93-106; G. Lepore, *Edifici di culto cristiano nella valle del Cesano. Pesaro - Ancona. La documentazione storica e archeologica tra tardoantico e medioevo* (Studi e scavi, 14), Imola 2000. A systematic and exhaustive update for Rome is: *Ecclesiae Urbis. Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi sulle Chiese di Roma* (*IV-X secolo*), I-III, Vatican City 2002. France: N. Duval (ed.), *Les premiers monuments chrétiens de la France, 1. Sud-Est et Corse*, Paris 1995. Spain: L. Olmo Enciso, *Arquitectura religiosa y organización litúrgica en época visigoda. La basílica de Recópolis*: Archivo Español de Arqueología 61 (1988) 157-178; C. Godoy Fernández, *Arqueología y Liturgia: Iglesias Hispánicas* (*siglos IV al VII*), Barcelona 1995; N. Duval, *Les relations entre l'Afrique et l'Espagne dans le domaine liturgique: existe-t-il une explication commune pour les "contre-absides" et "contre chœurs"? à propos de* Cristina Godoy Fernández, *Arqueología y Liturgia: Iglesias Hispánicas* (*siglos IV al VII*), Port de Terragona 1995: RivAC 76 (2000) 429-476. Croatia and Serbia: N. Duval - M. Jeremi - J. Guyon, *Caričin Grad, 1. Les basiliques B et J de Caričin Grad. Le trésor de Hajdučka Vodenica* (Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome, 75), Rome 1984; M. Prelog, *The basilica of Euphrasius in Poreč* (Monumenta artis Croatiae. First Series, 4), Zagreb 1986; N. Duval, *L architecture religieuse de Tsaritchin Grad dens le cadre de l'Illyricum oriental au 6^e siécle*, in *Villes et peuplement dans l'Illyricum protobyzantin. Actes du Colloque, organisé par l'École française de Rome. Rome, 12-14 mai 1982*, Rome 1984, 399-481; N. Duval - E. Marin et al., *Manastirine. Établissement préromain, nécropole et basilique paléochrétienne à Salone* (Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 194, 3), Rome 2001. Macedonia: B. Aleksova, *The Early Christian Basilicas at Stobi*, in *La Macedonia iugoslava. XXXIII Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina, Ravenna 15-22 marzo 1986*, Ravenna 1986, 13-81. Albania: N. Duval, *La basilique de Ballshi* (*Albanie*): Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France (1988) 131-135; N. Duval - P. Chevalier, *L architecture chrétienne de l'Albanie dans le cadre de l'Illyricum*, in *L'Illyrie méridional et l'Epire dans l'antiquité, 3. Actes du III^e Colloque international de Chantilly, 16-19 octobre 1996*, Paris 1999, 283-304. N Africa: N. Duval, *Une nouvelle basilique à double chœur à Hr Guessès, au nord de Timgad*: MEFRA: Antiquité 97 (1985) 1065-1078; N. Duval - F. Baratte - J.C. Golvin, *Les églises d'Haïdra, 6. La basilique des martyrs de la persécution de Dioclétien. Bilan de la campagne 1983*: CRAI (1989) 129-173; I. Gui - N. Duval - J.P. Caillet, *Basiliques chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord. Inventaire et typologie, 1. Inventaire des monuments de l'Algérie* (Collection des études augustiniennes. Série antiquité 129-130), Paris 1992; N. Duval, *La basilique de Bir el-Knissia à Carthage. Une fouille du pére Delattre redécouverte et réétudiée*: Antiquité Tardive 3 (1995) 283-302; N. Duval, *L'église V* (*des Saints-Gervais-Protais-et-Tryphon*) *à Sbeitla* (*Sufetula*), *Tunisie. Recherches de 1954-1963*: MEFRA 111 (1999) 927-989; N. Duval, *Les monuments chrétiens d'Haïdra: recherches récentes*: RivAC 77 (2001) 419-467. Near East: V. Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme*, Jerusalem 1982; N. Duval, *L'architecture chrétienne et les pratiques liturgiques en Jordanie en rapport avec la Palestine. Recherches nouvelles*, in *Churches Built in Ancient Times. Recent Studies in Early Christian Archaeology* (Research seminar held at the University of London on December 10-11, 1991), London 1994, 149-212. Particular architectural typologies: F. Tolotti, *Le basiliche cimiteriali con deambulatorio del suburbio romano: questione ancora aperta*: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Röm. Abt. 89 (1982) 153-211; *Ambrogio e la cruciforme "Romana" basilica degli Apostoli nei milleseicento anni dalla sua storia*, Milan 1986; V. Fiocchi Nicolai - M.P. Del Moro - D. Nuzzo - L. Spera, *Lo scavo della nuova basilica circiforme della via Ardeatina*: Rend. PARA 68 (1995-96) 69-233.

N. DUVAL

CILICIA

I. Christian origins - II. Council - III. Archaeology.

I. Christian origins. A region situated at the SE corner of Asia Minor, between Lycaonia, *Cappadocia and *Syria, integrated into the Roman Empire in 103 BC. Men from Cilicia were among the Jews who disputed with St. Stephen in ca. 36–37 (Acts 6:9). St. *Paul, a native of *Tarsus in Cilicia (Acts 9:11; 21:39; 22:3; 23:34) and in ca. 46 a visitor to his homeland (Gal 1:21), was entrusted with the apostolic letter of ca. 52 which was addressed to, among others, the "brethren of the Gentiles who are in Cilicia" (Acts 15:23), a province that Paul and Silas crossed in ca. 52 "strengthening the churches" (Acts 15:41). A place of deportation of confessors of the faith (Euseb., *Mart. Pal.* VIII, 13; X, 1; XI, 6), Cilicia counted not a few *martyrs commemorated by the Greek Synaxaria: *Athanasius, *Boniface, *Callinicus, *Quiricus and Julitta, Kyriainē, Clodius and Domnina, Diomede, Dula, Julian, *Hypatius, *Marinus, *Pelagia, Probus, Taracus and Andronicus, Zosimus, Talleleus, Zenaide and Philonilla, to whom we must add the *ascetics *Romanus, *Simeon Stylites, Theodosius and Talleleus. In the 3rd c., the churches of Cilicia were involved in the *Novatian *schism and the controversy over the validity of *baptism conferred by *heretics (Euseb., *HE* VI, 46,3; VII, 5,1 and 4). In the 1st half of the 5th c. the province was divided in two: Cilicia Prima, with Tarsus as metropolis and suffragans (*Diodore of Tarsus was its most famous son), and Cilicia Secunda, metropolis *Anazarbus (Bishop *Athanasius is memorable), with eight suffragan sees including Mopsuestia, famous for *Theodore. After the 7th-c. Arab occupation, Christianity (hierarchy mostly Jacobite) gradually died out. Remains of the ancient Christian presence are still visible at Tarsus, Anazarbus, Hierapolis, Coricus, Castabala and Flavianopolis.

DB II, 761-767; EC III, 1610-1612; LTK 6, 144-145; KLP III, 208-209; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 2, Paris 1965, 369; A. Vööbus, *The Synodicon in Syriac Tradition*, CSCO 367, Louvain 1975; S. Eyice, *La basilique de Canbazlier Cilicie*: Zograf 10 (1979) 22-29 and 19 pls.; Elisabeth Alföldi-Rosenbaum, *The Necropolis Adrassus* (*Balabolu*) *in Rough C.*, Vienna 1980.

D. Stiernon

II. Council. In 423 Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, called a council in Cilicia to condemn *Julian of Eclanum and *Pelagianism: which is surprising, since Julian had been Theodore's guest when he wrote his eight books against *Augustine. Moreover, Theodore too had always held that death and the other consequences of *original sin were proper to the state in which God had created human beings.

Mansi IV, 474; Hfl-Lecl II, 1, 214; Palazzini 1, 285.

C. Nardi

III. Archaeology. Cilicia, now in Turkey, bordered Isauria and was divided in two parts. St. Paul's city of Tarsus was capital of Cilicia Prima. It now has no Christian antiquities, only the memory of the *apostle in a Roman gate bearing his name. Excavations at nearby Küzlü Kule have uncovered *Hellenistic and Roman buildings with 4th-c. Roman tomb inscriptions with crosses (Goldman, *Excavations*, 384f.). Remains of five churches (5th-6th c.) have been found at Korycos, now Narli Kuyu, with a number of inscriptions (Guyer - Herzfeld, *Mon. Asiae Min. ant.*, II, 94-154; Keil - Wilhelm, *Mon. Asiae Min. ant.*, III, 120; Budde, *Mosaiken*, II). In Cilicia Secunda churches have been found at Anazarbus, now Anawarza, with mosaic floors; at Hierapolis, at Castabala, now Budrum, and at Flavias, now Kars el Bazar (Budde, *Mosaiken*, II). Remains of Christian basilicas are in two towns in the Taurus mountains: Mazilik and Akdam (Edwards). Better results have been attained at Mopsuestia, now Misis: mosaic floors of the church, with *Noah's ark and many animals, and scenes of *Samson's life with didactic inscriptions. The martyrium of Sts. Taracus, Probus and Andronicus is thought to have been found. Near Mardin, at Deir Zaʿfaran, are remains of a *monastic complex with graves; at Karylos, remains of churches outside the walls, surrounded by *sarcophagi. Many churches of Cilicia had an atrium, providing an enclosure for churches that could not be locked.

S. Guyer - E. Herzfeld, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*, II, Manchester 1930; J. Keil - A.U. Wilhelm, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*, III, Manchester 1931; H. Goldman, *Excavations at Küzlü Kule*, *Tarsus*, Princeton 1950; L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien*, II, Recklinghausen 1972; C. Dauphin, *Mosaic Pavements as an Index of Prosperity and Fashion*: Levant 12 (1980) 112-134; R.W. Edwards, *Two New Byzantine Churches in Cilicia*: AS 32 (1982) 23-32; S. Hill, *Matronianus, Comes Isauriae: An Inscription from an Early Byzantine Basilica at Yanikhan, Rough Cilicia*: AS 35 (1985) 93-97; O. Feld, *Die beiden Kirchen in Hierapolis Kastabala*, I, in *Studien zur spätantiken und byzantinischen Kunst*, Fest. F.W. Deichmann, Bonn 1986, 77-86; Id., *Kilikische Ambone*: MDAI (I) 39 (1989) 123-128; S. Hill, *The Early Byzantine Churches of Cilicia and Isauria*, Aldershot 1996.

B. Bagatti

CIRCUMCELLIONS. A revolutionary movement arising out of religious and agrarian discontent in N *Africa associated with the *Donatist church, par-

ticularly in *Numidia and *Mauretania in the 4th and early 5th c. (see *Praedestinatus*, *De haeres*. 69, "*in partibus Numidiae et Mauretaniae*"). Their name was derived from *circum cellas,* i.e., those who dwelled in or moved around the *cellae,* or *martyrs' shrines (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps*. 132, 3) "whence they got their food" (*C. Gaudentium* I, 28, 32). Certain Catholic writers outside *Africa referred to them as *Cotopitae* or *Cutzupitae* (e.g., Isid. of S., *Etym. Libri* VIII, 53). The origin of this term is unknown, but it might come from a combination of the *Coptic words *koté,* to "move around" or "wander," and *aouet,* "*cenobium" (see S. Calderone, *Circumcelliones*, 107). They epitomized the *apocalyptic *martyr-spirit of the Donatist church. They were regarded as "athletes" (*agonistici*) and "saints," ever ready for combat with the devil, now seen however as creditors and landowners as well as by Roman magistrates. If they failed to receive death at their hands, suicide, mainly by leaping over a precipice, was regarded as an effective alternative (Aug., *C. Gaudentium* I, 22, 25; 27, 30; 28, 32; Filaster, *Diversarum haereseon liber* 57, 85; cf. L. Leschi, *À propos des épitaphes chrétiennes . . .*). The Catholic writers *Optatus of Milevis (ca. 365) and *Augustine describe their depredations. Optatus describes how in ca. 340, due to the activities of Axido and Fasir, *duces sanctorum,* "no one could feel secure in his estates, the debtor's bond [*chirographia*] lost its force. In those days it was impossible for a creditor to exact payment of a debt." Slaves and masters were obliged to change places, and masters had to run before their own carriages (*De Schismate Donatistarum* III, 4: CSEL 26, 82). Fifty years later Augustine paints a similar picture of circumcellion attacks, only with Catholic clergy and Donatist converts to Catholicism added to their victims (see esp. *Ep.* 88, 8; 93, 11; 108, 4.18; 111, 1; 185, 4.15; *C. Cresconium* III, 48, 53; *Contra litteras Petiliani* II, 83, 184). They roamed in gangs (*turmae*), armed with clubs (*C. Ep. Parmeniani* I, 11, 17) called "Israels," and their watchword, *Deo Laudes,* was more feared than the lion's roar (*Enarr. in Ps*. 132, 6).

Augustine does indicate, however, that the movement also had a religious aspect. The "drunken mobs" (*greges ebrios*) of circumcellions were accompanied by *sanctimoniales* (*C. Ep. Parmeniani* II, 10, 19; cf. *C. Gaudentium* I, 36, 46 and *Ep*. 35, 2). The tombs of circumcellion "martyrs" became *pilgrimage centers (*Ad Catholicos Ep*. 19, 50). The circumcellions sold *relics of real or presumed martyrs (*De opere monachorum* 28, 36) and were themselves regarded as "confessors" and "martyrs" (*C. Ep. Parmeniani* III, 6, 29). Other writers confirm this. Though a Donatist himself, *Tyconius (ca. 380) criticized them for their superstition and described them as wandering from one saint's tomb to another for the sake of the salvation of their souls (quoted by Beatus of Liébana, *In Apocalypsin,* and cited from T. Hahn, *Tyconius-Studien*, Leipzig 1902, 68). *Isidore of Seville (d. 636) described them as a "fifth type of monk" (*Quintum genus [monachorum] est Circumcellionium qui sub habitu monachorum usquequaque vagantur: De off. eccles*. II, 16). There has been much discussion of their possible economic role as day laborers employed mainly for the olive harvest in Numidia (Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken*, 52-56), or of their legal status as an *ordo,* indicated in Honorius's anti-Donatist edict of 30 January 412 (CTh XVI, 5, 52; cf. J.P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme*, 332-334). It would seem, however, that a less legalistic interpretation is preferable, i.e., that *ordo* is used to indicate a definable group, as *tagma* is used to describe monks, and not a legal status in agrarian society.

The movement shows how the apocalyptic expectations of part of the rural population of N Africa in the 4th c. found their outlet in the martyr ideal of the Donatist church. The leaders of the latter at first rejected the circumcellions (Opt., III, 4) but later accepted them and even led them. *Schismatic religion was thus associated with radical social reform. While the memory of the circumcellions persisted (see Isid., loc. cit.), there is no evidence for the recrudescence of their activity in Africa in *Vandal or *Byzantine times.

The ancient sources are listed by F. Martroye, *Circumcellions*: DACL 3, 1692-1710. For inscriptions, see ibid., as well as: L. Leschi, *A propos des épitaphes chrétiennes du Djebel Nif en Nisr*: Rev. Africaine 83 (1940) 35-40; C. Saumagne, *Ouvriers agricoles ou rôdeurs de celliers? Les Circoncellions d'Afrique*: Annales d'hist. écon. et sociale 6 (1934) 351-364; A. Berthier et al., *Les vestiges du christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale*, Algiers 1942; J.P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine de Séptime Sévère à l'invasion vandale*, Paris 1958, ch. 4; H.J. Diesner, *Kirche und Staat in spätrömischen Reich*, Berlin 1963 (with particular essays on the sociolegal situation of the circumcellions); E. Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken*, Göteborg 1964, ch. 1; S. Calderone, *Circumcelliones*: PP 22 (1967) 94-109; W.H.C. Frend, *Circumcellions and Monks*: JTS n.s. 20 (1969) 542-549; Id., *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, 171-174; G. Gottlieb, *Die Circumcellionen. Bemerkungen zum donatistischen Streit*: Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum 10 (1978) 1-15; A. Schindler, *Kritische Bemerkungen zur Quellenbewertung in der Circumcellionenforschung*: SP 15 (1984) 238-241; A. Gotoh, *Circumcelliones: The Ideology Behind Their Activities*, in *Forms of Control and Subordination in Antiquity: Proceedings of the International Symposium for Studies on Ancient Worlds, Tokyo January 1986*, Leiden 1988, 303-311.

W.H.C. Frend

CIRCUMCISION. Ritual removal of the foreskin, practiced by various peoples (see *Ep. Barn.* 9,6; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30,33; Jerome, *In Ier.* 9,2; Cyril Alex., *C. Jul.* 9), it became for the Jews the sign of inclusion among the descendents of Abraham, in the people of the covenant, and of submission to the law. The prophets pointed out the importance of circumcision of the heart for being pleasing to God (Lev 26:41; Dt 10:16; Jer 4:4). *Philo interpreted these prophetic texts as an allusion to the renunciation of all sensuality (*Spec. Leg.* I,1-11, 304-306). The Christians, following St. *Paul, stressed this aspect (see Rom 2:25-29), presenting the circumcision of Christ as the stripping away of everything carnal (Col 2:11): for them it is *baptism, which joins one to the new Israel, the church, the people of God; bodily circumcision was its prefiguration (see Justin, *Dial.* 29,1 and 41,4; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* IV,16,1; Ambrose, *Abr.* I,29; Augustine, *Serm.* 196A,1; 260,1). Some sects like the *Ebionites and *Cerinthians returned to circumcision (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30,26; 33,34). Various Fathers argued against a purely carnal conception of circumcision, opposing it to spiritual circumcision (see *Ep. Barn.* 9,4-6; Justin, *Dial.* 41,4 and 43,2; Tertullian, *Ad ux.* I,2,3; Origen, *C. Cels.* I,22 and VI,24), which can be defined as "knowledge of God and of his Christ" (Justin, *Dial.* 28,4), and is manifested in "service to God and cultivation of truth in the heart" (Augustine, *Serm.* 196A,1). Circumcision according to the flesh recalls symbolically the need for *ascesis and chastity: "cut out the passion of lust" (Ambrose, *Abr.* 2,91; see also Origen, *Hom. Jos.* I,7; Methodius, *Symp.* 1,3).

DTC 2/2 (1905) 2519-2527; F.J. Dölger, *Sphragis*, Paderborn 1911; O. Cullmann, *Le baptême des enfants et la doctrine biblique du baptême*, Paris-Neuchâtel 1948; B. Bagatti, *L'Église de la circoncision*, Jerusalem 1965, 273 (see index); A. Hamman, *Le baptême et la confirmation*, Paris 1969, 9-10 and 242 (see index); *Beschneidung*: RAC 2 (1954) 164-169 (bibl.); G.W.H. Lampe (1976) 1074-1076; TRE 5 (1980) 714-724.

M. Maritano

CIRTA (present-day Constantine). Cirta, now Constantine or Kasantina (departmental capital, Algeria), occupies a strategic position on a plateau, in a bend of the Rummel River (or Rhumel, the ancient Ampsaga), 139 km (86.4 mi) SE of *Hippo. Capital of the *Numidian kingdom, under *Augustus it became a Roman colony and then capital of a vast confederation which included three other colonies (Chullu, Milevis and Rusicada). It suffered serious destruction at the time of the war between *Maxentius and *Domitian; it was rebuilt by *Constantine, for whom it is named, in 313–314, and became capital not only of Numidia Cirteana, as it had been until then, but of all of the reunified province. It resisted the *Vandal attacks until 454; after the *Byzantine reconquest it was the seat of the *dux Numidiae*.

The first sure sign of Christianity is the presence of Bishop Crescens at the Council of *Carthage of 256 (*Sent. epp.* 8). The victims of *Valerian's persecution are known from the *Passio Iacobi et Mariani* (BHL 131): they were taken before the governor of Lambaesis, where they suffered *martyrdom; they are recorded in a 6th-c. votive inscription at Constantine (CIL VIII 7924). During *Diocletian's persecution, its Bishop Paul and the subdeacon *Silvanus yielded (**traditores*). In 307 (most probable date), there was a meeting of bishops at Cirta for the ordination of Silvanus (*see* Cirta, Council of); the acts survive in a document from 320, the minutes of the trial held against Bishop Silvanus before the Numidian consul Zenophilus. The text shows the divisions, reciprocal accusations and suspicions that followed on the persecution. *Augustine calls this document *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (CSEL 26, 185-97; PL 8, 724-742); it includes, among other documents, a sort of report of the inventory of the goods confiscated from the church during the persecution and tells us something about the local church in 303, the election of the bishop in 307 and the origins of *Donatism in Cirta.

For the next 80 years the church of Cirta fell again into obscurity, reappearing under the name Constantine in ca. 400 when *Petilian was the Donatist bishop and *Profuturus the Catholic bishop, succeeded in 410 by *Fortunatus. Augustine addressed treatises to both. Of the Vandal era we know only Bishop Antoninus Honoratus, who wrote Arcadius a letter of exhortation to *martyrdom in the time of *Genseric (PL 50, 567-570), and Bishop *Victor, who took part in the council called by *Huneric in 484.

PWK 3, 2586-2588; DACL 3, 2713-2732; DHGE 13, 623-625; LTK³ 2, 1303; AugLex 1, 941-942; I. Gui - N. Duval - J.-P. Caillet, *Basiliques chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord*, Paris 1992, I, 205-208; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne*, Paris 2000.

V. Saxer

CIRTA, Council of. On 5 March 305, at Cirta in *Numidia (now Constantine, Algeria), a synod of 11 bishops was held to ordain a new bishop of Cirta. Most of the bishops present admitted handing over the Scriptures during *Diocletian's persecution and begged pardon. The oldest member and president, *Secundus of Tigisis, had also lapsed, and so he de-

cided "that everyone should render an account to God of his actions in this matter" (Aug., *Contra Cresconium* III, 27). Thus excused, they chose as bishop the deacon *Silvanus of Cirta who, like his Bishop Paul, had handed over the Scriptures in 303. Many of these bishops, including Silvanus, later became leaders of the Donatist sect, so keen to denounce *traditores* everywhere.

Hfl-Lecl I, 209-II; Palazzini 1, 209-211; J.A. Fischer, A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Paderborn 1997, 385-400; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000.

CH. MUNIER

CITIZENSHIP, Roman. In addition to freedom (*status libertatis*), Roman citizenship was an essential condition for the enjoyment of political rights, both private and public. The *civis* was originally one who lived with full rights *intra muros*, i.e., inside the city. Later the concept was broadened. Citizenship was acquired mainly by legitimate birth to citizen parents; the son of a *peregrinus* inherited his father's legal status; a freed slave obtained with his freedom the status of citizen. Citizenship was sometimes granted to whole communities but more often to individuals, in connection with particular services to the state (military services of special merit) or with the political tendencies that dominated from time to time, more or less open to the reception of foreign elements. Between 90 and 87 BC (Social War), the whole population of *Italy obtained citizenship; it was gradually extended until, with *Caracalla's *Constitutio Antoniniana* (212), it embraced all the subjects of the empire (*in orbe romano*). The problem of conceding citizenship to all Italians exploded with particular violence in the age of the Gracchi: under the agrarian reform promoted by Tiberius Gracchus, Italians were subject to the confiscation of their surplus portions of *ager publicus* but were excluded as noncitizens from the redistribution. Roman citizenship included *ius honorum* (right of access to magistrates), *ius suffragii* (right to vote in assemblies), right of appeal to the people in criminal cases, right to contract legal marriage, the right not to be tortured and full legal competency. These rights and duties underwent changes, even significant ones, through the centuries, esp. after Caracalla's concession of Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the empire in 212. Also important was the distinction between a person's legal status and social status: there could be poor Romans who possessed the privileges of citizenship and slaves or merchants who were not Roman citizens yet were very wealthy and influential. For his part, the Roman citizen was bound to military service and the payment of taxes. In *Justinian's legislation (6th c.), the *civis romanus* was still the privileged subject. Being a *civis* conferred a strong social identity and a close bond of belonging; the *peregrinus*, the noncitizen, however, enjoyed no civil rights (and human rights were linked to these). Christians made ample use of both concepts to speak of an identity and a belonging: they possessed heavenly citizenship, but on earth they were only *peregrini*, without a permanent home. This new citizenship was acquired with *baptism.

A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford ²1973; C. Castello, *L'acquisto della cittadinanza e i suoi riflessi nel diritto romano*, Milan 1951; *La nozione di "romano" tra cittadinanza e universalità, Da Roma alla Terza Roma*, eds. P.A. Catalano and P. Siniscalco, Atti del II Seminario intern. di studi storici, Naples 1984; E. Norelli, *A Diogneto*, Milan 1991; J.F. Gardner, *Being a Roman Citizen*, London 1993; G. Crifò, *Civis. La cittadinanza tra antico e moderno*, Bari - Rome 2000.

M. FORLIN PATRUCCO

CLAUDIAN, poet (ca. 370–early 5th c.). Claudius Claudianus was born ca. 370 at *Alexandria in *Egypt and there received an education which provided him with the rhetorical and cultural competence to undertake a great variety of professional services. Claudian distinguished himself from other poets with a similar formation by his complete mastery of poetic Latin. He made his official debut as a Latin poet at *Rome in January 395, with his *panegyric for the *consolatio* of Probinus and Olybrius, scions of one of the most conspicuous families of the Christian senatorial aristocracy. He then went immediately to *Milan, where the 11-year-old *Honorius had just succeeded *Theodosius (d. 17 January 395). Claudian attached himself to the actual holder of power, the *Vandal *generalissimo* *Stilicho, whom in a long series of encomiastic poems he exalted as defender of Roman security and values, presenting his actions in the most favorable light. (In this sense Alan Cameron spoke of Claudian as Stilicho's "propagandist.") The last act of Claudian's ten-year run as official poet of the Western court (first at Milan and from 402 at *Ravenna) was his recital at *Rome of the panegyric for the 6th *consolatio* of Honorius in early January 404; after that date, we lose track of Claudian, and it can reasonably be supposed that a premature death ended his activity during the same year.

In his compositions—even those which do not develop mythological subjects—Claudian often has

the *pagan gods intervene, whereas Christianity is absent. In itself, this choice would not be proof of an adherence to paganism: it was in fact consistent with the classical tradition and is reflected in the figurative arts, where the representation of pagan themes is attested even in cases where the work was commissioned by Christians. There is the testimony of *Augustine, however, who in *De civitate Dei* 5, 26 calls Claudian *a Christi nomine alienus*; this description is taken up and intensified by *Orosius (VII, 35, 21: *poeta quidem eximius, sed paganus pervicacissimus*).

In fact, of Claudian's almost 10,000 verses, only 21 hexameters of *car. min.* 32, *De salvatore,* have an unequivocally Christian character. Recited at court for the celebration of *Easter, the *De salvatore* treats the theme of the *incarnation, passion and *resurrection of Christ in classical language and a courtly tone but with an impeccable theology; the poem concludes by invoking Christ's protection over the Augustus. For this poem, which the common MS tradition attributes to Claudian, it is not methodologically proper to deny his authorship—as was done in the past—on the basis of the statements of Augustine and Orosius. Certainly, one hymn to the Savior is not enough to prove that Claudian was a Christian, even if it would be hard to believe that—at the Christian court of Honorius—he would make an open profession of paganism. If propagan sympathies and possible digs against Christianity are identifiable in places in his poems, they are nonetheless veiled and ambiguous references, or refer to persons who were already objects of criticism (Gualandri 1989).

In one case, however, Claudian does make an explicit reference to Christianity: in *car. min.* 50, an epigram on the pious *dux Iacobus*, in which, guilty of having criticized him, the poet looks to the saints for support against the barbarians, hoping for a bloodless victory to save him from cutting his verses to pieces. Criticism is divided over the meaning of the poem, in which Claudian displays a good knowledge of the cult of the saints (in particular of those venerated at Milan): some scholars consider it vehemently anti-Christian; for others, the object of his scorn is not Christianity as such but the attitude of the overly devout person in general, more concerned with honoring the saints and *martyrs than with defending the empire.

In any case, whether he nurtured a closet paganism or a Christian façade, it remains significant that, precisely in the years in which the church was exploiting *Theodosius's victory at the Frigido (6 September 394) to establish a relationship of cause and effect between the emperor's faith and his victory, Claudian "de-Christianizes" the victory and attributes Honorius's military successes—and those of Stilicho under him—solely to the latter's value and ability. *Prudentius would oppose this reading, proposed by Claudian in the *Bellum Geticum* for Stilicho's victory over *Alaric at Pollentia (402), in *Contra Symmachum* II, 708ff., attributing the victory to the faith of Honorius and Stilicho.

Camers's edition (Vienna 1510) is the first to attribute to Claudian two other Christian poems (Schmidt, 658): the *Laus Christi* (*car. min.*, *App.* 20), 30 hexameters which are probably the work of Merobaude, and the *miracula Christi* (*car. min.*, *App.* 21), 9 elegiac distichs probably inspired by Prudentius's *Dittochaeon*. The two Greek poems to the Savior passed down in the *Antologia Palatina* (*AP* I, 19 and 20) under the name of Klaudianos, for their versification technique—which follows *Nonnus of Panopolis and is quite different from that of Claudian's surviving Greek verses (Birt LXXIV)—is probably the work of a later author of the same name, active probably in the late 5th and early 6th c.

Editions: T. Birt, MGH, AA X, Berlin 1892; J.B. Hall, Leipzig 1985; Claudii Claudiani *Carmina minora*, intr., tr. and commentary, ed. M.L. Ricci, Bari 2001. Ed. with Eng. tr. by M. Platnauer, *Claudian*, I-II, Cambridge, MA [5]1990; the complete edition was edited for Les Belles Lettres by J.-L. Charlet.

Studies: W. Schmid, *Claudianus I*: RAC 3 (1957) 152-167 (esp. 158-163); *Claudianus II*, ibid., 168-169; A. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford 1970; S. Döpp, *Zeitgeschichte in Dichtungen Claudians*, Wiesbaden 1980, 24-41; C. Lo Cicero, *I carmi cristiani di Claudiano*: Atti Accad. Scienze, lettere and arti di Palermo 36 (1976-77) 5-51; I. Gualandri, *Alla corte imperiale di Milano nel IV secolo d.C.: riflessi politici del classicismo claudianeo*: Archivio storico lombardo 6 (1989) 9-35; P.L. Schmidt, *Zur niederen und höheren Kritik von Claudians* Carmina minora, in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine*, I, Paris 1992, 643-660; I. Gualandri, *Claudiano e Prudenzio: polemiche a distanza*, in F.E. Consolino (ed.), *Letteratura e propaganda nell'occidente latino da Augusto ai regni romanobarbarici*, Rome 2000, 67-105; S. Döpp, *Claudianus*, in S. Döpp - W. Geerling (eds.), *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature*, English Translation, New York 2000, 130.

On the De salvatore: Birt, LXIII-LXVIII; L. Alfonsi, *Su una fonte del* Carmen de Christi Iesu beneficiis *di Elpidio Rustico*: RFIC 84, 1956, 173-178; Cameron 214-218; Döpp, 25-35; J.-L. Charlet, *Théologie, politique et rhétorique: la célébration poétique de Pâques à la cour de Valentinien et d'Honorius, d'après Ausone* (Versus Paschales) *et Claudien* (De Salvatore), in var. aus., *La poesia tardoantica: tra retorica, teologia e politica.* Atti del V corso di Erice, 6-12 dicembre 1981, Messina 1984, 273-287; Ricci, op. cit., 234-239. On *car.min.* 50: Cameron 224-227; J. Vanderspoel, *Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints*: CQ 36 (1986) 244-255; Ricci, op. cit., 286-289; F.E. Consolino, *Poetry and Politics in Claudian's* carmina minora *22 and 50*, in *Aetas Claudianea*, eds. W.-W. Ehlers - F. Fehgenteu - S.M. Wheeler, Munich - Leipzig 2004, 142-174.

F.E. Consolino

CLAUDIANUS MAMERTUS (ca. 420/430–474). Eminent representative of the renaissance in Narbonese *Gaul at the end of the Western empire. Born between 420 and 430, perhaps at *Vienne; he passed his youth at *Lyon, where he listened to the debates of Bishop *Eucherius (bishop 434–450) and received a literary education together with his lifelong friend *Sidonius Apollinaris, who provides our knowledge of him; he was then a priest at Vienne and collaborator with the bishop, his brother, and animator of philosophical and doctrinal debates among a group of learned friends. Adversary of the semi-*Pelagian *Faustus of Riez, against whom he wrote, ca. 470, *De statu animae,* dedicated to Sidonius Apollinaris; the work refutes a work of Faustus, today identified as the last part of Epistle 3, which at that time circulated anonymously. In this treatise in three books, making particular use of Plato, *Neoplatonism and neo-Pythagoreanism—perhaps mediated by Apuleius and *Latin translations and compendiums—and among Christian authors, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ambrose and esp. *Augustine, he refutes, with dialectical rigor and some literary charm, the theory of the material nature of the *soul, accepted earlier by *Tertullian and tenaciously followed by Faustus, and upholds the spiritualist theory of its immateriality. Of Claudianus's two remaining letters, particularly important is that addressed to Sapaudus, a rhetor teaching at Vienne; it gives evidence of the cultural crisis in 5th-c. *Gaul due to widespread negligence and incompetence. Praised by Sidonius (*Ep*. 14) as a philosopher, orator, poet, exegete and defender of *orthodoxy, he probably wrote other works, including a hymn in trochaic verses and a lectionary, both cited by Sidonius. He is remembered as a rhetor and philosopher by *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 84); his metaphysical speculation on the soul was popular in the Middle Ages up to the time of Abelard and Alan of Lille.

CPL 983-984; A. Engelbrecht, *Claudiani Mamerti opera*, ed. A.E., Vienna 1885 (CSEL 11); E. Amann, *Claudianus*: DTC 9, 1809-1811; Fr. Bömer, *Der lat. Neoplatonismus u. Neopythagoreismus und Claudianus Mamertus in Sprache u. Philosophie* (Klass. Philol. St. 7), Bonn 1936: ed. R. Beutler: Gnomon 13 (1937) 552-558 and R. Philippson: PhW 58 (1938) 1033-1041; E. Harleman, *De Claudiano Mamerto Gallicae Latinitatis scriptore quaestiones*, Uppsala 1938; Id., *La littérature gallo-romaine vers la fin de l'empire d'Occident*: Eranos 76 (1978) 157-169; A. Jülicher, *Claudianus Mamertus*: PWK 3, 2660-2661; W. Schmid, *Claudianus Mamertus*: RAC 3, 169-179. N.K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul*, London 1955, 207-210; R. Bossuat, *Alain de Lille, Anticlaudianus*, Paris 1955; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident*, Paris 1948, 223-235; E.L. Fortin, *Christianisme et culture philosophique au Vᵉ siècle. La querelle de l'âme humaine en Occident*, Paris 1959; M. Simonetti, *La produzione letteraria latina fra romani e barbari*, Rome 1986, 105-106 (103-148, for a general picture of the historical-cultural milieu); M. Di Marco, *La polemica sull'anima tra "Fausto di Riez" e Claudiano Mamerto*, SEA 51, Rome 1995; S. Bonanni, *Il Contra poetas uanos carmen nel Par. Lat. 7558*: RCCM 39 (1997) 71-78; P. D'Alessandro, *Agostino, Claudiano Mamerto, Cassiodoro e i Disciplinarum libri di Marrone*, in *MOUSA*, scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli, Bologna 1997, 357-370.

S. Costanza

CLAUDIUS, abbot (7th-8th c.). Of the *monastery of St. Eugendus (Saint-Oyend-de-Joux, now Saint-Claude) in the Haut Jura, Claudius lived between the 7th c. and the early 8th. Venerated as a saint, his cult greatly increased in the 12th c. with the *inventio* of his intact body, and spread quickly beyond the region through the impetus of his most authoritative devotee, King Louis XI of France. His two *Vitae* are *hagiographical compositions, both written in the 13th c. and accepting a tradition which makes Claudius the first archbishop of the city of Besançon (from 626–633), and then *abbot of the *monastery of Condat (= Saint-Oyend), which he directed for 55 years. It is probable that while the hagiographical texts attributed to Claudius of Saint-Oyend the dignity of bishop of Besançon, the bishop was actually another Claudius who, during the 6th c., took part in the Councils of Epaone and Cione. The modern city of Saint-Claude, which arose near the abbey, is named for him; his feast is 6 June.

The hypothesis advanced by Perrat that Claudius is the author of the sermon for the feast of All Saints preserved in a papyrus envelope at Basel (1 B) seems unsustainable. It was opposed, in particular, by Tjäder, who asserts that the fragment in question contains, rather, a list of "objects and fabrics of various kinds, donated to or extant in some church or monastery" (32), perhaps compiled at *Ravenna in the 1st half of the 8th c. From this point of view, the papyrus fragment of Basel would seem to have no relation with the monastery of the Jura or with its abbot.

If the papyrus comes from Ravenna there is also no reason for it to be associated with Claudius, abbot of Saint-Oyend, of the *Tractatoria Cameracensis* (*inc.: Istae sunt pigmentae quas ad Cameracum debemus comparare*), on which see CPL 1312b. It is actually a diploma, written in the Merovingian period and handed down in an appendix to the *Statutes* of Adalard of Corbie in the MS Paris, BN, 13908,ff. 26-27, which attests to a flourishing commerce in Eastern products in France, in particular papyrus and spices, with which the city of Cambrai was regularly provisioned.

BHL 1840-1847: *AASS. Iunii*, I, 648-659; G. Duhem et al., *Saint Claude. Vie et présence*, Paris 1960; BS 4, Rome 1964, cols. 13-17, *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico* 1, Turin 1998, 453-454. CPL 1312: *Sermo in festivitate omnium sanctorum*: C. Perrat, *Des Pères du Jura à l'humaniste Grynaeus. Le papyrus de Bâle 1B*: Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de Renaissance 12 (1950) 149-162; Id., *Le papyrus I B de Bâle*: CRAI (1950) 114-116; J.-O. Tjäder, *Revisione dei* Papiri Latini *Basel 1 B–C* (*P. Grynaeus*), Rome 1953; Id., *Die nichtliterarischen lateinischen Papyri Italiens*, 1, Lund 1955, 37, nn. 53-54; A. Bruckner - R. Marichal, *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*, 1, Lausanne 1954, Ia, b.; Patrologia IV, 351. CPL 1312b: *Tractatoria Cameracensis*: B. Guérard, *Polyptique de l'abbé Irminon*, 1, Paris 1836, 335; F. Vercauteren, *Étude sur les civitates de la Belgique seconde*, Brussels 1934, 210-212; H. Pirenne, *La fin du commerce des Syriens en Occident*: AIPhO (= Mélanges Bidez) 2 (1934) 677-687 (part. p. 679, n. 1); Patrologia IV, 351.

V. Milazzo

CLAUDIUS, emperor (10–54). Born 10 BC at Lugdunum (Lyon) to Drusus and Antonia (daughter of the triumvir Anthony), he avoided politics, perhaps out of shyness, and dedicated himself to historical studies until in AD 41 the praetorians, having assassinated his nephew *Caligula, proclaimed him emperor. Claudius governed honestly and moderately, refusing divine honors and showing formal respect for the Senate, which he nonetheless sought to deprive of power. He granted citizenship to many provincials, conquered *Britain, enlarged the port of Ostia and gave *Rome a superb aqueduct. In ca. 50, he expelled the Jews from Rome for, according to *Suetonius (*Claud.* 25, 4), causing disorders *impulsore Chresto*; some scholars think Chrestus is a corruption of *Christus*; others, perhaps the name of a Jewish agitator. This hit the Jews directly: Aquila and his wife Priscilla had to take refuge in *Corinth (Acts 18:2). In a letter to the *Alexandrians, Claudius forbade the Jews to allow coreligionists to come from *Syria or *Egypt: some see this as a prohibition of Christian missionaries. Claudius first married Messalina, then his niece Agrippina, who made him adopt her son from a previous marriage, Domitius, the future *Nero, as heir over his own and Messalina's son Brittanicus. Claudius died in 54, perhaps poisoned by Agrippina. His reign saw *Paul's missions and the first propagation of Christianity.

H.I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, London 1924; L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma*, IV, Turin 1955; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 61-66 and 420-421 (bibl.); S. Benko, *The Edict of Claudius of A.D. 49 and the Instigator Chrestus*: Theol. Zeitschr. 25 (1969) 406-418; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan 2004; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; F. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Roma e il suo impero*, It. tr., Rome-Bari 1992; A. Giardina - A. Schiavone, *Storia di Roma*, Turin 1999; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

CLAUDIUS II Gothicus, emperor (ca. 214–270). Roman emperor 268–270. A native of *Dalmatia, he distinguished himself in 250 as a valiant officer of *Decius, then as general under *Valerian and *Gallienus. On the latter's death the army proclaimed Claudius emperor, which the Senate ratified. He fought the Germans on the shores of Lake Garda; his rout, at Naissus (Moesia), of *Ostrogoths, *Visigoths, Heruli and Gepidi, who had crossed the Danube, earned him the surname Gothicus. In 270, while working to reorganize the unity of the empire, he died at *Sirmium (*Pannonia) during a plague. It seems that Christians were persecuted at *Rome and in *Italy during his reign.

M. Christol, *L'empire romain du III^e siècle. Histoire politique (192-325 après J.-C.)*, Paris 1997; A. Watson, *Aurelian and the Third Century*, London 1999.

L. Navarra

CLAUDIUS MARIUS VICTORIUS (1st half of 5th c.). Claudius Marius (or Marius Claudius) Victorius (or Victor) was a *rhetor of *Marseille and the author of a rhetorical and didactic paraphrase in three books of the account in Genesis, from the *creation until the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, titled *Alethia* (*The Truth*), probably composed under the *Byzantine emperor *Theodosius II and the Western Roman emperor *Valentinian III (see *Gennadius of Marseille, *De viris illustribus* 61, E.C. Richardson, TU XIV [1896]). The poem is preceded by a *precatio* (*prayer), structured according to the *hymnic style, in 126 hexameters.

The *Precatio* is divided into two sections. In the first (vv. 1-100) Victorius sings the high praises of *God, celebrates God's works and makes a profession of the orthodox faith. In the second (vv. 101-126), which concludes with a *trinitarian *doxology, the poet asks God for the necessary help to bring to a happy end the poetic undertaking, the purpose of which is the moral and religious formation of young children (vv. 104-105: *dum teneros formare animos et corda paramus / ad uerum uirtutis iter puerilibus annis*), to whom he vows to offer a reading book that will replace the cosmogonic stories of the *pagan poets with the Genesis story. The faltering meter and the seemingly improper language are justifiable, as long as faith does not run into dangers: *Quod si lege*

metri quicquam peccauerit ordo / peccarit sermo inproprius sensusque uacillans / incauto passim liceat decurrere uersu / ne fidei hinc ullum subeat mensura periclum (vv. 119-122). The brief prologue of the second book also has a programmatic value. Here the poet claims for himself the right to link the truth to poetic perfecting: *nunc hominum mores et iam mortalia uersu / ingressum fas sit ueris miscere poetam* (vv. 4-5). Indeed, he exercises this right by amplifying the terse biblical text on original *sin, the flood and *Abraham with fictional narrative elements, scenes of *dialogue and descriptions, and even a number of didactic *excursus* as well as philosophical and theological reflections, exploiting a broad knowledge of the classical poets (Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid), the Christian writers (*Lactantius, *Ambrose of *Milan, *Augustine of *Hippo, *Prudentius) and especially the paraphrastic poets (*Juvencus, *Cyprian of *Carthage). The folklorist Alexander Krappe argues that in the account of the discovery of fire at the beginning of the second book, it would appear that the poet introduces a *Persian *myth. *Adam and Eve throw stones on the *serpent, who has returned to tempt them, and one of the stones, as it rebounds, produces a spark that ignites a forest.

In the first book, the poet paraphrases the creation account of Genesis, culminating in the creation of the man and *woman, who live blissfully in *Paradise, described in rich detail. Such bliss ceases with the sin of the first parents and their consequential expulsion from the earthly Paradise. With sin as the reason why the humanity loses the capacity to contemplate the world, a new age begins for humanity.

The second book opens with a broad poetic digression on the condition of the first parents after the expulsion from Paradise. The hostile world of nature makes them bemoan the generosity of lost Eden. Bare necessity is at the foundation of human society and progress, as becomes evident with the discovery of metals and agriculture. The paraphrase otherwise accentuates ignorance and the rise of human knowledge, determined by the need to regain the lost ways of thinking. The poet proves that he comprehends the historical conditions that characterize the birth of a civilization as well as the primordial laws of social evolution, and in doing so he positions himself as the Christian counterpart of Lucretius (5,722 ff.). Yet together with knowledge there arise doubt—the father of error—and superstition. Therefore, the poet intones the increase of the human species, its corruption that begins with the fratricide of Cain, and its punishment with the flood. The description of this cosmic catastrophe, which only *Noah survives in his ark, even has an *allegorical significance. As a figure of *baptism, the flood foreshadows the *redemption.

The third book recounts the dispersal of Noah's sons. When they seek to conquer the sky with the Tower of Babel, the Omnipotent, who gives a long discourse in a punitive tone, disperses humanity and impedes the harmony that was based on a common language. On account of their *piety, only *Abraham and his brother Lot are chosen, and lands at *Bethlehem and Shechem are granted to them. In the battle with his predatory enemies, Abraham is celebrated as an epic hero and a *Stoic sage, but Lot is captured; Abraham liberates him and receives the promise of descendants as numerous as the stars. By the time he is a centenarian, the promise is reached. Following a lacuna in the textual tradition, the poem ends with the terrible *judgment of God against Sodom and Gomorrah.

In addition to great poetic force, supremely expressed in the punitive acts of God that are justified by the *lex talionis* and announced in grand discourses, the insertion of philosophical elements into the biblical *narratio* distinguishes the poem. The best examples of this are the creation, the rise of human culture, the description of Paradise and the portrayal of Abraham.

CPL 1455. *Editions*: PL 61, 937-972; C. Schenkl, CSEL 16, 1 (1888) 335-498; P.F. Hovingh, *Claudius Marius Victorius, Alethia. La prière et les vers 1-170 du Livre I avec introduction, traduction et commentaire*, Groningen 1955; Id., CCL 128 (1960) 111-198.

Studies: Schanz 4, 2, 362-365; Patrologia III, 301-304 (with bibl.); S. Gamber, *Le Livre de la "Genèse" dans la poèsie latine au Ve siècle*, Paris 1899; O. Ferrari, *Un poeta cristiano del V secolo: Claudio Mario Vittorio*, Pavia 1912; A.H. Krappe, *A Persian Myth in the Aletheia of Claudius Marius Victor*: Speculum (1942) 255-260; P.F. Hovingh, *La fumée du sacrifice de Caïn et Abel et l'Alethia de Claudius Marius Victorius*: VChr 10 (1956) 43-48; A. Hudson-Williams, *Notes on Claudius Marius Victor*: CQ 14 (1964) 296-310; C. Witke, Numen Litterarum. *The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great*, Leiden and Köln 1971, 156-161; H.H. Homey, *Studien zur Alethia des Claudius Marius Victorius*, (Dissertation) Bonn 1972 (see review by S. Costanza, BStudLat 4 [1974] 312-314); R. Herzog, *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike*, Munich 1975; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975; C. Codoñer Merino, *Un pasaje de Alethia 2, 456-481*: Helmantica 28 (1977) 87-96; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 241-243; G. Malsbary, *Epic Exegesis and the Use of Virgil in the Early Biblical Poets*: Florilegium 7 (1985) 55-83; M. Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*, Liverpool 1985; A.V. Nazzaro, "Claudio Mario Vittorio" in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, V, Rome 1990, 599-600; D.J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, Leeds 1993, 39-45; 90-107; *Claudii Marii Victorii Alethias concordantia*, ed. M. Wacht, Hildesheim 2001.

A.V. Nazzaro

CLAUSULA and CURSUS. A sentence conclusion formed of long and short syllables, stressed or atonal with a regular cadence. In music, cadenza. It marked out the harmonious fluidity of the sentence, which was naturally arranged in small units, *stychoi*, i.e., short lines. To give a musical flow to a sentence was an exercise learned in rhetorical schools: *compositio verborum*. It was done after *inventio* and *dispositio*, and added a completely personal note. Cicero was a great master of the art of *compositio*, but his principles were not universally accepted. As a rule, the rhythm was given by the ordered arrangement of longs and shorts (quantitative *clausulae*), and by the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables (accentuative *clausulae*). The terms "metrical prose" for prose characterized by quantity, and "rhythmical prose" for that characterized by stress, are unclear and cause confusion. To distinguish rhythm based on quantity, it was common to use the terms *numerus* and *cursus*—the latter dear to the hearts of medieval teachers of *ars dictandi*—terms which indicated rhythm based on stress and quantity, or on stress when quantity was diminished. These were the sonorous cadences at the ends of sentences. But the term *numerus* expressed a very complex concept: *numerus orationis*, the rhythm of oration; *numerus poeticus*, the rhythm of poetry; *numerus cantus*, the rhythm of song. Cicero uses the term *cursus* to indicate the rhythmical rise and fall of speech: *cursus orationis* (*De orat.* 2, 10, 39; *Orat.* 58, 198); *cursus verborum* (*De orat.* 1, 35, 161; *De orat.* 3, 33, 136). Quintilian and Aulus Gellius use it in the same sense.

To put it more subtly, rhythm was obtained by an opportune arrangement of words, in which long and short syllables gave a feeling of reasonable alternation of strong and weak *tempi*. To Christian authors, rhythm was more important than *melos*, both in the double form of the play of longs, shorts and stresses, and in the cadences of stresses alone. Of the two elements, *melos* and rhythm, the latter remained the principal one, as it had a more lasting effect. Rhythm was the principal, the active element, the life and movement of *compositio verborum*, while *melos* was the passive element, the inert, resistant matter. *Melos* was the sweetness of poetry and prose which swayed the human soul, ψυχαγωγία. *Melos* varied according to the state of mind to be induced and depended on modulations of voice. Quintilian said (1,10,25) that the raising and lowering of the voice served to enthrall the minds of the listeners. *Augustine had wanted to write six books on *melos*, but circumstances prevented him, depriving us of an important resource. As in *De doctrina christiana* and *De musica*, his examination would have dwelt on the authors who preceded him and on the sacred texts.

In terms of stress, the outstanding *clausulae* are *cursus planus, cursus tardus, cursus velox* and *cursus trispondaicus*—the *cursus* that come from quantitative *clausulae*. In the cadence of stresses, we should remember to count from the last syllable which, quantitatively, is always *anceps,* short or long. *Cursus planus* (stressed on the second and fifth syllables: *ígne torrére*) comes from the trochaic cretic; *cursus tardus* (third and sixth syllables: *indulgénte vindémia*) from the double cretic or the tribrachic cretic; *cursus velox* (second and seventh syllables: *pérdere magistrátus*) from the ditrochee preceded by a cretic (the cretic was later replaced by a proparoxytone [a word stressed on the propenultimate syllable]); *cursus trispondaicus* (second and sixth syllables: *ésse videátur*) from the first paeon and trochee. The best modern study on *clausulae* and *cursus* is that of F. Di Capua (*Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei papi e nei documenti della cancelleria pontificia*, 3 vols., Rome 1937-1946). Besides the rhythm of the *clausulae,* we must evaluate other patterns of ancient rhetoric, better known as figures of sound. Otherwise we risk missing the formal values of ancient Christian prose, and even its content.

R.A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, Berkeley, CA [2]1991; *Historisches Wörterburch der Rhetorik*, ed. von G. Ueding, Darmstadt 1992ff., 2,397-405 and 4,1088-1104; *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, S.E. Porter (ed.), Leiden 1997.

A. Quacquarelli

CLEMENT of Alexandria (150–ca. 215)
I. Life - II. Works - III. Doctrine.

Titus Flavius Clemens, rightly considered one of the most important missionaries to the wealthy and educated classes, left little written information about himself, sparsely supplemented by others, e.g., *Eusebius (*HE* 5, 11; 6, 6).

I. Life. Clement was born ca. 150 and died ca. 215; precise dates are lacking. He is commonly held to have been born at *Athens, though this seems to be just a hypothesis derived from *Strom.* 1,1,11, where he relates his journeys in search of the best-known teachers of Christianity. We know that he started in Greece, then attended the lectures of a teacher in Sicily, then went to *Syria-*Palestine and finally to *Alexandria. From this we deduce that he became a Christian as an adult and was thirsty for knowledge; from contemporary accounts we know that it was common practice to go in search of the best teachers, and Clement too sought the best school; he would

later pour all his knowledge back into Christianity. At Alexandria, he found in *Pantaenus what he had been looking for: a congenial teacher and a refined penetration of the faith with the aid of the science of the time. We must distinguish the school that Clement opened at Alexandria, with its specific character, from the community catechetical schools: it more resembled that which *Justin opened at *Rome in the previous generation. It was for the most part a cycle of conferences, drawn out over years, on philosophical and cultural matters and daily problems of topical interest; entry was in principle open to all. And yet this "new philosophy" made clear, using philosophical terms, the Christian ideal of life. It is not certain that the course ended in *baptism. Clement may have also guided a small group in baptismal instruction, but most participants would have put it off to a later time or neglected it entirely. They did, however, let themselves be guided by the Christian ideal in solving the problems posed by wealth and education. Thus a way was opened to Christianity in the circle of the rich, the highly placed and dominant class, in which the penetration of Christianity had encountered some difficulty. Nor is it certain that Clement was a priest, as might be deduced from the corrupt passage of *Paed.* 1,37,3, and despite the honorific title of *presbyter conferred on him by his friend Alexander (Euseb., *HE* 6, 11, 6). In 202/203 the incipient persecution of *Septimius Severus forced him to leave Alexandria again. He took refuge with his friend Bishop Alexander, who at that time presided over a Christian community in *Cappadocia. Later Alexander became bishop of *Jerusalem and as such wrote, in 215/216, a letter to *Origen in which he mentioned *Pantaenus and Clement as being dead, so Clement must have died in this period (Euseb., *HE* 6,24,8-9).

Clement's person and work were held in great esteem in early Christianity, as is evident from the honorific titles conferred on him: *makarios* ("blessed") and *hagios* ("saint"), the latter until the 8th c. He was included as a saint in Usuard's *martyrology (4 December). Since Benedict XIV, he has been left out of the Roman Martyrology, for several reasons. First, Clement and his work have been damaged by his having been considered a presumed teacher of Origen in the Origenist controversies, though he was not strictly his teacher, and many points of teaching condemned in Origen have nothing to do with Clement. This damage was already reflected in the *Sacra Parallela,* which still cite him with some frequency but no longer give him the titles "blessed" and "saint." It later found peculiar expression in the **Decretum Gelasianum* (7th c.?), which, in the face of all reality, numbers him without ado among the *heretics. Given the vast circulation and enduring use of this text, it is no wonder that in the West, after *Cassiodorus, Clement's writings remained practically unused. In the East he was particularly harmed by the condemnation of *Photius, who, conditioned by a certain rigidity and incapacity to think historically, compared the terminology used by Clement and by the 2nd-3rd c. with that of his own period, and thought he could accuse him of *christological heterodoxy. Because of Photius's vast influence, his judgment of Clement's works had a big following, producing a negative effect lasting to our time; so it is no surprise if Clement has been largely forgotten in the East, from Photius on. He did Clement little justice by placing him in his own time and evaluating him only on the basis of attempts to solve problems of that time.

II. Works. Among Clement's surviving works, three (the *Protrepticus,* the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*) excel and seem to form a trilogy aimed at clearly explaining the gradual way toward perfection. But this is not the case: in fact the first two, the *Protrepticus* and the *Paedagogus,* are so very different in content from the redaction of the *Stromata* that the theory of a trilogy only barely stands, and thus this opinion cannot be maintained. The first two were written for the publishing market and for the public, while the *Stromata* was written to illustrate the activity of the school. The "trilogy" theory originated from the fact that Pier Vittori (Latinized to *Petrus Victorius*), publishing the *editio princeps* in 1550, casually changed the usual order of the works (that of Eusebius and *Jerome) to that of *Protrepticus, Paedagogus, Stromata*. This order was followed by Franz Overbeck in his essay *Anfänge des Christentums* as a tripartite mystical way of perfection, which in practice still continues to condition our judgment of Clement. Considered closely, the *Protrepticus* is presented, like *Aristotle's lost work of the same name, in the form of a proclamation addressed to educated persons with an interest in Christianity, seen as the true way of life, rather as Aristotle had done for *philosophy in his *Protrepticus*. The three books of the *Paedagogus* are a manual aiming to consolidate, broaden and deepen the benefit of faith imparted in baptismal teaching, also addressed to the highly educated. The *Stromata,* however, must be seen as a work to be used privately for expositions of the work of pedagogy. Clement starts from the rhetorical *topos* of support for his weak memory; the arguments, repropounded, could serve as pioneering models to initiate a similar didactic experience elsewhere. And

yet, through the philosophical arguments discussed, the *Capitula* present the true solution of the problems in a Christian perspective. No wonder we find so few, or only passing, references to the institutions and *sacraments of the church, though the basic ultimate purpose of the treatment remains true Christianity. While the intention is a description of the Christian ideal, presented in *Stoic terms, Clement emerges from the work as the great missionary to the rich and intellectual, who speaks their language.

The other book worth mentioning, the *Excerpta ex Theodoto,* shows another, even more marked, side of Clement: his skill in dialogue. Since, as far as we can conjecture, the primitive mission to *Egypt was probably from the start actuated by *Jewish Christian missionaries from Palestine, the *gnostic model of Christianity too was soon preached and, in Clement's time, many intellectuals not content with the simple faith of common Christians sought here the solution to their problems. Clement took up the problems of the gnostics, making *excerpta* from the *Valentinian *Theodotus with the intention of providing a way toward *orthodox faith. Argument and reply are so closely coupled here that it is often hard to tell what is Clement's and what is Theodotus's. The same method is used on the *Eclogae Propheticae,* in which Clement brings together proto-Christian speculations of the subapostolic period on the first chapters of Genesis and on many passages from the Prophets. Clement fits them into *Hellenistic models as an aid to seekers of truth who are not content with a simple ethic. The homily *Quis dives salvetur?* is composed differently. Clement answers the doubts and questions posed for the rich by Mk 10:17-31. He maintains that true poverty is to be free from rigid attachment to money and possessions and is aimed at inner freedom. As for Clement's lost writings, we should mention the *Hypotyposeis,* of which, besides citations by other authors, we have one longer extract in a *Latin translation from Cassiodorus's scriptorium (ca. 540), titled *Adumbrationes.* These were brief interpretations of all of Scripture in the form of **scholia,* of the type used for contemporary Homeric exegesis. A single fragment of the *Canon ecclesiasticus* is preserved by Eusebius (*HE* 6, 13, 3). Other works mentioned by Eusebius have not been preserved. *Anastasius the Sinaite cites a *De providentia,* but the attribution remains dubious. No letters were known until 1973, when M. Smith published a recently discovered document, which must be considered a letter by Clement, in which he mentions a secret and apocryphal gospel of Mark, accepted by deeply orthodox Christian circles as authentic and adhered to by Clement himself. But as the *Carpocratians, a gnostic sect, interpreted it in their own way, Clement opposed their interpretation. Of particular interest is the story of the young man raised from the dead, which could derive from a tradition circulating at the time and must have been a free redaction, predating Jn 11, of the raising of Lazarus. From this it is evident that Clement represents a wider view of canonicity than our own, and that everything concerning the life and teaching of the Redeemer was important to him. We should note that the citations in his writings reveal a vast knowledge of earlier Christian literature, as well as of Hellenistic Jewish literature, where his main source is *Philo of Alexandria. But his knowledge of secular literature is also surprising. We know various works solely through his citations; of others we know only the title, and that also through him. Manuals and school writings that he drew upon have been suggested; this may be so, but we must not forget that a master in the art of citations and in literature, as Clement was, gave his information a personal tone, and the consultation of a manual would offer him new stimuli and incentives.

III. Doctrine. For the NT, Clement uses the primitive Alexandrian text. Like other types of text this is relatively free from additions and open to different interpretative possibilities, but also faithful and good. This has led to its being seen as a prototype of the so-called Western text, whose origin must be placed much later. We must not forget the technique of the citations in Clement, who magisterially perfects the old Hellenistic practice in etymology and the use of words. Of his high esteem for Greek philosophy as a way to Christ we find many citations, a good half of them from *Plato, the other half from Jesus's words in the NT, which give the passages cited from Plato their full meaning. Since for Clement Greek philosophy, dependent on the oldest and greatest wisdom of humankind, is a precious good, it has a function similar to the OT. Some suggestions, such as thefts of the Greeks or the mediation of demons as the origin of philosophy, come from the arsenal of *apologetic and polemic and are therefore mentioned, but they are not in harmony with his specific ideas. In any case the ascending line of his search for truth starts from the primordial wells of human thought on philosophy, and still more from the OT, and ends with the apostles, and above all with Christ. The principles of his thought, like his critical discussion of it, come mainly from Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, and from that form of Platonism which included the *Middle Platonism of the school tending to *Neoplatonism, and finally

from his dialogue with gnosticism. All this was under the guidance and light of Christian faith, the penetration of which was his ultimate aim. Considered in this light, we understand better his continuity with the earlier Christian tradition, more influenced by Semitism, which he knew well and transformed for the benefit of the Greeks. The case is different for traditions merely reported: e.g., comparing Justin's *trinitarian doctrine with that of Clement, we find nothing new, something hardly surprising in an ante-*Nicene writer. His great central figure is Christ, whom he, in Greek, appropriately calls *Logos*. Christ is at the center of the Clementine reflections as humankind's great teacher and redeemer. The Christian must become like him: this is expounded with the help of the Stoic ideal of wisdom and with the use of Platonic and gnostic reasoning, from which he shows the often-wearisome way that, together with the eternal High Priest, leads us, though numerous gradations in this life and in the midst of the angelic ranks in the next, to the throne of God. Other opinions of his—on Adam's sin, on penitence, and on the problem of marriage and virginity, which he subordinates to marriage—become comprehensible only in the context of his polemic against gnosticism. Considered in its entirety, his doctrine is a spur to Christian faith, in which the stress is put on continuity, even if the conditions are changed. Thus Clement may be called a theologian of *tradition more than of *Scripture, and one who puts particular stress on the solution of current problems and consequently a great ethicist.

PG 8-9; O. Stählin, GCS 12 (1905; ^{2}1939; with U. Treu, ^{3}1972); 15 (1906; ^{2}1939; 3rd. ed. with L. Früchtel, GCS 52, 1960; 4th ed. with U. Treu, GCS 52, 1985); 17 (1909; L. Früchtel - U. Treu, ^{2}1970); 39/1-2 (Indexes 1934-1936; 2nd ed. only the index of citations 39/1, 1980, U. Treu). Tr.: Eng.: ANL 4, 12, 22, 24; Fr.: SC 2, 70, 108, 258, 30, 38, 278-279 (*Strom.* 5), 23 (*Exc. Th.*); It.: Turin 1971 (*Prot. e Pedagogo*); Ger.: BKV^{2} 7, 8, 17, 19, 20. E. de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1896; Cl. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Écriture*, Paris 1944; A. Knauber, *Katechetenschule oder Schulkatechumenat*: TTZ 60 (1951) 213-266; W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Klemens von Alexandrien*, Berlin 1952; E.F. Osborn, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*, Cambridge 1957; A. Méhat, *Étude sur les Stromates de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1966; J. Quasten, *Patrologia*, Turin 1967, I, 287-314; J.P. Broudéhoux, *Mariage et famille chez Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1970; A. Knauber, *Die patrologische Schätzung des Clemens von Alexandrien bis zu seinem neuerlichen Bekanntwerden durch den ersten Druckeditionem des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Festschr. J. Quasten I, Münster 1970, 289-308; M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, Bari 1970; S.R.C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971; A Brontesi, *La soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*, Rome 1972; L.F. Ladaría, *El Espíritu en Clemente de Alejandría*, Madrid 1980; S.R.C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study of Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, London 1976; G. Apostolopoulou, *Die Dialektik bei Klemens von Alexandria. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philosophischen Methoden*, Bern 1977; E.A. Clark, *Clement's Use of Aristotle: The Aristotelian Contribution to Clement of Alexandria's Refutation of Gnosticism*, New York 1977; R. Hoffmann, *Geschichte und Praxis. Ihre prinzipielle Begründung durch Klemens von Alexandrien. Ein Beitrag zum spätantiken Platonismus*, Munich 1979; A.K. Koffas, *Die Sophia-Lehre bei Klemens von Alexandrien—eine pädagogisch-anthropologische Untersuchung*, Frankfurt/M. 1982; D. Wyrwa, *Die christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, Berlin - New York 1983; C. Nardi, *Il battesimo in Clemente Alessandrino. Interpretazione di Eclogae propheticae I-26*, Rome 1984; H. Köhler, *Erkenntnis im Glauben. Der Beitrag des Clemens Alexandrinus zur Theorie der Glaubenserkenntnis und Lehrentwicklung*, Munich 1984-85; H. Blair, *The Kaleidoscope of Truth: Types and Archetypes in Clement of Alexandria*, Worthing 1986; M. Galloni, *Cultura, evangelizzazione e fede nel "Protrettico" di Clemente Alessandrino*, Rome 1986; Ch. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Klemens von Alexandrien*, Berlin 1987; A. van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis: An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*, Leiden 1988; P. Impara, *Gli Stromateis di Clemente Alessandrino ed il pensiero greco*, Rome 1989; E. Mascellani, *Prudens dispensator verbi: Romani 5,12-21 nell'esegesi di Clemente Alessandrino e Origene*, Florence 1990; L. Rizzerio, *Clemente di Alessandria e la "physiologa veramente gnostica": saggio sulle origini e le implicazioni di un'epistemologia e di un'ontologia "cristiane,"* Louvain 1996; L. Rizzerio, *L'accès à la transcendance divine selon Clément d'Alexandrie: dialectique platonicienne ou expérience de l'"union chrétienne"?*: REAug 44 (2) (1998) 159-179; D.K. Buell, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy*, Princeton 1999; U. Schneider, *Theologie als christliche Philosophie: zur Bedeutung der biblischen Botschaft im Denken des Clemens von Alexandria*, Berlin - New York 1999; M.J. Edwards, *Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos*: VChr 54 (2) (2000) 159-177; J.J. Sanguineti, *La antropología educativa de Clemente Alejandrino. El giro del paganismo al cristianismo*, Pamplona 2003.

M. Mees

CLEMENT of Rome, Letters of. Composed probably ca. AD 96–98, just after *Domitian's persecution, the letter of the *Roman community to that of Corinth, unanimously ascribed to Clement of Rome, was well known in the ancient church. *Hegesippus (Eusebius, *HE* III,16; IV,22,1) and *Irenaeus (*A.H.* III,3,3) mention it, and it was still read in Corinthian liturgical assemblies ca. 170 (see Dionysius of Corinth's letter to Soter: Euseb., *HE* IV,23,11). According to *Origen, who cites *I Clem.* 20,8 in *De princ.* II,3,6, the author is to be identified with the Clement mentioned as *Paul's collaborator in Phil 4:3 (*Com. Ioh.* VI,36). *Eusebius adds that Clement was bishop of the church of Rome for nine years, from 92–100 (*HE* III,4,9; 15; 34). Clement's letter to the Corinthians is a document of prime importance for our knowledge of late-1st-c. Roman *theology and *liturgy (chs. 59-61) and had a vast circulation in Christian antiquity, as the MS tradi-

tion attests. The text survives in six codices, three of them biblical, in four languages: the Greek codex Alexandrinus (5th c.), a *Coptic papyrus codex (5th-7th c.), a Syriac codex from *Edessa (1170); the Greek codex Hierosol. 54 (1056), a Coptic codex in Berlin (4th-5th c.) and an 11th-c. Latin MS. The letter reveals a strong awareness of the right possessed even then by the Church of Rome, thanks to the example of the *apostles *Peter and Paul (ch. 5), to intervene in the internal affairs of another community (i.e., Corinth), in this case to reconcile the split caused by the dismissal of some *presbyters by one or two proud agitators.

The whole document aims to recall the Corinthian community to the values of *eirēnē* and *homonoia* (63,2), through the practice of humility and obedience. Not without reason is Christ presented as the model of humility (ch. 16) and therefore as the only way of salvation (ch. 36). In this way the author wants to lead those who had carelessly and wrongfully revolted against the legitimate authority of the presbyters, founded on the tradition of the apostles, to *penitence and acknowledgment of their faults (chs. 1–3 and 40–58). To this end the first part of the letter (chs. 4-39) is interwoven with admonitory OT passages intended to demonstrate the nefarious effects of envy and hatred on human history, and the good effects of the spirit of humility and peace. There are also examples taken from the harmony of the cosmos (chs. 19,2–20,12), the structure of the army (ch. 37,1-4), the human body (ch. 37,5–38) and the Levitical hierarchy (chs. 40–41), as models of the interconnected, harmonious unity that must inspire Christ's body, the church. It should be noted that in 40,5 the technical term *laïkos anthrōpos* is used for the first time in Christian literature, to distinguish the people in general from the sacred order of priests and Levites. The author demonstrates an excellent knowledge not only of the OT and Jewish traditions but also of *Hellenistic culture, with a decidedly *Stoic emphasis: with literary skill he uses the devices of ancient rhetoric, though he puts them in a context of wider paraenetic-homiletic structures not unknown to the preaching of the Hellenistic Jewish synogogue, and sometimes has recourse to examples from mythology, such as Danaus and Dirce (ch. 6,2) or the Arabian phoenix (ch. 25).

It is unclear whether the Corinthian conflict was caused by any strictly doctrinal rather than disciplinary factors; but Clement's words against doubts about the *resurrection of the body (chs. 23–26) and against boasting about *ascetism (38,2; cf. a similar text in Ignatius, *Pol.* 5,2) might lead us to think so. To date it has not been duly recognized that the positions criticized in the letter are exactly the same as those elaborated and introduced into the Corinthian community about fifty years earlier by Apollos of Alexandria. In his correspondence with the Corinthians, St. Paul had criticized Apollos's *Encratite enthusiasm, which linked an absolute asceticism to an already-realized eschaton (marriage is abolished because the *resurrection has already taken place) (for more detail, see my analysis in ANRW II.26.2, 1232-1275). Clement's explicit mention of the earlier conflict at Corinth, which opposed the party of the apostles Paul and Cephas against the party of Apollos, seems to confirm the enduring vitality of Apollos's party at Corinth even in the late 1st c., made worse by the fact that now the antagonists, unlike at Apollos's time, no longer had direct contact with the apostolic generation (ch. 47). In this renewed clash of theological positions, Clement analogically assumes the role played by Peter and Paul against Apollos in the earlier conflict. One can say that Clement's strategy is entirely similar to that adopted by his contemporary Luke. For the latter also, Apollos is merely an underling, approved by Paul and his collaborators (Acts 18:24-28), which nonetheless doesn't keep Luke from harshly attacking the "heretics" who in his time continued to propagate Apollos's teachings (Acts 20:29-35). Indeed, the ideological and literary affinity between Clement and Luke may explain why the letter to the Hebrews was here or there attributed to one or the other (see Clem. Alex., *Hypot.* in Eusebius, *HE* VI, 14,2; Origen, *Hom. Hebr.* in Eusebius, *HE* VI, 25,14; Eusebius, *HE* III, 38,1-2).

Clement's letter thus finds its natural home—along with other contemporary writings such as the Pastoral Epistles, the *Epistle of *Barnabas* and the letters of *Ignatius of Antioch—in the general "proto-Catholic" movement of polemic and intervention against the fringe of ascetic "enthusiasts," rebels against presbyterial-episcopal power. At the same time, nothing of a political nature can be detected in the document. If on one hand the concluding prayer for the authority (ch. 60,4–61) demonstrates the work's basic loyalty to Rome, on the other hand it establishes that obedience to authority must never lead to a contradiction with the higher will of God. A recognition of the divine origin of political authority, expressed with these reservations, cannot be compared with the command of unconditional obedience contained in an interpolated text such as Rom 13:1-7.

A penitential homily of an unknown author, the oldest Christian preaching to have reached us (difficult to date later than the mid-2nd c.), has passed into ecclesiastical literature as the second letter of

Clement (see Euseb., *HE* III, 38,4), simply because it is transcribed after Clement's letter to the Corinthians in three codices (Alexandrian, Hierosol., one Syriac). In fact the homily's unassuming tone and unaffected language reveal an author with no literary aspirations. Its main interest is to recall new converts from idolatry and *paganism so as to show gratitude to Christ for the benefits received by observing the commandments and leading an ascetic life (chs. 3–4 and 15). The author collects and reworks complex theological traditions, such as the theme of carnal purity as a basic baptismal pledge (chs. 6 and 8) or the doctrine of the preexistence of the heavenly church (ch. 14). A point of anti-*Docetist polemic is included (ch. 9). The preacher's strong ascetical tension is also shown from the citation of an *apocryphal logion on the coming of the kingdom and the overcoming of the duality of the sexes (ch. 12), which recurs in Encratite texts such as the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (in Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III, 64,1) and the *Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* (log. 22). Its substantial lack of awareness of Pauline literature leads today to the hypothesis that the homily likely originated in *Syria, though some lean toward *Egypt, others Corinth. In fact the document's date of composition, geographical provenance, literary genre, and ideological orientation are still debated, and it would be tiresome to list all the proposals more or less weak, advanced thus far. Perhaps the only thing that can be asserted with some confidence is the text's "presbyterial" origin (ch. 17,3), which for that time period suggests its location within the "orthodox" or "proto-Catholic" front interested in opposing the growth of radical movements (enthusiastic, Encratite, pre- or protognostic) spreading throughout the eastern Mediterranean basin. This alone would be enough to justify the very early joining of this enigmatic document to Clement's prestigious letter.

At the time of *Epiphanius (see *Pan.* 30,15,2), two letters *Ad virgines* circulated under Clement's name, containing teaching on chastity. They opposed the practice of so-called *Syneisaktentum* and for this reason would seem to go back to the "orthodox" Syrian milieu of the 3rd-4th c.

K. Bihlmeyer - W. Schneemelcher, *Die Apostolischen Väter* I, Tübingen ³1970; A. Jaubert, *Clément de Rome. Epître aux Corinthiens*, SC 167, Paris 1971; K. Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus. Untersuchungen zu I Clemens 1-7*: BHTh 35, Tübingen 1966; D.A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*: SNT 34, Leiden 1973; K.P. Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*: SNT 38, Leiden 1974; Chr. Stegemann, *Herkunft und Entstehung des sogenannten zweiten Klemensbriefes*, Diss. Bonn 1974; P.F. Beatrice, *Continenza e matrimonio nel cristianesimo primitivo (sec. I-II)*: Etica sessuale e matrimonio nel cristianesimo delle origini (SPMed 5), Milan 1976, 3-68; Ph. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter*, Berlin - New York ²1978, 529-540, 737-744; E. Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch. Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus*, Münster i.W. 1979, 77-98, 231-236; A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion* (BHTh 58), Tübingen 1979, 72-82, 177-199, 263-272; D. Powell, *Clemens von Rom*: TRE 8 (1981) 113-120; Id., *Clemensbrief, Zweiter*: TRE 8 (1981) 121-123; K. Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (Schriften des Urchristentums 2), Munich 1984, 203-280; Ph. Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas* (Paradosis 33), Fribourg/ Swiss 1992; P.F. Beatrice, *L'eredità delle origini. Saggi sul cristianesimo primitivo*, Genoa 1992, 67-123; 227-286; A. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1992; O.B. Knoch, *Im Namen des Petrus und Paulus: Der Brief des Clemens Romanus und die Eigenart des römischen Christentums*: ANRW II.27.1, Berlin - New York 1992, 3-54; A.W. Ziegler - G. Brunner, *Die Frage nach einer politischen Absicht des Ersten Klemensbriefes*: ibid., 55-76; E. Baasland, *Der 2. Klemensbrief und frühchristliche Rhetorik: "Die erste christliche Predigt" im Lichte der neueren Forschung*: ibid., 78-157 (bibl.); G. Schneider, *Clemens von Rom. Epistola ad Corinthios. Brief an die Korinther* (FCh 15), Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1994; P.F. Beatrice, *Apollos of Alexandria and the Origins of the Jewish-Christian Baptist Encratism*: ANRW II.26.2, Berlin - New York 1995, 1232-1275; H.E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (KAV 2), Göttingen 1998.

P.F. Beatrice

CLEMENTINES (pseudo). The Pseudo-Clementines exist in two versions, the Greek *Homilies* and the Latin *Recognitiones,* both of which refer back to a common source usually called *Grundschrift* (G). One explanation, going back to J. Hilgenfeld (1848), is that the *Recognitiones* and *Homilies* are the independent creations of different authors with differing objectives, both departing from a source that is the work of one author (G), with the *Recognitiones* seeming to be closer to the original. Others see G as a *Jewish Christian work, written in *Syria in the 3rd c. and composed of various sources: (1) the account of the recognition; (2) missionary sermons of *Peter, or rather *Kerygmata Petrou*; (3) accounts of Peter's meetings with Simon; (4) Peter's dialogues with Apion; (5) a history of God's people from Abraham to the earliest days of the church, the work of an anti-Pauline Jewish Christian from ca. 200, taken up by *Rec.* I, 27-71, but identified with the *Ascension of James,* known by *Epiphanius. This latter work, from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. and the source of *Rec.* I, 33-71, attempts to discern a true path between two false ones. G, the work of a sectarian Jewish Christian, would have been written in Celesyria in the mid-3rd c. Its first elaboration, that of the *Homilies,* would correspond to the early 4th c., before *Nicaea. That of the *Recognitiones,* more autonomous from G,

could be the work of a Catholic (interpolated in his *trinitarian doctrine by a *Eunomian) of Celesyria or *Palestine, ca. 350.

The doctrine of the true prophet is the nucleus of the so-called *Preachings of Peter* against *Simon Magus. This doctrine is already referred to in the *Letter* of Peter to *James of Jerusalem. The preachings were sent to James by *Clement, who had accompanied Peter in his travels and was ordained bishop of *Rome by the *apostle himself, who was near death. Together with Peter's letter, Clement's *Letter* to James constitutes the introduction to the *Homilies,* which expounds how Scripture must be used for its adequate interpretation (Drijvers, 314)—the sole objective of the doctrine of the true Prophet. God gives the Spirit of Christ to Adam, who was thus in fact identical to Christ, the true Prophet. From the beginning of the world, humanity receives a continual prophecy, which reveals itself in various forms and under other names besides Adam and Christ, including, prominently, Moses (Drijvers, 315). But false prophecy always appears before the true. This doctrine is the author's antiheretical construction to refute the *Marcionism prevalent in Syria (Drijvers, 318). The author of G offers some explanations to reconcile the apparent contradictions in Scripture regarding the existence of opposites in creation, which both true and false prophecies attest. The fulfillment of false doctrine is predicted and foreknown by God, but people must recognize the right way based on a correct use of Scripture, so as to distinguish true doctrine from false and to follow a right interpretation (Drijvers, 320). The two letters are the introduction most appropriate to G as an anti-Marcionite treatise. G was probably called the *Periodoi Petrou* (Origen, *Philoc*. 23). The same title is given by *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 30,15.1-3), who mistakenly considers it an *Ebionite work. It therefore seems unlikely that a work titled *Kerygma Petrou,* identifiable as the source of G (*Periodoi Petrou*), would have had an autonomous existence. Its author is representative of this center of Syrian Christianity, characterized not so much by that notable mixture of Jewish traditions and Christian doctrine, as by its continual clash with the *Marcionites and other gnostic groups over cosmological and philosophical questions (Drijvers, 321). Nor is it anomalous that the author made ample use of *Bardesanes of Edessa's *Dialogue on Fate* or *Book of the Laws of the Countries,* of which it offers an ample citation in *Rec*. 9,19-29—*Eusebius (*HE* IV, 30) knew Bardesanes as a writer of anti-Marcionite dialogues (Drijvers, 322-323). The author must have written his anti-Marcionite book between 220 (Bardesanes died in 222) and 253 (death of Origen), a period in which Marcionism represented a real threat to nascent Syrian *orthodoxy. The identity between Adam and Christ, creation as composed of opposites (G attributes evil to the combination of four elements in a substance), and the doctrines of false prophecy and the spurious biblical texts were all used as ammunition in this battle, in which biblical interpretation was the central question (Drijvers, 323).

In the *Recognitiones,* Clement, of a distinguished Roman family, is separated from his parents and brothers. As a youth he is interested in religious questions and finds the teaching of the philosophers insufficient. Learning of the manifestation of the Son of God in Judea, he travels there and stays with Peter, who instructs him and takes him on his missions as a fellow worker. Peter works as a missionary, preacher and apologist; particularly important is his opposition to Simon Magus. At the end, Clement's whole family is reunited.

These *recognitiones* and other traits put the Clementines in the same class as the secular romances of the time. But their objective, at least in the original source, seems to have been apologetic, i.e., to transmit Christian doctrine systematically. This sets them apart from the apocryphal acts of the apostles, which are essentially adventure narratives.

The common theory is that the Clementines go back to a basic source, and some maintain that this in turn is based on two other works: *Kerygmata Petr*. and *Praxeis Petr.,* the first of which is clearly Ebionite and anti-Pauline (H. Waitz). Strecker and Schoeps base their theology and history of Jewish Christianity on an analysis of the Clementines' sources, as reconstructed by Waitz. Rius-Camps supposes that the original consisted of some "Journeys of Peter" (*Periodoi Petr.*), which he attributes to a disciple of Bardesanes. Then follows the basic line of Rehm, who thinks that the basic work dealt with Clement's journeys and recognitions and that its author composed it along the rationalist lines of the apologists, between Bardesanes and Origen. Its spiritual ambience is indeed that of the rationalism of the time of the *apologists. Justice on earth is a guarantee for the last *judgment. Living reasonably is demanded. Faith plays only a subordinate role. Jesus' death matters little from the religious point of view. Of more interest is the true prophet, guaranteed by the fulfillment of his predictions. According to Irmscher, the basic work (Syria, 1st half of the 3rd c.), which could not have circulated widely, was first reworked by the homilist, who had both ethical and metaphysical interests. His doctrine of "syzygies" (pairs of opposites in history, leading up to the being of God) is the cause of the opposition between Peter and Simon

Magus. His critical attitude to the OT is obvious. Only the *Homilies* truly frame the Peter/Simon motif in a dualistic structure: the rule of the syzygies, according to which Peter's action always follows that of Simon, as light succeeds darkness. The *Recognitions,* on the other hand, propose a doctrine of likeness (Côté 263). Simon seeks to pass off his rival Peter as what he himself is: a magician. Using *ars dialectica,* Peter defends himself as a philosopher. This is a rationalization of the antagonistic relation between *magic and *miracle, between good and evil (Côté 264). Peter, the leading disciple, and Simon, the leading heretic, clash, and carry out their argument as would the philosophers of the imperial era, around the accusation of magic (Côté 265). The two figures propose two opposite types of relation with Greek culture: Simon the Samaritan is the Hellenized barbarian (Côté 270-271); Peter the Jew is the barbarian who resists *Hellenization; rejects the claims of myth, magic and *philosophy; performs miracles invoking the one God; and defends the thesis of prophetic truth. The claims of philosophy are rejected so as to preserve its methods, while the methods of magic are rejected so as to imitate its efficacy (Côté 272). The Clementine corpus constitutes one of the most reliable documents for reconstructing the history of the relations between Hellenism and Jewish Christianity and for the study of cases of indirect Hellenization, such as that which presents the Clementine use of literary forms and themes, drawn from romance and from philosophy (Côté, 272).

In the Clement of the *Recognitions* a process of education is developed, under Peter's guidance, from the untrained *catechumen to the advanced disciple and apostle, who, as Peter's successor in the apostolic office, does not deny a pagan past and education but like his brother uses it for Christian purposes. The *Recognitions* thus not only remain within the tradition of the ancient educational romance but are also closer to the postulated *Grundschrift* than are the *Homilies*. The idea of evolution is present in the *Homilies* only rudimentarily: Clement the homelist did not receive an education from Peter; nonetheless, though the preachings and the doctrinally edifying discussions are missing, in his early youth he came in contact with Jewish Christianity, to the extant that the resulting education and his conversion remain fundamental presuppositions and can assume a guiding role, after his encounter with Peter, in his dispute with *Apion. The idea of development is therefore present only at the beginning but disappears completely by the end of the account (Vielberg 193).

Here we have two creations by two authors of a version of the romance composed by a single author. This confirms a thesis of J. Hilgenfeld (1848), which gave priority to the *Recognitions*. What we possess are two independent versions, each with different objectives (Vielberg 193-194).

The *Clem. Hom.* would have remained forgotten if they had not been appropriated by the *Ebionites, who made interpolations and added *1 Clem*., the *Ep. Pet.* and the *Diamartyria,* making the whole work expound a secret tradition, Petrine and anti-Pauline. This heretical falsification of the homilies may have provoked the composition of the *Clem. Recogn.* (which presuppose both the basic work and the homilies). The author seeks in every way to free them from whatever is contrary to the *dogma of the Great Church, leaving intact the prominence of Peter and James, of Ebionite origin. Its theology is that of the Jewish Christians, probably of Syria, where the pseudo-Clementine literature developed; this is exemplified in its conception of *baptism, which is not to take away Adam's sin but to dampen the fires of concupiscence. The person born of carnal desire is born of corruption, which is why a second birth, regeneration, is necessary (cf. Jn 3:5; *Hom.* XI, 26; *Rec.* VI, 9; IX, 7).

The date of composition seems earlier than *Const. Apost.* (Syria, ca. 360–380). In the third stage of the heretical interpolations, followers of the neo-*Arian *Eunomius made room, in the *Recognitiones,* for their idea of the *Trinity (III, 2-11). In the Great Church the work began to be considered suspect, and it eventually disappeared. In the West, it was preserved in a translation by *Rufinus, who sought to free it from all additions; but a later translator filled in Rufinus's gaps on the basis of the Greek document. Both the *Hom.* and the *Recogn*. were quickly translated into *Syriac. Two Greek *Compendia* (summaries of the doctrinal discussions, which improve the narrative) also survive. There is also an Arabic compendium and some Clementine fragments in Ethiopic.

PG 2, 19-646; PG I, 1157-1474; B. Rehm - J. Irmscher - F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen, I. Homilien*, GCS 42, Berlin 1969; B. Rehm - F. Paschke, *II. Recognitiones*, GCS 51, Berlin 1965; H. Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen Homilien und Rekognitionen*, Leipzig 1904; O. Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire et historique du roman Ps. Clémentin*, Paris 1930; B. Rehm, *Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften*: ZNTW 37 (1938) 77-184; H.J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen 1949; G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, Berlin 1950; H.J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis*, Tübingen ²1956; A. Salles, *Le diatribe antipaulinienne dans le roman pseudoclémentin et l'origine des kérygmes de Pierre*: RBi 64 (1957) 516-551; J. Irmscher, *Die Pseudo-Clementinen*, Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 2, 373-398; L.

Cyril, *Le Pseudo-Clementine e il Vangelo di Barnaba della Biblioteca nazionale di Vienna*: Asprenas 18 (1971) 333-369; J. Rius Camps, *Las Pseudo-Clementinas. Bases filológicas para una nueva interpretación*: Rev. Catalana Teol. 1 (1976) 79-158; LACL 155-157 (with bibl.).

R. Trevijano

CLEOMENES. A *heretic, he represented the *patripassian doctrine at *Rome, where he opened a school in the early 3rd c. According to the *Philosophumena,* our only source, he was a disciple of *Epigonus and had great success, partly thanks to the support of *Zephyrinus and esp. of *Callistus (*Philos*. IX, 7; IX, 11,2).

E. Prinzivalli

CLERGY

I. The term - II. Choice and requirements.

I. The term. In classical Greek and in the LXX, clergy (*clerus*, κλῆρος) means destiny, drawing of lots, the piece of land assigned by lot and hence heredity. *Philo adds a religious nuance: God is the *clerus* ("portion") of the believer and the Levite, and at the same time the believer is God's *clerus*. Matthias was chosen by the primitive community to replace Judas, by drawing lots (Acts 1:26); in the NT the term means not just the drawing of lots but also the portion allotted, which often has an eschatological significance (Acts 1:17; 8:21; 26:18; Col 1:12).

In the early Christian community, those with a ministry of direction were called by the collective term *clerus,* a loan translation from the Greek, to distinguish them from *laicus*. This terminology was in use by the start of the 3rd c. in both East and West (Clem. Alex., *Quis dives* 42; Orig., *Hom. 11,3 in Jer*.; *Exp. in Prov*. 26,17; Tertull., *De exhort. cast.* 7) and became common usage (Cypr., *Ep*. 45,2; *De unit. ecc*, 17; Anon., *De rebat.* 12; *De sing. clericorum*; Ambr., *Ep*. 18,14; *Const. Apost*. VI, 17,3; Counc. Ancyr. [314], can. 3; etc.). From *clerus* is derived the adjective *clericatus,* sometimes also used as a noun to indicate members of the clergy (Jerome, *Ep*. 60,10). In the CTh from 313 it is usual to designate the ministers of the Christian religion by the term *clerici qui divino cultui ministeria impendunt* (CTh 16, 2,2). Nevertheless, for the concession or revocation of privileges, in many laws the imperial authorities had to specify who belonged to the clergy. As far as Christian practice was concerned, one became a cleric by ordination or some other rite of installation, since it was *clerici omnes qui in ecclesiastici ministerii gradibus ordinati sunt* (Isid., *Ecc. off.* 2, 1).

The clergy are distinguished from the laity not because of their state of life but because their sacred function in the service of the people; a whole *ecclesiology underlies this distinction. *Augustine explained the term *clergy* by deriving it from the episode of the choosing of Matthias: *cleros et clericos hinc appellatos credimus*, *quia Matthias sorte electus est*, *quem primum per apostolos legimus ordinatum*, κλῆρος *cum graece*, *sors vel haereditas dicitur* (*Enarr. in Ps*. 67,19). This explanation did not catch on, whereas that proposed by *Jerome, which went back to Philo, was very popular in subsequent *theology and spirituality: "Clerics are so called either because they are the Lord's portion, or because the Lord is their portion" (*Ep*. 52,5 *ad Nepot*.). "In an age-old tradition, impressive in its unity, the idea of being the Lord's portion and of possessing him as one's portion has remained as the heart of the clerical state" (Congar 24-25).

In the Middle Ages, when monks, who in antiquity had been laymen, received the priesthood, people tended to speak of two kinds of Christians: one, the clergy, composed of monks and those assigned to worship; and the other, composed of laypeople (*Decr. Gratiani* C. 7 C. XII, q. 1). By the 4th c. the clergy were divided into two categories: *clerici inferioris ordinis* and *primi clerici* or *superioris ordinis* (bishops, priests and deacons [*Diakonia - Diaconate]). But it is not always clear which categories belonged to the clergy. In the West, *Isidore (6th c.) considered doorkeepers, psalmists, readers, exorcists, acolytes, *subdeacons, deacons, *presbyters and bishops to be members of the clergy. At first, entry into the clergy was by ordination, but in the early Middle Ages the rite of tonsure arose *ad clericum faciendum* (J. Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien*, Fribourg 1971, I, 417).

GLNT 5, 583-601; TLL 3, 1339ff.; Y.M.-J. Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*, Paris 1954; L. Hardick, *Gedanken zu Sinn und Tragweite des Begriffs clerici*: Arch. Franc. Hist. 10 (1957) 7-26; R. Gryson, *Les degrés du clergé et leurs dénominations chez saint Ambroise de Milan*: RBen 76 (1966) 119-127; A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hiérarchie*, Paris 1977; C. Tagliavini, *Storia di parole pagane e cristiane attraverso i tempi*, Brescia 1963; D. Powell, *Ordo Presbyterii*: JTS 26 (1975) 290-328; P. Iovino, *Valenza comunitaria del termine kleros nella S. Scrittura*, in *Laici-chierici: dualismo ecclesiologico?*, Palermo 1986, 116-123; É. Paoli, *Clericus dans l'œuvre d'Augustin: aspects philologiques et contexte historique*: Euphrosyne 20 (1992) 323-334; R. Seagraves, *Pascentes cum disciplina: A Lexical Study of the Clergy in the Cyprianic Correspondence*, Fribourg 1993; G. Schöllgen, *Die Anfänge der Professionalisierung des Klerus und das kirchliche Amt in der Syrischen Didaskalie*, Münster 1998; A. Faivre, *Clerus*: AugL 1, 1011-1020.

II. Choice and requirements. The basis of the bishop's authority was the conviction that he was chosen by God; but in practice he was designated by the community, though sometimes the elect was *invitus*. Procedure varied in the course of the first centuries. The **Didache* prescribes: "Elect yourselves bishops . . . worthy of the Lord" (ch. 15). The **Apostolic Tradition* is more specific: "Let him be ordained bishop who has been chosen by all the people; the chosen person's name shall be declared and, if it meets unanimous approval, etc." (ch. 2). *Cyprian is still clearer: "Divine tradition and apostolic practice must be carefully respected—tradition and practice found also among us in almost every province. That is, so as to proceed according to the law of ordination, the nearest bishops belonging to the same province must take a hand in the community in which the election is taking place. The bishop must be chosen in the presence of the people. The people truly know the life of each one and, living together, will be able to evaluate his conduct" (*Ep.* 67,5,1). Though clear, this text does not specify the role of the three participating groups: people, clergy and neighboring bishops. We have no more precise information for the 3rd c. Often the most wealthy and influential women favored one candidate or another (see Jerome, *Comm. in Tess.* 3,3).

During the 4th c., complex ecclesiastical and civil legislation was worked out, but it was only partially applied, since from the many documentable cases we can deduce a very diverse practice; yet nonobservance of the rules of election and ordination often caused disputes and conflicts. The presence of the people was always required: "He who must be in charge of everyone must be elected by everyone" (Leo Gt., *Ep.* 10, 6: PL 54, 634). In the West, at least theoretically, the people's participation was required even afterward (see *Statuta ecc. ant.*, ed. Munier, prologue). But the *metropolitan sought to play a central role at the expense of the other groups (see Leo Gt., *Ep.* 10, 4; 14, 15). He wanted to exclude the turbulent and rowdy masses (Council of *Laodicea, can. 13), who often imposed their own candidate. In the East too, the metropolitan's role was stressed; perhaps by the 5th c., he chose one of the candidates presented by the clergy, the *decuriones* and the important citizens (CJ I, 3, 41). The Second Council of *Nicaea (787) reserved election to the bishops alone (can. 3), a rule that became definitive in the East.

While popular participation could be a valid guarantee of the dignity of the person chosen, it was often the cause of struggles, divisions and abuses both within the community and among the aspirants, so that, as *Jerome observed, the least designing and most worthy were excluded (*Adv. Iovin.* 1, 34; cf. Aug., *Ep.* 213, 1; John Chrys., *De sacerd.* 3, 15). While the people's role was being reduced, the importance of the emperor's was growing. He had an interest in the choice of bishops because of their civic importance, as substitutes for the state authorities and guarantees of their subjects' loyalty. The manner of imperial intervention, never codified, could take different expressions: designating a candidate, ratifying an election already held, transferring or choosing between different candidates. Ideologically, this was in line with the old Roman idea of authority, which conceived of no other power than that of the state.

The bishop-elect did not necessarily have to belong to the city's clergy, but he had to be known to them; even laymen could be elected, but from the 4th c. legislation favored a choice from among the clergy according to the Council of *Serdica (can. 10), which prescribed that he must be a lector, deacon or presbyter; *Leo the Great also required a *cursus,* as a guarantee of his preparation. Meanwhile the practice of ordaining hermits or monks—a category not then belonging to the clergy—increased, in the hope that they had more preparation and, particularly, that they practiced continence. Monks aspired to the priesthood, seeing it as a means of social advancement. It was the bishop who chose all the other members of the clergy, though he took advice from others, esp. the presbyters: "When it comes to ordaining clerics, we are accustomed to consulting you before their ordination and examining each one's morals and merits in a public assembly" (Cypr., *Ep* 38, 1; cf. Orig., *In Matth.* 16, 21-22; *Didasc. apost.* 2, 34). The people also intervened in the nomination of presbyters, but probably not always. At times presbyters were ordained by urgent popular demand, as with Cyprian, *Ambrose, *Paulinus of Nola, *Augustine, Jerome's brother *Paulinianus and *Nepotianus. The growing difficulty of recruiting people specifically prepared for the ministry led to the idea of preparing future cadres, as suggested by Pope *Siricius (*Ep.* 1,9: PL 13, 1142-1143) and done by some great spirits, e.g., *Eusebius of Vercelli and Augustine. The Pastoral Epistles give indications, esp. moral ones, for the choice of a good bishop or a "deacon" (1 Tim 3:2-13; Tit 1:6). A neophyte or a twice-married man could not be a bishop (1 Tim 3:2, 6) and, by the 3rd c., those who had done public penitence or had been voluntarily mutilated or baptized during a grave illness (*clinici*) were ordinarily not admitted, not just to the episcopate, but to the clergy. We know some cases of neophytes who, by popular demand, were ordained bishops: *Ambrose,

*Synesius of Cyrene, *Nectarius of Constantinople. Interdictions, both civil and ecclesiastical, on admission to the clergy became numerous in the 4th c. and greatly limited choice. Professions unacceptable to the church included those involved in entertainment, state officials, soldiers baptized before military service, administrators of others' goods until they had finally accounted for their charge, and slaves and freedmen because they did not enjoy full civil liberty. The state too, for economic reasons, banned certain categories of people from entering the clergy: slaves and *coloni* without the written permission of their *patronus,* butchers and bakers, junior officials of various public services, employees of imperial industries, *curiales,* etc., those who possessed sufficient wealth: "It is right that the rich should assist the needs of the time and the poor should be sustained by the wealth of the church" (CTh 16,2,6; cf. 16,2,3). It was permitted to *clarissimi*, senators—but these were few and it was not always convenient for them—and to those in liberal professions (lawyers, professors) who because of their activities were not always acceptable to the church. That left only the urban artisan class, since in this period Christianity was a predominantly urban phenomenon. But the legislative rules were frequently ignored, as we can deduce from the repetition of similar laws and from the numerous exceptions. The rules which limited entry to the clergy also caused a scarcity of ministers, often lamented by bishops.

To assess the candidate's faith and conduct, genuine examinations (*scrutini*) were introduced so that, in the absence of specialized schools, skill in liturgical practice and familiarity with the bishop and other priests might be acquired. The examination was aimed at ascertaining the qualities needed for belonging to the *militia spiritalis*, rather than at intellectual preparation. It was also insisted that the minor orders be received gradually (*interstitia*) and exercised for a certain period of time, longer or shorter, as preparation for the higher grades and as a test of conduct through each grade (Leo Gt., *Ep*. 12, 4). These arrangements became more elaborate with Popes *Siricius (384–399) and *Zosimus (417–418). But many bishops were inadequately prepared (Greg. Nys., *Oratio* 18,33: PG 35, 1027; *Oratio* 43,25: PG 36, 531). Except in exceptional cases, the clergy were self-taught in religious matters, for which reason rules arose about their secular and religious education (Counc. of *Rome [465], can. 3; *Brev. Hipp*. can. 3, ed. Munier; Counc. of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon [410], can. 26: Mansi 7, 1181; *Statuta ecc. ant*., ed. Munier, prologue), since "frequently by God's judgment and popular vote illiterates are elected; but at least, once ordained priest, they should take care to learn God's law, so that they may teach it and not suffer the shame of learning from laymen" (Jerome, *In Agg*. 2, 11; Aug., *Ep*. 202, 3, 7; Novellae 6, 4 and 123, 12). During the 4th c., legislation, necessarily still variable, arose on the required age for receiving the various orders: 30 years for the priesthood (Council of *Neocaesarea [314/319], can. 11), but we find even bishops who were ordained very young (e.g., Antoninus of Fussala).

J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain* (*IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles*), Paris 1958; P.-P. Joannou, *La législation impériale et la christianisation de l'empire romain* (*311-476*), Rome 1972; R. Gryson, *Les élections ecclésiastiques au III^e^ siècle*: RHE 68 (1973) 353-404 (with bibl.); A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hiérarchie. Les premières étapes du cursus clericalis*, Paris 1974; P.G. Caron, *I poteri giuridici del laico nella chiesa primitiva*, Milan [2]1975; Id., *L'intervention de l'autorité impériale romaine dans l'élection des évêques*: RDC 28 (1978) 76-83; R. Gryson, *Les élections épiscopales en orient au IV^e^ siècle*: RHE 74 (1979) 301-345; J. Gaudemet, *Les élections dans l'Église latine des origines au XVI^e^ siècle*, Paris 1979; E. Hermoso de Mendoza, *La participación de la comunitad cristiana en la elección de los obispos. Siglos I-V*, Pamplona 1977; A.G. Hamman, *La formation du clergé latin, dans les quatre premiers siècles*: SP 20 (1989) 238-249; A. Faivre, *Ordonner la fraternité. Pouvoir d'innover et retour à l'ordre dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1992; E. Dassmann, *Ämter und Dienste in der frühchristlichen Gemeinde*, Bonn 1994; L. Pietri - Y. Duval - Ch. Pietri, *Peuple chrétien et plebs: Le rôle des laïcs dans les élections ecclésiastiques en Occident*, in *Institutions, société et vie politique*, Rome 1992, 373-395, now in *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997, 1059-1081; G. Bausenhart, *Das Amt der Kirche. Eine notwendende Neubestimmung,* Freiburg i. B. 1999; J.St.H. Gibaut, *The Cursus Honorum: A Study of the Origins and the Evaluation of Sequential Ordination*, New York 2000; J.A. Sabw Kanyang, *Episcopus et plebs. L'évêque et la communauté ecclésiale dans les conciles africains* (*345-525*), Bern 2000; A. Kramm, *Amt*: RAC Supp. 1 (2001) 350-401.

A. Di Berardino

CLERICS of VERDUN (5th c.). Three *presbyters (Franco, Paul and Valerian) and a deacon, Sisinno, authors of a letter written in the 2nd half of the 5th c., addressed to Polychronius (or Pulchrone), bishop of an unknown diocese, perhaps Verdun, handed down in a 6th-c. MS (Paris, BN, Lat. 12097, f. [143r]) from the canonical collection of Corbie. Speaking for all the *clerici,* they tell their bishop of the exile to which, like him, they had been subjected, and thank him for his intervention on their behalf; they also tell him that they have found refuge with Castor, perhaps bishop of Chartres, probably the same person who had given asylum to Polychronius; finally, they ask him to come and visit at *Easter, to encourage themselves and their fellow citizens. From the letter it is clear that it was not just individuals who were exiled, but the entire population of the city,

perhaps in consequence of *Frankish expansion toward the S at the time of Chilperic and *Clovis.

CPL 1000: *Epistula "de patria" ad Polochronium*. PLS 3, 831-832 (= ed. Turner 1929). L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 3, Paris 1915, 69-70; C.H. Turner, *Chapters in the History of Latin MSS of Canons. IV. The Corbie Ms (C), now Paris. Lat. 12097*: JTS 30 (1929) 225-236; G. Morin, *Castor et Polychronius. Un épisode peu connu de l'histoire ecclésiastique des Gaules:* RBen 51 (1939) 31-36; R.W. Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul. Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition*, Austin 1993, esp. 64ff.; Patrologia IV, 343.

V. Milazzo

CLERICS, Immunities and Privileges of

I. Fiscal immunity - II. Patrimonial statute - III. Forum privilege.

I. Fiscal immunity. A few months after the *Edict of Milan, *Constantine dispensed all clerics from the *munera* so that they would be able to dedicate themselves entirely to their ecclesiastical obligations (CTh XVI, 2,1: 31 October 313). Suppressed by *Julian, this ordinance was renewed by *Valentinian I and extended further by *Gratian. In 346, another constitution (CTh XVI, 2,10) exempted clerics from land taxes. In 360, this was limited to ecclesiastical goods; this was certainly due to the fact that some laymen, in order to avoid these taxes, entrusted the management of their goods to obliging clerics. This same constitution exempted clerics from the *munera sordida*; but *Theodosius II, in 423, was constrained by the difficulties of the times to require clerics and churches to participate again in the maintenance of bridges and the construction of streets (CTh XV, 3,6 = CI I, 2,7). Finally, in 441, *Valentinian III suspended all fiscal privileges of clerics (*Novella* X).

II. Patrimonial statute. A constitution of *Leo, valid only for the *pars orientalis,* granted clerics the right to conserve as property everything they had acquired from the time of their entrance into orders (CI I, 3,33: AD 472). Thus it was licit for them to alienate their own property to whomever they wished. Nevertheless, canonical legislation strove in many ways to limit this right. From the 4th c. on, *councils in *Africa prohibited clerics from disposing of their goods in favor of non-Catholics (*Epitome of Hippo*, can. 14; *Reg. Carth.* can. 81). Civil legislation of the 5th c. continued along the same lines: a constitution of Theodosius II granted the goods of a cleric who had not left a testament to his church (CTh V, 3,1).

III. Forum privilege. *1. Imperial legislation.* In 355 the Emperor *Constantius, in a constitution (CTh XVI, 2,12), introduced the reservation of forum for bishops who could be judged only by a tribunal established by other bishops. In 378, upon the request of the Roman synod, Emperor *Gratian sent a rescript to the *vicarius* of *Rome, Aquilinus, in which he determined the procedure to be followed in cases in which bishops were accused. In the constitution, he prescribed that in *Italy, beyond local courts of the first instance, there be instituted an ecclesiastical tribunal which would analyze the various questions before presenting them to the bishop of Rome; in the rest of the West he decided that cases involving clerics in the second instance be judged by a tribunal established by the metropolitan. Against this second sentence an appeal was possible either to a college of fifteen bishops or to the pope himself. Finally, the metropolitans were judged by the pope or by his delegate (*Collectio Avellana* 13, 11-12).

The effect of this imperial rescript was that in the entire West the governors of the various cities and the judicial authorities cooperated in such a way as to render effective the sentences of the bishops. Yet the rescript of Gratian did not take up a decision voted for by the synod, according to which the pope was subject only to the council or to the emperor. In the inferior grades of the hierarchy, the regulations of Constantine in favor of the **audientia episcopalis* were sufficient to ensure appearance of clerics accused in a process before the bishop's tribunal (CTh 1, 27, 1: 23 June 318 and *C. Sirm.* 1: AD 333); but parallel to the legislation which limited the *episopale iudicium* (*see Audientia Episcopalis*), some later measures intervened aimed at limiting reservation of the forum. In 384 *Theodosius I granted privilege of forum exclusively for cases pertaining to ecclesiastical matters (*C. Sirm.* III). In the 5th c. *Valentinian III, with the *Novella XXXV*, imposed greater severity in the application of the reservation: the disputing parties were allowed complete freedom to choose their own tribunal, but a preliminary compromise was necessary in order to approach an ecclesiastical tribunal: the judgment was then valid whether the two disputing parties were clerics or laymen. In this way, the possibility of the privilege of forum was excluded, since the will of the prosecutor or defendant to bring his case to the attention of a secular judge prevailed over the opposition of the other side. Further, the law also dealt with cases in which a bishop was accused, excluding the possibility that he refuse to be present in appeal before a state tribunal, but granting the privilege of defending himself through a proxy in cases of serious accusations. In the East, a

constitution of *Marcian reserved to the patriarch of *Constantinople processes against clerics of the city, provided that the one requesting the process accept this arrangement (CI I, 4,13 and I, 3,25: 456 AD).

2. *Canonical and ecclesiastical sources.* The institution of the privilege of forum was an absolute novelty for Roman law, but the practice was already present within the church, though it was limited to matters of faith and to cases in which a bishop had been accused (*Conc. Antiochenum* I [341], can. XV: Mansi II,1313-1315; *Conc. Sardicense* [347], can. V: Mansi III,9-10). The church, in response to ever more restrictive imperial legislation, naturally sought to remind clerics, in the many appeals of the pope and of the most eminent bishops, of their obligations concerning the reservation of forum and forbade them to turn to secular courts (Innocent I, *Ep.* II, 3; Augustine, *Enchiridion* 88, *De opere monachorum* XXIX, 37; Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae fusius tractatae, interrogatio* XLIX). This position was affirmed in many councils. The first certain attestation that deals with the problem of the *episcopale iudicium* is contained in the ninth canon of the Council of *Carthage in 397. The bishops in council decreed that any bishop, priest or deacon, if he should have to be involved in a process, should direct himself without any hesitation to the *iudicium ecclesiasticum*, as was the custom and the obligation for all Christians according to the Pauline precept (*Conc. Carthag.* III, can. IX: Mansi, III, 882). This regulation was confirmed by later councils, although reformulated in a more rigid manner (*Conc. Arel.* [451-452], can. XXXI: Mansi VII,882; *Conc. Venet.* [465], can. IX: Mansi VII,954; *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, can. LXXXVII: CCL 148,171). In the East as well, clerics were forbidden to resort to civil courts (*Conc. Chalced.* IV [451], can. IX: Hfl-Lecl II,2,791-797).

B. Biondi, *Il diritto romano cristiano*, I, Milano 1952, 361-374; L. Ferrari delle Spade, *Le immunità ecclesiastiche nel diritto romano imperiale*: Scritti giuridici III, Milano 1956; C.G. Mor, *Sui poteri civili dei vescovi dal IV al secolo VIII. I poteri temporali dei Vescovi in Italia e in Germania nel Medioevo*: Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico 3 (1979) 7-33; M.R. Cimma, *L'Episcopalis audientia nelle costituzioni imperiali da Costantino a Giustiniano*, Torino 1989, 100-132; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IVe-Ve siècles)*, Paris [2]1989, 172-179, 240-245; F. Marigliano, *I privilegi in favore dei chierici nella legislazione degli imperatori cristiani*, Rome 1991; Storia del Cristianesimo 2, 211-212, 532-533; G.L. Falchi, *La diffusione della legislazione imperiale ecclesiastica nei secoli IV e V*, in *Legislazione imperiale e religione nel IV secolo*, eds. J. Gaudemet - P. Siniscalco - G.L. Falchi, Rome 2000, 151-155; G. Pilara, *Sui tribunali ecclesiastici nel IV e V secolo: ulteriori considerazioni*: StudRom 52/3-4 (2004) 353-378.

G. Pilara

CLINICUS. From the Greek κλίνη ("bed"), κλινικός meant both the skilled doctor and the sick person confined to bed; in Christian language it also came to designate those who were baptized in grave danger of death (see Cypr., *Ep.* 69, 13). Many preferred to put off *baptism, either because they lacked the courage for conversion or because of the severity of *penitence for serious sins (see *De rebaptism.* 4-5; Ambr., *De paen.* II, 11,98ff.; Aug., *Sermo de urb. exc.* 6,7); many inscriptions concern dead neophytes (see Diehl 90; 965; 1477-1509A). For this reason the Fathers insisted on not delaying baptism. The baptism of *clinici,* while considered valid, fell under considerable disfavor because it was received only in danger, because it was administered by infusion, not immersion, and because of the scant preparation of the baptizand; it had to be complemented later by laying on of hands by the bishop (*De rebaptism.* 10; Cornelius in Euseb., *HE* VI, 43, 15; Counc. of Elvira, can. 38) and religious instruction (Counc. of *Laodicea, can. 47). In general, *clinici* could not receive orders, since baptism received in emergency was considered an impediment (see Cornelius in Euseb., *HE* VI, 43, 17; Counc. of Neocaes., can. 12).

DACL 3, 1942-1944; EC 3, 1873-1874; F.J. Dölger, *Antike und Christentum*, Münster 1930, vol. II, 258ff.; A. Goulon, *Un jeu de mots chez Lactance ("Divinae Institutiones," III, 8,10)*: REAug 19 (1973) 39-55; G.W. Clarke, *The Letters of Cyprian of Carthage*, New York 1989, vol. IV, 176-177.

A. Di Berardino

CLOTHING

I. Undergarments - II. Overgarments - III. Hairstyling - IV. Footwear - V. Military clothing.

In this entry clothing is treated in regard to its relevance for *iconography, although liturgical garments have a specific treatment, as do religious garments. For understanding clothing in *Late Antiquity and in the early Middle Ages, it is first of all important to distinguish undergarments (*indumenta*) from overgarments (*amictus*). This distinction will serve as the basis upon which we will classify our subject matter.

I. Undergarments. *Tunica* (i.e., "tunic," a Roman undergarment worn by both sexes, which could also be an overgarment). The undergarments, especially one having long sleeves, in part always remained visible, despite the overgarments. It was a type of shirt made of wool or flax, with or without sleeves, girded or ungirded. If it was long, it was called the *tunica talaris*; if ungirded and without sleeves it was called the *colobium*; if worn with the right shoulder

exposed it was called the *esomide*. It could be put on by itself or also as an outergarment along with undergarments, which could be more than one. At the time of Emperors *Commodus and Elagabalus, the use of the broad tunic, often ungirded, with long sleeves, almost at half calf or longer, was called the "Dalmatian tunic" (*dalmatica*). It was very common in the East. Used as an outer garment, it had ornate decorations. The Eastern emperors often used it under the chlamys (i.e., a short mantle or cloak worn by men in ancient Greece), a great tunic also made of seta or purple, which was called the *divitision* (Gk: an imperial military tunic; a long, belted robe having tight sleeves).

Perizoma (i.e., a girdle). A band around the lower part of the stomach; at times it was made to pass through the thighs.

Ventrale. Consisted of a sort of girdle around the loins, placed either above the tunic or in direct contact with the skin.

Strophium. A band that women would use to lift their breasts above or below the tunic.

Bracae. A type of zouave trousers, which the ancient Eastern and Nordic used, tight and long, also called *anassiride* or *saraballa*. They were often connected to footwear or used as underwear.

Hosae. The leg garments that were very much in use during the early Middle Ages: not to be confused with the *tubruci* or the *tibialia* (i.e., stockings or leggings), which were probably not worn on naked skin.

Femoralia (i.e., a covering for the thigh) or *feminalia* (i.e., bandages for the upper part of the thighs, thigh-bandages). There were various types, and they had different uses. For the throat, the chest, for the decoration of clothes, to cover the shins (*fasciae crurales*) or the feet (*fasciae pedules*).

II. Overgarments. *Toga.* A Roman garment par excellence, white, made of wool or flax, placed upon one or more tunics. Its form was semicircular or circular bisection. It was put on in various ways: on the shoulders with strips hanging in front (as in the case of the *pallium*), or with an end under the right armpit to free the arm. The same piece of cloth was draped upon the left shoulder or was folded again in front in the manner of the *balteus* (i.e., girdle, belt) and was carried again on the left arm. For this last type of style, a rather consistent measurement of fabric was necessary, as was in use in the imperial era, when the toga also had an abundance of folds on the body (*toga fusa*). The toga was also worn connected to the person, leaving their arms free. Among the decorations for this type of clothing, we should note a band of purple material on the colored togas (*toga praetexta*, used by young men but also by the high magistrates). The toga also had various decorations of purple (*togae pictae*); the emperor and some high individuals could have a toga made entirely of purple (*trabea*).

Pallium (*imation*). A Greek garment, made of wool, with a square or rectangular form, it was worn on the tunic or the flesh, also in the manner of the *esomide,* that is, with the right arm uncovered, a fashion also called "Cynic." It was worn in various ways, very similar to the most simple use described for the toga. This type of clothing would be connected to the sacred individuals and consequently to priestly attire (*Vestments, Liturgical).

Paenula. A cloak of heavy material, likewise heavy or made of leather, with a bell-bottom cut with a hole at the center for the head, all closed and without sleeves, and stretched down to the knees. At times it had a hood (*paenula cucullata*). Toga and *paenula* were well documented, as in the case of the figures found on the Arch of *Constantine.

Clamide (i.e., chlamys). A garment in the trapezoidal form, which was at times short, especially military (see below), put on in various ways, but more often pinned up with a pin at the same level of the left shoulder. They could have the decoration of a purple fold (*tabula purpurea*).

Paludamentum. A garment similar to the chlamys, but long and rather lavish.

Sagion. This type of clothing was similar to the chlamys; it was made of wool and connected to the shoulder with a knot or a pin. So too the *abolla*, made of double cloth, with a buckle under the neck or on the shoulder, and the *sagochlamys,* which consisted of two rectangles, one on the front and one on the person's back; united by buckles on the shoulders. Many of the aforementioned types of clothing can be documented, e.g., on the wooden doors of the Basilica of Santa Sabina in *Rome (5th c.) or on the reliefs of the Antonine Column.

Mandyas. This was the true and proper cloak (Persian in origin) pinned to the front, for military and ecclesiastical use. It seems that the garment understood today as a toga of the famous consular *diptychs from the 5th c. should be understood as a mandyas, an interpretation that could also be suggested in other cases.

Lacerna. A cloak made of light or heavy material, secured to the chest by a pin and often also equipped with a hood (under the entry *Vestments, Liturgical, see *piviale*).

Byrrus. A sort of *paenula brevis,* overcoat with a hood, cut short at the thighs.

Alicula. A sort of *lacerna brevis* sometimes made of fur. It was used by young men and especially shepherds.

Caracalla. A tunic with sleeves, open in the front and back, it took its name precisely from the emperor who wore it frequently, but was itself perhaps of Gallic origin. With respect to the *skaramangion* or the *skaranicon* or the *kandys* (which was also used by women), they were in the shape of a caftan and were intended to be used on horseback and were therefore rather short (see also the military outfit). They were very much in use at the court of *Byzantium.

The following elements were connected to clothing: the *palliola,* types of small pallia, a type of handkerchief (also called *sudaria* or *mappulae,* if used like napkins); various types of scarfs among which was the *orarium,* with long fringes, and the *loroi,* often crossed on the chest and also heavily decorated (see the mosaic of the Basilica of S. Agnese *extra muros* at Rome). The women then, in the West, but especially in the East, used veils for their heads (*velum, maphorium, kalumma, ricinum* etc.), more or less wide, nets for their hair (*reticula*), and headbands (*mitrae* or *mitellae*).

Among the coverings for the head, one should note the *pileus*, a tall and narrow beret, especially in the ancient examples, which remained then as a priestly insignia, conical in shape, tapered off on the top, or rather rounded off. At *Rome, preference was given to the short and roundish *pileus.* The one worn by the *Magi was typically Eastern, a rather high spherelike ending, tilted forward (Phrygian beret). At *Byzantium, the *pileus* continued in the *skiadion* (scholars, however, are not in agreement on this point). With regard to the the *pileus,* however, there is a significant amount of confusion, and the term was often used to refer to berets of various styles. The tiara was also a fez type of *pileus* (like that worn by the peoples of northeastern Asia), or a diadem in the shape of a modiolus with stripes at the back, or in the style of the Phrygian beret. It seems, however, to have been connected to a character of distinction like that of the pontifical tiara, which was a high and conical Phrygian beret (even if more often the tiara was shorter and not conical). In ancient times there existed a short type with straps under the chin used more often than not by the women (*mitella*).

The crown could be a standard precious circle for the tiara or the mitre. Even the kamilavka (i.e., a pressed down beret) could have a diadem around also connected over the head by precious bands. Among the other types of pilei, one should note the σκυφία and the *galerus* both round caps.

One could also wear a small *pallium* on the head connected behind the neck. The women then more often used a simple veil, but also a type of headdress in the form of a kamilavka or a turban with another veil (see the arcosolium of Veneranda in the *cemetery of *Domitilla at Rome). The petasos, however, was a hat with a large brim and a low back, tied under the chin or behind the back of the head, different from the pilei. Given that many types of male and female clothing were common to the two sexes, let us only state that the women in particular made a greater use of the *Dalmatian type, which was often very elegant. They then made use of narrow bands above their inner tunics to lift up their breasts, and they used the short tunic, which also had no sleeves, called the *colobium.* They also put on the palla like the shawl, in the Greek manner and directly on the skin or even in the esomid way or like a shawl. As was said, they made extensive use of the veil as well as nets for hair. The nuptial veil was called the *flammeum*.

III. Hairstyling. With respect to hairstyling, the women, especially during the imperial age, used more precious gems. First, the hair on the crown of the head was mostly tied in braids and made to hang from the back. From the 1st c. onward, however, curls began to be most frequently used, likewise connected by being interwoven, and a hairstyle that was at times very complex and imposing, which could be combined with a wig or hair weave. Very short hair (unless it was covered according to *monastic use) or shabby hair was not well received, but also excessive care of the hairstyle or its dyeing was criticized by Christian authors, who preferred to see women veiled or dressed with simplicity. In the 3rd c., parting of the hair in the center was the prevalent fashion, with folds on the sides more or less intricate and precise; in the 4th c., there was much variation: from the "helmet" type, to that of the diadem, often confused with the turban, which even at times was undoubtedly inserted into the hair. Wigs and hair weaves were of much help in hairstyles, and the higher the classes, the more ornate the styles were (see the mosaic of Theodora in the Basilica of San Vitale at *Ravenna). A veil and a headdress, perhaps at times divided with pearls, however, often hid a large part of the hairstyles; barbarian women, however, always had their hair loose or tied in large or small braids.

With respect to male hairstyles, let us recall that the male face with a well-trimmed beard can be seen starting from the *Hadrian era. The use of shaving the entire face returned at the time of Emperor *Constantine. The hairstyles of preference for that

era were rather short, often tucked with a curling iron. Long hair and a long beard were proper to the philosopher and also Eastern attire, or they were an indicator of an *ascetic life (the popes preferred short hair, with or without a short beard).

In the East, unshaven faces were more common, and hair was long and gathered or even turban-covered; examples of a complete shave, however, are not lacking. The barbarians had a beard and long hair (with the exception of the Gauls); among them, the *Longobards (Lombards) shaved their hair on the back and let it grow long in the front of the face with a split down the middle of the scalp.

IV. Footwear. Among footwear, we should mention the *solea,* a sole placed under the foot and tied to it with cords. There were then various types of *calcea,* more or less open and more or less covering the foot, to the point of true and properly speaking closed shoes (especially to accompany a toga) with a front opening to be easily threaded. The shoes of the patricians could also be decorated with studs of silver or ivory; the upper portion of the shoe was at times artistically carved. The *soccus,* however, was a type of boot that went above the ankle (other boots that went above the knee were the *zanchae*; these were of Persian origin). The *gallicae,* to the contrary, were low shoes, of Gallic origin, which were worn preferably with the *lacerna*. For the Roman soldiers there was the closed shoe with a high sole and nails, tied by laces on the outer arch. Hunters and workers had low boots, called *perones.* Last, let us note the *campagi,* which often covered the front tip and the heel but not the middle part of the foot, which was tied by a lace at the center. The imperial *campagi* especially had different types of decorations, but in time they became the typical footwear for church officials.

V. Military clothing. The ancient Romans derived their military style of clothing from the Etruscans and Greeks and in the late empire also from the Germans and the peoples of the Steppe and from Eastern civilizations. Therefore they put on one or more tunics (the upper tunic was made of white linen for the Palatine militias and red or dark crimson for the others). The *lorica* or shield, above the tunic, was originally in strips of leather with bronze plates and a supplement divided by the stomach at the bottom. On the shoulders there was an analogous spin off of the bands. The *loricae* could have pure circles of iron on the back and descending bands from the shoulders and connected to the torso, or could be the scales-type connected by metal threads, or true batches of links in the shape of intertwined rings. The shoulders and the forearms could be covered by scales and bands (*humeralia*). Each armored soldier was dressed in full armor, especially the foreign militias of the Easterners covered in armor from head to toe. As a cloak, they used the *sagum* with a buckle but also the *paenula* and the various types of chlamys among which was the *paludamentum* especially for the emperor's or the high officials. A belt (*cingulum*) from which dangled combat helmets used for a seige could have been supported by a *balteus* or a bandoleer. For the legs, they used greaves (*tibialia*), made of leather with metal reinforcements, but the average combat soldiers often did not have them; the shoes could be the sandal type or the closed *calceus*, especially for the officers. At times, the soldiers also put on *bracae*, which were rather tight and modified (banded) for harsh climates. The helmet was made of iron or even bronze, with a nonsalient crown and also with reinforcements at the top. Certain types of noncommissioned officers also had a plume of feathers (*cresta*). The front area of the helmet could be either stationary or mobile; there were metal pieces for the cheeks (*bucculae*: the Greek cheek piece) and metal bands under the chin.

With respect to the weaponry, let us mention the following: the shields, which were oval, rectangular, hexagonal, circular (*clipeus*), those made of wood, or wood covered with leather, also with metal reinforcements on the inside, where they crossed for the protection of the arm. The center bulge of the shield was called the *umbo.* The designs and the variegated colors on the shields were also used to distinguish the various brigades. The soldiers were furnished with a *spatha* and a *gladium*; the first was longer, but both had a double edge and a grasp for the hand, with a sheath (*vagina*) with a ring to hold everything on the belt or on the *balteus.* They also had a dagger, lance and javelins (the lance was generally longer with a *nodus* to hold it), bows with arrows, with a simple edge or hook, battle axes (*securides*) and also batons (especially for services of law and order). Let us also recall that there were numerous insignia, according to the various types of soldiers and also varieties of decorations applied to individuals or the same insignia (*armillae*, *torques*, *phalerae*). The Byzantines also used the Roman military outfit, with the addition of Eastern elements (for example, the *skaramangion* for the cavalry), which was of Parthian origin. Their helmets tended to take the shape of a cusp, and the shields were often oval; notable among the weapons was the use of the bow.

With respect to the barbarian military dress, we could mention some particularities exhibited by the *Huns, who had a broad tunic that went halfway

down the thigh, which was open on the sides and fastened and tied down on the wrists with a large pant fastened around the ankle, goat skins for the legs and leather boots. The beret was made of skin with the extremities hanging on the cheeks; the helmet was heavily fortified on the forehead. The casing of the bow hung from the belt on the front. The quiver, however, hung near the loins; in addition to golden objects, they had arrows made of bone, weapons of iron and traps to snare enemies. With respect to the Alans, scholars know for certain that they were excellent horsemen. Their military dress, perhaps, was also shared by the Scythians or the Sarmatians, the short and tightened tunic (a type of jacket), the trousers, the closed shoes or the ankle boots and, at times, the Phrygian beret. At the side they had a quiver; moreover, they carried lances, bows, daggers and double-edged swords. On the column of Emperor *Trajan, the Sarmatians are likewise wearing scale armor and cone-shaped helmets with horizontal and vertical bands; horses were also covered with hinged armored platings. The Dacians, however, had an uncovered head, short, fastened tunics, and trousers; at times their coats were buckled on the shoulder; their shields were oval. The barbarians also appeared in representations with a naked torso, trousers and a skullcap. Among the Persians, one finds the shielded horse; their shield was in the form of links, and perhaps they also carried a sleeved jacket made of skin. One can definitely thus summarize a series of notations on the Asian military costume. *Helmet:* hemispherical or pointed arch in shape; the helmet was stout or very high, with bands; at times, the lateral lines were added to the fringes. *Armor:* covered the body, part of the legs and all or part of the arm. It was made up of a type of leather coat fastened by a belt and fabric made of metal sheets in overlaying areas, overlapped by strips of leather. In central Asia, one finds the first attestation to the use of a large glove for the protection of the forearm. At times one also notes a protective plate for the groin area. *Footwear:* boots. *Weaponry:* bow, arrows, lance, also with flaming arrows. A single or double-headed ax, long or short sword with decorative carvings. *Helmet:* various forms of protection for the throat and the neck, and also a ridge to protect the base of the nose. *Armor:* made of scales, plates or mesh; also at times even for the horse. *Shield:* round, square or oval. All these elements merged mostly in the Roman and Byzantine world and then were found again in the West in late Middle Ages. The Gauls: their helmet could also have horns (for the god of war, who was a bull), with or without a visor; the shields were large and oval or hexagonal with a border of iron covered with leather; they had arrows and lances with a point in the shape of a large leaf, also shaped with a slight ripple, with decorative crossbars. The sword had a simple grip, more or less large and hung on the belt or the bandoleer. There was also a manlike clasp with small and raucous trumpets (*cornix*) likewise very high, with a pointed curve and flared like a throat of an imaginary animal. Every Gallic brigade had its own insignia. They draped the heads of their slain enemies along their horses' necks, according to the custom of Eastern peoples.

The Germans had a short and fastened tunic, rather tight trousers, a beard and long hair (as was already said), heavy shoes, and a cloak. Their weapons were as follows: the lance, the heavy, long or short sword. They usually carried an often-rounded shield, with a central knob at the end, a bow and a helmet, which perhaps replaced a previous hairy beret. The *Franks had double-edged and long knives, shoes of leather and a part of their legs were naked. The sleeves of their cowls only came down to their forearms. Their swords hung from their bandoleers and a large belt of skin with knobs on their loins. The lances had a tip with backward flaps. There were few helmets; they did not have armor and leg bands when riding their horses. By preference, the soldiers were naked to the waist and had bands of linen or skin for their legs and trousers; the shield was on the left. They used axes and lances in place of bows and arrows. Later, the military attire of the Franks changed through the influence of Roman military garb. Through contact with first the Byzantine and then the Roman world, the *Goths also lost the characteristics of their original military attire, concerning which, however, we do not have much information. Theodoric, in fact, was clothed in armor with small metal plates through bands on his legs, and Totila had a skullcap helmet with a nose cone with iron bands running across. With respect to the Longobards, we should note, for example, that on the Triumph of *Agilulf, many men in armor appear with areas of metal bands; their helmet has a panache, protecting the back part of the head, the cheeks and the throat. The shields are round and they ward off a lance. The legs are perhaps covered by leggings of leather in bands (*ocrea*, *impilia*). The following were among the furnishings discovered: sword, at times with a golden sheath and decorations; rather short lances, tips and arrows; straps and simple belts; shields (wood covered with leather or metallic layers); helmets (rare); spurs; fragments of shoes (the Longobards first covered their shin bones with bands of leather, then they used leggings: see

above); bracelets; metal basins; bags for fodder or for washing horses; large round shields; and semispherical *umboni*, culminating with a stud at which crosses or zoomorphic swastikas reached their apex. The *Celts were first naked, then they had a short tunic or fur coat, buckled on the shoulders.

Moreover, the Slavs, who were at first bereft of arms, subsequently enriched their weaponry thanks to the influence of the Germans and the Byzantines. (We have sparse and late artefacts.) Last, the Vikings had a closed helmet in the shape of a mask on the face with a cheekpiece. Between the 7th and 9th c., however, in addition to the closed helmet with cheek pieces and a figure of a ravenous bird on top, the horsemen had a lance and a round shield (the armor being doubtful); the infantrymen had leather tunics, a closed helmet with figures of a wild boar, a sword and an imposing lance. For the protection of the chest and shoulders, one can also perceive a sort of pelt or fur. Later, the following would also be characteristic: nose pieces, glazed helmets and swords with a golden grip.

C. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma nel Medio Evo. Le arti minori e il costume*, Rome 1960 (with bibl.). For Byzantine attire: C. Nicolescu, *L'héritage byzantin de l'art romain. Les broderies*: FR 18 (1971) 403-417 and also the work of F. Kolb, *Römische Mäntel: Paenula, Lacerna, Mandyas*: Röm. Mit. 80 (1973) 69-167; L. Pisetzky, *Storia del costume in Italia*, I, Milan 1964; J.P. Wild, *The Byrrus Britannicus*: Antiquity 37 (1963) 193-202; Id., *The Caracallus*: Latomus 23 (1964) 532-536; Id., *Textile Manufacture in the Northern Roman Provinces*, Cambridge 1970; *The World of Roman Costume*, ed. J.L. Sebesta - L. Bonfante, Madison, WI 1994; L. Bonfante, Introduction to *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, WI 1994; R. Martorelli, *Aspetti di storia del costume in Europa dall'età giustinianea al VII secolo*, in Atti del XIII Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana, Split-Poreć settembre 1994, Split-Città del Vaticano 1998, 723-733; *The Roman Textile Industry and Influence: A Birthday Tribute to John Peter Wild*, ed. P. Walton Rogers - L. Bender Jorgenseb - A. Rast-Eicher, Oxford 2001; RAC 21, 1-60; A. Köb - P. Riedel (eds.), *Kleidung und Repräsentation in Antike und Mittelalter*, München 2005.

M. Cecchelli

CLOTILDE, saint (ca. 474–544/548). Born in *Lyons as a Catholic *Burgundian princess, ca. 492–494 she married the Merovingian king *Clovis, still a *pagan, and led him to *baptism (he was baptized by Bishop *Remigius of Reims at Christmas, ca. 498–499); she was widowed in 511. She watched, powerless, the battles between the *Franks and the Burgundians, in which her eldest son Chlodomer died (524), leaving her with three sons; she was similarly powerless over the crimes of her surviving sons, *Chlothar and Childebert, who massacred Chlodomer's sons out of lust for power. She withdrew from the residence at *Paris to *Tours, near the tomb of St. *Martin, where she founded a female *monastery dedicated to St. Peter, where she died; she was buried at Paris, however, beside her husband in the Basilica of the Holy Apostles, which would later be called St. *Genevieve. The foremother of the Merovingians came to be venerated as a saint, feast 3 June.

BHL 1785-1786; BS 4,64-67; BBKL 1,997; LMA 2,1343-1345; M. Reydellet, *La royauté dans la littérature latine de Sidoine Apollinaire à Isidore de Séville*, Rome 1981; J.A. McNamara - J. E. Halborg (eds.), *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, Durham - London 1992.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

CLOVIS, king (466–511). Son of Childeric, king of one of the tribes of Salian *Franks by then established in NE *Gaul, he assumed power in 482, aged 16. His base of operations may initially have been at Tournai, where his father was buried. In 486 at Soissons he defeated the Roman Syagrius, king of Gallia Lugdunensis and parts of Belgica Secunda, and immediately thereafter extended his reign between the Somme and the Loire, establishing his residence at *Paris. Through the influence of his wife *Clotilde, a *Burgundian of *Nicene faith, and of *Remigius, *metropolitan of *Reims, he drew near to Christianity, and after defeating the Alemanni at Zülpich (Tolbiac), he promised—in the sanctuary of St. *Martin at Tours—to receive *baptism. Imitating Flavius *Theodoric, the *Ostrogoth king of *Italy who in 497 was recognized by the new emperor, *Anastasius I, Clovis waged a successful war against the *Arian *Visigoth king Alaric II and with the help of Gundobad's Burgundians (whom he had defeated in 500) defeated him at Vouillé (near *Poitiers) in 507. After this victory and the conquest of Toulouse, on his return (spring 508) Clovis stopped at Tours and there received investiture as *patricius* from those sent by Anastasius. On Christmas night of probably the same year (or in 497, according to the traditional date), Clovis was baptized, perhaps at Paris, where Remigius and his suffragan bishops had gathered. Soon after his sister Albofleda was also baptized, dying shortly later. His sister Audofleda was given in marriage to Flavius Theodoric. Probably at the end of Clovis's reign, the first formulation (class A of the MSS) of the *Lex Salica*—a collection of national customs for the Franks and the other German components of Clovis's kingdom—was written, with Roman influence but also on the model of the slightly earlier Burgundian codification.

Under Clovis's patronage the synod of Orléans was held in 511, which established (can. 4) the obliga-

tion of the approval of the king and of the local civil authority for priestly ordinations.

At Clovis's death the kingdom was divided among his sons (Theuderic, Chlodomer, Childebert, Chlothar). His daughter *Clotilde married, perhaps after 526, the Visigoth Amalaric, son of Alaric II and grandson of Theodoric.

Ep. ad episcopos: CPL 1818; PL 71, 1158 and 72, 1118; MGH *Legum sectio* I: *leg. nat. Germ.* II/1, 1883, 1-2 (A. Boretius).

Lex Salica: CPL 1813; MGH *Legum sectio* I: *leg. nat. Germ.* II/2, 1962, 2ff. (K.A. Eckhardt).

Letters addressed to Clovis: Remig., *Epist. Austras.* 1-2; Alc. Avit., *Epist.* 46; Cassiod., *Var.* II, 41; III, 4; *Conc. Aurel. a. 511*, CCL 148A, 5. The letter of Pope Anastasius II (*Ep.* 2, 624 Thiel) is considered apocryphal.

PLRE II, 288-290; A. Lippold: PWK *suppl.* XIII, 139-174. - F. Vogel, *Clodwig's Sieg über die Alamannen und seine Taufe*: HZ 56 (1886) 385-403; B. Krusch, *Chlodovechs Sieg über die Alamannen*: Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 12 (1886) 289-301; G. Tessier, *25 décembre . . . : Le Baptème de Clovis*, Paris 1964; B.S. Bachrach, *Procopius and the Chronology of Clovis' Reign*: Viator 1 (1970) 21-31; E. Griffe, *L'épiscopat gaulois et les royautés barbares de 482 à 507*: BLE 76 (1975) 261-284; I.N. Wood, *Gregory of Tours and Clovis*: RBPh 63 (1985) 249-272; C. Carozzi, *Le Clovis de Grégoire de Tours*: MA 98 (1992) 169-185; M. Spencer, *Dating the Baptism of Clovis, 1886-1993*: EME 3 (1994) 97-116; O. Guyotjeannin (ed.), *Clovis chez les historiens*, Paris 1996; M. Rouche, *Clovis*, Paris 1996; var. aus., *Die Franken Wegbereiter Europas. Vor 1500 Jahren: König Chlodwig und seine Erben*, Mainz 1996; M. Rouche (ed.), *Clovis. Histoire et mémoire*: *Clovis et son temps, l'événement*, Paris 1997; D.R. Shanzer, *Dating the Baptism of Clovis: The Bishop of Vienne vs. the Bishop of Tours*: EME 7 (1998) 29-57; G. Halsall, *Childeric's Grave, Clovis's Succession, and the Origins of the Merovingian Kingdom*, in *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul*, R.W. Mathisen - D. Shanzer (eds.), Aldershot 2001, 116-133.

E. Malaspina

CODEX APIARII CAUSAE (or *Gesta de nomine Apiarii:* CCL 149,98-148). On the occasion of the dispute regarding the case of *Apiarius, two collections of rules were composed by the *African bishops. The first, it seems, was composed immediately after the council of May 419 (two sessions: 25 and 30 May), and sent to *Rome (and passed into Italian collections: the *Teatina, Sanblasiana* etc.); the second, more complete, was written in November to justify the positions of the African bishops. This second collection comprised the *Gesta* (*Acts*) of the council, the authentic canons of *Nicaea translated into *Latin at *Constantinople by *Atticus, and the letters of *Cyril of Alexandria and of Atticus himself. Because of its size, this collection immediately underwent changes and mutilations, passing into the *Hispana*. Later, in 424 according to Munier, a third collection was compiled to defend the rights of the African churches against Rome's claims; it passed into the *Collectio Frisingensis,* where the editor tried to soften statements against papal authority. This collection was used by *Dionysius Exiguus.

CPL 1765; EOMIA I, 2,3, 566-595; *Concilia Africae, Concilium Carthag.*, CCL 149, 90-148. W. Telfer, *The Codex Verona LX (58)*: HTR 36 (1943) 169-246; F.L. Cross, *History and Fiction in the African Canons*: JTS 69 (1961) 227-247; C. Munier, *Tradition littéraire des conciles africains*: RecAug 10 (1975) 3-32; Id., *La tradition littéraire des dossiers africains*: RDC 29 (1979) 41-52; E.J. Kilmartin, *Early African Legislation Concerning the Liturgical Prayer*: EphLit 69 (1985) 105-127; H. Mordek, *Karthago oder Rom? Zu dem Anfängen der kirchlichen Rechtsquelle im Abendland*, in *Studia in Honorem A.M. Stickler*, Rome 1992, 359-374; J.E. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine*, New Haven 1997; PCBE 1,82f.

A. Di Berardino

CODEX JUSTINIANUS. Collection of imperial decrees made in 528 by order of *Justinian (527–565), who entrusted it to a ten-man commission of high magistrates and jurists (incl. Tribonian, *magister officiorum,* and Theophilus, professor of law at the school of *Constantinople), presided over by John of Cappadocia. The commission used three earlier compilations of laws: the *Codex Gregorianus* (ca. 291), the *Codex Hermogenianus* (with the laws of *Diocletian from 291 to 294) and the **Codex Theodosianus,* discarding all that was useless or obsolete, eliminating repetitions and contradictions, and giving the texts simplicity and clarity. The *Codex Justinianus* was published 7 April 529 (the work has not survived; we have only—through papyri—a list of rubrics and of the decrees of book I,11-16) but was soon overtaken by the emperor's abundant legislation; in 530 he ordered a new edition (*Codex repetitae praelectionis*), published mid-December 534. Besides the two editions of the code, in 533 the Digests (collections of passages from the works of the jurists) and the *Institutiones* (elementary principles of law for use in schools, to replace the classical ones of Gaius) came into force: Justinian intended the various collections to constitute a whole. After the reconquest of *Italy, the three compilations were sent there for publication and in 554, with the *Sanctio Pragmatica pro petitione Vigilii,* the promulgation of the subsequent *Novellae* issued in the East between 535–540 was also ordered.

The oldest law of the *Codex Justinianus* goes back to *Hadrian (VI, 23,1), the latest to November 534 (the year of publication). The code is divided into 12 books, and the books into titles, within which the

decrees are ordered chronologically, with information on the emperors who issued them, the recipients they were addressed to and their date of issue. The compilers of the collection had been authorized to make opportune changes in the texts of previous emperors' laws: comparison with the corresponding texts of the *Codex Theodosianus* and with the interpolations inserted therein is important for reconstructing the technique and the criteria which inspired the collection; where comparison is impossible, as for laws predating *Constantine, we must have recourse to the usual criteria of form and substance criticism. The laws are reproduced in the language in which they were written, meaning almost entirely in Latin. The first book is dedicated to religious arguments and begins with the *Cunctos populos,* the law of Theodosius issued at *Thessalonica in 380.

P. Krueger, *Codex Iustinianus*, Berlin 1887; Id., *Corpus Iuris Civilis 2*, Berlin 1929 (repr. 1954); G. Rotondi, *Studi sulle fonti del Codice Giustinianeo*, in *Scritti giuridici* I, Milan 1922, 110-283; H. Jaeger, *Justinien et l'episcopalis audientia*: RHD 38 (1960) 214-262; G.G. Archi, *Giustiniano legislatore*, Bologna 1979, with bibliography; for the historical context, see J.W. Barker, *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*, Madison-Milwaukee-London 1966; *Il mondo del diritto nell'epoca giustinianea, caratteri e problematiche*, Ravenna 1985; D. Mantovani, *Digesto e masse bluhmiane*, Milan 1987; G.A. Archi - C. Capizzi, *Giustiniano I tra politica e religione*, Soveria Mannelli 1994; O. Mazal, *Justinian und seine Zeit*, Cologne 2001.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CODEX of VISIONS. The *Codex of Visions* consists of three parts: the first presents the first three visions of the *Shepherd* of *Hermas, a well-known text, the second the *visio *Dorothei*—the the most important text in the codex—and the third, eight poems by various unknown authors. The codex as a whole was compiled probably in the 1st quarter of the 5th c. in the region of Panopolis in *Egypt, while the *visio* and poems were composed in the 1st half of the 4th c., shortly after Dorotheus's *martyrdom during the reign of *Diocletian. Some scholars defend the historicity of the person Dorotheus, and suppose that he himself is the author of the vision of Dorotheus; others think of a community, probably of clerics, who compiled the texts out of veneration for the martyr, perhaps for liturgical use. The theme of the codex is spiritual martyrdom, contrition, humility and *penitence as a means of reintegration into the church after a grave sin.

Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII: Hermas, *Il Pastore* (*Ia-IIIa visione*), Cologny-Geneva 1991; Papyrus Bodmer XXIX: *Vision de Dorothéos*, Cologny-Geneva 1984; Papyri Bodmer XXX-XXXVII: *"Codex des Visions" Poèmes divers*, Munich 1999; A. Hurst - J. Rudhardt, *Le Codex des Visions*, Geneva 2002.

S. Samulowitz

CODEX THEODOSIANUS. Official collection of imperial laws from *Constantine (312) to *Theodosius II (438, year of publication, to take effect on 1 January 439). Compiled to answer the need for legal certainty (requested, e.g., in the anonymous late-4th-c. treatise *De rebus bellicis*), it should be thought of as the expression of a precise initiative of the chancellery of the court of *Constantinople, with two aims: (1) to collect all the imperial decrees, from Constantine to Theodosius II inclusive, in a codex characterized by the *diversitates* existing between the various laws (see CTh I, 1,5 of 429), thus a sort of pure inventory of material; (2) to provide, besides the exposition of the laws, the integration of the *iura,* i.e., to present the dialogue between the regulative activity of the emperors and the creative interpretation of jurisprudence, with the declared aim of creating a *magisterium vitae,* a systematic exposition of the legal system considered as educational activity and instruction for imperial subjects (loc. cit.). The first program of 429 was essentially a failure, and in 435 Theodosius II began a new initiative (CTh I, 1,6), apparently autonomous and more modest than the first, which provided for the ordering of decrees according to the contents expressed in their titles and instructing the drafters of the collection to be brief and clear, i.e., to limit texts to the essential, clarifying their contents so as to make them usable in practice: the relationship between the two programs should perhaps be understood as a reuse, for different ends, of the material collected as a result of the provisions of 429.

In its surviving form, the *Codex Theodosianus* is divided into 16 books, and the books into titles expressing content, arranged according to the ascending chronological order of the original texts, of which only passages are reported, and not the whole law, with the *inscriptio* at the beginning (the emperor or emperors who emanated the law and the addressees) and a *subscriptio* at the end (place and date of issue). Sometimes the *inscriptiones* or the *subscriptiones* are erroneous. Often the original text has been taken apart and put under various titles according to the arguments treated. The lack of introductions in the reported passages keeps us ignorant of the reasons for a law's emanation and the purposes the legislator hoped to accomplish. Also, outside of their original context, the imperial decrees acquire a different historical meaning than that at

the time of their emanation. A vast part of the code was assumed into the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* or *Breviarium Alaricianum* (a compilation ordered by Alaric in 506 for the use of Roman citizens in Visigothic territory) and later into the **Codex Justinianus*. It remained in force in the Eastern empire until abrogated by the publication of the *Codex Justinianus* (529), and in *Italy until the conquest by *Justinian in 554.

The text is not preserved complete (much of it is known through the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*): the most serious lacunae are in the first five books; also, to the interpolations prescribed to the redactors in the programs we must add the glosses and paraphrases inserted in the text in the course of its transmission in subsequent MSS of the code proper and of Alaric's *Lex*.

Some problems of an ecclesiastical nature are included in various places: I, 27 *de episcopali definitione*; IV, 7 *de manumissionibus in ecclesia*; V, 3 *de bonis clericorum et monachorum*; IX, 45 *de his, qui ad ecclesias confugiunt*; a sign of willingness to consider, on the level of prescriptive law, the new problems represented by the triumph of the church as a social reality and an established institution. In particular the whole of the last book, XVI, is dedicated to the relations between the empire and the Catholic Church. The position of this book in the compilation and its special nature are disputed by scholars: is it a mere appendix, negligible for evaluating the criteria inspiring the collection, or does it contain its own internal logic justifying its structure, a choice of themes corresponding to the political and legal reality of the time? The most recent literature tends to see it as evidence of the empire's interest in religious unity, decisive in the support given by the state to the church insofar as it meant a guarantee of religious and civil peace within society. Compared with the code of Justinian, which opens with ecclesiastical legislation (1,1-13), enhancing the importance of the Catholic faith by recognizing the legal autonomy of all legislation pertaining to it, the compilers of the *Codex Theodosianus*—while fully aware of the historical reality of the institutional church—set this new reality within a prescriptive model which adhered to the constitutional structure of the state: recognition of the church as an institution was thus effected in connection with the requirements of civil society, and in collaboration—even on the legislative level—with its structures.

Th. Mommsen - P.M. Meyer, *Theodosiani libri XVI, cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, Berlin 1905; Eng. tr. by C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and Sirmondian Constitutions*, Princeton, NJ 1952; see in general J. Gaudemet, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'Église au IVe et Ve siècles*, Paris 1957; G.G. Archi, *Teodosio II e la sua codificazione*, Naples 1976; in particular, on book XVI, L. De Giovanni, *Chiesa e stato nel Codice Teodosiano*, Naples [4]1997; W. Turpin, *The Law Codes and Late Roman Law*: RIDA 32 (1985) 339-353; T. Honoré, *The Making of Theodosian Code*: ZSS 103 (1986) 139-216; *The Theodosian Code: Studies in the Imperial Law of Late Antiquity*, J. Harries - I. Wood (eds.), London 1993; A. Barzanò, *Il cristianesimo nelle leggi di Roma imperiale*, Milan 1996; T. Honoré, *Law in the Crisis of Empire (379-455 AD)*, Oxford 1998; E. Dovere, *Ius principale e Catholica Lex*, Naples [2]1999; É. Magnou-Notier (ed.), *Le Code Théodosien, Livre XVI*, Texte latin et traduction française, Paris 2002.

M. Forlin Patrucco
S. Samulowitz

COGITOSUS (Toimtenach), monk (7th c.). Irish monk, to whom, ca. 650, the community of the *monastery of Kildare (Cell Dara), to which he probably belonged, entrusted the composition of the *Life of St. Brigid,* foundress and first *abbess of that monastery. The work, written in Hiberno-Latin, is among the earliest evidence of Irish *hagiography, along with *Tírechán's *Collectanea* on St. *Patrick, *Muirchú's *Life of St. Patrick* and *Adamnan's *Life of St. Colombanus*. Complex and disputed are the relations between the *Life* compiled by Cogitosus and the other hagiographical works on the Irish virgin, in particular the two anonymous *Lives,* one in *Latin (the *Vita prima Brigitae*) and another in Old Irish (*Bethu Brigte*), which seem to derive, like that written by Cogitosus, from an earlier hagiographical work. Regarding its relation to continental hagiography, its conscious insertion into an already-consolidated literary genre has been demonstrated, along with its conscious originality, shown esp. in the prologues. In this sense Cogitosus can justifiably be considered the father of Irish hagiography, a primacy acknowledged by his student Muirchú in the prologue of the *Vita sancti Patricii*. The monastery of Kildare was a monastic foundation of both monks and nuns who lived in different parts of the monastery; the abbess, beginning with the foundress *Brigid, had a position of preeminence.

CPL 2147; *Vita S. Brigidae auctore Cogitoso* (BHL 1457): J.F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical. An Introduction and Guide*, Dublin 1979, n. 147 (359-360); PL 72, 775-790; S. Connolly - J.-M. Picard, *Cogitosus's Life of St Brigit: Content and Value*: Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland 117 (1987) 11-27 (Eng. tr.); M. Esposito, *On the Earliest Latin Life of St Brigid of Kildare*, PRIA 30c (1912-1913) 307-326, now in Id., *Latin Learning in Mediaeval Ireland*, London 1988; M. Esposito, *Notes on Latin Learning and Literature in Mediaeval Ireland*, 1, 6: Hermathena 45 (1930) 251-257, now in Id., *Latin Learning in Mediaeval Ireland*, London 1988; M. Winterbottom, *Variations on a Nautical Theme*: Herma-

thena 120 (1976) 55-58; R. Sharpe, *Vitae S. Brigitae: The Oldest Texts*: Peritia 1 (1982) 81-106; K. McCone, *Brigit in the Seventh Century: A Saint with Three Lives?*: Peritia 1 (1982) 107-145; J.-M. Picard, *Structural Patterns in Early Hiberno-Latin Hagiography*: Peritia 4 (1985) 67-82; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, 2, Stuttgart 1988, 230-243; K. McCone, *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature*, An Sagart 1990, esp. 179-202; C. Stancliffe, *The Miracle Stories in Seventh-Century Irish Saints' Lives*, in *Le septième siècle: changements et continuités. Actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warbourg Institute les 8-9 juillet 1988*, London 1992, 87-112; S. Connolly, *The Power Motif and the Use of Scripture in Cogitosus'* Vita Brigitae, in *Aquitaine and Ireland in the Middle Ages*, Dublin 1995, 207-220; D.A. Bray, *Die heilige Brigitte, die Marie der Gälen*, in *Herrscher, Helden, Heilige*, St. Gallen 1996, 629-638; L.M. Bitel, *Land of Women: Tales of Sex and Gender from Early Ireland*, Ithaca - New York - London 1996; Patrologia IV, 452-453; D. Howlett, *Vita I Sanctae Brigitae*: Peritia 12 (1998) 1-23; D. McCarthy, *The Chronology of St Brigit of Kildare*: Peritia 14 (2000) 255-281; D. McCarthy, *Topographical Characteristics of the Vita Prima and Vita Cogitosi Sanctae Brigitae*: Studia Celtica 35 (2001) 245-270; C. Olsen, *Did Brigit Love Animals Like a Good Celt Should? An Inquiry into Cogitosus's "Life of Saint Brigit"*: Comitatus 33 (2002) 1-17.

V. Milazzo

COLLATIO ALEXANDRI ET DINDIMI. A false epistolary exchange between Alexander the Great and Dindimus, king of the Brahmans, written in the 4th-5th c. at the same time as that between *Seneca and St. *Paul. Alexander's relations with Hindu sages were surrounded with legend by *pagan and Christian philosophers. The *Collatio Alexandri et Dindimi* is linked to or inspired by the *Comm. Palladii* and the *Dindimus de Bragmanibus* (see H. Becker, *Die Brahmanen in der Alexandersage*, Königsberg 1889). Its five letters are in the form of philosophical-religious controversies: (1) Alexander asks for information about the Brahmans. (2) Dindimus expounds his people's simplicity and purity. He indicts the pagans, and he praises poverty as the source of freedom and a life in conformity with nature. (3) Alexander criticizes the Brahmans' understanding of human rights. (4) Dindimus explains the Brahmans' return to heaven and their rejection of seductions. (5) Alexander praises freedom, culture and relativism.

CPL 192; PL 101, 1366-1375; PLS 1, 679-690; E. Liénard, *La Collatio Alexandri et Dindimi*: RBPh 15 (1936) 819-838; G.A. Gary, *A Note on the Mediaeval History of the Collatio Alex. cum Dind.*: CM 15 (1954) 124-129; T. Pritchard, *The Collatio Alexandri et Dindimi: A Revised Text*: CM 55 (1995) 255-283 (critical ed. of the text); M. Steinmann, *Die "Collatio Alexandri et Dindimi,"* Göttingen 2000 (Lat. text and Ger. tr.); M. Steinmann, *Collatio Aelxandri et Dindimi*: Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft 4 (2001) 51-84.

E. Romero Pose

COLLATIO CUM DONATISTIS. The Conference of *Carthage opened on 1 June 411 under the presidency of the imperial tribune, the notary *Marcellinus, in the baths of Gargiglianus. It was the culmination of a series of efforts, first by *Augustine (*Ep.* 34,5; 44,12; 61,2 etc.) and then by the whole *Catholic Church of N *Africa, to force the *Donatists into a confrontation which could decide which party had the better claim to be the "Catholic Church in N Africa." After the failure of a Catholic initiative (25 August 403; see *Gesta Collationis* III, 174), imperial edicts of 12 February 405 (CTh XVI, 6, 4 and 5, 38) condemned the Donatists as *heretics. The following year a Donatist delegation went to *Ravenna and seems to have accepted the idea of a conference (Aug., *Ep.* 88, 10). The project was delayed by four years of political conflicts (fall of *Stilicho, August 408) and wars in *Italy, but in summer 410 a Catholic delegation to the imperial court obtained *Honorius's consent to the conference. On 14 October 410, the emperor sent a personal letter to Marcellinus instructing him to call a conference within four months to put an end "to the vain error and sterile schism of the Donatists" (*Gesta Collationis* I, 4,1). But a later edict dated 19 January 411 allowed Marcellinus more room for impartiality (*Gesta Collationis*, I, 5). Nevertheless, when it finally opened, the initial probabilities were decidedly against the Donatists, who, not without reason, doubted the commissioner's impartiality (Aug., *Gesta cum Emerito* 2). Both parties deployed all their forces for the occasion, the Donatists bringing 285 bishops and the Catholics 286 (see S. Lancel, *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage*, I [SC 194], 110-118). The accounts of the first two sittings (1 and 3 June) survive entire, but the second part of the *Acta,* for the third and decisive session of 8 June, has been lost, apart from the headings of the discussion. During the procedure, each party was represented by six *actores* or delegates, who had permission to bring documentary proofs to support their case.

The first session was completely occupied with examining the credentials of the bishops. First the Catholics then the Donatists came forward to prove their identity to the satisfaction of the commissioner and the delegates on each side. Each one had to declare whether he had any enemies, and all remarks were written down by stenographers and signed by the speaker. The second session never got under way, since the Donatists complained that the minutes of the previous session were not yet ready, and demanded an adjournment. At dawn on 8 June, the conference met again. In the course of the debate, despite the efforts of *Petilian of Constantine (who

spoke 150 times), the Catholics gradually gained the upper hand. They were able to present documents showing that *Caecilian had been acquitted of the charge of being consecrated by a *traditor bishop, and therefore the *schism had never had any justification. The Catholics added that they were in *communion with other churches throughout the world and, finally, that Donatist treatment of the schism of *Maximian was inconsistent with their continued refusal to return to union with the Catholics. Augustine played a prominent role in turning the final day's debate in favor of the Catholics. Marcellinus formulated his decision in favor of the Catholics on 26 June, and on 30 January 412 the Donatist church was officially proscribed (CTh XVI, 5,52). Its clergy were exiled, its followers diminished considerably, and all its property was confiscated in favor of the Catholics.

The acts of the conference are of great value as an authentic account of the situation of the rival N African churches at the start of the 5th c., and they throw an interesting light on the administrative procedures of the Roman government in the West.

S. Lancel (ed.), *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411*, Paris 1972-1975 (SC 194, 195, 224); PL 11, 1223-1434; Monceaux IV, 388-425; E. Tengström, *Die Protokollierung der Collatio Carthaginensis*, Göteborg 1962; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, ch. 17; S. Lancel, op. cit., vol. I; M.A. Tilley, *Dilatory Donatists or Procrastinating Catholics: The Trial at the Conference of Carthage*: ChHist 60/1 (1991) 7-19.

W.H.C. Frend

COLLATIO LEGUM. Collection of Mosaic and Roman laws, compared in order to show the greater antiquity of the former and hence the truth of Christianity, which refers to them, against the claims to greater antiquity advanced by *pagan legal science. The biblical text is cited according to an otherwise unknown version of the LXX; the Roman laws are taken from the works of ancient jurists (ps.-Paul, ps.-Ulpian, Modestinus, Papinian and Gaius, the *Codex Gregorianum,* and the *Codex Hermogenianum*) and imperial decrees. Its 16 chapters each relate to a legislative problem, generally criminal: this must have constituted book I of the work, which presumably contained others (see Hincmar of Reims, *De div. Loth. et Tetb.*, interr. XII, resp.: PL 125, 697B). The collection, known as *Lex Dei* or *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio,* was probably composed in the late 4th or early 5th c. Its author is still unknown, despite numerous hypotheses (incl. *Ambrose and *Ambrosiaster). It has also been hypothesized that the work was composed in a Jewish context in the early 4th c.

CPL 168 (bibl.); CPPM IIA, 1786; Schanz IV, 1 (1914) 359-362; Th. Mommsen, *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio*, in *Collectio librorum juris antejustiniani*, t. III, Berlin 1890, 107-198; J. Baviera, *Fontes Juris Romani antejustiniani*, 2, Florentiae [2]1968, 544-589; L. Wenger, *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*, Vienna 1953, 545-548 (bibl.); Patrologia III, 175-176; A.M. Rabello, *Sull'ebraicità dell'autore della "Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum"*: Rassegna mensile di Israel 23 (1967) 339-349; D. Liebs, *Die Jurisprudenz im spätantiken Italien (260-640 n. Chr.)*, Berlin 1987, 162-174.

A. Pollastri

COLLECT. A variable *prayer, the first oration recited by the bishop or priest alone after the *Introit* of the *Mass. The three ancient Roman *sacramentaries preserve the texts of this prayer, which probably entered the Roman Mass at the time of Pope *Leo I. In the Roman *liturgy, the term *collecta* designated the assembly, esp. in the stational churches. But in the *Gallican sacramentaries, *collectio* (later *collecta*) denoted the priest's prayer summing up and concluding the prayer of the assembly. *John Cassian, in *De institutis coenobiorum* (CSEL 17, 23-24), speaks of him *qui orationem collecturus est* or *qui precem colligit*. Walafrid Strabo explains that the word *collecta* means that the petitions are gathered together (*De exord. et increm*. 22: PL 114, 945). It was under Gallican influence that the Franco-Roman prayer at the beginning of Mass came to be called the collect.

The collect is basically a prayer of petition. In its ancient Roman form it was addressed to the Father: *ut nemo in precibus vel Patrem pro Filio vel Filium pro Patre nominet; et cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio,* according to can. 23 of the III Council of *Carthage (397). Its complete structure includes a theological proposition with an allusion to the feast (*protasis*), followed by the petition (*apodosis*), and concluding with the clause *Per Dominum*. Those written in the 5th-6th c., the classical period of Roman literary art, employ the oratorical *cursus,* or rhythmic prose, which is present particularly in the collects of Pope Leo I. The Leonine *cursus* of the collects is more quantitative than accentuative: it follows more the laws of meter than of rhythm and is practically restricted to the *planus, tardus* and *velox* type of *cursus* (Di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico*, vol. I).

F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei papi e nei documenti della cancelleria romana dal IV al XIV secolo*, vol. I, Rome 1937; P. Bruylants, *Les oraisons du missel romain*, *texte et histoire*, 2 vols., Louvain 1952; B. Capelle, *Collecta*: Travaux liturgiques 2, Louvain 1962, 192-199; M. Metzger, *A Eucharistic Lexicon*, in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 3, Collegeville, MN 1999, 5; M. Dudley, *Collect*, in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, London 2002, 119-120.

A. Chupungco

COLLUCIANISTS. In his letter to *Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Arius greets him as a Collucianist, i.e., a fellow disciple of the school of *Lucian of Antioch. The name was anciently given to a group of Lucian's disciples who supported Arius doctrinally and politically: it included Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Maris of Chalcedon, *Theognis of Nicaea, Anthony of Tarsus, *Leontius of Antioch and *Asterius the Sophist.

G. Bardy, *Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école; les collucianistes*: RSR 22 (1932) 437-462; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur S. Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936.

M. Simonetti

COLLUTHUS (mid-6th c.). Alexandrian *monophysite, author of an *Apologia pro Theodosio* defending the *Tomus ad Theodoram* of *Theodosius, monophysite patriarch of *Alexandria (525–560), against the attacks of the deacon *Themistius, head of the sect of the *Agnoetae, who had been accused in the *Tomus*. Some fragments of the *Apologia* are preserved. Themistius replied with a *Contra Colluthum*.

CPG 7298: Mansi X, 1117E, 1121A, 1121D-1124A; DTC 15, 219-221; Beck 395; R. Riedinger, ACO ser. c. I, 330.14-17, 25-28, 30-33; 332.1-5; A. Van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, OLA 56, Leuven 1994, 6, 10-11, 16; Patrologia V, 362-363; 359-363 (Themistius).

F. Scorza Barcellona

COLLUTHUS of Alexandria (4th c.). Presbyter, founder of a sect. Following his claim to be a bishop (on what basis we do not know), the Council of *Alexandria of 324 declared him a mere *presbyter and that ordinations conferred by him were invalid (Athan., *Apol. sec.* 12, 75-77, 80). From a letter of *Alexander of Alexandria preserved by *Theodoret (*HE* I, 4), it seems that Colluthus began his *schism before the condemnation of *Arius. It has been thought, on the basis of some expressions in this letter, that Colluthus received money to confer orders and that he separated because he thought Alexander's position on Arius too bland: the name Colluthus is first among the presbyters who subscribed to Alexander's condemnation of Arius (Gelas. Cyz., *HE* II 3, 21). *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 69, 2, 4-7) mentions him as founder of a sect which soon disappeared. Following *Filaster (*Haer.* 79), later heresiologists considered Colluthus a supporter of the doctrine that God could not be held to have created evil, in contradiction of Is 45:7.

DCB 1, 596; EC 3, 1991; LTK[3] 2, 185 (*Colluthianer*); ODC[3] 377.

F. Scorza Barcellona

COLLYRIDIANI. *Epiphanius names this sect in the masculine (*Anc.* XIII,8), saying that its followers offered twice-baked bread called *collira* (see Lev 7:12; 8:26) to *Mary. He later explains (*Haer.* 78,23; 79,1) that they were a female sect active in *Arabia in the late 4th c., who venerated the Virgin as a deity and communicated once a year with bread offered to her on an altar.

F. Cocchini

COLMANUS (Colmán) (7th c.)
I. Monk of Iona and later bishop of Lindisfarne - II. Irish poet(s).

I. Monk of Iona and later bishop of Lindisfarne. There are more than one Irishman with this name of which we have information and some compositions. The first is Colmanus, monk of Iona and later bishop of Lindisfarne, an island on the E coast in the North Sea. *Bede mentions him in the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (3,25ff.), in connection with the controversy on the observance of *Easter (and on other rules of ecclesiastical life), in which those who followed Roman practice opposed those who followed *Celtic. At the Synod of Whitby (664) Colmanus supported the Celtic tradition, which went back to the *quartodeciman observance of Johannine tradition, against *Wilfrid, who promoted Roman observance. The synod ended with the "Roman" party's victory; Colmán left *Britain and returned to *Ireland to the small island of Inisboufinde, where he founded two *monasteries for monks he had brought with him, one for the *Scots and one for the English (at Muig éo). The Irish bishop's discourses, reported by Bede, are important evidence in favor of the cultural identity of the local churches. Bischoff sees this Colmanus as the author of the *Letter to Feradach,* preserved in a 9th-c. Brussels MS (BR, MS 5649-67 [ff. 186-187v]. *Inc.*: *Dilectissimo et eruditissimo filio Feradacho Colmanus*) in which mention is made of the "textual critical" work done by the community, aimed at correcting the manuscripts in their possession based on *multa . . . scripta librorum exemplaria* which *ad nos a Romanis . . . pervenerint*. In particular, Sedulius Scottus's *Carmen paschale* was the object of detailed textual notes.

M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*, Dublin 1985, 79, n. 290; R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540*, Turnhout 1997, 89, n. 198. F. de Reiffenberg, *Paléographie-histoire littéraire*: Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles-lettres de Bruxelles 10 (1843) 362-381 (esp. p. 368: the text of the letter is incomplete); F. Rädle, *Die Kenntniss der antiken latein-*

ischen Literatur bei den Iren in der Heimat und auf dem Kontinent, in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1982, 1, 484-500 (esp. p. 490-491); P. Ó Néill, "*Romani* Influences on Seventh-Century Hiberno-Latin Literature," in *Irland und Europa Die Kirche im Frühmittelalter*, Stuttgart 1984, 280-290; R. Sharpe, *An Irish Textual Critic and the* Carmen Paschale *of Sedulius: Colmán's Letter to Feradach*: Journal of Medieval Latin 2 (1992) 44-54 (ed. of the text at pp. 47-50); D. Howlett, *Aldhelm and Irish Learning*: Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi 52 (1994) 37-75 (esp. 60-65); Patrologia IV, 452; D. Howlett, *Insular Latin Writers' Rhythms*: Peritia 11 (1997) 53-116.

II. Irish poet(s). The Irish poet(s) Colmanus (it seems there may have been at least two of the same name) worked very probably in the 9th c. Two MSS (Paris, BN, nouv. acq., Lat. 1615,ff. 182v-183; Paris, BN, Lat. 18095,ff. 47-47v, both 9th c.) pass down two short poems in honor of St. *Brigid of Kildare, the first attributed to a *Colmanus nepos Cracavist,* who composed it at *Rome; the other to a *Colmanus episcopus*. To the former Colmanus is also attributed the composition of a short poem addressed to a friend of the same name, who was about to return to Ireland, their common homeland, by a sea voyage depicted as full of dangers (Paris, BN, nouv. acq., Lat. 1615,ff. 183 and London, Ms. Reg. 15. B. XIX. *Inc.*: *Dum subito properas dulces invisere terras*). The poem is composed in a good Latin, sprinkled with reminisces not only of Virgil but also of Ovid, Lucan and the ancient Christian poets.

J.F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical. An Introduction and Guide*, Dublin 1979, 551, n. 359; M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*, Dublin 1985, 79, n. 290; R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540*, Turnhout 1997, 89, n. 199. K. Strecker, MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, 6/1, 179-182; D. Schaller - E. Könsgen, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum*, Göttingen 1977, nn. 449; 4061; 14013; K. Meyer, *Colmán's Farewell to Colmán*: Ériu 3 (1907) 186-189 (with *editio princeps* by Wilhelm Meyer); M. Esposito, *The Poems of Colmanus "Nepos Cracavist" and Dungalus "Praecipuus Scottorum"*: JTS 33 (1932) 113-131, now in Id., *Irish Books and Learning in Mediaeval Europe*, Aldershot 1990; M. Esposito, *Notes on Latin Learning and Literature in Mediaeval Ireland, IV: On the Early Latin Lives of St. Brigid of Kildare*: Hermathena 49 (1935) 120-165 (p. 128 text), now in *Latin Learning in Mediaeval Ireland*, London 1988; R. Sharpe, Vita S. Brigitae: *The Oldest Texts*: Peritia 1 (1982) 81-106.

V. Milazzo

COLOGNE

I. The first three centuries - II. The 4th-6th centuries - III. Church buildings - IV. Inscriptions and minor arts.

I. The first three centuries. In 38 BC (or 19?) M. Vipsanius Agrippa forced the Germanic tribe of the *Ubii* to move from the right bank of the Rhine to the left and to found there the *oppidum Ubiorum* as their new center. The empress Agrippina, wife of *Claudius (41–54), was born there; in AD 50 she promoted the site to the rank of city with the name Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium (Strab. 4,3,4; Tac., *Ann.* 12,27,1); thereafter it functioned both as capital of the province Germania Inferior and as its ecclesiastical center. The origins of the Christian community of Cologne remain quite obscure, although some signs suggest the presence of a Christian community in the city already at the time of the last *persecutions. The 5th-6th-c. burial inscription of a girl of about 5 years, Rudu[f]ula, contains the expression *SOCIATA MS*, which perhaps may be understood as *sociata m[artyribu]s* "associated to the tombs of the martyrs," in allusion to a tomb *retro sanctos*. An inscription of St. *Ursula, possibly from the late 4th c., tells how a man from the East, Clematius, was moved by a heavenly vision to rebuild a basilica that arose on the site on which some virgins were *martyred. The crumbling church, which Clematius restored, was in a necropolis active until the 2nd half of the 1st c.; association of the martyrs with Ursula and her companions does not occur before the 9th c. Difficult to evaluate are the martyrdoms of soldiers attested, for the most part, on the site of legionary encampments. Cassius, *Florentius and companions are mentioned in a diploma of 691 (or 692) as protectors of Bonn. Unfortunately, archaeological research in the aforementioned area has thus far uncovered no graves. Gereon, too, only from the 7th c., has been related to a building, built by the end of the 4th c. at the center of a *cemetery NW of the city. *Gregory of Tours (*Liber in gloria martyrum* 61: MGH. SRM 1/2,530) does not name him, only citing 50 soldiers of the Theban legion who must have been thrown into a well inside a church (D. van Berchem, *Le martyre de la Légion Thébaine*, Basel 1956; J. Helgeland, *Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine*: ANRW II 23.1 [1979] 774-7).

II. The 4th-6th centuries. In 313 we find a *Maternus ex Agrippina civitate* among the arbitrators called to *Rome by *Constantine on the occasion of the *Donatist question (*Optatus, *De schismate Donatistarum* I, 23: CSEL 26,26); later he also subscribed, with the deacon *Macrinus*, to the acts of *Arles in 314 (*Concilia Galliae 314-506*: CCL 148,15). The fact that a Bishop Maternus appears, in the latest lists of bishops, in the third position between Valerius and *Agricius in the series of the bishops of *Trier, and is also passed down as the founder of Tongern, is not

easily explained. Cologne presents no data opposing the hypothesis that Maternus may have been buried in Trier. If we do not want to admit multiple homonymous bishops, or delete Maternus from the episcopal lists of Trier and Tongern, one may deduce from these toponymic interconnections that Cologne was founded from Trier and Tongern from Cologne, perhaps at the time of Maternus.

The next bishop known to us, Euphrates, also presents difficulties. In 342 he took part in the Synod of *Serdica and, with Bishop *Vincent of Capua, was sent by Emperor *Constantius, who was at *Antioch, to take a position in favor of the orthodox (Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum* 20,2; H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* II, Berlin 1934-41, 193). A few years later (346) he was removed in a synod of Gallican bishops at Cologne, presided over by *Maximinus of Trier, with the charge: *Christum deum negat* (*Concilia Galliae 314-506*: CCL 148,27). Since Euphrates, a convinced proponent of *Nicene faith, could not turn into an *Arian in the space of a few years, it is likely that the synod had found him guilty of radical *Sabellianism. It is likely that there was a falsification of the acts of the synod, which are known from a 10th-c. MS, in turn based on an 8th-c. biography of Bishop Maximinus. The falsification may have been motivated by the need to emphasize, in the post-Carolingian era, the preeminence of Trier over Cologne.

Toward the end of the 4th c. a Bishop *Severinus is attested, who, according to a document of 948, in 376 founded a *monastery in honor of Saints Cornelius and Cyprian, now called St. Severinus. *Gregory of Tours reports that Severinus heard a choir of angels singing during St. *Martin's agony (*De virtutibus S. Martini* 1,4: MGH. SRM 1/2,590). In the early 5th c. the *Franks pressed upon the Rhine; in 420 Trier fell briefly into their hands; soon after, they occupied Cologne, which led to a long period of silence in the sources after Severinus. Only in 566–567 does *Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmen* 3,14 (MGH.AA 4/1,67-68), cite a bishop, still with a Roman name: Carentius. The next bishop known to us, Eberigisil (ca. 590), was certainly of Germanic origin.

Few other documents supplement this sparse information on the bishops of Cologne. *Ammianus Marcellinus (15,5,31; Jones-Martindale-Morris I,840-841) tells how the *magister peditum Silvanus,* having had himself acclaimed Caesar, on the occasion of the Frankish irruption in 355, pursued by the soldiers of the commandant of the Roman army, took refuge in a *conventiculum ritus Christiani* and was then killed with many sword blows. In a letter of Emperor *Gratian we read that Ursinus, adversary of Pope *Damasus (366–384), was exiled to Cologne (*Collectio Avellana* 13,4: CSEL 35/1,55). *Salvian of Marseille recounts how the population of Cologne suffered in 450 at the hands of the invading Franks (*Ep.* 1,5: CSEL 8,201-202). A Roman noblewoman was constrained to put herself at the service of the *uxores barbarorum* to support herself. Finally Gregory of Tours (*Vitae Patrum* 6,2: MGH. SRM 1/2,681) relates that St. Gall destroyed a barbarian *pagan temple at Cologne ca. 520. It is possible that the cited *conventiculum ritus Christiani* refers to the cathedral of Cologne, traces of which have been discovered under the present duomo.

III. Church buildings. Archaeological finds give no proof of the existence of a Christian church at Cologne in the 3rd or 4th c. The most recent excavations under the present cathedral have not confirmed theories regarding a 1st-c. temple on the site, a pre-Constantinian *domus ecclesiae,* similar to that at *Dura Europos or to the presumed titular churches at Rome, a 4th-c. baptistery, or an episcopal house. It is true that the first layer excavated, from the 2nd to 3rd c., contains remains of two rooms furnished with heating systems, similar to the early Christian church of *Aquileia. While floor mosaics at Aquileia, however, give indubitable proof of liturgical use, at Cologne there is no such trace. The same is true for the pool from the period, ca. 70 m from the E wall of the houses. Since here also there are no indications of liturgical use, the hypothesis of an early Christian baptistery can no longer be sustained. One can only say that on this site there was a continual use of pre-Constantinian buildings with various alterations and reconstructions, to the point of leading, in the 2nd half of the 6th c., to the certain construction of a three-aisled basilica, dimensions 30 x 25 m, with the addition of a baptistery.

It remains to be ascertained whether the wall structures built on Roman foundations can be traced back to a Roman-period church; they are near the present-day Churches of St. George and St. Peter near the city wall and have no cemeterial area. It could have been a "parochial" church, as distinct from the episcopal church and located in the crowded *suburbium*.

Outside the walls were the cemeterial Churches of St. Gereon, St. Ursula and St. Severinus, built in the fields of late-Roman necropolises of the 1st c. AD. The brickwork of St. Gereon is from the Late Antique period; the church is an oval building of ca. 23 x 18 m with four semicircular niches on each side, radius ca. 2.30 m, and eastern apse. The church itself was not attested before a document of 839; some in-

scriptions in the cemetery indicate a liturgical use of the building in the early Christian period. Inscriptions on three *sarcophagi in the *confessio* confirm the veneration of the Theban martyrs. The three-aisled basilica of St. Ursula, dimensions 28 x 17 m, dates possibly to the 4th c. (after the Frankish invasions of 355/356?), as some tombs in the cemetery suggest, which contain objects decorated with early Christian iconographical themes. Christian use of the basilica, however, is not certainly attested before the construction of an ambo in the 6th c., and the cult of the martyrs not before the 10th c.

The Church of St. Severinus seems not to have had any particular relation with the cult of the martyrs. By the presence of Christian epitaphs in the surrounding cemetery, it can be supposed that the primitive building of 11.60 x 7.60 m was used as a private cemetery chapel by a Christian family. Around 470 the chapel was turned into a church, three-aisled with narthex, which, until the 6th c., had no new area for the deposition of the deceased. Thus in this case too, we cannot exclude the possibility that it was a "parochial church," established to serve a populous quarter on the periphery.

IV. Inscriptions and minor arts. There are many Christian funerary inscriptions, variously distributed: almost 20 have been found in Cologne cemeteries, all from the 4th to the 7th c. Among the remains of the floor of St. Gereon, fragments of mosaics have been found, which were perhaps part of the decoration of the barrel, which Venantius Fortunatus (*Carmen* 3,14: MGH.AA 4/1,68) and Gregory of Tours (*Liber in gloria martyrum* 61: MGH. SRM 1/2,530) had already noted. The fragment of a statue of a shepherd, from the cemetery of St. Severinus, is not of certain Christian origin (Fremersdorf 15, pl. 8,2).

Particularly abundant and significant are the finds of gold glass and richly decorated cups of finished glass, which must have been produced not only at Trier but also in workshops in Cologne. In the finished cups, the glasswork reaches perfection. Notable are the plate from St. Severinus, with many biblical scenes obtained with glass droplets, the cup decorated with biblical scenes from St. Ursula, and the conical glass chalice with depictions of the miracle of the spring, the resurrection of Lazarus and the first sin, all now preserved in the British Museum, London; a spherical cup of blue glass, decorated with incisions and covered with gold leaves and four medallions with OT scenes next to the busts of Constantine's sons, and the cup "of Adam and Eve," from a tomb of Luxemburger Strasse, both in the Römisch-Germanisches Museum at Cologne. On cups, no longer preserved, were depicted a scene of Susanna, the sacrifice of Isaac and the NT scenes of the *resurrection of the dead. Another chalice is decorated with a frieze made up of a scene of soldiers, perhaps Christian, among banners. Other objects, often from funeral trousseaus, include incised cups and gold glass, rings, silver spoons, box seals produced by early Christian artisans (for minor art objects with syncretistic, *gnostic and pagan-magical elements, see Doppelfeld 118-120). Rich funerary trousseaus have also been found in the tombs of Frankish princes, excavated under the presbytery of the cathedral.

Kölner Jahrbuch (until 1992: *für Vor und Frühgeschichte*) 1 (1955) ff.; F. Fremersdorf, *Ältestes Christentum* (*mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Grabungsergebnisse unter der Severinskirche in Köln*): Kölner Jahrbuch 2 (1956) 7-26; *Frühchristliches Köln*, Cologne 1965; F.W. Oediger, *Das Bistum Köln von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts*, in Geschichte des Erzbistums Köln 1, Cologne [2]1972; W. Schulten, *Kostbarkeiten in Köln*, Cologne 1978; H. Borger, *Die Abbilder des Himmels in Köln. Kölner Kirchenbauten als Quelle zur Siedlungsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Cologne 1979; H.Ch. Brennecke, Synodum congregavit contra Euphratam nefandissimum episcopum. *Zur angeblichen Kölner Synode gegen Euphrates*: ZKG 90 (1979) 30-54; O. Doppelfeld, *Vom unterirdischen Köln*, ed. G. Biegel, Cologne 1979; G. Ristow, *Römischer Götterhimmel und frühes Christentum. Bilder zur Frühzeit der Kölner Religions- und Kirchengeschichte*, Cologne 1980; J.G. Deckers, *Kult und Kirchen der Märtyrer in Köln*: RQA 83 (1988) 25-43; Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae occidentalis ab initio usque ad annum MCXCVIII, series V: Germania, tomus I: Archiepiscopatus Coloniensis, coadiuvantibus H. Kluger et E. Pack, curaverunt St. Weinfurter et O. Engels, Stuttgart 1982; St.R. Hauser, *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Silberlöffel* (JbAC Erg. band 19), Münster 1992; B. Päffgen, *Die Ausgrabungen in St. Severin zu Köln*, 3 vols., Mainz 1992; E. Dassmann, *Die Anfänge der Kirche in Deutschland*, Stuttgart 1993, 104-159; W. Schmitz, *Die spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Grabinschriften in Köln* (*4.-7. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*): Kölner Jahrbuch 28 (1995) 643-776; F. Brink, *Die Anfänge des Christentums in Trier, Köln und Mainz*: Trierer Zeitschrift 60 (1997) 229-254; K. Dietz, *Colonia Agrippinensis*: NP 3 (1997) 72-76; S. Ristow, *Die frühen Kirchen unter dem Kölner Dom: Befunde und Funde vom 4. Jahrhundert bis zur Bauzeit des alten Domes*, Cologne 2002; U. Verstegen, *St. Gereon in Köln in römischer und frühmittelalterlicher Zeit*, Cologne 2003.

H.R. Drobner

COLOR, SYMBOLISM and LITURGY. The use of different-colored vestments (most frequently white, black or violet, red and green) in certain liturgical circumstances expresses the mysteries of the Christian faith more visibly and effectively. Though attested only late and in the West, this use is undoubtedly connected, in some aspects, with the symbolic value of colors expressed throughout the

early church (as already in the *pagan and Jewish world).

Most excellent is *white*, linked in Mt 17:1-2 (Mk 9:2-3; Lk 9:28-29) with glory: the eternal beatitude of the Lord's transfiguration on Mt. Tabor is shown concretely by the whiteness of his clothing. All heavenly "inhabitants" are described as wearing white, e.g., the angels in Acts 1:10. From here it is a short step to an *eschatological significance, already expressed in various ways in the book of Revelation (see, e.g., Rev 4:4; 7:9ff.). In the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (*Sim.* 8,2,1-4), all the elect entering the tower (the church triumphant) receive a crown, a garment white as snow and the seal of incorruptibility. Similarly, in the vision of the noblewoman *Perpetua (*Pass. Perp.* 4,8), the *martyrs preceding her into paradise are clothed in white to show the glory in which they are clothed after death. This reality is taken up again particularly in the rite of the white baptismal garment. *Gregory of Nyssa (*Hom. Cant.* I), e.g., emphasizes that the baptizand wears the same tunic that clothed the Lord in purity and incorruptibility on Mt. Tabor. In general in the Fathers of the church, the white baptismal garment comes to signify *resurrection to new life and the reacquisition of primitive innocence, a status which must be preserved always so as to attain immortality; hence it is eschatological (V. Pavan, *La veste*, 264). Following an ancient tradition, *Jerome associates white with festivity and rejoicing (*Ep.* 118,4); in *Cyril of Jerusalem the white nuptial garment in the parable of Mt 22:2-14 is the good inner disposition with which we must approach the heavenly bridegroom's banquet (*Procatech.* 3). An illustration in the purple codex of Rossano (Calabria) shows the wise virgins of Mt 25:1-13 in paradise, clothed in white in contrast with the multicolored clothing of the foolish virgins.

Opposite to white is *black,* which thus becomes a symbol of death, darkness, evil, the devil (*Barn.* 4,10; Herm., *Sim.* IX, 19,1). Another illustration in the purple codex of Rossano depicts Barabbas dressed in black. *I Clem.* 8,3 makes red and black the colors of sin, citing Is 1:18. For Augustine, black indicates sin and affliction (*Civ. Dei* XI, 23). But *Cyprian (*Mort.* 20) censures the use of black for mourning and suggests wearing white to more aptly indicate the heavenly beatitude of the departed (a concept which, in certain aspects, has been reaffirmed by Vatican II: see *Constitutio de sacra liturgia* 81). Finally, a black or dark tunic, as earlier an animal-skin garment or belt (see Gen 3:21; Mt 3:4), is a sign of *penitence and and humility; it is considered (although sometimes with censure) typical of *ascetics and monks since it expressed the mortification of the senses and disdain for the world (Jerome, *Ep.* 66,13; Greg. Naz., *Carm.* II, 1,44,27ff.). Dark violet or deep blue were equivalent to black in ancient times, as iconographical evidence proposed by E. Kirschbaum, *L'angelo*, 218ff., confirms.

Beyond general concepts derived from ideas widespread in the pagan or Jewish world, there is little significant evidence about *red* and *green.* The red garment worn by the Lord on his shoulders during the passion (Mt 27:28) recalls for *Justin (*Dial.* 54,1-2) and *Tertullian (*Marc.* 4,40,5-6) the life which Christ gave to humanity by shedding his blood (A. Quacquarelli, *La società*, 112). *Origen (*Schol. in Cant.* 5,10) sees Christ's divinity and humanity authentically expressed by the two colors *white* and *red.* *Cassiodorus alludes to *red-purple* as a symbol of Christ's love or of the *Holy Spirit's tongues of fire (*Exp. in Cant.* 4,3). *Green* for *Bede *significat animas fide semper virentes* (*Expl. Apoc.* III,21): it is the color of hope in the incorruptible and eternal inheritance.

Judging from *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV, 22) and Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* I, 29; *Ep.* 64,3), the preferred color for worship during the early centuries seems to have been white (see A. Hermann, *Farbe*, RAC 7, 421-422); from the 6th c. on the tendency is more frequent to link the color of the vestments (in fact just white) with liturgical circumstances. References to the use of white vestments at *Easter time are found, e.g., in *Vita Caes. Arel.* 1,32 (PL 67, 1017) and in *Exp. brevis ant. lit. gall.* (PL 72, 98). One of the oldest testimonies of the liturgical use of black is from the Carolingian era (M. Andrieu, *Ord. Rom.* XX, 2; XXI, 2); from that period forward it is clear that the liturgical symbolism of colors became ever richer. Not until 1194–1195 do we see—in the work of Cardinal Lotario, the future Innocent III—a standardization and a first truly ordered canon of colors (specifically white, red, black and green) assigned to the different liturgical feasts (*De sacro altaris mysterio* I, 65: PL 217, 799-802).

In practice, this correspondence of colors to liturgical feasts meant: *white,* understood as the color of glory, immortality, joy, purity and innocence, was reserved for the feasts of the Lord, of the angels, of virgins and *confessors; for the dedication of a church; and, usually, for All Saints. *Red,* recalling the ardor of the Holy Spirit which appeared in the form of tongues of fire over the *apostles and the blood shed by the first Christians, was assigned to the solemnities of *Pentecost and of the *cross, and to the feasts of the *apostles and *martyrs. *Black,* associated with the ideas of sorrow, *penitence and *expiation, was used in connection with the commemora-

tion of the dead, throughout Advent and from Septuagesima to Easter Saturday. Less precise in Innocent is the significance of *green,* relegated by him simply to "ferial and common" days. Thus it seems to be understood as the color of the Sundays *per annum,* a time in which—according to a symbolic value given by Bede and confirmed by Bruno of Segni (11th c.), which considers green the color of faith (*Exp. in Ex.* 28) and immortality (*Exp. in Ap.* II, 4)—the church, after Pentecost, reflects on the last things and emphasizes its faith in the eternal inheritance.

Finally we should mention *pink* which, in the medieval Roman *liturgy, came to mark the third Sunday of Advent (*Gaudete* Sunday) and the fourth Sunday of *Lent (*Laetare* Sunday). Regarding the latter, Lotario records the use of *violet*, but also alludes to a well-known papal ceremony, that of the blessing of the golden rose, *propter laetitiam quam aurea rosa significat*. From the symbolic meaning unveiled by Innocent III we can easily intuit that the later, direct use of *pink* in the liturgy was to momentarily turn the thoughts of the faithful to the joy of Christmas or of the Lord's *resurrection.

The correspondence of colors to liturgical feasts as arranged by Innocent III was at that time accepted only by the Church of Rome. Indeed it could not be normative for the other churches, who in those times still enjoyed full autonomy in the defense of their own liturgical traditions. The Roman practice was made obligatory for the whole Catholic Church only with the decisions of the Council of Trent, though this does not mean that they were always respected.

The Eastern church does not have canons regarding colors, but, esp. for the *Byzantine church, besides the privilege accorded to the use of white at Easter time, red is generally indicated for *funeral rites and for Lent. It is thus evident that the invitation to penitence is in this case elicited through the memory of the shedding of blood.

E. Kirschbaum, *L'angelo rosso e l'angelo turchino*: RivAC 17 (1940) 209-248; P. Radó, *Enchiridion Liturgicum* II, Rome 1961, 1445ff.; M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia Liturgica*, I, Milan ³1964, 613-615; A. Hermann, *Farbe*: RAC 7, 413ff.; T. Schnitzler, *Farbensymbolik*: LIC 2, 7ff.; RBK 2, 524-533; T. Schnitzler, *Farben, liturgische*: LTK³ 3, 1979-1181; A.C. Rush, *The Colours of Red and Black in the Liturgy of the Dead*, in Kyriakon II, Münster W. 1970, 698-708; V. Pavan, *La veste bianca battesimale*, indicium *escatologico nella Chiesa dei primi secoli*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 257-271; A. Quacquarelli, *La società cristologica prima di Costantino e i riflessi nelle arti figurative*, Bari 1978, 102, 110-114; A.A. Häußling, *Farben/Farbensymbolik*: TRE 11, 26-29; A. Casartelli, *La funzione distintiva del colore nell'abbigliamento romano della prima età imperiale*: Aevum 72 (1998) 109-125; J.J. Ramos Passalodos, *Coloribus idololatria* (*Tert. Spect. IX,5*): Cuadernos de filología clásica, Estudios latinos 17 (1999) 89-103 (REAug [2000] 284 other bibl.); M. Pastoureau, *Ordo colorum. Notes sur la naissance des couleurs liturgiques*: La MaisonD. 176 (1988) 54-66; L. Luzzatto - R. Pompas, *Il siginficato dei colori nelle civiltà antiche*, Milan 2001.

V. Pavan

COLOSSEUM (COLISEUM), Flavian amphitheater. This building, a Roman archaeological invention (see Cozzo 197-253; Futrell 121-161), was a symbol from its conception, part of the political plan to exalt the Flavian dynasty. At the same time it restored a public space used by *Nero for private ends, the construction of the Domus Aurea, the Flavian amphitheater, was thus meant to reflect the power and magnificence of the Roman Empire. Following the proposal of Alföldy (*Eine Bauinschrift*, 208ff.), who found an inscription in two versions: I[MP(ERATOR)] CAES(AR) T(ITUS) VESPASI[ANUS AUG(USTUS)] AMPHITHEATR[UM NOVUM (?)] [EX] MANUBIS (vac.) [FIERI IUSSIT (?)] in the marble remains of another inscription (CIL VI, 1763, 32089), the building, which *Vespasian wanted but was begun by *Titus in AD 80, was to be financed, according to the custom of the time, with the spoils of war (*manubiae*): the riches of the *temple of *Jerusalem. *Rome would thus have a monumental space adequate for the spectacles offered to the people by the authorities, mainly gladiatorial fights (*munera gladiatorum*) and wild animal hunts (*venationes*). The elliptical design (188 x 156 m) favored both good sight lines for the attendees (ca. 55,000, seated according to social class) and the uniqueness of the spectacles, thanks to the special arrangement of the arena and the hypogea. Initially there were also naval battles or *naumachie* (see Bomgardner; Golvin). We must also mention the religious and cultic elements which, as in any aspect of Roman society, were an ever-present component of such events (see Futrell 77-93). The Flavian amphitheater replaced the earlier buildings, remaining the only building of this type in use at Rome from the late 1st c. to the early 6th c., when it fell into complete abandonment and ruin. The Castrense amphitheater, according to some, always functioned in relation to the Flavian amphitheater, both as a training ground for the gladiators—at least for the so-called praetorians—and as a holding ground for wild beasts (*vivarium*); some private spectacles may also have been held there (see Colagrossi 265-283). During these centuries the Flavian amphitheater underwent some modifications due to the requirements of the spectacles and public, but much reconstruction was done esp. due to damage caused by earthquakes and fires.

**Damnatio ad bestias,* according to Roman legisla-

tion (see *Digesta Iustiniani* 28.1.8.4; 28.3.6.6; 29.2.25.3; 48.8.11.1-2; 48.10.8; 48.13.7; 48.19.12; 48.19.28.15-16; 48.19.29; 48.19.31; 49.16.4.1; 49.18.1; 49.18.3), was carried out at Rome in the Flavian amphitheater as part of the programs of the *munera*.

These reasons—the specific use of the Flavian amphitheater and the carrying out of *damnatio ad bestias* in the arena—are the possible historical basis of the *hagiographical tradition attested by more than 15 martyrial *passiones,* which present the Flavian amphitheater as the scene of *martyrdom; they can also explain the link that Christians wanted to form with the building from the 5th to the 6th c., whether in the elaboration of these very hagiographical traditions or in the use of areas near the building as *cemeteries (but not inside it, as with other amphitheaters; see Ferrua; Rea, *Rota Colisei*, 121-125), or during the Middle Ages, as the seat of religious communities, churches and the *via crucis* in or near it. The monumental inscriptions of the popes (16th-17th c.), along with a type of devotional literature that is popular even today (19th c., see O'Reilly), are other manifestations of this link. As for the so-called martyrs of the Colosseum, leaving aside the apologetic dissertations written from the 18th to the early 20th c. (see Delehaye; Gori; Leclercq; Lugari; Marangoni; Martigny; Rovira) which claimed to offer information affirming or denying their historicity, we believe that some historical basis must be admitted, handed down not only through texts but also in the cult (including elements such as *relics and churches), in archaeological evidence, and in citations in other historical sources (see Grabar; Sicari). We can thus think of the group of martyrs of the Colosseum as a symbolic unit with a specific role and a clear popularity within the Christian tradition (see Beaujard-Prévot).

Besides Gaudentius, the hypothetical architect who built the Flavian amphitheater—according to the inscription found in the cemetery of S. Agnese on the Via Nomentana in the 17th c.: *Sic premia servas, Vespasiane dire / Civitas ubi gloriae tue autori / Premiatus es morte Gaudenti letare / Promisit iste, dat Kristus omnia tibi / Qui alium paravit theatru(m) in coelo* (see Colagrossi, 285-333)—the group of the martyrs of the Colosseum consists of Alexander (Mart. rom. 21 September; BHL 273), *Almachius or Telemachus (Mart. rom. 1 January; Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V, 26), the 260 soldiers (AASS 1 March), *Eleutherus (AASS 18 April; BHL 2451ff.), Eustace and companions (Mart. rom. 20 September; BHL 2760ff.), *Ignatius of Antioch (Mart. rom. 17 October; BHL 4255ff.) and Prisca (Mart. rom. 18 January; BHL 6926).

The saying *quandiu stabit Colisæus, stat et Roma; quando cadet Colisæus, cadet et Roma. Quando cadet Roma, cadet et mundus* ("as long as the Colosseum stands, so shall Rome; when the Colosseum falls, Rome shall fall; when Rome falls, so falls the world"), which was very famous and became a kind of prophecy, has been attributed to the Venerable *Bede (it is found in an anonymous work: *Collectanea* . . . CPL 407; PL 94, 543). The term *Colosseum,* from the 11th c., is generally linked to the bronze statue of Nero which was next to the building.

G. Marangoni, *Delle memorie sacre e profane dell'Anfiteatro Flavio di Roma*, Rome 1746; F. Rovira Bonet, *Breve e divota notizia della vita, martirio, virtù e miracoli d'alcuni santi dell'anfiteatro Flavio volgarmente detto il Colosseo*, Rome 1759 and 1796; F. Gori, *Le memorie storiche, i giuochi e gli scavi dell'Anfiteatro Flavio e i pretesi martiri cristiani del Colosseo*, Rome 1875; *Colysée*, in J. A. Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, Paris 1877, 191-195; H. Delehaye, *L'Amphithéâtre Flavien et ses environs dans les textes hagiographiques*: AB 16 (1897) 209-252; G.B. Lugari, *L'anfiteatro Flavio rivendicato ai martiri*, Rome 1899; H. Leclercq, *Amphithéâtre*: DACL 2, 1648-1665; P. Colagrossi, *L'Anfiteatro Flavio nei suoi venti secoli di storia*, Florence 1913; H. Delehaye, *Saint Almachius ou Télémaque*: AB 33 (1914) 421-428; G. Cozzo, *Ingegneria romana*, Rome 1928, 203-253; H. Delehaye, *Recherches sur le légendier romain*: AB 51 (1933) 34-98; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 96-97, 187-188; A. Grabar, *Martyrium. Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique*, I, Paris 1946, 33-37; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975; K.W. Weber, *Panem et circenses*, Düsseldorf 1983, Mainz a. R. 1994 (It. tr. Garzanti 1986); A.J. O'Reilly, *Martyrs of the Coliseum with Historical Records of the Great Amphitheater of Rome*, Rockford 1987; Th. Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators*, London 1992; R. Rea, *Il Colosseo e la valle da Teodorico ai Frangipane: note di studio*, in *La storia economica di Roma nell'alto medioevo alla luce dei recenti scavi archeologici*, eds. L. Paroli - P. Delogu, Florence 1993; G. Alföldy, *Eine Bauinschrift aus dem Colosseum*: ZPE 109 (1995) 195-226 (It. tr. in R. Rea [ed.], *Rota Colisei*, Milan 2002, 14-35); L. Abbondanza, *La valle del Colosseo*, Milan 1997; J.C. Golvin, *L'amphithéâtre romain*, I, Paris 1988, 173-180; R. Rea - M. C. Cartocci, *Amphiteatrum*, in E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, I. A-C, Rome 1993, 30-35; G. Sicari, *Reliquie insigni e "corpi santi" a Roma*, Rome 1998; A. Gabucci (ed.), *Il Colosseo*, Milan 1999; D.L. Bomgardner, *The Story of the Roman Amphitheatre*, London 2000, 1-31; A. Futrell, *Blood in the Arena*, Austin 2000, 77-93; 121-213; A. La Regina (ed.), *Sangue e arena*, Milan 2001; R. Rea (ed.), *Rota Colisei*, Milan 2002.

M. Flores Colín

COLUMBA, abbot (521–597). Irish founder of *monasteries (Derry, Durrow) and evangelizer of the Picts and Scots. His Gaelic name was Crimthann, in Latin, Columba. Ancient *hagiography compared him with *Patrick and *Brigid. Of the royal Uì Néill family, he was involved in political conflicts and in 563 had to leave *Ireland: so he worked in *Scotland, making converts and creating a vast monastic orga-

nization (similar to the one he founded on the island of Iona). A poet (the hymn *Altus prosator*) and defender of the first Celtic artists and a famous "scribe," he was called the apostle of Caledonia, since on his death in 597 a great part of Scotland had been converted. Information on him is in *Adamnanus's *Vita Columbae*.

CPL 1131; L. Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands*, London 1932.

L. Navarra

COLUMBANUS (ca. 543–615). Irish saint, *abbot of Luxeuil and Bobbio. After an adolescence of study, Columbanus entered monastic life and left his native Leinster to enter the school of a *vir venerabilis* named Sinell. He then embraced the *cenobitic life in the *monastery of Bangor, which he left at ca. age 50 with the consent of his abbot Comgall to follow the *peregrinatio pro Christo*. Received (ca. 593) at the court of the Austrasian king Childebert II at Metz, he then founded the monastery of Annegray and—in the kingdom of Guntram—those of Luxeuil and Fontaine, thus initiating in the Vosges region a continental monasticism of Iberian stamp, profoundly different from the monasticism descending from *Lérins present in the rest of Burgundy. In ca. 601 Columbanus met—as they passed through *Arles, Lérins or Gap—the Roman missionaries working in Kent, disciples of *Augustine of Canterbury (see Bede, *Hist.* II,4): perhaps from them, Columbanus received some of *Gregory the Great's works, which he had requested the previous year, after having read the *Regula pastoralis* (*Ep.* 1,9), which was sent to him perhaps in November 594, if we accept the identification of Columbanus with the presbyter Columbus (Greg. Gt., *Ep.* V, 17); a presbyter Columbus was also recommended by Gregory to Conon, abbot of Lérins (Greg. Gt., *Ep.* XI, 9), in October 600, i.e., after Gregory had received Columbanus's letter.

Denouncing the corruption of the new king of Burgundy, Theuderic II (son of Childebert II), and of his grandmother Brunhilda, Columbanus was banished from the kingdom (610); from Nantes he wrote a letter (*Ep.* 4) to the *congregatio* of his monks still at Luxeuil. Then, rather than returning to Ireland, Columbanus was accepted by *Chlothar II, king of Neustria, and then by Theudebert II, king of Austrasia. Sailing down the Rhine, he settled at Bregenz, where he dedicated himself to the evangelization of the Germanic population (in particular Alemanni and Suebi). Leaving his disciple Gallus near Lake Constance, he passed into the territory of the *Longobard (Lombard) king *Agilulf, where he founded the monastery of Bobbio (613). From there or from *Milan, in 614, Columbanus wrote a letter to *Boniface IV (*Ep.* 5) defending the thesis of the *Three Chapters held by *Theodelinda and Agilulf: their plan for unity between Romans and Longobards aimed at taking a distance from the *Byzantine East, but in Columbanus's wholly spiritual outlook, its purpose was above all to overcome the divisions produced by the *schism of the Three Chapters, breaking free of old theological controversies that were contrary to the interests of Irish *ascetism and evangelization. Columbanus died at Bobbio in 615. The monk Jonas of Susa wrote his life.

Among the works attributed to Columbanus (*Epistolae, Poenitentiale, Regula monachorum, Regula coenobialis, Instructiones, Carmina*), some poetical compositions (*ad Hunaldum, ad Sethum, ad Fidolium, Carmen navale*) are now considered—not unanimously—the work of Columbanus of Saint-Trond (late 8th c.); other works are also considered spurious.

Sharpe 201; Lapidge-Sharpe 639-642 and 1251; J.F. Kenney, *The Sources of the Early History of Ireland*, New York 1929, I, n. 50, 186-200; CPL 1107-1114, 1117-1118; PL 80, 209-293 (40, 1332-1334); MGH *Epist.* III, 1892, 156ff. (W. Gundlach); SLH II, 1957 (G.S.M. Walker); J. Laporte, *Le Pénitentiel de saint Colomban*, Tournai 1960 (Monumenta Christiana Selecta, IV); SLH V, 1963, 96-107 (L. Bieler); A. de Vogüé *et al.*, *Saint Colomban. Règles et pénitentiels monastiques*, Bégrolles-en-Mauge 1989 (comm. tr.); A.M. Canopi - G. Picasso (comm. tr.), *San Colombano abate, Istruzione e Regola dei monaci*, Seregno 1997; F.G. Nuvolone - P. Todde, *Le "Lettere" e la "Preghiera" di S. Colombano: versione italiana con testo latino a fronte, apparato e commento*, ABob 22 (2000) 43-290; var. aus., *San Colombano. Le opere*, Milan 2001. Works of doubtful authenticity: Sharpe 202; Lapidge-Sharpe 650-653; CPL 1112.1117.1119. Jonas, *Vita Sancti Columbani*: CPL 1115; PL 87, 1011-1046; MGH *Script. rer. Merov.* IV, 1-156 (B. Krusch); cf. VII/2, 822-827; M. Tosi (ed.), *Ionas Bobiensis, Vita S. Columbani . . .* (tr. E. Cremona - M. Paramidani), Piacenza 1965; A. de Vogüé *et al.*, *Ionas de Bobbio, Vie de saint Colomban et de ses disciples*, Bégrolles-en-Mauge 1998-99 (comm. tr.). F. MacManus, *Saint Columban*, London [2]1963; J.W. Smit, *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger* (*Columbanus*), Amsterdam 1971; *Colombano pioniere di civilizzazione cristiana europea*, Bobbio 1973; T. O'Fiaich, *Columbanus in His Own Words*, Dublin 1974; H.B. Clarke - M. Brenann (eds.), *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism*, Oxford 1981; *Die Iren und Europa in früheren Mittelalter*, H. Löwe (ed.), Stuttgart 1982, 171-201, 434-467, 468-483; F. Prinz, *Papst Gregor der Grosse und Columban der Jüngere*, in *Irland und Europa, Die Kirche im Frühmittelalter*, eds. P. Ní Chatháin - M. Richter, Stuttgart 1984, 328-337; J.P. Mackey, *The Theology of Columbanus*, in P. Ní Chatháin - M. Richter (eds.), *Irland und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1996, 228-239; M. Lapidge (ed.), *Columbanus. Studies on the Latin Writings*, Woodbridge 1997; F. Kurzawa, *Saint Colomban, figure emblématique du monachisme irlandais*, in *Les moines irlandais dans la Lorraine médiévale*, éd. F. Kurzawa, Metz 1999, 59-92.

E. Malaspina

COMBAT (iconography). Depictions of combat in Christian iconography can be divided into three groups: (1) combat between two people, (2) combat between a person and an animal, and (3) combat between animals. The first group contains a single example: a late 3rd-c. painting in a cubicle in the catacomb of SS. Pietro e Marcellino, *Rome. Man–animal combat appears in scenes of the Samson cycle in the catacomb of Via D. Compagni (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, pls. CV-CIX-XVII-XXXI, 1). An example of this type also appears on a panel of the *diptych of the consul Aureobindus (506), where a combat scene between men and lions in the circus is depicted. Combat between animals is much more common. The mosaics of the N and S halls of the Theodorian complex at *Aquileia (2nd decade of the 4th c.) show combat between cock and tortoise, symbols of light and darkness, respectively. A pavement mosaic from Amwas in *Palestine (5th-6th c.) shows combat between wild and domestic animals. In plastic art, a sarcophagus from Palazzo Lancellotti (Rep. 976) and one from Villa Ludovisi (Rep. 86), both in Rome, show scenes of cockfighting. Another example of combat is in the *Tours Pentateuch (fol. 56a).

DACL III, 2, 2886-2905; G.P. Kirsch, *Un cubicolo con pitture profane inedite nella catacomba dei SS. Pietro* e *Marcellino*: RivAC 10 (1933) 263ff.; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952, pls. 5,21; 36; 17,60; 19,59; B. Bagatti, *L'archeologia cristiana in Palestina*, Florence 1962, 103, pl. 8; A. Grabar, *L'età d'oro di Giustiniano*, Milan 1966, 278, fig. 320; J. Porcher, in J. Hubert - J. Porcher - W.F. Volbach, *L'Europa delle invasioni barbariche*, Milan 1968, 128; A. Ferrua, *Una nuova regione della catacomba dei SS. Pietro* e *Marcellino*: RivAC 44 (1968) 29ff.; E. Jastrzebowska, *Les origines de la scène du combat entre le coq et la tortue dans les mosaïques chrétiennes d'Aquilée*: AAAd VIII (1975) 93-107; P. Testini, *Arte mitraica e arte cristiana*, in *Mysteria Mithrae*, Rome 1979, 441-443.

A.M. Di Nino

COMMENTARIES, Biblical. As opposed to **quaestiones*—collections of interpretations of biblical passages of particular interest—and to **homilies*—preached to illustrate biblical passages read during liturgical functions—the biblical *commentary* can be defined as a work which systematically illustrates an entire book of the Bible or an organic section thereof, interpreting the text verse by verse. Among the Jews, the *pesher,* of which several examples were discovered at *Qumran, was a commentary of this type; but since the first Christian commentaries date from the late 2nd c., when the church was already profoundly *Hellenized, the models of these Christian texts must be sought more among the Greeks. In that context, schematizing, we can distinguish two types of commentary: one grammatical or literary, consisting mostly of short marginal explanations of poetry and prose texts studied at school and historical, antiquarian, grammatical or rhetorical in character; the other type is the philosophical commentary, in which the exegete illustrates the text of an illustrious philosopher (e.g., *Plato, *Aristotle) at great length and often in a very personal way: e.g., *Proclus's commentaries on Plato.

The earliest Christian commentary known to us is the *Commentary on John* by the mid-2nd-c. *gnostic *Heracleon. From its surviving fragments, it must have consisted of short explanations, little more than glosses, unsystematically illustrating the fourth gospel. Its model must be seen in the grammatical type of *pagan commentary. *Hippolytus's commentaries (turn of the 2nd/3rd c.) on Daniel, Song of Songs etc., show much the same character, though the interpretation seems more prolix than Heracleon's must have been. But those of *Origen (on John, Matthew, Song of Songs etc.) are much longer, reaching many books in length (33 on Jn, 10 on Song), and seem to resemble the philosophical type, perhaps through the medium of *Philo of Alexandria, whose works are mostly commentaries on passages from Genesis and Exodus resembling precisely this type of secular commentary.

After these early examples, in the great flowering of biblical commentaries that began in the 4th c. in the East and more than 50 years later in the West, we see examples of both forms, by now emancipated from secular models and adhering only, in the pattern described above, to the specific interpretative tendencies of their authors. In general, commentaries from the *Antioch area are literalist, short and to the point, while those from *Alexandria are *allegorical and usually much more long-winded. In the West, *Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram* most resembles this type in amplitude of comment.

The manner of composition could also vary. *Ambrose's commentaries (*De Abraham, De patriarchis* etc.) derive from a series of homilies, revised and adapted to rid them, at least superficially, of their homiletic character. Much of *Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob* is of the same type. Suppressing the distinction between one homily and the next is what differentiates this type of commentary from certain organized series of homilies by, e.g., *John Chrysostom or Augustine, which systematically interpret entire books of the sacred text or large sections of them but maintain for publication the distinction between the different homilies (Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis, Matthew* etc., Augus-

tine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos, Tractatus in Iohannem*). More normal is the commentary composed as a written work and intended solely for reading. Of this type are Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram,* *Jerome's *Commentaries on the Prophets* and the *Commentaries on the Minor Prophets* of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Cyril of Alexandria and *Theodoret. We cannot in principle rule out that a commentary of this type, e.g., that of *Hilary on Matthew, may be derived from a collection of homilies and so well revised as to eliminate any obvious trace of its origin.

The commentary of scholastic origin, i.e., one derived from teaching activity, deserves a separate treatment. It is the Alexandrian type of commentary, i.e., linked to the activity of the exegetes of the **Didaskaleion.* In fact Origen's commentaries, though later revised, betray such an origin in their way of presenting the material, with continual digressions and departures from the main line of interpretation: esp. the *Commentary on John*. The finding of the Tura papyri has shed much light on this narrow area. Two of *Didymus's five commentaries, those on the Psalms and on Ecclesiastes, faithfully reproduce the teacher's explanation in class, to the point of recording interruptions by students seeking clarification. Close examination of these texts, only recently discovered, will allow us to greatly deepen our knowledge of scholastic teaching of Scripture in the patristic age.

G. Bardy, *Commentaires patristiques de la Bible*: DBS 2, 73-103; R. Gryson - D. Smatula, *Les commentaires patristiques sur Isaïe d'Origène à Jérôme*: REAug 36 (1990) 3-41; *Commentaries-Kommentare*, Glenn W. Most (ed.), Göttingen 1999; LACL (2002) 437-439.

M. Simonetti

COMMODIAN. Probably the most enigmatic poet of Christian antiquity. The dating of his two works, the *Instructiones* and the *Carmen apologeticum,* which burst upon the history of Latin poetry like a dark sun ("*soleil noir*"—Fontaine), was at the center of critical debate for three centuries, developing in two directions. The early date, no longer considered, is represented by scholars such as Katwijc, Blumenkranz, Simonetti, Thraede, Salvatore, Gagé, Alföldy, Fontaine and Poinsotte, who put the composition of the two works in the mid-3rd c., at the time of *Decius's persecutions (Martin pushes the date back to the 1st decade of the 4th c., Ferrari to the 4th c.). The later date is represented by scholars such as Brewer, Hermann, Courcelle, Krestan and Sirago, who, on the basis of presumed references to the barbarian invasions in his works, opt for the 5th c. The enigmatic *inscriptio* of *Instr.* 2, 35, *nomen Gasaei,* has also been variously interpreted by critics: *Gaseus* would be a proper name or, changed to *Gazeus,* could even indicate Commodian's provenance from *Gaza (in *Palestine). *Gaseus* has also been interpreted as *custos aerarii* (community treasurer) or as "poet" by Sigwalt and by Salvatore, who defends this interpretation in light of the connection between the *inscriptio* and the poem's contents, in particular the last two verses (*Omnia non possum comprehendere parvo libello / Curiositas docti inveniet nomen in isto*). In fact the poet's name is contained in the acrostic *Commodianus mendicus Christi,* obtained by reading the initial letters of the verses from bottom to top. Also debated is the question of Commodian's birthplace and where he lived: *Gaul Narbonense (Brewer), *Rome (Martin), *Syria (Opelt) or *Africa (for most). Poinsotte tries to make the various positions agree, maintaining that Commodian, belonging to the milieu of Syrian merchants, settled in N *Italy, traveled both in the region of *Aquileia (which would explain his *apocalyptic vision, similar to that of *Victorinus of Petovium) and in Africa. Such travel would also explain his use of the African version of the Bible, the relation that exists between his compositions and the works of *Cyprian, his concern over judaizing *pagans, and the use of *acrostic, common in African nonfunerary epigraphy.

Of the two books in hexameters which constitute the *Instructiones,* the first, containing 41 acrostic compositions, moves in the *apologetic tradition and is characterized by criticisms aimed at pagans, Jews and judaizers, expressed with a notable propensity to hackneyed, rough polemic, full of vulgarities and sarcastic abuse; the second, containing 39 acrostics, is directed to Christians for corrective and hortatory purposes.

The *Carmen apologeticum* or *De duobus populis* (1059 rhythmic hexameters), partially transmitted in a codex written probably in the 8th c. at Nonantola, is not an apology but an exposition of the Christian *mystery for didactic purposes. In the prologue (which refers to the *praefatio* of the *Instructiones*), Commodian, after mentioning his conversion, sparked by reading Scripture, runs through the periods of the economy of salvation (original sin, flood, election of Israel, coming of Christ, rejection of the Jews because of their rejection of the Messiah) and, certain as he is of the robust happiness of the *millennium, concludes with a lively description of *eschatological times, which will be ushered in in the year 6,000 from the creation. Its sign will be the seventh *persecution, initiated at Rome by *Nero under pressure from the Jews. The empire will be destroyed and Rome burned, and the second antichrist, victo-

rious, will turn to the East. Then the battle between the two peoples, the pure and the impure, ignites before *Jerusalem. The scene of the end of the world after Satan's final defeat is the fruit of a vigorous fantasy: an endless dark night, the powerful voice of God, the collapse of the earth and stars under a storm of fire that lasts seven months, the descent of Christ with his angels, and the *resurrection of the dead from their tombs. The work, permeated by a fanatical faith and by an often extreme moralism, exhibits a theology clearly characterized by *Monarchian-*Sabellian doctrine.

The text of both works, despite the admirable work of many skillful editors, translators and exegetes, still contains hard-to-understand obscurities due to a language full of neologisms, barbarisms and popular terms, with frequent violations of prosody and metric. Commodian's cultural, linguistic and metric "primitivism," which led one critic to think of a "countercultural" experiment (Fontaine), corresponds to a rough religiosity that is nonetheless authentic and vigorous. The poet Commodian continues to be "a delight for linguists, a torment for scholars of metric and a puzzle for historians" (Di Berardino).

CPL 1470-71. *Editions:* PL 51,201-262; B. Dombart, CSEL 15, 1887; J. Martin, CCh 128, 1960; PLS 1. *Instr.:* J. Durel, *Les Instructions de Commodien*, Paris 1912; Ant. Salvatore, Naples 1965-68 (3 vols.: cr. text, It. tr. and notes). *Carm. apol.:* J.-B. Pitra, Spicilegium Solesmense, 1 (1852) 21-49; Ant. Salvatore, CP 5, 1975 (cr. text, It. tr. and comm.). Lexicon: A.F. van Katwijk, Amsterdam 1934.

Studies: A. Di Berardino, Patrologia III, 246-253 (bibl. up to 1977); H. Brewer, *Commodian von Gaza,* Paderborn 1906; H. Scheifler, *Quaestiones Commodianeae*, Diss. Breslau 1908; J. Durel, *Recherches sur la doctrine, la langue et le vocabulaire du poète*, Paris 1912; J. Martin, *Studien u. Beiträge zur Erklärung und Zeitbestimmung Commodian*, Leipzig 1913; H.B. Vroom, *De Commodiani metro et syntaxi adnotationes*, Utrecht 1917; E. Castorina, *La poesia di Commodiano nella storia della metrica latina*, Catania 1950; H.A.M. Hoppenbrouwers, *Commodien, poète chrétien*, Nijmegen 1964; J. Daniélou, *Les origines du christianisme latin*, Paris 1978, 93-111 (on Commodian's theology) and 224-234 (Commodian and the biblical *testimonia*); J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 39-52; V. Loi, *Commodiano nella crisi teologica ed ecclesiologica del III secolo*, in *La poesia tardo-antica: tra retorica, teologia e politica*. Atti del V Corso della Scuola Superiore di Archeologia and Civiltà Medievali (Erice, 6-12 dicembre 1981), Messina 1984, 187-207; A. Salvatore, *Commodiano: Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, I, 855-56; P. Baldwin, *Some Aspects of Commodian*, Illinois Classical Studies 14 (1989); N. Castrillo Benito, *Comodiano, primer poeta de la Cristiandad: estudio del vocalismo, con un apéndice bibliográfico sobre el autor y sus obras*: Revista Agustiniana 30 (1991-92) 44-55; J.-M. Poinsotte, *Commodien dit de Gaza*: REL 74 (1996) 270-281; Id., *Un "Nero rediuiuus" chez un poète apocalyptique de III^e siècle* (*Commodien*), in J.M. Croisille - R. Martin - Y. Perrin (eds.), *Neronia. 5. Néron: histoire et légende*, Brussels 1999, 201-213; G. Brugnoli, *Comm. Apol. 16-21*: GIF 49 (1997) 243-246; S. D'Elia, *Letteratura latina cristiana*. With a completely reworked and updated bibl. by A.V. Nazzaro, Rome ³2000, 53-55 and 176-177.

A.V. Nazzaro

COMMODUS (161–192). Marcus Aurelius Commodus, who ruled 180–192, was the first Roman emperor born of a reigning father (*Marcus Aurelius). After an unsuccessful plot against him (hatched by the Senate with his sister *Lucilla and his cousin Hummidius Quadratus), Commodus ended by losing interest in power, which passed first into the hands of Perennes, head of the praetorians, and later was shared by *Marcia, his pro-Christian concubine, Eclectus, and Aemilius Laetus, commanders of the praetorians. Commodus identified himself with Hercules, whose mythical labors as a gladiator he wished to emulate. During his reign the empire was shaken by insurrections and famines. Commodus was strangled by an athlete named Narcissus. Perhaps through Marcia's influence, Christians who had been forced to work in the mines of *Sardinia were freed, and synods could be held on the controversy over the feast of *Easter. The *Scillitan martyrs were beheaded during his reign.

L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma*, V, Turin 1960; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 199-207; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan 2004; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; F. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Roma e il suo impero*, It. tr., Rome-Bari 1992; A. Ziolkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

COMMUNICATION, Written. With the full recognition during *Theodosius's reign of Christianity as state religion, an intense cultural activity developed in centers of religious life such as *monasteries and episcopal sees, by that time already present in many regions of the empire. This was especially true when these centers were run by highly educated persons, such as *Ambrose, *Jerome and *Paulinus of Nola, who were accustomed to study or even, like *Augustine, former professors of *rhetoric. These men brought to the institutions which they inspired their experience of study, teaching and school organization, adapting it and putting it at the service of the church and of the Christian communities over which they had pastoral responsibility. Their command of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic facilitated their study and *exegesis of Scripture, provided useful tools for preaching, and made possible the writ-

ing of letters and books. Augustine, Jerome, *John Chrysostom and other Fathers gave themselves tirelessly to these activities, often moved by contingent reasons or solicited by various correspondents based on the needs of the various churches or of individuals (not necessarily believers), such as to produce an extraordinary number of texts aimed at offering an apology for the faith or at the instruction and edification of Christians, also promoting their publication for these same ends.

A kind of edition of a text, even if limited and nondefinitive, came into existence with the sending by the author of complete or partial copies of it to friends or those he knew, asking for their comments, or with readings before a select audience. From that moment the work, until then known only by its author, or at most by those who had contributed materially to its writing (stenographers, notary copyists), became de facto "public," at least for those who had been authorized to read it or hear it read, who could then decide to return it to the author for the necessary corrections, or, with the author's consent, promote its circulation.

The definitive act of publication, however, was the sending of a copy of the finished work to a friend as a gift, perhaps with a dedication; with this gift the author effectively lost control of his work and tacitly allowed its reproduction. Augustine, e.g., sending the definitive version of *De Trinitate* to *Aurelius of Carthage, in the dedicatory letter explicitly authorized his bishop friend to allow whoever wished to listen to, copy or read his work (Aug., *Ep*. 174). This instruction makes clear the close relation that reading and transcription had in the publication and circulation of texts.

An important role in the circulation of Christian writings was held by those whom bishops and the church fathers charged with delivering their correspondence to the various regions of the Empire (*baiuli, perlatores, portitores tabellarii*), often enlisted from their own *presbyterium,* among the various degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (monks, acolytes, *subdeacons, deacons [*Diakonia - Diaconate], *presbyters, even bishops) or, when this was not possible, even among trustworthy laypeople. The choice of ecclesiastics and monks for these tasks depended on their availability, their implicit trustworthiness and their level of education. Absolute fidelity was asked of these men since, besides the time required to carry out the entrusted mission, in some cases they delivered not only the Fathers' letters and books but also those of their correspondents. These were writings of every kind, from *exegetical studies to refutations, from heretical works to extremely sensitive documents such as the acts of councils or of disputes with *heretics, which absolutely could not be lost or fall into the hands of the church's enemies. Mentions of these men and their missions in the letters which they carried were in most cases stereotypical and almost removed from reality (according to the canons of traditional epistolography), in such a way as to transform real persons—sometimes even well-known persons highly involved in religious or political matters—into abstract, strongly idealized personalities. These messengers were used in order to communicate the sender's message as though he himself were present, the bearers pouring their heart into it: thus the messengers, like the letter, rendered the sender present to the recipient, in some instances themselves becoming a "living letter" (Aug., *Ep.* 31,2: CSEL 34,2,2).

The bearers, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, usually departed on their mission during the good season for reaching sometimes remote destinations by land or by sea. Facing wearying and dangerous voyages, their mission assured continued relations not only between churches near and far and among bishops and local or court authorities but also between bishops and those (Christians, *pagans, heretics) who submitted to them the widest variety of questions. Usually such persons were sent not just to deliver letters or books but also to perform various tasks, the nature of which often cannot be specified, due to the generality of references to them.

Some carried out their task scrupulously, without sparing themselves or hesitating, if necessary, to make sea voyages in the middle of winter, risking their health or sometimes even their life (Paul. Nol., *Ep.* 5,11: CSEL 29,32); others, sometimes for reasons out of their control but sometimes out of negligence, failed to complete their mission. Many texts were lost or stolen during these deliveries: some were never found, whereas others luckily reached their recipients after the most fantastic adventures.

We know the exact identity of many such bearers, esp. when they were members of the church hierarchy or freemen who were friends of the recipient or sender; those of servile condition, however, were designated generically as *homines* or *pueri*.

Among those who carried letters back and forth between Augustine and Jerome, we can mention the deacon Cyprian, the subdeacon Asterius, the priest Innocent (who also carried out various missions for other bishops at *Rome, *Alexandria, *Antioch and *Constantinople) and the presbyter *Orosius. Relations between *Hippo and *Nola, i.e., between Augustine and Paulinus, were assured by the layman *Romanianus, the youth Vetustinus, Bishop *Pos-

sidius of Calama, Romanus and Agilis and the deacon Quintus.

The task of the bearers of letters and books went well beyond the delivery to the recipient of what had been entrusted to them by the sender. Not only did they need to know the texts they carried and be able to read and explain them, contextualizing them orally with other information perhaps contained in separate documents, but they also had to update the recipient with information about the sender and his community.

It was not always possible to find bearers capable of carrying out such a complex task, such that in some circumstances senders were forced to delay sending their letters: emblematic is the case of *Consentius, a correspondent of Augustine, who, though he wanted to let Augustine know of the works he was composing against *Pelagius, thought it better to not send them until he could find a messenger qualified to converse and discuss the texts with the bishop of Hippo (Aug., *Ep.* 12*, 15, CSEL 88, 79).

D. Gorce, *Les voyages. L'hospitalité et le port des lettres*, Paris 1925; G. Cavallo, *Libro e pubblico alla fine del mondo antico. Libri editori e pubblico nel mondo antico. Guida storica e critica*, Rome - Bari 1975, 83-172; Id., *Dallo* scriptorium *senza biblioteca alla biblioteca senza* scriptorium, in *Dall'eremo al cenobio. La civiltà monastica in Italia dalle origini all'età di Dante*, Milan 1987, 331-422; Id., *Tra "volumen" e "codex." La lettura nel mondo romano*, in *Storia della Lettura*, eds. G. Cavallo - R. Chartier, Rome - Bari 1995, 37-69; M. Caltabiano, *Litterarum lumen. Ambienti culturali e libri tra il IV e il V secolo*, SEA 55, Rome 1996; Id., *Storie di uomini, lettere e libri nella corrispondenza di S. Agostino*, in *L'adorabile vescovo di Ippona*, Soveria Mannelli 2001, 73-96; Id., *I latori della corrispondenza di Agostino: tra idealizzazione realtà*: Augustinianum 60 (2001) 113-148; S. Mratscheck, *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola. Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*, Göttingen 2002; M. Caltabiano, *Libri iam in multorum manus exierunt. Agostino testimone della diffusione delle sue opere*, in *Tra IV e V secolo. Studi sulla cultura latina tardoantica*, Milan 2002, 141-157.

M. Caltabiano

COMMUNION

I. Meaning of the word - II. Aspects of eucharistic communion.

I. Meaning of the word. The Latin term *communio* was used to translate the Greek κοινωνία, although the equivalence is not perfect. In biblical Greek the word means "that which is common," that which constitutes a bond (see 2 Cor 13:14; 1 Jn 1:3); also a generous spirit of sharing (2 Cor 9:13); then the sign or proof of fraternal unity, esp. in holding goods in common (Acts 2:42); finally, participation in a collection to help the poorest (2 Cor 8:4), or in a common good par excellence, e.g., the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor 10:16)—a use which gives the word, in the *liturgy and in 4th-c. writers, the meaning of "communion in the eucharistic mystery" (Lampe 763).

Among the Latins the term expresses the act of association, participation, then the status of being common, the fact of sharing the same faith, the union with the whole church, which holds fast to spiritual and material goods, the reconciliation which reintegrates the sinner, making him reenter "communion" with it, and finally participation in the *Eucharist, receiving Christ, who offered himself for us.

II. Aspects of eucharistic communion. *Frequency.* In the first three centuries the faithful received Communion at every celebration (see *Tertullian, *Idol.* 7; *Cyprian, *Ep.* 56; *De or. dom.* 18). *Clement of Alexandria says that "every day the Lord gives himself in the food and drink of immortality" (*Quis dives* 23; see also *Origen, *In Gen hom.* 10,3). In the 4th c. we see a relaxation: *Basil of Caesarea (*Ep.* 93) and *John Chrysostom (*In Hebr. hom.* 17,4) encourage Christians to receive the Eucharist every day, since it is God's desire—declared *Hilary (*frag.* 7, PL 10, 725)—that "every day the Christ, bread of life, the bread come down from heaven, would dwell in us." The Council of *Agde (506) prescribes communication three times a year; that of Mâcon (585), once a week.

Administration of communion. *Justin informs us that deacons brought Communion to the absent (*1 Ap.* 67,5). There was also a custom of taking the sacred species home in order to communicate on the following days: see Tertullian, *De or.* 19,4; *Ad uxor.* II,5; Cyprian, *De Laps.* 26; *Hippolytus, *Tr. Ap.* 37; and still in the 4th c., see *Severus of Antioch, *Ep. a Cesaria*; Jerome, *Ep.* 49,15; *Augustine, *Opus imp. c. Iul.* 3,162. *Eusebius of Caesarea cites the example of simple laymen who bring Communion to the sick (*HE* VI, 44).

Under both species. The Council of *Nicaea (can. 13) already presents Communion under both species, brought as viaticum to the dying, as "ancient and canonical." Also see *Vita Ambr.* 47; the IV Council of *Carthage [= *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*], can. 76-78; and the I Council of *Orange (441), can. 3: "according to the definition of the Fathers."

Attitude in approaching the Eucharist. The Fathers insist much on the need to worthily prepare to receive the Eucharist. *Ambrose exhorted: "Live in such a way as to merit receiving [Christ] every day" (*Sacr.* V, 4,25); John Chrysostom recommended approaching with a pure conscience, respect and fear,

after having fasted and prayed (*In Nat. hom.* 7; *In 1 Cor hom.* 24,5): it is a preparation of the heart, not the mouth (see Augustine, *Serm.* 112,5), so as to receive Communion "with respect, devotion, humility" (*Isidore of Seville, *Eccl. off.* 2,18,7).

Effects of the Eucharist. It is considered "the one bread, the medicine of immortality, the antidote to death, the food of eternal life in Jesus Christ" (Ignatius Ant., *Eph.* 20,2); its main purpose is to unite us to Christ and, as a consequence, to each other, "in such a way that we would be in Christ and Christ in us. . . . Christ is in us through his flesh, and we are in him, so that with him, we are in God" (Hilary, *Trin.* 8,14; see also Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 10,6 and 21,25,4); it therefore makes us one body with Christ (see Cyril Alex., *In Io* 11,11), changes us into him (see Augustine, *Conf.* 7,10), generates an intimate transformation of the Christian: "Christ forms us according to his image in such a way that the qualities of his divine nature shine in us through sanctification, justice and a good life in conformity with virtue" (Cyril Alex., *Resp. ad Tiber.*).

DACL 3, 2427-2447; DTC 3, 515-552; DSp 2, 1188-1300; A. van Kol: Bijdragen 13 (1952) 419-433; Lampe 763-764; A.G. Martimort, *La chiesa in preghiera*, Rome 1963, 957 (index: s.v. communion); A. Chavasse, *À Rome, l'envoi de l'eucharistie, rite unificateur de l'église locale*: RBen 97 (1987) 7-12; C. Caspers - G. Lukken - G. Rouwhorst (eds.), *Bread of Heaven: Customs and Practices Surrounding Holy Communion: Essays in the History of Liturgy and Culture*, Kampen 1995; A. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford 1999.

M. Maritano

COMPUTI (apocryphal). During the 6th and 7th c., controversies arose in the West over the reckoning of the date of *Easter. The main cause of difference was the fact that neither the replacement of the *Supputatio romana vetus* by *Victorius of Aquitaine's computus (*see* Computus, Ecclesiastical) nor that of the latter by the Easter table of *Dionysius Exiguus, took place at the same time in the various churches. Even Victor's Easter *corsus* sometimes gave different dates for *Graeci* and *Latini* (e.g., in 577 and 590); meanwhile the *Celtic churches kept the *Supputatio romana vetus* until the 7th c., fixing the spring equinox at 25 March and accepting 25 March and 21 April as the extreme limits of Easter, from the 14th day of the moon (possibly coinciding with 14 Nisan) to the 20th. In this climate *computi* multiplied in support of the various positions, and remain a characteristic element of early medieval culture, in which astronomical data mingle with *allegorical interpretations of Scripture, polemic and apology defending peculiar liturgical traditions and a spirit of pseudo-scientific research. One of the most authoritative texts was the *Tractatus de *ratione Paschae,* attributed by one recension to *Athanasius and more commonly to *Martin of Braga, but really the work of an anonymous 5th-c. Iberian computist (see CPL 2302) with a considerable capacity for theological reflection; probably inspired by it are the false **Acts of the Council of Caesarea*, also known as *Epistula Synodica,* attributed to *Theophilus of Caesarea, composed between the 2nd half of the 6th c. and the early 7th, probably in *Britain, but perhaps in *Spain or *Africa; *Bede (*De temporum ratione*, 47: see CPL 2307) cites them as an authoritative source. Of Celtic origin are ps.-Anatolius's *De *ratione Paschae* (CPL 2303), the *Disputatio de *ratione paschali* attributed to Bishop Morinus of Alexandria (CPL 2306) and two *Epistolae* attributed to *Cyril of Alexandria (CPL 2304-2305).

Editions in B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlichmittelalterliche Chronologie*, I-II, Leipzig - Berlin 1880/1938; C. Frick, *Chronica minora*, I, Leipzig 1893. List of codices and editions in A. Cordoliani, *Les traités de comput du haut moyen âge* (526-1003): ALMA 17 (1943) 51-71. *Studies*: A. Cordoliani, *Les computistes insulaires et les écrits pseudoalexandrins*: BECh 106 (1945-46) 23ff.; *Textos de cómputo español del siglo VI. El "Prologus Cyrilli"*: Hispania Sacra 9 (1956) 127ff.; *Textes de comput espagnol. Encore le problème des traités de comput de Martin de Braga*: Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos 62 (1956) 685-697; CPPM III/A 160-839 (pp. 185-302).

V. Loi - B. Amata

COMPUTUS DE PASCHA. Handed down among *Cyprian's works, the *Computus de Pascha* was composed in the 5th year of the emperor Gordian (243) by an anonymous computist, probably *African judging from the biblical text he used. He proposed an *Easter table correcting the error of *Hippolytus of Rome (*see* Computus, Ecclesiastical), whose 16-year cycle was three days out of phase with the corresponding cycle of solar years; he held that the error was due to calculating the moon's movements starting from the first day of creation, fixed as 25 March, instead of taking 28 March, day of the creation of the moon. He based his correction more on his *exegesis of biblical passages than on astronomical calculations, and appealed to biblical teaching. Otherwise he was faithful to Hippolytus's table.

CPL 2276; PL 4, 939-974; CSEL 3/3, 248-271; CPPM III/A 750; P. Hufmayr, *Die pseudocyprianische Schrift De Pascha computus*, Augsburg 1896; Monceaux III, 79-102; G. Ogg, *The Computist of A.D. 243 and H.*: JTS 48 (1947) 206ff.; Id., *The Tabella Appended to the Pseudo-Cyprianic De Pascha Computus in the Codex Remensis*: VChr 8 (1954) 134-144; Id., *The Pseudo-*

Cyprianic De Pascha Computus, London 1955; V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines*, I, *La chronologie*, Paris 1958, 17-18.

V. Loi - B. Amata

COMPUTUS, ECCLESIASTICAL. The effort of many Christian writers to offer a certain basis for calculating the date of *Easter led to the origin and development of ecclesiastical computus, which could be called a technical, mathematical and astronomical science aimed at exactly establishing the date of the spring equinox. This calculation proved to be particularly difficult, since both solar and lunar years needed to be taken into account. The date of Easter is fixed according to the lunar calendar: it is celebrated on the Sunday immediately after the first full moon of spring; but it is moveable according to the solar calendar, since the lunar year is shorter than the solar year by ca. 11 days and 6 hours. To keep this difference of length between the solar and lunar years from making the day of the first full moon of spring (14 Nisan according to the Jewish calendar) slide indefinitely in relation to the solar calendar, an "embolismic" (i.e., "added") month must be added to the lunar year at regular intervals. But this insertion displaces the correspondence between 1/14 Nisan and the days of the solar calendar; it was thus necessary to identify a cycle of solar and lunar years which allowed the cyclical recurrence of the dates of Easter in the same order and on the same days. Moreover, in the resulting "Easter table," the insertion of the embolismic months caused, at the end of a cycle, a further displacement between the cycle of lunar years and the cycle of solar years, which had to be corrected by a periodic increase of the epact. By "epact" was meant the excess days of the solar year over the lunar year, or the age of the moon on 1 January of each year. The periodic increase of the epact was called a *saltus lunae*. The Easter tables of the Roman tradition also indicated the *concurrentes*, i.e., the conventional figures used by computists to determine on what day of the week each year would begin.

1. The first systematic Easter computus was that proposed by *Hippolytus of Rome in his work *Apodeixis chronon tou pascha*, whose Easter table is incised on the base of a statue found at Rome in 1551. The computus is based on a 16-year cycle; it started from 222 and gave the Easter dates for the next 112 years. Hippolytus did not allow celebration of Easter before the 16th day of the moon, so, if 14 Nisan fell on a Saturday, Easter had to be celebrated, not on the next day but eight days later. Hippolytus was convinced that after a 16-year cycle the Easter dates would return in the same order and on the same days of the solar calendar; in fact, at the end of the first cycle there is already a displacement of three days between the lunar and solar years under consideration. To obviate Hippolytus's error, in 243 an anonymous Latin-speaking African computist proposed a new computus (*Computus de Pascha*) with a simplistic correction of Hippolytus's mistake: he displaced the lunar dates proposed by Hippolytus by three days, taking as the starting point for his calculations not 25 March, date of the creation of the world, but 28 March, date of the creation of the moon. A few decades later, a new Easter cycle was proposed by the *African computist *Augustalis, who was the first to adopt an 84-year cycle. Augustalis's Easter table went from 213 to 312 and was adopted by the African churches and the Church of *Rome, with an indication of the added days that correspond to the leap year every 14 years. Probably in 298, Augustalis's cycle was replaced at Rome by the *supputatio romana vetus*, also based on an 84-year cycle; it allowed celebration of Easter neither before 25 March (traditional Roman date for the spring equinox) nor after 21 April, and differed from Augustalis's table in requiring a *saltus lunae* every 12 (rather than 14) years.

2. The Eastern churches, from the 2nd half of the 3rd c., followed an Easter computus proposed by *Anatolius of Laodicea, who used a 19-year cycle worked out in 432 BC by the Athenian Meto. Anatolius fixed the date of the spring equinox at 22 March and, disallowing celebration of Easter before the equinox, proposed 22 March and 25 April as the extreme limits of Easter. Anatolius's Easter table was continued by *Theophilus of Alexandria in the late 4th c. and then by his successor *Cyril.

3. In the course of the 4th c. the divergences between the Roman computus and the Alexandrian computus were considerable, so that more than once (in 333, 346, 349, 350, 357, 360, 387) the Roman church proposed different Easter dates from those of the East. The correction made to the *supputatio romana vetus* in 343, by which the equinox was fixed as 21 March in accordance with the new Alexandrian computus and the Easter limits fixed as 22 March and 21 April, from the 16th to the 22nd of the moon, was not sufficient to overcome the divergences.

Since the Easter controversies were still going on in the 5th c., Pope *Leo I entrusted the task of a new computus to *Victorius of Aquitaine: he combined the 19-year lunar cycle used at *Alexandria with a 28-year solar cycle, creating an Easter period of 532 years, at the end of which the Easter limits returned in the same order and on the same days of the calen-

dar; as Easter limits, Victor proposed 22 March and 24 April; he had a *saltus lunae* every 6/7 years of the 19-year cycle. But the divergences between the Roman computus and the Alexandrian computus continued, since Rome did not allow celebration of Easter before the 16th day of the moon, while Alexandria allowed it on the 15th day; Rome fixed 22 March and 24 April as Easter limits, but Alexandria fixed 22 March and 25 April.

In 525, at the request of the *primicerius notariorum* of Pope *John I (**Bonifacius, primicerius*), the learned Scythian monk *Dionysius, surnamed Exiguus, or "the Little," compiled an Easter table from 532 (in which the Alexandrian table compiled by Cyril came to an end) to 626, based on the 19-year Alexandrian cycle; as extreme limits of the new moons of Easter, Dionysius fixed 8 March and 5 April, and the corresponding full moons as 21 March and 18 April, so that the extreme limits of Easter became 22 March and 25 April, since Dionysius allowed Easter to be celebrated on the 15th day of the moon. Dionysius's computus triumphed over the *supputatio romana vetus* and Victorius's computus in the course of the 7th c., and became normative for the Middle Ages. But the *supputatio romana vetus* lasted much longer in the marginal areas of Western Christendom, leading to the 7th-c. Easter controversies between Rome and the churches of *Ireland and *Britain.

B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie. Der 84jährige Ostercyclus und seine Quellen*, I, Leipzig 1880; E. Schwartz, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*, AGG N.E. VIII/6 (1905); G. Gentz, v. *Ostern*: PWK XVIII/2 1647-1653; V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines*, I. *La chronologie*, Paris 1958, 6-55; V. Grumel, *Le problème de la date pascale aux IIIe et IVe siècles*: REByz 18 (1960) 163-178; A. Van de Vyver, *L'évolution du comput alexandrin et romain du IIIe au IVe siècle*: RHE 52 (1957) 5-25; D. McCarthy, *The Chronology and Sources of Early Irish Annals*: Early Medieval Europe 10 (2001) 321-334; D. Edel, *The Celtic West and Europe: Studies in Celtic Literature and Early Irish Church*, Bodnein 2001 (Computus 124-226).

V. Loi - B. Amata

CONANTIUS of PALENCIA (d. 638/639). Described by *Ildefonsus as a reflective and eloquent man, dedicated to the *liturgy and to the composition of sacred music, esp. for the morning office (*Vir. ill.* 11, PL 96, 203), Conantius was born ca. 580 and was bishop of Palencia for more than 30 years, from 607 to ca. 639. As bishop he participated in the Synod of *Toledo of 610 and in the Councils of Toledo IV (633), V (636) and VI (638); he instituted a school of formation for clergy, where he also had as a disciple *Fructuosus of Braga; and wrote a series of psalmodic prayers, in part recognized in the appendix of book IV of the *Liber orationum psalmographus* (Vega).

J. Pinell, *Liber orationum psalmographus*, Barcelona-Madrid 1972, 90-95; 217-231; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Tres notas sobre cultura latina medieval en la región palentina*, in *Actas del I Congreso de Historia de Palencia*, IV, Palencia 1987, 9-28; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 465-466.

P. Marone

CONCORDIA. When the Roman colony was settled, ca. 42 B.C., at the crossing of the Via Postumia and the Via Annia on the site of a previous *vicus*, Roman penetration in the region had been going on for centuries. The immediate purpose in founding *Iulia Concordia* was to settle veterans in fertile territory, and initially it shared the general conditions of well being and peace. In the last years of the empire, Concordia's strategic importance increased continually and it became the seat of a military arsenal specializing in the production of *sagittae*, according to the information in the 5th-c. *Notitia Dignitatum*, confirmed by a fair number of inscriptions.

Excavations near the parish church of St. Stephen and the Romanesque baptistery have uncovered an important early Christian complex, which illuminates the obscure period of the territory's Christian origins and is itself illumined by the famous address *in dedicatione ecclesiae* (*Sermo* XXVI), now ascribed by J. Lemarié to *Chromatius of Aquileia (388–408). Latin and Greek inscriptions cut from the *sarcophagi of a mixed *cemetery allow us to reconstruct the composite sociocultural milieu in which the first Christian community provided itself with stable diocesan institutions and church buildings. The large rectangular basilica recently discovered under the parish church seems to be that dedicated by Chromatius *in honorem sanctorum*, with *relics of the *apostles (*John the evangelist, *Andrew, *Thomas), as well as those of *Luke and *John the Baptist, between 389 and 400, when—in his words—*ornata est igitur Ecclesia Concordiensis et munere sanctorum et basilicae constructione et summi sacerdotis officio.* A confirmation of their presence within the complex is given by epigraphical evidence relative to privileged burials *ad sanctos*, like that on the sarcophagus of *Faustiniana famula Christi* which recommends her tomb to the saints' memory (*sanctorum memoriae*), and that on the sarcophagus of the presbyter Maurentius who rests *ante limina domnorum apostolorum.* This basilica, built in an external zone along the Augustan walls, next to the three-celled tomb on

the S and two cemeterial enclosures on the E, is generally recognized as the early Christian cathedral of Concordia; Chromatius's sermon does not confirm, but neither does it explicitly exclude, the identification of the basilica he dedicated with the cathedral, and recent archaeological data seem to support this identification. In any case, it is a cemeterial cathedral built in an area of necropolises, which raises a whole series of problems and hypotheses: nevertheless the funerary use of the area does not seem to exclude here, as elsewhere, the episcopal function of the basilica, dedicated with the sacred deposition of the relics according to a rite that was used increasingly from the time of *Ambrose on. Unfortunately, we do not know the name of the *sanctus vir* consecrated as the first bishop by Chromatius, and we have only a few names of his successors. *Attila's invasion in 452 and the flood of 589, lamented by Paul the Deacon, struck a mortal blow to the city's prosperity; after the *Longobard occupation (615–618), the episcopal see was transferred to Caorle, under *Byzantine rule.

P.L. Zovatto, *Antichi monumenti cristiani di Iulia Concordia Sagittaria*, Vatican City 1950; I. Furlan, *Architettura del complesso paleocristiano di Iulia Concordia: revisione e proposte*, in *Scritti storici in memoria di P.L. Zovatto*, Milan 1972, 79-95; G. Bovini, *Concordia paleocristiana*, Bologna 1973; G. Fogolari, *La maggior basilica paleocristiana di Concordia. Relazione preliminare*: AAAd VI (1974) 267-295; *Iulia Concordia dall'età romana all'età moderna*, eds. B. Scarpa Bonazza - B. Forlati Tamaro - G. dei Fogulari - L. Coletti - R. Cessi - G. Zille, Treviso 1978; L. Bertacchi, *Architettura e mosaico*, in *Da Aquileia a Venezia*, Milan 1980, 311-331; G. Lettich, *Le iscrizioni sepolcrali tardoantiche di Concordia*, Trieste 1983; G. Cuscito, *Cromazio di Aquileia e la Chiesa di Concordia*: AAAd 25 (1984) 69-88; D. Mazzoleni, *L'epigrafia cristiana a Concordia*: AAAd 31/2 (1987) 75-91; C. Noviello, *"Quievisti in saeculo": a proposito di una celebre iscrizione concordiese*: Atti and Memorie della Società Istriana di Archeologia and Storia Patria 97 (1997) 143-165; var. aus., *La Chiesa concordiese 389-1989*, Pordenone 1989; var. aus., *Concordia. Tremila anni di storia*, eds. P. Croce Da Villa and E. Balestrazzi, Concordia Sagittaria 2001.

G. Cuscito

CONCUBINAGE. Derived from the Latin verb *concubo* ("to live with"), the term itself indicates the essence of such a union: the cohabitation of two persons without the intent to marry (*sine affectione maritali*). Concubinage became more common with Augustus's legislation prohibiting marriage between *cives Romani* and women of a lower social class, such as slaves, landladies, actresses, ballerinas, prostitutes, libertines and women condemned for adultery; it corresponded to what we call morganatic marriage. Concubinage thus created problems for the primitive church, which held strongly to the uniqueness of the matrimonial union, though it was forced to live with the easy divorce offered by official marriage. In concubinage, the church saw a type of cohabitation that was weaker than even Roman marriage, not to mention the fact that until 326 (*Cod. Just.* 5,26,1), alongside Roman marriage, men could also keep concubines. If we are to believe *Hippolytus (*Elenchos* 9,12,24-25), to prevent Christians from marrying *pagans, even of the same social class, concubinage was recognized by Pope *Callistus as "marriage" in the eyes of the church. It was still practiced at the time of *Augustine: see his personal example, or *Serm.* 224, where he specifies that concubinage was so common that it would have been impossible to *excommunicate all the Christians living in such unions. It was tolerated, on the condition that the man did not have a concubine and a wife simultaneously, by canon 17 of *Toledo (400), and under certain conditions by the **Apostolic Tradition* and the **Apostolic Constitutions* 8,32, but some bishops also fought against it, wanting the man to marry his concubine, having redeemed her, or to send her away and marry another woman according to the law. Concubinage was finally rejected by Pope *Leo I (*Ep.* 167, to Rusticus of Narbonne, 4-6). Two imperial concubines played a role in the history of the church: *Marcia, companion of *Commodus; and *Helena, companion of *Constantius Chlorus and mother of *Constantine the Great.

H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce*, Paris 1971, 304-312; B. Rawson, *Roman Concubinage and Other de facto Marriages*: TAPhA 104 (1974) 279-305; J. Gaudemet, *La décision de Callixte en matière de mariage*, in *Sociétés et mariages*, Strasbourg 1980, 104-115; A. Rousselle, *Concubinat et adultère*: Opus 3 (1984) 75-84; J. Gaudemet, *Union libre et mariage dans la Rome impériale*: Iura 40 (1989) 1-23; K. Power, Sed unam tamen: *Augustine and His Concubine*: AugStud 24 (1993) 49-76.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

CONFESSOR. Called by this term were all Christians who, having publicly confessed their faith before a *pagan tribunal during the *persecutions, were punished with imprisonment, exile or other minor penalties, though without suffering *martyrdom. Confessors were venerated by the community while they awaited death in prison and later, if freed, they occupied an important position in the church. Particular rights within the community were accorded them, since they were considered clothed with the *Holy Spirit. They could therefore be associated with the clergy without having received regular ordination, though not with the episcopate (*Apos. Trad.* 9). Their prayers for the sick and their power of *inter-

cession for sinners were held to be efficacious. They also had the faculty to intervene in areas of church discipline.

The Latin term *confessor* is the equivalent of the Greek ὁμολογητής, which was initially used as a synonym of μάρτυς; but from the 2nd c. on they were more clearly distinguished: a "martyr" would be one who died during his sufferings, and a "confessor" one who survived, not sealing his witness with martyrdom. We first see this distinction in the *Letter on the Martyrs of Lyons* of 177, where those who have survived the persecution do not accept the title of martyr but prefer to be called only confessor (Euseb., *HE* V.2.2-3).

Later evidence shows how this terminological specification was consolidated over time (Tertull., *Pud.* XXII.3; Orig., *Com in Ioh.* II.34, 209-210); nevertheless, in some passages of *Hippolytus, *Tertullian and *Cyprian, some still-living confessors are called martyrs. Cyprian makes a further distinction between public confession (before pagan judges) and private (fleeing persecutors), an inferior degree (*De Lapsis* 3). Once the persecutions ended, the meaning of the term *confessor* expanded to also include bishops who fought for the faith and *ascetics who lived the faith radically, witnessing to Christ not in tortures but with their virtue.

P. de Labriolle, *Martyr et confesseur*: BALAC 1 (1911) 50-54; H. Delehaye, *Sanctus*, Brussels 1923, 74-95; DACL 3, 2508-15; LTK 2, 142; E.L. Hummel, *The Concept of Martyrdom According to St. Cyprian of Carthage*, Washington, DC 1946, 1-33; M. Lods, *Confesseurs et martyrs*, Neuchâtel 1958, 61-78; B. Kötting, *Die Stellung des Konfessors in der Alten Kirche*: JbAC 19 (1976) 7-23; P. Testini, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 123-125; E.R. Hardy, *The Decline and Fall of the Confessor-Presbyter*: SP 15 (1984) 221-225; M. Girardi, *Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo*, Bari 1990, 22-24; Th. Baumeister, *Genese und Entfaltung der altkirchlichen Theologie des Martyriums*, Bern 1991; Ph. Harnoncourt - H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 2,1, Regensburg 1994, 89-90; R. Grégoire, *Manuale di Agiologia*, Fabriano 1996, 46-48.

O. Jiménez

CONFIRMATION. "*Baptism in the spirit" is promised more than once in the NT (by *John the Baptist and by Jesus himself). Baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 8:16; 19:5) or "in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38; 10:48) confers the *Holy Spirit, the gift promised for the messianic age (Acts 2:38). Only in exceptional cases do the *apostles confer this gift by laying on of hands (Acts 8:17; 19:6). But we know little or nothing of the actual rite of baptism. Only "washing in water, accompanied by the word" is stressed (see Eph 5:26); the gift of the Spirit is referred entirely to this. In both cases cited, a laying on of hands is also mentioned; Paul, however, does not mention it. His words on sealing and *anointing with the Spirit do not necessarily imply a concrete rite of anointing with *oil. Even if a basis can be discerned for a further development of the baptismal *liturgy, we must confine ourselves to saying: Paul, and especially the NT (despite the exceptional cases mentioned in Acts), "connect the conferral of the Spirit only with baptism; the epistles know no conferring of the Spirit which concludes baptism and is conferred by laying on of hands or anointing" (Neunheuser, *Taufe im Geist*, 268). Yet the fact that, in the cases cited in Acts, laying on of hands was presented as known and practiced, and the potent image of anointing in the Holy Spirit (as well as the use of actual oil in the OT anointings that were its presupposition), led, in the slow process of evolution of the baptismal liturgy, to the introduction of a laying on of hands and, later, of one or more anointings, as the final moments of the washing. But it is probable that the liturgical moment of *initiation remained a unitary action, baptism, also called baptism in Spirit, without it being possible to distinguish individual rites as sacramental moments per se.

This conception remains in subsequent centuries, though the different rites are already attested in the primitive sources. While the **Didache* speaks only of "baptism in living water" (7,1), and *Justin offers little more, *Tertullian and, soon after, *Hippolytus's **Apostolic Tradition* give us a deeper treatment of the individual rites within the overall structure of the celebration: baptismal washing (triple immersion); "anointing with oil consecrated according to ancient custom"; "then hands are laid on, invoking the Holy Spirit with a blessing" (Tertull., *Bapt.* 2 and 7-8; Neunheuser, *Taufe und Firmung*, 25). Hippolytus describes the whole rite in detail; he knows a double postbaptismal anointing, the first by a *presbyter, the second with "holy oil" by the bishop, who finally signs the baptizand on the forehead (*consignans*: 21). But the whole preserves a great unity. *Origen says it clearly: "We are baptized with visible water and visible chrism according to the tradition of the church" (*in Rom. comm.* V,8). Baptismal washing and anointing with chrism are designated by the one name "baptism," a generalized use in those times, with one important exception: Tertullian, author of the first large monographic work *De baptismo*. He stresses that the water is able to produce miraculous effects by virtue of its previous consecration with the Spirit and with the *epiclesis of God's name; he further specifies that, in baptism with water, the Holy Spirit proper is not given: "Rather, in the baptismal wash-

ing we are purified by an angel sent by the Holy Spirit" (6). Baptismal immersion is followed by anointing, in analogy with the priestly anointing of the OT and with Christ's own anointing (7). Then follows "laying on of hands with the words of blessing which invoke the Holy Spirit" (8). But despite this singular formulation, which contains the true kernel of the matter since it more distinctly recognizes a particular infusion of the Spirit, different from that of baptism in a strict sense, the whole remains an indissoluble unity, designated as *baptismus aqua*, to which the wonderful *consecutio aeternitatis* is attributed as to a unitary action (2).

Although after the 4th c. the significance of the postbaptismal actions—laying on of hands, anointing, or both—is more clearly identified, the traditional conception remains: within a unitary ritual action, *initiatio Christiana*, which in its entirety procures the remission of sins, the grafting onto Christ and his church, the gift of the Holy Spirit—i.e., in a word, Christian salvation—the individual actions remain reciprocally united parts of a single sacramental action, in which, however, the particular mode of transmission of the Spirit, "perfecting" (*teleiosis*), is clearly set in a separate rite, without thereby denying baptismal immersion its (fundamental) sacramental efficacy. The sources of this interpretation, predominant all through the first millennium and not completely lost even in the scholastic era, are mainly *Ambrose and *Cyril of Jerusalem, author of the *mystagogical *catecheses.

Ambrose describes the procedure of initiation in *De mysteriis*. After baptism in the name of the *Trinity (4), *unctio in capite* (*ut fias electum genus, sacerdotale pretiosum*: 6,30), washing of feet (6) and clothing with the *vestimenta candida* (7), there follows another stage of the rite. The church recognizes the inward desire to come to the sacrament (*ad interiora cupit mysteria pervenire*—7,40), and the Lord replies to its prayer: *Pone me ut signaculum in cor tuum, quo fides tua pleno fulgeat sacrament* (7, 41). Ambrose applies this word to the liturgical moment: *Unde repete quia accepisti signaculum spiritale, spiritum sapientiae . . . ; et serva quod accepisti. Signavit te Pater, confirmavit te Christus Dominus, et dedit pignus Spiritus in cordibus tuis . . .* (2 Cor 1:21-22). All this is confirmed and deepened in *De Sacramentis:* the rites of baptism (*immersio et unctio*: II,7) and washing of feet (III,1), *sequitur spiritale signaculum . . . , quia post fontem superest ut perfectio fiat; quando ad invocationem sacerdotis Spiritus Sanctus infunditur, Spiritus Sapientiae . . .* (III,2,8: PL 16,434A). Then follows a *signatio* of laying on of hands, as a "perfecting" of the baptismal rites; through it the Spirit is transmitted in a special way but without this action being detached from the preceding ones.

So the West speaks of anointing only in close connection with baptism and puts the stress on *signatio* (laying on of hands) with a rite that "perfects" initiation; in the East, however, anointing with "holy oil" (*myron*) is clearly in evidence. This is the theme of the third mystagogical catechesis of Cyril of Jerusalem: *De sacro Chrismate* (PG 33,1087A-1094C). *Participes igitur Christi effecti, Christi . . . appellamini . . . dum Spiritus Sancti antitypum accepistis . . . postquam ex . . . piscina ascendistis, datum est chrisma, illius antitypum quo unctus est Christus* (1:1088-1089). This oil is not just any oil: after the epiclesis of the Spirit, it becomes "charism of Christ and power [*energētikon*] of the Holy Spirit, through the presence [*parousia*] of the deity" (3:1092A). This is proved in detail in the enumeration of the different anointings and their efficacy. The theological picture sketched out here remained fundamentally valid later on, even in the West, despite the difference in rites.

B. Neunheuser, *Taufe und Firmung* (HDG IV 2) 1956 = *Baptême et Confirmation*, Paris 1966, 19 and 101 (= 13-14 and 223) (bibl. up to 1956/1966); esp.: 19-23: 101-110 (= 49-57; 223-241); B. Lewandowski, *Evolutio ritus liturgiae Confirmationis in Ecclesiis occidentalibus*: EphLit 85 (1971) 29-47; 97-120; published separately by Edizioni Liturgiche, Rome 1971 (with good bibl. XI-XXIX); A.M. Triacca, *Rassegne e segnalazioni bibliografiche in merito alla Confermazione*: EphLit 86 (1972) 148-181 (ample bibl.). With reference to baptism: B. Neunheuser, *Taufe im Geist. Der Hl. Geist in den Riten der Taufliturgie*: Archiv. für Lit. wiss. 12 (1970) 268-284; G. Kretschmar, *Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche*, in Leiturgia. Handbuch des evgl. Gottesdienstes, K.F. Müller - W. Blankenburg (eds.), Kassel 1970, 1-348, esp.: 101-109; 137-198; 260-264; S. Regli, *Firmsakrament und christliche Entfaltung*, in Mysterium Salutis, vol. V, Einsiedeln 1976, 296-348 (with bibl.), It. tr. Brescia 1978, vol. X, 349-414; G. Winkler, *Das armenische Initiationsrituale*, Rome 1982; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du II^e au VI^e siècle*, Spoleto 1988; P.R. Tragan, *Le radici bibliche del sacramento della confermazione*: Riv. lit. 76 (1989) 214-231; P. Bradshaw, *Christian Initiation: A Study in Diversity*, see Id., *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, London 1992, 161-184; C. Granado, *La confirmación en el siglo IV. Ambrosio de Milán, Catequesis Jerosolimitanas, Juan Crisóstomo*: Estudios Trinitarios 27 (1993) 21-79; P. Turner, *Sources of Confirmation from the Fathers Through the Reformation*, Collegeville, MN 1993; J. Chalassery, *The Holy Spirit and the Christian Initiation in the East Syrian Tradition*, Rome 1995; H.B. Logan Alistair, *Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Syria: The Evidence of Ignatius, the "Didache" and the "Apostolic Constituions"*: JTS 49 (1998) 92-108; M. Hauke, *Die Firmung*, Paderborn 1999, 52-151; W. Kinzig - C. Markschies - M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis*, Berlin 1999; *Liturgia*, eds. D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca - C. Cibien, 2001, 438-463; A. Elberti, *La confermazione nella tradizione della Chiesa latina*, Milan 2003.

B. Neunheuser - P. de Navascués

CONON, bishop (6th c.). Consecrated by *Jacob Baradaeus. A disciple of *John Philoponus, whose *tritheist approach he shared. He distinguished three *hypostases* and three perfectly equal natures in the *Trinity. After having defended his teacher, in the reign of *Justin II (565–577), in a debate before *John, patriarch of *Constantinople, he later condemned him for doctrinal divergences on the *resurrection of the flesh, and wrote an *Invective* against him (Photius, cod. 24; Nic. Call., *HE* 18, 49). He maintained the destruction of the form, but not the matter, of human bodies after the resurrection, while Philoponus preached the destruction of form and matter and the creation of new glorious bodies. From Conon derived the Cononite sect, which lasted until the early 8th c.

CPG 7283; A. Van Roey, *Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon*: OLP 11 (1980) 141-143 (Syriac text); G. Furlani, *Un florilegio antitriteistico in lingua siriaca*: Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere and Arti 83 (1923-1924), Parte II, 671-673; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, esp. 179-187; A. Van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, OLA 56, Leuven 1994, 106, 14; Patrologia V, 151-153.

E. Prinzivalli

CONON, martyr (3rd c.). Several *martyrs named Conon are mentioned. One was bishop of *Edessa and died in 228. *Mart. Rom.* mentions another Conon, who suffered martyrdom with his sons at *Iconium in Isauria during *Aurelian's persecution. We possess acts regarding a certain Conon, called "the Gardener," a martyr in Pamphylia under *Decius. He is called a native of *Nazareth in Galilee—perhaps a hasty deduction from his statement: "I am of Nazareth. My family is Christ's"—who settled near Magydos, where he worked as a gardener. Arrested, he confessed his faith before the prefect Publius (or Pollio). Feast 5 or 6 March.

Acts published by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, St. Petersburg 1897, republished by Knopf-Krüger, Tübingen, 64-66; cf. BHL 1912-1913; *Vies des SS.* 3, 105-106; BS 4, 152-153; DHGE 13, 460-461; AB 53 (1935) 370-374; BHG 361 (the Gardener), 2077-2078 (the Isaurian); H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, 187-193 (Fr. tr. A. Hamman, *Les premiers martyrs*, Paris 1980); LTK³ 6, 274.

A. Hamman

CONON, pope (686–687). On the death of Pope *John V (685-686), two parties developed in the Church of *Rome: the clergy wanted the archpriest Peter as his successor; the army preferred the poet Theodore. In the end neither candidate was chosen, and agreement was reached on Conon, an old *presbyter of Sicilian origin. After being confirmed by the exarch of *Ravenna, Conon was consecrated 21 October 686. His pontificate lasted only 11 months, and the LP records no significant act of his. Conon died 21 September 687.

Mansi 11,737-738; LP I, 368-369 and 372 (see also CCLXII); Jaffé I, 243; *Italia pontificia* (P.F. Kehr), V, *Aemilia sive provincia Ravennae*, Berlin 1961, 7-8, 34 and 77; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 396-400 and 719; BBKL 4, 379-80; LTK³ 6, 274 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 626-29 (P. Bertolini).

M. Spinelli

CONSCIENCE, Freedom of. By "freedom of conscience" we mean, in a broad sense, each person's right to follow and affirm his own conviction in religious or civil matters. The expression also designates the climate—even more than the conditions—which the modern mindset demands of institutions so that each individual may freely adhere to those personal convictions that give light and meaning to existence and actions. In a more specific sense, freedom of conscience is the right of men and women to choose and to abide by their own religious convictions, without external compulsion.

For the ancient society of which the early Christians were a part, it is better to speak of freedom of *the* conscience, understood as the capacity to commit oneself in a decision for which one takes responsibility, after evaluating it in light of an inner warning based on an awareness of right and wrong, and of the opinion that is formed in the light of the imperatives which urge it.

According to this moral meaning, we may say that, with Christianity, autonomy of the conscience was affirmed in a more peremptory and widespread way and was connected with the recognition of the value of each individual person—that there is something in the person that escapes any human interference. With Christianity, in fact, the recognition and valuing of spiritual interiority—which for ancient *pagan philosophy was the privilege of the sage—became widespread and available to all. *Augustine of Hippo brought to perfection the path begun at the dawn of our era, confirming in universal terms an attitude which could be called interior listening, which is reflected in one's life. For Christians of the first centuries, freedom of conscience was based on the faith that, just as Jesus Christ had freed human beings from sin through his *incarnation, death and *resurrection, so also had he liberated them from every absolute, and thus idolatrous, power. This

principle found its point of impact in the distinction, indicated by Christ (see, e.g., Mt 22:15ff.), between the political and religious spheres (which made it possible for Christians to be loyal to the *res publica* [see Rom 13:1ff.; 1 Pet 2:13ff.] but to reject the sacralization of power). It was also expressed in the testimony given by the *martyrs and *confessors to whom many anonymous documents refer (acts and passions), along with exhortations to martyrdom, biographies, ancient letters, etc. From *Constantine on it must be noted that, while freedom of conscience still remained alive in men and women and manifested itself in various forms, this freedom was not assured by the political authorities (see, e.g., the series of repressive and discriminatory laws regarding non-Christians or non-Catholics in book XVI of the *Codex Theodosianus*), who were not infrequently requested by some bishops to act without respect for human conscience. But even in ancient times the evangelical seed was not lost, and maintained a perpetual tension in society that was destined never again to disappear.

A. Laurent: Cath 7, 650, s.v. *Liberté*; H. Chadwick, RAC 10, 1065ff., s.v. *Gewissen* (bibl. at cols. 1105-1107); P. Hadot, *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique*, Paris [3]1993; M.P. Baccari, *Cittadini, popoli e comunione nella legislazione dei secoli IV-VI*, Turin 1996; F. Renaud: NP 4, 1056-1057, s.v. *Gewissen*.

P. Siniscalco

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION
(to military service)

I. Until approximately 170 - II. Until the peace of Constantine - III. After the peace of Constantine.

It is not easy to answer the question regarding military service in the early church because of the scarcity and complexity of the evidence, which has been interpreted variously by many scholars according to their own militarist or pacifist ideology. One must also consider that the problem varies with the geographical area; e.g., in Roman *Africa one detects a certain antimilitarist sensibility in authors like *Tertullian, *Cyprian, *Arnobius, *Lactantius and in the stories of the military *martyrs. Moreover, to address the question, three different periods must be distinguished: until approximately 170, until the peace of Constantine and after the peace of Constantine.

I. Until approximately 170. The sources from this period do not tell us much; there is no evidence either of the presence of Christians in the Roman army or of an attitude of refusal to participate for reasons of conscience. Presumably, considering the number and the sociological condition of the first Christian generations, military life did not present a problem for the church. References to military service in the first two centuries are indirect: *Clement of Rome presents the army's discipline as a model for the community of *Corinth (*1 Ep. ad Cor.* 37,1-3); *Ignatius uses military terminology to express the concept of *militia Christi* (*Ad Polyc.* 6,2), taking up Paul's argument in Eph 6:10-20; the *apologists repeat the Christian message of peace and of the rejection of homicide (Just., *Tryph.* 110,3; Athenag., *Legat. Christ.* 35,4-5; Min. Fel., *Octav.* 30,6).

II. Until the peace of Constantine. First, we must make it clear that in the first centuries of Christianity we cannot speak of an offical discipline of the whole church against military service. But ca. 170 we find a movement which views faith as incompatible with soldiering. This position was not confined to the *heretical circles of the *Montanists, and later of the *Manichees, but is also found in some ecclesiastical writers. Evidence of this attitude is reported by *Origen in *Contra Celsum:* at the time of *Marcus Aurelius, *Celsus had lamented the absence of Christians in the army and exhorted them to fight for the emperor (*C. Cel.* VIII, 68-73). Other sources, however, speak of the presence of Christians in the ranks of the Roman army: *Eusebius of Caesarea recounts a battle won by Marcus Aurelius, thanks to the prayers of Christian soldiers (*HE* V, 4,3-5,7); *Clement of Alexandria mentions the possibility of Christian farmers, sailors or soldiers (*Protr.* 10,100,4); Tertullian acknowledges the existence of Christian military personnel (*Apolog.* 42,2-3; *De cor.*).

In analyzing the sources on conscientious objection during this period, one must distinguish between the absolute rejection of military service (the martyr *Maximilian; Tertull., *De idolol.* 19,1-3; Lact., *Div. inst.* VI, 20,15-17) and the refusal to engage in any activities proper to the life of soldiers: participating in combat, killing, the danger of *idolatry due to oaths etc. (*Trad. Apost.* 16; Tertull., *De cor.* 11). It seems that, due to the specialization of the Roman military, Christian soldiers could to a certain degree avoid these activities. It is also presumable that these were for the most part soldiers who converted to Christianity rather than believers who then enlisted. In the 2nd half of the 3rd c. the number of Christians in the army increased; thus during the last *persecutions there were many *martyrs who were soldiers: the centurion Marcellus, the veteran Julius etc.

III. After the peace of Constantine. The new situation of the church in the 4th c. would influence its

position on military service, which would become more positive. Still, exceptions were *Martin of Tours and *Victricius of Rouen, who had left the army for reasons of faith. In 314, the Council of *Arles showed the beginnings of a compromise with the emperor, condemning those who laid down their arms in peacetime. *Athanasius and *Basil of Caesarea seem to accept the killing of enemies in war; *Ambrose defends combat in war against the barbarians (*Exp. Luc.* 2,77); *Augustine argues in favor of the legitimacy of military service with the accounts of the conversions of soldiers in the NT (*Ep.* 189,4-6). Conscientious objection to the occupation of soldier would be limited only to *monasteries.

Concilium 7, 1965 (bibl. 1945-1965, ed. J. Fontaine); A. Harnack, *Militia Christi*, Darmstadt 1963 (repr.; It. tr. Palermo 2004); H. Karpp, *Die Stellung des alten Kirche zu Kriegsdienst und Krieg*: EvangTheol 17 (1957) 496-515; B. Schöpf, *Das Tötungsrecht bei den f. christ. Schriftstellern . . .*, Regensburg 1958; J.M. Hornus, *Évangile et Labarum*, Geneva 1960; G. Crescenti, *Obiettori di coscienza e martiri militari nei primi cinque secoli del cristianesimo*, Palermo 1966; P. Siniscalco, *Massimiliano: un obiettore di coscienza del tardo impero*, Turin 1974; J. Helgeland - R.J. Daly - J. Patout Burns, *Christians and the Military*, Philadelphia 1985; E. Pucciarelli, *I cristiani e il servizio militare*, Florence 1987; A. Barzanò, *Il cristianesimo delle origini di fronte al problema del servizio militare e della guerra*: RSCI 44 (1990) 440-450; S. Tanzarella, *Rifiuto del servizio militare e della violenza nel cristianesimo africano tra la fine del III e l'inizio del IV secolo*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 455-465; J. Fernández Ubiña, *Cristianos y militares. La Iglesia antigua ante el ejército y la guerra*, Granada 2000; A. Di Berardino, *Obiezione di coscienza e servizio civile nella Chiesa precostantiniana*, in *Chiesa e Impero*, Rome 2001, 101-129.

O. Jiménez

CONSENTIUS (d. after 420). Early 5th-c. theologian. It is unknown whether he was a layman, priest or monk. Probably from *Tarraconensis or S *Gaul. He settled in the Baleari islands where, in close connection with *Augustine and *Patroclus of Arles, he wrote on the *Trinity and against *Priscillianists, *Pelagians and Jews, in addition to his letters. Our principal source on Consentius are the letters to which Augustine replies, in 410, on the relation between the two natures in Christ and between the three divine persons (Cons. in Aug., *Ep.* 119, 1-5), and in 419/420 on the body of the glorified Christ and on what our body will be like in the *resurrection (Aug., *Ep.* 205). Consentius also went to *Hippo to meet Augustine but was unable to because the latter was away for health reasons (Aug., *Ep.* 119,1). Augustine, informed by Consentius of the theories of *Dictinius—whom he had known through *Fronto—dedicated *Contra Mendacium* to Consentius (420). We have three letters of Consentius (420): one (PL 33, 449-462; CSEL 34, 698-722) is on trinitarian-christological questions. The other two, recently discovered by J. Divjak (Divjak, *Ep.* 11 and 12), confront the Priscillianist problem and shed light on the history of the *Tarraconese and *Balearic church; among other things, they give us information on persons connected with Priscillianism and on Agapius, *Asterius, Fronto, Leonas, *Leontius, *Maximian and Carparius, *Patroclus, Paulinus of Diaca, Sagitius, the matron Severa, the priest Severus, bishops Severus and Syagrius, Titianus, and the monk Ursicius.

CPL 262, 373, 797; *Ep.*: PL 33, 449-462; ed. Goldbacher, CSEL 34, 698-722; J Divjak, CSEL 55, 51-80 (the other letters); cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 119; 120; 205; and *Contra Mendacium*; Patrologia III, Sp. ed. Madrid 1980, 677-678; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, Oxford 1976, 154-155; A. López Ferreiro, *Estudios histórico-críticos sobre el priscilianismo*, Santiago di Compostela 1980, 166-176; F. Moriones, *San Agustín y Consencio. Carta de San Agustín a Consencio sobre la razón y la revelación*: Augustinus 25 (1980) 29-50; L. Robles, *San Agustín y la cuestión priscilianista sobre el origen del alma. Correspondencia con autores españoles*: Augustinus 25 (1980) 51-69; U. Stafforst, *Ein neuentdeckter Brief an den Kirchenvater Augustin* (*Ep. 11* Consentii ad Augustinum*, ed. Divjak), in *Festschrift des Bismarck Gymnasiums*, Karlsruhe 1986, 67-79; A.M. La Bonnardière, *Du nouveau sur le priscillianisme* (*Epist. 11**), in *Les lettres de S. Augustin découvertes par Johannes Divjak*, Paris 1983, 205-214; M. Moreau, *Lecture de la lettre 11* de Consentius à Augustin. Un pastiche hagiographique?*, in op. cit., 215-223; A. Wankenne, *La correspondence de Consentius avec Saint Augustin*, in op. cit., 225-242; R. van Dam, *Sheep in Wolves' Clothing: The Letters of Consentius to Augustine*: JEH 37 (1986) 515-535; J. Amengual i Batle, *Consenci, Correspondencia amb Sant Agusti*, 2 vols., Barcelona 1987-1991; C.E. Quillen, *Consentius as a Reader of Augustine's Confessions*: REAug 37 (1991) 87-109; J. Amengual i Batle, *Una trilogía agustiniana antipriscilianista y unas sugerencias para una nueva cronología*: REAug44 (1998) 205-221; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura española*, Madrid 1997, II, 25-26; J.-P. Weiss, *Consentius, un écrivain espagnol témoin de son temps*, in *Mots chiffrés et déchiffrés*, Mélanges offerts à E. Bruner, Paris 1998, 707-732.

E. Romero Pose

CONSOLATIO. *Consolatio* comes naturally to the person who does not want to abandon a friend or relative who has suffered misfortune. The events that can bring regret and sadness are many: sickness, death, floods, earthquakes, ruined fortunes, etc. The models for the *consolatio* that deals with each of these misfortunes are different according to the matter to be treated. The more tearful the situation, the more need for a suitable and spontaneous form of expression. The greatest of all misfortunes, leaving us stupefied, is death, the breach that generates trauma and confusion. For the *Stoics, death is one of the cosmic changes, like the falling of leaves (Sen.,

Ep. 104, 1), a natural process of the world (Sen., *Ep.* 30, 11). We must not attach too much weight to death but must prepare for it (Sen., *Ep.* 61, 2). Christ always underlies Christian *consolatio*, in a tension that determines other values of content and form.

Ancient Christian *consolatio* has two points of reference: *Cyprian's *De mortalitate*, for the epidemic that raged at *Carthage in 256, and *Paulinus of Nola's *Carm.* 31. Cyprian's work reaches the pinnacle of artistic prose in the harmonious unfolding of the *cola* and *commata*, making us aware of the rhythm and *melos*; Paulinus's poem sounds the most poetic notes of *Late Antiquity. Cyprian cannot understand those who, while asking for God's will to be done, do not know how to die (*Mort.* 18: M. Simonetti CCL 3A, 26-27). The plague, allaying the fear of death, beneficially arouses in the souls of the faithful the desire for *martyrdom. It also becomes a school of fortitude and allows us see whether the healthy are available to the sick, if relatives have common feeling for each other, if masters have pity for their slaves, if doctors do not abandon the sick who beg for help, if the violent are able to restrain themselves, if thieves cease their baleful activities and if the rich give to the *poor (*Mort.* 16, cit., 25). He who would reach Christ's dwelling in heavenly glory must not mourn and weep but rejoice as the day of his departure approaches (*Mort.* 22, cit., 28-29). Awaiting him are the choir of the *apostles, the array of exultant prophets, the multitude of *martyrs crowned with glory, the triumphant virgins and the merciful who spent themselves for the poor (*Mort.* 26, cit., 31).

In *Carm.* 31, Paulinus of Nola wishes, by his *consolatio*, to be close to Pneumatius and Fedelis, who have lost their 8-year old son Celsus. He looks for original models which escape common classifications and fixes forever the canon of the Christian *consolatio*. In a few verses he touches on Celsus's brief earthly life. Christ calls from heaven, and the person cannot be sad, but joyful; he must cast all sorrow out of his heart if he does not wish to be ungrateful (*Carm.* 31, 195-200: G. de Hartel CSEL 30). In Paulinus's exhortation to his readers to weep for their sins and give themselves to Christ in expectation of eternal life, the ideal of charity emerges as the true help we can give to the poor. He attributes his conversion to poverty to St. Felix (*Carm.* 21, 491-499). As one of Christ's poor, he feels more honored than when he was a Roman senator. His fine dwellings and fertile lands—which he no longer possessed, having distributed them among the poor—were nothing compared to what he now has with Christ in the state of blessed poverty.

Again in Paulinus's consolatory letter to *Pammachius (*Ep.* 13: G. de Hartel CSEL 29, 84-107) on the death of his wife Paulina, the highest reference is to works of charity. Pammachius's inviting the poor of *Rome to St. Peter's to offer them food seems the image of Christ. Pammachius is thus doing not human work but God's, revivifying the pallid bodies of the hungry and clothing the cold (*Ep.* 13, 14, cit., 95-96). Paulinus seems almost to lose sight of Pammachius so as to consider the spiritual values of charity, Paulina's true **refrigerium*. The same theme of evangelical poverty informs the whole *consolatio* of *Carm.* 31. Witnessing to it himself, and thus persuasively, charity for him becomes a model of the Christian life, the person voluntarily poor for the love of Christ, to whom the kingdom of heaven is open. The rich man in the gospel, having refused alms to the poor Lazarus, was condemned to eternal fire (*Ep.* 13,6). Paulinus sees in divine justice, which restores to the poor what the rich had taken from him, a coherence hard to explain in human language. The poor man is in Abraham's bosom, the rich man in eternal fire (*Carm.* 31, 487-488). Paulinus exhorts Pneumatius and Fedelis to feel deeply the sufferings of the poor and to use their goods with benevolent piety. If Pneumatius and Fedelis wish to enjoy their dear Celsus forever, they must so act as to be admitted to the same heavenly dwelling as their son (*Carm.* 31, 535-544). In love for the poor we have an indissoluble link with Christ, and whoever has lived his earthly life in Christ will see eternal life in him (*Carm.* 31, 551-572). Pneumatius's and Fedelis's grief is excessive; it is a sin; those who live in God do not weep. He fixes attention on this with the sentence: *impia pietas animam lugere beatam* (*Carm.* 31, 45), immediately followed by another: *gaudentem deo flere nocens amor est* (*Carm.* 31, 46). These sentences are like the steps of the *consolatio*; Celsus enjoys in heavenly light what the living cannot even imagine. If Pneumatius and Fedelis will care for the poor, they can be united forever with their Celsus. It is the chain that binds them in an even closer kinship in the kingdom of heaven.

Many early Christian authors, Greek and Latin, used the *consolatio*, but none were able to attain the clear lines of Sts. Cyprian and Paulinus. With these Fathers the genre of *consolatio* marked a qualitative leap in the consideration of works of charity as of the greatest value for judgment beyond the grave. From this perspective not even *Gregory of Nazianzus contributed to the growth of this literary genre, since *eulogy ran away with him; the same must be said of *Gregory of Nyssa. The former, for *Basil the Great, and the latter, for *Macrina, take on other theologi-

cal-spiritual contents that create other forms which depart from *consolatio*. *Ambrose recommends that the sisters of the dead emperor *Valentinian never forget him but always keep him in their hearts and minds. In *De excessu fratris sui*, Ambrose says that he will never be able to forget *Satyrus, having always borne the yoke of this life together. *Jerome too, writing his consolatory letter to *Paula on the death of her daughter *Blesilla, remains completely concentrated on Blesilla, because he will never again see a child like her. But here scholastic consolatory elements take over, which do not concern us since they are not strictly pertinent to Christian *consolatio* as a specific literary genre in its own right, with its own proper characteristics. Apart from some partial studies and the repetitive articles of dictionaries and encyclopedias, in the last decades up-to-date and thorough research has been lacking, both for *consolatio* and for the other literary genres found in the Fathers. A still useful work is Ch. Favez's *La consolation latine chrétienne*, Paris 1937, and a step forward was recently marked by G. Cannone's *Elementi consolatori ed escatologici in alcune lettere di s. Agostino*: RecTh 48 (1981) 59-77.

R.C. Gregg, *Consolation Philosophy: Greek and Christian Paideia in Basil and the Two Gregories*, Philadelphia 1975; *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, G. Ueding (ed.), Darmstadt 1992ff., 2, 367-373; J.H.D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*, Oxford 1993; *Consolatio. Nuevos estudios*, C. Alonso del Real (ed.), Pamplona 2001.

A. Quacquarelli

CONSTANS I, emperor (d. 350). Flavius Iunius Constans, younger son of *Constantine, Caesar from 333, acclaimed Augustus by the army, later ratified by senatorial acclamation on 9 September 337, with his two brothers *Constantine II and *Constantius II. In the partition of the empire, decided at the meeting of Viminacium, he obtained *Italy, *Africa and the diocese of *Macedonia, under the tutelage of Constantine II, after whose defeat in 340 he remained lord of the whole *pars Occidentis* and hence also—from the point of view of church politics—spokesman of *Nicene orthodoxy against the Eastern *Arianism supported by Constantius II. He also took up the fight against *Donatism in Africa without success, creating strong resentment among the *schismatics. His government—praised for strength and justice by the historians Aurelius Victor and Eutropius—encountered grave internal difficulties: a rebellion in *Gaul (expressing the social and economic hardships of peoples oppressed by taxation) was led by the semibarbarian Magnentius, who in 350 declared the emperor deposed and had him killed as he tried to flee to *Spain.

G. Gigli, *La dinastia dei secondi Flavii: Costantino II, Costante, Costanzo II*, Rome 1959; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari ^{2}1973, 697-712; PLRE 1,220; G.A. Cecconi, *Elemosina e propaganda. Un'analisi della "Macariana persecutio" nel III libro di Ottato di Milevi*: REAug 36 (1990) 42-66; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 312-313; P.O. Cuneo, *La legislazione di Costantino II, Costanzo II e Costante (337-361)*, Milan 1997; *Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, Cambridge 1998, 1ff.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANS II, emperor (d. 668). Grandson of the *Byzantine emperor *Heraclius (d. 11 February 641), ascended the throne in September 641 aged 11, under the tutelage of the Senate; later called Pogonatus ("Bearded"). He tried without success to stop the advance of the Arabs, who conquered N Africa and sacked territories of Asia Minor; the civil war between Arabs saved the Byzantine Empire. Intolerant of limitations on his power, he had his brother Theodosius, rightful co-regent, killed in 660. Popular hatred of the "new Cain" was further fed by his cruel repression of *orthodox opponents of his religious policy—esp. *Maximus the Confessor and Pope *Martin, who had openly condemned the imperial edict of 648 (*Typos*) which forbade any discussion of Christ's will and energy (object of the monothelite controversy [*see* Monoenergism – Monothelitism])—and the abolition of Heraclius's *Echthesis*. In 642 he waged a campaign against the Arabs which hinged on the West, whose renewed strategic and economic importance was implicitly recognized as the center of Greek resistance in the Mediterranean: its total failure was followed by Constans II's assassination in 668 at *Syracuse, where the imperial capital had been transferred.

A.A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire 324-1453*, I, Madison-Milwakee ^{2}1964; P. Corsi, *La spedizione italiana di Costante II*, Bologna 1984; Id., *La politica italiana di Costante II*: Settimane di studio, Spoleto, 34 (1988) 751-796; J.F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge 1990; ODB 1, 598-603.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTIA (d. 330). Flavia Julia Constantia, daughter of *Constantius Chlorus and *Theodora, stepdaughter of *Maximian and so half sister of *Constantine I. Married *Licinius in 313 at *Milan; an adherent of *Arianism, she maintained close relations with *Eusebius of Caesarea and with Arius himself, whose cause she pleaded with *Constantine. A letter from Eusebius to Constantia condemning the cult of images was presented at the Council of

*Nicaea of 787 in support of the iconoclastic position.

PG 20, 1546; Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.* I, 11; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* I, 60; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* II, 27; O. Seeck, PWK IV, 1, 958; PLRE 1, 221; H.-G. Thümmel, *Eusebios' Brief an Kaiserin Constantia*: Klio 66 (1984) 210-22; H.A. Pohlsander, *Constantia*: Ancient Society 24 (1993) 151-167.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTIA or Constantina (d. 354). Daughter of *Constantine I and Fausta, older sister of *Constantius II; she first married Hannibalianus, son of Constantine's half brother (d. 337), then Caesar Gallus, brother of *Julian the Apostate. She built the famous mausoleum on the Via Nomentana at *Rome, to which her body was transported from *Bithynia, where she died in 354 (Ammianus 21,1,5).

F. Savio, *Costantina figlia dell'imperatore Costantino Magno e la basilica di S. Agnese a Roma*: AAT 42 (1907) 659-669, 732-741; various hagiographical legends associate Constantia with the martyr Agnes and present her as a virgin consecrated to God: see A. Amore, BS IV, 1964, 257-259; on the mausoleum, G. Matthiae, EC 4, 770-771, with bibl.; PLRE 1, 222 (*Constantina*); PCBE 2,466.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTINE. Deacon and *cartophylax* ("archivist") of *Constantinople. Lived between 550 and 650. We possess his *Eulogy of all the Martyrs* partly cited, in favor of iconodulia, by *Nicaea II and included in the Greek lectionaries (*Panegyrika*) as a reading for the feast of All Saints.

PG 88, 480-528 (BHG 1191; CPG 7403); LTK 6, 497; Patrologia V, 92-93.

D. Stiernon

CONSTANTINE I, emperor (271/273–337). Flavius Valerius Constantinus, son of *Constantius Chlorus and *Helena, born at Naissus (Niŝ, Serbia) 27 February 271/273. He fought in *Galerius's campaign against the Persians and was at Galerius's court when Galerius and Constantius Chlorus became Augusti on *Diocletian's abdication in 305. In 306 he was allowed to join his father in *Britain; in June 306 Constantius died and Constantine was acclaimed emperor by the local troops at Eburacum (*York). He went to *Trier, where in 307 he married Fausta, daughter of the emperor *Maximian. The complex political situation, aggravated by the usurpation of *Maxentius and the maneuvers of Maxentius's father, the old Augustus Maximian, was briefly resolved by Constantine's nomination as Caesar with *Maximinus Daia, though both claimed and maintained the full dignity of Augusti. Constantine came into conflict with Maximian in 310 and defeated him near Marseille. Two years later he took up the war against the "usurper" Maxentius: entering *Italy, he broke resistance in the north with two victories at Turin and Verona, finally defeating his rival at the Milvian bridge near *Rome; Maxentius fled and drowned in the Tiber. A tradition—already established during his lifetime—had Constantine, after a vision, place the Christian monogram on his soldiers' shields before the battle as a guarantee of victory under the sign of Christ. The meaning of this gesture—whether it was truly a "conversion" from his previous sun-worship to Christianity—is hotly debated, but from then on he always favored the Christians, as is proved by the regulations issued immediately afterward, in 313, by the sole remaining emperors, Constantine and *Licinius, in favor of freedom of worship—the so-called *Edict of Milan. The agreement between the two Augusti did not last long: after initial hostilities in 314–316, which ended in Constantine's favor, Licinius was finally defeated in 324, first at Adrianople and then at Chrysopolis, and forced to abdicate: Constantine thus became sole Augustus of the empire, in a universal monarchy that expressed on earth, on the theological-political plane, the celestial monarchy of the one true God; in this sense his victory over Licinius was also the victory of Christianity, a punishment for the Eastern Augustus's policy of *persecution.

Constantine carried out important reforms in the various sectors of state administration. He multiplied palace officials, creating a bureaucratic centralization in line with the needs of an absolute government. He completed the separation, begun by Diocletian, of civilian and military commands. He increased the authority of the council of the *princeps* (*consistorium*), formalizing its functions. He reformed the army, creating two supreme commanders for infantry and cavalry, directly responsible to the emperor, and increasing the importance of mobile over frontier troops. He introduced a new strong currency, the gold *solidus*, in an attempt to halt inflation. And finally, he issued the first regulations aimed at preventing *coloni* and members of corporations from changing their work and *curiales* from escaping the economic burdens of their status.

But Constantine's most consequential activities were in the political-religious sphere; his "conversion," whatever complex motivations underlay it, was translated into a series of measures directly bound up with the Christianization of the empire,

by creating structures capable of preserving the unity of the Christian church as essential to the unity of the state, legitimizing the monarchical form of the state by the *monotheistic religious principle of its heavenly archetype. In this direction tended the provisions in favor of the clergy, concession of ecclesiastical immunities, institution of episcopal tribunals for lay cases (*Episcopalis Audientia*), recognition of the legal validity of *manumissio in ecclesia*, *Sunday as a day of rest; but also the measures against *schisms and *heresies, and even the intervention against the *Donatists in *Africa (Councils of Rome of 313 and *Arles in 314) and the calling of the Council of *Nicaea in 325, to resolve the *Arian controversy, which threatened the unity of the *ecclesia catholica*. The meaning of the formula ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτός ("bishop of those outside"?) by which Constantine was designated, according to *Eusebius of Caesarea, has been discussed at length by modern critics: we must suppose that the emperor opposed—or rather compared—his own power over affairs (or persons) outside of the institution of the church to the power of the bishops over church affairs, thus fixing the relationship between church and empire. The abandonment of Rome as capital and the refounding of *Byzantium under the name of *Constantinople, destined to become the "new Rome," whose *dedicatio* took place in 330 with *pagan rites and Christian ceremonies, physically marked the break with *tradition and moved the empire's center of gravity to the East: but to some extent it also represented—esp. for the anti-Constantinian historical tradition—the creation of a Christian capital to the detriment of pagan Rome, which it drained of economic and human resources. The last years of Constantine's life saw an approach to *Arian positions: he was baptized by a bishop of Arian tendency shortly before his death near *Nicomedia in May 337.

Still fundamental is the old work of J. Burckhardt, *Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen*, Stuttgart 1852, It. tr. Florence 1957; A. Piganiol, *L'empereur Constantin*, Paris 1932; A.H.M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*, London 1948; J. Vogt, RAC 3, 306-379; on the "conversion": H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Constantins*, Göttingen 1954; S. Calderone, *Costantino e il Cattolicesimo*, Florence 1962; R. MacMullen, *Constantine*, London 1969; A. Alföldi, *Costantino tra paganesimo e cristianesimo*, It. tr. Bari 1976; a useful anthology of ancient and modern historiography is in *The Conversion of Constantine*, J.W. Eadie (ed.), New York 1977; on Constantine's political theology: R. Farina, *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del Cristianesimo*, Zürich 1966; on the policy of reform: S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari 21973, 651-697, with bibl.; I. König, *Origo Constantini: Anonymus Valesianus*, Trier 1987; *Costantino il Grande, Dall'antichità all'Umanesimo*, eds. G. Bonamente and V. Fusco, 2 vols., Macerata 1993; S.N.C. Lieu - D. Montserrat (eds.), *Constantine: History, Historiography, and Legend*, London 1998; H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*, Baltimore 2000; A. Di Berardino, *La cristianizzazione del tempo nei secoli IV-V: la domenica*: Augustinianum 42 (2002) 97-125; L. De Giovanni, *L'imperatore Costantino e il mondo pagano*, Naples [2]2003.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTINE II, emperor (d. 340). Perhaps the illegitimate son of *Constantine I, born at *Arles in 317 and almost immediately proclaimed Caesar, acclaimed Augustus with his brothers *Constans I and *Constantius I; division of the empire gave him *Gaul, *Spain and *Britain, tutelage over his younger brother Constans and therefore a sort of control over his territories. Early in 340 he moved against Constans to secure his part of the empire, but the ill-prepared venture encountered great hostility in *Italy, reflected in the judgment of the historian Aurelius Victor; Constantine fell into an ambush near *Aquileia, was killed and thrown in the River Alsa; all his territory then went to Constans.

G. Gigli, *La dinastia dei secondi Flavii*: *Costantino II, Costante, Costanzo II*, Rome 1959; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari [2]1973, 697ff.; PLRE 1, 223; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 310-311; P.O. Cuneo, *La legislazione di Costantino II, Costanzo II e Costante* (*337–361*), Milan 1997; *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 13, Cambridge 1998, 1ff.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTINE III, emperor. Raised to the throne by the legions of *Britain, from 407 to 411 he usurped imperial power in *Gaul. Attaining some successes against the *Vandals, he extended his dominion to *Spain and obtained recognition as Augustus from *Honorius. He established his residence at *Arles and nominated his oldest son Constans as Caesar; he tried to invade *Italy on the pretext of defending it from the *Goths but, betrayed by one of his generals stationed in Spain, was soon taken prisoner and handed over to Honorius, who had him put to death at *Ravenna (411).

PLRE II, 316-317; O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, V, Berlin 1913, 379-408; VI, Stuttgart 1920, 41-50; J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, London 1923, 188-194.

P. Marone

CONSTANTINE of Laodicea. *Monophysite bishop (d. 553). Formerly *magister militiae*, he was made bishop of *Laodicea (*Syria) in 510 and took part in

the episcopal ordination of *Severus of Antioch in November 512. He was expelled from his see in 510 by Emperor *Justin for his opposition to the *Chalcedonian *Christology. In exile, mainly in *Egypt, he took part in the main manifestations of the monophysite challenge. Recalled to *Constantinople (after 535), he defended the tenets of monophysitism before *Justinian. In 553 the emperor asked him to give his signature, probably in approval of the Third Council of Constantinople (553); already full of years, Constantine died before giving it. Among monophysites he was venerated as a thaumaturge. His works, still unedited in their *Syriac transmission, are a letter to Mark the Isaurian, another to the "orthodox" (= monophysite) bishops and ecclesiastical canons. Fragments of Severus of Antioch's letters to him also survive.

CPG 7107, 7108, 7109 (p. 574), 7110; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VIe siècle*, Leuven 1954, 36-37; Patrologia V, 215-216.

D. Stiernon

CONSTANTINE of Siout (d. 640). One of the major writers of *Coptic literature, he lived sometime between 550 and 640, i.e., in the period when the anti-*Chalcedonian church in *Egypt enjoyed relative freedom and could reorganize its spiritual and hierarchical life (esp. under Bishop *Damian). Constantine was first a monk and traveled in the Holy Land. He was then consecrated bishop of the important center of Siout (Gk. Lycopolis, Ar. Assiut) in Middle Egypt. His major works are two *encomia* of *Athanasius and two of Claudius the martyr, in which what remained of an Egyptian historical and doctrinal culture emerges.

G. Garitte, *Constantin évêque d'Assiout*: Studies Crum, Boston 1950, 287-304; G. Godron, *Textes coptes relatifs à Saint Claude d'Antioche*, Turnhout 1970 (PO 35, 4); T. Orlandi, *Constantini episcopi urbis Siout encomia in Athanasium duo*, Louvain 1974 (CSCO 349-350); Patrologia V, 570-571; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 590-593.

T. Orlandi

CONSTANTINOPLE (Istanbul)
I. City - II. Councils.

I. City. SE Europe and the Mediterranean world in general have, esp. in the last five centuries, undergone radical and decisive changes. Thus Constantinople, for a thousand years one of the most important centers of political and cultural life, has not just changed its ethnic character but also lost the role it played from *Late Antiquity to the mid-15th c. The political, administrative and cultural center of the Roman Empire, then of the *Byzantine Empire, with the Turkish conquest in 1453 Constantinople became the capital of the Turkish state. Since 1924, however, it has been a peripheral city of Turkey, since Ankara offers greater strategic advantages. From time immemorial Constantinople's marvelous geographical position has aroused ambitions of conquest. As early as 658 BC the Greek city of Megara founded the colony of Byzantion here on the Thracian Bosphorus, securing access to the less hospitable Euxine (Black) Sea. When in the early 4th c. AD western Europe's situation was made precarious by the invasions of Germanic peoples, *Constantine I (306–337) decided to transfer the capital to the East. After first inclining to *Serdica, a city near his native Naissos (modern Niš, Serbia), he opted for the old Byzantium, and the official inauguration took place 11 May 330. With the partition of the empire after the death of *Theodosius I (378–395), Theodosius's son *Honorius remained in the West (395–423), while his elder son *Arcadius (395–408) moved to the new capital.

The names applied to Constantinople had great significance for the fortunes of the capital on the Bosphorus. The new imperial see was named "City of Constantine" (*Kōnstantinoupolis*), while the old *pagan name was used very rarely, and never as an official name. The term "Byzantines" did not mean, as it does to us, the subjects of the empire in general, but the inhabitants of the capital. The prestige of the name *Constantinople* was such that, after the conquest of 1453, it prevailed even among the Turks, who, in official documents and even inscriptions on coins, called the capital *Konstantiniya*. But for centuries the Greek population simply called it ἡ Πόλις, i.e., "the city" par excellence—like *Urbs* for ancient *Rome—and the modern name *Istanbul* is derived from the popular expression εἰς τὴν Πόλιν (*ad Urbem*)—and not from a pre-etymology Islám-pól—just like Isnik from *Nicaea, Ismir from *Smyrna, Silistra = Is tin Dristra, for old Durostorum (medieval Bulgarian *Dristra*) on the Danube, etc. Since the Byzantines considered themselves the true successors of the old Roman Empire and sought to stress this continuity in various ways—hence their being called "Romans" or, in the Greek form, *Romaioi*—the capital was named Constantinople—New Rome, or even "city of the seven hills," *Heptalophos* or ἡ Νέα Ἑπτάλοφος, and as seat of the empire designated reigning city, ἡ βασιλεύουσα, whence the Slavs derived the name Carigrad (Tzarigrad), "city of the kings [of the sovereigns]," still used today among the Bulgarians, Serbs, etc. After the events of the early

13th c., when the Byzantines came into bitter conflict with the participants in the Fourth Crusade of 1203/1204 and close contacts were established with the European West, their awareness of the past was gradually obscured. This was partly a consequence of the great territorial losses, by which the frontiers of the empire now bounded only the regions inhabited by peoples of mainly Greek stock. The memory of ancient Rome was kept alive longer by the *patriarchate of Constantinople, since for centuries the head of the Greek church was called ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Νέας Ῥώμης καὶ οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης.

For its new dress as capital, the city underwent many changes, largely conceived with the aim of recalling the structure and organization of Rome on the Tiber. Thus its territory was divided into 14 *regiones* and, to attract more inhabitants, privileges equal to those of the citizens of Rome were granted. According to literary tradition, Constantine I built an imposing palace like that of the sovereigns of Rome: situated near the sea and finished in 337, the building was a synthesis of a Roman *castrum* and a *Hellenistic royal residence; this attempted amalgamation of Eastern and Roman influences characterized the whole artistic evolution of later times. Since the new capital was no less threatened by "barbarian" incursions than Rome had been, Constantine I saw to the defense not just of his own residence but also of the whole city, extending and reinforcing its existing walls. In subsequent decades the Constantinian wall showed itself insufficient and was modified and strengthened more than once. Under *Theodosius II (408–450), repair works were undertaken in 412–413 and, faced with the threat of the *Vandal fleet, in 439 the famous prefect of Constantinople, Cyrus, built the sea defense, with a double wall furnished with numerous towers (*pyrgoi*), part of which survive to this day. Under *Heraclius (610–641), another grave threat by Avars, Persians and Slavs forced the building of a defensive wall toward the Golden Horn.

Among the gates giving access to the city, we should mention the so-called Golden Gate used for triumphal processions. Many public and private palaces were built intending to imitate those of ancient Rome: thus the palace of the Blachernae, the palace called Bukoleon and the palace near the Springs, where there was a famous church dedicated to the Madonna. *Septimius Severus (193–211) built a hippodrome; Constantine I, after inaugurating the new capital, built a circus (*xylokerkos*) and a great hippodrome (now *At Meydani*) embellished with bronze statues and precious ornaments (324–330), and with a tribune for the emperor when he attended the entertainments (tragic events in the life of the empire took place here: the massacre of several thousand insurgents in the *Nika* insurrection of January 532 against the rule of *Justinian I [537–565]; the tragic triumph of *Justinian II [683–695, 705–711] over his rivals in 705). For the "birthday of the capital," 11 May 330, which became an official anniversary, Constantine had an image modeled in gilded wood which showed him with *Tychē*, or Winged Victory, in his right hand, an image later known as *Anthousa* ("flourishing").

Still with the aim of creating continuity with Rome on the Tiber, Constantine I set up a senate (*bouleutērion* or *synklētos*) at Constantinople, whose members—senators of Rome itself and some taken from provincial centers—enjoyed the same honors and privileges as Roman senators. Of the new city's various squares, we should mention the famous *Forum Constantini*, designed to become the true center of the capital: the statue of Helios, now transformed into an image of Constantine, was erected there on a porphyry column. Finally the capital was enriched with works of art, transported from the provinces and even from Rome (a famous statue of Apollo, the tripod of Pythia etc.). To satisfy the material needs of the population, the emperor *Valens (364–378) built an imposing aqueduct which still survives in part. Constantine I renovated the old baths of Zeuxippus; appropriate *xenones* were built for foreigners, the poor and the sick, and hospices for the old (*gerokomeia*).

Constantinople's population grew rapidly from the start, but any calculation is approximate: in the mid-6th c. it may have had three or four hundred thousand inhabitants, which would make it one of the most populous cities of the time. Such a multitude of people led to grave economic and political problems: devout and obedient to the authorities, the popular voice was expressed through the so-called circus parties or four factions, of which the most influential were the so-called *Venetoi* ("blues") and *Prasinoi* ("greens"), often in bitter mutual conflict, but sometimes in revolt against the sovereignty of the emperors.

In his new imperial capital, Constantine found a population of varied ethnic stock, whose beliefs were largely *pagan and only partly converted to faith in Christ. Legend attributes the origin of the Christian church there to the *apostle *Andrew and his disciple Stachys. The first Christian community at Byzantion, set up in the mid-2nd c., long remained under the jurisdiction of Heraclea (Perinthus) in *Thrace. At the start of the 4th c. it seems to have been well established; its Bishop Mitrophanes

(ca. 306/307–314) is attested by authentic sources. At the Council of Constantinople (381) the see of the capital was accorded not just the name New Rome but also second place after Rome on the Tiber, a position confirmed at *Chalcedon in 451.

The series of bishops who succeeded Mitrophanes can be established with great probability, though struggles between Catholics (orthodox) and *heretics disturbed religious life more than once, esp. over the *Arian doctrine. After the unhappy death of Emperor *Valens (9 August 378), the bishopric of Constantinople was held by *Gregory of Nazianzus (379–381), who took part in the council of 381 and then retired to solitude in *Cappadocia, unable to endure the internal struggles and intrigues. In 398 he was succeeded by *John called "Chrysostom" ("golden mouth"), renowned for his eloquence and great erudition; his intransigence and moral severity soon drew the hatred of both the heretical *Goths and the empress *Eudoxia ("the new Herodias"), and he was sent into exile in Asia Minor (404), where, after a fruitless intervention on his behalf by Rome, he died in 407. This tragic episode was a heavy blow to the prestige of the church of Constantinople. Yet the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the capital—thanks especially to its political authority—managed to expand not just in Thrace but also in the East, to the detriment of *Antioch and *Alexandria. This was the outcome of a bitter rivalry that would endure until the Arab conquest in the 1st half of the 7th c. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 not only decided on the deposition of *Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, but also confirmed the prerogatives of Constantinople, it being the imperial seat, residence of the emperor and senate, like old Rome (can. 28). This canon was not approved by Rome, still less by the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria.

Certain innovations—like the creation of the so-called permanent synod as a body of bishops residing at the capital, recognized at the council of 451—facilitated the intervention of the imperial power in the affairs of the church. One consequence of the extension of Constantinople's jurisdiction in the East was a further deterioration of relations with Rome. In the period between 484 and 519 the two churches lived in mutual *schism, which ended only in the reign of *Justin I (518–527) and *Justinian I (527–565), but in a precarious manner. Toward the end of the 6th c. a new conflict arose over the title "ecumenical (universal) patriarch," usurped by Constantinople against Rome, presaging a further separation between East and West. The great religious crisis in the Eastern Roman Empire in the course of the 7th and 8th c., with the spread of *monophysite, *monothelite and then, between 726 and 843, iconoclastic doctrines dug an even deeper chasm between the two centers of Christianity. Some territorial changes—like the annexation of E Illyricum to the possessions of the Eastern empire, the establishment of Eastern power in S *Italy and Sicily, until then under the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome, at the time of Justinian I—worsened relations. Mutually estranged, only rarely in contact and knowing each other less and less, the two parts of what was the Roman Empire took different paths of political and cultural development.

Constantinople's tendency to rivalry with Rome was manifested even in the 4th c. by the systematic accumulation in churches of *martyrs' *relics and sacred objects, in the presumption that this would give the new political and ecclesiastical see the *charis*, or "divine grace," that was lacking in its origin. Thus began the translation to Constantinople of relics, authentic and false, a practice begun by Constantine and followed by his successors. A long and documented list of churches and relics was published by P.R. Janin (1969); we mention Constantine's Church of the Holy Apostles, where precious relics were collected; the Church of the Non-Arian Goths (2nd half of 4th c.); the Anastasis, where Gregory of Nazianzus officiated in the last quarter of the 4th c.; St. Mary of the Blachernae, famous throughout the Middle Ages, built by the empress *Pulcheria ca. 450–453; two churches dedicated in the 5th c. to St. Irene. The great *monasteries included St. Bethlehem, work of the empress *Helena; the monastery of the *Akoimetoi* (*Acoemetae), ca. 420, built by a Syrian monk; the monastery *tou Dalmatou*, late 4th c.; the monastery of St. Alexandria (Alexander?) in the time of Theodosius I; the monastery of the Egyptians, 1st half of 5th c. In the 6th c. the monasteries of St. Bassus; St. Venantius; St. Dometius the Persian; the monastery of the Bessi, a Thracian tribe partly converted to Christianity; St. Asterius; and others were built. The most famous of Constantinople's churches, Hagia Sophia ("holy wisdom") or the "Great Church," is linked to the see of the orthodox patriarchate. Built, according to a legendary tradition, by Constantine, more reliable evidence attributes it to *Constantius II (337–361): burned down in the great revolt of 532, it was splendidly rebuilt and decorated under Justinian I.

The history of Constantinople in every century from the 7th to 1453, when the capital was conquered by the Turks, reflects all the vicissitudes of the Byzantine Empire as a whole. Gravely menaced in 626 by the siege of the Avars, Persians and Slavs, then more than once by the assaults and incursions of the

Bulgars, esp. at the start of the 9th and 10th c., and in particular in the time of King Simeon (893–927), the city always put up an effective resistance. In 1203–1204 it was conquered, for the first time in its history, by the participants in the Fourth Crusade, who partly destroyed and mercilessly sacked it. The capture of Constantinople at the end of May 1453 put an end to the existence of the Byzantine Empire, but not to Byzantine civilization, esp. in its literary and artistic forms; Constantinople, the main center of that civilization, survived as "Byzantium after Byzantium," even after the disappearance of the state as a political and military unit.

EC 4, 732-766; Cath 3, 102-117; DHGE 13, 626-768; EAA 2, 880-919; RBK 4, 366-594; LMA 5, 1387-1393; LTK³ 6, 306-311; EAA² 2, 318-323; EAM 5, 391-436; Comte Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, I-II, Geneva 1877-1878; Th. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanorum*, I-II, Leipzig 1901, 1907; H. Delehaye, *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*: Propylaeum ad AASS Nov., Brussels 1902; Ch. Diehl, *Constantinople*, Paris 1924; A.M. Schneider, *Byzanz, Vorarbeiten zur Topographie und Archäologie der Stadt*, Berlin 1936; Id., *Konstantinopel. Gesicht und Gestalt einer geschichtlichen Weltmetropole*, Mainz-Berlin 1956; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris 1950; Id., *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, I, *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, 3, *Les églises et les monastères*, Paris 1969; E. Fenster, *Laudes constantinopolitanae*, Munich 1968; J. Jarry, *Hérésies et factions dans l'Empire byzantin du IVe au VIIe siècle*, Le Caire 1968; R. Guilland, *Études de topographie de Constantinople byzantine*, I-II, Berlin-Amsterdam 1969; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974 (It. tr., Turin 1991); F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Rome 1987; G. Dagron, *Constantinople. Les sanctuaires et l'organisation de la vie religieuse*, in *Actes du XIe Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, II, Rome 1989, 1069-1085; U. Peschlow, *Konstantinopel und Kleinasien*, in *Actes du XIe Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, II, Rome 1989, 1563-1619; *Costantinopoli e l'arte delle province orientali*, eds. F. de' Maffei - C. Barsanti - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Rome 1990; *Les saints et leur sanctuaire à Byzance: textes, images et monuments*, publié par C. Jolivet-Lévy - M. Kaplan - J.-P. Sodini, Paris 1993; C. Mango - G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and Its Hinterland*, Oxford 1995; P. Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale: études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines*, Paris 1996; C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993; Id., *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312-1453*, Toronto 1986; Id., *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*, London 1998; *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, A.D. 284-813*, tr. with intr. and comm. by C. Mango and R. Scott, Oxford 1997; R. Krautheimer, *Tre capitali cristiane: topografia e politica*, Turin 2002; G. Vespignani, *Il Circo di Costantinopoli nuova Roma*, Spoleto 2001; *The Oxford history of Byzantium*, C. Mango (ed.), Oxford 2002.

I. Dujčev

II. Councils.

335/336. After the condemnation of *Athanasius by the Council of *Tyre, confirmed by *Constantine, many bishops from *Asia, *Bithynia, *Phrygia, *Cappadocia, *Pontus and *Thrace met to judge *Marcellus of Ancyra, an ardent anti-*Arian. The doctrine professed by Marcellus was of a radical *monarchian tendency, for which he was condemned and deposed. We do not know where Constantine exiled him. Bishop *Paul of Constantinople was also deposed and exiled at about this time. He too passed for a victim of the Arians, but his deposition was due to reasons of public order.

360. This council, willed by *Constantius and attended by bishops almost exclusively from regions close to the capital (but Ulfilas was there), confirmed the results of the Council of *Rimini (359), favoring *homoians and moderate Arians: it published a formula of faith of the same tenor as that of Rimini and condemned the main spokesmen of both the *homoiousians and the radical Arians (*anomoians). The main victim among the latter was *Aetius; among the former, *Basil of Ancyra, *Eustathius of Sebaste, *Eleusius of Cyzicus, *Silvanus of Tarsus and *Macedonius of Constantinople. *Eudoxius, leader of the moderate Arians, was transferred from *Antioch to replace Macedonius.

335-336: Hfl-Lecl 1, 667-678, 688; E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften* 3, 230-239; Simonetti 131-133; J.T. Lienhard, *Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research*: Theologische Studien 43 (1982) 486-503; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988, 284ff.; K. Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, Berlin 1994.

360: Hfl-Lecl 1, 956-959; Simonetti 338-342.

M. Simonetti

381. *Theodosius I (b. 347), of Spanish origin like his contemporary Pope *Damasus, was invested with the purple by Emperor *Gratian in 379. After defeating the *Goths, he promulgated at *Thessalonica, 28 February 380, the edict *De fide catholica,* imposing the Nicene formula of faith on his subjects as a dogmatic rule. After his solemn entry into Constantinople on 24 November 380, he immediately published, in late 380 or early 381, a decree of convocation for a synod of bishops of the Eastern empire. Opened in the imperial palace in May 381, it lasted until the end of July. About 150 bishops were present, including *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Meletius, *Cyril of Jerusalem, *Diodore of Tarsus and *Peter of Sebaste. The delegation of 71 bishops from the civil dioceses of the East was led by Meletius, bishop of the most important of the Antiochene Christian communities, who was also designated president of the synod. The Alexandrians, led by *Timothy, were absent from the opening of the synod. *Paulinus of Antioch deliberately did not

come. At the emperor's wish a group of 36 so-called *Macedonian bishops had also been invited, led by *Eleusius of Cyzicus and Martin of Lampsacus, against whose ideas the synod later pronounced.

*Macedonius had occupied the see of Constantinople from 341/342 to 360. For reasons still unknown, he gave his name to the theological current of the time which denied the true divinity of the *Holy Spirit and whose opinions *Athanasius was the first to mention and refute in his *Letters to Serapion,* written 356–360. These **pneumatomachi,* later called Macedonians, were not necessarily in line with the anti-Nicene parties. They taught that the Holy Spirit, unlike the Son whom they recognized as true God, was inferior in dignity, a minister, an interpreter, an angel. The Synod of *Alexandria convened by Athanasius in 362 had explicitly proclaimed that the Holy Spirit was equal to the Father and the Son. Around 370, *Basil of Caesarea had opposed the Arian *Eunomius with the same doctrine, which he then (in 374) developed in his treatise *On the Holy Spirit*. Meanwhile, after *Gratian's accession in 379, the Macedonian party organized itself into a real faction. Its main promoters were *Eustathius of Sebaste, *Eleusius of Cyzicus and *Marathonius, who had earlier been a wealthy employee of the magistrate's court; on Eustathius's advice he became a monk and founded a *monastery at Constantinople, having already founded a hospital there. The remnants of the Nicene community in the capital, where for four decades the bishops had been Arianizers, acquired a bishop in the person of Gregory of Nazianzus, who from 370 preached in the small church of the Anastasis.

After the opening of the synod of 381, the bishops of the majority, led and urged on by Theodosius, sought to obtain a unanimity in favor of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. But the Macedonians did not give way. A "tome" was composed in which the conciliar Fathers professed their faith and condemned the recent *heresies. This synodal letter is lost, but its essential contents can be reconstructed from another document, issued by the Synod of Constantinople of 382, and from the remaining canons of the council of 381. The Fathers professed the one substance (*ousia*) of the Father, the Son and the Spirit; they rejected the confusion of *hypostases* made by *Sabellius; and they ruled out any heterogeneity, thus condemning Eunomius and the other Arians. In short, their *tomos* contained a profession of faith, which is a true creed. Gregory of Nazianzus was recognized as legitimate bishop of the capital. But before the end of May, Meletius died. Theodosius attended his funeral in person. His death complicated the settlement of the *schism of Antioch and released such passions among the synodal members that Gregory himself, whose warnings were ill-understood and whose own enthronement was contested, resigned. *Nectarius, an old senator not yet baptized, was chosen to succeed him: he was quickly baptized and consecrated bishop, remaining so until his death in 397.

The canons of Constantinople I make clear the legal measures that were debated and finally approved at that council. Canon 1, after appealing to the Council of Nicaea of 325, condemns "all heresy and particularly that of the Eunomians or *anomoians, that of the *Arians or Eudoxians, and that of the semi-Arians or *pneumatomachi*; at the same time it condemns the heresies of the Sabellians, Marcellians, *Photinians and *Apollinarists." Canon 2 gives order to the limits of the bishops' jurisdictions in their own dioceses. Canon 3 says: "The bishop of Constantinople must have primacy of honor after the bishop of *Rome, since Constantinople is the new Rome." Canon 4 nullifies the consecration of *Maximus the Cynic, surreptitiously prepared by *Peter II of Alexandria, who had always wanted Maximus to replace Gregory of Nazianzus as bishop of Constantinople. The greatest political reverberations were reserved for canon 3. Flaunted at *Chalcedon in 451, where "the creed of the 150 Fathers" of 381 was also read during the second session, it contributed to putting Theodosius's synod of 381 on the level of "second ecumenical council." In fact, the creed attributed to the 150 bishops had already existed in 374 (Epiph., *Ancoratus*); in 381 they were content to promulgate it. It repeated the creed of 325, and to the Nicene formula "and in the Holy Spirit" it added the words "Lord [*to kyrion*], giver of life, proceeding from the Father [*ek tou Patros ekporeuomenon*], who with (*syn*) the Father and the Son is together worshiped and glorified [*symproskynoumenon*], and has spoken through [*dia*] the prophets."

The Fathers of Constantinople I departed on 9 July 381 after sending Theodosius a synodal letter. An imperial edict of 30 July 381 required the churches to be given back to the *orthodox. The Arian crisis and its final glimmers in the East now belonged to the past.

CPG IV, 8602-8604; A. Harnack, *Konstantinopolitanisches Symbol*: RE XI, 12-28; J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes* II, Paris 1921, 85-132; E. Schwartz, *Das Nicaenum und das Constantinopolitanum auf der Synode von Chalkedon*: ZNTW 26 (1926) 38-88; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *La struttura del simbolo Costantinopolitano*: OCP 12 (1946) 275-285; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London 1950; V. Monachino, *Genesi storica del canone 28° di Calcedonia*: Gregorianum 33 (1952) 261-292; H. Herman, *Chalkedon und die Ausgestaltung des konstantinopolitanischen*

Primats, in A. Grillmeier, H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* II, Würzburg 1952, 459-463; N.Q. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity*, London 1961; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nicée et Constantinople*, Hist. des Conciles Oecum. I, Paris 1963; B. Kötting, *Die abendländischen Teilnehmer an den ersten allgemeinen Konzilien*, in Reformata, Festgabe für Hubert Jedin I, Münster 1965, 1-21; R. Metz, *L'intervention de Théodose au 2e concile œcuménique* (*Constantinople 381*), Études d'histoire du droit canonique d. à Gabriel Le Bras, Paris 1965, 651-664; A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und Sein Symbol. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des 2. ökumenischen Konzils*, Göttingen 1965; G.L. Dossetti, *Il Simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli*, critical ed., Rome 1967; D.L. Holland, *The Creeds of Nicea and Constantinople Reexamined*: ChH 38 (1969) 248-261; B. Schultze, *Das Nicaenoconstantinopolitanum und das Filioque*: OCP 35 (1969) 334-346; H.J. Sieben, *Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee, II*: *Die fides Nicaena als Auktoritätsidee nach dem Zeugnis vorephesinischen Schrifttums*: ThPh 46 (1971) 40-70; J. Kunze, *Das Nizänisch-Konstantinopolitanische Symbol*, Leipzig 1898 = Aalen 1972; W. Beinert, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Ökumene. Eine Auslegung des grossen (nizäno-konstantinopolitanischen) Glaubensbekenntnisses*, Freiburg (Schweiz) 1973; TRE 19, 518-524; B. Schultze, *Die Pneumatologie des Symbols von Konstantinopel als abschliessende Formulierung der griechischen Theologie* (*381-1981*): OCP 47 (1981) 5-54; A.M. Ritter, *The Dogma of Constantinople* (*381*) *and Its Reception within the Churches of the Reformation*: ITQ 48 (1981) 228-232; P. Chrestou, *The Ecumenical Character of the First Synod of Constantinople, 381*: GOTR 27 (1982) 359-374; D.J. Constantelos, *Toward the Convocation of the Second Ecumenical Synod*: GOTR 27 (1982) 395-405; A. de Halleux, *Pour une profession commune de la foi selon l'esprit des Pères*: RTL 15 (1984) 275-296; Id., *"Hypostase" et "personne" dans la formation du dogme trinitaire* (*ca. 375-381*): RHE 79 (1984) 313-369; 625-676; Id., *Personnalisme ou essentialisme trinitaire chez les Pères cappadociens? Une mauvaise controverse*: RTL 17 (1986) 129-155; 265-292; P. L'Huillier, *Faits et fictions à propos du deuxième concile œcuménique*: Église et théologie 13 (1982) 135-156; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988; D. Spada, *Le confessioni di fede da Nicea a Costantinopoli*, Rome 1988; L. Perrone, in *Storia dei concili ecumenici*, ed. G. Alberigo, Bologna 1990, 57-70; R. Staats, *Die römische Tradition in Symbol von 381* (*NC*) *und seine Entstehung auf der Synode von Antiochien 379*: VChr 44 (1990) 209-222; L.D. Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils* (*325-787*), Collegeville 1990, 81-133 (It. tr. *Storia e cronaca dei sette concili che definirono la dottrina cristiana*, Casale Monf. 1998); *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. G. Alberigo, Bologna 1991, 20-35; R. Staats, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel: historische und theologische Grundlagen*, Darmstadt 1996; P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils*, Crestwood 1996, 101-142.

Ch. Kannengiesser

382. In summer 382 a number of Eastern bishops met at Constantinople at Theodosius's invitation to resolve the cases of *Maximus the Cynic and *Paulinus of Antioch, on which East and West disagreed: *Ambrose still considered the discredited Maximus the legitimate bishop of Constantinople, and the entire West and *Egypt considered Paulinus the bishop of Antioch, while the East had elected *Nectarius and *Flavian to those sees. The bishops examined a letter from *Damasus inviting them to a council at *Rome to decide the two questions. They made excuses for declining, reaffirmed the validity of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed understood in the light of the Basilian interpretation, which distinguished in the Trinity one divine *ousia* ("essence, substance") articulated in three *hypostases,* and expressed themselves decisively in favor of Nectarius and Flavian. This council is thought to have published two canons, later erroneously added to the four canons of the 381 council as canons 5 and 6: one related to the *schism of *Antioch and the other to the conciliar procedure to be followed in cases of accusations brought against bishops.

394. Some bishops including *Theophilus of Alexandria and Flavian of Antioch met under the presidency of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, to decide the case of Bagadius of Bostra, who had been deposed by a tribunal of only two bishops and replaced by Agapius. They laid down that a bishop could only be deposed by a council.

ca. 400. Some 20 local bishops met under the presidency of *John Chrysostom. Antoninus of *Ephesus was accused of having ordained bishops for money. A three-man commission of inquiry was set up, but Antoninus died before its conclusion. The procedure of this council was not completely regular, since Chrysostom was interfering in the affairs of another diocese; this was brought against him at the Synod of the *Oak.

404. John Chrysostom, deposed and exiled after the Synod of the Oak, had shortly after been recalled to his see by popular clamor, but his enemies continued to maneuver against him, supported by Emperor *Arcadius. In January 404 a council of ca. 90 bishops, about half favorable to John and half against him, met. Against his return, canon 4 of the Council of Antioch of ca. 327 was produced, which established that a deposed bishop could only resume his functions if rehabilitated by a new council. Arcadius arrogated to himself the decision on the case and again had Chrysostom extruded and sent into exile.

426. The bishops meeting at Constantinople to consecrate *Sisinnius as bishop (28 Feb) subscribed to an encyclical letter in which Sisinnius denied that *Messalians caught professing their ideas even after condemnation could be readmitted to ecclesiastical communion.

431. On 5 October 431 the priest *Maximinus was elected bishop of Constantinople to replace *Nestorius. He and the bishops meeting for his consecration sent letters transmitting the acts of the Council of *Ephesus to other sees, with news of the new election. A letter was also sent to Pope *Celestine. We

also know of a subsequent council which deposed *Helladius of Tarsus, *Eutherius of Tyana and other bishops who supported Nestorius.

ca. 443. A council, presided over by Bishop *Proclus of Constantinople and including *Cyril of Alexandria, judged the cases of Athanasius of Perrhes and Alexander of Antaradus. The former having been deposed by his clergy, *Domnus of Antioch was asked to intervene in the matter; the latter, whose election had aroused opposition, was declared fit to hold the office.

448. On 8 November 448 Flavian convoked the bishops present at Constantinople to resolve a question relating to disputes between Florentinus of Sardis and two of his suffragans. On this occasion *Eusebius of Dorylaeum, who had earlier accused Nestorius, brought an accusation against the monk *Eutyches, charging him with errors in *Christology. Eutyches appeared, only after repeated summons, on 22 November. His claim to recognize two natures in Christ before the union, but only one after, was identified as erroneous, and he was condemned and deposed from his priestly and *monastic dignities. This act marked the beginning of the *monophysite crisis.

449. On 19 April 449 a local council met to examine a protest by Eutyches that the acts of the council which condemned him had been falsified. After close examination it was decided that there had been no falsification, though the acts had not been drawn up with much care.

449/450. A local council held under *Anatolius withdrew certain cities from the jurisdiction of the bishop of *Tyre and transferred them to that of Berytus (Beirut).

450. In November 450 a local council presided over by Anatolius approved *Leo's letter concerning christology and anathematized the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches.

457. At *Alexandria, Bishop *Proterius had been murdered, and the monophysites had elected *Timothy Ailouros in his place. In the face of protests against this violence and the defense of the Egyptian monophysites, Emperor *Leo asked for the opinion of the Eastern bishops, who met in numerous provincial councils. The council at Constantinople, at which Anatolius presided and, as usual, those bishops passing through the capital took part, declared Timothy's election null and confirmed the validity of the decisions of *Chalcedon.

ca. 458. A council, presided over by patriarch *Gennadius, censured and invalidated certain episcopal elections held in *Galatia and condemned the authors of these actions.

477. In the context of the antimonophysite reaction that followed the end of *Basiliscus's usurpation and *Zeno's resumption of the throne, a council presided over by Bishop *Acacius of Constantinople declared *Peter the Fuller, bishop of Antioch, and Paul of Ephesus condemned and deposed.

482. A local council, presided over by Acacius, accepted Zeno's **Henoticon*.

492 and 496. In 492 Patriarch *Euphemius convoked the bishops present at Constantinople, got the validity of the deliberations of Chalcedon confirmed and entered relations with *Gelasius of Rome in an attempt to resolve the *Acacian schism. For this and other reasons he attracted the wrath of the emperor *Anastasius, who had him deposed by a council called in 496.

497/498. *Macedonius, elected patriarch of Constantinople in place of the deposed *Euphemius, subscribed to the **Henoticon,* for which many monks of the capital broke off communion with him. To heal the breach he called a local council, which confirmed the validity of the Chalcedonian decrees and kept silent about the *Henoticon*. The surviving records of these events are not very coherent.

518. In the antimonophysite reaction that took place at Constantinople after Emperor *Justin's election, Patriarch *John II, faced with requests from the people and monks, convoked ca. 40 bishops who were in Constantinople at the time. The metropolitan of Heraclea presided in the absence of John, who was represented. The names of patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius and of Pope Leo were restored to the *diptychs, the validity of the Council of Chalcedon was recognized and *Severus of Antioch was condemned.

530/531. Following a protest against the election of the layman *Stephen as bishop of Larissa in Thessaly, Patriarch *Epiphanius of Constantinople summoned Stephen to the capital and, despite his appeal to the pope's authority, had him deposed by a local council. This incident took place during the dispute between Rome and Constantinople over the rights claimed by both sees over Illyricum.

536. In this year the arrival of Pope *Agapetus at Constantinople led to the end of *Justinian's promonophysite policy and, consequently, the deposition of Patriarch *Anthimus, whom that policy had favored. At the request of Agapetus and many monks of Constantinople, the new patriarch, *Menas, called a local council in which bishops and clergy who had accompanied Agapetus also took part. Because of the pope's unexpected death, the council could not meet until 2 May. It condemned Anthimus, Severus of Antioch and his followers.

543. At Justinian's request, Patriarch Menas called a local council. It took note of a very severe letter from the emperor against *Origenism, which enjoyed great popularity in many Palestinian *monasteries. The letter, which concluded with 10 anathemata relating to the more radical aspects of *Origen's doctrine, was approved, and Origen and his followers condemned. This letter should not be confused with the anti-Origenian letter sent by Justinian to the council of 553.

553. This council, the fifth ecumenical, was called by Justinian at the request of Pope *Vigilius, who had been forcibly brought to Constantinople to approve the condemnation of the *Three Chapters required by the emperor. Sometime before the council opened, Justinian sent the conciliar fathers a letter condemning Origenism. The letter's 15 anathemata condemned not so much Origen's genuine doctrine as the more extremist Origenism of the 6th c. The council, however, which opened 5 May in a hall attached to the basilica of Hagia Sophia, with ca. 150 bishops under the presidency of Patriarch *Eutychius of Constantinople, dealt only with the question of the Three Chapters. Vigilius took no part in its work, though he was repeatedly asked to, citing his poor health as an excuse: in fact he was still trying to avoid assenting to the condemnation. On 14 May he published on the subject the *Constitutum,* which was also subscribed to by 16 Italian bishops who, like him, had abstained from participating: in the document Vigilius condemns 60 propositions taken from the writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia but refused to anathematize the memory of a dead man, which obviously included *Theodoret and *Ibas. The council however, in the sessions of 17 and 19 May, sanctioned the legitimacy of condemning men who had died in error; on 26 May it examined a series of documents produced by Justinian, aimed at showing that on several earlier occasions Vigilius had condemned the Three Chapters and, at the emperor's request, struck the pope's name from the diptychs, though without condemning him. In the final sitting of 2 June (8th session), it published 14 anathemata condemning the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's statements hostile to *Cyril of Alexandria and the Council of Ephesus of 431, and *Ibas of Edessa's letter to *Maris. At the same time it reaffirmed the validity of the first four ecumenical councils, hence also that of Chalcedon. Vigilius, who remained at Constantinople, sick, approved the condemnation of the Three Chapters on 8 December and confirmed this with a second *Constitutum* on 23 February 554.

ca. 588 and ca. 592. These two councils are recorded mainly because Patriarch *John IV of Constantinople, in judging various accusations against *Gregory of Antioch (ca. 588) and various priests and monks accused of *heresy (ca. 592), attributed to himself the title "Ecumenical Patriarch," which led to protests first from Pope *Pelagius II and then from *Gregory the Great.

638–639. Late in 638, just after *Heraclius's publication of the *Ekthesis,* which imposed the *monothelite doctrine, Patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople, whom this formula had inspired and favored, called a local council, which approved it. Sergius died on 9 December; as soon as he was elected, his successor *Pyrrhus called another council, January 639, which confirmed the approval.

680–681. This council, the 6th ecumenical, was called on 10 September 680 by Emperor Constantine IV, after agreements reached with Pope *Agatho, in order to resolve the *monoenergist and monothelite crisis. It was called *in *Trullo, Trullian,* from the domed hall (*trullos*) of the imperial palace, where sessions were held. The council opened on 7 November 680 in the presence of 43 Eastern bishops, including Patriarch George of Constantinople and *Macarius, patriarch of Antioch but resident at Constantinople, as well as a three-man delegation from Rome. The emperor presided in person over the first 11 of the council's 18 sessions. The reading of the acts of the 4th and 5th ecumenical councils and of Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum,* done to put the monothelite controversy into historical perspective, permitted the discovery of an *apocryphal text (Menas of Constantinople's letter to Pope Vigilius) by which, at the start of the controversy, Sergius of Constantinople had set great store, as supporting his monothelite doctrine. This was defended at the council by Macarius, who adduced a copious patristic *florilegium in support of it: according to him, to admit two wills in Christ was to fall back into *Nestorianism. Once the partiality of the collections he produced had been recognized, Macarius, who persisted in his ideas, was condemned and deposed (sessions of 20 and 22 March 681). After other discussions of lesser importance, in the final two sessions (11 and 16 September) the council's final document was drawn up. It was subscribed to in the emperor's presence by the participants, whose numbers had risen to 164. The council condemned the main supporters, living and dead, of monoenergism and monothelitism, including *Sergius of Constantinople, *Cyrus of Alexandria, *Honorius of Rome and Macarius himself. In its profession of faith it confirmed that as Christ has two natures, so he has two perfectly harmonious wills and two inseparable energies.

692. This council was called by *Justinian II to supplement the decrees of the 5th and 6th ecumenical councils by disciplinary rules: for this reason it was called *Quinisext,* and (like the 6th) *in Trullo* from the room in which the meetings were held. It opened on 1 September 692 in the presence of the emperor and over 200 Eastern bishops or their representatives; Bishop *Sergius of Rome was represented by three delegates. 102 canons were promulgated, touching on all fields of religious life and discipline, which was acknowledged to be very lax, even among the clergy. Some of the decisions sanctioned Eastern customs which differed from the Roman, e.g., can. 13, on married deacons and priests. Can. 36 confirmed the rights of Constantinople as second in hierarchical order after Rome and endowed with the same authority. The canons were all subscribed to, even by the papal representatives, but at Rome Sergius disowned their actions and would not accept the copy of the acts sent to him, because of can. 36 and the canons sanctioning customs contrary to Roman discipline.

754. Constantine V, the iconoclast emperor, called a council which opened 10 February in the palace of Hieria. This council, called the 7th ecumenical, was attended by 338 Eastern bishops presided over, in the vacancy of the see of Constantinople, by Theodosius of Ephesus. The Roman delegates were absent. The council condemned the cult of images, though forbidding any profanation or destruction of sacred buildings; but it did not accept the ideas of the emperor, who denied the validity of the intercession of the saints and of the Virgin, and it confirmed the validity of such intercession. From 8 August, the council held its sessions in the church of St. Mary of the Blachernae, ending on 27 August: the emperor himself read the council's decrees to the people; upholders of the cult of images were anathematized.

786. A council, called by Patriarch Tarasius and Empress Irene to restore the cult of images, opened on 1 August. Roman delegates were also present. But the proceedings, interrupted by the irruption into the meeting room of some iconoclastic soldiers, were not resumed.

382: Hfl-Lecl 2, 53-56; Simonetti 549-551; K. Müller, *Kanon 2. und 6. von Konstantinopel 381 und 382*, Festg. A. Jühlicher, Tübingen 1927, 190-202; - *394*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 97-99; - *ca. 400*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 122-125; - *404*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 150-154; - *426*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 216; Palazzini I, 327-328; - *431*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 378-381; - *ca. 443*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 764; - *448*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 518-538; L.R. Wickham, *Eutyches/ Eutychianischer Streit:* TRE 10 (1982) 558-565; G. May, *Das Lehrverfahren gegen Eutyches im November des Jahres 448. Zur Vorgeschichte des Konzils von Chalkedon*: AHC 21 (1989); - *449/450*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 545-554; Palazzini I, 330; - *450*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 633-634; - *457*: Mansi 7, 780; Palazzini I, 330-331; A.B. Schmidt, *Die Refutatio des Timothaeus Aeluros gegen das Konzil von Chalcedon. Ihre Bedeutung für die Bekenntnisentwicklung der armenischen Kirche Persiens im 6. Jahrhundert*: OC 73 (1989) 149-165; - *ca. 458*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 887; - *477*: Palazzini I, 331; - *492/496*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 939; - *497/498*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 945-947; Palazzini I, 331-332; - *518*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 1046-1048; - *530/531*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 1117-1119; - *536*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 1145-1154; J. Speigl, *Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel*: OS 43 (1994) 105-153; - *543*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 1187-1188; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur l'histoire du texte et des versions latines du De principiis d'Origène*, Paris 1923, 49-50; F. Carcione, *La politica religiosa di Giustiniano nella fase conclusiva della "seconda controversia origenista" (543-553). Gli intrecci con la controversia sui Tre Capitoli*: Studi and ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano 9 (1986) 131-147; P. Bettiolo, *Origenismo (in oriente, secc. V-VI)*, in A. Monaci Castagno (ed.), *Origene. Dizionario: la cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, Rome 2000, 336-337; - *553*: ACO IV, IIII; Mansi 11, 226-375; Hfl-Lecl 3, 68-132; DTC 3, 1231-1259; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 213-222; F.X. Murphy - P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et III* (Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques III), Paris 1973; H. Crouzel, *Origene e l'origenismo: le condanne di Origene*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 295-303; A. Grillmeier - T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. II/2. Die Kirche von Konstantinopel im 6. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1989; P. Gray, *Konstantinopel, II. Ökum. Synode v. 553*: TRE 19 (1990) 524-527; G.L.C. Frank, *The Council of Constantinople II as a Model Reconciliation Council*: TS 52 (1991) 636-650; P.A. Yannopoulos, *Il secondo concilio di Costantinopoli o quinto concilio ecumenico*, in G. Alberigo (ed.), *Storia dei concili ecumenici,* Bologna [2]1993, 121-133; - *588, 592*: Hfl-Lecl 3, 221-222; Palazzini I, 334; - *638/639*: Hfl-Lecl 3, 390-391; - *680–681*: Mansi 11, 539-688; Hfl-Lecl 3, 484-515; DTC 3, 1259-1274; R. Riedinger (ed.), *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum Tertium: Concilii actiones XII-XVIII, epistolae, indices* (ACO ser. II, vol. II/2), Berlin 1992; A. Thanner, *Papst Honorius I* (Stud. z. Theol. U. Gesch. 4), St. Ottilien 1989; K. Schäferdiek, *Konstantinopel, III. Ökum. Synode v. 680/681*: TRE 19 (1990) 527-529; P.A. Yannopoulos, *Il terzo concilio di Costantinopoli o sesto concilio ecumenico*, in G. Alberigo (ed.), *Storia dei concili ecumenici,* Bologna [2]1993, 134-144; - *692*: Mansi 11, 930-1006; Hfl-Lecl 3, 560-581; H. Ohme, *Das Concilium Quinisextum und seine Bischofsliste. Studien zum Kostantinopeler Konzil von 692*, Berlin-New York 1990; D. Salachas, *La normativa del Concilio Trullano commentata dai canonisti bizantini del XIII secolo Zonaras, Balsamone, Aristenos* (Oriente Cristiano 2-3/1991), Palermo 1991; G. Nedungatt - M. Featherstone (eds.), *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, Rome 1995; L.J. Patsavos (ed.), *Holy Cross Conference: The Council "in Trullo": Basis for Ecclesiastical Reform?*, Brookline, MA 1995; - *754*: Hfl-Lecl 3, 697-704; - *786*: Hfl-Lecl 3, 756-757; var. aus., *La legittimità del culto delle icone. Oriente e occidente riaffermano insieme la fede cristiana*, Bari 1988; P.A. Yannopoulos, *Il secondo concilio di Nicea (786/787) o settimo concilio*, in G. Alberigo (ed.), *Storia dei concili ecumenici*, Bologna [2]1993, 145-151; M. Andaloro, *Il secondo concilio di Nicea e l'età dell'immagine*, in *Vedere l'invisibile*, ed. L. Russo, Palermo 1997, 185-194; M. Re, *Il secondo concilio di Nicea e la controversia iconoclastica*, *ibid.* 171-183; C. Valenziano, *Il secondo concilio di Nicea*, *ibid.* 207-211.

M. Simonetti

CONSTANTIUS I, CHLORUS, emperor (d. 306). Flavius Valerius Constantius, the appellation Chlorus appearing much later. The father of *Constan-

tine I, in 293 he was appointed Caesar for the Western part of the empire in *Diocletian's tetrarchical organization; for this reason he had to divorce *Helena, Constantine's mother, and marry *Theodora, *Maximian's stepdaughter, with whom he had six children, including Dalmatius, Hannibalianus and *Constantia, the wife of *Licinius. He ordinarily resided at *Trier. In 296 he finally put down the insurrection in *Britain led by the Batavo-Roman officer Carausius, who, supported by the merchants of *Gaul, had for 10 years dominated the NW seas with his fleet, controlling the channel coasts. He then defeated Allectus, another usurper; then the Alamanni in 302. On the abdication of the two Augusti in 305, *Constantius and *Galerius became Augusti; next year Galerius allowed Constantine, who was at his court, to join Constantius in Britain. Constantius died at *York in June, and the local troops immediately acclaimed Constantine, rather than the designated Caesar Severus, as Augustus. Constantius did not apply to the letter Diocletian's edicts of *persecution against the Christians.

L. Cantarelli, *Per la storia dell'imperatore Costanzo Cloro*: Atti Accadem. Pont. di Arch., Memorie I (1923) 31-36; R. Andreotti, *Costanzo Cloro*: Didaskaleion 9 (1930) 157ff.; PLRE 1,227–1,228; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 280-282; *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government AD 284-324*, Oxford 1996; W. Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie: das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284-313 n. Chr.)*, Frankfurt a. M. 2001.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTIUS II, emperor (d. 361). Flavius Iulius Constantius, son of *Constantine I and Fausta, proclaimed Caesar in 324 and Augustus 9 September 337. On his father's death he obtained the prefecture of the East and the diocese of *Thrace. He continued his father's *Arianizing religious policy against that of his brother *Constantine II, spokesman of Western *Nicene *orthodoxy. From 337–350 he lived at *Antioch; in 348 he defeated the Persians at Singara. When *Constans was eliminated by the rebel Magnentius in 350, Constantius took up the struggle against the usurper, defeating him in 351 at Mursa in Illyricum, and then at Mons Seleucus (353) in the Veneto, thereby restoring the prestige of the Costantinids in the West, where emperors acclaimed by the army succeeded one another: the appointment of Gallus, son of Constantine I's half brother, as Caesar, was intended to guarantee the stability of the East, threatened by Persian attacks. He had to put down the revolts of his relative Nepotian (350) and Silvanus (355). From 351–359 he lived at *Sirmium and *Milan, after that in the East. Successive internal and external political difficulties were accompanied by complex religious and ecclesiastical questions: Constantius II's activity aimed at finding compromise doctrinal formulations that might unify the Eastern and Western episcopates, and solutions to the problem of the fiscal immunity of church property and that of *clerici*. In 355, to meet the military situation in *Gaul, threatened by *Franks and Alamanni, he appointed Gallus's half brother *Julian as Caesar: the future emperor, victor over the barbarians, was acclaimed Augustus by the soldiers in 360; Constantius then moved against his rival but died in 361 before meeting him on the field.

S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari [2]1973, 697ff.; religious policy: G. Gigli, *L'ortodossia, l'arianesimo e la politica di Costanzo II (337-361)*, Rome 1949; R. Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, Darmstadt 1977; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 314-322; T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993; P.O. Cuneo, *La legislazione di Costantino II, Costanzo II e Costante (337-361)*, Milan 1997; *Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, Cambridge 1998, 1ff.; G. Ventura da Silva, *Reis, santos e feiticeiras. Constâncio II e os fundamentos místicos da basileia 337-361*, Vitoria 2003.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTIUS III, emperor (d. 421). Native of Naissus, acclaimed emperor of the *pars Occidentis* of the Roman Empire on 8 February 421, a colleague of *Honorius from 421. Earlier, as an able *magister utriusque militiae,* he was marked out by military successes against usurpations in *Gaul and *Spain; in 417 he married Honorius's sister *Galla Placidia, freed from the *Visigoths among whom she had been long held hostage and whose king Ataulf she had married; in 418 he concluded a peace treaty with the Visigoths, allowing them to settle in Aquitania secunda. The future emperor *Valentinian III was born to him and Galla Placidia in 419. Died 2 September 421.

O. Seeck, PWK IV, 1, 1900, 1099-1102; see the metrical inscription of Albenga in his honor (CIL V, 7781 = ILS 735); PLRE 2,321-325; J.F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425*, Oxford 1975, 377-378; *Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, Cambridge 1998, 131-132; V.A. Sirago, *Galla Placidia, La Nobilissima*, Milan 1996.

M. Forlin Patrucco

CONSTANTIUS of Aquino (6th c.). One of the first bishops of the diocese of Aquino, Constantius was celebrated by *Gregory the Great (*Dialogues* III, 8:

SC 260, 284) as a model ascetic and champion of Christian virtue and was venerated from antiquity as the patron saint of Aquino. He lived in the 6th c.; during his episcopate (probably between 542 and 584) he sent a cleric to St. *Benedict to be *exorcised (*Dialogues* II, 16: SC 260, 184-186); on the political scene he saw the *Goth *Totila cede power to the Greek general *Narses, and then to the *Longobard (Lombard) Autari. In the Benedictine *cenobium he knew *Sabinus of Canosa, St. Benedict and perhaps also *Victor of Capua, to whom he seems to have turned for the compilation of a *Comes,* a sort of lectionary for the liturgical use of his church (Morin). Gregory the Great tells how, shortly before his death during the pontificate of *John III (561–574), Constantius predicted the sad fate of his city, decrying in the modest moral stature of his successors the termination of the episcopal see, the arrival of plague and the Longobard domination (*Dialogues* III, 8,1-2: SC 260, 284-286).

Quamquam licenter adsumatur, PL 30, 487-488; G. Morin, *L'auteur de la "Lettre a Constantius." Étude sur les origines du* Comes *ou Lectionnaire romain*: RB 7 (1890) 416-423; DHGE 13, 770; V. Fenicchia, *Costanzo, vescovo di Aquino*: BS 4 (1964) 263; var. aus., *Costanzo di Aquino* (*VI sec.*). *Il suo tempo - I suoi luoghi - Il suo culto*, ed. F. Carcione, Venafro 2000.

P. Marone

CONSTANTIUS of Lyons (5th c.). *Presbyter of the church of *Lyons in the 5th c., mentioned by *Sidonius Apollinaris as *eminens poëta* (*Ep*. II,10,3: PL 58, 487) but also as an able orator (*Ep*. IX,16,1: PL 58,636-637) and a man dedicated to the study of the sacred books (*Ep*. VII,18,4: PL 58,588). Constantius was chosen by *Patiens to execute the mural epigraphs of the basilica of Lyons (Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep*. II, 10,3: PL 58, 487) and very probably, between 475 and 480, wrote the *Vita Germani* in an essential and incisive style; in 46 chapters it presents the most important stages of the life and mission of Bishop *Germanus of Auxerre. The work strongly echoes the *hagiographical literature of the time and thus is of significant interest for the history of 5th-c. *Gaul and *Britain.

W. Levinson, ed., MGH 7, Hannover 1920, 225-283; R. Borius, ed., SC 112, Paris 1965; W. Levinson, *Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte*: Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde 29 (1904) 95-175; E. Griffe, *L'hagiographie gauloise au Vᵉ s. La vie de saint Germain d'Auxerre*: BLE 66 (1965) 289-294; W. Gessel, *Germanus von Auxerre* (*um 378 bis 448*): RQA 65 (1970) 1-44.

P. Marone

CONSTANTIUS tractarian (early 5th c.). The author, perhaps *Arnobius the Younger, of the *Praedestinatus* (written at *Rome between 432 and 435), speaking of the *Pelagian controversy, names a certain *Constantius tractator,* who had opposed the Pelagians (PL 53,6128B). The term *tractator* could indicate either a preacher or a person who comments on biblical texts. *Prosper also mentions a Constantius who had been *vicarius,* and then *servus Christi* (a monk), who had opposed the Pelagians at *Rome (MGH, AA 9,468) and suffered at their hands in 418. The name Constantius was frequent at the time. According to De Bruyn, the anti-Pelagian Constantius could be the author of the anonymous commentary on the Pauline letters, written between 396 and 405 and discovered by Frede in a Budapest MS.

H.J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, 2 vols., Freiburg 1973-1974; T.S. De Bruyn, *Constantius the Tractator: Author of an Anonymous Commentary on the Pauline Epistles?*: JTS 43 (1992) 38-54; PCBE I, 473, n. 3 and n. 11.

A. Di Berardino

CONSTITUTIONS of HIPPOLYTUS (epitome). The document which bears this name is a separate edition of book VIII of the **Apostolic Constitutions,* in which the following modifications have been made: (1) omission of the liturgical formulas relating to *Mass and *baptism (VIII,11-15; 29; 32, 1-17; 35-41), due to the interdiction made by the last of the apostolic canons against divulging "the mystical things" contained in the *Apos. Con.*; subsequently VIII,3 (still present in the *Syriac and Arabic texts) was eliminated as useless; (2) some corrections aimed at making the text more orthodox: see *Ep*. 6 with *Apos. Con.* VIII, 16; (3) two substitutions: for the installation of the bishop and the lector (*Ep*. 4 and 13), the interpolator has replaced the text of *Apos. Con.* with that of the **Apostolic Tradition,* the latter being earlier. Ordination of the lector was enacted through the handing over of the book and without imposition of hands by the bishop. Originally the *Epitome* was accompanied by the *85 *Apostolic Canons* like its model (*Const. Apost.* VIII); they are translated alongside each other in the *Syriac *Octateuch and its derivative the Arabic Octateuch.

CPG 1741; F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, II, Paderborn 1905 (repr. Turin 1979), 72-96, cf. XI-XIX. *Studies:* E. Schwartz, *Über die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen*: Schriften der wiss. Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 6, Strassburg 1910, 2-6, 8-9, 27-39; J. Blanc, *Fragments inédits de l'Epitomé des Constitutions Apostoliques*: RTAM 21 (1954) 265-299; J.-M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte. Ses documents. Son titulaire. Ses origines et son caractère*, Rome 1959, ²1965, 78-79; A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hiérarchie*, Paris 1977, 96-98; cf. M.

Metzger, *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, SC 320, Paris 1985, 42; B. Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique de Saint Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution*, Münster [5]1989, XXVII-XXVIII; B. Steimer, *Vertex traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 80-86.

P. Nautin

CONSULTATIONES ZACCHAEI ET APOLLONII. G. Morin wanted to attribute this work to *Firmicus Maternus (mid-4th c.), but similarities to *Sulpicius Severus and the expectation of the immediate end of the world suggest a later date. It certainly predates the end of the 5th c., since *Eugenius, bishop of *Carthage from 483, cites it (CPL 103). Book I responds to *pagan objections to the Christian faith. Book II follows the true doctrine on the *Trinity and the *Holy Spirit, with a warning against *Judaism and certain *heresies. The last book, going even more deeply into the Christian life, is a defense of *monastic life. Influenced by *Tertullian and *Lactantius, the author presents the Christian religion as a law requiring both knowledge of God and upright action. Notable in particular is the distinction between the common life of *humiliores* and the perfect life of monks. The *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* is the only ancient dialogue to offer a synthesis of the Christian faith in question and answer form.

CPL 103; PL 20, 1071-1166; PLS 1, 1095; G. Morin, FP 39, Bonn 1939; SC 401-402 (1994). A. Reatz, *Das theologische System der Consulationes Zacchaei Apollonii*, Freiburg 1920; DSp II/2, 1641-1645; J.L. Feiertag, *Die Consultationes Z.A.*, Fribourg 1990; M.A. Clausen, *Pagan Rebellion and Christian Apologetics in Fourth Century Rome*: JEH 46 (1995) 589-614; LTK[3] 2, 1305; LACL (2002) 164.

B. Studer

CONTEMPLATION. The term *contemplatio* was derived from the *templum* which the augur marked out with a rod as a site for his observations. In Greek θεωρεῖν meant "to see, look, be present at a spectacle," and by extension "to reflect, meditate, investigate." With the progress of thought, the term assumed very diverse meanings. The Greek *sophoi* soon realized that the senses provide only opinion (δόξα). To contemplate meant to consider things by using reason (νοῦς) to seek out their essence (λόγος). Spiritual Christians were convinced that this type of knowledge was still not true *gnosis,* contemplation. They distinguished and contrasted "simple" (ψιλή) and "spiritual" (πνευματική) knowledge. We must see things "in their relation to God," understanding the θεοτελὴς λόγος (*Maximus the Conf., *Ad Thal.* q. 32: PG 90, 372bc), the "wisdom" conceived before creation, the primordial meaning inherent in all creatures, which leads to God (Basil., *Hom. in princip. Prov.* 3: PG 31, 389c). In spiritual masters, the meaning of the term soon crystallized into a definition derived from a false etymology: θεωρία means θεὸν ὁρᾶν, to see God (Callistus Cataphyg., *De vita contemplativa* 2 and 19, PG 147, 836b, 852b).

For Christians it was clear that to understand the logos of things is a divine gift: the divine *mystery can only be known by a *revelation. If human beings are *logikos* by nature, then it is because they partake of the divine Logos. The indispensable condition for this revelation is purity of νοῦς, the spiritual eye, the heart, through πρᾶξις, which is thus the indispensable condition for *theoria*: πρᾶξις γὰρ θεωρίας ἀνάβασις (Orig., *In Lucam fragm.* 39: GCS 9, 252, 2).

A.J. Festugière, *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Platon*, Paris 1936; DSp 2, 1643-2193, esp. 1762ff. and 6, 848-856. I. Hausherr, *Les leçons d'un contemplatif. Le traité de l'oraison d'Evagre le Pontique*, Paris 1960; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique,"* Paris - Bruges 1961; T. Špidlík, *La contemplazione nella spiritualità cristiana orientale*: Encicl. delle relig., Florence 1970, vol. II, 385-390; Id., *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*, Rome 1978, 311ff.; B. McGinn, *The Foundation of Mysticism*, New York 1991, vol. I, passim (see index 490); *Dizionario di mistica*, ed. L. Borriello et al., Vatican City 1998, 338-348.

T. Špidlík

CONTINENTES. Even before the gospel teaching and that of the Pauline epistles on continence, one must bear in mind the influence of Greek *philosophy on the people of the early period after Christ. Christians, however, having received *baptism, felt themselves better able to resist every temptation of the body and senses. But the church strongly opposed the exclusivist teachings of groups who considered themselves the only true *enkrateis,* or the sole depositaries of the one rule of life, imposing an oppressive continence; in fact theologians of the first centuries describe perpetual continence as a gift of God which cannot be prescribed for all, and not infrequently these groups that loved continence excessively slid into *heresy. One must therefore make distinctions: in *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1,28,1), the *continentes* (ἐγκρατεῖς), heretics who accept the theories of *Saturnilus and *Marcion, are hostile to marriage out of hatred for God, who created man and woman for procreation; ungrateful to the Creator, they also abstain from animal flesh. With *Tatian they deny Adam's salvation. *Continentes* are also those who, though remaining in the church, struggle against sensuality. *Chastity is a tranquil possession, whereas

continence is hard work. It is one thing to be chaste, another to be continent. Virtue *non est in collectatione continentiae, sed in castitatis pace* (Cass., *Conl.* 12,11). *Tertullian describes the torment he underwent to be continent: *scio me . . . adulteria commisisse . . . nunc ad continentiam eniti* (*Resurr.* 59,3). *Continentes* are also married people who abstain from sexual relations in imitation of virginal chastity (Jerome, *Epist.* 49,2). Tertullian, therefore, distinguishes *virgines* from *continentes,* who may be male or female (*Castit.* 13,2; *Praescr.* 40,5); *Jerome knows the categories of virgins, widows, continent, married (*Epist.* 49,5) and in *De bono pudic.* 4 of ps.-Cyprian, *pudicitia* is preeminently in virgins, secondly in the continent and thirdly in married life. Given that moderation is needed in continence, it is precisely the *continentes* who are the subject of an imperial decree of 370: *ecclesiastici . . . vel qui continentium se volunt nomine nuncupari, viduarum ac pupillarum domos non adeant* (CTh 16,2,20).

U. Bianchi (ed.), *La tradizione dell'*enkrateia. *Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche*. Atti del Colloquio internazionale, Milan 20-23 aprile 1982, Rome 1985; and esp.: G. Quispel, *The Study of Encratism: A Historical Survey*, 35-81; A. Guillaumont, *Le célibat monastique et l'idéal chrétien de la virginité ont-ils des motivations ontologiques et protologiques?*, 83-98; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Le motivazioni protologiche dell'*enkrateia *nel cristianesimo dei primi secoli e nello gnosticismo*, 149-237; U. Bianchi, *La tradition de l'*enkrateia. *Motivations ontologiques et protologiques*, 293-315; H. Crouzel, *Les sources bibliques de l'*enkrateia *chrétienne*, 505-526; P. Brown, *Le renoncement à la chair: virginité, célibat et continence dans le christianisme primitif*, Paris 1995 (Fr. tr.).

C. Tibiletti - L. Odrobina

CONTINUATIO ANTIOCHIENSIS EUSEBII. A continuation of the *Chronici canones* of *Eusebius of Caesarea. Burgess has reconstructed the text based on *Jerome's *Chronaca,* that of Theophane, the *Chronaca composita* and the **Chronicon Paschale*. It was written at *Antioch in ca. 350, translated into *Syriac in the late 4th c. and summarized in Syriac in the early 5th c. It continues the list of the bishops of *Antioch, *Jerusalem and *Alexandria, interrupted by Eusebius at 303, and is the only source relating the construction by *Constantine of a bridge on the Danube (328), the destruction of the temples at Antioch (331), the fire in the basilica of *Nicomedia (332) and the organization of the port of Seleucia (346).

R.W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart 1999.

S. Borzì

CONTRA ORIGENEM DE VISIONE ISAIAE. This short work, preserved in *Latin and discovered by A.M. Amelli in 1901, refutes the interpretation given by *Origen of Isaiah's vision in Is 6. Its criticisms are many and are expressed in no uncertain terms, esp. against Origen's seeing the two seraphim as the Son and the Spirit; like *Jerome, the author understands that Origen has made them creatures. Amelli saw it as a work of Jerome, written at *Constantinople in 381, when he stayed with *Gregory of Nazianzus: but Jerome could not have written it at a time when he still greatly admired Origen. Dietsche attributed it to *Didymus, retouched by *Theophilus of Alexandria and translated by Jerome: but we see no reason to bring the "Origenist" Didymus in. Most authors (Diekamp, Altaner, Chavoutier) attribute the work to Theophilus and the translation to Jerome, after 393.

H. Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique d'Origène*, La Haye 1971, 275.

H. Crouzel

CONVERSION – CONVERTS. If we wish to understand the meaning attributed to conversion by the Christians of the first centuries, we must briefly recall some elements which characterized it in the OT and NT. The prophets gave conversion a positive interpretation: it expressed a new attitude of the person toward God, which invested the person's whole existence and was linked to an action of God. Along the same lines, the preaching of John the Baptist invited not just sinners and *pagans to conversion but also those who thought they had no need of it. Jesus summed up God's good news by saying (Mk 1:15): "The time is fulfilled and the *kingdom of God is at hand; be converted and believe the gospel." Some parables made clear the essence of such a conversion: e.g., the treasure in the field, the pearl, the guests at the wedding feast; they stressed certain important factors: the actual presence of the kingdom of God, God's invitation to human beings at this moment, the person's response which touches his whole life and requires action, though without forcing him to abandon his own history and his own world. The early Christians followed this direction: conversion for them meant not just passing from one religion to another but turning from a life of errors and vices to one of rigorous morality. But there was even more: it required the adhesion of the will to a faith, a "theology," whose first article consists in believing that God loves human beings and wants them to love him and each other; this led to a new life in a new people, a life that partook, through faith and *bap-

tism, of the sanctification brought by Christ. A significant testimony from among the many that could be drawn from the earliest writings is chs. 5-6 of the *Letter of *Diognetus* (probably late 2nd c.), which outline the identity of Christians and their function and place in the world.

Conversion, then, is of heart and behavior (μετάνοια); it is the personal act of a spirit turning to God (ἐπιστροφή); it supposes God's grace but at the same time is reflected in and leaves traces on the surrounding world; it is born out of a personal religious experience but not confined to it. Christian conversion possesses a marked originality compared with other religious manifestations of the ancient world. It has no parallel in the public worship of Greco-Roman *paganism or in the *initiation into the *mysteries; neither of these aimed to renew spirits and hearts (apart from some exceptional cases attested in the mystery religions). For those religions we may speak of an external adherence that required formal actions which often had little or nothing to do with intimate conviction. On the other hand, cases of "philosophical conversion" were not infrequent in the Greek and Roman world, even in the first centuries of our era; the theoretical system adopted dictated ethical norms which impinged on daily life. We know what an essential place ethics held in philosophy, esp. in the 2nd-3rd c. But the context in which this type of new spiritual orientation occurred was, by its nature, reserved to the few. *Judaism too propagated a form of proselytism that reached many areas of the empire, requiring renunciation of the honoring of pagan gods, giving official worship to *dea Roma* or swearing by the emperor's genius, so as to consecrate oneself exclusively to Yahweh—an act which in practice involved denial of one's race, country and city while remaining forever distinct from the true descendants of Abraham, the Israelites by birth who alone were part of the Jewish nation by right.

As propounded by the Christian community, conversion showed characteristics that were original in the ancient world and met a set of needs felt by its people: it involved the rediscovery and recovery of essential human values, of which everyone in such a critical and tormented age must have been in search; it also offered the novelty of Christ. It is worth pointing out that we meet "genuine conversion to paganism only when Christianity had become so powerful that its rival was, so to speak, made an entity by opposition and contrast" (Nock, *Conversion*, 13). Between *Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, the history of conversion was enriched by other events; think of the relations between barbarians and Christianity during the great invasions in the West: from the work of the *Arian Ulfila among the *Goths in the 4th c., first N of the Danube, then in Moesia within the empire, to the baptism of *Clovis and 3,000 *Franks in the late 5th c. (according to the mentality and customs of those people, who felt ethnic bonds very strongly, such that their chief's proposals, whether in politics, war or religion, once accepted, became an undisputed rule).

A.D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine*, Harvard 1933 (It. tr. *Conversione. Società e religione nel mondo antico*, Bari 1974); G. Bardy, *La conversion au Christianisme durant les premiers siècles*, Paris 1949 (It. tr. Milan 1980); A.D. Nock: RAC 2, 105-118 (bibl.); P. Aubin, *L'emploi des mots* ἐπιστρέφειν *et* ἐπιστροφή *dans la littérature chrétienne des trois premiers siècles. Contribution à la théologie de la conversion*, Paris 1960; Id., *Le problème de la "conversion." Etude sur un thème commun à l'hellénisme et au christianisme des trois premiers siècles*, Paris 1963; W.H.C. Frend: TRE 5 (1980), 443-453; s.v. Bekehrung I, 2-3; K. Löning: LTK[3] 2, 167-168, s.v. Bekehrung-III. Biblisch; J. Werbick, LTK[3] 2, 168-169, s.v. Bekehrung-IV. Historisch-theologisch.

P. Siniscalco

COPTIC

I. Language and literature - II. Church.

I. Language and literature. The adjective "Coptic" is derived through Arabic from the Greek *Aigyptios* ("*Egyptian"). The Egyptian Arabs used it to designate anything which, in contrast to themselves, was "native" Egyptian: population, religion, language, customs. Transplanted into the West, the term is the source of many ambiguities and would be advantageously replaced by "Egyptian." For traditional reasons we will speak here of the Coptic language as the last stage of the native language of the Egyptians (2nd-12th c.), and of Coptic literature as that which, in original works or translations, was expressed in that language; and of the Coptic church as that most genuinely Egyptian (from the 5th c. to the present: but we will consider only the period covered by the present encyclopedia).

The language, derived from Egyptian and partly from Greek, was objectively the most characteristic element that marked out the non-*Chalcedonian Egyptian Church (more exactly styled the Coptic Orthodox Church), though it was never used exclusively and, from the 10th c., may be considered a dead language. The alphabet is the Greek, in Late Antique capitals, with the addition of some signs derived from demotic Egyptian script. The grammatical structure is that of late Egyptian, spoken in the 2nd c. AD. The syntactical structure is mainly

that of the same Egyptian, with strong Greek influences in the concatenation of sentences. Vocabulary is mostly Egyptian, partly Greek (with Latin and Aramaic words of secondary derivation). It is customary to divide it into dialects. In fact Sahidic is the literary language that prevailed from the 3rd to the 8th c.; Bohairic prevailed from the 9th to the 12th c. and is still present in the liturgy. Specifically regional dialects were Akhmimic, Lycopolitan, Oxyrhynchite (or Middle Egyptian), Fayumic and other lesser ones. Literary use must go back to the 2nd c.; the earliest MS evidence is of the 3rd c. The first texts in Coptic were translations of biblical, so-called *gnostic and hermetic texts (*see* Nag Hammadi and respective entries), other ecclesiastical texts such as *Melito's *In s. Pascha,* and some *apocrypha. Translations of the OT were made from the Greek of the LXX, though for some books (e.g., the Minor Prophets) we may guess at other versions (Theodotion?), and sometimes we seem to see pre-hexaplar elements, i.e., outside the *Origenian tradition which became standard in Egypt as elsewhere. Translation of the NT usually falls into group H (the Hesychian). Numerous codices of both translations go back as far as the 4th c. and are thus very important for textual criticism, but all work in this field is still at an early stage. Particularly unclear are the relations within Coptic between the different versions, in different "dialects" and within the same "dialect." If we can believe *Epiphanius (*Panar*. LXVII), the first original author in Coptic was *Hieracas of Leontopolis, a monk of heterodox tendencies; but nothing of his survives. An original Coptic literature, albeit somewhat rudimentary in form, arose within Pachomian *monasticism: we possess works in Coptic (esp. "circular" letters) by *Pachomius himself, *Theodore of Tabennesi and *Horsiesi. The author who raised the language to a level comparable to that of contemporary literary languages (Greek included) was *Shenoute (350–466?), archimandrite of the monastery of Athrib (today called the White Monastery) in Upper Egypt, most of whose vast output has survived. His successor *Besa was also a prolific author of letters and *catecheses and wrote a biography of Shenoute. At the same time an abundant industry developed, translating texts of the Greek Fathers, incl. Alexandrian Egyptians like *Athanasius, *Theophilus and *Cyril, who do not appear to have written or preached in Coptic. The homilies and *hagiographies of the great church fathers (esp. the passions of the *martyrs) were taken into consideration. The former were chosen not so much on theological criteria (Coptic culture was never particularly fond of theological treatises) as on spiritual and moral ones, particularly the needs of the monks. Texts seem to have been chosen solely according to content, the author not mattering so much, so that, in Coptic literary tradition, attributions often ended by being dubious or downright multiple. For this reason we will follow the same criterion in our exposition.

Mainly monastic texts. These include an important treatise on virginity attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria, *Ephrem the Syrian's *Sermo asceticus,* some ascetical works of *Basil of Caesarea, *John Chrysostom's *De compunctione* and *Ad Theodorum,* a *De poenitentia* attributed to Theophilus of Alexandria, a long treatise *De poenitentia et abstinentia* composed of Chrysostomic extracts, attributed by critics to John the Faster, bishop of *Constantinople (d. 595). *Homilies for Liturgical Feasts:* two homilies by *Gregory of Nazianzus, on *Easter and on *baptism; two by John Chrysostom, on Christmas (also attributed to Basil or *Severian of Gabala) and on *Pentecost; and a homily for Good Friday, attributed to Theophilus of Alexandria. *Exegetical Homilies:* on the raising of Lazarus and on the parable of the vineyard, attributed to Athanasius; two homilies by John Chrysostom, on the scribes and Pharisees, and on the Canaanite woman (attributed in Coptic to "Eusebius the historian"!).

Various. Basil of Caesarea on *judgment and mercy (attributed in Coptic to Athanasius); John Chrysostom on Peter and Elijah and on David and Saul; the anonymous treatise called the **Didascalia*. Works translated on account of their author include Athanasius's *Commentary on the Psalms* and *Festal Letters*; *Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catecheses*; Gregory of Nazianzus's *encomia* on Athanasius and Basil; *Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus*; *Epiphanius of Salamis's *Anchoratus* and *De gemmis*; an anthology from John Chrysostom's commentary on Hebrews; two homilies by *Proclus of Constantinople on the *incarnation and on Easter; Cyril of Alexandria's *Epilysis XII capitulorum*. Different in character are the translations of canonical texts and conciliar acts. The Copts had formed two collections, one shorter and one longer, both called *Canons of the Apostles*. The material is that found in the Greek collections, arranged in a particular way. Then there were the so-called *Canons of Athanasius* and *Canon of Basil*. Under the name *Canons of Hippolytus* was a large collection of different texts connected with the Council of *Nicaea. The Councils of *Ephesus and *Chalcedon had their own acts, not quite corresponding with the Greek collections. Among *hagiographical texts we have those on the

most important Eastern saints (*George, *Cosmas and Damian, the two *Theodores, etc.), but on its own is the series of passions connected with Arianus, prefect of the *Thebaid, the great persecutor in Egypt during *Diocletian's persecution.

The Council of Chalcedon caused a change in the direction of Coptic literature. Its first consequence was the development of a historical-polemical literature aimed at opposing the similar literature produced in the Chalcedonian camp and at propounding a contrary interpretation of church tradition. Perhaps its most important product was the *History of the Church* (maybe by *Timothy Ailouros [d. 477], but at any rate written—in Greek?—in his time): the first part is a revised translation of Eusebius's *HE* I-VII; the second narrates in an original way the events between the period of *Peter of Alexandria and that of Timothy Ailouros. Conciliar collections also came into existence (perhaps partly preexistent in Coptic): Nicaea, Ephesus, Chalcedon; and lives of important people were written, such as *Dioscorus and Timothy Ailouros (eventually in the form of *plerophoriae* or the like) or anti-Chalcedonian *archimandrites. In this period it is hard to distinguish translations from original works; in any case the circles from which they issued were uniformly bilingual. After a period of grave crisis, the Coptic Church managed under *Damian (578–605) to provide itself with an autonomous, efficient organization, and original Coptic authors flourished in this period, producing homiletic texts to be read during functions, adapted both to new theological and liturgical requirements and to new public tastes. Hagiographical literature also went through a process of renewal, and the beginnings of the cycle of the legendary general Basilides and his family, one of the most interesting phenomena of Coptic literature, probably date from this time.

This literary renaissance soon had to suffer the traumas of the Persian and Arab invasions of Egypt. The consequences were imperceptible at first, and patriarchs like Benjamin and Agatho as well as bishops like Menas of Pshati and Zacharias of Shkou could freely publish their works. But from ca. 750 the Arabs extended stricter control over the Coptic Church's activities, and literature had to assume clandestine forms. Texts necessary for church life continued to be produced, but to avoid difficulties they had to be attributed to ancient authors. Even homilies were built around "cycles," to whose protagonists they were usually attributed. These were the great names of 4th-c. patristics—Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea—who narrate, in first person, facts often bordering on the fantastic, as a setting for religious arguments of a moral and partly theological character. Shortly afterward began the work of selecting and systematizing all the material, older and more recent, within the framework of the liturgical calendar: the most appropriate texts for each feast were chosen and held available in the libraries of churches and monasteries, to be read at the corresponding ceremony. From this would derive the so-called *Alexandrian Synaxarion,* drawn up in the 12th-c. in Arabic, which contains summaries of a great many homilies and lives and passions of Coptic saints, arranged according to the liturgical calendar. The Coptic MSS fell into disuse and were dispersed and lost, except in certain great monasteries (esp. the White Monastary in Upper Egypt and St. Macarius at Scete) where they lay half-forgotten in cells until the 18th c., when European scholars persuaded the monks to exhume them and give them away: in this way many of them ended up, whole or in fragments, in European libraries. From the 19th c. the fruits of casual or archaeological discoveries, dug up from the soil of an area once populated but now desert, were added to them.

II. Church. We understand "Coptic Church" here in the traditional sense of the *Egyptian Church, which did not accept the dictates of the Council of Chalcedon (451), and consequently set up an autonomous organization (independent esp. of *Rome and *Constantinople) which still exists today. But of course we must not detach it from the previous tradition of the Egyptian Church, of which the Coptic Orthodox Church (this seems the best name to use, to distinguish it from other Coptic churches that have arisen relatively recently) considers itself the legitimate heir, in the line of the patriarchs of Alexandria, starting from St. Mark, the traditional founder of the bishopric, through the great bishops *Peter, *Athanasius, *Cyril, the first schismatic Dioscorus (d. 454), Timothy Ailouros, Theodosius, Damian, Benjamin, to the present Shenouda III. The Coptic Church of Egypt gave birth to that of *Ethiopia (directly dependent on *Alexandria from at least 640 to 1936) and that of *Nubia (also directly dependent on Egypt, but whose slow demise does not allow valid documentation). The history of the Coptic Church can be divided into three periods.

1. 451–537. The *patriarchate was contested between pro- and anti-*Chalcedonians with alternating success, depending mainly on the leanings of the emperors, who, however, hoped for an accommodation between the two parties into which Christendom had split. The main figures of this period were

Dioscorus, who died in exile at Gangra; Timothy Ailouros (d. 477), author of polemical treatises and a strenuous fighter; Theodosius (d. 566) who, though protected by Empress *Theodora, had to remain in exile at *Constantinople, where he died. His period saw important theological disputes within the anti-Chalcedonian camp (*Severus of Antioch, *Julian of Halicarnassus) which left long aftereffects in Egypt, as elsewhere.

2. 537–641. the Chalcedonians, finally triumphant at Constantinople, imposed their patriarchs on Alexandria (they were called *Melkites, and their succession still persists). The Coptic Orthodox withdrew into clandestinity, alternating with periods of relative freedom. Internal divisions ceased under Damian (578–605), a Syrian monk who carried out a vigorous, effective and lasting reorganization of the clergy.

3. 641–1250. The Arab conquest freed the Copts from the heavy *Byzantine yoke and for a time allowed them a religious tranquility never enjoyed before. Relations with their rulers were often good, esp. under the Fatimids (969–1171), but were constantly threatened by the intermingling of religious and political-economic problems. Imposition of heavy taxes provoked turbulent revolts, which led to a stiffening of Arab attitudes in the religious sphere also: it was forbidden to build or restore churches or convents; indentifying marks had to be worn on the person; some feasts could not be publicly celebrated. The patriarchal see was moved from Alexandria to Fustat (Cairo), seat of the court. The liturgical books were translated into Arabic. As for *theology, it is hard to speak in this period of a genuine theology of the Coptic Church, which recognized itself more in the line of patriarchs descending in a direct line from Dioscorus than in subtle and complicated theological formulas, on which there was no little disagreement even among the opponents of the Chalcedonians. Yet there are formulas on which the (Coptic) Egyptian texts insist, though without going into them too deeply: the Council of Chalcedon wished, in its declaration of faith, to innovate from *Nicaea, therefore it must be rejected; whoever accepts its conclusions divides in two the second person of the *Trinity, thus forming a "quadrinity"; Christ, Logos and second person of the Trinity, is indissolubly God and man, he was nine months in the Virgin's womb, he assumed all the qualities of human nature, except sin, but including suffering. In the period that interests us, if we exclude *Christology, the rest of the doctrine presents no important differences from that common to the rest of Christendom.

W.C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, Leipzig [2]1961; J. Vergote, *Grammaire Copte*, vol. I, Louvain 1973; H.J. Polotsky, *Collected Papers*, Jerusalem 1971; J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte der koptischen Literatur*, in *Gesch. der christl. Lit. des Orients* (C. Brockelmann), Leipzig [2]1972; S. Morenz, *Die koptische Literatur*, in *Handbuch der Orientalistik I*, 2, Leiden - Cologne [2]1970, 239-250; T. Orlandi, *Elementi di lingua e letteratura copta*, Milan 1970; T. Orlandi, *The Future of Studies in Coptic Biblical and Ecclesiastical Literature*, in *The Future of Coptic Studies*, Leiden 1978, 143-163; Ch. Cannuyer, *Les Coptes*, s. 1, Turnhout 1990; M. Krause (ed.), *Ägypten in spätantik-christlicher Zeit. Einführung in das ägyptische Christentum*, Stuttgart - Berlin - Cologne 1994, 9-27; Th.H. Partrick, *Traditional Egyptian Christianity: A History of the Coptic Orthodox Church*, Greensboro, NC 1996; A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto cristiano*, Rome 1997; T. Orlandi, *Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari*, web page: http://cmcl.let.uniroma1.it/

T. Orlandi

CORICIUS (Χορίκιος) (6th c.). Greek sophist, contemporary of *Justinian; disciple of *Procopius, whom he succeeded as director of the school of *Gaza in *Palestine. He wrote "many works . . . fictitious (*plasmatikous*) discourses, *panegyrics, monodies, epithalamia and antiheretical discourses." *Photius further praises the clarity and naturalness of his style, his religious sense and respect for the sacred, but judges his inclusion of "pagan fables and tales, even when treating sacred subjects" out of place. Among his descriptions (ἐκφράσεις) and encomiums—a literary genre in which Coricius, according to Photius, "surpassed himself"—we must note the dubious eulogy of Bishop Marcian of Gaza (ca. 530–550), with precise descriptions of the Churches of St. Sergius and St. Stephen in that city. He also composed the funeral eulogy of his teacher Procopius.

CPG 7518; Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 160: R. Henry, II, Paris 1960, 121-123; R. Foerster - E. Richsteig, *Choricii Gazaei Opera,* Leipzig 1930, 1-47; S. Impellizeri, *La letteratura bizantina da Costantino agli iconoclasti*, Bari 1965, 174-175, 352; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I, Munich 1978, 165-176; W. Horändne, *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner*, I, Vienna 1981, 76-78; ODB 1, 430-431; Patrologia V, 281; F.-M. Abel, *Gaza au VI^e siècle d'après le rhéteur Chorikios*: Revue Biblique 40 (1931) 5-31; A. Sideras, *Zwei unbekannte Monodien von Chorikios?*: JÖBG 33 (1983) 57-73.

D. Stiernon

CORINTH. The Church of Corinth was founded by the *apostle *Paul (Acts 18:1-18; 1 Cor 1:14-16; 16:15) around the year 50 in a milieu that included Jews organized in a *synagogue (Acts 18:4, 8); but we cannot rule out Christianity having arrived earlier. The primitive community had important Jews as mem-

bers, but from the letters we can deduce that the majority was of Gentile origin. The city, destroyed by Mummius (146 BC), was rebuilt by Julius Caesar (44 BC) as a traditional Roman colony according to established practice; from 27 BC it was capital of the province of *Achaia. The original plan of the city was vast, ca. 150 hectares; it later spread toward the east. The ancient temples were preserved and the new part of the city enriched with splendid public buildings: the agora, adorned on the model of the Roman forum, acquired a monumental aspect. Corinth, known at that time as the largest and richest city of Hellas, had a multinational population of varied social extraction (de Waele; Wiseman 502-531; Broneer; Dinkler). In AD 267–268 it was destroyed by the Heruli and in the 4th c. suffered repeatedly from earthquakes; destroyed again by *Alaric's *Goths in 396, it rose again rapidly after each catastrophe. It was struck by another earthquake in 522 and by plague in 542 (Scranton 1-5); an earthquake razed it to the ground in 550–551, after which most of its inhabitants abandoned it. Then began a period of decline, which lasted until the early 9th c. (Pallas, *Données,* 298-305). After its destruction by *Alaric it was given a new city wall, which considerably restricted its expansion (Gregory). The church of Corinth, in a very complex ethnic and social context, was marked by religious enthusiasm (1 Cor 14:4-40), internal tensions and *heresies (*1 Clem*. I, 1-2, 3, 3-4, 27, 1-5, etc.: PG 1,201ff., 213ff., 231ff.; *Praedest*. I,23: PL 53,594; cf. Lebreton-Zeiller II,408-409); but it regained unity (Orig., *C. Cels*. III,30: PG 11,957; P. Koetschau GCS I,227-228; cf. Harnack 789; Lebreton-Zeiller IV,833), and had *martyrs (about 25 are commemorated, some certain, some legendary: Max Herzog z. Sachsen 47, 51, 54, 55; Delehaye 164 and 227; Phoughias 123-125 and 131) and prominent churchmen like Bishops *Dionysius, *Bacchyllus, Alexander, *Perigenes and Peter. From its foundation the church of Corinth was the religious center of the whole eparchy of Achaia (2 Cor 1:2), and hence its metropolis, subject to *Rome through the metropolitan of *Thessalonica, vicar of the pope (*see* Achaia): for the bishops of Corinth see Janin 878-879 (adding Eustathius, before 536 [Stikas 133]; on Photius [536–553]: Pallas-Ntantis 68-69 n. 7).

The Christians of Corinth, living in an atmosphere of syncretism, used the same cemeteries as the Gentiles, which were gradually Christianized (Pallas, *Investigations,* 9-14; Id., *Monuments,* 153-154). Christian sanctuaries predating 550–551 have been discovered at the edges of the old city, consecrated to the cult of the martyrs. Also at the edge of the late Roman city, but nearer the center, near the gate in the Roman wall that faced the amphitheater (which remained outside the late wall), was a large church building, recently found but not yet properly excavated. Probably a basilica, with a central-plan outbuilding (baptistery or martyrium, whose ruins rise considerably above ground level), it seems to date from the 1st half of the 6th c. (Pallas, *Scoperte,* 205-207). In the space adjacent to the agora, Christian worship took root after 550–551. The oldest church yet known is the basilica of Lechaeum—basilica C—in the port area on the gulf of Corinth, dedicated to the martyr Leonidas and the seven women who suffered martyrdom with him under *Decius. Its construction began under *Marcian (450–457) at the latest and ended not before *Justin I (518–527). Its height and architectural structure are typical: three aisles, pentapartite transept, narthex in five sections, two adjoining porticos on W side, atrium on E side, independent *diaconicon* on S side accessible from the narthex and the side aisle, symmetrical to N, with a room of unknown function (for catechesis or funerals?), and two small buildings, one at each side of the transverse aisle: that to the N is a mausoleum; that to the S may be a waiting room for clergy. The baptistery, on the N side with access from the narthex through the atrium, seems older than the basilica. The basilica had galleries and a wooden roof. At the crossing of the central nave and the transverse aisle was a vault (wooden cupola) supported on a canopy, consisting of four mighty pillars linked at the top by arches enclosed in colonnades (Pallas, *Monuments,* 165-171; Id., *Corinthe,* 95-101).

The basilica of Cranaeum—basilica A—near the Cenchraean gate (of the old walls) had three aisles divided by pillars, a wooden roof, transverse aisle, transept, narthex, W portico, atrium extending the length of the S side; N of the narthex and portico was a baptistery with adjoining rooms, reached from the narthex. The sides of the central body of the basilica were lined with monumental tombs. In front of the apse we may presume a roof higher than that of the rest of the basilica (Pallas, *Monuments,* 154-156; Id., *Corinthe,* 101-105). Built in the area of a necropolis which later became a Christian cemetery, it can be dated, with some approximation, between 500 and 520. The basilica of Scoutela—basilica B, outside the old walls, some way from the city—was probably dedicated to a martyr. It was smaller than basilica A, with three simple aisles, colonnade and narthex, baptistery to S accessible from the narthex, but no portico (Pallas, *Corinthe,* 105). The basilica of the martyr Quadratus—basilica D, near the old N cemetery, outside the late Roman wall—had almost the same characteristics and dimensions, with no

narthex, portico or baptistery, but perhaps with *diaconicon* and an annex for worship (Pallas, *Monuments,* 156-163; Id., *Corinthe,* 105-108). Both basilicas date from the first decades of the 6th c. After the destruction of Corinth by the earthquake of 550–551, on a small height near the agora, where the archaic Doric temple stood, rose a small three-aisled basilica—basilica E—with pastophory and polygonal apse. Modest, situated in a funerary area, it dates from the late 6th or early 7th c. (Pallas, *Corinthe,* 108-109) and seems to have served the small community that survived the catastrophe of 550–551. On the Acrocorinth, in a very poor state, is a basilica with three aisles divided by columns, built on the site of the old temple of Aphrodite (Blegen - Saillwell et al., 21-22, pl. II) and dated to the 2nd half of the 6th c. In Corinth's second port, Cenchraea on the Saronic gulf, were found a basilica and some underground funerary cells, at least one of which seems Christian (Pallas, *Investigations,* 7-8). The church architecture of Corinth exercised an influence beyond the bounds of the province of Achaia.

M. Herzog zu Sachsen, *Das christliche Hellas*, Leipzig 1918; A. Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig [4]1924 (It. tr. Milan 1906); C. Blegen - R. Saillwell et al., *Acrocorinth* (= Corinth III 1), Cambridge, MA 1930; H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels [2]1933; F.J. de Waele: PWK Suppl. VI (1935) 182-199 (s.v. *Korinthos*); O. Broneer, *Studies in the Topography of Corinth*: AE 1 (1937) 125-133; F. Dinkler, *Das Bema zu Korinth*: Marburg. Jahrb. f. Kunstwiss. 13 (1944) 12-22; J. Lebreton - J. Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, London II (1948) and IV (1949); R. Janin: DHGE 13, 876-880 (s.v. *Corinthe*); R. Scranton, *Mediaeval Architecture in the Central Area of Corinth* (= Corinth XVI), Princeton 1957; D.I. Pallas, *Scoperte archeologiche in Grecia negli anni 1956-1958*: RivAC 25 (1959) 187-223; E. Stikas, Κοιμητηριακὴ βασιλικὴ ἀρχαίας Κορίνθου: PAAH (1961) 129-136; M.G. Phoughias, Ἱστορία τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Κορίνθου, Athens 1968; D.I. Pallas, *Investigations sur les monuments chrétiens de Grèce avant Constantin*: CArch 24 (1975) 1-19; D.I. Pallas, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1959 à 1973*, Vatican City 1977; D.I. Pallas - S.P. Dantes, Ἐπιγραφὲς ἀπὸ τὴν Κόρινθω: AE (1977) 61-83; J. Wiseman, *Corinth and Rome I: 226 B.C.-A.D. 267*: ANRW II, Berlin - New York 1979, 438-548; Th.E. Gregory, *The Late Roman Wall at Corinth*: Hesperia 48 (1979) 264-280; D.I. Pallas, *Corinthe et Nikopolis pendant le bas moyen-âge*: FR 118 (1979) 93-142; Id., *Données nouvelles sur quelques boucles et fibules considerées comme avares et slaves et sur Corinthe entre le VI[e] et le IX[e] s.*: Byzantinobulgarica 7 (1981) 295-318; W. Elliger, *Paulus in Griechland. Philippi, Thessaloniki, Athen, Korint*, Stuttgart 1987; D. Engels, *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City*, Chicago 1990; *Towns in Transitions: Urban Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, N. Christie - S.S.T. Loseby - S. Hants (eds.), Brookfield, VT 1996, 99-125; LTK[3] 6,378-379; ODB 1,531-533; LMA 5,1444 (cf. 6,834-836); RBK 4,746-811; EAA[2] 2,301-303; RBK 5,746-811.

D.I. Pallas

CORIPPUS, Flavius Cresconius (6th c.). Epic poet born in the first decade of the 6th c., perhaps near *Carthage. After being a *grammaticus* and composing Georgics in the manner of Virgil, in 533 he moved to *Carthage, where, ca. 550, he composed the *Iohannis seu de bellis Lybicis,* an epic poem in 8 books of 6,667 verses, on the war of the Romans against the *Vandals of *Africa. The poem was influenced by Virgil's *Aeneid,* e.g., in the portrayal of the *magister militum* John Troglita, conqueror of the Moors; as a historical source, it is no less important than *Procopius's *Bellum vandalicum*. The success of this poem led to Corippus being called as *scriniarius* or *notarius* to *Justin II's court at *Byzantium, where he eventually fell into disgrace and died in poverty, perhaps shortly before 568. At Byzantium Corippus composed, on the model of *Claudian, the poem *In laudem Iustini minoris* in 4 books, in honor of the emperor. This must be considered a genuine *panegyric, though its tones and epic motifs transcend the classical model fixed by the rhetor *Menander. Emulation of the classical poets is prominent in these works, but echoes of *Juvencus, *Prudentius, *Sedulius and other Christian authors are present, as are Christian ideas and motifs such as the frequent prayer to God, e.g., John's to Jesus (*Joh.* I,151; IV,269-284; V,42; VI,100; VII,88-103; VIII,215 and 341-353), Justin's to the Creator (*In laud. Iu.* II,11-42) and the empress Sophia's to Mary (op. cit. II,52-69), and in book IV of the panegyric (op. cit. 294-311), the expression of the dogmas of the *Trinity and the *incarnation in accordance with the *Nicene Creed. Corippus's influence has been noted in *Venantius Fortunatus, *Eugenius of Toledo and *Aldhelm.

CPL 1515-1516; I. Partsch, *Corippi Africani grammatici libri qui supersunt*, MGH *Auct. ant.* 3, 2, Berlin 1879; M. Petschenig, *Flavii Cresconii Corippi Africani grammatici quae supersunt*: Berl. Stud. f. Kl. Philol. 4, 2 (1886); D. Romano, *In laudem Iustini*, text, tr. and ann. ed. D.R., Palermo 1970; Av. Cameron, *In laudem Iustini II*, ed. with comm., London 1976; U.J. Stache, *Flavius Cresconius Corippus "In laudem Iustini Aug. Minoris". Ein Kommentar*, Berlin 1976; R. Amann, *De Corippo priorum poetarum lat. imitatore*, Diss. Kiel 1885, Progr. Oldenburg 1889; B. Baldwin, *The Career of Corippus*: CQ 28 (1978) 372-376; G. Boano, *Su Massimiano e le sue elegie*: RFIC 27 (1949) 198-216; Av. Cameron, *Corippus' poem of Justin II*: ASNP 5 (1975/1976) 129-165; M. Darquennes, *Flavius Cresconius Corippus, Stylistische Studie*, Louvain 1941; L. Hakenson, *Some Notes on Corippus' Iohannis*: CQ 27 (1977) 424-29; J.U. Andres, *Concordantia in Flavii Corippi Ioannida*, Hildesheim 1993; *Berbères ou barbares? Recherches sur le livre second de la "Johannide" de CoripPe*, ed. V. Zarini, Nancy-Paris 1997; L. Krestan - K. Winkler, *Corippus*: RAC 3, 424-429; M. Manitius, *Zu spätlat. Dichtern*: Zs. f. österr. Gymn. 37 (1886) 81-101; Id., *Zu Aldhelm u. Beda*: SAW 112 (1896) 535-629; Th. Nissen, *Historisches Epos u. Panegyricus in der Spätantike*: Hermes 75 (1940) 298-325; D. Romano, *L'ultimo epos latino. Interpretazione della Iohannis di Corippo*: AAPal (1968) 6-26 = Letteratura and Storia nell'età

tardoromana, Palermo 1979, 252-272; F. Skutsch, *Corippus*: PWK 4,1, 1236-1246; A.R. Sodano, *Uno storico-poeta del secolo di Giustiniano, Flavio Cresconio Corippo*: Antiquitas 1 (1947) 27-37; A. Welzel, *De Claudiani et Corippi sermone epico*, Breslau 1906; H. Hofmann, *Corippus as a Patristic Author?*: VChr 43/4 (1989) 361-377; V. Zarini, *Poésie officielle et arts figurés au siècle de Justinien: images de pouvoir dans la "Johannide" de Corippe*: REL 75 (1997) 219-240.

S. Costanza

CORNELIUS I, pope (251–253). After *Fabian's death, 14 months passed before it was possible to elect a new bishop. The community, tested by *Decian's persecution, preferred Cornelius to *Novatian, who had directed it during the papal vacancy. After some hesitation, *Cyprian entered into communion with Cornelius, praising his goodness, prudence and humility (*Ep.* 45,2-3; 48,1-3; 55). A synod of 60 bishops approved his mild position on *lapsi,* *excommunicating Novatian. Cornelius communicated this to the bishops of *Alexandria, *Antioch and *Carthage. We have two letters to Cyprian (*Ep.* 49 and 50) and a fragment of one to *Fabius of Antioch which, besides the question of penance, touched on the organization of the Roman community (Euseb., *HE* VI, 43; Mirbt, n. 144). Condemned to exile in the new *persecution under Gallus, Cornelius died in 253 (Cypr., *Ep.* 60,2). Cyprian calls him a *martyr (*Ep.* 61,3; 67,6; 69,3).

CPL 50, with Cyprian's *Ep.* 49 and 50; AASS Sept. IV (1866) 143-191; DHGE 13,891-894; BS 4,182ff.; H.J. Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum*, Bonn 1968, 37-56; M. Bévenot, *Cyprian and His Recognition of Cornelius*: JTS 28 (1977) 346-359; HDG IV/3, 53ff. (with bibl. on Novatian); LTK[3] 2, 1313-1314; LACL (2002) 165.

B. Studer

CORNELIUS the CENTURIAN. Of the cohort called Italica, at Caesarea; his story is in Acts 10. From the 4th c. Cornelius's baths and house at Maritime *Caesarea were shown; a basilica was built above them (CCL 175,13. 116. 152). On 2 February the *Mart. hier.* mentions a certain Cornilianus. In his *martyrology Ado claims that this is the centurion; the *Synax. Eccl. CP* cites him on 13 September. Mentions of his episcopate at *Caesarea in *Palestine (*Apos. Con.* 7,46) and of his apostolate at Skepsis in Mysia (on the Hellespont) (BHG 371) are apocryphal, based on traditions unknown to us. Cornelius's tomb has been located at Caesarea and at Skepsis.

BHG 370-371; BS 4,189-192; LCI 7,341-342; G. Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium*, Rome 1989, 619-620; F. Bovon, *De vocatione gentium. Histoire de l'interprétation d'Actes 10,1-11,18 dans les six premiers siècles*, Tübingen 1967; P. Maraval, *Lieux Saints et Pèlerinages d'Orient*, Paris 1985, 300; R.L. Vann, *The Pilgrim's Harbor at Caesarea Maritima*: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City - Münster 1995, 1242-1243; see the commentaries on Acts.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

CORNERSTONE. The 4th-c. *christological disputes on the person of *Jesus Christ left their mark on *iconography with *gammadia*. For this reason, these *gammadia* are today called "christological." These letters are tied either to the symbolic language of numbers they represent or to the image that the individual signs reveal. The letter Γ (*gamma*) underwent several developments in early Christian iconography. It represents the number three and quickly began to represent the *Trinity. When one flips it, it becomes the capital *L* in Latin, through no coincidence with the corresponding letter in Greek. This letter, through its angle, revealed the image of the cornerstone and became its symbol. It is similar to the other *gammadia* such as the small o (*omicron*), to represent 100, the ϕ (*phi*) for a distaff, ζ (*zeta*) to represent the awful character of a person and the letter I (*iota*) to represent a ship's mast. The letter Γ flipped upside down into an *L* became a symbol of Christ the cornerstone.

The Fathers spoke of Christ the cornerstone by explaining Is 28:16; Zach 10:4; 1 Pet 2:6; Eph 2:20-21; and most especially Ps 118:22. According to *Origen (*Comm. Ioh.* 1,148-149: SC 120, 134-136), the rock of Psalm 118:22-23 is none other than *Jesus Christ, as Mt 21:42 and Acts 4:11 show. *Ambrose, in his *Commentary* on Lk 24:5 (*Exp. Lc.* 2,86), writes that the church is the mother of the living and God has built it upon Jesus Christ, the cornerstone upon whom the entire edifice grows. For *Didymus of Alexandria (*Zacc.* 1,259: SC 83, 326-328), Christ has united two walls into one corner, one formed of Jews (*Christians and Jews) that have come over to the gospel, and the other formed by *pagans that have come to Christianity. The church is formed of Jews and Greeks and has as its head Jesus Christ, who joins the building into one sole corner, making one sole building. *Augustine also says that the corner is the point of meeting for the two walls, the two peoples. The walls are not joined in the corner unless they come from two different directions. For St. *John of Damascus (*Nat.* 6: SC 80,60), from the mountain of the Lord that rises above every hill and mountain, the height of the angels and men, the cornerstone, Christ, has been detached—Christ, who unites what is divided: divinity and humanity, angels and men, pagans and Israel according to the flesh, into one sole spiritual Israel.

The *gammadia L,* the cornerstone, appears for the first time with its christological meaning in the catacomb of the Via Dino Compagni in *Rome on a person's pallium (4th c.). In his left hand, this person holds a scroll resting on his hip and with his right the hem of his pallium on which is portrayed the *L.* At times it is represented with a double *L,* as on the pallium of St. *Stephen (6th c.,) and the small basilica called the "basilica of the *Traditio clavium*," and the cemetery of Commodilla at *Rome. At *Naples, in the only painted arcosolium in the cemetery of St. Severo, a person shows on the hem of the pallium the same *gammadia* flipped in the opposite direction, ⅃, a perspectivism of sorts.

The use of the *L* as cornerstone became very widespread. One finds it at *Ravenna in the side chapel of the mausoleum of *Galla Placidia (5th c.). In the procession of the *martyrs of S. Apollinare Nuovo, it appears in a pair (*LL*) on the pallium of St. *Hippolytus (6th c.). At *Milan, in the small chapel of St. Aquilino, on the *mosaic of the apse on the righthand side, the young Christ seated on a throne in the middle of the apostolic college, displays the *L* on the hip of his pallium (5th c.). In the apse of *Parentium one can see the Madonna with child and the two angels with *L*'s.

The Lateran Triclinium of Piazza San Giovanni, Rome, ends in an apse with a mosaic. It is from the 8th c. but was entirely redone in the 18th. In the conch, Christ holds a book open with the words: *pax vobis*. Around him stand the *apostles, dressed in club-shaped tunics and the pallium, bearing the *gammadia*. The *L* as cornerstone is read on the pallium of the first apostle on the lefthand side, and on the right of the fifth. The use of the *gammadion L* at the Basilica of Santa Maria in Trastevere and S. Francesca Romana continued into the Middle Ages. It is difficult to say, however, if this was deliberate or merely a duplication of earlier models. The zeal with which it was used in the early centuries was lost, and an investigation into the matter is no longer easy.

A. Quacquarelli, *La simbologia delle lettere cristologiche nel Battistero degli ariani di Ravenna*: RomBarb 2 (1977) 231-246; Id., *Il monogramma cristologico* (*gammadia*): VetChr 15 (1978) 5-21; Id., *Il monogramma cristologico* (*gammadia*) *H*: VetChr 16 (1979) 5-20; Id., *Catechesi liturgica e iconologica alla Trinità nei primi secoli. Gammadia* (*lettera cristologica*) G: VetChr 18 (1981) 5-32; Id., *La lettera cristologica* (*gammadia*) *I nella iconografia dei primi secoli*: VetChr 23 (1986) 5-18; Id., *Retorica patristica e sue istituzioni interdisciplinari*, Rome 1995, 221- 225; T. Baarda, *"The Cornerstone": An Aramaism in the Diatessaron and the Gospel of Thomas*: NT 37 (1995) 285-300; D. Mazzoleni, s.v. *Gammadia*, in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 185-186.

A. Quacquarelli

CORPUS. The term *corpus* for a group of writings on the same subject was already used by the ancients. *Cassiodorus used it for a collection of letters, Pope *Gelasius for the totality of the books of the Bible (*Ep.* 9,1). D. Gothofredus (1583) applied it to his edition of the **Codex Justinianis, Corpus iuris civilis*. The word was extended to other fields: Latin poets, Byzantinology, inscriptions. The great modern patristic collections adopted it (instead of *Bibliotheca*): *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum,* Vienna 1866; *Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,* Paris, then Louvain; *Corpus Christianorum,* Turnhout 1953.

From the 16th c. the first collections and "libraries" of the Fathers appeared, at first containing minor authors and works, major authors having their own editions. We will mention, in chronological order, the following: the 1528 Basel Library, by J. Sichard, titled *Antidotum contra diversas omnium fere saeculorum haereses,* followed by the Zurich *Bibliotheca Patrum,* eds. C. Gesnerius and J. Simlerus, 1572, mainly *christological. In 1575 the *Bibliotheca Patrum Parisiensis* appeared, in 8 volumes ed. by Margarin de la Bigne and arranged by subject: it was the reply to the *Centuries* of Magdeburg and was reprinted and added to many times.

Margarin's enterprise was transformed by the *Bibliotheca Patrum Coloniensis* of 1618, in 14 volumes in chronological order, each volume corresponding to the centuries of the authors. Doubled in size, it became the *Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum,* Lyons 1677, in 27 volumes from the 1st to the 16th c.

In 1765–1781 the *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* was published in 14 volumes by A. Galland; it was a landmark, reproducing, for the Greeks, the Greek text. Migne abandoned the title of *Bibliotheca* (which he reserved for his own enterprise) and adopted that of *Cursus* (already used for other collections); for the first time in the history of publishing, he published in his *corpus* all the works of all writers, major and minor, providing the *opera omnia,* including *spuria,* in 221 volumes for the *Patrologia Latina* (1844–1864) and 161 volumes for the *Patrologia Graeca* (1857–1866).

Th. Ittig, *De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum*, Leipzig 1707; J.G. Dowling, *Notitia scriptorum SS. Patrum*, Oxford 1939; A. Hamman, *J.P. Migne. Le retour aux Pères de l'Église*, Paris 1975.

A. Hamman

CORSICA. The absence of explicit historical sources, with the exception of the Gregorian correspondence, and the scarcity of archaeological

sources mean that as yet we have no exhaustive picture of the topography and monuments of early Christian Corsica. Of the five presumed primitive dioceses on the island (Aleria, Mariana [now Lucciana], Sagona [now Vico], Aiacciu and perhaps Nebbiu [now Saint-Florent]), only two, Mariana on the E coast and Sagona on the W coast, have thus far been subject to partial archaeological investigation. A single *martyr is attested for Corsica in the *Mart. hier., Iulia,* but this may be Julie of Carthage, as already suggested by Lanzoni.

At Mariana, excavation near the medieval cathedral has revealed a very interesting architectural complex. Along one of the *decumani* of the Roman city was built a three-aisled basilica of considerable dimensions (38.60 x 17.90 m), inserted into the existing (imperial-era) urban fabric, reusing foundations of earlier structures (shops and dwellings, and an arcade running along the *decumanus*). SE of it was a baptistery with central pool, initially cruciform but later refashioned as a smaller octagon. The baptistery is built over an earlier small baths complex. These two buildings had mosaic pavements, only partly preserved: in the basilica, along the N and S sides of the raised presbytery, a series of panels with geometric motifs; on the presbytery the depiction, unique in the West, of the OT scene of the lion and ox reconciled in the kingdom, eating hay together (Is 11:6) with the words: [*leo et bos simul p*] *aleas manduc*[*abunt*]. In the baptistery figurative themes prevail: the oceans, two ducks, two fish, two dolphins and a single biblical reference, the deer at the spring (Ps 42:1). While the complex was first dated to the 2nd half of the 4th c., study of the mosaics and architecture, as well as historical and topographical data, led me to date the initial phase of the complex to the early 6th c., attributing its construction to *orthodox *African bishops who took refuge in Corsica during the reign of Thrasamund (496–523). Corsica (like Sardinia) was in fact a *Vandal province from 455–533. New stratigraphic data (2003) from the excavation of the sealed layers under the base of the mosaics, which were taken up in 2002, lead us now to move the date of the construction of the episcopal complex to the 2nd half of the 6th c., i.e., after the *Byzantine reconquest of Corsica. Also at Mariana, outside the urban settlement in an imperial-age necropolis, was the cemeterial basilica of St. Perteu (*Parthaeus*), perhaps an African (or his relics?) who landed in Corsica with the very bishops who built this edifice in his honor. These buildings remained in use during the early Middle Ages, with considerable restoration of the urban basilica and the baptistery; they were rebuilt from scratch in Pisan times (12th-13th c.): the urban basilica was moved further N, that of St. Perteu was rebuilt over the old one, with a slightly different orientation. Recent archaeological data have allowed us to ascertain that the urban site of Mariana was occupied without interruption until the 16th c.

At Sagona, excavation has revealed elements of the (presumed) primitive cathedral, dedicated to a St. A[p]pianus, perhaps also an African (at least according to a late *passio*), who would therefore be linked to the orthodox refugees to Corsica. This thesis is reinforced by the discovery, in 1965, of a dedicatory tile of a church or a venerated burial which says: [*in honore san*]*cti Apiani ivbante deo pavlvs fecit*; it cannot be determined whether Paulus was a bishop, an ecclesiastic or a generous lay donor, there being no other reference in the sources. Following the recent finds at Mariana and their chronology, it is difficult to date the ruins at Sagona to before the mid 6th c.: an apse, polygonal (three sided) outside and semicircular inside, and a very modest cruciform baptistery with pool initially circular, then made polygonal, perhaps in medieval times. A Pisan-style cathedral, then a small chapel (18th c.), were built over the early-Christian church. The apse of the primitive basilica has been found (polygonal outside, semicircular inside), with some connected rooms, and the baptistery, with the foundations of a small circular pool in the center. For now, we have no other data relative to the urban fabric of Sagona during *Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

A dig at Bravona, a small center N of Aleria but perhaps still in the diocese of Mariana, discovered a small baptismal church (cruciform pool), probably from the 2nd half of the 6th c. An important small *Longobard (Lombard)-era treasure (silver coins) was found there. The small complex was rebuilt in a medieval phase, ca. the 12th c.

In the valley of the Golo (a river emptying into the sea at Mariana), in the diocese of Mariana, under a medieval parish complex has been discovered a baptismal church (two apsed halls side by side), with cruciform pool and the remains of mosaics, also probably from the 2nd half of the 6th c.

We have nine letters of Pope *Gregory the Great concerning Corsica. They give a difficult picture of the Christianization of the island and the state of the dioceses, regularly without bishops and regular clergy, and with no *monasteries on the island. The two most important letters regard the construction of a rural baptismal church, during two different periods and at the pope's expense, in the mountains of the diocese of Aleria, to which an *episcopium* would be later added. At this point we have nothing to in-

dicate where this complex might have been located.

For past archaeological finds: G. Moracchini Mazel, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de la Corse*, Paris 1967; N. Duval, *Corse, Les premiers monuments chrétiens de la France - 1. Sud-est et Corse*, Paris 1995, 308-365; H. Lavagne, *Les fouilles de Mariana, 9, Les mosaïques paléochrétiennes*, Cahiers Corsica, 1981, 97; G. Moracchini Mazel, *Les fouilles de Mariana, 10, Les églises cimétériales de San Parteo*, Cahiers Corsica, 1992, 146-148. For more recent sources, finds and interpretations: F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia, dalle origini al principio del VII secolo*, Faenza 1927, II, 683-702; Ph. Pergola, *Vandales et Lombards en Corse: sources historiques et archéologiques*, in La Cultura in Italia tra Tardo Antico and Alto Medioevo (Rome, 12-16 novembre 1976), Rome 1981, II,913-917; Ph. Pergola, *L'administration vandale; Grégoire le Grand et le malgoverno byzantin; la tentative manquée d'une hégémonie pontificale*, in Mémorial des Corses (ed. F. Pomponi), Ajaccio 1981, I,226-255; S.P. Scalfati, *Il monachesimo in Corsica al tempo di Gregorio I, S. Benedetto nel suo tempo*, in Atti dell'VIII Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo (1980), Spoleto 1982, 761-772; Ph. Pergola, *Observations sur la chronologie des mosaïques de la basilique et du baptistère de Mariana* (*Corsica*), in III Colloquio Internazionale sul Mosaico Antico (Association Internationale pour l'Étude de la Mosaïque Antique - Ravenne, septembre 1980), Ravenna 1984, 401-440; Ph. Pergola, *Considérations nouvelles sur les mosaïques et les sculptures du complexe paléochrétien de Mariana* (*Corsica*), in Actes du X^{e} congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne (Thessalonique, septembre 1980), Vatican City - Thessalonica 1984, 397-408; Ph. Pergola, *Mariana, Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII^{e} siècle*, II, Paris 1986, 98-102; Ph. Pergola, C. Vismara (ed.), *Castellu* (*Haute-Corse*) *- Un établissement rural de l'antiquité tardive. Fouilles récentes* (*1981-1985*), Documents d'Archéologie Française, 18, Paris 1989; Ph. Pergola, *Gli interventi di Gregorio Magno in Corsica, aspetti religiosi, socio-economici e politici*, in Atti del Convegno Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo (Roma 9-12 maggio 1990), SEA, 33 (1991) 103-108; Ph. Pergola, *La Corsica dell'alto medioevo: un crocevia politico, economico e militare tra l'Africa e la costa tirrenica*, Medioevo Saggi and Rassegne 24 (La Corsica e il mondo mediterraneo nell'età medioevale), C.N.R., Cagliari 1999, 11-25; Ph. Pergola, *La Corse*, *Alle origini della parrocchia rurale* (*IV-VIII sec.*), Seminario di Archeologia Cristiana, Rome 19 March 1998; (ed. Ph. Pergola), *Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane*, XII, Vatican City, 1999, 7-10; 205-213; Ph. Pergola, *La Corse chrétienne dans l'Église Universelle des origines à la fin du haut moyen âge*: Corsica Christiana - 2000 ans de christianisme, 1, Ajaccio 2001, 14-36; Ph. Pergola, *Aux origines de la paroisse rurale: bilan l'Italie et la Corse*, Colloque international "aux origines de la paroisse rurale en Gaule Méridionale, IV^{e}-IX^{e} siècle," Université de Toulouse-II-Le Mirail - mars 2003 (dir. Chr. Delaplace), Toulouse 2005, 173-192.

Ph. Pergola

COSMAS and DAMIAN, doctors, martyrs, thaumaturges (3rd-4th c.). The first historical evidence concerning Cosmas and Damian regards their cult. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus mentions the basilica dedicated to them at Cyrrhus (*Ep. ad Anatolium*: PG 84, 747) and the *martyrion* of Cosmas alone (*Ep.* 145: SC 114, 168), which in fact also contained remains of his brother, according to the ancient practice of indicating groups of saints by the name of just one of them. Uncertain is the information according to which, in 400 (before Theodoret), *Rabbula, future bishop of *Edessa and saint, was converted by a miracle which occurred during a visit to the sanctuary of Cyrrhus or the chapel of St. Cosmas at Beroea, near *Aleppo (Peeters, 665; Luongo, 37 note 13). According to the archdeacon Theodosius (*De situ terrae sanctae 32:* CCL 175, 125) their tomb at Cyrrhus was a *pilgrimage destination in the 6th c. and was located on the site where they were killed, probably that which the tradition calls Phereman. The emperor *Justinian, healed by the two saints, had an outstanding devotion to them. *Procopius describes more than once the sovereign's gratitude toward his healers, in honor of whom he enlarged and fortified Cyrrhus, site of the sanctuary (*De aedificiis* I,VI,5 for the miracle regarding the emperor; II,XI,2-4 for the history of the city, which flourished also for political-military reasons). The two thaumaturges' fame is attested at Edessa, where in 457 Bishop Nonno had a *martyrion* built in their honor in the city's hospital (*Chronicon Edessenum* 68).

Parallel to the above was the historical-legendary spread of their *relics. Procopius says that in his day the remains were at Cyrrhus. In Edessa, the bodies of Cosmas and Damian were said to lie separately in two churches, with a division between groups, the creation of two different seats of the cult and of thaumaturgy, and significant economic benefits (*Chronicon of Rahmani*; see Luongo 38 n. 18).

A church dedicated to them at *Jerusalem, with a *monastery and a hospice for pilgrims, is attested by the nun Damiana in *John Moschus's *Pratum spirituale* (ch. 127: PG 87/3, col. 2990): the names of the two saints were very popular in antiquity. At *Constantinople there were six churches dedicated to them, all built by either patriarchs or imperial couples between the 5th and 6th c. The most important is the sanctuary which Paulinus, *Theodosius II's rival, had built in 439. A thaumaturgical site par excellence, the prodigies narrated in the *Libellus miraculorum* occurred there; falling into decay, it was later restored by Justinian and was described by Procopius, who captures the pilgrims' emotion upon their arrival, seeing the temple high above the promontory of the Kosmidion (*De aedificiis* I, VI, 5-8). Finally, at *Thessalonica Cosmas and Damian appear in the dome mosaic in the Church of St. George: the inscription calls them doctors and puts their feast in September (Delehaye, *Les origines*, 232).

Their recognition in the West began in the 5th c.; Pope *Symmachus (498–514) had an oratory built in their name near the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore

(*Liber pontificalis I, Duchesne, 262), which then became a monastery; *Felix IV (526–530) obtained two buildings in the forums, the *Templum Urbis* and the *Templum Romuli*, and turned them into the basilica which survives today. The focal point of the two saints' cult in *Italy, its 6th-c. mosaic presents the two healers as they approach Christ, introduced by *Peter and *Paul who, as *apostles and patrons of the *Urbe,* are larger than them. At the sides are St. Theodore and Felix IV, the pontiff, with a model of the church in his hand, portrayed alive in the glory of the saints. The inscription in distichs is dedicated to the two Eastern doctors, *martyrs who have become like a *spes salutis* for the people. Praise for the pope is not lacking: the text opens by emphasizing the beauty of the hall, resplendent with bright metal, and in which shines a light of faith that is even more precious.

On the opposite side of the forum is the place of worship dedicated to the Dioscuri, *pagan healers par excellence, and the spring of Esculapius, god of medicine, the Roman equivalent of Asclepius. The basilica's position seems significant, just as it is interesting to note that the monastery of St. Clement at Subiaco, said to be founded by St. *Benedict on the ruins of *Nero's villa on the right bank of the Aniene, was dedicated to them by the *abbot Honorius (Caraffa, BS IV, 225).

As for the legends which transmit their life, works and martyrdom, the Constantinople Synaxarion distinguishes three pairs of *anargiri* saints ('unmercenary saints,' physicians who required no payment) of the same name, to which correspond three different narrative schemes, which come together in the *Vita Asiatica, Passio Romana* and *Passio Arabica*. This shows that their "history," a sort of jumbled mass, changed as it took root in different places (Peeters, *Le tréfonds*, 66).

The *Vita Asiatica* (BHG 372-375c), handed down in over 100 MSS, tells of Theodotia, a pious and faithful woman who used Scripture to educate her two sons Cosmas and Damian. These had the ability to heal people and animals, a gift from the *Holy Spirit which they used without asking for pay, following Mt 10:8. A woman, Palladia, came to them; like the hemorrhaging woman in the gospel, she had futilely spent her money on doctors and was confined to bed. The two saints healed her; the healed woman prevailed on Damian to accept three eggs; upon returning, Cosmas became indignant with his brother and said that they would not be buried together. Damian died first; Cosmas continued his battle against evil alone. Among his patients was a lame camel that he healed and which, on the death of his healer, hastened to reveal that the quarrel between the two brothers was settled and urged that the two be buried together, which took place at Phereman. The narrative presents other miracles occurring in this same place, near Cyrrhus: a sleeping peasant swallows a serpent, then vomits it up; the wife of Malchus, entrusted by her husband to the saints' protection as he departed on a journey, becomes a prey of the devil, who is then defeated by the two "under the appearance of knights." The text was extremely popular, despite the fact that the two personalities are vague, and not even their *dies natalis* are mentioned. At *Constantinople they were honored on 1 November.

The *Passio Romana* (BHG 376-377e), more complex in structure, has a prologue in which the martyrs are exalted as models of holiness par excellence. Cosmas and Damian are introduced, without any mention of their family or background, in their guise as generous and disinterested followers of Christ who have given all for the poor, according to Mt 19:21. The devil has them denounced to Emperor Carinus as wicked atheists and magicians. Out of gratitude the inhabitants of their village hide them in a cave where the two pray, fast and keep vigil. The *pagans take hostages in their place; to avoid suffering to others, Cosmas and Damian give themselves up and are taken to the palace (at *Rome, possibly, although it doesn't say). The emperor accuses them of *magic and of not accepting money from their proselytes; he exhorts them to be grateful to the gods, who have given them the power to heal. The accused deliver a long speech which angers Carinus, who is punished by having his head contorted: blinded by the devil, he sees things upside down. The crowd is converted by the prodigy; the sovereign, declaring himself a lost sheep, confesses the faith and is healed; he then has the temples of the gods destroyed and releases Cosmas and Damian. There is no peace for them, however. The devil arouses their old teacher of medicine against them, envious over his disciples' success. Under the pretext of going to collect medicinal herbs, the new Cain draws them to a deserted place, kills them with a stone and hides the bodies in a canyon. The account is constructed according to the typical schemata of the late passions, with traits drawn from the *monastic world and a legendary quality: Carinus's conversion, which never happened, also appears in *John Malalas, in a *Syriac version and Greek adaptations.

The *Passio Arabica* has reached us in two versions. The first (BHG 378; AASS Septembris, VII, 439-440; Vat. 886 and 2027 from the Italo-Byzantine

area; Deubner, *Kosmas und Damian*, 218-220) puts the trial of Cosmas and Damian, Arabian doctors (whose brothers are Anthimus, Leontius and Euprepius) at Aegeae, the Cilician city famous for the temple of Asclepius. It is 25 November: these Christians refuse to *sacrifice to the *idols; tortured, they ask for increased fury against them. The presiding judge, Lysius, condemns them to drowning, but they are miraculously saved. The magistrate then asks them to teach him magic arts, which he will exercise in *Hadrian's name. Two demons appear who flog the magistrate, who, when his face is contorted, thinks the gods are angry. The Christians tell him that stones (the idols) cannot become angry. New tortures accomplish nothing. Sent to the stake, the fire spares them: the ground opens and receives them, saving them; they reemerge as the flames die out (a clear point of contact with the story of *Thecla). Crucified, they are showered with stones and arrows, which miss them and strike their assailants (see Sir 27:25-27 and Ps 7:14-16). Only by decapitation is it possible to kill them.

The second version (BHG 379; Codex *Barberinus* VI 22; Deubner, *Kosmas und Damian*, 220-225) takes up the schema of the first, expanding it and moving the date to 17 October. Lysius is a diabolical tyrant; Cosmas and Damian, dedicated to discourses and to prayer, speak at length. The insane judge is punished, and it is the saints themselves who save him. At the time of their capture, they were living with their brothers in caves—there is a monastic dimension to the group. Cosmas is the real protagonist, a sort of spokesman for the group. All die, after a last prayer in which they invoke health of soul and body for those who remain. The Arabic origin of the saints has great weight, as do the evident points of contact with the acts of the martyrs of Cilicia.

Among the three pairs of saints—set in different geographical areas, at different times and with different liturgical feasts—there is nonetheless a strong tendency to intersect. Among mixed legends are the *Acta siriaca* (BHO 210; Bedjan, VI, 107-119; Brit. Mus. Addit. 14644), which joins features of the *Passio Romana* with the *Asiatica*; the Coptic-Arabic legend; John Malalas's *Chronicle*; the anonymous Byzantine *Passio* (BHG 373d) and the paraphrase of John Xiphilinus, which has reached us in a *Georgian translation (Luongo, 43-44 and 59-62). The Syriac legend, prior to the 5th c., is probably one of the first rings in an uninterrupted chain of traditions, which rests on some historical data which cannot be doubted. Cosmas and Damian lived between the 3rd and 4th c. and were doctors and *anargiri*; persecuted, they confessed the faith. Even if they died a natural death, they were in fact compared to martyrs. Their cult and relics spread simultaneously from Cirrestica in Syria to many cities large and small, with the consequent flourishing of a whole literature about them, focused on the need to *exorcise sickness and suffering through faith (Delehaye, *Saints et reliquaires d'Orient*, 138; van Esbroeck, *La diffusion*, 61-77).

The *Libellus miraculorum* records the miracles which occurred at the sanctuary of Constantinople. The text, edited by Deubner on the basis of 25 manuscripts, relates 40 prodigies from between the 6th-7th c. and 1300. A new collection, with 14 different miracles, was printed by Ruprecht. The text shows the saints at work, and the reader can follow the development and the various results of the rite of **incubatio*. Illnesses cured were dropsy, cancer, stomach problems, hemorrhages, in addition to the usual gospel miracles concerning the blind, deaf, mute, lame and demon-possessed. The text is also characterized by a particular narrative style.

Among the problems raised by the famous pair is that of their aspect as a Christian response to the figures of the Dioscuri and of Asclepius: this question was central to a debate involving Deubner, Lucius and Delehaye.

In the West the predominant text seems to be the *Passio Arabica:* the *Acta latina* edited by Mombritius have many points of contact with it (BHL 1967; AASS *Septembris* VII, 440-442). They put the *dies natalis* at 27 September; the events unfold at Aegeae under *Diocletian and *Maximian. The trial is underway in court against doctors who heal in the name of Christ and who do not allow the gods to be worshiped. Cosmas presents himself and his brothers; together, all refuse to sacrifice to the idols. Tortured and flogged, they remain unhurt; they pray to the Lord and provoke the magistrate, who seeks to convince the "without-a-god," the Christian atheists. Chained and thrown into the sea, they are saved by an angel. Accused of casting spells, Cosmas reacts strongly and reaffirms his belief in Christ. The pagan says he is ready to follow them, and two demons slap him; afraid, he asks help of his victims, who free him. After dramatic confrontations, the protagonists are returned to jail. The next day, the new magistrate Lysius, irritated by their prayers and their refusal to sacrifice, orders the pyre lit: a sudden earthquake causes the flames to burn the pagans instead. Other tortures are followed by angelic interventions and prayers until, in a dramatic crescendo, they are crucified and stoned by the crowd; the stones and arrows fall on those who launch them. They must resort to decapitation, and all of the brothers return to God.

In Latin, the tendency of the *Passio Arabica* and *Vita Asiatica* to intersect is attested by the *Acta tertia* (BHL 1969; ed. Stilting, AASS *Septembris* VII, 443-444). The story of Theodotia's sons, physicians to people and animals, takes place at Aegeae, where they will be buried. A larger version also exists, with an expansion of its themes and a search for the marvelous (BHL 1070; ed. Surius, 722-726; AASS *Septembris* VII, 444-448).

Cosmas and Damian seem to be the last saints included in the list of the *communicantes* of the *Mass, in the 1st half of the 6th c. (Kennedy 191-193). Unknown by the **Depositio martyrum* of 354, they are known to the *Mart. hier.* and to the *Gelasian* and *Gregorian* sacramentaries, on 27 September. Their fame spread quickly beyond the *Urbe*. In the 6th c. they are present in the mosaics of S. Michele at *Ravenna; *Gregory of Tours attests their fame in *Gaul, calling them twins, doctors and martyrs (*In gloria martyrum* 94). *Aldhelm, between the 7th and 8th c., *Bede, Usuard and Adone mention them in their martyrologies (Giannarelli 52-53). Known from Sicily to all of France, from *Germany to *Spain, they became the patrons of doctors, surgeons, pharmacists and of those who practiced even minor medicine. They specialized in the healing of plague, dropsy and kidney illnesses and were also the object of *legendae novae* (see Bartholomew of Trent, *Passionale de sanctis* 85 and the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine). At Florence in the 15th c. they held a unique position as patrons of the Medici family, protagonists of a political-cultural project that assured the saints a strong presence in the figurative arts of Humanism and the Renaissance (see Novembri, Sebregondi, Dillon Bussi), with a new flourishing of stories linked to their lives and miracles.

AASS Septembris, VII, Paris and Rome 1867, 400-448; BHG 372-392; BHL 1967-1979 (*Novum Supplementum*, 227-229); BHO 210; H. Leclercq, *Cosme et Damien*: DACL 3,2350-2367; P. Bedjan, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum* VI, Paris 1896; F. Caraffa, *Cosma e Damiano*: BS 4, 223-225; M.L. Casanova, *Cosma e Damiano. Iconografia*: BS 4, 225-237; W. Artelt, *Kosmas und Damian mit ihren Brüdern Anthimus, Leonthius und Euprepius*: LCI 7, 344-352; J. Rendel-Harris, *The Dioscuri in the Christian Legends*, Cambridge 1903; Id., *The Cult of the Heavenly Twins*, Cambridge 1906; L. Deubner, *De incubatione*, Leipzig 1900; L. Deubner, *Kosmas und Damian*, Texte und Einleitung, Leipzig 1907; W. Weih, *Die syrische Kosmas und Damian Legende*, Schweinfurt 1910; W.E. Crum, *Placenames in Deubner's Kosmas und Damian*: Proceedings Society Bibl. Arch. 30 (1908) 45-52; H. Delehaye, *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique*: AB 27 (1908) 221-224; Id., *Les légendes hagiographiques*, Brussels 1927; Id., *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels [2]1933; Id., *Saints et reliquaires d'Orient:* AB 53 (1935) 225-244; Id., *Les recueils antiques des miracles des saints*: AB 43 (1925) 8-18; Id., *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Brussels [2]1966; F. Halkin, *Publications récentes de textes hagiographiques grecs*: AB 53 (1935) 366-381; E. Rupprecht (ed.), *Cosmae et Damiani sanctorum medicorum vita(m) et miracula e codice londinensi*, Berlin 1935; A. Pazzini, *I santi nella storia della medicina*, Rome 1937; P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*, Brussels 1950; G. Kaftal, *SS. Cosmas and Damian*, in *Iconography of the Saints in the Tuscany Painting*, Florence 1952, cols. 289-296; M.L. David-Danel, *Iconographie des saints médicins Côme et Damien*, Lille 1958; L. Réau, *Côme et Damien*, in *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, III, I, Paris 1958, 332-338; G. Matthiae, *Le chiese di Roma dal IV al X secolo*, Bologna 1962; H. Skrobucha, *Kosmas und Damian*, Recklinghausen 1965; A. Wittmann, *Kosmas und Damian. Kultausbreitung und Volksdevotion*, Berlin 1967; R. Budriesi, *La basilica dei SS. Cosma e Damiano a Roma*, Bologna 1968; M.A. Linage Conde, *Monasterios altomedievales españoles de los santos Cosme y Damián*: Cuadernos de historia de la medicina española 9 (1970) 11-74; B.M. Apollonij Ghetti, *Considerazioni sulla basilica dei SS. Cosma e Damiano*: RivAC 56 (1974) 7-54; N. Fernández Marcos, *Los Thaumata de Sofronio. Contribución al estudio de la incubatio cristiana*, Madrid 1975; M. van Esbroeck, *La diffusion orientale de la légende des saints Côme et Damien*, in *Hagiographie cultures et sociétés. IVe-XIIe siècles*. Actes du colloque (Nanterre-Paris 2-5 mai 1979), Paris 1981, 61-77; M. van Esbroeck, *La légende "romaine" de SS. Côme et Damien* (*BHG 373*) *et sa métaphrase géorgienne par Jean Xiphilin*, I: OCP 47 (1981) 389-425; G. Fichtner, *Das verpflanzte Mohrenbein. Zur Interpretation der Kosma und Damian Legende*, in *Medizin in mittelalterlichen Abenland*, Darmstadt 1982, 323-343; J.-D. Jacquet, *Le miracle de la Jambe Noire*, in *Les miracles miroirs de corps*. Ouvrage collectif sous la responsabilité de J. Delis et O. Redon, Paris 1983, 21-52; S. Wilson (ed.), *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, Cambridge 1983; V. Tiberia, *Il restauro del mosaico della basilica dei Santi Cosma e Damiano a Roma*, Todi 1991; G. Luongo, *Il "dossier" agiografico dei santi Cosma e Damiano*, in *Sant'Eufemia d'Aspromonte*. Atti del convegno di studio per il bicentenario dell'autonomia (Sant'Eufemia di Aspromonte, 14-16 dicembre 1990), ed. S. Leanza, Soveria Mannelli 1997, 33-89; M. Fanfani, *Cosma e Damiano, due medici santi nella storia della medicina e della città di Firenze*, Florence 1998; M. Forlin Patrucco, *Cosma e Damiano*, in *Il grande libro dei Santi. Dizionario enciclopedico*, eds. C. Leonardi - A. Riccardi - G. Zarri, eds. E. Guerriero - D. Tuniz, vol. I, Cinisello Balsamo 1998, 491-492; J. Duffin, *Saints Cosmas and Damian of Toronto: Origin and Meaning of the Medical Cults of Divine Twins*, in *Saints and the Sacred*, J. Goering - F. Guardiani - G. Silano (eds.), New York-Ottawa-Toronto 2001, 11-24; E. Giannarelli (ed.), *Cosma e Damiano dall'Oriente a Firenze*, Florence 2002; A. Dillon Bussi, *L'assenza di Cosma e Damiano nella miniatura fiorentina*, in E. Giannarelli (ed.), *Cosma e Damiano dall'Oriente a Firenze*, Florence 2002, 110-129; V. Novembri, *I santi Cosma e Damiano e la tradizione manoscritta nella Firenze medicea*, ibid., 66-75; L. Sebregondi, *Cosma e Damiano. Santi Medici e Medicei*, ibid., 76-109; V. Novembri, *Manoscritto Laurenziano Pluteo 20.8*, ed. and tr., ibid., 149-191; E. Giannarelli, *I cristiani e la medicina, Cosma e Damiano*, ibid., 7-65.

E. Giannarelli

COSMAS Indicopleustes. The author of the Χριστανικὴ τοπογραφία was an *Egyptian, probably *Alexandrian, who traveled to the Black Sea and E *Africa but did not reach India or the island of Taprobane (Ceylon, Sri Lanka), since his informa-

tion on them is secondhand; thus the name Indicopleustes is not really appropriate. Even the name Cosmas seems to derive from the subject of the work, i.e., the form of the universe (*cosmos*). In Photius's time (*Bibl.*, cod. 36) it circulated anonymously: he calls it the *Book of a Christian* and only in 11th-c. MSS does the name of Cosmas first appear. Nor is it certain that the author later became a monk on *Sinai. Cosmas, who received no systematic education, claims to have learned everything from the *Nestorian *catholicos Mar *Aba (540–552), and he does indeed show Nestorian tendencies: in *exegesis he follows *Diodore of Tarsus, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Severian of Gabala (Antiochene school). The work was probably written in the decade before the council on the *Three Chapters (553) and published anonymously. Its purpose is clearly theological-exegetical-polemical. He wishes to demonstrate, against Greek science and Christians who follow it, that the universe has the same form as Moses's tabernacle, i.e., not spherical but cuboid. At the base is the earth, a long flat rectangle, its length twice its width, bordered by uninterrupted walls which meet at the top to form the celestial vault, or upper heaven. Between the upper heaven and the earth is the firmament, which divides the universe into two levels: the higher, where God and the just dwell, first entered by Christ after his *resurrection; and the lower, seat of human beings in this life. The inhabited world is surrounded by an ocean with various indentations or inlets, forming the inner seas; in its N part rises a very high mountain which hides the sight of the sun during the night; the stars are moved by angels, who live beneath the firmament. These and other statements meet with *Photius's disapproval; he also severely criticizes its style. Historically the work attests to Christian attitudes opposed to Greek culture and science; it is also important for its conscientious description of the geography of the countries visited, the historical information attached and the illustrations that accompany the text.

CPG III, 7468; PG 88, 52-470; W. Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas indicopleustes. Topographie chrétienne*, Paris 1968ff. (SC 141.159.197); Bardenhewer 5, 95-97; DACL 8, 820-849; Beck 416-417; S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina*, Florence 1975, 186-189 and 423; Altaner 554; Patrologia V, 401-404.

A. De Nicola

COSMAS of Maiuma (674/676–751/752). Also called Cosmas of *Jerusalem, Cosmas Hagiopolites or Cosmas Melodus. Born ca. 674/676 at *Damascus; orphaned, he was raised, according to the legend, with *John of Damascus. He became a monk in the *laura of St. Sabas and in 735 was made bishop of Maiuma. Died 751/752. It seems that he spurred the Damascene to compose the *Fount of Knowledge*. His fame is linked to the composition of very refined hymns for the feasts of Our Lord and Our Lady. Doubts remain about their attribution, however, because of the tradition which has confused them with the works of his teacher, *Cosmas the Monk. We have some of his hymns in *Syriac translation. Besides poetry, he wrote commentaries on the poetry of his favorite author, *Gregory of Nazianzus.

Recently A. Kazhdan has questioned almost all of the information we have on the life of this person, emphasizing the inconsistency of the biographical tradition; his conclusions are very different from those commonly accepted and have not gained much support.

PG 98, 455-524; W. Christ - M. Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca carminum Christianorum*, Leipzig 1971, 161-204 (a large part of the texts which are considered genuine in the PG are here rejected). Individual editions of new discoveries: A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus: ByzZ 14 (1905) 519-526; H.J.W. Tillyard, *A Canon by Saint Cosmas*: ByzZ 28 (1928) 25-37; H.G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich [2]1977, 515ff.; Th.E. Detorakes, Κοσμᾶς ὁ Μελωδός. Βίος καὶ ἔργο, Thessalonica 1979 (the only monograph currently available); *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, II, Rome 1988, 594-610; Marienlexikon 3, 651-652 (important); *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, III, Rome 1988, 594-610; A. Kazhdan - S. Gero, *Kosmas of Jerusalem: A More Critical Approach to His Biography*: ByzZ 82 (1989) 122-132 (these scholars question Detorakes's earlier proposals); G. Menestrina, *Note al commento di Cosma di Gerusalemme ai Carmina di Gregorio Nazianzeno*, in C. Moreschini - G. Menestrina, *Gregorio Nazianzeno teologo e scrittore*, Bologna 1992, 217-226 (it is uncertain whether this commentary should be attributed to Cosmas the Elder [Cosmas the Monk] or Cosmas the Younger); G. Lozza (ed.), *Commentario ai carmi di Gregorio Nazianzeno*, Naples 2000.

C. Dell'Osso

COSMAS the Monk (or Cosmas the Elder) (7th-8th c.). Teacher of *John of Damascus, according to the latter's biography by John of Jerusalem (probably the patriarch who died in 970). A native of *Italy, Cosmas was captured by *Saracens and ransomed by John of Damascus's father, who charged him with John's education and that of his foster brother Cosmas, the future ecclesiastical poet. Cosmas was part of the *monastery of St. Sabas, near *Jerusalem. He wrote spiritual hymns, which tradition has confused with those of his disciple Cosmas.

Information on Cosmas the Monk comes from the biography of John of Damascus, written by John of Jerusalem (PG 94, 439-445); G. Menestrina, *Note al commento di Cosma di Gerusalemme ai Carmina di Gregorio Nazianzeno,* in C. Moreschini

- G. Menestrina, *Gregorio Nazianzeno teologo e scrittore*, Bologna 1992, 217-226 (it is uncertain whether this commentary should be attributed to Cosmas the Elder [Cosmas the Monk] or Cosmas the Younger).

J. Irmscher - C. Dell'Osso

COSMAS Vestitor (after 750; Βεστήτωρ designates an employee of the imperial wardrobe). A layman and author of some homilies preserved in MSS. We know nothing of his life. Flourished sometime between 740–850; useful as terminus a quo is the reference in one of his "encomia" to the Λειμωνάριον of *John Moschus (d. 619) (PG 87, 3, 2992-2993); as terminus ad quem, the presence of one of his works in cod. Ba 56 of Grottaferrata, 9th-10th c. In the manuscript tradition, his name is accompanied by the epithet μακάριος. One of his favorite subjects is *John Chrysostom: we have his *Life* (BHG 876 m), two *Laudationes* (BHG 880 a-b, c: the second unpublished), an *Oratio de exilio* (BHG 880 d); these are works of confused tradition, which repeat each other and give very common information known from other sources. Five *Orationes* (BHG 877 v-w-x, y, z, 878, 878 a) celebrate the translation of the saint's *relics (but the Synaxarion attributes others to him, incl. CPG III, 8162: Wenger, *L'assomption* . . . , 151): they are all—in chronological order, as Dyobouniotes has established—in cod. 231 of Athens National Library, and the fourth is also in other MSS. Ballerini (*Sylloge*, Rome 1856) has published Cosmas's *Oratio in Ioachim et Annam* (BHG 828); three *laudationes Zachariae* (BHG 1881 q-r, BHGn 1881 s) are unpublished. Four *Orationes in dormitionem b.v. Mariae* survive only in *Latin translation (cod. Aug. 80) and seem to be influenced by *Germanus I of *Constantinople: Mary's death and assumption are described in a way analogous to her son's death and *resurrection; legendary facts and theological statements are closely interwoven. There are doubts about the attribution to Cosmas of the very short *fragmentum ascetico-physiologicum,* ed. Wenger, *L'assomption* . . . , 152 n. 2.

CPG 8142-8163 (see Suppl. Noret, 2003); PG 65, 829-831; 106, 1005-1012; K.I. Dyobouniotes, EHBS 2 (1925) 50-83, 16 (1940) 151-155; A. Wenger, *L'assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle*, Paris 1955, 140-154, 315-333; F. Halkin, *Douze récits sur saint Jean Chrysostome*, Brussels 1977, 429-444; A. Wenger, *Les Homélies inédites de Cosmas Vestitor sur la dormition*: REByz 11 (1953) 284-300; Beck, 502; F. Halkin, *Douze récits byzantins sur saint Jean Chrysostome*, Brussels 1977, 429-442; Id., *Zacharie, père de Jean Baptiste, Trois panégyriques par Cosmas Vestitor*: AB 105 (1987) 151-163; LTK³ 6, 394-395; A.P. Orbàn, CCM 154, 99-126; Marienlexikon 3, 652; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, II, Rome 1988, 572-577; BBKL 4,545–4,546; E. Follieri, *Iota mutum: ripristino o eliminazione in alcuni testi bizantini*: RCCM 36 (1994) 271-280.

A. Labate

COSMOCRATOR/KOSMOKRATOR. Already in *John's gospel the ruler of the material world is identified with the principle of *evil (Jn 12:31: "now shall the prince of this world be cast out"; 14:30: "the prince of this world is coming"). St. *Paul relates darkness to the powers that rule the world, presenting them as enemies against whom human beings fight (Eph 6:12: "We are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, the powers, the rulers of this present darkness"). *Origen has this Pauline passage in mind when he speaks of the light of the *logos* (λόγος) reaching into the darkness: "it has reached the dwelling of the principalities [κοσμοκράτορες]," *Comm. in Jo*. II, 26 (84, 2-3 Preuschen). In *gnosticism, the *Valentinians identify the "ruler of this world" (called the prince of this world—ἄρχων—as in John's gospel, or *cosmocrator*—κοσμοκράτωρ—under the influence of the Pauline passage cited above) with the devil, and relates him closely to the spirits of evil, produced by the grief (λύπη) of Sophia (Σοφία), the aeon expelled from the pleroma: see *Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI, 33 and 34 (162, 2 and 13 Wendland) and *Epiphanius, *Pan*. 31, 19, 4-6 (I 414, 23-415, 8 Holl); the biblical demiurge, the psychic being generated by Sophia, resides in the seventh heaven, or Hebdomas (ἑβδομάς), while the cosmocrator (κοσμοκράτωρ), created by the demiurge, inhabits the lower parts of the material universe (see Epiphanius, ibid.). *Basilides speaks of two princes (ἄρχοντες) of the material world, produced by *Panspermia*: the great prince (μέγας ἄρχων) who resides in the eighth heaven (ὁ ὀγδοάς) (Hippolytus, *Ref.* VII, 23, pp. 200, 24-25, 201, 8-9 and 15-16), and the second prince, inferior to the first, architect and immediate administrator of the whole material world, who resides in the Hebdomas (Hippolytus, *Ref.* VII, 24, p. 202, 5-10).

F.L. Cross - E.A. Livingstone (eds.), *Cosmocrator*: ODC 422.

S. Lilla

COSMOPOLITANISM. In ancient *philosophy, the conception of cosmopolitanism was developed above all by the Cynics and the *Stoics, who thought that the wise person was first of all a citizen of the "city of Zeus," inhabited by the deities and the rational creatures. Hence their claim that the wise person is at home everywhere and, therefore, the exile is not a κακόν or *malum*. Early in the Christian era,

the Roman Stoic Musonius Rufus is a brilliant example of these conceptions.

In the Christian age, the city of Zeus was replaced by the city of God. That a Christian's πολίτευμα is first and foremost in heaven—and thus his or her patria is the *kingdom of heaven before any particular fatherland—was already stated in Phil 3:20. Between the 2nd and the 3rd c., the Christian philosopher *Bardesanes of Edessa, who fought against *Marcionism and *gnostic and *pagan determinism, in *Liber legum regionum* attests with satisfaction that the Christians in his day had spread in every nation and followed the law of Christ everywhere in the world. Before being citizens of a given state and following its laws, the Christians are citizens of the universal kingdom of Christ and obey Christ's law. The only parallel that Bardesanes draws for this transcendent citizenship of the Christian is that of the Jews, who, wherever in the world they may be, follow the Mosaic law before observing the laws and traditions of the places where they live.

It is interesting to observe that the Greek term κοσμοπολίτης in the Christian era is almost exclusively attested in *Hellenistic Jewish authors, such as *Philo of Alexandria—who was read and appreciated by many Christian *Fathers—and Christian ones. Philo in *Opif.* 3,4 refers it just to Moses, the author of both the law and *Genesis, the narrative on the creation of the cosmos (κοσμοποιΐα), presented by him as a preparation for the law. Thus, νόμος and κόσμος are in reciprocal harmony (συ κοσμοπολίτης νᾴδω), and the man who respects the law is immediately a citizen of the world, because he obeys the law of nature that governs the whole cosmos: τοῦ νομίμου ἀνδρὸς εὐθὺς ὄντος κοσμοπολίτου πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τῆς φύσεως τὰς πράξεις ἀπευθύνοντος, καθ' ἣν καὶ ὁ σύμπας κόσμος διοκεῖται. In *Opif.* 142,2 Philo maintains that, in particular, the first human being created by God was a real κοσμοπολίτης, who inhabited the whole cosmos without fear, and was endowed with authority over all other creatures and knew no war and, again, used the same law as the entire cosmos, i.e., the natural *logos* that is divine law: τῷ κοσμοπολίτῃ χρῆσθαιζπολιτείᾳ ᾗ καὶ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ὁ τῆς φύσεως ὀρθὸς λόγος, νόμος θειος ὤν. In *Gig.* 61,2 Philo explains that the "men of God" are not κοσμοπολῖται in the sense of being inhabitants of this world, since they inhabit the other world, the noetic and divine world. Moses, in particular, is called κοσμοπολίτης in *Conf. ling.* 106,3, because "he inhabited the cosmos as a city and a patria." In *Migr.* 5,3 he takes up the Stoic idea that the wise person is κοσμοπολίτης. Indeed, in *Vita Mos.* I,157 the wise are described as participating in all divine goods, without possessing anything personally, not even themselves, and are κοσμοπολῖται, so that they do not belong to any particular city, because God is the king of all nations. Such persons are true κοσμοπολῖται in that they regard the whole cosmos as a city; the citizens of this city are all those who devote their life to wisdom, and the city is presided over by virtue (τὸν μὲν κόσμον ἐνόμισαν εἶναι πόλιν, πολίτας δὲ τοὺς σοφίας ὁμιλητάς, ἀρετῆς ἐγγραφούσης, ᾗ πεπίστευται τὸ κοινὸν πολίτευμα πρυτανεύειν, *Spec. leg.* II 45): Philo clearly inherited the Stoic ideal of the City of Zeus. In *Somn.* 1,243 Philo observes that the whole heaven and the cosmos are a votive offering to God, who has also made them, and the souls who inhabit the cosmos and love God make a votive offering of themselves and sanctify themselves (ὅσαι μέντοι κοσμοπολίτιδες ψυχαὶ καὶ θεοφιλεῖς, ἑαυτὰς ἀνιεροῦσιν). *Didymus the Blind in his *Commentary on Psalms* 29-34 (cod. 186,18) defines the κοσμοπολῖται as the inhabitants of the noetic world (γίνονται κοσμοπολῖται καὶ ὑπερβαίνουσιν τοῦτον καὶ τὸν ὑπὸ τούτου δηλούμενον κληρονομοῦσιν). The *Apos. Con.* VII, 34.39 present the human being as an inhabitant of the cosmos and—with a pun—an ornament to it: Καὶ τέλος τῆς δημιουργίας τὸ λογικὸν ζῷον, τὸν κοσμοπολίτην . . . κόσμου κόσμον αὐτὸν ἀναδείξας (the very same ideas are expressed in VIII 12.41). The human being must learn the reason why the cosmos was created and he was made its inhabitant (κοσμοπολίτην), so to learn his own nature. Eustathius of Thessalonica, *De emendanda vita monachica* 1, calls the monks οὐρανοπολῖται rather than κοσμοπολῖται, in that they inhabit heaven rather than this world. The only *pagan authors for whom the use of κοσμοπολίτης is attested in the Christian era are Diogenes Laertius (VI 63), who ascribes the term to Diogenes the Cynic, who proclaimed himself an inhabitant of the cosmos (ἐρωτηθεὶς πόθεν εἴη, κοσμοπολίτης, ἔφη), and *Proclus (*Chrest.* 12): many cities claim to be Homer's homeland, but he would better be called κοσμοπολίτης.

It is evident that in Philo and in the Fathers the ancient Stoic ideal has been not only transferred but also transformed. In *Late Antiquity, moreover, a further issue closely related to this presented itself to the attention of the Fathers: if Christianity is fundamentally cosmopolitan, but in a transcendent sense, and all Christians are citizens of a kingdom that is not of this world, then Christianity should not limit itself to remaining within the boundaries of the Roman Empire but should extend to barbarian peoples too. As a matter of fact, this conclusion was not widely shared by Christian intellectuals, who often

tended to conflate Christianity and the empire. *Rufinus of Aquileia was one of the very few who supported the *evangelization of barbarian peoples also beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire, whereas *Horosius, for instance, rather than for the conversion of the barbarians outside the empire, hoped for their destruction. Before Rufinus, another admirer of *Origen, *Eusebius of Caesarea, the celebrator of the emperor who ceased the anti-Christian persecutions in the empire and paved the way for the Christian Roman Empire, held a universalistic notion of the empire, as an image of the heavenly kingdom ruled by God. Ideally, the empire should expand until it included all nations, all the earth, and all seas (an ideal that is found in *Themistius, and especially in his newly edited Πρὸς βασιλέα fragment, which I suspect was directed to *Theodosius). The ideal would have been that both Christianity and the empire could embrace all humanity. When it became clear that the empire could not conquer the barbarians, the problem arose whether to try to convert them all the same and expand Christianity beyond the boundaries of the empire, so that the Christians could share a common heavenly citizenship if not Roman citizenship. *Augustine's city of God, indeed, certainly did not coincide with the empire.

A. Lauras - H. Rondet, *Le thème des deux cités dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin*, Études augustiniennes (Paris 1951), 97-160; R. Farina, *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del Cristianesimo*, Zürich 1966; H.-I. Marrou, *Theologie de l'histoire*. Paris 1968; D.F. Donnelly, *The "City of God" and Utopia: A Reevaluation*, Augustinian Studies 8 (1977) 111-123; P. Piret, *La Destinée de l'homme: la Cité de Dieu: un commentaire du De civitate Dei d'Augustin*, Bruxelles 1991; M. Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City*, Cambridge 1991; J.L. Moles, *Cynic Cosmopolitanism*, in R. Bracht Branham - M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, eds., *The Cynics*, Berkeley 1996, 105-120; R.J. Dougherty, *Magnum opus et arduum: the Structure and the Argument of St. Augustine's* De civitate Dei, Ann Arbor 1997; I. Ramelli, *L'Europa e i Cristiani*, in *Studi sull'Europa antica*, ed. M. Sordi, II, Alessandria 2001, 263-283; Id., *La Città di Zeus di Musonio Rufo nelle sue ascendenze vetero-stoiche e nell'eredità neostoica e cristiana*, Stylos 11 (2002) 151-158; P. Kleingeld - E. Brown, *Cosmopolitanism*, in E.N. Zalta, ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism; I. Ramelli, *"Nostra autem conversatio in caelis est"* (*Phil. 3.20*). *Note su* conversatio *nei classici latini, nelle antiche versioni bibliche e nella patristica*, Sileno 31 (2005) 139-158; Id., *L'inedito* Pròs basiléa *di Temistio, con due postille e due tavole*, in collaboration with E. Amato, ByzZ 99 (2006) 1-67; Id., *Bardesane Kata Heimarmenes*, Bologna 2008; Id., *Stoicismo romano minore*, Milan 2008; D. Konstan, *Cosmopolitan Traditions*, in R. Balot, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Oxford 2009.

I. Ramelli

COSMOS (Kosmos). In all of Greek thought, the idea of "universe" is closely associated with that of "order": this is clear from the term *kosmos* itself, which has both meanings in Greek. Two main motifs characterize the Greek conception of the cosmos: the tendency to consider it a living being, beautiful, animate, intelligent, blessed and divine, in which harmony and concord reign supreme; and the idea of its contemplation, first origin of philosophy, of human ethics and of the conviction of the existence of a supreme ordering principle, immanent or transcendent. Both ideas were taken into *patristics.

For Plato, the universe is the best, most beautiful and most perfect of things that have come into being (*Tim.* 29a, 92c; cf. *Philebus* 30a, 30b), a living being with *soul and intelligence, born through the providence of the demiurge (*Tim.* 30b; cf. *Politicus* 269 c-d; *Philebus* 30a), a happy and sensible god (*Tim.* 34b, 92c) governed by its own soul (*Tim.* 34c; *Laws* X,896 d-e). Contemplation of the order of the heavens is the origin of the greatest gift given to human beings, namely, philosophy (*Tim.* 47 a-b); through contemplation the ordered revolutions of the heavens become the model of the order that must reign in the human mind (*Tim.* 47 b-c); contemplation always produces in human beings the belief in a higher, ordering intellect (*Philebus* 28e; *Laws* XII, 966 d-e); the study of astronomy prepares us to understand transcendent realities (*Rep.* VII, 529b). In the young *Aristotle, still under Plato's influence, we see both the idea of the divinity of the cosmos (*Perì philosophias*, Rose fr. 26 = Walzer fr. 26) and that of contemplation of the heavens as origin of belief in the gods and in a higher cause (op. cit., Rose fr. 10, 11 and 12 = Walzer fr. 12 and 13). For the mature Aristotle, the universe is divine (*De caelo* I,270 b 10-11), animate (*De caelo* II,285 a 29), eternal and unalterable (*De caelo* I,270 a 12-14; 270 a 25-27; 270 b 1-2).

The author of the ps.-Aristotelian treatise *De mundo* emphasizes the close relationship between philosophy and contemplation (391 a 1-8) and says that nothing is more excellent than the contemplation of the universe and the heavenly bodies (391 a 24–b 3), and he links the cosmos indissolubly to the idea of order safeguarded by God (391 b 9-12). For the *Stoics, the cosmos is a living, intelligent, rational, animate, absolutely perfect being (SVF I,110, 111, 113, 114; II,633, 634, 638, 641), governed by providence (SVF II,633, 634), ruled and pervaded by the divine *pneuma* immanent in it (SVF II,638), a real god (SVF II,637 and 641): the *logos*, the divine principle that permeates it and is identical with the *pneuma* (SVF I,85, 87, 88, 160; II,441), is also its law (*nomos*) (SVF I,162); and the law that regulates it,

determined by the *logos*, is the same law that must regulate human ethics, since human reason (*logos*) is nothing but a fragment of the universal *logos* (see, e.g., SVF II,634). The concept of "sympathy" (or interrelation) between the elements of the universe, the first cause of its harmony, goes back esp. to the Stoic Posidonius (see K. Reinhardt, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, Munich 1926, 103-121; the section "Die Harmonie im Weltraume" in K. Gronau, *Poseidonios und die jüdischchristliche Genesisexegese*, Leipzig - Berlin 1914, 142-146; and M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, Göttingen 1959, I,217 and II,108, where the relevant material is collected). In Stoicism too we see the idea of contemplation of the order of the universe, which allows human beings to believe in the divine principle immanent in it (SVF I,528; Manilius, *Astron.* IV,916-919; Cicero, *De nat. deor.* II,2, 4; II,21, 54-55).

*Philo of Alexandria adopts the Stoic concept of nature governed by the universal *logos,* which is also *nomos* (*Opif.* 3 and 143; *Prob.* 62), and of the cosmos as a state, of which human beings become citizens (*Opif.* 3 and 143; cf. SVF II,1127-1131); he repeatedly insists on contemplation of the sky, which allows one to ascend to its cause (see the passages cited in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 171 n. 2).

The idea of a close relationship between contemplation of the stars and the existence of a creating and ordering principle recurs in *Corp. Herm.* V,3-4 (Nock- Festugière I,61, 8-10 and 22-23). In *Middle Platonism, Alcinous says that astronomy makes it possible for one to pass from the sensible to the intelligible world and to attain an idea of the demiurge (*Did.* 161, Hermann 22-28 and 30-32).

In *Neoplatonism, Plotinus, arguing against the *gnostics, who despised the material world and thought it the product of an inferior diety, celebrates the beauty, symmetry and order of the sensible world, and maintains that its contemplation cannot fail to inspire the judicious person with a religious feeling which brings him to believe in its cause (*Enn.* II 9, 16 (II 134, 49-135, 55 Bréhier).

In patristics, *Clement of Alexandria says that the human being's upright posture is to allow him to contemplate the heavens (*Strom.* IV,163,1), that this contemplation is one of the "gnostic's" main occupations (*Strom.* IV, 163, 1) and that through astronomy the "gnostic" can raise himself to the heavens and approach the power of the Creator (*Strom.* VI,80,3 and 90,3). Abraham's interest in astronomy is for him, as for Philo, the ideal model of this "gnostic" attitude (*Strom.* I,31,2; V,8,6; VI,80,3). He also follows Philo in adopting the Stoic concept of the universe ruled by the *logos* (cf. the two parallel passages of Clement, *Protr.* 5,2 and Philo, *De Plant.* 9 in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 211). *Origen fully approves *Celsus's description of the cosmos as a complete and perfect work of God (*Cels.* IV,99 [I,373,6-8]) and, like Plotinus, says that contemplation of the order of the cosmos produces a sense of veneration for its Creator (*Cels.* 1,23 [I,73,23-24], VIII,38 [II,253,17-18]). The Posidonian concept of "sympathy," "concord," "communion" and "harmony" which prevail in the universe reemerges in *Basil the Great (*Hom. II in Gen.* 14 B [ed. Giet, SC 26 bis, 148, 11-14; PG 29, 33 A 11-15]). *Gregory of Nyssa too, in a passage strongly influenced by Stoic ideas, states that whoever contemplates the celestial revolutions, the conjunctions and the separations of the stars will be convinced of the existence of "a wise and creative divine power, which reveals itself in beings, pervades the whole and adapts the parts to the whole" (*De an. et res.*: PG 46.25 C 8-28 A 12; cf. *De beatid.* hom. VI in GNO VII/II 141,2-10, 142,2-4). Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite sees the universe as the effect of the ordering work of the Good (*Nomi div.* IV, 4: PG 3,697 B; PTS 33, 146,13–147,1), and in the peace, concord and union that reign in the cosmos he sees the expression of the divine power that pervades, unifies and holds together the whole (*Nomi div.* XI,1-4: PG 3, 948C-952D; PTS 33, 217,5–220,17; this section echoes Posidonian ideas, filtered through Neoplatonism).

K. Gronau, *Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*, Leipzig and Berlin 1914; K. Reinhardt, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, Munich 1926; A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste II, Le Dieu cosmique*, Paris 1949; M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, Göttingen 1959, I, 217 (It. tr. Florence 1967); W.L. Rowe, *The Cosmological Argument*, Princeton 1975; W.L. Craig, *The Cosmological Argument from Plato to Leibniz*, London 1980; S. Lilla, *Neuplatonisches Gedankengut in den Homilien über die Seligpreisungen Gregors von Nyssa* [Suppl.to VChr LXVIII] Leiden 2004, 117-136.

S. Lilla

COUNCIL. A formal assembly of bishops and other church dignitaries, to deliberate and legislate on ecclesiastical questions. The ecumenical council represents the universal church; particular councils (general, plenary, national, provincial etc.) represent more or less extensive regions. The institution arose naturally from the need felt, from the church's beginnings, by the leaders of the Christian communities to consult each other on common problems of faith and discipline. From the 2nd c. the bishops of *Asia consulted each other about *Montanism; at the urging of Pope *Victor (193–203), councils met in *Pontus, *Palestine and *Syria to pronounce on the date of *Easter. In ca. 220 Bishop *Agrippinus of

*Carthage asked an *African council to declare the nullity of *baptism administered by *heretics. Toward the mid-3rd c. the council was already an established institution at the regional level. The peace of *Constantine gave it new growth, while metropolitan and patriarchal structures became fixed, in turn giving rise to provincial and general councils. In 314 Constantine convoked the bishops of the Western part of the empire at *Arles to resolve the problem of *Donatism; in 325 he decided to gather an assembly of bishops from all parts of the empire at *Nicaea (the first ecumenical council).

The form, frequency and influence of councils have varied considerably in the course of the church's history. Besides the ecumenical and provincial councils whose origin we have described, we should mention the African plenary councils, above all those guided by the episcopal activity of *Aurelius (391–428); the Germanic national councils of the early Middle Ages, particularly those of *Frankish and Merovingian *Gaul; and the councils of *Visigothic *Spain. The African councils manifest the vitality of that church in its golden age; the national councils attest the church's political and social weight in the life of the young nations converted to the Catholic faith; the princes and nobility of the Visigothic kingdom attended councils with the bishops; all the major decisions for the life of the kingdom were taken by common consent.

The functions of councils were essentially *dogmatic (definitions on the truths of faith), liturgical (regulation of rites) and canonical (ordering of ecclesiastical discipline). The first of these was the essential business of ecumenical councils; the seven great ecumenical councils of antiquity (I Nicaea, 325; I *Constantinople, 381; *Ephesus, 431; *Chalcedon, 451; II Constantinople, 533; III Constantinople, 680; II Nicaea, 787) laid the foundations of *Christology and are recognized by Catholics and Orthodox. The majority of the ecumenical councils, but also the regional councils of antiquity (*Ancyra, 314; *Neocaesarea, ca. 315; *Gangra, ca. 340; *Antioch, ca. 341; *Laodicea, ca. 380), laid the basis of a universal discipline, passed down through the generations by the canonical collections. National and provincial councils sought to adapt this discipline to changing times. Sometimes the councils of the first centuries exercised judicial functions: in fact the aim of the provincial council was to regulate local controversies both through legislative rules and by exercising genuine jurisdiction. A noteworthy fact in the councils of antiquity is the important role the emperor played in them: he called them, fixed the order of the day and confirmed their decisions; by ratifying them, he gave conciliar decisions the value of imperial laws (since every citizen had to profess orthodox faith), subjecting those who opposed them to coercive secular justice.

J.K. Hefele - H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, t. I-VIII (in 16 vols.); var. aus., *Le concile et les conciles. Contribution à la vie conciliaire de l'Église*, Chevetogne 1960; DDC 3, 1268-1301; DTC 3, 636-676; LTK³ 6, 346-348; *Histoire des c. œcuméniques*, publiée sous la direction de G. Dumeige: t. II, Th. Camelot, *Ephèse (431) et Chalcédoine (451)*, Paris 1962 (It. tr., Vatican City 1997); t. I, Ortiz de Urbina, *Nicée (325) et Constantinople I (381)*, Paris 1963 (It. tr., Vatican City); F.X. Murphy - P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et III*, Paris 1974; R. Metz, *Histoire des conciles*, Paris ²1968; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979; L.D. Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*, Collegeville, MN ²1990 (It. tr., *Storia e cronaca dei sette concili che definirono la dottrina cristiana*, Casale Monf. 1998); G. Alberigo (ed.), *Storia dei concili ecumenici*, Brescia 1990; R. Aubert - G. Fedalto - D. Quaglioni, *Storia dei concili*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995; J. Wohlmuth, *Konzilien des ersten Jahrtausends von Konzil von Nizäa (325) bis zum vierten Konzil von Konstantinopel (869-870)*, Paderborn ²1998; J.H. Sieben, *Vom Apostelkonzil zum Ersten Vatikanum: Studien zur Geschichte der Konzilsidee*, Paderborn 1996; J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Paderborn 1997.

Ch. Munier

CREATION. Following the Judeo-Christian belief in one God, creator of heaven and earth, and carrying on the Jewish interest in biblical cosmology, expressed esp. in *Genesis (see Theoph. Ant., *Autol. II*, 10-32: first Christian commentary), *patristic theology gave a tremendous amount of space to the doctrine of the origin of the world: considering the wholly free action of God the Creator, stressing the universal extent of this divine action and admiring the goodness and harmony of the whole universe, created and preserved by the one God. Indeed, they presented this doctrine, perhaps not always with the same conviction, as one of the characteristics that distinguished Christianity from *paganism. It is quite true that the great dogmatic debates of the 4th and 5th c. were not directly concerned with the creation of the world, but the Christian idea of God the Creator was nonetheless their all-important background. Worked out substantially during the 2nd c., it was an undisputed part of the patrimony of faith of those times. This is attested by the primitive confessions of faith which, inspired by biblical formulas but not without suggestions of *Hellenism, profess God as the Father Almighty, i.e., sole author and preserver of all things (Justin, *1 Apol.* 61; 67: DS 1; 10; Iren., *Adv. haer*. I,10,1 etc.). Later confessions merely explain the same truth with new variations (cf. the forms of the Roman *creed, and the Eastern formu-

las: DS 11-76, esp. that of Nicaea: DS 125; 150), keeping the economic orientation of the primitive formulas. It is notable that the idea of creation—of God's free, potent action—is applied by the *Fathers, as in the Bible, to the establishment of the church, the conversion of sinners and the final perfection of all things. The evolution by which the simple repetition of the biblical doctrine of creation, with the aim of motivating praise of God (see *Did.* 10,3; *1 Clem.* 60,1), right living among the faithful (see *Did.* 1,2; *Barn.* 19,2) or order in the community (see *1 Clem.* 19,2-20,12), developed into a conscious and methodological development of themes, effected through the categories of Greek cosmology (demiurge, father of the universe) and explored through the theory of the Creator-Logos, can be explained primarily by the polemic against *gnosticism and against *philosophy, considered the basis of gnosticism (see May 151-152). Against the *Marcionites and *Valentinians, in some sense *Justin but still more *Tatian, *Theophilus and *Irenaeus, while recognizing the creative mediation of the Word, made clear that the God of salvation was himself the creator of all things, while rejecting the *Platonist idea of the eternal existence of matter and elaborating, in line with the Bible and the Judeo-Christian tradition (see esp. Herm., *Mand.* 1,1, cited by Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 20,2), the theory of creation ex nihilo. Thus Tatian, in response to certain debates raised at *Rome, was the first to declare that God also created matter (*Orat.* 5,3). Theophilus went further, not only stressing that God created everything through the Word and Wisdom (*Autol.* II, 18), but also using, in a philosophical perspective, the idea of creation ex nihilo (*Autol.* I, 4; II, 4,10.13; May 159-167). Irenaeus, finally, was the most complete. He declared more clearly than Theophilus that God had no need of anything to create the world, which he did by his own power, the Son and the Holy Spirit (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20,1). Reinterpreting in a clearly voluntarist way, he insisted still more on the fact that God created everything by his will (see May 170-171, 178-179).

This doctrine of creation ex nihilo was accepted by the authors of the 3rd c., by *Tertullian, *Hippolytus and *Origen. Radicalized, probably under the influence of philosophical debates on the eternity of the world (see Ricken), it provoked, or at least decisively determined, the *Arian controversy, which was a matter of distinguishing the creation of the world from the eternal generation of the Son (see the creed, with the anathemata: DS 125-126), and then the question of the Holy Spirit, not created, but proceeding from the Father, creator of all things visible and invisible (see Basil., *De Spir. S.* 18,45: DS 150). But this creationist orientation, expressed above all in the adage *omnia opera ad extra communia sunt*, risked compromising the trinitarian consideration of creation, as ante-Nicene theology had developed it, following esp. *Paul and *John. In the field of *Christology, the radical distinction made at *Nicaea between God the immutable Creator and creatures created once from nothing, *per voluntatem divinam*, and hence mutable, led to the exploration of the distinction between the divine and the human in Christ, and to the establishment of the one person of the divine Word as principle of union between these two distinct elements (see the formula *inconfuse, immutabiliter, indivise, inseparabiliter* of the Chalcedonian Creed: DS 302). But the doctrine of creation ex nihilo (in more concrete terms, the doctrine that one almighty God created all things without outside help and, in his totally gratuitous goodness, continually preserves them), which was presupposed in the great dogmatic controversies and then explicitly dogmatized against certain *Manichean tendencies (see DS 285-286), did not find the same resonance in every theologian who elaborated it or took it up. Indeed, in Irenaeus, who in his polemic against the *dualistic and pessimistic tendencies of gnosticism and Marcionism took it to its clearest expression, it is inserted in a profoundly economic context. Profiting from all the resources of the Bible (including the NT) and of *tradition, the great defender of the goodness of all creatures, spiritual and material, explains with great clarity that God, needing nothing, created humanity and the world to demonstrate his love. Placing humanity in the world, he began a patient process of education through which, by means of many economies, but especially through the *incarnation, he accustoms humanity to being his children, finally to resemble the divine immortality (see *Adv. haer.* III,21,10; IV,5,1; V,36,1-3).

While remaining more or less faithful to this economic approach to the theology of creation, later authors put it in a mainly rational and ontological perspective. Thus Tertullian not only explored the idea of the creative action of the Word (*Adv. Prax.* 7) but also brought out what is "proper" to the world and to human beings, who nonetheless depend entirely on their Creator (see Scheffczyk 47-48). *Origen, feeling his way to a Christian gnosis, tried to integrate the now traditional doctrine of creation ex nihilo into his unified vision of the world. Distinguishing, with *Philo and *Clement of Alexandria, two creations—first the creation of rational beings, then the postlapsarian creation of material things, destined to be the place in which fallen beings

would be led back to the divine unity, and not even ruling out of this historical process a succession of different worlds—he refused to compromise the economic perspective that Irenaeus had introduced into Christian theology from the Bible (see *De princ.* II,1,4; I,8,1; II,5,3; III,6,4). The *Cappadocian Fathers, though greatly indebted to Origen, revised his cosmology according to the needs of *orthodox faith and hence strengthened the historical elements of Irenaeus's cosmological vision. We should also point out the pains *Basil of Caesarea took to illustrate the biblical doctrine of creation with the data of the natural sciences of his time (see *Hexaemeron*).

*Augustine, leaning on Eastern and Western traditions and developing especially the voluntarism of Tertullian, *Marius Victorinus and *Ambrose, gave the relatively most complete doctrine of creation (see Scheffczyk 61-62; Mayer). Faced with contemporary Latin *Neoplatonism and with the *Manichean heresy as it had developed in N *Africa, he tried not just to keep the right balance between Platonist-inspired dualism and *Stoic monism but also to respect the links between creation and *redemption. In his many studies of the first chapters of Genesis (*Gen. imp.*; *Gen. Man.*; *Gen. litt.*; *Conf.* 11-13), his most important contribution to the theology of creation was his very elaborate distinction between eternity and time. Intimately uniting the beginning of time with creation itself, he managed not just to explore the distinction between the eternal Creator and creation in time but also to make possible, in principle, a unitary perspective of creation and preservation, and thus to avoid a purely protological consideration (see Smulders 677; Studer, *Gratia Christi*, 198-201, with the classical distinction between *conditio* and *administratio*; Mayer 86-97: *rationes causales*). It is quite true that Augustine did not overcome all the risks of a direct confrontation with the non-Christian tendencies of his time. He conceded too much to the Neoplatonist ideas of the "ladder of existence" (see Mayer 100-103), nor did he eliminate all the dualistic traces of Manicheism. The philosophical orientation imposed on him also led him to unite, in too risky a way, *providence (*gubernatio mundi*) with *predestination in his explanations of the encounter between the freedom of the transcendent God and human *free will, and above all to disregard to a considerable degree the economic perspectives of the Bible. Regarding this last aspect, it is difficult to see the nexus that, according to Augustine, exists between creation and sacred history, i.e., between the origin of all things and the historical realization of the *civitas Dei*. It is attested particularly by his way (too christocentric, however) of speaking of Christ as *creator et recreator, conditor et redemptor, formator et reformator*. This "christocentrism," however, was counterbalanced by a significant reflection on the creative act of the whole *Trinity (see Mayer 71-74). Along these lines we should mention Augustine's schema of *creatio, conversio, formatio,* by which he explored both creation and the new creation in *baptism (cf. Mayer 81ff.; 97-100, with *Conf.* 11-13). In any event, Augustine's theology of creation became the foundation of all later Western theology.

In the East, ps.-*Dionysius allowed the Neoplatonism of *Plotinus and esp. of *Proclus to make an even greater impression on him. According to him the goodness of God, who transcends all beings, makes his light irradiate all beings, giving them, in a descending gradation, being, life and knowledge (*Div. nom.* IV,1-3). Though the creation of this whole hierarchy comes about in a sort of emanation (*Div. nom.* V,8), this does not mean that the emanation puts in question divine freedom, or that there is a confusion of the divine and the created, i.e., that the divine, in becoming the principle of being, order and number, ceases to remain completely transcendent (*Div. nom.* V,10; cf. Scheffczyk 67). *Maximus the Confessor, in his loyalty to the Council of *Chalcedon, added the necessary corrections to this grandiose vision of the universe. Considering the incarnation of the Word as the goal of all divine manifestations (*Cap. theol.* 1,66f.: PG 90, 1108 AB), he restored the unique economy of creation and redemption.

DTC 3, 2034-2084; W. Theiler, *Demiurgos*: RAC 3, 694-711; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London (It. tr. Bologna 1972); C. Tresmontant, *La métaphysique du christianisme et la naissance de la philosophie chrétienne*, Paris 1961; L. Scheffczyk, *Schöpfung und Vorsehung*: HDG II/2a, Freiburg 1962 (bibl.); R.A. Norris, *God and World in Early Christian Theology*, London 1966; F. Szabó, *Le Christ créateur chez s. Ambroise*, Rome 1968; F. Ricken, *Nikaia als Krisis des altchristlichen Platonismus*: TheolPhilos 44 (1969) 321-341; P. Smulders, *Creazione*: Sacram. mundi 2 (1974) 669-682 (bibl.); G. May, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts*, Berlin 1978 (bibl.); J.C.M. van Winden, *Hexaemeron*: RAC 14 (1988) 1250-1269; M.-A. Vannier, *"Creatio," "Conversio," "Formatio" chez s. Augustin*, Fribourg 1991; B. Studer, *Gratia Christi*, Rome 1993, esp. 196-207; C. Markschies, *Demiurg, II. Vätertheologie*: LTK[3] 3, 82-83; J. Fantino, *L'origine de la doctrine de la création ex nihilo*: RSOhTh 80 (1996) 589-602; C. Mayer, *Creatio, Creator, Creatura*: AugLex II/1-2 (1996), 56-116 (vast bibl.); C. Scholten, *Antike Natur-Philosophie und christl. Kosmologie*, Berlin 1996; G. May, *Schöpfer/Schöpfung, V. Alte Kirche*: TRE 30 (1999) 296-299 (texts and studies); H. Kessler, *Schöpfung IV. Theologieu. dogmengeschichtlich*: LTK[3] 9, 226-230; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Creazione*: Origene (2000), 98-102. See also the introductions in the editions of the commentaries on Genesis, like SC 7; 26; 160; BAug 48-49.

B. Studer

CREATION (double). We speak of "double creation" when the creation of the world and of man is held to be the work of two creators (or one "primary" creator and one or more collaborators), or of a single creator working at two successive moments, with emphasis on a disparity in value between the "first" and "second" creations. As regards cosmogony, the notion of a "second" personage working with the Supreme Being as a coworker or an adversary appears in many primitive mythologies, which often ascribe an animal nature to it (Coyote among N American Indians, Crow among Old Siberians). Where he acts in opposition to the Creator, modifying or wrecking his work, the cosmogonic context takes on *dualistic connotations. In relation to anthropogeny, the concept of double creation differs according to whether it implies the presence of a Creator and coworkers entrusted by him with a part of the creative process, or of adverse entities working against the Creator himself or, finally, of a single Creator acting at successive moments.

In the case of the *gnostic systems of the first centuries AD, the creation of the human being is double because the body, formed by the Demiurge and the wicked archons, is opposed—in a clearly dualistic framework—to the spiritual element (intellect, soul, *pneuma*), whose origin is the divine world. Plato's *Timaeus* offers the example of an anthropogeny in which, together with the Demiurge who provides the higher part of the soul (= intellect), subordinate beings (the "young" gods identifiable in the astral divinities) intervene to provide its lower parts, more directly compromised with the body and the senses. In Plato the intervention of these coworkers, who act on behalf of the great Demiurge, has the aim of rendering the latter "inculpable" (*anaitios*) for man's negative ethical choices. *Philo of Alexandria's *anthropology, though biblically based, implies the notion of human double creation, both in that it admits "coworkers" of God and that it contemplates two creative acts of God himself. Both these possibilities are affirmed in *De opificio mundi*, through a particular *exegesis of the two accounts in Genesis (1:26-27 and 2:7). Philo distinguishes humanity created "in the image and likeness of God" from humanity "formed," understanding the former as an ideal prototype belonging to the first, intelligible level of the creation carried out by the Logos (*Opif.* 134), while the latter is the perceptible human being composed of body and soul. Sometimes for Philo "man as image and likeness" is the intellect (**nous*), i.e., the higher component of humanity (*Opif.* 66). Together with this notion of two moments (respectively, ideal-intelligible and sensible) in human creation goes that of the coworkers, asserted by Philo on the basis of the plural ("Let us make") used by the biblical author apropos of humanity as image. God entrusts his coworkers (angels, Powers) with the creation of that element in the rational soul which can incline toward evil, i.e., the faculty of choice (*autexousion*), which defines the human as a "liminal" (*methorios*) being, placed between mortal and immortal nature, between vice and virtue (*Opif.* 73-74; *De conf.* 179). *Origen, on the basis of Philo's exegesis of the two biblical accounts of hunan creation, drops the notion of God's "coworkers" but keeps that of the two successive creative acts, which, in a broad cosmological perspective, regard the world of intelligent beings, all equal and free, and then, after the graded fall of these due to a departure from the divine unity and love, the world of heavy bodies. Between the first creation (that of intellects, *noes*) and the second (that of the visible cosmos and bodies) came the transgression of the rational creatures, which, though differently graded and not universal (some *noes* fell only minimally or not at all), became the motive of God's second creative act. The human being has internally both the element of "image" (intellect or higher part of the soul), fruit of the "first creation," and the "formed" element (the body with its functions), pertaining to God's second creative act. *Gregory of Nyssa's anthropology, abandoning the Origenian idea of the preexistence of *noes* and the "antecedent fault," nevertheless retains a formula of double creation when, in *De hominis opificio,* he says that God's original plan contemplated a humanity which, created in God's image and likeness and endowed with a material body, was yet intended to reproduce itself "in the manner of the angels," i.e., without sexuality. Foreseeing the fall, which would consist in a decline toward sensibility, God provided humanity with sexual organs distinguished into male and female. The distinction of the sexes, then, though contemporaneous with the spiritual "image" element and the formation of the body, amounts to a "second creation," "added" in foreknowledge of the sin that would prevent the multiplication of the human race in the way God had originally intended.

U. Bianchi (ed.), *La "doppia creazione" dell'uomo negli Alessandrini, nei Cappadoci e nella gnosi*, Rome 1978; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Origene. Studi di antropologia e di storia della tradizione*, Rome 1984; Id., *"Doppia creazione" e origine del male nella tradizione cristiana antica: osservazioni storico-religiose*, in C. Gianotto (ed.), *La domanda di Giobbe e la razionalità sconfitta*, Atti del Convegno di Trento, 25-26 novembre 1992, Trent 1995, 53-76; Id., *Origene e la tradizione origeniana in Occidente: letture storico-religiose* (Biblioteca di Scienze religiose 142), Rome 1998.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

CREEDS and CONFESSIONS of FAITH. There are many doctrinal formulas, local or more widespread, in the NT (e.g., Rom 1:3-4; 4:24-25; 1 Cor 8:6; 1 Tim 2:5; 3:16; 2 Tim 2:8; 1 Pet 3:18) and in early Christian literature (e.g., Ign., *Eph.* 18,2; *Trall.* 9; *Smyrn.* 1,1-2; Polyc., *Ep.* 2,1), but they cannot be identified as rudimentary creeds, being too diversified and lacking later parallels. But in the primitive church we can discover two distinct predecessors of the later creed. The first is the *trinitarian formula directly based on or taken from Mt 28:19 and connected, as the text implies, with the baptismal rite; indeed, there is no evidence (against Cullmann, *Les premières confessions de foi chrétienne*) that it was used on other occasions outside the baptismal rite. We can trace its gradual growth in length and content down the first two centuries through the examples of *Justin, *Irenaeus, *Tertullian and the **Epistula Apostolorum*. Its form is interrogatory, i.e., it was presented to the candidate for *baptism in a series of questions. The second form of profession of faith is a *christological confession or **kerygma* ("preaching"), doubtless derived from the very old confession "Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor 12:3). But in Justin's time (ca. 150) it had become a "developed christological kerygma" (Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 75-76), briefly outlining the earthly and heavenly life of Jesus Christ, and a form of this kind can be traced in Irenaeus and Tertullian. Some scholars (e.g., Kelly) have thought that this formula was originally independent of the baptismal rite; but the evidence of the Western tradition in the MSS (Rome, ca. 120?) which interpolated in Acts 8:37 (baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch) the confession: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (with variants), and Pope *Stephen's claim (mid-3rd c.) to know a form of baptism in the name of Jesus Christ alone (and accepted as valid; Cypr., *Ep.* 73,4,1; 16,1,2), decidedly suggest that this christological confession too may have been associated with baptism, though perhaps it was also used on other occasions. Around 200, this developed christological confession was included in the simplest trinitarian formula to produce the predecessor of the type of *credo* known today as the *Apostles' Creed, though both the separate formulas and the resulting formula differed from church to church. We find this baptismal creed enlarged in *Hippolytus, *Clement of Alexandria, *Origen and *Cyprian.

Toward the mid-2nd c., however, another type of doctrinal formula appeared: the rule of faith (Greek: κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός, κανὼν τῆς πίστεως, ὅρος, etc.; Latin: **regula fidei, regula veritatis, mensura fidei, regula pietatis* etc.). The idea and the terminology are first found in Irenaeus (ca. 160–200), but it can also be seen in Tertullian, Hippolytus, the *Syriac **Didascalia Apostolorum*, Origen, Cyprian, *Novatian, *Dionysius of Alexandria and *Victorinus of Petovium, and we can find references elsewhere. It is certainly not identical with the baptismal creed (against Harnack, Kattenbusch and practically all the first scholars of the origin of the creeds) but consists of a generalized summary of the Christian faith as taught and preached in the churches of the writers who speak of it, summarized in slightly different terms according to the writer's predilections, but everywhere containing the same essential doctrine. Origen not only lists the themes not included in the rule (and so open to the development of speculation), but he also encourages his more advanced disciples to investigate them (e.g., the *resurrection of the body). All the ancient writers see the rule of faith as the proof of *orthodoxy and a safeguard against erroneous and heretical doctrines, while the baptismal creed, mentioned by many of them, is thought of as a simple model or summary, an epitome (Iren.), "the major and more important points, a summary, holy seeds" (Orig.). We have no clear evidence that in these very early times the baptismal creed was understood or used as a criterion of correct doctrine. Some *gnostic sects used a creed of their own.

In the second generation of the 3rd c., according to Kelly (op. cit., 49), the custom of *traditio* and *redditio symboli* began to be widely practiced in the church: the creed was handed over to the *catechumens at some initial moment of their instruction, and they repeated it later during the course of instruction, and again in the baptismal rite itself. Why the West used the word *symbolum* for the profession of faith is not well known, but this practice is evidence that, at the time it was adopted, two different types of profession of faith must have been in use: the interrogatory, put to the candidate when he was baptized, and the declaratory, a continuous profession of faith made by the candidate in the first person. The declaratory creed was certainly modeled on the baptismal creed in its content but must have also been influenced by the rule of faith. In the West its particular form, developed ca. 330 in the Church of *Rome (the old Roman Creed, known to scholars as **R**), originally drawn up in an early 2nd-c. Greek formula, became the model of all Western creeds of this type. The Eastern baptismal creeds varied considerably according to their place of origin. The Apostles' Creed as we know it today is a slightly enlarged and modified version of **R** (known as **T**), which probably came from SW France (Septimania) and was widely

adopted in western Europe before finally being accepted by the conservative Roman Church sometime between 800 and 1000. The legend that each apostle formulated one article of this *credo* was widely accepted by the end of the 4th c.

In the 3rd c. we can trace two examples of the use of an accurate doctrinal formula as proof of sound faith: the formula proposed by Bishop *Heraclides, in discussion with Origen ca. 246, to prove his orthodoxy (*Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide*, SC 67, 118-220), and the so-called *Letter of Hymenaeus,* probably proposed to *Paul of Samosata sometime between 264 and 268 (Mansi I,1033-1040). But the first certain example of a declaratory creed used as a proof of orthodox doctrine is in the letter written by *Eusebius, bishop of *Caesarea in *Palestine, to his congregation immediately after the Council of *Nicaea of 325 (ed. H.G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*, 1.22, 43-44), which he maintains is the *credo* he studied during his own prebaptismal catechetical instruction. To avoid a certain past misconception, we must make clear that no Christian writer of the first four or five centuries followed modern levels of meticulous literal accuracy in citing or reproducing creeds. The ancients were interested in the substantial content, not in the precise wording of their formulas of faith (see Greg. Naz., *Ep*. 58, 9, 10, 11; Greg. Nyss., *Con. Eunom*. II, 137). Eusebius states that his baptismal creed was identical with that newly drawn up by the council he had just attended. This creed, the Nicene Creed of 325, was the work of a council of bishops called by the emperor *Constantine in the city of Nicaea, in *Bithynia, to resolve the controversy over the definition of Christ's divinity which had arisen between *Alexander, bishop of *Alexandria, and *Arius, one of his *presbyters, and was threatening to divide the church which the emperor had just freed from the danger of *persecution and given his support to. This was the first time a general council had been held or a *credo* drawn up which was intended to be valid as a criterion of orthodoxy for all believers. Its original form was certainly not that of Eusebius's church but probably came from *Syria or Phoenicia. The bishops at Nicaea introduced into this creed certain expressions intended to avoid an Arian interpretation of their statements: e.g., the words applied to the Son, "generated from the Father's substance," "generated, not made," and, especially, "of the same substance as the Father" (ὁμοούσιον, Lat. *consubstantialem*). A series of anathemata, or condemnations, of particular Arian doctrines ("there was a time when he was not," "before he was generated he did not exist," "he was made from nothing," he derives "from a different Person [ὑπόστασις] or substance" (than that of the Father), he is "changeable or alterable") were added with the same purpose. This very important creed is called **N** by scholars.

In fact, this historic formulation of an ecumenical conciliar creed did not immediately serve the purpose it had been made for. In the West it did not circulate very widely, and soon after the Council of Nicaea it practically disappeared from the controversies that continued to rage for another 56 years. Nevertheless, **N** had shown a way to formulate creeds, and the years between 341 and 362 saw a series of attempts to resolve the differences of opinion in East and West by formulating a creed that could satisfy all the parties, or at least express the faith of the majority. Toward the end of this period even the emperor played a part. The most important examples of the written creeds of this period were the "Creed of the Dedication" or "Second Antiochene Creed," drawn up by the Synod of *Antioch of 341: it omitted *homoousion,* described the persons of the *Trinity as "three in person" (ὑπόστασις) but one in harmony (συμφωνία) and the Son as "the Father's image, without differences of substance [*ousia*]," and anathematized many Arian opinions. For some time (until ca. 370), there was a strong possibility that this creed could become an alternative to **N**; its attribution to *Lucian of Antioch, *martyr and theologian of the first years of the 4th c., is controversial. The "Fourth Antiochene Creed" (also of 341) was sent by the Eastern bishops to Emperor *Constans in the West in an attempt to conciliate Western opinion without returning to **N**. It too omitted *homoousion* and anathematized some Arian propositions, but it called Christ simply "God from God." Though of little importance in itself, this creed became the basis and substance of numerous other creeds, such as that of the Eastern bishops at Philippopolis (343), the "Fifth Antiochene Creed"—called **Ekthesis makrostichos,* drawn up at Antioch in 344 and containing a lengthy appendix condemning an ample series of heterodox opinions, esp. those that inclined to *Sabellianism (the refusal to see distinctions of persons in the deity), in particular that of *Marcellus of Ancyra—and the "First Creed of *Sirmium," formulated by the II Council of Sirmium (351) and largely aimed against Marcellus and his more radical disciple *Photinus of Sirmium.

A completely new direction was taken with the appearance in 357 of the "Second Creed of Sirmium," which later opponents would call the "blasphemy of Sirmium." Here, for the first time, something like a consistent Arian theology emerged: it rejected any

use of "substance" (*ousia*) as a term to define the Son's relation to the Father, on which it refused to speculate, and drastically subordinated the Son to the Father, together with the rest of creation. The creed provoked a reaction among a number of Eastern theologians which led to the "Third Creed of Sirmium," at the IV Council of Sirmium (358): it opted for ὁμοιούσιον rather than ὁμοούσιον and rejected the Arian alternatives of 357. An intermediate creed, known as the "Dated Creed," was drawn up at the V Council of Sirmium (May 359) in preparation for a divided general council (Easterners at *Seleucia in *Cilicia, Westerners at *Rimini in *Italy); this creed rejected the use of *ousia* and its derivatives but described the Son as "like the Father in everything." The *credo* that resulted from this general council, after theological conflicts and imperial interference had had their way (Creed of Nike, 360), was a watered-down version of the "Dated Creed" and defined the Son simply as "like according to the Scriptures," which left ample room for the Arian interpretation. From then until the Council of *Constantinople, which in 381 put an end to the Arian controversy, the creeds formulated were of little importance, perhaps because everyone recognized that the procedure of creating creeds had not necessarily allayed the controversy. The opponents of Arianism now aimed at attempting to restore **N** under the leadership of *Athanasius of Alexandria (ca. 296–373), who had long led the fight against Arianism and semi-Arianism. The Council of Constantinople (381) represented the triumph of his doctrine and that of the three great *Cappadocians, *Basil of Caesarea (ca. 330–379), *Gregory of Nazianzus (329–389) and Basil's brother *Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 330–ca. 395). To it has been traditionally attributed the best-known and most important creed in the history of Christianity, commonly known as the Nicene or Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (**C** to scholars). Whether the council of 381 did actually draw up this creed is the subject of a lively controversy (see Kelly, op. cit., ch. X). Before 451, contemporary or later attestations of the creed being drawn up in those circumstances are practically nonexistent, and the first clear evidence of **C**'s existence is in the final declaration of the Council of *Chalcedon (451), which in fact cites **C** to the letter. All in all, it seems preferable to agree with Kelly (following Ritter's theory in *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel*) that this *credo* was drawn up by the council of 381 in a fruitless attempt to reach agreement with the moderate opponents of a full recognition of the *Holy Spirit's divinity but was long considered by the majority of theologians as little more than a retrieval of **N**; the Western authorities in particular ignored it for a long time, as the fruit of a council which they only slowly and reluctantly acknowledged as ecumenical. The *credo* that was the basis of **C** was not **N** but may have been that of the Church of Jerusalem: *homoousion* was restored and the Son's eternal generation and noncreaturality were assured; a small and curious clause, "his kingdom will have no end," was inserted in opposition to the (by now almost extinct) doctrine of Marcellus, and the reference to the Holy Spirit, very brief in **N**, was greatly expanded to describe it as "Lord and giver of life," as proceeding from the Father, and "with the Father and the Son worshiped and glorified" (according to the teaching of the Cappadocians, particularly Basil).

As time passed, **C** became the central and universally recognized creed of Christianity, as it is today. At some point (ca. 700–800) it was also adopted in a *Latin formula as the baptismal creed of the Church of Rome (it was finally replaced by **T**). To this *credo,* over time, the Western Latin church made an addition not approved by any fully ecumenical council. First in *Spain, probably under the pressure of *Visigothic Arianism, then all through western Europe and finally (1014) in *Rome, to the expression "who proceeds from the Father" were added the words "and from the Son" (**Filioque*). For more than a thousand years this addition has been a cause of discord and friction between Eastern and Western (including Protestant) churches, and still is today. The practice of reciting **C** during the *Eucharist was introduced in the Eastern church in ca. 500 as an indirect consequence of the intense theological and ecclesiastical conflicts between groups divided by their conceptions of *Christology and was rapidly adopted throughout the East. It established itself more slowly in the West: traces of it can be found at the Council of *Toledo in Spain (589), then in the Irish church, and finally in Charlemagne's empire in the 8th and 9th c. The Church of Rome adopted it only in 1014.

Two relevant formulas remain to be examined. The first is called the Chalcedonian Definition and was drawn up by the ecumenical council held at Chalcedon in Bithynia in 451. Its intention was to resolve a controversy over the meaning of the doctrine of the *incarnation of the Son of God, a controversy agitated by theological thought ever since the ecumenical Council of *Ephesus (431) had condemned the doctrine of Bishop *Nestorius of Constantinople, which tended to divide the Son into a human element and a divine element, and the *latrocinium* of Ephesus (449), hastily convened and tumultuously conducted, had tried to impose on the

church a *monophysite (Alexandrian) rather than a *dyophysite (Antiochene) description of the incarnation. The definition worked out at Chalcedon had to maintain the balance between these two conflicting Christologies with equity and exactness, and to great extent succeeded. By confirming **N** and **C** and approving the relevant theological dissertations of *Cyril of Alexandria and Pope *Leo I, the definition laid down that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, had two natures, one fully divine, the other fully human, and that they were united in one person, "without confusion, without change, without division, without separation." This definition did not succeed in settling the controversy, which continued to rage, despite the efforts of many *Byzantine emperors to find a compromise or reconciliation, until it was suffocated by the coming of Islam. At any rate, the definition has remained ever since the basic statement of christological orthodoxy for the majority of Christian churches, including those of the Reformation.

The other formula requiring attention is the so-called Athanasian Creed or, as it is called from its opening words in Latin, **Quicumque vult*. Its origin and date have long been subjects of lively dispute; by the 16th c. it was understood that its traditional attribution to *Athanasius of Alexandria (which can be traced back to the 6th c.) was totally impossible. Its doctrine is evidently derived from *Augustine (354–430) and still more from the *Commonitorium* of *Vincent of Lérins (434); the creed was almost certainly known to *Caesarius of Arles (470–543). It is clearly aimed at the errors of Arius and Nestorius but shows no discernible influence of the Chalcedonian Definition. It consists of a concise, lapidary exposition, in late Latin, of the Western form of the trinitarian doctrine (with explicit affirmation of the *Filioque*), followed by a rather short exposition of the doctrine of the incarnation, which inter alia excludes *Apollinarianism, the doctrine that Christ lacked a human soul. Its "condemnatory clauses," which consign anyone who does not accept its doctrine to eternal damnation, made it decidedly suited to the temper of the Middle Ages but have induced moderns to keep their distance from it. Its treatment is completely Western, and it was never formally approved by the Eastern church. The most recent authority, Kelly (*The Athanasian Creed*), holds that it was composed in the *monastery of Lérins (off the S coast of *Gaul) or in a group associated with Lérins, between ca. 440 and ca. 520, perhaps in the circle of Caesarius of Arles, even if not directly by him.

F.J.A. Hort, *Two Dissertations*, London 1876; F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, Leipzig 1894, 1900 (2 vols.); A. Harnack, *Apostolisches Symbolum*: RE 1 (1896) 741-755; Id., *Konstantinopolitanisches Symbol*: RE 11 (1931-1932) 12-28; F. Loofs, *Das Nicänum*, in Festgabe für K. Müller, Tübingen 1922, 68-82; E. Schwartz, *Das Nicänum und das Konstantinopolitanum auf der Synode von Chalkedon*: ZNTW 25 (1926) 38-88; H. Lietzmann, *Symbolstudien*: ZNTW 21 (1922) 1-34; 22 (1923) 257-279; 24 (1925) 193-203; 26 (1927) 75-95; B. Capelle, *Les origines du symbole romain*: RecTh 2 (1930) 5-20; D. van den Eynde, *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique . . .*, Gembloux - Paris 1933; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *El símbolo Niceno*, Madrid 1947; O. Cullmann, *Les premières confessions de foi chrétienne*, Paris 1943, [2]1948 (It. tr. Rome 1948); R.P.C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church*, London 1962; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Athanasian Creed*, London 1964; A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*, Göttingen 1965; G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*, Rome 1967; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London [3]1972; R.P.C. Hanson, *Dogma and Formula in the Fathers*: SP 13 (II) (1975) 169-184; J.M. Perosanz, *El símbolo atanasiano*, Madrid 1976; G.L. Bray, *Creeds, Councils and Christ*, Downers Grove 1984; S. Sabugal, *Credo. La fe de la Iglesia. El símbolo de la fe. Historia e interpretación*, Zamora 1986; M.-Th. Nadeau, *Foi de l'église: évolution et sens d'une formule*, Paris 1988; D. Spada, *Le formule trinitarie: da Nicea a Costantinopoli*, Rome 1988; Id., *Le confessioni di fede da Nicea a Costantinopli*, Rome 1988; M.C. Zaffi, *Formulazioni di fede della chiesa antica: un contributo allo studio delle radici e teologia della "confessione" cristiana*, Rome 1989; S.M. Heim (ed.), *Faith to Creed: Ecumenical Perspectives on the Affirmation of the Apostolic Faith in the Fourth Century*, Papers of the Faith to Creed Consultation, Commission on Faith and Order, NCCCUSA, October 25-27, 1989, Waltham, Mass.-Grand Rapids 1991; H.J. Vogt, *Bilder der frühen Kirche: Bildworte der Bibel bei den Kirchenvätern: kleine Geschichte des Credo*, Munich 1993; J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, Berlin 1994; R. Staats, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel: historische und theologische Grundlagen*, Darmstadt 1996; W. Kinzig - Ch. Markschies - M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis: Studien zur sogenannten "Traditio Apostolica," zu den "Interrogationes de fide" und zum "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis,"* Berlin - New York 1999; A. Merkt, *Symbolum. Historische Bedeudung und patristische Deutung des Bekenntnisnamens*: RQ 96 (2001) 1-36; L.H. Westra, *The Apostle's Creed: Origin, History and Some Early Commentaries*, Turnhout 2002; D. Spada, *Le formule trinitarie da Nicea a Costantinopoli*, Rome [2]2003; G. Riedl, *Hermeneutische Grundstrukturen frühchristlicher Bekenntnisbildung*, Göttingen 2003; *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, J. Pelikan - V. Hothkiss (eds.), New Haven 2003.

R.P.C. Hanson

CRESCONIUS. *Donatist grammarian, friend of *Petilian of Constantine. Native of Proconsular Africa (*"Afer in Africa"*: Aug., *C. Cresconium* IV,71,83). In 401–402 he wrote a treatise defending Petilian's ideas, as presented in the latter's encyclical to his clergy and attacked by *Augustine in *C. Litteras Petiliani* I. Cresconius defended Petilian's baptismal theology, accused the *Catholics of having their origin in **traditio* and in their forefathers' *apostasy (*C. Cresc.* II,22,27; 36,41), and defended the readmission of *Maximian's followers to the Donatist church by the fact that they had repented of their *schism

within the time set by the Council of Bagai (*C. Cresc.* III,15,18; 17,20), while the Catholics continued to persecute the Donatists. Cresconius is a typical example of the many educated laymen in the ranks of the Donatists, who held that the essential quality of a church lay less in its numbers than in its integrity (*In paucis frequenter est veritas*; *errare multorum est*: *C. Cresc.* III,66,75 and cf. IV,18,21) and who disapproved of *rhetoric as something *pagan (*C. Cresc.* IV, 2, 2). Augustine's long books against his arguments, written ca. 406, contain important documentation of the origin of the schism, as well as on the Maximianist schism (303) within Donatism. Nothing is known of Cresconius after this.

Extracts of Cresconius's work are preserved by Augustine, *Contra Cresconium* (ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 52, 325-382); Monceaux VI, 2; P. Langa, *La Autoridad de la Sagrada Escritura en "Contra Cresconium"*: Augustiniana 41 (1991) 691-721; M. Moreau, *Cresconium grammaticum partis Donati* (*Ad-*) and *Cresconius grammaticus*, in AugL II/1-2, 1996, 131-139.

W.H.C. Frend

CRESCONIUS, canonist (6th c.). The work *Concordia canonum* by the otherwise unknown Cresconius, who describes himself as *Cresconius Christi famulorum exiguus* (PL 88,829), is dedicated to Bishop Liberinus (or Liberius). This Cresconius should not be confused with the 6th-c. poet Fl. Cresconius Corippus; the name Cresconius was common in *Africa. His purpose, as declared in the prologue, is to complete *Ferrandus's collection, bringing together *cuncta ecclesiastica constituta* (PL 88,831), and organizing the material according to arguments, as Ferrandus had done. Whereas Ferrandus had considered only conciliar decisions, Cresconius is much more complete; he uses the *Canones Apostolorum,* the Eastern and African councils (*Nicaea, *Ancyra, *Neocaesarea, *Gangra, *Antioch, *Laodicea, *Chalcedon, *Serdica, *Carthage) and passages from the decretals. It seems that Ferrandus was the only source for the councils, but while Ferrandus, in the *Breviatio,* reports the texts only partially, Cresconius includes them in their entirety. *Dionysius too is a source for Cresconius. Cardinale offers a comparative synopsis of the collections of Ferrandus, Dionysius and Cresconius. The *Concordia canonum,* also called *Liber canonum,* was composed of 300 titles or chapters. Although the arrangement is somewhat imperfect, it had a wide circulation and was much used for its peculiar characteristics. We know 20 manuscripts which report the whole text, as can be seen from the recent studies of Cardinale, Landau and Schmitz. In France it was taken up, with some additions, by the *Collectio XII librorum* (or Cresconius Gallicanus).

CPL 1769; PL 88, 829-842. H. Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich*, Berlin 1975, 253-255; P. Pinedo, *Concordia canonum Cresconii*: Ius canonicum 4 (1964) 35-64; E.J. Kilmartin, *Early African Legislation Concerning the Liturgical Prayer*: EphLit 69 (1985) 105-127; H. Mordek, *Analecta Canonistica I*: BMCL 16 (1986) 1-16; M. Cardinale, *La "Concordia canonum" di Cresconio e la sua diffusione nella cultura giuridica dell'Europa medievale*, I, *Prolegomeni generali e criteri metodologici*: Apollinaris 62 (1989) 283-331; P. Landau, *Kanonessammlungen in der Lombardei im frühen und Hohen Mittelalter*, in *Milano e il suo territorio* (*XI-XII sec.*), Atti dell'XI Congresso internaz. di studi sull'alto Medioevo, Milano 26-30 October 1987, Milan 1989, 424-457; G. Schmitz, *Vier-Bücher-Sammlung des Cod. Köln, Diözesan- und Dombibliothek 124. Zur kirchenrectlichen Kenntnis im 10. Jahrhundert*, in *Ex ipsis rerum documentis*, Fest. H. Zimmermann, Sigmaringen 1991, 233-255.

A. Di Berardino

CRETE

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Council - III. Archaeology.

I. Origins of Christianity. The Mediterranean island of Crete (Κρήτη) was an ecclesiastical province. It fell under Roman rule in 67 BC; in 27 BC *Augustus joined it to Cyrene to make a single senatorial province with the governor's residence at Gortyna. There were Cretans at *Jerusalem on the day of *Pentecost (Acts 2:11). In AD 60 the ship carrying *Paul prisoner to *Rome (Acts 27:7-26) touched at Crete. After being freed, he returned (63–67?) and left Titus there (Tit 1:12), writing to support him when his apostolic activity was obstructed by Judaizers. Besides Titus and the group of 10 *martyrs under *Decius, Crete venerates its *confessors from the time of the *persecutions, later inscribed in the *Byzantine Synaxaria: Cyril, Hermaius, Gregory of Akritas; and other saints: Eumenius the thaumaturge, Peter the neomartyr and the better-known Andrew. Morally established by 170, if we consider the eminent place assigned to Gortyna in a letter of *Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb., *HE* IV, 23, 5), the metropolis of Crete was officially established at the start of the 5th c. In the Cretan episcopate's letter to Emperor *Leo I on the murder of *Peter of Alexandria (454), the metropolitan of Gortyna is supported by eight suffragans (Mansi 7,621-622). The 22 cities listed in *Hierocles's *Synekdemos* (624) occur in a different order in the first *Notitia episcopalis* (8th c.), which attests the passing of the metropolis of Gortyna from the jurisdiction of Rome (*Illyricum orientale*) to that of *Constantinople, after the imperial *coup de*

force of 730 (Darrouzès, 216 n. 10; 221 n. 208-227). Suffragan sees included Knossos, ancient capital of the island. A volcanic eruption in the N part of the island was interpreted as divine disapproval, giving Emperor Leo III an occasion for the first iconomachy (733). Crete was occupied by Arabs in 823.

DB 2, 1111-1116; DBS 2, 159-175; DHGE 13, 1033-1037; EC 4, 870-871; LTK³ 6, 439-440; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 1, Paris 1963, 463-465; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Paris 1981; D. Tsougarakis, *The Byzantine Crete*, Oxford 1984; ODB 1, 545-547.

D. Stiernon

II. Council. Since Crete was part of Illyricum, it depended directly on the Roman Church until 730. In 667 a council was called there by Peter, metropolitan of Gortyna, to depose John, bishop of Lappa: the deposed bishop, who appealed to the pope, was imprisoned; he escaped and fled to Rome, where he proved his innocence before a council called by Pope *Vitalian. Among the island's bishops was St. *Andrew of Crete.

Mansi, *Supplem.*, I,501; Mansi XI, 99; A.C. Peltier, *Dictionnaire des Conciles*, I, Paris 1847, col. 787; Hfl-Lecl III, 1, 306; Palazzini 1, 349.

C. Nardi

III. Archaeology. Religious building in Crete underwent particular development in the early Byzantine period, at least up to the Arab invasion (it was reconquered by the Byzantines only in 961), reaching its greatest heights in the 6th c. In general the prevalent type is the three-aisled basilica, like that of Syias in the W of the island, which is preceded by a narthex, with ample remains of geometrical pavement mosaics (except for two squares with animals near the altar) in the nave and narthex (see A. Orlandos, *La basilica paleocristiana di Syias* [in Greek], 337-359). The Christian basilica of Knossos (appointment of a bishop to this see is attested in ca. 170), near an older cemetery, is of the same type, also with geometrical pavement mosaics (see W.H.C. Frend, *The Byzantine Church at Knossos*, 186-238). Also three-aisled is the "early Christian" building in whose nave the small church dedicated to St. Nicetas was installed in the middle Byzantine period; the original building had geometrical pavement mosaics, of which scant fragments remain, and marble capitals decorated with crosses (see K. Lassithiotakè, *Chiese di Creta* [in Greek], 95-177, esp. 118-119). The basilica of Elounda has three aisles with remains of pavement mosaic: in this building are the remains of a marble ambo with Greek inscription (see BCH 100 [1976] 728).

Recent finds include the discovery by the Italian team of two superimposed basilicas at Gortyna (the earlier one destroyed by an earthquake ca. 620), of which columns and capitals remain in situ (see BCH 104 [1980] 676), and the five-aisled basilica of Almyris Apokoronou at the foot of the hill of Phoinikia, excavated in 1973, with remains of pavement mosaics in the nave: of particular interest is the insertion into the large mosaic carpet of two squares with a large cross with the letters *alpha* and *omega* beside its shaft, an unusual motif in pavement mosaics, esp. after *Theodosius II's decree of ca. 427 forbidding representation of the cross on floors (see AD 1973-74 [1980], *Chronika*, 941-943, see bibl.). In addition to basilica-plan churches (the most common type on the island), the Church of St. George at Episkopi is an interesting central-plan building, part of a group that includes a baptistery from which comes a monolithic baptismal font similar to those outside Istanbul Arch. Mus.: by comparing it with Syrian central-plan churches, e.g., those of Ezra and Bostra (to me an unconvincing comparison), it has been dated to the 6th c. (see K. Lassithiotakè, *Chiese di Creta*, 203-208). The most important early Byzantine building is undoubtedly St. Titus at Gortyna, which attests the adequacy of the local workmen to metropolitan, in this case Constantinopolitan, traditions. Here, following a "fashion" attested in the 6th c., esp. in the period from *Justinian to *Justin II, two apses were added on to the side of the basilica-plan building: analogous cases are the Church of the Nativity at *Bethlehem and the cathedral of Dvin in *Armenia (apses added in the time of Justinian) and the Church of the Blachernae at *Constantinople (apses added under Justin II). The Church of St. Titus is also part of the limited group of peculiar late-6th- and early-7th-c. church buildings, such as, in Greece, basilica B of *Philippi and the *Katapoliani* of Paros, whose model was Hagia Sophia at Constantinople, though the metropolitan idea was filtered, distorted and simplified by local workmen.

In general see the following journals: *Kretika Chronika*, *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique* e l'*Archaiologikon Deltion*. In particular: A. Orlandos, *La basilica paleocristiana di Syias* (in Greek): KretikaChr 7 (1953) 337-359; A. Ferrua, *Le iscrizioni cristiane di Creta*: RivAC 30 (1954) 137-142; W.H.C. Frend, *The Byzantine Basilica Church at Knossos*: ABSA 57 (1962) 186-238, cf. SP V (= TU 80) (1962) 34-39; G. Rizza - V. Santa Maria Scrinari, *Il santuario sull'acropoli di Gortyna*, Rome 1968, esp. 68-96; K. Lassithiotakè, *Chiese di Creta* (in Greek): KretikaChr 21 (1969) 203-208; 23 (1971) 95-177; AD 29 (1973-1974); 35 (1980) 908-912; 941-943; BCH 100 (1976) 728; BCH 104 (1980) 676; BCH 105 (1981) 873ff.; EAA² 4,606-608; I.F. Sanders, *Roman Crete*, Warminster 1982; RBK 5,811-1174; N. Poulou-Papadimitriou, *Le monastère byzantin de Pseira-Crète: La céramique*, in *Akten des XII Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, II, Mün-

ster 1995, 119-131; LTK³ 6,439-440; S.A. Curuni, *Creta bizantina*, Quaderni di architettura 1, Rome 1987; G.W.M. Harrison, *The Romans and Crete*, Amsterdam 1993; R. Farioli Campanati, *I mosaici pavimentali della basilica di Mitropolis a Gortyna nell'ambito della produzione musiva di Creta*, in *La mosaïque grécoromaine.* 8, *Actes du VIII^e colloque international pour l'étude de la mosaïque antique et médiévale*, vol. I, Lausanne 2001, 261-265; D. Michaelides, *Some Characteristic Traits of a Mosaic Workshop in Early Christian Cyprus*, ibid., 314-325; C. Tsigonaki, *La sculpture architecturale en Crète à l'époque proto-byzantine (IV^e-VII^e siècle)*, Université Panthéon-Sorbonne (Paris) 2002.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

CRIMEN laesae romanae religionis. In *Roman law the term *crimen,* in the strict sense, meant a crime of particular gravity, publicly punished after a public accusation. Specifically, *crimen laesae romanae religionis* was a transgression against Roman religion, its beliefs and customs. For Christians this *crimen,* which usually consisted in the refusal to publicly recognize and practice the traditional religion—identified with the official religion of the *civitas*—was considered intolerable sacrilege and went together with the accusation against them of atheism. Numerous attestations are found in 2nd- and 3rd-c. apologetic writings: see, e.g., *Justin, *I Apol.* 4,7ff.; 6,1; *Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 3, 1; 4, 1ff. *Tertullian devotes particular attention to this accusation (*Apolog.* 10,1–28,1).

Brasiello: Novissimo Digesto Italiano 5, 1960, 1ff.; F. Raber, KLP 2, 1964, 1334-1335; B. Santalucia, *Diritto e processo penale nell'antica Roma*, Rome 1989; V. Giuffré, *La repressione criminale nell'esperienza Romana*, Padua ³1993.

P. Siniscalco

CRIMEN maiestatis imminutae. Crime against the greatness and sovereignty of the Roman people, personified in the first centuries by the emperor. Christians thus incurred *crimen maiestatis,* provided for by an apposite law (*lex de maiestate*), when they refused to swear by the *genium Caesaris* or to take part in the *sollemnia Caesaris*. The accusation was often paired with that of *crimen religionis: Deos . . . non colitis et pro imperatoribus sacrificia non penditis* (Tertull., *Apolog.* 10, 1; see also 28, 2ff.). We can read many examples of it in the acts and passions of the martyrs. See, e.g., *Mart. Polycarpi* 9,2; 10,1; *Acta Scilitanorum* 3.

C. Callewaert, *Les premiers chrétiens et l'accusation de lèse-majesté*: RevQuHist 76 (1904) 5-28; B. Santalucia, *Diritto e processo penale nell'antica Roma*, Rome 1989; V. Giuffré, *La repressione criminale nell'esperienza Romana*, Padua ³1993.

P. Siniscalco

CRISPINA (d. 304). A native of Tagora (Taoura, Algeria), suffered *martyrdom at *Tebessa (where remains of the martyrium and basilica in her honor survive), 5 December 304. She is mentioned in *Cal. carth.* and *Mart. hier.* We have her *Passion,* which cites part of the court proceedings that pronounced her condemnation (BHL 1989). *Augustine, who eulogized her more than once (*En. in Ps.* 120, 137; *Serm.* 286, 354; *De s. virginitate* 44), knew a more precise version of it. Crispina appears in the procession of martyrs in S. Apollinare Nuovo, *Ravenna.

DACL 15, 2002-2004: *Vie des SS.* 12, 162-168: BS 4, 309-311; V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 133-136; J.L. Maier, *Le dossier du Donatisme.* v. I: *Dès origines à la mort de Costance II (303-361)*, Texte und Untersuchungen 134, Berlin 1987, 105-112; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, I, 127-128; II, 693-695; F.E. Consolino, *La donna negli Acta martyrum*, in *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, ed. U. Mattioli, Genoa 1992, 95-117; J. Fontaine, *Littérature narrative sur le martyre et l'ascèse, de 280 à 370 aprés J.C.*, in *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, V: *Restauration et renouveau. La littérature latine de 284 à 347 après J.C.*, ed. R. Herzog, Turnhout 1993, 583-584; V. Saxer, *Afrique latine*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident dès origines à 1550*, ed. G. Philippart (CC. Hagiographies I), Turnhout 1994, 60-64; LTK³ 2, 1347; K. Rosen, *Passio sanctae Crispinae*: JbAC 40 (1997) 106-125; F. Scorza Barcellona, *L'agiografia donatista*, in M. Marin - C. Moreschini (eds.), *Africa cristiana. Storia, Religione, letteratura*, Brescia 2002, 138-140.

V. Saxer

CRISPINUS and CRISPINIANUS, martyrs. The Auxerre recension of *Mart. hier.* records Crispinus and Crispinianus on 25 October. Natives of Soissons in *Gaul, there was a basilica in their honor there (Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 5,34; 9,9). But a legendary *Passion* of the Riciovar cycle, perhaps from the 8th c., says that the two holy brothers were Roman shoemakers who suffered *martyrdom at Soissons under *Diocletian; by their torture and death, inflicted on them by the judge Riciovar, they witness to eternal life. The itinerary in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* (12th c.) puts their tomb in the basilica of SS. Giovanni e Paolo on the Caelian hill at *Rome (also BHL 1989d), the *Mart. rom.* at S. Lorenzo in Panisperna. It is clear from the chronology of their cult that they cannot have been of Roman origin or buried at Rome; their cult must have been imported to Rome as part of the Franco-Roman cultural exchanges of the Carolingian era. Through a play on words (Crispinus/Crispinianus, κρηπίς/*crepida*), they became shoemakers who served the poor free of charge.

BHL 1990-1994; AB 102 (1984) 178; BS 4, 313-318; LCI 6, 3-7; M.I. Allen, *The Metrical Passio Sanctorum Crispini et Crispiniani of Henry of Avranches*: AB 108 (1990) 357-386.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

CRITICAL EDITION. Ancient and *patristic texts, with few exceptions (e.g., epigraphical texts and some works on papyrus), have been passed down to us not in the original but through later manuscript copies, some even many centuries distant from the original. Since, through the entire time of transmission until a printed version, every work has undergone an inevitable process of progressive evolution or corruption, the purpose of a critical edition is to restore the original text to the degree possible, accompanied by an apparatus of documentation (critical apparatus). In the first two centuries of the age of the printing press, editors had scant or no knowledge of the historical process of the manuscript transmission of the ancient work they were about to print. More often than not the first editions (*editiones principes*) were based on a single manuscript, whose text was emended based on subjective criteria (*ope ingenii*). The 18th c. began to see an awareness of the importance of the systematic study of the manuscript tradition. Later, the recognition that a text's tradition proceeded genealogically, from one manuscript to another, and that the main factors that caused it to deteriorate during its transmission were recurrent and classifiable, allowed 19th-c. philologists to elaborate a scientific method of critical edition (K. Lachmann's method), which has two main stages: the *recensio codicum* and the *constitutio textus*. *Recensio* refers to the tracking down of all the manuscripts and also of indirect testimonies to the work, their historical, codicological and paleographical study, their collation, and the definition of their relations of dependence: the results of this work are represented in a *stemma codicum* (genealogical tree of the tradition), which gives information useful or even decisive for the choice of *lectiones*. When the manuscript tradition has been contaminated, the construction of the tree may not be possible. It is usually easier to reconstruct the path of the tradition of patristic-era works than that of ancient works, since we rarely have direct and certain evidence of the diffusion of the latter in the ancient period. For patristic works the archetype (the reconstructable manuscript, from which the entire known or knowable tradition has descended) is often a codex near to the original, or even the codex of the original edition, whereas for ancient works, when they exist, it is usually a codex from the period between the 5th and 8th c.

The second phase of the editorial work is the *constitutio textus,* the point at which the editor, judging the authenticity of the various *lectiones*, performs the *selectio,* or perhaps the *emendatio,* if the entire tradition is corrupted. The results of the *recensio* and the criteria that preside over the constitution of the text are described in the *praefatio* of the edition. The traditional rule, according to which the *praefatio* must be written in Latin, is today often ignored. The manuscripts used for the edition are listed in a *conspectus siglorum*. These characters (letters of the Latin alphabet for preserved codices, Greek letters for reconstructable lost MSS) serve to synthetically compile the *apparatus criticus,* where the *variae lectiones* which the editor did not approve are recorded, and the conjectures of the editor himself or of other scholars or past editors are indicated. The *apparatus fontium* contains internal references and parallel passages with works of the same or different authors, and the identification of citations, allusions and sources. A conventional system of diacritical signs highlights particular accidents that have happened to the text: omissions, interpolations, lacunae, irreparable corruptions. Texts passed down by a single witness (inscriptions, papyri, palimpsests) are usually published in a diplomatic edition. When there are various original redactions, it is possible and useful to publish them in parallel. Specific models have been worked out for the publication of fragments. Often the edition is provided with a specialized bibliography. It is considered important, and even more so before the recent advances in technology, that the critical edition be provided with good indexes.

P. Maas, *Textkritik*, Leipzig 1927; G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence [2]1952; H. Fränkel, *Testo critico e critica del testo*, Florence 1969; M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*, Stuttgart 1973; S. Timpanaro, *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*, Padua 1981; *Seminario Discipline umanistiche e informatica: il problema dell'integrazione* (*Roma, 8 ottobre 1991*), ed. T. Orlandi. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome 1993.

F. Gori

CROSS – CRUCIFIX. In pre-Christian antiquity the cross was a widespread symbol of life and hence of divinity. Its different forms were later developed in Christianity as well (ansate or Egyptian cross, ♀; St. Anthony's or Greek cross, T; immissa, capitate, open or Latin cross †; in the form of an X [*chi*]; gammadion or hooked cross, Γ; and the swastika or tetragammadion, symbol of rotary movement and so of everlasting life). The monogrammatic cross

was much developed by the Christians (in *Ep. Barn.* 9,8, we find *Iesus shortened to* IH) in the composite forms ⚹ (*chi iota*), ☧ (*chi rho*) and the cruciform monogram ⳩. In the *gnostic movement, it indicated the separation and simultaneous conjunction of the pleromatic and sensible worlds.

*Patristic literature and the evidence of *archaeology have their own point of reference on the cross, the feast of the *inventio crucis,* which arose out of the dedication of the Constantinian basilicas of the Holy Sepulchre and Calvary in 325. From that point the cult of the cross developed, giving rise to a whole identifiable *homiletic and *iconographic series. Before that date, the cross in the *Hellenistic-Roman world was simply a *servile supplicium,* and it appears as such in the NT. As for Christian evidence, if we except some elements in *Ignatius of Antioch (*Ad Eph.* 9,1 and 18,1; *Ad Trall.* 11,2; *Ad Philad.* 8,2), it is absent from the Apostolic Fathers and has a secondary place in the *Apologists. In *Justin, it is mentioned in connection with the *anima mundi,* of Platonic-Stoic extraction, graphically represented by an X (*chi*) (*Apol* 1, 60, 1 and 5); and with the *testimonia ligni* of the OT, in polemic against Judaism (*Dial.* 86). Particular attention was given to the cross by Christian circles in *Asia Minor, *Jewish Christians who celebrated *Easter according to the *quartodeciman tradition. In that context the cross was not the lowly wood of execution but the cross of life: it was the Lord himself signified as "Life suspended." The quartodeciman communities, celebrating Easter not in the Synoptic tradition of the Last Supper but in the Johannine tradition of the Lord's death, understood the passion as the fulfillment of the Jewish Passover (the true paschal lamb is Christ sacrificed on the cross) and so as victory over death. So, in their Easter homilies we have the encomium of the cross as encomium of the Pasch, light and life (giving rise to the interlaced monogram φως-ζωη), spread through the whole universe; for this reason Passion Friday (14 Nisan) was not a day of mourning, but "fasting absolutely had to end" on that day (Euseb., *HE* V, 23, 1). After the disappearance of the quartodeciman tradition of Easter (the Asians conformed to the Roman *mos* of celebrating it on the Sunday after the Spring equinox), the understanding of the cross as light and life gave way to other considerations: theological (*soteriology, reconciliation, *sacraments issuing from the cross), *ascetic (acceptance of suffering and perseverance), *liturgical (the tendency of poems *de veneranda cruce* and the *sermo de adoratione pretiosae crucis*). Then the *inventio crucis* led to the treatment of the cross as *signum victoriae,* the *crux invicta* so common in ancient *iconography, no longer related to the crucifixion but to the Lord's glorious *parousia (jeweled cross). The terminology of the cross, quartodeciman in context, received special treatment in its application to *ecclesiology. Also important in antiquity was the *signum crucis,* used before any action (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 13,36) and raised to having a ritual value of sacramental efficacy (Aug., *In Io. ev. tr.* 118,5) and as a sign of belonging to Christianity. (They became a Christian when, upon admission to the *audientes catechumens,* they were signed on the forehead with a cross.)

The oldest monument with a Christian cross is held to be the Palmyra inscription (136); then those of *Dura Europos and Medula in *Syria (232 and 197–198). In Western Christian *cemeteries, no pre-Constantinian cross has been dated; the inscription of St. Rufina at S. Callisto in *Rome is dated no later than the end of the 2nd c. After the finding of the cross at *Jerusalem, it appeared on *sarcophagi as the *crux invicta* (Wilpert, *Sarcofagi*, pl. 142,3 and 146,3) which, in iconography, assumed the connotations of a symbol or trophy (*tropaion*) of victory, whether carried like the Roman *labarum* or substituted for, e.g., the sepulcher (as *anastasis*), as it appears in post-Constantinian "passion" *sarcophagi. It is the *Christus victor* with a cross-headed scepter who celebrates his victory over death (Barberini diptych, Louvre, first half of the 6th c.) or appears, dressed as emperor, with the enthroned cross in the center (ivory, Musée des Beaux Arts, Lyons, also 6th c.); and *Christus cosmocrator* who is surrounded by nature participating in his crucifixion.

As for depiction of the crucifixion, apart from the 2nd-c. Palatine graffito (a crucifix with ass's head) it does not appear until the 1st half of the 5th c. The oldest (Christ naked on the cross) so far known is in the British Museum (420–430?); that on the wooden door of S. Sabina (top left panel) must be slightly later. In the East, a dramatic depiction of the crucifixion with Christ on the cross wearing a *colobium* developed in the 2nd half of the 6th c.: it appears in its mature phase in the gospels of *Rabbula (586). A similar but more symbolic type, very common in later Christian art, is that of the *ampullae* of Monza and Bobbio. The first cemeterial example of the depiction of the crucifixion is in the cemetery of S. Valentino (7th c.).

A separate mention is required by the golden crosslet obtained by the technique of beating out a thin gold leaf placed in contact with a mold of metal, ivory or hardwood, with the decorative motif in relief. Though having the form of a cross, varying from Latin to Greek with arms more or less ex-

tended, the ornamentation reproduced on its surface did not necessarily contain elements proper to Christian culture; indeed, we frequently find animal interlacing, typical Mediterranean and "*Byzantine" motifs; sometimes the human face, rarely the whole human body, reproductions of coins, simple punched motifs and, finally, Christian figurative motifs such as christograms, crosses, eagle, dove, deer etc. The use of the golden crosslet is connected with the *funeral rite of inhumation, since it was sewn, as the holes in the corners of the arms attest, onto the funeral veil put over the face of the deceased, whose high social rank it also denotes.

J. Gretser, *De cruce Christi*, 3 vols., Regensburg 1734; O. Zöckler, *Das Kreuz Christi*, Gütersloh 1875; *Croix et Crucifix*: DACL 3, 3045-3139 (Paris 1914); M. Sulzeberger, *Le symbole de la Croix et les Monogrammes de Jésus chez les premiers chrétiens*: Byzantion 2 (1925) 337-448; G. de Jerphanion, *La représentation de la Croix et du Crucifix aux origines de l'art chrétien*, in *La voix des monuments*, Paris 1930, 138-164; G. Guala Campiello, *Il valore della croce prima e dopo Gesù Cristo. Studio storico-religioso dalle origini al V secolo*, Rome 1930; H. Rondet, *La croix sur le front*: RSR 42 (1954) 388-394; A. Grillmeier, *Der Logos am Kreuz*, Munich 1956; F.J. Dölger, JbAC 1958-1963; H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche*, Salzburg 1964, 239-564 (*antenna crucis*) (It. tr. Alba 1971); G.Q. Reijners, *Tbe Terminology of the Holy Cross in Early Christian Literature*, Nijmegen 1965; P. Stockmeier, *Theologie und Kult des Kreuzes bei Johannes Chrysostomus*, Trier 1966; E. Dinkler, *Signum crucis*, Tübingen 1967; B. Leoni, *La croce e il suo segno. Venerazione del segno e culto della reliquia nella antichità cristiana*, Verona 1968; V. Grossi, *La Pasqua quartodecimana e il significato della croce nel II secolo*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 557-571; P. Yousif, *Le symbolisme de la croix dans la nature chez s. Ephrem de Nisibe*, Symposium Syriacum (OCA 205), Rome 1978, 207-227; H.J. Klimmert, *Das Kreuzessymbol in der zentralasiatischen Religionsbegegnung*: Zeitschrift f. Relig. u. Geistesgeschichte 31 (1979) 99-115; P. Testini, *Arte mitriaca e arte cristiana, Mysteria Mithrae*, Rome 1979, 429-457, in particular 443-454; S. Heid, *Kreuz, Jerusalem, Kosmos*, Aschendorf 2001.

V. Grossi

CROWN

I. Symbology and terminology - II. Iconography.

I. Symbology and terminology. The oldest Jewish literature speaks of the crown, initially probably in connection with the feast of tabernacles as a sign of dominion and power, then used in symbolic language about the Messiah: the crown symbolized the future earthly messianic kingdom and its glory. In Jewish *apocalyptic literature the crown is not used in reference to the messianic kingdom but as a religious symbol of participation in the *eschatological kingdom and its glory: the crown is granted to the just as a reward. In contrast, in *Hellenistic culture the crown (στέφανος) was a prize that exalted the earthly glory obtained through victory in battle or in an athletic contest. At Olympia, victors received a crown of olive branches as sign of triumph; the crown at Delphi was interwoven with laurel leaves; at Nemea, with celery leaves, and on the Isthmus, initially with pine leaves and later with fresh celery. Later, the Roman army rewarded its victorious heroes with the glory of the laurel wreath.

The Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman period was influenced by this competitive notion of the crown. *Philo of Alexandria prized virtue as a "holy" crown (*Agriculture* 112-119), since it is a "crown which is the vision of God" (*Praem. et poen.* 27). The fourth book of Maccabees applies agonistic terminology to *martyrdom: "The fear of God crowned his athletes," since "the prize was incorruptibility" (4 Macc 17:11-15). The Pauline epistles take up this Judeo-Hellenistic idea of the crown: "Do you not know that in the races at the stadium, all run, but only one wins the prize? So, you also, run so as to win! But every athlete is temperate in everything; they do this to obtain a corruptible crown, but we, an incorruptible one" (1 Cor 9:24-25). "In the athletic contests, one is not crowned who has not fought according to the rules" (2 Tim 2:5). "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my race, I have preserved my faith. Now all that remains for me is the crown of justice that the Lord, the just judge, will give me on that day" (2 Tim 4:7-8). The fight to keep one's faith is rewarded by the Lord. Like 2 Timothy, the Apocalypse presents the virtue of faithfulness as a prerequisite for being crowned: "Be faithful unto death, and I will give you the crown of life" (Rev 2:10). Likewise: "You will receive the crown of glory that does not fade" (1 Pet 5:4).

The Hellenistic Jewish and NT texts show clearly how the crowning after an athletic contest inspired metaphors applied to the spiritual victory of virtue (justice, faithfulness), leading to eternal life. This also explains the passage from the earthly crown of athletic and military victory to the crown of the martyrs, soldiers of Christ. Three reasons contributed to this transformation. The first and most important was rooted in the symbolic strength of the crown: as a symbol of victory in the *persecutions, the crown was apt for characterizing what Christians considered the highest victory, i.e., death by martyrdom; indeed, *Tertullian says explicitly: "Persecution can be seen as a battle" (*De fuga* 1,5). The second reason was that the crown of victory is simultaneously the prize of eternal glory and, in this sense, a direct analogy with the Jewish idea of victory. The third reason, somewhat external, was the concrete circumstance that many Christians suf-

fered martyrdom precisely on a field of contest (circus, amphitheater etc.). The crown of martyrdom symbolized the highest Christian victory and expressed the heavenly prize granted to the martyr immediately upon death. As such, this crown is a sign of heavenly glory and is opposed to human fame; the dual function of the crown—sign of victory and expression of reward—refers to a double meaning, earthly and transcendent.

In the *Martyrdom of *Polycarp,* the "crown of incorruptibility" (*Mart. Pol.* 19,2) symbolizes not so much the earthly victory of the martyr as the heavenly prize. In contrast, twenty years later the *Martyrdom of the Martyrs of Vienne and Lyons* stresses the earthly victory of the martyrial struggle. Thus, already at the beginnings of Christian martyrial literature (2nd c.), the two aspects of the *corona martyrum* were appreciated, though they quickly developed in very distinct ways.

Tertullian also holds fast to the NT images of the crown, indicating by it the heavenly prize in particular. Only on one occasion does Tertullian clearly allude to the earthly dimension of the martyrial victory, when he calls the martyrs "crowned" (*De scorp.* 6,2). A few years later, in *Hippolytus's *Commentary on Daniel,* the term στέφανος acquires a new value, expressing in particular the earthly victory of the martyr and his good reputation (*Comm. in Dan.* 2,22,2; 2,35,4); Hippolytus does show, however, that he knows the traditional meaning of crowning as heavenly prize (*Comm. in Dan.* 3,38,5). Around 250 the **Didascalia Apostolorum* presents the martyrial crown as mainly earthly glory: the martyr, his head adorned with the crown of victory, rises from this world and ascends to heaven (*Didascalia* 19-20).

From the 2nd half of the 3rd c., martyrdom itself was considered a crown of victory and a sign of glory which, by God's grace and action, adorns the martyr forever. The works of *Cyprian of Carthage show this, at a time when the pressure of persecution was strong. Cyprian's martyrial theology thus shows in Latin the same development found in Hippolytus and in the *Didascalia:* "The soldier of Christ, instructed in his commands and in his teaching, does not fear the battle, but is ready to receive the crown" (Cyprian, *Ep.* 58,11). One notes this same evolution in the *Passiones* and the *Legendae martyrum*. In Latin the words *corona* and *coronari* are increasingly enriched with a significance of earthly glory, and become a technical term. We see this same symbolic evolution in Greek as well. *Eusebius of Caesarea, an expert in Hellenistic culture, has recourse to the image of the crown in competitive contexts, mainly to designate the martyr's victory; nonetheless, this meaning of earthly glory is found only in the noun στέφανος, while the verb στεφανοῦσθαι, "to be crowned," keeps it meaning of the prize of eternal life and can be equated with τελειοῦσθαι, "to become perfect," in such a way that this latter verb acquires a martyrial connotation (see Eusebius, *Mart. Nicephori* 9).

This martyrial symbology persists in 4th- and 5th-c. patristic literature. It is enough to listen to any homily of *Augustine or *John Chrysostom on the feast of a martyr to note that a crown of victory awaits martyrs. In later works, the martyrial symbology of the crown is sometimes applied to the church, which is crowned with the glory of the martyrs: "The church grew with the persecutions, it was crowned with the martyrs" (Jerome, *Ep.* 82, 10).

II. Iconography. Early Christian art iconographically shaped the conception of a "crown of glory" along the same lines as martyrial literature. In Christian *iconography the crown is the exclusive symbol of victory. Sometimes Christ alone, sometimes the martyrs are represented with a crown of glory on their heads. Considering that in the period before the peace of *Constantine (313) the martyrs were depicted without symbols of glory, we must maintain that during the first three centuries the crown was not used in Christian art, despite the fact that the literature of this period made frequent reference to it. This reserve is explained by the fact that the crown still had a strong connection with *pagan ceremonies and *sacrifices. The crown of Christian martyrs, on the other hand, "does not fade" (1 Pet 5:4), since they have chosen the crown of heavenly glory rather than that of human fame: Cyprian, e.g., speaks of the martyrs who, as Christians, bear a sign engraved on their foreheads from *baptism and, because of it, cannot wear a diabolical crown on their heads: "A forehead, sealed with the sign of God, cannot be encircled by the crown of the devil; it is destined for the Lord's crown" (*De lapsis* 2). This antithesis explains why the early Christians refused to represent the exclusively spiritual idea of glory with a crown of laurels, which, moreover, was an expression of *idolatry.

Only once the persecutions ended and the opposition between profane crown and heavenly crown ceased did the crown begin to occupy a preeminent place in Christian art, from the 4th c. on. After the *Edict of Milan (313), the crown ceased to be a symbol of pagan worship and was used in Christian monuments. This was the result of a gradual process. Before AD 350 martyrs and the apostles were represented with crowns on their heads, but

especially between 350–400 this depiction became more frequent. Sometimes Christ himself crowns them, sometimes the hand of God. Often they are depicted in procession, offering their crowns to Christ or encircling the trophy of the *cross, in praise. Such representations continue after 400, reaching their monumental perfection in the churches of Santa Pudenziana, SS. Cosma e Damiano and San Vitale. Not just in basilicas but also in baptisteries the *apostles appear offering their crowns to Christ. Except when depicted on medallions, wearers of crowns are always depicted in some kind of action, since the crown was a rich symbol of vitality. From 400, crowns acquired the character of a sign or attribute of the martyr himself and lost much of the rich significance they had in the 4th c. An important circumstance is the fact that the martyrs never wear the crown on their heads or on their shoulders; rather, the crowns are placed in their hands or near their heads, or it is Christ, or the Father, who places it on their heads; the same iconography recurs in the case of Christ himself. This peculiarity is explained by the fact that for Christians the significance of the crown of martyrdom was symbolic, not functional, whereas for pagans it was both functional and symbolic; for Christians the crown had the spiritual meaning of glory—*corona vitae aeternae*—and therefore iconographical depictions of the crowned martyrs had to avoid suggestions of idolatry.

K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum*, Bonn 1940; A.I. Vermeulen, *The Semantic Development of Gloria in Early-Christian Latin*, Nijmegen 1956, 91-108; A.J. Brekelmans, *Martyrkranz. Eine symbolgeschichtliche Untersuchung im frühchristlichen Schrifttum*, Rome 1965.

A. Viciano

CRYPTOGRAPHY. Cryptography, from the Greek words κρύπτειν ('to hide') and γραφή ('writing'), is when a writer contrives to conceal in a text certain thoughts and words to which he attaches particular importance. His motive may be the practical one of hiding those thoughts from the uninitiated, but it may also assume an ideal aspect: the pure pleasure of rendering mysterious a concept expressed through seemingly insignificant letters. Cryptography is closely related to the letter game which purposefully combined—though at first sight in a disorganized manner—the letters of the alphabet. This letter game, already attested from the 3rd millennium BC and later widely practiced in the Egyptian and Greek worlds—in particular during the *Hellenistic period—was quickly put to use for religious ends and played a decisive role in the creation of cryptography. Drawing for the most part on the symbolic-literal repertoire already widely used by the *pagans (e.g., the famous palindrome *rotas opera tenet arepo sator*), the Christians—also tying into *gnostic philosophical-religious currents—produced properly cryptographic documents, attested mainly through epigraphical evidence. As has been well shown—especially through the research of Margherita Guarducci—even the very earliest Christian literary sources decisively document the widespread use of cryptography (famous, e.g., were the *carmina figurata* of the African Publius Optatian Porphyry, who lived in *Constantine's time). A great contribution to the knowledge of symbolic letters and of the use of mystical cryptography resulted from Guarducci's deciphering, in 1953–1958, of the many Christian graffiti incised between 290–320 on the so-called wall G, near the tomb of the *apostle *Peter under the papal altar of the Vatican basilica. These were mainly the names of deceased persons and devout invocations, in which the letters of the inscribed graffiti were ingeniously "elaborated" in a way that introduced and displayed the main concepts of the faith. It has thus been possible to understand, from the precise deciphering of the *epigraphs, that the early Christian faithful attributed a special value not only to the letter *T* (for its obvious similarity to a cross, thus a symbol of salvation) and to the *apocalyptic formula AΩ (applied to Christ-God as the beginning and end of all things, or in a congratulatory sense to the passage from death to the beginning of eternal life), but other letters were also incised, assuming an apparently hidden symbolic value. The letter *N* (in the Greek sense of victory), e.g., or the letters *R* (*resurrectio*), *S* (*salus*) or *V* (*vita*) could thus conceal within a name or a word which contained it (or also graffiti not comprised of whole words) a much deeper meaning than what one would have been led to expect. The evalution of cryptographic epigraphical documents in a religious context is nonetheless a very delicate work requiring much attention and considerable critical sense.

M. Guarducci, *I graffiti sotto la Confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano*, I-III, Vatican City 1958; Id., *La crittografia mistica e i graffiti vaticani*: ArchClass 13 (1961) 183-239; Id., *Dal gioco letterale alla crittografia mistica*, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.16.2, Berlin - New York 1978, 1736-1773.

M. Ghilardi

CUBICULARIUS. In the Roman world, this term designated the individual attached to the bedroom (*cubiculum*) of persons, normally, of high political

and social rank. Particularly important was the *cubicularius* of the imperial house, who superintended the emperor's personal service and all the domestic staff of his *cubiculum*, constituting in practice the princeps's most trusted bodyguard. (In the late empire, the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* was at the head of this service.) The persons mentioned in the Christian inscriptions (ICUR I, 1461; II, 6109; Diehl 226) must have been *cubicularii* of the imperial court or of some noble family.

The duties of the *cubicularius* attached to the person of the pope cannot have been much different from those of the imperial *cubicularius.* We do not know when this service was instituted; only that the *ministerium cubiculi pontificalis* was held by laymen until the time of *Gregory the Great (590–604), who replaced them with clerics or monks so that these could profit by contact with the pontiff's private life (Greg. Gt., MGH Ep. I, 363). In *Ordo Romanus* I (nn. 23, 33), it is the *cubicularii* who carry the pontifical ornaments and the chair on which the pope will sit into the sacristy of the stational church. The *custodes qui dicuntur cubicularii* had a totally different function: they were instituted—as we know from the **Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne LP I, 239)—by *Leo the Great (440–461) to be in charge of the apostolic tombs (*super sepulcra apostolorum*). These persons, chosen *ex clero romano* and comparable to the *mansionarii,* who looked after and maintained venerated tombs (near which they often lived), are frequently attested by *epigraphy, partly referring to the *cubicularii* of the two apostolic basilicas of Ostiense and the Vatican (ICUR I, 2043; II, 4852, 4865, 5088, 5179, 5180, 5725; CIL VI, 9315), partly relating to *tituli urbani* and other, extraurban, martyrial basilicas, to which this service had evidently been extended (ICUR VII, 17865, 27470). Two mosaic inscriptions at Grado mention *cubicularii* whose precise function is hard to establish (guards of relics, employees of some noble family or of the civil administration?).

G.B. De Rossi, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana*, III, Rome 1877, 531; Duchesne LP, 153, note 2, 239, 241, note 14; L. Cesano, s.v. *cubicularius*: Diz. Ep. Ant. Rom. II (1910), cols. 1280-1292; Ph. Lauer, *Le Palais de Latran. Étude historique et archéologique*, Paris 1911, 75; DACL III, col. 3166; M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut Moyen Âge*, II, Louvain 1948, 40; M.A. Cavallaro, *Intorno ai rapporti tra cariche statali e cariche ecclesiastiche nel basso impero. Note storico-epigrafiche sul cubiculariato*: Athenaeum 50 (1972) 158-175; J.-P. Caillet, *L'évergétisme monumental chrétien en Italie et à ses marges d'après l'épigraphie des pavements de mosaïque* (*IV^e-VII^e s.*), Rome 1993, 216-217, 247; O. Mazzoleni, *L'epigrafia della "Venetia et Histria" nel V secolo*, in *Atti del Convegno "Attila Flagellum Dei?,"* Aquileia, September 1990, Rome 1994, 200-201.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

CUMMIAN (d. 662). By his proper name (Cuumian, Cuimíne, Cumméne), variously transcribed (Cuiminus-Cuminus-Cummianus), he is not easily identified. He was perhaps *abbot at Durrow in S *Ireland but also thought to have been the abbot Cummeneus Albus at Iona (this does not seem probable). He could also be identified with Cuimmíne Fota (Cummianus Longus), who died in 661. His name was absorbed into the legendary cycle of Guaire Aidni, which makes him a globe-trotter. He could have been the abbot of Clonfert (ca. 590–662). Some texts can be listed under Cummian's name: the letter addressed to abbot Segienus of Iona and the hermit Beccanus (Beccán), to induce the *Celtic churches to adopt the *Roman date of *Easter (*De controversia paschali*), written ca. 632/633; he insists on church unity regarding the date of the Easter celebration. To him, or to another Cummian (a monk in Ireland who later lived at Bobbio in the 1st half of the 8th c.), is attributed a *Liber poenitentialis* or *Poenitentiale* (*seu Iudicia*) *Cummeani,* in which the author reviews the major vices and their penances. The hymn *Celebra, Iuda*, *in sanctorum apostolorum,* attributed to him, is an evocation in 22 distichs of the names of the *apostles, *evangelists and some other saints. Also attributed to him is a *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Marcum* (CPL 632; BCLL 345) and the *De figuris apostolorum* (BCLL 292).

CPL 1136, 1882, 2310; BCLL 289; *De controversia paschali*: PL 87, 969-978; *Poenitentiale Cummeani*: PL 87, 978-998: PLS, 4, 2039-2051; Hymn *Celebra, Iuda*: PLS, 4, 2051-2052; L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*, Dublin 1963, 108-135 (text and Eng. version); Dreves u. Blume, *Anal. hymnica M. Aevi*, Leipzig, 51 (1908) 308-311; J.F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland I*, New York 1929, n. 73, 93; T. Oakley, *A Great Penitential and Its Authorship*: Romanic Review 25 (1934) 25-33; J.E.L. Oulton, *The Epistle of Cummian "De controversia paschali"*: SP 1 = TU 63 (1957) 128-133; BS IV, 393; D. O Cróinín, *A Seventh-Century Irish Computus from the Circle of Cummianus*: PRIA 82 C (1982) 405-430; W. Walsh - D. O Cróinín (ed. and tr.), *Cummian's Letter De controversia Paschali and the De ratione conputandi* (Studies and Texts 86), Toronto 1988; Patrologia IV, 457-461; LACL 167-168.

L. Dattrino

CURA SANITATIS TIBERII. *See* *HEALING of TIBERIUS

CURSUS PUBLICUS. The Romans were great builders of roads, which initially had a military purpose but then became an essential tool for the government of the empire, the movement of people and goods, and the spread of news, books and culture. In the republican period there was a private

service of *tabellarii* (*Hemerodromoi*) maintained by important men, also for use by the government. With *Augustus began the *cursus publicus* (*evectio*) for the entire empire, i.e., the imperial service for the transport of public persons and goods (Suetonius, *Aug.* 49,3), thus only for government use. This had no connection with the public postal service or with the movement of private persons but provided the infrastructure for magistrates and personnel who traveled throughout the empire: thousands of *stationes* (or smaller *mansiones*), located at a distance of ca. 12 km (7.5 mi) along the Roman roads, offering horses, mules or other animals, and a carriage. A *diplomata* was required to use it (see Pliny, *Ep.* 10,120), but abuses were frequent; the person's *dignitas* did not matter, only official permission. The *cursus* functioned at the expense of provincials or of allies, who had to provide the *hospitalitas* and the means of transport for magistrates, their officials and for soldiers. Instead of *diplomata* (later called *evectio*), a sum of money (*viaticum*) was paid to cover the cost of transport; the administration and the army sometimes used other modes of transport, but always at provincial expense. From the 3rd c. there was a change: the traveling courts, the fact of multiple emperors, the growth of the bureaucracy, the provisions and centralization of the administration led to a reform, under *Diocletian, consisting in a more speedy *cursus velox*, and a *cursus clavularius* for the transport of goods, increasingly important in the 4th c. The involvement of local communities became more burdensome with the system of *munera*. Now, instead of *tabellarii* (or *frumentarii*), we find messengers and spies (*agentes in rebus, curiosi*); the number of *stationes* (*mansiones, mutationes*) increased everywhere, with the consequent increase in the speed of the *cursus velox*. The *Itinerarium Burdigalense,* the pilgrim who went to *Jerusalem from Bordeaux, gives an idea of the new state of the system.

*Dioscorus wrote to *Augustine from *Carthage, requesting an urgent response: "My brother Zenobius has been appointed director of the imperial chancellery (*magister memoriae*) and sent me, along with the expenses for the trip, the permit to travel using the state services" (*et misit nobis evectionem cum annonis*: Augustine, *Ep.* 117,1). Augustine himself, when he was appointed rhetor in the imperial capital, was proud of the fact that he was granted use of the *cursus publicus* to go to *Milan (*Conf.* 5,23: *impertita etiam evectione publica*). Ancient late-imperial literary, epigraphical and legal sources attest to the care given by authorities to the regulation and upkeep of this service. At first the empire guaranteed the service and authorized specific persons and the transfer of goods and news at the administrations' expense. In the 4th c., however, the *cursus publicus* belonged to the government, who managed it itself. There was no sea transport exclusively for passengers, who had to use cargo ships. The empire also used private commercial transport, by contract (*naulum*).

For the first time bishops had the privilege of use of the *cursus publicus* to go to the Council of *Arles in 314 (letter to Elaphius for the African bishops, through *Numidia, *Mauretania, *Spain: see Maier, *Le dossier*, 156; also for the return, there is mention of some *Donatist bishops for their return to *Africa, Maier 188: in this case by sea, meals included). *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 10,5,23-24) reports Emperor *Constantine's letter to the bishop of *Syracuse, called to the Council of Arles: he could bring with him two persons of lower rank (i.e., *presbyters: Bardy) and three servants (*paidas*); likewise for participation at the Council of *Nicaea of 325 (Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3,6; 4,43). Emperor *Constantius, to encourage participation at the Council of *Rimini, made transportation available, which was refused by many orthodox bishops to defend their independence: the bishops of Illyricum, *Italy and Africa, Spain and *Gaul: *quibus omnibus annonas et cellaria dare imperator praceperat*. The bishops of *Aquitaine, Gaul and *Britain refused because: *indecens visum: repudiatis fiscalibus, propriis sumptibus vivere maluerunt. Tres tantum ex Britannia inopia proprii publico usi sunt, cum oblatum a caeteris collationem respuissent, sanctius putantes fiscum gravare quam singulos* (SC 341,318). Severus praises the attitude of these bishops, poor as they were, and not having other means, made use of the government provision. *Ammianus Marcellinus also criticizes the use of the *cursus publicus: ut catervis antistum iumentis publicis ultro citoque discurrentibus per synodos, quos appellant, dum ritum omnem* [Constantius] *ad suum trahet conatur arbitrium, rei vehiculariae succideret nervos* (21,6,18).

With respect to the nascent phenomena of Christian *pilgrimages, until the start of the 4th c. we observe no differences from the normal means of travel. The *Peregrinatio *Egeriae* allows us to glimpse some changes underway in lodging, at least during the journey itself. The *mansiones* did not have a good reputation, so *clergy were prohibited from staying there; specific structures were thus set up for the assistance of pilgrims and clergy. *Hospitia* arose esp. in cities like *Rome and *Jerusalem that were pilgrimage destinations (*deversoria peregrinorum*). Ecclesiastical contacts also followed the route of the

cursus publicus. After the Council of *Serdica of 343, the acts were circulated in the West to obtain the signatures of the absentees; the list of these is given in the MS of the Archive of Verona: the subscriptions were according to the order in which they were collected, along the usual route followed by the *cursus publicus* (see *Codex Veronensis* LX: letter to the church at Mareotis: Turner, doc. 21; esp. Pietri, *Storia del crist.*, 284). In the "early medieval" period one notes a change: with the progressive withdrawal of civil authorities came an increase in the role of the church and of ecclesiastical and *monastic structures, which almost exclusively replaced the places for rest and hospitality along the road network, even after the drastic reduction in the volume of exchange and movement of persons. The collapse of the empire in the West led also to the decay of the *cursus*, even if some essential structures remained; in the East it lasted longer, as the **Codex Justinianus* attests.

DACL; E.J. Holmberg, *Zur Geschichte der Cursus Publicus*, Uppsala 1913; D. Gorce, *Les voyages, l'hospitalité et le port des lettres dans le monde chrétien des IVe et Ve siècles*, Paris 1925; H.-G. Pflaum, *Essai sur le Cursus publicus sous le haut Empire*, Paris 1940; E. Mohly, *Le port des lettres dans la correspondance de saint Basile*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1973; S. Mitchell, *The Requisitional Transport in the Roman Empire: A New Inscription from Pisidia*: JRS 66 (1976) 106-131; B.M. Levick, *The Government of the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook*, London 1985, 99-115; R. Chevalier, *Voyages et déplacements dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1988; J. Vilella, *Le transport maritime de voyageurs et de correspondance entre l'Espagne et l'extérieur pendant l'Antiquité Tardive*: Pact 27 (1990) 57-62; M.-Y. Perrin, *Ad implendum caritatis ministerium. La place des courriers dans la correspondance de Paulin de Nole*: MEFRA 104 (1992) 1025-1068; E.W. Black, *Cursus Publicus: The Infrastructure of Government in Roman Britain*, Oxford 1995; Ch. Vogler, *Les permis d'utiliser le courrier public dans la législation du Bas-Empire*: RHD 73 (1995) 67ff.; G. Uggeri, *Le stazioni postali romane nella terminologia tardoantica*: Caesarodunum 29 (1995) 137-144; L. Di Paola, *Viaggi, trasporti e istituzioni: studi sul "cursus publicus,"* Messina 1999; A. Kolb, *Transport und Nachrichtentransfer im Römischen Reich*, Berlin 2000; C. Corsi, *Le strutture di servizio del cursus publicus in Italia*, Oxford 2000.

A. Di Berardino

CUTHBERT, saint (*Cuthbertus*, ca. 634–20 March 687). Saint, bishop of *Lindisfarne (Scotland). A native of Northumbria, he entered *monastic life in 651. He was at Melrose, Ripon and Lindisfarne, where he became prior and, in obedience to the decisions of the Council of Whitby, got the Roman Easter (664) adopted. Retired to eremetical life on Farne Island (675), he was sought out by *pilgrims from all of *England. He was elected bishop, first of Hexham then of Lindisfarne, and abbot of the cloister three years before his death. In his last years he worked hard preaching and converting the local people. He is commemorated 20 March as the patron of Anglo-Saxons and of sea-travelers. From 999 his *relics were preserved in the cathedral of Durham, but the sanctuary was destroyed during the Reformation and its contents dispersed: still there today are the reliquary, some pieces of furniture and a *cross. Cuthbert wrote a monastic rule (lost). We have some biographies of Cuthbert: a *Vita Cuthberti* by an anonymous confrere (CPL 1379), and two by *Bede, one in prose (CPL 1380), another older one in verse (CPL 1381). Bede gives considerable attention both to Cuthbert's role as a pastor and to his numerous miracles and visions (Rosenthal), emphasizing his sufferings as a testimony to faith (Foley), along the lines of *Gregory the Great's thought.

Editions: for Bede's *Vita metrica*, W. Jaeger: Palaestra 198 (1935) 58-133; for the *vitae* in prose, B. Colgrave, *Two Lives of St. Cuthbert*, Cambridge - London - New York ²1985; A.I. Jones, *Aelfric's Life of St. Cuthbert*: Parergon n.s. 10 (1992) 35-43; Ch.F. Battiscombe (ed.), *The Relics of St. Cuthbert Studies Collected and Edited*, Oxford 1956. *Studies:* BHL 2019-2021; A Rimoldi: BS 4, 413; A.M. Tommasini: EC 4, 1098-1099; D.W. Rollason: LMA 3, 397; E. Craster, *The Miracles of St. Cuthbert at Farne*: AB 70 (1925) 5-19; C.J. Stranks, *The Life and Death of St. Cuthbert*, London 1964; G. Culkin, *Cuthbert*: P. Manns (ed.), *Die Heiligen in ihrer Zeit*, I, Wiesbaden ²1966, 360-364 = *I Santi. 1: Dagli apostoli al primo Medioevo*, Milan 1988, 330-334; L.E. Stoltz, *The Development of the Legend of St. Cuthbert*, diss. Tucson 1969; E. Temple, *A Note on the University College Life of St. Cuthbert*: BLR 9 (1978) 320-322; J.T. Rosenthal, *Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert Preparatory to the Ecclesiastical History*: CHR 68 (1982) 599-611; G. Bonner - S. Rollason - L. Stancliffe (eds.), *St. Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to A.D. 1200*, Woodbridge 1989, and the essays therein; C. Stevens, *St. Cuthbert: The Lindisfarne Years*: Cistercian Studies Quart. 26 (1991) 25-39; D.P. Kirby, *The Genesis of Cult: Cuthbert of Farne and Ecclesiastical Politics in Northumbria in the Late Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 46 (1995) 383-397; B. Abou-El-Haj, *Saint Cuthbert: The Post-Conquest Appropriation of an Anglo-Saxon Cult*, in P.E. Szarmach (ed.), *Holy Men and Holy Women*, Albany 1996, 177-206; G. Bonner, *Saint Cuthbert—Soul Friend*, in Id. (ed.), *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition*, Aldershot 1996, 23-42; W.T. Foley, *Suffering and Sanctity in Bede's Prose Life of St. Cuthbert*: JTS 50 (1999) 101-116.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

CYPRIAN, poet (4th-5th c.). The hexametric paraphrase of the first 7 books of the OT was first edited between 1852 and 1888 by J.B. Pitra, except for the poem on *Genesis, for which he completed the editions of Morel, Sirmond and Martène. Pitra attributed the poems to *Juvencus on the basis of the *inscriptio* of the two codices and linguistic and metrical affinities. In 1891 R. Peiper published it for the *Corpus Vindobonense* under the title *Cypriani*

Galli Poetae Heptateuchos, thus bringing to an end the age-old problem of its paternity and unity—previous critics had tended to detach the first book (Genesis) from the other six. The best MSS attest the author's name, Cyprian, but do not justify the name *Gallus,* probably derived from the place where the work was written and its linguistic peculiarities. Peiper, rejecting a previous identification of the poet with Cyprian, disciple of *Caesarius of Arles and bishop of Touloun (d. 546), fixed the composition of the *Heptateuchos* between 397 and 450; the work imitates *Claudian and is imitated by *Marius Claudius Victorius, *Aldhelm (7th c.) and *Bede (7th-8th c.). Subsequently Brewer identified Cyprian the poet in all probability with Cyprian the *presbyter, recipient of *Jerome's *Ep.* 140, who lived in N *Italy between 360 and 430.

The poem, in which Cyprian follows, along the lines of Juvencus, a historical-grammatical versification of Scripture without poetic or theological ambitions, is of 5250 verses, divided thus: Gen 1498, Ex 1330, Lev 309, Num 777, Dt 288, Josh 585, Jgs 760. Unlike the other paraphrastic poets, Cyprian makes no use of proems; he disdains digressions or *ornatus*; he is sober and concise in his descriptions (only 72 verses to describe creation and paradise and 6 for the flood); he employs rare expressions and neologisms sparingly; he Latinizes biblical names (e.g., *Noelus, Sethus, Lodus* etc.) and carefully avoids any reference to classical mythology. Despite his frequent prosodic and metrical irregularites, his versification is quite elegant and has some verses of exquisite craftsmanship. He uses Phalaecean hendecasyllables in the versification of the Canticle of Moses, which praises God for the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea (Ex 507-542), that of the Israelites at the well of Beer (Num 557-568) and that of the dying Moses (Dt 152-178). This metrical skill prevents one from attributing to inability the lack of freedom in paraphrase. Rather, we must consider it a deliberate abstention from any form of ornamentation, a sort of "monastic Atticism" (Fontaine).

Cyprian has a wide knowledge of the Christian poets *Prudentius and Paulinus, and of *pagans, esp. Virgil, of whom he uses entire verses and many *clausulae,* sometimes reelaborating them (as, e.g., in Gen 597: *magnificusque senex frigus captabat in umbra,* which recreates *Buc.* 1,51f. *Fortunate senex . . . / . . . frigus captabis opacum*), and whose *colores* he takes up esp. for his descriptions of nature. He uses a pre-Vulgate version of the biblical text, and in some cases goes back directly to the LXX (Gen 234-237 paraphrase, e.g., Gen 6,2, in the LXX text [*angeloi*] and that of the *Vetus* [*angeli*], but not that of the Vulgate [*filii*]). In *exegesis Cyprian gives preference to the literal sense. This preference and his disinterest in *allegorical and theological exegesis may rule out that Cyprian was an ecclesiastic; he may have been a layman and rhetor from a Christian family.

CPL 1423. *Editions:* CSEL 23; PLS 3,1151-1245. *Studies:* Patrologia III, 295-297; J.E.B. Mayor, *The Latin Heptateuch*, London - Cambridge 1899 (philological-linguistic comm.); S. Gamber, *Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au Ve siècle*, Paris 1899; H. Brewer, *Über den Heptateuchdichter Cyprian und die Caena Cypriani*: ZkTh 28 (1904) 92-115; F.E. Robbins, *The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis*, Chicago 1912; DTC 3 (1923) 2470-2472; RAC 3 (1957) 477-481; Ch. Witke, *Numen litterarum, The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great*, Leiden - Cologne 1971, 190-191; A. Longpré, *Traitement de l'élision chez le poète C. G.*: Phoenix 26 (1972) 63-67; Id., *Structure de l'hexamètre de C.G.*: Cahiers EtAn 1 (1972) 75-100; K. Smolak, *Lateinische Umdichtungen des biblischen Schöpfungsberichtes*: SP 12 (1975) 350-60 (= TU 115); J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 246-248; G. Malsbary, *Epic Exegesis and the Use of Vergil in the Early Biblical Poets*: Florilegium 7 (1985) 55-81; K. Pollmann, *Der sogenannte Heptateuchdichter und die "Alethia" des Claudius Marius Victorius. Anmerkungen zur Datierungsfrage und zur Imitationsforschung*: Hermes 120 (1992) 490-501; M.R. Petringa, *I "Sei giorni della creazione" nella parafrasi biblica di Cipriano Poeta. Tecnica compositiva e moduli espressivi*: Sileno 18 (1992) 133-156; Id., *Verg.*, Aen. 6, 520 and *Cypr. Gall.*, Gen. 349: Orpheus 17 (1996) 108-125; D.J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, Arca 31, Leeds 1993, 25-36; A.V. Nazzaro, *Poesia biblica come espressione teologica fra Tardoantico e Altomedioevo*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, Florence 2001, 119-153; M.R. Petringa, *La fortuna del poema dell'*Heptateuchos *tra VII e IX secolo, ibid.*, 511-536.

A.V. Nazzaro

CYPRIAN, presbyter (4th-5th c.). A personal friend and correspondent of *Jerome, whose *Ep.* 140 answers Cyprian's request for a plain, simple explanation of Ps 89[90]. Jerome praises Cyprian as one who meditates on God's law day and night. This letter, written ca. 414, as F. Cavallera prefers (*Saint Jérôme . . .* , t. II,54-55; 164), or 418, when the anti-*Pelagian struggle was still raging, contains a clear statement of the need for *grace to do good works (see chs. 5 and 21). This Cyprian may be the same as *Cyprian the poet.

F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son œuvre*, Louvain - Paris 1922; EC 3, 1685.

S. Zincone

CYPRIAN of Antioch. The old *martyrologies are unaware of any Cyprian, bishop of *Antioch. From the 4th c., stories circulated about him: his *Conver-*

sion, *Confession* and *Passion* belong to the genre of *hagiographical fiction in opposition to *pagan wisdom. The magician who sells his soul to the devil and the girl victorious over her seducer are themes of universal folklore, recurring in *Faust*. The *Confession,* an enlargement of the *Conversion* and the *Passion,* answers the need to finish a story. The fact that this legend was known to *Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 35, 1169-1193), *Prudentius (*Perist.* 13, 21-24), *Eudoxia (PG 103, 537-541) and is found in Greek, *Latin, *Syriac, Arabic, *Coptic, Ethiopic and *Palaeoslavonic can be attributed to the mentality of the times. His cult, in turn, is the fruit of his legend. From *Bede on, Cyprian and *Justina appear in all the martyrologies on 26 September, in the Synaxaria on 2 October. *Rome claimed to possess his *relics.

BHG 452-461; BS 3, 1281-1285; BHL 2047-2054; AASS, Sept. VII, 180-243; T. Zahn, *Cyprien von Antiochien*, Erlangen 1882; H. Delehaye, *Cyprien d'Antioche et Cyprien de Carthage*: AB 39 (1921) 314-332; A.D. Nock, *Cyprian of Antioch*: JTS (1927) 411ff.; A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismegiste*, I, Paris 1944, 37-40; 369-383; II, Paris 1953, 211-218; 251-257; H.M. Jackson, *A Contribution Toward an Edition of the Confession of Cyprian of Antioch. The Secreta Cypriani*: Muséon 101 (1988) 33-41; *Cipriano di Antiochia, Confessione*, ed. S. Fumagalli, Milan 1995; Q. Lampe, *Zur Entstehung der Kyprianoslegende*, in *Vir bonus dicendi peritus, Fest. A. Weische zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1997, 287-289.

A. Di Berardino

CYPRIAN of Carthage (d. 258)
I. Life and works - II. Character and activity - III. Martydom and cult.

According to P. Monceaux, Cyprian was "one of the finest figures of a bishop that the history of Christianity offers" (*Hist. litt. Afr. Chr.* 2, 237). Bishop of *Carthage from 249–258, he died a *martyr during *Valerian's persecution.

I. Life and works. Cyprian's life can be traced only inasmuch as it is reflected in his work. His biography by the deacon *Pontius is not so much a history as a *panegyric. The acts of his martyrdom are the only document that comes close to what actually occurred.

Reconstruction of the years before his episcopate remains hypothetical. But from his letter *Ad Donatum* (ca. 246) we learn not just that his conversion was recent but also the reasons for that conversion. His biographer mentions the role the priest *Caecilian played in it. Also from his first years of adherence to Christianity (246–249) come two works which attest Cyprian's reading: *Quod idola dii non sint,* marginal notes to *Tertullian and *Minucius Felix, and the *Testimonia ad Quirinum,* a *florilegium of biblical citations arranged by subject.

He quickly became a priest but even before then had renounced his inheritance as a landowner. In 249 he was elected bishop of the city, arousing the jealousy of candidates whom his unexpected nomination defeated. His first work as a bishop seems to have been *De habitu virginum,* perhaps written in connection with the episode behind *Ep.* 4. The work is certainly modeled on Tertullian, but as a person of refined sentiments and a pastor speaking with authority. The treatises *De oratione dominica* (250), *De lapsis, De unitate ecclesiae* (early 251) and no doubt *De zelo et livore* (251/252) were published in the sad days of *Decius's persecution, in the climate of disputes and *schisms arising out of the reconciliation of *apostates. While *De oratione dominica* starts from Tertullian's *De oratione,* but in a new *eucharistic and *ecclesiological dimension, *De lapsis* defines the procedures of their reconciliation, in the manner and the terms later formalized by the Councils of *Carthage and *Rome of 251. *De unitate* is the first treatise on the church; in it Cyprian adduces the principles of its unity and sees in the apostolic college the foundation of its structure, established by Christ. Chapter 4 exists in two versions. The oldest, according to general opinion, is that which comes out in favor of the primacy of Rome; the other, taking opposite positions, would be a revision by Cyprian himself at the time of the controversy over *baptism. *De zelo et livore* would preserve the echo of the controversies aroused against him, at the time of the schisms at Carthage, by his unlucky rivals to the episcopate.

The plague of 252, with its train of public calamities, provided the cue for three more treatises: *De mortalitate, De opere et eleemosynis, Ad Demetrianum*. The first is Cyprian's most original work: not merely an exhortation to Christian *Stoicism, it presents a theology of death, seen as God's summons, *accersitio dominica*. Regarding almsgiving, it is not just an urgent necessity in disastrous times like these, but a duty, since in the poor we serve God, and "God comes before our own children." In *Ad Demetrianum* he opposes and resolves the objections that *Augustine would come up against in the *City of God*: present evils are God's punishment, not because of Christianity, but for the crimes and persecutions of the *pagans. While the Christians resolve to "return love instead of hate; for the torments and pains inflicted on us, we show you the way of salvation." *De bono patientiae* depends on Tertullian's *De patientia* more directly than any other of Cyprian's works. Mentioned at the end of the letter

to Jubaianus (*Ep.* 73,26), it must date from 256, the time of the baptismal controversy. Cyprian's last work may be the exhortation to martyrdom *Ad Fortunatum,* which is certainly connected with a persecution, probably that of Valerian in 257–258. It consists of a selection of biblical passages on the duties of Christians in time of persecution. Some would identify its recipient as the bishop of Thuccabor, who attended the council of 1 September 256 (*Sent. epp.* 17). Finally, it is in Cyprian's letters that the man appears most clearly. They cover the whole period of his episcopate and allow us to fix sure reference points in the chronology of his life and works, from the start of Decius's persecution to the last days of his life (d. 14 September 258).

II. Character and activity. Cyprian's character was fully formed in his conversion: he remained celibate and put his fortune at the service of the church and the poor; on many occasions he was generous to the needy (*Ep.* 62, 76); he showed supreme magnanimity to his executioner. His conversion also had an intellectual character: apart from the letter *Ad Donatum,* where at every sentence the rhetor peeps out from under the convert, his literary work shows that he totally renounced secular literature. He now had only two teachers, but knew them thoroughly: the Bible and Tertullian, which made up his daily reading; this abandonment itself was for him a sort of *ascesis. But what his contemporaries praised in him was the rectitude of his thought, the firmness of his teaching, the nobility of his character, his generosity and availability to others, his faithfulness to his Christian commitment and to his duties as bishop, all finally crowned with martyrdom (see *Ep.* 77; *Passio Mariani et Jacobi* 6; *Passio Lucii et Montani* 13).

His activity played out above all during *Decius's persecution, from which, like *Dionysius of Alexandria, he escaped by flight. From his hiding place he continued to direct his community, enjoining them to assist prisoners, bury the dead and keep a register of martyrs. When the persecution became more harsh and defections multiplied, and when *confessors in prison began unduly to promote the reconciliation of apostates, Cyprian recommended patience and *penitence to the *lapsi,* reminded the confessors of the respect due the bishop's authority, and deferred resolution of the problem to after the persecution. He did not subsequently change his attitude on this, save for speeding up the readmission of penitent *lapsi* in danger of death. Instead of restoring calm, the bishop's decision displeased both apostates and confessors; they joined up with five priests who from the start had accepted Cyprian's election with bad grace. They promoted a schism and were *excommunicated. There were similar difficulties at Rome, where the election of *Cornelius led to *Novatian's schism. Meanwhile, around *Easter 251, the persecution ended, and soon afterward a general council of all *Africa was held at Carthage, which ruled on the question of *lapsi* in accordance with Cyprian's proposal. The schism of Carthage was rapidly reabsorbed, while that of Novatian spread to the whole church. In this difficult situation, Cyprian's support for his Roman colleague *Cornelius and his successor *Lucius was unwavering. The situation deteriorated with Pope *Stephen. Already the question of the deposed Spanish bishops (*Ep.* 67), and then that of *Marcian of Arles (*Ep.* 68), had caused friction between Rome and Carthage; the baptismal controversy made the differences between the two men public. Under what conditions should *heretics and schismatics who had received baptism outside of the Catholic church be readmitted to it? At Rome such baptism was considered valid and hands were merely laid on those who returned to the community, but at Carthage baptism by heretics was considered null, and those who had been baptized by heretics or schismatics were rebaptized. This practice had become traditional in Africa after *Agrippinus (ca. 220). The two churches might have continued to live in harmony with different customs, as in the past. This was not possible, however, since Stephen believed it his duty to bring the African bishops around to his point of view. When Cyprian became aware that the bishop of Rome was intervening in the internal affairs of the African churches, he felt it a blow to his authority. But there was more: Stephen seemed to have interpreted the primacy of Rome, expressed in ch. 4 of Cyprian's *De unitate,* too widely. Cut to the quick, the bishop of Carthage rewrote the passage in question, passing over Peter's primacy in silence. Both sides took up arms and sought supporters: Cyprian found one in *Firmilian, bishop of *Caesarea in *Cappadocia, a decisive and impassioned man. Meanwhile councils succeeded one another in Africa, aimed at reinforcing and asserting the unity of the African church: that of 1 September 256 showed it unanimous on Cyril's positions. Would they have reached the point of mutual excommunication if providence had not brought peace by taking Pope Stephen to itself? We cannot know, but the baptismal controversy between Stephen and Cyprian certainly shows that they enjoyed equal moral authority in the eyes of their contemporaries. It also shows how far Cyprian had succeeded in forging his country's unity, i.e., the unanimity of the African churches. This episcopate, scattered at

the time of Decius's persecution, was united behind its leader by the time of Valerian's—and ready, in part, to follow him to martyrdom. There can be no doubt that this was the result of Cyprian's influence.

III. Martydom and cult. The acts of Cyril's martyrdom reflect the stages of the persecution. On 30 August 257, summoned before the proconsul, Cyprian was notified of the imperial rescript on the basis of which bishops had to take part in pagan ceremonies, but he felt it incompatible with his profession of Christian faith—an incompatibility not just contingent but essential, and so his resolution was final. He was exiled for a year, and during his exile he wrote his last letters (*Ep.* 76-81). His penultimate letter cites the imperial rescript intensifying the persecution: immediate execution of bishops, priests and deacons; loss of rank for Roman senators, nobles and knights, confiscation of their goods, and condemnation to death if they persisted; exile and confiscation of goods for matrons; for soldiers, confiscation of goods and reduction to slavery. The letter refers to the execution of *Sixtus II, 6 August 258, so it must have been written that August. Returning to Carthage soon after, Cyprian was rearrested on 13 September and beheaded the next day *in agro Sexti*. He was buried not far away, in the cemetery of the procurator Macrobius Candidianus, on the Mappalia road. His cult was immediate. At the end of the century, according to the *Passio Maximiliani,* Christians were buried near his tomb. In the next century his name appears in the Roman **Depositio martyrum*, and his feast was celebrated on 14 September in the cemetery of Callistus. In Augustine's time there were three sanctuaries in his honor at Carthage: the *mensa Cypriani* on the site of his execution, the *basilica in Mappalibus* over his tomb, and a *memoria* near the sea. Augustine preached in his honor repeatedly. His cult is attested in *Spain at the time of *Prudentius; in the East he became the hero of a *hagiographical romance (*Cyprian of Antioch). In the Carolingian era his *relics were transferred, and from that period his feast was universally celebrated.

CPL 38-67; *Acta Cypriani* (BHL 2037); Sp. tr.: BAC 75, 756-761; It. tr.: M. Pellegrino, *Vita e martirio di S. Cipriano,* Alba 1955, 191-199; Fr. tr.: V. Saxer*, Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Rome 1979; *Atti e passioni dei martiri.* Introduzione di A.A.R. Bastiaensen, testo critico e commento ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen et al., Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Milan 1987, 193-231; J.L. Maier, *Le dossier du Donatisme.* I: *Des origines à la mort de Costance II* (*303-361*), Texte und Untersuchungen 134, Berlin 1987, 122-126; M.A. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa* (Translated Texts for Historians, 24), Liverpool 1996*,* 1-5; Pontius's *Vita Cypriani* (BHL 2041); Sp. tr.: BAC 75, 724-750; It. tr.: M. Pellegrino, op. cit., 89-187; M. Simonetti, CTP 6; L. Canali, in *Vite dei Santi*, Fondazione L. Valla, Milan 1975, 5-49; V. Saxer, *Afrique latine*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, sous la direction de Philippart G. (CC. Hagiographies I), Turnhout 1994, 35-43; Id., *Atti dei martiri*, 179-191; A. Wlosok, *Actes des martyrs et Passions,* in *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, V: *Restauration et renouveau. La littérature latine de 284 à 347 après J.C.*, ed. R. Herzog, Turnhout 1993, 426-427; 433-435; J. Aronen, *Indebtedness to Passio Perpetuae in Pontius' Vita Cypriani*: VChr 38,1 (1984) 67-76; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, II, Paris 1982, 671-695; *Histoire des saints*, II, 121-130; T. Baumeister, *Der heilige Bischof. Überlegungen zur Vita Cypriani*, in SP XVIII, Kalamazoo 1989, 275-282; S. Deleani, *Le récit de la mort de Cypriens dans la Vita Cypriani: structure et signification*, in *La narrativa cristiana antica. Codici narrativi, strutture formali, schemi retorici. XXIII Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana. Roma 5-7 maggio 1994*, Rome 1995 (SEA 50), 465-477; H. Montgomery, *Pontius' Vita Cypriani and the Making of a Saint*: SO 71 (1996) 195-215; V. Saxer, *La Vita Cypriani du diacre Pontius, "Première biographie chrétienne,"* in *Orbis Romanus Christianusque ab Diocletiani aetate usque ad Heraclium. Travaux sur l'Antiquité Tardive rassemblés autour de rechérches de Noël Duval*, Paris 1995, 237-251; Cyprian's *Works* (PL 4; CSEL 3,1-2; CCL 3, A-C; 3D *Prolegomena*); *Epistulae* (Fr. tr.: L. Bayard, Paris 1925); *De unitate ecclesiae* (Fr. tr.: P. de Labriolle, Paris 1942; V. Saxer, in *Les Pères dans la foi*, 1979); *De lapsis* (Sp. tr.: BAC 75, 562-597); *Ad Demetrianum* (ed. and It. tr.: E. Gallicet, CP 4); Monceaux 2; M. Bévenot, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate Chapt. 4 in the Light of the Mss.*: AG 11 (1937); DHGE 13, 1149-1160; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du IIIe s.*, coll. Studi di antichità cristiana 29, Rome 1969; Ch. Saumagne, *S. Cyprien, évêque de Carthage, "pape" d'Afrique* (coll. Études d'antiquités africaines), Paris 1975; A. d'Alès, *La théologie de S. Cyprien*, Paris 1922; E.W. Benson, *Cyprian, His Life, His Time, His Work*, London 1897; J.A. Faulkner, *Cyprian the Churchman*, Cincinnati - New York 1906; H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*: Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, IV, Bonn 1926; D.D. Sullivan, *The Life of the North Africans Revealed in the Works of St. Cyprian*, Washington, DC 1933; J.P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine de Septime Sévère à l'invasion arabe*, Paris 1958; M.A. Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis*, Tübingen 1971; L. Duquenne, *Chronologie des lettres de S. Cyprien*: Subsidia hagiografia, 54, Brussels 1972; M. Girardi, *Scrittura e battesimo degli eretici nella lettera di Firmiliano a Cipriano*: VetChr 19 (1982) 37-67; M. Pellegrino, *Eucarestia e martirio in San Cipriano*, in *Convivium dominicum*, Catania 1959, 135-150 (repr. *Ricerche patristiche* I, Turin 1982, 525-540); E. Gallicet, *Cipriano e la Chiesa*, in *La concezione della Chiesa nell'antica letteratura Cristiana* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale, 100), Genoa 1986; V. Saxer, *La Bible chez les Pères latins du IIIe siècle*, in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, sous la direction de J. Fontaine et Ch. Pietri, Paris 1985, 339-369; W. Wischmeyer, *Der Bischof im Prozes. Cyprian als Episcopus, Patronus, Advocatus und Martyr vor dem Proconsul*, in *Fructus centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink* (Instr. Patr. 19), Dordrecht 1989, 363-371; A.G. Hamman, *Ascèse et virginité à Carthage au IIIe siècle*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes. Miscellanea in onore di Monsignor Victor Saxe*, Studi di Antichità Cristiana, 48, Vatican City 1992; P. Siniscalco, *La lettera 63 di Cipriano sull'eucarestia. Osservazioni sulla cronologia, sulla simbologia, sui contenuti,* in *Storia e interpretazione degli antichi testi eucaristici*, Genoa 1995, 69-82; E. Zocca, *La "Senectus mundi." Significato, fonti e fortuna di un*

tema ciprianeo, in *Studi sul cristianesimo antico e moderno in Onore di Maria Grazia Mara*, eds. M. Simonetti and P. Siniscalco (= Augustinianum 35 [1995] 641-677); H. Montgomery, *The Bishop Who Fled: Responsibility and Honour in Saint Cyprian*, in SP XXI, Louvain 1989, 264-267; I. Pereira Lamelas, *Una domus et ecclesia dei in saeculo. Leitura socio-antropológica do projecto de ecclesia de S. Cipriano de Cartago*, Lisbon 2002. Annual bibliographical update: *Chronica Tertullianea et Cyprianea*, REAug 1986ff.

V. Saxer

CYPRIAN of Toulon (d. before 549). Born at Marseille or *Arles ca. 475, he was a pupil and follower of *Caesarius of Arles. As bishop of Touloun he took part in numerous Gallican councils (from that of Arles of 524 to that of Orléans of 541), in which questions regarding *grace and *predestination were discussed. On Caesarius's death he was commissioned with the writing of his biography by *Caesaria, second *abbess of the female *monastery founded by Caesarius at Arles. The work, in two books, one of the most important products of Gallican *hagiography, was written with the help of collaborators (the two bishops Firminus and Viventius, the *presbyter Messianus and the deacon Stephen) but displays a unitary plan and a solid structural harmony. Cyprian is also author of a letter to Maxim, bishop of Geneva, in which he defends himself against the charge of *theopaschism. He died before 549 (date of the Council of Orléans, in which his successor Palladius participated). Venerated as a saint and copatron of the city of Touloun, his feast is 3 October.

CPL 1020-1021; *Vita Caesarii*: CPL 1018; BHL 1508-1509; PL 67, cols. 1000-1024; MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.* 3, 433-501; *S. Caesarii episcopi opera omnia* 2, Maretioli 1942, 296-323; *La Gaule chrétienne: Vie de saint Hilaire d'Arles. Vie de Césaire d'Arles*, Paris 1997; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* 1, Paris 1907, 208; C. Wawra, *Ein Brief des Bischofs Cyprian von Toulon an des Bischofs Maximus von Genf*: ThQ 85 (1903) 575-594; P. Lejay, *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles*: RHL 10 (1905) 217-266; BS 3, 1280-1281; F.E. Consolino, *Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica,* Naples 1979, 73ff.; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, 1, Stuttgart 1986, 249ff.; W.E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius's Monastery for Women in Arles and the Composition and Function of the Vita Caesarii*: RBen 100 (1990) 441-481; Patrologia IV, 297-299.

V. Saxer

CYPRUS

I. History and councils - II. Archaeology.

I. History and councils. Cyprus (Κύπρος), which had a flourishing Jewish colony (Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* XVI, 129), was first evangelized by Christians fleeing from the persecution at *Jerusalem after the *martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 7:59-60). Barnabas, a *Hellenistic Jew, was a native of Cyprus, of a Levite family (Acts 4:36). In the first missionary journey (44–49), *Paul, Barnabas and *Mark evangelized the island from Salamis to Paphos, residence of the proconsul *Sergius Paulus, in whose presence Paul disputed with the pseudo-prophet Bar-Jesus (Acts 13:4-12). After the so-called Council of Jerusalem (49), at the start of the second missionary journey (49–52), Barnabas separated from Paul and returned to Cyprus (Acts 15:39). After the apostolic age we have only legendary information on John Mark, Barnabas and *Heraclides, the presumed first bishop of Cyprus, ordained by Paul and Barnabas. We do know for sure that under *Diocletian some Palestinian Christians were exiled to Cyprus (Eusebius, *De mart. Palaest.*) and that at *Nicaea (325) three Cypriot bishops subscribed (H. Gelzer, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina*, Leipzig 1898). Between 399 and 401, at the request of *Theophilus, patriarch of *Alexandria, *Epiphanius, archbishop of Salamis, called a council at Cyprus at which the reading of *Origen's works was forbidden, although Origen himself was not expressly condemned. This was the climate of the late 4th-c. *Origenist controversies, which involved *John Chrysostom; Epiphanius invited other episcopates to hold synods for the same purpose. Early in the 5th c. the metropolitans of *Antioch—capital of the diocese of the East—claimed the right to elect the metropolitan of Cyprus; Pope *Innocent I (415) supported Antioch, while the Council of *Ephesus (431) tacitly recognized the autocephaly of the Church of Cyprus. The question came up again at the time of the emperor *Zeno (474–491) and was resolved in Cyprus's favor with the help of the discovery, by metropolitan Anthimus of Salamis, of the tomb of the *apostle Barnabas. On 29 May 643 *Sergius, bishop of Constantia, called a provincial council (second council of Cyprus) of his suffragans to condemn *monothelitism. The decree of condemnation was sent to Pope *Theodore (642–649) with an accompanying letter recognizing the primacy of the see of *Rome. Subject to incursions from 632, Cyprus was eventually conquered by the Arabs. The *Byzantine reconquest began in the mid-9th c. and ended in the mid-10th c., when Cyprus came under the Comneni.

J. Hackett, *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus*, London 1901; S. Vailhé, *Formation de l'Église de Chypre (431)*: EO 13 (1910) 5-10; V. Laurent, *Les fastes épiscopaux de l'Église de Chypre*: REByz 6 (1948) 153-166; DTC 2, 2424-2434; DHGE 12, 791-827. First council of Cyprus: Mansi, *Supplem.* I, col. 275; Mansi III, cols. 1019-1022; A.C. Peltier, *Dictionnaire des Conciles* I, Paris 1847, col. 560; Hfl-Lecl II, 122; Palazzini 1, 289-290 Second Council of Cyprus: Mansi X, cols. 913-916; Hfl-Lecl III, 400;

Palazzini 1, 290; C. Petinos, *La naissance de l'église orthodoxe autocéphale de Chypre*: Istina 37 (1992) 43-54; C. Petinos, *L'Église de Chypre entre Constantinopel et Antioche* (*IVe-Ve siècle*): ByzF 25 (1999) 131-141.

C. Nardi

II. Archaeology. Despite Antioch's attempts at ecclesiastical subjugation, the island managed to remain independent. Recent excavations have uncovered several churches. Salamina, now Salamis, is one of the island's most important centers. Old excavations revealed a 4th-c. Christian basilica, that of St. Epiphanius, one of the largest in the Levant (Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, 425); originally with seven aisles, it was renovated at the time of *Justinian. The basilica at Kampanopetra is from the early 6th c. Near Famagosta, at Sykada, part of a marble altar mensa with remains of Greek inscription datable to the 5th c. was found. Also in the E, archaeologists at Yalusa all'Agia Trias found a 5th-6th-c. church, destroyed in the 7th c., with geometrical mosaic floors. In the N of the island, at Chrysokava, near Kyrenia, archaeologists found a Christian *cemetery (Karageorghis, *Masterpieces*, 1). Further W, Soloi has uncovered an early Christian basilica with floors of geometrical mosaic and *opus sectile*. In the center, E of Nicosia, at the *monastery of St. Spyridion at Tremetuschia was found the mosaic floor of an old Christian church with an inscription of Bishop Cartarius. S of Nicosia, near Politiko, at the monastery of St. Heracleides, 5th-6th-c. mosaic pavements were found whose geometrical designs included Solomon's knot. In the S, at Amatus, near Limassol, an old church, buried for centuries, was found on the N side of the road, and a basilica with mosaics in the E necropolis. Kurion has Roman buildings with a mosaic representing Achilles, baths built in Christian times with mosaics and remains of a three-aisled Christian basilica with mosaic floor and baptistery on the N side. In the W, Paphos has remains of a church of the patristic period, with geometrical mosaics, in the district of the Panagia Limeniotissa ("lady of the port"). Built in the 5th c., it was destroyed in 653 (Philactou, *Paphos*, 88-89). Near St. Paul's pillar is an old basilica with mosaic.

At Peyia, in the basilica of St. George, remains were found of an earlier basilica with mosaic pavement, recently relaid on a new bed. St. George's has a curious altar formed from two Byzantine capitals (Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, 380).

Two Cypriot churches preserve wall mosaics with religious subjects. In the church of Panagia Kanakaria near Lytrankomo, remains of a Virgin and child with angels are preserved in the apse. Once assigned to the 9th c. (Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, 332), after comparison with similar works they are now dated to the 6th c. (Stylianou, *Painted Churches*, 43-48; Karageorghis, *Masterpieces*, 11-12). The materials of the old church were reused in the present 12th-c. church. The church of Panagia Angeloktistos at Kiti, with mosaic representing the Virgin and child with the archangels *Michael and *Gabriel holding the globe, is better preserved. Once assigned to the 9th or 12th c., comparison with mosaics from *Ravenna suggest a 7th-c. date (Stylianou, *Painted Churches*, 49-51; Karagheorghis, *Masterpieces*, 9-10). Christian paintings are preserved at Salamis in a cistern transformed into a church: the figure of the Lord and an inscription invoking Sts. Epiphanius and Barnabas (Karagheorghis, *Masterpieces*, 11-12). In the pavements of the baths of Kurion we should note the figures of Ktisis (creation) and Phoebus, symbols of Christ, and the inscription of one Eustolios, in which Christ is mentioned.

Moveable objects of the Christian period include a series of nine silver plates depicting scenes from the stories of David (see Pierides, *Jewellery*), found at Lapithos (Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, 317-318) and datable to 610–630 (Fobelli, "Piatti argentei"), and a hexagonal silver censer with depictions of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary and Sts. *Peter, *Paul, *James and *John (Stylianou, *Painted Churches*, 28-29). Then, as now, there were ceramic factories in Cyprus; some 4th-c. terracotta lamps, found at Salamis and elsewhere, have particular forms with *crosses (Oziol, *Salamine*, 238-239).

V. Karagheorghis, *Masterpieces of the Byzantine Art of Cyprus*, Nicosia 1965; A. Pierides, *Jewellery in the Cyprus Museum*, Nicosia 1971; R. Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, Nicosia 1973; T. Oziol, *Salamine de Chypre. VII. Les Lampes du Musée de Chypre*, Paris 1977; A.C. Phylactou, *Paphos*, Nicosia 1977; A. Stylianou - J.A. Stylianou, *The Painted Churches of Cyprus: Treasures of Byzantine Art*, London, 1985; A. Paribeni, *Cipro, secoli 6°-7°*: EAM 4, 800-804, Rome 1993; M.L. Fobelli, *Fonti e cronologia dei piatti argentei di Cipro con le storie di Davide*: RIA, serie III, 6 (1983-84) 191-219; S. Curcic, *Middle Byzantine Architecture on Cyprus: Provincial or Regional?* (Annual Lecture on the History and Archaeology of Cyprus 13), Nicosia 2000; D. Michaelidis, *Archeologia paleocristiana a Cipro*: CCAB 44 (2001) 179-239.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

CYRIACUS. Saint, patriarch of *Constantinople (January/March 596–29 October 606). Priest and *oeconomos* of Hagia Sophia, he was called to succeed *John IV. He reacted negatively to the usurpation of *Phocas (23 November 602), murderer of Maurice, whose widow Cyriacus protected after obtaining guarantees of *orthodoxy and peace from Phocas.

No patriarchal act of his survives. We know from the protests of *Gregory the Great that in his letters to the pope (597) he assumed and defended the title of ecumenical patriarch. Other letters (602) are mentioned in the Life of St. Theodore of Sykeon. He built a church dedicated to the *Theotokos in the urban quarter "of the Diaconissa." Commemorated 30 October in the Byzantine Synaxaria, 27 October in *Mart. rom.*

DHGE 13, 1167-1168; BS 3, 1294-1295; J. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, II, Rome 1962, 83; A.N. Stratos, *Bisanzio nel secolo VII*, 1, 602-626 (in Greek), Athens 1965, 93-105 and passim; R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères de Constantinople*, Paris 1969, 181-182; V. Grumel, *Regestes*, 273-277a; L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 183-191.

D. Stiernon

CYRIACUS of al-Bahnasa (Oxyrhynchus). Cyriacus was bishop of al-Bahnasa, perhaps in the 8th c., but his activity can also be dated to the 14th/15th c. We have eight homilies under his name, including four discourses on Mary, preserved in Arabic (two on the flight into Egypt, the third on the Virgin's grief at her son's tomb, the fourth important for mariology on the *assumption, with strong anti-*Docetist elements); ascribed to him is the Ethiopic *Martyrdom of Pilate,* in which Pilate and his wife Procla are presented as saints; an Ethiopic *anaphora under his name is not authentic.

Editions: Abdel Massih Sulaiman, Cairo 1927; V. Arras: CSCO 351-352/Aeth 67-68, 1974, 34-55, 26-42; P. Dib, *Deux discours de Cyriaque, evêque de Behnesa sur la fuite en Égypte*: ROC 15 (1910) 157-161.

Translations: Erbetta 1,2, 616-618; G. Gharib (ed.), *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, 4, Rome 1991, 756-763; G. Giamberardini, *Il culto mariano in Egitto*, 2, Jerusalem 1974, 55-87; E. Lanchantin, *Un homélie sur le "Martyre de Pilate" attribuée à Cyriaque de Behnessa*: Apocrypha 13 (2002) 135-202; R.G. Coquin: Coptic Encyclopaedia 3, 669-671.

M. Starowieyski

CYRIL CELER (early 4th c.). Bishop of Laodicaea Combusta (Phrygia), at the beginning of Emperor *Constantine's reign he built a large church. His inscription survives: "Having been made bishop by the will of almighty God, and having administered the episcopate for 25 years with great distinction, and having rebuilt from its foundations the whole church and all the adornment around it, consisting of stoa and tetrastoa and paintings and mosaics and fountains and the outer gateway, and having provided for its entire construction in stone and, in a word, with everything, and being about to depart the life of this world, I made for myself a *sarcophagus and a base on which it must be placed, for the distinction of the church and of my family."

Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, W.E. Calder (ed.), Manchester 1928, I, 89, n. 170; cf. P. Brown, in *Age of Spirituality*, New York 1979, 19-20.

A. Di Berardino

CYRIL of Alexandria (370/380–444). Born at *Alexandria sometime between 370 and 380, he entered religious life and may have spent some time as a monk. He was nephew to the powerful Bishop *Theophilus, whom he accompanied in 403 to the Synod of the *Oak, which deposed *John Chrysostom, and whom he succeeded as bishop of Alexandria, 17 October 412. He inherited his uncle's power and ambitions, as well as his energy, political capacity, harshness to his enemies and lack of scruples. Only in 417 did he decide, for political reasons, to readmit Chrysostom's name to the *diptychs of his church. The policy of violence that he initiated against *pagans and *heretics caused, among other things, the murder of the famous Platonist philosopher *Hypatia by a gang of fanatical monks. The election of *Nestorius, representative of the rival see of *Antioch, as bishop of *Constantinople could not have pleased him; so he made the most of the opportunity offered by the protests aroused by Nestorius's imprudent statements on *Christology, and criticized him (429) in various letters, including some to Nestorius himself. The appeal of both parties to Pope *Celestine (430) ended in the Roman condemnation of Nestorius. Charged with communicating *Rome's decision to Nestorius, Cyril supplemented it with the famous 12 anathemata, a series of christological propositions formulated in terms unacceptable to any Antiochene. Nestorius's appeal to the emperor *Theodosius II resulted in the calling of an ecumenical *council at *Ephesus for spring 431. Cyril, exploiting the Antiochenes' delayed arrival, began proceedings on 22 June without waiting for them and rapidly obtained Nestorius's condemnation. Arriving four days later, the Antiochene bishops, led by *John of Antioch and favorable to Nestorius, condemned Cyril's actions and Cyril himself. Theodosius at first declared both Nestorius and Cyril deposed and had them imprisoned; but Cyril managed to return to Alexandria, which he entered in triumph, 30 October. He later thought it opportune to seek a reconciliation with the Antiochenes, with

whom he concluded the Pact of Union (433); they left Nestorius to his fate, and Cyril dropped the anathemata. He spent the next years defending and clarifying his christological doctrine against rivals and friends unconvinced of the soundness of his actions. Around 438–440, he joined the attacks against *Diodore of Tarsus and *Theodore of Mopsuestia, accused of having been Nestorius's precursors, but retracted in the face of John of Antioch's protest. He died 27 June 444. Cyril wrote much, and the rise of the Nestorian controversy divides his output into two parts: at first, he dedicated himself mainly to scriptural *exegesis and wrote against *Arianism; once the controversy began, it directly and indirectly polarized all of his activity, including his literary work. We also possess ca. 20 of his homilies and ca. 100 letters.

Cyril's surviving exegetical works on the OT are: *Adoration and Worship of God in Spirit and Truth,* in 17 books in dialogue form interpreting passages of the Pentateuch with reference to Christ, not in systematic order, but following a line of reasoning aimed at demonstrating that the Mosaic law is abrogated in letter but not in spirit, since it is fulfilled in Christ. The same material is systematically expounded in 13 books of *Glaphyra*. Not a collection of chosen passages, but overall interpretations, are the *Commentary on Isaiah* and *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*. The *catenae cite much fragmentary material on the Psalms, Song of Songs, Proverbs etc., not always certainly authentic. On the NT, only the *Commentary on John* survives complete; the *Commentary on Luke,* a systematic collection of homilies, is largely incomplete. We also get from the catenae many fragments on Matthew and on the Pauline Epistles. The Cyrillian interpretation of the OT is based on the traditional christological reading of the text, i.e., seen as a prophetic or symbolic anticipation (*typos*) of Christ and of the church, and is developed through traditionally Alexandrian criteria: distinction of several interpretative levels (literal, *typological and moral); recourse to other Greek translators and to the Hebrew text to supplement the LXX; use of etymologies of Hebrew names, numbers, animals etc., as a basis for *allegory. In contrast to *Origen and *Didymus, however, Cyril refrains from interpreting almost every detail of the OT as a prefiguration and anticipation of Christ. He states more than once that not all the OT authorizes this type of interpretation: Moses is a figure of Christ, but not everything about him is suitable to be transferred typologically to Christ (PG 71, 600-601). Cyril also gives much more room to the literal interpretation of prophetic texts than his predecessors had allowed: to them the OT had interest only inasmuch as it foretold, in a more or less hidden form, Christ; to Cyril, however, Israel's historical vicissitudes were interesting in their own right, apart from their christological reference. In the *Commentary on the Minor Prophets,* there are ample treatments of the history of Israel and the neighboring peoples as an end in themselves, without any typological implications. Cyril took great account in his exegesis of the criticisms made by the Antiochenes against the excessive allegorism of the Alexandrians, and he preferred to confine this type of interpretation to passages better adapted to it. The same approach is followed in his *Commentary on John,* i.e., on a text that particularly invites a *symbolic type of interpretation, in which Cyril, obviously without renouncing symbolic interpretation, also concedes a very large part to literal interpretation, with evident interest for the doctrinal dimension of the gospel text.

In the doctrinal field, before 429, Cyril gave his attention to fighting Arianism, whose ghosts still seemed alive to him, in two comprehensive works of similar content: the *Treasure on the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity* and *The Holy and Consubstantial Trinity,* the latter a dialogue. The *trinitarian doctrine expounded here was that which had been canonized by the long dispute of the 4th c., which testifies to the acceptance by the Alexandrians of the trinitarian formula of the *Cappadocians: one divine *ousia* articulated in three *hypostases*. From Cyril's last phase comes an isolated work, *For the Holy Religion of the Christians Against the Books of the Impious Julian,* of uncertain date (between 433 and his death), in which he refutes in detail the work *Against the Galileans* written more than 70 years earlier by the emperor *Julian the Apostate, thus confirming the topicality of the book and the persistent vitality of *paganism. Books 1-10, which refute Julian's books 1-3, and fragments of books 11-20 survive. The work's original dimensions are not known with any certainty. The fact that Cyril refutes Julian by means of ample citations of his text allows us to know something of that work as well.

Cyril's earliest activity against Nestorius is contained in several letters, three of them sent to Nestorius himself: the second (*Ep.* 4) contains a complete and balanced exposition of Cyril's Christology and was approved not just at Ephesus (431) but also at *Chalcedon (451); the third (*Ep.* 17) contains the 12 anathemata, which present this Christology in radicalized form for polemical ends. But in 430 Cyril published five books *Against Nestorius,* in which he refuted his rival's doctrines in great detail; and he answered *Andrew of Samosata's and *Theodoret of

Cyrrhus's refutations of his anathemata with *Against the Eastern Bishops* and the *Letter to Euoptius*. While in prison after the council, he wrote the *Explanation of the 12 Anathemata* on the same subject. From the outset he understood the importance of having the emperor, or at least some members of the imperial family and the court, on his side: this explains the three texts *On the True Faith,* the first addressed to *Theodosius II, the second and third to the emperor's wife and sisters, in 430. After his return to *Egypt came the *Defense to the Emperor,* in which he justified his actions before and during the council. The post-431 *Scholia de incarnatione unigeniti,* in which Cyril clarified the mode of union of the two natures in Christ, without confusion but also without division, survive entirely only in *Latin translation. We have only extracts, albeit copious ones, of *Against Diodore and Theodore,* written ca. 438 as part of the campaign unleashed by implacable anti-Nestorians against these two great Antiochene doctors, accused of having anticipated Nestorius's divisionist Christology. We should also note *Against Those Who Will Not Admit That the Holy Virgin Is Mother of God and Christ Is One,* and, among the many letters dedicated to the controversy and its aftermath, *Ep.* 39, to John of Antioch, in which Cyril rejoices over the reconciliation of 433, *Ep.* 45 and 46 to *Succensus and *Ep.* 40 to *Acacius of Melitene, in which he defends his Christology against its critics, insisting particularly on Christ's unity of nature.

The spirit that animates Cyrillian Christology is that of the *logos/sarx* approach, traditional to Alexandria from the last decades of the 3rd c. Though Cyril, after the condemnation of that christological approach in the person of *Apollinaris, was very careful to bring out the integrity (soul and body) of the Logos's human nature, he saw the union essentially in terms of the preeminence of the divine nature over the human nature, which is only a passive instrument of it. So Cyril is at the other extreme from Antiochene Christology, which valued the autonomy of Christ's human nature to the point of making it a second subject alongside the divine Logos: for Cyril this meant dividing Christ. So he heavily stressed the unity of subject in the union, in the sense that there is only one *hypostasis* ("person"), that of the Logos, which has assumed a whole and complete humanity. (Cyril was always loath, with some exceptions, to define the humanity assumed by Christ as a nature.) Indeed, Cyril gradually became more and more diffident toward the traditional terminology of *homo assumptus,* which spoke of assumed humanity, in which the divine Logos was clothed, since it seemed to him to present the union in too extrinsic a form; he preferred to speak, with Jn 1:14, of the Logos which became man. With even greater reason, he rejected certain typical Antiochene expressions which presented Christ's body as the temple in which the deity had made its dwelling.

Cyril always clearly specified that, in the union, the characteristics (*idiōmata*) of humanity and divinity were not confused, though, by virtue of the union, we can predicate of one what is proper to the other, i.e., we can say that God suffered and died, when, properly speaking, only his humanity died (*communicatio idiomatum*). He repeatedly put forward the example of the union of *soul and *body in humanity as an example in some way suitable for describing the union of humanity and divinity in Christ. But his terminology was not always consistent, partly because of political requirements: he sometimes spoke of two natures in Christ, divine and human, but his preferred terminology, esp. after 433, was that of a single nature resulting from the union, which he defined as "union of nature, natural union" (*Anat.* 3). Accustomed to appealing widely to earlier theologians, esp. to *Athanasius, to support his statements, he summed up his thought in the formula: "A single nature of the incarnate Logos," which he believed to be Athanasius's when in fact it was Apollinaris's. He admits that we must speak of two natures, but only before the union, i.e., only theoretically, since, at the moment of union, the resulting nature is only one, that of the incarnate Logos, in which the characteristics, whole and unconfused, of humanity and divinity subsist united in a single subject. Cyril was in fact the father of *monophysite Christology, and it was with good reason that the monophysites went back to him as to the supreme authority.

CPG III, 5200-5438.

Editions and translations: PG 68-77; ACO I, 1.3.5, etc. (see CPG); Ed. Pusey, 7 vols., Oxford 1868-1877; SC 97.231.237.246; *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Lettres Festales*, W.H. Burns (ed.) et al. = SC 372, 1991; 392, 1993; 434, 1998; *Cirillo di Alessandria. Epistole cristologiche*, ed. G. Lo Castro, Rome 1999; C. Ferrari Toniolo, *Cyrilliana in Psalmos. I frammenti del Commento ai Salmi di Cirillo di Alessandria nel codice Laudiano greco 42*, Catania 2000; Resources: B. Sesboüé - M. Fédou, *Bulletin de théologie patristique grecque*: RSR 86 (1998) 221-236.

Studies: Quasten II, 118-143; DTC 3, 2476-2527; A. Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, Rome 1952; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, London 1965, 329-333, 400-412; M.O. Boulnois, *Le paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique*, Paris 1994; J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology and Texts*, Leiden 1994; P. Rosa, *Gli occhi del corpo e della mente. Cirillo alessandrino; testi ermeneutici*, Bologna 1996; B.

Meunier, *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie. L'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite*, Paris 1997; D. Pazzini, *Il Prologo di Giovanni in Cirillo di Alessandria*, Brescia 1997; L.R. Wickham, *Cyrill von Alexandrien*: ThQ 178 (1998) 257-271: the entire issue of ThQ is dedicated to Cyril of Alexandria; S. Wessel, *Nestorius, Mary and Controversy in Cyril of Alexandria's Homily IV* (De Maria deipara in Nestorium, CPG 5248): AHC 31 (1999) 1-49; A. Camplani - A. Martin, *Lettres festales et listes épiscopales dans l'Église d'Alexandrie et d'Égypte. À propos de la liste épiscopale accompagnant la première lettre festale de Cyrille d'Alexandrie conservée en copte*: JJP 30 (2000) 7-20; S.A. McKinion, *Words, Imagery, and Mystery of Christ: A Reconstruction of Cyril of Alexandria's Christology*, Leiden - Boston - Cologne 2000; N. Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, London - New York 2000; T.G. Weinandy - Daniel A. Keating (eds.), *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, London 2003.

M. Simonetti

CYRIL of Jerusalem (ca. 315–ca. 387). Cyril was born, conjecturally, ca. 315 at *Jerusalem. He was a priest there; in 348, Bishop *Maximus died and Cyril was ordained bishop by the *Eusebians *Acacius of Caesarea and *Patrophilus of Scythopolis, instead of the priest Heraclius whom the dying Maximus seems to have designated as his successor. Having quarrelled with Acacius, for doctrinal reasons but mainly because Cyril sought to establish his see's independence of the metropolitan see of *Caesarea, he was deposed at a *council held at Jerusalem in 357. When the Eusebians split (357–358) into several groups, Cyril supported the *homoiousians, who reinstated him at the Council of *Seleucia (359). But in 360 the Council of *Constantinople, which saw the triumph of Acacius and the *homoians, deposed him again. Returning to his see when *Constantius died (362), he was exiled again as a result of *Valens's pro-*Arian policy, either in 367 or some years later. He returned in 378 and took part in the Councils of Constantinople of 381 and 382, the latter of which confirmed the validity of his episcopal ordination, which had been questioned. He died probably 18 March 387.

Cyril left a series of 24 catecheses, preached either when he was still a priest or immediately after his election as bishop. The first is introductory (*procatechesis*); the next 18 (2-19) are addressed to the *phōtizomenoi*, i.e., those to be baptized the coming *Easter, and turn mainly on the detailed interpretation of the baptismal creed used at Jerusalem. Nos. 20-24, called *Mystagogical Catecheses,* are addressed to the newly baptized and explain the meaning of the *sacraments they have just received (*baptism, *confirmation, *Eucharist) and of the *liturgy of the *Mass. These last catecheses are attributed by MSS either to Cyril or to his successor John, or to both together; modern scholars fail to agree on this question. The series of catecheses gives us much important information on the *catechumenate and on the liturgy in use at Jerusalem. Of Cyril we also have a homily on Jn 5:5 (healing of the paralytic) and a letter to Emperor Constantius, describing the appearance of a luminous *cross in the sky over Jerusalem on 7 May 351.

Cyril's reputation suffered much from his election promoted by the Eusebians and from subsequent events (Ruf., *HE* I, 23; Jer., *Chron.* s.a. 348), and he was considered a pro-Arian who only gradually passed over to the orthodox camp (Socr., *HE* V, 8; Soz., *HE* VII, 7). In fact, in the variegated Eusebian coalition of ca. 350, he represented the tendency closest to *Nicene orthodoxy, though he avoided using **homoousios* either out of prudence or, more probably, because he considered it open to *Sabellianism. In fact Cyril did not confine himself to refuting the radical Arian position that derived the Son from nothing but stated clearly that Christ is the real Son of God, by nature and not by adoption, really generated from the Father and like him in all things. Alone in the Eusebian group, he explicitly stated that the Son is coeternal (*aidios*) with the Father. In polemic with the Sabellians and with *Marcellus of Ancyra, Cyril has a clear idea of the personal subsistence of the Son, who with the Holy Spirit partakes of the Father's divinity. He confirms God's unity on the basis of the classical passages of Jn 10:30 and 14:9-10, and sees it dynamically, in the manner of the Easterners, as unity of will and as harmony. He also affirms the *Holy Spirit's personal distinctness from the Father and the Son, and his full divinity. So there are only a few traces of traditional ante-Nicene *subordinationism in Cyril. This doctrinal approach, not Nicene but very far from true Arianism, explains why he adhered at first to the homoiousian movement and later crossed over, with many homoiousians, to the Nicene ranks on the basis of the interpretation of *homoousios* provided by the Council of *Antioch of 363 (which he did not attend) and subsequently by *Basil of Caesarea.

CPG II, 3585-3618. *Editions and translations:* PG 33; SC 126; Reischl-Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymitani opera*, I-II, Munich 1848-1860; *Cirillo e Giovanni di Gerusalemme. Catechesi prebattesimali e mistagogiche*, tr. and commentary, ed. V. Saxer, Milan 1994; *Studies*: Quasten II, 365-380; DTC 3, 2527-2577; J. Lebon, *La position de saint Cyrille de Jérusalem dans les luttes provoquées par l'arianisme*: RHE 20 (1924) 181-210, 357-386; A. Paulin, *Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem catéchète*, Paris 1959; Simonetti 586; H.M. Riley, *Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ambrose of Milan,* Washington, DC 1974; A. Bonato, *La dottrina trinitaria di Cirillo di Gerusalemme*, Rome 1983;

R.L. Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*, Georgia 1997; A.J Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses*, Washington, DC 2001.

M. Simonetti

CYRIL of Jerusalem (pseudo) (7th-8th c.). Ascribed to *Cyril of Jerusalem is a homogeneous group of *Coptic homilies, written probably between the 7th and 8th c.: *On the Passion, On the New Sunday, On the Resurrection, On the Holy Cross,* and *On the Virgin Mary* (two versions), an important testimony of the tradition of the *assumption of Mary. These homilies have been published by H. Hyvernet, *Bibliothecae Pierpont Morgan codices coptici photographice expressi*, Rome 1922; E.A.W. Budge, *Miscellanous Coptic Texts*, London 1915; A. Campagnano, Milan 1980; *Encomion di Maria Maddalena*, R.G. Coquin, G. Gordon: BIFAO 90 (1990) 169-212. Still unpublished is the *Homily for the Wednesday After Easter* (CPG 3598-3604, CPGS 3605-3606). There is also another homily in Arabic and in Ethiopic on the help given by Mary to Matthias when he was in prison. Finally, also under Cyril's name is a collection of homilies in *Georgian: *On the Apparition of the Cross at the Time of Constantine; On the Discovery of the Nails of the Cross; On the Discovery of the Cross; On the Silence of Zechariah; On Pentecost* (CPG 3607).

T. Orlandi, Coptic Encyclopaedia 3, 681-682; Id., *Cirillo di Gerusalemme nella letteratura copta*: VetChr 9 (1971) 93-100; A. Campagnano, introduction, *op. cit.*; S. Mimouni, *Dormition et l'Assomption de la Vierge*, Théol. Hist. 98, Paris 1995, 188-194. It. tr.: Erbetta/2, 604-615; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, 4, Rome 1991, 686-697 (frag.); G. Giamberardini, *Il culto mariano in Egitto*, 2, Jerusalem 1974, 100-104; R. Basset, *Les apocryphes éthiopiens*, 5, Paris 1894 (Milan 1999), 48-71; V. Arras: CSCO 351-352/Aeth 67-68, 1974, 1-33, 1-25.

M. Starowieyski

CYRIL of Scythopolis (ca. 525–after 557). Born at *Scythopolis (now Beit She'an), capital of *Palestine II, in 543 he went to *Jerusalem to be present at the dedication of the new basilica of the *Theotokos built by *Justinian, visit the holy places and enter a *monastery. On the advice of John the Hesychast (*see* John the Silent) and after an inconclusive experience in a first monastery, he entered the *laura of *Euthymius in 544 and stayed there until 555. He was then part of a group of orthodox monks who went to occupy the New Laura after the expulsion of the *Origenists. In 557 he went to the Great Laura of *Sabas, where he stayed until his death. He owes his fame to the series of biographies of monks of the Judean *desert, which he wrote partly from archival evidence and partly from the stories of monks who had known the protagonists or their original circle (in particular *Cyriac for Euthymius and John the Hesychast for Sabas). For those whom he could still approach himself, he wrote their lives, adding his own personal testimony. Cyril shows the qualities of a sincere, trustworthy historian, as is shown especially by his concern for precision in the chronology of events. We must know, however, how to free the essential historical elements from a style which reflects the laws of the *hagiographical literature of the time. Thanks to him, we have a precise knowledge of the life of the lauras of Palestine of the 5th and 6th c., along with precise information on the *patriarchate of Jerusalem between the fourth and the fifth ecumenical councils and on the second Origenist crisis, which shows him a firm adversary of the monks who followed *Evagrius. For length and content, the two most important lives are those of Euthymius (d. 473) and Sabas (d. 532), respectively the inspirer and the organizer of the *Chalcedonian monasticism of the Judean desert. The other five are much shorter: John the Hesychast (d. after 557), Cyriac of the laura of Souka (d. 557), *Theodosius (d. 529), Bishop Theognios (d. 552) and Bishop Abrahamios (a contemporary). Cyril's work was quite popular in the *Byzantine world. We have translations in *Georgian, Arabic, *Syriac, *Palaeoslavonic and *Latin.

CPG 7535-7543; crit. ed. E. Schwarz (TU 49, 2), Leipzig 1939; tr. A.J. Festugière (*Les moines d'Orient*, III, 1-3: *Les moines de Palestine*, Paris 1962-63); R.M. Price, with introduction and notes by J. Binns, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis*, CSS 114, Kalamazoo, MI 1991; DSp 2, 2687-2690; E. Stein, *Cyrille de Scythopolis. A propos de la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres*: AB 62 (1944) 169-186; F. Dolbeau, *La Vie latine de saint Euthyme: une traduction inédite de Jean, diacre napolitain*: MEFRM 94 (1982) 315-335; B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'œuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris 1983; L. Perrone, *Il deserto e l'orizzonte della città. Le* Storie monastiche *di Cirillo di Scitopoli*, in *Cirillo di Scitopoli. Storie monastiche del deserto di Gerusalemme*, Praglia 1990, 9-90; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314-631*, Oxford 1994; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Washington, DC 1995; G. Filoramo, *Profezia e politica. Aspetti politici del profetismo cristiano*: CrSt 20 (1999) 521-544; B. Flusin, *Un hagiographe saisi par l'histoire: Cyrille de Scythopolis et la mesure du temps*, in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, Louvain 2001, 119-126; P.W. van der Horst, *The Role of Scripture in Cyril's of Scythopolis'* Lives of the Monks of Palestine, ibid., 127-145; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, Rome 2001; Grillmeier II/3.

J.-M. Sauget - L. Perrone

CYRILLONA (Qurillona). The codex of the British Library, *add.* 14591, pp. 54-67 and 72-83, preserves six interesting poetical texts, titled as follows: (1) *On the Institution of the Eucharist*; (2) *On the Washing of the Feet*; (3) *On the Pasch of Our Lord* by Mar Qurillona; (4) *On the Scourges*, by Qurillona; (5) *On Zacchaeus*; (6) *On the Grain of Wheat*. Only nos. 3 and 4 bear the name of Qurillona, but stylistic criteria and content allow us to conclude that the whole contained in the London MS can be attributed to the *Syrian poet (though Griffin [13-23] dissents regarding *On the Grain of Wheat*). The allusion in *On the Scourges* to the *Hun invasion (395) also allows us to date it to between the last quarter of the 4th c. and the first quarter of the 5th c. A certain Absamya, nephew of *Ephrem of Nisibis according to the **Chronicle of Edessa* and Barhebraeus's *Ecclesiastical Chronicle,* composed poems or homilies on the Hun invasion: a few critics have maintained the identification of the two, supposing that Absamya took the name Cyrillona at his priestly ordination. Recently the hypothesis has been proposed that the last poem, which presents parallels with both *Gregory of Nyssa and with Cyrillona's other texts, was actually the product of a later editor. The images and religious language closely recall those of 4th-c. prose and poetic texts, in particular those of Ephrem of Nisibis.

G. Bickell, *Die Gedichte des Cyrillonas*: ZDMG 27 (1873), 566-598; Duval 335-336; Baumstark 67-68; Chabot 33; Ortiz de Urbina 86-88; C. Vona, *I carmi di Cirillona*. Studio introduttivo - traduzione - commento (Scrinium Patr. Later. 2), Rome 1963; F. Graffin, *Deux poèmes de Cyrillonas*: *le lavement des pieds et le discours après la Cène*: OrSyr 10 (1965) 307-330; *Cyrillonas. L'Agneau Véritable. Hymnes Cantiques et Homélies*. Intr., tr. D. Cerbelaud, Chevetogne - Paris 1984; C.W. Griffin, Cyrillona: A Critical Study and Commentary, diss. Washington DC, 2011.

A. Camplani

CYRUS of Alexandria (d. 642). Patriarch. As bishop of Fasi (Sebastopolis), in 626 he adhered to the *monothelitism of *Sergius of Constantinople, becoming a pawn in Sergius's and *Heraclius's plan for religious unity. He was appointed *Byzantine patriarch of *Alexandria in 631, also with the functions of prefect of *Egypt and military governor, so as to suppress *monophysitism more effectively. In 633 he called a council at Alexandria promulgating an act of union under 9 headings (*Kephalaia*) based on monothelitism. In 640, during the Arab advance on Egypt, Heraclius accused him of high treason and deposed him. Restored in 641, in November of that year he negotiated the capitulation of Alexandria. Died 21 March 642. Besides the *Kephalaia*, we possess three letters from Cyrus to Sergius (Mansi X, 1003-1006; XI 559-668).

CPG 7610-7613. Fliche-Martin 5 (It. ed.), Turin 1971, passim; EC 3, 1734; Coptic. Enc. 3, 682-683.

E. Prinzivalli

CYRUS of Edessa (mid-6th c.). *Nestorian doctor, disciple of Mar *Aba and *Thomas of Edessa. Studied at the school of *Nisibis, taught at *Seleucia-Ctesiphon and probably at al-Hira. Of his works we have only six treatises on as many liturgical celebrations, which continue two treatises of Thomas of Edessa and in which we can see a strong influence of the positions of *Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Ortiz de Urbina 127-128; W.F. Macomber, *The Theological Synthesis of Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian Theologian of the Mid-Sixth Century*: OCP 30 (1964) 5-38 and 363-384; Id., *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian Theologian of the Mid-Sixth Century*, CSCO 355-356/Syr. 155-156, Louvain 1974; M. Van Esbroeck, *Peter the Fuller and Cyrus of Edessa*: Aram 11-12 (1999-2000) 467-474.

S.J. Voicu

CYRUS of Panopolis (d. ca. 457). Official of the Eastern empire, poet. Born at Panopolis in *Egypt, he distinguished himself precociously as the author of epic poems and epigrams. Thanks to the empress *Eudoxia, a lover of poetry, he was able to exercise a certain influence on *Theodosius II; in 435 he was *praefectus urbis Constantinopolitanae,* then *praefectus praetorio Orientis,* and finally consul in 441. He completed the city walls of *Constantinople, built a church to *Mary *Theotokos and oversaw urban development. He was the first prefect to issue his rulings in *Latin and Greek. Accused of aspiring to the crown and of being a bad Christian, Cyrus lost his post and was made bishop, against his will, of Cotyaeum in *Phrygia. He succeeded in calming the inhabitants of that city, known for their fanaticism, with a Christmas homily of just two sentences (published by Theophanes the Chronicler and commented on by T.E. Gregory, *The Remarkable Christmas Homily of Kyros Panopolites*: GRBS 16 [1975] 317-324). At Cotyaeum he also composed the epigram to *Daniel the Stylite (*Anthologia Graeca* 1, 99). After a time he was forced out of his bishopric by a new accusation. He lived on a private income as a landowner until his death.

PWK 12, 188-190. His poetical works: *Anthol. graeca* 1, 99; 7, 557; 9, 136, 623, 808-809, 813; 15, 9 with Ger. tr. and concise notes by H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca*, 4 vols., 2nd ed., Munich (1965-); H. Delehaye, *Un épigramme de l'Anthologie grecque (1,99)*: REG 9 (1896) 216-224; D.J. Constantelos, *Kyros*

Panopolites, Rebuilder of Constantinople: GRBS 12 (1971) 451-464; PLRE 2, 336-339; B. Baldwin, *Cyrus of Panopolis: A Remarkable Sermon and an Unremarkable Poem*: VChr 36 (1982) 169-172; A. Cameron, *The Empress and the Poet: Paganism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II*: Yale Classical Studies 27 (1982) 217-289.

J. Irmscher - C. dell'Osso

CYRUS of Tyana (6th c.). The 7th-c. Greek *florilegium *Doctrina Patrum* contains two fragments of a letter to the miaphysite bishops Julian and Severus, attributed to Cyrus, bishop of *Tyana. The work, miaphysite in tendency, was written probably between 508–511, when both recipients were at *Constantinople, protected by the policy of the emperor *Anastasius. In a letter of 519–520, written by *Severus of Antioch to the *Cappadocian bishops *Proclus and *Eusebius and preserved in the *Syriac collection of Athanasius of Nisibis (ed. Brooks), the bishop condemns a certain Cyrus and invites his recipients to abandon their sophistical errors. If he is referring to the same Cyrus, he must have modified his christological beliefs.

CPG 7111; Diekamp 313; Patrologia V, 164; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieur au VI^e siècle* (CSCO 127, Subsidia 2), Louvain 1951, 113-114; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* 2/2, Freiburg 1984, 263-264.

K. den Biesen

D

DACIA TRAIANA. In Dacia—conquered and made a Roman province by the emperor Trajan (105–106) and later abandoned by *Aurelian (271–275)—and N of the lower Danube generally in what is now Romania, the spread of Christianity was due above all to the permanent contacts between the local Daco-Roman population on both banks of the river, conscious of their common origin. An important part was played in the persistence of these contacts and in the propagation and preservation of the Christian religion in present-day Romania by the uninterrupted possession of certain bridgeheads on the left bank of the Danube after Aurelian's withdrawal, and esp. by the expansion of the Roman Empire N of the Danube, first under *Constantine and his successors, and later under *Justinian (527–565).

A series of small, typically Christian objects found in Dacia Traiana constitute important proof of the spread of Christianity in this area before the *Edict of Milan (313), and perhaps even prior to the abandonment of the N Danubian province by Aurelian. Among these objects is the Potaissa (Turda, in Transylvania) gem (intaglio), whose four symbolic representations—the inscription ΙΧΘΥΣ, the figure of the Good Shepherd (symbols of Christ), Jonah (symbol of the resurrection) and the *arbor evangelica* (symbol of the divine kingdom)—make it one of the most important finds of early Christian minor art: symbolic in character, it may date from the period of the persecutions. To the same period are assigned a gem depicting the Good Shepherd, found in Transylvania, and two other gems found in *Dacia Inferior* at Romula, one with two upright fish with a *cross between them, the other with two peacocks supporting a cross with their beaks. The gnostic gems discovered in Dacia Traiana constitute a special category: two at Porolissum (Moigrad, Transylvania), three with the inscription *Abrasax* at Romula and at Orlea (district of Olt), and a gold disk with the epigraph *Iao Adonai*, found at Dierna (Orsova). These attest the presence of a significant number of Christian heretics, whether soldiers, merchants or small government employees, who arrived in Roman Dacia from the East (Syria or Egypt) from the 2nd to the early 4th c.

The large-scale spread of Christianity took place in Dacia Traiana at the time of Constantine and his successors. Left sole emperor (324), Constantine began an offensive policy in the Lower Danube, rebuilding fortresses on both sides of the river, adding new ones and building the bridge between Oescus and Sucidava (328). He also repaired the Roman road running N of Sucidava and re-annexed to the empire the plain between the river and the Carpathians. The most numerous Christian remains of Dacia Traiana have been found at Sucidava (Celei - Corabia, district of Olt). An important find N of the Carpathians in Transylvania (once *Dacia Superior*) was the Biertan (district of Sibiu) *donarium*, consisting of two bronze pieces: a *tabella ansata* with the perforated epigraph *Ego Zenovius votum posui*, and a Constantinian monogram of Christ (*chi-rho*) inscribed in a circle; the objects were found with two bronze vases used for worship. A ceramic with monogram and an epigraph similar to that of Biertan were recently found at Porolissum (Moigrad, Transylvania; 4th c.). Also probably used in worship was a small bronze lamp ornamented with a cross and a dove found near the city of Dej (Transylvania; 4th-5th c.). Christian objects from the same period from Transylvania include a clay lamp found at Apulum (Alba Iulia), thought to be of Italian origin, and two local lamps of the same material, one at Ulpia Traiana (Sarmizegetuza) and the other at Apulum. Two older Roman monuments, "Christianized" with the sign of the cross, have been found at Cluj-Napoca and Ampelum (Zlatna). After the great Hun invasion (376–453), the last Eastern emperor to consider reconquering Dacia was Justinian. To this end he rebuilt the old bridgeheads on the left bank of the Danube, and together with the military offensive he began another, religious, one, founding the arch-

bishopric of *Iustiniana Prima*, which included territory N of the Danube. To this period belong the Christian basilica found at Sucidava and various objects found S and E of the Carpathians: terracotta lamps at Drobeta (Turnu Severin), a beautiful bronze lamp at Luciu (district of Ialomita), molds for small crosses found at Olteni (district of Ilfov), Straulesti (Bucharest), Cindesti (district of Buzau) and Botosana (district of Suceava). This material shows the continuity of links between the Daco-Roman population and the Roman world (later Byzantine) S of the Danube.

I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; Id., *Christian Art in Romania*, 1, Bucharest 1979; A. MacKenzie, *Archaelogy in Romania: The Mystery of the Roman Occupation*, London 1986; *Roman Limes on the Middle and Lower Danube*, Belgrade 1996; D.M. Pippidi - I.I. Russu, *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae*, Bucharest 1977–1988; E. Popescu, *Christianitas daco-romana: florilegium studiorum*, Bucuresti 1994; I. Piso, *Inscriptions d'Apulum*, Paris 2001; EAA[2] 4,576-583.

I. Barnea

DADISHO' of Beth Qatraya (7th c.). Native of the region of Qatar, which in antiquity extended along the entire northern coast of the Persian Gulf, Dadisho' lived as a monk and then a recluse in two monasteries, those of Rab-Kennare and Holy Apostles; we have no further information regarding Holy Apostles Monastery, hypothesized to have been located in the mountains of Bet Huzaye (Susania or Khuzistan, in modern S Iran). It is certain that Dadisho' also lived for a period in the famous monastery of *Rabban Shabur. His most important work—a high point of Syriac literature for quality, erudition and writing style—is a commentary on the discourses of Abba Isaiah. In it, the account Dadisho' gives of various episodes of the life of Rabban Shabur suggests that he wrote it not long after the latter's death, perhaps in the third quarter of the 7th c.

Like his contemporary and compatriot *Isaac of Nineveh, Dadisho' was a passionate defender of the solitary life in a strict sense, at a time when it seems to have been little appreciated. His description, in his *Discourse on Solitude*, of the various types of monks then present in the Eastern Church is interesting: he basically distinguishes between monks who live in monasteries near the large public streets and practice agriculture and hospitality, and hermits who live in or near more isolated monasteries. These latter are then divided into six categories, from novices who live permanently in community to hermits who live entirely by themselves. We also have two treatises *On the Silence of the Seven Weeks*, in which he speaks of the practice of the temporary reclusion of "advanced" monks in their cells during the three times of fasting of the Eastern Church's liturgical year.

Dadisho' is a sober writer, strongly influenced by *Evagrius of Pontus. He defends a monastic, i.e., "spiritual," reading of the Bible, decidedly different from Antiochene-style "historical" reading or from "homiletic" reading. He develops his vision of the spiritual life mainly as marginal notes to the writings of the monastic tradition. He also wrote a commentary (almost entirely unpublished) in this manner on the *Paradise of the Fathers*, which had just been published by *Henanisho, but also seems to have been inspired by the *apophthegmata*, the Macarian homilies and *Mark the Hermit. Dadisho's writings show him to have been a meticulous philologist, careful to note and discuss the textual variants attested by the various copies available to him, a balanced exegete, and a gifted and tested monk.

Editions and translations: A. Mingana, *Early Christian Mystics* (Woodbrooke Studies VII), Cambridge 1934, 201-247 (tr. 76-143): *Discorso sulla solitudine*, followed by five other pamphlets or extracts from later writings; R. Draguet, *Commentaire du livre d'Abba Isaïe par Dadisho' Qatraya* (CSCO 326-327), Louvain 1972; A. Guillaumont - M. Albert, *Lettre de Dadisho' Qatraya à Abkosh sur l'hésychia*, in *Mémorial A.-J. Festugière. Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, Geneva 1984, 235-245 (Fr. tr.); S. Brock, *The Syriac Fathers on the Spiritual Life* (Cistercian Studies 101), Kalamazoo 1987, 306-310: tr. of one of the extracts published by Mingana.

Baumstark, 226f.; BO III/1, 98f.; Bettiolo, *Lineamenti*, 586-588; DSp 3, 2-3; P. Bettiolo, *Esegesi e purezza di cuore. La testimonianze di Dadisho' Qatraya (VII sec.), nestoriano e solitario*: AnSE 3 (1986) 201-213; R. Beulay, *La lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, Chevetogne (see index); N. Sims-Williams, *Dādīšo' Qaṭrāyā's Commentary on the Paradise of the Fathers*: AB 112 (1994) 33-64.

K. den Biesen

DALMATIA. The province of Dalmatia, on the eastern shore of the Adriatic, extended from the River Rosa (Arsa) in Istria to the Mat in Albania, although its southern part was separated and included in the province of Prevalis in 293 (S of the Mouths of Cattaro). Its N border coincided with the northern line of the Dinaric Alps, S of the Sava. Its main city was *Salona, metropolitan see and later also seat of the vicariate of West Illyricum.

In one letter (Rom 15:19), the apostle Paul wrote that he had spread the faith as far as Illyricum, in another (2 Tim 4:10), that he had sent Titus to Dalmatia. Legends also claim that Luke the evangelist visited Dalmatia. Christianity did not develop significantly, however, until the arrival of eastern missionaries in Dalmatia toward the mid-3rd c. The first known

martyr was a bishop *Venantius. The martyrs Domnius, Septimius, *Anastasius, *Asterius, *Gaianus, *Paulinianus, Telius, Antiochianus and probably others died during the *Diocletian persecutions of 304. After the *Edict of Milan, Christian cemeteries developed around the tombs of the Salonitan martyrs. During the 4th c. Christianity became Dalmatia's most important religion. Other dioceses in Salona besides Dalmatia were Arba (Rab), Senia (Senj), Iader (Zadar/Zara), Skradin (near Šibenik), Muccur (Makarska), Narona (Vid near Metkovic), Epidaurum (Cavtat near Dubrovnik/Ragusa), Rhisinium (Risan in the Mouths of Cattaro); and in the hinterland Ludrum (Otok near Senj), Baloie (Spovo in Bosnia?), Bistue (Zenica), Martari (Mostar?) and Sarsenterum (Arzano near Imostski?). There were very probably other dioceses, now unknown. The list of the bishops of Salona is rather complete from the 4th-7th c., although this not the case for the other Dalmatian dioceses, with the exception of the names of the participants at the councils of Salona of 530 and 533. The ancient cities of Dalmatia were destroyed during the early 7th-c. Avar and Slav invasions. The first Christian churches arose in the early 4th c. within and outside the cities. The first church building (*domus ecclesiae*) was found at Salona: it was probably built in the last decades of the 3rd c. and is preserved as an oratory in the cathedral complex. A *domus ecclesiae* was also built at Iader, later included in the episcopal complex and turned into a catecumeneo; it was embellished with floor mosaics (motif: a spring flanked by deer). Many churches have been found at Salona; there must also have been churches elsewhere. Very large, sumptuous churches arose at Salona and elsewhere in the 5th c., generally longitudinal-plan with projecting semi-circular apses and rooms for liturgical services (baptisteries, etc.). In the cities basilicas were often three-aisled (Salona, Iader, Arba, Apsorus, Narona, etc.). Sometimes the apse is inscribed and attached to the E wall of the church, as at Iader, Salona, Epetion, Povlja (island of Brač), Polace (island of Mljet) etc., although basilicas of this type are less frequent than the normal plan: both types go back to the 5th c. In the 6th c. other plans began to appear: central, cruciform, trilobate, etc., very often with a central dome. The 6th c. also saw the Christianization of the *pagus*, as numerous churches of various sizes, many with baptisteries, appeared in rural areas; there are indications that they were used for both daily and memorial worship.

One characteristic of the churches of Dalmatia is the so-called *basilicae geminae*, built in cities, but also in rural areas (Srima near Šibenik). In Dalmatia, according to St. *Jerome (letters to Julian 11, 85 and to Heliodorus 60, 10: PL 22, 594 and 965), there must have been groups of hermitages in caves and other isolated places, esp. on islands, though few of these have been identified. Cenobitic monasteries have been found near Salona (Rizinice and Crikvina), at Klapavica (N of Salona), in the isles of Stipanska (near Solta) and Majsan (near Korcula/Curzola). These monasteries were very small: a small church, some cells for the monks and a courtyard. Building activity in Dalmatia decreased during the Gothic occupation, ca. 480–535; a new period of prosperity began with the *Justinian conquest. A basilica with baptistery at Salona was attributed to the Goths, but identification with the cathedral of the Goths is uncertain. Other arts besides architecture also developed in Dalmatia, such as hypogea with barrel vaults, often preserving 4th-c. frescos in the manner of the last phases of Roman catacomb painting; in the late 5th c. and 6th c. a more decadent style prevails. Sarcophagi, esp. at Salona, better express the artistic tendencies of 4th-c. sculpture: some were imported, but most of those produced locally were smooth. Importation of pieces from *Rome continued until the early 5th c., the most numerous and valuable being from the second half of the 4th c.: one depicting the Flight of the Israelites through the Red Sea (Split Archaeological Museum) and another with the figure of the shepherd (Split cathedral) stand out. Many other sarcophagi were made in the workshops of Salona. A group of the most luxurious are in Proconnesian marble, with front decorated with architectural elements: usually the spouses are depicted full-length in the side arcades, with an inscription in the central tabernacle; or, the surface was smooth. The most famous and richly decorated depicts the Good Shepherd (Split Archaeological Museum) in the tabernacle and minor scenes that are hard to interpret and so continually debated. Production of these sarcophagi ceased ca. the mid-4th c.

Even more numerous, but of decadent quality, are sarcophagi in local limestone, similar to earlier pagan sarcophagi: on the front is a central *tabula*, replaced by a central *cross; very often these sarcophagi were undecorated. Decoration inside Dalmatian churches, at times truly sumptuous, consisted of marble imposts, capitals, *plutaei*, cornices, etc.; in churches of the Dalmatian hinterland, however, certain reliefs show a technique so primitive as to make dating difficult. Many private and liturgical furnishings have been found in Dalmatia: crockery, amulets, lamps, gold-glass, thuribles, crosses, etc.

Two valuable reliquaries were recently found at Novalja (island of Pag), one of silver with Christ among the apostles, the other a laminated bronze *scrinium* decorated with five OT and five NT scenes. The

period of prosperity under Justinian was followed by one of decadence (early 7th c.), with the consequent collapse of the ancient civilization of the E Adriatic.

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans la province Dalmatie*, Paris 1906; W. Gerber, *Altchristliche Kultbauten Istriens und Dalmatiens*, Dresden 1912; W. Gerber, *Forschungen in Salona* I, Vienna 1917; R. Egger, *Forschungen in Salona* II, Vienna 1926; J. Brondsted - F. Weilbach - E. Dyggve, *Recherches à Salone*, Copenhagen 1927; D. Rendic-Miocevic, *Battisteri in ambienti rurali nell'Adriatico orientale*, CCAB, Ravenna 1972, 281ff.; *Disputationes Salonitanae* I, Split 1975; N. Cambi, in *Prop. Kunst. Gesch. Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, ed. B. Brenk, Berlin 1977, 301ff.; N. Cambi, *Starokršcanska crkvena arhitektura na podrucju salonitanske metropolije*: Arheološki vestnik 29 (1978) 606ff.; B. Migotti, *Ranokršcanska topografija na podrucju izmedu Krke i Cetine*, Zagreb 1990; D. Basler, *Spätantike und frühchristliche Architektur in Bosnien und der Herzegowina*, R. Pillinger - A. Pülz - H. Vetters (eds.), Vienna 1993; P. Vežic, *Zadar na pragu kršcanstva*: Diadora 15 (1993) 29ff.; N. Cambi, *Sarkofag Dobrog pastira i njegova grupa - The Good Shepherd and Its Group*, Split 1994; *Salona I. Recherches archéologiques franco-croates à Salona. Catalogue de la sculpture architecturale paléochrétienne de Salone*, N. Duval - E. Marin - C. Metzger (eds.), Rome-Split 1994; *Salona Christiana*, E. Marin (ed.), Split 1994; J. Jelicic-Radonic, *Ranokršcanske dvojne crkve u Starom Gradu na Hvaru*, Split 1994; J. Jelicic-Radonic, *Gata crkva Justinijanova doba*, Split 1994; J. Belamaric - R. Bužancic - D. Domancic - J. Jelicic-Radonic - V. Kovacic, *Ranokršcanski spomenici otoka Braca*, Split 1994; P. Chevalier, *Salona II. Ecclesiae Dalmatiae. L'architecture paléochrétienne de la province romaine de Dalmatie (IVe-VIIe s.)*. I-II, Rome-Split 1995; E. Marin et al., *Starokršcanska bazilika i krstionica u Naroni, srednjovjekovno groblje, novovjekovna crkva*: Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 87-89 (1994–1996) 9ff.; *Acta Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae*, Split-Porec 1994, II, Vatican City-Split 1998; J. Dresken Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*, II, Mainz 1998; N. Cambi - A. Gamulin - S. Tonkovic, *Starokršcanska bazilika u Zmijavcima*, Split-Zmijavci 1999; *Salona III. Recherches archéologiques franco-croates à Salone. Manastirine. Établissement préromain, nécropole et basilique paléochrétienne à Salone*, D. Duval - E. Marin (eds.), Rome - Split 2000; N. Cambi, *Povijest umjetnosti u Hrvatskoj. Antika*, Zagreb 2002; A. Uglešic, *Ranokršcanska arhitektura na podrucju današnje Zadarske nadbiskupije*, Zadar 2002; E. Marin et al., *Erešove bar. Villa suburbana iz 3. st. i starokršcanska crkva iz 7. st. u Naroni*: Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 94 (2002) 9ff.; N. Cambi, *Sarcofagi con la croce nel centro della cassa*, in *Akten des Symposiums "Frühchristliche Sarkophage,"* Marburg 1999; *Sarkophag Studien* II, Mainz 2002, 47ff.

N. Cambi

DALMATIUS, monk (d. ca. 440), archimandrite of *Constantinople. Saint. Feast 3 August. Initially an officer in the imperial guard, he became a monk later in life with his son Faustus and succeeded his teacher Isaac as archimandrite of the chief convent of Constantinople. He came to *Cyril's help at the Council of *Ephesus (431). After 48 years he left his monastery and led the city's monks in solemn procession to appear before *Theodosius II, who responded by calling the opposing parties to Chalcedon for clarifications. Dalmatius wrote two letters to the Council of Ephesus and an apology.

CPG III, 5776-5778; DHGE 14, 27-28. The letters and the apology are respectively in PG 85, 1799–1800 (*Epistula ad Synodum*); 1800–1801 (*Epistula cleri constantinopolitani ad Synodum*); 1801 (Apologia); Patrologia 5, 32.

E. Prinzivalli

DALMATIUS of Cyzicus (5th c.). A monk of Cyzicus, elected bishop by the people in preference to *Proclus, who had been designated by *Sisinnius, archbishop of *Constantinople (Socr., *HE* 7, 28). He took part in the Council of *Ephesus (431). His collection of documents of the Council of *Nicaea (325) was used by *Gelasius of Cyzicus as a source for his *Storia Ecclesiastica.*

LTK[3] 2, 1381.

E. Prinzivalli

DAMASCIUS (d. after 538). Last representative of the *Neoplatonist philosophical school. Born at *Damascus in Syria, probably ca. 462. He began his studies at *Alexandria, then went to *Athens ca. 482–483 (ca. 491–492 according to some scholars) as a teacher of rhetoric. In 492 he converted to philosophy under the influence of *Isidore, a Neoplatonic philosopher he had known in *Alexandria, and began his studies under the guidance of *Marinus, then head of the Athenian school. He took over as head of the Athenian school after 515, upon returning from a trip to Syria with *Isidore. In 529 an ordinance of *Justinian ratified the closing of the school, which was again flourishing under Damascius's energetic reorganization. According to Agathias (*Hist.* 2,30,3–31,9), the philosopher went into exile to the king of Persia, where he tried in vain to resurrect the school. He died in Syria after 538.

Of his works we have two commentaries *On the Phaedo*, a commentary *On the Philebus*, a treatise *On first principles* and a commentary *On Parmenides.* Sizeable fragments of the *Paradox, Life of Isidore, Treatise on Aristotle's Meteorology, Commentary on Aristotle's "De Coelo," Treatise on Number, Space and Time* and a *Commentary on the First Alcibiades* are found in *Photius, *John Philoponus, *Simplicius and *Olympiodorus.

Damascius effected a profound reorganization of the Neoplatonic school of Athens, restoring its philosophical values in the face of Christianity and the spread of theurgy, haughtily introduced by *Iambli-

chus. His writings show how he completely reestablished the traditional Neoplatonic *cursus* based on the study of Aristotle, Plato and the Chaldean Oracles. Damascius's metaphysics tended to exacerbate some aspects of Plotinus's negative theology: the separation between the one and the many, already analyzed by earlier Neoplatonists, became in Damascius an unhealable rupture. The originary being is prior to both unity and multiplicity, and thus only through *hyperagnoia* (a sort of hyper-ignorance) can one have a kind of presentiment of this being. Human thought is incapable of deducing multiplicity, the knowable or the determinate.

Editions: De Primis Principiis, J. Kopp, Frankfurt 1826; A. Chaignet, Paris 1898 (repr. Brussels 1964); C.E. Ruelle, Paris 1889 (repr. Brussels 1964); L.G. Westerink - J. Combès, Paris 1986–1991; *In Platonis Parmenidem*, C.E. Ruelle, Paris 1889 (repr. Brussels 1964); *Vita d'Isidoro*, A. Chaignet, Paris 1903 (repr. Frankfurt 1962); C. Zintzen, Hildesheim 1967; R. Henry, Paris 1960; P. Athanassiadi, Athens-Oxford 1999; L.G. Westerink, *Lectures on the Philebus: Wrongly Attributed to Olympiodous*, Amsterdam 1959; Id., *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*, Amsterdam 1977.

Studies: A very competent study on Damascius is in the intr. to the ed. of the works edited by Westerink; C.G. Steel, *The Changing Self. A Study on the Soul in Later Platonism: Iamblichus, Damascius and Priscianus*, Brussels 1978; J. Bertier - L. Brisson - J. Combès, *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne (Platon, Aristote, Proclus, Damascius)*, Paris 1977; J. Combès, *Études néoplatoniciennes*, Grenoble 1989; P. Athanassiadi, *The Philosophical History, Damascius*, Athens-Oxford 1999.

M. Conti

DAMASCUS. Ancient city of S Syria, located 100 km (62 mi) from the Mediterranean, near the Anti-Lebanon Range at the edge of the desert in an oasis crossed by the River Barada. A Roman colony from 222, Damascus was visited in AD 38 by St. Paul, who was baptized there by Ananias. The episcopal see is attested at least from 325; two centuries later the city became the metropolitan see of the province of *Phoenicia Libanensis*, with jurisdiction over some suffragans. Damascus's checkerboard street plan is partially preserved; the decuman, the famous Straight Street mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, is partially recognizable. Archaeologically, only scant traces remain of Christian churches: the vacuum is in part compensated for by the sources. The most important building was the cathedral: built under *Theodosius I (380–395) and dedicated to the Baptist, whose head it preserves, it rose over the grandiose *temenos* of the temple of Damascene Jupiter, in line with the edicts (390–391) prohibiting sacrifices in temples (CTh XVI, 10-12). For the period before the Umayyad conquest in 635–636, the sources also mention the churches of the Theotokos, St. Ananias, St. Thomas, St. Sergius, St. Leontius—the latter built at *Justinian's expense, as attested by *Procopius (*De Aed.* 5,9,26); for some of these the location or date of construction can only be hypothesized.

With the Arab takeover, the cathedral dedicated to the Baptist was divided between Christians and Arabs; the latter oriented their part of the building S, toward Mecca, according to a practice widely employed in Syria, Mesopotamia, and later in southern Spain and Sicily. The cathedral was definitively destroyed when Damascus replaced Medina as the Umayyad capital, the grandiose Umayyad mosque rising in its place, built by the caliph Walid from 705–715. Artists were called from Byzantium for its decoration: it was covered, internally and externally, with nonfigurative mosaics, in part still extant; the mosaic tesserae were in part reused, as the sources emphasize. The mosque also reemployed much Roman and Byzantine period material, esp. columns and capitals: still preserved on the S side are two entrances that belonged to the cathedral complex, with Greek inscriptions on the jack arch. A new cathedral, dedicated to the Virgin, was built following the demolition of the old one; it was rebuilt numerous times. Simultaneously with these events, Syro-Eastern/Nestorian and Syro-Western/Jacobite hierarchies developed alongside the Orthodox diocese. With the ascent to power of the Abbassid dynasty in 750 and the subsequent relocation of the caliphate to the E toward the new capital of Baghdad, the city underwent a period of decline: the end of the golden age seems to have coincided with the death in 749 of one of the greatest eastern theologians, St. *John Damascene, bard of the Virgin and vigorous defender of images, born at Damascus during the previous century to an Arab-Christian family.

H. Kennedy, *The Last Century of the Byzantine Syria. A Reinterpretation*: Byzantinische Forschungen 10 (1985) 141-183; J. Nasrallah, *Damas et la Damascène: leurs églises à l'époque byzantine*: Proche Orient Chrétien 35 (1985) 37-58, 264-276; Fedalto, II, 729ff.; G.H. Salies, *Die Mosaiken der Grossen Moschee von Damaskus*, Corso di Cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 35 (1988) 295-313; D. Sack, *Damaskus. Entwicklung und Struktur einer Orientalisch-Islamischen Stadt*, Mainz 1989; J. Nasrallah, *De la cathédrale de Damas à la mosquée omayyade*, in *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam*, Colloque Int., Lyon 1990 (Damas 1992), 139-144; M. Mundell Mango, s.v. *Damascus*: ODB I, 580; P. Cuneo, s.v. *Damasco*: EAM V, 614-619.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

DAMASUS. Bishop of *Rome (1 October 366–11 December 384), among those who contributed most, with *Innocent and *Leo, to the evolution of the "papacy." Though the *Liber pontificalis* says he was of

Spanish origin (39, ed. Duchesne LP, 212), Damasus was a member of the Roman clergy. His father, Antonius, a Roman ecclesiastic who died while Damasus was still young, perhaps was a suburban bishop after having been deacon of Rome (*Epigram.* 57, Ferrua, 210); his mother, Laurentia, belonged to the order of widows and died in her nineties (*Epigram.* 10, Ferrua, 106); a sister, Irene, made a vow of virginity (*Epigram.* 11, Ferrua, 108). Damasus, already a deacon at the time of Pope *Liberius and later accused of having supported the antipope *Felix—imposed by the pro-Arian emperor *Constantius II in place of Liberius, whom he had exiled to Beroea (Thrace; 365)—had a modest affluence, sufficient to bring a *titulus* with a small landed estate in central Italy to the paternal home and to have a small mausoleum built (not yet identified archaeologically) near the tomb of Sts. Marco and Marcellino on the via Ardeatina. Damasus is one of the first Roman bishops whose attitude and intellectual capacities we can glimpse; he sometimes used *Jerome as a secretary (Jerome, *Ep.* 18; 19; 21; 127), esp. for scriptural difficulties, and may have asked him to undertake an edition of Paul's epistles (*Epigram.* 1, Ferrua, 82; A. Vaccari, Biblica 1 [1920] 534). His poetry (Ferrua; Fontaine, *Poésie*, 110ff.), despite its roughness, shows a certain artistic sensibility (also seen in his employment of *Philocalus) and an intent to nourish Christian interpretation with the language of traditional secular culture. The most conspicuous and characteristic part of his production is found in the corpus of epigrams, in its present state comprising seventy compositions, reaching us in their epigraphic originals and/or in Late Medieval copies preserved in syllogisms.

His ascension to the episcopate was marked by grave difficulties (see in particular in *Coll. Avellana* 1, the *Gesta . . . inter Liberium et Felicem*, CPL 1570), because a rigorist minority accused him of usurping Felix's succession, opposing him (24 September 366) with the deacon *Ursinus. The conflict between the two parties, during which Damasus's partisans assaulted the *basilica Iulii* (Trastevere) and the *basilica Sicinini* (perhaps the *basilica Liberii*, later S. Maria Maggiore), provoked riots (366–368), which forced the prefect of the city and later Emperor Valentinian to intervene (*Coll. Avellana* 5-12, CPL 1574). Ursinus, back in Rome after a first exile, was again expelled (16 November 367). Damasus, having obtained imperial consent, sought to definitively close the question of Ursinus, including by synodal condemnation: on the third anniversary of his election (1 October 368), he convoked a council and sought unsuccessfully to have the bishops condemn Ursinus. During the following two years Ursinus's activity gradually diminished, and in 371 he was expelled from all the regions of suburbicarian Italy and sent to *Gaul. Damasus's relations with the emperor deteriorated at the time of the great trials of the urban aristocracy on charges of magic: a constitution of *Valentinian I's western chancellery, emanated from Trier 30 July 370, forbade Roman clerics from frequenting the homes of widows and from receiving inheritances from women with whom they had religious dealings (CTh XVI, 2,20), and criminal proceedings were instituted against Damasus, related to the accusation of a converted Jew, Isaac. These difficulties unquestionably stirred up the activity of the pope's adversaries, esp. Ursinus, who still agitated from exile in 378; they also explain the energetic and unified policy, carried out with varying success, against the sects present at Rome (*Luciferians, *Donatists; see the *Libellus precum*, a long sequence of complaints, presented in 384 to *Valentinian II, *Theodosius and *Arcadius, by two Luciferian presbyters, *Marcellinus and *Faustus; CPL 1571). In any case, *Gratian's new policy and occasionally a prefect's intervention favored the conversion of the pagans. Damasus intervened with *Ambrose of *Milan (382) to obstruct the senate's attempt to restore the Altar of Victory to the Roman curia, a request it had made to the court of Milan.

Although Damasus's work in the field of *liturgy is not known, his intervention seems to have been decisive for the organization of the cult of the martyrs. While a theology of martyrdom was developing, his *elogia martyrum* placed on martyrs' tombs marked out venerated sepulchres, already indicated in the Roman ordinary (of 336), thus making new cults official in most of the cemeteries that had become communal, except perhaps that of via Latina. During his time three *tituli* (of Anastasia, Fasciola and Damasus) were built, and the sites of S. Clemente and S. Pudenziana prepared. At St. Peter's, the entrances to the basilica and a baptistery were organized; he intervened a number of times in the catacombs (esp. in the Appian zone), and it is likely that he founded the large three-aisled "semipogea" basilica dedicated to Sts. Nereus and Achilleus in the area of the cemetery of Domitilla on the via Ardeatina.

Damasus's relations with the other churches marked a real turning point in papal policy. At first in Italy he attempted to win back the *homoian episcopate that existed from Milan to Illyricum: a council of the Nicene bishops at Rome (368/372) forcefully confirmed the condemnation of Auxentius of Milan (*Ep.* 1: PL 13, 748). In 378 another Roman council asked that the pope could be judged directly by the emperor in criminal matters; but Damasus refrained

from intervening at the Council of *Aquileia (381), organized by *Ambrose. Damasus, who would not accept an invitation sent by *Priscillian, addressed the first common decretal to Gaul (ed. Babut, Paris 1904), a small disciplinary manual for a missionary church, in response to a request. Pressing entreaties gradually began to arrive from the East, where the emperor *Valens favored Arianism: Damasus finally delegated the priest *Evagrius (374) and entered into communion with the little church of Paulinus at *Antioch, ignoring *Meletius, who was supported by *Basil of Caesarea; but he broke with Vitalis, an Antiochene priest favorable to the ideas of *Apollinaris of Laodicea, and, after many attempts by the envoys of Basil and the East, called a Roman council (377), which published, in the presence of *Peter of *Alexandria, a list of anathemata (*Ep.* 4, ed. C. Turner; see CPL 1633), in fact a volume which sketched out a refutation of Apollinarism and the *pneumatomachi.* In 380 the emperor Theodosius issued an edict (CTh XVI, 1,2) imposing communion with Damasus and Peter of Alexandria as a test of Catholic unity; the Council of Constantinople, however, to which Damasus delegated Acholius of Thessalonica, marked the restoration of an orthodox episcopate in the East, centered on Constantinople, which claimed the rights of a second Rome. Damasus responded in a Roman council (382), where the pericope Mt 16:18 was explicitly applied to Roman primacy for the first time.

A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942; see also the recension of A. Vaccari, Biblica 24 (1943) 190-194: M.A. Norton, *Pope Damasus: Leaders of Iberian Christianity*, ed. J. Marique, Boston 1962, 13-80; A. Lippold, *Ursinus und Damasus*: Historia 14 (1965) 105-128; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana, Recherches sur l'Église de Rome (311–440)*, I, Rome 1976, ch. VI-X; Patrologia III, 260-264; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la Poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, ch. VII; *Saecularia Damasiana.* Atti del convegno internazionale per il XVI centenario della morte di Papa Damasus I (11-12-384–10/12-12-1984), Vatican City 1986; EPapi I, 349-372; G. Pilara, *Problemi ancora aperti nel pontificato damasiano. Lo scisma ursiniano e i concili romani nel pontificato di Damaso*: Clio 28/1 (2002) 115-133; R. Lizzi Testa, *Senatori, popolo, papi. Il governo di Roma al tempo dei Valentiniani,* Rome 2004.

Ch. Pietri - M. Ghilardi

DAMIAN of Alexandria (d. 605), anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of *Alexandria from 578–605. Of Syrian origin, he was elected at the end of a period of grave organizational crisis in the anti-Chalcedonian Egyptian church, in the wake of the measures of *Justinian and his successors aimed at restoring unity to the church of the empire. Damian succeeded brilliantly in reconstituting the Egyptian clergy in his hierarchy, a work that endured. He was less successful, however, in the other serious problem, that of relations with the other important anti-Chalcedonian church—the Syrian—creating a theological and personal conflict that was resolved only during the time of his successor *Anastasius. Of his works, probably written in Greek, we have only an important synodal letter sent to the Syrian church and fragments of the *Coptic translation of a homily on the incarnation (ed. Orlandi). An important school of Coptic writers developed during his patriarchate—authors of homilies, encomia of saints, exegesis and polemic: Constantine of Assiut, John of Ashmunein, *Rufus of Shotep, *John of Paralos.

CPG 7240-7249. Jean Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1923; W.E. Crum, *Theological Texts from Coptic Papyri*, Oxford 1913; BBKL 1,1205; Patrologia V, 394-401; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 688-689; Ph. Blaudeau, *Le voyage de Damien d'Alexandrie vers Antioche puis Constantinople (579–580), motivations et objectifs*: OCP 63 (1997) 333-361; T. Orlandi, *Papiro di Torino 63000, 1: Damiano di Alessandria, Sul Natale*: H. Melaerts (ed.), *Papyri in Honorem Johannis Bingen Octogenarii* (*P. Bingen*), Louvain 2000, 593-613.

T. Orlandi

DAMIAN of Pavia (late 7th c.). Western bishops were invited by Constantine IV, emperor of the East, to attend the 6th ecumenical council (681–682), III Constantinople, convoked to discuss and condemn *monothelitism. *Mansuetus, archbishop of *Milan, gathered a local council to respond to the invitation. At his request the Greek-educated Damian, future bishop of Pavia (elected ca. 680), in 679 drafted in Greek the letter to the emperor and an extensive profession of trinitarian and christological faith; the letter has been preserved in Latin (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* 6,4). The two texts, together with the *synodica* of Pope *Agatho, were accepted by the council, and constituted the basis of the council's decisions. The letter praises Constantine for his works, inviting him to imitate *Constantine I and *Theodosius; it also proclaims fidelity to the first five ecumenical councils and praises the orthodoxy of the *Longobard kings.

CPL 1170-1171; PL 87, 1261-1265 (Mansi 11, 203-208); Rbe 32 (1905) 512; *Expositio fidei*: PL 87, 1265-1267 (PL 13, 651-655); G.P. Bognetti, *Storia di Milano*, II, Milan 1954, 190-193; DBI 32, 339-343; A.M. Orselli, *La città altomedievale e il suo santo Patrono: (ancora una volta) il "campione pavese,"* Rome 1979; *Diocesi di Pavia*, A. Caprioli et al. (eds.), Brescia 1985, passim.

A. Di Berardino

DAMNATIO AD BESTIAS. "Condemnation to the beasts" is considered a lighter punishment among

some scholars than execution, perhaps because in some cases the condemned were armed or otherwise able to defend themselves. It was applied to parricides, murderers, rebels, prisoners of war and sometimes Christians (Polycarp, the martyrs of Lyons, Perpetua and companions, etc.). It was a favorite entertainment of the ancients; we possess depictions of it.

DACL I, 449-462; J.P. Callu, *Le Jardin des supplices au Bas-Empire*, in *Du Châtiment dans la cité. Supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le monde antique*, École Française de Rome 1984, 313-357; D. Grodzynski, *Tortures mortelles et catégories sociales. Les summa supplicia dans le droit romain aux IIIe et IVe s.*, ibid., 361-403; C. Vismara, *Il supplizio come spettacolo*, Rome 1990; K.M. Coleman, *Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments*: JRS 80 (1990) 44-73; R. Rea, *I cristiani, vittime e spettatori nel Templum demonum: il Colosseo*, in *Aurea Roma. Dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, S. Ensoli - E. La Rocca (eds.), Rome 2000, 129-133; D. Augenti, *Spettacoli del Colosseo nelle cronache degli antichi*, Rome 2001, 34-39 (mosaic depictions of torture *ad bestias*); I. Rivière, *Constantin, le crime et le christianisme: contribution à l'étude des lois et des mœurs de l'Antiquité Tardive*: Antiquité Tardive 10 (2002) 344-353.

V. Saxer

DAMNATIO AD METALLA. "Condemnation to the mines" or quarries, equivalent to modern "hard labor." The harshness of the punishment and poor sanitary conditions led to the rapid death of the condemned, among whom were Christians.

Tertullian, *Apol.* 9,2; Cyprian, *Ep.* 76-79; Eusebius, *Mart. Palest.* 7-8; *V. Const.* 2,32; Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr.* 5,19; DAGR 3/2,1840-74; DACL I,467-474; A. Bellucci, *I martiri cristiani dannati ad metalla nella Spagna e nella Sardegna*, Naples 1959; F. Millar, *Condemnation to Hard Labour in the Roman Empire from the Iulio-Claudians to Constantine*: PBSR 39 (1984) 124-147 (in part. 137-143); C. Domergue, *Les mines de la péninsule ibérique dans l'antiquité romaine*, École Française de Rome 1990, 348.

V. Saxer

DANCE. Popular among the pagans at spectacles and in worship: with contortions and gyrating movements to induce ecstasy (Apulieus, *Metam.* 7, 27), or in orgiastic feasts such as those for the goddess Syria, accompanied by religious songs and instrumental music (Lucian, *Dea Syria* 50). Among the Jews: in plazas (Chrys., *Adv. Iudaeos* 1,3; PG 48, 847; Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 91,2; PL 37, 1172; ". . . there is no difference between the theater and the synagogue": Chrys., l.c.) and in synagogues (Philo of Alex., *De vita contemplativa* 83-90; G.P. Wetter, *La danse rituelle*, 259). Among heretics: the Melitians (4th c.) would dance, while singing, clapping their hands and ringing bells (Theod., *Haer. fab. comp.* 4, 7; PG 83, 426), the *Priscillianists and Manicheans doing so promiscuously (Epiph., *Haer.* 80,8-9). The Fathers disapproved of the use in church of dance moves taken from the theater, or from pagan, Jewish or heretical worship. "Where dance is, so is the devil" (Chrys., *In Matth. hom.* 48,3: PG 58, 491). Dances are attested, however, in honor of the martyr Polientus, late 4th c. (L. Gougaud, *La danse*, 5-22), and at *Antioch after *Julian's death, in the churches and precincts of the martyrs (Euseb., *HE* X, 9: PG 20, 904). Whether cultic dance derived from the Greek mysteries (G.P. Wetter, *La danse rituelle*, 75) or from the synagogue (R. Eisler, *Dance macabre*, 195) is disputed. The church's directives were not uniform: perhaps allowed at first, it was later prohibited because of intemperances (R. Torniai, *La danza*, 115).

L. Gougaud, *La danse dans les églises*: RHE 15 (1914) 5-22; Th. Gérold, *Les Pères de l'Église et la musique*, Paris 1931; R. Eisler, *Dance macabre*: Traditio 6 (1948) 187-225; R. Torniai, *La danza sacra*, Rome 1950; R. Kraus, *History of the Dance*, Englewood Cliffs 1969; O. Pasquato, *Gli spettacoli in S. Giovanni Crisostomo. Paganesimo e cristianesimo ad Antiochia e Costantinopoli nel IV secolo* (OCA 201), Rome 1976, 258-265; P. Riché, *Dances profanes et religieuses dans la haut Moyen Âge*, in *Mélanges Robert Mandrou*, Paris 1985, 159-167; M. Dania, *La danza sacra: esperienze antiche e nuove*, Rome 2000; G.P.Wetter, *La danse rituelle dans l'église ancienne*, Paris 1961.

O. Pasquato

DANIEL
I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. The name Daniel, which means "God is judge" or "God judges," was very common in the Middle East in the centuries before Christ. The OT prophetic book of Daniel contains many stories, the most important of which are the prayer of Azariah, the song of the three young men (3,24-90), the story of Susanna (13,1-64), the dragon (13,64–14,42); the last three are preserved only in the Septuagint and other versions. This apocalyptic book has various characteristics: history is divided into several very distinct periods; the author believes in the resurrection of the body, awaits the coming of the future world, provides a detailed doctrine of angels, and attaches great importance to the revelation of mysteries: Daniel, the book's central figure, prepares by fasting to learn the revelation. The historicity of the man Daniel is problematic: the OT books make no mention of a prophet living in exile; only the book of Ezekiel (14:4, 20 and 28:3) speaks of a wise man, a Daniel it compares with Noah and Job, but who was not of Jewish origin. The figure of Daniel also significantly resembles that of Joseph, in the two parallel episodes

in which the prophet interprets the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2:1-49) and the patriarch that of Pharaoh (Gen 41:1-42). The book had a great influence on Jewish and rabbinic apocalyptic literature: in the latter, Daniel became the type of the just one tested and saved by God. The church fathers used *Theodotion's translation. The NT authors focused esp. on ch. 7. The figure of Daniel was of notable importance in early Christian writings, esp. for the episodes of Daniel in the lions' den, the three young men in the furnace and the story of Susanna. For *Origen, Daniel in the lions' den prefigured Christ's triumph (*C. Cels.* 7,57). *Hippolytus saw a rich baptismal symbolism, esp. in the story of Susanna: Susanna represents the church; her husband, Joachim, Christ; the gardens, the community of saints; Babylon, this world; the lying old men, those who persecute Christians; the bath, baptism; the oil, the post-baptismal *myron* (*Comm. in Dan.* 1, 15-16; 3,31). The *Apos. Con.* (V, 7, 12) follow this interpretation.

In patristic works, Daniel in the lions' den represents the just one, persecuted and then saved by God (*1 Ep. Clem.* 45,6-8); he attained great importance at the time of the persecutions (Cypr., *Ep.* 57,8), since he was considered a prototype of the martyr. The Fathers included Daniel among the OT saints (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 48,74; Cypr., *De laps.* 19); his fidelity to the covenant was interpreted as an example of Christian faith (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 5,4); the image of Daniel was frequently used to represent virtue and the power of prayer (Cypr., *De or. dom.* 21; Orig., *De or.* 13,3; Hipp., *Comm. in Dan.* 2,29 and 38; Greg. Elv., *Tract.* 18).

Daniel the "sage," full of wisdom and prudence, became the archetype of the Christian (Just., *Dial.* 87,4; Cypr., *Ad Fort.* 11; Aster., *Hom. VI in Dan. et Susannam*: PG 50, 241; Greg. Nyss.: PG 45, 1017D; 46, 857C; Did.: PG 39, 1397C; Theodoret: PG 81, 1268A), whose actions (fasting and abstinence) very clearly reveal the weakness of the human mind before divine revelation (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 9,1; 12-14; John Chrys., *De incompr. Dei nat.* 3,4). We have only two Eastern commentaries on Daniel from the patristic era, both Syrian: one is attributed to *Ephrem, but is certainly later, and the other to Isho'dad. Both commentators focus on Daniel's visions, which they interpret in both a messianic sense (esp. Dan 2:34-35) and a purely historical sense, explaining in detail how the prophet conceals the future events of the succession of the empires of the Babylonians, Medes and Persians, until the battles of the Diadochi and the Maccabean revolts. The figure of Daniel thus becomes, in Syrian circles, that of the prophet-historian, who precisely anticipates the events that prepare the coming of Christ.

DTC 4, 55-103; RAC 3, 575-585; RGG³ 2, 26-30; LTK³ 3, 10-13; TRE 8, 325-349; K. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel*, Darmstadt 1980; A.S. Van der Woude (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, Louvain 1993; E. Haag, *Daniel*, Neue Echter-Bibel, Würzburg 1993.

L. Vanyó

II. Iconography. One of the four great OT prophets, model of wisdom and type of the just man persecuted but freed by God: as such Daniel takes an active part in the judgment of Susanna and is depicted refusing to adore Nebuchadnezzar's statue, beside the three young men in the furnace (Rome, cemetery of Priscilla: 4th c.; cemetery of Callistus: 4th c.); Daniel was depicted to express the hope of salvation and resurrection from the dead.

1. This symbolism is attributed to the most popular episode—numbered by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Vita Const.* 3,49) among the σύμβολα of Constantine—that of Daniel's condemnation to the lions' den; the scene appears in cemetery paintings from the 3rd c. (Rome, cemetery of Callistus, area of Lucina: 220–230; cemetery of Domitilla, gallery of the Flavii: second half 3rd c.) and on sarcophagi, probably for the first time on a sarcophagus of the Museo Nazionale di Napoli (mid-3rd c.) and, in time, on a great variety of monuments (Brescia, Museo Cristiano, lipsanotheca: 4th c.; London, British Museum, glass cup from St. Severinus, Cologne; Cologne, Römisch-germanisches Museum, blue glass cup; St. Petersburg, Museum of the Hermitage, glass cup from Podgoritsa: 5th c.; Cividale del Friuli, Tesoro del Duomo, cameo: mid-5th c.; London, British Museum, ivory pyx: 6th c.) and on "barbarian" lamps, bronze medallions and bronze *fibulae.* Daniel is shown in the attitude of an *orans* among the lions, standing, youthful, beardless, from the 4th c. mostly naked in Roman depictions, usually clothed in non-Roman depictions (Istanbul Archaeological Museum, fragmentary stele: 5th c.; ibid., plutaeus: 5th c.; Ravenna, Museo Nazionale, sarcophagus of the *Traditio legis*, right side: 5th c.; Ravenna, church of S. Vitale, sarcophagus of the exarch Isacius: 5th c.; Ravenna, baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte, stucco: 5th c.; Ravenna, S. Apollinare Nuovo, plutaeus: mid-6th c.; Ecija, sarcophagus: 6th c.; Rome, Museo dell'Alto Medioevo, ivory pyx from Nocera Umbra: 6th c.; Washington, ivory pyx from Moggio: 6th c.—the presence here of two angels holding the lions' jaws shut has no parallels); these last also differ in the number of lions, often more than two (Cagliari, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, funerary relief: late 3rd or early 4th c.; Alcaudete, sarcophagus: first half 5th c.). Sometimes also depicted among the lions

helping Daniel, in reference to the second condemnation (Dan 14:31-39), is the prophet Habakkuk (Vat., Museo Pio Crist., sarcophagus 135, right side: second quarter 4th c.; ibid., sarcophagus "of the two brothers": second third 4th c.), or Habakkuk and an angel (Vat., Museo Pio Crist., child's sarcophagus: first third 4th c.; ibid., sarcophagus 189: first third 4th c.; ibid., sarcophagus 175: second quarter 4th c.). The same characters also appear in a fuller depiction of the same episode, i.e., at the moment when the angel seizes Habakkuk by the hair and carries him to Daniel to relieve his hunger; the scene is very frequent in the East and can assume various aspects (Istanbul Archaeological Museum, plutaeus from Thasos: 5th c.; Rome, Basilica of S. Sabina, wooden doors [Daniel among the lions is absent]: second half 5th-6th c.; Trier, ivory pyx: 6th c.; Rome, Museo dell'Alto Medioevo, ivory pyx from Nocera Umbra: 6th c.; London, British Museum, ivory pyx: 6th c.).

2. The episode of the killing of the Babylonian dragon occurs between Daniel's first and second condemnations: though never painted, it was depicted on other classes of monument; Daniel offers a cake to the dragon, rearing up or wrapped around a tree-trunk, often near an altar with lit fire—divine worship of the reptile—(Vat., Museo Pio Crist., sarcophagus lid: second third 4th c.; Rome, Villa Doria Pamphili, sarcophagus; London, British Museum, fragment of glass plate; Brescia, Museo Cristiano, lipsanotheca: 6th c.) and before the entrance to a temple (Crozon, Ardèche, sarcophagus of the Coll. R. Giraud).

3. Finally, Daniel is depicted among the prophets, with *rotulus* closed or unrolled, for the first time in the Gospels of Rabbula (fol. 8v: 6th c.) and again, among others, in chapel no. 12 of the convent of Bawit (6th-7th c.).

G. Carandente, EC IV, 1146ff.; Th. Klauser, RAC 3, 575-585; K. Wessel, RBK I, 1113-1120; H. Schlosser, LCI I, 469-473; Wp 39; Ws II, 251ff.; G. Wilpert, *Il simbolismo eucaristico del cibo di Daniele nella fossa dei leoni*: Rend. PARA 9 (1933) 89-94; H. Kuhn, *Die Danielschnallen der Völkerwandeungszeit*: Jahrbuch für prähistorische und etnographische Kunst 15-16 (1941-42) 140-169; W. Deonna, *Daniel, le "maître des fauves." A propos d'une lampe chrétienne du musée de Genève*: Artibus Asiae 12 (1949) 119-140, 347-374; J. Schneider, *Daniel und der Bel zu Babylon*: Zeitschrift für schw. Archäologie und Kunstgesch. 15 (1954) 93-99; G. Wacker, *Die Ikonographie des Daniel in der Löwengrube*, Marburg 1954; G.C. Menis, *Un malnoto cammeo cividalese con Daniele fra i leoni vestito alla persiana*: RivAC 49 (1973) 183-193; TIP 162-164; M. Dulaey, *Daniel, les trois hébreux et Suzanne*, in Id., *Le berger divin: "Des forêts de symboles." L'initiation chrétienne et la Bible (Ier-VIe siècle)*, Paris 2001, 157-189.

G. Santagata

DANIEL (d. 744). Bishop of Winchester (705–744). He and *Aldhelm were assigned the two parts of the diocese of the western Saxons when it was divided in 705. Three of his letters to *Boniface are preserved, written over a rather long period of time. The first (718) is a sort of safe-conduct, recommending *Boniface (then still Wynfrith) to the king, princes and abbots; the second (723/724) is full of advice on the best way to evangelize still-pagan populations; the third, much later (742/744), addresses the theme of the difficult oversight of a Christian community in which even priests committed the most atrocious crimes (homicide, adultery, etc.): Daniel invites Boniface to use tolerance and persuasion. *Bede, in the preface of the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, mentions his correspondence with Bishop Daniel, who had sent him information on the history of the Saxon church and the surrounding regions.

M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 2/1, Munich 1911, 72-73 and 146; T. Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas*, Freiburg 1954; P. Lendinara, *Un popolo privato dei suoi dèi. Notizie sul paganesimo nelle prime opere anglolatine*: Mythos 1 (1989) 103-126; Patrologia IV, 412-413.

V. Milazzo

DANIEL bar Maryam. Contemporary of the *catholicos* Isho'yahb III the Great (649/50–660), he is the author of an ecclesiastical history in four parts, almost entirely lost, which seems to have been an important source of the Chronicle of Seert and which had a profound influence on Syro-eastern historiography. A manual of chronology is also attributed to him.

Baumstark, 207; BBKL 20, 359f.; BO III/1, 231; E. Degen, *Daniel bar Maryam. Ein nestorianischer Kirchenhistoriker*: OC 52 (1968) 45-80; E. Degen, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Daniel bar Maryam – eine Quelle der Chronik von Se'ert*: ZDMG Suppl. 1 (1969) 511-516.

K. den Biesen

DANIEL of Salah (6th c.). Monk of the monastery of Salah in Tur 'Abdin and miaphysite author of a commentary on the Psalms, written ca. 541/542, only partially published. The commentary is in the form of homilies in three volumes, each commenting on 50 psalms; it is dedicated to a certain John, *hegumen of the monastery of St. Eusebius of Kephar Bartā in the region of Apamea. Daniel also seems to have written a commentary on Qoheleth (fragments of which are preserved in Severus's *catena*) and a treatise on the plagues of Egypt. His work is interest-

ing because it allows us to grasp the exegetical methods in use in the anti-Chalcedonian Syrian circles of his time. He in fact uses some methods and results of Antiochene exegesis, while at another level developing a reading of the prophetic, christological and spiritual senses of the text. He also loves to compare the lessons of the Hebrew and Greek texts, which offers him yet another method of approach.

Baumstark, 179; BBKL 21, 304f.; BO I, 495; Patrologia V, 473; G. Dietrich, *Eine jakobitische Einleitung in den Psalter in Verbindung mit zwei Homilien aus dem grossen Psalmenkommentar des Daniel von Salah*, Giessen 1901 (with Ger. tr.); S.P. Cowe, *Daniel of Salah as Commentator on the Psalter*: SP 20 (1989) 152-159; L. Van Rompay, *The Christian Syriac Tradition of Interpretation*, in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation I*, Göttingen 1996, 612-641 (esp. 639f.); D.G.K. Taylor, *The Manuscript Tradition of Daniel of Salah's Psalm Commentary*, in *Symposium Syriacum VII* (OCA 256), Rome 1998, 61-69.

K. den Biesen

DANIEL of Scete (6th c.?). The collections of **Apophthegmata Patrum*, such as the ascetic *Paterika*, preserve in Greek and in various eastern versions a series (more or less extensive in different cases) of edifying stories in which Daniel of Scete, an elder or *hieromonacos*, appears, more as narrator than protagonist. Only one of the works seems to offer biographical information on Daniel who, as a young monk, was thrice captured by barbarians; the third time he killed his captor to return to his cell. Confessing his crime to the ecclesiastical and civil authorities and finding that no one would impose a penance on him, he imposed one on himself. The *Coptic and Ethiopic recensions contain an episode not yet found in the Greek, in which Daniel appears as a fierce anti-Chalcedonian. All of the texts in question seem to unanimously place Daniel in the 6th-c. G. Garitte, however, the latest scholar to have examined the accessible sources (while awaiting a systematic study of the collections not yet fully analyzed), concludes that "the stories of Daniel" have all the characteristics of edifying fables; it is likely that not all refer to the same Daniel; it is impossible to say whether they contain any historical element; it remains unclear whether a famous abbot named Daniel existed at Scete in the 6th c.

BHG Nov. Auct. 2099z-2102c; BHO 241ff.; CPG 7363; DHGE 14, 70-72; S.P. Brock, *A Syriac Narratio attributed to Abba Daniel of Sketis*: AB 113 (1995) 269-280; LTK[3] 3, 14-15.

J.-M. Sauget

DANIEL the Stylite (d. 493). Feast 11 December; born ca. 409 in Syria, near Samosata. Died at Anaplesa near the Bosporus, not far from *Constantinople. He became a monk very young and, on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, met St. *Simeon the Elder, the first *stylite, at Qennesrin, or Qalat Shiman. He hesitated long before imitating this lifestyle, ascending a column only in 460. *Leo I consulted him on some christological questions. He helped *Acacius in his difficulties with *Basiliscus, deigning on that occasion to descend from his column.

H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites*, Paris 1923; Id., AB 32 (1913) 121-216; I. Peña - P. Castellana - F. Romualdo, *Les Stylites syriens*, Milan 1975; C. Tcherakian, *Daniel the Syrian's Exegesis of the Psalms of David*: Bazmavep 125 (1987) 69-74.

M. van Esbroeck

DASIUS. Four martyrs bear this name. The first belonged to an unidentifiable group, the so-called group of Damascus. The second, a soldier, died at Durostorum in Mesia on 20 November 303, and in a legendary *Passio* became the hero who opposes a New Year's feast similar to Saturnalia and a feast of Chronos (R. Pillinger, *Das Martyrium des heiligen Dasius*, Vienna 1988). Probably in ca. 579, when Durostorum was invaded by the Avars, his body was transferred to Ancona. The third was a soldier of Lower Egypt, martyred under *Diocletian, feast 30 August. The last belonged to a group of Nicomedian soldiers; his feast in the *Mart. syr.* and the *Mart. hier.* is 21 October.

BHG 491-492; BS 3, 1153-1154; 4, 483-485.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DAVID

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. David is the "father" of the Messiah: the Christ who will be born of his flesh will be called the "son of David" (Mt 1:1 and 21:9). He is king, prophet, shepherd. The people await a liberator from David's family whose "kingdom will not end" (Lk 1:33; 2 Sam 7:16). The Essenes seem to have expected a Davidic ("kingly") Messiah and an Aaronic ("priestly") Messiah (CD XX, 1 and 1 QS 9,11). Jesus, inheriting "the throne of David his father" (Lk 1:32), is presented as a spiritual and universal king who also possesses prophethood and the priesthood (Mt 22:41-45; Jn 18:36-37). In the day of judgment the "shoot of David" (Rev 5:5 from Is 11:1) will hold in his hand "the key of David" (Rev 3:7 from Is 22:22), the key of the heavenly Jerusalem.

The Fathers identified David with Christ. He has "the heart of God" (1 Sam 13:14; Hipp., *Dav.* 2,1), and is a righteous man because he is able to ask for forgiveness (Clem. of Rom. 18,1-17). Gnostics saw in Jesse's eighth son a symbol of the "ogdoad" (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I 18,3); Ebionites were hostile to David (*Ps. Clem. Hom.* XVIII 13,3-4). Taking up the figurative traditions of the synagogue, churchmen discovered in each Davidic likeness the image of Christ, who, as "seed of David," is man and, as "seed of the Holy Spirit," is God (Ign., *Eph.* 18,2 and *Trall.* 9,1; Tertull., *Carn. Chr.* 21,5-22,6). Jesus is "the holy vine of David" and the "God of David" (*Did.* 9,2 and 10,6; cf. Clem. Al., *Quis div.* 29,3). *Hippolytus, sensing David's Messianic centrality, dedicated an entire treatise to him, as did *Ambrose and *Chrysostom. In *De David et Goliath* (CSCO 263-264), David's victory over the giant, allegorized in every detail, is a sign of the victory of Christ over evil, in which every person who puts on the armor of God participates (6,1–15,4). Christ, defeating death and proclaiming the resurrection, reveals the salvific import of Davidic election: God chose David that from him the Messiah, begotten in the Spirit by the Father, might be born in the flesh. David, consecrated king with the anointing of immortal life (2,2–4,5), was "begotten of the Father's heart" so that he could beget the man Jesus: "As the Word was begotten from my heart, so the man was born of David! Indeed he says: I have found David, a man after my own heart: my heart has begotten the Word and, through David, also the man" (Hipp., *In. Ct.* 2,23; cf. *Dav.* 4,6 and 11,4; *Antichr.* 8). Mary, born into David's family, in accepting Jesus accepts in her flesh the humanity of all those who have loved justice, interweaving it with the Spirit received from God to form Christ's humanity (*In. Ct.* 27,1-12; *Co. Dan.* II 27,6-7; *Ben. Jacob* 16; *Antichr.* 4). Hippolytus's interpretation is the foundation of patristic exegesis: David is king, prophet and priest (*Dav.* 2,1-2 and 12,2).

1. King. Anointed by God, the king of Israel foreshadows the universal king (Hipp., *Dav.* 16,2-5; Tertull., *Marc.* III 20,1-10; IV 36,8-14; Hilary, *In Ps.* 51,4). The "true David" is Jesus (Hipp., *Dav.* 11,4; Ambr., *Apol.* I 17,81; Aug., *In Ps.* 96,2). Christ, the king who becomes a servant, is persecuted as was David (Melit., *Hom.* 59,434 and 69,504; Aug., *In Ps.* 51,1-5), but victorious over the lion and the bear, who represent death and sin, and over the giant, who is Satan: "as David threw down Goliath, it is Christ who kills the devil. . . . It is humility that kills pride" (Aug., *In Ps.* 33,1,4; cf. Hipp., *Dav.* 11,1-4; Cypr., *Test.* 2,16; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 5,30; Aug., *Serm.* 32,1-28). The king, as Bathsheba's husband, prefigures Christ's marriage with the purified church (Ambr., *Apol.* I 3,14; II 8, 40ff.; cf. Orig., *In Rom.* 2,14). The bread that David ate in the sanctuary prefigures the *Eucharist (Ambr., *In Lc.* 5,37; Theodoret, *In I Reg.* 52).

2. Prophet. David is "the perfect prophet" because he makes prophecy into a song of life (Hipp., *Dav.* 1,1 and 11,2; Ambr., *In Ps.* 118, 10,32). The "sweet singer of Israel" (2 Sam 23:1), considered the father of music and physician of the soul, "drove away demons with his music of truth," revealing that the "all-harmonious, well-tuned, holy instrument" of the divine music is man made in God's image; the Word "plays to God with this instrument of a thousand voices and sings with the instrument that is man" (Clem. Al., *Protr.* I 5,3-4; cf. *Strom.* VI 88,1-5; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 5,30 and 17,2; Ambr., *In Ps.* 1,7; Jerome, *Ep.* 53,8; Theodoret, *In I Reg.* 46). The Word is the "plectrum" that makes the prophets resound like lyres (Hipp., *Antichr.* 2). David's "lyre" (1 Sam 16:23) is "the musical instrument of humanity; its song is the word revealed to us by him who became incarnate" (Greg. Nyss., *In Ps.* 2,16). His "psalter" is made "in the form of the body of the Lord" (Hilary, *In Ps.* prol. 7). Christ uses his humanity like a lyre (Hipp., *Antichr.* 2; *Dav.* 5,2). "In our communities David sings Christ because, through David, Christ has sung himself" (Tertull., *Carn. Chr.* 20,3). David is the "instrument of the divine voice" for that most sweet song that is "the remission of sins and the resurrection of the dead"; in his Psalms "Christ in person" speaks: history becomes prophecy in a superhuman musical language that exalts the sweetness of the word and spurs to virtue (Ambr., *Iac.* II 9,39; *Apol.* I 17,80). These themes enrich the Fathers' numerous *Commentaries on the Psalms*, esp. Psalm 50.

3. Shepherd. David is the "true shepherd" (Hipp., *Dav.* 5,1), exemplar of all the virtues: meekness, humility, patience, wisdom, generosity, faith (Hipp., *Dav.* 12,1-2; Did., *In Ps.* 50; Greg. Nyss., *Melet.*; Ambr., *Apol.* I 6,30 and 17,81). Repentance for sin is a fundamental example: David the king, sign of human frailty, through the cry of the psalm begging pardon reveals that the saint is a pardoned sinner who proclaims the mercy of God and the resurrection of man (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 2,11-12; Ambr., *Apol.* I 7,35 et passim; *Interp. Job et David* IV 1,1; *In Lc.* 3,37-39). One who sees the saints fall, says *Augustine, "observes the greatness of the wound, but does not despair of the majesty of the physician": he can "rise again with David" (Aug., *In Ps.* 50,3-5). Meekness and humility make of David a model for those who desire to live the beatitudes: "be meek like Moses and David, because the meek will possess the earth" (*Apos. Con.* VII 7,3; cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.* 14,2). David

prefigured Christ the good shepherd: "he who will be raised up to pasture the saints is not David the patriarch, but Christ" (Ezek 34:23, in Orig., *In Jo.* I 23,146; cf. Aug., *Serm.* 47,20). Jesus is "the true David, the truly humble," who emptied himself in the incarnation and the *cross (Ambr., *In Ps.* 118,14,4).

H. Leclercq, *David*: DACL 4, 295-303; L. Pirot, *David*: DBS 2, 287-330; S.M. Harris, *St. David in the Liturgy*, Oxford 1940; J. Daniélou, *David*: RAC 3, 594-603; P. Hadot - M. Cordier, *Ambroise de Milan. Apologie de David*, SC 239, Paris 1977; L.F. Pizzolato, *La dottrina esegetica di Sant'Ambrogio*, Milan 1978, 117-129; P. Meloni, *La chitarra di David*: Sandalion 5 (1982) 233-261.

P. Meloni

II. Iconography. A prefiguration of Christ and his victory over the forces of evil. David is depicted in the Goliath episode from the first half of the 3rd c. to symbolize the soul saved from death (*Dura Europos, baptistery: 244–245). The same episode is a favorite in cemeteries: in painting, of which we have only one example (Rome, cemetery of Domitilla: 4th c.), and on sarcophagi (Ancona, Museo Diocesano, sarcophagus of Flavius Gorgonius: late 4th c.; Vienne, Museum, sarcophagus lid; Vienne, sarcophagus lid of Place de l'Hôtel de Ville); and on various other monuments, including the reliquiary of Brescia (4th c.) and a fresco of S. Maria Antiqua (705–707), in which David prepares to cut off Goliath's head. David is usually depicted as a shepherd with *baculum*, sling and/or bag of stones; Goliath is fully armed. Episodes from David's life begin to be depicted from the 4th c. (Brescia, Museo Cristiano, reliquiary: 4th c.; Milan, S. Ambrose, wooden doors: late 4th c.); such episodes—Samuel anointing David; David comforting Saul with the lyre; David killing the bear and the lion, and snatching the lamb out of the lion's jaws; Saul preparing David's armor; David's marriage—are repeated, though with variations and additions, in monuments of later ages (Baouît, convent, chapel no. 3, frescos, unique type of David as cupbearer: 6th-7th c.; Nicosia of Cyprus, National Museum, treasure of Karavas, near Kyrenia: 613–629/630; New York, from Cyprus, silver plate: 7th c.). David is also shown in prophet's dress, esp. to symbolize, as the author of royal and messianic psalms, the concordance between the OT and NT (Rossano, purple Codex: 6th c.; Sinope, gospels, Paris, Bibl. Nat. suppl. gr. 1286: 6th c.). Finally, we should mention David as victor over the two-headed serpent in, among others, a relief of Niederdollendorf near Bonn (early 7th c.) and in the Durham manuscript of the Lindisfarne school (probably the work of *Bede). In the field of epigraphy, an inscription on a Visigothic bronze basin (6th-7th c.) mentions David's victory.

J. Daniélou, *David*: RAC 3, 594-603; K. Wessel, RBK I, 1145-1161; R. Wyss, LCI I, 477-490; Wp 356f.; Ws II, 264f.; P.V.C. Baur, *David and Goliath on an Early Christian Lamp*: Yale Classical Studies 1 (1928) 41-51; M. Calberg, *David vainqueur de Goliath*: BullMusRoyArtHist (1952) 29-34; J. Guyon, *L'évolution des sites urbains en Provence* (*Antiquité et haut Moyen Âge*): Ktèma 7 (1982) 129-140; F. Bisconti, *Un fenomeno di continuità iconografica: Orfeo citaredo, Davide salmista, Cristo pastore . . .* , in *Cristianesimo e giudaismo: eredità e confronti*: Augustinianum 28 (1988) 429-436; TIP 164f.; T. Nagasawa, *Notes sur l'évolution de l'iconographie du "Combat de David contre Goliath," des origines au Xe siècle*: Byzantion 58 (1988) 123-139; M. Dulaey, *Les combats de David*, in Id., *"Des forêts de symboles." L'initiation chrétienne et la Bible* (*Ier-VIe siècle*), Paris 2001, 243-264.

G. Santagata

DAVID of Wales (d. ca. 601). Patron saint of Wales, mentioned for the first time—indicating the date of his death in 601—in a manuscript of the 10th-c. *Annales Cambriae*. Very little is known for certain of his life and work, and many of the deeds attributed to him seem to belong solely to late Celtic hagiography's rich and copious strain of fantasy. Although mention of and information on him is found sporadically in various 8th-10th-c. documents, the first official biography—very fanciful and influenced by St. *Benedict's biography—was written only in the late 11th c. by Bishop Rhygyfarch (sometimes written Rythmark, Rithmarch, Ryddmarch or Ricemarchus). This version was a major source for the later editions—enriched by even less-probable elements—of Giraldus Cambrensis, William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, John of Tinemouth and John Capgrave. According to those writers, David was the son of Sant or Sandde ab Ceredig ab Cunnedda, prince of Keretica province (in the present-day county of Cardiganshire), and Non or Nonna or Nonnita (sometimes also called Melaria), and was born ca. 454 near the Rhos valley, near Hen-Meneu or Hen-Mynyw (ancient *Vetus Menevia*, later St. Davids).

Raised and educated initially by St. Illtyd at Caerworgorn (later called Llanilltyd Fawr or Lanwit Major, five miles from Cowbridge in the Glamorganshire), he then spent ten years studying Sacred Scripture at Whitland in Carmarthenshire under the guidance of St. Paulinus. Later embracing an austere monastic life, he evangelized Britain, founding or restoring twelve monasteries in his missionary wanderings (among which stand out those of Glastonbury, Bath and Leominster). Miraculously saved from an attempted poisoning by some monks, he went to Jerusalem, where he was ordained bishop and, back in Wales, succeeded Dubricius as bishop of Caerleon; from there he transferred to the see of

Menevia. He presided at numerous and important synods that discussed complex liturgical and disciplinary questions of the Celtic churches; it is certain that he had a preeminent role in the anti-Pelagian synod of Brefi (Llanddewi Brefi in Cardiganshire, perhaps identifiable with the Roman military outpost Loventium). According to hagiographers, he died at the ripe old age of 147, and his tomb quickly became a pilgrimage destination. In 966 his relics were transferred to Glastonbury; he was canonized ca. 1120 by Pope Callistus II.

Nothing remains of the church and monastery founded by David at Menevia in the 6th c. Precious iconographical evidence is in the frescos of the church of Saint-Divy de Landerneau, where the famous episode of the Council of Brefi is depicted: while the saint was preaching against the Pelagians, the earth arose miraculously to form a hill so that he could be seen, while the dove of the Holy Spirit alighted on his shoulder. He is commemorated 1 March in the Celtic and Irish calendars and in the *Mart. hier.*

DCB 1, 791-793; EC 4, 1243; DHGE 14, 114-115; BS 4, 514-515; LTK 3, 42; A.W. Wade-Evans, *Life of St. David*, London 1923; S.M. Harris, *Saint David in the Liturgy*, Cardiff 1940; J. Wyn Evans, *St David and St Davids: Some Observations on the Cult, Site and Buildings*, in J. Cartwright (ed.), *Celtic Hagiography and Saints' Cults*, Cardiff 2003, 10-25.

M. Ghilardi

DAVID the Armenian. Name of various authors who are often confused in the manuscript tradition and whose identity and chronology are still uncertain. The main ones are (1) David the invincible (anyałt'; 6th c.?), translator of the Hellenophile school of numerous philosophical (Aristotle, Porphyry, Dionysius Thrax) and theological (*Cyril of *Alexandria, *Dionysius the Areopagite, *Nemesius of Emesa) treatises and author of some philosophical treatises, and (2) David of Hark' (7th c.?), author of some homilies (*On the cross*; *Against the heretics*).

Patrologia V, 999; *Koriwn vardapeti, Mambrēi vercanołi ew Dawt'i Anyałt'i matenagrowt'iwnk'* [Writings of Koriwn teacher, Mambrè lector and David the Invincible], Venetik 1833, 103-635; N. Akinian, *Dawit' Anyałt' ew Dawit' Hark'ac'i. Yownaban dproc'i t'argmanič' ern ēst Hay awandowt'ean ew VI.-VII. darow Dawit' imastasērnerě* [David the Invincible and David of Hark': the Graecophile translators according to the Armenian tradition and the philosophers of the 6th-7th c. called David]: HA 70 (1956) 123-163; 301-320; Id., *Dawit' Hark'ac'woy targmannowt'iwnerě* [The translations of David of Hark']: HA 71 (1957) 267-281; V.K. Čalojan, *Filosofia Davida Nepobedimogo*, Erevan 1946; S.A. Arevšatjan, *Formirovanie filosofskoj nauki v drevnej Armenii (5-6 vv.)*, Erevan 1973; Id., *David Anakht (Nepobedimyi). Analiz "Vvedenija" Porfirija . . .* , Erevan 1976; S.S. Arevšatjan, *David l'Invincible et sa doctrine philosophique*, REArm n.s. 15 (1981) 33-43; B. Kendall - R.W. Thomson, *Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy by David the Invincible Philosopher*, English Translation of the Old Armenian Version with Introduction and Notes (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 5), Chico 1983; A.K. Sanjian (ed.), *David Anhaghth, the "Invincible" Philosopher*, Atlanta 1986; P. Ananian, *Dawit' P'ilisop'ac'i erek' growt'iwnnerì ew anor ašakert T'eodoros Dakoni anyayt growt'iwně. Tre scritti di Davide il filosofo e un discorso inedito di Teodoro Dacon*, Venice-S. Lazzaro 1985 [It. sum. 48-49]; S. Ajamian, *An Introduction to the Book of Psalms by David Anaght*: Ch. Burchard (ed.), Armenia and the Bible. Papers Presented to the International Symposium held at Heidelberg, July 16-19, 1990 (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 12), Atlanta 1993, 15-21; A. Topchyan, *David the Invincible, Commentary on Aristotle's Prior Analytics: Critical Old Armenian Text with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes,* Philosophia Antiqua, Leiden 2010.

S.J. Voicu

DEACONESSES. The Greco-Roman world with its concept of a woman's dignity in the family, the Jewish world with its marginalized vision of women, and the Christian world with the figure of Mary mother of Jesus, and the women who accompanied Jesus' mission and to whom he entrusted the mission of the first proclamation of the resurrection, all came together to establish the service that women offered in the church's internal life during the first centuries. In Rom 16:1 Paul speaks of Phoebe, a deaconess of the church of Cenchreae, but it is difficult to determine her exact role, and whether her diaconate was a ministry in the proper sense. *Origen, commenting on the passage (*Comm. in Rom.* 10,17), speaks of a diaconate of women, to which should belong women who have given "assistance to many, and with their good works have merited the praise of the Apostles." The diaconate of women is attested in the East. *Pliny the Younger, in the letter to Trajan (*Ep.* 10,96,8), speaks of the tortures to which two *ministrae* were subjected so as to extort information from them about their coreligionists.

*Clement of *Alexandria (*Strom.* 3,6,53), commenting on 1 Cor 9:5, speaks of the women who, accompanying the *apostles, collaborated in their ministry, "causing the Lord's teaching to reach the women, without giving rise to malicious gossip."

The *Didascalia of the Apostles* 2,26,4-6 (first half 3rd c.) lists the tasks of women: the domestic evangelization of women; assistance in the baptism of women, anointing those who descend in the water with oil and receiving them when they come out of the water, and teaching them how to preserve intact the seal of baptism; visiting and helping sick women. They could not teach, however, or administer baptism, though the *Didascalia* had such an elevated concept of woman as to

present her as a "type" (*typus*) of the Holy Spirit. The prohibition of teaching and baptizing—of OT and Jewish influence and derivation—also appears in the *Apostolic Constitutions* 3,6,1-2.

The feminine diaconate took form after the first two Christian centuries. From the 4th-c. testimonies regarding women became more numerous, but they were not considered part of the clergy, even if ordained with the laying on of hands (χειροτονία); virginity or being the widow of one husband were an indispensable requirement. This form of institutionalized feminine diaconate remained exclusive to the East and was never introduced in the West. Deaconesses should not be confused with widows, since the diaconate expressed a function whereas widowhood indicated a higher, ascetical state of life. Among heretical sects, esp. the *Montanists, women taught, baptized, administered the *Eucharist and carried out episcopal or presbyterial tasks.

DACL 4, 725-733; DIP 3, 469-470; ODC 455-456, 1761-1762; J. Leipoldt, *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum*, Leipzig 1954; J. Daniélou, *Le ministère des femmes dans l'Église ancienne*: La MaisonD 61 (1960) 70-96; R. Gryson, *Il ministero della donna nella Chiesa antica*, Rome 1974; M.G. Mara, *Le funzioni della donna nella Chiesa antica*: RivPastorLit 19/2 (1981) 5-16; E. Pasztor, *La donna nei movimenti religiosi del Medio Evo*: RivPastorLit 19/2 (1981) 17-30; A.G. Martimort, *Les diaconesses*, Rome 1982; L. Cracco Ruggini, *La donna e il sacro, tra paganesimo e cristianesimo*, in Atti del II Convegno Nazionale di Studi su *La donna nel mondo antico* (Turin 18-19-20 aprile 1988), Turin 1989, 243-275; C. Militello, *La donna nella Chiesa: problemi aperti*: Studi ecumenici 6 (1988, 1) 59-102; G. Duby - M. Perrot, *Storia delle donne in occidente*, I, *L'antichità*, Rome-Bari 1990, 487-496; P. Sorci, *Ministeri liturgici della donna nella Chiesa antica*, in C. Militello (ed.), *Donna e ministero, un dibattito ecumenico*, Rome 1991, 17-30; P. Sorci, *Diaconato ed altri ministeri liturgici della donna*, in U. Mattioli (ed.), *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, Genova 1992, 331-364; A.D. Salapatas, *The Liturgical Role of the Deaconess in the Apostolic Constitutions*: OCP 68 (2001) 561-578.

M.G. Bianco

DEAD, Ceremonies for the

I. Funerals - II. Remembrance of the dead.

In honoring their dead, the living display, more or less consciously, the belief that the dead survive their disappearance and need appropriate care in the afterlife. When this care, besides being a natural expression of affection, is clothed in religious expression, we may speak of ceremonies for the dead. Christians initially followed contemporary Jewish and *pagan customs. Only over time were these Christianized and a specifically Christian attitude to death created, but even then they remain a vehicle of ideas and customs whose origins are lost to us.

I. Funerals. Care for the dead began in the home from the moment of death. The series of practices that succeeded each other from death to burial were called *funus* and can be divided as follows:

1. *The funerary toilette*. After expiring, the dead person was called by name (*conclamatio*) to ensure that death had actually occurred, a rite still observed at the death of a *pope. The eyes and mouth were closed, and then the body was washed, perfumed and dressed as befitted one's station: all this by professionals. Meanwhile, rather than abandon themselves to grief like pagans, relatives were invited to sing psalms. Prayers seem to have been said by a priest.

2. *Laying out*. Laid out on a bed prepared for the purpose (*feretrum*), crowned with flowers (this custom, rebuked by *Tertullian, took root among Christians, as texts and *archaeology show), surrounded by family, the deceased received at home (monks later at church) the traditional (incense, candles) and Christian honors (prayer for the deceased with night vigil if necessary). Burial was originally on the day of death, so laying out lasted only a day. If death was in the evening, there was a night vigil. Sometimes laying out was prolonged for some days to allow relatives to come to the funeral from a distance.

3. *The funeral procession*. According to old Roman custom, which *Julian the Apostate vainly attempted to revive, the dead person was carried to the tomb at night by torchlight. This custom is still attested by *Cyprian (*Act. Cypr.* 5, 6) and perhaps by epigraphy (CIL 11, 2538), but it disappeared in the course of the 4th c., when daytime burial began. The deceased was carried on the *feretrum*, followed by relatives and friends, men with head covered, women with hair unfastened, both dressed in dark colors or black. Psalms and hymns were sung during the procession.

4. *Deposition*. Christians always practiced burial, never cremation. Upon arrival at the tomb, the stretcher was placed on the ground, and the family took leave of the dead with a kiss. For an important person there would be a funeral eulogy; in all cases an acclamation. For *Monica's funeral rites a mass was celebrated near the tomb before interment, a custom not attested in other cases. The body was laid in the tomb on a bed of flowers and fragrant herbs, and covered with quicklime: the tomb was then closed and sealed. An identifying sign was put on it, perhaps an inscription on the enclosing slab giving the name, day, month and sometimes year of *depositio*. The funerary banquet (*refrigerium*) celebrated nearby closed the funeral.

II. Remembrance of the dead. The funeral ceremonial was periodically renewed, though only in part, and completed in particular aspects. The elements that made up these commemorations were:

1. In pagan times, portraits of the dead appeared in the funeral procession and were preserved in patrician dwellings; among Christians, this was formally prohibited as idolatrous (Cypr., *Quod idola dii non sint*).

2. The period of mourning that followed burial involved a commemorative celebration of the deceased on the 3rd, 7th, 9th, and 30th or 40th day: essentially a funeral banquet and celebration of the Eucharist. These rites had parallels among pagans and Jews; they were related to ancient beliefs about the formation of the embryo and the decomposition of the corpse.

3. Annual celebrations. First, the personal anniversary of the deceased. Among pagans the celebration was that of birth: *natalitium*; among Christians that of death: ἡμέρα γενέθλιος, **natale* or *dies natalis*. Tertullian says expressly that, in commemorating the dead, Christians had replaced the day of birth by that of death (*Cor.* 3,3). There were also communal commemorations for all the deceased. While the *rosalia* and *violatio* seem to have had little following among Christians as feasts of the dead (DACL 15, 8-9), this was not so for the *parentalia*, which ended 22 February with the *caristia*: the period of mourning lasted ten days, followed on the eleventh by a feast in which the family gathered around its dead. All these celebrations, personal and communal, included a mass and a banquet.

4. Mass for the dead. This Christian custom is universally attested on the third day (*Act. Iohan.* ed. Bonnet, I, 156; Pallad., *Hist. Laus.* 21; *Const. App.* 8,42, ed. Funk, I, 552; Evodius, in Aug., *Ep.* 158,2). The anniversary mass is explicitly attested by Tertullian (*Cor.* 3,3; *Exh. cast.* 11,1; *Monog.* 10,1), but there is indirect testimony in texts on the anniversaries of the martyrs (Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques* . . . , 105-107, 171-173): *qui potest plus potest minus*. At these masses the names of the dead, individually or as a group, were included in the reading of the diptychs (*Saxer*, 162-165).

5. Funerary banquets. These had different names in different times and places: *refrigerium*, *convivium*, etc.; and different "menus," in which bread, fish, wine, water, sometimes milk, gruel occupied an important place. Sobriety does not seem to have been a rule: Tertullian speaks of people returning drunk from elegant dinners (*Test. an.* 4,3-6); Augustine, of "copious libations and revelry" (*Ep.* 22,3). Indeed, guests in banquet scenes in catacombs have a merry air. We may state that the custom was general: texts and monuments prove it. These banquets were intended both to nourish the dead, as certain funerary furnishings demonstrate (channels for libations), and to strengthen the bonds of friendship among the living on the one hand, and between the living and the dead on the other. Over time there were attempts to turn them into love-feasts, or at least occasions for charity. The custom survived long, if under different forms.

The form finally taken by ceremonies for the dead, in their totally Christinaized aspect, must be sought in the *Ordines romani* and, later, in the Romano-Gallican rituals of death: as these show, it was the church that cared for Christians, accompanying them with its prayers from last illness to the tomb and beyond, in *the hope of the resurrection*.

RAC 9, 924-939, 1000-1006; M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia liturgica* 2, Milan [3]1969, 471-516; C. Vogel, *L'environnement cultuel du défunt durant la période paléochrétienne*, Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia 1, Rome 1975, 381-413; P.-A. Février, *Le culte des morts dans les communautés chrétiennes durant le III[e] siècle*, Atti del IX Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana 1, Vatican City 1978, 211-274; D. Sicard, *La liturgie de la mort dans l'église latine des origines à la réforme carolingienne*, Münster 1978; B. Kötting, *Die Tradition der Grabkirche*, in K. Schmid - J. Wollasch (eds.), *Memoria*, Munich 1984, 69-78; A. Angenendt, *Theologie und Liturgie der mittelalterlichen Toten-Memoria*, in *ibid.*, 79-199; G. Tellenbach, *Die historische Dimension der liturgischen commemoratio im Mittelalter*, in *ibid.*, 200-214; Ph. Harnoncourt - H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 2,1, Regensburg 1994, 81-83; A. Samellas, *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean*, Tübingen 2002; U. Volp, *Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike*, London-Boston 2002; M. Costambeys, *The Culture and Practice of Burial in and Around Rome in the Sixth Century*, Ecclesiae Urbis 1, Vatican City 2002, 721-731.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DEATH. In the Greco-Roman world, various conceptions of death are found in different philosophical and religious sects. Parmenides, in line with his assertion of the existence of the sole Being and not of Non-Being, in fact denied death; he refused to admit the existence of birth and death and the transformations entailed by the idea of "becoming." To this effect, he even assigned a form of sense-perception and knowledge to corpses. The Heraclitean perspective was dialectic: the death of each individual being is but a moment in the whole universal rhythm, in the perpetual renewal of life (frags. 22B26, 36, 48, 77 Diels-Kranz). In Orphism, Pythagoreanism and *Platonism, physical death is the liberation of the soul from the bonds of matter (Plato, *Phaedr.* 64Aff.; Plutarch, *De facie* 28), although this liberation may be continually challenged by the danger of a reincarnation, which is

avoided only by the pure and wise. The atomist Democritus and his followers, Epicurus and the Epicureans, embraced a materialistic perspective according to which death is the dissolution of the atomic compounds of our body and our soul, the latter too being material and made of atoms. This is why, according to Epicurus, "As long as we are, death is not, and when death is, we no longer are" (*Ep. ad Men.* 4,124-125), and Lucretius repeats: "Death is nothing for us, nor does it touch us at all" (*DRN* 3,924-925). Cicero understood this claim, but he objected: "I am not without my fears that this itself is an evil: I do not mean the immediate deprivation of sense, but the fact that we shall hereafter suffer deprivation" (*Tusc.* 1,12). The Stoic perspective is also materialistic: the soul is material just as every other existing being, and it will dissolve in the universal Logos at the end of each cosmic cycle, thus totally losing its individuality. But each being and each event will return, identical, over and over again in each cosmic cycle, *in infinitum.* Rather soon, Stoicism seems to have accepted the theory of astral immortality at least for the virtuous, as, e.g., *Hercules Oetaeus*, ascribed to Seneca, attests. But already in Greek pagan philosophy the notion of a moral and spiritual life and death began to appear, e.g., in the *Middle-Platonist *Philo and in the Stoics Seneca and Juvenal: indeed, in the imperial period Stoicism was receptive of Middle-Platonic motifs. In Satire 8, 85-86, in reference to a dissolute man, Juvenal says: *dignus morte periit, coenet licet ostrea centum / Gaurana*, "He who is worthy of death is already dead, even though he may have a hundred prized oysters at dinner." He is distinguishing between physical and spiritual life: a dissolute person may be alive bodily, but spiritually dead. Seneca, shortly after Juvenal, likewise affirmed that the *otiosi*, affected by existential emptiness, even if they are still alive, are in fact spiritually dead: *aeger est, immo mortuus est* (*Brev. Vit.* 12,19).

Philo of *Alexandria in *Heres* 293 similarly asserts: "According to the legislator [Moses], only the wise person enjoys a good old age and a very long life, whereas the fool has an extremely short life, and is always learning to die, or rather is already dead [ἤδη τετελευτηκότα] to life according to virtue [τὴν ἀρετῆς ζωήν]." Similar reflections on true life and true death are expressed by Philo also in *Det.* 49, *Praem.* 70 and *Fug.* 55. In *Praem.* 79 Philo clarifies the difference between the two kinds of death: physical, which is an "indifferent" (ἀδιάφορον) and may even be a good, and spiritual, which is an evil, and states that one may endure for long, and even forever, in spiritual death, which is the punishment (τιμωρία) for sins. In *Fug.* 55 Philo states again that one can be apparently alive but spiritually dead (ζῶντες τεθνήκασι), which is the case with vicious and foolish persons, even when they live very long. He calls them "dead" (νεκρούς), because they are deprived of the virtuous life. The wise and virtuous, on the contrary, live forever (ζῆν εἰσαεί), even though their earthly life is very short or they have already died (τεθνηκότες ζῶσι). A sentence ascribed to the Pythagorean Sextus, 7, also refers to the same notion of being apparently alive but spiritually dead (νεκρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐν σώματι ζῶντι). Of course, the gist of this conception goes back at least to Socrates in Plato's *Apology*, e.g., 40C-41D and 42A, and, even more, *Phaedo.* Indeed, it has its roots in the Orphic, Pythagorean and Platonic notion that the life of the soul is opposed to that of the body and is perfected after death, i.e., after the liberation of the soul from the body, as is precisely expressed in Plato's *Phaedo*, e.g., 80C-81B; 114Cff.; 118A and passim. That the idea of being physically alive but spiritually dead is basically Platonic is indicated by its presence not only in Plato and Philo and the Pythagorean tradition, but also in the Neo-Academic Cicero, *Ad Att.* 12,2: "Is not life all over with a man who makes only pleasure, and not right, his aim?"

Notably, this very same concept is also expressed in one of the New Testament passages that are most influenced by Hellenistic moral philosophy, 1 Tim 5:6: the author, referring to a widow who devotes her life to pleasures, says: "She who gives herself to a life of pleasure, even if she is alive, is already dead [ζῶσα τέθνηκεν]." But in Rev 3:1-2, too, the meaning conveyed is exactly the same: the person who acts badly is morally and spiritually dead or deadly ill: "I know your deeds: you are said to be alive [ζῇς], and yet you are dead [νεκρός]. Get up, and strengthen what remains which is about to die [ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν]; for I did not find your deeds perfect before my God." As is evident, John does not conceive of this condition as definitive and irredeemable: he looks to the future and invites the dying to improve and live. This notion of the spiritual death of the immoral person can be compared to Paul's description of the death of the soul in Rom 7:6-25 and 8:1-13. Here Paul depicts spiritual life as death to sin and spiritual death as the result of sin: "sin began to live [ἀνέζησεν], while I died [ἀπέθανον]" (7:9-10); "this body of death [θανάτου]" (7:6); "the law of sin and death [θανάτου]" (8:2); "the way of thinking proper to the flesh is death [θάνατος], that of the spirit is life [ζωή] and peace" (8:6); "your body is dead [νεκρόν] due to sin, but your spirit is life [ζωή] thanks to justification" (8:10). Rom 7:7-25 has been rightly connected by

Emma Wasserman to Philo's conception of spiritual death; as I have shown, there are many other authors and texts that are influenced by this idea. The same notion of sinners finding themselves in spiritual death is conveyed by the *Shepherd* of Hermas, *Sim.* 6.2.3: those who are represented as sheep living a life of pleasure (σπαταλῶντα, exactly the same verb used in 1 Tim 5:6, ἡ σπαταλῶσα) are doomed to death (θάνατος).

Related to this set of ideas is the widely attested notion that the death of a Christian—at first the day of a martyr's death, then extended to all Christians—is his or her *dies natalis*, his or her birth to the other life, regarded as the true life, or the more important life, in that it is eternal. Now, already in 4 Macc 16:12-13 the idea is attested that the death of the martyrs is their birth to immortality. But even in a pagan author contemporary with the first Christians, in Seneca, there is a passage that expresses a strikingly similar concept: the day of one's death is his or her *dies aeterni natalis.* In his *Epistulae ad Lucilium*, dating to the last years of his life, in the 60s of the 1st c., and in particular in one of the last, roughly contemporary with the first anti-Christian persecution under Nero, which produced the first Christian martyrs, Seneca observes: "When the day comes to separate the heavenly from its earthly blend, I shall leave the body here where I found it, and shall of my own volition find my way to the gods. I am not apart from them now, but am merely detained in a heavy and earthly prison. . . . As the mother's womb holds us for ten months, . . . just so, . . . we are making ourselves ready for another birth. A different beginning, a different condition, await us. That day, which you fear as being the end of all things, is the birthday of your eternity" (*Ep.* 102,22-26).

Of course, both the above-mentioned passages and the whole biblical conception of death, in addition to the philosophers' views (esp. Platonic), provide the basis for the Fathers' thinking concerning death. In the Bible, Gen 3:19 presents death as the consequence of original sin, a conception that is echoed in Rom 5:12 ("death entered the world due to sin"), 5:17 ("death began to reign because of one human being"), 5:21 ("sin reigned in death," ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ), and 6:23 ("the wages of sin is death"); 1 Cor 15:21 ("death came into being because of one human being"), and Jas 1:15 ("sin . . . generates death"). Thus, as is also emphasized in the book of Wisdom, death was not part of God's original plan; it was not created by God, who created only good things, but it entered the world through sin, by a deception, due to the devil's fraud (Wisd 2:24). Death is not good, since it is not a creation of God; it is an evil, and this, as I shall point out, at least for some NT and patristic authors has momentous consequences in respect to its future disappearance.

While in the ancient books of the OT death is seen as entering the "bosom of Abraham," in more recent books references to life after death take the form of ζωὴ αἰώνιος or ἀΐδιος, a key concept in the NT as well. In Tobias 3:6, the place of the afterlife is said to be a τόπος αἰώνιος, the first passage in the OT in which αἰώνιος undoubtedly refers to the world to come (see τόπος αἰώνιος in Is 33:14). In 2 Macc 7:9, the doctrine of resurrection is affirmed and αἰώνιος is used with reference to life in the future world: God "will resurrect us to a return to life in the world to come" (εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει) and 4 Macc 15:3: "which saves, leading to life in the world to come" (τὴν σώζουσαν εἰς αἰωνίαν ζωήν). In 4 Macc 13:15 (cf. 9:9), the evil will suffer "in torment in the world to come" (ἐν αἰωνίῳ βασάνῳ); this language will be picked up in NT references to "αἰώνιος life" and "αἰώνιον fire." In Dan 12:2-3, another late book of the OT, the prophecy of resurrection runs as follows: "They will rise, some to life in the world to come [εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον], some to reproach, and some again to dispersion and shame in the world to come [εἰς διασπορὰν καὶ αἰσχύνην αἰώνιον]." In Wisd 3:12, another later book, those honored by God are said to be going to rise "to life in the world to come" (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον). 4 Macc 10:15 describes the martyrs' life after death as "the eternal life [ἀΐδιον βίον] of the pious"; which is opposed to the death of their persecutor, the tyrant, in the world to come (αἰώνιον ὄλεθρον). This contrast between the parallel but antithetical expressions ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος and βίος ἀΐδιος is notable and will consistently return in patristic authors, as has been pointed out by Ramelli and Konstan. Both adjectives refer to life after death, but while retribution is described with the general and polysemous term αἰώνιος, life in the beyond is denoted by means of the more technical term ἀΐδιος, denoting a strictly endless condition.

In the NT, Jesus Christ is the destroyer of death and is Life itself. In John 11:25-26 he proclaims: "I am the Resurrection and the Life [ζωή]. Whoever believes in me will continue to live even though he will die [κἂν ἀποθάνῃ], and whoever lives and believes in me will certainly not die [οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ] in the world to come." This declaration comes just before the resurrection of Lazarus (Jn 11:44: "the one who was dead came out" of the tomb, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκός) and Caiaphas's prophecy that Jesus' death will be "for the sake of the nation," to which John adds: "and not only for the sake of the nation, but in order to gather into

unity the children of God now dispersed" (Jn 11:51-52). So, 1 Jn 2:2 repeats that Jesus with his death was an expiatory victim (ἱλασμός), "not only for our sins, but also for the whole world." If Jesus is Life, those who follow his commandment will not experience death, and his commandment is love: "We have passed from death to life because we love our siblings; whoever does not love remains in death" (1 Jn 3:14). Paul foretells the eschatological resurrection (Rom 8:11; 1 Cor 15; 1 Th 4:16 etc.), for not even our bodies will remain in death forever: they will rise again and be made glorious like that of Christ (Phil 3:21).

Paul claims that neither life nor death will be able to separate us from God's love (Rom 8:35-39). Above all, in 1 Cor 15:24-28 he foretells the eventual annihilation of death: "Then the end will come, when he will hand the kingdom to God the Father, after destroying every principality, power and force. For he must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy will be destroyed: death. . . . Then the Son himself will submit to him who has subjected all to him, so that God will be all in all." Paul distinguishes between submission of creatures and complete destruction of the powers of evil and death, which are not creatures.

Likewise, in Rev 14:15 death and Hades are thrown into "the lake of fire, the second death": this is the death of death, its annihilation. The author of Revelation, in a visionary fashion, predicts the eventual eviction of evil and elimination of death, which is also foretold in 1 Cor 15:24-28, certainly known to him. For death is not alive; it is no creature of God; it was not created at the beginning. It appeared as a result of sin, and will not subsist in the end, as Paul maintained. Thus, death and hell will die and disappear. In Rev 21:4 the statement, "death will no more exist" (ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, Vulgate: *mors ultra non erit*) does not concern only the heavenly Jerusalem, but is an absolute declaration, perfectly consistent with the casting of death into the second death. Indeed, it is first of all the symbols of the powers of evil that are said to be cast into this lake: the beast and the pseudo-prophet. According to *Origen, *Schol. Ap.* 38, the beast represents all evil, all iniquity (πάσης τῆς ἀδικίας), so that every force of apostasy (πᾶσα δύναμις ἀποστατική) from the Good may be cast into the fire. The whole of Revelation strongly conveys the idea of the eventual destruction of evil: this is essentially what its author prefigures in his visionary account, which is eschatological.

In Rev 21:8 the sinners too, who cannot yet enter the heavenly Jerusalem, are said to be cast into the lake of fire, "which is the second death": but their presence there is in no way declared to be eternal (although elsewhere both Jesus and Paul do speak of eternal fire and eternal suffering, see Mt 18:8; 25:41,46; Mk 3:29; 2 Th 1:9; Heb 6:2). I think that the second death in the case of death itself means the death of death, i.e., its total disappearance; in the case of human beings, it means spiritual death as opposed to merely physical death, the second death after the first death, which was the death of the body: the second death, which involves, not all humans, but only sinners, is seen as the exclusion from the Good, from communion with God, from the holy Jerusalem. The second death that sinners will experience will be the death occurring in the other world as opposed to that occurring in this world; for humans it is their κόλασις αἰώνιος (eternal punishment/correction), whereas for death itself it is its elimination, the death of death. Since death will be no more, the "death" of human beings in the lake of fire will be, not their annihilation, but their purification from evil, a view which is akin to what some of the Greek fathers such as Origen held in their view of the *apokatastasis,* although others such as Augustine held that the second death was eternal (*Civ. Dei* 13,2 and 8; 14,1). It seems to be the same as that which is mentioned in 1 Cor 3:13-15 as testing the works of each person and destroying the evil works while purifying the sinner, who will suffer a loss (ζημιωθήσεται; Vulgate: *detrimentum patietur*), but will be saved through fire (αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός).

A close analysis of Rev 19-22 indeed suggests that the lake of fire has a purifying function for humans, the ceasing of all κατάθεμα indicates the end of all exclusion and malediction, and the "nations," which repeatedly seem to be destroyed, continue to reappear anew and are said to finally benefit from a healing deriving from a tree that is Jesus' *Cross (Rev 22:2; cf. Didymus, *Comm. Prov.* 1625BC). The nations' death is a purifying suffering: what is eliminated is evil, not the people themselves. This is why they can reappear afterwards, receive the healing that comes from the Cross, and finally enter the heavenly Jerusalem. Origen clearly held this: in *Hom. Jer.* 1.16 he observes that, when Scriptures speak of death and destruction of kingdoms and nations (ἔθνη), they do not refer to the realms of this world, nor to the elimination of any human beings: it is the kingdom of evil that will be destroyed and demolished down to its very roots by God, in order to purify human beings and prepare a basis for a good planting and edification; it is sin, in all its varieties, that will be eradicated and destroyed (ἀπολλύναι) and abolished, so that upon the ruins of evil God may build his Temple and plant "the garden of Good, the new Paradise." The concept of

the final eviction of evil and its substitution with good emerges again in *Hom. Jer.* 16, 6, where the destruction of evil is directly connected to the end of punishment—expressly assimilated to death—for sinners: for God gives death only in order to give life again. Indeed, all the aforementioned Pauline and Johannine passages on the eventual elimination of death will be fundamental for several Fathers' reflection, esp. for Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa, who will interpret this "death" that will be utterly destroyed not only as physical death, but also as spiritual death.

Philo—whose conception of spiritual death I have already mentioned as a parallel to that of other Platonists, some Stoics and some NT passages—and Origen, who was very well acquainted with Philo, both take "death" in at least a twofold sense: physical death, i.e., the detachment of the souls from the body, and spiritual death, that is, the death of the soul. Philo seems to maintain that death is the natural condition of both our bodies and our souls without the grace of God. Indeed, he thinks that eternal life is a privilege granted by God's grace exclusively to virtuous souls, whereas the others seem to be destined to die. For only the rational soul is immortal and incorruptible and destined to return home, and only those who have exercised it will survive: "another life without a body, which *only the soul of the wise* will live" (*Quaest. in Gen.* 3.11; cf. *Spec.* 3.206-207; *Cher.* 144; *Sacr.* 6; *Prob.* 117-118). For only a purified soul is really incorruptible (*Her.* 276).

Origen was likewise convinced that the vicious soul perishes, as the soul is not immortal in respect to "the true death" (ἡ ὄντως θάνατος), i.e., spiritual death, as he explains in *Dial. Heracl.* 25. Here, he distinguishes three different meanings of the noun *death*: one is the death that consists in the separation of the soul from the body, which is also the most common meaning of "death." With respect to this death, the soul is immortal. Another sense of *death* is death to sin, which is an enormous good; "blessed is the soul that dies to sin," he says. But there is another meaning of *death*: the death to God, which is caused by sin. This is the most serious kind of death, a positive evil, and to this death the soul is liable: "the soul is mortal in respect to the true death" (θνητὴ τοῦ ὄντως θανάτου ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή). But Origen, differently from Philo, as it seems, did not regard this death of the soul, this perdition and state of "being lost" (ἀπόλωλα), as eternal, because Christ has come to rescue the lost sheep, and the Bible everywhere announces resurrection after death ("can you see throughout all Scriptures the announcement of the resurrection of the dead?"— ἐπαγγελίαν ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν), as Origen emphasizes in his *Homilies on Jeremiah*, on the basis of his twofold conception of resurrection, both physical and spiritual, which forms an apt pendant to the different meanings of death theorized by him. In the end, in the beatitude, all souls will become immortal also to sin, which will exclude the possibility that there may be a new fall (*Dial. Heracl.* 26-27).

This same idea will be taken up by *Ambrose, *In Luc.* 7.39: "cum autem, firmitate beatitudinis roborata, coeperit obnoxia non esse peccato, iam *non erit mortalis*." For in the end death will no more exist; no soul will be mortal any longer in the *telos*. To this effect, Origen presents an argument that is both philosophical and based on Scripture. He claims that eternal life and eternal death cannot coexist, because they are contradictory and absolute; therefore, one of them cannot be eternal and must disappear; now, according to Origen, Paul in 1 Cor 15:26 foretells that it will be death that is eliminated: "For an eternal will not be contrary to an eternal, but identical. But now it is certain that death is contrary to life, therefore it is certain that if life is eternal, it is not possible for death to be eternal . . . for when the death of the soul, who is the last enemy, should be destroyed, then this shared death, which we have said is like the shadow of the other, will necessarily be abolished, . . . and the reign of death will be destroyed equally with death" (Orig., *Comm. in Rom.* 5,7). The eventual destruction of death, in Origen's view, depends on Christ's own death on the cross, which occurred only once, but was so powerful as to be enough to save all rational creatures, living in all eons, which is not at odds with their free will. "Christ died for sin once, and he is no longer dead, and because he lives, he lives to God. . . . We indeed do not deny that free will always remains in the rational nature, but the power of the cross of Christ and his death is so great, which is received at the end of the age, we assert, that not only does it bring healing and a remedy for the present and the future ages, but even for those of the past, and this not only suffices for our human existence, but also for the heavenly powers and ranks. For according to the passage of the Apostle Paul himself, Christ has brought peace through the blood of his cross not only for those who are on earth, but also those in heaven" (*Comm. in Rom.* 5,10).

The conception of life and death at both levels, physical and spiritual, is typical, not only of Origen, but also of Bardesanes (Bardaisan). For this reason he was accused of denying the resurrection, the same accusation that was leveled against Origen: in the case of Origen, this charge is unfounded; I sus-

pect that the same may be the case with Bardesanes, who probably intended resurrection both in the physical sense (as the restoration of the perfect body before the fall) and in the spiritual sense (as the salvation of the soul, its resurrection from the death of sin). Bardesanes in his antignostic polemic (parallel to that of Origen) distinguished, not human beings in general into different classes, but each human being into (1) body and animate soul, both mortal and subject respectively to nature and fate, and (2) the rational/intellectual soul (or spirit), immortal and endowed with free will.

In *Prose Refutations* (II p. 158, 20ff.) *Ephrem attests that Bardesanes attributed to the human being a body, a soul and a spirit, and that the soul—clearly understood here as the animate soul, not as intellectual soul—does not possess knowledge, which belongs only to the spirit, i.e., the intellect or *logos*, the rational or intellectual soul, which is the divine component in the human being. "The *logos*, they say, is the unknown leaven hidden in the soul, which is deprived of knowledge and is extraneous both to the body and to the *logos.* If this be the case, the body cannot adhere to the soul, nor can the soul adhere to the *logos*, which is divine." It is again Ephrem who attests that Bardesanes thought that, just as Adam introduced spiritual death, in addition to physical, so Christ has made it again possible to have access to salvation, which was previously prevented by Adam's sin. The death of our present, corruptible body, in that it paves the way to its restoration to the perfect, incorruptible body, was defined by Bardesanes as "an advantage," as attested by Ephrem in *Carmina Nisibena* 51: Bardesanes "called the damage produced by the serpent 'an advantage.'" It is evident that the damage produced by the serpent can be considered to be "an advantage" only if one understands it as physical death, certainly not as spiritual death, which can by no means be deemed a benefit.

This confirms that, according to Bardesanes, the original sin caused, not only spiritual death, but also physical death. This gives the lie to Ephrem's assertion that in Bardesanes's opinion Adam's sin produced only spiritual death, not physical death; that, even without this sin, the human body would have been corruptible and with no hope for resurrection, and that the life brought about by Christ is exclusively spiritual life, the salvation of the soul, and not also the resurrection of the bodies. Such an idea is not confirmed by any fragment of Bardesanes: none contains an explicit denial of the resurrection. I rather suspect that Bardesanes, like Origen, understood the death caused by Adam and the life brought about by Christ on both planes: (1) the death and the resurrection of the body; (2) the death of the soul, spiritual death, sin, and spiritual life, i.e., salvation.

My suggestion seems to me to be further supported by Beck's investigation (E. Beck, *Bardaisan und seine Schule bei Ephräm*, Le Muséon 91 [1978] 271-333: 300-307) into the gradation that, according to Bardesanes, leads from a heavy and corruptible corporeality to a lighter and lighter one, typical of the spiritual elements. The spiritual body is fine, light and incorruptible; it characterized human nature before the fall and will characterize it again in the resurrection, which Origen maintains as well. That Bardesanes conceived of an incorruptible body, different from the heavy, corruptible and mortal body of present human life, is proved with certainty by a fragment from his *De India*, quoted by Porphyry, in which the cosmic Adam-Christ is characterized by a living but incorruptible body, material but of a different matter from those constituting this world: it seems to be the incorruptible body of the origin, before the fall, and of the resurrection, presumably composed by pure elements without commixture of darkness.

Our present, corruptible body, instead, just like the whole of the present world, according to Bardesanes is constituted not only by pure elements, but also by some particles of darkness, which is pure negativity and a symbol of evil. However, our present body is far from being entirely composed by the "nature of evil" mentioned by Ephrem (*Prose Refutations* I, p. 147, 18ff.). After death, our body returns to "dust" (ibid., II, p. 143, 1-24), but this is perfectly consistent with the Bible. Bardesanes does not deem our body evil as though he were a *Manichean (although Ephrem tends to assimilate him to a Manichean): evil is the fruit of a choice of our free will, as for Origen. The body per se is neither evil nor good; its death is not a punishment for it being evil, nor a sign of its evil nature.

In *Prose Refutations* (II p. 153) Ephrem accuses Bardesanes of evacuating both Adam's sin and Christ's work, in that neither of them brings, respectively, the death and resurrection of the body. Now, according to Bardesanes what depends on Adam is first of all—but not necessarily exclusively—the spiritual death that comes from sin, and what depends on Christ is spiritual resurrection and eternal salvation, as is clear from the following fragment coming from a section of *Prose Refutations* (II, 143-169) generally known as *Against Bardesanes*: "According to Bardesanes, the death initiated by Adam was an impediment to souls, in that they were impeded in the place where they had to cross, because Adam's sin impeded them. And the life—

he says—that our Lord has brought about consists in the fact that he taught the Truth and was lifted up, and had them cross over and enter the kingdom. Thus—he says—our Lord taught us that 'Whoever observes my word will not taste death forever,' because—he says—his/her soul is not impeded when it crosses in the crossing place, unlike the old impediment by which the souls were impeded before the coming of our Savior." Bardesanes here intends "life" and "death" in a spiritual sense, just like Origen and Gregory of Nyssa.

Now, this does not entail that Origen or Gregory denied the resurrection of the body (the latter even devoted his *De Anima et Resurrectione* in support of it), and this per se does not mean that Bardesanes denied it either. The notion that Adam caused spiritual death and Christ brought spiritual life does not imply the denial of the resurrection of the body. What is clear is that for Bardesanes, just as for many other Fathers, the worse death is the death of sin, and what Christ has brought is first of all spiritual life. The fragment in *Prose Refutations* II, 164, 18-26, "death is sin," precisely corresponds to the main and most serious meaning of "death" indicated by Origen in *Dialogus cum Heraclide* 25ff.: this is the only death in respect to which our soul is mortal. In *Comm. in Io.* 20.25.221 Origen observes that "Adam and Eve died the very same day in which they transgressed, and they were killed by no other than the devil, who kills the human beings." This is not physical, but spiritual death, and yet Origen did not deny that Adam introduced also the death of the body, and that there the resurrection of all bodies will occur. Neither did Bardesanes necessarily deny this.

Ephrem, who in the 4th c., as I have mentioned, polemicized with Bardesanes in his *Hymni contra Haereses* and *Prose Refutations*, emphasized Christ's victory over death, Sheol and the devil. He thus situates himself within an important Christian tradition that meditated upon Christ's *descensus ad inferos* (= *sheol*) after his death and before his resurrection and upon the universally salvific meaning of this event, which assumes an esp. important weight in both Origen's thought and Gregory of Nyssa's *De tridui spatio*. Now, just as in Gregory, in Ephrem, the emptying of *sheol* immediately takes on an eschatological meaning as well: it is the announcement of the universal resurrection of all the dead. For this *descensus* takes place in a sacred place and time; therefore, it does not belong to a specific historical moment, but has its fulfillment only in the *telos*. That *sheol*, which is the place of death, will be completely emptied in the end, is grounded in the unity of the whole of humanity, realized in Christ and deeply felt also by Gregory of Nyssa.

Ephrem says that it is impossible to repent when one is in *sheol* (*Carm. Nis.* 3,16), but not after the resurrection, if one is in hell (*gehenna*). According to Ephrem, those who will surely remain forever in hell will be death itself, *sheol*, satan and sin, which will lose every power. In *Carm. Nis.* 59,8-9 the prosopopoea of death foretells to Satan that "Hell will probably be emptied thanks to mercy, and you will remain there alone with your servants." Similarly Ephrem says that some will enter Paradise because they deserve it and some thanks to mercy (*Carm. Nis.* 35,1-5; 39,7; *Hymni de Paradiso* 5,12-14; 10,14-15; 9,3-6). Ephrem often celebrates Christ's victory not only over physical death (*sheol*), but also over spiritual death (hell, *gehenna*), Satan and sin (see *Hymns on Unleavened Bread* 4,1-19; 3; 52; *Hymni de Nativitate*, 26,9). In *Hymni de Nativitate* 3,18 Ephrem proclaims that Christ "has killed death through his own death" and says that Christ's benefits "have emptied the left side." Ephrem declares that Jesus has killed "our enemy" (ibid. ,18,27) and Satan (*Hymni de verginitate* 14,11-13; *Hymni de fide* 38,7); "mortal sin has been put to death" by him (*De Domino* 21). Christ's *descensus ad inferos* upon his death is indeed crucial to several Fathers' reflection.

*Methodius, who follows Origen in many respects, in *Symp.* 9,2 claims that God, without being responsible for death—since the cause of death is sin, not God—has given physical death to humanity as a providential gift, so that human beings could not sin forever, and thus should not risk being punished forever ("that the human being might not sin forever and might not be liable to an eternity of condemnation"). Therefore, the very possibility of an eternal punishment is excluded, according to Methodius—and surely in line with Origen—thanks to God's providential gift of physical death. A similar idea is found in Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis* 3, where Ephrem interprets the exile of Adam and Eve from Eden after their sin, and thence the introduction of physical death, as a sign of God's mercy, in that God wanted to make their suffering only temporary, not eternal. It is God's providence that decided to give physical death to humanity after the fall, in order to shorten human tribulation in the present condition of decay and illness.

Gregory of Nyssa maintains that death entered the world as a consequence of sin; it was not created by God. A biblical basis for this conception is obviously found in Wisd 1:13, "The Lord did not create death," and 2:24: "Death entered the world because of the devil's envy." Indeed Gregory ascribes a good deal of responsibility for the fall directly to the dev-

il's deception, which tends to merge with the deception of the senses. So, he states that the original sin was a wrong judgment due to the deceit of the senses (*Or. cat.* 21,4-5). This sin, however, was also facilitated by a lack of love for God. The "skin tunics" (Gen 3:21) represent the present condition of mortality and liability to passions, which associates humans with irrational animals. The identification of the skin tunics with death is particularly clear in *Or. cat.* 8: after the fall, God takes off from the human beings the garments of their original happiness, i.e., immortality, confidence (*parrēsia*), and *apatheia*, and puts death on them. Since the skin, once it is separated from the animal, is dead, God, in covering the human beings with skin tunics, covers them with death, which is proper to irrational animals. Gregory emphasizes that this garment, i.e., death and mortality (νεκρώτης), remained something alien and external (ἔξωθεν) to the human being. Precisely because death is fundamentally alien to humanity—since it is not a creature of God—Gregory can explain Christ's victory over death as extending to the whole of humanity (*Or. cat.* 26): by means of his own death, Jesus Christ destroyed the power of death in the same way that light dispels darkness. Christ, who is Life, approached death in order to utterly destroy it, just as fire purifies gold by eliminating all that is alien to it.

Gregory's interpretation clearly derives from Origen. Unlike Philo (*Quaest. in Gen.* 1.53; Iren. *AH* 1.5.5) and the Valentinians (Tert. *Adv. Val.* 24), and contrary to certain accusations brought against him, Origen did not identify the skin tunics with the body *tout court*. Already *Clement had warned that such an identification, endorsed by the *Encratite Cassian, was incorrect (*Strom.* 3,14). Origen held that the skin tunics conceal a mystery that is deeper than that of the fall of the soul according to Plato (*C. Cels.* 4,40). *Procopius of Gaza (*Comm. in Gen.* PG 87/1.221A) likely attests to Origen's interpretation of the skin tunics: these are not the body, since the human being in paradise already had a body, fine (λεπτομερές) and luminous (αὐγοειδές) and immortal, but these are the mortal and heavy corporeality that was given to the *anthrōpos* after the sin. But after death, at the resurrection, all humans will recover immortality. An important confirmation to Procopius's attestation is provided, to my mind, by his quasi-contemporary Simon Gobar (*ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 232,287b-291b), who knew Origen and his admirers very well and often reports his thought. Concerning the skin tunics, he too reports their identification with mortality and heavy corporeality and liability to passions, which arrived after the fall, but which we shall lose at the resurrection (ὅπερ καὶ ἀποτιθέμεθα ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, 288a). The key term αὐγοειδές is used here, too, which confirms the identity of source with Procopius.

Gregory stresses that the skin tunics are not the body, but "a fleshly mentality" (*De virg.* 12-13). The skin tunics are "the dead and earthly kind of vision." (*Vit. Moys.* GNO 7/1,39-40). Thus, they are directly linked to death. And in *De mort.* (GNO 9,55-62) Gregory explains that God inflicted death upon the human being after the fall as a good: through the experience of evil (πεῖρα), the human being would discover that it is finite and, since it is foreign to our nature, it cannot endure forever. The resurrected body will take off the skin tunics when it will be transformed at the resurrection, and death and fire have purified it from mortality and passions and all the *scoriae* (dross) of the present life, which are totally extraneous to life in the next world: "The body will be transformed when it is created again at the resurrection into something more divine: death will have purified it [θανάτου ἀποκαθάραντος] from all that is useless and superfluous to the enjoyment of the future life. After purification in fire, it will take off all that is earthly and useless, what the experts call *scoriae* . . . now the nature of our body has many qualities that are scoriae, which have some usefulness for the present life, but will be completely useless and alien to the blessedness we hope for."

Now, the very same idea of the deposition of the skin tunics at the resurrection was already set forth by Origen, as I have shown. Even the selfsame verb is used by Origen and by Gregory for this action of "taking off": ἀποτίθημι. Death, Gregory maintains, is a good thing, because it destroys all that is superfluous to the next, blessed life: "What happens to iron in fire, when the fusion destroys what is useless, will also happen when all that is superfluous will be destroyed through dissolution in death [διὰ τῆς ἐν τῇ νεκρότητι λύσεως], and our body will be set right through death [διὰ τοῦ θανάτου κατορθοῦται]." Physical death is thus presented in a positive and providential light. For it will free us from all passions and will direct our desires to what is really worthy of them: "Dross will disappear, those things to which the impulses of our desires are now directed: pleasures, riches, love for glory, power, anger, haughtiness, and the like. Thus, our impulse, once liberated and purified from all this, will turn in its activity only to what is worth desiring and loving: it will not altogether extinguish our natural impulses toward those objects, but will transform them in view of the immaterial participation in the true blessings." Death is good because it destroys our present body, our

"earthly house," to give us our new house, not made by human hands but by God, for the other world: "It is the purified body that we should love, not the scoriae that have been taken off. For what divine Scripture says is true: after the destruction of our earthly house, then we shall find the building made by God for us: a house not made by human hands, in the next world, in heaven, worthy of being itself the home of God in Spirit." All the properties of our body will be transformed into something "more divine." So too, Gregory foresees the deposition of the skin tunics, these dead tunics taken from animals and symbolizing death (*De an.* 148-149).

That death does not come from God, but derives from sin, and that Christ's sacrifice was intended to liberate from death the whole of humanity is highlighted by *Faustus of Riez (or, of Lérins) in his *De gratia* and commenting on Paul's letter to the Romans (in particular, Paul's sentence *stipendium peccati mors*). Faustus polemicizes against predestinationism and insists that God's grace is not reserved to some predestined human beings, but the effects of Christ's victory over death is for all.

L.F. Mateo-Seco, *La teología de la muerte en la* Oratio catechetica magna *de Gregorio de Nisa*, Scripta Theologica 1 (1969) 453-473; I. Ramelli, *La Chiesa di Roma e la cultura pagana: echi cristiani nell'*Hercules Oetaeus*?*, RSCI 52 (1998) 11-31; *Osservazioni sul concetto di "giorno natalizio" nel mondo greco e romano e sull'espressione di Seneca* dies aeterni natalis, 'Ilu 6 (2001) 169-181; T. Buchan, *Blessed Is He Who Has Brought Adam from Sheol*, Piscataway, NJ 2004; M.L. Annecchino, *Stipendium peccati mors*, Auctores Nostri 4 (2006) 195-209; I. Ramelli, *La colpa antecedente come ermeneutica del male in sede storico-religiosa e nei testi biblici*, Ricerche Storico-Bibliche 19 (2007) 11-64; Id., *Gregorio di Nissa Sull'anima e la resurrezione*, Milan 2007; E. Wassermann, *The Death of the Soul in* Romans 7, JBL 126 (2007) 793-816; I. Ramelli - D. Konstan, *Terms for Eternity*, Piscataway 2007; *Origen's Exegesis of Jeremiah: Resurrection Announced Throughout the Bible and Its Twofold Conception*, Augustinianum 48 (2008) 59-78; *Philosophical Allegoresis of Scripture in Philo and Its Legacy in Gregory of Nyssa*, Studia Philonica Annual 20 (2008); *1 Cor 15:24-26: Submission of Enemies and Annihilation of Evil and Death: A Case for a New Translation and a History of Interpretation*, SMSR 74,2 (2008) 241-258; A. Lund-Jacobsen, *Gen 1-3 as Source for the Anthropology of Origen*, VChr 2 (2008) 213-232: 215; I. Ramelli, *La centralità del mistero di Cristo nell'escatologia di s. Efrem*, Augustinianum 49,2 (2009).

I. Ramelli

DECALOGUE. Code given by God to Moses on Sinai (Ex 19:1ff.) at the moment when the second covenant was established, a summary of the Mosaic Law. We know two versions: Ex 20:1-17 and Dt 5:6-21, both of which go back to a probably shorter original. Jewish tradition considers it a jewel of ten pearls in which the Torah is summed up, and that it was already observed by the patriarchs. Its daily recital in the Temple was later prohibited, so as not to endorse the heresy that only the Decalogue was revealed by God at Sinai. In some communities it is read at Pentecost, a feast which, according to a postbiblical tradition, commemorated the Sinaitic theophany.

From the beginning, the church gave the Decalogue a special place in catechesis, as a privileged and universally valid expression of the divine will. For the Fathers it was the focus of Christian moral purity, in contrast to the grossness of polytheism (which at times was atheistic) and pagan moral dissoluteness; the permanent elements of Jewish Law are still based on it. The Decalogue contains the basic requirements of natural morality, and was written in the human heart before being written in stone. To the stages of salvation history (creation, old covenant, new covenant) corresponds a progressive revelation of the divine will: natural law, old law (in which the Decalogue occupies a special place), new law. The latter neither abrogates nor contradicts the first two, but assumes and completes them: the Decalogue came to be considered an anticipation of the law of Christ. The prologue of the Decalogue was rewritten to place it at creation rather than at the exodus, thus extending its validity to all people.

J.J. Stamm, *Der Dekalog im Lichte der neueren Forschung*, Bern [2]1962: Eng. tr. with additions by M.E. Andrew, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, 2, 1967; G. Bourgeault, *Décalogue et morale chrétienne, Enquête patristique sur l'utilisation de l'interprétation chrétiennes du décalogue de c. 60 à c. 220*, Paris 1971; B. Reicke, *Die Zehn Worte in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Tübingen 1973; H. Schüngel-Straumann, *Der Dekalog – Gottes Gebote*, Stuttgart 1973, It. ed. F. Montagnini (ed.), *Decalogo e comandamenti di Dio*, Brescia 1977; J. Schreiner, *I Dieci Comandamenti nella vita del popolo di Dio*, Brescia 1991; R.M. Grant, *The Decalogue in Early Christianity*, in E. Ferguson (ed.), *Christian Life*, New York 1993, 1-17; A. Orbe, *Estudios sobre la teología cristiana primitiva*, Madrid 1994, 287-322; M. Lluch-Baixauli, *El Decálogo en los escritos de S. Agustín*: Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia 8 (1999) 125-144.

S. Cavalletti

DECENTIUS of Gubbio (d. after 416). Bishop of Eugubium, known only from the letter sent him by Pope *Innocent I of 19 March 416 (*Ep.* 25; CPL 1641), responding to some liturgical problems put to him by his Umbrian diocese: (1) When should the kiss of peace occur at *Mass, before (*Gaul) or after the canon (*Rome)? (2) Should the names of those making the offering be read after the preface and before the *"collectio post nomina"* and the kiss of peace (Gaul) or during the *"memento vivorum"* of the

canon (Rome)? (3) Who should *consignare* the neophytes, i.e., who should make the sign of the *cross on their forehead with chrism (confirmation), the presbyter (Gaul) or the bishop (Rome)? (4) Should the weekly fast be observed only on Friday as in all the churches outside Rome, or also on Saturday? (5) Should the rite of *fermentum* (Roman custom by which bread consecrated at the papal Mass was carried to the *tituli* of Rome, to be used in consecrating wine for parish Masses) be administered only *intra muros* or also outside of Gubbio (since it was a rural diocese)? (6) Does imposition of hands by a priest or deacon over a possessed baptized person (an exorcism?) require the permission of the bishop? (7) Regarding penitential discipline: the ordinary day for the reconciliation of public penitents is Holy Thursday. (8) Regarding the anointing of the sick (i.e., the faithful, excluding catechumens and penitents), according to Lk 5:14-15: not only the bishop, but also presbyters and laypeople have permission to anoint the sick when sacramental chrism, blessed by the bishop, is used. The letter makes it clear that ca. 416 at Gubbio the Roman *liturgy was exposed to Gallican influences, and that the pope attempted to impose the Roman liturgy in the city; his resolution in pushing for liturgical unity is surprising.

PCBE 2,1, 536-537; G. Malchiodi, *La lettera di s. Innocenzo I a Decenzio vescovo di Gubbio*, Rome 1921; R. Cabié (éd.), *La lettre du pape Innocent I[er] à Décentius de Gubbio (19 mars 416)*, Louvain 1973; M.F. Connell, *Church and Worship in Fifth-Century Rome. The Letter of Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio*, Cambridge 2002.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DECIUS, emperor (d. 251). Gaius Messius Quintus Traianus Decius, Roman emperor 249–251. Born ca. 200 near *Sirmium in Pannonia, he became one of the most influential senators of his time. In 248 the emperor Philip sent him to the eastern frontier along the Danube, an area he knew well and which was deeply troubled: the usual pressure of the *Goths was increased in 248 by the mutiny of the legions of Moesia and Pannonia. Acclaimed emperor by the army, he attacked and defeated Philip at Verona (249). With him began the series of Illyrican emperors who tried to restore the power of *Rome, torn by military anarchy. Convinced that to achieve this purpose he had to restore the republican and imperial tradition and reinvigorate the old religion, he took various measures, including one that particularly affected Christians. Late in 249 he issued a general edict ordering Roman citizens to participate in a *supplicatio*, consisting of offerings of incense, libations and consumption of sacrificial meat, to show their loyalty to the *dei publici*. This was the first general edict in the history of the empire to strike at all Christians (the credibility of a passage in the *Historia Augusta* [Sparziano, *Sept. Sev.* 17,1], according to which an earlier general edict of *Septimius Severus had forbidden Jewish and Christian proselytism, is still disputed).

Decius's intention does not seem to have been to make martyrs, but apostates. Many Christians defected, some by performing the required sacrifice in full (*sacrificati*), some merely burning a few grains of incense (*thurificati*), others purchased the *libellus* issued by special commissions (*libellatici*), and finally others yielded to threats or torture.

Many, on the other hand, held firm to their faith and were killed, among them bishops Fabian of Rome (see *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, I, 4; Euseb., *HE* VI, 39,1), Alexander of Jerusalem (see Euseb., *HE* VI, 39,2-3) and *Babylas of *Antioch (see Euseb., *HE* VI, 39,4). Even *Origen, arrested at *Caesarea of Palestine where he was teaching, was tortured and later died from the effects. *Cyprian of Carthage, judging it necessary to continue guiding his church, which was undergoing a very difficult period because of the persecution, retired to a safe place from where he maintained contact with his flock. In his treatise on the apostates (*De lapsis*) he recounts the experience and, while praising the martyrs and confessors who survived the test, does not ignore the problems, including disciplinary, created by Christians who had denied the faith.

After about a year (late 250) the persecution had lost its intensity; by spring 251 it seems to have been spent. In the meantime, Decius had to face a particular threat to Moesia by the Goths and Carpi. Insufficiently supported (or perhaps betrayed) by the regional Roman military commander Trebonianus Gallus (who succeeded him as emperor), Decius was defeated and killed in the swamps of Abrittus, in present-day Dobruja (Romania), in early summer 251.

Despite his efforts to forcefully impose loyalty to the pagan tradition on his subjects (papyri preserve Egyptian *libelli* from June-July 250 with the prescribed formula of loyalty), Decius's religious policy, in particular toward Christians, did not achieve the hoped-for results and, despite the defections, it seems in a way to have tempered the churches in preparation for the trials of the coming years.

Information on the persecution (and its consequences) in Cyprian, *De lapsis* 42, PL 4, 465-498; CSEL 3, 1, 235-264; CCL 3, 217-242; *Ep.*, 8, 25, 34, 51, 57, CSEL 3, 2, 485ff.; Eusebius of Caes., *HE* VI, 39-42; *Catalogi Romanorum Pontificum*, in L. Duchesne, LP 1, Paris 1886. On the certificates of sacrifice preserved

in Egyptian papyri, see A. Biludau, *Die ägyptischen Libelli und die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius*: RQA, Supplementheft 27, 1931; E. Liesering, *Untersuchungen zur Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius*, Würzburg 1933; A. Alföldi, *Zu den Christenverfolgungen in der Mitte des III. Jh.*: Klio (1938) 323-348; R. Andreotti, *Religione ufficiale e culto dell'imperatore nei "libelli" di Decio.* Studi in onore di A. Calderini and R. Paribeni, I, Milan 1956, 369-376; K. Gross, *Decius*: RAC 3, 611-629; Ch. Saumagne, *La persécution à Carthage d'après la correspondance de Saint Cyprien*: BSNAF, Paris 1957, 23-42; O. Giordano, *I Cristiani nel III secolo. L'editto di Decio*, Messina 1966; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III^e siècle*, Vatican City 1969; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (II^e-III^e siècle)*, Paris 1979, 249ff.; R. Ziegler: *Festschrift Opelt* 1988, 385ff.; L. Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios, prêtre de Smyrne*, Washington D.C. 1994.

P. Siniscalco

DECRETUM GELASIANUM. A composite document that begins with the title *Incipit concilium urbis Romae, sub Damaso papa. De explanatione fidei.* Its five chapters, grouped in two parts (1-3; 4-5), deal with the names of Christ and of the Holy Spirit (ch. 1); provide a list of the books of the OT and NT (ch. 2); expound the theme of the primacy of the church of *Rome, followed by those of *Alexandria and *Antioch (ch. 3); give a list of orthodox Fathers whose writings can be recommended and name the three councils of *Nicaea, *Ephesus and *Chalcedon (ch. 4); and finally give a curious list of apocryphal books beginning with the Council of *Rimini, which is condemned for eternity (ch. 5). Known since the 7th c. under the name *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis* (from chs. 2 and 4), its dogmatic pretensions may be deduced from the fact that its author passed it off as the work of a 4th-c. Roman synod. Considered authentic, it was copied so often that we now have 36 manuscripts of it. The manuscript tradition reveals the precariousness of its attribution: Pope *Damasus (366–384), Pope *Gelasius (492–496), Pope *Hormisdas (514–523). Its attribution *en bloc* to Damasus is historically impossible. The two parts which compose the Decretum Gelesianum belong to two different periods and issue from two different mentalities. Chs. 1-3, closely related to one another, reveal the sources of authority, the guarantees of faith, listed in descending order: first Christ, in whom the Holy Spirit is manifested, then Sacred Scripture, then the Roman church followed by the two churches of Alexandria and Antioch, also bearers of old traditions. This organic block probably goes back to the time of Pope Damasus and could be the work of a Roman council datable to 382. It is important for biblical scholars, since it overcomes the distinction between proto- and deuterocanonical books.

The less systematic chs. 4-5 are not the work of an assembly but of an individual, who made a list of the subsidiary authorities of the faith and put together, from memory, a series of names of authors of previous centuries. Since nearly all of the most recent authors are datable, the latest being Peter the monk (died Alexandria ca. 489), and since it ignores the 6th-c. controversies over the *Three Chapters, *Origen and *Faustus of Riez, it was presumably composed in the late 5th or early 6th c., probably in *Gaul. The two parts were combined very soon, perhaps in 519, the year of the reconciliation between Rome and *Byzantium after the schism of *Acacius. The attribution to Gelasius seems to have come about (doubtless in the 7th c.) both because the first part of the Decretum Gelasianum issued from an assembly held by a pope, and because Gelasius in his time had a reputation as a reformer.

Decretum Gelasii: FP 19, 787-794 (chs. 1-3); CPL 1676; PL 59, 157-164, 165-180 (chs. 4-5); E. von Dobschütz, *Das* Decretum gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis *im kritischen Text herausgegeben und untersucht* (TU 8,3/4), Leipzig 1912, 3-60; H. Leclercq, *Gélasien (Décret)*: DACL VI, Paris 1924, 722-747; G. Bardy, *Gélase (Décret de)*: DBS III, 579-590; A. Kleinhaus, *Gelasio I, papa, santo*: EC V, 1982-1983; Patrologia III, 263f.; B. Moreton, TRE 12 (1984) 273-276; P. Nautin, *Gélase I^er*, DHGE 20, 283-294; M. Spinelli, *Gelasius I*, LTK³ 4, 401-402; Bratož Rajko, *Gelasio I*, EPapi I, 458-462.

E. Peretto

DEDICATION of CHURCHES

I. Roman ritual - II. Gallican ritual - III. Romano-Germanic ritual - IV. Eastern rites.

The dedication of churches (*dedicatio, consecratio ecclesiae*) cannot be explained without apologetic and theological recourse to the dedication of the Jewish *temple at *Jerusalem (Num 7; 1 Kgs 8; Ezra 6). We know nothing of rites of dedication during the first three centuries; texts giving information on such rites are from a later period, and project onto the past the customs of their own time. *Eusebius of Caesarea says nothing of them in his passages relating the inauguration of the church of *Tyre in 314 (*HE* 10,3-4) and of the *Anastasis* of Jerusalem (or rather, the founding of the Basilica of the the Holy Cross in Jerusalem) in 335 (*vita Const.* 4,43-47); he speaks only of a particularly solemn *Mass, with preaching by some of the *bishops present. The consecration of a church was everywhere a right reserved to bishops, and we have some homilies given on such occasions: of Gaudentius (*Tract.* 17), Pseudo-Maximinus (*Sermo* 87: CCL 23, 355-357),

*Augustine (*Sermones* 336-338) and Pseudo-Hilary (*Dedic. eccl.*; CPL 467). Consecration had no relation to the church's name, which could depend on a variety of factors (M. Jost, *Die Patrozinien der Kirchen Roms während des ersten Jahrtausends*: Hagiographica 8 [2001] 1-34). An inscription often records the dedication, with anniversaries celebrated from the 4th c. (DACL 4, 398-404). Between 350-400 a new element appeared in addition to a Mass: *relics were deposited in newly built churches, first at *Constantinople (*Apostoleion*) and then in N Italy (Ambr., *Ep.* 22,1-2).

I. Roman ritual. Still in the 6th c. the first celebration of the *Eucharist was the rite of consecration of the building (Vigil., *Epist. ad Profut.*: PL 84, 832; *Liber Diurnus* 9-10; *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, n. 703-714; *Sacramentarium Veronense*, n. 130-133), even if other rites did exist, such as the deposition of relics (Greg. the Great, *Dial.* 3,30), aspersion with holy water (Greg. the Great, *Ep.* 11,56; Bede, *HE* 1,30) and the erection of the cross; these latter rites were enacted esp. when a pagan temple was converted into a Christian church (S. Heid, *Vexillum Crucis. Das Kreuz als Religions-, Missions- und Imperialsymbol in der frühen Kirche*: RivAC 78 [2002] 191-259). Only representative relics (*brandea*) were placed in the altar, or the altar was built over a martyr's existing tomb, as, e.g., at St. Peter's or St. Paul's at the time of *Gregory the Great. The *Gregorianum Hadrianum* (n. 815-822) describes the papal rite in the mid-8th c.—a very simple rite, probably that of Gregory: arrival of the relics, aspersion of the building with holy water, deposition of the relics (in the altar), dressing of the altar, celebration of Mass. The 8th-c. *Ordo Romanus* 42 agrees with the Roman rite of the 6th-7th c., adding only the anointing of the altar.

II. Gallican ritual. At *Rome the central rite was the deposition of the relics, whereas in *Gaul it was the consecration of the altar. The earliest Gallican dedication ritual is cited in the Angoulême Sacramentary, which describes the rite in use until the late 7th c., before Roman influence (CPL 1905d). The ritual included a litany, aspersion of the building and altar, blessing, anointing and adorning of the altar, procession and deposition of the relics, Mass (*Gregory of Tours, *Glor. conf.* 20). The Gallican rite is more developed in the *Missale Francorum* (n. 56-58). Other rites were added in the Carolingian period, including the *Celtic alphabet rite, in the *Ordo Romanus* 41, and the chants (e.g., ps. 24) attested in the Gelasian Sacramentary.

III. Romano-Germanic ritual. A Roman-Gallican rite (*Ordo Romanus* 41) and a Roman-suburbicarian rite (*Ordo Romanus* 42) were in use in the late 8th c. The 9th-c. *Ordo ad benedicendam ecclesiam* (Eng. tr. Repsher 139-169), which fuses the Gallican and Roman rites, is part of the 10th-c. Romano-Germanic Pontifical, which also contains an explanation of the dedication (*Quid significent duodecim candelae*; Repsher 171-193). The Sacramentary of Drogo of Metz (13th c.) represents the near-definitive rite of dedication: vigil and arrival of the relics, aspersion of the church from the outside, entrance, writing of the alphabet, aspersion and anointing of the altar and church (12 candles symbolize the apostles), entrance and deposition of the relics, consecration of the liturgical furnishings, celebration of Mass. The ritual in this form, however, included much repetition (e.g., a triple aspersion with water), which has been eliminated by the recent reforms.

IV. Eastern rites. We do not have scientific editions of all the Eastern euchologia, thus only a few rapid notes are possible (DACL 4, 397-398). Anointing of the altar seems to have originated in Syria (ca. 400), passing then to Gaul. The Second Council of Nicaea (787, can. 7) considers the deposition of relics as obligatory for every dedication. According to Goar, the Barberini euchologion (8th c.) provides for a nocturnal vigil, consecration of the altar, censing, aspersions with holy water, deposition of relics, adorning of the altar, Mass. The orthodox rite of dedication is found in Simeon of Thessalonica, *De sacro templo* (PG 155, 305-361).

F.X. Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer* 1, Freiburg 1882, 346-348; RAC 3, 643-649; LMA 5, 1186-1188; J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* 1, Munich 1924, 663-750; M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia Liturgica* 4, Milan [2]1959, 502-523; U. Süßenbach, *Christuskult und kaiserliche Baupolitik bei Konstantin*, Bonn 1977; M. Black, *The Festival of Encaenia Ecclesiae in the Ancient Church with Special Reference to Palestine and Syria*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 5 (1954) 78-85; J. Wilkinson, *Jewish Influences on the Early Christian Rite of Jerusalem*: Muséon 92 (1979) 347-359; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, Portland 1986, 180-181; J. Schwartz, *The Encaenia of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Temple of Solomon and the Jews*: Theologische Zeitschrift 43 (1987) 265-281; A. Palmer - L. Rodley, *The Inauguration Anthem of Hagia Sophia in Edessa*: Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 12 (1988) 117-167; M. van Esbroeck, *Le discours de Jean Damascène pour la Dédicace de l'Anastasis*: OCP 63 (1997) 53-98; B. Repsher, *The Rite of Church Dedication in the Early Medieval Era*, Lampeter 1998; T.-C. Forneck, *Die Feier der Dedicatio ecclesiae im Römischen Ritus*, Aachen 1999; A. Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter*, Darmstadt 2000, 431-446.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DEDICATION, Council of the. After the Council of *Tyre (335), the bishops who had met there went, at *Constantine's wish, to *Jerusalem, to celebrate there the feast of the dedication of the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre (or *Anastasis*) and Constantine's thirtieth year as emperor. Constantine wanted *Arius rehabilitated and peace reestablished in the church. We possess a summary of his letter read to the council: he states that he has interrogated the Arians and attests their orthodoxy—confirmed by a profession of faith—and asks that they be readmitted to ecclesial communion. The bishops obeyed and communicated their decisions by letter to the church of *Alexandria and to all the churches of *Egypt, *Libya and *Pentapolis: once the main source of discord—*Athanasius—had been exiled, the division in the church had to end. Abbot *Anthony wrote to the emperor defending Athanasius, but Constantine was inflexible in applying the council. Arius did not enjoy his triumph, however, dying suddenly before being readmitted to the church of Alexandria.

Athanasius, *Synod.* 21; *Adv. Arian.* 84; *Ad. Serap. de morte Ari*; Socrates, *HE* I, 33-37; Sozomen, *HE* 11,29; Theodoret, I, 31; L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, II, Paris 1910, 184f.; G. Bardy, *La reazione eusebiana e lo scisma di Serdica*, in Fliche-Martin, III, 1, 139-141; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 128-129.

C. Nardi

DEFENSOR

I. Defensor civitatis - II. Defensor ecclesiae.

I. Defensor civitatis (or *plebis*). Had the office of defending his city and its *humiliores* from oppressors both public and private (*potentiores*): *ut innocens et quieta rusticitas peculiaris patrocinii beneficio fruatur* (CTh 1,29,5). Laws were often not enforced by officials, who profited from their office. In other cases the poorest were oppressed by authorities did not apply laws for their protection (CTh 1,29,5; Augustine, *Ep.* 22,1 Divjak). Sometimes it was the rulers, imperial officials and heads of cities—in other words the authorities—who burdened the weakest with taxes, exempting the rich. For this reason there were *defensores* with the necessary function and authority to enforce laws. The *defensor* was instituted by *Valentinian in 368 for Illyricum as the *patronus plebis* (CTh 1,29,1, the 364 date is incorrect), in some regions recognizing an office already in existence (OxP 901 del 336). It was thus a western initiative; during the same period the *defensor* was also created in other territories where it did not already exist (CTh 1,29,4 [378]; 1,29,3 [368, or 370 or 373], sent to the prefect at the praetorium) (other laws CTh 1,29,5; CI 1,55,3; 1,55,8 [21 January 409]; CI 1,55,5 del 385).

The institution did not spread to all regions immediately; in 401 the bishops of *Africa requested a *defensor propter afflictionem pauperum* (can. 75: CCL 149,202). *Augustine strongly lamented (420): "the reason is clearly in the fact that there are no 'defenders' *[defensores]* who in some way protect them from the wickedness of the powerful who trample upon them, and who are capable of making them respect the laws in favor of the poor against those who despise them; 'defenders', I repeat, supported by an appropriate social status and elected by their fellow citizens, among whom they enjoy a good reputation, in such a way that they be characterized by honesty and authority. When these are lacking in cities or in their surrounding territories, in vain do we afflict ourselves over the misfortunes to which we could come in relief" (*Ep.* 22,2 Divjak).

Augustine insisted that the *defensor*, whether a private person or an official, have sufficient social status (*dignitas*) to have the authority to oppose the *potentes* (*Ep.* 22,2-4 Divjak). Late Antiquity saw frequent changes in the competence and procedure of appointing the *defensor civitatis*. At first he was appointed by the praetorian prefect, from 387 by the *civitas* (CTh 1, 29,6) and from 409 by the clergy and notables, and he had to be a Catholic (CI 1,55,8); there were also later changes. Since his powers were modified more than once, eventually becoming a municipal magistrature, we deduce that the performance of the office proved difficult (Cassiodorus, *Variae* 7,11,2, does not list the clergy for nomination, just the *supplicatio civium*). The *defensor civitatis* disappeared in the West, we do not know when; in the East *Justinian attempted to reenergize it (15 November 535), but the institution was linked to municipalities. The expression, however, was also used in a broad sense, for example in the case of a bishop who defended his city against invasion.

II. Defensor ecclesiae. Initially a church lawyer designated by the emperor, functioning as legal representative and defender of the interests of the local church (*defensores scholastici*: CCL 149,215). The first evidence is found at *Rome: a *defensor ecclesiae urbis Romae.* *Possidius mentions the *defensor ecclesiae* in 403 (*Vita Aug.* 12,5: PL 32, 43), when the church of Calama must have already had one. The first imperial mention of the *defensor ecclesiae* was by Emperor *Honorius in 407 (CTh 16, 2, 38), who responded a few months later to a specific request of the African bishops of 13 June 407 (*Reg. Ecc. Carth.*, can. 97: CCL 149,215). The imperial provision was

valid for Africa, where the institution already existed but was not widespread (regarding Rome, see Zosimus, *Ep.* 9,3). A letter of Augustine (20 Divjak) mentions that the *defensor* for Fussala created a diocese in 411–412: being a new diocese perhaps it had need of a legal representative before the civil authorities, who were not protecting the people.

Roman *defensores* are known mostly from literary sources; inscriptions show that they were also present elsewhere. While at first the *defensor ecclesiae* was a layman, later he was a cleric who had received the tonsure. The powers and appointment of the *defensor ecclesiae* also evolved and expanded to the point of his having diplomatic and administrative functions of every kind, helping the bishop in his nonecclesial functions. According to Pope *Pelagius II (d. 590), the duties of the *defensor ecclesiae* pertained to the *causarum cognitio, conventiones, actus, publica litigia, et quaecumque vel ecclesiastica instituta vel supplicantium necessitas poscit* (*Ep. et dec.* 8: PL 72, 745). A Roman *defensor* could be sent to *Constantinople (CSEL 25,1, 158f.), execute the bishop's directives or participate in the administration of the church's goods.

DACL 4,406-427 (defensor civitatis); NDI² 5,313-316 (defensor civitatis); RAC 3,649-656 (defensor civitatis); B. Biondi, *Il diritto romano cristiano*, Milan 1952, II, 198-201 (defensor civitatis); EC 4, 1302-1303 (defensor ecclesiae); RAC 3,656-658 (defensor ecclesiae); F. Martroye, *Les "defensores Ecclesiae" aux Vᵉ et VIᵉ siècles*: RD (1923) 597-622; S. Mochi Onory, *Vescovi e città*, Bologna 1933, 177ff.; P.L. Zovatto, *Il "Defensor ecclesiae" e le iscrizioni musive di Trieste*: RSCI 19 (1965) 1-8; L. Pani Ermini, *Iscrizioni cristiane inedite di S. Saturno a Cagliari. Contributo allo studio del "defensor ecclesiae" nell'antichità cristiana*: RSCI 23 (1969) 1-20; R.M. Frakes, *Late Roman Social Justice and the Origin of the Defensor Civitatis*: The Classical Journal 89 (1994) 337-349; V. Mannino, *Ricerche sul "defensor civitatis,"* Milan 1984; F. Pergami, *Sulla istituzione del Defensor civitatis*: SDHI 61 (1995) 413-443; F. Jacques, *Le défenseur de cité d'après la lettre 22* de saint Augustin*: REAug 32 (1986) 56-73; R. Barcelona, *Fausto di Riez, defensor civitatis et defensor orthodoxiae. Sul ruolo del vescovo in Gallia nel V secolo,* in *Vescovi e pastori in età teodosiana*, II, Rome 1997, 777-802; R.M. Frakes, *The Syro-Roman Lawbook and the "Defensor Civitatis"*: Byzantion 68 (1998) 347-355; Id., *Contra potentium iniurias: The Defensor civitatis and Late Roman Justice*, Munich 2001; Ph. Blaudeau, *Vice mea. Remarques sur les représentations pontificales auprès de l'empereur d'Orient dans la seconde moitié du Vᵉ siècle (452-496)*: MEFRA 113 (2001) 1058-1123.

A. Di Berardino

DEFENSOR, monk (d. after 700). Monk at Ligugé in Poitou, who compiled ca. 700 the *Liber scintillarum*, a collection of passages drawn from Scripture and from the Fathers (mostly Latin, some Greek and one Syrian, *Ephrem). The work, frequently copied from the 8th-16th c., is divided into 81 chapters, each with a title—generally the name of a vice or a virtue, which shows the author's purpose of moral teaching and ascetic training. The prologue has two versions, short and long; the long one, which seems authentic, mentions the monastery of Saint-Martin de Ligugé where the monk Defensor developed the collection.

CPL 1302; PL 88, 597-718; CCL 117,1-308; SC 77 and 86; A. Vaccari, *Il "liber scintillarum" del monaco Defensor*: StudMed 17 (1951) 86-92; H.-M. Rochais, *Defensor et les Scintillae. Essai de bibliographie critique*: RBen 61 (1951) 63-80; Id., *Contribution à l'histoire des florilèges ascétiques du haut moyen âge latin. Le "Liber scintillarum"*: RBen 63 (1953) 246-291; Id., *Defensoriana. Archéologie du "Liber scintillarum"*: SE 9 (1957) 199-264.

S. Zincone

DELPHINUS of Bordeaux (d. 403/404). The second reliably attested bishop of *Bordeaux (380–403/4), after Orientalis, who was present at the Council of *Arles in 314. Delphinus had great merit as an evangelizer of his own diocese and enjoyed great prestige. A friend of *Phoebadius of Agen, he regularly corresponded with *Ambrose of *Milan, and was considered the spiritual father of *Paulinus of Nola, to whom he administered baptism in 389 and from whom he received five letters (*Ep.* 10, 14, 19, 20, 35), praising his biblical knowledge. His times were disturbed by the polemic against the heretic *Priscillian and his followers: Delphinus himself participated in two councils, in 380 at *Saragossa and in 384 at *Bordeaux, in which the condemnation of the heretic was discussed. None of his works have reached us. His feast is celebrated 24 December (30 December at Bordeaux); he was considered patron of Aquitaine.

P. Fabre, *Essai sur la chronologie de l'œuvre de s. Paulin de Nole*, Paris 1948, 57-65; Id., *S. Paulin de Nole et l'amitié chrétienne*, Paris 1949, 252-261; *Vies des SS.* 12 (1956) 640-643; DHGE 14 (1960) 185-187 (bibl.); BS 4 (1964) 541-542 (bibl.); E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, I, Paris, 1964, 310-312; A. Mandouze (ed.), *Storia dei santi e della santità cristiana*, III, *Vescovi e monaci riconosciuti dal popolo (314-604)*, It. tr., Bergamo 1991, 269.

M. Maritano

DEMETRIAN of Antioch, saint (3rd c.). Saint, feast 10 November, bishop of *Antioch, successor of *Fabius (Euseb., *HE* VI, 46,4) and father of Bishop *Domnus. Elected in 253, he was deported to Persia with his fellow-citizens by *Shapur I, and continued to serve the deported community as bishop at Gondeshapur. Died ca. 260.

DHGE 14, 194; BS 4, 550f.

E. Prinzivalli

DEMETRIAS (d. 460?), saint, Roman virgin and ascetic (*Rome ca. 398–460 [?]). Daughter of *Anicia Juliana and the consul Olybrius Probus, granddaughter of Anicia Proba Faltonia, Demetrias was a descendant of the *gens Anicia*, one of the first politically important Roman families to convert to Christianity. Settled with her mother at *Carthage after her father's death and the sack of Rome (410), she came to know *Augustine and *Alypius. In late 413 or early 414, Demetrias renounced an illustrious marriage, consecrating herself to God and receiving the veil from Bishop *Aurelius of Carthage. Due partly to her youth, the event aroused such interest in the Christian community that eminent persons addressed advice and encouragement to her mother and grandmother. Pope *Innocent I (PL 20, 518-519) and Augustine (*Ep.* 150: CSEL 44, 380-382) wrote congratulatory letters to Juliana and Proba; *Pelagius and *Jerome also wrote. Pelagius sent a letter from *Africa, *Ad Demetriadem* (PL 30, 15-46; 33, 1099-1120), in fact an instruction manual for the consecrated virgin: written in the style of the court, after the usual compliments it contained advice on temperate ascesis, as well as Pelagius's doctrine of nature and grace. Jerome wrote a treatise, *Ad Demetriadem* (*Ep.* 130: CSEL 56, 175-201), from Bethlehem. After the *laudatio* of the family, he praised the faith and ardor with which the young woman had consecrated herself to God, renouncing the comforts of her social position. Jerome advised her to dedicate fixed hours to prayer and Bible reading, to do penance, to be generous toward the poor, to guard herself from heresies. Pelagius's letter—which circulated anonymously—greatly worried Augustine, who pointed out (*Ep.* 188: CSEL 57, 119-130) its doctrinal ambiguity: this was the first skirmish of the Pelagian controversy. After returning to Rome, Demetrias received an explicitly anti-Pelagian letter, *Ad sacram virginem Demetriadem seu de humilitate tractatus* (PL 55, 161-180, among the works of *Leo the Great), generally attributed to *Prosper of Aquitaine. The *Liber Pontificalis* attests she that had a basilica built in honor of St. Stephen on a property she owned on the via Latina (Duchesne LP I, 238); its ruins and dedicatory inscription were discovered in 1858 (Diehl 1765).

M. Gonsette, *Les directeurs spirituels de Démétriade*: NRTh 60 (1933) 783-801; G. Bardy, *Démétriade*: DSp 3, 133-137; K.C. Krabbe, *Epistula ad Demetriadem de vera humilitate*, PSt 97, Washington D.C. 1965 (Pelagius's work); H.A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, II, Tübingen 1979, 87-88; G. Mariani, *Sant'Agostino guida spirituale. Lettere del vescovo di Ippona a Proba, Giuliana e Demetriade*, Rome 1982; C. Tibiletti, *Moduli stoici in Pelagio. A Demetriade*, in *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte*, Urbino 1987, 109-119; E. Giannarelli, *Demetriade*, in *Il grande libro dei santi*, Cinisello B. 1988, 527-529.

G. Pani

DEMETRIUS MEGALOMARTYR (d. 306?). The saint's name appears on 9 April, as a native of *Sirmium, in *Mart. Syr.* and *Mart. hier.*, in which he is called a deacon; they do not mention a martyr with this name honored at Thessalonica. After the destruction of Sirmium by *Attila in 441, the saint's cult was probably moved to Thessalonica where, in ca. 510–520, a basilica was built in his honor within the walls over older structures. There was no tomb with relics: a ciborium replaced the presence of the saint's relics. The political situation influenced the growth of his legend: in 535 the seat of the prefecture of Illyricum was moved from Sirmium to Thessalonica. The legend turned the deacon into a soldier and proconsul who suffered under *Maximian (306). In the 7th c., the collection of miracles edited by Archbishop *John of Thessalonica calls him an intercessor and protector of the city against the Avars and Slavs. Demetrius is depicted at *Rome in S. Maria Antiqua; icons frequently depict him as a cavalryman. *Cyril and *Methodius brought his cult to Moravia and Pannonia, the Crusades to the West. The Greeks celebrate Demetrius 26 October; Florus inserts him in his martyrology on 8 October.

BHG 496-547; BHL 2121-2127; BHO 248-251; BS 4, 556-565; LCI 6, 41-45; BBKL 1, 1255-1256; LMA 3, 686-689; E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*, Tübingen 1904, 214-228; W. De Grüneisen, *Sainte Marie Antique*, Rome 1911, 522-523; P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils de miracles de S. Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, 1. *Le texte*, Paris 1979; C. Bakirtzis, *Le culte de Saint Démétrius*: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City - Münster 1995, 58-68; E. Schurr, *Die Ikonographie der Heiligen*, Dettelbach 1997, 252-263; J.C. Skedros, *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki. Civic Patron and Divine Protector, 4th-7th Centuries CE*, Harrisburg 1999 (with a tr. of BHG 496-497); D. Woods, *Thessalonica's Patron. Saint Demetrius or Emeterius?*: HTR 93 (2000) 221-234; Ch. Bakirtzis, *Pilgrimage to Thessalonike. The Tomb of St. Demetrios*: DOP 56 (2002) 175-192.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DEMETRIUS of Alexandria (d. 232). According to *Eusebius (*HE* 5, 22), Demetrius was made bishop in the tenth year of *Commodus (189) and governed for 43 years (*HE* 6, 26), until 232. After *Septimius Severus's persecution, he entrusted the teaching of catechesis to the young *Origen (*HE* 6, 3), whose self-mutilation he initially approved but later con-

demned (*HE* 6, 8). He encouraged Origen's apostolic work (*HE* 6, 14), but protested when *Alexander of Jerusalem and *Theoctistus of Caesarea allowed him to preach while still a layman, obliging him to return to *Alexandria (*HE* 6, 19). When Origen, ordained priest during a second journey to *Palestine, returned to Alexandria after disputing with certain heretics in Greece (230–231), Demetrius, offended by this ordination carried out by extraneous bishops, made Origen's mutilation public and held a synod of bishops and priests which obliged the theologian to leave Egypt; with some other bishops, he declared Origen deposed from the priesthood (*Pamphilus according to *Photius, *Bibl.* 118). *Jerome, at that time still an Origenist (*Ep.* 33), and Eusebius attribute Demetrius's hostility to jealousy: evidence (e.g., Origen's letter "To the friends of Alexandria") seems to indicate that there may have been doctrinal concerns, as well. Approved by *Rome, Demetrius's sentence was ignored by the bishops of *Palestine, *Syria, *Arabia and *Achaia (Greece), who received Origen, recognizing his priesthood. Demetrius died shortly thereafter. *Coptic sources give him a peasant origin and attribute to him some letters to Pope *Victor and to the bishops of *Antioch and *Jerusalem on the date of *Easter. The events of Demetrius's relationship with Origen find an adequate explanation in the historical context of the passage—precisely the work of the strong-willed Demetrius—from a presbyteral to an episcopal hierarchical structure in the church of Alexandria.

A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung* . . . 1893, 330-332.

H. Crouzel

DEMETRIUS of Antioch (pseudo) (6th c.?). *Coptic literary tradition and the Ethiopian tradition dependent on it know a Demetrius, bishop of *Antioch, said to have ordained *John Chrysostom as priest. This Demetrius is named in a Coptic *Encomium of St. Victor*, attributed to Chrysostom (a patent falsehood). Directly attributed to him are a homily on Christmas (Coptic; ed. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*), one *on Penitence* (Coptic; ed. De Vis, *Homélies coptes* I), *Miracula S. Philothei* (Coptic, fragmentary) and *Miracula S. Victoris* (Ethiopic). It is certain that the figure of Demetrius was invented at a later date, when the memory of Chrysostom's true consecrator, *Flavian I of Antioch, had been forgotten in Egypt. The reasons for the invention are unknown.

H. De Vis, *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane*, Copenhagen 1922-1929, I, 127-197; T. Orlandi, *Demetrio di Antiochia e Giovanni Crisostomo*: Acme 23 (1970) 175-178; K. Modras, *Omelia copta attribuita a Demetrio di Antiochia "Sul Natale e Maria Vergine,"* Rome 1994; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 893-894.

T. Orlandi

DEMON. The NT writings often mention Satan (also called the devil), his angels (as distinct from good angels) and demons, following the LXX δαιμόνια and πνεύματα (RAC 9,692). The synoptic gospels and esp. Acts emphasize Jesus' superiority to demons, esp. manifested in exorcisms (RAC 9,693f.); the fourth gospel, on the other hand, does not go into this problem, though it does present the unbelieving Jews as children of the devil (Jn 8:44) and opposes Christ to the prince of this world (Jn 12:31; 14:30). Paul's epistles hardly mention spirits and demons (see 1 Cor 12:3), but reserve an important place for principalities, dominations and powers, characterizing them as wicked beings (1 Cor 15:24, 27; Col 1:15-20; Eph 1:20–2:2) but subjecting them completely to Christ, victorious over them in the parousia and indeed already in the resurrection (cf. RAC 9,695f., with Phil 2:9-11 and other texts). The Apocalypse gives a detailed account of the struggle of Christ and his church against the devil and his angels (cf. DSp 3,150f., with Rev 12). All of this rather ample NT demonology undoubtedly goes back to biblical (see esp. Job 1–2; Zech 3:1f.; Wisd 2:24) and Jewish traditions (esp. the Qumran writings).

Besides its distant Eastern roots, we can certainly detect resemblances to the demonology of the Hellenistic world, distinguished by its religious syncretism but sharing the biblical world's fear and anguish before the many hostile and harmful forces of everyday life. Judeo-Christian and pagan demonologies, however, were separated by a wide gulf, since the former considers demons and evil spirits to be creatures of God who at one point rebelled against the Creator. This biblically based general judgment of Christian demonology is also true of its later developments, which are essentially a continual reinterpretation of the primitive heritage.

Evaluation is more difficult and complex regarding details, however, since from the 2nd c. external influences were undoubtedly greater: this is attested by the very Christian authors who had to oppose pagan opinion on this matter. Thus *Clement of *Alexandria who, discussing biblical doctrines taken up by the Greeks, likens their demons to the angels of the Bible (*Strom.* VI,3; cf. *Paed.* III, 2,14); so also *Augustine, who mentions that the negative sense that Scripture always gives to the word *demons* would also have been accepted by the pagans (cf.

Den Boeft 213f., with *Civ. Dei* IX,19). It is not easy, however, to define the extent to which patristic demonology was determined in its particular positions by its non-Christian surroundings. If, on the one hand, during the first four centuries theologians in general did not deal systematically with the question and their references are mostly scattered, we should also note that certain pagan authors like *Celsus and *Porphyry were influenced by the Judeo-Christian tradition (RAC 5,53-60). The matter is considerably complicated by the bewildering variety of reference points: evil spirits and Judeo-Christian demons on the one hand, and on the other, the demons (some even considered good), *aeons, ghosts, nature spirits, mediators and souls of certain dead people, of the pagan tradition. We must nonetheless hold firmly to our previous statement that the Jewish matrix of patristic demonology was by far the most important.

None of this puts in doubt—and indeed it confirms—that the devil and demons held an important place in the thought and devotion of the early Christian churches. In fact, Christians attributed every fact and phenomenon that in any way hindered the person's union with God and the submission of the world to Christ to demonic influence, seeing it everywhere. Faced with this demonization of the whole environment—felt to be hostile to faith—they took unceasing pains to discover and combat the nefarious action of demons: in *liturgy, in ascesis, in popular devotions (the sign of the *cross), in prayer, in preaching and even in theology itself.

To better understand the crucial, ongoing confrontation taking place on the theological level as a gradual reinterpretation of the Judeo-Christian heritage, it is helpful to distinguish the fields in which Christian thinkers were concerned with the question of demons. In the first place they took account of it in antipagan apologetic. Faced every day and everywhere with expressions of pagan life, judged as contrary to Christian faith and morals—be it idolatry, entertainments, mythology, superstition, divination—the 2nd-c. apologists tried to work out a demonological explanation; they thus attributed idol-worship to the action of demons who had taken possession of the images erected in honor of the gods, i.e., of certain famous dead men (see so-called *euhemerism*: RAC 9,740ff.). Similarly, they attributed pagan worship to the intent of demons, who wished to feed on the aroma of sacrifices or receive honors reserved to God alone (RAC 9,742ff.). They likewise condemned myths, magic, divination and other pagan practices as means by which the demons tried to prevent conversion and seduce believers (RAC 9,744-750). At the same time, the Christians of the 2nd c. were forced to defend their own existence against public opinion that accused them of immorality and atheism, and indeed to explain the violent and unjust hostility toward them. In this also, they cited the pernicious action of demons, who had ever stirred up people against the truth, provoking the persecution of the just (RAC 9,755ff.). In the same way, later authors would see the instigation of demons behind heresies, indeed continually stigmatizing the demonic possession of the heretics (RAC 9, 756).

Included in all this antipagan polemic was a more fundamental problem that not only concerned Christians, but was also felt by pagans, i.e., the question of the origin of evil. *Origen was clearly aware of this *philosophical knot* of demonology when he wrote: "It is impossible to know the origin of evil without knowing the teaching on the devil and his angels, that is, what he was before becoming the devil, as well as the reason why his angels shared his apostasy" (*C. Cels.* IV, 65). Indeed, against the dualistic tendencies of the times, theologians of the Great Church—the apologists and, more clearly, Origen (*C. Cels.* IV, 65) and so many other Fathers after him (see the texts in RAC 9,701.721)—stressed that even the devil and demons were creatures of God and that their wickedness was not innate, but due to their own completely free decision. Rejecting the *Manichean positions in which the *gnostic dualism of the 2nd c. survived, Augustine deepened Catholic doctrine on the origin of the devil and demons (HDG 45f.; Den Boeft 214). His position ultimately received official confirmation by the Synod of *Braga (561), which condemned the errors of Spanish *Priscillianism (HDG 57).

The same dualistic climate of the 2nd c. gave rise to a *soteriological vision* summed up under the title *theory of redemption* (RAC 9,710ff.; Studer 70-73). *Justin had already emphasized Christ's victory over the demons for mainly apologetic reasons. For him, the struggle between Christ and the demons had already taken place in Jesus' temptation (*Dial.* 125,2ff.) and passion (*Apol.* 1,63,10), but continued in the church, esp. in exorcisms, and will only be victoriously concluded at the Lord's parousia (*Apol.* 1,28,1). This idea of Christ's triumph, taken from the apostolic tradition, found a mythological expression in the theme of the *descensus ad inferos*, later inserted into the baptismal creed (Studer 68f.). More important, however, was the development that the apostolic doctrine on the victory of the Savior produced in the anti-Marcionite discussion on the justice and goodness of God. Extending the biblical theme of

the "ransom for many" (Mk 10:45) in his extremely dualistic perspective, *Marcion himself seems to have claimed that the good God had redeemed human beings, paying his Son's blood in ransom to the demiurge.

In the polemic against his dualism, Christian authors from *Irenaeus on, inspired by the biblical and traditional themes of the demons' ignorance (1 Cor 2:7f.; Ign., *Eph.* 19,1-3), cancellation of the certificate of debt (Col 2:14f.), ransom and the precious blood of Jesus, elaborated the theory of a just victory of Christ over the devil, stressing both the devil's deception by God and the devil's *abusus potestatis*, having extended his "just rights" over human beings—his prisoners due to sin—to include the innocent life of Christ, thus losing both the unjustly persecuted Jesus and sinful humanity at one and the same time. This theory, illustrated with many popular details, some even in bad taste, was defended esp. by Origen (*Hom. Exod.* 6,9) and *Gregory of Nyssa (*Or. cat.* 22f.), whereas *Gregory of Nazianzus strongly criticized it (*Or.* 45,22). Nonetheless, by inserting the victorious liberation of humanity, expressed perhaps in a way that owed too much to folklore, into the whole of *salvation history*, the Fathers opened some truly grandiose perspectives. Thus, following the Pauline antithesis of Adam and Christ, Irenaeus put forward his doctrine of the apokatastasis: having defeated the first Adam, seducing him to disobedience, the devil was defeated by the obedience of the second Adam, Christ (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 3, 18,7). This historical vision of Christ's redemptive work then became the common heritage of the Fathers, who would never cease, in imitation of the Bible's own relative dualism, to oppose light to darkness, Christ's kingdom to that of Belial—a perspective given its most powerful expression by Augustine in his apologia *De civitate Dei.*

All of these apologetic, philosophical, soteriological and historical concerns could not fail to have significant repercussions in *parenetic literature.* Indeed, it was in the ascetical-moral field that Christian demonology reached its widest extension (DSp 3,152-219). Following Jewish traditions, attested most clearly in the Qumran writings, Christian moralists quickly put forward the practical demands of faith, opposing the way of light, over which God's angels were given charge, with that of darkness, dominated by Satan's angels (*Barn.* 18,1f.; *Did.* 1,1), or tried to explain the origin of evil in humanity itself by distinguishing two spirits, one good, the other of temptation (cf. the *Ps.-Clem.Hom.* and *Herm.* and DSp 3,160-168). Following the same Jewish traditions, also present in the NT writings but reread in the context of Stoic ethics, each vice was ascribed to a particular spirit (see DSp 3,168-174). This doctrine on the vices and their demons attained its most complete synthesis in *Evagrius of Pontus's theory on the eight vices (DSp 3,200f.), later taken up by Byzantine authors (John Damascene, *De octo Spir.*: PG 95, 80-96) and handed down through *John Cassian's *Collationes* (7-8) to the medieval West (DSp 3,208f.). Understanding sins and vices as instigated by the nefarious action of demons, the spiritual writers, beginning with Origen (DSp 3,182-189), thus considered the entire life of faith as a temptation, a struggle against demons; they esp. associated the commencement of this struggle with the catechumenate and baptism, exhorting not just catechumens but the whole community to ascesis, fasting and prayer, and insisting on the need to renounce the *pompa diaboli* (DSp 3,174-182). Likewise they stressed these demands of the Christian life in penitential preaching, esp. during Lent. They also celebrated, esp. in hagiographical writings—largely on the model of *Athanasius's *Vita Antonii*—the glorious victories gained by monks and saints, like the martyrs before them, over the devil and demons (DSp 3,194-196).

In light of the importance attributed to demons in the life of the church and of the individual believer, one can easily understand why the Christian authors took special care to explain properly the biblical passages most concerning demons and the activities attributed to them, such as the account of the union of the "sons of God" with the "daughters of men" (Gen 6:1-4: origin of the demons), the episode of the witch of Endor (1 Sam 28:7-25: invocation of the dead), the first two chapters of Job (Greg. Gt., *Moralia*) or the story of the Magi (Mt 2:1-12: astrology).

Rereading, therefore, for various reasons and in ever-changing conditions, the demonology inherited from the Judeo-Christian tradition, early Christian authors asked, more or less systematically, the following questions: in the first place, as we have said, they were interested in the *origin* of the devil and demons. Faithful to the Bible's fundamental conviction that God created all things, they firmly held that evil spirits were also creatures of the one Creator and that, as he could not create anything evil, their wickedness did not come from God, but solely from their own freedom. Many distinguished the sin of the devil, prince of the apostate angels, from that of his followers, perhaps committed immediately after it (RAC 9,702).

According to Jewish traditions, represented esp. by the book of Enoch but also present in the NT (see

Jude 14), the fall of the angels was long understood as a carnal sin whose fruit was the giants and the demons (RAC 9,720f.). But this mythological idea soon gave way to more spiritual explanations, and indeed was explicitly rejected (RAC 9,702f.). Based esp. on Wisd 2:24, the cause was considered to be the devil's envy of Adam, who was seduced so that he would share the unhappiness of the fallen angels (see RAC 9,722f.: on *Lactantius). The doctrine of the pride and rebellion of the devil gradually came to prevail, however, a doctrine esp. defended by Augustine (cf. RAC 9,702f., with *En. Ps.* 58,11,5). This theological development regarding the fall of the devil and his followers also had secondary consequences. On the one hand, the primitive distinction between fallen angels and demons, favored esp. by Jewish exegesis of Gen 6:1-4, was gradually abandoned—attributing the same characteristics to both groups, they ended up being completely identified (RAC 9,724ff.). On the other hand, by linking the apostasy of the angels with that of the devil, the time of the former event was moved back to the beginning (cf. RAC 9,723f., with Augustine, *Gen. lit.* XI, 16,21; *Civ. Dei* XV, 23). Also of considerable interest is the Origenian doctrine that intellectual beings committed more or less grave sins and were consequently condemned to a more or less substantial corporeity, i.e., they became angels, humans or demons (cf. RAC 9,701f., with *Princ.* 1, 8,2).

A second question of patristic demonology concerned the *final destiny* of the devil and his angels (RAC 9,758f.): fallen into sin, they were expelled from heaven; their condemnation, however, was not definitive, and their activity continues between heaven and earth. Only at the universal judgment will they suffer "death in immortality" (Tat., *Orat.* 14), being punished in eternal fire. Origen nonetheless advanced the hypothesis, later contested by anti-Origenists, of a repentance of the devil (*Princ.* 1,6,3). Until that definitive condemnation, the demons, living in the air, exercise a pernicious power over human beings, indeed over the entire world.

The *nature of this nefarious dominion* was the third and undoubtedly the most extensive problem of patristic demonology (RAC 5,194-197; 9,734-757). Filling the whole world, or rather dwelling in the lower air between heaven and earth, the devil and his angels do everything they can to separate human beings from God: they cause sickness and natural disasters; they invent noxious arts like magic, astrology and even feminine fashion; they imitate Christian rites and corrupt sound teaching with myths and heresies; they provoke human beings to sin and vice; they esp. threaten newborns, who must therefore be protected by exorcisms and baptism. Their activity, however, is not without limits (RAC 9,756f.): subject always to the divine will, they essentially act in accordance with divine providence; their pernicious actions are even hindered by the good angels. Above all, human freedom, helped by God and the angels, can always resist even the most subtle seductions of the devil and his followers. In particular, demons cannot penetrate the interior of human beings: while they cause bad dreams and disturb anxious souls, they do not know the mysteries of the heart, and their attacks are thus always essentially external.

Finally, in thinking about the origin, condemnation and esp. the present activity of the devil and demons, the Fathers could not avoid considering the question of their *nature* (RAC 9,728-734). In the elaboration of their demonology, as with their angelology, we see a gradual spiritualization. Like the angels, demons were soon presented as spiritual beings (πνεύματα - *spiritus*, with negative attributes). According to *Tertullian, however, though not having flesh, they are not immaterial: rather, they are of a very fine substance (*Adv. Marc.* II,8,2; *Carn.* 6,9), which no longer possesses the dignity of that of the angels (Latt., *Instit.* II,14, 1). This opinion endured among the Latins until Augustine (*Gen. lit.* III, 10,14f.), who, while attributing to demons an "airy" corporeity, hesitated to explain demonic apparitions by means of this corporeity (*Trin.* III, 1,5); rather, he stressed that demons do not accept material sacrifices, asking instead for the honors and submission due to God (*Civ. Dei* X, 19; cf. RAC 9,743). Augustine thus prepared a completely spiritual understanding of the demonic nature, though in fact he was not much interested in such questions (*Ench.* 15,59).

The spiritualization went much further, however, among the Greeks (RAC 9,703f.), who, assuming the angelic origin of demons, stressed their immateriality. In the 4th c. they explicitly denied that demons had a body that needed feeding. As with angelic corporeity, that of demons was understood to be something relative, i.e., more subtle than the human body; nevertheless, the nature of demons was not equated with that of angels. While Origen had admitted a twofold difference between angels and demons, both in nature and character (προαίρεσις; Orig., *C. Cels.* III, 37), later one sees a difference only in character (ps.-Athan., *Quaest. ad Ant.* 7: PG 28, 604A). The visibility and mobility of demons was determined in a way consistent with the opinion of a more or less fine corporeity: they were normally invisible, but could make themselves seen by means of their own body or that of another. They are also very

fast, moving on wings throughout the whole earth. Because of their mobility, but also because of their wider experience, they exceed human beings in knowledge, more easily guessing even thoughts (Aug., *Div. daem.* 3,7; 5,9). Their knowledge of the mysteries of salvation, however, is very small: in particular, they have not understood the profound significance of the Lord's incarnation and cross.

In conclusion, it can be said that the existence and activity of the devil and demons played a very important role not only in the popular beliefs and devotions of the early church (see also RAC 9,761-797), but also in the theology of the Fathers. Significantly conditioned by the cosmological and anthropological vision of the times, patristic demonology presents many difficulties for the modern mentality. An understanding of it should be sought, however, not just to enter into the mentality of the early Christian authors, but also to be able to deduce from it that lesson on the origin and gravity of evil without which we cannot completely appreciate the saving work of Jesus Christ, the central point of Christian faith.

S. Lyonnet et al., *Démon*: DSp 3, 141-238 (bibl.); J. Michl et al., *Engel*: RAC 5, 53-322 (bibl.); C. Colpe et al., *Geister*: RAC 9, 546-797 (bibl.); H. Wey, *Die Funktionen der bösen Geister bei den griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrhunderts nach Christus*, Winterthur 1957; J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournai 1958 (It. tr. Bologna 1974); J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles*, Tournai 1961 (It. tr. Bologna 1976); G. Tavard, *Die Engel*: HDG II/2b, Freiburg 1968 (bibl.); J. Daniélou, *Les origines du christianisme latin*, Paris 1978; B. Studer, *Die Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*: HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978; G. Tavard, *Dämonen V/1: Alte Kirche*: TRE 8 (1981) 286-291; L. Scheffczyk, *Dämon IV*: LTK³ 3, 3f.; den Boeft, *Daemon(es)*: AugL II/1-2 (Basel 1996) 213-222; J. Haustein, *Dämonen, IV. Kirchengeschichtliche*, Geister: RGG⁴ 2, 537ff.

B. Studer

DEMOPHILUS of Constantinople (d. 387). Of a good family and a moderate *Arian, as bishop of Beroea (Thrace) he was part of an eastern delegation that presented the *Ekthesis makrostichos* to Constans at *Milan in 345. In 351 he participated at the Council of *Sirmium which deposed *Photinus; his presence in 359 at *Rimini is uncertain. In 356–357 Pope *Liberius was exiled to Beroea, near him; Demophilus must have had a hand in the pope's decision to comply and subscribe the condemnation of *Athanasius. In 370 *Valens promoted his election to bishop of *Constantinople to succeed the deceased *Eudoxius, who had been bishop of the capital for 11 years. Demophilus, ordained by Arian bishops, supported the emperor's pro-Arian activity in the East, but was also very hostile to radical Arians. In 380 he refused *Theodosius's order to subscribe the Nicene Creed and was forced to abandon his see and return to his native Thrace (Socrates, *HE* 5,7; Philostorgius, *HE* 9,10 and 14). In 383 the emperor asked of him a profession of faith as leader of the moderate Arians; it has not reached us (Socrates, *HE* 5,10: PG 67, 688-693; Sozomen, *HE* 7,12: PG 67, 1445). Philostorgius (*HE* 9,14) has him professing a *monophysite *Christology *ante litteram.* Upon his death Marinus was elected as the Arian bishop, but Dorotheus, then at *Antioch, was later selected (Sozomen, *HE* 7,14).

Hfl-Lecl 1,918-928; DHGE 14, 212-215; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer*, Tübingen 1988; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim.

M. Simonetti

DENDRITAE, from the Greek *dendron* (tree). Eastern Christian ascetics who spent part of their lives in trees (a *Maronite monk at Irenim, near Apamea: ROC 4 [1899] 337-40) or inside their trunks (the monk Adolas, *Pratum spirituale* 70: PG 87, 2924). It is likely that some of them, like *stylites, built huts among the branches, as did shepherds who lived in places exposed to the danger of wild animals.

DACL IV, 582-583; EC 4, 1430; DIP III, 442; C.P. Charalampidis, *The Dendrites in Pre-Christian and Christian Historical-Literary Tradition and Iconography*, Rome 1995.

T. Špidlík

DEO GRATIAS. Formula of greeting and thanksgiving, and liturgical acclamation, meaning "thanks be to God." The expression was used by St. Paul (1 Cor 15:57; 2 Cor 2:14) and was first taken up by African Christians: the *Scillitan martyrs, upon hearing the proconsul's sentence of condemnation, responded, "Deo gratias." The acclamation reappears in the *Passio Perpetuae* and the *Acts of Martyrdom* of *Cyprian. African Christians used it as a baptismal name and a greeting. St. *Augustine explains its meaning: with this expression one means to thank God upon meeting another Christian, rejoicing that they both live in Christ (*En. Ps.* 132,6). Catholics joined the *Deo laudes* to the *Deo gratias* in acclamations and inscriptions: the former expression became a mark of the *Donatists, more feared than the war trumpet or the lion's roar (Augustine, *Contra litt. Petil.* II, 65,146; 84,186, and *En. Ps.* 132,6). *Deo gratias* is also an acclamation of joy and glory to God for miracles (Aug., *Civ. Dei* 22,8) and for the election of

bishops (Aug., *Ep.* 213). It has been preserved in the *Regula Benedicti* 66 as an expression of welcome to one who knocks at the door. It passed into the Mozarabic liturgy, then the *Ambrosian, Roman and *Gallican: the faithful give thanks to the Lord for what they hear and celebrate. It thus expresses a basic attitude of the Christian, joined to a humble acknowledgment that everything is God's gift.

DACL 4 (1920) 649-659; EC 4 (1950) 1437; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* I, Rome [2]1950, 174; R. Lesage (ed.), *Dizionario pratico di liturgia romana*, Rome 1956, 144; J.A. Jungmann, *Missarum solemnia*, Vienna 1962, I, 537-538; AugL 2,294-296.

M. Maritano

DEO LAUDES. *Donatist password, used by *circumcellions as a war cry (vividly described by *Augustine, *Ep.* 108,5,14 and *C. Litteras Petiliani* II, 65,146; 84,186), "more feared than a lion's roar" (*Enarr. in Ps.* 132,6), and contrasted with the Catholic *Deo gratias.* The Donatist expression is found in fragments of architecture or other inscriptions in stone at ca. 30 sites, esp. N of the Aures mountains and in the olive-producing area S of Theveste, but also in *Mauretania Sitifensis and Tripolitania (Henchir Msuffin). Apart from churches, the motto was inscribed on an olive press at Hr. Gosset (district of Theveste) and on the architrave of a farm and ecclesiastical building at Msuffin, Tripolitania (information: R.C. Goodchild). It was traced on a false stone door-arch in a chapel near Khenchela (illustrated by H. Leclercq, DACL 4, 654, fig. 3710). It was associated with the rite of baptism, as in *Deo laudes super aquas* (Ps 28:3), Novar[ensia] = Sillègue [CIL VIII, 20482]), with the invocation *B*(*onis*) *B*(*ene*), Henchir bou Said (*Bull. des Antiquaires de France*, 1909, 210) and, in the church cemetery of Ain Ghorab (district of Theveste), with the relics of the martyrs (v. L. Leschi, *Basilique et cimetière donatiste de Numidie [Ain Ghorab]*: Rev. Africaine 78 [1936] 27-43). None of these inscriptions seems to be later than the early 5th c. They confirm the statements of *Optatus, Augustine and others about the strength of the circumcellion movement in *Numidia in the 4th and early 5th c., also showing its close identification with the main nucleus of the Donatist church in that province.

H. Leclercq, *Deo Gratias - Deo Laudes*: DACL 4, 652-659; Monceaux IV, 439-443; P. Cayerl, *Une basilique donatiste de Numidie* (*Ksar el Kelb*): MEFR 51 (1934) 114-142; A. Berthier et al., *Les vestiges du Christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale*, Algiers 1942, 77 (Foun el Amba), 103 (Naamane); M. Klöckener, *Deo gratias, Deo laudes*, in AugL II/1-2, Basel 1996, 294-296.

W.H.C. Frend

DEOGRATIAS (d. 457), bishop of *Carthage. Successor of Quodvultdeus in the see of Carthage from 454–457, his election was obtained from *Genseric by *Valentinian III. He was ordained in the basilica of Faustus, 24 October. He helped prisoners brought from *Rome by the *Vandal king after the sack of 455, making available two basilicas to accommodate them. The see remained vacant for 24 years after his death. In the *Cal. Carth.* he is included 5 January, in the *Mart. rom.* 22 March, but neither of these dates is certainly that of his death.

Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr.* 1,8; LTK 3, 99-100; DHGE 14, 312-313; V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 187-189; PCBE 1, 271-273; J.- L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine vandale et byzantine*, Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 11, Rome 1973, 290; A. Isola, *I cristiani dell'Africa Vandalica nei "Sermoni" del tempo* (*429-534*), Milan 1990, 1-2; 47; 87; 118.

V. Saxer

DEPOSITIO AD SANCTOS. The earliest example of burying Christians near the tombs of saints could be that of *Maximilian, buried near St. *Cyprian of Carthage in 295. *Ambrose (*Exc. Satyr.*) explains that the practice protects the dead person from dangers beyond the grave. *Augustine, in his *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* (ca. 421–422), addressed to *Paulinus of Nola, explains that the proximity to the tombs has value only if it encourages the living to pray more fervently for their dead ones. Christian archaeology offers many examples of the practice.

DACL I, 479-509; V. Saxer, *Morts martyrs reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 108, 116, 166, 239; P.A. Fevrier, *Le cult des martyrs en Afrique et ses plus anciens monuments*, in *Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina*, Faenza 1970, 191-195; Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IV^{e} au VI^{e} siècle*, II, Rome 1982, 501-523; Id., *Auprès des saints, corps et âme. L'inhumation "ad sanctos "dans la chrétienté d'Orient et d'Occident du III^{e} au VII^{e} siècle*, Paris 1988; Id., "*Sanctorum sepulcris sociari,*" in *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (III^{e}-XIII^{e}). Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome "La Sapienza." Rome, 27-29 octobre 1988* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 149), Rome 1991, 333-351; *L'inhumation privilegiée du IV^{e} au VIII^{e} siècle en Occident. Actes du Colloque tenu à Créteil le 16-18 mars 1984*, Y. Duval and J.Ch. Picard (eds.), Paris 1986; J.Ch. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au X^{e} siècle* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 268), Rome 1988; G. Mallet - P. Perry, *Les tombeaux de saints à l'époque romane; quelques exemples*: Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa 29 (1998) 113-120.

V. Saxer

DEPOSITIO EPISCOPORUM - DEPOSITIO MARTYRUM

I. The *Depositiones* and the Chronographer - II. The *Depositio episcoporum* - III. The *Depositio martyrum.*

I. The *Depositiones* and the Chronographer. The two *Depositiones* pose the same problems with respect to origin, date and function; they have the same heortological characteristics and the same destiny. They were incorporated together into the Chronographer of 354 by Furius Dionysius *Philocalus, occupying the third-to-last and penultimate places (parts 11 and 12). Its decorations make this collection of Roman writings a *de luxe* book in the same class as the Vienna Genesis and the Vatican Virgil. Its date of 354 is given by the consular *fasti*, the lists of the prefects of *Rome and of the popes, and by the Liberian catalog. Moreover, the two *Depositiones* are based on a calendar that begins on 25 December, i.e., with the winter solstice. Each item contains three elements: the day of the month (but no year), which could also be the day of their death, a name of a pope or martyr, and their place of burial (*depositio*). The function of the two documents is clear from their arrangement and from the expression that appears on 14 September: *XVIII. kal. octob.* (*dies natalis*) *Cypriani Africae, Romae celebratur in* (*coemeterio*) *Calisti*: their purpose was to regulate the Roman church's official celebration of the anniversaries of the deaths of those whose names they list. The lists reflect an intensification of the veneration of the saints at Rome. Ten years after the Chronographer, Pope *Damasus attended to the so-called historical crypts of the catacombs, and had his epigrams written to Furius Dionysius Philocalus in characteristic calligraphy, called from then on "Philocalian."

II. The *Depositio episcoporum.* In order, the first bishop of Rome commemorated in the calendar is *Dionysius, 27 December, in the cemetery of *Callistus. The names then follow the order of the calendar, ignoring the year of death until *Eutychianus, 8 December, in the cemetery of Callistus. Then come two names following the normal order, *Mark, 7 October (336), *Julius, 12 April (352). Since the last pope of the original list is *Sylvester (31 December 335), we deduce that the compilation stopped at 336, and that the list was later completed with two new names before finally being closed in 354, as regards the exemplar used by the Chronographer. The *Mart. hier.* used a different exemplar, updated to the time of *Boniface's episcopate (418–422).

III. The *Depositio martyrum.* Though we possess no similar elements for dating the second document, it is possible that it was drawn up during the same period as the first. All the items in it follow the order of the calendar and are largely concerned with the martyrs whose feasts are celebrated at Rome or in the immediately surrounding area. There are three papal martyrs: *Fabian (20 January 250), *Sixtus II (6 August 258), *Callistus (14 October 222), who of course are not included in the *Depositio episcoporum.* Besides *Peter and *Paul, Callistus is the earliest martyr recorded. Curiously, these Roman martyrs are not listed: *Ignatius of *Antioch (ca. 110), Pope *Telesphorus under *Hadrian (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 3,3,3), *Ptolemy and Lucius under Antoninus Pius (Just., *Apol.* 2,2), *Justin in 165 (BHG 972z, 973), Apollonius under *Commodus, whose *Passio*, however, may not be authentic (BHG 149; V. Saxer, *Martyrium Apollonii Romani. Analyse structurelle et problèmes d'authenticité*: Rend. PARA 55-56 [1982–1984] 265-298; P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen [2]1989, 270-277). The item for 29 June 258, regarding the celebrations for Peter *in Catacumbas* and for Paul *in Ostiense Tusco et Basso consulibus* (258), cannot concern their martyrdom, but refers to an event pertaining to their cult, on the occasion of *Valerian's persecution. There are 16 Roman martyrs or groups of martyrs, to which others from Porto, Albano and *Africa (*Cyprian, *Perpetua and *Felicity) are added. For the martyrs of *Diocletian's persecution, the consular year is cited (304). Finally there are two nonmartyrial feasts: Christmas, 25 December (theological idea: Christ as the first martyr; his birth as the beginning of the *dies natales* of the martyrs); the chair of Peter, 22 February (*Cathedra). This document was also used by the compiler of the *Mart. hier.*

CPL 2028; Duchesne LP 1, 10-12; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 18-20; RAC 19, 1186-1187; H. Stern, *Le calendrier de 354*, Paris 1953; Ph. Harnoncourt - H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 2,1, Regensburg 1994, 137-138; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, Brussels [2]2000, 14-17 and 404.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DESCENT into HELL. A doctrine of Jewish Christian origin that entered some formulations of the *credo.* Commenting on the creed, *Rufinus (ca. 404) interprets Christ's descent into hell as a taking possession of the infernal realms, announcing the good news to the dead who there awaited resurrection (*Expos. Symb.* 12,15,26). He notes that the phrase was not present in the creeds of the Roman and Eastern churches, unless implicitly in the mention of burial

(ibid., 16). From the 7th c. on it spread increasingly, assuming the form of a soteriological act and becoming a proposition of faith, assent to which was required of those returning to the Roman church (see DS, passim). The roots of the doctrine are in the NT, esp. in Peter's Pentecost discourse (Acts 2:24-31) and in Paul (Rom 10:7, cf. Eph 4:9). Whereas other NT passages (Mt 12:40; Lk 23:43) are outside this christological perspective, 1 Pet 3:18-20 seems at least disputable: the phrase "he went and preached to the spirits in prison" may be interpreted as a clear allusion. Leaving aside some textual-critical difficulties, the context (Easter and baptismal) and cosmic vision of Christ's preaching must be emphasized.

The truth that Christ, moved by the Holy Spirit, desires to save all people, even the most perverted of sinners (e.g., those at the time of Noah), is proposed through a mythological and legendary image linked with the cosmic notions of the time, according to which people of earlier generations continued to live a diminished existence in the realm of the dead. Christ appearing in this realm and announcing liberation is a vivid way of saying that salvation is offered to all. In the perspective of Jewish theological categories, according to which those who acted well before the coming of the Messiah waited in Sheol for his descent and their consequent liberation, the picture is limited to the OT righteous. Regarding Christ himself, his soul, still subsistent in the person of the Word, was really present in Sheol (place of the dead); the purpose of this descent-presence, which coincided with his death and ended with his resurrection, was to accord to the just the clear vision of God, the essential element of eternal beatitude and their glorification in heaven with Christ. The Fathers' speculations agree on a fundamental point: Christ preached to the rebellious spirits in Sheol with the intention of converting them, just as he did with human beings. Some of the Fathers foresaw a complete emptying of hell, with the sole exception of the devil (Cyr. Al., *Hom. pasch.* VII; Greg. Naz., *Oratio* 45, 24).

Hermas, *Shepherd, Parab.* XI, 16: PG 2, 995; SC 53,326-328; CPS 16,215, 217; Clement Al., *Strom.* VI, 6: PG 9, 266-276; GCS 2,453-459; Origen, *Contra Celsum* II, 43: PG 12, 855; GCS 1,166; SC 132, 382; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* IV 22: PG 7, 1045; SC 100,686; Irenaeus, *Epideixis*, chs. 56.78 (E. Peretto [ed.], Rome 1981, 150-151, 174-175); SC 62,118-121; 144-145; Gregory Naz., CPG 3010, *Oratio* 45, 24: PG 36, 557; Cyril Al., CPG 5240, *Homilia paschalis VII*: PG 77, 552; Rufinus, CPL 196, *Expositio Symboli*, 14,15,16: PL 21, 352-355; CCL 20,149, 152, 161; P. Callon, *Descente du Christ aux enfers*: Cath III, 658-661; J. Chaine, *Descente du Christ aux enfers*: DBS II, 395-431; K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief*, Freiburg - Basel - Vienna [2]1964, 98-117; W.J. Dalton, *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, A Study of 1 Peter 3,18–4,6*, Rome 1965; J. Capmany, *Discesa di Gesù agli inferi*: Enc Bibl, Turin 1969, 940-941; U. Vanni, *Lettere di Pietro, Giacomo, Giuda*, Rome 1974, 59-60; 64-65; J. Daniélou, *La Teologia del giudeo-cristianesimo*, Bologna 1974, 325, 334; J. Galot, *La descente du Christ aux enfers*: NRTh 83 (1961) 471-491; K.H. Schelkle, *Le lettere di Pietro. La lettera di Giuda* (CTNT, XIII/2), Brescia 1981, 180-186; G. Ancona, *Discesa agli inferi. Storia e interpretazione di un articolo di fede*, Rome 1999; R. Gounelle, *La descente du Christ aux enfers*, Paris 2000; T. Buchan, *Blessed Is He Who Has Brought Adam from Sheol,* Georgias Dissertations 13, Piscataway NJ 2004.

E. Peretto

DESCENT into HELL (apocryphal). The doctrine of Christ's descent into hell has its roots in the NT (esp. 1 Pet 3:18-20) and developed during the patristic period: R. Gounelle presents a dossier of patristic texts until 550 (290-424). This tradition found its imaginative expression in the account of the *Descent into Hell*, part III of the *Acts of Pilate* (*Gospel of Nicodemus*) (q.v.). In response to questions put to them by the Jews, Leucius and Carinus—sons of Simeon (Lk 2:25-28), fictitious authors of the five great apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, and among those resurrected during Christ's passion (Mt 27:52-53)—recount as eye witnesses mysteries that took place in Hades after Christ's death; both written accounts are identical, thus confirming their truth as the testimony of two witnesses. The text recounts Christ's descent into hell and his victory over the devil, Hades and *death; Christ leads out of Hades all the OT righteous and *John the Baptist. The account is theological: it shows the victory of light over darkness and the universal redemption accomplished through the mystery of the *cross. Probably of Jewish Christian origin, the *Descent into Hell* has been perfectly inserted into the *Acts of Pilate* (a late work), of which it is now an integral part. The text is very picturesque and expressive (the dialogues and monologues are esp. vivid); it was translated or paraphrased in various languages and greatly influenced literature and painting; some of its passages have even been inserted into liturgical texts.

J. Kroll, *Gott in Hölle. Der Mythos des Descensuskampfe*, Leipzig 1932; B. Bagatti, *L'iconografia dell'Anastasis o Discesa agli inferi*: Liber Annuus 32 (1982) 239-272; R. Gounelle, *Pourquoi, selon l'Evangile de Nicodème, le Christ est descendu aux Enfers*, in J.D. Kaestli - D. Marguerat (eds.), *Le mystère apocryphe*, Geneva 1995, 67-84; Id., *La descente du Christ aux Enfers, institutionalisation d'une croyance*, Paris 2000; Z. Izydorczyk (ed.), *The Medieval "Gospel of Nicodemus,"* Tempe 1997 (influence of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* in the culture of various countries).

M. Starowieyski

DESERT. When the anonymous translator of *Athanasius's *Vita Antonii* wanted to make the concepts of

ἠρεμεῖν (49,4) and/or ἀναχωρεῖν (48,1) comprehensible to Latin readers, he had to use more words than the Greek text used. He thus specified that the *vere secedere et in silentio esse* (49,4) or *quiescere* (49,3) had as its content *attendere sibi e vacare studio deifico* (3,2), at the invitation, almost the inspiration, of God (50,1), in order to *dirigere animum in conspectu Dei* (55,4), without avoiding the needs of the brothers, hermits or simple people who sought out *Anthony or wanted a visit from him. The eremetical ideal spread initially in the East, where the experience of solitary life included ascetics with no rule (Sarabaites, *Encratites), whose way of life was opposed by reforms. In the 4th c. it came to the West where, at *Rome, *Trier and elsewhere, the *Vita Antonii* was widely circulated in its two Latin versions—*Evagrius's literary version and the earlier anonymous one, which was more popular. According to Athanasius, Anthony was the first hermit to dwell in the desert. Parallel traditions point to *Paul of Thebes (Jerome, *Vita Pauli* 1,1) and Amun (*Vita Antonii* 60) as the initiators of the eremitical life. Anchoritic life probably arose simultaneously in different places (K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*, Tübingen 1936, 70,2). Places where monks, *anchorites or *cenobites, gathered were numerous from the start: Lower Egypt (Anthony), Upper Egypt (Pachomius), *Syria, *Palestine, *Cappadocia, *Constantinople, Greece, *Persia, *Ethiopia—through the centuries extending to the whole Christian East. In the West: N Africa, the Iberian peninsula, *Italy, *Gaul, the Celtic lands, with *Jerome, *Columbanus, *Benedict and others.

In every form of Christian monasticism, as indeed in any form of monasticism, including those less ancient—Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, pre-Columbian American, native African—there are common elements such as voluntary withdrawal from the world, the discipline typical of solitary life, and the renunciation of material goods, family and independence. The desert, as a manifestation of the desire for solitude, is present in all civilizations and in every period of their development, since it is the manifestation of a deep human need, that of seeking a relationship of communion with the Transcendent and a fully human relationship with oneself.

Literary and philosophical elements, OT and NT biblical elements, imitation of Jesus—all were present and came together in the history and development of desert monasticism. The desert became a real place where a certain type of life was practiced, and a spiritual place—an interior sphere in which a specific form of communion with God was sought, an ascetical category common to all spiritual experiences. After the great persecutions, which presented the figure of the true and complete disciple of Christ in the martyr, withdrawal to the desert became the way, accessible to anyone, to become an imitator of Christ and to enter the path of the *sequela Christi*. The desert thus became the place in which Jesus is imitated (*Vita Antonii* 47ff.), and the monks were those who, in a Christian social milieu that was no longer as authentic and genuine as during the persecutions of the first centuries, preserved intact the original ideal of the Christian life (C. Morin, *L'idéal monastique et la vie chrétienne des premiers jours*, Paris [3]1921). *Origen's *Ad Martyras* shows the transition from the ideal of the martyr trained by *ascesis to the ideal of ascesis as equivalent to *martyrdom.

In the OT, the desert was the place where the Jewish people became aware of God's call and of the way he acted to teach them and make them *his* people (Lev 26:12; Dt 7:6; 26:18; etc.). It was also the place where God tested the people, and where they consummated their rebellions against him, so that none of those who were in the desert entered the Promised Land (Num 14:22ff.).

In the life of individuals, the experience of the desert prepared the protagonists of the great religious "undertakings": Moses, David, the prophets. In the OT an "idealistic," mystical conception of the desert, linked to the spirituality and mentality of the Exodus and to the eschatology of the Messianic times, coexists with a "realistic," pessimistic conception, not exclusive to the Jews but shared by the neighboring civilizations, for whom the desert was the place that contrasted with cultivated and inhabited lands, and was therefore inhabited by wild beasts and demons: the fitting place for those excluded from human society. The great prophets who received *theophanies in the desert (cf. the theophanies of Moses, Ex 3:1-18, and Elijah, 1 Sam 19:9ff., with Athanasius's *Vita Antonii*, the first to present Elijah as a model for desert solitaries), *John the Baptist, who preached conversion and penance in the desert (Mt 3:1ff.: Mk 1:1ff.; Lk 3:1ff.), and Jesus, who withdrew to the desert to combat the devil (Mt 4:1ff.; Mk 1:12-13; Lk 4:1ff.), are the anchorites' models. For monks the desert was the place where all these realities were fulfilled, even if different aspects of life in the desert were emphasized at different periods.

Ancient wisdom had offered human beings the experience that two things (*otium* and *solitudo*) that brought weariness to most (*languorem afferunt*) made better men of those with great and wise souls (Cic., *De off.* 3, 1,1, taken up by Ambr., *De off.* 3, 1,2, who notes that Moses, not Scipio the African, was

the first to experience *solus non esse, cum solus esset, nec minus otiosus, cum otiosus esset*). *Stoicism invited many to *consistere* and *secum morari*, as the primary condition of inner serenity (see Sen., *Ep.* 2,1; 7,2; 10,1; 56,5; etc.). Plato invited men to ἑαυτῷ, πως προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν (*Symp.* 174 D 5), withdrawal into oneself and separation from sensible realities (ἐκ τούτων *sc.* τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἀναχωρεῖν, *Phaedo* 83 A6). If Dio Chrysostom recognized πολλὴ ἐρημία καὶ ἀναχώρεσις (Λόγοι, ed. von Arnim II 261,32–262,4) as indispensable for *paideia* and philosophy, Plotinus used and practiced ἀναχωρεῖν as inner refuge (Porph., *Vita Plotini* 22), as "flight of the alone to the alone" (μόνος πρὸς μόνον).

But it was a Christian use of ἀναχωρεῖν (*Vita Antonii* 45,1), influenced by Mt 14:13 and Jn 6:15, that oriented "flight from the world" to the giving of oneself to prayer (Orig., *In Lc. hom.* XI).

In the Hellenistic milieu there developed a romantic desire for solitude (J. Burckhardt, *L'età di Costantino*, Florence 1957, It. tr., 405ff.), to withdrawal to the desert, where the citizen, tired by the life of the great metropolises, could create an idyllic retreat in which he could lead a life of simple, pure study, far from the schemes of the city, to find or recover inner peace. The desert thus came to be valued as such, losing the sense of something temporary and provisional that it had in Scripture: this is Philo's idea of the desert (*De decalogo* 2; *De vita contemplativa* 22-23: a blessed place, privileged because pure). From the 4th c., the literary theme of the desert appears in monastic authors with a certain level of literary culture. *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Ep.* 4,6) replies to *Basil of Caesarea's enthusiastic description of the desert (*Ep.* 14) that such enthusiasm is a rhetorical theme. *Jerome's image of the desert (*Vita Pauli*) was also idyllic, becoming very popular in literature and painting. His *Ep.* 14 inviting *Heliodorus to the eremitical life, though presenting realistic elements (*Ep.* 14,1: *nudos amat eremus. Nolo te antiquae peregrinationis terreat difficultas*), opens into an enthusiastic song—which had a significant impact in the birth and development of the subsequent "idealistic," idyllic ideal of the desert—which exalts the desert, *Christi floribus vernans*, where the light is clearer, poverty is blessed, toil guarantees victory, faith casts out hunger, and closeness to Christ takes away the discomforts of penance, harshness and squalor, in an eschatological projection of the present life (*Ep.* 14,10, copied in some points from Cypr., *Ep.* 76,2ff.).

Alongside this "literary" conception of the desert was a more "realistic" idea of what life in the desert implied, demanded and offered. For the monks of Egypt (almost the "natural" place of the desert), the desert was very real: the place of sterile lands, tombs (as is typical of the Semitic mentality), wild beasts and nomadic bands. The monk went to the desert in response to a "call," whose connotations varied for each individual and which impelled the seeking of solitude (as the name "monk" indicates, see Jerome, *Ep.* 14,6) so as to more freely live the teaching of the NT (1 Cor 7:25ff.; Mt 10:9-10; Acts 2:44; Rom 14:1-2). The fact that withdrawal to the desert was open to hospitality gives the full, true meaning of the separation, which was not an "alienation" in the modern social-psychological sense, but a separation so as to be able to offer others, with the word of God, a fully human welcome (*Reg. Bened.* 53,8-9; *Vita Antonii* 48.57ff. passim). Hospitality was thus a duty and was offered in a climate of faith since, in the guest's visit, the monk was invited to recognize the visitation of God (*H. mon.* 8,55, ed. Festugière 68, 348ff.; Cass., *Conl.* 2,26).

Anchorites met for the solemn and common celebration of the *liturgy on Saturdays and Sundays (*H. mon.* 20, 7, ed. Festugière 120, 38ff.; Cass., *Conl.* 3,1); at these gatherings they learned whether someone was sick or had died (*H. monl.* 20, 7, ed. Festugière 121, 40ff.). In the desert the monk met wild beasts and tamed them (Cyr. Scyth., *Euthym.* 23,4ff.; 118,30–119,14; 138,19–139,11; etc.), and serpents who then defended him against robbers (*H. mon.* 9,6-7, ed. Festugière 73,33-47; Greg. Gt., *Dial.* 1,3). But most of all in the desert the monk struggled with the devil, who assumed the most varied appearances and waged a fierce war, without truce, against him. In the desert the monk sought to unify his life, and he thus had to struggle against his thoughts (λογισμοί = demon for *Evagrius, late 4th c.) and memories (the demon was identified with the inner world that tended to separate the person from God); he had to face the struggle of the heart (καρδία—*Apopht. Patr. Anton.* 11), not so much of unchastity (πορνεία). Through this struggle in the desert, the monk sought *hēsychia*, God's presence, training for it by what we would call the practice of the presence of God, μνήμη τοῦ θεοῦ.

It is the seeking of God's presence, not escape from the devil's temptations, that the monk sought in withdrawing to the desert. The most dangerous and subtle of the devil's temptations was that of ἀκήδεια, i.e., dissuading the monk from remaining in the desert. By ascesis one could win *hēsychia* (inner tranquility), through which the anchorite rid his mind of earthly things, to unite it to Christ within the limits allowed by the human condition (Cass., *Conl.* 19,8). The hermit's solitude was not

only an effective means for gaining purity of heart, it was at the same time an inner condition born of purity of heart.

Anachōrēsis, the separation from the world indispensable for escaping the passions, was not motivated by aversion to people (*Apopht. Patr. Arsenio* 1-2; Climacus maintains it must be done ἀμίσως), but by the fact that interaction with people impedes or destroys *hēsychia.* While all monks must leave the world and their family, the anchorite also abandons living in company with other monks; indeed, he had to separate himself even from his own body and live as though he were outside it: this was the purpose of fasting, penance, vigils. *Hēsychia* has various aspects: *apatheia,* contemplation, purity (absence of earthly concerns, replaced by spiritual concerns such as people's salvation), lack of useless curiosity, simplicity and interior freedom that disposed to contemplation (Cass., *Conl.* 14,9), union with Christ (Cass., *Conl.* 10,6).

LTK 10, 1335-1336; J. Guillet, *Thème de la marche au désert dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*: RecSR 36 (1949) 161-181; A.J. Festugière, *Personal Religion Among the Greeks*, Berkeley, CA 1954, 53-67; L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du Nouveau Testament et des Pères*, Paris 1960; A.J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient. I. Culture ou sainteté*, Paris 1961, 41-57; J. Leclercq, *Eremus et eremita. Pour l'histoire du vocabulaire de la vie solitaire*: CollOrdCistRef 25 (1963) 8-30; P. Deseille, *L'évangile au désert. Dès premiers moines à S. Bernard*, Paris 1965; Id., *L'esprit du monachisme pachomien*, Bellefontaine 1968; J. Leclercq, *Marginalité et accueil*: CollCist 33 (1971) 401-405; Id., *Évangile et culture dans la tradition bénédictine*: NRTh 94 (1972) 171-182; J. Steinmann, *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition*, Eng. tr., New York 1958; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Les oxymores desertum civitas et desertum floribus vernans*: StudMon 15 (1973) 7-15; Var. aus., *Les mystiques du désert dans l'Islam, le Judaïsme, et le Christianisme*, Sénanque 1974; Var. aus., *Askese und Mönchtum in der alten Kirche*, Darmstadt 1975; A. Guillaumont, *La conception du désert chez les moines d'Égypte*: RHR 188 (1975) 3-21; E. Ward, *The Desert Myth: Reflections on the Desert Ideal*, Kalamazoo, MI 1976, 183-199; S. Bonnet - E. Gouley, *Les ermites*, Paris 1980; G. Trotta, *La via del deserto tra ebraismo e cristianesimo*, Brescia 1993; D. Burton Christie, *The Word in the Desert. Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism*, Oxford 1993; S.P. Bratton, *Christianity, Wilderness and Wildlife. The Original Desert Solitaire*, London 1993; M.-E. Brunert, *Das Ideal der Wüsten-Askese und seine Rezeption in Gallien bis Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts*, Münster 1994; T.L. Burden, *The Kerygma of the Wilderness Traditions in the Hebrew Bible*, New York 1994; A. Sisti, *L'esperienza del deserto nella Bibbia*: Euntes docete 51 (1998) 99-125; P. Miquel, *Lessico del deserto. Le parole della spiritualità*, It. ed. V. Lanzarini (ed.), Bose 1998; M.-M. Davy, *Esperienze mistiche in Oriente e in Occidente*, It. ed. L. Borriello (ed.), Vatican City 2000; D. Carrer, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA 2002 (ample bibl.).

M.G. Bianco

DESIDERIUS of Cahors (d. 650). Desiderius, a member of the Gallo-Roman senatorial aristocracy of Aquitaine, received a classical education at home, and after studying law and rhetoric entered the court of *Chlothar II (d. 629), king of Neustria, where his elder brother, *Rusticus, served as chaplain and archdeacon before being appointed bishop of Cahors. At court Desiderius was the king's treasurer, and succeeded his brother *Syagrius as governor of *Marseille. In 630, shortly after his brother Rusticus's assassination, he was elected bishop by the people of Cahors, where he remained until his death in 650. At Cahors he rebuilt and restored churches and founded the first monastery. During the 22 years of his episcopate he continued his contacts with the royal court and with his friends from his time as Chlothar's treasurer; he corresponded with them regularly, himself preparing a collection of 36 letters, 20 of which were addressed to him. These letters are an extraordinary source of information for the history of the reigns of Chlothar II, Dagobert I (d. 639) and his two sons, Sigebert I (d. 656) and Clovis II (d. 657), as well as for the relations and exchange of communication among important Merovingians.

Some of his letters address problems regarding the episcopal administration of Cahors, others refer to legal proceedings; most, however, were written to cultivate social contacts. Many are addressed to old friends so as to continue to foster *amicitia* and *dulcedo*, such as characterized the letters of *Sidonius Apollinaris or *Avitus of Vienne, even if his Latin does not come close to theirs. He does show ability, however, using a lively style with a rich and pleasant literary sensibility. It is unfortunate that his Carolingian biographer did not have more of his letters (BHL 2143; CPL 1304).

CPL 1303; PL 87, 247-266; W. Arndt (ed.), MGH *Ep.* III, Berlin 1892, 193-214, repr. in CCL 117, Turnhout 1957, 309-342; D. Norberg (ed.), *Epistulae Sancti Desiderii*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis 6, Uppsala 1961. Fr. tr. (selected): R. Barroux, *Dagobert roi des Francs*, Paris 1938, 174-175. R. Rey, *Un grand bâtisseur au temps du roi Dagobert, S. Didier évêqee de Cahors*: Annales du Midi 65 (1953) 287-294; J. Durliat, *Les attributions civiles des évêques mérovingiens: l'exemple de Didier, évêque de Cahors (630–655)*: Annales du Midi 91 (1979) 237-254; PLRE III, 398; P.J. Geary, *Before France and Germany. The Creation and Transformation of the Merovingian World*, New York - Oxford 1988, 160-162, 165-166; I.N. Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751*, London 1994, in part. 149-152; Patrologia IV, 348f.; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751*, Leiden 1995.

Y. Hen

DEUS TUORUM MILITUM. The hymn recited at Vespers on the Common of a martyr. It was written

by an unknown author between the 5th-6th c. There are two recensions, a shorter one of four strophes (Chevalier, *Repertor. hymnolog.*, no. 4534) and a longer one of eight strophes (ibid., no. 4533). The text of the new breviary gives strophes of both versions, as they are considered particularly beautiful (Lentini, *Hymni instaur.*, 156). The second strophe is the most inspired and comes closest to the meaning and value of martyrdom; the rest resolves into a prayer. It has often been put to music, including by Orlando di Lasso, Monteverdi and Vivaldi. It is also used by other Christian confessions.

U. Chevalier, *Repertorium hymnologicum*, I, Louvain 1892, nos. 4534 and 4535; A. Lentini, *Hymni instaurandi Breviarii romani*, Vatican City 1968, 156 (with comm.); Dreves u. Blume, *Analecta hymnica Medii Aevi*, Leipzig, 51 (1907) 130, nn. 114 a) b); EC 4, 1500-1501; CE 2,822; J. Szövérffy, *Die Annalen der latein. Hymnendichtung*, I, Berlin 1964, 96; ICL p. 166, n. 76; P.M. Lefferts, *The Motet in England in the Fourteenth Century*, Ann Arbor, MI 1986, 277.

L. Dattrino

DEUSDEDIT (d. 664). *Bede (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II, 18) tells how at the death of Justus, once bishop of Hrofescaestir (Rochester) and later archbishop of Doruvernis (*Canterbury), the archbishop of Eboracum (*York) Paulinus elected *Honorius as his successor. The pope of the same name ratified the election by sending the pallium, with a letter (quite valuable for historians) confirming that at the death of one of the archbishops of the two mentioned sees, the other archbishop had the faculty of appointing the successor without having to make the long and arduous trip to *Rome. Still according to Bede (III, 20), however, at Archbishop Honorius's death (30 September 653) the practice, intended to equate the episcopal dignity of the two principal English sees, failed: after 18 months of vacancy, Ithamar, bishop of Hrofescaestir, elected Deusdedit (original *Celtic name: Frithbona) as the 6th archbishop of Canterbury.

We know very little of Deusdedit's life and pastoral activity, but fortunately Bede stressed his Saxon origin—he was a native of Wessex—allowing us to recognize in him the first in a long line of Anglo-Saxon bishops. He was ordained archbishop 26 March 655 and—still according to Bede—ruled his diocese for 9 years, 4 months and 2 days. At Ithamar's death (656), Deusdedit consecrated Damian, a southern Saxon, as his successor on the see of Hrofescaestir; this is Deusdedit's only official act that we are certain of: attribution of the foundation of monasteries to him is unproven. He died on 14 July 664—the same day as Earconbert, king of Kent and son of Eadbald—and was buried in the portico of St. Peter's church near the tomb of the first bishop, St. Augustine. According to circumstantial evidence from Bede (IV, 1), his see remained vacant for a long period, and to correct this dangerous situation Egbert, king of Kent and son of Earconbert, and Oswiu, sovereign of Northumbria, sent the priest Wighard—a highly esteemed English religious thought capable of remedying the precariousness and organizational gaps of the English churches—to Rome for the purpose of having him ordained archbishop by Pope *Vitalian. He died of plague at Rome, however, which gave the pope the opportunity of sending a person of his own choosing to that hard-to-manage country—an outsider not preconditioned by the difficult environment. After a long search, the choice fell to the Cilician monk *Theodore, a native of Tarsus, whose episcopal activity as Deusdedit's successor proved decisive for the radical and definitive reorganization of the churches of England.

Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* III, 20, 28-29 and IV, 1-2; DCB 1, 821-822; DHGE 14, 357; 7, 310; BS 4, 590; LTK 3, 115.

M. Ghilardi

DEVOTION - DEVOTIONS. Here we will examine forms of piety and objects that favored devotion. Little is known of private devotion and its forms in the first Christian centuries. In the presence of paganism, believers carefully avoided anything that could be seen as a pagan remnant. *Tertullian (*De oratione* 15) reviews some deviations that bordered on superstition, such as removing one's cloak to pray, and takes issue with those who refused the kiss of peace on the pretext of having fasted (18). For him, the Christian life must alternate between respites and vigils, which dispose the faithful to eschatological expectation (29). He also tells us of the custom of taking home the eucharistic bread to nourish personal devotion.

*Cyprian links prayer to the time of the episodes of Christ's passion (*De or. dom.* 34). This connection reappears in the *Traditio Apostolica*, which advises those who are tempted to make the sign of the *cross on their forehead and eyes, to cast out the devil with the sign of redemption (*Trad. Ap.* 42; also see Tertull., *De or.* 3,4). This sign is even more effective if traced with the *Eucharist (Just., *Dial.* 40,1; Dölger, AC 3,231-244). The sign of the cross used in baptism recalls both the seal of the elect and membership in Christ. It became a sign of victory, and now plays a considerable role in both piety and Christian art: we

find the cross incised on Christian dwellings. Also attested is a tradition of praying, facing east, before death (as with some martyrs, see *Didasc.* 12 based on Ps 68:34 and Mt 24:27). The posture of the Christian in prayer with arms extended and raised appears frequently in Christian art. The *liturgy exercised a profound influence on popular piety, which it nourished and inspired. On simple potsherds and papyri we find acclamations, doxologies (Faiyum papyrus), the trisagion, maranatha, Kyrie eleison, the beginning of the Gloria, and sometimes a Bible verse or a psalm. In *Coptic areas scholars have found charms or talismans, clear expressions of religious syncretism.

Epitaphs in particular reflect the devotion of the faithful. Prayers are addressed to God, to Christ (e.g., "Jesus, son of God, Alleluia"), to the Holy Spirit; the most solemn invoke the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." The Eucharist is cited as the pledge of resurrection (inscriptions of Abercius, Pectorius: see Hamman, *Prières des premiers chrétiens*, nos. 132, 133; see also 95,110-131). The stereotyped liturgical formulae, which recur frequently in inscriptions and sometimes in accounting books preserved by papyri, are a prelude to the ejaculatory prayers that *Augustine recommended to Proba (*Ep.* 130,20) and which nourished monastic piety. *John Climacus had monks simply repeat the name of Jesus (*Scala* 27).

From the 2nd c. Christians collected relics and objects that had been in contact with martyrs. From the 4th c. esp., we see a marked increase in relics and objects of piety: above all, the holy cross, venerated throughout the world (Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 4,10; 10,19; 13,4). At *Jerusalem, pilgrims had to be watched so they did not remove slivers of the cross with their teeth as they venerated it (Egeria 37,2). *Gregory the Great sent fragments of the true cross with his letters (*Ep.* 14,12). Also at Jerusalem, pilgrims received oil that had been in contact with the holy cross. *Macrina wore an iron cross over her heart and an iron ring, which is surprising, given that the Council of *Laodicea (can. 36) had prohibited such objects from being made or worn. *Jerome rebuked women who wore small gospels or fragments of the cross (*In Mt. comm.* IV, 23), as did *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 15,1). *John Chrysostom preferred to see children wearing a cross rather than an amulet, and knew of the practice of wearing a fragment of the true cross mounted in gold as a necklace (*Hom. Quod Christus sit Deus*). *Clement attests the custom of incising Christian symbols on signet rings. Christians loved wearing medals with a simple cross or the monogram of Christ or the profile of a saint, with an inscription, e.g., *Dominus dat legem.* A papyrus has been discovered with an invocation of the blood of Christ (Dölger, AC 5,255-261). A 4th-c. medal preserved at the Vatican Museum has the Virgin showing the Child to the Magi. Some believers had boxes with gospel pericopes inside (Dölger, AC 5,110). The opening of Matthew's gospel has been found on a papyrus at Cairo. The nails of the Crucifix were likewise reproduced, which leads to the theme of images and their cult. The cult of relics was not limited to the cross, but included the martyrs, their remains and everything that touched their remains: clothes, water from pilgrimages preserved in phials (we have many examples), oil from sanctuary lamps, candle wax (esp. from Paschal candles), even soil from Palestine. Hagiography informs us of the spread of this cult, which Augustine himself promoted in his last years. Catacomb graffiti also gives important evidence on worship, devotions and pilgrims.

Articles in DACL: *Amulettes*, I, 1784-1860; *Croix et crucifix*, III, 3045-3131; *Amulettes chrétiennes* (ed. Wessely): PO XVIII, 399-423; AC 3 (1932) 81-116 (Macrina); *Art. Devotionalien*: RAC 3, 862-871 (bibl.); AC I-V (passim); S. Salaville, *Christus in pietate*: EphLit 52 (1938) 221-236; B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa*, Regensburg 1950; B. Fischer, *Le Christ dans les Psaumes. La dévotion aux Psaumes dans l'Église des Martyrs*: La MaisonD 27 (1951) 86-113; A. Hamman, *Prières des premiers chrétiens*, Paris 1952 (It. tr. Milan 1962); M. Simon, *Les Saints d'Israël dans la dévotion de l'Église Ancienne*: RHPhR 34 (1954) 98-127; J. Hausherr, *L'Hésychasme. Étude de spiritualité*, Rome 1956; B. Kötting, *Le Pèlerinage de Rome et le dévouement à l'Église*: Lumen Vitae 13 (1958) 241-248; A. Hamman, *La prière*, II, Tournai 1959, 270-273 (It., Sp. tr.); J. Hausherr, *Noms du Christ et voies d'oraison*, Rome 1960; S. Ferrua, *Rileggendo i graffiti di S. Sebastiano*: La Civiltà Cattolica 116 (1965) 134-141, 428-437; A. Frolow, *La relique de la croix*, Paris 1961; Id., *Les reliques de la vraie croix*, Paris 1965; B. Fischer, *La prière ecclésiale et familiale dans le christianisme ancien*: La MaisonD 116 (1973) 41-58; J.M. McCulloh, *The Cult of Relics in the Letters and "Dialogues" of Pope Gregory the Great: A Lexicographical Study*: Traditio 32 (1976) 145-184; E.D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460*, Oxford 1982, 128-154; J.H. Walker, *Nouveaux aperçus sur la pratique de la réserve eucharistique et la dévotion à l'eucharistie. L'apport de l'église romaine ancienne*: La MaisonD 154 (1983) 167-184; P. Jounel, *Le culte des reliques et son influence sur l'art chrétien*: La MaisonD 170 (1987) 29-57; A. Hamman, *La prière dans l'église ancienne*, Berne 1989; Y. de Andía, *Prière à Jésus et hésychasme dans l'Église orientale*: Christus 39 (1992) 309-324; P. Maraval, *L'attitude des Pères du IVe siècle devant les lieux saints et les pèlerinages*: Irénikon 65 (1992) 5-23; G.T. Dennis, *Popular Religious Attitudes and Practices in Byzantium*: POC 43 (1993) 273-294; R.A. Markus, *How on Earth Could Places Become Holy? Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places*: JECS 2 (1994) 257-271; D. Krueger, *Writing as Devotion: Hagiographical Composition and the Cult of the Saints in Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Cyril of Scythopolis*: ChHist 66 (1997) 709-719; R. MacMullen, *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries*, New Haven - London 1997, 103-149; L. Perrone, *Christian Holy Places and Pilgrimage in an Age of Dogmatic Conflicts*: POC 48 (1998) 5-37; G. Sicari, *Reliquie insigni e "corpi santi" a Roma*, Rome 1998; C.P. Charalampidis, *Representations of Supplicants* (*orants*) *in the Iconography of the First Four Centuries of Christianity*, in *La preghiera nel tardo*

antico (SEA 66), Rome 1999, 471-476; M.W. Meyer - R. Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, Princeton 1999; J. Michaud, *Culte des reliques et épigraphie. L'exemple des dédicaces et des consécrations d'autels*, in E. Bozóky - A.M. Helvétius, *Les reliques: objets, cultes, symboles*, Turnhout 1999, 199-212; M. Wallraff, *La preghiera verso oriente alle origini di un uso liturgico*, in *La preghiera nel tardo antico* (SEA 66), Rome 1999, 463-469; F. Bisconti - V. Fiocchi - D. Mazzoleni, *Las catacumbas cristianas de Roma*, Regensburg 1999, 48-59, 147-180 (It., Eng., Fr., Ger. tr.); B. Beaujard - F. Prévot, *Il culto dei santi in Occidente*, in *Storia del Cristianesimo*, III, *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, Rome 2002, 968-1009.

A. Hamman - M. Flores Colín

DEXTER, Nummius Aemilianus (2nd half 4th c.). Son of Bishop *Pacian of Barcelona. Proconsul of Asia under *Theodosius from 379–387, he became praetorian prefect under *Honorius (395). *Jerome dedicated his *De viribus illustribus* to him, after Dexter had persuaded him to compose biographies of the Christian writers on the model of Suetonius. In ch. 132 Jerome mentions the *omnimoda historia,* written by Dexter, of which we have no trace. The *Chronicon Dextri* (PL 21, 55-572) is a counterfeit by a 17th-c. Spanish Jesuit.

DCB 1, 823; PLRE I, 151.

G. Pilara

DIACONATE (minor ministries). Doorkeepers, exorcists, acolytes, lectors and subdeacons. Until the reforms of Pope Paul VI they were called minor orders, and were conferred on candidates for the priesthood as phases of the ecclesiastical *gradus* (Mohlberg, *Liber sacramemtorum*, 115-116).

In times of persecution, the doorkeeper (lat.: *aeditus, ianitor, ostiarius*; Gr. πυλωρός) must have acted as a kind of security guard to prevent pagans and ill-wishers from entering Christian meeting places. After the persecutions, he was entrusted with the care and custody of churches and oratories. At the same time he had the duty of keeping order and tranquility during the celebration of the *liturgy, as *Epiphanius attests (*Pan.* III, 2,21: PG 42, 825). In the Byzantine liturgy, the words for sending away catechumens were probably addressed to him: τὰς θύρας, τὰς θύρας. The doorkeeper had other not strictly liturgical roles: St. *Ambrose entrusted him with the task of enforcing his prohibition of *refrigeria* in cemeteries, as *Augustine attests in *Confessions* (6, 2): "*Cum ad memorias sanctorum, sicut in Africa solebat, pultis et panem et merum attulisset* (*Monica*), *atque ab ostiario prohiberetur.*"

In the early church until the 3rd c., the exorcist was not necessarily an ordained or instituted minister. Exorcism was a function of any Christian called to cast out the evil spirit from a possessed person (Tertull., *Apol.* 23). *Cyprian also spoke of exorcism in the sense of casting demons out of persons who were possessed, and described the powers and dramatic effects of demons on the possessed (*Ad Demetr.* 14). Origen declared that demons are expelled not by magic rites or incantations, but by prayers and abjurations (*C. Cels.* 6, 4). *Cyril of Jerusalem encouraged his catechumens to receive willingly and devoutly the exorcism he had conferred by breathing on them (*Procat.* 9). In the cited references, emphasis is more on the office than on the minister himself. The first trace of ordination of exorcists is found in the Gelasian Sacramentary (Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum*, 116, 118).

The acolyte had no clearly defined function in the liturgy of the early church. Pope *Damasus (*Epigr.* 18: PL 13, 392) speaks of the martyr Tarcisius who carried the *Eucharist to sick members of the community. The tradition remained even after the persecutions, but in a different way: the acolyte brought the *fermentum* to the titular churches of *Rome on Sundays, as Pope *Innocent writes to Bishop *Decentius of Gubbio (*Ep. 25 ad Decentium*: PL 20, 556). A later development of the role of acolyte is described by *Isidore in *De eccl. off.* (I, 2,24), where he writes that acolytes lit the candles and carried them during the reading of the gospel and the offering of the sacrifice or canon of the *Mass. Later sacramentaries such as the Gelasian, the Gregorian and their revisions speak of the ordination of acolytes.

The office of lector may be considered one of the oldest liturgical roles. Since *Justin (*I Apol.* 67) indicates the lector not by a noun, but a participle—τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος—it is clear that he was a well-defined person. All Justin says is that the lector read the *memoriae* of the apostles or prophets for as long as time permitted, before the homily by the president of the assembly. *Tertullian's *De praescr. haer.* (41: CCL 1,222) shows that, unlike the heretics, the Catholic church considered the lectorate as a stable office, not to be confused with others: "*Itaque,*" he writes of heretics, "*alius hodie episcopus, cras alius: hodie diaconus qui cras lector; hodie presbyter qui cras laicus.*" *Hippolytus distinguished the ministry of lectors from those of bishop, presbyter and deacon, using the word καθίσταται instead of χειροτιθεῖται of their institution: "The lector is instituted when the bishop consigns him the book; he receives no laying on of hands" (Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique*, LQF 39,30). In Hippolytus's hierarchy the lector comes after confessors and widows, but before virgins and subdeacons,

an order reflecting that of contemporary Egypt. Cyprian began to speak of lectors as clerics: *"in ordinationibus clericis . . ."* (*Ep.* 38: CSEL 3,580). The letter speaks of a certain Aurelius whom Cyprian had ordained without consulting the local presbyters and deacons, because of his obvious and outstanding merits. In *Ambrose's time, the lectors at *Milan were almost always young men beginning their ecclesiastical career. In the homily *De excessu fratris* 61 (CSEL 73,240-241), Ambrose says: *"Unde non immerito quantus fuerit, hodie quoque per vocem lectoris parvuli spiritus sanctus expressit."* The Cappadocians also speak of the office of the lectorate, which was considered the entry into ecclesiastical service and precluded its holder from secular work such as teaching rhetoric (Greg. Naz., *Ep.* 11: PG 37, 44).

Indeed, *Gregory of Nazianzus recommended that candidates for higher ecclesiastical office should first pass through the lower grades, like *Basil, who served as lector before becoming a priest and bishop (*Orat.* 43, 27: LNPF 7, 404-405). *Jerome speaks of lectors as distinct from cantors in the liturgy, and requiring a high level of morality. Regarding the use of vestments for lectors, he advises: *"Si lector, si acolythus, si psaltes te sequitur, non ornentur vestibus, sed moribus, nec calamistro crispent comas, sed pudicitiam habitu polliceantur"* (*Ep.* 52: CSEL 54, 423-424). *Africa also had lectors, as we see in Augustine's writings, which allude to young lectors who read from the codices of Scripture chosen by the bishop (*Enarr. in Ps.* 138,1: CCL 40, 1990; *Ep.* 29,4: CSEL 33,115-116; *De doctr. christ.* IV, 6: CCL 32,119-120; *Ep.* 71,3: CSEL 34,250-251). *Isidore of Seville attests the ministry of lectors in Spain. In *De eccl. off.* II, 1-4 (PL 83, 777-780) he lists the technical and moral requirements of lectors; he also distinguishes them from cantors and assigns them two tasks: *pronuntiare* the readings, *praedicare populis.* If *praedicare* is to be understood as explanation of the readings, it is unlikely that lectors at Seville were youths (*Ep.* 1: PL 83, 893-898; see also *Libri etym. sive orig.* VII, 12).

The subdeacon in the early church did not occupy a higher rank than that of lector. Hippolytus puts him after the lector (Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique*, LQF 39,32). Only in the 6th c. does the subdeacon assume the role of reading during the liturgy; the change could have been because the lectors who lived in the episcopal schools were only children. In the East, the subdeacon was more important, as appears from the *Apos. Con.*: he is put after the deacon (VIII, 12,43: ed. Funk 512) and considered as instituted by the apostles (VIII, 46,13: 560). With Paul VI's reform, the office of subdeacon was eliminated in the Latin Church, to give more importance to the role of lector, although the *Apos. Con.* "*Ministeria quaedam*" maintains the possibility of calling the acolyte "subdeacon": *Nihil tamen obstat, quominus, ex Conferentiae Episcopalis iudicio, Acolythus alicubi etiam Subdiaconus vocari possit* (no. IV: AAS 64 [1972] 532).

L.C. Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum romanae aecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, Rome 1960 ([2]1968); A. Martimort (ed.), *L'Église en prière*, Tournai 1961 (It. tr. Rome [2]1966), 481-482, 500-503; K. Adloff, *Lektor*: TRE 20 (1990) 734-736; A. Lameri, *La "traditio instrumentorum" e delle insegne dei riti di ordinazione e di istituzione dei ministeri oggi. Studio storico-liturgico*, Padua 1995; E. Cattaneo (ed.), *Suddiaconi, lettori, accoliti, esorcisti, ostiari, I ministeri nella chiesa antica. Testi patristici dei primi tre secoli*, Milan 1997, 169-180.

A. Chupungco

DIACRINOMENI. The term, meaning "hesitant," was applied to those who were undecided over whether to recognize the authority of the Council of *Chalcedon (Timothy of Constantinople, PG 86, 52-56); they were later subdivided into twelve sects. Leontius Scholasticus says that the emperor *Anastasius I belonged to this group (*Sect.* V, 3: PG 86, 1229). Later the followers of *Severus of *Antioch were also called diacrinomeni, in the sense of the "those who distinguish themselves": they professed the consubstantiality of Christ with the Father as to his divinity, and with human beings as to his humanity, but did not acknowledge the faith of Chalcedon. Their doctrine was expounded to the patriarch of *Constantinople in 535 (Evagr., *HE* IV, 11).

F. Cocchini

DIADOCHUS of Photice. Bishop of Epirus Vetus (ca. 400–474). Praised by *Victor of Vita as a great pontiff (CSEL 7,2) and cited by *Photius as an anti-*monophysite (*Bibl.*, cod. 231), he has been identified with one of the signers of a letter of Chalcedonian solidarity to the emperor *Leo (Didachus of Phocas, Mansi 7,619). This is the tendency of his *Discourse on the Ascension of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, which proclaims the glorification in a single divine hypostasis of the Lord's human nature. Its influence was felt not just in the East: Pomerius transmitted its doctrine to the West through *Caesarius of Arles. The *Vision of St. Diadochus Bishop of Photice in Epirus* is mystical in content: St. *John the Baptist talks to Diadochus about the familiarity with God's word (theology in a restricted sense) that he gained in the silence of the hermitage, and thus he was able to hear the Father's voice at the Jordan, not emitted by an organ of speech,

but in the form of glory as an impressed species, beyond the sensible form of the dove. The *Hundred Gnostic Chapters* are rich explorations of this experiential knowledge made fruitful by the Spirit. The ascetic integrates the movements of the flesh without extinguishing it; he exhorts us to rid ourselves of the mire of the body, by contemplation, to prepare it for the joy of incorruptibility (54.89). A *Catechesis* attributed to him shows some characteristics of his doctrine, but is not supported by many codices.

CPG 6106-6108; PG 65, 1148-1212; DSp 3, 817-834; DHGE 14, 374-378; F. Doerr, *Diadochos von Photike und die Messalianer*, Freiburg im Br. 1937; H.I. Marrou, *Diadoque de Photiké et Victor de Vita*: REA 45 (1943) 61-80; E. Des Places, *Diadoque de Photicé*, SC 5; V. Messana, *Diadoco, Cento considerazioni sulla fede*, Rome 1978 (It. tr.); V. Messana, *Diadoco di Fotica e cultura cristiana in Epiro nel V secolo*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 151-166; V. Messana, *La nudité d'Adam et Ève chez Diadoque*: SP 17 (1982) I, 325-332; K.J. Fricke, *Das Böse bei Diadochos von Photike*, in W. Strothmann (ed.), *Makarios-Symposion über das Böse*, Wiesbaden 1983, 123-149; Ch. Joest, *"Gott lieben in voller Empfindung des Herzens": Diadochos von Photike und seine Lehre der Unterscheidung*: OS 41 (1992) 149-186; P. Argárate, *La Luz de tu Rostro: teología de la "Gloria" en Diádoco de Fótice*: OCP 65/2 (1999) 257-278.

C. Riggi

DIAKONIA - DIACONATE. The notion of *diakonia* or "service" is well attested in the New Testament; however, its precise connotations are difficult to determine therein, and become more precise later on. In the Pastoral Epistles, which are among the latest NT books, the deacons, both male and female deacons, appear as an established category in the church, for which specific requirements existed (1 Tim 3). In Acts 6:1-6 *diakonia* indicates not only table service, but also the ministry of the word and prayer. Paul's designation of Phoebe as *diakonos*, and not as *diakonissa*, in Rom 16:1 indicates that ancient references to *diakonoi* should not be regarded as necessarily referring only to male deacons.

The Letter of *Clement to the Corinthians (42) mentions *diakonoi* together with *episkopoi* and *presbyteroi* (44), even though the distinctions among the respective functions of these categories is unclear. The *Shepherd* of Hermas (*Sim.* 9,26-27) mentions *diakonoi* and *episkopoi*, but the hierarchy of deacons, presbyters and bishop seems to first appear in Ignatius, *Tral.* 3,1. According to *Irenaeus, the deacons are the successors of the seven deacons instituted by the twelve apostles in Acts 6:1-6. *Justin (*Apol.* 1,65) mentions *diakonoi* as distinct from the Christian community in general (*adelphoi*) and its leader (*proestōs*).

The *Didache* (15,1-2) mentions *diakonoi* chosen by the community and ordained by *cheirotonia.* In the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (early 3rd c.) women deacons constitute an ecclesiastical order along with male deacons and presbyters; their relation to the bishop is assimilated to that of Christ to the Father, and they are said to be worthy of honor as *typos* of the Holy Spirit. They are ordained by the bishop with *cheirotonia*, just as male deacons and presbyters, and are formally included in the clergy. Their office included the administration of baptism, esp. to women, postbaptismal instruction, pastoral visits to women, proclamation, travel, ministry, spiritual and material support of women. The *Traditio Apostolica* includes deacons (of both genders) in the clerical group together with presbyters and bishops.

Testimonies from the 4th c. onwards are numerous. The *Apostolic Constitutions* devote a whole section, VIII 17-18, to deacons. Likewise, Ambrose devotes a section of his *De officiis ministrorum* (II 28) to deacons. Pelagius, *In Rom.* 16,1, at the beginning of the 5th c. attests that in his day the ministry of *diaconissae* consisted in the administration of baptism and teaching, esp. women. The *Acts of Philip* (4th-5th c.) mention διακόνισσαι along with διάκονοι, and πρεσβύτιδες along with πρεσβύτεροι, among the clergy. Likewise, in the *Martyrdom of Matthew* 28, a converted king is ordained πρεσβύτερος, his wife πρεσβύτις, his son διάκονος, and his wife διακόνισσα: that the female titles cannot possibly be interpreted as "wife of the presbyter" and "wife of the deacon" here is proved by the ordination of all four of them and their inclusion in the priestly dignity or ἱεροσύνη.

Ps.-*Dionysius presents deacons, presbyters and bishops as the steps of the ecclesiastical hierarchy that imitate the celestial one in his *De ecclesiastica hierarchia.* Justinian's *Novellae* explicitly include deaconesses within the clergy and says that they are ordained though χειροτονία. These documents also attest that that they administered baptism to men as well, and partook in the arcane rites (ἀπόρρητοι) and the most holy and venerable mysteries (σεβασμιωτάτοις μυστηρίοις), i.e., the *Eucharistic consecration. Even at the end of the 7th c., the Trullan synod considered women deacons to be ordained (χειροτονεῖν) and to belong to the priestly order (ἱερατική) as well as male deacons and presbyters. Similarly, in the *Testamentum Domini nostri*, widows and women deacons and presbyters are all included in the *clerus* and located together with the bishop behind the veil at the moment of the Eucharistic sacrifice at *Mass. Their ordination is indicated by the same word that des-

ignates the ordination of male deacons, presbyters and bishops. Some wealthy deaconesses, such as Olympia in Constantinople, used their riches in support of the church and for charitable works.

Epigraphical as well as literary evidence of both men and women deacons in Late Antiquity is abundant, in the East and in the West. Atto, bishop of Vercelli in the 10th c., replying to a priest, Ambrose (who asked him how to understand the terms *presbytera* and *diacona* that he found in the canons), admitted that women were regularly ordained deacons and presbyters and president of churches in the early church. Atto also indicates with precision the respective ecclesiastical offices of deacons and presbyters: for the former, ministry and baptism; for the latter, preaching, leading and teaching. The rites for the ordination of male and female deacons were identical. In the Pontifical of Egbert of *York (8th c.) the ordination of a deaconess is included among those of male deacons. In the Roman-Germanic Pontifical (10th c.) the ordination of an abbess or deaconess is included among those of abbots and deacons, and "female deacons and female presbyters" are mentioned therein along with their male colleagues. Pope Zacharias's prohibition against anybody having intercourse with a *presbytera*, *diacona*, *nonna* or *monacha* (743) imposes celibacy on women presbyters, deaconesses, conventual women and nuns, not on wives of presbyters and deacons. The same is the case with the prohibitions of popes Leo VII and *Gregory II of marriage with a *presbytera* or a *diacona*, and again with the analogous prohibition ascribed to Pope Nicolas I (9th c.). These and many more testimonies show that the diaconate continued to be a ministry shared by both men and women for many centuries, with similar functions and identical requirements and ordination rites.

J. Mayer, *Monumenta de viduis diaconissis virginibusque tractantia*, Bonn 1938; G. Dix, *Le ministère dans l'église ancienne*, Neuchâtel 1955; R. Gryson, *Le ministère des femmes dans l'église ancienne*, Gembloux 1972; J.M. Barnett, *The Diaconate: A Full and Equal Order,* New York 1981; A.G. Martimort, *Les diaconesses: essai historique*, Rome 1982; U. Eisen, *Amsträgerinnen in frühen Christentum*, Göttingen 1996; A. Di Berardino, *La chiesa antica: ecclesiologia e istituzioni*, Rome 1984; J.N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*, New York - Oxford 1990; P. Sorci, *Diaconato e altri ministeri liturgici della donna*, in *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, ed. U. Mattioli, Genoa 1992, 331-364; E. Cattaneo, *I ministeri nella Chiesa antica*, Milan 1997; G. Hamman, *Storia del diaconato*, Bose 2004; K. Madigan – C. Osiek, *Ordained Women in the Early Church. A Documentary History*, Baltimore - London 2005; E. Petrolino, *Diaconato servizio missione*, Città del Vaticano 2006; J. Murphy-O'Connor – C. Militello – M.L. Rigato, *Paolo e le donne*, Assisi 2006; I. Ramelli, *Donne diacono: fonti e studi recenti sulla Chiesa dei primi secoli*, Il Regno 15.III.2006, 171-175; Id., review of Madigan-Osiek, Orpheus 28 (2007) 338-346; G. Macy, *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination*, Oxford 2008; Id., review of Macy, SMSR 74,2 (2008) 347-353; Var. aus., *Diaconia, Diaconie. XXXVIII Incontro di Studiosi di Antichità Cristiane*, Augustinianum, 8-10 May 2009 [SEA], Rome 2010.

I. Ramelli

DIALOGI DE SANCTA TRINITATE IV-V. The two texts, which have been handed down in a pseudo-Athanasian corpus likely collected in the Byzantine age, are part of the anti-Apollinarian polemic, but belong to different authors and cultural environments. They are fictitious dialogues that pay no attention to the setting and the description of the characters, but aim at presenting the opposition of the two interlocutors' theses, and particularly the refutation of the Apollinarian ideas.

Dial. IV, of which there are two ancient versions (the Latin one, written by the end of the 5th c., and the Armenian one, probably produced in the 7th c.) and a few extracts in Syriac (*Florilegium Edessenum anonymum*, *syriace ante 562*), is a dialogue between an Apollinarist and an Orthodox. Some internal elements suggest that the text was written in the seventh decade of the 4th c. Attempts to identify the author of the dialogue have always encountered objective difficulties, so that it seems possible to define only the environment in which it was written. In this sense, *Dial. IV* contains several points of contact with the Alexandrian tradition, and in particular with the milieu influenced by Didymus's thought.

Dial. V refutes item by item Apollinaris of Laodicea's Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, probably composed in the last years of the Laodicean's life. Although the author of the text cannot be identified in this case either, certain elements in *Dial. V* lead to post-Ephesus Antioch's ground, characterized by Theodoret of Cyrrhus's thinking.

CPG 2284; *Ed.*: *Pseudo-Atanasio. Dialoghi IV e V sulla santa Trinità*, testo greco con traduzione italiana, versione latina e armena, ed. A. Capone, Leuven 2011; *Opere di Atanasio in una traduzione latina inedita*, nota di I. Costa, in *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana* n.s. XLII, Naples 1993, pp. 221-265; Ch. Bizer, *Studien zu pseudathanasianischen Dialogen der Orthodoxos und Aëtios*, Bonn 1970; P. Jungmann, *Die armenische Fassung des sog. Pseudo-athanasianischen Dialogus de Sancta Trinitate IV*: Oriens Christianus 53 (1969) 159-201; *Knikʻ Hawatoy*, ed. Tēr Mkrtčʻean, 1914 (= Leuven 1974). *Studi.*: A. Capone, *De sancta Trinitate Dialogus IV*: note critiche alla versione latina"; Classica et Christiana 3 (2008) 69-81; P. Andrist, *Les protagonistes égyptiens du débat apollinariste. Le Dialogue d'Athanase et Zachée et les dialogues pseudoathanasiens – intertextualité et polémique religieuse en Égypte vers la fin du IVe siècle*: Recherches Augustiniennes 34 (2005)63-141; E. Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*, Göttingen 1969.

A. Capone

DIALOGUE. The literary genre of dialogue, very common in classical literature, also enjoyed a certain success with the Christian authors of the first centuries. The origins of Christian dialogue are not completely clear. It probably took shape from the meeting of earlier subliterary forms of expression such as the Rabbinic debates over the interpretation of the Jewish Law, Cynic-Stoic diatribe and the controversies reported in the primitive Christian literature of the gospels and the *Praxeis* (cf. ps.-*Clementines).

1. The earliest Christian dialogue we know of, written by *Aristo of Pella (ca. 140), is the debate between Papiscus the Jew and Jason the Jewish Christian over the interpretation of the OT. The more famous *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* by *Justin Martyr also employs this controversialist model, but gives it a higher literary dignity thanks to its evident references to Plato. The dialogue form would subsequently be used more than once in the ongoing polemic against the pagans. Antipagan apologetic dialogue, or apology in dialogue form, had its most famous example in *Minucius Felix's *Octavius*, where we feel the presence of Cicero's *De natura deorum*; we should also mention *Macarius of Magnesia's *Apokritikos*, and still later *Aeneas of Gaza's *Theophrastus* and *Zacharias of Mytilene's *Ammonius*. More complex cases of religious controversy, involving a variety of adversarial sources simultaneously (pagan cults, Judaism, heresies), are offered by the *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* and by the so-called *Religionsgespräch* held at the Sassanid court.

2. It is important to note that neither the rich dialogic output of the imperial age (Plutarch, *Lucian, Athenaeus, *Macrobius) nor the famous biblical precedent of the book of Job left much of a trace on Christian literary dialogue. Literate Christian authors went back exclusively to *Plato and Cicero, esp. when they sought to model themselves on classical philosophical dialogue in the creation of Christian philosophical dialogue. In this field the outstanding names are *Gregory of Nyssa with his *Dialogue on the Soul and Resurrection* (directly inspired by Plato's *Phaedo*) and, of course, *Augustine with the philosophical dialogues of his youth, the four Cassiciacum dialogues (*Contra Academicos*, *De beata vita*, *De ordine* and the *Soliloquia*, a novelty in the absolute sense) and, after his baptism, *De quantitate animae*, *De magistro*, *De libero arbitrio* and *De musica*. Other works must also be attributed to strictly philosophical Christian dialogue: *Bardesanes of Edessa's *Book of the Laws of the Countries* and *Gregory Thaumaturgus's *To Theopompus, on the Impassibility and Passibility of God*.

3. But philosophical dialogue in which the Christian author seeks to work out rational answers independent of revelation, though in harmony with it, is a mere parenthesis in the vaster output of the predominantly theological dialogues developed in the context of the innumerable doctrinal controversies between orthodox and heretics. The documentation on these controversies has been subjected to various forms of literary reelaboration, from protocol—limited to recording the progress of the controversy, pretending to report the dialogue as it actually occurred, not unlike the protocols of the judiciary interrogators in the *Acta martyrum*—to dialogue having a strong doctrinal component, vitally rooted in the great tradition of philosophical dialogue. To *Origen we owe two dialogues on the resurrection and a *Dialogue with Heraclides* and his fellow bishops on the Father, the Son and the soul. *Methodius of Olympus wrote several theological dialogues in which he managed to temper his polemical intent in the demanding literary forms of Platonic dialogue: the *Symposium of the Ten Virgins*, a work rich in anti-Encratite ideas; *Aglaophon on the Resurrection*, an antignostic, anti-Origenist dialogue; the antignostic dialogue *On free will*; and *De lepra*. After Methodius, controversial dialogue assumed everterser forms with the antignostic *Dialogue of Adamantius* and *Hegemonius's anti-Manichean *Acta Archelai* (the presence of an external judge in these disputes between Christians is interesting). Anti-Arian and anti-Macedonian dialogues multiplied in the 4th and 5th c., adhering to the form of oral debate as it actually happened (e.g., the 7 ps.-Athanasian dialogues). *Jerome wrote theological dialogues against *Luciferians and *Pelagians, *Cyril of *Alexandria against *Arians and *Nestorians; Nestorius wrote a self-defense in dialogue form, the *Book of Heraclides*, while *Theodoret of Cyrrhus opposed the *monophysites with the dialogue *Eranistes*, and *Arnobius the Younger defended Roman trinitarian and christological doctrine in *Conflictus Arnobii et Serapionis*. In a letter to *Diodore of Tarsus, *Basil of Caesarea clearly expressed his preference for that genre of dialogue in which, conceding nothing to the elegance of Platonic dialogue but following Aristotle and Theophrastus, the Christian author expounded his opponent's objections and the necessary replies in a simple and clear style, so as to create a work useful for building up the common faith (*Ep*. 135,1).

4. We can only mention in this setting the dialogue of "revelation" (*Offenbarungsdialog*), which shows some affinity with contemporary *hermetic formulations and themes (one thinks of the revelation in dialogue form on gnosis and salvation; this

affinity, however, would be better studied and specified on the literary and historical-religious levels). In these texts, variously elaborated, the dialogue generally takes place between the heavenly being that reveals (the Redeemer-Savior) and the human recipients of the revelation. These are for the most part "gnostic" works from *Nag Hammadi, in which debates between the Lord's disciples and the questions they ask the Risen Christ during his post-Easter apparitions are invariably followed by the clarifying response in which teaching on salvation is imparted, resolving the debate. One notes in these gnostic texts, properly gospels in dialogue form (*dialogue gospels - Dialogevangelien*), a strong and capable feminine presence (many questions remain open: see now the updated treatment of the debate in Hartenstein's monograph). On the other hand, as examples of orthodox dialogue of revelation as early as the 2nd c., we can cite the *Epistle of the Apostles* and the *Shepherd* of Hermas (where the dialogue is between a single recipient of the revelation and various heavenly beings). The revelation (an *explanatio somnii*) of the Tiburtine Sibyl to the 100 judges begins with a dialogue (the Greek monophysite version is also known as the "Oracle of Baalbek"), and the revelation of Zoroaster to Hystaspes on the coming of the Messiah is transmitted in dialogue form (these last two prophetic texts of the Tiburtine Sibyl and Zoroaster were later brought together as books III and IV of the early 6th-c. *Theosophia*).

E. Bratke, *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden* (TU, NF IV/3), Leipzig 1899; A. Hermann - G. Bardy, *Dialog*: RAC 3 (1957) 928-955; H. Dörrie - H. Dörries, *Erotapokriseis*: RAC 4 (1966) 342-370; M. Hoffmann, *Der Dialog bei den christlichen Schriftstellern der ersten vier Jahrhunderte* (TU 96), Berlin 1966; M. Wacht, *Aeneas von Gaza als Apologet. Seine Kosmologie im Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Theophaneia 21), Bonn 1969; B.R. Voss, *Der Dialog in der frühchristlichen Literatur* (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 9), Munich 1970; P.L. Schmidt, *Zur Typologie und Literarisierung des frühchristlichen lateinischen Dialogs*, in Var. aus., *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'Antiquité Tardive en Occident* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 23), Vandoeuvres - Geneva 1977, 101-180; Ph. Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue. The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*, New York 1980; K. Berger, *Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament*: ANRW II.25,2, Berlin - New York 1984, 1031-1432, here 1301-1316; C. Apostolopoulos, *Phaedo Christianus. Studien zur Verbindung und Abwägung des Verhältnisses zwischen dem platonischen 'Phaidon' und dem Dialog Gregors von Nyssa "Über die Seele und Auferstehung,"* Frankfurt - Bern - New York 1986; G.P. Luttikhuizen, *The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues*, in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (BETL 86), Louvain 1989, 363-372; J.-L. Feiertag, *Les Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii. Étude d'histoire et de sotériologie* (Paradosis 30), Fribourg (Switz.) 1990; H.M. Meissner, *Rhetorik und Theologie. Der Dialog Gregors von Nyssa De anima et resurrectione* (Patrologia I), Frankfurt a.M. 1991; J. Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre. Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge* (TU 146), Berlin 2000; P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia. An Attempt at Reconstruction* (VChrS 56), Leiden - Boston - Cologne 2001.

P.F. Beatrice

DIALOGUE of a MONTANIST with an ORTHODOX. Written ca. the end of the 4th c., perhaps at *Antioch (Ficker), *Alexandria (de Labriolle) or, according to a recent hypothesis, in a *Cappadocian context (Cavalcanti), the Dialogue is a work of antiheretical propaganda in which two characters, identified only as an orthodox and a *Montanist, debate a series of problems that had emerged in the course of the controversy between the sect founded by *Montanus and the Catholic Church. Discussed in five sections—enriched with many Pauline and Johannine passages—are the pericope of 1 Cor 13 (I), the existence of prophecy after Christ (II), trinitarian doctrine (III), the Paraclete (IV) and the prophetic power of women (V). Its purpose is clearly polemical: the orthodox reduces his adversary to silence, basically accusing him of professing a monarchian doctrine, of believing that Montanus possessed the fullness of the Holy Spirit and of permitting women to dishonor the Lord by writing sacred books.

G. Ficker, *Widerlegung eines Montanisten*: ZKG 26 (1905) 447-463; A.M. Berruto, *Dialogo di un montanista con un ortodosso*, Bologna 1999; P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme*, Fribourg-Paris 1913, XCIII–CVIII; E. Cavalcanti (ed.), *Pseudo-Atanasio. Dialoghi contro i Macedoniani*, Turin 1983, 11; A. Jensen, *Gottes selbstbewusste Töchter. Frauenemanzipation im frühen Christentum?*, Freiburg - Basel - Vienna 1992, 254-362 (in particular 302-326).

P. Marone

DIALOGUES of JESUS (apocryphal). A group of apocrypha in dialogue form, often *gnostic in tone. The dialogue usually occurs on the Mount of Olives, where Jesus reveals his mysteries to the apostles. These texts have a certain connection with the literary genre of **Quaestiones et responsiones*. These dialogues are found in (or constitute) the following texts: the *Freer Logion*, a text inserted between Mk 16:14 and 15 in the Freer codex; the *Epistula Apostolorum* (chs. 12-51); 5 *Coptic texts—4 of the *Nag Hammadi Library: *Epistula Iacobi apocrypha* (I cod.), *Liber Thomae Atheltae* (II cod.), *Dialogus Salvatoris* (III cod.), *Epistula Petri ad Philippum* (VIII cod.); also in Coptic is the *Dialogus Ioannis cum Iesu*, preserved fragmentarily. A dialogue with the apostles is also found in other texts, such as the *Apoca-*

lypse of Peter, the *Questiones Bartholomaei* and the *Interrogationes Ioannis*, a Cathar-medieval text, but containing gnostic and *Manichean fragments. The lively dialogue between God and Esdras is found in various texts preserved under the name Esdras.

CANT 22-27 (editions); H. Köster, *Dialog und Spruchüberlieferung*: EvangTheol 39 (1979) 532-556; P. Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue. The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*, New York 1980; K. Rudolf, *Der gnostische Dialog als litt. Genus*, in Id., *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte*, Leiden 1996, 103-122.

M. Starowieyski

DIALOGUS SUB NOMINE HIERONYMI ET AUGUSTINI. In all complete editions of the works of *Jerome, beginning from the 1468 *princeps* through that of Erasmus, an anonymous text, later than Jerome, is included, entitled *Dialogus sub nomine Hieronymi et Augustini de origine animarum*. The author lived in S Italy ca. the mid 5th c., perhaps a monk who fled *Africa at the time of *Genseric. Since the author shows sympathy for Jerome's thesis on the soul's creation directly by God and against Augustinian spiritual *traducianism, the *Dialogus* was inserted among his works. The author knows well the whole preceding discussion and the theological thought of the two Fathers, from whom he extracts the passages of the dialogue with a refined compilational technique, perfectly succeeding in presenting and maintaining the positions of the two protagonists. *Augustine, based on his discussion of original sin and the baptism of babies, seems more expert in the theological discussion, but Jerome wins. The author reinforces the creationist thesis with biblical citations, esp. from the Gospel of John: "My Father works always, and so do I" (Jn 5:17). There is another brief, later treatise on the same theme, *Altercatio Ambrosii contra eos qui animam non confitentur* (CPL 170).

CPL 633 (*Ep.* 37 of Jerome); CPPM II, A n. 886; PL 30, 261-271 (in the 1846 ed.), PL 30, 270-280 (ed. 1865). Text and It. tr.: I. Tolomio, *L'anima dell'uomo. Trattati sull'anima dal V al IX secolo*, Milan 1979, 110-134 (with bibl.); P. Courcelle, *Littérature latine d'époque patristique*, in *Actes du premier Congrès de la Féd. Intern. des Ass. d'études classiques*, Paris 1951, 287-307 (*Altercatio* 289); I. Tolomio, *L'origine dell'anima nell'Alto Medioevo*: Medioevo 13 (1987) 51-73 (*Dialogus* 60-62; *Altercatio* 62).

A. Di Berardino

DIATESSARON. Mathematical-musical term (the harmony of the fourth) applied by *Tatian—a native of the East and disciple of *Justin at *Rome—to his harmony of the four gospels. Tatian's was neither the only nor the first attempt to present the four distinct gospel accounts in a single unitary form, but it was certainly the most successful: due to its practical character it prevailed far and wide, both in the East, where it was the official gospel of the church of *Edessa and was continually in use in churches at least until the time of *Rabbula (early 5th c.), and in the West, though less so there. In some sense it was the first "Life of Jesus," composed on the basis of the four gospels.

The Greek term Διὰ τεσσάρων suggests an original Greek version: in fact, a Greek fragment of the Diatessaron was discovered at *Dura Europos in 1933 (ed. by Ch. Kraeling in *Studies and Documents* III, London 1935). In 1999, Parker and others denied that the fragment was part of the Diatessaron, but instead an independent effort to harmonize the gospels; this hypothesis was contested by Joosten (2003). It has also been asserted by some critics that this fragment is not the original, but a retranslation from Syriac (P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, Oxford [2]1959, 295), the language in which Tatian drew up the Diatessaron as a unified gospel, prepared with liturgical and missionary intent for his native people. Since the work is lost, the possibility of reconstructing the original Diatessaron—also very important for the earliest history of the gospel text—is conditioned by the possibility, as yet rather uncertain, of establishing a tree of dependence and mutual influence between the various forms of "gospel harmonies" that have been preserved.

Two essential problems must be taken into account: (1) The structure of the Diatessaron presumably closest to the original is certainly that given by *Ephrem the Syrian's *Commentary* (preserved entire in the Armenian version: ed. with Lat. tr. by L. Leloir, in CSCO *arm.* 137; 145, I-II, Louvain 1953–54; and about half in the original Syriac, recovered in the Chester-Beatty manuscripts, ed. L. Leloir, Dublin 1963; Leloir later published other recoveries in the original Syriac). (2) The structure itself of the work and the wide use made of it, for reasons of practicality, allowed both a number of transpositions within the general scheme, to adapt it to the needs of individual communities, and esp., in the redactions used in remote areas or among heterodox groups, the insertion of extracanonical or apocryphal *logia* with the elimination or substitution of passages. We know, for example, that the Diatessaron used among Encratite groups suppressed the genealogies of Jesus. Moreover, the Diatessaron being a gospel harmony that reduced the synoptic parallels to a unity, upon returning to the separate gospels, the conflated readings were reintroduced into one or other of the syn-

optics through the Diatessaron's influence. The unresolved critical problems posed by a comparative study of the various forms of the Diatessaron are extremely complicated. The essential witnesses of this harmonizing tradition are (a) the cited commentary of Ephrem the Syrian (besides the Greek fragment); (b) the *Arab* Diatessaron known in various manuscripts (ed. A. Ciasca, Rome 1888; A.S. Marmardji, Beirut 1935); (c) the *Persian* Diatessaron *translated from the Syriac*, containing many apocryphal readings (ed. G. Messina, Rome 1951); (d) a series of old Eastern versions of the NT and various citations in the Eastern Fathers, dependent on some form of Diatessaron (Armenian, Georgian and Arab versions of the NT, citations of the *Manichean *Kephalaia*, and in the *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*); (e) the *Codex Fuldensis* of the NT copied by *Victor of Capua (shortly before 546), which contains an old Latin gospel harmony (which Victor called *Diapente*: see F. Bolgiani, *Vittore di Capua e il Diatessaron*, Mem. Accad. Sc. Turin, Cl. Sc. Mor., 4a, 2, Turin 1962); (f) a series of medieval Dutch gospel harmonies; (g) two 13th-14th-c. Italian gospel harmonies (Venetian and Tuscan); (h) an Early English harmony (the *Pepysian Gospel Harmony*); (i) a group of High German gospel harmonies; (j) the *Heliand* (a medieval Saxon poem on the life of Christ); (k) the Commentary of Zacharias of Chrysopolis, *Concordia evangeliorum quattuor* (PL 186, 11-620). The Diatessaron also strongly influenced the composition of subsequent lives of Jesus, of which the best-known and most widely circulated was Ludolf of Saxony's *Life of Christ* (*Monotessaron*).

CPG 1106 (ample bibl., see also the Suppl.); P.A. Ciasca, *Tatiani evangeliorum harmonia*, Rome [2]1934; V. Todesco - A. Vaccari - M. Vattasso, *Il Diatessaron*, Rome 1938; C. Peters, *Das Diatessaron Tatians*, Seine Überlieferung und sein Nachwirken in Morgen- und Abendland sowie der heutige Stand seiner Erforschung, Rome 1939; L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem. Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant. Texte syriaque* (*Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709*). *Folios additionels*, Louvain/Paris 1990; A. Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, Louvain 1951; L. Leloir, *Le Diatessaron de Tatien*: OrSyr 1 (1956) 208-231, 313-335; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Trama e carattere del D. di T.*: OCP 24 (1959) 326-357; A. Vaccari, *Le lezioni evangeliche di Eusebio e il Diatessaron di T. nella letteratura siriaca*: Riv. di Studi Orient. (Scritti in onore di G. Furlani) 32 (1957) 433-452; G. Quispel, *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas*, Leiden 1975; Id., *A Diatessaron Reading in a Latin Manichean Codex*: VChr 47 (1993) 374-378; L. Leloir, *Le commentaire d'Ephrem sur le Diatessaron. Quarante et un folios retrouvés*: RBi 94 (1987) 481-518; M.-É. Boismard, *Le Diatessaron: de Tatien à Justin*, Paris 1992; C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron*, Oxford 1993; T. Baarda, *Essays on the Diatessaron*, Kampen 1994; W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship*, Leiden 1994; *La más antigua vida de Jesús: Diatessaron / Taciano*, tr. by J. Álvarez Maestro, Madrid 1999; J. Joosse, *An Introduction to Arabic Diatessaron*: OC 83 (1993) 72-129; D.C. Parker - D.G.K. Taylor - M.S. Goodacre, *The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony*, in D.G.K. Taylor, *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Atlanta, GA 1999, 192-228; J. Joosten, *Tatian's "Diatessaron" and the Old Testament Peshitta*: JBL 120 (2001) 501-523; Id., *The "Gospel of Barnabas" and the Diatessaron*: HTR 95 (2002) 73-96; Id., *The Dura Parchment and the Diatessaron*: VCh 57 (2003) 159-175; U.B. Schmid, *In Search of Tatian's Diatessaron in the West*: VCh 57 (2003) 176-199; E.J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century, The Case of Tatian*, London 2003.

F. Bolgiani

DICTINIUS. Son of *Symposius of Astorga, and later himself bishop of the same city, renounced the *Priscillianist doctrine at the first Council of *Toledo (400). Composed various treatises (Leo Gr., *Ep.* 15, 16), among them one entitled *Libra*, composed of twelve questions, in analogy with the twelve ounces of the Roman pound. In this work, which *Augustine's *Contra mendacium* gives us information about (3,5; 21,41), it seems that Dictinius, still in his Priscillianist phase, upheld the licitness of lying to hide one's religious doctrines, based on some scriptural texts.

]CPL 797; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila. The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976.

S. Zincone

DIDACHE. The last great commentators on the Didache (J.-P. Audet, R.A. Kraft, S. Giet, K. Niederwimmer and G. Visonà) have rightly pointed out that it is not the homogeneous work of one author, but an anonymous compilation from various sources, derived from the living tradition of well-defined ecclesial communities. An unknown Jewish Christian author, addressing himself to communities in which there were also Christians who had come over from paganism, collected, in a manual, some texts derived from the tradition that seemed to him useful for the edification of converts. Thus he began with the teaching on the *Two Ways, of Life and of Death* (chs. 1,1–6,1), joining it to a block of liturgical traditions on baptism, fasting, prayer and the eucharistic supper (chs. 7–10); he also used sources in the disciplinary (chs. 11–13) and concluding (chs. 14–16) parts of the work.

The richness of the Didache derives from the various elements of the tradition it contains.

1. P. Audet has shown the literary affinities of the *Two Ways* with the Qumran *Manual of Discipline*; this is evident esp. in the *Doctrina apostolorum* (which is not a translation of our Greek Didache) and in chs. 18–20 of the *Epistle of Barnabas.* In fact, it must be stressed that the text of the *Two Ways* in

our Didache does not maintain the dualistic framework of the Qumran teaching; in this it resembles, in certain points, Jewish wisdom literature. The text of the *Two Ways* is no further Christianized except in the addition, at the beginning, of the "evangelical section" (*Did.* 1,3b–2,1), which is missing in a good part of the textual tradition. This is an interesting illustration of the fact that Christian ethics could, in large part, be based on Jewish tradition.

2. The eucharistic prayers of chs. 9–10 are very archaic (it is enough to study their *Christology and eschatology to note this), and are inspired by Jewish table blessings. This kinship constitutes the main argument of those who say that these prayers accompanied a meal (*Did.* 10,1). This may be called a eucharistic supper not only because we find allusions to the Christian *Eucharist in the prayers, but also because, in all likelihood, verse 6 of ch. 10 introduced the communion.

3. Chs. 11–13, on the apostles, prophets and teachers, are of primary importance for determining the milieu in which the Didache originated. These give instruction on Christian hospitality toward itinerant ministers. The organization of the Christian mission reflected in these chapters recalls the situation that we find in W Syria, leading us to place the origin of the Didache in that region, despite other indications that could favor Egypt.

Since the Didache is a compilation from various sources, the question of its date in fact becomes the question of the age of the traditions of which it is composed and the question of the *terminus ante quem* of the final redaction of the work. For the latter, we align ourselves with A. Adam and J.-P. Audet, who maintain that the whole of the work goes back to the 1st c. With this, we rule out the late dating of the work to the 2nd c. or later, on account of a supposed use by the Didache of the NT writings and, eventually, of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd* of Hermas; it also seems to us difficult to maintain the thesis that would spread the history of the redaction of the Didache over the first two centuries.

A. Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, TU 2,1-2, Leipzig 1884; J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè. Instructions des apôtres*, Paris 1958; H. Lietzmann, *Die Didache mit kritischen Apparat*, Berlin [6]1962; R.A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache* (*The Apostolic Fathers, A New Translation and Commentary, III*), New York 1965; U. Mattioli, *La "Didachè," dottrina dei dodici apostoli*, Alba 1969; W. Rordorf - A. Tuilier, *La doctrine des douze Apôtres* (*Didachè*), SC 248bis, Paris [2]1998; A. Adam, *Erwägungen zur Herkunft der Didache*: ZKG 63 (1957) 1-47; A. Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*, Stockholm 1968; F.E. Vokes, *The Didache - Still Debated*: ChQ 3 (1970) 57-62; S. Giet, *L'énigme de la Didachè*, Paris 1970; K. Niederwimmer, *Die Didachè*, Göttingen [3]1993; G. Schöllgen, *Didachè: Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre*, FCh 1, Freiburg 1991; G.N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context,* NovTSup 77, Leiden 1995; J.A. Diaper (ed.), *The Didachè in Modern Research*, AGSU 37, Leiden 1996; G. Visonà, *Didachè. Insegnamento degli Apostoli*, Milan 2000; H. van de Sanat - D. Flusser, *The Didache. Its Jewish Sources and Its Places in Early Judaism and Christianity*, Assen - Minneapolis, MN 2002; A. Milavec, *The Didache*, New York 2003.

W. Rordorf

DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM. Extant in its entirety in Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopic, partially in Latin, and in a few Greek fragments, this church order deals principally with the episcopate and with the duties of the bishop. It has been suggested that the overall purpose of the *Didascalia* is to impose episcopacy and to undermine other forms of leadership, in particular the authority exercised by widows. This may be an overstatement, but certainly part of the redactor's purpose is the consolidation of episcopal authority. In the first edition of this encyclopedia, Nautin suggested that the redactor had used a lost treatise on the threefold order, which was also employed by the redactor of the *Apostolic Church Order.* This is possible, though it is also possible that this treatise was transmitted to the redactor through the means of the *Apostolic Church Order*, as there are echoes of that document throughout the treatise.

Although the whole is addressed to the bishops, numerous topics, such as the Pascha, the importance of teaching trades to children and the origin of heresy are included in what is a rambling and contradictory document made up of numerous strata of tradition. Among the tensions within the treatise, we may note contradictory statements on penance and a chaotic chapter on the Pascha that attempts to combine different paschal chronologies, incorporating a document of *Quartodeciman provenance (though here the textual tradition is extremely complex, as there is a large omission in one manuscript, perhaps representing an attempt to rationalize the situation.)

Beyond directing the bishops, the Didascalist is much exercised by Judaizing tendencies within the communities addressed, leading to polemic against those who keep the Sabbath, and a view of the law of the Old Testament as secondary. This indicates a Syrian provenance; a citation by *Aphraates indicates a *terminus ad quem* of the mid-fourth century, though much of the material may be earlier.

J.V. Bartlet, *Fragments of the Didascalia apostolorum in Greek*: JTS 18 (1917) 301-309; S. Brock - M. Vasey, *The Liturgical Portions of the Didascalia*, Bramcote 1928 (bibl.); R.H. Connolly, *Didascalia apostolorum*, Oxford 1929; E. Tidner, *Didascaliae apostolorum, canonum ecclesiasticorum, traditionis apostolicae versiones Latinae* (TU 75), Berlin 1963; A. Vööbus, *The Didasca-*

lia apostolorum in Syriac (CSCO 401-402, 407-408), Louvain 1979; C. Methuen, *Widows, Bishops and the Struggle for Authority in the* Didascalia apostolorum: JEH 46 (1995) 197-213; G. Schöllgen, *Die Anfänge der Professionalisierung des Klerus und das kirchliche Amt in der Syrischen Didaskalia* (JbAC Ergänzungsband 26), Münster 1998 (bibl.); M. Penn, *Bold and Having No Shame: Ambiguous Widows, Controlling Clergy and Early Syrian Communities*: Hugoye 4 (2001).

S. Stewart-Sykes

DIDASKALEION. The school we know best from classical antiquity is that of *Alexandria. It is likely that the teaching of *Pantaenus and *Clement did not have the official character attributed to it by *Eusebius (*HE* VI, 3,1-3 and 8,1-8), and that the real founder of the school, with *Demetrius, was *Origen. During the time of Origen the school was divided, leaving catechesis to *Heraclas and reserving to Origen the most advanced students (Euseb. *HE* VI, 15). Silent about the succeeding 35 years, Eusebius next mentions Achillas as scholarch (Euseb. *HE* VII, 32,30). *Philip of Side (PG 39, 229) mentions other scholarchs, but this information must be evaluated carefully: following Origen is Heraclas, then *Dionysius, *Pierius,*Theognostus, and others up to *Didymus. It is hard to say, however, whether the school had an official status. In any event, other independent facts suggest that the didaskaleion existed until the episcopate of *Theophilus, run by persons with ties to both the bishop and the monastic community.

Once Origen moved and settled at Caesarea, he resumed teaching (Euseb. *HE* VI, 30): *Gregory Thaumaturgus's *Address of Thanks to Origen* relates his teaching program. At the end of the 3rd c. the school in Caesarea was continued by Pamphilus (Euseb., *Mart. Pal.* IV, 6; V, 2).

G. Bardy, *Aux origines de l'École d'Alexandrie*: RecSR 27 (1937) 65-90; *Pour l'histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*: RBi 50 (1942) 80-109; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo*, Rome 2002, 33-64

E. Prinzivalli

DIDASKALOS. Teacher of catechumens in the early church. The title was customary in Judaism (Rabbi) for designating the teachers of the Law, interpreters of the Torah. In the gospels it is given to *John the Baptist and Jesus. In the NT and in the apostolic fathers the title is rarely used on its own; at times its use is discouraged (Mt 23:8, 10), and it thus fell rapidly into disuse. On the other hand, the trilogy *apostles*, *prophets* and *teachers* is frequent in Paul (1 Cor 12:29; Eph 4:11), and seems characteristic of the missionary center of *Antioch in the mid-1st c. (Acts 13:1: prophets and teachers, presented as itinerant teachers).

A. Lemaire, *Les Ministères aux origines de l'Église*, Paris 1971.

E. Prinzivalli

DIDYMUS the BLIND of Alexandria (313–398). Little is known of the life of this prolific 4th-c. writer. According to *Jerome, he was still alive in 393 (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 109) and was "83 years old." Palladius says that he visited him "four times in 10 years, and he ended his days aged 85" (*Hist. laus.* IV, 1). Since Palladius went to *Alexandria in 388 (I, 1), this suggests that Didymus died in 398; he would therefore have been born between 310 (Jerome) and 313 (Palladius). He lost his vision at four (Pal. *Hist. laus.* IV, 1) or five (Jerome, *Chron.*); his knowledge thus gives evidence of a prodigious memory. *Rufinus of Aquileia presents him as "the teacher of the ecclesiastical school of Alexandria approved by *Athanasius" (*HE* II, 7). Rufinus's mention is confirmed by a fragment of *Philip of Side, an independent source, which inserts Didymus in a succession of scholarchs of the Alexandrian **didaskaleion*: despite some plain errors in Philip's list, the convergence of his information with Rufinus's, and that of external verification with Didymus's own works—in particular with the *Commentary on the Psalms* and that on *Ecclesiastes* found at *Tura, in which Didymus shows himself to be a typical school teacher and reveals his attachment to the local bishop—favor the acceptance of a continuity of Didymus with the *didaskaleion* founded by *Origen and linked to episcopal institutions. The fact that Palladius, speaking of his "cell" (*Hist. laus.* IV,3), suggests that Didymus led a monastic life, does not in the least contradict his role as a teacher of the *didaskaleion*. Early monasticism, esp. in Egypt, took quite different forms from the literary mythology of withdrawal to the desert, and many monks lived in cities. Even granting that Didymus's audience was largely composed of monks (as was the case with Rufinus and Jerome), this in no way alters his teaching which, like Origen's in the great commentaries, is attentive to the rigorous application of proper exegetical method.

Surviving works. Until recently, only the following works of Didymus were known: (1) a treatise *Against the Manichees*, preserved in Greek (PG 39, 1088-1109; the preceding part, cols. 1085-1088, is a later addition); (2) a treatise *On the Holy Spirit* in a Latin translation made by Jerome (PG 39, 1031-1086); (3) fragments of commentaries in the catenae

on the Octateuch and Kings (Devreesse, ST 201, 167-173), on Psalms (Devreesse, ST 264, 147-210; Mühlenberg, PTS 16, II), on Proverbs (PG 39), on Job (PG 39), on John (Reuss, TU 89, 177-186), on Paul's epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians (Staab, *Pauluskommen.*, Münster 1933, 1-44), on Acts (PG 39); (4) a brief commentary on the Catholic epistles, translated into Latin by *Epiphanius Scholasticus at *Cassiodorus's order; some fragments also remain in Greek (PG 39, or Zoepft, *Neutestamentl. Abh.* IV, 1); (5) many other fragments, esp. in *John of Damascus's *Sacra Parallela* (CPG 2544); (6) books 4 and 5 added to *Basil of Caesarea's *Contra Eunomium* (PG 29, 671-768); their attribution to Didymus, initially maintained by Spasskij and Funk, was confirmed in 1937 when J. Lebon found a fragment of them cited under Didymus's name (*Muséon*, [1937] 61-83). In 1941 an important find of papyri at Tura, near Cairo, gave us other commentaries by Didymus: on Genesis (Nautin-Doutreleau, SC 233 and 244); on Job (Heinrichs - Hagedorn - Koenen, PTA 1-4); on Zechariah (Doutreleau, SC 83, 84, 85); on Psalms (PTA 4,6,7,8,12); and on Ecclesiastes (PTA 9,13,16,22,25). In fact, all of the works found at Tura are anonymous. The attribution of the first three to Didymus does not present problems: attribution of the commentary on Genesis to him is suggested by a comparison with the catena of *Procopius; that on Job by a comparison with the *Sacra Parallela* and the catena of Nicetas; that on Zechariah by a comparison with Jerome's homonymous work, upon which Didymus's text significantly depends. Difficulties have arisen concerning the last two, however. Both are written in a sloppy style proper to oral address, and for both, comparison with the corresponding catenae, though showing conceptual affinities between the interpretations, contains no passages that can be superimposed linguistically. Further comparison, however, leads to the clear conclusion that both texts are from the same author; the linguistic affinities and the very numerous conceptual parallels, almost paraphrases, would be otherwise inexplicable. The text of the catenae is already polished for publication, whereas that of Tura was produced at a different time, transcribed by a tachygrapher without revision and later recopied; it reproduces Didymus's lectures, including students' questions.

A contested attribution. De Trinitate: In the 18th c. the Mingarelli brothers published under Didymus's name a work in three books on the Trinity, preserved in Greek in a manuscript of the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome; the beginning and end are missing, such that the author's name was lost (PG 39, 269-992). They made use of Socrates (*HE* IV, 25), who mentions a *De Trinitate* by Didymus in three books, but the text presents very clear differences of style and substance with respect to the commentaries on Genesis, Job and Zechariah found at Tura (L. Doutreleau: RecSR 45 [1957] 514-557); we must therefore be cautious in attributing this treatise to Didymus. The contrary argument adopted by L. Koenen: *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 17 (1960) 83-105, is unconvincing.

Other works mentioned by ancient authors. Didymus himself, in *De Spiritu Sancto* and in the commentary on Zechariah, and later authors mention many other works composed by him (see Bardy, *Didyme l'aveugle* and L. Doutreleau, SC 83, 119-126). The most important are a commentary on Isaiah in 24 books (dedicated to Jerome); others on Matthew, John and the Apocalypse; the treatises on the *Virtues*, on *Sects* (or ?) on *Opinions*, on the *Son* (of God), on the *death of children* (requested by Rufinus) and an *Apologia* for Origen's *De Principiis.*

Didymus, both in his exegesis and his doctrine (the preexistence of souls and apokatastasis), depends closely on Origen, but knew how to rework the latter's thought in light of opponents' objections.

CPG 2544-2572 (see also Supp.); PG 39, 131-1818; L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle, Sur Zacharie*, SC 83-85, Paris 1962; *Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*: PTA 9 (1969), 13 (1970), 16 (1972), 22 (1977); P. Nautin - L. Doutreleau, *Sur la Genèse. Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura*, SC 233 and 244, Paris 1976 and 1978; E. Staimer, *Die Schrift "De Spiritu Sancto" von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien*, Munich 1960; A. Gesché, *La christologie du "Commentaire sur les Psaumes" découvert à Toura*, Gembloux 1962; L. Béranger, *Sur deux énigmes du "De Trinitate" de Didyme l'Aveugle*: RecSR 51 (1963) 255-267; A. Kehl, *Der Psalmenkommentar von Tura, Quaternion IX*, Cologne 1964; W.A. Bienert, *"Allegoria" und "Anagoge" bei Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandria*, Berlin 1972; A. Heron, *Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind*, Diss. Tübingen 1972; J. Tigcheler, *Didyme l'Aveugle et l'exégèse allégorique*, Nijmegen 1977; M.-J. Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier (III-V siècles)*, I-II, Rome 1982-1985; M. Simonetti, *Lettera e allegoria nell'esegesi veterotestamentaria di Didimo*: VetChr 20 (1983) 341-389; *Didymiana*: VetChr 21 (1984) 129-155; E. Prinzivalli, *Didimo il Cieco e l'interpretazione dei Salmi*, Rome - L'Aquila 1988; Id., *Magister ecclesiae*, 33-64; M. Ghattas, *Die Christologie Didymus' des Blinden von Alexandria in den Schriften von Tura*, Münster 2002; Id., *Didimo il Cieco, Lezioni sui Salmi: Il Commento ai Salmi scoperto a Tura*, Alba 2005.

E. Prinzivalli

DIGAMY. This term—like trigamy, tetragamy, polygamy—was applied in the primitive church not to simultaneous marriages, but successive. In fact simultaneous marriages could not exist under Roman law, since to contract a new marriage, in itself a sign of the failure of the *affectio maritalis*, meant the au-

tomatic dissolution of the earlier marriage. The term thus indicated marriage after divorce or widowhood. In this sense the second, third or fourth marriage was not condemned, and indeed was rather common among the Romans, in certain cases even imposed (for celibate, widowed or divorced men between 25-60 and without children) by Augustus's matrimonial laws, which also applied to women between 20-50. This was the case until 320 (CTh 8,16,1; but also later under Majorian: *Nov. Mai.* 6,5), esp. in the case of a husband's death, after a period of mourning of at least ten or twelve months. Even so, in inscriptions the title *univira* ("woman with one husband") was highest praise. The fact that, except in *Justin, *1 Apol.* 15, 3-4, and Athenagoras, *Leg.* 3, we do not know of cases in which "marriage" after divorce was effectual and certain, whereas a new marriage during widowhood is continually attested (see, e.g., Orig., *Frr.* 27 and 35 on *1 Cor.*; *Philosophumena* 9,12), does not of itself mean that the practice did not exist in Christianity: there are passages in which the practice is uncertain, which new studies interpret in the sense of a genuine new marriage for divorced people. It is thus difficult to say with certainty who are the *digamoi* with whom, according to *Nicaea, *can.* 8, the *Novatianists must reestablish communion. According to Crouzel they would be only those "remarried during widowhood," based on Epiphanius's *Panarion* 59, without Holl's correction in GCS; accepting the correction, it could also include those "remarried after divorce."

While remarriage after divorce may therefore have been permitted, multiple marriages because of widowhood were punishable in Asia Minor: Laodicea, *can.* 1; Basil, *Epist.* 188,4, in which, even though there was a one-year punishment for digamy (two years, according to others), the second marriage was still accepted; the punishment for trigamy, on the other hand, was exclusion from the community for 3-5 years, since such unions could not be considered marriages, but only "limited fornications" (*porneia kekolasmenē*), in reference to the Lord's words (Jn 4:18); at the same time, they were not condemned more harshly because they were preferable to unlimited fornication (Basil, *Epist.* 199,50). Elsewhere polygamy was not punished, even if not encouraged: it was reproved as being opposed to the precepts of Gen 2:23-24, and was not justified by the impossibility of observing continence. Arguments advanced by digamists, such as being unable to administer their goods, control their slaves or represent their household in public, were rejected as invalid (Jer., *Epist.* 123,13; John Chrys., *Reg. fem.* 7; *Non iter. coniug.* 4). According to *John Chrysostom, those who have remarried are despised by all (*Virg.* 37,1). While not condemned without appeal, therefore, but tolerated based on Rom 7:2-3 and 1 Cor 7:39-40, in theory polygamists were absolutely excluded from the clergy, although according to *Jerome the number of remarried bishops in his day was greater than the number of participants at the Council of *Rimini (*Epist.* 69,2).

H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce*, Paris 1971; A. Metro, Binas nuptias constituere *in D.3.2.1.*: Iura 26 (1975) 101-108; G. Cereti, *Divorzio, nuove nozze e penitenza nella Chiesa primitiva*, Bologna 1977; H. Crouzel, *Les* digamoi *visés par le concile de Nicée dans son canon 8*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 533-545; R. Macina, *Pour éclairer le terme* digamoi: RSR 61 (1987) 54-73; A. Arjava, *Women and Law in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 1996.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

DIOCLETIAN, emperor (d. ca. 313). Of very humble Dalmatian origin, Diocletian fought as an officer in the emperor Numerian's army when the latter was killed in 284, at the end of an unfortunate Persian campaign. Diocletian publicly accused the praetorian prefect Aprus of the crime and had him executed, and the soldiers acclaimed him emperor at Chalcedon. The other emperor, Carinus, Numerian's brother, moved against him and defeated him in Pannonia, but was killed by his own soldiers after the battle. Diocletian, remaining sole lord, and appointed his companion-in-arms *Maximian as coemperor in the West, giving him the title of Caesar, in 286 conferring upon him the dignity of Augustus. The organization Diocletian gave to the state (tetrarchy) provided for the subdivision of the empire between four sovereigns (two with the higher rank of Augustus and two with the inferior rank of Caesar), and the introduction of an elective, rather than hereditary, principle of succession. This complex system, which maintained a hierarchy not only between the Augusti and the Caesars, but also between the two Augusti (with Diocletian at the summit of power), was reinforced by a religious aura and organized on the model of the Eastern monarchies: all that pertained to the person of the emperor (*dominus noster*) and all court institutions had a sacred character. In 287 Diocletian took the title of *Iovius*, descendent of Jupiter, giving his colleague that of *Herculius* (i.e., of the stock of Hercules). The two Caesars, Galerius and *Constantius Chlorus, appointed in 293, were each invested with the name of their own Augustus, as if to constitute two dynastic lines of divine descent. None of the sovereigns chose *Rome as a capital: Diocletian's seat

was Nicomedia, Maximian's *Milan.

Diocletian's reforms involved nearly every area of state organization: administration, finance, the economy, the army. His notorious persecution was the last systematic sanguinary action against the Christians in Roman imperial history. It took place in the last years of his reign, beginning in 303: the four edicts condemning Christian worship, which were preceded by an anti-Manichean persecution, should be seen as part of an effort to restore the unity of the state, whose religious cohesion was threatened by the incessant progress of Christianity. Diocletian abdicated in 305, forcing his colleague Maximian to do the same. He spent the last years of life at *Salona (near today's Spalato, Split), where the remains of his palace still exist; he returned briefly to public life in 308 in an attempt to restore the tetrarchical order, already in crisis shortly after his abdication.

G. Costa, Diz. Ep. II, 3, Rome 1961, 1793-1908 (= Id., *Il Dalmata fatale*); W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie I, Guerres et réformes*, Paris 1946; W. Ensslin, PWK VII A 2, 1948, 2419-2495; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari [2]1973, 586-599; on the Diocletianean fiscal reform, see A. Déléage, *La capitation du bas-empire*, Mâcon 1945; on the persecution, H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'Empire Romain*, Brussels [2]1964; T.D. Barnes, *New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, Cambridge 1982; S. Williams, *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*, New York 1985; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 266-271; S. Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs. Imperial Pronouncements and Government AD 284–324*, Oxford 1996; W. Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie: das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284-313 n. Chr.)*, Frankfurt am Main 2001.

M. Forlin Patrucco

DIODORE of Tarsus (d. before 394). A native of *Antioch and pupil of *Silvanus of Tarsus and *Eusebius of Emesa, Diodore completed his studies at Athens. A monk and then priest in his city, he had occasion to dispute with the emperor *Julian (362–363). In the Antiochene schism he sided with *Meletius, and with *Flavian he headed the Meletian community after Meletius was exiled—first by *Constantius II and then by *Valens—until he too was exiled to *Armenia (372). After Valens's death he was ordained bishop of Tarsus (378) and played a prominent part in the Council of *Constantinople of 381. He died before 394, when his fame as an exegete and theologian was great. At the time of the *Nestorian controversy, however, he was considered among Nestorius's precursors and was subjected to violent attacks, including some by *Cyril, until he too became involved, though only indirectly, in the condemnation of the *Three Chapters (553).

The condemnation led to the disappearance of all of his writings, which from various sources (*Jerome, Ebedjesu, *Suidas) we know to have been very numerous, and of which only fragments remain, with perhaps one exception (see below). Astronomy was the subject of *Against the Astronomers, the Astrologers and Fate* and other works (among them one against Aristotle's "fifth substance") against determinism and astral fatalism in defense of divine providence. A great many doctrinal works were directed against pagan philosophical doctrines on God, nature, matter (*Against Plato on God and the Gods*; *On Nature and Matter*; *On God and the False Matter of the Greeks*); against Arians and Macedonians (*On the Unity of God*; *On the Holy Spirit*); some addressed other theological problems (*On the Resurrection of the Dead; On the Soul*). Very important was his *Against the Synousiasts*, i.e., the Apollinarists, since it was in polemic with them that the Antiochenes most stressed the distinction between divinity and humanity in Christ, thus incurring the charge of Nestorianism *ante litteram.*

Diodore was the head of an important school of scriptural exegesis and can be considered the true founder of the Antiochene exegetical school. *Theodore of Mopsuestia and perhaps *John Chrysostom were his pupils. We know that he wrote commentaries on a good number of the books of the OT and NT, and a theoretical work *On the Difference Between Theory and Allegory.* He reacted against what he considered the excessive allegorism of the Alexandrians, proposing a predominantly literal appreciation of the sacred text, without however excluding *theoria*, i.e., the possibility of seeing some OT episodes as typological and prophetic anticipations of the events of Christ and the church. The few surviving fragments that were known until 1980 show him to be a convinced literalist, with a tendency to highlight the overall meaning of the books he interpreted and to harmonize the interpretation of individual details of the text with these general criteria.

In 1980 publication began of a complete *Commentary on the Psalms* (Psalms 1–50 and an introduction to Psalm 118), previously unpublished and of disputed attribution. Olivier, the editor, adduces good reasons for sustaining Diodore's authorship. The commentary on the biblical text is conducted according to the typical canons of Antiochene interpretation in a strict sense, which are expounded in detail in the general introduction to the *Commentary on the Psalms* and in the introduction to Psalm 118.

CPG II, 3815-3822; CCG 6 (*Com. Ps.* 1-50); Quasten II, 400-404 (bibl.); J. Deconinck, *Essai sur la chaîne de l'Octateuque avec*

une édition des Commentaires de Diodore de Tarse, Paris 1912; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Münster 1933, 83-112; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (ST 201), Vatican City 1959, 155-167; E. Schweizer, *Diodor von Tarsus als Exeget*: ZNTW 40 (1941–1942) 33-75; R. Abramowski, *Den theologische Nachlass des Diodor von Tarsus*: ZNTW 42 (1949) 19-69; G. Bounoure, *Eusèbe citateur de Diodore*: REG 95 (1982) 433-439; M. Simonetti, *Interpretazione delle rubriche e destinazione dei salmi nei "Commentarii in Psalmos" di Diodoro*: ASE 2 (1985) 79-92; J.R. Pouchet, *Les rapports de Basile de Césarée avec Diodore de Tarse*: BLE 1986 (243-272); J.M. Olivier, *Un fragment palimpseste du "Commentaire" de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes ("Vindob. Theol. gr. 177," X^{e} s.)*: RHT 18 (1988), 233-241; S. Zincone, *Studi sulla visione dell'Uomo in ambito antiocheno: Diodoro, Crisostomo, Teodoro, Teodoreto*, L'Aquila-Rome 1988; J.J. O'Keefe, *"A Letter that Killeth": Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms*: JECS 8 (2000).

M. SIMONETTI

DIOGNETUS, Letter to. A manuscript, conventionally known as MS F, was discovered by chance at *Constantinople ca. 1436. It contained various works, mostly apologetic, five of which were erroneously attributed to *Justin; the last of these erroneously attributed works was entitled *To Diognetus*. Stephanus, in his *editio princeps* (1592), was the first to describe it as a letter, probably because it was addressed to a person identified only as Diognetus; in fact the work fits—if only in the broadest sense—in the apologetic tradition, and develops and concludes with an exhortation to embrace the Christian faith.

After various wanderings, MS F—the only witness to *To Diognetus*—arrived at the Strasbourg Municipal Library, where it remained until it was destroyed in 1870 by a Prussian artillery bombardment. Before its destruction, however, two accurate recensions were made by Cunitz and Reuss, based on MS F.

Structurally, the text of *To Diognetus*—which has two lacunae, in ch. VII and after ch. X—opens with an introduction in which the author proposes to respond to some questions on Christianity posed to him by the pagan Diognetus; after a rapid and essential refutation of pagan idolatry and the ritualistic practices of Jewish worship (chs. II-IV), he goes on to a positive exposition of the Christian mystery, lived by the faithful in the concrete circumstances of daily life through the testimony of love toward all, even in imminent persecution (chs. V-VI). The author emphasizes the transcendence of revelation and the economy of salvation, which culminates in the incarnation of the Word and his redemptive sacrifice: acceptance of God's saving message is shown by returning his love, imitating his goodness by rejecting all selfishness, oppression and violence, and so establishing already on earth the eschatological atmosphere of the Kingdom of God (chs. VII-X). Ch. VI is deservedly famous: the author presents the life-giving action of Christians in the world, comparing it to the soul's function in the body. The final chapters, XI-XII, which develop a discourse on the Logos and stress the indissoluble unity between knowledge and life through a penetrating allegorical interpretation of Gen 2:9, are considered inauthentic by many scholars, even recent ones, who ascribe them to a later age and a different author; their arguments are neither decisive nor fully convincing, as Marrou validly asserted in his edition of *To Diognetus* (SC 33 bis, 219ff.). Attempts to identify the work's author or the probably fictitious recipient have been vain; its date of composition is thought to be late 2nd c. or at the latest early 3rd c., perhaps in *Alexandria; Asia Minor or *Rome have also been hypothesized (Norelli).

PG 2, 1168B-1185B. Of fundamental importance is the ed. of J.C.Th. von Otto (*Corpus apologetarum christianorum* III, Ienae ^{3}1879, 158-210). We also mention those of C.C.J. Bunsen (London 1854), O. von Gebhardt (Leipzig ^{2}1878), J.R. Harmer (London ^{2}1893), F.X. Funk (Tübingen ^{2}1901), J. Geffcken (Heidelberg 1928), E.H. Blakeney (London 1943), H.G. Meecham (Manchester 1949), H.-I. Marrou (Paris ^{2}1965, SC 33bis). Many translations into modern languages exist, e.g., the Eng. and Fr. of the cited eds. of Meecham and Marrou, the Ger. tr. of G. Rauschen (BKV2, 12, Kempten-Munich 1913, 159-173) and the Sp. tr. of D. Ruiz Bueno (BAC 65, Madrid ^{4}1979, 813-860). Italian translations include those of E. Buonaiuti (Rome 1921), G. Bosio (*I Padri Apostolici*, II, CPS, Turin 1942, 289-333), L. Leone (Lecce 1972), A. Quacquarelli (*I Padri Apostolici*, CTP 5, Rome ^{2}1978, 353-363), S. Zincone (Rome ^{2}1981), E. Norelli (Letture cristiane del primo millennio 11, Milan 1991). For the ample bibliography on *To Diognetus*, see in particular the editions of Meecham and of Marrou; we note here some studies more recent than the second edition of Marrou or not reported in it: J.B. Bauer, *An Diognet VI*: VChr 17 (1963) 207-210; M.G. Mara, *Osservazioni sull'"Ad Diognetum"*: SMSR 35 (1964) 267-279; S. Pétrement, *Valentin est-il l'auteur de l'Épître à Diognète?*: RHPhR 46 (1966) 34-62; G. Jossa, *Melitone e l'A Diogneto*: AIIS 2 (1969-70) 89-109; W. Eltester, *Das Mysterium des Christentums. Anmerkungen zum Diognetbrief*: ZNTW 61 (1970) 278-293; J.T. Lienhard, *The Christology of the Epistle to Diognetus*: VChr 24 (1970) 280-289; V. Messana, *Il topos dell'ironia platonica in Ad Diognetum 1-4*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 489-495; R. Brändle, *Die Ethik den "Schrift an Diognet." Eine Wiederaufnahme paulinischer und johanneischer Theologie am Ausgang des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Zürich 1975; A.L. Townsley, *Notes for an Interpretation of the Epistle to Diognetus*: RSC 24 (1976) 5-20; M. Rizzi, *La questione dell'unità dell'"Ad Diognetum,"* Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 16, Milan 1989; F. Blanchetière, *Au cœur de la cité: le chrétien philosophe selon l'à Diognète 5-6*, RSR 63 (1989) 183-194; A. Urbán, *Concordantia in Epistulam ad Diognetum*, Concordantia in Patres Apostolicos I, Alpha-Omega, Reihe A, CXXXV, Hildesheim - Zürich - New York 1993; K. Schneider, *Die Stellung der Juden und Christen in der Welt nach dem Diognetbrief*: JbAC 42 (1999) 20-41.

S. ZINCONE

DIONYSIUS, pope (259/260?–267/268?). Dionysius was a respected presbyter under *Sixtus II; *Dionysius of Alexandria wrote to him regarding the administration of baptism by heretics (Euseb., *HE* VII, 5,6). Under *Gallienus, who had restored to the Christians the churches expropriated by *Valerian, Dionysius, himself now a bishop, reorganized the Roman community. At the request of Libyan presbyters, he called a synod which condemned both *Sabellius and the tendency—called *Marcionite—to break the divine monarchy into three *hypostases; he communicated these decisions to Dionysius of Alexandria, accused by the presbyters of tritheism (DS 112-115). The Alexandrian bishop justified his trinitarian theology by further explaining the possible use of ὁμοούσιος, which he had previously rejected (see Athan., *Sent. Dion.*). According to *Basil (*Ep.* 70), Dionysius helped the communities of *Cappadocia, devastated by foreign invaders. He never received the letter of the Synod of *Antioch that had condemned *Paul of Samosata (Euseb., *HE* VII, 7). Not unjustly is he considered one of the most important popes of the 3rd c.

BS 4, 631f.; G.C. Stead, *Divine Substance*, Oxford 1977, 216-222; W.A. Bienert, *Das vornicaenische homoousios als Ausdruck der Rechtgläubigkeit*: ZKG 90 (1979) 151-175; Id., *Dionysius von Alexandrien*, Berlin 1978, esp. 220f.; M. Simonetti, *Ancora su homoousios. A proposito di due recenti studi*: VetChr 17 (1980) 85-98; L. Abramowski, *Dionysius of Rome († 268) and Dionysius of Alexandria († 264/5)*, in Id., *Formula and Context*, London 1992, n. 11; G. Schaiger: LTK[3] 3, 246; RGG[4] 2, 863; U. Heil, *Athanasius von Alexandrien, De sententia Dionysii*: PTS 52, Berlin 1999; LACL (2002) 208. – See studies on Dionysius of Alexandria, such as TRE 8 (1981) 767-771 (bibl.).

B. Studer

DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS (d. ca. 545). A native of the Roman province of *Scythia Minor* (Dobrudja), Dionysius lived as a monk at *Rome from ca. 500–ca. 545; out of humility, he loved to call himself *Exiguus* ("the Little"). His friend *Cassiodorus eulogized him in *Inst.* 1, 23. With a consummate knowledge of Greek and Latin, he was one of the principal mediators of Greek ecclesiastical culture in the West; for his work as translator, canonist and *computist he must be considered one of the founders of medieval culture. Among his translations from Greek into Latin are the *Vita Pachomii* included in the *Vitae Patrum* (PL 73, 227-282), the *Historia inventionis capitis S. Iohannis Baptistae*; *Gregory of Nyssa's *De creatione hominis*, *Proclus of Constantinople's *Tomus ad Armenos*; the *Epistola Synodica S. Cyrilli et Concilii Alexandrini contra Nestorium* and two letters of *Cyril of Alexandria to Bishop *Succensus of Diocaesarea in Isauria, in support of his fellow Scythian monks living at Rome, who defended the *theopaschite formulae. Attribution to Dionysius of the *Exempla Patrum*, a florilegium of 99 sentences on the theopaschite question, is disputed.

Dionysius's fame in the Middle Ages was linked to his *Codex canonum ecclesiasticorum*, a collection of Greek and Latin canons, for which he can be considered the founder of Canon Law. According to *Cassiodorus, *Inst.* I, 23, the collection was made at the request of Bishop Stephen of Salona. In his dedicatory letter Dionysius explains its composition: at the beginning he put 50 apostolic canons, followed by the 165 canons universally recognized by the Greek church, i.e., those of the Councils of *Nicaea, *Ancyra, *Neocaesarea, *Gangra, *Antioch, *Laodicea and *Constantinople; then 27 canons of the Council of *Chalcedon; and finally 20 canons of the Council of *Serdica and 138 of the Council of *Carthage of 419. Under Pope *Symmachus (498–514)—as we deduce from his preface to Julian, presbyter of the church of St. Anastasia—Dionysius brought together "*Praeteritorum Sedis Apostolicae praesulum constituta*," i.e., the Decretals of popes *Siricius (384–399) and *Anastasius II (496–498). This collection of Decretals was later joined to a second edition of the *Codex canonum ecclesiasticorum* to form the collection known as the *Dionysiana*. Finally, commissioned by Pope *Hormisdas (514–523), Dionysius incorporated the Greek synodal canons into a Greek-Latin collection, of which only the preface remains.

Dionysius's work in the field of ecclesiastical computus also aroused great interest: the *Libellus de cyclo magno Paschalae*, the *Argumenta paschalia*, the *Epistola ad Bonifatium primicerium et Bonum secundicerium de ratione Paschae*, all of which effectively contributed to the acceptance of the Alexandrian 19-year Easter cycle in the West. Following Cyril of Alexandria's Easter Table from 532 to 626, he replaced the era of *Diocletian with the Christian era, taking as his starting-point the birth of Christ, which he placed on 25 December of the year 753 from the foundation of Rome; he thus postponed the real date of Christ's birth by at least four years.

Updated bibl. in Patrologia 4, 192; C. Gallagher, *Church Law and Order in Rome and Byzantium. A Comparative Study*, Brookfield, VT 2002; CPPM III/A 770-775.

V. Loi - B. Amata

DIONYSIUS of Alexandria (d. ca. 265). We know almost nothing of Dionysius's life prior to his election as bishop of *Alexandria in 248. A phrase from

one of his letters seems to indicate that he was well off and had a brilliant civil career before entering the clergy (Euseb., *HE* 7, 11,18); his writings also show that he was educated. *Eusebius says (*HE* 6, 29,47) that he was a disciple of *Origen, and that before succeeding *Heraclas as bishop, he had succeeded him as head of the city's catechetical school. Whereas Eusebius artificially reconstructs a succession of teachers for the period before Origen, for the period after him, given the multiple attestations concerning the catechetical school and its teachers, a skepticism in principle does not seem to be warranted; the school therefore continued at least until Dionysius.

Events become clearer after his promotion to the episcopate. During the same year a persecution broke out against the Christians in the city, followed in 249 by a civil war and an epidemic; Dionysius, hidden within the city, described the events in various letters. *Decius became emperor shortly thereafter (September 249) and issued an edict ordering all citizens to sacrifice to the empire's gods. Dionysius then left Alexandria to hide in Mareotis, then in the Libyan desert. This flight would cost him—like *Cyprian—an attack by the martyrs, a fact which explains his position in the subsequent controversies. In March 251 two rival bishops were elected at *Rome: *Cornelius, accused of having bought a certificate of sacrifice (*libellus*) instead of confessing the faith, and *Novatian, who preached severity against those who had been weak in confessing the faith during the persecution; Dionysius declared at once for Cornelius. Another controversy broke out between Cornelius's second successor *Stephen (254–257) and Cyprian of Carthage over the way of readmitting Christians baptized by the *Novatianists to the church: Stephen, more benevolent toward the Novatianists, was content with the imposition of hands, whereas Cyprian considered their baptism null, rebaptizing them. Informed by Cyprian, Dionysius took his side in the many letters he sent to Rome under Stephen and his successor *Sixtus II (257–258).

At the same time as this controversy, another regarding the Trinity arose in the Libyan *Pentapolis, where the bishop of Ptolemais was accused by his colleagues of *Sabellianism. Dionysius's anti-Sabellian intervention led him to be accused by members of his own community of Alexandria to Sixtus's successor *Dionysius of Rome (259–268), who sent to the church of Alexandria a letter against their bishop. Dionysius of Alexandria vindicated himself in a *Refutation and apologia* in four books, fragments of which were cited by *Athanasius in his treatise *De sententia Dionysii*. Finally, ca. 265, Dionysius was asked to go to *Antioch to judge the bishop of that city, *Paul of Samosata; he declined the invitation, citing age and infirmity. He died shortly after, in 264 or 265. He is the author of an Easter canon (*HE* VII, 20) and some lost works, one of which, *On the Promises*, held that John's Apocalypse was not written by the apostle and evangelist of that name (*HE* VII, 24-26; III 28, 3-4).

CPG 1550-1610; *Catena Hauniensis in Ecclesiasten in qua saepe exegesis seruatur Dionysii Alexandrini nunc primum edita ab Antonio Labate*, Turnhout 1992. For Dionysius's life, see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* books VI and VII passim; P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens*, Paris 1961, 143-165 (his correspondence with Rome); for his works, W.A. Bienert, *Dionysius von Alexandrien* (PTS 21), Berlin 1978; M. Sordi, *Dionisio di Alessandria e le vicende della persecuzione di Valeriano in Egitto*, in *Paradoxos politeia, Studi Lazzati*, Milan 1980, 288-295; H. Pietras, *L'unità di Dio in Dionigi*: Gregorianum 72 (1991) 459-490; Id., *Il fondamento ecclesiologico della posizione di Dionigi di Alessandria nella controversia battesimale*, in *Recherches et tradition. Mél. H. Crouzel*, Paris 1992, 199-210; A. Labate, *Il recupero del Commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Dionigi Alessandrino attraverso le catene bizantine*: Koinonia 16 (1992) 53-74; M. Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo*, Rome 1993, 273-297; Y. Tissot, *Le rapt de Denys d'Alexandrie et la chronologie de ses "Lettres festales"*: RHPhR 77 (1997) 51-65; LACL3 201-203; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister Ecclesiae: il dibattito su Origene tra terzo e quarto secolo*, Rome 2002, 33-64.

P. Nautin - E. Prinzivalli

DIONYSIUS of Corinth. Our only chronological certainty about this bishop of *Corinth is that he wrote to Bishop *Soter of Rome (166–175). *Eusebius had eight letters written by Dionysius and one addressed to him; he cites or summarizes them in *HE* 4, 23. They show that Dionysius was consulted by the bishops of *Pontus on the problem of whether converts from every kind of sin should be accepted into the church; Dionysius responded affirmatively. He was denounced to Pope Soter, who reproved him. He then wrote to Soter specifying and defending his positions, adding to his letter those he had written earlier on the same problem—thus these letters survive.

P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens*, Paris 1961, 13-32.

P. Nautin

DIONYSIUS of Milan. Bishop of *Milan in 355, when the council was held there in which the anti-*Arian majority yielded to the pressure of the pro-Arians and that of Emperor *Constantius and subscribed *Athanasius's condemnation. Dionysius was among the very few who refused, for which he was deposed—and replaced by *Auxentius—and

exiled to *Armenia, where he soon died. *Ambrose, shortly after his election as bishop of *Milan, obtained with *Basil's help the return of Dionysius's relics from *Armenia.

DHGE 14,263; PCBE II/1, 563-565.

M. SIMONETTI

DIONYSIUS (Denis or Denys) of Paris (d. 250?). According to the oldest *passio* (BHL 2171, ca. 250?) Dionysius was sent to *Gaul by Pope *Clement, St. Peter's successor, to evangelize the people there. He preached at Paris, where he was beheaded, as attested by *Venantius Fortunatus (*carm.* 11) and *Gregory of Tours (*hist.* 1,30); the latter, however, puts his martyrdom at the time of *Decius (249–250). The Gallican version of *Mart. hier.* puts his feast 9 October and makes Rusticus and *Eleutherus his companions in martyrdom. At St. *Geneviève's initiative, in the 5th c. a basilica was built over Dionysius's tomb, in which the Merovingian kings were later buried. A second Passion (BHL 2178), written ca. 800, identified Dionysius with *Dionysius the Areopagite, St. *Paul's disciple (*At* 17,34), making him a headless martyr—a very popular motif in iconography. In the life (BHL 2175) of Abbot Hilduin (814–840) he was identified with the author of mystical works known as the Areopagite. This life became canonical for the entire Middle Ages, though even then some scholars (e.g., Abelard) had doubts.

BHL 2172-2203; BS 4, 650-661; LMA 3, 1077-1079; BBKL 1, 1325-1326; R.J. Loenertz, *La Légende parisienne de S. Denys l'Areopagite*: AB 69 (1951) 217-237; M. Zender, *Die Verehrung des hl. D. v. P. in Kirche und Volk: Festschrift F. Petri*, Bonn 1970, 528-551.

S. SAMULOWITZ

DIONYSIUS of Tell-Mahre (d. 845). *Monophysite (*Jacobite) patriarch. He was a monk of the convent of Qenneshrin until it was burned down by the Muslims (815); he then moved to Kaisun. Ordained deacon, priest and bishop on three successive days, he succeeded Cyriac in 818. The monks of Gubba opposed him for his suppression from the *liturgy of the words "we break the heavenly bread," setting up first Abraham and then Simeon (837) as patriarchs in opposition to him. More than once—even traveling to Baghdad and Egypt—he had to plead the cause of Christians, brutally oppressed by the Muslims. He wrote a *Chronicle* (lost) in two parts (16 books), covering the years 582–843; we have some direct fragments, citations in Bar-Hebraeus and Michael the Syrian and extracts in the *Chronicon* of 1234. He died 22 August 845.

R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque*, Paris 1907 (repr. 1970), 388f.; EC 4, 1670; DHGE 14,310 (with ample bibliography); I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia syriaca*, Rome 1965, 220; LTK 3, 404f.

A. DE NICOLA

DIONYSIUS the AREOPAGITE (pseudo) (4th-5th c.).

I. The Dionysian question - II. Surviving works - III. Other writings - IV. Relation to the Platonic tradition and earlier patristics - V. Theology.

I. The Dionysian question. The identity of the author who, under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite—mentioned in Acts 17:34—composed the works known as the *Corpus Areopagiticum* (or *Dionysiacum*), is still a mystery. Dionysius the Areopagite was first officially mentioned by the Severian *monophysites and by Bishop *Hypatius of Ephesus at the meeting between *Chalcedonian *Catholics and *Severian *monophysites at *Constantinople in 532: while the Severians appealed to this author to prove the orthodoxy of their doctrine, Hypatius doubted the authenticity of his writings (E. Schwartz, ACO IV 2, 172-173).

Although throughout the Middle Ages the author of the *Corpus* was effectively venerated as St. Paul's disciple, Hypatius's position was not completely isolated: I. Hausherr has collected evidence of scholars who seem not to have believed that the *Corpus* belonged to the apostolic age: some unknown 6th-c. authors, along with *Photius, *Aretas, Peter of Damascus, *John of Antioch, *Joseph Hazzaia (8th-c. Syrian writer) and Simeon Petritsi (13th-c. Georgian monk: OCP 2 [1936] 484-490).

It was during the Renaissance, however, that the legend of Dionysius the Areopagite was decisively debunked by Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus. Although apologists for the authenticity of the *Corpus* have not been lacking from the Renaissance until our own time, esp. among the French (who were compelled to identify the Dionysius the Areopagite of Acts 17:34 not only with the author of the *Corpus*, but also with the first bishop of Paris), Valla and Erasmus's thesis was adopted and furthered by 17th-c. scholars such as Le Quien, Le Nourry and Daillé, and is now universally accepted. The parallel studies of H. Koch and J. Stiglmayr served, if not to give the author a face, at least to specify his chronology with sufficient approximation. They in fact showed how the part of the fourth chapter of *De div. nom.* dedicated to the prob-

lem of evil depended on Proclus's *De malorum subsistentia*; the author of the *Corpus* thus had to be either a contemporary of Proclus (d. 485) or shortly later than him. In another work, J. Stiglmayr further specified the chronology of the *Corpus* to between 482 (date of the *Henotikon*) and the early 6th c. (*Das Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen* . . . , Feldkirch 1895). It seems valid to conclude that the author of the *Corpus* was a Syrian Christian who lived long at Athens, where he enthusiastically followed—and was profoundly influenced by—the courses of *Proclus and *Damascius. An indication of his affective ties to Athens is his choice as a pseudonym, among the many options, of the Athenian Dionysius the Areopagite, and that in the titles of his works he calls himself the bishop of Athens. In the 5th c. the Athenian school was frequented by various Syrians: Damascius was from Damascus; Salustius, Odenathus, Uranius, Hilary and Mara were of Syrian origin; Marinus, Proclus's successor, was a Palestinian who abandoned Judaism for Hellenism (*Vita Is.* 141, p. 196). The author of the *Corpus* must have been part of this circle.

II. Surviving works. The *Celestial Hierarchy*, in fifteen chapters, organizes the various categories of angels named by the OT and by St. Paul into a rigid hierarchical system regulated by well-defined laws.

The *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, in seven chapters, describes and allegorically interprets the liturgical functions of initiation into the Christian religion (ch. 2), *Mass and the sacrament of the *Eucharist (ch. 3), the consecration of the unguent (ch. 4) and the various funeral rites (ch. 7); and examines the hierarchical structure of the church, image of the celestial hierarchy (*Cael. hier.* I, 3,121C2-4). The visible head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is the bishop (ἱεράρχης), who transmits initiation to members of lower rank, who in turn transmit it to the lowest ranks: these can thus turn toward the higher, as happens in the celestial hierarchy (I, 2,372D-373A); but the true head of every hierarchy, celestial or human, is Jesus (372A, 373B), of whom the bishop is a symbol (V, 5,505B1-3). The church hierarchy occupies an intermediate position between the celestial hierarchy and the "legal" hierarchy of the OT (V, 2,501C-D), and like the celestial hierarchy (*Cael. hier.* III) carries out the three functions of purification, illumination and initiation; it is composed of three orders of initiators (bishops, priests, ministers) and three orders of initiates (which are, from lowest to highest, the purified, the enlightened and the perfect).

The *Divine Names*, the longest work of the *Corpus*, examines in 13 chapters the most important names attributed to the deity by Scripture. Ch. I insists on the absolute transcendence of the deity with respect to all beings, and hence its unknowability and ineffability: the most fitting way to approach it is the *via negativa*, which consists of depriving it of any possible attribute and thus of all names (I, 5,593C). Ch. II reminds us that the various names examined in the treatise must be referred to all three persons of the Trinity (636C, 652A), and illustrates the two basic concepts of "union" and "distinction." Ch. III emphasizes the importance of prayer (it is like a chain leading human beings to God), and then draws a portrait of ps.-Dionysius's venerated teacher Hierotheus. Ch. IV expounds the first principle as goodness, light, beauty and love, and goes on, closely following Proclus's *De malorum subsistentia*, to examine the problem of evil, which in an absolute sense does not exist and in a relative sense can only be understood as a partial absence of good. The subsequent chapters examine the other names of the divine emanations: being (ch. V), life (ch. VI), wisdom, intelligence, reason, truth (ch. VII), power, justice, salvation, inequality (ch. VIII), dissimilarity, quiet, movement, equality (ch. IX), omnipotence, "ancient of days," eternity and time (ch. X), peace, expressions such as *autozōē*, *autoeinai*, *autodynamis*, which refer to the first realities emanating from God (ch. XI), "holy of holies," "king of kings," "lord of lords," "God of gods" (ch. XII), and finally perfection and the "one," regarding which the "one" which is above being, identical with the first principle, must be distinguished from the "one being," identical with its emanation (ch. XIII). All these names, present in Scripture and in part in *Plato's *Parmenides*, are discussed and interpreted according to the canons of the latest stage of *Neoplatonist philosophy, i.e., that of Proclus and Damascius.

The *Mystical Theology*, in five chapters, is the shortest and, as the title implies, most "mystical" treatise of the *Corpus*. Ch. I reminds us that union with God is an experience that excludes any sensory or intellectual activity whatsoever (997B, cf. *De div. nom.* I, 1,588A) and celebrates the *via negativa* (1000B). Ch. II considers mystical darkness as an expression of ignorance of God, which is one with the highest knowledge of him, and goes on to specify the roles of positive and negative theology: while the former proceeds from the higher to the lower, the latter follows an ascending process from lower to higher (1025A-B). Ch. III interprets entry into darkness as absolute absence of word and thought, characteristic of union with God (1033 B-C). Chs. IV and V (1040D, 1045D, 1048A-B) stress the transcendence of the first principle with respect to every sensible object and intelligible concept.

Of the ten *Letters*, the *first*, like the *Mystical Theology*, makes knowledge of God coincide with ignorance of him; the *second* places the first principle above the deity and the good; the *third* specifies that Jesus' divine nature remained hidden even after his incarnation; the *fourth* says that Jesus incarnate was a real man (1072A), but at the same remained superessential, as his activity demonstrates (1072B): he was God made man; the *fifth* resumes the theme of divine darkness, into which one who wishes to attain knowledge of God must enter; the *sixth* exhorts us to remain firm in the truth, without being lost in the refutation of others' errors; the *seventh* says that demonstration of the truth is itself sufficient to refute contrary theses, and then speaks of the sophist Apollophanes—who seems not to have recognized the presence of the divine law in the universe—and of the eclipse of the sun that occurred at Jesus' death, observed by ps.-Dionysius at Heliopolis; the *eighth* praises meekness and rebukes the monk Demophilus who, criticizing a priest, failed to respect the church's hierarchical order, in which criticisms can only be leveled by higher members, not lower; the *ninth* speaks of scriptural symbolism and of the deity that remains transcendent, though manifesting itself to all beings; the *tenth* predicts the end of St. John the Evangelist's imprisonment at Patmos and his return to Asia.

III. Other writings. In the writings that have reached us, ps.-Dionysius cites other works of his—seven in all—which have not survived: (1) *The Intelligible Things and the Things of the Senses* (see *Eccl. hier.* I, 2 [373B], II, III, 2 [397C]); (2) *Theological Institutions* (see *De div. nom.* I, 1 [585B], I, 5 [593B], II, 1 [636C], II, 3 [640B], II, 7 [645A], XI, 5 [953B]; *Myst. theol.* III [1032D]); (3) *Symbolic Theology* (see *Cael. hier.* XV, 6 [336A]; *De div. nom.* I, 8 [597B], IV, 4 [700C], IX, 5 [913 B], XIII, 4 [984B]; *Myst. theol.* III [1033A-B], *Ep.* IX, 1 [1104B]); (4) *Divine Hymns* (see *Cael. hier.* VII, 4 [212B]); (5) *The Angelic Properties and Orders* (see *De div. nom.* IV, 2 [696B]); (6) *On God's Judgment* (see *De div. nom.* IV, 35 [736B]); (7) *On the Soul* (see *De div. nom.* IV, 2 [696C]). It is difficult to establish whether these are real or fictitious works.

IV. Relation to the Platonic tradition and earlier patristics. The author of the scholium on ps.-Dionysius edited in PG 4, 21D 1-3 was already aware of the very close correspondences, not only doctrinal but also terminological, between Proclus and the author of the *Corpus*—though he ended by asserting the dependence of the former on the latter. In the modern period, among the many scholars who from the early 19th c. until now have examined the dependency of ps.-Dionysius on the Platonic tradition (and esp. on Proclus's Neoplatonism) we should mention J.G.V. Engelhardt, A. Jahn, H. Koch, J. Stiglmayr, H. Weertz, H.F. Müller, G. della Volpe, R. Roques, M. Schiavone, B. Brons, H.D. Saffrey, S. Gersch, L.H. Grondijs, R.F. Hathaway (the last two have in particular shown the dependency of ps.-Dionysius on Damascius). E. von Ivánka and esp. E. Corsini called attention to the relations between ps.-Dionysius's theology and Plato's *Parmenides.* To E. Corsini—following up the suggestions of C. Pera—we also owe the discovery of various parallels between the treatment of evil by ps.-Dionysius and *Sallustius's *De diis.* Recently, S. Lilla revisited the relations between the theology of ps.-Dionysius and that of the author of the fragment of the commentary on the *Parmenides* edited by P. Hadot and attributed by him to *Porphyry, and also on those between ps.-Dionysius and Damascius (see the article in the volume edited by Y. de Andia, cited in the bibl.). No less important have been the inquiries into the relations between ps.-Dionysius and the Greek patristic tradition, represented by the studies of C. Pera, E.Ch. Puech, V. Lossky, E. von Ivánka and W. Völker, who in an important book examined in depth the dependency of the author of the *Corpus* esp. on the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers. It is now clear that the Platonic and patristic traditions are equally important for understanding ps.-Dionysius: neither can be ignored or undervalued in favor of the other.

V. Theology.

A. The law of monē, proodos and epistrophē. Monē refers to the absolute transcendence of the first principle: motionless, detached from everything, unalterable and always the same (*De div. nom.* 9,8,916B), and practically identical with *henōsis* (*De div. nom.* 2,4,640D). *Proodos* indicates its emanation—or overflowing—due to the superabundance of its energy, both when it produces beings by multiplying itself and when it manifests its providence and love toward them: it is thus identified on the one hand with *diakrisis*, *pollaplasiasmos* and creative activity, and on the other with πρόνοια and ἔρως (*De div. nom.* 4,4,712C). Yet *proodos* in no way alters the stable unity of *monē.*

Finally, *epistrophē* means the return of *proodos* to its original source (*De div. nom.* 2,11,549B), as well as the conversion of beings—produced by *proodos* toward the first principle and their tendency to unite to it: well considered, this second aspect of *epistrophē* is nothing but a particular case of the first, since all

beings emanate from the "one" and are thus part of the divine *proodos*.

While *monē* is the original source and the point from which emanation starts and to which it returns, *proodos* and *epistrophē* represent a genuine cyclical movement of the divine energy that emanates from the transcendent "one" and returns to it (*De div. nom.* 4,14,712D-713A). These three moments were already fundamental in Neoplatonism.

B. "Unions" and "distinctions." These two basic concepts are widely illustrated in the second chapter of the *Divine Names.* On a more general level, while union (*henōsis*) refers to the deity considered in his absolute transcendence (*monē*) distinction (*diakrisis*) regards his emanations (*proodoi*), manifestations (*ekphanseis*) and multiplications (*pollaplasiasmoi*), which produce the various real existents. Nevertheless, "union" and "distinction" in turn admit, each on its own account, other "unions" and "distinctions": in the "union" represented by the absolutely transcendent deity, while the "unions" are the common property of all three persons that compose the deity, the "distinctions" are grounded on the three persons of the Trinity, which admit no confusion either between themselves or between their roles.

C. Negative and positive theology in relation to the application to the deity of the first two hypotheses of Plato's Parmenides. Ps.-Dionysius uses both "negative theology"—denying the first principle every possible attribute (apophatic method)—and "positive theology," which attributes every property to the deity (cataphatic method). Negative theology appears in *Cael. hier.* II, 3,140D; *De div. nom.* I, 5,593C; I, 6,596A; XIII, 3,980D, 981A; *Myst. theol.* I, 1, 1000 A; II, 1025A; positive theology in *De div. nom.* I, 5,593D; I, 6,596B; both methods are used simultaneously in *De div. nom.* I, 5,593C-D; I, 6,596A-B and considered equally legitimate in *Myst. theol.* I, 2,1000 B. According to ps.-Dionysius, the two "ways" do not contradict one another: whereas negative theology considers the deity in his absolute transcendence (*monē*) and stresses his difference from beings, positive theology considers it as the cause of all beings, i.e., the principle from which all beings emanate by virtue of *proodos* and in which they are thus potentially contained. Whereas positive theology, through *proodos* considers the descending process from the deity to beings, negative theology rises from beings to the first principle, which remains always detached from them. These two methods also explain how the deity can be simultaneously nameless and the object of all possible names—a doctrine also found in the *Corpus Herm.* V, 10. Strictly connected to the adoption of the two "theologies" is the application to the deity of negative and positive concepts characteristic, respectively, of the "one" of the first and second hypotheses of Plato's *Parmenides*, which, first by the Neopythagoreans and then by the various exponents of Neoplatonism, was given a theological-metaphysical interpretation and thus became the basis of the theology of Neoplatonism. Apart from chs. IX and X of the *Divine Names*, in which the positive concepts are those that characterize the "one" of the second hypothesis of the *Parmenides*, ps.-Dionysius takes up the negative conclusions of the first hypothesis in *De div. nom.* I, 5,593A-B; II, 11,649C4-6; V, 4,817D; XIII, 3,981A (cf. *Parm.* 141e, 142 a); and the positive conclusions of the second hypothesis in *De div. nom.* V, 8,824A (cf. *Parm.* 155d); and makes simultaneous use of both hypotheses in *De div. nom.* V, 10,825B and VII, 3,872A.

D. The superiority of negative theology. Though recognizing the legitimacy of both theologies, ps.-Dionysius seems to consider "negative theology" more suited to the absolutely unknown nature of the first principle: in *Cael. hier.* II, 3, 140D 6-7, he says that it is a more appropriate method; and in *De div. nom.* XIII, 3,981D, he recalls with approval the preference accorded to the negative procedure by the "theologians" who taught him. Proclus too preferred this procedure and, like ps.-Dionysius, identified it with the ascending process (*Th. plat.* 2,5: II, 38,19-21). The *via negativa* is one of the main characteristics of the theology of the whole Platonic and patristic tradition. Ps.-Dionysius's words in *Cael. hier.* II, 3 140D 5-6, "which designate not what is, but what is not," should be compared with *Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V, 71,3 (CGS II, 374, 13-15) and with Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 3,14 (V, 68,6-7 Bréhier).

E. The absolute transcendence of the deity. The natural consequence of the application of the negative concepts of the first hypothesis of the *Parmenides* to the divine *monē* is the stress put on the transcendence of the first principle. The most characteristic motifs of the Pseudo-Dionysian doctrine of divine transcendence are these: God is formless and untouchable; he is above all beings; he is unlike any being; he is above being; he is a nonbeing; he is above mind; he is above thought and knowledge, and is thus absence of thought and unknowable; the knowledge that we can have of him is the same as ignorance; he is above words, and so ineffable, without names and above every name: he is above every state (including those of quiet and movement) and every affirmation and negation; he is above infinity and limit; he is at the same time identical to infinity in a threefold sense (because he includes everything

potentially in himself, because he is provided with an infinite number of creative powers, and because he is unknown); he is above time and eternity. The listed doctrines go back—with the exception of the penultimate, which derives from Neoplatonism and from *Gregory of Nyssa (see S. Lilla, JTS n.s. 31 [1980] 98-103)—to some passages in certain Platonic dialogues (Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, Paris 1954, IV, 79-81); the doctrine of God's unnameability has been influenced by certain passages of Scripture (Ex 6:3; Eph 1:21; Phil 2:9). The same doctrines, therefore, characterize the theology of the whole subsequent Platonic tradition—until the last, Neoplatonism—and that of Philo and the Greek patristic tradition.

F. The immanence of the deity in the universe. If, considered in its *monē,* the deity remains absolutely transcendent, considered in its emanation (*proodos*)—which is both providential and creative—it pervades everything, reaches all beings and is therefore immanent in the universe (see, e.g., *Cael. hier.* 1,1, 12B 4). This emanation—which becomes a genuine "transmission" (*diadosis*, *chorēgia*)—comes about as a result of the overflowing (*ekblyzein*, *hyperblyzein*) of the infinite power (*dynamis*) of which God is immeasurably full (*Cael. hier.* IV, 1,177 C 13-14; *De div. nom.* VIII, 8,892B1 etc.). The doctrine of the divine power that pervades (*diēkei*) the universe and holds it together (*synēchei*) is characteristic of Stoicism and is also found in *Hellenistic Judaism, *Middle Platonism, *Neoplatonism and *Gregory of Nyssa. The idea of the immeasurably full divine principle whose infinite power overflows of its own accord, originating the emanation that reaches everywhere, is typically Neoplatonic.

G. The characteristics of God's creative work. The first principle contains a priori, in its ineffable unity, the totality of beings. This idea is expressed by the terms *proēchei, prolambanei prolēptikē, perilēptikē*. This is equivalent to saying that all beings already exist a priori either in the first principle (*prophestēkota*; see, e.g., *De div. nom.* VII, 2,869B 13) or as ideas (*logoi* or *thelēmata*) in its most universal emanation, being (*De div. nom.* V, 8,824C 6-15). The deity produces (*paragei*) beings by making them proceed from its own essence, in which they are originally contained: this occurs because the activity that produces beings is one with the divine emanation (*proodos*), which for this reason is called *ousiopoios* (see, e.g., *De div. nom.* V, 9,825A 6). Despite, however, this infinite multiplication or subdivision of the divine *proodos*, the original source—corresponding to *monē*—suffers no alteration or diminution either in its superessential unity or in its superabundant energy, remaining always the same in its unmoving identity (e.g., *De div. nom.* II, 11,649B 6-7; 9-11; 12-14).

H. The three persons of the Trinity. The superessential unity of the first principle comprehends in itself, in a manner that surpasses human understanding, the persons of the Trinity who, as we have seen, represent the *diakrisis* at the heart of the transcendent deity's *henōsis*; while remaining clearly distinct and admitting no reciprocity or confusion between their roles (640C, 641A 12-13, 641D), the three persons nonetheless exist in one another in such a way as to form a higher unity, just as the lights of different lamps merge into one light. Other important themes of ps.-Dionysius are the laws that regulate the angelic hierarchy and, by reflection, that of the church; the doctrine of evil; symbolism; the language of mystery; mysticism. A specific treatment of these can be found in my essay in Augustinianum 22 (1982) 533-577.

CPG 6600-6635; PG 3, 119-1120; SC 58 bis, Paris [2]1970 (*Coel. hier.* with Fr. tr.); PTS 33 Berlin 1990 (Suchla), 36 Berlin 1991 (Heil, Ritter); S. Lilla, *Il testo tachigrafico del De divinis nominibus* (*Vat. gr.* 1809): ST 263, Vatican City 1970; Fr. tr.: M. de Gandillac, Paris 1943; Eng.: J. Parker, London - Oxford 1897; It.: E. Turolla, Padua 1956; S. Lilla, Rome 1986 (*Ger. cel., Teol. mist., Lettere*), Rome 2002 (*Ger. eccl.*); P. Scazzoso, Milan 1981; S. Lilla, *Introduzione allo studio dello Ps. Dionigi Areopagita*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 533-577 (with ample bibliography); DSp 3,244-322; RAC 3,1075-1121; DHGE 14,265-310; H. Koch, Philologus 54 (1895) 438-454; Id., *Ps. Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus und Mysterienwesen*, Mainz 1900; J. Stiglmayr, HJ 16 (1895) 253-273; C. Pera, *Denys le mystique et la Théomachie*: RSPhTh 25 (1936) 1-75; A. van den Daele, *Indices pseudo-Dionysiani*, Louvain 1941; R. Roques, *L'univers dionysien*, Paris 1954 (repr. Paris 1983); W. Völker, *Kontemplation und Ekstase bei Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagita*, Wiesbaden 1958; E. Corsini, *La questione areopagita: Contributi alla cronologia dello Pseudo-Dionigi*: AAT 93 (1958/59) 28-227; Id., *Il trattato De divinis nominibus dello ps. Dionigi e i commenti neoplatonici al Parmenide*, Turin 1962; P. Scazzoso, *Ricerche sulla struttura del linguaggio dello Pseudo-Dionigi Areopagita*, Milan 1967; R.F. Hathaway, *Hierarchy and the Definition of Order in the Letters of pseudo-Dionysius*, The Hague 1969; B. Brons, *Gott und die Seienden. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von neuplatonischer Metaphysik und christlicher Tradition bei Dionysius Areopagita*, Göttingen 1976; S. Lilla, *Terminologia trinitaria nello Pseudo-Dionigi l'Areopagita. Suoi antecedenti e sua influenza sugli autori successivi*: Augustinianum 13 (1973) 609-623; C.A. Bernard, *Les formes de la théologie d'après le pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*: Gregorianum 58 (1978) 39-69; S. Gersch, *From Iamblichus to Eriugena. An Investigation of the Prehistory and Evolution of the Pseudo-Dionysius Tradition*, Leiden 1978; C.A. Bernard, *La doctrine mystique de Denys l'Aréopagite*: Gregorianum 68 (1987) 523-566; A. Louth, *Denys the Aréopagite*, London 1989; S. Lilla, *Denys l'Aréopagite (Pseudo)*, in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, II, Paris 1994, 727-742; Id., in G. Bosio - E. Dal Covolo - M. Maritano, *Introduzione ai Padri della Chiesa* (*secoli V-VIII*), Turin 1996, 177-222 (with bibl. updated to 1992); Y. de Andia, *Henosis: l'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite*, Leiden 1996; Y. de Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en*

Orient et en Occident, Actes du colloque international, Paris, 21-24 septembre 1994, Paris 1997; Patrologia V, 135-143; S. Lilla, *Dionigi l'Areopagitae il Platonismo cristiano*, Brescia 2005.

S. Lilla

DIONYSIUS the AREOPAGITE (pseudo), (apocryphal). In the *corpus Dionysiacum* are ten letters, including those addressed to *John the Theologian, to *Timothy and to *Polycarp. We also have the letters ascribed by Dionysius to Titus on the death of the apostles Peter and Paul (CANT 197), and another in Armenian to Titus on the transitus of Mary (CANT 164). In the 7th c. an autobiography of Dionysius was written in Greek; a clever child, he was miraculously saved from being sacrificed to the gods; after a great career, while traveling in Syria he had a vision at Heliopolis of the astronomical phenomena that accompanied Christ's passion; 14 years later he met Paul, who preached Christ, and Dionysius converted. The author seems only to have known ps.-Dionysius's letters and the spurious letter to Apollophani (PG 3, 1119-1122); his astronomical information was taken from an anonymous treatise preserved in *Coptic. The autobiography was very popular in the ancient world: the Greek original is lost, but Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, Georgian and Syriac versions exist; the work has no particular historical or literary value.

CPG 6633. Versions: Syriac (BHO 255.3) - M.A. Kugener, OrChr 7 (1907) 292-348; Arabic - P. Peeters, Al-Maʿšriq 12 (1909) 118-127; Lat. tr. from the Arabic text: AB 29 (1910) 302-322, esp. 306; Graf 1,268 n.; Coptic (fragments, BHO 255.2); E.O. von Lemm, *Eine dem Dionysius Areopagita zugeschriebene Schrift in koptischer Sprache*: Bulletin de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg 5,12,3 (1900) 267-306; Georgian - P. Peeters: AB 39 (1921) 293-313.

M. Starowieyski

DIONYSIUS the ROMAN DEACON. Lived at *Rome between the 5th and 6th c. and practiced medicine without pay, even after being imprisoned by the *Goths (perhaps *Alaric's *Visigoths in 410 or *Totila's *Ostrogoths in 546).

ICR, II, 93, n. 63; 106, n. 49; PLRE II, 363; PCBE II/1, 570.

P. Marone

DIOSCORUS, martyr. Commemorated 18 May in *Mart. hier.*, 13 October in *Synax. Eccl. CP*, the saint is the subject of a *Passio* that has reached us in Latin, Greek (4th c.) and Syriac (5th/6th c.) redactions; the latter two, both fragmentary, derive from a trustworthy contemporary document. From the acts we learn that Dioscorus, a councilor at Cynopolis, appeared before Culcianus, prefect of Egypt, and was beheaded in 305/307 at *Alexandria. Some have mistakenly tried to see in Dioscorus the *interpretatio christiana* of the pagan Dioscuri.

BHL 2203e-f; BS 4, 662-663; E. Tisserant, *Une version syriaque de la Passion de S. Dioscore*: AB 39 (1921) 333-344; Oxyrhynchus Papyri 50 (1983) 22-24.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DIOSCORUS, pope (d. 530). Before his death Pope *Felix IV (526–530) nominated the deacon *Boniface as his successor, conferring upon him the episcopal pallium. The Byzantine party, however, succeeded in installing the Alexandrian deacon Dioscorus, who had previously been an effective diplomat, in his place. Most of the Roman clergy adhered to this new designation, although it was contrary to the will of the people: precisely for this reason Dioscorus is considered more of an antipope. His pontificate remains historically irrelevant, however, because of its brevity: only 22 days, from 22 September to 14 October 530, the date of his death.

LP I, XL, 46, 100-102, 106, 270, 281, 287 and 542; *Collectio Avellana*, O. Guenther (ed.), Pragae . . . 1898, CSEL 35/2, 594-599, 607-610, 618-621, 627-632, 636f., 641f., 649f., 652-654, 671-673, 675-692 and 694; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 116, 119, 151, 155f., 159, 161f., 164, 167f., 170, 177f., 195ff. and 200; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II, Paris . . . 1949, 139, 227, 232, 330 and 342; DHGE 14, 507-508; K. Khella, *Dioskoros I. von Alexandrien (444-454). Theologie und Kirchenpolitik*, I-III, Hamburg 1981–1983; II, 9-282; III, 13-111; LTK[3] 3, 250 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 495-499 (G. Braga).

M. Spinelli

DIOSCORUS of Alexandria (d. 454). As archdeacon of the church of *Alexandria he accompanied his bishop, St. *Cyril, to the Council of *Ephesus. He succeeded Cyril in 444, striking harshly at his closest collaborators. Invited by *Theodosius II to preside over the other Council of Ephesus (449), he supported the *archimandrite *Eutyches against *Flavian of Constantinople, provoking the violence that earned the assembly the name of *latrocinium.* After Theodosius's death, *Pulcheria and *Marcian assembled at *Chalcedon the fourth ecumenical council (451) which, in its third session, anathematized Dioscorus. Exiled to Asia Minor, Dioscorus died at *Gangra 4 September 454, venerated as a saint by the non-Chalcedonian churches. A year later the deacon *Theognostus composed his *panegyric.

CPG 5441-5473; EC 4,1681f.; LTK 3,409-410; CE 4,879; DHGE 14, 508-514; RGG[4] 2, 864-865; F. Hasse, *Patriarch Dioskur von Alexandria nach monophysitischen Quellen* (Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen 6), Breslau 1908, 141-233; J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909, 84-93; J. Lebon, *Autour du cas de Dioscore d'Alexandrie*: Muséon 59 (1946) 515-528; Grillmeier 1, 523-529.

D. Stiernon

DIOSPOLIS, Council of. At Diospolis, a city in *Palestine identified with Lydda, Bishop *John of Jerusalem presided over a council in 415 at which *Pelagius and the deacon Anianus were present. Bishop Eros of *Arles and Bishop Lazarus of Aix, both expelled from their sees, were in Palestine and had compiled a summary of Pelagius's errors, adding to it those of his disciple *Celestius, but could not be present at the council for health reasons. The charges, drawn up in Latin by the Gallic bishops, were read at the Synod, not in full, but translated and summarized in Greek. After discussing marginal points of Pelagius's doctrine (knowledge of the law; the promise of the kingdom of heaven to the OT righteous; holiness present in the church), they confronted the main theses of freedom and *impeccantia*, which required a deeper investigation. With regard to the proposition *omnes voluntate propria regi* ("we are all led by our own will"), Pelagius specified that he did not deny God's help when human beings chose good, or God's abandonment when they chose evil. He made Celestius responsible for certain propositions attributed to him, e.g., that God gives grace in proportion to human merits. On impeccability, Pelagius said that holiness was attainable through grace and accessible to human efforts. Finally, with the council fathers, Pelagius condemned the theses already marked out by the church of *Africa and was thus declared to be in communion with the church. *Jerome considered the council "miserable."

Augustine, *De gestis Pel.*; *C. Iulian.* I, 32; *De pecc. origin.*; Orosius, *Liber apol.* 6; Mansi IV, cols. 311-315; Hfl-Lecl II, 1, 178f. and 183; G. de Plinval, *Pélage. Ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme*, Lausanne 1943, 284-292; Palazzini 2, 265-267; de Plinval, *Le lotte del pelagianesimo*, in Fliche-Martin, IV, 123-125.

C. Nardi

DIPTYCH

I. Archaeology - II. Ecclesiastical use.

I. Archaeology. Etymology reveals its form: δὶς πτύσσειν, to fold twice. A diptych is essentially two tablets or valves joined so as to fold together. From the start it was a deluxe variant on the ordinary wax tablet; the inner faces, smooth and wax-covered, were used for writing, the outer were often decorated in relief or embossed. Wide diffusion is attested in the later imperial age, when it became more and more common for ordinary consuls to give writing tablets as gifts to illustrious persons; the custom should also be referred to the more restricted circle of the emperor. This characteristic, in this particular period, made the diptych a useful vehicle for understanding court art, heavily influenced by the classicism (and hence conservatism) expressed by and for the ruling class. Having become an instrument of political propaganda, its use was limited by a regulation of 384 (CTh XV, 9,1), which allowed the right to possess diptychs only to those of consular rank; this is indirect evidence of their wide diffusion in the course of the 4th c.

Generally speaking, we can divide diptychs into consular and private: the former are easily recognizable, since the consul appears on the outside of the valves, shown with the attributes of his dignity (dress, insignia, *sella curulis*, pose, etc.); the latter, with various subjects on the valves, were often shown to belong to great private *familiae* by inscriptions on a scroll. Both these types might pass into the third category, that of ecclesiastical diptychs, which could either be given to the church or made expressly by or for it. One of the most celebrated examples is that of Nicomachi and the Symmachi, dated late 4th c.: it is classicizing in the profiles of the images depicted, and simultaneously pictorial—following contemporary taste—in the details of the subsidiary decoration, informed by meticulous style and negative relief. More precisely datable are those of Anicius Probus, consul in 406, and Felix, consul in 420, where the pictorial aims of contemporary plastic art, very evident in the diptychs of Basil (480) and Boethius (487), are more clearly seen. In the 6th c. output does not seem to decline in relation to the augmented prestige of certain *familiae* of noble rank. Numerous replicas of the diptychs of Areobindus (506), scattered in various collections, reveal—behind the formal aspect linked to the artistic milieu of *Constantinople—the vehicles of Byzantine propaganda in the West.

The diptych of Anastasius Paulus Probus Sabinianus (517) is part of the same cultural trend as that of Flavius Strategius Apion (539) in the *Justinian period. This output, which keeps in mind the official iconography, is accompanied from the end of the 4th c. by diptychs with more properly Christian scenes. Chronological definition is more difficult for these latter, since we often have to refer to stylistic and iconographical criteria rather than to objective data. Jesus

Christ, the apostles, figures of saints or esp. venerated persons, OT and NT scenes, represent the privatization of the sacred images that accompanied the consular images on the ivory valves; they document the religious culture, as well as the superstitions, of the new ruling class. After the great flowering of the 4th–6th c., it cannot be said that the use of the diptych declined; indeed, it lasted far into the Dark and Middle Ages, though conceptually far removed from the motifs that marked its greatest period.

G. Bovini, s.v. *Dittico*: EC 1, 1760–1761; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952; RAC 3,1138-1149; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Roma, la fine dell'arte antica*, Milan [2]1976; for the diptych's particular value as a vehicle of propaganda, in general, E.A. Havelock - J.P. Hershbell, *Arte e comunicazione nel mondo antico. Guida storica e critica*, Rome-Bari 1981; A. Cameron, *Pagan ivories*, in *Symmaque à l'occasion du mille-six-centième anniversaire du conflit de l'autel de la Victoire*, F. Paschoud (ed.), Paris 1986, 41-72; C. Bertelli, *Gli avori tardoantichi*, in *387 d.C.: Ambrogio e Agostino. Le sorgenti dell'Europa*, Milan 2003, 173-178.

U. Broccoli

II. Ecclesiastical use. Diptychs also entered the sphere of the church as catalogs of dead and living persons, who were remembered during the celebration of the *liturgy, esp. in the eucharistic synaxis (Cyr. of Jer., *Cath. myst.* 5,8-10; Epiph., *Panarion* 75,3: PG 43, 508A; *Liturg. of St. Jas.*: PO 26,212.12, and in general almost all the citations in this article). They were indicated by various terms, the most common being *tabellae*, *codices*, and esp. *diptyca*, which became a technical term.

Included in such catalogs were the names of martyrs, founders of churches, benefactors, bishops who succeeded one another in a see, other bishops of the province or bishops with whom they were in communion (esp. the pope), and the name of the emperor. So, some names were fixed according to the various churches, while others changed with the times (i.e., those of living people). The diptychs were subject to continual growth: e.g., the list of the bishops of a see. The lists of baptizands or of the newly baptized, however, should not be considered true diptychs (see Cyr. of Jer., *Procath.* 1; *Catech.* 3,2; Greg. of Nys., *Bapt.*: PG 46, 417; Ambr., *In Lc.* IV, 76; Counc. of Arles I, can. 13).

*Cyprian already attests a tradition of praying for the dead (*Ep.* 1,2), and in particular took great care to draw up lists of those who had died for the faith, to commemorate them (*Ep.* 12,2), since there was a firm conviction that "the prayer of that holy and awesome sacrifice is of great benefit to those for whom it is offered" (Cyr. of Jer., *Cath. myst.* 5,8).

The inclusion of the names of living persons arose from the same conviction that prayer benefited them too, but it acquired another, deeper meaning: it expressed the communion that existed in the Christian community, even among persons far away from each another. *Dionysius the Areopagite observed: "We exchange the holy kiss, and we make the mysterious and superterrestrial recitation of the names written on the tablets. Nor indeed is it possible for those divided from one another to be united with the One and participate in the pacific unity of the One" (*Ecc. hier.* III, 3,8: PG 3, 437A). The scholiast on Dionysius's text notes that "at that time they read only the tables of the dead; not, as now, those of the living too" (PG 4, 145A).

For this reason, for the living or the dead to have their *nomen in sacris diptycis scriptum* (Facundus of Her., *Defens.* 4,1: PL 67, 608) was a sign of communion with the persons named and a judgment of their orthodoxy (hence it was sometimes called the *liber vitae*). When communion was entered with the bishops of another episcopal see, the act of *nomen in diptyca recipere* was performed (Rusticus, ACO I, 4 p. 90.2; cf. Theodoret, *HE* 5,34,12; Atticus, *Ep.* 75 [among Cyril's letters]: PG 77, 352B; *Coll. cum don.* 230: SC 224, 1170; Counc. of Chal., *Acta* 13, ACO II, 1.3, 49.36). Conversely, the removal of a name from the diptychs was a sign of condemnation (Justinian, *Conf.*: PG 86, 1027C; Theodore Lect., *fr.*: PG 86, 220B; Evagr., *HE* 3,34: PG 86, 2674AB). This inclusion or removal could also be effected retrospectively, so that bishops judged to be heretics were removed and in some cases no longer read in later centuries (Facundus of Her., *Defens.* 4,1: PL 67, 609; Mansi 8,1044 and 1051f.; cf. DACL 4, 1054).

During the 5th- and 6th-c. christological disputes, the inclusion or exclusion of names in the diptychs gave rise to conflicts. The exclusion of a bishop's name from the diptychs was an indication of the separation of churches and also of the excommunication of a prelate. Indeed, it was assumed that even the names of the ecumenical councils were included as a sign of their acceptance, as in the case of John of Constantinople, who was requested to include in the diptychs the names of his predecessors *Euphemius and *Macedonius, of Pope *Leo I and of the four ecumenical councils (Mansi 8,1044 and 1051f.; cf. JTS 12 [1911] 386f.).

The moment and the manner of reading the diptychs by the deacon during the liturgical celebration were different in the various churches and within the same church, changing over time in some cases; *Jerome, for the 4th c., writes that *publice diaconus in ecclesia recitat offerentium nomina* (*In Ezech.* 4,18: PL 25, 175).

A.F. Gori, *Thesaurus Veterum Diptychorum Consularium et Ecclesiasticorum*, 3 vols., Florence 1759; E. Bishop, *Liturgical Comments and Memoranda*: JTS 11 (1910) 67-73; 12 (1911) 384-413; DACL 4,1045-1094; EC 1, 1760-1761; RAC 3,1138-1148; Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, s.v.; ODB 1,636-638; LMA 3,1101-1103; RBK 1,1068-1975; S. Salaville, *Une mention de Saint Augustin dans les diptyques de la liturgie grecque de Saint Jacques*: L'année théologique 11 (1950) 52-56; M. McCormick, *A Liturgical Diptych from Coptic Egypt in the Museum of Fine Arts*: Muséon 94 (1981) 47-54; J.M. Sansterre, *Où le diptyche consulaire de Clementinus fut-il remployé à une fin liturgique?*: Byzantion 54 (1984) 641-647; R.F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, IV: The Diptychs*, OCA 238, Rome 1991; D. Kinney, *The Iconography of the Ivory Diptych Nichomachorum-Symmachorum*: JbAC 37 (1994) 64-96; J.-C. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au Xᵉ siècle*, Rome 1988; A. Camplani - A. Martin, *Lettres festales et listes épiscopales dans l'église d'Alexandrie et d'Egypte. A propos de la liste épiscopale accompagnant la première lettre festale de Cyrille d'Alexandrie conservée en copte*: JJP 30 (2000) 7-20.

A. Di Berardino

DISCIPLESHIP. *See* *CATECHUMENATE — DISCIPLESHIP

DISCIPLINA ARCANI (Discipline of the Secret). The term refers to elements of certain Christian rituals and the teaching about them that are deliberately shrouded in *mystery: this esp. regards *baptism and the *Eucharist and the formulas associated with them, such as the Our Father (*see* *Lord's Prayer) and the creed (*traditio* and *redditio Symboli*). The discipline is considered an aspect of Christian *catechesis, proposed for pedagogical reasons to safeguard the sublimity and venerable nature of the doctrine conveyed against a devaluation due to its being too widely known or its being confused with other, competing, *pagan rituals. This explains the development of this discipline esp. during—and not beyond—the 4th c., contemporaneously with the growing spread of Christianity and the institutionalization and ritualization of the catechumenate. In fact, traces of a teaching for initiates, influenced by *Judaism, are already present in certain sayings of Jesus (e.g., Mt 13:11; Lk 8:10), of Paul (e.g., 1 Cor 2:6ff. and 3:1-2), and esp. in the Apocalypse and apocrypha.

Reserve regarding certain notions concerning the Christian mysteries is also attested in the ***Apostolic Tradition* (21, 3rd c.?). In the *Alexandrian tradition and elsewhere an ascent to Christian knowledge by degrees is theorized. *Clement of Alexandria, referring to 1 Cor 3, distinguishes common faith from perfect knowledge (or "gnostic perfection"), not immediately accessible (e.g., *Strom.* V 26,1.5). *Origen also refers to Paul (1 Cor 2:6) to justify the transmission of the divine mysteries exclusively to those advanced in the faith, and he thus refutes *Celsus, for whom an initiation only for the pure should be the case only in the pagan mystery cults, whereas sinners of every kind are called to Christian worship (*Cels.* III 59-62).

The disciplina arcani was in fact influenced by the *Hellenistic mystery cults, the principal medium through which the vocabulary and practice of secrecy in religious ritual reached Christianity, as a protection from profane external intrusions. Traces of esotericism were frequent in the *Late Antique Greco-Roman religious world and were often seen as a means of attraction. Thus in the Christian setting we find the insistence on the duty to maintain secrecy concerning the ritual and meaning of baptism and the Eucharist, which seem to have been celebrated behind closed doors in the evening or at night (Cyril Hier., *Catech.* 1,1; Ambr., *Myst.* 2, 5; Chrys., *Hom. in Mt* 23, 3). *Basil of Caesarea emphasized both the value of the truths of the faith and that the rites be conveyed orally, and thus to be reserved in a halo of mystery and hiddenness (e.g., the sign of the *cross, the words of the *epiclesis in the consecration of the eucharstic *bread and *chalice, the blessing of the baptismal *water and *oil, and various details of the administration of that sacrament; see *Spir.* 27,66). A *mystagogy is needed for the penetration of these *mysteries, like that in the baptismal catecheses of *John Chrysostom (e.g. *Ad Illum.* 1,4) and in those of John/*Cyril of Jerusalem, who, e.g., says that he wanted to wait for the baptism of his interlocutors before revealing to them its deeper meaning (*Catech.* 1,11; 2,1).

*Ambrose also reserves his teaching on the mysteries only to the baptized, admonishing them not to divulge what has been told them regarding the Eucharist (*Myst.* 1,2 and 9,55). *Augustine, in preparing to illustrate the creed, the summary of the Christian faith, considers it easily grasped by neophytes but at the same time completely understandable only by spiritual people, those most advanced in divine knowledge; his explanation is therefore intended to defend it from the aberrant interpretations of *heretics (*Fid. et symb.* 1).

Practices linked to the *disciplina* tended to diminish from the 5th c., though an echo is still heard, e.g., in *Gregory of Tours (*Franc.* II 29), and a vague hint in *Gregory the Great (*Dial.* II 23, 4-5). The writings of ps.-*Dionysius (*Eccl. hier.* I 1) and *Maximus the Confessor (*Mystag.*, esp. proem.; 15; 24) nonetheless testify how the *disciplina* would persist even later in the Christian *mystical tradition.

P. Batiffol, *Arcane*: DThC 1/2, 1738-1758; E. Vacandard, *Arcane*: DHGE 3, 1497-1513; O. Perler, *Arcandisziplin*: RAC 1, 667-676; H. Clasen, *Die Arkandisziplin in der Alten Kirche*, Heidelberg 1956; V. Recchia, *L'arcano nell'iniziazione cristiana*: Annali della Facoltà di Magistero dell'Università di Bari 4 (1965) 243-273; D. Powell, *Arcandisziplin*: TRE 4, 1-8; K.W. Bolle, *Secrecy in Religions*, Leiden 1987; C. Jacob, *"Arkandisziplin," Allegorese, Mystagogie. Ein neuer Zugang zur Theologie des Ambrosius von Mailand*, Frankfurt 1990; G.G. Stroumsa, *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*, Leiden 1996; F. Graf - W. Wischmeyer, *Arcandisziplin*: RGG[4] 1, 743-746.

C. Ricci

DISCIPLINE. The term *discipline*, which today evokes laws and related concepts, in antiquity indicated everything that a disciple could receive from a teacher. In this sense we find it used of Christians with respect to Jesus Christ and, more precisely, esp. in *Tertullian's abundant use of it in reference to what the apostles transmitted to the churches founded by them. In ancient Christianity, therefore, the term referred not just to the legal order, but (a) to Christianity in its totality consigned by Christ to the apostles and by these to the churches (Tertull., *De praescr.* 6,4 and 19,2-3); (b) as doctrine of a philosophy, of magic, etc. (7,4; 33,12; 35,1); (c) as a way of living according to the doctrine held (43,2: *doctrinae index disciplina est*; 44,1: *apud nos testimonia disciplinae ad probationem veritatis*); and (d) as order in theological research, i.e., done according to reason or logic (9,6; 41,1 and 3).

H.I. Marrou, *Doctrina et disciplina dans la langue des Pères de l'Église*: ALMA 9 (1931) 5-25; TLL V, 1316-1326; V. Morel, *Le développement de la disciplina sous l'action du Saint-Esprit chez Tertullien*: RHE 35 (1939) 243-265; Id., *Disciplina. Le mot et l'idée représentée par lui dans les œuvres de Tertullien*: RHE 40 (1944–45) 5-46 (45-46 chronological table of passages with the word *disciplina* in Tertullian's works); O. Mauch, *Der lateinische Begriff disciplina. Eine Wortuntersuchung*, Freibourg i.B. 1941; W. Dürig, *Disciplina. Eine Studie zum Bedeutungsumfang des Wortes in der Sprache der Liturgie und der Väter*: SE 4 (1952) 245-279; S. Hübner, *Disciplina*: ZKTh 84 (1962) 58ff.; G. Juessen - G. Schrimp, *Disciplina, doctrina*: HWP 2 (1972) 256-261.

V. Grossi

DIVINIZATION. It is clear that the divinization of human beings was a fundamental theme of patristics, esp. the Greek. Unfortunately, its consideration by Ritschl and his followers as, along with sacramentalism, a typical case of the Hellenization of the gospel, means that to this day its study has been compromised by more or less partial debates on certain unilateral premises, such as Christ's assumption of universal human nature, salvation by means of a physical contact between divinity and humanity in Christ, and the absorption of human beings into God. But research on divinization has also been greatly complicated by the historical data itself. The relevant vocabulary, for example, underwent a considerable evolution. *Theopoiein* and its various forms appear only from *Clement of *Alexandria on (Lampe 630f.). Under the influence of ps.-Dionysius, *theōsis* assumed more importance than *theopoiēsis* (Lampe 649f.). The equivalent Latin terms, *deificare* and *deificatio*, obtained a rather modest importance only in the 5th c. (Blaise 250; ThLL 5,403f.). The reality itself, however, was expressed by many other words, both Greek and Latin, such as *aphtharsia, methexis, koinōnia, henōsis, glorificatio, profectus ad Deum*, etc.

The anthropological premises, moreover, vary according to author, since they don't all evaluate Adam's intimacy with God and hence the injurious consequences of his sin in the same way. The theological and christological premises were equally diverse: the way they were conceived corresponded to how the divine transcendence was understood. This problem includes a not unimportant tension between divinization understood as a work carried out by Christ the savior, and divinization seen as a divine action carried out in souls, i.e., between Jesus' assumption of humanity and the union of Christ with the church.

Even the biblical basis of the patristic doctrine of human divinization seems, at first sight, far from solid. There are few explicit texts, all of a clearly Hellenistic stamp, such as Wisd 2:23 (ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ) and 6:18ff. (*aphtharsia*); Acts 17:28 (citation of ps.-Epimenides and Aratus), 2 Pet 1:4 (*koinōnoi*). The biblical foundation is much more solid than it appears, however, as long as one makes use of the Scriptural evidence without forcing it. Texts concerning human beings as God's image (Gen 1:26-27), divine sonship (Gal 4:5ff.; Rom 8:15), imitation of God (Mt 5:44-48) and of Christ (Phil 2:5-11), and texts presenting the new life of Christians as a pledge and anticipation of future glory (1 Cor 13:12; 2 Cor 3:18; 1 Jn 3:1-3), must all be considered in this light.

Reinterpreting, in particularly open milieus, this rich heritage of the biblical tradition, esp. the Johannine, Pauline and Wisdom literature, Christian authors soon began to develop the theology of divinization. Early on, the apostolic fathers and the Greek apologists saw the intimate union of human beings with God in an eschatological perspective, stressing the divine gift of immortality (*aphtharsia*), assured by Jesus' resurrection and by the *Eucharist, and conferred in the Lord's parousia (Ign., *Eph.* 4,2; *Polyc.* 2,2f.; 6,1; *Eph.* 20,2; *1 Clem.* 36,2: *immortal gnosis*; *2 Clem.* 6,6-9; Hermas, *Sim.* V, 6,5ff.; Just., *Apol.* 10,3; 52,3). While *Justin mentions this Christian hope in

the context of true philosophy (*Dial.* 1), his disciple *Tatian presents the human being's destined immortality as an assimilation to God to be attained in gnosis (*Orat.* 12f.). It is in *Theophilus, however, that the technical vocabulary of divinization first appears (*Autol.* 2,24; 27). All these references to immortality, divine privilege to be conceded to those who live by faith in Christ, were not limited only to eschatological hope, but they were nevertheless only somewhat occasional.

The situation changed under the decisive influence of 2nd-c. *gnosticism which, taking up the myth of the primordial man dispersed in matter and illustrating it by, among other things, the parable of the lost sheep (see Hübner, *Einheit*, 290-311), was not per se interested in a divinization in the sense of a transformation to divine life, but taught rather a return to the divine sphere of those who were akin to God *per naturam.* Against this religious movement, esp. in its *Valentinian form, *Irenaeus worked out the first authentically Christian synthesis on human divinization (Tremblay). Integrating elements of gnosticism into his history of the saving incarnation of the Word, he shows how God, manifesting himself in his goodness through the Son in the power of the Holy Spirit, leads back the whole person (created in the image and likeness, i.e., destined to resemble the immortal God, but fallen through sin into corruption), by knowledge of the Son in the Spirit, to the eternal vision of and thus union with him in immortality (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 19,1; IV, 20; V, 36). Irenaeus's line, at once gnostic and historical, would be followed by later Greek, esp. Alexandrian, authors, though they put the accent elsewhere, insisting more on assimilative knowledge, or perhaps preferring impassibility (*apatheia*) to incorruptibility (*aphtharsia*), according to the stronger or weaker influence of Greek philosophy. Thus Clement of Alexandria, the first to make full use of the technical and religious language of the philosophy of his time, further defined the divine pedagogy spoken of by Irenaeus as a process of divinization that made human beings rise from incredulity, through faith and gnosis, to charity, source of impassibility, though not forgetting the illuminative role of baptism (*Strom.* 2, 22; 7, 10; *Paed.* 1,6,26).

*Origen, for his part, placed divinization within the vast framework in which he explained the relationship between God and the world through the mystery of the Logos. To a greater extent than his predecessors, he sought to base himself on the biblical data (*Comm. in Jo.*), and insisted on the human freedom that is the consequence of growing union with the Logos, God's image. Above all he stressed the incarnation, as the supreme mystery of the Word. For him, the union of the Word with the ever-faithful soul of Jesus, likened to the interpenetration of iron and fire, is the model of all divinization (*Princ.* 11,6). On the other hand, Jesus' *kenōsis* in death was not just the highest expression of his love for God (*Comm. in Jo.* V, 284), but also the prelude of the glorious resurrection which, begun in Christ, would be fulfilled for the whole church (*Comm. in Jo.* X, 228f.). This doctrine of divinization, while distinguished by its synthetic strength, like all of Origen's theology, is defective in two points: the preexistence of Jesus' soul and the excessively spiritualistic tendency.

The enormous progress made by theology in the 4th c., however, made itself felt in the question of divinization. *Athanasius, the great defender of Nicene faith, managed to reduce Irenaeus's heritage to an impressive simplicity, asserting that the incarnation of the Word has definitively restored the human being's primordial resemblance to God on two levels: that of the incorruptibility of the body and that, impossible without the first, of gnosis (*Incarn.* 9). He also used the doctrine of human divinization, by now a firmly established theological doctrine, to demonstrate, against the Arians, the divinity both of Christ (*Ar.* II, 70; III, 33) and of the Holy Spirit (*Ep. Serap.* 1,24). *Gregory of Nyssa, expounding his ideas on divinization esp. in his *Oratio catechetica magna*, dedicated to teachers "who need system in their instruction" (*Or. catech. prol.*), considers this doctrine an essential part of Christian teaching. Aware of the risks of pantheism inherent in the ideas he and his predecessors had taken over from *Platonism, he stressed the distance that exists between God's image in human beings and its eternal model (*Or. catech.* 5,6), i.e., the mutability of the former and the immutability of the latter (ibid., 21,1f.). To overcome the mutability, the cause of the loss of Adam's likeness to God, the immutable Word was made man (ibid., 32,3), a saving work that is fulfilled, however, for each person in baptism (ibid., 33-36) and the Eucharist (ibid., 37). This doctrine could be easily deepened on particular points with texts of *Basil and *Cyril of Alexandria on the role of the Holy Spirit, of *Theodore of Mopsuestia on baptism or of *John Chrysostom and *Cyril of Jerusalem on the Eucharist. As a whole, however, Gregory's remains the most substantial synthesis prior to the theology of ps.-*Dionysius and *Maximus the Confessor.

Under the influence of *Proclus, ps.-Dionysius integrated human divinization into his grandiose vision of the emanation of all things from God and their return to him (*Cael. hier.* 1,3f.); Maximus, in

line with Chalcedonian *Christology, maintained the christological *indivise-inconfuse* in his explanation of divinization (*Quaest. ad Thal.* 59), and opposed divine love, the motive of the incarnation, to human love, the measure of divinization (*Ambig.*: PG 91, 1113B). This broad vision of human restoration to the primordial state (kinship with God, freely given him from the beginning), founded on the incarnation of the Word, eternal image of God, including his *kenōsis* unto death, and fulfilled in individuals esp. by means of the sacraments, is characteristic of Greek theology.

The Latins, more interested in moral holiness and therefore insisting more on the elimination of sin as *culpa* than on liberation from mortal corruption, seem to have been less open to it. Yet divinization is not absent from Latin theology, itself indebted to the Greek and dependent on the same philosophical influences. *Tertullian took from Irenaeus the idea of the *admirabile commercium* between God and humanity (*Adv. Marc.* 11,27); Hilary, influenced by Origen, developed a theology of the glorification of the human being that is a doctrine of divinization, based on the *communio naturalis* with the incarnate Word and realized in a special way in the Eucharist (Fierro); *Ambrose attached importance to transformation to divine life (*Myst.* 7,37-42; *Incarn.* 4,23). *Augustine, while seeing grace primarily as *medicina* and *adiutorium*, and giving great importance to the church as *Christus totus*, did not neglect the communion in which the individual, thanks to Christ's mediation, is united with God (*Serm.* 47,21; 192,1). For him, the baptized person is just with the only Just One, and thus he is a child of God like Christ, though not yet in the perfect state, since he hopes, by the Spirit diffused in him, to see God as he is in the resurrection (*Ep.* 140 and 147). Leo the Great expressed the same thought with formulae that were perhaps even more precise (*Serm.* 21,3; 23,5; 26,4). For him also, the Word was made flesh so that human beings could be raised, in the grace of the Spirit, to become children of God (*Serm.* 22,5).

DSp 3,1370-1398; RAC 6,54-219; J. Gross, *La divinisation du chrétien d'après les Pères grecs*, Paris 1938; E. von Ivánka, *Platonismo e neoplatonismo*: Dizion. Teol. II, Brescia 1967, 659-670; A. Fierro, *Sobre la gloria en san Hilario*, Rome 1964; H.E. Turner, *Jésus le Sauveur*, Paris 1965, 75-100; R.M. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa. Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der "physischen" Erlösungslehre*, Leiden 1974; B. Studer, *Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*: HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978; R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon s. Irénée de Lyon*, Münster 1978; B. Studer, *Le Christ, notre justice, selon s. Augustin*: RecAug 15 (1980) 99-143; R. Flogaus, *Vergöttlichung, III. Theologiegeschichtlich*: LTK³ 10, 665f.

B. Studer

DIVORCE. In Roman law, divorce was equally available to both the husband and the wife, even without the other party's consent, at least until 331 (CTh 3,16,1), when the possibility of unilateral divorce was limited to particular cases. The wife could be repudiated only for adultery, witchcraft or acting as a procuress; the husband for murder, witchcraft or grave-robbing. Those convicted of these crimes were already subject to capital punishment; therefore, if a unilateral divorce was not initiated for one of these reasons, the initiating party incurred a penalty on the dowry, and the woman was sent away. This law was revoked under *Julian, but revived from the mid-5th c. This notwithstanding, unilateral divorce remained valid, whereas divorce with the consent of both parties continued to be freely available.

This was the context in which the bishops and theologians began their great fight against the practice of divorce. If, theoretically, they did not recognize unilateral divorce—nor consensual divorce either, based on the NT—there were two cases in which separation was permitted: adultery (Mt 5:32; 19:9), and the difference of religion (1 Cor 7:12-16) of one party, this latter in the case where a person, married when both spouses were pagan, converts, and the other spouse is unable to live in peace with him or her. The validity of each reason had different force: with a partner's adultery, for most Fathers beginning from *Hermas, separation was obligatory; for others, it was merely a concession. According to Hermas, *Basil of Ancyra, *Theodoret and *Augustine, the guilty party who accepts correction must be taken back; this could not be done according to *John Chrysostom, *Basil of Caesarea, *Cyril of Alexandria and *Jerome, based on Dt 24:1-4. In the case of the conversion of one of the two pagan parties, Augustine requires that the initiative in separating not come from the believer, and he exhorts the Christian spouse to do everything possible to avoid it. Despite the polemic of *Clement of Alexandria and *Origen against heretics who dissolved marriages for religious reasons, Basil of Caesarea (*Mor.* 73,1; *Great Asketicon* 12) admitted separation in order to enter religious life.

When considering divorce, however, one must distinguish between the separation of the spouses and the possibility of contracting a new marriage: this latter problem, posed to moderns by Mt 19:9, didn't trouble the ancients at all, except for a few 4th-5th-c. Latin authors, because they read that text in the form of Mt 5:32 (which may have been the original form), where a new marriage of the initiator is not spoken of. The situation is different in the case

of the other reason for separation: the passage clearly says that the converted partner may remarry. Paradoxically, a second marriage contracted after a separation that has occurred because of an unbelieving spouse is admitted only by *Ambrosiaster (with the same conditions for both sexes). Conversely, along with other Fathers, Augustine formally opposed it (*Con. adult.* 1,13-24): according to him, the unbeliever was also bound not to remarry, based on Gen 2:24: thus in antiquity the "Pauline privilege" meant nothing more than the possibility of separation, but without permission for a new marriage. Given, on the other hand, that in the case of the adultery of the partner the gospel passages say nothing about prohibition of a second marriage, the passages were interpreted differently even from the earliest Fathers. Many condemned remarriage explicitly, one (Ambrosiaster, *Comm. 1 Cor.* ad 7,10-11) allowed it for the husband, others didn't address the problem directly, and still others, though condemning it in theory, would accept it as pastors. Thus Origen (*Com. Mt.* XIV, 23-24) mentions that some bishops had allowed the second marriage of a woman whose first husband was alive: they acted against Scripture, but not entirely without reason. Nevertheless at the end of § 24 he specifies that the new marriage is merely a façade and is not valid; Basil (*Epist.* 199, *can.* 26) offers, as a principle, that "fornication" can never become marriage: nevertheless, if it is not possible to separate the false spouses they should be made to do penance and left in peace "in the fear that something worse might not happen." The Council of *Arles (314, *can.* 11) judged that if a young husband caught his wife in flagrant adultery, he must not remarry, but that this was more advice than an ecclesiastical sanction: see also Augustine (*De fide et oper.* 19,35) and the letter of Leo the Great to Nicetas of Aquileia, and perhaps Epiphanius (*Panarion* 59, 4), if he is not treating only of remarried widows. Nautin favors this interpretation, while Crouzel opposes it.

Given the extreme variety of doctrinal positions, some modern scholars, wanting to find a general practice followed by the Fathers, argue for the thesis that the Fathers, while accepting separation after adultery, would not permit a second marriage. Others argue that the acceptance of separation for adultery would also include permission to remarry. It seems that the problem can begin to find a proper balance if we consider that there could have been a difference in the practice and/or in the doctrine of the Fathers, in the sense that while certain authors excluded the theoretical possibility of a second marriage after divorce due to a partner's adultery, they could accept the idea that some bishops would allow it for pastoral reasons: at the same time many authors were silent on the matter, and one even explicitly allows it, as we saw above. One notes a certain inequality in the treatment of the problem, in that whereas wives who had been betrayed were severely prohibited from remarrying, prescriptions and obligations for husbands were defined only very rarely. Some interpreted the lack of prescriptions as a tacit consent given to divorced men. In any case this disparity was later eliminated, but in a different manner in the West than in the East. In the West, under the influence esp. of Jerome and Augustine, both parties were bound to remain single, whereas in the East both parties were allowed to remarry.

H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce*, Paris 1971; Id., *Le texte patristique de Mt 5,32 et 19,9*: NTS 19 (1972–1973) 98-119; Id., *Divorce et mariage dans l'Église primitive: Quelques réflexions de méthodologie historique*: NRTh 98 (1976) 891-917; P. Mattei, *Le divorce chez Tertullien. Examen de la question à la lumière des développements que le* De monogamia *consacre à ce sujet*: RSR 60 (1986) 207-234; Ch. Munier, *La sollicitude pastorale de l'Église ancienne en matière de divorce et de remariage*: LThPh 54 (1988) 19-30; P. Mattei, *Du divorce, de Tertullien, et de quelques autres sujets: perspectives nouvelles et idées reçues*: REAug 39 (1993) 23-35; Id., *Deux notes sur mariage (divorce) et virginité dans Novatien*: RSLR 29 (1993) 357-365.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

DOCETISM. By the term *docetism* we understand the various attempts to explain Christ's incarnation and passion in a dualistic and spiritualistic way, excluding all that would seem unworthy of the Son of God, a man born of a virgin and without sin. This does not refer to a specific sect, as some heresiological texts might suggest (Lampe 379: δοκηταί, and esp. Tertull., *Carn. res.* 1), but to a tendency to undervalue the historical reality of God's saving work; it is understandable primarily in *Platonic contexts, in which the true realities of the intelligible world were opposed to the apparent realities of the sensible world. In any case, there was a great variety among the so-called Docetists. Those spoken of by 1 and 2 Jn and *Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 13; *Trall.* 9f.) disregarded the true humanity of Jesus, the basis of salvation. *Marcion, to exclude any connection between the demiurge and the savior, admitted a "heavenly" flesh. For similar reasons, *Apelles imagined a body like that taken by the angels in their appearances. Strictly speaking, only the *Valentinians should be considered Docetists. According to them the Savior assumed only what was to be saved, hence no corporeal substance. Although docetism in the sense explained was characteristic esp. of the heresies opposed by *Tertullian (*Carn. res.*) and *Hippolytus

(*Ref.* 8,8-11; 10,16), the temptation to minimize the salvific value of the *incarnation, including the inner weaknesses of the man Jesus, would never be absent from Christian theology—to say nothing of the risk of exaggerated practical conclusions for the Christian life (devaluation of the corporeal values of sexuality and marriage).

DSp 3,1461-1468; A. Orbe, *Cristología gnóstica*, Madrid 1976; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I, Freiburg 1979, 187ff. (summarized by Orbe; other studies); E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, Wiesbaden 1979; U.B. Müller, *Die Menschwerdung Gottes. Frühchristliche Inkarnationsvorstellungen und die Anfänge des Doketismus*, Stuttgart 1990; T. Hainthaler, *Doketismus*: LTK³ 3, 301f. (bibl.); W. Löhr, *Doketismus, I/1: Alte Kirche*: RGG⁴ 2, 925ff. (bibl.).

B. Studer

DOCTRINA PATRUM (λόγοι ἁγίων πατέρων): a voluminous Greek christological *florilegium, whose original redaction (approx. chs. 1-30) was composed in the second half of the 7th c. It seems less an original work than a compilation made from other similar collections, some still existing (*Maximus the Confessor's *Ep.* 15; the florilegium of the Lateran Synod of 649), some lost (the florilegium on which *Leontius of Byzantium and *Leontius of Jerusalem depend, etc.).

F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des siebenten und achten Jahrhunderts*, Münster i. W. 1907, ²1981.

S.J. Voicu

DOGMA, History of. *1. Premises.* It is helpful to begin by making a somewhat practical distinction (see RGG⁴ 2, 915f.). On the one hand, the history of dogma is defined as the process of the origin and reception of normative doctrinal consensuses. On the other hand, scholars see the history of dogma as a discipline that studies the history of dogma in the first sense, but as part of the history of Christian theology. The history of dogma as a theme of scientific research began in the 18th-c. Enlightenment, receiving significant impetus from G.W.F. Hegel's philosophy of history (1831) and reaching its culmination in A. von Harnack's (d. 1930) *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (1886–1890). The elaboration of the history of dogma is essentially linked to the history of German Protestantism, although there was also interest in it in Catholic circles, for example in the Tübingen school, in J.H. Newman, in the modernist controversy in the early 20th century and in the recent Catholic theology whose representatives, such as M. Schmaus and A. Grillmeier, concerned themselves mainly with the hermeneutics of ancient Christian doctrines. There is no need to present here in detail the history of the historical-theological discipline (see TRE 9,116-123; LTK³ 3,298-201; RGG⁴ 2,915ff.). We must, however, call attention to the arguments behind the various approaches—that is, the question of in what sense the apostolic tradition has arrived at the conviction that the Christian churches proclaim, still today, the good news of Christ. In terms less intellectual than personalistic, the question arises of how the original testimony of the encounter with Jesus Christ is capable of leading to an experience of Christ today, and to a contemporary witness to his presence. This personalistic approach seeks to avoid a reduction of the history of Christian doctrine to a historiography of ideas, instead of also considering the daily attitudes and spiritual ideals of our fathers and mothers in faith (see LTK³ 3,284ff.). The common reception of the basic truths of the gospel goes back to the time when the churches were not yet divided as in the second millennium.

Whatever the exact explanation might be of the passage from the apostolic tradition to the testimony of the churches of today, it is interesting to investigate in what sense the authors of the ancient churches might have seen this problem, and in what way modern research might help in evaluating the development of faith and of theology in the ancient church. Before addressing this twofold question, however, it is worth specifying what is commonly meant by dogma and history (see LTK³ 3,284f.). Regarding dogma, a fairly wide consensus exists today in the Christian communities: it is ordinarily defined as the doctrine of faith, proposed as such by the churches. Opinions differ, however, on the exact way and the authority by which the churches define what all Christians are called to accept by faith. Nevertheless, even Catholic dogmatic historiography adopts in practice a broad concept of dogma, not limiting it to doctrines defined as such by the ecclesiastical magisterium, but understanding it as including all preaching of the faith, and indeed as the faith of the church (Lehmann, *MystSal*, 799). Nor is the church's infallible authority stressed, since, on the one hand, there is an acknowledgment of the practical impossibility of indicating for each Christian doctrine the degree of authority with which it is taught in the church, and on the other hand, in the study of the development of the history of dogmas the opinions of theologians are also taken into account, since without these, historians would be unable to fully evaluate the church's official doctrines themselves.

Likewise, today there is agreement on two fundamental aspects of the historicity of dogma: a historical passage is admitted from the initial faith in Christ to that of today—that is, from the apostolic tradition, passed down essentially in the writings that the church itself considers to be Sacred Scripture, to the contemporary proclamation of the gospel of Christ. The "dogmatic" decisions of synods clearly play a key role in this process, but they do not explain the whole reception of the apostolic tradition. It is also accepted that the continual elucidation of the primitive message is part of the historicity of the church itself, and thus occurs under the influence of a variety of factors: internally, first worship, then the faithful and scientific reading of the Bible, intellectual research into a deeper understanding of the faith, care to exclude from this study all erroneous interpretations, and Christian spirituality; externally, the more-developed organization of the Christian communities, the encounter with new cultures, and the political and social conditions of Christians.

Given that the concepts of dogma and history of dogma go back only to the end of the 18th c., and since then have evolved considerably under the influence of the historical sciences, in particular in the discussions of the positions of liberal Protestantism (von Harnack and others) and of modernism (see Söll; Lehmann), two approaches are possible for a patristic consideration of dogma in history. One could examine to what extent the ancient churches have in some way contributed to modern reflections on the history of dogma; or, departing from the modern conception of the history of Christian doctrines—a conception certainly unknown to the Fathers—one can try to show how the historical phenomena of the patristic era should be evaluated in light of modern research.

2. *The patristic contribution.* Taking up the first perspective, we will start from the fact that the patristic use of the term *dogma* reflects that of classical Hellenism. In it the fundamental idea, "that which seems (δοκεῖ) to be right," is applied both in a somewhat theoretical sense—opinion, doctrine, philosophical principle—and in a practical sense, i.e., a decision taken and promulgated by an authority (never religious), i.e., edict, decree. In the NT (esp. Acts 16:4) and the apostolic fathers we find only the latter use, but this had no influence on the immediate development of the concept (Elze, *Begriff*, 423f.). Under the influence of Stoicism, the apologists, esp. *Justin and *Tatian, but also *Clement and *Origen, who see Christianity as the true philosophy, take up the first sense, which is also connected with the idea of *hairesis*, i.e., distinguishing between the dogma or dogmas of philosophers, heretics and Christians (see Orig., *C. Cels.* 3,39). *Eusebius of Caesarea understands dogma not just in the sense of doctrine, identifying it with *pistis*, but he also refers it to synodal authority (Elze, *Begriff*, 429f.). We would thus expect dogma in this sense to appear in the acts of the councils. This is not the case, however, perhaps because it includes too much of the idea of something "subjective," "human" (Elze, *Begriff*, 430f.). *Sozomen (Elze, *Begriff*, 432) and *Justinian (Mirbt, n. 484) are exceptions. Moreover, it is remarkable that *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 4,2) and *Gregory of Nyssa contrast fidelity to dogma (doctrine) with good moral conduct, and that *Basil distinguishes *dogma*, doctrine still to be considered secret, and *kerygma*, public teaching (*Spir. Sanct.* 27,66: SC 17 bis, 89ff.).

Among the Latins use of the term *dogma* was somewhat rare. Obviously it became more frequent under the influence of Origen's works, translated into Latin by *Jerome and *Rufinus (Elze, *Begriff*, 434). While for these and others it can mean either the false doctrines of philosophers or heretics, or Catholic doctrine, *Augustine uses it exclusively in a negative sense (*dogmata nefaria*, also in *Mendac.* 4; *C. duas ep. pelag.* II, 3,5. *Gest. Pel.* 6,16.18, with negative overtones). Entirely different is the use of *dogma* in *Vincent of Lérins's *Commonitorium* (only 7 of 28 instances have a negative sense; see Becker, *Dogma*, 339). For him, while the Arian error is a *dogma novum*, the true doctrine guaranteed by the *consensio Ecclesiae catholicae universitatis et antiquitatis* (*Comm.* 38; see Sieben, *Konzilsidee*, 154) is called *dogma Ecclesiae* (*Comm.* 120), *dogma caeleste* (*Comm.* 122), even *prisca illa caelestis philosophiae* (*!*) *dogmata* (*Comm.* 135).

Although the patristic use of *dogma* is thus quite removed from modern use—except for Vincent of Lérins, who exercised a great influence from 1500 on (Elze, *Begriff*, 438, with reference to Kremser), esp. on Vatican I (Lehmann, *MystSal*, 652)—the idea of a doctrine of faith, presented by church authorities as a condition of communion of faith, is far from absent. We need only consider the concepts of apostolic tradition and *depositum fidei*, the liturgical custom of requiring of baptizands faith in the Trinity, the synodal practice of formulating confessions of faith (*ekthesis*), the *satisfactio* that new bishops or heretics had to provide in order to be admitted to the communion of faith, and the theological method based on the *regula fidei* (see Kelly). During the 4th and 5th c. four particular elements were added to the subject matter of Catholic doctrine: the Nicene

Creed, considered to be God's word, the basis of Christian orthodoxy and model for further synodal decisions; the integration of conciliar decisions into imperial legislation; dogmatic formalism, imposed after 400 (Hanson); and the popes' claims of the integrity in faith of the church of *Rome.

As for the historicity of dogma, Christians very soon made a clear distinction between the church's apostolic origins and its later circumstances, thus assuming a historical transition from the primitive preaching to the later preaching of the gospel, to which they nonetheless extended the revealing and inspiring activity of the Holy Spirit in the sense of Jn 14:26 (Congar). Also, defending from the 2nd c. on the unity of the two Testaments, they developed the idea of a certain progress of revelation, i.e., of a divine pedagogy, of God's adaptation to humanity and an ever-increasing enlightenment. Though they saw innovation almost exclusively in the relationship of the NT to the OT, there were those who admitted deeper clarification of apostolic intent even during the time of the church, such as *Gregory of Nazianzus regarding the doctrine on the divinity of the Holy Spirit (*Or.* 31,25ff.). Also noteworthy is Augustine's theory on the *emendatio* of councils (Sieben, *Konzilsidee*, 92f.).

The most explicit teaching on development of dogma is undoubtedly found in Vincent of Lérins. While insisting on the *depositum custodi* (*Comm.* 22), he could not avoid the question of whether there existed a *profectus religionis* in the church. He certainly admits it, but not in the sense of a *permutatio fidei* (*Comm.* 23); rather, there is only a better knowledge and a more devout veneration of what has been believed *semper, ubique, ab omnibus* (*Comm.* 2). In the same sense Leo considers the event of Chalcedon (451), not as the promulgation of a new faith, but as a clearer manifestation of the truth always believed (*Ep.* 104,1). Also noteworthy is the fact that the catalogs of heresies, despite their lack of a historical spirit, include an idea of a succession of heresies, and in part even a connection between them.

Finally we may consider the reflections of the early Christian authors, esp. Origen and Augustine, on the relation between history in the ancient sense of an account, and faith with the meaning of the reception of authoritative witnesses. To recognize that the Christian faith is not possible without the *narratio rerum gestarum* requires an attention to the historicity of the recounted fact, of the testimonies concerning them and of the ever-new inculturated reception of these testimonies (see Studer, *Cognitio historialis* and *Historia*).

3. Retrospective evaluation. In the second perspective the following aspects must be borne in mind. The starting point of the history of dogma must be located in the religious movement started by Jesus of Nazareth. Prepared by the experience of the people of Israel (monotheism of the law and the prophets) and confronted with the experiences of contemporary Judaism, Jesus had the experience of intimacy with the Father and of his Messianic vocation. The primitive community, on the other hand, guided by familiarity with Jesus himself, experienced the Easter mystery as the confirmation given by God, in the power of the Holy Spirit, to the proclamation of the coming of the kingdom, which appeared to have been compromised by the *cross. This basic experience was passed on in preaching to later generations, calling them to the same experience of faith. In this context, therefore, it makes sense to speak of the history of faith in Christ.

Postapostolic Christianity experienced the presence of the glorious Christ in the church, thanks to the apostolic memories handed down *in scriptis* in the gospels and apostolic letters. They, however, reinterpreted the primitive preaching that resulted from faith in Christ in the light of their own experience in new religious and cultural conditions, thus leading not just to new reflections on faith, but also new formulations of faith. This complex process continued over the centuries, nourished and protected not only by Scripture, but also by the later consensual writings that illuminated the ever-living apostolic preaching in light of the church's ever-changing circumstances.

This explanation of the history of faith, and thus also of dogma, is well-illustrated by a consideration of baptismal faith. For the first Christians, the encounter with the Lord in baptism, conversion to him, was undoubtedly a privileged experience of faith. The Epistle to the Romans (5–8) is the most eloquent attestation of this. This baptismal experience found dogmatic expression in the mandate, attributed to the risen Christ, to baptize all in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (Mt 28:19; *Did.* 7). The baptismal formula would thus be the light in which new converts would see their baptism. Those, on the other hand, who were baptized in other historical and religious circumstances—the 4th c.—would reinterpret the formula to the point of arriving, at the end of that century, at a universal acceptance of faith in the Trinity. The main steps toward this goal, which were not the last, were (1) Justin presents the baptismal creed to the pagans as an expression of Christian religiosity (*Apol.* 6; 61-67); (2) *Irenaeus frames his catechesis within the three articles of the baptismal creed (*Epid.* 3-6; 100); (3)

the *Traditio Apostolica* mentions it in its defense of the traditional *liturgy (ch. 21); (4) Origen makes it the basis of his vision of the world (*Princ. praef.*); (5) the Council of Nicaea rules out any graduality of the three persons; (6) anti-Sabellian theologians, like Eusebius of Caesarea, see it as the main evidence of the true distinction of the divine persons (Hahn, 188); (7) Basil derives *homotimia*, the equal adoration of the Father, Son and Spirit, from the baptismal consecration in the triple name; (8) he also insists on the necessity of understanding Jesus' baptismal command starting precisely from baptismal experience. Thus baptismal faith, experienced and further elucidated on both a theological and a dogmatic level, became during the first centuries the explicit confession that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, really distinct but without distinction of degree, are nonetheless one God.

The example of baptismal faith, which is clearly fundamental, helps us to understand better the complexity of the history of Christian dogma. It demonstrates that the ongoing elucidation of the primitive faith took place mainly in the liturgy, the primary place of encounter with Christ, Son of God and source of the Spirit (Lehmann, *MystSal*, 634f.). In it we see too the influences of the encounter with rhetoric (concept of *persona*) and philosophy, as well as the role of the magisterium which ruled out false explanations and whose most solemn decision, that of Nicaea, was likened to the divine word; and the function of theology, which sought to justify the interpretation of baptismal faith by looking at it in the context of the Bible, the basic witness of the fundamental baptismal experience. Finally, this explanation of the history of dogma includes the requirements of a complete historiography. We cannot content ourselves with synodal decisions or the canonical letters of bishops, and neither is it enough to explain these undoubtedly decisive documents merely by the heresies they opposed; we must refer to the theology that brought to maturity those situations in which church authorities could no longer avoid taking a position. Also to be considered are preaching, liturgical texts, the testimony of Christian devotion, hagiography and Christian art, since all of this evidence expresses the consciousness of faith that lies behind the synodal confessions, decrees and canons, to say nothing of doctrines, like soteriology, that were never directly the object of the ancient magisterium.

Finally we must point out, to the extent possible, the homogeneous transition from Scripture, in which the apostolic experience of the risen Christ remains in some way still accessible to us, to the theological and dogmatic expressions of the ever-renewed recovery of that original experience of the faith of the people of God.

Besides articles in dictionaries and in manuals of history of dogma, see esp.: A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche*, Breslau 1897; Y. Congar, *La Tradition et les traditions*, Paris 1960 (Eng. tr. Needham, MA [2]1998); M. Elze, *Der Begriff des Dogmas in der Alten Kirche*: ZThK 61 (1964) 421-438; K. Lehmann, in *Mysterium Salutis* I, Einsiedeln 1965, 622-787 (It. tr. Brescia 1968); G. Söll, *Dogma und Dogmenentwicklung*: HDG I/5, Freiburg 1971; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London 1972; R.P.C. Hanson, *Dogma and Formula in the Fathers*, SP 13, Berlin 1975, 169-184; K.J. Becker, *Dogma*: Gregorianum 57 (1976) 307-350; 658-701 (Latin part up to 1500); H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979; TRE 9 (1982) 26-35. 116-125; J.B. Studer, *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1985; J. Drumm, *Doxologia und Dogma*, Paderborn 1991; B. Studer, *La cognitio historialis nel* De civitate Dei *di Agostino*: SEA 50, Rome 1995, 520-553; LTK[3] 3, 283-288; 295-301; RGG[4] 2, 895-899; 915-920; B. Studer, *Der Begriff der Geschichte in Schriftum des Origenes von Alexandrien*, in *Origeniana Octava*, L. Perrone (ed.), Louvain 2003, 757-777.

B. Studer

DOMITIAN, emperor (51–96). Titus Flavius Domitian, Vespasian's second son, emperor of *Rome from 81 (the year of his brother Titus's death) to 96. He adopted a popular policy, in contrast to the strictly conservative policy of the first two Flavii. A devotee of the cults of Isis, he gave Eastern characteristics to his monarchy. The emphasis in the last years of his reign on the cult of his person (he had himself called *Dominus et Deus*) led to a persecution against Jews and Christians, at that time not clearly distinguished for the purposes of police surveillance. Its illustrious victims included *Flavius Clemens, Flavia Domitilla and *Acilius Glabrio (killed in exile). Under Domitian the martyrs of Asia Minor cited in Rev 2:13 and 20:4 were killed; the apostle *John was exiled to Patmos; *Hegesippus (Euseb., *HE* III, 19-20) relates how some of Jesus' relatives were called to Rome for an inquiry. Domitian's persecution is attested in the first *Letter of Clement to the Corinthians* (VII, 1 and LIX, 4) and in the *Shepherd* of Hermas (passim). *Tertullian (*Apol.* 5,4) and *Melito of Sardis (Euseb., *HE* IV, 26,9 and III, 17-18) attribute to Domitian a generally anti-Christian activity. A political motive for the persecution can be found in the wide penetration of Christianity into the ruling class of imperial society (esp. in the senatorial class among Domitian's opposition), as evidenced by the victims recorded by pagan authors (Suet., *Dom.* 15,1).

S. Rossi, *La cosiddetta persecuzione di Domiziano*: GIF 15 (1962)

302-341; L.W. Barnard, *Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian*: NTS 10 (1963) 251-260; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 105-117; Id., *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan ²1990; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; F. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Roma e il suo impero*, It. tr., Rome - Bari 1992; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

DOMITIAN of Ancyra (5th c.). *Hegumen of the Palestinian *cenobium of *Martyrius, he and *Theodore Askidas led the *Origenists of *Palestine in the first decades of the 6th c. Thanks to the influence of *Leontius of Byzantium, Domitian was designated by *Justinian as bishop of Ancyra (ca. 540). When *Ephrem of Antioch condemned Palestinian Origenism (ca. 542), Domitian and Theodore put pressure on *Peter of Jerusalem to break off communion with the patriarch of *Antioch, but without result. Later Domitian and Theodore were behind the condemnation of the *Three Chapters. *Facundus of Hermiane cites (IV, 4,15) a very explicit passage of Domitian on the matter.

L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 204-207; F. Carcione, *La politica religiosa di Giustiniano nella fase iniziale della "seconda controversia origenista"*: Studi and Ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano 8 (1985) 6-7, 14.

M. Simonetti

DOMITILLA. Gave her name to a Roman catacomb. Once identified with Flavia Domitilla, niece of the emperor Titus Flavius Vespasian and wife of the consul Titus Flavius Clemens, she was accused of atheism in 96 under Titus Flavius Domitian and exiled to the island of Pandataria near Ischia, now Ventotene (Dio Cass., *Hist. rom.* 67,14,1-2; Suet., *Dom.* 15). She should rather be identified with another Domitilla, mentioned by *Eusebius (*HE* 3,18,4), a niece of Titus Flavius Clemens and exiled in 96 to the island of Ponza for being a Christian; in the 4th c. her cell became a pilgrimage destination (Jer., *Ep.* 108,7). There was no cult of Domitilla in ancient *Rome; her name is not in the *Mart. hier.* According to the 6th-c. *Passio SS. Nerei et Achillei*, originally written in Greek, this second Domitilla was a martyr of Terracina. The name *cymiterium domitillae*, from the 7th c., refers instead to a Roman noblewoman named Domitilla who owned the land where the catacomb developed (CIL 6, 948, 8942, 16246). Florus includes her in his martyrology 7 May.

BHG 1327; BHL 2257, 6058-6066; AB 102 (1984) 180; BS 5, 878-879; LCI 6, 81; BBKL 1, 1359-1360; RAC 4, 104-106; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 147-148; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane*, Rome ²1999, 211-217; P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen ²1989, 166-172; J. Ulrich, *Euseb, Hist. Eccl. III,14-20 und die Frage nach der Christenverfolgung unter Domitian*: ZNTW 87 (1996) 269-289.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DOMNUS (d. 271/272), bishop of *Antioch and son of Bishop *Demetrian, *Paul of Samosata's predecessor. Domnus was elected by the Council of Antioch of 268 following Paul's excommunication and deposition. Paul, however, with *Zenobia's support, kept possession of the see until late 271 or early 272, when *Aurelian, having reconquered Antioch, decided the dispute in favor of the orthodox (Euseb., *HE* VII, 30,17-19). Domnus died in 271 or 272 and was succeeded by Timaeus.

DHGE 14,644.

E. Prinzivalli

DONATION of CONSTANTINE. The *Liber pontificalis* contains, in the section dedicated to Pope *Sylvester, the so-called Donation of Constantine. The *Constitutum Constantini* is actually an apocryphal letter, addressed by Constantine to Pope Sylvester, his successors to the see of *Rome and all Catholic bishops of the world, who with this imperial constitution were subordinated to the authority of the bishop of Rome. The letter has two parts: a profession of faith and the donation itself. The emperor concedes power, dignity and imperial insignia to the pope and to his successors, along with perpetual sovereignty "over Rome, the provinces and the cities of all of Italy *or* of the Western provinces." A later version of the text replaced *or* with *and*, with obvious expansionist motives.

The text attributes primacy over the other patriarchates—*Antioch, *Alexandria, *Constantinople and *Jerusalem—to *Rome. The success of the spurious Donation of Constantine, the intent of which was to legitimize the freedom and ecclesiastical independence of the Roman see with respect to the civil power, was immense; it was not only inserted in various legal texts, but was also appealed to in the controversy of the two powers (Arnold of Brescia, William of Ockham, Marsilius of Padua) as an argument in support of papist theses. There are still serious doubts regarding the date of composition of this document (ca. 850 it was already known and considered trustworthy in *Gaul; thus, either shortly before or contemporaneous with the *Decretales*

Pseudo-Isidorianae, which include it) and on the place of composition (perhaps Rome, perhaps the abbey of Saint-Denis near Paris). The question of the letter's authenticity was already raised in the 15th c. by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (the future Pius II), followed by various humanists (Reginald Pecock, Nicholas of Cusa and Lorenzo Valla), who demonstrated the Donation of Constantine's falsity through textual and literary criticism and numerous historical testimonies.

Il Constitutum Constantini, P. Ciprotti (ed.), Milan 1966; L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis*, I, Paris 1886, CIX-CXX; E. Griffe, various articles on the Donation of Constantine in BLE 52 (1952) 224-226, 58 (1957) 238-241, 59 (1958) 193-221; I.P. Kirsch, *La "Donatio Constantini"*: La Scuola Cattolica 41 (1913) 198-213; P. De Leo, *Il "Constitutum Constantini,"* Reggio Calabria 1974; M. Edwards (ed.), *Constantine and Christendom: The Orations to the Saints; The Greek and Latin Accounts of the Discovery of the Cross; The Edict of Constantine to Pope Silvester*, Liverpool 2003 (bibl.).

J.A. Cabrera Montero

DONATIONS to the Church. From the peace of Constantine, imperial donations were a significant source of property for the church: land, Roman buildings, confiscated pagan temples, judicial fines given to the church to help the poor, etc. In the 5th c., however, esp. in West, as the public treasury gradually emptied, this relationship became rarer. The church was thus forced to rely on private generosity, which took various forms, esp. manual offerings in money or in kind during liturgical assemblies. Here we will deal only with donations in life (A) and donations in death (B).

A. Donations in life consisted of sums of money or real estate intended for worship or charitable purposes, and could be immediate or with right of usufruct. A constitution of *Zeno (ca. 470), valid for the eastern part of the empire, established that donations had to be made according to legal forms approved by the imperial chancellery; this both bound the promiser and obliged the beneficiary, the church, to respect the resulting burdens, and esp. to observe scrupulously the allocation of donations: CI 1,12,15. Endowment (*dos*) was a particular form of donation: the allotted sum had to yield an income in support of a pious work, ordinarily a church building, in this way guaranteeing religious services and the chaplain's needs. Pope *Gelasius introduced strict control over foundations in territories where his authority extended; to avoid the inconveniences rising from the systems adopted by private churches, he prescribed that the founder should renounce, for himself and his descendants, any special claims over the new church and over receipt of the income of the endowment (*Ep.* XIV: Thiel, 364).

B. From 312/313 Constantine had recognized the right of Christian communities to own property. In 321 he accorded private citizens the right to make provision for the church at their death (CTh 16,2,4). The church itself encouraged this type of donation, esp. from bishops and clergy (see Reg. Ecc. Carth. ca. 81). In a sermon, *Augustine invites the faithful to include "God's part" among their successors, counting the church as one of their heirs (*Serm.* 355; cf. Ambr., *Expl. evang. sec. Luc.* 8,77). *Basil too suggests leaving half of one's inheritance to the church.

O. Schilling, *Reichtum und Eigentum in der altchristlichen Literatur*, Freiburg i. B. 1908; E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en Gaule*, I, Lille-Paris 1910, 13-25; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain*, Paris 1958, 291-299; P. Landau, *Kirchengut*: TRE 18, 560-575; J.L. Murga Gener, *Donaciones y testamentos "in bonum animae" en el derecho romano tardío*, Pamplona 1968; L. De Salvo, *Nolo munera ista* (*Aug. Serm. 355,3*)*: eredità e donazioni in Agostino*: AARC 9 (1993) 299-323; J. Kunderewicz, *Disposizioni testamentarie e donazioni a scopo di beneficenza nel diritto giustinianeo*: SDHI 47 (1981) 47-92; Ch. Pietri, *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997 (various articles); R. Soraci, *Il "Privilegium christianitatis" e i "Fisci commoda" durante il regno di Valentiniano I*: Quaderni Catanesi 2 (1990) 217-285.

Ch. Munier

DONATISM

I. Origins and history - II. Doctrine - III. A protest movement - IV. Donatism outside Africa.

Donatism was a schism that affected the church of N *Africa in the 4th and early 5th c., but lasted at least up to the turn of the 7th c. It reflected socioeconomic and religious divisions among N African Christians. In refuting the *Donatists, *Augustine worked out his theology of the church and the *sacraments, as well as his ideas on the coercion of religious dissidents by the state.

I. Origins and history. The immediate cause of the schism was linked with events in N Africa during the "great" persecution of 303–305. Many members of the clergy, bishops included, obeyed the authorities and handed over the books of the Scriptures. In the eyes of those who had resisted, they were considered *traditores*, "traitors" and apostates, unworthy of the clerical state. The persecution in N Africa was brief but violent (Euseb., *HE* VIII, 6,10), produced "many martyrs" and, when it ended in early spring 305, people recalled the admirable conduct of the confessors, esp. those of *Abitina (near Membressa, in W Tunisia). These Christians had continued to

meet after the fall of their bishop and were arrested and imprisoned at *Carthage. Even in prison, they solemnly condemned *traditores* and those who received the sacraments from *traditores*. These, they declared, would have no part with them in the kingdom of heaven (*Acta Saturnini* 18: PL 8, 701). Further, the archdeacon of Carthage, *Caecilian, was accused of having brutally prevented Christians from bringing food to the imprisoned confessors (ibid., ch. 17).

In 311–12, *Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, died, and Caecilian was elected in his place (Opt., *De schismate donatistarum* I, 18: CSEL 26,20). Opposition was immediate, even if partially motivated by factionalism (Opt., ibid.). Caecilian had evidently been consecrated in great haste, and in particular without the presence of the bishops of *Numidia, whose primate had obtained the privilege of consecrating every new bishop of Carthage (see Aug., *Psalmus contra partem Donati* 11,44-46: PL 43, 26); moreover, one of the consecrating bishops, *Felix of Aptunga, was suspected of being a *traditor*. In 312, after the murder of the *interventor* (temporary administrator) he had appointed for the see of Carthage (Aug., *Ep.* 44,4,8), the primate of Numidia, *Secundus of Tigisis, called a council of 70 bishops and declared Caecilian deposed (Opt., 1,19; Aug., *Ad catholicos Epist.* 18,46: CSEL 52,291; Anon., *Contra Fulgentium donatistam* 26: PL 43, 774 and CSEL 53,309). A lector named *Maiorinus, chaplain to Lucilla, a rich Spanish matron whom Caecilian had once deeply offended (Opt., I, 16), was elected in his place.

"One altar was erected against another" (Opt., I, 15 and 19): this was the situation that faced Constantine in late autumn 312 when N Africa came over to him without a blow being struck. Perhaps at the suggestion of his adviser Bishop *Ossius of Cordoba (Aug., *Contra Ep. Parmeniani* I, 4,6 and 5,10), Constantine supported Caecilian from the start and threatened his opponents with punishment (Euseb., *HE* X, 6; von Soden, *Urkunden*, 8). But when the emperor showed his intention of freeing clergy in communion with Caecilian from municipal financial burdens (*munera*; Euseb., *HE* X, 7; von Soden, *Urkunden*, 9), his opponents appealed to him (15 April 313) to allow the bishops of *Gaul, who had not been affected by the persecution, to judge the question (Opt., I, 22: Aug., *Ep.* 88,2: CSEL 24,2, 408, and von Soden, *Urkunden*, 11). Not long after, Maiorinus died and was succeeded by the much more formidable *Donatus of *Casae Nigrae* (*Gesta apud Zenophilum* 1; Opt., *De schismate*, app. 1: CSEL 26,185).

Constantine delegated the case to Bishop *Miltiades of Rome, himself an African, whose council of 2-5 October 313 pronounced in favor of Caecilian (Opt., I, 23-24). On 1 August 314 a fuller council, meeting at *Arles by order of the emperor, also absolved Caecilian and showed horror at the violent attitudes of his opponents (Opt., app. 4; von Soden, *Urkunden*, 16). On 15 February 315, Felix of Aptunga too was formally acquitted of the charge of *traditio*, in an audience at Carthage before the proconsul Aelianus (*Acta Purgationis Felicis*: Opt., app. 2; von Soden, *Urkunden*, 19; cf. Aug., *Ep.* 88,4 and *C. Cresc.* III, 70,81). After another appeal to Constantine and a reexamination of the whole case, the emperor himself gave a final judgment in Caecilian's favor, 10 November 316 (*C. Cresc.* III, 56,67 and 71,82. For the sequence of events, see Frend, *Donatist Church*, 141-159). After this, Constantine promulgated "a very severe law" against the Donatists (Aug., *Ep.* 105,2,9; cf. von Soden, *Urkunden*, 26). There were attacks on Donatist assemblies at Carthage (*Passio Donati*: PL 8, 753ff.). In December 320 the Donatist cause found itself in a potentially even more difficult position when Nundinarius, a deacon of the church of Constantine-Cirta, capital of Numidia, accused his bishop Sylvanus and other Numidian Donatist leaders of themselves being *traditores* and guilty of other grave crimes (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*: Opt., app. 1; cf. von Soden, *Urkunden*, 28). The case was submitted to Zenophilus, *consularis* of Numidia, and proven, but apparently the Donatists were not disadvantaged by it, and in May 321 Constantine desisted from his attempts at coercion (Euseb., *Vita Constantini* I, 45; Aug., *Ad Donat. post Collat.* 31,54 and 33,56; von Soden, *Urkunden*, 30).

For the rest of Constantine's reign, the Donatists gained ground. Around 320 they established their own episcopal see at *Rome (Opt., II,4; R.B. Eno, *The Significance of the Lists of Roman Bishops in the Anti-Donatist Polemic*: VChr 47 [1993] 158-169), in February 330 they took over the main church at Constantine (Opt., app. 10: CTh XVI, 2,7) and in 336 Donatus gathered a council of 270 bishops at Carthage (Aug., *Ep.* 93,43). At this time, *Jerome admits (*De vir. ill.* 93: PL 23, 734) that Donatus had made his the religion of "nearly all of Africa."

The situation stayed like this for the next sixty years. Despite Donatus's exile in 347, the severe repression of the Donatists by the imperial commissioners Paul and Macarius and the consequent Catholic influence from 347–361 (Opt., III, 3 and 12; VII, 6; cf. Frend, *Donatist Church*, 176-187), support for the Donatists hardly wavered. The Donatist leaders returned in triumph under *Julian (Opt., II, 16-18). Donatus's successor *Parmenian provided firm government and ensured the stability of the Donatist church.

On his death in 391/392, however, a major schism broke out. His successor *Primian was a rough, ignorant man who represented the Numidians and the more extreme elements of the church; his opponent *Maximian was a relative of Donatus and reflected the more moderate opinions of the Donatists of Proconsular Africa and Byzacena. The advantage was initially with the Maximianists: 100 bishops, mainly from Byzacena, condemned Primian for various disciplinary infractions at the Council of Cebarsussa (24 June 393; Aug., *Ep.* 43,9,26 and *Enarr. 2 in Ps. 36* 19-20; cf. Frend, *Donatist Church*, 213-220). But it was at the Council of Bagai, in S Numidia (24 April 394), attended by 310 Primianist bishops, that the schism was consummated (Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 56,62 and IV, 4,5; 7,9). In the next three years, Primian's supporters won a series of legal actions against the Maximianists and were at the same time able to reduce the antiheretical legislation of *Theodosius (*C. Cresc.* III, 56,62; IV, 47,57; 48,58), which might have been applied against them. Despite the Maximianist schism, the year 390 saw the Donatist church at the height of its power and prosperity.

The support of some Donatists, such as Bishop *Optatus of Thamugadi (Timgad), for Gildo's revolt in 393 provided the Catholics with a unique occasion to turn the tables on their opponents. In *Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, they had an able organizer and leader who strengthened the church's discipline and increased its security through the annual councils that met at Carthage. In St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, they found a pastor and theologian capable of defeating the Donatists in debate. From summer 403, the Catholics felt sufficiently strong to force their opponents to take part in a conference aimed at deciding which of the two parties had the most valid claim to be the "Catholic" church of N Africa (for the text, see PL 11, 1200-1201; for the debate, see P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire*, IV, 263-264 and S. Lancel, *Actes*, I, 14-16). Primian refused, but the following year the Catholics managed to appeal to the antiheretical legislation against the Donatists and, between 12 February and 5 March 405, the Emperor *Honorius sent to Africa edicts and supplementary *decreta* aimed at banning the Donatist church and confiscating its property (CTh XVI, 5,37 and 38; 6,3-4 and 5).

In the next six years the Donatists lost ground, esp. among the better-off classes, who found it prudent to conform to the emperor's will (see P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 240–241, the example of Celer). When in May 411 the conference of Carthage took place, presided over by the imperial representative, the tribune and *notarius* *Marcellinus Flavius, the Donatists could still summon up 285 bishops, just one fewer than their opponents (see Lancel, *Actes*, I, 117-118). The Catholics emerged victorious, however, and Donatism was again banned by an edict (CTh XVI, 5,52: 30 January 412), this time more effectively. Though some 30 Numidian bishops succeeded in meeting in Council at *Cirta, ca. 414 (Aug., *C. Gaudentium* I, 37,47), and though Bishop *Gaudentius of Thamugadi refused to hand his cathedral over to the authorities in 420/21 (Aug., *C. Gaudentium*), the Catholics clearly gained the ascendancy. Quite a few Donatist communities reunited with them (ibid. I, 12,13) in conformity with the 4th-5th-c. conciliar deliberations (P. Marone, *Le deliberazioni conciliari della chiesa occidentale del IV e V secolo relative ai donatisti convertiti al cattolicesimo*, in *I concili occidentali secoli III-V. XXX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma 3-5 maggio*: SEA 78 [2001] 269-287). The last known dated Donatist inscription comes from the garrison town of Ala Milaria (Benian) in *Mauretania, but it commemorates the building of a church from 434–439 in honor of a Donatist martyr, the *sanctimonialis* Robba (CIL VIII, 21570-4; cf. S. Gsell, *Les fouilles de Benian*, Alger 1901).

Apart from the final edition of the *Liber genealogus*, dated between 455–463 (MGH AA, IX, 196; see P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire*, IV, 102 and VI, 247-248), the Vandal occupation and Byzantine restoration furnish but little solid information on the Donatists. In Numidia, however (e.g., at Ain Fakroun: CIL VIII 18742), Donatist-type inscriptions of the Byzantine period have been found, and there are in that province rural churches that show signs of uninterrupted occupation from the 4th to the 6th c. Donatism unexpectedly renewed its vigor in S Numidia during the pontificate of *Gregory I (Greg., *Ep.* I, 33; III, 32; IV, 35; VI, 34): this was not on the whole surprising, but the causes remain obscure (on the question of whether there was a Donatist revival at this time, see R.A. Markus, *The Problem of "Donatism" in the Sixth Century*, in *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo*, XIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità Christian, Rome 9-12 May 1990, SEA 33 [1991] 159-166). In the 7th c. and at the time of the Arab invasion, obscurity descends once more.

II. Doctrine. The debate between Donatists and Catholics turned on the nature of the church as a society and its relations with the world and its institutions.

The Donatists considered themselves the authentic heirs of the church of N Africa as it had been before the great persecution, and in particular as it had been at *Cyprian's time. They were therefore conservative in their *liturgy, celebrated the *agape* as well as

the *Eucharist, and ignored the new feasts accepted by the Catholics, such as *Epiphany (Aug., *Sermo* 202,2). They opposed *monasticism (Aug., *C. litt. Petiliani* III, 40,48 and *Enarr. in Ps.* 132,3) and kept the African Bible, while the Catholics used the Vulgate. They remained a *fraternitas* dedicated to fighting the devil, and they aspired to martyrdom as their forebears had done before Constantine's conversion.

From the beginning of its history, ca. 180, the N African church had rejoiced in martyrs and martyrdom and boasted of its tight-knit constitution and exclusive character (see Tertull., *De spect.* 1 and *Apol.* 50, 13, "community" = *secta*). "We are a society (*corpus*) with a common religious feeling, a uniform discipline and a common bond of hope," proclaims *Tertullian (*Apol.* 39,1). This conception of the church implies the complete rejection of Greco-Roman culture and philosophy (*De praescr.* 7), the acceptance of the church as the living dwelling of the Holy Spirit and of martyrdom as the death most pleasing to the Spirit (*De Fug.* 5), capable of wiping out the stain of every postbaptismal sin (*Apol.* 50,16; *De An.* 55,5). Tertullian always stresses the spiritual nature of the church (*De Pud.* 21) and the need for the holiness of its members, in anticipation of the imminent end. The sacraments, esp. baptism, must be administered by "a minister free from the blame of sin" (*De Exhort. Cast.* 10 and *Bapt.* 15), and the distinctive mark of the church itself was purity and integrity (*De Pud.* 18, "*nec habentem maculam aut rugam*").

With Cyprian, between 248–258, these same ideas received an institutional character. Confessors and martyrs deserved commemoration by the church, but Cyprian considered the greater glory (martyrdom) as pertaining to the bishop (*Ep.* 13,1: CSEL 3,2, 504-505). Only the church, represented by its bishops, could remit sins. Confessors, however illustrious, had no such right (*Ep.* 27,3), and voluntary martyrdom (i.e., not regulated by the church) was disapproved of (*Ep.* 81). At the same time, Cyprian insisted on the church's integrity and purity. "Closed garden," "sealed fountain" (*Ep.* 69,2; 74,11), Noah's ark: these were the main OT images he used to describe the church's exclusive nature. Moreover, in his dispute with Pope *Stephen in 254–56, Cyprian found the African bishops ready to agree that, first, no priest in mortal sin could validly administer a sacrament, and that it was the duty of the community to separate itself from a sinful priest under the pain of risking contamination by sin (*Ep.* 67,4); second, there could be no valid baptism administrated outside of the church, and whoever received baptism from heretics or schismatics had to be rebaptized upon entering the Catholic church (Cypr., *Ep.* 69-74 and *Sent. epis.*, passim).

Donatist ecclesiology combined aspects of both Tertullian and Cyprian. The Donatists shared Cyprian's opinions on the absolute importance of the church's integrity, and appealed to his authority to support their baptismal theology (Aug., *Bapt.* I, 1, "*de beatissimi martyris Cypriani auctoritate*": PL 43, 109). At the conference of Carthage of 411 their *Mandatum* (*Coll. Carth.* III, 258: SC 224,1196) stated: "We show rather that in the Sacred Scriptures the church of God is everywhere proclaimed to be holy and immaculate" (*Magis ostendimus Ecclesiam Domini in scripturis divinis sanctam et immaculatam fore ubique nuntiatam*). But integrity came first. Only the *pure church* must be proclaimed to the outside world. The churches outside of Africa, being in communion with Caecilian, had apostatized. Christianity survived only in Africa (Aug., *Ad Cathol. Epist.* 9,23). Following Cyprian, Parmenian claimed that the Donatist church was truly the "closed garden and sealed fountain" (*hortum conclusum et fontem signatum*: Opt., I, 10), and possessed the requisite gifts (*dotes*: ibid.). From this it followed that only sacraments administered by a "holy minister," i.e., a Donatist, were valid (*Petilian, cited by Aug., *C. litt. Petiliani* II, 2,4; 7,14: CSEL 52,24,25). Baptism received from someone outside of the church was as if received "from a dead person" (ibid. II, 7,14 and cf. Cypr., *Ep.* 71,1). Consequently, baptism and the other sacraments dispensed by *traditor* clergy (i.e., by Catholics) were invalid, and Catholics who entered the Donatist church had to be rebaptized, a requirement that seemed particularly scandalous to Augustine.

From Cyprian the Donatists likewise received a solid episcopal tradition, giving great authority to whatever their bishops taught ("*Quod volumus sanctum est*," cit. by Aug., *C. Ep. Parmeniani* II, 13,30 and confirmed by Crispinus of Calama, who spoke with "*patriarchali sermone*," Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 46,50). Parmenian, like Cyprian, taught that the bishop was an intermediary between the Christian people and God (Aug., *C. Ep. Parmen.* II, 8,15: PL 43, 59-60). In the Donatist conception, the bishop was a biblical man "who always had the gospel on his lips and martyrdom in his heart" (*Passio Marculi*: PL 8, 762). Still following Cyprian, communion with Rome was maintained through a succession of "true bishops" (Opt., II, 4), which lasted until the conference of Carthage. The Donatist bishop of Rome, though, came after the primates of Carthage and Numidia in importance. Finally, the Donatists rejected the heresies condemned by the church in the past.

From another important perspective, however,

the roots of the Donatist doctrinal tradition went beyond Cyprian to the original ideas of N African Christianity. Like Tertullian, Donatists considered separation from *lapsi* and persecution by the state as distinctive signs of rectitude. To cite again the Donatist *Mandatum* of 411, they claimed above all that they were "bishops of the Catholic truth, which suffers persecution, but does not persecute" (*Januarianus et caeteri, episcopi veritatis catholicae quae persecutionem patitur, non quae facit*: SC 224,1194; PL 11, 1408 B). They did not acknowledge the "Christian times" resulting from the conversion of the emperors to Christianity. Petilian of Constantine, like Donatus himself (*Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?*: Opt., III, 73), considered secular magistrates irrevocably hostile to the church, and the Donatist church as continuing the tradition of the just sufferer, traceable back to the time of Cain and Abel (Petilian of Constantine, cit. by Aug., *C. litt. Petiliani* II, 92,202).

The role of the suffering people of God implied the ideal of martyrdom, including voluntary martyrdom, which Cyprian deprecated (*Ep.* 81). As with other themes, the matter is clear in Petilian: "So I say that he [Christ] has ordained that we must undergo death for the faith that each must keep in order to be in communion with the church. In fact Christianity progresses through the death of its followers" (Aug., *C. litt. Petiliani* II, 89,196; cf. Tertull., *Apol.* 50,13: "the blood of Christians is seed"). In rural Numidia, Donatist chapels invariably had the body of a martyr (real or presumed) under the altar and, close by, a sealed vase or an urn containing relics (for many examples, see A. Berthier et al., *Les Vestiges du Christianisme*). It was the "succession of martyrs" that mattered (*Acta Saturnini* 20: PL 8, 703) and, as in Tertullian's time, martyrdom was willingly accepted as a sign of the Holy Spirit's continuing work in the church. "In our church," claimed the author of the *Acta Saturnini* (ch. 20) "the virtues of the people are multiplied by the presence of the Spirit. The joy of the Spirit is to conquer in the martyrs and triumph in the confessors" (Tertull., *De Spect.* 29, "*ad tubam angeli erigere, ad martyrum palmas gloriare*"). For this reason the Donatist liturgy seems to have left room for ecstatic or enthusiastic songs of praise, along with the celebration of the Eucharist.

"Praise the Lord and exalt him, you just, let us glory in the Lord and rejoice"; this inscription in a church at Thamallula in Mauretania sums up the conviction of many ordinary Donatists in the 4th c. (S. Gsell, *Bull. arch. du Comité des travaux historiques et archéologiques* [1908] CCXVI); "praise God," **Deo laudes*, was the password and war cry of the Donatists, immediately recognizable as such (Aug., *Ep.* 108,5,14; *C. litt. Petiliani* II, 65,146; 84,188; *Enarr. in Ps.* 132,6; cf. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire*, IV, 439-443 and Berthier et al., *Vestiges*, 77). At the same time the Donatists produced intellectual and well-educated laymen (see Aug., *Ep.* 43 and 44) like *Cresconius, in reply to whose treatise in defense of Petilian Augustine dedicated four books, and able theologians like Vitellius Afer (Gennad., *De Script. Eccles.* 4: PL 59, 1059) and *Tyconius. Tyconius developed the doctrine that God's people had been divided from time immemorial into true and false brothers, and that Donatus had rightly insisted on this separation, in a grand theory of human society. The two churches represented two types of humanity, defined less by external obedience than by the will of individuals toward justice or toward evil. These ideas, though repudiated by the Donatists, influenced the Augustinian conception of the "two cities" (see A. Pincherle, *Da Ticonio a Sant'Agostino*: Ricerche Religiose 1 [1925] 443-466). Tyconius's biblical exegesis, summarized in his *Regulae*, had a great influence on Augustine's literary works (P. Marone, *L'uso delle "Regole" di Ticonio nella produzione letteraria di Agostino*: SMSR 24/2 [2000] 241-254), and on later medieval exegesis, esp. that of *Beatus of Liébana and *Bede (P.C. Bori, *La ricezione delle Regole di Ticonio, da Agostino a Erasmo*: AnSE 5 [1988] 125-142).

III. A protest movement. Though originally and principally a religious movement that considered Donatus a reformer and purifier of the church (Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 56,62) and drew its adherents from every class within the N African church, Donatism had a strong social and cultural appeal. The recovery of the martyr psychology and of the apocalyptic tradition of N African Christianity appealed particularly to Christians in rural communities, for whom the administrative and fiscal reforms of *Diocletian and *Constantine meant heavier taxes and a greater burden of debt.

"It was not modern historians who invented Donatist Numidia" (Lancel, *Actes*, I, 155). Contemporary witnesses all admit that Donatism originated in Numidia and Mauretania Sitifensis, esp. in the rural areas (thus Aug., *Ep.* 58,1 and 129,6; *Enarr. in Ps.* 36,11,19: *"Adtende nunc Caecilianum: tu servasti Numidiam, ille orbem terrarum"*; *Ep. ad Cathol.* 19,51: *"Numidia ubi vos praepolletis"*; see Petilian, *Coll. Carth.* I, 165, and Alypius, ibid., I, 181 [Donatist rural dioceses]; *Praedestinatus, De Haeres.* 69, on the *circumcellions, *"in partibus Numidiae superioris et Mauretaniae"*). Numidia's ecclesiastical identity, going back to the end of the 3rd c., reflected its eco-

nomic and geographical differences from Proconsular Africa. The S slope of the Atlas range and the river valleys are set in a high plateau which the Romans, in the 2nd c., had managed to transform into a zone of dry cultivation, esp. of olives and barley. From the 4th c. this region was densely populated with villages (see S. Gsell, *Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie*, Paris 1911, esp. *feuille*, *Constantine*, and Berthier et al., *Vestiges*, 23-31). The remaining buildings and the excavations in central Numidia, esp. those of André Berthier and his colleagues from 1930 on, have revealed a uniform Christian population. Churches and chapels dedicated to the martyrs were, with private olive presses, the most important buildings in the villages (ibid., 166-171). Despite the insufficiency of dating criteria, it seems that many of these chapels were in use contemporaneously, between 380–450 (ibid., 170).

Before the "great persecution," Christianity in Numidia tended to be uncompromising in its attitudes (see *Acta Maximiliani*, ed. H. Musurillo, Oxford 1972, 244). Support for the Donatism represented by Donatus of *Casae Nigrae* himself was to be expected. Augustine held that the schism had originated in Numidia (*Serm.* 46, 15,39: PL 38, 293). When the *circumcellions first made their appearance, ca. 340 (Opt., III, 4), they showed that the social and economic burdens (debts, sense of social injustice) had found their outlet through Donatism. And yet antagonism toward the landed proprietors was expressed in religious terms. The leaders of the circumcellions called themselves *duces sanctorum*, while the others were *agonistici* (Opt., III, 4, 81). The emperors who tried to suppress the Donatists were called "precursors of the Antichrist," representatives of the *saeculum* (*Passio Maximiani et Isaaci*: PL 8, 768 A; *Passio Marculi*, ibid., 761 D), whom Christians had the duty to eternally oppose. In the 5th c. the same hostility to the secular authorities was manifested against *Genseric and the *Vandal rulers (*Liber genealogus*, 627: MGH, AA, IX, 196).

Some Donatist leaders supported Firmus, the rebel leader of the Kabyles, in 372–375 (Aug., *Ep.* 87,10 and *C. Ep. Parmen.* I, 10,16 and 11,17), and it has been established that exorbitant taxes were one cause of the revolt (Zos., *Hist. nova* IV, 16). *Gildo's revolt was also supported in Numidia (Aug., *C. Ep. Parmen.* II, 2,4 and *C. litt. Petiliani* II, 23,53; 83,184; and 92,209), but it would be anachronistic to consider Donatism a political revolt against the empire or even a fruit of N African particularism. In terms of the cultural life of N Africa, Numidian Donatism marked a vigorous renaissance of traditional indigenous N African art, esp. that of wood sculpture (see Frend, *The Revival of Berber Art*: Antiquity 16 [1942] 342-352). The language of the Donatist church's liturgy and preaching was Latin. The Donatist leaders, such as *Petilian or *Emeritus, came from the class that spoke Latin and had been brought up on the classics, just like their Catholic opponents. Nevertheless, the circumcellion movement itself would not have appeared credible without a real, though not fully articulated, connection between the rigorist tradition of Christianity in N Africa, reflected by the Donatists, and political and economic discontent. The Donatist bishops, like *Macrobius, Augustine's rival at Hippo, were ready to identify themselves with the circumcellion movement, despite the differences of culture or even of language (see Aug., *Ep.* 108, 5,14 and *Ep.* 111,1). Augustine, on the other hand, was more at ease with the wealthy or ruling classes of his diocese (see Frend, *The Donatist Church*, ch. 20).

Conclusion: Donatism began as a revolt against what many Christians in N Africa considered a betrayal of the faith by their own leaders, and continued as a protest against the effects of the *christiana tempora* initiated by Constantine; it drew its strength from the puritan and apocalyptic traditions of N African theology. Educated laymen and clergy, as well as rural circumcellions, could find their identity in the Donatist church. Moreover, Donatism was sustained by strong popular memories of the *dies traditionis/ thurificationis* (see CIL VIII, 6700) and of the "persecution of Paul and Macarius" (the *tempora macariana*). The fact that Donatism did not become the religion of the N African people—as monophysitism became that of the Copts—depended on an adverse combination of circumstances. At the crucial moment of the failure of Gildo's revolt in 398, the Donatists found themselves faced by a revived and reorganized Catholic church, ably guided by Augustine and his friends and supported by the coercive power of the imperial authorities. After 429, the prevalence of new religious, political and military factors under the *Vandals and the *Byzantines prevented any effective revival of Donatism, until N African Christianity itself went into irremediable decline. However, the Donatist heritage of puritan nonconformity, which associated concern for Christian integrity with social justice, survived and has continued to influence Christian thought and action in the West into the present.

P. Monceaux, *Histore littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, IV-VII, Paris 1912–23 (repr. Brussels 1966); H. von Soden, *Urkunden zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Donatismus*, Bonn 1913 (repr. Berlin 1950) (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 122); A. Berthier - F. Logeart - M. Martin, *Les Vestiges du christian-*

isme antique dans la Numidie Centrale, Algiers 1942; G.G. Willis, *St. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy*, London 1950; J.P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine de Septime Sévère à l'invasion arabe*, Paris 1958; H.J. Diesner, *Kirche und Staat in spätrömischen Reich*, Berlin 1963; E.L. Grasmück, *Coercitio, Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit*, Bonn 1964; E. Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken: Soziale, wirtschaftliche und politische Aspekte einer nordafrikanischen Kirchenspaltung*, Göteborg 1964; R. Crespin, *Ministère et sainteté, pastorale du clergé et solution de la crise donatiste dans la vie et doctrine de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1965; P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography*, London 1967; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church, a Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford [2]1971; S. Lancel, *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411*, Paris 1972–75 (SC 194-195, 224), 3 vols., esp. vol. I; B. Kriegbaum, *Kirche der Traditoren oder Kirche der Märtyrer? Die Vorgeschichte des Donatismus*, Innsbruck - Vienna 1986; M.A. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa*, Liverpool 1996; Id., *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World*, Minneapolis 1997; S. Lancel - J.S. Alexander, *Donatistae*: AugL, II/3-4, Basel 1999, 606-638; M. Edwards, tr. and ed., *Optatus: Against the Donatists*, TTH 27, Liverpool 1997.

W.H.C. Frend

IV. Donatism outside Africa. We know of Donatist groups in Italy, Spain and Gaul, small in number and hardly active. In *Rome they reorganized the community of the *montenses*, the name deriving perhaps from the place of their meetings, also called *campitae* and *campenses.* According to *Optatus (II, 4), the Roman group was founded in 320; it was led at first by a temporary administrator (*interventor*), then by a bishop. Augustine (*Contra litt. Petiliani* II, 108,246; *Ep. ad. cath. secta donat.* 3,6) attests that the Donatists sent bishops to Rome and to Spain. The *Coll. Cartag.* cites the names of these bishops: Victorinus, *Boniface, Eucolpius, *Macrobius, *Lucian, Claudian and *Felix. Claudian, Lucian's successor as leader of the Donatist community, set himself up as the pope of the Donatists and was supported by the partisans of the antipope *Ursinus; he opposed *Damasus, pope of the *Catholica*, who, with the help of the secular arm, sought to exile him. Claudian managed to remain at Rome until 378 when, on the occasion of the Council of Rome, he was expelled and went to Africa, where he created the group of the *Claudianenses.* At the Council of Rome of 386, Donatists and Catholics were reconciled and the few existing Donatists joined the Catholics. In Spain, we do not know where they settled. It was probably here, or in Gaul, that Donatus the Great died and Parmenian was ordained (Opt., II, 7). It is traditionally said (the Maurists, Monceaux) that Lucilla, the promoter of the schism, was Spanish, despite the divergent information given by Optatus, Augustine and the trial of Sylvanus. The Donatists' links with Spain left traces among the Priscillianists. In Gaul, they began to live in groups during the Vandal domination and persecution, and during the emigration of the schismatics. It was at the Council of *Arles (314) that the contest between Caecilian and Donatus was clarified. The bishop to whom Augustine refers (*C. Cresc.* III, 63,70) must certainly have lived in Gaul. *Leo the Great and *Avitus tell us that in 458 and 502 there were still Donatists at *Narbonne and *Lyons, who ended, perhaps, by being absorbed by the Catholics.

Monceaux IV, 47-49; 122-124; V. Monachino, *Il primato nello scisma donatista*: AHP 2 (1964) 7-44; M. Sotomayor y Muro, *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, BAC, Madrid 1979, 1, 193-195; PCBE 1, 210; 1, 646; 1, 666.

E. Romero Pose

DONATISTS

I. Anonymous - II. Martyrs.

I. Anonymous. The followers of Donatus wrote many treatises, *libelli* and chronicles. We only have simple descriptions of the famous anonymous *libelli* mentioned by *Augustine. Donatist defamatory literature against Catholic bishops nearly always hid behind anonymity, until efforts were made to identify the authors so as to punish them (CTh IX, 34,1-9). But it was never possible to bring to an end the systematic search for anonymous Donatist literature, which in the end mingled with Catholic writings.

CPL 722: *Ep. Pseudocypriani ad plebem Carthaginensem*: PL 4, 433 - CSEL 3/3, 273-274; CPL 723: *Ep. Hieronymi ad Damasum papam*: PLS 1, 303; CPL 84: *Prophetiae ex omnibus libris collectae*: PLS 1, 177, 1738-1741; CPL 2254: *Liber genealogus*: PL 49, 523-543; MGH AA, 9, 154-196; CPL 2055: *P.D. et Saturnini*: ST 65 (1935) 3-71; 387-402; PL 8, 688-703; CPL 2063: *P. Max., Sec. et Donatillae*: AB 9 (1890) 110-116; ST 65 (1935) 75-97; Monceaux IV, Paris 1912; E. Romero Pose, *Ticonio y el sermón "in nat. sanct. innoc."*: Gregorianum 60 (1979) 513-544.

E. Romero Pose

II. Martyrs. The Donatists liked to call themselves a church of martyrs, "advocates with God." Their desire for martyrdom went as far as suicide (Aug., *Ep.* 173,4; *C. Gaud.* I, 1; *Retract.* II, 85; *C. litt. Pet.* II, 20,46; *C. Cresc.* III, 49,54). They appropriated martyrs from before the schism (312), and added to them those who perished during the conflicts with the Catholics (Opt., III, 4.6.8), whom *Optatus calls *dubii martyres* (III. 8). Provincial councils were called to settle the question of claimed Donatist martyrs. From epigraphs of martyrs in *Africa—"Africa is full of the bodies of martyrs" (Aug., *Ep.* 78)—it is difficult to distinguish a Catholic from a Donatist martyr; but

half of the martyrs' inscriptions of 4th- to 5th-c. *Numidia belong to the martyrs of Donatus. They have Punic or Libyan names, and are not cited by *Augustine, the martyrologies or the calendar of *Carthage. Donatist literature on martyrs comprises sermons, letters and booklets, which can be classified as follows: (*a*) *common martyrs*, prior to the split of 312, with adaptations of acts and passions in use in Africa; they are the precursors of the schism; (*b*) *proper martyrs.* The lists of Donatist martyrs are very long, esp. those pertaining to the persecution of Macarius (347), the Edict of Union (405–412) and the Decimations of the *Circumcellions (340–347).

CPL 719-721, 2049a, 2055, 2063. *Acta Crispinae*: ed. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri: ST 9 (1902) 23-35, 78-79 (= H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, 302-309); *P. Maximae, Secundae et Donatillae*: ed. De Smedt: AB 9 (1890) 110-116; ed. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri: ST 65 (1935) 75-97; *Acta Saturnini*: ed. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri: ST 65 (1935) 3-71.387-402; PL 8, 688-703; *P. Advocati et Donati*: PL 8, 752-758; *P. Marculi*: PL 8, 760-766: AB 53 (1935) 81-89; *P. Maximiani et Isaaci*: PL 8, 767-774; *Sermo de P. Cypriani*: R. Reitzenstein, *Die Nachrichten über den Tod Cyprians*: SHAW 14 (1913) 46-69; ed. H. Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 169-175; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei Martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 184-193, 242-247; P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1912, III, 93-187; IV, 461-484; V, 35-98; V. Saxer, *Morts Martyrs Reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 235-244; E. Romero Pose, *A proposito de las Actas y Pasiones donatistas*: SSR 4 (1980) 59-76; W. Lazewski, *La sentenza agostiniana: Martyrem non facit poena sed causa*, Rome 1986; J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier donatiste*, Berlin 1987; V. Saxer, *L'Afrique latine*: Hagiographies 1 (1994) 25-95.

E. Romero Pose

DONATUS AELIUS, grammarian (4th c.). A prominent figure in 4th-c. Roman culture, at his school of rhetoric he taught the young *Jerome, who remembered his celebrated teacher with affection (*Chron.* ad ann. 353). We have from Donatus a scholastic manual of particular importance: divided into a part dedicated to beginners (*Ars minor* or *prima*) and one directed to upper-level students (*Ars maior* or *secunda*), the text would become an authoritative tool for the study of Latin throughout the Middle Ages. We have some parts of a commentary on Virgil, including a dedication and a biography of the poet, followed by an introduction to the *Bucolics*, to which can be added some fragments cited in Servius, Priscian and the *Scholia Bernensia.* Donatus presents the poet Virgil as a master of every doctrine, a model that would be widely exploited in medieval literature until Dante. Finally, we have larger portions of Donatus's commentary on the comedies of Terence.

DNP 3, *Aelius D.* 3, 775; N. Marinone, *Elio Donato, Macrobio e Servio commentatori di Virgilio*, Vercelli 1946; L. Holtz, *A l'école de Donat, de saint Augustin à Bède*: Latomus 36 (1977) 522-538; L. Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion* (*IV-IX siècle*), Paris 1981.

G. Pilara

DONATUS of Besançon (ca. 590–ca. 660). Saint, feast 7 August. Born in Upper Burgundy, he embraced monastic life at a very young age, entering the monastery of Luxeuil under the guidance of St. *Columbanus. He became bishop of Besançon in 624 and founded a men's monastery (St. Paul), to which he gave a rule that combined those of St. *Columbanus and St. *Benedict, and a woman's monastery (Joussa-Moutier), whose rule he wrote himself, basing it on those of Saints Columbanus, Benedict and *Caesarius of *Arles. Upon his death he was buried in the monastery of St. Paul.

CPL 1860; ASS Aug. II, Venice 1751, 197-200; BS 4, 785f.; DSp 3, 1573-1577; Lex des Mitt 3, 1237-1238; LTK 3, 334; R. Hanslik, *Regula Donati*, SP 10 (TU 107), Berlin 1970, 100-104; A. de Vogüé, *La Règle de Donat pour l'abbesse Gauthstrude*: Benedictina 25 (1978) 219-313.

G. Pilara

DONATUS of Carthage (d. 355)
I. First period - II. Conflict with Caecilian - III. Donatus's government, 317–347 - IV. Fall and exile, 347–355 - V. Theology.

A native of Casae Nigrae, he was bishop of *Carthage. From 315–355 he inspired and led the *Donatist schism in N Africa.

I. First period. Born ca. 270 at Casae Nigrae, in S *Numidia some 100 km (62 mi) S of *Tebessa, he may have been bishop at the time of the "great persecution" (303–305). He firmly opposed any collaboration with the pagan authorities and later, on 5 October 313, was declared guilty by a council and by Pope *Miltiades of having rebaptized *lapsi* among the clergy (Opt., *De schismate donat.* I, 24). In *Augustine's time he was considered responsible for the schism at the time of Bishop *Mensurius of Carthage (before 303–311/12) (*Brev. Collationis cum Donatistis* III, 12,24). When *Caecilian was elected to succeed Mensurius, Donatus seems to have worked to coordinate the opposition, but became its leader only after the death of Caecilian's main rival, Lucilla's chaplain *Maiorinus (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*: Opt., *De schismate*, app. I: CSEL 26,185).

II. Conflict with Caecilian. Caecilian's opponents appealed to *Constantine to arbitrate between Caecilian and themselves (April 313). Constantine delegated the case to Pope Miltiades (311–314), whose council of 19 Italian and Gallic bishops pronounced against Donatus and in favor of Caecilian (5 October 313). On 1 August 314, a larger council meeting at *Arles and representing the prefectures of *Gaul cleared Caecilian of all charges. Moreover, in February 315 the proconsular tribunal acquitted Bishop *Felix of Aptunga, one of Caecilian's consecrators, of the charge of being a *traditor* during the persecution. Some N African Christians were not prepared to accept the beginning of a new era in relations between church and empire and aligned themselves with Donatus, seeing him as representing the ideal of a complete separation between the church and the world. Donatus, imprisoned in Italy, received from Constantine another opportunity to confront Caecilian (Opt., *De schismate*, app. VI), but took advantage of the occasion to escape from prison and return to N Africa (Opt., I, 26). Despite Constantine's final verdict in favor of Caecilian (10 November 316; Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 71,82, and *Ad Donatistas post collationem* 33,56), and a direct persecution of the adherents to Donatism at Carthage in spring 317 (Aug., *Ep.* 105,9, "*severissima lex*"), from then on Donatus was accepted as bishop of Carthage by the majority of N African Christians (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 93: "*paene totam Africam decepit*").

III. Donatus's government, 317–347. The details of Donatus's long government are scarce and reach us only through the writings of his opponents. He spared no effort to ensure recognition and acceptance of his cause throughout N Africa (Opt., III, 3). His personal prestige among his followers was immense. Like *Cyprian before him, he united the priestly and prophetic functions (ibid., and Aug., *In Joannis Ev. tract.* XIII, 17). People swore "on his white hair," as they might today "on the beard of the Prophet" (Aug., *In Ps.* 10,5). During his lifetime he was known simply as "Donatus of Carthage" (Opt., III, 3: CSEL 26,76). More prosaic admirers at the end of the century saw in him "the man who purified the church of Carthage of error" (Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 56,62). In 336 he successfully defied the efforts of Gregory, Constantine's *praefectus praetorio* in Africa, to remove him (Opt., III, 3); indeed, during the same period he gathered a council at Carthage of not less than 270 bishops (Aug., *Ep.* 93,43). On this occasion he showed sufficient flexibility over ecclesiastical problems in distant *Mauretania, and allowed some exceptions to the rule that baptism given by a minister not in communion with his church had to be repeated when an individual or a community became Donatists.

IV. Fall and exile, 347–355. In 346, Caecilian having left the scene (and perhaps encouraged by *Athanasius of Alexandria's restoration, 21 October 346), Donatus asked the emperor *Constans to recognize him as sole bishop of Carthage (Opt., III, 1). Constans sent a commission to Carthage composed of two imperial *notarii*, Paul and Macarius, who came with gifts for the poor (ibid., III, 3) and some instructions to deliver. They soon made it clear, however, that they were siding with Donatus's rival, *Gratus. When they finally contacted Donatus, they got a rude answer from him: at their meeting Donatus made his famous remark, "*Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?*" (ibid., III, 3). Riots broke out at Carthage (*Passio Maximiani et Isaaci*), while in the countryside the commissioners were attacked by *circumcellions (Opt., III, 4). Unity was then proclaimed, with Gratus as bishop of Carthage (ibid., III, 1). Donatus was arrested and exiled, probably in Gaul. He had misjudged the situation, and died ca. 355 (Jerome, *Chron.* ad ann. 355) without setting foot in Africa again.

V. Theology. No theological work of Donatus's has survived. We can gather something of his opinions, however, from the few citations used by Augustine in *Contra epistolam Parmeniani*, while *Jerome mentions a work, *De Spiritu Sancto*, characterizing it as "Arian" (*De vir. ill.* 93). Donatus's ideas recall those of Cyprian and are centered on a Christian version of the doctrine of the "remnant." Without abandoning the idea that the church *should* be universal, he thought that at present it was a small body of the saved, surrounded by false Christians. The parable of the tares could be applied to these latter, whose number had been increased by the fact that the church outside Africa maintained communion with Caecilian. Only the African church remained "God's field" (see Aug., *Contra ep. Parmen.* II, 2,5), although the idea of a final universality was not abandoned. Donatus, ca. 314, sent *Victor of Garba to *Rome to maintain the "true succession" to the apostles there (Opt., II, 4), and after 343 put the Donatist church in contact with the Eastern party at the Council of *Serdica (Aug., *Ep.* 44,3,6 and *C. Cresc.* III, 34,38 and IV, 44,52). But for him, as for other Donatist leaders, the criterion of integrity was prior to that of universality as a proof of Catholicism. According to a fleeting hint of Jerome, the Holy Spirit played a considerable role for Donatus, as it had in *Tertullian's doctrine of the church. There is not

doubt that Donatus was an important Christian leader in his time. Augustine was prepared to associate him with Cyprian among the "precious stones" of the N African church (*"Lapis pretiosus erat Cyprianus, sed mansit in huius ornamento: lapis pretiosus erat Donatus": Serm.* 37,3: PL 38, 223). Like Athanasius in the East, he represented the new forces of popular Christianity that emerged with the triumph of the church under Constantine.

Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* II, 2,5; Monceaux V, 104ff.; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, 153-171, 177-182; on the question of whether Donatus of Casae Nigrae was Donatus of Carthage, see J.S. Alexander, *Donatus of Carthage and Donatus of Casae Nigrae*: JTS 31 (1980) 540-547; PCBE 1, 292-303; W.H.C. Frend, *Donatus "paene totam Africam decepit": How?*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 48 (1997) 611-627; J.S. Alexander, *Donatus* 1, AugL, II/5-6, 644-646.

W.H.C. Frend

DONUS, pope (676–678). Native of *Rome and son of Mauricius, he succeeded *Adeodatus II (672–676). Donus (or Domnus) brought an end to the brief schism of *Ravenna, whose archbishop had expressed autocephalous tendencies. He dispersed the monks of a Roman monastery inclined to *Nestorian positions. From a letter sent him by the emperor Constantine IV (but arriving at Rome after the pope's death) we deduce with certainty that Donus did not differ from his predecessors on the monothelite question, holding firmly against this heresy. The LP attests Donus's intense building activity: he built the church of S. Eufemia on the via Appia and had the great atrium of St. Peter's basilica paved with large slabs of white marble. He died 11 June 678 and was buried in St. Peter's.

Mansi 11, 195-202; LP I, 348-349; II, 255-256, n. 4; Jaffé I, 479; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 365-367; DHGE 14, 671f. (H. Marot); LTK[3] 3, 336 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 610-612 (S. Gasparri).

M. Spinelli

DOORKEEPER (Porter). The letter of Pope *Cornelius (d. 253) sent to *Fabius of Antioch mentions the existence at Rome of doorkeepers (*ostiarius*, *ianitor*; in Greek *pylōros* or *thyrōros*); it does not indicate the number, but probably there would have been seven. The **Liber pontificalis* presents two lists of the *cursus clericalis*: the first, at the time of Pope *Caius (283-296), places the *ostiarius* at the first level (p. 161, ed. Duchesne); the second, at the time of Pope *Sylvester (314-335), omits it (p. 171), but names a *custos martyrum*. The ministry of doorkeeping is recorded in the *Constitutum Silvestri* (cap. 11: PL 8,838) and in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (2,36,3; 2,28,5) and by ps.-*Ignatius (*Ad Antioch.* 12: PG 5,908). It was not an obligatory degree in the ecclesiastical *cursus*; this began with the other orders. *Paulinus of Nola counted doorkeepers among the clergy (*Carm.* 1,10; 19,447). The so-called council of 275 bishops celebrated under Pope Sylvester (actually, a ps.-council ca. 500) prescribed that *Si quis ad clericatum promoveri desiderat, hoc iustum est ut sit ostiarius annum unum* (*can* 5: PL 8,826; *Liber pont.*, ed. Duschesne, p. 303). Doorkeepers were also named in the *Theodosian Code in a law of *Gratian of 377 (CTh 16,12,24), destined for the *vicarius* of Italy, Catafronius, to exempt him from the *munera personalia*. In 258 at Rome, a doorkeeper Romanus was killed at the same time as the deacon *Lawrence (*Liber pont.* 1,155, ed. Duchesne). In the **Didascalia apostolorum* (2,57,6; 2,58,1) deacons perform the functions of a doorkeeper. While according to the so-called council of Laodicea the *subdeacons must monitor the doors (*can.* 43), according to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the subdeacons monitored the doors where men entered, while the deaconesses those where women entered (2,25,26) (see PL 20,671 note d); these were listed among the clerical offices (2,26,3; 2,28,5; 3,11,1-3; 6,17,2). The anonymous *De septem ordinibus* puts the ministry of doorkeeper in second place, after the *fossor* (gravedigger), with the duty of guarding everything that was inside and outside of the church and even *in omnibus fideles recipiant, respuant infideles* (2: PL 30,152; ed. A. W. Kalff, Würzburg 1935, p. 35).

At Milan, the doorkeeper prevents *Monica from "bringing to the tombs of the saints porridge, bread and wine" (*Augustine, *Conf.* 6,2). Doorkeepers are mentioned by Pope *Gelasius (*Ep.* 14,2: Thiel 363). For Pope *Pelagius (d. 561) the ministries of the doorkeeper and the bishop are at two extremes, the former the lowest and the latter the highest, in the ecclesiastical hierarchy (*Liber pont.* 1,303; cfr. 1,309). The office of doorkeeper in the Roman church was replaced, accordng to Duchesne, by the *mansionarii* (sacristans) (*Origines du culte chrétien*, Paris [5]1925, p. 365, n. 3; for the *mansionarii* cf. Diehl 1290 and 1290A). There are testimonies of doorkeepers at *Trier (13, 789; Diehl 1288) and *Salona (CIL 3, 13142; Diehl 1289; see index of Diehl, vol. III, p. 374), at *Jerusalem (DACL 14,1532f.), and at *Hippo, where Augustine named a needy *ostiarius* of the church of St. Theogenes (*Ep.* 26, Divjak). According to the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, written in *Gaul in the second

half of the 5th c., we have the ordination of a doorkeeper: "When a doorkeeper is ordained, at the beginning it falls to the archdeacon to explain to him how he must comport himself in the house of God. Then at the signal of the *archdeacon, the bishop will give him the keys of the church and will say to him: 'Be attentive,' alluding to the fact that he will have to give an account to God of the things he guarded with these keys" (*can* 97). *Isidore of Seville writes that the doorkeeper had authority to allow only the faithful to enter church and to reject the unworthy (*De off.* 2,15: PL 83,974). The Council of *Narbonne (589) joins the office of doorkeeper with attending to the doors (*can.* 13). The Council of *Toledo (597) established that, in the absence of a priest or deacon, the bishop "chooses a doorkeeper, who maintains the cleaning of the church, and who, every evening, lights all the candles of the holy relics" (*can.* 2); the Council of Toledo of 633 ordered that "the doorkeepers watch over the only door by which the bishops should enter" (*can.* 4) on the occasion of a council.

In antiquity there were penitents who could not have access to orders; they were permitted, in some places, to become doorkeepers (see Council of Toledo in 397/400: *can.* 2; Braga in 572: *can.* 23); the subdeacon widower, if he remarried, was demoted to the rank of doorkeeper (Council of Toledo in 397/400: *can.* 4; Braga in 572: *can.* 44). The office of doorkeeper was abolished in 1972 by Pope Paul VI, after the Vatican II Council (*Ministeria quaedam*, in *Enchiridion Vaticanum* 4,1749-1770).

DACL 14,1525-1533; DTC 12,2600-2602; EC 9,435-437; M. Andrieu, *Les ordres mineurs dans l'ancien rituel romain*: RevSR 5 (1925) 232-274, esp. 253ff.; Ph. Oppenheim, *De antiquissima quoad ostiarios documentatione*: Ephem. Liturgicae 52 (1938) 179-186; J. Lungkofler, *Die Vorstufen zu den höheren Weihen nach dem Liber Pontificalis*: ZKTh 66 (1942) 1-19; W. Croce, *Die niederen Weihen und ihre hierarchische Wertung*: ZKTh 70 (1948) 257-314; C. De Beaucourt, E. Mura, *Les degrès du Sacerdoce: I, Ordres mineurs, II, Ordres sacrés*, Paris 1947; V. Monachino, *La cura pastorale a Milano, Cartagine e Roma*, Rome 1947, 17-18; 154; 325; B. Fischer, *Esquisse historique sur les ordres mineurs*: Maison-Dieu 61(1960) 58-69; J.G. Davies, *Deacons, Diaconesses and Minor Orders in the Patristic Period*: JEH 14 (1963) 1-15; B. Botte, *Le problème des ordres mineurs:* QLP 46(1965)26-31; J. Lecuyer, *Les ordres mineurs en questions*: Maison-Dieu 102 (1970) 97-107; R. E. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ from Their Origins to the Twelfth Century*, Berlin-New York 1978; A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hierarchie*, Paris, 1977, pp. 229, 236, 287; R. E. Reynolds, *Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages: Duties and Ordination,* Ashgate 1999; P. Pellegrini, *Militia clericatus, monachici ordines. Istituzioni ecclesiastiche e società in Gregorio Magno*, Catania 2008, p. 83.

A. Di Berardino

DOROTHEA (early 4th c.). *Eusebius tells how *Maximinus Daia was in love with a Christian noblewoman of *Alexandria, whom he condemned to exile because she rejected him (*HE* 8,14,15). This woman, whose name Eusebius does not know, is called Dorothea by *Rufinus in his translation of Eusebius's ecclesiastical history. Baronius wrongly identified her with *Catherine of Alexandria; she has also been confused with a legendary Dorothea of Caesarea in *Cappadocia, executed under *Diocletian (BHL 2321-2325; K. Wolf, *The Legend of Saint Dorothy*: AB 114 [1996] 41-72; BHL 3981 and 9000 are plagiarisms of 2323) and mentioned by *Mart. hier.* on 6 February.

Also, there was a Dorothea among the 40 women executed at Heraclea in Thrace under Licinius (BHG 2281).

Díaz 429; BS 4, 816, 820-826; LCI 6, 89-92.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

DOROTHEUS (d. after 380). Antiochene presbyter, follower of *Meletius, entrusted by *Basil the Great with some delicate diplomatic missions. In 372, while still a deacon, he was sent by Basil to *Alexandria to ask *Athanasius's mediation in the relations with the Western church; the mission was unsuccessful. In 374 and 377 he went to *Damasus to ask him to send a Western delegation to the East, also unsuccessfully. He again went to *Rome with a letter of Basil denouncing *Eustathius of Sebaste, *Apollinaris and *Paulinus (Basil., *Ep.* 263).

M. Richard, *Saint Basile et la mission du diacre Sabinus*: AB 67 (1949) 178-202; Simonetti, passim; R. Pouchet, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: une stratégie de communion*, Rome 1992.

E. Prinzivalli

DOROTHEUS, Vision of. The *editio princeps* of a previously unknown Greek text contained in the *Pap. Bodmer* 29, the *Vision of Dorotheus*, was published in 1984. A poem in 343 hexameters, it presents itself as the autobiographical account of a visionary dream had by a certain Dorotheus, son of the poet Quintus (v. 300 and *explicit*). The papyrus text, heavily damaged and with gaps, and therefore extremely difficult to read and interpret, has led in the years since then to various critical interventions, often contrasting. The *Pap. Bodmer* 29 is part of the so-called *Codex of Visions* (written ca. AD 400), in which are also preserved the first three visions of the *Shepherd* of Hermas (in prose) and eight other minor poetical

compositions closely related to the *Vision of Dorotheus* (*To Abraham*; *To the Just*; *Eulogy of the Lord Jesus*; *Words of Cain*; *The Lord to Those Who Suffer*; *Words of Abel*; *Poem with Mutilated Title*; *Hymn*).

Dorotheus commits various transgressions and disobeys the order to guard the door of the palace of God. For this behavior he is severely punished, at the order of Christ and Gabriel. He is again stationed as the palace guard and, baptized with the name Andrew (brave man), finally decides to fearlessly proclaim his faith. This, in broad strokes, is the content of the vision that tells of repentance for past sins and conversion from spiritual laziness to a newly discovered courage in giving witness. The recent publication of the poem *To the Just* confirms the historical existence of this person, Dorotheus son of Quintus (v. 160), and sheds new light on his high social position, "ascetical" conversion and final glorification through martyrdom.

Among the various proposals advanced thus far for identifying the author, context and date of the *Vision*, none can yet claim a consensus. Elements upon which a coherent explanation might be based are the following: first, the author is a person with a good literary education, though he does take certain morphological, syntactic, metrical and lexical freedoms; he shows a substantial confidence with the models of the epic genre (Homer, Hesiod, Apollonius of Rhodes) and with the centonaria compositional techniques common at his time. He might have gained this knowledge from his father, if one admits that the poet Quintus is none other than Quintus Smyrnaeus, the author of the *Posthomerica*. Moreover, the technical terminology used to designate the celestial palace officials who appear in the vision reveal the author's frequentation and detailed knowledge of the highly placed politico-military circles of the second half of the 4th c. (Bremmer). The *megaron* in which the vision occurs (v. 4), however, is not necessarily to be identified with the palace of the emperor, as is often asserted without adequate justification; it could be the see of an imperial prefect, such as the *Augustales* of Egypt with its see at *Alexandria. All of this keeps us from placing our Dorotheus at the time of the persecution of *Diocletian, as the Swiss and Dutch editors propose (also as simple conjecture) on the basis of information found in *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 7, 32,2-4 and 8, 1,4; 6,5). Finally, the religious ideas in the vision's text, far from echoing properly "gnostic" motifs (as Livrea and Maccoull assert), point rather, as is confirmed in the additional poems, to an essentially orthodox ecclesiastical context, which confesses Jesus as the only God (v. 293 and *explicit*) and is deeply involved in the experience of ascetic renunciation and martyrdom. Indeed the ideas of conversion and martyrdom seem to be the main thread that connects the various components of the entire *Codex of Visions*.

Prosopographical research into different persons named Dorotheus who lived between the 3rd and 4th c. has brought to light the existence of a (Macarius) Dorotheus, martyred in AD 371 at Alexandria of Egypt under the *Augustales* *Tatian, i.e., at the time of the persecution against the Egyptian monks initiated by the pro-*Arian emperor *Valens. This information is reported exclusively in the so-called *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, a Merovingian translation of an Alexandrian *Chronicle* composed in the early 5th c., and later updated and reproduced as an appendix to the *Theosophia* in the early 6th c. (see P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia*, Leiden 2001, 133, ll. 122ff., and what I have written in Kernos 14 [2001] 322-325).

It would seem entirely plausible, therefore, to attribute the *Vision* to this Dorotheus, who is twice called *makar* (*Vision*, v. 302; *To the Just*, v. 135); he was very probably a high imperial official of a tepid, cowardly Nicene faith who, following a radical ascetical conversion, at a certain point found the courage to expose himself even to martyrdom. The other brief poems come from the circle of the "Just," companions and spiritual heirs of the martyr. Despite the obscurity in which he remains shrouded, we must conclude that Dorotheus, precisely because he left conspicuous traces of his martyrdom in the Alexandrian *Chronicle*, as well as in the two contemporary poems of the Bodmer papyri, was a very important person in orthodox Egyptian Christianity.

Editio princeps: A. Hurst - O. Reverdin - J. Rudhardt, *Papyrus Bodmer XXIX. Vision de Dorothéos*, Cologny-Genève 1984; A.H.M. Kessels - P.W. Van der Horst, *The Vision of Dorotheus (Pap. Bodmer 29) Edited with Introduction, Translation and Notes*: VChr 41 (1987) 313-359; J.N. Bremmer, *An Imperial Palace Guard in Heaven: The Date of the Vision of Dorotheus*: ZPE 75 (1988) 82-88; Id., *The Vision of Dorotheus*: J. Den Boeft - A. Hilhorst (eds.), Early Christian Poetry. A Collection of Essays (VChrS 22), Leiden - New York - Cologne 1993, 253-261 (bibl.); A. Hurst - J. Rudhardt, *Papyri Bodmer XXX-XXXVII. "Codex des Visions." Poèmes divers*, Munich 1999.

P.F. Beatrice

DOROTHEUS of Antioch (3rd c.). Antiochene presbyter of the second half of the 3rd c., ordained by *Cyril of Antioch in 290 (Jerome, *Chron. ad annum*). Well versed in Greek culture, he also learned Hebrew so as to pursue his study of Sacred Scripture (Eusebius, *HE* VII, 32,2-4). *Eusebius at-

tended some of his lectures and greatly esteemed him for both his doctrine and his life. Eusebius also tells us that the emperor put Dorotheus in charge of the administration of the Tyre purple works.

DHGE 14,685-686; DCB 1,899.

M. Simonetti

DOROTHEUS of Antioch (d. 407). From ca. 365 bishop of Heraclea (Thrace), a moderate *Arian and supporter of *Demophilus of *Constantinople. On the death of *Euzoius, ca. 375, he was elected bishop of the Arian community of *Antioch, but *Theodosius's anti-Arian edict of 381 forced him to abandon the see. He returned to his native *Thrace, but then went to Constantinople to take the place of the elected *Marinus, considered unsuited by his party. He also had some followers of his theological positions (Socrates, *HE* 4,35; 5,33; Sozomen, *HE* 7,17).

EC 4,1888; DHGE 14,685; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, 801 and 807.

M. Simonetti

DOROTHEUS of Gaza (6th c.). Disciple, ca. 525, of the recluses *Barsanuphius and John in Abbot Seridos's monastery, he received a precious group of letters of direction from them. He later became head of a monastery and left some *Instructions* to his monks, *Letters* and *Sentences*. The *Life* of his disciple Dositheus mentions him. Dorotheus made a fine synthesis of the **Apophthegmata*, the Cappadocians, *Evagrius of Pontus, *John Chrysostom, *Mark the Hermit and Isaiah: in short, the traditions of Palestinian *monasticism. In his surviving works he steers clear of the christological controversies. Through Theodore the Studite, he would enjoy a great ascendancy over Greek, Russian and Arab monasticism.

CPG 7352-7360; CPG/S 7352; PG 88, 1612-1841; DSp 3,1651-1664; Patrologia V, 279-280; L. Regnault, *Dorothée de Gaza, Œuvres spirituelles* (SC 92), Paris 1963 (with the orig. Greek text); M. Paparozzi, *Doroteo di Gaza, Insegnamenti spirituali*, Rome 1979; L. Cremaschi, *Doroteo di Gaza. Scritti e insegnamenti spirituali*, Rome 1980; J. Pauli, *Menschsein und Menschwerden nach der geistlichen Lehre des Dorotheus von Gaza*, St. Ottilien 1998; Dorotheus von Gaza, *Doctrinae Diversae. Die geistliche Lehre. Griechisch-deutsch*, ed. J. Pauli, 2 vols., Freiburg 2000.

J. Gribomont

DOROTHEUS of Marcianopolis (Moesia, 5th c.). Partisan of *Nestorius, it is said that in a liturgical function he condemned anyone who proclaimed *Mary to be mother of God. At Ephesus (431) he sided with the Eastern bishops against *Cyril. Sometime later, Nestorius's successor *Maximian had him condemned by a local synod, but his community would not accept his successor. The emperor *Theodosius exiled him to *Cappadocia. Some of his letters on the controversy survive.

CPG 5781-5786; DHGE 14, 688; Patrologia V, 37-38.

M. Simonetti

DOROTHEUS of Thessalonica (d. ca. 535). Bishop of *Thessalonica from at least 514 to 535, by which year he had died. He declared himself a partisan of Patriarch *Timothy of Constantinople, and refused to remove from the diptychs the names of the bishops who had occupied the see under *Zeno and *Anastasius. This prolongation of the *Acacian schism into the reign of *Justin and *Justinian procured his excommunication by *Hormisdas of Rome. Unfortunately he was among those who reestablished contact with Hormisdas in 514. It is worth noting that Theophanes the Chronicler was amazed to see him called "patriarch" by *Theodore the Lector, whose censured work survives in fragments.

E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, Munich 1939, 250-252.

M. van Esbroeck

DOSITHEUS of Samaria (1st c.). Our knowledge of Dositheus (from patristic, Jewish and Arab sources) is confused, contradictory and in some cases manifestly legendary. The practical impossibility of reconciling all the sources has led some authors (given in McL. Wilson) to postulate more than one person of this name. Given these difficulties, the facts must be treated with particular caution and accepted with reserve. Dositheus was a native of Samaria and lived probably in the 1st c. AD. *Hegesippus (in Euseb., *HE* IV, 22,5) makes him the founder and leader of one of the seven heresies that disturbed the church's peace as early as the 1st c. Ps.-*Tertullian (*Adv. omnes haer.* 1) puts him among the Jewish heretics, saying that he denied the inspiration of the prophets. The ps.-*Clementines (*Hom.* II, 24; *Rec.* I, 54; II, 8) connect him with *John the Baptist and make him the predecessor and teacher of *Simon Magus. Dositheus claimed to be Taeb, the Messiah of the Samaritans,

and his disciples referred the prophecies of Dt 18:15 and Num 24:17 to him (see Orig., *C. Cels.* 1,57; VI, 11; *In Ioh.* XIII, 27). He was the author of various works that circulated among his followers. His teachings inspired the sect known as the *Dositheans*, whom we know, e.g., through the (rather contradictory) evidence of *Epiphanius (*Pan.* XIII) and *Eulogius of Alexandria (6th c.; in Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 230), and whom Arab sources document as still active in the 10th c. AD. On the doctrines of Dositheus and his sectaries our sources provide conflicting information, hard to organize into a single coherent picture. In any case, from the available documentation it seems that Dositheus's teachings were *Encratite in character: great value was attributed to continence and virginity; in particular, he insisted on rigorous observance of the Mosaic Law, esp. regarding the Sabbath and prescriptions of ritual purity.

One of the texts of the Coptic library of Nag Hammadi calls itself the "Apocalypse of Dositheus" (*Three Stelae of Seth*—NHC VII, 5: 118,10). This reference to the obscure heresiarch of Samaria probably responds to the need to relate the work to someone traditionally linked with the origins of the gnostic movement, and may reflect the existence of relations between the so-called *Sethian groups and the Samaritan tradition. According to Goulet, the heretic Dositheus of Cilicia, known only through the work of *Macarius of Magnesia, should be distinguished from Dositheus of Samaria.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums urkundlich dargestellt*, Leipzig 1884 (= Hildesheim 1963), 155-161; S. Krauss, *Dosithée et les Dosithéens*: Rev. Et. Juives 42 (1901) 27-42; K. Kohler, *Dositheus, the Samaritan Heresiarch, and his Relations to Jewish and Christian Doctrines and Sects*: Am. Journ. of Theol. 15 (1911) 404-435; R. McL. Wilson, *Simon, Dositheus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*: ZRGG 9 (1957) 21-30; K. Beyschlag, *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis*: WUNT 16, Tübingen 1974; R.J. Coggins, *The Samaritans and Acts*: NTS 28 (1982) 423-434; J.E. Fossum, *Samaritan Sects and Movements*, in A.D. Crown (ed.), *The Samaritans*, Tübingen 1989; F. Dexinger and R. Pummer, eds., *Die Samaritaner*, WdF 604, Darmstadt 1992; S. Haar, *Simon Magus: The First Gnostic?*, Berlin 2003; R. Goulet, *Dosithée de Cilicie*: Apocryphæ 14 (2003) 55-72.

C. Gianotto

DOVE. The significance of the dove in Christian antiquity is linked to biblical symbolism. The Jewish tradition of the OT attests a particular and rich symbolism regarding the dove, emphasizing faithfulness as the animal's main characteristic, a quality well illustrated in the story of the dove sent out by Noah, which returns to the ark to announce the end of the flood (Gen 8:8-12). Another notable motif is the fact that the dove, returning out of fidelity, brought an olive branch, symbolizing peace and security. The rereading of this text highlights the messianic function of Christ, the peace of God, come to reconcile, in the Holy Spirit, a world separated by sin. In this perspective Christians attentively reread the gospel texts on Jesus' baptism, to shed light on the presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of Christians (Mt 3:16; Mk 1:10; Lk 3:22; Jn 1:32). To this end it is useful to recall that, besides the literal interpretation, there is a prominent symbolic interpretation: the Spirit manifests itself in the form of a dove, but is not the dove (Origen, *Hom. in Lucam evangelium* 27, 49).

In the light of this exegetical orientation, the church fathers created a link between the gospel and some OT texts, such as that in the *Song of Songs (1:14; 4:1; 5:12), so as to exalt the characteristics and qualities of the dove, with an exhortation to Christians to follow its virtues, e.g., faithfulness, chastity, goodness, simplicity. To the dove's simplicity *Origen adds purity, to characterize the Holy Spirit that Christians must imitate (*Hom. in Lucam evangelium* 27, 49). In reference to Ps 67, *Didymus of Alexandria speaks of the "wings of the dove," like those of the Holy Spirit in the episode of Jesus' baptism, showing its loftiness and heavenly greatness (*In Gen.* 46). St. *Cyprian reminds the Christians of his time of the connection between the qualities of the dove and those of the Holy Spirit: "For this reason the Holy Spirit also comes under the form of a dove, which is a simple and happy animal, not embittered by rancor; it doesn't bite ferociously, or tear to pieces with its claws; it loves human company and frequents just one house" (*Unit. Eccl.* 9). According to the African father these qualities of the Holy Spirit, expressed through the image of the dove, should shine in the church. He adds that the dove, as a symbol of goodness, is opposed to the serpent who poisons and destroys the Lord's sheep, united in the church. In *Jerome too we find the exhortation to imitate the dove's simplicity (*Com. Osea*). Clearly emerging in *Ambrose is the relationship between the dove and the Holy Spirit, who brings peace of heart and tranquility of soul (*De mysteriis* 11). In the *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* 2,92, using christological and pneumatological interpretation, Ambrose invites Christians to live as the dove: "Why as the dove? Because the grace of baptism requires simplicity, that we be as simple as doves. The grace of baptism requires peace, which the dove, in the ancient prefiguration, brought to the ark which alone remained immune from the flood. But the one who has now been marked out to descend in the form of a dove, has taught me that in that branch, in

that ark, were the symbols of peace and of the church, since precisely in the midst of the flood of the world the Holy Spirit brings a fruitful peace to the church." *Augustine, who uses the word *dove* at least 181 times in his writings, shows a strong dependence on Ambrose, not only in moral interpretation, encouraging the virtues in the life of Christians, but esp. dogmatically. In fact Augustine, following his teacher, brings into full light the significance of the dove in relation to trinitarian theology, starting from the narrative of Jesus' baptism, which concludes with the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove (*in specie columbae*). The identification of the dove with the Holy Spirit is so strong that at times Augustine calls it a dove. In this sense the dove is invoked to teach the faithful openness of heart, and to accept true peace (*in columba vera pax*), unity (*in columba unitas*) and simplicity (*simplex ut columba*).

From this perspective comes the connection between pneumatology and ecclesiology, which brings out the theology of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit: the dove lives not only in the hearts of each of the faithful, but also in the church as a community of believers, wanted and founded by Christ. For this reason the church is identified with the dove (*columba autem ecclesia est*), since it manifests true peace. In this line of thought St. *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep. ad Severum* 32, 10), explaining the Trinity in the light of the episode of Jesus' baptism, highlights the identification of the Holy Spirit with the dove. In the same sense *Maximus of Turin writes: "As then, the flood over, the dove brought to the ark of Noah the sign of peace, so, after the judgment, Christ also will bring to the church of Peter the joy of peace, since he is the dove or peace" (*Serm.* 49, 3).

Against this background, the influence of this double symbolic meaning on Christian archaeology is not surprising. The symbolism of the dove bringing the olive branch refers to the messenger of heavenly peace, who manifests himself with gentleness, innocence and simplicity of heart. From the 3rd c. on, Christian art fixed the dove as the favorite image for indicating the presence of the Holy Spirit in the faithful departed. Thus we have in funerary monuments of every kind, esp. in the catacombs of St. *Callistus in the 4th c., the depiction of the dove bearing an olive branch in its mouth or feet, signifying the peace of those who rest in the Lord. Besides these funerary depictions, also notable in the early church is the use of a vase in the form of a dove to preserve the *Eucharist (*columba eucharistica*; Tert., *Liber adv. Valentinianos* 3).

H. Lesètre, *Colombe*: DTC 2, 846-851; J.P. Kirsch, *Colombe*: DACL, 3, 2198-2231; AL 1, 1069-1078; H. Leclercq, *Colombe eucharistique*: DACL 3, 2231-2234; F. Suehlig, *Die Taube als religiöses Symbol in christlichen Altertum*, Freiburg i. B. 1930; M.P. Ciccarese, *Animali: simbolici. Alle origini del bestiario cristiano*, I, Bologna 2002.

M.W. Libambu

DOXOLOGY. Doxology is an acknowledgment of the glory of God (*doxa*), a glory that consists in the confession and proclamation of God's nature and mystery, revealed in his works and, in a special way, in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ (Jn 1:14).

The earliest Christian communities inherited from Judaism the practice of closing their prayers with a doxology (Origen, *De or.* 33, 6). There are examples of this in numerous NT passages, esp. in the letters of Paul, Peter and Jude, and in Revelation. These NT doxologies refer only to the Father or the Son, never to the Holy Spirit—the usual case in the first centuries. The apostolic fathers address the Father or the Son *in the* and *with the* Holy Spirit (*Didache* 9, 4); *Justin, rather, the Father through the Son and through the Holy Spirit (*1 Apol.* 67). *Origen says that prayer should begin and end with praise to God the Father through Christ in the Holy Spirit (*De or.* 33).

The doxology that has reached us, *Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit*, originates from the baptismal formula of Mt 28:19. It became the normal form beginning in the 4th c., specifically to refute *Arianism. From then on there was an effort to avoid any type of *subordinationist interpretation.

The Eastern Church distinguishes two doxologies: great (*gloria in excelsis Deo . . .*) and small (*gloria patri . . .*).

While doxology is essentially a trinitarian acclamation, it also touches on other realities: at times ecclesiological (*tibi gloria patri et filio cum sancto spiritu in sancta ecclesia: Trad. Ap.* 6; 4; 7) in line with Eph 3:21; others eschatological (*in saecula saeculorum, o nunc et semper, in saecula saeculorum*). This latter part, *sicut erat*, originated in Western communities and is never found in the East.

The use of doxology transcends the liturgical sphere and extends to patristic literature, esp. in letters. Among numerous examples, we can cite *1 Clem.*; *2 Clem.*; Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives*, *Pedagogo*; Origen; *Tertullian, *De orat.* etc.

The various doxologies, in going beyond the liturgical and euchological spheres, constitute a privileged window for understanding the evolution of Christian theology. They reflect the evolution of trinitarian doctrine and, with it, christo-

logical and pneumatological doctrine, the object of numerous debates and controversies in the course of the first centuries. They sought, therefore, as *Basil maintains in his *Treatise on the Holy Spirit*, to safeguard the equal dignity of each of the Persons of the Trinity (*homotimia*).

B. Botte, *In unitate Spiritus Sancti: L'ordinaire de la messe*, Paris 1953; D.B. Capelle, *Le texte du "Gloria in excelsis"*: RHE 44 (1949) 439-457; H. Crouzel, *Les doxologies finales des homélies d'Origène selon le texte grec et les versions latines*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 98-107; A. Hamman, *La prière*, I, Letournai 1959; II, 1962; V. Pavan, *La dossologia nella comunicazione cristologica dei primi due secoli* (*I e II Clem., Iust.*): VetChr 12 (1975) 391-415; A. Stuiber, *Doxologie*, RAC 4, 210-226; C. Renoux, Le *Gloria in excelsis Deo* de l'Église arménienne, in *Crossroad of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*, ed. H.-J. Feulner - E. Velkovska - R.F. Taft, Rome 2000, 603-618.

J.A. Cabrera Montero

DRACONTIUS, Blossius Aemilius (d. after 496). 5th-c. Latin poet, born ca. 450–460 under the reign of *Genseric, of a senatorial family originally from Campania but transplanted to *Africa. At *Carthage the young Dracontius frequented (474–475) the school of Felicianus, a Carthaginian *grammaticus* to whom he was indebted for an education based on the reading of the classics. In the following years, until 484, he successfully dedicated himself to the law as *togatus fori proconsulis.* Falling suddenly into disgrace, he was imprisoned on Gunthamund's orders for having written a *carmen ignotum* praising an equally unknown recipient, sometimes identified with *Theodoric, sometimes with *Zeno. After Gunthamund's death he was freed, ca. 496, by his successor Thrasamund, and resumed his legal work. He died at an unspecified date, apparently after having recovered the state of well-being he had enjoyed before his imprisonment.

The young Dracontius's early poetic work, closely linked to the teaching of the rhetor Felicianus, consists of the *Hylas* and the *Laus Herculis*, two poems of pagan and scholastic intonation. To the period of his legal work belong the *Controversia de statua viri fortis* and the *Deliberativa Achillis, an corpus Hectoris vendat*, oratorical in tone. In the same period he composed other poems, also handed down in the collection of so-called *Romulea*, among them the epylls *De raptu Helenae*, *Medea* and the *Orestis tragoedia*, compositions of mythological content, which however reveal a new ethical-religious intention of the condemnation of pagan myth.

But it was the dramatic and painful experience of prison which brought to maturity Dracontius's more consciously Christian vision of life and the world, as revealed in the *Satisfactio* and still more in the *Laudes Dei.* The tone of the *Satisfactio*, addressed between 484 and 490 to King Gunthamund to solicit his pardon and grace, is oratorical and *panegyrical; even the scriptural citations on divine clemency and the *exempla pietatis* taken from history are used to the end of obtaining freedom from the sovereign. The prisoner's emotion in invoking the king's clemency appears again in the three books of the *Laudes Dei*, composed in the last years of his imprisonment, between 490–496. The biblical motif of God *iratus* and *placidus* in his *pietas* is the dominant theme of the work, in which arguments drawn from the OT and NT are developed with lyrical *élan*, in a free exemplificatory paraphrase. Finally, still *captivus*, Dracontius composed the *Epithalamium Ioannis et Vitulae*, whose counterpart, the *Epithalamium in fratribus dictum*, was written not long after he regained his freedom. In thanksgiving, he addressed to Thrasamund a *Panegyricus* (lost) and dedicated to him two epigrams of Alexandrine stamp, *De mensibus* and *De origine rosarum*, the last known literary evidence of this poet, whose last years of life remain shrouded in mystery.

Arevalus PL 60; F. Baehrens, *Poetae lat. min.*, V, Leipzig 1883 (*Carmina profana*; *Orestis tragoedia*); F. Vollmer, *Fl. Merobaudis reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii Carmina*, Berlin 1905; Id., *Poetae lat. min. post Baehrens iterum rec.*, V, Leipzig 1914; F. Corsaro, *Bl. Aem. Dracontii De Laudibus Dei* ed. italice vertit, Catania 1962; S. Gennaro, *Satisfactio* (tr. comm.), Catania 1952; Dracontius, *Œuvres*, Les Belles Lettres, t. I (*Louanges de Dieu* I-II, ed. C. Camus - C. Moussy); t. II (*Louanges de Dieu* III, *Réparation*, ed. C. Moussy); t. III (*La tragédie d'Oreste, Poèmes profanes* I-V, ed. J. Bouquet); t. IV (*Poèmes profanes* VIX, fragments, ed. É. Wolff), Paris 1985. 1988. 1995. 1996; A.M. Quartiroli, *Gli epilli di Draconzio*: Athenaeum 24 (1946) 160-87; Id., *Gli epilli di Draconzio*: ibid. 25 (1947) 17-34; C. Arena, *Rapporti fra Reposiano e Draconzio*: MSLC 3 (1951) 110-123; F. Migneco, *Draconzio: Romalea IV, V, IX*: MSLC 7 (1955) 43-65; E. Rapisarda, *Il poeta della misericordia divina*: Orpheus 2 (1955) 1-9; L. Alfonsi, *Dracontiana*: Aevum 34 (1960) 100-103; Id., *Sulla Satisfactio di Draconzio*: GIF 13 (1960) 356; D. Romano, *Studi Draconziani*, Palermo 1960; F. Corsaro, *Problemi storico-letterari del cristianesimo africano del V sec.*: MSLC 11 (1961) 5-32; C. Gnilka, *Zu Iuvenal und Dracontius*: JbAC 8-9 (1965) 177-183; S. Blomgren, *In Dracontii carmina adnotationes criticae*: Eranos 64 (1966) 46-66; F. Bertini, *Autori latini in Africa*, Genoa 1974, 81-97; I. Gualandri, *Problemi draconziani*: RIL (1974) 872-890; E. Clerici, *Due poeti: Emilio Blossio Draconzio e Venanzio Fortunato*: RIL 107 (1973) 108-150; K. Smolak, *Die Stellung der Hexamerondichtung des Dracontius*: Festsch. Kraus, Vienna 1972, 381-387; G. Aricò, *Mito e tecnica narrativa nell'Orestis tragoedia*: Atti Acc. Sc. Lett. Palermo 37 (1977-78) 7-104; J.M. Díaz de Bustamante, *Draconcio y sus Carmina profana*, Santiago de Compostela 1978; R.M. Agudo Cubas, *Dos epilios de Draconcio*: CFL 14 (1978) 263-328; R. Speranza, *Draconzio, Sat. 272*: MPhL 3 (1978) 213-218; R. Marino, *Concordanze della Orestis tragoedia di Draconzio*, Pisa 1981; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident Chrétien*, Paris 1981, 252; A. Grillone, *"Purgandus Orestes": bravura avvocatizia e cammino spirituale di Draconzio*

nell'"*Orestis tragoedia*," Quaderni Catanesi 9 (1987) 77-102; B. Weber, *Der Hylas des Dracontius: Romulea 2*, Stuttgart 1995; W. Speyer, *Der Bibeldichter Dracontius als Exeget des Sechstagewerkes Gottes*, in G. Schöllgen - C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für E. Dassman*, Münster 1996, 464-484; L. Castagna (ed.), *Studi draconziani*, Naples 1997; A. Grillone, *Sul testo dell'"Orestis Tragoedia" di Draconzio*: Res publica Litterarum 3 (2000) 185-206; M. Mülke, *Interpolationen in Dracontius*, in W. Blumer - R. Henke - M. Mulke (eds.), *Alvarium. Festschrift für Ch. Gnilka*, JbAC (Ergänzungsband 33), Münster 2002, 279-291.

S. Costanza

DREAMS and the FATHERS. The mystery of dream life, which is simultaneously so close to and so different from daily life, the history of its influence on the individual, just as the causes and the meaning of certain extraordinary dreams, have fascinated people of all ages and, among these, even the first Christians. At the time in which Christianity was spreading, divination through dreams had an important role, perhaps because the traditional divinities saw their popularity diminishing. Ancient Christianity did not deny that dreams could bear messages, but they rejected oneiromancy (i.e., the prediction of the future by means of the interpretation of dreams) along with all forms of divination. The **Apostolic Tradition* (ch. 16) bears witness that Christianity refused to confer baptism on the interpreters of dreams, and the Emperor *Constantius II took measures against the oneiromancers. Although at times God conceded to dreams (to good as well as bad people), it was God himself who supplied their interpretations, and there was no longer any place for specialists of interpretation; this was also the reading taken from the book of *Daniel (see *Pseudo-Clementine homilies* 17,15-18).

As in the case of the Bible and the Jews and pagans of their time, Christians believed that dreams could be the vehicle for a divine revelation, and *Luke openly states this in the Acts of the Apostles when he affirmed that after *Pentecost Joel's prophecy was fulfilled: "your sons and daughters will prophesy, your young men will have visions and your old men dreams" (2:16-18). Patristic literature, therefore, abounds with reports of dreams. But not all a bird's flights speak of what is to come, Homer said in ancient times; excessive attention to the revelations by some individuals or groups of Christians quickly led to a wise skepticism and a reflection on criteria for discernment.

Patristic reflections on dreams. The Pythagoreans, the *Platonists and the *Stoics allowed without difficulty that a dream could be a bearer of a higher knowledge, because everyone thought in one way or another that the *soul was of the divine nature and that the dream freed the bonds that united it to the body: in some way freeing the soul from the body, the dream allowed it to penetrate the world of the divine powers, or at least it rendered it open to a revelation when its attention was no longer concentrated on earthly realities. But all the Fathers also recognized that dreams do not always have the same importance; for this reason the ancients had a system of classification for various types of dreams. Within the patristic world, one finds classifications of dreams in the writings of *Tertullian, under the influence of the Stoics (*De Anima* 47), and in *Augustine, perhaps under the influence of the *Neoplatonist *Porphyry of Tyre or Chalcidius (*De Genesi ad litteram* 12,18,39; see also, for a different classification, *Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 8,24,42).

Tertullian recognized two types of natural dreams, those that are a reflection of the tasks of the day, and those that the soul created by itself, animated by a perpetual and innate movement; and two types of supernatural dreams, those sent by God and those sent by demons (*De Anima* 47). Augustine, in turn, divided dreams into (1) *phantasiae* or trite dreams, that have their source in the reproductive or the creative imagination, and (2) *ostensiones* (i.e., showings, manifestations), inspired dreams, in turn divided into clear and symbolic dreams, which can be attributed to God, the angels or the demons (*De Genesi ad litteram* 12,18,39-23,49). The great difference between his system and Tertullian's was in that he saw in the dream a lower form of revelation. For Augustine, in fact, there existed three types of dreams: the vision of the corporeal eyes; the imaginative ("spiritual") vision, through which one sees "the images of things that are perceived through the body"; the intellectual vision, which is the eye of the understanding (*De Genesi ad litteram* 12,6,15). Dreams pertain to the imaginary vision, and therefore do not derive from the higher part of the soul: for this reason, even the demons can make use of them (*Trin.* 11,4,7).

Augustine could not accept, as did the ancient philosophers, that the dream freed the soul from the body and rendered it more suited for participating in truth, because certain powers of the soul, just as judgment, reason or the will, are much less asleep in the course of the dream: there are dreams "certainly suggested in a certain sense by the body to the soul," and the dream is characteristic of the soul within the body (*De Genesi ad litteram* 12,30,58). The mechanism of the inspired dream was not, in Augustine's eyes, substantially different from that of the ordinary dream: once sleep has broken the bonds of the

senses with reality, "the soul is forced to direct its intentional force toward the images that are presented, be they emitted from the memory or caused from another mysterious force" (*Trin.* 11,4,7). The Bishop of Hippo acknowledged that the angels or the demons could intervene in dreams, but he was very reserved when it came to affirming that a particular dream was attributable to them.

Scripture abounds with visions and true dreams, but the ancient church often showed itself reticent with respect to new visions. Tertullian and the *Montanists believed that dreams and visions, the work of the *Paraclete, must complete the revelation of the NT; they practiced fasting and prayer and even incubation in order to obtain them (Tertullian, *De Anima* 48,7; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 49,1-2). The *Donatists seem to have partly shared these beliefs. Following revelations in dreams, some bishops such as *Ambrose and *Cyril of Alexandria, some priests and monks, or pious women, who are usually called "Lucina," were able to find the relics of forgotten martyrs; but in *Africa, the ecclesiastical authorities showed themselves to be prudent before approving the construction of altars requested following a dream, or to support the cult of the saints discovered in this manner.

It was believed that all such actions required discernment, as did the prophecies in the OT (see Dt 18; Jer 29:8-9). Against the *Donatists, Augustine vociferously affirmed that a thing cannot simply be true "because one of our brothers or sisters has had a certain vision while awake or a certain dream during sleep" (*Ep. ad Catholicos* 19,49). One must be "attentive to the more secure way of the *Scriptures," or rather, in a more certain way "one can receive warnings when one is not in a state of sleep, but in an awake state" (*De cat. rud.* 6,10).

Dreams and Christian life. What are the criteria that allow one to say that a dream is a revelation? For Tertullian, dreams that lead us to God are divine, and those that disturb us are demonic (*De Anima* 47,2). Such criteria are nothing more than a rough outline when compared to those that such monks as *Evagrius and *Cassian would use. The content of the dream is decisive, just as the positive or negative influence is upon the dreamer.

A dream has led more than one person to convert to Christianity: *Origen attests to this fact (*C. Cels.* 1,46) and Augustine confirms it (*De cat. rud.* 6,10; see *Ep.* 159,3 and 227: conversion of *Gennadius and *Dioscorus). They could also strengthen and comfort the believer in a moment of trial, as the dreams describing the authentic *Passions* of the martyrs attest, such as those of *Felicity and *Perpetua; and in the subsequent hagiographic literature it would become a true and proper *topos.* Dreams can help the Christian see clearly in moments of difficulty, as shown by the correspondence of the *Life* and the *Acts* of *Cyprian, who granted them great importance in his personal conduct and the governance of his church (*Ep.* 11,4-7; 66,10). They can also put the faithful on the road to healing: the miracles of St. Stephen (**miraculis S. Stephani*) and the 17th book of the *City of God* recount the story of sick people healed following the night apparitions of St. Stephen. These dreams allowed people to touch with their hands the fact that God is close and that he takes care of them personally. In Augustine's *Confessions*, one of the functions of *Monica's dreams, which appear to announce the conversion of her son, is that of emphasizing the constant work of divine providence in Augustine's life (*Conf.* 3,11,18-20).

Although all were agreed in maintaining that a dream of religious content could be an instrument of God—the decisive criteria was given by the beneficent influence that it had on the dreamer, as was seen in the case of Monica's dream—there was less agreement among those who discerned in ordinary dreams a means for knowing themselves. Tertullian maintained that the good or bad acts that were carried out in dreams were indifferent (*De Anima* 45,4). Augustine, who reflected much upon the phenomenon of dreams and their mechanisms, thought to the contrary that they could clarify the deep ego and indicate what was not yet sufficiently converted in it (*Conf.* 10,30,41-42), and that allowed one to perceive the greatness of the wound caused by original sin (*City of God* 22,22,3). According to *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4,139,4) or *John Cassian (*Coll.* 22,6), the purification of the passions includes also those of dreams, which are therefore a mirror of the soul. For *Evagrius of Pontus our dreams and also our reactions to these dreams can reveal our hidden thoughts (*Pract.* 64). And in the eyes of *Synesius of Cyrene it is vain to hope to reach the knowledge of oneself without knowing one's own dreams.

Beyond its role in the conduct of the individual's life, in what measure can the dream be a source of revelation? *Origen did not at all exclude this possibility (*C. Cels.* 2,60), although Augustine often combated such an idea: if one sees the dead in dreams, they appear in the same way as the living, and it is none other than dreamy images of the same nature (*De cura pro mortuis* 11,13; *Ep.* 158,8); only the martyrs and the angels were capable of truly appearing to men. The ancients were fascinated by visions of the afterlife, accounts of which already abounded in the apocryphal literature. Augustine himself, who

knew that the beneficiaries of such visions saw some dreamy images and not the realities of the other world, did not fail to use such accounts for the edification of the faithful, as is proven by the accounts that he gave of the dreams of Curma or Tutulismeni (*De cura pro mortuis* 12,15; *Serm.* 308,5). With respect to the vision of God, it is reserved for the higher part of the soul and the "intellectual" vision, and it is therefore impossible for it to occur in the course of a dream. This opinion was also shared by *Diadocus of Photice (*On vision*: SC 5b,172).

The subsequent mystical tradition valued daily vision higher than the dream. In antiquity, the hierarchy of values appeared at times to be ruined because the dream was an entirely normal phenomenon in the human being, although the vision could be the result of a psychological disturbance (Origen, *C. Cels.* 2,60). Some authors went to the point of appealing to the dreamy experience of their listeners to help them overcome an overly literal reading of the biblical visions (Origen, *C. Cels.* 1,48; Augustine, *Ep.* 169,11; *Eusebius of Emesa, *Hom.* 25,25-28). The great interest attributed by the ancients to dreams of a religious content was similar to that of certain contemporary psychoanalysts who, without attributing to dreams a supernatural origin, acknowledge their impact upon the patient and their importance in the healing process.

F. Refoulé, *Rêves et vie spirituelle chez Évagre le Pontique*: Vie Spirituelle, Suppl. 59 (1961) 470-516; J. Le Goff, *Les rêves dans la culture et la psychologie de l'Occident*, in *Pour un autre Moyen-Âge*, Paris 1975, 299-306; L.Ch. Ferrari, *The Dreams of Monica in Augustine's Confessions*: Augustinian Studies 10 (1979) 3-17; R.G.A. Van Lieshout, *Greeks on Dreams*, Utrecht 1980; J. Amat, *Songes et visions: l'au-delà dans la littérature latine tardive*, Paris 1985; C. Mertens, *Les premiers martyrs et leurs rêves*: RHE 81 (1986) 5-46; M. Dulaey, *Le Rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin*, Paris 1973; Id., *Songe et prophétie dans les Confessions d'Augustin*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 379-391; *Sogni, visioni e profezie nell'antico cristianesimo*, XVII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana: Augustinianum 29 (1989); DSp 14, 1990, 1054-1066: *Songes, rêves*, 1. Écriture Sainte (S. Légasse); 2. Époque patristique (M. Dulaey); B. Feichtinger, *Der Traum des Hieronymus—Ein Psychogramm*: VChr 45 (1991) 54-77; Id.: REAug 43 (1997) 41-61; S.F. Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 1992; P. Cox Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity. Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton, NJ 1994; C. Moreschini, *Sogni e filosofia nella tardà antichità*, in *Paideia*, Studi in onore di M. Naldini, Roma 1994, 511-522; G. Stroumsa, *Dreams and Visions in Early Christian Discourses*, in D. Schulman - G. Stroumsa, *Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*, Oxford 1999, 189-212; M. Burger (éd.), *Rêves: visions révélatrices*, Studia Religiosa Helvetica, Bern 2003; P. Lory, *Le rêve et ses interprétations en Islam*, Paris 2003; M.A. Monaca, *Il sogno nelle Confessioni di Agostino*, in *Le Confessioni di Agostino (402-2002): Bilancio e prospettive*, SEA 85, Roma 2003, 191-213; B. Näf, *Traum und Traumdeutung im Altertum*, Berlin 2004.

M. Dulaey

DROPSY (iconography). The only example in iconography in Christian antiquity which in all probability refers to the episode in the gospel of the man suffering dropsy (Lk 14:2-5 . . . *Et ecce homo quidam hydropicus erat ante illum . . . sanavit eum ac dimisit*) is documented on the ivory diptych of Erevan, datable to the 6th c. (Volbach-Hirmer, no. 142, pl. 75). The artistic representation of this NT account occupies one of the panels on the perimeter of the left panel of the diptych. The scene shows Christ, making the gesture of speech and carrying a *cross with his right hand, and a man having a very swollen stomach which is exposed to view; this last detail is clearly the element characterizing the composition. Only in a much later period are other representations of this episode found: in the decoration in fresco in the church of S. Angelo in Formis (11th c.) and in the mosaics in S. Marco in Venice (11th c.), in which the image of Christ is accompanied by the explicit inscription *hydropicum curat.*

L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, II, 2, Paris 1957, 374.

C. Carletti

DRUNKENNESS. "Inebriation in spirit" is the joy of one immersed in the love of God. The history of ecstatic manifestations in antiquity includes, in the sanctuaries, priests and priestesses inspired by Apollo, and in the forests, men and women invaded by Dionysius. *Plato, who admired poetry, says that "the poet is a light, lofty, sacred being, who cannot write his poems if he has not first been inspired by the god, entering a state of ecstasy and unconsciousness" (*Ione* 534, a-d). The Bible, symbolically exalting the wine of wisdom, recommends sobriety to those who await the outpouring of the Spirit (Pr 9:1-6; Eph 5:18; 1 Th 5:6; 1 Pet 4:7; cf. Acts 2:15-18 and Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 17, 18-19). *Philo of Alexandria, inebriated by God's word proclaimed by the prophets, defines the ecstasy of inspiration as a "sober and divine inebriation"; when God sends a prophet "he uses his vocal cords, his mouth and his tongue, to reveal what he wants to . . . with an invisible and melodious art" (*Rer. div.* 266; cf. *Opif.* 71; *Leg. All.* 1,84 and 3,82; *Mos.* 1,187; *Ebr.* 147). In the gnostic vision, inebriation is the light of the "knowledge of God" (*Od. Sal.* 11, 6-8; *Ev. Th.* 12). The extraordinary ecstasy of the *Montanists does not appear to have been genuine.

Christians, illuminated by the *Psalms and the *Song of Songs (Ps 23:5 and 36:8; Song 2:4 and 5:1), find the encounter with Christ in the word and in the *Eucharist inebriating (Orig., *In Jo.* I 30, 206; *In Mt. comm. ser.* 85; Cypr., *Ep.* 63, 11; Hil., *In Ps.* 64, 13-

15; John Chrys., *Adv. ebriosos*). The church-bride, inflamed with joy by the nuptial celebration of *Baptism, feels in the Eucharist the elation of the embrace of the divine bridegroom. *Origen says that the Christian lives perennially in God, going out of himself and ascending to the heights of love in a progressive mystical intoxication that allays the bitterness of life: "The Word manifests his beauty . . . in making glad with the sober drink those who are able to dedicate themselves to the joy of the banquet" (*In Jo.* X 10, 66; cf. *Co. Ct.* III, 184, 21-186, 12; *In Lev.* 7, 1-2; *In Jo.* X 12, 66; Euseb., *In Ps.* 35, 9-10; Greg. Gt., *In Ez.* I 10, 7). *Gregory of Nyssa, in the language of Song 2:13, shows that the word of Christ leads "to the good and sober inebriation, that inebriation in which human beings experience the ecstasy that transports them from material realities to divine realities" (*In Ct.* V; cf. *In Ct.* X and *In Asc.*, PG 46, 692). *Ambrose considers "sober inebriation" a guide to virtue, and in the eucharistic elation gains a foretaste of the heavenly banquet: "Good is that spiritual inebriation which does not make the body stagger, but strengthens the steps of the heart. Good is the inebriation of the chalice of salvation, which banishes the sadness of a guilty conscience and infuses the joy of eternal life" (*In Ps.* 118,21,4; cf. *Cain* I 5, 19; *Noe* 29, 111; *Isaac* 5, 49; *Bon. mort.* 5, 20; *Hel.* 10,33; *In Ps.* 1, 33; 118, 15, 28 and 21, 4; *Sacr.* 5, 17; also Jerome, *In Jer.* VI 17,10-11). Ambrose exclaims in the hymn for Matins: *laeti bibamus sobriam ebrietatem Spiritus* (2,6). *Augustine discerns in the human heart the thirst for eternal inebriation (*In Ps.* 35, 14 and 62, 6).

H. Lewy, *Sobria ebrietas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik*, Giessen 1929; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris 1944, 274-302; J. Leclercq, *Jour d'ivresse*: VieSp 76 (1947) 574-591; J. Quasten, *Sobria ebrietas in Ambrosius' De Sacramentis*: Misc. L.C. Mohlberg I, Rome 1948, 117-125; R. Johanny, *L'eucharistie centre de l'histoire du salut chez Saint Ambroise de Milan*, Paris 1968, 205-236; H.J. Sieben - A. Solignac, *Ivresse spirituelle*: DSp 7, 2312-2337; P. Meloni, *L'ebbrezza dell'eucaristia nella spiritualità sponsale dei Padri*: Parola, Spirito and Vita 7 (1983) 215-231.

P. Meloni

DUALISM. In the historical-religious meaning of the term, dualism may be defined as that doctrine, formulated systematically or expressed in mythical form, which holds to the existence of two principles that, in different ways, have given rise to everything that exists and manifests itself in this world. This historical-religious notion of dualism thus concerns the ontological level of the creation and differs from the philosophical meaning of the term (dualism as opposed to monism and equivalent to the affirmation of transcendence) and from its use in an ethical sense (the opposition between good and evil).

A distinction is made between an "absolute" dualism, when the two principles are coeternal and mutually independent, and a "mitigated" or "monarchian" dualism, when the second principle derives from the first, but constitutes a principle by giving rise in turn to a creation of its own. An example of absolute dualism would be Iranian Zoroastrianism, esp. in the later formulations of the Middle Persian treatises, which oppose Ohrmazd (old Avestic Ahura Mazda), the good creator god, to Ahriman (= Angra Manyu, "Destroying Spirit"), the antigod, associated with lying and corruption and who, with his demons, penetrates the world to bring it death and destruction. Moreover, he operates a malevolent "counter-creation" of his own (noxious animals, etc.). Iranian dualism is thus procosmic (creation is a divine work) and eschatological, affirming the final destruction of the evil principle and its death-dealing activity.

Examples of mitigated dualistic doctrines could be some systems of gnosticism of the first centuries which, starting from a supreme deity, show the origin, via a process of successive emanations and degeneration, of one or more persons (the Demiurge, Archons) of malevolent nature, who become creators of the world and of the human body, molding a matter held to be ontologically negative. The gnostic systems were happy to identify the inferior Demiurge with the God of the OT, opposing him to Jesus' Father, who is totally unrelated to matter and the highest expression of that spiritual, divine world from which the human spiritual component, which the Savior came to redeem, is derived. The Fathers argued at great length against gnostic dualism, affirming the unicity of God, the good and just creator and savior of humanity, and the unity of revelation of the OT and NT.

Gnostic dualism, besides being theological (two "gods") and cosmological (divine world opposed to material cosmos), was also anthropological, since it affirmed the human being's dual origin and substance (body molded by the inferior Demiurge, soul or divine intellect consubstantial with the supreme Deity). It was thus anticosmic and antisomatic, since the cosmos and the human body were considered negative realities. Even in the gnostic perspective, the opposition will come to an end with the destruction of matter and its rulers.

One expression of the absolute type of gnostic dualism, with its own characteristics and broad speculative developments, was *Manicheism. Forms of mitigated dualism, anticosmic and antisomatic, were

those medieval heresies that, like the Bulgar Bogomils and the European Cathars, claimed that Satan, the first angel of God, rebelled against him and became the creator of the world and the human body.

U. Bianchi, *Il dualismo religioso. Saggio storico ed etnologico*, Rome 1958; U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le origini dello gnosticismo*, Leiden 1967; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *I dualismi medievali*, in G. Filoramo (ed.), *Storia delle Religioni*, vol. III, *Religioni dualiste e Islam*, Bari 1995, 69-98; F. Zambon, *La cena segreta. Trattati e rituali catari*, Milan 1997.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

DUMIUM. A monastery near *Braga (province of *Gallaecia). Its presence dates from shortly after 550, the date of the arrival in those lands of its founder and first abbot St. Martin of Dumium (or Braga), at the same time as the conversion of the Suevi to Catholicism. In 556, in order to have St. Martin as bishop, it was raised to an episcopal see; from then on its abbots were all bishops. The monastery was always a suffragan see of Braga. It had a rich library. Among its monks we know *Paschasius, whom St. Martin charged with translating the *Vitae Patrum* (PL 73, 1025-1062). The Dumium episcopate coexisted with that of Braga until the time of the Arab invasion, although sometimes the two dioceses had the same man as bishop, as the lists of prelates show. *Bishops*: St. Martin (556–at least 572); John (589); Germanus (633); Ricimir (ca. 638–654: mentioned at the 10th Council of *Toledo); Fructuosus (d. 654); Leodegisius Julianus (d. 675); Benjamin (d. 681); Liuva (d. 683); Vincent (d. 688); Felix (d. 693).

Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 208-209; A. de J. da Costa, *São Martinho de Dume*, Braga 1950; ES 18, 27ff.; I. Pereira Lamelas, *Os primeiros passos do cristianismo no território português*: Itinerarium 46 (2000) 67-69.

P. De Luis

DURA EUROPOS. The double name of this great caravan station on the Euphrates river, while recalling its pre-Hellenistic founding (in Akkadian *duru* = wall), also evokes its acquisition by the Macedonian Seleucus I Nicator who, "founding" the city no later than 312 BC, gave to it the name of his native town, "Europos." The project of the Seleucid sovereigns to Hellenize their reign is reflected in the layout of Dura Europos, which is similar to that of *Antioch, *Apamea and Laodicea.

Falling into the hands of the Parthians shortly after 128 BC, the city, an outpost on the border of the Parthian kingdom, was increasingly militarized, though it continued to be an important commercial center. When Mesopotamia became a Roman province, Dura Europos became the object of dispute between the Parthian kingdom and the Roman Empire. It was only in AD 165 under the emperor Lucius Verus that it came into Roman possession, who stationed there the 20th cohort of the Palmyran auxiliaries. With the emergence of the neo-Persian *Sassanid kingdom (AD 227), Dura Europos grew in importance as a Roman fortification. Nevertheless, in 256 it fell to the Persian Sapor I, who besieged and destroyed it. In 272 the city was definitively abandoned until nearly three centuries later, when *Justinian, fighting against the Persians, fortified it.

Whereas written sources tell us very little about the Christian history of Dura Europos, we are learning much of primary importance from the archaeological evidence. Extremely significant was the finding, in an urban center as reduced as it was, of 20 different churches, with altars, reliefs, paintings and inscriptions—evidence of religious fervor, and of the different faiths that coexisted in the city. The first traces of the Christian presence at Dura Europos go back to the first decades of the 3rd c. During these years (ca. 232) a private house was used as a church (*domus ecclesiae*), which accords with the climate of religious tolerance promoted by *Alexander Severus (222–235). This site in Dura Europos is the oldest place of Christian worship, and the only one we know of set up in a private house. It consisted of a large meeting room and a baptistery. The baptistery room was embellished by frescoes that have been transferred to the Yale Gallery in New Haven (USA). They are the oldest known Christian paintings, and depict the salvation of the neophytes through baptism.

Also datable to 232 is the inscription that—after that of *Palmyra (136)—is the oldest monument containing a Christian *cross. Archaeology also reveals the friendly relations that existed at Dura Europos between Christians and Jews. A graffito of the Christian Siseos testifies that he, though a Christian, participated in the construction of the synagogue, built in AD 235 and embellished with precious frescoes with biblical scenes, preserved in the museum of Damascus. Near the synagogue have been found Hebrew parchments containing eucharistic prayers similar to those in the *Didache*. Of notable importance for the history of Christian literature has been the finding of a fragment of 14 lines of *Tatian's *Diatesseron*, transcribed certainly before 254. Regarding the city's history, we know that at the time of the Sassanid king Sapor II (310–380), a hermit named Benjamin suffered martyrdom at Dura Europos. With the Islamic domination, the traces of life of this small but flourishing commercial city disappeared—but the ex-

cavations begun in the 1920s by Yale University (USA) and those still underway are restoring to us, piece by piece, the wonder of this city on the Euphrates.

P. Lériche (ed.), *Doura Europos*, Beyrouth 1997; J. Balty, *La peinture en Syrie*, in *Archéologie et histoire de la Syrie*, II, Saarbrücken 1989, 525-531; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monf. 1994, 85-88; RAC 4, 358-370; T. Gnoli, *Roma, Edessa e Palmira nel III sec. d.C.*, Pisa-Rome 2000.

L. Padovese

DVIN (Greek Δούβιος). Founded 4th c. BC, located on a hill in the valley Arart Marz of the river Arax, 35 km (22 mi) S of Yerevan not far from Mt. Ararat. The Arsacid king Chosroes II (330–338) refounded the city, moving his residence there from Artaxata. A Persian marzban was killed there in the Armenian uprising of 572; on this occasion the cathedral of St. Gregory, which had been used as a depot, was burned down. In 640 Dvin was conquered by the Muslims and was made the seat of the governor Dabil. The capital of *Armenia from the 4th–9th c., Dvin was a prosperous commercial city and was destroyed by Turkish invaders in the 13th c. It was an episcopal see from the 4th c., and from the 5th c. a see of the Armenian catholicos—not from the time of Giwt (461–471/478), but from that of catholicos *John I Mandakuni (ca. 484/485), when Armenia obtained religious autonomy within the Persian empire.

Dvin then became the ecclesiastical and administrative capital, hosting numerous synods: the city boasts numerous and significant Christian buildings. The phases of construction have been identified for the "cathedral" dedicated to St. *Gregory the Illuminator: the building of Vahan Mamikonian (late 5th c.), who rebuilt the churches destroyed in the mid-5th c. by the Zoroastrians; the reconstruction of Smbat Bagratuni (606–621), when the earlier plan of three aisles divided by pillars was modified by adding two apses on the sides, after a "fashion" peculiar to the 6th c. (cf. *Constantinople and *Bethlehem; see M. D'Onofrio, *Le chiese di Dvin*, 13-48). Near this building arose the palace of the catholicos of Armenia, who resided at Dvin for about five centuries, and the one-aisled church of St. Yzbuzit (6th c.). Another church, now vanished, was the church of St. Sergius, built by Narses III (641–661), probably *extra moenia*: to it D'Onofrio attributes a pendentive preserved in the museum of Dvin, whose resemblance to those of Zvart'noc includes its bearing functions, factors that have led to a hypothetical identification of the so-called ghost building of Dvin with the church of St. Sergius, which was probably similar to Zvart'noc in iconography and architectural decoration. After the Turkish destruction (13th c.), the site was forgotten until the early 20th c., when excavations began.

A. Khatchatrian, *Dvin*: RBK, II, Stuttgart 1971; M. D'Onofrio, *Le chiese di Dvin*, Rome 1973; A. Khatchatrian, *Inscriptions et histoire des églises arméniennes*, Milan 1974, 38-39; EC 4, 2016; CE 3, 1129-30; DHGE 14, 1243-1244; EAM 4 759-760.; N. Garsoïan, *L'église armenienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, Louvain 1999 (passim).

M. Falla Castelfranchi

DYNAMIS - ENERGEIA. Δύναμις and ἐνέργεια are pivotal concepts in Aristotle's metaphysics and were taken up by patristic authors. However, the Fathers' use of these terms did not always also imply the acceptance of the Aristotelian dialectic of potentiality and actuality. The most important use of these concepts in patristic authors is related to the theme of the knowledge of God, apophaticism, and the relationship between *theologia* and *oikonomia*. *Philo had developed the doctrine of the powers of God, the *dynameis*, as expressions of the unknowable divinity, and surely at least *Clement, *Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa were indebted to him in their reflections on apophaticism. But the notion of *dynamis* plays an important role in the doctrine of creation as well, esp. in *Justin, *Bardesanes, Clement, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and some other patristic thinkers.

According to Bardesanes, the Christian philosopher of Edessa who was a contemporary of Clement of Alexandria, Christ-Logos, who created this world, is (as he puts it in a fragment preserved by *Ephrem) "the power of the primordial Logos." "Power" corresponds to Greek *dynamis*. The Logos's being primordial and original is related to his divinity. Precisely because he is God, the Logos was "in the beginning" (Jn 1:1, echoing Gen 1:1), and the *dynamis* to which Bardesanes's formula alludes is nothing but an aspect of Christ-Logos. Indeed, in Origen too, *dynamis* is one of the main *epinoiai* of Christ, besides Logos and Sophia/Wisdom, and plays a core role in the doctrine of creation.

This conception is already clear in Justin, one of the very first patristic philosophers, and influenced by *Platonism as well. In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, written when Bardesanes was a child or shortly earlier, Justin calls Christ precisely *Dynamis*, *Logos* and *Sophia*: "God begot him from himself in the beginning, before all creatures, Power of Logos [δύναμις λογική] . . . Son, Wisdom [Σοφία] . . . God, Lord, and Logos" (61.1). Most remarkably, Justin's expression, "Power of Logos begotten in the beginning," in refer-

ence to Christ, exactly corresponds to Bardesanes's designation of Christ in the aforementioned fragment preserved by Ephrem: "Power of the primordial Logos." I wonder whether this impressive correspondence might indicate that Bardesanes knew Justin's work and thought. It is worthwhile to report Justin's subsequent statement concerning the divinity and eternity of the Logos and its action in creation: "The Logos of Wisdom is itself God, begotten by the Father of the universe, *Logos*, *Wisdom*, *Power*, and glory of the Father"; it is he who said: "The Lord established me as the principle . . . before the world . . . while God prepared the heavens I was there." Notably, Clement of Alexandria also connected the Logos of God with the δυνάμεις, and more precisely with the spiritual powers (see Ramelli, *Clement's Notion of the Logos*). For Justin, Clement, Bardesanes and Origen, Christ-Logos is God's Power and Wisdom, by means of which God created the world.

*Gregory of Nyssa further developed this train of thought. He describes Christ-Logos-Wisdom as the seat of all Ideas of realities before creation (*De Perf.* 260B); through God's *dynamis*, who is Christ-Logos, these Ideas became creatures. This is the creation of the world performed by Christ-Logos, which is also described by Gregory in *In Hex.* 72B. Here he observes that the Ideas of all realities were contemplated by God, in the divine Mind-Logos, before their creation as realities, and it was "the Logos of *dynamis*" that brought these Ideas to reality. The "divine *dynamis*" is again said to have created all things in *De hom. op.* 3: "The creation [κτίσις] was made impromptu, so to say, by the divine *dynamis*, in that it was constituted at the same time as the order was given."

The role of divine *dynamis* in creation, which explicates itself in God's operations or ἐνέργειαι, also forms the basis for a distinction on the gnoseological plane, the import of which affects the whole doctrine of apophaticism. Once again, it is in Origen and in Gregory of Nyssa, with important parallels in *Neoplatonism and developments in ps.-*Dionysius and *Maximus the Confessor, that this conception is best delineated. Gregory of Nyssa maintained that we cannot know or say anything about God's nature (οὐσία), but we can only know God's operations (ἐνέργειαι), which in turn are distinct from, and originated by, divine power (δύναμις), which we can know, not in itself, but only by inference from its operations and creatures. That God's nature and substance is ineffable is insisted upon by Gregory esp. in *Ad Ablabium*, in his polemic against *Eunomius, and in his homilies on the Song of Songs. The Godhead, who is "invisible in its nature," becomes "visible in his operations" (*De beat.* GNO VII/2, 141) and is thus grasped by human intellect in some of its aspects, τινα περὶ αὐτήν, or τὰ περὶ τὸν Θεόν (GNO I, 256).

Gregory is relying on Origen, e.g., in *C. Cels.* VI, 65, who also knows the expression τὰ περί, which was already employed by Clement, *Strom.* V 11,71,3 (a passage concerning the abstractive process in our knowledge of God). This expression, and the underlying concept, was also used by *Plotinus *Enn.* V 3,14, and was taken up by *Basil in the second book of his *C. Eun.* and by another Origenian author, ps.-Dionysius (*Cael. Hier.* II 3). The ineffability of the divinity in its nature and the possibility only of saying something of what concerns it (τι περὶ αὐτοῦ) was also held by Plotinus (*Enn.* V 3,13-14), who displays the οὐσία-ἐνέργεια-δύναμις triad as well. Apophaticism in Plotinus, however, seems to be more radical than in Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and other patristic authors, due to a precise ontological basis: Plotinus's One completely transcends Being itself, whereas Origen and Gregory partially maintain the identification of God with Being, as they felt bound by Ex 3:14.

God's οὐσία, which is accessible to our knowledge only through God's ἐνέργειαι, is common to all three Persons of the Trinity, according to Gregory. Indeed, he also considers the δύναμις to be one and the same for all three Persons of the Trinity, and identifies this δύναμις with the divine will (θέλημα, βούλησις), which is also regarded by him as common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. This is also why Christ's *epinoiai* (such as Physician, Rock, Spring, Way, Life, Resurrection and so on) are ascribed by Gregory to the whole Trinity, which, per se, transcends every name, but *quoad nos* "becomes πολυώνυμος thanks to the variety of its beneficial operations" (*Ad Abl.* GNO III/1, 56). From the fact that the οὐσία is one and the same for the whole Trinity also derives the unicity of the δύναμις and of the ἐνέργεια, but this on the ontological plane. On the gnoseological one, according to the order of our knowledge, which starts from what we can realize, if the three Persons have one and the same activity (ἐνέργεια), then they must have also one and the same power (δύναμις); now, if they have the same activity and the same power, they will necessarily have also the same nature and substance (φύσις, οὐσία; *De orat. dom.* GNO VII/2,41,6-10).

This idea was already present in *Irenaeus, *A.H.* IV 20, in a great admirer of Origen such as *Athanasius (*Ep. ad Serap.* 28) and in *Didymus the Blind, Origen's faithful follower (*Spir. Sanct.* 17,32,36); among the Cappadocians, it also appears in Basil

(*De Spir. Sanct.* 16,38). On the Neoplatonic side, the necessity of considering οὐσία, δύναμις and ἐνέργεια in a unitary way is also found in *Iamblichus (*Myst.* I 5,18). Athanasius, Didymus, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa probably depended on Origen, who insisted on the supreme unity of God, described by him as monad and henad and absolutely simple in *Princ.* I 1,6. In this passage, *Rufinus's *mens* obviously corresponds to Greek νοῦς, which Origen here identifies with God, even though in *C. Cels.* VII 38 he affirms that God is either Νοῦς or even beyond Νοῦς and οὐσία. In *Protr. ad mart.* 46 Origen affirms that God transcends the νοητά, and in *Comm. Io.* XIX 6,1 he states that the nature and power of God are beyond οὐσία. Such an oscillation was present in *Middle Platonism, in Philo and in Clement of Alexandria; while *Numenius identified God with the One and the Nous, in Plotinus the Nous is subordinate to the One. Likewise, another patristic philosopher, *Marius Victorinus, says that God is *sine exsistentia sine substantia sine intellegentia sine vita . . . non per privationem sed per supralationem . . . praeexsistens* (*Adv. Ar.* IV 23;26), *supra omnem exsistentiam, supra omne* ὄν, *supra omnem cognoscentiam* (*Ad Cand.* 13). Therefore, God is beyond or before *substantia*, knowledge and *operatio* (*inoperans operatio; actio inactuosa: Adv. Ar.* IA, 12-13; *ineffabiles res et investigabilia mysteria Dei voluntatum aut operationum: Ad Cand.* 1). Indeed, in Victorinus the *substantia-virtus-operatio* triad closely corresponds to the οὐσία-ἐνέργεια-δύναμις triad in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa. The Father, for Victorinus, is the pole of *esse/substantia*, while the Son and the Spirit represent that of *agere/operatio* (see esp. *Adv. Arium* IV).

Both Victorinus and Gregory of Nyssa had behind them an already Christianized Platonic system, that of Origen, in which the reflection on οὐσία, δύναμις and ἐνέργεια specifically in reference to the Christian God was already well defined. Indeed, Origen inspired Gregory and other patristic thinkers such as *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 28,13) with the notion of the incomprehensibility of God's substance as opposed to our possibility of knowing the Godhead through its operations or *energeiai* (*Princ.* II 6,1).

The Son himself has become the will of the Father (*C. Eun.* II, GNO I,288), for "immediately, without any interval, along with God's will [βουλή] there also appeared the work [ἔργον]. God's will is, at the same time, power [δύναμις]" (*De an.* 69A). The creation performed by God's power is nothing else but God's will that is transformed into substance (οὐσιοῦται, ibid. 124B). "God's will became the matter and substance of creatures" (*In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius*, GNO III/2, 11,4-7); "it turned itself into the matter, structure, and power of the world" (*Vit. Greg. Thaum.* p. 24,11-12). The implication of God's *dynamis* in creation also results from *Hex.* PG 44,77D, in which Gregory of Nyssa affirms that God created τῇ δυνάμει, at the beginning, the οὐσία of all things. He follows the Stoic and Neoplatonic (Plot. *Enn.* III 2,2) positive conception of δύναμις, which is not tantamount to lack and imperfection, as it was in Aristotle, but indicates ontological force, richness and resource.

It is thanks to his *dynamis* that God, after the creation, remains present to the world in the same way as the soul is present to the human body, thanks to its *dynamis*, which allows the world to endure in existence, even though it is utterly transcendent, just as the soul operates in the body through its vital ἐνέργεια, although it maintains all the pureness and simplicity of its essence (*De an.* 24C, 44BC). Now, already Origen, in *Philoc.* 2 (cf. 1,7), insists on God's providence and δύναμις, which is present everywhere in creation. At the same time, in *Comm. in Io.* XIX 6,37-38, he observes that God's φύσις and δύναμις are both beyond the οὐσία and cannot be grasped by human comprehension. God is impossible to know for human knowledge (*C. Cels.* VI 65); however, God is intelligible: πάντων ἐπέκεινα ὤν, ἀρρήτῳ τινὶ δυνάμει νοητὸς (ibid. VII 45). God is beyond Being and Intellect (ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας ἐστι πρεσβείᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ὁ θεός; ibid. VI 64; ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας, VII 38), and yet is also Being in the fullest sense (ἣ καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν οὐσία, ibid. and *Princ.* I 3,5). Only the invisible and incorporeal nature is οὐσία proper (κυρίως οὐσία, *Comm. in Io.* XX 18,159), and "invisible and incorporeal οὐσία" is said of God in *C. Cels.* VI, 71. All the rest is οὐσία only insofar as it participates in God's οὐσία (*C. Cels.* VI 64). But the Son, who is God, has the οὐσία not by participation but by essence (*Sel. in Ps.* PG 12, 1656,13; *C. Cels.* VI 64: οὐδ' οὐσίας μετέχει ὁ θεός· μετέχεται γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ μετέχει . . . ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν οὐ μετέχει μὲν δικαιοσύνης, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ὢν μετέχεται ὑπὸ τῶν δικαίων). Origen, like *Evagrius of Pontus, Gregory of Nyssa and all of his patristic followers, maintains the identity of God with the supreme Being because of the aforementioned formula in Ex 3:14, but also in order to identify the Being, who is God, with the Good (along Plato's lines), and thus reduce evil to nonbeing: οὐκ ἔσονται οὐσίαι τὰ κακά (*Philoc.* 24,4). God's δύναμις is good, positively and absolutely good, and its ἐνέργεια explicates itself in creation and providence (*Princ.* II 9,1; III 5,2; IV 4,8).

G. Isaye, *L'unité de l'opération divine dans les écrits trinitaires de Grégoire de Nysse*, RSR 27 (1937) 422-439; J. Whittaker, ΕΠΕΚΕΙΝΑ ΝΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΣΙΑΣ, VChr 23 (1969) 91-104; L. Cignelli, *Il tema Logos-Dynamis in Origene*, in LA 34 (1984) 239-272; J.C.M. van Winden, *Notiz über Dynamis bei Gregor*

von Nyssa, in ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ. *Festschrift für Hadwiga Hörner*, Frankfurt 1991, 147-150 = Id., *Arché. A Collection of Patristic Studies*, Leiden 1997, 146-150; S. Coakley, *Re-thinking Gregory of Nyssa: Introduction – Gender, Trinitarian Analogies, and the Pedagogy of the Song*, in *Re-thinking Gregory of Nyssa*, ed. Id., Malden 2003 (= Modern Theology 18, 2002) 1-13; R. Somos, *The Divine Power in Origen's Theory of Salvation*, in *Pagani e cristiani alla ricerca della salvezza (secoli I-III). XXXIV Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana, Roma, Augustinianum, 5-7 maggio 2005* [SEA 96], Rome 2006, 711-724; A. Ojell, *The Constitutive Elements of the Apophatic System of Gregory of Nyssa*, in *Studia Patristica*, Leuven 2006, 397-402, reprinted in Id., *One Word, One Body, One Voice*, Helsinki 2007, section II, article 3; I. Ramelli, *Bardaisan of Edessa: A Reassessment of the Evidence and a Reinterpretation*, Piscataway 2009; C. Köckert, *Christliche Kosmologie und kaiserzeitliche Philosophie*, Tübingen 2009; I. Ramelli, *Clement's Notion of the Logos "All Things As One." Its Alexandrian Background in Philo and Its Developments in Origen and Nyssen*, in *Alexandrian Personae: Scholarly Culture and Religious Traditions in Ancient Alexandria*, ed. Z. Plese - R. Hirsch-Luipold, Tübingen 2010; Id., *La triade* ousia - energeia - dynamis *in Gregorio di Nissa: ascendenze origeniane e alcuni sviluppi*, in *Ousia - dynamis - energeia. La triade ontologica neoplatonica e la sua fortuna*, prefaced by G. D'Onofrio, forthcoming in Salerno, Schola Salernitana series.

I. Ramelli

DYNAMIUS PATRICIUS (d. 601). It is probable that this person, was the Dynamius *rector Provinciae* spoken of by *Gregory of Tours (*HF* VI, 7.11; IX, 11; cf. also Ven. Fort., *Carm.* VI, 9-10). We have two of Dynamius Patricius's letters and his *Vita S. Maximi episcopi Reiensis*, whereas the *Vita S. Marini*, attributed to him, is from a later period. A poem of Dynamius Patricius in elegiac distichs, *De Lerine insula*, is in the *Anthologia Latina* (I, 2, Leipzig 1906, 265-266).

CPL 1058,2125; PL 80, 25-26 and 31-40; MGH *Epist.* III, 127,130-131; CCL 117, 430-431 and 435-436.

S. Zincone

DYOPHYSITISM - DYOPHYSITES. By dyophysitism, whose adherents are called dyophysites, we understand the doctrine of two natures, divine and human, in Christ. This *christological position, defended esp. by the Antiochenes against *Apollinaris of Laodicea and *Cyril of Alexandria, and then by adherents to *Chalcedonian faith against the so-called *monophysites, had its roots in the first Christian writings, which in some way distinguish between a divine element (πνεῦμα - λόγος) and a human element (σάρξ) in Christ (Rom 1:3-4; Jn 1:14; Ign., *Eph.* 7,2). This tendency to distinguish was reinforced in the struggle against the pagans and heretics of the 2nd and 3rd c. Some spoke of two *ousiae* (*Melito), others of two φύσεις to which correspond two series of attributes, divine and human (*Origen), or others of two *substantiae* (*Tertullian). It was only the *Arian controversy, however, in which the concept of divine generation as distinct from human was developed, which led to the bolder elaboration of the two natures, based on the two births, eternal (from God) and temporal (from Mary), also corresponding to two consubstantialities (DS 271f.; 298f.; 301f.). This evolution, though in some sense clarifying, nevertheless provoked the christological problem, i.e., the question of how the two natures constitute a single Christ. Though the question was resolved terminologically at the Council of Chalcedon (451), to this day the monophysites are unreconciled with those who accept the creed of Chalcedon, whom they call dyophysites. Apart from cultural reasons, the difficulty of obtaining agreement comes mainly from differing concepts of nature, i.e., a somewhat static concept for the dyophysites and a dynamic concept (ἐνέργεια) for the monophysites (see a good example of discussion of the two positions in John of Damascus, *Jacob.* 78: ed. Kotter IV, 135ff.).

A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I, Freiburg 1979, passim, esp. 494; Id., II/1, Freiburg 1986; B. Studer, *Dio Salvatore*, It. ed. Rome 1986, esp. 311-318 (Eng. tr.: *Trinity and Incarnation: The Faith of the Early Church*, Edinburgh 1993; T. Hainthaler, *Monophysitismus*: LTK[3] 7, 418-421 (bibl.).

B. Studer

E

EADBURGA. English nun, known as *Boniface's correspondent, not to be confused with Eadburga, daughter of Centwine, king of Wessex (676–685). Between 719 and 722 she sent two letters to Boniface: one to tell him that she had not yet been able to find the copy of a text she had been trying to send him and to ask him for some extracts from *Scripture and for some *Masses to be said for a deceased relative; the other, written with the abbess Eangyth, to tell him that she wanted to make a pilgrimage to Rome to receive absolution.

PL 96, 837; M. Tangl, ed., MGH, *Ep.* I, Berlin 1916, 26-28 (n. 15); Id., *Studien zur Neuausgabe der Bonifatius-Briefe*: Neues Archiv 40 (1914–1915) 639-790 and 41 (1916–1917) 23-101; Patrologia IV, 411.

P. Marone

EAST - ORIENTATION
For the early Christians and for ourselves, the content of these terms could have two meanings: (A) the everyday one (geographical, linguistic and political), (B) the theological and metaphorical one.

A. Geographically, *East* generally had three meanings: (1) within the Roman Empire, it indicated the provinces of Greek culture in which Greek was the predominant language. The frontier between regions of Greek and Latin culture followed more or less this line of demarcation: *Syrtis Maior*, *Scupi*, **Serdica*, *Odessos*, *Tomi*, *Istros*—at the time of *Diocletian, the European administrative borders deviated from this imaginary line, passing through *Scodra* and **Singidunum*; (2) for a citizen of the empire, the East meant the whole of the lands beyond the imperial frontier in Asia, in the modern sense, esp. the neighboring lands: *Arabia, *Mesopotamia, Assyria, Media, *Armenia; (3) after the division of the empire into 15 dioceses, from Diocletian to the 6th c., in political administration *orientalis* meant one of these dioceses, the one containing the ten Near Eastern provinces in the form of a triangle: Mt. *Sinai—Isauria—Mesopotamia.

The linguistic meaning of *East* was similar to the geographic meaning: for a Roman from the Latin countries, it meant the peoples of Greek culture; for a citizen of the empire, Easterners were the peoples outside the sphere of Hellenism, in Asia.

In the history of Christianity, the adjective *oriental/Eastern* indicates literature in the *Syriac, *Georgian, *Coptic, *Armenian and *Palaeoslavonic languages, etc. In the sphere of liturgy, however, it means all types of divine worship derived from the rites of the most ancient Eastern patriarchates, *Alexandria and *Antioch.

B. In a theological sense, *East* indicated the attitudes, problems, mentality, special tendencies and characteristics of the Greek church, when Greek theology definitively detached itself from Latin.

Ancient religions gave much importance to orientation: in prayer, in the construction of tombs, in the laying out of cities and of temples. Vitruvius writes that the temple should be oriented west-east, so that the statue of the god would look *ad vespertinam caeli regionem*, and the believers who look upon the statue would make sacrifices *ad partem caeli orientis* (IV, 5,1-2). The metaphorical meaning of the term *east* is closely connected with the symbolism of the sun. Some cults worshiped the sun, and spread throughout the Roman Empire (F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Brussels 1929, 125-150). For Christians, the sun is Christ. "The Holy Spirit loves the East, figure of Christ," writes *Tertullian (*Adv. Val.* 3); similarly *Gregory of Nyssa (*De vita S. Macr.*: PG 46, 984A; *Or. in laud. Bas.*: PG 46, 798C). The idea recurs in the Roman liturgy in the antiphon of the third day before Christmas: "*O Oriens, splendor lucis aeternae et sol iustitiae. . . .*" It was a very widespread custom to turn to the East, both in private prayer (Basil, *De Sp. s.* 27; Meth. Ol., *Symp.* 11,2) and in the liturgy: baptismal (Ambr., *De myst.* 7; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 19,11) or

eucharistic (*Apos. Con.* II, 57). The Acts of Paul attest that Paul "turned toward the east, raised his hands to heaven and prayed at length" (*Martyrdom of Paul* 5). Already in the 3rd c., *Origen wrote: "Who would not admit that the East clearly indicates that we must pray turned to that region to indicate that the soul looks toward the rising of the true light" (*On Prayer* 32,1). Because of this gesture, observes Tertullian, the pagans think that Christians worship the sun, since they pray turned toward the East and celebrate their liturgy on Sunday, the *dies solis* (*Ad nationes* 1,13). *Clement of Alexandria also testifies to the practice of praying turned to the East (*Stromata* 7,43,6), as does the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (2,57).

The structure of *church buildings was generally influenced by this custom. Even in the funeral rite, the East frequently played an important role, showing the last position the Christian had to assume, both dying and dead. In the 1st centuries, the meaning of this gesture was linked to eschatological expectation (Mt 24:27; *Didasc. Addai* 2,1). Origen writes, "Redemption comes from the East; from there in fact man had his origin, hence the name 'East' . . . for this reason you are always invited to turn your gaze toward the East *from whence arises the sun of justice* and from where, for you, arises the light . . ." (*Hom. in Lev.* 9,10). Later, prayer toward the East was related to the theme of *paradise, following the Genesis account, which placed the ancient homeland in the East (Gen 2:8); according to the *Apocalypse of Moses* (ch. 29), Adam *often returned to the barred* frontier of the earthly paradise to ask pardon. The Christian, like his forefather Adam, wishes to return to his lost homeland, and so, like him, he turns in private prayer to the East (Greg. Nyss., *Or. in laud. Bas.*: PG 44, 1184D). In the following century, at *Rome, *Leo the Great criticizes as a vestige of paganism those who, influenced by sun worship, upon entering St. Peter's first turned toward the sun to make a superstitious gesture (*Serm.* 22,6; 27,4).

DACL 12, 1610-1657 (*Orient, Occident*); 12, 2658-2665 (*Orientales*); 12, 2665-2669 (*Orientation*); A. Podossinov, *Himmelsrichtung*: RAC 15, 233-286; E. Peterson, *La croce e la preghiera verso Oriente*: EphLit 59 (1945) 52-62; J. Daniélou, *Bible et liturgie*, Paris 1951; C. Vogel, *L'orientation vers l'est du célébrant et des fidèles pendant la célébration eucharistique*: OrSyr 9 (1964) 3-37; Id., *Sol aequinotialis. Problèmes et techniques de l'orientation dans le culte chrétien*: RSR 36 (1962) 175-211; Id., *La croix eschatologique*, in *Noël, Épiphanie, retour du Christ*, Paris 1967, 85-108; M.J. Moreton, *Eis anatolas blepsate: Orientation as Liturgical Principle*, SP 17, Oxford 1982, 575-590; G. Tosi, *La città antica e la* Religio *nel* De Architectura *di Vitruvio*, in *Religione e città nel mondo antico*, Rome 1984, 425-439; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, I, Milan [3]1998, 278-313; F.M. Pace, *Dall'oriente la salvezza. Osservazioni sull'orientazione nel cristianesimo antico*: Humanitas 38 (1983) 358-375; Th.K. Carrol - Th. Halton, *Liturgical Practice in the Fathers*, Wilmington 1988 (58ff.; 51; 60; *Apos. Con.*); G. Bissoli, *Il tempio nella letteratura giudaica e neotestamentaria*, Jerusalem 1994; M. Wallraff, *Christus verus Sol: Sonnenverehrung und Christentum in der Spätantike*, Münster 2001; U.M. Lang, *Rivolti al Signore. L'orientamento nella preghiera liturgica*, Siena 2006.

G. Ladocsi

EASTER

I. The theological content of the feast - II. The celebration of the feast - III. The Easter controversy.

I. The theological content of the feast. R. Cantalamessa demonstrated how one must distinguish the two understandings of Easter within the Christian tradition, both of which go back to Judaism.

1. The Jewish tradition. At the beginning, the Passover was a nomadic feast (probably in relation to transhumance); the rite of the blood of the Lamb sprinkled on the lintels and the two doorposts had an apotropaic meaning: one must protect against the Destroyer. In the religion of Israel, the one who "passes over" was God, who spared the homes of his people (Ex 12:27). To this first understanding, a second was added: the Passover stood in relation to the memory of the Exodus from Egypt, which reminded the Israelites of human deliverance from slavery (Ex 13:8, 14; Dt 16:1); in Hellenistic Judaism (see Philo, *Leg. Spec.* II, 147) and in Judaism after the structure of the Second Temple, this anthropological understanding of the feast prevailed over the primitive understanding.

2. The Christian tradition. Jesus died during the Jewish Passover (whether it was on the 14th of Nisan, according to *John's chronology, or the 15th of Nisan, according to the chronology of the Synoptic Gospels). This coincidence could not but exert influence on the Christian tradition. One perceives a progressive "paschalization" of the events of Holy Friday, on the basis of the typological interpretation of the OT. It is typical that, from the beginning, the two Jewish understandings about the Passover were present in the Christian tradition (see 1 Cor 5:7-8). Nevertheless, one can distinguish two types of paschal theology:

a. In the *Asiatic* type, the Passover is placed in relation to *πάσχειν/passio* and takes on an almost exclusively christological meaning (the content of the feast is a commemoration of the past and the fervent expectation of eschatological events). And this *Quartodeciman Passover appears in *Melito of Sardis's homily *On the Passover*. Nevertheless, we know that the Roman Easter was not different from the Asiatic feast in its content but only in its date (the origin of the Roman Easter, however, could also date back to the primitive church).

b. In the *Alexandrian* type, Easter is placed in relation to the idea of *transitus*/passage and takes on an almost exclusively *anthropological* meaning (one has passed from the shadow to the reality, one lives in the present anticipating the eschatological and heavenly truth; the tendency of "dehistoricizing" the feast and the *sacraments is apparent here). Later Greek patristic authors would confuse this paschal theology of the Alexandrians such as *Clement and *Origen with the Asiatic tradition.

c. Among Latin patristic authors, who based themselves primarily upon the Asiatic tradition, the Alexandrian tradition would be introduced beginning with *Ambrose (*De sacr.* 1,4,12; *De Cain et Abel* 1,8,31; *Ep.* 1,10) and *Jerome (*Comm. in Evang. Matth.* IV, 26,2). *Augustine would have the credit of reaching a christological synthesis of the two traditions on the basis of Jn 13:1 (*Tract. in Evang. Joh.* 55,1). "It is through his passion that the Lord 'passed' from death into life and has opened to us believers the way to the *resurrection so that even we might pass from death to life" (*Enarr. in Psalm.* 120,6; see *Civ. Dei* XVI, 43). This synthesis allows him—and his successors—to combine the historical, sacramental, mystical and eschatological aspects of the Easter feast.

II. The celebration of the feast. For the origins (which are difficult to trace) and the various forms of the celebration of Easter, during the first centuries, see the section below on the Easter controversy. In the 4th c., the organization and celebration of the Paschal cycle began to become uniform in various ecclesiastical regions.

1. The date. The ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325) required all the churches to celebrate Easter in accordance with the Roman and Alexandrian practice, that is, the first *Sunday after the first full moon following the equinox of spring; each year the bishop of *Alexandria would send an encyclical letter to the other churches announcing the date of Easter. But differences of calendar between the East and West made this desire to celebrate Easter everywhere on the same day to be nothing more than wishful thinking, even up to our own times (see the recent ecumenical meetings that have attempted to set Easter day for the Sunday following the second Saturday of April).

2. The liturgy. Lent is mentioned for the first time in 334 by *Athanasius (*Ep. fest.* 6,13; cf. 13,8; then *Itin. Egeriae* 27-29).

a. Holy Week seems to be an institution that reflects the devotion of the first Christian pilgrims who traveled to the Holy Land to live out the various moments of Christ's passion. The first detailed report of the events scheduled for this week has been preserved in the *Itinerarium Egereiae* (*The Travels of Egeria*) from the end of the 4th c. (30–38). *Egeria left the following information about Holy Week: Palm Sunday took place on the Mount of Olives; one was to descend upon the city of *Jerusalem in procession with olive and palm branches in hand (see Mk 11:1-10 and parallel texts; Jn 12:1, 12-19); it seems that on the same day the *redditio symboli* (recitation of the Creed) took place (46) by the *catechumens, as in the West. On Tuesday, texts were read from Christ's eschatological discourse (Mk 13:5-57 and parallel texts) on the Mount of Olives; on Wednesday the story of Judas's betrayal was read at the Holy Sepulcher (Mk 14:10-11 and parallel texts).

b. The Easter triduum began Thursday evening. At Jerusalem, the faithful spent the night from Thursday through Friday in vigil on the Mount of Olives and Gethsemane (Mk 14:32-52 and parallel texts); in *Syria, during this vigil, the institution of the *Eucharist was commemorated (see Aphraates, *Demonstr.* 12). *Holy Friday*—likewise from Egeria's account—Christians spent the time reflecting upon Jesus' morning appearance before Pilate (Mk 15:2-15 and parallel texts) and the flagellation (Mk 15:16-20 and parallel texts). At noon, the wood of the cross found by *Helena was shown to the faithful; then, for three hours, the people read the account of the passion, along with OT prophecies about Christ. Holy Saturday had no official services; in all the churches a *fast was observed in memory of "the absence of the bridegroom" (Mk 2:20 and parallel texts) and Christ's "rest" (*Apos. Con.* VII, 23,4; VIII, 47,67), but his *descent into hell was recalled, which, for the Byzantine tradition, would become the first sign of his victory over the kingdom of *death (see Amphil. of Iconium, *Or. in diem sabbatis* 1). The Paschal vigil on Saturday evening was the climax of the feast: "the mother of all holy vigils, during which the entire world stands vigil" (Aug., *Serm.* 219). The development of the vigil has its roots in the tradition of the primitive Paschal celebration, which is still reflected in the **Didascalia siriaca* of the 3rd c.: "stay together in the same place, persevering in vigil all night long, making supplication and prayers, reading the prophets, the Gospel and the Psalms with fear and trembling, with fervent supplication until the third hour of the night following the Saturday, then eat, rejoice, be glad and exalt because Christ, the pledge of our resurrection, has arisen" (V, 19). During the 4th c. (and probably already in the **Apostolic Tradition* of the 3rd c.; see Tertull., *Bapt.* 19,1), the Paschal vigil was also the solemn moment of *baptism; the catechetical homilies of both East and

West describe for us in detail the baptismal rites and symbols. With the decline of the catechumenate of the ancient church (with the increase of the practice of infant baptism), the Easter vigil would lose its importance along with the entire Easter triduum; fortunately, this "mother of the vigils" is being recovered in all the churches.

c. The Octave of Easter. During the eight days following Easter, church leaders imparted to the newly baptized the mystagogical catechesis on the sacraments recently received, that is, baptism, *anointing and Eucharist, as well as an explanation of the *Lord's Prayer. For the *Dominica in albis* also known as *Quasimodo geniti*, which follows the end of the octave, the catechumens wore their white garments for the last time.

*Pentecost: the 50 days separating Easter from Pentecost established Eastertide, *qui est propri dies festus* (Tertull., *Bapt.* 19.2). From the 4th c. on there is also evidence of the Feast of the *Ascension on the 40th day after Easter (*Itin. Egeriae* 42).

P. Maraval, *Égérie, Journal de voyage*, SC 296, Paris 1982; P. Nautin, *Homélies pascales*, I, SC 27, Paris 1950; II, SC 36, Paris 1953; B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner* (Beitr. z. Förd. christl. Theol. 2, 54), Gütersloh 1953; Var. aus., *Paschatis Sollemnia*: Mélanges Jungmann, Freiburg-Wien 1959; B. Botte, *Ambroise de Milan, Des sacrements. Des mystères. Explication du Symbole*, SC 25 bis, Paris 1961; W. Rordorf, *Zur Ursprung des Osterfestes am Sonntag*: ThZ 18 (1962) 167-189; O. Casel, *La fête de Pâque dans l'Église des Pères* (Lex Orandi 37), Paris 1963; R. Le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale*, Rome 1963; O. Perler, *Méliton de Sardes, Sur la Pâque*, SC 123, Paris 1966; A. Piédagnel - P. Paris, *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catécheses mystagogiques*, SC 126, Paris 1966; S. Poque, *Augustin d'Hippone, Sermons pour la Pâque*, SC 116, Paris 1966; H. Auf der Maur, *Die Osterhomillien des Asterios Sophistes als Quelle für die Geschichte der Osterfeier*, Trier 1967; R. Cantalamessa, *L'omelia "In S. Pascha" dello Pseudo Ippolito di Roma. Ricerche sulla teologia dell'Asia Minore nella seconda metà del II secolo*, Milan 1967; J. van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars*, Leiden [2]1961; W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern. Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche*, Berlin 1969; R. Cantalamessa, *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza. Le tradizioni pasquali della Bibbia e della primitiva Chiesa*, Casale Monf. 1984 (repr.); M. Aubineau, *Homélies pascales*, SC 187, Paris 1972; G. Kretschmar, *Christliches Passa im 2. Jahrhundert and die Ausbildung der christlichen Theologie*: RecSR 60 (1972) 287-323; R. Martin Achard, *Essai biblique sur les fêtes d'Israël*, Geneva 1974, 29-72; A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*: TU 121, Berlin 1977; M. Aubineau, *Hésychius de Jérusalem, Les homélies festales*, I-II, Bruxelles 1978–1980; R. Cantalamessa, *La Pasqua nella Chiesa antica*, Turin 1978 (Fr. tr. Bern 1980); P. Nautin, *Origène, Sur la Pâque*, Paris 1979; H. Auf den Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit*, I: *Herrenfeste in Woche and Jahr*, Regensburg 1983, 56-153; G. Visonà, *Ostern*: TRE 25, 517-530 (bibl.); Id., *Pseudo Ippolito. In sanctum Pascha*, Milan 1988; K. Gerlach, *The Antenicene Pascha*, Leuven 1998.

W. Rordorf

III. The Easter controversy. In the second century, the churches of *Rome and *Alexandria and numerous other Eastern and Western churches were celebrating the Easter celebration of Christ's *resurrection on the *Sunday immediately following the full moon of spring; the churches of Asia Minor, however, the premier of which was *Ephesus, celebrated Easter on the 14th day of the full moon of spring (14th of Nisan according to the Hebrew calendar). This practice drew inspiration from the Johannine tradition, according to which Jesus, who was the true Paschal Lamb, was sacrificed the same day on which the Jews were celebrating the Passover. The diversity of opinions also had doctrinal and disciplinary implications because, in the interpretation of the Easter liturgy, the churches that observed the *Quartodeciman custom emphasized the soteriological meaning of Jesus' passion and during the Easter celebration on the date established for the 14th of Nisan there was an immediate cessation of preparatory penitential fasting for Easter, thus even distinguishing the liturgical practice of the churches of Asia Minor with respect to the observance of Easter on a Sunday (see Euseb., *HE* V, 23,1).

*Eusebius (*HE* V, 23,2) mentions numerous synods in both East and West over the course of the 2nd c. that decreed that "the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should not be on any other day than Sunday and only on that day should the Easter fasts come to an end." Eusebius also reports the testimony of *Irenaeus of Lyons (*HE* IV, 14, 1 to be interpreted in light of V, 24, 16) of a first effort to resolve the conflict between the two liturgical practices during the time of the bishop of Rome *Anicetus and the bishop of *Ephesus *Polycarp (ca. 154) that proved ineffective because Anicetus was unable to persuade Polycarp not to observe the Quartodeciman practice, nor was Polycarp able to persuade Anicetus to observe it. Nevertheless, they remained in peace and ecclesial communion because neither Anicetus nor his successor *Soter broke communion with the bishops of Asia Minor (see Euseb., *HE* V, 24, 14).

Toward the end of the 2nd c., however, during the pontificate of Pope *Victor, a dramatic conflict arose over the Quartodeciman observance, almost certainly because the presbyter *Blastus set forth much propaganda in favor of that observance at Rome (see Euseb., *HE* V, 15, compare with V, 20, 1 and ps.-Tertullian, *Adv. omn. haer.* 8, 1). After having convoked a synod (see Euseb., *HE* V, 23, 3), Victor the bishop of Rome wrote a letter to *Polycrates of Ephesus telling him to observe Easter on Sunday and threatening him with excommunication if he continued to celebrate Easter on the 14th of Nisan;

Victor's letter has been lost, but its content can be deduced from Polycrates's reply, fragments of which have been preserved by Eusebius (*HE* V, 24, 2-8). With unbending determination Polycrates defended the apostolicity of the Quartodeciman tradition and upheld the desire of the Eastern churches to remain faithful to *tradition. To reconcile the parties involved and to preserve ecclesiastical communion, *Irenaeus of Lyons intervened in this crisis "in the name of the brothers from *Gaul" (see Euseb., *HE* V, 24,12-17): he openly agreed with the principle that Easter should be celebrated on Sunday but maintained that it was more opportune not to oppose harshly the Quartodeciman practice of the Eastern bishops, which he believed was established on the authority of *John, the disciple of the Lord, and allowed by Victor's predecessors. The documents that have come down to us do not allow us to determine what Victor's final position on the matter was, but it seems that the parties involved did not break ecclesial communion. However, the Church of Rome considered the Quartodeciman followers of Blastus to be heretics, and it is significant that even the *Philos.* VIII, 18, written around 235, lists the Quartodecimans among other heretical groups, and the anonymous author of the *Adv. omn. haer.*, transmitted under the name of *Tertullian, almost certainly inspired by *Hippolytus's *Syntagma*, mentions Blastus's Quartodeciman followers among other heretical groups (8, 1).

In the 2nd c., the Easter controversy made itself known through other historical-exegetical expressions: within the very Quartodeciman observance, John's chronology of Christ's passion must have been fiercely debated, which placed the death of Jesus on the 14th of Nisan, the day of the Jewish Passover, in contradistinction to the chronology of the Synoptic Gospels, according to which Jesus completed the celebration of the Passover on the 14th of Nisan and was crucified the following day, that is, the 15th of Nisan. Eusebius informs us of this disagreement which took place primarily at *Laodicea (*HE* IV, 26,3): *Melito of Sardis and *Apollinaris of Hierapolis must have been directly involved in this matter; but one also detects an echo of this debate in *Clement of Alexandria's work on Easter and in the writings of Hippolytus of Rome (see the texts of the **Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Dindorf, Bonn 1832, 13-15). In subsequent ages, Easter controversies would return, but these were centered primarily on the specific problem of the date of Easter Sunday, which at that time was set for different days, according to the various ecclesiastical *computi that had been adopted such as the controversy against the churches of *Syria and *Cilicia after the Council of *Nicaea (*see* *Protopaschites) and the arguments between the Celtic and the Roman observance of Easter in Ireland during St. *Columbanus's time.

B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner*, Gütersloh 1953 (Beitr. z. Förder, christl. Theol., 2. Reihe, 54); P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II^e et III^e siècles*, Paris 1961; R. Cantalamessa, *L'omelia "In S. Pascha" dello Pseudo-Ippolito di Roma*, Milan 1967, 67-108; Id., *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza*, Casale Monf. 1984 (repr.), 116-137; Id., *La Pasqua nella Chiesa antica*, Turin 1981; J. Rist, s.v. *Viktor*: BBKL 12 (1997) 1334-1337; L. Duchesne, *La question pascale au concile de Nicée*: RevQuest Hist 28 (1880) 5-42; M. Richard, *La question pascale au second siècle*: OrSyr 6 (1961) 179-212; Ch. Mohrmann, *Le conflit pascal au II^e siècle. Note philologique*: VChr 16 (1962) 154-171; V. Loi, *Il 25 Marzo data pasquale e la cronologia giovannea della Passione in età patristica*: EphLit 85 (1971) 48-69; A. Di Berardino, *L'imperatore Costantino e la celebrazione della Pasqua*, in *Costantino il Grande*, Macerata 1992, 363-384; R.V. Peri, *La data comune della Pasqua*: Riv. lit. 1-2/88 (2001) 103-124 (cf. XI.2003: http://www.rivistaliturgica.it/numero.asp?codice=1201).

V. Loi - B. Amata

EASTER HOMILIES. The Easter homilies of the *Fathers occupy a place of special importance in the ancient corpus of homilies for two reasons: (1) After the week-long celebration of the Lord's death and *resurrection, from the beginning of Christianity, Easter was not only the most ancient annual feast of the liturgical calendar, but also Christianity's fundamental, highest and, including *Pentecost, longest feast. (2) Easter theology includes the entire mystery of salvation, beginning from the creation of the world, through original sin, the preparation for the coming of the Savior in the OT, his *incarnation, death and resurrection until his return at the end of time. Consequently, the Fathers' Easter homilies are the richest and most developed for the entire *liturgical year.

The two most ancient and sole extant Easter homilies from the first three centuries are dated to the same period of the oldest information that has survived about an annual feast of the Christian Easter: *Melito of Sardis, *Peri Pascha* (ca. 160–170) and pseudo-*Hippolytus, *In sanctum Pascha* (between 164/166 and the end of the 2nd c.). Both are inserted within the *Quartodeciman tradition of celebrating Easter "with the Jews," that is, on the 14th of Nisan, regardless of the day of the week, which, at the same time, caused the Easter controversy. Consequently, the homilies insist upon the typology of Christ as the new Paschal Lamb (1 Cor 5:7) and his prefiguration in the OT Passover (Ex 12) such as the fulfillment of all the prophecies/figures of the OT, especially the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:1-8) and the

persecutions of the prophets (Is 53:7, "he was like a lamb led to the slaughter"; Jer 11:19, "I will be like a gentle lamb"; cf. Mt 5:12). At the same time, the Easter homilies take this interrelation as a point of departure for limiting the novelty of Christianity in comparison to Judaism, which has now been superseded, including the argument that the Jews rejected and killed the Messiah.

Moreover, the discoveries of Melito's homilies in 1940 caused a fundamental change in the way scholars evaluated the development of homilies in the ancient church; this homily presents itself as a large hymn containing all the elements of "Asiatic" rhetoric: alliterations, anaphora, antitheses, chiasma, epiphora, parallelisms etc. Up until that time, scholars presupposed that the use of classical *rhetoric in the homilies of the Fathers began only after "the Constantinian turning point" in the 4th c.; this change was seen as one of the causes for the church's decline. The hymn-like style also continued in the following centuries, always provoked by the paradox of the mystery of the salvation, death and resurrection, the old and the new, and the inability to explain the mystery apart from a song of awe and praise.

In the 4th c., the Easter homilies naturally followed the development of the Easter cycle beginning from ca. 380 and the institution of the catechumenate, which required the catechesis of the *competentes* (i.e., the ones qualified) in preparation for *baptism during the Easter vigil or *Pentecost and the ancillary instruction of the newly baptized during Pentecost. Therefore, the themes of the Easter homilies shifted. The various elements of the entire mystery of the faith, up until that time, were celebrated in a single moment or redistributed among various occasions: Palm Sunday, Holy Friday, Holy Saturday, Easter evening, Easter day, Easter time, Mesopentecost, *Ascension, the Pentecost vigil and Pentecost, even if there never was an absolute division. The Lenten homilies were dedicated to, among other things, the teaching of the *Creed and the *Lord's prayer to the *catechumens, while the holy days of Easter and the time thereafter was primarily dedicated to explaining the *Eucharist and the other elements of the faith and the moral life to show the way to the most perfect Christian life.

Among others, the Easter homilies of the following authors have survived: *Augustine, *Alexander of Alexandria, *Apollinaris, *Asterius the Sophist, *Gaudentius of Brescia, *John Chrysostom, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Leo the Great, *Maximus of Turin, *Peter Chrysologus, pseudo-Chrysostom, pseudo-Epiphanius, pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *Zeno of Verona.

In addition to the fact that the Easter homilies treated all the aspects of the history of salvation, two themes enjoyed special attention from the very beginning: (1) the question of where and how Christ spent his time between death and resurrection: as well as in the "heart of the earth" (Mt 12:40), in *paradise with the thief (Lk 23:43) and in the hands of the Father (Lk 23:46), to explain the method of salvation; (2) the reason for this *descent into hell, based on the preaching "to the spirits," according to 1 Pet 3:19, to explain how the righteous who lived before Christ were saved. This theme achieved greatest success in the form of Christ's great fight and victory over Hades, the conquest over the infernal city, the liberation of men and women from the snares of *death and a great victory procession toward heaven. Pseudo-Epiphanius's homily *In sabbato magno* (CPG 3768) marks the high point of this development and exerted a vast amount of influence during the Middle Ages. Today it is still cited in the breviary. Psalm 24:7-10 "lift up your heads, O gates! That the King of glory may come in," cited in this context, however, has a twofold function in the Easter homilies. Until the very end of the 4th c. it referred to Christ's entry into the heavenly city—the angels who guarded the doors did not want to open them because they did not recognize Christ who was returning with a humanity united to his divinity—and only after was it used for the arrival of the Savior standing before the abode of hell.

P. Nautin, *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton*, Paris 1953; Ph.T. Weller, *The Easter Sermons of St. Augustine*, Washington, D.C. 1955; W. Schneemelcher, *Der Sermo* "De anima et corpore" *ein Werk Alexanders von Alexandrien?* in Festschrift G. Dehn, Neukirchen 1957, 119-143; O. Perler, *Ein Hymnus zur Ostervigil von Meliton?* Fribourg 1961; St. Czerwik, *Homilia paschalis apud patres usque ad saeculum quintum*, Rome 1961; H. Auf der Maur, *Die Osterhomilien des Asterios Sophistes als Quelle für die Geschichte der Osterfeier*, Trier 1967; R. Cantalamessa, *L'omelia* "In S. Pascha" *dello Pseudo-Ippolito di Roma*, Milan 1967; J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères Cappadociens*, Paris 1968; L. Vanyó, *L'Omelia Anatolica sulla Pasqua nell'anno 387*: Augustinianum 15 (1975) 225-228; V. Loi, *L'omelia* "In sanctum Pascha" *di Ippolito di Roma*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 461-484; E. Cattaneo, *Trois homélies pseudo-chrysostomiennes sur la pâque comme oeuvre d'Apollinaire de Laodicée*, Paris 1981; A. Spira - Ch. Klock (eds.), *The Easter Sermons of Gregory of Nyssa*, Cambridge, MA 1981; H.R. Drobner, *Gregor von Nyssa. Die drei Tage zwischen Tod und Auferstehung unseres Herrn Jesus Christus*, Leiden 1982; Id., *Die Deutung des alttestamentlichen Pascha (Ex 12) bei Gregor von Nyssa im Lichte der Auslegungstradition der griechischen Kirche*, in H.R. Drobner - Ch. Klock (eds.), *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, Leiden 1990, 273-296; Id., *Die Himmelfahrtspredigt Gregors von Nyssa*, in H. Eisenberger (ed.), *ERMHNEUMATA*, Heidelberg 1990, 95-115; Id., *Die Karsamstagspredigt des Amphilochius von Ikonium*, in *Greek and Latin Studies in Memory of C. Fabricius*, Göteborg 1990, 1-23; Id., *Eine pseudo-athanasianische Osterpre-*

digt (CPG II 2247) über die Wahrheit Gottes und ihre Erfüllung, in L.R. Wickham - C.P. Bammel (eds.), *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Leiden 1993, 43-51; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast. Melito,* Peri Pascha *and the Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy at Sardis*, Leiden 1998; L.H. Cohick, *The* Peri Pascha *Attributed to Melito of Sardis*, Providence 2000.

H.R. Drobner

EBIONITES. Grouped under the name of Ebionites in ancient Christian literature are an indefinite number of Jewish Christian sects with some common characteristics, the most important of which are that they accepted Jesus as a "a mere man" (*nudus homo*, Tertull., *De carne Christi* 14), lived according to the Jewish law and rejected St. *Paul. *Irenaeus is the first to mention them as a heretical group (*Adv. haer.* I, 26, 2); according to him, they used the gospel of *Matthew. *Origen knows Jewish Christians in *Egypt whom he calls Ebionites, who emphasized the unique position of Israel (*De princ.* IV, 3, 5) and celebrated the *Eucharist with unleavened bread (*in Matth. comm. ser.* 79). He knows that the word *Ebionite* is derived from the Hebrew word for "poor," but explains it as proof of their "poverty of understanding" (*De princ.* IV, 3, 8). The proper name Ebion, the sect's supposed founder, is false (Tertull., *De praescr. haer.* IV, 8). Origen also knows a Jewish Christian gospel according to the Ebionites which he cites several times (*in Joh.* II, 12). *Eusebius, who knows little about Jewish Christian groups, but is the first to connect them with the Christians who left *Jerusalem and fled to *Pella before AD 70 (*Onomasticon*, p. 138, 24-25, ed. De Lagarde).

*Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30) knew a number of Jewish Christian writings, whose contents he uses to describe the Ebionites. He cites a gospel according to the Ebionites of which he gives several citations (30, 3, 7), a book called the *Periodoi* of Peter (30, 15, 1) and the *Anabathmoi* of James, all anonymous works (30, 16, 6-7). The latter two were used by the author of the ps.-*Clementine *Homiliae* and *Recognitiones*. From these sources, Epiphanius deduced that Christ appeared on earth periodically over the ages, that contact with *Gentiles was avoided, ritual purifications accepted and the prophets rejected. Since he met some of these ideas in sources on the *Elkesaites and noted that they were not present in the old traditions on the Ebionites, e.g., in Irenaeus, he held that the Ebionites showed signs of a development influenced by Elkesaite doctrines. This supposition must be rejected. It is obvious that the Elkesaite movement, coming from the region of Parthia, was influenced by Jewish Christian ideas present, e.g., in the writings known to Epiphanius. These writings clearly show a branch of Jewish Christianity different from that known either to Irenaeus or to Origen.

A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien*: TU 37 (1911); H.J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen 1949; G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum der Pseudoklementinen*: TU 70 (1958); B. Bagatti, *L'Église de la circoncision*, Jerusalem 1965; A.F.J. Klijn - G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*, Leiden 1973, 19-43; D.A. Bertrand, *L'évangile des Ebionites: Une harmonie évangélique antérieure au Diatessaron*: NTS 26 (1980) 548-563; A. Orbe, *Cristología gnóstica*, 2 vols., Madrid 1976 (see index); G. Howard, *The Gospel of the Ebionites*: ANRW II, 25, 5 (1988) 4030-4053; R.A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity. From the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century*, Leiden 1988; F. Manns, *L'Israel de Dieu. Essais sur le christianisme primitif*, Jerusalem 1996; S.C. Mimouni, *Le judéo-christianisme*, Paris 1998, 287-334; S. Légasse, *L'antipaulinisme sectaire au temps des Pères de l'Église*, Paris 2000.

A.F.J. Klijn

ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS of the APOSTLES. This work, still called by various names by moderns, including "Ecclesiastical Ordinance (or Constitution) of the Apostles" (Faivre), has nothing in common with the "85 *Apostolic Canons." It is preserved in the original Greek text—with the *Didache,* the only surviving text of this literary genre—in a 12th-c. MS of Vienna and in many translations into Eastern languages, and in Latin fragments in the Verona palimpsest (chs. 18-30). It comprises, after an introduction (I-III), two very different parts.

The first part (IV-XIV) consists of chs. 1-4 of the *Didache* with some additions. In a first phase, this first part had an independent life in a slightly shorter form, of which a summary preserved in three late manuscripts has been published by Th. Schermann (*Eine Elfapostelmoral*, Munich 1903). The second part (XV), artificially linked to the first, deals with ordinations. In its present state, the text mentions the bishop, the *presbyters, the lector, deacons, widows and the laity, and expounds the reasons ministries cannot be conferred upon women, except that of assisting sick women. The text has some incoherencies, however, which allow us to identify two layers; the oldest mentions only the bishop, deacons and widows. This ancient treatise on the three orders was the starting point of the **Didascalia Apostolorum*, which preserves vestigial traces of it; it was also used by the author of the **Apostolic Tradition*. Chronologically, it is from the period between the *Didache* and the letters of *Ignatius of Antioch, i.e., in the first years of the 2nd c. The present text is the work of a 4th- or 5th-c. compiler, in *Syria or more

probably in *Egypt, who had come across the separate edition of chs. 1-4 of the *Didache* and the old treatise on the three orders; he joined the two texts, adding a preamble, numerous additions and some modifications.

CPG 1739. J.W. Bickell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, I, Giessen 1843, 107-132 (*editio princeps*); J.B. Pitra, *Iuris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, I, Rome 1864, 75-88; F.X. Funk, *Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum*, Tübingen 1887, 50-72; Th. Schermann, *Die allgemeine Kirchenordnung frühchristlichen Liturgien und kirchliche Überlieferung*, Paderborn 1914 (repr. New York 1968), 12-34. Latin fragments: E. Tidner, *Didascaliae apostolorum, Canonum ecclesiasticorum*, Berlin 1963, 107-113. New Syriac evidence: A Vööbus, *Die Entdeckung der ältesten Urkunde für die syrische Übersetzung der Apostolische Kirchenordnung*: OrChr 63 (1979) 37-40. Translations: J.P. Arendzen: JTS 3 (1902) 59-80 (Syriac text and Eng. tr.); G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici*, London 1904, 295-306; Ger.: J.W. Bickell, ibid., 87-97; Schermann, ibid.

Studies: A. Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, TU 2,5, Leipzig 1884, 193-241; A. Harnack, *Die Quellen der Sogennanten Apostolischen Kirchenordnung nebst einer Untersuchung über einer Ursprung des Lectorats und der anderen niederen Weihen*, TU, 5, Leipzig 1886 (recension of L. Duchesne: Bulletin critique 7 [1886] 316-370), Eng. tr.: *Sources of the Apostolic Canons with a Treatise on the Origin of Readership and Other Lower Orders*, London 1895; H. Leclercq: DACL 2, 1923-1931; J.-M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte*, Rome 1959, [2]1965; R.A. Kraft, *Some Notes on Sabbath Observance on Early Christianity*: Andrews Seminary Studies 3 (1965) 18-33; P. Bradshaw: TRE 18, 666-667; R.-G. Coquin: Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 453-456, esp. p. 454; A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hiérarchie*, Paris 1977, 143-153; Id., *Le texte grec de la "Constitution ecclésiastique des apôtres"*: RevSR 55 (1981) 31-42; Id., *Apostolicité et pseudo-apostolicité dans la Constitution ecclésiastique des apôtres. L'art de faire parler les origines*: RevSR 66 (1992) 19-67; B. Steimer, *Vertex traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 60-71; H. König - J. Lössl, *Erweiterung der Zweiweglehre in der Apostolischen Kirchenordnung*: ZKG 107 (1996) 291-299; B. Lemoine, *L'évêque dans la C.E.A.*: QuLi 80 (1999) 5-23.

P. Nautin

ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION

I. Dioceses - II. Parishes - III. Ecclesiastical provinces - IV. Patriarchates.

I. Dioceses. The term *diocese* is derived from Roman public law: a *dioecesis* was a vast area of several provinces, ruled by a *vicarius*. In the ecclesiastical sphere the term "diocese" (διοίκησις) was reached by a transition, in Christian antiquity, from the term "church" (ἐκκλησία)—which referred to the universal church, the particular church and the church building—to that of parish (παροικία), and only later exclusively to that of diocese. In the West, besides *paroecia*, the terms *ecclesia*, *territorium*, *fines episcopatus* and *dioecesis* were also used. In 417 Pope *Zosimus referred to rural communities, previously called *dioceses*, as *paroeciae*. From the end of the 6th c., with *Sidonius Apollinaris, the two terms were used equivalently. From the 7th c., a bishop's territory was called *dioecesis* and the particular community led by him was the *paroecia*.

The origin of the dioceses coincided with the beginnings of Christian preaching and is visible in the context of St. Paul's journeys. In the territories of the Greco-Roman world (the Palestinian Jewish sphere was ruled by the apostolic college), Paul founded Christian communities in the great cities, to each of which he appointed a college of presbyters, supported by deacons. Paul is seen assisted by other hierarchical members with subordinate powers, whom community members obey (1 Cor 16:15-16; 1 Th 5:12; Rom 12:6ff.). They are called elders, presbyters (Acts 14:23); they are overseers (ἐπίσκοποι) to rule God's church as pastors (Acts 20:17, 28): at this point, presbyters and bishops designate holders of the same functions. Deacons have different tasks from those of presbyters-bishops (1 Tim 1:1-10; 5:17-19; Tit 1:5-11). Alongside the hierarchical members, there are the charismatics with gifts, such as prophecy and tongues, aimed at keeping the new faith alive. As for Paul, his having been directly called as an apostle to the Gentiles justifies his unique place in the ordering of his communities (2 Cor 10:8; 13:10; 1 Cor 4:21), where he appears as teacher, judge and legislator (1 Cor 7:17; Tit 1:5). Likewise with Peter, beginning from *Antioch. The disciples, sent into these territories, inherited the task of government from their respective apostles, establishing an uninterrupted apostolic succession. Bishops were installed in the urban centers, which were more populated by Christians and were strategic missionary centers. Following the propagation of Christianity in various cities, a presbyter was put with the bishop. Each of these bishops was equal in authority to the other bishops, but any could excel in personal gifts. The setting-up of a diocese was more and more linked to the number of believers and to the rise of new cities (Council of *Serdica, can. 6; Council of *Chalcedon, can. 17).

Territories with many cities usually had small but numerous bishoprics, as in N Africa and S-central Italy, while territories with few cities had vast bishoprics, as in N Italy, Gaul, Spain, the Danubian and Balkan provinces. The diocesan area usually coincided with the urban-administrative area and, through an intrinsic mechanism, the lesser dioceses usually gravitated toward the dioceses corresponding to the provincial capitals, with which they already had economic and political links. Residence was obligatory for bishops, though often disregarded,

esp. in the 4th c., by Eastern courtier-bishops (Council of *Nicaea, can. 16; Council of Antioch, can. 3; Council of Serdica, cans. 7-8, 11-12; Council of *Carthage [390], can. 7; [397], can. 56). In the East, the care of the rural population of a local church was entrusted to a χωρεπίσκοπος or chorbishop, who was completely dependent on the urban bishop: thus the synods of *Ancyra, *Neocaesarea, Nicaea (4th c.). They later tended to be replaced by *periodeuti* (*visitatores*, *circuitores*), i.e., simple itinerant priests (Synod of *Laodicea [ca. 380], can. 57). The West, all civil order having been overturned by the barbarian invasions, turned to the pope for the founding of dioceses and the setting-up of the church hierarchy. Otherwise, the bishop of Rome did not as a rule intervene in the setting-up of new local churches. While the bishops of Africa, in the West, moved rather autonomously in bringing local *Donatist churches within the orbit of the Catholic churches, in the East the state authority intervened or was drawn into the matter in cases of conflict. For Italy, 16 dioceses are documented at the end of the 3rd c.; 55 more arose in the 4th c.; another 155 in the 5th c.; in the 6th c., 57 more; and at the start of the 7th c., another 13. In all, at the start of the 7th c., peninsular and insular Italy counted 258 dioceses. The reasons for this increase include the freedom of the church (*Edict of Milan, 313), eminent episcopal figures such as St. *Ambrose at Milan, St. *Eusebius at Vercelli and St. *Maximus at Turin, and the decisive role of the bishop of Rome.

EC 4, 1651-1653; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII*, Faenza 1927; S. Mochi Onory, *Vescovi e città*, Bologna 1933; A. Schürmann, *Diözese*: RAC 3, 1053-1063; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain (IVe-Ve siècles)*, Paris 1958, 322-377; Fr.S. Pericoli-Ridolfini, *Le origini della Chiesa di Alessandria d'Egitto e la cronologia dei vescovi alessandrini dei secoli I e II*: Rend. Acc. Lincei, VIII serie, 17 (1962) 308-343; Id., *Vescovi antiocheni dei primi due secoli e la questione dell'episcopato antiocheno di Pietro*, in *Comunione interecclesiale, Collegialità, Primato, Ecumenismo*, "Communio" 12, Rome 1972, 339-360 (the first bishop was not Peter, but Ennodius, from 44); J. Mazzini, *La terminologia della ripartizione territoriale ecclesiastica nei testi conciliari latini dei secoli IV e V*: Studi Urbinati 43 (1974–1975) 233-266; K. Baus - E. Ewig, *Storia della Chiesa. I. Le origini (I-IV sec.)*, Milan 1977, 132-135; Id., *Storia della Chiesa. II. L'epoca dei concili (IV-V sec.)*, Milan 1977, 253-255; Fliche-Martin, III/2, 639-650; L. Scipioni, *Vescovo e popolo. L'esercizio dell'autorità nella Chiesa primitiva (sec. III)*, Milan 1977; Ch. Munier, *Autorité épiscopale et sollicitude pastorale IIe-VIe siècle*, Aldershot 1991; Ch. Pietri, *La nuova geografia (organizzazione ecclesiastica)*. A. *L'Oriente*, in *Storia del cristianesimo*, 2 (250–430), Rome 2000 (Fr. orig. 1995), 86-130; B. *L'Occidente e i suoi confini danubiani e balcanici*: I. *La Chiesa d'Africa*, *Storia del crist.* 2, 131-137; II. L. Pietri, *Roma e l'Italia*, in *Storia del crist.* 2, 137-141; P. Maraval, *Alessandria e l'Egitto*, in *Storia del crist.* 2, 822-838; Id., *Antiochia e l'Oriente*, in *Storia del crist.* 2, 839-854; Id., *Costantinopoli, l'Illirico e l'Asia minore*, in *Storia del crist.* 2, 855-869; V. Saxer, *I progressi dell'organizzazione ecclesiastica dalla fine del II secolo alla metà del III secolo (18–250)*, in *Storia del cristianesimo*, 1, Rome 2003 (Fr. orig. 2000), 730-765.

O. Pasquato

II. Parishes. In the first centuries the bishop was at the center of both the Christian *liturgy and church administration. The *Eucharist and *baptism were normally administered only by him; in cases of necessity, also by presbyters. From the point when Christianity also reached the villages, for liturgical services in those places the figure of the *periodeuta*, an itinerant presbyter, spread. In the great cities, with the growth of the Christian community, it became impossible to meet just at the city center, both because of distance and because of the capacity of the meeting hall. Thus liturgical decentralization, with the parochial system, became necessary. Trustworthy historical information on communities subject to the bishop, but not directly led by him, comes from the councils of *Antioch (341) for the East and *Serdica (343) for the West. The bishop led not just the urban community, but also that of the village (*chōra*). If there were bishops in the villages (*chōrepiskopoi*), they should only administer the churches dependent on them (Council of Antioch, can. 10). From this we deduce that not all the country churches had their own bishop, and that country parishes existed. At Serdica, bishops were forbidden to interfere in the parishes of another bishop (can. 18). Pope *Innocent (402–417) said that all his churches were inside the city walls; but he supposed that the other bishops administered more distant parishes. Rome seems to have had no country parishes. Only those presbyters in charge of the cemeteries outside the city walls were comparable to the country parish priests of other episcopal areas. Innocent calls the churches in Rome **Tituli* (*Ep. ad Decen.* 5). The Roman parishes must have arisen long before Innocent, but the accounts of them in the LP were written after his time, at the end of the 5th c. By the mid 3rd c., Cornelius lists 46 presbyters, 7 deacons (*Diakonia - Diaconate), 7 *subdeacons, 42 acolytes, 52 *exorcists, lectors and *doorkeepers in the Roman community, as well as 1500 widows and needy people fed by the community (Euseb., *HE* VI, 43,11). The Roman community must have numbered tens of thousands, who could not all have come together at once to celebrate the Eucharist. According to the LP, Cletus (ca. 80–90) ordained 25 presbyters and *Evaristus (after 100) allotted the Roman Tituli to the presbyters (and ordained 7 deacons). *Urban (d. 230) acquired 25 silver *patenae*

(probably for 25 Tituli). *Fabian (236–250) allotted the municipal regions to the deacons and installed 7 subdeacons (the areas of the *diaconiae* were not identical to those of the Tituli).

That Pope *Dionysius (260–268) entrusted the churches to the presbyters is something that we must certainly put at an earlier time; he also raised cemeteries (and their parish churches) to the status of *dioceses*, i.e., he elevated the cemetery churches outside the walls into parish churches. *Marcellus (ca. 300) elevated the 25 Tituli into *dioceses*, for the numerous baptisms (neophytes) and penitents.

The author of the LP, then, gives the name *dioceses* to autonomous presbyterial communities with the right to confer baptism. This linguistic use is first attested by *Sulpicius Severus who relates of *Martin of Tours (*Dial.* II, 9,6; *Ep.* 1,10; 3,6) that in the vast region of his episcopal city he founded about 10 country parishes (*dioceses*). In the 5th and 6th c. the parochial organization of the countryside was completed everywhere: as we see esp. in *Gaul, where only in ca. 600 did *diocesis* become the common term for an episcopal community, while presbyterial communities were now called parishes. The urban parishes may have been developed in the other great cities, as they were in Rome, by the 3rd c. In *Augustine's time in *Numidia we find presbyters in the small centers who perform liturgical functions (*Ep.* 83; *Ep.* 139,1); some presbyters were killed by the *Donatists (*Ep.* 133,1; *Ep.* 134,1).

Duchesne LP 4, 1923, 1212-1219; DACL 13, 1938, 2197-2199; K. Müller, *Parochie and Diözese im Abendland in spätrömischer und merowingischer Zeit*: ZNTW 32 (1933) 149-185; E. Griffe, *Les premières paroisses de la Gaule*: BLE 50 (1949) 229-239; Id., *À travers les paroisses rurales de la Gaule au VI^{e} siècle*: BLE 75 (1975) 3-26; W. Geerlings, *Augustinus und sein Bistum*: ThQ 158 (1978) 27-35; A. Martin, *Topographie et liturgie: le problème des "paroisses" d'Alexandrie, in Actes du XIe Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne*, Rome 1989, 113-114; V. Bo, *Storia della parrocchia: I secoli delle origini (sec. IVV)*, Rome ²1992, II: *I secoli dell'infanzia (sec. VI-XI)*, Rome 1990; M. Colardelle, *Les paroisses rurales*, in *Atlas archéologique de la France*, Paris 1992; *Pastoral Care before the Parish*, ed. J. Blair - R. Sharpe, Leicester, NY 1992; Ch. Pietri, *Régions ecclésiastiques et paroisses romaines*, in *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997, 173-200; *Alle origini della parrocchia rurale, IV-VIII sec.*, ed. Ph. Pergola, Vatican City 1999; G. Gantino Wataghin, *Christianisation et organisation ecclésiastique de campagne, L'Italie du Nord aux IV^{e}-VIII^{e} siècles*, in *Towns and Their Territories between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. G.B. Brogiolo et al., Leiden 2000, 209-234.

H.J. Vogt

III. Ecclesiastical provinces (with metropolitan center). From the 4th c. a coordination appeared, which gave rise to a more complex and hierarchical structure: the ecclesiastical province (ἐπαρχία). The fact is explained along the lines of missionary practice that, spreading from the capital to other centers of the province, generated communities which were filiations of the central episcopal or mother church. The bishop of the mother church (μητρόπολις) was, from the 4th c., called the metropolitan (ἐπίσκοπος μητροπολίτης), later ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, and had jurisdiction over the other bishops (ἐπαρχιῶται), who from the 8th c. were also called "suffragans." Another factor in the formation and cohesion of ecclesiastical provinces, from the end of the 2nd c., was the synods, set up with the aim of bringing together the bishops, not just of one political province, but also of a wider territory (Euseb., *HE* 5,23,25), to debate important ecclesiastical affairs going beyond the local sphere of the churches. The provincial council was called and presided over by the metropolitan (Council of *Antioch [341], cans. 14, 16, 20). It had competence over all questions of the province (Council of *Constantinople I [381], can. 2).

The ecclesiastical provinces, increasing in number, continued to conform to the boundaries of the political provinces, which were multiplied by *Diocletian and his successors until, at the start of the 5th c., there were 120 of them. All of the bishops of a province, with the metropolitan's confirmation, could install a bishop in their own diocese (Council of *Nicaea [325], can. 4).

The frequent imprecision of the territorial boundaries was at the root of jurisdictional problems, later regulated by conciliar canons. But bishops' interventions outside their own territory were more properly "the consequence of a universal ecclesial sense that the bishops of previous centuries had exercised. The most typical example of this universal interest is provided by the correspondence the bishops held with many other sees for the purpose of resolving questions and difficulties" (J-R. Palanque, in Fliche-Martin III, 2, Turin ³1977, 640). But in the West a more complex type of grouping later arose: the episcopal sees of Roman N Africa came under *Carthage and those of S-central Italy under Rome, whose prestige and power went beyond the metropolitan sphere. There was a similar configuration in the East: for Antioch, with respect to Syria and the eastern provinces of Asia Minor regarding participation in the synods of Antioch (Euseb., *HE* 6,46,3; 7,5,1-2), and with respect to *Cilicia and *Osroene regarding missionary activity (*HE* 6,12,2); and for the see of *Alexandria, on which all the sees of *Egypt, *Libya and *Pentapolis depended (Council of Nicaea, can. 6). The sees of Antioch and Alexandria appeared as supermetropolises: the path to the patriarchates was al-

ready in evidence. The ecclesiastical province had its own metropolitan center in the civil capital of the province, where the metropolitan resided, i.e., close to the civil governor and more able to help his colleagues in their relations with him. Synods (4th-5th c.) established his power: besides the presidency of the provincial synod, he had a certain role watching over the religious-ecclesiastical life of the province and over the bishops themselves. The bishop, though autonomous in his own territory, had to obtain approval from the metropolitan and the other bishops for extraterritorial undertakings.

The metropolitan institution prevailed first in the Greek East, except for Egypt (and its dependants Libya and Pentapolis), where the bishops depended on the bishop of Alexandria. In the Latin West there was marked heterogeneity. The bishops of suburbicarian Italy depended directly on the bishop of Rome. The bishop of Milan, residence of the emperor and the *vicarius annonarius*, one of the few large cities of N Italy, was the main metropolitan of an ecclesiastical territory comprising several provinces. From ca. 425, the see of *Aquileia was metropolis of the provinces of Venice, Istria, *Rhaetia and *Noricum, as was *Sirmium of Pannonia. Aquileia and *Ravenna were preeminent at the time of the co-emperors *Honorius (395–423) and *Arcadius (395–408). In the provinces of N Africa the metropolitan (primate) was the oldest bishop, who did not necessarily reside in the metropolis. In Proconsularis, however, the metropolitan was the bishop of Carthage, who also had a certain influence in the other provinces. In Gaul, from the 4th c. the metropolitan sees coincided with the provincial capitals. The popes set up the apostolic vicariate of *Arles, a see founded by St. *Trophimus, a disciple of St. Peter. For *Spain, we have no evidence of the existence of the metropolitan institution until after the mid 5th c.; only in the 6th c. do we see the great provincial synods there. Everywhere, in general, ecclesiastical provinces corresponded to civil administrative units, but the church reserved the right to keep their own areas despite the changeability of the civil ones (Innocent I, *Ep.* 24,2; Council of Chalcedon, can. 12). For individual metropolises, Eastern and Western, see J-R. Palanque, in Fliche-Martin III/2, 650-695.

DACL, 9, 786-790; EC 8, 914-915; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain (IVe-Ve siècles)*, Paris 1958, 380-407; Fliche-Martin III/2, 639-650; K. Baus - E. Ewig, *Storia della Chiesa*, II, Milan 1977, 450-452.

IV. Patriarchates. The legal bases for their foundation were laid at the Council of Nicaea ([325], can. 6), which made the bishops of Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis dependent on the bishop of Alexandria and recognized the privileged situation of Antioch, whose bishop had metropolitan powers over the 22 bishops of Coele-Syria as well as those of Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Palestine and *Cyprus. These positions were also recognized by the councils of *Constantinople ([381], can. 2) and *Ephesus (431). Can. 2 of Constantinople also named the political dioceses of the Eastern part of the empire: Oriens, *Asia, *Pontus and *Thrace, without alluding to a church to whose bishop the government of their respective dioceses belonged: we can already foresee the institution of the Eastern patriarchate, the more so if we take into account can. 3: "The bishop of Constantinople will have primacy of honor (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς) immediately after the bishop of Rome, since that is a new Rome (νέαν Ῥώμην)": the *thronos* of Alexandria, the principal one in the East, had to take second place. Ambitions of prelates and imperial *caesaropapism, as well as the fact of having been founded by *Constantine (330) and made capital of the empire (so that its bishop had to be raised in dignity), took Constantinople in just 70 years from a suffragan diocese of Heraclea to first patriarchate of the whole East (Council of Chalcedon [451], can. 28). Its effective power was consolidated through the appeals of the Eastern clergy to the emperors, transmitted from them to the bishop of Constantinople, who presided over the permanent synod (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα) composed of visiting bishops. As for *Jerusalem, the Council of Constantinople (can. 7) recognized its bishop's "traditional honorific position" (ἀκουλουθία τῆς τιμῆς), but was mindful of the metropolitan rights of Caesarea.

The primary factor in the origin of the three patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Rome was their geopolitical and economic role, a factor that had partly guided the Christian missionaries. This same rationale, though considered completely inadequate by popes *Damasus, *Boniface I, *Leo I and *Gelasius I, was the only reason for the institution of the patriarchate of Constantinople. Then there was the linguistic-cultural factor of the inhabitants of the areas where they arose: there was, in fact, a patriarchate respectively in the territories of Egyptian culture (Alexandria), Syrian culture (Antioch), Greek culture (Constantinople), Latin culture (Rome, although in this area, with Carthage, there was a certain independence of N Africa) and Jewish culture (Jerusalem). But above all there was the element of the apostolic origin of the leading episcopal sees, which acquired more and more weight, partly through Roman pressure. Only at the Council of Chalcedon (451) was Jerusalem recognized as a pa-

triarchal see with jurisdiction over Palestine, through the good offices of its bishop *Juvenal (422–458), and made independent of Antioch. Following the finding of the presumed tomb of the apostle Barnabas (488) in Cyprus, the Cypriot church attained equality with that of Antioch; from definitive independence, obtained for it by the emperor *Zeno, it then passed to "autocephaly." As for Rome, popes Leo I (440-461) and Gelasius I (492-496) added to the Petrine principle the peculiar link between Peter and the Roman church, claiming that this was to be considered the apostolic see *par excellence*, with the popes as heirs of Peter's primatial powers.

Having addressed the origin of the dioceses and seen that a group of them constituted an ecclesiastical province and several provinces a patriarchate, we must now follow the development of the five patriarchates: Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, Constantinople and Jerusalem. In the patriarchate of Alexandria, many, rejecting Leo I's dogmatic "tome" and the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, detached themselves from the Catholic Church and formed a new "Coptic" church, calling the Catholics "*Melkites" or emperor's men. The Greek patriarchate, its numbers greatly reduced, remained faithful to the Council of Chalcedon. The Melkite patriarchs include three saints: St. *Proterius (452–457), St. *Eulogius (580–607) and St. *John III, the Almsgiver (609–619). *Maximus the Confessor and *Sophronius defended Catholic orthodoxy at the time of the Arab invasion (638), on whose eve the Greek church of Alexandria counted only 200,000 faithful, mostly foreigners, against the 5/6,000,000 of the indigenous Coptic church.

The patriarchate of Antioch was displeased by the rise of the patriarchate of Constantinople, at the Council of Chalcedon (451), to first see of the East. Meanwhile it was infiltrated by heresy, so much so that the patriarchal see alternated between heretics and orthodox until, under the *monophysite patriarch *Severus (512–518), *Jacob Baradeus organized the "*Jacobite" church: by the mid 6th c., about half of the inhabitants of Syria adhered to this. The situation deteriorated during the Arab occupation (638–969). The patriarchate of Jerusalem, to defend itself from Antioch and Alexandria, sought help from Constantinople, whose faith it followed. The Persian invasion (614) put an end to a brief period of splendor. The histories of the patriarchates of Constantinople and Rome are interwoven. The bishops of Constantinople aimed at "second place in the hierarchy after the pope and [at] privileges equal to his, though without demanding universal primacy, still acknowledged by them to the Roman see, though passed over in silence as far as possible" (M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin. Aperçu historique et doctrinal*, Paris 1941, 37).

The matter appeared more logical on the death of *Theodosius I (395) and the division of the Roman Empire into two parts. Now, in can. 28 of the Council of Chalcedon (CoeD, pp. 99-100), which modified can. 3 of Constantinople (381) (CoeD, p. 32), the privileges of the see of Constantinople were made equal to those of Rome, while conceding first place to the latter; the bishop of Constantinople had the right to ordain the metropolitans of the (civil) dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Thrace. The patriarchate of Constantinople, comprising these three exarchates, was now founded *de jure*.

Can. 28 served the bishop of Constantinople for his patriarchal jurisdiction. In the mid 7th c., the patriarchate counted 33 metropolises with 352 suffragan bishoprics and 24 autocephalous archbishoprics. From the 7th c. the see of Constantinople was also called *apostolic*; indeed in the 9th c. it was declared to be of apostolic origin (heir of Ephesus, therefore of St. John the apostle; linked to the legend of St. Andrew the apostle, evangelizer of Byzantium): we thus arrive at the theory of the "pentarchy," installed by the Holy Spirit, of apostolic succession and composed of superior leaders of identical dignity. The Roman see was agreeable to the pluralistic structure as long as the patriarchates were shown to be based on apostolic origin. Conflicts arose through Rome's vaunting her preeminent apostolic origin, claiming to be the universal leader of the church. The **Decretum Gelasianum*, the case of *John Chrysostom under Innocent I (402–417), Leo I's (440–461) opposition to can. 28 of Chalcedon, the patriarch of Constantinople's assumption, against Roman protest, of the title "ecumenical" (= imperial) patriarch (6th c.), etc., are so many steps in a gradual tension and distancing between Rome and Constantinople. But the primacy of the bishops of Constantinople among the churches of the East was uncontested, all the more so since the Eastern patriarchates went over either to the Nestorian (Antioch) or the monophysite (Alexandria) heresy, and ended up under Muslim rule (7th c.). Relationships with the emperor were regulated by mutual exchanges of synodal letters with a profession of faith by the pope or the patriarch elect; with the insertion of the patriarch's name or that of the pope into the diptychs and its commemoration during the canon of the mass, read by the deacon from the ambo; and with the diplomatic representation of the pope or patriarch to the emperor through permanent ambassadors or special nuncios (*apocrisiarii*). This diplomatic network,

though necessary, failed to prevent the rift between the sees of Constantinople and Rome from widening further and further and culminating in the schism of 1054.

EC 6, 759-763: patriarchate of Al.; EC 6, 1461-1463: patr. of Ant.; EC 4, 732-737: patr. of Const.; EC 6, 201-202: patr. of Jer.; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain (IVe-Ve siècles)*, Paris 1958, 389-407; P.P. Joannou, *Pape, Concile et patriarches dans la tradition de l'Église orientale jusqu'au IXe siècle*, Grottaferrata 1962; W. de Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg i. Br. 1963; K. Baus - E. Ewig, *Storia della Chiesa. II. L'epoca dei concili (IV-V sec.)*, Milan 1977, 258-263; Var. aus., *I Patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio*, OCA 181, Rome 1968; V. Monachino, *Il canone 28 di Calcedonia. Genesi storica*, Aquila 1979; F. Feghali, *Perspectives sur l'histoire et l'institution des patriarcats orientaux*, in Mél. Dauvillier, Toulouse 1979, 269-292; G. Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy*, Oxford 1986; G. Fedalto, *Le Chiese d'Oriente. Da Giustiniano alla caduta di Costantinopoli*, Milan 1991, 14-27 (ecclesiastical organization of the Church of Constantinople and of the other patriarchates at the time of Justinian); J. Gaudemet, *Storia del diritto canonico. Ecclesia et Civitas*, Cinisello Balsamo 1998 (Fr. orig. 1994), 144-147; B. Flusin, *Vescovi e patriarchi. Le strutture della Chiesa imperiale*, in *Storia del cristianesimo*, 3 (432–610), Rome 2002 (Fr. orig. 1998), 459-512. Roman see: A. Fransen, *Papstgeschichte. Das Petrusamt*, Freiburg i. Br. [2]1979; J. Gaudemet, *Storia del diritto canonico*, 153-166.

O. Pasquato

ECCLESIOLOGY. According to *1 Clement*, the churches of Rome and Corinth sojourn in a foreign land, having their full citizenship only in heaven. The church is identified with those "called (elect), sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (preface). All who are part of the church must and can stand in God's presence (29, 1), but not all are on the same level. God himself has willed a ranked order: "Some liturgies are assigned to the High Priest; a leading place belongs to the priests, the Levites have their own services, while the layperson is bound by the regulations for laypeople" (40, 5). God sent Christ, who entrusted the good news to the apostles (42, 1); they in turn appointed their first proselytes as bishops and deacons (*Diakonia) for those who came to accept the faith (42, 4). So their office preceded the community (*ekklēsia*), whereas later generations of officeholders were commissioned with the consent of the whole community. The exercise of the function of these "*presbyteroi*" consists of "*leiturgia*" and "*episcopē*," i.e., they "offer the oblations." Though *Clement speaks of bishops, deacons (42, 4.5) and presbyters (surely in the sense of specific offices 44, 5; 47, 6; 54, 2; 57, 1), he does not make clear whether these are three grades of the hierarchy; it seems rather that the "established presbyters" (54, 2) occupied the office of bishop collegially; but in the way Clement stresses the role of the high priest (40, 5), we may possibly see a reference to a single bishop.

The martyr-bishop Ignatius of Antioch clearly cites the triple distinction of the office of deacons, presbyters (together forming the presbyterate) and sole bishop (*Eph.* 1, 3; 2, 2; 4, 1; 20, 2; *Magn.* 2; 6, 1ff.). For him as for Clement (59, 3), the Father of Jesus Christ is the bishop of all (*Magn.* 3, 1); the bishop is God's vicar (*Magn.* 6, 1), the image (*typos*) of the Father (*Trall.* 3, 1). The presbyters stand in the place of the council of the apostles united before God (*Magn.* 6, 1; *Trall.* 2, 2; 3, 1; *Smyrn.* 8, 1). The deacons must be respected as Christ himself (*Trall.* 3, 1), or as a commandment of God (*Smyrn.* 8, 1); to them is entrusted the service of Christ Jesus (*Magn.* 6, 1). The repeated insistence on subordination to the bishop and to the presbyterate does not seem to be an end in itself—as in Clement, for whom degree confers beauty on the world and on the church—but to serve the purpose of unity. The unity of the church (*Eph.* 4, 2; 5, 1; *Phld.* 2, 2; 7, 2; *Pol.* 2, 1) must correspond to God's unicity (*Phil.* 8, 1; 9, 1; *Smyrn.* 12, 2; *Pol.* 8, 3; *Trall.* 11, 2); whoever has left her and turned elsewhere must return (*Phld.* 3, 2) to God's unity (ibid. 8, 1). The church's prayers will be heard only when unity reigns (*Eph.* 4, 2). A community must not censure its bishop to silence him, "since he whom the Master of the house sends as his administrator must be welcomed as the sender himself" (*Eph.* 6, 1). So the community does not share in the appointment of the bishop, but it is not clear who confers the office. He who believes in the *incarnation, passion and *resurrection (*Magn.* 11) is like a branch of the *cross and produces fruits of immortality. Christ calls his members to himself and to his life, since the head cannot be born without the members (*Trall.* 11, 2). In this way the passion belongs to the essence of the church, which comes after the prophecies, the law of Moses and the gospel proclaimed until now; the sufferings of each of us witness to the faith (*Smyrn.* 5, 1).

To the Roman *Hermas (ca. 150), the church appears (*Vis.* I) as an old woman splendidly dressed, since "she is first among all and the world was created for her sake" (*Vis.* II, 4, 1). Moreover, the church is identified with its members; at first she appears old, since the spirit of Christians is old and exhausted, and has no strength left because of their weaknesses and uncertainties (*Vis.* III, 11, 2). In the third vision, the church is young, beautiful and gay, because "you have welcomed the renewal of your spirit" (*Vis.* III, 9, 1 and 2). But the church is also mother of the "presidents of the community" (*Vis.* III, 9, 1 and 7). The seer's focus on the

universal church is shown by the construction of the tower "which seems to rise as from a single stone" (*Vis.* III, 2, 6).

*Theophilus of Antioch (ca. 185) stressed the missionary effectiveness of the many communities taken individually: "as in the sea there are islands . . . havens for voyagers in the storm . . . in this guise God has given to the world, shaken and lashed by the billows of sin, the assemblies (*synagōgai*) called holy churches, where the doctrines of truth are found, where those who want to be saved take refuge, since they are lovers of truth and want to flee from God's wrath and judgment" (*Autol.* 2, 14). Certainly, whoever considers the actual communities cannot be unaware that "as there are rocky islands . . . where sailors are smashed to bits, so there are doctrines of error, heresies that lead those who turn to them to perdition; these are not led by the Logos of truth" (ibid.). In dispute with heretics, esp. with *gnosticism, the custody and transmission of the truth became the church's badge and title of dignity.

For *Irenaeus, the church is the one "worthy vessel" in which the *Holy Spirit has deposited the faith as a "precious good," a faith which remains forever young and keeps its vessel young and healthy (*Adv. haer.* 3, 24, 1). An effect of the Spirit, which guarantees the church's possession of the truth, are the holders of ministry (*Adv. haer.* 3, 24, 1), in the first place the bishops appointed by the apostles and their successors up to this day (*Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 1-3). Whoever rejects the bishops rejects the church and with it God's Spirit; and the Spirit is truth (*Adv. haer.* 3, 24, 1), always and everywhere the same (*Adv. haer.* 1, 10, 2). The church possesses truth, the same truth announced by the prophets, brought to fulfillment by Christ, handed down by the apostles: having accepted it, she preserves it faithfully, communicates it to her children (*Adv. haer.* 2, 30, 11) and acts as a link between the apostles and later generations. For Irenaeus as for Hermas, the believers are the church (*Adv. haer.* 3, 6, 1). Its different members are closely united to one another, since "all recognize one God and Father, believe in the same economy of the incarnation of the Son of God, know the same outpouring of the Spirit, observe the same precepts and the same system of church government, await one same coming of the Lord and hope for the same salvation of the whole person, soul and body" (*Adv. haer.* 5, 20, 1). As content of the church's true knowledge, Irenaeus lists "(1) the doctrine of the apostles; (2) the ancient organization of the church throughout the world; (3) the mark of Christ's body according to the succession of bishops, to whom they (the apostles) entrusted each local church; (4) the faithful preservation of the *Scriptures which have come down to us; (5) the complete collection of them without addition or subtraction; (6) a reading of them containing no deception; (7) a correct, harmonious exposition of them, exempt from danger and blasphemy; (8) finally the supreme gift of charity. . . ." (*Adv. haer.* 4, 33, 8). For Irenaeus, the church as an institution is an argument for faith; the character of the body of Christ is impressed on it through the succession of bishops, something that almost no other Father of the church brings out more convincingly or penetratingly. Though the church is one throughout the world, the local communities are also churches. Those founded by the apostles serve as a canon in controversies of lesser importance (*Adv. haer.* 3, 5, 1), but because of the more excellent origin of the church of Rome—founded by the apostles *Peter and *Paul—it is understood that each church must be in agreement with it, since in it the tradition that comes from the apostles has always been preserved (*Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 2).

For *Clement of Alexandria (d. after 200), the church is proof of God's power always at work. "As his will is a work and is called the world, so his intention is the salvation of humanity, and this is called the church" (*Paed.* I, 6, 27, 2). In the ecclesiastical orders of bishops, presbyters and deacons, Clement sees "images of the angelic world and of the future condition which, according to the Scriptures, await those who have walked in the way of the apostles, in perfect justice" (*Strom.* VI, 13, 107). The just will sit, even if they had no presidency here on earth (though they should hold one, and the ordained should be perfect), on 24 thrones to judge the people, as Rev 4:4 puts it (*Strom.* VI, 13, 106). Clement probably understood the 24 thrones as a tribunal for the new dual people, composed of Jews and pagans. "Grace has been duplicated," but, even if there is some justification in speaking of more than one Testament, we must speak of a "single Covenant (*diathēkē*) which works salvation," which "has come down to us from the foundation of the world and has (only wrongly) been considered as given in different ways in accordance with successive generations and times" (*Strom.* VI, 13, 106). The one Testament can be likened to the one God: "O ineffable mystery; the universal Father is one, and one the universal Word; and the Holy Spirit is one and the same everywhere; and one virgin becomes mother, which I love to call the church" (*Paed.* I, 6, 42, 1).

*Tertullian (d. after 200) goes further than Clement: "The reason why the church is mentioned (in the baptismal creed) is clear; it is because where the three divine persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit,

are present, there also is the church, the body of the three persons" (*Bapt.* 6). After Tertullian, no Father of the church expresses himself in this way: even Augustine, the great theologian of the church, limits himself to saying, "After the *Trinity, we must add the church, as after the inhabitant his house, after God his temple, after the founder his city" (*Ench.* 15, 56). In his exposition of the *Lord's Prayer, Tertullian affirms: "In the title of Father, the Son is also invoked, nor is Mother church left out, because in the father and the son we recognize the mother, in which the very name of father and son finds its basis" (*Orat.* 2). He is also the first to point out the parallel between Adam and Eve on one hand and Christ and the church on the other: "as Adam was a figure of Christ, Adam's sleep represents the death of Christ, who had to fall asleep in *death so that from his wounded side the church, true mother of the living, could be formed" (*De an.* 43). The church lives in each of its members, feels and suffers with each one, because she is Christ himself (*Poen.* 10). "We are one body by the consciousness of religion, the unity of discipline and the covenant of hope" (*Apol.* 39, 1). Christians know that God examines them; so that "in our meetings a judgment takes place in God's name; and if one has sinned gravely, he is excluded (excommunicated) from the community of prayer, from the meeting and from any religious association" (*Apol.* 39, 4). As in Irenaeus, the communities of apostolic origin have a special authority (*Praescr.* 35, 2-5); but since all are linked to each other through the "communion of peace, the name of brotherhood and the mark of hospitality," all the churches are "the first and all are apostolic" (*Praescr*. 20, 7-9).

*Origen, while desiring to understand the inner reality of which all degrees of ecclesial ministry are a symbol (*Mt. Com.* 14, 22), leaves no doubt that "the form of the churches is entrusted to the priests" (*Num. hom.* 9, 1), which is why judgment on faith and morals is the province of those who hold ministries. There is no inner hierarchy of the perfect that can exercise full powers and replace the clergy. Nevertheless, a sinner must seek the advice of a perfect person as much as possible, to know his own state and the means of salvation. A bishop who is personally in a state of sin will bind and loose in vain, since, not possessing a clear criterion of virtue, he cannot be sure that his judgment corresponds to that of heaven (*Mt. Com.* 12, 14). This is not *Donatism *ante litteram*, but the conviction that discernment is given only as the fruit of a virtuous life. The church is the community of those who work for a deeper understanding of *revelation, a mutual participation in it and a common realization of it (*Jo. Com.* 19, 8, 45). Believers, even when not attaining the highest perfection, possess the *hope of salvation, though this seems highly graduated, able to include even a little dishonor (*Josh. hom.* 10, 1) if anyone should fall far short of their task. But for unbelievers or heretics, even an austere life seems to lead to perdition (*Ezech. hom.* 7, 3; *Mt. Com. Ser.* 33). Israel is the first and last recipient of all God's favors; all other peoples can be admitted to them only in its place (*fragm.* 464 in *Mt* 23,39; *fragm.* 125 in *Lc* 8,41). The provisional destiny of the synagogue cannot affect the church as a whole; Jesus weeps only over individual souls, as he wept over Jerusalem (*Lc. hom.* 38; *Jer. hom.* 13, 2).

The church is not sinful; rather, whoever falls into sin ceases to belong to the church (*Mt. Com.* 12, 11ff.), not just when excommunicated, but even when his sin remains hidden. If his sin is discovered, he must be excommunicated; only for those whose exclusion is not possible is the parable of the wheat and tares valid; but their presence in the church is clearly unjustified, like the persistence of the Jebusites in Jerusalem. Believers must avoid, as far as possible, any contact with them (*Josh. hom.* 21, 1, 2). Indeed, from birth no one is exempt from guilt, but it is possible to free oneself from sin. Even the churchman (*ekklesiastikos*) was defiled, but now he no longer has "any spot" (*Lc. hom.* 2).

The holy church, for Origen, is not something heavenly or otherworldly: it lives not just in the objective sanctity of doctrine and *sacraments, but in the saints of actual communities, i.e., in the sanctity of Christians. Many Christians live so purely as to be able to be considered perfect priests (*C. Cels.* 7, 48). Neither the communion of all Christians nor the totality of all the (local) communities is identified simply with the church, the holy body of Christ; by following the way of penance and sanctification, made possible by grace (*Rom. Com.* 5, 7; *Lev. hom.* 9, 8), we are identified more and more with Christ's body. Therefore this reality of the church in process of realization must be increasingly known, which occurs, e.g., through seeking the spiritual meaning of Scripture, which refers to the church herself. In fact Origen is rather reserved in this; various passages in which later exegesis would see the church, he interprets as referring to the individual soul (e.g., Mt 24:40-41 and Lk 17:34, in *Mt. Com. Ser.* 57, 58 and *Mt. fragm.* 488ff. and *fragm.* 225 in *Lk.*). The church cannot be fully realized on earth, since sinners are found in her and sin in her members; she must in all things follow her savior who was crucified, buried and rose on the third day (*Jo. Com.* 10, 35, 229). The church's body will rise again in the future world, passing through God's judgment, which will sepa-

rate the noble from the ignoble parts (*Jo. Com.* 10, 36, 237); to each will be assigned his proper place according to the merits acquired on earth (ibid. 10, 39, 268), and excluding those who are not in harmony with the other members (ibid. 10, 36, 236).

The ecclesiological ideas of *Cyprian were born from persecution, the rebellion of some clerics, the breaking up of the communities and the controversy over *baptism. Like Ignatius, he sees the ministry of the bishop as the guarantee of unity: "God is one, Christ is one, the church is one and the *cathedra* too is one, that founded by Peter himself" (*Ep.* 43, 5 Hartel). For him, the see of Peter is not just the see of Rome; each bishop has a *cathedra* of his own, as a 3rd-c. African bishop opposed by Tertullian put it: each church is linked to Peter (*Petri propinquam*), possessing the same power of the keys (*Pud.* 21). Since Christ wills unity, he has conferred the primacy on Peter, but "the other apostles were what Peter was" (*Unit.* 4). A few years later Cyprian would declare, against Pope *Stephen, that Peter never claimed to possess a primacy that claimed obedience (*Ep.* 71, 3). It was perhaps then that he corrected his work on unity to what we now read: "The origin (of the church) comes from unity"; what in the first edition he called apostasy from the chair of Peter, on which the church is founded (*Unit.* 4), he now called "opposition to the church." One novelty in Cyprian is his awareness of the individual bishop's responsibility for the whole church (ibid. 5). "This is why the great college (*corpus*) of bishops (*sacerdotes*) exists . . . and if anyone creates factions or breaks up Christ's flock, let others take care to gather the sheep back into the fold." In this manner Cyprian solicits Pope Stephen to send a letter dismissing the *Novatianist bishop of *Arles and appoint another bishop there (*Ep.* 68, 3); he thus seems to offer good evidence in favor of the pope's authority.

Cyprian borrows from Tertullian his speech on *pax ecclesiae*; "peace of and with the church," i.e., reconciliation for sinners, can be accorded the apostates of *Decius's persecution only when "peace for the church," i.e., the end of persecution, has come (*Ep.* 15, 2 etc.). In fact, for those fallen into apostasy (the *lapsi*) a period of greater penitence was required; it would end, and *pax* would be given them, at the moment when the church's peace was again threatened by a new persecution (*Ep.* 55, 17 and 57, 1). Through reconciliation, brothers in the faith are "armed, fortified and trained for combat" (ibid.). Full connection with the church confers grace; reconciliation is equivalent to the sacrament of penance. Cyprian often calls the church Mother (*Ep.* 15, 2; 43, 6; 74, 7, etc.). He carries Tertullian's ideas to their maximum expression: "He who does not have the church for mother, cannot have God for father" (*Unit.* 6). It follows for him that all sacraments administered outside the church are invalid. Baptism can be administered only in the *catholica*; what is conferred outside is "contamination with profane water" (*Ep.* 72, 1, etc.), because the Holy Spirit works only in the church (*Ep.* 69, 11-12).

*Methodius (end of 3rd c.) updates Tertullian's parallel between Adam and Christ: "For the sake of the church, the Word left the Father who is in heaven and came down to join himself to the woman, and fell asleep in the ecstasy of his passion, dying for her of his own spontaneous will. . . . The church grows from day to day . . . by the embrace and communion of the Word, which even now descends among us and even now is rapt out of himself when we recall his passion. In no other way could the church conceive and regenerate the faithful through the washing of regeneration, if Christ himself, for these believers of the church . . . did not return to die, descending from the heavens, and, adhering to his lady the church, did not offer himself so that something of his power could be taken from his rib, by which all those who are built up and regenerated in him by washing might grow by taking from his bone and from his flesh, i.e., from his sanctity and from his glory" (*Symp.* 3, 8). Here Methodius is not speaking of the Eucharistic meal, but understands the rib of the new Adam as the sevenfold Spirit by which God perfects Christ's bride, "that is, the souls united to him by the bond of marriage."

*Hilary of Poitiers considers the church as God's tent (*In ps.* 51, 16), i.e., "the desired house; it is joyful news: living stones are placed on the foundation of the twelve precious stones; they have been squared for building, first by Moses in the law, then by the prophets in their suffering, by the Lord in his body, by the apostles in martyrdom and by the Holy Spirit in marvelous deeds" (*In ps.* 121, 3; see also *In ps.* 126, 8, 9). The church is likened to the Trinity, almost assumed into it: "So it is proper to God's people, to be brothers under one father, to be one under one Spirit, to advance harmoniously in one family, to be members of one body under one head" (*In ps.* 132, 3). Christ has "renewed us for a new life, transforming us into new people, assuming us into the body of his flesh. He is the church, since through the sacrament of his body he comprises everything in himself" (*In ps.* 125, 6). The church is like Christ in this too: "it overcomes when it is struck, it is acknowledged when it is attacked, it conquers when it is abandoned. It would certainly be its wish that all people should live at its side and in its bosom . . . but . . . if it some-

times suffers harm, in that it cannot save all (e.g., heretics), this is compensated for by the certainty that it alone can offer beatitude" (*Trin.* 7, 4).

For *Ambrose as for Hilary, the church grows when it is diminished, overcomes when it is persecuted and fills the earth with the light of its faith and devotion (*Hex.* 4, 7). It is like the mother of life, prefigured by Eve (*In ps.* 36, 36ff.), like the sterile-fertile woman prefigured in Sarah (*Abr.* 1, 31ff.) and Rebekah (ibid. 2, 2-3; Is 2:9), since it allows God's blessing to pass from the Jewish people to the new people. Some characters who appear in the gospel, e.g., the Samaritan woman (Jn 4:7ff.), the widow of Nain (Lk 7:11-17), the sinner in the house of Simon the leper, are not just images of the church (Is 26; *In Lc.* 5, 89; 6, 13), but also allegorical figures: by her spiritual teaching the woman of Lk 13:21 sanctifies the three parts of the human person: body, soul and spirit (*In Lc.* 7, 19). The two women grinding at the same mill signify that "the church is elected (by God), the synagogue abandoned; or that the good sense is taken and the impure left" (*Cain* 1, 30; cf. *In Lc.* 8, 52). Here Ambrose goes beyond Origen, who found only the soul, not the church, in this passage. Certainly there were similar interpretations on the soul and the church in Origen, but for Ambrose this is the guiding principle of his exegesis: "*ecclesia vel anima*" (e.g., see also *Virg.* 1, 31; *Ep.* 13; *In ps.* 118 *Tract.* 6, 8; *Hex.* 6, 49; *Myst.* 37; etc.). He thus draws from the texts a richer spiritual meaning, something stressed perhaps most of all by *Maximus of Turin. For him, not only does "the synagogue grind in vain, since it does not put Christ's teaching into the mixture, but it is also eternally condemned to turn the mill of its own incredulity" (*Hom.* 111). In his excessive zeal for allegorical interpretation, Maximus forgot the Pauline passage: all Israel will be saved (Rom 11:26). Ambrose aligns himself with salvation-history: "What is celebrated now in the church was just a shadow in the prophets' speeches; . . . now we see through the image; then, when the image has vanished and the truth arrives, we will see truly" (*In ps.* 28, 25). Indeed the church, as compared with the image represented by the people of the Old Covenant, may be already considered the truth (*In ps.* 118 *Tract.* 5, 6), yet it continually bears in itself and adumbrates "the image of the heavenly reality" (*Interpell.* 2, 9).

While for Ambrose the prerogative of the Roman church consists ultimately only in the fact of preserving the faith of Peter and of all the apostles (*Excess.* 1, 47), *Jerome is clearer than any other Father on the primacy of the see of Rome. He reassures Pope *Damasus, whom he sees as "the successor of the fisherman": "I feel myself bound to your Holiness, i.e., to the *cathedra Petri*, in communion of faith. I know that Christ's church has been founded on this rock" (*Ep.* 15, 2). He is prepared, at an order of the pope, to formulate a new profession of faith (*Ep.* 15, 4).

From liturgical practice, in which the church sang the psalms as its proper prayer and as a hymn of praise, *Augustine develops, esp. on the basis of the letter to the Ephesians, the image of the church as the "whole Christ, head and body. The head is our Savior himself . . . , his body is the church . . . spread throughout the world." Christ the head "did not wish to speak apart from the body, because he did not wish to be separated from us. . . . If he is with us, he speaks in us, speaks of us, speaks through us, as we also speak in him" (*En. in ps.* 56, 1; *Serm.* 137, 1; *En. in ps.* 30, 1). Since he contains the church in himself as his body, Christ is "the perfect man" according to Eph 4:13 (*En. in ps.* 90, 2). The church is also Christ's bride, following the expression of Eph 5:21-32 (*Serm.* 341, 12; *En. in ps.* 90, 2). This great mystery has its beginning in the virgin's womb: there God's word is the bridegroom, the flesh the bride; in him the whole church is figured. Thus the one Christ, perfect in himself, is one with his church, just as the whole Christ speaks in the psalms. Sometimes we come across expressions in them which seem unsuited to Christ, our head, the Word who in the beginning was God and was with God: and some of these words seem unsuited to him even in his form of a servant. And yet it is Christ who speaks, because Christ is in his members. So it is a single person who is formed from two terms: the head and the body, the bridegroom and the bride. The prophet Isaiah also celebrates the unity of this person as marvelous and sublime, or rather, more than once Christ says prophetically in him: "like a bridegroom he has decked me with a garland, and like a bride he has adorned me with jewels" (Is 61:10). He calls himself "bridegroom and bride" (*En. in ps.* 30, 2, 4). The procedure of the eucharistic celebration leads Augustine to identify Christ's ecclesial body with the eucharistic body: "If you are the body and members of Christ, your mystery is placed on the Lord's altar. Receive what you are (your mystery). Say Amen to what you are" (*Serm.* 273).

Against the separatism of the Donatists, Augustine stresses the church's universality (*Ep.* 52, 1; 76 etc.); against their false claim to sanctity, he refers to the parables of the wheat and the tares (*Ep.* 93, 2) and of the dragnet (*Civ. Dei* 18, 49). The church in history is like a threshing floor full of grain and chaff. Whoever looks at the threshing floor from a dis-

tance thinks there is nothing there but straw: the ears of grain are almost separate from each other, so that each thinks he is advancing alone (*En. in ps.* 25, 5). Jacob's lame leg signifies the bad Christians; and yet he was blessed, which refers to the good (*Serm.* 5, 8). The church is the ark, which contains pure and impure together (*Serm.* 264, 5). Asked whether the church is a composition of good and bad, Augustine replies resolutely: "To the church—i.e., to the body of Christ, to grace and to the community of saints—those who are negligent hearers or who engage in bad behavior do not belong" (*Serm.* 149, 4). The ark contains pure and impure, but is built with incorruptible beams, i.e., the souls of the saints and of the just (*Serm.* 264, 5).

Only in the saints does "the communion of saints, the church, the true mother of believers" exist (ibid.). Bad Christians possess "*communio sacramentorum*," participation in the sacraments (*Ep.* 98, 28; *Civ. Dei* 1, 35ff.), but are not part of the community (*societas* or *congregatio*: *Serm.* 233, 2) of saints. "Many seem excluded who are actually included; others who seem to belong to it are excluded" (*Bapt.* V, 27, 38). This expression is valid, however, "in that ineffable divine prescience" (ibid.), i.e., in the perspective of its future fulfillment. "The full assembly of the saints will be after the resurrection" (*Serm.* 223, 2). Augustine's last word on this problem is that "the church, without spot or wrinkle, must not be understood as if it actually were so, but as destined to become so, when it is in glory" (*Retract.* II, 18).

Against *Pelagius, Augustine stresses divine predestination: "like him who is predestined to be our head, many of us are predestined in him to be his members" (*Praed. sanct.* 15, 31). "One who is predestined to eternal life will not end his present life without the sacrament of the mediator" (*C. Julian.* 5, 4), and will also be led to *communio sacramentorum*. This does not guarantee membership in the final salvific community, but is its premise. In this way Augustine's late thoughts on predestination become determinative for the idea of the church. Of the two Cities (*civitates*), one is "predestined to reign eternally with God, the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil" (*Civ. Dei* 15, 1). It was certainly not God's will that there should be two Cities, but the congregation of the reprobate originated in a free turning away from God (ibid. 11, 33; 12, 2). And just as God is the creator of good natures, he is also the just orderer of bad wills, so that, when bad wills use good natures badly, he uses even bad wills well (ibid. 11, 17). God allows even human sins, because he knows how to draw good out of them. "By his grace he gathers from among the generations of humanity, deservedly and justly condemned, a people numerous enough to supply the places of the fallen angels, so that the beloved and supernal city should not only not be deprived of the number of its citizens, but should be gladdened by a number perhaps even greater" (*Civ. Dei* 22, 1, 2). Augustine expresses these ideas in his handbook on faith, hope and charity (*Ench.* 29, 7), where he maintains, unlike *John Chrysostom (*Hom. in illud "Vidi Dominum"* 4,2), that it was not heaven that was made for the church, but the church for heaven.

*Basil the Great considers the church as God's daughter and as a queen sitting at his right hand (*In ps.* 44, 9). But "the bad are mingled with the healthy body of the church" (*In Hex.* 5, 5). Moreover, not all are equal in the church, but in this "great house there is not just every sort of vessel—gold, silver, wood and clay—but a great multiplicity of arts" (ibid. 3, 5); in this way no one is excluded from its profit (*In ps.* 48, 1). The idea of the fraternity of the church, which Basil propounds above all else in his moral and ascetical works, fell on fertile soil. His distinction between **kerygma*, what is proclaimed openly, and *dogma*, what is known to few (*De Spir.* 27, 66), did not catch on, though he cited the example of orientation during prayer, in which emerges the lively desire for paradise (situated in the East), something known to few.

For *Gregory of Nyssa, ecclesiology can be based on the Pauline phrase "if the first fruits are holy, so is the whole lump" (Rom 11:16). The head of the ecclesial body is not the eternal God-Logos himself, but the God-bearing man, fruit of the Virgin, in whom the fullness of divinity dwelt bodily (Col 2:9), the first fruits of the whole dough, through whom the Word assimilated our nature and purified it. (*Cant.* 13; cf. *Praef.* PG 46, 273A). In this way the dynamism of becoming church is expressed, as is the obligation of imitation.

*Cyril of Alexandria deduces the unity of the ecclesial body from the unity of the divine essence (*In Joh.* 11, 11); the unity of Christ's members is accomplished by the fact that they receive the same eucharistic bread and become one body with Christ and with each other (PG 74, 560BC). Equally efficacious is the fact that the same Holy Spirit dwells in individual believers (PG 74, 561AB). Thus those who belong to the church are recipients of the sacraments and become once more what man was originally: formed in God's image (i.e., in the Son) and likeness (i.e., according to the Holy Spirit).

For Pope *Leo the Great, the church is the Roman Catholic Church. The one church has been prepared by the one Roman Empire, which brought

together many nations and allowed them access to the gospel (*Serm.* 82, 2). Now Rome has acquired a new significance through Peter: "From the whole world Peter alone was chosen, given as head to those called from all peoples, to the apostles and to all the fathers of the churches. Peter governs all the churches and bishops because Christ, who truly leads them, grants them every power only through Peter" (*Ep.* 4, 2). Peter unceasingly protects his *cathedra* and is continually present, in such a way that his "continual communion with the eternal priest" (*Serm.* 5, 4) is that of the pope himself. Leo does not merely call himself Peter's successor. Undoubtedly he speaks of his heirs (ibid.), but for him the pope is in a precise sense the personification or visible representation of Peter, and in this sense he may be called Peter (*Serm.* 2, 2).

For *Gregory the Great, the communities, as seen from the outside, together form in the world "one Catholic church" among all peoples (*Mor.* 16, 68); but internally the number of the elect is fixed (*Mor.* 25, 20). Many who are part of the "holy church of the elect" (*Mor.* 13, 46) lived before Christ and were saved by faith in the future passion, which was suffered for them too, just as we are saved through the same passion, now past (*Hom. in Ez.* 3, 16). Gregory sees "the church as a reality erected against the glory of this world" (*Hom. in Evang.* II, 32, 6). The church's splendor is shown not just by the miracles at the tombs of the saints, but also by the high esteem enjoyed by "preachers" (*In 1 Reg.* 1, 104), who direct the whole world, enjoy prosperity and "sing the praise of almighty God by the splendor of their lives" (*In 1 Reg.* 2, 59, 62).

P.Th. Camelot, *Die Lehre von der Kirche. Väterzeit bis ausschliesslich Augustinus* (HDG III, 3b), Freiburg 1970 (Sp. tr. Madrid 1978); W. Simonis, *Ecclesia visibilis et invisibilis*, Frankfurt 1970 (*Ecclesiologia e sacramentaria della tradizione africana*); Y. Congar, *Die Lehre von der Kirche. Von Augustinus bis zum abendländischen Schisma* (HDG III, 3c), Freiburg 1971; H. Rahner, *L'ecclesiologia dei Padri. Simboli della Chiesa*, Rome 1971; P.V. Dias, *Kirche in der Schrift und im 2. Jhdt* (HDG III, 3a), Freiburg 1974 (Sp. tr. Madrid 1978); R. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Leiden 1974; H.J. Vogt, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Origenes*, Cologne 1974; Id., *Ignatius von Antiochien über den Bischof und seine Gemeinde*: ThQ 158 (1978) 15-27; Id., *Das sichtbare Reich Gottes in abendländisch-patristischen Deutung*, in *Reich-Gottes Kirche-Civitas Dei*, = 16. *Forschungsgespräch*, Salzburg 1980; G. Toscani, *Teologia della Chiesa in S. Ambrogio*, Milan 1974; P. Scazzoso, *Introduzione alla ecclesiologia di San Basilio*, Milan 1975; L. Ladaria, *El Espíritu Santo en San Hilario de Poitiers*, Madrid 1977; J. Ratzinger, *Popolo e casa di Dio in S. Agostino*, Milan 1977; A. Giacobbi, *La Chiesa in S. Agostino, I. Mistero di comunione*, Rome 1978; P.J. Fedwick, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*, Toronto 1979; J. Blank, *Vom Urchristentum zur Kirche. Kirchenstrukturen im Rückblick auf den biblischen Ursprung*, Munich 1982; V. Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos. The Primacy of Rome as Reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the Historico-Apologetic Writings of Saint Athanasius the Great*, Münster 1982; A. Antón, *El misterio de la Iglesia. Evolución histórica de las ideas eclesiológicas*, Madrid 1986; B.E. Bowe, *A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome*, Minneapolis 1988; *Einheit der Kirche in vorkonstantinischer Zeit. Vorträge, gehalten bei der Patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft, 2-4 Januar 1985 in Bern*, eds. F. v. Lilienfeld - A.M. Ritter, Erlangen 1989; M.A. Cenzon Santos, *Baptismal Ecclesiology of Saint Augustin. A Theological Study of His Antidonatist Letters*, Rome 1990; A. Faivre, *Ordonner la fraternité. Pouvoir d'innover et retour à l'ordre dans l'église ancienne*, Paris 1992; M. Garijo Guembe, *Communions of Saints: Foundation, Nature, and a Structure*, Collegeville, MN, 1994; M. Fiedrowicz, *Das Kirchenverständnis Gregors des Grossen: eine Untersuchung seiner exegetischen und homilitischen Werke*, Freiburg 1995; D. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church*, Cambridge 1995; G. Biffi, *Casta meretrix. Saggio sull'ecclesiologia di Ambrogio di Milano*, Casale Monf. 1996; *Misericordia sempre. "Casta meretrix" in alcuni testi dei Padri della Chiesa*, ed. S. Chialà and L. Cremaschi, Bose 1998; A. Dulles - P. Granfield, *The Theology of the Church. A Bibliography*, New York 1999; J. Mühlsteiger, *Sanctorum Communio*, in *Tradition – Wegweisung in die Zukunft* (FS J. Mühlsteiger) ed. K. Breitsching, Berlin 2001, 811-835; I. Pereira Lamelas, *Una Domus et Ecclesia Dei in saeculo. Leitura sócio-antropológica do projecto de ecclesia de S. Cipriano de Cartago*, Lisbon 2002; H.J. Vogt, *Immagini della Chiesa delle origini*, Milan 2003; G.D. Dunn, *Clement of Rome and the Question of Roman Primacy in the Early African Tradition*: Augustinianum 43 (2003) 5-24.

H.J. Vogt

ECONOMY. The word οἰκονομία (Latin *dispensatio*, *dispositio*) found ample theological use, rich in content, in the patristic writings (Lampe 940-943). This is easily explained, given the frequency of the word in secular authors (see Reumann) and the suggestive ideas expressed by *economy* in the *corpus paulinum* (Eph 1:3-14; 9:3; Col 1:25). In the *Apologists and the Alexandrians, *economy* refers, with Stoic nuances, to the order in creation and to divine providence. At the same time economy takes on a soteriological meaning, comprising all the divine decrees, decided in eternity and fulfilled in time in view of human salvation. Developing this properly Christian subject matter, the *gnostics distinguish between the internal organization of the **pleroma* and its earthly manifestation. *Irenaeus, taking up this idea, gives it a clearly historical meaning. In view of the unity of the two Testaments, he joins it to his famous idea of *recapitulation. But *Tertullian, opposing the mistaken opinion of divine *monarchia*, follows the gnostics in the sense that he prolongs the historical economy as far as the eternal *dispositio.* *Origen, among the divine economies, makes that of the incarnation prevalent—a meaning prepared by *Ignatius and *Justin (see Studer, *Theologia*, 577-578). In his wake, economy was confined more and more to

the saving action of the incarnate Word, as distinct from his eternal existence; thus in *Eusebius (*HE* 1,1,7-8; *C. Marc.* II 3,22), *Athanasius (anti-Arian polemic) and then in Greek theology (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 38; Greg. Nyss., *Orat. cat.*). In the Cappadocians, the term *economy* is vested with an ecclesiological meaning: it concerns the administration of the *sacraments (Basil., *Ep.* 199,47, Greg. Nyss., *Orat. Cat.* 34) and the tolerant attitude to ecclesial communion, a meaning that would come to have great popularity in Byzantine theology. Though avoiding the term *theologia* in a Christian sense, *Augustine, like other 4th-c. authors, opposes the *res aeternae* to the *dispensatio* (cf. Studer, *Theologia*, 579, with *F. et symb.* 4,6; *Agon.* 17,19). Further developing ideas that were already traditional, he arrives at the clear affirmation that the economy reveals *theologia*. Like his predecessors, he applies this principle to the real distinction and order of the divine persons, to the relation of the temporal missions of the Son and the Spirit and the eternal characteristics of the Father, who has existence from himself and not from another, of the Son who is born of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son (see Studer, *Theologia*, 587-590, with the cit. texts). In this sense Augustine's doctrine on the immanent *Trinity is solidly based on *historia*, i.e., on the *narratio rerum gestarum* (see Studer, *History*, 354-364).

Cath 3,1305ff.; J. Reumann, Οἰκονομία *as "Ethical Accomodation" in the Fathers, and Its Pagan Background*: TU 78, Berlin 1961, 370-379 (classical background); K. Duchatelez, *La notion d'économie et ses richesses théologiques*: NRTh 92 (1970) 267-308 (bibl.); A Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I, Freiburg 1979, passim and bibl.; U. Dierse, *Ökonomie, II. Theologisch*: HWP 6 (1984) 1153-1162; G.G. Blum, *Oikonomia – Theologia*: OS 33 (1984) 281-301 (bibl.); R.J. Kees, *Die Lehre von der Oikonomia Gottes in der Oratio Catechetica Gregors von Nyssa*, Leiden 1995; B. Studer, *Theologia – Oikonomia*, in Stud. Ans. 124 (Rome 1997), 575-600; B. Studer, *History and Faith in Augustine's De Trinitate*: Augustinian Studies 28 (1997) 7-50; E.M. Faber, *Ökonomie*: LTK[3] 7, 1014-1015 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Incarnazione*: Origene – Dizionario (2000), 225-229 (bibl.); J. Rexer, *Die Festtheologie Gregors von Nyssa*, Frankfurt 2002, 262-272.

B. Studer

ECSTASY. Ecstatic phenomena also appear in non-Christian religions; enthusiasm has an important place even in Greek philosophy. The *Holy Spirit manifested itself in the first Christian communities as an ecstatic power, but it is hard to say what character this power had. *Montanus later stressed the person's passivity in such states. The ecstasies of the first monks often have the character of a vision (*horasis*), but they do not imply a supersession of the intellect. Later we can distinguish three different positions in spiritual authors: (1) *Nilus (*Ad Magnam* 27, PG 79, 1004) defines prayer as a *harpagē*, "a rapture of the spirit and a total ecstasy outside the sensible." The intellect must forget, but only that which does not concern God. For *Syriac authors, ecstasy seems to be equated with moral purity, which results in a prayer without distractions. (2) The ecstasy of *Evagrius is more radical, requiring an "infinite ignorance" of all partial notions so that the intellect may become pure light ("light-mysticism"): it is not ecstatic, however, but "catastatic"—to see God is something natural to the intellect. (3) "Darkness-mysticism" is ecstatic in the true sense: *Gregory of Nyssa distinguishes three degrees of knowledge of God: (a) in light, (b) in cloud, (c) in darkness. In the third degree, the intellect recognizes its incapacity to see God-Love, it goes out of itself (*ek-stasis*), and the person is raised to God on the "wings of love."

DSp II, 1862-1885, IV, 2, 2045ff.; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique,"* Paris-Bruges 1961; T. Špidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*: OCA 206, Rome 1978, 327ff.; bibl. p. 386ff.; I. Couliano, *Esperienza dell'estasi dall'ellenismo al Medioevo*, Bari 1986; Ph. Savvopoulos, *Ekstatische Person als Bildungsziel bei Johannes Klimakos. Ein Beitrag zur griechischorthodoxen Pädagogik*, Frankfurt 1986; B. McGinn, *The Foundation of Mysticism*, New York 1991, vol. I, passim (see index pp. 490-491); *Dizionario di mistica*, eds. L. Borriello et al., Vatican City 1998, 477-479.

T. Špidlík

EDESSA (Syriac Urhây, Arabic ar-Ruhâ, now Urfa in Turkey)
I. History - II. Archaeology.

I. History. Founded in 304 BC by Seleucus I, Edessa enters history only in 132 BC, when the Seleucids, retreating westward over the Euphrates, abandoned Mesopotamia to the Parthians. It was then that the kingdom of *Osroene was established, with Edessa as capital. The representatives of the dynasties that succeeded each other in this kingdom over some 375 years (132 BC–AD 244) were mostly Nabatean Arabs or Parthians. The region's population, however, was of varied origin: mixed with native Arameans were Nabatean Arabs, Parthians, descendents of Macedonian colonists, Persians and Jews. This ethnic diversity ensured the coexistence of different religious currents in the paganism of Edessa: alongside Babylonian divinities like Nabu and Baal were venerated the goddess Atargatis and the god Hadas of Harran, and all the gods of the pantheon of the desert Arabs. Castration in honor of Atargatis, goddess of fertility,

was widely practiced; Chaldaean astrology was much in vogue. Moreover, Edessa's medicinal springs gave it the prestige of a center of miraculous cures.

Origins of Christianity. The Syriac work known as *Doctrina Addai* attributes the evangelization of Edessa to *Addai (or Addaeus), a disciple sent by Jesus himself: Addai converts and baptizes King *Abgar V Uchama ("the Black"). *Eusebius of Caesarea relates this episode and mentions an exchange of letters between Jesus and Abgar, to which he attributes historical value (*HE* I, 13; II, 1,6-7). This text, likely legendary, goes back to the late 4th or early 5th c. and reflects the viewpoint of orthodox Christianity at the time of *Ephrem the Syrian (d. 373). The Armenian church took up this legend in order to derive its origin from the apostles. What is certain is that Edessa, given its position on the silk route, was evangelized very early. Syrian Christianity recruited its first followers among the Jewish communities of *Adiabene, numerous at that time in that kingdom, whose dynasty had, since its rulers' conversion to Judaism, long maintained close relations with *Palestine. So Christianity seems to have begun its spread into Osroene from the east, rather than from Palestine. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that the Syriac version of the OT, known as *Peshitta (the "Simple"), seems to have originated among the Jews of Edessa.

The first historical document attesting a Christian presence in the region of Edessa is the epitaph of *Abercius (second half of 2nd c.). Eusebius (*HE* V,23,4) mentions the bishops of Osroene who, toward the end of the 2nd c., sent the other churches a letter expounding their point of view on the question of *Easter. But the most important document remains the *Chronicle of Edessa, a 6th-c. compilation based on much older archival documents. The work starts with the flood that struck Edessa in AD 201 and particularly damaged the Christian church. The only important earlier events, mentioned after the account of this catastrophe, are the birth of Christ, the apostasy of *Marcion in 138 and the birth of *Bardesanes in 154. The birth of *Mani in 240 is also noted, but there is nowhere any mention of the conversion of the king of Edessa. At present, the conversion of Abgar IX the Great is no longer considered historically proven. Only one fact is certain: at the beginning of the 3rd c., the church of Edessa was linked to the see of *Antioch; it was to Antioch that *Palut went to receive episcopal consecration from the hands of *Serapion. Soon after, in 216, Osroene was annexed by the Roman Empire.

Despite Edessa's links with Antioch, local Christianity continued to show a great variety of forms. Edessa's cultural and religious milieu was fertile ground for the birth of a multitude of sects, more or less *gnostic. Works like the *Odes of Solomon* (early 2nd c.), the *Gospel of Thomas* (mid 2nd c.), *Bardesanes's *Book of the Laws of the Countries* and *Tatian's *Address to the Greeks* (second half of 2nd c.) were composed, even if not all of them, at Edessa, where they enjoyed great popularity. Tatian's *Diatessaron* shows signs of the author's *encratism. The start of the 3rd c. saw an increase in *Marcionite influence and the appearance of the *Acts of Thomas*.

It is evident that the church of Edessa too had its martyrs. Leaving aside the legendary account of the martyrdom of Sharbil, Babai and Barsamya, we have the account of the martyrdom of Shemona, Gurya and Habib (309–310), a document whose historical authenticity has been fully ascertained. With these the church of Edessa truly enters history. Bishop Qôna, who began to build the cathedral of Edessa probably in 313, is the first of an episcopal list with no significant gaps. His second successor, Aithalla, attended the Council of *Nicaea in 325. The most important figure of the church of Edessa in the second half of the 4th c. was St. Ephrem. Born ca. 306 at *Nisibis, he spent most of his life in that city. In 363 the Romans ceded Nisibis to the Persians and (that year or the next) Ephrem fled to Edessa, where he died in 373, after having incessantly fought the many heretical sects still flourishing at the time. He was the true founder of the School of the Persians, so called because of the great number of young men who left Persia to become the great Doctor's disciples. At Ephrem's death, the Arian emperor *Valens exiled the orthodox clergy and people; when Valens died in 378, the exiles were able to return to Edessa.

The 5th c. was marked by the episcopate of *Rabbula (412–435), who set himself up as an intransigent defender of Catholic orthodoxy against *Nestorianism and the gnostic sects: he cast Nestorius's followers out of the School of the Persians. But under his successor *Ibas (or Hiba), Nestorianism made such progress at Edessa that in 489 Bishop *Cyrus, with *Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 522), obtained the closure of the School from the emperor *Zeno. Expelled from Edessa, teachers and disciples transferred their school to Nisibis, which thus became the center from which Nestorianism spread into Persia and as far as China. The final separation between the East and West Syrian churches goes back to this time.

The 6th c. saw the triumph of *monophysitism at Edessa: in 541 *Jacob Baradeus, founder of the *Jacobite Church, became bishop of Edessa and spent his whole life converting Asia Minor, Syria and *Mesopotamia to monophysitism. In 609 *Chosroes II

took possession of Edessa, deported the Jacobite Christians *en masse* and imposed a Nestorian bishop on the city. Between 622 and 627 *Heraclius inflicted a series of defeats on Chosroes, who was assassinated by his son in 628. Soon after, the Muslim Arabs put an end to the rivalry between the Persian and Roman empires. On 20 August 636, at the battle of Yarmuk, Syria fell into their hands; in 637 they penetrated Mesopotamia, and in 639 Edessa fell into their power. It was then that the city lost all its political importance, and on the religious plane too its role was exhausted.

There are Christian archaeological remains, but only a few inscriptions.

EC 5, 72-75; RAC 4, 552-597; R. Duval, *Histoire politique, religieuse et littérature d'Édesse jusqu'à la première croisade*, Paris 1892; Ortiz de Urbina 13-14, 44, 193-194, 206; A.F.J. Klijn, *Edessa, die Stadt des Apostels Thomas*, Neukirchen 1965; G.G. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*: CSCO 300 Subs. 34; J.B. Segal, *Edessa "The blessed City,"* Oxford 1970; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Cults and Beliefs at Edessa*, Leiden 1980; (compte-rendu de A. de Halleux in LM 94 [1981] 205-208); R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945; J. Teixidor, *Les derniers rois d'Édesse d'après deux nouveaux documents syriaques*: ZPE 76 (1989) 219-222; *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. 1, *Nahe und Mittlere Osten*, 42, *Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa and Osrhoene*, texts, translations and commentary by H.J.W. Drijvers and J.F. Healy, Leiden 1999; I. Ramelli, *Edessa e i Romani fra Augusto e i Severi: aspetti del regno di Abgar V e di Abgar IX*: Aevum 73 (1999) 107-143; T. Gnoli, *Roma, Edessa e Palmira nel III sec. d.C.: problemi istituzionali: uno studio sui papiri dell'Eufrate*, Pisa 2001; M. Amerise, *La scrittura e l'immagine nella cultura tardoantica: il caso di Abgar di Edessa*: OCP 67 (2001) 437-445; S.K. Ross, *Roman Edessa: Politics and Culture on the Eastern Fringes of the Roman Empire, 114–242*, London - New York 2001 (A. Camplani and T. Gnoli in: Mediterraneo Antico 4 [2001] 41-68).

R. Lavenant

II. Archaeology. According to the *Doctrine of Addai*, a portrait of Jesus was painted at Edessa for the king Abgar. This seems to be something different from the *acheiropoiētos* spoken of by *Evagrius (*HE* 4,17), held in great esteem for having saved the city from the siege of Chosroes (544); it was later taken to *Constantinople. The *Chronicle of Edessa (CSCO SS Syri I, 1903, 1-13; II, 1-11) lists numerous Christian buildings, including the church of St. Thomas visited by *Egeria in ca. 380. The cathedral was built between 312 and 323 near the springs at the foot of the town; destroyed by a flood, it was rebuilt by the emperor *Justinian. It was described by a liturgical hymn, sung during its consecration. There were also many Christian churches of various confessions (*Nestorian, *monophysite, *Maronite); nothing remains of any of these buildings. Many mosaic floors have been discovered, but so far no Christian subjects. The same goes for sculpture. Only some inscriptions attest local Christianity (Devreesse, *Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 293-294).

R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Eglise jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945; K.E. McVey, *The Domed Church as Microcosm: Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol*: DOP 37 (1983) 91-121; A. Cameron, *The History of the Image of Edessa: The Telling of a Story*, in *Okeanos, Essays Presented to I. Ševčenko*, Cambridge, MA, 1984, 80-94; H.J.W. Drijvers, *East of Antioch. Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*, London 1984; T.A. Sinclair, *Eastern Turkey. An Architectural and Archaeological Survey*, IV, London 1990, 1-28; EAM 5, 662-663; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionaires chrétiennes dans l'Empire perse*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002 (see index).

B. Bagatti

EDICT of MILAN. Name wrongly given to the text, cited by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* X, 5) and *Lactantius (*De mort. persec.* 48), of a letter written to the provincial governors in 313 by the two emperors *Constantine I and *Licinius, who had met at *Milan after Constantine's victory over the usurper *Maxentius. The document recognized freedom of worship for Christians and marked a decisive step forward from *Galerius's edict of 311, which merely ended the anti-Christian *persecutions for reasons of clemency and political opportunity; the text also prescribed restitution of goods previously confiscated from Christian communities (*corpori Christianorum*), thus sanctioning their existence as lawful institutions. Modern criticism has considerably reduced the importance attributed for centuries both to the so-called Edict and to Constantine's personal initiative in favor of Christian worship.

O. Seeck, *Das sogennante Edikt von Mailand*: ZKG 12 (1891) 381ff. (the preserved text is not an edict); H. Grégoire, *La conversion de Costantin*: Byzantion 7 (1932) 648ff. (the document was not issued at Milan, but at Nicomedia); J.-R. Palanque, *A propos du prétendu Edit de Milan*: ibid. 10 (1935) 607ff. (against an excessive devaluation of Constantine's initiative); T. Christensen, *The so-called Edict of Milan*: CM 35 (1984) 129-175; G. Lombardi, *L'editto di Milano del 313 e la laicità dello Stato*: SDHI 50 (1984) 1-60; Ch. Delvoye, *Encore "l'édit de Milan,"* in *Studi G. Bovini*, Ravenna 1989, 195-201; J. Rist, *Die Mailänder Vereinbarung von 313: Staatsreligion versus Religionsfreiheit*: SP 34 (2001) 217-223.

M. Forlin Patrucco

EGBERT (678–766). Born in 678 of a noble Northumbrian family, Egbert received a monastic education in the schools of *Ireland. After having been both a disciple and friend of *Bede, he became archbishop of *York (ca. 732) and until his death in 766

worked actively to reorganize the English church.

He received two letters, one from *Boniface (*Ep.* 38, PL 89, 736-738), who thanks him for some manuscripts, and another from Bede (*Ep.* 2, PL 94, 657-668), who exhorts him to personal sanctity and to the carrying out of a large-scale work of Christian evangelization. It seems that Egbert wrote the *Dialogus Ecclesiasticae Institutiones*, the *Ep. ad Uuynfridum* (*Letter to Boniface*) and an Anglo-Saxon penitential.

A.W. Haddan - W. Stubbs (eds.), *Eccl. Doc.*, Oxford 1878, 3, 403-413, 416-431; M. Tangl (ed.), MGH, *Ep.* I, Berlin 1916, 18-21; A.J. Frantzen, *The Significance of the Frankish Penitentials*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 30 (1979) 409-431; Id., *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England*, New Brunswick 1983, 69-78, 82-83; P. Sims Williams, *An Unpublished Seventh- or Eighth-Century Anglo-Latin Letter in Boulogne-sur-Mer MS 74 (82)*: Medium Aevum 48 (1979) 1-22; J.-P. Bouhot, *Les pénitentiels attribués à Bède le Vénérable et à Egbert d'York*: RHT 16 (1986) 141-169.

P. Marone

EGERIA (d. after 385). A rich and educated noblewoman, perhaps a native of *Gallaecia in Spain or S *Gaul; she was part of a circle of women united by religious interests, or perhaps a nun with an important position in her community. The name Egeria—less precisely Aetheria—is generally accepted today (based on a letter of the Galician hermit *Valerius), but her first editors, e.g., Gamurrini and Geyer, thought to identify her with *Sylvia, the prefect *Rufinus's sister. She wrote a famous and interesting summary of a *pilgrimage she took, *Itinerarium* or *Peregrinatio ad loca santa*. In this diary, in the form of letters to her "sisters," in the first part she describes the journey made from 381–384 (according to Devos's careful research) from *Sinai to *Jerusalem, then to Mt. Nebo in Idumea, the land of Job, and finally to *Mesopotamia, from *Antioch to *Edessa and Harran and then the return to *Constantinople via the sanctuaries of *Thecla at Seleucia in Isauria and of Euphemia, making the ca. 5000-km (3100-mi) trip on foot or by carriage; in the second part she describes the liturgy of Jerusalem. The only manuscript, originally from Montecassino and preserved at Arezzo, was discovered by Gamurrini in 1884 and published in 1887; the work was mutilated at the beginning and end, and had two lacunae. Egeria was fascinated more by the religious aspect of what she saw than by natural wonders or historical curiosities: she lingered over the biblical places marked by the presence of God, reports legends and memories linked to the great figures of the history of Israel or of early Christianity, tells us of liturgical celebrations and religious feasts, and of *catechesis before and after *baptism; she informs us of ecclesiastical organization and monastic life. The work is a source of inestimable value on all these points. The *Itinerarium* describes the churches of Jerusalem and its surroundings (Holy Sepulchre, Zion, Mount of Olives, *Bethlehem, Bethany), and provides information on the *liturgical year and its feasts (*Epiphany, *Lent, and esp. Holy Week and *Easter at Jerusalem).

Egeria met various monks in Sinai, *Egypt, *Syria and Mesopotamia; some accompanied her, and she relates her detailed questioning of them; she mentions some virgins living at Jerusalem. The monasteries appear to have been hermitages grouped around a church where a priest officiated; Egeria takes pleasure in emphasizing her participation in the *Eucharist whenever she has the opportunity; she communicates well the increase of collective emotion during the celebrations of Holy Week in the places that were mute witnesses of Christ's passion. At Jerusalem, since people came from various regions and languages (Greek, Syriac, Latin), there was always someone to translate from one language to another, so all could understand. With simple but effective words, Egeria outlines for us almost the "model" of the Christian pilgrimage: "This was our habit: every time we succeeded in reaching the desired place, we would first of all say a prayer, then read the relative passage taken from the Bible, then recite an appropriate psalm and finally conclude with a *prayer" (*Pilgrimage* 10,7). Thus the ancient pilgrimage expressed itself above all as an itinerary of *faith and worship, where prayer and the Eucharist played an essential role. The style is lively and personal, narrative and detailed, vibrant with enthusiasm. Egeria's language is spoken Latin, but includes reflections of classical culture and numerous Grecisms (Greek terms transliterated into Latin): basically a language dependent on Christian authors.

Bibliography, Lexicons, Concordances: M. Starowieyski, *Bibliographia Egeriana*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 297-318; P. Devos, *Egeriana*: AB 101 (1983) 43-70; 105 (1987) 159-166 and 415-424; 109 (1991) 363-381; 112 (1994) 242-254; W. van Oorde, *Lexicon Aetherianum*, Amsterdam 1930; D.R Blackman - G.G. Betts, *Concordantia in Itinerarium Egeriae*, Hildesheim 1989.

Editions: CPL 2325; G.F. Gamurrini, 1887; P. Geyer: CSEL 39 (1898) 37-101 [= PLS 1, 1045-1092]; H. Pétré: SC 19 (1948); E. Franceschini - R. Weber: CCL 175 (1965) 37-90 (bibl.); P. Maraval: SC 296 (1982); N. Natalucci: BPat 17 (1991); G.-D. Thönnes: FC 20 (1995). It. tr.: C. Zoppoli, Turin 1966; P. Siniscalco - L. Scarampi (CTP 48), Rome 1985, [2]1992; N. Natalucci (BPat 17), Florence 1991 and Bologna 1999; E. Giannarelli, Milan 1992.

Studies: F. Lofstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio*

Aeteriae, Uppsala 1911; DACL 5/1 (1922) 552-584; [see also 7/2 (1927) 2304-2392; 14/1 (1939) 92-110]; DHGE 15 (1963) 1-5; A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Observations sur le vocabulaire liturgique dans l'Itinéraire d'Egérie* (Diss.) Nijmegen 1962; P. Devos, *La date du voyage d'Egérie*: AB 85 (1967) 165-194; Id., *Egérie*: AB 86 (1968) 87-108; C. Milani, *I grecismi nell'Itinerarium Egeriae*: Aevum 43 (1969) 200-234; C. Mohrmann, *Egérie et le monachisme*: Misc. Dekkers, Bruges 1975, 163-180; Patrologia 3 (1978) 529-532 (ample bibl.); E. Lamirande, *La pèlerine Égérie: une grande dame de l'antiquité chrétienne*: Église et Théologie 15 (1984) 259-291; TRE 16 (1987) 621-622 [s.v. *Jerusalem*, IV]; V. Väänänen, *Le Journal-Épitre d'Égérie (Itinerarium Égeriae): Étude linguistique*, Helsinki 1987; H. Sivan, *Who Was Egeria? Piety and Pilgrimage in the Age of Gratian*: HTR 81 (1988) 59-72; Var. aus., *Atti del convegno internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae (Arezzo 23-25 ottobre 1987)*, Città di Castello 1990; LTK³ 3, 464.

M. Maritano

EGYPT

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Liturgy - III. Archaeology.
Ancient Egypt, in N-E Africa, extended along the Nile valley as far as the first cataract (Philae/Aswan), including part of the Libyan and Arabian deserts. The pharaohs of the middle kingdom, the Ptolemys and the Roman emperors pushed its S borders beyond the second cataract. The foundation of the colony of Naucratis in 700 BC on the Canopic branch of the Nile by the Milesians begins the history of Greek Egypt which, after its conquest by Alexander the Great, became a stable kingdom under the Ptolemaic dynasty until the Roman conquest of 30 BC. Egypt is a "gift of the Nile" (Hecataeus of Miletus 550-490 BC). The existence of the great river has left profound marks on the topography, economic and political history, and even the religious life of the Egyptian people. In this singular context we can glimpse the development of so-called lines of force that nourished the sociocultural originality of Greco-Roman Egypt even in its encounter with Christianity.

I. Origins of Christianity. On the origin of Christianity in Egypt we possess only scanty and uncertain evidence. The Acts of the Apostles (18:24-25) speak of the arrival at *Ephesus of a certain Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew "instructed in the way of the Lord" who "taught with exactness the things regarding Jesus," but who "knew only the baptism of John." Nevertheless there is nothing in the text, which appears in all the manuscripts except one (the famous Codex Bezae), that authorizes us to assert that this Apollos had come to know Christianity in his native city, and not in some other city in the eastern part of the Roman Empire.

An ancient tradition, which the Coptic Church still recognizes as valid, attributed the beginnings of the preaching of the Good News in Egypt and the foundation of the Christian community of *Alexandria to *Mark the evangelist. This is attested by *Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* (II, 16, 1), but he introduces the information regarding Mark with "they say," making it clear that he was not entirely certain this was true. In *Jerome's Latin translation-revision of Eusebius's *Chronicle*, the following information appears in the year 43: "Mark the evangelist, Peter's interpreter (*interpres*), announced Christ to Egypt and at Alexandria." Another passage of the *Ecclesiastical History* (II, 24) says that Annianus succeeded Mark as leader of the church of Alexandria; and in the Latin version of the *Chronicle*, in the year 62, we read: "First after Mark the evangelist, Annianus was ordained bishop of the Alexandrian church; he led it for 22 years." Neither Eusebius nor Jerome say that Mark died a martyr; this is likely a legend that sprung up later.

Judgment is divided among modern scholars on the value of the tradition that makes Mark the founder of the Alexandrian Christian community. Many have observed that no hint of this is found in the many works preserved by two important Alexandrian writers, *Clement and *Origen, who certainly would have mentioned it in several places if they had known of it. Nor is there any mention in other 2nd- and 3rd-c. Christian authors where we might expect it, e.g., *Irenaeus of Lyons (ca. 140–202). In 1973, however, Morton Smith published a text that presents itself as an *excerptum* "from the letters of the most holy Clement, author of the *Stromateis*" in which it is said, among other things, that Mark, having written his gospel at Rome, went to Alexandria after Peter's death and there wrote a "more spiritual Gospel . . . [for] those who are being initiated into the great mysteries." According to the editor this is an authentic letter, previously unknown, of Clement of Alexandria. What it says of Mark would correlate to a tradition known for some time, according to which a "secret" gospel, written by Mark, was in the possession of the *Carpocratians, a gnostic sect. Smith's publication of the text led to a lively debate over its attribution to Clement. Oden (2007) presents literary, archaeological and circumstantial evidence of Mark's life and death in Alexandria.

There is no doubt, however, that a Christian community was begun at Alexandria already in apostolic times. The city's Jewish component—the natural environment for the spread of Christianity during the first generations—was very numerous, and religious ferment, born of a crisis of the tradi-

tional form of the Jewish religion and manifest in Jewish literary and philosophical output at Alexandria, favored the spread of the new faith. Relations between the Alexandrian Diaspora and *Palestine were ongoing and intensive.

For the 2nd c., the primary evidence we have are the list of the bishops of Alexandria transmitted by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* (probably based on the list compiled by the chronographer Sextus *Julius Africanus, and for the most part reliable), biblical papyri (found outside Alexandria) and the information provided by Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–215). The scarcity of evidence on Christianity at Alexandria and in Egypt for the hundred years between the beginning of its spread and the time in which Clement wrote has preoccupied many scholars, leading them to suppose that the development of the Egyptian church was interrupted at a certain point and refounded midway or near the end of the 2nd c. These hypothetical events are explained in two ways: either that the Jewish character of the Christian communities of Egypt had exposed them to repression during and after the insurrection of Egyptian Jews (115–117), or that, because of the strong gnostic influences among the Christians of the first generations, the Egyptian church of the second half of the 2nd c. did not adequately preserve its records. These two explanations are not necessarily mutually exclusive—in fact, a variety of religious options could have coexisted within the Egyptian church. These are, nonetheless, hypotheses. It is possible that the relative lack of evidence is merely by chance or by centuries of persecution, war or intentional destruction.

Beginning from the last decades of the 2nd c. with Clement of Alexandria, Christianization made rapid progress in Egypt, and not just at Alexandria. There are sure indications of this; e.g., the discovery of papyri containing biblical texts or documents attesting the presence of Christians in various places in Egypt, including even Upper Egypt. The persecutions ordered by *Decius, *Valerian and *Diocletian did not slow the pace of development of the Christian communities.

Despite the increase in the number of Christian communities, the process of formation of a network of bishoprics took place later in Egypt than elsewhere. A work written by an orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, Eutychius (10th c.), informs us that the first to ordain bishops for Egypt was *Demetrius (bishop of Alexandria, 189–231), who ordained three. His successor *Heraclas (231–247) continued this work, ordaining twenty bishops. Eutychius says nothing precise about these bishops' field of activity, and names no city. By the time of *Dionysius (bishop of Alexandria, 248–264/265), Egypt had powerful bishop. This is attested by two letters of Dionysius, referred to textually by Eusebius (*HE* VII, 21, 2; 24, 1): the only Egyptian bishops mentioned here, Nepos and Hierax, bear the strange title of ἐπίσκοπος τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον, "bishop of the lands (or: of the things?) of Egypt."

*Alexander, bishop of Alexandria from 312–328, wrote in a letter that a synod called by him and which had condemned *Arius, had gathered "almost 100" bishops; this number also appears in letters of *Athanasius. The list of the names of bishops that results from Annik Martin's detailed research, however, gives a more modest number for the first quarter of the 4th c.: 57 bishoprics in Egypt, 16 in *Libya and the *Pentapolis. In the following decades of the 4th c. the number of bishoprics grew continually. Toward the end of the century there are 75 bishoprics in Egypt, 23 in Libya and the Pentapolis. At that time, every Egyptian town with the status of city had a bishop. Even some larger towns whose administrative status was nonetheless a village had, for various reasons, their own bishop. At Alexandria and in Upper Egypt, the presbyters had a higher position than in the churches of other countries. There is a well-attested tradition that, up to the time of Demetrius and Heraclas, the bishops at Alexandria were elected by the Alexandrian presbyters from within their own group (this practice may have endured even longer, up to the time of Dionysius).

In the 4th c., when the number of Christians in Egypt increased rapidly, especially (and this is a peculiar trait of the Egyptian Christianity of that time) in the villages, a network of autonomous churches, led by presbyters, was formed—churches that in some way can be compared to parishes.

A characteristic trait of the Egyptian church was the dominant role of the bishop of Alexandria. The Alexandrian episcopate had under it the bishoprics of Libya (we do not know when this relationship of dependence was established; in canon 6 of the Council of *Nicaea, thus in a text of 325, it is said that this relationship conforms to "an ancient practice") and all of the Egyptian bishoprics. The Alexandrian episcopate prevented the formation of ecclesiastical metropolises in Egypt, and imposed on all the Egyptian bishoprics the obligation to send their candidates to Alexandria to receive episcopal ordination. Beginning with Dionysius (mentioned above), the bishop of Alexandria sent an *Easter letter to all the Egyptian bishops, in which he announced the date of the following Easter.

The Christian communities of Egypt, at least

from the 3rd c. (we know too little for the 2nd c.), were composed of both Greek- and Egyptian-speakers (i.e., what we traditionally call Coptic; the first translations of biblical texts into Coptic were made in the 3rd c.). There is no reason to think that the division between Christians and pagans coincided with the division between Coptic- and Greek-speaking citizens. The religious crisis that underlay the rapid spread of Christianity involved all social groups.

Christianity did not divide, and indeed united, the different social groups. Even the clear distinction between Alexandria and Egypt (recall the expression "Alexandria in Egypt") no longer had meaning when considering Christian Alexandria. Considering what we now know of the culture of the 3rd and 4th c., we must admit that there is no basis to oppose—as scholars often do—Alexandria to Egypt. In the Alexandrian church there was place not only for the cultural élite (for thinkers such as *Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria), but also for ordinary folk, Greek- or Coptic-speaking. And conversely, the Christian communities of Egypt were not made up only of peasants and artisans, to whom the theological subtleties of the Alexandrian masters were inaccessible and irrelevant. Many cities of the Delta and of the Nile valley had a significant level of cultural life, and among its participants were some who were interested in theology.

Scholars disagree as to when Christians became the majority in Egypt's population: at the time of Constantine (R.S. Bagnall)? Toward the end of the 4th c. (E. Wipszycka)? It is certain, however, that in the 5th c. pagans were decidely in the minority. In some towns, however, they were strong enough to be able to practice their cult, which had been prohibited by the imperial authorities. Among others, groups of monks sometimes took part—violently—in the fight against pagans who gathered around certain ancient sanctuaries.

A. Heckel, *Die Kirche von Ägypten. Ihre Anfänge, ihre Organisation und ihre Entwicklung*, diss., Strassburg 1918; E.A. Judge - S.R. Pickering, *Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community in Egypt to the Mid-Fourth Century*: JbAC 20 (1977) 47-71; G.H.R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity.* I: *A Review of Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976*, North Ryde, Australia 1981, followed in the subsequent years by similar volumes, beginning with vol. V, eds. S.R. Llewelyn and R.A. Kearsley; B.A. Pearson - J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Philadelphia 1986; R.S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton, NJ 1993; E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive*, Rome 1996; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328-373)*, École Française de Rome 1996; A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, Rome 1997; M. Naldini, *Il cristianesimo in Egitto. Lettere private nei papiri dei secoli II-IV*, Fiesole [2]1998; E. Wipszycka, *Les papyrus documentaires concernant l'Église d'avant le tournant constantinien. Un bilan des vingt dernières années*, in *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, Florence 2001, 1307-1330; A. Jakab, *Ecclesia alexandrina. Evolution sociale et institutions du christianisme alexandrin (IIe-IIIe siècles)*, Bern 2001; T.C. Oden, *The African Memory of Mark,* Downers Grove IL 2011.

E. Wipszycka

II. Liturgy. The surviving liturgical documents from Egypt of the patristic era are rare and fragmentary due to the literary devastations of the Roman persecutions and the Arab conquest. The information we can draw from the works of the Alexandrian fathers or from hagiography is insufficient to reconstruct how the liturgy might have been celebrated in these regions. The diligent investigations whose results F.E. Brightman has brought together (*Liturgies Eastern and Western* I, 1896, Appendix J, 504-509) demonstrate this clearly, even for the liturgy of the *Eucharist with which we are better acquainted. It seems that, after the 5th c. at least, this liturgy was heavily influenced by *Antiochene customs, esp. through the **Apostolic Constitutions*. This influence of the Syrian metropolis was reinforced when, from 451, the church of Egypt more decisively asserted its autonomy from *Constantinople, and above all from the time of the Arab conquest when Patriarch *Benjamin (626–665) reorganized the liturgy, generalizing the use of the Egyptian (Coptic) language. The decrees of the reforming patriarchs of the 11th and 13th c., the great liturgical and canonical compilations of the 13th-14th c., and finally the *Ordinatio* of Patriarch Gabriel V (1409–1427) definitively fixed these liturgical traditions whose texts, apart from rare fragments, survive only in MSS of that era. So, for the period that concerns us, we have only fragments that escaped the destruction and whose origin and even meaning remain mostly uncertain.

1. *Fragments of anaphorae*: (a) The most important is *Papyrus gr.* 254 of Strasbourg University Library (*ed. M. Andrieu - P. Collomp*: RSR 1928, 489-515), datable to the 4th-5th c. This text preserves the formulary of thanksgiving (lines 1-2 are missing) and part of the intercessions. (b) A fragment, in very poor condition, preserved in the British Museum (*Pap. 2037 E.F.*) on 6th-7th-c. parchment, identified by G. Mercati (*Aegyptus* 30 [1950] 3-7), gives a very similar text which may allow us to supplement the former by some words. (c) Much more important, a 6th-c.-parchment folio preserved in the John Rylands Library, Manchester (*Pap. Gr. Lat.* 465), gives a great deal of the anaphora of St. Mark, from after the *postsanctus* to the end of the *epiclesis. These three

texts allow us to reconstruct the greater part of the anaphora of St. Mark in a form quite close to that preserved in the Coptic version called "of St. Cyril," while the Greek text has only come down to us in six late (12th-16th c.) MSS of *Melkite origin, which transmit it in a more or less deeply Byzantinized recension. Other fragments of anaphorae have been published by Th. Lefort (*Coptica Lovaniensia*, Muséon 1940, 22-24 and 26) and by E. Lanne (*Le Grand Euchologe du Monastère Blanc*: PO 28, 2) in a Sahidic Coptic version. Most of them seem to be translated from Greek. Particular attention has been paid to three fragmentary folios from Deir-Balizeh in the Guizeh region, preserved in the Bodleian, Oxford (*ms. Gr. Lit.* d. 2-4, P), first published by P. de Puniet (RBen 1909, 34-51, reprinted in Cabrol-Leclercq: *Reliquiae liturgicae vetustissimae*, Monum. Lit. I, 2; CLXIV-CLXV) and subsequently with an abundant philological and liturgical commentary by Dom B. Capelle (C.H. Roberts - D.B. Capelle, *An early euchologium. The Dêr-Balizeh papyrus enlarged and reedited*: Bibl. du Muséon 23, Louvain 1949). Recently J. Van Haelst proposed a new reconstruction, modifying the order of the folios (Bibl. Ephem. Theol. Lov. XXVII [1970] 201-212).

2. Finally we should point out that numerous texts of liturgical interest have been transmitted by papyri, *ostraka* or in the form of inscriptions and graffiti. Besides those published in *Monumenta Liturgiae I e II*, a rich collection can be found in the article *Papyrus* of the DACL, and in C. Wessely, *Les plus anciens monuments du christianisme écrits sur papyrus*: PO IV, 2 and XVIII, 3; but, in many cases, the origin and destination remain uncertain.

3. *The euchologion of Serapion*. Of exceptional importance is the collection of 31 liturgical prayers preserved in an 11th-c. MS on Mt. Athos (Athos Lavra 149) that contains several texts attributed to Bishop *Serapion of Thmuis, a friend of St. *Athanasius who dedicated his four Letters on the Holy Spirit to him. First published at Kiev in 1894 by A. Dmitrievsij, it attracted scholarly attention thanks to two simultaneous editions by G. Wobbermin (TU, N.F. II, 3) and F.E. Brightman (JTS October 1899 and January 1900), soon followed by F.X. Funk's reconstruction (*Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum* II, Paderborn 1905, 158-203). The collection's homogeneity, defended by Brightman from the start, has never been doubted; likewise, attempts have been made to justify the arrangement of the various parts, at first sight rather strange, despite the fact that Brightman—followed by Funk—proposed a more logical reconstuction. The authenticity of the attribution of the whole to Serapion of Thmuis was also long undisputed, despite the fact that his name appears only in the title of the anaphora (I) and of the prayer for the blessing of the oils (XV). But careful examination of the anaphora, the only passage that has been studied closely, led Dom B. Botte to question this attribution. Some passages seemed to him incompatible with Serapion's strictly Nicene theology and betrayed an Arianizing attitude both in the doctrine of the Logos and, still more, in that of the *Holy Spirit (B. Botte, *L'euchologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?*: OrChr 48 [1964] 50-56)—difficulties that had not been considered by D.B. Capelle, *L'anaphore de Sérapion, essai d'exégèse*: Muséon 59 (1946) 425-443. We may consider the question still open. In any case it is certain that, if the Alexandrian character of the theology and liturgy of these prayers is indubitable, in both these aspects they denote peculiarities that make it hard to recognize them as the habitual liturgy of a church.

G.J. Cuming, *The Liturgy of St. Mark*, OCA 234, Rome 1990; M.E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary Liturgical and Theological Analysis*, OCA, Rome 1995; M. Krause, ed. *Ägypten in spätantik-christlicher Zeit, Einführung in die koptische Kultur*, Wiesbaden 1998; J. Henner, *Fragmenta liturgica coptica: Editionen und Kommentar liturgischer Texte der koptischen Kirche des ersten Jahrtausends*, Tübingen 2000.

I.H. Dalmais

III. Archaeology

1. Ecclesiastical architecture. While the structure of houses, tombs, baths, military installations and other public buildings was not significantly modified by the advance of Christianity, two new types of building with particular characteristics appeared: churches and convents, whereas the building of pagan sanctuaries seems to have stopped.

a. General characteristics. Egyptian church architecture, from the time of its oldest known expressions, exists in the context of the Mediterranean architectural tradition. The structure of buildings in the countries of N Africa and the Near East, with the expected canonical partitions, esp. for the basilica, was also obligatory, with the same connotations, in Egypt. There too the most common structure was the three-aisled basilica. The sanctuary was to the E and consisted, as in *Syria, of a central apse with, at the sides, two more rooms assigned to collateral liturgical functions. The *naos*, the area reserved for the laity, usually had three aisles, rarely five. The side aisles, esp. in Upper Egypt, were often connected by two other small aisles on the W and E sides, thus forming a quadripartite ambulatory. This typically Egyptian peculiarity occurs in basilicas nowhere else. Otherwise, the only typically Egyptian feature

is the general scheme of the architectural layout, which is given a cubic, compact form resembling those of the old Pharaonic temples. A narthex was added to this compact structure, usually on the W side. An atrium of the type generally found in European churches was unknown here.

b. Development in the 4th and 5th c. 5th-c. churches are rare. The first examples, however, like the church SE of Kellis (Dakhla Oasis) from the first half of the 4th c., are basilicas with quadripartite ambulatory. Inside the larger churches, like the southern church of Antinopolis (P. Grossmann, *Vic. Oriente* 12 [2000] 269-281, fig. 1) and the oldest church (ca. 336) of the main Pachomian convent of Pbou, today Fa'w al-Qibli (P. Grossmann, *Esempi d'arch.*, 151ff., fig. 1B), the central nave is tripartite, thus forming a larger space and giving the church a quality of having five aisles. All these buildings still have an undeniably provincial character. The same would have been true of most of the churches of this period, now lost. Presumably only in the capital, Alexandria, did monumental buildings exist in the 4th c.

Monumental examples must have existed in the church from the first half of the 5th c., since some buildings built in the mid 5th c. in Hermopolis Magna, Pbou and Suhag are unthinkable without a corresponding model. They are among the best of that period and presuppose a fully developed architectural program, which would later undergo only small modifications. Noteworthy is the complex articulation of the *naos*, linked with two small transverse aisles and with a narthex on the W side of the church. From here to the *naos*, passage is assured by at least one door, and usually three. But only in the cathedral of Hermopolis Magna do we find an atrium. All the buildings have a sanctuary with more than one room, with a central space, normally apsed. In front of this is the altar, in a space that extends into the *naos* and is surrounded by *cancelli*. Only in monastic churches is the altar situated in the central space of the sanctuary. In the church of the convent of Shenoute near Suhag, the so-called White Convent (U. Monneret de Villard, *Sohag* I-II; P. Grossmann, *Esempi d'arch.*, 155ff., fig. 3), and in a few other southern churches, the niche has the form of a triconch. Furthermore, some churches—except perhaps the monastic church of Pbou, not yet completely studied—have a matroneum, reached by stairs arranged at various points. The church of Pbou certainly had five aisles, of which the outside ones were conceived as quadrilateral corridors (P. Grossmann, *Esempi d'arch.*, 159). The episcopal church of Hermopolis Magna had a tripartite transept with horseshoe ends (see Wace - Megaw - Skeat, *Hermopolis Magna*); this form, however, cannot be understood as a triconch. In the last quarter of the 5th c., the transept appears again in the great basilica and pilgrimage center of Abu Mina, the largest church known in Egyptian territory, where the arms of the transverse aisle present a genuine terminus (see P. Grossmann, *Abu Mina* IX, 212ff.). Since such 5th-c. buildings attest for the sanctuary a program of relatively mature and complex spaces, as in all likelihood can be learned from the width of the space in question, there follows for the smaller buildings of the same period a canonical division of the spaces into three categories. As a rule this consists of a semicircular apse and two adjacent rectangular rooms, at least one of which is directly accessible from the nave. Exceptional cases, in which the adjacent rooms are absent, are thus far known only in the Mediterranean coastal zones. In buildings that possess a presbytery in the form of a triconch, the Γ-shaped side rooms are attached to the lateral conchs. From the 5th c. on, esp. in the Theban area, the two central columns of the E ambulatory of the *naos* stood out more prominently and were set farther apart, thus forming a second triumphal arch at the front of the apse. The altar was now, except in the churches of the monastic colony of Kellia, almost always placed in front of the apse and was surrounded, as usual, by *cancelli*. The walls of these churches, esp. of the sanctuary, but also often of the area reserved for the congregation, are furnished with numerous niches, regularly spaced. These account for the sometimes enormous thickness of the walls in most Egyptian churches; they also occur in simpler buildings. Only in the churches of the Mediterranean coastal area, more profoundly influenced, as we know, by imperial architecture, are such lateral niches absent.

c. Principal buildings of the 6th c. In the 6th c. the structure of the basilica remains more or less unvaried. However, the proportions appear more reduced and the design more uniform. No more great complexes were built. In their place were built—esp. in the area around Alexandria—some central-plan buildings which can be assigned to the type of four-lobed buildings that originated in Syria and Asia Minor and which were certainly influenced by them (see P. Grossmann, *Abu Mina* IX, 222ff.). So far we know two examples: one from Abu Mina and a perfectly circular church at Pelusium (P. Grossmann - M. Fafiz, BSCA 40 [2001] 109-116). Most have three aisles, i.e., a central space and an ambulatory separated from the central space by columns. These buildings can rightly be numbered among the best-known examples of Late Antique architecture in

Egypt. There may be a direct model for them in Alexandria. At the same time or a little later, some buildings appear in Upper Egypt supported by four corner pillars (P. Grossmann, *Elephantine*, II, Mainz 1979, 86ff.). As for their diffusion, they spread out considerably, esp. in the architecture of *Nubia, showing outstanding developments there.

2. Monasteries

a. Cloisters. Already in the early Christian era two radically different systems of monastic life had developed in Egypt: that of the *anchorites, who lived in solitude in the desert, far from human civilization, and that of the *cenobites, who lived in community in the cultivated areas. Their monastic buildings, like their ways of life, were radically different. Egyptian anchorites lived as hermits, or in common with a small number of disciples. Consequently, their dwellings were, up to the Arab period, always isolated huts (κελλία), often at a great distance from each other. In the earliest times they were content with caves dug in rock or with empty tombs, furnished inside in a very primitive way for living requirements. In the 5th and 6th c. the *kellia* were still small, modest dwellings, but already with more than one room, answering only to the most elementary needs of domestic life. The houses of the monastic colony E of Abu Mina (W. Müller-Wiener - P. Grossmann, *Abu Mina* IV, 463-468) also comprised a large room in front, for visits and for work, and a small dormitory at the back, also used for recital of daily prayers. Kitchen and toilet were outside. The similar but underground monastic dwelling of Adaima near Isna had a separate oratory (S. Sauneron, *Les ermitages*). But the large, well-developed dwellings (Coptic *manshubi*) of the desert, today Wadi'n-Natrun (E. White, *Monasteries Natrûn* III), and of the laura of *Kellia* (F. Daumas - A. Guillaumont, *Kellia Kom.* 519; R. Kasser, *Kellia Top.*), date at least from the post-Arab period.

The church was always built at a later date and was placed at a central point, though at a great distance from some *kellia*; some of the more isolated *kellia* therefore had their own churches. From the 5th c. we know of the construction of a refuge-tower (Arabic *gausaq*), usually in the vicinity of the church, where the monks would flee in the case of attack (the oldest example is in complex 57,4/18 at Kellia; see M. Egloff, *Kellia* III [1977], pl. 117). This was a tower of several stories, with strong walls; its upper floor was reached directly by a drawbridge, for reasons of security. But this tower could only be used by those anchorites who lived in the immediate vicinity, if they chose not to flee.

b. Cenobia. Much more developed were the convents of the cenobite monastic movement initiated by St. *Pachomius. In accordance with rule laid down by this monastic father (*Monac. graec.*, 3 ed. Nau, PO IV, 1908, 425ff.), the monks lived in large community complexes, in groups usually of three (ibid. 426) to a cell. The hours of the day were rigorously distributed between work and prayer. Meals were taken in common in a large refectory (ibid. 428). The cenobia were surrounded by a wall, which made a strict separation from the outside world. The entrances, which certainly existed, were strictly watched, and no monk was to leave without the superior's permission. As yet, unfortunately, we possess no archaeological evidence of such structures in any Pachomian convent. But two later attestations do exist. An 8th-c. cenobitic convent (unpublished) discovered by the Egyptian Antiquities Service near Antinopolis has a one-storied building for housing the monks, with a wide corridor in the middle opening onto individual dormitory cells on both sides. Sleeping-places were arranged along the outside wall, each with a small niche in the wall for the occupant's personal effects. The refectories of cenobia were mostly two-aisled rooms. One could sit with one's back to the wall or on benches arranged in a circle (example at Saqqara; see P. Grossmann - H.G. Severin, *Jeremiaskloster*: MDAI(K) 38 [1982] 162-163). There was not always a table in the middle of the circle of seats, though one is expressly mentioned in Pachomius's rule (*Monac. graec.*, ed. Nau, PO IV, 1908, 429). In convents of this type, too, the church was usually a later addition.

W. de Bock, *Matériaux pour servir à l'archéologie de l'Égypte chrétienne*, St. Petersburg 1901; C.M. Kaufmann, *Die Ausgrabung der Menas Heiligtümer in der Mareotiswüste*, I-III, Cairo 1906-1908; Id., *Die Menasstadt und das Nationalheiligtum der altchristlichen Ägypter*, Leipzig 1910; J.E. Quibell, *Excavations at Saqqara*, II-IV, Cairo 1908-1912; E. Chassinat, *Fouilles à Baouît* [MIFAO 17, 1911] without text; J. Clédat, *Fouilles à Khirbet el-Flousiyeh*: Ann. Serv. arch. de l'Égypte 16 (1916) 6-96; U. Monneret de Villard, *Les couvents près de Sohâg*, I-II, Milan 1925; H.G.E. White, *The Monasteries of the Wâdi'n Natrûn*, I-III, New York 1932, [2]1980; F.W. Deichmann, *Zum Altägyptischen in der koptischen Baukunst*: MDAI(K) 8 (1938) 34-37; U. Monneret de Villard, *La basilica cristiana in Egitto*, Atti del IV Congr. int. di arch. crist., Vatican City, October 1938 (1940), I, 291-319; J.B. Ward Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Menas in the Maryut*: PBSR 17 (1946) 26-71; H. Torp, *Some Aspects of Early Monastic Architecture*: Byzantion 25-27 (1955-57) 513-538; A.J.B. Wace - A.H.S. Megaw - T.C. Skeat, *Hermopolis Magna, Ashmunein*, Alexandria 1959; K. Wessel, *Koptische Kunst*, Recklinghausen 1963; P. du Bourguet, *Les Coptes*, Baden-Baden 1967; W. Müller-Wiener - P. Grossmann, *Abu Mina* IV: AA (1967) 457-480; F. Daumas - A. Guillaumont, *Kellia* I (FIFAO 28) Kom 219, Cairo 1969; F. Daumas, *Rapport sur l'activité de l'IFAO du Caire au cours des années 1968-1969*: CRAI (1969) 496-507; R. Kasser, *Kellia* II. *Topographie*, Geneva 1972; S. Sauneron, *Les ermitages*

chrétiens du désert d'Esna, I-IV, Cairo 1972; M. Egloff, *Kellia, la poterie copte: quatre siècles d'artisanat et d'échanges en Basse-Egypte*. Geneva 1977; P. Grossmann, *Eine vergessene frühchristliche Kirche beim Luxor Tempel*: MDAI(K) 29 (1973) 167-181; Id., *Zur frühchristlichen Baukunst in Ägypten*: Enchoria 8 (1978) 135-146; Id., *Abu Mina* IX: MDAI(K) 36 (1980) 203-227; Id., *Esempi d'architettura paleocristiana in Egitto dal V al VII secolo*: CCAB 28 (1981) 149-176; H.G. Severin, *Zur Südkirche von Bauit*: MDAI(K) 33 (1977) 113-124; P. Grossmann - H.G. Severin, *Reinigungsarbeiten im Jeremiaskloster bei Saqqara IV*: MDAI(K) 38 (1982) 155-193; P. Grossmann - H. Jaritz, *Abu Mina* X: MDAI(K) 38 (1982) 139-154; R. Kasser et al., EK 8184 I-III (Louvain 1981-1999); I. Clédat, *Le monastère de Baouit* (MIFAO 111, 1999); G. Haeny - A. Leibundgut, *Kellia. Kôm Qouçoût 'Isa '366*, Louvain 1999; N.H. Henein - M. Wuttmann, *Kellia, l'ermitage copte*, QR 195 (MIFAO 41, 2000); P. Grossmann, *Christliche Architektur in Ägypten* [HdO 1, 62] Leiden 2002; F. Caloment, *Contribution à l'archéologie et à l'histoire de l'art "coptes." Autopsie d'une feuille singulière*: Journal of Coptic Studies 5 (2003) 115-144.

P. Grossmann

3. Sculpture

a. Present state of studies. Evaluations of so-called Coptic sculpture, in the framework of Late Antique sculpture, are considerably discrepant; as far as value judgments and dates go, the specialized bibliography offers a confused overall picture. Mainly responsible for this situation are certain still-fashionable errors of the old historiography, and the following difficulties: in nearly all the old excavations, to which we owe the most celebrated monuments and complexes (Ahnas/Heracleopolis Magna, Bawit, Saqqara, Bahnasa/Oxyrhynchus), in wrongly evaluating the architecture, the types and characteristics of the sculptures have also been ignored and distorted. In particular we have failed to recognize the sepulchral, and indeed pagan, character of certain architectural complexes and the sculptures that decorated them, and so these complexes have been wrongly interpreted as Christian churches (e.g., in E. Naville's excavations at Ahnas; J.E. Quibell's at Saqqara, esp. dig n. 1823; E. Breccia's at Bahnasa. See H.G. Severin, *Scavi*, 299-314). Second, we have taken and still take little account of the Egyptian custom of reusing old architectural structures and decorative elements not only in their original use, but also for analogous or even different functions. Hence many buildings with architectural decorations, including church buildings, have been wrongly considered homogeneous units (e.g., Bawit, S church: see H.G. Severin, *Süd-Kirche von Bawīt*, 113-124; Bawit, N church: see H.G. Severin, *Notizen*, X-XX; Ashmûnein/Hermopolis Magna, main basilica of S. Jeremiah's monastery: see P. Grossmann - H.G. Severin, *Reinigungsarbeiten 4. Bericht*, X-XX. Research has thus been conditioned, for decades and up to our own day, by the presumption of the Christian or sacral-Christian character of some sculptures and by certain concepts wrongly considered as fixed points. Third, since some materials of Late Antique Egyptian sculpture, caught up in the trade of *objets d'art*, are typically provided with false attestations of origin, we lose any possibility of connecting them with their original circumstances (topography, architectural type, iconographical context, date), and the way to mystification is opened.

In particular the field of figurative sculpture—which has always attracted the most authors, being by far the most prevalent sector, quantitatively, of ornamental sculpture—has been gravely polluted by a huge number of false or falsified objects ending up in non-Egyptian collections, fed into the market on a massive scale for more than twenty years. Spectacular in this regard have been the series of so-called Sheikh Ibada reliefs and their derivatives, which have generated a wave of false problems, with related literature (the few authentic examples of this type of sepulchral relief come from Bahnasa; see K. Parlasca, *Grabreliefs von Oxyrhynchos*, 161-166). The most important collections of Late Antique Egyptian sculpture are in the Cairo Coptic Museum, the Graeco-Roman Museum at Alexandria (materials esp. from Bahnasa: E. Breccia, *Musée Gréco-Romain I*, pl. 41-51; *Musée Gréco-Romain II*, pl. 24-47) and the early Christian and Byzantine collection of the Berlin State Museums (O. Wulff, *Bildwerke*, 24-47, 65-93, 310-315; A. Effenberger, *Koptische Kunst*, passim). Only in a few cases have the sculptures found in the archaeological zones and in the still-extant early Christian or Late Antique buildings of Egypt been properly cataloged and documented.

b. Materials. The materials of Late Antique sculpture in Egypt were porphyry, granite, marble, limestone, sandstone, stucco and wood. Of these, porphyry played a particular role; specialized workshops, probably located in Alexandria, worked mainly for export (incl. sarcophagi and imperial portraits). From the 5th c. it seems that granite was little used for architectural elements; granite pieces in the Late Antique buildings of Egypt are mostly reused. Marble was highly prized, but it did not occur in Egypt and had to be imported by sea. Importation of finished works from *Constantinople seems to have been relatively rare; rather, rough imported forms were finished or decorated in or near Alexandria, and sent inland from there. Among the evidence of this extensive output are the many hundreds of 4th-6th-c. pedestals, bases, column shafts and capitals that were later reused in Islamic buildings. On the whole, it seems that the largest series of

marble manufactures were used exclusively in the coastal zone (e.g., Abu Mina) and in the big cities. The material most used in the Egyptian interior was limestone, sometimes sandstone, available in many parts of the Nile valley; the vast local output of Egyptian sculpture, usually called Coptic sculpture, was worked in these rocky places. Stucco was employed partly for pieces intended for particular structures (e.g., keystones of domes) and for the detailed decoration of schematically roughed-out sandstone blocks (e.g., the cornice of the transept basilica of Ashmûnein); great stucco capitals—like the imperial-era works in Tuna al-Gabal—seem to have been very rare in Late Antiquity (an outstanding unique example in Wadi ʿn-Natrun). The preservation, unusually abundant, of wooden sculptures is due to the favorable climatic conditions of Middle and Upper Egypt.

c. Typology. Nearly all surviving stone sculptures and many of those in wood were made for insertion into architectural complexes, and so we must count the following among architectural sculptures: in stone—architraves, jambs, lunettes, tympana, niche decorations, pedestals and bases, decorated columns and pillars, capitals of various kinds, cornices and friezes, *cancelli*, windows, and nearly all the groups of funerary reliefs; in wood—doors, balustrades and grilles, trusses and crossbeams, cornices and friezes, decorations. Used for furnishing rooms were, among other things, vase-stands in decorated stone, decorated wooden furniture, chests and various wooden objects.

d. Influences and peculiarities. Marble sculpture was subject—in relation to the provenance of the materials—to a constant influence from outside. Generally its character was East Roman; forms and motifs were influenced by models from Constantinople and *Asia Minor. In local limestone and sandstone sculpture such influences remained sporadic, limited in time and space; even in Alexandrian marble sculpture, we do not feel the presence of outside motifs. Forms typical of Constantinopolitan art are absent for generations in Egyptian work, e.g., in the second half of the 5th c., the fundamental motif of the acanthus finely interwoven with the related combinations of motifs and types. Only in the first half of the 6th c. did Egypt receive a tide of Constantinopolitan models, inventions of the workshops of the capital in the early 6th c. and the time of *Justinian I, esp. the pilaster capital in the special form of the curled capital. Such influences are attested, in the same period, in figurative reliefs, though only to a limited degree in local products (Bawit, Fayum; the reused wooden door of the church of St. Barbara in the old city of Cairo). The rich inventory of motifs on limestone and sandstone works drew profit from imperial-era E Mediterranean sources and continued local traditions for centuries. These products have a provincial Late Antique character, with well-identified peculiarities, clearly distinguishable from the products of neighboring artistic provinces. Among their most marked characteristics are (1) architraves of niches in the form of broken pediments, in two basic types, often represented in the same period, (2) coordination of the side field with the front field by using corbelled cornices and coffered panels or interlaced friezes, (3) funerary reliefs with differentiated architectural motifs, (4) wall decorations with friezes of vines and leaves, (5) cornices with corbelled friezes and coffered panels, (6) Corinthian capitals of various categories decorated with a drastically reduced repertoire of motifs, following uncanonical and fantastic criteria.

Scientific literature has always stressed the peculiarities that can be encountered in the typology and elaborations of the local Egyptian culture of Late Antiquity, but with somewhat diverging evaluations. The extreme positions that tend to refer the types and style of this work directly to the Pharaonic heritage, excluding any influence of the Eastern Roman empire from the cultural horizon thus drawn, have erred in the same way as the interpretations that recognize, as primary source, a national Egyptian artistic culture developed in opposition to the culture of the Greco-Roman superstratum and Byzantine orthodoxy. Elements long available show that the majority of the oldest sculptures known to us (Ahnas, Saqqara S, Bahnasa) were created for funerary complexes. So too, the iconography of gables over niches, cited more than once, with figurative documentation (e.g., Leda and the Swan, Aphrodite, Daphne, Dionysius, Fauns and Maenads, Nereids and marine sprites, etc.), corresponds point by point with the subject matter of the imperial-era sepulchral art of other regions, e.g., Rome (see H. Torp, *Leda christiana*, 106-112). From the existential nexus between local stonecutters' and sculptors' workshops and the genre of funerary architecture, in Egypt particularly evolved over time, we could without difficulty explain the poverty of typology as compared to the simultaneous wealth of forms, as well as the independence from foreign models and the traditionalism of Egyptian sculpture. It is clear that the local workshops of the necropolises had been fitted out to satisfy the radically new requirements of the architectural decoration of Christian buildings. On one hand, from a thematic and stylistic point of view, local styles can be identified; on the other, it appears

more and more clear that great supraregional stylistic movements developed at a later period. Thus, types and elaborations with significant similarities are attested, around the first half of the 5th c., in the decorations of the funerary complexes of Bahnasa and the church of the monastery of Shenoute (Deir el-Abyad near Suhag), while the late 5th and first half of the 6th c. saw similar types and forms at Saqqara S and at Bawit.

e. Reliable dates. For the period from the end of the tetrarchy to the Islamic invasion of the region, there is no reliably datable iconographical evidence. For certain groups, East Roman models offer elements of dating. The only fixed points for architectural sculpture—after the failed attempts to date the complexes of Bawit and Saqqara (see III, 3, a above)—are provided by three mid 5th-c. monuments: the pieces originally prepared for the church of the monastery of Shenoute (remains of friezes, cornices and rich decorations of niches in the presbytery, the baptistery and the narthex on the S and W sides; parts of the doorway); the well-preserved decoration of the church of Dair al-Ahmar near Suhag (capitals, bases, decorations of doors and niches in the presbytery and in the E wall of the *naos*); the artifacts, relatively few, originally prepared for the transept basilica of Ashmûnein (pilaster bases, some capitals, corbel moldings, two friezes of niches [?], etc.).

W.E. Crum, *Coptic Monuments* (general catalog of Egyptian antiquities in the Cairo Museum, nos. 8001-8741), Cairo 1902; J. Strzygowski, *Koptische Kunst* (general catalog of Egyptian antiquities in the Cairo Museum nos. 7001-7394 and 8742-9200), Vienna 1904; J.E. Quibell, *Excavations at Saqqara* (1907–1908), Cairo 1909; Id. (1908–1909, 1909–1910), Cairo 1912; O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und mittelalterliche byzantinische und italienische Bildwerke*, Parte I: *Altchristliche Bildwerke* (description of sculptures of the Christian period, 2nd ed., vol. III, Berlin 1909; E. Chassinat, *Fouilles à Baouit* (Mémoires de l'Institut d'archéol. orient. du Caire, vol. 13, 1), Cairo 1911; U. Monneret de Villard, *La scultura ad Ahnas*, Milan 1923; Id., *Les couvents près de Sohag I-II*, Milan 1925–1926; G. Duthuit, *La sculpture copte*, Paris 1931; E. Breccia, *Le Musée Gréco-Romain d'Alexandrie* (1925–1931), Bergamo 1932; Id. (1931–1932) Bergamo 1933; J. des Graviers, *Inventaire des objects coptes de la Salle de Baouit au Louvre*: RivAC 9 (1932) 50-96; E. Kitzinger, *Notes on Early Coptic Sculpture*: Archaeologia 87 (1938) 181-215; J.B. Ward Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Menas in the Maryut*: Papers of the British School at Rome 17 (1949) 26-71; A.J.B. Wace - A.H.S. Megaw - T.C. Skeat, *Hermopolis magna, Ashmunein. The Ptolemaic Sanctuary and the Basilica*, Alexandria 1959; J. Beckwith, *Coptic Sculpture 300-1300*, London 1963; K. Wessel, *Koptische Kunst. Die Spätantike in Ägypten*, Recklinghausen 1963; P. du Bourguet, *I copti*, Milan 1969; Id., *Les coptes*, Paris 1988; H. Torp, *Leda christiana. The Problem of the Interpretation of Coptic Sculpture with Mythological Motifs*: AAAH 4 (1969) 101-112; L. Török, *On the Chronology of the Ahnas Sculpture*: AAnt Hung 22 (1970) 163-182; F.W. Deichmann, *Die Spolien in der spätantiken Architektur* (Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 1975, fasc. 6), Munich 1975; A. Effenberger, *Koptische Kunst. Ägypten in spätantiker, byzantinischer und frühislamischer Zeit*, Vienna 1976; Id., *Die Grabstele aus Medinet el-Fajum. Zum Bild der stillenden Gottesmutter in der Koptischen Kunst*: FBSM 18 (1977) 158-168; H.-G. Severin, *Frühchristliche Skulptur und Malerei in Ägypten*, in B. Brenk, *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt - Berlin - Vienna 1977, 246-253; Id., *Zur Süd-Kirche von Bawit*: MDAI(K) 33 (1977) 113-124; K. Parlasca, *Der Übergang von der spätrömischen zur frühkoptischen Kunst im Lichte der Grabreliefs von Oxyrhynchos*: Enchoria 8 (special volume) (1978) 115 (161)–120 (166); H.-G. Severin, *Gli scavi eseguiti ad Ahnas, Bahnasa, Bawit e Saqqara. Storia delle interpretazioni e nuovi risultati*: CCAB 28 (1981) 299-314; Id., *Problemi di scultura tardo-antica in Egitto*: ibid. 315-336; M. Rassart-Debergh, *Le pitture del convento di S. Geremia a Saqqara*: CCAB 18 (1981) 255-279; Id., *La décoration picturale du monastère de Saqqara. Essai de reconstitution*: AAAH 9 (1981) 9-124; H.-G. Severin, *Beispiele der Verwendung spätantiker Spolien. Ägyptische Notizen, II*, in Fest. Friedrich Wilhelm Deichmann, II, Bonn 1986, 101-108; *L'icône copte*, I, *À travers les âges*, Limoges 1990; M. Rassart-Debergh, *Arte e archeologia copte: principali testimonianze*, in *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, Rome 1997, 293-318 (with rich bibl.); M. Krause, ed., *Ägypten in spätantik-christlicher Zeit, Einführung in die koptische Kultur*, Wiesbaden 1998; D. Bénazeth, *Mathaf al-Qibti, Catalogue général du Musée copte du Caire*, 1, *Objets en métal*, Le Caire: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 2001; P. Grossmann, *Christliche Architektur in Ägypten*, Leiden 2002; see esp. the many entries in *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, 8 vols., New York 1991.

H.-G. Severin

4. Painting

a. Architectural painting. Ever since the first publications, Late Antique, Early Christian and Early Medieval Egyptian painting has been a popular field of study, particularly the sector of figurative compositions. This notwithstanding, there is still a real contrast between the quality of archaeological evidence and the enthusiasm of the studies addressed to iconographical problems. The former is fragmentary, so that a definitive critical evaluation is not possible. Dates are usually approximate and not confirmed by the context (chronology of architecture; identification of layers and overworkings; inscriptions and graffiti, etc.; see the new edition of the Coptic graffiti of the necropolis of al-Bagawat, which go back to the 6th-11th c., with a particular concentration in the 7th-9th c., and which may put in doubt the traditional date of the funerary chapels: G. Roquet, *Graffites coptes*, 25-49). Recent research has recovered a masterpiece of Late Antique Egyptian painting: the official monumental painting of the imperial religious complex of Luxor, which constitutes the link between Roman triumphal art and the decoration of the great Christian churches (J.G. Deckers, *Wandmalerei*, 600-652). Surviving mosaics are very rare (e.g., that on the vault at Abu Mina, 6th c.: H.G. Severin, *Skulptur und Malerei*, 253, fig. 291 b).

In all the civilized provinces, and even in the oases, evidence remains of ornamental architectural painting dividing the wall surfaces into zones and fields. Figurative motifs are found on walls, vaults and columns; complex figurative compositions were much used, esp. in wall niches, apses and domes. Similar paintings are preserved in necropolises (e.g., at al-Bagawat; of the Alexandrian cemeterial frescoes we have only copies), in churches and monasteries (e.g.: Bawit, Saqqara, Kellia, Dair Abu Hinnis, Abu Girga, Karm al-Ahbariya) and in hermitages (e.g., Isna). The well-known niche frescoes, which enclose themes of great breadth in very small spaces, were mostly created after the Arab invasion (mainly at Bawit and Saqqara). The range of artistic quality is very wide: the pictorial decorations, preserved in optimal conditions, of the church of Karm al-Ahbariya (W. Müller-Wiener, *Abu Mena 6. Bericht*, 473-480, fig. 14-15) may give an idea of the lost Alexandrian frescoes, while the paintings of some necropolises (e.g., al-Bagawat), monasteries and hermitages (Isna) remain on the level of artisans. In some cases the dearth of ornamental paintings has been made up for by the relief decoration, quite frequent, of some architectural elements (e.g., the painted pilasters of the niches in the triconch of Dair al-Ahmar, the niche pilasters decorated in relief in the triconch of Dair al-Abyad near Suhag). Remains of lids of wooden chests decorated with figurative depictions (F.W. Deichmann, *Kassettendecken*, 83-107) are the sole evidence of this genre from the early Christian period.

b. Painting on moveable objects. The series of mummy portraits goes up to the early Christian era, but use of them was limited to followers of the old religions. For historical reasons we must rule out a continuation of the genre beyond the end of the 4th c. (K. Parlasca, *Mumienporträts*). The rare early Christian icons, like the portrait of Bishop Abrahan (Berlin) and the double image of Christ and Abbot Menas (Paris) may be considered a technical continuation of them. Besides the painted chests we have the unique example of the peacock sarcophagus of Qarara (Heidelberg).

J. Clédat, *Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouit*, Le Caire 1904; J.E. Quibell, *Excavations at Saqqara* (1906–1907), Le Caire 1908; Id. (1907–1908), Le Caire 1909; Id. (1908–1909, 1909–1910), Le Caire 1912; J. Clédat, *Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouit*, Le Caire 1916; J. Maspéro, *Fouilles exécutées à Baouit.* Notes mises en ordre et éditées par E. Drioton, Le Caire 1932, 1943; A. Fakhry, *The Necropolis of el-Bagawat in Kharga-Oasis*, Cairo 1951; K. Wessel, *Koptische Kunst. Die Spätantike in Ägypten*, Recklinghausen 1963; K. Parlasca, *Mumienporträts und verwandte Denkmäler*, Wiesbaden 1966; R. Kasser, *Kellia 1965*, Geneva 1967; P. du Bourguet, *I copti*, Milan 1969; Id., *Les coptes*, Paris 1988; W. Müller-Wiener, *Abu Mena 6. vorläufiger Bericht*: AA (1967) 473-480; F. Daumas - A. Guillaumont, *Kellia I Kom 219* (FIFAO 28), Cairo 1969; R. Kasser, *Kellia. Topographie*, Geneva 1972; S. Sauneron et al., *Les ermitages chrétiens du désert d'Esna* (FIFAO 29, 1-4), Cairo 1972; A. Effenberger, *Koptische Kunst. Ägypten in spätantiker, byzantinischer und frühislamischer Zeit*, Vienna 1976; F.W. Deichmann, *Kassettendecken*: JÖByz 21 (1972) 83-107; G. Roquet, *Les graffites coptes de Bagawat*: Bulletin de la Société française d'Égyptologie 76 (1976) 25-49; H.-G. Severin, *Frühchristliche Skulptur und Malerei in Ägypten*, in B. Brenk, *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt-Berlin-Vienna 1977, 243-253; J.G. Deckers, *Die Wandmalerei im Kaiserkultraum von Luxor*: JDAI 94 (1979) 600-652; M. Rassart-Debergh, *Le pitture del convento di S. Geremia a Saqqara*: CCAB 28 (1981) 255-279; P. van Moorsel - M. Huijbers, *The Preserved Wallpaintings of Apa Jeremias*: AAAH 9 (1981) X-XX; M. Rassart-Debergh, *La peinture copte avant le XII^e siècle. Une approche*: AAAH 9 (1981) 221-285; Id., *La décoration picturale du monastère de Saqqara. Essai de reconstitution*: AAAH 9 (1981) 9-124; A. Karakovkine, *Certains monuments coptes de l'Ermitage (Saint-Pétersbourg)*, in *Akten des XII Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, II, Münster 1995, 889-891; M. Rassart-Debergh, *Arte e archeologia copte: principali testimonianze*, in *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, Rome 1997, 293-318 (with rich bibl.); M. Krause, ed., *Ägypten in spätantik-christlicher Zeit, Einführung in die koptische Kultur*, Wiesbaden 1998; see esp. the many entries in *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, 8 vols., New York 1991.

H.-G. Severin

EKTHESIS MAKROSTICHOS. The early sources give this name to a long doctrinal text that the Eusebians delivered to Emperor *Constans at *Milan in 345 in order to mitigate his unfavorable impression of the rupture caused by the Council of *Serdica. An elucidation of the Antiochene formula of 341, its approach to the *Trinity is based on the articulation of the three divine *prosopa* (the term *hypostasis* is avoided out of consideration for the Westerners), clearly distinct from each other.

A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, Breslau 1897, 192-196; Simonetti 182-192; G. Feige, *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner*, Leipzig 1991, 142-145; A.M. Ritter, *Dogma und Lehre in der alten Kirche*, in C. Andresen (ed.), *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, vol. I, Göttingen 1982, 187ff.; H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II*, Berlin 1984 54ff., F. Dinsen, *Homoousios. Die Geschichte des Begriffs bis zum Konzil von Konstantinopel* (381), Kiel 1976, 108ff.

M. Simonetti

EKTHESIS of HERACLIUS. The patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople (d. 638), to resolve the question of *monothelitism, affirmed that there are two natures in Christ, according to *dyophysite doctrine, but only one operation (*energia*), as the *monophysites wanted. This doctrine came to be called *monoener-

gism (or monoergism). Sergius obtained from the emperor Heraclius the issuing of a document (*Ekthesis*) in 638, according to which in Christ there was only one operation and one will. Pope *Martin and *Maximus the Confessor opposed this new doctrine; the emperor *Constans then issued the *Typos*, with which he banned discussion of the question of one or two wills in Christ. The Lateran Council of 649 rejected this new document, and both Martin and Maximus were arrested. Martin died in Crimea in 655; Maximus was tried and condemned in 662 and sent to Laico (Georgia), where he died.

M. Simonetti, *Il Cristo*, II, *Testi teologici e spirituali in lingua greca dal IV al VII secolo*, Milan 1986, 514ff.; 633ff.; M. Simonetti, *Un falso Ippolito nella polemica monotelita*: VetChr 24 (1987) 113-146.

A. Di Berardino

ELEUSIUS of Cyzicus (d. ca. 384). Ordained bishop of Cyzicus (Hellespont) ca. 358 by *Macedonius of Constantinople, he actively collaborated with *Basil of Ancyra in the activity of the *homoiousians in 358–359 and played an important part in the Council of *Seleucia (359). For this he was deposed at the Council of *Constantinople of 360, which sanctioned the defeat of the homoiousians. Restored to his see on *Constantius's death (362), he was removed from it by *Julian, who aimed to punish several bishops who had harmed pagan worship and temples. Also harassed by *Valens, after 362 he resumed his part in the trinitarian controversy, still aligned with the homoiousians. When the controversy over the *Holy Spirit broke out, he became one of the leaders of the *Macedonians, i.e., the homoiousian wing that refused to acknowledge the Holy Spirit's divinity. In ca. 376 he presided over a Macedonian council at Cyzicus which ignored the Nicene **homoousion*, again confirmed the validity of the *homoiousion*, and defined the Holy Spirit as a creature. Sent to the Council of Constantinople of 381 together with other Macedonians, he refused to subscribe the Nicene Creed of 325 beforehand and so left the proceedings. In 383, at *Theodosius's request, he presented that emperor with a formula of faith, whose terms we do not know.

Socrates, *HE* 2,39-40; 4,6; 5,8-10; Sozomen, *HE* 4,20,2-24; 5,15; DHGE 15, 144-145; Simonetti 588.

M. Simonetti

ELEUTHERUS (Eleuterus, Eleutherius), pope (175–189). Succeeded *Soter perhaps in 175 and was pope until his death in 189 (the date at which a more certain chronology for the bishops of *Rome begins). In Irenaeus's list, Eleutherus is in the final place, the twelfth successor to the apostle *Peter (*Adv. haer.* III, 3, 3). A Greek from Nicopolis (Epirus), deacon to Anicetus (Eus., *HE* IV, 22, 1), the son of Abbondius or Abbondantius (LP I, 136), he lived under the emperor *Commodus, in a period of relative truce in the Roman *persecutions. The church's peace was disturbed in another sense by the spread in the West of the *Montanist heresy. In the context of that controversy, in 177 Eleutherus received through Irenaeus, then a simple presbyter, a letter on Montanist theories (Euseb., *HE* V,3,4; V,4,1-2). The document was addressed from the Christians of *Lyons, then prisoners and confessors of the faith, "to the brothers of Asia and Phrygia, and to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome." Rather than condemning Montanism, the Christians of Lyons expounded its heterodox contents, informing Eleutherus of them and inviting him to that moderate and pacific approach which he did in fact observe in the years that followed, refusing to disturb the church's internal peace with condemnations that were too broad and harsh. This caution seems to be confirmed by *Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean*, where in a probable allusion to Eleutherus he rebukes a bishop of Rome for having recognized the orthodoxy of Montanus and other heresiarchs (PL 2, 178-179). It is also true that in his last years Eleutherus assumed a less conciliatory attitude toward the Montanists. The LP mentions a sending of missionaries by Eleutherus to *Britain, at the request of King Lucius. The circumstances of Eleutherus's death are unknown, although he is remembered as a martyr of the church of Rome (26 May).

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adv. haeres.* III, 3, 3, SC 211 (A. Rousseau - L. Doutreleau), 36-38; Tertullian, *De praescript. haeret.* 30, 2, CCL 1-2 (R.F. Refoulé), 210; Id., *Adv. Prax.* I, 5, CCL 1-2, III, 5; Euseb., *HE* IV,11,7; 22,3; V, Prologue, 1; 22; 24,14; PG 5, 1143 (letter of Eleutherus to Lucius); P. Hinschius, *Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* [. . .], Leipzig 1863, 125-127; LP I, LXV, CI-CIV, 58-61 and 136-137; *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, II, London 1880, 79-81; III, 1882, 754-756; L. Duchesne, *E. et le roi breton Lucius*: Revue celtique 6 (1883–1885) 491ff.; *Catholicisme* IV, 1-2 (G. Bardy); DTC IV, 2, Paris 1956, 1-2; BS IV, 1004-1007 (B. Cignitti - I.B. Marsali); DHGE XV, 147-148 (B. Botte); LTK³ 3, 586 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi 1, 226-229 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

ELEUTHERUS (Eleuterus, Eleutherius) of Tournai (d. 531). Born ca. 456 of Christian parents and a member of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy, Eleu-

therus spent most of his youth at the royal court of Tournai. The *Vita Medardi* (BHL 5864), and subordinately the *Vita Eleutherii* (BHL 2455), state that after having been a count, between 497 and 500 he was consecrated bishop of Tournai and made considerable efforts to combat pagans and heretics, in particular *Arians. He also went to *Rome, first to Pope *Symmachus and then to Pope *Hormisdas, and held a synod in 527. Died 30 August 531. Six sermons (*Sermo, seu confessio de SS. Trinitate*; *Transitus S. Eleutherii episcopi*; *Sermo de Trinitate*; *Sermo de incarnatione Domini*; *Sermo de natale Domini*; *Sermo in annuntiationis festum*) and a prayer (*Oratio Beati Eleutherii*) have been erroneously attributed to Eleutherus.

CPL 1004; PL 65, 83-102; P. Rolland, *Les Monumenta historiae Tornacensis saec. XII*: Annuaire de l'Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique 73 (1926) 255-313; Id., *Les origines légendaires de Tournai*: RBPh 25 (1946–1947) 555-581; A. Lumpe, *Die Quellen von Ps. Eleutherius, sermo de Trinitate*: RhM 100 (1957) 199-200; BS IV, 1012; DHGE XV, 150-153; Patrologia IV, 300.

P. Marone

ELIAS of Jerusalem (430–518). Patriarch of *Jerusalem (494–516). Saint: feast 4 July. Of Arab origin, an *anchorite in *Egypt and *Palestine, consecrated priest by Anastasius of Jerusalem, he became patriarch at the height of the *Acacian schism, under the reign of the *monophysite emperor *Anastasius. Although he was orthodox and antimonophysite, Elias, wanting to maintain a moderate and conciliatory approach, accepted the **Henotikon* and avoided an open defense of the Council of *Chalcedon; he nonetheless did not escape the attacks of the monophysites. In 512 he managed to avoid, through St. *Sabas's intercession with Anastasius, the deposition decreed by the Council of Sidon, though his friend *Flavian II of Antioch was deposed. Elias then refused communion with Flavian's successor at Antioch, the monophysite *Severus. He was exiled to Aila (Eilat), on the Red Sea, where he died.

BS IV, 1053-1057; DHGE 15, 189-190; Patrologia 5, see index; Storia del Cristianesimo 3, passim.

E. Prinzivalli

ELIGIUS of Noyon-Tournai (ca. 590–660). Born ca. 590 at Chaptelat, near Limoges, of an old Gallo-Roman family, he was apprenticed as a goldsmith in the mint of Limoges before going over to the service of kings *Chlothar II and Dagobert, where he exercised an immense influence over 7th-c. monetization, also creating masterpieces of religious art. Still a layman, he founded monasteries at Solignac, *Paris and Noyon, helping the poor and prisoners. On Dagobert's death, Eligius was ordained bishop of Noyon 13 May 641. He evangelized the N part of his vast diocese, fallen back into paganism with the barbarian invasions, but with only moderate success; he took part in the synods of Orléans (639/641)—a fact known only from his *Life* (CPL 2094)—and Chalon-sur-Saône (24 October 647/653). The homilies transmitted under his name are not authentic (PL 87, 593-662), except the homily *De supremo iudicio* (CPL 2096), in which he has constant recourse to the homilies of *Caesarius of Arles. We also have a letter of his written to *Desiderius of Cahors (CPL 1303) and the *Charta cessionis Solemniacensis* (CPL 2095). Died 1 December 660 and was buried at Noyon.

BHL 2474-2480; *Verzeichnis* (Freiburg [4]1995), 441-442; BS 4, 1064-1073; BBKL 1, 1490-1491; C. Baussan, *St. Éloi*, Paris 1932; P. Fouracre, *The Work of Audoenus of Rouen and E. of Noyon in Extending Episcopal Influence from the Town to the Country*, in D. Baker (ed.), *The Church in Town and Countryside*, Oxford 1979, 77-91; A. de Vogüé, *Vestiges de l'"Admonitio ad filium spiritualem" du Pseudo-Basile dans la prédication de saint Éloi*: RB 98 (1988) 18-20.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

ELIJAH, prophet

I. Exegesis - II. Iconography.

I. Exegesis. There is an OT apocryphon entitled the *Apocalypse of Elijah*. E. Schürer (*Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3, 368) considers it a Christian work of the 3rd c. W. Bousset (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie: Die Apokalypse des Elias*: ZKG 20 [1899] 103-112) considers it a Jewish work revised by a 3rd-c. Christian. More recently, without convincing proof, J.M. Rosenstiehl (*L'Apocalypse d'Élie. Introduction, traduction et notes*, Paris 1972) has tried by force of circumstances to date it to the 1st c. BC.

This work had little influence on the Christian reception of the prophet Elijah. *Clement of Rome (*Cor.* 17, 1) proposes Elijah as a true model. *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 8, 4; 39, 1-2; 49, 1-3; 69, 1; 87, 6) mentions him mainly in the eschatological perspective. *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20, 10; V, 5, 1) only speaks of him twice, and always on a typological level. *Origen evokes him on two levels: that of the prophet's history; and, esp. in his NT commentaries and homilies (*Com. Mt.* 12, 13, 17; *Hom. Lc.*; *Com. Jo.*; *Com. Rom.*), that of the significance of the events in which the prophet took part. From the Origenian interpre-

tation of Elijah come teachings on practical Christian life, esp. through his OT homilies (*Hom. Gn.* 16, 3; *Hom. Ex.* 3 and 8; *In Ps.* 4, 5, 37). *Methodius of Olympus explains in an anti-Origenist sense Elijah's flight from Jezebel and his apparition on Mt. Tabor (*Symp.* 10, 3; *De res.* I and III).

References to Elijah in 4th-5th-c. Greek patristics are rare. *Eusebius of Caesarea names him in *On the martyrs of Palestine* 11, 9. Many references appear in *Athanasius, the most interesting being in *Vita Antonii* 7, where Elijah is presented as a model for monks. *Eusebius of Emesa, in his *Oratio II de Filio*, uses Elijah to emphasize the Son's superiority to all OT figures. *Cyril of Jerusalem presents Elijah to catechumens as bearer of the gifts of the Holy Spirit (*Cat.* 2, 3; 12, 14). Hardly mentioned by *Basil (*Great Rules* 23) and only conventionally in *Gregory of Nazianzus, in *Gregory of Nyssa Elijah becomes a commonplace when the saint has recourse to *Scripture. *John Chrysostom dedicates a whole homily to Elijah: *On Elijah, the widow and almsgiving.* *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Nilus, *Isidore of Pelusium, *Diadochus of Photice and *Maximus the Confessor hardly mention him.

In the *Syriac tradition, Elijah appears as a giant of biblical prophecy, a man of action and prayer, "prophet and father of prophets," esp. in *Aphraates and *Ephrem. Among the Latins, according to *Cyprian (*Ep.* 67, 8) Elijah is a model of the martyrs; a prophet of the last days for *Hilary (*Com. Mt.* 26, 6), *Augustine (*Civ. Dei* 20, 29) and *Gregory the Great (*Moral.* XI, 15, 24); an ascetic of the desert, virgin and poor, for *Ambrose, who dedicates a whole treatise to him, *De Helia et ieiunio*; a model of monastic life for *Jerome (*Ep.* 58, 5) and *John Cassian (*Inst.* 1, 1; *Conl.* 14, 4; 18, 6). The *Pelagian crisis would emphasize his need of grace, and *Isidore of Seville would see in Elijah's assumption a distant annunciation of Christ's ascension.

EC 5, 232-235; BS 4, 1031-1032; DSp 576-571; *Élie le prophète*, I-II, Études carmelitaines, Bruges 1956; E. Poirot, *Le saint prophète Élie chez les Pères de l'Église*. Textes présentés par les Carmelites du Monastère St.-Élie, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1992; M. Masson, *Élie ou l'appel du silence*, Paris 1992; E. Poirot, *Les prophètes Élie et Élisée dans la littérature chrétienne ancienne*, Turnhout 1997.

Ch. Kannengiesser

II. Iconography. Many works of Latin and Greek Fathers contain more or less extensive references to Elijah. His ascent into heaven in a fiery chariot is disbelieved only by *Origen (*In Ps.* XV, 9), who denies that his body could have been dead. According to *Augustine, Elijah and Enoch will die together at the end of the world, fighting against *Antichrist (*Ep.* CXCIII, 3, 5; *De Gen. ad litt.* IX, 5). These same two figures are identified with the figures of the two witnesses of Rev 11 by various authors, including *Jerome (*Comm. in Ev. Mt.* III, 57), who considers Elijah the second precursor of Christ, as St. John the Baptist was the first. A similar comparison appears in *Gregory of Nyssa (*De Virg.* VI) and in St. Augustine (*Civ. Dei* XX, 29). For his many virtues (poverty, continence, faithfulness in prayer, penitence), he is pointed to as an example of monastic life by St. *Athanasius (*Vita Ant.*) and *John Cassian (*Conl.* XIV, 4). *Ambrose (*De vid.* I, 3) gives him first place among the prophets, and Jerome too celebrates the conduct of his life and his work of exalting the divine glory (*Contra Ioan. Hieros.* II; *Comm. in Ez.* XI, 35).

The scene of Elijah most widespread in the early Christian figurative repertoire is that of his ascent in a fiery chariot (2 Kings 2:11) which, formally, draws inspiration from scenes of *apotheosis and triumph in classical art and which alludes to the baptism of fire. The oldest depictions yet known are probably those on Roman sarcophagi, where Elijah appears even before the time of *Constantine (Ws 190, 3). In painting, Elijah is recognizable on a damaged lunette in the catacomb of *Domitilla (4th c.) (Wp 230, 2): the prophet, beardless, in tunic and pallium, is on the moving *quadriga* while Elisha points to him. A lunette of an arcosolium in the catacomb of Via D. Compagni (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, pl. XXIII) dates from the second half of the 4th c. In mosaics, Elijah appears at Milan (apse of S. Aquilino) and Ravenna (S. Apollinare in Classe), with the usual compositional schemes. In sculpture, the scene appears on few sarcophagi besides those mentioned above: the Borghese sarcophagus in the Louvre (Ws 82, 2), that of St. Ambrose at Milan (Ws 189, 2). In a design on the sarcophagus of St. Peter's in the Vatican (Rep. 675, 2), a single scene comprises the whole event, while in a fragment in the Arles Museum (Ws 198, 1), it is in two parts: above, Elijah in the chariot hands over the pallium; below, Elisha, bald and bearded, receives it; another character next to Elisha is interpreted as the Jordan. A fragment of baptismal font from the church of *Vitalis* at Sbeitla, now in the Bardo Museum, Tunis, dates from the 4th c. Elijah also appears probably on the left side of the Brescia Reliquary (350–370), on a fragmentary clay tablet in the Bardo Museum (5th c.) and on the wooden door of S. Sabina, Rome (ca. 430).

DACL IV, 2670-2674; EC II, 232-234; RAC 4, 1157-1163; LCI I, 607-613; M.A. Merlin, *Catalogue des Musées et Collections archéologiques de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie. Musée Aloui*, Paris 1921, II, L 110, 283; III, C 1444, 73; C. Cecchelli, in Calderini -

Chierici - Cecchelli, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore*, Milan 1952, 221-229; Volbach-Hirmer, 75, fig. 86, 94, fig. 168; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Märtyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 267-283; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom*, Tübingen 1980, 41-45, figs. 34-36; C. Stella, *Scheda n. 5b. li*, in Var. aus., *Milano capitale dell'Impero Romano 286-402 d.C.*, Milan 1990; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la via Latina*, Florence 1990; A.M. Ardovino, *I mosaici di S. Aquilino: note sulla loro storia e prospettive di ricerca*, in *Milano ritrovata*, Milan 1991, 43-48; J. Dresken-Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarcophage. Band II*, Mainz am Rhein 1998, n. 150,2; M. Perraymond, *Elia* (s.v.), in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 170-171.

M. Perraymond

ELISAEUS, doctor (Ełišē Vardapet) (6th c.?). Armenian author of a *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, which recounts the Armenian insurrection of the years 449–451. Traditionally considered an eyewitness of the events he relates, Elisaeus is now more commonly dated in the 6th c.; Akinian puts the composition of the *History* in the 7th c., seeing the present text as a 9th-c. revision that transformed the original hero, Vardan II, into Vardan I. In the manuscripts Elisaeus appears as the author of homilies and ascetic and exegetical treatises, which seem to use translations from the Hellenophile period (6th c.), but at the same time show little interest in the anti-Chalcedonian disputes.

DHGE 15, 232-235; DSp 4, 594-596; Bardenhewer V, 202-206; G. Cappelletti, *Eliseo storico armeno del quinto secolo*, Venice 1840; *Srboy hawrn meroy Ełišēi vardapeti Matenagrowtiwnk'* [Works of our holy father Elisaeus doctor], Venice 1859; V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie.* II, Paris 1869, 177-251; S. Weber, *Ausgewählte Schriften der armenischen Kirchenväter* I, Munich 1927, 271-298; N. Akinian, *Ełišē vardapet ew iwr Patmowt'iwn Hayoc' paterazmi. Matenagrakan-patmakan owsowmnasirowt'iwn* [Elisaeus doctor and his "History of the Armenian War." Historical-critical research]. I-II, Vienna 1932-36 [Ger. summ. in appendix]; N. Akinian, *Ełišē vardapet Kołbac'i: Keank'n ew grak'an gorcownēwt'iwnĕ* [Elisaeus of *Kołb*, doctor: life and literary activity]: HA 64 (1950) 385-421; 65 (1951) 1-43; B.L. Zekiyan, *Ełišē as Witness of the Ecclesiology of the Early Armenian Church*, in N.G. Garsoïan et al. (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Washington, D.C. 1982, 187-197; R. Thomson, *Ełishē, History of Vardan and the Armenian War* (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 5), Cambridge, MA - London 1982; L. Leloir, *Élisée l'Arménien, Discours sur la Transfiguration*, in *Joie de la Transfiguration d'après les Pères d'Orient*, ed. M. Coune (Spiritualité orientale 39), Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1985, 135-138; H.H. K'yoseyan, *Ełišē i čaragrakan erkeri ałbyowrneric'* [Sources of the homiletic works of Ełišē]: Patmabanasirakan Handēs 123 (1988) 4, 108-112; B. Outtier, *Une exhortation aux moines d'Élisée l'arménien*, in Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont. Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux (Cahiers d'orientalisme 20), Geneva 1988, 97-101; R.W. Thomson, *Aspects of Armenian Biblical Exegesis: Ełišē on the Passion*, in S. Ajamian - M.E. Stone, *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament*: Papers Presented to the Conference on the Armenian New Testament May 22-28, 1992 (University of Pennsylvania. Armenian Texts and Studies 13), Atlanta 1994, 83-95; R.W. Thomson, *Ełišē, The History of Vardan and the Armenian War. A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1957 Yerevan Edition* (Classical Armenian Texts), Delmar 1993; R.W. Thomson, *A Homily on the Passion of Christ Attributed to Elishe*, Louvain 2000.

S.J. Voicu

ELKESAITES. The origin of the Elkesaites goes back to the Jewish inhabitants of the border region during the Roman-Parthian War at the end of Trajan's reign (ca. 116). At that time a book was written among these Jews which contained revelations and demanded conversion in view of an imminent judgment. According to the book, the revelations were made by two important angels. Although a man called Elxai is generally mentioned in connection with the book, it is normally held that in this word we can make out the Hebrew words *ksh ḥyl* (Book of) "Hidden power." The revelations were not fulfilled, but the book enjoyed such immense credit that its contents were not only interpreted, but even adapted to new circumstances.

We know that a certain Alcibiades of *Apamea came to Rome in the time of Bishop *Callistus preaching a second baptism, referring to the Elkesaite book of revelation (*Elenchos* IX, 13, 1-17, 2). *Origen wrote that the Elkesaites appeared at *Caesarea announcing that pardon was possible even for those who had denied the faith (Euseb., *HE* VI, 38). *Epiphanius describes a sect called *Sampseni*, who according to him derived from the *Osseni*, who had been influenced by Elxai (*Pan.*, chs. 19 and 53). The *Fihrist*, a work written in Arabic at the end of the 10th c., reveals that a sect of *Mughtasilah*, founded by Elxai, counted Mani's brother among its members and that *Mani himself had been "their head" (al-Nadim, *Kitab al-Fihrist* 9, 1, ed. Dodge, vol. II, 773-774 and 811). This is supported by a *Manichean document on Mani's youth, commonly called the Cologne Mani Codex. The problem connected with the study of the Elkesaites is to determine, on the one hand, to what extent their original ideas influenced already-existing religious groups, and on the other, to what extent Elkesaite ideas were influenced by these groups. We know from *Hippolytus that Alcibiades propagated a conception of Jewish life and accepted a Christology in which Christ appeared in all eras; in this regard Hippolytus also speaks of practices of exorcism and astrology. The Jewish Christian element is much less important in

Epiphanius's descriptions. He emphasizes the supposed influence of the Elkesaites on the *Ebionites, but it is plausible that the influence went the other way. Finally, we note that in the description of the *Fihrist* and the Cologne Mani Codex nothing is said about Jewish Christian ideas. With the Elkesaites, then, it would seem that we are not dealing with a particular group, but with the influence of a mysterious book of revelations that held sway over a number of preexisting religious ideas, probably starting with some Jewish Christian groups E of the Jordan.

EC 5, 194; W. Brandt, *Elchasai*, Leipzig 1912; A.F.J. Klijn - G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*: Supplements to Novum Testamentum 36, Leiden 1973, 54-67; Id., *Elchasai and Mani*: VChr 28 (1974) 277-289; L. Cyril, *Elchasai e gli elchasaiti*, Cosenza 1984; G. Lüdemann, *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*, Minneapolis 1989; S.C. Mimouni, *Le judéo-christianisme*, Paris 1998; S. Légasse, *L'antipaulinisme sectaire au temps des Pères de l'Église*, Paris 2000.

A.F.J. Klijn

ELPIDIUS (4th c.). The layman Elpidius is mentioned by *Jerome (*Ep.* 133, 4; CSEL 56, 248). *Sulpicius Severus calls him a rhetor and presents him, with a woman named Agape, as *Priscillian's teacher. Also according to Sulpicius, Elpidius was condemned at the Council of *Saragossa of 380 (*Chron.* II, 46-47).

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila. The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976, 20, 27, 37; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic. Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1995, 139-140.

S. Zincone

ELPIDIUS RUSTICUS (5th-6th c.). Latin Christian poet (late 5th c.–first half 6th c.), variously identified with the deacon Elpidius, Theodoric's teacher, recipient of letters from *Cassiodorus, *Ennodius and Avitus, mentioned in *Procopius and the *Vita Caesarii* (Fabricius); with Flavius Elpidius Rusticius Domnulus, Theodoric's *comes consistorialis*, *subscriptor* of some classical texts (Brandes); with the Gallic poet Domnulus, mentioned by *Sidonius Apollinaris, whom some scholars consider the same person as the *subscriptor* of *Ravenna (Jahn, Cavallin). The solution, not yet reached, of this problem is connected with that of the source of the two Elpidian works: *Carmen de Christi Iesu beneficiis* (149 hexameters) and a series of epigrams entitled *Historiarum Testamenti veteris et novi Tristicha XXIV*, first published by G. Fabricius at Basle in 1564 on the basis of a codex now lost. The *Tristicha*, probably captions to figurative cycles of episodes from both Testaments recalling *Prudentius's *Dittochaeon*, lack the technique of the *Carmen*, dictated by intense religiosity and quite often rising to genuine poetic vibrations, with various Sedulian borrowings. Composed between 525 (death of *Boethius, alluded to in vv. 45-47) and the end of the *Ostrogoth kingdom (555; in v. 140 this is spoken of as still existing), it may be considered an effective and devout summary, through its essential moments, of Christ's saving action in human history, with a final vision of heavenly beatitude, contrasted with the evils (famine, war, sickness, cruelty of tyrants) dominating the poet's own time. Noteworthy in the *Carmen*, besides the presence of some neologisms, is the proclaimed difference and superiority of the poetry of Christ's "*vates*" to the artificial poetry of pagan writers, "experts in errors" (vv. 39-40). Finally, there are four epigrams (*Versus Rustici defensori Augustin*: CPL 1508) which summarize *Augustine's trinitarian doctrine.

CPL 1506-1508a; PL 62, 543-548; D.H. Groen, *Rustici Elpidii carmina*, Groningen 1942; F. Corsaro, *Elpidio Rustico*, Catania 1955; S. Cavallin, *Le poète Domnulus. Étude prosopographique*: SE 7 (1955) 50-66; Patrologia IV, 285-286.

L. Navarra

ELVIRA, Council of. We know two cities with the Latin name *Eliberris* (*Iliberris*): one in Gallia Narbonensis, the other in the province of Baetica. There is no doubt that the council was celebrated in the latter: it is sufficiently proven by the sees of the participants. Archaeological data fix its site in an outlying ward (Abaicín) of modern Granada, ruling out other homonymous places nearby. Most problematic is the year of its celebration, since the acts give only its day and month: 15 May. All are agreed on only one fact: it was held after 295 (probable beginning of Ossius of Cordoba's episcopate) and before 314 (year of the Council of *Arles). Nothing can help us determine the exact year except the data derived from a study of its 81 canons: can. 25 refers to those who are given the title of *confessores*; can. 60 does not accept as martyrs those put to death only for destroying idols; can. 73 mentions informers on Christians. All this seems to indicate the aftermath of a persecution; in this case, it would be that of *Diocletian and we could date it between 306 and 314. But other clues oblige us to take the date back to before the persecution: the absence of the problem of *lapsi* (present at the Council of Arles) and the coexistence of Christians and pagans, a situation characteristic of the time of lasting peace, not of that of persecution. So

we can place the year of celebration between 300 and 303. The acts are signed by 19 bishops and 24 presbyters, delegates of 37 Christian communities (six of them sent a presbyter as well as the bishop). We can thus speak of a national council, also because the representatives of the five Roman provinces were present: *Baetica, 19 (and probably 3 more); *Carthage, 8; *Lusitania, 3; *Tarraconensis, 1 (and probably one more); and *Gallaecia, 1. In all the registers Felix of Acci (Guadix) signed first, a privilege probably given him on account of his personal seniority among the bishops, not of the antiquity of his see.

The importance of this council is considerable for our knowledge of the church in *Spain at that time. The first thing it tells us is the wide diffusion of Christianity in the peninsula, esp. in Baetica, as in its various social strata: *flamines* (cans. 2, 3, 4, 55); duumvirs (can. 56); rich matrons (cans. 5, 41); landowners (can. 40); usurers (can. 20); charioteers and actors (cans. 62, 69); freedmen (can. 80). The second is how ineffective was this Christianization, since idolatry still existed among Christians (can. 1), who took part in pagan worship (can. 59) and had idols in their houses (can. 41); Christians married pagans or Jews (cans. 15, 16, 17); even the bishops believed in witchcraft and were notably permissive in matters of married life and in sexual matters. We should also note a certain rigidity in the penalties imposed, to the point of total exclusion from the church of backsliding userers (can. 20), those who kept idols in their houses (can. 41), those who had their crops blessed by Jews (can. 49), and charioteers and actors who failed to keep their promise to renounce this type of work (can. 62). The council wanted to intensify the Christian life, freeing it from all pagan links and vestiges and from any contact with Jews, and it wanted insistently to make the lives of the clergy exemplary—famous on this account is can. 33, variously interpreted, which requires sexual abstinence to bishops, presbyters and deacons during the exercise of their ministry. All this depends on the authenticity of the canons, among the earliest preserved of any council. Their late appearance (in *Hispana*; 2nd half of 6th c.), other internal factors such as the vocabulary used, the unusual number of canons (81), which are jumbled and some at first sight contradictory, and the presence of some subjects treated at later councils, have led some to deny their authenticity and consider them a later compilation; in this case only the first 21 (22) canons would belong to the acts of the Council of Elvira. One author (J. Suberbiola) maintains the thesis that the 81 canons are the acts of five Spanish councils from the 3rd and 4th c., but the evidence advanced does not give a sufficient response to the questions raised by recent proposals.

ES 19 and 55-56; DHGE 15, 317-348; R. García Villoslada, *Historia de la iglesia en España*, 1, Madrid 1978, 81-119; Mansilla, *Geografía* 1, 92-130; Martínez Diez, *Hispana* IV, 233-268; Vives, *Concilios*, 1-15; Orlandís, *Concilios*, 25-63; M. Meigne, *Concile ou collection d'Elvire?*: RHE 70 (1975) 361-387; E. Griffe, *Le Concile d'Elvire et les origines du célibat ecclésiastique*: BLE 77 (1976) 123-127; D. Ramos-Lissón, *En torno a la autenticidad de algunos cánones del concilio de Elvira*: ScTh 11 (1979) 181-186; D. Ramos-Lissón, *Communio y recepción de cánones conciliares de los sínodos hispánicos en los siglos IV y V*: AHC 12 (1980) 26-37; J. Suberbiola Martínez, *Nuevos concilios hispano-romanos de los siglos III y IV. La Colección de Elvira*, Universidad de Málaga 1987; M. Sotomayor, *Las actas del Concilio de Elvira. Estado de la cuestión*: Revista del centro de estudios históricos de Granada y su Reino 3 (1989) 35-67; J. Vilella - P.E. Barreda, *Los cánones de la Hispana atribuidos a un Concilio Iliberritano. Estudio filológico*: SEA 78 (2002) 545-579; *El concilio de Elvira y su tiempo*, eds. M. Sotomayor - J. Fernández Ubiña, Granada 2005.

P. de Luis

EMERENTIANA (d. 303?). One of a group of martyrs buried in the *coemeterium majus* on the Via Nomentana, known from an inscription (ICUR 21590) and included in *Mart. hier.* on 16 September. In *Gaul she is given prominence by the historical martyrologies and by the late manuscripts of the *Mart. hier.*, on the basis of a chapter added to the *Passio* of St. *Agnes in which Emerentiana is considered her foster sister; she was stoned while still a catechumen, during her sister's funeral in the catacomb (BHL 2527). These events led to the institution of a feast in her honor on 23 January. The 7th-c. Roman itineraries also attest her cult (CCL 175, 306. 319. 326). Emerentiana's body was translated by Pope Paschal I to the basilica of S. Prassede (Duchesne LP 2, 64); Emerentiana is also included in the procession of martyrs in the mosaics of S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna.

AB 102 (1984) 183; BS 4, 1161-1167; LCI 6, 144; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 81-82; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane*, Rome [2]1999, 146.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

EMERITUS (d. after 418). *Donatist bishop of *Carthage and leader of the Donatist cause at the Conference of Carthage of 411. Apparently a lawyer by training. He first came to the fore in 394, when he drew up the decree of the *Primianist majority at the Council of Bagai, which excommunicated the followers of *Maximian. His language was both

ornate and virulent (see Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 19, 22; *De Gestis cum Emerito* 10-11). At the Conference of Carthage in 411 he was one of six bishops who spoke for the Donatists and, with *Petilian of Constantine, he upheld the Donatist cause from start to finish. On this occasion he showed himself a master of procedural tactics and an effective orator, speaking 64 times, often at length, in the first three days of the debate. Deprived, like other Donatist bishops, of his see by order of the imperial government (CTh XVI, 5, 52), he nonetheless remained active around Caesarea (Cherchel). In September 418 *Augustine, visiting that city, met him by chance in the forum and tried to persuade him to accept union with the Catholics. In a tense scene in the cathedral of Caesarea, Emeritus refused, and despite Augustine's exhortations remained to the end firmly attached to Donatist principles (*De Gestis cum Emerito*, 12).

Augustine, *De Gestis cum Emerito* (ed. Petschenig, CSEL 53, 181-196) and *Sermo ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem* (ibid., 167-178); see also *Contra Cresconium* III, 19, 22 (sentence of the Council of Bagai); Monceaux VI, 145-189; S. Lancel, *Actes de la conférence de Carthage en 411*, I, Paris 1972 (SC 194), 208-221 (list of Emeritus's interventions during the conference of Carthage, 208, n. 5); PCBE I, 340-349; P. Langa, *Actas del debate con el donatista Emerito. Introducción, bibliografía y notas*, BAC 34, Madrid 1994, 569-614; S. Lancel, *Emeritum episcopum Donatistarum post conlationem (Ad-)* and *Emeritus* in AugL, II/5-6, Basel 2001, 801-804.

W.H.C. Frend

EMESA

I. City - II. Archaeology.

I. City. Emesa (modern Homs, Hims), on the right side of the Orontes river in a fertile plane, was a crossroads on the passage from the sea to the interior and *Palmyra, as well as a strategic point between *Damascus, *Aleppo and Palmyra. It was part of the Roman province of *Syria, coming under indirect Roman control at the time of Pompey and governed by a vassal king. It was named Emesa under *Domitian (81–96), when it came under direct Roman control. It also became a Roman colony with the typical structures of a city. Under *Theodosius it was attached to the province of Lebanese Phoenicia, of which it was the capital. It was the birthplace of Julia Domna, wife of the emperor *Septimius Severus, Julia Mammaea, and of the emperors *Heliogabalus (218–222) and *Alexander Severus (222–235), under both of whom the city experienced significant development in the first half of the 3rd c. The god Ba'al (Helios-Baal), of whom the emperor Heliogabalus was a priest, was worshiped there under the form of a black rock; the cult spread due to the favor of the imperial family, a temple being built on the Palatine at *Rome.

We know nothing of the Christian origins in Emesa, although the *Liber Pontificalis* (p. 134) says that Pope *Anicetus (154–166) was born there. We know of the teacher Julian who lived at the time of the emperor Numerian (283–284); during *Diocletian's persecution there were some martyrs, including Sylvanus, whom *Eusebius of Caesarea describes as bishop "of the churches around Emesa" (Eusebius, *HE* 8,13,3), and whose episcopate lasted 40 years (Eusebius, *HE* 9,6,1). Bishop Anatolius was present at the councils of *Nicaea (325) and *Antioch (341). During the Arian controversy the bishop was *Eusebius (died before 359), a writer praised by *Jerome for his style (*De vir. ill.* 91). Bishop Mark, under the emperor Julian (d. 363), destroyed a pagan temple and was imprisoned and tortured because he would not rebuild it; the church was turned into a temple of Bacchus (Theodoret, *HE* 3,7; *Chronicon Pasch.*: PG 92, 741B). The city was praised by *Julian for its paganism (*Misopogon* 7,28). In the late 4th c. the bishop was *Nemesius, an important theologian. Also born there was the Byzantine hymnographer *Romanus Melodus (d. after 555), who then moved to *Constantinople. *Simeon the Holy Fool was born and lived at Emesa in the 6th c.; *Leontius of Neapolis wrote his life. The episcopal see depended on the metropolitan of Damascus. When the head of *John the Baptist was found in a nearby cave (452) and was carried into the city, Emesa became an autocephalous ecclesiastical metropolis. After the Council of *Chalcedon (451), there were two Christian communities at Emesa: one *Melkite and the other *monophysite. The Anonymous Piacentine writes: "We arrived at Emesa, where there is the head of St. John the Baptist in a glass container" (46,7). In 969 the head was taken to Constantinople. Emesa was conquered by the Arabs in 637, who turned the church of St. John the Baptist into a mosque, which it still is today. In 1099 it was occupied by the Crusaders.

EAA 3, 326-327; DHGE 15, 397-400; DACL 4, 2723-2730; LTK³ 5, 260-261; Fedalto II, 736; *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, vol. II, Leiden 1971, 409-415; J. Nasrallah, *Saints et évêques d'Émèse (Homs)*: POC 21 (1971) 213-234; R.D. Sallivan, *The Dynasty of Emesa*: ANRW II 8 (1986) 198-219; W.J. Aerts, *Emesa in der Vita Symeonis Sali von Leontios von Neapolis*, in V. Vavřínek (ed.), *From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium*, Prague 1986, 113-116; M. Frey, *Untersuchungen zur Religion und zur Religionspolitik des Kaiser s Elagabal*, Stuttgart 1989; L. Rydén, *Gaza, Emesa and Constantinople: Late Ancient Cities in the Light of Hagiography*, in *Aspects of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium*, Stock-

holm 1993, 13-144; J.-M. Fiey, *Pour un Oriens Christianus novus*, Beirut 1993, 211-214; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monf. 1994, 96-91; W. Bell, *Rome in the East*, London - New York 2000, 33-47 (Emesa).

A. Di Berardino

II. Archaeology. At Emesa is a 5th-6th-c. chapel with a mosaic floor; at Karm el-Arabis a three-aisled church with mosaic floors in geometrical designs, and a necropolis. During the restoration of the orthodox church of St. Elias, traces of wall mosaics were found in the apse. Inscriptions mention a church of St. George and invoke St. John. On the crosses are invocations to the Virgin and the archangels Michael and Gabriel; on one a person is depicted in the middle, others are funerary crosses. In the necropolis was buried a deacon and probably also a bishop with red vestments, as appears from the mosaic that reproduces it, of the Justinianian period (Balty, *Mosaïques*, n. 67, 144), now in the Damascus Museum.

J. Balty, *Mosaïques antiques de Syrie*, Brussels 1977; W. Bell, *Rome in the East*, London - New York 2000, 33-47 (Emesa).

B. Bagatti

ENCOLPION. As its etymology indicates, encolpion (from the Greek ἐν κόλπῳ, "on the bosom") was a general name given to any object worn on the breast, hanging from the neck, by ancient Christians for mainly devotional ends. A direct descendant of the amulets and *bullae* worn by the classical world to ward off evil and disease, the use of encolpia among Christians is documented from at least the 4th c., the time of its earliest literary references (Greg. Nyssa, *V. Macr.*: PG 46, 990; John Chrys., *Hom. XIX ad pop. Antiochenum*: PG 49, 196), but its use must almost certainly go back further, even to earliest antiquity. Like the term's meaning, the form of encolpia varies considerably. Generally small, they sometimes consisted of small containers (boxes, *capsellae*, flasks, etc.) suitable for holding fragments of relics; sometimes, more simply, of round medallions with a hook, round or rectangular plaques, symbolic figures, etc. Particularly widespread from the 5th c. is the encolpion in the form of a cross (pectoral cross), often containing a minuscule relic of the Holy Cross. The materials of these were also quite varied: gold, silver, bronze, lead, stone, ivory, crystal, wood, etc. Given their frequent character of reliquaries, encolpia were often richly decorated with figures from the usual Christian repertoire of symbols and biblical, christological or hagiographical scenes. Also frequent are inscriptions, often containing formulae of invocation. A long list of the many surviving encolpia is given in Wessel.

C. Cecchelli, *La vita di Roma nel Medio Evo*. I.1, Rome 1951-52, 43, 119-124, 128, 156-157; I.2, Rome 1960, 742-744, 916-918, 996-997; K. Wessel, s.v. *Enkolpion*: RBK 2, 152-164 (with ample bibl.).

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

ENCRATISM (from ἐγκράτεια = continence) meant a form of extreme asceticism, which quickly appeared suspect to the early church since it implied a rejection of the goods created by God for the use and service of humanity (1 Tim 4:1-5). This ascetic tendency, which rejected marriage and the consumption of meat, was widespread even before Christianity in *Palestine (Essenes), in *Egypt (Therapeuti) and in the pagan world (ascetic forms assumed from Cynicism and strands of late *Platonism). Such tendencies interested Christianity from the start, sharing as they did its esteem for eschatological virginity and chastity (1 Cor 7), but differing from it by the radicalism of their conceptual premises and by their having become typical of various heterodox currents (*Satornilus, *Marcion, etc.). It is doubtful whether an actual sect of Encratites (Ἐγκρατεῖς, Ἐγκρατηταί, Ἐγκρατῖται, according to different heresiologists) existed, at least at first; there was more a like set of behaviors and ideas, present among various currents more or less heretical or marginal to the Great Church, which rejected marriage, procreation, meat and wine.

According to *Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* I, 28, 1), these different tendencies came together in the doctrine of *Tatian, "patriarch of the Encratites," who gave encratism a more rigorous doctrinal formulation based on the doctrine of Adam's fall and damnation, involving the whole human race and transmitted through procreation, with features added from *Valentinian *gnosis. Encratite or related ideas appear in Syrian Christianity (such as the administration of *baptism only to those who professed complete chastity), just as there are denunciations and refutations of these ideas by various church Fathers (besides Irenaeus, cit., and III, 23, see Clem. Al., *Paed.* II, 2, 33, 1; *Strom.* I, 15, 71, 6; III, 17, 101, 1-103, 1 and passim; VII, 17, 108, 1-2; Hippol., *Ref.* VIII, 20, 1-4; Euseb., *HE* IV, 29; Epiph., *Panar.* 45-46-47, etc.). Precise traces of Encratite ideas are still found in fragments preserved by way of citations (e.g., in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, in the dialogue between Jesus and Salome, cited by Clem. Al., *Strom.* III, 9, 63, 2-66, 1; *Excerpt. ex Theod.* 67, 1-4), and in various passages of the *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* (esp. *Acts of Thomas*,

Acts of Paul, *Acts of John*, etc.), as in the *Gospel of Thomas* discovered at *Nag Hammadî. Toward the end of the 2nd c. an example of moderate orthodox encratism is given by the so-called *Sentences of Sextus*, a compilation of ascetic sayings of pagan origin that had been christianized. Encratic currents, flourishing in the 2nd c., continued in subsequent centuries. According to *Eusebius (*HE* IV, 29, 4-5), the leader of certain 3rd-c. Encratites was a certain Severus, of gnostic tendencies, whose disciples accepted the OT but rejected St. Paul. According to *Epiphanius (*Panar.* 47) there were numerous Encratites in *Phrygia and Pisidia in the 4th c. A certain number of epigraphs, considered as belonging to these groups, have been published, though it is not certain whether the encratism "referred to was actually heretical." In the 4th c., in fact, we see in monastic and ascetic circles generally an ever clearer recovery of ἐγκράτεια, which becomes almost the essential connotation of monastic life, though here and there it continued to arouse suspicions because of the radical forms it could sometimes assume. Various ascetic motifs which, at least formally, closely recall the encratism of the 2nd c. have been recognized specifically in *Messalianism, but even those were, at least in part, recovered by the Great Church.

On the sources for the history of encratism: H. Koch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Askese und des Mönchtums in der alten Kirche*, Tübingen 1933 (first part); F. Bolgiani, *La tradizione eresiologica sull'Encratismo*, I-II, AOT 91, 1956–57; 96, 1961–62. On encratic ascesis: K. Müller, *Die Forderung der Ehelosigkeit für alle Getauften in der alten Kirche*, Tübingen 1927; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, I, Louvain 1958; G. Blond, *L'"hérésie" encratite vers la fin du IV^e siècle*: RecSR 32 (1944) 157-210 (with republication and discussion of the epigraphs published by W.M. Calder and others); E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Rome - Freiburg - Vienna 1959, 183-220; H. Chadwick (ed.), *The Sentences of Sextus*, Cambridge 1959; Id., art. *Enkrateia*: RAC 5 (1962) 343-365; *Atti del Convegno "La tradition de l'Enkrateia,"* Milano 20-23 aprile 1982, Milan 1985; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *L'Epistula Titi discipuli Pauli De dispositione sanctimonii e la tradizione dell'enkrateia*: ANRW II, 25,6 (1988) 4551-4664; Y. Tissot, *L'encratisme des Actes du Thomas*: ANRW II, 25,6 (1988) 4415-4430.

F. Bolgiani

ENCYCLOPEDIA. By the term *encyclopedia* (Gk. ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία) the ancients designated, from the Hellenistic era, the group of disciplines that formed the indispensable basis for the education of the cultured man and, at a higher level, assumed the more specific function of a propaedeutic to the study of philosophy. This group, apart from occasional additions or subtractions, comprised as a rule what would become, over time, the well-known canonical disciplines of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic) and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, music, geometry, astronomy). The attitude of the Fathers toward encyclopedic culture was at various times well-disposed or extremely cautious, according to their different approaches to classical culture in general. Greek *patrology shows significant cases of appreciation and adherence, such as that of *Origen who, in a letter to *Gregory Thaumaturgus, exhorted his friend to put Greek philosophy and ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα at the service of the Christian faith; or of *Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, who according to Eusebius had studied all, or nearly all, of the liberal disciplines.

Above all, it is in Latin patrology that we meet a genuine attempt to reorganize in a Christian sense the system of the disciplines (or liberal arts, by another name) that had first been given comprehensive treatment in Varro's nine *Disciplinarum libri*. If *Lactantius (*Institutiones* III, 25, 1) praised the function of the *disciplinae* as a preparation for philosophy, it was *Augustine who put forward a concrete plan for an adaptation of the Varronian encyclopedia. Of this project, a rough sketch of which can in some sense be traced in the *excursus* on the *disciplinae* contained in book II of *De ordine*, Augustine only succeeded in completing a *Liber de grammatica* (lost, at least in its original version) and six books *De musica* which, though limited to the rhythmic-metrical aspect, are the most prestigious treatise (in dialogue form) on musical aesthetics in all of patristic literature. Also linked to the encyclopedic tradition are the treatises of *Boethius's so-called *quadrivium* (only a *De arithmetica* and a *De musica* remain, based exclusively on Greek sources and with no explicit connection with Augustine and the patristic tradition) and esp. book II of *Cassiodorus's *Institutiones*, a sort of handbook for the use of the monks of Vivarium, which joins a summary treatment of the essential principles of each discipline to a list of books available in their own library. An encyclopedic compendium of great prestige throughout the Middle Ages—extended from the *quadrivium* to other sciences—was that contained in *Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* which, however, along with an ambitious plan of cultural synthesis, reveals clear lacunae due to the general decadence of the period. We cannot speak properly of an encyclopedic culture for the insular culture of the 7th and 8th c., despite the interest of the Venerable *Bede in disciplines such as arithmology, the science of nature and perhaps even music; we must await the 9th c. and the Carolingian Renaissance for the great syntheses of an Augustine, a Boethius, a

Cassiodorus or an Isidore to be thoroughly and definitively included in the cultural development of medieval Christian literature.

Fundamental is the volume of H.I. Marrou, *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris [4]1958 (It. tr. Milan 1994); see also U. Pizzani, *Il filone enciclopedico nella Patristica da S. Agostino a S. Isidoro di Siviglia*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 667-696; Id., *Il filone enciclopedico nel primo secolo d.c.*, in *La storia, la letteratura e l'arte a Roma: da Tiberio a Domiziano*, Mantua 1992, 191-216; Id., *L'enciclopedismo tardoantico e le discipline del quadrivio: prospective metodologiche*, in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, ed. A. Garzya, Naples 1989, 49-69; F. Della Corte, *Agostino e il progetto enciclopedico*, in *L'umanesimo di sant'Agostino*, ed. M. Fabris, Bari 1988, 89-117; A. Tessier, *Il tardo enciclopedismo: alcuni motivi*, in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, I, 3, Rome 1994, 741-756; M. Díaz y Díaz, *Enciclopedismo e sapere cristiano tra tardo-antico e alto Medioevo*, tr. Aldo Granata, Milan 1999; L. Holtz, *Arti liberali ed enciclopedismo da Cassiodoro a Alcuino*, in *Giornate filologiche "Francesco Della Corte,"* II, Genoa 2001, 213-230; G. Polara, *L'enciclopedismo di Cassiodoro dai "Chronica" al "De ortographia,"* in ibid., 187-205; CPPM III/A, 11-14.

U. Pizzani

ENDELECHIUS (4th-5th c.). Severus Sanctus Endelechius, identifiable with *Paulinus of Nola's friend of that name (epist. 28, 6), was a Gallo-Roman rhetor active at *Rome in 395. Under his name an 11th-c. manuscript (now lost) transmits an amoeba-poem of 132 verses in 33 (number alluding to the years of Christ's life) Asclepiadean strophes under the title *De mortibus boum*, later changed to *De virtute signi crucis Domini*. It is a dialogue between three cowherds: Egon and Bucolus lament that a terrible plague of livestock (probably that of 386), after having devastated *Pannonia, Illyricum and the region of the *Belgae*, ravaged their district (probably *Gaul) and destroyed Bucolus's herd; he pathetically describes the effect of the disease upon his unhappy animals. Bucolus then asks Tityrus, who has arrived with a miraculously unharmed herd, to say what god has protected it. To this question Tityrus replies that his only remedy against the plague was the sign of the *cross of Christ, the god "magnis qui colitur solus in urbibus" (v. 106), impressed on the animals' foreheads. The sign of the cross and *prayer are efficacious, if done with *faith. Altars are not needed, only a pure heart. The two cowherds convert to Christ on the spot, and are ready to go with Tityrus to the nearby city to venerate the god whose "signum quo vis morbida vincitur" (v. 132) is also proclaimed as salutary for human beings.

The bucolic poem, which represents an important segment of Virgil's prodigious *Fortleben*, is characterized by the crossing of genres; it recalls, in fact, both the first *Eclogue* and the third book of the *Georgics* (one thinks of the famous description of the plague that afflicted the cattle in the mountainous province of Noricum), and Horace, though the meter has been changed.

CPL 1456. *Editions:* PL 19, 797-800; F. Buecheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, 1, 2, Leipzig 1906 (repr. Amsterdam 1972), 334-339; D. Korzeniewsky, *Hirtengedichte aus spätrömischer und karolingischer Zeit*, Darmstadt 1976 (text with Ger. tr. and comm.). *Studies:* C. Weyman, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, Munich 1926 (repr. Hildesheim 1975) 103-110; W. Schmid, *Tityrus christianus. Probleme religiöser Hirtendichtung an der Wende vom vierten zum fünften Jahrhundert*: RhM 96 (1953) 101-165 (rev. and expanded ed. in K. Garber, *Europäische Bukolik und Georgik*, Darmstadt 1976, 44-121); F. Corsaro, *L'autore del* De mortibus boum, *Paolino da Nola e la politica religiosa di Teodosio*: Orpheus 22 (1975) 3-26; T. Alimonti, *Struttura, ideologia ed imitazione virgiliana nel "De mortibus boum" di Endelechio*, Turin 1976; Id., *Endelechio*: Enciclopedia Virgiliana, II, Rome 1985, 219-220; J. Fontaine, *La conversion du chritianisme à la culture antique: la lecture chrétienne de l'univers bucolique de Virgile*: BAGB 37 (1978) 50-75 (repr. in *Études sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence*, Paris 1980); C.G. van Leijenhorst, *Endelechius'* De mortibus boum: Hermeneus 51 (1979) 140-147; M. Barton, *Spätantike Bukolik zwischen paganer Tradition und christlicher Verkündigung. Das Carmen de mortibus boum des Endelechius*, Trier 2000.

A.V. Nazzaro

ENHYPOSTASIS. The word ἐνυπόστασις means both "actual existence" and "independent existence" (εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτόν) (Lampe 485-486). While in the first sense we encounter it as a theological term from the 4th c. on (see Epiph., *Anc.* 77-78), in the second it occurs in Byzantine authors exploring the Chalcedonian distinction between φύσις and ὑπόστασις. *Leontius of *Byzantium and, even more exactly, *Leontius of Jerusalem after him, develop the concept to demonstrate against *Nestorians and *monophysites that every concrete nature, while always being in a hypostasis, does not necessarily exist in its own hypostasis (ἰδιουπόστατος) (Lampe 666). Hence in Christ the hypostasis of the Logos is both the subject of the properties of his human nature and the principle of subsistence of this nature, thus uniting the human properties with the divine properties and distinguishing that man from all others.

J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes*, III, Paris 1928, 151-159; H.A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, I, Cambridge, MA 1964, 414ff.; S. Otto, *Person u. Subsistenz*, Munich 1968; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* II/2 (1989), 63-69, 204-208; H.L. Müller, *Enhypostasie*: LTK[3] 3, 673-674; C. Markschies, *Enhypostasis*: RGG[4] 2, 1315-1316.

B. Studer

ENNODIUS (474–521). Latin Christian writer, born at *Arles in 474 to noble parents. Orphaned, he completed his studies in N Italy, living with an aunt at Pavia. Beginning an ecclesiastical career, he worked with Bishop *Epiphanius of Pavia and was in *Rome in 502 with Bishop *Lawrence of Milan at the "synod of the palm"; in 515 and 517, now bishop of Pavia, he was sent by Pope *Hormisdas to the emperor *Anastasius at *Constantinople to try to end the *Acacian schism. Died 521.

A transitional figure, he had to face the problem posed by the Greco-Roman cultural heritage: to deny it or to incorporate it into the new Christian vision. Linguistic affectations and pagan-Christian *contaminatio* are present in his 28 *Dictiones*, scholastic exercises on sacred and profane subjects, and two books of *Carmina*. We have a sort of moral portrait of the author in his 297 *Letters*, both because of the importance of the recipients and because, despite frequent vacuity of form and content, a vivid sense of spirituality pervades them at times. Still more intimate is the autobiographical *Eucharisticum de vita sua*, which modestly echoes *Augustine's *Confessiones*, also promising a *conversio* from profane to sacred studies. The need for a Christian culture to counter the study of the classics is confirmed in the *Paraenesis didascalica*, a sort of *ratio studiorum* in prose mixed with verse. Historically important is the *Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico*, which transcends biographical or episodic interest to become a symptom and statement of ideological position.

The problem of the impact of the two cultures, pagan and Christian, resolved by a partial absorption of the former into the latter, had now been replaced by that of the preservation of the new cultural synthesis and the addition to it of the fresh energies of the barbarians. Ennodius intuited the importance of the entry of the Germanic peoples into the history of the West, as we see from the *Panegyricus* which, though a precious historical source, is also the expression of an illusion of Ennodius: he believed a Romano-Gothic syncretism was possible and saw in *Theodoric a defender of civilization, a man of Providence.

Ennodius's participation in ecclesiastical affairs is known through his *Libellus adversus eos qui contra Synodum praesumpserunt*, composed to refute the accusations, contained in a violent anonymous pamphlet, against Symmachus and the work of the "synod of the palm." In it, he combines the ardor of the orator with the subtlety of the theologian and the skill of the rhetor. With the *Vita Epiphani* and the *Vita beati Antoni*, Ennodius makes a dignified entry into early medieval hagiography, indeed he brings to it a new note of cultural commitment and critical sense which, by almost totally excluding the marvelous (rampant in the devotional literature of the time), brings the holy closer to the more accessible and imitable human dimensions. Ennodius's concern for church unity is clear from his antimonophysite *Dictio VI*, while his position on semipelagianism, to which he alludes in a letter to *Constantius and some passages of the *Eucharisticum*, is disputed.

CPL 1487-1503; PL 63, 14-464; A. Dubois, *La latinité d'Ennodius*, Paris 1903; G.M. Cook, *The Life of S. Epiphanius by Ennodius*, Washington, D.C. 1942; L. Navarra, *Ennodio e la "facies" storico-culturale del suo tempo*, Cassino 1974; Id., *Contributo storico di Ennodio*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 315-342; M. Cesa, *Ennodio: Vita del beatissimo Epifanio vescovo della Chiesa pavese*, Como 1988; B. Marotta Mannino, *La "Vita Antoni" di Ennodio fra tradizione classica e cristiana*: Orpheus 10 (1989) 335-358; M. Carini, *Due città per un poeta. Saggio su Magno Felice Ennodio*, Catania 1989; S.A.H. Kennell, *Ennodius and the Pagan Gods*: Athenaeum 80 (1992) 236-242; W.D. Lebek, *Deklamation und Dichtung in der "Dictio Ennodi diaconi quando de Roma rediit,"* in *Festschr. A. Dihle*, Göttingen 1993, 264-299; Ch. Rohr, *Der Theoderich-Panegyricus des Ennodius*, Hannover 1995 (MGH, Studien und Texte 12); S.A.H. Kennell, *Magnus Felix Ennodius: A Gentleman of the Church*, Ann Arbor 2000; S. Rota (ed.), *M.F. Ennodio. Panegirico del Clementissimo re Teoderico (Op. 1)*, Rome 2002.

L. Navarra

ENTERTAINMENTS

I. Mime - II. Pantomime and other entertainments - III. Judgment of the Fathers - IV. Attempts at reform.

I. Mime. The mime is defined as follows: *sermonis cuiuslibet imitatio et motus sine reverentia vel factorum et dictorum turpium cum lascivia imitatio,* "the imitation of any speech and movement without reverence even of deeds and the imitation of scandalous statements with playfulness/lewdness" (Diomedes, *Gramm. lat.*, ed. Keil III, 491). The actor, μῖμος, *mimus*, often imitated with vulgar gestures (*mimica levitas*) (Donatus, *Ad Verg. Aen.* V, 64) scenes from daily life. The actors were different, with a leader (the archmime); they were joined together in a society (*collegium*, *sodalitas*); they did not wear masks. A typical personage was the Roman mime, *stupidus calvus* (i.e., a senseless bald man), who wore the *centuculus* (i.e., a mime's garment) (Apul., *Apol.* XIII), a waistcoat with colored patches (Arlecchino), a short tunic and a tall, pointy cap. He performed the role of the adulterer and the mime of adultery, that of the priest and the mime-parity: in these representations, he was the protagonist. Moreover, he appears as the shaven jester, a victim in the

mimes of adultery, and in the mime of the religious parody he appears immersed in baptismal water. The actresses present in the mime were from a lower social condition and of dubious reputation; they went around with their heads uncovered with wavy and curly hair (John Chrys., *C. ludos et theatra*, 2: PG 56, 267), they made obscene jokes with gentle gestures or sang wicked songs (John Chrys., *In Iohan. hom.* 18: PG 59, 120).

The structural elements of the mime were the dance, vulgar songs or crude chants, the choir of mixed voices, instrumental music with various types of instruments. The text was the point of departure for the representation and constituted the plot, although the remainder was improvised. At the beginning, as an opening act, the plot (*fabula*) was read, while a mime exhorted to benevolence; there was also a person in charge of getting applause from the audience (Libanius, *Or.* 41,7). There existed *mimographi* (i.e., composers of mimes) (*Jerome, *Ep.* 54,15: PL 22, 558). With respect to the mime, nothing else is known aside from what the Fathers said in polemic against them.

According to Reich, the mime could be classified in various genres: the mime of daily or real life, called "biological," the mime of the topic taken from mythology, and therefore "mythological." Moreover, the mime genre was recurrent in the exhibitions during the nuptial and nonnuptial feasts such as those convivial feasts (with ethereal, acrobatic and other types of dances) or feasts organized by the state or during the intermissions of the races held at the hippodrome or in the orchestra exhibited at the theater (Thetis mime or the mime in the water, *John Chrys., *In Matth. hom.* 7,6-8: PG 57, 79-82) or lastly in parody of the Christian mysteries, especially *baptism, like the one dating back to the time of *Diocletian at *Alexandria (Socr., *HE* I, 6: PG 67, 52; Arnob., *Adv. nat.*: PL 5, 271: *de sacris semper eorum movet risus*; Greg. Naz., *Apol. or.* 11,84: PG 35, 489). This type of mime flourished during the period of Arianism: "in the same theaters the Christian religion was mocked" (Socr., *HE* I, 6: PG 67, 51). Baptism and martyrdom were preferred themes; for this reason *Augustine set forth the problem of the validity of a baptism conferred on stage: *an iocans . . . sicut in mimo,* "whether joking . . . just as in the mime" (*De bapt.* VII, 53: PL 43, 242).

II. Pantomime and other entertainments. The structural elements of the pantomime were as follows: actor pantomime (actor-dancer, a mute person, who expressed himself by dancing out in the manner of a mime with musical accompaniment the ideas sung by the chorus); the chorus that sang the legend, *fabulae salticae* (dancing songs) with female or mixed voices; a musical instrument; the appearances; and lastly, the themes, which were mythological, especially the theme of adultery.

During the imperial era the entertainments in the amphitheater, the circus and the hippodrome were common. In the amphitheater, various types of entertainments were carried out: gladiatorial fights (*ludi gladiatori*); fights waged on horseback by horsemen carrying long lances; battles between the *essedarii* (war-chariot fighters), and lastly the *venationes* (the hunting shows). The Christian masses, along with the pagans, attended the amphitheaters (Emperor *Honorius in 404 sanctioned its demise, which had already largely occurred). In the circus and in the hippodrome, *ludi circenses* (i.e., circus games) and horse races took place; the latter were well known by Christians (John Chrys., *De Lazaro concio* VII, 1: PG 48, 1045). In Late Antique *Rome and *Constantinople, the various *factiones* of the circus (i.e., the company of persons acting together to run the circus) were famous, which often also had an influence on the political and social life of the city.

III. Judgment of the Fathers. The attitude of the Fathers varied according to the types of entertainments. *Clement of Alexandria considered the exhibitions and the gymnastic exercises something admirable, if practiced with moderation (*Paed.* III, 10: SC 158, 49), although he condemned the professional ethics of some entertainers. The stadium and the theater, however, were judged by some as "the cathedra of pestilence" (*Paed.* III, 11: SC 158, 76-77). *Tertullian regarded athletic games as idolatrous (*De spect.* 11,1-3: CCL 1, 240-243); some (such as boxing and wrestling) are violent while others are useless (*De spect.* 18,1-3: CCL 1, 243).

Their judgments on the circus and the amphitheater were more severe, inasmuch as watching a man be killed is almost like killing him yourself (Athenag., *Legat.* 24,4-5; Theoph. Ant., *Ad Antol.* 3,15: SC 20, 235). For Tertullian the circus and the amphitheater events were idolatrous manifestations (*De spect.* 7,2: CCL 1, 146-150) because they were connected to the pagan cult (the worship of the sun). *Cyprian wrote, "What show is there without an idol? What game without a sacrifice?" (*De spect.* 4: PL 4, 813). For *Augustine, the gladiators were public sinners (*De fide et op.* 18,33: PL 40, 220).

With respect to the theatrical entertainments, the Fathers prohibited catechumens from attending them because of their pagan, mythological, perverse and luxurious character; the actor is a person pos-

sessed. A trace of this prohibition probably also remains in the baptismal formulas (H. Waszink, *Pompa diaboli*: VChr 1 [1947] 13-41). Such entertainments were immoral (Clem. of Alex., *Paed.* III, 11: SC 108, 76, 77). To delight in the flutist, choirs, dances, Egyptian rattlesnakes, cymbals and timbales is disorderly and foolish (*Paed.* II, 4: SC 108-140). *Theophilus of Antioch condemned anthropophagia (i.e., cannibalism) (Thyestes and Atreus) and adulteries among the gods (*Ad Autol.* 3,15: SC 20, 235). For Tertullian, religious motives (idolatry) prevent a Christian from attending them in light of their baptismal promises (*De spect.* 13-14) and for moral reasons (*De spect.* 15 and 17: CCL 1, 288-289). For *Cyprian, the tragedy, *cothurnus*, represented parracides, incests and mimes (*Ad Donat.* 8: CCL 1, 290ff.). It is a scandal for the catechumens to see the same men filling the churches on Christian feast days and the theaters on pagan feast days (Aug., *De cat. rud.* 25,48: CCL 46, 172). *Basil of Caesarea warns the Christians not to pay attention to the entertainments and dissolute theatrical songs of charlatans (*In Hex. hom.* 4: SC 26, 80). *John Chrysostom recalls in this regard their baptismal promises that were incompatible with the "Satanic exhibition" (*In Iohan. hom.* 1,4: PG 59, 28-29); the average 4th-c. Christian, Chrysostom laments, gives less attention to Christ than they do to a pantomime (*In Iohan. hom.* 17,4: PG 59, 112): entertainments, musical lewdness, Satanic songs are placed by young people before spiritual songs (Id., *In ep. ad Cor. hom.* 48,3: PG 58, 491). John Chrysostom prohibited transgressors from receiving the *sacraments (*In Matth. hom.* 17,5-6: PG 56, 269).

Parents and educators should keep children far from theaters so that their children do not get molested (homosexuality) (*In Matth. hom.* 59,7: PG 58, 584). Adultery is not only the union of bodies, but it is also an immodest look (*De poen. hom.* 6,2: PG 49, 315). Actors are condemned for their conduct, looks and precious garments (*In Matth. hom.* 58,4: PG 58, 645). Moreover, young actors are regarded as suspect, because they are corrupt and perverted (*In ep. I ad Cor. hom.* 12,5: PG 61, 102). The theater is a loss of time, it habituates one to an unreal life, it is a waste of money, robbery from the poor, and it causes the destruction of marriages. Christians also bring to church theatrical customs: rude voices, sensuous movements of the body, clapping of the hands, stomping of the feet and immodest looks. They know the songs of the theater, but not the Psalms; the names of horses, but they are unable to identify which and how many letters the apostle *Paul wrote (*In illus Salutate Prisc.* 1,1: PG 51, 188). The judgment of the Fathers with respect to the theater is imperious: the theater ought to be condemned on the basis of the aforementioned reasons. It was untimely, however, for the Fathers to imagine a type of theater that was different from the pagan one that existed at that time; the passage to a Christian theater would demand its time, precisely the one necessary to later be transferred, through the dramatic homily, to the medieval liturgical drama.

IV. Attempts at reform. The Fathers committed themselves to offering new entertainments: the beauties of nature, the wonders of God (*mirabilia Dei*) contained in the *Scriptures, the contemplation of the spirit in its war against the passions, the ardent expectation of the ultimate realities, the vision in heaven of God: *Spectaculum . . . Deus ipse est*, "God himself is the show" (Aug., *En. in Ps.* 146,4: CCL 40, 2124). On the pastoral level, they valued in this regard the *liturgical forms*, like the singing of the Psalms: in all the churches, Christians sang with loud voices hymns and psalms to God (Constant., *Or. ad sanct. coet.* 12: PG 20, 1271; Basil., *Ep.* 107,3: PG 32, 763). In the 4th c., at *Edessa, responsorial psalmody and antiphonal song began, which was also practiced by John Chrysostom at Constantinople in the anti-Arian processions (Socr., *HE* VI, 8: PG 67, 689). Regarding hymns, St. *Ephrem in the 4th c. inserted orthodox words into the heretical songs (D. Jeannin, *Mélodies*, I, Paris 1923, 146); such hymns reached *Gaul from *Byzantium through *Rome and *Milan (Aug., *Conf.* IX, 7). Other liturgical forms include the visits to the monasteries: outside the city, amid nature, and listening to the singing of the Psalms; the Christian feasts: to Sunday was added Christmas, Epiphany and Easter.

For the Fathers, however, "every day is a feast day"; they intended thereby to break the connection between a feast day and a set day, which was a custom proper to the pagans. Another liturgical form that provided a substitution was the cult of the *martyrs: for the neophytes, the feasts of the martyrs were the compensation for their renunciation of the pagan entertainments and feasts (Greg. Nyss., *Vita S. Gregorii Thaum.*: PG 46, 954). The feasts of the martyrs were developed for the most part according to the following schema: a pilgrimage to the *martyrion* (i.e., a church that contains the relics of martyrs, marking the site of a martyr's grave) on the day of the vigil (often Sunday), the liturgy of the word with one or more *panegyrics (for the presence of the bishops) on the martyr, Eucharistic liturgy, followed by the agape (at times with abuses): everything was done amidst flowers, lights, drapes. The Fathers re-

buked excesses of songs and dances, esp. in front of and at times inside the *martyrion*, intemperance in drinking and eating were the worthy object of repeated rebukes by the Fathers. Despite these reservations, on the whole, martyr feasts turned out to have been simultaneously popular and religiously appropriate. In the cult of the martyrs the translation of the relics reentered, at times at night, with phantasmagories (i.e., an exhibition of optical illusions produced with fire) of lights, even on the sea: on the occasion of the reception of the relics of St. Phoca, John Chrysostom exclaimed, "For the second time we make of the sea a church with torches, bathed with fire and fillings of flames with water" (*De s. Hierom. Phoca* 1: PG 50, 699), and in another circumstance, "The torchlight procession gave the impression of a river of fire" (*Dicta postquam reliquiae, hom.* 2,1: PG 63, 468-469). It was the spiritual Christian feast that buried the pagan feast. In the context of a martyrial feast, John Chrysostom, in the suburb of *Antioch, Daphne, would say, "Behold the suburb of the heavenly Jerusalem; behold spiritual Daphne!" (*In s. Iulianum martyrem*: PG 50, 672).

Lastly, the commitment of the Fathers was noteworthy with respect to music; for them, the musical instrument of preference was the human tongue. They generally prohibited in the worship service the use of string and wind instruments (Chrysostom allowed for the reed-pipe [tibia], lyre and bagpipes). In the liturgy, the lyre was perhaps allowed. Earsplitting instruments, however, were prohibited because, in addition to arousing the emotions, they recalled the ambience found in the theater, circus and the pagan cults (in the cult for Cybele and Isis, loud music was played to drive out evil spirits) and pagan weddings. The Fathers moved in this direction to offer Christians "new entertainments."

Imperial and canonical legislation intervened in order to prohibit certain entertainments, but not always with success. *Constantine abolished the gladiatorial games (anno 325; CTh XV, 12,1), and the other emperors did likewise from 357 to 397. Later, they took measures against the theater (CTh XV, 5,7). The church prohibited church officials from attending the games during wedding ceremonies (Council of *Laodicea 380: can. 53); actors were not admitted to baptism, and Christian actors were denied communion (*Elvira: can. 62; Council of *Arles I: can. 4 and 5; 397: can. 35).

Sources: works of the Fathers, especially John Chrysostom, PG 47-64; Tertullian, *De spectaculis*, ed. E. Castorina, Florence 1961; CCL 1, 227-253; M. Bonaria, *Mimorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, I-II, Genoa 1955.

Studies: H. Reich, *Der Mimus*, I-II, Berlin 1903; L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, II, Leipzig [8]1910 (Eng. tr. 1907, repr. 1969); F.J. Dölger, Sol Salutis, *Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum*, Munich 1930; J. Quasten, *Musik und Gesang in der heidnischen Antike und christlichen Frühzeit*, Münster 1930; Th. Gérold, *Les Pères, l'Église et la musique*, Paris 1931; C. Hog, *Les rapports de la musique chrétienne et de la musique de l'antiquité classique*: Byzantion 26 (1956) 383-412. On entertainment in Late Antiquity: *Enciclopedia dello Spettacolo*, I-IX, Rome 1954–62; updated volumes: 1955–65; H. Jürgens, *Pompa diaboli. Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater*, Stuttgart 1972; W. Weismann, *Kirche und Schauspiele. Die Schauspiele im Urteil der lateinischen Kirchenväter unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Augustin*, Würzburg 1972; O. Pasquato, *Gli spettacoli in S. Giovanni Crisostomo. Paganesimo e cristianesimo ad Antiochia e Costantinopoli nel IV secolo*, Rome 1976, 97-207; O.G. Brockett, *Storia del teatro. Dal dramma sacro dell'antico Egitto agli esperimenti degli anni ottanta*, Venice 1988, 17-84 (Greek and Roman theater); M. Carlson, *Teorie del teatro. Panorama storico e critico*, Bologna 1997, 43-51 (Roman and late classical theory); J.R. Brown (ed.), *Storia del teatro*, Bologna 1998, 25-59 (Greek theater, by D. Wiles); 61-104 (Theater in Roman and Christian Europe, by L. du S. Read); F. Doglio, *Teatro*, in F. Lever et al. (ed.), *La comunicazione. Il dizionario di scienze e tecniche*, Rome 2002, 1115-1122 (1115-1119: history); T. Lewicki, *Circo*, ibid, 214-215 (214: history); L. D'Abbicco, *Mimo*, ibid., 759-760; F.E. Consolino, *Tertulliano e gli atleti all'inferno*, in *Ad contemplandam sapientiam*, Studi in memoria di S. Leanza, Soveria Mannelli 2004, 163-170.

O. Pasquato

ENTRY of JESUS into JERUSALEM (iconography). Though this representation took its inspiration from the Gospels (Mt 21:6-9; Mk 11:4-11; Lk 19:32-38; Jn 12:14-16), it is actually limited to the final moment of the story (the apostles never appear searching for the mule and leading it to the Lord). This scene entered into the repertory of Christian art beginning in the 4th c., together with the image of *Christus Rex* in contrast to the image of the emperor. Even the iconography is modeled on the *Adventus* of the emperor in *Rome or in some other great city (e.g., Rome: the Arch of Constantine), but substituting the chariot of the emperor with a donkey that proceeds from the left toward the right. The representation consists of many elements: Christ on the donkey with a tunic and pallium, making the gesture of speech (recently interpreted as the sign of the Ogdoad); a figure in smaller size in a sleeved tunic with or without a girdle, who extends his mantle in front of the donkey (e.g., Ws 212,2; 92,2); the crowd that acclaims Christ while waving palm branches (e.g., Ws 141,1; 230,6); apostles (e.g., Ws 225,1; 92,2); a background of city walls (e.g., Ws 230,6). Sometimes there appears between the legs of the donkey a colt scampering along (Mt 21:5) (e.g., Ws 235,5; Dinkler, fig. 5).

Sometimes between the branches of the tree there appears the shape of a figure in smaller size

(e.g., Ws 235,5; 13). Some consider this figure to be Zacchaeus (von Sybel, Becker, Ws, Bovini), who, since he was of a small stature, climbed a sycamore tree in order to be present at Christ's arrival in Jericho. This episode, which, in Luke's narrative (Lk 19:1-6), precedes the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem, is translated into iconography by the presence of this small figure among the tree branches, and therefore, by a fusion of the two scenes. Others (Dinkler) hold that it represents the Hebrews ready to cut the tree branches that would be extended as Christ passed by, according to Matthew's account (Mt 21:1-11); thus, there is no contamination between the two scenes. Still others (Nicoletti, Bisconti, Cristini) hold that the fact of contamination can be concluded only in those cases in which Christ speaks to the figure between the branches, as is probably the case on the sarcophagus of Berja (Ws 151,2) or on a tile of the *cathedra* of Maximian (Volbach, n. 140). On the so-called sarcophagi of Bethseda (the most ancient of these is the Vat. 125; it can be dated to the last quarter of the 4th c.: Ws 230,6) the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem is always preceded by the call of Zacchaeus, which has independent importance and is portrayed with many details: crowds, wreathes, palms, city gates. Zacchaeus also appears sometimes by himself, portrayed among tree branches, as on a fragment of a sarcophagus of Arles (Dinkler, fig. 35) and in an ivory diptych of the Castello Sforzesco of Milan (Volbach, n. 111).

The scene was unknown in 4th-c. painting. Some think that there is one example in the cemetery of the Vigna Cassia in Syracuse, but the present condition of the painting does not allow us to confirm this. The scene appears in a fresco (first half of the 5th c.) in a hypogeum in S. Maria in Stelle (Verona). The representation of the entrance into Jerusalem reoccurs on ivory objects in Milan, Museo del Duomo (diptych, 5th c.) (Volbach, n. 119); in *Ravenna, Museo Arcivescovile (*cathedra* of *Maximian, mid-5th c.) (Volbach, n. 140); in miniatures of the 6th and 7th c., such as the *codex* of Rabbula (Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, pl. 11b), of Rossano (Muñoz, pl. 2), *Corpus Christi College, ms. 286* (Wormald, pl. 4).

LCI I, 593f.; E. Becker, *Einzug in Jerusalem: Strenna Buliciana*, Zagabriae-Aspalathi 1924, 337f.; Ws 310f.; E. Dinkler, *Der Einzug in Jerusalem. Ikonographische Untersuchungen in Anschluss an einem bisher unbekannten Sarkophagfragment*, mit einem epigr. Beit. v. H. Brandenburg, Opladen 1970; A. Muñoz, *Codex Purpureus Rossanensis e il frammento della Sinope*, Rome 1907; L. von Sybel, *Christliche Antike, Einführung in die altchristliche Kunst,* 2 vols., Marburg 1906-1909; F. Wormald, *The Miniatures in the Gospels of St. Augustine (Corpus Christi College, ms. 286)*, Cambridge 1954; *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*. Erster Band: *Rom und Ostia*, F.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg (eds.), Wiesbaden 1967; W. Dorigo, *L'ipogeo di S. Maria in Stelle in Val Padana (Verona)*, in *Saggi di Storia dell'arte* 6, 1968, 9f.; J.M.C. Toynbee, *The Early Christian Paintings at Santa Maria in Stelle near Verona*, in *Kyriakon*. Festschr. J. Quasten 2, Münster 1970, 648f.; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica e i suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei monumenti*, Bari 1973; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und der frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz ³1976; A. Nicoletti, *I sarcofagi di Bethesda*, Milan 1981; F. Bisconti, *La chiamata di Zaccheo (Lc 19,1-10): riflessioni patristiche e traduzioni figurate*: Bessarione 6 (1988) 89-104; TIP 200-201, 307-308.

D. Calcagnini Carletti

EPHESUS

I. Historical notes - II. Councils.

I. Historical notes. Ephesus, a Lydian city at the mouth of the present-day Cayster river on the Aegean coast, recorded by all ancient geographers (see Ptol., V, 2; Strab., XIV, 1, 20ff.; Plin., *Nat. Hist.* V, 29, 115), was of very ancient origin (legendary foundation by Amazons). From the establishment of the province of Asia, Ephesus was its metropolis and seat of the governor: even after its division into seven lesser provinces under *Diocletian, Ephesus remained capital of the most important, *Asia proconsularis*. A city teeming with productive activity and commercial traffic, religious life (the local temple of Artemis was one of the wonders of the world) and cultural life (seat of the *Mouseion*, a sort of academy of medicine, as well as the famous library of Celsus), it was among the most flourishing centers of Christian propagation and one of the most important episcopal sees of the East. One of the best-known "Pauline cities" (Acts 18 and 19), held to be the home of the aged St. *John (a church was erected on the supposed site of his tomb in the time of *Justinian), it was one of the "seven churches" of the Apocalypse. Later traditions had it that the Virgin *Mary and *Mary Magdalene also died there; its people received a letter from *Ignatius of Antioch, written at *Smyrna while being taken prisoner to *Rome. Much frequented by pilgrims, it was the burial place of the so-called *seven sleepers, young men who—according to legend—went to sleep in a cave where they had sought refuge during *Decius's persecution and awoke two centuries later at the time of *Theodosius II (H. Leclerq: DACL 15, 1251-1261). With the creation by Diocletian of the diocese of Asia, of which it was capital, it exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the diocese's 11 provinces, a jurisdiction recognized by the councils of *Nicaea (can. 6) and *Constantinople (can. 2) in 381, when it had 39 suffragans.

Bishops (note that at the Council of Chalcedon

[451] Leontius of Magnesia declared that until then Ephesus had had 27 bishops, only some 15 of whom are known to us): Timothy, John I, Onesimus (martyr under Trajan), *Polycrates, *Apollonius, Isaac, Menophans (at Nicaea), Eventius (Macedonian), Menophans II, Antoninus (ca. 400), Heraclides (appointed by *John Chrysostom and deposed by *Theophilus of Alexandria: Socr., *HE* VI, 17), Castinus, Memnon (431), Basil (440), Bassianus (446–451), Stephen, John II, Paul (monophysite), Aetherius (monophysite), Hypatius, Andrew, Rufinus, Procopius, Eutropius, Abraham, Rufinus, Theodore, Stephen.

H. Burchner, *Ephesos*: PWK V, 2, 2772-2822; P. Romanelli, *Ephesus*: Diz. epigr. 2, 3, 1961, 2110-2127; R. Janin, *Ephesus*: DHGE 15, 554-561; W.M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches and Their Place in the Plan of the Apocalypse*, London 1904, 210-250; R. Tonneau, *Éphèse au temps de saint Paul*: RBi 38 (1929) 5-34 and 321-363; D. Knibbe - W. Alzinger, *Ephesos von Beginn der römische Herrschaft in Kleinasien bis zum Ende der Principatszeit*, ANRW II, 7; 2 (1980) 748-830; Fedalto 1, 113-114; V. Conti, *Paolo ad Efeso*: RivBib 37 (1989) 283-303; M. Günther, *Die Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Ephesus*, Frankfurt a. M. 1995; *Efeso paleocristiana e bizantina / Frühchristlicher und byzantinischer Ephesos*, ed. R. Pillinger - H.H. Reinhardt - J. Gunhild, Vienna 1999.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Councils. *400*. A local council meeting at *Constantinople between 399 and 400 under the presidency of John Chrysostom had appointed a three-man commission to examine various charges against Bishop Antoninus of Ephesus. He died before the commission had deliberated and, at the request of the local clergy, Chrysostom presided over a council of ca. 70 Asiatic bishops at Ephesus, which elected the deacon Heraclides as his successor. Provisions were taken against simoniacal elections and six bishops found guilty of this crime were deposed and replaced.

431. The Council of Ephesus, the third ecumenical council, was called by Emperor *Theodosius II at the request of Patriarch *Nestorius of Constantinople. Letters of convocation were sent on 19 November 430 to all the metropolitans of the Eastern empire and a few Western bishops: the council was indicated at Ephesus for Pentecost 431. It was to resolve the difficulties caused by the teaching of *Nestorius who, in harmony with the dictates of Antiochene Christology, did not agree that Mary should be called Mother of God (**Theotokos*) and had consequently aroused the reaction of *Cyril of Alexandria and the condemnation of *Celestine of Rome. Pentecost 431 fell on 7 June. On this date many bishops were still absent, including the Eastern bishops (i.e., of the diocese of the East), who were mostly of an Antiochene doctrinal cast and hence favorable to Nestorius. When they were known to be within a few days' journey of Ephesus, Cyril forestalled them and convoked the council for 22 June in the great church of Ephesus, dedicated to Mary. The majority of the bishops present—about 200—were hostile to Nestorius: among them were Cyril with some 50 Egyptian bishops, *Memnon of Ephesus with many bishops from Asia Minor, who resented the claim of the patriarch of Constantinople to primacy over them, and *Juvenal of Jerusalem with some Palestinian bishops. They started work despite the protests of the *comes* *Candidianus, the imperial official seconded to the council, who objected to the irregularity of the proceedings and in vain proposed to wait for the latecomers.

In just one session, after the reading of the Nicene Creed of 325 and of ample evidence relating to the controversy, including Cyril's 12 anathemata, the council approved Cyril's texts and the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius, who had refused to attend the proceedings. He was charged with this refusal and with his impious preaching. The Eastern bishops arrived on 24 June and, told what had happened, met under the presidency of *John of Antioch: they complained about the irregularity of the proceedings, stressed the dangers of *Apollinarianism and *Arianism which they saw in Cyril's anathemata, and declared Cyril and Memnon condemned and deposed. While they were awaiting Theodosius's decisions on all these events, Pope Celestine's delegates Arcadius, Proiettus and Philip arrived extremely late, having been ordered to conform with Cyril. Cyril reconvened the council and, at the sessions of 10 and 11 July, the Roman delegates approved all the decisions taken against Nestorius. At two subsequent sessions (16 and 17 July), the bishops meeting around Cyril and Memnon condemned John of Antioch and 34 other Eastern bishops and declared them deposed. Two final sessions, on 22 and 31 July, dealt mostly with secondary questions; at the session of 22 July the council laid down that from then on, no other formula of faith would be admitted than the Nicene Creed of 325. In the first days of August Theodosius's reply reached Ephesus: he approved the deposition of all three bishops—Nestorius, Cyril and Memnon—rejected all the other decisions and declared the council dissolved. There followed a period of confused and futile attempts at compromise during which Cyril multiplied pressure on the court in his favor, while Nestorius renounced his episcopal see and withdrew to a monastery near Antioch. A discussion at Chalcedon between delegates of the two parties bore no fruit

with regard to the 12 anathemata, the point of greatest friction between Alexandrians and the Eastern bishops. Theodosius then declared the council definitively closed and authorized the bishops still at Ephesus to return to their sees, with the exception of Cyril. But he, by the time Theodosius's letter reached Ephesus, had already left for Alexandria, where he was welcomed triumphantly.

Ca. 434 and ca. 447. The 11th session of the Council of Chalcedon (29 October 451) examined the conflict between *Bassianus and *Stephen over the see of Ephesus. Bassianus maintained that bishop Memnon, jealous of the popularity he enjoyed among the Ephesians as a priest, had consecrated him bishop of Evaza to get rid of him, but he had not accepted the ordination. In 434 a council called at Ephesus by Basil, Memnon's successor, had recognized the invalidity of the ordination. On Basil's death, Bassianus had been elected in his place; but in 447 a council of 40 Asiatic bishops, meeting at the emperor *Theodosius II's orders, had declared Bassianus's election invalid and deposed him, electing Stephen in his place. Stephen claimed that, on Basil's death, Bassianus had irregularly taken possession of the see with the help of the mob, and that his consecration had been irregular. The Council of Chalcedon decided to consider both elections irregular and to elect a new bishop of Ephesus.

449. This council, later called *latrocinium Ephesinum*, was called by the emperor Theodosius II at Ephesus for 1 August 449. It was proposed to reexamine the condemnation of *Eutyches and the subsequent disputes between *monophysites and *dyophysites. Faced with the violent reactions of the monophysites, led by *Dioscorus of Alexandria, to Eutyches' condemnation, Theodosius had changed his position, originally unfavorable to Eutyches. Dioscorus himself was delegated to preside over the council, assisted by *Juvenal of Jerusalem, while *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the most seasoned exponent of dyophysite Christology, was forbidden to attend. The council opened 8 August in St. Mary's church in the presence of some 130 bishops. The Roman delegation requested the reading of some letters of *Leo of Rome, including one, doctrinally very important, to *Flavian, bishop of Constantinople and adversary of Eutyches (*Tomus ad Flavianum*); but Dioscorus eluded the request. Subsequently Eutyches was cleared of every accusation and the dyophysite Christology, which preached two natures in Christ after the incarnation, divine and human, was condemned. Dioscorus then demanded the condemnation of Flavian and of *Eusebius of Dorylaeum, who had been the first to accuse Nestorius. In the tumult that followed, soldiers and others entered the council chamber. Flavian was severely beaten and died three days later, while Eusebius managed to escape; both were condemned by the council. At a later session, on 22 August, *Ibas of Edessa and Theodoret were condemned along with others, including *Domnus of Antioch, who had so far approved all of the council's proceedings. Thus all the Antiochene exponents of dyophysite Christology were eliminated, and Dioscorus closed the council by having Cyril's 12 anathemata read and approved.

Ca. 475. In the context of the pro-monophysite policy of the usurper *Basiliscus (475–476), a council of numerous Asiatic bishops met at Ephesus, including the monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy Aelurus (*Timothy II), who was passing through. The council upheld the rights of the metropolitan see of Ephesus against the primacy of the patriarch of Constantinople, sanctioned by the Council of Chalcedon, restored the local bishop Paul whom *Acacius of Constantinople had expelled because he had been elected without his participation, confirmed the pro-monophysite encyclical issued by Basiliscus and asked the emperor to punish the bishops who had refused to subscribe it.

P.T. Camelot, *Éphèse et Chalcédoine*, Paris 1962; *400*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 122; P. Stockmeier, *Ephesos, Synoden/Konzilien*: LMA 3, 2050-2052; J. Vogt, *Ephesus. Konzil u. Synoden*: LTK[3] 3, 706ff. *431*: ACO I, I-IV; Hfl-Lecl 2, 219-277; L. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974 (bibl.); A.J. Festugière, *Éphese et Chalcédoine. Actes des conciles*, Paris 1982; J.J. O'Keefe, *A Historic-Systematic Study of the Christology of Nestorius*, Münster 1987; J.A. McGuckin, *The Christology of Nestorius of Constantinople*: Patristic and Byzantine Review 7 (1988) 93-129; A. de Halleux, *Les 12 chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Éphese*: RTL 23 (1992) 425-458; A. de Halleux, *La première session du Concile de Éphèse (22 juin 431)*: EThL 69 (1993) 48-87; E. Reichert, *Nestorius*: BBKL 6 (1993) 629-633; H. Engelmann, *Konzilsakten und Grabungsbericht (zur Marienkirche in Ephesus)*: ZPE 102 (1994) 185-188; V. Limberis, *The Council of Ephesos: The Demise of the See of Ephesos and the Rise of the Cult of the Theotokos*, in H. Koester (ed.), *Ephesos. Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, Valley Forge, PA 1995, 321-340; R. Teja, *La "tragedia" de Efeso (431): herejía y poder en la antigüedad tardía*, Universidad de Cantabria 1995; B. Studer, *La recezione del concilio di Efeso del 431: La tradizione: forme e modi* = SEA 31, Rome 1999, 427-442; *434, 447*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 479; 2, 757; 3, 755; *449*: Mansi 6, 503-930; Hfl-Lecl 2, 555-621; DHGE 15, 574-579; *Le Chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente* (432-610), ed. L. Pietri, it. ed., ed. E. Prinzivalli, Rome 2002; *475*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 912-913.

M. Simonetti

EPHREM of Antioch or of Amida (his birthplace). Bishop of Antioch (527–545). One of the leaders of

the Chalcedonian party in the time of *Justinian. Before his episcopate we know only that he was a civil servant, attaining the dignity of *comes orientis*. As bishop of *Antioch, he acted vigorously and systematically against the followers of *Severus of Antioch, making pastoral journeys and calling a synod at Antioch (ca. 538). He showed similar energy in subscribing the condemnation of *Origenism (synod of Antioch of 542; Justinian's edict of 543). We have mainly fragments of his works (very numerous according to Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cods. 228-229), which reveal a loyal but not particularly original follower of the *Neochalcedonian party.

CPG 6902-6916; DHGE 15, 581-585; J. Lebon, *Ephrem d'Amid, patriarche d'Antioche (526–544)*: Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Ch. Moeller, I, Louvain-Paris 1914, 197-214; G. Downey, *Ephraemius. Patriarch of Antioch*: Church History 7 (1938) 364-370.

S.J. Voicu

EPHREM the Syrian (ca. 306–373)
I. Life - II. Works - III. Ephrem as poet, exegete and theologian.

Ephrem of *Nisibis (feast in the Syrian church 28 January or 1 February; in the Byzantine rite 28 January; in the Coptic rite 9 July; in the Latin church 9 July or 1 February, at present 18 June) is unquestionably the most important of the Syrian Fathers and the greatest poet of the patristic era. His original work is, with that of *Aphraates, an irreplaceable link in the chain of the Eastern tradition. Witness to a Jewish Christianity that developed on the fringe of the Roman Empire, he placed the biblical-semitic tradition and its symbols in opposition to the influence of Greek philosophy. His poetic genius, often badly imitated by his Syrian successors, still animates the Eastern liturgies today, and is inherited by the *Byzantine branch through the oblique line of *Romanus Melodus's *kontakion*. We will confine ourselves here to the authentic Syriac Ephrem: for the rest, see Ortiz de Urbina, par. 19, D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou and J. Kirchmeyer, DSp I, 800-822, and K. Samir, *L'Efrem arabe, État des travaux*: OCA 205 (1978) 229ff. and M. Schmidt, *Ephraem Latinus*: ZDMG, Suppl. 4 (1980) 181-184 for the question of the translations and the tangle of *spuria* and *dubia*. This survey is based primarily on R. Murray, cited below.

I. Life. Born at Nisibis of Christian parents ca. 306. Ephrem grew up under the tutelage of Bishop *Jacob (303–338, present in 325 at the Council of Nicaea), with whom he founded the theological school of *Nisibis. Ephrem, once a deacon, became its main animator under Jacob's successors Babu (from 338), Vologeses (346–349) and Abraham (from 361). After the sieges of 338, 346 and 350 (*Carmina Nisibena*, *Memre de Fide*), the war between Romans and Persians resumed in 359 (*Memre su Nicomedia*); in 362–363 *Julian the Apostate was killed not far from Nisibis (*Hymni contra Julianum*). His successor, the orthodox *Jovian, ceded the city to the *Sassanids in 363. Ephrem had to leave it and move to *Edessa, where he continued his work of preaching, teaching and controversy until his death (373, according to the *Chronicle of Edessa). Various scholars have shown (against the theses of A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, CSCO 184 and 187 [sub. 14 and 17] 1958–60) that it would be anachronistic to make Ephrem a monk or an *anchorite. He was simply a "son of the covenant," i.e., a full member of the Christian community, or rather of its élite, having consecrated his life to Christ in abstinence and virginity. It is worth emphasizing how Ephrem was reclaimed from the monastic circles, which attributed a great many writings to him and were the compilers of his "lives," which they embellished with legends, e.g., a journey in the Egyptian desert and a meeting with *Basil the Great at *Caesarea (B. Outtier, *S.E. d'après ses biographies et ses œuvres*: PdO 4 [1973] 11-35).

II. Works. Except for the works previously cited, which contain some historical data, and the *Hymni de Fide adversus scrutatores*, which speak of the struggle with the Arians in Edessa, a chronology of Ephrem's works is hard to establish. In general it is preferred to classify the doctor's writings according to their different literary genres. Here we will cite only the main works, which have generally benefited from a recent edition, marking those whose authenticity is disputed with a dagger (†):

1. prose scriptural commentaries: (a) on Genesis and Exodus; (b) on the **Diatessaron* (gospel harmony); (c) on the Pauline letters (passed down in Armenian); (d) on the OT and on Acts (Armenian fragments in the catenae); (e) *Confutationes* of *Mani, *Marcion and *Bardesanes; (f) *Sermo de Domino Nostro*; *letters*: (g) to Hypatius; (h) to Publius; (i) *ad Montanos*†.

2. metrical homilies (or *mēmrē*): (a) *Sermones de Fide*; (b) *Mēmrē on Nicomedia* (in Armenian); (c) *Sermones in Hebdomadam Sanctam*†; (d) a great number of passages whose authenticity can be ruled out.

3. hymns (or *madrēšē*): (a) *Carmina Nisibena*; (b) *Hymni contra Julianum*; (c) *H. contra Haereses*; (d) *H. de Fide adversus scrutatores*; (e) *H. de Nativitate*;

(f) *H. de Azymis, de Crucifixione, de Resurrectione*; (g) *H. de Paradiso*; (h) *H. de Ieiunio*; (i) *H. de Virginitate*; (j) *de Ecclesia*; (k) a mixed collection in Armenian; (l) *H. de Epiphania*†; (m) numerous inauthentic hagiographical hymns: the closest to Ephrem are *de Abraham Qidunaya*, *de Juliano Saba*, *de Confessoribus et Martyribus*, *de Maria Virgine*.

III. Ephrem as poet, exegete and theologian. Like an immense litany, Ephrem's essentially poetic work reflects an Aramaic and Mesopotamian Christianity, which appears terribly archaic when compared to that of contemporaries like *Basil or *Gregory of Nyssa. In fact the doctor of Nisibis is a privileged witness of the tradition of the primitive Persian church, which lived at the margins of Greek culture; he himself did not know Greek and he rejected the rationalism that was the prerogative of heretics, the "curious," whom he had to combat ceaselessly: *Bardesanes, *Marcion, *Mani and above all the *Arians. Hence, notwithstanding his vehement polemic against the Jews, his greatest affinities are with the Jewish, Jewish Christian and pre-Nicene "Asiatic" traditions (of which the school of Antioch would be, with that of Edessa, the main heir). His OT exegesis is often close to the targumic and midrashic traditions and, for the NT, he makes use of *testimonia* and typological parallelism, like *Melito of Sardis. In his poetic-contemplative approach to the mystery of God, though he betrays a secondhand knowledge of some Stoic themes and at times uses terms that would later become technical, such as *kyāna* (nature) or *qnōma* (person, hypostasis), Ephrem isolates himself in a radical agnosticism reflected in silence and humility (inner harmony); this preserves him from modalist, *tritheist and *subordinationist deviations, and led to his being adopted as spiritual father of different factions of the church in the 5th and 6th c.

The heart of his faithful search—concerned to preserve the integrity of human freedom and not simplistic, since he rejects from the outset the Scriptural "fundamentalism" of the speculatives—resides in his semantic openness, his polysemy of symbols, in the divine names drawn not just from *Scripture (King, Shepherd, Bridegroom) or from ancient Mesopotamia (Maker, Physician, Vital Remedy), but also from nature. Indeed the perfect harmony of God and his creation, rooted in the "dialectical" mystery of the Son's incarnation, opens the door to this analogical experience of God (R. Murray even sees Ephrem as the precursor of the philosophy of P. Ricoeur): "This Jesus has multiplied symbols for us; I have fallen into a sea of symbols, which show me in parables the *resurrection of the dead through every kind of symbol and figure" (*Carmina Nisibena* 39, 17). Hence Ephrem describes the *Trinity through the image of sun/fire, ray, heat; paradise through the images of Noah's ark, Mt. Sinai, or the different facets of the human being, God's likeness (body, soul and spirit). He speaks of the relation between the Father and the Son as like that between the tree and its fruit; of the Spirit who hovers over the *sacraments (*baptism, *orders, *Eucharist); of the *economy of salvation as a road that extends "from the tree to the cross, from the wood to the wood, from Eden to Sion, from Sion to the holy Church and from the church to kingdom" (*H. de Fide* 26, 4).

Ephrem's symbolic, christocentric method makes a systematic exposition of his doctrine difficult. Nevertheless, studies of different aspects of his thought have multiplied in recent years. We will confine ourselves to reference works and to the most recent works. *Editions and translations*: The old editions of J.S. Assemani (6 vols., Rome 1732–43, with Lat. tr.), the Mechitarists (4 vols., Venice 1836, in Armenian), J. Overbeck (Oxford 1865) and T.J. Lamy (4 vols., Paris 1882–1902, Lat. tr.) are now out of date. Recent publications are largely in CSCO; all those of Beck are followed by a German tr.

1. prose: (a) R.M. Tonneau, CSCO 152-153, Syr. 71-72 (1955), cf. T. Jansma's corrections in OC 20 (1972) 59ff. and 22 (1974) 121ff.; (b) L. Leloir, *Commentarius in Evangelium Concordans*, Syriac text and Lat. tr., Chester Beatty Monographs 8, Dublin 1962; Id., CSCO 137 and 145, arm. 1-2 (1953-54), Lat. tr.; Id., SC 121 (1966), Fr. tr.; Id., *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant. Texte syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty, 709). Folios additionnels*, Louvain-Paris 1990, with Lat. tr.; C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron. An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac Ms 709 with Introduction and Notes*, Journal of Semitic Studies. Suppl. 2, Oxford 1993; (c-d) Id. in DHGE, XV, 595ff.; (e) E. Beck, OC 60 (1976) 24-68, Ger. tr.; (f) Id., CSCO 271, Syr. 117 (1966); Id., in OC 22 (1974) 76-120; (h) S.P. Brock, in Muséon 89 (1976) 261-305, (i) E. Beck, CSCO 334-335, Syr. 148-149 (1973).

2. metrical homilies: (a) E. Beck, CSCO 212-13, Syr. 88-89 (1961); (b) A. Renoux, PO 37 (1975), Fr. tr.; (c) E. Beck, CSCO 412-13, Syr. 181-182 (1979); (d) Id., *Sermones I-IV*, CSCO 305-306, 312-313, 320-321, 334-335, Syr. 130-131, 134-135, 138-139, 148-149 (1970-73).

3. hymns: (a) E. Beck, CSCO 218-219, 240-241, Syr. 92-93, 102-103 (1961–63); Fr. tr. P. Féghali, C. Navarre, *Saint Éphrem, Les chants de Nisibe*, Paris 1989; (b) Id., CSCO 174-175, Syr. 78-79 (1975); (c) Id., CSCO 169-170, Syr. 76-77 (1957); (d) Id., CSCO 154-155, Syr. 73-74 (1955); (e) Id., CSCO 186-187, Syr. 82-83 (1959); Fr. tr. Fr. Cassigena-Trévedy, SC 459 (2001); (f) Id., *Paschahymnen*, CSCO 248-249, Syr. 108-109 (1964); Fr. tr. G.M.A. Rouwhorst, *Les hymnes pascales d'Éphrem de Nisibe*, Leiden 1989; (g) see (b); Fr. tr. R. Lavenant, SC 137 (1968); Eng. tr. S. Brock, *St. Ephrem the Syrian. Hymns on Paradise*, New York 1990; (h) E. Beck, CSCO 246-247, Syr. 106-107 (1964); Fr. tr. D. Cerbelaud, *Hymnes sur le Jeûne* (Spiritualité orientale 69), Bégrolles-en-Mauges 1997; (i) E. Beck, CSCO 223-224, Syr. 94-95 (1962); (j) Id., CSCO 198-199, Syr. 84-85 (1960); (k) L. Mariès - C. Mercier, PO 30 (1961); (l) see (e); (m) E. Beck, CSCO

322-323, Syr. 140-141 (1972) and Id., *Nachträge . . .* , CSCO 363-364, Syr. 159-160 (1975). Eng. tr. of various hymns in S.P. Brock, *The Harp of Spirit*, Suppl. to Sobornost 4, 1975, and in K.E. McVey, *Ephrem the Syrian, Hymns*, New York 1989 (*de Nativitate*, *contra Julianum*, *de Virginitate*).

Studies: Dictionary articles: E. Beck: DSp 4, 788-800 (1956); Id.: RAC 5, 520-581 (1962); L. Leloir: DHGE 15, 590-597; J.M. Sauget: BS 4, 944-949 (1964); Ortiz de Urbina §§ 18-20, 56-83; R. Murray: *Catholic Dictionary of Theology*, 2, 220-223 (1967); Id., *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 9, 1986, 755-762; K.E. McVey, *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, New York 1997, 376-377. Instruments: M. Roncaglia, *Essai de bibliographie sur E.*; K. Samir, *Compléments de bibliographie éphremienne*; S.P. Brock, *A Classified Bibliography*, ad loc.; K. den Biesen, *Bibliography of Ephrem the Syrian*, Giove in Umbria 2002. Monographs and articles: R. Murray, *Symbols of the Church and Kingdom*, Cambridge 1975; Id., *The Theory of Symbolism in St. Ephrem's Theology*: PdO 6-7 (1975-76) (= Mélanges Graffin) 1-20; B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse I, Les Pères grecs et orientaux*, Paris 1980, 165-187; E. Beck, numerous articles esp. in OC and recent volumes of CSCO 391, sub. 55 (1978): *Ephräms Polemik gegen Mani . . .* ; CSCO 419, sub. 58 (1980): *Ephräm Psychologie und Erkenntnislehre*; CSCO 425, sub. 62 (1981): *Ephräm Trinitätslehre . . .* ; Nabil El Khoury, *Die Interpretation der Welt bei Ephräm dem Syrer*, Mainz 1976; J. Martikainen, *Das Böse und der Teufel in der Theologie Ephräms des Syrers*, Åbo 1978; S. Hidal, *Interpretatio syriaca*, Lund 1974; T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis I-II in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian*, Uppsala 1978; G. Saber, *La théologie baptismale de Sain Eprem*, Kaslik 1974; P. Youssif, *L'eucharistie chez St. Ephrem de Nisibe*: OCA 224, 1984; S. Brock, *The Luminous Eye* (Cistercian Studies Series 124), Kalamazoo 1992, Patrologia V, 445-448.

F. Rilliet

EPICLESIS. The earliest appearance of an epiclesis in liturgical documents is in the *Anaphora of *Addai and Mari (Hänggi - Pahl, *Prex Eucharistica*, 380) and in the **Apostolic Tradition* (ibid., 81). In both texts the invocation is directed to the coming of the Holy Spirit "on this your servants' oblation" (Addai and Mari) or "*in oblationem sanctae Ecclesiae*" (*Apost. Trad.*), so that the assembly may profit spiritually by receiving it. There is no mention of a transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ as a result of the epiclesis. It is in the mystagogical Catecheses of *Cyril (or John) of Jerusalem that the role of the Holy Spirit in the transformation of the eucharistic species into Christ's body and blood is clearly indicated: "Then we, being sanctified through these spiritual hymns, invoke the merciful God that he may send his Holy Spirit on these offerings, so that he may make the bread Christ's body and the wine Christ's blood; what the Holy Spirit touches is sanctified and transformed" (*Cat. Myst.* V, 7: Hänggi - Pahl, *Prex Eucharistica*, 208). From the time of the Council of *Constantinople (381), which defined the divinity and consubstantiality of the three Persons of the *Trinity, this statement appears as a liturgical application of the conciliar doctrine. At Rome, whose eucharistic epiclesis is primitive in that it does not mention the role of the Holy Spirit in the transformation of the species, Pope *Gelasius writes: "*Ad divini mysterii consecrationem coelestis Spiritus invocatus adveniat*" (*Frag.* 7, *Ep. ad Elp.*). It should be noted that Gelasius could not have deduced the consecratory role of the epiclesis just from the Roman canon: it is probable that he had applied the Council of 381 liturgically to the Roman canon or that he was under the theological influence of the East.

The consecratory nature of the epiclesis is affirmed by many Fathers after the Council of Constantinople. *Gregory of Nyssa writes: "Though things of little value before the blessing, after the sanctification that comes from the Spirit, both these things work in an excellent way" (*In bapt. Christi*: PG 46, 581). *Theophilus of Alexandria echoes this doctrine when he says: "*Dicit Origenes Spiritum sanctum non operari ea quae inanima sunt nec ad irrationabilia pervenire. Quod asserens non recogitat aquas in baptismate mysticas adventu sancti Spiritus consecrari, panemque dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur et quem frangimus in sanctificationem nostri; et sacrum calicem (quae in mensa Ecclesiae collocantur et utique inanimae sunt) per invocationem et adventum sancti Spiritus sanctificari*" (*Epist. paschalis an. 402*, 13; Jerome's Lat. tr.: PL 20, 801). *John Chrysostom gives a similar testimony: "The priest is there not to draw down fire but the Holy Spirit: and he makes long supplications, not for a flame kindled on high to consume the offerings, but for grace, descending on the sacrifice, to kindle through it the hearts of all" (*De Sacer.* III, 4: PG 48, 642). In the West, *Gaudentius of Brescia affirms the same doctrine: "*Ne commune et terrenum existimes sacramentum, sed ut per ignem divini Spiritus id effectum quod annuntiatum est, credas quia quod accipis corpus est illius panis caelestis, et sanguis est illius sacrae vitis*" (*Serm. II de Exodi lectione*: PL 20, 858-859). *Augustine, who follows *Ambrose on the consecratory power of Christ's words, also speaks of the consecratory aspect of the epiclesis: "*Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi . . . non sanctificatur, ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei cum haec omnia quae per corporales motus in illo opere fiunt, Deus operetur*" (*De Trin.* III, 4, 10: PL 42, 874). *Isidore of Seville writes: "*Oblatio, quae Deo offertur, sanctificata per Spiritum sanctum, Christi corpori et sanguini conformatur*" (*De eccl. off.*, L 15: PL 83, 753).

Not just the Fathers, but the Eastern anaphorae

too confirm the consecratory dimension of the epiclesis: "We beseech you, send your Holy Spirit upon us and upon these offerings. Make this bread the precious body of your Christ, transforming it with your Holy Spirit. Amen. Make what is in this chalice the precious blood of your Christ, transforming it with your Holy Spirit. Amen. To whoever receives it, may it avail for sobriety of soul, remission of sins, communion of your Holy Spirit, fullness of the kingdom of heaven, confidence in you, and not for sin and damnation" (*Anaph. Ioan. Chrysost.*: Hänggi - Pahl, *Prex Eucharistica*, 226; cf. *Anaph. Basilii Caesar. Byzantina*: ibid., 236, 238). In these texts the epiclesis, as a consecratory prayer, is closely connected with the epiclesis of communion. Indeed we may say that the consecratory epiclesis does not stand on its own, but in relation to the spiritual transformation of the assembly in communion. The main interest of these anaphorae is not the transformation of the eucharistic species considered in themselves, but insofar as this transformation makes the *sacrament a communion with God. This is probably why, in these anaphorae, the epicleses of consecration and communion, which in the Roman Canon and in the new eucharistic prayers are distinguished into the pre- and post-consecratory epicleses, are combined together and placed after the account of institution. The explanation that the whole anaphora and not just part of it (whether the account of institution or the epiclesis) is consecratory remains a good one, but the immediate explanation of this problem seems to be the purpose of the epiclesis as *conditio sine qua non* of sacramental communion.

If the development of the consecratory epiclesis comes close on the heels of the pneumatological controversies, affirmations of the consecratory character of the words of institution appear much earlier. *Irenaeus of Lyons, e.g., says: ". . . *eum qui ex natura panis est, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: 'Hoc est meum corpus.' Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est . . .* " (*Adv. haer.* IV, 17, 5: PG 8, 1023; see also V, 2, 3: PG 8, 1125-1126). Ambrose, commenting on the words of institution, says: "*Quid dicamus de ipsa consecratione divina ubi verba ipsa Domini Salvatoris operantur? Nam sacramentum istud, quod accipis, Christi sermone conficitur . . . Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus: Hoc est corpus meum. Ante benedictionem verborum caelestium alia species nominatur; post consecrationem corpus significatur. Ipse dicit sanguinem suum. Ante consecrationem aliud dicitur; post consecrationem sanguis nuncupatur. Et tu dicis: Amen, hoc est: verum est*" (*De Myster.* IX, 52, 54: SC 25, 125, 127), and: "*Quomodo potest, qui panis est, corpus esse Christi? Consecratione. Consecratio autem quibus verbis est, cuius sermonibus? Domini Iesu. Nam et reliqua omnia quae dicuntur in superioribus, a sacerdote dicuntur. Laudes Deo deferuntur, oratio petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro coeteris. Ubi venitur ut conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, iam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi conficit sacramentum . . . Vides ergo quam operarius sit sermo Christi*" (*De Sacram.* IV, 4: SC 25bis, 82). Augustine follows the same doctrine when he says: "*Panis ille quem videtis in altari, sanctificatus per verbum Dei, corpus est Christi. Calix ille, immo quod habet calix, sanctificatus per verbum Dei, sanguis est Christi*" (*Serm.* 227: PL 38, 1099), and "*Tolle verbum, panis est et vinum. Adde verbum, et jam aliud est. Et ipsum aliud, quid est? Corpus Christi et sanguis Christi. Tolle ergo verbum: panis est et vinum; adde verbum et fiet sacramentum*" (*Sermo 6, de sacramento altaris ad infantes* 2: PL 46, 834-835). In the East, the main testimonies are those of Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat. catech.*: PG 45, 96-97) and John Chrysostom (*Hom. I de proditione Judae* 6: PG 49, 381-382).

In both East and West, affirmation of the consecratory character of the words of institution does not necessarily rule out the consecratory nature of the epiclesis: this is affirmed by both Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom and, in the liturgical praxis itself, by the Alexandrian anaphora of St. Mark and the anaphora of Serapion, which have an epiclesis before the institution: "Truly heaven and earth are full of your glory, by the manifestation of our Lord God and Savior Jesus Christ: grant, O God, that this sacrifice too may be filled with your blessing through the coming of your most Holy Spirit" (*Anaph. Marci Evang.*: Hänggi - Pahl, *Prex Eucharistica*, 112; cf. *Anaph. Serapionis*, ibid., 130). The Roman Canon, in both its Ambrosian and Gregorian forms, contains a pre-institutory epiclesis (ibid., 450, 465). Though the Holy Spirit is not mentioned, its action of transforming the oblation into a spiritual (*rationabilem*) reality receives sufficient attention. Thus, even where the words of institution are considered the consecratory element of the anaphora, the epiclesis is always associated with them.

The existence of epicleses in other sacramental celebrations is attested by *Tertullian, who speaks of the sanctification of the baptismal water through the Holy Spirit (*De Bapt.* 4: CSEL 20, 204). Ambrose implies it (*De sacr.* I, 15: SC 25bis, 58, 60), as does Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cath. Myst.* III, 3: SC 126, 124). The prayer of ordination in the *Apost. Trad.* mentions the Holy Spirit received by the presbyter, the deacon

and the bishop for their ministry (Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique* . . . , LQF 39, 8, 20, 26).

A. Hänggi - I. Pahl (eds.), *Prex Eucharistica*, Fribourg (Ch) 1968 (Spicil. Friburg. 12); M. Jugie, *De forma eucharistica, de epiclesibus eucharisticis*, Rome 1943; A. Chavasse, *L'épiclèse eucharistique dans les anciennes liturgies*: MSR 3 (1946) 197-206; B. Botte, *L'épiclèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales*: SE 6 (1954) 48-72; Id., *L'épiclèse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte*: RQA 14 (1947) 241-251; A. Marini, *L'epiclesi nel canone romano*: EphLit 90 (1976) 243-261; K. Gamber, *Die Epiklese im abendländischen Eucharistiegebet*, Studia Patristica et Liturgica 18, Regensburg 1988; R. Taft, *From Logos to Spirit. On the Early History of the Epiclesis,* in *Gratias Agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet*, A Heinz - H. Rennings (eds.), Freiburg 1992, 489-502; C. Giraudo, *La doppia epiclesis delle preghiere eucaristiche, Vincoli di carità. La celebrazione eucaristica rinnovata dal Vaticano II*, Bose 1995, 177-179; A. Thaler, *Die Epiklese in der Eucharistiefeier*: Liturgisches Jahrbuch 46 (1996/3) 178-199; G. Winkler, *Weiter Beobachtung zur frühen Epiklese*: OC 80 (1996) 177-200; I. Schinella, *L'epiclesi nella Liturgia eucaristica della Chiesa latina*: Liturgia 145 (1998) 29-50; J. Dricoll, *Anamnesis, Epiclesis and Fundamental Theology*: EO 15 (1998/2) 211-238; E. Lodi, *The Oriental Anaphoras: Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 3, Collegeville, MN 1999, 91-94.

A. Chupungco

EPICTETUS of Corinth. A contemporary of *Athanasius of Alexandria, to whom he wrote concerning the more controversial christological opinions in his church. Like his predecessors Hesiod and Dionysius II (to whom Pope Julius I wrote), Epictetus battled *Arianism. Athanasius, in his reply written after the Roman Synod of 371, expounded in minute detail the errors denounced by *Epictetus, and affirmed that the Nicene faith is sufficient against all heretical impiety.

CPG II, 2095; PG 26, 1049-1070; J. Lebon, *Altération doctrinale de la lettre à Épictète de saint Athanase*: RHE 31 (1935) 713-761; E. Ferguson, *The Church at Corinth Outside the New Testament*: Restoration Quarterly 3 (1959) 169-172; E.D. Moutsoulas, *La lettre d'Athanase d'Alexandrie à Épictète*, in *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1974, 313-333; M. Tetz, *Markellianer und Athanasius von Alexandrien*: ZNTW 64 (1973) 75-121 (esp. 102-103; 108, 117-118); A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328–373)*, Paris 1996, 626-629.

Ch. Kannengiesser

EPIGONUS. According to the author of the *Philosophumena* (IX, 7, 1), our sole source on Epigonus, he, a disciple of *Noetus of *Smyrna and teacher of *Cleomenes, was the first to spread the *patripassian heresy at Rome. The etymology of his name (descendant) suggests that he is an invented person.

DHGE 15, 602-603.

E. Prinzivalli

EPIGRAM. By *epigram* is meant either an inscription proper or a brief composition rising to the dignity of an autonomous poetic genre, and present in Greek and Latin literature with an extraordinary variety of motifs and formal expressions. The epigram, renewed in content no less than in modes of expression, appears in Christian antiquity mainly in its primary meaning of an inscription—metrical or in prose, intended for incision or not, funerary (epitaph) or dedicatory in character.

Leaving aside sepulchral inscriptions proper, which are covered in the entry "Epigraphy, Christian," we will focus here on the literary epigram. The Christian literary epigram developed mainly after *Constantine, in the East with *Gregory of Nazianzus and in the West with Pope *Damasus (366–384). Between 357 and 385 Gregory composed a group of *Epitaphs* in various meters (elegiac distichs, hexameters, iambic trimeters), constituting a sort of "Christian Spoon River" (E. Bellini). Recalling many dear departed friends, Gregory revived the themes of Greek poetry and Alexandrian epigrammatic poetry (the transitoriness and unhappiness of human existence, the glory that accompanies one who in life has done deeds worthy of remembrance) in the light of Christian hope.

In the West, the ancient Roman funeral *elogium*, rising to new literary dignity, was revived and Christianized with Damasus, "the first great poet of the Theodosian era," whom *Jerome (*Vir. inl.* 103, 1) recalls as a writer of elegant verse. Damasus conceived the plan of seeking out, restoring and giving over to veneration almost all of the suburban monuments of the martyrs and popes of earlier centuries. He undertook excavations, restored catacombs and verified the authenticity of relics. In the process, he had the idea of increasing the fame of the monuments by having metrical *elogia* (some current in the Christian communities, some composed *ex novo*) incised on the restored *loculi*. The metrical *tituli* (almost all Virgilian hexameters), incised in the marble by Furius Dionysius *Philocalus, were a main attraction for pilgrims (who at that time came to Rome from all over the empire) and contributed to the spread of the cult of the martyrs. In addition to *elogia* we should recall the *Versus ad fratrem corripiendum*, an epigram not destined to be incised, which opens with an interesting reuse in a polemical setting of the *incipit* of Virgil's first Eclogue (*Tityre, tu fido recubans sub tegmine Christi* ~ *Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*), and warns the *sacerdotes dei* against the dangers of profane poetry. The epigram—in which Damasus demonstrates his capacity to use a linguistic code (Virgilian bucolic poetry) emptied

of its original ideological values and rendered apt for expressing antithetical (Christian) values—proved to be a subtle and effective tool of religious propaganda among educated persons. With his verses, Damasus undoubtedly contributed to defining a new Christian *Romanitas*.

*Ambrose of Milan (374–397) had two churches built in that city: the first, built between 382 and 386, is the *Basilica Apostolorum*, later called S. Nazario; the second, built between 395 and 396, was dedicated to the martyrs and later named for Ambrose himself. To him is attributed the inscription in the *Basilica Apostolorum*, which in five elegiac distichs tells of the foundation and dedication of the basilica, in a cruciform plan, and notes the deposition of the mortal remains of S. Nazario under the altar of the semicircular apse. Ambrose is also the author of 21 hexametric distichs which were the captions of the biblical scenes decorating the basilica's walls; the perspective in which the bishop illustrates the largely OT scenes is christological and ecclesiological. To him we also owe eight elegiac distichs for the octagonal baptistery of S. Tecla, centered on the symbolism of the number eight, that of the ogdoad, indicating the day of Christ's *resurrection. Ambrose is also the author of two epitaphs in elegiac distichs, for his brother Satyrus and for Dedalia, sister of the consul Manlius.

*Paulinus of Nola composed metrical *tituli*, with a description of the architectural structure of the basilicas in which they were inscribed or with an illustration of the pictures adorning the basilicas of Nola, Fundi and Primuliacum, inserting them in his *Epist.* 32 to Severus. The importance of the illustrations and their respective captions is stated explicitly by Paulinus in *Carm.* 27, 580-585: *Propterea visum nobis utile totis / Felicis domibus pictura ludere sancta / (. . .) quae super exprimitur titulis ut littera monstret / quod manus explicuit*. Among *tituli* dedicated to persons were those for the priest Clarus and the youth Cynegius, buried near the martyr Felix. An unusual concept is found in this hexametrical *elogium*, supplemented by Mommsen, i.e., that on the day of judgment the martyr Felix will accompany Cynegius before God's judgment seat.

To so-called iconological epigrams belong the 49 hexametrical tetrastichs composed by *Prudentius to illustrate biblical episodes, which go under the name *Dittochaeon* (= double nourishment—of the OT and NT?). It seems by now settled that the two series of 24 tetrastichs each were to illustrate the OT and NT biblical scenes decorating the walls of a Spanish basilica, while the 49th tetrastich was to illustrate a scene from the Apocalypse painted in the basilica's apse (Pillinger); some, however, think that the inscriptions belonged to a miniature biblical codex (Recio Veganzones), or that they constitute a sort of iconographical anthology to be drawn upon as necessary (Quacquarelli). To this work are related the 24 hexametrical tristich compositions (*Historiarum Testamenti veteris et novi Tristicha XXIV*) of *Elpidius Rusticus, who lived at *Ravenna in the first half of the 6th c.; these were also for the illustration of biblical scenes.

A special place in the history of Christian epigrammatic poetry belongs to *Prosper of Aquitaine (390–455), who composed two epigrams against an unknown detractor of *Augustine; a satirical epigram, *Epitaphium Nestorianae et Pelagianae haereseon*, written after 431 (the epigram, once again a satirical composition, is put at the service of theological polemic); and 106 *Epigrammata*, which are a poetical paraphrase of the *Liber sententiarum* compiled from works of Augustine, written ca. 451 against the *Eutychians. Thirteen compositions (epitaphs, inscriptions for churches, eulogies of friends) in various meters (elegiac distichs, hexameters, Phalaecean hendecasyllables)—among which stands out the *elogium* in memory of *Claudianus Mamertus—are inserted in the collection of letters in 9 books that *Sidonius Apollinarius composed between 469 and 480. In the 6th c., while in the East epigrammatic poetry took on a bawdy and jocular character even in authors of undoubted Christian faith, e.g., *Paul Silentiarius and Agathias, in Italy *Ennodius of Pavia, the last *epitaphista*, author of 151 epigrams of varied meter and content, flourished. Besides profane elements inspired by Martial, in him we find Christian elements in the form of epitaphs, epigraphs for churches, encomia of clerics. Among Christian epigrams should be recalled the *tituli* composed by Ennodius, at the request of Bishop *Lawrence of Milan, to illustrate the images of the Ambrosian bishops portrayed on the walls of the church of S. Nazario; the poet attempts to illustrate the moral characteristics of the bishops based on their images.

Sepulchral and monumental poetry was very popular in *Gaul from the 6th c., thanks first to *Venantius Fortunatus (535–603/04) and later to Alcuin and the other poets of Charlemagne's court. Book IV of Venantius's *Miscellanea* contains 28 epitaphs (some intended for incision, others for reading, such as no. 26 for Wilithuta, wife of Dagaulfus, who died in childbirth aged 17, which has 160 verses). Venantius's epitaphs are laced with philosophical-religious considerations, including some of pagan derivation: the brevity of life, the precariousness

of human affairs, punishment for the wicked and reward for the good.

RAC 5 (1962) 539–577; G. Bernt, *Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter*, Munich 1968; G. Pfohl (ed.), *Das Epigramm. Zur Geschichte einer inschriftlichen und literarischen Gattung*, Darmstadt 1969; A. Di Berardino, *Poesia e innografia nel Tardo Antico*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, II, Rome 1981, 493-511; D. Mazzoleni, *Patristica ed epigrafia*, in A. Quacquarelli (ed.), *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, Rome 1989, 319-365. - Gregorio di Nazianzo, *Epitaffi*, testo tr. e comm. di C. Peri, Milan 1975. - *Epigrammata Damasiana*, recensuit et instruxit A. Ferrua, Vatican City 1942; A.V. Nazzaro, *Sui* Versus ad fratrem corripiendum *di papa Damaso*: KOINONIA 1 (1977) 195-203; J. Fontaine, *Damase poète théodosien*, in *Saecularia Damasiana*, Vatican City 1986, 113-145. - Testo delle *Inscriptiones et tituli* di Ambrogio con tr. it. e note, eds. G. and I. Biffi in *S. Ambrosii Episc. Mediolanensis Op.* 22 (Milan-Rome 1994) 93-121; I. Schuster, *Di una catechesi biblica di S. Ambrogio*: Riv. Dioc. Mil. (1951) 19-30; O. Perler, *L'inscription du baptistère de Ste. Thècle et le* De Sacramentis *de S. Ambroise*: RivAC (1951) 145-166; P. Borella, *L'arte a servizio della catechesi nella Milano di S. Ambrogio*: Arte Christian 54 (1966) 73-80; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica e i suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei sacramenti*, Bari 1973, 69-70; Var. aus., *Ambrogio e la cruciforme "romana" basilica degli Apostoli nei milleseicento anni della sua storia*, Milan 1986. - G. Guttilla, *I* tituli *in onore del* presbyter Clarus *e la datazione del Carme 31 di Paolino di Nola*: BStudLat. 19 (1989) 58-69; Id., *I Carmi 27 e 28 di Paolino di Nola e le Epistole 30 e 32 a Sulpicio Severo*: Orpheus 15 (1995) 59-82; A. Ruggiero, *Agostino, Paolino e l'epigrafe per Cinegio*: Impegno and Dialogo (Nola) 8 (1990-91) 147-181; T. Piscitelli Carpino, *Paolino di Nola: le iscrizioni absidali delle Basiliche di Nola e Fondi e la donazione delle reliquie*, in T. Piscitelli Carpino (ed.), *Fondi tra Antichità e Medioevo*. Atti del Convegno 31 marzo - 1 aprile 2000, Comune di Fondi 2002, 109-163 (with bibl.). - R. Pillinger, *Die Tituli Historiarum, oder das sogenannte Dittochaeon des Prudentius*, Vienna 1980; A. Recio Veganzones, review of *R. Pillinger, Die Tituli Historiarum*: RivAC 57 (1981) 347-351; A. Quacquarelli, *Reazione pagana e trasformazione della cultura (fine IV sec. d.C.)*, Bari 1986, 158. - F. Corsaro, *Elpidio Rustico*, Catania 1955; Id., *Didascalia e tipologia nei* Tristicha *di Elpidio Rustico*: Orpheus 21 (2000) 44-53. - G. Polara, *I distici di Ennodio*, in G. Catanzaro - F. Santucci (eds.), *La poesia cristiana latina in distici elegiaci*. Atti Conv. Intern. Assisi 20-22 marzo 1992, Assisi 1993, 217-239; D. Di Rienzo, *Intertestualità biblica nel II libro dei* Carmina *di Ennodio*, in E. D'Angelo (ed.), *Atti della Seconda Giornata Ennodiana*, Naples 2003, 91-107. - P. Santorelli, *L'*Epitaphium Eusebiae *di Venanzio Fortunato (IV 28)*, in G. Catanzaro - F. Santucci (eds.), *La poesia cristiana latina,* 285-316; Id. *Venanzio Fortunato*, Epitaphium Vilithutae (IV 26), introd., tr. and comm., ed. P. Santorelli, Naples 1994.

A.V. Nazzaro

EPIGRAMMA PAULINI (5th c.). A poem of 110 hexameters, it appears in the *Codex Par. lat.* 7558 (9th c.) together with the *Alethia* of *Claudius Marius Victorius (to whom it was formerly attributed), and is today attributed to Paulinus of Béziers (*Gallia Narbonensis*). Composed after the invasions of the Vandals and Alans (407–409), which devastated S *Gaul, the *Epigramma* describes—by means of a dialogue (variously reconstructed by, among others, Griffe and Fo) between an old monk, Tesbon, and a younger guest, Salmon, who had previously lived for a time in the monastery—the regions of S Gaul devastated by the barbarians, lingering over the moral and spiritual decadence of those who did not grasp the lessons of the invasions, considered a divine punishment. The women, having abandoned Sacred *Scripture, amused themselves reciting Virgil and Ovid, dressing up as Dido or Corinna and applauding, in houses turned into theaters, declamations of lyrical orations and the mimes of Marullus (vv. 76-79).

The composition, which has significant points of contact with the *Carmen de Providentia* attributed to *Prosper of Aquitaine (composed ca. 416) and *Salvian's *De gubernatione Dei* (composed between 440 and 450), goes back—as Smolak shows—to two classical models: the satirical diatribe of Horace and Juvenal, and Virgil's first Eclogue; the pastoral setting is well adapted to the concept of the monastic life as an anticipation of the peace of Paradise.

CPL 1464. Editions: PL 61, 969-972 (defective); CSEL 16, 1 (1888) 503-510; A. Schuller, *Das sogenannte* S. Paulini epigramma. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar, Diss., Vienna 1999; K. Smolak, *Zwischen Bukolik und Satire: Das sogenannte Sancti Paulini Epigramma*: International Journal of the Classical Tradition 6 (1999) 3-20. Studies: E. Griffe, *L'*Epigramma Paulini, *poème gallo-romain du V*[e] *siècle*: REAug. 2 (1956) 187-194 (with Fr. tr.); Patrologia III, 317-318; A. Gallico, *Note per una nuova edizione dell'*Epigramma Paulini: Studi Storico Religiosi 6 (1982) 163-172; A.V. Nazzaro, *Paolino*: Enciclopedia Oraziana, III, Rome 1998, 49-50; A. Fo, *Il cosiddetto Epigramma Paulini attribuito a Paolino de Béziers*, testo criticamente riveduto, traduzione e studio: RomBarb 16 (1999) 97-167.

A.V. Nazzaro

EPIGRAPHIC SYLLOGES. This term refers to well-known collections of inscriptions, which are invaluable because they report texts that have often been lost and that were of great historical, archaeological and hagiographical importance (think of the case of the epigraphs composed by Pope *Damasus, the originals of which have not been preserved, or of which only random fragments exist). The first in-depth study on these documents was composed in the second volume of the *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae* by De Rossi, who critically analyzed all of the very numerous manuscripts that were well known until 1888, which were dated from the 6th through the 16th c., also providing epigraphic comments and emphasizing their chief characteristics. Subsequent investigations on the epigraphic collections were undertaken by Silvagni.

By the 4th c. certain pilgrims had begun to copy for devotion and personal use inscriptions found in venerated places; subsequently small collections were made, prototypes for more extensive works, which equipped the first Roman itineraries. From the 9th c. onwards the original collections, which were already full of lacunae, became a source of inspiration for new compilations, in which, however, often noteworthy corrections and variants, even typographical, were inserted skipping over certain parts. These documents form the basis for subsequent anthologies, which were added in various redactions until the present. It was rather difficult for De Rossi to distinguish in the various texts the most ancient redactions and their sources.

The majority of the epigraphic collections contain inscriptions from Rome, and they generally subdivide into two primary groups: the basilicas, containing the dedications of urban and suburban sanctuaries; the cemeteries, mostly regarding the Roman catacombs, apart from some poems pertaining to the basilicas. According to Silvagni, all the epigraphic collections go back to two prototypes: the first from the 7th c., which originated along with an itinerary and was formed by cemeterial epigraphs, apart from a few basilical epigraphs; the second from the 8th c., composed only by inscriptions from St. Peter's Basilica and a description of the basilica.

The most important epigraphic inscriptions come from monasteries in *Gaul and *Germany, as well as from *Britain (Cambridge and *Canterbury). From other areas (for example, *Milan) only a few fragmentary documents have survived. The most ancient would be the epigraphic collections of Latin poems inserted in the *Anthologia Salmasiana* (ICR II, 238ff.) and dated to the 5th c., although the *Collection* of Tours is attributed to the first half of the 6th c., which gathers together the existing inscriptions in that sanctuary. Moreover, the documents considered most important and which are dated before the year 1000 are as follows: the *Corpus Laureshamense* (Vat. Pal. lat. 833), from two authors of the 9th and 10th c.; the *Corpus Einsiedlense* (Eins. 326) containing pagan and Christian texts; the *Corpus Virdunense* (Vird. 45), from the 10th c. Likewise worthy of mention, among the cemeterial collections, are the following corpora: *Turonense*, *Einsiedlense II*, *Sangallense*, *Virdunense I*, *Vaticana*, *Centulense*, *Harleiana*, *Laureshamense IV* and *Laureshamense III*; among the basilica collections: *Laureshamense I* and *Laureshamense II*, *Virdunense II*, *Wirceburgense* and *Cantabrigense*. The practice of composing epigraphic collections is attested until the 10th c. and was resumed in the 14th, contining almost uninterrupted thereafter. Besides that from *Rome, there is an epigraphic collection from the city of Nola and two from Milan (also containing texts of Pavia, Vercelli, Piacenza and Ivrea).

DACL 7, 1, 850-1089; 15, 1, 35-42; 1755-1756; ICR I-II, Rome 1888; A. Silvagni, *Nuovo ordinamento delle sillogi epigrafiche di Roma anteriori al sec. XI*, Rome 1921; Id., ICUR I, pp. XX-LVI; Id., *Studio critico sopra le due sillogi medievali di iscrizioni cristiane milanesi*: RivAC 15 (1938) 107-122 and 249-279; Id., *La silloge epigrafica di Cambridge*: RivAC 20 (1943) 49-112; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 32-36.

D. Mazzoleni

EPIGRAPHY, Christian

I. Christians inscriptions: A Late Antique problem - II. First manifestations of Christian inscriptions - III. The pre-Constantinian era - IV. The late imperial era - V. Devotional inscriptions.

I. Christians inscriptions: A Late Antique problem. Even a summary view of the substantial number of inscriptions (ca. 70,000 examples), for the most part funerary, that are conventionally defined as Christian allows us to easily verify that even those commissioned by Christians assumed the forms, functions and meanings that characterized Roman inscriptions of Late Antiquity. A funerary inscription, even in its conception and use by *Christi fideles*, had as its primary aim the *commemoratio* of the deceased, identification of the burial, its protection, and a response to that final oblivion, the *secunda mors*; it is the immediate result—even if formally mediated and homogenized by the stereotypical formularies—of the irruption of *death. It is not, on the other hand—at least at the level of general practice—the deliberate and explicit affirmation of a creed, or the premeditated reflection of a doctrinal principle; its existence is not due to an autonomous initiative of the new faith, but to an age-old tradition with respect to which—to use G. Sanders's fine expression—it appears to be a kind of "effect of salvation"; within the parameters of that tradition, expressions and signs found space and justification that gave life to a genuinely Christian particularity. In their formal manifestations, these peculiarities do not in general present any traces of system or rigor. Almost a refraction of a "work in progress," they seem rather to indicate, at least for common practice, that in the Christian communities "neither faith nor culture existed in a pure state, both being the result of mediations, combinations and compromises which constitute the inexhaustible richness of every spiritual conquest" (G. Sanders). The contraints of a com-

plete self-referentiality appear to be completely foreign to a production in which, for at least three centuries (3rd-5th), there was a simultaneous interaction of "symbioses and metabolisms," reuses and transformations: that "dialectic between the ancient world and Christianity" (*Auseinandersetzung zwischen Antike und Christentum*) which is one of the most typical traits of the cultural and spiritual dynamisms of Late Antiquity.

It is moreover an indisputable fact that a very substantial portion (ca. 60%) of the inscriptions attributable to Christian buyers, and particularly in the 3rd and 4th c., present no traces of elements clearly inspired by principles and practices derived from the *Evangelium vitae*: for the most part funerary texts exhibited the sole functionality of indicating the physical presence of the deceased and perpetuating their memory via the inscription's text. The absence of objective textual or figurative "elements" traceable to a specific religious identity does not prejudice, in principle, the possibility of identifying the commissioning (Christian or pagan) of formally "neutral" inscriptions, in cases—of course—where it is possible to trace the find to an original monumental context (subterranean or open-air cemetery, cemeterial basilica, church) which, by its location in time and space, morphology, typology, is proposed as the result of a conscious initiative of the Christian community. In the final analysis, this leads to the formation of the principle that an inscription commissioned by or for an individual Christian—contrary to what was held for over a century by an essentially "partial" criticism, with little sensibility for the archaeological dimension of the epigraphical find—does not necessarily show specific identifying elements in the text or its accompanying figurative apparatus.

Presently in the *Orbis christianus antiquus*, the most substantial epigraphical complex is that of the city of *Rome (ca. 40,000 examples), to which can be added—with highly significant evidence, including quantitatively—numerous centers on the Italian peninsula (in particular *Milan, *Aquileia, Grado, Concordia, *Ravenna, Chiusi, Bolsena, Eclano, Tropea), Sicily, *Sardinia, *Spain, *Gaul, *Africa, *Asia Minor, *Syria, Greece, *Dalmatia.

II. First manifestations of Christian inscriptions. The oldest manifestations of Christian inscriptions can likely be attributed to the second half of the 2nd c. and the early 3rd c. These were a relatively limited group of funerary texts that seem to document the phase, in fact not easily defined in all of its components, in which individuals of Christian faith had their own tombs prepared and the respective memorial written in pagan burial areas. Real or presumed "signs" of Christian belonging would, in the opinion of some, be identified in the presence of symbols, figurative themes or locutions containing more or less veiled allusions to the new faith, inserted—generally in a disorganized way (which has aroused and continues to arouse some legitimate suspicions)—in the context of the normative textual structures of 2nd- and 3rd-c. pagan practice. One fact that is certain is that the original use of these (sometimes reused) materials can be traced to *sub divo* funerary areas, i.e., in the open, as is clearly indicated by supports composed either of stelae or of sarcophagus covers.

From excavations in the Vatican necropolis come some inscriptions exemplifying which, and how many, elements of uncertainty remain for an objective evaluation of this evidence. The example with the greatest evidence—and perhaps the most famous—is the stele of *Licinia Amias* (ICUR II 4246), whose inscription, introduced by the traditional dedication *dis Manibus*, is preceded by the image of two fishes opposite an anchor and by the exegetical inscription ἰχθὺς ζώντων ("fish of the living"); the christological meaning is implied in the acrostic Ἰ(ησοῦς) Χ(ριστὸς) Θ(εοῦ) Υ(ἱὸς) Σ(ωτήρ), "Jesus Christ, God's Son, Savior." It must be observed, however, that this stele was reused at least twice already in ancient times, since it shows an obvious deepening of the level of the writing in the part containing the Latin dedication (*Liciniae Amiati be/nemerenti vixit* [- - -]), as though preceded by the wearing away of an earlier text; the insertion of the Greek writing and the relative figurative apparatus thus seems to be a later intervention, nothing about which says that it must necessarily be attributed to the ancient world.

From the same Vatican burial area come two sarcophagi with inscriptions, that of *Livia Primitiva* (ICUR II 4212) and that dedicated by *Saturninus* and *Musa* (ICUR II 4224) to their son, generally attributed to individuals of Christian faith: in neither case do the text or the figurative themes represented (fish, anchor, shepherd, sheep, a veiled woman praying) appear to be decisive arguments in favor of a Christian commissioning, also because, in both cases, we do not know their primitive monumental context. Similar reservations can be advanced for the stelae of Τολλία Ἀσκληπιακή (ICUR X 26971), of *Aegrilius Bottus Philadespotus* (ICUR V 15360) with anchor and fish below the inscription, of *Iulia Calliste* (ICUR 3.2.1), which presents in the lower part the enigmatic and perhaps later sign P IH XP.

On the other hand, no doubts about attribution

seem to remain for the small black stele of Πρῶτος (ICUR X 27233), with the inscription ἐν ἁγίῳ | πνεύμα|τι θεοῦ | ἐνθάδε | κεῖται ("Here rests Proto in the Holy Spirit of God"); or for the sarcophagus dedicated in 217 to *Prosenes*, a powerful former imperial slave at the court of *Marcus Aurelius and *Commodus, whose date of death is introduced by *receptus ad deum* (ICUR VI 17246); or for the memorial erected between 198 and 211 by *Alexander* | *augg*(*ustorum*) *ser*(*vus*) to his son *Marcus*, which concludes with a plea to the brothers in the faith not to tamper with the grave: *peto a bobis* [scil. *vobis*] | *fratres boni per* | *unum deum ne quis* | *<h>u<nc> titelo* [scil. *titulum*] *moles*[*tet*] (ICUR X 27126). Perhaps also commissioned by Christians are the 18 inscriptions found in the cemetery of the "Piazzola" under the *memoria apostolorum* on the Via Appia where, into a pagan complex which arose in the mid 2nd c., a Christian presence was inserted between the late 2nd and early 3rd c., as we are led to suppose by a painting with a gospel theme (the Gerasene demoniac? But recent research following a restoration raises serious questions regarding this identification) and a graffito with the acrostic I{T}ΧΘΥΣ (ICUR V 12889), intersected by a T (an altered cross?). The users of this cemetery belonged mostly to two nuclear families, the *Ancotii* and the *Ulpii*, who commissioned Latin and Greek inscriptions (ICUR V 12890-12905) characterized by an evident formal and technically executed homogeneity, e.g., the systematic absence of the dedication *dis Manibus* and the presence of the figurative module fish-anchor, which, moreover, on the basis of the fundamental research (too often ignored) of F.J. Dölger and some recent acquisitions, in no way can be considered to be of exclusively Christians use, as indicated by numerous examples of their use in pagan inscriptions (Carletti 2000). Serious doubts of attribution can also be raised for other epigraphical evidence outside Rome: e.g., two stelae of Classe (2nd-3rd c.), at Antifonte (CIL XI 320) and at Valeria Maria (CIL XI 332), in which neither the presence in the pediment of the shepherd, fish and a disc surrounded by rays (read by some as a christogram) are elements sufficient to indicate a Christian origin; for the same reasons (the presence in the figurative apparatus of fish or presumed doves), it seems rash to consider some stelae of *Edessa in Macedonia as Christian (Feissel n. 7).

Clearly excluded as Christian inscriptions—as already indicated by Ferrua (1978, 601)—are some inscriptions of *Arles and *Lyons, characterized respectively by the presence of the binomial fish-anchor and by a presumed Pythagorean Ψ. Likewise in Africa, where Monceaux believed he had identified certainly Christian 3rd-c. inscriptions, the most recent critics, esp. Février and Duval, have reconsidered in depth the presumed criteria of attribution which, e.g., had led the inscription of *Magnia Crescentina* (Tipasa, CIL VIII 20892) to be considered as Christian due to the presence of an anchor and a dove, or that of Rasinia Secunda (CIL VIII 9289), due to the obituary formula *reddidit* followed by the date.

III. The pre-Constantinian era. In ca. 200, an act fundamental for the history of the Christian community was formalized at Rome under *Septimius Severus. Pope *Zephyrinus (198–217) put his deacon Callistus, an ex-slave, in charge of the administration of an underground burial area on the Via Appia, the future cemetery of St. Callistus (the evidence regarding the entrustment to Callistus of the *coemeterium* on the Via Appia [εἰς τὸ κοιμητήριον κατέστησεν] is reported by ps.-Hippolytus, *Philosophumena* IX, 12: GCS 26, 3, 248). This was the act establishing a communitarian cemetery of the Christians, whose distinctive character with respect to contemporary practice was in the substantial change in statute: no longer a cemetery for the nobility or a corporate one, but comunitarian, and therefore open without distinction to all members of the faith, independent of their social extraction. Over the next fifty years other underground funerary areas were added, encircling the city in its immediate suburbs along the Vias Appia, Ardeatina, Tiburtina, Salaria, Nomentana and Aurelia. The characteristic of these locations—already called *coemeteria* in the 3rd c., as we have seen—of ownership by the Christian community, or in any case for its exclusive use, are seen, not only in some morphological, topographical and administrative-organizational aspects of the areas for receiving the dead (generally galleries with wall loculi), but also and especially in many aspects of the forms and ways of "inscribing death."

The most surprising fact that we garner from a first reading of these inscriptions is the very high percentage of texts (83%) that, at least apparently, present no Christian or pagan connotation (dedication to Mani or others): thus inscriptions that, at least provisionally, we are led to define as "neutral," though commissioned by individuals of Christian faith and destined for cemeteries belonging to the community. The other large-scale phenomenon is the high percentage (62%) of inscriptions that present only the name of the deceased with a structure that we may call "*nomen singulum*." If the percentages pertaining to the onomastic system (*cognomina*

singula 62%, *duo nomina* 34%, *tria nomina* 4%) on the one hand fit coherently into the general process of the dissolution of the traditional onomastic system and consequent establishment of the "*single name system*," on the other hand they seem to coherently reflect the actual social composition of the communities, which were predominantly composed of elements from the lower-middle class and with a substantial servile component.

In these inscriptions, generally assignable to between 200 and the beginning of the Constantinian era, an explicit sign of the new faith recurs sporadically (17%) in the form of locutions based on the terms *pax*—εἰρήνη (*pax tibi*, *pax tecum*, εἰρήνη σοι, εἰρήνη σου), which seem to function as formulae of greeting, in this case a farewell to the survivors of the deceased: *Caelestina* | *pax* (ICUR IX 25046), *Filumena pax tecum* (ICUR VIII 23243), *pax tecum Priv|ata* (ICUR IX 25457), Κρησκεντῖνα εἰρήνη σοι (ICUR IX 26087). These directly take up the contemporary formula of greeting in the community, whose antecedent was the Hebrew *shalom*, but which finds its conceptual root and thus its justification in the NT writings, where *pax* marks greetings among the living in a Christian sense. Thus we have a process of transposition from the world of the living to that of the dead which, on the formal level, found its most immediate epigraphical antecedent in the pagan practice which, at the foot of the inscription, sometimes included locutions such as *salve*, *ave*, *vale*, χαῖρε, addressed to the deceased: exemplary in this sense is an inscription in the catacomb of Priscilla in which both forms of greeting, the classical and the Christian, are combined: *Leonti p|ax a fra|tribus* | *vale* (ICUR IX 25319). Contemporaneously with the appearance of these formulary modules came more articulate expressions and, especially, the irenic formula *par excellence*—ἐν εἰρήνῃ, which would accompany early Christian epigraphical production until the end (6th c.) of its course.

The characteristics that can be observed in Roman inscriptions recur systematically in other centers as well, which preserve early Christian funerary sites certainly attributable to the pre-Constantinian era: thus the structure of the *singulum* name, accompanied or not by an irenic formula, is found at Naples in the vestibule of the catacomb of S. Gennaro, at Syracuse in the complex of S. Maria del Gesù (Vigna Cassia), at Hadrumetum (modern-day Sousse) in the catacomb of the Good Shepherd, in Provence at Arles and Vaison-la-Romaine, at Amiens and at Autun. Entirely atypical and appearing nowhere else are the elements that characterize the pre-Constantinian inscriptions of the Aegean island of Thera, where the text of the inscription is composed of ἄγγελος followed by the name of the deceased, and of those of the Tembris Valley (Phrygia), where the inscription includes the initial or specifying formula Χρειστιανοὶ Χρειστιανοῖς "Christians [did this] to Christians."

During the pre-Constantinian era Christian inscriptions mainly showed a textual plan reduced to the indispensable minimum, which was substantially different from prevalent contemporary pagan practice, which, in the course of the 3rd c., had reached the maximum of its textual articulation with the insertion of multiple facts remembering the deceased and their survivors, i.e., those who dedicated the tomb. De Rossi, who dedicated many years of his activity to the study of primitive Christian cemeterial nuclei, of course noticed this evidence, limiting himself to comment on "a laconic and mysterious quality in early Christian inscriptions." But there was nothing mysterious in this practice, much less crypto-Christian; it was rather a clearly defined ideological choice that touched on the mode of being and appearance of the Christian community in society: the ideological referent seems to be the Pauline precept of Gal 3:28: "there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither man nor woman, because you are all one in Jesus Christ." The rigorous consistency of this approach, wholly communitarian, finds a further extraordinary epigraphical "translation" in the oldest pontifical cemetery, that of area I in St. Callistus, where the inscriptions of the leaders of the 3rd-c. community (from Pontian d. 235 to Gaius d. 296: ICUR IV 10670, 10558, 10694, 10645, 10616, 10584) differ in nothing from those of the common faithful; for them too, only the individual element, the name, is registered; no space whatsoever is given to any other retrospective data, and even the minimal *elogium*, the *benemerenti*, is lacking. These are the tangible effects of what was maturing in the church of Rome, and probably also in other centers, between the late 2nd and early 3rd c.: first, the transition from collegial (presbyterial) government to the monarchical and centralized government begun under the pontificate of *Victor (188–198), which seems to explain a widespread prevalence of homogenous inscriptions, probably inspired and controlled from above; second, the establishment, in particular by Callistus, of a new and prevailing ideology of being church: not the elite, educated, rigorist, select community longed for by ps.-*Hippolytus and *Novatian, but an open community with a strong and varied popular component, which saw itself reflected in the image of No-

ah's Ark, in which all the animals (the pure and the impure) found equal acceptance: this image of the community is that which seems to shine through 3rd-c. funerary inscriptions taken as a whole.

IV. The late imperial era. A presentation, though summary, of Christian inscriptions in the centuries of the late imperial era (4th-5th c.) must consider from the outset the new situations in which the Church of Rome (as an institution and as a community) would find itself in the aftermath of religious pacification. One emerging phenomenon—perhaps the most dramatic in its extension and consequences—was that of mass conversion. In accepting a large number of new members, the communities de facto accepted in their milieu the coexistence of a rooted pagan formation with an as yet immature, perhaps superficial and at times even calculated, adherence to the new faith: St. *Jerome, for example, denounced the fact that, among the new converts, many were Christians "in name only" (*Ep.* 45, 4, 2 anno 385; 125, 6, 3 anno 411). Faced with this phenomenon the church diligently increased its catechetical activities, widely using not just oral communication, but written. It is during this period that the Christians first widely adopted the new form of the book (the *codex*), and it was also during this period that saw in the Latin church the extremely rapid spread of a new graphical style in books, uncial script, which already in the course of the 4th c. had begun to be used in inscriptions, through the mediation of ecclesiastics. The church, heir to the middling-to-high level of written culture in the society of the middle imperial period, came to propose itself, perhaps even unconsciously (this was not its main objective), as the element of "continuity" during a time in which, for the exercise of its own mandate, it succeeded in "maintaining the diffusion of writing at a high level in the lower classes of society even in centuries, such as the 4th and 5th, in which scholastic organization and primary instruction, which had once flourished, were declining in every part of the empire" (A. Petrucci).

Already at the start of the Constantinian era and even more evidently beginning in the mid 4th c., the new ecclesial reality concretely manifested itself also through the practice of inscriptions which, in not a few aspects, after the parenthesis of the 3rd c., began to reappropriate the consolidated heritage of the tradition. Between the pre-Constantinian era and that which immediately followed it, the differences are immediately evident and very profound. With good reason A. Ferrua, comparing the pre-Constantinian inscriptions of region I - Y of the catacomb of SS. Marcellino e Pietro on the Via Labicana with those of the second half of the 4th c. of the cemetery of Commodilla, could legitimately observe: "It is incredible how in a few decades cemeterial practices would change profoundly, and in almost every aspect of their explication: we seem to enter a new world."

The first and most evident symptoms of the "new world" evoked by Ferrua can preliminarily be fixed in two aspects of significant importance: first, the reentry into current practice of all that had been "ideologically" excluded in the epigraphical structures of "archaic laconism" (retrospective data); and second, a greater and more conscious visibility of the "specifically Christian" which, still submerged and almost reticent in the 3rd c., over a brief period increasingly became a clear sign of belonging. The most striking evidence of this phenomenon is the extraordinary proliferation of christological signs (first the monogram and the monogrammatic cross and then, from the 5th c., the Greek cross and then the Latin) which invaded every type of inscription, including those on objects for everyday use (*instrumentum*).

With the Constantinian era, the inscriptions put on the tombs of Christians, noticeably increasing in length, reappropriated the traditional dedicatory structure ("from so-and-so to so-and-so"), into which was reinserted information about the life of the deceased: biometric data, the *elogium*, remembrance of the role played in the civil, ecclesial and family communities, mention of the day of death/burial (*depositus / depositio*—κατετέθη / κατάθεσις) which, while it cannot be called specifically Christian in a theological-doctrinal sense (as has been erroneously maintained), nonetheless seemed to be widely adopted by Christians. Also inserted into these same structures were terms, expressions or simply "signs" that identified deceased and dedicator as followers of the new faith: most typical and widespread was the definitive consolidation of the irenic formulae *in pace*—ἐν εἰρήνῃ, variously assumed with eschatological (*in pace Christi*, *Dei*, *Domini*), funerary (the *quies* of the tomb) or retrospective value, the latter in reference to a life lived *secundum legem domini* (e.g., *Maxema que vi|xit in pace a|nnos triginta*: ICUR IV 9419). It is precisely in this specific formulary context, much more so than in the tired repetition of formulae of the pagan inheritance (e.g., the *dis Manibus*), by then already emptied of their original meanings, that we find symptoms of the gap between the doctrinal-disciplinary norm and its actual impact on the behavior of the mass of new converts. This can be observed, e.g., in inscriptions that mention Christian

initiation (ca. 60 examples datable between 330 and the mid 5th c.), in which the average age of the newly-baptized deceased (from 20 to 50 years) allows the legitimate supposition of a deliberate and calculated delay of *baptism until the approach of death (ICUR I 2087, 2833, 3202, 3553; II 4164; III 7379; IV 11806, 11862, 12020, 12459, 12652; V 13443; VII 17548, 18469, 18631, 18693, 18979, 19820; IX 24870): these *procrastinantes* (as the fathers of the church called them) therefore approached baptism in the *status* of *audientes*, and not of *electi*. In this evidence—and this is substantially valid for both Latin and Greek inscriptions throughout the *Orbis christianus antiquus*—Christian initiation, with rare exceptions, is mentioned not with the specifically technical terms βάπτισμα | βαπτίζειν (*baptisma*, *-us* | *baptizare*) and the Latin equivalents *tinctio—tingere*, but with formulae such as *gratiam dei accipere* (*percipere*, *consequi*), *fidem accipere*, which clearly record the effects of initiation rather than those properly connected with the ritual action, as would be implicit in *baptisma—baptizare*. We can in fact note a double lexical-expressive register in the mention of baptism and of the images connected with it: that discussed here, succinct and reduced to a limited, stereotypical vocabulary; and that, profoundly different, more refined and more doctrinally aware, documented esp. in inscriptions *ad fontes*, i.e., inscriptions conceived and commissioned by the hierarchy and placed in baptisteries, such as the very famous one wanted by St. *Ambrose for the baptistery connected to the cathedral of St. Thecla at *Milan (Cuscito 2001, n. 16; ILCV 1841), or that for the Lateran baptistery of *Sixtus III (432–440: Cuscito n. 4; ILCV 1513).

With respect to the specifically doctrinal sphere, we observe a clear separation between popular inscriptions and those of the élites, clerical and lay. Evidence from the latter groups contains expressions and formulae that go back, sometimes in explicit terms and in articulate settings, to the basic principles of the Christian faith: profession of faith, hope of *resurrection, immortality, intercession of the saints, mention of worthy behavior in light of the gospel. Among the numerous examples are those of the neophyte *Aedesius . . . qui crededit in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto* (ICUR 13443); the presbyter *Tirgrinus* who declares *pono metum de fine meo, spes una salutis nam mihi fit Christus, quo duce mors moritur* (ICUR VI 15842); *Iunianus* and *Bictora*, remembered respectively as *amator pauperorum* and *amatrix pauperorum*; of *Gentianus fidelis*, to whom the survivors address a prayer of intercession: *et in orationis tuis roges pro nobis quia scimus te in Christo* (ICUR VIII 22480); the Syracusan Criside in whose Greek inscription we read: “Remember, God, your servant Criside and give her a splendid repose, a place of comfort in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” (IGCVO 475); Cyriacus and Babosa to whom are dedicated, respectively, the hopeful formulae *martures sancti bonibenedicti vos atiutate Quiriacu* (ICUR X 26350) and *refrigeret tibi Deus et Christus et domni nostri Adeodatus et Felix* (i.e., the martyrs Felix and Adautto; ICUR II 6152). Noteworthy in this context is a conspicuous group of Syrian inscriptions characterized by the presence—as *incipit* of the inscriptions—of the monotheistic formula εἷς θεός, of Jewish origin and already used among the pagans (Guarducci IV, 274). Naturally, all of these elements were particularly popular in decorative monumental inscriptions (i.e., inscriptions in churches) and in funerary inscriptions of community leaders (Carletti 2001, 345-354, 362-383).

An age-old tradition that endured without interruption was that of the “cult of the name”—the essential element of funerary inscriptions—which precisely in the 4th and 5th c., and esp. in inscriptions in verse, was emphatically visualized through the use of acrostic, or by insertion into equivocal constructions, through which, in harmony or in contrast with the meaning of the name, the moral and/or spiritual qualities of the deceased were expressed, as e.g.: *hic requiescit Superbus | tantum in nomine dictus, | quem innocentem miotemq(ue) sa(n)cti novere beati* . . . (ICUR V 13954); . . . *Felicitas isto | clauditur infelix falso cognomine dicta* (ICUR I 713); . . . *Anastasia secundum nomen credo futuram* (i.e., *vitam*; ICUR II 6130).

Another peculiar trait symptomatic of the “new times” can be seen in the large-scale irruption in the epigraphical formulary of a series of locutions that repropose the atavistic need for the possession and visibility of the final dwelling. The faithful—unheard of in the pre-Constantinian era—concerned themselves already in their lifetime with assuring a dignified burial for themselves and their relatives: thus reemerged, even in communitarian burial grounds—which continued, formally, to be that of Christians—the tradition of the tomb of the nobility (the *cubiculum*), often decorated with paintings and furnished with imposing doors to emphasize ownership and to protect exclusivity of use. As a consequence we note the widespread recovery of the formulary repertoire that fixed on the stone the acquisition of the tomb during life and certified its possession: *se vivi fecerunt*, *fecit sibi et suis*, *se vivo fecit*, to which was frequently added the specific kind of burial (*locus*, *arcosolium*, *cubiculum*, *sar-*

cophagus, *tumulus*, *memoria*, *domus*, *domus aeternalis*), and the verbal forms *emere* and *comparare*, used either absolutely (see ICUR V 13148, 13150, 13613; X 27541, 27542) or in conjunction with the explicit mention of the object of acquisition, the burial (ICUR III 8266; V 13113, 13140, 13471), of which not infrequently the location was also indicated (ICUR IV 12494 . . . *in cymiterium Balbinae in crypta noba*; IV 12458 . . . *emit sibi et ux|ori suae Felicitati a Felice fossore | in Balbinis basili|ca locum sub teglata se vibum*). Emerging in these formulary contexts in the role of protagonist was the figure of the *fossor*, whose presence, barely discernible in the pre-Constantinian era and almost exclusively in the production of frescoes (e.g., in the so-called cubicles of the sacraments in St. Callistus), assumes, beginning in the first third of the 4th c., an important epigraphical visibility, with a significant concentration from the time of Pope Damasus until the early 5th c., which was the period of maximum development of the cult of the martyrs in the catacombs and of the consequent phenomenon of graves located near venerated tombs (**Depositio ad sanctos*), the most desired and likely the most expensive (ICUR II 6077, III 8669; IV 9441, 9924, 12748; VI 17192; VIII 23546; IX 25165; X 27034, 27060). Their activities, expanding well beyond their normal tasks (excavation and preparation of graves), came to include the direct management of the sale of graves (ICUR II 6077, 6102; IV 12458).

Also during that same key juncture of Damasus's pontificate began the process of conversion of not a few members of aristocratic families, along with the emergence of an enterprising class that would occupy increasingly important roles in the pontifical curia. For them, prestige, ancestry and power were perpetuated also in their final dwelling. This occurred esp. in the great cemeterial basilicas of Via Cornelia, Via Ostiense, Via Appia and Via Tiburtina which, for their monumental visibility and the prestige of the associated martyrs (Peter, Paul, Lawrence), became the preferred cemeteries of the upper echelons of society, whether lay or clerical. There was not a systematic exclusion of "ordinary" deceased, but a very limited space was reserved for them, little more than for common mass graves, in which there was no possibility of an inscription.

Concentrated to a high degree (54%) in these monumental cemeteries—certainly not by chance—was one of the most typical products of Late Antique funerary epigraphy: the inscription in verse, which, beginning precisely in the second half of the 4th c., attained a notable diffusion, thanks especially to the powerful impulse of the activity, in many respects unique and unrepeatable, of Damasus with the composition of the *elogia martyrum*, and in the wake of the entrance into the community of those familiar groups that were most rooted in the traditional culture. The epigraphical genre of the *carmina*—classical in its expressive forms, metrical structures and graphical forms—would become the Church of Rome's official form for public exposition: the great inscriptions that adorn churches (St. Peter's, St. Paul's, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Sabina) are in verse, and beginning with Pope *Liberius (352-366: ICUR IX 24831) the funerary inscriptions of the popes began to be composed in verse.

Nothing of what can be observed in monumental cemeteries and churches with respect to the quantity and quality of epigraphical production is reflected in the anonymous pockets of some catacombs active from the mid 4th to the first decades of the 5th c., where in vain do we look for individuals belonging to the *élites* of society, burial arrangements of some pretention, or even less inscriptions in verse. The users of these cemeteries seem to belong to culturally and economically depressed social classes: the already sporadic and in some cases even exceptional practice of the written funerary memorial shows evidence of having undergone an irreversible collapse. The data pointing in this direction seems incontrovertible: in level I of the cemetery of Panfilo, put in use between 348 and 361 (ICUR X 26549, 26550), of 325 burials in niches (*loculi*) only 3% bear a written text; in the complex of S. Agnese on the Via Nomentana the percentage of tombs bearing writing is 14% (of a total of 5,753 tombs), in the catacomb of Commodilla on the Via Ostiense it does not exceed 13%, and in that of Marcellino e Pietro on the Via Labicana only 10% (2,200) of the 22,500 burials are accompanied by an inscription. In essence "written death" was no longer, as in the 3rd c., a balanced reflection of the actual social stratification of the communities, but tended to be concentrated more and more in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the aristocracy and the public and pontifical bureaucracies, contexts in which, due to tradition and contingent necessity (pastoral and professional), the production and circulation of written culture continued to be vital. Illuminating in this sense is the situation observable in the *basilica Apostolorum* on the Via Appia where, from 340 to the first decades of the 5th c. (the period of greatest activity), there were about 1,000 burials. Here, relative to contemporary underground cemeteries, the greatest difference besides the obvious morphological and structural differences is that of the frequency of a written memorial, which are concentrated in a high percentage (60%)

in burials belonging to the societal hierarchies: *viri clarissimi* and *clarissimae feminae* (ICUR V 13355 anno 389, 13507, 13551, 13594, 13796a; 13327 anno 371, 13335 anno 389, 13484, 13491, 13562, 13606, 13740), *viri perfectissimi* (ICUR V 13487), *viri ac feminae honesti* (ICUR V 13309 anno 360, 13365 anno 394, 13385 anno 404, 13411, 13413 anno 518, 13674). In this as in other suburban complexes (St. Peter's, St. Paul's, S. Lorenzo) were tangibly manifest the symptoms of that process of selection that in the centuries of the Early Middle Ages would lead Roman epigraphical production in a single direction: that of "inscribing the great" (A. Petrucci).

In the other regions of the *Orbis christianus antiquus*, from the middle of the 4th c., we note an extraordinary proliferation of epigraphical production, in large part funerary, commissioned by Christians. The texts, in the course of ca. 50 years, began to conform to a single structure, indicative-locational ("here lies/rests so-and-so"), which definitively replaces the dedicatory form ("so-and-so to so-and-so") of consolidated pagan and Christian tradition. This was a profound change, manifested by the beginning obituary formulae *hic iacet*, *hic positus est*, *locus cuisdam* and especially *hic quiescit*, *hic requiescit*. Another aspect that marks the epigraphical formulary in the passage from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages is the appearance in epigraphical formularies of surprisingly articulate formulae, of obvious ecclesiastical origin, which, besides a monetary fine to be paid to civil authorities or to the church, threaten unspeakable calamities against violators of the grave, including divine judgment as manifested in some events of sacred history (the leprosy of Naaman and of Elisha's servant Gehazi, the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira, the demise of Judas the traitor) or in the anathema that the 318 fathers of Nicaea launched against Arius. These forms were very popular in Italy (ILCV 3848, 3849, 3850, 3851, 3852, 3853, 3859, 3860, 3861, 3864), except at Rome, where we count very few examples (ICUR II 4421, V 13130, VII 18191; ILCV 3858A), and especially in Asia Minor and particularly in Phrygia, where one of the constants of local inscriptions was the so-called formula of Eumenia: the potential violator of the grave is reminded that "he will have to deal with God" (Perraymond 1980–81). In the different areas—though within a homogeneous textual structure, by now even codified—one can note some peculiarities of form: thus the conspicuous production of Trier is characterized by the initial formula *hic pausat* and by the presence at the end of the inscription of the figurative module of two doves facing a tree; in Africa, besides the denomination of the burial with the term *mensa*, we observe the rather widespread practice of designating the deceased with the term *fidelis*, and the introductory formula *memoria* (Duval 1988). In Italy, in particular local areas, one observes specific formulary traits such as the inscriptions of Bolsena with the typical phrase *pax tibi cum sanctis* (ICI I passim), or those of Tropea in which the dedication of the grave is expressed with the formula *cui bene fecit* (ICI V 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39).

V. Devotional inscriptions. From the pre-Constantinian era the practice of devotional inscriptions directed to the "heroes" of the Roman church, i.e., the martyrs of the faith, developed rapidly within the community. These were extemporaneous attestations, generally autograph, traced as graffiti on the walls of the sacred areas in the city's suburbs. The most important complex of this type of written production, unique in its genre, is certainly that called "of the Triclia" under the *basilica Apostolorum* on the Via Appia: a courtyard, porticoed on three sides and furnished with benches, on whose walls were traced 332 graffiti (22% of them in Greek) between the mid 3rd and early 4th c., attesting the memory of some 600 individuals. In this place where, according to a tradition already attested by the **depositio martyrum* and by an epigram of Pope *Damasus ("You who go in search of the names of Peter and Paul, must know that the saints once dwelt here": ICUR V 13273, vv. 1-2), Peter and Paul were temporarily buried, a funerary cult center developed for a period of about 50 years for the commemoration of the two apostles, in honor of whom visitors ate a ritual meal (*refrigerium*) and sometimes left written traces of their presence. This is not the place to take up the hoary (and perhaps idle, in their periodic repetition) questions about the presence of Peter and Paul *in catacumbas*, whether dead (following a translation) or alive (tradition of a dwelling there). What seems certain is that the Christian community of Rome considered that place as an area made sacred by the presence, whether true or presumed, of a funerary memory of the two apostles. In this sense the messages conveyed by the graffiti traced on the walls of the porticoed courtyard (*triclia*) do not seem to admit of doubts. The numerous visitors there seem to have been for the most part little skilled in writing, and used unusual large, rough capital letters, sometimes alternated with small letters (esp. the letter b), traced "with difficulty" with implements not always suitable to the purpose, as it seems we must conclude from the oversized, ragged character of the letters, which were uneven and often not very clear.

Most of these inscriptions contain prayers addressed to the two apostles, usually expressed in the locutions "remember so-and-so" (*in mente habete*, εἰς μνείαν ἔχετε: ICUR V 12914, 12980, 13055), "protect so-and-so" (συντηρήσατε,τηρήσατε: 13053), "pray for so-and-so" (*petite*, *orate*, *rogate pro*: 12931, 12989) "help so-and-so" (*subvenite*, *adiuvate*: 12967). Sometimes visitors made explicit the particular motive that led them to ask the intervention of Peter and Paul: a good journey by sea [*Petre et Paule in mente* | *ha*]*bete Restitu*[*tum*] | *nabiga felix in deo*] (ICUR V 12973 and the similar 12959), or the victory of one's favorite horse in the circus races, as indicated by some images of richly dressed horses with their heads wreathed (ICUR V 13088 a-c, 13089 a-d). One certain fact that results from the texts of these graffiti, as well as from the morphology and the functional typology of the setting, is that not a few visitors expressed their devotion also with a meal consumed in honor of the two martyrs. This custom finds cogent expression in the terms *refrigerium*, *refrigerare*, taken from everyday language and already used among the pagans to indicate the meals taken at the tombs of relatives: *Petro et Paulo* | *Tomius Coelius* | *refriger*[*i*]*um feci* (ICUR V 12981); *Dalmatius* | *botum is promisit* | *refrigerium* (V 12932); *XIIII kal*(*endas*) *apriles* | *refrigeravi* | *Parthenius in deo et nos in deo omnes* (V 12961).

Another complex of graffiti inscriptions, all in Latin, is dated to between the late 3rd and first two decades of the 4th c.: the very famous—perhaps more for the debates it has aroused than for its intrinsic value—area of the so-called wall G under the confession of St. Peter's in the Vatican. Here, different from what has been observed for the graffiti of the *triclia*, one sees "a frenetic superimposition of different writings in the same very small space, without respect for the preceding messages, with no graphic order and with no concern for legibility" (Petrucci). The important fact that emerges from these inscriptions is the precocious occurrence of the christological monogram in the decussate form, used mostly as an abbreviation (*compendium scripturae*) in acclamatory contexts such as [- - - *et*] *Simplici vivite in Chr*(*isto*); *Nikasi vibas in Chr*(*isto*); *Victor* | *Gaudentia* | *vivatis in Chr*(*isto*); *Marcu* | *bive in Chr*(*isto*). Also important, and in some ways surprising, is the absence of any mention of the Apostle's name; nor, to this end, do some efforts appear persuasive to see its presence in some abbreviated monogrammatic forms (the letters PE), effectively a "laboratory reconstruction," i.e., through a presumed mechanism of transfigurations, superimpositions and tangents among alphabetical elements belonging to different inscriptions and hands. From the 4th c., however, the monogram PE is in fact widely documented in funerary inscriptions, as well in other types of inscriptions (e.g., the contorniates), as a literal "compendium" of the congratulatory acclamation *p*(*alma*) *e*(*t*) *l*(*aurus*): a typically Late Antique formula which in some way could be considered specific to the Christians.

In the course of the 4th and 5th c., besides in the Roman sanctuaries (in particular in Callisto, Marcellino e Pietro, Priscilla), the practice of devotional inscriptions scratched into the burial site spread to a great rural sanctuary, that of S. Felice at Nola, where on a small plaster panel texts are preserved—in every way similar to those at Rome—which record the names of visitors and sometimes that of the saint in the context of invocational formulae. The custom of extemporaneous devotional writings was common at Rome throughout the early Middle Ages, and in fact it is precisely during the course of the 6th-8th c. where we find its maximum diffusion as a phenomenon associated with pilgrimages *ad limina*. Cultic centers, all of them suburban, that preserve evidence of this devotional practice are the martyrs' sanctuaries, esp. those of S. Calepodio on the Via Aurelia, Ponziano on the Via Portuense, Commodilla on the Via Ostiense, S. Callisto and Pretestato on the Via Appia, the anonymous basilica of the Via Ardeatina, S. Ippolito on the Via Tiburtina, S. Ermete and S. Panfilo on the Via Salaria, S. Valentino on the Via Flaminia.

With the start of the 8th c. began inexorably the end of this practice of writing which, at Rome, from the first imperial age and then uninterruptedly for seven centuries, in different ways, places and circumstances, was proposed as one of the symptomatic "signs" of an extensive and indirect diffusion of extemporaneous and occasional epigraphical writing. But between the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th c., the material contexts of this practice were lost—the suburban sanctuaries, which were emptied of their precious contents, the bodies of the martyrs. The final seal of this period can be considered the inscription put by Paschal I (817–824) in the church of S. Prassede in memory of the translation of 2300 bodies of martyrs (or presumed as such) from the sanctuaries of the catacombs to the urban church on the Esquiline.

S.L. Agnello, *Silloge di iscrizioni paleocristiane della Sicilia*, Rome 1953; M. Guarducci, *I graffiti sotto la confessione di S. Pietro in Vaticano*, I-III, Vatican City 1958; P.A. Février, *Remarques sur les inscriptions funéraires datées de Maurétanie Césarienne orientale (II-V siècle)*: MEFRA 76 (1964) 105-172; G. Cuscito, *Depositus in hanc piscinam. Morte e risurrezione*

nell'antico cristianesimo aquileiese: Aquileia Nostra 42 (1971) 57-64; Id., *Valori umani e religiosi nell'epigrafia cristiana dell'Alto Adriatico*: AAAd 2 (1972) 167-196; Ch. Pietri, *Grabinschrift*: RAC 12, Stuttgart 1983, cols. 514-590; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, IV, Rome 1978; A. Ferrua, *L'epigrafia cristiana prima di Costantino*, in *Atti IX Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia cristiana*, Vatican City 1978, 583-613; J. Janssens, *Vita e morte del cristiano negli epitaffi di Roma anteriori al VII secolo*, Rome 1981; M. Perraymond, *Formule imprecatorie ('Arai) nelle iscrizioni funerarie paleocristiane*: Annali dell'Istituto di Lingua and letteratura latina - Facoltà di Magistero - Università di Roma "La Sapienza" 2-3 (1980-81) 115-152; G. Cuscito, *Studi e ricerche di epigrafia cristiana a Milano: Felix Ravenna* 127-129 (1985) 133-157; Ch. Pietri, *La Bible dans l'épigraphie de l'Occident latin*, in *Le monde antique et la Bible*, Paris 1985, 189-205; C. Carletti, *Iscrizioni cristiane a Roma. Testimonianze di vita cristiana (secoli III-VII)*, Florence 1986; Id., *"Epigrafia cristiana" "Epigrafia dei cristiani": alle origini della terza età dell'epigrafia*, in *La terza età dell'epigrafia*, in *Colloquio AIEGL - Borghesi '86*, Faenza 1988, 115-135; Id., L'epigrafia dei cristiani: prassi e ideologia tra tradizione e innovazione, in *Aurea Roma: dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, S. Ensoli - E. La Rocca (eds.), Rome 2000; N. Duval, *L'épigraphie funéraire chrétienne d'Afrique: traditions et ruptures, constantes et diversites*, ibid., 265-309; A. Ferrua, *Note e giunte alle iscrizioni cristiane della Sicilia*, Vatican City 1989; Id., *La polemica antiariana nei monumenti paleocristiani*, Vatican City 1991; G. Sanders, *Lapides memores. Païens et chrétiens face à la mort: le témoignage de l'épigraphie funéraire latine*, Faenza 1991; A. Felle, *Note su Sacra Scrittura ed epigrafia cristiana in margine a C. Wessel, Inscriptiones Graecae Christianae Veteres Occidentis*: ASE 9 (1992) 467-482; A. Petrucci, *Le scritture ultime. Ideologia della morte e strategia dello scrivere nella tradizione occidentale*, Turin 1995; C. Carletti, *Viatores ad martyres. Testimonianze scritte altomedievali nelle catacombe romane*, in *Epigrafia medievale greca e latina. Ideologia e funzione* (Atti del Seminario di Erice 12-18 sett. 1991), Spoleto 1995, 197-225; A. Felle, *Loci scritturistici nella produzione epigrafica romana*: VetChr 32 (1995) 61-89; Var. aus., *Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano. Materiali e contributi per una mostra epigrafica*, ed. I. Di Stefano Manzella, Vatican City 1997; C. Carletti, "*Un mondo nuovo." Epigrafia funeraria dei cristiani a Roma in età postcostantiniana*: VetChr 35 (1998) 39-67; Id., *L'epigrafia di apparato negli edifici di culto da Costantino a Gregorio Magno*, in *La comunità cristiana di Roma: la sua vita e la sua cultura dalle origini all'alto medio evo*, eds. L. Pani Ermini - P. Siniscalco, Vatican City 2000, 439-459; Id., *L'arca di Noé: ovvero la chiesa di Callisto e l'uniformità della morte scritta*: Antiquité tardive 9 (2001) 97-102; Id., *Dalla "pratica aperta" alla "pratica chiusa": produzione epigrafica a Roma tra V e VIII secolo*, in *XLVIII Settimana CISAM*, I, Spoleto 2001, 325-392; D. Mazzoleni, *Epigrafi del mondo cristiano antico*, Rome 2002; G. Cuscito, *La prassi epigrafica dei cristiani in Alto Adriatico tra simbiosi e metabolismo*, in *Historiam perscrutari*. Miscellanea O. Pasquato, Rome 2002, 255-277.

Editions used for cited texts: Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores. Nova series, eds. A. Silvagni - A. Ferrua - D. Mazzoleni - C. Carletti, vols. I-X, Romae - In Civitate Vaticana 1922-1992 (= ICUR); *Inscriptiones Christianae Italiae*, vol. IX, Bari 1985-1995 (= ICI); *Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres*, vols. I-III, ed. E. Diehl, Dublin - Zürich [3]1970; vol. IV, *Supplementum*, eds. J. Moreau - H.I. Marrou, ibid. 1967 (= ILCV); *Inscriptiones Graecae Christianae Veteres Occidentis*, ed. K. Wessel - A. Ferrua - C. Carletti, Bari 1989; *Epigrammata damasiana*, ed. A. Ferrua, Vatican City 1942; *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédoine du III^{e} au VI^{e} siècle*, par D. Feissel, Paris 1983; *The "Christians" for "Christians." Inscriptions of Phrygia*, Greek texts, translation and commentary by E. Gibson, Missoula 1978; G. Kiourtzian, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes des Cyclades*, Paris 2000.

C. Carletti

EPIPHANES (2nd c.), heretic of gnostic tendency, son of *Carpocrates and known from a mention in *Clement (*Strom.* III, 2, 5-9). He wrote a treatise *On justice* in which he maintained that the natural law—the work of God the creator, the source of equality and of complete communion of goods and of women—has been violated by human law, which prescribed the division of property and marriage. Hence his system was not dualistic, since responsibility for evil was attributed to human law. Clement relates that Epiphanes's mother Alexandra was a native of Cephalonia, and that at Same of Cephalonia, Epiphanes, dead at 17 and immediately divinized, received honors at the time of the full moon. This last fact, of doubtful credibility, has led to the hypothesis of the identification of Epiphanes with a lunar god, and of Carpocrates, also called Harpocrates, with Horus.

W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, 33-36; K.L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication. Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity*, Berkeley 2003, 273-291; F. Bolgiani, *La polemica di Clemente Alessandrino contro gli gnostici libertini nel III libro degli Stromati*: SMSR 38 (1967) 86-136, esp. 95-99; *Testi patristici in lingua greca e latina*, ed. M. Simonetti, Milan 1993, 183-194.

E. Prinzivalli

EPIPHANIUS, monk (8th-9th c.), monk and priest of *Constantinople. A monk in the Kallistratos convent of Constantinople, we have no other information on his life; he is often identified with others of the same name: Epiphanius, *hegumen of Mount St. Auxentius, or Epiphanius Agiopolita. He is the author of the first *Life of Mary* (two recensions), also attributed to *Epiphanius of Salamis, written based on the various apocrypha and translated into Latin in the 12th c. by Paschalis Romanus; and of the *Life of Andrew Apostle*, important for the development of the Apostle's legend (the apostolicity of the see of Constantinople). Other works are ascribed to him.

BHG 1049, BHL 5343v, CANT 91 (*Life of Mary*); BHG 102, CANT 233 (*Life of Andrew*); PG 120, 186-260; Sp. tr. of the *Life of Mary*: G. Pons Pons, Madrid 1996; J. Darrouzès: DHGE 15, 1963, 615; A.A. Longo: LTK[3] 3, 722-723 (bibl.).

M. Starowieyski

EPIPHANIUS of Constantinople (d. 535). In 520, year of his consecration as patriarch of *Constantinople (Mansi VIII, 490; 491; 492), he ratified the union with *Rome; he wrote frequently to Pope *Hormisdas and sent him gifts (Mansi VIII, 502-503; 505-506; 514-515; 524). He tried to put the region of *Thessalonica under his own jurisdiction, supporting the revolt (531) of two bishops who opposed the election of *Stephen of Larissa. Stephen appealed to Pope *Boniface II, who confirmed (III Council of Rome) the dependence on Rome of all Illyricum (Mansi VIII, 739-784). Died June 535 (Theophanes, *Chron.* A.C. 529).

Patrologia V, 44.

F. COCCHINI

EPIPHANIUS of Pavia (438–496). Became bishop of Pavia in 466. He lived in a particularly difficult period for the Western empire, working always for peace; more than once he was asked to mediate disputes between various Germanic kings. He contributed to the rebuilding of Pavia, destroyed by *Odoacer in 476, and obtained its exemption from tribute. He also earned the respect of *Theodoric, king of the *Ostrogoths, who sent him to Gundobald, king of the *Burgundians, to obtain the liberation of 6000 prisoners. These facts come from his biography written by *Ennodius, in his turn bishop of Pavia.

AASS (Venice 1734) Ian. II, 364-380; Ennodius, *Vita Epiphani*, CSEL 6, 331-383; PCBE 2, 637-641; DBI 43, 22-24; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Ticinum: dal 476 d.C. alla fine del regno gotico*, in *Storia di Pavia*, I, Milan 1984, 272ff.; V. Lanzani, *Ticinum: Le origini della città cristiana*, ibid., I, Milan 1984, 350ff.; Id., *La Chiesa pavese nell'alto Medio Evo: da Ennodio alla caduta del Regno longobardo*, ibid., II, Milan 1987, 408ff.

G. PILARA

EPIPHANIUS of Salamis (d. 403). Bishop of Salamis from ca. 365 to 403. Born ca. 315 at Besanduche, near Eleutheropolis in *Palestine. Educated in *Egypt; returning home aged 20, he founded a *cenobium, of which he was superior and presbyter for ca. 30 years. From there he zealously followed heretical movements, taking part in the anti-Nicene struggle and drawing attention to the presence of *Ebionites, *gnostics, *Manicheans, *Quartodecimans, *Audiani, etc. He tells us of his visit to *Eusebius of Vercelli, who had been transferred to a palace of *Comes* Joseph of Tiberias (curator of sacred buildings from the time of Constantine) in Arian Scythopolis. He denounced the mitigated forms of *Basil of Ancyra's homoiousianism (third formula of Sirmium: 358) and the various attitudes of Ebionism, S and N of *Damascus, to believers in Christ's divinity. He was not intransigent, however, against those who did not celebrate *Easter according to the decrees of *Nicaea. Formed on the simplicity of biblical culture, he condemned with particular vigor the neosophistic language of the time as falsity and gnostic theatricality, unworthy of the Message. For this he was accused, esp. by the moderns, of anti-Hellenic mania and limited intellect; but in fact he was consistent with his Egyptian training, midway between *allegorism and literalism, christocentric even in isopsephism. The fame of his teaching and sanctity led to his being made bishop of *Constantia* (ancient Salamis, modern Famagusta), where he pursued his activities, missionary and catechetical, controversial and pastoral, uncomprimising in the fundamentals of the faith, but more sympathetic in resolving the practical problems of his diocese and his suffragan dioceses. He allowed bishops under his jurisdiction to ordain presbyters for his flock; he encouraged ascetic life by word and example, leading *Jerome to call *Cyprus a meeting place for monks from the whole world (*Ep.* 108). But his main concern was to keep them in purity of faith, for him the guarantee of the church's unity. On the schism of *Antioch, he was in communion with *Alexandria and with St. Peter's successor, seeing *Paulinus as the sole genuine representative of *Eustathian orthodoxy; he went to Rome with Paulinus in 382 to obtain from Pope *Damasus a decision favorable to the Eustathians.

A veteran of the struggle against *Origenism, aged ca. 80 he was involved in Theophilus's campaign against the Long Brothers, who had taken refuge with *John Chrysostom. He had known them at the time of his education in the Egyptian monastery, and had condemned their *subordinationist Christology and theories on preexistence and *resurrection. Despite not having read all of *Origen's books, he had good reasons for condemning the Origenist monks, from among whom he had seen emerge the most conspicuous exponents of *Arianism. Jerome says he was averse to quarrels and was admired by the unlearned and the erudite alike; *Socrates praises his piety and rectitude; *Sozomen admires him.

Today we usually remember just the heresiologist and collector of singular information, and forget the pastor and teacher of spirituality. We forget that his works were mostly polemical: his masterpiece, the *Panarion*; the *Ancoratus*; the three works *Against Images*. The other four works accepted as authentic are all incomplete: *On Measures and*

Weights, *On the Twelve Jewels*, *Letters*, *Commentaries on Scripture* surviving minimally among the scholia of the Greek catenae.

*Palladius, so favorable to Chrysostom, had nothing to say against Epiphanius. Nor did the case of Origen do any immediate harm to his reputation, which remained undisputed all through the Middle Ages, until the revival of humanistic thought and classical form. Then Melanchthon criticized the weakness of Epiphanius's theological structure and his careless manner of expression; others exacerbated the contempt by bringing in his attitude, which they considered presumptuous and sectarian; his intellect, judged incapable of understanding Origen; his pastoral activity, judged only in the light of an alleged overconfidence that led him to commit errors. Epiphanius was certainly a great pastor of souls, anxious to find antidotes for the 80 serpents of heresy, a mystic of the *Holy Spirit which proceeds from the Father and the Son, an ecclesiologist open to dialogue with souls disposed to faith (the countless maidens of the *Song of Songs), severe only against spirits obstinate in harboring the poison of error. We forget that his controversial writings all appear to be dictated by a certain mentality apparently alien from kerygmatic dialogue, which posterity finds it difficult to share.

CPG 3744-3807; PG 41-43; GCS 25, 31, 37; It. tr.: C. Riggi, *Epifanio contro Mani* (part of the *Panarion*), Rome 1967; Id., *L'ancora della fede*, Rome 1977; Altaner 325-328 and 601 (with bibl.); DHGE 15, 717-731; DSp 4, 854-861; RAC 5, 909-927; K. Holl, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius (Ancoratus and Panarion)*, Leipzig 1910; Id., *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte I*, Tübingen 1928, 210-350; M. Villain, *Rufin d'Aquilée. La querelle autour d'Origène (rôle d'Epiphane de Salamine)*: RecSR 37 (1937) 5-18; E. Moutsoulas, *Der Begriff "Häresie" bei E. von Salamis*: SP 7 (TU 92), Berlin 1966, 362-371; C. Riggi, *Il termine di "hairesis" nell'accezione di Epifanio di Salamina*: Salesianum 29 (1967) 3-27; C. Riggi, *Lavoro e ricchezza nel Panarion di Epifanio*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 161-175; R.M. Hübner, *Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius (Panarion, haer. 65) über Paulus von Samosata, Ps.-Athanasius, contra Sabellianos*: ZKG 90 (1979) 201-220; C. Riggi, *Formule di fede in Sant'Epifanio di Salamina*: Salesianum 41 (1979) 309-321; B. Schultze, *Epiphanius über Petrus*: Archivum historiae pontificiae 17 (1979) 7-68; M. Mees, *Textverständnis und Varianten in Kap. 5 des Johannesevangeliums bei Epiphanius von Salamis*: Lateranum 46 (1980) 250-284; Id., *Textformen und Interpretation von Jn 6 bei Epiphanius*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 339-364; Id., *Die antihäretische Polemik des Epiphanius von Salamis und ihr Gebrauch von Jn 4*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 405-425; C. Riggi, *Sangue e antropologia biblica in Epifanio di Salamina*, in Centro Studi Sanguis Christi, *Atti della Settimana Sangue e Antropologia biblica nella patristica*, Rome 1982, II, 389-411; Id., *Catechesi sullo Spirito Santo in Epifanio di Salamina*, in S. Felici (ed.), *Spirito Santo e catechesi patristica*, Rome 1983, 59-73; Id., *Origene e origenisti secondo Epifanio (Haer. 64)*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 115-142; J.F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, Macon 1988; W. Adler, *The Origins of the Proto-heresies. Fragments from a Chronicle from the First Book of Epiphanius' Panarion*: JTS 41 (1990) 472-501; A. Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine*, Paris 1992; F. Dolbeau, *Nouvelles recherches sur le De ortu et obitu prophetarum et apostolorum*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 91-107; J. Dummer, *Epiphanius von Constantia und die Apologie des Aristides: eine quellenkritische Untersuchung*: Philologus 138/2 (1994) 267-287; M. Mees, *Text und Textverständnis von Joh 8,12-59 in den Werken des Epiphanius von Salamis*, in Id., *Die frühe Rezeptionsgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums: am Beispiel von Textüberlieferung und Väterexegese*, Würzburg 1994, 175-193; O. Knorr, *Die Parallelüberlieferung zum Panarion des Epiphanius von Salamis: textkritische Anmerkungen zur Neuausgabe*: WS 112 (1999) 113-127.

C. Riggi

EPIPHANIUS Scholasticus (5th-6th c.), monk. A writer born perhaps in the late 5th c. and living in the 6th, he was apparently *Cassiodorus's secretary (*scholasticus*) at Vivarium (Calabria). His name is linked to a *Historia tripartita*, in 12 books, modeled on the *Historia tripartita* of *Theodore the Lector, i.e., summarizing and reworking the text of the ecclesiastical histories of *Socrates, *Sozomen and *Theodoret. The work, in the form of a handbook, was very popular in the Middle Ages and later. Critics disagree over Cassiodorus's part in its compilation: some think he had a hand in choosing *excerpta* from the three authors' *Histories*, leaving Epiphanius to then make the Latin translation; others think he intervened in the final draft (so much as to attribute the work to him); still others think that Epiphanius himself read, chose and translated the Greek sources and that Cassiodorus merely "oversaw" him and added a short preface. Besides the mentioned work, Epiphanius translated Greek works of *Didymus the Blind (commentaries on biblical books: *Proverbs*, *Catholic Epistles*), *Philo of Carpasia (*Song of Songs*) and other Christian authors into Latin.

Verzeichnis, 306; PL 69, 879-1214; CSEL 71; M.L.W. Laistner, *The Value and Influence of Cassiodorus' Ecclesiastical History*: HTR 41 (1948) 51-67; L. Szymanski, *The Translation Procedure of Epiphanius-Cassiodorus in the Historia Tripartita Books I and II*, Washington, D.C. 1963; R. Hanslik, *Epiphanius Scholasticus oder Cassiodor? Zur Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*: Philologus 115 (1971) 107-113; F. Weissengruber, *Epiphanius Scholasticus als Übersetzer. Zu Cassiodorus-Epiphanius Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*: SAW 283, 5, Vienna 1972; LTK 3, 947; DHGE 11, 1376ff.; W. Berschin, *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter von Hieronymus bis Nikolaus von Kues*, Bern-Munich 1980.

P. Siniscalco

EPIPHANIUS SYNCELLUS (d. after 431). Epiphanius, archdeacon and secretary of *Cyril of Alexan-

dria, is known to us from a single writing: a letter sent to *Maximian, the new bishop of *Constantinople after *Nestorius's departure, in the period immediately following the Council of *Ephesus. The brief text, furnished with a unique appendix (CPG III, 5450 and 5396; ACO I,4, 222-225), is extremely interesting for a knowledge of the tangled background to the then extremely intense theological debate and the accompanying diplomatic intrigue. In fact in it Epiphanius says that Bishop Cyril, so worried over the negative direction of events as to fall sick, was disappointed over the little zeal shown for his cause by his colleague at Constantinople. What is needed, the author firmly requests, is that every effort be made at court to gain the emperor's favor. The *Alexandrian church had already taken steps along these lines, sending letters to the most influential dignitaries, to the Augusta *Pulcheria and to the ladies *Marcella and Droseria, and sending these same people gifts (*eulogiae*, *benedictiones*) so conspicuous as to have bled the coffers to the point of having to take out loans, both then and at a later date. But that was not enough. Maximian in his turn had to intervene at court, esp. with Pulcheria, maintain contacts with the Alexandrian clergy and act in concert with Cyril: only in this way was the whole question brought to a happy conclusion. To convince his correspondent, attached to the note was a detailed list of the gifts given and their recipients, probably to give Maximian another nudge and, especially, a useful suggestion.

This text has reached us through an indirect tradition. The letter and the list of gifts were in fact included in the *Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenaei*, a dossier composed in the 6th c. by a defender of the *Three Chapters, probably an African, who had translated from Greek into Latin a series of texts taken mostly from a lost apology of Nestorius, entitled *Tragedy* and written by the count *Irenaeus, friend of Theodoret and Nestorius. The whole was thus handed down by an opponent of Cyril. This is not surprising, considering that Cyril himself seems to have felt obliged to respond to the accusations that came against him because of the facts exposed in Epiphanius's letter, at least if a homily is to be attributed to him in which, with a typical trick of *retorsio*, Cyril accuses Nestorius himself of having emptied the coffers to incite the court against him (PG 77, 1029-1040; cf. CPG III, 5248).

Mansi, V, 987-989; PG 84, 826-829; Tillemont, XIV, 439; ACO I,4, 222-225; Hfl-Lecl II, 426, 436, 441; P. Batiffol, *Les présents de S. Cyrille à la cour de Costantinople*: BALAC 1 (1911) 246-267; (= Id., *Études de Liturgie et d'archéologie chrétienne*, Paris 1919, 154-179); P.Th. Camelot, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine* (Histoire des conciles œcuméniques, 2), Paris 1962, 58; Fliche-Martin IV, 234; Ch. Fraisse-Coué, *Il dibattito teologico nell'età di Teodosio II: Nestorio*, in *Storia del cristianesimo. Religione, politica e cultura*, 2: *La nascita di una cristianità (250–430)*, eds. Ch. and L. Pietri, it. ed., ed. A. Di Berardino, Rome 2000, 506-507, 514-515; Id., *Da Efeso a Calcedonia: "La pace illusoria" (433–451)*, in *Storia del cristianesimo. Religione, politica e cultura*, 3: *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, ed. L. Pietri, it. ed., ed. E. Prinzivalli, Rome 2002, 41.

E. Zocca

EPIPHANIUS the Latin. In PLS 3, 834-964 is the text of the *Interpretatio Evangeliorum* attributed to a bishop named Epiphanius, no better identified despite the studies of Morin, still uncertain whether to make him a bishop of Benevento or Seville in the late 5th to early 6th c. The only sure facts are the work's Latin origin and its date during the period indicated. The *Interpretatio Evangeliorum* follows the narrative of the synoptics, in 62 chapters. After briefly commenting on Christ's nativity, infancy, Herod's persecution, the *baptism, temptation and calling of Peter and Andrew, the remaining 42 chs. briefly comment on Jesus' miracles and parables. The text as we know it does not narrate the events of the Paschal mystery. Its emphasis is on making the gospel texts ecclesially and sacramentally topical. The use of earlier patristic commentaries is constant, though reduced to the essential: for ch. 25: *De divite* (Mt 19:16-29/Lk 18:18-30) see, e.g., *Origen, *Comm. Mt.* XV, 10-12; *John Chrysostom, *Hom* 63 *in Mt.*; *Augustine, *Serm.* 84, 85; for ch. 37: *De parabola duorum filiorum secundum Lucam* (Lk 15:11-32), see Origen, *Comm. Lc. frag.* 216 and 218 (GCS IX, 321), *Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3, 23, 5, *Tertullian, *Pudic.* 9, 11. The community addressed by Epiphanius, already aware of the Christian mystery, appears mainly interested in a sacramental discourse and a common spiritual walk.

CPL 914; PLS 3, 834-964; G. Morin, *Le commentaire inédit de l'évêque latin Epiphanius sur les Évangiles*: RBen 24 (1907) 336-359; M. Inguanez, *I sermoni sui Vangeli del vescovo latino Epifanio nei codici Cassinesi*: Riv. storica benedettina 19 (1915) 368-375; A. Erikson, *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio evangeliorum*, Lund 1939; Patrologia IV, 236-238.

M.G. Mara

EPIPHANY, Feast of

I. In the East - II. In the West.

I. In the East. Epiphany is, as the name indicates, of Eastern origin (ἐπιφάνεια, *epiphania*, θεοφάνεια, *theophania*). Epiphany means, in the Hellenistic

sense, the "shining forth" and soteriological revelation of God, who is revealed in the miracles of his omnipotence. *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1,21,146) first mentions the celebration of the *baptism of Jesus on 6 and 10 January, but it is only celebrated, as Clement himself says, by the *gnostics of *Basilides (theological idea: only at the baptism is the Logos joined with Jesus' flesh); we do not know whether the feast was then called Epiphany. At *Alexandria, probably under Athanasius, the feast is linked to various moments: Jesus' birth, his baptism, the wedding at Cana. Initially there was probably a connection with a popular feast at Alexandria: the birth of the god Aion of the virgin Kore; on the same day there was the rite of drawing water from the Nile (Epiph., *Haer.* 51,22,10; 51,30,3). Evidence on this becomes numerous only in the last third of the 4th c.: Epiphany is attested at *Caesarea in *Cappadocia in 372 (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 43,52), at *Cyprus ca. 374–377 (as the *nativity, adoration of the *magi, *wedding at Cana); at *Antioch in 386 (nativity). At Jerusalem ca. 381–384 Epiphany included a stational liturgy in honor of Jesus' birth: on 5 January, *Statio* (station) in the shepherds' field at Bethlehem, *Statio* in the grotto of the nativity, vigil in the basilica and return to Jerusalem on 6 January; then *Statio* in the Anastasis (almost a feast of light), *Eucharist in the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre (*Peregr. Eger.* 9,1; 25,6-12; *Lect. Armen.* 1; *Lect. Georg.* 2-25; FCh 20, 84-86). *Egeria does not know the feast of 25 December; at *Bethlehem it was celebrated only by the Latin ascetics (Jerome, *Hom. de nat.*). In *Syria, also, the theme of the Epiphany is Jesus' birth (Ephrem). Testimonies to the Epiphany are very numerous esp. in the years 380/90, when the Roman feast of Christmas was introduced in the East on 25 December (in Cappadocia: ca. 370–378; Antioch: 386; Alexandria: 432; Palestine: 6th c.) and the Epiphany became the celebration of the incarnation, the feast of the baptism of Jesus and of lights. In Cappadocia and at Constantinople 6 January became the preferred day for baptism.

II. In the West. The feast passed into the West before 361, when *Ammianus Marcellinus mentions it in *Gaul (21,2,5), while at the same time, or soon after, it was still unknown in *Africa (and probably at *Rome), where only Christmas was celebrated, together with the adoration of the magi (*Optatus of Milevis). *Augustine knew the feast (only the adoration of the magi; *Serm.* 199-204); thus from the 5th c. it became the preferred day for baptism. In Gaul in the first half of the 5th c., Epiphany included commemoration of the adoration of the magi, the baptism of Jesus and the wedding at Cana. In *Spain the first evidence of the Epiphany is from the Council of *Saragossa of 380 (*can.* 4). *Isidore of Seville tells of the adoration of the magi, the baptism of Jesus and the wedding at Cana. In N Italy the theme of the feast oscillated between the *tria miracula* of the adoration of the magi, the baptism and the wedding at Cana (*Ambrose, *Luc.* 4,76; *Filaster of Brescia, *Haer.* 140,1-4; *Peter Chrysologus of *Ravenna, ps.-Maximus of Turin). Pope *Siricius, in his letter to Himerius (385), mentions the feast of the Epiphany. At Rome, before *Gregory the Great, the adoration of the magi was the only theme of the feast of the Epiphany (Leo, *Serm.* 31-38); later the baptism and the wedding at Cana were also added. The oldest formulae of the *Mass of the Epiphany are in the *Gelasianum Vetus* (nos. 61-68) and the *Gregorianum Hadrianum* (nos. 87-91): *apparitio*, adoration of the magi, star, enlightenment of the nations. Only in the *Romano-German Pontifical* do we again find the Eastern interpretation of this feast: adoration of the magi, baptism of Jesus, wedding at Cana and multiplication of the loaves; the administration of baptism was expressly excluded on 6 January. Epiphany was the day of baptism in Gaul, N Africa and *Ireland; Rome protested this development (Leo, *Ep.* 16; Gelasius, *Ep.* 14).

CPG 5, 148-149; PO 38,4 (three Syrian homilies); RAC 5, 902-906; TRE 9, 762-770; LMA 5, 25-26 (the ascension in art); M. Meslin, *Les ariens d'occident*, Paris 1967, 401-403; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* 2, Milan [3]1969, 102-114; H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 1, Regensburg 1983, 154-165; H. Rahner, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, Basel 1984, 124-133; H. Förster, *Die Feier der Geburt Christi in der Alten Kirche*, Tübingen 2000; G. Passarelli, *Icone delle dodici grandi feste bizantine*, Milan 2000, 125-146; K. Thadathil, *The Feast of the Epiphany in the Malankara and the West Syrian Traditions*, Diss. Pont. Institutum Orientale, Romae 2001.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

EPIRUS. As a geographical entity Epirus extends from the Ionian Sea to the mountains that separate it from *Thessaly and *Macedonia to the E; to the N it is bounded by the Ceraunian mountains and the rivers Sousitsa (anc. *Polyanthos*) and Vjosa (anc. *Aoos*), to the S by the Ambracian gulf (Philippson - Kirsten 11ff.). With the administrative reorganization carried out probably under *Diocletian and his successors, the name Epirus was assigned to two eparchies of the diocese of Macedonia: Old Epirus (*Epirus Vetus*) and New Epirus (*Epirus Nova*). To Old Epirus was assigned the territory S of the Ceraunian mountains, Acharnania, part of Aetolia S of the river Acheloos as far as the mouth of the Gulf of Pa-

tras, and the isles of Corfù, Ithaka and Levkas. Its capital was Nicopolis; its most important cities Dodona, Euroia, Hadrianopolis or Justinianopolis (now Libochovo), Appon (location unknown), Phoenice (Finiki), Anchiasmus or Onchiasmus (now Aghioi Saranta or simply Saranta), Buthrotum (Butrinto), Photice (near Limponi or Limpobethra, N-E of Paramythia) and Corcyra. New Epirus, Illyria, to which was annexed a portion of *Macedonia salutaris*, extended in the territory N of the Ceraunian mountains as far as Drin and, in the E, beyond Lake Ohrid. Its capital was Durazzo (anc. Epidamnos or Dyrrachium); its most important cities, Scampa or Scampia (now Elbasan), Apollonia (near the monastery of Pojani), Boullìs or Byllìs (now Ballsh), Amantia (now Pljoka, Pliocia), Pulcheriopolis (perhaps modern Berat), Aulon (now Valona, Vlora), Lychnidos (now Ohrid), Alistron (location unknown) and Skepton (?) (location also unknown) (Hierocl., *Synekd.* 651-653; Honigmann 19-20; cf. Marquardt I, 320-321, 331, Chrysos 12-21, Soustal - Koder 41-42 and 46-49). The small number of Epirote cities is due to the fact that few were legally recognized as *civitates* (Chrysos 13-14). The two Epirus's were annexed to Macedonia, one of the two dioceses of E Illyricum (*Praefectura praetorio per Illyricum: Not. dign.*, Or. III, Seeck 9-10), whose capital was *Thessalonica. From the time of *Theodosius I (379–395), E Illyricum was under the jurisdiction of the Eastern empire. Epirus suffered, to varying degrees, the invasions of the Heruli (267), *Goths (380), Goths under *Alaric (397 and 406), *Ostrogoths (479–482), Getae (517), Ostrogoths again (551) and Slavs (548–549) (Chrysos 25, 40-41, 41-50, 63-64, 65-68, 69-70). In 474 Nicopolis was sacked by the *Vandals (ibid. 52-55); in 479–482 Dyrrachium fell into the hands of the Ostrogoths (ibid. 55-63; cf. Soustal - Koder 47-50). The settlement of the Slavs, from 587 on, caused destruction and mass migration (ibid. 71-80, Soustal - Koder 50-54), but Nicopolis was spared (Chrysos 77), as was Dyrrachium (Janin). Their metropolitans took part in the ecumenical councils of the 7th c. (Soustal - Koder 52).

The population was mixed: in the S parts the Hellenic ethnic element and Greek language predominated, in the N the Illyrican element with Latin as official language. At the time of the administrative reorganization of the Byzantine Empire, Old and New Epirus respectively constituted, in the mid 9th c., the themes of Nicopolis and Dyrrachium (Zakythinos XVII, 239-243 and 210-218, ibid. XXI, 194-197 and 198-205, Soustal - Koder 53ff.). Early Christian Nicopolis, of limited extension, was surrounded by new walls presumably in 474 (Chrysos 53); in ca. 540 *Justinian rebuilt its fortifications (Pallas, *Epiros* 229). Between the late 9th and early 10th c., Nicopolis ceased to exist. Dyrrachium, birthplace of the emperor *Anastasius I (491–518), was given new fortifications under Justinian (Proc., *Aed.* IV 4; CSHB 277; Miraj, with up-to-date bibl.). Christianity was probably introduced to Epirus by St. *Paul (Tit 3:12; cf. Harnack, *Mission*, 624). At Nicopolis it seems to have developed from a Hellenized Jewish community. In the mid 3rd c. *Origen, in search of an old translation of the OT, stayed at Nicopolis (Euseb., *HE* VI 16, PG 20, 553-556, GCS II/2, 552-554 [Schwartz]). Pope *Eleutherus was born at Nicopolis (Botte). Ecclesiastical figures include *Diadochus, bishop of Photice. The names of Christian martyrs from the 3rd c. are known, but not the names of any bishops. As the eparchy of E Illyricum, Epirus was under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Rome through the metropolitan of Thessalonica, the pope's vicar (Pallas, *L'Illyricum* 70-73), until the 8th c., when it came under *Constantinople. Church life was subject to the metropolitans of Nicopolis and Dyrrachium, who were obeyed by the bishops, who took part in ecumenical councils and met in local synods (Konidaris 453ff., 483ff. passim; Chrysos 99-104; Soustal - Koder 81-83). Episcopal sees were set up, it seems, in the cities legally recognized as such (Chrysos 13-14). On the bishops, see Konidaris 511-513. The list of bishops of Nicopolis is in Phourikis 150-155 (see also Pallas, *Epiros* 214, with bibl.); for the list of bishops of Dyrrachium, see Janin. Of the ancient temples, that of Dodona had lost all importance even before Christ (Spieser 319-320). Early Christian monuments are found in many of the Epirote cities mentioned above: Nicopolis (see below), Dodona (Pallas, *Epiros* 238-241; Id., *Corinthe* 131), Euroia (building attributable perhaps to Donatus, bishop of Euroia at the time of Theodosius I [379–395]: Pallas, *Epiros* 238; Id., *Monuments* 138-140), Phoenice (Pallas, *Epiros* 235-236; Soustal - Koder 158), Anchiasmus (Pallas, *Epiros* 303-308; Soustal - Koder 255-256. A one-aisled basilica with inscribed apse and lateral buildings on the N side was recently discovered at Boutrotos [Pallas 232-235; Soustal - Koder 133-134]. The published plan of the basilica already known is wrong. On the baptistery mosaics: Nallbani, *Mozaiku i pabtisterit*), Photice (Pallas, *Epiros* 237-238; Id., *Monuments* 140-141; Soustal - Koder 236-237), Corfù (Pallas, *Monuments* 142-146; Soustal - Koder 180-181), Dyrrachium (see below), Scampia (Pallas, *Epiros* 253: The basilica of St. Peter is attributed to 519 [Chrysos 103]. A basilica with baptistery has been discovered in the village of Lin, near Pogradec [Anamali, *Les mosaïques*]), Apol-

lonia (Pallas 253), Boullis (Pallas 253; Anamali, *Bazilika*; Kosta), Amantia (Pallas 253; Anamali, *Amantie* 119-120. Justinian rebuilt its fortress: Proc. *Aed.* IV 4; CSHB 278), Pulcheriopolis (Pallas 253), Lychnidos (Pallas 254, Bitrakova Grozdanova). Among non-episcopal towns, there are early Christian remains at Antigone (now Argirocastro: Pallas 236, Andrea, Budina, Baçe).

The most important monuments are at Nicopolis, where six basilicas have so far been brought to light or identified (Pallas, *Epiros* 214-232; Id., *Corinthe* 119-131; Konstantios). The most remarkable for size and architectural structure is that of Alcisone—basilica B—of the mid 5th c. (Pallas, *Epiros* 215ff.; Id., *Corinthe* 119-123 and *Monuments et textes* 50ff. and 60ff. passim). Distinguished for its mosaic floor decorations is the basilica of Dumezio or of St. Demetrius—basilica A—dating from 575 (Pallas, *Epiros* 214-215 and 231-232; Id., *Corinthe* 126-128). Nicopolis was the center from which church architecture and mosaic paving techniques spread to the whole of central Greece and Epirus (Pallas, *Corinthe* 131-134; Assimakopoulou-Atzaka 263-275). Characteristic of church architecture in Nicopolis are the presence of a transverse aisle or transept, a separate building used as a sacristy, and pastophories of Greek type (Pallas, *Monuments et textes* 55ff. and 80ff.). Architectural reliefs discovered at Dyrrachium (bibl. in Pallas, *Epiros* 253) suggest the existence of large church buildings. Inside the amphitheater has been found a small chapel with baptistery and wall mosaics, perhaps early 7th c. (Thierry, Nallbani, *Mozaiku i kishës*).

J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I, Leipzig [2]1881; O. Seeck, *Notitia dignitatum; accedunt, Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae; et, Latercula prouinciarum,* 1876, repr. Frankfurt a. M. [3]1983; A. von Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig [4]1924; P.A. Phourikis, Μικρὰ συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Ἠπειρωτικὴν Ἰστορίαν. Νικόπολις – Πρέβεζα: Epeirotika Chronika 3 (1928) 118-159; D.A. Zakythenos, Μελέται περὶ τῆς διοικητικῆς διαιρέσεως καὶ τῆς ἐπαρχιακής διοικήσεως ἐν τῷ βυζαντινῷ κράτει: EHBS 17 (1941) 208-274 and 21 (1951) 179-209; G.I. Konidaris, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία τῆς Ἐλλάδος I, Athens 1954; A. Philippson - E. Kirsten, *Die griechischen Landschaften*, II, 1, Frankfurt am Main 1956; R. Janin: DHGE 14, 1248-1252 (s.v. *Dyrrachium*); B. Botte: DHGE 15, 147-148 (s.v. *Eleuthère*); N. Thierry, *Une mosaïque à Dyrrachium*: CArch 18 (1968) 227-229; D.I. Pallas: RBK 2, 207-334 (s.v. *Epiros*); S. Anamali, *Amantie*: Iliria 2 (1972) 67-148; H. Nallbani, *Mozaiku i Kishës së Amphiteatrit në Durrës*: Monumentet 7-8 (1974) 111-116; [S. Anamali - S. Adhami], *Mosaïques de l'Albanie*, Tiranë 1974; V. Bitrakova Grozdanova, *Monuments paléochrétiens de la région d'Ohrid*, Ohrid 1975; S. Anamali, *Les mosaïques de la basilique paléochrétienne de Lin (Pogradec)*: Iliria 3 (1975) 339-349; J.M. Spieser, *La christianisation des sanctuaires païens en Grèce*, Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heligtümern, ed. U. Jantzen, Tübingen 1976, 309-320; Zh. Andrea, *Gërminet arkeologike të viteve 1974–1975*: Iliria 6 (1976) 342-346; Dh. Budina, *Mozaiku i trikonkës paleokristiane të Antoginesë*: ibid. 7-8 (1977-78) 225-235; S. Anamali, *Bazilika e Ballshit*: ibid. 296-301; A. Baçe, *Arkitektura e dy kishave paleokristiane dhe e varreve në Kështjellën në Paleokastër*: Monumentet 15-16 (1978) 73-85; H. Nallbani, *Mozaiku i baptisterit të Butrint ndërtim i njekohëshëm*: ibid. 18 (1979) 57-61; S. Kosta, *Restaurimi i mozaikëve të Mesopotamit dhe Bylisit*: ibid. 17 (1979) 62-67; D.I. Pallas, *Corinthe et Nikopolis du Bas moyen âge*: FR 118 (1979) 93-142; Id., *Monuments et textes. Remarques sur la liturgie dans quelques basiliques paléochrétiennes de l'Illyricum oriental*: EHBS 44 (1979–80) 37-116 and 523; Id., *L'Illyricum oriental: aperçu historique, la problématique de son archéologie chrétienne*: Theologia 51 (1980) 62-76; P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Rapports présentés au X^e Congrès Intern. d'Archéol. Chrétienne (Thessalonique 1980), Thessalonica 1980, 205-281: F. Miraj, *Për një interpretim të ri të monogrameve në tullat e murit rrethues të Durrësit*: Monumentet 20 (1980) 127-129; Ev.K. Chrysos, Συμβολὴ στὴν Ἱστορία τῆς Ἠπείρου κατὰ τὴν πρωτοβυζαντινὴ ἐποχὴ (Δ'–S' αι.):- Epeirotika Chronika 23 (1981) 5-104; Dem. Konstantios, Νέα παλαιοχριστιανικὴ βασιλικὴ στὴ Νικόπολη τῆς Ἠπείρου: ibid. 346-349; P. Soustal - J. Koder, *Nikopolis und Kephallenia* (= Tabula Imperii Byzantini 3), Vienna 1981; *Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Nicopolis*, Prèvesa 1987 (various articles); S. Anamali, *L'état actuel des recherches sur l'origine des villes du Moyen Âge en Albanie*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, III, Rome 1989, 2617-2635; G. Karaiskaj, *Städte der Spätantike in Albanien*, in *Akten des XII Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, II, Münster 1995, 892-897; Z. Andrea, *Archaeology in Albania 1984–1990*: Archaeological Reports 38 (1992) 71-88; E. Chalkia: EAM 5, 830-836.

D.I. PALLAS

EPISCOPAL LISTS. The church from its birth appears to us as a growing phenomenon of aggregation to the initial group through the work of the *apostles (Acts 2:41-47; 5:14; 11:24; 17:4); the number of communities in different cities grows, but all were in communion with each other through their origin and their profession of faith. *Tertullian expressed this common doctrine as follows: "So the apostles (which means 'sent') . . . at first preached faith in Jesus Christ and set up churches for Judea and, soon after, scattered throughout the world, announced the same doctrine and the same faith to the nations and so founded churches in every city. From these the other churches then derived the offshoots of their faith and the seed of doctrine, and still derive it in order to be churches. In this way they too are considered apostolic, as offspring of the churches of the apostles" (*De praesc.* 20,4-7). To this end we see, from the start, the apostles bringing into being certain structures that would ensure continuity for their teaching and ministry: they set up leaders (Acts 14:23; 20:17-35; 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6), who were to do the same (Tit 1:5-9; 2:1-15; 1 Tim 5:17-22). On the one hand, there was the idea of a doctrine to be jealously guarded (1 Tim 4:12-16; 6:20; 2 Tim 1:13-14;

2:15; 3:14–4:5); on the other, the idea of continuity of ministry through the legitimate succession of the community's leaders (Clem. Rom., *Ep. ad Cor.*, chs. 42 and 44). This idea, already present in *Clement of Rome, is developed in *Irenaeus, who writes: *eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi et successores eorum usque ad nos* (*Adv. haer.* III, 3,1; cf. III, 3,4; IV, 26,2), and reaches its full formulation with *Hippolytus and Tertullian.

The two ideas of tradition and apostolic succession were joined together—mainly for apologetic needs against those who defended a secret transmission of doctrine—and, in the course of the 2nd c., led to the elaboration of the doctrine that the tradition was transmitted through succession in the ministry. The idea of continuity was essential for the early church: "Ever since the Christians first wrote their history, they conceived it as the continuity of a movement of communication of the divine life which, begun in God, was propagated on earth, after Christ, through the apostles and the succession of bishops" (Y. Congar, *Mysterium salutis*, 7, Brescia 1972, p. 643 n. 12).

In this subtle interweaving of ideas, the episcopal lists—i.e., chronological lists of bishops of churches—arose as historical proof of succession, which guaranteed a community's orthodoxy of teaching, since it could go back through the uninterrupted succession of its bishops to the origins. We must not forget that in the 2nd c. there was a greater identification of a local church with its bishop, who was considered the expression of his community.

*Hegesippus was the first to draw up the list of the bishops of *Rome (Euseb., *HE* IV, 22,3), followed by Irenaeus, who provides reasons for it: "Hence the tradition of the apostles, manifested in the whole world, can be seen in every church by all those who wish to see the truth, and we can list the bishops established by the apostles in the churches and their successors up to ourselves. . . . But since it would take too long in this work to list the successions of all the churches, we will take the greatest and oldest church, known to everyone, the church founded and established at Rome by the two glorious apostles Peter and Paul" (*Adv. haer.* III, 3,1-2); a little further on he offers the list of the Roman bishops. *Eusebius of Caesarea also draws up the list of the bishops of the principal churches: *Jerusalem, *Antioch, *Alexandria and Rome. Other old lists are found in works of a chronological nature.

The episcopal succession in each church, going back directly or indirectly to the apostles, provided a guarantee of apostolicity of origin and so also of doctrine, allowed the combating of the many heresies that arose from time to time. Tertullian formulates the argument thus: "It may be that there are heresies which dare to go back to the apostolic age, so as to appear to be taught by the apostles, to have arisen under them. We can answer them: let them produce the birth certificates of their churches; let them show the catalogs of their bishops, showing their succession from the beginning, to show us that he who was the first bishop received investiture and was preceded by one of the apostles or at least by an apostolic man, with whom the apostles had had constant relations. This is the way the apostolic churches exhibit their own titles: thus the church of *Smyrna shows that *Polycarp was placed on that see by *John; thus that of Rome shows us that Clement was ordained by Peter: and thus the other churches exhibit the bishops who, established in the episcopate by the apostles, are for them the vehicles of the apostolic seed" (*De praescr.* 32,1-2).

The episcopal lists of the main churches were those mainly used for apologetic purposes, since communion with them was a guarantee of apostolicity and orthodoxy for the others as well. But with the passage of time, with the intention of providing such lists complete, invented names were sometimes introduced to fill gaps of early times and to defend a greater antiquity, or an apostolic foundation was invented, as in the notorious case of *Constantinople, which only in the 6th c. discovered its founder to be the apostle Andrew. At first these lists were just chronological lists of names; later some of them were amplified or filled out with other facts until they constituted a short history of a community, as is the case of the *Liber pontificalis* for the Roman church and similar works (such as Gregory of Tours's list of the bishops of Tours at the end of his *Historia francorum*). There was also a tendency to consider the bishops of the early centuries as saints.

So the episcopal lists, though being valuable documents providing information that we would not have otherwise, are at the same time uncertain, esp. for the earliest period, and must be studied attentively case by case to evaluate their historical value.

DACL 9, 1207-1536; RAC 2, 407-415; Cath 7, 829-837; P.B. Gams, *Series episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Regensburg 1873; C.H. Turner, *The Early Episcopal Lists*: JTS 1 (1900) 529-553; J. Dubois, *La composition des anciennes listes épiscopales*: Bull. de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France 1967, 74-104; N. Duval, *Une nouvelle édition des listes épiscopales africaines*: REAug 29 (1974) 313-322; J. Dubois, *Les listes épiscopales, témoins de l'organisation ecclésiastique et de transmission des traditions*: RHEF 62 (1976) 7-256 (only for Gaul); Fedalto; Ch. Munier, *À propos d'Ignace d'Antioche. Observations sur la liste épiscopale d'Antioche*: RSR 55 (1981) 126-131; E. Cattaneo, *Cataloghi e biografie dei vescovi di Milano dalle origini al secolo XVI*, Milan 1982; J.-C. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures,*

listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au Xe siècle, Rome 1988; J. Hofmann, *Die amtliche Stellung der in der ältesten römischen Bischofsliste der überlieferten Männer in der Kirche von Rom*: Historisches Jahrbuch 109 (1989) 1-23; R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, Edinburgh 1990; V. Ruggieri, *The IV Century Greek Episcopal Lists in the "Mardin Syriac. 7" (olim "Mardin Orth. 309/9")*: OCP 59 (1993) 315-356; Var. aus., *Griechisch-syrische Väterlisten der frühen griechischen Synoden ["Nomina episcoporum"; "Catalogus episcoporum"]*: OC 77 (1993) 1-96; F. Manns, *La liste des premiers évêques de Jérusalem*, in *Early Christianity in Context. Monuments and Documents*, ed. F. Manns - E. Alliata, Jerusalem 1995, 419-431; J.-C. Picard, *Évêques, saints et cités en Italie et en Gaule*, Rome 1998; A. Camplani - A. Martin, *Lettres festales et listes épiscopales dans l'église d'Alexandrie et d'Égypte. À propos de la liste épiscopale accompagnant la première lettre festale de Cyrille d'Alexandrie conservée en copte*: JJP 30 (2000) 7-20.

A. Di Berardino

EPISTOLA ANNE AD SENECAM. The *Epistola Anne ad Senecam de superbia et idolis* is a brief 4th-c. Latin treatise against idolatry; Jewish or Christian, the end mutilated, it is preserved in the Cologne MS, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, MS Dom 17 fol. 99r-102r (first quarter 9th c.). It is rich in both OT and Senecan reminisces, esp. regarding the polemic against idols and against a distorted way of conceiving the deity, which may have contributed to the selection of the title—which is probably not authentic and was influenced by the collection of letters attributed to Seneca and St. Paul that circulated in the 4th c. Seneca was not pro-Jewish, and the only Annas who was his contemporary was the high priest of 62, who was disliked, by Christians because he encouraged the assassination of James the Less, and was the son of the Annas who, with Caiaphas, sent Jesus Christ to his death. Similarly Annas was disliked by the Romans of Seneca's time for his abuse of power in 62 and by the Jews for political reasons. Also, as a Sadducee, Annas did not believe in *resurrection or the afterlife: the *Epistola*, on the other hand, maintains the survival of the soul for judgment. In its present form there is no greeting, and in the body of the presumed letter the names of Annas and Seneca never appear: the author usually addresses himself in the second person plural (occasionally he uses the singular) to unspecified *fratres*, a term linked to the doctrine of God's universal Fatherhood, which is developed in the opusculum. This paranetic (i.e., in defense of the true conception of the deity and of the human being) treatise has many thematic and terminological contacts with Christian apologetic, beginning with Paul's discourse in the Areopagus. § I describes the characteristics of God *Pater*, Lord of the universe, and ties our life and actions to the divine will, in anticipation of future judgment; § II invites an investigation, not so much of cosmological questions, but of the human being, and attacks false pagan representations of the soul; it proclaims human immortality and judgment after this life; § III speaks of the creation of the soul by God and its infusion into the human body; § IV denounces the impotence of manmade idols, which are closely associated with *death; § V explains that God can be recognized in nature; and § VI again criticizes idolatrous beliefs like the cult of Bacchus, which are, as already in Seneca, the hypostatization of human passions.

B. Bischoff, *Der Brief des Hohenpriesters Annas an den Philosophen Seneca*, in *Anecdota novissima, Texte des vierten bis sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1984, 1-9; L. Cracco Ruggini, *La lettera di Anna a Seneca nella Roma pagana e cristiana del IV secolo*: Augustinianum 28 (1988) 301-25; W. Wischmeyer, *Die Epistula Anne ad Senecam, Eine jüdische Missionsschrift des lateinischen Bereichs*, in *Juden und Christen in der Antike*, ed. J. Van Amersfoot - J. Van Oort, Kampen 1990, 72-93; A. Hilhorst, *The* Epistola Anne ad Senecam: *Jewish or Christian?* in *Eulogia. Mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen*, ed. G.J.M. Bartelink - A. Hilhorst - C. Kneepkens, Steenbrugis 1991, 147-161; A. Merkt, *Maximus I. von Turin*, Leiden - New York - Cologne 1997, 95-96; D.T. Runia, *Filone di Alessandria nella prima letteratura cristiana*, It. tr. Milan 1999, 304 n. 1; G. Zecchini, *L'immagine di Nerone nel lessico* Suda (*con una postilla sulla* Lettera di Anna a Seneca), in *Neronia V. Néron: histoire et légende*, ed. J.M. Croisille - R. Martin - Y. Perrin, Brussels 1999, 214-224; I. Ramelli, *Alcune osservazioni sulla cosiddetta* Epistola Anne: Paideia 56 (2001) 65-78; Id., *Dio come padre nello Stoicismo romano al tempo della predicazione cristiana e nell'"Epistola Anne,"* in *Scripta Antiqua in honorem A. Montenegro Duque et J.Mª. Blázquez Martínez*, ed. S. Crespo Ortiz de Zárate - A. Alonso Ávila, Valladolid 2002, 343-351.

I. Ramelli

EPISTULA APOLOGETICA. In a collection of Latin texts that concern mainly the question of the *Three Chapters and its repercussions in the West (Paris BN, lat. 1682, 9th c. MS) is an *Epistula generalis seu apologetica contra Iohannem Ravennatem episcopum*, only recently published by Claire Sotinel. We know a John II, bishop of *Ravenna (578–595), who had fought against the schismatics of *Aquileia and to whom *Gregory the Great dedicates his *Regula pastoralis* (*Ep.* 1,24: MGH ep. 1, 37-38). The author, a monk or an ecclesiastic who expressly says that his *epistula* will be anonymous (ch. 1), proclaims himself a sinner and desirous of obtaining pardon and ecclesial reconciliation; he turns to Bishop John, who refuses to enter relations with him. Feeling guilty and condemned to prison, the author is called a *miser* by the bishop, who refuses him pardon; John also sides against the *papa universalis*, the

Roman pontiff, who takes an interest in the author's case so as to absolve him. The author, condemned to death and forced to remain in prison, writes at length on the themes of mercy, pardon and not despairing of salvation. The document is interesting for the evolution of penitential discipline in the late 6th c. The writer refers to three authorities: the bishop of Ravenna, the pope and a political authority, distinct from the eternal authority, which has condemned him to death. The text must be from 593–595, at a time when relations between Pope Gregory and John of Ravenna were strained.

Edition, Fr. tr. and study: C. Sotinel, *Rhétorique de la faute et pastorale de la réconciliation dans la Lettre apologétique contre Jean de Ravenne*, École Française, Rome 1994; PCBE 2, 1087-1093.

A. Di Berardino

EPISTULA APOSTOLORUM (*Book Revealed to His Disciples*). The title *Epistula* is from the Latin translation. Only the first part of the *Epistula apostolorum* is a letter; the work as a whole belongs to the literary genre of *Dialogues of Jesus* with the *apostles. The text, written in Greek between 160 and 180 in *Egypt or in *Syria, is preserved entirely only in an Ethiopic version, which the first editors of the Ethiopic text called *The Testament in Galilee of Our Lord Jesus Christ*—the title of the apocalypse that precedes the *Epistula apostolorum* in that MS. It is preserved fragmentarily in Coptic, and a few passages in Latin. The first chapters (1-11) contain a discourse of Jesus; the second part (12-50) is a dialogue of Jesus with his disciples after the *resurrection. The document contains interesting fragments on Jesus' life (e.g., birth, childhood, wedding at Cana, passion and resurrection). The epilogue speaks of his *ascension (51). Though containing some gnostic elements, the *Epistula apostolorum* is aimed against *gnosis and the gnostics: *Simon Magus and *Cerinthus. The author stresses the unity of the two Testaments.

CANT 22; *Editions:* Ethiopic text: L. Guerrier, S. Grébaut, PO 9, 1913, 172-233; Coptic: C. Schmidt, TU 43, 1919 (repr. Hildesheim 1967). *Translations:* J.N. Pérès, Apocryphes 5, 1994; It.: Erbetta 3, 37-62; Moraldi 2, 27-60; Pol.: S. Kur, in Starowieyski 3, 27-50, bibl. 355; Ger.: H. Duensing, Kleine Texte 152, Bonn 1925; C.D.G. Müller, in Schneemelcher 1, 205-233; M. Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum*, Berlin 1965; J. Hills, *Tradition and Composition in the Epistula Apostolorum*, Minneapolis 1990; J.N. Pérès, "L'*Épître des Apôtres!* et *l'Anaphore des Apôtres*: quelques convergences," *Apocrypha* 8 (1997) 89-96; Id., "Un élément de christologie quartodécimane dans l'*Épître des Apôtres*: l'agape pascale comme occurence de solidarité: *Apocrypha* 13 (2002) 113-121.

M. Starowieyski

EPISTULA DE PATRIA. A letter whose senders are listed at the beginning: Paul, Francus, Valerianus, etc. The recipient was a bishop, Polochronius, perhaps one of the signatories of the councils of *Gaul held at *Valence and Mâcon in 385 (MGH, Leg. III, Concilia, I 163 and 173). The letter's context reveals that the senders had been exiles (Incipit: *De patria gravi sumus exire necessitate compulsi*) and were sent by another bishop named Castor, quite unknown to us, to seek asylum with Polochronius (at Verdun? in the Alps of Upper Provence?); they thank him for his hospitality and invite him to visit their own see. The style, in a popular Latin, betrays the language of the Merovingian era. Noteworthy is the use of the second person plural pronoun.

CPL 1000; PLS 3, 831-832; C. Turner: JTS 30 (1929) 225-236; G. Morin: RBen 51 (1939) 31-36; Repertorium 353, with the title "*Epistola quorundam clericorum ad Polychronium.*"

L. Dattrino

EPISTULA FERMETIS AD HADRIANUM. This must be numbered among travelers' tales describing natural wonders seen in distant lands: in this case India and Asia generally. We have a Latin version from a Greek original, first published by Omont (BECh, 507ff.). The work, which presents itself as a direct letter to the emperor *Hadrian, is a fiction devised solely to highlight the emperor's personal taste for journeys and exotic things. Its importance arises from the fact that it must be considered one of the springs from which the first streams of French literature would flow. A variant on this letter is entitled *Epistola Premonis regis ad Traianum imperatorem*. It is not rare in early documents for Hadrian to be given the name Traianus; the name of King Premonis is fictitious. Faral has published the two versions in parallel columns. Incipit: *Litteras tuas, domine Caesar*.

CPL 1125; H. Omont: BECh 74 (1913) 507-515; E. Faral: Romania 43 (1914) 199-215, 353-370.

L. Dattrino

EPISTULA SCYTHARUM MONACHORUM AD EPISCOPOS. Sent before 523 by the monks of *Scythia Minor under *John Maxentius, to the African bishops exiled in *Sardinia by the *Vandal king Thrasamund, to declare their solidarity with the African prelates and esp. to discuss the condemnation that the presbyter *Trifolius had expressed (*Ep. Trifolii presbyteri ad beatum Faustum senatorem*, CCL 85A, 137-138) concerning the *Theopaschite formula

Unus de Trinitate passus est, composed in the context of the *Acacian schism.

CCL 85A, 157-172; J.A. McGuckin, *The "Theopaschite Confession" (Text and Historical Context): A Study in the Cyrilline Reinterpretation of Chalcedon*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 35 (1984) 239-255; F. Carcione, *La controversia tra Ormisda e i monaci sciti sulla formula "Unus de Trinitate passus est carne": calcedonismo integralista e calcedonismo integrato a confronto*, in *Atti del Convegno su Papa Ormisda (514–523). Magistero, cura pastorale ed impegno ecumenico*, ed. C. Noce, Frosinone 1993, 57ff.; C. Sotinel, *Le rôle des expertises dans les débats théologiques du VI^{e} siècle*: SP 34 (2001) 246-249.

P. MARONE

EPISTULA TITI. The *Epistula Titi, discipuli Pauli, de dispositione sanctimonii* was discovered by D. De Bruyne in an 8th-c. Würzburg MS. Probably a sermon, it is an exhortation to chastity aimed at men and women and opposes the cohabitation of male ascetics with women vowed to virginity. Composed perhaps in a *Priscillianist setting, it is disputed whether it was originally written in Latin or is a translation from the Greek, as De Bruyne prefers. The Latin and Priscillianist origin is defended by A. von Harnack and H. Koch, who hold that it uses *Cyprian and the ps.-Cyprian *De singularitate clericorum*. G. Sfameni Gasparro, in an ample study, maintains rather that the anonymous author of the *Epistula Titi* is from a circle marked by rigoristic formulations of the *enkrateia* which are consistent with the definition of *encratism, and which were attested also in the West in the 3rd and in the course of the 4th-5th c. Pointing out that the work shows close parallels to African works datable to the mid 4th c. at the latest, Sfameni Gasparro dates the *Epistula* to the late 4th c., in a generally Western context.

CPL 796; the ed. of the *Epistula Titi*, ed. D. De Bruyne, is in RBen 37 (1925) 47-72; A. von Harnack, *Der apokryphe Brief des Paulusschülers Titus "De dispositione sanctimonii"*: Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. 17 (1925) 180-213; H. Koch, *Zu Ps.-Titus, De dispositione sanctimonii*: ZNTW 32 (1933) 131-144; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *L'Epistula Titi disciputi Pauli de dispositione sanctimonii e la tradizione dell'enkrateia*, ANRW II 25. 6 (1988): 4551-4664.

S. ZINCONE

EPISTULAE AUSTRASICAE. Name given to a corpus of 48 letters, written between the late 5th c. and late 6th c. by princes, bishops and Frankish notables and compiled from the royal chancellery at Metz. Given the quality of the writers, though some letters are banal and trivial (one is even in verse, *Ep.* 23), usually they are historically very important. As for form, more than once we note the singular contrast between the custom of this literary genre, which imposed affected and mannered expressions, and the quality of the Latin, by now greatly deteriorated.

CPL 1055-1067; MGH *Ep.* 3, 110-153 (CCL 117, 403-470); I.N. Wood, *Administration, Law and Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, Cambridge 1991, 63-81; Id., *Letters and Letter-Collections from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages: The Prose Works of Avitus of Vienne*, in M.A. Mayer (ed.), *The Culture of Christendom. Essays in Medieval History in Commemoration of Denis L.T. Bethel*, London 1993, 29-43; E. Malaspina, *Il "Liber epistolarum" della cancelleria austrasica (sec. V-VI)*, text, tr. and commentary, Rome 2001.

M. SIMONETTI

EQUITIUS of Hippo Dyarrhytus (d. after 404). Catholic bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus in Proconsular Africa (Bizerte - Tunisia), known from the acts of African councils held between 401 and 404. When Equitius refused to submit to a conciliar condemnation, an episcopal delegation was sent in the spring 401 from Pope *Anastasius, Bishop *Venerius of Milan and the emperor Honorius to deal with the situation. On 13 September of the same year a new council sent a commission of 20 bishops to Hippo to organize the election of his successor. Once more on 16 June 404 a new episcopal delegation presented itself to the emperor, the pope and the Italian bishops, for the purpose of putting an end to Equitius's unjustified claim to hold on to episcopal power. Equitius is discussed by scholars because nothing is known of his person, and his case remains very obscure.

C. Munier (ed.), *Concilia Africae*, CCL 149, 198, 203, 213; PCBE 1, 356; O. Perler, *Les voyages de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1969, esp. 238-239; J. Merdinger, *Bishop Equitius and the Problem of Episcopal Malfeasance in Late Roman Africa*: SP 34, 170-176; J.A. Sabw Kanyang, *Episcopus et plebs. L'évêque et la communauté ecclésiale dans les conciles africains* (345–525), Berne 1999; M.-E. Mombili Thumaini, *L'aspect d'autonomie de communion dans la praxis africaine des recours à Rome (III^{e}–V^{e} siècles). Essai d'interprétation du comportement ambivalent de l'épiscopat africain*, Rome 2001.

M.W. LIBAMBU

ERECHTHIUS of Antioch (5th c.). Miaphysite bishop of Antioch in Pisidia ca. 440, mentioned by Timothy Aelurus (*Timothy II of Alexandria) in his great work against the Council of *Chalcedon (451). We have two of his homilies: one on the Theophany (PG 86, 3321b), preached at *Constantinople before the patriarch *Proclus (434–446) and translated into Syriac, Armenian and Arabic, and one on the Nativity, which has reached us only in a Syriac translation.

CPG 6163-6164; DHGE 15, 693; PG 86/2, 3321-3322; fragment of the homily on the Theophany in E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, ABAW XXXII/6, 1927, 28; Syriac tr. in F. Nau, *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Église nestorienne* (PO 13/2), Paris 1916, 169-170; Armenian tr. in N. Akinian, *Timotheus Aelurus in der armenischen Literatur*, Vienna 1909, 23-25; Arabic tr. in G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* (ST 118), Rome 1944, 366; Syriac tr. of the homily on the Nativity in F. Nau, *Documents . . .* , Paris 1916., 171-180.

K. den Biesen

ESCHATOLOGY. 1. In modern theological language, the term *eschatology* means the "doctrine (*-logia*) of the last things (*ta eschata*)." The form ἐσχατολογία is not attested in the NT, nor does it appear in the Fathers. It was coined by Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider in an 1804 work to designate what was traditionally called *novissimi*, *res novissimae* (J. Carmignac, *Les dangers de l'eschatologie*, 365ff.). Its conceptual sphere was then extended and broadened, esp. from the end of the 19th c., until it was dangerously confused with concepts from which it should have been kept rigorously distinct, such as messianism, apocalypticism, kingdom of God. Its use is thus not exempt from misunderstandings, which have led many scholars to advise against using the term (J. Carmignac, *Le mirage*, 136-137). Its presence here thus requires further preliminary clarification and justification.

Modern scholars are not always agreed on the contents that should be included in the concept of eschatology. They oscillate between positions that limit its content to three *eschata* (*parousia, *resurrection, *judgment), and more elastic and extended definitions that add themes like *death, damnation, *purgatory, the end of the world, *beatitude, the offering to the Father. The meaning used here will be the traditional one. The term *eschatology* will thus indicate a group of final events concerning humanity's end (both individually—individual eschatology—and collectively—collective eschatology) and the end of the world (cosmic eschatology). For specific treatment of the various eschatological themes, see the following entries: for cosmic eschatology, *see* *apokatastasis, *cosmos; for individual eschatology, *see* *resurrection, *refrigerium, *purgatory, *paradise; for collective eschatology, *see* *millenarism, *parousia, *judgment. The following considerations, with no claim to system or completeness, aim to identify some premises of the Fathers' eschatological beliefs and to provide some interpretative ideas that may serve to connect the various themes.

2. The various eschatological aspects have common roots in the heart of the NT message and faith: humanity's redemption through Jesus, the incarnate, dead and risen Christ. While it is true that the Fathers, even such thinkers as *Origen or *Augustine, wrote no systematic treatments of eschatological doctrines, they were in general "fully aware of that inner logic that led from belief in Christ the redeemer to hope in the future time" (Florovski, *Eschatology in the Patristic Age*, 256). This common faith was historically translated into a plurality of outlooks and beliefs, which produced a very broad doctrinal spectrum in which "between the ultraviolet of a spiritualizing conception carried to extremes and the infrared of popular beliefs, all the intermediate shades and colors are present" (Visser, *A Bird's-Eye View*, 22). This variety is also a sign of vitality and depends not so much solely on the diversity of historical-geographical situations and local traditions, but also on social differences and different cultural levels in interpreting and receiving the content of the eschatological message. But it is precisely these discordancies that help to bring out certain basic themes that contribute to a more "symphonic" orchestration of the interpretative voices.

Also at the heart of Christian eschatology is the conception of time. As has been stressed more than once, starting with the studies of O. Cullmann, Christ's death and resurrection quickly imposed themselves as a decisive temporal watershed. For the Christian of the first generations who looked trustfully to the second parousia, it constituted a fundamental tension between "already" and "not yet," onto whose trunk the various eschatological beliefs were destined to be grafted. Thus were laid down the premises from which a cyclical conception of time like that among the Greeks, on which the metaphysical conception of Being was founded, would be overcome. *Circuitus illi jam explosi sunt*, exclaimed St. Augustine, to express a more general awareness of the conflict taking place: we must follow that straight path which is Christ, thus turning the mind *a vano et inepto impiorum circuitu* (*Civ. Dei* XII, 20).

This change brought with it a correlated doctrine of creation. If the controversy with the *gnostics in the course of the 2nd c. had helped, in the case of an *Irenaeus, to clarify the outlines of a salvation-history whose ineluctable point of departure was God's creative act, only in the 4th c., following the dangers that were seen in Origen's daring synthesis, was the problem of distinguishing more clearly between "creating" and "becoming" faced head on. With Augustine, time itself becomes a creature subject to the divine plan: destined for final consummation, and at the same time a way along which the stages of the process of salvation unfold, a *telos* at

which to aim, since its dissolution ushers in the celebration of the triumph of the eschatological hopes.

But perhaps the point of greatest friction between Christian and pagan eschatological beliefs was caused by the belief in the resurrection of the dead. This had nothing to do with a return to origins, but with a new act of divine creation. What is more, as, e.g., *Celsus's objections show, the possibility of ransoming the body went against a mental habit profoundly rooted in Greek thought, according to which only what is spiritual—i.e., the *soul—was worthy to survive. It is not simply, as the Fathers repeatedly recall, a matter of defending the *body as a divine creation, but rather of molding anthropological ideas on the trunk of a new anthropology capable of defending the complexity of the human personality. These are some of the specific and leading elements on which the eschatological reflection of the Fathers would be articulated in its attempt to mediate the heritage of faith with Jewish tradition and pagan culture. But these unitary lines must not make us forget the many and sometimes divergent solutions attempted. More than an evolution and a succession of phases, chronological or psychological, we see a complex process, characterized by a dialectic between continuity and change. Certain solutions or proposals had to wait a long time to be properly evaluated and accepted or rejected by the body of believers. Often, then, the thought of any one Father shows oscillations that are more or less inevitable, before reaching solutions that are in some way clear and definitive. Finally, we must observe that the pace, at times too rapid, of some thinkers was set against the slow, measured progress of channels of transmission of the *depositum fidei* that are more static by nature, such as the *liturgy, the various *creeds and, after a certain point, the material of *iconography. What the historian finds, then, is a complex process of transformation, of which we will confine ourselves to indicating some of the most important phases.

3. The delay and subsequent postponement of the parousia did not seem to have produced, esp. in the course of the 2nd c., the disastrous effects that certain modern interpreters have wished to attribute to them, without sure textual confirmation. Though throughout the century millenarian hopes, from* Papias to *Justin and *Irenaeus, occupy an important place, we should not forget that these forces were opposed by contrary tendencies. The church was a growing body, in process of formation. As *Origen clearly states in his commentary on Rom 7:5: "*Omne ergo corpus Ecclesiae redimendum sperat Apostolus, nec putat posse quae perfecta sunt dari singulis quibusdam membris, nisi universum corpus in unum fuerit congregatum.*" For this reason *Tertullian, at the end of the 2nd c., in a passage of his *Apologeticum* (XXXIX, 2), prays not just for Caesar, their ministers, the good of the world and for peace, but also for the deferment of the end. Justin, too, in the mid 2nd c., shows an awareness that within the church of his time, alongside the millenarian tensions of which he was a supporter, there were other positions that could be accepted provided they were pious and respectful of tradition (*Dial.* LXXX, 2). The logic of an expectation that lived between the certainty of what had already taken place and the hope of the second parousia was also manifest in the very structure of certain liturgical practices. In *baptism, e.g., "the faithful receive the guarantee of the promised inheritance; they are sealed for the final redemption of soul and body at the Parousia. In the *eucharist the eschatological bread of heaven is made available within the present order" (Lampe, *Early Patristic Eschatology*, cit. in Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 461). As the popularity of certain themes by which early Christian symbolism was nourished teaches us, the channel of the symbol, whether literary or iconographical, constituted an important occasion for the persistence of this bipolarity. Thus, the symbolism of death as spiritual marriage, though it "looks to the future, does not belong completely to the future. There is an earthly experience and an anticipation of what is to come. The risen Lord and the heavenly Bridegroom have already filled us with the 'firstfruits of the Spirit'" (Rush, 101). Divine service, finally, included the continual reading and meditation on passages of the gospel message, which could invite at times, as in the case of Tertullian, to pray for the deferment of the end, and at times for the hastening of the parousia.

4. The process that would lead from this situation of bipolarity to the Augustinian doctrine of the "two cities" was complex and bound up with the interaction of multiple factors both internal and external to the life of the church. Of the latter, the confrontation of the *apologists with the pagan world and the struggle against the gnostics appear decisive. The apologists' contribution to the working out of the eschatological heritage can be identified in three orders of factors. First, the attempt to prove to the pagans the reasonableness of certain beliefs such as judgment or infernal punishment by seeking parallels in mythology betrays, beneath the recourse to the theory of theft, a universalizing tension. Second, in the thought of various apologists, in order to justify the concept of God as judge, recourse was had to a natural theodicy that also became important for

the parenetic and propagandistic aims of this type of literature. Third, as the case of Justin teaches us, in this way Christian thought was penetrated by categories of Greek thought, in this case *Middle Platonic, which were destined to create—viz. the resurrection of the dead—important tensions and contradictions. The second external factor is linked to the struggle against the gnostics. To the extent that they sought to adapt the Christian message to their mythology, the gnostics ended by attacking its hopes at decisive points. By systematically denying the reality of the incarnation, they threatened at its basis the fundamental dialectic between "already" and "not yet." By rejecting the goodness of creation, they made faith in the resurrection of bodies impossible. Finally, their doctrine of *predestination, by guaranteeing salvation to a few "pneumatics," eliminated free will and with it the necessity of judgment (not by chance did Irenaeus and Tertullian argue at length against *Marcion's ditheism, which delegated the function of judge to the just God of the OT). The reply of Irenaeus, then of Tertullian and *Hippolytus, would aim to establish the nature, phases and *telos* of Christian redemption, inserting eschatological hope into a typical economy of salvation.

As for internal factors, the contribution of the school of *Alexandria was particularly significant. In *Origen's system, individual and collective eschatology are intimately linked to cosmic eschatology in a cosmological perspective based on the *archai* and ruled by the *telos* of *apokatastasis*. The profound link between creatures and God, despite the limits imposed by creatureliness, by which God is conceived of as perennial beneficent activity toward creatures, determines a tension toward the *telos*, in its twofold meaning of end and fulfillment. In Origen's *De principiis* the *telos* (both *end* and *goal*), the opposite pole to the *archē*, is always recalled and present, with specific treatments that return in each of the four books. The cosmic end/goal is the restoration—in Greek *apokatastasis*—of the primitive state. The implicit dynamism of the rational creature's recovery, expressed with the biblical image of Gen 1:26-27, of the likeness with God yet to be attained (*Princ.* 3,6,1), prevents one—aside from the search for statements to resolve the question of whether or not he had conceived of a generalized fall of beings—from thinking of a pure and simple return to the initial situation of the *archē*: the love poured forth in this process by both parties—and esp. the saving action of Christ—has generated a surplus, producing a dialectic that creates an imbalance in Origen's discourse, a progressive tension toward a future of glorious assimilation to God, rather than toward the past. In light of this vision of a total recovery, Origen effects, thanks to the very allegorical means he uses, a spiritualized rereading of traditional eschatological ideas. From the attack on millenarianism to the symbolic interpretation of many concrete details regarding the parousia, judgment or hellfire, Origen's part would be decisive in this field as well, all the more since, aware of the diversity of the public he was addressing, he could always fall back, when it seemed opportune to him, on the literal sense of the biblical expressions. Finally, it should be noted that the least contested aspect of Origen's eschatological teaching was the centrality it gives to the individualization of the process related to the expectation of the last things, a centrality that finds its counterpart, on the more general level of the Origenian system, in the role Origen assigns—also in polemic with the gnostics—to free will.

This path would be followed in a more systematic way by the subsequent reflection of the Fathers. The growing attention to the intermediate condition between individual death and final judgment, which in certain cases appears to presage themes like particular judgment or the remissive function of *ignis purgatorius*, which would assume a central role in Scholastic theology, was also favored, after the Constantinian changes, by the disappearance of millenarian hopes. The interpretation of the millennium given by *Tyconius and esp. by Augustine is particularly important in this respect. The church's victory had already taken place and the prophecy of Rev 20:9 had been fulfilled. In this way Augustine could bring out the church's true nature as a divine *civitas* journeying toward its fullness.

In Augustine's thought, even through oscillations and rethinkings, the various eschatological themes are thus re-presented within a conception that, if not systematic, is certainly unitary in tendency and was destined to shape subsequent patristic reflection. It is characterized by the need to create "an eschatology based on the Bible" (Eger, *Die Eschatologie Augustins*, 91), which prefers, rather than allegorical exegesis, an approach adhering to the letter of the text. Thus it is applied to the various eschatological themes: parousia, resurrection, judgment. Particularly striking is the attention given to the problem of the intermediate state, to the point that Augustine has been seen as the "creator" of purgatory. Common to these different treatments is the fundamental aspiration to the blessed life promised to the Christian, a life in which the redeemed will finally be able to contemplate God directly. After Augustine, the Fathers, continuing to move within the framework he had outlined, seem to be mainly

preoccupied with clarifying details and examining particulars that remained unclear or contradictory. Outstanding among these is the contribution of *Gregory the Great. Not only, following the line of a realism eager for details, did he fix central aspects of the doctrine of purgatory, but he also insisted on the theme of infernal punishment. While the end of the world—whose proofs he sought and found in the dramatic events of his time, of which he was a witness and protagonist—appeared to him to be imminent, at the same time, following the path already trodden by Augustine, he recalled the eschatological task that awaits the church: reaching out toward the kingdom of heaven, but also prefiguring it by preaching its coming to humanity. In this way, even while drawing the contours of a church finally come to the end of its sufferings, he contributed to prolonging "the time of the church," "collaborating in the foundation of a renewed church, destined to succeed the era of the Fathers, the church of the mediaeval West" (Dagens, *La fin des temps*, 288).

L. Atzberger, *Geschichte der christhlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit*, Freiburg i. B. 1896, Nachdruck, Leiden 1970; H. Eger, *Die Eschatologie Augustins*, Greifswald 1933; G. Florovski, *Eschatology in the Patristic Age*: SP 2 (1957) 235-250; A.J. Visser, *A Bird's Eye View of Ancient Christian Eschatology*: Numen 14 (1967) 4-22; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London [4]1978, 459-489; Cl. Dagens, *La fin des temps et l'Église selon S. Grégoire le Grand*: RecSR 58 (1970) 273-288; J. Carmignac, *Les dangers de l'eschatologie*: NTS 17 (1971) 365-390; Id., *Le mirage de l'eschatologie*, Paris 1979; A.C. Rush, *Death as a Spiritual Marriage*, VChr 26 (1972) 81- 101; A. Fernández, *La escatología en el siglo II*, Burgos 1979; Var. aus., *Studi sull'escatologia.* VI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana (Roma, maggio 1977), n. speciale di Augustinianum 18 (1978); *Mysterium salutis*, vol. 11, Brescia 1978; B.E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church. A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*, Cambridge [3]1995; *Origene. Dizionario. La cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, ed. A. Monaci Castagno, Rome 2000 (s.v. *escatologia*); "*Millennium*": *l'attesa della fine nei primi secoli cristiani*, ed. R. Uglione, Turin 2002.

G. Filoramo

ESDRAS (Ezra) (apocryphal). Besides the canonical book of Ezra (also either called *1 Esdras* or included as part of *1 Esdras*) and that of Nehemiah (also either called *2 Esdras* or included as part of *1 Esdras*), there are a certain number of books in Greek, Latin and the various languages, under the name of Esdras/Ezra. These books are Jewish, Christianized Jewish or Christian, and are of the apocalyptic, didactic and historical genres.

The figure of Ezra/Esdras was particularly popular in late Judaism and early Christianity. In this same period a series of books were ascribed to the names of less-known biblical personages (e.g., the *Book of Enoch*). Ezra, a reformer and renewer of Judaism, becomes a model of the pious priest, lover of Sacred *Scripture, prophet, beloved of God and intercessor before God, and finally a saint in the Catholic Church, with a center of his cult at Teano in Italy.

Among the books under the name of Esdras, the most famous is *4 Esdras*, composed of visions, of Jewish origin and very popular in the Christian world; it was translated into various languages, including Latin, and was part of the Vulgate.

Modern scholarly discussion has divided the Vulgate's *4 Esdras* as follows:

4 Ezra containing chs. 3-14 of the book;
5 Ezra containing chs. 1-2 of the book;
6 Ezra containing chs. 15-16 of the book

5 Ezra is of Christian origin; *6 Ezra* is a 4th-c. Christian apocrypha, directed against God's enemies and containing an exhortation to faithfulness to God. *3 Esdras* (Vulgate, but *1 Esdras* (α) LXX and *1 Esdras* NRSV) is a historical book composed of the fragments of Ezra, Neh and 2 Chr, with some additional content. There are also the *Apocalypses of Esdras*, in Greek, Syriac (*of the Arab kingdom*) and Ethiopic. The *Vision of Esdras* and the *Apocalypse of Sedrach* (the name Esdras deformed) are apocalyptic literature, recounting Ezra's/Esdras's travels beyond the grave, his discussions with God and his death. (Esdras does not want to let his soul depart!) The Armenian *Questions of Esdras* addresses problems concerning the soul; the nature of the year is discussed in the *Explanations of Esdras* (9th-c. Latin apocrypha).

These texts exist in various Eastern translations and enjoyed great success in the Christian world: Latin fragments of *5 Ezra* have been introduced into the texts of the Latin *Mass.

CAVT 179-189; CANT 340-342; W. Schneemelcher, RAC 6, 1962, 595-612; LCIK 1,681, cf. 6,170; 6,169; BS 5, 83-86; J.B. Frey, DBS 1, 411-418; 430-444; A.M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 1-2, Turnhout 2000, 1, 803-881 (bibl.). *Editions:* E. Wahl, Leiden 1977 (*Apocal. graeca*, *Visio*, *Apocal. of Sedrach*); Vulgate: books 3 and 4 (i.e., also 5 and 6). *Translations:* Eng.: Charlesworth 1, 517-613; It.: Sacchi, IV Esdra: 2, 337-372 (bibl.); III Esdra 1, 97-178; Pol.: Starowieyski 3, 168-209; Sp.: N. Fernandez Marcos, in A. Diez Macho, *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, 2, Madrid 1983, 445-478 (III Esdr.). J. Labourt, *Le V[e] livre d'Esdras*: RBib 17 (1909) 412-434.

Studies: J. Daniélou, *Le V[e] Esdras et le judéo-christianisme latin au II[e] siècle*, in FS C. Widengren, Leiden 1972, 162-171; G.N. Stanton, *5 Ezra and Matthean Christianity in the Second Century*: JTS 28 (1977) 67-83; T.A. Bergren, *Fifth Ezra: The Text, Origin and Early History*, Atlanta 1990; Id., *Sixth Ezra: The Text, Origin and Early History*, Oxford 1998; F.G. Nuvolone, *"Apocalypse d'Esdras" grecque et latine, rapports et rhétorique*: Apocrypha 7 (1996) 81-108.

M. Starowieyski

ETERNITY. The conception of eternity in the Fathers is influenced not only by the philosophical formation (especially Platonic) of some of them, but primarily by the biblical concept. In pre-Socratic philosophy there is no secure attestation of the term αἰώνιος, whereas eternity or perpetuality is indicated by ἀΐδιος, employed by Heraclitus, Empedocles, Parmenides, etc.; in Democritus it refers to the absolute eternity of the atoms. In Platonism, eternity was conceived for the first time in a metaphysical manner: the αἰών (the standard term for eternity in *Plato and *Middle Platonism and *Neoplatonism) is not in time, but beyond time, in that it transcends it (while time is famously defined as "a moving image of eternity" in *Tim.* 37D5: whereas eternity remains in oneness, time moves according to number); it is the eternity of the divinity, which is unbegotten. The ἀϊδιότης is everlastingness throughout all times, like that of the *soul, or of stars; sometimes it also refers to the Ideas.

In other philosophical schools, however, and in Greek in general, the meaning of αἰών, αἰώνιος and ἀΐδιος was very different. Aristotle seems never to use αἰώνιος, and αἰών only occasionally, mostly in the traditional sense of "life," whereas in his corpus there are nearly 300 occurrences of ἀΐδιος, which is Aristotle's preferred word to designate eternity. His conception of eternity and use of the relevant terminology is generally followed by his commentators. In the *Stoics, αἰών and αἰώνιος, rather than indicating eternity strictly, are rather related to a cyclical conception of αἰῶνες or cyclically recurring cosmic eras, marked by the periodic destruction and restoration of new worlds, where the events follow one another according to Necessity, always identical in each world. Eternity is rather expressed through ἀΐδιος, which is frequent in the Stoics, occurring over thirty times in the *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* in the sense of that which endures forever. It is applied to bodies and matter, the ὄντα or realities that truly exist according to Stoic materialism, and above all to God. Notably, to designate eternity, *Marcus Aurelius does not employ αἰών alone, as Plato and *Plotinus do, but ἀΐδιος αἰών, meaning "eternal duration." The Epicureans, following Democritus, regularly employ ἀΐδιος, never αἰών, to designate the eternity of such imperishable constituents of the universe as atoms and void.

Also outside the philosophical world, in Greek eternity was not indicated by αἰών. In *Homer, early lyric, and tragedy, αἰών principally bears the sense of "life" or "a period of time" or "generation." Also in classical and Hellenistic Greek, it means "long duration," "perpetuity from one generation to the next," "lifetime" and the like; it sometimes indicates eternity only in reference to the divine, but this meaning is generally conveyed by ἀΐδιος.

In the Bible, likewise, αἰών and αἰώνιος do not mean "eternity" and "eternal"; they only acquire this meaning, sometimes, when they refer to God. In the Hebrew Bible, the principal term for eternity is *ʿôlām*, which is almost always translated with αἰών and αἰώνιος in the Septuagint and does not at all mean "eternity" or "eternal," but only acquires this sense when it refers to God or what is closely related to God, and only because of God's own eternal nature. Otherwise, it indicates a long time, a remote time in the past or in the future, the series of generations, a lifetime, or it even means "worldly" or "mundane," or, especially in the most recent books, it refers to the other world (Ramelli - Konstan, 37-49). In the most recent books of the Old Testament, eternity in its strict sense is expressed by ἀΐδιος, which properly means "eternal," "with no end": in Wisd 7:26, it refers to God, "eternal light," and in 4 Mac 10:15 to the eternal life: here τὸν ἀΐδιον τῶν εὐσεβῶν βίον is contrasted to τὸν αἰώνιον τοῦ τυράννου ὄλεθρον, where it is notable that the eternal life is ἀΐδιος, i.e., really "eternal, with no end," whereas the *death of the impious tyrant in the next world is αἰώνιος, i.e., belonging to the other αἰών.

In the New Testament, too, αἰώνιος means "eternal" only in reference to God, otherwise it means "long-lasting" (e.g., χρόνοι αἰώνιοι in Rom 16:25-26 and 2 Tim 1:9 cannot mean "eternal times"!), and αἰών means a "century" or "age," or indicates this or, most often, the next world. Only ἀΐδιος refers to eternity proper, e.g., in Rom 1:20. Above all, when it comes to the future life and death, whereas αἰώνιος refers to both life and death and punishment and fire in the New Testament, which are thus labeled as "belonging to the next world or αἰών" (in opposition to this world, κόσμος or καιρός, or to χρόνος, see, e.g., Mk 10:30 and all John), ἀΐδιος refers only to life; it never refers to death or punishment of human beings or fire. Therefore, in the Bible only life is said to be properly "eternal," "without end," a characteristic that essentially and intrinsically belongs to God. Indeed, eternal life is the participation in the life of God, by grace; Christ himself is said to be this life.

This precise distinction is maintained by many Greek Fathers, especially *Tatian, *Clement, *Origen, *Didymus, *Athanasius, the Cappadocians, *Evagrius, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *John Chrysostom, *Proclus of Constantinople, ps.-*Dionysius and *Maximus the Confessor (Ramelli - Konstan 82-225). They apply to God both the biblical αἰώνιος and the more philosophical (but attested also in the

Bible!) ἀΐδιος—the latter from the apologists onward, e.g., *Aristides and *Athenagoras—but they refer ἀΐδιος only to the future life and bliss, whereas to future death, punishment of human beings, suffering and fire only αἰώνιος is applied. A passage of Didymus (*Comm. on Job* 76,11ff.), a close follower of Origen, on the polysemy of αἰώνιος and αἰών is telling, since it shows that he was perfectly aware that αἰών in the Bible does not mean "eternity"; only if αἰώνιος refers to God does it signify "eternal" in the absolute sense, without beginning or end, and not subject to time, whereas for human beings it indicates the continuation of this life in the life to come, in the next world: "It must be noted that αἰώνιος is said in several ways: in the expression, 'αἰώνιος God,' it means beginningless and endless; for God is called αἰώνιος by virtue of having neither a beginning nor an end of his existence. But αἰώνιος is something different when used in the expression, 'things unseen are αἰώνια': for these things are not αἰώνια in the way God is, but rather because they do not perish but remain forever in the same condition. And αἰώνιος is meant differently again when it is measured against present time, as when it is said: 'the sons of this αἰών are wiser in their generation'; for the time that extends over the life of a human being is also called an αἰών. Indeed, it is laid down concerning the Hebrew who did not wish to be freed in the seventh year, that he will be your slave unto the αἰών: for no slave of a human being remains forever, even after his death. It is in this sense that Paul too writes (1 Cor 8:13): 'if flesh causes my brother to stumble, I shall not eat flesh through the αἰών,' using this term in place of 'throughout my life.'"

The same awareness was present in many other patristic writers. Let us single out the conception of eternity and the relevant vocabulary at least in Clement, Origen and the Cappadocians. Clement's use of αἰών, αἰώνιος and ἀΐδιος is especially frequent and is remarkably similar to that of Origen. Αἰώνιος is clearly used in the case of biblical quotations, paraphrases or commentaries, very often in reference to life or salvation in the world to come (ζωή, σωτηρία αἰώνιος) or equivalent expressions (such as "αἰώνιος repose," "tent," and "home" or "dwelling," as well as the αἰώνιος kingdom of heaven), and in connection with γνῶσις, faith and ethical commitment, but also with God's mercy and his economy of salvation and therapeutic effect: life in the world to come is provided by the Savior, through grace. This is the *telos* of the present life, and in turn this *telos* is explicitly identified with the ἀποκατάστασις; in two passages, ἀποκατάστασις is closely associated with the concept of eternity. In comparison with this abundant use of the adjective in reference to life, the two occurrences of the biblical πῦρ αἰώνιον, the fire in the world to come, seem sparse. Αἰώνιος, moreover, is often used in reference to God, to the three Persons of the *Trinity, or to what pertains to God, in which case—and exclusively in this case—it acquires the sense of "eternal," *ab aeterno* and *in aeternum*. Ἀΐδιος too is amply employed in the sense of "absolutely eternal," also to explain that the eternity of God is not an infinite extension into the past and future, but rather "an ἀΐδιος today." The same adjective is often found in connection with eternal life, ζωὴ ἀΐδιος, as a parallel to ζωὴ αἰώνιος and ζωὴ μέλλουσα, but the latter two phrases put the emphasis on the fact that this life pertains to the future αἰών, whereas the former insists strictly on its eternity and absolute everlastingness. The same is the case with σωτηρία ἀΐδιος, "eternal salvation," and ἀΐδιος ὑγεία, "eternal health," granted by God the Physician, who cures with the goal of salvation. Important differences are evident when the subject is "death" and "fire": we have only two occurrences of "ἀΐδιος death," but they are hypothetical and corrected by divine mercy, which acts in order to avoid the realization of an eternal death, and, in face of the two occurrences of "αἰώνιον fire," there is not a single instance of "ἀΐδιον fire."

The same conception of eternity and terminological usage is found in Origen. In his extant Greek works, ἀΐδιος is almost always used in reference to God, whose eternity is absolute: God's power, divinity, kingdom, existence, mercy, etc., may also be designated as ἀΐδια. As in the Bible, αἰώνιος means "eternal" in the absolute sense only in the relatively few instances in which the term is applied to God, but when Origen is not quoting *Scripture, he is more likely to employ ἀΐδιος in these contexts. Αἰώνιος also refers to the life to come, without focusing on its eternity, and can be applied as well to the series of αἰῶνες that precede the true eternity. Origen's idea of a succession of αἰῶνες is very different from the Stoic one, because in his view each of them does not at all repeat the events of the former ones by necessity and Fate, but it is different from all others and characterized by the free decisions of the rational creatures. Moreover, contrary to the Stoic conception, the succession of αἰῶνες will come to an end in the *telos*, when the complete **apokatastasis* will take place, and all will finally participate in the absolute eternity (ἀϊδιότης) of divine life.

This idea of the participation of all in the absolute eternity of divine life in the *apokatastasis* is taken up by *Gregory of Nyssa. In his writings we find a pre-

dominant use of the philosophical adjective ἀΐδιος, in comparison with αἰώνιος, which is mostly confined to scriptural citations and reminiscences. Indeed, Gregory is the most philosophically minded of the Cappadocians and, along with Origen and Augustine, of all the Fathers. In his writings, ἀΐδιος is used very widely, in reference to God, the *Trinity, and its eternity *a parte ante* and *a parte post*. Characteristic of his usage is *C. Eun.* I 9,4, where, in reference to the Son, ἀΐδιος is made to correspond to ἀγέννητος and ἀτελεύτητος: for "eternal" means "ungenerated" and "imperishable." Gregory, like Origen, uses ἀΐδιος fairly frequently also in reference to the eternal life that awaits humans by the grace of Christ and that is thus characterized as endless; ἀΐδιος indicates also the eternal joy that is proper to eternal life. In *Or. cat.* 16,63, ζωὴ ἀΐδιος is considered to be a gift that was awaiting us from the beginning and to which we ought to return; it is identified with God and Christ himself in *C. Eun.* II 1,536. The ἀΐδιος life of God is that which traverses the αἰῶνες (ibid. II 1,457), and the life of God itself is that in which the blessed will participate. In *Hom. Cant.* (GNO VI 69,3) it is promised to humans that they will endure for eternity (πρὸς τὸ ἀΐδιον), together with him who is forever (ἀεὶ ὄντι). The examples could multiply.

The reason for the remarkable frequency with which Gregory employs ἀΐδιος in connection with life is that he conceives of it as a strictly eternal life in the ἀϊδιότης of the apokatastasis, after the end of the αἰών itself: a life that will last for an eternity that is beyond time, together with God, who is beyond any temporal dimension. God is the Good, and its opposite is evil, which is not ἐξ ἀϊδίου and thus cannot subsist eternally (*Inscr. Ps.* GNO V 100,21-25). Of course, αἰώνιος too is employed by Gregory, generally in connection with scriptural citations, whereas in philosophical discussions which demand their own vocabulary it is ἀΐδιος that is used. Like Origen, Gregory too, when he speaks of life in the beyond, uses ζωὴ ἀΐδιος, if he wishes to indicate its eternity, and ζωὴ αἰώνιος, if he wishes to emphasize that it will be in the next world, in very many instances (so, too, "αἰώνιος home" in heaven, δόξα αἰώνιος, αἰώνιος μακαριότης, "αἰώνιοι and ineffable hopes," i.e., hopes for life in the future αἰών rather than to hopes that are themselves eternal, etc.). The connection between αἰώνιος life and the αἰών to come is especially clear in *Inst. Chr.* (GNO VIII/1,79,4), where the αἰώνιος joy that characterizes the future life is "that which the souls of the saints will enjoy in the future age that is expected [ἐν τῷ προσδοκομένῳ αἰῶνι]." But when he speaks of destruction or death or misfortune or punishment or the fire in the life to come, Gregory uses always and only αἰώνιος (e.g., ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος, πῦρ αἰώνιον, αἰώνιος κόλασις, αἰσχύνη καὶ ἀτιμία αἰώνιος), never ἀΐδιος. For he holds that the purifying fire will be applied to sinners in the αἰών, which will end with the apokatastasis, the absolute eternity (ἀϊδιότης), and since life will endure in this eternity, but not death and punishment, and all evil will disappear, only life can be called really eternal (ἀΐδιος), not death (as already Origen argued in *Comm. Rom.* V 7: *si vita aeterna est, mors esse non possit aeterna*).

Death, fire and punishment are merely αἰώνια, for they will be in the future αἰών but will cease at the end of the αἰών, or even earlier for some people. In *De Inf.* 91,23–92,2, the use of αἰώνιος in reference to purification in the next world makes it particularly clear that it is not a question of eternal punishment, but rather of a purification that will have an end: "after long periods of time [χρόνων μακρῶν περίοδοις], by means of purification in the future age [διὰ τῆς αἰωνίας καθάρσεως], God will return this person again to the totality of those who are saved [τῷ τῶν σῳζομένων πληρώματι]," where the total number of the saved coincides, for Gregory, with all humankind. Gregory adds that "this will be absolutely clear to all those who consider God's power" and God's nature, with reference to Jesus' assertion in the gospel that the salvation of sinners is "impossible among human beings, but everything is possible for God." In *De Anima*, Gregory uses αἰών and αἰώνιος in reference to purifying punishment, while explicitly denying that it is eternal: the αἰών in question is—just as in Origen—that between the death of the individual and the universal apokatastasis, after which there no longer is any aeon, but rather the perfect and immutable ἀϊδιότης of all creatures in God, when (in Origen's words) "no one will be in the αἰών any longer, but God will be all in all."

Divine eternity, in which humans will participate, is not an infinite extension in time, but transcends all time. In Gregory, as in Origen and several Fathers influenced by the Origenian tradition, the eternity of God is closely related to God's infinity, on which also Gregory's conception of ἐπέκτασις depends. For God transcends every διάστημα of space or time. Gregory explains this well in *C. Eun.* I 1,371: the nature of God is absolutely eternal (ἀΐδιος) because it is not situated in time, just as it is not located in a place: it is ἀδιάστατος. In *Fragments on Matthew* 487, he speaks of τὸ χρονικὸν τοῦτο διάστημα, "this temporal extension," and αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ χρονικὸν διάστημα, "temporal extension itself." He also employs the term διάστημα in reference to intervals of

time in several passages, such as *Comm. Matth.* 15,28.34. In *De Or.* 27,13-14, Origen compares the extension or διάστημα of a day with that of an entire αἰών. Indeed, time, according to Origen, depends on the freedom of the νόες and on God's Providence, which respects their freedom but at the same time is also infallible in bringing all creatures to the eventual salvation (*C. Cels.* V 21 etc.): the differentiation of the merits or demerits acquired by rational creatures through their free choices takes place in time, which is the explication of the νόες's free will and free choices, and which extends through several αἰῶνες, but concludes with the ἀϊδιότης of the apokatastasis (*Princ.* II 3,5). In this connection, another convergence between Origen and Gregory of Nyssa is the description of eternal divine life as ἀδιάστατος, a term already used by *Philo and, then, by Plotinus, who, like Origen, also employs διάστασις, in addition to διάστημα, in reference to time. Gregory in turn will oppose the corporeal nature, διαστηματική, to the incorporeal one, ἀδιάστατος (*De an.* 48; *De hom. op.* 23,3; *C. Eun.*12, where his adherence to Origen's vocabulary is particularly evident).

It is in this light that we should consider Augustine's conception of time and eternity, of the temporality of creatures and the eternity of God, a relationship that is analyzed in Book 11 of the *Confessions*. Whereas eternity, far from being an infinite extension in time, is a "lack of extension" and thus is timeless, time is an "extension" or "dimension of the soul" (*distentio animi*), where *distentio* precisely corresponds to διάστημα/διάστασις, and lack of extension to the idea of being ἀδιάστατος. Eternity was not and will not be, but it is an eternal present, and so it represents the fullness of being. Of course, eternity and the fullness of being are typical of God. The Plotinian background for this conception, both in Gregory of Nyssa and in Augustine, is evident: Plotinus too defined eternity as ἀδιάστατος, an eternal present, proper to the fullness of Being. Tzamalikos has also proposed our seeing Origen's influence behind Augustine's conception of time and eternity, and, also in the light of recent studies on the influence of Origen on Augustine, I think he may be right. According to the former, however, in the end all rational creatures will participate in divine eternity and life.

J. Guitton, *Le temps et l'éternité chez Plotin et Saint Augustin*, Paris 1955; H. Keizer, *Life, Time, Entirety*, Amsterdam 1999; E. Degani, Αἰών, Bologna 2001; G. Heidl, *Origen's Influence on the Young Augustine*, Louaize, Lebanon - Piscataway, NJ, 2003, with my review Stylos 14 (2005) 194-198; I. Ramelli, *Aion*, in *Enciclopedia Filosofica*, I, Milan [2]2006, 217; P. Tzamalikos, *Origen: Philosophy of History and Eschatology*, Leiden 2007; I. Ramelli - D. Konstan, *Terms for Eternity.* Αἰώνιος *and* Ἀΐδιος *in Classical and Christian Authors*, Piscataway 2007; Id., *Gregorio di Nissa. Sull'anima e la resurrezione*, Milan 2007, critical essays and commentaries; Id., *Origen, Bardaisan, and the Origin of Universal Salvation*: HTR 102.2 (2009) 135-168; Id., *Apocatastasi*, Milan 2010.

I. Ramelli

ETHELBERT (560–616) king of Kent: his kingdom extended as far as the river Humber. A pagan, he married the Christian Bertha, daughter of the Frankish king Charibert of Paris. In 597 he welcomed *Augustine and his companions, sent to evangelize the Anglo-Saxons, allowing them to live at *Canterbury, his capital. It seems that he soon converted to Christianity, and in June 601 *Gregory the Great addressed letters to him (*Ep.* XI,37) and to Bertha (*Ep.* XI,35). The code of laws attributed to Ethelbert, composed *iuxta exempla Romanorum* (Bede, *Hist.* II,5) but in the Anglo-Saxon language, is closer to the *Lex Salica* (whose first redaction goes back to the early 6th c.) than to Roman models; according to Germanic customary law, the code aims at the protection of personal goods, including those of clergy. He was succeeded by his son Eadbald.

CPL 1827; F. Liebermann (ed.), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, I, Halle 1903, 3-8; PLRE IIIA, 20; DHGE XV, 1156-1158; A.W.B. Simpson, *The Laws of Ethelbert*, in S.A. Morris - T.A. Green et al. (eds.), *On the Laws and Customs of England*, Chapel Hill 1981, 3-17.

E. Malaspina

ETHICS. The early Fathers were deeply interested in the moral implications of the Christian faith, starting with the familiar morals of the *Apostolic Fathers and the public defense of the *apologists. Among Greek Fathers, *Clement of Alexandria resolves various pressing problems and gives detailed advice, *Basil prescribes the behavior of the monk and *Chrysostom preaches ethics to his congregations. Among Latin Fathers, *Tertullian is a rigorist who exaggerates situations, *Lactantius formulates the basic principles of law and *Ambrose follows the model of Cicero in a moral treatise. Ancient tendencies are summed up in *Augustine who, as a *Platonist and a Westerner, joins them all together. At first, private matters remained central; later, the Christian state added wider problems.

Ethical exhortation is formulated in various literary forms: the Apostolic Fathers use those found in the NT: the "two ways" of *life and *death, catalogs of virtues and vices, family codes, proverbs, letters and parables. This variety grows in later writings. Clement of Alexandria provides a manual for daily

life and an appeal for spiritual perfection, Basil formulates a Rule (in two forms), which had lasting influence, while Chrysostom prefers to rely on his sermons. Tertullian writes on specific questions; Lactantius inserts moral principles into a doctrinal context; and Ambrose systematically treats of the virtues. Augustine deals with general principles and concrete problems in letters, sermons and treatises of various kinds.

Recurrent themes include freedom, justice and love. Freedom is the condition of moral action; determinism is constantly opposed. Ethics begin and end in Christology. *Clement of Rome links divine justice with the order of the universe (*1 Cor.* 40). The perfection of every virtue is love, without which no one can please God (*1 Cor.* 49-50). Christians must be disciples, following and imitating those who have gone before them (*1 Cor.* 63). *Ignatius insists on the imitation of Christ and the Christian's close communion with his Lord (*Eph.* 1; *Rom.* 4, 6, 7; *Phil.* 7). Martyrdom is the crown the Christian athlete aspires to (*Pol.* 2; *Rom.* 4, 6). *Hermas makes a last appeal for justice to a church that has betrayed its past (*Vis.* 2, 2). Rigorism and *asceticism mark the path of highest rectitude. Every act that brings pleasure is an act of self-indulgence, but it is not wrong to indulge in doing good (*Sim.* 6, 5). Christian justice obeys the divine precepts: it is the way of love for God, for neighbors and for enemies (*Didache* 1).

With *Justin, we move in a different world, with the need to explain Christian faith and practice. Christians are considered immoral by some, ignorant by others, faithless by the Jews, and irrational by all: Justin defends and explains. Everyone may observe the changed lives of Christians, a result of their conversion. Those who once lived unworthily now follow the one unbegotten God and pray that their enemies may know the true God. Love for enemies is the distinctive sign of the Christian (*1 Apol.* 14-16). Justice and love are joined in the one commandment given by the one God. The new law takes the place of the old: the law given on Horeb is no longer valid. Christ is the eternal and definitive law (*Dial.* 11, 2) for all rational creatures, human beings who by nature know right from wrong. This universal justice is summed up in the dual precept of love for God and for the living rational being who is our neighbor (*Dial.* 93). Against any kind of determinism, Justin maintains that human beings are rational and capable of choosing between just and unjust: otherwise there could be no hope of salvation for humanity, and morality would be a matter of opinion (*1 Apol.* 28). If there were no free will, human actions would be neither praised nor blamed, and people would not unexpectedly change from good to bad and from bad to good (*1 Apol.* 43, 1). God puts off judgment of the world so that human beings can choose salvation (*2 Apol.* 7, 1). Justin uses a new word, *autexousios* (*Dial.* 88, 102, 144), to bring out the fact of human free choice.

Clement of Alexandria has left us the first complete treatment of Christian morality in daily life as it progresses toward perfection. Right reason should govern all human behavior. Virtue is a harmonious rational state that follows the order of the universe. Lustfulness, like any fault, puts things out of place and throws nature into confusion: it is irrational since it subverts the end of the person. With this *Stoic insistence on life in accordance with nature, Clement gives detailed instructions for every aspect of life. One reason for this attention was a *gnostic sect that taught a heavenly justice and defended sexual communism among those who wished to reestablish the higher order. Clement also insists, against *Marcion, on the unity of justice and goodness. In Clement we find a strong ethical monism and an interest in detailed prescription. His presentation of love includes both loving union with God and the good works that spring from this love (*Quis div. salv.* 27-28). Love of God is the path to perfection, "because the more a man loves God, the more closely he enters God" (ibid.). Love of neighbor develops together with love for God. Perfection consists in martyrdom, which "reveals the perfect work of love" (*Strom.* IV, 4, 14), but the true gnostic anticipates heaven on earth and worships God with his whole life; he lives in continual mental prayer, giving undivided attention to God (*Strom.* VII, 7, 43). This is the first exposition of Christian perfection and spirituality, which would dominate subsequent religious life.

Clement's enthusiasm comes from debate with false gnostics and from the mixture of *Paul and *Plato that dominates his teaching. His ascetic tendencies are evident in sobriety, self-control and freedom from the passions, which join humanity to God. Here he joins with the philosophers against the gnostics, who claimed affinity with God and yet indulged their passions. Clement's presentation of gnostic morality has been criticized on the basis of the ascetism of the Nag Hammadi writings. Yet he names specific leaders and practices (*Strom.* III, 2, 5-6; III, 4, 25-5, 44), and declares that the splendid freedom of the heretics is incompatible with the furtive dissimulation of their misdeeds (*Strom.* III, 4, 30). However, he tenaciously defends marriage against the gnostic form of asceticism. Marriage is a life of greater day-to-day stress than the tranquillity

of celibacy (*Strom.* VII, 12, 70), and a spiritual union that anticipates the heavenly life (*Strom.* VI, 12, and VII, 12-13).

Despite many similarities between Clement and the Sentences of *Sextus, the latter's ascetic exertion is much more severe; he demands every possible renunciation of the body and exhibits the Pythagorean *soma-sema*. In contrast with Clement, his attitude to riches is extremely negative; love of money is a trap: the wise man will possess no private property other than his virtue (79, 81), and private property is impossible for those who are brothers under the one heavenly Father (228). Assimilation to God remains the main goal of ethical endeavor: the *soul must always live in the presence of God while it aims at sinless perfection (8, 234, 237). It leaves the world behind and ascends to God by faith (402), through his Word (420). The wise man is God among human beings (376a), and his soul incorporates God (82d). This assimilation is always possible thanks to a severe renunciation of the body's needs; every sexual desire must be destroyed (232-233). Those who wish to be more closely united with God must renounce marriage; on the other hand, family life is not incompatible with the wise man's life as long as he is aware of its dangers (230a, 230b). *Death is a welcome liberation of the soul from the burden of the body (320). *Faith is the basis of a good life (6, 400, 402); the believer is set free (36) and prevails over the world and human beings (43, 182). Sextus gives a narrower description of *love than Clement: love is directed toward anyone whose soul resembles (106a) God (106b) and truth (158). To love God means to carry out his will (442), and to love another wise man is to love oneself (219, 226).

*Basil of Caesarea insists on human *freedom. Without free will there can be no basis for praise or blame, and the possibility of merit is the first condition of any just judgment (*Hom.* 6, 7). He rejects astrology in one homily and demonstrates in another that God cannot be the author of evil. Moral choice belongs to the person's faculties and his will is free. Justice is more important than any other consideration and admits no compromise. There is no difference between venial and grave sins, since every sin is disobedience to God, who will judge all on the last day (*Reg. f.*, *Pr*: PG 31, 891-892). Christian justice must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, and must be characterized by supererogation (*Mor.* 80, 22). Starting from his fundamental horror of sin and zeal for justice, he ends in a detailed presentation of the upright life. As in Clement, every detail of life is examined. In the *Moralia*, Basil collects NT passages prescribing the good or forbidding the bad. In the long and short *Rules* he addresses the details of monastic life. Basil wanted the *Rules* to become the source of moral reform for the whole church, led by the monks' example. In his homilies on the six days of creation, Basil shows the order, harmony and example of nature. The same God is revealed in creation and in the moral life. His law is established in nature, so that fish migrate (*Hex.* 7, 4) and swallows build their nests with regularity, perseverance and exemplary industry (*Hex.* 8, 5). Love of God and neighbor, the end of the commandments, arises from an innate tendency. The heart of the person turns to the beauty and splendor of God, so that longing for God and seeking God's love rises above everything else. United to God in continual prayer, love grows until it reaches perfection. Christ's disciples are distinguished by their mutual love (*Mor.* 5) and by the peace they show to all. Mutual love, like love of God, is a tendency innate in human beings, a seed that must be developed in the unity of Christ's body.

In John Chrysostom we find the same insistence on human freedom and moral responsibility. Sin comes from the sinner's will, not from any external cause (*Comm. Ps.* 140, 7); all are given knowledge of what is right or wrong. The person can accept or reject God's grace (*Hom. Hebr.* 34, 2). As in Clement, free will is distinct from freedom. All have free will, but only Christ's disciple can break the slavery of sin and live a truly free life (*Theod.* 2, 5). God must be just: he will judge all people, and their present actions will determine their eternal destiny. God does not remain outside the person's moral struggle: he is just and justifies. He does not preside over our contest like an impartial referee: he fights at our side against the devil. God's law governs everything and gives the person an interior law. The natural law is able to guide the conscience to what is good and away from what is evil (*De statuis* 12, 9). The same God who established the order of the universe formulated the moral order and requires of the person a life of order and moderation. Only sin is to be feared: nothing can harm the person who does not harm himself.

Along with consciousness of the cosmic order, John upholds the importance of work, which is a law of nature and the will of the Creator, who also works in his world (*Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam* [Rom 16:3], 1, 5). Work finds its meaning through the love that produces every virtue. "Virtue is born from love and love from virtue; they generate each other mutually" (*Hom. Eph.* 9, 3). God joins human beings together by the bonds of his love. He has made humanity such that its members need one another and must

live together in friendship and mutual relationship (*Hom. 1 Cor.* 34, 4). Christ's love is a great power which, according to Paul, is stronger than any human or angelic power. Thus love cannot be imprisoned in silence: it spreads like fire from friend to friend (*De Comp. ad Demet.* 1, 8). Love is humanity's greatest teacher; it transforms the violent and sensual into peaceful people, and gives courage to the timid (*Hom. 1 Cor.* 33, 8). Love guides the way to perfection in this world and admits no compromises: "The measure of love is never to stop" (*Hom. Phil.* 2, 1).

In Tertullian and the Latin Fathers too, the old emphasis remains: freedom, justice and love; but we do not find Clement's synthesis, passed to later Greek Fathers through Origen. In fact, this synthesis came from the union of Paul and Plato and, though Tertullian uses philosophy, he is no Platonist, but rather a Stoic and, as such, occupied with reason and laws, compassion, chastity and patience. His ethical teaching depends on *Scripture, which he uses as a book of sacred law, giving the precise words uncontestable authority. Freedom remains important; Tertullian establishes this point at some length (*Adv. Marc.* 2, 6). God can be known only by a worthy being who possesses his image and likeness: free will, which makes the person capable of spontaneously doing good. Part of goodness is thus set free by God in the human souls whom he has freed. Free will is also the source of evil in the world: God's prescience does not limit human freedom. Human beings no longer present the true image of God in which they were made: sin has so disfigured this image that it needs to be restored by the incarnate Christ, who became man so that human beings might become God (*Adv. Marc.* 2, 27). The heavenly image becomes ours to the extent that we advance in the holiness, justice and truth of Christ (*De Res.* 49). This imitation of God in Christ is reinforced by fear of God's judgment. Goodness and justice are inseparable and are found in intimacy with God, outside which all is corrupt. What is not of God is of the devil, hence the world cannot produce virtue; its apparent virtues cannot be accepted as indifferent, but are the work of the devil. Good and evil have no common basis. Good is absolute, rational and dependent on God. Rationality is connected with conscience and natural law. Conscience decides what should be done and judges what has been done (*Paen.* 12). A common ground between Christian and pagan conscience (*Apol.* 9-10) is what nature teaches (*Test.* 5; *Adv. Marc.* 1, 3). Nature is the primary norm for all, common to all people, in whose hearts it is inscribed (*De Cor.* 5-6). This was made explicit in the Decalogue, but the law proceeds from Moses to its final fulfillment in Christ (*Adv. Marc.* 4, 15-16).

To Scripture and nature Tertullian adds church discipline: these are the three guides in moral matters. Love remains the supreme sacrament and the treasure of the Christian (*Fug.* 14), whom it sometimes calls to the gift of life itself for the love of God (*Scorp.* 4). "See how they love one another": this is the mark of the Christian family (*Apol.* 39), which is a special unity within the wider unity of the human race. Tertullian formulates a catalogue of Christian virtues, looking particularly at chastity and patience. Salvation is closely connected with modesty (*Cult.* 2). Virginity and celibacy are of primary importance (*Cast.* 1); the good done by Christians is the fundamental argument of apologetic. Care of the hair or skin is a form of prostitution (*Cult.*, passim). Abstinence within marriage is praised (*Ux.* 1, 6). Widows and widowers are recommended to take the opportunity offered by their misfortune to reject the flesh and gain the spirit (*Cast.* 10). Patience is central to the moral life, strengthening faith, peace, charity, humility and penitence, and restraining the flesh, the tongue and the hands from evil (*De Pat.* 15).

Lactantius formulates a specific structure for his ethics. Reason is important, since virtue needs knowledge to guide its steps. Freedom is essential since Christ does not use violence when he asks obedience, but leaves human freedom intact (*Inst.* 4, 24). The will is directed toward doing good by the virtue that is entirely within our power (*Inst.* 6, 5.6). There is a desire (*cupiditas*) to do what is right, just as there is an opposite desire born of a bad will (*Inst.* 6, 5.9). Since moral action derives from faith, freedom of belief is essential. Persons must be free to worship as they wish. Force may constrain people to simulate reverence, but it cannot constrain the will to actual reverence (*Ep.* 49 [54], 1-2). Reason and choice go together. Wisdom is the knowledge of God (*Ira* 22, 2) and an understanding of the duty to do good and abstain from evil (*Inst.* 5, 17). In this way wisdom combines religion and morality, since God is the source of all goodness (*Inst.* 6, 9). The greatest justice, without knowledge of God, is like a body without a head (*Inst.* 6. 9). To know and honor God is the whole of human wisdom (*Inst.* 3, 30), and only justice can lead the person to God (*Inst.* 7, 27). Justice is piety and knowledge of God as Father (*Inst.* 3, 9). The world has been made so that human beings may know and serve God forever (*Ep.* 64 [69], 1).

The unity of the upright life is again brought out in the description of the human being as the image of God, because of the capacity to know and think

(*Ira* 18, 14, 17). From this resemblance arise the two sources of ethics: persons should respect other persons as they respect God (*Inst.* 6, 10, 1), and neglect their own body so that their affinity with God may become ever more evident (*Ira* 18, 14). Relationship with God is summarized (as in St. Paul) by the concept of sacrifice (*Inst.* 6, 25). Nothing visible is offered to God, but only the devotion of soul and spirit (*Inst.* 5, 19). God requires nothing external and is worshiped by the sacrifice of an upright life (*Ep.* 53 [581). The tension between body and soul is part of a wider tension that is essential for the moral life. There are two lives or two ways, and the choice between them is an essential struggle (*certamen*), since "God has made everything so as to put two things in opposition" (*Inst.* 6, 22). So we must always wage a struggle and make a choice (*Inst.* 4, 4, 15-17). Lactantius openly accepts Cicero's position on natural law (*Inst.* 6, 8, citing Cicero, *Rep.* 3, 22-23). The divine inner law serves as a basis from which to criticize positive law with its expedient variations between nations (*Inst.* 6,9). Reason is the only guide to right conduct (*Inst.* 2, 6, 11) and is found perfected in Christ (*Ep.* 37 [42]). Although reason is supreme, the *affectus* (passions) are not condemned, as with Stoicism: rather, they must be used well and directed to what is just (*Inst.* 6, 16). The great virtue that governs and crowns moral life is patience or perseverance (*Inst.* 6, 18). Sacrifice to God and patience are completed with *humanitas* and *innocentia* toward others. Lactantius speaks little of *caritas*, but subdivides this virtue into specific, concrete parts. People are bound by their common *humanitas* (*Inst.* 6, 10), and this must be expressed by their mercy or mutual humanity (*Inst.* 6, 10). *Humanitas*, taken from Cicero, is deepened by Christian mercy (*Ep.* 33 [38] 8). With it goes *innocentia* (*Inst.* 5, 17), refusal to render evil for evil. Whatever cruelty is inflicted upon them, Christians do not retort with words or actions, but trust patiently and quietly in God (*Ep.* 48 [53]). Among other themes, Lactantius defends private property and rejects Plato's idealistic communism (*Inst.* 3, 21).

*Ambrose maintains the Stoic tendencies of the earliest Latin authors, but joins to them the Platonism of the Greek Fathers. His *De Officiis ministrorum* is based on Cicero's *De Officiis*, completed by biblical teaching. He follows Cicero in making clear what is upright or useful and what is both upright and useful: but his measure is based on what is eternal, not on the present world (*Off.* I, 9). He distinguishes duties valid for all (ordinary) from those valid only for some (perfect) (*Off.* I, 11), and describes the four cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance. The good life is eternal life, which is found in knowledge of God and in doing good (*Off.* II, 2). Here Ambrose moves from a plurality of virtues to the one source of goodness, from philosophy to theology and from Stoicism to Platonism. He gives a positive description of the Christian battle and victory (*Luc. Prol.* 6 and *Jac.* 1, 6, 23). Adversity must be accepted as a school of faith and the way to victory (*Luc.* 6, 37-39). In his last works, Ambrose makes love the highest Christian virtue. Love flows from faith and hope from love, in a perennial cycle (*Luc.* 8, 30). But love is the greatest, the fullness and perfection of all the rest (*Ep.* 78, 9).

*Augustine sums up the greater part of patristic ethics. Freedom, justice and love remain central. The tensions in each sphere are unified by Christian discipleship, the single obedience that joins together all the ethical imperatives. Humility must accompany every Christian virtue and point to its origin in God (*Ep.* 118, 22). All human beings have free will, but are incapable of overcoming temptations (*Enarr. in Ps.* 89, 4). Through grace the human will is led back to its original efficacy and the person recovers freedom and charity (*Ep.* 167, 6, 19). Augustine defends free will against *Manichean determinism, but rejects the *Pelagian claim that people can choose rightly without God. "So we do not in any way weaken the free choice of each human will, nor do we deny with ungrateful pride, but affirm with grateful devotion, that grace of God by which the free will is aided" (*De bono vid.* 17, 21). Justification comes from God whose eternal law commands that the natural law be observed. This means following the order impressed by the Creator in the creation (*Faust.* 22, 27 and 30). Nature is ruled by laws; living creatures have instincts fixed in accordance with the natural law (*Gen. ad litt.* IX, 17, 32). Measure, form and order are universal goods. Order is what guides us to God (*De ord.* I, 9, 27).

Augustine is aware of the complexity of moral problems. There are various degrees of virtue and vice: e.g., a liar is one who denies truth or affirms falsehood, but lying has eight possible degrees of gravity (*De mend.* 14, 25). War may vary from mass extermination to deplorable necessity. Suicide is always evil. Augustine wrote several times on marriage and celibacy, but concluded that he was limited to showing the complexity of the problems (*Retract.* II, 53). All justice, however, comes from God, *fons justitiae* (*Civ. Dei* I, 21), *sol justitiae* (*Civ. Dei* V, 16) and *summa justitia* (*Civ. Dei* XX, 2). From God flows the justice by which human beings are justified (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 2). God's goodness, unlike that of creatures, does not change but remains al-

ways the same (*Enchir.* 12, 4). Even in his description of love, Augustine is conscious of unity and variety together. The oft-cited "Love and do what you will" (*In Ep. Jo.* 7, 8) shows how love uses different energies and actions. Love may be severe, as he thought it had to be in dealing with the *Donatists.

He is more convincing elsewhere, in his presentation of what he calls the *ordo amoris*. The good things of the world should be loved as a pledge of love for God who made them. "God, then, has given you these things. Love him who has made them" (*In Ep. Jo.* 2, 11). Next, in ascending order, comes love of self, the gift of self to God (*Serm.* 34, 7 and 57, 7). Then follows love of neighbor, which shows the church to be a demonstration of the truth of the gospel and a living sacrament. Finally and above all is love of God. God is love, present in every love that binds the good angels and God's servants. This means that God is nearer and better known since he himself is love (*Trin.* VIII, 11-12). Love thus calls the person to perfection, to the God whom he will praise and love forever (*Enarr. in Ps.* 38, 8). The person's end, whether one speaks of justice or love, is God himself. "Blessed is the one who possesses God" (*De mor. eccl. cath.* 11, 18). The variety and unity of ethical concepts find their coherence in the discipleship that derives only from God and that follows and imitates Christ (*Serm.* 304, 22).

Some ethical concepts persist throughout the patristic period. Free will is defended against *gnostic and *Manichean determinism, but perfect freedom is found only in God, and the person strives to reach freedom through the grace of God. Justice becomes insistence on harmonious order, and the notion of natural law emerges. Love remains central, except in Lactantius, whose ideal is expressed by the concepts *humanitas* and *innocentia*. Love becomes more mystical and spiritual. Martyrdom remains the ideal of the Christian's moral progress and, when martyrdom is no longer possible, *ascesis grows in importance. The call to deny the world is strong, even if mitigated by the risk of a heretical dualism. In all the variety and confusion, following Christ remains the main task; assimilation to God, imitation of Christ, participation in God—all represent the individual ways by which the ancient Fathers joined together justice and love.

K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt bei griechischen Mönchtum*, Leipzig 1898; Ch. Baur, *Das Ideal der christlichen Vollkommenheit nach dem hl. J. Chrysostomus*: ThGl 6 (1914) 564-574; E. Tröltsch, *Augustin, Die christliche Antike und das Mittelalter*, Munich - Berlin 1915 (It. tr. Naples 1970); J. Rivière, *S. Basile, évêque de Césarée* (Les moralistes chrétiens), Paris 1925; M. Viller, *Le martyr et l'ascète*: RAM 6 (1925) 105-142; Id., *Martyr et perfection*: RAM 6 (1925) 3-25; Ch. Baur, *Der Weg der christlichen Vollkommenheit nach der Lehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus*: ThGl 20 (1928) 26-41; J. Mausbach, *Die Ethik des heiligen Augustinus*, I, II, Freiburg i. Br. 1929; L. Meyer, *S. Jean Chrysostome, maître de perfection chrétienne*, Paris 1933; K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*, Tübingen 1936; J. Burnaby, *Amor Dei. A Study of St Augustine's Teaching on the Love of God as the Motive of the Christian Life*, London 1938; T. Preiss, *La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et de l'unité chez Ignace d'Antioche*: RHPhR (1938) 197-241; M. Viller - K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik in der Väterzeit*, Freiburg i. Br. 1939 (It. tr. Brescia 1991); D. Amand, *L'ascèse monastique de S. Basile*, Maredsous 1948; T. Ruther, *Die sittliche Forderung der Apatheia in den beiden ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten und bei Klemens von Alexandrien*, Freiburg i. Br. 1949; W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, Berlin - Leipzig 1952; J. Dumortier, *Les idées morales de S. J. Chrysostome*: MSR 12 (1955) 27-36; J. Gribomont, *Les règles morales de S. Basile et le NT*: SP 2 (TU 64) (1957) 416-426; H. Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus*, Cambridge 1959; O. Schaffner, *Christliche Demut*, Würzburg 1959; A.M. Malingrey, *Philosophia*, Paris 1961; A. Benito y Durán, *Filosofia de s. Basilio Magno*: SP 5 (TU 80) (1962) 446-472; R. Holte, *Béatitude et Sagesse. S. Augustin et le problème de la fin de l'homme dans la philosophie ancienne*, Paris 1962; E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosias von Mailand*, Münster 1965 (It. tr. Varese 1975); O. Prunet, *La morale de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1966; A. Zumkeller, *Das Mönchtum des heiligen Augustinus*, Würzburg 1968; M. Spanneut, *Tertullien et les premiers moralistes africains*, Gembloux 1969; J.P. Broudéhoux, *Mariage et famille chez Clém. d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1970; E. Osborn, *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought*, Cambridge 1976; A. J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, Philadelphia [2]1983; F.X. Murphy, *The Christian Way of Life*, Message of the Fathers of the Church 18, Wilmington 1986; R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, Harmondsworth 1986 (It. tr. Bari 1991); W.S. Babcock, *Augustine on Sin and Moral Agency*: The Journal of Religious Ethics 16 (1988) 28-55; A. Jagu, *La morale d'Epictète et le christianisme*: ANRW II,36,3 (1989) 2164-2199; H. Chadwick, *The Originality of Early Christian Ethics. A James Bryce Mem. Lecture Delivered in the Wolfons Hall*, Oxford 1990; W.S. Babcock (ed.), *The Ethics of St. Augustine*, Atlanta 1991; J. Wetzel, *Augustine and the Limits of Virtue*, Cambridge 1992; W.A. Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality, The First Two Centuries*, New Haven 1993; *Etica cristiana nei secoli III e IV: eredità e confronti*, SEA 53, Rome 1996; R. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*, Edinburgh 1997; A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *Les valeurs d'ordo et leur réception chez saint Augustin*: REAug 45 (1999) 295-334; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Agostino tra etica e religione*, Brescia 1999.

E. Osborn

ETHIOPIA

I. Early Christianity - II. Liturgy - III. Christian art - IV. Classical language or Ge'ez - V. Literature.

I. Early Christianity. The introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia should be linked, it would seem, to the story of Queen Candace's treasurer (Acts 8:27). Yet we know nothing more of the early centuries. There were probably Christians among the foreign merchants residing at Adulis and *Aksum; their religious propaganda must have gained importance

with the growth of the church's prestige in the Roman Empire and with the success following on *Constantine's decree (313), which allowed full freedom to the spread of the gospel; in fact, the only source that speaks of the beginnings of the spread of Christianity in Ethiopia (or more precisely in the kingdom of Aksum) puts these events at the time of Constantine. According to the historian *Rufinus (*Historia Eccl.* I, 9-10), "*temporibus Constantini*," two young Syrians, *Frumentius and Aedesius, shipwrecked on the coast of "India ulterior," were reduced to slavery by the king, whose confidence they later won. On the king's death, Frumentius, now prime minister of the queen regent, diligently set out to discover whether there were any Christians among the Roman merchants, and gave them leave to build churches and celebrate rites. Aedesius later returned to *Tyre, where, having become a priest, he met Rufinus. Frumentius went to *Alexandria to inform St. *Athanasius of events, who ordained him bishop of the country. Rufinus, however, is imprecise about its geographical position, calling it vaguely "India ulterior"; its exact name is known only from a letter sent by the emperor *Constantius in ca. 356 to the two sovereigns of Aksum: Aizanas and Sazanas. This letter, handed down by Athanasius (*Apologia* 31), asks the Aksumites to send bishop Frumentius back to Alexandria to submit to the *Arian patriarch *George, who took possession of that see early in 357, but fled from it in August 358. The letter's recipients were almost certainly King Ezana and his brother Sazana; according to a group of Aksumite inscriptions, Ezana passed from paganism to monotheism before being converted to Christianity (ca. mid 4th c.).

Altogether, these Aksumite documents allow us to establish an evolution from polytheism to Christianity, without specifying times or ways. Rufinus shows only how the evangelization of the kingdom of Aksum began; Frumentius's ministerial activity must be considered the continuation of apostolic activity, a stage in the economy of salvation. It is unclear why Frumentius went to Alexandria rather than *Antioch; there may have been preexistent links between the primitive Ethiopian Christian communities and the neighboring *Egyptian sees. The fact remains that, by receiving episcopal ordination from St. Athanasius, he made the church of Ethiopia dependent on the patriarch of Alexandria; the two churches would also remain linked in *monophysitism.

With Ezana's conversion, Christianity became the official religion of the kingdom of Aksum, to which groups of Syrian monks migrated in the 5th and 6th c., as is hinted by local traditions that, in the *Acts* of the "nine saints" and the "just men" (*ṣādqān*), preserve references to the origin of these "saints" in *Rom* (Eastern empire) and to Syrian proper names. Though the Syrian origin of these monks is now universally admitted, it is less certain whether they were for or against the Council of *Chalcedon; many scholars, and the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, hold that they were monophysites. From the "Lives of the Just," we deduce that the immigrant missionaries met local resistance to their evangelization, perhaps related to the decline of Aksumite power, when Christianity was expanding more and more toward the S of that kingdom.

The long, scarcely documented medieval period (7th-12th c.) is characterized by the decline of the kingdom of Aksum and the removal of the capital to the Lasta region under the Zagwe dynasty, famous for its construction of the rock-hewn churches of Lalibela. During these centuries the Ethiopian church continued to depend on the Alexandrian; the metropolitan of Ethiopia, always an Egyptian, was chosen and consecrated by the patriarch of Alexandria, to whom the Ethiopian kings turned for a new bishop whenever the death of the incumbent metropolitan left the country without one. Evangelization intensified and expanded in the pagan regions of Ethiopia, as we can deduce from *Acts* of local saints living in those centuries. With the coming of Islam in the 7th c., Muslim expansion made lines of communication more difficult between the West and Christian Ethiopia, which for centuries strenuously resisted the new faith, giving Christianity more and more the character of a national religion. With the establishment of the Muslim empire, relations between Ethiopia and other Christian countries could be maintained only through Egypt and *Jerusalem. The Ethiopians who went on pilgrimage to the holy city constituted a community of their own; through them, news of the wonderful Christian king of that distant African land reached Europe.

In 1270 the Solomonids seized power in the Ethiopian nation, which in the following centuries saw the greatest expansion of its borders, esp. under kings Dawit (1382–1413) and Zarʿa Yaʿqob (1434–1468), together with an intensification of the struggle between the Christian state and Islam. At the same time there were new developments in the church of St. Frumentius. While on the one hand the presence in Ethiopia of an Egyptian metropolitan continued, on the other a hierarchy of regular clergy asserted itself. In the 13th c. this hierarchy recognized the abbot of St. Stephen of Hàic as its supe-

rior; later, the supremacy of the secular clergy would be assumed by the abbot of Debre Libanos monastery in Shewa, who, under the title of *echage*, maintained his power over the Ethiopian monastic communities, except for the later monks of the north who recognized a saintly 14th-c. Ethiopian monk, Eustathius, as their founder. Theological disputes flourished in this period, as did heresies, among which were (1) denial of the "Feast of Mount Zion," aimed against the institution of the *Eucharist; (2) the heresy of the Mikaelites, who held that God does not have a human form, but a form that he alone knows, and acknowledged three names, but only one person, in the *Trinity; (3) the heresy of the Stephanites, who refused to venerate Mary and the cross. These doctrinal deviations were severely opposed and, in part, suppressed by King Zar'a Ya'qob.

C. Conti Rossini, *Storia d'Etiopia*, Bergamo 1928; Sergew Hable Sellassie, *Ancient and Medieval Ethiopian History to 1270*, Addis Ababa 1972; Taddesse Tamrat, *Church and State in Ethiopia 1270–1527*, Oxford 1972; E. Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I-II, Rome 1943/47; E. Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible*, London 1968; Id., *The Ethiopians*, Oxford 1973; C.F. Brown, *Ethiopian Perspectives: A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Ethiopia*, African Bibliographic Center. Special Bibliographical Series. N.S. 5, Westport-London 1978; G. Hasselblatt, *Aethiopien. Menschen, Kirchen, Kulturen*, Stuttgart 1979; O. Raineri, "*Gadla Sadqan*" o "*Vita dei Giusti*": Missionari dell'Etiopia nel sesto secolo, Nicolaus 6 (1978) 143-163; F. Thelamon, *Païens et Chrétiens au IVᵉ siècle. L'apparat de l'"Histoire ecclésiastique" de Rufin d'Aquilée*, Paris 1981; R. Beylot, *Estifanos hétérodoxe éthiopien du XVᵉ siècle*: RHR 198 (1981) 279-284; Getatchew Haile, *Religious Controversies and the Growth of Ethiopic Literature in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*: OC 65 (1981) 102-136; O. Raineri, *La spiritualità etiopica*, Rome 1996; Id., *Chiesa etiopica*: Enciclopedia dei Santi. Le Chiese Orientali (BS), vol. I, Rome 1998, CVIII-CIX; Id., *I doni della Serenissima al re Davide I d'Etiopia (ms. Raineri 43 della Vaticana)*: OCP 65:2 (1999) 363-448; Id., *Etiopia, Chiesa Ortodossa*: Dizionario Enciclopedico dell'Oriente Cristiano, ed. E.G. Ferrugia S.I., Rome 2000, 287-288; Id., *La versione etiopica dei Vangeli*, in *I Vangeli dei Popoli. La Parola e l'Immagine di Cristo nelle culture e nella storia*, ed. F. D'Aiuto - G. Morello - A.M. Piazzoni (*Mostra "I Vangeli dei Popoli" Città del Vaticano Palazzo della Cancelleria, 21 giugno - 10 dicembre 2000)*, Rome 2000, 61-66.

O. Raineri

II. Liturgy. The Ethiopian church recognizes Alexandria as the origin of its liturgy, but this does not mean that the Ethiopian liturgy is the same as that celebrated in the Egyptian church today. The rites, probably identical in Alexandria and Aksum in the 4th c., remain unchanged in their central nucleus in both churches, but have different nuances due to the cultural and psychological differences of the two African nations. Tradition has it that St. Frumentius, ordained bishop of Aksum by St. Athanasius, introduced into his church the *Coptic liturgy, which passed through various phases, the first of which was the use of the Greek language in the Ethiopian liturgy, since that language was then used in the Egyptian church. Frumentius's own Syrian origins, and that of the famous nine saints and the just men (*ṣādqān*) who, in the 5th-6th c., spread the gospel and monasticism in N Ethiopia, led to the introduction of considerable Syrian influences into the church, easily visible even today, esp. in the sacred language (*Ge'ez*) of the Alexandrian-Ethiopian rite. Further contributions to this rite were made by various Eastern liturgies through the contacts over the centuries of Ethiopian monks, on pilgrimage in Jerusalem, with the various Christian communities in the holy city. Many Jewish influences can also be noted, e.g., in the construction of Ethiopian churches—with the presence, among other things, of the *Sancta Sanctorum*—in the celebration of the sabbath, and in the innumerable allusions to OT texts and characters.

For celebrating the *Eucharist, the church of Ethiopia recognizes the texts of 17-20 anaphorae, the most used being that of the Holy Apostles. *Mass, which must always be sung and is characterized by the active participation of the faithful, is divided into two parts: (1) the *ordinary*, invariable except in the biblical readings, comprises the liturgy of the catechumens (preparation of offerings, offertory, liturgy of the word) and the pre-anaphora, with which the Mass of the faithful begins (various prayers, *lavabo*, kiss of peace); (2) the *anaphora*, which can change according to circumstances, is composed of the preface and the eucharistic prayer proper. Besides the missal (*kidase*) and the rituals for the administration of the *sacraments, the most-used books include: the synaxarion, the antiphonary for the whole year (*deggua*, attributed to the 6th-c. St. Yared), the collection of responsories (*mawase'et*) and hymns (*me'raf*); particular honor is also enjoyed by the "Books of Hours," the "Praises of Mary" (*weddase maryam*) and the "Miracles of Mary" (*Ta'amera maryam*). The Ethiopians follow the Julian calendar; the year is divided into 13 months, 12 of 30 days and one of 5-6 days, and is 7-8 years behind the Gregorian calendar (1974 EE = AD 1981/2). The most important feasts are those of Our Lord (*incarnation, *circumcision, *epiphany, *presentation in the temple, sojourn in Egypt, miracle of Cana, transfiguration, passion, *resurrection, appearance to Thomas, *ascension, *Pentecost, finding and exaltation of the cross); then follow the 32 annual festivals in honor of Mary, to whom a most tender devotion is offered; besides the apostles, particular veneration is given to the OT saints and to the angels, particularly Mi-

chael, Gabriel and Raphael. Worthy of particular note are the long and rigorous fasts. Chant and sacred music, unrelated to those of other Christian churches, are often accompanied by dances and executed to the accompaniment of drums, sistra and ceremonial batons.

S. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Liturgy*, Milwaukee 1915; E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of the Saints of the Ethiopian Church*, I-VI, Cambridge 1928; A. Takia Māryām Samhāray Selim, *De SS. Sacramentis secundum ritum Aethiopicum*, Rome 1931; E. Hammerschmidt, *Studies in the Ethiopic Anaphoras*, Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten 25, Berlin 1961; C. Sumner, *The Ethiopic Liturgy: An Analysis*: JourEthSt 1 (1963) 40-46; B. Velat, *Etude sur la Me'erāf*, PO XXXIII, 1966; A. Tito Lepisa, *The Three Modes and the Signs of the Songs in the Ethiopian Liturgy*: Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa 1966, II, 162-187; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex eucharistica. Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*: Spicilegium Friburgense 12, Friburg 1968; O. Raineri, *Luca 23, 42, greco, nella liturgia etiopica del Venerdì Santo*: EphLit 94 (1980) 271-277; Habtemichael Kidane, *L'Ufficio divino della Chiesa etiopica. Studio storico-critico con particolare riferimento alle ore cattedrali* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 257), Rome 1998; O. Raineri, *L'anafora etiopica inedita di Maria: Na 'kwetata amlāk bafequr waldeka Iyasus Krestos*, Miscellanea Bibliotecae Apostolicae Vaticanae VII (ST 396), Vatican City 2000, 337-354.

O. Raineri

III. Christian art. The peoples of Semitic language who occupied the N-central part of the Ethiopian highlands took their culture from South Arabia and from the eastern Hellenistic and Roman world; this mixture of influences, with some of a local character, gave Ethiopian culture a formal Christian aspect, from the 4th c., with the spread of the new religion in the country. The oldest Christian monuments in Ethiopia are found along an ancient road that climbs from Adulis to the highlands and goes through Qohaito, Toconda, Cascase and Ieha, to Aksum. Churches of the first type are externally rectangular, with apse generally square; the body of the building is usually divided into 3 aisles by 2 rows of monolithic pillars; the material is always stone.

During the Middle Ages, the center of Ethiopian civilization moved from the regions of Aksum toward Lasta, where, at Imraha, the church shows a new structure: the pillars dividing the church into 3 aisles support arcades; the sanctuary is formed of 3 rooms, the central one covered by a small dome, while the nave is raised above the aisles. The most important monuments of the Zagwe period are the churches excavated in rock using a particular technique consisting of the isolation of a block of rock in order to work it, inside and out, into the form of a building. These types of churches are found in other parts of the Christian world, esp. in *Cappadocia. As for ground plan, their forms differ: the churches of Libanos and of Mary at Lalibela present an Aksumite structure; others have 5 aisles or are cruciform, such as the church of St. George at Lalibela. They often have arcades, on pillars, and women's galleries. The church of Golgotha at Lalibela is unusual in having sculptures of saints and an altar with the symbols of the four evangelists. With the advent of the Solomonid dynasty (1270), we see a great decline, and church buildings assume new forms bearing no relation to the earlier ones. Round churches become more and more common in this period. The medieval churches are usually decorated with paintings, while in some of them, e.g., the church of Debre Damo, we find inlaid wooden panels. There are immense numbers of sacred vases, crosses, thuribles, *tabot* (sacred stones) and other richly ornamented liturgical furnishings in metal, often precious metal.

The artistic genre that survives in greatest numbers, however, is that of codex miniatures, though unfortunately the oldest of them hardly go back beyond the 14th c.; the style and iconography of these parchment miniatures show a descent from Egyptian and Syrian styles. Around the 15th c. Ethiopia was influenced by Western artists, as is easily seen, e.g., in the church of Martula Maryam in Gojam, and in the miniatures. Finally we cannot pass over in silence the most widespread popular artistic genre in Ethiopia: the depictions and illustrations that decorate so-called magic scrolls (*asmat* or *talsam*). The oldest collection of protective prayers goes back to the 14th c., and the ornamental motifs most recurrent on these parchment texts are angels, saints, crosses, the Virgin, geometrical designs and other depictions, the humblest and most spontaneous suggested by the imagination.

U. Monneret de Villard, *L'origine dei più antichi tipi di chiese abissine*, Atti del 3° Congresso di studi Coloniali di Firenze, 1937; A.A. Monti della Corte, *Lalibelà*, Rome 1940; R. Sauter, *Où en est notre connaissance des églises rupestres d'Ethiopie?*: Annales d'Ethiopie 5 (1963) 235-292; Ibid. 10 (1976) 157-175 (with the most complete bibl. on the rock churches); J. Leroy, *La pittura etiopica durante il medioevo e sotto la dinastia di Gondar*, Milan 1964; W. Staude, *Die ikonographischen Regeln in der äthiopischen Kirchenmalerei*: Archiv für Völkerkunde 13 (1959) 235-308; S. Chojnacki, *Short Introduction to Ethiopian Traditional Painting*: JourEthSt II, 2 (1964) 1-11; Id., *Note on the Early Imagery of the Virgin Mary in Ethiopia*: Ethnologische Zeitschrift Zürich II (1977) 5-41; O.A. Jäger, *Aethiopische Miniaturen*, Berlin 1957; J. Mercier, *Rouleaux magiques éthiopiens*, Paris 1979; Augostino da Hebo, *Il Tabot: la sua importanza religiosa e giuridico-cultuale nella chiesa etiopica* (ed. Habtemichael Kidane): OCP 60 (1994) 131-157; O. Raineri, *Santi guerrieri a cavallo: tele etiopiche*. Ill. by Qēs Adamu Tesfaw. Intr. by S. Chojnacki (texts: Italian - English), Clusone (Bg) 1996; *African Zion. The Sacred Art of Ethiopia*, catalog by M. Heldman with S.C. Munro Hay, essays by D.E. Crummey, R. Grierson, G. Haile, R. Pankhurst, T. Tarmat, S. Uhlig and C. Zanotti-Eman,

ed. by R. Grierson, Yale University Press, New Haven and London in association with InterCultura, Fort Worth, The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, The Institute of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa 1996; M. Di Salvo, *Chiese d'Etiopia*, with texts by S. Chojnacki, O. Raineri, Milan 1999 (publ. in It. and in Eng.).

O. Raineri

IV. Classical language or Geʿez. Ancient Ethiopic has its own distinctive alphabet, derived from the S Arabian; yet this Semitic alphabet seems to resemble archaic Greek more than Phoenician. S Arabian writing was *boustrophedon*, i.e., lines going from right to left alternated with lines going from left to right; Ethiopic, like Greek and Latin, went only from left to right. The Ethiopic alphabet originally had letters or consonants which, around the beginning of the 4th c. AD, were enriched and clarified by vowel signs; the Ethiopians, instead of applying the vowel signs over and under the consonants, as generally happened in other Semitic languages, modified each consonant according to which of the 7 vowels was to follow it, so that one sign expressed consonant and vowel together. The number of signs was later increased as a result of the transformation of some letters to indicate a consonant followed by a diphthong. For writing numbers, Ethiopic abandoned S Arabian signs and adopted the Greek. *Geʿez*, besides our own sounds, has three grades of aspirate (h); a sort of light breath ('); an occlusive sound (ʿ) like the Arabic *ayn*: an emphatic dental *t*; an explosive *s*; and other particular sounds.

Personal pronouns in the 2nd and 3rd persons have a masculine and a feminine form; when referred to verbs, in the indirect cases, they are joined to the verb itself as suffixes. The verb, in its basic form, consists of 3 syllables; the root is given by the 3rd-person masculine singular of the perfect; from this form can be obtained a causative, a reflexive-passive, a reflexive-causative; still other forms can be derived: an intensive, a frequentative; from these can be formed causatives, passive-reflexives and causative-passives. Conjugation: there are two tenses, perfect and imperfect, both in the indicative mood. There are also the subjunctive, with one tense, the imperative, the infinitive, the gerund and the participle. Nouns: these can be primitive or derived from a verbal word; there are two genders; the plural can be formed with suffixes or by internal modifications (fractional plural). Prepositions: some are used as prefixes, others are separate. The syntax of *Geʿez* is quite simple and can in some ways be compared to that of neo-Latin languages. Ancient Ethiopic, which was the language of the court and hence the official language from the first centuries AD, and which has not been spoken for several centuries, still survives as a sacred language and, in part, as a literary language.

C. Conti Rossini, *Grammatica elementare della lingua etiopica*, Rome 1941; T.O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Geʿez)*: Harvard Semitic Studies 24, Missoula 1978; A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae*, Leipzig 1965; G. da Maggiora, *Vocabolario etiopico-italiano-latino ad uso dei principianti*, Asmara 1953; A.J. Drewes - R. Schneider, *Origine et développement de l'écriture éthiopienne jusqu'à l'époque des inscriptions royales d'Axoum*: Annales d'Ethiopie 10 (1976) 136-156; E. Ullendorff, *The Semitic Languages of Ethiopia. A Comparative Phonology*, London 1955; E. Mittwoch, *Die traditionelle Aussprache des Äthiopischen*, Berlin 1926; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (*Classical Ethiopic*). Geʿez-English / English-Geʿez with an index of the Semitic roots, Wiesbaden 1987; Id., *Concise Dictionary of Geʿez* (*Classical Ethiopic*), Wiesbaden 1989; O. Raineri, *Introduzione alla lingua Geʿez* (*etiopico classico*), Rome 2002.

O. Raineri

V. Literature. Literature in the *Geʿez* language finds its first expressions in some epigraphs, still extant, dating from about the 4th c. BC; these inscriptions are mostly dedicatory or commemorate the deeds of kings. With the introduction of Christianity, translation of the *Scriptures, OT and NT, began in Ethiopia: Ecclesiastes was translated in 677/8. Textual criticism tends to hold that these versions were made from a Greek text. In addition to the books of the Bible commonly accepted in the canon of the Christian churches, the Ethiopians accepted as inspired, and translated into their language, other texts, such as the book of *Jubilees,* the book of *Enoch* (preserved entire only in *Geʿez*), the *Shepherd* of Hermas and some books attributed to Ezra. At about the same time as the Scriptures were translated in Ethiopia, they also accepted some patristic writings relating to the most important and disputed mysteries of the Christian faith, such as the *Trinity and the nature of Christ: the most important of these were the *qerillos*, which comprised three opuscula of St. *Cyril of Alexandria and a collection of homilies attributed to various Fathers; the didactic *Physiologus, quite widespread in Christian antiquity; the monastic rules of St. *Pachomius; "Acts" of saints, like the lives of St. Paul the Hermit and St. *Anthony abbot—a literary genre that the Ethiopians would take as a model and cultivate to glorify illustrious local persons; patristic works, like the homilies of St. *John Chrysostom; Mariological opuscula like the *Pact of Mercy* (*kidana mehrat*), in which Jesus promises to pardon anyone who invokes him in the name of the Virgin. Since these works preserve considerable traces of Greek, they must have been translated in the first centuries (IV-VII) of Ethiopian Christianity, when Greek was still used among the

Copts, in whose monasteries their versions were probably made.

In the 13th c., with the advent of the Solomonid dynasty (1270), Ethiopia entered a new period, particularly rich in literary output; the translations were now made from Arabic, which had become the common liturgical language in the church of Alexandria. Translations included the *synodos*, a collection of canons, the *Didascalia of the Apostles*, liturgical texts; books fashionable in the Middle Ages, esp. in the East: the "History of the Jews" (*Yosippon*), stories and journeys of Alexander the Great, also a subject of original compositions in Ethiopic. Secular literature begins with the famous *Glory of Kings* (*kebra nagast*), which tells of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. In the 14th c. the *Book of Hours* appeared in *Ge'ez*, both in the redaction derived from the Egyptian church and in one of local make, as well as the office for the dead (*mashafa genzat*). The second half of the 14th c. saw the fruitful literary activity of metropolitan Salama, to whom is attributed the revision of the Scriptures and the introduction of various works into Ethiopic, some translated into *Ge'ez* by himself. Among them are the *filkesyos*, containing rules for monastic life; the *Praises of Mary*; the *Acts of the Passion* (*gebra hemamat*); the *Synaxarion*; the *Acts of the Martyrs*; the *Lives of the Apostles* and of other saints. Many of these "Lives" are followed by a hymn (*malke'* = effigy, image), in strophes, praising the individual parts of the body of the person celebrated. The 15th c. was characterized by a wealth of hagiographies of indigenous monks, among them the very famous Takla Haymanot and Eustathius. King Zar'a Ya'qob (1434–1468) wrote the *Book of Light* and other works refuting heretical beliefs and opposing religious deviations. In this period, besides prose, poetical work for sacred celebrations flourished, e.g., the collection of hymns called *The Lord Has Reigned* (*Egzi'abeher nagsa*) and the *Lyre of the Virgin* (*arganona dengel*). In Marian literature, the *Miracles of Mary* stand out. The first *qene* (poetical chants) and the use of the *sawasew* (scale, grammar and vocabulary) may date from the late 15th c. From earliest times there was an exuberant production of magic-religious writings, with varied and remote cultural links; such are the *Fillet of Justification*, the *Bulwark of the Cross*, the *Net of Solomon*; the liturgical text *Teaching of the Secrets* (*temherta hebu'at*) was and is widely used as an amulet. In Ethiopic literature, which, as we have seen, is mostly religious, a place of their own is held by the *Royal Chronicles*, particularly, for this period, those of Zar'a Ya'qob, Ba'eda Māyām (d. 1478) and Eskender (d. 1494).

I. Guidi, *Storia della letteratura etiopica*, Rome 1932; E. Cerulli, *La letteratura etiopica*, Florence - Milan 1968; L. Ricci, *Letterature dell'Etiopia* (Botto, "Storia of the letterature d'Oriente"), Milan 1969; K. Basset, *Les Apocryphes éthiopiens traduits en français*, Paris 1893/1909; E. Littmann, *The Legend of the Queen of Sheba in the Tradition of Axum*, Leiden - Princeton 1909; M.A. Knibb - E. Ullendorff, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, I-II, Oxford 1978; L. Fusella, *Libro dei Giubilei; Libro di Enoc* ("Apocrifi dell'A.T.," Classici UTET), Turin 1981; E. Cerulli, *Il libro etiopico dei Miracoli di Maria*, Rome 1943; B.M. Weischer, *Qērellos III . . .* , Wiesbaden 1977; Id., *Qïrellos IV . . .* , Wiesbaden 1980; O. Raineri, "*Vita dei Giusti" Missionari dell'Etiopia nel sesto secolo: varianti e inno*: Ephemerides Carmeliticae 31 (1980) 377-413; S. Strelcyn, *Prières magiques éthiopiennes pour délier les charmes*, Warsaw 1955; for edited works, see esp. the two largest collections: CSCO (SAe) and PO; V. Six, *Die Vita des Abund Tadewos von Däbrä Maryam im Tanasee*, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar, Wiesbaden 1975; Y. Beyene, ed., *Giorgis di Saglā: Il Libro del mistero* (*maṣḥafa mesṭir*), CSCO 532-533, SAe 97-98, Louvain 1993; M. Kropp, *Der Siegreiche Feldzug des Königs 'Āmda-Ṣeyon gegen die Muslime in Adal in Jahre 1332 n. Ch.*, CSCO 538-539, SAe 99-100, Louvain 1994; A. Bausi, *Il Sïnodos etiopico*, CSCO 552-553, SAe 101-102, Louvain 1995; G. Lusini, *Il "Gadla Absādi"* (*Babra Māryām, Sarā'ē*), CSCO 557-558, SAe 103-104, Louvain 1996; O. Raineri, *Atti di Banadlewos (1303–1400)*, ed. of the Ethiopic text and It. tr., PO 48.l, no. 213, 1998; Id., *Gli Atti etiopici del martire egiziano Giorgio il Nuovo* (d. 978) (ST 392), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City 1999; *Codices Comboniani Aethiopici, recensuit Osvaldus Raineri*, Vatican City 2000.

O. RAINERI

EUBULUS of Lystra 7th-c. bishop of that Lycaonian city. Author [ca. 634] of a "Discourse against the written request made to the emperor *Heraclius by Athanasius, pseudobishop of the Severians" (i.e., *Athanasius "Gammal" of Antioch), of which two fragments were included in the *Doctrina Patrum* as proof that *Cyril of Alexandria, in treating the union of Christ, did not confuse *physis* with *hypostasis*.

CPG 7685; Fr. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi*, Münster ²1981, 141-148, cf. p. XLVII; *Patrologia* V, 162-163.

D. STIERNON

EUCHARIST

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. The Greek term *Eucharist*, "thanksgiving," for Christians came to designate the sacred meal (the Lord's "Supper"), the consecratory blessing, the sacramental elements and finally the eucharistic action itself. The earliest Christian terms seem to have been *fractio panis*, a gesture which by metonymy designated the entire action (Lk 24:35; Acts 2:42, later taken up by *Act. Pauli et Thec.* 5; Serap., *Eucol.* 14,15), and "Lord's supper" (1 Cor 11:19). *Igna-

tius uses "Eucharist" as a technical term (*Eph.* 13,1; *Phil.* 4; *Syrm.* 8,1) to indicate both the celebration by which Christ is made really present and the mystery that reactualizes Christ's redemptive incarnation and creates unity in the church. With this term *Justin indicates both the eucharistic liturgy and the eucharistic food (*1 Ap.* 65-67); he also uses the term **anamnēsis* (*Dial.* 41,1; 70,4; 117,3), which sometimes recurs in *John Chrysostom and in the liturgies (*Der Balyzeh: Trad. Ap.* 4,10; *Lit. Johannis Chrys.*). In the 4th c. Greeks often use the term *mystērion*, and esp. its plural, "mysteries, holy mysteries." Also very frequent are the terms "to offer" and "offering": in Greek *prosphora* (Latin *oblatio*), which for the Syrians became *kurbons*, gift. The term *synaxis*, which ordinarily indicates the holy assembly gathered to offer the Eucharist, can mean the celebration itself.

The Greek terms were transliterated into Latin: the common term *eucharistia*, a formal borrowing from the Greek; *mystēria* (*Vita Ambr.* 23; Ambrose, *Comm. in Luc.* 7,11; *Innocent, *Ep.* 25 and the sacramentaries), a term also translated as *sacramenta* (*Tertullian, *De cor.* 3; *Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,4; also *Hilary, *Ambrose, *Augustine). Cyprian also uses the term *dominicum celebrare* (*Ep.* 63,16; *De opere* 15; cf. *Act. Saturn.* 7). The expression *sacrum* or *sacrum facere* is general, analogous to *actio/agere* (see in Ambrose), which expresses the effectuation *par excellence* of sacred action. The term *Missa*, the dismissal at the end of a celebration, appears already in the 4th c. (Egeria, *Itin.* 25,10; Ambrose, *Ep.* 76 [20],4).

The *fractio panis* was the action that Jesus performed at the Last Supper and repeated after his *resurrection. The first Eucharist was passed down as a complete Paschal event: Christ, the suffering servant, becomes the victorious Lord. This was part of the worship of the first Christians: it was dominated by the joy of remembering the resurrection and simultaneously a "proclamation of the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor 11:26).

The **Didache* links the Eucharist to the fraternal **agapē*, which explains the ambivalence of the expressions in the prayers, which were modeled on Jewish prayers but changed and reworked with a Christian spirit and terminology (chs. 9-10). Every Sunday the faithful gathered to break the bread and give thanks (ch. 14). Both the prayers and the celebration make clear the Eucharist's ecclesial and eschatological character. The Eucharist occupies a central place in the letters of Ignatius (*Eph.* 5,2; 13,1; 20,2; *Magn.* 7,1-2; *Phil.* 4; *Smyrn.* 7,1; 8,1-2). Presided over by the bishop or his designee, in the Eucharist Christ is really present; in a privileged way, it realizes and concretely manifests unity with Christ and with the church; it plays an essential role in identifying the authentic Christian community. The Eucharist demands charity and faith in the "one bread that is the medicine of immortality, the antidote for *death, so as to live forever in Jesus Christ" (*Eph.* 20,2). Ignatius considers martyrdom to be closely correlated with the Eucharist: it is like a liturgical offering, the martyr enacting in himself the profound meaning of the Eucharist, as a total and life-giving gift.

Justin offers the first description of the Eucharist after the NT (*1 Apol.* 65 and 67), in relation to *baptism and Sunday. He clearly distinguishes two parts: the liturgy of the word and the properly eucharistic part (as well as the liturgy extended into one's life through charity, the ethical-social reflection of a religious celebration). The remembrances of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read; the presider gives a homily of exhortation. All stand and lift up their prayers. Bread and wine are brought, with water. The presider recites the (consecratory) prayer of thanksgiving, to which all respond: "Amen." The eucharistic food is distributed, not forgetting those who are absent. At the end offerings are collected for the needy, realizing the fraternal charity the Eucharist requires. A pure oblation and a spiritual sacrifice (*Dial.* 41 and 117), the Eucharist is an *anamnēsis* of all of history, from the creation to the accomplishment of salvation; it must be expressed in "a life in conformity with the Lord's precepts" (*1 Ap.* 66,1). *Irenaeus (d. ca. 200) puts the Eucharist at the center of his vision of the world and of history: with all the dynamism of its mystery it opposes *gnostic theses. The bread and wine are not only saved, but, becoming vehicles of grace—the body and blood of Christ—are saviors. The Eucharist recapitulates and fulfills the long history of all earthly offerings and, in Christ in glory, anticipates the mystery of the whole harvest (*Adv. Haer.* IV,17-18). A particular assimilation to the Eucharist and its existential place recur in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, which celebrate the martyrs' "thanksgiving" through the gift of their lives, dying to the world to rise again in God (Ignatius, *Rom.* 2,2; see also Polycarp, Martyrs of Lyons). Inscriptions and epitaphs (*Abercius, *Pektorios) express desire for the Eucharist, from which is drawn the hope of incorruptibility. *Cyprian in *Ep.* 63 offers the first eucharistic treatise. He associates the Eucharist with Christ's passion and resurrection, to which the faithful respond with their sacrifice. In addition to spiritual joy, he emphasizes, in the bond between Christ and the faithful, the unity symbolized by the grains combined in the one bread (already the *Didache*), a classical theme in the

entire tradition up to the Middle Ages.

As for the organization of liturgies, while the structure of the assembly was fixed during the first centuries, the celebrant was free to improvise the prayers of thanksgiving and consecration based on a common tradition. The anaphora, to judge from later texts like the *Apostolic Constitutions*, followed the pattern of the baptismal creed, taking up its themes in the form of thanksgiving, in a trinitarian development. Salvation history became thanksgiving and eschatological expectation. The **Apostolic Tradition* is presented less as a real liturgy of a specific church—not even Rome's—than as a model on which others could also align themselves. The anaphora is a continuous text that develops without the interruption of the *Sanctus*. The structure is clearly christological and insists above all on the mystery of redemption. The theme of creation, so important in the Jewish liturgy and so clear in the *Apos. Con.*, is almost avoided here. The prayer, which, like the Roman creed, centers on the work of Christ, introduces the account of institution, the thanksgiving in the form of *anamnēsis*, and finally the *epiclesis to the Holy Spirit. This can be compared with the "Clementine liturgy" of the *Apos. Con.*, whose Jewish inspiration and roots are evident, and which is an essential link between the archaic liturgies and the great liturgies of the 4th and 5th c. The attribution to Clement has a Jewish Christian feel. The anaphora develops the history of salvation: praise of God, creation of the world, creation of humans, salvation history; all these prepare for the *Sanctus*. The account of institution is followed by an anamnesis, an epiclesis and intercession for the church. Hamman has demonstrated (in *Kyriakon* 835-843) the perfect symmetry between the anaphora and the baptismal catechesis (*Apos. Con.* VII,39,2-5). The prayer opens on the mystery of the *Trinity, which is revealed in the economy, creation and history of salvation, up to its fulfillment. This solemn prayer begins with the Father, moves to the work of the Son, passes on to the ecclesial action of the Holy Spirit and closes with a doxology. Baptismal confession become consecratory thanksgiving, it is faith made into a sacramental mystery and a *sacrament of the whole faith.

The golden age of patristics (4th-5th c.) was the era of the great liturgies, in both East and West. Different liturgical families arose during this period, developing autonomously at *Antioch, *Alexandria, in *Cappadocia, and at *Constantinople. The various churches gradually fixed their own liturgies: each had several formularies of anaphora. The East introduced the *Sanctus* in the 4th c. (Serapion, *Eucol.*; *Apos. Con.*). The *Syriac liturgy (and the *Byzantine, which derives from it) stressed the epiclesis to the Holy Spirit. The epiclesis and the prayers of intercession exchanged places according to liturgical families. The West tended to lose sight of the connection between the preface and the canon, which, as the word implies, was set once and for all. Ambrose cites a fragment of it (*De sacr.* III,1,5); *Gregory the Great gave it its definitive form. It seems to have been gradually imposed on the whole West during the Carolingian Empire. *Catechesis more than controversy (which was virtually nonexistent) informs us of the sacramental teaching of the Fathers, who insist on Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, on the reality of his sacrifice, actualized in the church's celebration, and on the unity of the faithful with Christ and among themselves in the Eucharist. They also recall the close connection between the word of God and the body of Christ: *Caesarius of Arles, echoing St. Augustine, says that "the Word of Christ is not less than the Body of Christ" (*Sermo* 78,2); St. Ambrose had already proclaimed that one drinks of Christ from the chalice of the *Scriptures as from the eucharistic chalice (*En. Ps* 1,33). We have exceptional evidence of the various Greek and Latin Fathers. The catechesis of the *Mass was based on biblical figures and rites. The Hexateuch provided the principal types: *Melchizedek (see Cyprian, Ambrose Augustine, Roman canon) and the manna, which St. John had already used. *Methodius, like Ambrose, brings together three figures: Adam's rib, the rock in the desert, Christ's wound on the cross. To these is added the bread of the Presence (*Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 24,6).

To this common background were added the blessing of Judah (Cyprian), which Justin and Irenaeus apply to Christ's passion; Noah's drunkenness, which prefigures *sobria ebrietas* (Cyprian); the Passover lamb, which represents the passion more than the Eucharist (exceptions: Cyprian, *Commodian, *Gregory of Elvira). We should also mention the psalms, esp. Ps 53. Ps 42 is presented as a eucharistic catechesis (*Gregory of Nyssa). The nuptial image drawn by Ambrose from the *Song of Songs allowed the development of a theology of *teleiōsis* and ecstasy. *Maximus the Confessor develops a theology of the spiritual life, from Christian initiation to perfection. Besides biblical figures, the Fathers also explain the various rites of the Mass, from preparation to communion and thanksgiving (*Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. myst.*). They emphasize the continuity between the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the bread. For them, the Eucharist is the *sacramentum redemptionis*, the sacrament that contains and dispenses all of Christ's redemptive and saving action, from his death

to his resurrection. The Antiochenes, like *Theodore of Mopsuestia, less sensitive to biblical typology, see in it above all "the figures of heavenly goods and delights": the eschatological aspect, traditional since the *Didache* and Serapion's *Euchologion* (13).

John Chrysostom and Augustine love to develop the ecclesial aspect: "It is your mystery that is placed on the Lord's altar. It is your mystery that you receive. To that which you are, you reply: Amen" (Aug., *Serm.* 272). St. Gregory the Great, who read and commented on Sacred Scripture with passion and enthusiasm, says of himself that often, reading and rereading a text, he was unable to grasp its meaning, but "putting it before the brothers, I understood it" (*In Ez.* lib. II, *hom.* II,1).

The term "mystical body," which originally meant the *terminus a quo*, ended by designating the *terminus ad quem*, i.e., the church, as H. de Lubac has shown. Hilary prefers to dwell on incorporation into Christ through the Eucharist, sacrament of the symbiosis between two living things, which makes the member identical with its head. The Eucharist is the sacrament of divinization (*Hilary, ps.-*Dionysius). To explain it the Fathers use the analogies of fire and the body, the body and the members, the bridegroom and the bride. Finally, faithful to the initiatives of the first centuries, the Fathers, Augustine and esp. John Chrysostom, bring out the concrete and social consequences and irradiations of the Eucharist. "The altar is composed of Christ's own members, and for you the Lord's body is the rock of sacrifice" (John Chrys., *In 2 Cor hom.* 20,3; other texts in Hamman, *Vie liturgique*, 282-284). Fundamental here is the thought hinted at in the *Didache* (4,8) and taken up with great frequency in patristic preaching: how is it possible to partake together of heavenly goods, without being able to then share earthly goods with the brothers?

In conclusion, we can summarize that the patristic age took the following lines on the Eucharist: (1) The Lord's Last Supper is called "Eucharist." (2) In the Eucharist, there is a *salutaris* presence of Jesus Christ in real terms of body and blood. This reality becomes an argument for defending the reality of the incarnation of the Word. The liturgical evidence has no exception on this point (Ambrose, *De sacr.* 4,14). (3) The Eucharist is understood as *oratio prex* of the eucharistic species, on the lines of the community's *sacrificium offerre*. It is the one valid sacrifice that may be offered to God (anti-Jewish and antipagan polemical context) and is not divisible, as though it could be offered by divided and opposed Christian groups, erecting one altar against another (antiheretical and antischismatic context, esp. in Cyprian's time and in the subsequent period of the *Donatist controversy in Africa). It was in the context of the Eucharist, "the one sacrifice," that the Eucharist-church unity relationship was developed. (4) Regarding the historical nature of the sources (e.g., K. Gamber's *Codices Liturgici Latini*), we must bear in mind that, given the distinct and not always verifiable stratification of these documents, we use the term "historical evidence" with a particular meaning. (5) In the West, the codification of the eucharistic prayers had a mainly christological tone, related in detail to the meeting of the moment; in the East it followed a biblical-historical direction based on creation and on God's love revealed in history.

Texts: J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima,* 7 fasc., Bonn 1935–1937; J. Solano, *Textos eucarísticos primitivos*, 2 vols., Madrid 1952–1954; A. Hamman, *Prières eucharistiques des premiers siècles*, Paris 1957; Id., *La messe. Liturgies anciennes et textes patristiques*, Paris 1964; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex eucharistica*, Fribourg 1968; A. Hamman, *L'Eucharistie dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, Paris 1981; G. Di Nola, *Monumenta eucharistica. La testimonianza dei Padri* (Bibliotheca Patristica Eucharistica, vols. 1-4) [bilingual ed.], Vatican City 1997–; *Segno di unità. Le più antiche eucaristie delle chiese*, ed. the monks and nuns of Bose, under the direction of E. Mazza, Bose/Magnano 1996 (the most complete collection). *Studies*: M. Goguel, *L'eucharistie des origines à Justin martyr*, Paris 1910; J.A. Jungmann, *Missarum solemnia*, Vienna 1948 (It. tr. Turin 1953); A. Piolanti (ed.), *L'eucarestia*, Rome 1957; Var. aus., *Convivium Dominicum*, Catania 1959; *Eucharistie*: DSp IV (1961) 1553-1586; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, vol. III, Milan 1966; L. Bouyer, *L'eucharistie*, Tournai - Paris 1966 (It. tr. Turin 1969); L. Ligier, *De la cène de Jésus à l'anaphore de l'Église*: La Maison Dieu 87 (1966) 7-51; A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique et vie sociale*, Paris 1968; Id., *Du symbole de la foi à l'anaphore eucharistique*, in *Kyriakon*. Festschrift J. Quasten, Münster 1970, II, 835-843; B. Botte et al., *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident*, Paris 1970; W. Rordorf et al., *L'eucharistie des premiers chrétiens*, Paris 1976; J. Betz, *Eucharestie in der Schrift und Patristik*: HDG IV,4a, Freiburg 1979; *Eucaristia*, in D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca (eds.), *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia*, Cinisello Balsamo (Mi) 1984, [3]1988, 482-508; P. Youssif, *L'Eucharistie chez Saint Ephrem de Nisibe*, OCA 224, Rome 1984; E. LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and in the Early Church*, Collegeville, MN 1996; M. Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft, Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristliche Mahlfeiern*, Tübingen 1996; M. Cristiani, *Tempo rituale e tempo storico. Comunione cristiana e sacrificio. Le controversie eucaristiche nell'Alto Medioevo*, Spoleto 1997; S.A. Panimolle (ed.), *Dizionario di spiritualità Biblico-Patristica* 20. *L'Eucaristia nei Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1998; A. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists, Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford 1999; P. Carlotti - M. Maritano (eds.), *L'Eucaristia nel vissuto dei giovani*, Rome 2002, 217-261: *L'eucaristia nella vita dei cristiani dei primi secoli*; E. Mazza, *La celebrazione eucaristica*, Bologna 2003.

A. Hamman - M. Maritano

II. Iconography. The Eucharist as a sacramental and liturgical event remained for a long time without a direct representation in early Christian art,

though this does not rule out the possibility of the eucharistic motif being included in other iconographical themes.

1. Banquet scenes. We must consider carefully the first depictions of banquets in the 3rd-4th c., long held to be eucharistic solemnities because of the presence of the *fractio panis*. Thus Wilpert interpreted the banquet scene in the Greek chapel of the catacomb of S. Priscilla: the bishop, as president of the liturgical celebration, does not lie on the *stibadium* like the other six guests, but occupies the place of honor *in cornu dextro*. He breaks the bread with a certain solemnity, to distribute it to the others, as he will do with the wine in a two-handled cup near his hand. The woman participating in the banquet has her head veiled, which was rigorously prescribed for eucharistic celebrations, whereas for ordinary banquets it was pointless and unusual. Seven baskets of bread and a plate with two fishes and loaves recall the biblical account of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes (Wilpert, *Fractio panis*, 5ff.; 8/17).

Against this eucharistic interpretation, others see early Christian banquet scenes as depicting funeral banquets, in close parallel with scenes of similar structure in secular art. Bread and fish are the customary food of the dead; the baskets of bread, which recur frequently, allude to the large number of guests, who were often given loaves as gifts. Heavy consumption of wine is suggested by the lively gestures with which the servers are invited to mix new wine, as we see in several parts of the banquet scene in the area of the Agapai in SS. Pietro and Marcellino (WK 133, 2; 157, 1ff.). The survival of the pagan tradition of the funeral banquet in the early Christian period is amply demonstrated (Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ 5, 503/27; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim* = Theophaneia 11 [Bonn 1957] 124-136). Interestingly, in the banquet scenes in SS. Pietro and Marcellino the servers are usually called Agape and Irene (a recent discovery has revealed the name of a Sabina, RivAC 35 [1970] fig. 22). If these are not simply two very common Christian names, we can obviously see in the funeral banquet the expression of the hope of participation in the celestial feast of the blessed, where Love and Peace will prepare the meal. In any case, the banquet depicted in the hypogeum of Vibia as a realistic funeral banquet is clearly characterized by the captions as a banquet of the blessed: Vibia, introduced into the Elysium by the *angelus bonus*, takes part in the banquet amidst the *bonorum iudicio iudicati* (WK 132, 1). Nor is the opinion that the many baskets (or vases) allude to the high number of guests always on target. In cubicle A of SS. Pietro and Marcellino, Christ distributing the wine at Cana is set in the framework of a banquet scene (WK 57). The motif of the multiplication of the bread and wine is set even more integrally in a banquet scene, with the caption ΤΑΣ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑΣ ΧΥ ΕΣΘΙΟΝΤΕΣ, on the frieze of the apse of the underground basilica of Karmuz at Alexandria (DACL 1, 1127ff. and fig. 279; RBK 1 [1966] 106).

The varied interpretation of proto-Christian banquet scenes marked out the route later followed by research on early Christian iconography. In contrast with the first apodeictic judgments, it is advisable not to determine the spiritual content of the earliest banquet scenes by archaeological means alone. To what extent the memory of the biblical multiplication of the loaves, the hope of participation in the eschatological banquet, and perhaps also the representation of the Eucharist were present in the minds of authors and spectators, remains an open question.

2. Biblical scenes and typological prefigurations of the Eucharist. Whether the OT scenes of *Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac (WK 41; 78), the gathering of the manna (catacombs of Cyriaca [WK 242, 2]), the return of the spies with the cluster of grapes (DACL 8, 1161 and fig. 1157ff. 11ff.), *Habakkuk bringing bread to *Daniel in the lions' den (Rep. 43-5), and finally the depiction of *Abel and *Melchizedek contain eucharistic symbolism is something that cannot as a rule be established with certainty, and is deduced more from patristic interpretations than from the depictions themselves. For the sacrifice of Isaac, e.g., it seems that its interpretation as a type of Christ's sacrifice on the cross and model of Abraham's obedience in faith precedes the eucharistic interpretation, such that eucharistic content can be ruled out of the earliest iconographical repesentations. But the 6th-c. mosaics of the presbytery of S. Vitale in *Ravenna, showing Abel and Melchizedek beside an altar, do express an undeniable eucharistic allegory, given that they are in the apse of the church (Timmers 689, fig. 1); this also goes for the adjacent scenes of Abraham offering hospitality to the three men at Mamre and hastening to sacrifice his son. The two mosaics, with the scenes of Abel, Abraham and Melchizedek, recur in S. Apollinare in Classe as an illustration of the prayer *Supra quae* of the Roman canon. NT motifs should be considered in the same way. Representations of the multiplication of bread and wine on the oldest sarcophagus friezes are not necessarily derived from the salvific sepulchral symbolism of Jesus' miracles; but they were later linked with the representation of the Last Supper, so that we can no longer rule out a eucharistic meaning (Salerno ivory relief, 11th c., Schiller, fig. 70). The oldest representation of the Last Supper is

on the mosaics of the portico of S. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna (520–6) (Schiller fig. 67). Here, as in the *codex Rossanensis* (third quarter of 6th c.), Christ sits at table, in the place of honor *in cornu dextro*, surrounded by the apostles. In the *codex Augustinus* (ca. 600), he sits at the center of the table (Schiller fig. 73). In Byzantine art, the so-called communion of the apostles is a representation of the Last Supper transferred to the liturgical plane. From the 6th c. on, a number of representations have come down to us, variously structured, on the silver *patenae* of Riha (Dumbarton Oaks Collection) and Stuma near Antioch (Schiller fig. 56), in the Rossano codex, and in the codex of Rabbula at Florence (Schiller fig. 57ff.; 61).

3. Characterizing symbols and elements. In many medieval Christian symbols a eucharistic meaning must be acknowledged, esp. in depictions of bread, fish, vines, grape clusters and wine. The eucharistic symbolism of the fish is attested as early as the 2nd-3rd c. by the inscriptions of Abercius and Pektorios (Dölger 2, 486-515). Many see a symbolic representation of the Eucharist in the two figures of fish in the crypt of Lucina in S. Callisto and in the baskets of loaves next to what may be a chalice full of red wine (WK 28, 1ff.), but this remains undemonstrable (Dölger 5, 527-533). The same reservations apply to the lamb multiplying loaves in the new area of the catacomb of Commodilla (RivAC 34 [1958] 35) and on the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, whose side panels also show gleaning and grape-harvest scenes (Rep. 680, 1-3). Grape clusters and vines, which lend themselves to a vast range of symbolic representations, can refer with certainty to the Eucharist only when the context unequivocally suggests it, as, e.g., on the silver cup of Antioch (5th c.) (*Age of Spirituality*, 605-608).

J. Wilpert, *Fractio panis. Die älteste Darstellung des eucharistischen Opfers in der "Cappella Greca,"* Freiburg 1895; F.J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ 1-5, Münster 1928–43; G. Mathew, *The Origins of Eucharistic Symbolism*: Dominican Studies 6 (1943) 1-11; M. Vloberg, *L'Eucharistie dans l'Art*, 2 vols., Grenoble - Paris 1946; L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'Art Chrétien*, vol. 11/2, Paris 1957, 409-426; K. Wessel, *Abendmahl*: RBK 1, 1-11; Id., *Apostelkommunion*: ibid. 1, 239-245; G. Schiller, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, vol. II: *Die Passion Jesu Christi*, Gütersloh 1968, 35-51; J.J.M. Timmers, *Eucharistie*: LCI I, 687-695; E. Jastrzebowska, *Les scènes de banquet dans les peintures et sculptures chrétiennes des III^e et IV^e siècles*: RecAug 14 (1979) 4-90; *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century*, ed. K. Weitzmann, New York 1979; J. Engemann, *Der Ehrenplatz beim antiken Sigmamahl*: JbAC Erg.-Bd. 9 (1982) 239-250; A. Quacquarelli, *L'eucaristia e le scene iconografiche dei primi secoli*: Civiltà classica and cristiana 6 (1985) 475-488.

E. Dassmann

EUCHERIA (5th-6th c.). Poetess, native of Gaul, lived probably 5th-6th c. One of her poems survives, in 16 distichs (= Anth. Lat. 390 Bücheler - Riese), more epigrammatical than satirical in nature. It is probably a game, with evident reference to verses of Virgil, Horace and Martial. The whole composition proceeds by the frontal opposition of elements diverse and contrary by nature, just as society has a dual classification. For example: "*Iungatur nunc cerva asino, nunc tigris onagro; // Iungatur fesso concita damma bovi*" (vv. 21-22). The final verse may be a pleasantry or bitter sarcasm: "An uncouth slave aspires to Eucheria's hand!" (*Rusticus et servus sic petat Eucheriam!*)

CPL 1479; F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia latina*, I, 1, Leipzig 1894, 303-305; PWK VI, 881-882; A. Thomas, *Crassantus ou Craxantus*: ALMA 3 (1927) 49-58; KLP 2, 402; M. Marcovich - A. Georgiadou, *Eucheria's Adynata*: Illinois Classical Studies 13 (1988) 165-174; A. Georgiadou, *Binary Opposition and Aristocratic Ideology in Anthol. Lat. 386 Shackleton Bailey (= 390 Riese)*: Acta Classica 40 (1997) 49-61.

L. Dattrino

EUCHERIUS (pseudo) (7th c.?). *De situ Hierosolymae* is a description of Jerusalem and Judea, erroneously attributed to *Eucherius of Lyons. The work is in the form of a letter addressed, under the pseudonym *Eucherius episcopus*, to a presbyter named Faustus. These brief pages must predate *Bede, who used them as a source (Bede, *Liber de locis sanctis*, CSEL, 39, 299-324), and Adomnanus—thus before 680. The author seems to have had no personal experience of the holy places: he cites Jerome's *Ep.* 129, 5 *ad Dardanum* as his primary source, and in chs. 16-20; 21-30 includes almost the whole of book III, ch. 6 of *Hegesippus's *Histories* (CSEL 66, 194-198).

CPL 2326; CPPM 2,2185; PLS 111, 45-48; CSEL 39, 123-134; CCL 175, 235-243; Schanz IV, 1 (1914), 404; Repertorium p. 385f.; RAC 5, 175-176; T. O'Loughlin, *The Exegetical Purpose of Adomnán's De Locis Sanctis*: CMCS 24 (1992) 37-53; Id., *Dating the De situ Hierosolymae: The Insular Evidence*: RBen 105 (1995) 9-19.

L. Dattrino - A. Di Berardino

EUCHERIUS Comes (5th c.). This Eucherius (or Euclerius) is thought to have belonged to the 5th-c. Roman nobility. From the content of the short (10-hexameter) poem of which he is considered the author, we deduce him to have been a judge, not a lawyer. Indeed, he turns to Christ to receive the light necessary to search out the secrets of laws and to give fair sentence (. . . *inter nebulas legum dignoscere*

causas). It is unusual to find in this Christian judge such anxiety that, afraid of foundering in the great mass of laws inherited from Roman tradition, he invokes divine aid to avoid errors (. . . *qua luce reperta, Fas mihi sit populis reserata resolvere iura*). For this reason the brief composition has been called an *oratio* rather than a *carmen*.

CPL 1478; PLS I, 779; F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, I, 2, Leipzig 1906, 268; M. Manitius, *Gesch. d. Christl.-lat. Poesie*, Stuttgart 1891, 317; PLRE 2,406.

L. Dattrino

EUCHERIUS of Lyons (d. 449/455). Place and date of birth unknown. With his wife Galla and their sons Salonius and Veranus, both later bishops, he retired to the asceterium of *Lérins soon after its foundation by *Honoratus, between 412 and 420 (Pricoco, *L'isola dei santi*, 38f.). Honoratus's biographer *Hilary of Arles (*Sermo de vita Honorati* 22) and *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 51, 2) attest that Eucherius established residence with his wife on the contiguous islet of Lero. A late, legendary life (*Vita Consortiae*, AASS Iuni 4, 250a) gives him two daughters as well, and makes him of a senatorial family, a fact which seems to be confirmed by his kinship with one Valerian, to whom he dedicated the epistle *De contemptu mundi* and whom he celebrates *in maximos saeculi apices patre soceroque elatus* (Pricoco, 56, lines 23-24), and by an allusion of Hilary (*Sermo . . . Hon.* 22: *[Eucherius] pulcherrime splendidus mundo*). We do not know how long he remained at Lérins; according to *John Cassian (*Conl.* 11, *praef.* 1), he was on the point of making a journey to *Egypt, home of the great ascetics, but never did so. On the island he wrote *De laude eremi* and, some years later (430 or 431), *De contemptu mundi*.

After this date and before 441, the year in which he took part as a bishop in the first Council of *Orange, he was called to the see of *Lyons. Here too, probably, he was associated with ascetic ventures, patronizing nascent monastic communities and circulating the texts of Eastern asceticism (*Vita Patrum Iurensium* 11; Pricoco, *L'isola dei santi*, 45f.), esp. Cassian's works, of which *Gennadius makes him the summarizer (*Vir. ill.* 64). He died in 449 (*Chron. Gall.* a. 452, 134) or shortly later, between 450 and 455, under *Valentinian and Marcian (Gennad., *Vir. ill.* 64). He enjoyed great prestige: Cassian dedicated part II of his *Conlationes* to him and Honoratus (*Conl.* 11, *praef.* 1) and praised his merits as an ascetic; *Polemius Silvius dedicated his *Laterculum* to him (*Laterc. a. 449*, 518); *Claudianus Mamertus (*De statu animae* II, 9) celebrated him as the greatest bishop of his time.

Of the many writings attributed to Eucherius, most are not authentic and must be restored to the so-called *Eusebius Gallicanus or later writers. The two opuscola *De laude eremi* and *De contemptu mundi*, two treatises of biblical exegesis, *Formulae spiritalis intellegentiae* and *Instructiones*, and the *Passio Acaunensium martyrum* are authentic. *De laude eremi* is a glorification, in the form of a letter, of the ascetical life and the asceterium of Lérins. Dedicated to Hilary, the future bishop of *Arles, it celebrates his return to the island after having followed Honoratus to Arles, drawn back by love of the eremitic life; it must have been written between the episcopal elections of Honoratus (427–428) and Hilary (429–430). In *De contemptu mundi et saecularis philosophiae*, also epistolary in form and composed ca. 430 (as the year 1185 from the foundation of Rome approaches, he writes: Pricoco, 94, lines 569-571), the noble dedicatee, Valerian, is exhorted to the Christian life or, more probably, to monastic profession. Worldly goods, whose imminent end is shown by clear signs, are contrasted with heavenly beatitude, with the tightly woven development of arguments and ideas typical of ancient Christian writers.

The *Passio Acaunensium martyrum*, written at Lyons during his episcopate (if the accompanying letter, in which Eucherius addresses bishop Salvius or Silvius as *frater*—as an equal—is authentic) and sometimes denied to Eucherius, narrates one of the most contested episodes in the history of the persecutions: the massacre of 6600 Christian soldiers of the *Theban Legion, who suffered martyrdom near Acaunum by order of the emperor *Maximian for refusing to persecute their coreligionists.

The two exegetical works are also from the years of his episcopate. The *Formulae spiritalis intellegentiae*, dedicated to his son Veranus, interprets numerous biblical expressions, grouped in rubrics (*membra domini*, *terrena*, *animantia*, *interior homo*, *Hierusalem* etc.). The *Instructiones*, dedicated to his son Salonius, is in two books: in the first Eucherius explains a series of difficult biblical passages, from Genesis to Revelation; the second, shorter book clarifies Hebrew and Greek names in *Scripture. Partial researches have shown the lack of originality of these works. As he himself says (*Instr.* I, *praef.*, CSEL 31, 65, 6-8; 139, 19-20), Eucherius deduces his interpretations from authoritative exegetes who have preceded him, surely from *Jerome in book II of the *Instructiones* (I. Opelt, *Quellenstudien zu E.*) and in the part of book I on the Psalms (Curti, *Spiritalis intelligentia*, 1 n. 2). In the *praefatio* of the *For-*

mulae, Eucherius illustrates his own exegetical method. He postulates a *triplex scripturarum regula*, i.e., the literal reading, the moral or tropological reading, and the spiritual or anagogical reading, which he correlates—though purely extrinsically—to the tripartite division of the human being (body, soul and spirit) and of philosophy (physical or natural, ethical or moral, logical or rational). But Eucherius does not apply this theory to his own writings, confining himself to a merely dual exegesis, literal and esp. allegorical (Curti). Eucherius's exegetical works spread widely and had lasting influence, as is proven by the manuscript tradition—much richer and more complex than Wotke has shown—present in the major scriptorial centers of medieval Europe and in almost every century from the 6th to the age of humanism.

CPL 488-498; PL 50, 701-1214 (all the works, including *spuria*); CSEL 31, ed. C. Wotke, Vienna 1894 (the authentic works, except *De cont. mundi*); CCL 66, Turnhout 2004, ed. C. Mandolfo; *Passio Acaunensium martyrum*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM III, Hannover 1896, 32-39; *De laude eremi*, ed. S. Pricoco, Catania 1965; *De contemptu mundi*, intr., critical text and comm. by S. Pricoco, Florence 1990; A. Mellier, *De vita et scriptis S. Eucherii*, Lyons 1877; A. Gouilloud, *St. Eucher, Lérins et l'Église de Lyon au Ve siècle*, Lyons 1881; Schanz IV, 2, Munich 1920, 518-521; L. Cristiani, *Lérins et ses Fondateurs*, S. Wandrille 1946; K.F. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, nos. 120, 168; J. Van Berchem, *Le martyre de la Légion Thébaine*, Basel 1956; C. Curti, *La Passio Acaunensium martyrum di Eucherio di Lione*: Convivium Dominicum, Catania 1959, 297-327; L. Cristiani, *Eucher*: DSp IV, 2, 1653-1660; L. Dupraz, *Les Passions de S. Maurice d'Agaune*, Fribourg 1961; R. Etaix, *Eucher de Lyon*: DHGE 15, 1315-1317; I. Opelt, *Quellenstudien zu Eucherius*: Hermes 91 (1963) 476-483; S. Pricoco, *Per una nuova edizione del "De contemptu mundi" di Eucherio di Lione*, Turin 1967; L. Alfonsi, *Il "De laude eremi" di Eucherio*: Convivium 36 (1968) 361-369; I. Opelt, *Zur literarischen Eigenart von Eucherius' Schrift De laude eremi*: VChr 22 (1968) 198-208; S. Pricoco, *Barbari, senso della fine e teologia politica. Su un passo del "De contemptu mundi" di Eucherio di Lione*: RomBarb 2 (1977) 208-228; C. Curti, *Spiritalis intelligentia. Nota sulla dottrina esegetica di Eucherio di Lione*: Kerygma und Logos. Festschrift C. Andresen, Göttingen 1978, 15 pp.; S. Pricoco, *L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978; PLRE II, *Eucherius* 3, 405; S. Pricoco, *Eucherio di Lione: un padre della chiesa tra Erasmo e Tillemont*: Studi storicoreligiosi 6 (1982) 23-44; F. Prinz, *Fühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Darmstadt 21988, passim, esp. 66-69; 457-461; R. Nouailhat, *Saints et Patrons. Les premiers moines de Lérins*, Paris 1988; R. Nurnberg, *Askese als sozialer Impuls. Monastische-asketische Spiritualität als Wurzel und Triebfeder sozialer Ideen und Aktivitaten der Kirche in Sudgallien im 5. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1988; C.M. Kasper, *Theologie und Askese. Die Spiritualität des Inselmönchtums von Lérins im 5. Jahrhundert*, Münster 1991; C. Mandolfo, *Eucherii Lugdunensis, Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae*, critical ed., Catania 2001.

S. Pricoco

EUCHITES. *See* *MESSALIANS

EUDOXIA (d. 404). Daughter of the Frankish general Bauto and sister of Arbogast, she married the emperor *Arcadius on 27 April 395. Received the title of *Augusta* (400), something unusual for empresses. She directly opposed the *Arians, and initially had good relations with the archbishop of *Constantinople, *John Chrysostom. She reacted to his criticism of the tone of life at the court, however, by supporting his condemnation at the Synod of the *Oak (403). Chrysostom was immediately recalled, however, due to popular agitation and the wish of Eudoxia herself. The final break came when Chrysostom protested the dedication of a silver statue to the empress; she reacted by having him exiled for good on 9 June 404. Eudoxia died 6 October the same year and was buried at Constantinople in the church of the Holy Apostles.

PLRE II, *Aelia Eudoxia* 1, 410; KL 1, *Eudokia*, 1550; DNP 1, *Ae. Eudoxia* 4, 168-169; C.A. Balducci, *Il dissidio fra S. Giovanni Crisostomo e Eudossia*, in Atti del IV Congresso nazionale di studi romani, 1, Rome 1938, 303-310; K.G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA 1982, 48-78; J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom*, Oxford 1990; A. Cameron - J. Long, *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius*, Berkeley, CA 1993.

G. Pilara

EUDOXIA (Eudocia, Eudokia), (ca. 400–460). Originally named Athenaïs from her birthplace, Eudoxia was the daughter of the philosopher Leontius and received a good education. For hereditary reasons she asked protection from *Theodosius II's sister *Pulcheria, who introduced her to court. She had great success and in June 421 married Theodosius II, after having been baptized by *Atticus, patriarch of *Constantinople, who gave her the name Aelia Eudoxia. In 423 she was proclaimed Augusta. She sided with *Nestorius against *Cyril of Alexandria. In 438 she went on pilgrimage to *Jerusalem, returning with relics of St. Stephen. In 442 she was accused of infidelity and exiled to Jerusalem, where she died. *Photius (cods. 183, 184) esteemed her poetry, which in fact was quite modest. She wrote a short poem in honor of Theodosius II, celebrating his victory over the Persians, a metaphrase of the Octateuch and the prophets Zechariah and Daniel, 3 books in hexameters on the martyrdom of Cyprian (PG 85, 832-864), the *Praises* of Antioch, a speech made during a visit to that city, and the completion of Patricius's *Homeric Centos*.

CPG 6020-6025; DHGE 15, 1336-1337 (bibl.); PLRE II, *Aelia Eudocia (Athenis)* 2, 408-409; DNP 4, *Aelia Eudokia* 1, 220-221; A. Grillmeier - H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, Würzburg 1951, 604-608; K.G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA 1982, 112-146; A. Cameron, *The Empress and the Poet. Paganism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II*: Yale Classical Studies 27 (1982) 217-289.

G. Pilara

EUDOXIUS (d. 370). Native of Armenia, bishop of Germanicia (Syria), he was among the *Eusebians at *Serdica (343) and then part of the Eastern delegation that delivered the **Ekthesis makrostichos* to the emperor *Constans at *Milan in 345. He may have attended the anti-Photinian Council of *Sirmium in 351. In 357, on the death of *Leontius, he got himself elected bishop of Antioch by a *coup de main* which annoyed *Constantius. At this point he began to support radical *Arian propaganda, which was reviving at that time, and protected *Aetius and *Eunomius. In 357 he presided over a small pro-Arian council at *Antioch, which approved the formula of Sirmium published some months earlier. During this period Eudoxius went so far as to declare the Son unlike the Father in substance and to deny his real generation from the Father. Momentarily struck by the *homoiousian reaction of 358, he soon regained the emperor's favor and, at *Seleucia, was among the minority who withstood the homoiousians. Put on the spot here and in the talks at *Constantinople following the council, he abandoned the radical Arians for a more moderate position and so emerged triumphant, with Acacius, from the Council of Constantinople of 360; he followed up his victory by obtaining a transfer to the see of Constantinople, left vacant by the deposition of *Macedonius. He held it until his death (370), repelling several attacks by the homoiousians after Constantius's death, enjoying *Valens's favor and following, with *Euzoius of Antioch, a moderate pro-Arian policy which led him to a decisive break with the radical Arians. A profession of faith surviving under his name, of doubtful authenticity, professes the *logos/sarx* Christology, which was Arian before becoming *Apollinarist.

CPG 3405-3410; M. Tetz, *Eudoxius Fragmente*: SP 3 (TU 78), Berlin 1961, 314-323; DHGE 15, 1337-1340; DTC 5, 1484-1487; Simonetti, passim; E. Cavalcanti, *Studi eunomiani*, Rome 1976, passim; BBKL I, 1550-1551.

M. Simonetti

EUGENIUS, monk. Native of Clysma in *Egypt (near Suez), after 25 years as a pearl fisher he became a disciple of *Pachomius. Retiring first to Nitria, then to Syria (region of *Nisibis), he founded a monastery on Mt. *Izla, where he had 70 disciples, who in turn founded numerous monasteries. Eugenius (Awgin in Syriac MSS) was the founder of monasticism in Syria, according to the legendary life that appeared in the 9th c. and was spread by numerous MSS. Critical opinion on its historicity varies. J. Assemani, improbably, identifies Eugenius with Aonès (Soz., *HE* VI, 33-34, calls Aonès one of the founders of monasticism in Persia), J. Labourt explains how Eugenius (Awgin) could be identified with the founder of the Mar Agwin monastery of Izla, and P. Peeters holds that the story of Eugenius belongs to the cycle of legends formed around the monastery of St. *Jacob of Nisibis. His Egyptian origin may simply be a response to the desire to give Mesopotamian monasticism an illustrious ancestry in Egypt, the home of monasticism.

A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, I, Louvain 1958, 21-220; J.M. Fiey, *Aonès, Awun et Awgin (Eugène). Aux origines du monachisme mésopotamien*: AB 80 (1962) 52-81; DHGE 15, 1359-1360; DIP 3, 1343; LTK 3, 980.

M.G. Bianco

EUGENIUS I, pope (654–657). Native of *Rome, succeeded *Martin I while the latter was still in exile in Crimea. Immediately upon his election Eugenius began to work for reconciliation between the church of Rome and *Constans II, a supporter of *monothelitism. To this end he sent *apocrisaries to the Byzantine court to inform the emperor of his election, and to reaffirm the orthodox faith and the Roman see's opposition to monothelitism. The patriarch *Pyrrhus, promoter of the *Typos*, offered to assist the papal legates. Upon Pyrrhus's death a year later, his successor Paul sent Eugenius a letter in which he expressed a somewhat ambiguous position on the monothelite question. The document was repudiated by a meeting of the Roman clergy and people, supported by *Maximus the Confessor. As a result relations between the papacy and the Eastern empire once again became tense, though without a direct conflict, in part due to the weakness of the emperor, who had been defeated at Phoenix by the Muslims in 655. Eugenius died after a pontificate of nearly three years, 6 June 657.

LP I, 341-342; Jaffé I, 234; Hfl-Lecl III, 461-470; Mansi 11, 1-14; DTC V, 1488-1489; D. Mallardo, *Papa Sant'Eugenio I*, Naples 1943; DHGE XV, 1346-1347; DBI 43 (1993), 483-486 (J.-M. Sansterre); Magi, 223-225; LTK[3] 3, 980 (S. Scholz); EPapi I, 603-606 (J.-M. Sansterre).

M. Spinelli

EUGENIUS FLAVIUS (d. 394). Roman usurper (392–394), Christian. A teacher of rhetoric, he held the post of *magister scrinii* when Arbogast had him proclaimed Augustus on 22 August 392. He sought an understanding with *Ambrose and *Theodosius, but the latter would not recognize him. Eugenius then leagued himself with the Roman senators headed by Nicomachus Flavianus. He was defeated at the river Frigidus (Vipacco; tributary of the Isonzo) and killed (394).

Letters Addressed to Eugenius: Ambr., *Ep.* 57; Symm., *Ep.* 2,81; PLRE I, 293; EC V, 804-805. *On Eugenius's coins:* J.H.F. Bloemers, *Ein spätrömischer Goldmünzenfund aus Obbicht, Prov. Limburg*: Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek 19 (1969) 73-80.

E. Malaspina

EUGENIUS of Ancyra (4th c.). Deacon of *Ancyra. Follower of *Marcellus, he bore a letter to *Athanasius containing the Marcellian community's profession of faith: in it the *Arians and *Sabellians are anathematized, and the subsistence of the *Trinity in a single hypostasis is affirmed. The letter, of ca. 371, was probably sent to defend themselves against *Basil's accusations.

CPG II, 2810; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Egypte au IV^e^ siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996.

E. Prinzivalli

EUGENIUS of Carthage (d. 505). Perhaps a disciple of *Diadochus, the prologue of *Victor of Vita's *Historia persecutionis* was addressed to him. He was of Eastern origin. In 480–481, after the *persecutions of the Catholics by the *Vandals, *Huneric, yielding to the pressure of the emperor *Zeno, allowed a bishop to be elected at *Carthage after a vacancy of 24 years; Eugenius was elected (according to Delmaire, in 478–479). His charitable works made him popular. He allowed Arian Vandals to participate in eucharistic celebrations. During the conference of the African bishops of the two confessions, convoked by the Vandal king at Carthage in 484, Eugenius and his Catholic colleagues stood up to the king and wrote a *liber fidei catholicae* (Vict. of Vita, *Hist.* 2,56-101) to confirm their orthodoxy. In reprisal they were exiled; Eugenius was taken to Turris Tamalleni (oasis of Mansurah, near Telmine, Tunisia). Recalled from exile by Gunthamund (484–496) in 487, Eugenius was exiled a second time by Thrasamund (496–523) to Albi (Tarn department) in France, where he died in 505. The liturgical books of Albi put his feast on 6 September, perhaps the day of his death. The *Calendarium Carthaginense* cites him on 5 January. The date of 13 July in the *Mart. rom.* offers no guarantee. Of Eugenius's works we have the *Liber fidei*, and a letter *Ad cives suos pro custodienda fide catholica* (*Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2,3), written during his first exile in 484.

CPL 799; PL 68, 769-771; BHL 2678-2681; Verzeichnis 451; PCBE 1, 362-365; LACL3 237-238; V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 194-199; R. Delmaire, *La date de l'ambassade d'Alexander à Carthage et l'élection de l'évêque Eugenius*: REAug 33 (1987) 85-89; J. Moorhead, *Victor of Vita. History of the Vandal Persecution*, Liverpool 1992.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

EUGENIUS of Seleucia (6th c.). Bishop of *Seleucia, consecrated by *Jacob Baradeus following the death of *Theodosius of Alexandria (19 June 566). Thanks also to the support of the monk Athanasius, the empress Theodora's grandson (d. 548), he became a promoter of the *monophysite doctrine of tritheism, causing inevitable divisions in the Chalcedonian church. After signing two accords aimed at ending the controversies, in 569 he was condemned and excommunicated by a *Jacobite synod of *Constantinople. He then associated himself with the deposed Arian bishops *Conon and *Theonas ordaining bishops in East and West and so initiating a true and proper tritheist hierarchy, until he was banished to the New Monastery of Jerusalem as a result of Emperor *Justin II's persecution of the monophysites (571). He died after his release in Pamphylia.

A fierce opponent of *John Philoponus, who with the publication of *De resurrectione* had brought about a kind of schism within the tritheist church itself, Eugenius disputed Philoponus's concept of the *Trinity in a letter written with Conon and Theonas (*Ep. ad eorum asseclas*); he also ridiculed his doctrine of the *resurrection in an invective written with a certain Themistius and the above-mentioned Conon (*Cononitarum tractatus contra doctrinam Philoponi de resurrectione*).

CPG 7175, 7177, 7283, 7284a; CSCO 17, 185-186, 198-202; CSCO 103, 129-130, 138-140; A. Van Roey, *Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon*: OLP 11 (1980) 141-143; G. Furlani, *Un florilegio antitriteistico in lingua siriaca*: Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti 83 (1923–1924), Parte seconda, 671-673; Id., *Sei scritti antitriteistici in lingua siriaca*, PO 14, Paris 1920; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e^ siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, 179-187; A. Van Roey, *La controverse trithéite depuis la condamnation de Conon et Eugène jusqu'à la conversion de l'évêque Élie*, in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. Van der Ploeg O.P.*, ed. W.C. Delsman et al., Alter Orient und Altes Testament 211, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982, 487-497; Id., *Un traité co-*

nonite contre la doctrine de Jean Philopon sur la résurrection, in *Antidoron. Hommage à M. Geerard*, I, Wetteren 1984, 123-139; Id., *La controverse trithéite jusqu'à l'excommunication de Conon et d'Eugène (557–569)*: OLP 16 (1985) 141-165; A. Van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 56 (1994) 106 and 141.

P. Marone

EUGENIUS of Toledo (d. 657). Born at *Toledo, but probably a *Goth. Already a cleric, he went to *Saragossa, where he became a monk and then worked with Bishop *Braulio as archdeacon (Ildef., *Vir. ill.* 13, 1). At the death of *Eugenius I, King Chindaswinth decided during the VII Council of Toledo (646) to make Eugenius bishop, despite Braulio's tenacious opposition. He was bishop for twelve years and died ca. the end of 657, after having presided over the VIII (653), IX (655) and X (656) councils of Toledo. A timid and delicate soul, of poor health, he achieved a high level of literary formation. At Chindaswinth's request he minutely reviewed the text of Dracontius's cosmogonic poem, so that "the text turned out finer through the skill of the reviser than through the ability of the author" (Ildef., *Vir. ill.* 13, 4). He was an inspired poet: we have a large collection of his poems (102), in which purely lyrical compositions are set beside epitaphs and short scholastic didactic poems. Also attributed to Eugenius is a series of brief liturgical and canonical texts; it is also very probable that he wrote the *Passio* or *Acta martyrum Caesaraugustanorum*, often thought to be the work of Braulio of Saragossa. *Ildefonsus, moreover, attributes to him the *De Trinitate*, a brilliant treatise with a well-ordered argument, of which we know with certainty only the brief passages cited by *Julian of Toledo (*Progn.* III,17,24,26).

CPL 1236; Díaz 196-204; PL 87, 369-413; MGH *auct. ant.* XIV, 27-287; F. Vollmer, *Die Gedichtsammlung des Engenins von Toledo*: Neues Archiv 26 (1901) 393-409; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lat. Literatur des Mittelalters*, I, Munich 1911, 194-197; F. Rivera Recio, *San Eugenio de Toledo y su culto*, Toledo 1963; G. Bernt, *Das lateinische Epigramm*, Munich 1968; DHEE 2, 882-883; A.C. Vega, *De patrología española. Sobre el opúsculo "de sancta Trinitate" de S. Eugenio II de Toledo*: Boletín de la real Academia de la Historia 166 (1970) 63-75; J. Pérez de Urbel, *San Eugenio de Toledo*, in *La patrología Toledano-visigoda*, Madrid 1970, 195-214; C. Codoñer, *The Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo*: Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 3 (1981) 333-342; U. Dominguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 113-155.

P. Marone

EUGIPPIUS (ca. 460–ca. 535). Late Latin Christian writer, born ca. 460 and active in the first part of the 6th c. He is associated with St. *Severinus, apostle of *Noricum, and was probably his young disciple. His origins are uncertain, though some think he was from the region of *Aquileia, and was later at *Lérins for a time. We know for certain only that he was the third abbot, after Lucillus and Marcianus, of the monastic community that his brethren, fleeing Noricum to escape barbarian violence, founded at *Castrum Lucullanum* (Pizzofalcone) near *Naples, next to the new tomb of St. Severinus, which had been translated there after long wanderings throughout Italy; all this Eugippius himself tells us in his *Vita s. Severini*, written in 511. Though colored by the marvelous, the *Life* is a source of prime importance—the only evidence we have of conditions in the Roman Empire's outer provinces at the time of the barbarian impact (Rugi, Heruli, Alamanni, etc.). As a biographer, Eugippius seems esp. to stress the didactic aspect, thus offering a model of virtue and behavior for the monastic community he directed. With the *Life* we should mention the two *epistulae* about it exchanged by Eugippius and the Roman deacon *Paschasius. In recent years Vogüé seems to have finally discovered the *Rule* which, according to some early authors (*Cassiodorus and *Isidore), Eugippius wrote for the monks of the monastery of St. Severinus. He corresponded with the most illustrious personages of his day (*Fulgentius of Ruspe, Paschasius, the deacon *Ferrandus, *Maxentius, Cassiodorus, *Dionysius Exiguus and the Roman virgin *Proba, Cassiodorus's niece). From a remark by Fulgentius (*Ep.* V, 12) and from a note on a codex at Epternach (Paris, *Bibl. nat. lat.* 9389), we can assert without doubt that he organized around himself a flourishing library and an active *scriptorium*. His *Excerpta ex operibus s. Augustini*, an anthology of passages (348?) drawn by Eugippius from more than 40 of St. *Augustine's works, are very important for establishing Augustine's text. For important evidence and judgments on Eugippius's literary work, see Cassiodorus (*Inst. div.* 23) and Isidore (*Vir. ill.* 26).

CPL 676-678, PL 62, 549-1200; PLS 3, 1263; CSEL 9, 1-2 (P. Knoll); R. Noll (- E. Vetter), *Eugippius. Das Leben des heiligen Severin*, Berlin [2]1963 (with Ger. tr. opposite), Passau 1981; F. Villegas - A. de Vogüé, *Eugippii Regula*, Vienna 1976 (CSEL 87); *Vita sancti Severini*, ed. T. Nüsslein, Bamberg 1985; *Das Leben des heiligen Severin*, new ed. A. Heine, Essen 1986; *Eugippe, Vie de saint Séverin*, introd., texte Latin, tr., notes & index par Ph. Régerat, Paris 1991 (SC 374). For the *Excerpta*, the CSEL edition is much criticized (see D. De Bruyne, *Miscellanea Agostino* II, Rome 1931, 337-339); K. Kramert - E.K. Winter, eds., *St. Severin. Der Heilige zwischen Ost und West*, Klosterneuberg 1958; L. Bieler - L. Krestan, *Eugippius. The Life of Saint Severin* (FC 55), Washington, D.C. 1965; I. Bóna, *Eugippii Vita s. Severini*: Antik Tanulmányok 16 (1969) 265-290 (Hungarian); Fr. tr., ed. by Ph. Régerat, *Vie de Saint Séverin*, Paris 1991; M. Pellegrino, *Il Com-*

memoratorium Vitae sancti Severini*: RSCI 12 (1958) 1-26; DHGE 15, 1376-1378; P. Siniscalco, *Il numero primitivo degli "Excerpta" di Eugippio*: REAug 10 (1964) 331-342; A. de Vogüé, *La Règle d'Eugippe retrouvée?*: RevAscMyst 47 (1971) 233-265; M. van Uytfanghe, *Eléments évangéliques dans la structure et la composition de la "Vie de saint Séverin" d'Eugippius*: SE 21 (1972/73) 147-158; Id., *La Bible dans la "Vie de saint Séverin" d'Eugippius*: Latomus 33 (1974) 324-352; A. Quacquarelli, *La "Vita sancti Severini" di Eugippio: etopeia e sentenze*: VetChr 13 (1976) 229-253; E.M. Ruprechtsberger, *Beobachtungen zum Stil und zur Sprache des Eugippius*: ROE 4 (1976) 227-299; J.T. Lienhard, *The Earliest Florilegia of Augustine*: AugStud 8 (1977) 28-30; *Die Regel des Eugippius: die Klosterordnung des Verfassers der "Vita Sancti Severini" im Lichte ihrer Quellen*, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar von M. Krausgruber, Thaur bei Innsbruck 1996; G. Wirth, *Anmerkungen zur Vita des Severin von Noricum*: Quaderni Catanesi 1 (1979) 217-266; R. Pillinger, *Bibliographie zur Vita Sancti Severini (1980–1998)*: Mitteil. zur christl. Arch. 5 (1999) 93-96; W. Pohl - M. Diesenberger (eds.), *Eugippius und Severin: der Autor, der Text und der Heilige*, Vienna 2001; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, Paris 2003, vol. 8, 131-159; 335-373.

V. Pavan

EULALIA of Barcelona, martyr. The *Passio* and the cult of the virgin Eulalia are attested only from the 7th c., if we allow that the hymn *Fulget hic honor sepulchri* (PL 31, 449) was in fact composed by *Quiricius, bishop of *Barcelona in 656 (CPL 1273). The various mentions in the 7th-9th-c. martyologies are more certain regarding the date, but pose problems of content. The *Mart. hier.* puts a Eulalia, native of Italy, on 12 February; *Bede and the anonymous martyrologist of *Lyons (ca. 800) put her on the same date but make her a native of Barcelona; this latter date and place were agreed on by all later martyrologies. In 877 her relics were found outside the city, at S. Eulalia de Campo. At about the same time the *Passio* of *Eulalia of Mérida was adapted to her, decapitating her instead of burning her alive. But it is open to debate whether she should be identified with Eulalia of Mérida or not.

BHL 2693-2698; AB 102 (1984) 184; *Verzeichnis* 62; Díaz 316, 352; CPL 2069a; BS 5, 204-209; DHEE 2, 883; M. Dietz, *Gebetsklänge aus Altspanien*, Bonn 1947, 151-152; R. García Villoslada, *Historia de la Iglesia en España* 1, Madrid 1979, 39 (bibl.).

V. Saxer - S. Heid

EULALIA of Mérida, martyr. The most famous Spanish martyr. Around 405 Prudentius dedicated ch. III of the *Perist.* (CPL 1443) to her, mentioning the basilica over her tomb. Eulalia defended her homeland against the Suevians and the *Goths. The *Mart. hier.* lists her on 10 December: *in Spaniis civitate Almeri sanctae Eulaliae virginis et martyris*. Her name appears in the Visigothic Orational and the Mozarabic Lectionary (*Liber commicus*). Her cult spread in Spain from the 4th c.; according to some scholars, her personality was duplicated at Barcelona. Her cult involved the whole peninsula and reached *Africa (Aug., *Serm. Morin* 2 [PLS 2, 660-662]; *Calendarium Carthaginense*), *Gaul (basilica of Montday, ca. 455; Ven. Fort., *Carm.* 8,3,170; Greg. of Tours, *Glor. mart.* 90; *Missale Gothicum*), Italy (S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna) and England (Aldhelm, PL 89, 146, 273). According to *Prudentius and the *Passio* BHL 2700 of the 6th c. (according to Petruccione 83; 7th-8th c. according to Frede, Verzeichnis 62; it may be even older BHG 2700b), Eulalia voluntarily offered herself to martyrdom at age 12 and was crucified, finally dying at the stake outside the city, 10 December 304. When she died, her soul ascended in the form of a dove (a topos).

BHL 2699-2703; Díaz 311, 376; CPL 2069b; DHEE 2, 883; C. García Rodríguez, *El culto de los santos en la España romana y visigoda*, Madrid 1966, 284-289; R. García Villoslada, *Historia de la Iglesia en España* 1, Madrid 1979, 78-80; A. Recio Veganzones, *"Baetica" paleocristiana y visigoda. La antigua "Nebrissa" – hoy Lebrija (Sevilla)*: RivAC 55 (1979) 80-87; J. Petruccione, *The Portrait of St. Eulalia of Mérida in Prudentius' Peristephanon 3*: AB 108 (1990) 81-104; A.T. Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, Liverpool 1997 (*vitae patrum Meridae*); A. Gambasin, *Il martirio di Santa Eulalia*, Treviso 1997.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

EULALIUS, antipope (418–419). Archdeacon of the Church of Rome, perhaps a native of Greece. Upon *Zosimus's death (27 December 418) he was elected bishop in the Lateran basilica by a small group of Roman deacons in opposition to *Boniface, and like him was consecrated on the following Sunday (29 December). While each believed himself to be the legitimate pontiff, a series of conflicts disturbed the public order. Thus in 419 the emperor Honorius, seeking to end the schism and the many resulting disorders, convened a council at *Ravenna, but without result. Only in the face of Eulalius's complete insubordination against *Achilleus of Spoleto, chosen in the interim to celebrate the *Easter rites at Rome, was Boniface recognized as legitimate. On 7 April Honorius communicated the resolution of the events at Rome to the proconsul of Africa Largo. Eulalius, initially supported by the prefect Symmachus and by the imperial power generally, after 419 was relegated to Campania, where he died in 423.

LP I, 88-89, 227-229; *Ep. Imperatorum Pontificum aliorum*, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35/2, 59-80; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, I, Rome 1976,

452-460; S. Christ, *Some Notes on the Bonifacian-Eulalian Schism*: Aevum 51 (1977) 163-167; H. Chantraine, *Das Schisma von 418/419 und das Eingreifen der kaiserlichen Gewalt in die römische Bischofswahl*, in *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Kneissl - V. Losemann, Darmstadt 1988, 79-94; A. Pollastri, *Eulalio antipapa*: EPapi I, 404-405.

P. Marone

EULALIUS of Antioch (d. 331). Bishop of *Antioch for a few months, in the context of the disorders that accompanied and followed the deposition of *Eustathius in 327. Eulalias succeeded *Paulinus of Tyre (d. 330), who was elected to replace Eustathius and himself remained in office only a few months. Eulalius was succeeded by *Euphronius.

DCB 2, 279; Fedalto 2, 687.

M. Simonetti

EULOGIA (Greek εὐλογία; Latin *eulogia*): to speak well; blessing, both by God and of God by human beings; blessing in general. The blessing of something with a solemn prayer. The term εὐλογία also took on other meanings: (1) St. Paul uses it to indicate the *Eucharist (cup of blessing) (1 Cor 10:16); for Christian writers εὐλογία became synonymous with Eucharist (*Acts of Thomas* 26; 29; Orig., *Hom. 19, 13 in Jer.* PG 13, 489C; Basil, *De Spir. san.* 66 PG 32, 188B); the εὐλογία is the Eucharist sent to the absent (Justin, 1 *Apol.* 67, 5; Euseb., *HE* V, 24, 15). (2) Besides the blessed meal (*agapē*), εὐλογία also indicates the unconsecrated bread offered by the faithful for the eucharistic celebration (*Apos. Con.* VIII, 31, 2; Aug., *C. litt. Pet.* 3, 16, 19; *Ep.* 36, 8, 19); or the blessed bread distributed to the sick (Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 5, 14; *Gloria conf.* 30). (3) A blessed object (fruits, esp. bread) or gifts exchanged in sign of friendship and unity (Paul. Nol., *Ep.* 3; Greg. Gt., *Ep.* 13, 45; Ven. Fort., *Carm.* 10, 1, 9; *Radeg.* 2, 7; Bened., *Regula* 54) and, in the Latin Middle Ages, the gift offered by the priest to the bishop (*Conc. Meld.*, can. 45; Leo IV, *Ep.* 8, 3 PL 115, 668). (4) εὐλογία can refer to any object used for devotion (relics of holy places; lamp oil from Palestine preserved in *ampullae*; water).

Lampe 569f.; Cath 4, 684-686; RAC 6, 900-928; L. Janssens, *Les eulogies*: RBen 7 (1890) 515-520; B. Bagatti, *Eulogie palestinesi*: OCP 15 (1949) 126-166; G. Vermeer, *Observations sur le vocabulaire du Pélerinage chez Egérie et Antonin de Plaicence*, Nijmegen 1965; M. Paternoster, *L'imposizione delle mani nella Chiesa primitiva. Rassegna delle testimonianze bibliche, patristiche e liturgiche, fino al sec. V*, Rome 1977, [2]1983; N. Natalucci, *Grecismiesotismi nell'Itinerarium di Egeria*, in *Paideia cristiana. Studi in onore di M. Naldini*, Rome 1994, 103-113; M. Piccirillo, *Uno stampo per eulogia trovato a Gerusalemme*: Liber Annuus 44 (1994) 585-589; J. Engemann, *Eulogien und Votive*, in *Akten des XII. Inter. Kongress f. Christ. Archäologie*, I, Münster 1995, 223-233; B. Klausen-Nottmeyer, *Eulogie – Transpot und Weitergabe von Segenskraft*, in ibid., 922-927.

A. Di Berardino

EULOGIUS of Alexandria (d. 607/608). Native of *Antioch (Chalcedonian), bishop of *Alexandria from 580 to 607/8. Remembered as a friend and correspondent of *Gregory the Great and for his theological polemics against *monophysites and *Novatianists. None of his works survives completely (but see Photius, *Bibl.*, cods. 182, 208, 225-227, 230, 280).

CPL 6971-6979; DHGE 15, 1388-1389; Patrologia V, 392-393; P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus. The Church Historian*, Louvain 1981, 18, 28, 31, 40, 104, 127, 231; M. Maccarone, *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio*, Vatican City 1989, 340.

T. Orlandi

EUNAPIUS of Sardis (345/6–ca. 420). *Neoplatonist rhetor, disciple of Chrysanthius, of the school of *Iamblichus. Studied five years at *Athens attending the lectures of the Christian *Prohaeresius and others; he was also initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, then returned to his homeland and taught rhetoric. Because of his interest in the study of medicine, Oribasius dedicated a work to him (CMG VI,3). At his advice Eunapius continued Dexippus's historical work with 14 books of *Historika hypomnēmata*, narrating the history of the Roman Empire from ca. 270–404; in the meantime (after 396), on the advice of Chrysanthius, he also write the *Vitae sophistarum*, beginning with *Plotinus and *Porphyry and continuing with the *Platonists and rhetors of his day, in opposition to Christian hagiographies. We have only fragments of the *Historiae*: the main one is known by the name *Peri presbeiōn* (*De legationibus*). *Photius (cod. 77) tells us that Eunapius praised *Julian and denigrated *Constantine and the Christians of the imperial court; from the surviving fragments, Eunapius's opposition to Christianity seems to turn on the polemic against the monks.

PG 113, 649-661; FHG 4, 11-56; L. Dindorf, *Historici Graeci minores.* I, Leipzig 1870, 205-274; J.F. Boissonade, *Eunapii Sardiani Vitas Sophistarum et Fragmenta Historiarum*, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1822; G. Giangrande, ed. *Vitae sophistarum*, Rome 1956; PLRE I, 296; I. Opelt, RAC 6, 928-936; H. Dörrie, KLP 2,427-428; J.R. Mozley, DCB 2,285-286; A. Cameron, *A New Fragment of Eunapius*: Classical Review, n.s. 17 (1967) 10-11; R.T. Ridley, *Eunapius and Zosimus*: Helikon 9-10 (1969–1970) 574-

592; A.B. Breebaart, *Eunapius of Sardes and the Writing of History*: Mnemosyne 32 (1979) 360-375; R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius . . .*, Liverpool 1981; *Index in Eunapii Vitas sophistarum*, ed. J. & M.M. Avotins, Hildesheim 1983; A. Boldini, *Ricerche sulla Storia di Eunapio di Sardi. Problemi di storiografia tardopagana*, Bologna 1984; F. Paschoud, *Eunapiana*, in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982–1983*, Bonn 1985, 239-304.

E. Malaspina

EUNOMIUS of Berea. Late 4th-c. bishop who belonged, with Polemon, to the radical Apollinarists (Synousiasts). The *Doctrina Patrum* contains two fragments of a letter of his to Zosimus.

Diekamp, 309 and 312; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 153 and 273-277.

K. den Biesen

EUNOMIUS of Cyzicus (d. ca. 394). Native of *Cappadocia, of humble birth, secretary and disciple of *Aetius, Eunomius was the greatest exponent of radical *Arianism (*anomoianism). *Eudoxius ordained him deacon (ca. 357), then in 360 bishop of Cyzicus, but his radical Arian preaching provoked popular protest and his removal. After 362 he collaborated actively with Aetius in the organization of a regular anomoian community with its own bishops, and broke off relations with Eudoxius and *Euzoius, too moderate in his eyes. *Theodosius's Catholic policy signaled the decline of his star; a veteran of condemnations and exiles, he was once again condemned and exiled in 383, first to *Moesia, then to *Caesarea in Cappadocia. He was finally allowed to retire to a property of his own; he died ca. 394. We know he wrote much, but little survives. His *Apologia*, written in 361, is a complete, organic exposition of radical Arian doctrine. It was refuted in detail in 363–364 by *Basil in his *Against Eunomius*; Eunomius replied in 378 with an *Apologia for the apologia*, of which large extracts survive in *Gregory of Nyssa's refutation of it. In 383 at Theodosius's request, Eunomius wrote a rather detailed *Confessio (Expositio) Fidei*, which clearly summarizes his doctrine. Nothing survives of his *Commentary on Romans* in 7 books or his letters, of which *Photius (cod. 138) knew 40.

CPG 11, 2455-2460; PG 30, 836-868; Quasten II, 310-312 (bibl.); RAC 6, 936-947; Simonetti 588-589; E. Cavalcanti, *Studi Eunomiani*, Rome 1976; L. Abramowski, *Eunomius*: RAC 6, 936-947; A. Ritter, *Eusebius von Cyzicus*: TRE 10, 525-528; F.X. Risch, *Eunomios*: LTK[3] 3, 989-990; ODC 572-573; T. Böhm, *Eunomius von Cyzicus*: LACL (1998) 208-209. *Editions and translations*: R.P. Vaggione (ed.), Eunomius, *The Extant Works, Text and Translation*, Oxford 1987; B. Sesboüé et al. (eds.), Basile de Césarée, *Contre Eunome I* (SC 299), Paris 1982; Id., *Contre Eunome II suivi de Eunome. Apologie* (SC 305), Paris 1983; 179-299; Gregorius v. Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium*, ed. W. Jaeger: GNO 1-2, Leiden 1960. *Studies*: M.F. Wiles, *Eunomius: Hairsplitting Dialectician or Defender of the Accessibility of Salvation?* in R.D. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Othodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge 1989, 157-172; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988, 611-636; P. Papageorgiou, *Plotinos and Eunomios: A Parallel Theology of the Three Hypostases*: The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 37 (1992) 215-231; F.X. Risch, *Ps.-Basilius. Adversus Eunomium IV-V*, Leiden 1992, see intr.; K.-H. Uthemann, *Die Sprache der Theologie nach Eunomius*: ZKG 104 (1993) 143-175; B. Pottier (ed.), *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse: étude systématique du "Contre Eunome" avec traduction inédite des extraits d'Eunome*, Namur 1994; M.R. Barnes, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and Gregory of Nyssa: Two Traditions of Transcendent Causality*: VChr 52 (1998) 59-87; F. Pilloni, *Influssi Eunomiani sull'origine e lo sviluppo della teologia dei Cappadoci*, Rome 1998; R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford 2000.

M. Simonetti

EUNUCHS. Castration was practiced in antiquity for two main reasons: (1) in various religious cults of Asia Minor, Phoenicia and Babylon, eunuchs constituted a class of pure servants of the deity, who could be priests, but also laymen, like the *mētragyrtai* of the god Cybele (the so-called *galli*), still in existence in late-4th-c. Rome (Prudentius, *Perist.* 10,196-200; Paul. of Nola, *Carm.* 19,185ff.; Jerome, *Com. in Osee* 14); (2) first in the Persian world and later also in the Hellenistic-Roman world, eunuchs made so as infants for court functions, prostitution, service to women, or simply as servants. They were expensive (Pliny, *HN* 7,39) and considered *semiviri* (ibid. 11,110,263) or a *tertium genus* as a sign of disdain (*Hist. Augusta* 18,23,27). The castration of slaves was prohibited by emperors beginning with *Domitian (Suetonius, *Dom.* 7; Ammianus 18,4), esp. by *Hadrian (Dig. 48,8,4,2 [*homicidium*]) and *Constantine (CI 4,42,1). Under the latter's son *Constantius, however, there was a significant increase in the practice, since eunuchs occupied important positions at court; *Julian, who had been educated by the eunuch Macedonius, got rid of them, but later the phenomenon again reestablished itself (Ammianus 18,4). *Ammianus observes ironically that the emperor Constantius "had a great influence on Eusebius," the head of the *cubicularii* (18,4,3). Eunuchs had great power at court, occupying very important positions, but could be easily eliminated, since they had neither great families behind them nor descendants. Each successive prohibition of castration increased importation, which was more expensive. The number of eunuchs increased during the Byzan-

tine Empire, meaning that they were not only being imported, but Roman citizens were also being made eunuchs. Mutilation often led to death (Justinian, *Nov.* 142, *prol.*). In any case eunuchs were despised by both pagans and Christians: considered vile, venal, servile and effeminate, they evoked physical and moral revulsion (Basil, *Ep.* 115; Cyril of Alex. PG 77, 1108). Infantile castration altered the male body into a feminine form, creating an ambiguous type.

A significant portion of *Gregory of Nazianzus's discourse 37, proclaimed in the presence of the court, dealt with eunuchs, some of whom were present. He begins ironically: "I want to say something virile about eunuchs" (37,16: SC 318 p. 304). They must not boast of something that is involuntary; there is no merit for something that derives from nature. He asks them not to prostitute themselves, out of love for Christ's divinity (ch. 17 and 18). There must have been Christians among the eunuchs at court, esp. from the late 4th c. (Gerontius, *Life of Melania* 11).

The church slowly worked out a position, which nevertheless fluctuated according to time and context, though from the 4th c. eunuchism was ordinarily rejected. The Acts of the Apostles mention the *baptism of the eunuch of Candace by Philip (8:27). Justin speaks (*1 Ap.* 29) of a Christian of Alexandria who wanted to be made a eunuch, presenting a request to the governor Felix, who rejected it. The mid 2nd-c. *Apocryphal Acts of John* criticize a Christian who mutilated himself after his conversion (ch. 53 and 54), since "it is not the organs that are troublesome to man, but the hidden sources, from which every vile movement has its origin and comes to light." *Melito of Sardis was a eunuch (Eusebius, *HE* 5,24: PG 20, 696). *Athenagoras speaks of Christian eunuchs (*Suppl.* 34,1-2); *Tertullian of the *spadones voluntarii* (*De res.* 61,6; *De virg. vel.* 10,1), where the language could indicate the *continentes*; the anonymous short work *De singularitate clericorum* criticizes them. The Roman author of the *Philosophoumena* refers to an elderly Christian eunuch (a priest?) named Hyacinthus, the teacher of Marcia, *Commodus's concubine (6,22. 55; 9,12: PG 16, 3260, 3292, 3382). *Origen castrated himself in youthful enthusiasm (Eusebius, *HE* 6,8: PG 20, 537), something he later regretted and advised against (*Com. in Matth.* 15,1-5). At *Diocletian's court there were powerful Christian eunuchs who died as martyrs (Lactantius, *De mort.* 15,1; Eusebius, *HE* 8,1,4).

The first canon of the Council of *Nicaea—the argument must have been very important if the conciliar legislation took it up first—prohibits the ordination of voluntary eunuchs and requires the deposition of clerics who are mutilated voluntarily. The Greek text is not very clear, whereas the Syriac version specifies that this regards admission to the clergy (Martin, in Pitra, *Analecta sacra* 1888, vol. 4, 455). This severe legislation suggests that there were many cases, precisely at the time when monasticism was beginning to develop. Was the intent to oppose a rash asceticism? The legislation pertains only to clergy, not to laymen. There was probably an underlying biblical motivation, since eunuchs were excluded from the priesthood (Lev 22:20) and from the community (Dt 23:2), though they were rehabilitated at a later period (Is 56:3-5; Wisd 3:13-14). *Athanasius tells of the Phrygian *Leontius, a cleric at Antioch who lived with Eustolium, an *agapetae; not wanting to separate from her, he mutilated himself; his bishop *Eustathius deposed him, but the emperor *Constantius promoted him to the episcopate (*Apol. de fuga* 26: PG 25, 676f.; Theodoret, *HE* 2,23: PG 82, 1068; Socrates, *HE* 2,26: PG 67, 265f.). *Palladius mentions another eunuch bishop, of Ephesus, who lived a dissolute life (*Dial.* 15,55-100).

The **Apostolic Canons* establish that involuntary eunuchs can be admitted to the clergy (21; 22); clerics who have castrated themselves must be deposed (23), while laymen must refrain from communion for three years (can. 24). This legislation was applied consistently in the West, even if there may have been occasional exceptions, since the Council of *Arles of 452 still records the prohibition (can. 7). The *Byzantine church was much more flexible, perhaps because there were more eunuchs, including many clergy, monks and even patriarchs, such as Germanus I (715–730) and others after him. The Fathers were against physical mutilation, but insisted on the submission of the body to the will through spiritual castration (Clem. Al., *Pedag.* 3,4,3; Orig., *Com. in Matth.* 15,1-5; John Chrys., *Hom. in Matth.* 662,3; Aug., *De virgi.* 24: PL 409, 409; Basil of Ancyra, *De virg.* 60f.).

Frequently in Christian circles disdain for eunuchs underwent a transformation, inspired by the gospel saying reported by Matthew (19:12); the eunuch became the symbol of the pious, chaste and respectable person. Tertullian writes that eunuchs have merited grace and are invited to the kingdom of heaven (*De monog.* 7). There are various historically certain eunuch martyrs; the late *Passiones*, on the other hand, tend to consider a martyr they know little about to be a eunuch (Gaiffier and Boulhol - Cochelin), thus increasing their number. Being a eunuch becomes a title of honor; St. *Eleutherus was described as the ideal eunuch (AASS, Aug. I, 555E).

A.D. Nock, *Essays* 1, Cambridge, MA 1972, 7-15; DACL 2, 2369-2372; 5, 744; RAC 4, 620-650 (Effiminatus); 8, 984-1034 (Gal-

los); 20, 285ff. (Kastration); R. Guilland, *Les Eunuques dans l'Empire Byzantin: Étude de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines*, in *Études Byzantines*, Paris 1943, vol. I, 197-238; B. de Gaiffier, *Palatins et eunuques dans quelques documents hagiographiques*: AB 75 (1957) 17-46; R.P.C. Hanson, *A Note on Origen's Self-Mutilation*: VChr 20 (1966) 81-82; L. Barni, *Il recente dibattito sul "logion" degli eunuchi (Mt 19,10-12)*: SP 34 (1987) 129-151; P. Boulhol - I. Cochelin, *La réhabilitation de l'eunuque dans l'hagiographie antique (IVe-VIe siècles)*, in *Memoriam Sanctorum venerantes, Misc. Victor Saxer*, Vatican City 1992, 49-76; M. Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*, Chicago 2001; *Eunuchs in Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. S. Tougher, London 2002; K.M. Ringrose, *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender in Byzantium*, Chicago 2003.

A. Di Berardino

EUPHEMIA of Chalcedon (d. 303). Euphemia, "she of whom one can only speak well," as her name indicates, suffered martyrdom under *Domitian. The only certain date regarding the saint is that of her death (16 September 303), attested by the *Fasti Vindobonenses Priores* (MGH, *Auct. ant.* IX, 290). Her cult developed very quickly: *Egeria (ca. 23) and *Evagrius of Antioch (*HE* II, 3) attest the existence of a basilica dedicated to her at *Chalcedon, while *Asterius of Amasea documents the celebration of her feast as early as the beginning of the 5th c. and describes a cycle of frescoes depicting four scenes of her martyrdom: she was burned to death after having her teeth extracted (PG 40, 333-337). The old *passio* (BHG 619d), at least a century later than Asterius's account, differs from it on some points of the story: after having survived a long series of tortures unharmed (wheel torture, hot furnaces, stoning, voracious fish, beating with clubs, etc.), Euphemia was condemned *ad bestias* (*damnation ad bestias). There was great devotion to her in the 5th c., as proven by the fact that her basilica was chosen as the site of the Council of Chalcedon. Various sources in the succeeding centuries attest how Euphemia was considered a bulwark of orthodoxy: according to Constantine of Tio (BHG 621), Theodorus Vestone (BHG 624) and the so-called *Imperial Menologia* (BHG 624m), at the conclusion of the council orthodox and *monophysites placed their respective professions of faith in her sarcophagus: after a few days the orthodox text was found on the saint's breast, the other at her feet, as though she had rejected it. This wonder, known as the "miracle of the book," led to the celebration of the martyr as the guardian of orthodoxy on 11 July, included in many Eastern and Western calendars. From the 4th c. the spread of her relics was extraordinary, even in the West: the churches of *Milan, Nola, Rouen, *Ravenna, *Aquileia and Grado preserve her valuable remains, while her cult and the dedication of basilicas in her honor are attested from antiquity in the cities of N Italy, at Rome, Albano, Tivoli, Antioch, Lemno and Constantinople, to where it is said that her body was translated in the 7th c. because of the Persian attacks on Chalcedon. All Eastern and Western calendars and historical martyrologies agree on 16 September as the date of the celebration of her feast, except the *Gelasian *Sacramentary*, which unaccountably gives the date as 13 April, attested by a very small number of other sources.

AASS, Sept. V, 252-286 (Paris 1866); BHG 619-624n; BHL 2708-2716; BHO 286-287; BS 5, 154-162; Cath. 4, 690-691; DACL 5, 745-746; DHGE 15, 1409-1410; LTK³ 3, 991-992; MGH, *Auct. ant.* IX, 290; *Vies des SS.* 9, 338-341; A.M. Schneider, in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, Würzburg 1951, 291-302; F. Halkin, *Euphémie de Chalcédoine* (Subsidia Hagiographica 41), Brussels 1965.

V. Novembri

EUPHEMIUS of Constantinople (d. 515). Consecrated patriarch of *Constantinople in 489, he was a strenuous defender of the Council of *Chalcedon, seeking by all means to return to union with Rome. In 492 he called a synod of bishops to confirm the decrees of Chalcedon (Mansi, VII, 1180), but this merely increased the enmity of the emperor *Anastasius I, a *monophysite despite the orthodox confession of faith he had subscribed, at Euphemius's request, at the time of his election (Evagr., *HE* III, 32). Having escaped Anastasius's persecutions, Euphemius was condemned, deposed (against the popular will) and exiled to Euchaita in 495. Died at *Ancyra in 515.

DCB II, 292-294; DHGE 15, 1410-1411.

F. Cocchini

EUPHRATAS of Cologne (4th c.), bishop. Took part in the Council of *Serdica (343). He and *Vincent of Capua were entrusted by the council to take a synodal letter to *Constantinople with an account of the council and a plea for *Athanasius and the exiled orthodox bishops. At *Antioch, in an attempt to discredit the mission, Bishop Stephen, a follower of *Eusebius of Nicomedia, introduced a prostitute into Euphratas's room, but the trap was discovered and Stephen was deposed by Constantius (Athan., *Hist. Ar.* 20; Theodor., *HE* II, 7-8). The acts of a synod at *Cologne (346) attest the deposi-

tion of Euphratas for Photinianism, but their authenticity is disputed.

DHGE 15, 1412-1414.

E. Prinzivalli

EUPHRONIUS of Antioch (d. after 332). One of the bishops who occupied the see of *Antioch after the deposition of *Eustathius. The tradition contains some uncertainties over the order of succession to that see (see *Eulalius* (4), DCB 2, 279). Euphronius was elected by the Arians, after they had proposed *Eusebius of Caesarea for the see of Antioch, asking *Constantine's support; Eusebius refused, however, appealing to can. 15 of *Nicaea, which forbade the translation of bishops. Constantine then proposed Euphronius, a priest of *Caesarea in *Cappadocia, and George of Arethusa. Euphronius was elected, and governed for a year and a few months.

Eusebius, *Vita C.* III, 60, 61, 62; Socrates, *HE* I, 24; Sozomen, *HE* II, 19; Theodoret, *HE* I, 22; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antiochie depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945, 116.

A. Pollastri

EUPLUS of Catania (d. 304), commemorated 12 August in the *Mart. hier.*, the historical martyrologies and the Marble Calendar of Naples; 11 August in the Constantinople Synaxarion. His cult was widespread in antiquity, with churches in his honor at Messina, *Rome and *Naples. His feast also appeared in the old Roman *Capitularia evangeliorum*. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri edited the critical edition of the four recensions of his passion. The oldest is Greek and was compiled on the basis of two primitive court records, perhaps incompletely reproduced with a small number of redactional modifications. From them we learn that the martyr was condemned to death, and executed on 12 August 304.

DHGE 15, 1417; *Vies des SS.* 8, 207-209; Cath 4, 695; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *S. Euplo*: ST 49, 1-54; F. Corsaro, *Studi sui documenti agiografici intorno al martirio di S. Euplo*: Orpheus 4 (1957) 33-62; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 221-226; V. Saxer, *Atti dei martiri dei primi tre secoli*, Padova ²1989, 204-208; LTK³ 3, 993; G. Philippart, *L'hagiographie sicilienne dans le cadre de l'hagiographie de l'Occident*, in R. Barcellona - S. Pricoco (eds.), *La Sicilia nella tarda antichità. Religione e società*, Soveria Mannelli 1999, 179-182; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Agli inizi dell'agiografia occidentale*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, sous la direction de G. Philippart (CC. Hagiographies III), Turnhout 2001, 52-55.

V. Saxer

EUPREPIUS (4th c.). Bishop of Paltos (*Syria). *Severus of Antioch preserves a fragment of a memo addressed by Euprepius to *Paulinus of Antioch, against the *Messalians.

CPG II, 3440.

E. Prinzivalli

EURIC. King of the *Visigoths (466–484). Son of Theodoric I, he murdered his brother Theodoric II at *Toulouse and assumed power, sending notice to the emperor *Leo I and to the Suevi, *Vandal and *Ostrogoth kings. He defeated the Breton leader Riothamus, conquered Auvergne and in 476 *Arles and *Marseille, after concluding an accord with the emperor Julius Honorius through the mediation of *Epiphanius, bishop of Pavia. Having enlarged his kingdom in *Gaul and *Spain, Euric made war on the *Burgundians. An *Arian, he persecuted Romans of *Nicene faith, but also used the services of competent people such as Leo of *Narbonne, his adviser, speech editor and legal counselor (Sidonius, *Epist.* VIII,3,3). The beginning of the written redaction of the so-called *Codex* or *Edictum Eurici*, a compilation of Roman laws supplemented by Gothic traditions, goes back to Euric. He died at Arles in 484 and was succeeded by his son Alaric II.

Codex Eurici: CPL 1802; MGH *Legum sectio* I: *leg. nat. Germ.* I, 1902, 1-32 (K. Zeumer); A. d'Ors, *El Código de Eurico. Edición, Palingenesia, Indices: Estudios visigóticos*, II, Madrid - Rome 1960; PLRE II, 427-428; DCB II, 300, 302; DHGE XV, 1420-1421. E.A. Thompson, *The Visigoths from Fritigern to Euric*: Historia 12 (1963) 105-126; A. Gillett, *The Accession of Euric*: Francia 26/1 (1999) 1-40; I. Gualandri, *Figure di barbari in Sidonio Apollinare*, in *Il Tardoantico alle soglie del Duemila. Diritto religione società*, ed. G. Lanata, Pisa 2000, 105-129.

E. Malaspina

EUSEBIAN CANONS. A sort of concordance of the four gospels made by *Eusebius of Caesarea, according to the canons of Alexandrian pagan philology. A first concordance of the gospels was made by *Ammonius the Alexandrian (3rd c.), based on Matthew's gospel, to which were added the parallel passages from the other gospels. This method, however, allowed for the *lectio continua* of only Matthew's gospel. Eusebius's technique, which he explained in a letter to Carpianus, is more refined. First he divided the gospels into brief sections, to which he assigned numbers; he then prepared a table of ten canons, each containing a list of passages, in the following order: passages (1) common to the four gospels; (2) common to the synoptics; (3) common

to Mt, Lk and Jn; (4) common to Mt, Mk and Jn; (5) common to Mt and Lk; (6) common to Mt and Mk; (7) common to Mt and Jn; (8) common to Mk and Lk; (9) common to Lk and Jn; (10) unique to each gospel, in the order of Mt, Mk, Lk and Jn. In the text of the gospels, a number indicates the canon and another indicates the parallel passages. Eusebius's system is transmitted in Syriac and Latin manuscripts.

Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* [27]1993, 84-89; LTK[3] 3, 1005-1006; C. Nordenfalk, *Die spätantiken Kanontafeln*, Göteborg 1938; J. Leroy, *Nouveaux témoins des Canons d'Eusèbe illustrés selon la tradition syriaque*: CArch 9 (1957) 117-140; Id., *Recherches sur la tradition iconographique des Canons d'Eusèbe*: CArch 12 (1962) 173-204; H.H. Oliver, *The Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus*: NT 3 (1959) 138-145; DACL 2, 1950-1954.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

EUSEBIANS. By this term, which properly indicated the partisans of *Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Athanasius also indicated the followers of *Arius, with no distinction from the term Arian. But since, after Arius's death, Eusebius distanced himself from Arius's more radical statements in favor of a more traditional and moderately *subordinationist doctrinal formulation, around which much of the Eastern episcopate rallied against the upholders of the *Nicene Creed, modern scholars use the name Eusebian to indicate this alignment, in which genuine Arians coexisted alongside representatives of a much more moderate theology.

A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV[e] siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim.

M. Simonetti

EUSEBIUS, pope, saint (d. 308). Feast 17 August; initially 26 September. His episcopate was very brief—a few months during 308—when *Maxentius was emperor at *Rome; some think the year was 309 or 310. According to the *Liberian catalog*, composed ca. 336 and inserted in the *Chronography of 354 (ed. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, 76), he was pope from 18 April until 17 August of an unspecified year. He succeeded Pope *Marcellus, who died 16 January 308, after a vacancy of three months and eight days. Some of the sources disagree on some chronological data; some do not mention Pope Marcellus. The information in the **Liber pontificalis* is not very reliable; in it the author draws on a legendary text in circulation at the time (Duchesne LP, 1, XIX; LX; III, 56).

Our main reliable source remains an epigram, of only eight verses, of Pope *Damasus (ICUR IV, 9515; Diehl 963; Ferrua n. 18; 18[1]; 18[2]; Reekmans p. 699). From it one can partially reconstruct the chaotic and extremely tense situation at Rome at the time of his election and pontificate, since the Roman community was split into two *partes* (*Marcellus, pope), with the opposition led by one *Heraclius: *Heraclius vetuit lapsos peccata dolere* (Ferrua n. 18, v. 1). The emperor *Maxentius intervened, sending both Heraclius and Eusebius into exile. Heraclius led the *pars* that wanted to readmit the **lapsi* after the persecution, whereas Eusebius demanded, according to custom and as his predecessor Marcellus had required, an appropriate penance (*Eusebius miseros docuit sua crimina flere*). Eusebius died at Syracuse; his body was brought back to Rome and buried in S. Callisto. The decretal letters, clearly spurious, are attributed to Eusebius (PL 6, 1101-1109); they are nonetheless very interesting regarding ecclesiastical discipline and canon law.

AASS Sept. Anversa 7,265-271, II ed., 26-27; II,690-732; PL 6, 25-26 (a brief biography with sources); Jaffé 1885, nn. 163-170; G.B. De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, Rome 1864, vol. I, 201-210; L. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis* vol. 1, Paris 1886, CVII-CIX; 8-10; 74-75; 167; vol. 3 ed. C. Vogel, Paris 1957, 284; I. Carini, *Le catacombe di S. Giovanni in Siracusa e le memorie di papa Eusebio*, Rome 1890; BS 5,246-248; E. Caspar, *Die Geschichte des Papstums*, I, Tübingen 1930, 43; 99f.; 128f.; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 129-136 and 181; R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice tipografico della città di Roma*, II, Rome 1942; D. De Decker, *La politique religieuse de Maxence*: Byzantion 38 (1968) 472-562; G.L. Falchi, *La signficativa motivazione di un decreto di papa Eugenio, 311–312*, in T. Ladu, *La datazione della Sindone*. Atti del V Congresso Nazionale di Sindonogia, Quartuccio, Cagliari 1990, 439-442; L. Reekmans, *Les tombeaux des papes Gaius (283–296) et Eusèbe (309 ou 310) et des martyrs Caloncerus et Parthenius dans la catacombe de Callixte. Aperçu d'une recherche*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes. Miscellanea V. Saxer*, Vatican City 1992, 689-709; EPapi I, 313-316.

A. Di Berardino

EUSEBIUS GALLICANUS. Conventional name given to a collection, made in *Gaul, of 76 homilies containing material of disparate origin: *Cyprian, *Novatian, *Ambrose, *Augustine, *Faustus of Riez. The origin of the collection seems to go back to *Caesarius, but it was systematized and reworked by an unknown hand in the 7th c. As we have it, it reveals the presence of different hands, as well as literal borrowings from several sources. The basic order is that of the liturgical year: Christmas, *Epiphany, Lent, *Easter, *Ascension, *Pentecost, with intercalated homilies on martyrs and saints; other homilies on various subjects follow, including 10 addressed to monks, with a strong ascetical focus. For the most important feasts, several sermons of varied argument are grouped together. Properly

scriptural developments are rare: even when the homily begins from a passage of *Scripture, the main interest is not exegetical, but moral and practical, to edify and instruct at an elementary level. All in all, the collection seems to have been made with care and kept in mind the low religious and cultural level of the people of that time: the form is simple, too much repetition is avoided, and texts of a mainly moral and ascetical interest are chosen.

CPL 966; CCL 101, 101A, 101B; J.-P. Weiss, *La descente du Christ aux Enfers et le thème de la lumière dans les "Homélies pascales" de Pseudo-Eusèbe le Gallican*: BLE 101 (2000) 338-366.

M. Simonetti

EUSEBIUS of Alexandria (mid 3rd c.): deacon of *Dionysius of Alexandria, identified by *Eusebius of Caesarea, perhaps mistakenly, with *Eusebius of Laodicea.

DHGE 15, 1433-1434; 1465-1466; BS 3, 655-657.

S.J. Voicu

EUSEBIUS of Alexandria (pseudo) (late 5th c.–early 6th c.): under this name goes a collection of 21 or 22 Greek homilies that had considerable circulation in Latin and Eastern languages. The collection is now thought to be homogeneous, though the author's identity remains problematical: the *Life* of Eusebius (BHG 635) by John the *notarius* has him as the immediate successor of *Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), but this is clearly untenable, since no Eusebius is attested in the see of *Alexandria before the 11th c. Exegesis of the homilies shows specific affinities with the Syro-Palestinian area. Nor can it be ruled out that the homilies and the *Life* are by the same author. Some terminological traits and a 6th-c. papyrus allow us to fix the chronology of the corpus with sufficient precision. Various topics are addressed: festive homilies, antipagan polemics and ascetic *didascalie*, often in reply to questions put by a disciple named Alexander. The use of Eusebius's homilies in the Latin world produced the so-called *Eusebius Gallicanus.

CPG 5510-5533; BHG 635-635z; DTC 5, 1526-1527; DSp 4, 1686-1687; PG 86, 297-300 (*Life*); 313-536 (*homilies*); G. Lafontaine, *Les homélies d'Eusèbe d'Alexandrie*, Louvain 1966 (diss.); F. Nau, *Notes sur diverses homélies pseudépigraphiques et sur les œuvres attribuées à Eusèbe d'Alexandrie . . .* : ROC 13 (1908) 406-434; J. Leroy - Fr. Glorie, *"Eusèbe d'Alexandrie" source d'"Eusèbe de Gaule"*: SE 19 (1969–70) 33-70; G. Lafontaine, *Le sermon "sur le dimanche d'Eusèbe d'Alexandrie," version arménienne et version géorgienne*: Muséon 87 (1974) 23-44; Id., *La version arménienne du sermon d'Eusèbe d'Alexandrie "Sur la venue de Jean aux Enfers"*: Muséon 91 (1978) 87-104; Id., *La version arménienne du sermon d'Eusèbe d'Alexandrie "Sur la trahison de Judas"*: Muséon 91 (1978) 335-353; J.M. Sauget, *La version arabe de l'homélie "Sur la trahison de Judas" d'Eusèbe d'Alexandrie*: Muséon 92 (1979) 5-23; Id., *La version syriaque de l'homélie "Sur l'Ascension de Notre-Seigneur" d'Eusèbe d'Alexandrie*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 299-317; D. Sheerin, *St. John the Baptist in the Lower World*: VChr 30 (1976) 1-22; M. Gronewald, *Kein durchtriebener Räuber . . .* : ZPE 34 (1979) 22-25; M. van Esbroeck, *Version géorgienne de l'homélie eusébienne CPG 5528 sur l'Ascension*: OCP 51 (1985) 277-306; L.S.B. MacCoull, *Who Was Eusebius of Alexandria?*: Byzantinoslavica 60 (1999) 9-18.

S.J. Voicu

EUSEBIUS of Bologna (4th c.). Bishop of Bologna ca. 380, took part in the anti-*Arian Council of *Aquileia and supported *Ambrose in accusing *Palladius of Ratiaria and Secondianus of Singidunum of Arianism.

DHGE 15, 1435; BS 5, 250f.; BBKL XVI, 470; PCBE II/1, 698-700.

M. Simonetti

EUSEBIUS of Caesarea (Cappadocia) (d. 370). A wealthy, respected layman of *Caesarea, he held municipal office when, still unbaptized, he was unwillingly forced to become bishop (362) by the people. The election displeased *Julian the Apostate, who was even more annoyed when Eusebius called *Basil, whom he esteemed for his piety and doctrine, to the clergy. Envy soon poisoned his relations with Basil, however, such that the latter chose to leave the city. But in 365, when *Arianism, supported by *Valens, again became dangerous, Eusebius recalled Basil through the intervention and mediation of *Gregory of Nazianzus. Basil, humble and respectful as he was, became Eusebius's adviser and coadjutor and succeeded him at his death (370).

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* 18, 33f.; 43, 28-43; *Ep.* 16-19: DHGE 15, 1436f.; R. Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

A. De Nicola

EUSEBIUS of Caesarea (Palestine) (ca. 265–339)
I. Life - II. Historical works - III. Apologetic works - IV. Biblical and exegetical works - V. Dogmatic works.

I. Life. Born in Palestine, perhaps at *Caesarea, ca. 265; educated in that city, seat of the school and famous library founded by *Origen. His teacher was *Pamphilus, the most learned of Origen's disciples, for whom Eusebius's gratitude and veneration were so deep that he assumed the name Εὐσέβιος τοῦ

Παμφίλου. To him Eusebius owed his scientific training and his devotion to Origen; together they composed the *Defense of Origen* and restored and reordered the library of Caesarea. During *Diocletian's persecution, of which Pamphilus was a victim (6 February 310), Eusebius escaped death by fleeing to *Tyre and from there to the Egyptian desert of the Thebaïd; arrested and imprisoned, he was soon able to return to Palestine thanks to *Gallerius's Edict of Tolerance of 311. Raised to the see of Caesarea (ca. 313), he was involved from the start in the Arian controversy; he sided with *Arius, but did not share his more extreme doctrinal ideas. Averse to the ὁμοούσιος (= the Son of the same substance or essence as the Father), which smacked to him of *Sabellianism, in 325 he was excommunicated by the Synod of *Antioch for refusing to adhere to a formula condemning Arius's teaching. Despite this, he participated later in the same year in the Council of *Nicaea, where he had an opportunity to rehabilitate himself by subscribing Arius's condemnation and the formula of faith, though his decision was determined more by the intention of complying with *Constantine's expressed wish than by intimate conviction. But the position Eusebius took at Nicaea—certainly not consistent with his doctrinal orientation—was temporary: after the council, he continued to work on behalf of Arius and his party, and collaborated with the heresiarch's ardent supporter *Eusebius of Nicomedia in deposing bishops who defended the Nicene Creed: *Eustathius of Antioch, *Athanasius, *Marcellus of Ancyra. His friendship with and devotion to Constantine, architect of the peace between church and empire, were sincere and boundless: he celebrated the 20th and 30th anniversaries of his accession with official addresses. He died soon after the emperor, ca. 339–340.

Eusebius's literary work was vast and took in various fields: historiography, exegesis, philology, theology, apologetics, etc.: his doctrine is profound enough to be on a level with Origen's, though he is inferior to Origen as a thinker and writer. *Photius, while acknowledging his great erudition, called his style neither pleasing nor brilliant. Modern scholars have found imprecisions and defects of various kinds in his works, but an unprejudiced judgment cannot fail to recognize that without his research we would know little about the first centuries of Christianity. His historical writings are his best work and the source of his imperishable fame.

II. Historical works. The *Chronicon*, composed before 303, comprises two parts. The first, almost an introduction to the second, summarizes the history of the most famous peoples of antiquity: Chaldeans, Assyrians, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans; the second part provides synchronous tables arranged in parallel columns and accompanied by brief notes on the main facts of sacred and profane history, from the birth of Abraham (2016–2015 BC) to AD 303. The Greek original is lost, save a few fragments and extracts; an Armenian version (ca. 600) is preserved entire, as is a Latin version of part II by *Jerome, who enriched the text by continuing it up to 378 and adding notes on Roman history and literature. Both versions were made from a revision of the original text, which continued the narrative up to the 20th year of Constantine (325). The work's apologetic intention—to show that the Jewish religion, forerunner of Christianity, was older than other religions—was not new: other apologists, e.g., *Theophilus of Antioch, had done the same. Even the design was not new: something similar had already been successfully tried by *Julius Africanus, whom Eusebius probably used as a source. Yet Eusebius greatly excels his predecessors by his more marked critical and philological sensitivity, shown both by his choice of sources and by his rejection of Adam as the starting point of history—judging his date to be not historically ascertainable—and of millenarism as the final phase, still present in Julius Africanus.

By far his most important historical work is the *Ecclesiastical History* in 10 books, from the beginning of the church to Constantine's victory over Licinius (324) and the reunification of the empire under Constantine. It seems certain that the work had more than one redaction. Schwartz (*Codex Vaticanus gr.*) distinguishes four: the first, comprising books I-VIII and written in 312–313; the second, which adds book IX, in 315; the third, with book X, in 317; the fourth in ca. 323. Other hypotheses have been formulated that bring forward the publication of books I-VIII, and the latest studies place them in the years preceding *Diocletian's persecution (303). We have three versions: the first in Syriac, probably made in the 4th c., which served as the basis for an Armenian version; *Rufinus translated it into Latin and continued it up to 395. The apologetic intention is evident: the final victory of Christianity over the adverse powers of the state is tangible proof of its divine origin and legitimacy. But beyond this very specific intention, various defects have been pointed out in the *History*: it lacks a personal reworking of the sources and an organically combined historical framework; disproportion has been noted in the treatment of the material, superficiality in the solution to some questions, partiality in judgment. Nonetheless, with all these faults, the work has in-

disputable merits: it acquaints us with otherwise unknown texts and documents and provides valuable information on the history of the primitive church, on episcopal successions, martyrs, heretics, etc.

Often inserted in the surviving MSS of the *Ecclesiastical History*, between books VIII and IX or sometimes after book X, is an opusculum on the *Martyrs of Palestine*, which relates the glorious deeds of these martyrs, often from eyewitnesses or first-hand information. Thanks to this work we have more detailed information on the violence of the persecution in Palestine and the number of executions there than for any other province of the East. Two redactions exist: a short one, surviving in the original Greek, and a longer one, surviving in a Syriac version.

The *Life of Constantine*, in 4 books, has aroused and continues to arouse heated debate, resulting in diametrically opposed theories: from an authentically Eusebian work, it came to be considered apocryphal. Argument has fastened particularly on the 15 documents that the author incorporated, which have been considered either absolutely genuine or the manipulations of a forger. Today the theory of authenticity wins increasing consensus, without ruling out the *Life* having undergone various revisions. The work is a *panegyric and, as such, adheres to the canons of the genre, skillfully keeping quiet about its hero's negative and reprehensible aspects and exaggerating positive particulars: in Eusebius's eyes, Constantine is as the "friend of almighty God" and a "new Moses." Exaggeration, reticence and an encomiastic tone are the work's characteristic motifs. Based on it, ancients and moderns have constructed the image of a courtier bishop, always loyal to the emperor's orders, at times going so far as to doubt the sincerity of Eusebius's feelings for him. But to evaluate Eusebius's attitude fully, we must remember the age in which he lived, which, after having experienced the fury of the persecution, saw an unhoped-for peace and, for the first time, the new religion openly favored by the emperor. In this light we can understand how Constantine would have appeared to Eusebius as God's instrument in casting down his enemies, and why he considered him almost as Christ's earthly representative and saw in his empire the image of the heavenly kingdom.

Added to the *Life* in the MSS is an *Address of the Emperor Constantine to the Assembly of the Saints*, which sometimes appears as book V, but in fact is like an appendix to book IV: it is a defense of the Christian religion, centering on a demonstration of the divinity of Christ, to whom Constantine gives credit for his successes in war. Regarding its authenticity, here too scholarly opinion is divided. After the *Address*, the MSS of the *Life* transmit the *Praise of Constantine*, two works joined under the same title. Chs. 1-10 contain the official address pronounced by Eusebius in 335 for the 30th anniversary of Constantine's reign; chs. 11-18 are a work presented by Eusebius to the emperor for the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

III. Apologetic works. A certain apologetic tone is present in all of Eusebius's literary work, but some works belong more specifically to this genre. The earliest of these seems to be the *Elementary General Introduction* in 10 books, of which we possess books VI-IX, which go under the title of *Prophetic eclogues*, and fragments of books IV and X. The four surviving books contain a collection of an essential commentary on the OT Messianic prophecies. *Against Hierocles*, written ca. 303 (Harnack, Barnes) or ca. 312 (Schwartz, Forrat, Borzì), refutes the *Philalēthēs* (*Hierocles Sossianus) demonstrating the untenability of Philostratus's portrait of Apollonius of Tyana, the superiority of Christ over Apollonius, and a providential vision of the world, according to which human nature cannot raise itself to the divine nature. Lost except for some fragments is the treatise *Against Porphyry* in 25 books, repelling the attacks launched by that *Neoplatonist philosopher against Christianity. Equally lost is the *Refutation and Defense* in 2 books, of which two redactions were known in *Photius's time. Of the *Apology for Origen* in 6 books, in whose composition Eusebius collaborated with Pamphilus and added book VI after the latter's martyrdom, only book I remains in Rufinus's version.

Eusebius's most important apologetic works are undoubtedly the *Preparation for the Gospel* and the *Proof of the Gospel*, written one after the other, after 312 and probably before 320, and both dedicated to *Theodotus of Laodicea. The *Preparation*, in 15 books, all preserved in the original text, takes up the customary themes of Greek and Latin apologetic: falsity of polytheistic religions (books I-VI); superiority to pagan religion in both content and antiquity of Jewish monotheism, and even more so of Christian monotheism (books VII-XIII); contradiction of the Greek philosophers and principal errors of their doctrines (books XIV-XV). But no apologist before Eusebius had given so much space to the treatment, or supported the demonstrations by such a wealth of argument or with such profound erudition, the latter proven by the numerous extracts from earlier authors that Eusebius, following the *ratio* already used in the *History*, incorporated into the work. Of

the *Proof*s 20 books, I-X and part of XV are preserved. In the 10 surviving books, Eusebius replies to the Jews, who accused the Christians of having distorted and corrupted their religion. He demonstrates the temporary nature of the Mosaic law, which constituted almost a moment of transition between the age of the patriarchs and Christ's coming, and how the OT prophecies were fulfilled in Christ, in his incarnation, passion and *death. Programmatically, the *Preparation* and the *Proof* are addressed respectively to the pagans and the Jews, but they also take aim at *Porphyry's treatise *Against the Christians*, though, adopting a procedure different from that of Origen in *Contra Celsum*, Eusebius does not address Porphyry's objections point by point. It is not improbable that his systematic refutation of his opponent's thesis was contained in the lost *Against Porphyry*.

From the last years of Eusebius's life comes the *Theophany*, a popular work, rhetorically constructed, in 5 books: the original text survives in fragments and the whole in a Syriac version. It gives an account of the manifestations of the Logos in the creation and preservation of the universe, in human conscience and in the incarnation, reworking much material already used in the two great apologetic works.

IV. Biblical and exegetical works. Eusebius's name is also attached to his labors on the Bible, though more as a scholar and philologist than as an exegete proper. With Pamphilus he worked on the text of the two Testaments, and also wrote popular works. Of an extensive treatise on biblical geography and topography in four parts, we possess, in the Greek text and a Latin translation by Jerome, only part IV, the famous *Onomasticon* or book of places mentioned in *Scripture. From the preface we can gather the subjects of the lost parts: (1) a Greek interpretation of the ethnological terms in the Hebrew Scriptures; (2) a topography of Judea; (3) a plan of Jerusalem and the temple. The work was written certainly before 331 (probably between 326 and 330), since Bishop *Paulinus of Tyre, whose suggestions Eusebius took into account, died in that year. The *Evangelical Canons*, dedicated to Carpianus, offer a rapid synoptic vision of the four gospels by means of ten tables, each containing a list of parallel passages. Eusebius was inspired by *Ammonius of Alexandria, who had pioneered this system in his *Evangelical Concordance* or *Sections*. The *Gospel Questions and Solutions*, surviving in extensive Greek and Syriac fragments, comprise two parts: the first resolving some apparent contradictions in the gospel accounts of Christ's infancy; the second explaining divergences on his *resurrection. The *catenae give us an extensive fragment of the work *On Easter*, which dealt with the date of its celebration and the relation between the Christian *Easter and the Jewish Passover.

In exegesis, Eusebius is indebted to Origen—a dependence that is undeniable, though it has often been exaggerated to the point of making Eusebius a slipshod and inept pillager. This conviction has been favored by the fragmentary state of the exegetical texts of both of them, and by the uncertain authenticity of the passages reproduced in the current editions under both names. Eusebius's "theoria" can briefly be summarized as follows: he distinguishes the literal sense (πρὸς λέξιν, καθ' ἱστορίαν, κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον διάνοιαν) from the spiritual sense, which he ordinarily calls διάνοια or θεωρία: for him the former is something imperfect, while the latter is the only sense capable of perceiving the true spirit of the sacred text. While recognizing the importance and validity of literal exegesis, which is certainly more consonant with the historical narratives, he rarely claims that it exhausts the meaning of the text, while he frequently proposes the spiritual interpretation as the only one possible. His position is essentially halfway between the positions of Alexandria and Antioch, but leans more toward the former: he does not disregard the more obvious, literal, sense, but in practice prefers the spiritual sense, while avoiding exaggerations of it. Very little remains of his vast exegetical output.

Of the ponderous *Commentary on the Psalms*, only about a third has been saved entire (on Ps 51–95:3), fortunately handed down directly in the 10th-c. MS *Coislin* 44; the commentary on Ps 37 has also come down by direct tradition, confused with Basil's work (PG 30). This part is certainly genuine: it was first transcribed by Montfaucon, if not always faithfully, from the Coislinian codex, and is reproduced in PG 23. Of the rest of the work, relating to Ps 1–50 and 95:4–150, fragments of unequal length have been taken from catenae that generally inspire little confidence, such that the current editions (those of Montfaucon and Mai, PG 23 and 24, and that of Pitra, *Analecta Sacra* III) offer, alongside authentic material, much that is doubtfully Eusebian or downright spurious. The *Commentary on the Psalms* seems to have been one of Eusebius's last works, though at this point we cannot assign it an exact date. It was highly regarded in Christian antiquity for erudition and doctrine; *Hilary of Poitiers and *Eusebius of Vercelli made two Latin versions, now lost. To the catenae we also owe the recovery of numerous fragments, not all certainly authentic, of the

Commentary on Isaiah. Jerome mentions it, but contradicts himself on its division into books; in the preface to his own *Commentary on Isaiah* he gives it 15 books, in *De viris illustribus* he gives it 10. He judges the work severely, though he used it in his own commentary: despite promising to give equal space to both the literal and the spiritual sense, Eusebius made excessive use of allegory. Short passages from a commentary on Luke's gospel have also been extracted from the catenae, but they seem to come from other works by Eusebius rather than from a presumed exegetical work on that gospel.

V. Dogmatic works. In theology too Eusebius depends on Origen, but takes up only certain aspects of his doctrine while neglecting others, clearly more important, such as the doctrine of the **apokatastasis* and that of the Son's coeternity with and generation from the Father. In trinitarian matters, Eusebius's convictions are permeated with Arianism, though he did not accept the doctrine's more extreme theses and more than once refuted its proposition that the Son was created from nothing. But he also kept his distance from the doctrinal positions of Arius's opponents, denying the equality of the Father and the Son in dignity and honor and affirming a hierarchical (and Origenian) conception of the *Trinity, in which the Son is subordinate to the Father and the Holy Spirit is subordinate to the Son, whose creature he is. In the doctrinal field, Eusebius's activity was confined to refuting a work of unspecified title by Bishop *Marcellus of Ancyra, aimed against the leaders of the Arian party and particularly the sophist *Asterius. To this argument Eusebius dedicated his *Against Marcellus* in 2 books and *Ecclesiastical Theology* in 3 books, probably written respectively in 336 (the year of Marcellus's deposition by the Arian synod of Constantinople) and 337. Marcellus's work is lost but, thanks to Eusebius's minute refutation of it and esp. thanks to the numerous passages he cites, we can partly reconstruct its contents. Citing the Bible at every step, Eusebius rebuts Marcellus's imputations against Asterius and the charge of *Sabellianism, i.e., of following that form of *monarchianism that denied the personal subsistence of the Son, considering him a mode of manifestation of the Father.

Two of the three letters that survive entire out of Eusebius's vast correspondence are concerned with dogmatic questions: one, dedicatory, to *Flacillus of Antioch, in which Eusebius briefly relates his argument with Marcellus and presents his *Ecclesiastical Theology*, and the other, addressed to his diocese, on the conclusion of the Council of Nicaea. In the letter, preserved by Athanasius in his *Decrees of the Council of Nicaea*, Eusebius endeavors to justify his attitude to Nicaea, esp. his adherence to the ὁμοούσιος. The third complete letter, to Carpianus, deals with biblical matters and is like an introduction to the *Evangelical Canons*. Of other letters written before the Council of Nicaea we have only reports, as well as extracts of one sent to Constantine's sister *Constantia, whom Eusebius rebukes for asking him about an image of Christ, calling the custom of sculpting and painting the Deity idolatrous.

CPG 3465-3507; PG 19-24; GCS various volumes; SC 31, 41, 55 and 73 (*Storia ecclesiastica*); 206, 228, 262, 266, 215, 292 (*Preparazione evangelica*); G. Bardy, *La Littérature Patristique des "Quaestiones et Responsiones" sur l'écriture sainte*: RBi (1932) 210-236; 341-369; 515-537; F.J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili. A Study of the Man and His Writings*, Cambridge 1933; H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Amsterdam 1939; Id., *Kirche and Kaiser*, Zürich 1947; J. Moreau, *Zum Problem der V.C.*: Historia 4 (1955) 234-245; D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, London 1956; J. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, Dakar 1961; A. Weber, *Arché. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Rome 1964; R. Farina, *La teologia di Eusebio e la "svolta di Nicea"*: Salesianum 27 (1965) 666-671; Id., *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea*, Zürich 1966; C. Curti, *Due articoli eusebiani ("Commentarii in Psalmos")*, Noto 1971; G.C. Stead, *Eusebius and the Council of Nicaea*: JTS 24 (1973) 85-100; C. Curti, *Il linguaggio relativo al Padre e ai Figlio in alcuni passi dei "Commentarii in Psalmos" di Eusebio di Cesaria*: Augustinianum 13 (1973) 483-506; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; C. Andresen, *Siegreiche Kirche im Aufstieg des Christentums. Untersuchungen zu Eusebius von Caesarea and Dionysios von Alexandrien*: ANRW II, 23, 1 (1979), 387-459; C. Luibhéid, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*, Dublin 1978; E. des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur. Platonismus et Écriture Sainte* [Théol. Hist. 63], Paris 1982; M. Simonetti, *Esegesi e ideologia nel* Commento a Isaiah *di Eusebio*: RSLR 19 (1983) 3-44; C. Curti, *La cronologia dei* Commentarii in Psalmos *di Eusebio di Cesarea*: QC (= Quaderni Catanesi) 2 (1990) 53-65; F. Winkelmann, *Euseb von Kaisarea. Der Vater der Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin 1991; Var. aus., *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, ed. H.W. Attridge - G. Hata, Leiden 1992; S. Calderone, *Storia e teologia in Eusebio di Cesarea*, in E. dal Covolo - R. Uglione (eds.), *Cristianesimo e istituzioni politiche*, Rome 1997, 81-94; R. Farina, *La concezione della pace nel IV secolo. Costantino il Grande ed Eusebio di Cesarea*: *Cristianesimo e istituzioni politiche*, ibid., 95-105; R.W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart 1999; J. Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden* (PTS 49), Berlin - New York 1999; A. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea*, Göttingen 1999; V. Lombino, *La fede in Eusebio di Cesarea*, in *La fede nei Padri della Chiesa* (Dizionario di Spiritualità biblico-patristica 22), Rome 1999, 210-247; A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism* [Jewish and Christian Perspectives, Series 3], Leiden 2000; S. Borzì, *Sulla datazione del* Contra Hieroclem *di Eusebio di Cesarea. Una proposta*: Salesianum 65 (2003) 158-160; A. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, Leiden - Boston 2003; Eus., *Commentary on Isaiah*, Eng. tr. and intro. J. Armstong, ACT, Downers Grove, IL 2013.

C. Curti

EUSEBIUS of Cremona (d. after 418). Native of Cremona from a well-off family (ca. mid 4th c.); he held some public responsibilities, which he abandoned in a conversion to the monastic life under the influence of *Jerome, whom he met at *Rome. He became Jerome's disciple, following him to Palestine (392), where he was ordained priest before his return to Rome in 398. Jerome praised his character (*Ep.* 53,11) in a letter addressed to *Paulinus of Nola, whom Eusebius had known years earlier. Jerome dedicated to him his commentaries on Matthew and Jeremiah (414/416). In 398 Eusebius returned to Italy, going first to Rome, where he also linked up with *Pammachius. In the controversy that arose between *Rufinus and Jerome he openly sided with his master, both at Rome and in N Italy. He met Rufinus at *Milan, who accused him of having falsified his translation of *Origen's *De principiis*. He wrote to *Cyril of Alexandria to denounce the Pelagian *Valerian (*Coll. Avellana* 49: CSEL 35,1, p. 114). Eusebius died perhaps at Cremona.

CPL 1602. In the *Collectio Avellana* (CSEL 35, 1, 113-115, n. 49) is reproduced a letter to Cyril, attributable to Eusebius. Jerome, *Ep.* PL 22: 53, 10, 549; 57, 2, 569; 74, 1, 682; 143, 2, 1181; Rufinus, *Apol.*, PL 21: I, 19, 556-557; II, 44, 620; J. Labourt, *S. Jérôme, Lettres*, Paris 1953, III, Appendice C, 239-241; BS V 253-254; Patrologia III, 223-224; Y.-M. Duval, *Le Liber Hieronymi ad Gaudentium. Rufin d'Aquilée, Gaudence de Brescia et Eusèbe de Crémone*: RBen 97 (1987) 163-186; PCBE 2, 700-703.

L. Dattrino

EUSEBIUS of Dorylaeum (d. after 451). He was a highly-placed layman (rhetor and advocate) at *Constantinople when he first publicly opposed *Nestorius's statements against Mary's title of **theotokos* (430). In 448 we find him bishop of Dorylaeum (*Phrygia), still in the role of an accuser: this time of *Eutyches, who had given an overly monophysite emphasis to *Cyril's teaching. Eusebius contributed to the archimandrite's condemnation at the Council of Constantinople in November 448. The subsequent pro-Eutychian reaction was aimed particularly against him: he was not allowed to speak at the Council of *Ephesus of 449 and was deposed there. Imprisoned, he managed to escape and fled to *Rome. In 451 he appeared before the Council of Chalcedon, which reinstated him. We know nothing of him after this date.

CPG III, 5940-5944; ACO I, 1, etc. (see CPG); DTC 5, 1532-1537; BBKL I, 1564-1565.

M. Simonetti

EUSEBIUS of Emesa (ca. 300–before 359). Born at *Edessa ca. 300, of Syrian stock but Greek education; he was a pupil of *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Patrophilus of Scythopolis, before completing his education at *Antioch and *Alexandria. Connected with influential members of the *Eusebian party, he was offered the see of Alexandria after *Athanasius's expulsion, but turned it down. Elected bishop of *Emesa soon afterwards, he was accused of astrology and had to abandon the see. He returned through the intervention of *George of Laodicea, and died before 359. *Jerome, who considered him an *Arian (*Chron.* ad anno 347) but appreciated his learning (*Vir. ill.* 91), records many of his works, including one *Against Jews, Pagans and Novatians* and *Homilies on the Gospels*. We know of a *Commentary on Galatians* and a work against the *Marcionites and *Manicheans. Besides numerous exegetical fragments, we have a corpus of 29 homilies in Latin translation, almost all on doctrinal subjects: free will, the incorporeity of God and the soul, the trinitarian controversy. While fighting on the Eusebian and anti-Nicene front, his homilies avoid overly technical treatments; he often appeals to peace and concord, preaching adherence to the Scriptural data. He argues against the opposite extremes of *Sabellian and Marcellian *monarchianism and radical Arianism, following *Eusebius of Caesarea in a trinitarian presentation that stresses the Son's subsistence, his real generation from the Father and therefore his divinity, though subordinate to the supreme divinity of the Father, with whom his dynamic unity of willing and action is stressed. This conception, which attenuates the *subordinationism of Eusebius of Caesarea but preserves his main lines of thought, had great influence on *homoiousian theology. Eusebius's exegetical *Hom.* 11 opposes excessive *allegorism in interpreting *Scripture: without excluding it altogether, he criticizes those who use it to avoid the difficulties of the literal text. His surviving fragments display an exegesis with a strongly literalist tendency.

CPG II, 3525-3543; Quasten II 351-354; DHGE 15, 1462-1463; E.M. Buytaert, *L'héritage littéraire d'Eusèbe d'Emèse*, Louvain 1949; Id., *Eusèbe d'Emèse, Discours conservés en latin*, I-II, Louvain 1953-1957; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (ST 201), Vatican City 1959, 55-103; Simonetti 192-197; BBKL I, 1565; R. Barend, *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew and Syriac biblical texts in Eusebius of Emesa's "Commentary on Genesis,"* Louvain 1997.

M. Simonetti

EUSEBIUS of Heraclea (d. after 431). Bishop of Heraclea in *Bithynia, among the signers of *Nesto-

rius's sentence of deposition in the first session of the Council of *Ephesus (431); author of a homily, surviving only in an Ethiopic version, celebrating Nestorius's deposition in veiled but sufficiently understandable terms.

CPG 6143; A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica*, Leipzig 1866, 102-103 (new edition ed. E. Littmann, Berlin 1950; Darmstadt 1968). S. Grébaut, *Traduction de la version éthiopienne d'une homélie d'Eusèbe, évêque d'Héraclée*: ROC 16 (1911) 424-425; Bardenhewer IV, 200.

F. Scorza Barcellona

EUSEBIUS of Laodicea (d. 270). Deacon of the church of *Alexandria under St. *Dionysius (247–264), he distinguished himself during *Valerian's persecution (257). Since the bishop was forced to remain hidden, Eusebius helped imprisoned Christians and buried the dead, risking his life to do so (Dionysius's letter to Domitius and to Didymus: PG 10, 1293). In the course of the civil war that followed on Valerian's death (259), Emilian declared himself emperor at Alexandria, and for this was besieged in the Bruchium quarter by the general

*Theodotus (who sided with *Gallienus) was quickly reduced to hunger. Eusebius, acting with his friend Anatolius to spare the neighborhood the terrible consequences of the siege, helped many inhabitants, including many Christians, leave the area by night, providing them with shelter, food and medicine.

In 264 Eusebius took part in the Council of *Antioch (gathered against *Paul of Samosata), perhaps representing Bishop Dionysius. At the conclusion of the council the Syrian faithful acclaimed him bishop of Laodicea, a see vacant since Socrates's death. With all probability, in the immediately succeeding years he took part in two other councils against Paul of Samosata, who was finally deposed in 269. Eusebius died in 270.

Tillemont, IV, 304; AASS Iulii, I, Venice 1746, 642; E. Venably: DCB 2, 359; Eus. Caes., *Historia Eccl*., VII, 11, 32, ed. G. Bardy, SC 41, II, Paris 1955, 179-186, 222-231; P. Nautin, DHGE 15, 1465-1466 (expresses perplexity over Eusebius of Caesarea and hypothesizes that Eusebius of Laodicea and his successor Anatolius are confused with two unknown homonymous bishops of Laodicea); LTK[3] 3, 1010-1011 (W.A. Bienert).

M. Spinelli

EUSEBIUS of Milan (d. 462?). Bishop of *Milan, consecrated in 451, succeeding Lazarus, who died in March 451. Shortly after his election and before the Council of *Chalcedon (October 451), he celebrated, perhaps at Milan, a council of 20 bishops and two pontifical legates. During the council Leo's letter condemning *Eutyches and professing the two natures in Christ was read. Eusebius then wrote to Pope *Leo to tell him of the meeting's success and to confirm his christological orthodoxy and his adherence to the pope's letter. He rebuilt the church of S. Tecla (*Ecclesia maior*), destroyed by fire during *Attila's invasion (452). If *Gennadius's information is true (*Vir. ill.* 34; PL 58, 1078 B), Eusebius also wrote some pamphlets (*De crucis Domini mysterio, et apostolorum, praecipueque Petri constantia . . .*), now lost. It seems that it was this Eusebius who consecrated *Avitus, the emperor who was defeated in 457, as bishop of Piacenza. He died 8 August, perhaps in 462. Eusebius was celebrated for his charity by Ennodius of Pavia (*Carm.* 2,84).

CPL 1656; PL 54, 945-950, *Ep.* 97; DHGE 15, 1466; LTK 3, 1200; BS V 257-258; PCBE 2, 704f.

L. Dattrino

EUSEBIUS of Nicomedia (d. ca. 341). Disciple of *Lucian of Antioch. *Arius, in the letter he wrote to Eusebius from *Palestine shortly after his expulsion from *Alexandria (Theodor., *HE* 1, 4; Epiph., *Haer.* 69, 6), calls him a "co-Lucianist." Soon made bishop of Berytus (Beirut) in Phoenicia, shortly before 318 Eusebius obtained a transfer to the see of *Nicomedia, where the emperor *Licinius was residing. *Alexander of Alexandria, in the encyclical letter *Henos sōmatos*, reproved him thus: "Eusebius, the present bishop of Nicomedia, who, ever since he left Berytus and satisfied his greed with the church of Nicomedia without being punished for it, considers himself in charge of the church's affairs" (Socr., *HE* 1, 6). In fact as soon as Eusebius arrived at Nicomedia he used the protection invoked by Arius as a pretext to launch a campaign of letters against Alexander, to whom he also wrote personally. We have only his letter to *Paulinus of Tyre (H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, III, 1), written ca. 321. Licinius, after a second defeat by *Constantine (ca. summer 324), fled to Nicomedia and sent Eusebius to deal with the victor. Before the Council of *Nicaea, Eusebius held a synod in *Bithynia, favorable to Arius. At the start of the Council of Nicaea, in May 325, he read an exposition of his doctrine on the Son of God, which was judged blasphemous (Athan., *Decr.* 3; Ambr., *De fide*, 3, 15; Theodor., *HE* 1, 6, reporting the reaction of *Eustathius of Antioch).

It seems, however, that he did subscribe the profession of Nicene faith, at least avoiding a judgment against himself in that solemn setting. Ancient his-

torians disagree on his position, but do not mention him among those proscribed by Nicaea. His opposition to the Nicene *homoousios*, his collaboration with the Alexandrian Arians despite the sentence of exile passed against Arius and his followers, and finally his great familiarity with *Constantia, *Licinius's widow and *Constantine's half-sister, procured him exile some three months after the council. For the occasion, in November or December 325, Constantine sent a bitter letter to the faithful of Constantinople (Opitz, *Urk.* 27). Eusebius was replaced by *Amphion (Athan., *Apol.* 7 - Opitz 93, 18), but after three years, again thanks to Constantia, he was able to return after presenting Constantine with a written declaration of his sentiments, judged sufficiently orthodox to legitimate the act of clemency. Eusebius's rehabilitation was read during the Council of Nicaea's "second session": even today the attitude of that session remains controversial. From that moment, Eusebius used all his credit with the emperor to serve the Arian cause.

From 329, he obtained the deposition of *Eustathius of Antioch, the most virulent opponent of Arian doctrine at Nicaea (Theodor., *HE* 1, 20; Socr., *HE* 1, 24; Soz., *HE* 2, 19). Having gained Constantine's complete confidence, Eusebius worked for the removal of *Athanasius, *Alexander of Alexandria's young successor after 328. Arius, recalled from exile, had for his part presented a profession of faith that favored his rehabilitation. Eusebius then persuaded the emperor to ask for a similar profession from the new bishop of Alexandria. Athanasius's persistent refusal gave Eusebius the opportunity to unite a large number of Eastern bishops against Athanasius, with the emperor's consent. He also exploited to this end Athanasius's difficulties with the *Meletian schismatics. A first synod of the *Eusebians, at *Caesarea in Palestine (ca. 333), had little effect; but the Synod of *Tyre, in 335, apparently in conformity with the canonical statues of Nicaea and under the emperor's protection, decided upon Athanasius's deposition and exile to Trier. The synod celebrated in December 335, on the occasion of the dedication of the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre built by Constantine in *Jerusalem, crowned Eusebius's offensive by readmitting Arius and his followers to communion. *Marcellus of Ancyra, a Nicene from the start and friend of Athanasius, was in turn deposed by a Eusebian synod held at Constantinople. Despite the threat of another synod, Eusebius failed to cause the aged *Alexander of Constantinople to yield. He baptized the dying Constantine (d. 22 May 337) and may have been the trustee of his will (Philost., *HE* 2, 16).

Distantly related to the imperial family, according to *Ammianus Marcellinus (*Ann.* 22, 9, 4), between 339 and 342 he easily contributed to the religious education of *Julian, *Constantius II's nephew and eventual successor. In late 338 or early 339, at the start of Constantius II's reign in the Eastern part of the empire, Eusebius managed to take possession of the see of Constantinople, aided by the conflict between *Paul and *Macedonius, the two local candidates to succeed Alexander (Athan., *Ap. c. ar.* 6; Dagron, 427-428). In 337 or 338 he had already begun to protest, with *Theodore of Heraclea, the election of the "Nicene" Paul. In 339 he presided over a council at Antioch which once more deposed Athanasius, replacing him with *Gregory the Cappadocian. Gregory's installation, supported by the military, provoked serious riots, but Athanasius managed to escape and took refuge at Rome under the protection of Pope *Julius I, to whom Eusebius himself turned to obtain ratification of the decisions of Tyre (335) and acceptance of Gregory's election. The pope thought of calling a full council that would bring together and pacify all the litigants, but waited in vain for 18 months and had to be content with a small synod, which rehabilitated Athanasius and *Marcellus of Ancyra. Eusebius died before receiving the letter in which the pope, probably during winter 341/42, communicated his decisions to the Eastern bishops.

Before his death, Eusebius had had close contacts with the *Goths. In 341 at Constantinople he consecrated Bishop Ulfila, in order to entrust to him the semi-Roman Christian community, composed of deportees and prisoners outside the bounds of the empire. Eusebius's successor Eudoxius continued and strengthened these contacts, while also extending the influence of his see as far as Bithynia, which was removed from the civil diocese of Pontus.

H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* III, I, Berlin 1934, 15-17, *Urkunde* 8; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936; A. Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nikomedien. Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Lebens, under besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Führerschaft im arianischen Streit*, Hale 1903; M. Spanneut, DHGE 15, 1466-1471; P. Nautin, *Note critique sur la lettre d'Eusèbe de Nicomédie à Paulin de Tyr* (Théodoret, *HE* I, 6, 2): VChr 17 (1963) 24-27; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974; C. Luibheid, *The Arianism of Eusebius of Nicomedia*: ITQ 43 (1976) 3-23; BBKL 1, 1566-1568; LACL 248f.; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God, the Arian controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 27-32; O. Nordreval, *The Emperor Constantine and Arius: Unity in the Church and Unity in the Empire*: Studia Theologica. Scand. Journal of Theology 42 (1988) 113-150; G.C. Stead, *Athanasius' Earliest Written Work*: JTS 39 (1988) 76-91; S. Hagith, *Ulfila's Own Conversion*: HTR 89 (1996) 373-386; Storia del cristianesimo II, 639 (index).

Ch. Kannengiesser

EUSEBIUS of Samosata (ca. 310–379/380). In 361 he was already a bishop of great moral authority; a *homoian by origin, he contributed to *Meletius's election at *Antioch and then protected him against the Arianism of the emperor *Constantius. After *Julian's death (363) he took the initiative in approaching *Athanasius. A faithful ally to Meletius in exile and a spiritual father to *Basil during his priesthood, he promoted Basil's election at *Caesarea and was his best support in his policy of unity in Nicene orthodoxy; he was exiled to Thrace ca. 373. *Peter of Alexandria and *Damasus attacked him in a *Refutation* (CPG 2242; PG 28, 85-88), but numerous letters of Basil and *Gregory of Nazianzus (perhaps also the latter's *Or.* 33, 5), *Socrates, *Sozomen and *Theodoret testify in his favor. Returning to his see on *Valens's death, he played an important role in the restoration of Nicene faith and was assassinated by a fanatical Arian (BHG 2133-2135; BHO 294).

F. Halkin, *Une Vie grecque d'Eusèbe de Samosate*: AB (1967) 5-15; P. Devos, *Le dossier syriaque de S. Eusèbe de Samosate*: ibid. 195-240; Id., *La vie syriaque de S. Eusèbe de Samosate*: AB (1972) 360-362; R. Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

J. Gribomont

EUSEBIUS of Thessalonica (6th-7th c.). Bishop of *Thessalonica ca. 600. According to *Photius (*Bibl.*, 162), a certain Eusebius, "in rank a bishop, in faith orthodox," wrote a work in 10 books against an "*aphthartodocetist" monk named Andrew. *Gregory the Great wrote two letters to Eusebius, one disciplinary (in 593), the other concerning the disturbances arising from the monk Andrew's falsification of letters and texts; Eusebius is thought to have written his 10 books to refute an opusculum of Andrew's. These books are lost, but we know from *Photius, who gives a good verdict on them, that his style was clear.

G. Ladocsi

EUSEBIUS of Vercelli (d. 371). Born in *Sardinia, he went for a time to *Rome (Ambr., *Ep.* 63), where he was a companion of the future Pope *Liberius and probably knew *Athanasius (339–342). He remained there until his election as bishop of Vercelli (345). When *Constantius II tried to wring a condemnation of Athanasius out of the bishops convened at *Milan for the council (355), Eusebius opposed him. Exiled, he went to *Scythopolis (Palestine) (355–360), subject to the pro-Arian bishop *Patrophilus. Transferred to *Cappadocia, he was finally taken to the Thebaid. Freed by Constantius's death, he took part in the Council of *Alexandria (362). He then went to *Antioch to settle the schism among the orthodox, but failed due to the intransigence of *Lucifer of Cagliari. Back in Italy, he continued his anti-Arian activity with *Hilary of Poitiers (Y.-M. Duval, *Vrais et faux problèmes concernant le retour d'exil d'Hilaire* . . . : Athenaeum 48 [1970] 267-275). He died some time in 370–371. *Jerome cites his translation of *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Commentary on the Psalms* (*Vir. ill.* 96). Preserved at Vercelli is the *Codex Vercellensis* of the gospels, a pre-Hieronymian Latin translation perhaps by Eusebius. Recent critics reject the authenticity of the ps.-Athanasian *De Trinitate*. Of his letters, *Ad Constantium Augustum* (PL 12, 947; CCL 9, 103) and *Ad presbyteros et plebem Italiae* (PL 12, 947-954; CCL 9, 104-109) are considered authentic.

CPL 105ff.; PL 12, 959-968; 62, 237-286; CCL 9, 1-205, 451-419; F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia fino al 1300, Piemonte*, Turin 1899, 412-420, 514-554; F. Lanzoni, *Le origini delle diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 1031-1038; E. Crovella, *S. Eusebio di Vercelli*, Vercelli 1960; BS 5, 263-210; L. Dattrino, *La lettera di Eusebio al clero e al popolo della sua diocesi*: Lateranum n.s. 45 (1979) 60-82; M. Capellino, *Spiritualità di S. Eusebio*, Vercelli 1986; T. Bosco, *Eusebio di Vercelli nel suo tempo pagano e cristiano*, Leumann (Turin) 1995; M. Capellino (ed.), *S. Eusebio di Vercelli* (Documenti and osservazioni storico-teologiche), Vercelli 1996; P. Meloni, *Eusebio di Vercelli "natione Sardus" vescovo, confessore, monaco*: Sandalion 19 (1996) 133-159; M. Simonetti, *Scritti di e attribuiti a Eusebio di Vercelli*: Cassiodorus 3 (1997) 37-48; *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, ed. E. dal Covolo - R. Uglione - G.M. Vian, Rome 1997; M. Capellino (ed.), *Il Rito Eusebiano*, Vercelli 1999; M. Capellino (ed.), *Testo evangelico del codice "Eusebiano" e della Neovolgata*, Vercelli 2001; Y.-M. Duval, *La place et l'importance du Concile d'Alexandrie ou de 362 dans l'"Histoire de l'Église" de Rufin d'Aquilée*: REAug 47 (2001) 283-302; PCBE 2, 692-697.

L. Dattrino

EUSTATHIUS, monk (6th c.). A *Chalcedonian, he is the author of an *Epistola ad Timotheum scholasticum de duabus naturis* (CPG 6810; PG 861, 901-942). Otherwise unknown, Eustathius abundantly cites the works of *Severus of Antioch, accusing him of *Docetism and contradictions, and must have lived slightly later than he.

P. Allen, *Eustathii Monachi Epistula de Duabus Naturis*, in *Diversorum Postchalcedonensium Auctorum Collectanea* I, CCG 19, Turnhout - Louvain 1989, 391-474; Id., *Greek Citations from Severus of Antioch in Eustathius Monachus*: OLP 12 (1981) 261-264; Id.: CCG 19, 395-409; Patrologia V, 149-150.

J. Gribomont

EUSTATHIUS of Antioch (d. after 343). Native of Side (Pamphylia), he was first bishop of *Aleppo (Beroea), then of *Antioch (324). An intransigent opponent of the Arians, he played a prominent role in the Council of *Nicaea (325). He later disputed with *Eusebius of Caesarea. During the anti-Nicene reaction that began soon after the council, he was accused by a council that met at Antioch in 327 under Eusebius's presidency, condemned and deposed for reasons not doctrinal, but presumably disciplinary (immorality? abuse of power?). Exiled to Trajanopolis (*Thrace), we hear no more of him, such that he is thought to have died before *Constantine's death (337). Some fragments of a work of his against Photinus, however, which seem to be authentic, would prolong his activity up to ca. 343–345. In any event the account by *Socrates (*HE* IV, 14) and *Sozomen (*HE* VI, 13) of his anti-Arian activity at *Constantinople in 370 does not seem credible. Only a few fragments have reached us of the various anti-Arian treatises named by Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 85): *Against the Arians*, *On the Soul*, *On Pr.* 8,22, etc.

A *monarchian, but a moderate one, Eustathius distinguishes in the divine nature the *prosopa* of Father and Son, but considers the *prosopon* merely a mode of appearance or presentation of the divinity and strongly insists on the perfect unity of the Father and the Son, the Logos and wisdom of the Father. In this initial phase of the Arian controversy, he was the only one to argue against the Arians' *logos/sarx* Christology, derived from Alexandria, in favor of a *logos*/man conception that preserved the integrity of the humanity assumed by the divine Logos. The stress he puts on this concept shows Eustathius's Asiatic approach and, in fact, his christological terminology has significant points of contact with that of *Paul of Samosata, though without sharing the adoptionist excesses that led to Paul's condemnation. Eustathius's one surviving work is *On the Witch of Endor* (1 Sam 28), strongly polemical against *Origen, whom Eustathius accuses of having allegorized the whole of *Scripture. From all we know of him, he appears as one of the last representatives of the Asiatic tradition, some of whose tendencies would be continued by the school of Antioch: in this sense his opposition to Arianism is part of the wider context of the Asiatic reaction to the spread of Alexandrian culture in Syrian lands.

CPG II, 3350-3673; E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Eustathius v. Antiochien und Gregor v. Nyssa über die Hexe von Endor* (KT 83), Bonn - Berlin 1912, 16-62; M. Spanneut, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustache d'Antioche avec une édition nouvelle des fragments*, Lille 1948; Quasten II, 301-309; DHGE 16, 13-23; R.V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch*, Cambridge 1928; Simonetti 589; *Eustathius von Antiochien*: BBKL I (1975) 1570; *Eustathius, St. Bp. of Antioch*: ODC (1997) 576; T. Fuhrer, *Eustathius von Antiochien*: LACL (1998) 218-219. *Editions and translations*: M. van Esbroeck, *L'homélie d'Eustathe d'Antioche en géorgien (CPG 3394)*: OC 66 (1982) 189-214; J.H. Declerck, *Eustathii Antiocheni, Patris Nicaeni, opera quae supersunt omnia* (CCG 51), Louvain 2002. *Studies*: M. Spanneut, *La position théologique d'Eustathe d'Antioche*: JTS 5 (1954) 220-224; M. Simonetti (ed.), Origen, Eustathius, Gregory of Nyssa, *La maga di Endor*, Florence 1989; J.W. Trigg, *Eustathius of Antioch's Attack on Origen: What Is at Issue in an Ancient Controversy?*: Journal of Religion 75 (1995) 219-238.

M. Simonetti

EUSTATHIUS of Berytus (d. after 451). Sided with *Cyril and the *monophysites in the christological controversies of the first half of the 5th c. In 448 was part of a commission which, at *Tyre and Berytus (Beirut), judged *Ibas of Edessa, accused of being a partisan of *Nestorius. At the Council of *Ephesus of 449, he was against *Flavian of Constantinople and, in Cyril's name, upheld the monophysite doctrine. At the Council of *Chalcedon (451) he still upheld Cyrillian monophysitism, but tried to present it in a way not incompatible with the doctrine of the two natures, and retracted on the validity of Flavian's condemnation in 449.

DHGE 16, 23; CPG 6718; Patrologia V, 183-184.

M. Simonetti

EUSTATHIUS of Epiphania (early 5th c.).*Syrian author of a lost *Chronicle*. Mentioned and praised more than once by *Evagrius Scholasticus in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, he is also cited by the *Suidas, by *John Malalas and in the prologue of the Slav Malalas. According to *Evagrius (*HE* V, 24; PG 86, 2, 2841), Eustathius's work was divided into two parts: the first went up to the Trojan War, the second—Suidas speaks only of this part and mentions a division into nine books—included events up to the 12th year of the reign of *Anastasius (502–503) and was broken off, perhaps, in its treatment of the destruction of Amida by the Persians under King Cabades. According to Evagrius (*HE* 3, 37; PG 86, 2, 2676) and John Malalas (PG 97, 589 C), Eustathius died without finishing the work, although the fact that he stopped without describing the events of 502–503 should not necessarily lead us to conclude that he died in that year (Th. Mommsen, *Zosimus*: ByzZ 12 [1903] 533). Eustathius's sources were numerous, in Evagrius's judgment (*HE* V, 24): among them were Charax (for fabulous history), *Zosimus and *Priscus. An inventory of the library of Patmos,

compiled in 1201, mentions a MS that may have contained the *Chronicle*.

C. Müller, FHG IV, Paris 1851, 138-142; L. Dindorf, *Historici graeci minores* I, Leipzig 1870, 353-363; L. Jeep, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu den griechischen Kirchenhistorikern*: JKPh, 14 Suppl., Leipzig 1885, 53-178 (cf., esp., 159-161); C. Benjamin, *Eustathios*: PWK VI, 1 (1907) 1450-1451; W. Schmid, *Geschichte*: HAW 7, 2, 2, 1034; P. Maas, *Eine Handschrift der Weltgeschichte des Eustathios von Epiphaneia*: ByzZ 38 (1938) 350; M.E. Colonna, *Gli storici bizantini dal IV secolo al XV secolo* I, Naples 1956, 44-45; G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, Berlin [2]1958, I, 483; G. Garitte, *Eustathe d'Epiphanie*: DHGE 16, 24-26; ODB 2, 1065; P. Allen, *An Early Epitomator of Josephus, Eustathius of Epiphaneia*: ByzZ 81 (1988) 1-11; Evagrius Scholasticus, *Storia ecclesiastica*, Rome 1998.

A. Labate

EUSTATHIUS of Sebaste (ca. 300–ca. 380). Initiator of *ascetism in Asia Minor, probably born at *Caesarea in *Cappadocia. The main events of his life are known through the closing address of the Arian Council of *Constantinople (360) and from the letters of *Basil of Caesarea, in particular letters 244 and 263. The son of Bishop Eulalius (of Sebaste?), Eustathius was educated in *Egypt, where he knew *Arius when he was still at peace with the church. Back in Caesarea, he made a profession of orthodoxy and was ordained (to what is not known) before 325 by Bishop *Hermogenes. He took the lead in controversial groups and was therefore deposed more than once—the first time by his father, for wearing a habit inappropriate for a cleric (Socrates, *HE* 2,43). In the 340s he exercised a great social and reforming influence on *Macedonius, then a candidate for the see of Constantinople; he was also *Aetius's teacher (Basil, *Ep.* 130,1). *Eusebius of Nicomedia, having obtained the see of Constantinople for himself through the emperor's favor, had Eustathius's extreme asceticism denounced to the Armenian bishops at the Council of *Gangra, and then deposed him at the Council of *Antioch (340 and 341). He was made bishop of *Sebaste before 357 by the Arians: his name appears in a list of the Arian priests of Antioch (Athanasius: PG 25, 553B). This ecclesiastical promotion and the building of a model hospice drove an even more radical wing, led by a certain Aerius, to oppose Eustathius, but at the same time a group led by Basil adhered to him, accepting his ascetic tradition but bringing to it an evangelical and philosophical contribution. At the Council of Constantinople of 360 he was deposed, but in 362 returned to his see thanks to the emperor *Julian's amnesty. With Basil, Eustathius stood out for his opposition to *Eunomius, and then, at the time of the Council of *Lampsacus (364), for his adherence to the faith of Nicaea and communion with Rome.

Eustathius also inspired the ascetical and pastoral work of Basil, who founded a charitable institution at Caesarea, the Basileiad. Eustathius remained quite cold, however, toward *Meletius of Antioch, who had occupied the see of Sebaste after one of Eustathius's depositions; Meletius now intended to prove his orthodoxy (placed in doubt by Athanasius and the West) by openly proclaiming the worship of the Holy Spirit. Basil tried in vain to reach an agreement, meeting with him for two days in 362, but was himself accused of *Sabellianism by one of Eustathius's priests. After reaching an oral agreement, Eustathius retracted; Basil was attacked by Eustathius himself in 373, and two years later it was impossible to keep the breach hidden. It was then that Basil published his treatise *On the Holy Spirit*, whose essential nucleus was the reconstruction of his dialogue (373) with his old teacher. At the Council of Phargamos of June 373 Basil again sought to defend Eustathius (*Ep.* 128) and succeeded in having him sign a declaration of faith (*Ep.* 125; cf. 224 and 244), but Eustathius's accusations of heresy against Basil brought about a complete break in 376. After Basil's death, his friends and witnesses deliberately kept quiet about the influence of this teacher-become-enemy-and-heretic: it is precisely this influence, however, that explains the dogmatic and ascetic evolution of the great bishop of Caesarea. We possess no written works of Eustathius, but we see an echo of the groups directed by him in the Cappadocians and, probably, in ps.-Macarius. Eustathius preached an original asceticism, but was not as intransigent as some of his disciples; he attempted to link ascetical practice to the demands of the ecclesial community, including through charitable and assistance institutions such as the *ptōchotropheion* of Sebaste.

DHGE 16, 26-33; DSp 4, 1708-1712; J. Gribomont, *Eustathe le Philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée*: RHE (1959) 115-124; Id., *S. Basile et le monachisme enthousiaste*: Irénikon 53 (1980) 123-144; DHGE 16, 26-33 (Gribomont); DSp 4, 1708-1712 (Gribomont); TRE 10, 547-550; BBKL 1, 1750-1751; S. Mongelli, *Eustatio de Sebaste, Basilio e lo scisma macedoniano*: Nicolaus 3 (1975) 455-469; C. Frazee, *Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century. Eustathios of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea*: Catholic Historical Review 66 (1980) 16-33; J. de Churruca, *L'anathème du Concile de Gangres contre ceux qui sous prétexte de christianisme incitent les esclaves à quitter leurs maîtres*: RD 60 (1982) 261-278; N.G. Garsoïan, *Nerses le Grand, Basile de Césarée et Eustathe de Sébaste*: REArm 17 (1983) 145-169; M.G. Haykin, *And Who Is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus*: VChr 41 (1987) 377-385.

J. Gribomont

EUSTOCHIUM (before 370–before 418/419). Roman noblewoman, daughter of St. *Paula, sister of *Blesilla and Paulina, sister-in-law of *Pammachius. At a very young age she formed an attachment with St. *Jerome, followed him to *Bethlehem and lived as a nun and a scholar. Many of Jerome's letters (esp. *Ep.* 22, the famous treatise on virginity) and some of his commentaries and translations are dedicated to her, either alone or in association with her mother. She took part in the master's scientific and literary activity. *Palladius mentions her in his *Historia Lausiaca*, 41.

DHGE 16, 43-45; P. Antin, DSp IV, 1715-1718; BS 5, 302-304; G. Del Ton, *S. Paola*, Milan 1950, passim; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome*, London 1975, passim; St. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis*, Salzburg 1992; Ch. Krumeich, *Hieronymus und die christlichen feminae clarissimae*, Bonn 1993; L. Mirri, *La dolcezza nella lotta: donne e ascesi secondo Girolamo*, Bose 1996; P. Laurence, *Jérôme et le nouveau modèle féminin: la conversion à la "vie parfaite,"* Paris 1997; PCBE 2, 713-718.

J. Gribomont

EUSTORGIUS of Milan (4th c.). Bishop of *Milan from 343 to ca. 350. Two ancient documents mention him: a poem written in his praise, perhaps dating to the 6th or 7th c., and his legend, probably attributable to Landulf (11th c.). Eustorgius is mentioned by *Athanasius, who numbers him among the most illustrious Catholic bishops (*Ep. Aeg. Lyb.* 8), and by *Ambrose, who calls him a confessor (*C. Aux.* 18).

F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300 descritti per regioni. La Lombardia*, I, Milan - Florence 1913, 108-114, 718-720; P. Church, s.v. *Eustorgio*, in *Il grande libro dei Santi*, ed. C. Leonardi - A. Riccardi - G. Zarri, Cinisello Balsamo 1998, I 640-641; PCBE 2,719.

S. Zincone

EUSTRATIUS of Constantinople (6th c.). Author of an encomium of *Eutychius of Constantinople (d. 582; BHG 657), of a revision of the life of St. Golinduch (BHG 700-702b) and of a treatise *De statu animarum post mortem*, which is particularly interesting for the problem it treats and its abundance of patristic citations. Of his *De anima et angelis*, only fragments remain.

CPG 7520-7523; DSp 4, 1718-1719; P. Peeters, *Sainte Golindouch, martyre perse . . .* : AB 62 (1944) 74-125; H.-G. Beck, *Kirche and theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959, 410-411; PG 86, 2273-2390; A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta hierosolymitikēs stachyologias, ē, Syllogē anekdotōn kai spaniōn hellēnikōn syngraphōn peri tōn kata tēn Heōan orthodoxōn ekklēsiōn kai malista tēs tōn Palaistinōn*, 5. vols., Brussels 1963, 4, 149-174; 5, 392,396; L. Allacci, *De utriusque Ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua in dogmate de purgatorio consensione*, Rome 1655, 319-580 [partial ed.]; Av. Cameron, *Eustratius's Life of the Patriarch Eutychius and the Fifth Ecumenical Council*, in *Kathegetria: Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for Her 80th Birthday*, ed. J. Chrysostomides, Camberley, Eng. 1988, 225-247; C. Laga, *Eustratii presbyteri Vita Eutychii patriarchae Constantinopolitani* (CCG 25), Turnhout - Louvain 1992; N. Constas, *An Apology for the Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity: Eustratius Presbyter of Constantinople, On the State of Souls After Death* (*CPG 7522*): JECS 10 (2002) 267-285.

S.J. Voicu

EUTHALIUS (4th c.?). Editor of a considerable part of the NT books (Acts of the Apostles, Catholic epistles, the Pauline corpus), presenting the text στιχηδόν, in phrases aligned by *cola* and *commata* and with a division into chapters (κεφάλαια) and shorter subdivisions (μερικαὶ ὑποδιαιρέσεις) indicating the beginning and end of liturgical pericopes (ἀναγνώσεις). Nothing certain is known of Euthalius's life, times and work.

His *recensio* of the NT is attested in particular by codex H, unfortunately incomplete and dismembered, of the letters of St. Paul (*Coislinianus* 202, 6th c.). It was thought that the στιχηδόν *recensio* of the Acts of the Apostles was the work of *Pamphilus of Caesarea, *Eusebius's illustrious friend, among whose works it was published (PG 10, 1549-1557). But it is certain that Acts, the Catholic epistles and the Pauline corpus show the work of a single editor, who began with the *recensio* of the Pauline epistles and then took on Acts and the Catholic epistles (PG 85, 629). Euthalius was neither the first nor the last to undertake such a work. Eusebius had done something similar for the gospels, and Euthalius himself, in the preface to the Pauline corpus, claims to imitate a "very wise follower of Christ" who had done something similar before him (PG 85, 708 A). Euthalius's date is much discussed; 4th c. is most probable (J.-A. Robinson, *Euthaliana*, Cambridge 1895, 28ff.). It is difficult to accept the hypothesis that he lived in the 7th c., perhaps at *Antioch, where he made his edition of St. Paul's letters (H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, 1, Berlin 1902, 608f.) and, after being exiled to *Sardinia, was made bishop of Sulci. There is no way to ascertain whether, as the codices attest, Euthalius was a deacon (Egyptian or Syrian?) and then bishop of Sulci (or Sulca?, the codices call him ἐπίσκοπος Σούλκης), or whether these facts are just the hypotheses of late copyists.

CPG 3640-3642; PG 10, 1549-1558; PG 85, 628-789; A. Vardanian, *Euthalius' Werke. Untersuchungen und Texte* (Kritische Ausgabe der altarmenischen Schriftsteller und Übersetzungen 3,1), Vienna 1930; G. Bardy, DBS 2, 1215-1218; L.C. Willard, *A*

Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus (Dissert. Yale Univ., 1970), Ann Arbor, MI 1971; S.P. Brock, *The Syriac Euthalian Material and the Philoxenian Version of the NT*: ZNTW 70 (1978) 120-130; J.N. Birdsall, *The Euthalian Material and Its Georgian Versions*: OC 68 (1984) 170-195; M.G. Bianco, LTK³ 3, 1018-1019; BBKL 14, 962-964.

M.G. Bianco

EUTHALIUS of Sulci. Known only from his confession of trinitarian and christological faith, in which he accepts the five ecumenical councils and the synod of *Rome under *Martin I (648), and rejects the *homologia* composed by John, *exceptor* of the duchy, against Maximus of holy memory (i.e., *Maximus the Confessor [d. 662]), which he acknowledges to have imprudently subscribed in the past. It is chronologically impossible to identify this bishop of Sulci in *Sardinia with the deacon *Euthalius, editor of sacred texts (A. Boscolo, *La Sardegna bizantina e altogiudicale*, Sassari 1978, 52-53).

CPG 7742; H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1, 1, Göttingen ²1911, 637-682; EI 14, 651.

D. Stiernon

EUTHERIUS of Tyana (5th c.). Bishop of *Tyana, metropolitan of Cappadocia II, and throughout his life an ardent supporter of *Nestorius. Before the start of the Council of *Ephesus, *John of Antioch denounced *Cyril of Alexandria's anathemata to him as *Apollinarist (PG 83, 1311; see also ACO I,4, 147, lines 20-23), which led him to take a position he would never reconsider or alter. At Ephesus, he at first subscribed the report of Nestorius and those with him, who had written the emperor *Theodosius II regarding Cyril's (unilateral) open meeting, held without the consent of the imperial commissary (ACO I,1,5, 13-15; ACO I,4, 30-31); he then took part in the anticouncil held by John of Antioch, subscribing this also (ACO I,1,5, 124; ACO I,4, 38). This brought his condemnation by the Cyrillian meeting (ACO I,1,3, 13,25, 26, 31), a condemnation that was never revoked, despite the good offices of *Paul of Emesa (ACO I,1,4, 32; I,1,7, 164). When the two opposing fronts did everything they could to bring about a rapprochement, he declared himself permanently opposed to any attempt at agreement that did not involve the prior condemnation of Cyril's anathemata and the rehabilitation of Nestorius. His position hardened to the point of provoking his separation, once peace had been reached, from John of Antioch and the other Easterners who had agreed, regarding them all as traitors. He was finally deposed by *Maximian, Nestorius's successor at Constantinople, and by the *endemousa* Synod (ACO I,1,7, 153,29, ibid.; 154,16). Exiled from *Scythopolis, he fled to *Tyre, where he died at an unspecified date.

Just as with all our information about him, his surviving writings are also inextricably tied up with the *christological question that troubled the East in the first half of the 5th c. The *Synodicon* of the deacon *Rusticus preserves five of his letters, addressed to John of Antioch, Elladius of Tarsus, *Alexander of Hieropolis, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Pope *Sixtus III, all regarding the peace to be concluded or that was concluded with Cyril, written probably between 432 and 433 (PG 84, 681-685; 726-731; 815-826; ACO, I,4, 109-112; 144-148). Also attributable to him is another work that refutes some Cyrillian expressions, written apparently after the Council of Ephesus and under the impression of those events—the *Confutationes quarundam propositionum*, preserved under *Athanasius's name and under that of Theodoret of Cyrrhus (PG 28, 1337-1394). In his monograph on the bishop of Tyana, Ficker published another fragment of particular interest in which, before Theodoret, eucharistic *dyophysitism is distinctly expressed (P. Batiffol).

CPG III (1979) 197-198, nn. 6147-6153; PG 28, 1337-1395; PG 84, 727-731; ACO I, 4, 109-111; 145-148; 213-221; ACO IV,3,1, 230; J.L. Schultze - J.A. Nosselt, *Beati Theodoreti episcopi Cyri opera omnia*, Leipzig 1774, 1113-1174; G. Ficker, *Eutherius von Tyana. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ephesenischen Konzils*, Leipzig 1908; P. Batiffol, *Nouvelles études documentaires sur la sainte eucharistie*: Revue du clergé français (1 déc. 1908) 531-534; G. Bareille, *Eucharistie d'après les Pères*, DTC V (1924), cols.1165-1166; J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni Liber contra impium grammaticum*, CSCO 94, Louvain ²1952, 207; M. Tetz, *Eine Antilogie des Eutherios von Tyana*, Berlin 1964; A. Van Roey, *Euthérius de Tyane*, DHGE 16 (1967) 50-51; Hfl-Lecl II, 369-461; Fliche-Martin IV, 24-248; LTK² 3, 1208-1209; Ch. Fraisse-Coué, *Il dibattito teologico nell'età di Teodosio II: Nestorio*, in Storia del cristianesimo 2, 500-518; Id., *Da Efeso a Calcedonia: "La Pace Illusoria" (433-451)*, in Storia del cristianesimo 3, 40-43.

E. Zocca

EUTHYMIAN HISTORY, Greek legend (6th c.). An etiological legend that takes its name from the unknown monk Euthymius, inserted in *John of Damascus's *2nd Homily on the Assumption*. The empress *Pulcheria asks *Juvenal, patriarch of *Jerusalem, for the body of Mary for the new church of Blacherne in Constantinople. Juvenal, based on *Dionysius the Areopagite's testimony, says that Mary's body is not in her tomb on Gethsemane, and sends Mary's garments to the capital, which are then deposited in the church of Blacherne. The text is the earliest testimony regarding Mary's tomb on Gethsemane.

CANT 104; BHG 1056e; SC 80, 1961, 168-175; B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 5, Berlin 1988, 504f. (Gr. text); M. van Esbroeck: Parole de l'Orient 6-7 (1995) 479-491 (Arabic text); the Georgian text is not yet published.; tr.: It. Erbetta 1/2, 526-528; Pol., Starowieyski 832-834; S. Mimouni, *Dormition et l'Assomption de la Vierge*, Paris 1995, 552-584.

M. Starowieyski

EUTHYMIUS the Great, saint (377–473). His mother, a widow and deaconess, offered him at the age of three to Bishop Otreius of Melitene, who immediately baptized him and made him a lector. Priest and prior of some monks at age 19, in 405 he went to the laura of Pharan near *Jerusalem, founded by St. *Charito; at first he spent each Lent in solitude, then he retired to a cave where, ca. 428, his disciples built the laura that bears his name. His prestige spread throughout Palestinian monasticism; he converted some Arab nomads and led the empress *Eudoxia back to Chalcedonian orthodoxy. *Cyril of Scythopolis wrote his biography (ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49, 2, Leipzig 1962; tr. A.J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient*, III, 1, Paris 1962). Feast 20 January.

DSp 4, 1720-1722; D.J. Chitty, *The Desert a City*, Oxford 1966; L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980; B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'oeuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris 1983; BBKL 14, 964-966; Patrologia V, 291-293; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, Rome 2001, passim.

J. Gribomont

EUTROPIUS of Orange (d. ca. 494). Born at *Marseille, he was bishop of Orange from ca. 463 until his death (after 475, perhaps in 494). According to the biography written by *Verus, a 6th-c. successor of his, Eutropius was converted by his wife and, left a widower, was taken on as a deacon by *Eustathius, bishop of Marseille. After becoming bishop of Orange he continued his life of prayer and mortification, worked various miracles and took part in various regional synods (*Arles in 463 and 475). He corresponded with Pope *Hilarus (Jaffé I, 557) and *Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* VI,6), and was a friend of *Faustus of Riez. He was buried in the church of St. Julian; part of his epitaph was found in 1801. Feast 27 May.

BHL 2782; AASS (1688) Mai, VI, 693-694; Duchesne, *Fastes* I (1907) 265; *Vies des SS.* 5 (1947) 529-531; Cath 4 (1956) 733; E. Griffe, *Gaule*, II (1966) 205-207; BS 5 (1964) 345; DHGE 16 (1967) 82-83; DBF 13 (1975) 281-282; LTK³ 3, 1023.

M. Maritano

EUTROPIUS of Saintes (3rd c.?). Honored as the first bishop of Saintes (perhaps 3rd c.) and as a martyr (from the mark of an axe blow on his skull). *Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* I,13)—who does not call him a martyr—reports that the basilica built in his honor over his tomb was restored by Bishop *Leontius of *Bordeaux. *Gregory of *Tours (*In gloria mart.* 56) says that he was sent to *Gaul by Pope Clement, and after spreading Christianity with his preaching, was beheaded; these statements have no historical foundation, however. Feast 30 April.

BHL 2784-2788; AASS (1675) Aprilis, III, 733-736; L. Audiat, *S. Eutrope, premier évêque de Saintes dans l'histoire, la légende et l'archéologie*, Paris 1887; *Vies des SS.* 4 (1946) 745-747; Cath 4 (1956) 733-734; BS 5 (1964) 345-347; DHGE 16 (1967) 83-84; LTK³ 3, 1023.

M. Maritano

EUTROPIUS of Valencia (6th c.). In the late 6th c. this Spanish bishop wrote a short treatise in epistolary style, *De octo vitiis*, in which he presents the (by then standard) eight capital sins as connected with one another as cause and effect, such that the struggle against one is effective against all the others as well. In another letter, *De districtione monachorum et ruina monasteriorum*, he insists on the need for strong discipline in monasteries and shows the defects and weaknesses that were already threatening the purity of monastic life.

CPL 1095-1096; Díaz 38; PL 80, 9-20; DHGE 16, 84-86; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Anedocta Wisigothica*, I, Salamanca 1958, 20-35; A. Robles Sierra, *Eutropio de Valencia, su figura y su doctrina*: Teología espiritual 21 (1977) 302-322; Patrologia IV, 69-70.

M. Simonetti

EUTROPIUS the Eunuch (d. after 399). Of Persian origin, after being freed from slavery he became part of the imperial palace at *Constantinople, where in 393 he attained a position of the highest rank. In 395, when *Theodosius died leaving the Eastern Empire to his son *Arcadius, who was still a child, he assumed command with *Rufinus. Anxious to increase his power, Eutropius convinced the young emperor Arcadius to marry *Eudoxia instead of Rufinus's daughter, and after Rufinus had been killed (thanks partly to Eutropius's collaboration with *Stilicho), wanting to pursue Theodosius's earlier probarbarian policy, between 395 and 396 he conceded to *Alaric the title of *magister militum per Illyricum*, making him an ally. But in 399, following Gothic revolt, he fell into disgrace and was soon imprisoned and condemned to death, as two dramatic

speeches of *John Chrysostom testify (*Homiliae in Eutropium*, PG 52, 391-414).

CPG 4392, 4528; Claudian, *In Eutropium*, ed. Fargues, Paris 1933; PLRE II, 440-442.

P. Marone

EUTROPIUS the Presbyter (4th-5th c.). Late 4th- or early 5th-c. writer, probably from the NE Iberian peninsula, although often thought to be from Aquitaine. According to *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 49), Eutropius wrote two epistolary treatises to console two sisters whose father had deprived them of their inheritance for having professed religious life. Scholars have identified the letters with those *De contemnenda haereditate* and *De vera circumcisione*, which have reached us under various names, including ps.-Jerome. He also wrote a letter "On the perfect man," and the important work *De similitudine carnis peccati*, initially attributed to *Pacian of Barcelona. His good literary and theological training is clear in these works, whose authorship has recently been definitively established.

CPL 565-567; PL 30, 45-50, 188, 210; 57, 933-958; PLS I, 529-556; J. Madoz, *Herencia literaria del presbítero Eutropio*: EstEcl 16 (1942) 27-54; F. Cavallera, *L'héritage littéraire et spirituel du prêtre Eutrope*: RAM 24 (1948) 60-71; P. Courcelle, *Un nouveau traité d'Eutrope, prêtre aquitain vers l'an 400*: REA 76 (1954) 377-390; H.S. Eymann, *Eutropius Presbyter und sein Traktat "De similitudine carnis peccati,"* Frankfurt 1985; U. Dominguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 72-74.

M. Díaz y Díaz

EUTYCHES (ca. 378–454). Having become a monk near *Constantinople very early—in 448 he claimed to have led a monastic life for 70 years (ACO II, 2, 1, 34; II, 4, 144)—he was ordained priest and elected archimandrite of a large monastery. He was a friend of *Cyril of Alexandria and those connected with him (Mansi 6, 628.631.713), of his successor Dioscorus (from 444), and especially of *Theodosius II's powerful eunuch Chrysaphius, for which Eutyches was highly esteemed and influential in both ecclesiastical and political circles. Intending to combat the *Nestorians, he likened them to the upholders of the two natures in Christ: the sources consider Eutyches ill-educated and imprudent. On 8 November 448 *Eusebius of Dorylaeum accused him before *Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople. Invited to defend himself, Eutyches appeared only at the third request and was condemned in the permanent synod on 22 November. He then wrote to Pope *Leo and other important bishops, and had the support of Chrysaphius and indirectly of Theodosius II, with the result that he was restored during the so-called *latrocinium* of *Ephesus of 449. With the death of his two political protectors (450) Eutyches also lost ground, and his doctrine was condemned by the Council of *Chalcedon of 451. He was exiled, and was still alive in 454 (Leo Gt., *Ep.* 134: PL 54, 1095). For doctrinal events and his theology, *see* *monophysitism.

CPG 6937-6940. DTC 5,1582-1609; DHGE 16, 86-91; TRE 10, 558-565. E. Schwarz, *Der Prozess des Eutyches*, Munich 1929; R. Draguet, *La Christologie d'Euthyches d'après les actes du synode de Flavien*: Byzantium 6 (1931) 441-457; B. Lemmi, *Leone ed Eutiche*: Angelicum 29 (1952) 3-42; CGG I, 229-242; II, 197-222, 224-228; G. Grillmeier, *Gesù Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, Brescia 1982, I, 929-944; II,1, 1996, passim; G. May, *Das Lehrnerfahren gegen Eutyches in November des Jahre 448*: AHC 21 (1989) 1-61.

A. Di Berardino

EUTYCHIANUS, pope (275–283). Succeeded *Felix I. The LP calls him a native of Luni, an Etruscan city near the mouth of the Magra river from which the surrounding region of Lunigiana gets its name. The same source attributes to Eutychianus the ordination of 40 priests and five deacons and the consecration of nine bishops; he also buried 342 martyrs and instituted a special blessing of broad beans and of grapes (LP I, 159-160). He does not appear to have been martyred. According to the *Liberian catalog* he died 7 December, while in the **Depositio episcoporum* his *dies natalis* (*birthday) is 8 December. He was buried in the Crypt of the Popes of the cemetery of S. Callisto; his epitaph was found in the 19th century by G.B. De Rossi.

Eus., *HE* VII, 32, 1; LP I, 6-7, 10, 70-71 and 159-160; III, 75; F. Podestà, *S. Eutichiano papa*, Florence 1916; G. Sforza, *La patria di papa Eutichiano*: Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 55 (1920) 539-548; BS V, 317-319 (A. Amore); C. Bonfigli, *Il primo papa ligure*: Bollettino Ecclesiastico di La Spezia 45 (1975) 212-219; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* IV, *Epigrafi sacre pagane e cristiane*, Rome 1978, 547-549; LTK[3] 3, 1024 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 298-300 (G.M. Vian).

M. Spinelli

EUTYCHIUS of Constantinople (ca. 512–582), patriarch, saint. Born at Theium (*Phrygia) ca. 512, Eutychius was *hieromonachos* and archimandrite (*catholicos*) at *Amasea, whose bishop sent him to *Constantinople in 552 as his representative at the proposed council. There *Justinian designated him to succeed the patriarch *Menas (d. 21 August 552); as patriarch, he presided over the sessions and sub-

scribed the acts of the fifth ecumenical council (Constantinople II, May-June 553), Pope *Vigilius being present on the Bosporus. Deposed by *Justinian (late January 565), whose *aphthartodocetism he had criticized, he retired in exile to his old monastery at Amasea. After the death of Patriarch *John III he was restored by *Justin II (3 October 577). He died 5-6 April, after repudiating his earlier opinion on the incorruptibility of risen bodies, which had opposed him to the deacon Gregory (future Pope *Gregory I), then papal *apocrisiarius at Constantinople. We have the text of his *libellus* to Pope Vigilius (6 January 553) on communion of faith with the apostolic see and on the need to resolve in council the issue of the *Three Chapters; also a homily on the *Eucharist and an Armenian version of a treatise *De differentia naturae et hypostaseos*. His is the earliest preserved seal of a patriarch of Constantinople. His *Life* was written by a disciple, the presbyter *Eustratius, between 582 and 602. The Byzantine Synaxaria commemorate him 6 or 20 April.

PG 86, 2392-2405, 2273-2390; ACO IV, 1 passim; Grumel, *Regestes* I, 244-249, 260-263; P. Anannian, *L'opuscolo di Eutichio, patriarca di Costantinopoli sulla "Distinzione della natura e della persona"*: Armeniaca. Mélanges d'études arméniennes, Venice 1969, 316-382 (with It. tr.); V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 1, Paris 1963, 3n, n. 1; BHG 657; CPG 6937-6940; BS 5, 323-324; DHGE 16, 94-95; CE 5, 643; L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini (VI-VII sec.)*, Rome - Louvain 1972, 148-160; RGG4 2, 1687; *Patrologia* V, 47, 84-85, 88-90, 95, 97, 672-673; P. Van den Ven, *L'accession de Jean le Scholastique*: Byzantion 35 (1965) 320-352; S.S. Arevshatyan, *Le "Livre des êtres" et la question de l'appartenence de deux lettres dogmatiques anciennes*: REArm 18 (1984) 23-32; Grillmeier 2/2, 10-11, 440, 442, 469-472, 474, 490-492; C. Laga (ed.), *Eustratii presbyteri vita Eutychii patriarchae constantinopolitani* (CCSG 25), Turnhout - Louvain 1992.

D. Stiernon

EUTYCHIUS of Eleutheropolis (d. after 365). This bishop of *Palestine during the 360s was the main supporter of *Acacius in the controversy against *Cyril of Jerusalem. There had long been a rivalry of influence between *Jerusalem and *Caesarea, cloaked at this period in a doctrinal difference: against Cyril, a supporter of the **homoiousios*, Acacius rejected any use of the word **ousia* and recommended calling the Son *homoios* with the Father. At the Council of *Seleucia of 359, Eutychius subscribed the profession of faith proposed by Acacius and was condemned with him by the *homoiousians, who had a majority at the council. But the next year Acacius and Eutychius went to the emperor *Constantius at Constantinople where, on the occasion of the dedication of the church of Hagia Sophia, a new council was held which condemned the homoiousians. After Constantius's death, when the Nicene **homoousios* triumphed under his successor *Jovian, Acacius and Eutychius accepted it at the Council of Antioch of 363, though specifying that they meant it in the sense that the Son was *homoios* with the Father in everything (Socr., *HE* III, 25).

DHGE 16, 95-97; H. Horst, *Eutychios und die Kirchengeschichte – Das Erste Konzil von Nikaia (325)*: OC 74 (1901) 52-167.

P. Nautin

EUZOIUS of Antioch (d. ca. 375). Deacon of *Alexandria, very attached to *Arius though quite a bit younger than he was, Euzoius was with him throughout the entire first phase of the controversy. Exiled with Arius following the Council of *Nicaea, he was later recalled, and with Arius wrote a profession of faith to *Constantine, following which he was rehabilitated at the Council of *Jerusalem (335). He long outlived his teacher: in 359 he took part in the Council of *Seleucia, siding with the pro-Arian group. In 360 he was elected bishop of *Antioch to replace the deposed *Meletius, and from then on was the leader, with *Eudoxius, of the moderate Arians. In 361 he baptized the emperor *Constantius at the point of death. In 362 he held a small council of pro-Arian bishops at Antioch to reinstate *Aetius, but he and Eudoxius finally broke with the radical Arians. He remained bishop of the Arian community of Antioch until his death (ca. 375).

DHGE 16, 98-101; Simonetti 589; G. Fernández, *Algunos problemas en torno al obisbo Euzoio de Antioquía*: Espacio, Tiemp y Forma 13 (2002) 321-323.

M. Simonetti

EUZOIUS of Caesarea (d. 381). A moderate Arian, elected bishop of *Caesarea in Palestine in place of *Gelasius, who ca. 370 was exiled as a result of *Valens's pro-Arian policy. After *Acacius, Euzoius worked to reorganize and restore *Origen's old library. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 113) mentions various works of Euzoius (all lost), but gives no titles.

Quasten II, 351; DCB 2, 418; Fedalto 2, 1015; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim.

M. Simonetti

EVAGRIUS, monk (4th-5th c.). Native of S *Gaul, known through *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 51 [50]). Ceillier proposes to identify him with the disciple of *Martin of Tours who, according to *Sulpicius Severus, retired to solitude (*Dial.* 3, 1; 4, 2, 8). The identification is likely, though disputed by Harnack. He wrote ca. 430 the *Altercatio legis inter Simonem Iudaeum et Theophilum Christianum*, a kind of dialogue intended to harmonize OT monotheism with trinitarian and christological doctrine. *Tertullian uses it (*Adversus Iudaeos*), as does *Cyprian, in particular in the *Testimonia* (*Ad Quirinum*). The dialogue has points of contact with *Gregory of Elvira's *Tractatus Origenis*.

CPL 482; PL 20, 1165-1172; TU 1, 3 (1883) 1-136; CSEL 45 (1904) 1-54; CCL 64, 255-302; A.L. Williams, *Adv. Iudaeos. A Bird's Eye View of Christian Apologia until the Renaissance*, Cambridge 1935; E. Schulz-Flügel, *Gregorius Eliberitanus*, Freiburg 1994, 256-302.

A. Hamman

EVAGRIUS of Antioch (ca. 320 – ca. 394). A noble Antiochene (it seems of a Latin military family), perhaps a friend of *Libanius (the identity is uncertain), he married and followed an official career until 362, when he followed *Eusebius of Vercelli on his return to Italy after exile. He translated the *Life of Anthony*, a text of Athanasian propaganda (CPG 2101). Friendly with the emperor *Valentinian, he was able to help *Damasus in his difficulties; he protected the young *Jerome, taking him to *Antioch and visiting St. *Basil at Caesarea on the way (Basil, *Ep. 156*). He adhered to *Paulinus's "little church," favored by Rome; he introduced Jerome to *Chalcidian monastic circles, but made him accept priesthood in Paulinus's service; he defended Paulinus's cause (and that of *Maximus the Cynic?) at the Council of *Aquileia of 381. He allowed the dying Paulinus to lay hands on him and thus became his successor, but on his death the dissident community joined *Flavian's orthodox church. Evagrius is a fine example of a Latin-minded Easterner, important for understanding Jerome.

F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IVe-Ve s.)*, Paris 1905; DHGE 16, 102-107.

J. Gribomont

EVAGRIUS of Constantinople (4th c.). Elected bishop of *Constantinople (370) by a college of Nicene bishops, but the emperor *Valens, who had approved the Arian *Demophilus, did not recognize him and exiled him to *Egypt, where he died before Valens (378). Baronius introduced his name into the *Mart. rom.* (6 March).

DHGE 16, 107; CE 5, 645.

D. Stiernon

EVAGRIUS of Epiphania (Scholasticus) (d. after 594). 6th-c. ecclesiastical historian (born at Epiphania in *Syria, ca. 527 [Epiphaneia, on the Orontes]; died at *Antioch, post-594), author of a *Historia ecclesiastica* in 6 books and other lost works (discourses, dialogues, letters). After studying law at *Constantinople, he returned to Antioch, where he practiced law (hence his name *Scholasticus*) and held various public offices, including the honorific position of exconsulate of the emperor Maurice (582–602); he was Patriarch *Gregory's (570–593) legal advisor. In this capacity he accompanied Gregory to Constantinople in 588 and defended him before the imperial tribunal and the synod against accusations by the *comes Orientis*, Asterius (*HE* VI, 7). After Gregory's death (593 or 594) he retired to private life and wrote his history. The work, conceived as a continuation of the *Histories* of *Socrates, *Sozomen and *Theodoret, encompasses the period 431–594 and ends with Patriarch Gregory's death, in the twelfth year of the emperor Maurice (August 593 – August 594). Without neglecting political and civil history, Evagrius is most interested in dogmatic questions, and his work is our most important source for the history of the 5th-6th-c. *Nestorian and *monophysite controversies. An impartial and reliable historian, Evagrius has good critical judgment (despite his credulity in the marvelous and miraculous) and uses good sources (Agathias, *Procopius, John of Epiphania, *John Malalas, *Zacharias Scholasticus), in many cases eyewitness accounts. His rigorous orthodoxy does not lead him, as often happened at that time, to summary and superficial condemnations, just as his Christianity does not prevent him admiring Hellenism. His literary model is Thucydides, whose language and style he imitates, giving his work, as *Photius observed, a not ungraceful Atticizing tendency (*Bibl.*, cod. 29).

CPG III 7500; PG 86/2,2405-2906 (= ed. by Valesius, 1673, revised by W. Reading, 1713); Critical ed. by J. Bidez - L. Parmentier, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*, London 1898 (Amsterdam ²1964); Evagrius, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, ed. A.J. Festugière, Byzantion 45 (1976) 188-471 (Fr. tr.); It. tr. ed. F. Carcione, *Storia ecclesiastica*, Rome 1998; Eng. tr.: W. Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, Liverpool 2000. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Munich ²1897, 245-247; W. Gass - G. Krüger: PWK V, 649-650;

O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, V, Freiburg i. Br. 1932, 119-121; Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I, Berlin ²1958, 257-259; DHGE 16, 1495-1498; G.F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories. Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*, Théol. Hist. 46, Paris 1977; P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 41, Louvain 1981; V.A. Caires, *Evagrius Scholasticus, A Literary Analysis*: ByzF 8 (1982) 29-50; E. Dovere, *La Storia di Evagrio Scolastico per la storia del diritto romano*: SDHI 58 (1992) 376-385; I.V. Krivushin, *La révolte de Monocarton vue par Évagre, Théophylacte Simocatta et Théophane*: Byzantion 63 (1993) 154-172; E. Dovere, *Tracce di prassi costituzionale nella narratio storiografica di Evagrio*: SDHI 61 (1995) 531-556; Patrologia V, 227-228; L.M. Whitby, *Evagrius on Patriarchs and Emperors*, in *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, ed. M. Whitby, Leiden 1998, 321-344.

S. Leanza

EVAGRIUS of Pontus (ca. 345–399). Born at Ibora in *Pontus, he joined St. *Basil and was ordained lector, but preferred the philosophy of *Gregory of Nazianzus, whose deacon he was. Soon after Gregory's retirement, he took refuge at *Jerusalem with Melania, even more of a "mystic." Around 383 he settled in the desert of *Nitria and two years later at Cellae (Kellia), in friendship with the two Macarii, Ammonius and other Origenians. The esteem of Patriarch *Theophilus, who supported him, turned to hostility some months after Evagrius's death. Already controversial during his lifetime, as his esoteric prudence demonstrates, in 553 Evagrius was condemned in the context of the second Origenist controversy for some speculations that, though referring primarily to spiritual reality, were understood as ontological assertions. The main points were the preexistence of souls before the creation of the material world (with certain implications for the relation between the eternal Logos and the incarnate Christ) and that of the apokatastasis, i.e., a universal restoration, including Satan, at the end of time. The condemnation in 553 was probably pronounced by a synod at *Constantinople, called by *Justinian shortly before the great ecumenical council (Constantinople II), when its participants had already gathered at the capital.

At that time much of Evagrius's writings in the original Greek disappeared; they are preserved primarily in Syriac and Armenian versions (in some cases retouched). The best parts of his spiritual doctrine, however, profoundly influenced *Rufinus, *John Cassian, *Palladius, *John Climacus, *Maximus and many others, esp. Easterners. His work is vast (CPG 2430-2482). The treatises addressed to a wider public have been preserved in Greek, either under his name (the *Practical Treatise*, ed. A. and C. Guillaumont, SC 170-171, Paris 1971; the *Sentences* to monks and those to virgins, ed. H. Gressmann, *Nonnenspiegel und Mönchsspiegel des Euagrios Pontikos*; TU 39, 4, Leipzig 1913; *Rerum monachalium rationes*, PG 40, 1252-1264, and other sentences, ibid. 1264-1269) or under that of Nilus (*Ad Eulogium*; *De vitiis quae opposita sunt virtutibus*; *De malignis cogitationibus*; *De octo spiritibus malitiae*; *De oratione . . .*, PG 79, 1093-1240; *De mal. cogit.* also: ed. A. and C. Guillaumont - P. Géhin, SC 438, Paris 1998). Among his most important esoteric works are the six centuries of *Kephalaia gnostica* (ed. A. Guillaumont, PO 28, 1, Paris 1958), the *Gnostic* (A. and C. Guillaumont, SC 356, Paris 1989) and the letters, esp. one to Melania (ed. W. Frankenberg, *Evagrius Ponticus*, Berlin 1912, 564-619; also G. Vitestam, *Seconde partie du traité qui passe sous le nom de "La grande lettre d'Évagre . . . ,"* Lund 1964). For the rest of his works, whose authenticity is not always certain, see CPG 2430-2482; CPG/Suppl. 2430-2483.

Evagrius's doctrine begins from an acute observation of the psychology of the solitary, the vices which threaten him, and the *ascesis that purifies his heart and thoughts and leads him to the knowledge of God (*gnōsis*). This background explains the Evagrian conception of the world and of the spiritual life. The *nous*, created pure, fell from the cosmic Unity of divine contemplation. God then created the material world where the *nous,* diffused into a human soul and joined to the body, is redeemed through the successive phases of the spiritual life. In ascetic practice (*praktikē*) the soul fights against evil thoughts and the vices to purify itself of the passions and acquire the virtues. In this way it reaches the state of impassibility (*apatheia*), the necessary condition for passing to the phase of knowledge (*gnōstikē*). Starting at this point from the contemplation of creatures (*physikē*), it passes through various levels and reaches the highest degree of contemplation, that of the *Trinity (*theologikē*), its proper goal.

It is disputed whether Evagrius didn't transgress the limits of orthodoxy in expressing his ideal of mystical union, esp. on the christological and eschatological levels, though the author continually reviewed his own thought and sought to avoid *pantheism. Later, in fact, some of his Palestinian and Syrian followers—the so-called Origenists, went further than he had. But it is also likely that the condemnation of 553 was due, at least in part, to hostile interpretations by the anti-Origenists in the extremely complicated events that preceded the ecumenical council. In any event, Evagrius is certainly much more useful when read dialectically and as a stimulus to the spiritual life, as is often done.

DSp 4, 1731-1744; BS 5, 356-363; I. Hausherr, *Les leçons d'un contemplatif*, Paris 1960; A. Guillaumont, *Les "Kephalaia gnostica" d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens*, Paris 1962; A. Levasti, *Il più grande mistico del Deserto: Evagrio il Pontico*: Riv. di ascetica and mistica 13 (1968) 242-264; G. Bunge, *Évagre le Pontique et les deux Macaire*: Irénikon 56 (1983) 215-227, 323-360; Id., *Evagrios Pontikos, Briefe aus der Wüste*, Trier 1986; Id., *Origenismus-Gnostizismus. Zum geistesgeschichtlichen Standort des Evagrios Pontikos*: VChr 40 (1986) 24-54; J. Driscoll, *The "Ad Monachos" of Evagrius Ponticus: Its Structure and a Select Commentary*, Rome 1991; E. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, Princeton, NJ 1992; S. Rubenson, *Evagrios Pontikos und die Theologie der Wüste*, in Logos. Festschrift für Luise Abramowski, ed. H. Brennecke - E. Grasmück - C. Markschies, Berlin 1993, 384-401; R. Sinkewicz, *Evagrius of Pontus. The Greek Ascetic Corpus*, Oxford 2003; J. Driscoll, *Evagrius Ponticus, Ad monachos, translation and commentary*, New York 2003.

J. Gribomont - D. Hombergen

EVANGELISTS

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. The term *evangelist* was used of the first Christian preachers (Acts 21:8; Eph 4:11; 2 Tim 4:5), although it had already fallen into disuse by the time the **Didache* was composed. Sources from the first half of the 2nd c. give widely varied evidence of knowledge of particular gospels; but while for the most part traditions linked to the synoptic tradition were used, these traditions were nonetheless not incorporated into the first three gospels. Among the gospels known and used, it seems that Mark's was the most highly regarded, whereas very little was known of John's, though its use in some regions is certain (p^{52} is from the first quarter of the 2nd c.). Most of the communities at that time had the use of only one gospel. Initially the gospels were used as a source for traditions about the Lord, though they were not considered "Sacred *Scripture" on par with the OT. At the beginning "gospel" was not a literary concept, but was used to refer to the content of preaching; gradually the Lord's authority was transferred to the writings that handed down his words (Schneemelcher, 13-14). When the word *gospel* came to designate a book, it became common to call its author an "evangelist" (Hipp., *Antichr.* 56; Tertull., *Adv Prax.* 21, 23).

The ecclesiastical tradition attributes the first gospel to the apostle Matthew, named among the twelve by the synoptics (Mt 10:3 par.); also, Mt is the only gospel to cite Matthew in the account of the call of the publican, whereas Mk and Lk call him Levi (Mt 9:9 par.). Eusebius (*HE* III, 39, 16; V, 8, 2) holds that Matthew evangelized the Jews and wrote his gospel in the "Hebrew language," citing *Papias and *Irenaeus as sources to confirm this statement (*HE* III, 24, 5-6). According to *Eusebius (*HE* VI, 25, 4), *Origen also accepted this tradition, which was later repeated by *Cyril of Jerusalem, *Epiphanius, *John Chrysostom and *Jerome. The oldest statement on the author of Mk is a note of Papias's (Euseb., *HE* III, 39, 15), who links him to Peter. *Justin's (*Dial.* 106) reference to Peter's "memoirs" is probably also a reference to Mk. In our sources, Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* III, 41, 1) is the first to mention Luke, whose gospel he knows well; in this passage he links Luke with Paul. But not until Epiphanius (*Pan.* II, 51, 11) do we find any identification of Luke with one of the 72 disciples of Lk 10:1. The Muratorian *Canon and the Anti-Marcionite Prologue, like Irenaeus, make Luke a companion and disciple of Paul. As for the traditional account of the life and literary activity of the apostle John, it first appears in Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* II, 22, 5; III, 3, 4). Before him, Justin, who could have known the fourth gospel, says nothing about its author, though he attributes the apocalypse to him. The four gospels had canonical value, but their apostolic authorship did not play a decisive role in this process. For the authors of Mk and Lk, the construction of a relationship of discipleship with the apostles probably began when their respective gospels were already highly thought of, and certainly under these names.

From the last quarter of the 2nd c. the four canonical gospels were associated with the four cherubim of Ezek 1:4-14 and the four living creatures of Rev 4:6-8. It was the persistent attraction of many Christians and "heretics" to a single written gospel (a synthesis or otherwise), as much as the objections of critics, that moved Irenaeus to write what seems to be the first complete defense of the fourfold gospel. He (*Adv. haer.* III, 11, 8) asserts that there can be no more and no fewer than four gospels, and gives them the characteristics of the four living creatures. These are four aspects that, for Irenaeus, represent the fourfold way in which the eternal Logos works. The lion symbolizes the royal office and effective power of the Son of God; the bull, his sacrificial and priestly character; the face of the man, his coming in human nature; the soaring eagle recalls the gift of the Spirit that descends on the church. Although the ancient writers differ in how they apply the symbols to the four Evangelists, this difference is greater regarding Mark. For Irenaeus, he is the eagle; for *Augustine, the man (*De consensu Ev.* I, 6, 9). For *Ambrose (*Virg.* 114; *Abr.* II, 54) and in Jerome's preferred schema, he is the lion. The authority of Jerome (*In Ezech.* I, 1; *Comm. in Mt.*, prol.) established them

once and for all: for John, the eagle (for the sublime heights of the prologue); for Mark, the lion (for the Baptist's voice in the wilderness); for Luke, the bull (for Zechariah's sacrifice); and for Matthew, the man's face (for his genealogy); this schema prevailed in the Middle Ages.

W. Schneemelcher, *Haupteinleitung*, in Id., *Neutestamentliche Apocryphen*, I, Tübingen [5]1987, 1-61; G.N. Stanton, *The Fourfold Gospel*: NTS 43 (1997) 317-346.

R. TREVIJANO

II. Iconography. The oldest figurative evidence of the Evangelists is probably recognizable in a fresco of the catacomb of SS. Marco and Marcelliano at Rome (mid 4th c.) (Wp pl. 162, 2), where the Evangelists, dressed in tunic and pallium, are shown on either side of Christ, who sits enthroned with an open *volumen* in his left hand; at his feet is the significant presence of a *capsa* containing four scrolls. In funerary plastic art, the Evangelists can be recognized with certainty by their names, incised above their heads, in the sarcophagus of Apt (France) (Ws pl. 37, 2-3), or written on the scrolls in their hands, on the sarcophagus of Concordius at *Arles (Ws pl. 34, 3). Distinctive and thus far unique is the depiction on a fragment of a sarcophagus lid of the Museo Pio Cristiano: in a boat, symbol of the church, the image of Christ as pilot is associated with three oarsmen named as *Marcus*, *Luca*, *Iohannes*; Matthew must have been on the missing part of the lid, indicated by his name (Diehl 1965 adn.).

The symbolic representation of the four Evangelists in the form of a tetramorph does not begin to appear in Christian art until the 5th c. It is directly connected with the vision of Ezek 1:4-14 and the corresponding Johannine vision of Rev 4:6-8, where, according to the agreed-upon interpretation of the Fathers, the four figures of the lion, calf, eagle and man correspond respectively to Mark, Luke, John and Matthew. The four Evangelists were depicted in this form esp. in mosaic decorations in church buildings: e.g., a baptistery at *Naples (early 5th c.); the apse of S. Pudenziana (5th c.) and triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore (5th c.), *Rome; at *Thessalonica, in the apse of Hosios David, with *Ezekiel and *Habakkuk (5th c.); and at *Ravenna, the mausoleum of Galla Placidia (5th c.) and basilicas of S. Apollinare Nuovo (6th c.) and S. Vitale (6th c.), where the human figures of Luke and John are accompanied by their respective symbols.

The only evidence we have in painting is a fresco in the catacomb of Gaudiosus at Naples, datable to the late 5th to early 6th c., in which we again find a cruciform schema with the symbols of the evangelists set at the four corners of the vault of a cubicle, with the bust of Christ in the center (M. Schmauder, *Das sogennante Cubiculum des hl. Nostrianus in der Gaudiosus-Katakombe. Zur spätantiken Malerei in Neapel*: JbAC 39 [1996] 225-262). The four rivers of paradise that flow from the mount on which Christ stands in the form of a lamb must also be recognized as an allusion to the four Evangelists, as we can see in a 5th-c. fresco in the cemetery of SS. Pietro and Marcellino (Wp pl. 252 = Deckers - Reinhard Seeliger - Mietke, *Die Katakombe*, no. 3); also symbols of the Evangelists are the sheep with *Mar*(*cus*) and *Ioan*(*nes*) written beside them on a sarcophagus fragment in Mus. Naz. Rom. (Ws pl. 36, 1).

DACL V, 845-852; U. Nilgen, LCI I, 696-713; J.G. Deckers - H. Reinhard Seeliger - G. Mietke, *Die Katakombe "santi Marcellino e Pietro." Repertorium der Malerein*, Vatican City - Münster 1987; M. Minasi: TIP 174-177.

C. CARLETTI

EVANGELIZATION (spread of Christianity). From the beginning the primitive Christians worked intensely to spread the gospel message, conquer for the faith and establish the church. The ease of communication in the 1st and 2nd c. AD, the self-assertion of the "middle class" against the senatorial class, the decentralization that brought with it a more balanced network of commerce and exchange, all aided the transmission of the gospel. The philosophical humanism admired by the emperors of the time, despite being an ideal reserved for the few, created a cultural and linguistic unity that allowed a dialogue of confrontation and encounter between opposing parties. Some Christians were aware of the privileged situation in which the work of proselytism took place: the earliest evidence of this is in *Melito of Sardis, who observed in ca. 170 that the Christian "philosophy" that began to spread in the reign of *Augustus arose and developed together with the empire (Euseb. of Caes., *HE* IV, 26, 7ff.). Later *Irenaeus and *Origen took up the same theme, with different emphases.

The gospel was taken to the nations from *Jerusalem, and its first steps were in *Palestine and the surrounding regions. From the NT we know of the existence of roughly thirty primitive communities (founded ca. 30–70) at Lydda, Joppa/Jaffa, *Caesarea, *Tyre, Sidon, *Damascus and *Antioch; in Anatolia we have information of the communities of Derbe, Iconian Lystra, Pisidian Antioch, *Philippi and Troad, Colossae and *Ephesus, *Smyrna, Pergamum and Philadelphia; in Greece, those of *Thessalonica,

Berea, *Athens and *Corinth; more to the W or NW we know of the communities of *Malta, Pozzuoli and *Rome. One of the first great routes beyond Palestine traveled by Christ's apostles and disciples was the road which, going back to remotest antiquity, began at *Alexandria of *Egypt and ended at Hellespont, the so-called way of the sea: it linked Egypt with Palestine, where it passed through the Azotus, Jaffa, Lydda, Caesarea, Ptolemais, Tyre and Tripoli, as far as Syrian Antioch: all centers in which a Christian presence is attested before *Trajan's time. To the NW of Antioch, sometimes winding along the coast and sometimes further inland, it reached *Tarsus and, past the Cilician Gates, arrived first at Perga, then at Miletus, Ephesus and Smyrna. Here ended another important route, which linked *Galatia and *Phrygia to Lydia and Caria. Along its margins and in its immediate neighborhood were centers like Derbe, Lystra, *Iconium, Antioch of Pisidia, Colossae and Laodicea, as well as Hieropolis, Philadelphia and Sardis: an area in which Christianity spread with surprising speed by the end of the 1st c. The "way of the sea" then went N through Pergamum, Troad, *Nicomedia and finally touched the Bosporus: beyond which, in Europe, the *Via Egnatia* led to Dyrrachium on the Adriatic sea, on whose other shore was Italy, with the *Via Appia* that led to Rome. Along this great route we can prove the existence of the great majority of the oldest Christian communities. In the 2nd c. Christianity developed along the road that led E from Asia Minor to Mesopotamia (*Caesarea in *Cappadocia, *Edessa, Carrhae); to the W, following the S Mediterranean coast, it spread in Egypt and N Africa; finally to the NW, esp. through maritime traffic, it established itself on the coasts of S and central Italy and, further away, in *Gaul, along the Rhone valley, and in *Spain.

The crisis of the 3rd c.—which, among other things, reduced the volume of traffic, contracted business and exchange, ruined commercial houses, and forced decreased maintenance (and sometimes abandonment) of important roads—seems also to have affected evangelization: the spread of Christianity changed from being extensive to intensive, and greatly accelerated: from the greater centers it extended to the lesser, and from these to the villages (see, e.g., Origen, *C. Cels.* III, 9). In this way many churches carried out a process of consolidation (in Africa, central and S Italy, Spain), which is shown by episcopal lists, synodal subscriptions, martyrological and literary documents, epigraphy, and archaeological finds. It was in this period that the increased number of conversions that accompanied years of peace for the Christians also brought the church surprises and problems, as seen in the violent *persecutions of *Decius and *Valerian in the mid 3rd c., and the apostasies that followed.

The "Christianization" of the empire at the start of the 4th c. obviously facilitated the spread of Christ's message within its borders, but even outside those borders it continued to expand. It is probable that the work of evangelization usually depended on casual means: e.g., fugitives, Roman exiles or barbarians who, after having fought in the imperial armies and been converted to the new religion, spread it on their return home. Merchants played a considerable role, as they had from the start: it may have been a merchant who told Frigitil, queen of the Marcomanni (settled between the Elbe and the Oder), about *Ambrose, which led to her desire for Christian instruction, her conversion and her journey to *Milan to meet the bishop, who by then, alas, was dead (397). Elsewhere it was prisoners taken by the barbarians during raids and sacks who introduced Christianity among them: thus the *Goths, who we know were represented by a bishop at the Council of *Nicaea (325). In those same years Ulfila (ca. 311–ca. 383), first in Gothic territory N of the Danube and then in lower *Moesia, became the evangelizer of the *Visigoths, bringing them an Arian confession of faith. The religious influence and cultural dissemination exercised by his Gothic translation of the Bible was immense.

Further S, on the shores of the Red Sea beyond the borders of the empire, in Homerite *Arabia and Aksumite Ethiopia, we know of the work of *Frumentius and Aedesius: two young Christians, sole survivors of a voyage of exploration, who sowed the first Christian seed, and in the mid 4th c. obtained the free exercise of their religion. Other cases could be mentioned, like *Gregory the Illuminator (257–332), traditional founder of Christianity in Armenia: son of a Parthian prince, taken to *Cappadocia during the Persian occupation, he became a Christian, returned to Armenia and converted King Tiridates (ca. 305), with the result that the religion of Christ was declared the state religion.

In the 5th c. and later, the movement of evangelization showed original elements alongside the traditional ways and developments, in part due to changed historical conditions. First, expansion from Christian centers continued: thus the theological school of Edessa, later of *Nisibis, contributed in the 5th c. to the rise of the (Nestorian) church of *Persia; this in turn extended its mission to Kurdistan, India (Malabar), the isles of Socotra and Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and parts of central Asia. In a similar way in the Aksumite kingdom, Christian-

ity took root and further established itself in the 5th and 6th c.; there the long work of translating the Scriptures into Ge'ez, the old Ethiopic language, led to a national liturgy and a Christian art. Even the lands E of the Jordan and the Dead Sea saw a flowering of Christianity: in the mid 6th c. there were 100 monastic centers in the area, all *monophysite, born of the tradition of the see of Alexandria and its christological theology.

Second, we see another phenomenon, first on the E and N borders of the empire from the Danube to the Rhine, and then throughout Europe, linked to the barbarians and their migrations. Between the late 4th and 6th c., the Western church found itself in a new situation and was obliged, in a way, to start from scratch: contact with Greco-Roman paganism moved to the background, while the problems of the conversion of the pagan Germans and their passage from *Arianism to orthodoxy became urgent. At the same time, Christian penetration into the rural areas of central Europe posed not a few problems. The devastated scene of the empire was dominated by a series of exceptional men who, each in their own way, spread and consolidated the gospel message in a wholly new situation: from Genoveffa at *Paris to *Severinus in Noricum, from *Lupus of Troyes to *Germanus of Auxerre in *Britain, from *Epiphanius of Pavia to Victor of Turin in Burgundy, from *Remigius of Reims (who played a considerable role in the conversion of *Clovis and the *Franks to *Catholicism in 496) to *Sidonius Apollinaris, from *Caesarius of Arles to *Leander of Seville, from the monks of *Lérins to *Benedict of Nursia. Thus it happened that the Latins of the West, conquered by the pagan or heretical Germans, by remaining firm in their faith succeeded in converting their conquerors and thus carried on the evangelistic mission in the heart of Europe.

Third, another dimension, independent of the first two, appears: leading figures, esp. monks, natives of areas at the far corners of the empire or outside it, became preachers of Christ to pagans and Christians: we think of *Patrick (ca. 389–461), a native of *Britain, whose religious work was in *Ireland, a land that had escaped the rule of Rome and knew only pagan cults in the original forms of the country; with him we think of his collaborators and successors (Gauls, Franks, Bretons, Romans) who founded many monasteries (where Latin was taught) on the island. Soon after, the Irish monk *Columba (521–597), of noble lineage, established monastic communities at Denny, Durrow and later on the isle of Iona, and introduced the gospel to the Scots and Picts, converting their king. In 590 his *confrère* and contemporary *Columbanus (ca. 543–615) crossed over to Gaul, where he founded the monastery of Luxeuil, then went on to Switzerland and finally to Italy, more precisely to Milan, to Agilulf and Theodelinda (when the Longobards finally abandoned Arianism and embraced Catholicism); from there he settled at Bobbio, where he ended his life in the monastery built in those years, destined to become a famous center of faith, art and culture.

So, starting from a point on the periphery of the empire (Palestine), evangelization in the first centuries found the most fertile ground for development within the empire's borders; but while inevitably following the historical vicissitudes connected with the empire, it did not forget the broader horizon for which its message was destined; at times accelerating, at times with hesitation and delays, it went beyond the sphere of the Roman Empire to engage other lands and peoples in a history that continues to our day.

A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 2 vols., Leipzig [4]1924; K.S. Latourette, *A History of Expansion of Christianity. The First Five Centuries*, I, New York - London 1937; B. Koetting: RAC 2, 1138-1159, s.v. Christentum, I (Ausbreitung); P. Siniscalco, *Le vie di commercio e la diffusione del cristianesimo*, in Var. aus., *Mondo greco-romano e cristianesimo*, Rome 1982. Historical atlases are useful on the theme, such as K. Piper, *Atlas Orbis Christiani antiqui*, Düsseldorf 1931 (sources and indexes in various languages); F. van der Meer - C. Mohrmann, *Atlas de l'Antiquité Chrétienne*, Paris 1960 (Ger. ed., Gütersloh 1959; Eng., London 1959); H. Jedin - H. Latourette - J. Martin, *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte*, Freiburg 1970; E.G. Hinson, *The Evangelization of the Roman Empire. Identity and Adaptability*, Macon, GA 1981; R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire(AD 100–400)*, New Haven, CT 1984; J. Guyon, *I primi secoli della missione cristiana*, in *Storia dell'Italia religiosa*, I: *L'Antichità e il Medioevo*, ed. A. Vauchez, Rome - Bari 1993, 79ff.; J. Comby, *Deux mille ans d'évangélisation: histoire de l'expansion chrétienne*, Paris, 1992, (It. tr.) *Duemila anni di evangelizzazione. Storia dell'espansione cristiana*, Turin 1994, 3ff.; L. Tescaroli, *Evangelizzare o rievangelizzare. Storia dell'evangelizzazione*, Rome 1998, 9ff. For a rapid historiographical summary of the theme, see P. Siniscalco, *L'evangelizzazione dei popoli del Mediterraneo nei primi secoli cristiani*, in *Il cammino dell'evangelizzazione. Problemi storiografici*, ed. G. Martina and U. Dovere, Bologna 2001, 41-72.

P. Siniscalco

EVARISTUS, pope (97–105). Succeeded *Clement perhaps in 97 (88–97; Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 3, 3; Euseb., *HE* III, 34; IV, 1) and lived under the emperor *Trajan. According to the LP, which says he was a Jew from *Jerusalem, it was Evaristus who attributed the various *tituli* to the Roman presbyters and who first ordained seven deacons to help the bishop in preaching. This information should be

received cautiously, however, and perhaps places these events too early. The LP also reports that Evaristus died a martyr, perhaps in 105, and is buried on the Vatican hill near Peter. The *Roman Martyrology* confirms this, fixing his feast on 29 October. Ps.-Isidore (PL 130, 81-90) attributes two decretals to Evaristus: one for the Egyptian bishops, on Christ, head of the church and the church, Christ's body; the other for the African bishops, on the ordination of deacons and *catechesis. The attribution, however, is unfounded.

LP I, CXXXVII-CXLI, 54-55 and 126; AS [. . .] *Octobris*, XI, Brussels 1864, 799-804; BS V, 372-373 (I. Daniele); EPapi I, 212-213 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

EVIL. The theme of evil was treated by the Fathers esp. in relation to *gnosticism, *Marcionism and *Manicheism, but sometimes also in relation to the conceptions of the pagan philosophers, both *Stoic and *Neoplatonist. The 2nd-c. *apologists had to confront both gnostic conceptions and, very similar but distinct, those of Marcionism. For the gnostic, human salvation was closely linked to the knowledge of the origin of evil, with which the soul struggles in this world. They respond to the question *unde malum* with a mythical account that narrates the passage from the original pneumatic world—constituted of more or less numerous spiritual realities, called aeons and emanations of a transcendent, unknown God—to the creation of the physical world, the work of a second god, the demiurge, and the consequence of a prior sin committed by the last of the aeons, *Sophia*. It is therefore the demiurge, identified with the God of the OT, who is most directly responsible for evil, since he created the world out of preexistent matter, as well as people of various categories with respect to salvation: hylic or somatic, psychical, and spiritual. Marcion also speaks of two gods, identified with the God of the OT and that of the NT, but with no reference to the pneumatic world or to a prior fault. The God revealed by Jesus Christ is the good God, who wants to save people, whereas the OT god is a just god, but also choleric and cruel: it is he who created the world out of preexisting matter, and thus he is the author of evil, since matter is the origin of all evils.

The first author to oppose these conceptions was the martyr and philosopher *Justin, author of a book *Against Marcion* (lost). From the *Dialogue with Trypho* we know that Justin affirmed the unicity of God and directly related the salvation brought by Christ to Adam's transgression and the consequent fall of humanity under a sentence of death (*Dial.*, 88; PG 6, 685-686). He writes that the Word "became man through the Virgin, so that the disobedience caused by the serpent would be dissolved in the same way that it was begun. Eve in fact, who was a virgin and incorrupt, received the word of the serpent and gave birth to disobedience and death" (*Dial.* 100; PG 6, 1081-1082). Though with different accents, other apologists such as *Tatian, *Theophilus of Antioch and the great *Irenaeus of Lyons referred to the sin of Adam and Eve as the origin of evil. The antignostic and anti-Marcionite polemic of these authors rests on some common principles: there is one God and not two; evils were not willed by God, nor were they produced by a fault that is prior to the creation of the world, nor are they caused by matter, which too was created by God; evil is the inheritance of the condemnation of the sin of the first human couple, Adam and Eve, who, created in a state of integrity, were deceived by the devil and committed an act of disobedience to the Creator, who is both good and just. A strong accent on the sin of Adam and its disastrous consequences for humanity is in the *Easter homily of *Melito of Sardis, also from the 2nd c. (*De Pascha* 48-49: SC 123, 86).

Origen's position is more complex. *De principiis*, on the one hand, advances the hypothesis of the preexistence of souls and of their prior fault, as the cause of their fall into bodies and of the different types of people; on the other hand, against gnostic determinism of the three natures of people, it defends personal freedom, having recourse to divine foreknowledge to explain their varied earthly condition and different callings. In other works, however, Origen too speaks of the sin of Adam, appealing to biblical testimony, such as Ps 50:7 and Job 14:4, to explain the condition of sin into which each person is born, the reason why the church customarily baptizes infants (*In Lev. Hom.* 8,3). In Origen, however, with the hypothesis of *apokatastasis—i.e., with the theory of the return of all things to God and the consequent final salvation of all, including the devil—an optimistic vision prevails, which would later be accepted by few and criticized by many.

Among the Latin authors, Justin and Irenaeus are explicitly appealed to by the Carthaginian priest *Tertullian, who also wrote a treatise *Against Marcion*, divided into five books and exercising a great influence on all Western authors, in particular St. *Augustine. To the Marcionites, who relied heavily on the verse of the prophet Isaiah: *Ego sum qui condo mala* (Is 45:7) to attribute to the OT creator God the evils that afflict humanity, Tertullian re-

sponded by calling attention to the ambiguity of the word *evil*, which could refer to two types of evil: *mala delicti* and *mala supplicii,* or, using other words, *mala culpae* and *mala poenae*. If one bears this distinction in mind, observed Tertullian, it becomes clear that the ancient prophet wanted to attribute to God not *delicta* or *culpae*, i.e., sins, which come from the devil, but only *supplicia* or *poenae*, inflicted by God and which in no way compromise his justice. The evils inflicted by God, in fact, "are undoubtedly evil for those who are punished, but in themselves they are good, because they are just and defenders of the good, the enemies of crimes and in this order worthy of God" (*Adv. Marcionem* 2,22,4: PG 7, 784).

Manicheism too is a gnostic and dualistic conception. It responds to the basic question, *unde malum*, with a mythological cosmogony, divided into three stages. In the beginning existed two substances or coeternal principles, contrary and totally separate from one another: one totally good, that dwelt in the land of light, the other totally evil, that dwelt in the land of darkness. With the invasion of the kingdom of light by the kingdom of darkness, and the defensive response of the former, began the stage of mixture and battle between the two substances, first in the cosmos and then in man. At the end will be the final separation of the two contrary substances.

The first to respond to the threatening spread of Manichean dualism were the Christian theologians of the regions near Persia: Syria and Palestine. The main names are *Hegemonius, *Titus of Bostra, *Diodore of Tarsus and *Serapion of Thmuis. Hegemonius wrote the *Acta disputationis Archelai cum Manete*, a fictitious discussion between the bishop Archelaus and a disciple of Mani, written in Syria in the late 3rd c. and very soon translated from the Greek into Latin. Titus of Bostra lived at the time of the emperor *Julian; he wrote a treatise, in four books, entitled *Against the Manichees*. According to information reported by *Photius, Diodore of Tarsus also wrote a work *Against the Manichees,* a full 25 books. A treatise *Against the Manichees* was also written by St. Athanasius's friend Serapion of Thmuis. The anti-Manichean polemic of these authors aimed to reject the dualism of the two eternal and contrary principles of good and evil, attributing the whole creation to the work of the one God and forcefully rejecting the idea of a natural evil: only sin, fruit of the creature's free will, is evil properly speaking, whereas physical evils (sickness, death, etc.) are not true evils, but natural phenomena, which are at times even useful; nothing is said of the sin of Adam, or it is seen simply as a bad example given to his descendants.

Among the other Eastern Fathers, *Basil of Caesarea follows the Syro-Palestinian anti-Manichean line (see his homily, *God is not the author of evil*, PG 31, 341 and *Hexaemeron*, *Hom.* II, 5: SC 26, 161), but most of them continued to follow the tradition that attributed human evils to Adam's sin: *Methodius of Olympus (*De resurrectione* II, 6: PG 41, 1161D); *Gregory of Nyssa (*De beatitudinibus* 6: PG 44, 1273A); *John Chrysostom, for whom the sin of Adam was so grave as to include in the condemnation the whole human race, such that from the angelic life of the earthly paradise it fell under the yoke of death and concupiscence (*Ep. ad Olymp*. 10,(3): SC 13, 156); *Didymus the Blind (*In Iob* X, 15: PG 39, 1145B); *Hesychius of Jerusalem (*In Leviticum* V, 15-16: PG 93, 974D-975B).

In the West the problem of evil became central in the reflection of St. Augustine, due to his long experience in the Manichean sect and the many friends it had led into error. Augustine, however, in addition to Manicheism also opposed pagan conceptions of evil as early as the dialogue *De ordine*, written before his *baptism; while taking some points from *Neoplatonism, he refutes *Plotinus's assertion that evils are necessary for the perfection of the universe. This idea is expressly rejected in *De libero arbitrio*: "Neither sins nor misery are necessary for the perfection of the universe, but souls as souls" (*Lib. arb.* 3,9,26). In *De civitate Dei*, he also explicitly rejects the *Stoic and Plotinian conception that considers only moral evils to be true evils, while underestimating the seriousness of evils suffered by human beings, considering them to be natural occurrences, easily controllable by the wise person (*Civ. Dei* XIX, 4,4-5). With regard to the anti-Manichean polemic, St. Augustine follows the line indicated by *Ambrose: on the one hand he emphasizes the Neoplatonic notion of evil as a privation of good; on the other he accepts the tradition that stresses the biblical account of Adam's sin, relying heavily on Tertullian. At the beginning of *De libero arbitrio*, in fact, the twofold distinction between evil and its author made by Tertullian in *Adversus Marcionem* is recalled: "We call evil what one does that is evil, and what one suffers of evil. Since we believe that in a world governed by divine providence no one can suffer an evil unjustly, we must conclude that the evils that we suffer are just punishments of God and that God would be the author of these evils that human beings undergo. Of the other type of evil, however, each is the author of his own wicked actions, which could not be punished by God, if they were not done willfully" (*Lib. arb.* 1,1,1). Confirming Tertullian's influence, in *De moribus Manichaeorum* Augustine returns to the phrase: *ego facio bona et condo mala* (Is 45:7), used

by the Marcionites to attribute evils to the Creator, explaining it in the sense of an *ordinatio iudiciaria*, already suggested in *De ordine*: God does not create evil, but once it has been committed by man, he integrates it into the order, punishing it according to justice (*Mor. Eccl. cath. et man.* 2,7,9).

It is superfluous to add that in the West, after Tertullian and before St. Augustine, all the Fathers saw the origin of human evils in the sin of Adam. The first to oppose this tradition were the *Pelagians, who came to deny any negative inheritance of the sin of Adam in his descendants, except for his bad example. Finally, it is interesting to note how the Pelagian bishop *Julian of Eclanum opposed the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, common to the whole Western tradition and a good part of the East, by referring explicitly to an anti-Manichean treatise of Serapion of Thmuis, cited in his work under the name of Basil (*C. Iulianum* 1,5,16-17), and thus taking inspiration from the Syro-Palestinian anti-Manichean tradition. Like Serapion, Julian too attributed no importance to Adam's sin to explain the evils in the world; he considers sin alone, the work of the free human will, to be evil true and proper, while the other evils that human beings suffer are seen as natural phenomena, which can even be useful.

R. Jolivet, *Le problème du mal d'après St. Augustin*, Paris 1936; A. Sertillanges, *Le problème du mal*, Paris 1951 (It. tr. *Il problema del male. La storia*, Rome 1951); Ch. Journet, *Le mal. Essai théologique*, Bruges 1961; A. Kreiner, *Gott im Leid. Zur Stichhaltigkeit der Theodizee-Argumente*, Freiburg i. B. 1997; N. Cipriani, *Il problema del male in S. Agostino*, in *Agostino non è (il) male*, ed. G. Fidelibus, Chieti 1997, 27-41; Id., *La polemica antiafricana di Giuliano d'Eclano: artificio letterario o scontro di tradizioni teologiche?*, in *Cristianesimo e specificità regionali nel mediterraneo latino (sec. IV-V)*, SEA 46, 147-160.

S. Folgado Flórez - N. Cipriani

EVODIUS (pseudo). Author of a 6th-c. Coptic Marian homily. Under the name Evodius (Copt. Euchodios)—archbishop of Rome, spiritual son of St. Peter and eyewitness of events related to the death and assumption of *Mary—there is a homily that describes these events. It is written for the feast of the death (21 Tobi = 16 Jan) and resurrection of Mary (16 Mesori = 9 Aug). The text is important for mariology. Also under Evodius's name are a *Homily on the Passion* and an *Encomium of the Apostles*.

CANT 133; BHO 667; T. Orlandi, Coptic Encyclopaedia 3, 1078f.; P. de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, Gottingae 1883, 38-66; It. tr.: Erbetta 1/2, 539-601; *Testi mariani per il primo millenio*, 4, ed. G. Gharib, Rome 1991, 702-713; S. Mimouni, *Dormition et l'Assomption de la Vierge*: Théol. Hist. 98, Paris 1995, 195-201.

M. Starowieyski

EVODIUS of Antioch (1st c.). First bishop of *Antioch, saint. Feast 6 May in the East, 29 April in the West. The date of his elevation is uncertain, perhaps ca. 44. We know nothing of his life, his personality being obscured by that of his successor *Ignatius. Nicephorus Callistus attributes some surely spurious writings to him, including a letter of which he cites a fragment (*HE* II, 3).

DHGE 16, 133.

E. Prinzivalli

EVODIUS of Uzalis (d. after 422). Compatriot, disciple and friend of *Augustine, he was present at *Monica's death (*Conf.* 9,12,31). He became (ca. 395–401) bishop of *Uzalis (*Africa Proconsularis*), where he founded a monastery. He was an active participant in the struggle against the *Donatists and was the first to spread St. *Stephen's relics in *Africa. He built a *Memoria* in honor of St. Stephen at Hippo and translated his relics to Uzalis; the *De *miraculis S. Stephani* was composed at his initiative (ca. 420). He appears in Augustine's youthful dialogues (*De quantitate animae*, *De libero arbitrio*) and in the latter's correspondence of 414–415 (*Ep.* 158-164, 169); he is also thought to be the author of the ps.-Augustinian work *De fide contra Manichaeos*. Died ca. 422–427; his cult, feast 16 October, is late and without historical basis.

CPL 389-391a; BS 5, 396-397; PCBE 1, 366-373; LACL[3] 257-258; A.D. Fitzgerald, *Augustine Through the Ages*, Cambridge 1999, 344; M. Baltes, *Platonisches Gedankengut im Brief des Evodius an Augustin (Ep. 158)*: VChr 40 (1986) 251-260; AugL 2,1158-1161; F. Decret, *Le traité d'Evodius "Contre les Manichéens." Un compendium à l'usage du parfait controversiste*: Augustinianum 31 (1991) 387-409; Y.-M. Duval, *Note sur la lettre d'Evodius à l'abbé Valentin d'Hadrumète (CPL 389)*: REAug 49 (2003) 123-130.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

EXAMPLE (Exemplum). The idea of exemplarity is fundamental in patristic theology, connected as it is with the basic themes of the human being as God's image; of Christ as teacher; of prophecy (λόγος – τύπος). Deeply rooted in the NT, which speaks of the imitation of God, of Jesus and of the just (see Heb 12), it took on new shades of meaning in the Greco-Roman context. In rhetoric, παράδειγμα and *exemplum* (*similitudo*) served demonstrative and persuasive eloquence; philosophy developed the *causa exemplaris*; in the Roman tradition, *exemplum maiorum* was understood as *auctoritas*. Its true meaning was therefore not limited to that of a moral model; it also indicated a past event as a reason for hope, in-

deed a principle that bore the imitators along with it, like the *exemplum resurrectionis*, which is simultaneously an incitement to spiritual life and the principle of the *resurrection of the dead.

DSp 4, 1886-1892; RAC 6, 1229-1257; Lampe, s.v.; B. Studer, "*Sacramentum et exemplum" chez s. Augustin*: RecAug 10 (1975) 87-141; W. Geerlings, *Christus exemplum*, Mainz 1978; J. Klein, *Exemplum*: HWRhet 3 (1996) 60-70.

B. Studer

EXCOMMUNICATION. Excommunication resulted in being placed outside *communion with the community and therefore it incurred the prohibition of continuing to being part of it. Within Christianity it was an inheritance from Judaism both in the moral sense for the transgressions of the Mosaic law and for the concrete ban (in Talmudic literature one finds the *nidduy*, i.e., the small excommunication, and the *ḥerem*, i.e., the large excommunication). Moses Maimonides collected in the Talmud more than 24 cases of excommunication which, in general, were against heretics, sectarians and liberals. If one died excommunicated, a pertinent statement in this regard was placed on one's sepulchral stone. In Mt 18:16 one has, as in the Jewish practice, an example of coercion by means of excommunication. In the Christian community excommunication was very much connected to penitential practice, expressed by the terminology of excommunication-peace (reintegration into the community occurred through the rebestowing of peace on the one excommunicated) and was inflicted on account of grave sins, for example, persistence in heresy or disobedience to authority. In general, excommunication was issued by a bishop or was dependent upon synodal or conciliar decisions. To be inflicted with excommunication was, in ancient Christianity, a truly great disgrace, from which one was released only with great difficulty. Excommunication was a public intervention and, as such, it placed public discredit upon the one to whom it pertained.

J. Wiesner, *Der Bann in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung auf dem Boden des Judentums*, Leipzig 1864; J. Döller, *Der Bann im AT und im späteren Judentum*: ZKG 37 (1913) 1-24; J. Gaudemet, *Notes sur les formes anciennes de l'excommunication*: RSR 23 (1949) 64-77; W. Doskocil, s.v. *Exkommunikation*: RAC 7, 1-22; Id., *Der Bann in der Urkirche*, München 1958; G. Folliet, *Une collection anonyme "Pro causa iniustae excommunicationis" des VII^e-VIII^e siècles*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 295-309.

V. Grossi

EXEGESIS, PATRISTIC. Christianity, like Judaism, is a religion of the book, in that Holy *Scripture, considered an expression of God's revelation to his people, occupies a central place, and every action in the life of God's people, from doctrine to discipline to liturgy (both collective and individual), must be brought into conformity with it. And given that the Jews had had to submit the Bible to an assiduous work of interpretation and adaptation in order to conform every action of their life to its dictates, it was natural for the believers of the nascent church to take from Judaism, along with the OT, the relevant hermeneutical procedures and ways of presentation: the homily, e.g., an important moment in the community liturgy, was derived from the synagogue liturgy. But Jews and Christians were divided precisely by their fundamental evaluation of the sacred text: Jews read in it the expectation of the Messiah, Christians the demonstration that the awaited Messiah had come in the person of Jesus. The ensuing polemics pushed Christians to a further examination of the OT, to which they began to give a christological reading. This reading not only prompted the interpretation that the traditional messianic prophecies were fulfilled in Christ, but also suggested to *Paul and his followers the idea of reinterpreting the law christologically—i.e., spiritually, in the light of the opposition of letter and spirit—and led them to see OT episodes as the anticipation and symbol of facts about Christ and the church (typological interpretation of the OT), through the use of an allegorical interpretation of the text. This procedure was not unknown to Palestinian Jews, but earlier used mainly by pagans to interpret myths and Homeric tales and later by Hellenized Jews (Philo, etc.). Thus Paul in 1 Cor 10:1-11 interpreted the crossing of the Red Sea and the cloud in the desert as symbolizing *baptism); in Gal 4:22-24 he saw Isaac and Ishmael symbolizing Christians and Jews, etc. During this same period Christian interpreters also started making the first collections of *Testimonia*, i.e., OT passages grouped in homogeneous series for didactic, polemical, apologetic and liturgical ends. So although Paul and other Christians still used the OT on the basis of Jewish hermeneutical procedures (use of *midrash*, *pesher* etc.), the spirit of their interpretation was by now essentially new.

The different interpretative tendencies begun in the apostolic age continued in the subapostolic age. *Clement of Rome applied the OT to the new needs of the Christian community without breaking away from its literal sense, whether illustrating his discourse with examples (*1 Clem.* 4.7.9-12: citations of Cain, Esau, Moses, Jonah, Enoch, Noah, Abraham,

etc.) or expressing his religious feelings in prayer (59-60). From the 2nd c., Christian OT apocrypha (3 and 4 Esdras, 3 and 4 Maccabees, etc.) put new content into literary forms typical of the OT: this literal appreciation acclimatized the church to the OT as the norm of the moral law, codified, e.g., in book III of *Cyprian's *Testimonia ad Quirinum* alongside the NT, while Jewish Christians of a radical tendency contested even the lawfulness of interpreting Scripture allegorically (Ps.-Clem., *Recogn.* X, 42). Against this, ps.-*Barnabas continued to broaden the typological interpretation of the OT (chs. 6 and 12, the Promised Land and Joshua as symbols of Christ), while also radicalizing the spiritual reading of the law, whose efficacy was denied to the Jews precisely because of their merely literal understanding of the sacred text (10, etc.).

But neither Paul nor Barnabas, though reading the OT with non-Jewish eyes, denied its validity for the Christian church. This denial was the work of the *gnostics, whose negative evaluation of the material world led them to devalue its creator, the God of the Jews, and consequently the OT, his revelation. So although their religious experience was rooted in certain OT passages, esp. in the creation account, profoundly reworked to bring out the distinction of various natures in human beings (spiritual, psychic, hylic), their overall evaluation of the OT reflected the influence of their basic approach: literal interpretation of anthropomorphisms and of entire episodes, in order to bring out the distinction between the just God of the OT and the good God of the NT (examples in Orig., *Princ.* II, 5, 1); positive evaluation of facts and people presented negatively in the OT as hostile to Yahweh (sin of Adam and Eve, Cain, Sodom and Gomorrah, etc.); but also allegorical interpretation, e.g., in ps.-Hipp., *Refut.* V, 16, 4-13 (*Peratae*), so as to connect various OT episodes (Cain, Joseph, Nimrod, etc.) in a sort of gnostic salvation history. Meanwhile other gnostics were less monolithic in their rejection of the OT: *Ptolemy the *Valentinian, in the *Letter to Florus*, distinguishes in the Mosaic law between parts that are imperfect but not bad, others of symbolic value, perfected and fulfilled by Christ, and still others abolished; and Valentinians and other gnostics saw the Logos already at work, in a hidden way, in the OT, and so distinguished between prophecies inspired by the Demiurge (= God of the OT) and others inspired by the Logos (Iren., *Haer.* I, 7, 3; I, 30, 11).

The gnostics opposed the just God of the OT with the good God of the NT: in this sense they were the first to use the NT books on a vast scale, considering them divinely inspired and therefore normative. The *Commentary on John* by the Valentinian *Heracleon, only fragments of which survive, is to our knowledge the first certain exegetical work dedicated to a NT book. The interpretation of the NT given by the gnostics, in this case the Valentinians, was strongly allegorizing and tended to force the text in the direction of typically gnostic doctrines: Ptolemy found the Valentinian ogdoad in John's prologue (Iren., *Haer.* I, 8, 5-6) and Heracleon saw the Samaritan woman and the son of the *basilikos* (Jn 4:46) as symbols of spiritual and psychic people (Heracleon, *Comm Jn.*, frr. 17-24.40).

The antignostic reaction in the late 2nd and early 3rd c. concentrated mainly on the defense of the OT. And if *Justin, in polemic with the Jews, confined himself to broadening its typological interpretation, *Irenaeus organized it in a specifically antignostic sense in such as way as to present the OT revelation as a progressive education of humanity, readying it to accept the supreme revelation of the NT (*Adv. haer.* IV, 13, 3; 20, 8; 21, 3): between OT and NT there is progress, not a break. In this antignostic milieu Irenaeus's exegetical *ratio* varies, not just because he combines simple typologies with very elaborate ones (V, 8, 3), but also because, alongside a typological interpretation of the OT, for other passages he gives a literal one: thus he interprets, e.g., the account of the creation and of human sin (V, 15, 4; 23, 1, etc.), as does *Theophilus (*Autol.* II, 10ff.). Even for the NT, which Irenaeus uses systematically together with the OT, the interpretation varies: sometimes, alongside the prevalent literal interpretation, he gives the allegorical one (*Adv. haer.* IV, 22, 1; V, 25, 4). But precisely because of this varied way of interpreting, guided by no precise rule, Irenaeus finds himself in difficulties in opposing the gnostics' allegorical interpretation of Scripture: he accuses it of being distorting (I, 3, 6) and refutes it in an eschatological sense (V, 35, 2), but to find a criterion of distinction between true and false allegory, he can do nothing but appeal to the church's official tradition (III, 1-4, etc.). *Tertullian's attitude is the same, brought out even more prominently by the fact that he polemicizes on several fronts, against gnostics, Jews and pagans: he rejects the pagan allegory of myths and gnostic allegory (*Ad nat.* II, 12, 17; *Adv. val.* I, 3), but he uses allegory against the Jews and against Marcion (*Adv. Mar.* III, 5, 3-4); in the end he too takes refuge in the argument from authority: only the Catholic Church gives the authentic interpretation of Scripture (*Praescr.*).

The authors whom we have so far looked at used and interpreted Scripture for polemical and catechetical ends, not for exegesis in the strict sense.

With *Hippolytus (late 2nd–early 3rd c.), the Catholics too arrived at the exegetical treatise proper, i.e., explanation dedicated to the systematic illustration of large parts of the sacred text, in particular the OT (commentaries on Daniel, *Song of Songs, the Blessings of the patriarchs, of Moses, etc.). In the *Commentary on Daniel*, typological interpretation alternates with literal, but elsewhere it clearly prevails, with a wholly *christological reading of the texts: Hippolytus is the first Christian to attest the interpretation of the bride and groom of the Song of Songs as *typoi* of Christ and the church, a Christian transposition of the Jewish interpretation that saw them as symbols of Yahweh and Israel. Despite this exegetical effort, Hippolytus feels no need to fix precise rules of interpretation, and this lack of method is felt more than once in his pages, in which simple typologies alternate with other very elaborate ones, and which are not always consistent in their evaluation of the letter of the text.

In the more demanding cultural milieu of *Alexandria, in polemic esp. with gnostics, Christian exegesis of Sacred Scripture between the late 2nd and mid 3rd c. broadened its range of activity and fixed precise norms. *Clement, who left little that is specifically exegetical but who used Scripture throughout all his works, recognizes various senses in it (historical, doctrinal, prophetic, mystical) and brings them out using a prevalently allegorical method. Indeed he saw the symbol as a means of expression for the passage from the sensible to the intelligible, and hence characteristic of religious language, which tends to present its contents in a covert way, not immediately accessible to the profane (*Strom.* V, 21). He thus extended the boundaries of the traditional allegorical interpretation of the sacred text, putting alongside the typological interpretation the cosmological one, which saw earthly realities as the *typos* of heavenly ones (the temple of Jerusalem as *typos* of heaven, *Strom.* V, 32ff.), and the moral one (Hagar and Sarah symbols of worldly knowledge and wisdom, *Strom.* I, 30), both strongly influenced by *Philo. From here he also deduced hermeneutical procedures that would become typical of Alexandrian exegesis: the symbolic value of numbers, animals, plants, etc., and allegory drawn from the etymology of Hebrew names.

*Origen brought to Alexandrian exegesis a greater wealth of interests and a more rigorous method of research. His innumerable exegetical works, grouped by the ancients into *Scholia* (collections of explanations of passages of particular interest), *Homilies* and *Commentaries*, looked not just at the traditionally more studied books (Genesis, Psalms, Prophets, Gospels, Paul), but also at others previously neglected (Joshua, Judges, Job, Proverbs, etc.). His method of research, while particularly valuing the spiritual (allegorical) interpretation, also took a systematic interest in the literal, which he saw as the initial stage of exegesis, which allowed the most important part, the allegorical, to be addressed in a nonarbitrary way. For this reason Origen gave special care to textual criticism by means of the *Hexapla*, in which the Greek translation of the OT normally used in the church, known as the Septuagint (LXX), was systematically checked against the Hebrew text and Greek translations. In *Princ.* IV, 1-3, he gives the first treatise on scriptural exegesis. Here (IV, 2, 4) he distinguishes three levels of interpretation for nearly every passage of Scripture: literal, spiritual (= typological), moral (= psychological). An outstanding example of this type of exegesis is the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, in which the three interpretations follow each other systematically, passage by passage, and the royal spouses are seen first as *typoi* of Christ and the church, then of the Logos and the believer's soul. But at other times Origen proposes two levels of interpretation, letter/spirit, correlated with the distinction of Christians into simple and perfect (or rather, becoming perfect): to the literal interpretation he adds, as the climax of the exegesis, a single, allegorical interpretation, which may assume various contents. In fact, on one hand Origen broadens the traditional typology (OT as *typos* of NT) by adding another which sees the NT as *typos* (*Ap.* 14,6) of the eternal gospel, i.e., to be fulfilled at the end of the world; on the other, like Philo and Clement, he is led to see earthly realities as the symbol of heavenly realities. Finally, he makes use of the moral dimension, i.e., the application of the sacred text to the existential experience of the individual believer. This multiform allegory is put to work through all the hermeneutical procedures that we have seen as typical of Philo and Clement. Beyond the distinction into two, three or even four senses, it finds unity and maximum density in the conviction that the word of God has an inexhaustible fecundity that no interpretation can circumscribe or exhaust: continual study allows us to know it ever better in its inexhaustible plurality of meanings (*Hom. Ex.* 1, 1).

Origenian exegesis spread widely in the East in the second half of the 3rd c., part of a vaster cultural initiative broadly open to the values of *Platonism; it met with favor, but also aroused reactions in areas dominated by Asiatic culture. While *Methodius of Olympus was influenced by Origen's allegorism, *Eustathius of Antioch (early 4th c.) reacted harshly

to it: he accused Origen of allegorizing the whole of Scripture, and criticized the abuse of allegories drawn from the etymologies of Hebrew names (PG 18, 656-657). During the same period in *Syria and *Palestine, Origenism was represented by *Eusebius of Caesarea, whose historical and antiquarian interests helped him appreciate the philological and literalist component of the master's hermeneutic, and led him to make use of the historical, as well as the traditional christological, aspect of the OT books he interpreted (Psalms, Isaiah). Gospel passages, also, that posed interpretive difficulties were resolved according to the letter of the text, without recourse to allegory (*Quaestiones et solutiones* to Stephen and Marinus).

Eusebius already felt the fresh air that began to blow through every aspect of Christian life with the Constantinian change, which led to a great literary flowering, including in exegesis. In the East this novelty made itself felt in a progressive use of the letter of the sacred text, to the detriment of allegorical interpretation, which was warned against in some quarters as excessive and artificial in its generalized application to the whole of Scripture, typical of the Alexandrians. Two contributions to this change of direction—which never succeeded in prevailing—were the criticism of the pagan *Porphyry, who had accused Christian exegetes of having recourse to allegory to avoid the difficulties posed by the letter of the biblical text, and the spread of historical sensibility and interest, which led to the OT being read not just as a christological anticipation of the NT, but as a work of history, the history of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

The center of this anti-Alexandrian reaction in the late 4th and early 5th c. was the so-called school of Antioch. Its remote origins must be seen not in *Lucian of Antioch, of whose exegetical *ratio* we know nothing, but in the above-mentioned interest in the literal appreciation of Scripture, noted in Syria and Palestine in the course of the 4th c. It was contributed to, on one hand, by the literalistic strand we referred to, alongside the allegorical, in Asiatic exegesis (Irenaeus, Theophilus), and on the other by the Eusebian exploitation of the literalist and philological component of Origen's exegesis. *Acacius of Caesarea, *Eusebius of Emesa, *Apollinaris of Laodicea, despite the little that remains of their work, well attest this use of literal interpretation of OT and NT: in Eusebius of Emesa's observation (*Hom.* 11, p. 261 Buytaert) that we should not have recourse to allegory to resolve the difficulties of a passage, we seem to hear Porphyry's criticism reechoed.

Among the Cappadocians, if *Gregory of Nyssa remained faithful to the letter and spirit of Origenian exegesis, whose spiritual dimension he particularly utilized (*Commentary on Song of Songs*, *Life of Moses*), *Basil's *Hexaemeron* shows traces of the new way of evaluating the OT: not so much in its isolated attacks on allegorism (*Hexaem.* 3, 9), as in its reading the biblical account of creation in a spirit of scientific erudition (7 and 8 on the creation of the animals). His commentary on certain psalms also restricts their christological meaning in favor of moral teaching, following a tendency favored by preachers of the time. The founder of the school of Antioch—a reality quite different from the Alexandrian school, as it was not controlled by the local bishop—was *Diodore of Tarsus (second half 4th c.); its greatest representative was his disciple *Theodore of Mopsuestia, since *John Chrysostom's interests were mainly in oratory, though in the context of a literalist Antiochene exegesis. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (first half 5th c.) closes the series of these great exegetes: unlike his predecessors, he left a bit of room for traditional typology. The literalism of Diodore (of whom only fragments remain, to which has recently been added a *Commentary on the Psalms*) and Theodore was fed by historical interests and was openly polemical against Alexandrian allegorism and its hermeneutical procedures, against which they also wrote (lost) theoretical works. In theory, Theodore maintained the hermeneutical principle that certain OT passages were to be understood as *typoi* of Christ, and he even established rules to identify them (PG 66, 320-321), but in practice he restricted the application of the rule as much as possible: he interpreted only four psalms (2, 8, 44, 109) christologically, and he denied any christological meaning to the *Song of Songs*, seeing it only as a profane love song. Typology tended to link OT and NT; but Theodore saw more break than continuity between them. For this reason he was a good exegete of Paul, while his programmatic literalism cut him off from the symbolic riches of John's gospel.

A near-contemporary of Theodore was the Alexandrian *Didymus, whose vast exegetical output (partially restored by the Tura papyri) attests the persistence of the Origenian tradition at Alexandria: everything in him is derived from his master, from theoretical principles to the whole baggage of hermeneutical procedures, with a tendency to a spiritualistic type of interpretation sensitive to the needs of monastic life. But with *Cyril of Alexandria the unity of the Alexandrian exegetical *ratio* entered a crisis: on the one hand, an evident historical interest led him to make use of the literal sense of the OT books he interpreted, esp. when

they concerned the historical vicissitudes of Israel; on the other, he felt the weight of the Antiochene criticisms of excessive allegorism and he expressly declared that the christological reading of the OT should not be indiscriminately extended to the whole text, as Origen and Didymus wished, but should be limited to certain passages (PG 71, 600-601). Consequently his OT commentaries (Isaiah, Minor Prophets) show a mixture of letter and allegory that is less open to Antiochene criticism, but which lacks the compactness of the traditional interpretation. Even his commentary on John, a text so well suited to symbolic interpretation, suffers from his limiting stance toward allegorism.

In the East the fashion for patristic *florilegia, compiled for the demands of theological polemic, had already begun in Cyril's day. They reflect a general literary exhaustion which, in the specific field of exegesis, was expressed in the composition of *catenae, i.e., commentaries made by bringing together, in the margin of a biblical text, verse by verse, a number of interpretations of famous exegetes. This convenient system of compilation, begun by *Procopius of Gaza in the 6th c., has preserved interpretations taken from now-vanished texts, but it also facilitated their disappearance, since the summary proved more handy than the original. But even in the 7th c. we note the effective survival of the methods of Alexandrian exegesis in *Anastasius the Sinaite, and in the 6th c. the first Greek commentaries, by *Oecumenius and *Andrew of Caesarea, on the Apocalypse, a book much neglected in the East as a result of antimillenarian polemic.

In the field of exegesis the West lagged perceptibly behind the East. Tertullian, *Novatian and Cyprian use many biblical passages in their works, but had no specific exegetical interests. Hippolytus of Rome (to be distinguished from the Eastern author of the commentaries on Song of Songs, Daniel, etc.), part of whose commentary on the Psalms has survived (though attributed to him not without reservation), did have exegetical interests; but he still wrote in Greek. For the first Latin exegetical works we must await the late 3rd and early 4th c.: *Reticius of Autun, author of a lost commentary on Song of Songs, and *Victorinus of Petovium (Pettau), whose surviving commentary on the Apocalypse reveals millenarian sympathies. Only in the second half of the 4th c. did this type of literature begin to be cultivated with interest, both in homilies and in commentaries intended only for reading: for this latter genre, we mention *Hilary (commentaries on Matthew and Psalms), for the former *Ambrose, whose many OT commentaries and that on Luke are derived from collections of homilies: we know how much his preaching influenced *Augustine. In fact both Hilary and Ambrose made the Alexandrian type of exegesis known in the West, its hermeneutical principles prevailing with the spread of Platonic philosophy (Origen, Plotinus, Porphyry) in the West. It was this type of strongly allegorizing exegesis that allowed certain harsh OT anthropomorphisms to be presented in a way accessible to the sensibility of educated people, while the composition of verse paraphrases (*Juvencus, *Sedulius, etc.) sought to make up for the insufficiencies of language and style in the too-literal Latin translations of Scripture from the Greek text. Special mention must be made of *Tyconius and *Marius Victorinus. Tyconius, a *Donatist *sui generis*, wrote the *Liber regularum*, in which he presents some hermeneutical rules aimed at facilitating an allegorical understanding of the sacred text, and a fundamental commentary on the Apocalypse, lost but for large fragments. In the latter he downplayed the work's eschatological tension, referring it not just to the end times, but to the whole time of the church; he also spiritualized its interpretation in an antimillenarian sense and softened its anti-Roman *animus*. This work inspired subsequent Western commentaries on the Apocalypse, and indeed from them we can reconstruct the Tyconian exegesis. Marius Victorinus, the famous *grammaticus* slightly earlier than Tyconius and a convert to Christianity in his old age, was the first Westerner to comment on some of Paul's epistles (those on Galatians, Philippians and Ephesians survive). Standing outside the patristic tradition, he comments on them in a rigidly literal way according to the rules of scholastic commentary on classical authors, bringing out well the Pauline opposition between law and grace.

These commentaries of Marius Victorinus suggest two considerations of a more general nature: (1) it is clear that Victorinus knows little or nothing of the OT; we see almost the same ignorance earlier in *Lactantius; the fact that some preachers of this time (Ambrose, *Zeno, *Gregory of Elvira) insist particularly on OT themes argues that this was something their flocks needed to be instructed on, proof of a fairly generalized ignorance of the OT in the West. (2) Interest in Paul did not remain confined to Victorinus but developed greatly in the late 4th and early 5th c., esp. at Rome, related to the increased interest in the problems of the relation between divine grace and human free will, as various commentaries attest (*Ambrosiaster, Jerome, *Pelagius, Origen-Rufinus on Romans, an epistle that particularly interested Augustine). If Jerome depended closely

on Origen and so was happy to allegorize, Ambrosiaster and Pelagius preferred a literal interpretation, proof of the spread, in the West too, of the literalistic tendency that we noticed in the East in the course of the 4th c. This tendency, which culminated in *Julian of Eclanum (commentaries on some minor prophets), closely dependent on Theodore of Mopsuestia, was decidedly surpassed by the allegorizing tendency, though not without an awareness of the danger of an exaggerated allegorism.

The acme of Western exegesis was in the late 4th and early 5th c., with Jerome and Augustine. Jerome was trained exegetically in the East, at Didymus's school and on Origen's books, and his first experiments (on Ecclesiastes, Galatians, Ephesians, etc.) are little more than paraphrases summarizing Origenian commentaries. But gradually, through the effect of the Origenist controversy, Jerome distanced himself from the master's allegorism, while appreciating more and more his philological and critical rigor. The main fruit of this rethinking was the Latin version of the OT, based on the original Hebrew with the help of Greek translations; this was a new and sensational phenomenon for Latin culture, usually deaf to the needs of philological criticism, so much so that Jerome encountered difficulties in getting his translation accepted, though ultimately his fame rocketed. His mature exegesis, dedicated mainly to the major and minor Prophets, was in theory frequently critical of allegory (*Ep.* 53, 7), though he continued to support Origen's tripartite interpretation (*Ep.* 120, 12). His procedure combines the dictates of philology with those of allegory: he critically discusses each passage he examines, comparing the Hebrew text and the Greek translations, esp. that of the LXX; then the literal and spiritual (allegorical) interpretations follow, the latter taken from Origen and Didymus. Even the commentary on Matthew, his one mature exegetical work dedicated to the NT, though programmatically literal, is still variously indebted to Origenian allegorism.

As for Augustine, even his personal life interests the history of exegesis: we must suppose many educated people of the time to have shared his initial distaste for the OT because of its many anthropomorphisms and the bad form of the Latin translation, as well as his overcoming of this distaste thanks to Ambrose's allegorical and spiritualistic exegesis. On the strength of this experience, the early Augustine was strongly allegoristic in his explanation of Genesis against the Manicheans. But his allegorical fervor decreased with time (*De Genesi ad litteram*), though he always preferred the spiritual type of interpretation to the literal. His activity was expressed both in commentaries made for reading—returning several times to the book of Genesis—and in both isolated and serial preaching (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *Tractatus in Iohannem*), aimed at drawing from the biblical text the greatest possible spiritual nourishment for his rough hearers, to whose level he sought to adapt the tone of his discourse. His great theoretical work in four books, *De doctrina christiana*, made Scripture the sole foundation of Christian culture and gave rules of interpretation, in part taken from Tyconius, which fully respected the demands of philology and spirituality as well as the freedom of the interpreter: a difficult text allows of different interpretations, as long as they are not contrary to *recta fides* (III, 27).

The general decline of Christian letters in the West caused by the barbarian invasions had ruinous repercussions on exegesis: the few works dedicated to it from the mid-5th to the 7th c. were mostly content to repeat, usually abbreviating, the interpretations of the great exegetes of the past, esp. Jerome and Augustine (*Isidore of Seville, *Julian of Toledo), while commentators on the Apocalypse, a work much read because it was felt to be in tune with those dramatic times, went back to Tyconius (Caesarius, Apringius, Primasius, in the 6th c.). The manuals of exegetical theory by *Eucherius and *Junilius sanctioned the preeminence of allegorical interpretation, which found in *Gregory the Great, at the end of the 6th c., an exegete capable of reviving in a new and personal way the suggestions inherited from Augustine and others (*Moralia in Iob*, etc.). *John Cassian (early 5th c.) attests (*Coll.* 14, 8), alongside the old norm of three senses of Scripture, that of four senses, destined for great popularity in the Middle Ages: to the three traditional senses (literal, spiritual [typological], moral [psychological]), he adds the anagogical, which sees earthly realities as the symbol of heavenly realities.

G. Bardy, *Commentaires patristiques de la Bible*: DBS 2, 73-103; *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I (1970) 412-586; B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse* I, Paris 1980; M. Simonetti, *Profilo storico dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1981; M. Fiedrowicz, *Exegese*: LACL (1998) 226-228; M. Simonetti, *Lettera e/o Allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985; K. Froelich (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, Philadelphia 1985; J.N. Guinot, *La typologie comme technique herméneutique: Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères*m Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 2, Strasbourg 1989; E. Norelli, *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana* 1. *Da Gesù a Origene*, Bologna 1993; C. Kannengiesser, *Die Bibel in der frühen Kirche*: CoeD 27 (1991) 25-30; A. Quacquarelli, *Esegesi biblica e patristica tra tardo antico e altomedioevo*, Bari 1991; C. Schäublin, *Pagane Prägung der christlichen Exegese*, in J.V. Oort - U. Wickert (eds.), *Die christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, Kampen 1992, 148-173; S. Felici (ed.), *Esegesi e catechesi nei*

Padri (secc. II-IV), Rome 1993; *secc. IV-VII*, Rome 1994; M. Canévet, *Bible et les Pères*: NRTh 116 (1994) 48-60; J.V. Banning, *Allegorische Schriftauslegung*: ZKTh 117 (1995) 265-295; C. Moreschini (ed.), *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in età tardoantica: Atti del III convegno dell'associazione di Studi Tardoantichi*, Naples 1995; G. Schöllgen (ed.), *Stimuli. Die Exegese und ihre Hermeneutikin Antike und Christentum. Festschrift f. E. Dassmann*, Münster 1996; M. Fiedrowicz, *Prinzipien der Schriftauslegung in der Alten Kirche*, Bern 1997; *L'esegesi nei Padri Latini. Dalle origini a Gregorio Magno.* XXVIII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 6-8 May 1999, 2 vols., Rome 2000; Ch. Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, Leiden 2004.

M. Simonetti

EXHORTATIO DE PAENITENTIA. A collection of biblical passages on the theme of *penance. The title probably derives from the text's beginning, which speaks of remission of sins for those who turn to God with a sincere heart. The invitation to do penance (*agere paenitentiam*) is in fact defined as the act of returning to God (*convertere ad Dominum*, Sir 17:23). The text essentially takes up the teaching of the prophets, calling God's people to conversion, *revertere* considered a synonym for *convertere* (Is 31:6; Jer 3:12, 14, 22; Ezek 18:30; Zech 1:3; Hos 14:2; Sir 17:23). The author presents various texts of the prophets to convince the sinner to trust in divine mercy (Is 54:8), since the hour has arrived to return to the Lord, whose justice does not leave the sinner to die in his sin. Many NT passages are also adduced, e.g., from Acts (8:19), St. Paul (2 Cor 7:10; 2:10; 12:20; 13:2; 2 Tim 2:16) and Revelation (Rev 2:5). The texts' silence on gospel passages concerning conversion is curious. This does not diminish its literary value, in which the choice of the many *Scripture verses confirms the connection between them, so as to create a dialogue between God and the sinner. Although *Cyprian was considered a possible author, this hypothesis has been abandoned for insufficient evidence. The African Latin version of the Bible was already widely circulated in Cyprian's time and had many editions. Nor can we indicate with certainty the date of this text.

CPL 65; PL, 4,1153-1158; Patrologia I, 601; B. Capelle, *Le texte du psautier latin en Afrique*, Rome 1913, 51, n. 2.

M.W. Libambu

EXODUS

I. The Fathers of the first 2 c. - II. The Greek Fathers from the 3rd c. - III. Writers in Syriac - IV. The Latin Fathers.

I. The Fathers of the first 2 c. Great attention was given to the Exodus from the start. *Clement of Rome's *Letter to the Corinthians* uses the Exodus to exhort the faithful to obedience, seeing the Mosaic institutions as a typological figure of the church's ministries (esp. chs. 40-43, 53). The *Epistle of *Barnabas* emphasizes the break with the OT: what matters in the Exodus is its spiritual and allegorical interpretation (chs. 4, 12, 14-15). *Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* contains many typological interpretations of the Exodus (DSp IV, col. 1974). *Irenaeus says that the typology of the Exodus is a tradition received from the Presbyters, which we have no right to ignore (*Adv. haer.* IV, 30-31; examples in DSp IV, 1974). The *Homily on Easter*, published under the name of *Melito of Sardis, is a parallel between the first Passover and the passion.

II. The Greek Fathers from the 3rd c. *Clement of Alexandria was very interested in the Exodus, often in dependence on Alexandrian Jewish traditions, and esp. on *Philo (J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri*, Paris 1950, 191-193; C. Mondésert, Intr. to SC 30, 36-37). The first works explicitly dedicated to the Exodus are those of *Origen: *Homilies on Exodus* and *Scholia on Exodus*, preserved in the catenae (Devreesse, 41-44), to which we must add two books *On Easter*, perhaps part of the eight Homilies on *Easter mentioned by Eusebius (ed. O. Guéraud and P. Nautin, *Origène*, *Sur la Pâque*, Paris 1979), as well as numerous pages from other works of Origen, esp. his *Homilies on Numbers* (Eng. tr., T.P. Scheck, ACT, Downers Grove, IL 2009), *Leviticus* and *Joshua*, and the *Scholia* on these books. In the Exodus Origen sees, besides the historical sense, three others: an allegorical sense (applied to Christ and the church), a moral or tropological sense (applied to the life of each Christian) and an anagogical or eschatological sense (reserved for the consummation of the ages) (*see* *Exegesis, patristic): see H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit. L'intelligence de l'Ecriture d'après Origène*, Paris 1950; *Exégèse Médiévale*, I, Paris 1959, 198-207. Also see the main references in DSp IV, 1976–1979. *Eusebius of Caesarea's works contain many teachings on the Exodus; see esp. the important fragment *De solemnitate paschali* (CPG 3479), which applies the prescriptions concerning the Jewish Passover to the Christian life; but also numerous other passages: DSp IV, 1979. Some texts of *Didymus of Alexandria on the Exodus are preserved in the catenae (Devreesse, 172); an edition of new texts discovered at Tura was made by P. Nautin and L. Doutreleau (CPG Suppl. 2546). Of the Cappadocians, apart from some passages in *Basil and *Gregory of Na-

zianzus, we must cite mainly *Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses*, composed of two parts: one historical, but also based on extrabiblical traditions; the other allegorical, containing a description of the perfect life using the patterns of the Exodus (J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri*, 191-203; W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, Wiesbaden 1955). *Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechesis* and John of Jerusalem's *Mystagogical Catechesis* contain numerous parallels between the Christian situation and the events of the Exodus: III, 5; XII, 28; XIII, 20-21; XVI, 25; *Myst.* I, 2-3. Some fragments of *Diodore of Tarsus on the Exodus are preserved in the Greek catenae or in a Latin translation published by Pitra (CPG 3815 and 3817). Important fragments of Eusebius of Emesa are also preserved in the catenae (Devreesse, 82-94). Numerous passages in the works of St. John Chrysostom treat of the Exodus, in particular in his Homilies on 1 Cor 9 (PG 61, 190-193) and 1 Cor 10 (PG 51, 241-252); for other references see DSp IV, 1980ff. Theodore of Mopsuestia comments abundantly on the Exodus in his *Commentary on Psalm 77* (ed. Devreesse, 517-541). Much of the teaching of these authors recurs in Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Questions on the Exodus*. Of *Severian of Gabala we must cite esp. the *Homilia de Serpente*. A scholium of *Hesychius of Jerusalem on Ex 3:8 (Devreesse, 181) clearly indicates his principle of interpretation, which he applies in the *Commentary on Leviticus*: the events of the Exodus apply to the church. We can draw abundantly on Cyril of Alexandria's *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum* and other passages in his works, esp.: *De ador. et cultu in spiritu et verit.* 1 and 5; *Comment. in Joan.* 3, 6; *Hom. 60 in Lc.* (CSCO 140, 155-156); his interpretation follows Origen. We must also mention an extract of *Gennadius of Constantinople on Exodus 26 (CPG 3970), a sermon of *Basil of Seleucia on Moses (CPG 6656, 9) and two pseudo-Athanasian homilies on Easter, probably by the same author (CPG 6657-6658). In ps.-*Dionysius, as in Gregory of Nyssa, Moses's ascent of Mt. Sinai becomes a model of spiritual ascent (*Ep.* 8, 1; *Mystical theology* 1). Many details concerning the Exodus can be found in the work of *Severus of Antioch: see the fragments cited by Devreesse (187-201) and the *Cathedral Homily* 67 on the Virgin Mary (PO 8, 349-367). In *John Climacus's *Scala Paradisi*, the Exodus is interpreted in terms of the monastic life: see esp. Steps 1 and 2 (PG 88, 632ff.).

III. Writers in Syriac. *Aphraate's *Demonstrations* 11 and 12 apply to Christians the prescriptions of the Exodus on the Passover and those on the crossing of the Jordan (PS I, 501-502 and 505ff.). *Ephrem makes numerous references to the Exodus and gives great prominence to the figure of Moses; see esp. his *Commentary on the Exodus* (CSCO 152-153), whose interpretation is mainly christological and ecclesial. In the *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles*, preserved in Armenian, there are also many texts referring esp. to 1 Cor 10 and Hebrews. For *Jacob of Sarug, see esp. his *Homily on Moses's Veil*. *Philoxenus of Mabbug systematically uses the Exodus to describe the Christian's spiritual journey; see esp. *Homilies* 7, 9 and 13 in E. Lemoine's translation (SC 44).

IV. The Latin Fathers. For *Hippolytus of Rome, see esp. his commentary on the *Blessings of Moses*; but numerous other citations are scattered throughout his works (DSp IV, 1975). For *Tertullian, we must cite esp. books 2-4 of *Adversus Marcionem*, chs. 1-6 of *Adversus Judaeos* and the treatise *De Baptismo*, very important for sacramental typology. For a Christian interpretation of the Exodus, *Cyprian's *Testimonia ad Quirinum* are a first-rate source. Along the same lines, we must point out St. *Hilary's *Tractatus mysteriorum*, *Zeno of Verona's *Tractatus* or *Sermones* 1 and 2, and *Gregory of Elvira's *Tractatus de libris scripturarum*. St. Ambrose is one of the richest sources for the spiritual interpretation of the Exodus, esp. from the liturgical perspective: see *De sacramentis*, *De mysteriis*, as well as many of his commentaries on the psalms (DSp IV, 1983). See also *Gaudentius of Brescia's first 6 *Tractatus* on the Exodus and some of Ambrosiaster's *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. To St. *Jerome's homily *De Exodo in vigilia Paschae* we must add *Ep.* 22, 68 and esp. *Ep.* 78 to *Fabiola, which applies the stages of the desert to the Christian life, taking inspiration from Origen's Homily 27 on Numbers (see A. Méhat, in SC 29, 13-16 and 48-64). Of *Paulinus of Nola, we may mention *Carmen* 26. Cyprianus Gallus's 5th-c. poem *Heptateuchos* (ed. R. Peiper, CSEL 23, Vienna, 1891) is a historical summary of the exodus story (cf. *Sedulius's *Paschale Carmen* and *Opus Paschale*).

St. *Augustine's work is very rich in references to the Exodus. The main traditional themes are grouped in the following passages: *Contra Faustum* 12, 29-30; *De catechizandis rudibus* 20; *Sermones* 352 and 363; *In Johannis Evangelium* 26, 12 and 28, 9. The Exodus is usually interpreted in terms of the life of Christians, freed from slavery to sin and pilgrims in search of the promised land. Many texts consider the Paschal lamb and the Passover (main references in M. Pontet, *L'exégèse de S. Augustin prédicateur*, Paris 1945, 360-361; to them we must add *Ep.* 55, 2.3.9.17.30). The *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* are generally confined to the literal historical sense. Some particular themes are the crossing of the Red

Sea (*Serm. Wilmart* 5, 2), Mara (*Quaest. in Heptat.* 2, 57), the water from the rock (*Contr. Faust.* 16, 15-17; *Civ. Dei*, 13, 21), the bronze serpent (*Serm.* 6, 7), Moses's fast (*Ep.* 55, 28; *Serm.* 205, 1; 210, 8; cf. M. Pontet, ibid., 302), etc. On the theophanies to Moses, see J. Lebreton, *S. Augustin théologien de la Trinité. Son exégèse des théophanies*, in *Misc. Agost.* 2, 821-836. *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, probably by Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage, contains a commentary on the events of the Exodus which depends on Origen, as does the ps.-Ambrosian treatise *De XLII mansionibus filiorum Israel*.

With *John Cassian, the Exodus becomes the image of the monastic life, the direct and certain way, the main road leading to God (*Conlat.* 24, 24-25; cf. J. Leclercq, *La voie royale*: Vie Spir. Supp. 7 [1948] 347ff.). In the Exodus are found models for the monastic vocation (*Conlat.* 3, 3-4), lessons for resisting temptation (3, 7), for spiritual combat (5, 14-16), etc. (DSp II, 235). Along the same lines, *Eucherius, a monk at *Lérins before becoming bishop of *Lyons, praises the desert in his *De laude heremi*: it is the place where we meet God, like Moses and the people who left Egypt. The same teachings, but with a much wider perspective, recur in *Gregory the Great: the *Moralia in Iob* frequently compare the problems of the spiritual life with the episodes of the Exodus (DSp IV, 1986-1987); a fine parallel between the first Passover and the *Eucharist is in *Hom. 2 in Evangelia* 7-9. An important series of sermons by St. *Caesarius of Arles concerns the Exodus: *Serm.* 95-116. The author depends mainly on Origen, but also on Augustine and Gregory of Elvira, and applies the main teachings of the Exodus to daily Christian life. In *Cassiodorus's *Expositio Psalmorum*, see esp. psalms 77, 94, 104, 105, 113, 134, 135. *Isidore of Seville's *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum* contain a rich spiritual explanation of the Exodus, influenced by Origen but also by Jerome's *Letter to Fabiola*. Besides the commentaries attributed to him, *Bede wrote *De mansionibus filiorum Israel* (*Epist.* 14) and *De tabernaculo et vasis eius ac vestibus sacerdotum*, influenced by Isidore and Origen.

CPL 5, 118; LCI 2, 436-442; 3, 282-297; RAC 7, 22-44; F.J. Doelger, *Der Durchzug durch das Rote Meer als Sinnbild der christlichen Taufe*: AC 2 (1930) 63-69; Id., *Der Durchzug durch den Jordan als Sinnbild der christlichen Taufe*: ibid. 70-79; H. Scheidt, *Die Taufwasserweihegebete im Sinne vergleichender Liturgieforschung untersucht*, Münster 1935; P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Église*, Uppsala 1942; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri*, Paris 1950, 131-256; Id., *Bible et Liturgie*, Paris 1951; F. Hofmans, *De profet Mozes in de Apologie van sint Justinus martelaar*: EThL 30 (1954) 416-439; R.M. Tonneau, *Moïse dans la Tradition Syrienne*, in *Moïse, homme de l'Alliance*, Paris 1955, 245-265; J. Daniélou, *Moïse, exemple et figure chez Grégoire de Nysse*, ibid. 267-282; A. Luneau, *Moïse et les Pères latins*: ibid. 283-303; O. Rousseau, *Les mystères de l'Exode d'après les Pères*: Bible et vie chrétienne 9 (1955) 31-42; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois*, Vatican City 1959; P. Prigent, *L'Epître de Barnabé et ses sources*, Paris 1961, 60-141; R. Le Déaut - J. Lécuyer, s.v. *Exode*: DSp IV, 1961, 1957-1995; J. Rousse, s.v. *Lectio divina*: DSp IX, 472-481; P.M. Guillaume, s.v. *Moïse*: DSp X, 1464-1471; H.J. Sieben, *Exegesis Patrum*, Rome 1983, 22-25; G. Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium*, Rome 1989, 264-281; M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament* 1. *The History of Its Interpretation* 1-2, Göttingen 1996–2000; D. von der Nahmer, *Agiografia altomedievale e uso della Bibbia*, Naples 2001; J.T. Lienhard (ed.), *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (ACCS, Old Testament, 3), Downers Grove, IL 2001.

J. Lécuyer

EXORCISM - EXORCIST. The Latin word *exorcismus* (sometimes *exorchismus*) derives from the Greek ἐξορκισμός, and designates the action exercised by pagan priests, in the name of the ancient deities, to cast out impure or evil spirits (*actio exorcizandi*, *actio expellendi*). In this sense the practice was widespread in pagan antiquity, using magic formulas, dance and purification rites. In Christian Latin a theological specification was added: the action of casting out demons in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. This new semantics was enriched by the reading of the gospels. Indeed, some spoke of *exorcismum agere* (Tert., *Praescr.* 41; *Spect.* 26; Cyp., *Sent.* 37; Aug., *C. Iul.* 3, 9,18). This action came to be increasingly part of the liturgy, esp. *baptism, which required confirmation on the part of the church by a minister called precisely an *exorcist* (Cyp., *Ep.* 23; Isid., *Eccl. Off.* 2, 13). The *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 24 lists him after the subdeacon (*presbyteros, diaconos, subdiaconos, adque exorcistas et lectores, ostiarios etiam et omnes perinde, qui sunt, personalium munerum expertes esse praecipimus*) (ibid.). The exorcist received from the bishop the power to lay hands on the sick and on catechumens (*potestatem inponendi manus super inergumenos sive catecumenos*) (Isid., *Eccl. Off.* 2, 13). Outside of the context of the baptismal liturgy, *Augustine recognizes in the exorcist one who can understand the sounds of the words spoken by a person tormented by the devil (*cum daemon in eis loquitur ea passione, cui exorcista requiritur, sciunt, quid loquantur: quanto minus ille intellegeret verborum sonos*) (*Gen. litt.* II, 36). So, it was in the context of a rite of exorcism (*ritus exorcizandi in ecclesia Christi ante baptismum*) that this power was used in word and in action.

The conception of exorcism in Christian antiquity derives basically from Jewish faith in the divine power to cast out demons and unclean spirits. In the early church, the fruitfulness of the practice of

exorcism was a consequence of the Lord's command in the gospels; indeed, casting out demons was a sign that announced the coming of the kingdom of God (Mk 16:17; Mt 18:19). The disciples were conscious of and convinced that they were continuing Jesus' messianic work in the world. In the apologetic context, exorcism quickly became an argument apt for proving and demonstrating the truth of the Christian religion, which many passages of the apologists confirm.

In the East, the Greek Fathers stand out for their claim of the superiority of Christians vis-à-vis magic and the pagan gods. In other words, Christians, even if less educated, were able to perform these acts because of their faith in God, who renders effective his grace, inherent in their religion (*C. Cels.* 4, 1). During this period it can be said that exorcism was a part of the church's daily life. At the church's beginnings, however, exorcism properly speaking did not yet exist. The presence of this power in laypeople, men or women, was not ruled out. In fact all Christians, esp. those who had the charism, could use this power according to need, even with all the risks of abuse. *Athanasius insists on the fact that the Christian religion had freed human beings from their servitude to the lies of paganism, casting out the demons' deceptions by the *cross (*Incarn. Verbi* 47). Indeed, one of the novelties of exorcism in the patristic period in the East was the Lord's cross as a symbol of God's victory over the powers of evil. St. *Epiphanius speaks of healing through faith and the sign of the cross. But at the same time, the church attended to prebaptismal exorcism through *catechesis. Among the Eastern Fathers, *Cyril of Jerusalem gave particular attention to this liturgy, showing the link between exorcism and Sacred *Scripture, and esp. its link with the mystery of the cross. In any case, beyond its function in the propagation of the new religion, the Fathers linked exorcism to the question of health, emphasizing a theology of integral salvation, since the health of a person possessed by the devil was often compromised due to the consequences of their sins. *Gregory of Nyssa, recounting the life of St. *Ephrem, stresses the fact that a possessed person was freed from demons after confessing his sin of avarice and cupidity to the saint, who healed him through prayer and the laying on of hands.

In the West also, the first evidence of exorcism had primarily an apologetic purpose. *Minucius Felix says that demons are inferior to the power of the one God (*Octavius* 27). *Tertullian uses exorcism as a testimony to the true religion in his apology against the pagans, saying that the order given by Christians causes demons, who had falsely proclaimed themselves gods, to flee. The novelty here was undoubtedly the fact that Christians could exercise this power of Christ freely, as opposed to the pagans who demanded payment for their services (*Apol.* 33). The stress on the theology of divine power, probably a result of interpretation of the first article of the Creed (*Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem*), also appears in *Cyprian, when he tries to convince his interlocutor, Demetrianus, about the demons' flight during exorcism (*Demetr.* 14, 15). Here the bishop of *Carthage wants to emphasize the dramatic victory of the divine power over his enemy, the devil; he stresses the fact that the devil groans and shrieks before being cast out. This is not an unimportant detail: many other Latin Fathers take it up in their descriptions of exorcism, to underscore the collapse of the pagan gods, incarnated in the demons who have been cast out. On the whole, the evidence highlights the actualization of the divine power through human words and gestures, in particular through the laying on of hands. Nonetheless, it was rightly held that the divine power was not limited to a particular human gesture or word. St. *Martin, for example, prayed silently during an exorcism without touching the possessed person.

Considering the seriousness of this mission, the early church insisted on spiritual preparation—prayer and fasting—before performing an exorcism. But with the passage of time, the practice of exorcism was subjected to the oversight of episcopal authority, so as to avoid the abuses and dangers associated with this ministry. Thus exorcism had to be recognized as a ministry of the church, and the exorcist, being part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, had to refrain from any private employment (law of 5 March 377). This arrangement was insisted upon so that exorcism, like all other ministries, would be exercised within the church, full time, and apart from any financial interest. Hence the practice of exorcism as an ecclesiastical ministry was no longer left to the spontaneity of the faithful, but had to follow at least a certain order recognized by the church, since it involved an authoritative prayer: the command to the demon to depart. The ritual, in fact, was composed mainly of formulas of prayer imitating Jesus' words in the gospels; the power of these words could make those possessed by demons shout and tremble. *Hilary testifies to this in Psalm 64, as does *Sulpicius Severus regarding St. Martin (*Dialog.* III, 6). Simplicity was insisted on in the formulas—not too much refinement or rhetorical enhancement. Some elements of the rite were accepted only after many years: breathing on the person, *anointing with oil,

use of a cross (as *Athanasius and *Cyril of Jerusalem testify). A certain freedom must be recognized both in the choice of formulas and in the order of the elements of the ritual, since exorcism was not only a ministry, but also a charism linked to a specific person. St. Euphrasia (d. 410), for example, used her mother superior's staff to strike at and cast out the demons. One of the oldest rituals of exorcism is Egyptian in origin: it used the explicit formula of authority to cast out the demon, after invoking the names of the patriarchs, the saints and Christ.

To sum up, we can say that the practice of exorcism began in private houses, to later enter into the churches through the liturgy, esp. the baptismal liturgy. At this time Christians began to distinguish the exorcism of a possessed person from the exorcism of the unbaptized. Certain liturgical acts therefore came to be fixed: prayer, laying on of hands, use of oil. In Augustine the word *exorcismus*, though it appears rarely, is used in the context of the fight against *Pelagianism. As a rite of purification done by the minister during the baptism of infants, exorcism became a strong argument not only regarding the universality of original sin, but also concerning the will of Christians to break every tie with the devil (*Pecc. meritis et remissione de bapt. parvul.* 1, 34, 63).

RAC 7, 44-117; LTK³ 3, 1125-1126; ThLL 5, 1554-1558; DACL, 5, 964-978; DTC, 5, 1762-1780; ibid., 1780-1786; DDC 5, 668-671; F.J. Dölger, *Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritual*, Paderborn 1909; A. Blaise - H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens*, Strasbourg 1954, 331; A. Adnès - P. Canivet, *Guérisons miraculeuses et exorcismes dans l'Histoire Philothée de Théodoret de Cyr*: RHR 171 (1967) 53-82, 149-179; O. Boecher, *Christus exorcista*, Stuttgart 1972; B. Kleinheyer, *Keine Handauflegung zur Weihe von Exorzisten*: RBen 90 (1980) 141-147; H.A. Kelly, *The Devil at Baptism. Ritual, Theology, and Drama*, Ithaca 1985; R.J.S. Barrett-Lennard, *Christian Healing After the New Testament. Some Approaches to Illness in the Second, Third and Fourth Centuries*, Lanham - New York - London 1994; A. Destro - M. Pesce, *Paolo, l'esorcismo e la magia secondo gli Atti degli Apostoli*, in *Atti del II Simposio di Tarso su s. Paolo Apostolo*, Rome 1994, 89-116; A. Monaci Castagno, *Il diavolo e i suoi angeli. Testi e tradizioni (secoli I-III)*, Florence 1996; W. Cotter, *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity, A Sourcebook*, London 1999; T.M. Finn, *Exorcism and Social Analysis: The Second Century Roman Christians and Survival*: SP 18/3, 141-153; AugL 2, 1188-1193 (ample bibliography); R. Wisniewski, *Suspended in the Air. On the Peculiar Case of Exorcism in Late Ancient Christian Literature*, in *Euergesias Charin, Studies Presented to B. Bravo and E. Wipszycka by Their Disciples*, ed. T. Derda et al., Warsaw 2002, 363-380.

M.W. Libambu

EXPIATION. In patristic theology the concept of expiation is found mainly in the soteriological context, and in this case too it develops from biblical categories and images. In the OT, the word that the Vulgate and modern versions render *expiatio* (purification) or *propitiatio* (Jerome, *Dan.* 8,16) corresponds to the Hebrew *kipper*. This means primarily the action of purifying persons and things to make them once more acceptable to God. It takes place primarily through *sacrifices offered by the priest, but also by other means, such as intercession, suffering (Is 53) and esp. conversion, without which, according to the prophets, there is no expiation (Moraldi, on the OT and Judaism). But this fundamental theme should be considered along with other complementary ones: the doctrine of sin to be expiated, the restoration of the covenant or reconciliation with God, and the pardon of God who, according to the prophets, himself brings about conversion. The NT, esp. Paul and John, takes up this group of themes to describe the saving significance of Jesus' death. More than the OT and Judaism, Paul stresses that God himself reconciles human beings to himself (1 Cor 5:19) in the blood of Jesus Christ, the place of his forgiveness (Rom 3:25; 1 Jn 4:10). Moreover, it is natural for the NT to see God's expiatory work in a christological perspective, putting Jesus' free death above any other means of expiation (see esp. Heb).

This is the line followed by patristic soteriology, which is largely a presentation of the respective biblical themes. In fact Jesus' death, freely offered by him and accepted by his Father for our sins, takes a prominent place in the patristic church (see the creeds). The consideration of Jesus' death as a sacrifice obviously varies according to periods, regions and authors. It would be an exaggeration to consider this approach as typically Western, since it does not appear only in the Latins, nor does it stand out as something exclusively theirs (Turner, *Jésus le Sauveur*, 101ff.). So if it is true that the Apostolic Fathers see Christ mainly as teacher and moral model, they are also interested in the properly Jewish theme of blood (*1 Clem.* 7,4; *Barn.* 5,1); nor do they ignore Christ as priest (*1 Clem.* 64). The *Apologists, who present Christianity as true philosophy, insist on illumination through the Logos, but do not overlook Jesus' sacrificial death (Just., *Dial.* 13,1ff.; 40-41; *Apol.* 1,32,7). *Irenaeus, keeping to the Pauline idea of recapitulation, includes in it reconciliation with God, obtained by obedience unto death (*Adv. haer.* V,16,3). The *Alexandrians, alongside the theme of true knowledge of God, linked to that of likeness with him, develop their popular theory of the tricking of the devil, and in their works explicitly attest Christ's expiatory death (Orig., *Cels.* 1,69; Athan., *Ar.* 2,76; *Incarn.* 20; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 30,5; Greg. Nyssa, *Apoll.*

17; Cyr. of Jer., *Cat.* 13; cf. Kelly, *Doctrines*, 377-386). Among *Origen's disciples, *Basil is particularly clear in declaring that only the God-Man, Jesus Christ, could offer an expiation sufficient for all human beings (*Hom. Ps.* 48, 4).

It is natural that, in the more historical approach of *Antiochene theology, the theme of Jesus' expiatory death found a still more important place (John Chrys., *Hom. in Gal.* 2,8; Theodor., *In Dan.* 9,24; cf. Kelly, *Doctrines*, 385-386, 395-396). In the West, where Christianity was seen primarily as the new *religio*, and where there was a greater sense of Adam's sin as *felix culpa*—thematized under the legalistic categories of *reatus culpae et poenae*—and a greater awareness of the OT law but also of the true justice inculcated by Paul, it is to be expected that the soteriology of sacrificial expiation should be more widespread than in the East (Turner, *Jésus le Sauveur*, 103-107). Though the themes of Christ's victory and redemption were present everywhere, the Latins were particularly interested in the death that Jesus freely (without *debitum mortis*) accepted, bearing our sins (Is 53), indeed undergoing our condemnation (1 Cor 5:21; Gal 3:13). If *Tertullian hardly explores soteriological thought—though he affirms that Christ came, free from all sin and perfectly holy, to die for sinners (*Pud.* 22, Turner 108-109)—his disciple *Cyprian is more explicit on the death undergone for our sins (Turner 109). Even more important is the evidence of *Hilary and *Ambrose (Turner 109-113). According to Hilary, the Son of God accepted death without any necessity to satisfy the obligation for punishment (Ps 53:12; 129–130: *Ipse pro peccatis nostris et propitiatio et redemptio et deprecatio est iniquitatum nostrarum*). Ambrose, commenting on 2 Cor 5:21, says that God pardoned us, not sparing his Son and making him sin for us (Ps 37:6; *Fug.* 7,44). Finally, *Augustine, who is distinguished by a very complex soteriology (*Ench.* 41,108), not only stresses that the sacrifice of the cross, commemorated in the eucharistic *sacrament, has fulfilled and replaced all the sacrifices of the OT (*Faust.* 20,21), but returns continually to 2 Cor 5:12—which means, according to him, that Christ was made an expiatory sacrifice for us (Lyonnet - Sabourrin, *Sin*, 211-225). Yet Augustine presents a very spiritual concept of sacrifice (*Civ. Dei* 10,6). Understanding sacrifice as the unifying action of the one mediator, he does not just answer his Neoplatonist interlocutors, but puts himself in the biblical perspective of conversion, the basis of all expiation.

To evaluate fully the patristic doctrine of Christ's expiatory death, we must bear in mind the following facts. Very soon there was a clear displacement of the expiatory and reconciliatory action, attributed to God himself, to an almost exclusively christological consideration. This is particularly attested by exegesis of 2 Cor 5:19 in which "God" is no longer referred to the Father, but to the Word present in Christ (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 16,9; Greg. Nyssa, *Apoll.* 18,45; Aug., *En. Ps.* 67,23; Leo, *Serm.* 69,4). Moreover, the Fathers, even those who, like Augustine, define sacrifice as an act of love, make little attempt to describe Jesus' expiatory action as supreme love for the Father. Finally, bearing in mind the biblical premises, in particular what is said of Christ as high priest (intercession), spotless victim and just sufferer, it is not surprising that the life of Christians themselves should be, in some way, likened to Jesus' expiatory action. Their whole existence must be a sacrifice pleasing to God (Rom 1:1) (cf. *1 Clem.* 36,1; 59,2; Orig., *C. Cels.* 8,64,2). With the apostle they are called to complete what is lacking in Christ's sufferings for the church (Col 1:24). This goes especially for the sacrifice of martyrdom (Ign., *Rom.* 2,2); for the *sacrificium humilitatis*, which penitents must fulfill with the help of priests and faithful (Tertull., *Pat.* 13; *Paen.* 9-10); and also for fasting and *ascesis, esp. during Lent (Tertull., *Ieiun.* 15; Leo, *Serm.* 12,4; 39,2). Moreover the *Eucharist itself, *sacramentum passionis Christi*, is also celebrated for the remission of sins (Cypr., *Ep.* 63,13-14; Ambr., *Sacr.* IV,6,28; 5,24). It must also be recognized, however, that in sacrificial contexts the idea of expiation in a strict sense (purification or reconciliation through blood) is not made explicit to the same degree. In fact, the Latin tradition of 1 Jn 2:2 attests this, where *hilasmos* is translated not only as *expiatio*, but also as *deprecatio* or *placatio* (W. Thiele, *Vetus Latina* 26/1, 262).

J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1960 (It. tr. Bologna 1972); DSp 4/2, 2026-2045 (Bible); F.H. Kettler, *Versöhnung*: RGG 6 (1962) 1373-1378; H.E.W. Turner, *Jésus le Sauveur*, Paris 1965; S. Lyonnet - L. Sabourrin, *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice*, Rome 1970; B. Studer, *Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*: HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978; B. Studer - J. Werbick, *Versöhnung*, III: LTK[3] 10, 723ff. (bibl.); C. Gestrich, *Sühne*, V.: TRE 32 (2001) 348-355 (bibl.).

B. Studer

EXPOSITIO FIDEI CATHOLICAE. Profession of faith (Incipit: *Secundum sacramentum sancti symboli Dei*) that has reached us in two versions: by an unknown author, in a MS it is attributed to a certain Ambrose, bishop of Chalcedon; but it was also passed down in the works of *Julian of Eclanum (PL 45, 1732-1736; 48, 509-526). Scholars attribute it to various authors: a work of *Pelagian origin (Nuvo-

lone, DSp 12, 2922), Ambrose of Altinum (Lanzoni), an author from the region of *Antioch (Bardy), *Ambrose of Milan (Richard). *Theodoret of Cyrrhus cites it as the work of Ambrose of Milan (PG 83, 181-184). One notes dependencies and similarities with the pseudo-Ambrosian *De Trinitate* (CPPM A/2 27) and with Pelagian works. After a profession of trinitarian faith, the author expounds at length on Christology, on the rejection of *Arianism and on the *incarnation, which occurred *non permutatione deitatis*; he affirms the two perfect natures in Christ: *ex duobus substantiis plenismus*. The anthropological part follows: the necessity of *baptism, including for infants, sinful humanity and salvation (it does not mention original sin).

CPL 778; CPPM II/A, 16 and 1225a; PLS 1,1683-1685; (cf. CPL 1771); F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi di Italia*, II, Faenza 1927, 909-911; A. Pertusi, *Le antiche traduzioni greche delle opere di S. Ambrogio e l'Expositio fidei a lui falsamente attribuita*: Aevum 18 (1944) 184-187; G. Bardy, *L'Expositio fidei attribué à S. Ambroise*, in *Miscellanea G. Mercati*, ST 121, I, Vatican City 1946, 199-218; M. Richard, *Notes sur les florilèges dogmatiques du V^e et du VI^e siècle*, in *Actes du VI^e Congrès intern. d'études byzantines*, Paris 1950, 307-318 (esp. 314-316 = Opera Minora, vol. III, Turnhout 1976, n. II); DSp 12, 2922; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, 940-944.

A. Di Berardino

EXTRA ECCLESIAM NULLA SALUS. An axiom which, with slight modification, derives from Cyprian ("*salus extra ecclesiam non est*": *Ep.* 73,21,2). Rightly understood, it has biblical roots: Christ is the unique and universal mediator of salvation, and the Christian, through *baptism (Mk 16:16; Jn 3:5), is inserted in a community comparable to the saving ark (1 Pt 3:20-21). The necessity of the church for salvation is therefore based on the unique salvific mediation of Christ. The axiom is anticipated in *Ignatius of Antioch (*Phil.* 3,2-3), *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. Haer.* 3,24,1), *Clement Al. (*Paed.* 1,6,27,2), *Hippolytus of Rome (*Com. in Dan* 1,17). *Origen, applying typological exegesis to Rahab's house being spared destruction (Josh 2:18-19), expresses himself in a way similar to the classical formulation: "*extra hanc domum, id est extra ecclesiam, nemo salvatur*" (*Hom. Iesu Nave* 3,5). *Cyprian also reiterates this idea in *Ep.* 4,4,3; 55,24,1-2; 74,11,3 and in *De unit.* 6, declaring that one who does not have the church as a mother cannot have God as a father (see also *Ep.* 74,7,2; *De Laps.* 9). These expressions must be set in their historical context: since the Christian community was threatened by schism and heresy, Cyprian defends the church's unity, insisting on the fact that in it are found the means of salvation—in the first place *baptism, which incorporates into the church. He is thus not presenting a principle regarding the eternal salvation of all people, but exhorting his community to be united around Christ and the church, his bride, which participates in the divine plan of redemption. Far from a rigoristic and restrictive interpretation, Cyprian's axiom meant to reassure the faithful that salvation is attained through the church. *Lactantius also echoes Cyprian's axiom: one who does not enter through the church has no part in the hope of life and of eternal salvation (*Div. Inst.* 4,30,11).

Other Fathers insist rather on the culpability of those who voluntarily exclude themselves from salvation: Ambrose says that they deprive themselves of their own accord of a good offered to all (*In Ps 118, sermo* 8,57). For *Gregory of Nyssa, those who refuse the gift of faith are to be blamed (*Or. Cat.* 30), and *Chrysostom holds that there is no salvation for those who do not want to accept Christ (*In 1 Tim* 2 *Hom.* 7,2). For *Cyril of Alexandria, "mercy cannot be obtained outside of the holy city" (*In P*s. 30,22).

*Augustine takes up Cyprian's axiom, but inserts it into a precise ecclesiological vision: the bond of unity in the church is the virtue of charity, and whoever breaks it is guilty of grave sin and removes himself from salvation, as he writes of the *Donatists: "One who is an enemy of unity cannot be a partaker of divine charity. Consequently, those who are outside the church do not have the Holy Spirit" (*Ep.* 185,5; see also *Ep.* 141,5). One who is outside the Catholic Church can have everything except salvation (*Serm. ad Caes. eccl.* 6; see also *Bapt.* 4,17,24: heretics, though they receive baptism validly, derive no benefit from it). There is no cult outside of the Catholic Church capable of purifying the soul of the passions (as e.g., theurgic rites): there is no human redemption that parallels that of Christ (*Sermo Dolbeau* 26). Exclusion from salvation therefore results from the misuse of freedom and from culpably rejecting the faith that is offered (*Spir et litt.* 33,58; see also *Adv. Iud.* 10,15). Those who are not freed by the grace of Christ are justly condemned, since they have some sin (*Nat. et grat.* 4-5). Among Augustine's followers, *Prosper of Aquitaine held that even the pagans are not denied help (*Vocat.* 2,17), such that "those without grace are to be blamed for their wrong willing" (ibid. 2,19). *Fulgentius of Ruspe, on the other hand, gives a rigid and exclusivist interpretation of the axiom: only in the Catholic Church can baptism be of any use (*De Fide* 43-44 and 79-80 [36-37]), and those who "end this life outside of the Catholic Church will go to the eternal fire" (*De Fide* 81 [38]).

In the course of history the axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" has at times been removed from its proper context and improperly absolutized, in a way that fails to harmonize it with other texts expressing God's universal salvific will (1 Tim 2:4). The original sense of the phrase is that of exhorting the members of the church to fidelity, recognizing that our salvation is brought about only by Christ (Acts 4:12): he makes himself present among us in the church, to which all people, in various ways, are ordained.

Y. Congar, *Hors de l'Eglise pas de salut*: Cath 5 (1962) 948-956; J. Ratzinger, *Il nuovo popolo di Dio*, Brescia 1971, 365-390; P. Fietta, *L'assioma* "extra ecclesiam nulla salus" *nel contesto della dottrina ecclesiologica di S. Cipriano*: Studia Patavina 22 (1975) 376-416; Id., "*Salus extra ecclesiam non est.*" *Indagine storico-teologica sul significato dell'assioma nel pensiero di San Cipriano*, Padova 1976; M. Bévenot, *"Salus extra Ecclesiam non est" (St. Cyprien)*, in *Fides Sacramenti. Sacramentum Fidei*, ed. H. Auf der Maur et al., Assen 1981, 97-105; F.A. Sullivan, *Salvation outside the Church? Tracing the History of the Catholic Response*, New York 1992; M.T. Marshall, *No Salvation Outside the Church?* Lewinston 1993; G. Gäde, "*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*"*? Ein patristisches Axiom und der heutige religiöse Pluralismus*: Catholica 55 (2001) 194-214; R. Dodaro, *Agostino d'Ippona*, Sermo Dolbeau *26 e la questione della* "salus extra ecclesiam": Lateranum 68 (2002) 259-266.

M. Maritano

EXULTET. Various texts exist of the *praeconium paschale* or blessing of the *Paschal candle. Bishop *Ennodius of Pavia composed two (CSEL 6, 415-422), the Gelasian *Sacramentary gives a brief, simple text of blessing, the *Hispanic *Missale mixtum* contains two, the *Ambrosian missal one (Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, 627-628). But the most popular was the *Gallican *Exultet*, introduced to Rome by the 8th-c. Gelasian Sacramentaries.

The *Exultet*'s origin is uncertain, but it is clear that it was inspired by *Ambrose. Textual analysis shows, if not Ambrose's hand, at least his mind: e.g., "*non prodesset nasci nisi redimi profuisset*" (*Exp. in Luc.* 2, 41: CCL 14, 49), or "*Felix ruina quae reparatur in melius*" (*In Ps.* 39, 20, 1: PL 14, 1116). The part of the *Exultet* that speaks of bees was inspired by Virgil, *Georg.* IV, 56-57: e.g., "*ingentis animo augusto in pectore versant*" or "*aliae purissima mella stipant, et liquido distendunt nectare cellas.*" In his letter to Praesidius (Morin, *Pour l'authenticité*), Jerome derides this praise of the bees as entirely out of place in the *Easter liturgy.

The text of the *Exultet* has three main parts: introduction, thanksgiving and peroration. The introduction begins with the joy of the angels over Christ's *resurrection, the earth's participation in this joy and the church's role in proclaiming it. Typical of the Franco-German mentality is the deacon's *apologia*, "*qui me non meis meritis*." The second part deals with the Paschal thanksgiving and the praise of God, who worked marvels on Easter night. Particular stress is put on the typology of the *Exodus and on the image of the bees, who virginally produced the Paschal candle just as Mary conceived and bore Christ. The peroration sums up the Paschal praise and closes with a universal petition.

From the end of the 4th c. the singing of the *praeconium paschale* was the task of deacons. The *Liber pontificalis* records that Pope *Zosimus gave deacons permission to bless the Paschal candle in parishes (*Lib. Pont.* [ed. Perovsky], II, 95). The Angoulême Gelasian Sacramentary (ca. 800) tells us that Augustine sang the *praeconium paschale* as a deacon: "*adhuc diaconus cum esset et cecinit feliciter.*" Augustine himself composed a blessing "*quod in laude quadam cerei breviter versibus dixi*" (*Civ. Dei* XV, 22: CSEL 40, 2, 108). Important sources of the text of the *Exultet* are the Gallican Sacramentaries (*Missale Gothicum*, ms. Vat. Reg. lat. 317; *Missale Bobbiense*, ms. Paris. lat. 13246; *Missale Gallicanum vetus*, Cod. Vat. Pal. lat. 493), the 8th-c. Gelasian Sacramentaries (*Sacram. Gelasianum Gellonense*, Paris B.N. lat. 12048; *Sacram. Gelas. Engolismense*, Paris B.N. lat. 816; *Sacram. Gelasianum Fuldense*, Göttingen, Universitätsbibl., Cod. theol. 231) and the Gregorian Sacramentaries (*Sacram. Gregorianum Ottoboniense*, ms. Vat. Ottob. lat. 313; *Sacram. Gregor. Reginense*, ms. Vat. Regin. lat. 337).

G. Morin, *Pour l'authenticité de la lettre de S. Jérôme à Présidius*: BALAC 3 (1913) 52-60; H. Schmidt, *Hebdomada sancta*, Rome 1962; G. Cavallo, *Rotoli di Exultet dell'Italia meridionale*, Bari 1973; H. Doutei - F. Vongrey, *Exultet-Rolle*, Graz 1975; U. Perovsky (ed.), *Liber pontificalis*, Rome 1976 (Studia Gratiana, 22); A.J. MacGregor, *Fire and Light in the Western Triduum*, Collegeville, MN 1992; A.J. MacGregor, *Easter Candle*, in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, London 2002, 161-162.

A. Chupungco

EXUPERIUS of Toulouse (d. after 412). Bishop of *Toulouse at the start of the 5th c., Exuperius completed the basilica of the bishop and martyr *Saturninus begun by his predecessor Silvius (*Passio S. Saturnini*), consecrating it 1 November 402 and solemnly depositing in it the relics exhumed from the original grave. He received a letter from Pope *Innocent I (20 February 405) in response to his questions on ecclesiastical discipline and the canon of *Scripture. *Jerome dedicates to him the *Commentary on Zechariah*, on this occasion praising his munificence toward the monks of *Palestine, *Egypt

and *Libya. In Letter 123 (409) Jerome praises him for protecting Toulouse from the *Vandals in 407–408, and, in Letter 125 (411–412), for his charity toward victims of the invasion. *Paulinus, future bishop of Nola, puts him as first among the saintly bishops of S *Gaul, all of whom were testimonies of faith and religion in those difficult times. Some local traditions have him born at Arreau in the Aure valley (Hautes Pyrénées) and die at Blagnac in the immediate vicinity of Toulouse. His feast is 28 September, assigned him by Usuard (late 9th c.).

Sources: Epistola of Innocent I: PL 20, 495-502; AASS Sept. VII, 623-630; Jerome, *Ep.* 4; 10; 11; 54; 95; 125; Jerome, *Comm. in Zachariam*, prologues to books I and II; Greg. Turon., *Historia Francorum* 2,13; E. Griffe, *Exupère*: DHGE, 16,263-264; H. Crouzel, *S. Jérôme et ses amis toulousains*: BLE 73 (1972) 129-138.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

EZANA (ʿĒzānā, Αἰζάνας; 4th c.). First Christian king of *Aksum. His conversion is deduced from two series of epigraphs: one in which he declares himself "son of Mahrem (= Mars)," the other in which he professes himself a Christian. His conversion is traditionally ascribed to *Frumentius, a link denied by Altheim and Stiehl, who put Ezana in the 5th c.

E. Littmann, *Sabaische, griechische und altabessinische Inschriften* (Deutsche Aksum-Expedition 4), Berlin 1913; F. Anfray - A. Caquot - P. Nautin, *Une nouvelle inscription grecque d'Ezana, roi d'Axoum*: Journal des Savants (1970) 260-273; F. Altheim - R. Stiehl, *Christentum am Roten Meer*, I, Berlin - New York 1971, 402-412; E. Dinkler, *New Questions Concerning King Ezana of Axum*: Études et travaux 9 (1976) 6-15.

S.J. Voicu

EZEKIEL (iconography). The most widespread episode relating to Ezekiel in the early Christian figurative repertoire is his vision in the valley of the dry bones (Ezek 37:1-10), which is also explicitly mentioned by St. *Jerome (*In Ezech.* 37). Ezekiel was thus held to prefigure Christ, and was included in the fresco cycle of the synagogue of *Dura Europos, before 256, but does not appear in early Christian painting. The episode is attested on some Roman sarcophagi (Ws 184, 1; 194, 4, 9; 206, 7; 215, 7; 219, 1), and on a Spanish one from Gerona (Ws 112, 2), all from the Constantinian era to the early 5th c. Ezekiel, young and beardless, in tunic and pallium, brings the *virga* close to a small naked figure lying on the ground, its head resting on a skull. In some cases we see other small-scale figures, already risen. The same scene appears among OT scenes on a gold-glass from Cologne, now in the British Museum (early 4th c.): Ezekiel, in the usual dress, with *virga*, is surrounded by scattered members coming together. Other scenes relating to the prophet are much rarer: among mss., in the codex of Rabbula, f.7b., Ezekiel, with David and Christ, is freeing a female demoniac (a. 586), while the *Maiestas Domini*, understood as Ezekiel's vision (Ezek 10), is depicted in the apse mosaic of the church of Hosios David at *Thessalonica (5th c.).

DACL V, 1050-1052; LCI II, 716-718; J. Klinkenberg, *Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln*, Cologne 1906, 273, fig. 110; C.H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Doura Europos. The Synagogue*, New Haven 1956, 178-194, plates LXIX-LXXI; Volbach-Hirmer, 87, figs. 133-135; Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, 59; E. Dassmann, *Sündervergebung durch Taufe Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1978, 60, 70, 220-221; F. Bisconti, *Un coperchio di sarcofago paleocristiano nel cimitero Maggiore*, in "*Quaeritur inventus colitur*." Miscellanea in onore di p. U.M. Fasola, Vatican City 1989, 23-49; M. Perraymond, *Sogni, visioni e profezie nell'antico cristianesimo: Abramo, Giacobbe, Ezechiele, Pastore d'Erma, Felicita e Perpetua*, in Augustinianum - Atti del XVII Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana - Rome 5-7 May 1988, Rome 1989, 549-563; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Frammento di sarcofago cristiano da Vescovio (Forum Novum) presso Torri in Sabina*: RivAC 59 (1990) 121-140; J. Dresken-Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarcophage - Band II*, Mainz am Rhein 1998, n. 11; M. Perraymond, s.v. *Visioni*, in F. Bisconti, *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 303.

M. Perraymond

EZNIK of Kolb (bishop of Bagrewand, first half 5th c.): traditionally one of those disciples of *Mesrob who translated the *Scriptures and many patristic works from the Greek. After a stay at *Constantinople, from where he brought the authentic acts of the Council of *Ephesus (431), he became a bishop and took part in the Synod of Astisat (449). Eznik is the first original Armenian author. Of him we know, besides a fragmentary letter, a long treatise, composed ca. 441–448, which expounds the true doctrine on the nature of God and man: the problem of *evil, angels, human free will, in effect a kind of *summa theologica*. Eznik debates various groups of opponents: *Marcionites, *Manicheans, Zoroastrians, *pagans and Greek *philosophers, and thus the treatise, untitled in the only known ms., in modern editions is called *De Deo* or *Against the Sects*. The work, which is contemporary with the translation of the Scriptures, is a sort of model of the classical Armenian language. It has been shown that in many points Eznik depends materially (though with much originality) on Greek sources: esp. *Methodius's *De libero arbitrio*, but also on *Epiphanius, *Hippolytus, *Basil of Caesarea, *Ephrem and the **Didascalia*. He

may also have known *Irenaeus, *Diodore of Tarsus and *Aristide's *Apologia*.

RAC 7, 118-129; Bardenhewer V, 209-216; K.M. Schmid, *Des Wardapet Eznik von Kołb Wider die Sekten*, Vienna 1900; L. Mariès, *Le* De Deo *d'Eznik de Kołb connu sous le nom de "Contre les sectes." Études de critique littéraire et textuelle*: REArm 4 (1924) 113-205; 5 (1925) 11-130; L. Mariès - Ch. Mercier, *Eznik de Kolb, De Deo.* I-II: PO 28, 3-4 (Paris 1959) 411-776; S. Weber, *Ausgewählte Schriften der armenischen Kirchenwäter*, I, Munich 1927, 1-180; V.K. á alojan, *Eznik Kokhbaci Kniga oproverzenij (o dobre i zle)*, Erevan 1968; M. van Esbroeck, *Le passage d'Eznik (P. 241) dans le "De universo" d'Hippolyte*: Muséon 87 (1974) 441-444; M. Minassian, *Le manuscrit actuel de l'ouvrage d'Eznik est - il celui de la première édition?* in T.J. Samuelian - M.E. Stone, *Medieval Armenian Culture* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6), Chico 1984, 240-249; L. Van Rompay, *Eznik de Kolb et Théodore de Mopsueste. A propos d'une hypothèse de Louis Mariès*: OLP 15 (1984) 159-175; A. Orengo, *Eznik di Kołb, Confutazione delle sette (Ełc Aładoc'). Intr., tr. e note* (Progetti linguistici), Pisa 1996; M.J. Blanchard - R.D. Young, *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Eznik of Kołb (floruit c. 430 - c. 450). An English Translation, with Introduction and Notes* (Eastern Christian Texts in Translation 2), Louvain 1998.

S.J. Voicu

EZRA. *See* *ESDRAS (Ezra) (apocryphal)

F

FABIAN, pope (236–250). Fabian was elected pope 10 January 236, succeeding *Anterus, who had lasted barely a month in office and had died the week before (3 January 236); he died a martyr in the *persecution of *Decius on 20 January 250. According to a legend reported by *Eusebius (*HE* 6, 29,3), as the Roman community was reunited to elect the successor of Anterus, "a dove descended suddenly from the sky and landed on his [Fabian's] head," although Fabian was almost unknown and no one was considering him. During his episcopate, under the emperors Gordianus and *Philip the Arab, the church enjoyed a period of peace, therefore Fabian could dedicate himself to organizing the structure of the Roman community. According to the **Chronography of 354* (MGH, Auct. ant. IX-1, 75 = LP I, 148), Fabian assigned the various regions of Rome to deacons: probably two of the 14 Augustan regions for each deacon, of whom there were 7 (canonical number for the city of Rome), aided by 7 subdeacons (Eus., *HE* 6, 43,11). Fabian also intervened in *Africa with a letter—lost to us—in order to condemn *Privatus of *Lambaesis, already condemned by 90 African bishops (Cypr., *Ep.* 59,10); *Origen wrote him a letter to demonstrate to him the *orthodoxy of his doctrine (Eus., *HE* 6, 36,4; Jer., *Ep.* 84,10: PL 22,751). He probably ordained *Novatian a priest, making an exception to the rule that the **clinici* could not be ordained, against the judgment of many (Eus., *HE* 6, 43,17). According to the *Liber pontificalis* (I, 145) he arranged to bring back to Rome the body of his predecessor *Pontianus, who died condemned to the mines in *Sardinia, although this was prohibited by law (see *Digesto* 48,24,2) (did he receive authorization for this?). He finished many construction projects in the *cemeteries (*Chronogr.*, 75). Fabian's authority must have been great, if at his death the emperor Decius "would have been willing to hear with greater patience and tolerance that someone who challenged him for power had risen against him, rather than to learn that a bishop had been elected in Rome" (Cypr., *Ep.* 55,9). For this reason Fabian was among the first victims of the persecution of Decius (20 Jan. 250) and his death was communicated to other communities by the Roman clergy with a letter praising his life and death highly, praises in which *Cyprian of Carthage participated (*Ep.* 3,1). He was buried in the cemetery of *Callistus, next to Pontianus and Anterus, in the crypt that was the tomb of many popes of the 3rd c. The sepulchral inscription has been discovered (Diehl 955). A long *vacatio* of the Roman throne followed Fabian's death, due to difficulties in electing his successor, who was *Cornelius, elected only in March 251.

DHGE 16, 317-318; DACL 5, 1058-1064; EC 5, 941-942; BS 5, 426-429; L. Duchesne, *Les régions de Rome au Moyen Âge*: MEFR 10 (1890) 126-149; F. Grossi Gondi, *San Fabiano*, Rome 1916; EPapi I, Rome 2000, 265-268.

A. Di Berardino

FABIOLA (d. 399). A Roman noblewoman, married to a debauched husband, divorced and entered a second marriage; at the death of her second husband, she did public penitence and adopted an austere life. In 394 she went to *Bethlehem to visit *Jerome and his saintly women, and began the study of the sacred *Scriptures. Jerome dedicated to her the commentary on the stages of the people of God in the desert and also that on the vestments of the high priest. Fabiola is famous for her generosity toward the poor; she served them personally in the hospital founded by her in Ostia. (cf. Jerome *Ep.* 64; 77; 78).

A. Penna, *S. Gerolamo*, Turin-Rome 1949, 205-209; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome*, London 1975, 210-212; DHGE 16, 319-320; St. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis*, Salzburg 1992; Ch. Krumeich, *Hieronymus und die christlichen feminae clarissimae*, Bonn 1993; PCBE 2, 734-735.

J. Gribomont

FABIOLA (1st half 5th c.). A noble, pious and charitable lady, perhaps Roman, who had received and supported the refugee Antoninus of Fussala in his appeal in Rome against *Augustine first with Pope *Boniface (d. 4 September 422), who had declared in his favor, and then with Pope *Celestine (elected 10 September). Augustine wrote her a long letter, after Boniface's death, narrating in detail his dealings with Antoninus and the numerous wicked deeds committed by the latter (20* Divjak). He also wrote to Pope Celestine about the same case (*Ep.* 209) to entreat him not to receive Antoninus. It is uncertain if this is the same Fabiola, also a noblewoman, but African, to whom Augustine wrote letter 267, in 402, responding to a (now-lost) letter from her, to console and encourage her in her life in the world. *Jerome dedicated the first two books of the *Commentary to Ezekiel* to this Fabiola. The identification could be favored by the fact that the Fabiola residing in Rome was known to Antoninus. Furthermore a Fabiola, deceased 2 November 452, is buried in the Vatican (CIL 6, 31974).

PCBE 2, 735-736; PLRE 2, 448, no. 3.

A. Di Berardino

FABIUS of Antioch (d. 252/253). Followed *Babylas, martyr in the persecution of *Decius in 249, as bishop of *Antioch. During this *persecution many Christians had bowed to the imperial edict and had sacrificed. Was it possible to grant them pardon and reintegrate them into the church? Like *Novatian in the West, Fabius in the East preached intransigence. The metropolitans of three neighboring provinces—*Helenus of *Tarsus (Cilicia), *Firmilian of *Caesarea in Cappadocia and *Theoctistus of *Caesarea in Palestine—requested the support of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria against him (Eus., *HE* 6,46,3). *Cornelius of Rome wrote a long letter to Fabius in the attempt to make him hear reason (6,43,5-21), and *Dionysius of Alexandria did the same (6,41,42.44). These are important documents, not only for the history of the persecution and of the crisis that followed in the church, but also for the Christian institutions and the liturgy of the time (composition of the clergy at Rome, clinical *baptism, viaticum, etc.). Fabius died in 252 or 253.

P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens*, Paris 1961, 143-156, 164-165; DHGE 16, 320-321.

P. Nautin

FACUNDUS of Hermiane (d. 571). An African bishop, he found himself in *Constantinople when *Justinian published the edict of condemnation of the *Three Chapters. Facundus, like almost the entire African episcopate, opposed this and, to confirm in this direction the wavering Pope *Vigilius, wrote a large work before the publication of the *Iudicatum* (11 April 548) on the part of the pope. Because the work took an anti-Justinian direction, Facundus had to find a refuge, probably in Africa, to flee the wrath of the emperor. From here he intervened again in the matter; he was still active in 568. The large work mentioned above, in 12 books addressed *Ad Iustinianum* and commonly known as *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, is a defense of the Three Chapters based on an enormous documentation related to the various phases of the complicated christological controversy starting from the 4th c. (*Apollinariansm, *Nestorianism, *monophysitism) and reveals an unusual capacity to grasp the significance of the affair in its historical dimension. To defend *Theodore of Mopsuestia, condemned *post mortem*, Facundus maintained that error in good faith is not enough to make a heretic, which reflects perseverance in an error that had become known; and he reveals himself aware that the christological dogma was defined only gradually, so that the ancient theologians could not be blamed for errors revealed only by later reflection. Facundus kept to the Chalcedonian theology, integrated, acc. to the decision of Justinian, with the *Theopaschite formula *Unus de Trinitate passus est*. In two later writings, much shorter, the *Liber contra Mocianum Scholasticum* and the *Epistula fidei catholicae in defensione trium capitulorum*, he supported the legitimacy of the schismatics, who continued defending the Three Chapters even after the condemnation of Pope Vigilius, and considered everyone who condemned them as heretics.

CPL 866-868; PL 67, 527-878; CCL 90A; SC 471 (2002); 478 (2003); 484 (2004); 499 (2006); DTC 5, 2066; W. Pewesin, *Imperium, Ecclesia universalis, Rom. Der Kampf der Afrikanischen Kirche um die Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1937; R.B. Eno, *Doctrinal Authority in the African Ecclesiology of the Sixth Century. Ferrandus and Facundus*: REAug 22 (1976) 95-113; M. Simonetti, *Haereticum non facit ignorantia. Una nota su Facondo di Ermiane e la sua difesa dei Tre Capitoli*: Orpheus n.s. 1 (1980) 76-105; BBKL I, 1592; A. Placanica, *Facondo Ermianense e la polemica per i Tre Capitoli*: Maia 43 (1991) 41-46; P. Bruns, *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Die Haltung des Facundus von Hermiane und der nordafrikanischen Kirche während des Drei-Kapitel-Streits (553)*: ZKG 106 (1995) 151-178.

M. Simonetti

FAITH
I. Old Testament - II. Judaism - III. New Testament - IV. Jewish-Christian writings - V. The Apostolic Fathers - VI. The apologists and antiheretical writers - VII. The golden age of patristics.

The fathers of the church were interested in the content of the faith, *die Heilsgeschichte,* more than in the analysis of the act of faith itself (Aubert 13-14). This article will examine primarily their theology of faith, while the contents of the faith will be treated under various other entries. Concerning faith in non-Christian Greek and Roman literature, see Lührmann 51-55; Wolfson 112-119.

I. Old Testament. The Hebrew root used most frequently to express the faith of Israel in God is *ʾmn*: it indicates stability, certainty, faithfulness, trustworthiness. The verb *ʾaman* expresses firmness (hence truth), as in Is 7:9: "If you will not believe [*taʾaminu*], you will not have stability [*teʾamenu*]"; the words *ʾemunah* and *ʾemet* signify fidelity. The notion of faith also includes trust, as in Gen 15:6: "He believed the Lord, who accounted it to him as righteousness." In the OT believing is an ontological question, "being/not being" (cf. Is 7:9; 28:14-16) rather than an epistemological one, "knowing/not knowing" (De Bovis 539), as in the NT: "If you know me, you will also know my Father" (Jn 8:19; cf. Jn 4:42; Eph 1:17; 1 Jn 4:16) and in the use of Is 7:9 LXX, in the fathers of the church: "If you will not believe, you will not understand [*intelligetis*]."

II. Judaism. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses are pointed out as models of faith: Sir 44:19-23; 1 Mac 5:52; Jdth 8:22-29; *Jubilees* 6:19; 18:1-19; 21:2; *Psalms of Solomon* 16:14. It is a recurrent theme in the Fathers: *Cyprian, *Ep.* 63,4; *Ambrose, *De Patriarc., De Abr., De Isaac et an., De Jac. et vita bea.*; *Augustine, *Serm.* 2; *Civ. Dei* 16,32; *Gregory of Nyssa, *De vita Moysis*; *Gregory the Great, *Moral.* 27,10,7. In *Philo of Alexandria faith is included within the frame of *Hellenistic Judaism. Faith is believing that God is one (Θεὸς εἷς ἔστι) and having trust in his "*providence," πρόνοια, and "providential care" (*Opif.* 170-172; *Virt.* 216). This requires believing in his promises (*Leg. All.* 3,208; *Abr.* 275; *Mut. Nom.* 166) and turning one's back on that which is destined to perish (*Praem. Poen.* 28). Thanks to the mediation of faith, one is freed from doubt and hesitation and vested with certainty and trust (*Confus.* 31). Salvation is through faith, as for Abraham (*Migr.* 44; *Abr.* 268-273).

III. New Testament. Faith has a central role here. The expression "believe in Christ" (πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν) appears often: Mk 9:42; Mt 18:16; Acts 10:43; 19:4; in John more than thirty times between 2:11 and 17:20. To "believe in him" (Jn 3:15; 6:29; 20:31) is to "come to him" (Jn 5:40; 6:35; 7:37), "receive him" (Jn 1:12; 5:43), "love him" (8:42; 14:15; 16:27). In Mk 1:15 the μετάνοια preached by Jesus is intimately connected with faith: "Change your life and believe the gospel." Faith is trust and confidence in Jesus (Mk 9:23-24). In the letters of *Paul, faith is closely connected with the *Heilsgeschichte.* The apostolic **kerygma* inclines the listeners to faith, to *conversion and to the return to God (Rom 10:9). Paul opposes the Jewish position of justification through the works of the law, of which he points out the impotence because of slavery to *sin (Rom 7:7ff.; 8:1-4). For the writers of the NT, Abraham is the model of the true believer (Rom 4; Gal 3; Heb 11; Jas 2:20-24), and "those who are of faith" are by that very fact made children of Abraham (Gal 3:7; Rom 4:16) and receive their blessing only in union with this "believer" (Gal 3:9) in whose faith they are walking (Rom 4:12), inasmuch as they believe in him who raised Jesus, "author and perfector of the faith" (Heb 12:2), from the dead (Rom 4:24).

IV. Jewish-Christian writings. *1. Didache.* Πίστις appears three times: 10,2, where thanks are given for the γνῶσις, πιστίς and ἀθανασία; 16,2, "the entire time of your faith," indicates the time since conversion; faith separates from *pagans and Jews. Perseverance in the faith leads to salvation: 16,5, "'as many as remain solid' in their faith will be saved" (cf. Mt 10:22; 24:13).

2. The Letter of Barnabas. Compare *Did.* 16,2 with *Barn.* 4,9: "The time of your life and of faith." "Hope in God, in Jesus, in the name, in the cross" (19,7c; 6,9; 11,11; 8,5; 12,2; 16,8; 11,8) means the same as "to believe" in God, in him (16,7; 16,3); *hope and faith are often juxtaposed (1,6; 4,8; 6,3; 11,8; 12,7) (see Kraft 30). Faith is fullness and perfection in the Old Testament (3,6; 9,3; 16,7). Abraham, "for having believed, he alone" is the model of "our people" (13,7); the object of this faith is Christ (6,2-4). Faith comes from hearing (11,11). Barnabas writes in order that the Christians, in addition to their faith, may have "perfect knowledge" (ἵνα μετὰ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν τελείαν ἔχητε καὶ τὴν γνῶσιν 1,5), "wisdom, understanding, science and knowledge" (21,5; cf. 2,3). This is the first hint in Christian literature of the Augustinian *crede ut intelligas* (Kleist 168n.13). On "*gnosis" in Barnabas, see Kraft 22-24.

3. The Shepherd of Hermas. The principal theme of the teaching of *Hermas concentrates on the faith with which one believes in God (*Mand.* 1,2) and

which guides the believer in service of the Lord and flight from sin (*Mand.* 1; cf. 6,1,1). The Christian must "clothe himself in faith" because it is strong and completes everything (*Mand.* 9,7,10; *Sim.* 6,1,2), it is the first of the good works (*Mand.* 8,9) and the mother of the other *virtues (*Vis.* 3,8,2ff.). Listening leads to faith and faith to *metanoia* and to the confirmation of the faith itself in *baptism (*Mand.* 4,3,1). Faith is the necessary prerequisite for life and adherence to the church (*Vis.* 3,8,1-3). Faith is believing in the Son of God (*Sim.* 8,3,2). In Hermas, faith-trust is displayed rather than faith-knowledge. In consequence, Hermas warns: "If you bear the name and do not carry its power, you will have borne the name in vain" (*Sim.* 9,13,2).

V. The Apostolic Fathers. *1. First Letter of Clement.* *Clement praises the Corinthians for their "excellent and solid faith" and for their "perfect and profound knowledge [*gnosis*]," i.e., their profound comprehension of the mysteries of the Christian faith. It is an expression dear to St. Paul (2 Cor 4:6; Phil 3:10; Gal 4:9; Eph 3:19). Faith and knowledge hold hands. Clement speaks of "searching out the depths of the divine knowledge" (40,1; cf. Rom 11:33; 1 Cor 2:10). Through Christ "we taste immortal knowledge" (36,2). "Greater knowledge" implies greater responsibility (41,4). "May each one be faithful, each one capable of explaining the deep knowledge" (48,5; cf. the theme of faith and knowledge in the *Odes of Solomon* 4,7,8). Knowledge makes faith perfect. Sanctification comes from faith, a free gift of God, which includes works as a consequence of the faith (*1 Clem.* 32 and 33).

*2. *Ignatius of Antioch.* Object and foundation of the faith is the christological *kerygma*, as it is reflected particularly in St. Paul (*Trall.* 2,1; 9,2; *Phil.* 8,2; 9,2; cf. *Magn.* 1,1: "In the faith of Jesus Christ"). Against the *Docetists, he recommends "firmness in faith" (*Eph.* 10,2) and "harmony in your faith" (*Eph.* 13,1; 20,2). "The knowledge of God is Jesus Christ" (*Eph.* 17,2); he is the true *gnosis* and gives immortality (ibid.; cf. *Magn.* 6,2). "Faith is the beginning and love is the end" of Christian life (*Eph.* 14,1).

*3. *Polycarp of Smyrna.* Faith is "mother of us all" (*Phil.* 3,2-3; cf. Gal 4:26). The fruits of faith are salvation and resurrection from the dead (*Phil.* 5,2). Faith consists in "believing in him who made our Lord Jesus Christ rise from the dead and gave him glory" (2,1; cf. 1 Pet 1:21).

VI. The apologists and antiheretical writers. *1. *Justin.* He was one of the first Christian writers who tried to reconcile faith and reason. The *resurrection, prophecy and the theology of the Logos are the foundations of the faith (Escribano-Alberca 26-31). Given that God can create a human being from a seed (*1 Apol.* 19,2-3), it is not irrational to believe that God can re-create bodies after these have been dispersed in the earth (19,5). Prophecy is truth testimony—historic realization which offers proofs of the faith also for the pagans. (*1 Apol.* 30-50; *Dial.* 28,32). Gnosis is "the grace to understand" the meaning of the prophecies (*Dial.* 58,1; 92,1; 112,3; 119,1), knowledge of God and of Christ (*Dial.* 14,1; 28,4; 39,5; 69,4; 88,6, cf. Camelot 512). Christ, the divine Logos, is universal reason, the "seminal logos" in which all rational beings participate (*1 Apol.* 46; *2 Apol.* 10; *Dial.* 128-129). Faith is "believing that the crucified Jesus is the Christ of God" (*Dial.* 46,1). The Christians are "the descendants of Abraham, who was blessed because of his faith" (*Dial.* 11,5); they are "regenerated through water, faith and wood" (*Dial.* 138,3) because "they have believed through the baptism of penitence and the knowledge of God" (*Dial.* 14,1).

*2. *Irenaeus.* First among Christian writers to interpret Is 7:9 (LXX) in terms of the problem of faith-knowledge. "The fulfillment [of these commandments] is the acquisition of the faith because 'if you will not believe,' Isaiah says, 'you will not understand' (Is 7:9, LXX); and the truth provokes faith, because faith has as its object that which really exists (see Heb 11:1), in such a way that we believe in the things which are precisely because they are and thus, believing in the things because they are, we maintain our perpetually firm conviction regarding them" (*Dem.* 3; SC 62,33; cf. n. 3). The true gnosis, which is the doctrine of the *apostles (*Adv. haer.* IV, 33,8), consists of faith (*Adv. haer.* I,10,3). Irenaeus contrasts the unity of the faith with the diversity of the gnostic doctrine and of the gnostic "succession." There is a single and identical faith, preached by the apostles, which remains in the church thanks to the uninterrupted succession of the *bishops (*Adv. haer.* III, 3,1-3). The faith of Abraham and that of the Christian are "one and the same" (*Adv. haer.* IV, 21,1). Opposing gnostic determinism, Irenaeus argues that the assent of the intellect to the faith is free: "In faith the freedom of human choice is preserved by God under his own control" (*Adv. haer.* IV, 37,5). His doctrine is rooted "in the development of the salvation *oikonomia* of the faith" ("die heilsökonomische Entfaltung des Glaubens"; Escribano-Alberca 32-38): the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις or restoration of humanity in the incarnate Logos by means of a progressive education.

*3. *Clement of Alexandria.* The foundation of the faith is the Logos, "Teacher of the little ones" (*Paed.*

I, 1,1; SC 70,108). Faith in God means listening to the Logos (*Protr.* 84,3; SC 2,151). "He who has remained incredulous at the voice of the Logos has not believed in God" (*Strom.* II, 12,1; SC 38,42). In Clement we find a biblically oriented theology of faith, on the base of Is 7:9 (*Strom.* I, 1,8,2: SC 30,49; II, 2,8,2: SC 32,38; II, 4,17,4: SC 38,45; IV,21,134,4: GCS 15,308,1); Hab 2:4; cf. Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38; 11:1-2, 6 (*Strom.* II, 6,29; II, 2,8: SC 38,38.56) (see Camelot in SC 38,12-19). Clement defines and defends his concept of faith in confrontation with philosophers: "The faith which the Greeks denigrate as futile and barbarous is in fact a premise [πρόληψις] freely adopted, an assent [συγκατάθεσις] given with reverence—'the foundation of that which is hoped for and demonstration of things unseen,' acc. to the apostle. Without faith it is impossible to please God (Heb 11:1-2, 6). Others have defined it as an intellectual assent [συγκατάθεσις] for a reality not manifest, just as a demonstration is an assent to a reality as yet unknown. . . . The study of the faith applies itself to these things in order to become knowledge [ἐπιστήμη] based on a solid foundation," in other words, gnosis (*Strom.* II, 2,8-9: SC 38,38-39) (see Daniélou, *Gospel* 318). Clement explains: "Nothing can be learned without faith because nothing can be learned without a previous intellectual concept [ἄνευ προλήψεως]. As the prophet says (Is 7:9, LXX): 'If you will not believe, you will not understand'" (*Strom.* 11,4,17: SC 38,45).

Clement combines the Aristotelian definition of faith with the Stoic one of assent (συγκατάθεσις) and the Epicurean one of πρόληψις, previous knowledge (Wolfson 120-121). Responding to the *Valentinian idea of the "faith of the *spirituali* who adhere to gnosis and not to the 'mere faith' of the **psychici*," Clement insists that "there is neither gnosis without faith, nor faith without gnosis" (*Strom.* V, 1,3: GCS 15,328). In contrast with *Basilides, who held that "God is known by nature (φύσει)," Clement repeated that "faith is the rational assent of the soul which exercises its *free will, not an undefined beauty which supposedly belongs immediately to the creature" (*Strom.* V, 1,3: GCS 15,327). He concludes: "Nothing remains for us but to discern the unknowable (ἄγνωστον) through the grace of God and through that *logos* alone which proceeds from him" (*Strom.* V, 12,82: GCS 15,381).

4. Origen. The source of faith is the word of the *Scripture which leads, as it were, to a spiritual marriage of the believing soul with the "Logos-Scripture" (*Hom. in Gen.* 10,5: GCS 6,99, 24-26). The wells in Genesis (24 and 29) are figures of the Scripture: at wells the patriarchs encounter their spouses (see Escribano-Albenca 64). Origen (*C. Cels.* 5,20; *In Joh.* 19,3: GCS IV, 182, 15) distinguishes between simple faith (ψιλὴ πίστις; πιστεύειν μόνον) and faith joined with knowledge (πιστεύειν ἐγνωκέναι); the latter is of greater importance (*C. Cels.* 1,13). After the resurrection, the disciples will remember what Jesus had said (Jn 2:22), "and they will believe: along with their knowledge, also their faith will be made perfect" (*In Joh.* 10,37: GCS 10,211,24 5.; cf. Völker 80). Faith produces assent (*C. Cels.* 3,39) and is sufficient for the greater part of humankind (*C. Cels.* 1,9).

VII. The golden age of patristics. *1. The East.* The version of Is 7:9 in the Septuagint, "if you will not believe, you will not understand" (instead of the Hebrew "you shall not be established"), continued to create theological and psychological problems for the Fathers: does faith precede the act of the intelligence, or follow it? In the *Ep. ad Amphilochium* (235), Basil asks: "Which is first, knowledge or faith? We say that, all things considered, in the case of the sciences faith precedes knowledge; but in our instruction, even if someone says that knowledge begins before faith, we agree—provided that a knowledge commensurate with human comprehension be understood. In the case of the sciences, we must first believe that the letter 'A' is really called that and later, after having learned the letters and their pronunciation, also reach an accurate notion of the meaning. But in what concerns our faith in God, the idea that God exists comes first, and we conclude this from his works . . . faith follows this knowledge, and adoration follows this faith." And on Ps 115:1, he declares: "Faith must precede any discourse on God, faith and not demonstration (ἀπόδειξις), faith which bends the mind to assent more than the methods of reason, faith which is not born from geometric principles, but from the action of the *Holy Spirit." Given that all knowledge is preceded by a type of belief, the Christian faith also must precede knowledge, not exactly as a common and elementary notion, but as a demonstrative knowledge (ἀπόδειξις). According to the Fathers, first of all there is a natural knowledge of God which comes from the creation; the gift of faith follows, finally the *scientia* knowledge of the content of the faith, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, in *Graecarum affect. curatio* 1 (PG 83,813 D-816A), presents an optimal summary of Greek patristic thought: "Let no one speak against faith. After all, Aristotle calls faith the criterion of science. Epicurus says that faith is an anticipation (πρόληψις) of the mind and that this anticipation becomes first of all cognition (γνῶσις) and then comprehension (κατάληψις). Furthermore, as we define it, faith is a voluntary as-

sent (συγκατάθεσις) of the mind or contemplation (θεωρία) of secret things and concentration on that which really is and understanding of invisible things. . . . Faith needs knowledge, just as knowledge needs faith. But faith precedes knowledge, and knowledge follows faith."

Greek theology remains fundamentally within this outline. Theodoret uses a series of terms coming from the gnoseological vocabulary of Greek *philosophy—συγκατάθεσις, θεωρία, κατάληψις—which indicate clearly the intellectual character of the faith. In brief, first of all there is an initial knowledge of God and of the fact of revelation, verified by the miracles; then faith, under the influence of grace, accepts the truth without questions; finally comes the dialectical investigation into the depths of the revealed truth: this is Christian *gnosis*, i.e., theology (Parente 188-189).

2. The West. Augustine. From Is 7:9 (LXX) Augustine derived the aphorism: "Crede ut intelligas." Later informed of a *translation closer to the Hebrew, he noted that there was "something precious in both the translations (*ex utroque magnum aliquid insinuatur*). . . . The essence of knowledge is the vision of God, while faith feeds us like children. . . . But if we do not walk in faith, we cannot reach the vision, which does not disappear, but continues through our intellect, once it has been purified through union with the Truth" (*De doc. chr.* II, 12). The path of knowledge is authority and reason: Christ is this supreme authority (*C. Acad.* III, 20,43). Authority has only a temporal priority, reason enjoys the primacy by right (*De ord.* II, 9,26). "Authority demands faith and prepares humanity for reason. Reason leads to comprehension and to knowledge." It is reason that indicates "who must be believed" (*De v. relig.* 24,45). Every certainty begins with faith, including the certainties of human origin (*Util. cred.* 12,26).

The *De Mag.* lays out the *intellectus fidei* through the interlacing of Is 7:9 LXX with Mt 23:8-10. Faith has the role of warning and outer call, so that one is inwardly oriented toward Christ and illuminated by the "inner Truth" (*De Mag.* 14,46) (Cf. Du Roy, *L'intelligence* 214) because "the Son of God has become Son of man in such a way as to receive in himself our faith (*ipse in se exciperet fidem nostram*) and lead us to his truth" (*Trin.* 4, 18,24). Augustine combines the gnoseological outline, faith-authority-reason-understanding, with the theological outline of the *incarnation and the *Trinity (cf. Du Roy, CE I, 1052). In *Trin.*, "Augustine distinguishes *two paths* of his theology: the dogmatic path or *justification of the faith*, and seeking the *understanding of the faith*" (Bourassa 685). According to Augustine, first there is a certain knowledge of the fact of revelation (*De fid. rer. invis.* 7, 10; *C. ep. Man.* 4,5; *Civ. Dei* 22, 5), then the assent of faith under the influence of grace (*De praed. sanct.* 2, 5; *De spir. et litt.* 21,54), finally the reflection on what is believed, which leads to a more profound comprehension (*Ep.* 120, 1, 3-4). A complete summary is found in *En. in Ps.* 118 s. 18,3: NBA 27, 1272: "No one, without understanding at least something, can believe in God: but it is also true that to believe the revelation in all its fullness one must be healed by the same faith with which one began to believe. In reality there are things which, if they are not understood, are not believed: just as there are others which, if they are not believed, are not understood. Faith comes from listening and listening comes in turn from the proclamation of Christ (cf. *Rom* 10,17). Now, how could anyone believe someone who proclaims the faith if he, aside from other matters, does not know the language of the preacher? On the other hand, if no truths existed which we cannot understand if we have not first believed, the Prophet would not have said: 'If you will not believe, you will not understand' (Is 7:9 LXX). In conclusion, our intellect progresses by penetrating the believed truths ever deeper: the faith progresses similarly by succeeding in believing what it has understood; the mind finally progresses in the very act of understanding, and that because it penetrates ever deeper into the same things proposed by faith." Augustine says of himself: "Quaesivi te et desideravi intellectu videre quod credidi" (*Trin.* XV, 28,51).

General conclusion. "From Justin on, the history of the dogma of Christ is full of tension between faith as the hearing of the kerygma and the effort for an understanding of the faith" (Grillmeier 617). *Intellige ut credas, crede ut intelligas.*

J.P. Migne, *Index de fide*, PL 220 (1891) 571-576; M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, Freiburg i.B. 1909, I, 125-143; ThLL 6.1, 661-693: *fides*; W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen 1931; DTC 6, 78-82, 98-99, 109-115, Tables Générales 1538; P. Parente, *La teologia patristica della fede e il testo d'Isaia 7,9*: Doctor Communis I (1948) 185-190; J. Kleist, *The Epistle of Barnabas*: ACW 6 (1948); EC 5, 1094-1097; J. Daniélou, *Abraham dans la tradition chrétienne*: CahSion 5 (1951) 160-179; M. Löhrer, *Der Glaubensbegriff des hl. Augustinus in seinen ersten Schriften bis zu den Confessiones*, Einsiedeln 1955; R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi*, Louvain [3]1958; H. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, Cambridge, MA 1956 (It. tr. Brescia 1978); RGG[3] II (1958) 1588-1600; TWNT 6, 174-230 (TDNT 6, 174-228); DSp 5, 530-619; R. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers* III, New York 1965; O. Du Roy, *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon saint Augustin*, Paris 1966; P.-T. Camelot, *Gnose chrétienne*: DSp 6, 509-523; CE 5, 792-797; A. Di Berardino, *Cristo e la fede nei discorsi di S.A. sul Vangelo di S. Giov.*, Naples 1967 (datt.); Lampe col. 1082-1088, s.v. πιστεύω/πίστις; J. Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, London 1973; I. Escribano-Alberca, HDG, Band I, fasc.

2a: *Glaube und Gotteserkenntnis in der Schriflt und Patristik* (1974); F. Bourassa, *Théologie Trinitaire chez saint Augustin*: Gregorianum 58 (1977) 685; A. Trapè, *Ragione e fede in S.A.*, Patrologia III, 382-383; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I, Freiburg i.B. 1979; D. Lührmann, *Glaube*: RAC 11, 48-122 (bibl. 119-122); RAC 14, 626-648 (*fides* as inheritance); A. Schindler, *Augustin*: TRE 4 (1979) 662-666; 13, 275-305; R. Mortley, *Gnosis* I (*Erkenntnislehre)*: RAC 11, 501-516; A. Le Boulluec, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, *Stromates*, V, I and II, SC 278/279 (1981); G. af Hällström, *Fides simpliciorum According to Origen of Alexandria*, Helsinki 1984; *El diálogo fe-cultura en la antigüedad cristiana*, ed. D. Ramos-Lissón et al., Pamplona 1996; G. Theissen, *Come cambia la fede. Una prospettiva evoluzionistica*, Turin 1999; *La fede nei Padri della Chiesa*, ed. S. Panimolle, Rome 1999; AugL 3, 1334-1340 (TeSelle); M.-É. Boismard, *À l'aube du christianisme. Avant la naissance des dogmes*, Paris 1998 (It. tr. Casale Monf. 2000); O. Casel, *Fede, gnosi e mistero. Saggio di teologia del culto cristiano*, Padova 2002.

R.J. De Simone

FAITHFUL. The term "faithful" (*fidelis* = πιστός) includes several meanings: (a) it can designate "one who believes," i.e., one who puts his *faith in another, or through this binds himself to something; (b) adherence to a teaching, etc.; (c) adherence to God who inspires absolute trust: *fidelis homo est credens promittente Deo* (Augustine, *Enar. in Ps.* 32,2,1,9). The opposite is *incredulus*. (d) "Faithful" is also applied to God, not only as "he who is worthy of faith," but also as "he who is faithful to his promises": *fidelis Deus est exhibens quod promisit homini* (Augustine, *op. cit.*); God himself chooses in order that they be *fideles*. Finally, (e) the word, as a substantive, was habitually used to indicate the baptized, who as such had full participation in the *liturgy and in the life of the Christian community, in contrast with the term *christianus*, which also included the *catechumens, who believe in Christ but do not yet have full participation in his mystery (Lact., *Istitut.* 4,13,26; Jer., *In Is.* 22,15; Aug., *In Ioh.* 14,2; *Enar. in Ps.* 48,1,3; 52,1; *sermones* 235,3; 361,6: *christiani, inquiunt, sumus. Fideles ergo estis? Baptizati estis? Baptizati, inquiunt, sumus*; [*Sermo* 151,2,2]). *Augustine often uses the double term *christianus fidelis* (*Ep.* 227; 268,2; *Conf.* 9,3,5; 8,2,5). The same meaning is common in Christian inscriptions of the first centuries. Consider the example of an *epigraph dedicated to a child dead at the age of two years and some months, baptized, born from baptized parents: *fidelis ex fidelibus* (*pistos ex pistōn*: Rome, Museo Pio Cristiano in Vaticano, III century, DACL 5, 1587).

DTC 5, 1586ff.; DACL 5, 1586-1594; ThLL s.v. *fidelis*; EC 5, 1106-1107; Lampe 1087; É. Lamirande, *"Fidelis" et l'ecclésiologie de s. Augustin. Un thème étrangement négligé*: Augustinianum 41 (2001) 169-200; AugL 2, 1330-1333.

L. Dattrino

FALSIFICATION. Falsification is as old a practice as writing, and it was widespread up until the time when the moral and legal concept of literary property and the rights of the author triumphed in the modern era. The author of a work can be falsified (in which case one has *pseudepigraphy) or the text of the work itself can be falsified via interpolations, imitations, plagiarism, and the creation of forgeries. Here we are concerned with falsification of works. Almost every literary genre has been falsified. We have, therefore, false papal letters, false decretals, false *Acts* of councils, false disciplinary canons, false *Acts* of the martyrs, false liturgies (e.g., *Lit. clementina, Const. Ap.* VIII), false lives of saints, false diplomas, false charters (the most famous is, perhaps, that of Alaon), false testaments, false inscriptions, false donations, false graffiti. The phenomenon is not limited to antiquity, nor is it a particularity of religious literature, even if it is present there with notable frequency. Falsification is born from various motives. One can distinguish fraud of the devout (the *Acts of Paul* are due to a follower of the *apostle), the fraud of *apologists, the fraud of *heretics (which is the most recurrent and virulent). Fraud is not limited to the text, but also extends to the *translations, which can be tendentious. It is sufficient to compare a translation by *Jerome with one by *Rufinus. There were workshops specializing in forgery. One was organized at Alexandria by the prefect of the city, which, acc. to *Anastasius the Sinaite, employed twelve copyists. The latter confessed to having personally falsified the **Tomus ad Flavianum*. Fraud invaded religious literature to such an extent that the 6th Council of *Constantinople in 680 dedicated itself largely to demasking interpolated MSS and fictitious letters: this earned it the nickname "council of antiquarians and paleographers." The *Apollinarians were considered masters in the falsification of texts (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 229). *Apollinaris attributed his own works to various authors, including *Athanasius. *Cyril himself was a victim of Apollinarian falsifications, which invaded a series of christological writings. The *Luciferians followed their example in the 4th and 5th c. The *Pelagians did so as well.

DACL 5, 1213-1246; RAC 7, 236-277 (bibl.); L. Saltet, *Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens:* BLE 7 (1906) 300-321; G. Bardy, *Faux et fraudes littéraires:* RHE 32 (1936) 5-23, 275-302; W. Speyer, *Die literarische Falschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, Munich 1971.

A. Hamman - F. Gori

FAMILY

I. Relations between spouses - II. Parents and children.

I. Relations between spouses. The law that regulates the cohabitation of married persons contains a complex of reciprocal rights and duties, whose principal aspects are well developed in the doctrine of the *Fathers. Two principles regulate the relations between spouses: in the conjugal life, these are on a level of parity; in the familial society, on the other hand, which demands an order, a directive unity and therefore a hierarchy, naturally the husband is the head; and yet, the division of duties that the familial community imposes, acc. to the respective qualities of each of the spouses, does not imply any legal inequality.

a. Conjugal life. Christian doctrine affirms that man and woman are perfectly equal before God in dignity and value. *Philosophy of the imperial period already had a very noble understanding of matrimony as a perfect union of *bodies and *souls, which creates a spiritual community unique in its kind, founded on reciprocal concern and dedication without reserve. The Fathers repeat the arguments of this philosophy: they affirm the moral equality of the sexes, the natural equality of the two in the areas of intellectual and spiritual life; they reinforce these arguments with personal considerations of the innate equality of all people, children of God, brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ. In light of these principles, Christian morality proclaims the duty of identical and reciprocal *fidelity* on the part of the spouses; it condemns with equal severity all that betrays it—not only acts but also conscious desires and guilty thoughts. As opposed to ancient customs and rights, which were extremely indulgent toward the man's infidelity, the Fathers—following the apostle (1 Cor 6:12-20; cf. Heb 13:4)—condemn with the same force the infidelity of the woman and that of the man. They establish the equal obligation of fidelity on the part of the spouses to the law of God which, from the beginning, instituted monogamous marriage (Arist., *Apol.* 15,6; Just., *Dial.* 93,1-2; Ign. Ant., *Ad Polyc.* 5,2; Theoph. Ant., *Ad Autol.* III, 25; *Didascalia* VI, 22,10; Lact., *Inst.* VI, 23). Little by little over time, the churches struggled to eradicate adultery from society, forecasting eternal punishments that would strike the guilty and establishing very severe canonical sanctions: in particular perpetual or temporary excommunication. The penitential treatment reserved for adulterers varied from one region to another and evolved acc. to the times. From the patristic era, the situation of the divorced who remarried constituted one of the most difficult pastoral problems; the hesitations of St. Augustine attest to its complexity. If the spouses are held to a perfect reciprocal fidelity, this means that they also have the right to request *conjugal relations*, jointly with that of granting them. The Fathers repeat the teaching of the apostle (1 Cor 7:3-4): fulfilling this duty is an obligation of justice; refusing it, through a desire for excessive asceticism, although animated by the best intentions, could bring—acc. to *Origen—serious risks to the stability of the couple.

The ecclesiastical writers recommend taking advantage of matrimony with moderation; avoiding the egotistical search for pleasure (Clem. Al., *Strom.* III 58,62; Sextus, *Sent.* 231): this is a theme common to the philosophical and rabbinical tradition (Preisker, 74). These refer constantly to the natural end of marriage, and demand that every conjugal act obey the law of procreation (as a result, relations with pregnant women are excluded, with women during their periods, after menopause, etc.). For that matter, the Jewish conception of matrimony influenced the patristic teaching and, more precisely, the custom of observing periods of voluntary continence for religious or penitential purposes. The apostle also had explained this principle (1 Cor 7:5); the tendency to *encratism, extremely developed in certain writers in the 2nd and 3rd c., would lead to the imposition of conjugal continence before every religious act, and in particular before the fast and reception of the *Eucharist. The practice of spiritual matrimony (total abstinence from conjugal relations) and chaste cohabitation with ascetics (the *agapetoi*) are other aspects of this tendency.

b. The familial society. The Fathers affirm the absolute equality of the spouses concerning the rights and duties of conjugal life, but admit their inequality within the familial community. Following the apostle, they underline the authority of the man and the duties of submission and of respect of the woman toward her husband (Tit 2:5; Eph 5:21-25; 1 Pet 3:1; Ign. Ant., *Ad Polyc.* 5; Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 20,12; V, 9,4). The ps.-*Clementine homilies trace the ideal image of the happy family: modest, reserved, the woman considers her husband as lord and master; she shares with him joys and sorrows, trials and deprivations. The Syriac *Didascalia* offers married women similar counsel, which clearly shows the effect of paternalistic Eastern customs and the longtime domination on the part of the man: a good wife respects and fears her husband; is always quick to serve him; stays in the most hidden part of the house and, working with wool and linen, hides herself from the view of every outsider. Many factors favored this custom: the literary genre of the domestic "mirrors"; the difference in age between the spouses, sometimes considerable; social conditions; restrictions and prejudices. To justify the duty of

submission of the woman, the writers sometimes invoke the argument (very common among the Greek philosophers) of the natural inferiority of the woman, not only from a physical point of view, but also psychological (less resistance to the temptations of vanity, pleasure and frivolous seductions; see Clem. Al., *Paed.* II, 33,2; 117, *Letter of Aristeas* 250). Along the lines of 1 Tim 2:14, *Tertullian and Origen repeat rabbinical commentaries on the first chapters of *Genesis, traversed by an accentuated misogyny: the woman was the first to abandon the law of God, and pushed *Adam to *sin.

Authors who describe the domestic obligations of the husband are rare; this fact underlines the irreplaceable role of the woman, placed beside the man to be his help in everything (cf. Gen 2:18).

II. Parents and children. The patristic doctrine combats all factors that lead to the dissolution of the familial society; combats without compromise abortion, infanticide and the ancient practice of exposing newborns. The church also concerns itself with the orphan. The Syriac *Didascalia* writes that the role of tutor of the orphans of the community is a duty of the bishop; he must insure their religious and moral education and should make them learn a trade, so that they can earn their living in a dignified way. There are many recommendations of the Fathers on the duties of parents and children: they continue the wisdom tradition and the gospel teachings (Eph 6:1-3; Col 3:20-21; 1 Tim 5:4). The Apostolic Fathers emphasize the fear of God, which should be at the base of all moral formation. Among the *virtues that must be exercised in youth, they mention in particular filial love, obedience and respect toward parents. Education toward purity, through the formation of character and the flight from wicked company, also has an important place in their recommendations. Finally, they recall the duty of assistance and support on the part of children toward their parents in need.

B. Biondi, *Il diritto romano cristiano*, III, 1-57; 102-106; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain*, Paris 1958, 548-561; RAC 4, 1190-1219; 7, 286-358; H. Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Berlin 1927; LTK 3, 1167-1172; T.A. Sabattini, *La famiglia cristiana nell'Apologetico di Tertulliano*: Rivista di Studi Classici 23 (1975) 51-66; Ch. Munier, *Divorce, Remariage et pénitence dans l'Église primitive*: RSR 52 (1978) 97-117; Id., *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain* (IIe-IIIe siècles), III, Église et Cité, Paris 1979, 3-71; O. Vannucchi Forzieri, *La risoluzione del matrimonio nel IV-V secolo. Legislazione imperiale e pensiero della Chiesa*: Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Toscana La Colombaria 50 (1985) 65-172; O. Pasquato, *Eredità giudaica e famiglia cristiana. La testimonianza di Giovanni Crisostomo*: Lateranum 54 (1988) 58-91; Ch. Munier, *Matrimonio e Verginità nella Chiesa Antica*, It. tr., G. Ranella, Turin 1990; R. Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*, Sheffield 1991; J.F. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, Oxford 1998; S.G. Nathan, *The Family in Late Antiquity. The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition*, London-New York 2000; A. De Francesco, *Il diritto agli alimenti tra genitori e figli*: Labeo 47/1 (2001) 28-62.

Ch. Munier - G. Pilara

FASTIDIOSUS the Arian (2nd half of 5th–early 6th c.). An African who lived in the *Vandal era and moved from *Catholicism to *Arianism. We know him because *Fulgentius refuted one of his sermons, the text of which has reached us along with the Fulgentian refutation. This sermon is very short, addressed first against the Catholics and then against the *Donatists: Against the Catholics he repeats the traditional Arian arguments intended to reduce the dignity of Christ to the level of a creature, arguments updated a little in the light of the christological controversy of the 5th c. Against the Donatists, Fastidiosus exalts the value of *baptism, referring to the Augustinian teaching on original *sin and *grace.

CPL 708; PL 65, 375-377; CCL 91, 280-283; DHGE 16, 674-675; PCBE I, 382.

M. Simonetti

FASTIDIUS (1st half 5th c.). Pelagian, *Gennadius speaks of him in *De viris ill.* (56-57) as *Britannorum episcopus* and author of *De vita christiana*. There is no other mention of him from antiquity. Studies related to Pelagianism mention him frequently, considering him the author of the *Corpus Pelagianum* (writings attributed to *Pelagius) and the *De vita chr.* Ascetic-moral writings of the 4th-5th c. are attributed to him (*De vita chr., De divitiis, De malis doctoribus, De castitate, Qualiter religionis* or *De possibilitate non peccandi*: ed. Caspari, Christiania 1890, 114-119).

J. Baër, *De operibus Fastidii*, Britannorum episcopi, Nürnberg 1902; I. Kirmer, *Das Eigentum des Fastidius im pelagianischen Schrifttum*, St. Ottilien 1938; G. Plinval, *Pélage. Ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme. Étude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse*, Lausanne 1943; R.F. Evans, *Pelagius. Fastidius and the Pseudo-Augustinian* De vita christiana: JTS 13 (1962) 72-98; J. Morris, *Pelagian Literature*: JTS 16 (1965) 25-60; E. TeSelle, *Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius*: Augustinian Studies 3 (1972) 61-62; V. Grossi, Patrologia III, 441-442.

V. Grossi

FASTING and ABSTINENCE

I. Ascetic and social significance - II. Liturgical and canonical tradition.

I. Ascetic and social significance. "Eating" is the road to death. In the ancient world the mythic poets thought that the gods nourished themselves on aromas to preserve their immortality. Fasting was the rite that prevented the powers of death, deep-seated in food, from penetrating human beings—a therapy of purification, serenity and freedom. The Hebrews knew ritual, funereal, medicinal and ecstatic fasts. By requiring a fast on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29), God revealed its ethical and liturgical significance, abolishing its magical meaning. The faithful Israelite knew that "*prayer with fasting is a good thing, as is *almsgiving with *justice" (Tob 12:8). As a sign of repentance and abandonment to God, fasting is a purification that leads to the recovery of oneself, and it disposes the *soul to love of fellow believers and justice toward the poor (Is 58:1-11). For *Moses and *Elijah fasting was a preparation for *theophany. Jesus inaugurated his theophany with the fast in the desert, and revealed that his food is the will of the Father (Mt 4:2; Jn 4:24); he recommends cheerfulness when fasting, and feasting in the bridegroom's presence (Mt 6:16-18; 9:14-15). *Paul proclaims freedom, since all food is a gift of God (Rom 14:1-22; 1 Cor 10:23-31; 1 Tim 4:1-5).

Christians practiced fasting as a participation in the paschal mystery of Christ. Liberation from the formalisms of Jewish abstinence increased their sympathy for this daily martyrdom that strengthened prayer and works of charity (Acts 13:3; 14:23; *2 Clem.* 16:4; Polyc., *Phil.* 7:2; Min. Fel., *Oct.* 8,4). The **Didache* transforms the "pray" of Mt 5:44 into "fast for your persecutors" (1.3): to pray and fast means to love to the point of giving one's life. The prebaptismal fast disposes the believer to illumination and grafts one into Christ's death in view of the *resurrection (*Did.* 7.4; Just., *Ap.* 11.61; Tertull., *Bapt.* 20; Hipp., *Trad. ap.* 20; Aug., *Fid. et op.* VI 8). Paschal significance inspired the choice of days and times: Wednesday and Friday, Lent and Holy Week (*Did.* 8.1). Sunday was a feast, as was the whole period from *Easter to *Pentecost (Tertull., *Cor.* 3).

The Christian above all fasts spiritually by abstaining from evil (Hermas, *Sim.* V 1.5; cf. Emped. *fr. B* 144) and by observing the commandments, trusting in God and serving him with a pure heart. Fasting from food must be to the advantage of the poor: "on the day of fasting, eat only bread and water and, calculating the cost of the food you would have eaten, give the same amount to a widow, an orphan, a needy person" (*Sim.* V 3.7; cf. Cypr., *Or.* 32-33); "the whole *family will participate in the fast with joy: Observe these things with your children and with all your household: in this way you will be happy" (*Sim.* V 3.9). *Abstinence* is a partial fast, esp. from the meat and wine by which we survive so as to be able to fast again (Clem. Al., *Paed.* II, 1,1ff.; Tertull., *Cult. Fem.* II 9,7; Orig., *In Jer.* 20,7; Eus., *HE* 5,3,2 and *Dem. ev.* 3,5; Jerome, *Jov.* 5,18). Abstinence is *ascesis, not aversion to diabolical foods (*Can. Ap.* 50 and 52). Some groups abstained from particular foods: *encratites, *Ebionites, *Marcionites, *Manicheans, *Priscillianists, who seem to have considered Jesus a vegetarian (Iren., *Haer.* I 2,1, Tertull., *Ieiun.* 15,1; Epiph., *Haer.* 30, 18ff. and 47,1; Aug., *Haer.* 25.46.70). Some claimed that Peter "ate only bread, olives and herbs" (*Ps. Clem. rec.* VII 6,4; cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.* 14,4). The *Montanist *Tertullian condemned the "perpetual abstinence" of Marcion and *Tatian, but also the laxity of pleasure-loving Christians who "hate fasts"; he argues that fasting expiates the primordial *sin, nourishes prayer, obtains pardon, conquers evil, introduces one to the mysteries (*Ieiun* 1,1; 3,4; 7; 15; *Paen.* 9,4). Jesus' saying "blessed are the hungry" is an invitation to fasting, to detachment from earthly goods, to consuming only what one needs: the rich man Dives was punished for not having fasted. The true food that leads to the resurrection is the Father's will: "a lighter body will rise more rapidly" (*Ieiun.* 15,6-17,7 and *Orat.* 6,2-3; cf. Novat., *Cib.* 6; Aug., *Util. ieiun.* 1,1).

*Clement of Alexandria, with recourse to *Scripture and *philosophy, recommends frugality and temperance to free oneself from matter (*Paed.* II 1,1–2,34; III 12,90). For *Origen fasting is an experience of freedom, not an obligation in view of Pythagorean *metempsychosis (*C. Cels.* 5,49 and 8,30); mortification of the flesh puts the person in communion with Christ, raising him from human existence to the divine life (*In Lev.* 10,1-2; cf. Ambr., *In Ps.* 40,1; Greg. Nyss., *Beat.* IV; Aug., *Util. ieiun.* 1,1). Fasting assures *peace in the world and in families, because it frees from selfishness (Basil., *Ieiun. hom.* 2,5; cf. Crom., *Serm.* 35,4 and *In Mt.* 29). It is an angelic life which leads us back to *paradise, where "sin entered through food"; in fact "those who do not believe in the afterlife indulge in food and drink" (Ambr., *Hel.* 3,4; 4,7; *Ep.* 63,17).

*Monasticism raised the ascesis of fasting to almost unattainable heights. *Anthony ate bread, water and salt (Athan., *Ant.* 7,6). *Pachomius fasted, but did not want the monks to lack food (*Vita Pach.* 25). For *Jerome, the monk should always be a little hungry: "If you want to be perfect, it is better to fatten the soul than the body" (*Jov.* 2,6; *Ep.* 54,105). *Basil in his *Homily on Fasting* recommends balance, sincerity and respect for each person's condition: "Satiety pleases the stomach, fasting is a gain for the

soul. . . . Anoint your head and wash your face (Mt 6:17). . . . Show yourself as you are! Don't appear gloomy and somber so as to be known as an ascetic. . . . Fasting done for show bears no fruit for the future life" (Basil., *Ieiun.* 1): this is the inclination to *discretio* (cf. Cass., *Coll.* 21,13ff. and *Inst. coen.* 5,5ff.; Hipp., *Trad. Ap.* 25; Epiph., *Haer.* 3; *Exp. fid.* 23; Theodoret, *Haer. fab.* 5,29). The *Rule of Benedict* recommends that one "love fasting," but practice it with discretion (4, 39-41,49). The monastic East deepened the personal aspect of fasting, while the West focused on its social value; *Leo the Great, who dedicated thirty treatises to fasting (12-20; 39-50; 86-94), proclaimed forcefully: "the abstinence of one who fasts must become the nourishment of the poor" (*Serm.* 13,1).

II. Liturgical and canonical tradition. The Christian week was consecrated by two days of fasting, called "station days" (Tertull., *Orat.* 19,1; Hermas, *Sim.* 5,1-2): Wednesday and Friday, instead of Monday and Thursday, the days observed by the Jews (*Did.* 8.1; Tertull., *Orat.* 19; *Ieiun.* 2,3; 14,2-3). Wednesday was the day of the Lord's betrayal, Friday the day of his crucifixion (Tertull., *Jejun.* 14; *Didasc. Ap.* 21; Aug., *Ep.* 36,13,30); from the 3rd c. they became obligatory fast days (*Const. Ap.* V 14; Epiph., *Expos. fid.* 22). In the West it was the custom to fast on Saturdays: not so in the East, except for the Saturday before Easter (*Const. Ap.* V; Basil., *Hom. I de Ieiun.*; Aug., *Ep.* 36,13,31). The earliest Easter fast was limited to Good Friday, later extended to include Holy Saturday. The Easter fast caused lively controversies among 2nd-c. Christians (Eus., *HE* 5,23-25; Socr., *HE* V,22; von Campenhausen, 114-138). *Irenaeus (Eus., *HE* 5,24) says that some recommended one day (Good Friday), others two (Good Friday and Holy Saturday), while some fasted continuously for 40 hours (the time during which Christ's body remained in the tomb). Ps.-*Hippolytus, *Trad. ap.* 33, prescribes a fast of two days, from Friday until the end of the Easter evening *Mass, *antequam oblatio fiat* (Botte [SC 11bis], 78; cf. Tertull., *Ieiun.* 2,4). From the 3rd c. it became customary to fast during the whole of Holy Week (Dionysius Al., *Ep. ad Basilidem*, can. 1: PG 10, 1277; *Didascalia* 21). At Rome a fast of three weeks was observed before Easter (Socr., *HE* V, 22), but Christians had to interrupt their fast on the Sundays before Easter (*Statue of St. Hippolytus*: ἀπονηστίξεσθαι δὲ δεῖ οὐ ἄν ἐνπέσῃ κυριακή Guarducci 539; cf. Tertull., *De Cor.* 3,4; Aug., *Ep.* 36,12,29; Cass. *Inst.* II 18).

In the East, *Athanasius of Alexandria, *Ep.* 1,10 (329), speaks of a fast of six days before Easter, but later, *Ep.* 3,1 (331), says that the traditional fast is 40 days. The older Holy Week fast was thus gradually incorporated, from the 4th c., into the Lenten fast in imitation of Christ, Moses and Elijah, though the theoretical distinction between the two was maintained (see John Chrys., *Hom. 30 in Gen.* 2,1). At Rome from the 7th c., Ash Wednesday was designated as the beginning of the Lenten fast: "*Feria IIII: caput de ieiuniis*" (*Sacrament. Gelasianum*, 49: ed. Mohlberg, 39). The *Didache* 7,4 enjoins fasting on candidates for *baptism, on the one who baptizes and on the community. Fasting was part of the immediate preparation for baptism (Just., *1 Apol.* 61; Tertull., *Bapt.* 20; ps.-Hippolytus, *Trad. ap.* 20; Aug., *Ep.* 54,10). The earliest evidence of a eucharistic fast is from the 3rd c. Tertullian (*Ad uxorem* II 5,2) asks the Christian wife of a pagan: "Will your husband not know what [the Eucharist] is on which you feed secretly before taking any other food [*ante omnem cibum gustes*]?" And ps.-Hippolytus (*Trad. ap.* 36) states: "Every believer, before touching food, hastens to receive the Eucharist. If he receives it with faith, no mortal thing will be able to harm him." For the oldest explicit legislation, see the councils of *Hippo of 393 (can. 28) and *Carthage of 397 (can. 29: Mansi III, 885, 923).

R. Abersmann, *Das Fasten bei den Griechen und Römern*, Giessen 1929; DSp 1, 122-133; 8, 1164-1179; RAC 7, 447-524; A. Guillaume, *Jeûne et charité dans l'église latine des origines au XIII[e] siécle, en particulier chez saint Léon le Grand*, Paris 1954; Th. Pichler, *Das Fasten bei Basileios dem Grossen und im antiken Heidentum*, Innsbruck 1955; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, Milan 1955–1956, II, 104-111; III, 516-519; H. Musurillo, *The Problem of Ascetical Fasting in the Greek Patristic Writers*: Traditio 12 (1956) 1-64; var. aus., *Redécouverte du Jeûne. Sagesse du corps*, Paris 1959; H.F. von Campenhausen, *Ostertermin oder Osterfasten? Zum Verständnis des Irenäusbriefs an Victor* (Eus. *Hist. Eccl. 5,24,12-17*): VChr 28 (1974) 114-138; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, IV, Rome 1978; J.F. Wimmer, *The Meaning and Motivation of Fasting according to the Synoptic Gospels*, Rome 1980; A. Grün, *Digiunare*, Cinisello B. 2003.

P. Meloni - R.J. Desimone

FATHER, FATHERS of the CHURCH

I. Father - II. The Fathers in the Middle Ages - III. The Fathers during the Renaissance.

I. Father. In *Judaism and in the *Bible, the term *father* refers to an ancestor (a transmitter of life and above all the deposit of divine promises) and also a teacher, inasmuch as he is a "spiritual parent" of the disciple; the rabbi belongs to this category, so too the Pythagoreans and the Cynics considered the one who initiates students into *philosophy to be a father. *Paul uses this image when dealing with Chris-

tians begotten by him through the gospel (1 Cor 14–15). In the postapostolic age, Christian writers use the term "Fathers" to refer to the great figures of the Old Testament, the models of the *faith and *virtue (*1 Clem.* 30:7; 60:4); and also the *apostles (*1 Clem.* 62:2; see esp. the *apocryphal acts: *Act. Jo.* 81; *Act. Andreae et Mathiae* 17); the founders of a philosophical school or *gnostic system (see Justin, *Dial.* 2,2; 3,7; 35,6; Clem. Al., *Protr.* V, 66,4; cf. II, 13,5). The *pagans referred to *Polycarp as "the teacher of Asia and the father of Christians" (*Mart. Pol.* 12,2). The faithful of *Lyons sent their letter to *Eleutherius *bishop of *Rome, calling him "father" (Eus., *HE* 5,4,2). Above all, the bishops were referred to as father, inasmuch as they were teachers of faith. *Irenaeus writes: "the one who has received a teaching from the mouth of another is called the 'son' of the one who has instructed him, and the latter is called 'father'" (Iren., *Adv. Haer.* IV, 41,2; see also Clem. Al., *Strom.* I, 1,2,1; I, 1,1,3).

The Latin Fathers (*Cyprian, *Ambrose and *Augustine) apply to the *bishop the word "papa," a title derived from familial language (a title that will later be reserved for the *pope, Supreme Pontiff, the bishop of Rome). By extension, they also applied the title to priests (Chrysostom, *In Illud: Paulus vocatus, hom.* 4,1) and, in *monasticism, to *abbots and *ascetics (*Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 17).

From the mid-4th c. onward, Christian writers applied the term to bishops, defenders of *orthodoxy and *discipline, who joined together at the Council of *Nicaea (see Basil, *Ep.* 140,2; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 35,15). During the course of the great theological controversies of the 4th and 5th c., the conformity, or lack thereof, of a doctrine to the teaching of the "Fathers" is a proof of orthodoxy or *heresy. At the Council of *Ephesus, *Cyril of Alexandria ordered that a dossier of patristic citations be read (Mansi IV, 1183-1195; E. Schwartz, ACO I, 1,1, pp. 31-44, etc.). By that time, the term simultaneously designated both conciliar fathers (texts in E. Wiest, *Institutiones patrologiae*, Ingolstadt 1795, 530-534) and individual bishops whose doctrinal agreement provides a guarantee of orthodoxy. This last aspect would take on special importance throughout the course of history.

*Augustine in his controversies with the *Donatists and with the *Pelagians elaborated several ideas that further nuanced the concept and the authority of the "Fathers of the Church." *Cyprian belongs to this category because he provided a standard and because of his approved actions in recourse to the church (see Aug., *Bapt.* 4,5,7; 5,25,36); against the Pelagians, he cites various patristic texts, even *Jerome's, who was not a bishop (Aug., *C. Iulian.* I,7,34), and he affirms that the invididual testimonies of the Fathers have value inasmuch as they agree with the testimonies of the other Fathers, who, because of this agreement, are the voice of the church. *Vincent of Lérins calls the Fathers *magistri probabiles*, "recognized teachers" (*Comm.* 3). He would then add that these men, aside from having the prerogative of antiquity, "lived, taught and remained in the faith and the Catholic *communion in a holy, wise and constant way and earned the honor of dying faithful to Christ and to give their lives for him" (ibid. 28, 6; see also 2,5; 3,4; 29,6; 33,2). Therefore, he excludes writers such as *Tertullian and *Origen, despite their skill (*Comm.* 17 and 18). The apocryphal decree attributed to Pope *Gelasius, *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, at last establishes a catalog of recognized authors in the *Catholic Church and lists the received and rejected *books. Notwithstanding its spurious character, this decree exerted considerable influence on the transmission of texts.

Four requirements have been traditionally established to characterize the fathers of the church: (1) orthodoxy: in the sense of remaining faithful in communion with the church in the true teaching, at least on the whole; (2) a holy life: the result of a life in conformity to the gospel and a coherent witness with one's teaching; a witness that often took one to the point of *martyrdom; (3) approbation from the church: which manifests itself both directly and openly with the citation of texts, but more often than not implicitly with allusions or reference to the thought of the author; (4) antiquity: pertains to those who lived in the first Christian centuries. Although these requirements are still valid, they should not be considered exhaustive and absolute. Authors lacking any of the first three requirements were referred to more specifically as "ecclesiastical writers" (just as Jerome had already defined them, *Vir. ill.* prol.; *Ep.* 112,3).

J. Madoz, *El concilio de Éfeso, ejemplo de argumentación patrística*: Estudios eclesiásticos 10 (1931) 305-338; I. Backes, *Der Väterbeweis in der Dogmatik*: ThQ 114 (1933) 208-221; L. Dürr, *Heilige Vaterschaft im antiken Orient*: Heilige Überlieferung, ed. O. Casel, Munster 1938, 1-20; H. Emonds, s.v. *Abt*, RAC 1 (1950) 45-55; Lampe 1051; A. Bénoit, *Attualità dei Padri della Chiesa*, Bologna 1970, Ital. trans; E. Bellini, *I Padri nella tradizione cristiana*, Milan 1982; E. dal Covolo, A. M. Triacca (eds.), *Lo studio dei Padri della Chiesa oggi*, Rome 1991; J.-L. Quantin, *Le catholicisme classique et les Pères de l'Eglise. Un retour aux sources (1669–1713)*, Paris 1999; L. Dattrino, *Padri e pastori per una nuova umanità*: in: M. Maritano (ed.), *Historiam perscrutari*, Miscellanea Pasquato, Rome 2002, 611-624.

M. Maritano

II. The Fathers in the Middle Ages
1. General introduction - 2. The Early Middle Ages and the Carolingian Renaissance - 3. The Renaissance of the 12th century - 4. The 13th century.

1. General introduction. The influence of the fathers of the church is a dominant characteristic of the intellectual and spiritual life of medieval Europe. As E. Amann underscores: "Il suffit d'ouvrir les *Sentences* de Pierre Lombard ou le *Décret* de Gratien, ces deux 'trésors' du Moyen Âge, pour voir la place qu'y tient l'érudition patristique," "One simply need open Peter Lombard's *Sentences* or Gratian's *Decretum*, the two 'treasures' of the Middle Ages, to see the place that 'patristic learning' holds therein" (Amann, col. 1204). Although it is clear that there was a "patristic influence," the details of such influence differ considerably from century to century, from place to place, and from one author to the next, with respect to the sources used, the relative authority of each Father and the method of interpretation. Medieval authors inevitably chose certain *auctoritates*, and there was often the problem of evaluating one authority with another or the need for reconciling authorities in apparent disagreement.

*Augustine, as usual, enjoyed special honor among medieval authors, as Notkero Balbulo (d. 912) underscores: *Si Augustinus adest, sufficit tibi*, "If Augustine is present, that should be sufficient for you" (*De interp. div. script.* 5, PL 131, 998). In Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, e.g., 680 citations come from Augustine, which are rivaled only by the 66 from *Ambrose (Bougerol 1997, p. 115). In *Gratian's *Decretum* the proportions are similar: in fact, the *Decretum* is a primary source for the *Sententiae*, providing 236 citations, esp. in the fourth book of the *Sentences*, which treats the sacraments. Peter Lombard's *auctoritates* are derived primarily from the Latin Fathers, among whom are Ambrose, *Hilary, Jerome, *Gregory the Great, *Ambrosiaster, *Fulgentius, *Bede, *Isidore, *Leo the Great and *Gennadius, but also from the Greek Fathers: *John of Damascus, *John Chrysostom and *Origen. Citations of extracts, however, did not necessarily correspond to the actual works of the Fathers. Peter Lombard, Bougerol (ibid. 115) observes, knew only four of Augustine's works firsthand; the rest of his knowledge about his works derived from the *Glossa ordinaria* and Florus of Lyons's *Expositio*.

The influence of the Greek Fathers varied acc. to the availability of the translations and the specific theological predilections of medieval authors. First of all, medieval authors inherited a corpus of Latin translations from ancient Christianity that included the works of Origen, the Cappadocian Fathers, John Chrysostom and others (Gribomont 1978). That corpus of texts grew substantially in the 9th c. when John Scotus Eriugena translated some works by ps.-*Dionysius, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Maximus the Confessor; and in the 12th and 13th c. when John the Saracen translated the Greek Fathers (he lived in the middle of the 12th c. and was the author of a new translation of ps.-Dionysius's work), Burgundio of Pisa (d. 1193; author of translations of works by John of Damascus, John Chrysostom and *Nemesius of Emesa) and Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253; author of the translation of the *Epistulae* of *Ignatius of Antioch, the **Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, John of Damascus and a new version of ps.-Dionysius). In each case, the new translations were the product and, at the same, the nourishment of the renewed interest in patristic texts both in the context of monastic piety and in the nascent scholastic movement of the cathedral schools and the emerging universities. Henri de Lubac, in his magisterial study on biblical interpretation in the medieval period, heavily underscores the central importance of Origen: "l'un des pricipaux éducateurs du moyen âge latin," "one of the primary teachers of the Latin Middle Ages" (de Lubac 1959, 219); and Jean Leclercq emphasizes Origen's importance in the theology and the monastic spirituality of the 12th c., esp. among the Cistercians (Leclercq 1957). But enthusiasm for Greek sources never led to an isolation or opposition toward the Latin Fathers; instead, it represented an enrichment of that patristic tradition from which, as Bernard of Clairvaux reiterates, Augustine and Ambrose are the "two pillars" (*De baptismo* II c.8, PL 182, 1036C). According to Étienne Gilson, Ambrose's spiritual exegesis of the *Song of Songs is in fact the chief source of the "Socratisme chrétien" (Christian Socraticism) that pervades the entire theology of Bernard of Clairvaux and other Cistercian teachers (Gilson 1947, 92).

In the albeit complex history of scholastic and mystical theology of the 2nd half of the 12th and the entire 13th c., ps.-Dionysius became the chief Greek patristic authority; the same applies to other very diverse figures such as Bonaventure (d. 1274), Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) and Meister Eckhart (d. 1328); but Eckhart was always interpreted in a context that was profoundly Latin and Augustinian. Without a doubt, that assessment holds true for Bonaventure and Eckhart, but also for Thomas Aquinas, concerning whom Leo Elders correctly emphasizes that "indeed, throughout the *Summa theologiae*, Augustine is the Father of the Church who enjoys the greatest authority and is quoted most, over four

times more than Gregory and over five times more than Dionysius. One may say that Thomas composed his works in an uninterrupted dialogue with Augustine" (Elders 1999, 364). Although the great scholastics and mystics were all deeply tied to the authority of the Fathers, Dante (d. 1321), a generation after Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas, appealed to the Italian cardinals, lamenting the fact that the leaders of the church, by devoting themselves to the earthly ends, have set aside the great Fathers in favor of the decretalists, among whom he names Ambrose, Augustine, Dionysius, John of Damascus and Bede (*Ep. XI*, "Cardinalibus ytalicis Dantes de Florentia").

2. The Early Middle Ages and the Carolingian Renaissance. It is not easy to draw a line marking the end of Christian antiquity and the beginning of medieval Europe. Although Max Manitius's classic *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittlelalters* marked the beginning of the Middle Ages with *Boethius (d. 526) and *Cassiodorus (d. 580), modern scholars of church history have moved the end of the patristic era to *Isidore of Seville (d. 636) and the Venerable Bede (d. 735). From the perspective of medieval history, these first two centuries essentially appear to be a period of assimilation of the patristic inheritance, characterized by **florilegia*, *excerpta*, collections of **sententiae*, which began already the *Liber sententiarum* of *Prosper of Aquitaine—earning him the title "The first representative of Medieval *Augustinianism" (Cappuyns 1929)—and the *Excerpta* of Vincent of Lérins (written in 434). But the period was also a time of evaluation, consolidation and, at times, even disputation over patristic authorities, as occurred esp. during the "*semi-Pelagian" controversy, when *Fulgentius of Ruspe (d. 532) and *Caesarius of Arles (d. 543) defended Augustine's position against the teachings of *Faustus of Riez (d. ca. 490); two popes (*Gelasius and *Hormisdas) confirmed Augustine's authority, as did the Second Council of *Orange in 529. *Boethius stood alone in his search for an explanation of the patristic teaching (esp. *ex Augustini scriptis semina rationum*, *Trin.*, prol.) by means of the principles of *Aristotelian and *Neoplatonic logic; his contemporaries apparently ignored his project, but it achieved utmost importance in the following centuries, esp. in the 12th, the so-called *Aetas Boetiana* (Chenu 1957, ch. 6). These centuries also witnessed the strengthening of the Benedictines (Monte Cassino, 529), the educators of Europe in the Early Middle Ages, who expanded knowledge about the Fathers throughout the centuries of the Middle Ages (Leclerq 1957, ch. 6).

Nevertheless, only in the 9th c. did the influence of the Fathers attain its utmost flourishing during the course of the "Carolingian Renaissance," a resurrection of the learning that was promoted by the great emperor and guided by *Alcuin of York (d. 804), "the teacher and creator of the new Carolingian civilization" (Cristiani 1987, p. xi). Einhard, the biographer of Charlemagne, tells us that the emperor himself loved the works of Augustine, esp. the *City of God* (*Vita Karoli Magni*, 24), a work from which many readers deduced principles for political theology (Contrini 1999, 124-129). And "in an age replete with iconoclastic, predestinarian, christological, trinitarian and other stormy controversies, Augustine's works served all sides" (ibid., p. 126). Thus, the controversy between John Scotus Eriugena and Gottschalk of Orbais was primarily a debate over the correct interpretation of Augustine. Similarly, in the controversy between Radbertus (d. ca. 860) and his disciple Ratramnus (d. after 868), both authors supported their position by using patristic authorities (esp. Ambrose and Augustine) but disagreed on the interpretation of their writings.

In the context of the Carolingian theological controversies, undoubtedly the most interesting and important interpreter of the Fathers was John Scotus Eriugena, an Irish immigrant and teacher at the court of Charles the Bald; he was well noted for his use of Greek patristic sources: Basil and Origen as much as for his translation of *Gregory of Nyssa, ps.-*Dionysius and *Maximus the Confessor, and for his blending of such Greek sources with his Latin cultural formation in the "most brilliant and ingenious arrangement of an imposing amount of patristic material that the Early Middle Ages had ever known" (Cristiani 1987, p. xxx). Modern historians have done quite a bit of study on questions regarding Eriugena's exact sources and the proportions of his synthesis of the patristic East and West. In one of his works, *De divina praedestinatione*, all the explicit patristic references are Latin-based (esp. from Augustine), but certain scholars believe that one can already see in it the influence of Greek sources (Mainoldi, 2003, pp. xlvi-li) and in the *Periphyseon* the citations of *Origen, *Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, ps.-Dionysius and Maximus the Confessor are extensive. Eriugena almost always finds that his Greek authors are in harmony with the Latin tradition (esp. the Augustinian tradition): *nec inter se dissonant, nisi in significationibus vocabulorum*, "and they do not disagree among themselves, save only in regard to the meanings of words" (*Periphyseon* V, 31). Where there seems to be a disagreement, he brings Ambrose into the controversy

to mediate a solution (D'Onofrio 1994, 118-119).

Eriugena's synthesis of the Eastern and Western tradition is of great importance for the history of medieval patristic interpretation. As W. Otten maintains: "it is in his establishment of a connection between Dionysius and Augustine that Eriugena showed tremendous foresight. For it is precisely through its fascination with these different but not divergent Christian-*Platonic strands of the patristic tradition in Eriugena that Carolingian theology became firmly linked to the intellectual revival of 12th-c. Europe" (Otten 1997, 43). Although the question regarding the immediate influence of Eriugena remains partially unclear (see O'Meara synthesis 1988, 198-212), such influence becomes rather evident in that movement E. Jeauneau describes as the "Eriugenean Renaissance" of the 12th c. (Jeauneau 1987), in which, as M.-D. Chenu observes, Ambrose, Origen and Augustine unite in Eriugena to nourish "la mentalité symbolique" of 12th.-c. theology (Chenu 1957, 174).

3. The Renaissance of the 12th century. The history of the influence of the Fathers in the 12th c. is extremely complex. It is marked by the following: a renewed freedom of speculation, as in the case of Anselm of Aosta (archbishop of Canterbury) and the Platonists of Chartres; a heavily critical spirit, as in Abelard's *Sic et non*; and a renewed flourishing of monastic spirituality, as represented in a special way by Bernard of Clairvaux and his followers, the Cistercians (Pranger 1977). All these tendencies involved a lively commitment to the patristic tradition, and all were considerably influenced by the discovery of new sources beginning in the middle of the previous century. And the commitment to organize the patristic inheritance in a systematic form (e.g., the *Summae Sententiarum*) received a great thrust from the collections of civil and ecclesiastical canons (Werckmeister 1997; Grabmann 1911, 86-87). A precise judgment of the extent of the Greek patristic influence on the development of scholasticism and mysticism will depend upon the research scholars do in the future. One of the most representative witnesses of such interests is the *Clavis physicae* of Honorius of Autun "Augustodunensis" (ed. P. Lucentini, Rome 1974), a summary of the pseudonymous *Periphyseon*; and we know from the catalogs of the medieval libraries and the MSS that have survived to our day that the text of ps.-Dionysius and Eriugena (at times by means of the summary of Honorius) were available in all of Europe. The *Periphyseon* is mentioned under a pseudonymous name in the *Sententiae Anselmi* and extracts from the works of John of Eriugena were introduced into the *Glossa ordinaria et interlinearis* at Laon and in Anselm of Laon's *Ennarationes in Johannem*; and there are significant indications of such influence in at least two dozen 12th-c. authors (Crouse 1994, 406).

During the middle of the century, ps.-Dionysius was esp. represented at the school of Saint Victor by a translation of John the Saracen and by the commentary of Hugh of Saint Victor. As in the case of the exegetical works of Origen and other Greek Fathers, Dionysius's texts were assimilated into a context that was fundamentally Latin and *Augustinian. For Honorius, e.g., Augustine is always a primary source; nevertheless, his Augustine is the one understood acc. to Eriugena's perspective and articulated acc. to his characteristic vocabulary. In the history of medieval thought, "Augustinianism" could at times mean different things from the moment that the texts were chosen and reinterpreted in relation to new interests. Thus, we cannot speak of just one "Medieval Augustinianism" plain and simple. Anselm of Aosta, e.g., "the Father of Scholasticism" is certainly one of Augustine's followers, and in the prologue of his *Monologion*, he invites us to compare his work with Augustine's *De Trinitate* (*Monologion*, ed. Schmitt, I, p. 8); although Augustine devoted the first four books of his treatise to the *auctoritates* of *Scripture, Anselm insists on proceeding *sola ratione*, as Lanfranc of Bec noted. Even the "Victorines" were Augustinians, but they made ready use of Dionysian terminology, which Anselm (who would have had some familiarity with these texts) entirely avoids. As S. Vanni Rovighi observes, "There were different ways of being Augustinian" (Vanni Rovighi 1978, p. 102).

4. The 13th century. In the 2nd half of the 12th c., and for the entire 13th, the intellectual life of Europe was greatly enriched by the acquisition of many previously unknown texts: Aristotelian, *Platonic, *Neoplatonic and patristic texts, many of which had fundamental importance in the formation of High Scholasticism and suggested new perspectives in the interpretation of already well-known sources. Aside from the translations of some major works of Aristotle and of some of his Greek commentators, and of different significant theologically Neoplatonic texts (e.g., the *Liber de causis*), primarily through Islamic and Byzantine sources, medieval authors acquired important patristic texts such as the new version of John of Damascus and ps.-Dionysius translated by Robert Grosseteste (d. 1258) and Thomas of Vercelli's (d. 1258) *Extractio* (a "simplified paraphrase"). This second Latin reception of

ps.-Dionysius (McEvoy 1999) was of fundamental importance, esp. for the development of mystical theology with its concepts of *excessus mentis*, *principalis affectio* and *supermentalis unicio*, etc., concepts that expressed a radical division between the cognitive and affective spheres, thus forming a division between Scholasticism and Mysticism—a distinction foreign to the Augustinian tradition—where the cognitive and affective spheres remain always in relation to the *Trinity.

All the great Scholastic philosophers and theologians of the 13th c. tried in their own ways to reach a coherent synthesis of patristic scholarship (Greek and Latin) and the scholarship of Aristotelianism and Neoplatonism. Thus, for Bonaventure and his followers, Aristotle provides the fundamental elements of *scientia*; Plato, *sapientia*; whereas Augustine embraces both (Bonaventure, *Sermo 4 de rebus theol.*, 181, *Opera* X, 572). Even Thomas Aquinas, although he does not entirely avoid directing criticism toward Augustine (Gilson 1926), remains "proprement un scholastique authentiquement nourri d'Augustin" (Chenu 1957, 31); but he is also, at the same time, an entirely favorable commentator of ps.-Dionysius and observes that *Dionysius fere ubique sequitur Aristotelem* (*In II Sent.,* d.14 q.1 ad 2). And although Aquinas establishes his entire concept of the theological-philosophical system upon the Dionysian model of *exitus* and *reditus*, such a concept is not at all foreign to Augustine.

The chief authority of the Scriptures and the interpretive authority of the Fathers remained intact, and, as in Aristotle, the Scholastics subordinated all the other sciences to theology ("first philosophy") and Aristotelian and Neoplatonic theology to the theology of the "pagina sacra." Thus, for Dante, the poet of Scholasticism, Aristotle is "the teacher of those who know" (*Inferno* IV, 131), and his teaching pervades the *Divina Commedia* from beginning to end; but Aristotle himself remains in Limbo while Bernard of Clairvaux has the privilege of accompanying the pilgrim to the final trinitarian vision, in which the cognitive and affective spheres are perfectly united.

M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols., Freiburg i.B. 1909, 1911; E. Gilson, *Pourquoi saint Thomas a critiqué saint Augustin*: Archives d'hist. doct. et litt. du moyen âge I (1926) 46-80; M. Cappuyns, *Le prémier représentant de l'augustinisme médiévale. Prosper d'Aquitaine*: RTAM 1 (1929) 309-337; E. Gilson, *La théologie mystique de saint Bernard*, Paris 1947; M.-D. Chenu, *Introduction a l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris-Montreal 1950; C. Munier, *Les sources patristiques du droit de l'Église du VIII^e au XIII^e siécle*, Strasbourg 1957; J. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu*, Paris 1957; M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle*, Paris 1957; C. Viola, *L'influence de la méthode anselmienne*, in H. Kohlenberger, ed., *Analecta Anselmiana* 4/2, Frankfurt 1975, 1-32; H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale. Première partie*, I and II, Paris 1959; E. Amann, *Pères de l'Église:* DTC XII/1, 1192-1215; S. Vanni Rovighi, *Studi di filosofia medioevale*, I, Milan 1978; D. Bell, *William of Saint Thierry and Jean Scot Eriugena*: Citeaux 22 (1982) 5-28; M. Cristiani, ed., *Giovanni Scafo. Omelia sul prologo di Giovanni*, Vicenza 1987; É. Jeauneau, *Études Érigéniennes*, Paris 1987; E. Jeauneau, *Le Renouveau érigénien du XII^e siècle*, in W. Beierwaltes, ed., *Eriugena Redivivus*, Heidelberg 1987; J. O'Meara, *Eriugena*, Oxford 1988; J. Madec, *Jean Scot et ses auteurs. Annotations Ériugéniennes*, Paris 1988; K. Ruh, *Geschichte der abendländischen Mystik*, I, Munich 1990; G. D'Onofrio, *The Concordia of Augustine and Dionysius. Toward a Hermeneutic of the Disagreement of Patristic Sources in John the Scot's* Periphyseon, in B. McGinn - W. Otten, eds., *Eriugena. East and West*, Notre Dame-London 1994, 115-140; R. Crouse, *What Is Augustinian in Twelfth-Century Mysticism?* in F. van Fleteren - J. C. Schnaubelt - J. Reino, eds., *Collectanea Augustiniana. Augustine, Mystic and Mystagogue*, New York 1994, 401-414; A. Di Berardino, ed., *Patrologia IV*, Genoa 1996; J. Gribomont, *The Translations. Jerome and Rufinus*, in Patrologia III, ch. IV; I.D. Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, Leiden-New York-Cologne, I, 1997, in particular: W. Otten, *The Texture of Tradition. The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology*, 3-50; J. Werckmeister, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in Canon Law*, in ibid., 51-81; J.-G. Bougerol, *The Church Fathers and the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, in ibid., 113-164; B. Pranger, Sic et Non: *Patristic Authority Between Refusal and Acceptance. Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux*, in ibid., 165-193; J.-G. Bougerol, *The Church Fathers as* auctoritates *in Scholastic Theology to Bonaventure*, in ibid., 290-335; L. Elders, *Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church*, in ibid., 337-366; J. Contrini, *Carolingian Era, Early*, in A. Fitzgerald, ed., *Augustine Through the Ages*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge 1999, 124-129; J. McEvoy, *Thomas Gallus*, Abbas Vercellensis, *and the Commentary on* De mystica theologia *ascribed to Johannes Scotus Eriugena*, in J. Cleary, ed., *Traditions of Platonism. Essays in Honour of John Dillon*, Aldershot 1999, 389-405; C. Leonardi, ed., *Letteratura latina medievale (secolo VI-XV)*, Florence 2002; E. Mainoldi, ed., *Giovanni Scafo Eriugena. De praedestinatione liber*, Florence 2003.

R. Crouse

III. The Fathers during the Renaissance

1. Renewed interest in the 14th and 15th c. for patristic texts and their uses - 2. Patristic studies in the 16th c.: Humanism, Reformation and Counter Reformation - 3. The uses of the fathers of the church in the Reformation and Counter Reformation.

The period between the mid-14th and early 17th c. saw an unprecedented development both in the number of patristic works made available and in the diversity of treatments and uses they were put to. This was due to a variety of factors. The growing emphasis on returning to ancient pagan sources in the 14th-15th c. inevitably entailed a return to early Christian sources as a corollary. These were then found of vital importance in resolving problems of doctrine in the climate of religious unrest fostered

first by the Great Schism and the Conciliarist movement, and somewhat later by the series of events that followed Luther's break with Rome. In the 14th-15th c. we can, broadly speaking, distinguish two phenomena conducive to the rediscovery of patristic learning: the Renaissance of humanist learning, esp. S of the Alps, and a growing need in theological circles in universities to define what constituted the true church. The two phenomena did not result in the same type of revival of patristic sources. Humanists who worked mainly outside the university context favored the method known as imitative readings of early authors, which enabled them to absorb the given author's doctrine, ethical values, as well as his rhetoric. This approach necessitated the availability of a complete text. The emphasis here was not so much on early church doctrine and its authority irrespective of context as on a particular author's teaching and eloquence as conveyed by the sum total of his writings. In universities, Christian texts continued to be seen as a means of providing true propositions about faith which could be extracted from their context and gathered into collections of sentences. However, the two methods often combined, which meant, among other things, that collections of patristic sayings in the 14th and 15th c. were more accurate and better founded textually, as new MSS of complete works were discovered.

1. Renewed interest in the 14th and 15th c. for patristic texts and their uses. Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457) is generally considered the most radical representative of the humanist method. In rejecting the application of *philosophical categories to theology, he explicitly advocated a return to the Greek and Latin Fathers such as *Basil, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ambrose and *Jerome as they alone preserved the true method by not confusing theology and philosophy. Valla also challenged the authenticity of the *Dionysian corpus, a view that did not find extensive support in the 15th or 16th c. While Valla favored a philological approach to theology, other, earlier humanists favored a rhetorical approach. This was based on their optimistic view of the human being as created in God's image which, after being obscured by original *sin, was renewed through redemption. The best example of this approach was Pier Paolo Vergerio (ca. 1370–1444), who contributed to establishing Jerome as the ideal of classical learning and moral virtue dedicated to Christian scholarship and eloquence. He was also the first to identify the *apostles and early *martyrs with public leaders of pagan antiquity who promoted political peace, and to consider early Christianity as a model of civic virtue.

The most lively center of patristic learning in the late 14th and early 15th c. was *Florence where Coluccio Salutati promoted both Greek (it was he who brought over the famous Greek teacher Manuel Chrysoloras) and Latin studies. Salutati's own collection comprised MSS of most of the Latin Fathers, including notably *Lactantius, Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose. Together with such Greek Fathers as he knew (*John Chrysostom in particular) they represented in his view the height of literary, moral, civic and theological achievement. That they did was very largely due to the fact that they had themselves received classical educations. It was Salutati who asked Leonardo Bruni to translate Basil's *Ad iuuenes* in 1403 as part of his defense of a humanist educational curriculum. The work to this day is extant in over 300 MSS and over 100 editions, ca. 1470–ca. 1560. However, the first humanist to devote himself actively to patristic studies, treating them as his chief concern and not just as a byproduct of the pagan classics, was Ambroggio Traversari (1386–1439), a Camaldolese monk. As well as transcribing and making emendations to MSS of several Latin Fathers such as *Tertullian (fallen into oblivion until then), Lactantius, Ambrose and Jerome, whom he particularly respected, he was the first Western scholar since Burgundio of Pisa (ca. 1110–1193) to translate several Greek patristic texts into Latin. Traversari's earliest translations of Basil, Chrysostom and Climachus's *Scala paradisi* were all of texts that encouraged monastic life. By the mid 1420s he was also translating Athanasius's *Contra gentes* and *De incarnatione verbi*. Among his other translations we might mention the *Sermons* of *Ephrem, Chrysostom's *Homilies* on *1 and 2 Timothy* and *Titus* as well as parts of Basil's *Contra Eunomium* for the Council of Florence (1439). He is best known, however, for his Latin version of ps.-Dionysius, which found a much wider public at the time.

The Council of Florence did much to foster and further the study of the Greek Fathers. In its wake, George of Trebizond (1396–ca. 1474), a Cretan émigré turned papal scribe, translated Basil's *Contra Eunomium* I-V and *De Spiritu sancto* (1442). Both versions were to be revised by him in 1467/1468. They were initially carried out at the request of Bessarion, who had attended the Council as a pro-union bishop of Nicaea. The "Western" version of *Contra Eunomium*, which had interpolated several passages on the double *procession of the *Holy Spirit, played a crucial role in the **filioque* discussions with the Greek delegation. In 1440 Bessarion was made cardinal by Eugenius IV and continued to foster an interest in Greek patristics from Rome. Trebizond,

who was to become a prominent member of Bessarion's circle, was also responsible for Latin translations of *Cyril of Alexandria's *Thesaurus* (excerpts of which had also been used in the conciliar debates), Chrysostom's *Homilies on Matthew* 26–28 and *Eusebius's *Praeparatio euangelica*. Of the Italian humanists sponsored by Bessarion, Cristoforo Persona (d. 1485) translated the Pauline commentaries of Theophylact of Ohrid, which he attributed to Athanasius, a large number of Chrysostom's moral *sermons* and Origen's *Contra Celsum*. Major patristic achievements dating from the pontificate of Sixtus IV after Bessarion's death include Johannes Argyropulos's translation of Basil's *Hexaemeron* and Lilio Tifernate's translation of Philo's Old Testament commentaries. All these works, with the exception of Trebizond's translation of Basil's *De Spiritu sancto*, which fell into oblivion as a result of an incidental omission, were subsequently printed and reprinted until well into the 16th century. A later prominent representative of Italian humanist translators of the Fathers is Raffaele Maffei (1451–1522), who translated some of Chrysostom's works and many treatises of the Cappadocians, including a collection of Basil's *sermons* and letters later printed with the Trebizond and Argyropulos versions.

In universities, the period immediately prior to the Reformation was characterized by the revival of the doctrines and writings of Augustine. While the doctrinal nature of the Augustinianism of the late Middle Ages is somewhat difficult to define, one of its manifestations was an increase of interest in the corpus of Augustine's writings and a preference for older witnesses to its text. This interest was not limited to Augustine: other Fathers such ps.-Dionysius, Ambrose, as well as more recent authorities such as Anselm were subjected to a similar treatment, albeit less intensively. The period was also characterized by increased production of patristic *florilegia in university circles. While Augustinian florilegia such as the *Milleloquium veritatis sancti Augustini* of Bartholomaeus of Urbino were of particular importance, *milleloquia* of other Fathers such as Ambrose were also produced. Whereas nonuniversity humanist circles of the period favored the dissemination of complete texts of the Fathers, universities tended to remain attached to the sentences approach. For the first time, however, theologians became aware that each individual *sententia* is a quotation from a longer text. The university circles were also slow to recognize the importance of the Greek Fathers, ps.-Dionysius (whose authenticity was not challenged in universities until much later) constituting the most notable exception.

Apart from the usefulness of some Greek Fathers in the double procession debates and the exploitation of Chrysostom's *Homilies* on *Matthew* 16 and *John* 21 in support of Peter's primacy, patristic literature throughout this period provided humanists with a useful counterauthority to Scholasticism. It also provided a valuable source of the doctrine of human preeminence over other creatures. First and foremost, however, all humanists valued the Fathers as expositors of the biblical text, which they regarded as the sole normative expression of Christianity, regardless of their individual views on the primacy of Peter, etc. In university and clerical circles, an increase in interest in Augustine's doctrine of *predestination in the 14th c. coincided with an awareness of a more critical approach to his texts. At the same time the Fathers were increasingly cited in debates over the nature of the true church during the conciliar period with authors like John Wycliffe and Marsiglio of Padua making extensive use of Augustine and Jerome in their attacks on the doctrine of Peter's primacy. Canonists of the period, while still relying on the *Decree of Gratian* and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, made increasing use of the acts of the early councils (which they knew only indirectly) and of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica* in Jerome's version. By and large, clerical and university circles of the 14th-15th c. took a less active interest than humanists in the Fathers as expositors of the Bible. This was to change with Erasmus's publication of the New Testament (1516) and Luther's introduction of the Reformation.

2. Patristic studies in the 16th c.: Humanism, Reformation and Counter Reformation. Significantly in the 1st quarter of the 16th c. the most eminent editors of patristic texts such as Erasmus, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples or Beatus Rhenanus worked outside university circles. Erasmus is the most famous of them. During his lifetime he produced editions of *Jerome (1516), *Cyprian (1520), *Arnobius the Younger, whom he mistook for *Arnobius the Elder (1522), *Hilary (1523), *John Chrysostom (1525), *Irenaeus (1526), *Athanasius (1527), *Ambrose (1527), *Augustine (1529), *Gregory of Nazianzus (1531), *Basil (1532) and *Origen (1536). Of those, his editions of Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Cyprian and Hilary contain the complete works as available at the time. His edition of Augustine was intended as an improvement upon the 1505 Basel edition. Erasmus's preface does not refer to any classically Augustinian doctrines such as the issue of *grace and *free will, which so preoccupied most theologians of his era and before him. His only significant

Greek edition is that of Basil's *De Spiritu sancto* (1532). Erasmus's interest in the Fathers was partly doctrinal, partly linguistic and rhetorical, and partly devotional. He also aimed to produce the most accurate text possible. We might note that his preference went to the Western Fathers and that, like the Italian humanists of a previous generation, he combines an interest in patristics with an interest in pagan antiquity.

Among other outstanding examples of this type of humanist learning we might mention Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547), who edited several pagan authors as well as producing first editions of *Tertullian (1521), the *Ecclesiastical History* of *Eusebius-*Rufinus and the *Historia tripartita* (1523). Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (ca. 1450–1536)—more inclusive than Erasmus in his attitude to the writings of the early church—is best known for first editions of the interpolated version of *Ignatius's *Epistles* (1498), the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (1513) and Rufinus's version of the ps.-Clementine *Recognitions* (1504). As the century progresses, we see that an increasing number of patristic editions emanate from university circles regardless of whether they are Catholic or Protestant. Some examples here are the Protestant Theodore Beza's (d. 1605) Greek-Latin edition of ps.-Athanasius's *Dialogi de Trinitate* and Basil's *Contra Eunomium* (Geneva, 1570); François du Jon's edition of Tertullian (1590); the Catholic Wolfgang Lazius's edition of the ps.-Abdias version of the *Lives of the Apostles* (1551); as well as Gentien Hervet's edition of *Clement of Alexandria (1551).

While there was an increasing tendency in the course of the century to publish Greek Fathers in Greek-Latin editions, the Latin version remained the norm. Many of the translations or editions of both Greek and Latin Fathers that appeared in the 16th c. are a conscious effort to improve upon earlier efforts. The best examples here are the attempts of the Bern reformer Wolfgang Musculus and of the French Carthusian Geoffroi Tilmann to improve upon George of Trebizond's, Argyropulos's and Maffei's versions of Basil (published respectively in Basel 1540 and in Paris 1547). Musculus's edition came out in the same year as the completely new Latin translation by the German physician Janus Cornarius (d. 1558), which proved more popular with both Catholics and Protestants than either Musculus or Tilmann's revisions of the earlier versions. The same Cornarius was responsible for the first Greek edition of Basil's complete works (Basel, 1551) and for the first Latin translation of the *Panarion* of *Epiphanius of Salamis (Basel, 1543).

Although the increasing concern with textual accuracy that is observed in the course of the century seems to stand at odds with the prevailing tendency to publish only the Latin translations of the Greek Fathers, this is in fact far from being the case. Quite often, the absence of a Greek text, which is more frequently encountered in Roman Catholic editions, is due simply to lack of competent printers. Jacques de Billy (1535–1581), the French Benedictine responsible for the first edition of the works of Gregory of Nazianzus (1569), complained about this quite openly. Indeed, although he was able to obtain copies of several Greek MSS from the Vatican, not just of Gregory but also of *Isidore of Pelusium (1585) and of *John of Damascus's *Sacra Parallela* (as part of *Opera omnia*, 1577), Billy only published Latin versions of these Fathers. At the same time, however, the Vatican, which acted as provider of MSS, wanted biblical quotations from Fathers such as Gregory to be translated by the Vulgate. This suggests a preference for the Latin version of Christianity in the post-Tridentine Roman Catholic establishment. There were no such injunctions in the Protestant camp. Protestant printers, esp. those in Basel and Geneva, were often also those who had Greek fonts. Indeed, partly due to this and partly due to the tradition established by Erasmus and Froben, Basel became in the 16th c. the center of Greek and Latin patristic production. Only those editions that had an openly anti-Reformation purpose expressed in prefaces, marginal notes or indexes tended to appear in Rome or Paris. By the mid-16th c., however, all patristic editions, whatever their confessional slant and language, were marked by a concern to achieve the greatest possible degree of textual accuracy. This humanist heritage was common to both Catholics and Protestants and was given added momentum by the reforms subsequent to the Council of Trent.

3. The uses of the Fathers of the Church in the Reformation and Counter Reformation. Martin Luther was marked more by late medieval Augustinianism than by humanism. However, once he became convinced that the biblical message emphasized faith at the expense of good works, he became interested in establishing a sharp distinction between the authority of the Bible, which he considered as absolute, and that of the Fathers, which he thought limited and relative, i.e., subject to correction in the light of scriptural evidence. He states this notably in *Von den Konziliis und Kirchen* (1539) where he lists the chief Fathers together with their contributions to Christian doctrine. This slightly cautious attitude did not stop other reformers very early on from using the Fathers' writings to defend the Reformation against

the attacks of Catholic theologians particularly but also against one another, e.g., in the eucharistic quarrels of 1525–1536 between Zwinglians and Lutherans. Recent editions, esp. those of Erasmus, provided an invaluable store of textual and historical evidence, which was frequently open to conflicting theological interpretations. Both Protestants and Catholics used these editions. Whereas Luther tried to divide sharply the Fathers' authority from that of the Bible, Ulrich Zwingli and Martin Bucer adopted the "implicit normativity" approach. They tended to interpret the Bible through institutional and individual writings of the early church, which they interpreted in turn through the Bible. This approach made for a closer coexistence of biblical and patristic authority in their works. However, they were just as aware of the Fathers' limitations as Luther and did not hesitate to criticize either their doctrine or their exegetical method when they deemed it necessary, i.e., when it diverged too far from their own beliefs. As regards exegesis, while sharing the humanist penchant for the Fathers as prime expositors of *Scripture (more so than Catholic theologians of the period), they were nonetheless extremely critical of their tendency to resort to allegory. Origen particularly was unpopular because of this.

John Calvin, aware of both the supremacy of Scripture and of its silence on certain points, used the Fathers where he thought that Scripture could not provide all the necessary evidence. His recourse to the Cappadocians and to Cyril of Alexandria to support the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, to Augustine to support his doctrine of predestination, and to a variety of patristic sources to support the Genevan model of church government are examples of this.

Once the boundaries between confessions became better defined, the main purpose for Protestants and Catholics alike was to use the doctrines of the early church to help construct a confessional identity. This wish of both parties to give themselves a past also explains the appearance of new confessionally oriented *Histories* of the early church: the *Centuries of Magdeburg* (1554–1574) for all the churches that derived from the Reformation and the *Ecclesiastical Annals* of Caesar Baronius (1588–1603) for the Catholics. Both were based on recent patristic editions and on unpublished material; each took historical scholarship to unprecedented heights. The main drive of both Protestant and Catholic scholars to produce patristic editions that were free from what they deemed to be heterodox glosses and "corruptions" also dates from the Tridentine and post-Tridentine period. The editions of Irenaeus provide a good example here. The Erasmus edition of *Contra haereses* is given a Protestant identity in 1570 by Nicolas Des Gallars, who added the Greek fragments of Epiphanius and anti-Roman glosses. A few years later (1575) François Feuardent, OFM, published the complete text for the first time, giving it an openly anti-Protestant orientation.

The later 16th and early 17th c. witnessed the publication of a number of guides to patristic editions and literature. On the Protestant side theologians such as Andreas Hyperius (*Methodus*, 1567), Abraham Scultetus (*Syntagma*, 1598–1613) and André Rivet (*Criticus sacer*, ca. 1612) produced digests intended to ensure that pastors gave a Protestant interpretation of the Fathers. Roman Catholic guides such as Sixtus of Siena's *Bibliotheca sancta*, Possevino's *Apparatus sacer* or Bellarmine's *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (1613), which was intended as the contemporary equivalent of Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, fulfilled a similar function in the Catholic camp.

In sum, it can be said that there are marked similarities of approach to patristic studies between Catholic and Calvinist post-Tridentine scholars. What distinguishes them is their attitude to the *consensus patrum*. For Catholics, the idea of the Fathers of the first seven centuries constituting a unified body of doctrine that supports the teaching of the Roman Church is fundamental. Calvinists tend to privilege particular Fathers to support particular doctrines and do not see the body of doctrine of the first seven centuries as homogeneous, although in their view it does on the whole support their own doctrines. Significantly, in the post-Tridentine period the most eminent patristic scholars are either Calvinist or Catholic. What characterizes the Lutheran church of the period is its interest in the history of the church, which includes the unearthing and publication of Christian apocryphal material. Significantly, it is Michael Neander's editions of Luther's Greek Catechism of 1564 and 1567 that include pieces such as the *editio princeps* of the **Protevangelium of James* and *Prochorus's *Acts of John*. This tradition is carried over into the large collection of *Orthodoxographa* of Johann Jakob Grynaeus, published in 1569 before the author's conversion from Lutheranism to Calvinism. All these texts were published in Basel. Interest in Christian apocryphal literature, particularly texts such as the ps.-Abdias version of the *Lives of the Apostles*, published in three different versions in 1531, 1551, 1552 and reprinted several times, was also present among some Roman Catholic scholars. However, their publication was not so much meant to encourage an interest in history as to foster piety in the form of venerating the

saints, etc. Other Roman Catholic scholars such as Bellarmine were united with their Calvinist counterparts in firmly refuting the authenticity and value of all Christian apocryphal literature, not only ps.-Abdias but also Prochorus's *Acts of John*, etc.

The variety of the authors published, as well as increased concern with textual and historical accuracy, mean that the 16th-c. editors, while seeking a confessional identity in the history of the early church, ushered in the study of patristics in the modern sense of the term.

P. Petitmengin, *À propos des éditions patristiques de la Contre-Réforme : le 'Saint-Augustin' de la typographie vaticane*: RecAug 4 (1966) 199-251; C. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers. Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance*, Albany 1977; I. Backus, *Lectures humanistes de Basile de Césarée. Traductions latines (1439–1618)*, Paris 1990; Id., *La patristique et les guerres de religion en France. Étude de l'activité littéraire de Jacques de Billy (1535-81) O.S.B., d'après le MS Sens 167 et les sources imprimées*, Paris 1993; Id., *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation, 1378–1615*, Leiden 2003; *Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. I. Backus, 2 vols., Leiden 1997 (Vol. 2 contains 15 articles from various authors on the fathers of the church during the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Counter Reformation); *Auctoritas patrum I-II. Zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. Und 16. Jahrhundert / Contributions on the Reception of the Church Fathers in the 15th and 16th Century*, ed. L. Grane, A. Schindler, M. Wriedt, Mainz 1993, 1998; *Tradizioni patristiche nell'Umanesimo. Atti del convegno Istituto Nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze 6-8 febbraio 1997*, ed. M.R. Cortesi, C. Leonardi, Tavarnuzze 2000; Atti del convegno *I Padri sotto il torchio. Le edizioni dl'antichità cristiana nei secoli 15-16*, ed. M.R. Cortesi, Tavarnuzze 2002.

I. Backus

FATHER, NAME of GOD. The title *Father* given to *God in Christianity has very specific biblical roots. The OT writers came to the concept of God's fatherhood through an understanding of the fatherhood of their ancestors (the patriarchs), a concept that reached its apex in the spiritual and universal fatherhood of *Abraham (*father of a multitude*, i.e., of many peoples [Gen 17:5]) and carries with it the blessing of *all the nations of the earth* (Gen 12:3). The transition from the fatherhood of the ancestors to God's fatherhood, Father of Israel and then of all humankind (Is 64:7; Mal 2:10) was not difficult because he is the universal creator. In the NT, the fatherhood of God becomes explicit both in respect to all people and esp. to *Jesus the Christ. With respect to people, God is presented as the *Father of the little ones* (Mt 11:25), Jews (Mt 21:31ff.) or *pagans (Mt 25:32ff.), *children who pray to God their Father (Mt 6:9; Mk 14:36; Lk 11:2) and imitate him (Mt 5:44ff.; 18:33). With respect to Jesus of Nazareth, God is the Father of Jesus. Jesus is his *Son* (Mk 13:32; Rom 15:6; 2 Cor 1:3; Eph 1:3; 1 Pet 1:3), even the *only begotten* son (the tradition of *John). The Synoptic *tradition of God as the Father, particularly in *Matthew's gospel, developed in Christians' *piety, esp. in their liturgical piety (**Didache* 8,2-3; *Tertullian, *Cyprian and *Augustine's *commentaries on the *Lord's Prayer), bearing witness to the brotherhood of all people and the knowledge of God in the church, which is the mother of believers. The Johannine tradition, however, which was more closely connected to Greek culture and the mystery cults, led to a greater understanding and specification of the *names of God, among which was the name Father—the one most frequently used. The same tradition also opened the difficulty of applying the name "Father" to Jesus the Christ, who was acknowledged as God but also designated in the *Scriptures as the "Son."

In the *Platonism of the *Timaeus* and in the *Middle Platonism that followed it, the title Father, which the name of God connoted, is understood to be the origin of everything alongside the principle that is not to be identified with the material universe. The adjective *agennētos* (unbegotten) of itself pertains to the title Father with respect to creation, which is, however, "begotten." The historical context of the mystery religions that were contemporaneous to Christianity even knew of God's name as Father, in the sense that God reveals himself to the one initiated as "the Father of everything" (*Corpus Hermeticum* 1, 1,12; 21; 30) and is *Providence (ibid. IV, fr. 26,3). The conception of the God-of-everything as applied to creation became explicit in the conception of God as Father-Son, a duality/unity upon which all life depends (ibid. 1,1,6). One should read *Melito of Sardis's attribution of the title Father to Christ in this context (*Perì Pascha* 9,63), as well as *Synesius's similar attribution in his hymns. Although it was possible in a Christian setting of Greek extraction to understand the concept of Christ-God as Father in the sense of the "Demiurge" creator (the Word) from whom the visible *cosmos depends, that application encountered many difficulties because the notion of the Word carried with it the notion of *Filius* (Son), i.e., the notion of generation. Christ came to be portrayed as begotten and unbegotten (Justin, 1 *Apol.*14 and 22). The *monarchian controversy, which then raised a debated question about God on the basis of Greek epistemology and led to the modalist *heresy, caused the Christian religion to apply the title Father solely to God the Father. The controversy even put all premonarchian

literature in question when such literature simultaneously spoke of Christ as Father-Son.

TWNT 5,952 and 1023; SC 210, 325-331; H.I. Marrou, SC 33 bis, 192; V. Grossi, "Il titolo cristologico di "Padre" nell'antichità cristiana," *Augustinianum* 16 (1976) 237-269; Id., *Tertulliano-Cipriano-Agostino. Il Padre nostro*, Rome 1980.

V. Grossi

FAUSTINUS (4th c.). Around 380 he was a priest in Rome of the schismatic sect of the *Luciferians. At the request of *Flaccilla, wife of *Theodosius, he wrote a *De trinitate* in which he expounded the fundamental points of the anti-*Arian *Catholic doctrine, without particular originality but very clearly. He sent a brief profession of faith to Theodosius to defend himself from the accusation of *Sabellianism launched at him by Catholics. In 384, along with the Luciferian priest *Marcellinus, he addressed to Theodosius the *De confessione verae fidei et ostentatione sacrae communionis et persecutione adversantium veritati*, better known as *Libellus precum*, to obtain protection for the schismatics from the violence of the Catholics. The work contains, along with some already legendary elements, important information on the history of the Luciferians.

CPL 119-120; PL 13, 37-108; CCL 69, 287-392; Patrologia III, 83-84; M. Simonetti, *Note su Faustino*: SE 14 (1963) 50-98; PCBE II/1, 747-749.

M. Simonetti

FAUSTINUS of Potenza Picena (d. after 425/426). Bishop of Potentiae (Potenza Picena, Macerata), he was sent, with the Roman priests Philippus and Asellus, by Pope *Zosimus in 418 to *Carthage to discuss the case of the priest *Apiarius of Sicca Veneria (today Le Kef, in Tunisia) with the African episcopate. Apiarius, having been excommunicated for unknown reasons by his bishop, had appealed to Rome. The delegates also had the task of handling the appeal to the Apostolic See and the petitions to the imperial court at *Ravenna. They arrived bearing an ensemble of canons, considered to be from Nicaea, in reality from *Serdica, which were contested by the African bishops but which they declared themselves ready to accept in a provisional manner. Faustinus remained in Carthage waiting for instructions from the new pope, *Boniface, which arrived 26 April 419. Two other Roman clerics, Dulcitius and Felix, arrived also. In the council of 419 the displayed canons were contested again, with speeches by *Alypius and by *Augustine. Decisions were reached (*Canones in causa Apiarii*). Faustinus returned to Carthage again, probably in 425, still concerning the case of Apiarius, excommunicated again for serious crimes, but who again had appealed to Rome. He appeared as the advocate of the accused, but the trial finished with the confession of Apiarius. Faustinus was charged with carrying the results of the synod of the bishops to Pope *Celestine.

Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana* II, Rome 1976, 1250-1275; PCBE 1, 82-83; 2, 750-752; J. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine*, New Haven, CT-London 1997, 111-135, 182-199.

A. Di Berardino

FAUSTUS (5th c.). Priest and *archimandrite of the church of *Constantinople, between 449 and 450 he was exhorted multiple times by Pope *Leo (*Ep.* 32, 51, 61, 72, 75; PG 54, 795-798, 843-846, 874-876, 897-898, 901-904) not to let himself be influenced by the *monophysite doctrine and to continue to fight for the true faith. On the other hand, Faustus wrote in 451 to the emperor *Marcian, with the collaboration of 18 other orthodox archimandrites of Constantinople, to invite him to judge and oppose adequately the spread of the heresy of *Eutyches.

CPG 8911, 8926, 8955, 8967, 9003; ACO II, 4,5-6, 11-12, 25-26, 28; ACO II, I,2,119-120; C. Silva Tarouca, *Die Quellen der Briefsammlungen Papst Leos des Grossen*, in *Papsttum und Kaisertum. Forschungen zur politischen Geschichte und Geisteskultur des Mittelalters*, Munich 1925, 44; Id., *Textus et Documenta*, Ser. Theol. 15, Rome 1933, 21-22, 37-38, 49-50.

P. Marone

FAUSTUS of Byzantium (4th c.). This is the pseudonym of an author of a *History of *Armenia*, which goes from the year 330, the death of King Tiridates, to 387, the division of the Armenian kingdom between the *Byzantines and *Persians. The author seems to have been in contact with *Nerses the Great, **catholicos* of Armenia (353–373), who plays a large role in the work. The nickname *the Byzantine*, already attested in the 5th c. by *Lazarus of Pharb, if it does not refer to the place of birth (nothing is known of the family or social conditions of Faustus), indicates the place of his intellectual and literary education. The work, originally written in Greek (the Armenian alphabet had not yet been created), has reached us in an Armenian translation of the 2nd half of the 5th c. and was composed of six books, but the first two have been lost. *Procopius of Caesarea (*De bello pers.* 1,5,9-40 and *De aedif.* 3,1,6) gives extracts of a *History of Armenia* that corre-

spond to Faustus 4,52ff. and 5,7. The work is the only source for the history of Armenia in the 4th c. The author, who knows the country and its language well, is careful to record the traditions and the memories of the nation, esp. the popular ones. He dedicates particular attention to the relationships between church and nobility, to the moral conduct of the personages, to dissents and intrigues of the feudal families; he has a complete independence of judgment and is generally trustworthy; certain parts, such as those which describe the sending of the embassies to Caesarea in Cappadocia for the consecration of the *catholicoi*, presuppose written documents.

Armenian text: Venice 1933. *Translations*: V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anc. et mod. de l'Arménie*, I, Paris 1867, 209-310; M. Lauer, *Des Faustus von Byzanz Gesch. Arm.*, Cologne 1879; N. Garsoïan (ed.), *The Epic Histories, also known as Patmut'iwn Hayoc' (History of Armenia)*, New York 1984 (repr. from the ed. of St. Petersburg 1883); G. Uluhogian et al. (eds.), *P'awstos Buzand, Storia degli Armeni*, trans. M. Bais - L.D. Nocetti, Milan 1997; Patrologia V, 603; Bardenhewer 5, 185-187; DACL 9, II, 1588-1590; EC 5, 1064; Cath 4, 1120; LTK² 4, 43; DHGE 16, 728; CSCO 132, XX, 69; Altaner 363.

A. De Nicola

FAUSTUS of Riez (ca. 400–490/495). Of British origin, born around 400, he was a monk at *Lérins from 424 to 433, abbot of the monastery from 433 to 457, bishop of Riez from 457 until his death (490–495). During his episcopate, Faustus opposed in some way the expansionist policy of the Goth *Euric, who, having seized Riez (476), sent him into exile to an unknown location. He returned to Riez in 485 at the death of Euric. He enjoyed wide prestige both as a monk and as bishop, and was in epistolary communication with various members of the Gallic aristocracy, among others *Sidonius and *Ruricius. Of the various works recorded by *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 86), *De spiritu sancto*, *De gratia* and 12 letters have reached us. Engelbrecht (CSEL 21) also attributes to him the authorship of many *sermones* included in the collection of the so-called Gallican Eusebius. But even if it is certain that material from Faustus has entered this collection, it is also true that this material has been modified in various ways. However, the sermon for Maximus, his predecessor on the episcopal throne of Riez, can be attributed to him with certainty.

The *De spiritu sancto*, composed after 470, is addressed specifically against the *Macedonians, but the immediate motive for which Faustus wrote against these *heretics, who were always little known in the West, is not clear. On the foundation of the works of *Ambrose, *Rufinus, ps.-*Athanasius, perhaps *Basil and *Didymus, Faustus gives a full treatment of the divinity of the *Holy Spirit, with complete mastery of the subject, but without bringing novelties to a theme already thoroughly investigated. More important is his contribution in the area of the polemic on the relationship between *grace and *free will. He was involved with the priest *Lucidus, who professed a radical *predestination and was condemned for this reason by a council held at *Arles (472 ca). In the context of this question, Faustus wrote the *De gratia* in two books, in which he takes an intermediate position between the opposed excesses of the *Pelagians and of the predestinationists. Unlike *Augustine, against whom he argues clandestinely multiple times, Faustus is convinced that the *sin of *Adam has, to be sure, wounded human nature, but not entirely deprived it of the aspiration for the *good: in this way, although the aid of divine grace is preeminent for the salvation of human beings, a certain margin is also left for human free initiative. For this reason Faustus was opposed by *Fulgentius and by other radical Augustinians, and modern scholars consider him to be a representative of so-called *semi-Pelagianism.

In reality he sought a balanced solution to the difficult question, putting aside the most radical aspects of the Pelagian and predestinarian theses and attending to all of the terms of the question, without privileging some of them at the expense of others, as the adversaries whom he combated did. Of the letters, we should mention the first, in which Faustus invites Lucidus to turn away from his errors; the second, which is Lucidus's retraction following the condemnation of the council; the third, anti-Arian in subject; the fourth, of christological content; and above all the fifth, in which Faustus maintains the corporeality of the *soul, since only God is incorporeal. This thesis was opposed by *Claudianus Mamertus, while *Avitus (*Ep.* 4) argued against one of his writings, not extant, as too rigorous concerning the remission of sins.

CPL 961-965; PL 58, 783-870; CSEL 21; G. Weigel, *Faustus of Riez*, Philadelphia 1938; M. Simonetti, *Fausto di Riez e i Macedoniani*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 333-354; Id., *Il De gratia di Fausto di Riez*: SSR 1 (1977) 125-145; C. Tibiletti, *Libero arbitrio e grazia in Fausto di Riez*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 259-285; Id., *Fausto di Riez nei giudizi della critica*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 567-587; R.J.H. Collins, *Faustus of Riez*: TRE 11 (1983) 1336-1338; *Faustus von Reji*: BBKL II (1990), 1-2; C.M. Kasper, *Faustus v. Riez*: LTK³ 3, 1199-1200; C.M. Kasper, *Faustus von Riez*: LACL (1998) 233-234.

Editions and translations: *Epistulae ad Ruricium*, ed. R. Demeulenaere (CCL 64), 1985, 406-415; *Homiliae*, ed. F. Glorie (CCL 101, 101A and B), 1970-1971; C.M. Kasper, *Faustus von Riez. Predigten an die Mönche*: Erbe und Auftrage 67 (1991) 293-

304; 368-386; 453-466; Id.: Erbe und Auftrage 68 (1992) 108-124; 186-194; 279-292; 369-384; 471-480.

Studies: L.A. van Buchem, *L'Homélie pseudo-eusébienne de Pentecôte. L'Origine de la* Confirmatio *en Gaule Méridionale et l'interprétation de ce rite par Fauste de Riez*, Nijmegen 1967; C.P. Laurent, *L'homélie de Pâques "Magnitudo" (in CCSL, t. 101, p. 192-208) de Saint Fauste de Riez (ou de Lérins) (fin du Vᵉ siècle). Aux sources patristiques lointaines de la transsubstantiation*: Divinitas 27 (1983) 123-154; Id., *Commentaire du sermon "Magnitudo" de S. Fauste de Riez. L'enseignement eucharistique de "Magnitudo"*: Divinitas 28 (1984) 203-241; Id., *Bref commentaire du sermon eucharistique "Magnitudo" de saint Fauste de Riez*: Divinitas 29 (1985) 3-42; C. Tibiletti, *Rassegna di studi e testi sui "semipelagiani"*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 507-522; Id., *Polemiche in Africa contro i teologi Provenzali*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 499-517; C.M. Kasper, *Weg und Ziel der asketischen Lebens*: RThPh 63 (1988) 230-241; D.J.T. Nodes, *"De Subitanea Paenitentia" in Letters of Faustus of Riez and Avitus of Vienne*: RTAM 55 (1988) 30-40; C.M. Kasper, *Der Beitrag der Mönche zur Entwicklung des Gnadenstreites. Festschrift f. C. Mayer*, Würzburg 1989, 153-182; T.A. Smith, De gratia. *Faustus of Riez's Treatise on Grace and Its Place in the History of Theology*, University of Notre Dame, 1990; C.M. Kasper, *Theologie und Askese*, Münster 1991; A. de Vogüé, *Vie monastique à Lérins*: RHE 88 (1993) 5-53; M. Di Marco, *La polemica sull'anima tra Fausto di Riez e Claudiano Mamerto*, Rome 1995; G. Patio, *The Theology of Faustus of Riez Amidst the Controversies in 5th Century Gaul*, Rome 2001.

M. Simonetti

FAUSTUS the Manichean. Born ca. 340 at Milevis (modern Mila, Algeria), he came from a *pagan background, and so converted to *Manicheism, where he rose to the rank of bishop. He came from humble circumstances, but managed to acquire a reputation for eloquence; yet *Augustine of Hippo reports (*Confessiones* V,vi,11) that Faustus, though certainly eloquent (V,iii,3), had little cultural learning. He did not even know the Manichean writings, other than those in Latin translation. His eloquence failed to mask his inability to answer the young rhetor's concerns when they met in *Carthage around the end of 382 or early 383 (V,vii,12). After that, Augustine began sliding away from Manicheism. Faustus was arrested and exiled, probably in 386, but pardoned soon after, though forbidden to teach. He then disappeared from history, leaving behind his *Capitula*, a writing that survives because Augustine quotes it in his *Contra Faustum manichaeum* (written before 405). Faustus produced his work probably between 386 and 390 (the proposed year of his death), against a former Manichean turned Catholic (possibly Augustine himself). Its main purpose is to show that Manicheism is Christianity in its purest form, sharply distinguished from *Judaism. Faustus does this by invoking biblical pericopes, either to prove their conformity with Manichean doctrine, or to explain why Manicheans repudiated them. Thus he rejects the whole of the OT, because of its dietary laws, incidents of polygamy, animal sacrifice, sabbath observance and circumcision. The procedure followed in each *capitulum* (there were possibly twenty-two of them) is to first present Catholic objections regarding some point of Manichean doctrine, then to offer a rebuttal. Faustus therefore avoids any reference to Manichean writings, and only occasionally alludes to its doctrines. However, in repudiating Catholic ideas he invokes texts Catholics would recognize (including the pseudepigraphal *Acts of Paul and Thecla*: *C. Faust.* XXX,4). His primary target is the inspired character of the OT. Faustus demonstrates that he knows it as well as he knows the NT, and has given us the most extensive Manichean polemic we possess against what are seen to be the OT's wicked deity, meaningless ritual prescriptions, moral deficiencies and approval of frauds ascribed to Moses and the prophets. Christian tradition has no part to play in this polemic: the individual may interpret *Scripture as he or she sees fit. Faustus also touches on the issues of the true nature of *God, the *incarnation and "Jewish interpolations" in the NT. In addition, Faustus emphasizes Manichean asceticism as further proof of his religion's superiority to Catholic Christianity.

CPL 321; PL 42, 207-518; CSEL 25/1, 251-797; A. Bruckner, *Faustus von Mileve. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des abendländischen Manichäismus*, Basel 1901; P. Monceaux, *Le manichéen Faustus de Milev. Restitution de ses Capitula*, Paris 1924; PAC 1, 390-397; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 51-70 and passim; Id., *Les manichéens d'Afrique*, in J. Ries - F. Decret - W.H.C. Frend - M.G. Mara, *Le epistole paoline nei manichei i donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Sussidi Patristici, 5, Rome 1989, 29-85; Id., *Le dogme manichéen fondamental des deux principes selon Faustus de Milev*, in A. van Tongerloo - S. Giversen (eds.), *Manichaica Selecta*, Manichaean Studies, 1, Leuven 1991, 59-69, repr. in Id., *Essais sur l'Église manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de saint Augustin: Recueil d'études*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 47, Rome 1995, 147-158; Id., *Faustus de Milev, un évêque manichéen au temps de saint Augustin*, in *Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 58, II, Rome 1997, 763-775; G. Wurst, *Bemerkungen zu Struktur und genus litterarium der Capitula des Faustus von Mileve*, in J. van Oort - O. Wermelinger - G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 49, Leiden 2001, 307-324.

J. Kevin Coyle

FELICIAN of Musti (end 4th c.). Donatist bishop of Musti (Aug., *Ep.* 51,2) in proconsular *Africa. At the death of *Parmenian, *Donatist bishop of *Carthage, *Primian was elected as his successor; he condemned

several deacons, and *Maximian among them, who, protected by a woman of Carthage, rallied to his side a group of bishops of proconsular Africa. Primian was called in to resolve the conflict, but did not appear; instead, he prevented his adversaries from meeting. The meeting, however, took place anyway, at Cabarsussi in 393, and the participants condemned Primian and elected in his place, for Carthage, Maximian. Felician was among the twelve bishops consecrating Maximian (*Ep.* 51,2). Thus was born a sect within the schism itself: the Maximianists. Primian called the Council of Bagai (394) as a response, in which 310 bishops participated. Maximian and his consecrators were condemned, and it was decided to remove them from their sees. Felician opposed this decision, supported in this by the Donatists of Musti. In 397, Felician and Praetextatus reconciled with Primian and declared valid the baptisms administered within the schism. This solution of a political character, in opposition to Donatist principles, allowed Augustine—source for a biography of Felician (*Ep.* 51,2-5; 53, 3-6; 70,2; 76,3-4; 88,11; 106,1.5.12.14; 108,2.5.15; 141,6; *Enarr.* 36,2,20; *C.ep. Parm.* I, 9; II, 20.31.34; III, 18.21.29; *Bapt. c. don.* I, 2,7; III, 17; *C. litt. Pet.* I, 11, 16,26; II, 16.19; III, 46; *De unit. eccl.* 46; *C. Cresc.* III, 16.22.59.62; IV, 4.5.31.46.61.66; *Brev. coil. c. don.* I, 12; *Ad don. p. coil.* 5; *De gestis cum Em.* 8,9,10; *C. Gaud.* I, 54)—to declare the incoherence of the schism.

DTC 5, 2126-2128; Monceaux IV, 57-67; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford 1952, 219-220; PCBE 1, 400-402; J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier donatiste*, Berlin 1987.

E. Romero Pose

FELICISSIMUS of Carthage (3rd c.). Felicissimus was among the forerunners of *Donatism; he was a wealthy Christian who opposed his bishop *Cyprian at the time of the *persecution of *Decius (250), concerning the reconciliation of the **lapsi*. He was illegally ordained a deacon and was placed at the head of the dissidents of Carthageda Novato who, in 251, went to Rome to increase the number of schismatics following *Novatian. Felicissimus opposed the rigidity of Cyprian in the treatment of the *lapsi* and reconciled them on his own authority by means of the *libelli pacis*. Having established himself "on the mountain" (Byrsa?), he claimed to excommunicate Cyprian, but was excommunicated in his name by the representatives of the bishop. All traces of him disappeared after the persecution.

Monceaux 2, 31-32; LTK[3] 3, 1216; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III[e] siècle*, Vatican City [2]1984, 145-146; J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Paderborn 1997.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FELICITY, martyr. Roman. The *Mart. hier.* and the Roman *sacramentaries (except the Leonine) mention Felicity on 23 November. The *Itiner. Salisb.* indicates her tomb in the cemetery of Maximus on the Via Salaria. The *Ep. de locis SS.* and the itineraries of later date consider her son the martyr Silanus of the group of 10 July. They refer to the legendary passion that makes her the mother of these seven martyrs, and that can be considered the Roman calque of the biblical episode of the seven Maccabees and their mother.

Cath 5, 1144-1145; Vies des SS. 11, 783-784; DHGE 16, 864-866, BS 5, 605-611; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 43-51; LTK[3] 3, 1216-1217; LCI 6, 221-223; L. Goosen, *Dizionario dei santi. Storia, letteratura, arte e musica*, It. tr., Milan 2000, 180-181; P.A. Février - J. Guyon, *Septimus ex numero fratrum. À propos de sept frères martyrs et de leur mère, quelques réflexions sur Damase et l'hagiographie de son temps*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes. Miscellanea in onore di Monsignor Victor Saxer* (Studi di Antichità Cristiana 48), Vatican City 1992, 375-402.

V. Saxer

FELIX I, pope (d. 274). Apparently born in *Rome to a certain Constantius. He held the pontificate from 269 to 274, under the emperor *Aurelian, at first good-willed toward the Christians and later a promoter of the ninth *persecution. Nevertheless Felix did not die a martyr, despite the contrary testimonies of *Cyril of Alexandria and the *Roman Martyrology*, which say he died for the faith along the Via Appia, commemorating him 10 May. In reality his name is not included in the *Depositio martyrum* but in the **Depositio episcoporum*, which concerns confessors. Further he seems to have died not 30 May but 30 December (perhaps in the date *III Kal.* the abbreviation *ian.* was exchanged with *iun.*). Felix found himself involved against his will in the theological dispute that had concluded with the Council of *Antioch and the condemnation of *Paul of Samosata. The bishops had sent a synodal letter in 269 to *Dionysius, predecessor of Felix, to inform him of their action and to request confirmation from him (Eus., *HE* 7,30,2-17). Dionysius having died in the meantime, it was Felix who confirmed the conclusions of the council and the condemnation of the heretic bishop, who nevertheless refused to recant and resign. Therefore it is likely that a phrase cited by Cyril belongs in reality to Felix, even if it has probably been modified (ACO I, I, 7, 45; *Patrol.* I, 488).

Eus., *HE* 7,30; LP I, CXXIII-CXXIV, 6-7, 10, 70-71, 158; II, 63-64; III, 75; G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate. Étude historique*, Louvain 1929, 358-363; B. de Gaiffier, *Les notices des papes Félix dans le Martyrologe Romain*: AB 81 (1963) 333-336; ICUR IV (G.B. De Rossi - A. Ferrua), Vatican City 1964, 9516; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 23; LTK[3] 3, 1218 (H. Muller); EPapi I, 296-298 (G.M. Vian).

M. Spinelli

FELIX II, antipope (d. 365). Archdeacon of the church of *Rome and probably also of Roman origin, in 355 he was consecrated bishop in the imperial palace in the presence of a few civil servants, in opposition to *Liberius who was in *Thrace for having opposed the emperor *Constantius in the matter of the *Arian controversy. Later, in 358 when Liberius was able to return from exile for having signed the condemnation of *Athanasius, Felix, who in reality had never enjoyed the favor of the people, was forced by the Romans to leave the city. He tried to gain control of the basilica *Iulia* (S. Maria in Trastevere), but in the end had to retreat to one of his properties, on the Via Portuense, where he died 22 November 365.

Nevertheless in the 6th c., when the memory of these events was no longer quite so clear, Felix, considered to be a legitimate pope, reached the point of being identified with one of the martyrs of the same name (LP I, 207-215) buried near his residence.

Gesta inter Liberium et Felicem, CSEL 35/1, 1-4; G.N. Verrando, *Analisi topografica degli antichi cimiteri sotterranei ubicati nei pressi delle due vie Aurelie*: RivAC 63 (1987) 293-357; M. Simonetti, *Felice II antipapa*: EPapi I, 348-349.

P. Marone

FELIX III (II), pope (d. 492). Bishop of Rome from 483 to 492, this pontiff is usually indicated as Felix III, even if in reality *Felix II (consecrated at Rome in 355) was limited to substituting for the exiled Pope *Liberius, for which reason he is not for all intents and purposes considered as a pope. The LP claims Felix was born in Rome, son of a presbyter, also named Felix. Felix also married and had children before his sacerdotal ordination: among his descendants were *Gregory the Great (cf. *Dial.* 4, 16). Felix faced difficult situations more or less everywhere, beginning with *Italy, governed *de facto* in those years by the usurper *Odoacer. In *Africa he intervened with the emperor *Zeno to stop the persecutions of the Catholics by the *Arian *Vandals and the exiling of many bishops, esp. under *Huneric. The situation grew less serious in 487 with the arrival of Gunthamund. There were also serious problems from the East, where the monophysite patriarchs *Acacius and *Peter Mongus were seated on the thrones of *Constantinople and *Alexandria. Felix energetically took position against them, writing to Zeno, sending legates to the spot, inviting *Acacius in vain to come to Rome and finally excommunicating the Constantinopolitan bishop. Thus was reached in 484 the rupture between Rome and the East known as the "Acacian schism," which lasted until 519 (Acacius died in 489). After 490 Felix intervened in the *Pelagian controversy, writing two letters to the bishop *Honorius sympathetic to this heresy, and integrating the second letter with the *Contra Andromacum* (a work erroneously ascribed to his successor *Gelasius I), in which the pontiff contests the revival of the Lupercalia sought by a Roman patrician (Andromacus). Felix built the basilica of S. Agapetus in Rome and was buried in S. Paul Outside the Walls. Of two inscriptions found near this basilica, one concerns the father of Felix and the other Felix himself and his family (G. B. De Rossi, *Insciptiones christianae urbis Romae*, I, nn. 831 and 833).

Felicis papae III Epistolae et decreta, PL 58, 893-944, 967-973; *De evitanda communione Acacii*, PL 58, 944-967; C. Baronio, *Martyrologium Romanum restitutum cum adnotationibus*, Rome 1586, *sub die* 25 febbraio; Jaffé I, 591-618, 80-83; 625-626, 84; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 25-44, 749 and 810; *Storia della Chiesa*, ed. H. Jedin, III, Milan 1978, 9-16; P. Nautin, *La lettre de Félix III à André de Thessalonique et sa doctrine sur l'Église et l'Empire*: RHE 77 (1982) 5-34; Id., *La lettre "Diabolicae artis" de Félix III aux moines de Constantinople et de Bithynie*: REA 30 (1984) 263-268; BS V, 579-580 (C. Marcora); DHGE 16, 889-895 (P. Nautin); LTK[3] 3, 1219 (H. Muller); EPapi I, 450-457 (R. Bratoz).

M. Spinelli

FELIX IV (III), pope (d. 530). Of Samnite origin, son of one Castorius, in 519 he is supposed to have taken part as a deacon in a delegation sent to the East by Pope *Hormisdas to resolve the "Acacian schism." Felix succeeded *John I at the instigation of King *Theoderic, who died suddenly, however, one month after the consecration of the pope (July 526). The new sovereign, Atalaric, and his mother Amalasunta on the advice of *Cassiodorus continued to support Felix, favoring, among other things, the authority of the ecclesiastical tribunals with respect to secular institutions. This pope converted some pagan sacred buildings of the Roman Forum into the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, having it decorated with *mosaics, and restored on the Via Salaria the basilica of S. Saturninus, severely damaged by a fire. At the beginning of 529 Felix sent to *Caesarius of Arles, charged with settling the *semi-

Pelagian question, 25 *Capitula* on grace, which *Prosper of Aquitaine and the Scythian monk Maxentius had taken from the works of *Augustine. In July of the same year the Second Council of *Orange approved the *Capitula* and condemned semi-Pelagianism. Before dying Felix designated his own successor in the person of *Boniface, his vigorous collaborator. But when the pope died (September 530) the party of the Byzantines succeeded in imposing in his place, even if for just a few days, the Alexandrian deacon *Dioscorus.

CPL 1686-1688; PL 65, 11-16 (*Epistula ad Caesarium* e *Constitutum de ecclesia Ravennatis*); G.B. De Rossi, *I tre antichi edifici componenti la chiesa dei SS. Cosma e Damiano*: BACr I f., 5 (1867) 61-72; L. Duchesne, *La succession du pape Félix IV*: MEFRA 3 (1883) 239-266; Id., *L'Église au VI^e siècle*, Paris 1925, 134 and 142-145; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 151ff., 193-197, 201-2, 315 and 767; M. Cappuyns, *L'origine des "capitula" d'Orange (529)*: RTAM 6 (1934) 121-142; DACL 14/2 (1948) 2669-2673; DHGE 16, 895-896; *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* I, Rome 1993, s.v. *Ss. Cosmas et Damianus, Basilica*, 324-325; P. Bertolini: DBI 12, 133-136; LTK^3 3, 1219 (G. Schwaiger); *Dizionario storico del Papato*, ed. Ph. Levillain, I, Milan 1996, 591-592; EPapi I, 487-492 (J.-M. Sansterre).

M. Spinelli

FELIX and ADAUCTUS (d. 303?). An inscription, the oldest testimony of the cult of the two Roman martyrs, documents the intervention of Pope *Damasus on their tombs, venerated by pilgrims who visited the catacombs of Commodilla, near S. Paul Outside the Walls, in which there is also a celebrated representation of the two saints from ca. 528. For what pertains to the 7th c., see the Roman itineraries (CCL 175, 299, 316, 327). The name of the two martyrs was inserted in the *Mart. hier*. on 30 August; the *Sacramentarium Veronense* offers a formula for their feast. The *Passio* of the 6th/7th c. has no historic value. Felix, a presbyter, was condemned to decapitation under *Diocletian. While he was being led to the place of execution, an unknown believer professed his own Christian faith and was therefore killed together with him: Adauctus (from *adiectus*).

BHL 2878-2884; *Verzeichnis* 64; LCI 6, 234; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, n. 7; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 207-208; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane*, Rome ^{2}1999, 218-221; J.G. Deckers et al., *Die Katakombe "Commodilla,"* Vatican City 1994; E. Schurr, *Die Ikonographie der Heiligen*, Dettelbach 1997, 316-323.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FELIX GILLITANUS (6th c.). A monk of the monastery of Cillium (Byzacena) in N Africa (and not of the Vivarium of Cassiodorus), an opponent of Pope *Vigilius (537–555) during the controversy of the *Three Chapters, he was exiled first in Egypt together with the deacon *Rusticus (PL 68,960), and then to Sinope in *Pontus, where he died in 557 (Victor of Tunnuna, ed. Mommsen, *Chronica minora* 2 [MGH, *Auct. ant.* 11], Berlin 1894, pp. 204-5). From Felix two very brief texts remain: (a) *Praefatio Felicis*, in which he explains how the year of the incarnation was calculated by *Dionysius Exiguus; (b) *Prologus,* a presentation of the paschal tables of Dionysius, built on the Alexandrian system, for the users of his region from *ab Incarnatione D. N. J. C. 532 anno Indictione decima usque ad DCXXVI Incarnationis annum*.

CPL 2287; PL 129, 1331-1332; B. Krisch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, I, Leipzig 1988, 207-208; II, Berlin 1938, 67-68 and 86-87; A. Lane Poole, *Studies in Chronology and History*, Oxford 1934, repr. 1969, 32-33; C.W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de temporibus*, Cambridge, MA 1943, 73 n. 5; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique Romaine au Bas-Empire*, II, Paris 1981, 287; G. Declercq, *Dionysius Exiguus and the Introduction of the Christian Era*: SE 41 (2002) 165-246 (esp. 230ff.).

A. Di Berardino

FELIX of Aptunga (Apthungi, Apthugni) (beginning of 4th c.). Bishop of Aptunga, in 311 he participated in the consecration of *Caecilian, bishop of *Carthage (*Opt.*, I, 18.19.27); for this he was considered an enemy by the *Donatists. He was accused and condemned as a *traditor* in the Donatist synod of Carthage in 312. This sentence served as a pretext for the Donatists not to accept the decisions of the Council of *Rome (313), which approved the validity of the ordination of Caecilian. The schismatics demanded that the case of Felix be reconsidered. At this point, *Constantine ordered the *vicarius* of Africa, Elius Paulinus, to make inquiries into the accusations raised against Felix. The consultations were begun in Aptunga and concluded at Carthage in favor of Felix (314). To eliminate every doubt, the Council of *Arles (314) declared valid the ordination performed by a *traditor* bishop (can. 13). The *dossier* of the inquiry—*Acta* or *Gesta purgationis Felicis*—has been preserved for the most part in *Gesta purgationis Caeciliani et Felicis*. The authenticity of these *acta* is confirmed by the mentions of *Optatus, *Augustine and *Gesta Collationis*, whose lacunae can be filled with the information that reaches us from Optatus and from Augustine. The *acta* trace the path followed in the various audiences and the functions of the personages and the courts. There is no literary preoccupation, just the simple account of the proceedings between Catholics and Donatists.

Acta purgationis F. episcopi Autamnitani: CSEL 26, 197-204; Monceaux IV, 17-22, 210-229; PCBE 1, 409-410; J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier donatiste*, Berlin 1987; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne*, Paris 2000, 213-341.

E. Romero Pose

FELIX of Nola (3rd c.). A priest and confessor acc. to *Prudentius (*Carm.* 12,9) and *Augustine (*De VIII Dulc. quaest.* 2,2), but considered a martyr at the time of *Gregory of Tours (*Glor. mart.* 104); Felix died very old after the *persecutions of *Decius and *Valerian and was buried at Cimitile, in the *coemeterium* of Nola of the 2nd c. The eulogy of Pope *Damasus (A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, n. 59) is probably the oldest document of the veneration of Felix. His cult was spread above all by the work of *Paulinus of Nola, who from 395 on dedicated to him every year a *carmen natalicium* (*Carm.* 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 27-28; literature: CSEL 30.2, 630-638) on the occasion of the anniversary of his death, 14 January of a year unknown to us of the 3rd c. The feast attracted many pilgrims (funeral banquets), and there were numerous miracles through which the devil was defeated. Felix had the reputation of being *vindex veritatis*.

BHL 2870-2876; AB 102 (1984) 185; CPL 1997; BS 5, 549-555; LCI 6, 229-230; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 228-237; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938, 42-45; V. Saxer, *Pilgerwesen in Italien und Rom im späten Altertum und Frühmittelalter*, Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City-Münster 1995, 46-51; T. Lehmann, *Der Besuch des Papstes Damasus an der Pilgerstätte des hl. Felix in Cimitile/Nola*, 969-981; M. Skeb, *Christo vivere. Studien zum literarischen Christusbild des Paulinus von Nola*, Bonn 1997; H. Brandenburg - L. Ermini Pani (eds.), *Cimitile e Paolino di Nola. La tomba di S. Felice e il centro di pellegrinaggio. Trent'anni di ricerche*, Vatican City, 2003.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FELIX of Thibiuca (d. 15 July 303). Bishop of Thibiuca (Zoustina, Tunisia). Condemned to death by the proconsul *Anulinus 15 July 303, at *Carthage, for having refused to hand over the *Scriptures, Felix was buried *in via quae dicitur Scillitanorum in Fausti* (cemetery). His veneration passed into S Italy at the time of the *Vandal *persecution; from here derive the passions that we retain, which make of Felix an Italian saint, and in which we can recognize elements of the original passion.

Vies des SS. 10, 817-823; BS 4, 585-587; DHGE 16, 884; PCBE 1, 407-8; J.L. Maier, *Le dossier du Donatisme*, v. I: *Des origines à la mort de Costance II (303–361)* (Texte und Untersuchungen 134), Berlin 1987, 46-57; V. Saxer, *Afrique latine*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, sous la direction de G. Philippart (CC. Hagiographies I) Turnhout 1994, 53-54; M.A. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories. The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa* (Translated Texts for Historians 24), Liverpool 1996, 7-11; LTK³ 3, 1221.

V. Saxer

FELIX of Trier (d. 400). Elected bishop of *Trier in 386 (Sulp. Sev., *Dial.* 3,13), during the Priscillianist crisis, succeeding Brittus. The usurper *Maximus had his seat at Trier at that time. In that year in the same city the trial was held against *Priscillian, who was condemned to death. Despite the opposition to such a punishment by *Ambrose, *Martin of Tours and Pope *Siricius, the bishop Felix was favorable and was excommunicated by the pope along with all those who had condemned Priscillian (the Council of *Turin of 398, can. 6, records the sentence of Siricius). Either his election or the attitude taken during the trial provoked a division within the church of *Gaul between Felicians, who remained in communion with him, and the anti-Felicians, who accused him of being in relationship with *Ithacius and *Hydatius, the two ferocious anti-Priscillianists. A council of the Felicians was held at *Nîmes in 394 (or 396) to overcome the division; the crisis finished at the Council of Turin of 398 with the resignation of Felix. He died in 400, and his name appears in the Roman martyrology 26 March, probably the day of his death.

EC 5, 1137; BS 5, 565-566; LTK³ 3, 1221; DHGE 16, 915; Fliche-Martin-Frutaz, *Storia d. Chiesa*, III, 2, 683-687; N. Gauthier, *L'Évangélisation des pays de la Moselle*, Paris 1980, 66-81; Storia del cristianesimo 2, Rome 2000, 406-7 and 781.

L. Dattrino - A. Di Berardino

FELIX the Manichean. A teacher (*doctor*) of the religion, who came to *Hippo toward the end of 404 to spread his religion. In the *Retractationes* (II,8) *Augustine of Hippo calls him *ineruditus liberalibus litteris*, but considers him a more able opponent in debate than *Fortunatus. Soon after Felix arrived, five of his books (perhaps the five by *Mani himself known in N Africa) were seized by the authorities. Felix then offered to discuss the contents of the impounded books with Augustine. This would prove, he said, that they contained nothing damnable; if they did, Felix declared himself ready to be burned with them. At this point Augustine agreed to the public debate he sought. The *Acta habita cum Felice*, Augustine's record of the proceedings, reports two sessions spread over two days (7 and 12 December).

In them, Felix is portrayed as evasive and full of subterfuge. In the first session, he begins by declaring that he will be disadvantaged if he is refused access to his books. At this, Augustine produces Mani's *Letter of the Foundation* and begins to ridicule its contents. In the course of this session, Felix becomes increasingly evasive under questioning, and Augustine's frustration mounts. One can sympathize with Felix's dilemma: he cannot divulge the whole of Manichean teaching before a mainly hostile audience (largely made up of Augustine's own flock); yet, without being more forthcoming, he will have no chance against Augustine. The first session ends when Felix asks for time to mull over the accusation that the Manichean *anthropology, which presents humans as mixtures of the *good and *evil substances, indicates that the principle of good which permitted the mixture can therefore not be completely good. The second session opens with another plea by Felix to return his books, but when Augustine offers to have them brought, Felix drops the matter. He also refuses to address the issue with which the first session ended. Augustine then steers the discussion toward other matters: the relation of *free will to evil—the second session's main point, acc. to *Retr.* II,8—the nature of *God, and Christ's *incarnation (*C. Felicem*, II,8-11). For his part, Felix keeps resorting to the uncooperative tactics of the previous session, and finally an exasperated Augustine threatens him with *anathema, which would bring severe legal consequences. Felix then signs a repudiation of Mani and his teachings. If the addressee of Augustine's *Ep. 79* is the same Felix, his renunciation was motivated by genuine conversion.

CPL 322; PL 42, 519-552; CSEL 25/2, 801-852; BA 17, 636-757; PCBE 1, 417-418; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Félix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 71-89; J.M. Lieu - S.N.C. Lieu, *'Felix Conversus ex Manichaeis' – A Case of Mistaken Identity*: JTS 23 (1981) 173-176, repr. in S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 118), Leiden-New York-Cologne 1994, 153-155.

J. Kevin Coyle

FERRANDUS of Carthage (d. before 546). A student of *Fulgentius of Ruspe, active in the 1st half of the 6th c., he followed his master into exile in *Sardinia. He was a deacon of the church of *Carthage. He had a reputation as a good theologian and was contacted even from Rome for clarifications of a christological nature. He died during the initial phase of the question of the *Three Chapters, before 546. The *Vita* of Fulgentius, written by him, is based on direct experience and firsthand documentation, so that it is full of information and fully reliable. Ferrandus presents Fulgentius as a model of Christian life on the example of *Augustine, and the tone of the work is one of exaltation and edification, but the entire miraculous element is absent from it, a commonplace of the genre degenerating at that time into legend. Extant from Ferrandus are a letter written to Fulgentius to request clarifications on various doctrinal difficulties, and other letters written to Western and Eastern figures to respond to similar requests addressed to him. Above all, *Ep.* 3 and 5 are important; they are of anti-*monophysite christological content, in which Ferrandus defends the Chalcedonian formula. The two letters are situated within the context of the *Theopaschite controversy: in *Ep.* 5. Ferrandus considers it useless to waste time discussing the formula *Unus de Trinitate passus*, which nevertheless he considers compatible with *orthodoxy, and waits for a decision of the ecclesiastical magisterium on the subject. *Ep.* 3 on the other hand openly defends the formula against the various objections that were raised against it: he interprets it correctly in the sense that one of the *Trinity, the Son, suffered in the flesh. Since Rome approved the Theopaschite formula in 534, *Ep.* 5 dates to slightly before this, and *Ep.* 3 to slightly after. In *Ep.* 6, Ferrandus takes a position against the condemnation of the Three Chapters because he considers it contradictory to the decisions of Chalcedon, irrevocable since they were issued from an ecumenical council sanctioned by the approval of the bishop of Rome.

CPL 847-848; PL 65, 117-150 and 67, 887-950; G. Lapeyre, ed., *Vita Fulgentii*, Paris 1929; DTC 5, 2174-2175; R.B. Eno, *Doctrinal Authority in the African Ecclesiology of the Sixth Century*: REAug 22 (1976) 95-113; PCBE 1, 446-450; R.B. Eno, *Ferrandus and Facundus on Doctrinal Authority*: SP 15 (1984) 291-296; A. Isola, *Sulla paternità della Vita Fulgentii*: VetChr 23 (1986) 63-71; BBKL II, 19.

M. Simonetti

FERREOLUS of Uzès (d. 581). *Gregory of *Tours informs us that this bishop died 4 January 581 (*Hist.* 6,7). Under his name is preserved a monastic rule composed between 553 and 573 (CPL 1849) dedicated to the monastery of Ferréolac (in the ancient diocese of Die), founded by him and named in memory of the Gallic martyr of the 3rd c. Ferreolus. His prescriptions show the influence of the monastic tradition of *Basil, *Pachomius, *Cassian and *Augustine and are close to the *Regula Benedicti*, even if they do not depend directly. The rule mirrors the typical observance of a monastery of S *Gaul. The

influence of the *Regula Ferreoli* on the *Regula Tarnatensis* (CPL 1851) is notable; perhaps they come from the same author. The *Vitae* of Ferreolus (BHL 2901-2) are endowed with scarce historiographic value.

Verzeichnis, 473; BS 5, 650-651; L.R. Desalle, *Règles de Césaire, F. et Regula Tarnatensis*: Augustinianum 11 (1961) 5-26; G. Holzherr, *Regula Ferreoli*, Einsiedeln 1961; V. Desprez: Revue Mabillon 60 (1981–1984) 117-148; Id., *Règles monastiques d'Occident*, Bégrolles-en-Mauges 1980, 287-339.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

FESTAL LETTERS. The epistolographic genre of *festal letters*, in Greek *epistolai heortastikai*, i.e, letters regarding *Easter, the Christian feast (*heortē*) *par excellence*, was born of the recognition on the part of the bishops of *Alexandria to announce the annual date of Easter to the Christian community of *Egypt and to other parts of the Mediterranean. The first explicit sign of the existence of this genre of document may be found in the *Ecclesiastical History* of *Eusebius of Caesarea with reference to *Dionysius of Alexandria (247-264): "Dionysius, besides his epistles already mentioned, wrote at that time also his extant festal letters which have come down to us, in which he speaks in solemn terms about the feast of Easter" (*HE* 7,20). This evidence, as well as several late allusions to the composition of texts on the Easter festival, points to the birth of the genre under the first Alexandrian bishop of whom we have a concrete historical picture, *Demetrius of Alexandria (188-230). The most important data we have about the sending of the festal letters is given by *John Cassian in the *Conferences*: "In the country of Egypt a custom is by ancient tradition observed that—when *Epiphany is past, which the priests of that province regard as the time both of the Lord's baptism and also of his birth in the flesh, and so celebrate the commemoration of these mysteries not separately as in the W provinces but on the single festival of this day—letters are sent from the bishop of Alexandria to all the churches of Egypt, in which the beginning of Lent and the day of Easter are fixed, not only for all the cities but also for all the monasteries" (X, 2). This is of course a rather late testimony (around 420) and refers to the form that the festal letters assumed in the time of *Cyril of Alexandria. The announcement of the date of the beginning of *Lent is certainly a novelty introduced by *Athanasius, but we do not know when the custom was established of reading the letter on the day of the Epiphany: if this were ancient, we could speculate that the festal letters must have been drawn up toward the end of November of the previous year, to be able to reach the whole Egyptian territory before the Epiphany. The other interesting feature of Cassian's testimony is his insistence that the letters were sent not only to the bishops but also to the monasteries of Egypt. We do not have a date of origin for this practice either. It seems probable that Athanasius was one of the principal promoters of it: in fact, we have evidence of the arrival of his letter XXXIX, written for Easter in 367, not only in the dioceses of Egypt but also in the Pachomian monasteries, as the *Lives* of *Pachomius (Bohairic life, 189) demonstrate.

From the end of the 4th c. onward we can therefore be certain that the festal letters were conveyed to all the dioceses of Egypt and to the most important monasteries, from the Nile Delta and *Libya as far as Aswan, as well as to other important episcopal sees of the Mediterranean. From the Greek original, tens of copies were made of each letter in the episcopal chancery, and in some receiving dioceses translated into *Coptic; later, the letters of some bishops were gathered together and reissued in collections. In fact, we can identify a number of different ways in which these letters have been transmitted:

a. Letters composed by one bishop in the course of his episcopal tenure, collected together after his death: the most notable case is that of Cyril, but also the Coptic and *Syriac versions of the letters of Athanasius are in this category, in that both derive from two different Greek collections.

b. *Liturgical homilies that contain a festal letter, either in part or in whole, inserted into the section dedicated to the Easter season, such as the case of the Athanasian letter XLI, partially transcribed in a Coptic lectionary (Bohairic), or that of a letter of the *Melkite patriarch *Eulogius, still unpublished.

c. Indirect tradition, such as quotations, short or long, taken by later authors from the letters of past bishops of Alexandria, which in many cases is the only evidence we have of them: the letters of Dionysius are quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea, those of *Peter I are conserved in a dogmatic anthology; fragments of those of Athanasius, *Theophilus, Cyril, *Damian, and *Benjamin are to be found in many subsequent authors because of their dogmatic and liturgical importance; a particular case of indirect tradition is the complete Latin translation by *Jerome of some letters of Theophilus.

d. The papyrus copies that were issued annually by the Alexandrian episcopal chancery. This is a group of scrolls of great interest, as they carry the Greek text of a particular letter recently issued by the bishop of Alexandria and transcribed into tens of copies by his scribes. In two cases these scribes carry a Coptic translation, probably extemporane-

ous, of a Greek copy newly arrived in the Egyptian dioceses: e.g., Coptic fragments of the first festal letter of Cyril (412-444) and of another which may be ascribed to Damian (578-607). As is well known, the scroll of papyrus could be written on one of its two sides. Placed lengthways, it was usually inscribed along the horizontal fibers, in a succession of columns; placed vertically, using the papyrus breadthways, the texts (usually important administrative documents) were written perpendicular to the vertical fibers (*transversa charta*), in only one column. The other side was normally left empty, at least for as long as the scroll was used. The festal letters of the bishops of Alexandria follow both typologies: *P. Grenfell* II 112 (Letter of Peter IV in 577) was written in one column only, vertically; but the type more common is that used also for the transcription of literary texts, i.e., with parallel columns following the direction of the fiber: this is the case with the letters conserved in *P. Köln* V 215 (*Benjamin or Agatho, from 663 or 674), *P. Heid.* IV 295 (of uncertain attribution), P. Berolin. 10677 (Alexander II) and *P. Vindob.* K 10157 (Cyril).

e. The *ostraca* (fragments of pottery, or pieces of other material) found in the area of Thebes conserve in Coptic the last of several letters written between the 6th and 7th c. This is an unusual and interesting custom: evidently the faithful transcribed the date of Easter, announced for a particular year, on the material that was readily available.

From Dionysius and Athanasius onward we witness the formation of what may truly be described as a literary genre: to the notification of the day of Easter the bishops of Alexandria added moral exhortations, reference to religious affairs of the day, brief doctrinal expositions, as well as lists of bishops, meaning that although the content of the genre is certainly variable, it is distinct from that of the Easter sermon proper, or from that of baptismal writings, addressed principally to *catechumens. The content of the festal letters is not properly the mysteries of Easter or of *baptism, but must be understood as addressed to a wider audience, in need of a moral and doctrinal catechesis grounded in Scripture.

As we have already noted, the first fragments conserved of these letters are from Dionysius. Eusebius is the principal source of them, but others, classified by numerical order, are conserved in late anthologies. The themes are varied and refer often to contemporary events (persecutions, war, epidemics), but also morals, and above all Easter. Of particular interest for us are the fragments of the festal letter of *Peter I for Easter of 309, preserved in a dogmatic anthology. Their subject is that of the quality of the risen body, a question of great importance, and an object of a lively discussion in the 3rd and 4th c., including in the Alexandrian context. The dogmatic anthology also includes the end of the letter, which deserves mention for its liturgical importance: in it Peter announces the end of the Holy Week fast and the date of Easter (expressed both acc. to the Roman and the Egyptian calendars), but mentions neither Lent nor *Pentecost. From *Alexander, predecessor of Athanasius, we have only a fragment, which is in fact a paraphrase of Col 1:15 and Phil 2:5-7, originating, acc. to M. Richard, in a letter sent to Pope *Sylvester, mentioned in turn by *Liberius in a text conserved among the historical fragments of *Hilary of Poitiers.

With the festal letters of Athanasius we have the first trace of the creation of *corpora* of letters gathered together at the death of the bishop of Alexandria. These have come down to us in two incomplete collections, one Coptic and one Syriac. We may note a difference in the tradition here from that of the letters of other bishops of the metropolis. In fact, while the Coptic collection, and the Greek model of which it is a translation, fall within the more common genre of ancient editions of homiletic cycles or collections of letters, the Syriac collection reflects a rearrangement that the Athanasian festal letters have undergone within the archives of the see of Alexandria itself. Of this Syriac collection we possess only one mutilated MS, which preserves fifteen texts, including letters and notices, each of which is preceded by a heading that carries the date of Easter and other chronological information. The whole is introduced by a text structured in chapters, the *Index*, that gives for each year of the Athanasian episcopate, in addition to the date of Easter, the names of the consuls and prefects of Egypt, and often details about the life of Athanasius and of his church that have been extracted from official documents and registers deposited at the chancery. Two novelties characterize the letters of Athanasius: from 334 onward the final formula includes the date of the beginning of Lent, lasting six weeks; some letters contain, in a postscript, the list of bishops recently nominated by the patriarch, a practice that would be followed by Theophilus and Cyril.

Of the letters of Theophilus we also have many fragments in Greek, *Armenian and Syriac, found above all in dogmatic works, in *Acts* of councils and in many anthologies (CPG 2580-2591). New Coptic fragments have been identified in a work that may be attributed to *Shenoute (letter of 401) and one in a work in Syriac of *Peter of Callinicum. The most celebrated letters, known to us in their entirety, are

16, 17 and 19, translated into Latin by Jerome and conserved in his correspondence.

The letters of Cyril are the only ones to have come down in Greek in an (almost) complete collection, edited after his death. The bishop brings to maturity a literary genre that from Athanasius onward tends to deepen and extend its characteristic themes: Easter is always central, as is the reason, closely connected to it, for the incarnation of the *Logos*; to these elements news of the church is added, as well as, above all, doctrinal polemic, that is anti-*Arian, anti-*Apollinarian and anti-*Nestorian. The Greek collection has undergone editorial retouching, intended to eliminate that which from a certain point of view was seen as superfluous: in particular the postscripts that indicate episcopal successions are omitted, which in fact had certainly been drawn up by Cyril, as is shown by the Coptic version of the first letter.

The festal letters of the bishops of Alexandria from Cyril onward are not extant. However, the indirect tradition, the papyri and the *ostraca*, have conserved parts of them, including from the period when the hierarchy was duplicated owing to the christological controversies. The papyrus *P. Grenfell* II 112, containing a festal letter of Peter IV, is important in the history of Greek paleography and significant also for the history of *dogma. A letter of Damian is to be found in two Coptic MSS, the result of an extemporaneous translation from the Greek. A reasonably strong indirect tradition is given us also in his case by quotations of his letters by the polemicist Peter of Callinicum, author of a tract against the trinitarian doctrine of Damian. With *Eulogius of Alexandria, we find ourselves on one side of the barrier that divided the Egyptian church in two: from this correspondent and friend of *Gregory the Great we have an unpublished festal letter in Greek, contained within a set of liturgical homilies. The letters of Benjamin bear witness to a liturgical change of real importance: the extension of the Lenten fast from six to eight weeks, the eighth assimilated to Holy Week. This is attested by quotations in *John of Damascus, but also by the *ostraca* that contain the conclusions of Benjamin's letters. A long dogmatic fragment of his 16th letter is conserved in Ethiopian. Finally, the festal letter of Alexander II is the last example on papyrus that we know today, in the form of the copy sent to the monastery of Shenoute.

After this long review, we can identify the main elements of the genre. The structure of the festal letter emerges as follows:

1. The beginning, which usually records the approach of the feast, and lists the prophetic references to Easter;

2. The central section, containing various themes: the longest part of the letter, which includes the main catechetical, theological and polemical message, often culminating in a quotation from 1 Cor 5:7;

3. Exhortations on the correct observance of Easter, on living a pure Christian life, on aiding the poor and on brotherly love;

4. The announcement of the dates of the Easter season, mentioning Pentecost, with a doxology;

5. In some cases a postscript that normally contains the episcopal nominations, but also sometimes providing other types of information.

General information about the transmission of the festal letters: P. Évieux, *Introduction*, in *Cyrille d'Alexandrie, Lettres Festales,* I-VI. *Introduction générale* by P. Évieux. Critical introduction and Greek text by W.H. Burns. Trans. and notes by L. Arragon et al. (SC 372), Paris 1991, 11-118; A. Külzer, *Die "Festbriefe"* (Epistolai heortastikai) – *Eine wenig beachtete Untergattung der byzantinistischen Briefliteratur*: ByzZ 91 (1998) 378-390; K. Aland - H.-U. Rosenbaum, *Osterfestbrief*, in *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*. 2: *Kirchenväter-Papyri*. Teil 1: *Beschreibungen* (Patristische Texte und Studien 42), Berlin-New York 1995, 523-541.

Dionysius: C.L. Feltoe, *The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*, Cambridge 1904.

Peter: M. Richard, *Le florilège du cod. Vatopédi 236 sur le corruptible et l'incorruptible*: Muséon 86 (1973) 249-273, esp. 267, nn. 13-14; Id., *Le comput pascal par Octaétéris:* Muséon 87 (1974) 307-339.

Alexander: see Liberius, in Hilary, *Historical Fragments*, ed. Feder (CSEL 65), 91-92.

Athanasius: see *Athanasius of Alexandria and A. Camplani, *Atanasio di Alessandria. Lettere festali. Anonimo. Indice delle Lettere festali*, intro., trans. and notes (Letture cristiane del primo millennio 34), Milan 2003.

Theophilus: CSEL 55, 159-181; 185-211; 213-232; S. Emmel, *Theophilus's Festal Letter of 401 as quoted by Shenoute*, in *Divitiae Aegypti*, Festschrift M. Krause, Wiesbaden 1995, 93-98; other fragments in CPG and in *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni Tractatus contra Damianum*. IV: lib. III cap. XXXV-L et addendum libro secundo, eds. R.Y. Ebied - A. Van Roey - L.R. Wickham (CCG 54), Turnhout-Leuven 2003, 16 (Festal letter I).

Cyril: PG 77, 401-982; *Cyrille d'Alexandrie, Lettres Festales*, ed. Burns (SC 372, 392, 434), Paris 1991, 1993, 1998; A. Camplani, *La prima lettera festale di Cirillo di Alessandria e la testimonianza di P. Vindob. K 10157:* AugR 39 (1999) 129-138.

Peter IV: B.P. Grenfell - A.S. Hunt, *Greek Papyri. Series II. New Classical Fragments and Other Greek and Latin Papyri*, Oxford 1897, 163-167; A. Camplani, *La Quaresima egiziana nel VII secolo: note di cronologia su Mon. Epiph. 77, Manchester Rylands Suppl. 47-48, P. Grenf. II 112, P. Berol. 10677, P. Köln 215 e un'omelia copta*: AugR 32 (1992) 423-432.

Damian: *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni Tractatus contra Damianum*. II: lib. III cap. I-XIX, eds. R.Y. Ebied - A.

Van Roey - L.R. Wickham (CCG 32), Turnhout-Leuven 1996, 518-519, 524 (Damian); A. Camplani, *Coptic Fragments from a Festal Letter of the Late Sixth Century (John Rylands Library, Coptic Suppl. n. 47-48): Damian or Eulogius?,* in *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium. Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies*, Leiden 2000 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 133), Leuven-Paris-Dudley 2004, 317-327.

Eulogius: E. Crisci, *I palinsesti di Grottaferrata*, Naples 1990, 224-225.

Benjamin: C.D. Müller, *Die Homilie über die Hochzeit zu Kana und weitere Schriften des Patriarchen Benjamin I von Alexandrien*, Heidelberg 1968; Giovanni Damasceno, *De sacris ieiuniis*: PG 95, 77.

For Alexander II and the other patriarchs, see above K. Aland - U. Rosenbaum; G. Cavallo, *Grammata Alexandrina:* JÖByz 24 (1975) 23-54.

A. Camplani

FESTUS (d. after 62). Porcius Festus was sent by *Nero as Roman procurator in *Palestine from 60 to 62, succeeding Felix (Acts 24:27; Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* XX, 8,9; 9,1; *Bell. Iud.* II, 14,1). In his administration he revealed himself to be just and proper, despite finding himself in difficult situations of anarchy and revolt. Paul, who had been imprisoned under Felix, was led into his presence to be judged, but appealed to caesar. Festus, before sending him to Rome, had him meet King *Agrippa II and his sister Bernice (Acts 25:23-32) in an audience. Festus died in Judea, a little after his term of office, in 62.

DB 2/2 (1899) 2216-2217; *Dictionary of the Bible* 2, Edinburg [3]1902, 4-5; U. Holzmeister, *Der hl. Paulus vor dem Richterstuhle des Festus* (*Apg 25,1-12)*: ZKTh 36 (1912) 489-511 and 742-782; Id., *Storia dei tempi del Nuovo Testamento*, Casale Monf. 1950, 107-112; Cath 4 (1956) 1215; EC 9 (1962) 1768-1769; NCE 5 (1966) 900; *Enciclopedia della Bibbia* 3 (Turin 1970) 358-361; BBKL 2 (1990) 24-25 (bibl.).

M. Maritano

FIBULA (buckle). An accurate subdivision of the fibulae into various groups by shape, size and workmanship was completed by Cavada for his study on the elements of masculine dress found in the central and E Alpine valleys (Cavada 1999, 93-108).

A first group consists in the fibulae of great size, with fixed plates of various shapes (triangular, pentagonal, etc.), decorated with carvings (*Kerbschnitt*) which generally present zoomorphic figures, like the pentagonal plate with lions found at Aquileia, attested along the N *limes*, from *Britain to *Pannonia, but also in the more internal zones of Raetia and *Noricum and in the more militarized regions of W *Africa. They appear between the third quarter and the end of the 4th c., lasting until the last decades of the 5th c. The distinctive typological element is the ring of oval form, obtained by fusion in open mold, in zoomorphic shape and closed with a plate in folded foil, smooth or decorated with stamps.

The fibulae with mobile plates, decorated with stamps or smooth, constitute, on the other hand, the most documented type in the Late Antique period, beginning from the second third of the 4th c., when the practice of placing belts and girdles in masculine tombs first appears—a practice later to become customary. There are numerous variants: in the methods of fabrication, in the form of the ring, in the plate attached to the leather, smooth or decorated. Two subgroups are distinguished: "A" constituted of fibulae of three pieces (ring, buckle tongue, plate) and "B" of fibulae of four pieces (arch, bar, buckle tongue, plate).

The lyre fibulae with trapezoidal hole, which are also called "omega" fibulae, make up another group.

Finally there are fibulae with drilled fixed plates, which derive from the fibulae with drilled mobile plates and which can be found in Britannia, N Gaul and the regions near the Danube where this type of fibula appears with frequency in contexts of the third and final quarter of the 4th c.

Among the fibulae of Gothic environments those of zoomorphic profile should also be recorded, such as the fibulae in the form of eagles, a pair of which, with *cloisonnè* decoration (gold settings with inset almandines), has been found in the tomb of a wealthy woman in Domagnano (Republic of San Marino), and which has been dated to the end of the 5th/beginning of the 6th c.

V. Bierbrauer, *Die Ostgotischen Grab- und Schatzfunde in Italien*, Spoleto s.a. (1975); var. aus., *Magistra Barbaritas. I barbari in Italia* (Antica Madre, Collana di studi sull'Italia antica), Milan 1990; M. Kazanski, *Les Goths*, Paris 1991; R. Martorelli, *Alcune scene cristologiche su fibule e fibbie dei primi secoli*, in *Bessarione*, Quaderno 8, Rome 1991, 121-137; var. aus., *I Goti*, Milan 1994; F. Lo Schiavo, *Fibula*: Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, Secondo Supplemento II (1994) 634-640; E. Cavada, *Complementi dell'abbigliamento maschile e militari tardoantichi* (*fine IV-V secolo d.C.) nelle valli alpine centrorientali* (*bacini del Sarca e dell'Adige)*, in G.P. Brogiolo, *Le fortificazioni del Garda e i sistemi di difesa dell'Italia settentrionale tra tardo antico e alto medioevo*, 2° Convegno Archeologico del Garda - Gardone Riviera (BS), 7-9 ottobre 1998, Mantova 1999, 93-108; J. Arce - P. Delogu (eds.), *Visigoti e Longobardi. Atti del Seminario* (Roma 28-29 aprile 1997), Florence 2001; P. Delogu (ed.), *Le invasioni barbariche nel meridione dell'impero. Visigoti, Vandali, Ostrogoti.* Atti del convegno svoltosi alla Casa della cultura di Cosenza dal 24 al 26 luglio 1998, Catanzaro 2001.

C. Loasses

FIDES HIERONYMI. A profession of faith that begins *Credo in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, visibilium et invisibilium factorem*, and that was published for the first time by Morin (Anecd. Mareds. III, 3. 199-200). It can be considered as a combination of articles from the *Apostles' and Nicene *Creeds. The expression *Descendit ad inferos* should be kept in mind, which appears for the first time in the baptismal creed in use in the church of *Aquileia at the time of *Rufinus (*Comm. in Symbol. Apostol.* 18; PL 21, 356), and not yet included in those of the church of Rome and the East. Also, the other expression *Sanctorum communionem* makes its first appearance in an instruction of *Niceta of Remesiana (*Explan. Symbol.* 10; PL 52, 871). Cross does not exclude the possibility of the attribution of the *fides hieronmymi* to *Jerome himself (ODC 551), while Bulhart (CCL 69,273-4), in the footsteps of Wilmart (RBen 30, 174), refers to *Gregory of Elvira. This *fides hieronymi* must not be confused with a profession of faith of the same title, which begins *Catholicam fidem ita profitemur* and which is related in some way with the First Council of *Toledo (CPL 638; PLS II 295-296).

CPL 553; CPPM 2, 626; 628; PLS I, 515-516; CCL 69, 273-275; G. Morin: Anecdota Maredsolana 3 (1903) 199-200; Id., RBen 21 (1904) 1-10; A. Wilmart, RBen 30 (1913) 274ff.; ODC, 610 s.v.

L. Dattrino

FIDES NICAENA. A writing erroneously attributed to *Athanasius, and also known under the title *Didascalia CCCXVIII Patrum Nicaenorum.* The designation, with which it begins, runs thus: "Faith of the 318 *Fathers, God-bearers, present at *Nicaea, and truly marvelous and saving teaching concerning the Holy *Trinity." In reality it consists of two parts: the first contains, in a profession of faith, the Nicene creed with a dogmatic commentary, in which the theories of *Sabellius, *Photius, the *anthropomorphites and *Arius are condemned, and at the same time precise elements of the dogma are recalled. The second part contains and reassumes a long series of monastic and moral rules, and is entirely similar to the so-called *Syntagma ad Monachos*, also attributed to Athanasius by certain MSS (PG 28, 835-45). Many elements could suggest an Egyptian origin.

CPG 2, 2298; 2298/Supplementum; PG 28, 1637-1644; Per la *Didascalia*, Batiffol, Paris 1887 (partial repr. in A. Hahn, *Biblioth. Symbol.* 308-312): Id., *Le syntagma doctrinae de saint Athanase*, in *Studia Patristica*: Études d'ancienne Littér. Chrétienne 2 (1890) 116-160; G. Garitte, *Une lettre grecque attribuée à saint Antoine*: Muséon 55 (1942) 104-123; G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*, Rome 1967, 51-54, with notes 48 and 49; Altaner 82; R. Riedinger - H. Thurn, *Die Didascalia CCCXVIII patrum Nicaenorum und das Syntagma ad monachos im Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 (a. 1276)*: JÖByz 35 (1985) 75-92.

L. Dattrino

FIDUCIA. For the ecclesiastical writers the term generally corresponds to the Greek παρρησία (Jer., *Comm. in Eph.* 3, 12; PL, 26,516 A). It appears 23 times in the NT, often in the sense of *fiduciam habere* = to trust (Mt 14:27). The meaning of the word undergoes a certain evolution through the effect either of an opposite term (*fear*, 1 Jn 4:17-18) or of a synonym (**hope*, 2 Cor 3:12; Phil 1:20). Thence is derived the word's rather frequent meaning of designating the relationship between *God and the believer (L. Engels, *Fiducia dans la Vulgate*, 134). Admitting, therefore, that *fiducia* is a quality of the *soul, there remains the question whether this turns into an objective element (as in the OT, in the sense of a divine guarantee, included in the covenant stipulated by God himself with his people), or a subjective one, in the confidence placed in God by all believers. In this sense the word παρρησία (*fiducia*) should apparently be understand in most of the *Fathers. Thus, e.g., in *Origen the term is often linked to the complement πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (*in Deum*) (*Comm. in Ier. Hom.* 16, PG 13, 444B; *In Cant. Cant. Hom.* GCS Orig., VIII, 34; 60,123; etc.). Also in Hilary: ... *propria conscientia altioris fiducia* (*In Ps.* 54,2; PL 9,348). Furthermore, the *resurrection of Christ constituted the guarantee of the entire Christian *fiducia*. *Tertullian wrote: *Fiducia christianorum resurrectio mortuorum* (*De res.* 1,1; PL, 2,841).

RAC 7, 839-877; DSp 5, 619-630; P. Joüon, *Divers sens de* παρρησία *dans le NT*: RSR 30 (1940) 239-242; H. Schlier, παρρησία: TWNT V, 877 (TDNT 5, 884-886); H. Jaeger, παρρησία *fiducia*: *Étude spirituelle des mots*, SP = TU 63, 221-239; L. Engels, *Fiducia dans la Vulgate. Le problème de traduction* παρρησία - *Fiducia*: Graecitas et Latin. Christ. primaera, Suppl., Fasc. I (1964) 97-144; L. Cignelli, *Il titolo "Cristo speranza" nell'esegesi patristica*: SBF 23 (1973) 105-150.

L. Dattrino

FIERY FURNACE (iconography). The episode of the three young Jews in Babylon (Dan 3) appears in ancient Christian art in two distinct representations which transmit the two significant moments of the scriptural account: the refusal to adore the idol and the torture in the furnace.

1. First to appear, the scene of the *Three youths in the furnace* occurs already at the beginning of the 3rd c. in a fresco of the *cemetery of Priscilla at

*Rome (Wp pl. 16). Between the 2nd half of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th c. it is introduced also into the decoration of *sarcophagi (Ws pls. 176, 2; 192, 1) and afterward it is received into the figurative repertory of the "minor arts." The iconographic *iter* of the composition could be synthesized in this way: In the examples of the 3rd c. it is usually represented in its essential terms: the furnace and the three youths, in *expansis manibus* posture, surrounded by flames. In those of the 4th c., other elements are found of a more exclusively narrative character, all traceable to the biblical account, such as the accuser, the angel, the servant who stokes the fire. From the iconological point of view the image of the three youths in the furnace, no differently from other representations taken from the Holy *Scripture, appeared to the faithful of the first centuries as a paradigm of salvation.

2. The first figurative testimonies of the theme of the *Refusal* (Dan 3:16-18) appear in the environment of funerary *sculpture between the end of the 3rd c. and the beginning of the 4th c. (Ws pls. 287, 1; Rep. n. 625), penetrating a little later also into the repertory of cemetery painting (Wp pls. 123, 1; RivAC 26 [1950] fig. 7). The elements that give life to the composition and reoccur constantly in both sculpture and *painting are Nebuchadnezzar in the act of commanding adoration, the soldier, the half-bust of the idol, the three youths in the posture of refusal. In all the examples known to us of the representation of the refusal, the presence of a detail of the greatest importance can be noted: the identity between the face of Nebuchadnezzar and that of the idol. If one considers that the theme of the refusal is born precisely in the ultimate period of the time of the tetrarchs, it will be appear clearly how such an identification serves as a characterizing element. Finally, an attempt to express the polemical attitude of the community in regard to the imperial cult is evidenced as well. The message included in the biblical text, already explicit by itself, is put in context; the immediate reference creeps in, the incontrovertible affirmation: the generic golden statue set up by Nebuchadnezzar is replaced with the image of the emperor. Still more meaningful are the compositions that present the contrast between the *Refusal* and the *Adoration of the *Magi*; here the royalty of Christ is hammered home in an even more explicit way and in clearly polemical terms: only the Savior is worthy of veneration, and therefore adoration is appropriate for him only. The theme of the two contrasting positions appears in the first quarter of the 4th c. on the front of a sarcophagus of the cemetery of Marcus and Marcellianus (Ws pl. 129, 2) and a little later will be frescoed on an *arcosolium* of the same cemetery (RivAC 26 [1950] fig. 7).

3. Around the second half of the 4th c. the two situations related to the episode of the three youths enter also into the figurative repertory of the so-called minor arts: above all in the ceramic lamps, but also on objects for liturgical use such as capsels and pyxes, along with reliquaries.

J. Daniélou, RAC 3, 575-585; B. Ott, LCI 2, 464-466; C. Carletti, *I tre giovani ebrei di Babilonia nell'arte cristiana antica* (Quad. Vetera Christianorum 9), Brescia 1975; M. Wegner, *Das Nabuchodonosor-Bild. Das Bild im Bild: Pietas*. Festschrift B. Kötting, Münster 1980, 528-538; B. Mazzei, s.v. *Fanciulli ebrei*: TIP, 177-178.

C. Carletti

FILASTER (Philaster, Philastrius) (d. before 397). Active in the 2nd half of the 4th c., he tried without success to oppose the *Arian bishop *Auxentius at *Milan and was punished with beatings (Gaud., *Serm.* 21). He participated as bishop of Brescia at the anti-Arian Council of *Aquileia in 381. Between 380 and 390 he wrote the *Diversarum haereseon liber*, using, in addition to *Irenaeus, above all the *Panarion* of *Epiphanius, but remaining, in Augustine's judgment (*Ep.* 222), inferior to the source. In reality it is a superficial and generic work, even where it treats heresies, such as Arianism, that the author had known personally, and it is not free of errors and misunderstandings. Filaster, just like Epiphanius, considered any doctrine opposed to Christianity as *heresy, even if chronologically prior; therefore before the 128 heresies that come after the beginning of the church he includes 28 prior Jewish ones. To multiply the number of heresies, Filaster considers the protagonists of certain episodes of the OT to be heretics with precise nomenclature (*musuritae, trogloditae, puteoritae,* etc.) and includes in the number of heresies many propositions of doctrinal and disciplinary character that he considered erroneous but that do not seem to have given rise to heretical or schismatic movements. Filaster does not even know the distinction between heresy and *schism, already well established before his time.

CPL 121; PL 12, 1111-1302; CSEL 38, 1; CCL 9, 207-324; Patrologia III, 120-122; var. aus., *Eresia ed eresiologia nella Chiesa antica*: Augustinianum 25/3 (1985) 597-906; E. Guidoboni, *Filastrio e l'eresia sull'origine naturale del terremoto*, in Id. (ed.), *I terremoti prima del Mille in Italia e nell'area mediterranea. Storia, archeologia, sismologia*, Bologna-Rome 1989, 178-181; *San Filastrio di Brescia, Delle varie eresie*. Intr., tr., notes and index by G. Banterle, Milan-Rome 1991; F. Vattioni, *La prima lingua in Filastrio da Brescia*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 397-436.

M. Simonetti

FILIOQUE. The introduction of the *filioque* into the Nicene-Constantinopolitan *Creed, decided by the Synod of *Braga (675), received in *Gaul under Charlemagne, accepted finally by the Roman church (ca. 1013), which has become one of the major causes of dissension between the Western and *Byzantine churches, interests patristic theology for two reasons: the legitimacy of the fact itself and its content. As to the issue of the legitimacy of such a change in the creed, it should be mentioned that the Council of *Constantinople itself (381) altered the Nicene Creed, without worrying about the agreement of the Latins. Furthermore, the *Ephesian Council (431), which forbade professing a faith different from that of *Nicaea (COeD 54), did not cite its Constantinopolitan version. With regard to the doctrinal aspect, the *filioque* is a central point of the trinitarian theology of *Augustine. Taking up the idea of the Spirit as gift of the *Father and the Son from *Hilary (cf. Hil., *Trin.* II,29), and the theme of the Spirit as mutual love of Father and Son from *Marius Victorinus (*Hymn.*, I,4; III,242ff; cf. Zeno of Verona *Tract.* I,17 with Augustine, *Trin.* VI 10,11) and from *Ambrose (*Fid.* V 7,90; cf. Origen, *Com. Rom.* IV,9), Augustine, not only in his speculations, but also in the doctrine destined for the simple faithful, drawing inspiration above all from *John, presents the Father and the Son as the unique *principium* (i.e., origin or beginning) of the *Holy Spirit; the first, however, as *principium non de principio*, the second, on the other hand, as *principium de principio* (*Maxim.* 2,17,4; cf. *Trin.* 15,17,29; 15,26-27). The Greek authors did not reach this conclusion because they wished to avoid the danger that the Spirit would be considered a creature, not coming from the same hypostasis of the Father, but made by means of the Son, like the other creatures. The very creed of Constantinople itself, composed in view of the Macedonian positions, should be seen in a similar framework. The formula *by means of the Son* (instrument, intermediary), as it is found above all in *Gregory of Nyssa, is nevertheless not so far from the *filioque* of Augustine. This is also true for *Cyril of Alexandria, who, however, was preoccupied by the question in reference to Christ, glorified by his own Spirit (DS 260). Since the controversy of the *filioque* comes after the patristic era, it is not necessary to discuss in this place the diverse solutions proposed, even if they are justified also by means of patristic positions.

DTC 5, 2309-2343; H. du Manoir, *Dogme et spiritualité chez s. Cyrille d'A.*, Paris 1944; M. Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus*, Münster ^{2}1966; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London ^{3}1972; A. de Halleux, *La profession de l'Esprit-Saint dans le symbole de Constantinople*: RTL 10 (1979) 5-39; B. Schultze, *Die Pneumatologie des Symbols von Konstantinopel als abschliessende Formulierung der griechischen Theologie (381-1981)*: OCP 47 (1981) 5-54; B.J. Hilberath - W. Hryniewicz, *Filioque*: LTK^3 3, 1279ff. (including the controversy); *Stellungnahme des Päpstlichen Rates zur Förderung der Einheit der Christen*: Una Sancta 50 (1995) 316-324; B. Studer, *Zur Pneumatologie des Augustinus von Hippo* (*Trin. XV 17,27–27,50)*: SA 127 (Rome 1999) 311-327; Id., *La foi en l'Esprit Saint dans l'Église Ancienne*: SA 127, 445-463 (bibl.); B. Oberdorfer - K.C. Felmy, *Filioque*: RGG^4 3, 119-121 (bibl.); B. Oberdorfer, *Filioque. Geschichte und Theologie eines ökumenischen Problems*, Göttingen 2001.

B. Studer

FINNIAN of Clonard (d. 549). Findian (Finden), latinized as *Finnianus* or *Finianus*, was born in *Ireland at Mysdall, around 470; his instructors were the bishops St. Fortchern (d. after 490) and St. David of Menevia (d. around 601 at the age of 147). An evangelist of Ireland, Finnian is the founder of the monastery of Clonard (Cluain Iraird), out of which came several famous ecclesiastical personalities: S. Ciarán of Clonmacnoise (d. 549?), S. Colomba of Iona (d. 597), S. Comgall of Bangor (d. 600). Penitent and thaumaturge, a man of classical and biblical culture, Finnian could be the author of the *Paenitentiale Vinniani* (Penitential of St. Finnian of Moville [d. 579/580]). He died at Clonard 12 December 549. As an object of liturgical veneration, his name was signaled in a Visigothic martyrology of the beginning of the 9th c. (Escorial I.III. 13).

BHL 2989; EC 5, 1395; P. Grosjean, *Notes d'hagiographie celtique, 24. Mention de S. Finnián de Cluain Iraird dans un martyrologe visigotique du début du IX^e siècle*: AB 72 (1954) 347-352; Id., *La liste des Disciples de S. Finnián*: AB 73 (1955) 316-322; J. Hughes, *The Historical Value of the Lives of St. Finnian of Clonard*: Eng. Hist. Rev. 69 (1954) 353-372; BS 5, 832-833; D. Dumville, *The Penitential of Vinnianus*, in *Gildas. New Approaches*, ed. M. Lapidge - D. Dumville, Woodbridge 1984, 207-214; P. Byrne, *The Community of Clonard from the Sixth to the Twelfth Centuries*: Perita 4 (1985) 157-173; Patrologia IV, 517-518; BBKL XXI, 401.

R. Grégoire

FIRMICUS MATERNUS (d. after 350). The MS tradition attributes to Firmicus Maternus two writings of fairly diverse content which go back to the 4th c.: the *Matheseos libri VIII* (334–337) and the *De errore profanarum religionum* (343–347). All information on our author owes to these two writings. He was born in Sicily and lived mostly in *Syracuse. Descendant of a senatorial family, he must have received a solid rhetorical-philosophical education. While still a *pagan, he wrote (between 334–337) his *Matheseos*, a kind of manual of astrology. Obviously

in debt to Greek sources and even more to Latin ones, he has left us a work that, more than any other preserved from antiquity, informs us as to the astrological beliefs and practices of that time.

In his second work, *De errore profanarum religionum*, composed after his conversion to Christianity (between 346–350), Firmicus Maternus combats contemporaneous paganism in the form of the divinization of the elements and above all that of the mysteries. After demonstrating in a rather aggressive way the inanity and immorality of the myths and pagan cults, he concludes by calling his readers to conversion and by reminding the emperors (*Constantius and *Constans) the serious duty they have of destroying without remorse the pagan religion. This hardly tolerant attitude is explained at least in part by the character of a convert who defended with zeal the Christian cause when Christianity had become the *causa victrix*, protected now by the emperors themselves. Obviously, however, he intends not only to refute pagan errors, but also to lead nonbelievers to conversion. Even though it is addressed primarily to pagans, the work leans on scriptural proofs, which it owes almost exclusively to the *Testimonia* of *Cyprian. It should also be remarked that the *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii*, attributed to him by Morin, do not go back beyond the 5th c.

CPL 101-102; *Matheseos libri VIII*: W. Kroll - F. Skutsch - K. Ziegler, (Teubneriana) Leipzig 1897–1913 (repr. 1968); *De errore prof. relig.*: PL 12, 981-1050; C. Halm, CSEL 2 (1967) 75-130; K. Ziegler, Munich 1953; A. Pastorino, Florence 1956 (1969) (commentary); DSp 5, 384-388; RAC 7, 946-959; K. Hoheisel, *Das Urteil über die nichtchristlichen Religionen im Traktat "De err. prof. relig." des Iulius F. Maternus* (Diss.), Bonn 1971/72; P.F. Beatrice (ed.), *L'intolleranza cristiana*, Bologna 1990; LTK³ 3, 1297; R. Herzog (ed.), *Hdb. lat. Lit. Antike*, V (1989) 84-93; LACL (2002) 267-268.

B. Studer

FIRMILIAN of Caesarea in Cappadocia (d. 268). Bishop of the metropolis of *Cappadocia for more than thirty years (from ca. 230 to ca. 268), we know that he received *Origen in 232 or 233 and permitted him to preach in his churches. In 235, under *Maximinus Thrax, the Christians in Cappadocia were persecuted and Firmilian took refuge in *Palestine, where he consorted again with Origen; from there he returned to *Caesarea of Cappadocia. It seems that during the *persecution of *Decius (249–250) he again avoided the opportunity to confess the faith because he was found, later, alongside Bishop *Helenus of *Tarsus in conflict with Bishop *Fabius of Antioch, who leaned toward the severity of *Novatian against all those who had failed in courage during the persecution. With the support of Firmilian, Helenus organized a council to depose Fabius, who in the meantime died. The accusations against Firmilian and Helenus did not stop; rather they were taken to *Rome, where they found a favorable hearing in Pope *Stephen (254–257), who was more inclined toward the Novatians; he made known in a letter that he was excluding the two bishops from his communion. In 256, Stephen also broke communion with *Cyprian of Carthage, because the latter considered invalid the *baptism conferred by the Novatians. Cyprian then appealed to the bishops of the East; Firmilian approved his doctrinal position against that of Stephen in a long letter, which is preserved (*Ep.* 75, of the correspondence of Cyprian). Some years later, Firmilian was invited twice by Helenus of Tarsus to go to *Antioch for a council that heard the case of the bishop of that city, *Paul of Samosata, accused of heresy. At the time of the first council, Firmilian declared himself satisfied with the responses of Paul, so that the latter was not condemned; the second time, toward 268, he once again set out for Antioch, but died during the voyage to Tarsus.

CPG 1760; Eusebius, *HE* 6 and 7, passim; DHGE 17, 249-252; P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens*, Paris 1961, 152-156, 238-250; M. Girardi, *Scrittura e battesimo degli eretici nella lettera di Firmiliano a Cipriano*: VetChr 19 (1982) 37-67; S.G. Hall, *Stephen of Rome and the One Baptism*: SP XVII, 2, 796-798; C. Trevett, *Spiritual Authority and the "Heretical" Woman. Firmilian's Word to the Church in Carthage*, in *Portraits of Spiritual Authority*, ed. J.W. Drijvers - J.W. Watt, Leiden 1999, 45-62.

P. Nautin

FIRMUS of Caesarea in Cappadocia (d. 439). One of the leaders of the Cyrillian party at the Council of *Ephesus; 45 letters of his survive, as well as a brief *homily pronounced at the Council of Ephesus (preserved in Ethiopian in the *Qērellos*).

CPG 6120-6121; DHGE 17, 264; Cath 4, 1320; PG 77, 1481-1514; B.M. Weischer, *Qērellos* IV 1. *Homilien und Briefe zum Konzil von Ephesos*, Wiesbaden 1979, 134-137; S. Grébaut, *Traduction de la version éthiopienne d'une homélie de Firmus, évêque de Césarée*: ROC 15 (1910) 324-325; M.-A. Calvet-Sebasti - P.-L. Gatier, *Firmus de Césarée, Lettres. Introduction, texte et traduction, notes et index* (SC 350), Paris 1989.

S.J. Voicu

FISH. The fish is a symbol attested in ancient *Egypt, in Mesopotamian culture, and in Greece and Rome. The symbol was associated with the Orphean-Dionysian mystery cults and the goddess Cybele.

Even in the OT many images of fish appear, starting from the creation of the sea creatures and every type of animal that swims and swarms in the water of Gen 1:20-22, to the large sea monster that swallowed *Jonah and spewed him onto the land (Jon 2:1-11). In the NT, then, the fish became an image of believers (Lk 5:10; Mt 13:47ff.), while the *apostles were described as "fishers of men" (Mt 4:19; Mk 1:16). Fish, moreover, along with bread, was the food *Jesus multiplied (Mt 14:19 and 15:34-36). The symbolism was enriched in the writings of ancient Christian authors, and fish became a very strong *symbol, also because the Greek word that expresses it, ΙΧΘΥΣ (*ichthys*), already at the end of the 2nd c. was interpreted as an acrostic "Jesus Christ, God's Son, Savior," so that as a result *Clement of Alexandria invited Christians to decorate their seal with a fish (*Paed.* III, 59,2: GCS I, 270,7ff.). *Archaeological finds have confirmed the antiquity of the symbol that appears, alone or duplicated, esp. in funerary contexts, and is at times associated with the acrostic ΙΧΘΥΣ, as occurs, e.g., in a graffito in the catacombs of Priscilla, or in the funerary stone of Licinia Amia, where one finds the formula ΙΧΘΥΣ ΖΩΝΤΩΝ (fish of the living) and the portrayal of two fish set face-to-face and divided by an anchor (see L. Gambassi, s.v. *Pesce*, 254). Scholars have asked themselves about the relationship between the figurative symbol of the fish in the acrostic, indicating the chronological priority at one point of one and at another point of the other (a summary of the major positions on this question can be found in L. Gambassi, s.v. *Pesce*, 252).

The symbol of the fish is understood only when one starts from the meaning that was attributed to the ocean in which it lived. In fact, if one keeps in mind the key identification of the ocean with the world and *sin, one can better explain why the fish was a symbol of the believer captured and, therefore, saved by Christ and the apostles, though the fish that remains in the abyss is a symbol of those who will be damned (*ps.-Barn.* 10,5; Clem. Al., *Paed.* 3,52,2 and 59,2: GCS I, 296,21 and I, 270,7ff.; *Strom.* II, 15,67: SC 38, 86-87; Orig., *Mt. Com.* 13,10: GCS Origen, X, 207,29). The act of fishing, which implies the extraction of the fish from the place of sin, was consequently adapted to the *resurrection, by which one understands well the christological interpretation of the fish: *Augustine associated the abyss of mortality in which Christ lived with the depth of the waters in which the fish live (*Civ. Dei* 18,23: CCL 48, 613-614) and defined Christ as the "Great Fish," who was the first to emerge from the water and to rise to heaven as our intercessor (*In Ioh. ev. tr.* 17,11: CCL 36, 176,15ff.). *Zeno of Verona considered Christ the fish who was the first to rise from the dead and from whose mouth issued forth two covenants (*Tract.* 1,375). In *Tertullian's writings, the two symbols of the faithful fish and the Christ-fish are found: human beings are indeed the "small fish," that are born in the water acc. to the image of the true fish (the Greek term *ichthys* is used), and they are saved only by staying in the water (*Bapt.* 1,3: CCL 1,1, 277,11); the ocean is here understood, therefore, in a positive sense, a source of life; it is the regenerating water of *baptism. This living water would be interpreted subsequently as the water of the Jordan, in which Christ the fish is born through water and where, after the resurrection, he will provide living food for his disciples (*Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 55,5). In the figurative arts there are many representations of Christ in the Jordan surrounded by fish, and the symbol of the fish appears very frequently in the baptismal fonts (Gambassi, *Pesce*, 255-256).

The symbolism of the fish is not limited, however, to the sacrament of baptism, but is also found in a eucharistic context because it is food: one merely has to reflect on the gospel accounts of the multiplication of the loaves of bread and the fish (Mt 14:15-21; Mk 6:35-44; Lk 9:12-17; Jn 6:11-14 and, again, Mt 15:32-38 and Mk 8:1-9) or to the time when the disciples offered roasted fish to the risen Christ (Lk 24:41-43). Augustine (*Conf.* XIII, 21: CSEL 33, 367,16-18) compared Christ to the fish raised from the ocean depths to become food on the table, a food destined for the land united to God (*Conf.* XIII, 23: CSEL 33, 372,22-23), a theme that would become traditional.

The christological interpretation of the fish hanging on the fishing rod caused some Fathers to detect in it an allusion to the passion of the Lord. Augustine, e.g., commenting upon Jn 21:9, identified the fish placed over the fire with Christ on the cross (*In Ioh. Ev. tr.* 123,3: CCL 36, 676,20), establishing a tradition that would continue long after him.

Among the various fish, the whale deserves special mention, or rather the large sea creature responsible for swallowing *Jonah and spitting him out after only three days. In fact, this large fish was often confused with the ocean monsters, protagonists of myths, or with the biblical dragon that lived in the abyss: in the catacombs of Priscilla, one finds a depiction of Jonah in the jaws of the monster, which looks like a cross between a dragon and a whale. The story of Jonah, already interpreted as a prefiguration of Christ's death and resurrection in Mt 12:39-41, was often invoked by ancient Christian authors. Zeno of Verona, e.g. (*Tractatus* I, 34,8: CChL 22,87), identified in Jonah's sleeping on the ship a symbol of

the mystery of the Lord, declaring that Jonah was an image of Christ; the ship, an image of the cross, inasmuch as it was also made of wood; the sleep, a figure of the passion; the sea, an image of this world, which in vain has fought against God, while the large sea creature is a representation of hell. The whale thus emerged as a symbol of an infernal monster, the devil, and was thus identified with Leviathan (Job 40:25ff.), which is destined to be captured by the Lord (Job 3:8). This is a type of the devil, whom Christ deceived and defeated by his resurrection (Orig., *Hom. Lev.* 8,3: GCS 7, 398).

In a manner analogous to Jonah's whale, the other large sea creatures and monsters found in *Scripture should be identified with the devil (*Ambrose, *Exp. Ev. Lc* IV, 40: CSEL 32/4, 159; *Explan. Ps.* 36,63,3: CSEL 64/6, 121 and *Gregory the Great, *Mor. In Iob* VIII, 23,39: CCL 143, 410); these monsters are defeated when the righteous resist temptation (Augustine, *Adn. in Iob* 26: CSEL 28/3, 563), or when a sinner repents and receives baptism (Gregory the Great, *Mor. in Iob* IV, 9,14: CChL 143,172). Lastly, in *Origen's writings the sea monsters are at times a symbol of wicked thoughts that emerge from the human heart in order to be judged by God (*Hom in Gen* 1,8: GCS Orig. 6,11).

F.J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ. *Das Fischsymbol in frühchristlicher Zeit, 1. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen*, Rom 1910; Id., ΙΧΘΥΣ. *Der heilige Fisch in den antiken Religionen und im Christentum*, 2, Münster 1922; Id., ΙΧΘΥΣ. *Die Fischdenkmäler in der frühchristlichen Plastik, Malerei und Kleinkunst*, 5., Münster 1943; J. Engemann, s.v. *Fisch, Fischer, Fischfang*: RAC 7, 959-1095; E. Sauser, s.v. *Fisch*: LCI 2, 35-39; L. Gambassi, s.v. *Pesce*: TIP, 252-258; M.P. Ciccarese (ed.), *Animali simbolici. Alle origini del bestiario cristiano* I (Agnello - Gufo), Bologna 2002, s.v. Balena/cetaceo, 191-201.

C. Noce

FISHERMAN. Closely connected to the symbolism of the *fish is that of the fisherman, which occupies an important place in the NT: many of the apostles were in fact fishermen, called by Jesus to become "fishers of men" (Mt 4:19; Mk 1:16; Lk 5:10). This passage lies at the foundation of the soteriological interpretation of the catch, understood as the winning of souls for eternal life: *Clement of Alexandria identified the fisherman in this sense, namely, the fisherman who draws in *souls to safety, in one passage *Peter (*Paed.* III, 52,2: GCS I, 266,21-24), in another *Jesus Christ (*Paed.* III, 101,3: GCS I, 291,23-292,28), designated as *the* "fisher of men." The image of Peter, fisher of men, borrowed above all from Mt 17:27, "go to the sea and cast a hook," was a favorite of the Latin West as a symbol of the primacy of Peter. *Augustine (*In Ioh. Ev. tract.* 42,1: CCL 36, 615-616) detected an allegorical meaning in the hook, namely, the Word of God, which was able to draw in the faithful; *Hilary (*Com. Mt* 17,13: SC 258, 72, 1-4) and *Zeno of Verona (*Tract.* I, 37,6: CCL 22, 102, 51) did so as well. Hilary perceived the teaching in which Peter is able to draw martyrs and faithful to God; Zeno, a symbol of evangelical preaching; *Peter Chrysologus distinguished between the hook of sanctity and the net of the teaching that leads the flock of men to *faith (*Serm.* 107,3: CCL 24, 666, 23-24). During the Middle Ages, the popes began to seal their letters with the small hook of the fishermen (*anulus piscatoris*), probably starting from the time of Clement IV, in 1265 (see Rahner, 829-830). *Ambrose developed the image of Peter, fisherman of souls, primarily in his *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*: the amazing act of Peter's miraculous catch (Lk 5:3ff.) consists in the fact that the fish have been captured to live, to emerge from the abyss of the sea to the heights of heaven (*Exp. Ev. sec. Luc.* 4,72: CSEL 32, 4, 176,6-8). The nets, though overloaded, do not allow the boats of the church and Israel to sink: in the end, even the *heretics will be gathered in (*Exp. Ev. sec. Luc.* 4,77-78: CSEL 32, 4, 177,24-178,7).

The incongruity between the death of the fish and the destiny of human life was already noticed by *Origen. Commenting on Mt 13:47-50, i.e., the parable in which the kingdom of heaven is compared to a net cast into the sea that gathers every type of fish, Origen noted how for the fish it is bad to find oneself in the net, but in the parable it is bad not to find oneself in the net, because the net is a symbol of the church, the only place for salvation (*Com. Mt* X, 13: GCS X, 15,30-16,4). The sifting of the bad fish from the net, however, refers to the eschatological *judgment (*Com. Mt* X, 12-13: GCS X, 14,22-15,21). The net, moreover, is a symbol of *Scripture, which is capable of capturing various types of faithful (*Com. Mt* X, 12: GCS X, 13,26–14,20). Elsewhere, Origen interpreted the net as a catch like faith (*Hom. Lev* VII, 7: GCS VII, 392,6-9), although others put it in relation to the teachings of the gospel (Jerome, *In Mt* II, 47-49: SC 242, 290,362-292,374) or with the doctrine of Christ (Hilary, *In Mt* XIII, 9: SC 254, 302,1-9).

On the basis of a christological interpretation of the fish, which we have already seen was common, the fishing rod that achieves the catch in Mt 17:27 became a symbol of the cross (as Ambrose seems to have affirmed; *Hex.* V, 6,15). Moreover, as in the case of the net, it is a symbol of the Word of God (Augustine, *In Ioh. Ev. tract.* 42,1, cit.).

Lastly, more rare is the baptismal interpretation of the fisherman which praised the *apostles inas-

much as they were fishers of men and baptizers, as one finds in *Ephrem's writings (*De epiph.* 7,24-27: CSCO 187, 154); similar occurrences of this association of ideas are also found in the figurative arts (see L. Gambassi, 250).

J. Engemann, s.v. *Fisch. Fischer, Fischfang*: RAC 7, 1969, 959-1095; B. Ott, s.v. *Fischer Fischfang*: LCI 2, 35-39; H. Rahner, *L'ecclesiologia dei Padri*, Rome 1971, 827ff.; L. Gambassi: TIP, 248-252.

C. Noce

FLACCILLA (d. 386). Of Spanish origin, she married the emperor *Theodosius I in 376. With him she had three children: *Arcadius, *Pulcheria and *Honorius. The sources (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, V, 18; Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.*, VII, 6; Gennadius, *De Vir. Ill.* 16) agree in presenting her as dedicated to good works, an adversary of *paganism and of *Arianism. At her death *Gregory of Nyssa delivered the funeral oration (PG 46, 877-892).

DCB 2, 524-525; PLRE I, *Aelia Flavia Flaccilla*, 341-342.

G. Pilara

FLACCILLUS of Antioch (d. before 343). Succeeded *Euphronius on the throne of *Antioch around 330, proponent of the Eusebian *Arians, he participated in 335 in the Council of *Tyre, that condemned *Athanasius; in the same year he was in *Jerusalem on the occasion of the dedication of the church of the Anastasis. In 339 he supported the election of *Gregory the Cappadocian to the Alexandrian see. In 340–341 he was one of the Eastern bishops who, alongside *Eusebius of Nicomedia, were in unfriendly correspondence with *Julius of Rome concerning the Roman council of 341. Also in 341, he presided at the Council of Antioch, at which the Eusebians responded to the Roman synod in an anti-Nicene sense. At this time he contributed to reintegrating the bishop *Eusebius at *Emesa, who had abandoned his seat because of the hostility of the people. He died before 343.

DHGE 17, 310-311; F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IVe-Ve siècle)*, Paris 1905; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim; Fedalto 2, 687.

M. Simonetti

FLAVIAN, martyr. Diverse martyrs carry this name: (1) The first is a Flavian mentioned by Usuardus in his martyrology on 30 January, perhaps a vice-prefect of Rome, a merely legendary personage, of whom no *passio* exists; his tomb was venerated at Civitavecchia (BHL 5857d). (2) The historic reality of Flavian of Ancona, martyred under *Diocletian, is not certain because the ancient martyrologies do not mention him (BHL 6622). (3) A martyr of Bôbîdouna (*Noviodunum* in Moesia [today Isaccea, in Romania] or a city in Africa?) with this name is in the *Mart. syr.* 25 May, a day that suggests a link with the Flavian of BHL 6009. (4) Another, from the time of *Julian the Apostate, would have been prefect of Rome, then exiled to *Aquas Taurinas* (Montefiascone), where a Romanesque church, dedicated to him, was raised. No value can be given to his legend (BHL 1322-1323; LCI 6, 245-246). (5) The last was a companion in martyrdom of *Montanus and Lucius of Carthage (BHL 6009), who died 25 May 259.

BS 5, 879-885, 909.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FLAVIAN I of Antioch (bishop 381–404). He was born in the early years of the 4th c. to a prosperous family. Around 350, although still a simple lay ascetic, he was, together with *Diodore the future bishop of *Tarsus, one of the leaders of the Nicene party at *Antioch, a circumstance in which he showed himself to be very active, organizing liturgical assemblies, introducing the choral singing of the antiphons and proposing the present anti-*Arian formulation of the *Gloria Patri*. He was ordained a priest in 362–363 by *Meletius, whom he succeeded, despite the explicit opposition of *Gregory of Nazianzus. Because of the enduring *schism at Antioch (and also several irregularities in his election), recognition of his ordination was delayed by the West, which was in communion with his rival *Paulinus. As bishop he carried out ceaseless organizing and charitable activities, widely attested in the works of *John Chrysostom, his disciple. His zeal for the church was manifested in a special way during the revolt "of the statues" (February 387), when Flavian, despite his advanced age, did not hesitate to undertake the long voyage to *Constantinople to intercede with *Theodosius I for the pardon of the city, threatened with imperial reprisals. From his works, only a homily *De anathemate* (transmitted under the name of Chrysostom) remains, which concerns the Antiochene schism, as well as a few fragments transmitted by later *florilegia, esp. the *Eranistes* of *Theodoret.

CPG 3430-3436; DHGE 17, 380-386; PG 48, 945-952; F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IVe-Ve siècle)*, Paris 1905; L. Perrone, *Flaviano di Antiochia, Nessun anatema, né per i vivi né*

per i morti! = De non anathematizandis vivis vel defunctis (Testi dei Padri della Chiesa 1), Magnano 1993.

S.J. Voicu

FLAVIAN II of Antioch (d. after 518). *Chalcedonian archbishop and patriarch of *Antioch from 498 to 512, successor to the archbishop Palladius. During his episcopate there was a resurgence of the christological controversies, esp. due to the influence of *monophysite followers of *Philoxenus of Mabbug, who sought to transform into a tool of the anti-Chalcedonian battle the formula of faith of the **Henotikon* (482), developed by *Acacius of Constantinople and sanctioned by the emperor *Zeno in order to bring all the subjects of the empire back to the unity of faith. Having disappointed with his reconciliatory and substantially pro-Chalcedonian attitude the expectations of the Philoxenian monophysites—who expected from him *anathemas against *Nestorius, *Diodore of Tarsus, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, as well as the condemnation of Chalcedonian *dyophysitism and the approval of the *Henotikon*, understood as a refutation of the Chalcedonian "additions" to what had been defined in the preceding councils of *Nicaea, *Constantinople and *Ephesus—Flavian fell victim to the defamatory campaign and the ferocious hostility of his adversaries, and after various vicissitudes and some temporary success (such as that of the Synod of Sidon in 511) he was deposed in 512 and replaced with the monophysite bishop *Severus, and finally exiled by imperial order to *Petra (Arabia Petrea, in the area of the present Ma'an). When the emperor *Justin I, after having ended the Acacian schism, restored to their thrones the deposed Chalcedonian bishops, he put on the chair of Antioch, in place of Severus, not Flavian, but a certain Paul: probably at that time Flavian had already died. From him no writings are extant.

R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945; A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Louvain 1963; DHGE 17, 386-388; A. Fliche - V. Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, It. ed., IV, Turin [3]1977; Patrologia V (cf. index).

S. Leanza

FLAVIAN of Chalon-sur-Saône (d. 591). Referendary of Gontran, the king of Burgundy, he succeeded Agricola on the episcopal throne at his death (580). He took part in the councils of Mâcon (581 and 585), *Lyons (583), Valence (585) and in the *baptism of Chlotar, son of Fredegund, at Nemours. The hymn *Versus ad mandatum in cena Domini* is attributed to him. He founded or restored the abbey of S. Peter at Chalon.

CPL 2014; PLRE III, *A. Flavius*, 487; A.S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns*, Cambridge 1922, 201-204.

G. Pilara

FLAVIAN of Constantinople (d. 449). A member of the clergy of *Constantinople, he was elected patriarch there in 446, at the death of *Proclus, and a little later, in 448, found himself confronted by the beginning of the *monophysite crisis, provoked by the preaching of the monk *Eutyches in the capital itself. The latter was accused before Flavian by *Eusebius of Dorylaeum, and the patriarch convoked a local council which condemned Eutyches on 18 November. On this occasion, Flavian affirmed that Christ is of two natures in a single **hypostasis* and a single **prosopon*. But the immediate reaction to the condemnation, headed by *Dioscorus of Alexandria and favored by the emperor *Theodosius, led to the convocation of an ecumenical council at *Ephesus in 449, which was carefully prepared in favor of Eutyches. In this context, *Leo the Great sent a dogmatic letter to Flavian, the **Tomus ad Flavianum*, which would become the foundational document of Chalcedonian Christology. At the time, however, it did not provide any help to Flavian, who, accused by Dioscorus on 8 August, was deposed from his charge. In the tumult that followed, while trying to escape, he was seized and badly beaten by his adversaries. Imprisoned, he died three days later while he was en route for exile. His orthodoxy was recognized two years later at the Council of *Chalcedon, which rehabilitated his memory.

CPG III, 5930-5938; DHGE 17, 390-396; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, Philadelphia 1984, 763-770; Patrologia V, 36-37; BBKL II, 52; S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-ecclesiastici in Oriente nella tarda antichità. Il II Concilio di Efeso (449)*, Madrid 2001.

M. Simonetti

FLAVIAN of Philippi. Bishop of *Philippi in the 5th c., Pope *Celestine I sent him a letter on the occasion of the Council of *Ephesus (431) to inform him that he had entrusted to *Cyril of Alexandria the task of preparing the case against *Nestorius (PL 50, 465). At the council, Flavian replaced *Rufus of Thessalonica, hindered from participating (Mansi IV, 1280 and 1305), and to this fact is probably due the title of archbishop, erroneously attributed to him by *Liberatus (*Breviar.* 5: PL 68, 977). He had an im-

portant role in the condemnation of Nestorius. He was among the signers of both the edict of deposition of the heretic (Mansi IV, 1212), and of the conciliar letter to the clergy and people of *Constantinople (Mansi IV, 1304); his name appears also in the list of the orthodox bishops for the emperors *Theodosius II and *Valentinian III (Mansi IV, 1425). The Nestorians tried in vain to win him to their side.

DHGE 17, 397-398; A. Fliche - V. Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, It. ed., IV, Turin [3]1977; L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il Concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974; A. Crabbe, *The Invitation List to the Council of Ephesus and Metropolitan Hierarchy in the Fifth Century*: JTS 32 (1981) 369-400; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976 (cf. index).

S. Leanza

FLAVIANUS, Virius Nicomachus (d. after 394). Related to the *pagan Symmachus, he shared with him the attempt to restore declining paganism in the 2nd half of the 4th c. He fulfilled high public charges. In 376, as vicar of *Africa, acc. to the testimony of *Augustine (*Ep.* 87,8), he favored the *Donatists and for this was recalled by the emperor *Gratian. He was appointed *praefectus praetorio Italiae Illyrici et Africae* by Theodosius in the years 390–392 and 393–394, because of his fame as a scholar (he translated the *Life of *Apollonius of Tyana* by Philostratus into Latin) and historian (he composed *Annales*, which have not survived). He was consul around 393–394. He supported the rebellion of *Eugenius (Soz., *HE* 7,22,5), from whom he obtained the restoration of the *Altar of Victory (Paul Med., *Vita Ambr.* 26) and the restitution of the goods confiscated from the pagan temples. In 393–394 he renewed pagan worship at Rome. He died in 394 in the Alps in a military action against Theodosius, after having threatened to turn the church of *Milan into a cattle shed, once having reached there, and to force the clergy to enter the army (Paul Med., *Vita Ambr.* 31). It has been hypothesized that the *Carmen contra paganos* refers to him (for the bibl. cf. Patrologia III, 316-317).

PWK 6, 2506-2511; PLRE I, 347-349; PCBE 1, 827.

A. Pollastri

FLAVIUS CLEMENS, consul (1st c). Son of Titus Flavius Sabinus, he belonged to the *gens Flavia* and was the cousin of the emperors *Titus and *Domitian. His two sons were designated by Domitian as eventual successors to the empire (Suet., *Domitian* 15). He was consul in the year 95. Dio Cassio accused him of atheism and of following Jewish customs (*Hist. Rom.* LXVII, 14,1-2), and *Suetonius accused him of indifference and political inertia (*Domitian* 15). Such accusations, frequently formulated against Christians, would suggest that Flavius Clemens was a Christian. His consular mandate having ceased, he was condemned to death for religious reasons, which do not exclude those of political jealousy. His wife Flavia Domitilla, whose name is given to a Christian cemetery situated on his property, was sent into exile on the island of Ventotene. In the same period other citizens were exiled, deprived of their property or condemned to death. Suetonius hastens to note that the crime committed against Flavius Clemens and his family accelerated the end of the emperor, who was assassinated a short time later (*Domitian* 15.17). A later tradition identified the consul with Pope *Clement of Rome, but there are no documents to justify such an identification, despite their being contemporaries. One could suppose that the latter belonged to a family of freedmen of Flavius Clemens.

A. Fliche - V. Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, I, Turin [3]1958, 376-377, 524-535; G. Bardy, *Clément* (Titus Flavius): DHGE XII, 1083; BBKL 7, 503-519.

E. Peretto

FLESH. In the language of the Septuagint, the Greek term σάρξ was often adopted as an equivalent to the Hebrew *basar*, meaning the human being in its corporeity and earthly existence, frail and ephemeral, and thus implicitly contrasted with the divine being and its properties of holiness and eternity, or contrasted with the angelic being in its immaterial characteristics. From the time of Epicurus, poets and pagan *philosophers used σάρξ to designate the body, but already in the moral language of late *Stoicism, esp. in Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, σάρξ took on a strongly negative connotation, indicating almost a disdain for the person's corporeal dimension, in opposition to the *logos* (*ratio*). In Latin also, *caro*, which translates σάρξ, is pregnant with negativity (cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 74,16; *Ad Marc.* 24,5). Among Christian authors, the anthropological meaning of the biblical *basar* prevailed in reference to the human person, accentuating his corporeity, often in contexts that claim the divine origin of the human body against *gnostic interpretations in general and *Marcionite in particular (cf. Ignatius, *Rom.* 2,1; Tatian, *Orat.* 13,1; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V, 6,1; Clem. Al., *Strom.* III, 9,65,2; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* I, 29,1; *An.* 27,5; *Res.* 49,2; Novatian, *Trin.* X, 55; Lactantius, *Div.*

Inst. IV, 25,16; *Ira Dei* 1,5). Nevertheless, the negative dimension of the two terms σάρξ and *caro* tends to be reinforced in reference to the tendencies of the human body toward *evil, under the suggestion esp. of Pauline and Johannine texts (cf. ps.-Barnabas, *Ep.* 10,9; *Ep. Diogn.* 10,9; Clem. Al., *Paedag.* 1, 6,36,3; *Strom.* II, 41,4; Origen, *Princ.* III, 4,4; Tertullian, *Mart.* 1,1; *An.* 40,2; Novatian, *Trin.* XXIX, 170; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* VI, 13,5-10).

The term σάρξ/*caro* was particularly developed in *Christology, under the inspiration of NT statements (cf. Jn 1:14; 1 Jn 4:2; Rom 9:5) in which it designates the human nature of Jesus Christ; it is particularly frequent in contexts aimed at asserting the reality of Jesus' human body against *Docetic interpretations: it is enough to think of *Tertullian's *De carne Christi* and of the formulae it uses to designate the *incarnation, such as *carnem accipere* (6,5), *carnem suscipere* (17,3), *carnem gestare* (5, 1; 18,7), near or equivalent to Greek formulae (cf. Clem. Al., *Paedag.* III, 1,2,2; *Strom.* VI, 16,137,4; VII, 2,7,5). Among these, particularly significant is the christological formula κατὰ πνεῦμα κατὰ σάρκα (= *secundum spiritum / secundum carnem)*, inspired by Rom 1:3 and 9:5, in which σάρξ/*caro* designates weak and fragile human nature as compared with Christ's divine nature (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III, 22,1; IV, 4,1; *Epid.* 3; Hippolytus, *Ben. Iac.* 16,27; *C. Noet.* 16; Tertullian, *Carn. Chr.* 22,3; *Adv. Iud.* 13,11; Cyprian, *Test.* II, 8; 11,11; Novatian, *Trin.* XVII, 95). In christological formulae until the *Arian crisis, σάρξ/*caro* indicates human nature as a whole. Only beginning with Arian exegesis could the σάρξ/*caro* of the christological formulae be used to emphasize the purely corporeal aspect of the humanity assumed by Christ. This limiting interpretation would be reinforced by *Apollinaris of Laodicea; but against the Arian and Apollinarian interpretations, the *orthodox tradition confirmed the anthropological meaning of the biblical tradition to claim the full humanity of Jesus Christ (cf. Athanasius, *Tom.* 7; Basil, *Ep.* 236, 1; 261,3; Didymus, *Heb.* 1, 6; Theodore Mops., *In Jo.* 1, 14).

C.H. Lindijer, *Het Begrip Sarx bij Paulus*, Assen 1952; J.N. Seventer, *Paul und Seneca*, Leiden 1961, 80-81; R. Braun, *"Deus Christianorum." Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, Paris 1962, 300-304; V. Loi, *Lattanzio nella storia del linguaggio e del pensiero teologico pre-niceno*, Zürich 1970, 208-210; 221-224; ThLL III, 484,56ff., 488,3; DSp 2,439-443; GLNT XI, 1266-1338 (TDNT 7, 98-151); Lampe 1224-1226.

V. Loi - B. Amata

FLIGHT

I. Flight from persecution - II. Flight from the world.

I. Flight from persecution. According to the witness of the gospels, just as Jesus foretold his own passion (cf. Mt 16:21ff.; 17:13; 17:22-23, etc.), he also predicted *persecutions for his followers (cf. Mt 10:16ff.; Lk 12:8ff.; Jn 15:18ff., etc.) in terms such that this does not appear as an exceptional event for Christian communities. From the first centuries, how to act when faced with persecution had been discussed, and, as is natural, the figure and events of Christ and his first disciples were considered. At the beginning of his earthly life Jesus was removed from the danger of death and led by Joseph and Mary to Egypt (cf. Mt 2:14ff.); during his public ministry he distanced himself from those who wished to kill him (cf. Mt 14:13; Lk 9:10). Also in his speeches, he advised his disciples, when they were persecuted in one city, to flee to another (cf. Mt 10:23; 24:16, etc.). When he reached the moment of his passion, however, and was confronted with those who came to arrest him, he did not flee nor did he agree to be defended with violence (cf. Mt 26:47). The conduct and teaching of the Christians who belonged to the Great Church followed along these same lines. The apostles, including *Peter and *Paul, were forced to flee to escape the traps set by enemies (cf. Acts 9:29-30; 14:5-6; 17:10-15).

Similar cases were not lacking in later times. A little after the middle of the 2nd c., as the persecution grew more intense, *Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, accepted the counsel of those among his followers who insisted that he escape from the city until—face to face with those who had come to take him—he felt he had to stay in order that "the will of God be done" (cf. *Mart. Pol.* 7). In 177, in the face of the test that was about to engulf the community of *Lyons and *Vienne, in *Gaul, "the grace of God . . . allowed the weak to escape" (Eus., *HE* 5,1,5,6). The examples could be multiplied easily. It is sufficient to recall again the case of *Cyprian, bishop of *Carthage, who, after the promulgation of the general edict of Decius against the Christians (250), took refuge not far from the city, not without provoking criticism within his church, to which he responded himself: "If the crown is a gift of the goodness of God, it cannot be received except at the appointed hour. Whoever retreats for a time, while remaining faithful to Christ, does not deny his *faith, but awaits his hour" (*De lapsis* 10; consider also the defense of his conduct that his biographer *Pontius makes in the *Vita Cypriani* 7-8). It is not by chance, furthermore, that the edict of Decius foresaw the confiscation of goods

for whoever fled. It is known that, a few years later, during the following persecution of *Valerian, the bishop of Carthage was first of all exiled and later martyred (258). Flight from persecution therefore was permitted, but certainly not imposed: its appropriateness depended on the circumstances, on the position that each person held in the community and above all on the discernment of the will of God.

Likewise important, e.g., are the words that Augustine addresses to his clergy in a letter of 428–429—years in which *Genseric, at the head of the *Arian *Vandals, had passed into Africa and had begun to vex the Christians: flight is permitted when the priestly ministry is not indispensable to the *salus* (the salvation) of the faithful, also for the purpose of preserving oneself to benefit the church in quieter times. If later it should be necessary to decide who must stay and who flee, "may the lot put an end to disputation" (Pr 18:18), because God judges better than humans (cf. *Ep.* 228,9ff.). Spontaneously offering oneself to the authorities is something the church discourages; in fact, acc. to the expressions of *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV, 10), the Lord does not want a person to be the cause of his own death nor of the crime committed by the one who persecutes and kills him. Such a disciplinary indication takes on its full meaning when one keeps in mind that in the first centuries persons were not lacking who, exalting martyrdom, reached the point of proposing it to the faithful as an obligation. An echo of such a position is found in the treatise of *Tertullian under the title *De fuga in persecutione*; there, contradicting the opinion expressed in the *De patientia* (13) and in the *Ad uxorem* (1,3), Tertullian maintains that flight from persecution is not licit because it conflicts with the will of God and becomes therefore a renunciation of God who sends persecution to confirm the faith of his followers (even if the devil has a hand in it).

In the light of this principle Tertullian rejects every objection, interpreting in a restrictive way the passages of the sacred *Scripture that oppose it. This idea is very much affected by the influence of *Montanism and also later will have success; the Great Church will continue to oppose it, considering flight from persecution illicit and cause of *sin only when it involves denying the faith or violating a duty.

H. Leclercq, s.v. *Fuite de la persécution*: DACL 5, 2660-2684. On the persecutions of the early centuries, in general, cf. J. Vogt, s.v. *Christenverfolgung*: RAC 2, 1159-1207; W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, Oxford 1965; R. Freudenberger: TRE 8 (1981) 23-29 (within the borders of the Roman Empire) (bibl. on pp. 28-29.); K. Schäferdiek - R. Freudenberger: TRE 8 (1981) 29-35 (outside the Roman Empire, among the Goths, the Sassanids, the Arabs, the Islamics) (bibl. on pp. 34-35), s.v. *Christenverfolgungen*. On *De fuga in persecutione* of Tertullian: cf. I. Marra, critical ed., Turin 1932; J. Thierry, with intr., tr. into Flemish and comm., *Tertullianus de fuga in persecutione*, Hilversum 1941.

P. Siniscalco

II. Flight from the world. With the expressions *fuga mundi*, or *fuga saeculi,* the early Latin Christians understood the renunciation and separation from worldly goods for the purpose of encountering God in a more intense and exclusive manner. From a certain perspective, this conduct answers the essential challenges of the gospel message: "If anyone would come after me," Jesus says to his disciples, "let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it. For what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life?" (Mt 16:24-26). One aspect therefore of the *fuga mundi* applies to all Christians, while other dimensions have to do with the environment of individual vocations, ever since ancient times. For an exhaustive treatment of the theme it would be necessary to begin from pre-Christian times, examining the relevamt evidence from the Greco-Roman world, the Jewish world and above all the sacred *Scripture; furthermore, it would be appropriate to consider the phenomena and conceptions concerning "flight from the world" in the patristic era both along a chronological line and in geographic areas, distinguishing East from West. For a profile of the theme, articulated in this way, see Alszeghy (*Fuite du monde,* DSp 5, 1575-1599; bibl. at coll. 1592, 1596, 1599). Here we will limit ourselves to identifying some traits of the ideal and practice of "flight from the world," as they are proposed in the first centuries of our era among the Christians. To understand their attitude in facing the *mundus* (κόσμος) it is perhaps useful to keep in mind a twofold distinction: the first (*a*) concerning the meaning attributed to the term "world"; the second (*b*) the meaning given to the term "flight," or better yet, "separation."

a. World indicates, among other things, the visible world, created by God, the great mass of the universe having an order and a harmony perceived by the eyes and the intelligence of human beings. But from the NT (cf., e.g., Jn 1:9-10; 14:30; Col 2:8, etc.), the word takes on a completely negative connotation: "this world" is opposed to "the world to come" and to "eternal life," and therefore becomes the name and symbol of that part of humanity that has forgotten the Creator and lives without any transcendent perspective; it is identified with idolatry,

with *sin, with all that is different and distant from God. In this second sense, every Christian is called to flee the "world," acc. to the unanimous and incessant warning of the patristic writings. "Do not have Jesus Christ on the lips and the world in the heart," warns *Ignatius of Antioch in his letter to the Romans (7,1). A separation is therefore necessary from what is worldly; various figures, whether from the OT or imaginary, quickly became familiar in ancient Christian literature and assisted in making this necessity clear. Think of the people of Israel in pilgrimage in search of their homeland; think of the patriarchs, who were their leaders, "types" of a pilgrimage proposed to every person who wished to reach perfection. "Hear my prayer, Lord, . . . for I am an outsider, a stranger like all my fathers," says the psalmist (Ps 38:13), and Ambrose (*De Abr.* II, 62), one among the numerous voices who could just as well be cited, comments, "Anyone indeed who is a pilgrim, is a citizen of Heaven; anyone, on the other hand, who thinks to fix all the substance of the soul in this world and rejoices in the acquisition of earthly inheritance is excluded from the kingdom of God."

b. No less important for the reflection and for the discipline elaborated by the ecclesiastical pastors and writers of the first centuries is the meaning attributed to such a *separation*. In broad strokes, the common direction found upon investigating the texts is sufficiently homogeneous: although not denying the positive value of the world, as a creature of God, the Christian must be inwardly separated from it. One must not leave the world materially, but with the spirit, *Origen observes (*In Exod.* 3,3).

Some vocations demand also the material renunciation of goods; thus, particularly from the end of the 3rd c. on, the spiritual flight of the soul is realized also by seeking refuge in the desert. This explains the flowering of hermitism and of *cenobitism and the importance assumed by the monk in the religious world of the time. He was the example par excellence of one who has left the world with the body as well as with the heart, without forgetting the world, but being present to it in other ways.

The case of *Anthony, monk of the Egyptian desert, as presented by *Athanasius in the *Vita Antonii*, is emblematic in this regard. In this sense fleeing from the world acc. to the Christian vision is not purely natural, nor does it find its realization only in the effort of the individual; it is a supernatural event that is accomplished with the help of God and that begins with the mystical union of the person with Christ: this is a useful element to better evaluate similarities and differences between the Christian conception and the analogous *Platonic conception, and esp. the *Neoplatonic one (*Plotinus frequently affirms that the height of perfection consists in the fleeing of the individual toward the One: see, e.g., *Enn.* VI, 9,11; I, 6,6; V, 1,6 etc.).

At the end of 4th c., the golden age of patristics, *Augustine, particularly in the *Confessions*, distinguishes the terms *mundus* and *saeculum* in a meaningful way, assigning them to two different notional fields: the first to the field of space, the second to the field of time. If all Christians must renounce the "world of sin," none of them, not even the monk, must abandon the world inasmuch as it is created by God. The monk, rather, renounces a particular aspect of worldly life that is in itself legitimate. Under the urgent pressure of the *eschatological spirit, he does not apply himself to assure the development and the earthly fortune of the societies in which he may take part. "In this he follows Christ, not only in the intentions of the life of the Lord—things to which all are held—but also in his state of life: without taking a wife or fathering children, without hoping for a 'position' or a 'career,' without having possessions."

The monks, therefore, renounce only certain aspects of the life that passes through time (the Greek equivalent of *saeculum* is *aiōn*) (L.M.J. Venheijen, *"Mundus" et "saeculum,"* 682); such renunciation, on the other hand, every Christian without distinction is called to realize—not an effective separation, but certainly an affective one.

RAC 1, 193-204 (*Aiōn*); DSp 5, 1575-1599. For the *De fuga saeculi* of Ambrose, see, among others, H. Savon, *Saint Ambroise devant l'exégèse de Philon le Juif*, I, Paris 1977, 329ff. and relevant notes, II, 145ff.; F. Martinez, *L'ascétisme chrétien pendant les trois premiers siècles de l'Église*, Paris 1913; H. Koch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Askese und des Mönchtums in der alten Kirche*, Tübingen 1933; L.M.J. Verheijen, *"Mundus" et "saeculum" dans les Confessions de Saint Augustin*: SMSR 38 (1967) (= Studi in onore di A. Pincherle), 665-682; A.P. Orbán, *Les dénominations du monde chez les premiers auteurs chrétiens*, Nijmegen 1970; M. Ruiz Jurado, *El concepto de "mundo" en los tres primeros siglos de la Iglesia*: EstEcl 51 (1976) 79-94.

P. Siniscalco

FLOOD, Universal (iconography). While the episode of the flood (Gen 6–8) in ancient Christian art was most often depicted with the simple iconographical scheme of a human figure (*Noah) leaning half out of an ark—expressed most schematically as a square box—there were also more narrative formulations of the event, which sought to depict the unfolding of the action, and sometimes the setting of the cataclysm in a realistic and dramatic way. If we rule out a disputed mid-4th c. *painting in the

catacomb of via D. Compagni at Rome (Nestori, 72, n. 2) in which some would see this episode (A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960, 47, pl. 93), the only figurative evidence of the flood in narrative schemes is found in biblical miniatures. This can be found in the Cotton Genesis (5th-6th c.), as we can gather from the narthex *mosaic of St. Mark's basilica, Venice, which punctiliously follows the lost miniature original (Bianchi Bandinelli, *La composizione del diluvio*, pl. 32,2); similarly, in the Ashburnham Pentateuch (7th c.; K. Weitzmann, *Manuscrits gréco-romains et paléochrétiens*, New York 1977, fig. 45); and finally, also and esp. in the Vienna Genesis (6th c.), where the spatiality of the composition—in which ark, people and animals are depicted in full perspective, swirling and dramatically immersed in the waters—has led to the suggestion of an archetype from the Hellenistic tradition in mural painting or in mosaic, datable to the 3rd c. AD (Bianchi Bandinelli, *La composizione del diluvio*, 66-77, pl. 30).

R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *La composizione del diluvio nella Genesi di Vienna:* MDAI(R) 62 (1955), 66-67 (see also Bandinelli, *Archeologia e cultura*, Rome ²1979, 328-343); L. Kötzsche Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe an der via Latina in Rom. Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie der alttestamentlichen Wandmalereien:* JbAC Erg. 4 (1976) 51-54.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

FLORENTIUS (1st half of 5th c.). Minister under *Theodosius II and then under *Marcian. He held the highest posts of the empire: in 422 he was named *praefectus urbis Constantinopolitanae*, then prefect of the praetorium of the East in the period 428–430 and again in 438–439. As imperial representative he participated in 448 and 449 in the permanent synod of *Constantinople and in 451 in the Council of *Chalcedon (ACO II, 1,1,55; 138-139; 145; 171; 175-176; 2,69; 85; 138).

PLRE II, *Fl. Florentius* 7, 478-480; DNP 4, *Flavius Florentius* 4, 565; A. Grillmeier - H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, II, Würzburg 1954, 214-216.

G. Pilara

FLORENTIUS of Strasbourg (6th c.). Probably of Gallic-Roman origin, Florentius was the successor of St. Arbogast in the see of Strasbourg in the last 3rd of the 6th c. and died 3 April. As a great missionary, it is said that he founded the monastery of St. Thomas in Strasbourg and the monastery of Niederhaslach next to Roman ruins. At first buried in the cloister of the future chapter of St. Thomas, he was later transferred to Niederhaslach 7 November 810, the day that became his liturgical feast day. The most ancient *Vita* was written after 1160 by a canon of Haslach (BHL 3045). Florentius had supposedly been a Scot who came with some disciples to Alsace to lead a hermitic life there.

BHL 3043-3046f; BS 5, 858-859; BBK 16, 496-497; M. Barth, *Der heilige Florentius, Bischof von Strassburg*, Strasbourg 1952.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FLORIAN. There are two *martyrs with this name: one from Bologna, without any historical attachments, who is celebrated 17 December (BHL 3053b, 3053d); the other, of Lorch (Austria), is mentioned by the *Mart. hier.* 4 May. The report was enlarged probably during the Carolingian period on the basis of a *passio* of the same time which, almost certainly based on that of St. *Irenaeus of Sirmium, has Florian die during the *persecution of *Diocletian. The martyr Florian was then thrown in the river Enns with a stone around his neck (BHL 3054-3061). Recent excavations below St. Lawrence at Lorch have brought to light a tomb, probably belonging to the forty martyrs mentioned in the *Passio* of Florian; obviously these were already venerated in the 4th c.

BS 5, 934-940; BBKL 2, 64; LCI 6, 250-254; E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* 1, Innsbruck 1935, 30-32; R. Sörries, *Frühchristliche Reliquienfunde und Wallfahrtsstätten im Alpen-Donau-Raum*: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City-Münster 1995, 1187-1188; R. Harreither, *Der hl. Florian. Der einzige namentlich bekannte Martyrer in Noricum Ripense*, in R. Bratoz (ed.), *Westillyricum und Nordostitalien in der spätrömischen Zeit*, Ljubljana 1996, 235-262; R. Zinnhobler, *Der heilige Florian und seine Gefährten*, in *1000 Jahre Ostarrîchi. Seine christliche Vorgeschichte*, Innsbruck-Vienna 1997, 23-30.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FLORIAN, abbot (5th-6th c.). The little information we have of him comes from two letters preserved in the collection *Epistolae Austrasicae*. Baptized by *Ennodius, disciple of *Caesarius of Arles (*Ep. Austras.* 5,4-5: CCL 117, p. 412), he entered into the monastery of *Romenum*, in Milanese territory, whose abbot Theodotus was his teacher in the comprehension of the *Scriptures. *Arator wrote him in 544 to praise his culture and his library (*Ep. ad Florianum*: CSEL 72, pp. 1-2); also Ennodius (d. 521) sent him letters (MGH AA 7, pp. 23-24). The two letters of Florian were directed to *Nicetius of Trier. The first requested prayers for his bishop Dacius of *Milan (d. 552); the second solicited an intervention

with King Theobald, of Austrasia, to respect the oath made in his name with respect to the *fideles* of the island of Comacina. Perhaps a third letter to Nicetius (CCL 117, pp. 448-449) and an *epigram (cf. CPL 518) are also his.

CPL 518; 1059; 1504; Verzeichnis, 476; CPPM 2, 187; PL 72, 917; PL 45, 1857-1858; PL 51, 149-152; CCL 117, 413-416; MGH AA 7, LIX-LX (ep. 1), p. 116 ep. 3; DBI 48, 336-338; J. Jenal, *Italia ascetica atque monastica*, Stuttgart 1995, I, 144-156; P. Radiciotti, *Note su Floriano*: RFIC 126 (1998) 183-188; PCBE 2, 845-6.

A. Di Berardino

FLORILEGIA. The problems associated with the patristic florilegia are very complex. Not only are critical editions of many of them lacking, but also it is often difficult to establish their provenance and their influences. An ample introduction, very instructive in the field of the pre-Byzantine literature, is found in the now classic work of A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im glauben der Kirche*. Basing his work on the research of H. Chadwick and above all of M. Richard, the great expert of patristic *Christology presents the christological florilegia without completely ignoring other forms of the anthology. The following exposition will follow in his footsteps. Although bringing a minor simplification to the question, it is perhaps useful to begin from the distinction between dogmatic florilegia, spiritual florilegia and biblical *catena. Post-Chalcedonian authors adhere to the patristic tradition, including their treatment of other literary genres. Starting from this presupposition, Grillmeier refers to the catalogs of *heresies and the collections of definitions and aporias. Almost all the other literary forms could be added, including sermons (cf. B. Studer, *Storia della Teologia*, 583-598). In these writings, however, the citations are more or less exact, and are mostly presented without the name of the author. *John of Damascus, e.g., integrated into his *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* long passages from his predecessors without specifying from where he took them. His work, despite being obviously of a compilatory character, is not therefore to be considered technically a patristic florilegia (against Grillmeier, 87). This article will discuss only florilegia proper; therefore catenae also will be omitted.

In dogmatic florilegia the compiler reunites a more or less considerable series of passages (*testimonia*), indicating their provenance explicitly (name of the author, title of the work, perhaps the chapter) to refute doctrinal errors and demonstrate the truths of the orthodox faith in virtue of the authority of the recognized authors. This literary genre had very deep roots (*see* *argumentation, patristic). From the beginning Christian life has been oriented by the *Tradition, a normative principle inherited from *Judaism and reinterpreted later in the light of the Greco-Roman cultural and religious traditions. This tradition, recognized quickly as apostolic, was brought little by little into relation with individuals endowed with a certain authority, or with the "ecclesiastic fathers" (*Eusebius), i.e., therefore, with the synodal fathers of *Nicaea. But only in the 4th c. was a theological method developed that leaned explicitly on the authority of the fathers, the so-called patristic argument. This evolution is explained not only by the exigencies of the *Arian controversy, but also by the influence of Judeo-Christian *exegesis and from common conventions in literary, philosophical and legal fields. The great promoters of this new theological method were, as is well known, Eusebius (*HE* 1,1,4), *Basil, *Augustine and *Cyril of Alexandria (cf. Graumann). The latter in particular is to be considered in this place, precisely because the later christological controversies, in which the patristic florilegia reached their perfection, in large measure turned his theology around. Cyril, in fact, was the principal pioneer of Eastern patristic argumentation. Inspired perhaps by a collection in which *Eusebius of Dorylaeum had reunited some texts of *Nestorius (CPG 5940), he composed five florilegia, four of which have been preserved. In one of these, the so-called *Florilegium ephesinum* presented to the participants at the Synod of *Ephesus, Cyril opposed the testimonies of the Fathers to the opinions of Nestorius in order to make Nestorius's heresies obvious (CPG 8675, 9). His florilegia constitute the basis for the *monophysite florilegia. The longest among these have been added to the writings that *Timothy Aelurus launched between 458 and 477 against the decisions of *Chalcedon (CPG 5475).

The Antiochene adversaries of Cyril immediately took up the weapon of the florilegia. *Theodoret added to his *Pentalogos* against Cyril a florilegium preserved only in Latin (CPG 6215). From a similar florilegium of *Andrew of Samosata only the list of names of the cited authors is known. Theodoret himself published in 447 in his *Eranistes* a larger florilegium, which became the basis for the *dyophysite florilegium (CPG 6217). In the *Acts* of the Council of Chalcedon this florilegium of Theodoret is found together with the first florilegium translated into Greek of *Leo I (CPG 9021; cf. also Leo, *Ep.* 165,10). The florilegia enlarged by Theodoret (CPG 6215) in defense of the council were published later, as well as a collection of citations of Cyril (ed. Hes-

pel) which *Severus of Antioch examined critically and refuted in his *Philalethes* (CPG 7023) during his stay in Constantinople (508–511) (cf. A. Grillmeier 2/2, 21ff.; 28-31).

After the edict of *Zeno (482) the dogmatic florilegium was employed as the principal weapon of theological controversy both by monophysites and by dyophysites. But only one Alexandrian florilegium related to this period has been preserved. After 520 *Leontius of Byzantium and *Justinian gave life to florilegia independent of the preceding ones. Leontius added a florilegium to each of the three books *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* (CPG 6813). These and other florilegia of Leontius had a great influence on later dyophysite florilegia, e.g., on that of *De sectis* (CPG 6823). The monophysite florilegia, on the other hand, have been preserved only in *Syriac. The most famous is that of Severus of Antioch (CPG 7023). In this new phase of the christological controversy, however, a methodological novelty is also encountered. The criticism of the received texts becomes more acute (cf. B. Studer, in *Storia Teol.* 586-587). On the one hand, ever more numerous florilegia appear compiled only secondhand; against this tendency Severus protested strongly, denouncing this often superficial use of patristic passages (cf. CPG 7022 and 7024). On the other hand, the most expert scholars of the time discussed the authenticity of the reported citations. The necessity of this criticism was imposed when certain *falsifications of the *Apollinarians were brought to light, which had already entered into the tradition of the florilegia before 500, a time in which they were generally composed on the basis of a personal reading of patristic texts. The most relevant criticism of these falsifications was attributed to Leontius of Byzantium, but does not belong to him (CPG 6817). The new conflicts in the 7th c. led to the composition of florilegia against the *monothelites. The largest is that composed around 646 by *Maximus the Confessor (CPG 7697, 15). Such antimonothelite florilegia were also used in the discussions held at the synods of the Lateran in 649 (cf. CPG 9402) and of Constantinople (cf. CPG 9429). Finally, the iconoclast controversy gave the occasion for a redaction of florilegia in favor of the veneration of images. Thus *John of Damascus completed all three discourses on *images with patristic florilegia (cf. CPG 8045).

In the 7th c. the attempt to present systematically all the doctrine of the faith with patristic citations finally appears. An author, who has remained anonymous up to today, but who without doubt was part of the environment of Maximus, published around the years 660–685 the *Doctrina Patrum*, which was later used by, among others, John of Damascus (cf. Kotter 1.2.4). In the West, however, collections of patristic *testimonia* are encountered that did not intend so much to demonstrate the validity of synodal decisions, as much as affirm that the Catholic exegetes had constantly preserved the true faith.

Augustine attests this form of recourse to the authority of the *tractatores catholici* in the two letters in which he discusses the vision of God (*Ep.* 147-8). More important is his fairly free method of referring to the patristic *testimonia* which he opposes to *Pelagius and his followers (cf. *Nat. gr.* 61,71; 65,78; *C. ep. Pelag.* IV, 10,27-11,31; *C. Iul.* II, 10,33-37: only names of authors, without texts). To defend his interpretation of biblical texts, esp. of passages from the letters to Romans and Galatians, Augustine bases himself above all on African and Roman traditions, represented by *Cyprian and *Ambrose. The spiritual florilegia of the Eastern tradition, on the other hand, which include explicit citations of the Bible, the Fathers and also of profane authors, were compiled with a view toward Christian life, *asceticism and spiritual progress; such florilegia, however, were composed only starting from the 8th c. (cf. M. Richard, DSp 475-6). Nevertheless, a first class, defined by Richard as "Damascene," constitute a later development of the *Sacra Parallela*, attributed precisely to John of Damascus. This three-part work on God, on man, and on *virtues and vices can be reconstructed from later florilegia and *excerpta*. In fact, collections of patristic sayings prior to the ascetic works elaborated after 800 should be mentioned (cf. B. Studer, in *Storia Teol.* 593-594). Thus, Antiochus, a monk of Mar Saba, wrote pandects in 150 *kephalaia* around 620, which, however, constitute rather a continuous exposition of spiritual themes of the Fathers (CPG 7843; cf. M. Richard, DSp 499). Someone after Maximus the Confessor composed the *Capita de caritate*, which presents numerous sayings of the Fathers, slightly modified (CPG 7693). John of Damascus, for his part, added a florilegium to his tract *De sacris ieiuniis* (CPG 8051). *John of Scythopolis, of the 1st half of the 6th c., left the first text of *Scolii* to the writings of ps.-*Dionysius (CPG 6852). Following his footsteps, Maximus the Confessor, in the *Ambigua* (CPG 7705) and in other writings, interpreted passages of the same ps.-Dionysius and of *Gregory of Nazianzus. This method of study adopted from the Fathers led quite naturally to the patristic florilegia of the 8th-9th centuries.

F. Diekamp (ed.), *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*, Münster 1907, 2nd ed. 1981; M. Richard, *Les florilèges diphysites du Ve et du VIe siècle*, in *Chalkedon* I, Freiburg 1951,

721-748 (cf. the numerous other studies of the same author); M. Richard, *Florilèges spirituels grecs*: DSp 5 (1964) 475-512; H. Chadwick, *Florilegium*: RAC 7 (1969) 1131-1160; G.H. Ettlinger, *Theodoret of Cyrus. Eranistes*, Critical Text and Prolegomena, Oxford 1975; B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskus* 3, PTS 17, Berlin 1975, 24-33; E. Mühlenberg, *Griechische Florilegien*: TRE 11 (1983) 215-219 (bibl.); A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/1 and 2/2, Freiburg 1986 and 1989, 58-100; B. Studer, *Una teologia patristica*, in *Storia della teologia*, I (1993), 583-598; W. Speyer, *Florilegium*: LTK^3 3, 1330-1331 (bibl.); T. Graumann, *Kirche de Väter. Vätertheologie und Väterbeweis in den Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)*, Tübingen 2002 (with bibl.); B. Studer, *Die christliche Theologie des Eusebius von Cäsarea*: Adamantius 10 (2004) 138-166.

B. Studer

FLORILEGIUM EDESSENUM ANONYMUM. Anti-*Nestorian Greek florilegium preserved only in a *Syriac redaction prior to 562. Probably composed a little after the Council of *Ephesus (431), it depends in large part on the Cyrillian florilegium *De fide ad reginas* and, in its present state, offers some parallels with the *florilegia cited by *Severus of Antioch.

I. Rucker, *Florilegium Edessenum Anonymum (syriace ante 562)* (= Sitzungsberichte Bayer. Akad. [1933] 5), Munich 1933.

S.J. Voicu

FLORINUS (2nd c.). Contemporary of *Irenaeus and his fellow student at the school of *Polycarp of Smyrna, he was later presbyter at Rome, where he adhered to the *Valentinian *heresy. According to the testimony of *Eusebius (*HE* 5,20,1-8), Irenaeus wrote a letter *On the Monarchia, or that God is not the author of evil* against him; and later, when Florinus became a follower of Valentinianism, another letter *On the *Ogdoad.* There exists furthermore a Syriac fragment of a letter of Irenaeus addressed to Pope *Victor (fr. XXVIII, in *Sancti Irenaei episcopi lugdunensis libros quinque adversus haereses*, ed. W. Wigan Harvey, Cambridge 1857, vol. II, 457), where Irenaeus asks the pope to take precautions against Florinus, whose writings were widespread in *Gaul and put at risk the faith of the Christians. From the title of the letters that Irenaeus wrote about him and from the brief mention of Agapius (*Universal History*, part II, in PO VII, 516-517) some elements of his theology can be reconstructed: Florinus probably shared the *gnostic doctrines on the origins of *evil and the Valentinian doctrine of the aeons and the primordial ogdoad, denying the unity of the three divine persons and the *resurrection of the dead. These few doctrinal elements do not allow Florinus to be linked with certainty to any known gnostic system, except generically to the Italian school of Valentinus.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884 (facs. repr. Hildesheim 1963), 446-448; K. Kastner, *Irenäus von Lyon und der römische Presbyter Florinus*: Der Katholik 42 (1910), 40-54, 88-105; H. Koch, *Tertullian und der römische Presbyter Florinus*: ZNTW 13 (1912) 59-83; K. Kastner, *Zur Kontroverse über den angeblichen Ketzer Florìnus*: ibid., 133-156; E. Fliedner, *Die ketzergeschichtlichen Angaben des Agapius und das System des Florìnus*, diss., Münster 1942. Bibliographic index: D.M. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography. 1948–1969*; vol. 2: *1970–1994*; vol. 3: *1995–2006*, Leiden 1971, 1997, 2009; M.J. Edwards, *Gnostics and Valentinians in the Church Fathers*: JTS 40 (1989) 26-47.

C. Gianotto

FLORUS of Hadrumetum (d. after 418). A monk of the monastery of *Hadrumetum (5th c.). Together with his friend Felix he visited Uzalis, his birthplace near Utica, where he was able to read Augustine's letter 194, written in 418 to a Roman priest, the future Pope *Sixtus III. From Uzalis he went to *Carthage, while his friend Felix returned to Hadrumetum, carrying with him the letter of *Augustine (*Ep.* 216,2). The letter of Augustine, read without the knowledge of the abbot Valentinus, provoked differing opinions and disagreements in the monastery on the problem of *grace (*Ep.* 216,3; 214,6). To resolve the questions and restore peace, Augustine wrote *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (*Retr.* II, 6), a work that he sent to Hadrumetum together with letters 214 and 215. Sometime later Florinus proceeded to *Hippo (Ag., *Ep.* 215,8; 215 A), carrying a letter from Valentinus, which narrated the origin of the agitation in Hadrumetum; Augustine then responded with letter 216.

PCBE 1, 478-9; BA 24, Paris 1962; NBA 20; V. Grossi, *La crisi antropologica nel monastero di Adrumeto*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 103-133; M. Vessey, *Opus imperfectum; Augustine and His Readers, 426–435 A.D.*: VChr 52 (1998) 264-285.

E. Romero Pose

FOOT WASHING. A baptismal rite practiced in the *Quartodeciman communities who followed the Johannine observance, in polemic against the *baptism by total immersion whose origin they trace to *John the Baptist, a view strongly held in the communities of Petrine and Synoptic origin (Jn 13:10: whoever receives baptism by foot washing does not need to wash the head and hands also). Through this rite it is affirmed that the active principle of baptismal purification does not consist in the physical element of the water, but in service to the self-

humiliation of the crucified Messiah who founds the community on reciprocal love. In the Syriac East the memory of the original baptismal meaning of the foot washing survived for a long time (Aphraates, *Dem. XII*: *De Paschate*; Cyrillona, *Hymn on the Washing of the Feet*, etc.), despite the normal practice of baptism by immersion. In contrast, the baptismal ritual of the foot washing was transplanted into the West by the Johannine Quartodeciman mission originating out of Asia. For *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* IV, 22,1), the Savior purified the just who departed during the *descensus ad inferos* by conferring on them the sacrament of baptism through foot washing, an affirmation that presupposes on his part the knowledge and practice of this rite within the Quartodeciman tradition of Johannine origin defended by him in the letter to *Victor of Rome (Eus., *HE* 5,24,11-18).

After the long silence of the sources for the entire 3rd c., it is possible to follow directly the evolution of the rite in the West from the 4th c. onward. At Aquileia, it was placed immediately before baptism (Chrom., *Sermo* XV), while from all other testimonies it appears as one of the various postbaptismal rites. In the 4th c. the understanding of the baptismal value of the foot washing entered definitively into crisis, to the point that the Council of *Elvira decreed its abolition (can. 48). At *Milan, around 390, *Ambrose had to justify the existence of this rite in the eyes of those who, based on the Roman baptismal practice, which has no provision for it, intended to abolish it or to practice it as a simple gesture of *hospitality (*De Sacr.* III, 1,4-7); for Ambrose the foot washing fulfilled the specific function of purifying the *neophyte from original *sin, in contrast to the purification from personal sins which one expected from baptismal washing (*De Myst.* 6,32; *In psalm.* 48,8-9). According to *Augustine, in contrast, the foot washing had nothing to do with the sacrament of baptismal regeneration, but was simply the example of supreme *humility left by the Lord to his disciples (*Ep.* 55,18,33; *Virg.* 32,32; *In psalm.* 92,3). In particular, in foot washing we must see the mystery of the sacrifice of the *cross which allows the penitential remission of the inevitable postbaptismal daily sins (*In evang. Ioh.* 55-58).

The influence of both Augustine and the monastic tradition, which saw foot washing as exclusively an act of hospitality and humility (John Cass., *Inst.* IV, 19,2; *Reg. Bened.* 53,13-15, etc.) conditioned the interpretation of the postbaptismal foot washing in the Celtic and Gallican area in the early medieval centuries (Caes. of Arles, *Serm.* 64,2; 204,3, etc.; ps.-Max. of Turin, *Sermo de baptismo* III; *Missale Gothicum*, *Missale Gallicanum vetus*, *Missale Bobbiense*, *Stowe Missal*). In some churches the postbaptismal foot washing slid to the week of the octave, Tuesday or Sunday (ps.-Fulg., *Sermones IV de pedibus lavandis*), but in the end it irreversibly disappeared due to the upper hand taken by the new rite of foot washing observed on Maundy Thursday.

The non-Quartodeciman Greek tradition, stretching from *Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* II, 38,1 and II, 63,2) to the exegetes of the Antiochene school, considered foot washing as the supreme example of the Master's humility and love and as preparation of the *apostles for the evangelical mission. *Origen, through the allegorical-moral reading, had reached the point of interpreting it as the mystery of the purification of the feet of the soul and the interior man (cf. *Comm. in Joh.* XXXII). In the Eastern churches such as *Alexandria, *Jerusalem, *Antioch and *Constantinople, the baptismal rite of foot washing had never been practiced; this, coupled with Greek *exegesis, brought about the new foot washing rite on Maundy Thursday as a substitute for and competitor with baptismal foot washing. Born in the cathedral liturgy of the holy city not before the end of the 5th c. (*Georgian Lectionary* in CSCO 189, 92 and 205, 100-101), this rite on Maundy Thursday spread rapidly from Jerusalem to Byzantium (*Cod. Barber. Vat. graec. 336* of the 8th c.) and the West, where it appears attested very early in Spain (Counc. Toledo XVII of 694, can. 3) and at Rome, in the papal liturgy of the Lateran, around 700, as is clear from the *Ordo* edited by A. Chavasse in RHE 50 (1955) 21-35. From Rome the rite spread in turn throughout the entire Latin West starting from the end of the 8th c. on in the wave of liturgical Romanization inaugurated by Pippin the Short and Charlemagne.

Th. Schäfer, *Die Fusswaschung im monastischen Brauchtum und in der lateinischen Liturgie*, Beuron 1956; H. Giess, *Die Darstellung der Fusswaschung Christi in den Kunstwerken des 4.-12. Jahrhunderts*, Rome 1962; G. Richter, *Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium. Geschichte ihrer Deutung*, Regensburg 1967; M.A. Argal Echarri, *El lavatorio des los pies y el pecado original en san Ambrosio*, in *El pecado original*. XXIX Semana Española de teología, 15-19 Sept. 1969, Madrid 1970, 141-159; B. Kötting, *Fusswaschung*: RAC 8, 743-777; P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccat. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milan 1978, 181-185; Id., *Due nuovi testimoni della lavanda dei piedi in età patristica. Cromazio di Aquileia e Severiano di Gabala*, in *Ecclesia orans*. Mélanges A. Hamman (Augustinianum 20/1-2), Rome 1980, 23-54; Id., *La lavanda dei piedi. Contributo alla storia delle antiche liturgie cristiane*, Rome 1983; B. Kleinheyer, *Sakramentliche Feiern I. Die Feiern der Eingliederung in die Kirche*, Regensburg 1989, 74-76; J.C. Thomas, *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community* (JSNTSup 61), Sheffield 1991; P.F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, London [2]2002; P.F. Beatrice, *John 13,1-10 and Romans 13,1-7 in Irenaeus of Lyons. Two Test Cases for New Testament*

Textual Criticism, in J.K. Elliott - C.B. Amphoux (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity*. Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000 (Histoire du Texte Biblique 6), Lausanne 2003, 369-386; M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004, 191-201.

P.F. Beatrice

FOREKNOWLEDGE. The ability to know in advance (προγινώσκειν) future events was, for Greek authors, an ability of human intellect. The noun "foreknowledge" (in Greek πρόγνωσις) had its most proper context in the medical vocabulary, in the sense of prognosis, i.e., foresight about the course an illness would take by observing the patient, even if it was then extended to the astrological meaning, as the prognosis of a person's destiny or an event's outcome (cf., *Tatian, *Speech to the Greeks* 1,1). The Greek OT began the theological meaning of the substantive and the verb, using them to refer to the foreknowledge that *God has of historic events (Jdth 8:6 LXX; the same in Wis 8:8, where the subject is divine wisdom), but also the knowledge of the future that a person can have through divine revelation (Jdth 11:6 LXX; likewise in Wis 18:6). In Wis 6:13 one reads that divine wisdom precedes in knowledge all those who desire it and, therefore, here the objects of foreknowledge are certain individuals. In the NT, the noun appears twice. In Acts 2:23, it was used to emphasize that God already knew that the Jews would receive Jesus with hostility, to the point of seizing him and effecting his death, which is nonetheless included in God's salvific and providential plan. In 1 Pet 1:2, God's foreknowledge is the reason for the election of believers who were thus chosen because they were known beforehand. With respect to the New Testament's use of the verb, in 1 Pet 1:20 it refers to Christ's salvific mission, known by God already before the foundation of the world; elsewhere, it expresses the eternal knowledge that God has of those who would follow Christ (Rom 8:29). Israel has also benefited from this prior knowledge (Rom 11:2), which in a certain way has the characteristics of an election. Other uses can be found in Acts 26:5 and 2 Pet 3:17. These are less technical uses and can therefore be overlooked in this entry.

In *2 Clem.* 9:9 mention is made of God's foreknowledge, which knows the heart of the human being; *Hermas maintained that since the Lord knew beforehand his creatures' weakness, he established a time of repentance (*Mand.* 4,3,4), and the difficulty of this weakness was revealed to Hermas because, by recognizing it beforehand, he could prepare himself to endure it (*Sim.* 7,5). For *Justin Martyr, God knows in advance what will occur and it is precisely this understanding that creates the possibility of prophecies (1 *Apol.* 44,11; *Dial.* 95,2; 135,4); even Christ benefited from this prior knowledge (*Dial.* 35,7; 82,1); the spirit of foreknowledge has been poured out moreover on certain Christians (*Dial.* 39,2). God's foreknowledge should not be understood, however, in a necessitating sense: God knows that some people, who were known beforehand, will believe (1 *Apol.* 45,1), although others become reprobate on account of their free choice without God being held responsible in any way (*Dial.* 140,4). God's foreknowledge does not contradict human *freedom (1 *Apol.*43,1-8), but in a certain sense comes to its aid: God in fact waits to carry out the last judgment precisely to give many the opportunity to benefit from his delay in punishing (1 *Apol.* 28,2). For *Clement of Alexandria, foreknowledge is an appropriate definition for prophecy understood as anticipated knowledge (*Strom.* II, 12,54,1). *Revelation has an aspect of anticipated knowledge of the future that is able to awaken hope in awaited blessings (*Strom.* 8,1,5,2).

For *Origen, the idea that God knows events before these occur is a principle inherent in the very notion of God, substantiated by the prophecies contained in sacred *Scripture (*Phil.* 23,4). The fact that God knows in advance the choices and the outcomes of human deeds does not in any way compromise the freedom of these people: Origen explained it by taking the example of Judas's betrayal and the case of Laius, the father of Oedipus: the former was able to not betray his friend and the latter was able to not beget a child; far from determining their choices, the prophecies concerning them only declared in advance what their choices would be (*C. Celsum* 2,20; *Phil.* 23,8; see also *In Rom.* 8,23). God's foreknowledge, therefore, does not intervene to cause people to perish, but can act in view of their improvement by allowing sinners, after having tolerated the evil, to be healed more radically and permanently (*Princ.* 3,1,13; 3,1,17): this happened to the pharaoh about whom one reads in Exodus and concerning whom Paul spoke in Rom 9:17-18 (*Princ.* 3,1,13-14).

Using the light of foreknowledge, Origen proceeded to interpret certain scriptural passages that could lend themselves to a *predestinarian-determinist reading; among these were Rom 1:1 (Paul's calling) and Rom 8:28-30 (the election of Christians). God chooses those whose inclinations toward the *good he knew in advance. This foreknowledge of God can have as its object those who must still come into the world (*Phil.* 25; *In Rom.* 1,3) or rather the

one who is already living and dedicates himself with such passion to fulfill the good so that he merits election from God (*In Rom.* 7,7). With this interpretation, Origen, in a way not unlike Justin Martyr, resolved the crucial problem of the relationship between God's foreknowledge and human free action. Origen's solution was destined to have great success in the ancient church and to provide a guideline for the interpretation of biblical passages that would lead one to suspect a sort of predeterminism of the saved. Among these biblical passages is Rom 9:10-13, in which Paul spoke of Jacob's election and Esau's rejection, which Origen interpreted along the aforementioned lines (*In Rom.* 13,15 to be read in connection with *In Rom.* 7,7-8; it is established, however, that elsewhere Origen explained God's actions by making reference to the merits acquired by the two brothers before their souls acquired a body, *Princ.* 3,1,22). Against every form of *gnostic determinism, *Jerome adopted a position not unlike the one expressed in Origen's commentary (*In Gal.* 1,1,13-14), and *Ambrosiaster (*In Rom.* 8,29; 9,11) and *Pelagius did the same (*In Rom.* 8,28; 9,10-12). The *Liber de induratione cordis Pharaonis* (CPL 729), an anonymous Pelagian text, fully developed terms already seen in Origen's work to demonstrate that one should in no way think that divine foreknowledge abolishes human freedom.

*Augustine's conviction that foreknowledge was the cause of election led to an important development. In a text written in 394, he adopted a position along the lines of those explained by Origen above (*Exp. quar. Prop. ex ep. ad Rom.* 47; 53; acc. to the enumeration of PL 55; 61). Nevertheless, Augustine, in a work written shortly thereafter, expressed a slightly different idea: all people are equally sinners, and no one could merit anything unless God's mercy had not come to their rescue by first of all calling them. The call of some over others, then, is something that remains inexplicable to people, even if it corresponds to God's hidden and just design (*De div. Quaest. 83*, q. 68, 5-6). Lastly, in a document written in 397, Augustine completely rejected the idea that God chose Jacob in view of his virtue and rejected Esau because of his future wickedness: foreknown merits do not cause someone's election, but it is the fact of being chosen and the act of responding willingly to this election that causes one to attain merit (*De div. Quaest. ad Simpl.* 1,2).

GLNT 2, 532-535 (TWNT 1, 715-716); M. Simonetti, *Origene. I principi*, Turin 1968; A. Colonna, *Origene. Contro Celso*, Turin 1971; E. Junod, *Origène. Philocalie* 21-27, SC 226, Paris 1976; A. Monaci Castagno, *L'idea di preesistenza delle anime e l'esegesi di Rm 9, 9-21*, in H. Crouzel - A. Quacquarelli, eds., *Origeniana Secunda. Second colloque des études origéniennes*, Bari 1980; F. Cocchini, *Origene. Commento alla lettera ai Romani*, Casale Monf. 1985; J.R. Díaz Sánchez-Cid, *Justicia, pecado y filiación. Sobre el comentario de Orígenes a los Romanos*, Toledo 1991; N. Cipriani, *L'autonomia della volontà nell'atto di fede*, in *Il mistero del male e la libertà possibile. Linee di antropologia agostiniana*. Atti del VI seminario del Centro Studi Agostiniani di Perugia, SEA 48, Rome 1995.

G. Caruso

FORGIVENESS. Forgiveness is a distinctive feature in Christianity, although it was not appreciated as much in the *pagan world, in which pity and mercy were considered more important. Both in the New Testament and in patristic authors it is a theme that receives much attention. In the New Testament, in Lk 17:3-4, Jesus says, "If your brother sins, rebuke him, but *if he repents* [μετανοήσῃ], forgive [ἄφες] him. And if he sins seven times a day against you and for seven times he returns to you, saying, '*I repent* [μετανοῶ],' you will forgive [ἀφήσεις] him." Forgiveness depends on the offender's repentance and its manifestation to the offended person. Matthew 18:23-35 also shows both human and divine forgiveness as conditional: here, the servant who had his debt forgiven/canceled by his master upon his supplications (18:27) is condemned because he did not forgive a debtor when the latter supplicated him. God's forgiveness depends on human forgiveness: "So will my heavenly Father do, too, if you do not forgive your brother" (18:35).

The *parable of the prodigal son in Lk 15, one of those most clearly intended to show divine forgiveness, emphasizes the son's repentance, expressed to his father: "Father, I have sinned against heaven and you: I am unworthy of being called your son" (15:18-19 and 21). Repentance is also a requirement of forgiveness in the parable of the lost sheep, equated with a "*repenting* sinner," as opposed to the "ninety-nine righteous who need no repentance" (Lk 15:7). In the third parable in Lk 15 the lost drachma is a symbol of a "sinner who *repents*" (Lk 15:10). In the final mission of the apostles in Lk 24:47, "repentance and forgiveness of sins [ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν] will be preached to all people." Forgiveness must be preceded by repentance. Similarly, in Lk 7:36-50, Jesus declares that a woman's sins are forgiven after she has manifested repentance by crying. Likewise, in 1 Jn 1:9 forgiveness of sins depends upon one's acknowledgment of them: "if we recognize our sins . . . he will forgive [ἄφῇ] our sins." The repentance–forgiveness scheme also appears in Mk 1:4 and Lk 3:3 in reference to John the Baptist, who announces "a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness [ἄφεσιν]

of sins." The same sequence is in Mk 4:12: "that they may repent/convert and be forgiven." And in Acts 5:31, in a speech before the Sanhedrin, Peter explains that God sent Jesus and exalted him in order to "give Israel repentance and forgiveness [ἄφεσιν] of sins." Forgiveness always presupposes repentance. In Lk 6:37 and Mt 7:1-5 Jesus again places a condition on our being forgiven: we shall be forgiven if we forgive, we shall not be judged and condemned if we do not judge and condemn. This too indicates that forgiveness is not regarded as unconditional. Likewise, in Lk 11:4 the *Lord's Prayer includes the following passage addressed to the Father: "forgive [ἄφες] our sins [ἁμαρτίας], *because* we too forgive all our debtors." The parallel in Mt 6:12 has ὀφειλήματα instead of ἁμαρτίας. Here, too, forgiveness has a precise condition: that we forgive in turn. This is stressed in Jesus' words explaining the prayer in Mt 6:14-15: "If you forgive people their sins, your heavenly Father will forgive you too, but if you don't forgive them, neither will your Father forgive your sins." Similarly, in Mk 11:25 forgiving people is the condition of being forgiven by God.

In Lk 23:34, Jesus on the cross exclaims: "Father, forgive them [ἄφες αὐτοῖς], because they do not know what they are doing." All modern versions translate "Father, forgive them," and ancient versions such as Syriac, Coptic and Latin use a verb that, like ἀφίημι, can mean "forgive," but also much else. The difficulty is that Jesus asks God to "forgive" his killers by adducing that they are *unaware* of what they are doing. But this rules out any culpability, which would also exclude forgiveness. Jesus here is not speaking of forgiveness proper, since ignorance excludes awareness, recognition of guilt, and repentance. Rather, he means "do not even impute this to them; do not impute any responsibility to them." This is confirmed by the words of *Stephen, whose martyrdom imitates Jesus' death: In Acts 7:60—remarkably another Lukan narrative—just before dying his words echo Jesus' words, but with a significant change in the verb: "Lord, do not impute to them [μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς] this *sin." The Vulgate does not use *dimittere*, its standard verb for "to forgive," but renders *Domine, ne statuas illis hoc peccatum*, "Lord, do not impute to them this sin." Likewise, the Peshitta renders: "do not impute to them (this sin)." The negative form μὴ στήσῃς exactly corresponds to the positive imperative ἄφες in Lk 23:34, where it means, not "forgive" (as the offenders are unaware of their sin), but "do not impute." Both Jesus' and Stephen's words mean, "Lord, do not count this act as a sin of theirs." Moreover, Jesus' words in Lk 23:34a are present only in a part of the MS tradition, so that, e.g., Nestle and Aland rejected them as a subsequent addition. I think that v. 34a was present in the original edition of Luke and was subsequently dropped, from the 3rd c. onward, in a part of the tradition, as is confirmed by at least two intentional echoes of it in Luke-Acts. One is in the aforementioned invocation in Acts 7:8, where Stephen, imitating Jesus, asks God not to impute his death to his killers. The other is in Peter's Jerusalem speech in Acts 3:17, yet another Lukan text, where, like Jesus, Peter affirms that those who caused Jesus' death did not know what they were doing: "Now, brothers, I know that you have acted *out of ignorance*, just as your leaders did." Peter insists on the fact that the Jerusalem people and chiefs caused Jesus' death also in other passages (Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13-15; 4:10; 5:30). Likewise, in Acts 13:27-28, another Lukan text, Paul declares that the Jerusalem people and leaders caused Jesus' death, and that they did so *out of ignorance*, in that they did not realize who Jesus was: "because they *ignored* [ἀγνοήσαντες] his identity, they condemned him." This confirms that the author of Acts drew on Jesus' words from the gospel, "they are unaware of what they are doing."

Peter repeats that they acted out of ignorance; therefore, they were not responsible. But now that they have learned the truth and are aware of what they did (see, e.g., Acts 2:37), because of this awareness, he exhorts them to repent, and at the same time guarantees that their repentance will produce God's forgiveness (Acts 2:38; 3:19-21, 25; 5:31). Thus, here too forgiveness depends on repentance. In Acts 3:20-26 Peter even presents repentance as the premise of the universal restoration (ἀποκατάστασις πάντων) that will be a consequence of the forgiveness of sins and that is also described as "the comfort and consolation coming from the Face of the Lord" (3:21) and the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham, to bless "all the families of the world" in his progeny (3:25). This eschatological perspective corresponds to Paul's prophecy in Rom 11:26 that in the eschatological times "the totality of the gentiles will enter and the whole of Israel will be saved." Again, this is connected to the remission of sins: in v. 27 God says, "I shall remove their sins." The repentance–forgiveness scheme is repeated in another speech of Peter's: "*Repent* and pray the Lord that he may *forgive* you this thought" (Acts 8:22).

The Fathers generally understood forgiveness as closely related to divine *grace, but not as unconditional, whether it comes from God or from humans. A core role in their reflection on forgiveness was played by their soteriological and eschatological issues.

Among the so-called Apostolic Fathers, *1 Clement* 8 is wholly devoted to repentance and quotes scriptural passages in which the Lord grants forgiveness to those who have repented (Ezek 33:11; other sections from Ezek 33; Is 1:16-20); in *1 Clement* 9 the author goes on to say that in this way it is also possible to ask for God's mercy. Repentance is a prerequisite of forgiveness. In *Phil.* 3, *Ignatius urges the leaders of the community to forgive the repenting sinners: "I therefore exhort you in the Lord to receive with tenderness those who *repent* and return to the unity of the church." For "to all those who *repent* the Lord grants *forgiveness* [ἀφίει], if they *repent* returning to the unity of God and communion with the bishop" (8). Likewise, in *Smyrn.* 5, regarding some heretics, he says: "Be it far from me to make any mention of them, until they *repent.*" Forgiveness rests upon repentance. Still in the 2nd c., *Justin in *1 Apol.* 61,6-7 explains that the Lord forgives those who repent, quoting Is 1:16-20 (already employed by Clement of Rome): "How those who have sinned and *repent* will *escape their sins*, is declared by Isaiah the prophet . . . : 'Wash, make yourself clean; put away the evil of your doings from your *souls; learn to do well; judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow: and then come and let us reason together, says the Lord. And even if your sins be as scarlet, I shall make them white like wool. . . . But if you refuse and rebel, the sword will devour you.'"

Those who do not repent are not forgiven. Also in *Dial. Tryph.* 95, Justin declares that forgiveness depends on repentance: "If, indeed, you *repent* of your sins, and recognize this person to be Christ, and observe his commandments, then . . . *forgiveness* [ἄφεσις] of sins will be yours." The same concept is repeated in *Dial. Tryph.* 108. In 141, 2-3 Justin is adamant that those who do not repent cannot obtain forgiveness: "if they *repent*, all those who wish can *obtain mercy* [ἐλέους] from God . . . whoever *repents* of his sins will receive *forgiveness* [ἄφεσιν] of sins from God. But if even to such a man [i.e., King David] no *forgiveness* [ἄφεσις] was granted before *repentance* . . . how can the impure and utterly abandoned hope that the Lord will not *take their sin into account*, if they do not weep, mourn, and *repent*?"

*Clement of Alexandria attaches great importance to forgiveness, including interpersonal forgiveness, so to make of it an essential feature of the "gnostic," i.e., the perfect Christian, in *Strom.* 7,13,81: "He never remembers those who have sinned against him, but forgives them. Wherefore also he righteously prays, saying, 'Forgive us; for we too forgive.' For this also is one of the things which God wishes, to covet nothing, to hate no one. For all humans are *the work of one will.*" The perfect Christian will forgive because he or she will hate no one, in that God wanted all human beings to exist. The idea of the unity of all humanity in Clement is essential, as it will be in *Origen and, with particular emphasis, in *Gregory of Nyssa. Clement emphasizes God's forgiveness, too. He states that there is no place where divine mercy is not active: its providential activity is always present, in heaven, on earth and even in hell, where repentance and conversion can still occur: "The Savior, in sum, is always active, because his own work is to save. And this he did precisely by drawing to salvation those who wanted to believe in him, thanks to preaching, wherever they were found. . . . They repented, converted and believed, even though they were imprisoned in hell. . . . God is good and able to save, with impartial justice, *those who repent and convert*, in this world *or elsewhere*; for it is not only on this earth that God's active power extends, but it is *everywhere*," even in hell (*Strom.* 6,6,45-47).

Divine *providence and forgiveness are clearly not considered by Clement to be unconditional, but they respond to, and at the same time elicit, a moral improvement on the part of humans. For punishment itself serves God's purpose of purifying and improving humans (*Strom.* 7,13,81); punishment and suffering are inflicted by God "for an education that is salvific" (cf. *Strom.* 7,10,56,4-5). Clement has a strongly therapeutic and pedagogical conception of God's salvific *oikonomia*. Conversion and repentance must be voluntary to elicit God's forgiveness, but are strongly favored by the pedagogical and therapeutic action of Christ-Logos, who is teacher and physician, and "almost *compels* people to salvation out of an excess of goodness" (*Strom.* 7, 14,86,6).

According to Origen, *De or.* 8,1, "it is impossible to obtain the forgiveness of one's sins by praying if one has not heartily forgiven the sibling who has offended him or her and now *asks to be forgiven.*" In 9,1 Origen insists that, when one prays, one should raise "pure hands" in that one should "forgive each of his or her offenders." In 28,7, he extensively quotes Mt 18:23-35: "Therefore, we *must forgive* [ἀφετέον] those who have sinned against us, *at least if they declare that they repent*. And this, even if our debtor should do so many times. For Jesus says, 'If he sins against you seven times a day, and for seven times *he returns to you, saying, I repent*, you will forgive him'" (Lk 17:3-4). Origen, immediately after, tackles the question of what to do with those who have offended us but do *not* repent. He does not recommend forgiving them, but correcting them; if they persist in refusing to be corrected, the fault would be with them. All hints offered by Clement were developed by Ori-

gen, whose *eschatology is pivotal in his thought and is all based on forgiveness and grace, two closely related concepts in his view. Basing himself on Rom 6:23, Origen emphasizes that eternal life, i.e., salvation, is a free gift from God, which will be bestowed upon all in the end, when all, after *purification, healing and instruction, will voluntarily adhere to the *Good, i.e., God.

Justice will be realized in punishments in the next world, grace in blessedness and eternal life. Punishments will be commensurate with one's sins in this life (*Comm. in Rom.* 22,11), and therefore will be limited, but eternal blessedness, which is participation in divine life and ultimately a *theōsis*, cannot be commensurate with one's merits, but is a work of God's grace, and has no limit and no end (*Comm. in Rom.* 3,1,155-175). Origen expounds Paul's claim—that as all became culpable in *Adam, so will all be justified in Christ (Rom 5:18-19), that God made all culpable to bestow mercy upon all (Rom 11:32), and that Christ assumed all of humanity and died for all when all were still sinners (Rom 5:8-9)—to emphasize that salvation and blessedness are due to divine grace, not to anyone's merits. But Origen ascribes a crucial importance to human free will and is far from thinking that the final restoration will entail God's forgiveness of anyone without conversion. To reach eternal blessedness, all will have to be purified, healed and illuminated. Once their intellectual sight is made clean, all will voluntarily reject *evil, which will thus disappear, and adhere to the Good-God, entering eternal blessedness. Origen indeed stresses that conversion is necessary for anyone to obtain forgiveness from God, and that obedience toward the Good will not mean a forced submission, but the knowledge of the Good and the spontaneous obedience to it through love. In fact, Origen explicitly identifies the universal submission to Christ foretold in 1 Cor 15:24-28 with universal salvation (e.g., in *Princ.* 1,6,1; *Commentary on John* 6,295-296). This is the only way of interpreting this submission "in a way worthy of the goodness of the God of the universe" and of "God's lamb, who takes up the sin of the world." Violence and compulsion would be unworthy of God.

He comments on the Lord's Prayer (*De or.* 18-21), quoting, in his philological sensitivity, the verse on forgiveness in both Matthew's and Luke's versions. We are always indebted in many ways to many, he argues, so we should remit the debts of our debtors, remembering that we are much more indebted to others and to God. If we can remit the sins of our debtors, it is because we imitate God who, properly, is the only one who has the power of remitting sins. Origen ascribes importance to repentance and to its expression by words and/or tears. Tears of repentance are good in that repentance leads to forgiveness and hence salvation. Examples abound. Through repentance, sinners are forgiven and come to life. Those who will be confined to the "outer darkness," hell, will desire the light and repent, praying God to rescue them from there (*Comm. in Matth.* 17,24). Thus, God will cast them into hell that they may repent and ask for divine help. According to *Fr. in I Cor.* 24, God will separate the sinners from the good in the next world, so that they may not spread their contagion among all, but will also cure them, having them repent. Theirs will be a therapeutic and pedagogical suffering: what will be consumed will be their "fleshly way of thinking," whereas their soul will be healed.

A central feature of Origen's thought on repentance and forgiveness is his dynamic conception of moral progress in each rational creature and in history. He rejected the Stoic idea of *aeons that cyclically repeated themselves, with identical behaviors in the same people (*C. Cels.* 4,12; 4,67-68; 5,20; *De princ.* 2,3). For him, history is in progress and points to one *telos*: the **apokatastasis*, when the sequence of aeons will cease and "all beings will be no more in an aeon, but God will be all in all" (*De princ.* 2,3,5). Origen sees this progression realized in the attainment of God's likeness as a result of moral progress. This conception of moral progress, again, points to a close link between Origen's conception of forgiveness and his *soteriology and eschatology.

In early Christianity, the connection between repentance and forgiveness is clear, esp. thanks to the *sacrament of penance or reconciliation, which was public. The offender had to publicly manifest his or her repentance. The connection between repentance, penitence and forgiveness was crucial to the controversies about the **lapsi* and *libellatici* who, after *Decius's *persecution in AD 250, asked to be readmitted into the church, and often were recommended by *confessores*. *Cyprian's epistles are the main source of our information. He advised that, after the end of the persecution, each case would have to be evaluated separately, acc. to the seriousness of each one's sins. In his *De lapsis* (AD 251) he stresses the different degrees of culpability, and states that the *lapsi* should be readmitted into the church after proportionate public penances, recommending *prayer, grieving, *fasting, *almsgiving, tears of contrition and all manifestations of repentance aiming at the attainment of forgiveness. This position is confirmed by many passages of Cyprian's letters as well. He also knew the works of *Tertullian,

who devoted a whole treatise to repentance in AD 203 in which he allowed for repentance, public penance and forgiveness also after *baptism, emphasizing the link between repentance and forgiveness. In chapter 8 Tertullian underlines that the Lord is willing to forgive those who repent.

The idea that repentant *lapsi* should be forgiven after a public penance was rejected by the *Novatians who, after Decius's persecution, left the church. They did not allow for forgiveness even after the sinners' repentance. During this *schism, acc. to *Socrates (*HE* 5,19), some churches appointed specific presbyters to the "penitential office": sinners would confess their sins before them and receive an appropriate penance in order to obtain forgiveness by God. Forgiveness and readmission into the church after public penance were experienced even by emperors. *Ambrose of Milan imposed a public penitence upon *Theodosius before forgiving him for the massacre of Thessalonica (AD 390 or 389). The earliest source is Ambrose's Letter 51 to Theodosius, in which Ambrose claims that "the Lord himself does not forgive but those who repent" (11). *Eusebius (*HE* 6,34) reports that a bishop already forbade the Roman emperor *Philip the Arab to take part in the church's prayers on Easter eve before repenting for his crimes, probably for the elimination of Gordian III in AD 244. Of course, this tradition presupposes that Philip was a Christian and reflects the penitential praxis of the church.

*Basil (*Reg. mor.* 52, 777AB) comments on Lk 17:3-4 by stressing the importance of repentance for forgiveness, the same that is also highlighted in *Ep.* 22,3 (Courtonne): "One must not harbor resentment against the person who sinned and *repents,* but must heartily *forgive* this person. The man who says that he *repents* for a sin must not only feel pierced through by the sin that he has perpetrated, but must also produce fruits worthy of his repentance."

The third Cappadocian Father, Gregory of Nyssa, treated forgiveness esp. in *De oratione dominica*, Or. 5. Here, Gregory points out that the remission of debts is proper to God, and that only God can remit sins; as a consequence, our forgiveness is an imitation of God. According to a conception dear to Origen and to him, he stresses that we ought to acquire a similarity to God in forgiving sins and "becoming God ourselves," acc. to the ideal of *theōsis*. If we forgive, we shall be forgiven by God, and, as God's nature is infinite, there will be an infinity of forgiveness on the part of God, an "abundant gift." This makes it clear that grace is an essential factor of God's forgiveness. The latter always requires human repentance, but it is grace that fills up the gap between human merit and the infinitude of the blessings offered by God. Gregory accepted even the most criticized aspect of Origen's *apokatastasis* doctrine; even the devil will be forgiven in the end, which will occur after the devil's conversion to the Good (i.e., God), but all, including him, will indeed repent and convert, through a process of instruction, purification and sanctification, thanks to which all will reject evil and voluntarily choose the Good. This very process will take place thanks to God's grace, which extends to all of humanity and at the end of which evil will utterly disappear; Gregory and Origen share this conviction, which is grounded not only in the ontological nonsubsistence of evil, but also in 1 Cor 15:26, acc. to which death will eventually be destroyed: for both understand this death not only as physical, but also as spiritual. And spiritual death was caused by sin.

The doctrine of *apokatastasis*, as theorized by Gregory and Origen, surely bears a crucial relation to forgiveness, the remission of all sins being a condition for universal salvation. The condition of forgiveness, in turn, will be repentance, conversion and purification. Gregory, in *De an.* 101-104, interpreting the parable in Mt 18:23-25 and Lk 7:41, observes that in the other world all will pay the "debt" contracted with their sins and will be unable to enter blessedness before paying it up to the last coin. Everyone's "debt" will be entirely repaid, and therefore canceled, sooner or later, and will return free, like God: "God's nature is the source of all virtue; so, in it there will be those who have attained freedom from evil, that, as the Apostle says, God may be 'all in all'" (1 Cor 15:28). Purification in the next world will be commensurate with one's sins, and therefore limited, whereas blessedness, which is the gift of God, who is infinite, has no limit and no end. It is out of love that the divinity pulls all souls to itself, as Gregory explains esp. in *De anima*; Gregory calls God's love *agapē* and even *erōs* when he wants to highlight its intensity.

Whereas in Origen on can count about a hundred occurrences of *aphesis* and *aphiēmi* in reference to forgiveness of sins, Gregory uses the term much less, even though his work has survived in much better condition. This is also because almost all of Origen's surviving works are exegetical. Origen and Gregory, indeed, mostly use the vocabulary of forgiveness in an exegetical context, in reference to *Scripture or *liturgy. That forgiveness is conceived as conditional by Gregory and Origen is further indicated by the widespread attestation of *metanoia*, "repentance/conversion," in their writings: more than 300 occurrences in Origen, almost 50 in Gregory. The *apokatastasis*, acc. to both of them, will not

take place without repentance, but what makes them sure that it will be universal is their certainty that all, thanks to purification and illumination, mainly performed by Christ-Logos, Teacher and Physician, will convert, will have their sins forgiven and will cling to God, who is the Good.

*Gregory of Nazianzus also had much sympathy for the doctrine of *apokatastasis* and knew Origen's thought well. He used the image of the "baptism of tears" to signify purifying repentance for the attainment of forgiveness. The latter was granted by the Lord who loves humanity, even to Peter who denied him thrice. So, even to those who have denied their faith it is necessary to grant forgiveness, if they repent (*Or.* 39). The OT quotation of God on which Origen insisted: "I want mercy rather than sacrificial offerings," Gregory refers to Jesus, "who came for the conversion of sinners." Nazianzus is convinced that after one's death conversion is still possible if it has not yet occurred. He takes up Origen's notion of Christ as Physician, and emphasizes one of the main pillars of the doctrine of *apokatastasis*: punishment absolutely must not exceed the measure of sin, because in this way it would produce despair, not repentance and improvement. Forgiveness must be granted only to those who repent, but mildness must be observed with a view to the rectification of sinners. Punishment, commensurate with sins, will be limited, and in this God's justice will be expressed, after which there will be the expression of God's grace. Eternal life and bliss will not be commensurate to what anyone deserves, but will be a limitless gift from God. Nazianzus too, like Origen and Nyssa, sees punishment as remedial and therapeutic, as a way to improve all and to render all worthy of forgiveness.

In the "Ephraem Graecus," emphasis on contrition and forgiveness is found in *De oratione*, where the author declares that our sins will be forgiven if we repent with suffering and an afflicted soul. Prayer also helps forgiveness, because it is against resentment and corrects sins (διόρθωσις). "Ephraem" insists on the notion that God's forgiveness depends on our own willingness to forgive in turn (Mk 11:25): "If you have forgiven [ἀφῆκας], I too shall forgive [ἀφίω] you." The author recommends contrition for one's sins, not to be sad, but to be forgiven and be in grace. He also cites the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, where the publican is forgiven thanks to his humility, confession and repentance.

*John Chrysostom—a disciple of *Diodore of Tarsus, who embraced the doctrine of *apokatastasis*—drew from Origen the notion of Christ as Physician, already present in Clement. Even if one has reached the extreme limit of evil, the Physician will open up many ways of forgiveness and salvation. Chrysostom gives even more emphasis than do Origen and the Cappadocians on the aspect of a sinner's *metanoia* for obtaining God's forgiveness. Especially in his Homilies on 1 Corinthians (PG 61, 194-196), he insists that repentance and good deeds are indispensable to gain forgiveness. All humans are sinners, but all can "rise up again," ἀναστῆναι. Notably, ἀνίστημι denotes the resurrection; ἀνάστασις as the remission of sins is the spiritual component of the *resurrection. According to a holistic view of the resurrection typical of Origen and shared by his followers, the physical component will be liberation from physical death, but the spiritual component will be the liberation from evil and the restoration of the soul to the Good. Chrysostom uses the metaphor of being wounded in order to introduce the motif of Christ as Physician: those who are sick with evil "need the Physician who applies medications" and can heal those whom human physicians cannot: "do not despair: for even though your wounds are difficult to heal, they are not incurable. Our Physician can: so skilled is he," echoing Origen's statement that "no being is incurable for the One who has created it." What is necessary is only to be aware of one's sins/wounds, which is the premise of repentance and forgiveness. If one repents and begins to do good deeds, every sin can be remitted, however serious. The first of the good deeds that Chrysostom recommends is interpersonal forgiveness, and contrition in repentance itself. All other good deeds follow: almsgiving, justice, help to widows and orphans, pity, endurance and so on. Chrysostom insists, here and in many other passages, that these produce salvation and the liberation from the eternal death of hell.

Unlike Origen and his followers, who believed that God will apply both justice and grace to all in the end, *Augustine, although he adhered to the doctrine of *apokatastasis* at first, later thought that God will apply justice to some and grace to others. For some, divine forgiveness will be ruled out forever, because after death there will be no more chance to repent and thereby obtain forgiveness. Yet Augustine offered splendid reflections on forgiveness. For instance, commenting on Jn 13:10-15, he inserts a meditation on the Lord's Prayer, on the words that were already commented on by Origen and Nyssa: "forgive [*dimitte*] us our debts [*debita*], as we also forgive our debtors." He allegorically interprets the exhortation to wash one another's feet as a recommendation to forgive one another and pray for one another. Christ is presented by Augustine as intercessor and forgiver (Homily 58 on John and

elsewhere); however, his intercession is seen as effective only for some. The whole theodicy was at stake: after the rejection of Origen's theodicy, two alternatives remained: that of *Pelagius, who did not admit of grace or original sin, and that of Augustine, who considered grace to be necessary for salvation, as did Origen, but reserved it for some, acc. to God's inscrutable election. Augustine too, like Origen, relied on Romans, but with a different understanding of the breadth of divine grace, which was also influenced by Augustine's war against Pelagianism. It is just after its outbreak that he began to overtly criticize the doctrine of *apokatatstasis*.

The Syriac 8th-c. mystic *John of Dalyatha, a supporter of the *apokatastasis*, also emphasized forgiveness and the importance of repentance to this effect. Other people's prayer for a sinner may help his repentance, which comes from Christ's grace (*Ep.* 43,25). John devotes his Letter 43 to repentance (*tyābūtā*), which always produces forgiveness and salvation: it brings one back from spiritual death to life and leads one to heaven, being like a fire that burns all sins.

B. Marotta, *Eleemosyna a morte liberat (Tob 12:9). Sul valore salvifico dell'elemosina*, in *Pagani e Cristiani alla ricerca della salvezza. Atti del XXXIV Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana*, Rome, Augustinianum 2006, 817-827; I. Ramelli, *Gregorio di Nissa. Sull'Anima e la Resurrezione*, Milan 2007; P. Tzamalikos, *Origen. Philosophy of History and Eschatology*, Leiden 2007; I. Ramelli, *Note per un'indagine della mistica siro-orientale dell'VIII secolo: Giovanni di Dalyatha e la tradizione origeniana*: 'Ilu 12 (2007) 147-179; Id., *Origen's Exegesis of Jeremiah. Resurrection Announced Throughout the Bible and Its Twofold Conception*: Augustinianum 48 (2008) 59-78; Id., *Forgiveness in Patristic Philosophy*, in var. aus., *Ancient Forgiveness*, Cambridge 2010; Id., *Luke 23:34a. A Case Against Its Athetesis*: Sileno 36 (2010); Id., *Unconditional Forgivness in Christianity? Some Reflections on Ancient Christian Sources and Practices*, chap. 2 in C. Fricke (ed.), *Ethics of Forgiveness*, New York 2011.

I. Ramelli

FORNICATION. The history of the Latin word *fornicatio* shows the fundamental influence of *Judaism and Christianity. Originally *fornicatio* (derived from *fornix*, "arcade, portico," where the prostitutes enticed their clients, see Isid., *Diff. verb.* 263,37,22) and its Gr. equivalent πορνεία (probably from πέρνημι, "purchase," which indicates the payment for the sexual service, see Liddell - Scott 1451) described the sexual act with a prostitute, which was permitted at Rome. Thus it must be carefully distinguished from the so-called *stuprum* which occurred when a man had sexual relations with an unmarried girl or an adolescent of free birth, which, in contrast, entailed severe punishment. Under the influence of the OT and of rabbinism, the meaning of the concept grew in the NT to include every act of concupiscence and illicit sexuality: thus prostitution, incest, idolatry, lascivious behavior and sex outside of marriage. In the Septuagint, in fact, *porneia* could be used in a very broad sense, since it had occupied the semantic field of the Hebrew *zenut*, which indicates either a single woman who has relations with a man, or anyone who gives his own daughter for sexual purposes without the intention of marrying her, or who does not marry off his daughter after puberty, or who has a dowry too small to get married.

In the patristic period, the interpretation by the fathers of Mt 5:32 and 19:9—which originally could allude to an actual cohabitation which for some reason was extramarital, thus allowing Christians to exit from such "irregular unions"—interpreted πορνεία based on Dt 24:1-4, as if it were a synonym of μοιχεία (properly "adultery"). The term ended up including not only the concept of adultery (Aug., *Quaest. Hept.* 2,71) but also every type of *sin against the 6th commandment. Another reason for this identification was the fact that all of these irregular relations, inasmuch as they did not guarantee exclusivity, could be considered comparable to the sexual act with a prostitute. It is in this sense that the word also became identified with *stuprum* and with *adulterium*, given that in the first case there is no matrimony that would assure exclusivity, and in the second it is precisely the exclusivity guaranteed by matrimony that has been corrupted (Luc. Cal., *Non conv. cum haer.* 11; Isid., *Sent.* 2,642,31). These technical terms later qualify fornication; it is named *stuprum* if someone sleeps with a virgin or a widow (Gr. φθορά; and this can happen by force [*vis*] or consensually); it is adultery if it occurs with a married woman (Papin., *Dig.* 48,5,6,1). It is in this larger sense that we see the word used in reference to concubinage (cohabitation without intention of matrimony), to the third or fourth marriage (Basil, *Ep.* 188,4), to marriage without the consent of the father or pedagogue of the girl (*Ep.* 199,38), to the marriage of nuns (*Ep.* 188,6) and to other cases. Concerning the Latin terminology, while a man can be called *fornicator* or *fornicarius* for having been together with a prostitute or for having committed a *stuprum* or an *adulterium*, women can be called *fornicariae* if they are prostitutes, *adulterae* if they agree to the *stuprum*; if they do not agree, they will be *constupratae* but not *fornicariae*. Alongside the more general meaning, in the 4th c. a broader meaning began to be conferred on the notion of fornication in which it soon reached the point of indicating any illicit sexual act except *adulterium* (Jer., *Comm. Proph. min.*,

Os. 1,2; *Ep.* 123,3,3). It also began to be codified in a more coherent way.

The ecclesiastical sanction for fornication properly so-called is a solid period of exclusion from the community (from 3 to 7 years), depending on the gravity of the deed, but certainly not as long as that for adultery. Furthermore, if interpreted as identifying fornication with adultery, the passages Mt 5:32 and 19:9 theoretically make divorce possible because of fornication on the part of the spouse (Bas., *Ep.* 188,9).

A. Vaccari, *La clausola sul divorzio in Mt 5,32 e 19,9*: RivBibl 5 (1955) 97-111; H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce*, Paris 1971; J. Jensen, *Does* porneia *Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina*: NTS 20 (1976) 161-184.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

FORTUNATIAN of Aquileia (4th c.). According to the testimony of *Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 97), Fortunatian was bishop of *Aquileia under *Constantius (337–361). At the Synod of *Serdica he was in the party of the Western defenders of *Athanasius. He apparently persuaded *Liberius (352–366) later to be more flexible. He seems to have died a little before 368. Of his writings we know only three fragments of his *commentary on the gospels and a few allusions made by Jerome, who used it (cf. *Com. Mat. praef.*: PL 26, 200; *Ep.* 10,3: ed. Labourt I, 29). A connection with ps.-Jerome, *Exp. Quattuor Evangeliorum* cannot be demonstrated.

CPL 104; A. Wilmart - B. Bischoff, CCL9 (1957) 365-370; P. Meywaert, *New Fragments*: FS B. Bischoff, Monaco 1988, 277-283; L. Duchesne, *Libère et Fortunatien*: MEFR 28 (1908) 31-78; DHGE 11, 1182-1185; J. Lemarié, *Italie. Aquilée*: DSp7 (1971) 2161-2162; J. Doignon, in HLL 5, § 577; RGG 3 (2000) 204; LACL (2002) 271.

B. Studer

FORTUNATIAN of Sicca Veneria (1st half of 5th c.). Bishop of *Sicca, he appeared in the list of those present at the conference of *Carthage in 411, in the sixth place among the bishops designated to dispute against the *Donatists. His name, furthermore, is present in the list of bishops who took part in the councils of Carthage and Milevi, called in October 416 to discuss the *Pelagian question (Aug., *Ep.*, 175-176). From a doctrinal point of view Fortunatian seems to have been favorable to the position of the anthropomorphites, as it appears from a letter of *Augustine addressed to Fortunatian on the theme of the knowledge of God and on *anthropomorphism (*Ep.* 148; cf. *Retract.* 2,41): the bishop of *Hippo asked him to be the mediator between himself and an unidentified bishop, with whom he had argued on this theme, and clarified in the letter his thought on the subject.

PCBE 1, Afrique, *Fortunatianus* 4, 482-485.

G. Pilara

FORTUNATUS of Carthage (middle of 3rd c.). According to St. *Cyprian (*Ep.* 14, 16, 43, 44) and *Pontius (*Vita Cypr.* 5), at the death of *Donatus, bishop of *Carthage, Cyprian was designated as his successor (249). Some priests—among them Fortunatus—led by *Felicissimus, a layman ordained a deacon by *Novatus, opposed Cyprian and refused obedience to him. They were all excommunicated by a synod in 251. This condemnation was confirmed by the Council of Carthage. In response, Felicissimus joined with *Privatus, deposed bishop of *Lambaesis, and the two ordained Fortunatus bishop of Carthage. Thus, in 251–52, there were three bishops at Carthage: Cyprian for the Catholics; Fortunatus for the followers of Felicissimus (a party of around 25 bishops) and *Maximus for the Novatians. Felicissimus sought to be recognized by Pope *Cornelius, but Cyprian convinced the pope to break with Felicissimus and Fortunatus in 252.

DHGE 17, 1173; Monceaux II, 31-32, 208-209; G.W. Clarke, *The Letters of Cyprian of Carthage*, New York 1984, I, 266-268.

E. Romero Pose

FORTUNATUS the Manichean (d. after 392). In the late 4th c., he had been living for a long time in Hippo Regius, winning converts to *Manicheism, of which he was a presbyter. Nothing further is known about his life, beyond *Possidius's statement that *Augustine had known him in Carthage (*Life of Augustine*, 6). Local Catholics organized a debate between the latter, by then a Catholic presbyter, and Fortunatus, who agreed to it reluctantly. Augustine's record of the exchange, held 28 and 29 August 392, is preserved in his *Acta disputationis habitae cum Fortunato manichaeo* and summarized in *Retractationes* I,16.

Augustine opens the first day with a résumé of Manichean beliefs with which Fortunatus agrees. The Manichean then tries to make Augustine admit that Manichean moral behavior is irreproachable. Wary, Augustine accuses his interlocutor of not honoring an agreement to stick to doctrinal issues. This tactic wins the sympathy of the audience, who also

take Fortunatus to task for invoking *Scripture instead of remaining with arguments from reason. On the second day, Fortunatus presents his version of Manichean doctrine, esp. regarding *evil. Here he comes to the heart of the issue: God has nothing to do with evil's existence. Augustine agrees with this, but then compares the Catholic and Manichean views on the cause of moral evil. Fortunatus rejects the attribution of moral responsibility to human *free will because that would imply that God is powerless, or at best an accomplice in evil. Neither debater, it is clear, can satisfactorily explain evil, esp. using reason alone. Augustine's exit from the impasse is to offer the audience a choice between the Catholic God who takes a loving risk in creating beings with free will, and the Manichean God who not only deliberately condemns the human soul to enslavement in matter, but does so out of self-preservation. At this juncture, rather than admit defeat, Fortunatus declares himself ready to consult his superiors on points of the system he has been unsuccessful in defending. He then leaves Hippo for good, unconverted.

The primary interest of this text for us is that it is the authentic record of a meeting between a Catholic and a Manichean where, for once, we have a sense of the public positions of the two groups vis-à-vis each other, and we can measure the effect of the arguments on an audience of the late Western Roman Empire, even if that audience is from a single locale and favorable to the Catholic protagonist. The Manichean position, as Fortunatus represents it, may also be regionalized; e.g., his portrayal of Christ has traits peculiar to the Manicheism of N Africa.

CPL 318; PL 42, 11-130; CSEL 25/1, 83-112; BA 17, 117-193; NBA 13/1, 263-319; PCBE 1, 490-493; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Félix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 39-50.

J. Kevin Coyle

FORTY MARTYRS of SEBASTE. In the *Mart. hier.* (9 March), we read: "In **Armenia Minor*, at *Sebaste, forty soldiers belonging to the *Legio XII Fulminata*, residing at Melitene, whose *Acts* we possess." These *Acts* (BHG 1201-1202; BHL 7537-7539; BHO 712-713), even if they were not written by an author who lived during that time, do not lack historical value acc. to Delehaye. We possess *panegyrics based on these documents written by *Ephrem the Syrian, *Basil the Great, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Gaudentius of Brescia (BHG 1204-1208; BHL 7542), and the testament edited by one of the *martyrs in prison. They died after being placed in a pool of ice. Their legend was depicted on a fresco in the Roman oratory dedicated to them at the entrance of S. Maria Antiqua.

DACL 14, 2003-2006; Vies des SS. 3, 21-22; LTK[2] 9, 556; BS 11, 768-771; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *I santi quaranta martiri di Sebastia*: ST 49, 155-184; A. Orbán, *Testamentum XL martyrum*, It. tr. by S. Ronchey in *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen, Milan 1987, 339-351, 582-583; M. Girardi, *Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo*, Bari 1990, 121-144; P. Karlin-Hayter, *Passio of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia. The Greek Tradition, The Earliest Account (BHG 1201)*: AB 109 (1991) 249-304.

V. Saxer

FOSSOR. From the *Acts* of the requisition of the church of *Cirta, following the *Diocletian edict of 303 (*Gesta apud Zenophilum* = CSEL 26, 186-187), one learns that the *fossor*—also known by the names *laborantes*, κοπιῶντες, κοπιάται and *copiatae*—not only carried out the activity of diggers of underground cemeteries, but also those of *quadratarii*, *pictores*, *musivarii* and *albarii.* While Saturninus, when asked *cuius condicionis es?* responded *fossor*, the other *fossor*, Victor, responded *artifex* to the same question. The *fossores* were evidently organized into corporations, to be identified, for the most ancient period, with the *collegia tenuiorum*, and were subsidized by the community (Waltzing, *Études historiques*, passim). They had to subdivide into squads, which became fixed, esp. for the grand complexes of the via Appia, Salaria and Ardeatina, as the peculiarities, different in the various cemeteries, of the negative architecture, the typology of the tombs, the *epigraphic formulas and the decorative techniques indicate. With the end of the *persecutions the *fossores* made up a very compact social group, even if the quality of their work progressively declined, and they acquired many privileges. At the end of the 4th c. they became the effective owners of the cemeteries, so that they directly managed the purchase and sale of the tombs, as a dense group of inscriptions testifies (Guyon, *La vente des tombes*, 349ff.); the most ancient (337–352) currently known comes from the cemetery of *Callistus and records, among other things, that the tomb was purchased *ab Alexandro fosso[re]* (ICUR IV, 11751). In the 5th c., perhaps because of the excessive avidity and the continual abuses of the *fossores*, the members of the clergy (esp. the *mansionarii*, the *cubicularii* and the *presbyteri*) assumed the responsibility for the cemeterial administration. Finally *Gregory the Great, in 597, abolished every kind of tax on burials (*Ep.* VIII, 3).

The custom of representing the *fossor* in pictures and inscriptions on slabs should be placed within

the realistic expressive tendency proper to popular Italic art (Bianchi Bandinelli, *Arte plebea*, 39ff.), which from the 3rd c. had a notable development in the entire *orbis antiquus*, expressing itself in spontaneous and immediate little scenes taken from daily life and therefore also from professional activity (Reddé, *Les scènes de métier*, 4ff.). It is for this reason that in the paleo-Christian cemeteries, next to rare scenes of breadmaking, of commerce in wine, vegetables and casks, or other even more concise scenes that reproduce only the tools of work (Bisconti, *Mestieri nelle catacombe*, passim), the *fossores* appear represented in the precise moment of digging (Conde Guerri, *Los "fossores,"* 23-102). In line with this *iconography, dressed in short work tunics without sleeves and having a belt at the waist, these figures appear in paintings from the 1st decade of the 3rd c. and throughout the entire 4th c. Thus they occupy in a symmetrical position the two internal walls of the entrance to some cubicles at S. Callistus (Wp 48,1; Josi, *Cimitero*, A2 = beginning of 3rd c.) and at SS. Peter and Marcellinus (Wp 107,2; 103,5; 59,1; 48,3; 65,3; 59,2 = middle of 3rd c. and Wp 48,3; 112,5 = beginning of 4th c.). Sometimes the *fossores* appear standing, but identifiable by the pick, the lantern or basket for gathering dirt associated with their figure: thus again at S. Callistus (Josi, *Cimitero*, A3 = beginning of 3rd c.), in the *hypogeum* of Via D. Compagni (Ferrua 1990, fig. 74 = middle of 4th c.), in the cemetery *ad duas lauros* (Kirsch, *Cubicoli*, 34-35; Wp 113,3 = middle of 4th c.: Wp 48,2 = end of 3rd c.; Testini *Archeologia*, 766 = middle of 4th c.) and at the cemetery of Bassilla (Wp 152 = middle of 4th c.). Other *paintings were discovered by ancient visitors to the catacombs and then disappeared again; recently Fr. U.M. Fasola has rediscovered, in the anonymous cemetery of Via Anapo, the *fosro Tofimus* (*sic*), as the painted didascalia explains (Conde Guerri, *Los "fossores,"* fig. 30).

This sober iconographic scheme, even more abbreviated, is followed also by several inscriptions on slabs found at Calepodius (Nestori, *La catacomba*, 210), at Commodilla (ICUR II, 6446), at Marcus and Marcellianus (ICUR IV, 12228), at S. Agnes (Conde Guerri, *Los "fossores,"* fig. 37).

From these representations—and esp. the one painted on the rear lunette of a cubicle at Domitilla (Wp 180 = middle of 4th c.) concerning the *fossor* Diogenes, around whose figure (unfortunately lost at present) various work tools and an abstract representation of the dense network of cemeterial galleries are arranged—the various paraphernalia used for excavation can be identified. Among these the *dolabra fossoria*, the mallet, the chisel, the compass, the shovel, the hook for the lamp, the *groma* (De Angelis d'Ossat, *Di un utensile*, 179) are recognizable.

The notable recurrence of the *fossor* in the figurative arts suggests a particular meaning for these representations that surpasses the original realistic motive to reach some symbolic significance that would suggest that the figures are a Christianized *genius loci*, or else an allegory of the biblical Tobit *père* or, finally, the personification of the life-death antinomy (Conde Guerri, *Los "fossores,"* 103ff.).

G.P. Kirsch, *Cubicoli dipinti del cimitero dei SS. Pietro e Marcellino sulla via Labicana*: RivAC 4 (1927) 259-287; E. Josi, *Il cimitero di Callisto*, Rome 1933; G. De Angelis d'Ossat, *Di un utensile dei fossori*, Rend. della Pont. Accad. Rom. di Arch., 1937, 179ff.; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca di IV secolo sotto la via Latina*, Florence 1990; J.P. Waltzing, *Études historiques sur les corporations professionelles chez les Romains*, Louvain [2]1968; A. Nestori, *La catacomba di Calepodio*: RivAC 48 (1972) 193-200; J. Guyon, *La vente des tombes à travers l'épigraphie de la Rome chrétienne (III^e-VII^e siècles). Le rôle des fossores, mansionarii, praepositi et prêtres*: MEFRA 86 (1974) 349-506; Ch. Pietri, *Appendice prosopographique à Roma Christiana (311–440)*: MEFRA 89 (1977) 398-406; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Arte plebea. Dall'ellenismo al medioevo*, Rome 1978, 35-48; M. Reddé, *Les scènes de métier dans la sculpture funéraire gallo-romaine*: Gallia 36 (1978) 1,4-63; E. Conde Guerri, *Los "fossores" de Roma paleocristiana*, Vatican City 1979; P. Testini, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 150-155; C. Carletti, *Iscrizioni cristiane a Roma. Testimonianze di vita cristiana (secoli III-VII)*, Florence 1986; M. Minasi, TIP, 182-184; F. Bisconti, *Mestieri nelle catacombe romane*, Vatican City 2000.

F. Bisconti

FOUR CROWNED MARTYRS. A titular basilica at *Rome was dedicated to the four crowned martyrs from the end of the 6th c. situated on the slope of the Caelian Hill, but there are still many open questions concerning both the identity of these four individuals who were the object of veneration and the very origins of the place of worship and the succession of its building phases.

On the first issue, scholars generally tend to recognize in the four crowned martyrs who were venerated on the Caelian Hill the protagonists of the hagiographical account who underwent martyrdom at *Sirmium, *Pannonia, in 306 during the time of the emperor *Diocletian, but various difficulties impede this identification, the most obvious consisting in the specific detail about the group of martyrs from Pannonia consisting of five persons, not four. For an examination of the complex hagiographical question, see the detailed analysis done by A. Amore (BS 10, 1276-1286), who maintained that there were two distinct series of sources, which were established at the same time. To the first group belong, among others, the statements in the Leonine and

Gregorian Sacramentaries that attest to the veneration of the four crowned martyrs in the city of Rome, whose specific names, however, were never mentioned, evidently because they were already unknown in ancient times; in this line, the biography of Pope Leo IV is inserted (847–855) as contained in the *Liber pontificalis* (LP II, 115-116), in which the statement is made that the pontiff who promoted the restoration of the basilica of the Caelian Hill went to great lengths to find the remains of the titular martyrs, which were not found in the church, and once found, he placed them there. In light of this information, therefore, the relics of the holy four crowned martyrs were recovered only from the mid-9th c., but the editor of the source does not clarify from where they were recovered.

A second group of sources, however, makes up part of the *passio* of the five martyrs from Pannonia: Claudius, Nicostratus, Simpronianus, Castorius and Simplicius. This redaction can be attributed to the 6th c. The first four, acc. to legend, were brave sculptors who were secretly Christians; after Simplicius had been converted by their example, he joined them. Because they were known for their great skill in their art, the same Emperor Diocletian commissioned some works from them, among which was a statue of the god Aesclepius, which the five refused to do. Upon declaring their faith, acc. to the usual model of such texts, the accusations began, then the conversion of many who were present, the condemnation and the execution of the punishment and the recovery of their bodies by a godly person. The account then has a sort of appendix, in which a story is told that several months later the same emperor, when he returned to Rome, commissioned the construction of a temple to Aesclepius near the baths of *Trajan and commanded that all the soldiers offer sacrifice there. The refusal to follow such a command led to the deaths of other Christians, this time the four *cornicularii* (the assistants of a centurion), whose abandoned bodies were buried by St. Sebastian and Pope *Miltiades on the third mile of the Via Labicana. Because the names of these new martyrs were unknown, but the date of their death coincided with that of the five martyrs from Pannonia (8 November), the same pontiff, likewise on the authority of the *passio*, promoted the cult and arbitrarily attributed to them the names of the first four protagonists of the events (Claudius, Nicostratus, Simpronianus and Castorius). This account therefore seems to clearly exclude the simple identification of the four crowned martyrs with the five artists of Sirmium.

Other sources that can be attributed to the 7th c. seem to derive from the hagiographical account: The itinerary *De locis sanctis*, which situates the veneration of the four crowned martyrs on the Via Labicana, reports the names of the five martyrs from Pannonia (*iuxta viam vero Lavicanam . . . sancti isti dormiunt . . . IIII Coronati id est Claudius, Nicostratus, Simpronianus, Castorius, Simplicius*). In some versions of the Martyrology of *Jerome, 8 November is remembered as the feast of the four crowned martyrs (whose names also coincide with those of the martyrs of Sirmium, with the exception of the last, Simplicius), but the celebration of that feast was then inserted in the church already existing at that time on the Caelian Hill.

The element that allowed the superimposition of the two traditions can be identified in the actual veneration at Rome, attested in the 4th c. by the **Depositio martyrum*, of individuals (Clement, Sempronianus, Claudius and Nicostratus) who were celebrated 9 November *in comitatu*. It is easy to note the proximity of the dates of the feast for these latter individuals and for the martyrs mentioned in the aforementioned sources, although the interpretation of the qualification *in comitatu* is more complex, a qualification that is generally understood as a reference to a toponym, but translatable rather as the specification that the veneration of the four occurred "together," acc. to M. Cecchelli's recent proposal.

Turning now to events pertaining to the worship edifice, equally thorny questions complicate its most ancient history: the first definite mention of a *titulus sanctorum Quattor Coronatorum* dates back to the year 595, when the place of worship was artistically represented by a presbyter at the Roman synod held in that year. Still lacking certain confirmation is the possibility that over the course of the 6th c. the dedication to the four crowned martyrs replaced a more ancient dedication, that of the *titulus Aemilianae*, already present with its own clergy at the Roman synod of 499. The reconstruction of the building phases pertaining to the basilica (which also does not lack opposing interpretations) should begin with the identification of a large *aula* with an apse that can be dated to the 4th c. It probably belonged to a patrician *domus* attested to on the Caelian Hill, within which the most ancient place for Christian worship was erected. The *Liber pontificalis* mentions the restoration efforts in it promoted by Popes *Honorius I (625–638: LP I, 324, 326) and Hadrian I (772–795: LP I, 572), whose traces on the monument have not yet been identified with certainty, and which was followed by the entire reconstruction of the edifice commissioned by Pope Leo IV toward the mid-9th c. (847–855: LP II, 115-116): the primitive *aula* with an apse on this occasion was not entirely

eliminated, but was modified to construct the central aisle, with the apse, of a much broader three-aisled basilica; the new church was then adorned, acc. to the custom of the Carolingian era, with a semicircular crypt in which were placed the relics of the four martyrs, which had been recovered, acc. to the *Liber pontificalis*, by the pontiff himself. The structure was brought to completion with three small chapels dedicated to St. Barbara, St. Sixtus and St. Nicholas, and probably even an enormous portico. Very important elements pertaining to the early Christian building and its Carolingian transformation have emerged over the course of recent excavations in the cloister of the structure on the Caelian Hill (Barelli - Pugliese 1994; Barelli 2002; Barelli 2006), which also led to the identification of a baptismal facility.

The imposing structure that is still preserved in its general features is nonetheless the fruit of the subsequent complete reconstruction that followed the devastating fire that struck the basilica and its adjoining buildings in 1084, and which is due to the intervention of Robert Guiscard. A first attempt at restoration, attested to by the discovery of a plug to close the archways of the columns, left space for a total reconstruction, but led to a new consecration of the church by Pope Paschal II in 1116. The place of worship was rebuilt in rather reduced dimensions, reduced into a new three-aisled church in the sole W portion of the nave of the old basilica; it was, however, inserted within a large monastic structure, whose construction was promoted by the same Paschal II and was enlarged over the course of the 13th c. with the construction of the monastery and the chapel of St. Sylvester, astutely decorated with scenes taken from the *Acta Silvestri*.

BS 10, 1276-1286 (A. Amore); LTK[3] 10, 780-781 (bibl.); LTUR 4, 177-179; A. Muñoz, *Il restauro della Chiesa e del Chiostro dei SS. Quattro Coronati*, Rome 1914; A.M. Colini, *Storia e topografia del Celio*: Memorie della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, s. III, 7 (1944); B.M. Apollonj Ghetti, *I SS. Quattro Coronati* (Le chiese di Roma illustrate, 81), Rome 1964; L. Barelli - R. Pugliese, *Note sulla basilica titolare dei SS. Quattro Coronati in Roma*: Palladio 13 (1994) 19-24; L. Barelli, *Il complesso dei SS. Quattro Coronati nel IX secolo*, in *Ecclesiae Urbis*, Atti del Congr. Int. di Studi sulle chiese di Roma (IV-X sec.), ed. F. Guidobaldi - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Vatican City 2002, II, 979-992; L. Barelli (ed.), *La fontana del chiostro dei SS. Quattro Coronati a Roma. Storia e restauri*, Rome 2006.

A. Milella

FRAGMENTA ARIANA. In 1828, Angelo Mai published 21 fragments contained in a *palimpsest in provenance from Bobbio. The first 19 certainly contain *Arian material, and because of the unity of style and tone should be assigned to a single author, although apparently derived from different works. Fragment 17 contains an ample profession of faith, others cite passages from Arians of an earlier period—*Athanasius of Anazarbus and *Theognis of Nicaea—and refute ideas of *Hilary, *Phoebadius and *Ambrose. The author, a radical Arian of the school of *Wulfila, is polemical not only with Catholics but also with the Macedonians. It has been proposed that he should be identified with various exponents of Western Arianism known to us at the end of the 4th to the beginning of the 5th c.: Wulfila, *Auxentius, *Palladius, *Maximinus, but without solid reasons. The fragments, however, should be dated to that time.

CPL 705; PL 13, 593-628; Patrologia III, 98; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 113-134; T. Böhm, *Fragmenta Ariana*: LACL (1998), 239; J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, Berlin 1994, 136-194.

M. Simonetti

FRANKS. A Germanic people of uncertain origin—acc. to *Gregory of Tours they came from *Pannonia—including different tribes established near the North Sea and along the right bank of the Rhine. From here, starting from the 2nd half of the 3rd c., the Franks made multiple land and sea raids in all of *Gaul; they were always repulsed by Roman generals and emperors who nevertheless used groups of defeated Franks as colonists to repopulate and recultivate some of the extensive territory of devastated Gaul. In the course of the 4th c., many Frankish soldiers were used as auxiliaries in the Roman legions, and Frankish officials fulfilled high charges in the service of the emperor (e.g., Merobaudes, Arbogastes, Bauto). The most important tribe for future history was that of the Salians, originally installed on the coast of the North Sea, who later moved S to occupy the Toxandria, the region between the Meuse and the Scheldt. Defeated by *Julian (358) they were nevertheless left in the same territory as *foederati*; afterward, under the guidance of King Chlodio, they took over Tournai and Cambrai, extending their dominion up to the Somme. In the course of the 5th c. the eastern group of the Franks, situated along the Rhine, accomplished a series of devastating incursions into the regions of *Trier and *Cologne, and were successful, after the middle of the 5th c., in permanently occupying the territory on the left bank of the Rhine, with their capital at Trier. After 450, the Salesian kingdom, with its capital at Tournai, was governed by Childeric, whom *Greg-

ory of Tours claimed was son of Meroveus, eponym of the Merovingian dynasty. Childeric fought as a loyal ally at the flank of the Roman generals of Gaul against the *Visigoths, the Saxons and the Alamanni. At his death the throne was occupied by his son *Clovis (481/482), who began a policy of great expansion: he defeated Syagrius at Soissons (486/487) and progressively extended his dominion up to the Loire; he conducted victorious campaigns against the Thuringi (491) and the Alamanni; he defeated the Visigoths of Alaric II at Vouillé (507), expanding the limits of his kingdom up to the Pyrenees. Clovis received from the emperor of the East, Anastasius, the privilege of the honorary consulate which legitimized, in the eyes of the subjected Romans, the sovereignty of the Frankish king. He established his capital at *Paris and reinforced his power with murder and deception, freeing himself from the other Salian kings and engulfing the kingdom of the Rhineland Franks.

A few years after he married the Burgundian princess *Clotilde, a Catholic, Clovis, who had always shown deference toward the Gallic-Roman episcopate, converted, having himself baptized by *Remigius, bishop of *Reims. The adoption of Catholicism on the part of the king brought with it the conversion of the Frankish people as well and facilitated the fusion between conquerors and subjects; it also had notable political consequences. *Avitus, bishop of *Vienne, understood the historic importance of the event, as his letter of congratulations shows, which salutes in Clovis the only Catholic king in the West. Since the other barbarian peoples were either pagans or *Arians, Clovis appeared to the Catholics as the protector of the orthodox faith, foreshadowing that guiding position in the Christian West assumed later by the Carolingians. He treated the Gallic-Roman population with clemency, respecting their language and property, and he established a Roman-Germanic state in which both the ancient provincial *cives* and the Franks, as Catholics, were equally placed under the authority of the bishops. In reality the Frankish church in the Merovingian period held political power; it was a state church and a national church in close connection with the king. At the death of Clovis (511), the four sons divided the kingdom as a personal inheritance, with different capitals: Chlodomer at Orleans, Childebert at Paris, *Chlothar at Soissons and Theuderic at Reims. They continued the work of expansion of Frankish power: they occupied Thuringia (531), taking prisoner the princess *Radegund, whom Chlothar later married; they seized Burgundy (534), and from Vitiges they obtained Provence (537) which furnished the Franks, through *Marseille, with an opening to the Mediterranean. Theudebert, having succeeded to his father Theuderic, in the course of repeated incursions into *Italy set up numerous garrisons in the Po valley and coined money in his own name; but at his death (548) the precarious Frankish dominion in Italy disappeared. The influence of the Franks extended to Alamannia, Raetia, Bavaria and Pannonia, reaching its greatest extent around 560, when the entire state was reunited under Chlothar; but at his death (561), a period of ferocious fratricidal battles followed which reinforced the aristocracy and favored the division of the vast territory into three regions: Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy, with separate administrations. When *Chlothar II again reunited the entire kingdom under his power (613), he was forced to grant a certain independence to Austrasia and to Burgundy, each with its own mayor of the palace.

In 614, Chlothar II called a council at Paris with all the Merovingian episcopate to publish the *capitularia regum Francorum*, with large concessions to the bishops and the aristocracy. His son Dagobert was more rigid in defense of the monarchical authority and rights, supported missionary activity among the Basques to the S and Frisians to the N, and concluded a "perpetual peace" with the emperor of the East *Heraclius (631), in view of their common fight against the Slavs. With the death of Dagobert (639) began the decadence of the Merovingian dynasty and the decline of imperial authority in favor of the mayors of the palace who gradually acquired full power. In Austrasia, Arnolph, bishop of Metz, and Pippin of Landen, who had been mayor of the palace of the young King Dagobert, gave rise to a powerful dynasty, later known as Carolingian from its most illustrious representative, destined to gradually supplant the Merovingians. In fact, after a bloody period of civil wars culminating in the battle of Tertry (687), Pippin of Heristal, mayor of Austrasia, succeeded in imposing his governance on the whole Merovingian kingdom, newly unified. The kings of this period did not have any importance: the power belonged in fact to Pippin II, who defended energetically the military and religious unity of the entire kingdom. At his death (714), new disorders followed until Charles, later called Martel, illegitimate son of Pippin, succeeded in reestablishing order and seizing power with arms and diplomacy. His great merit was in repulsing the Arabs, ending the Islamic advance at the battle of Poitiers (732): his victory was decisive for the saving of Christianity. He imposed the Frankish primacy on the barbarian tribes of Germany, accomplishing expeditions

against the Alamanni, the Frisians and the Saxons. In internal politics he was hostile to the grand episcopal aristocracy, he deposed bishops, deprived the churches of privileges and confiscated ecclesiastical goods to pay his *milites*, provoking a further decadence of the Frankish church. On the other hand, he favored the evangelizing work of the Catholic missionaries in European areas still predominantly pagan, with the consequent political and social organization and diffusion of civilization. In particular he protected *Boniface, a great preacher in Thuringia and Bavaria, and later, elected archbishop (732), the architect of the reform of the Frankish church and mediator between the Franks and the papacy.

J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings and Other Studies in Frankish History*, London 1962; R. Latouche, *Gaulois et Francs. De Vercingétorix à Charlemagne*, Grenoble 1965; R. Grand, *Recherches sur l'origine des Francs*, Paris 1965; G. Tessier, *La conversion de Clovis et la christianisation des Francs*, in *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di Studio XIV, Spoleto 1967, 149-189; H. Zöllner, *Geschichte der Franken bis zur Mitte des sechsten Jahrhunderts*, Munich 1970; H. Grahn-Hoeck, *Die fränkische Oberschicht im 6. Jh. Studien zu ihrer rechtlichen und politischen Stellung*, Sigmaringen 1976; J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish church*, Oxford 1983; E. James, *The Franks*, Oxford 1988; I.N. Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751*, London 1994; W.M. Daly, *Clovis. How Barbaric, How Pagan?*: Speculum 69 (1994) 619-664.

C. Braidotti

FRAVITTA (d. 490). Patriarch of *Constantinople for four months between 489 and 490, after the death of *Acacius. He wrote a letter of communion to *Peter Mongus of *Alexandria, preserved for us in Syriac translation by *Zacharias Rhetor, with an appeal to overcome the differences that had arisen after the Council of *Chalcedon (451) and the promulgation of the **Henoticon* decree (481) on the part of the emperor *Zeno. He also tried to reestablish communion with Pope *Felix III, who in 484 had excommunicated and deposed Acacius because he recognized Peter Mongus as archbishop of Alexandria. The conciliatory attitude of Fravitta did not produce any effect on either of his interlocutors: Peter Mongus repeated the condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of *Leo the Great, while Felix III did not grant communion to Fravitta because the bearers of the letter were not able to assure him of the suppression of the names of Acacius and Peter Mongus from the *diptychs.

CPG 5996; CSCO 84, 9-11 (text); CSCO 88, 6-7 (tr.); DHGE 18, 1128-1129; Patrologia V, 42.

F. Scorza Barcellona

FREDEGAR (pseudo) (7th c.?). The attribution of the composition of the *Chronica* to a Fredegar appears to be the fruit of an erroneous reading of the MSS by the humanists (*sed carius*, read as *Fredcarius*, later changed into *Fredegarius*), and now the almost unanimously accepted opinion holds that the writing is a compilation, perhaps the result of the work of numerous authors. In fact the *Chronica* appear as a heterogeneous whole, comprising at least five parts, in the most ancient MS—more or less contemporaneous with the compilation—that transmits them (the Claromontanus, Paris, BN, Lat. 10910). The fourth part is original, introduced by a *praefatio* that explains the structure and plan of the work. This starts off with the Latin translation of the so-called *Chronaca* of *Hippolytus of Rome; it proceeds with extracts from the *Chronicon* of *Jerome and with a synthesis of the *Historiae* of *Gregory of Tours and concludes with some extracts from the *Chronica* of *Isidore of Seville, reaching up to 642.

Multiple hypotheses have been advanced by scholars on the phases and modalities of the compilation and on the number and political-geographic affiliation of its editors: they go from the three editors proposed by Krusch, all of the 7th c., two of Burgundian origin and one of Austrasian (a hypothesis that is still today among the best supported), and from the two of Hellmann, to the sole editor of Goffart, who accepted reflections already advanced by preceding scholars. Finally, acc. to Erikson, who confronted the question from the linguistic point of view, there was no author Fredegar (or someone in his place), but only a compiler who drew on various sources, transforming them acc. to his personal style.

In their original part the *Chronica* narrate the history of the Merovingian kingdom from 584 to 642 (with interpolations that reach up to 658); therefore they represent a primary source for knowledge of the vicissitudes of the Franks; in particular they are the only source for the period after 591–592, which ends with *Gregory of Tours. On the whole the chronicler creates a "universal Francocentric history." The literary evaluation of the work is severe: the use of the sources has usually been judged uncritical, the sense of narration scarce, the coloring of fable excessive, the Latin barbaric. In such a panorama, contrary voices such as that of Goffart, who defined it as "the most important literary work of the Frankish kingdom in the 7th c.," are rare.

More recently, critical historiography has revealed the ideological implications underpinning the "origin myth" of the Merovingian dynasty that is narrated in the *Chronica* and has granted a specific

importance to the perspective of the editor in relationship to the sources, revealing his intentional autonomy. According to this vision, the portrait of Clovis that emerges from the work appears to contrast strongly with that elaborated by Gregory of Tours, for whom the king was the true founder of the Frankish people thanks to his baptism. In the picture painted by Gregory, in fact, Clovis is put into a mythic-Christian tradition; in that of the author of the *Chronica* into a mythic-pagan one, in which the Christian elements are reduced to a minimum, and Clovis loses his charisma of "founder" to become the fifth king of the Franks, starting from the historical-legendary information endorsed by ps.-Fredegar.

CPL 1314. *Editions*: MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.*, 2, 1-193; J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar with Its Continuations*, London 1960; Frédégaire, *Chronique des temps mérovingiens (livre IV et continuations)*, Fr. tr. and comm. by O. Devillers - J. Meyers, Turnhout 2001.

Studies: G. Schnürer, *Die Verfasser der sogenannten Fredegar-Chronik*, Fribourg 1900; M. Baudot, *La question du pseudo-Frédégaire*: Le Moyen Âge, S. II, 29 (1928) 129-170; S. Hellmann, *Das Fredegarproblem*: Historische Vierteljahrschrift 29 (1934) 36-92, now in Id., *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen*, Darmstadt 1961, 101-157; J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Fredegar and the History of France*: Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 40 (1957–1958) 529-550, now in *The Long-Haired Kings and Other Studies*, London 1962, 71-94; W. Goffart, *The Fredegar Problem Reconsidered*: Speculum 38 (1963) 206-241; A. Erikson, *The Problem of Authorship in the "Chronicle" of Fredegar*: Eranos 63 (1965) 47-76; B. Luiselli, *Il mito dell'origine romana dei Galli, dei Franchi, degli Scandinavi*: Romanobarbarica 3 (1978) 89-121; K.H.J. Gardiner, *Notes on the Chronology of Fredegar Book IV*: Parergon 20 (1978) 40-44; W. Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, Princeton, NJ 1988; W. Goffart, *Rome's Fall and After*, London 1989; F. Brunhölz, *Histoire de la littérature latine du moyen âge*, I/1, Fr. tr., Louvain-la-Neuve 1990, 137-138 and 269; I.N. Wood, *Fredegar's Fable*, in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, Vienna-Munich 1994, 359-366; R. Waswo, *Our Ancestor, the Trojans. Inventing Cultural Identity in the Middle Ages*: Exemplaria 7 (1995) 269-290; K.F. Werner, *La "conquête franque" de la Gaule. Itinéraires historiographiques d'une erreur*, in *Clovis chez les historiens. Études réunies par O. Guyotjeannin* (= Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartres 154 [1996]), 7-45; Patrologia IV, 354-358; A. Callender Murray, *Post vocantur Merohingii. Fredegar, Merovech and 'Sacral Kingship,'* in *After Rome's Fall. Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History. Essays presented to Walter Goffart*, Toronto 1998, 121-152; C. Carozzi, *Clovis, de Grégoire de Tours aux Grandes Chroniques de France. Naissance d'une mémoire ambigüe*, in *Faire mémoire. Souvenir et commémoration au Moyen Âge*, Aix-en-Provence 1999, 41-61; G. Scheibelreiter, *Fredegar Chronist einer Epoche*, in *The Medieval Chronicle.* Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Drieberg-Utrecht, 13-16 July 1996, Amsterdam 1999, 251-259; G. Scheibelreiter, *Die barbarische Gesellschaft. Mentalitäts-geschichte der europäischen Achsenzeit 5.-8. Jahrhundert*, Darmstadt 1999.

B. Clausi

FREEDOM – FREE WILL. The notion of freedom was central to ancient *philosophical reflection, esp. in *Platonism and *Stoicism. The former, following Plato, privileged persuasion, instruction and free adherence to rules and discipline as a basis for education; the latter, from the ancient Stoa (esp. Chrysippus) onward, strongly felt the need of a reconciliation between universal fate/necessity (εἱμαρμένη, ἀνάγκη) and human freedom.

*Justin's main criticism of Stoic thought, which he otherwise appreciated in many other respects (*2 Apol.* 8,1) but which he left for the Platonic doctrine and Christianity, lies precisely in its determinism, which in fact denies human freedom, as he denounces in his second *Apology* 7,3-8, Indeed, in his first *Apology* (28,3 and 43,1-8), Justin attacks determinism, using the Stoic ethical terminology, but insisting on human freedom and on each human's responsibility before God. According to Justin, the Stoic ethic is good, but is not adequately grounded in metaphysics and is undermined by determinism. Other patristic authors as well supported the doctrine of human freedom and responsibility—grounded in the *Bible and in the idea of a *judgment and of God's punishment or reward for human deeds—against determinism: for instance *Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* II 27; *Irenaeus, *AH* IV 4,3; 37,1-6; 39,1; and *Athenagoras, who also was well acquainted with Greek philosophy. But those who, after Justin, most vigorously defended freedom against *gnostic and astrological predestinationism were surely *Clement, *Origen and *Bardesanes. The first two strongly fought against the *Valentinian idea that humanity is divided into three classes, each predestined to salvation or damnation by nature, independent of individual choices. Clement argued for human freedom in many passages, esp. in *Strom.* I, 1,4,1, where he applies Plato's principle that virtue is something ἀδέσποτον and God is ἀναίτιος to claim that each one is responsible for his or her own choices—just as he does in VII, 2, 12 and in I, 17, 83-84, where he also adduces examples drawn by *Chrysippus on human freedom (SVF II, 353 and 236)—or in IV, 24, 153, 1-2 and in II, 14-15, 60ff.

Clement devotes a long treatment to human responsibility, drawing support both from the Bible and from the classical world. Every rational creature is endowed with freedom, including the devil, who was not evil by nature, but became such due to a bad choice (I, 17, 83-84). Clement espouses the Socratic-Platonic principle that one chooses evil mistaking it for good (ethical intellectualism), and takes up the Stoic one that errors are the consequence of an assent given to a wrong proposition. It is clear that,

from this perspective, in order to make good choices, one must have good knowledge and intellectual discernment. In I, 20, 115-116, Clement attacks Valentinus's claim that a soul may be saved by nature rather than by knowledge. Clement openly criticizes gnostic predestinationism, as theorized by Valentinus, *Basilides and their followers, in that it undermines human freedom, the ἑκούσιον and ἀκούσιον, and divine punishment and reward in God's "salvific justice" (*Strom.* II, 3). If human beings had no freedom, they would be like puppets. The very same argument is to be found in a contemporary of Clement, Bardesanes of Edessa, who wrote a Κατὰ Εἱμαρμένης that is at least partially preserved in Greek by *Eusebius and in Syriac in the so-called *Liber Legum Regionum*, col. 10 Nau: if human beings had been created by God without freedom, they would be simply an instrument of him who moved them toward good or evil. Bardesanes, like Clement and Origen, polemicized against gnosticism and *Marcionism, and against astrological predestinationism. The whole *Liber* and the Eusebian excerpts are all devoted to the refutation of determinism and fate and to the defense of human free will. The same arguments *Contra Fatum*, partially already present in Philo and in the Platonic philosophical tradition, occur again in Origen, *Didymus the Blind, *Diodore of Tarsus (who wrote a Κατὰ Εἱμαρμένης preserved by *Photius) and *Gregory of Nyssa, who also wrote a treatise titled *Contra Fatum*.

For Origen in particular the endorsement of human freedom was crucial. I have endeavored to demonstrate that he even based his theodicy and eschatology precisely on this polemic against gnostic determinism, as is evident from *Princ.* III, where he begins with supporting human freedom and constructing a theodicy that destroys Valentinian and Marcionite doctrines, and ends with the theory of **apokatastasis*. Indeed, both for him and, later, for *Gregory of Nyssa, who was deeply influenced by Origen, human freedom does not at all undermine the eventual *apokatastasis*: for in the αἰῶνες each one will experience the consequences of his or her previous free choices, but sooner or later all will achieve purification and illumination, thanks also to the help of the angels and of Christ-Logos, who is the Great Physician, and all will *voluntarily* adhere to the *Good, i.e., God. The *apokatastasis* is not in the least at odds with the freedom of all rational creatures. All will not be forced to submission, but will voluntarily and consciously choose the Good after knowing it, thanks to a pure, undarkened mind.

Origen's ethical intellectualism certainly played a core role, but it is important to observe that the final, blessed *telos* is achieved and preserved by all not only by means of knowledge and illumination, purification and sanctification, but also and above all by means of love (ἀγάπη), which guarantees the unity of all in the *apokatastasis*. Indeed, acc. to Origen, human freedom does not entail a new fall in the end, and thus the series of αἰῶνες will come to an end in the ἀϊδιότης of *apokatastasis* (*see* *eternity), because "love never fails." Origen (*Comm. in Rom.* V, 10,15-16) cites St. Paul, 1 Cor 13:8a: ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει. There will be no more κόρος (satiety), because the goodness of God, as an object of love, will never be exhausted. "What it is that will be able to restrain freedom in the future world in order to prevent it from falling again into *sin is indicated by the Apostle in a short statement: *Love never falls*. This is why love is said to be greater than faith and than hope. For it is only thanks to love that it will no longer be possible to sin . . . once we have reached the culmination of perfection, it will be all the more impossible that our freedom may fall from the object of its love. . . . The power of love is so great as to attract everything to itself [*tanta caritatis vis est ut ad se omnia trahat*]. Love will bring all to itself and will overthrow all powers, because it is God who first gave us the basis for love. Thus, quite rightly, love, which, alone, is greater than all the rest, will keep every creature far from falling. Then God will be *all in all* [*ideo merito caritas, quae sola omnium maior est, omnem creaturam continebit a lapsu. Tunc erit Deus omnia in omnibus*]." This is what Gregory of Nyssa, too, will maintain (*In illud. Tunc et Ipse Filius*, pp. 13-14 Downing): "No one will fall out [μηδενὸς ἀποπίπτοντος] of God's Kingdom." The *apokatastasis* is characterized by perfect and indefectible love acc. to both Origen and Gregory.

At the same time, the *apokatastasis* will be the reign of freedom: one of the New Testament passages that Origen most loves and repeatedly applies to the *resurrection and *apokatastasis* is Rom 8:21: each creature will be liberated from the slavery of corruption into the liberty of the glory of God's children. "The whole creation hopes for its liberation, hopes to be set free from the chains of corruption, when the children of God, who had fallen and dispersed, will be collected again into unity" (*Princ.* III, 5,4); "I understand the Apostle's words, 'all creation will be liberated from the slavery of corruption into the liberty of the glory of God's children' [Rom 8:21] in the sense that the first creation of rational and incorporeal beings was such as not to be subject to corruption, in that it was without (heavy) bodies. For, wherever there are bodies, immediately corruption follows. The creation will be set free from the

slavery of corruption when it has received the glory of God's Son, and God will be all in all" (*Princ.* III, 6,1). Indeed, in *Princ.* I, 7,5 Origen presents the *apokatastasis* as "the liberation of the creation and the end of slavery," i.e., the enslavement to evil that brought about death and corruption. The *apokatastasis* will be the glorious achievement of perfect freedom for all human beings and all rational creatures. This idea is shared entirely by Nyssa as well. In *De Anima*, 101,25-43, he describes the *apokatastasis* as the achievement of true freedom after the liberation from evil: "The gospel . . . asserts that the justice of God applies to all, granting the time necessary for the cancelation of the debt, acc. to its weight, without neglecting even the smallest of debts. And the Evangelist has said that the cancelation of debts does not come by means of a payment of money, but rather that the debtor is consigned to torturers, until he has paid his entire debt: and this means nothing other than that, by means of the required suffering and the penalty of participation in pain, he cancels the debt that he acquired during his earthly life. . . . And so, after having shed all that was alien to him, i.e., sin, and after having stripped off the shame that resulted from his debts, he can finally arrive at a condition of freedom and of trust."

There is another sense in which freedom can be understood: as opposed to *slavery, which in the ancient world was a regular institution. Among philosophers, and esp. in Roman Stoicism, it was stressed that both slavery and freedom are to be found in the moral sphere—as enslavement to passions and freedom from passions guaranteed by wisdom—and it was often recommended to treat slaves humanely, in light of our common human nature, e.g., by Seneca. Perhaps the one who went farthest was a disciple of Musonius Rufus, Dio Chrysostom: he recognized that slavery in itself "is unjust and does not belong to truth" (*Or.* 15,25-28), just as all manners of possession of a person on the part of another person are unjust, because by nature and in truth all human beings are free—although not even Dio fought for the elimination of slavery. St. Paul, too, notoriously exhorted masters to love their fellow believers even if slaves, and to remember that they too have a Master in heaven, before whom all human beings, slaves and free, will have to appear at the judgment. And in Gal 3:28 Paul claims that "in Christ there is neither slave nor free." But neither Seneca nor Paul condemned slavery as an institution; in 1 Cor 7:20 Paul recommends his fellow believers maintain the social condition they had before their conversion to Christianity (since it evidently is an "indifferent," in Stoic terminology), and, after converting the fugitive slave Onesimus, he sent him back to his master Philemon, albeit certainly calling him "my heart," in that he was his spiritual son.

Generally speaking, the position of the Fathers did not result in a condemnation of slavery as an institution either. Mostly, they saw it as an evil, to be sure, but a necessary evil, a consequence of the Fall that, as such, cannot be eliminated. *Augustine (*Civ. Dei* 19,15) presents slavery as the fruit of sin. It is not part of God's plan, but a result of decay; it will be eliminated only in the other world. Some Fathers, such as *Theodoret in *De Providentia Divina* 7, even maintained the usefulness, not only of poverty and richness, but also of slavery and mastery, on the pretext of a differentiation of tasks. *Basil, in *De spiritu sancto* 20, recognizes that no human being is a slave by nature—an assertion that goes against Aristotle's conviction—since by nature all human beings are free; but soon he explains that some are slaves because of a war, others due to poverty and others thanks to an ineffable providential dispensation, for the worse were commanded to serve the better, which is "not even a condemnation, but a blessing." For it is useful that those who have scarce intelligence serve those who are better. At least Basil insists that in respect to God we are all slaves, since we all belong to God our Creator. But *John Chrysostom claimed (e.g., in *Hom. in 1 Cor.* 40,5) that there is no need for slaves, as God made us capable of serving ourselves and even our neighbors; he adduces the example of St. Paul, who worked for himself and had no slaves. Especially having many slaves is "shameful," for it is not necessity that introduced slavery, but sin: but now Christ has eliminated this, because in Christ there is neither slave nor free. Therefore, John's advice is to let one's slaves free, because keeping slaves is not a work of *philanthrōpia*.

Above all, at least one Father thought that human freedom is so precious a good and divine gift to all humans that the very institution of slavery is intolerable and should be abolished altogether; namely, *Gregory of Nyssa. Differently from other patristic authors, he believed that slavery, far from being an indifferent or an inescapable consequence of the Fall, is a positive offense to God and to humankind, and that it ought to be radically eliminated. His main argument is found in his fourth *Homily on *Ecclesiastes* (GNO 5, 334-352), in commenting on Eccl 2:7. These homilies were preached in AD 379; in 321 Constantine had granted churches the power of *manumissio in Ecclesia*, and Easter had become a traditional occasion for the emancipation of slaves. Gregory exhorts his flock to set free their slaves (*In*

Sanctam Ecclesiam, GNO 9, 250-251). But his discourse is not occasional: it rather consists in a full argument for the intrinsic illegitimacy and impiety of all slavery.

From the beginning of the homily (334) he criticizes those human beings who presume to be masters of other human beings, which is nothing but a huge presumption; one cannot pretend to possess another human being in front of God, since we all belong only to God. Those who pretend to own other persons make of God's possession their own possession (335). Those who presume to possess slaves go against God's decree, which made all human beings free. God's law gives us no privilege over one another, for God made each human being the master of all creation, and anyone who dares enslave any human being fights against God's decision. God granted humans the command over irrational creatures, not over other humans. Those who presume to own slaves divide human nature into slavery and mastery (336). But the image of God can be bought at no price: God made each human being the owner of the whole cosmos, and no amount of money, however huge, could buy it. Not even God would enslave humanity: for, as humans enslaved themselves to sin, God called them again to freedom; not even the whole world could ever buy one human creature. Only a fool could presume to be the master of the image of God (337). All are equal, all liable to the same passions and sufferings and joys, all breathe the same air, all will have the same judgment, the same Kingdom or Gehenna, and the same salvation, and it is not permitted to divide human nature into slavery and mastery. But the root of all sins is the love of money and possessions (339). Similar positions are held by Gregory in *De Oratione Dominica*, GNO 7/2, 70-71, and *De Beatitudinibus* 3. Gregory observes that τὸ αὐτοκρατὲς καὶ τὸ ἀδέσποτον are fundamental characteristics of the entire human nature, created in the image of God.

N.D. O'Donaghue, *Freedom in the City of God*, Prudentia 11 (1979) 27-32; R. Klein, *Die Sklaverei in der Sicht der Bischöfe Ambrosius und Augustinus*, Stuttgart 1988; C.E. Manning, *Stoicism and Slavery in the Roman Empire*, in ANRW, II.36.3 (1989) 1518-1543; S. Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*, Oxford 1998; T. Brennan, *The Stoic Life. Emotions, Duties, and Fate*, Oxford 2005; I. Ramelli, *La coerenza della soteriologia origeniana. Dalla polemica contro il determinismo gnostico all'universale restaurazione escatologica*, in *Pagani e cristiani alla ricerca della salvezza. Atti del XXXIV Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana, Roma, Augustinianum, 5-7.V.2005* [SEA 96], Rome 2006, 661-688; Id., *Il* βασιλεύς *come* νόμος ἔμψυχος *tra diritto naturale e diritto divino. Spunti platonici del concetto e sviluppi di età imperiale*, Naples 2006; Id., *Gregorio di Nissa: Sull'Anima e la Resurrezione*, Milan 2007; Id., *Bardesane* Κατὰ Εἱμαρμένης, Bologna 2009; Id., *Slavery as a Necessary Evil or as an Evil That Should Be Abolished? The Patristic Debate*, Annual Meeting of the SBL, Boston, November 2008.

I. Ramelli

FRIENDSHIP. The awareness that Christian charity must extend to all did not prevent the Fathers of the first centuries from discussing the theme of friendship, as a relationship of preferential love that may mutually unite some men and women. They were encouraged in this by examples in *Scripture: the friendship between David and Jonathan (1 Kgs 18:20; 2 Kgs 1) and the exhortation of Prov 17:17: "A friend loves at all time, and a brother is born for adversity." Mentioned more than once in the NT is the friendship between Christ himself and Lazarus (cf. M. Garzonio, *Lazzaro. L'amicizia nella Bibbia*, Milan 1994) or the other disciples. Friendship was principally considered a good that human beings possess by nature (Aug., *De bon. coniug.* 1,1); it must therefore be desired for itself and not for ulterior ends (ibid., 9,9; *Ep.* 130, 6, 13), and is essential for life (*Soliloq.* 1,7). In this conception the Fathers faithfully followed the idea of friendship already held by the *pagans. According to Aristotle: "Among the various kinds of friendship, the truest is that which is born of the common aspiration for virtue" (*Et. Nicom.* 8,6.1202). *Lucian of Samosata considered friendship to be that thing "admired above all others" (*Tossari o l'amicizia*, 7). *Clement refers to Pythagoras (*Protr.* XII, 122,3), and *Augustine cites Cicero (*C. Acad.* 3, 6, 13), who had defined friendship as "communication of human and divine things through benevolence and love" (Cic., *Lael.* 6,2).

From this definition, however, Augustine emphasized the aspect most proper to Christian friendship: it is above all "communication of divine things," a communication such as to render the friendship perfect and eternal, since it unites friends to the Lord himself (Aug., *Ep.* 258, 1). The specific quality of friendship must be its duration (Jerome, *Ep.* 3,6) (for Jerome's friendships, cf. I. Grego, *San Girolamo e i suoi amici romani*: Asprenas [1985] 429-444): not transitory, but eternal (Cic., *Lael.* 9, 32). For this to occur, God must have a part in the friendship. For Clement of Alexandria it is the mediation of the Logos that establishes the close relationship of friendship between God and the creature (*Strom.* 2,9.41,2); for Origen, the Logos makes us friends of God (*C. Cels.* 4,3). The eternity of God, moreover, guarantees the eternity of friendship (Paul. Nol., *Ep.* 3, 1; 40,2; Aug., *Conf.* IV 7; John Chrys., *Hom. in Col.* 1, 3). Friends must also flee *sin, helping one another

(Athan., *Om. Copta*, codex M 577 = Athanasius, in *Omelie Copte*, ed. T. Orlandi, Turin 1981, 55; Ambr., *De off.* 3; John Chrys., *Hom. in Eph.* 18,4; *Hom. in Heb.* 30,2; Aug., *Ep.* 151, 7), and avoiding the friendship of *heretics (Athan., *Vita Ant.* 68). The characteristics of Christian friendship are amply pointed out by *Ambrose based on scriptural texts (*De off.* 3, 124-134). In addition, the person's relationship with God can also be understood as friendship, thanks to the mediation of the Word (Clem. Al., *Prot.* XII, 122, 3): it is Christ who has taught us a way of life that leads to friendship with God (Orig., *C. Cel.* 1, 3, 28), such that all things are common to these friends, God and the human being (Clem. Al., *Prot.* l.c.), with the covenant itself being understood as a communion of friendship (Id., *Paed.* 1, 7, 56). Friendship with celestial creatures is also discussed (Aug., *Civ. Dei* 19,9; Leo the Great, *Serm.* 35, 4) in a tension that must lead friendship to extend to all, including enemies (Aug., *Serm.* 56, 10, 14).

Among the most famous friendships in patristics is that between *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nazianzus. Gregory wrote to Basil: "I breathe you even more than the air, and live only when I am with you, whether in your presence, or in your absence through images" (*Ep.* 6,5). The friendship between *John Chrysostom and *Olympias should also be noted (we have 17 letters from the former to the latter), and that between *John Cassian and *Germanus. In *Confer.* I, Cassian writes: "From the beginning of my Christian life, I had a perfect union of intentions with him. I was with him in the *cenobium, I was with him in the hermitage, to the point that those who knew us, in order to indicate the unity of our purposes, said that we were one soul in two bodies."

P. Fabre, *Saint Paulin de Nole et l'amitié chrétienne*, Paris 1949; M. Aquinas McNamara, *L'amicizia in s. Agostino*, Milan 1970; L.F. Pizzolato, *L'amicizia cristiana*, Turin 1973; C. Mazzucco - C. Militello - A. Valerio, *E Dio li creò . . . Coppie straordinarie nei primi tredici secoli di cristianesimo*, Milan 1990; C. Militello, *Amicizia tra asceti e ascete*, in *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, ed. U. Mattioli, Genoa 1992, 279-304; R. Piccolomini, *L'amicizia. Sant'Agostino*, Rome 1994; C. Romano, *Un'anima in due corpi. L'amicizia nella patristica*, Salerno 1995.

M.G. Mara

FRONTO of Cirta. A native of *Cirta in Africa (95/100–166/175 AD), he lived at *Rome, becoming a celebrated orator and carrying out an intense judicial activity with political and forensic speeches. Around 138 he obtained the post of tutor of the future emperor *Marcus Aurelius (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 24). He also made a career in politics: praetor (ILS 1129 and 2928), *consul suffectus* in 143 and governor of Asia (however, he renounced this office). He wrote various works (letters, speeches, etc.) discovered by A. Mai in a *palimpsest of Bobbio in 1815. Only *Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 9,6 and 31,2) alludes to a speech of his against the Christians—not extant—which Fronto probably delivered around 160, where various infamous charges are set out (orgies, sexual liberties, cannibalism, ritual homicide of children, onolatry, etc.): Fronto seems to have made himself spokesman for the *pagan reaction or instrument of the official political line, hostile to Christians. The hypothesis of Schanz (96) that Fronto had given this speech before the senate, perhaps at the request of the emperor, does not appear likely and still less is it verifiable. For Hubík the 2 *Apology* of Justin is a response to it.

Fronto appears as one of the principal representatives of the archaizing tendency of the 2nd c.: he delighted in linguistic studies and the pursuit of a refined vocabulary and stylistic elegance; he dedicated himself to the assiduous reading of texts, preferably archaic, considered examples of the true and genuine Latin literary culture.

Editions: C.R. Haines, *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, MA-London 1919–1920; F. Portalupi, *Opere di Marco Cornelio Frontone* (Classici latini), Turin 1974; M.P.J. van den Hout, *M. Cornelius Fronto*, *Epistulae* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana) Leipzig [2]1988; *Marcus Cornelius Fronto*, *Epistulae* (Scriptorum Romanorum quae extant omnia), 2 vols., Pisa 1989. *Studies*: K. Hubík, *Die Apologie des hl. Justinus*, Vienna 1912, 164-172 and passim; M. Schanz *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 3, Munich [3]1922, 88-100; P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, Paris 1934, 87-94; P. Frassinetti, *L'orazione di Frontone contro i cristiani*: GIF 2 (1949) 238-254; F. Portalupi, *Marco Cornelio Frontone*, Turin 1961; KLP 2 (1967) 616-618; RAC 8, 520-524; M.C. Cristofori, *L'oratio di Frontone contro i cristiani e la persecuzione di Marco Aurelio*: RSCI 32 (1978) 130-139; E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome*, Cambridge, MA-London 1980; B. Baldwin, *Fronto on the Christians*: Illinois Classical Studies 15 (1990) 177-181; C. Bammel, *Die erste lateinische Rede gegen die Christen*: ZKG 104 (1993) 295-311; P.V. Cova, *Marco Cornelio Frontone*: ANRW II.34.2 (1993) 874-918 (bibl.); P. Soverini, *Aspetti e problemi delle teorie retoriche frontoniane*: ibid., 919-1004; A. Michel, *Rhétorique et philosophie au second siècle après J.-C.*: ANRW II.34.1 (1993) 3-78.

M. Maritano

FRUCTUOSUS of Braga (d. 665). Monk and bishop, coming from the royal Visigothic family (related to King Sisenand and to the bishops Peter of Béziers and Selva [Sclua] of *Narbonne), he had his education in Palencia under the guidance of *Conantius. He dedicated himself to anchoritic *asceticism, but the presence and pressure of disciples led him to

found new monasteries: Compludum and Rufiana in Bierzo, others in the province of León, on the Atlantic (perhaps in the province of Pontevedra) and in Andalucia. He was elected abbot-bishop of *Dumium before 650; in 656, he was metropolitan of *Braga, where in 665 he died. His tomb (a strange building still preserved) became a center of worship. This and his monastic asceticism led to the composition of his *Vita* toward 674, unduly attributed to *Valerius of Bierzo. He wrote a *Rule of the Monks* for the exclusive use of the first monastery he founded in Compludum, a supplication to King Recceswinth in favor of some political prisoners, and a letter to *Braulio of Saragossa, in which certain works, not to be found in Galicia, were requested. A *Common Rule* has been attributed to him; but this, in reality, must be the work of his disciples. Perhaps he merely contributed to it. There is no reason to attribute to him the paternity of a monastic movement, called Fructuosian or federal, because the structure of the monastery is based on a mutual rapport between abbot and monks.

CPL 1869-1871; Diaz 216-219, 314-315; PL 80, 690-692; 87, 1099-1130; A.C. do Amaral, *Vida e reglas religiosas de S. Fructuoso Brucarense*, Lisbon 1805; I. Herwegen, *Das Pactum des hl. Fruktuosus von Braga*, Stuttgart 1907; C.F. Nock, *The Vita Sancti Fructuosi*, Washington DC 1946; M. Martins, *Correntes da filosofia religiosa em Braga*, Porto 1950, 287-320; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *La Vida de San Fructuoso de Braga*, Braga 1974; BS 5, 1295-96; DIP 4, 983-986; R. Grégoire, *Valeurs ascétiques et spirituelles de la "Regula monachorum" et de la "Regula communis" de S. Fructueux de Braga*: RAM 43 (1976) 159-176; A. de Almeida Matos, *La "regula monastica communis." Su origen y autoría*: AST 51-52 (1978-79) 191-202; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Fructuosiana*, in *De Tertullien aux mozarabes*, Mélanges Fontaine, II, Paris 1992, 31-40; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 289-343.

M. Díaz y Díaz

FRUCTUOSUS of Tarragona (d. 259). Bishop of *Tarragona, Fructuosus and his deacons Augurius and Eulogius suffered martyrdom 21 January 259. In 1926–1930 the place in which they had been buried and a fragment of an inscription that indicates their names were discovered. Above the tomb a basilica was raised; its layout has been identified. Their *passion* (BHL 3196), which largely reports the minutes of the trial during which they were condemned, has been preserved in a rewritten version that seems to be from the end of the 4th c. *Prudentius dedicated the *Perist.* VI to them, and *Augustine, *Serm.* 273. In antiquity their veneration spread in *Baetica, in Catalonia, in S *Gaul and in *Africa. The *Visigothic Orational* (conserved at Verona) contains several prayers in their honor; the martyrologies mention their feast.

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Gli atti di S. Fruttuoso di Tarragona*: ST 63, 129-181; Delehaye 144-199; C. García Rodríguez, *El culto de los Santos en la España romana y visigoda*, Madrid 1966, 316-321; BS 5, 1296-1298; DHEE 2, 962-3; LTK[3] IV, 178-179; *Histoire des saints*, II, 158-160; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografiche*, ST 65, Rome 1935; A. Wlosok, *Actes des martyrs et Passions*, in *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, V: *Restauration et renouveau. La littérature latine de 284 à 347 après J.C.*, ed. R. Herzog, avant propos de J. Fontaine, Turnhout 1993, 486-487; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-christiana*, I. *Siglos III-IV*, Madrid 1998, 34-45; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Agli inizi dell'agiografia occidentale*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, sous la direction de G. Philippart (CC. Hagiographies III), Turnhout 2001, 49-52.

V. Saxer

FRUMENTIUS. The apostle of "India ulterior," he was consecrated bishop by *Athanasius (Ruf., *HE* X, 9: GCS Eus., 2,2, 971-973; cf. PL 21, 478-480). The traditional identification of Frumentius with Abba Salama, first apostle of *Ethiopia, has been contested by Altheim and Stiehl.

BS 5, 1292-1294; F. Altheim - R. Stiehl, *Christentum am Roten Meer*, I, Berlin-New York 1971, 402-409.

S.J. Voicu

FULGENTIUM DONATISTAM, ADVERSUS. Known for some time and published with other Augustinian works, the *Adversus Fulgentium Donatistam* is a brief work composed of two distinct parts: the refutation of a *Donatist pamphlet on *baptism and a fictional dialogue between Augustine, spokesman for the Catholics, and Fulgentius, spokesman for the Donatists. P. Monceaux, in his work dedicated to African writers, attributes this work not to Augustine, as the codices claim, but to an African writer contemporaneous with Augustine, to whom he gives the name Fulgentius Donatist, and dates the work on the basis of internal evidence (reference to the Conference of *Carthage of 411 and to the *schism of the *Maximianists) between 412 and 420. His judgment on the quality of the work is not among the most favorable, above all because of the lack of internal harmony in the dialogue: the anonymous interlocutors suddenly acquire precise names, Augustine and Fulgentius, and the discourse, at first rather sluggish, at the end acquires vivacity; nevertheless, he acknowledges the historic value of a work that conveys noteworthy parts of the Donatist treatise to us.

C. Lambot in 1948 announced a new MS that revealed a considerable lacuna in the text, a lacuna

that at last allows us to explain the different rhythms of the dialogue and the introduction of the names of the interlocutors; Lambot has described the MS in question and has prepared an edition of the complete work, prefacing it with a study concerning the author, the divisions of the text, the closeness with other writings of a similar content. Furthermore, acc. to Lambot, Augustine cannot be recognized as the author of the work. The unanimous attribution to the bishop of Hippo by all the MSS would have been conditioned by the original absence of a title: to designate the work, one of the protagonists of the dialogue would simply have been identified as the author; apart from the names of the participants, no internal evidence reveals any clue as to the identity of the author; the date is a little later than the Conference of Carthage (411), given that the work shows strong affinities with other African writings of that period.

After a brief introduction, where "to seek the truth in all things, recognize it where it is found, keep it after it has been recognized" (I, 4-5) is pointed out as a precise duty of the Christian, a dialogue takes place between a *donatista* and a *catholicus*, supporters of opposed theories on baptism: acc. to the Donatist, the baptism dispensed by the Catholic clergy is invalid and those who enter into his church must be rebaptized; naturally, the repetition of baptism is completely excluded by the Catholic. Each of the interlocutors relies heavily on the Holy *Scriptures to support his own thesis. The observations of P. Monceaux, for the section of the text known to him, on the sacred text used by the two contestants are interesting; on this question, we add simply that the *catholicus* tends esp. to challenge the passages cited by the Donatist, reusing them against the adversary after having revised the exegesis in an orthodox interpretation. The dialogue even reaches contemptuous notes: the Donatist is accused of considering himself so perfect, in the rites and the interpretations which he has chosen, as to relegate others, including God himself, outside the circle of the true followers of God (XV, 20). The first part concludes with the apostrophe to brother Fulgentius who has brought the pamphlet into the hands of the author: he corrects and leads to the truth one who desires always to be a disciple of the truth (XXX, 32-38). The dialogue of the second part is vivacious; the hypothetical encounter between Fulgentius and Augustine is proposed to clarify all the tortuous quibbles of the controversy; playing on the meaning of the words and putting forth stringent logical arguments, he returns to attacking the Donatist conception of baptism. The task of ridiculing the presumption of an African church being left as the only remaining depository of the correct faith against the entirety of the Christian world falls to Augustine (cf. XXIV, 2-5).

PL 43, 763-774; CSEL 53, 287-310; CPL 380; Monceaux VI, 220-232; C. Lambot: RBen 58 (1948) 177-222.

D. NUZZO

FULGENTIUS, Fabius Planciades (late 5th c.?). Little or nothing is known of this author, including when he lived (estimates fluctuate between the 4th and 6th c.), given the scarcity and ambiguity of the information obtainable from his work and the absence of any external data. He was of African origin but later than Martianus Capella. That he was Christian appears with certainty, based on the polemical suggestions contained within his famous studies of allegorical interpretation—the *Mythologiarum libri tres* (mythological stories allegorically interpreted) and the *Expositio Vergilianae continentiae* (allegorical interpretation of the *Aeneid* of Virgil)—on an isolated citation of *Tertullian in the bizarre *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* (explanation of 62 obsolete words with examples taken from the ancient authors up to Martianus Capella), and above all on the biblical inspiration of his universal chronicle, the *De aetatibus mundi et hominis* (14 passages that describe biblical and profane events), an incomplete work in 14 books that the MSS attribute to a *Fabius Claudius Gordianus Fulgentius*, but which unequivocal stylistic-textual agreements prove to be the work (like the very brief *Super Thebaidem* having reached us with the name of *S. Fulgentius Episcopus*) of the same author as the above-mentioned works.

A possible identification with Fulgentius of Ruspe has been considered, with whom he shares African origin; this thesis has also been proposed again recently by Langlois. The fundamental cultural orientations, however, of the two authors are extremely different: exclusively theological and doctrinal in the first, plain and skillfully literary and erudite (consider the "lipographic" technique of the *De aetatibus*) in the second.

CPL 849-853; R. Helm, repr. Leipzig 1970 (with bibl.); *Expositio sermonum antiquorum*, intr., text, trans. and notes by U. Pizzani, Rome 1969; *Expositio Vergilianae continentiae*, intr., text, trans. and commentary by T. Agozzino - F. Zanlucchi, Padova 1972; O. Friebel, *Fulgentius der Mythograph und Bischof*, Paderborn 1911; *Fulgentius the mythographer*, trans. L.F. Whitbread Columbus, Ohio 1971; R. Edwards, *Fulgentius and the Collapse of Meaning*: Helios 4 (1976) 17-35; G. Rauner-Hafner, *Die Vergilinterpretation des Fulgentius*: MLatJb 13 (1978) 7-49; P. Magno, *Su alcune citazioni di Fulgenzio riguardanti Ennio e Pacuvio*: RSC 26 (1978) 451-458; C. Stoecker, *Alexander der Grosse bei Fulgentius und die Historia Alexandri Macedonis des*

Antidamas: VChr 33 (1979) 55-75; P. Langlois: RAC 8, 632-661 (identifies the two Fulgentii); B. Baldwin, *Fulgentius and His Sources*: Traditio 54 (1988) 37-57; J.C. Relihan, *Fulgentius, Mitologiae 1.20-21*: AJPh 109 (1988) 229-230; A. Bisanti, *Le citazioni omeriche di Fulgenzio*, in *Studi di filologia classica in onore di G. Monaco*, Palermo 1991, IV, 1483-1490; M. Manca, *Un prologo di troppo nel De aetatibus mundi et hominis di Fulgenzio*: Quaderni del Dipartimento di filologia, linguistica e tradizione classica 1998, Bologna 1998; B.G. Hays, *A Second Look at Fulgentius's Alexander*: VChr 54 (2000) 204-207.

U. Pizzani

FULGENTIUS of Astigi (Écija) (d. before 625). Brother of *Leander, Florentina and *Isidore (6th c.). Biographical details are gathered from the *Regula* of Leander (PL 72, 892), and information on his episcopate is furnished to us by the *Acts* of the councils of *Toledo (610) and *Seville (619). Fulgentius was born in Cartagena in 540–550, to the Catholic Severianus, a Roman citizen of Spanish origin and representative of the kingdom of Toledo at Cartagena; his mother, acc. to some, was an Arian, perhaps of the name Turtura. After the Byzantine occupation, the family of Fulgentius departed for Seville in 552. He returned to Cartagena to recover his father's possessions, but we know nothing of his residence there from 575 to 589. It is probable that he was a bishop in 600. In 610 he certainly was bishop of Astigi and signed the decree of *Gundemar (610–612) for the establishment of Toledo as a metropolitan see. In the Second Council of Seville (619), the bishop of Malaga demanded from Fulgentius some parishes included in the jurisdictional territory of Astigi after the Byzantine occupation; Fulgentius, on his side, demanded from the bishop of Cordoba a basilica situated on the border of the two dioceses. In 620 Isidore dedicated to him the *De eccl. off.* Fulgentius died before 625. The veneration paid to him is posterior to 1330. Falsifiers of the 16th–17th c., confusing Fulgentius with *Fulgentius of Ruspe, among other inaccuracies, attributed to the first a treatise *De fide* and another treatise on mythology.

DHGE 19, 371-374; BS 5, 1302-1303; J.F. Rivera Recio, *Encumbramiento de la Sede Toledana durante la dominación visigótica*: Hispania Sacra 8 (1955) 13-19; Leandro de Sevilla, *De la instrucción de las vírgenes y desprecio del mundo*, trans., study and notes by Jaime Velásquez, Madrid 1979, 13-18.

E. Romero Pose

FULGENTIUS of Ruspe (467–532). From an excellent family, he was born in 467 in *Africa at Thelepte (Byzacena). His widowed mother Mariana made sure that he received a complete education, which even included knowledge of Greek. But after some years dedicated to administering the family inheritance, Fulgentius entered a monastery despite the hostility of his mother. The anti-Catholic persecution of the *Vandals forced him to change residence more than once, and one time he was badly beaten by an *Arian priest. He decided to take himself to the monks of *Egypt, but in Sicily he abandoned the idea and proceeded to *Rome (500). After returning to monastic life in Africa, despite his reluctance he was not able to avoid a more direct ecclesiastical charge. Made a priest and later bishop of Ruspe (Byzacena) in 507, he was exiled with the other members of the Catholic clergy to *Sardinia. Meanwhile, his prestige as a man of doctrine had increased greatly, and in 515 King Thrasamund wanted him at *Carthage for discussions, but sometime later sent him back to Sardinia because of the anti-Arian activity that Fulgentius was carrying out. He returned to Africa at the death of Thrasamund (523) and spent his last years dedicated to writing and pastoral activity. He died 1 January 532.

The *Vita* of Fulgentius, written by *Ferrandus, the primary source for information of a biographical nature, mentions some works that have not reached us. But those which have been preserved are sufficient to offer a precise portrait of the author. They are of a doctrinal character and are organized around two centers of interest, one trinitarian and christological of an anti-Arian slant, and the other soteriological (*grace and *free will) against the so-called *semi-Pelagians.

In the first group, *Contra arianos liber unus*, perhaps the oldest work of Fulgentius, was written in 515 at Carthage to respond to a series of Arian objections proposed by Thrasamund. The Arian, having done poorly in the first encounter with Fulgentius, sent him another series of questions, but in order to make it more difficult did not permit him to make a copy of the text and took it away from him after he had read it. Obliged to respond, Fulgentius laments, at the beginning of the *Ad Trasamundum libri III*, the unfavorable conditions in which he is constrained to write, but this does not prevent him from developing the matter organically, centered above all on specifically christological themes, because the most serious errors centered on this point. In reality Fulgentius, without omitting the specific anti-Arian thematic, primarily treats the relationship between the person and nature in Christ in polemic with the *Nestorians and the *monophysites in this work.

Also worthy of mention are the 10 books *Ad Fabianum*, of which only fragments have reached us;

the *Contra sermonem Fastidiosi ariani*, written to refute an Arian sermon that is also extant; *De fide ad Petrum* and *De trinitate ad Felicem*; books II and III *Ad Monimum*; *Ep.* 8 and 14. *Adversus Pintam* has been lost. The anti-Arian themes treated by Fulgentius retraces that of the end of the 4th c., by now traditional, without originality but with a full mastery of the complex matters and a capacity to present them in a personal way. The novelty here consists in the interference in the Arian controversy of the great christological discussions of the 5th c. That is why Fulgentius treats this matter thoroughly as well, in adherence to the Chalcedonian theology, but with a particular insistence on underlining the unity of the subject in the distinction of the two natures of Christ.

A series of requests, including that of the Scythian monks (*Ep.* 16 of the correspondence), pushed Fulgentius to treat the old Pelagian question as well, which came up again repeatedly. The *De gratia* of *Faustus of Riez had had great success, and the supporters of radical Augustinianism found difficulty in opposing it. Therefore Fulgentius, during the second exile in Sardinia, wrote a group of works on this problem: the first of *Ad Monimum libri III*, *Contra Faustum Reiensem libri VII* (nonextant), *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae*, and *Ep.* 15 and 17.

The doctrine that Fulgentius expounds in these texts is Augustinian in the most radical sense: human nature, corrupted *funditus* (entirely) by the *sin of *Adam which was transmitted to his descendants, makes each person incapable of wanting the *good and of saving oneself by his or her own devices by means of free will; only the grace of God saves a person, granted freely, which precedes merits and determines them; therefore the salvation of anyone is exclusively due to God. God grants this grace not to all but only to some who are predestined, chosen by the inscrutable divine judgment. All the others are left to their destiny, predestined not by sin but rather to the punishment that follows it. Like Augustine, Fulgentius does not deny completely the action of free will in the person, but does not succeed in plausibly harmonizing this presence with the rigid doctrine of predestination. Also, when the cooperation of the person with the preponderant action of grace is present, he clarifies that even this good will is predisposed by God, so that yet again free will falls completely under the initiative of grace, and one returns to the *aporia* left unresolved by Augustine.

We have pointed out several letters of Fulgentius: only 19 have reached us, and some are those of his correspondents. They are all engaged doctrinally and pastorally; none are correspondence for correspondence's sake.

Of the various sermons that have reached us under his name, the edition of CCL 91A only attests 8 of them as authentic, dedicated to various themes (liturgical festivals, celebration of martyrs, explanations of scriptural passages).

His *Abecedarium* has recently been discovered, better known as *Psalmus contra Wandalos arianos*, composed in imitation of the anti-Donatist *Psalmus* of Augustine: 23 alphabetic stanzas of 12 verses, not composed in meter, in imitation of the biblical psalms. The content is strongly committed to doctrine and is presented in a much simpler form than that usually adopted by the author, in order to be more accessible to the people.

CPL 814-846; PL 65; CCL 91 and 91A; M.G. Bianco, *Abecedarium Fulgentii episcopi*: Orpheus NS 1 (1980) 152-171; G. Lapeyre, *Fulgence de Ruspe*, Paris 1929; B. Nisters, *Die Christologie des Fulgentius von Ruspe*, Rome 1930; Repertorium 4, 604; PCBE 1, 507-513; M. Djuth, *Fulgentius of Ruspe. The initium bonae voluntatis*: Augustinian Studies 20 (1989) 39-60; BBKL II, 152-153; F.P. Rizzo, *Fulgenzio a Siracusa*, in *Studi di filologia classica in onore di G. Monaco*, Palermo 1991, IV, 1473-1482; V. Grossi, *La questione della predestinazione nell'agostinismo di Fulgenzio di Ruspe* (*Cagliari 502–523)*, in *La Sardegna paleocristiana tra Eusebio e Gregorio Magno.* Atti del Convegno, Cagliari, 10-12 ottobre 1996, Cagliari 1999, 201-225; D. Bachelet, *Fulgence de Ruspe. Lettres ascétiques et morales*, SC 487, Paris 2004.

M. Simonetti

FULGENTIUS the Donatist (d. after 411). A *Donatist writer, he was probably a priest (410–420). He is known as the author of the *Libellus de Baptismo*, written sometime after the Conference of *Carthage of 411 and preserved thanks to the citations contained within the reply of a *Catholic, perhaps a student of *Augustine. Fulgentius asserted that "there was only one baptism, which the Samaritan woman (i.e., the Catholic) did not possess. There was an 'enclosed garden' which was the church, where a sealed fountain was prohibited to every unworthy person. There was an oil, which was the most holy unction, which dead flies had corrupted (cf. Eccl. 10:1) and which should in no case be given to sinners." Fulgentius concentrated on the unworthiness of the Catholics, as *traditores*, to dispense valid *sacraments, but his treatise is also noteworthy inasmuch as it contains the only literal citation of the opinion of one of the bishops present at the council gathered at Carthage in 312, where *Caecilian was excommunicated. It is a good example of the level of popular religious debate in the period following the official condemnation of Donatism in 412.

Anon., *Contra Fulgentium Donatistam*: PL 43, 763-774; Monceaux VI, cap. 6, *Fulgentius le Donatiste*; PCBE I, 506-507.

W.H.C. Frend

FULMINATA (legio XII). The column of *Marcus Aurelius (Rome, piazza Colonna), among the other bas-reliefs that describe the victories of the emperor (161–180), represents the scene of the torrential rain and the lightning that saved the XII legion in Dacia from thirst and defeat. The episode of 172 (the sources offer various dates between 171 and 174), probably identified already by the emperor in a letter to the senate as a divine intervention, immediately became an object of interpretation in a Christian sense acc. to which the salvation depended on the prayers of the Christians, as *Apollinaris of Hierapolis, between 175 and 180 ca. (Eus., *HE* 5,5,4), and *Tertullian (*Apol.* 5,6; *Scap.* 4,7) testify. The column attributes the miracle to the demon of rain; Cassius Dio (*Hist. rom.* 71,8,1-10,5) on the other hand attributes it to the Egyptian magician Arnuphis, to Hermes and to other demons. An apocryphal letter of Marcus Aurelius favorable to the Christians was also put in circulation (CPG 1075). The nickname of Fulminata is not due to the miracle of the storm, because the legion already bore the name at the time of Augustus: it had probably been a sign of homage and devotion to Zeus Keraunos.

M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 3, Munich [3]1922, 252-253; M. Sordi, *Le monete di Marco Aurelio con Mercurio e la pioggia miracolosa*: Annali dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica 5-6 (1958–1959) 41-55.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

FUNERARY RITES. By the phrase "funerary rites" we are referring to that developed number of gestures, practices and *symbols with which the ancients faced the theme of death by seeking a relationship between the world of the living and the world of the dead. The process of elaboration of various rituals during the centuries of Late Antiquity should be analyzed in close relationship to the phenomena of continuity and discontinuity with the previous era. On the one hand, some aspects, esp. those pertaining to how the material of the rites developed, should be analyzed in close connection to the widespread and well-established behaviors during the centuries constituting, in some respects, a uniform cultural and anthropological inheritance. On the other hand, there also emerged themes and issues tied to attempts to "reconcile" the ancient practices with the new religion, which at times emphasize the contrasts and contradictions, or rather, the behavioral norms and precepts against which the writings of the fathers of the church and the bishops and, to a lesser extent, the conciliar canons raised their voices.

In recent decades, the historiographical debate has faced in particular the interpretation of the church's role in the ways of approaching and evaluating the reality of the funerary rites. The object of debate is the problem of the diversification and the interaction between the "popular" position of a lay multitude that was still tied to pagan or "neutral" beliefs—i.e., those that were not definable within precise religious categories—and the position of the church, which sought a malleable communicative channel and mediation with the persisting material vision of the faithful. The processes of transformation by which "the rites done by Christians" could be called "Christian rites" are numerous and complex and should be analyzed in the milieu of a broader context that also includes phenomena connected to the cult of the *martyrs and the *relics, in which the gradual "Christianization" of the worship practices can be perceived more in the ultimate finalities than in the means used. On the other hand, the funerary rites should be understood within the reality in which the borders between "sacred" and "profane"—the latter understood as the product of religious and cultural pluralism—were not only very transient, but also greatly changeable. The flexibility of these borders resulted in a copresence and coexistence of various sensibilities that were more or less close to reasons of a religious character, making it difficult to connect the context of the rites to a sole and uniform identity.

The entirety of the funerary rites can be articulated in two primary conceptual categories. One should not consider these rigidly separate, but tightly connected and complementary; the different aspects and the various nuances can reenter the complex system that constitutes the Christian approach to the world of death. The first category includes the series of beliefs, convictions, fears and symbols that become concrete in functional rituals for the deceased person's preparation for interment, and the participation of the family and the mourning community (the funerary *toilette*, the viewing of the dead person, the funerary procession and the interment). The second category relates to the underlying ideology understood in the commemoration of the deceased, which presupposed subsequent care and visits to the tomb on the days of their anniversaries, expressed primarily through liturgical celebrations and the repetition of the funerary banquet (*see* *dead, ceremonies for the; *refrigerium).

The study of the funerary rites is based on comparative analyses of various types of sources (written, *iconographic and *archaeological) that offer different points of view through which Christians

expressed not only their idea of care for the deceased and their tombs, but also the need for socialization and communication. The practices that met the latter need emerged in a significant way esp. in the development of ritual practices tied to funerary meals.

One can analyze the funerary rites in a chronological framework of historical and broadly "homogeneous" time periods from the 3rd c., the period of the birth and spread of the first *cemeteries of the Christian community, to the 6th-7th c., a period that marks in certain respects a historical and cultural division. This chronological marker prefigured significant changes in the means of organization and the handling of the funerary areas, namely, in the way of conceiving the relationship between the space of the dead and the space of the living, and in relation to the various funerary cultures pertaining to the "barbarian" populations, which in the Early Middle Ages entered into contact with the "Roman" population.

After a phase marked by the coexistence of burials by interment and by cremation from the age of Hadrian until the 3rd c., interment became the only type of burial in the 4th c.—despite certain instances attested when it was delayed. With this gradual spread of the practice of burial by interment, the body of the deceased person became the new object of attention. The practices by which one prepared the body before its placement in the tomb were documented in the written sources, esp. of the 4th-5th c., and were connected to the deep conviction that the body preserved a level of materiality such as to be able to perceive the care offered by the living to the inanimate body.

Some specific treatments—some lasting longer than others—were developed for the preservation of the body; or they might be considered as ways of facing the fears connected to the phenomenon of the decomposition of the flesh. The *Apocryphal Acts of Peter* (4th c.), offers a description of a different procedure in which the body of the martyr was washed with milk and wine, lathered with a mixture of aromatic substances and spices prepared for the embalming, and finally placed in a *sarcophagus filled with honey (*Passione di Pietro dello Ps. Lino*: ed. Erbetta II, 177). *John Chrysostom condemned the excesses in the development of the funerary rites; in particular he noted that the use of clothing for the deceased and sprinkling them with aromas did not offer indefinite protection from decomposition of the body (*Hom. in Joannem* 85,5: PG 59, 465-468). *Augustine took a more tentative approach, emphasizing the uselessness of certain funerary customs, including the use of *aromata* (*En. Ps.* 33, D. 2,25).

The following church fathers mentioned the wrapping of the body in cloth garments or a shroud: *Prudentius (*Cathemerinon* X, 49-52: CCL 126, 55) and *Jerome, who specified the involvement of the *clerici* who specialized in the preparation of the cadaver (*Ep.* I, 12: CSEL 54, 7). In a hagiographical text from the 2nd half of the 5th c., the *Vita Germani*, Constantius of Laon mentions that the bishop of Auxerre, when proceeding to the interment of the unburied body, ordered that the deceased person's members be wrapped in *vinculis linteis* (Constantius Lugdunensis, *Vita sancti Germani* 10: SC 112, 138-142). An iconographic representation of this funerary custom comes from the cemeterial hypogeum of Commodilla, at *Rome on the Via Ostia, where an inscription on a marble slab portrays, in an elaborate way, a body wrapped in flax with a gravedigger nearby (ICUR II, 6446).

Some sources, such as the texts of *Lactantius, which refer to the *defunctorum . . . vestibus pretiosis* (*Divinae institutiones* II, 4: CSEL 19, 109), of Jerome (*Vita s. Pauli primi eremitae* 17: PL 23, 28-29) and of *Augustine (*En. Ps.* 48, D. 2,7), reaffirm condemnations of the extravagant display of riches at the time of death in the use of clothes and precious fabrics. Despite these invectives, interments with precious garments continue to be attested in the primary sources even during a later period, as in a text of *John Moschus (late 6th-early 7th c.) in which he recounts an attempt to violate the corpse precisely because of the deceased person's *pretiosis vestibus* (*Pratum spirituale* 78: PG 87/3, 2931-2936).

Archaeological remains of fabrics within the tombs were documented, e.g., in some catacombs in the city of Rome; in particular, in a funerary area identified with the cemetery of Novella—in the range of the cemeterial structure of Priscilla on the Via Salaria *nova*—a burial cell housed a deceased person who was completely wrapped in bandages shaped in the form of a cross. In some pavement tombs excavated in the early decades of the 20th c. at the ground level of the basilica dedicated to the *apostles (the structure of St. *Sebastian) on the Appian Way various entombed bodies were discovered wrapped in fabrics, in some cases in even more layers and enriched by golden threads (Styger, 21-22; Spera 2005, 16). Concerning the burial of women, which can be dated to the 6th-7th c., within a tomb that was part of the ecclesiastical structure of St. Peter, located at Canosa in Apulia, a pin was found that was used to hold to the woman's hair a veil made of brocade with soft golden filaments (Nuzzo 2003, 135). Other cemeterial areas document the cus-

tom of dressing the deceased person with everyday garments, archaeological traces of which remain esp. by what is left of their shoes; in the catacomb of Castelvecchio Subequo, near Aquila (4th-early 7th c.), in several tombs were found iron nails tied to the elements in leather and wood (Giuntella et al., 282-284). Several small iron studs, presumably for shoes with nailed soles, were discovered in a significant number of tombs of the cemetery basilica discovered in the vicinity of San Giusto, near Lucera in Apulia, and dated around the 6th c. (De Santis - Giuliani, 229).

Further work relating to the preparation of the body concerned the laying out of the corpse on the *lectus funebris* in the presence of the family. A valuable iconographic testimony of this remains in the funerary area underlying the cemeterial structure of St. Sebastian at Rome, in a wall fresco from the mausoleum of Claudius the Hermit, originally of a pagan order, visited from the mid-2nd to the early decades of the 3rd c.; the *paintings that adorn the funerary monument can be dated to AD 150–160 (Ferrua [2]1990, 72-73).

A series of rituals accompanied the deceased person on the journey toward the place of interment; Tertullian described a prayer scene near the deceased person *morante adhuc sepultura*, "while the burial itself was delayed," completed by a presbyter in the presence of onlookers (*De anima* 51,6: CCL 2, 857). In the final decades of the 4th c., *Gregory of Nyssa recounted the funeral of his sister *Macrina, in Cappadocia, at which the community gathered together during the funerary *vigil and spent the night singing *hymns and *psalms; the following morning, in the presence of the local bishop, the funerary court went toward the place of interment where, at last, a prayer was recited (*De vita s. Macrinae* 25-36: SC 178, 227-259). The funerary ceremonies for Augustine's mother, *Monica, which were held at Ostia, adds a detail not attested by other sources: the performance of a *eucharistic celebration before the interment. One must emphasize that from Augustine's description one can infer that in the area of the necropolis there existed areas set aside for the performance of such rituals (Augustine, *Conf.* 9,12,32). A rare archaeological witness to these spaces has been identified near the Jewish catacomb of the Villa Torlonia at Rome (Fasola 1976, 41).

The performance of the eucharistic celebration during the funeral was subjected to a series of restrictions and regulations in the canon of the African council of 393 in which the bishops prohibited such a celebration in the presence of a corpse as well as administration of the Eucharist to a dead body (*Concilium Hipponense* 4: CCL 149, 21), a significant prohibition confirmed in the diocesan Synod of Auxerre (*Concilia Galliae* 12: CCL 148A, 267). The analysis of a special sarcophagus, discovered near Brescia and datable between the 5th and 7th c., has recently led scholars to posit the existence of a funerary practice in open violation of the conciliar norms; the upper surface of the cover contains an opening, which is closed by a sort of limestone plug and furnished with the inscription *crux Christi alere peccator(em)*. It seems that the text could refer to the practice of placing the eucharistic species within the tomb, in addition to, of course, other substances (Sannazaro). A diplomatic approach to this disputed question seems to have been offered in a statement made by *Gregory the Great, in which he recounted an anecdote attributed to St. Benedict who, to help a young monk whose soul was in eternal rest, granted his relatives permission to place a consecrated host on the chest of the deceased monk (Gregory the Great, *Dialogues* II, 24,1-2).

Even with respect to funerals, the fathers of the church were sure to emphasize the futility of certain external manifestations of sorrow and to condemn the extravagance in the performance of these rituals; only prayer and alms could help the deceased person in his or her journey toward salvation (John Chrysostom, *In Iohannem hom.* 62,5: PG 59, 348; Augustine, *Serm.* 172,2,2). At times the epitaph made explicit the friends and relatives' organization of the funeral with such expressions as *facere funus* (e.g., ICUR V, 15322, a. 387; VI, 17117, mid-4th c.).

The deceased's placement within the tomb involved two distinct documented practices esp. evident from the archaeological finds: systems of arrangement within the tomb; the placement of a funerary wardrobe. The use of materials and devices generally placed at the bottom of the tomb is to be attributed not only to the fears concerning the processes of the body's decomposition but also to the more functional aspects of burial tied to hygiene. Forms of arrangement of the surfaces on which buried bodies were laid out were documented in the cemeterial basilica of San Sebastiano at Rome, where numerous tombs showed the bottom covered by a layer of lime. In the cemeterial structure of Cornus, in *Sardinia, some of the burials dated to the mid-5th c. were placed on a bed of coals acc. to a well-known rite in the necropolis in Germanic culture; moreover, substances such as ash and coal allowed for the absorption of liquid organics. In various contexts, cemeteries attest the use of tombs that have the bottom covered with slabs with holes in them for drainage of cadaverous liquid; the function of this

system was to accelerate the processes of decomposition. Examples of these artifacts, at times no longer discovered *in situ*, are attested, e.g., in the cemeterial basilica of San Sebastiano at Rome (Styger, 22; Spera 2005, 15-16) or, later (7th c.), in the tomb discovered near the sanctuary of S. Michele a Monte Sant'Angelo in Apulia (De Santis-Nuzzo, 145-146).

The arrangement of the interior of the tomb sometimes made provisions for funerary cushions on which the deceased could rest his or her head, which were often produced with materials that would last, but in some cases, as at San Sebastiano, with leaves, perhaps of a laurel tree (Styger, 22, 25; Spera 2005, 16); this latter practice is also attested during the mid-6th c. in a text of *Gregory of Tours (*De gloria confessorum* 84: PL 71, 892). The body was inserted into the tomb facing upward, a practice that became the most widespread in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, even though other ways to position the body are evident; the preference for this position seems to have responded to the demand for maintaining the deceased person's "gaze" toward heaven.

The act of interment included the actual placement of possessions within the tombs. By now, scholars have completely rejected the idea that one could distinguish pagan burials from Christian ones on the basis of the relative presence or absence of possessions in the tombs; the placement of possessions inside or outside the tomb was a generally widespread practice documented in Christian funerary contexts. Within the tomb, one can distinguish distinctly personal possessions, closely related to the life and adornment of the deceased, and also a set of ritual objects that express the deceased's underlying beliefs; this distinction of course does not exclude the presence, attested in various ways, of each type of possession in the same burial site. In the account of the trip to the Holy Land by the monk Antonino Piacentino, which can be dated to the years 560–570, the author described the baptismal rite at the end of which the faithful immersed themselves in the Jordan River for the blessing "dressed with a shroud and many other objects that they preserved for burial" (C. Milani, *Itinerarium Antonini Piacentini. Un viaggio in terra santa del 560–570 d.C.*, Milan 1977, 242). The citation, which is rather problematic, can be interpreted both as a reference to containers used during the celebration of baptism and then chosen to be deposited with the deceased person, and, in a more general way, to their objects for personal use.

Personal possessions primarily consisted of handmade objects connected to clothing (e.g., belt buckles [*see* *fibula], hat pins and luxury hairpins), the person's adornment (e.g., rings, bracelets, earrings, necklaces and pendants) and daily furnishings (toiletries, toys, objects tied to activity carried out in the life of the deceased). The placement of personal possessions should perhaps be put in relation to the ancient legal understanding that considered some objects as tied to the owner even after his or her death, removing them from hereditary transmission. On the other hand, one should also consider the social function bound up with the personal possession, which, upon burial, would clearly identify the deceased's connection to a specific group.

The possessions used during funerary rites could refer to multiple symbolic and cultic meanings. The presence of plates, primarily ceramic and glass, within—often in proximity to the head of the deceased—and/or outside the tomb can be connected, in the first place, to the practice of funerary meals and their symbolism by which the ancients expressed their conviction—already proper to some pagan rites—of the survival after death of the material needs of the deceased, such as thirst and hunger, thus creating an indissoluble bond between the worlds of the living and of the dead. In some cases, the placement of containers occurred in association with the remains of a meal, to be interpreted as true and proper meal offerings even following the completion of the funerary banquet held directly on the tomb or in the immediate vicinity. At Muralto, in Lombardy, in a tomb from the 2nd half of the 4th c., probably belonging to a building of Christian worship, archaeologists recovered an urn placed below the buried body containing the bones of a swine (Sannazaro 1990, 53). The case of the Sardinian necropolis of Cornus is now well known, where, within a tomb that dates between the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th c., a pitcher was found in which chicken bones were kept (Giuntella 1999, 83).

In addition to possessions, the use of containers in miniature—that is of modest dimensions that imitated models on the larger scale of common use—seems to suggest the existence of a specialized and exclusive production specifically associated with the funerary rituals. This is the case, e.g., of some nail spikes found in the cemeterial structure of San Felice at Cimitile (Nola) that go back to the 6th-7th c. (Stasolla, 276-277). Widely attested, moreover, is the introduction of containers that were no longer functional and often in fragments. At times, the container was intentionally broken; there may have been a ritual breaking that could be interpreted, on the one hand, as a sort of purificatory ceremony through which one was "liberated" from objects

considered impure inasmuch as they were connected to death, although on the other hand, it could represent a means for establishing a lasting bond with the dead, who in this way "participated" in the rite (De Francesco).

The presence of containers inside the tomb could also have other meanings; omitting the problematic mentioned above of a possible symbolic meaning connected to the rite of baptism celebrated during life, there may be—in the case of shapes such as the balsamari, attested increasingly in Late Antiquity—a relationship to the ritual of spreading fragrant substances near and inside the tomb. Spindle-shaped vials and glass cruets were found, e.g., in some tombs belonging to the cemeterial basilica furnished with an ambulatory found at Rome on the Via Ardeatina (Fiocchi Nicolai et al. 1995–1996, 192-194). Another possession with heavy ritual meanings was the coin, which, when the intention of its placement can be verified, indicates different meanings, acc. to its position with respect to the tomb and the buried body, and acc. to its value. The practice of placing a coin in the tomb—at times inserted into the mouth or the hand of the deceased person, or simply placed inside—is attested from the Classical Age and was based on the pagan belief that one had to pay an offering to Charon (i.e., the mythical ferryman of Hades) to cross the mythical River Styx. This rite continued to be documented in Christian funerary contexts from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages and signified an offering of alms toward the afterlife and was still full of apotropaic meanings The recently emphasized magical-religious meanings (Perassi) have been suggested by the material the coins were made of and their shape; it was a protection for the tomb against evil spirits or possible brigands. The placement of a single coin between the hands of the deceased was found in some tombs from the early decades of the 4th c., belonging to the Late Antique cemetery identified in the courtyards of the Università Cattolica di Milano; an explicit presence of a Christian community has not been documented, however (Perassi, 109). A coin within a deceased's mouth was found in a tomb from the Necropolis of Cornus, which contained possessions datable to the 2nd half of the 6th c. (Giuntella 1999, 142).

The placement of coins in the tomb in boxes of a certain consistency, at times preserved in suitable containers—a use that began to be attested starting from the Late Antique period—may have multiple ritual meanings. On the one hand, the "viatic" value of this type of offering may have persisted. On the other hand, it could represent an ostentatious display of riches or make some connection to the life of the deceased person with a meaning, in certain instances, similar to that of the personal possessions discussed above. Some significant examples have been attested in Sicily: in three infant burial cells from the catacomb of the so-called Vigna Cassia at Syracuse, monetary collections consisting in one case of more than 100 coins (Garraffo); in the catacomb of San Senatore at Albano, 6th-c. tombs restored six distinct monetary collections, the most famous of which consisted of more than 200 coins (Fiocchi Nicolai et al. 1992, 91-97). The perforated coins, however, should be considered elements of personal possession, to which one could also assign a talismanic meaning reused as pendants and ornaments. The practice of placing money within the tomb must have been sufficiently widespread to lead *Theodoric, in a regulation written from the 1st decade of the 6th c., to order a limitation of the custom because these objects "were more useful for the living than for the dead" (Cassiodorus, *Variae* IV, 34: MGH AA XII, 129).

The interpretation of the presence of coins outside the tomb—a rite scarcely attested archaeologically—becomes problematic, given the difficulties of distinguishing the actual intention of the original ritual gesture. A typical case was recently represented again by the Necropolis of Cornus, where a significant number of burials have restored numismatic finds in the areas immediately outside the tombs (Giuntella 1999, 68-69). Scholars have discussed an "obol-offering" in relation to the unfolding of the rites of *refrigerium*, in which all the elements—the coin could be considered on the same level as dietary substances—function to create a connection to the otherworldly "reality."

A particular class of materials consisting of clay and glass lanterns merits specific discussion for the value of its multiple meanings in funerary contexts. In the first place, one should consider the functional aspect of these handmade objects used widely for illumination; one should note the discovery in the necropolis of Cimitile of a number of glass fragments outside the tombs that were interpreted as traces of glass lamps used as a *signaculum* (Pani Ermini et al. 1993, 305-306). On the other hand, the frequent placement of clay lamps within the tombs, esp. in the hypogeum cemeteries, but not exclusively, can be attributed to the desire for emphasizing the symbolic aspect of light that one hoped would accompany the deceased in his journey toward the otherworldly "reality." The universality of this ritual message is evidenced by the documented presence of lanterns as a funerary possession even in the

tombs—even for cremations—belonging to a use that was not explicitly Christian as in the case of the aforementioned Late Antique necropolis of *Milan (Airoldi 117). The symbolic theme of light, therefore—although present in pagan, or rather "neutral," culture—is significantly added to the process of the Christianization of funerary rituals as an implicit reference to the eternal light and the spirit's survival, also suggested by the gospel parable of the ten virgins in which the soul presents itself before the Lord with a lit lamp (Mt 25:1-13). Clear demonstrations of this symbolism can be found when the handmade object placed near the tomb does not present traces of smoking or when only the figurative representation of a lantern appears, of which we have various examples in cemeterial hypogeal structures such as that of San Cristina at Bolsena, which, at the burial cell's point of closure, has a depiction of a lantern lit within a fake niche (Fiocchi Nicolai 1988, 160); in the Roman catacomb of Pamphilus, on the Via Salaria *vetus*, a lit lamp and an anchor are sketched on the mortar of a burial cell's closure (Josi 1926, 89). Further documentation is also offered by inscriptions on slabs (ICUR IV, 9913). The well-known prohibition contained in can. 34 of the Council of Elvira, Spain, 303–306, seems to take on an opposite meaning (Vives, *Concilios*, 7-8); it enjoins that one not light candles in the cemeteries during the day in order not to disturb the *sanctorum spiritus*—where the term *sanctus* is to be understood as a synonym for the *fidelis*—leaving one to understand the survival of beliefs based on a "negative" value of light. The double functional and symbolic aspect appears closely connected and complementary in the use of placing lanterns outside the tomb in even further examples; the case of the tomb belonging to a hypogeal of the cemeterial structure of Sts. Rufina and Secunda at the 9th mile of the Via Cornelia is exemplary. Upon the discovery of this tomb, it became evident that it was equipped with five lanterns placed on the cover and on a small facing table (Fiocchi Nicolai 1988, 63).

Lastly, one must ascribe a magical and apotropaic function to a series of objects, a function which was attested frequently even in the funerary possessions from Late Antiquity, and which were closely connected to the demand for protecting the tomb and the deceased person. The presence of handmade objects considered magical, both inside and outside the tomb, contributed to neutralizing the negative influences such as sicknesses or epidemics, and the *larvae* (ghosts) or *insepulti* (unburied), i.e., the spirits of the deceased who did not receive proper funerary honors, could have an influence on the living; Christian authors also faced these issues (Tertullian, *De Anima* 56: CCL 2, 863-865; Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 9-10). The numerous condemnations expressed by the ecclesiastical hierarchy on the making and use of amulets and on the participation in magical rites, were unable to undermine the widespread continuance of such beliefs.

Numerous objects were attributed a magical-apotropaic value in antiquity and are substantially exemplified in three distinct but complementary categories. To the first group belong the special objects that owe a magical force to characters intrinsically connected to specific symbols or alphabetic engravings as for example gems, plates and glass characters of Egyptian divinities, masks and heads of Gorgon. Second, an apotropaic force was attributed to handmade objects of daily use such as nails and bells, the latter were chosen because the sound they emitted performed the function of scattering the evil spirits, as indirectly attested by John Chrysostom (*In epistula 1 ad Corinthios hom.* 12,7: PG 61, 105-108). The third aspect pertains to the material with which the objects were produced; specific magical and healing effects were tied to certain types of rocks and metals (Nuzzo 2000).

Regarding the articles of the tomb, a particular phenomenon widely documented in cemeterial hypogeal contexts involving "grave articles" deserves consideration: the practice of affixing to the outside of tombs on the wet mortar with which the burial cells were sealed objects of various sorts (e.g., lanterns, glass or clay receptacles, objects of personal decoration, coins and toys) and organic and inorganic materials, even fragmentary (e.g., shells, pieces of marble and terra cotta, cakes shaped from glass and pieces of a *mosaic). The phenomenon, which has not yet been systematically or exhaustively analyzed, seems to be confined to certain sectors of some Roman catacombs characterized by an almost indiscriminate use of simple *loculus* tombs, and generally, but not exclusively, datable around the 2nd half of the 4th c. The interpretation of these types of articles, understood to be in some way "profitable" outside the tomb, goes beyond the simple "identification" of the grave, highlighting, in the interweaving of concepts of "furnishings and articles," a set of elements that interact with each other and overlap in the definition of the tomb's "identity." This interpretive approach has led to a diversified evaluation of how various elements functioned, highlighting all the various ritual meanings, which, however, rescue from anonymity overlapping tombs laid on undifferentiated *pilae*. The multiple layered meanings of the articles/furniture could refer to dif-

ferent interconnected aspects: a decorative meaning may apply primarily to the furniture of the tomb, a personal article of the deceased might have a symbolic-evocative value tied to specific rituals and, lastly, articles may have an apotropaic function for the tomb's protection (De Santis 1994; Felle - Del Moro - Nuzzo; De Santis 1998; De Santis 2000).

The commemoration of the deceased involved shared social aspects of the funerary rite that connote and accompany the life of the family gathered together at specific times: the 3rd, 7th or 9th, 30th or 40th day from death, the anniversary of the *dies natalis* (*birthday) corresponding to the day of death in substitution for the pagan *natalitium*, the day of one's birth. The repeated ritual practices for one's own relative appear in two primary expressive forms: rites belonging to a more properly liturgical sphere such as the recitation of prayer and celebration of the Mass and practices involving concrete gestures such as the offering of food to the deceased, the completion of funerary banquets or their virtual and symbolic evocation.

From an analysis of the written sources a canonized and institutionalized liturgical practice does not seem to emerge specifically for the commemoration of the deceased but rather suggestions of practices such as those proposed in the *Constitutiones apostolicae* (in 4th c.), which refers to the songs and prayers to be recited on the days of the anniversaries. They also indicate the behavior for the clergy who were invited to participate in the rites of the commemoration (*Constitutiones apostolicae* VIII, 42,1-3 and 44: SC 330, 260-261). The expression *oblationes facere* leads one to understand a relationship between the eucharistic celebration and the anniversary of the dead, found in the writings of Tertullian, who mentions annual celebrations (*De Corona* 3,3: CCL 2, 1042-1043). One of *Cyprian's letters seems to attest the association of the Mass and prayers for the "repose" of the deceased, which are to be performed, however, in church and not at the tomb (*Ep.* 1,2,1: CCL 3B, 3-4). Augustine explicitly spoke of *supplicationes pro spiritibus mortuorum*, which took the form of a single prayer (*generali commemoratione*) in the instances when there were no individual prayers by the relatives; he therefore seems to affirm the existence of two parallel manners of prayer: one communal promoted by the church, the other heavily tied to the ritual customs of the family (*De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 4,6). A particular reference to how the faithful expressed their desire for individual intercession can be found in the writings of John Chrysostom, who identifies alms for the needy as the best means to remember one's own relative in the prayers of all those who have benefited from them (*In acta apostolorum hom.* 21,4: PG 60, 170). Gregory the Great continued to reaffirm the exclusive usefulness of prayers and eucharistic celebrations for the dead, which, when repeated, even acquired an expiatory function for sinners (*Dialogues* 4,52-57).

In this regard, it is significant to note the text of three funerary inscriptions found in proconsular Africa, at Sufetula (Sbeitla), that can be dated between 540 and the beginning of the 7th c., that seem to contain a formulary taken from the liturgy of the deceased, which could relate to the celebrations of funerals or even those commemorative celebrations following the interment: *D[omi]n[us] d[e] h[oc] s[ae]c[u]lo tran/sitorio ad sua reg/na convocare dig/natus est, {convo/care} ubi est sede/s sempiterna et requ/ies aeterna. Amen*, "the Lord has deigned to call from this transitory world to his kingdoms, where there is an everlasting throne and eternal rest" (Duval 1988, 302-303).

The pagan ritual that provided for the consumption of meals near the tombs of relatives and the offering of foods and drinks was based on the concept of the soul's survival within the tomb or in its immediate vicinity, with the specific needs of the earthly dimension. The church found itself having to face the reality of these rooted customs and to oppose the abuses by promoting processes of Christianization.

The first testimonies of Christian authors' approaches to the consumption of funerary meals are from the African context. The implicit expression of a perplexity regarding the banquets is contained in a passage from Tertullian, who emphasized, in the rejection of any form of idolatry, what Christians must not do (*De Spectaculis* 12,3-4: CCL 1, 238). Cyprian spoke explicitly of *turpia et lutulenta convivia*, with respect to a complex event, on which he found himself having to render a judgment regarding the behavior of two Spanish bishops (*Ep.* 67,6: CCL 3C, 456-457).

Starting from the 2nd half of the 4th c., the literary sources progressively broadened and became enriched; the bishops of Verona and Brescia, when speaking to the *neophytes, likened the funerary meals and the *parentalia* to the idolatrous and superstitious practices of the pagans from which Christians must refrain (*Zeno, *Tractatus* 1,3: PL 11, 296; *Gaudentius, *Sermo* 4: PL 20, 870). Between the 4th and the 5th c., when the celebration of banquets became a widespread practice even during the anniversaries of the martyrs, the debate that moved the ecclesiastical hierarchy seems to have been conditioned by the demand to avoid cultic

practices and to anchor the devotional forms for liturgies and communal gestures. From Augustine's *Confessions*, one can conclude that at Milan Bishop Ambrose, before 385, had prohibited the funerary banquets *ad memorias sanctorum* (*Conf.* 6,2; for Ambrose's direct testimony on the subject, see *De Elia et ieiunio admonitio* 17,62: PL 14, 719). Shortly after, two African councils, from 307 and 401, reaffirmed this prohibition, first applied only to ecclesiastical officials, then extended to all (*Registri Ecclesiae Carthaginensis Excerpta* 3,53 and 6,60: CCL 149, 190.196-197). Even at Rome, the primary sources denounce episodes of *quotidiana vinolentia* at the basilica of St. Peter in the Vatican (Augustine, *Ep.* 29,10). From another point of view, *Paulinus of Nola describes the banquet offered in 397 by his friend *Pammachius, whose charitable intention he praised, in memory of his wife in the basilica of St. Peter, at which a large number of *pauperes* participated (*Ep.* 13,11: CSEL 29, 92-93).

Returning many times to the topic, Augustine expressed a twofold position between a clear condemnation of all forms of degeneration and abuse in the rituals, on the one hand, and on the other, a highlighting of the ways that Christians could enhance the lives of the living in their worship while respecting their own religious principles (*Ep.* 22,1,6 and 29,9; *Serm.* 172,2; 361,6,). In fraternal and charitable sharing, Augustine found the religious dimension for "converting" the ancient practices of the banquets into *agape* feasts (*Contra Faustum* 20,20). This perspective has certainly significantly contributed to catalyzing those processes of Christianization that led to, e.g., transforming the *Caristia* (22 February), by which the *parentalia* were brought to a conclusion, on the feast of the *cathedra Petri* already attested in the **Depositio martyrum* (R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, II, Rome 1942, 18). In the 6th c., the festival of the *cathedra Petri* was still deeply popular among the faithful, who celebrated it by bringing dietary offerings to the deceased, as attested, in a critical way, by some conciliar and literary sources (Council of Tours, can. 22 a. 567: Mansi, 9, 803; a work of doubtful attribution, *Sermo in Cathedra s. Petri*: PL 39, 2101).

The coexistence of a perception and a "material" and "spiritual" use of these rituals appears clearly in the rich funerary epigraphic documentation in which the terms *refrigerium* and *refrigerare*, which were already used in pagan inscriptions, allude both to the practical development of the rites and the eschatological dimension that connected the physical restoration to the desire for spiritual refreshment. A further sign of the attention to the rites of commemoration appears in the proliferation of the mention of the *dies mortis* on the epitaphs, which was typical in Late Antiquity. The presence of a date expressed the need to formalize the periodic celebration on the tomb (Carletti 2004, 37-41). The sharing of food near the tombs, therefore, concretely assured the "survival" of the deceased person by preserving and perpetuating their memory as it took on a heavy meaning of familial and social cohesion. The double meaning, concrete and metaphorical, seems to be well represented in the famous mosaic epigraph discovered in the African necropolis of Tipasa, where the text (*In Chr[isto] Deo / pax et concordia sit / convivio nostro*) and the support, a table with the depiction of seafood and fish, agree in expressing the christological and communal dimension of the rite. The same multiple meaning is found in the representations of banquet scenes that give a figurative interpretation, full of symbolic values. From the Roman catacombs come the most numerous testimonies; the case of the so-called region of the Agape is representative: in the cemetery of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter on the Via Labicana (4th c.), the figurative message, united to the didactic message of the inscriptions (ICUR VI, 15942-15949), expresses strong fidelity to the traditions of conviviality as instruments for affirming victory over death, which was by then inserted into a scheme of social relations and daily life (Mazzei). Likewise at Rome other significant testimonies emerged in which the written and figurative message united into a single epigraphic product, as occurred, for instance, in the engraved slab of *Criste*: a male figure, presumably the father of the deceased person and the dedicator of the inscription, is represented in the act of drinking (ICUR III, 6618). In other inscriptions, the deceased person is the sole protagonist of the ritual, which makes him a participant of the "heavenly joy," as in the epitaph of *Auguriana*, who was portrayed as praying with cups in hand (ICUR VI, 15867), and in that of the *Eutropos*, a sculptor of sarcophagi, who is represented in the act of raising the cup in order "to refresh himself" (ICUR VI, 17225).

The rich and variegated archaeological documentation that attests to the practice of *refrigerium* can be divided, on the basis of the intrinsic characteristics and purposes, into two primary categories, which more often than not coexist in the milieu of the necropolis itself. One includes the devices and handmade objects closely connected to the tomb of the single individual, or limited groups, that functioned for the material development of the banquet or for offerings of food—a banquet seen, however, in

a substantially "private" form (liquid channels, tables, chairs and structures for the offerings). The second involves the monumental evidence of spaces adapted and set aside for the communal and collective consumption of ritual meals.

Some devices, which were very widespread even in funerary contexts of the classical age, functioned to connect the burial with the external and allowed the reception of food offerings or perfumes from the living; the ritual made the moment of sharing and participation between the living and the dead concrete. We see this type of ritual in Paulinus of Nola's description of the insertion of perfumes contained in *vascula* within the tomb of the Martyr *Felix, by means of *foramina* (*Poemata* 21, vv. 590-615: CSEL 30, 177-178) and perhaps even the well-known verse by Prudentius *et frigida saxa / liquido spargemur odore* (and cool stones / we are sprinkled with a serene fragrance), with which he concludes the hymn for the funeral ceremony of the deceased person (*Cathemerinon* X, 169-172: CCL 126, 59). One of the cases attested to in the *Basilica Apostolorum* on the Via Appia in Rome is significant; a polysomatic monumental sarcophagus from the mid-4th c., found inside a mausoleum joined to the circular basilica, was furnished with a long bronze tube attached on the cover in a way that from the floor of the funerary milieu one could directly place the offerings of those who had been buried (Ferrua 1951, 23-24). Slab coverings for the tombs designed for libations, in some cases connected to clay or metallic tubes, or rather protected by gullies, are attested not only at Rome but also in numerous cemeterial contexts from Late Antiquity—open galleries and hypogea, distributed in all of the area of the Mediterranean, esp. the W part: in Sicily (catacomb of S. Giovanni at Syracuse), in Sardinia (necropolis of Cornus), in the Iberian Peninsula (necropolis of S. *Fructuosus at *Tarragona), in N Africa (cemeterial basilica of *Tebessa and *Timgad), in the area of *Dalmatia (the cemetery of Manastirine near *Salona). At times, the slabs had a written message; a Sardinian inscription provides but one example: the slab is inscribed with a text on the outside of the tomb in which the author wishes *refrigerium* for the deceased person (Giuntella - Borghetti - Stiaffini, 44-45).

We see a greater and even wider proliferation of the structures placed outside the tombs on which libation offerings were placed or on which funerary meals were consumed. In some cases, devices are included or overhang the structure of the tomb; in other cases, they are placed in spaces adjacent to the tombs, and display various forms and typologies: circular, semicircular and rectangular tables, a *sigma*, at times decorated with mosaics, epigraphs; tables decorated with reliefs alluding to the meal, furnished with cavities for the offerings. Often, in the immediate vicinities of these structures are specific systems for the storing and drainage of water, an element, for practical and symbolic reasons, necessary for the performance of the rite of *refrigerium*. Other discoveries, organic and inorganic, are connected to the consumption of foods. Various examples have been documented from African (esp. at Tipasa), Spanish, Sardinian, Sicilian, Dalmatian and NE Italian necropolises (Giuntella - Borghetti - Stiaffini; Duval 1985). In the ground-level necropolis of Agrigento (Sicily, 3rd-5th c.) a table with a niche for offerings was found arranged in such a way as to form a unitary level belonging to three distinct floor tombs, perhaps attributable to a single familial group (Bonacasa Carra, 398). The tables equipped with a figurative apparatus are primarily from African areas, such as the aforementioned mosaic from Tipasa or that of Timgad, upon which were carved relief images of various types of dishes such as bread and fish. The well-known inscription of *Aelia Secundula* from 299 from Satafis in Mauretania (ILCV 1570), also African, lacks specifically Christian elements and describes the preparation of the rite of the gathered relatives: "we have thought to prepare a table of stone, around which to recall his numerous virtuous works, while foods and chalices and coverings for setting the table are prepared and offered" (lines 4-6; trans. in Carletti 2004, 40).

Within the hypogea necropolises, one must suppose that the actual performance of banquets was conditioned by the restricted space and the lack of lighting and, in certain cases, by the difficult accessibility of a given tomb, often made almost impossible by the continual deepening of the galleries; forms and structures were therefore ritual forms and structures for the celebration of an "abbreviated" rite or even only to begin a virtual and symbolic tie to the deceased. The Roman catacombs, from the 4th c. onward, esp. among the areas of those who were privileged, rather frequently have tables made with cylindrical and quadrangular supports made from bricks or composed of columns and slabs, in marble or ceramic, upon which were placed the offerings of the meal by some of the family members, although one cannot exclude the possibility that they could have been used as a support for lanterns. In one region from the 2nd half of the 4th c., from the catacomb of the Giordani on the Via Salaria *nova*, this type of table was placed primarily within burial cells, which were therefore functional for the cultic and memorial visitation of more tombs (Chalkia). Simi-

lar, but designed for a more humble use, are the smaller shelves made from fragments of marble or brick, affixed on the mortar of the closing point of the burial cells, but their primary function was to support lamps, which in some cases were found *in situ*. Nevertheless, one can also suppose them to be used as shelves for objects and containers connected to the rites suggestive of the funerary meals.

Another series of handmade objects relate to a symbolic meaning of the rite of *refrigerium*: the seats, the so-called cathedra, a particular concentration of which one observes in a region from the 2nd half of the 4th c. of the hypogeal cemetery on the Via Nomentana in Rome. These structures, characterized by their small dimensions, have been extracted from tuff and placed within the burial cells; these have been interpreted as the symbol of the sharing of the funerary meal with the deceased person for whom they reserved a suitable place (Fasola 1961).

As mentioned above, other archaeological and monumental evidence documents a flourishing of the ritual structures of the ever-increasing groups and, in certain cases, the existence of spaces designed for collective ceremonies. These include rooms, underground and ground level, enclosed spaces, and buildings that provide for benches, seats, tables and devices suited for storing water. Underground areas fitted in this way are attested already starting from the 3rd c., in the Roman catacomb structures, where one observes a substantial separation between places delegated for banquets and for tombs and a special attention given to decorative aspects (pictorial coverings, in marble and mosaic). In the cemetery of Priscilla, at the beginning of the 3rd c., a room belonging to the so-called hypogeum of the *Acilii*, which originally performed the function of a cistern, was transformed by placing stone benches close to the walls (Tolotti, 154-161). A sepulchral chamber from the cemetery of *Praetextatus probably already in the construction phase (2nd half of the 3rd c.) took measures to leave space for the presence of a bench on three sides of the room; in the 4th c., a limited group of tombs were housed in the sepulchral chamber, which continued, however, to preserve its original ritual purpose with the presence of a counter, reorganized and enlarged, and with the positioning of a table immediately outside, lined up with the entry (Spera 2004, 70, 183-186). In Africa, the familial hypogeum of the so-called Adam and Eve at Gargaresc (Tripolitania) contains a room designed for funerary banquets inasmuch as it lacks tombs and is furnished with a *stibadion* and a table extracted from a piece of a column; paintings decorate the room, which are datable to the 2nd half of the 4th c., with a representation of torchbearers and an amphora to be interpreted as the material protagonists of the rite (Di Vita).

A conceptual and monumental turn in the organization and in the ways of participating in the rites of the commemoration is certainly represented by the construction of cemeterial basilicas in funerary areas; starting from the Constantinian age, in close connection to the progressive development of the cult of the martyrs, places previously designated for a familial type of visiting were transformed into spaces predisposed to the collective burial and communal celebrations where the funerary rites offered for the single individual were "strengthened" by those celebrated for the martyrs, combining the social and religious aspects.

In this regard, the example of Rome is extremely significant, where the monumental funerary basilicas commissioned by Constantine characterize the suburban landscape of the city by creating rival centers of attraction to the traditional urban ones. In these "covered cemeteries" the commemorative rituals could be carried out both inside and outside as well as in the adjacent structures. The aforementioned testimony of Paulinus of Nola is typical with reference to the basilica of St. Peter, from which one concludes that the church members used the atrium and the stairway access for the celebration of the banquets (see above).

Even in the N African necropolises, one witnesses the transformation of the spaces and the shape of their borders laid out in relation to the ritual demands; e.g., there is frequent documentation of the placement of tables not only near the individual tombs but also within the enclosed spaces or sheltered by a portico for receiving the participants of the banquet for a communal ceremony. A portion of the funerary area of Tipasa, which became more important by the presence of the basilica dedicated to Bishop Alexander, was enclosed and intended to receive a series of benches along the wall and tables protected by a portico-type structure; a well is located near the stairs leading to the yard. In the necropolis of Matarès, likewise at Tipasa, are attestations to communal tables of large dimensions and set apart, suited for the consumption of various meals at the same time; moreover, sophisticated systems of water drainage permitted the flow of water directly on the supports for the banquets (Février 1970).

In conclusion, it is possible to apply to the funerary rites an interpretive category used for the epigraphic documentation commissioned by Christians, namely, the concepts of symbiosis and

metabolism, which are well adapted for examining the phenomenon of a complex reality in which a specifically Christian identity emerged in the context of Late Antique culture following a gradual process based on negotiation and compromise (*see* *epigraphy, Christian).

A. Ferrua, *Il refrigerio dentro la tomba. I-II*: La Civiltà Cattolica 92/2 (1941) 373-378, 457-463 (= *Scritti vari di epigrafia e antichità cristiane*, Bari 1991, 69-81); R. Krautheimer, *Mensa-coemeterium-martyrium*: Cahiers Archéologiques 11 (1960) 15-40; P.A. Février, *À propos du repas funéraire: culte et sociabilité*: Cahiers Archéologiques 26 (1977) 29-45; Id., *Le culte des morts dans les communautés chrétiennes durant le III^e siècle*, in Atti IX Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana (Rome 1975), Vatican City 1978, 211-274; E. Jastrzebowska, *Les scènes des banquets dans les peintures et les sculptures chrétiennes des 3^e et 4^e siècles*: RecAug 14 (1979) 3-90; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980; E. Jastrzebowska, *Untersuchungen zum christlichen Totenmahl aufgrund der Monumente des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts unter der Basilika des Hl. Sebastien in Rom*, in *Europäische Hochschulschriften Archäologie* XXXVIII, Frankfurt 1981; C. D'Angela, *L'obolo a Caronte. Usi funerari medievali tra paganesimo e cristianesimo*: Quaderni Medievali 15 (1983) 82-91; P.A. Février, *La tombe chrétienne et l'au-delà*, in *Le temps chrétiens de la fin de l'antiquité au moyen-âge. III^e-XIII^e siècles*, Colloques internationaux du CNRS (Paris 1981), Paris 1984, 163-183; A.M. Giuntella - G. Borghetti - D. Stiaffini, Mensae *e riti funerari in Sardegna. La testimonianza di Cornus*, Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche. 1, Martina Franca 1985; N. Duval, Piscinae *et* mensae *funéraires. De Salone à Aquilée*, in *Aquileia, la Dalmazia e l'Illirico*, Antichità Altoadriatiche 26, Udine 1985, 437-462; P.A. Février, *La mort chrétienne*, in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, XXXIII settimana CISAM (Spoleto 1985), Spoleto 1987, 881-942; U.M. Fasola - V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Le necropoli durante la formazione della città cristiana*, in Atti XI Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana (Lyons, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste 1986), Vatican City 1989, 1153-1205; R. Teja, *Prácticas de la oferta votiva del paganesimo al cristianesimo. La prohibición del refrigerium en Milán y Roma*: Scienze dell'Antichità. Storia, archeologia, antropologia 3-4 (1989–1990) 234-239; A.M. Giuntella, *Sepoltura e rito. Consuetudini e innovazioni*, in *Le sepolture in Sardegna dal IV al VII secolo, L'Archeologia romana e altomedievale nell'Oristanese*, Atti IV Convegno (Cuglieri 1987), Oristano 1990, 215-229; C. Amante Simoni, *Sepoltura e monete. Obolo viatico – obolo offerta*, in ibid., 231-242; D. Stiaffini, *La suppellettile vitrea nelle aree cimiteriali in Sardegna. IV-VII secolo*, in ibid., 243-256; J.Ch. Picard, *Cristianizzazione e pratiche funerarie. Tarda antichità e alto medioevo (IV-VIII sec.)*, Turin 1992; A.M. Giuntella, *L'uso degli spazi. Sepolture e riti funerari*, in G. Cantino Wataghin (ed.), *La "civitas christiana." Urbanistica delle città italiane fra antichità e altomedioevo. Aspetti di archeologia urbana*, I Seminario di studio, Turin 1992, 127-137; C. Amante Simoni, *Moneta e riti funerari nei secoli VI e VII*, in ibid., 138-140; P. De Santis, *Elementi di corredo nei sepolcri delle catacombe romane. L'esempio delle regioni di Leone e della galleria Bb nella catacomba di Commodilla*: VetChr 31 (1994) 23-51; A.E. Felle - M.P. Del Moro - D. Nuzzo, *Elementi di "corredo-arredo" delle tombe del cimitero di S. Ippolito sulla via Tiburtina*: RivAC 70 (1994) 89-158; C. D'Angela, *Contesti tombali tardoantichi e altomedievali*, in R. Cantilena (ed.), *Caronte. Un obolo per l'aldilà*: La Parola del passato 50 (1995) 319-326; P. De Santis, *La teoria dei "segni mnemonici" negli scritti di Giovanni Battista de Rossi*, in Atti XIII Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana (Split-Porec 1994), Vatican City-Split 1998, 339-350; L. Chioffi, *Mummificazione e imbalsamazione a Roma ed in altri luoghi del mondo romano*: Opuscula Epigraphica 8 (1998); A.M. Giuntella, *Note su alcuni aspetti della ritualità funeraria nell'altomedioevo. Consuetudini e innovazioni*, in G.P. Brogiolo - G. Cantino Wataghin (eds.), *Sepolture tra IV e VIII secolo* (VII Seminario sul Tardo Antico e l'Alto Medioevo in Italia centro-settentrionale Gardone Riviera 1996), Mantova 1998, 61-75; P. De Santis, *Glass Vessels as Grave Goods and Grave Ornaments in the Catacombs of Rome. Some Examples*, in J. Pearce - M. Millett - M. Struck (eds.), *Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World*, Papers from . . . symposium Univ. Durham, 18-20 April 1997, Oxford 2000, 238-243; R. Martorelli, *Clothing in Burial Practice in Italy in the Early Christian Period*, in ibid., 244-248; D. Nuzzo, *Amulet and Grave in Late Antiquity. Some Examples from Roman Cemeteries*, in ibid., 249-255; B. Mazzei, *Banchetto*, in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 134-136; M. Marinone, *I riti funerari*, in L. Pani Ermini (ed.), *Christiana Loca. Lo spazio cristiano nella Roma del primo millennio*, Catalogo della mostra, Rome 2000, 71-80; U. Volp, *Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike*, Leiden-Boston 2002; D. De Francesco, *Materiali vitrei nei corredi delle tombe del cimitero di s. Ilario "ad bivium" presso Valmontone. A proposito della cosiddetta "frammentazione rituale,"* in E. Russo (ed.), *1983–1993. Dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti VII Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana (Cassino 1993), Cassino 2003, 555-565; E. Rebillard, *Religion et sépulture. L'église, les vivants et les morts dans l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris 2003; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Elementi di trasformazione dello spazio funerario tra tarda antichità ed altomedioevo*, in *Uomo e spazio nell'alto medioevo*, L settimana CISAM (Spoleto 2002), Spoleto 2003, 921-969; C. Carletti, Dies mortis-depositio. *Un modulo "profano" nell'epigrafia tardoantica*: VetChr 41 (2004) 21-48; L. Spera, *Riti funerari e "culto dei morti" nella tarda antichità. Un quadro archeologico dai cimiteri paleocristiani di Roma*: Augustinianum 45 (2005) 5-34.

Archaeological-monumental contexts for reference: P. Styger, *Il monumento apostolico della via Appia*: Dissertazioni Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 13 (1918) 3-115; E. Josi, *Il cimitero di Panfilo II*: RivAC 3 (1926) 51-211; A. Ferrua, *Tre sarcofaghi importanti da S. Sebastiano*: RivAC 27 (1951) 7-33; U.M. Fasola, *La regione delle cattedre nel cimitero Maggiore*: RivAC 37 (1961) 237-267; P.A. Février, *Le culte des martyres en Afrique et ses plus anciens monuments*: Corsi di cultura ravennate e bizantina 17, Ravenna 1970, 191-215; F. Tolotti, *Il cimitero di Priscilla*, Rome 1970; U.M. Fasola, *Le due catacombe ebraiche di Villa Torlonia*: RivAC 52 (1976) 7-62; A. Di Vita, *L'ipogeo di Adamo ed Eva a Gargaresc*, in Atti del IX Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana (Rome 1975), Vatican City 1978, 199-256; S. Garraffo, *Su alcuni rinvenimenti monetari nell'area cimiteriale dell'ex Vigna Cassia a Siracusa*: RivAC 57 (1981) 283-324; E. Chalkia, *Le mense del "coemeterium Iordanorum"*: RivAC 62 (1986) 169-197; N. Duval, *L'épigraphie funéraire chrétienne d'Afrique. Traditions et ruptures, constantes et diversités*, in A. Donati (ed.), *La terza età dell'epigrafia*, Faenza 1988, 302-303; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *I cimiteri paleocristiani del Lazio. I. Etruria meridionale*, Rome 1988; R.M. Bonacasa Carra, *La necropoli paleocristiana di Agrigento. Aspetti e problemi*, in *Le sepolture in Sardegna dal IV al VII secolo, L'Archeologia romana e altomedievale nell'Oristanese*, Atti IV Convegno (Cuglieri 1987), Oristano 1990, 391-412; M. Sannazaro, *La cristianizzazione delle aree rurali della Lombardia (IV-VI secolo). Testimonianze scritte e materiali*, Milan 1990; A. Ferrua, *La basilica e la catacomba di s. Sebastiano*, Vatican City [2]1990; E. Chalkia, *Le mense paleocristiane. Tipologia e funzioni delle mense seconda-*

rie nel culto paleocristiano, Vatican City 1991; A.M. Giuntella et al., *Recenti indagini nella catacomba di Castelvecchio Subequo (AQ)*: RivAC 67 (1991) 249-321; V. Fiocchi Nicolai et al., *Scavi nella catacomba di s. Senatore ad Albano Laziale*: RivAC 68 (1992) 7-140; L. Pani Ermini et al., *Recenti indagini nel complesso martiriale di S. Felice a Cimitile*: RivAC 69 (1993) 223-313; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *La nuova basilica circiforme della via Ardeatina*, con appendice di M.P. Del Moro - D. Nuzzo - L. Spera: Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 68 (1995–1996) 69-233; P. De Santis - R. Giuliani, *I corredi funerari*, in G. Volpe (ed.), *San Giusto I. La "villa," le "ecclesiae." Primi risultati dagli scavi nel sito rurale di San Giusto (Lucera): 1995–97*, Bari 1998, 221-232; A.M. Giuntella, *Le sepolture*, in *Cornus* I,1. *L'area cimiteriale orientale*, Oristano 1999, 81-89; P. De Santis - D. Nuzzo, *Sepolture* ad limina *nel santuario di San Michele a Monte Sant'Angelo. Ultime indagini (1999)*: VetChr 38 (2001) 131-156; C. Perassi, *Le monete della necropoli. Osservazioni sul rituale funerario*, in M. Sannazaro (ed.), *Ricerche archeologiche nei cortili dell'Università cattolica. La necropoli tardoantica*, Atti delle giornate di studio (Milan 1999), Milan 2001, 101-111; F. Airoldi, *Le incinerazioni in età tardoromana. Caratteristiche e diffusione del fenomeno*, in ibid., 115-124; A. Samellas, *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50–600). The Christianization of the East: An Interpretation*, Tübingen 2002; D. Nuzzo, *Realizzazione del vano di passaggio e suo uso funerario*, in G. Volpe et al., *Il complesso episcopale paleocristiano di san Pietro a Canosa. Seconda relazione preliminare (campagna di scavi 2002)*: Archeologia Medievale 30 (2003) 132-135; F.R. Stasolla, *Riti e corredi funerari a Cimitile*, in H. Brandenburg - L. Pani Ermini (eds.), *Cimitile e Paolino di Nola, la tomba di s. Felice e il centro di pellegrinaggio. Trent'anni di ricerche*, Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana (Rome 2000), Vatican City 2003, 275-279; L. Spera, *Il complesso di Pretestato sulla Via Appia. Storia topografica e monumentale di un insediamento funerario paleocristiano nel suburbio di Roma*, Vatican City 2004; N. Maes, *Caring for Body and Soul in the Early Christian Mediterranean. Eastern and Western Perspeptives*: Byzantion 76 (2006) 571-579; M. Sannazaro, *La cristianizzazione delle pratiche funerarie: il caso di Padenghe sul Garda (BS)*, in *La cristianizzazione in Italia tra tardoantico ed altomedioevo. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti IX Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana (Agrigento 2004), Palermo 2007, 671-690.

P. De Santis

G

GABRIEL (iconography). In *Scripture Gabriel appears as the messenger *par excellence*, who announces to Zechariah the birth of *John the Baptist (Lk 1:19) and to *Mary that of Jesus (Lk 1:26-28). The attributes and *gestures attributed to the archangel Gabriel in *iconography refer directly to his principal function as an envoy: he is always shown in the gesture of speech and, at least starting from the 5th c., beyond being winged, he carries the *baculus* of the messenger, more rarely a lit lantern, a mirror on which are written the orders of *God, or a phylactery with the words *Ave Maria gratia plena*. The most ancient figurative testimony of the archangel Gabriel appears in the course of the 4th c. in a fresco of the cemetery of SS. Peter and Marcellinus in Rome (Wilpert, *Ein Cyclus*, pls. I-IV = J.G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Commodilla." Repertorium der Malerein*, no. 17; cf. B. Mazzei, *Il cubicolo dell'Annunciazione nelle catacombe di Priscilla. Nuove osservazioni alla luce dei recenti restauri*: RivAC 75 [1999] 258-262). Here Gabriel, as yet without his specific individual attributes (wings, *baculus*), is represented in the act of the *adlocutio* while he announces to Mary the birth of the Christ. The image of Gabriel becomes completely defined in its essential iconographic terms starting from the end of the 4th through the 5th c. This can be confirmed in the Pignatta *sarcophagus of *Ravenna, in which Gabriel is in the act of addressing Mary, shown seated and with a spindle in her right hand, and in the *mosaics of the triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome. The valuable depiction of the Annunciation found on the ivory chair of Maximian in the Museo Arcivescovile of Ravenna (Volbach n. 140, pls. 72-74) belongs to the 6th c. Here, underlining his function as divine messenger, Gabriel is represented with a cross-shaped *baculus*.

Together with *Michael, Gabriel shares the role of guardian of the church and in this function is represented in the presbyterial mosaic of St. Vitale in Ravenna (5th c.) and in the apsidal one of the *Panaghia Angeloktistos* in *Cyprus (7th c.).

DACL 6, 10-29; LCI 2, 74-77; EC 5, 1833-1834; BS 5, 1326-1336; G. Wilpert, *Ein Cyclus christologischer Gemälde aus der Katakombe der hl. Petrus und Marcellinus*, Freiburg i.B. 1891; C. Lamy-Lassalle, *Les archanges en costume impérial dans la peinture murale italienne*: Synthronon, Paris 1968, 189-198; P. Testini, *Su una discussa figurazione del sarcofago detto del profeta Eliseo o Pignatta*: FR 113/114 (1977) esp. 334ff.; R. Giuliani, s.v. *Angelo*: TIP 109.

C. Carletti

GABRIEL QATRAYA (7th c.). The literary sources mention five Syro-Eastern authors by the name Gabriel Qatraya, who could also be a single person who lived in the 1st half of the 7th c. The absence of precise information is reflected in the sources themselves, some of which attempt to identify him. Thus there existed a Gabriel, celebrated exegete of the school of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon and teacher of the catholicos Henanisho (d. 699/700). According to the historian Abdisho bar Berika (d. 1318), a Gabriel Qatraya wrote a christological sermon, *Mēmrā on the Union*, and a *Solution to Questions Concerning the Faith*, while *Babai the Great (d. ca. 627/628), again acc. to Abdisho, wrote a treatise, *Book of the Causes*, about or against some authors among whom one was Gabriel Qatraya. There are, furthermore, two other authors named Gabriel Qatraya of whom we know a little more: one was the author of a commentary on *liturgy in five books, datable to the 1st half of the 7th c., while the other was an exegete cited by two anonymous comments on the OT (8th-10th c.), by Isho'dad of Merv in his commentaries on the OT and NT (ca. 850) and by the lexicographer Bar-Barhūl (10th c.). In an anonymous *Vita* of Isaac of Nineveh, this last Gabriel Qatraya is considered a relative of Isaac, while the *Gannat bussāmē* (13th c.) identifies him with Gabriel Aryā ("the lion"), also a relative of Isaac.

DHGE 19, 563-4; BO III/1, 172-173; Baumstark, 200-201; T. Jansma, *Investigations into the Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, in *Studies on the Book of Genesis,* B. Gemser - J. Hoftijzer - A.R.

Hulst et al. (eds.), Leiden 1958, 69-181; S.H. Jammo, *Gabriel Qaṭraya et son commentaire sur la liturgie chaldéenne*: OCP 32 (1966) 39-52; Id., *L'office du soir chaldéen au temps de Gabriel Qaṭraya*: OS 12 (1967) 187-210; L. Van Rompay, *A Hitherto Unknown Nestorian Commentary on Genesis and Exodus I–IX,32 in the Syriac Manuscript (olim) Dijarbekr 22*: OLP 5 (1974) 73-78; Id., *Le Commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Diyarbaker 22*. I-II (CSCO 483-484; Syr 205-206), Louvain 1986, in part. II, xxvii-xxxii.

K. den Biesen

GAIANUS (6th c.). A follower of the *monophysitism of *Julian of Halicarnassus (*see* *aphthartodocetism) opposed by *Severus of Antioch. At the death of the monophysite *Timothy IV of Alexandria in 535, one part of the people elected *Theodosius, follower of Severus, and another Gaianus, follower of Julian. Gaianus occupied the Alexandrian see for a brief period; the intervention of *Narses reestablished Theodosius. Gaianus was exiled first to *Carthage and then to *Sardinia, where he died. Nevertheless the aphthartodocetist monophysite sect continued, and his followers were also called Gaianites (from Gaianus) and Julianists (from Julian of Halicarnassus).

Liberato, *Breviarium*, 19-20: PL 68, 1032-1038; DTC 6, 998-1023; F. Diekamp, *Zum Aphthartodoketenstreit*: ThRev 25 (1927) 89-93; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, II/4, London 1996, 45-54; E. Wipszycka, *L'épitaphe du Duhela SB III 6249. Moins gaïnites dans de monastères alexandrins*: JJP 28 (1998) 55-66.

A. Di Berardino

GAIUS (and the Alogi) (2nd c.). A Christian writer of the end of the 2nd c. The only direct sources on Gaius are *Eusebius and Dionysius bar Salibi. Comparing the information reported by them, the following certain facts can be gathered: Gaius was a Roman writer, author of a work against the *Montanist *Proclus, of which Eusebius preserves some fragments. He did not believe the Fourth Gospel and the *Apocalypse to be Johannine, attributing them to *Cerinthus. According to Eusebius, who does not mention the opposition of Gaius to the Fourth Gospel, he was orthodox and highly esteemed; acc. to Dionysius he was a heretic. Dionysius preserves some passages of a writing of *Hippolytus against Gaius: the *Capitula adv. Caium*. The objections of Gaius to the Apocalypse contained therein concern presumed contradictions between this work and the Pauline writings. The figure of Gaius is usually associated with the Alogi, a name created by *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51) on the basis of a wordplay (*a-logos*: without reason, but also implying an adversary of the Logos) for a group of opponents of the Johannine works, which they attributed to Cerinthus. They accused the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse of falsities and incoherencies with the other writings of the NT, in particular with the Synoptics. The validity of Epiphanius's report is questionable. It has been held that Epiphanius drew upon Hippolytus (perhaps in the lost *Syntagma*), but the absence of any mention of Gaius in his report creates difficulties: it is an inexplicable omission given the polemic of Hippolytus with Gaius. Over time the conviction of the heterodoxy of Gaius has imposed itself in criticism, on the evidence of Epiphanius and Dionysius bar Salibi. However, it seems more precise to locate Gaius and his possible followers in the context of the hesitations that had developed at Rome, toward the end of the 2nd c., among part of the hierarchy toward the Johannine writings, because of the problems created by *gnostics, Montanists and *quartodecimans who all, under various aspects, appealed to John.

CPG 1330-1331; the fragments of *Adv. Proclum* in Eusebius, *HE* II, 25,6-7; III, 28,1-2; III, 31,4; VI, 20,3. The fragments of *Capitula adv. Caium* in I. Sedlacek, *Dionysius bar Salibi. In Apocalypsim, Actus et Epistulas catholicas* (CSCO 53.60; Syr. 18.20), Paris 1909–1910; TRE I, 290-295; E. Prinzivalli, *Gaio e gli Alogi*: SSR 5 (1981) 53-68; A. Camplani - E. Prinzivalli, *Sul significato dei nuovi frammenti siriaci dei "Capitula aduersus Caium" attribuiti a Ippolito*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 49-82.

E. Prinzivalli

GALATIA. A region in the central part of Asia Minor, formed primarily of high plateaus, Galatia took this name in the 3rd c. BC following the immigration of *Celtic tribes. It was reduced by Augustus to a Roman province after the death of the last Galatian king, Amyntas, in AD 25. The legate of the province also had authority over Pisidia, Lycaonia, Pamphylia, Isauria, Paphlagonia, the Galatian *Pontus and, between 80 and 114, over *Cappadocia. The Galatian region was *evangelized by *Paul in the course of his second missionary journey (Acts 16:6). In all probability, it is to the Christian communities of this region that he addressed the letter to the Galatians. The principal cities of Galatia were Pessinus, *Ancyra and Tavium. In the course of the 4th c. three councils took place at Ancyra: one orthodox in 314, one *homoiousian in 358 and one pro-*Arian in ca. 375. Between 385 and 395 Galatia was divided in two eparchies: Galatia Prima with metropolis Ancyra and Galatia Seconda with metropolis Pessinus; later, through the effect of can. 28 of the Council of *Chal-

cedon (451), the ecclesiastical province of Galatia was put under the patriarchate of *Constantinople. From the monastic point of view mention should be made of the *anchorite Peter the Galatian, *Nilus of Ancyra and the monk Leontius who later became metropolitan of Ancyra.

Ancyra: DHGE 2,1538-1543; *Galatia*: DHGE 19,714-731.

S. Zincone

GALBIUS and CANDIDUS, a Greek legend (6th c.?). An etiological account of the discovery of the clothes of Mary. It was a "pious theft" done by two employees of Constantinople, Galbius and Candidus, who, after having stolen the clothes of Mary, took them to the capital to deposit them in the church of Blacherne.

A. Wenger, *L'Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI[e] au X[e] siècle*, Paris 1955, 293-311 (2 recensions, Fr. tr.); Pol. tr.: Starowieyski 1/2, 827-832; S. Mimouni, *Dormition et l'Assomption de la Vierge*, Paris 1995, 604-617.

M. Starowieyski

GALEN (ca. 129–199). Doctor, grammarian and philosopher, born in Pergamon (Asia Minor), died in Rome in 199. A student of *Platonic teachers, he traveled before settling in Rome, where he was the doctor of *Marcus Aurelius and cared for his son *Commodus. He wrote numerous works on medicine and philosophy which exercised a great influence during the Byzantine Middle Ages. He was a rationalist and an eclectic, excluding Epicureanism and the skeptic movements. Galen mentions the Christians only four times together with Jews in the expression "followers of Moses and of Christ"; he is critical of their fideist attitude, inasmuch as they accept "laws not demonstrated," and he has reservations about their critical spirit, because of their elementary philosophy. He admires the rigor of their customs and the chastity practiced by men and women (*De puls. diff.* II, 4, ed. Kühn, Leipzig 1824, 579 and 657), "and they behave in a way analogous to that of true philosophers" (Carrara, 132).

RAC 8, 777-786; R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians*, Oxford 1949; P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, Paris 1934, 94-97; P. Carrara, *I pagani di fronte al cristianesimo. Testimonianze dei secoli I e II*, Florence 1984, 127-132; R.M. Grant, *Paul, Galen, and Origen*: JTS 34 (1983) 533-536; S. Gero, *Galen on the Christians. A Reappraisal of the Arabic Evidence*: OCP 56 (1990) 371-411.

A. Hamman

GALERIUS (ca. 250–311). C. Galerius Val. Maximianus, born of humble origins in the area around *Serdica (today Sofia), in Dacia Ripensis (Illyricum), about 250. He received the title of Caesar on 1 March 293, together with *Constantius Chlorus, in the tetrarchic system created by *Diocletian. He led military campaigns in *Egypt in 294; in the Orient he was defeated near Ctesiphon in 295 by the Persians; in 298 he obtained a favorable treaty for the Romans. A convinced pagan, he was among the most active supporters of the anti-Christian persecutory politics of Diocletian. At the abdication of the two *Augusti* in 305, he became emperor for the Orient; he invaded Italy in 307 to avenge the death of *Severus against *Maxentius. During his withdrawal, he sacked Italy. When in 308 the Augustus *Maximian tried to reconquer the throne, he sought to win the elderly Diocletian to his side; in the meeting of *Carnuntum* in October of 308, *Licinius was named Augustus, while *Maximinus Daia and *Constantine were names *filii Augustorum*. But the compromise solution lasted only as long as Galerius lived; a severe illness that struck him in 311 (described in *De mort. persec.* 35,3 of Lactantius)—which provoked his death and which he himself seems to have attributed to his own acts of *persecution against the Christians—may have led him to pronounce in April of 311 an Edict of Tolerance, with the intention of placating the Christian God.

PWK 14,2, 2516-2598; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari [2]1973, 587ff.; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 283-287; S. Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs. Imperial Pronouncements and Government AD 284–324*, Oxford 1996; W. Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarche. Das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313 n. Chr.)*, Frankfurt a.M. 2001.

M. Forlin Patrucco

GALILEANS (Christian). The expansion of Christianity in the Jewish world outside of Jerusalem is briefly mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. Justin completes the biblical data recalling various components of the Jewish community of Jerusalem: Genists, Merists, *Galilei*, Hellenes, Baptists (*Dial.* 80,4). The Galileans, mentioned by Justin, who acknowledged as guide Judas the Galilean (Acts 5:37, Josephus Flavius, *Ant.* 18,1), should not be confused with the Christian Galileans. The foundation of the Christian church in Acts 9:31 is taken for granted through a stereotyped literary formula. The apostles' family links in Galilee suggest that the region had been evangelized very early. The absence of docu-

ments does not allow us to decide on possible sympathies of the Christians of Galilee for independence movements active there. Nor can the presence of Simon, nicknamed the Zealot, among Jesus' disciples be brought as an argument in favor of this hypothesis. The Zealots become a political party with the Jewish war of AD 66–70. After 70, there is no further mention of Christianity in Galilee. This leads one to believe that it was confessed in majority by fishers and farmers, who have left no traces of themselves. For Epictetus (*Discourses* IV, 7,6) the term "Galileans" designated the Christians, just as for the emperor *Julian the Apostate, who used it habitually in his works in a disdainful sense (Greg. Naz., *Oration* 4,75). Julian also wrote a work with the title *Adversus Galilaeos*.

L.F. Elliott Binns, *Galilean Christianity*, Chicago 1956; M. Simon, *Les sectes juives au temps de Jésus*, Paris 1960; G. Jossa, *Gesù e i movimenti di liberazione della Palestina*, Brescia 1980, 61-77; Emperor Julian, *Contra Galilaeos*, intr., critical text and tr. by E. Masaracchia, Rome 1990; L.I. Levine (ed.), *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, New York 1992; D. Argiolas, *I "Galilei" nell'epistolario dell'imperatore Giuliano l'Apostata*: Theologica. Annali della Pontificia Fac. Teologica della Sardegna 4 (1995) 161-196; E. Masaracchia, *Aspetti della cultura di Giuliano nel "Contra Galilaeos"*: Rudiae 10 (1998) 91-111; E. Nodet - J. Taylor, *Essai sur les origines du christianisme*, Paris 1999 (It. tr., Casale Monf. 2000).

E. Peretto

GALL (d. ca. 645). A saint of Irish origin, disciple of *Columbanus. Following his teacher in the territory of the Alamanni, he stopped near the Lake of Constance, where he established a hermitage at the sources of the Steinach, where later a church rose and where Othmar, in the 1st half of the 8th c., founded the celebrated monastery called "of Saint Gall." Gall evangelized Alamanni, Suebi and neighboring peoples, at the E edges of Austrasia. He refused the bishopric of Constance and the charge of abbot of Luxeuil. A *homily delivered at Constance for the episcopal consecration of his disciple John was attributed to Gall, but the Latin text that survives (PL 87, 13-26) seems to be the work of Notker Balbulus (d. 912). Gall died at Arbon during a visit with his friend Willimar. His feast is celebrated 16 October. His legend includes the hagiographic *topos* of the encounter with the bear, in whose company Gall is often represented. According to a *carmen* composed between 835 and 850, perhaps by Walafrid Strabo (*Carmen Sangallense* n. 5, ms. 187 of Saint Gall), the other name of Gall would have been Seth: in this case he would have been the designatory of the *Carmen ad Sethum,* attributed by some to Columbanus of Bobbio, by others to Columbanus of Saint-Trond (late 8th c.).

Sharpe 306; J.F. Kenney, *The Sources of the Early History of Ireland*, New York 1929, I, n. 50, 206-208; BHL 3245-3258; BS 6,15-19; DCB 2,601-602; B. and H. Helbling, *Der heilige Gallus in der Geschichte*: SZG 12 (1962) 1-62; G. Gindele, *Columban verzichtet auf seinen Messpriester Gallus*: SMGBZ 90 (1979) 438-445; M.W. Herren, *A Ninth-Century Poem for St. Gall's Feast Day and the "Ad Sethum" of Columbanus*: SM 24 (1983) 487-520; G. Hilty, *Die Konstanzer Predigt des heiligen Gallus und das Fortleben des Romanischen am Südufer des Bodensees bis ins 7. Jahrhundert.Geistesleben um den Bodensee im frühen Mittelalter*: Vorträge eines Mediävistischen Symposions vom 30. September bis zum 3. Oktober 1987 . . . , ed. A. Masser - A. Wolf, Freiburg 1989, 57-63; K.H. Burmeister, "*Ohne Bregenz kein St. Gallen." Der Weg des hl. Gallus von Bregenz nach St. Gallen*: SVGB 114 (1996) 5-16; M. Jochimsen, *Der Heilige Gallus. Der Mönch, der Bär und das goldene Halsband*, in *Herrscher, Helden, Heilige*, ed. U. Müller - W. Wunderlich, St. Gallen 1996, 639-651.

E. Malaspina

GALLA PLACIDIA (ca. 388–450). Aelia Galla Placidia, daughter of the emperor *Theodosius I and half-sister of *Arcadius and *Honorius, emperors respectively of the East and the West. Born at* Constantinople a little before 390, she lived mostly in *Ravenna, where she took an active part in the intrigues of the court, contributing to the ruin of the general *Stilicho who met his death there in 408. In 410, during the sack of *Rome, she was imprisoned by *Alaric, but four years later married his brother-in-law, Ataulf, at *Narbonne, even without the agreement of the emperor Honorius, with all possible pomp and acc. to traditional Roman custom, contributing to the improvement of the difficult relations between the *Visigoths and the Empire. After the death of Ataulf and of a son she bore him, Galla Placidia entered a new matrimony (416) with the general and patrician *Constantius, with whom she had two children, Justa Grata Honoria and Placidus Valentinian. In 419 she was involved in the troubles concerning the election of the new bishop of Rome, as several of her letters attest. She obtained a little later the title of Augusta, when Constantius was co-opted Augustus of the Occident. But the following year, Constantius having died, Galla Placidia found refuge from the wrath of Honorius with *Theodosius II in the East. At the death of her brother, after the defeat of the usurper John, the kingdom passed to *Valentinian III (423 or 425), on whose behalf she was regent until 437. In such a position, scheming and calculating, she inserted herself into the conflict between *Aetius and *Boniface, making use of Aetius until Boniface's death in battle. Aetius was then exiled by the empress (435), but regained the greatest honors from her later. From 437 Galla Placidia, although continuing to be a figure of the greatest importance, dedicated herself with zeal to worship,

building or restoring many churches. Up until her death she represented a perfect example of the aristocracy with a will of iron, so characteristic of the late empire. Buried at first in Rome, her body was placed in the celebrated mausoleum of Ravenna which bears her name, but which in reality had been intended as a church of St. Lawrence.

CSEL 35, 1, 71-74; W. Ensslin, *Placidia* (1), PWK XX, 1910-1931; *Galla* (2), PLRE, I, 382; A. Lippold, KLP 4, 876-877; K. Groß-Albenhausen, NP 4, 762-763; H. Benrath, *Die Kaiserin G.P.*, Stuttgart 1937 (= 1951); E. Stein - J.-R. Palanque, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* 1.1, Paris 1958 (= Amsterdam 1968); V.A. Sirago, *G.P. e la trasformazione politica dell'Occidente*, Louvain 1961; F. Gerke, *L'iconografia delle monete imperiali dell'Augusta G.P.* Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 13 (1966) 163-204; M.A. Nagl, *G.P.: Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, New York 1967; S.I. Oost, *G.P. Augusta. A Biographical Essay*, Chicago-London 1968; S.I. Oost, *G.P. and the Law*: CPh 63 (1968) 114-121; L. Storoni Mazzolani, *G.P.*, Milan 1975 (= 2002); Ph. Caffin, *G.P., la dernière impératrice de Rome*, Paris 1977; A. Lippold, *Kaiser Theodosius und seine Zeit*, Stuttgart ²1980; E. Demougeot, *L'évolution politique de G.P.*: Gerion 3 (1985) 183-210; S. Rebenich, *Gratian. A Son of Theodosius, and the Birth of G.P.*: Historia 34 (1985) 372-385; Id., *Gratianus Redivivus*: Historia 38 (1989) 376-379; M. Donnini, *G.P. nelle fonti latine medievali, umanistiche e rinascimentali*: StudMed 35 (1994) 695-732; A. Collaci, *G.P. La vita e i giorni*, Florence 1995; M. Clauss, *Die Frauen der theodosianischen Familie*, in H. Temporini - G. Vitzthum (eds.), *Die Kaiserinnen Roms. Von Livia bis Theodora*, Munich 2002, 370-436.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

GALLAECIA (Galicia). Province of *Hispania* created following the administrative reforms of *Diocletian (ca. 297) with the W most territories of the *Tarraconensis*. The first Christian testimonies of Gallaecia mention the double See of *Legio-Asturica* (León-Astorga) as already well established (254; Cyprian, *Ep.* 67) and the firm adhesion of many Galician bishops to the *Priscillanist heresy—a theme treated at the Council of *Toledo I (400; *Exemplar professionum*)—and, to a lesser degree, to *Manicheism (Hydatius, *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 445, 122) and to *Arianism, introduced among the Suebi by Ajax (466; Hydatius, *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 465-466, 228; Isidore, *Hist. Sueu.* 90). In the year 409, Suebi, Alans and *Vandals penetrated into the *Iberian peninsula (Hydatius, *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 409, 34) and, in 414, installed themselves in Gallaecia (Isidore, *Hist. Sueu.* 73), esp. in the *conventus Lucense*, *Bracarense*, *Asturum* and *Cluniacense*. Their settlement brought conflicts with the Hispanic-Roman population, as shown by the flight of *Orosius to *Hippo (prior to 415; Orosius, *Hist. adu. pag. libri* 3,20,7; 5,2,1; 5,1,15; 5,2,8) and the three-month imprisonment of *Hydatius, probably bishop of Chaves (Hyd., *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 460, 196 and 202), despite the Catholic faith of some of their kings, such as Requiarius (Hyd., *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 448, 129). In the 4th-5th c., Gallaecia had numerous direct contacts with *Africa and with the Orient: *Turibius, Orosius, Hydatius, the three Avitus Bacchiarius and others, such as the pilgrims *Egeria (for some, an Aquitanian) and Pimenia. In the middle of 6th c., the Suebian king—either Charraricus (*Gregory of Tours, *De mirac. s. Martini* 1,11) or Theodimir (Isidore, *Hist. Sueu.* 91)—converted to Catholicism. In 585 the Suebian kingdom was annexed to the Visigothic kingdom of *Leovigild (Isidore, *Hist. Sueu.* 49).

Beyond Hydatius and Orosius, the documentation on the history of the Galician church in the Suebian-Visigothic period is constituted, principally, by the letter of the Roman bishop *Vigilius to a certain colleague, the bishop of Braga *Profuturus (29 June 538; Vigilius, *Ep.* 1); by the acts of the three councils of *Braga (561, 572 and 675); by the works of *Martin of Braga (2nd half of 6th c.); by the *Divisio Theodomiri* (or *Parochiale Sueuorum*), a text dated between 572 and 582, in which the 13 Suebian episcopal sees are grouped around two Suebian religious provinces (Lugo and Braga); and by the works of *Isidore of Seville (mid 6th-mid 7th c.), *Fructuosus of Braga (2nd half of 7th c.) and *Valerius of Bierzo, a Leónese hermit (7th c.).

The Christianization of Gallaecia, very sparse at the beginning of the 4th c., intensified starting from the end of the 4th c., as the *chrismon* on a slab of white marble demonstrates, perhaps a table for the offerings (S. Maria de Hermida, Quiroga, Lugo; 1st quarter of the 5th c.); the paleo-Christian *sarcophagi (1st third of the 4th c.) of S. Justo de la Vega (Astorga), of S. Maria de Temes (Carballedo, Lugo), of the *Orans* of Monterrei (Orense) and of Vilar de Servoi (Castrelo do Val, Orense); the cover of a sarcophagus in stone with sepulchral mosaic, a local work, found at Frende (Baião, Portugal; late 4th-mid 5th c.). More difficult to date are the sarcophagus of Villanueva de Lorenzana (Lugo) and those of the zone between Orense and Chaves (5th-7th c.). The earliest documented churches are those of S. Eulalia de Tines (Vimianzo, La Coruña), built above a late imperial villa, in which an inscription bearing the formula *in pace* was found; S. Eulalia de Bóveda (Lugo), a direct Christianization of a pagan edifice (4th-5th c.) and the *martyrium* of Marialba (Marialba de la Ribera, León), with a cylindrical baptistery and three phases of construction: a large rectangular room with a horseshoe apse (phase I; 4th c.), an edifice on a central plan and central vault (phase

II; late 4th-early 5th c.) and a transformation of the apse which raised the floor, resting on 13 tombs (phase III; late 6th-early 7th c.).

At the beginning of the 5th c., in the Suebian epoch, new episcopal sees are present: *Celenis* (Caldas de Reyes; a temporary see) and *Bracara* (Braga) and, a little later, *Lucus* (Lugo) and *Aquae Flaviae* (Chaves). The sources mention the existence of *basilicae sanctorum* at Braga (Hyd., *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 456-457, 167) and of *sanctae ecclesiae* at Astorga (Hyd., *Cont. Chron. Hieron.*, a. 457, 179), in both cases with altars, ornaments and liturgical furnishings. By the 6th c. the sees of *Auria* (Orense), *Brittania* (S. Maria de Bretoña), *Dumio* (Dume), *Iria Flavia* (Padrón), *Laniobrensis* (site unknown), *Magneto* (Meinedo; transferred to Oporto), *Portus Cale* (Oporto), and *Tude* (Tuy) were added. The archaeological finds consist of a sepulchral sarcophagus in provenance from the cathedral of Braga (early 5th c.) of African influence with a lateral *chrismon*; the cover of the sarcophagus of Ithacius in provenance from S. Maria (Oviedo; late 5th-early 6th c.), this also with a *chrismon*, of Ravennate influence, and the church of S. Miguel Arcángel de Navatejera (Villaquilambre, León; 5th c.), a cruciform building situated above a Roman villa.

From the 2nd half of the 6th c. are the churches of S. Maria (Tuy); S. Martín (Orense); S. Martín de Mondoñedo (Mondoñedo); S. Esteban (Ribas de Sil, Orense) and S. Pedro (Triacastela, Lugo); in addition to the reliefs of Saamasas (Lugo), with an animal decoration of Ravennate influence, and the sepulchral *laus* of Modesta (Tuy; end 6th c.), S. Maria de Padrón and S. Fiz de Solovio (Santiago de Compostela) also go back, perhaps, to the 6th c.

The following churches all date back to the 7th c.: S. Fructuoso de Montelios (Braga) was a Greek-cross basilica built by S. Fructuosus as a mausoleum (656–665) of Byzantine type with an external decoration that recalls the mausoleum of *Galla Placidia (Ravenna) and horseshoe chapels between three of the arms of the cross, with a cupola at the center and vaults in the lateral arms. S. Juan de Baños, in the *conventus Asturum* (Cerrato, Palencia; consecrated in 661, a work of Recceswinth), was an edifice of basilica plan with three aisles, rectangular apse, portico but without a baptistery, despite being intituled to S. John the Baptist. S. Pedro de Balsemão (Lamego, Portugal), a building situated on the border between Gallaecia and *Lusitania*, mostly reconstructed, on a quadrangular plant with three aisles, featured a rectangular apse without baptistery. More difficult to date is the church, still to be excavated, of S. Comba de Bande (Baños de Bande, Orense), reconstructed for the most part at the time of Alfonso III (end of 10th c.); S. Pedro de la Nave (Campillo, Zamora), very complicated in plan and of a much-disputed chronology, with polygonal capitals decorated with scenes of the OT, without baptistery; S. Colomba (Villaquejida, León), a typical example of a medieval church above a Roman *villa*, the oratory of Ouvigo (Orense), or even the Crypt of the Cathedral of Palencia, acc. to Schlunk, the *martyrium* of Antolín dated to the 2nd half of the 7th c. Furthermore, abundant liturgical material is available from the principal episcopal sees.

Other basilicas and esp. monasteries are documented by the sources, such as the primitive monastery of Samos (Vives, 559; 2nd half of the 7th c.), the monastery *Maximus* (*Parochiale Sueu.* 13,1) or the Christian edifices of the zone of the Bierzo described by Valerius, among which are mentioned the church of Ricimiro; the oratory in memory of Fructuosus and the monasteries *Rufianense*, *Compludum* and that founded by John. Furthermore, Valerius specifies that many lay *domini* of the Bierzo had the custom of changing their properties into monasteries (Valerius Bergid., *De genere monach.* 1,9-14), certainly to benefit from fiscal exemptions, an aspect dealt with by the 2nd Council of *Braga (*Conc. Brac.* II [572], ch. 5).

C. Torres, *Límites geográficos de Galicia en los siglos IV y V*: Cuadernos de Estudios Gallegos 4 (1949) 367-382; P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana. Siglos IV-VI*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; Id., *Arqueología cristiana hispánica de tiempos romanos y visigodos*: RivAC 43 (1967) 177-232; J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*, Barcelona [2]1969; M. Sotomayor, *Datos históricos sobre sarcófagos romano-cristianos de España*, Granada 1973; R. Puertas, *Iglesias hispánicas (s. IV al VIII). Testimonios literarios*, Madrid 1975; H. Schlunk - Th. Hauschild, *Hispania Antiqua. Die Denkmäler der frühchristlichen und westgotischen Zeit*, Mainz am Rhein 1979; E.A. Thompson, *The Conversion of the Spanish Suevi to Catholicism. Visigothic Spain*, Oxford 1980, 77-92; P. Díaz Martínez, *Los distintos "grupos sociales" del noroeste hispano y la invasión de los suevos*: SHHA 1 (1983) 75-88; A. Ferreiro, *The Missionary Labors of St. Martin of Braga in 6th Century Galicia*: StudMon 23 (1983) 11-26; J. Mattoso, *A história das parroquias em Portugal*: Portugal Medieval. Novas interpretações, Lisbon 1984, 37-76; P. Díaz Martínez, *Comunidades monásticas y comunidades campesinas en la España visigoda*, in *Los Visigodos. Historia y civilización*, Murcia 1986, 189-195; R. Teja, *La carta 67 de S. Cipriano a las comunidades cristianas de León-Astorga y Mérida. Algunos problemas y soluciones*, in *Cristianismo y aculturación en tiempos del imperio romano*, Murcia 1990, 115-124; P. Díaz Martínez, *El monacato y la cristianización del NO hispano. Un proceso de aculturación*, in ibid., 531-539; L. Caballero - J.C. Sánchez, *Reutilizaciones de material romano en edificios de culto cristiano*, in ibid., 431-485; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *La cristianización en Galicia*, in *La romanización de Galicia*, A Coruña 1992, 105-120; J. Vilella, *Roma, Cartago i la cristiandat hispana segons l'epístola 67 de Cebrià*. Homenatge a Miquel Tarradell, Barcelona 1993, 883-887; C. Godoy, *Arqueología y*

liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII), Barcelona 1995; J.M. Novo, *Lugo en los tiempos oscuros. Las menciones literarias de la ciudad entre los siglos V y X (2)*: Boletín do Museo Provincial de Lugo 7 (1995–1996) 67-80; L. Caballero - F. Arce, *La iglesia de San Pedro de la Nave (Zamora). Arqueología y arquitectura*: AEA 70 (1997) 221-274; J.E. López Pereira, *La cristianización de la Gallaecia*, in *Galicia castrexa e romana*, Santiago 1997, 282-288; F. Singul, *La pintura de Santa Eulalia de Bóveda (Lugo). Ortodoxia y clasicismo en la pintura paleocristiana del Noroeste hispánico*: Boletín Auriense 27 (1997) 175-193; J. Vilella, *Priscilianismo galaico y política antipriscilianista durante el siglo V*: AntTard 5 (1997) 177-185; M.J.V. Branco, *St. Martín of Braga, the Sueves and Gallaecia*, in *The Visigoths. Studies in Culture and Society*, Leiden 1999, 63-97; J.L. Quiroga - M.R. Lovelle, *Topografía funeraria rural entre el Miño y el Duero durante la Antigüedad Tardía (s. V-VII). Aproximación a un marco cronológico y tipológico*: Madrider Mitteilungen 40 (1999) 228-253; J. Vilella, *Idacio, un cronista de su tiempo*: Compostellanum 44 (1999) 39-54; Id., *Biografía crítica de Orosio*: JbAC 43 (2000) 94-121; O. Núñez, *El mundo funerario bajoimperial y sus aportaciones al estudio de la cristianización de Gallaecia*: Minius 8 (2000) 61-74.

C. Buenacasa

GALLICAN LITURGY

I. Origin and development - II. Principal characteristics.

I. Origin and development. We should first of all specify that when we speak of *liturgia* or *ritus gallicanus* we refer exclusively to the local *liturgy that was formed in the S of *Gaul, probably at the beginning of the 6th c., and which became extinct with the adoption of the Roman rite on the part of Charlemagne for the entire Franco-Roman Empire. Even highly qualified studies often use an ambiguous terminology: the name of "gallicana" is given also to a Roman liturgy reelaborated in the Carolingian cultural environment. It is true that the Carolingian cultural movement, which is characterized by its eclecticism and which prided itself on being extensively documented, made use sometimes of ancient Gallican texts in its liturgical adaptations, as it also made use of Ambrosian texts and Hispanic texts. But this does not mean that the Franco-Roman liturgy, which is sometimes given the qualifier of "Gallicanized Roman liturgy," represents a natural evolution or a survival relative to the ancient Gallican rite. That which distinguishes the true Gallican rite clearly from the Franco-Roman *liturgy is its purely Latin cultural matrix. We will nevertheless see that, in the period of decadence, which the Gallican rite reached too quickly, there was some penetration of the literary style and mentality of the Merovingians in the composition of texts. The Gallican rite was born at the same time as the Hispanic rite, based on the same foundations and through the effect of an identical historic phenomenon. Whether in the churches of Spain or in those of Gaul, a heritage of liturgical traditions already existed, coming from the E and Italy, but above all from Latin Africa.

The historic phenomenon that produced the birth of the Gallican rite and the Hispanic rite consisted initially in an attempt to realize in their own environments and with their own means something similar to that which had already happened in the liturgy of Rome in the 5th c. The production on a grand scale—as it was happening in Rome—of variable texts for the *eucharistic celebration, the production of which was accompanied by the composition or reelaboration of euchological texts for the administration of the *sacraments—*catechumenate, *baptism, chrism, *matrimony, ministerial *ordination—and of a certain repertory of orations intended for the morning and evening offices, was understood as an explosion of euchological creativity, which excited in all the West a certain sense of emulation. The first euchological schools of Gaul and Spain were therefore formed, which in an earliest moment must have been tightly linked together.

It was almost an imitation of the Roman development. As we have already indicated, the initial intention was to realize euchological creativity, but in their own environment and with their own means. Thus, both the Gallican rite and the Hispanic remained far from the structure of the Roman *Mass of the 5th-6th c. because they remained faithful to another structure, their own ancient one, coming from Latin Africa, and which now constituted an important part of their liturgical heritage. Nor did the Gallican and Hispanic euchological schools let themselves be fascinated by the literary style of the Roman texts, and always for the same reason: they intended to remain faithful to their style, looser and less dense than the Roman, and thus—although under the pressure of the euchological creativity of Rome—faithfulness to their own literary forms did not disappear, through which they were often able to integrate into the new texts certain locutions of the archaic texts.

From the philological and literary study of the liturgical formulas, it can be deduced that the most ancient Gallican texts which have reached us were composed around the last decade of the 6th c. This date corresponds in fact to certain historical information, which attributes the composition of texts for the Mass to the priest *Museus of *Marseille (ca. 459), to Eustathius of Marseille and to *Sidonius Apollinaris (432–490). The composition of a *sacramentary is attributed to *Gregory of Tours (538–594); but his was probably more a work of redaction

than a true creation of texts; a work similar to that of *Gregory the Great at Rome and of *Julian of Toledo in Spain. Among the Gallican authors who attended to the distribution of the readings, we have the names of *Claudianus (ca. 460), the already cited Museus of Marseille and *Caesarius of Arles (470–542). The same Caesarius presided at the Council of *Agde in the year 506, whose can. 30 was intended to regulate some particulars of the office.

Studying the liturgical books, comparing them among themselves and trying to discover in them the points of contact with other neighboring rites, one discovers that the Gallican rite turns out to be more than anything else a complex of distinct local activities, each one tending to form its own liturgy, without there being a true and proper coordination between them, despite having easy reciprocal exchanges. In other words, the Gallican rite never reached a phase of more or less uniform codification of its liturgical books. Every sacramentary is the result of a different attempt to compose the principal book of the eucharistic celebration; all draw on a common stock of *libelli*, but the choice and the ordering happen acc. to distinct and sometimes divergent criteria. There is not, e.g., even the slightest agreement between the lectionary of Luxeuil and the other distributions of readings that we find in texts like the Missal of Bobbio and in many fragments of other lectionaries.

One of the biggest difficulties that we encounter in the historical study of the ancient Gallican rite is precisely this dispersion of its liturgical books, aggravated also by the fact that we have remained completely without any documentation concerning certain sectors of the liturgy. We know the euchological texts for the Eucharist celebration and for the administration of the sacraments. We have also the systems of readings, even if represented, as we have said, in a very fragmentary way. But no antiphonary has survived containing the *chants for the Mass, and all the books intended for the celebration of the office have been lost. The only exception in this matter is presented by several hymns, probably of Gallican origin, which Caesarius cites in his monastic rule together with the hymns of *Ambrose, and which later survived in the medieval monastic hymnals.

What appears certain is that the Gallican rite, just after having emerged, saw itself menaced first by an invading Frankish cultural influence and later by a suffocating penetration of Roman elements. The political situation did not favor the consolidation of a well-defined autochthonous liturgy. The Provence region, with its two great sees of Marseille and of *Arles, which seems to have been the cradle of the Gallican rite, in a few years passed from the hands of the *Visigoths to those of the *Ostrogoths (ca. 508), and finally was invaded by the *Franks (537).

The most ancient documents we have on Gallican liturgical texts are from the middle of the 7th c. The codifying activity, always heterogeneous, as we have already outlined, extended until the middle of the 8th c. The liturgical books are the great witnesses of the labor of this difficult historic period. On the one hand, there is the *Missale Gothicum*, which tries to collect the Gallican texts for the Eucharist and make of them a book very similar, externally, to the Roman sacramentaries, but sometimes forcing the original texts, other times interpreting them to assign them to feasts or times of the year for which they were not composed, or even importing prayers from the Roman books to fill in gaps. On the other hand, there is the *Missale Bobbiense*, which preserves the structure of the Gallican Mass only up to the preface; for the remainder, one assumes that it adopted the Roman canon, and yet the same sacramentary copied at Bobbio amplifies the repertory of the prefaces with inferior Gallican productions. Frontally opposed to the *Missale Gothicum* and to the *Missale Bobbiense* is the *palimpsest sacramentary preserved at the Ambrosiana of *Milan, which refuses all Roman influence, and tries to furnish itself with texts coming from Spain, more congenial to the authentic Gallican style.

The movement that pushed those churches united within the kingdom of the Franks toward the Roman rite was therefore prior to the decision of Charlemagne to officially adopt the liturgy of Rome in his entire territory. But there are signs of resistance to such a movement, as the palimpsest of Milan demonstrates.

II. Principal characteristics. The most distinctive particularity of the Gallican rite is its system of composing the Eucharist prayer with varying euchological texts, including those which immediately precede and follow the account of the institution. In this, the Gallican rite differs from the Roman and the Ambrosian, which have a fixed canon. It resembles rather the Hispanic rite. In the Hispanic rite, however, the system of one *anaphora with variable parts is more evolved and perfected. The Gallican rite remained in the first phase of experimentation, i.e., when the variable parts were not yet coordinated among themselves. They were composed of repertories of prefaces, of *post sancti* and *post mysteria*, but not in the same number, and without there necessarily being a connection between one part and another of the Eucharist prayer. Probably the

first Gallican and Hispanic authors wanted to compose, for the central part of the Eucharistic prayer, a certain number of new texts, which were like variants on the traditional themes of the Eucharistic texts of their ancient heritage.

Imitating from far off that which had happened in the Roman rite, the Gallican authors composed, for the various times and feasts of the liturgical year, formulas for the *praefatio missae*, for the *collectio*, for the prayers *post nomina* and *ad pacem*, and also for the *contestatio*, which corresponds to the Roman preface. But remaining excluded from this fusion between the theme of the liturgical year and the specific function of each piece within the global composition of the anaphora were the *post sanctus* and the *post mysterium*, i.e., the two texts that, together with the account of the institution, correspond to the part of the canon that goes from the *sanctus* to the doxology. Sporadically we find a text of *post sanctus* composed expressly for a feast; but this never happens with the *post mysterium*. The formulas that could lead one to believe the contrary are all from the period of the codification of the sacramentaries, and almost always it is a matter of arrangements done on the basis of Roman texts. The Hispanic rite, on the other hand, went progressively toward the literary and thematic unity of the entire Eucharistic prayer, even if still composed of variable texts; and it is normal, in the area of the Hispanic rite, that all the texts, including those of the *post sanctus* and the *post pridie*, develop the theme of the season or of the feast of the liturgical year.

Another Gallican peculiarity, in the sector of the pontifical ritual, is that of adding before the prayers of benediction an admonition addressed to the assembly that anticipates the contents of the benediction. When it is a matter of conferring ministerial orders, the euchological system is composed of at least three moments: explanation of the mystery, invitation to prayer and the prayer of benediction. This type of euchological complex, which reveals the intention of involving the assembly more intimately in the sacramental act, is nothing other than a systematic and developed application of a very ancient and universal liturgical principle. Consider the *exultet* (admonition-preface of benediction) and the Roman prayers of Good Friday (invitation to prayer). The method became so congenial to the Gallican and Hispanic rites that one of the variable texts of each Mass assumed this didascalic form: the Gallican *praefatio missae*, which corresponds to the Hispanic *oratio admonitionis*. This system of combing didascalias, admonitions and prayers in the composition of the pontifical ritual was later widely used by the liturgists of the Carolingian period. It is above all for this reason that the Carolingian adaptations of the ancient Roman liturgy have been considered a Gallicanized liturgy.

As for the peculiarities of style or content, it is almost impossible to formulate evaluations that define the Gallican rite globally, given the heterogeneity of its collections. Perhaps the most universal note—i.e., that which is found as much in the best ancient texts as in the more recent and inferior ones—is the tendency to integrate in the new texts phrases or locutions coming from the most ancient texts. The phenomenon is not unique—we find it on a smaller scale in the Hispanic rite, and also in the Ambrosian—but it happens with greater frequency in the Gallican. The phrases in question undoubtedly come from anaphoric texts prior to the division of the Eucharistic prayer into variable parts.

Perhaps because of this solicitude to maintain their bond to tradition also literally, the Gallican euchological schools are distinguished from those of all the other rites in the formulation of the *anamnesis. The genuinely Gallican texts of the *post mysterium*, when the anamnesis is formally expressed, recall only the death of the Lord, basing themselves on the Pauline gloss of 1 Cor 11:26 and, as it seems, on the African Eucharistic texts of the time of St. *Cyprian. This distinguishes the Gallican rite from all other rites, even from the Hispanic, in which the anamnesis has for its object, at the very least, the death and resurrection of Christ.

Sometimes, in describing the literary characteristics of the Gallican rite, it has been asserted that its texts are prolix. Such an evaluation is gratuitous and does not take account of the different origins of its euchological collections. In reality, among the most genuinely Gallican texts there are some of extreme concision and density of content.

DACL 6,473-596; J.B. Thibaut, *L'ancienne liturgie gallicane. Son origine et sa formation en Provence aux Ve et VIe siècles*, Paris 1929; F. Cabrol, *Les origines de la liturgie gallicane*: RHE 25 (1930) 951-962; A. Wilmart, *La réforme liturgique de Charlemagne*: EphLit 45 (1931) 186-207; A.G. Martimort, *La liturgie de la messe en Gaule*: Compagnie de St. Sulpice. Bulletin du Comité des Études 22 (1949) 204-222; E. Griffe, *Aux origines de la liturgie gallicane*: BLE 52 (1951) 17-43; W.S. Porter, *The Gallican Rite*, London 1958; J. Pinell, *Legitima Eucharistia. Cuestiones sobre la anámnesis y la epíclesis en el antiguo rito galicano*: Mélanges Liturgiques B. Botte, Louvain 1972, 445-460; Id., *Anámnesis y epíclesis en el antiguo rito galicano*: Didaskalia 4 (1974) 1-130; G. Ramis, *Le famiglie liturgiche in Occidente*, in *Scientia Liturgica*, ed. A.J. Chupungco, Casale Monf. 1998, I, 40-47; J. Pinell, *Storia delle liturgie occidentali non romane*, in ibid., 195-218; G. Ramis, *Libri liturgici occidentali non romani*, in ibid., 331-343.

J. Pinell

GALLIENUS, emperor (ca. 218–268). Of noble origin, he was born around 218 and died assassinated near Milan in 268 (see among the other evidence, Jer., *Chron.* s.a. 268; Zos. I, 40; Zon. XII, 25). Raised to power by his father *Valerian from 253, proclaimed Caesar by the senate and Augustus by his own parent, he remained sole emperor for eight years, after the death of Valerian in the East (260). Living in very difficult years for the empire, at first he defended the Rhine border from the attacks of the *Franks and of the Alamanni, then the Danubian lands from the repeated incursions of the *Goths, as well as having to confront internal rebellions. In 260 the situation became even more critical. The Franks spread over Gaul and reached into Spain; the Alamanni pushed into N *Italy, while in the E the Persians, under the leadership of *Shapur I, had got the better of the Romans. In this predicament, Gallienus, practically renouncing the exercise of his direct command of conspicuous parts of the empire, left the task of combating the Persians to Odenathus, prince of *Palmyra, and opposed in vain the usurper Postumus, who established the Roman Empire of the *Galliae*, extending over Gaul, Spain and *Britain. In the middle of a sometimes desperate situation, the efforts of Gallienus stood out in many areas. He initiated a political reform, with the intention of consolidating his authority and transforming the entire imperial administration to make it more responsive to the demands of his time. He was present in the domain of the arts and culture with a program that privileged Hellenism; he intervened in the organization of the army; he favored *Neoplatonic philosophy.

Toward Christianity he had a realistic and farseeing attitude. In this matter one must mention that the critics do not always agree. According to some, the emperor continued the fight against Christianity, changing only the tactic: from the violent *persecution undertaken by his father he passed to indulgence, intended to make it reenter the orbit of the pagan *civitas*. The spread of the Eleusinian mysteries, of which Gallienus was himself an initiate, should then be interpreted as one of the means put into place to reduce Christian influence on the people. According to others he demonstrated entirely favorable sentiments toward the new religion. The emperor annulled the edict of persecution put in place by Valerian and restored to the Christians their places of worship, goods and cemeteries: the church was thus de facto acknowledged. Certainly Christian sources present him in a positive light. While he was still alive, around 262, *Dionysius bishop of Alexandria exalted him in a letter and noted that in him "the sovereign authority now flourishes with more splendor, is seen and understood from far off, and it penetrates everywhere" (Eus., *HE* 7, 23,3). *Eusebius also informs us (ibid. 7, 13) that Gallienus, having adopted a more moderate system of government than Valerian, stopped the persecution with edicts, ordered with a rescript (of which the historian gives the text, translating it from Latin) that those responsible for the churches carry out the duties of their ministry, and restored the cemeteries to the Christians. Certainly from 260 a period of peace began for the Christians that lasted about forty years, disturbed only by sporadic hostile acts; the projected persecution of *Aurelian did not take place because of the death of the emperor himself (275). Only at the end of the 3rd c. would the last grand persecution loom into view.

Historia Augusta, Vita Gallieni; Aur. Vict., *Caes.* 33; Eus. Caes., *Historia eccles.* 7, 13; Zos. *Historia* I, 36-40; Wickert: PWK 13, 350-369; A. Alföldi, *Fünfundzwanzig Jahre Römisch-Germanischer Kommission*, Berlin-Leipzig 1930, 11-49; L. De Regibus, *La monarchia militare di Gallieno*, Genoa 1939; J. Vogt: RAC 2, 1188; S. Pezzella, *L'imperatore Gallieno e il cristianesimo*, Rome 1965; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo a Roma*, Bologna 1965, 306-311 and passim; E.W. Merten, *Zwei Herrscherfeste in der* Historia Augusta. *Untersuchungen zu den pompae der Kaiser Gallienus und Aurelianus*, Bonn 1968; E. Manni: RAC 8, 962-984 (cols. 980-984, large bibl. of works later than 1939); S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari 1973, 526ff.; PLRE, 383-4; L. De Blois, *The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus*, Leiden 1976; A. Alföldi, *Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts n.C.*, Darmstadt 1980; J. Michael: LTK³ 4, 273-274.

P. Siniscalco

GALLONIUS, martyr and companions (d. 303). Until 1996, the year in which the *Passio Gallonii martyris* (P. Chiesa) was published for the first time, the events of Gallonius and his companions were totally unknown to us. The text contains an account of the arrest and the first trial undergone by Gallonius and a group of 26 Christians of Timidia Regia, then of a second trial undergone by Gallonius alone, to whom a later group of 11 faithful from the colony of Utina joined themselves. Both of the trials ended with the condemnation of all the accused. The 26 *Timidenses* met their death (Victorinus and Germanus burnt at the stake, the others, who remain anonymous, put to the sword), while the punishment of Gallonius was deferred. The second trial confirmed the condemnation to *vivicomburium* for Gallonius and destined the 11 of Utina to the sword. The accusations against the martyrs during the interrogations refer to the times of the *Diocletian *persecution, and more exactly to the first persecutory edict (303), which prohibited the participation in liturgi-

cal reunions and demanded the surrender of the sacred books.

It has been proposed that the Gallonius protagonist of both the trials is to be identified with a *Gallonius* (or *Gallonus*) recorded in the *Kalendarium Carthaginenses* on 11 June, and further it has been thought that the 26 Christians of the first trial could be linked to a group of martyrs *Timidenses*, commemorated in that same text on 31 May; meanwhile we possess nothing corresponding to the martyrs of the second group. Furthermore, the minutes from Utina appear, in our *Passio*, less genuine that those from Timidia Regia, there being obvious differences both on the formal and structural levels. Precisely this realization led the editor to suppose that the delay of the condemnation of Gallonius might be nothing other than an artifice introduced by the hagiographer to establish a link between two originally independent accounts. The union of the two texts would have happened in Africa in any case, in the Diocletian era, given that in Europe there would have been no reason or method for it to happen. The *Passio*, as it appears today, nevertheless holds a notable importance, whether on the literary plane or on the historic-documentary one. On the one hand, it witnesses to a particular stage in the genre of the *Acta Proconsularia*; on the other, it attests to the possibilities of liturgical reunions in time of persecution. Finally, it appears as a tangible example of that "Catholic" martyrial literature (or in any case "not Donatist") that had been presented, acc. to the mention in Augustine (*Brevic.* XVII, 32), to the Carthaginian conference of 411.

P. Chiesa, *Un testo agiografico africano ad Aquileia. Gli Acta di Gallonio e dei martiri di Timidia Regia*: AB 114 (1996) 241-268 (ed. text pp. 265-268); F. Scorza Barcellona, *Agli inizi dell'agiografia occidentale*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, ed. G. Philippart (CCHag 3), Turnhout 2001, 17-97 (85-88).

E. Zocca

GAMMADIA. The deeper analysis and correct interpretation of the gammadia, letters that decorate the clothes of masculine personages in paleo-Christian art, was undertaken only in recent times, thanks principally to the efforts of A. Quacquarelli. Before his studies, in fact, different explanations were sought—not always very convincing ones—to explain their significance, considering them to be substantially decorative filler or improbable initials of the names of the represented personages (DACL 6, 1 [1924] 610-613). In reality the gammadia, christological *monograms that are part of the unity of the symbolic language of ancient Christianity, appear often in the earliest Christian *iconography—at least starting from the 3rd c.—principally on the pallium of Christ, or on the clothes of *martyrs, *prophets and *apostles. The meaning, given that their use continued up to the 8th and 9th c.—with some revivals up into the modern era—was lost fairly early, and many scholars in the past maintained that it was a useless enterprise to try to decipher their correct meaning. As has been nevertheless well demonstrated, basing the interpretations principally on patristic *exegesis and on numerology, some of them have revealed a very precise meaning that certainly lies outside chance or pure decorative intent. In this way, relying on the numeric values of the letters of the Greek alphabet and on the interpretation of them offered by key passages contained in the works of the Fathers of the church, it has been possible to understand that *I*, initial of the name of Jesus both in the Greek and the Latin version, through the numeric value 10 which it represents, refers to the law, the Decalogue given to Moses which Christ came to carry to completion, and at the same time, hinting at a simple arithmetical operation, it would refer also to the gospels (if the components of the number 10, 1 + 2 + 3 + 4, are added, one obtains in fact 10). The gammadion *H* (numeric value 8) communicates the Christ in the spiritual world of the **ogdoad* and reflects a message that all the faithful receive: the presence of Christ in our midst who teaches us to follow his precepts for our salvation. For the Fathers of the church, the OT and the NT form an inescapable unity: if *Z* is the number 7, the OT, i.e., the Law, *H* is the incarnation of the Word, the Christ, i.e., the NT. Whoever denies the OT cannot have *H*, just as whoever denies the NT cannot have the *Z* necessary to pass from 7 to 8, i.e., to the *ogdoad*. The gammadion Γ, corresponding to the number 3, would allude, as it is easy to guess, to the *Trinity and would make explicit the unity of *God in three Persons, while the gammadion Λ, not corresponding to the uppercase Latin letter or to reversed Γ, had the symbolic value of a graphic nature, because it would recall the cornerstone, rejected by men but preferred by God (1 Pet 2:5), against which they stumble who do not believe in the Word (1 Pet 2:7-8), and in the same way would recall the idea of a building, understood in the sense that every Christian believer is a temple of God. The term *gammadia* progressively lost its meaning and original value in the Middle Ages and was extended to different ornamental graphi-

cal signs of geometric type. The meaning of some letters, for example the *A*, the *N*, the *O*, the Ϲ (lunate sigma) or the *R*—which seem to refer back only to the Latin alphabet—has still not been deciphered today.

A. Quacquarelli, *La simbologia delle lettere cristologiche nel battistero degli Ariani di Ravenna*: RomBarb 2 (1977) 231-246; Id., *Il monogramma cristologico (gammadia)* Z: VetChr 15 (1978) 5-21; Id., *Il monogramma cristologico (gammadia)* H: VetChr 16 (1979) 5-20; Id., *Catechesi liturgica e iconologia della Trinità nei primi secoli. Gammadia (lettera cristologica)* G: VetChr 18 (1981) 5-32; Id., *La gammadia pietra angolare* L: VetChr 21 (1984) 5-25; Id., *La lettera cristologica (gammadia) I nella iconografia dei primi secoli*: VetChr 23 (1986) 5-18; D. Mazzoleni, s.v. *Gammadia*, in TIP, 185-186.

M. Ghilardi

GANGRA

I. The city - II. Council.

I. The city. A city of Paphlagonia, today Çankiri in Turkey, residence of the kings of the region before the Roman occupation (Strab., *Geogr.* XII, 3,41), Gangra was annexed to the Roman province of *Galatia in 6–5 BC—the year considered the beginning of the era of Gangra—and also belonged to it in ecclesiastical organization until the middle of the 5th c., when it passed under the patriarchate of Constantinople. Gangra was the metropolitan See of Paphlagonia, but never had more than five suffragan sees. We do not know the Christian origins at Gangra, but names of martyrs have reached us: the Novatian Alexander (Socr., *HE* II, 38: PG 67, 325 BC)—the *Novatian movement was strong in the region—*Callinicus, *Mamas of Caesarea, whose parents, also confessors of the faith, were from Gangra, etc. In the council celebrated there, its bishop *Hypatius was present (Socr., *HE* II, 43: PG 67, 352-353), who also participated in the Council of *Nicaea and died in 326. During the 5th and 6th c. illustrious personages were relegated to Gangra: *Dioscorus of Alexandria, *Timothy Aelurus. *Philoxenus of Mabbug sojourned in the city, as did the exiled *Macedonius of Constantinople in 515, dying there in 516. The bishops of Paphlagonia depended on the metropolitan of Gangra.

DHGE 19,1091-1103; KLP 2,691; W.M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, London 1890, 257-258 and 318-319; P. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, Princeton, NJ 1950, passim; A.H.M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire*, Oxford [2]1971, 166-167 and 559-60. (bibl.); I. Kaygusuz, *Deux inscriptions de Gangra-Germanicopolis (Çankiri)*: ZPE 49 (1982) 177-183.

A. Di Berardino

II. Council. It was convened in the course of the 4th c., but the date is uncertain: the historian *Socrates locates it after 360, while *Sozomen puts it before the Council of *Antioch of 341. The 340 date seems more likely because it corresponds better to the information furnished by St. *Basil. Presided over by *Eusebius of Nicomedia, the 14 bishops present condemned errors and attitudes of *Eustathius of Sebaste and of his disciples. Eustathius, a proponent of rigorist monasticism, at first had had the esteem of Basil. Later elected bishop of *Sebaste in the extreme E part of Asia Minor, he attracted so much hostility of all kinds for his extravagances that in 348 he was deposed by a synod held at *Melitene in *Armenia. The Council of Gangra stigmatized various attitudes of the Eustathians: their condemnation of marriage and of the family (can. 1, 9, 10, 14-16); refusal to attend worship officiated by a married priest and liturgical separatism (can. 4-8, 11, 20); abstaining from eating meat (can. 2); their particular fasting days (can. 18-19); their unusual dress (can. 12-13, 17); and the fact that they induced slaves to disobey their owners (can. 3). Inspired by a sense of moderation, the canons that defended marriage and the family were accepted by many churches.

Basil, *Epist.* 288,13; Joannou 1, 2, 83-99; CPG 8553-4; Hfl-Lecl I, 2,1029-1045; F. Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius Briefe*, Halle 1898, 83; Palazzini 2, 100; Simonetti 411; *I canoni dei concili della chiesa antica*, ed. A. Di Berardino, I, Rome 2006, 289-297.

C. Nardi

GARMENTS of SKINS. (*See* *anthropology.) The interpretation of Gen 3:21, namely. the biblical text that states that God gave *Adam and Eve some garments of skin at the time he expelled them from the garden of *paradise, was of great importance in the history of the anthropological speculations of ancient Christianity. The Jew *Philo of Alexandria had read in the episode the account of the creation of the human body by God (*Quaest. Gen.* I, 53), and the *Neoplatonist philosopher *Porphyry, perhaps through the influence of *Numenius of Apamea, called the body "a garment of skin" (*De abstin.* I, 31,3; II, 46,1). But in Christian *encratite and *Messalian circles, the Philonian identification of the garments of skins with human bodies was reinterpreted in the sense that human corporeality is to be considered, in its material heaviness, sexual and mortal, just as the "garment of shame," which the *soul of the human being puts on as a result of, and as a punishment for, the original fall (see *Julius Cassian in Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III, 95,2; ps.-Macar., *Hom.* 47,6;

ps.-Epiph., *Hom. II in Sabbato Magno*: PG 43, 464 B). The prebaptismal rite of the hair shirt probably had an influence on this interpretation (*Odes of Solomon* 25,8; *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. cath.* 12,24-25 and 14,8; *Jerome, *Ep.* 64,19). Widespread also in gnostic Valentinian circles (see *Exc. Theod.* 55,1; *Pistis Sophia* 69; heresiological information provided by Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 5,5; *Philosoph.* X, 13,4; Tertull., *Adv. Valent.* 24,2-3), the allegorical interpretation of the garments of skins was shared by *Origen acc. to an explicit accusation raised by *Epiphanius of Salamis (*Ancor.* 54,2ff.; *Panar.* LXIV, 4,3-11; *Ep. ad Joan. Hier.* [51,5 *inter Hieronym.*: CSEL 54, 403]). *Didymus the Blind derived this interpretation from Origen (*Com. Gen. ad loc. e Com. Iob* 10,11 [from the *papyri of Tura]), *Macarius Magnes (*In Gen. hom.* 17 [*fragm.* Pitra]) and *Ambrose of Milan (*Ep.* 49,4 and *Exp. Ps.* CXVIII, 11,14).

This allegorical interpretation that identified the garments of skins with mortal and sexually differentiated bodies was soon opposed by the literalist interpretation, which was widespread in Greek patristic texts, from *Irenaeus to the Antiochenes, who understood the tunics of skins as true and proper garments that manifest the merciful attention of God with respect to the sinful first parents. But starting from *Hippolytus (*In Gen. fragm.* 6) and Origen (*Hom. lev.* 6,2), a different interpretation began to be imposed which read in the garments a symbol of the body's corruption and mortality, which were merited by the progenitors as a result of their *sin (see the insightful information provided by *Procopius of Gaza: PG 87/1, 220 A ff.). *Gregory of Nyssa wavered between the notions of the animal corporeality and the mortality of the body, and remained substantially undecided between the two traditions of Origen and *Methodius of Olympus (*Aglaophon or on the Resurrection*). In the West, with *Augustine, there prevailed the identification of the garments of skins with the postlapsarian mortality of the body (see *De Gen. Man.* II, 21,32, etc.).

J. Quasten, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium*: HTR 35 (1942) 209-219; J. Pépin, *Saint Augustin et le symbolisme néoplatonicien de la vêture*: AugM I, Paris 1954, 293-306; M. Simonetti, *Alcune osservazioni sull'interpretazione origeniana di Genesi 2,7 e 3,21*: Aevum 36 (1962) 370-381; J.Z. Smith, *The Garments of Shame*: History of Rel. 5 (1966) 217-238; J.H. Waszink, *Porphyrios und Numenios*, in *Porphyre*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 12, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1966, 33-83; G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle* (Supp. NT 15), Leiden 1967; J. Daniélou, *L'Être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse*, Leiden 1970, 154-164; H. Crouzel, *Les critiques adressées par Méthode et ses contemporains à la doctrine origénienne du corps ressuscité*: Gregorianum 53 (1972) 679-716; P.F. Beatrice, *Le tuniche di pelle. Antiche letture di Gen. 3,21*, in U. Bianchi (ed.), *La tradizione dell'Enkrateia. Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche*, Rome 1985, 433-484 (bibl.); C. Noce, *Vestis varia. L'immagine della veste nell'opera di Origene* (SEA 79), Rome 2002; H. Tremblay, *Job 19,25-27 dans la Septante et chez les Pères grecs*, Paris 2002, 314-326.

P.F. Beatrice

GAUDENTIUS of Brescia (d. after 410). The little data on his life is gathered from his *Serm.* 16 and 21. A pupil of *Filaster and, a few years after 390, proposed as his successor at Brescia, he accepted only through the pleading of *Ambrose and others. In 405 he was sent by *Honorius, together with two other bishops, to *Constantinople to obtain from *Arcadius the reexamination of the question of *John Chrysostom, who had been deposed and exiled, but the mission did not achieve anything. In 410 *Rufinus dedicated the translation of the ps.-*Clementine *Recognitiones* to him. He was a good preacher. A small corpus of 15 *homilies has reached us from him, which he himself sent to a certain Benevolus who had not been able to hear them in church. Modern scholars have added 6 other homilies to it. From the first group, 10 are on paschal themes and, in deference to the *tradition and to the *liturgy, interpreted some passages of the Exodus taken typologically as figures of the liberation from *sin claimed by Christ for the church with the paschal sacrifice. The other homilies are on various themes: *Serm.* 13 on Christmas attacks greed for earthly goods; 19 has an anti-Arian theme; the 20th is a brief *panegyric of St. Peter and St. Paul; the 21st is *de vita et obitu Filastrii*. On every subject, even doctrinal ones, Gaudentius reveals a good education and knows how to express himself at an excellent literary level.

CPL 139-143; PL 20, 827-1006; CSEL 68; Patrologia III, 122-124; G.M. Bruni, *Teologia della Storia secondo Gaudenzio di Brescia*, Vicenza 1967; C. Truzzi, *Zeno, Gaudenzio e Cromazio, testi e contenuti della predicazione cristiana per le chiese di Verona e di Aquileia (360–410 ca.)*, Brescia 1985, 65-73; BBKL II, 185-186; B. Degórski, *Pietro e Paolo martiri a Roma nell'insegnamento di Gaudenzio di Brescia*, in *Pietro e Paolo. Il loro rapporto con Roma nelle testimonianze antiche*, XXXI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 4-6 maggio 2000, SEA 74, Rome 2001, 233-260.

M. Simonetti

GAUDENTIUS of Novara (d. ca. 418). The first bishop of Novara, he received his first Christian education in the shadow of two other saints: *Lawrence the priest, first apostle and martyr of the city, and Eusebius, first bishop of Vercelli and founder of monastic life in N *Italy. After the martyrdom of

Lawrence, he rejoined *Eusebius in his exile in the East. Having returned to Vercelli, he remained in that city until around 398, when he was made bishop of Novara. His bishopric lasted about twenty years. Among the conversions he made were those of Lawrence's murderers. His death dates to around 418.

PCBE 2, 891; F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia. Piemonte*, Turin 1898, 243-248; G. Cavigioli, *La vita di s. Gaudenzio*, Novara 1934; EC 5, 1962-1963; BS 6, 56-57; C.G. Mor, *Osservazioni sulla più antica lista episcopale di Novara*, Novara 1967; G. Colombo, *I santi Gaudenzio, Agabio, Lorenzo nel sacramentario del sec. XI-XII, - cod. 35 (54), della Biblioteca capitolare di S. Maria in Novara*: Novarien 6 (1974) 9-50; J.-Ch. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au Xe siècle*, Rome 1988, 459-463; 636-640.

L. Dattrino

GAUDENTIUS the Donatist (d. after 422). Donatist bishop of Thamugadi (*Timgad) (398–421). He was the successor of *Optatus, sufficiently eminent to be chosen one of the seven spokesmen (*actores*) of the *Donatists at the conference of *Carthage in 411. There his specific contribution was the affirmation that Catholicity signifies before all and above all the purity and integrity of the church and only in this context its geographic extension (*Coll. Carth.* III, 102). Following the condemnation of Donatism, he abandoned Thamugadi temporarily, but returned there and took back possession of the city churches. He took part in the Donatist Council of *Cirta in ca. 414, called by *Petilian of Constantine (Aug., *C. Gaud.* I, 37,47-48). Toward 420, however, his position was combated by the imperial tribune, the **notarius* Dulcitius, who in an edict reminded the Donatists of their condemnation and ordered them to return the churches still in their possession.

Gaudentius wrote twice to Dulcitius refusing and threatening to set himself on fire inside his church (probably the large church built by his predecessor, Optatus) if there was any attempt to enforce the edict (Aug., *C. Gaud.* I, 1). Dulcitius consulted Augustine, and the latter entered the controversy (*C. Gaud.* I, 1). Gaudentius replied and Augustine wrote, in 421 probably, the first book of the *Contra Gaudentium*. Gaudentius justified the threat of suicide with the example of Razis (2 Mac 14:41) and insisted on the Christian duty of martyrdom when faced with *persecution (Gaud., *Ep. II ad Dulcitium* 14). It is not known if he carried out his threat, but the absence of any trace of destruction in the large church of Thamugadi suggests that he did not. In the debate with Dulcitius and Augustine, Gaudentius revealed his capacity for uniting a literary style derived from a classical education with a total attachment to the Bible. With his refusal of compromises and his defiance of the imperial authority in the name of religion, he faithfully reflected the spirit of Donatism in his time.

Augustine, *Contra Gaudentium* I-II (CSEL 53,201-274); Monceaux VI, ch. 5; S. Lancel, *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411*, Paris 1972 (SC 194-195), I, 199-200; PCBE 1, 522-525; L.J. Van der Lof, *Gaudentius de Thamugadi*: Augustiniana 17 (1967) 5-13; P. Langa, *Réplica a Gaudencio obispo donatista. Introducción, bibliografía y notas*, BAC 34, Madrid 1994, 615-763.

W.H.C. Frend

GAUL. The first testimony of the *evangelization of Gaul, a "letter of the servants of Christ in pilgrimage at *Vienne and at *Lyons" destined for their brethren of *Asia and of *Phrygia (Eus., *HE* 5, 1-4), illustrates the difficulties of a small Christian minority, describing the *pogrom* that occurred in Lyons between 175 and 180, probably in 177, determined by the members of the trade associations more than by the faithful of Eastern religions (Cracco-Ruggini, *Les Martyrs de Lyon*, 77ff.).

The letter addressed by the survivors of the *persecution illustrates the atmosphere of eschatological tension without any need to look for a *Montanist influence there; it also suggests the composition of this community, whose most important members were faithful adherents of Greek culture; and it attests finally to a ministerial organization whose archaic vocabulary cannot be interpreted acc. to the norms established later. Nothing proves, finally, that the mission to Gallic territory had Asiatic origins, while some indications (the attitude of *Irenaeus in the paschal question: Eus., *HE* 5, 23,3 and 24,11) underline the links of the Christianity of Lyons with *Rome (Ch. Pietri, *Les Martyrs de Lyon*, 211ff.). After the persecution, Irenaeus assumed the charge of bishop, but it cannot be said that his refutation of gnosticism was done for local pastoral needs.

Much has been made of this first text of the Christians of Lyons (Duchesne, *Fastes*, I, 39-47), but neither the amplifications of Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1,10,2; also Tertull., *Adv. Jud.* 7) nor the glosses of *Eusebius to the letter (*HE* V, 23,3) succeed in demonstrating with certainty that Lyons was a metropolitan see. For the 3rd c. it should be mentioned only that *Cyprian (*Ep.* 68) attests the existence of several bishops in Gaul, including a *Marcian of Arles, accused of being favorable to *Novatian. That does not, however, suffice to establish the progress of evangelization for several reasons:

1. *Epigraphy confirms the presence of Christian

communities at Arles. But the inscription of *Pektorios at *Autun is not securely dated before the Constantinian epoch, and one must exclude the epigraphic testimonies invoked for *Marseille, Lyons and *Bordeaux.

2. Duchesne proposed using the testimony of the episcopal lists, considered certain, to date the foundation of the sees of Vienne, *Reims and *Trier from the middle of the 3rd c., and those of Aquitaine, Bourges and Bordeaux from the end of the century, and then those of the regions of Lyons, *Tours, Sens and *Paris, on a par with Metz in the Belgica I. In reality, this analysis, which had at least the merit of denying the legends about apostolic foundations, is based on the premise that the episcopal lists conserve memories of the origins, because they would have been used in the local *liturgy—a hypothesis justly rejected by J. Dubois (*Listes*, 9-20).

3. Finally, the evidence of the *sanctoral* acc. to the literary sources (from *Prudentius to *Venantius Fortunatus, to *Gregory of Tours), of the "Hieronymian" *martyrology, of the lives of the saints (CPL 2076-2146) and sometimes of archaeology (Hubert, *Architecture*; Février: V and VIII Congr. Int. Arch. Crist.) make it possible to reconstruct mainly the development of the cult of the martyrs at the end of the 4th c., rather than the geography and the chronology of the martyrs of the 3rd c. In 250, the persecution of *Decius certainly must have touched Gaul (cf. the attitude of Marcian of Arles), but nothing is known for sure concerning *Valerian or *Aurelian (despite a late cycle of passions), while, acc. to *Lactantius (*Mort. Pers.* 15), the persecution of Diocletian spared Gaul. In any case, the martyrdom of *Saturninus (Griffe, *Gaule*, I 395-402) attests the pre-Constantinian origins of the church of *Toulouse; perhaps the martyrdom of *Paul (mentioned by Prudentius; Griffe, *Gaule*, I, 164) and those of *Narbonne. The cult of *Victor at Marseille, end of the 5th c., does not provide decisive arguments; neither does the legend of the Theban Legion offer them for the Valais (contra Dupraz, D. van Berchem). There remain also too many uncertainties regarding, e.g., Pontius of Cimiez, celebrated in the 5th c. by the bishop *Valerian (CPL 1002), or Symphorian of Autun, whose passion could go back to the 5th c. *Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* II, 32) notes that the evangelization of Gaul happened rather late: the church in the 3rd c. was organized in old Narbonensis, in the valley of the Rhone, and perhaps in Germany.

With the conversion of Constantine and the progressive institution of a Christian empire, the evangelization became more rapid: in 314, as the first sign of this new climate, and through the initiative of Constantine, a council united several bishops, a majority of them Gallic. Significantly, they excommunicated the faithful who deserted *in pace*, the church having then obtained peace after the persecution (can. 3, Munier, CCL 148, 5). Proof of the progress of Christianization is the proliferation of episcopal sees, attested in the subscription lists of the councils: Arles, *Valence (374), Nîmes (394 or 396), Riez (439) (Munier, CCL 148, 14; p. 41; p. 51; p. 71). Another list attributed to an apocryphal Council of *Cologne (Gauthier, *Evangélisation*, 447) preserves the signatures of the Gallic bishops gathered after the Council of *Serdica (343) in favor of *Athanasius. These indications in the Viennensis and the Narbonensis attest to about 10 sees in the Constantinian epoch, then about 15 at the end of the 4th c., a period when the Alpine provinces were reached. Also at the end of the 4th c. the Lyonese region included about 10 sees, from Rouen and Tours to Autun, including Paris and Sens. More to the N, the network seems less dense around Reims and Trier (Gauthier, *Evangélisation*, 27ff.). The W maritime region, esp. N of the Loire, is almost untouched: there remain in Aquitaine some sees, among them Bordeaux and the city of Clermont (*Alvernia*). The absence of a metropolitan organization explains these gaps; a few sees dominate, whose importance depends on the political situation (Trier, residence of the court) or on the prestige of a bishop (*Hilary at Poitiers, *Martin at Tours, *Proculus at Marseille). The councils did not succeed in resolving well the conflicts of jurisdiction between Arles and Vienne and between Arles and Marseille (Council of *Valence in 375; Council of *Turin in 398/399; Munier, CCL 148, 52).

A second element indicates the advances of Christianization: the transformation of the urban landscape. Contrary to a traditional hypothesis, in Gaul the first building employed for worship (*ecclesia*) was built in the city: meeting point for the liturgy, assistance, asylum; later it was flanked by a baptistery and by a *domus ecclesiae*, or episcopal residence (Ch. Pietri, *Topographie*). In funereal zones, on the periphery, appear ever more frequent oratories, provided with imported relics (Ewig, II, 260-371), sometimes buildings (*basilicae*) consecrated to the rare martyrs of Gaul which hosted, most of the time, tombs of bishops, without forgetting the monasteries (cf. the *vicus christianorum* of Clermont).

To promote missionary work, a clergy was constituted, a Christian society that entered into a different environment, even to the local aristocracy (Gassmann, *Episkopat*, 48). The Roman decretals (of *Damasus, *Innocent, *Celestine, *Leo), addressed in response to local appeals, reveal rigorous rules

for the recruitment of the clergy (*lex continentiae*). Although some of the original traits of the *Gallican liturgy are poorly known (Leclercq, DACL, s.v.), and whose affinity with the Eastern Duchesne perhaps exaggerated (Griffe, *Gaule*, III, 165), we can see the effort of the bishops to organize a *catechesis (Hilary; in the 6th c. *Caesarius of Arles), to spread the veneration of the martyrs (at Rouen, Victricius), to organize assistance, rendered more necessary by the barbarian crisis (*Salvian) and facilitated by the development of an ecclesiastical property (Lesne, *Propriété*, 1-70). This missionary effort aimed at the aristocracy: the influence of the classical culture impregnates a Christian spirituality still marked, in the 4th c., by archaic *millenarist traditions (Simonetti, *Alle origini*). From *Ausonius, who owes little to the Bible, came a Christian *poetry (Fontaine, *Poésie*, 81 and from the same author, the commentary to the *Vita Martini*). The countryside, on the other hand, resisted the missions longer (Demougeot - Speyer, *Gallia*, 914ff.), though the foundation of the first rural churches attests to the missionary impetus (Imbart, *Églises*, 2-53), in particular the activity of Martin in the territory of Tours (L. Pietri, *Tours*). Martin exemplifies several aspects of Christianity in Gaul. As the founder of a first monastic community at Ligugé, the bishop instituted another at Marmoutier, thus giving the example of a monk-bishop. An *ascetic, rigorist movement, sometimes on the margins of the ecclesiastical institutions (though much less than Babut affirms, *Martin*), took inspiration also from Eastern and African models, more directly with the arrival of *John Cassian (Marrou, *Christiana*, 345-372). Martin's example also shows Gaul's sensitivity to the grand problems of Christianity: the episcopate in fact became involved, under Constantius (345–360), in the mid-4th-c. *Arian crisis (Simonetti, *Crisi*, 220ff.). The execution of *Priscillian at Trier divided the episcopate even more profoundly. At the beginning of the 5th c., immediately after the crisis, the links with Rome were reinforced: Pope *Zosimus (417–418) tried to create, for the benefit of Arles, an institution that would replace Roman influence (Ch. Pietri, *Roma*, II, 1000-1043).

This vicariate also illustrates the desire to maintain Catholic unity despite the collapse (at the beginning of the 5th c.) of political unity due to the barbarian invasions. These devastated Christian Gaul: in the N several episcopal sees disappeared, sometimes permanently (Bavay), esp. in the areas where evangelization was still weak. The restoration was very late here (6th-7th c.), and limited, mostly using itinerant bishops (Tournai-Noyon; Thérouanne-Boulogne; De Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église de Belgique*). In the S, however, the network of episcopal sees grew tighter, reaching Upper Provence and all the regions, overlooked for a long time, between the Pyrenees and the Garonne. The founding of monasteries sometimes adapted to the political situation created by the barbarian kingdoms or to the geographic evolution (transfer from Langres to Dijon). Now the bishop occupied more than ever a preeminent position, that of a *defensor civitatis*, protector of the poor against the assaults of the barbarians and of the powerful (see the inscriptions: Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft*). He had at his disposal a domain enriched with donations, even if he had ever greater difficulties in controlling the pious institutions (Lesne, *Propriété*, 79-195). In the 5th c., certain aristocrats found in the episcopate the possibility of serving an ideal of *romanitas*, of culture and of faith: *Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ruricius of Limoges (Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel*). It is clear that one should not overestimate the quality of these people, who included many ambitious among their ranks (esp. when the Frankish monarchy controlled the elections) or more simply mediocre prelates. On the whole, however, they fulfilled with tenacity their pastoral charge, as attested by the organization of the calendar (see *Perpetuus at Tours; the institution at Vienne of the *rogations through the efforts of Mamertus) and the development, from the 5th c. and above all in the 6th, of the rural churches (Griffe, BLE 1975, 3ff.).

The flowering of monasticism accompanied this mission with the foundation of stable communities, organized acc. to a *rule, which spread throughout Gaul: e.g., that of Caesarius of Arles (315), adopted in 570 at *Poitiers by *Radegund. In the 5th c., the community of Lérins sent out its monks as bishops (Prinz, *Mönchtum*, 47ff.). From 430, the founding of Romanus, then of Engendius at Condat, in the Jura, illustrates a type of monastery established in the "desert" as a center for mission and assistance (in addition, among the people a whole spiritual movement developed: penitents and *conversi*; cf. Vogel). Among the centers of the 7th c., that of Luxeuil should be mentioned, founded by the Irishman *Columbanus, whose austere rule became more flexible under Benedictine influence. The consolidation of the barbarian monarchies determined a transformation of the relationships of the church with the political power. In the 5th c., in S Gaul, the Arian Visigothic kings sometimes created difficulties (esp. *Euric, 466–484). The N churches (Tours, Reims) struggled increasingly to achieve the Christianization of the pagan *Franks: the conversion of *Clovis, between

497 and 508 (Tessier), is celebrated as that of a new Constantine. But with the division of the Frankish realm (511), despite some periods of reunification, the bishops and the clergy were implicated increasingly in dynastic conflicts: the assassination of Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen, in 586, and of *Leodegar of Autun in 678. Certainly the episcopate could exercise a political influence, sometimes effective and peaceful: thus King Dagobert (629–639) surrounded himself with counselors, chosen among bishops or future bishops, such as Arnulf of Metz, Dado of S. Oer, *Desiderius of Cahors, *Eligius of Noyon.

These examples reveal a new social type of ecclesiastic, but also attest an interference by the political society among the clergy which issued, esp. in the 7th c., in a detestable simoniac traffic and in the occupation of episcopal sees on the part of laymen. Thus the political power disposed ever more of the goods of the church to the advantage of liege men, whether clerics or lay. Hugo, nephew of Charles Martel, assumed the bishopric of Rouen and at the same time that of Paris and of Bayeux (723–730). Some of the numerous councils of the 6th and 7th c. were preoccupied with stopping this dangerous secularization, to moralize the episcopal elections and to maintain as best they could the authority of the metropolitans; but until the 7th c. this crisis led progressively to the withdrawal of Gaul into itself and the loosening of links with Rome.

In the 5th and 6th c. certain centers of reflection and spirituality were active in the S of Gaul: Marseille (Salvian, Cassian, *Museus, Gennadius), Arles (Caesarius the African, *Julian Pomerius), Vienne (*Avitus and above all *Claudianus Mamertus, nourished by an entire *Neoplatonic tradition), to the N of the Loire, Poitiers (Venantius Fortunatus) and above all Tours. In this city, where by that time the memory of Martin attracted *pilgrimages (L. Pietri, *Tours*), Gregory, at the end of the 6th c., orchestrated a reflection that recalls, in a synthesis of different traditions, the sending of seven messengers from Rome for the purpose of Gallic conversions and celebrates the *Gesta Dei per Francos*. After Gregory, the 7th c. appears entirely lifeless, waiting for the Carolingian Renaissance.

Cf. the bibliographies in Fliche-Martin, vols. III, IV and V; in the various vols. of *Histoire des Diocèses de France* (ed. J.R. Palanque and B. Plongeron), Paris; and of *Histoire des Provinces* (dir. Ph. Wolff), Toulouse. E. Demougeot - W. Speyer, *Gallia*: RAC 7, 891-927 and 944-962; J. Fontaine, *France*: DSp 5, 785-805; Ch. Pietri, *Frankreich*: TRE 11, 346-353; Id., *Les Martyrs de Lyon*, Colloque CNRS de Lyon, Paris 1978; P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les paroisses rurales du IVe au XIe siècle*, Paris 1900; E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France*, Lille 1900; Duchesne, *Fastes*, I and III; E.Ch. Babut, *Saint Martin de Tours*, Paris 1912; E. De Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église de Belgique, des origines au XIIe siècle*, I, Brussels 1940; K. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948; J. Hubert, *L'architecture religieuse du Haut Moyen-Âge en France*, Paris 1952; C. Vogel, *La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule*, Paris 1952; D. van Berchem, *Les Martyrs de la Légion Thébaine. Essai sur la formation d'une légende*, Basel 1956; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'Époque romaine*, Paris, I, 1964; II, 1966; III, 1965; G. Tessier, *Le baptême de Clovis*, Paris 1964; P.A. Février, *L'archéologie chrétienne en France de 1954 à 1962*: Atti del VI Congr. Int. di Arch. Crist., Vatican City 1965, 57-92; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankreich*, Vienna 1965; P.A. Février - N. Duval, *Les monuments chrétiens de la Gaule transalpine*: Actas del VIII Congreso de Arq. Crist., Rome-Barcelona, 1969, 57-106; M. Simonetti, *Alle origini di una cultura cristiana in Gallia*: MAL Quaderno 158 (1973) 117-131; J. Dubois, *Les listes épiscopales, témoins de l'organisation ecclésiastique*: RHEF 62 (1975) 9-24; E. Griffe, *À travers les paroisses rurales de la Gaule au VIe siècle*: BLE 76 (1975) 3-26; Ch. Pietri, *Remarques sur la topographie chrétienne des cités entre Loire et Rhin (IVe-VIIe s.)*: RHEF 62 (1975) 189-204; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; M. Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien vom IV. bis zum VII. Jhdt.*: Beihefte *Francia*, V, Munich 1976; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana (311–440)*, Rome 1976; P. Gassmann, *Der Episkopat im Gallien in V. Jhdt.*, Diss., Bonn 1977; H. Marrou, *Christiana tempora*, Rome 1978; E. Ewig, *Spätantikes und Frankisches Gallien*: Beihefte *Francia* III, 1 and 2, Munich 1976–1979; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de Première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen-Âge*, Paris 1980; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981; L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IVe au VIe siècle*, Paris 1983; Ch. Pietri, *Remarques sur la christianisation du Nord de la Gaule (IVe-VIe siècles)*: La Revue du Nord 66 (1984) 58-68; Id., *Chiesa e comunità locali nell'Occidente cristiano (IV-VI d.C.). L'esempio della Gallia*, in A. Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico. III. Le merci, gli insediamenti*, Rome 1986, 761-795, 923-934; P. Saint-Roch, *L'utilisation liturgique de l'espace urbain et suburbain. L'exemple de quatre villes de France*: Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne, Lyon-Vienne-Grenoble-Genève-Aoste, 21-28 Septembre 1986, I-III, Vatican City 1989, II, 1103-1115; E. Dàbrowska, *La sépulture des évêques et des abbés dans la Gaule du IVe au VIIe siècle*, in ibid., 1259-1266; J. Guyon, *Baptistères et groupes épiscopaux de Provence. Élaboration, diffusion et devenir d'un type architectural*, in ibid., 1427-1449; M. Colardelle, *Églises et sépultures dans les Alpes du Nord (Aoste, Genève, Grenoble, Lyon et Vienne)*, in ibid., 1535-1549; E. Dàbrowska, *Les tombes de saints évêques en Gaule en tant que lieux de pèlerinage*, Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Bonn, 22-28 September 1991, I-II, Vatican City 1995, II, 663-666; *Fifth-century Gaul. A Crisis of Identity?* ed. J. Drinkwater - H. Elton, Cambridge 1992; L. Pietri, in *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours. II. Naissance d'une chrétienté (250–430)*, Paris 1995, 832-860; Id., in *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours. III. Les églises d'Orient et d'Occident*, Paris 1998, 207-246, 321-386; J.-Ch. Picard, *Évêques, saints et cités in Italie et en Gaule. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire*, Rome 1998; J. Guyon (éd.), *Les premiers chrétiens en Provence*, Paris 2001.

Ch. Pietri - M. Ghilardi

GAZA (Heb. *'Azzâh*, "the strong," Aram. *Ghazzeh*, Egyptian *Gazatu*, Assyrian *Hazzatu*, Gr. Γάζα). A

city of SW *Palestine on the Mediterranean, Gaza was a center of Hellenistic *paganism around the principal temple, the *Marneion*. The inhabitants were little inclined to convert to Christianity. Constantine ordered the separation from Gaza of the neighboring city Maiuma, favorable to the new religion, which from then on took the name *Constantia*, while the emperor *Julian reunited the two cities. The inhabitants of Gaza converted only in the 5th c. under the edict of the emperor *Arcadius, which prohibited pagan worship, and through the zeal of St. *Porphyry, a favorite of the Empress *Eudoxia, who built on the ruins of the *Marneion* a large basilica, called *Eudoxiana*. The territory of Gaza had at that time three bishops: one at Gaza, one at Maiuma, one at Anthedon. During the 5th and the 6th c., *Zosimus, *Procopius, *Coricius, Isidore, *Aeneas, Timothy and John distinguished themselves in the famous school of Gaza (cf. K. Seitz, *Die Schule von Gaza*, Heidelberg 1892). In 541 or 542, a council was called, by order of Emperor Justinian (482–565). Participating in this council were the deacon *Pelagius, *apocrisarius of the Roman Church in Constantinople; *Ephrem, patriarch of Antioch; *Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem; and *Hypatius, bishop of Ephesus. The background of the council was as follows: Paul, patriarch of Alexandria, had wanted to depose the *dux* of Egypt, the military authority assigned to the defense of the borders, but the deacon Prois, treasurer of the church, had alerted the duke: Paul then had Prois imprisoned by the augustal prefect who had him tortured to death. As the family of the deacon turned to Justinian, the emperor had the augustal prefect beheaded and called a council at Gaza in which, under the presidency of Pelagius, Paul was deposed and a certain *Zoilus was nominated. In the council the *Origenist movement was also denounced to the pope, and the pope entrusted this question to the emperor. Following the battle of Tadun (634–635), Gaza fell into the power of the Arabs, who held it in great esteem for the sepulcher of Hashim, grandfather of Muhammad and fatherland of Ash-Shafi'i, founder of the Sunnite school.

DB 3, 118-124; EC 5, 1971-1972. On the council, see Mansi IX, col. 706; Mansi, *Suppl.* I, col. 428; A. Peltier, *Dictionnaire des Conciles*, I, Paris 1847, col. 231; Hfl-Lecl II, 2, 1078-1081; B. Brouria-Ashkelony, *The Monastic School of Gaza*, Leiden 2005; J. Lee Hevelone-Harper, *Disciples of the Desert. Monks, Laity, and Spiritual Authority in the Sixth-century Gaza*, Baltimore 2005.

C. Nardi

GELASIUS I, pope (d. 496). We are informed about the life of Gelasius—bishop of Rome from 1 March 492 to 19 November 496—by contemporary sources (Eugippius, *Vita Sancti Severini* 46, CSEL 9/2, 65,15-19; SC 374, 294; Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro defensione Trium Capitulorum* 5,4,3, CCL 90A, 154, 252-255; Id., *Contra Mocianum*, 9, 16, 60, CCL 90A, 403,82-88; 404,136-138; 414,505-518; Victor of Tunnunna, *Chronicon* 69, CCL 173, 22,355-356; Cassiodorus, *De institutione* 8, PL 70, 1119C; Dionysius Exiguus, *Praefatio in collectione decretorum Pontificum Romanorum ad Iulianum presbyterum*, CCL 85, 45-47) and from the Pontiff's epistolary, transmitted to us by the *Collectio Britannica* and by a second group of three collections: the *Avellana*, published by Guenther (*Coll. Avell.*, CSEL 35), the *Berolinensis* and the *Veronensis*, edited by Schwartz (*Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma* [in successive publs.], Munich 1934). Two other letters by Gelasius have been passed down by the collections of *Dionysius Exiguus (to the bishops *per Lucaniam, Brutios et Siciliam*) and of *Arles (to the bishop Eonius). The second collection of the letters of Gelasius has suffered damage of various kinds during the course of its transmission. In addition, some letters of *Felix III (483–492) have been attributed to Gelasius: the letter to *Fravitta (PublS 111-113); two fragments entitled *De anathematis vinculo* (also called *Tractatus* IV) and *De vitanda communione Acacii* (PublS 7-15 and ibid., 33-49); two letters to the bishop Honorius of Salona (*Coll. Avell.* 96, CSEL 35, 398-400; *Coll. Avell.* 98, CSEL 35, 436-439); the letter to Andromachus against the feast of the *Lupercalia* (*Tractatus* VI: *Coll. Avell.* 100, CSEL 35,453-464; SC 65, 162-189). By style and contents, the *Epistola ad Syriae episcopos* is evidently spurious (*Patrum Nova Bibliotheca*, II, Rome 1844, 653-662).

The late portrait of the *Liber pontificalis* attributes an African origin to Gelasius and gives the name of his father: *Gelasius, natione Afer, ex patre Valerio* (LP I, 255). Nautin asserts that the notice is unfounded and gives greater credit to the affirmation of Gelasius that, in the letter to the emperor *Anastasius (491–518), he is declared *Romanus natus* (PublS 19, 27). It is not improbable that the notice has a foundation in truth and that the father of Gelasius and his family were Africans or of African origin. We know nothing of his ecclesiastical career prior to the episcopate. Nautin has called into doubt that Gelasius was secretary of his predecessors *Simplicius (468–483) and Felix III, but it is not improbable that he contributed at the Lateran *scrinium*.

One of the first problems for Gelasius, after his election, was the war between *Odoacer (ca. 437–493) and *Theodoric (489–526) for possession of Italy, which ended with the taking of *Ravenna on

the part of the *Ostrogoths in February of 493 (cf. *Excerpta Valesiana* 49-57). Despite the *Arian confession of the Ostrogoths, the relations were good between the Roman See and the court of Ravenna during Gelasius's pontificate, and they were marked by—if not collaboration—surely a profound respect. Between 494 and 496 the relations between Gelasius and the Ostrogoths focused mostly on questions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the privilege of the forum (*Epp. Theodericianae variae*, I-VIII, MGH [AA] 12,1,389-391). There is no want of courtesy letters and requests for aid, written to influential ladies at the Ostrogothic court—the *inlustris femina* Firmina and Ereleuva, mother of Theodoric (*Frag. Thiel* 36,502). Some letters attest to the intervening rapport between Gelasius and functionaries of the Ostrogothic kingdom: two to the *comites* Teia and Hostilius, concerning the ecclesiastical forum, and a note to the *defensor Duclius* on the new prelate Lucera Anastasius (*Ep. Thiel* 24,390; *Frag. Thiel* 3,484-485; *Ep. ad Mercurium* [II], PLS 3,760-761). The epistolary also offers notices regarding his relations with the Italian episcopate, with that of *Gaul, and with the bishops of the Balkan region, whose traditional bonds of communion with the Roman See Gelasius sought to strengthen.

In 493 Gelasius wrote to the bishops of *Picenum* about the case of *Socrates, an ecclesiastical propagator of *Pelagian ideas, and Gelasius asked the prelates to suppress his activities. Pelagianism was then in a period of new growth in Gaul, Italy and in the Balkans, and to this heresy Gelasius dedicated a tractate (*Tractatus* V or *Dicta aduersus Pelagianam haeresim*, *Coll. Avell.* 97, CSEL 35,400-436; cf. *Ep. universis episcopis per Picenum*, *Coll. Avell.* 94, CSEL 35,357-368). The letters attributed to Gelasius on the Pelagian question, written to the bishop Honorius, are actually by Felix III (*Coll. Avell.* 96 and 98, CSEL 35, 398-400; 436-439). The letters to the Italian bishops deal with numerous matters of the apostolic see in the peninsula: the internal life of ecclesial communities and of all the faithful, ordinations, inquiries, processes, questions regarding ecclesiastical goods, consecrations of churches, crimes and injustices, right to asylum, and testaments. We are informed about the relations with the churches of Gaul by a missive to Aeonius of Arles and from two notices of ps.-Gennadius regarding the professions of faith sent to Gelasius by *Honoratus of Marseille and by one of his clergy, both of whom were accused of heresy (possibly Pelagianism) and Gelasius's response, by which he recognizes their orthodoxy.

Another serious question that Gelasius, only recently elected bishop, had to confront was the Acacian schism, thus called after the bishop of Constantinople, *Acacius, who was excommunicated by Felix III in 484 because he had given his support to the politics of compromise with the *monophysites with the **Henotikon* of the emperor *Zeno (474–491) and with the reintegration of *Peter Mongus of Alexandria, disciple of the monophysite *Timothy Aelurus (457–477). In the ecclesiastical concepts of Rome, the imperial authority could not absolve the Alexandrian bishop of the accusation of heresy and of complicity with Timothy Aelurus, and the shared intervention of Acacius could not constitute a solution, because Alexandria, the second See of Christianity, could not receive reconciliation into the *Oikoumenē* from an inferior see, Constantinople, but only from the *prima sedes*, i.e., Rome (PublS, 15,5-13).

Gelasius dedicated several works to the Acacian schism and to the christological controversies: among these, the so-called *Tractatus III* is, in reality, a letter, the most engaging theological work of Gelasius, the theme being Christ's two natures (PublS 85-106). The text was addressed to the Balkan Peninsula bishops faithful to Rome and to the bishops with whom Gelasius wished to solidify the traditionally privileged relationship which the See of Constantinople, before and during the Acacian schism, had put up for discussion several times with its politics of expansion in that region. The letter was furnished with a *florilegium, and Saltet rightly claims that it depends upon the lost Antiochene document from the Council of *Ephesus in 431; Schwartz and Richard have traced it back to the patristic testimonies of the lost *Pentalogus* of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. Another affinity between Gelasius's letter and Antiochene theology is the letter's eucharistic teaching, similar to that of the *Eranistes* of Theodoret and of the ps.-Chrysostom works (*Ep. ad Caesarium monachum*, PG 52, 755).

As was usual for the Roman authorities, the works of Gelasius in defense of Chalcedonian Christology are often connected to the defense of the primacy of the Roman See and to the refutation of the privileges conceded to the See of Constantinople by the council in 381 (PublS 17, 31-37). Zeno's intervention in the christological question and the reconciliation of Peter Mongus pushed Gelasius, following the path of Felix III, to hold up the autonomy of the church in the confrontations with the imperial power in the doctrinal and disciplinary spheres: to this theme he dedicated a part of the *Tractatus IV* and of the celebrated letter of 494 to the emperor Anastasius, this letter being known for the doctrine of the "two powers" (PublS 19-24), which has a long

history of effects, beginning with the Middle Ages, particularly with the reform of the 11th c. One of the most solemn acts that consecrated the politics of Gelasius was the Roman Synod of 13 March 495 in which Misenus of Cuma—a papal legate who had adhered to the Acacian schism at Constantinople—made an act of contrition and was acquitted by the pope. Eleven times the synod acclaimed Gelasius *Vicarius Christi*, a papal appellative that seems to have been used for the first time during his pontificate (*Coll. Avell.* 103, CSEL 35, 474-487).

The *Liber pontificalis* attributes to Gelasius some works that have not come down to us: a tractate *Adversus Nestorium et Eutychem* (which is not the letter on the two natures), two books *Adversum Arrium*, hymns *Ad modum beati Ambrosii*, a sacramentary and various *orationes*. To him the **Decretum Gelasianum* and the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* have been attributed, though actually they are works compiled after his death. Dionyius Exiguus, who left a beautiful eulogy of Gelasius (*Praefatio in collectione decretorum*), affirms that he had collected first-hand notices from Roman clerics who had been his students, but that he had never known Gelasius because he arrived in Rome after his death (ca. 500). For this reason it is evident that it was not the pope who inspired the *Dionysiana* collection, as Peitz holds. Gelasius was immediately venerated as a saint: *beatus Gelasius in sanctitate vitae atque scientia per universum mundum celebrioris famae gloria praedicatus* (Facundus of Hermiane, *Contra Mocianum* 16, CCL 90A, 404,136-138). The date of his death (19 November) coincides with an ancient liturgical commemoration, attested by *Bede, by some recensions of Ado's *Martyrologium*, by the additions to that of Usuardo and by other attestations (*Le Martirologe d'Adon. Ses deux familles, ses trois recensions. Texte et commentaire*, ed. J. Dubois - G. Renaud, Paris 1984, 387; Usuardo, *Martyrologium*, PL 124, 713-714). The *Martyrologium Romanum* fixed the liturgical memorial on the date of his *depositio*, 21 November (*Martyr. rom.*, *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum decembris*, ed. H. Delehaye et al., Brussels 1940, 537; 538n.8). *John the Deacon speaks in the 9th c. of the funerary *titulus*, which faded away and was long ago placed on the sepulcher in the atrium of the basilica of St. Peter's at the Vatican (*Gregorii Magni vita* IV,68, PL 75,221B).

CPL 1667-1675; Ph. Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum. Ab condita Ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, I, Leipzig 1885; *Epistolae*, 1-43, ed. A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II, ex schedis clar. Petri Coustantii aliisque editis, adibiti praestantissimis codicibus Italiae et Germaniae*, I, [Braunsbergae 1867] Hildesheim-New York 1974, 287-483; *Fragmenta*, 1-49, ed. A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, ibid., 483-510; 503-596; *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, ed. O. Guenther, Prague-Vienna-Leipzig 1895 (CSEL 35); *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, ed. E. Schwartz, Munich 1934 (ABAW Neue Folge. Heft 10); ed. A. Hamman, Paris 1963 (PLS 3); *Epistolae Pontificum Romanorum ineditae*, ed. S. Loewenfeld, Graz [2]1959; P. Ewald, *Die Papastbriefe der Britischen Sammlung, Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellen deutscher Geschichte des Mittelalters* 5 (1880) 275-414; *Lettre contre les Lupercales et dix-huit Messes du Sacramentaire léonien*, ed. G. Pommarès, Paris 1959 (SC 65); J.B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense complectens Sanctorum Patrum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera, selecta e Graecis orientalibusque et Latinis codicibus, publici juris facta*, IV, Paris 1858.

Vita: Duchesne LP 255-257; *Gelasius I*, BBKL, II, Hamm 1970, 197-199; W. Ullmann, *Gelasius I (492–496). Das Papsttum an der Wende der Spätantike zum Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1981; Nautin P., *Gélase*, DHGE 20,283-294; R. Bratož, *Gelasio I, santo*, EPapi I,458-462.

Christology and other studies: C. Moeller, *Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VIe siècle*, in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, ed. A. Grillmeier - H. Bacht, Würzburg 1951, 637-720; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, 2/1, ed. italiana S. Olivieri, Brescia 1982, esp. 399-416; Gelasio, *Lettera sulle due nature. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*, ed. R. Ronzani (Biblioteca Patristica, 48), Bologna 2011; H. Koch, *Gelasius im kirchenpolitischen Dienste seiner Vorgänger, der Päpste Simplicius (468–483) und Felix III (483–492). Ein Beitrag zur Sprache des Papstes Gelasius I (492–496) und früherer Papstbriefe*, Munich 1935; F. Dvornik, *Pope Gelasius and Emperor Anastasius*, ByzZ 44 (1951) 111-116; J. Gaudemet, *Histoire d'un texte. Le chapitres 4 et 27 de la décrétale du pape Gélase du 11 mars 494*, in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offert à Henri-Charles Puech*, Paris 1974, 289-298; P. Nautin, *La lettre de Félix III à André de Thessalonique et sa doctrine sur l'Église et l'empire*: RHE 77 (1982) 5-34; Ph. Blaudeau, *Condemnation et absolution synodales d'un légat. Le cas de Misène de Cumes (483–495)*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale*, XXX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 2002 (SEA 78) 503-528; S. Destephen, *Une province romaine sortie de l'ombre. La Dardanie d'après la correspondance du pape Gélase*: MEFRA 120/1 (2008) 163-181; E. Michaud, *Le pape Gélase et le monophysisme eucharistique*: Kirchliche Zeitschrift 1899, 303-309; J. Kilmartin - J. Daly, *The Eucharistic Theology of Pope Gelasius I. A Nontridentine View*, SP 29, 1997, 283-289; M. Maccarrone, Vicarius Christi *e* vicarius Petri *nel periodo patristico*, RSCI 1 (1948) 1-32; Ph.V. Bagan, *The Syntax of the Letters of Pope Gelasius I*, Washington DC 1945; F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei papi e nei documenti della cancelleria romana dal IV al XIV secolo, III, Parte I. Il latino letterario medievale e lo stile della curia romana – Parte II. Da Ilaro a Ormisda*: Lateranum, n.s. 11-12 (1946) 3-214; A.W.J. Holleman, *Pope Gelasius I and Lupercalia*, Amsterdam 1974; G. Otranto, *Due epistole di papa Gelasio I (492–96) sulla comunità cristiana di Lucera*: VetChr 14 (1977) 122-137; Id., *Note sul sacerdozio femminile nell'antichità in margine a una testimonianza di Gelasio I*: VetChr 19 (1982) 341-360; S. Prete, *La lettera di Gelasio I ai vescovi del* Picenum *sul pelagianesimo*: Studia Picena 43 (1976) 9-28; D.J. Chapman, *On the "Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis"*: RBen 30 (1913) 187-208, 315-333;

Ch. Munier, *Gelasianum (decretum)*: DHGE 20, 303-304; V. Grossi, *Il "Decretum Gelasianum." Nota in margine all'autorità della Chiesa di Roma alla fine del V sec.*: Augustinianum 41 (2001) 231-255; C. Pietri, *D'Alexandrie à Rome. Jean Talaia émule d'Athanase au Ve siècle*, in *Alexandrina. Hellénisme, judaisme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert*, Paris 1987, 277-295; Id., *L'hérésie et l'hérétique selon l'Église romaine (IVe-Ve siècles)*, in *Eresia e eresiologia nella Chiesa antica*, XII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Augustinianum 25 (1985) 867-887; Id., *La conversion de Rome et la primauté du Pape (IV-VIe S.)*, in *Il primato del Vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio. Ricerche e testimonianze*, ed. M. Maccarrone, Vatican City 1991, 219-243; Id., *La géographie de l'Illyricum ecclésiastique et ses relation avec l'Église de Rome (Ve-VIe siècles)*, in *Villes et peuplement dans l'Illyricum protobyzantin. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française de Rome (Rome, 12-14 mai 1982)*, Rome 1984, 21-59; V. Parlato, *Il vicariato di Tessalonica (IV-VII sec.)*: Studi urbinati di scienze giuridiche 49-50 (1980–1982) 133-150; P.W.M. Peitz, *Dionysius Exiguus Studien*, Berlin 1960; M. Richard, *Les florilèges diphysites du Ve et du VIe siècle, Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, ed. A. Grillmeier - H. Bacht, Würzburg 1951, 721-748; Id., *Opera minora*, II-III, ed. E. Dekkers - M. Geerard - A. van Roey - G. Verbeke, Turnholt-Leuven 1977, 3; Id., *Notes sur les florilèges dogmatique du V et du VI siècle, Opera Minora*, I, ed. E. Dekkers - M. Geerard - A. van Roey - G. Verbeke., Turnholt-Leuven 1976, 2; L. Saltet, *Les sources de l'Eranisthés de Théodoret*: RHE 5 (1906) 289-303, 513-536, 741-754; E. Stein, *Le période byzantine de la papauté*: Catholic Historical Review 21 (1935–1936) 129-163; A.K. Ziegler, *Pope Gelasius and His Teaching on the Relation of Church and State*: Catholic Historical Review 27 (1941–1942) 412-437; G. Soranzo, *I precedenti della cosidetta teoria gelasiana*: RSCI 1 (1947) 3-21; W. Ensslin, *Auctoritas und Potestas. Zur Zweigewaltenlehre des Papstes Gelasius I.*, "Historisches Jahrbuch" 74 (1955) 661-668; O. Bartolini, *La dottrina gelasiana dei due poteri nella polemica per la successione nel regno di Lorena (869–879)*, in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, 4, Vatican City 1964 (Studi e Testi, 234), 35-58; Id., *Scritti scelti di storia medievale*, Livorno 1968, 739-762; A. Cottrell, *"Auctoritas" and "potestas." A Reevaluation of the Correspondence of Gelasius I on Papal-Imperial Relations*: Mediaeval Studies 55 (1993) 95-109; P. Toubert, *La doctine gélasienne des deux puvoirs*, in *Studi in onore di Giosuè Musca*, Bari 2000, 519-540; D. Duffault, *Le "De anathematis vinculo" et la réintroduction du schéma gélasien dans l'empire carolingien au IXe siècle, Foi chrétienne et églises dans la société politique de l'Occident du Haut Moyen Âge (IVe-XIIe siècle)*, ed. J. Hoareau-Dodineau - P. Texier, Limoges 2004, 319-331; Y. Sassier, *"Auctoritas pontificum" et "potestas regia." Faut-il tenir pour négligeable l'influence de la doctrine gélasienne aux temps carolingiens?* in *Le Pouvoir au Moyen Âge. Idéologies, Pratiques, Représentations*, ed. C. Carozzi - H. Taviani-Carozzi, Aix-en-Provence 2005, 213-236.

Rocco Ronzani

GELASIUS of Caesarea (ca. 335–395). Born around 335–336 to a sister of *Cyril of Jerusalem, he was raised to the episcopal throne of Caesarea ca. 367, succeeding *Acacius, a disciple of *Eusebius. A convinced asserter of the Nicene Creed, under the emperor *Valens he was chased from his see to make way for the Arian *Euzoius, but returned there definitively in 379, at the arrival of *Theodosius to the throne. He was a writer of a certain talent by *Jerome's judgment, who says he did not publish his works. Nevertheless, various citations that occur in later authors demonstrated that some had had a certain diffusion: in *Theodoret, in *Leontius of Byzantium, in *Severus of Antioch and in the compiler of the **Doctrina patrum*.

He wrote dogmatic treatises, whose fragments have recently increased in number, and, acc. to *Photius, an *Ecclesiastical History* continuing that of Eusebius on the suggestion of his uncle Cyril. Photius was also familiar with another writing by him, today entirely lost, *Against the Anomoians*. About the *Ecclesiastical History*, this too lost, scholarly debate has proposed opposing solutions. The opinion of Photius acc. to which Gelasius, together with his uncle Cyril, had completed a version in Greek of the last part of the work of *Rufinus—in which the latter continued the *History* of Eusebius from 324 until 395—has been shown to be inconsistent, because Gelasius was already dead when after 401 Rufinus began the translation into Latin of the Eusebian *History*. Today, there is a common preference for indicating in the work of Gelasius the principal source of the last two books of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Rufinus (i.e., of that section in which Rufinus continued Eusebius). However other hypotheses have been formulated: they range from the defense of the absolute originality of the last two books of the Rufinian *History* to the conviction that not only Rufinus but also other historians, such as *Gelasius of Cyzicus, the author of the *Vita Metrophanis*, *George the Monk and *Socrates, used Gelasius and that, therefore, the *History* of the latter can largely be reconstructed thanks to the works of such presumed imitators. Nautin maintains that Gelasius, in the narration of the events of the time of Constantine, did nothing other than expand the *History* of Eusebius.

The *Doctrina patrum* attributes to Gelasius an *Interpretation of the Creed*, which, on the basis of fragments that have survived, contained a collection of catechetical instructions of the same type as the work of his uncle Cyril.

CPG 3520-3521; BBKL 2, 199-200; F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica* (OCA 117), Rome 1938, 16-49; A. Glas, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia, die Vorlage für die beiden letzten Bücher der Kirchengeschichte Rufins* (Diss.), Leipzig 1914; P. van den Ven, *Fragments de la recension grecque de l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Rufin dans un texte hagiographique*: Muséon 2 (1915) 92-115; P. Heseler, *Hagiographica I-II. Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia* (Diss. Philol. Bonn), Atene 1934; F.X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia. His Life and His Works*, Washington DC 1945, 160-164; F. Scheidweiler, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia*: ByzZ 46 (1953) 277-301; Id., *Die Bedeutung der Vita Metrophanis et Alexandri für die Quellenkritik bei den griechischen Kirchenhistorik-*

ern: ByzZ 50 (1957) 74-98; F. Winkelmann, *Das Problem der Rekonstruktion der Historia Ecclesiastica des Gelasius von Caesarea*: Forschungen und Fortschritte 10 (1964) 311-314; Id., *Die Quellen der Historia Ecclesiastica des Gelasius von Cyzicus (nach 475). Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasius von Caesarea*: Byzantinoslavica 27 (1966) 104-130; Id., *Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia*, Berlin 1966; J. Schamp, *Gélase ou Rufin. Un fait nouveau sur des fragments oubliés de Gélase de Césarée (CPG 3521)*: Byzantion 57 (1987) 360-390 (with tr. of the fragments CPG 3521); P. Nautin, *La continuation de l'Histoire ecclésiastique d'Eusèbe par Gélase de Césarée*: REB 50 (1992) 163-183.

C. Curti

GELASIUS of Cyzicus (d. after 475). What we know of him comes from the preface to his works and from *Photius (cods. 15 and 88). He wrote, toward 475, an *Ecclesiastical History* in three books to refute the *monophysites and in which he refers to the events of the Eastern church at the time of Constantine. The preserved section, three books, reaches until the Council of *Tyre of 335; we know the length of the lost part through the mention in Photius. It is for the most part a work of compilation that used *Eusebius, *Rufinus, *Theodoret and *Socrates, and, acc. to some, also the lost *Ecclesiastical History* of *Gelasius of Caesarea. Apart from the latter, all the sources are known, but Gelasius in the *praefatio* declares to have taken advantage of other documents as well: an ancient MS that his father, a priest of Cyzicus, had received from the bishop of that city and that confirmed the acts and speeches of the Council of *Nicaea; the writings of a certain priest John, of whom nothing is known. The value of these new documents that only Gelasius has preserved has been the object of discussions on the part of scholars. Nevertheless the authenticity of some is almost universally admitted today.

CPG 6034; GCS 28; PG 85, 1191-1360; G. Loeschcke - M. Heinemann, *Gelasius, Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 28, Leipzig 1918; C.H. Turner, *On Gelasius of Cyzicus*: JTS 1 (1899) 125ff.; G. Loeschcke, *Das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzicenus*, Bonn 1906; A. Glas, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia, die Vorlage für die beiden letzten Bücher der Kirchengeschichte Rufins* (Diss.), Leipzig 1914; G. Mercati, *Opere minori*, IV, Vatican City 1937, 56ff.; F. Winkelmann, *Die Quellen der Historia Ecclesiastica des Gelasius von Cyzicus*: ByzS 27 (1966) 104-130 (bibl.); C.T.H.R. Ehrhardt, *Constantinian Documents in Gelasius of Cyzicus, Ecclesiastical History*: JbAC 23 (1980) 48-57; G.C. Hansen, *Eine fingierte Ansprache Konstantins auf dem Konzil von Nikaia*: ZAC 2 (1998) 173-198.

C. Curti

GEMINIANUS, saint (342/344–ca. 396). He has been venerated as the protector of Modena at least since the 8th c. Even if the *Vita s. Geminiani* (10th-11th c.) records him as the predecessor of Teodulo (bishop after 396), Geminianus should perhaps be identified with the bishop—whose see is not mentioned—who had himself represented by his presbyter Aprus at the Council of *Milan presided over by *Ambrose in 392/393 (the synodal letter sent to Pope *Siricius: in Ambr. *epist. extra coll.* 15,14, CSEL 82,3, 300-1). His feast is celebrated 31 January and the translation 30 April.

PCBE 2/1, 907; BS 6, 97-104; BHL 3296-3302. G. Pistoni, *San Geminiano vescovo e protettore di Modena nella vita, nel culto, nell'arte*, Modena 1983; W. Montorsi (ed.), *Trattati e sermoni di San Geminiano "protettore," vescovo di Modena*, Modena 1991; W. Montorsi, *Geminiano e Zenone. Due santi per una leggenda, con un cenno sulla Civitas Geminiana*, Modena 1993; P. Golinelli, *Modena, san Geminiano e san Zeno. A proposito di recenti ipotesi storiografiche*: Deput. storia patria prov. modenesi, Atti e memorie 15 (1993) 79-90; Id., *Culti comuni su versanti opposti. Venerio, Prospero, Geminiano*, in *Città e culto dei santi nel Medioevo italiano*, Bologna [2]1996, 131-150; E. Anti, *Zeno di Verona e Geminiano di Modena. Due "Vitae" a confronto*: Annuario storico zenoniano (1996) 27-52; *Civitas Geminiana. La Città e il suo Patrono (Modena, dicembre 1997-febbraio 1998)*, ed. F. Piccinini, Modena 1997.

E. Malaspina

GEMINIUS (4th c.). His name is found only in the catalog of *Jerome (*Vir. Ill.* 64), who has him as a presbyter of *Antioch and appreciates him as a writer, adding: "he has left us rather few documents of his talent": but of these, we know neither the titles nor the contents.

G. Ladocsi

GENESIS, Patristic Interpretation of

I. The creation of the world - II. The creation of human beings - III. Adam and Eve - IV. Sin and the promise - V. The patriarchs.

Late Judaism, and esp. *Philo, attributed a particular importance to the book of Genesis, of which the OT itself had already given many "rereadings." The NT in turn reread it in relationship with the mystery of the Christ. Patristic literature used these sources, Jewish and Christian, in the most diverse contexts. The story of the origins of the world fixed with clarity first of all the condition of the creature. *God is the sovereign Lord of all things, and there are no others. This point was fundamental in the apologetic intended for the *pagans as also in the polemics that opposed the church to the heterodox *gnosis. The original Fall and the grand patriarchal figures would equally constitute essential themes of

Christian reflection. The book of Genesis is one of those most frequently commented upon in the ancient church. The long list of these commentaries can be found in the *Indices* of Migne (PG, ed. Cavallera, Paris 1912, 144-145; PL 218, 931-938). For the literature of the Christian East, A. Levene, *The Early Syriac Fathers on Genesis*, London 1951; Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, *Patrologia V (I Padri orientali)*, Genoa 2000. The notable repertory compiled by Y.-M. Congar in *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges H. de Lubac*, Paris 1963, I, 215ff., should also be consulted.

I. The creation of the world. Every particular of the sacred text evokes different aspects of the mystery. The two first words (ἐν ἀρχῇ) are commonly linked with Pr 8:22 and Jn 1:3. God has made the universe "in the Son." The creation and the work of salvation are therefore in immediate relation. The second verse seems to suppose a formless preexisting material, like that of *Timaeus* 51a. Numerous explanations have been proposed in order to eliminate the hypothesis of a second coeternal principle. In this area Wis 11:17 and Sir 18:1 in particular have been invoked. The spirit above the waters is assimilated to the *Holy Spirit. A figure of baptism has been seen here. Saying *fiat lux* in v. 3, God uttered a word. Some have understood this as being the Word. But this risks denying his coeternity with the Father. The formula can also be interpreted as a command directed to the Son, because it is through his mediation that all things have been made. The existence of the light before the creation of the stars posed a difficult question. It could be supposed that it is the light emanating from the Word to illuminate the world.

This command could just as well be a figurative manner of indicating the angelic creation, which would then have been the starting point of the creation (Philo Alex., *De op. mundi* 31). "The seven days" are analyzed in this way into the details. One exegetical tradition tries to explain the story account in the most literal sense (e.g., the schools of *Edessa and *Antioch); another turns systematically to allegory and to figurative language (e.g., the school of *Alexandria). *Augustine proposed a fairly daring analysis of the whole, largely inspired on the fundamental outlines of *Neoplatonism, in which all the details find a place in a system of relationships. The "first day" represents the angelic nature: this takes shape in its movement of *conversio* toward the Creator. The evening corresponds to the moment in which this turns toward itself and recognizes its own nature. The morning indicates the stage of the return of the angelic awareness toward its own principle, no longer to be informed but to carry back in praise to this principle that which it has recognized (*De Gen. ad litt.* 4,22,39). The three stages have nothing to do with a physical time: they designate three phases of a noetic process. Augustine, in short, applies to the *hexameron the three stages of the formation of the Plotinian **nous*. The days after the first apply this triple movement of the awareness to the categories of creatures. At the end of the process, the seventh day begins with the act of praise for the work of the sixth day, but at the end it concludes in the repose of God (see A. Solignac, *In principio*, 153-171).

II. The creation of human beings. Genesis presents two accounts of the creation of humankind (Gen 1:26-27 and 2:7). In the first, the human is made in the image and likeness of God; in the second, they are modeled with the mud of the earth. Here too *exegesis is divided into two great traditions. According to the Alexandrian school, the first account concerns the creation of the spiritual person who does not proceed from a preexisting material; the second the "exterior" person, molded starting from the dust and into whom a spirit of life has been breathed. Only the first human being was made "in the image of God" (he is not "an image of God," something only true of the Logos). How, furthermore, could it be otherwise, given that God has nothing corporeal? Humans are called to pass from the order of the *image—as they were made on the first day—to the order of the likeness, as they will become when they are participants in the *resurrection of Christ, beyond images and shadows, at the level of the true realities. The participation of the person in the image of God constitutes the essence of one's being. One's terrestrial condition always remains, in fact, something exterior to the person. Contrary to the Alexandrian tradition, the Asiatic tradition maintains that the two accounts of Genesis refer to a single creation. God made human beings, modeling them starting from the mud of the earth, in the image of the risen Christ. Nevertheless, all the time of the economy of salvation will be required in order for them to finish growing in likeness. In this *anthropology, strongly centered on the persons of flesh and blood that we are, it is the whole of human behavior that God wishes to gradually assume into glory. We human beings are not only a *soul linked to corporality as a consequence of *sin, we are a *body and a soul, *capax Dei*.

III. Adam and Eve. The tradition, taking up Rom 5:14, has seen in the first Adam a figure of the second.

From the beginning God has prearranged all things in view of that which would be completed in the *incarnation and in the resurrection of Christ (the *recapitulation). The union of Christ and the church, signified by the wound in the pierced side of the Lord, was prefigured, acc. to Eph 5:32, by the union of *Adam and Eve. This mystery has often been presented as already completed before the ages. The church has been understood herself as a supertemporal reality, whose origins, earlier than the historic fact of the incarnation, coincide with those of the world in the plan of God. The birth of Eve would recall in particular to St. *Hilary the resurrection of the flesh (*Tr. myst.* 1,5). The theme of *Ecclesia ab Abel* underlines the preexistence of the church in the OT.

IV. Sin and the promise. The sin of Adam occupies an important place in the understanding of the human condition. Along the lines of Rom 5:12-17, the original Fall is put in relation with the superabundant redemption achieved in Christ. Christ, working *a contrario*, repairs *in melius* that which had been ruined. The Eve-Mary parallel, suggested by the preceding, underlines how the obedience of the second—i.e., her readiness to accept salvation—corresponds to the disobedience of the first. The first part of Gen 3:15 announces the hostility between the woman and the *serpent. This offered itself to an ecclesial or Marian interpretation, as did the second part, provided that it is read, as in the Vulgate, *ipsa tuum calcabit caput*, and not, like the Septuagint, αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλήν. In this case it is the posterity of the woman (the Christ) who must crush the head of the monster. Hippolytus (*De bened. Is. et Jac.* 22 [Dan]: PO 27, 90 and 229) put this text in relation with the blessings of Jacob (Gen 49:16-18). The serpent bites the horse on the shank and makes the horseman fall backward (εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω). This is what was accomplished in the passion of Christ. The devil has attacked the humanity of the Word: Christ has "fallen backward" to go and mysteriously seek ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων the wounded humanity of the first human and to unite it with his resurrection (ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα). The efficacy of Easter reverses that of Adam. *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 4,22,1; 4,40,3; 3,23,7; 5,21,1) points out with even greater insistence this inversion. Christ assumed in his own flesh the hostility of the serpent which has been leading humanity to perdition since the beginning. In his death he wanted to be bitten himself by the serpent, but in order to crush his head. With this, he had to join his resurrection with all humanity, of whom he is the epitome. History is thus formed by a double movement: from the beginning until Christ *death reigned; Christ extends his resurrection to all humanity since its origins. In this way he completes the plan of God at the dawn of the creation, acc. to which humankind had to be conformed to the glorious flesh of the Lord. The exegesis of Gen 3:15 joins here with that of Gen 1:26-27 and 2:7, putting the *salus carnis* particularly in evidence.

V. The patriarchs. The scene of the flood evokes the judgment of God. But it has also been put in relation with the baptismal waters. In this view *Noah represents every baptized person; the ark, the mystery of the church. Abraham appears as the type of one who receives the Word of God in faith and as the depository of the promise in the covenant, both figures of that which is given us in Christ (Gal 4:21-26), "a high priest acc. to the order of *Melchizedek" (Heb 7:1-28). The miraculous birth of Isaac from a sterile woman prefigures the virginal maternity; his substitution for Ishmael prepares the substitution of the nations for the chosen people. The figure of Isaac recalls above all the sacrifice of Christ, who was not spared by his Father. *Origen (*Hom. in Gen.* 10,5) and *Ambrose (*De Isaac* 6 and 7) take up and Christianize the symbolism of the matrimonies of the patriarchs developed by Philo; the wedding of Isaac and Rebekah refers to the union between the soul and the Word and, at the same time, between the Word and the church. Finally, the blessing of Jacob (Gen 49) confirms, at v. 10, that Christ, born of the tribe of Judah, is the Messiah. The sleep and awakening of the lion, at v. 9, are images of the death and resurrection of the Lord. During the era of *Arianism the allegory was pushed even further, linking the mention of the lion cub, associated to that of the lion, with the unity of nature of the Father and the Son. Quickly, as a matter of fact, the whole of chapter 49 was interpreted typologically in the life of Jesus, of the newborn church and of the opposition between Jews and Christians (M. Simonetti, in SC 140, 11-24). God appeared at various times to the patriarchs. These theophanies have often been presented as manifestations of the Word. Apologetic thus established his preexistence and his distinction from the Father. The Father is beyond every form and, as a consequence, invisible and not directly perceptible (Just., *Dial.* 56,1; 60,2; 127,2). He can, however, be seen through him whom he sent. The OT often distinguished God and his *Angel (Gen 16:7-13; 22:11). The ancient theology would do the same. The formula had a strong *subordinationist flavor: no wonder that Arianism exploited it. Despite everything, severe criticism of this typology

would have to wait for St. Augustine (*Trin.* II, 7,12–18,35).

We have stressed the importance of the Jewish sources, esp. of Philo, in the patristic interpretation of the book of Genesis. The Fathers also owed much, as was natural, to the Hellenistic culture, esp. concerning the explanations of the account of the creation. Their exegesis cannot, however, be reduced to its sources, Greek or Hebraic. This exegesis is, in fact, dominated by the figure of Christ. Since *protology is subordinated to *eschatology, "he who has been initiated into the secret power of the resurrection knows the end in view of which God predisposed the beginning of everything" (Max. Conf., *Cap. theol. et oec. Cent.* 1,66: PG 90, 1107).

1. *General studies*: see, first of all Y. Congar, *Le thème de Dieu-Créateur dans les explications de l'Hexaméron dans la tradition chrétienne*, in *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges H. de Lubac*, I, Paris 1963, 189-222 (important bibl. of patristic texts). See further F.E. Robbins, *The Hexaemeral Literature. A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis*, Chicago 1912; *Hexaméron*: DTC 6, 2335-2339; *Pentateuque chez les Pères*: DBS 7, 687-708; A. Levene, *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, London 1951; T. Jansma, *Investigation into the Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*: Oudtestamentische Studien, Leiden 12 (1958) 69-182; G.T. Armstrong, *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche. Die drei Kirchenväter*, Tübingen 1962; A. Quacquarelli, *La Genesi nella letteratura dei Padri anteniceni*: RivBib 15 (1967) 471-495; M. Simonetti, *Profilo storico dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1981; W. Horbury, *Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers*: Mikra 291 (1988–1990) 727-787; M. Simonetti, *Lettera e/o allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985; A. Louth - M. Conti (eds.), *Genesis 1–11*, ACCS, OT 1, Downers Grove, IL 2001; M. Sheridan, *Genesis 12–50*, ACCS, OT 2, Downers Grove, IL 2002.

2. *The creation*: E.W. Moeller, *Geschichte der Kosmologie in der Griechischen Kirche bis zu Origenes*, Halle 1860; P. Duhem, *Le système du monde. Histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic*, 5 vols., Paris 1913–1917; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, Tübingen 1951; C. Tresmontant, *La métaphysique du christianisme et la naissance de la philosophie chrétienne. Problèmes de la création et de l'anthropologie des origines à s. Augustin*, Paris 1961; L. Scheffczyk, *Schöpfung und Vorsehung* (HDG II, 2a), Freiburg 1963; H.F. Weiss, *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinensischen Judentums*, TU 97, Berlin 1966; U. Früchtel, *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien*, Leiden 1968; E. Peters, *What Was God Doing Before He Created the Heavens and the Earth?*: Augustiniana 34 (1984) 53-74; J.C.M. van Winden, *Hexaemeron*: RAC 14 (1988) 1250-1269; B.W. Anderson (ed.), *Creation in the Old Testament* (Issues in Religion and Theology, 6), London 1984, 65-73; E. Pagels, *The Politics of Paradise. Augustine's Exegesis of Genesis 1–3 versus That of John Chrysostom*: HTR 78 (1985) 67-100.

3. *Typology of Genesis*: J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum futuri. Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*, Paris 1950; Id., *Bible et liturgie*, Paris 1951; Id., *Théologie du Judéo-christianisme*, Tournai 1957; Id., *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique*, Tournai 1961; B. Vawter, *On Genesis. A New Reading*, New York 1977.

4. *The account of the beginnings*: C.F. Burney, *Christ as the ARXH of Creation*: JTS 27 (1926) 160-177; A. Orbe, *Hacia la primera teología de la procesión del Verbo*: Est. Valentinianos 1, Rome 1958; Id., *En los albores de la exégesis johannea*: Est. Valentinianos 2, Rome 1955; Id., *La teología del Espíritu Santo*: Est. Valentinianos 4, Rome 1966; J. Pépin, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne (Ambroise, Exam. I,1,1-4)*, Paris 1964; F. Szabó, *Le rôle du Fils dans la création selon s. Ambroise*: Augustinianum 7 (1967) 258-305; var. aus., *In principio. Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse*, Paris 1973; J.C.M. van Winden, *The Early Christian Exegesis of "Heaven and Earth" in Genesis 1,1*, in Studia J.H. Waszink, Amsterdam 1973, 371-382; A. Tarabochia Canavero, *Esegesi biblica e cosmologica. Note sull'interpretazione patristica e medievale di Genesi 1,2*, Milan 1981; W. Witakowsky, *The Idea of Septimana Mundi and the Millenarian Typology of the Creation Week in Syriac Tradition*: Symposium Syriacum (1988–1990) 93-110; K.E. Greene-MacCreight, *Ad Litteram. How Augustine, Calvin and Barth Read the 'Plain Sense' of Genesis 1–3*, Frankfurt am Main 1999.

5. *The creation of human beings*: DSp 4, 1772-1788; H. Karpp, *Probleme altchristlicher Anthropologie. Biblische Anthropologie und philosophische Psychologie bei den Kirchenvätern des dritten Jahrh.*, Gütersloh 1950; H. Merki, *Von der platonischen Ausgleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Freiburg 1952; Y. Congar, *Ecclesia ab Abel*, in FS Adam, Düsseldorf 1952, 79-108; A. Orbe, *Cristo y la Iglesia en su matrimonio anterior a los siglos*: Estudios Ecl. 29 (1955) 299-344, H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*, Paris 1956; R. McL. Wilson, *The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen 1,26*: SP 1 (TU 63) (1957) 420-437; E. des Places, *Syngeneia. La parenté de l'homme avec Dieu, d'Homère à la patristique*, Paris 1964; P. Schwanz, *Imago Dei als christologischanthropologisches Problem in der Geschichte der Alten Kirche von Paulus bis Clemens von Alexandrien*, Leipzig 1966; A. Orbe, *Antropología de San Ireneo*, Madrid 1969; G. Visonà, *L'uomo a immagine di Dio. L'interpretazione di Genesi 1,26 nel pensiero cristiano dei primi tre secoli*: Studia Patavina 27 (1980) 393-430; S. Zincone, *Il tema dell'uomo/donna immagine di Dio nei Commenti paolini e a Gn di area antiochena (Diodoro, Crisostomo, Teodoro, Teodoreto)*: AnSE 2 (1985) 103-113.

6. *The sin of Adam*: R. Laurentin, *L'interprétation de Gen 3,15 dans la tradition jusqu'au début du XIII[e] siècle*, Paris 1954; H.G. Leder, *Die Auslegung der zentralen theologischen Aussagen der Paradieseserzählung in der ältesten Literatur des Judentums und in der alten Kirche*, Greifswald 1960; M. Harl, *La prise de conscience de la "nudité" d'Adam. Une interprétation de Gen 3,7 chez les Pères grecs*: SP 7 (TU 92) (1966) 486-495; E. Testa, *Il peccato di Adamo nella Patristica*, Jerusalem 1970; A. Orbe, *"Ipse tuum calcabit caput" (S. Ireneo y Gen 3,15)*: Gregorianum 52 (1971) 95-150, 215-271; P.F. Beatrice, *Le tuniche di pelle. Antiche letture di Gen. 3,21*, in *La tradizione dell'enkrateia*, ed. U. Bianchi, Rome 1985, 433-484; E. Pagels, *Adam and Eve and the Serpent in Genesis 1–3* (Occasional Papers of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity), Claremont, CA 1988.

7. *Augustine*: *Les Confessions*, ed. A. Solignac: BA 13-14 (1962); *De Genesi ad litteram*, ed. A. Solignac: BA 48-49 (1972); G. Pelland, *Cinq études d'Augustin sur le début de la Genèse*, Montréal-Tournai-Paris 1972.

8. *The patriarchs*: H. Moretus, *Les bénédictions des Patriarches dans la littérature du IV[e] au VIII[e] siècle*: BLE 10 (1909) 398-411; M. Simonetti, *Note su antichi commenti alle benedizioni dei Patriarchi*, Cagliari 1961. *Noah*: J.P. Lewis, *A Study of the Inter-*

pretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature, Leiden 1968; Y. Frot, *L'interprétation ecclésiologique de l'épisode du Déluge chez le Pères des trois premiers siècles*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 335-348;. *Melchizedek*: J.L. Ska, *Melchisedech*: DSp 10, 967-972; G. Bardy, *Melchisedech dans la tradition patristique*: RBi 35 (1926) 496-509; 36 (1927) 25-45; G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese*, Giessen 1927; F.L. Horton, *The Melchisedech Tradition. A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Cent. and in the Epist. to the Hebrews*, Cambridge-London 1976. *Abraham*: T. Klauser, *Abraham*: RAC 1, 21-25. *Isaac*: J. Daniélou, *Typologie d'Isaac*: Biblica (1947) 363-393; J. Gribomont, *Isaac le Patriarche*: DSp 7, 1992-2005; D. Lerch, *Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet, Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Tübingen 1950; M. Harl, *La "ligature" d'Isaac (Gen. 22,9) dans la Septante et chez les Pères grecs*, in *Hellenica et Judaica*, Leuven 1986, 457-472. *Jacob*: P.M. Guillaume, *Jacob le Patriarche*: DSp 8, 8-14; S. Pricoco, *La scala di Giacobbe. L'interpretazione ascetica di Gen. 28,12 da Filone a S. Benedetto*: Regulae Benedicti Studia 14/15 (1985–1986) 41-58; G.M. Vian, *Interpretazioni giudaiche e cristiane antiche del sogno di Giacobbe (Gen. 28,10-22)*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 307-332. *Joseph*: A.W. Argyle, *Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching*: Exp. Times 67 (1955-56) 199-201; M. Dulaey, *Joseph le Patriarche, figure du Christ*, in *Figures de l'AT*, Strasbourg 1989, 83-105.

9. *The theophanies*: B. Kominiak, *The Theophanies of the OT in the Writings of St. Justin*, Washington DC 1948; L. Thunberg, *Early Christian Interpretations of the Three Angels in Gen 18*: SP 7 (TU 92) (1966) 560-570; G.T. Armstrong, *The Genesis' Theophanies of Hilary of Poitiers*: SP 10 (TU 107) (1970) 203-207.

G. Pelland

GENESIUS of Arles (d. 303?). Probably martyred under the reign of *Diocletian, he is mentioned as eaerly as *Prudentius (*Perist.* 4,35) and *Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* 8,3,157). The *Vita* of *Apollinaris of Valence (BHL 634) attests *pilgrimages to the tomb of Genesius. According to his oldest *Passio* (BHL 3304) he was a **notarius* who refused to register some edicts of *persecution and therefore was condemned to death. His feast, 25 August, coincides with the feast of the Roman martyr Genesius, an actor, of whom we known nothing: it is probable that at the origin of the cult of the Roman derived from the martyr of Arles, whose popularity caused many duplications and transfers both in *Gaul and elsewhere in W Europe.

BHL 3304-3310; 3315-3326; BS 6, 115-117; 121-124; S. Cavallin, *S. Genès le notaire*: Eranos 43 (1945) 150-175; A. Amore, *I Martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 102-103.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

GENEVIÈVE of Paris (ca. 422–ca. 502). Born ca. 422 at Nanterre, she was noticed in 429 by *Germanus of Auxerre and, still adolescent, received the virgins' veil from the hands of the bishop Vilicus. She had a basilica built in honor of St. Denis. She was a pilgrim at *Tours to venerate St. *Martin. When Paris was besieged by *Attila (451), she kept the morale of her compatriots high, earning the admiration even of the Frankish kings *Childeric and *Clovis. She died on a 3 January around 502 and was buried in the basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul, which later took her name, in which Clovis and *Clotilde were interred a little later. In 1793 her bones were burnt and her precious reliquary melted by the Revolutionary government. She is the patron of *Paris and is venerated in the church of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont. Her *Vita* (BHL 3335), composed around 520, exists in three principal recensions, whose historical reliability is much disputed.

BHL 3334-3350; BS 6, 157-164; LCI 6, 361-365; LMA 4, 1237; BBKL 2, 206-207; J. Dubois - L. Beaumont-Maillet, *Ste. G. de Paris*, Paris 1982; M. Heinzelmann - J.-C. Poulin, *Les Vies anciennes de s. G. de Paris*, Paris 1986.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

GENNADIUS of Constantinople. Patriarch, 458–471. Before his episcopal consecration, he opposed the *anathemas of *Cyril of Alexandria and supported the decisions of *Chalcedon (451). As patriarch he remained faithful to the council and engaged in the struggle against the *monophysites. An energetic administrator, he united a synod against simoniacs which confirmed the relevant prescriptions (458). He wrote to *Martyrius of Antioch on the reconciliation of *heretics with valuable information on the sects of the time and on canonical discipline of the *sacraments of initiation. Few of his works survive: some disciplinary epistles and fragments of **catenae* (above all on *Genesis and on the Pauline epistles) in which he reveals himself to be a follower of Antiochene literalism, esp. to the positions of *Theodore of Mopsuestia. No trace remains of his commentary on *Daniel and of his *homilies (Gennadius of Marseille, *De vir. ill.* 91).

CPG 5970-5986; DSp 6, 203-204; BS 6, 132-134; PG 85, 1623-1668; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 15), Münster i.W. 1933, 352-422; F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica* (OCA 117), Rome 1938, 54-108; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (ST 201), Vatican City 1959, 183-185; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs des Psaumes* (ST 264), Vatican City 1970, 318; S.J. Voicu, *Gennadio di Costantinopoli. La trasmissione del frammento In Hebr. 9,25*: OCP 48 (1982) 435-437.

S.J. Voicu

GENNADIUS of Marseille (d. after 496). The scarce information we have on his life comes from the last chapter of *De viris illustribus*, modeled on the autobiographical one that closes the homonymous work of *Jerome. Rejected today as spurious, after having been considered for a long time as authentic, this nevertheless appears credibly to have been composed in an environment and time close to Gennadius. From it we learn that Gennadius was a priest of the church of *Marseille (Gennadius is called *Massiliensis* by *Cassiodorus: *Inst. divin. lit.* I, 17,2: PL 70, 1134B), still alive at the time of Pope *Gelasius (492–496) and author of a great number of heresiological works: eight books *Against All the Heresies*, five *Against Nestorius*, ten *Against Eutyches*, three *Against Pelagius*, homilies on the millennium and the *Apocalypse of John and a letter *De fide*, sent to Gelasius. These have all been lost. Gennadius himself alludes to other writings, likewise lost: a *Catalogus haereticorum* (perhaps to be identified with the tract *Against All the Heresies*) and translations of Greek writers, such as the *monophysite bishop of Alexandria *Timothy and *Evagrius of Pontus (*Vir. ill.* 73,11).

The *De viris illustribus* is a catalog of Christian writers of the 5th c., composed as a continuation of that of Jerome and divided into 101 chapters, some of which are spurious and include additions of unknown redactors. The profiles are brief and often elusive, but they derive for the most part from direct knowledge and offer a valuable panorama of the intellectual and spiritual life of *Gaul in the 5th c. Despite following Jerome's example in its essential characteristics, Gennadius departs from it in other aspects: by not turning the Greco-Latin culture into either an object of polemic nor an inevitable and spontaneous point of reference, by the greater attention given to monastic culture, by the dominant ecclesiological interest and by his inclination to group the writers acc. to a thematic affinity. The work of Gennadius and that of Jerome immediately circulated together (Cassiodorus, *Inst. divin. lit.* I, 17,2: PL 70, 1134BC and *Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* VI,6: PL 82, 237B), and in the MS tradition they have also sometimes been transmitted without a break between one and the other. The work was not written in a single burst in a unified way, but by putting together notes and files drafted in many years of study. Three blocks of chapters can be distinguished in it with certainty, composed at a notable interval from one another. The last of these was composed between 474 and 476 (Diekamp, Feder). The accusation of "*semi-Pelagianism" that scholars (from Tillemont to now) have made against Gennadius, to the point of making the *De viris* a polemical writing composed with a specific anti-*Augustinian intention (Czapla, Feder), is absolutely unfounded.

A *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*, at other times attributed to Augustine or Isidore of Seville, has been ascribed to Gennadius with likelihood. The work is a summary of the principal Christian dogmas and refutes rapidly the major heresies. Pelagian deviations are not recognizable in this work either. Gennadius has also been proposed as the author of a small canonical collection which has reached us with the title *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* (Munier) (CPL 1776; CCL 148,162-188).

CPL 957-959; PL 58, 979-1120; *De viris inlustribus*, ed. E.G. Richardson, TU 14, Leipzig 1896; *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*, ed. C.H. Turner: JTS 7 (1905) 78-99; *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*: PL 56, 103-107 and 879-889; B. Czapla, *Gennadius als Literarhistoriker* (Kirchengesch. Studien 14,1), Münster i.B. 1898; F. Diekamp, *Wann hat Gennadius seinen Schriftstellerkatalog verfasst?*: RQA 12 (1898) 411-420; G. Morin, *Le Liber Dogmatum de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s'y rattachent*: RBen 24 (1907) 445-455; M. Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Liter.*, IV, 2, Munich 1920, 552-554; A. Feder, *Der Semipelagianismus im Schriftstellerkatalog des Gennadius von Marseille*: Scholastik 2 (1927) 481-514; Id., *Die Entstehung und Veröffentlichung des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs*: Scholastik 8 (1933) 217-232; Id., *Zusätze des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs*: ibid., 380-399; Ch. Munier, *Les Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, Paris 1960; Id., *Gennade*: DSp IV, 205-208; S. Pricoco, *Storia letteraria e storia ecclesiastica. Dal "De viris inlustribus" di Girolamo a Gennadio*, Catania 1979; C. Riggi, *La figura di Niceta di Remesiana secondo la biografia gennadiana*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 189-200; DHGE 20 (1984) 477-479; G.M. Pintus, *Eucherio di Lione nella cronologia di Gennadio e Marcellino*: Studi Medievali 25 (1984) 795-812; P.J. Galán Sánchez, *Evolución del género cristiano De uiris illustribus. De S. Jerónimo a Gennadio de Marsella*, in Actas del VIII congreso español de estudios clásicos, II, Madrid 1994, 651-658.

S. Pricoco

GENRES, LITERARY. The characterization of the particular modes in which literary expression is realized brought to light the notion of literary genres; above all the authority of the tradition was decisive for their establishment in Greek and Latin literature. This fixed for oratory three genres: the deliberative, the judicial or forensic, and the demonstrative or epideictic. The encomiastic genre was added later.

Classic texts for the history of the literary genres are the *Poetics* of Aristotle and the *Ars poetica* of Horace (*Ep.* 11,3). In particular Aristotle speaks of epic and of tragedy (but he only offers an ample analysis of the latter) as characteristic genres. The ancient theory is normative and prescriptive, rigidly distinguishing the genres and indicating in a hierarchy that is reflected in a social differentia-

tion as well as an expressive one: in tragedy and in epic the figures of heroes, kings and nobles appear; in comedy the middle classes are represented; satire and farce give voice to the common people and to the facts of daily life. Thus it was in the ancient theater; but at the same time the agreement between content and expression was manifest, and therefore a precise stylistic gradation prevailed. In a later era it became clear that the science of genres has no single tradition and is not inspired by a single teaching. In other words, it is not possible to defend the immutable character of classical genres: every culture in fact has its genres, therefore their number is not limited nor are the canons immutable for the authors. It has been written that the literary genre is an "institution." "One can work through, express oneself through, existing institutions, create new ones, or get on, so far as possible, without sharing in polities or rituals; one can also join, but then reshape, institutions" (R. Wellek - A. Warren, *Theory of Literature*, 226). These observations are perfectly appropriate to the early Christian writers. In synthesis, it can be said that Christian writers, with the characters, capacities and the gifts that distinguish each one, in part accepted the literary genres spread through the pagan world; in part they renewed them; in part they created new ones in facing the interior and exterior exigencies to which they had to respond. To give just a few examples, think of the profound adaptations that ancient biography underwent to become hagiographic literature, or the classical *oratio* to become Christian *homily. On another note, consider the substantial novelty constituted by the *Acta* or by the *Passiones* of the martyrs, or again by the *Acta apostolorum* and by the gospels.

As for the stylistic gradations linked to the genres, these also went through a notable transformation. E. Auerbach has remarked on it (*Literary Language*, 39 and passim) with regard to Augustine: he has a model in Cicero, "but he rejected Cicero's assumption that each level of style corresponded to a class of subject matter. The themes of Christian literature, he held, are all sublime." And yet, given that the character of the doctrine (at the same time sublime and difficult), the audience to whom it is addressed (humans in general), the end on which it was intent (conforming the lives of all to the model of Christ), it was expressed, acc. to necessity, in the "lowly" style, in the "intermediate" and in the "sublime": which is to say that the tripartition of expression has a great practical value for Christian *catechesis and homiletics (E. Auerbach, ibid.). In this vision, a dynamic prospective of the literary phenomenon is proposed, acc. to which the genres are in continual transformation.

Regarding Christian literature, from its earliest writings one is present "at an encounter, or better a mixture of literary genres whether classical or Hebrew." This, in short, aligns with "the Hellenistic norm of the 'Kreuzung der Gattungen': even if—as in archaic Greece—the laws are not expressly formulated" (Alfonsi). *See also* *commentaries; *exegesis; *hagiography; *letter (epistle); *panegyric;* parable;* poetry, Christian; *poetry, Syriac; *sayings of Jesus; *sermon.

E. Auerbach, *Literatursprache und Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike und im Mittelalter*, Bern 1959 (Eng. tr., *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages,* Princeton 1993); R. Wellek - A. Warren, *Theory of Literature*, New York [3]1956 (1st ed. 1949); H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, Munich [2]1973; L.E. Rossi, *I generi letterari* e *le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche*: BICS 18 (1971) 72ff.; var. aus., *I generi letterari nella Patristica*. Atti del III incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, maggio 1974: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 381-699 (for an orientation, see the introductory speech of L. Alfonsi, ibid., 451-458); J. Fontaine, *Unité et diversité du mélange des genres et des tons chez quelques écrivains latins de la fin du IV^e siècle. Ausone, Ambroise, Ammien*, in *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'Antiquité Tardive en Occident*, Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1977, 425-472; Id., *Comment doit-on appliquer la notion de genre littéraire à la littérature chrétienne du IV^e siècle?*: Philologus 132 (1988) 53-73; F.J. Tovar Paz, Tractatus, sermones atque homiliae. *El cultivo del genero del discurso homilético en la Hispania tardoantigua y visigótica* (Resumen de la Tesis presentada para la obtención del grado de Doctor), Caceres 1992; J.-C. Fredouille, *L'apologétique chrétienne antique. Métamorphose d'un genre polymorphe*: REAug 41 (1995) 201-216.

P. Siniscalco

GENSERIC (d. 477). King of the *Vandals from 428 to 477. Son of a slave woman, he succeeded his half brother Gunderic, king of the Vandals and of the Alans. From the Iberian peninsula where he was living, Genseric led his people into *Africa (429) on the invitation of the *magister militum* Boniface, who in the hope of liberating the territory from the presence of the *Goths, trusted himself to an even more fearful enemy. After having conquered Africa, he succeeded in obtaining the recognition of his reign from the emperor *Valentinian III, who accepted the Vandals as *foederati* of the empire (435). The siege of the city of *Hippo should be mentioned, which lasted 14 months, during which St. Augustine died (430). A few years later (439), Genseric broke the treaty and conquered Hippo and *Carthage, starting a long war. In 455 he headed in the direction of Rome with a giant army. Pope *Leo the

Great (440–461), as he had done before with *Attila (452), parleyed with the Vandal king, obtaining agreement that the inhabitants be spared. The city, however, was sacked, and the empress herself, Licinia Eudoxia, was taken as a hostage with her two daughters. In 468 the emperor *Leo I began a military campaign against the Vandals, which turned out to be useless and disastrous for the Byzantine empire. After the conquest of Sicily, which Genseric ceded to *Odoacer upon payment of an annual tribute, the Vandal kingdom covered an immense territory, including all the N coast of Africa. Of *Arian faith, Genseric persecuted the *Catholics and exiled their bishops. With his death began the decline of his people.

Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, Paris 1955; F. Giunta, *Genserico e la Sicilia*, Palermo 1958; P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire de grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris 1964, 115-139, 183-190; E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, 2. *De l'avènement de Dioclétien (284) à l'occupation germanique de l'Empire romain d'Occident (début du VI[e] siècle)*, II, Paris 1979, 508-513, 566-631; M.E. Gil Egea, *Piratas o estadistas. La política exterior del reino vandalo durante el reinado de Genserico*: Polis. Revista de ideas y formas políticas de la antigüedad clásica 9 (1997) 107-129; L. Gatto, *Storia di Roma nel Medioevo*, Rome 2000, 73-77; N. Francovich Onesti, *I Vandali. Lingua e Storia*, Rome 2002; Storia del Cristianesimo 3, 246-273; H.-W. Goetz - F. Farnut - W. Pohl (eds.), *Regna and Gentes. The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformations of the Roman World*, Boston 2003, 55-83.

G. Pilara

GENTILES. A term that acquired a fundamental importance in both the Jewish and Christian religions, designating, originally, populations that had developed from the same stock (Dt 7:6) and, at a later time, the pagan polytheist peoples in opposition to Jewish and Christian monotheism (Ps 2:1.8; 1 Cor 5:1; 12:2; 1 Th 4:5; 1 Pt 2:12, etc.). In the OT, the opposition most often refers to that between Israel (people of God) and pagans (Gentiles) in a racial context that, with the approach to the NT, was absorbed by the religious one. In the prophetic vision, the primacy of Israel and the obligations that derive from it do not preclude the participation of the Gentiles (= the nations) in the construction of the history of all humanity, even if such participation takes on aspects of punishment (Is 8:9; 10:5-16; Jer 24:8-9; Hos 8:10), since there is a single Lord of the one and the others (Jer 3:17; 10:7; Hag 2:6-9; Zech 8:20-23; 14:16, etc.). While the phenomenon of proselytism signals a certain openness toward the Gentiles within the Judaism of the time of Jesus Christ, the community of Qumran used a different language: impious, idolaters (1QpHab 12,13; 13,30); enemies of God (1QM 12,11). Yet they will recognize the faithfulness and the glory of God (1Qh 6,12).

In the NT the racial distinction lost its importance; the distinction founded on primacy in religion, however, remained, but profoundly modified toward a sense of a salvation open to all people (Mt 28:19-20; Mk 16:15-16), acc. to which the Gentiles are no longer strangers without hope and without God in this world (Eph 2:12). In the patristic literature the religious distinction maintained itself in particular among the *Apologists (*Aristides, *Justin). Beyond the usual meaning (2 *Clem.* 13,2.3; 17; Ign., *Trall.* 8,2; *Smyrn.* 1,2; Pol., *Philp.* 10,2; 11,2.4; very frequent in the *Shepherd* of *Hermas; *Ad Diog.* 11,1.3), the term appears in opposition to the Jews (*Heracleon in Orig., *Jo* 13,16; *Hom. Clem.* 2,19, Athan., *Lit. enc.* 3.4) and to the Christians (Hermas, *Mand.* 10,1,4; Hipp., *Ib.* 7,19; Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 3,8; *Ib.* 2,13; Or., *Hom. 1, 7 in Jer.*, 2 *Clem.* 17,4). As a substantive (Clem. Alex., *Ib.* 6,6; Athan., *Apol.* 2,14, attached to "Arians") and adjective together with "vulgar" it means pagan (Clem., *Paed.* 2,6,1).

J. Pierron - P. Grelot, *Nazioni*: Diz. Teol. Bibl., Bologna [2]1967, 660-669; C. Gancho, *Gentili*: Enc. della Bibbia, III, Turin 1970, 674-677; H. Bietenhard, ἔθνος, κτλ: Diz. Conc. Bibl. NT, Bologna 1976, 1318-1322; Id., λαός: ibid., 1322-1326, M. Simon - A. Benoit, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo*, Bari 1978, passim; D. Ruiz Bueno, *Padres apologetas griegos* (II c.), term in index (BAC 116), Madrid 1979; Lampe, 407.

E. Peretto

GEORGE, monk and presbyter (7th c.). Heresiologist and computist who lived in the 1st half of the 7th c. He was unknown, even in name, until his existence was discovered at the end of the 14th c. by Diekamp, who published extracts of two treatises by George, preserved in a MS in the Vatican Library (Gr. 2210), one of which is a computational treatise and the other a brief heresiological treatment. Fifty years later, M. Richard discovered in the Mt. Athos monastery of Vatopedi a more complete MS of the heresiological treatise. These writings reveal nothing of the identity of George, other than his attachment to Chalcedonian orthodoxy. (1) *On the Heresies*, in fifteen chapters, is dedicated to a certain Epiphanius. The first eight deal with various ancient heresies, from *Manicheism to various forms of *gnosticism up to a heresy of *Melchizedek. The following seven chapters have to do with the various heresies and the most important heretics: *Origenism (ch. 9), *Apollinaris (ch. 10), *Nestorius, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Diodore of Tarsus, *Paul of

Samosata and *Photinus (ch. 11), *Eutyches and *Dioscorus (ch. 12), the *Severians, *Theodosians, *Jacobites and *tritheists (ch. 13), *Julian of Halicarnassus and *Gaianus of Alexandria, *aphthartodocetists (ch. 14) and *Agnoetae (ch. 15). The longest chapter by far is that on Origenism, so much so that even in the MS of Vatopedi some of its parts have been summarized. George draws on the *Panarion* of *Epiphanius, on the *De sectis* of the late 6th c. and on the *anathemas of Origenism approved at the fifth ecumenical council. The absence of any mention of *monoenergism or monothelitism suggests a date prior to the promulgation of the **Ekthesis* in 638. (2) Diekamp has published two extracts of the treatise *On the Date of Easter* (or two extracts of different but rigidly similar treatises), which deal with the paschal cycle and how it is situated within the succession of years from the foundation of the world. Together with the **Computus ecclesiasticus* of *Maximus, it is the first computational treatise to give evidence of the so-called Byzantine epoch. It is dated in the year of indiction 638–639, the year of the promulgation of the *Ekthesis* on the part of the emperor *Heraclius.

CPG 7820-7822; F. Diekamp, *Der Mönch und Presbyter Georgios, ein unbekannter Schriftsteller des 7. Jahrhunderts*: ByzZ 9 (1900) 14-51; M. Richard, *Le traité de Georges hiéromoine sur les hérésies*: REB 28 (1970) 250-269 (= Id., Opera Minora III, Turnhout-Leuven, 1977, n. 62); Id., *Les "Chapitres à Épiphane sur les hérésies" de Georges hiéromoine (VII[e] siècle)*: EHBS 25 (1955) 331-362 (= Id., Opera Minora III, Turnhout-Leuven, 1977, n. 61); V. Grumel, *La chronologie*, Paris 1958, 111-128; DHGE 20, 622-623.

A. Louth

GEORGE CHOIROBOSKOS (8th c.?). George Choiroboskos (it is uncertain if this nickname ["swineherd"] is a family inheritance or indicates one of his occupations during his youth) is indicated in the MSS as διάκονος, χαρτοφύλαξ, μέγας γραμματικός and οἰκουμενικὸς διδάσκαλος of *Constantinople. In the past he has been placed between the 6th and the 10th c.; in more recent times W. Bühler and Chr. Teodoridis (*Johannes von Damaskos terminus post quem für Choiroboskos*: ByzZ 69 [1976] 397-401) have maintained that his activity took place between 750 and 825; most recently Chr. Theodoridis (*Der Hymnograph Klemens terminus post quem für Choiroboskos*: ByzZ 73 [1980] 341-345) supposed that he was a contemporary of *Photius (9th c.). He was the author of lessons on various aspects of grammar, collected and transmitted to us ἀπὸ φωνῆς by his disciples, used by Constantine Laskaris and Urban of Belluno, some having survived in their entirety, others in fragments (Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte* VII, 2, 2, 1079-1080). Among these, the *Epimerismi in Psalmos* should be mentioned, i.e., grammatical explanations (of the Psalms and of the Odes), known by the author of the *Etym. Gudian.* (PWK 3, 2366) and which show formal ruggedness of style and of argument justified by the form of transmission of the text.

CPG 7955; Th. Gaisford, *Georgii Choerobosci dictata in Theodosii canones et epimerismi in Psalmos*, III, Oxford 1842, 1-192; L. Cohn, *Choiroboskos*: PWK 3, 2363-2367; Krumbacher, 583-585; Bardenhewer V, 99; Beck 468; ODB 2, 425; Ch. Theodoridis, *Der Hymnograph Klemens terminus post quem für Choiroboskos*: ByzZ 73 (1980) 341-345.

A. Labate

GEORGE GRAMMATICUS (6th c.). A writer, very likely of the 6th c., author of an encomium of St. Barnabas in two recensions (or of two different encomia: the MS tradition offers two different *incipit*), as yet unpublished. The identity of this George with the poet George Grammaticus, disciple of the epic poet *Colluthus, has not been demonstrated.

CPG 7414-7415: BHG 218 a-b; Beck 400.

F. Scorza Barcellona

GEORGE MEGALOMARTYR (d. 303?). His *Passio* is entirely legendary and romantic. The soldier George of Cappadocia was martyred under Dacian (Diocletian?) at Lydda-Diospoli in Palestine, killed several times and always miraculously resuscitated again (martyr of indelible life). The oldest redaction of the legend is BHG 670, which seems to go back to the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th c. and to come from Asia Minor; the most widespread redaction is BHG 671. It is difficult to establish what the authentic nucleus is; some scholars have erroneously hypothesized that George was derived from the pagan cult of Tammuz, Horus, Perseus or Mithras. The veneration of George began in Lydda where, from the 5th c., a *Martyrium* was built above the tomb of the martyr (CCL 175, 116, 142, 229-233). Already in the 5th c. there were two versions of the legend in Latin, but at the beginning of the 6th c. the Gelasian decree (*see* *Decretum Gelasianum) forbade reading them. Probably for this reason a "revised" version was composed in Merovingian *Gaul, more respectful of history. In the West the ancient date of the feast was 24 April (*Mart. hier.*: 25 April); Rome and Naples observed the Byzantine date: 23 April (*Sacramentarium Gregorianum*; Marble calen-

dar of Naples; *Synax. Eccl. CP*). *Gregory of Tours mentions the translation of relics to Limoges and Le Mans (*Glor. mart.* 101). At Rome, *Belisarius entrusted the port of S. Sebastian to the protection of the saint (BS 6, 518); from the 7th c. there are mentions of the church of S. Giorgio in Velabro (CCL 175, 337; MS of Berlin of the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* [in the edition of C. Mohlberg of the *Sacr. Veronense*]; Duchesne LP 1, 360), and the head of George, discovered in the Lateran Patriarchium by Pope Zachary, was transferred there (Duchesne LP 1, 434). In 896 the head was transferred to Reichenau-Oberzell, on Lake Constance. From the 6th-7th c. George appears in art as the killer of a dragon.

BHG 669-691; BHL 3363-3406; BHO 309-322; Verzeichnis 67; LCI 6, 365-390; BS 6, 512-531; BBK 2, 208-209; TRE 12, 380-385; E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*, Tübingen 1904, 239-242; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938, 49-51; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926, repr. Rome 2000; W. Buchowiecki, *Handbuch der Kirchen Roms* 2, Vienna 1970, 49-63; G. Didi-Huberman et al., *Saint Georges et le dragon*, Paris 1994; P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient*, Paris 1985; S. Anneser et al. (eds.), *Sanct Georg. Der Ritter mit dem Drachen*, Lindenberg 2001.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

GEORGE of Alexandria (7th c.). Patriarch of Alexandria, successor of *John the Almsgiver, probably in 620. From him has reached us a *Vita* of *John Chrysostom, a compilation based principally on the *Dialogue on the Life of Saint John Chrysostom* of *Palladius.

CPG 7979. P.R. Norton, *The Vita S. Chrysostomi by Georgius Alexandrinus*: CPh 20 (1925) 69-72; C. Baur, *Georgius Alexandrinus*: ByzZ 27 (1927) 1-16; F. Halkin, *Douze récits byzantins sur S. Jean Chrysostom* (Subs. Hag. 60), Brussels 1977, 69-301.

A. Louth

GEORGE of Laodicea (d. 360?). A priest of *Alexandria, an *Arian of radical leanings, he was deposed by *Alexander (ca. 320) and did not succeed in having himself admitted by *Eustathius to the clergy of *Antioch, where he had moved. Back on the scene at the time of the anti-Nicene reaction, he was in line to be elected bishop of Antioch (ca. 328), but *Euphronius was preferred to him. Sometime later he was elected bishop of Laodicea (Syria), where around 342 he excommunicated *Apollinaris, as a Nicene and friend of *Athanasius. The latter would number him many times among his most bitter enemies. The Westerners reunited at *Serdica (343) excommunicated him as an Arian leader, even though he did not participate in the council. At the death of *Leontius he aspired to the cathedra of Antioch, but was supplanted by *Eudoxius. With time George had moderated his initial Arianism a great deal, so that, disturbed by the radical Arian propaganda (*anomoian), which Eudoxius was favoring at Antioch, he wrote to *Basil of Ancyra, inviting him to oppose it. Basil replied with the Council of *Ancyra of 358, whose synodal letter, a political manifesto of the *homoiousian theology, was signed, not only by Basil, but also by George, just as another explanatory document of the next year was. In the Council of *Seleucia he was among the leaders of the homoiousian faction. Nothing is known however of provisions regarding him from the Council of *Constantinople of 360, which saw the deposition of the principal homoiousian exponents. Since *Acacius ordained in 360 another bishop of Laodicea, we must deduce that George was deposed or died precisely at that time. *Theodoret (*HE*) presents him of Arian tendency in a rhetorical contest that took place at Antioch in 360: but perhaps he has confused George of Laodicea with *George of Alexandria, also called the Cappadocian.

CPG II, 3555-3558; DCB 2, 637-638; Simonetti 590.

M. Simonetti

GEORGE of Pisidia (7th c.). Poet and Byzantine hagiographer of the 1st half of the 7th c. A native of Antioch of Pisidia (Asia Minor), he moved to *Constantinople, where he was deacon and *sceuophylax* (sacristan) of the "Great Church" (Hagia Sophia) and *referendarius* or patriarchal nuntius to the emperor *Heraclius at the time of the patriarch *Sergius (610–638), his spiritual master and friend. In 622–623, in his role as imperial counselor, he took part in the first Byzantine expeditions against *Persia. He was still alive between 631 and 634. The poetic work of George, only partially preserved, derives from 619/620 through just after 630. The first poems exalt the arrival of Heraclius victorious over Phocas and his victories against the Avars and above all against the Persians with the recovery of the Holy Cross. The more recent poems sing the work of the six days of creation (**hexameron*) and the *resurrection of Christ, reflect on the vanity of human life, and combat the *monophysitism of the "impious" *Severus (of Antioch). In prose only a *Vita* survives of the contemporary martyr St. Anastasius or, more precisely, a *panegyric of the heroic virtues of this personage, martyred in Persia in 628.

CPG 7827-7839; BHG 86; PG 92, 1197-1753; EC 9, 1751; A. Pertusi, *Giorgio di Pisidia, Poemi. I: Panegirici epici*, Ettal 1960; F.

Gonnelli, *Giorgio di Pisidia, Esamerone*. Intr., critical text, It. tr. and indices, Pisa 1998; *Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia*, ed. L. Tartaglia (Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina), Turin 1998; S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina da Costantino agli iconoclasti*, Bari 1965, 264-268, 363-364; N. Radošević, *L'Hexaemeron di Giorgio di Pisidia e la sua traduzione slovena* (in Serbian), Belgrade 1979; P. Speck, *Zufälliges zum Bellum Avaricum des Georgios Pisides*, Munich 1980; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, 2, Rome 1988, 88f.; ODB 2, 838; Patrologia V, 48, 103-105; M. Whitby, *Defender of the Cross. George of Pisidia on the Emperor Heraclius and His Deputies*, in *The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 183), ed. M. Whitby, Leiden-Boston 1998, 247-273; Id., *George of Pisidia's Presentation of the Emperor Heraclius and His Campaigns. Variety and Development*, in *The Reign of Heraclius (610–641). Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.I. Reinink - B.H. Stolte, Leuven 2002, 157-173.

D. Stiernon

GEORGE of Sykeon (Eleusios). Monk and Byzantine hagiographer (6th–7th c.). Eleusios by name, he was born in the obscure village of Adigermara, in *Galatia, to parents previously sterile who had implored the prayer of the nearby St. Theodore of Sykeon. While still a child (*nepios*), he was entrusted by them to the *monastery of St. George of Sykeon (Galatia) founded by St. Theodore. Under the monastic name of George, he was for twelve years (601–613) a disciple of the saint. Having become **hegumen* of that monastery, he wrote the *Vita* of the defunct master (d. 613), gathering from eyewitnesses or those worthy of belief the facts prior to his familiarity with the saint. Even if it is not free of hagiographic clichés, the *Vita* is an important document for the religious history of Asia Minor in the 7th c.

CPG 7973; BHG 1748; BS 12, 263-265; A.-J. Festugière, *Vie de Théodore de Sykeôn*, Brussels 1970, I, 160-161; II, 160-165; Patrologia V, 151.

D. Stiernon

GEORGE of the Arabs (d. 724). Bishop of the nomadic tribes of Christian Arabs of Mesopotamia from 686, this illustrious imitator of *Jacob of Edessa belongs to that generation of *monophysite theologians, literary and philosophical, who cast a critical gaze over their own traditions. George is not only the translator and commentator of Aristotle, the author of **scholia* on the homilies of *Gregory of Nazianzus, but there is also preserved a correspondence by him with the monks of the region of *Aleppo and other works of an essentially liturgical character; some of these, less important, seem to be of dubious authenticity. The most notable are a metrical *homily on the *Myron* and an "explanation of the mysteries of the church" (*sacraments). A. Vööbus found another four *mēmrē*, of which two have been published: *On the Life of Severus of Antioch* and *On Palm Sunday*.

Baumstark 257-258; Ortiz de Urbina 183-184; S.P. Brock, *Syriac Studies. A Classified Bibliography (1980–1990)*, Kaslik 1996; Patrologia V, 491-493; A. Vööbus, *The Discovery of New Important "Mēmrē" of Giwargi, the Bishop of Arabs*: Journal of Semitic Studies 18 (1973) 235-237; K.E. MacVey, *The Mēmra on the Life of Severus of Antioch, Composed by George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes*, thesis, Cambridge, MA 1977; F. Rilliet, *Une homélie métrique sur la fête des hosannas attribuée à Georges évêque des Arabes*: OC 74 (1990) 72-102; D. Miller, *George, Bishop of the Arabs, on the Philosophy*: ARAM 5 (1993) 303-320.

F. Rilliet

GEORGE the Cappadocian. Originally from *Cappadocia and of *Arian leanings, he was seated with force on the episcopal throne of *Alexandria at the beginning of 357, in place of *Athanasius, through the will of the emperor *Constantius. He immediately inaugurated a policy of terror toward the partisans of Athanasius, who were exposed to violence of various kinds. The pagans too suffered harassment and abuses from him, so that an uprising that broke out toward the end of 358 forced him to leave Alexandria. He took part in the Council of *Sirmium of 359, and in those of *Seleucia of 359 and of *Constantinople of 360 as a proponent of Arianism. It was perhaps he, and not *George of Laodicea—as *Theodoret indicates (*HE* II, 31)—who took part in the rhetorical contest held in 360 at *Antioch on the interpretation of Pr 8:22, together with *Meletius and *Euzoius. Having returned to Alexandria 26 November 361, four days after the announcement of the death of Constantius his protector, he was the victim of another popular uprising in which pagans and Christians participated. Thrown in prison, on 24 December he was pulled by force by the people and lynched, together with two civil servants of the imperial administration.

EC 6, 445; DCB 2, 638-640; Simonetti 590; DHGE 602-610; M. Caltabiano, *L'assassinio di Giorgio di Cappadocia (Alessandria, 361 d.C.)*: Quaderni Catanesi 7 (1985) 17-59; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim, esp. 518-527.

M. Simonetti

GEORGIA

I. Christian origins - II. Architecture - III. Painting and sculpture.

I. Christian origins. Georgia (*Sak'art'vel* in Georgian), a region of the Caucasus, corresponds to the two ancient regions of Colchis, to the W, and *Iberia, to the E; it lies between the Black Sea, *Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey. The W part had undergone Greek influence starting from the 6th c. BC; in 65–64 BC Iberia became a Roman protectorate. The two regions are separated by mountainous zones (Surami Ridge). The E part, from the 4th c., was under *Sassanid influence and often the scene of combat between Byzantines and Persians; the W part, on the other hand, had greater relations first with the Roman Empire and then with the Byzantine until the 10th c.

*Rufinus's story about the apostolate of Saint Nino and the *evangelization of Iberia, written only a few decades after the event, is today considered a reliable source, partly because the information contained therein was narrated to Rufinus (d. 410) in the first person by the Christian Bacurius (Rufinus, *HE* 1,10-11), of the royal family of Iberia, between 394 and ca. 397. The narration of Rufinus is confirmed by later sources. Bacurius could have been the Roman *tribunus* of whom *Ammianus Marcellinus also speaks (31,12, 16) and the governor of *Palestine (PLRE 1, 144; Braund 246ff.): the events took place, as Rufinus himself specifies, at the time of Constantine, when the King Mirian (265–342) sat on the throne of Iberia. Despite the geographic position of the region, traversed by the grand commercial arteries on the route between Europe and Asia, it seems that Christianity penetrated there relatively late. Its origins remain obscure: the reports about its claimed evangelization on the part of the apostle *Andrew, transmitted by late sources (in particular by the "Georgian annals," compiled in the 18th c. on the basis of older documents), are hardly reliable. Legendary likewise is the story of the Tunic of Christ. It is, however, probable that the coastal regions encountered the Christian religion first and were, already at the time of Constantine, organized into dioceses—Patrophilus of Pityus (Bichvinta), at the NW extremity of Abkhazia, was present at the Council of *Nicaea—and from there was propagated to the interior. Similarly, a penetration of Christianity from Armenia and Syria is possible.

In any case, the first Georgian bishop attested in the sources seems to be John (Ioane, ca. 335–363), ordained, acc. to Rufinus, by *Alexander of Constantinople, even if, at least until the 8th c., the time of Bishop Ioane III (744–760), the *catholicoi* of Iberia were ordained in Antioch. During the reign of Vahtang (446–499) there was already a **catholicos* in the capital, Mcxeta; the Georgian church became autocephalous. It seems that the first *catholicos* of Georgian origin was elected only in the 6th c. He was Saba I (523–552): later, toward the end of the century, the separation occurred between the Armenian and Georgian churches, under the *catholicos* Kirion II (595–610), with the rejection of *monophysitism and the adherence to the Council of *Chalcedon. In the Council of *Dvin (505–506), in Armenia, the bishops of Georgia and Armenia accepted the **Henotikon* of the emperor *Zeno.

After the siege and sack of Tbilisi at the hands of the Khazars (627), Georgia fell under Byzantine domination. At the same time, the first Arab invasions took place: after brief periods of understanding with the local populations, at the beginning of the 8th c., an emir, with seat at Tbilisi (in 655), was put at the head of the country's administration, while the W regions were at least nominally under Byzantine rule. Under the impulse of the Bagratide dynasty, which reigned for twelve centuries, the unifying movement that developed following these events (the reunification occurred toward 1008 with Bagrat III), was largely based on Georgian monks who had built, in the occupied territories and esp. in the Tao, numerous monasteries, propulsive centers of Georgian culture. Monasticism and Georgian monasteries constitute the most notable aspect of the Georgian civilization of this period: the movement further counted numerous monasteries in all the E, and esp. in Palestine (see in particular the convent of the Holy Cross at *Jerusalem), where the most ancient inscriptions in the Georgian language have been found (430) in the monastery of St. Theodore. One of the leaders of the Georgian monastic movement is considered to be the monophysite Peter the Iberian, or "the Georgian" (413–ca. 489), later bishop of Maiuma (*Gaza), nephew of the Christian king of Iberia Bosmarios. Another Georgian monastic settlement of particular importance was that called Clibanon, having arisen near the monastery of St. *Simeon the Stylite the Younger on the *Mons Admirabilis* near Antioch, of which there is mention until ca. the 13th c.: the Georgian monastery also included a *scriptorium* where, acc. to the sources, numerous liturgical and patristic texts were translated into Georgian. Later, Georgian monastic communities were established in Egypt, in the Sinai, at Constantinople, on Olympus of Bithynia and on Athos, where in the 10th c. the famous μονὴ τῶν Ἰβήρων was founded. Saintly Georgian monks such as St. Gregory of Khandzta, St. Serapion of Zarzma, St. Saba of Ishkhan were universally known, and their monasteries still exist. These latter were esp. located in the Tao, a region that was the cradle of the

independence and the unification of Georgia, whose first king was a Bagratid of Tao, Ashot I (786–826): with him opens the golden age of unified Georgia.

II. Architecture. From the sources (Rufinus) we know that the same Saint Nino, after having converted the Georgian people and King Mirian to the Christian religion, had a church built in the capital of Iberia, Mcxeta, acc. to her plans. This was probably a building of limited dimensions, as the examination of the surviving constructions of the 4th c. in Georgia permits us to hypothesize: among these, the church of the monastery of Nekressi should be mentioned, a single-aisle structure, with an apse included within a rectilinear wall and a crypt. From the earliest architectural evidence it is possible to identify the use of a building technique that would be peculiar to Georgia, i.e., a screen of stone blocks with an internal conglomerate, a structure of ancient local tradition, whose use would determine those technical and formal solutions specific to this area.

Constructions of modest dimensions still appear at the beginning of the 5th c., such as the church of the monastery of Dzveli-Chouamta and that of the Forty Martyrs of Nokalakevi, and the first significant Georgian basilicas date only to the end of the century. The Sion of Bolnissi should be mentioned in particular. It was begun, as an inscription specifies (one of the most ancient in Georgian, in uppercase letters [*Asomtavruli*]), in 478–479 and finished in 492–493. The name *Sion*, widely used in Georgia, is linked to the Sion of Jerusalem, the basilica of the Dormition of the Virgin, and in Georgian it has become a synonym of *basilica*, in particular one dedicated to the Virgin. The building, with three aisles, divided by pilasters, and a semicircular apse, is surrounded on the sides by a portico and probably should be interpreted as the historical prototype of a typology that became popular in the Caucasus (F.W. Deichmann, *Bolnissi*, 316–321).

The constructions of the 6th c. are more numerous. In this period, alongside longitudinal plans, numerous buildings on a central plan appear, specifically tetraconchal (e.g., Dzveli-Gavazi) and polylobate (the cathedral of Ninotsminda). The central plan building would thereafter have a widespread diffusion in Georgia, where the local architects created new solutions: it should be underlined that, at least up to the end of the 6th c., the cupola rested on the perimeter walls, and only in the 7th c. would the use of four free pilasters be introduced, on which the weight of the central cupola partially rests, such as in the church of Tsromi (626–634), where this system appears for the first time. Still in the 6th c. appears a particular type of worship building, limited to Georgia only, namely, the "basilica of three churches," a definition suggested by the analysis of the internal structure, not revealed by the exterior, of the buildings belonging to this typology. The central nave is cleanly separated from the side aisles with full walls, so as to define three more or less independent architectural units: consider in this regard the church of Zegani dated to the 7th c. (V. Beridze, *Architecture*, 77-80). The most important building of this period is the Church of the Holy Cross at Mcxeta-Djvari, built between 586 and 604 on commission for the Prince Stephan on the spot where, acc. to the tradition, a cross desired by Saint Nino had been placed. It is a mature work that is the result of a series of constructive experiences and experiments that had proceeded in the region for more than a century. It is a tetraconch with four protruding rectangular areas, with the E-W axis particularly emphasized; the cupola rests on a drum and its weight is borne on the angle niches and on the perimeter walls: the exterior is well correlated with the interior, of which it announces every articulation. The *iconography of the building, in tetraconch, would later have great popularity in the 7th c. in Georgia (the Sion of Ateni, constructed, as an inscription explains, by the Armenian architect T'odosak') and, later, in the 10th c. Just as for Armenia, this is a tradition originally foreign to the region, probably entering from N Syria, where numerous examples are known, and therefore translated by the local craftsmen who interpreted independent of the prototypes and with numerous variations the original theme of the tetraconch.

Alongside the churches of the Djvari type (G. Čubinašvili, *I monumenti del tipo Ǧvari*), two examples appear later of a tetraconch with ambulatory, Bana and Ishkhan. The first, originally considered to date to the end of the 9th c., has recently been assigned to the 7th, together with the remains of the second, incorporated into a later building: both should be attributed to the building activity of the Armenian *catholicos* Nerses III the Builder (641–661), born at Ishkhan. In this regard, however, we are probably dealing with the antecedents of Zvart'noc and not with monuments derived from this key building of Armenian architectural culture, as is commonly held, and in particular Bana, as can be deduced from the analysis of the surviving capitals of the S apse, still *in situ*: they are basket capitals, a kind widely spread throughout Armenia. In these constructions the correspondence between the lower part in basket-weave and the upper part is not

very successful and lacks unity; besides, classicizing decorative motifs prevail, of which, however, it is not easy to discover the archaeological sources in this area. At Zvart'noc, on the other hand, the surviving examples are defined with a greater completion, the parts corresponding perfectly, and the basket motif predominates. The capitals of Bana, an ancient episcopal see, moreover, are therefore more archaic, so much as to allow the proposal of a date earlier than either Zvart'noc or the age of Nerses III: the terms of the question of the provenance of Ishkhan and above all of Bana from Zvart'noc should therefore be reconsidered, even if the hypothesis advanced is later accepted.

From the middle of the 8th to the end of the 10th c. the region was the theater of great battles for political and territorial unity. In this period, as has been seen, the activity of the monasteries, centers of Georgian culture, multiplied, and a great number of monastic edifices rose, some of which exist up to now. Among these, the church of Kvelatsminda should be mentioned, of the type called "of three churches," covered by two cupolas on the axis, the only example in the Caucasus, and perhaps the oldest phase of the church of the monastery of Ikalto, quadrangular, with a cupola on four disengaged pilasters. The variety of the iconography and the coverings, the different types of construction that were explored at this time, however difficult, anticipated the great artistic and cultural flowering of the 10th-13th c., which allowed Georgian architecture to occupy a distinguished position, independent of the contemporaneous Western and Eastern architectural experiments, in the framework of posticonoclastic Byzantine architecture.

III. Painting and sculpture. The study of medieval Georgian *painting is of exceptional interest because of the iconodoule position of the Georgian church, and it is within this optic that the most ancient cycles should be investigated, providing probably useful fragments for the reconstruction, even if only partial, of the difficult problem of the figurative arts in the iconoclast period. It should also be taken into account that precise offshoots from Byzantine art, properly called, emerge from the analysis of the pictorial production, in contrast with the autochthonous and independent position of the architecture. For the period between the 5th and 9th c. the testimonies are scarce. Of particular interest are the surviving fragments of the apsidal *mosaic of Tsromi (7th c.) in which Christ is represented between two *angels, a canonical iconography in the region, of which many examples have been preserved (esp. with regard to the contemporaneous plastic production): from the fleeting remains of the image of Christ can be noted the monumental setting of the figure and his vigorous expressionism, characteristics which also mark the coeval Georgian *sculpture and that will be found in later cycles (e.g., Ošk, 1066), and the generic references to the Sassanid decorative repertory of the *palm cornice that mark the apsidal dome.

The frescoes of the rupestrian convents of the David Gareža and of the cupola church of Dodo are dated to the 9th c.: in the later cycle Christ is represented, in the apse, between two archangels and, below, a cherub and a seraph on flaming wheels, together with the symbols of the evangelists. Here also the entire composition reveals evident conservative traits, a particular fact of Georgian painting. The near-constant presence in the iconographic programs of the representation of the *Deisis*, a very widespread image in the Caucasus, should be underlined. Often the most hierarchically significant spot is reserved for it, the apsidal semi-dome: one of the most ancient images of the East is the *Deisis* in enamel of the Cross of Martvili (late 8th-early 9th c.).

This is eminently architectural decoration, never entirely in the round, which develops, from the first meaningful manifestations (e.g., the capitals of the Sion of Bolnissi, late 5th c.), along the lines of an aesthetic discourse always aligned with the local traditions, both from a stylistic and an iconographic point of view. The decorative programs always foresee, as the fulcrum of the composition, the triumph of the cross, a concept of Palestinian origin (see the tympana of Djvari), which also appears in the pictorial cycles. Another particular motif of the Georgian tradition is the nearly constant presence of the donors, from ancient edifices such as Mcxeta (late 6th c.) to finished examples such as Ošk Vank in the Tao (mid 10th c.), where the donors, in a unique example in the Caucasus, Syria and Asia Minor, show the square halo, symbol of a living person.

EAA² 2, 742-747; EAM 6, 540-548 (1995); RAC 17, 12-106; LTK³ 4, 490-493; M. Tamarati, *L'église géorgienne des origines jusqu'à nos jours*, Rome 1910; P. Peeters, *Le début du Christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques*: AB 50 (1932) 5-58; G. Čubinašvili, *Tsromi*, Moscow 1969 (in Russian); W. Ponomarew, s.v. *Georgien*, RBK Stuttgart 1971; W. Beridzè, *Architecture géorgienne paléochrétienne*: CCAB 20 (1973) 63-111; N. Thierry, *La peinture médiévale géorgienne*: ibid., 409-422; G. Čubinašvili, *I monumenti del tipo Ǧvari*, Milan ²1974; W.Z. Djobadzè, *Materials for the Study of Georgian Monasteries in the Western Environs of Antioch on the Orontes*, CSCO 372, Subs. 48, Louvain 1976; F. Gandolfo, *Propyläen-Kunstgeschichte; Suppl. 1: Spätantike und frühes Christentum*, s.v. Georgien, Berlin 1977; B. Vakhtang, *L'architecture religieuse géorgienne des IVᵉ-VIIᵉ siècles*: IIᵉ Symposium international sur l'art géor-

gien, Tbilisi 1977; W.F. Deichmann, *Zur Entwicklung der Pfeilerbasilika. die Basilika von Bolnissi*: Bedi Karth 36 (1978) 316-324; M. Falla Castelfranchi, s.v. *Georgia*, in Enc. Univ. dell'Arte, Rome 1978; K. Salia, *Histoire de la nation géorgienne*, Paris 1980; O. Lordkipanidze, *The Graeco-Roman World and Ancient Georgia (Colchis and Iberia)*, in *Modes de contacts et processus de transformations dans les sociétés anciennes*, Rome 1983, 123-142; M. van Esbroeck, RAC, Suppl. 1985, 257-266; H. von Skerst, *Der Gralstempel im Kaukasus. Ur-Christentum in Armenien und Georgien*, Stuttgart 1986; I. Reissner - B. Coulie, *La Géorgie. Histoire, art, culture*, Turnhout 1990; O. Lordkipanidze, *Archäologie in Georgien von der Altsteinzeit bis zum frühen Mittelalter*, Wientheim 1991; D. Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity. A History of Colchis and Transcausian Iberia 550–AD 562*, Oxford 1994; M. Manana Dzumberovna, *Spätantike und frühchristliche Mosaike in Georgien*, Vienna 1995; N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le Grand Schisme d'Orient*, CSCO 574, Subs. 100, Louvain 1999; *Santa Nino e la Georgia. Storia e spiritualità cristiana nel Paese del Vello d'oro*, Atti del I Conv. Int. di studi georgiani, ed. G. Shurgaia, Rome 2000; E.M. Synek, *Georgia's Conversion to Its Female Apostle*, in *Christianizing People and Converting*, ed. G. Armstrong - I.N. Wood, Turnhout 2000, 3-13.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

GEORGIAN LANGUAGE and LITERATURE. The Georgian language does not belong to the Indo-European family, nor to the Semitic group, nor to the Turanian families. Georgian is the only Caucasian language of which the writing began after the 1st half of the 5th c. The oldest inscription is doubtless that in a mosaic in the desert of Bethlehem; the oldest dated inscription however is that of the church of Bolnissi of 494, 20th year of Peroz. It appears that the same person who created the Armenian script also created the Georgian. The beginnings of Georgian literature are closely linked to Armenian literature. Only when, at the beginning of the 7th c., the Georgian church separated from the Armenian did the literary influence also grow weaker. Georgian literature began with translations, first of all of the Bible. The old translation derives from the old Armenian translation, which itself was also influenced by the readings of the Syriac **Diatessaron*. The Georgians translated from Greek, Armenian, Syriac and Arabic. The most important centers of Georgian literary production were far from the homeland, e.g., in the monastery of St. *Sabas near Jerusalem and that of St. *Catherine in the *Sinai peninsula. From 980 the Georgian Church adhered to the Church of Byzantium. During that time original works were written, as well as translations and elaborations of Greek works, revisions of works already translated from the Armenian and now revised based on the Greek originals. The largest centers were a Georgian monastery on Athos and another in *Antioch. (Among the most important original works were secular texts such as *The Knight with the Panther's Skin* by Šotha Rustaveli [n. 1172], the epic of Sargis and the chivalrous epic *Abdulmesia* of Giovanni Šatveli.)

An overview of the whole has been presented by M. Tarchnišvili - J. Assfalg, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (ST 185), Vatican City, 1955. Taken from the *History of Literature* edited by K. Kekelidze, this work describes different literary genres and about 74 Georgian authors: from the martyrdom of Saint Shushanik by Jacob of Tsurtav in the 6th c., up to Jonas Khelašvili who wrote in 932. There are also numerous anonymous translators. The *Bible, the *apocrypha, *exegesis, dogmatics, polemics, *hagiographies, *ascetic writings, *homilies, *poetry, *liturgy and canon law are all represented. For spiritual literature, significant additional material can be found in DSp 6,244-256 (s.v. *Georgia*). It is very useful to add to Tarchnišvili the bibliographies of three Georgian specialists who more than any others have studied the ancient Christian literature: K. Kekelidze, Akaki Shanidze and Ilia Abuladze, Muséon 76 (1963) 443-480; 80, 431-474; 82, 405-442. The latter has published a corpus of the Georgian hagiography in Georgian, described in AB 89 (1971) 419-420 and 98 (1980) 409-421. For liturgy and in particular for *hymnography, the works published at Tbilisi are of great importance for rediscovering the existing forms of the ancient rite of Jerusalem, before the Byzantinization of worship in the holy city. For the importance of homiletic, see M. van Esbroeck, *Les plus anciens homéliaires géorgiens*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1975.

It often happens that texts lost in Greek survive in Georgian. The *palimpsests, often very ancient, help to rediscover the ancient form of texts already altered in Greek. The publication "Bedi Kartlisa," edited in Paris, regularly offers recensions and articles in different fields of scientific activity on ancient Georgian Christian literature. Concerning the authors, difficult to identify, of the great corpus of the *Annals of Georgia*, in Georgian "Life of Georgia: Kartlis Tskhovreba," a well-done analysis has been provided by Toumanoff, *Medieval Georgian Historical Literature (VIIth-XVth Centuries)*: Traditio 1 (1943) 139-182. The accumulation of old chronicles, their combination to give an appearance of unity, make of such *Histories* of the kings of Georgia a whole that has still been but little explored, despite the numerous efforts of I. Džavakhišvili and I. Berdzenišvili, many times reprinted and reunited in collections. The art institute of Tbilisi is no less active: the Christian architecture of the old churches of Georgia constitutes a wonder for all the

historians of art who have not yet pushed their research so far. Georgian literature has never been touched by Islam. It expresses itself in the epic or poetic categories of Iran prior to Islam. The very ancient diaspora in the *monasteries of *Palestine, then at *Constantinople, at Antioch, in the Sinai and on the Black Mountain near Antioch have preserved MS treasures that are subjects of current study through the Institute of Manuscripts at Tbilisi, and an entire library is being recorded with all the desirable accuracy, giving an inestimable quantity of information. In canon law E. Gabidzašvili has published the *Didi Sdžuliskanoni* (Tbilisi 1975), a translation of the Greek collection of 14 titles; this is further completed by the map sketched by David the Builder around 1105 (543–559).

In every period the literary activity of the Georgians appears unusual. The life of Saint Nino, the apostle of the Georgians, is a whole of great complexity. Despite certain literary links with the *Ecclesiastical History* of *Rufinus, who around 400 already narrates the episode, the larger part of the account is completely autonomous. Contemporaneous research has also begun to print in their entirety MSS of great importance, such as the homilary of Mount Sinai of 864, published in full in 1959. There is, further, the Šatberd MS 1141 of the 11th c., a collection reproduced for the most part in PO for the texts attributed to *Hippolytus, and the MS of the British Museum Or. 11281, collected by Vies, written in the 11th c. but translated based on an Arabic model. It is enough, for the moment, to go through the Georgian translations in the CPG to realize the importance of the period covered. Often these texts, translated in antiquity, conserve details that point toward a better comprehension of the reworkings that have occurred in the Greek tradition in the slow march of the centuries. The Georgian church offers the singular circumstance of having followed the henotic movement under Zeno and Anastasius, but not having completely eliminated the documents of that period, documents condemned under *Justinian in all the Greek MSS. Very early they were conformed to Justinian and the prior traditions were rewritten. One should remember such circumstances when one studies ancient Georgian texts.

M. Tarchnišvili - J. Assfalg, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur auf Grund des ersten Bandes der georgischen Literaturgeschichte von K. Kekelidze* (Studi e testi 185), Vatican City 1955; G. Garitte, *Bibliographie de K. Kekelidze (d. 1962)*: Muséon 76 (1963) 443-480; Id., *Bibliographie du Prof. A. Sanidze*: ibid. 80 (1967) 431-474; Id., *Bibliographie d'Ilia Abuladze*: ibid. 82 (1969) 405-442; Akademija Nauk Gruzinskoj SSR, *Russko-Gruzinskij Slovar'*, Tbilisi 1956; K. Tschenkeli, *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*, Zürich 1958, I-II; *Glossarium Ibericum in Epistolas Paulinas antiquioris versionis*, ed. J. Molitor, Louvain 1976, CSCO 373, Subs. 49; T. Shimomiya, *Zur Typologie des Georgischen*, Tokyo 1978; N.F. Sosiašvili, *Korpus gruzinskich nadpisej*, Tbilisi 1980; A.C. Harris, *Georgian Syntax*, Cambridge 1981; E.J. Furnée, *Beiträge zur georgischen Etymologie*, Leuven 1982; J. Gipperti, *Iranica armeno-iberica*, Vienna 1993; B. Outtier, *Langue et littérature géorgiennes*, in M. Albert et al., *Christianismes orientaux. introduction à l'étude des langues et des littératures* (Initiations au christianisme ancien), Paris 1993, 261-296; J.N. Birdsall, *The Old Syriac Gospels and the Georgian Version. The Question of Relationship*, in *VI Symposium Syriacum*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1994, 43-50; H. Fähnrich, *Grammatik der altgeorgischen Sprache*, Hamburg 1994; B. Outtier, *La documentation en patristique géorgienne*, in *La documentation patristique. Bilan et prospective*, ed. J.-C. Fredouille - R.-M. Roberge, Paris 1995, 181-184; M. van Esbroeck, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge. Études historiques sur les traditions orientales*, Aldershot 1995; G.B. Hewitt, *Georgian. A Structural Reference Grammar*, Amsterdam 1995; E. Khintibidze, *Georgian-Byzantine Literary Contacts*, Amsterdam 1996; B. Outtier, *À propos des traductions de l'arabe en arménien et en géorgien*: Parole de l'Orient 21 (1996) 57-63; G. Shurgaia, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in georgiano*, in *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società*. 3: *I greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 1053-1070; G. Shurgaia, *La spiritualità georgiana. Martirio di Abo, santo e beato martire di Cristo di Ioane Sabanisze* (La spiritualità cristiana orientale 3), Rome 2003.

M. van Esbroeck - I. Ramelli

GERASENE DEMONIAC (iconography). Among the numerous episodes of the exorcism of demons reported in the gospels, only that performed by Christ in the country of the Gerasenes (Mt 8:28-34; Mk 5:1-20; Lk 8:26-39) was included in ancient Christian iconography. The only example of the theme of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac we have during the formative period of Christian iconographical production may be an early 3rd-c. fresco done in the attic of the mausoleum of *M. Clodius Hermes*, under the complex of the *Basilica Apostolorum* at Rome. The composition presents at the center a nude male character, kneeling and clearly turned toward a figure before him in a *tunica clavata*; on the right of the scene a herd of swine descends headlong toward a stretch of water. Only in the 5th c. did iconography again take up this scriptural theme: we find it in the wall decoration of a church building (Ravenna, S. Apollinare Nuovo, 6th c.), on liturgical objects, as in the ivory pyxes of Darmstadt and of the Hermitage of Leningrad (Volbach, n. 170, pl. 86 and n. 179, pl. 90), and in the diptychs of Murano and of the Louvre (Volbach, n. 125, pl. 66 and n. 144, pl. 76). In these examples, the formulation of the scene reflects the pericopes of Mark and Luke in which only one demoniac is mentioned. Matthew's version, which speaks of *duo habentes daemonia* (8:28), finds its figurative tradition in a miniature of the codex of

Rabbula (6th c.) and in the diptych of Yerevan (Volbach, n. 142, pl. 75, 6th c.). On the iconological level, at least for the 3rd c., the scene of the demoniac may convey an obvious polemical message against the ineffective exorcism rituals practiced by magi and pagan enchanters, perhaps reflecting the exegetical tradition of the Fathers, who always used this evangelical theme in polemical contexts (Feliers). In a later period the theme of the demoniac, like other NT episodes, came to assume a more specifically narrative character, aimed at illustrating Christ's power as a thaumaturge.

W. Artelt, s.v. *Besessene*: LCI 1, 273-277; C. Cecchelli - G. Furlani - M. Salmi (ed. and comm.), *The Rabbula Gospels*, Olten-Lausanne 1959, f. 8b, 59-60, J. Feliers, *L'exégèse de la péricope des porcs de Gérasa dans la patristique latine*: SP 10, Berlin 1970, 225-229; U.M. Fasola, *Lavori nelle catacombe*: RivAC 54 (1978) 7-13; C. Carletti, *Pagani e cristiani nel sepolcreto della "piazzola" sotto la basilica Apostolorum a Roma*: VetChr 18 (1981) 287-307.

C. Carletti

GERASIMUS, hermit (d. 475). Born in *Lycia (Asia Minor), he established himself as a hermit in the region of the Dead Sea. Initially he did not accept the decisions of the Council of *Chalcedon, but thanks to *Euthymius, he returned to Chalcedonian orthodoxy, and toward 453 he founded a *laura, a novelty at that time, which would become famous and later carry his name. This was located about 6 km (3.7 mi) S of Jericho and to the N of the Dead Sea (the present locality of Deir Hajla). The monks still lived as hermits in their own cells (or caves) for five days a week and came together Saturday and Sunday for common meals and for the celebration of the *Eucharist in the **cenobium*, which included church, kitchen, refectory, storage, residences for the abbot, the presbyters and other persons, e.g., places for the training of the novices. Gerasimus demanded that on Saturday they bring the fruit of their labor, share food—and wine also—and that they return to their cells Sunday evening carrying food and the material for manual labor. They were not allowed to keep lamps, hot beverages or to cook food; the monks could own a coat, a tunic and little else. The cells had to remain open when the hermits were absent. The monastery of Gerasimus continued until the 12th c.; at the end of the 19th a new one was built in the neighborhood. *John Moschus recounts several episodes of the monastery, including the anecdote that Gerasimus took a thorn out of the paw of a lion, who later remained faithful to him for five years (*Spiritual Meadow*, ch. 107). Through the similarity of names with Jerome, the episode was later also attributed to *Jerome, who is often represented in *iconography with a lion. The feast of Gerasimus occurs on 5 March both in the West and in the Syriac world (in the Byzantine *synaxaria*, 4 or 20 March).

BHG 393-396f; 695f-648d; AASS, mart. I, 386-389; BS 6, 199-200; DHGE 20, 828-829; LTK³ 4, 496; LCI 6, 391-393; Y. Hirschfeld, *Gerasimus and His Laura in the Jordan Valley*: RB 98 (1991) 419-430; *Nel deserto accanto ai fratelli. Vite di Gerasimo e di Giorgio di Choziba di Anonimo dell'VIII secolo – Antonio di Choziba*, intr., tr. and notes by L. Campagnano Di Segni, Comunità di Bose, Magnano 1991; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ. The Monasteries of Palestine 314–631*, Oxford 1994; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism. A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Washington DC 1995 (see index).

A. Di Berardino

GERMANUS of Auxerre (ca. 378–448). Born at Auxerre ca. 378, trained as a lawyer at *Autun and at *Rome, he was a high imperial civil servant, but later (7 July 418) was ordained bishop of his native city. He was a defender of the poor oppressed by taxes; he restored and built civil and sacred buildings; and he participated actively in the religious life of his time. He encouraged *Geneviève of Paris in her religious vocation. He also went twice to *Britain (429 and 445) to oppose *Pelagianism there, and he contributed to the education of *Patrick, apostle of *Ireland, whom he consecrated bishop (432). He died on the occasion of a visit to the court of *Ravenna (31 July 448). His body was returned in triumph to Auxerre (1 October 448), where his veneration began immediately. All of his writings have been lost; there remains a *Vita* composed in 480 by the priest *Constantius of Lyons (BHL 3453).

BHL 3453-3464; BS 6, 232-236; BBKL 2, 225-226; R. Borius, *Constance de Lyon. Vie de S. Germain d'Auxerre*: SC 112, Paris 1965; G. Le Bras - É. Gilson (eds.), *S. Germain d'Auxerre et son temps*, Auxerre ²1955; E.A. Thompson, *S. Germanus of Auxerre and the End of Roman Britain*, Woodbridge 1984.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

GERMANUS of Capua (d. ca. 541). *Gregory the Great records that at the very moment of Germanus's death St. *Benedict saw his soul rise to heaven in a globe of fire (*Dialogues* II, 35, SC 260, 236-242), while Pope *Hormisdas called him a "most religious man" (*Collectio Avellana* 149, CSEL 35/2, 598.2-4). Germanus was an authentic pioneer of ecumenism, destined to have a brilliant posthumous fortune in the Cassino area, where in 873 his relics were moved by the will of Emperor Louis II. Son of one Amantius, having been left an orphan, he distributed all

his goods to the poor in order to dedicate himself to an *ascetic life (*Vita Germani*, in B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum*, Paris ²1910, 583). As bishop of *Capua, in 519–520 he led the pontifical delegation sent to Constantinople concerning the *Acacian schism (LP I, 100-101, 270) and succeeded in brilliantly overcoming the conflicts that for the first time had seen the Church of Rome solidly opposed to that of the East (*Collectio Avellana* 148, CSEL 35/2, 594), facing with great shrewdness delicate problems such as the *Theopaschite question raised by the Scythian monks (ibid. 216, CSEL 35/2, 675-6), the calculation of the date of *Easter (ibid. 185, CSEL 35/2, 642) and the reintegration of some Chalcedonian bishops deposed by the emperor *Anastasius (ibid. 171, CSEL 35/2, 627-8). He presumably died in 541.

A. Lentini, *Due legati papali a Costantinopoli nel secolo VI. Germano di Capua e Sabino di Canosa*, in Atti del IV Congr. Naz. di Studi Romani, Rome 1938, 3-11; Id., *S. Germano, vescovo di Capua*, Montecassino 1963; Id., *Germano, vescovo di Capua, santo*: BS VI, Rome 1965, 237-239; Id., *Il "Libellus" portato a Bisanzio da Germano di Capua*, in *Il contributo dell'arcidiocesi di Capua alla vita religiosa e culturale nel Meridione*, Rome 1967, 343-349; Id., *La legazione bizantina di Germano di Capua nel "Sanctuarium Capuanum" di Michele Monaco*, in *Michele Monaco e il seicento capuano*, ed. P. Borraro, Salerno 1980, 47-54; Id., *Germain de Capoue*: DHGE XXVIII, 905-906; var. aus., *Germano di Capua (d. 541 ca.). Ambasciatore ecumenico a Costantinopoli e modello di santità per il Cassinate*, ed. F. Carcione, Venafro 1999.

P. Marone

GERMANUS of Constantinople (d. ca. 733). Patriarch of *Constantinople from 715 to 730, he is a saint celebrated by the Byzantine Church and by the Roman *Martyrology 12 May. There is useful information about him in the *Vita Germani* (BHG 697). The year of his birth is likely between 631 and 649 (BS 6, 243-244). His father, the patrician Justinian, had occupied important posts under *Heraclius and was later condemned to death by Constantine IV Pogonatos. Germanus was made a eunuch at that time and made a member of the clergy of Hagia Sophia of which he later, toward 678, became the *primicerius*. Metropolitan of Cyzicus in the Hellespont in 705 (but perhaps also before: DTC 6, 1301), he was called in August of 715, under the emperor Anastasius II, to occupy the patriarchal seat of Constantinople (E.W. Brooks, *On the Lists of the Patriarchs of Constantinople from 638 to 715*: ByzZ 6 [1897] 33-54). Perhaps already in that same year he called a synod of a hundred prelates or so to anathematize the followers of *monothelitism. A firm defender of images, after having assured himself of papal support, he opposed the emperor from 726 (when *Leo III the Isaurian intensified his iconoclastic campaign, perhaps promulgating an edict: Fliche-Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, V2, 595-596), and was forced by him to abdicate in January 730. This date is accelerated to 729 by H. Hubert (*Observations sur la chronologie de Théophane et de quelques lettres des papes [726–774]*: ByzZ 6 [1897] 495-496). He took refuge in the paternal property of Platanion, where he died at a very advanced age toward 733. Buried in the monastery of Cora, he was excommunicated in the iconoclastic synod of 754 and definitively rehabilitated at the Council of *Nicaea II in 787.

We do not have all the works of Germanus: some were destroyed by Leo III and by successive iconoclastic emperors.

1. Epistulae (complete list in CPG): *Ad Iohannem episcopum Synadensem* (Mansi XIII, 100B-105A), *Ad Constantinum episcopum Nacoliae* (Mansi XIII, 105B), *Ad Thomam episcopum Claudiopoleos* (Mansi XIII, 108A-128A), *Ad Armenios*. The first three letters, in defense of the cult of the images, are of great interest for the reconstruction of the origins of the dispute but of little literary value; the fourth—the Greek original has been lost, but a Latin translation based on an Armenian text has survived—attempts to explain to the monophysite Armenians the decrees of the Council of *Chalcedon and the teaching of the Fathers, esp. of *Cyril of Alexandria, on the two natures of Christ.

2. Homiliae: Numerous homilies have been transmitted under the name Germanus. For the most part they are dedicated to the celebration of the Virgin. Since, however, the homiletic tradition does not usually add the ordinal number of the patriarchs, they could also belong to Germanus II and, less probably, to Germanus III. The following can be considered authentic: *In Annuntiationem* (BHG 1145n-q); *In S. Mariae zonam* (BHG 1086); *De Praesentatione* (BHG 1076w: the first part is lost); *De Acathisto* (BHG 1130s: despite this attribution, the institution of the feast of the *Acathistus by Germanus is not certain); I and II *In Praesentationem* (BHG 1103-1104); I, II and III *In Dormitionem* (BHG 1119, 1135, 1155: they are found united in some codices; the first two were part of a trilogy from which the third seems alien. See G. Chevalier, *Les trilogies homilétiques dans l'élaboration des fêtes mariales*: Gregorianum 18 [1937] 372-376). Doubts remain about the authenticity of the homilies *De Dormitione* (BHGa 1146q), *De Translatione cinguli Dei Genitricis* (BHG 1147: in the codices it also appears under the names of Nicetas Syncellus, Nice-

tas Paphlagonius and Theodore Graptus, but it is perhaps from George of Nicomedia: Beck 475); *In S. Mariae zonam* (BHG 1123g: unpublished); *In Zachariam* (BHG 1881m: unpublished). The following belong to Germanus II: *In vivificam crucem* (BHG 451; PG 98, 221-244) and *In Domini corporis sepulturam* (PG 98, 244-290). In the homilies, Germanus seems prolix acc. to the canons of Byzantine rhetoric, and his Mariology is directed toward celebrating the purity of the Virgin and her role of mediation and intercession.

3. Tractatus: *De haeresibus et synodis*, a text dedicated to the deacon *Anthimus, gives a historical survey of the *heresies, with indication of the protagonists and of the councils that dealt with them, written in the last years of his life after his abdication, without the possibility of consulting books: thus several omissions, which, however, did not prevent Mai from defining it a *gemmula*. *De vitae termino* is a dialogue between a rationalist and an orthodox believer on the dogma of the *foreknowledge and the *providence of God: the opinion of *Basil on the limits of human life is discussed. Photius transcribed it in *Quaest. CXLIX ad Amphilochium* without mentioning the true author. Regarding *De vera et legitima retributione*, Photius provides us with a summary of this lost work (*Bibl.*, cod. 233). The author, in an attempt to justify *Gregory of Nyssa, who had accepted the *Origenian doctrine of the **apokatastasis*, maintained that the *Oratio catechetica* and the *De anima et resurrectione* of Gregory had been interpolated by Origenist heretics (Quasten II, 293–294). The work *Historia mystica ecclesiae catholicae*, an important commentary on the liturgical symbolism of the Eastern Masses of Basil, of *John Chrysostom and of the Presanctified has reached us in different recensions, suffered numerous interpolations and presents a confused MS tradition. It also appears under the names of *Basil of Caesarea and *Cyril of Jerusalem. It is nevertheless probable that Germanus participated in the compilation, esp. since Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who procured a Latin translation, knew this attribution.

4. Hymns: The name of Germanus is present in the liturgical books (C. Emereau, *Hymnographi byzantini*: EO 22 [1923] 428-431; E. Follieri, *Initia hymnorum ecclesiae graecae*, 6 vols., Vatican City 1960-65); his activity as a composer deserves a specialized study.

CPG 8001-8033; PG 98, 39-454; W. Christ - M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum*, Leipzig 1871, 98-99. *Translations*: C. Garton - G. Leendert (eds.), *On Predestined Terms of Life* (Gr. and Eng. text), Buffalo 1979; P. Meyendorff (ed.), *On the Divine Liturgy* (Gr. and Eng. text), Crestwood, NY 1984; Germano di Costantinopoli, *Omelie mariologiche* (le omelie mariane e le lettere sulle sacre immagini), ed. V. Fazzo, Rome 1985; F. Carcione, *Timoteo e Germano di Costantinopoli, Gli scritti*, Rome 1993; G. Pons Pons, *Homilías mariológicas*, introducción y notas de A. Fazzo, Madrid 1990; V. Grumel, *Homélie de saint Germain sur la délivrance de Constantinople*: REB 16 (1958) 183-205; A. Wenger, *Un nouveau témoin de l'assomption, une homélie attribuée à Saint Germain de Constantinople*: REB 16 (1958) 43-58; *Analecta hymnica graeca e codicibus eruta Italiae Inferioris*, 12 vols., Rome 1966–1980; E.M. Toniolo, *Sull'ingresso della Vergine nel santo dei santi. Una finale inedita di omelia bizantina*: Marianum 36 (1974) 101-105; F. Combefis, *Novam auctarium*, II, Paris 1648, 790-802; Krumbacher, 66-67; V. Grumel, *L'iconologie de Saint Germain de Constantinople*: EO 21 (1922) 165-175; F. Cayré, *Germain*: DTC 6, 1300-1309; E. Perniola, *La mariologia di S. Germano*, Rome 1954; Beck, 473-476; BS 6, 243-253, DSp 6, 309-311; E. Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I . . . mit dem griechisch-deutschen Text der "Vita Germani,"* Würzburg 1975; Patrologia V, 133-4; LACL³ 285-286.; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, 2, Rome 1988, 318-390.

A. Labate

GERMANUS of Paris (Born at Autun, end 5th c.; d. 576). *Venantius Fortunatus, in narrating his life (PL 72, 55-78), presents the integrity and the austerity of Germanus and the numerous extraordinary episodes of his life. Ordained priest by Agrippinus, he was later chosen by *Nectarius to be abbot of the monastery of St. Symphorian. King *Chilperic (561–584) called him to *Paris to succeed the bishop *Libanus and appreciated his advice, despite the despotic and cruel character of the king's reign. A courageous letter has reached us, written by Germanus to the warlike queen Brunhilda (534–ca. 613), which invites her to sentiments of peace, mildness and humility. For many centuries the *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae* (PL 72, 88-98) was attributed to Germanus: two letters which inform us on the rites and uses observed in the churches of *Gaul at the beginning of the Middle Ages on the authority of an long-remembered tradition. A deeper examination of these writings leads to the conclusion that the two letters, attributed by the codices to Germanus of Paris, are the work of an anonymous author who composed them in the 7th c. From them it is therefore possible to know the *Gallican liturgy, but elements of *Visigothic (*Isidore of Seville) and Byzantine importation, received in the era in which the letters were written, cannot be ignored.

CPL 1060; PL 72, 77-80, 88-98; DACL 6, 1049-1102; BS 6, 257-259; LTK 4, 533; LMA 4, 1346-1347; ODC 668-669; DHGE 20, 927-929; J. Quasten, *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae Germano Parisiensi ascripta*, Münster 1934; R. Cabié, *Les lettres attribuées à saint Germain de Paris et les origines de la liturgie gallicane*: Bulletin de Littérature Ecclesiastique 73 (1972) 183-192; J. Dubois, *La malle de voyage de l'évêque Ger-*

main de Paris (d. 576): Bullettin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France (1983) 238-249; M. Becher, *Neue Überlegungen zum Geburtsdatum Karls des Großen*: Francia 19 (1992) 50-54; R. Van Dann, *Saints and Their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*, Princeton, NJ 1993, 29-31, 233-234; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul A.D. 481–751*, Leiden 1995, 47-49; Patrologia IV, 302-303 (bibl.); P. Bernard, *Sources de l'*Expositio: EO 13 (1996) 65-73; J. Torsy, *Der Große Namenstagskalender, Aktualisierte und erweiterte Neuausgabe*, ed. H.J. Kracht, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna [2]1997, 146; LACL (2002) 286-287.

M.G. Bianco

GERMANY

I. Spread of Christianity up to 313 - II. Christian topography in the 4th-7th c. - III. Migration of peoples and continuity of the church - IV. Vestiges of paleo-Christian art.

A panorama of the history of Christianity of the first six centuries in Germany in the modern sense does not embrace geographically the Roman provinces of *Germania superior* (I) and *inferior* (II) as they were around AD 90, and still less the borders established at the Diocletian restructuring. *Germania I*, divided by *Diocletian, included, in the S part, *Maxima Sequanorum*, with Besançon (*Vesontio*) as the capital, modern Switzerland, and the French territory bordering to the SW. *Germania II* was enlarged with the annexation of the *civitas Tungrorum* (Tongeren in Belgium). On the other hand, great sections of the Diocletian province *Belgica* belonged to it, including *Trier (*Colonia Augusta Treverorum*), which was until the 5th c. administrative center of the *Praefectura Galliarum*, later transferred because of the Germanic invasion in 395–402 to *Arles, matching the territory of the later German Empire, as well as the N part of the Diocletian province *Raetia II*, with Augsburg (*Augusta Vindelicorum*) as capital. To the E of the Rhine and N of the Danube, after the renunciation of the conquest of the interior of Germany, only the so-called *Agri Decumates* were under the control of Rome, i.e., the territory to the S of the *limes*, functioning as a fortified line that linked the Rhine and the Danube. This began in the N near Rheinbrohl, continued for a stretch along the Main, proceeded to the S to Lorch, then turning E to link up with the Danube near Kehlheim (D. Baatz, *Der römische Limes*, Berlin 1974, 11-17; 53-64). The border underwent modifications several times following the vicissitudes of war. Since the territory defended by the *limes* was not incorporated at the time of Roman occupation into the bordering provinces, but remained under military occupation, the formation of Christian centers was not possible.

I. Spread of Christianity up to 313. The first mention of Christians in Germany, a little later than 180, is found in *Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 10,2 (SC 264, 159), who, to demonstrate that the faith and tradition of the church were identical in the entire known world, mentions also αἱ ἐν Γερμανίαις ἱδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι, i.e., the churches residing in the Germanic provinces. Given that Irenaeus expresses himself in a technically correct manner from the administrative point of view when he speaks of the Germanies in the plural, we should rule out the idea that this might be a simple rhetorical affectation without any geographical value. It is more difficult to determine if he is using the term ἐκκλησίαι thinking of churches governed by *bishops, mentioned as bearers of a genuine tradition of faith, or only to groups of Christians who lived isolated or in little communities. The enumeration of *Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 7,4 (CCL 2, 1354), tells us even less; it should be understood as an extension, motivated by apologetic intentions, of Acts 2:9-11. From the imperial period there are no other literary mentions.

Even from the most ancient archaeological finds and from the various types of burials (position of the cadaver, absence of funeral ornament, direction toward the *East) definite Christian elements cannot be deduced. Objects with representations of *fish, stags, hares or shepherds carrying a lamb on their shoulders, even cross ornaments, are not unequivocal Christian symbols without the corresponding context. The *memoria* under the cathedral of Bonn should not be dated to 260–300 (H. Lehner - W. Bader, *Baugeschichtliche Untersuchungen am Bonner Münster*: Bonner Jahrbücher 136/137 [1932] 3-216), but rather to the middle of the 4th c. (H. v. Petrikovits, *Die Zeitstellung der ältesten frühchristlichen Kultanlage unter dem Bonner Münster*, in Id., *Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und Archäologie*, Bonn 1976, 463-472), and the presence of Christians in the Roman army has not been proved with certainty.

All the other sources on the origins of Christianity in the first three centuries date to the period of peace, and their historical accuracy requires verification. The account of the martyrdom of St. Afra at Augusta under Diocletian appears worthy of belief, transmitted by the *Mart. hier.* (MGH [SRM] 7, 200-204) and the poet *Venantius Fortunatus (*Vita S. Martini* 4, 640-643: MGH [AA] 4/1, 368), which suggests the presence of a Christian community in this city at the time of the last *persecutions (B. Schimmelpfennig, *War die hl. Afra eine Römerin?* in *Vera lex historiae*. Festschrift D. Kurze, ed. St. Jenks, Cologne 1993, 277-303). For *Cologne also the exis-

tence of a Christian community can be presumed by the end of the 3rd c.

At Xanten (*Colonia Ulpia Traiana*; in the Middle Ages: *Ad Sanctos*) the most ancient mention of the martyr Victor, together with a mention of the rediscovery of the bones of the martyr Mallosus of Birten (*oppidum Bertunensium*), goes back to *Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum* 61 (MGH [SRM] /2, 530). The excavations at Xanten in a necropolis of the 4th c. have brought to light the skeletons of two men who died violently, between roughly 30 and 40 years of age, whose burial would have been, acc. to the coins found inside, between 346 and 350; whether the two were soldiers executed legally because of their faith or rather fallen in a riot cannot be determined. The memory of the place of their burial was in any case preserved, as shown by a *memoria* with a *mensa*, placed on their tombs a little after 383–388. After the destruction of the *memoria* in the middle of the 5th c. because of a fire, a hall 7.7 x 5.5 m (25.3 x 18 ft) was built, leveling the space surrounding the two tombs, with attendant destruction of various sepulchers around it (Th. Otten, *Die Ausgrabungen unter St. Viktor zu Xanten*, Mainz 2003). In later legends all these episodes of martyrdom were linked to the fate of the *Theban legion, about which the *Passio Acaunensium martyrum* of the bishop *Eucherius (d. ca. 450) (MGH [SRM] 3, 20-41) informs us. Probably a legend of Eastern origin, which spoke of the martyrdom of soldiers of a Theban legion, it was brought to the West and linked with the discovery of local relics, perhaps following the episode of *Gervasius and Protasius at *Milan. The legendary character of the story, as well as the gaps in the archaeological research, do not at all exclude the martyrdom of the soldiers; rather, a particular attention could have been turned toward the Christians in the Roman army that *Constantius Chlorus, Caesar of the West, did not pay the civil population (D. van Berchem, *Le martyre de la Légion Thébaine*, Basel 1956; J. Helgeland, *Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine*: ANRW II, 23.1 [1979] 774-777).

II. Christian topography in the 4th-7th c. To the S and W of the Danube and Rhine there were already Christians in various places in the 3rd c. Even in the *Agri Decumates* their presence should not be excluded categorically, even if no historic value can be attributed to the testimony of *Sozomen, *HE* II, 6,1 (GCS 50, 58; SC 306, 254), acc. to which "tribes from both shores of the Rhine passed over to the Christian faith" already before Constantine, or to the observation of Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* I, 16 (CSEL 4, 12) on the spread of Christianity in the tribe of the Alamanni. Only after the Edict of Constantine, when the church, within a framework of ever more pro-Christian legislation, was able to develop its organization and send missionaries to more distant regions, does evidence of Christians multiply. The communities remained largely outside the *Arian disorders. *Paganism, however, did not disappear quickly; the cult of the temples, the sanctuaries of Mithras and of Isis, and esp. the places of worship of the indigenous divinities, partially Romanized, survived in different places.

a. The most important city of the Diocletian *Raetia II* was Augusta (Augsburg), which under *Hadrian (117–138) was raised to a *municipium*. The presence of a first Christian community, attested by the uninterrupted veneration for Afra, has already been mentioned. There is no bishops' list from the Roman era, but there is mention, through more recent versions of the legend of the martyrdom of Afra, of a *Zosimus* (or *Dionysius*), who around 400 must have been bishop of Augusta. The *sanctus Valentinus* mentioned as bishop in *Raetia* in the biography of *Severinus of Noricum, edited by *Eugippius (41,1: CSEL 9/2, 58), concerns Passau rather than Augusta, from which he must have departed in the direction of Säben (*Sabiona*), before the invasion of the Alamanni. Monumental paleo-Christian remains are found only under the church of St. Stephen: a basilica with three aisles from the end of the 4th to the beginning of the 5th c.

Whether Regensburg (*Regina Castra*), whose church of St. George rises above a necropolis and dates to the 1st half of the 5th c., and Passau (Celt.: *Boiodurum*, Lat.: *Batavis*), which developed above two Roman castles, were then episcopal sees cannot be determined (*Kleine deutsche Kirchengeschichte* 14; Bauerreiss, 5-11, declares favorably). We have, however, at Regensburg a stone from a feminine burial of the end of the 4th c. with a christological *monogram and the inscription "*martiribus sociatae*," which suggest a burial *retro sanctos* (CIL III 5972; G. Waldherr, Martiribus sociata. *Überlegungen zur "ältesten" christlichen Inschrift Rätiens*, in K. Dietz [ed.], *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum*. Festschrift A. Lippold, Würzburg 1993, 553-577), and from the 16th c. a report of a bishop named *Lupus* hypothetically martyred ca. 490.

For Passau the *Vita Severini* of Eugippius (22,5: CSEL 9/2, 41) attests a baptistery, and under the church of the monastery of Holy Cross was excavated a building with single aisle 21 m (69 ft) in length, probably datable to the paleo-Christian period (R. Christlein, *Die Ausgrabungen unter der*

Klosterkirche Hl. Kreuz zu Passau: Mitteilungen der Freunde der bayerischen Vor- und Frühgeschichte 11, Mai 1979). For the castle *Boiotro* (Beiderwies) on the other side of the Inn River (belonging to the province *Noricum ripense*), the *Vita Severini* 22,1 (CSEL 9/2, 39) speaks of a monastery founded by Severinus and of a martyrial church. In fact, the excavations there discovered a small church with narthex and apse under the church of St. Severinus, which contained a paleo-Christian reliquary (W. Sage, *Die Ausgrabungen in der Severinskirche zu Passau-Innstadt 1976*: Ostbairische Grenzmarken 21 [1979] 5-48; R. Christlein, *Das spätrömische Kastell Boiotro zu Passau-Innstadt*, in J. Werner - E. Ewig [eds.], *Von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter*, Sigmaringen 1979, 91-123; *Severin zwischen Römerzeit und Völkerwanderung. Katalog*, Linz 1982).

In the castle *Quintanis* (Künzing) on the Danube between Passau and Regensburg, Eugippius (*Vita Severini* 15-16; 24,2: CSEL 9/2, 32-3; 42) mentions priests, deacons, a subdeacon, *doorkeepers and porters and a church built outside the castle. On the ridge of S. Lorenz in the district of Schongau near Epfach (*Abodiacum*) a church building has been found with an apse of 15.50 x 9.50 m (50.9 x 31.2 ft) which, acc. to the coins found there, should be dated to between 364 and 394. A terracotta lamp of the 4th c. with Christogram confirms the existence of a paleo-Christian community (G. Pohl, *Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Lorenzberg bei Epfach*, Mainz 1975).

b. The capital of the province *Belgica I* was *Trier, of which rich historic information and numerous monuments have been preserved. Although an extensive mission into the rural zones cannot be supposed before the conversion of *Clovis in 498–499, the bishop Maximinus sent Castor and Lubentius as missionaries to the Roman forts built along the principal roads (N. Kyll, *Die Einführung des Christentums bei der Landbevölkerung des Trierer Landes*: Pastor Bonus 48 [1937] 245-249). Even though the bishops Nicetius and Magnentius continued this missionary effort in the 6th c., relatively few monumental remains have been conserved.

In the S cemetery of Bitburg (*Castellum Bedonis*) tombs starting from the end of the 6th c. have been found, and among these also the church of S. Maria, perhaps dated to the Late Antique period (K.-H. Gilles, *Zur spätrömischen und frühmittelalterlichen Topographie von Bitburg und Neumagen*: Trierer Zeitschrift 45 [1982] 293-308). In Fort Pachten, S of Trier, an inscription indicates the existence of a paleo-Christian church. The church of S. Maurice at Tholey, situated near the road between Metz and Mainz, should be dated to the end of the 6th c. In addition, at Neumagen (*Noviomagus Treverorum*) a Christian funeral inscription suggests the existence of an antique Christian community (already in the 2nd half of the 4th c.?; F.X. Kraus, *Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande*, Freiburg 1890, no. 73). Saint Castor took up residence as a hermit at Karden (*Cartadomus*) and is said to have built a church dedicated to the Madonna, near or in which he was buried. For Potentius and his sons Felicius and Simplicius, missionaries sent by the bishop Maximinus, a memorial *ecclesiola* was supposedly built. In fact, in the funeral area surrounding the church of S. Maria, the remains of a Late Antique hall have been excavated (J. Wagner, *Zur Siedlungsgeschichte des mittleren Mosellandes durch die ersten christlichen Glaubensboten*: Pastor Bonus 48 [1937] 350-358; F. Pauly, *Das Stift St. Kastor in Karden an der Mosel*, Berlin 1986; L. Schwinden, *Zu den frühchristlichen Inschriften von Karden an der Mosel*: Trierer Zeitschrift 54 [1991] 267-274). It cannot be determined whether the church St. Martin at Münstermaifeld was built by the bishop Magnerich (after 561) or by Modoald (after 626). Cruciform burial stones are found also at Moselkern, Nittel, Nickenich, Ochtendung, Plaid, Lehmen and Mayen.

c. The information regarding the German territory of the province *Germania I* are rather more scarce. It should be added that the metropolis of Mainz (*Moguntiacum*) and other cities that were episcopal sees, such as Strasbourg (*Argentorate*), Speyer (*Noviomagus*) and Worms (*Civitas Vangionum*, later *Borbetomagus*), suffered gravely through the invasions of the Germans who crossed the Rhine after the *limes* were no longer defended. *Ammianus Marcellinus (21,10,1-2) informs us of the raid of Rando, the prince of the Alamanni, at Mainz in 368, perhaps on Easter Day, the surveillance being less strict on this day: this suggests that, at the middle of the 4th c., the Christian community of this city was very conspicuous. Jerome recounts other tribulations suffered at the beginning of the 5th c. (*Ep.* 123,16; CSEL 56, 93-4). The lists of bishops that have reached us from the other cities mentioned are uncertain and incomplete. The names of the first bishops of Mainz (Mar[t]inus), Speyer (Iessis), Worms (Victor) and Strasbourg (Amandus) are known through their participation in a synod at Cologne (346), and nevertheless their historicity is doubtful (*Concilia Galliae 314–506*: CCL 148, 27-29). For Mainz, the bishops Aureus, Maximus and Sophronius are also mentioned; with Sidonius, in the 6th c., the reconstruction of the city began under Frankish dominion.

Archaeological finds are also scarce. Around 25

funeral inscriptions of the 4th-6th c.—the great majority from the area around St. Alban—attest the continuity of a Christian population not only for Mainz but also for Bingen, Boppard, Wiesbaden and Worms, from which, even if only incomplete information can be gathered on the density and social composition of the Christian population, some light can nevertheless be cast on the transformation of the political class, thanks to the replacement of Roman names with Germanic ones.

In the area of the E cemetery of Mainz, which goes back to the 1st c., a cemeterial church (29.6 x 14.6 m [97.1 x 47.9 ft]) was built probably in the 5th-6th c., which should date to the era of the death of the priest Albanus, likely in the course of an Alamannic incursion in 406.

The ancient cathedral of Mainz, not datable archaeologically, has been conjecturally located in the present (Protestant) church of St. John. This is probably in the location of St. Martin (ancient), near which, acc. to Venantius Fortunatus (*Carmen* IX, 9: MGH [AA] 4/1, 215-6), the bishop Sidonius built the ancient baptismal church of St. John. The dedication to St. Martin suggests a date not earlier than the end of the 5th c., when his veneration began to spread.

From Worms and from Speyer there are no known paleo-Christian remains. Traces of paleo-Christian churches have been found, however, in the Roman forts of Alzey (between 357 and 370), Kreuznach, Boppard (*Boudobriga*; a church of 33 x 9 m [108.3 x 29.5 ft], built next to a pool, with sanctuary and baptismal font; perhaps not earlier than the 6th c.), and Koblenz (*Confluentes*) (after 406). Also at Kobern/Gondorf funeral inscriptions attest a Late Antique Christian population (M. Schulze-Dörlamm, *Die spätrömischen und frühmittelalterlichen Gräberfelder von Gondorf*, Stuttgart 1990).

d. The capital and ecclesiastical center of *Germania inferior* was *Cologne. Not much is known of the other episcopal sees of *Germania II*. The *Notitia Galliarum* and the other sources only know Tongeren (Atuatuca). Among the bishops of Tongeren, beyond the claimed founder Maternus, there are historic mentions of a Servatius, also present at *Serdica in 342–343. It should not be excluded that also the important center Xanten (*Colonia Ulpia Traiana*) was—even if only temporarily—an episcopal see. Few other remains of churches of the Roman era in the vast Low Germanic area are worthy of note, beyond the already mentioned *memoria* dedicated to the martyrs at Xanten.

At Bonn (*Castrum Bonna*) two locations of possible paleo-Christian worship have been discovered. Beneath the crypt of the Münster, a Roman cemetery was present, in which a small cult edifice was built in the 4th c. Excavations discovered a room of 13.77 x 8.8 m (45.2 x 28.9 ft), built above a *cella memoriae* of 3.55 x 2.55 m (11.6 x 8.4 ft) furnished with a walled bench along three walls and two tables. For structural reasons it was not possible to excavate below the *cella* to determine if a tomb was being venerated. *Terminus post quem* of the building are the years from 260 to 300. The second religious building was found below the *Dietkirche* (St. Peter), about 1 km (.6 mi) N of the *cella*, in the legionary camp. The remains are preserved of a church of ca. 20 x 10 m (65.6 x 32.8 ft), going back to the 4th c., which for some would have been an oratory, for others even the parish or episcopal church of Bonn.

At Aachen (*Aquae Granni*) various funeral stones attest the existence of a Christian cemetery in the 5th c. (H. Cüppers, *Aquae Granni. Beiträge zur Archäologie von Aachen*, Cologne 1982). At Remagen (*Rigomagus*), fragments of an enclosure adorned with a Christogram have been discovered, which indicate the existence of a church, as well as the funerary inscription of *Meteriola* of the 5th c. (H. Hemgesberg, *Die ersten Remagener Kirchen im Lichte eines früchristlichen Schrankenfragments*: Annalen des hist. Vereins vom Niederrhein 189 [1986] 9-34; Id., *Die frühchristliche Meteriola-Inschrift aus Remagen*: Bonner Jahrbücher 186 [1986] 299-314). At Neuss (*Novaesium*) a rectangular room from 400–450 was discovered under the crypt of St. *Quirinus, without however any hint of its function (H. Borger, *Bemerkungen zur Frühgeschichte der Stadt Neuss im Mittelalter*: Das Rheinische Landesmuseum, Bonn 1969, 29-31).

III. Migration of peoples and continuity of the church. The very fact that only the list of bishops of Trier has reached us complete, while the others show serious gaps in the 4th-6th c., shows how precarious the Roman dominion was over the territory of the Rhine and the Danube. Raetia was the first to fall. After repeated attempts, the Alamanni in 260 finally broke down the *limes* and invaded the *Agri Decumates*. Toward the middle of the 4th c., the threat also hung over the confines of the Rhine (351: temporary incursion in the territory on the left bank of the Rhine, from Basil to Mainz; 368: raid against the inhabitants of Mainz gathered in the church), but the Romans succeeded in expelling the assailants; in 406 the Rhine borders were further weakened by the invasion of the Alans and Vandals, with whom the Alamanni joined; in 407 the Burgundians followed, chased out in their turn by Huns. In 440 Mainz was destroyed; in 455 much of *Maxima Se-*

quanorum (Alsace, part of German Switzerland) and of *Raetia* (territory of Augusta) were already in the hands of Alamanni.

At the beginning of the 5th c. the Franks pressed on the Rhine. Already in 420 Trier fell for a brief time into their hands. A little later they occupied Cologne. The Salian Franks headed for Brabant, pushing along the Somme to the Seine and the Loire, and putting an end in 486 to what had remained of the Roman Empire under *Syagrius. The Ripuarian Franks invaded the upper basin of the Meuse and the Moselle and broke out toward the S up to the territory of Worms and Speyer, where they confronted the Alamanni. The decisive battle between the two Germanic peoples in 496 was fundamental for the later development of the church. It was won by the Frank Clovis, whose baptism into the Nicene faith followed, administered on Christmas Day of 498 or 499 by Bishop Remy of Reims.

The fate of the Christian communities in the period that runs from the dismantling of the Roman administration and the successive withdrawal of the Roman troops until the reconstruction of the ecclesiastical organization, now under Germanic, esp. Frankish, domination, cannot be clearly delineated; a variety of situations arose. The transfer of the Rhaetian episcopal sees from Windisch, beyond Kaiseraugust-Basilea, toward Lausanne suggests a retreat before Germanic pressure. The transfer of the bishopric of Tongeren, for which a bishop is attested again around 500, to Maastricht, before 535, could be attributed to the fact that the *evangelization of the Franks, after the baptism of Clovis, proceeded slowly, so that the ecclesiastical center in *Germania II* needed to be located in a territory with a more pronounced support within the Roman population. At Augusta it seems that the series of bishops was interrupted in the 5th c. to be renewed by the Frankish king Dagobert I (d. 639) only toward the beginning of 7th c. Visible gaps are found in the lists of the bishops of Cologne (400–after 650), Mainz (440–ca. 540), Strasbourg (ca. 360–mid 6th c.), Speyer and Worms (likewise of 150 years, starting from the middle of the 4th c.) so as to give the impression that the government of the Rhine dioceses was restricted, in that period, to Trier and W *Sequania*.

*Salvian of Marseille informs us about the destruction of the Rhine cities and the difficulties affecting the surviving Christian population (*De gubern. Dei* 6,13-15: CSEL 8, 145-150). Even if the Christian communities do not seem to have been completely destroyed, one observes nevertheless a drastic reduction of the influence of Christianity and a concomitant "repaganization," characterized by the renewal of Germanic religious practices in the territories on the left bank of the Rhine. A syncretism of pagan Roman cults with Germanic religious traditions and with surviving practices of Gallic-Celtic origin was created; typical for the Rhine area was the cult of the Matrons, for example.

The evangelization of the Germans took place slowly in the Frankish domains, after the conversion of Clovis. Childebert I (511–558), son of Clovis, forced the dominant class of property owners to suppress the pagan cults; at the same time the hermit St. Goar was evangelizing the middle Rhineland. Other hermits, such as Ingbert, Disibod and Wendelin, in the 2nd half of the 6th c., evangelized the territory of the Rhineland Palatinate. Their Germanic names show that the Frankish area was already beginning to play a role in the missionary activity. Nevertheless, Frankish Christianity gave the impetus to a vast expansion beyond the borders of the Romanized territory only in 7th c., in the footsteps of the monastic movement that had developed from the Irish-Scottish evangelization, which had conquered the nobility and the bishopric of the Merovingian kingdom. At the Synod of Paris of 614, Speyer, Worms and Strasbourg are newly represented by bishops now mostly of Frankish origin (*Concilia Galliae 511–695*: CCL 148A, 280-282). The Irish missionary *Colombanus and his companion Gallus encountered, even at the beginning of the 7th c., paganism deeply rooted in the territory of Alamanni. Nevertheless, the *Pactus Alamanorum*, the oldest Alamannic legal codex, transmitted from the 1st half of the 7th c., shows Christian influence. The bishopric of Augusta, in *Raetia II*, could be rebuilt with all likelihood only in the times of Dagobert, while the inner Swabian-Bavarian territory acquired a durable ecclesiastical organization only later, in the Carolingian era, through the efforts of St. Boniface.

IV. Vestiges of paleo-Christian art. Monumental testimonies are completely absent, other than the remains of the religious, which have already been discussed. The great majority of the objects of the minor arts (*statues, *mosaics, *sarcophagi, glassware, boxes, ironware, ivories, pyxes) come from the zones of Trier and Cologne. Naturally it cannot be determined with certainty if the recovered artifacts come, entirely or in part, from local workshops.

For the persons and places cited, see AB, ASS, BBKL, BHL, BS, DHGE, LCI, LMA, LTK, DNP, TRE passim.

L. Duchesne, *Fastes*, 3, Paris 1915; W. Neuss, *Die Anfänge des*

Christentums im Rheinlande, Bonn ²1933; L. Stamer, *Kirchengeschichte der Pfalz bis zur Vollendung des Kaiserdomes in Speyer*, Speyer 1936; R. Bauerreis, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns. I. Von den Anfängen bis zu den Ungarneinfällen*, St. Ottilien 1949; H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte Schwabens, I*, Stuttgart 1950; R. de Maeyer, *Belgien*: RAC 2 (1954) 118-125; F. Zoepfl, *Das Bistum Augsburg und seine Bischöfe im Mittelalter*, Munich-Augsburg 1955; E. Klebel, *Zur Geschichte der christlichen Mission im schwäbischen Stammesgebiet*: Zeitschr. für Württembergische Landesgeschichte 17 (1958) 145-218; E. Hegel, *Die Rheinische Kirche in römischer und frühfränkischer Zeit. Das erste Jahrtausend, Textband I*, Düsseldorf ²1963, 93-113; W. Boppert, *Die frühchristlichen Inschriften des Mittelrheingebietes*, Mainz 1971; *Frühchristliche Zeugnisse im Einzugsgebiet von Rhein und Mosel*, ed. Th.K. Kempf - W. Reusch, Trier 1965; W. Söltner, *Die Bonner Ausgrabungen* 1971: Das Rheinische Landesmuseum 6 (1971) 81-84; ANRW II 4-5, 2 (1975–1976); *Rheinisches Landesmuseum Bonn. Führer durch die Sammlungen*: Kunst und Altertum am Rhein 79, Cologne-Bonn 1977; H. v. Petrikovits, *Germania (Romana)*: RAC 10 (1978) 548-654; *Rheinische Geschichte*, ed. F. Petri - G. Droege, vol. I,1: H. v. Petrikovits, *Altertum*, Düsseldorf 1978; K. Schäferdiek, *Germanenmission*: RAC 10 (1978) 492-548; J. Werner - E. Ewig (eds.), *Von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter*, Sigmaringen 1979; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de Première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen-Age (IIIᵉ-VIIIᵉ siècles)*, Paris 1980; *Kleine deutsche Kirchengeschichte*, ed. B. Kötting, Freiburg 1980, 9-25; P. Stockmeier, *Die Vita Severini im Lichte der Archäologie*: Oberösterreichische Heimatblätter 36 (1982) 16-27; J.G. Deckers, *Neue Funde und Befunde zur Spätantike in den römischen Provinzen Raetia, Germania superior und Germania inferior sowie Belgica*: Actes du Xᵉ Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne II (Studi di Antichità Cristiana 37/2), Vatican City 1984, 59-70; K. Hausberger, *Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg I*, Regensburg 1989; M. Weidemann, *Die kirchliche Organisation der Provinzen Belgica und Germania vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert*: Willibrord, zijn wereld en zijn werk, ed. P. Bange - A.G. Weiler, Nijmegen 1990, 286-316; A. Angenendt, *Das Frühmittelalter. Die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900*, Stuttgart 1990; E. Dassmann, *Die Anfänge der Kirche in Deutschland von der Spätantike bis zur frühfränkischen Zeit*, Stuttgart 1993; J. Kremer, *Studien zum frühen Christentum in Niedergermanien*, Bonn 1993; F. Brink, *Die Anfänge des Christentums in Trier, Köln und Mainz*: Trierer Zeitschrift 60 (1997) 229-254; Y. Freigang, *Die Grabdenkmäler der gallo-römischen Kultur im Moselland*: Jahrbuch des Röm.-German. Zentralmuseums Mainz 44/1 (1997) 277-440; E. Dassmann: *Handbuch der Mainzer Kirchengeschichte I*, ed. F. Jürgensmeier, Würzburg 2000, 19-86; N. Gauthier, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIIIᵉ siècle, XI. Province ecclésiastique de Mayence* (Germania prima), Paris 2000; E. Dassmann, *Augsburg*: RAC, Suppl. 1 (2001) 693-718.

H.R. Drobner

GERMINIUS of Sirmium (d. ca. 374). Native to Cyzicus (Hellespont), in 351 he was elected bishop of *Sirmium, imperial residence, replacing the deposed *Photinus, and from then on he collaborated tightly with the pro-*Arian policy of *Valens of Mursa and *Ursacius of Singidunum: he was present both at the drawing up of the Sirmian Formula of 357 and at the Council of *Rimini (359). He had some sort of interaction with *Hilary and *Eusebius of Vercelli who, coming back at different times from the East to the West, passed through Sirmium (361–363). On 13 January 366 he had a public discussion with the layman Heraclianus, of Nicene faith: on this occasion Germinius defended the Formula of Rimini and a theological position with pro-Arian tendencies, but demonstrated a great deal of moderation with regard to his rival. In the same year he reached the decision to abandon the Formula of Rimini in favor of one more decisively anti-Arian, despite its not being aligned with the Nicene Creed and therefore not containing the **homoousios*; on this occasion he rejected the protests of Valens and Ursacius.

CPL 655-657; Simonetti 590; Id., *Osservazioni sull'"altercatio Heracliani cum Germinio"*: VChr 21 (1967) 39-58; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim; DHGE 20,984-985; D. Harrison Williams, *Another Exception to Later Fourth-Century "Arian" Typologies. The Case of Germinius of Sirmium*: JECS 4 (1996) 335-357.

M. Simonetti

GERONA. Archaeological evidence indicates the presence of Christianity starting from the 4th c. From the decretal of *Innocent I to the bishops present at the Council of *Toledo (400), we learn of the irregular consecration of a bishop of Huesca. In the year 517, while Frontinianus was bishop, a council was held there. The acts bear the signatures of seven bishops, including that of the metropolitan John of Tarragona, whose signature is in front of the others; it is presumed that he presided at the council. With the exception of Orontius, bishop of Granada (Iliberis), all the other bishops belonged to the province of *Tarragona. The council issued ten canons: four aimed at regulating liturgical matters, two concerning the discipline of *baptism and four directed to the clergy.

Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 156-158; Hfl-Lecl II, 2, 1029-1030; Palazzini 2, 116-117; Vives, *Concilios*, 39-41; Martínez Díez, *Hispana* IV, 283-290; Orlandís, *Concilios* 109-114; J. Boswell, *The Council of Gerona of 517*: Classical Folia 32 (1978) 131-134.

P. de Luis

GERONTIUS (ca. 395–ca. 480). A Palestinian monk, linked with *Melania the Younger, whose *Vita* he probably wrote (ca. 440; ed. D. Gorce, *Vie de s. Mélanie*: SC 90, Paris 1962). Later he became archimandrite of the *cenobites of *Palestine, but placed himself at the head of the resistance against the Council of *Chalcedon (cf. his adversary *Cyril

of Scythopolis: ed. Schwartz, TU 49/2, index p. 261; and the *monophysite John Rufus, *Plerophoria*: PO 8, Paris 1912, and *Vita Petri Iberici*, ed. R. Raabe, Leipzig 1895). The reconciliation of the patriarch *Juvenal with his colleague *Elpidius and his protectress, the empress *Eudoxia, in 456, as likewise that of the patriarch *Martyrius with the dissidents, toward 479, left him impenitent in schism (L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 103–139).

BHG 1241; A. Giardina, *Carità eversiva. Le donazioni di Melania la Giovane e gli equilibri della società tardoromana*, in *Studi Calderone*, Messina 1986, II, 77-102; E.A. Clark, *The Life of Melania the Younger. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, New York 1984; Id., *Piety, Propaganda, and Politics in the Life of Melania the Younger*: SP 18/2, 167-183; L. Patrick, *Gérontios et la "Vie de sainte Mélanie,"* in *Les personnages du roman grec*, ed. B. Pouderon, Lyon 2001, 309-327.

J. Gribomont

GERONTIUS of Nicomedia (d. after 400/401). According to *Sozomen (*HE* VIII, 6) he was a deacon at *Milan during the episcopate of *Ambrose, whose order to remain temporarily withdrawn at home, in penitence, for having spread the story of a specter that had supposedly attacked him at night, he disobeyed by going to *Constantinople. There he acquired fame for his medical arts and was consecrated bishop of *Nicomedia in Bithynia. On hearing of this, Ambrose requested his deposition from the bishop of Constantinople *Nectarius, who did not succeed in this enterprise because of the opposition of the people. *John Chrysostom, having become bishop of Constantinople, deposed Gerontius in his voyage across *Asia Minor and did not yield to the popular manifestations of protest in response, whether at Nicomedia or Constantinople, but the deposition of Gerontius was one of the subjects of accusation turned against him in the Synod of the *Oak (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 59).

DCB 2, 662; PCBE 1, 926.

A. Pollastri

GERVASIUS and PROTASIUS, martyrs (d. ca. 303). These Milanese martyrs were unknown until *Ambrose discovered their bodies 17 June 386 in the cemetery at the *Porta di Vercelli*, excavating in front of the chapel of Sts. *Nabor and Felix (*Ep.* 22,2: PL 16, 1020), where an urn was found with their remains, of which the memory had been lost; in the evening the remains were transferred to the basilica Fausta. On 19 June he had them solemnly transferred into the recently completed basilica at the *Porta Romana* (later: St. Ambrose), where they were placed under the altar (Ambr., *Ep.* 22). For the occasion Ambrose gave two sermons, one in the basilica Fausta and the other in the new church. This *translatio* served as a model for the introduction of relics into a newly built basilica, a practice incorporated into the rite for the dedication of churches. It was also at the origin of a series of discoveries and translations of saints in N Italy. The veneration of Sts. Gervasius and Protasius spread immediately throughout the West (*Ravenna, Brescia, *Rome, *Vienne, Rouen, Carmona, *Africa). In the ancient martyrologies—*Mart. hier.*, *Cal. Carth.*, *Cal. di Carmona*—their names appear on 19 June. Their *Passion* has no historic value.

DACL 6, 1232-1239; LTK² 6, 765; Cath 6, 1899; BS 6, 298-304; *Vies des SS.* 6, 308-310; BBKL 7, 1004-1007; V. Zangara, *L'inventio dei corpi di Gervasio e Protasio*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 119-133; A. Isola, *L'esegesi biblica del sermo 286 di Agostino*: VetChr 23 (1986) 267-281; G. Nauroy, *Le fouet et le miel. Le combat d'Ambroise en 386 contre l'arianisme milanais*: RecAug 23 (1988) 5-86; J. den Boeft, *Milaan 386. Protasius en Gervasius*, in A. Hilhorst (ed.), *De heiligenverering in de eerste eeuwen van het christendom*, Nijmegen 1988, 167-177.

V. Saxer

GESTA APUD ZENOPHILUM. The MS of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* Parisinus 1711 preserves the proceedings of the trial that took place at *Cirta (and not at Thamugadi, *Numidia) on 8 December 320, brought by the deacon Nundinarius against his bishop, *Silvanus of Cirta, before the consular governor Zenophilus. The trial concerns struggles among *Donatists, during which the minutes were read of the confiscation of the goods and sacred books at Cirta, in accordance with the first edict, in 303, of *Diocletian's *persecution against the Christians. The edict imposed, among other things, the surrender of the holy books and the other sacred objects kept in churches (*Acta Munati Felicis*). Silvanus, still a deacon when he had surrendered the goods and books, was accused of having been elected bishop of Cirta after the persecution through misappropriations and violence. Connected with the Silvanus affair is the *Protocol of Cirta*, an account of a reunion, presided over by *Secundus of Tigisis, on the occasion of the election of Silvanus, from which it is clear that all of those bishops had been **traditores* during the persecution. The document, beyond being useful for knowledge of the origins of Donatism, is very important for its information on the organization of a Christian community at the beginning of the 4th c. and for a slice of Christian

life. Furthermore, the document was used a great deal by the *Catholics in the Donatist polemic, esp. by *Augustine (*C. Cresc.* 3,26,29; 3,27,30, and elsewhere).

CPL 244; CSEL 26, 185-197; P.W. Hooterp, *Deux procès verbaux donatistes*: ALMA 15 (1940) 39-112; S. Lancel, *Les débuts du Donatisme. La date du "Protocole de Cirta" et l'élection épiscopale de Silvanus*: REAug 25 (1979) 217-229; Y. Duval, *Les Gesta apud Zenophilum et la "paix de Maxence" (Gesta f 22b)*: Ant. Tardive 3 (1995) 55-63; M.A. Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa, The Donatist Church*, Minneapolis 1997; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000 (rev.: Simonetti: RSLR 2002, 367-370).

A. Di Berardino

GESTA PURGATIONIS CAECILIANI ET FELICIS. This is a collection of documents compiled by a *Catholic between 330 and 347 that has reached us in a very incomplete state in a MS of the *De schismate donatistarum* of *Optatus of Milevis. It was used by him in his works. Its title is taken from the conclusion: *Gesta purgationis Caeciliani episcopi et Felicis* (CSEL 26, 216). The collection was used extensively on the Catholic side in the polemics with the Donatists. It intended, directly or indirectly, to defend the legitimacy of *Caecilian as bishop of Carthage. It can be divided into three parts.

The first consists of the *Purgatio Caeciliani*, which includes, in addition to the **Gesta apud Zenophilum* (CSEL 26, 185-197), other documents to demonstrate the innocence of Caecilian. The tenor of these documents is known through references by Optatus, by *Augustine and by the conference of Carthage of 411 (Monceaux V, 269-70). The *Gesta apud Zenophilum* is the incomplete summary of the trial that took place at *Cirta on 8 December 320, brought by the deacon Nundinarius against his bishop, *Silvanus of Cirta, before the *consularis* of Numidia, Zenophilus, and it was at the beginning of the *Purgatio Caeciliani*. Although the trial was an internal affair for the Donatist movement, it was used a great deal by the Catholics in later polemics (e.g., Opt., *De schism.* I, 13-14; Aug., *Ep.* 43,6,7; 53,2,4; *C. Cresc.* III, 27,30-31; III, 28,32-3). Nundinarius presented to the *consularis* oral and written evidence against Silvanus, from which it appeared that the latter had been a **traditor* in the *persecutions of 303, had been elected bishop in 304/305 by the rabble, had robbed the temple of Serapis and was a simoniac. The text throws a very sinister light on the origins of Donatism and its first protagonists. Also included are the original minutes of the search by Roman officials carried out in the church of Cirta in 303, acc. to the directives of the edict of *Diocletian.

The second part, very incomplete, concerns the *Purgatio Felicis* (CSEL 26, 197-204) with three documents: a letter of the proconsul Helianus, who, after the inquiry was complete, reported to the emperor Constantine on the innocence of Felix; a letter of the emperor to the proconsul Probianus; and finally the *Acta purgationis Felicis*, full of gaps, with reports of the trial hearings and references to earlier documents. In these the innocence of Felix is demonstrated with the sentence of 15 February 314.

The third part of the collection includes eight letters, most of which are from the emperor Constantine. This third part was probably added later to the original *dossier*.

CPL 244; CSEL 26, 185-216; L. Duchesne, *Le dossier du Donatisme*: MEFR Ant. 10 (1890) 589-650; Monceaux III, 93-102; IV, 210-239; V, 3-34, 269-274; Ch. Turner, *Notes on the Anti-Donatist Dossier and on Optatus*: JTS 27 (1926) 283-296; P.W. Hoogterp, *Deux procès-verbaux donatistes*: ALMA 15 (1940) 39-112; S. Lancel, *Les débuts du Donatisme. La date du "Protocole de Cirta" et de l'élection épiscopale de Silvanus*: REAug 25 (1979) 217-229; PCBE 1, 175-6; 1, 409-10; 1, 788-9; 1, 1078-1080; M.A. Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa, The Donatist Church*, Minneapolis 1997; Y. Duval, *Les Gesta apud Zenophilum et la "paix de Maxence" (Gesta f 22b)*: Ant. Tardive 3 (1995) 55-63; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000.

A. Di Berardino

GESTURES (iconography). The examination of the gestures made by individual personages in a scene reveals a means of expression of fundamental importance for the figurative language of Christian art. Gestures, like attributes or the typology of clothing, contribute effectively to the understanding of the concepts meant to be expressed. For this reason we will indicate the most meaningful among them.

Dextrarum iunctio. This is the gesture of spouses, taken from classical art and repeated in Christian art. Sometimes, in the place of the Lord, there appears behind the Christian couple the image of *Iuno Pronuba*, a simple symbol of Concord once its attribute of divinity had been lost (Ws, 156).

Impositio manus or *manuum*. This can be interpreted as a sacred gesture to transmit supernatural powers or gifts or to perform miracles (e.g., scenes of the multiplication of bread or of baptism); but it could also be interpreted as a gesture of blessing (e.g., scenes of *Noah, Isaac or *Jacob), or of accusation (scenes of Susanna and the elders) (Ws, pls. 65,5; 211,2; Wp, pls. 14; 96; 196,1; 208).

Adlocutio and *acclamatio*. These gestures are expressed with the right arm extended and raised. The

middle and index fingers are likewise extended. The thumb can be down. The hand can also be completely open, as it always is in gestures of acclamation (Ws, pls. 42,3; 154,4).

Manibus expansis. This gesture mostly indicates a state of beatitude. The figures are shown standing, with the arms and hands open and raised: their salvation has therefore already taken place, and a celestial life has begun for them. Such a gesture also indicates a praying person (Ws, pls. 178,2).

Veiled hands. Carrying or receiving something with veiled hands indicates a great deference with respect to those *res sacrae* that one is receiving or carrying (e.g., scenes of the *traditio legis*, or of the Elders offering chalices or crowns [Ws, pls. 121,2-4]). The gesture of the Elders in particular, with hands veiled and raised, also indicates homage and acclamation. The offering of crowns later also represents the symbol of martyrdom. (There are in addition numerous examples of the gesture of the imposition of crowns on the heads of the martyrs, as a recognition of their sacrifice, on the part of the Divinity, who in this case does not have veiled hands.)

Hand on the shoulder. If the gesture in question concerns a soldier, he is almost always placed within a representation of an arrest (e.g., scenes of the arrest of Peter; Ws, pl. 91).

Hand below the chin. This is the gesture of someone who is sad, thoughtful, afraid or seriously troubled (e.g., scenes of *Job afflicted by boils, or the "repose of Jonas"; Wp, pls. 6; 100).

Kneeling personages. People in this posture have the expression particular to the supplicant or someone performing an act of adoration (Wp, pl. 172,1).

In additon to the works of Wilpert—Ws; Wp; WMM (analytical index of the text at the entries: Act and Gesture)—L. De Bruyne, *L'imposition des mains dans l'art chrétien ancien*: RivAC 20 (1943) 113-114; *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, ed. and intr. by F. Bisconti, Vatican City 2000.

M. Cecchelli

GESTURES, LITURGICAL. "Jesus did not preach a false and absolute interiority. For him, gesture was never empty of meaning nor reprehensible. Authentically human and authentically Christian prayer is that in which both *body and *soul participate" (Th. Ohm, *Jesus Christus*, 209). With this attitude, Jesus adhered to the manner of prayer in the OT. The apostles preserved this attitude unchanged. Thus, in the NT we know of standing for *prayer, kneeling for prayer, lifting up the eyes, spreading the hands, prostration for adoration, listening to the Word of God while seated and a reader standing up to proclaim the Holy Scripture. The postapostolic era faithfully preserved this reverent and spiritually profound attitude in prayer and every other liturgical action. Certainly, excessive attention is not paid to this. Authenticity and sincerity of the exterior forms, which should be the expression of an interior and spiritual adoration of God, are emphasized.

In this regard, Tertullian, in one of the first treatises on posture in prayer, the *De oratione* (CSEL 20, 180-200; CCL 1, 257-274), criticizing exaggerations, observes: *cum modestia et humilitate adorantes magis commendabimus deo preces nostras ne ipsis quidem manibus sublimius elevatis, sed temperate ac probe elatis, ne vultu quidem in audaciam erecto* (ch. 17, p. 190). He gives instructions on the correct exterior attitude: *de genu ponendo*; one should pray kneeling, other than on the day of the Lord and for the whole time of the 50 days of *Easter (ch. 23, p. 196). Furthermore, *omni die quis dubitet prosternere se deo vel prima saltem oratione qua lucem ingredimur?* (ibid., p. 197). The custom established among the faithful is confirmed by the tradition. Thus, he accurately specifies in the *De corona* (CSEL 70, 153-188): *Hanc si nulla scriptura determinavit, certe consuetudo corroboravit, quae sine dubio de traditione manavit* (ch. 3, p. 157). Certain customs occurring in the course of the baptismal celebrations have a direct relationship with this tradition: it is not appropriate *de geniculis adorare* on the day of the Lord and in paschal time. And further: *Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calciatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quacumque nos conversatio exercet, frontem signaculo terimus* (ch. 3, p. 158). "The way in which Tertullian places the sign of the cross within the heritage of the tradition of the church demonstrates that the gesture was not for him a tradition typical of Africa or of the Latin West, but, above all, an attitude of the popular Christian religiosity" (F.J. Dölger, JbAC, 1,12-13). The same is valid for posture in prayer, of which Tertullian says casually: *Illuc sursum suspicientes christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudato, quia non erubescimus, . . . precantes sumus* (*Apol.* 30, 4: CCL 1, 141).

We find an analogous situation in the East. *Clement of Alexandria strongly emphasizes, for his "gnostics," the interior attitude and spirituality; but he also prescribes "lifting the head and raising the hands toward Heaven," "standing" during the final public prayer pronounced out loud, in order to express in this way the yearning of all spiritual people toward the *Good and the Holy (*Strom.* VII, 40,1: GCS 17,30,19-25). On this issue *Origen is even more

profound: *in ecclesiasticis observationibus sunt nonnulla huiusmodi, quae omnibus quidem facere necesse est. . . . Nam quod v. gr. genua flectimus orantes et quod ex omnibus coeli plagis ad solam Orientis partem conversi orationem fundimus, non facile cuiquam puto ratione compertam. . . . Et omnia haec operta licet et velata portamus . . . , ut a magno pontifice atque eius filiis tradita et commendata suscepimus* (*In Num. hom.* V, 1: GCS 30,26,14-24). In the *De orat.* he prescribes the necessity of genuflection when one accuses oneself of sins in the presence of God. The genuflection "at the name of Jesus" later grew common as an act of humiliation before God (31,3: GCS, *Orig.* II, 396,21-397,4). These gestures are in any case only occasional events: they demonstrate nevertheless in an impressive manner how much such exterior attitudes constitute a true and proper heritage of the believers' faith, even if they have not always been rightly understood.

The *Apostolic Tradition* offers a general overview, almost systematic, in the context of a treatment of ecclesiastical discipline. Normally one prays standing (ch. 25, Botte LQF 39, p. 65). Before the morning prayer it is necessary to wash one's hands (ch. 41, p. 88). At the third hour, if one is not at home, one may pray in silence: *ora in corde tuo Deum* (ibid., p. 90). The midnight prayer also should be preceded by the ablution of the hands: this is a prayer that should be recited together with one's wife. In this circumstance one makes a gesture with a sign of the cross and a bit of saliva: *Per consignationem cum udo flatu et per manum sputum amplectens, corpus tuum . . . sanctificatum est* (ibid., p. 94). After the mention of this infrequent and strange custom, we find an entire chapter (42, p. 98) *de signo crucis*: at any time it is good to sign one's forehead with the sign of the cross as a defense against the devil: *frontem et oculos per manum consignantes* (p. 100), to avoid damnation.

Between the 2nd and the 4th c. certain gestures spread widely, under the guidance of tradition, among pious habits. By these gestures the body, sanctified in the bath of *baptism and filled, through unction, with the *Holy Spirit, favors prayer, expressing the interior states of the soul, indeed supporting and strengthening them. The gaze turns toward heaven with the head; with the mouth one exchanges the holy *kiss of peace; the fingers of the hand effect a meaningful gesture in the sign of the cross; the hands are lifted up in prayer. One stands for prayer, kneels on determined days and in certain penitential occasions and for adoration. There is also a silent and vigilant prayer, which is done seated. In *Ep. 130 ad Probam*, Augustine, without dwelling for long on the meaning of exterior gestures, offers teachings on prayer (CSEL 44, 40-77; PL 33, 494-507). He speaks of ejaculatory prayers: *crebras . . . orationes, sed eas tamen brevissimas et raptim quodam modo iaculatas* (ch. 20, p. 62); *plerumque hoc negotium plus gemitibus quam sermonibus agitur, plus fletu quam afflatu* (pp. 62-63). *Hoc tamen late patet, ut homo Christianus in qualibet tribulatione constitutus in hoc gemitus edat, in hoc lacrimas fundat* (ch. 21, p. 64). In the conclusion he asks *Proba to pray for him and admonishes: *in ieiuniis et vigiliis et omni castigatione corporis, qua plurimum adiuvatur oratio, facitat quoque vestrum quod poterit* (ch. 31, p. 76).

That which has thus been handed down by the Fathers has remained alive in all the liturgical forms of the centuries. The Christian puts oneself before God, in front of the altar, with the hands raised, the eyes lifted up, kneeling during the supplications and during penitential time, decisively avoiding genuflections during the feasts and Eastertide, exchanging the kiss of peace, always ready to sign oneself with the cross to strengthen oneself against the attacks of the Evil One, and thereby to confess Jesus the Crucified and Risen. Though overly charged with ceremony in certain verses (M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani*, II, Louvain 1960, 65-108; cf. J.A. Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia*, Freiburg [5]1962, I, 96-97), the *Ordo Romanus I* offers a witness to this attitude of piety and devotion during liturgical functions.

Various entries in DACL 4, 2662-2670; 6, 1017-1021; 7, 391-413; LTK[3] 4, 536-537; RAC 8, 1134-1258 (passim); 10, 895-902; Th. Ohm, *Jesus Christus und die Gebetsgebärde*: Benedikt. Monatsschrift 23 (1947) 198-209; Id., *Die Gebetsgebärden der Völker und das Christentum*, Leiden 1948; F.J. Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens*: JbAC 1 (1958) 5-19, with continuation in the following vols. from 2 to 10; H. Michalowicz, *Ritus genuflexionis (proskynesis) in celebratione eucharistica Liturgiae Romanae primi millenii. Investigatio liturgica*, Diss. S. Anselmo, Rome 1972; M. Paternoster, *L'imposizione delle mani nella Chiesa primitiva*: EphLit 91 (1977) 203-234; 332-349; B. Neunheuser, *Les gestes de la prière à genoux et de la génuflexion dans les Églises de rite romain*, in *Gestes et paroles dans les diverses familles liturgiques*, Rome 1978, 153-165; E. Fiala, *L'imposition des mains come signe de la communication de l'Esprit Saint dans les rites latins*, in *Le Saint-Esprit dans la liturgie* (Conférences Saint-Serge XVI[e] semaine d'études liturgiques Paris, 1-4 Juillet 1969), Rome 1977, 87-103; V. Saxer, *"Il étendit les mains à l'heure de sa Passion." Le thème de l'orant/-te dans la littérature chrétienne des II[e] et III[e] siècles*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 335-365; C. Vogel, *Handauflegung*: RAC 13, 482-494; J.C. Schmitt, *La raison des gestes dans l'Occident médiéval*, Paris 1990; G. Freyburger - L. Pernot, *Bibliographie analytique de la prière grecque et romaine (1898–1998)*, Turnhout 2000.

B. Neunheuser - P. de Navascués

GIFT. In Greco-Roman antiquity the exchange of gifts, an expression of mutual ties, occupied a place of prime importance in social life both public and private. By them, rulers and the rich demonstrated εὐεργεσία and *liberalitas* toward their subjects and clients. Equally important was the custom of making gifts on the occasion of great feasts (*Saturnalia*, New Year) or family events (birth, betrothal, marriage). During the first three centuries, and even later to some degree, Christians opposed these customs, judging them *pagan and connected with *idolatry (Tertull., *Idol.* 10,3; 13-14). According to Lactantius, there is no true benevolence other than *alms given to the needy (*Inst.* 6,11,26; cf. Ambr., *Off.* 2,25). The Constantinian era changed the situation here. Constantine and his family and others showed *liberalitas* also to the church and clergy, who didn't hesitate to accept it, although not without provoking bitter criticism, both pagan (*Ammianus Marcellinus against *Damasus) and Christian (*Jerome). At the same time there began in Christian circles the custom of exchanging letters on the great feasts, Easter and Christmas (see the correspondence of *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Basil and *Theodoret). Nonetheless, as in early times bishops recommended alms above all, connected with the *Eucharist and esp. with the major seasons of the liturgical year (*Lent, etc.) (Aug., *Serm.* 193,3). Also noteworthy is the exchange of *eulogia*, esp. in monastic settings. Two final observations will help us understand better the rather negative position toward these ancient customs. The requirement that the gift must express an inner openness to one's neighbor, not a *do ut des*, corresponds to the demands of the gospel (Mt 6:2ff., etc.). On the other hand, for Christians the true gift is that of the *Holy Spirit, which *God communicates to believers through the risen Christ, and by which he gives life to his church (*see also* *grace, *charisms).

RAC 10,685-703; H. Mürmel - O. Bayer, *Gabe*: RGG[4] 3, 445-446 (bibl.).

B. Studer

GILDAS the Wise (d. 570). The first *Celtic writer working in Latin after the abandonment of *Britain by the Romans. Born probably at the beginning of the 6th c. in W Britain, he passed most of his life there. He visited *Ireland and (although this is not completely certain) also *Rome and *Gaul, where he founded the monastery of Gildas-de-Rhuys. He died in 570. Under his name a brief penitential has reached us, *Praefatio de paenitentia*, and fragments of letters of disciplinary content. But his fundamental work is the *De excidio Britanniae*, written a little before 547. The work, which aims to show the reader the drama of Roman Britain, abandoned by the legions at the end of the 4th c. and successively devastated by Picts, Scots, Angles and Saxons, is divided into two parts: The first (chs. 3-26) tells the history of Britain from the origins until the invasions of the barbarians, finally defeated by Ambrose Aurelian near Mount Badon (beginning of the 6th c.). The second part (chs. 27-110) presents and reproves the vices of the Britons who, forgetful of the past calamities, have subverted and put aside every norm of *truth and *justice. The continual comparison with biblical paradigms serves to reveal the baseness of the Christianity of the Britons of his time. Gildas is not ignorant of letters: the very mixture of genres that is found in his works (history, epistolography, exhortation) can be explained in the context of a literary tradition that did not disdain combinations of this kind; and if his Latin is heavy, it also savors of an accurate elaboration.

CPL 1319-1324; PL 69, 329-392; MGH (AA) 13,25-85; B. Bischoff, *Das Reisegebet des Gildas (Spätes siebentes Jahrhundert?)*: Anecdota Novissima: Texte des vierten bis sechzehnten Jahrhunderts, Stuttgart 1984, 154-161; BBKL II, 246-247; N.J. Higham, *Old Light on the Dark Age Landscape. The Description of Britain in the* De Excidio Britanniae *of Gildas*: Journal of Historical Geography 17 (1991) 363-372; N. Wright, *"Gildas" Reading. A Survey*: SE 32 (1991) 121-162; Patrologia IV, 436-439.

M. Simonetti

GILDO (d. 398). Son of Nubel, a powerful chieftain of the Kabyles of *Mauretania Caesariensis, and brother of Firmus, who rebelled in 372 against the Roman authorities. Gildo, however, served the Romans with honor against his brother (Amm. Marc., *Rerum gestarum libri* XXIX, 5,6 e 21.24). He was rewarded with the nomination as *comes et magister utriusque militiae per Africam* in 386 (CTh IX, 7,9 of 30 December 393, for the title). He gradually grew disappointed with regard to *Theodosius I, and did not send him aid during the revolt of *Eugenius (392–394). He had by this point become a supporter of the *Donatists and formed a solid friendship with the Donatist bishop *Optatus of Thamugadi (Aug., *C. epist. Parmeniani* II, 4,8; 15,34; *C. litteras Petiliani* II, 92,209; 101,232; *Ep.* 87,5). In the autumn of 397 he revolted against the Western government and proclaimed his fidelity to that of the East, but was defeated and killed by an army led by his brother Mascezel, whose son Gildo had assassinated; his ally the bishop Optatus was also executed with him

(Oros., VII, 36,4-11; Prosp. of Aq., *Epit. Chr. sub anno* 398; Claud., *De bello Gildonico*). Gildo possessed enormous properties in N Africa, so large that at his death a special commissioner was named to take care of them (*Notit. Dig. occ.* XII, 5. Cf. CTh VII, 8,7 [June 400], IX, 42,16 [December 399] and 19 [April 405]). His family, however, maintained links with the Roman aristocracy; thus his daughter Salvinia (Jer., *Ep.* 123,17) married *Nebridius, nephew of the empress *Flaccilla (Jer., *Ep.* 70). Gildo was a powerful and unscrupulous indigenous chieftain, whose ambitions, had they been realized, could have led to results of great importance for the destinies of Donatism and Catholicism in N Africa.

The sources are those indicated in the article; O. Seeck, *Gildus*: PWK 7 (1910) 1360-1363; PLRE 1,395-396; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford ²1971, ch. 4; PCBE I, 539; P. Langa, *La rebelión de Gildon*, in *Notas complementarias*, BAC 32, Madrid 1988, 862-863.

W.H.C. Frend

GIRK' T'GHT'OTS' (The Book of Letters). An extensive medieval Armenian collection of works primarily of dogmatic character, of notable historical and textual interest. Until now it has been studied and translated in a very partial manner, yet despite the insufficiencies of the first edition, it has not yet been replaced.

Girkʿ tŁėtʿocʿ [Book of Letters] (Sahak Mesropean Matenadaran 5), Tʿiflis 1901; M. Tallon, *Livre des lettres (Girk tʿltʿoç / Ier groupe. Documents concernant les relations avec les grecs*: Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph 32,1 (1955) 1-146; L. Frivold, *The Incarnation. A Study of the Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Armenian Church in the 5th and 6th Centuries According to the Book of Letters*, Oslo 1981; S.S. Arevšatyan, *Le "Livre des êtres" et la question de l'appartenance de deux lettres dogmatiques anciennes*: Revue des études Arméniennes n.s. 18 (1984) 23-32; M.G. Grigorian [Grigorean], *Apołinarean hatakotorkʿ hay astowacabanakan grakanowtʿean mej* [Fragments of Apollinaris in Armenian theological literature]: HA 101 (1987) 243-277; N. Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient* (CSCO 574, subs. 100), Louvain 1999, 412-583; A. Schmidt, *Das armenische "Buch der Briefe." Seine Bedeutung als quellenkundliche Sammlung für die christologischen Streitigkeiten in Armenien im 6./7. Jh.*, in *Logos. Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993*, ed. H.C. Brennecke . . . (BZNW 67), Berlin-New York 1993, 511-533 (526ff., structure of the Tiflis ed.).

S.J. Voicu

GLORIA. Beyond the meanings of celebrity, fame, honor, the word *gloria*, in patristic Latin, took on, through its Greek equivalent δόξα, the biblical sense of manifestation of the divine power (*kabod*), of acknowledgment of *God on the part of human beings and of *eschatological salvation communicated by the risen Christ. It is notable, however, that the Latins translated δόξα—ignoring, incidentally, the meaning of "opinion"—not only with *gloria*, but also with *maiestas*, *claritas* and *honor*. Given the importance of the biblical theme of *gloria*, it is not surprising that it occupies a considerable place in Latin theology (*Hilary, *Ambrose) and *liturgy.

M. Steinheimer, *Die* δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ *in der römischen Liturgie*, Munich 1951; A.J. Vermeulen, *The Semantic Development of Gloria in Early-Christian Latin*, Nijmegen 1956; A. Fierro, *Sobre la Gloria en San Hilario*, Rome 1964; B. Studer, *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der Alten Kirche*, Düsseldorf 1985, passim.

B. Studer

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS DEO. Composed in the manner of the psalms, this work belongs to the most ancient *liturgical forms. It opens with the song of the angels at the annunciation of the birth of Christ to the shepherds (Lk 2:14). Acclamations to *God follow, closed with an indication of his glory and his omnipotence. This first part is directed to the Father and constitutes the oldest part of the hymn. The second part passes from praise to supplication and is directed to the Son: the allusions to Christ, only-begotten of the Father, to his redemption, to his glory (seated at the right hand of the Father), show an insistence that underlines the indubitable influences of an opposition to contemporary and erroneous christological theories, above all *Arian. The hymn has reached us in two redactions: one, in the so-called *Codex Alexandrinus* (A), is thought to be older and more authentic; the other, included in the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* (C), reveals interpolations from a hand not always orthodox. There is no mention, in the adopted form, of the *Holy Spirit: the third Person, however, was explicitly called upon in the conclusion of the first part (cod. A): *Domine Fili unigenite et Sancte Spiritus*.

DACL 6,1528-1540; RAC 11,196-225; LTK³ 4,751-752; B. Capelle, *Le texte du "Gloria in excelsis"*: RHE 44 (1949) 439-457; W. Stapelmann, *Der Hymnus angelicus. Geschichte und Erklärung des Gloria*, Heidelberg 1948; EC 6,868-869; ODC 681-682.

L. Dattrino

GLOSS – GLOSSARY. Initially a gloss indicate that an explanation for an obscure word was needed; later it indicated the explanation itself. Aristotle used it in the latter sense, specifying that it is a very ancient method of teaching (*Rhet.* III, 3,2). *Glossary* was also applied to the collections of words ex-

plained; and *glossators*, the authors who compiled the glossaries. The habit of glossing texts and laws dates back to Alexander the Great and continued throughout the entire Middle Ages, with the exception of the *Justinian period, when any commentary on the imperial laws was forbidden. In Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages the custom spread of gathering the commentaries of different authors on biblical or legal terms, creating the so-called **catenae*, which rise to major importance for following the development of ideas or for reconstructing partially lost texts. The most frequently glossed books are the Bible, the *Corpus iuris civilis* or the *Corpus iuris canonici*.

The biblical glossary gave rise to the singular phenomena known by the name of *glossa ordinaria* (= a continuous commentary on the whole Bible put in the side margins of the text) (cf. PL 113-114) and of *glossa interlinearis* (= short explanatory notes put between the lines of the text). The most important kinds of glosses are the corrective, intended to rectify readings held to be inexact or difficult; explicative, aimed at explaining little-known or archaic terms; integrative, trying to complete a text missing one or more words. The oldest glossary is that of *Hesychius of Alexandria (5th-6th c.), who wrote a vast Greek philological lexicon of the classical authors and of dialectic, taking the most important material from Diogenianus of Heraclea or from Apollonius Sophist of the era of Hadrian and from various collections of sayings. Biblical glosses were introduced into the glossary before the 8th c. Other glossaries were compiled by *Theodoret, *Photius, Ecumenius, Zonara and *Suidas (ca. 976).

In the Western Middle Ages, biblical commentaries known as "the glossary" are attributed to Anselm of Laon (1050–1117) and to his school. Among the disciples and collaborators of Anselm there was the magister Gilbertus Universalis, who glossed a good number of biblical texts in continuous form; some were widespread; Peter Lombard enriched the glossary of Anselm of Laon. In this period the glossaries were called "glossaria magna"; that of Peter Lombard, "glossaria media"; that of Gilbert and that of Anselm, "glossaria parva." From 1180 each gloss was signaled with a symbol. *Isidore of Seville, in his 20 books of the *Etymologies*, had elaborated a theological-alphabetical glossary. The glosses to civil and canon law took the form of *scholia*, the most important of which are the commentaries on the *Libri Basilicorum*. Famous glossators of the *Corpus iuris civilis* were the Bolognese jurists, with Pepo and his school at their head. A similar path was taken by the canonists who glossed the *Decretum* of *Gratian and then the *Decretales*, and were called decretists and decretalists. In the legal field the glosses tended to resolve the problems that were posed by laws contrasting with one other (*quaestiones*; *solutiones contrariorum*), relying on parallel texts; they also served to mark the difference between the legal sources and traditions.

EI 17, 427-429; EC 6, 870-873; *Enc. della Bibbia*, Turin 1970, 3, 1305-1307; B. Smalley, *Lo studio della Bibbia nel Medioevo*, Bologna 1972, 85-107; H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, Paris 1959–1964, passim; E. Bertola, *La Glossa ordinaria biblica ed i suoi problemi*: Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 45 (1978) 34-78; R. Wielcockx, *Autour de la Glossa ordinaria*: Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 49 (1982) 222-228; TRE 13, 452-457; R. Weigand, *Die Glossen zum Dekret Gratians. Studien zu den frühen Glossen und Glossenkompositionen*, Rome 1991.

E. Peretto

GLOSSA PSALMORUM. A kind of Latin **catena* on the *Psalms, published by H. Boese, in which every verse includes a short commentary, of unknown author and a 7th-c. context, since it refers to the *Regula Benedicti* and *Gregory the Great is cited (Boese, 1982, 66-67). The terminology indicates a monastic provenance. The text is transmitted by eleven codices, a sign of its dissemination, but in only one is the title found: *Incipiunt glose psalmorum ex traditione seniorum*. The oldest witness is a fragment of the beginning of the 8th c., and the author might be a certain Iohannes Romanus Diaconus. The text of the Psalms is an important witness for the reconstruction of the Latin Psalter prior to *Jerome. The *praefatio* had already been published by De Bruyne and is found in numerous MSS. The compiler drew on multiple sources (ibid., 48-49), esp. and abundantly from the *Enarrationes* of St. *Augustine, but also from Jerome, *Hilary of Poitiers (for Psalm 118) and Gregory the Great. The author, in explaining individual verses, practices a simple *exegesis related to the demands of a monastic spirituality, even if he sometimes refers to a historical explanation, as he does, e.g., at Psalm 113.

CPL 1167c; Stegmüller 9165; 9900; 11193; H. Boese, *Die alte "Glosa Psalmorum ex traditione seniorum." Untersuchungen, Materialien, Texte*, Freiburg 1982 (ed. of about twenty psalms); Id., *Anonymi glosa Psalmorum ex traditione seniorum*, Teil I: *Praefatio und Psalmen 1–100*, Freiburg 1992 (for the observations on the ed., see J. Doignon: REL 71 [1993] 381-2); Teil II: *Psalmen 101–150*, Freiburg 1994.

A. Di Berardino

GNOSIS – GNOSTICISM. The term *gnosis*, from the Greek γνῶσις, indicates the "knowledge" of the

divine mysteries, conceived in general as extremely elitist and present in different religious and philosophical directions, ancient and modern (M. Tardieu, *Histoire du mot "gnostique,"* in Id. - J.D. Dubois, *Introduction à la littérature gnostique*, I, Paris 1986, 21-37). More circumscribed, however, is gnosticism (R.McL. Wilson, *From Gnosis to Gnosticism*, in *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions offerts à H.C. Puech*, Paris 1974, 423-436; *Gnosis and Gnosticism*: Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies: Oxford, Sept. 3-8 1979, ed. M. Krause, Leiden 1981, NHS 17), a religious phenomenon born probably in the 1st c. AD that flowered during the 2nd c., aimed at obtaining true knowledge of divine and human spiritual reality, on which our documentation, until the middle of the 20th c., was furnished essentially by Christian *heresiologists; today we make use also of the valuable Coptic texts of the library of *Nag Hammadi. For the designation, see M. Smith, *The History of the Term "Gnosticism,"* in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II, ed. B. Layton, Leiden 1981, 796-807. A rich collection of the following indirect and direct sources was already furnished by W. Foerster, *Die Gnosis*. I. *Die Zeugnisse der Kirchenväter*, Zürich 1969, II. *Koptische und mandäische Quellen*, Zürich 1971, Eng. tr. Oxford 1972–1974. In Italian there is, e.g., *Testi gnostici*, ed. L. Moraldi, Turin 1982; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici cristiani*, Bari 1970; Id., *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, Vicenza 1993; Rome-Milan ³2001.

The very definition of gnosticism, given multiple times and in different ways in the history of the studies of this phenomenon, in particular at an important congress at Messina (*Le origini dello Gnosticismo*, Colloquio di Messina, 13-18 April 1966, Leiden 1967, ed. U. Bianchi: Studies in History of Religion 12), gave rise to many reflections, among which notable examples are those of N. Brox, Γνωστικοί *als häresiologischer Terminus*: ZNTW 57 (1966) 105-114; M.J. Edwards, *Gnostics and the Valentinians in the Church Fathers*: JTS 40 (1989) 26-47, or the studies of R.McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, London 1958, ²1964; Id., *Slippery Words*, II: *Gnosis, Gnostic, Gnosticism*: Expository Times 89 (1978) 296-301; Id., *Gnosis and Gnosticism. The Messina Definition*, in *Agathê elpis. Studi storico-religiosi in onore di U. Bianchi*, ed. G. Sfameni Gasparro, Rome 1994, 539-551. Recently, in particular, gnosticism has been the subject of considerable debate that has questioned the legitimacy of the category of gnosticism itself. E.g., acc. to K.L. King (*What Is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, MA-London 2003), *gnosticism* would be a mere rhetorical term, originally intended to define orthodoxy by contrast, and confused with a historical entity; she, however, does not propose its abolition, favored by some, nor put it between quotation marks; she continues to employ the term, recalling however that in her opinion it is a modern category created on the model of the ancient heresiologists. In the 19th and 20th c. there were efforts to define gnosticism by determining its genealogy and fixing its essential characteristics. It is described as a Christian heresy in the accounts of the Fathers, such as *Irenaeus, whom we can consider the principal source, but also *Justin, *Clement, *Origen, *Tertullian, *Hippolytus, *Epiphanius. In particular many studies have been directed to the attestations and the polemic of Irenaeus, such as G. Vallée, *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics. Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius*, Waterloo 1981; G. Filoramo, *Antropologie in conflitto. Il caso di Ireneo e degli gnostici*: Humanitas 1 (1996) 52-67; J. Holzhausen, *Irenäus und die valentinianische Gnosis*: VChr 55/4 (2001) 341-355; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Eretici e maghi in Ireneo. L'accusa di magia come strumento di polemica antignostica*, in *Munera amicitiae*, ed. R. Barcellona - T. Sardella, Soveria Mannelli 2003, 471-472.

Already A. von Harnack, in *Dogmengeschichte* (1885), defined gnosticism, identified by him through a series of typical traits, as an "acute Hellenization of Christianity," with the application to the latter of *Platonic, Pythagorean and Stoic *philosophy. Hellenization in general had supposedly affected the *dogma and not the essence of Christianity, characterized by evangelical enthusiasm which Protestantism had recovered. Next, the school of history of religions brought, also through philology, linguistics and the historical and typological method and thanks to interest in the East, a notable contribution to the study of gnosticism, whose origins were traced no longer to a heretical Christianity, but rather to the pre-Christian Eastern religiosity. Gnosticism was followed from its presumed origins even up to the syncretistic developments, thanks also to the discoveries of gnostic, *Manichean and *Mandean texts. The qualification of *syncretism has in fact often been associated with gnosticism; see in particular A. Böhlig, *Gnosis und Synkretismus*, I-II, Tübingen 1989. R. Reitzenstein thought to reconstruct the myth of the Iranian gnostic Savior and traced Jesus' epithet Ναζωραῖος to the *Nazarenes, seen as ancient Mandeans. W. Bousset (*Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen 1907, ²1973) studied the πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος and δεύτερος θεός of gnosticism, of which he furnished a series of typological traits, as an "acute Easternization of Christianity," seen as pre-Christian, un-Hellenic and anti-Judaic, in reaction to which Catholicism

supposedly defined itself; in contrast to Harnack, he put importance also on Christian theology and worship. R. Bultmann observed in the Johannine gospel a knowledge of gnosticism and criticism of it, and in its Logos an influence of the Wisdom of the OT and of Philo. He accepted the Iranian derivation of the myth of the Savior and showed how Christianity and gnosticism shared the conception of humanity's critical situation in the world, differing in identifying the cause: fate for gnosticism and *sin for Christianity. W. Bauer in *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (1934) maintained that heresy, and in particular the gnostic one, should not be considered a secondary development of orthodoxy and that the origins of Christianity should not be read with the lenses of the latter ecclesiastical authors; he also dedicated special attention to the particular forms of Christianity that had developed, e.g., in *Egypt or at *Edessa.

In the same year, H. Jonas wrote vol. 1 of *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* (titled *Die Mythologische Gnosis*, Göttingen 1934; vol. 2 would be *Von der Mythologie zur mystischen Philosophie*, Göttingen 1954; see Id., *Lo Gnosticismo*, It. tr. Turin 1973, ²1992). Jonas considered gnosticism in its originality and unity and in its context, not just as an assimilation of preceding ideas, nor as a Hellenization or Easternization of Christianity, but rather as independent. The characteristics of gnosticism acc. to Jonas were knowledge, dynamism and pathomorphic crisis, myth, cosmological *dualism, which includes a weakening of *ethics into *asceticism or libertinism, impiety and difficulty in understanding the incarnation and the cross, artificiality in creation of myths. This reconstruction has been subjected to various criticisms, e.g., by M. Waldstein, *Hans Jonas' Construct 'Gnosticism'. Analysis and Critique*: JECS 8 (2002) 341-372, and by King (*What Is Gnosticism?*). In addition, for Jonas, Christianity and gnosticism respond to the same situation without being interdependent: they are two species in the same genre. The new discoveries of sources esp. of Mandeans (fixed only to the 2nd-3rd c. AD, a date confirmed by E. Lupieri, *I Mandei. Gli ultimi gnostici*, Brescia 1993; Eng. tr. *The Mandaeans. The Last Gnostics*, Grand Rapids, MI 2001) do not support the thesis of a pre-Christian origin of gnosticism; even the pre-Christian myth of the Savior has been refuted by C. Colpe.

The contributions of the Coptic library of Nag Hammadi on the categories, origins and typology of gnosticism have been of inestimable value. King (*What Is . . . ?*, ch. 6) criticizes the classification of the texts of Nag Hammadi (on which there is an important essay *Les textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification*, in Actes du colloque, Québec 15-19 septembre 1993, ed. L. Painchaud - A. Pasquier, Québec-Louvain-Paris 1995) into *Valentinian, *Sethian, *Hermetic (on the relations between gnosticism and hermeticism, see *Gnosis and Hermeticism from Antiquity to Modern Times*, ed. R. van den Broek - W.J. Hanegraaff, Albany 1997) and "Thomist," or connected with the tradition of the apostle *Thomas, from which classification Christian apocrypha escape, such as the *Gospel of Mary* and *Gospel of the Savior* or the *Apocryphon of James*, which belong to the corpus of the gnostic Christian apocrypha, and other Greek texts such as a passage from Plato, all included in the Coptic library. These documents, containing much Judaizing material, have led to supposing a Jewish origin of gnosticism already proposed by Friedländer; the relationship between gnosticism and Judaism has been investigated by R. Wilson, *Jewish Gnosis and Gnostic Origins. A Survey*: Hebrew Union College Annual 45 (1974) 179-189; *Altes Testament-Frühjudentum-Gnosis*, ed. K.W. Tröger, Gütersloh 1980; A. Magris, *Riflessioni sul rapporto fra Giudaismo e Gnosticismo*: Cassiodorus 1 (1995) 207-211; Id., *Trasformazioni del modello biblico di Dio nello Gnosticismo*: AnSE 12 (1995) 233-251; it is not for nothing that we also have Jewish sources on gnosticism: A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, Leiden 1977; B. Pearson, *Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature*, in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. M.A. Stone, Assen-Philadelphia 1984, 443-481. However, the Jewish gnostic texts that we possess are Christianized, and S. Petrément (*Le Dieu séparé. Les origines du gnosticisme*, Paris 1984; Eng. tr. San Francisco 1990) and A.H.B. Logan (*Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy*, Edinburgh 1996), e.g., hypothesize a birth of gnosticism from Judaism through Christianity, and some, such as P. Perkins (*Gnosticism and the New Testament*, Minneapolis 1993), suppose a Samaritan origin, the possibility of which has been investigated also by J. Fossum (*The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism*, Tübingen 1985).

For Jonas, gnosticism does not have proper origins, even if it has these antecedents. King (*What Is . . . ?*, ch. 7) holds that gnosticism does not have a single origin and is not monolithic, so that it is difficult to define it univocally, and tries to demonstrate, referring to many documents, how it is not possible to apply to all the gnostic texts in our possession, e.g., the three characteristics of gnosticism often defined as such: anticosmic dualism, incompatibility with ethics and the consequent ascetic or libertine es-

capes, and christological docetism. The positions of M.A. Williams appear more extreme (*Rethinking Gnosticism. An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, Princeton, NJ 1996), who tries to destroy the category of gnosticism itself, considered an invention of the ancient heresiologists and modern critics. Other scholars of gnosticism, on the other hand, such as Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, observe that similar attempts at deconstruction run into a hard knot of sources that are difficult to eliminate completely (e.g., G. Sfameni Gasparrro, *Temi apocalittici nello Gnosticismo*, in *Millennium*, ed. R. Uglione, Turin 2002, 101-141: 103-104; Id., *Tempo della storia e tempo della salvezza nello Gnosticismo*, in *Theoretical Frameworks for the Study of Graeco-Roman Religions*, Thessaloniki 2003, 171-207 n. 3).

Gnosticism is therefore a movement of sometimes elusive outlines, but it does not seem impossible to describe it at least in general lines, always remaining aware of its notable complexity both in the mythological variants of the various systems, traditionally divided into Valentinian, *Ophite and Sethian, and in their different positions on problems of ethics, *anthropology, *soteriology, which can be gleaned from direct and indirect sources. Furthermore, the multiple influences frequently exercised on different gnostic currents by Greek philosophy, above all Platonic, should also be kept in mind (on the relationships between gnosticism and late Platonism, see R.T. Wallis - J. Bregman, eds., *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, Albany 1992; J.D. Turner - R. Majercik, eds., *Gnosticism and Later Platonism*, Atlanta 2000; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, Québec-Louvain-Paris 2001), but also by Jewish tradition, e.g., evident in many texts of Nag Hammadi. We have seen the relationship between gnosticism and Christianity discussed for some time and at length by critics. On this subject we can further mention some important studies such as that of G. Quispel, *Gnosticism and the New Testament*, in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J.P. Hyatt, Nashville, TN 1965, 252-271; R.M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, New York ²1966; Id., *Heresy and Criticism*, Louisville-Westminster 1993; R. Wilson, *Gnosis and the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1968; *Gnosis und Neues Testament*, ed. K.W. Tröger, Berlin 1973; J. Magne, *From Christianity to Gnosis and from Gnosis to Christianity*, Atlanta 1993.

The image of gnosticism as a Christian heresy today appears rather reductive, because various gnostic texts of Nag Hammadi offer no trace of Christian influence. For some texts it has been suggested that Christianization occurred at a later date (cf. e.g., M. Krause, *Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi*, in *Mullus*. Festschrift Th. Klauser, Münster 1964, 215-223). There exist therefore both non-Christian gnostic writings, or only secondarily and superficially Christianized, and certainly Christian gnostic texts such as those typical of the gnosticism of *Basilides, of Valentinus and the Valentinians, aimed at *exegesis of the gospel and christological reflection, studied, e.g., by A. Orbe, *Christlogía gnóstica*, I-II, Madrid 1976; P. Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue. The Early Church and the Christ of Gnosticism*, New York 1980; Id., *Logos Christologies in the Nag Hammadi Codices*: VChr 35 (1981) 379-396; Id., *Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament*: CBQ 43 (1981) 590-606; *Nag-Hammadi, Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, ed. C.W. Hedrick - R. Hodgson, Peabody, MA 1986; D. Voorgang, *Die Passion Jesu und Christi in der Gnosis*, Frankfurt a.M. etc. 1991; and G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Gesù il Christ nello Gnosticismo*: Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica 24, Rome 2000, 128-199. However, in particular for Valentinian gnosticism (already the specific object of the important studies of F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de St. Irénée*, Paris 1947; A. Orbe, *Estudios Valentinianos*, I-V, Rome 1955–1966; *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I, *The School of Valentinus*, Leiden 1980; A. McGuire, *Valentinus and the "Gnostikê Hairesis,"* Ph.D. Diss., Yale 1983; G. Quispel, *The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic*: VChr 50 [1996] 327-352), the doubt, not unanimously received, regarding the actual gnosticism of Valentinus raised by C. Markschies (*Valentinus Gnosticus?* Tübingen 1992; Id., *Nochmals. Valentinus und die Gnostikoi*: VChr 51 [1997] 179-187; *Valentinian Gnosticism*, in *The Nag-Hammadi Library After Fifty Years*, ed. D. Turner - A. McGuire, Leiden 1997, 401-438) should be remembered, but see the observations of M. Simonetti (*Valentinus Gnosticus*: Cassiodorus 1 [1995] 197-205), and earlier of U. Bianchi (*À propos de quelques discussions récentes sur la terminologie, la définition et la méthode de l'étude du gnosticisme*, in *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism, Stockholm 1973*, Leiden 1977, 16-26). Also important are the investigations of M.J. Edwards, *Gnostics and the Valentinians in the Church Fathers*: JTS 40 (1989) 26-47; G. Quispel, *Valentinus and the Gnostikoi*: VChr 50 (1996) 327-352; F. Bermejo, *La escisión imposible. Lectura del Gnosticismo Valentiniano*, Salamanca 1998; A. Magris, *L'escatologia valentiniana*: AnSE 16 (1999) 133-139. The polemical aspect of gnosticism with respect to orthodox Christianity has been investigated by K. Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen*

das kirchliche Christentum, Leiden 1978.

In gnosticism, knowledge, which is directly salvific, is revealed by a Savior—a complex and elusive figure, often intersecting with that of Jesus Christ and studied recently by A. Magris (*Testi gnostici sulla vicenda del Salvatore*: Fil&Teol 13 [1999] 84-99)—and transmitted by an esoteric tradition. For gnostic initiation, which is not called διδασκαλία, "instruction," by chance, generally consists in the revelation of a mythic account aimed at clarifying "who we are, what we have become; where we are, from where we have been precipitated; where we are headed, how we are purified; what generation is, what regeneration is" (*Exc. ex Theod.* 78,2). If, as has been seen, the historical origins of gnosticism are debated, it seems to be possible to trace the psychological and religious motivations to a condition of existential insecurity and malaise widespread in the 1st-2nd c. AD both in the pagan and in the Christian world, which in gnosticism expresses a sense of alienation and sometimes also aversion to the world, such that in the extreme gnostic expressions this is identified with *evil, from which gnostics, since they are pneumatics and not carnal beings, must flee. For their true home is the divine πλήρωμα (*pleroma), the fullness of divinity: the pneumatic beings are opposed to the hylics and psychic beings (*see* *psychici) and are indicated differently, by the Ophites and Sethians as the "sons of the Light" or the "race that does not waver," by Basilides as the "Third Filiation," and by Valentinus as "the church of the spiritual": for the Valentinian category of the "psychici," see M. Simonetti, *Psyche e Psychikos nella gnosi valentiniana*: RSLR 2 (1966) 1-47; as for the light, linked to the pneumatics, generally opposed to the darkness connected with matter, its symbolism is esp. important in gnosticism and has been studied by G. Filoramo (*Luce e gnosi. Saggio sull' illuminazione nello Gnosticismo*, Rome 1980).

The ontological dualism between the material principle and the spiritual one is a characteristic frequently present in gnostic texts. In general a cosmological dualism derives from it that is also reflected in the refusal of the unity of the principal divine creator, exactly contrary to Christianity and, still earlier, Judaism and the Greek tradition of the "cosmic god," as already *Plotinus observed (*Enn.* II, 9). Gnosticism tends on the contrary to identify two principal creators, one for the material world, often identified with the God of the OT, and another for the spiritual world, considered the true God, unknowable and ineffable, acc. to the principles of apophatic theology: this is an aspect particularly underlined in many texts, both of the direct and of the indirect tradition. For example, in Hippolytus (*Ref.* VII, 21,1), Basilides puts as the principle of everything a God "who does not exist," οὐκ ὤν, "free from thought, sensibility, will, etc." Starting from this totally transcendent divinity, the πλήρωμα, composed of *aeons, manifests itself (on which, most recently, see G. Zuntz, Αἰών *in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Vienna 1992; G. Casadio, *From Hellenistic* Αἰών *to Gnostic* Αἰῶνες, in *Religion im Wandel der Kosmologien*, ed. D. Zeller, Bern 1999, 175-190; Id., s.v. *Aion*, in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, I², Detroit-New York 2005, 207-210).

The known God, distinct from the unknowable Father, appears androgynous, with a feminine component called from time to time Σιωπή, Πρόνοια, Ἔννοια, or, respectively, Silence, Providence, Thought, so that the reflection of this God on itself is generative and manifests its true reality (the feminine principles of gnosticism have been studied recently by K.L. King, *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism*, Philadelphia 1988). This generative act has multiple successive developments: first the production of a son, named *Barbelo or Νοῦς, from the original couple, who manifests its image externally; then a series of emanations that constitute the πλήρωμα—conceived generally as circular—namely, the aeons, the last of which is Σοφία, Wisdom, to whom is attributed a sin variously configured as a presumptuous longing for knowledge, or desire for the Father, or will to imitate his productive activity (on the delineation of this mythic figure in the Coptic gnostic texts, see C. Scholten, *Martyrium und Sophiamythos im Gnostizismus nach den Texten des N.H.*, Münster 1987). This sin, whatever it is, explains the origin of evil and, finally, the material world (G. Filoramo, *Il tema della caduta nello gnosticismo*: Annuario Filosofico 9 [1999] 95-110). For Wisdom, or one of her *hypostases—for the Valentinians Sophia Achamoth—is cut off from the pleromatic world, and the foundations are laid for the work of the Demiurge, often called Jaldabaoth, who creates the world from a preexisting matter, shadow, appearance and absence of being, inspired by models, the τύποι transmitted to him by Sophia Achamoth, acc. to the Valentinians of Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 5,3); he reigns over the entire universe with the seven *archons* who are identified with the seven planetary spheres and who were also created by him. On the gnostic conception of the *archons*, see I.S. Gilhus, *The Nature of the Archons*, Wiesbaden 1985.

The account of human creation as well is often inspired by the biblical narrative, distinguishing, however, the formation of the material part, made by the Demiuge in his own image, and the insuffla-

tion of the pneumatic principle which assimilated Adam to God (J. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, Göttingen 1960, esp. 127-128) and which has a salvific function. The general lines of the gnostic conceptions of the genesis of the world and of humankind are traced by G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Creazione e antropologia nello Gnosticismo*: Dizionario di Spiritualità Biblico-Patristica 11, 2, Rome 1995, 61-81.

Other gnostic currents, such as the Sethian, at least acc. to the account of Hippolytus (*Ref.* VI, 19,2), rather than conceiving of evil as a result of the progressive fragmentation and attenuation of the divine world, postulate already at the beginning a principle of *good and one of evil, which are accompanied by an intermediate divine principle, Πνεῦμα or Λόγος, useful for the creation of the world, through the mixture of the two principles effected by it, and for its salvation, owed however to the spiritual principle. (See W. Wink, *Cracking the Gnostic Code. The Powers in Gnosticism*, Atlanta 1993, SBL Monograph Series 46, and, on the Sethians, at least H.M. Schenke, *Das sethianische System nach Nag Hammadi Handschriften*, in *Studia Coptica*, ed. P. Nagel, Berlin 1974, 165-172; A. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic Literature*, Leiden 1977; G.W. MacRae, *Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions*, Missoula, MT 1977; *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II. *Sethian Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, Leiden 1981; *Le deuxième traité du Grand Seth*: NH 7, 2, ed. tr. L. Painchaud, Québec 1982, Bibliothèque copte de NH 6; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism. A Literary History*, in W. Hedrick - R. Hodgson, *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, Peabody 1986, 55-86.)

The doctrine of salvation of the various gnostic currents does not appear monolithic. In some texts, the salvation acquired through gnosis during life seems to be considered definitive, as the true *resurrection: so, e.g., in the Valentinian treatise *On the Resurrection* (NHC I, 4, p. 46, 21-22). Otherwise, this salvation is seen as an anticipation of the definitive one that can only be had after *death, with the liberation of the spirit from the *body, when the *soul will progressively traverse the already mentioned *archontic spheres (from these a late gnostic sect, of the 4th c., takes its name). Only then will the punishment of the wicked take place (*Gospel of Truth*: NHC I, 3, p. 21, 34-37), on the day of judgment, and there can be *metempsychosis. In some texts of Nag Hammadi, as in the *Paraphrase of Shem* (NHC VII, 1, p. 43, 28-45, 31), impressive descriptions of the end of the world appear (on gnostic apocalyptic: I. Gruenwald, *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism*, Frankfurt a.M. 1988; *Apocalittica e Gnosticismo*, Atti del Colloquio internazionale, Rome, 18-19 June 1993, ed. M.V. Cerutti, Rome 1995; H.W. Attridge, *Valentinian and Sethian Apocalyptic Tradition*: JECS 8 [2000] 173-211; Sfameni, *Temi apocalittici*). One gnostic apocalyptic scenario was already known to Irenaeus, acc. to the Valentinian vision of a cosmic conflagration that will be followed by the **apokatastasis*, on the basis of an eschatological theory shared by Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa, with the reestablishment of the original situation, which this time will be definitive and immutable, since the spiritual principle will then have defeated evil.

According to the presentation of the heresiologists, gnostic ethics tends inevitably to abolish itself either into asceticism or into libertinism, since the gnostic—privileged since already saved—is superior to laws. Above all, Epiphanius (*Pan.* 26) emphasizes the libertine practices of certain gnostic groups. The texts of Nag Hammadi, however, point much more clearly in the other direction, the ascetic, with more or less extreme positions, derived from contempt for the body and the world in general and from the refusal of concupiscence: this tendency had moreover already been identified by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 24,2). The radical alternation between asceticism and libertinism, supported on the basis of the heresiologists, e.g., by Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, in a rather emphatic fashion, is today contested, and at least restricted, by several parties. We have pointed out above all the criticism of King (*What Is Gnostisism?* 191-217) of this and other stylizations of gnostic thought: she also observes that in the Nag Hammadi texts there is no tendency toward libertinism, expressly condemned on the contrary in the *Witness of Truth* and in general limited, as it seems, to some groups, while an ascetical tendency is notable, which is moreover often present in the Christian church as well. As for a tendency to minimize the value of ethics in gnosticism, K. Rudolph shows the importance of ethical endeavor also within gnosticism (*Die Gnosis. Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion*, Leipzig 1977, [2]1980, Eng. tr. San Francisco 1983).

Gnostic liturgy and cultural practices appear to be relatively poorly attested. Some gnostic movements, esp. Valentinian, preferred a purely spiritual worship that fled from every exterior manifestation, since, as Irenaeus attests (*Adv. haer.* I, 21,4), the mystery of the invisible and ineffable power should not be celebrated by means of visible and corruptible objects; cult practices are not salvific, but rather the knowledge of this ineffable principle. However, both the heresiologists and the Nag Hammadi texts attest gnostic prayers, hymns and psalms, such as that of Valentinus preserved by Hippolytus (*Ref.* VI, 37,6-8).

Some gnostics, like the *Simonians or the *Carpocratians (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 23,4; 25,6), also venerated images; individual places of gnostic worship have been discovered, like the Hypogeum of the Aurelii. Of some gnostic sects, such as the Ophites, we know that they venerated the *serpent. And the role taken on by the *sacraments in the Valentinian gnosticism should not be forgotten, which the Coptic contributions have helped to clarify (J.É. Ménard, *L'exposé valentinien. Les fragments sur le baptême et sur l'eucharistie*: *NH XI, 2,* Bibliothèque copte de NH Textes 14, Québec 1985; J.-M. Sevrin, *Le dossier baptismal séthien. Études sur la sacramentaire gnostique*, Bibiothèque copte de NH Études 2, Québec 1986). In particular on the sacrament of the nuptial chamber among the Valentinians we are informed mostly by the *Gospel of Philip*—a text of obviously Valentinian tone, containing concepts typical of gnostic experience and ritual, whose identification with the homonymous gospel mentioned by Epiphanius is debated. It contains exhortations and explanations from individuals who present themselves as Jews converted to Christian gnosticism, aimed at one or more listeners and focused on the meaning of the names of Jesus Christ, on the destiny and the liberation of the soul in the world, on the heavenly bread brought by Christ as a spiritual nourishment. Particularly important is the theme of the distinction of the genders as a symbol of the rending of the original unity which is destined to be reestablished in the *spirituali*, and it is the central theme of the sacraments, including giving much importantce to what is typically gnostic, the bridal chamber, which symbolizes the union of the "pneumatic" with his own angel and the restoration of the original unity (see A. Orbe, *Los Valentinianos y el matrimonio espiritual*: Gregorianum 58 [1977] 5-53).

The origins and the first manifestations of gnosticism constitute a problem that, as we have seen, is highly debated among critics and seems not to have been resolved yet with any certainty. The Simonians, in particular, would be connected with Simon Magus who, in Acts 8:9-25, is presented as a man who, toward the middle of the 1st c., in Samaria, was called "the great power," and, according to the heresiologists, was at the origins of the gnostic movement. The historicity of this figure, present later in the tradition of the apocryphal *Acts of the Apostles*, is controversial (K. Rudolph, *Simon-Magus oder Gnosticus? Zur Stand der Debatte*: ThRu 42 [1977] 279-359); in any case, the heresiological reports concerning the *Simonians, *Menander and *Satornilus (respectively Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 23,5; 24,1-2) indicate the 1st half of the 2nd c., when *Carpocrates and, above all, Basilides seem to have been active, of whose works, and those of his son *Isidore, relatively little remains for us, unfortunately; we have better documentation concerning Valentinian gnosticism (on Basilides, see W.A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1996, with bibl. 338-382; and more recently B.A. Pearson, *Basilides the Gnostic,* in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics,"* ed. A. Marjanen - P. Luomanen, Leiden-Boston 2008). The greatest flowering of gnosticism seems to have taken place from the middle of the 2nd c., by which time it was present in Palestine, Syria, Egypt and Rome. From *Marcion, whose characterization as a gnostic is debated, but whose cosmic and theological dualism—with the creator God of the OT considered distinct and inferior compared to the supreme God of the NT—must, it seems, be traced to gnostic roots, the gnosticism of this mature period is articulated into Valentinian, Ophitic and Sethian, where the most important movement appears clearly to be the Valentinian. Of Valentinus himself, an Egyptian active at Alexandria and later Rome in the middle of the 2nd c., we know relatively little, and his works have reached us in fragments: letters, sermons, psalms. The identification of his *Gospel of Truth* with that found at Nag Hammadi, maintained by the first editor of the Coptic text, G. Quispel, is uncertain: it is a speech held by the Master to his "pneumatic" disciples to communicate to them the message of truth, the acquisition of awareness of their own true nature and reaching the fullness of being. We have more information, also thanks to Irenaeus, concerning the school of Valentinus, divided acc. to Hippolytus into two great branches: one Eastern, represented by Ardesianes (perhaps *Bardesanes of Edessa, whose thought is gleaned from heresiological fragments and from the *Liber Legum Regionum*, a work of his school) and by Assionicus; and one Western, better documented, with *Ptolemy the Gnostic and *Heracleon.

Ptolemy (on whom see C. Markschies, *New Research on Ptolemaeus Gnosticus*: Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum 4 [2000] 225-254), a student of Valentinus together with Heracleon and Marcus, who lived in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD, in the *Letter to Flora* given in its entirety by Epiphanius in *Adv. haer.*, dwells on the interpretation of the OT, of which only the Ten Commandments are of divine origin, due to the Demiurge creator of the universe; the rest comes partly from Moses and partly from the elders of the Jewish people. The savior, as earlier for Valentinus, is identified with Jesus Christ, the only one to fulfill the Decalogue, perfecting it, while he abolished all the other laws, of which the ritual

ones should be read as symbols of the "spiritual and transcendent world": circumcision is that of the heart, fasting is abstention from evil, etc. Ptolemy, who in the *Letter* proclaims the scriptural and apostolic foundation of his own doctrines, also wrote a commentary to the Prologue of John, whose contents have been reported by Epiphanius and by Irenaeus (on the Johannine gospel and gnosticism, see H. Koester, *The History-of-Religions School, Gnosis, and the Gospel of John*: Studia Theologica 40 [1986] 115-136; G. Iacopino, *Il Vangelo di John nei testi gnostici copti*, SEA 49, Rome 1995). He interprets the Prologue allegorically as referring to the origin of the first *Ogdoad (on which see A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica*, Bari 1973), i.e., the first eight aeons of the Valentinian *pleroma*—the latter ones are produced from the Logos emitted from the Only-Begotten Son—composed of 30 aeons formed by the unfolding of the first principle, Bythos or abyss; then Sophia produced the extrapleromatic reality, hylic, psychic and pneumatic. From Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 12) we know that the followers of Ptolemy theorized two consorts of Bythos, Ennoia (Thought) and Thelesis (Will), who generated, respectively, Aletheia (Truth) and Monogenes (Only-Begotten) in their image. According to others, the first Ogdoad did not emerge progressively, one aeon from another, but all at once, from the Pre-Father—who, when he wanted to create, took the name Father—and from his Ennoia. In general, the line of Ptolemy seems to attenuate the Valentinian dualism and evaluate more positively both the OT, whose Demiurge is at least called "just," and the psychic element, acknowledged as present in Christ and having returned into the Hebdomad with the Demiurge after the crucifixion, while the pneumatic element returned into the superior Ogdoad, so that salvation could also be extended to the *psychici*, beyond the few *pneumatici*. Furthermore, acc. to Tertullian. (*Adv. Val.* 4), the Ptolemaic aeons are personal substances considered as external to the divinity, while Valentinus had conceived of them as sentiments and affections of the divinity.

Of the other disciple of Valentinus, Heracleon, many fragments of the commentary on John's gospel have reached us thanks to the refutation of it that Origen, showing respect and admiration for his adversary, made in his own homonymous work, even if the loss of many books of the Origenian commentary has also led to the reduction of the preserved fragments of Heracleon, who in this work addressed not just the initiates but also the grand public, excluding therefore, as it seems, the mythological superstructure and confirming rather the same principles as Ptolemy: distinction of people into hylic, psychic and pneumatic and of the OT God from the NT one. The exegesis of the gospel of John is eminently allegorical, attentive to detail even if concise: the words and works of Christ are interpreted as symbols of the spiritual realities, of the three kinds of people and of the relationships between the *pneumatici* and their angels. For example, John the Baptist, as a prophet, is considered the symbol of the "psychic" person, linked to the economy of the OT; as more than prophet, acc. to the definition of Mt 11:9, he represents the "pneumatic" person, symbolized also by the Samaritan woman: while the material envelope in which he is enclosed induces him to evil, he progressively becomes aware of his true nature and the Savior purifies him and leads him to gnosis.

The Valentinian school, even in its ramifications, presents nonetheless a fairly unitary and typical attitude, with the already recorded doctrine of the *pleroma* of 30 aeons and the importance of the first Ogdoad within it; with the centrality of Sophia; and with notable appreciation for the psychic element, whose most direct representative, the Demiurge, is evaluated in a positive enough way and appears destined to a happy fate (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 7,1). With this soteriological optimism, the Western Valentinian school approaches in a certain way the positions of the Great Church. It is interesting to study the influence of Valentinian gnosticism on Origen, who was also a friend of one of its followers and whom we have seen treat Heracleon with respect, even in criticism (H. Strutwolf, *Gnosis als System. Zur Rezeption der valentinianischen Gnosis bei Origenes*, Göttingen 1993; cf. D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley, CA 1992; R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, Leiden 1996; I. Ramelli, *La coerenza della soteriologia origeniana*, in *Pagani e Cristiani in cerca della Salvezza (secoli I-III)*. Atti del XXXIV Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana, Rome, Augustinianum, 5-7 May 2005, Rome 2006, 661-688).

A similar tendency seems to reinforce itself in some gnostic systems of the 3rd c.: e.g., in the four books of the *Pistis Sophia*, the savior, who is Jesus and who gives revelations to his disciples after the resurrection, makes all the souls who desire him participants in gnosis and the mysteries: "all men who will receive the mysteries in the Ineffable will become kings with me and sit at my right hand and at my left in my kingdom" (ch. 96). These declarations of soteriological universalism on the one hand anticipate the Manichean message (on the relations

between gnosticism and Manicheism, see A. Böhlig - C. Markschies, *Gnosis und Manichäismus*, Berlin-New York 1994), and on the other hand, they depart from the perfectionist demands of the gnostic elect of the 2nd c., approaching more closely the Christianity of the Great Church.

Bibliographical collections: D.M. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography. 1948–1969*; vol. 2: *1970–1994*; vol. 3: *1995–2006*, Leiden 1971, 1997, 2009; K. Rudolph, *Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht*: ThRu 34 (1969) 121-175; 181-231; 358-361; ThRu 36 (1971) 1-61; 89-124; ThRu 37 (1972) 289-360; ThRu 38 (1973) 1-25.

H. Schenke, *Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis*, Göttingen 1962; W. Eltester, *Christentum und Gnosis*, Berlin 1969; M. Krause - P. Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, Glückstadt 1971; J. Doresse, *La Gnose*, in H.-Ch. Puech, *Histoire des religions*, II, Paris 1972, 364-429; G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion*, Zürich [2]1972; Id., *Gnostic Studies*, I-II, Leiden 1974–1975; E. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism*, Grand Rapids, MI 1973; *Gnosis und Gnostizismus*, ed. K. Rudolph, Darmstadt 1975; *Proc. of the Intern. Colloquium on Gnosticism. Stockholm, Aug. 20-25 1973*, Leiden 1977; H. Green, *Gnosis and Gnosticism*: Numen 24 (1977) 95-134; B. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians. A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, Missoula, MT 1976; *Gnosis. Festschrift H. Jonas*, ed. B. Aland, Göttingen 1978; H.-Ch. Puech, *En Quête de la Gnose, I-II*, Paris 1978; *Tertullien, Contre les valentiniens*, éd. tr. comm. J.-C. Fredouille, Paris 1980–1981; *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions Presented to G. Quispel*, ed. R. van den Broek - M. Vermaseren, Leiden 1981; *The New Testament and Gnosis*, ed. A. Logan - A. Wedderburn, Edinburgh 1983; H.M. Schenke, *The Problem of Gnosis*: The Second Century 3, 2 (1983) 73-87; *Religionstheorie und politische Theologie, II, Gnosis und Politik*, ed. J. Taubes, Munich 1984; G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed. Studies in Gnostic Mythology*, Leiden 1984; H.A. Green, *The Economic and Social Origins of Gnosticism*, Atlanta 1985; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *I Padri Apostolici di fronte ai movimenti ereticali di tipo encratita e gnostico*: Parola Spirito Vita 12 (1985) 228-244; M. Tardieu - J.D. Dubois, *Introduction à la littérature gnostique*, Paris 1986; H. Koester, *La tradition apostolique et les origines du Gnosticisme*: RThPh 119 (1987) 1-16; G. MacRae, *Studies in the New Testament and Gnosticism*, ed. D.J. Harrington - S.B. Marrow, Wilmington 1987; M. Marcovich, *Studies in Graeco-Roman Religions and Gnosticism*, Leiden 1988; J.A. Williams, *Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic Gospel of Truth from N.H.*, Atlanta 1988; J.P. Couliano, *Les gnoses dualistes d'Occident*, Paris [2]1989 (It. tr. Milan 1989); T. Onuki, *Gnosis und Stoa. Eine Untersuchung zum Apokryphon des Johannes*, Freiburg-Göttingen 1989; J. Bergman et al., eds., *Gnostica, mandaica, liturgica. Festschrift E. Segelberg*, Uppsala 1990; B. Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, Minneapolis 1990; C. Gianotto, ed., *La Testimonianza veritiera*, Brescia 1990; *Gnostikerne og bibelen*, intr. tr. M. Müller, København 1991; K. Rudolph, *Gnosticism, in Early Christianity . . . In Honour of W.H.C. Frend*, ed. I. Hazlett, London 1991, 186-197; M. Scopello, *Les Gnostiques*, Paris 1991; M. Brumlik, *Die Gnostiker*, Frankfurt 1992; G. Filoramo, *Sulle origini dello Gnosticismo*: RSLR (1993) 493-510; Id., *Il problema del tempo nello Gnosticismo*, in Id., *Figure del sacro*, Brescia 1993, 29-45; Id., *L'attesa della fine. Storia della Gnosi*, Bari 1987 (Eng. tr. Oxford 1990); D.L. Hoffman, *The Status of Women and Gnosticism in Irenaeus and Tertullian*, Ann Arbor, MI 1994; J. Iwersen, *Gnosis und Geschichte*, Hamburg 1994; *Lo Gnosticismo*, in *Storia delle religioni*, ed. G. Filoramo, III, Rome-Bari 1995, 5-26; R. Segal, ed., *The Allure of Gnosticism*, Chicago-La Salle 1995; A. Magris, *Riflessioni sul rapporto fra giudaismo e gnosticismo*: Cassiodorus 1 (1995) 207-211; U. Bianchi, *L'uomo gnostico di fronte al divino e al mondo*, in J. Ries (ed.), *Crisi, rottura e cambiamenti*, Milan 1995, 143-161; N. Deutsch, *The Gnostic Imagination*, Leiden 1995; C. Colpe, *Kleine Schriften*, 6 vols., Berlin 1996; K. Rudolph, *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte*, Leiden 1996; G. Casadio, *Vie gnostiche all'immortalità*, Brescia 1997; G. Hanratty, *Studies in Gnosticism and in the Philosophy of Religion*, Dublin 1997; A. Magris, *La logica del pensiero gnostico*, Brescia 1997; C. Scholten, *Probleme der Gnosisforschung*: Communio 26 (1997) 481-501; *Destino e salvezza. Tra culti pagani e gnosi cristiana*, ed. G. Sfameni Gasparro, Cosenza 1998; C. Colpe, *Weltdeutungen im Widerstreit*, Berlin-New York 1999; Th. Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?* Leiden 1999, VC Suppl. 47; I. Ramelli, *Linee generali per una presentazione e per un commento del* Liber legum regionum: RIL 133 (1999) 311-355; Id., *Bardesane e la sua scuola tra la cultura occidentale e quella orientale. Il lessico della libertà nel Liber Legum Regionum*, in *Pensiero e istituzioni del mondo classico nelle culture del Vicino Oriente*, ed. R.B. Finazzi - A. Valvo, Alessandria 2001, 237-255; J. Iwersen, *Gnosis zur Einführung*, Hamburg 2001; C. Markschies, *Die Gnosis*, Munich 2001; R. Roukema, *Gnosis and Faith in Early Christianity. An Introduction to Gnosticism*, Eng. tr., Harrisburg 1999; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *La fede nello Gnosticismo*: Dizionario di Spiritualità Biblico-Patristica 16, Rome 1999, 86-133; Id., *Gesù il Cristo nello Gnosticismo*, ibid. 128-199; Id., *Grazia divina e divinizzazione dell'uomo nello Gnosticismo*, ibid., 31, Rome 2002, 48-84; Id., *La notion grecque du destin et la sotériologie gnostique*, in *The Nag Hammadi Texts in the History of Religion*, ed. S. Giversen - T. Petersen - J. Pödemann, Copenhagen 2002, 105-124; *La gnose, une question philosophique*: colloque 16-17 octobre 1997 Un. Paris IV-Sorbonne, ed. N. Depraz - J.F. Marquet, Paris 2000; M.G. Lancellotti, *The Naassenes. A Gnostic Identity*, Münster 2000; G. Filoramo, *Veggenti, profeti, gnostici*, Brescia 2005; A. Marjanen (ed.), *Was There a Gnostic Religion?* Göttingen 2005; R. van der Broek, *Gnosticism*, in *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, I, ed. W.J. Hannegraaff et al., Leiden-Boston 2005, 412; E. Albrile, *Wisdom and Metempsychosis. A Gnostic Myth*: Teresianum 57 (2006) 185-202.

I. Ramelli

GOD

I. Patristic doctrine on God. - II. Knowledge of God.

I. Patristic doctrine on God. Who is God, acc. to the Fathers of the church? How does he act in the world, and what are his nature and qualities? The answers to these questions are very complex. As with the Jewish religion, Christian "theological" thought was based on the *liturgy and the practices of everyday life: the Christian novelty was that it was linked to faith in Jesus Christ, the one savior of the whole human race (RGG[4] 3, 1114). Discourse about God, therefore, varies not only acc. to periods and authors, but also acc. to the character of individual works: apologetic, catechetical, dogmatic or homi-

letic. In a particular way it depends on the reception of the *Bible, the authoritative source of God's *revelation, and thus the key to the explanation of the world. In any case, it is obvious that the God of religious practices (invocations, *doxologies) and the God of theological reflection are one and the same (Werbick). For a correct appraisal, therefore, of the Fathers' overall response to the question "who is God?" one must start from their biblical perspective. From the beginning the Christian faith took up the Jewish confession, the *shema*: "Hear, O Israel: Yahweh is our God, Yahweh is one" (Dt 6:4), modifying it in a Christian sense, i.e., adding the Son and the *Holy Spirit. In line with the baptismal command (Mt 28:19; *Did.* 7,1), this confession is clearly attested by the *Apostles' Creed, which goes back to 2nd-c. formulae: "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et in Iesum Christum, Filium eius unicum Dominum nostrum . . . et in Spiritum Sanctum" (DS 10-30).

All this means that, when the Fathers speak of God, they do so principally in the NT sense (cf. Rahner), referring, i.e., to the first article of the *Credo*, to God the Father almighty, creator of all things, though extending the divine titling to the Son and even to the Holy Spirit. Only in later periods did Christian authors, esp. in philosophically oriented texts, mean by the term *God* the entire *Trinity—the one and eternal deity—or at times just Christ. The first article of the Christian faith was thus continually reinterpreted acc. to the ever-changing situations of the churches: modern research sees these developments in the context of the so-called Hellenization of the gospel. While recognizing that this centuries-long process had its roots in the Greek versions of the OT, and in a certain Hellenistic orientation of its later books and of the NT writings (esp. the Pauline and Johannine), it must also be admitted that it was fully fostered only by the 2nd-c. encounter with non-Christians, both Jewish and *pagan. Indeed at that point Christian intellectuals claimed to possess the "true *philosophy," which allowed them to choose from among the valid ideas of outside philosophers (RGG[4] 3, 1114).

Against the Jews of the Diaspora, *Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* stresses that God is the Father of Jesus Christ, demonstrating, by means of OT **testimonia* but also with philosophical categories, the distinction between the Father, first and invisible God, and the Word, second and visible God. Defending the Christian religion against the objections of atheism and promoting it in intellectual circles, Justin and the other *apologists, following Jewish apologetic but also making use of some Hellenistic monotheistic tendencies, highlight the unicity of the true God, wholly transcendent (in line with *Middle Platonism) but also immanent (in line with *Stoicism). In the same antipagan perspective they began to develop proofs of God's existence, deduced from the perfections and order of the universe, his work (Athenag., *Leg.* 4-5; Theoph. Ant., *Autol.* I, 2-4). Doubtless such concerns included the tension between the incomprehensible God and his manifestation, between the divine reality in itself and divine action in the world.

No less decisive was the confrontation with *heretics—the so-called *gnostics of the 2nd c.—and with too-simple believers. Against the latter, Christian authors sought to exclude anthropomorphic ideas of God, particularly opposing an exaggerated understanding of the divine *monarchia*, taking up and augmenting the by-then traditional arguments for the distinction between Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Tertull., *Prax.* 2-3; Orig., *Dial.* 1-4). In the antimonarchian polemic, however, *Tertullian, taking up Stoic "materialism," presented God as *substantia*, formless mass, from which derived the *portiones* of the Son and the Holy Spirit (TRE 654-655). Against the gnostics, on the other hand—who, in view of Christian faith in a wholly providential and omnipresent God were esp. concerned with the question of the origin of *evil, and thus defended an aggravated dualism (distinguishing the good God from the just one, the God of the gospel from that of the Law)—the theologians of the Great Church, beginning with *Irenaeus, defended the one God, both in a historical sense (the unity of the two Testaments) and in a philosophical sense (author of all things, including matter). This confrontation clarified the distinction between God and the world, between ἀγέν(ν)ητος and γένητα (Prestige, *Dieu*, 54-64), although it risked compromising their position with the Middle Platonist concept of the Logos, intermediary between God and the world. All these reflections were brought together in *Origen's *De principiis* (see esp. *I praef.* 4), and later in *Augustine's works against the *Manicheans, survivors of 2nd-c. gnosticism.

The 4th-c. controversies on the divinity of the Son and then on that of the Holy Spirit led the Fathers to a further reinterpretation of the Christian *credo*. Against primitive *Arianism, the defenders of Nicene faith showed that the authentically Christian concept of God the Creator (*creatio ex nihilo*) did not exclude that Christ, the Father's true—not adopted—Son, was equally God. In later discussions, on the other hand, the Cappadocians and others re-

jected the identification of ἀγέννησία with the divine οὐσία (*ousia), referring it only to the relation between the Father and the Son (Basil., *Adv. Eun.* I,15). In the same period, the new political-cultural situation of the churches allowed Christian theology to draw inspiration more than ever from Greco-Roman political ideas. In comparing the divine monarchy with the imperial monarch *Constantine the Great, *Eusebius of Caesarea and others did not for this reason call into question the Trinity, as some scholars claim (see Beskow, 314-325, who refers to Peterson and others). Political ideas came into play in the West even before the birth of the imperial church: influenced by Roman legal views, Tertullian and, following him, *Cyprian, presented God above all as legislator and therefore as judge. In particular they introduced the Latin idea of the *auctoritas divina* (HWP 3,739-740).

These continual confrontations undoubtedly provoked a rather more metaphysical and legal reinterpretation of the biblical tradition's essentially historical concept of God. Instead of beginning from *Scripture, in which God in himself, the divine nature, is conceived of in light of salvation history, Christian scholars inserted themselves into the philosophical traditions in which one rises dialectically from the visible, mutable world to the immutable, invisible origin of all things. Faced with intellectual audiences and personally interested in Greek philosophy, esp. *Platonism, Christian authors from the 2nd c. on had recourse to philosophical categories and models, among them the traditional etymologies of θεός (Prestige, *Dieu*, 25-26), when they had to clarify their thought on the one God, creator and ruler of the world. This is evident in *Clement of Alexandria, who receives the biblical idea of education from Irenaeus, but gives it a much more Greek coloring (HWPh 3,738). The encounter with philosophical views appears even more clearly, however, in the increasingly frequent use of God's negative attributes. Already clearly proclaimed in the Apostolic *Fathers (Ign., *Eph.* 7,2), the negative description of the divine nature was stressed in the apologists under the influence of Middle Platonist philosophy (Daniélou, *Histoire*, II, 297-316); it took heterodox forms in Arius (Grillmeier, *Jesus*, 368) and reached its perfection in *Gregory of Nyssa and ps.-*Dionysius. The negative attribute of divine immutability, moreover, asserted from the 2nd c. on, became the focal point of Christian theology. Though well-suited to emphasizing the distinction between the ingenerate God and generated creatures, this fundamental "dogma" of Greek philosophy clashed with the historical concept of God, leading in particular to the debates on the eternal generation of the Son, the true incarnation of the true God and the absolute gratuity of divine *grace. The elaboration of negative theology was not without progress and regress. Whereas Clement of Alexandria denied any quality in God (ἄποιος), Origen, in view of the knowledge that God has of himself, admitted certain limits in him (DTC 4,1052-1053). The Cappadocians and later theologians—under the manifest influence of *Plotinus—recognized in God a simplicity of plenitude: God was considered as the sum of every perfection, and esp. as *summum bonum*. Finally, God's supreme perfection was reduced to his full and simple essence. We see this clearly in *exegesis of Ex 3:14 and esp. in the more arduous reflections of *Marius Victorinus, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine and ps.-Dionysius. Especially noteworthy is the fact that Augustine preferred the concept of *essentia* to that of *substantia*, considering the former to be closer to Moses's vision in the desert.

There is no question that this evolution of thought on God continually risked compromising the biblical traditions. Not only did it include a significant transformation of certain biblical attributes of God—such as *eternity, goodness and *justice (RGG[3] 2, 1719-20)—but it led to a strong prevalence of the ontological approach to the doctrine of God. Indeed it is clear that Christian authors were not wholly successful in avoiding the risks of the confrontation between the "God of the Fathers" and the "God of the philosophers" (RGG[3] 2, 1718), a fact that was also largely true of Augustine. Perceiving the tension between the historical vision and the philosophical approach to God, he did, however, develop the distinction between the name of substance and that of mercy, between the *idipsum esse* and the God of the Fathers (Studer, *Gratia Christi*), and in the polemic against *Porphyry, he not only corrected the natural theology of the Platonists (*Civ. Dei* VIII-X), but also defended the *cognitio historialis*, thanks to which all people, and not only philosophers, know God through his historical action (*Civ. Dei* XI-XXII; cf. Studer, *Cognitio historialis*).

The extent to which it would be an exaggeration to claim that the Christian authors sacrificed the God of the Bible to that of the philosophers becomes clear from the personalistic approach of their theology. In fact, leaving aside the positive aspects of the philosophical framework, such as its universalism, they never substituted an impersonal deity for the personal God of the Bible. Even the most Platonist among them—such as Origen, who taught an eternal creation, and ps.-Dionysius, who insisted on hi-

erarchical causality in the universe—maintained the freedom of God's creative act. Though employing the philosophical schema of origin and return, they did not confuse God, beginning and end, with an eternal world. Origen's disciple *Gregory Thaumaturgus did not hesitate to say that God could exclude ἀπάθεια itself by his will (RGG³ 2, 1721). The Latin tradition, so interested in God's moral attributes, was even more biblical. Tertullian not only too-categorically affirmed that God could do what he wills (*Prax.* 10) but, distinguishing between *Deus* and *Dominus*, clearly indicated the distance that separates God from the world (*Adv. Hermog.* 2-3)—something perhaps not always respected in deducing the divine existence from creatures. *Lactantius even defended divine wrath (*ira*). Finally, Augustine insisted so much on God's freedom, the only source of grace, as to give the impression of an unyielding *predestinationism (Lettieri). Precisely in the context of his voluntarism, however, presenting God as *love with all clarity, he extended the essentially biblical views of Irenaeus, Origen, *Athanasius and *Ambrose (Studer, *Christusbild*).

The voluntaristic and thus personalistic orientation of patristic "theology" is confirmed by the Ambrosian spirituality of the *Christus omnia*. Without ignoring trinitarian faith, *Ambrose stresses his personal relationship with Christ, the Lord and Savior. Following Ambrose and thus Origen (Studer, *Christusbild*), Augustine develops the wholly personal biblical theme of the *quaerere faciem Dei* (*Conf.*; *Trin.* IX). "The more certainly," he says, "we love the face of Christ, and in it the face of God that we desire to see, the more we discover in the 'back' the greatness of the love with which Christ first loved us" (*Trin.* II, 17,28, with Ex 33:18-23. Cf. *Trin.* XV, 27,49; *Qu. diu.* 69).

How mistaken it is to try to attribute to early Christian authors an impersonal understanding of God may also be seen from Christian liturgy and *spirituality. In worship, the biblical doxologies addressed to God the Father were always preserved, at least in the church's official prayers (Orig., *Dial.* 4). The memory of God's great saving actions was celebrated in the *Eucharist, and esp. at the great feasts. Finally, the baptismal liturgy shows that Christians understood their relationship with God as conversion to the personal God (Augustine, *Conf.* XIII). The spiritual aspirations of Christians likewise presuppose a personalist vision of God. The imitation of God, though yielding to the imitation of Christ, never ceased to be emphasized. Even those who gave great importance to deification, a seemingly abstract concept, clearly identified it with the biblical ideal of divine sonship. For them, thanks to the incarnation of the Son of God, Christians were truly brothers and sisters of Christ and, as such, children of the one God (Heb 1:12ff. in Cyril). Even communal relations with God, i.e., between him and the church, were described using the personalist imagery of the Bible: house of God, bride of the Word, temple of the Holy Spirit.

DTC 4,1023-1152; K. Rahner, *Theos im NT*, Schriften I, Einsiedeln 1954, 91-167; G.L. Prestige, *Dieu dans la pensée patristique*, Paris 1955; J. Daniélou, *Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée*, 3 vols., Paris 1958, 1961, 1978; RGG³ 2, 1717-1722; P. Beskow, *Rex gloriae*, Uppsala 1962; R. Braun, *Deus christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, Paris 1962; F. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 1966; R. Farina, *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea*, Zürich 1966; W. Maas, *Unveränderlichkeit Gottes*, Munich 1974; B. Kötting, *Gott, V. Patristik*: HWP 3 (1974) 735-742; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Freiburg 1979; R. Hübner, *Der Gott der Kirchenväter und der Gott der Bibel*, Munich 1979; G.C. Stead, *Gott, V, Alte Kirche*: TRE 13 (1984) 652-657; B. Studer, *Gratia Christi – gratia Dei bei Augustinus von Hippo*, Rome 1993; Id., *La cognitio historialis di Porfirio nel De civitate Dei di Agostino*: SEA 50, Rome 1995, 520-553; Id., *Das Christusbild des Origenes und des Ambrosius*, Origen. Sept., Louvain 1999, 571-590; J. Werbick, *Gott*: LTK³ 4, 863-866; G. Madec, *Deus*: AugL II/1-2 (1996) 314-319; II/3-4 (1999) 321-365; L. Ayres - M.R. Barnes, *God*, in *Augustine Through the Ages*, ed. A.Q. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 384-390 (bibl.); RGG⁴ 3, 1113-1127, esp. 1114-15; G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino*, Brescia 2001.

II. Knowledge of God. Christianity presents itself fundamentally as a religion of divine *revelation. This consists of the action that God, creator of the universe, initiated in the history of Israel, explaining its significance through the *prophets, and that he fulfilled in the historical existence of Jesus Christ, his Son, who was then proclaimed by the *apostles. In a Christian sense, therefore, revelation is the prophetic word of Jesus and of the apostles regarding God's saving intentions. Human beings are called to respond to that word with faith in the historical presence of God the Savior. This faith, though principally obedience and fidelity to the one true God, is not possible without a certain knowledge of God and of his will. The extent to which the encounter between God and human beings also includes intellectual elements, even in the biblical context, appears esp. in the OT *theophany accounts, which reflect the keen desire to see God; the common veneration for the Law, as a book entrusted to the interpretation of the priests and scribes; the aspiration to wisdom in later Judaism; apocalyptic tendencies, with desires to know the mysteries of God; the teaching of Jesus, both prophet and teacher; the apostolic *preaching of the word; the gnostic move-

ments in certain primitive communities, such as at *Corinth. Religious experience, which in the first Christian communities was strongly centered on *fides ex auditu*, on gnosis and on instruction, later assumed an even more clearly cognitive orientation, to the point where the question of the possibility and the way of knowing God became a central theme of Christian theology. This growing value assigned to the knowledge of God can be explained by the following factors: The Jewish confession of the name of God, adapted to the major moments of the Christian liturgy, required a more exact formulation and a fuller explanation of faith in God (Just., *1 Apol.* 61-67, Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 6-9). *Parenesis supposed a similarly thematized justification (see for the Apostolic Fathers, DTC 4,1027). Above all, the encounter with Hellenistic culture—already prepared in the *synagogue—so imbued with the desire to know God in his relation to the world, necessarily reinforced the intellectual elements of the Christian religion. Obliged to defend the Christian religious attitude on a scientific level and to propagate the faith even in intellectual circles, the apologists not only contrasted the worship of the true and only God with pagan *idolatry, but also presented Christianity as a true philosophy (DTC 4,1032-1035). There were even those who, following the Platonic tradition, had recourse to mystery language to describe this Christian gnosis (Clem., *Prot.* XII, 119-121; *Strom.* VII, 57).

At about the same time, the 2nd-c. gnostic movement, which touched Christian circles, imposed the gnostic idea of salvation. We see this esp. in *Irenaeus, who tended to reduce salvation history to the manifestation and vision of God (Tremblay). Also resulting from the confrontation with the gnostics was the development of theodicy (the question of the origin of evil) and of the question of the one God, creator and redeemer. In the gnostic line, represented by Irenaeus, Clement and Origen, the later Fathers developed two spiritual ideals of knowledge of God: knowledge *per amorem* and knowledge *per contemplationem* (DSp 3,886-890). The Arian controversy also concerned the knowledge of God, since, while *Arius had excluded all positive knowledge of God, *Eunomius, identifying ἀγέννησία with God's οὐσία, supposed a comprehensive knowledge of God. Against him, Gregory of Nyssa measured God's incomprehensibility by his infinity, understanding the latter as infinite fullness that reveals itself in complete freedom (LTK[3] 3,782). In the late 4th c., disputes with the *Audiani and with certain overly simple monks obliged *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 70), *Theophilus and others to revisit the question of anthropomorphism, discussed so many times before. The confrontation with *Neoplatonism finally led Augustine to deepen, more than the Alexandrians, the difference between faith *ex auditu* and the rational knowledge of God. In these very complex conditions, Christian authors never ceased to take the knowledge of God into more or less reflective consideration. Even if they did not elaborate a complete doctrine on the question—except ps.-Dionysius who, in *De div. nominibus* and *De myst. theologia*, achieved a notable synthesis (DTC 4,1118-1127)—they explored one or another aspect which, taken together, made up the essentials of a theology of the knowledge of God.

This patristic vision was dominated by the thesis, accepted everywhere, that God is completely transcendent, while being immanent in creation and esp. in the human soul. Transcending all creatures, he remains incomprehensible to them (this aspect was repeated esp. by the Fathers who opposed Eunomius's positions) (DTC 4,1088-1097). Human beings, unable at least in this life to grasp God in his intimate nature, are also incapable of speaking congruently of him (Just., *2 Apol.* 6.12; Aug., *Serm.* 341,79). At the same time, God, being wholly spiritual, is also invisible, unless he wishes to reveal himself (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV,20,1). While the authors of the first centuries radically excluded the visibility of the "first God," conceding it only to the Word, the "second God," following the Arian controversy Augustine defended an equal invisibility for all three of the divine persons (*Ep.* 147; *Trin.* III,11,21).

Although God is incomprehensible and ineffable, he is nonetheless, acc. to the Fathers, genuinely knowable. A certain knowledge of him is already common to all human beings, even to sinners (DTC 4,1040; 1070-1075). Above all, God can truly be known because of the love with which he is revealed through the prophets and through Jesus Christ to all who, in the power of the Holy Spirit, believe in him. Thanks to revelation in Scripture, in creation and in the soul (Orig., *Princ.* I, 3,1), human beings can know *that* God exists (*an sit*), but also *ex parte*, *what* he is (*quid*). Given the possibility of knowing God partially, Christian authors from the 2nd c. on developed proofs for God's existence (Athenag., *Leg.* 4-5; Theoph. Ant., *Autol.* I, 2-4). As compared with Greek philosophy, which they substantially follow, they insist even more on the *testimonium animae* (Tertull.) and on the innate knowledge of God (Clem. Al.), i.e., they refer to the soul as image of the Word who is the perfect image of God (Basil., *Hom. Attende* 7; Aug., *Lib. arb.* II, 2-15). The traditional demonstrations departing from the beauty of the

cosmos (Stoics) or from movements in the world (Aristotle) were placed by them into a biblical perspective, in which they prove the existence of the one God, creator of the world, also relying on biblical texts such as Wis 13:5; Rom 1:20; Acts 17:27-28 and in particular Ex 3:14. Also admitting a certain knowledge of the divine nature, the Fathers reflected on the possibility of attributing to God whatever is *good and beautiful, and on the necessity of excluding all that is unworthy of him. They distinguished God's absolute attributes, such as goodness and truth, from his relative attributes such as Lord, creator, merciful. These reflections bear primarily on the divine names in the Bible but, acc. to the culture of individual authors, also took on a more or less philosophical character (Origen and Basil's doctrine on ἔννοιαι).

Elaborated esp. by Origen and the Cappadocians, the theory of the divine names was further developed in Augustine. For him, all that is said of God is said of him *substantialiter*, except what concerns the distinction of the persons. Nevertheless, we cannot know any perfection as it exists in God. For this reason human beings need metaphors and analogies, as the Bible itself teaches (*Trin.* I, 1,2). We do not even have a name that says everything about him; rather, we need many names to express the *simplicitas multiplex* and the *multiplicitas simplex* (DTC 4,1112-1116). Ultimately, human beings know God only by seeking his face and reaching out to him in hope (*Trin.* XV, 1,1). Departing from Middle Platonic premises, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa and esp. ps.-Dionysius conceived the method of the three ways: affirmation, negation and eminence (or transcendence). That is, one can attribute a created perfection to God, but must immediately add that it does not exist in him according to human conceptions, but in a much more perfect way (DTC 4,1094-1119).

The sources of the knowledge of God are very complex: on the one hand, the revelation given by the Bible and the visible creation, and on the other, the interior life of the soul. The Fathers were faced with the problem of the relation between the knowledge of faith and rational knowledge, between simple faith and further investigation of that faith. While Origen insisted on faith as the basis of gnosis, Basil recognized a certain priority of the knowledge of God through creation (*Ep.* 235,1). Augustine took up the Alexandrian distinction between simple faith and spiritual gnosis (*credo ut intelligam*), putting it, however, in a Latin framework, opposing *ratio* to *auctoritas fidei*. Moreover, more than Origen, he based the knowledge of faith on history (*historia*), i.e., on the *narratio* of the love of the humble God, thus indicating in what sense the knowledge of God based on faith surpasses the *theologia naturalis* of the Platonists, the culmination of philosophical criticism of the Greek myths (*Civ. Dei* VIII). Nor does he neglect rational examination of the *utilitas credendi* (*Ep.* 120,3; *Ver. rel.* 24,45): he analyzes the process that leads from the rational knowledge of divine authority to the act of faith, and from it to the rational intelligence of faith. While perhaps still too enclosed within the Platonic tradition and failing to distinguish clearly between the knowledge of the truth made possible by the *magister interior* and the knowledge of faith aided by the grace of Christ, Augustine nevertheless indicates that God is known only because he has manifested himself in his love (cf. the more negative evaluation in LTK[3] 3,783).

All of the Fathers acknowledge that, in this life, even holy people such as *Moses and *Paul only arrive at a partial knowledge of God. They stress, therefore, that knowledge of God on the part of *homo viator* is only a preparation for and anticipation of the eternal vision reserved to the *angels and the blessed.

DTC 4, 1023-1152; DSp 3,838.929; RGG[3] 2, 1717-1722; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique,"* Bruges 1961; E. von Ivánka, *Platonismo e neoplatonismo*: Dizion. Teol. II, Brescia 1967, 659-670; G.L. Prestige, *Dio nel pensiero de Padri*, It. tr. Bologna 1969; R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon s. Irénée de Lyon*, Münster 1978; I. Escribano-Alberca, HDG I,2a; K.H. Lütcke, *Auctoritas*: AugL 1 (1994) 489-410; G. Watson, *Cogitatio*: AugL 1 (1994) 1046-1051; T. Pröpper, *Erkenntnis Gottes*: LTK[3] 3, 781-786; B. Studer, *La cognitio historialis di Porfirio nel De civitate Dei di Agostino*, SEA 50, Rome 1996, 520-553; Id., *History and Faith in Augustine's De Trinitate*: Augustinian Studies 28 (1997) 7-50; Id., *Schola Christiana*, Paderborn 1998.

B. STUDER

GOGO (d. 581). A Frankish layman in the service of Sigebert I (535–575) from 565 and, relying on the testimony of *Venantius Fortunatus, who goes so far as to compare him to Orpheus (*Miscellanea* 7,1-4: PL 88, 231-237), also a poet of a certain merit. As advisor, Gogo became a figure of great prestige at court, where he filled the charge of *maior domus* and after 575 was named, probably by Brunhilda, *nutricius* of Childebert II (570–596) king of Austrasia. He died in 581. From Gogo only four letters have reached us, concerning life at court (*Ep. Austrasicae* 13, 16, 22 and 48), indicative at any rate of a notable cultural formation.

CPL 1061; W. Gundlach ed., MGH, *Epp.* III, Berlin 1892, 127-128, 130, 134-135, 152-153; repr. in CCL 117, Turnhout 1957, 431-

432, 434-435, 441-442, 469-470; D. Norberg, *Ad epistulas varias merovingici aevi adnotationes*: Eranos 35 (1937) 105-119; E. Ewig, *Die Merowinger und das Frankenreich*, Stuttgart 1988, 44-45, 86, 93; I.N. Wood, *Administration, Law and Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, Cambridge 1991, 63-81; J. George, *Venantius Fortunatus. A Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, Oxford 1992, 14, 136-140; Patrologia IV, 303-304.

P. MARONE

GOLDEN RULE. The Golden Rule is an *ethical maxim that expresses the *good quality* of human relationships, marked by *reciprocity*. Present under positive or negative formulation in all the great religions and world cultures (Buddhism, Jainism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Sikhism, etc.), the Golden Rule constitutes, inasmuch as it is a basic norm, the "principles" of universal moral action. It does not prescribe specific behaviors, but rather indicates the form of a truly human way of acting, because it commands the good disposition of one human being toward another, and in the ultimate analysis, one human being's existence for the *other*. In the ethical reflection of the ancient church, which was largely indebted to Hellenistic *philosophy, and bent toward the actualization of an authentic righteousness in the double indication of the gospel's command to *love, the universal and interiorly obligating character of the dictum constitutes the common supporting theme of the most authoritative Fathers' teaching.

Although in early Christianity it was believed that the Golden Rule came from a biblical source, the Golden Rule still possessed its own tradition both in the Hellenistic world and in the cultures that were much older than Greek culture, because its most remote written codification dates back to Zoroaster (628–551 BC), although one can be reasonably certain of its presence in the Vedic Indian tradition as early as the year 3000 BC, then codified in the writings of the Hindu text Mahabharata (300 BC–AD 300), as the "summa of Dharma-obligations": "do not do to others what would make you feel pain if done to you" (5:15,17). In Old Testament wisdom, it reached its first formulation through a long development between the 3rd and the 2nd c. BC, to the time of the redaction of the *Book of Tobit*, where we find the statement: "do not do to anyone what you do not like" (Tob 4:15). The passage of the Golden Rule into Old Testament and *Hellenistic Judaism was decisive, however, both because in a period in which an attempt was made to simplify the precepts of the *Torah*, the recapitulating function of the entire law was attributed to the Golden Rule and it was associated to the command of love, and because only thanks to the values taken from Hellenism did it acquire a truly universal openness. The positive New Testament formulations of the Golden Rule (Mt 7:12; Lk 6:31) therefore inherited this process of refinement, and nevertheless the ethical value ascended toward the elevated heights of Jesus' teaching because if Mt 7:12 summarizes, as an attentive *exegesis notes, the entire *Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule is associated with the command of a superior love that is capable of including love for enemies (Mt 5:44).

In the first occurrence in patristic texts (**Didache* 1,2), although the precept is placed within the doctrine of the two ways and placed next to the precept of love, the scope of the Matthean Golden Rule—which does not simply establish a dictum for respecting another person's freedom but rather allows for the actualization of the fullness of a truly universal love—regresses toward an extrinsic moralizing command. In subsequent patristic reflection, the movement toward an extrinsic evaluation of the Golden Rule became even more pronounced, to the point of making it an ethical norm of *justice (*Justin, *Dial.* 93,1; *Clem. Alex., *Strom.* II, 139; *Cyprian, *Test. ad Quir.* 3,119; ps.-Clem., *Recogn.* 8,56; *Lactantius, *Epit.* 55,1-3)—even if the dictates of the gospel that captures the spirit with which the Christian must love in every circumstance has not been forgotten (*Tertullian, *Marc.* IV, 16).

In the Latin patristic tradition, one should appreciate how profound and diverse was *Augustine's reflection, who, in a philosophical dialogue, defined the Golden Rule in its negative formulation a "common dictum" (*vulgare proverbium*), to which one must appeal for inspiration in educating young people (*De ordine* II, 8,25). The meaning of this statement is clarified by Augustine in his subsequent reflection, which would identify in the negative formulation of the Golden Rule a natural law written within the heart of each person (*C. Faustum* XV, 7; *Ep.* 157,3,15; *Conf.* I, 18,29). In truth, it did not contradict that positive formulation, which reaches human beings through biblical revelation; nevertheless, the negative formulation possesses an ethical breadth with respect to the other, because in the dictum of not doing to another what one does not want to happen to oneself, one can include wicked actions (*flagitia*) that offend God (*Sermo* 9). Just as the natural law, the Golden Rule contains the characteristics of immutability and knowability inasmuch as it carries in itself a type of justice that remains identical independent from the changes of culture (*Doctr. Chr.* III, 14,22). Therefore, the trans-

gression of the Golden Rule can be charged to a human being's wicked and guilty will (*En. Ps.* 35,1; *Conf.* II, 4,9).

With the passing of time, Augustine's reflection on the Golden Rule also became more profound, and it accompanied the theological problems that he had to face. Thus, although he had identified in the negative formulation of the Golden Rule an instrument for resolving ethical problems such as possible conflicts of conscience (*En. Ps.* 57,2), the value of the positive formulation, which in the Latin version of the gospel texts available to him commanded one to do to others all good things (Mt 7:12: *omnia ... bona*) that we would want done to us, also bore weight (*Serm. dom. m.* II, 22,74, NBA X/2, 269). To avoid any possible subjectivism in the evaluation of the *good, Augustine presupposes, making reference to the *Stoic doctrine of the three "good affective dispositions," the existence in the acting subject of an authentic "will," understood as a "good" will, which is only possessed by the wise person (*Civ. Dei* XIV, 8,1). Nevertheless, due to the *Pelagian controversy, he would have the opportunity to specify that the will is made good only through God's *grace and, definitively, by observing the Golden Rule, one has absolute need for God's help, because in a postlapsarian condition without the grace of Christ, the human being does not possess virtues that lead to salvation (*C. Iul.* IV, 3,25).

The preference Augustine showed toward the negative formulation of the Golden Rule is found in the writings of other authors, as in other contexts of Christian life, from *epigraphy to *poetry (see Bastiaensen), to the monastic *rules. In the *Regula Benedicti*, the Golden Rule, which was believed to derive from the Bible (*scriptum est*), was held in great esteem, seeing that it was cited immediately after the precept of love for God and the brethren (IV, 9). Nevertheless, it acquired the value of a universal precept that was applicable furthermore not only to the monk but to every believer: it indicated, i.e., not a special way for the monk's perfection, as much as a necessary "precautionary principle" to avoid what is *evil, esp. for those who live in community (61,14; 70,7).

Thanks to its frequent occurrence in ancient Christian literature (see Dihle 1962, 103-109; Id., 1981, 938-939), the Golden Rule passed as a foundational ethical principle to the Western Medieval authors, who made it a summary norm for every morality, whether rational or revealed. In the ethical teaching of *Gregory the Great, whose authority in this transition of ages was determinative, the Golden Rule played a role of primary importance for the implementation of justice. The pope suggested that there underlies a hierarchical gradation between the negative Old Testament formulation and the positive one found in the gospel formulation, an expression of the NT's fullness (*Hom. in Ev.*, II, 38,11; *Moralia in Iob* VI, 35,54). One would be a natural precept, the other a revealed norm (*regula testamenti*). In any case, the performance of the Golden Rule allowed one to implement the fullness of gospel justice, that each person can regard as a spiritual tribunal (*tribunal mentis*) in one's own heart (*in foro cordis*) (*Moralia in Iob* XIX, 22,35).

A. Dihle, *Die goldene Regel. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der antiken und frühchristlichen Vulgärethik*, Göttingen 1962; Id., *Goldene Regel*: RAC 11 (1981) 930-940; A. Bastiaensen, *Le "praeceptum aureum" dans la tradition épigraphique et littéraire*: RBen 98 (1988) 251-257; J. Wattles, *The Golden Rule*, Oxford-New York 1996; C. Vigna - S. Zanardo, eds., *La regola d'oro come etica universale*, Milan 2005.

V. Lombino

GOOD. The Fathers based their notion of the Good both on Greek *philosophy and on the *Bible. As for the first source, Socrates's Good (ἀγαθόν), conceived by him at an essentially *ethical level, as *virtue and science, was for the first time identified by Euclides with Parmenides's Being-One, which constituted a shift to the metaphysical plane. But it was above all *Plato who elaborated the metaphysical doctrine of the Good: he put it at the top of the Ideas and posited the Good as the supreme principle in his *protology, together with the Dyad. All things derive their reality and knowability from the Good. At the same time, the Demiurge, i.e., the God who is the creator of the cosmos, is said to be "good" in *Tim.* 29A and *Rep.* II 379BC; similarly, in *Phaedr.* 247A and *Tim.* 29E, Plato affirms that malevolence is alien to God's nature. Thus, the intelligible world depends on the Idea of Good, and the sense-perceptible world depends on the Demiurge's goodness. In Aristotle's thinking, the Unmoved Mover, which is the prime Substance and the supreme *Nous, is identified with the Good and the Beautiful, and by virtue of this is the final cause of all. *Middle Platonism, both *pagan and Christian, identified God with the supreme Good: see Plutarch, *De Iside*, 53; Albinus, *Epit.* 10,3; Numenius *ap.* Eus. *PE* XI 22, who identified the supreme God with the αὐτοαγαθόν, the same term that *Origen too applied to God. In this respect, the most important *Neoplatonic development is offered by *Plotinus, who expressly identified the Good with the One, his first *hypostasis, beyond Being and Thought.

It is in a Middle Platonic context, however, that we see the first synthesis between the philosophical tradition and biblical *exegesis in the conception of God-Good, with *Philo, who was a precursor of the Fathers in conjoining Platonism and the Bible. In Philo's view, God is One, totally transcendent and good: what is more, God is φιλάνθρωπος (*Virt.* 77), but God's love for human beings seems to be restricted to the virtuous (*Abr.* 50; *Mutat.* 18). This aspect will change in Christianity, when God's goodness and love will be considered to have all human beings, and all creatures, as their object. Both Philo and the Christians, however, shared the common ground of the Bible—or better, of the Old Testament, whereas it is the New that explains the discrepancies between Philo and even those Fathers who knew him best and followed him most closely, such as *Clement, Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa.

Let us consider the Bible. The Septuagint contains 548 occurrences of ἀγαθός and 236 of καλός; in the New Testament, the former occurs 102 times and the latter again 102 times. The meaning "good" also for καλός is patent in Heb 5:14, e.g., where καλόν and κακόν are opposed to one another as "good" and "*evil"—therefore, καλόν is here synonymous with ἀγαθόν. It likewise means "good" in John 10:11, 14, where Jesus is ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, i.e., "the good shepherd" (rather than "the handsome shepherd"); in the *Genesis description of the Tree of Good and Evil as of "καλόν and κακόν"; and above all in the *creation narrative, which is also fundamental for the Platonic Fathers' reflection on the metaphysical value of the goodness of creation. In the Genesis account, where, by the way, only καλός is attested and there is no occurrence of ἀγαθόν, after each creating act God contemplates the created being or beings resulting from that act, καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν, "and God saw that it was a good thing." All that God created is good, because it was set into being by God, who is the Being (Ex 3:14) and is the Good. As a result, what was not created by God has no ontological existence and is not good.

In the New Testament, too, God is described both as intrinsically good and as giver of good things. In Mt 19:17 Jesus famously asserts that only God is good (Mk 10:18; Lk 18:19; Mt 20:15). According to Origen's subsequent interpretation, this means that only God is the Good, and never loses his goodness, whereas all created beings simply participate in the Good, so they are not stable in it, and their choices may also turn to evil. From the fact that only God is the Good, it also follows that all possible good things come only from God, as is declared in Jas 1:17: every good endowment and every perfect gift (πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον) comes from on high, from the Father of lights, or of illuminations (πατὴρ τῶν φωτῶν). Of course, καλός in the sense of "good" is also applied to human deeds or created things in the New Testament: deeds, fruits, seeds, bread and so on. Moreover, it is said to be καλόν, decidedly meaning "good," to enter life (clearly, life eternal) with one eye, rather than to keep both eyes but to be cast into Gehenna (Mt 18:9; cf. Mk 9:43, 45). Likewise, καλόν means "good" in 1 Cor 7:1, where Paul states that it is καλόν for a man not to touch any woman, and presumably vice-versa.

But these statements belong to the ethical sphere. The ontological assertions will be even more momentous for the Fathers, esp. the Platonic Fathers, such as Clement, Origen, *Evagrius and the Cappadocians. And in relation to the Good are these assertions: that only God is good, indeed God is the Good, and all that God created is good. Thus, only the creatures of God are good and have ontological subsistence. God created only what is good; evil entered the world because of a deception and an error: it is not a creature of God, but the result of a bad choice, and it has no ontological subsistence. Evil in turn brought about *death, but evil and its consequence, death (Wis 1:13), have no ontological substance, in that they are not creatures of God, and therefore cannot subsist forever. There was a time in which evil did not exist, and there will be a time when evil will no longer exist (this is a fundamental tenet of Origen's, Gregory of Nyssa's and Evagrius's thought), whereas it is the "germs of Good" that are absolutely inextinguishable (Evagrius). This is what Paul foretells in 1 Cor 15:26-28: Christ will reign until all enemies have submitted to him (in a submission that Origen and Gregory of Nyssa identify with salvation, achieved through spiritual healing and conversion. *Eusebius, an admirer of Origen, will call it ἡ θεραπευτικὴ καὶ διορθωτικὴ βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The creatures of God will convert; the powers of evil, on the other hand, and the last enemy, death, will be destroyed. Then God will be all in all, i.e., God alone will be all good things for all. Evil and death, which entered the world with *Adam, will vanish in the reign of Christ: as all die in Adam, all will receive life in Christ (1 Cor 15:22-23). Due to one person, the condemnation has reached all human beings; likewise, also thanks to the work of *righteousness of one person, the vivifying justification reaches all human beings and all will be made righteous (Rom 5:18-19). As Gregory of Nyssa puts it in *In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius* 11 (Downing), Adam brought evil to all, whereas Christ has

brought the Good to all: "the Good has entered human nature, pouring from one human being to all, just as evil had poured into all through one single human being."

Only the Good (and life) will remain, not evil, because the Good is God (and the life is Christ), and all that is good has God as its creator and ontological guarantor—God who is Being par excellence (Ex 3:14).

The equation God-Good-Being, which is particularly clear in Origen and in Gregory of Nyssa, is an important feature in patristic thought. Both *Athanasius and *Gregory of Nazianzus, who knew the Platonic doctrines but also Origen's thought very well, took up the affirmation of God's essential goodness in *De incarnatione* 3 and 42, and in *De oratione* 28,11, respectively. Origen in his Περὶ Ἀρχῶν and Gregory of Nyssa in his *In Illud: Tunc et ipse Filius* explain that the Good is present in a permanent and substantial manner only in the *Trinity, whereas in all other beings, i.e., in all creatures, including the angels, it is present only partially and by participation, so that they can lose it. Only God is good, and indeed is the Good. Origen in *Princ.* I, 2,13 describes God the Father as "original and absolute Good" and "the Good itself," αὐτοαγαθόν. This is why Jesus says that only God is good. The Son, who is begotten by the Father, and the Spirit who proceeds from the Father, *reproduce* this original Good, whereas the creatures *participate* in it. As a consequence, "they have in themselves an accidental good, not the substantial Good"; in the creatures, "the Good is not present in a substantial way, as it is in God, in Christ and in the Holy Spirit. For only in the Trinity, who created all things, the Good exists in a substantial way. The other beings possess it in an accidental way, so that it may fail, and they are in bliss only when, and insofar as, they participate in the holiness of Wisdom and of the divinity itself" (*Princ.* I, 6,2; cf. I, 8,3, etc.). Gregory of Nyssa in *De anima et resurrectione* (92D-93AC) depicts God as "the nature that exceeds all possible concepts of Good and transcends all power, in that it lacks nothing of what is possible to conceive in respect to the Good, because it is the fullness of good things and does not happen to be in a condition of beauty and goodness by participation in something that is beautiful and good, but it is itself the essence of beauty and of the Good. . . . Since, then, divine nature transcends all other good things, and the Good always and absolutely loves the Good, then, while it looks at itself, it both wishes what it has and has what it wishes, without admitting anything alien in itself. On the other hand, outside it there is nothing but evil. Now, evil—albeit it is paradoxical to say—has its own being in non-being, since the origin of evil is nothing else than a lack of what is. And what properly and primarily is, is the nature of the Good. Thus, what is not in what is, certainly is in non-being." God is absolute Good and absolute positivity; in God there is no evil nor malevolence; as a consequence, punishments inflicted by God are not retributive, but purifying and exclusively aimed at the improvement of the sinners.

The infinitude of God-Good and, on the opposite side, the finitude and limited nature of evil is emphasized esp. by Gregory of Nyssa: "Only that which is contrary to the Beauty and the Good is limited, whereas the Good whose nature is not susceptible of evil will progress toward the unlimited and infinite" (*De an.* 97AB). An important consequence of this statement is that an eternal permanence in evil is utterly impossible, in that once one has touched the deepest point of evil, as in the case of the devil, one will only move back and return to the Good, i.e., to the true Being. For only those who are in the Good do truly exist; those who are in evil indeed tend to nonexistence: as a consequence, they cannot endure forever in evil. One alternative may be that they will vanish, and this theory was actually supported by a few patristic authors, such as *Arnobius—who was notably anti-Platonic—but Origen, Nyssa, Evagrius and their followers refuse to endorse this conclusion because these beings were created by God to exist, not to fall out of existence; otherwise God's creative action would result in a failure. Therefore, if these creatures cannot endure in evil forever, the only possible alternative is that they will convert and return to the Good. It will be sin and evil, not the sinners, that are extinguished forever, because the sinners are creatures of God, whereas evil is not. And in the end all will be found in the Good, i.e., in God, in an infinite loving tension toward the supreme object of our love. Because of their mutability, the voluntary submission of all creatures to Christ and to God will be indispensable for them to be able to participate in God's good things (*In Illud: Tunc et Ipse* 7 Downing).

Moreover, in the end—and only in the end—the creatures will never again abandon the Good in order to turn to evil, which in the **apokatastasis* will have vanished completely. For all, then, will participate in divine life, and God will be all good in all, so that their free will will never turn to any other object. The *apokatastasis* will be the reign of perfect unity in love, and there will be no more fall, because "love will never fall," as Origen maintains, quoting 1 Cor 13:8 in *Comm. in Rom.* V 10,15-16, and as Gregory of Nyssa repeats in *De Anima*, 96BC: "The divine

Apostle . . . foretells the end of all our concerns and solicitudes, and their cessation in peace . . . but of love alone he does not find the end . . . because love never falls, which is tantamount to saying that it always remains in the same condition. . . . Thus, if the soul will reach this end, it will find itself in such a condition as to need nothing else, in that it will be surrounded by the fullness of existing realities, and it alone seems, in some way, to keep in itself the stamp of divine beatitude. For the life of the superior nature is love, since what is beautiful and good is lovable in all respects for those who know it; now, the divinity knows itself and such a knowledge immediately becomes love, because that which is known by it is beautiful and good by nature, and insolent satiety does not attach itself to what is truly beautiful and good. Thus, since satiety does not interrupt the disposition to love what is beautiful and good, divine life will always endure through love, for it is both beautiful and good by nature, and disposed by nature to love the beautiful and the good, and feels no satiety in this activity acc. to love, because it is impossible to find a termination to the Beautiful and the Good." The infinity of the Good that is God is again the guarantee of the stability of the eventual condition of perfect unity and love. This condition is also salvation, which is "the culmination of all good things" (τὸ ἀκόρτατον τῶν ἀγαθῶν πάντων, *In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius*, 25 Downing) and is achieved through the alienation from evil (διὰ τῆς τοῦ κακοῦ ἀλλοτριώσεως), the result of which will be the complete destruction of evil. Only the Good will remain, and divine life will permeate all.

*Augustine also posits the supreme Good in God. In an early work (*De mor. Man.* II 7,9), he had the final restoration depend upon God's goodness (not in a psychological but in an ontological way): *Dei bonitas . . . omnia deficientia sic ordinat . . . donec ad id recurrant unde defecerunt.* Augustine returned to this passage in his *Retractationes* I, 7,6, to explain that it should not be understood in an Origenian sense, and that the damned, those doomed to the so-called eternal fire, should be excluded from the final restoration: *Non sic accipiendum est, tanquam omnia recurrant ad id unde defecerunt sicut Origeni visum est . . . non enim recurrunt ad Deum a quo defecerunt qui sempiterno igne punientur.* But originally Augustine's words are likely to have referred to the *apokatastasis*, and I deem it probable that Augustine was inspired by a precise passage of Origen's *De Principiis* (1.6.1), which Rufinus translated in AD 397 or immediately thereafter: *In unum sane finem putamus quod bonitas Dei per Christum suum universam revocet creaturam.* In both passages, of Origen's and Augustine's, it is God's goodness that makes the restoration of the fallen creatures possible. And God's goodness is not simply God's kindness or compassion, but the ontological identification of God with the Good. Indeed, Augustine's polemic against the *Manicheans surely reinforced this identification of God with the Good and the idea that evil is not at all a principle that is equal and antithetical to God. He was on the same track as Origen, Evagrius and the Cappadocians in stressing the ontological nothingness of evil—which, of course, had obvious consequences also for eschatology.

In Augustine's view, God is the One, is pure Being (*idipsum esse*), acc. to Ex 3:14 (*Expl. Ps.* 101,2,10; 134,4; *Trin.* III 10,21; XV 5,8), and is the sum of all goods and all intelligible things. In *De vita beata* 4,34, the One or Good is said to be "the measure and limit of all things," just as in *Plotinus's *Enn.* I 8,2,5, which Augustine certainly knew. On the contrary, evil is reduced to a lack of order and measure, a privation of form, with no ontological existence. And in *De mor. Man.* I 15,17 it is properly God the Father who is the Good. In *83 Quaest.* 6 the idea appears again that evil is a privation of form, measure and beauty. Augustine argues that all beings have some beauty or form (*species*), and beauty implies measure, and measure entails good; evil, having no good, has no measure, and thus has no form, but what has no form does not even exist. God is the source of all beautiful things and all good things because he reduces to order what is out of order: in God supreme Beauty coincides with supreme Good and is perfect Unity (*De libero arbitrio*; *Serm.* 241). In *Civ. Dei* XI and XII Augustine often repeats that evil does not exist but is rather a "damage," not in God, who is the Good and is immutable, but in the creature who chooses to separate from God: such a decision has no reason in itself, but is made possible by the fact that creatures are created *ex nihilo* and are attracted by nothingness, and surely evil is nothingness. But it is in *Conf.* VII 11,17 that the ontological argument from creation comes forth: every substance was created by God, but God did not create evil; therefore, evil has no substance and no ontological existence. This conception of evil as a mere lack, with no positive existence of its own, will appear again in works of the last period of Augustine's work, such as *C. Iul.* I 9,44-45 (after AD 420), where he takes up the Platonizing and Origenian characterization of evil in Ambrose's *Isaac vel anima* 7,67 as "a privation of good." Likewise, Augustine describes evil as a result of a wrong act of will, a *defectus a summo Bono, ubi bonum creatum Bono creante privatur.*

It is clear that the notion of evil as a lack of order, measure and form implies that the opposite of evil is a good that is also beautiful; all of Augustine's *De Ordine* is imbued with this conception, which is also found in passages from *De Trinitate*, *De civitate Dei*, *De quantitate animae*, etc. This bivalence has its roots not only in Greek thought and Platonism in particular, but also in the abovementioned biblical use of καλόν in the sense of "good." Especially in Gregory of Nyssa, the concept of good is expressed, not only by ἀγαθόν, but also by καλόν (properly meaning "beautiful, beauty"). Especially in his *homilies on the *Song of Songs, Gregory presents God as infinite Beauty; in God's image human beings were created (*Hom. op.* 4). In his *De mortuis* and *De anima*, too, God is the supreme Beauty, and human beings will recover their original beauty, which reflects that of God, and which was obfuscated by *sin. It is because beauty is essentially divine—and in God it is the same as the Good—that Gregory of Nazianzus in *Carm.* II I 39 *in versos suos*, 48-51, justifies his own *poetry in that he does not want to leave the adorned discourses to the pagans, but he wishes to preserve beauty for Christian poetry, and he adds that for the Christians κάλος consists in θεωρία (contemplation).

Finally, one of the most interesting observations that emerge from a systematic study of the history of the Christian doctrine of *apokatastasis* (Ramelli) is that the patristic authors who supported it did not base it on a metaphysical—let alone cosmological—necessity, but essentially on Christ's *incarnation, sacrifice and *resurrection, and on God's ἀγαθότης/ *bonitas*, i.e., on the fact that God is the Absolute Good.

A. Meredith, *The Good and the Beautiful in Gregory of Nyssa*, in Ἑρμηνεύματα: *Festschrift für H. Hörner*, ed. E. Herbert, Heidelberg 1990, 133-145; A. Capbosq, *Schönheit Gottes und des Menschen*, Bern-Frankfurt am Main 2000; M.S.M. Scott, *Shades of Grace*, in HTR 99 (2006) 65-83; D. Iozzia, *Il paradosso della bellezza divina. Gregorio di Nissa, In Cant. VI, 191, 7-9*, Orpheus 28 (2007) 100-115; M. Ludlow, *Gregory of Nyssa, Ancient and (Post)modern*, Oxford 2007, esp. 142ff.; I. Ramelli, *Christian Soteriology and Christian Platonism*, VChr 61,3 (2007) 313-356; Id., *Gregorio di Nissa Sull'anima e la resurrezione*, Milan 2007; Id., *Philosophical Allegoresis of Scripture in Philo and Its Legacy in Gregory of Nyssa*, Studia Philonica Annual 20 (2008); Id., *1 Cor 15:24-26. Submission of Enemies and Annihilation of Evil and Death*, SMSR 74,2 (2008) 241-258; Id., *Apocatastasi*, Milan 2009.

I. Ramelli

GORGONIA (d. 369/374). Probably the older sister of *Gregory of Nazianzus, born before ca. 330, wife and mother, she is known thanks to the funeral oration pronounced by her brother. Having married young and almost certainly baptized shortly before marriage, she had her husband Alypius and the children baptized as well, two of whom became bishops. She died between 369 and 374, after her brother Caesarius and before her parents. The location of her tomb is unknown, but perhaps it was at *Iconium. Of Gorgonia we know the funeral eulogy; it is the only source for the life of Gorgonia, except for several verses of the *Anthologia Palatina* and compositions by Gregory (SC 405, 57-60). Her veneration appeared in a later period, in the footsteps of Gregory of Nazianzus. The martyrology of Rabban Sliba names her along with all the members of her family 25 January (AB 27, 174). Information about her veneration is found in Nicephorus Callistus. Only the Greek codex 1582 of Paris (13th c.) of the *Synax. Eccl. CP*, as well the Menaia in Venice (16th c.) cites the feast on 23 February. Baronius inserted her in the *Mart. rom.* on 9 December.

BHG 704; PLRE 1, 398; BS 7, 121-122; R. Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

GOSPEL of the SAVIOR. This title is used to refer to two different fragmentary texts of noncanonical gospels, which refer to Jesus with the title "Savior." (a) The first is the MS P.Oxy 840, which is full of lacunae and was discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1905, a fragment in Greek, which presents a debate with the High Priest Levi on the question of ritual purity in relation to the *temple, the High Priest having washed in contaminated water, although *baptism which is a rebirth, is accomplished "in the waters of eternal life." This document emerged from a *Jewish-Christian context. The anonymous author, acc. to Kruger, knew of the canonical gospels (Mk 7:1-23; Lk 11:37-52; Mt 23:1-39; Jn 7:1-52; 13:10). (b) The second is P. Berol. 22220, *papyri fragments with numerous lacunae, in Sahidic *Coptic, the *editio princeps* of which was published in 1991 by Hedrick and Mirecki, to be completed now with some fragments from Strasburg. The papyrus dates to the 4th-7th c. The two editors think that the Greek original goes back to the late 2nd c. The fragment pertains to the Savior's last hours: the protagonist dialogues with his disciples after the Last Supper, prays to the Father that the chalice be taken from him and then turns directly to the cross and says, "O cross, do not be afraid! I am rich." The anonymous author depended on the gospels of *Matthew, *John and the book of *Revelation.

Editions: Hennecke - Schneemelcher, English edition, Cambridge 1991, 94-95; Erbetta 1, 105-106; Moraldi 1, 422-423; M.J. Kruger, *The Gospel of the Savior. An Analysis of P.Oxy. 840 and Its Place in the Gospel Traditions of Early Christianity*, Leiden-Boston 2005. *Studies*: H.-M. Schenke, *Das sogenannte 'Unbekannte Berliner Evangelium' (UBE)*: Zeitschrift f. antikes Christentum 2 (1998) 199-213; C.H.W. Hedrick - P.A. Mirecki, *Gospel of the Savior. A New Ancient Gospel*, California Classical Library, Santa Rosa, CA 1999; T. Nagel, *Das Unbekannte Berliner Evangelium und das Johannesevangelium*: ZNTW 93 (2002) 251-267; S. Emmel, *The Recently Published* Gospel of the Savior *("Unbekanntes Berliner Evangelium"). Righting the Order of Pages and Events*: HTR 95 (2002) 45-72; Id., *Preliminary Reedition and Translation of the Gospel of the Savior. New Light on the Strasbourg Coptic Gospel and the Stauros-Text from Nubia*: Apocrypha 14 (2003) 9-53; C.W. Hedrick, *Caveats to a "Righted Order" of the Gospel of the Savior*: HTR 96 (2003) 229-238; B.D. Ehrman, *Lost Scriptures*, Oxford 2003, 52-56; Id., *I cristianesimi perduti. Apocrifi, sette ed eretici nella battaglia per le Sacre Scritture*, Rome 2005; A. Destro - M. Pesce, *Constellations of Texts in Early Christianity. The Gospel of the Savior and Johannist Writings*: AnSE 22 (2005) 337-353.

A. Di Berardino

GOSPELS (apocryphal)

I. Texts pertaining to the life of Jesus, Mary, Joseph and John the Baptist - II. Texts preserved in fragments.

This phrase was used as a norm for indicating the extracanonical accounts pertaining, usually, to some periods or events from the life of *Jesus but also *Mary, *Joseph and *John the Baptist; only rare and rather late apocryphal gospels recount the entire life of Jesus. There exists, moreover, a group of fragments of texts from the first centuries that often call themselves, or are called by the authors who cite them, "gospels." These two groups are normally treated as "apocryphal gospels." It would be mistaken, however, to regard these texts as alternative gospel accounts. The authors seek rather to complement the gospel accounts, to explain them, to express their own theological opinions and to give an *exegesis of biblical texts through images with the objective of interesting the readers. These texts only rarely offer new traditions about Jesus and Mary, but they do exhibit a very interesting image of the piety of Christians for the age in which they were written.

I. Texts pertaining to the life of Jesus, Mary, Joseph and John the Baptist. (a) The first group is established by texts on the infancy of Mary and Jesus. The foundational text, upon which all the other works are based, is the *Nativity of Mary* (from the 16th c. onward it was called the **Protevangelium of James*), a Greek apocryphal text from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. The text tells of Mary's birth, her infancy, her marriage to Joseph, the Annunciation and birth of Jesus. This text exists in numerous traditions and independent paraphrases (e.g., *Nativity of Mary*, a 9th-c. Latin text) or inserted in other texts (*Gospel of ps.-*Matthew*, a Latin apocryphal text; the *Armenian Infancy Gospel* and others). The second foundational text of this group is the *Paidika Kyriou* (popularly referred to as the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*), an apocryphal Greek text from the 2nd c.: it contains a series of accounts about baby Jesus and his wondrous deeds; the number of these accounts and episodes is different in the various collections (concordance in CANT, pp. 38-39). Even this text, which is often translated and paraphrased, exists in an independent form or rather inserted into various texts (e.g., in the *Armenian Infancy Gospel*). Alongside this text is an apocryphal Ethiopian text, *The Miracles of Jesus*. The *Gospel of ps.-Matthew* contains an account of the holy family's trip to *Egypt, which was noticeably developed in the *Arabic Gospel* and in the *Armenian Infancy Gospel*. In various texts (esp. Eastern ones) the story of the three *Magi is developed, as in the *Syriac legend, the *Georgian Gospel* or in the correspondence between *Longinus and *Augustus.

As an appendix to this group, scholars have included the works concerning St. Joseph and St. John the Baptist. With respect to St. Joseph we have an important text: *The History of Joseph the Carpenter*, written in Greek, but preserved in Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic) and Arabic: Jesus recounts the death of his putative father; inserted therein are fragments on the life of Jesus. There exists, moreover, two Greek and Syriac lives of St. John the Baptist.

(b) Another group of apocryphal gospels or texts pertain to the passion and resurrection of Christ. The most ancient text is the *Gospel of Peter*, a Greek apocryphal text from the 2nd c., preserved in fragments and the papyrus of Akhmin: it recounts Pontius *Pilate's judgment, the passion and resurrection. The most popular text was the *Acts of Pilate*, also called the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (5th c., but the existence of an apocryphal text under this name was known already in the 2nd c.). This text gives an account of God's judgment on Pilate, his condemnation, death and *descent into hell (this last part was esp. popular). This work also exists in versions in various languages. We have, moreover, a group of approximately ten works, usually later texts, primarily in Latin but also in Greek and Eastern languages, and rather brief, called the *Cycle of Pilate* (the most important being *Epistula Pilati ad Claudium*, *Anaphora and Paradosis Pilati* [Arabic, Armenian, Syriac and Slavic translations], *Epistulae Pilati et Herodi*, *Epistula Pilati ad Tiberium*, *Cura sanitatis Tiberii*, *Vindicta Salvatoris*, *Mors Pilati*, *Narratio*

Iosephi de Arimathaea [in Latin and Georgian], *Martyrium Pilati* in Syriac, and the *Evangelium Gamalielis* in Ethiopian). These texts pertain to various individuals who were connected in some way to the death of Jesus, i.e., Pilate and his wife called Procla (Procula) (who, in the Ethiopian apocrypha, become saints), Herod, *Joseph of Arimathea and others. There are biblical (Herod, Pilate) historical (*Titus, *Tiberius and *Vespasian) or even fictitious characters (Nathan, the woman with the flow of blood who was over time given the name *Veronica). Several accounts mention the events after the death of Jesus (the death of Pilate and Herod, the destruction of *Jerusalem, the discovery of Jesus' garments). These texts have the form of an account, a letter or a report. These apocryphal texts, which are bereft of reliable historical or artistic value, performed, however, a significant role in medieval culture.

(c) In addition, there is a group of apocryphal gospels, usually of a later production, which account more or less for the entire life of Jesus, such as the *Georgian Gospel* (extensive fragments of which remain); the *Arabic Gospel* (at one time called the *Gospel of the Infancy*; until the discovery of some fragments concerning the entire life); the Arabic *Gospel of John* and the *Gospel of Barnabas*, a late text produced by Islamic propaganda, which was preserved in the vernacular language.

(d) Another group of apocryphal gospels are usually associated the *Transitus*, and though typically numbered among the gospels, they are also connected to the literature pertaining to the apostles, in which they perform an important role. The various *Transitus* speak of Mary's dormition (death) and assumption; they constitute an extensive group of texts transmitted in various languages. The *Transitus*, ascribed to St. *John the Evangelist, Joseph of Arimathea, *Melito of Sardis and others, are rather late texts (6th c.) but probably preserve much more ancient fragments.

II. Texts preserved in fragments. (a) The fragments of the ancient gospels constitute a group of an entirely special character; some of them come from the 1st-2nd c. These were the texts used most by the Jewish Christians, *gnostics, *heretics and by more or less orthodox authors, usually preserved in Greek and Latin, which were mentioned or cited by the writers of the patristic age. The most important are the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (nearly 60 fragments, also medieval), the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (8 fragments) and the *Nazarenes (Nasoreans) (usually connected to that of the Hebrews, or rather identified with it). These are the most studied texts and are very important for the study of Christianity of the 1st-2nd c. We have, moreover, another group of more than 20 texts whose titles we know (often imprecise) or of which unintelligible fragments remain. These are the gospels of *Andrew, *Basilides, *Bardesanes, *Cerinthus, Eve, *Philip, *Judas Iscariot, *Mani, *Marcion, *Mary Magdalene, *Matthew, Perfection, the Twelve, at least four gospels of the Egyptians, the Seventy, the Four Cardinal Points, the *Living Gospel* (or *Gospel of the Living*), *Genna Marias*, *Questions of Mary Magdalen* (perhaps identical to the *Gospel of Mary Magdalene*), *Traditions of *Matthias* (perhaps identical to the *Gospel of Matthias*), *Memories of the Apostles*. Lastly, in the Letter to *Theodore, which is attributed to *Clement of Alexandria, some fragments of a gospel of St. *Mark have been discovered; the question of its authenticity is still unresolved.

(b) Alongside these are fragments of anonymous gospels in the *papyri: P. Oxy 840 and 1224, P. Egerton 2, P. Berol. 11,710, P. Fayum, P. Cair. 10.7359 and P. Merton 51. Three fragments in the papyri of Oxyrhynchus (1, 655, 656) were identified as the Greek version of the *Gospel of Thomas* of *Nag Hammadi (codex II), a collection of 114 logia of Jesus; close to this work is the *Gospel of Philip*, likewise from Nag Hammadi (codex II).

(c) Another group of texts about Jesus, preserved in fragments, are found in texts outside the gospels: in the **Epistula Apostolorum*, the **Ascension of Isaiah*, the **Odes of Solomon* and the *Sibylline Oracles*; and in the gnostic texts *Justin the gnostic's *Baruch* and *Pistis Sophia*. These texts, just as those of the papyri, are of special interest to biblical scholars. Another group of texts about Jesus are found in the writings of Jews—rather late and clearly anti-Christian traditions—such as the *Toledoth Ješu* (on this point, see Agobard of Lyons, PL 104, 87-88). Lastly, fragments on Jesus, usually taken from the apocrypha, are found in the works of Muslim authors (the Qur'an, a long fragment about Jesus in Tabari's *Chronicle* from the 9th/10th c., a Muslim writer of **agrapha*.

(d) To this group of fragmentary gospels belong the *agrapha*, i.e., sayings attributed to Jesus that are found outside the canonical gospels, usually in Greek or Latin; there exists, moreover, a series of Muslim *agrapha* found in the writings of Arabic authors.

All these texts, although incomplete, poorly preserved and often imprecise, have great importance for understanding the history of ancient Christianity.

CANT 1-20, 28-83. A. de Santos Otero, *Los evangelios apócrifos*, Madrid [6]1988, bilingual ed.; K. v. Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, [2]Leipzig 1876 (Hildesheim 1966). The apocryphal gos-

pels (complete and fragmentary texts) usually constitute the first volume (or the first part) of all the collections of the NT apocrypha such as those of Elliott, Erbetta, Moraldi, Schneemelcher, Starowieyski, EApC; other collections of apocryphal gospels are those of Craveri, A. de Santos Otero, Madrid 2001 (only Sp. tr.) and others.

Agrapha: we only have the collections of A. Resch, TU 15, 3/4, 1906 (Darmstadt 1974) and W.D. Stroker, Atlanta 1989; Muslim *agrapha*: PO 13,3, 1916; 19,4, 1926.

Jewish-Christian translations: see the collections of the apocrypha, esp. A.F.J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, Leiden 1992.

Jewish traditions about Jesus: G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Cambridge 1893; J.B. Aufhauser, *Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse*, Bonn 1913; R.T. Hereford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, London 1903; B. Pick, *Jesus in the Talmud. His Personality, His Disciples and His Sayings*, Chicago 1913; H.L. Strack - P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, 1, Munich 1922, 36-40; J. Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*, Darmstadt 1978; J.P. Osier, *L'Évangile du Ghetto*, Paris 1984 (Fr. tr.).

Muslim traditions about Jesus: Tabarî (839–923), *La Chronique, Histoire des prophètes et des rois*, trans. H. Zotenberg, 1, Paris 2001, 86-121. D. Sidersky, *Les origines des légendes musulmanes dans le Coran et dans les Vies des Prophètes*, Paris 1933, 136-150; J.M. Abd-el-Jalil, *La vie de Marie selon le Coran et l'Islam*, in *Maria, Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 1, Paris 1949, 183-211; J. Jeremias, *Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Agraphon "Die Welt ist eine Brücke"*: NAWG (1953) 95-103; H. Sahlin, *"Die Welt ist eine Brücke"*: ZNE (1956) 286-287; S.M. Stern, *Quotations from Apocryphal Gospels in 'Abd-al-Jabbār*: JTS 18 (1967) 34-57; 19 (1968) 128ff.; F.F. Bruce, *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the NT*, London 1974, 167-186; R. Arnaldez, *Jésus, fils de Marie, prophète d'Islam*, Paris 1980; A.J. Wensinck - P. Jonstone, *Maryam*, in *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, 6, Leyden 1986, 613-617 (bibl.); K. Kościelniak, *Tradycja muzułmańska na tle akulturacji chrzecijańskoislamskiej od VII do X wieku*, Kraków 2001.

M. Starowieyski

GOTHIC LITERATURE. The early church, in its work *evangelizing the Roman world, was already doing what today we usually call inculturation. It placed the Christian message, without sacrificing anything from it, within the culture of Roman society: it transmitted this message to its recipients both through the humble expressive systems and culture of the popular masses of the empire (speaking Greek, Latin or other languages), and through the elevated expressive systems and culture of the social and intellectual elites. Indeed, in this second area, the Christians, since their religion was founded on the "Book" (the *Scriptures) and was therefore an educated religion, made use of the *disciplinae* (or *artes*) *liberales* taught in the imperial schools, *disciplinae* considered by them as useful instruments for studying and teaching the scriptural text. There were two paths of inculturation in the Roman world, therefore: inculturation on the popular level and inculturation at the level of the social and intellectual elites.

This is worth emphasizing: thanks to inculturation, the Christian teaching was carried out, just as it is today, respectful of cultures, in confrontation with them, incarnated and rooted in them so as to create new cultural riches. In turning next to the peoples outside the Roman world (acc. to the Messianic mandate: "Go and make disciples of all nations" [Mt 28:19]), Christianity continued its inculturation in the various areas then called barbarian, using the languages and cultures of their masses. But since these new realms lacked the support for biblical hermeneutic that the *disciplinae* (or *artes*) *liberales* supplied within *Romanitas*, the *disciplinae* were therefore introduced into the horizons of the Christianization of the barbarians. Consequently, the inculturation within the Roman world at the level of the intellectual elites, turned into Roman acculturation, which created, as it progressed, Christian intellectuals, Roman not by birth but by culture. With the progressive Christianization of the non-Roman world, Christian inculturation, brought about by *preaching to and *catechesis of the masses, and Roman intellectual acculturation, brought by the study and teaching of the scriptural text, proceeded therefore in parallel. The same Christianization, on the one hand, legitimizing and favoring the local languages and cultures that led to the birth of the plurality of literatures in vernacular (and "national") languages, on the other hand, also led to the birth of an intellectual and supranational common tongue (*koinē*) of linguistically and culturally traditional Roman education that became the bearer of classical culture. Christianity became, therefore, the central engine of the process of cultural formation of Europe.

Gothic Christian culture, which formed and flowered in the 4th c., was brought about directly by the inculturative and acculturative action produced by the Christianization of the Gothic world. It was the first epochal step in the encounter, thanks to Christianization of the Roman, Germanic and Celtic worlds, from which Western European culture would be born.

It is mentioned that a certain Theophilus, bishop of Gothia, sat among the Fathers participating in the Council of *Nicaea of 325 (*Patrum Nicaenorum nomina*, ed. H. Gelzer - H. Hilgenfeld - O. Cuntz, Lat. ser.: nos. 216, 219; Gr. ser.: no. 211; index Patr. Nicaen. restitutus: no. 219), and that Nicetas was a disciple, still in Gothia, of the same Theophilus (*Martyrium S.

Nicetae Gothi 2, PG 115, 705B). This tells us that there were Christians among the Goths in 325: there is reason to believe that seeds of Christianity were already present in the Gothic world, having penetrated there, as often happened elsewhere, through prisoners and merchants from the Roman world, and that, just as elsewhere, the official church intervened at a later time with the dispatch of a bishop (cf. the Greek character of the name both of the bishop mentioned as well as that of his disciple and collaborator). This phase can be considered the prehistory of the Christianization of the Goths. But the history of their Christianization coincides above all with their Arianization. For the great trinitarian controversy that agitated the Roman world in the 4th c. did not remain without reflection in the area of the Goths, and *Wulfila (or Vulfila or Ulfila) was precisely the great protagonist of the Arianization of the Gothic world, in which nevertheless Christians of Nicene faith continued to exist.

Born ca. 311 in a family descended from Christian prisoners captured on the occasion of a Gothic incursion into Cappadocia and fully assimilated to Gothic society (his name itself is Gothic: *Wulf-* [nom. sing. *Wulfs*] + *-ila*, and means "Wolfling," "Little Wolf"), after having been lector of his church, Wulfila was consecrated bishop in 341 by the moderate *Arian *Eusebius of Nicomedia. He adhered to Arianism, present above all in the Eastern part of the church, and spread the Arian creed among the *Visigoths (settled in a region bordering the E provinces of the empire), who in turn passed it to the *Ostrogoths (settled to the N of the Black Sea) and other Germanic groups lying to the E of the Empire. After seven years of exercising the episcopate in the formerly Roman Dacia, Wulfila, moving with many other Christian Visigoths into imperial territory, into *Moesia, to escape the *persecution at the hands of the *pagan Gothic King Athanaric, persevered for another thirty-three years in the episcopal mission among his people and, thanks to his knowledge—as testified by his disciple, the Arian *Auxentius of Durostorum—not only of Gothic, but also of Greek and Latin (*Epistula de vita, fide et obitu Ulfilae* 53 and 54, PLS 1, 705), he participated in the great contemporary trinitarian debate: in fact, the Arian doctrine of Wulfila, initially moderate, developed into a radical Arianism of *Eunomian character.

Thanks to Wulfila, the translation of the Bible into Gothic (large fragments have reached us, almost exclusively of the NT)—the greatest expression of his episcopal activity—took place in the Arian Christianity of the Goths. It was a remarkable event of inculturation, performed by him for his people, during which he created the national Gothic alphabet, basing it on the Greek biblical majuscule with the addition of certain characters from Latin uncial and some runic signs. If, as mentioned above, inculturation can produce new cultural riches, Wulfila's inculturative enterprise was clearly the epochal turning point in the history of Germanic culture. With his translation he lifted Gothic from an oral language, up to that point exclusively so, to a written one, which thereafter rose to become a literary language: the Wulfilan Bible was the first literary monument of the entire Germanic culture.

The Christianization of the Goths prior to Wulfila and esp. Wulfila's translation of the Bible enriched Gothic greatly. To understand this adequately it is useful to look back at the linguistic reflections that Christianization had already produced among the Latin-speaking masses. The Christian education of these people posed the problem for the preachers of transmitting to them, in a linguistically accessible manner, a doctrine whose first disseminators had preached and written in Greek. Catechesis resolved it in the way that we can define as most natural linguistically. A complex of Greek terms indicating concrete Christian realities (things, religious duties, institutions) were transferred en masse into Latin (with integration, naturally, into the morphological system of this language). The acquisition, on the Latin side, of those concrete realities was also, automatically, the acquisition and consequent assimilation of their names (acc. to a typology of loan words, apparent in the contacts between different languages both ancient and modern). The Latin language was enriched therefore with new Hellenisms such as *apostata*, *apostolus*, *baptismus* or *baptisma*, *catechumenus*, *diaconus*, *ecclesia*, *eleemosyna*, *episcopus*, *evangelium*, *martyr*, *neophytus*, *presbyter*, *propheta* and others. But there were also fundamental theological concepts that had to be borrowed from the theology in the Greek language. In order for these to be understood by the Latin-speaking masses incapable of understanding Greek, it was catechetically necessary that the propagators of the Christian creed in the West replace the relevant Greek terminology with adequate Latin terms. These, therefore, were either taken from the traditional Latin lexical heritage and acquired therefore obvious semantic enrichment in a Christian sense, giving rise to semantic neologisms (*fides*, *credere*, *caro*, *spiritus*, *tingere*, *lavacrum*, *sanguis*, *diligere*, etc.), or they were new formations based on already-existing Latin words and began to express new and exquisitely Christian concepts and giving rise to true and

proper lexical neologisms (*Salvator*, *Trinitas*, *dilectio*, *regeneratio*, *revelatio*, *carnalis*, *spiritalis*, etc.). The special Christian language (*Sondersprache*), which the Nijmegen school had the merit of discovering and investigating, came therefore into being within Latin.

A similar reality was created in the Gothic language by Christian preaching and above all by the Wulfilan translation of the Bible. The expression, whether in the pre-Wulfilan or in the Wulfilan phase, of the Christian message in Gothic could not help but bring with it the introduction in the language itself of numerous Christian Hellenisms and/or Latinisms indicating concrete things, ecclesiastical duties and institutions (*aggilus*, "angel"; *aikklesjo*, "church"; *aipiskaupus*, "bishop"; *aipistaule*, "epistle"; *aiwaggeljo*, "gospel"; *apaustaulus*, "apostle"; *daimonareis*, "possessed"; *diabaulus*, "devil"; *diakaunus*, "deacon"; *praufetes*, "prophet," etc.), which came thus to join the profane Latinisms and Hellenisms already acquired by the Goths, by mercantile and other contacts, starting from the time of their settlement in the Vistula region (similarly, Gothic, through the Greek and Latin of the Christians, did not fail to acquire a few Hebrew words: *gaiainna* ["Gehenna"], *rabbaunei* and *rabbei* [honorific title of a master of the law, a form of address given to Christ]).

Next, fundamental theological concepts were taken, such as those of *faith, believe, save, *grace, *justification, *love as agape, flesh as worldliness, etc. In the *evangelization of a people neither Latin nor Greek, it is evident that Greek or Latin terminology would have been absolutely unfit for expressing these difficult concepts. Therefore the concept of faith (Gr. πίστις; Lat. *fides*) was expressed, as the Wulfilan text of the Bible shows, with the Gothic *galaubeins*. In parallel, the concept of believing (πιστεύειν in Greek, *credere* in Latin) was expressed with *galaubjan,* "to believe." Thus also the other concepts mentioned above were rendered in the following ways: to save (Gr. σώζειν, Lat. *salvare*): Goth. *nasjan*; Savior (Gr. Σωτήρ, Lat. *Salvator*): Goth. *nasjands*; to baptize (Gr. βαπτίζειν, Lat. *ting*(*u*)*ere* and later, Hellenizing, *baptizare*): Goth. *daupjan*; baptism (Gr. βάπτισμα or βαπτισμός, Lat. *tinctio* and later, in a Hellenizing coinage, *baptisma* or *baptismus*): Goth. *daupeins*; grace (Gr. χάρις, Lat. *gratia*): Goth. *ansts*; justification (Gr. δικαίωμα, Lat. *iustificatio*): Goth. *garaihtei*; to be justified (Gr. δικαιοῦσθαι, Lat. *iustificari*): Goth. *garaihts wairdan*; agape (Gr. ἀγάπη, Lat. *dilectio*): Goth. *frijapwa*; flesh as worldliness (Gr. σάρξ, Lat. *caro*): Goth. *leik*.

Given the absence of a pagan Gothic literature before the Bible of Wulfila, we do not have documentation of the use of Gothic words in pagan contexts. Consequently we cannot have that comparative vision of their pagan and Christian use that would allow us to grasp concretely their semantic change, or their semantic enrichment in a Christian sense. Nevertheless one can easily intuit how those words belonged, already in themselves (without Christian connotation), to the daily and profane life of the Goths and how therefore they preexisted the Christianization of this people. For example, the verb *galaubjan* expressed, already outside the Christian sphere, the notion of believing as a pure and simple mental operation, linked to the most diverse contingencies of ordinary life. The verb *nasjan* expressed the common idea of healing or saving. *Daupeins* and *daupjan* expressed, respectively, the notions of the bath and of bathing as merely natural and corporal facts. *Leik* was the body in flesh and bone. It is equally easy to intuit the semantic enrichment that these same words acquired thanks to their assumption, on the part of Wulfila and the other evangelizers, as words indicating clearly Christian—and therefore profoundly new—concepts. Consider *galaubjan*: from believing generically to believing specifically understood as a salvific act of faith; *nasjan*: from the notion of the generic and natural act of healing or saving to the notion of the specifically supernatural and redemptive act carried out by Christ; *daupjan*: from the notion of the merely material act of immersion to the concept of bodily immersion with a spiritually regenerative effect; *garaihts*: from the notion of a person naturally just to the notion of a person rendered supernaturally just by the redemptive act; *frijapwa*: from the notion of love as a natural sentiment among people to the notion of the supernatural love of God for human beings and the entirely spiritual love of humans for God; *leik*: from the notion of body and flesh to the notion of worldliness.

Special attention should be given to the fact that before the well-attested and consolidated Greek and Latin ways of designating the regenerative bath (βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, *baptisma*, *baptismus*), Christian Gothic, rather than taking over wholesale, as in many other cases (see above), the Hellenism/Latinism, instead translated, making use of the national words *daupjan* ("to bathe") and *daupeins* ("bath"): it is a significant example of the evangelizing effort to express with genuine Gothic words the rite of Christian initiation. Furthermore, Christianity also brought into Gothic certain lexical formations that were definitely novelties compared to pre-Christian Gothic. Certainly *daupjands* ("baptizer, baptist")

was a new Christian formation, based on *daupjan*: if *daupjan*, as already mentioned, in pre-Christian and therefore profane Gothic was the material act of immersion and in Christian Gothic was now the profoundly new act of bodily immersion with supernaturally salvific effect, i.e., baptism, it is evident that *daupjands*, inasmuch as it indicates he who presided at this rite, could not be anything but a new lexical acquisition. Next we have evident calques of Latin or Greek words: *armahairts* ("merciful"), formed on Latin *misericors*, with *arma-* (<*arms*, "miserable") corresponding to *miseri-*, and *-hairts* (<*hairto*, "heart") in clear correspondence with *cor* (cf. Goth. *armahairtei*, "mercy," calque of Lat. *misericordia*); *midwissei* ("conscience"), formed either on Latin *conscientia* or else on Greek συνείδησις, with *mid-* corresponding to Latin *cum-* or to Greek συν-, and *-wissei* (in which the notion of knowledge is present) in correspondence with Lat. *scientia* or with Greek εἴδησις, "knowledge." And again: *gudhus* ("temple," "synagogue"), formed on the Latin expression *domus dei*, is clearly constituted from *gud* ("god"), corresponding to Latin *deus*, and from *hus* ("house"), corresponding to Latin *domus*. And it is not improbable that a calque from Greek is present in *usstass* ("resurrection"), corresponding to the Greek ἀνάστασις (of the same meaning), with *us-* traceable to ἀνά- and *-stass* (cf. the Gothic verb *standan*) traceable to στάσις: furthermore, the fact that the concept of resurrection was so Christian and new legitimizes the interpretation offered here.

The global evaluation of these aspects of Christian Gothic (Hellenisms and Latinisms indicating concrete realities, semantic neologisms and new lexical formations) leads us to conclude that also within Gothic a special Christian language came into existence as a consequence of Christianization and of the Wulfilan translation of the Bible, in a dynamic analogous to that which took place in the Christian Latin environment.

Finally it should be pointed out that the Gothic translation of the scriptural text reveals an influence of the Arian faith of its author. Philippians 2:6, "who [Christ Jesus], despite being of divine nature, did not consider it robbery to be in equal [ἴσα] condition to that of God," was translated in this way by Wulfila: *saei in gudaskaunein wisands ni wulwa rahnida wisan sik galeiko guda*. On the one hand, the Greek adjective ὅμοιος ("similar") is always rendered by Wulfila with the Gothic adjective *galeiks*, and the verb ὁμοιοῦν ("assimilate, make similar") is rendered by him with the Gothic verb *galeikon*, and the substantive ὁμοίωμα ("similarity") with the Gothic substantive *galeiki*. On the other hand, the adjective ἴσος, "equal," is translated sometimes *samaleiks* and sometimes *samalaups*, and ἰσο- ("equal, of the same nature"), as first element of a composition, is rendered in Gothic with *ibna*, and the substantive ἰσότης ("equality") is given as *ibnassus*. However, only in the cited Phil 2:6 is the adverbial form ἴσα (adj. *aequalem* in the *Vulgata*) is rendered by Wulfila with the adverb *galeiko*, which on the basis of the mentioned relationship ὅμοιος/*galeiks* and the like, we have to interpret "of similar condition." It is then evident that against the relationship of equality of nature of Christ with God, and therefore of the Son with the Father, Wulfila, translating polemically, articulated a relationship of similarity of nature of Christ with God. John 5:18 is not included among the Wulfilan biblical fragments, where the evangelist relates that the Jews sought to kill Jesus for the fact that the latter considered himself son of God and equal (ἴσον/*aequale*) to God. But on the basis of what we have said above concerning ἴσα/*galeiko* in Phil 2:6 it is not difficult to conjecture that also concerning the Greek of Jn 5:18 Wulfila used the Gothic adjective *galeikana* ("similar").

Gothic Christian inculturation also helps account for the surviving Catholic Gothic community at *Constantinople. We learn from a sermon of *John Chrysostom (PL 63, 472) that in the ecclesiastical communities of Constantinople, religious songs resounded in Greek, Latin, Syriac and a barbarian language. Regarding the latter, the conjecture that this was Gothic is easy and immediate. We know nothing of their melody, but we can postulate the structure of their versification on the basis of the common old Germanic verse technique: they would have been songs in anisosyllabic, bipartite and alliterative verses. The inculturation is therefore clear: the ministers of the Word composed or had composed, with a catechetic or euchological purpose, songs in Gothic and in Gothic meter (and, perhaps, Gothic melodies) destined for the people in order that they, thanks to the familiarity of the language and the metrical structure (and perhaps of the music), might easily absorb and retain the contents of the Word.

Let us turn to acculturation, creator of Christian intellectual life. The already-mentioned Auxentius (*Epistula de vita, fide et obitu Ulfilae* 54) testifies that Wulfila wrote treatises and explanations in three languages: that means, obviously, he used, acc. to the addressees and the situations, Gothic, Greek and Latin. The treatises were certainly writings of theological controversy; the explanations were *commentaries on the Scriptures. With his translation of the biblical text into Gothic, Wulfila, as stated above,

elevated the Gothic language itself to a literary language: this naturally revealed itself in the Wulfilan writings in Gothic, as we find them in the so-called *Skeireins*, which have reached us in anonymous fragments. This substantial monument from Gothic literature, as its fragments show, was an explanation (the meaning of the term *Skeireins* is precisely "explanation") of the gospel of John. We notice that in *Skeir.* 5, 23-24 the author cites Jn 5:23, "in order that everyone honor the Son just as [καθώς] they honor the Father," and clarifies that this must be understood "not equal, but similar honor" (*ni ibnon ak galeika sweripa*). The coherence of this *exegesis with the Arian doctrine, and more specifically with the Gothic translation of Phil 2:6, which we have already discussed, is clear. Therefore Arianism did not fail to make its mark on the *Skeireins* also. We also know from *Theodoret (*Hist. eccl.* V, 30, ed. Parmentier - Hansen, GCS, N.F. 5) that Chrysostom engaged, using an interpreter, in theological discussions with Gothic interlocutors. Finally, *Jerome furnished to the Goths Sunnia and Fretela (evidently of Nicene faith), after they had appealed to him, explanations concerning criticism of the text of the *Psalms (*Ep.* 106, ed. Labourt of the letters of Jerome, V, Paris 1955).

This entire latter category of data, considered as a whole, lets us see, in the Christianized Gothic world, a world of true and proper Christian intellectuals (whether of Arian or Nicene confession). Among themselves, as far as we know, they cultivated the reading of biblical commentaries, doctrinal treatises and works of textual-critical interest in the Holy Scriptures. All this is clearly along the lines of much analogous literature already in flower in the Greek and Latin Christian culture.

On the prehistory of the Christianization of the Goths: B. Luiselli, *La formazione della cultura europea occidentale*, Rome 2003, 118-124.

On the Christianization of the Goths: E.A. Thompson, *The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila*, Oxford 1966; P. Scardigli, *La conversione dei Goti al cristianesimo*, XIV Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1967, 47-86; B. Luiselli; *Cristianesimo e fenomeni regionali dell'inculturazione nei secc. IV-VII*, in *Cristianesimo e specificità regionali nel Mediterraneo latino (secc. IV-VI)*, XXII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome, 6-8 maggio 1993, Rome 1994, 12-19; L.C. Russel, *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity. A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation*, New York-Oxford 1994, 135-140; B. Luiselli, *La formazione*, 124-132; B. Luiselli, *Dall'arianesimo dei Visigoti di Costantinopoli all'arianesimo degli Ostrogoti d'Italia*: RAL 16,1 (2005) 5-30.

On the teachings of Wulfila: M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 442, 460, 481, 482, 502, and esp. Id., *L'arianesimo di Ulfila*: RomBarb 1 (1976) 297-323.

For the text of the Gothic Bible: *Die gotische Bibel*, ed. W. Streitberg, I: *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage*, II: *Gotisch-Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* (repr. Heidelberg 1971 from 3. unveränd. Aufl.). The famous *Codex Argenteus* (late 5th-early 6th c.), from the University Library of Uppsala (ms. DG I), is the most important witness of the Gothic Bible. Its last folio was found in 1971 at Speyer, on which see F. Haffner - P. Scardigli, *Unum redivivum folium*, II. Anhang a P. Scardigli, *Die Goten. Sprache und Kultur*, Munich 1973, 302-319. On Christian Gothic as a special language (*Sondersprache*), see B. Luiselli, *La formazione*, 460-467. On the influence of the Arian creed on the Gothic tr. of the Bible, see G. Mirarchi, *L'arianesimo nei frammenti della Bibbia gotica*: Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Filologia germanica 19 (1976) 163-184; B. Luiselli, *Storia culturale dei rapporti tra mondo romano e mondo germanico*, Rome 1992, 455-458. Editions of the *Skeireins. Die gotische Bibel*, ed. W. Streitberg, ibid., I. Anhang, 456-471; see also *The Gothic Commentary on the Gospel of John.* Skeireins aiwaggelions pairh Iohannen. *A Decipherment*, ed. and tr. by W.H. Bennett, New York 1960. On Arianism in the *Skeireins*: B. Luiselli, *Storia culturale*, 459-460. K. Schäferdiek, *Die Fragmente der "Skeireins" und der Johanneskommentar des Theodor von Herakleia*, in *Schwellenzeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Christentums in Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*, ed. W.A. Löhr - H.Ch. Brennecke, Berlin 1996, 69-87 (proves that the *Skeireins* is the tr. of the lost commentary of *Theodore of Heraclea).

B. LUISELLI

GOTHS. An ancient Germanic population, probably originally from Scandinavia (Gotland). The name, close in its etymology to the Gothic *giutan*, has a disputed orthography among authors: Γούτωνες in Strabo, *Gutones* in Pliny, *Gothones* in Tacitus, *Getae* in *Jordanes and others (there is frequent confusion with the Getae or Dacians). Their early historical events are obscure and uncertain: acc. to some sagas, they were led by King Bering in emigrating from Scandinavia, and, after having fought against the Ulmerings and the *Vandals, they occupied the S coast of the Baltic Sea. Classical sources in the 1st c. BC put them at the mouth of the Vistula (Tac., *Germ.* 44) and, thereafter, that of the Danube. Then, in the course of their slow but constant expansion, the Goths entered into battle with the Roman Empire during the time of *Caracalla (Hist. Aug., *Carac.* 10, 6), dealing the imperial armies numerous serious defeats. After sporadic encounters with the troops of *Maximinus Thrax and *Philip the Arab, they obtained their first great victory at Abritus (251) against *Decius, who died in the battle. After they overcame the weak resistance of the Romans, they and other peoples devastated *Thrace, *Moesia and Greece, sacking the cities of Trebizond, *Chalcedon, *Nicomedia and *Ephesus (Jordanes, *Get.* 20, 107); at the end of 261 they obtained *Cappadocia, from where they de-

ported many Christian prisoners, among whom must have been the grandparents of Wulfila. After they completed another ruinous expedition against the cities and ports of Greece (sacking those of *Athens, *Corinth, *Sparta, Argo), the Goths were stopped at Naissus (269) by *Claudius II Gothicus (Hist. Aug., *Claud.* 9, 4). Thereafter they obtained the territories N of the Danube from *Aurelian (Hist. Aug., *Aurel.* 39, 7), from which, however, they would cross to devastate the bordering provinces at the beginning of the 4th c. After being defeated several times by *Constantine (315, 323, 324), the Goths were then received into the service of the Roman army as auxiliaries, and they fought under *Constantius and *Julian against the Persians (Amm. Marc., *Rer. gest. libri* 20, 8,1, and 23, 2, 7). In 376 the invasion of the *Huns put an end to the rule of the Goths along the Black Sea. This led to their definitive separation into *Ostrogoths and *Visigoths. The former submitted and remained in the territories occupied by the Huns; the latter preferred to emigrate S. Other Goths fled to the Crimea. From this moment the historical vicissitudes of the Goths were clearly divided.

Even though *Valens had welcomed them into Thrace, the Visigoths, lead by Fritigern, rebelled and inflicted a serious defeat upon the imperial forces at Hadrianopolis in 378 (Ammian. XXXI, 11-13). After a truce with *Theodosius, the Visigoths returned to their raiding in Thrace, Greece and Illyria. They entered *Italy guided by *Alaric, but they were stopped at Pollentium in 402 and at *Verona in 403 by *Stilicho, whose death in 408 took away any remaining defense of Italy, henceforth directly exposed to the Goths' invasions, which reached their height in the famous sack of Rome in 410. Alaric then headed to the S of Italy, probably wishing to conquer *Africa, but he died at Cosenza in 410. Under his successors Athaulf and Wallia, the Visigoths withdrew to *Gaul, where they founded the kingdom of *Toulouse (419–507), and then to Spain "*Tarraconensis." The kingdom reached its greatest splendor under *Euric (466–484), who laid the foundations of Visigoth rule in Spain, but then it was annexed by the *Franks after *Clovis's victory over Alaric II at Vouillé (507). The Visigoth kingdom in Spain enjoyed long periods of prosperity with *Leovigild (567–586), *Recared (586–601) and Recceswinth (649–672), until the 8th c. (711, victory of the Arabs over the Visigoths led by Roderic).

The Ostrogoths, led by Vladimir, settled in *Pannonia during the course of the 4th c., later occupying Bulgaria and Lower Moesia. With the agreement of the emperors, they exercised a containing action against the other barbarian populations. In 451 they contributed, perhaps in a decisive manner, to the victory of *Aetius over the Huns in the battle of Catalaunian Fields. After repeated raids in Illyria (459), Gothic hostages, *Theodoric among them, were deported to Constantinople. After Theodoric gained the imperial house's favor, he intervened directly in their affairs, helping the legitimate sovereign *Zeno against the usurper, *Basiliscus. In 488, by Zeno's explicit invitation, Theodoric moved to conquer Italy, which was ruled at that time by *Odoacer. Theodoric defeated and killed him at *Ravenna (493), then he founded his own government with the consent of the Byzantine emperor. An effort at maintaining ancient institutions and astute political alliances with other barbarian sovereigns, often based on matrimonial ties, made Theodoric's rule a period of happy internal prosperity. This was disturbed only in his final years by *persecutions and excesses against the senatorial nobility (the death of *Boethius, and of the senators *Symmachus and Albinus). After Theodoric died (526), the grave disagreements between the Goths and the Romans came to light, and were sharpened by their different religious beliefs. The death of Amalasunta (535), Theodoric's daughter and regent in the name of her son Athalaric, had for its consequence the military intervention of *Justinian, who sent into Italy an army commanded by the generals *Belisarius and *Narses. For almost 20 years the Goths resisted bitterly under the princes Theodatus, Totila, Vitiges and Teias, but the defeats suffered by the latter, at Busta Gallorum (552) and at Mons Lactarius, near *Naples (553), signaled the definitive fall of Ostrogothic domination in Italy.

Ruled by somewhat primitive institutions and customs, the Goths did not remain unaffected by the superior civilization of the Romans, and thus they made an effort, if not to assimilate their cultural heritage (in the field of legislation and in the administrative system), at least to promote and to develop a peaceful coexistence. This attempt encountered several obstacles, among which was the adherence to different Christian churches. Linked originally to polytheistic cults (the *Asen*, Jordanes, *Get.* XIII,78), the Goths discovered Christianity during the course of the 3rd c., during their raids in Cappadocia (264), where they encountered Christian communities. In 325, at the Council of *Nicaea, bishop Theophilus Bosphoritanus signed the Creed as bishop of Gothia. But the Goths were evangelized by *Wulfila (311–383, ordained bishop by *Eusebius of Nicomedia in 341), and converted to the *Arian doctrine. Arianism allowed the Goths to preserve their national identity even during the most troubled moments of their his-

tory, though they probably never fully understood its doctrinal differences with orthodoxy (Procopius, *B.G.* IV, 4,11). In the course of an *evangelization effort lasting about seven years, Wulfila aimed to create a network of small ecclesial communities, acting in turn as centers of doctrinal radiation. The main instrument of the conversion of the Goths was the translation of the Bible, which Wulfila himself carried out in his mother tongue (*see* *Gothic literature). The Christianization of the Goths, after experiencing grave obstacles in the persecution by the pagan Athanaric, was fully accomplished in the 2nd half of the 4th c. with the conversion of King Fritigern, with Wulfila's help, to Arianism. While the Ostrogoths never abandoned their adherence to the Arian creed, the Visigoths were converted to Catholicism under Recared (586–601).

Sources: Numerous sources deal with the Goths, in particular for the 4th-6th c. Worthy of mention are the following important authors: Pliny the Elder, Strabo, *Tacitus, *Ammianus Marcellinus, *Sozomen, *Socrates, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Philostorgius, *Claudian, *Sidonius Apollinaris, the *Anonymous Valesianus, *Ennodius, *Jordanes, *Cassiodorus, *Procopius, *Isidore of Seville.

Studies: PWK Suppl. 1, 797-845; EI 25, 754-756; EC 6, 937-940; I. von Bredow, NP IV, 1025-1027; *I goti in Occidente. Problemi. Settimane de studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, III, Spoleto 1956; M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Barbarian West*, Oxford 1966; D. Claude, *Adel, Kirche und Königtum im Westgotenreich*, Sigmaringen 1971; P.D. King, *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom*, Cambridge 1972; P. Scardigli, *Die Goten, Sprache und Kultur*, Munich 1973; B. Saitti, *Aspetti sociali ed economici dei regni romano-barbarici*, I, Catania 1974; T.S. Burns, *Transformations in Ostrogothic Social Structure*, Ann Arbor 1974; Ph. Dixon, *Barbarian Europe*, Oxford 1976; B. and P. Scardigli, *I rapporti tra Goti e Romani nel III e IV secolo*: RomBarb 1 (1976) 261-295; G. Pepe, *Il medioevo barbarico in Italia*, Turin [6]1977; A. Carile, *Il Bellum Gothicum dall'Isonzo a Ravenna*: AAAd 13 (1978) 147-193; Th.S. Burns, *Calculating Ostrogothic Army and Population*: AncW 1 (1978) 187-190; Id., *The Ostrogoths. Kingship and Society*, Wiesbaden 1980; H. Wolfram, *Storia dei Goti*, 2 vols., It. ed. revised and expanded by M. Cesa, Rome 1985; A. Ambrosioni - S. Lusuardi Siena, *I Goti in Italia alla luce delle fonti scritte e delle testimonianze archeologiche*, Milan 1985; V.A. Sirago, *Gli Ostrogoti in Gallia secondo le Variae di Cassiodoro*, REA 89 (1987) 63-77; *Teoderico il Grande e i goti d'Italia*. Atti del 13° Congr. int. di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milan, 2-6 novembre 1992, Spoleto 1993; P.J. Heather, *The Goths*, Oxford 1996; B. Luiselli, *Dall'arianesimo dei Visigoti di Costantinopoli all'arianesimo degli Ostrogoti d'Italia*: RAL 16,1 (2005) 5-30; G. Pilara, *Ancora un momento di riflessione sulla politica italiana di Teoderico, re dei Goti*: Studi Romani 53/3-4 (2005).

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

GRACE

I. Introduction - II. Eastern Fathers - III. Latin Fathers

I. Introduction. The technical use that Western theology makes of the term *grace* (Lat. *gratia*, Gr. *χάρις*) from the 5th c. onward and the interpretation of patristic texts depend on *Augustine's theological reflections, who is called by later tradition *doctor gratiae* (RAC 11, 315-386; 426-427). Influenced by this fact, some scholars believed that the Eastern churches did not elaborate a doctrine of grace, and that Western theology on grace began with Augustine (Kähler 1637). It is true that Eastern theologians, while acknowledging the free character of the divine initiative in the *economy of salvation, did not write treatises titled *De gratia*. And it is certain that they were not carried away by the crucial concerns of Augustine, though it cannot be denied that there was some reception in the East of the Augustinian doctrine on grace (Fransen 656-657; Lorenz 70). Moreover, the issues developed by Augustine from 412 until his death (430), in reaction to *Pelagius and his followers, have undeniably influenced the Western theological reflection on the free character of grace. Indeed, grace as the *medicina* for every descendant of *Adam, and an indispensable *auxilium* for every salvific action, would definitively establish in Western thought the question of the relation between eternal *predestination and human *free will. Nevertheless, this problem does not exhaust the thought of Augustine, who has much broader theological perspectives, esp. in his *homilies. Much less can one limit patristic theology on grace to that period. In fact, it is very significant that the Fathers should make use of *χάρις* and of *gratia* in order to describe, in general, the benevolent favor of God and all his benefits, and esp. the economy of salvation (the redemptive work of Christ), *baptism, *martyrdom and *virginity. On the other hand, they have a wide range of equivalent expressions, e.g., under the aspect of divine favor, εὐδοκία, εὔνοια, εὐεργεσία, φιλανθρωπία, συγκατάβασις, *vocatio*, *praedestinatio*; under the aspect of a benefit communicated: πνεῦμα, δύναμις, δόξα, *donum*, *iustitia*, etc. The concept itself of grace as *auxilium gratuitum*, employed in the Pelagian controversy, i.e. to say, the relationship between the transcendent God and the human being's corrupted free will, also includes fully the doctrines on God and humanity, i.e., *anthropology, and indeed *christology and *ecclesiology. For Augustine, *auxilium*, which every descendant of Adam needs, is always Christ's grace and grace given in the church.

In any case, though taking into account the extent of the problem of grace in patristic theology and in the thought of Augustine, a Western scholar can only with difficulty avoid an excessive influence of Augustine's perspective on the Pelagian contro-

versy. The seriousness of this risk becomes even more evident when one also takes into account that later theology, more or less in the wake of Augustine, introduced a clearer distinction between grace as a favor or the presence of God (*gratia increata*), and grace as a benefit or gift of God in the human being (*gratia creata*) (from 1225 onward), and has developed since the 16th c. the concept of the supernatural (Fransen 644-645). Therefore one easily runs the risk either of restricting or explaining the texts of the Fathers, and of Augustine himself, too much in the light of subsequent theological concerns.

In order to avoid unilateral interpretations, rather than simply study the use of χάρις and *gratia*, we examine the fundamental idea of the salvation that the one God *freely* communicates by means of the Spirit of the Risen Christ in his church, an idea expressed sometimes in other words and categories (RAC 11, 386). Though widening in this way our analysis, we do not, however, intend to expound in this article the full meaning of the union with the living God bestowed on human beings (the remission of sins, reconciliation with God, *justification, divine filiation, capacity for the spiritual, anticipated glorification, etc.). In highlighting its free character, which is its characteristic as a gift, we take into consideration only the free initiative of God on which it is based. Salvation, on the other hand, inasmuch as it is accomplished by Christ, announced in the church, carried out in the person and the world, is reserved for other entries (*see* *soteriology, *justification, *sacraments, etc.).

The focus on the free character of grace corresponds, after all, with the orientation of the Bible: (1) the OT texts that exalt God full of grace and mercy (RAC 11, 351, with Ex 34:6-7); (2) the Pauline texts that oppose the righteousness of faith in the grace of Christ to the righteousness in which the person faithful to the law takes pride (Rom 3:27-28.; 1 Cor 4:7) and that place grace, whereby God lowers himself to humanity, in the eschatological perspective of the perfect vision to be attained in heaven (1 Cor 13:2; 2 Cor 5:7); (3) the fundamental idea that the gospel is nothing but the good news of the grace of God (Acts 20:24). Augustine, who defined grace as *quod gratis datur* (*En. Ps.* 103,3,8, and other texts in Seeberg 464; cf. also Hil., *In Mat.* 28,1), understood this point, central to all divine revelation, better than the other Fathers. Nevertheless, the other Fathers of the church, both Eastern and Latin, have discussed the idea that God unites himself to the human being how and when he wants (Fransen 636-637; DSp 6, 704-705).

Considering grace first under the formal aspect of salvation freely communicated by God in Christ, in addition to discovering a greater consensus between East and West, one also understands the essence of Christianity even better. In fact, reading the patristic texts anew in this light, we understand more clearly that the main themes of grace pertain to (a) the nature of God, who is *good and merciful, just and *faithful; (b) the meaning of the economy of salvation, which culminates in the incarnation of the only Son of God; and (c) the destiny of the human being, a creature of God, but totally open to him and thus in communion with all creatures.

II. Eastern Fathers. In the 1st half of the 2nd c., Christian authors, in accordance with the primarily hortatory intention of their writings, emphasized the moral requirements of the new life of Christ. *1 *Clement*, however, speaks of Christ's blood that has brought the "grace of conversion" to the whole world (7,4-8,5); *Ignatius of Antioch sees grace in Christ (*Eph.* 11,1; *Smyr.* 7,1) and also recalls the *Eucharist, pledge of eternal life (*Eph.* 20,2); the **Didache* shows the path that leads to life through baptism and the Eucharist (1-10, cf. *Barn.* 18-21); the epistle of **Barnabas* insists on the novelty of the covenant (RAC 11, 362, texts); *2 Clement* warns not to neglect Jesus the author of our salvation (1,1-5). These authors describe the new life put into operation by the *Holy Spirit, also called God's χάρις (Martín).

Later, the Greek *Apologists, dealing with the Jewish tradition and the religious aspirations of the *pagans, try to prove that only in Jesus Christ, the Messiah and the incarnate Word of God, has the true alliance been established and the fullness of truth been manifested. Thus, they not only defend the antiquity of the Christian religion, and therefore its universal value, but at the same time they also emphasize the unprecedented novelty of the gospel of Christ. *Ad Diognetum* also affirms the necessity of grace (8,6; 9,1).

Toward the end of the 2nd c., antignostic theology, provoked by the dualistic and elitist pretensions of a certain Christian movement, started to defend the divinization of the whole human being, based on the incarnation of the Word (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 19,1), and the vocation of all people to the vision of the invisible God (Tremblay). Thus *Irenaeus, while giving considerable importance to human freedom, presents the salvation that takes place in history under the aspect of education and the *recapitulation of all things in Christ, a development over time that originates entirely in the *love of the one God who reveals himself, when and in what manner he

wills (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20,5). This presentation of the initiative of the God who saves is all the more significant because it is not inspired by a misinterpretation of Paul (see the *Antitheses* of Marcion), but by the apostle's complete thought, indeed, by the *Bible as a whole. From now on, the faith begun in the salvation freely offered by God, Father and creator of all things, also appears in the baptismal profession (RAC 11, 375-376). That same baptismal spirituality, by calling baptism a seal or an illumination, almost identifies it with grace (*gratia baptismi*). In fact, by restoring instantaneously and perfectly, although not magically, divine life, it attests to the free character of salvation (Clem. Al., *Paedag.* I, 6,25-6; Tertull., *Bapt.* 15,3). Likewise, acc. to hortatory and hagiographic Christian writings, the great ideals of the faith—martyrdom and virginity—cannot be realized by human effort, but only with the grace of the Holy Spirit and therefore are a clear demonstration of the novelty of the Christian religion (Ign., *Rom.* 1,1-2; Eus., *HE* 5, 1: history of the martyrs of Lyons; Tertull., *Virg.* 13-4; Cypr., *Hab. virg.* 3-4; cf. RAC 11, 379-382).

In the 3rd c. Christian *gnosticism develops in its own way the divine origin of Christian existence. *Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), introducing the question of ὁμοίωσις θεῷ in a *Platonizing interpretation of 2 Pet 1:4, appears, perhaps, to exaggerate the relationship between the human being and God, but, also acc. to him, the gnostic person returns to perfect resemblance with God through divine love for people (RAC 11, 392-393). *Origen (d. 253/254), trying to explain, in light of the *regula fidei*, the whole meaning of the universe, its origin and purpose, insists strongly on the role of free will in rational beings in this whole process of departure and return. For this reason, he distinguishes between the two creations: the first of rational beings, the second (*infralapsaria*) of the material world, thus announcing the theme of the *felix culpa*, acc. to which the incarnation of the Word, in a more astonishing way, leads back to the original state. At the same time, Origen emphasizes that the spiritual progress of free persons, their supernatural transformation (*C. Cels.* 5,23), takes place through the Logos in the Holy Spirit (*De Princ.* I, 3,5), and that by means of the grace of baptism (*Comm. Jo.* VI, 33).

This explanation of the world, taking over in substance the trinitarian view of Irenaeus in a philosophical perspective, found a greater theological and christological elaboration during the dogmatic disputes of the 4th and 5th c. As is well known, the anti-Arian theologians such as *Athanasius, *Basil and *Didymus defend before all else, starting from the true divinization of the believer, both the divinity of the Word, the true Son of God, and the divinity of the Holy Spirit, the source of life and holiness. Basil in particular, focusing on the dominion of the Holy Spirit not only uses the word χάρις often (*De Spir. s.* 8,17-18) but, with this term, also distinguishes the divine essence of the Spirit and his benefits (8,17; 27,68: distinction applied to Christ) (RAC 11,400-401). More important, however, is the way in which these theologians point out the Nicene distinction between *genitus* and *factus*, in reality between nature (φύσις) and grace (θέσις χάρις). Origen had already contrasted the *Trinity, altogether incorporeal, with rational beings, but the discussion of Arius's Origenism leads the defenders of the faith of Nicaea to draw a clearer distinction between the Trinity and creatures. According to the logic of this distinction, they also distinguished between Christ, the Son of God *per naturam*, and human beings, joined one to another *per naturam*, but children of God *per adoptionem* or *per gratiam*. In light of this double distinction, their doctrine of salvation freely offered takes on a more precise outline. On the one hand, they derive the salvation of human beings both from Christ, *true* God, and the Holy Spirit, equally *true* God, i.e. to say, from the Trinity, known only through revelation, indeed an incomprehensible mystery. On the other hand, they clearly state that divine filiation is solely due to the benevolent will of the Father for reasons beyond the mere existence of a corruptible creation. In addition, in seeking the reasons for the incarnation of the Logos, Athanasius (d. 373) does in fact admit that Adam, though by nature (φύσει) created and subject to corruption, knew God directly when in paradise, thanks to the presence of the Logos in him. The first man, however, having sinned, lost his original state as image of the Logos, which is knowledge of the truth and eternal life. Nevertheless, through the incarnation, the Logos has so united himself to humankind such that an incorrupt nature, and therefore the knowledge of God, has been incorporated into him forever (*Incarn.* 5; 11; 54). God, not content with bringing human beings to paradise, but wanting to ensure the salvation of humankind and securing it through the incarnation of his Son, has demonstrated in the clearest possible way that human salvation is due to his grace. The κατὰ χάριν of being κατ᾽ εικόνα τοῦ λόγου was accomplished by the κατὰ χάριν of being ἐν σαρκί τοῦ λόγου (RAC 11, 397-400). The incarnational theology of grace reaches its perfection in *Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). Forced by his Antiochene opponents to clarify the soteriological vision of Athanasius, so dear to him, not only does

he clearly distinguish between Christ μονογενής, and Christ πρωτότοκος of the brethren (*Incarn.*: PG 75, 1229B, 1233BC; cf. *Com. Jo.* I, 9 [1,12]: PG 73, 153BC) but is also concerned to safeguard the true incarnation of the Logos itself, the true Son of God, thus deepening the wholly unheard-of mystery of the union of Christians with God. Moreover, even his formulas on the Holy Spirit, gift of the risen Christ, exceed those of the prior tradition.

At this time of great dogmatic controversies, some authors are also interested in the more limited question of the relationship between divine grace and human freedom. *Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) speaks of χάρις esp. in the context of his doctrine on ὁμοίωσις θεῷ, understood as the beauty of the *soul. He is concerned in particular with the cooperation (συνέργεια) between χάρις, a new force communicated in baptism, and the free efforts of the person. According to him, grace is added to human action, and not vice versa, because grace is more powerful (RAC 11, 406-407). *John Chrysostom (d. 407) expresses himself in a similar vein, though in a broader context. An astute exegete of the Pauline letters, he considers grace as a force that drives the soul to do good, provided, however, that this has been deserved. Nonetheless, he remembers that God does not fail to do the greater part, and indeed that the reward for good works is itself a gift of grace (RAC 11, 408-411). It is clear from the way they refer grace to baptism how much Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom, while recognizing the crucial role of human freedom, attribute to divine initiative (see also Cyril of Jerusalem: RAC 11, 400).

The interest of these two authors in the problem of grace and human freedom is naturally present in the *monastic environments close to them. Engaged in constant *prayer and *asceticism, these monks obviously emphasize human action. Nevertheless, it is they who defend most the deification from above of the righteous person and give great value, often too much, as for example the *Messalians, to the experience of the Holy Spirit, who alone could purify and perfect the spiritual person (RAC 11, 403-406).

In the wake of these currents, monastic Byzantine authors of the 6th and 7th c. deepen further the doctrine of the spiritual union of the person with God. As part of the hierarchies of all spiritual beings, ps.-*Dionysius traces the origin of the believer's enlightenment through the upper hierarchies to the transcendent God. By highlighting the divine origin of all knowledge, he also creates the expression ὑπερφύσις, translated later by *supernaturalis* (Deneffe). *Maximus the Confessor (d. 662), loyal to the Chalcedonian faith, matured by monastic experience and the suffering of *persecution, modifies the Dionysian vision of the universe more than a little. He not only adds charity to gnosis, but sees its foundation in the *cross of Christ. By distinguishing the two wills in the one *hypostasis of the Word, bringing the problem of *indivise-inconfuse* to a personal level, he makes the comparison between the incarnation of the Word and the mysterious relationship between creator and creature more relevant, and also identifies unambiguously the incarnation of the Word as a model of the absolute free character of grace, i.e., of ὑπερφύσις that perfects φύσις, as he proposes in his explanations of charismatic knowledge (*Quaest. Thal.* 59: PG 90, 604D-608C) and of the joy that God, in his grace, grants to the nature of those who are worthy (*Cap. quinq. cent.* IV, 20: PG 90, 1312C) (Stoeckle 91-98). His ideas were summarized in part by *John of Damascus in the *Expositio fidei*. His distinction between φύσις and χάρις (*Expos.* 81: IV, 8) is noteworthy, as well as that between *voluntas antecedens* and *voluntas consequens* (*Expos.* 43: II, 29), taken up again by medieval theology.

III. Latin Fathers. In the West, the theology of grace developed partly in a similar way, partly in new manner. Following Irenaeus, *Tertullian (d. ca. 220) distinguishes between *imago* and *similitudo*, i.e., between the human being created by means of the Word, and one perfected by the work of the Holy Spirit, seeing the incarnation as the necessary basis for the later work of perfection (*Res.* 6,3-5; 9,1-2; *Bapt.* 5,6-7). He defends, moreover, human freedom, which is understood as a gift from God (*Adv. Marc.* II, 5-6). However, paying attention to the psychological analysis of human action (*De anima*), he identifies, esp. with the expressions *meritum* and *satisfactio*, the will as the fundamental principle, which will form the basis of the more practical theology of the Latin Fathers, thus paving the way for the fundamental distinction between *natura* and *gratia*, characteristic of all theology after Augustine (cf. DSp 6, 706-707, with Tertullian, *Anim.* 21,6). Fighting the Marcionite antithesis between the God who is good and the God who is just, he directs Latin theology toward the concept of predestination in which *justice is bound to the goodness of God. Finally, the great importance he attaches to baptism, which, as *paenitentia prima*, is a much easier conversion than the *paenitentia secunda*, which is very difficult, is later confirmed by his follower, *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258). He states that baptism is the only path toward light (*Ad Don.* 4-5), and then only in the church, which alone possesses

the Holy Spirit (*Ep.* 70,1). Grace itself is defined as free (*Test.* III, 100).

The great controversies of the imperial church also had repercussions in the West. Defending the Nicene faith in Gaul, *Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367) proposed a theology of glory, in which the divine origin of salvation appeared in a new light. On the question of human freedom, he asserted, however, that man takes the first step toward God through merit, thus obtaining his further assistance (RAC 11, 413-414). *Marius Victorinus (d. after 362), granting importance to the universal divine activity, emphasized instead divine mercy, by which people attain salvation (RAC 11, 412-414). *Ambrose of Milan (d. 397), the great defender of the Nicene faith in N Italy, took from Athanasius the clear distinction between the divine sonship of the only Son of God, which he has by nature, and the adoptive sonship of Christians. He did so from the perspective of the Latin distinction between *natura* and *gratia* (Szabó), but followed him in the doctrine of the *felix culpa*. According to Ambrose, Adam, by losing original grace, transmitted to his descendants guilt and *sin (*Apol. Dav.* I, 11,56; II, 12,71; see also the distinct position of *Ambrosiaster: RAC 11, 415-6). Therefore, the human being is in need of grace, esp. for initial conversion (*Com. Luc.* 1,10: *a Deo enim praeparatur voluntas hominis*; 7,27; 7,132). With respect to advancing in the Christian life, Ambrose seems to be less consistent. For this reason he admonished the faithful to anticipate with prayer the coming of Christ, true sun of justice (*In Ps.* 118,19,30). However, by clearly acknowledging original sin, emphasizing the scope of the incarnation of the only Son of God, developing the doctrine on the Holy Spirit, the giver of grace and divine gift, sometimes even referring the election of human beings to divine benevolence, he affirmed very precisely the absolutely free character of salvation (RAC 11, 414-415).

The doctrine of grace proclaimed by Ambrose comes into full clarity in Augustine of Hippo (d. 430). Thanks to his experiences as a convert, both the negative and positive influences of *Manicheism and *Neoplatonism, his loyalty to the African tradition, esp. with respect to infant baptism, and most of all thanks to the intense study of the Pauline letters, he clarified the question at its heart, i.e., the more personal Divine-human relationship. Augustine, however, did not take into account only this thorny problem to which, from 412 onward, and esp. from 415 to 418, he devoted many letters and treatises (see list in Patrologia III, 365-366) but also found many fine words about the presence of God in us (*Ep.* 104,4,10), on the divine inhabitation (*Serm.* 57,2,2) and other major themes of the earlier tradition (Philips 98-109). It is certain, however, that he was driven by this issue to a very laborious theological reflection, perhaps the greatest ever known.

While, in fact, in his earlier writings, esp. in the anti-Manichean ones, he had insisted on human freedom, around 395/396, under the decisive influence of the great letters of the apostle Paul, he began to make every salutary act dependent on divine grace, understood as an inner light and effective force (*effectrix bonae voluntatis*) (see for the importance of the *Ad Simpl.* on the new orientation, Löhrer 778-781, with bibl.; Lettieri, esp. part 4, with the history of the most recent research). This radical position particularly characterizes the *Confessions*, but is almost absent from the first part of *De doctrina christiana* (Lettieri 23-64). From 412 onward, he deepened the fundamental insight of 396, whose revolutionary aspect he himself later revealed (*gratia vicit*) (*Retract* II, 1; *Praed.* IV, 8; cf. RAC 11, 418). He discusses it in the context of the issues raised by *Celestius and Pelagius regarding infant baptism *in remissionem peccatorum*, i.e. to say, from original sin, and of the possibility of remaining without sin in this life (*Ep.* 157; *Peccat. merit.*). Later, Augustine continued to better define the relationship between *natura* and *gratia*, i.e., between what is common to all descendants of Adam and what God brings to pass in the elect. While for Pelagius, human nature has remained intact despite the sin of Adam, and has in itself the possibility not to sin and to do good, acc. to Augustine, human nature was so corrupted by Adam's sin (*natura vitiata*) that now only an inner and efficacious grace, the grace of Christ, the new Adam, can return true freedom to the free will, i.e., produce in it and through it individual salutary acts. The positions of Augustine from 412 to 418, and that which the Synod of *Carthage had taken in 411, were enshrined in the African council of 418 (DS 222-230) and largely accepted also by the Apostolic See (Fransen 654-655).

From 418 onward, against the insistence of Julian of *Eclanum, Augustine sought to further explain the need for the Christian to be healed completely from the *concupiscentia carnis*, which, together with *superbia*, *ignorantia* and *difficultas voluntatis*, continues to demonstrate the *reatus originalis* of all men (Lorenz 59-60). Although he asserts the goodness of marriage, it is compromised, acc. to his opponents, by his doctrine of original sin. In 426/427, he also answered the objections of the monks of Hadrumetum. According to them, his ideas on the necessity of grace call into question each and every act of asceticism and correction. He

clarified finally, against attacks from the so-called *Messalians (called from the 17th c. on "Semi-Pelagians"; Fransen 657), his thought on the *initium fidei* and on the *gratis perseverantiae* and thus on predestination as well, without which, acc. to him, the free character of grace could not be safeguarded (*Praed.*; *Persev.*). These later elaborations are attested in the second part of *De Doctrina Christiana* (Lettieri 429-437). Thus pointing out the relationship between the interior aid of God and the saving effectiveness of human action, he highlighted the indisputable absolute gratuity of the whole economy of salvation, and indeed, by placing in the incarnation of the Word the model of the free character of grace (*Praed.* 15,31; *Persev.* 24,67; *C. Iul. op. imp.* I, 138) surpassed his predecessors. The abundant grace of Rom 5:20 is not for him, in fact, only grace permanently inserted in sinful humanity through the incarnation (as suggested by Athanasius and those who had taken up the doctrine of the *felix culpa*), nor does it simply coincide with the incarnation, in which the history of salvation reaches its climax. Rather, Augustine saw the incarnation of the only Son of God as the grace of all graces, perceiving that the grace of Christ unites the creature with God in such a way that no creature, *qua creatura*, could expect more from the immense goodness of its Creator (Studer, *Gratia Christi*, 110-119).

The discussions concerning divine predestination and the efficacy of baptism continued after the death of Augustine (Fransen 675-676; Lorenz 68-69). His friends, esp. *Prosper of Aquitaine, in the face of resistance from the Messalians, while faithfully following his teacher, gave more importance to the universality of salvation. Finally, the Council of *Orange (529), under the guidance of *Caesarius of Arles and with the approval of the Apostolic See, confirmed the mitigated Augustinianism that had developed during the 5th c. and that later influenced the theology of the High Middle Ages (Lorenz 71). Still later, *Gregory the Great (d. 604), who was so widely read during the Middle Ages, took up this form of Augustinianism also, but putting more emphasis on *consentire* and *accipere* than on the divine communication of grace (Auer 988). Thus, the idea of the free character of grace, that Augustine had defended against Pelagius and his followers, entered the heritage of the faith of the Latin church, and was moreover received by some of the other churches. His position can still be used to evaluate the various issues with which the church of the Fathers, following the Bible, and particularly the letters of the apostle, had in some way expressed the essence of the Christian faith, namely, the concept that initiative for the unheard-of union with God belongs only to the Father, who with the Son and the Holy Spirit is the one and only God.

R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II, Leipzig [2]1910 (still useful, esp. for Augustine); A. Deneffe, *Geschichte des Wortes "supernaturalis"*: ZKTh 46 (1922) 337-360; E. Kähler, *Gnade*, IV. *Dogmengeschichtlich*: RGG[3] 2, 1637-1640; J. Auer, *Gnade, III. Zur Geschichte der Gnadenlehre*: LTK 4, 984-991 (cf. *Sacram. Mundi* 2 [Freiburg 1968], 445-450); B. Stoeckle, "Gratia supponit naturam," *Geschichte und Analyse eines theologischen Axioms*, Rome 1962; R. Lorenz, *Gnade und Erkenntnis bei Augustinus*: ZKG 75 (1964) 21-78; C. Moussy, *Gratia et sa famille*, Paris 1966; C. Baumgartner, *Grâce*: DSp 6, 701-726; F. Szabó, *Le Christ créateur chez s. Ambroise*, Rome 1968; R. Lorenz, *Das vierte bis sechste Jahrhundert. Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*, Göttingen 1970, 54-71; J.P. Martin, *El Espíritu Santo en los orígenes del Cristianismo*, Zürich 1971 (cf. Augustinianum 20 [1980] 471-481); G. Philips, *S. Augustin a-t-il connu une "grâce incréée"?*: EThL 47 (1971) 97-116; Id., *L'union personelle avec le Dieu vivant*, Gembloux 1974; G. Greshake, *Gnade und konkrete Freiheit. Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*, Mainz 1972; P. Fransen, *Dogmengeschichtliche Entfaltung der Gnadenlehre*: MySal IV/2, Einsiedeln 1973, 631-765 (bibl.); M. Löhrer: MySal IV/2, 778-781: *Sull'Ad Simplicianum di S. Agostino*; A. Vanneste, *Nature et grâce dans la théologie de s. Augustin*: RecAug 10 (1975) 143-169; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975; B. Studer, *Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*: HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978; R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon s. Irénée de Lyon*, Münster 1978; H. Dörrie - H. Dittmann - O. Knoch - A. Schindler, *Gnade*: RAC 11, 313-446 (fundamental, extensive bibl.); TRE 13, 476-511; G. Greshake - E.-M. Faber, *Gnade*, V.: LTK[3] 4, 772-779; R. Rieger, *Gnade*: RGG[4] 3, 1027-1032; G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino*, Brescia 2001 (bibl.).

B. Studer

GRATIAN (359–383). Son of *Valentinian I, he was emperor of the Western Roman Empire from 375 to 383 when on 25 August, at age 24, he was killed as a result of a conspiracy that arose within his own army, while he was preparing to fight in *Gaul *Magnus Maximus, who had assumed the imperial title. For a brief period (August 378 to January 379), following the death of *Valens, he also ruled the E half of the empire, which he then decided to entrust to the general Theodosius, proclaiming him Augustus. Educated esp. by the poet *Ausonius, he spent the first years of his rule in *Trier, in Gaul, from where in 376 he made a quick journey to Rome (at which time the philosopher *Themistius dedicated to him his *Oration* XVI). Because of the threats of the Goths in the E, and to bring aid to the provinces of Illyricum, he left Gaul and settled first at *Sirmium and then at *Milan. At Sirmium (probably in July 378, see Palanque, *Saint Ambroise*, 497) he must have met for the first time *Ambrose, establishing a relationship as his student that would last the rest of his life. The occasion was a council convened to rat-

ify the deposition of six *Arian bishops from their sees in Illyricum. Dating to 380 (Palanque, 501-502) is a letter of Gratian to Ambrose, who responded after a few months (*Ep.* 1). In it he asks Ambrose to join him in Trier, where he had returned in the autumn of 379. Ambrose, at the request of the emperor to be instructed in the faith against the Arian heresy, wrote for him the *De fide* and later, to complete the education previously provided, sent three books on the *Holy Spirit. Perhaps Ambrose also exalted the figure of Gratian, the just man, in his work *De Noe*. In 381 Gratian himself convened the Council of *Aquileia, and ensured the execution of the judgments established there (Ambr., *Ep.* 10 and 11) in order to eradicate Arianism from the Western empire. In 382 he convened the Council of *Rome (Jer., *Ep.* 108 and Soz., *HE* VII, 11), which also dealt with the followers of *Priscillian. After meeting with Ambrose, his policy of total support for Catholicism is manifested in concrete measures such as the abolition of the title *pontifex maximus* given to the emperor; the removal of the altar of Victory from the senate house; the abolition of grants and immunities enjoyed by *pagan priests and the vestal virgins (for antipagan laws, see CTh XVI, 7.1-2; 10.7,8); and the laws of 3 August 379 and 22 April 380, which proscribed heresy (CTh XVI, 5.5).

J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1933, 39-115; M. Fortina, *L'imperatore Graziano*, Turin 1953; H. Glaesener, *L'empereur Gratien et S. Ambroise*: RHE 52 (1957) 466-488; G. Gigli, *Il regno dell'imperatore Graziano*, Rome 1963; G. Gottlieb, *Ambrosius von Mailand und Kaiser Gratian*, Göttingen 1973; A. Paredi, *Ambrogio, Graziano, Teodosio*: Antichità Altoadriatiche 22 (1982) 17-49.

M.G. Mara

GRATUS. The name of numerous saints: (1) The bishop of Aosta with this name ought to be identified, it seems, with the priest who in 451 signed, in the name of his bishop Eustasius (PL 54, 948B), the synodal letter of the provincial Council of *Milan and was his successor (PCBE 2,1, 940-941). He was present at the translation of the relics of Innocent, martyr of the *Theban Legion, into the basilica of *Agaunum*/S. Moritz (BHL 5741-5745). He died 7 September in a year unknown to us, ca. 500 (CIL 5, 6859). His *Vita* has no historic value (BHL 3634a-3634b). (2) The bishop of *Carthage named Gratus, who lived around the middle of the 4th c., is known for the council that was held at Carthage during his episcopacy (CCL 149A, 3-10). He is the first bishop not a martyr whose name appears in the *Calendarium Carthaginense*, on 5 May (*Mart. hier.*: 29 April); (3) The bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône, present at the council that was held in this city between 647 and 653 (O. Pontal, *Die Synoden im Merowingerreich*, Paderborn 1986, 193-197) and at the assembly of Clichy in 654; he is remembered 8 October (BHL 3635). (4) The first bishop we know of Oloron (in the lower Pyrenees), present at the Council of *Agde in 506, remembered 19 October.

BS 7, 156-160; LCI 6, 425-426; 192-197; R. Devos, *Le culte populaire de saint Grat dans l'ancien diocèse de Genève-Annecy*, in M. Costa (éd.), *Le culte et ses rites. Des témoins manuscrits aux expressions de la dévotion populaire*, Actes du Colloque international d'Aoste (2 et 3 avril 1993), Aoste 1994, 109-120; A.P. Frutaz, *Le fonti per la storia della valle d'Aosta*, Aosta [2]1998.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

GRATUS of Carthage (d. before 359). Successor of *Caecilian as Catholic bishop of *Carthage during the *Donatist schism. With the strengthening of religious unity and the exile of *Donatus under *Constance in 347, Gratus found himself without a Donatist rival in the city. He was present at the Council of *Serdica in 343. He then took the opportunity to call a general council of the N African church in Carthage, around 348, in an attempt to restore and define ecclesiastical discipline for a unified church. The Donatist insistence on a second baptism for all who had fallen into schism or for heretics was condemned (can. 1), and there was an attempt to bring more order to the cult of the *martyrs (can. 2). In order to improve discipline they insisted on continence for clergy and widows (can. 3 and 4). They forbade the clergy from holding positions of administration of landed property (can. 6 and 9) and exacting interest on loans (can. 13). Bishops were forbidden from usurping the jurisdiction of their neighbors and removing communities from their jurisdiction (can. 10). During the discussion, Gratus proved himself a good presider and administrator but not a leading figure. All was not well in N Africa, as demonstrated by Antigonus's complaint, who was bishop of Magina. According to him, his old Donatist rival in the diocese was considered by the people a "father," but he was seen as a "stepfather" (can. 12: *susurrat populis ut illum patrem, me vitricum nominent*). Gratus must have died before 359, since *Restitutus represented the N Africans as bishop of Carthage at the Council of *Rimini.

Concilium Carthaginense sub Grato a. 345-348: Ch. Munier (ed.), *Concilia Africae A. 345-A. 525*. CCL 149, 3-10; Monceaux III, 216 and 221-226; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, 177-184; PCBE I, 544-545.

W.H.C. Frend

GREEK, CHRISTIAN. Christianity can be historically connected with the religious life of late Judaism. The Qumran documents testify, with a significant amount of data, that the religious expressions of the Jews, the Greeks and the Christians were similar, but with a significant note of isolation on the part of the Jews. From the moment that the Christian message spread in a prodigious way beyond the borders of Judea to cover almost the entire area of Greek influence, via both culture and language, a process of Christianization of the Greek-speaking world became necessary, which involved, as a consequence, a process of Hellenization of the new religion. The first phase of Christian Hellenism can be traced back to the apostolic age, because of the use of the Greek language in the writings of the NT and in those known as the Apostolic Fathers. The term *hellenismos*, in fact, originally meant, as the verb *hellenizo* indicates in Greek, the correct use of the Greek language. This was a term of classical *rhetoric to indicate the first and the most important of the five virtues of speech: the grammatically correct use of language. It was already in use by Theophrastus, when a strong foreign presence in Greece threatened to undermine the purity of the language. Christian Greek, in a strong continuity of thought and expression with the classical world (*see* *Christianity and classical culture), became the most appropriate tool to expound with original and developed contributions the new message, by means of the whole ensemble of concepts, philosophical and rhetorical categories, metaphors and subtle nuances of meaning that were typical of classical Greek culture.

The Christians had to overcome comparison with a language and a culture so advanced. From a purely Jewish movement they managed to merge into the structures of the Hellenized Jews in Paul's time, not only in the regions of the Diaspora but in *Palestine itself. The Jewish aristocracy was in fact not at all open to other peoples, as Josephus notes also, and was even less inclined to learn a "barbaric" language. The Hellenized section of the Jewish people, open to Greek culture, became the first recipient of the mission of Christian preachers. The apostles of the *Jerusalem community, who in the Acts are called *Hellenistai*, spread throughout Palestine after the martyrdom of *Stephen. They are always in opposition to the Jews, but they are not Greeks, although they knew how to speak or understand Greek. It is an important fact that the name Christian was born in the Greek city of *Antioch, where the Hellenized Jews exercised their first missionary activity. The large following of converts among the Gentiles is explained by the fact that they could understand the language spoken and used in the *synagogues of the Diaspora, as evidenced by *Philo of Alexandria, who also uses literary Greek, esp. for his fellow Jews, assimilated and learned.

The missionary activity of *Paul, his discussions with the Jews during his apostolic journeys and his letters are documents of literary Greek, placed at the service of *evangelization, with all the subtleties of logic and classical rhetoric. It is very significant that his citations of the OT do not conform to the original Hebrew but the Greek translation of the Septuagint. Even the literary genres soon became the heritage of Christian *preaching, which, starting from *protreptic and apology, and even the word *metanoia* (conversion), borrowed from *Plato, were adopted as the badge of a new *philosophy, which like others required first a shift in attitude and life.

Christians made extensive use of the thesis and antithesis in vogue in the schools of rhetoric to convince the educated public to accept the Master who possessed and revealed the truth to all. Paul, visiting *Athens, the cultural and intellectual center of classical Greece and the symbol of its historical tradition, preaches about the unknown god to an audience of Epicurean and *Stoic philosophers in the venerable seat of the Areopagus (Acts 17:17). He quotes the verse of Aratus or Cleanthes: "We are his offspring"; his language and his arguments are Stoic and aimed at convincing minds educated in philosophy.

Even in the *Acts of the Apostle *Philip*, the protagonist comes to Athens, like Paul, with a clear intent to imitate, and says: "I have come to Athens to reveal to you the **paideia* of Christ," thus presenting Christianity as a continuation of the classical *paideia* of the Greeks. The acceptance of a confrontation or dialogue was easy for those who claimed to be indigenous and to possess the ancient *paideia*.

The translation of sources became an unstoppable process from the moment when the first evangelists, going back to the oldest oral or written reports of the sayings and deeds of Jesus, translated them, adapting them from the original Aramaic to Greek. Luke considered defective both the language and style of the material collected earlier. *Clement and *Origen were educated in the Platonic intellectual system, which was the dominant culture. The progress of civilization from *Homer to Plato was reinterpreted in a spiritual and providential manner. Especially Plato, pointing to the immaterial world, with the sweetness of the language of his dialogues, indicated in the reality beyond this world a journey and a destination. It is not therefore surprising that in the Mediterranean basin, particularly in the E

and neighboring areas, whether or not subject to the Roman Empire, the gospel was preached in Greek, a language that became sacred because it was used in writing the entire NT and in translating all the canonical books of the OT. The language used was *koine* Greek, the everyday speech of the inhabitants of the various regions of the Hellenistic world; a language colored by Semitic expressions, under the decisive influence of a people whose mother tongue was Aramaic. The first *evangelization took place among the Hellenized Jews of the Diaspora, who were better prepared religiously and culturally for the message, accompanied by an apologetic production, adapted to explain to the Gentiles the elements that characterized the Jewish religious tradition. *Alexandria was the city where all the sacred books of the Jews had been translated, the translation known as the Septuagint, which was received in common also by the Greek-speaking Christian communities. At Antioch, and perhaps even Rome, *preaching and *catechesis in the synagogues was given in Greek, thus developing a particular religious language, which probably influenced the language of the New Testament. Already in the Apostolic age the linguistic tradition of the Septuagint, by means of its liturgical, catechetical and homiletic use, became a characteristic aspect of Christian Greek. The Greek translation of the OT edited by the learned proselyte Jews Aquila and *Theodotion was neglected, as well as that by the *Jewish Christian *Symmachus.

The novelty of the Christian message enriched the traditional vocabulary of the *koine* with new words and meanings, without, however, upsetting the syntax—not, at least, to the extent it did to Latin in the West, and definitely rejecting the language compromised by the *pagan worship of the gods.

Therefore, the creativity of Christian Greek is apparent in the context of the *liturgy and *sacraments, in the organizational structure of the community, in an effort to adequately express the content of *dogma and, above all, in the effort to adapt to the comprehension of a humble audience, both culturally and socially, terms and constructs familiar to the people and often used only in the specific geographic area concerned.

The Semitic matrix of the Old and New Testament tradition and of various authors of the first generation of preachers of the gospel converged into a unique language group, which was consolidated and developed considerably, allowing the survival in the liturgy of terms such as *sabaoth*, *hosanna*, *alleluia*, *amen*, *gehenna*, *pascha*, *seraphim*, *cherubim*. Common terms of the *koine* Greek acquired new semantic meanings in the context of the Jewish religion, and became familiar in the Christian community: Semitic borrowings of the type δόξα ("opinion, renown") come to mind, which was adopted by the Septuagint translators as an equivalent of the Hebrew *kabod*, and became the common word expressing the *glory*, *majesty*, *sublimity* of God and, therefore, also of Christ. Another example is the verb ἐξομολογεῖσθαι ("recognize, admit to a fault or error"), which became the equivalent to *hodah*, with the added meaning of "to confess one's faith" and "to praise," "celebrate God" in confessing one's sins and faith. Another example is διαθήκη ("treaty," "alliance" and "testament") equivalent to *berith*, which indicates a sacred trust, the covenant between God and his people, and later came to indicate the salvific economy of God for Israel and the Christian people, and therefore of the books and the written documents that manifest the divine economy in the OT and NT.

The word εἰρήνη, translation of *shalom*, has the common meaning of *peace or the absence of war in general. It adds the notion of the Messianic peace, peace within human beings in their relations with God, external peace, the absence of *persecution of the church, and esp. of internal peace in the church, of communion among the bishops and between the bishops and the faithful, which became almost synonymous with συμφωνία, ecclesiastical peace. Δικαιοσύνη corresponds to *sedaqah*, and may indicate *justice in general as well as interior holiness before God; σάρξ, which translates *basar*, "flesh," can refer to the human nature of the Son of God incarnate, or human nature as corrupted by *sin, in opposition to the spirit. Examples of Semitic borrowings include the elative genitive of the type εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ("the ages of ages"), a common expression in the doxology; the genitive of quality in place of an adjective, such as ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, a sinful man (in Latin: *homo/vir peccati*); constructs with ἐν and the instrumental and associative dative, modeled on the Semitic phrases with the preposition *be*, such as ἐν τούτῳ νίκα, "conquer in this" (Latin: *in hoc vince*), ἐν σαρκὶ ἔρχεσθαι (Latin: *in carne venire*) to describe the incarnation of Christ, ἐν δόξῃ ἔρχεσθαι, "come in glory" (Latin: *in gloria venire*) to describe the glorious *parousia of Christ; the pleonastic use of the *verba dicendi*, esp. in biblical quotations; the use of the plurals οὐρανοί, "the heavens" and αἰῶνες, "the ages"; the periphrastic construction of εἰμί with the participle instead of the finite form of the *verba dicendi*.

Even Christian self-definition and self-knowledge, as compared to Judaism and paganism, resulted in

the creation of new terms, esp. in a profound semantic renewal of the terms of the linguistic tradition of the Septuagint or of terms from the common language: e.g., ἐκκλησία is adopted to designate the Christian community, under the influence of the Hebrew *qahal*, which refers to the liturgical assembly of the Israelite people in the desert, rather than under the influence of *ʿedah*, the term usually referring to the Qumran community; ἀπόστολος changes from meaning "sent" to the more specific "apostle," i.e., "one of the twelve disciples of Jesus"; ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, διάκονος, κλῆρος, κατηχούμενος—"*bishop," "priest," "deacon," "clergy," catechumen"—which seem to have antecedents in the Aramaic language of the Qumran community, designate a strong hierarchical structure and particular ecclesiastical institutions. Sacramental theology is enriched by "technical" terms such as βάπτισμα, "*baptism," a form peculiar to Christianity and used in preference to βαπτισμός; ἐξομολόγησις, "sacramental penance, confession"; εὐχαριστία, "thanksgiving," "*eucharist"; and χειροτονεία, imposition of the hands, i.e., "ordination" (of the bishop and the priest). A particular ethical-religious affection in community relations is designated by ἀγάπη, "Christian charity," κοινωνία/*communio*, the ecclesial communion, which sometimes is synonymous with εἰρήνη, the "ecclesiastical peace" and with συμφωνία, "reciprocated harmony."

On the other hand, the following words acquired negative semantic connotations: ἀποστασία and ἀποστάτης, "apostasy" and "apostate"; αἵρεσις and αἱρετικός, "*heresy" and "heretic." The development and deepening of doctrine also enriched the vocabulary with new words and new theological and ecclesiological terms such as σαρκοφόρος, σάρκωσις, ἐνανθρώπησις, σαρκοῦσθαι—"incarnate," "incarnation," "to become incarnate," in reference to the mission of Christ; παράδοσις to emphasize the "*tradition"; πάθος and ἀνάστασις to describe the passion and *resurrection of Christ. The technical use of terms is also developed in the context of theological disputes: παράκλητος and πνεῦμα ἅγιον to describe the *Holy Spirit, λόγος to designate the preexistent Christ, οἰκονομία to describe both the interpersonal organization of the divine life as well as the plan of salvation.

However, the excessive wealth of the Hellenistic religious and philosophical language prevented a more creative development of the Christian idiom; indeed, from the time of Clement of Alexandria and Origen there is a tendency to accept fully the tradition of the pagan philosophical-religious language, while the great writers and orators of the 4th c. affirm their willingness to comply with the canons of the highest linguistic and literary classical tradition. Therefore, the creativity of Christian Greek (almost limited solely to vocabulary and almost insignificant with respect to morphological and syntactic structures, as compared to the *koine*) is much lower than that of Christian Latin, strong in the works of the great writers of the 4th c. such as *Augustine, *Jerome, *Ambrose, who can be considered the champions of the new Christianized classical Latin.

G.J.M. Bartelink, *Lexicologish-semantische studie over de taal van de Apostolische Vaders*, Utrecht 1952; E. Hatch, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, Graz, Akademische Drucku. Verlagsanstalt 1954; H. Thyen, *Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie*, Göttingen 1955; G. Dix, *Jew and Greek*, Westminster 1955; F. Blass - A. Debrunner - R.W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago 1961; J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology*, Nijmegen 1962; G.Q. Reijners, *The Terminology of the Holy Cross in Early Christian Literature*, Nijmegen 1965; DB 3, 312-331; DBS 3, 1320-1369; Chr. Mohrmann, *Linguistic Problems in the Early Church*, in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, I, Rome 1958, 103-111; Id., *Wortform und Wortinhalt. Bemerkungen zum Bedeutungswandel im altchristlichen Griechisch und Latein*: MTZ 7 (1956) 99-115 (repr. in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, II, Rome 1961, 11-34); Id., *Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church*: VChr 11 (1957) 11-36 (repr. in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, III, Rome 1965, 171-196); Id., *L'étude du grec et du latin de l'antiquité chrétienne. Passé, présent, avenir*, in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, IV, Rome 1977, 91-110; H.B. Timothy, *The Early Christian Apologists and Greek Philosophy Exemplified by Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria*, Assen 1973; G.A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, Princeton, NJ 1983; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'Impero Romano*, Milan 1984; Id., *Alessandro Magno tra storia e mito*, Milan 1984; P. Wendland, *La cultura ellenistico-romana nei suoi rapporti con giudaismo e cristianesimo*, Brescia 1986; A. Barzanò, *I cristiani nell'Impero Romano precostantiniano*, Milan 1990; M. Zerwick - M. Grosvenor, *Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (A), Rome 1996; W. Jaeger, *Cristianesimo primitivo e paideia greca*, Florence 1997; P. Grelot Pierre, *Regole e tradizioni del cristianesimo primitivo*, Casale Monf. 1998; E.W. Stegemann - W. Stegemann, *Storia sociale del cristianesimo primitivo. Gli inizi nel giudaismo e le comunità cristiane nel mondo mediterraneo*, Bologna 1998; J. Swetnam James, *Il greco del Nuovo Testamento*, Bologna 1998; M. Lombardi, *Aspetti innovativi della diegesi nel vangelo di Luca*: Orpheus 23 (2002) 50-73 (cf. 19-20 [1998–1999] 326-362).

V. Loi - B. Amata

GREGENTIUS (4th c.). Bishop of Tapfar (or Zafar) in the country of the Himyarites (S *Arabia), he is a saint celebrated by the Byzantine church on 19 December. There is uncertainty about his life and works. He was born perhaps at Bliarès (ancient Ulpiana in *Moesia?), as stated in his *Life* (BHG 705d) published by A. Vasiliev (viz. Vremennik 14 [1907] 23-67) or, less probably, in *Milan, as stated in the Greek *Menaion*. Perhaps a bishop in *Ethiopia, he

later worked in S Arabia about the year 535, at the time of *Justinian, when the *persecution of Christians had ceased, and the *Ethiopians dominated the region, contributing to the conversion of Arab Jews and participating in some religious controversies. A testimony to his activities are two works of historical and cultural interest attributed to him, almost certainly erroneously, which are probably collections of news gathered from different works: *Leges Homeritarum* (BHG 706 h, 706 i), legislation drafted under the name of King Abraham, and *Disputatio cum Herbano Iudaeo* (BHG 706-706 a,b), a public debate, held before the king and various authorities, including religious ones, and transcribed by Palladius, a disciple of Gregentius. In reality, this *Disputatio* (the MS tradition has yet to be studied in depth) is a passage from the *Life of Gregentius*.

CPG 7008-7009; PG 86, 567-784; R. Dareste, *Lois des Homérites*: Revue Historique 29 (1905) 157-170 (Fr. tr.); A. d'Emilia, *Intorno ai* Νόμοι τῶν Ὁμερητῶν, in Atti Congr. Int. Dir. Rom., 1, Verona 1953, 181-182; Krumbacher 59; E. Mangenot, *Gregentius*: DTC 6, 1775-1776; DHGE 21, 1385-6; ODB 2, 874; Beck 386, 407; R. Janin, *Gregenzio*: BS 7, 167-168; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, II, Munich 1978, 428; Patrologia V, 306-7; D.G. Letsios, *Some Remarks on Reflections of Byzantine Foreign Policy in the "Martyrdom" of Arethas and the "Acts" of Gregentius*: Graeco-Arabica 4 (1991) 141-155; Id., *Die äthiopisch-himyaritischen Kriege des 6. Jahrhunderts und die Christianisierung Äthiopiens*: JÖBG 41 (1991) 25-41; D.M. Olster, *Roman Defeat, Christian Response, and the Literary Construction of the Jew*, Philadelphia 1994, 138-157; A. Berger, *Das Dossier des heiligen Gregentios, ein Werk der Makedonenzeit*: Byzantina 22 (2001) 53-65; BBKL 42, 460-461.

A. Labate

GREGORY, presbyter (of Caesarea/of Cappadocia?). Name of two persons often confused: (a) (6th-7th c.?) author of a life of *Gregory of Nazianzus (BHG 723-723c; PG 35, 244-305); (b) (or also George or Germanus, 7th-9th c.?) author of an encomium of the Fathers of *Nicaea (BHG 1431; PG 111, 420-440). Other works are found sporadically in the Greek MSS under this name (see CPG 4662).

CPG 7975; Beck 459, 545-546; S.J. Voicu, *Rifacimenti pseudocrisostomici di omelie basiliane*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 503.

S.J. Voicu

GREGORY II, pope (d. 731). Native of *Rome, a member of the Savelli family, he succeeded *Constantine I (708–715) and was consecrated 19 March 715. He first entered the Benedictine order, handling responsible tasks for the Apostolic See and acquiring experience and competence in ecclesiastical affairs. In this role in 710 he followed, as deacon, his predecessor to *Constantinople, meeting *Justinian II and earning his esteem. Gregory launched notable measures in matrimonial law, ecclesiastical discipline and *liturgy, confirming the absolute validity of the *sacraments and denying the necessity of repeating *baptism administered by unworthy priests, toward whom the pope recommended a merciful approach and an effort to regain them. On the external front, Gregory promoted the *evangelization of *Germany beyond the Roman *limes*, relying on the collaboration of Wynfrith, who, after rebaptism as *Boniface and having become bishop of Thuringia, founded monasteries in Bavaria and eliminated the *pagan persistences. The pope's position was clear and decisive when faced with the iconoclasm of *Leo III the Isaurian, esp. after the resignation and death of the patriarch of Constantinople, *Germanus, replaced by the iconoclast Athanasius. Gregory defended the *orthodox doctrine, distinguishing between the adoration and veneration: a thesis that the Council of *Nicaea II (787) would confirm. Pope Gregory also had the merit of stopping, with the help of the Dukes of Spoleto and of Benevento, the advances of the Lombard King Liutprand, obtaining for this the gift of the castles in Sutri and Bieda, the first nucleus of the temporal power of the popes. Having thus obtained full control of Rome, Gregory restored the monuments that were destroyed by the *Longobards and revived the monastery of Montecassino. He died 10 February 731. From him remain 15 of his letters (to Leo III on the veneration images, to Boniface and to other personages), a decree treating discipline and 17 *anathematas declared by the synod of 721 against illegitimate marriages.

PL 89, 495-534; MGH, *Ep.* III, 93, 266-270; 273-277; 699-702 (The attribution to Gregory II or to Gregory III of the two letters on p. 702 is doubtful); LP I, 396-414; Jaffé I, 249-257; DTC 6, 1781-1785; DHGE 21, 1420-1421; W. Kelley, *Pope Gregory II on Divorce and Remarriage*, Rome 1976; T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter. The Birth of the Papal State*, Philadelphia 1984; D.S. Sefton, *The Popes and the Holy Images in the Eighth Century*: Studies in Med. Culture 23 (1987) 117-130; H. Michels, *Zur Echtheit der Briefe Papst Gregors an Kaiser Leon III*: ZKG 99 (1988) 367-1991 (against authenticity); LTK[3] 4, 1013-1014 (A. Angenendt); G. Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le "cesaropapisme" byzantin*, Paris 1996, 169-197; EPapi I, 647-651 (P. Delogu).

M. Spinelli

GREGORY III, pope (d. 741). By origin a Syrian, he succeeded *Gregory II (715–731) and was consecrated 18 March 731. He was the last pope to receive the backing of the exarch of *Ravenna. Very culti-

vated, a good orator, knowledgeable in Greek and in the Scriptures, Gregory followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, continuing the fight against iconoclasm, consolidating papal authority and completing the *evangelization of *Germany. For this last work he enjoyed, as did his predecessor, the collaboration of *Boniface, granting him the archbishop's pallium, making Germany a regular ecclesiastical province with more dioceses and finishing the reform of the churches of Bavaria, Hesse and Thuringia. Against his will, the relationships with *Byzantium were stormy. The pope, by means of a legate, sent a letter to *Leo III the Isaurian wherein he invited him to abandon iconoclasm; the emperor not only rejected the request, but he arrested and exiled the papal representative. Gregory therefore convoked a council in 732 to approve the cult of images. The Isaurian reacted by sending a military fleet in 734 against Rome (which was overwhelmed by storm) and confiscating the ecclesiastical properties in the S of Italy. On the Italian front, the now normal exigency of self-defense against the *Longobards made Gregory the first pope to enter into contact with the *Franks: Faced with the threat of new attacks from Liutprand's side, who reproached Gregory for having offered hospitality to the rebel dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, the pope sought the aid of Charles Martel, duke of the Franks. Though he did not obtain from the Lombard king the restitution to Gregory of the invaded territories, Charles Martel was able to keep him far from Rome. From a liturgical-disciplinary point of view, Gregory perfected the legislation on matrimony and drew up other significant norms for the life of the church, showing himself a clear and firm custodian of orthodoxy. He died 27 November 741. His letters to Leo III, Charles Martel and Boniface remain. There is the dubious attribution to Gregory of the *Excerptum ex Patrum dictis et canonum sententiis*, a manual for confessors.

PL 89, 575-588; MGH, *Ep.* III, 278-280; 290-294; 476-479; 703-709 (the two letters on p. 702 are perhaps from Gregory II); LP I, 415-425; Jaffé I, 257-262; DTC 6, 1785-1790; DHG 21, 1421-1422; C. Capizzi, *Decisioni conciliari e impegno storiografico*: Critica Storica 18 (1981) 48-73; F. Kerff, *Das Paenitentiale Pseudo-Gregorii III*: ZRG Kanon. Abt 69 (1983) 46-63; P. Llewellyn, *The Popes and the Constitution in the Eighth Century*: EHR 101 (1986) 42-67; M. De Jong, *Wat bedoelde paus Gregorius III*, in *Convivium aangeboden aan prof. J. M. van Winter*, Verloren 1988, 177-200; E. Dekkers, *Benedictiones quas faciunt Galli. Qu'a voulu demander saint Boniface*: Lateinische Kultur im VIII Jahrhundert – Traube Gedenkschrift, St. Ottilien 1989, 41-46; F. Marazzi, *Il conflitto fra Leone III Isaurico e il papato e il "definitivo" inizio del Medioevo a Roma. Un'ipotesi in discussione*: Papers of the British Schoool at Rome 59 (1991) 231-257; Id. *Roma, il Lazio, il Mediterraneo. Relazioni fra economia e politica dal VII al IX secolo*, in *La storia economica di Roma nell'Alto Medioevo alla luce dei recenti scavi archeologici* (L. Paroli - P. Delogu), Florence 1993, 267-285; LTK³ 4, 1014 (A. Angenendt); EPapi I, 651-656 (P. Delogu).

M. Spinelli

GREGORY of Agrigentum (7th c.–early 8th c.). A certain Leontius, priest-monk (**hegumen*) of the monastery of St. *Sabas of Rome, who claims to have gathered information from his monastery, wrote the not very trustworthy biography, with numerous anachronisms, of Bishop Gregory of Agrigentum (BHG³ I, n. 707f.: PG 98, 549-716, now edited by Berger, who places it between 750 and 830) and without chronological coordinates. Gregory was born of a rich family in the area neighboring Agrigentum; he must have had an education, and after having spent some years in the East and having visited Rome, by papal nomination he became bishop of Agrigentum. Accused, he was constrained to come to Rome to defend himself and was found innocent. Gregory has left some writings as well, among which are biblical *commentaries. From another source we know of a Gregory of Agrigentum who was forced to come to Rome, during the time of Gregory the Great, in 591 (Gregory, *Ep.* 1,70; 3,27), and after two years was declared innocent. We tend to distinguish the two Gregorys; the exegete would have been the one who lived later. His feast day falls on 23 November.

There is an *Explanatio super Ecclesiasten* by Gregory (PG 98, 741-1181, crit. ed. by G.H. Ettlinger, in preparation, in CCG) that reveals the vast cultural formation of the author, both classical and Christian, for he knew the great Greek Fathers (*Basil, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, *John Chrysostom), and he manifests a noted interest in philosophical and theological problems, with particular regard to the problem of *free will. The prologue indicates his method of historical and spiritual interpretation, even if in practice the literal interpretation is most prevalent. Actually, Gregory does not adopt any fixed exegetical schema in a constant and systematic manner, not even the bipartite type that was theoretically enunciated in the prologue, but he lets himself be guided by the tenor of the biblical text. Regarding the comprehensive interpretation of Ecclesiastes, Gregory, at the beginning of the *commentary, gathers from the previous exegetical tradition and makes his own the christological interpretation, which sees in Solomon the type of Christ who speaks mystically to the church (PG 98, 745-746, with derivation from Gregory of Nyssa regarding the allegorical significance of the name *ekklesiastes*).

This typology is not, however, exploited throughout the rest of the commentary, in which, as it was said, the literal interpretation predominates. Gregory, in contrast with his predecessors, does not seem to have been excessively disturbed or preoccupied by the "Epicurean" content of Ecclesiastes. A more attentive and appropriate consideration of the literal sense allows him to attenuate the range of the so-called Epicurean passages and to interpret them as an acceptable invitation to the moderate use of earthly goods, acc. to the divine plan and the necessities of nature (PG 98, 833, 873, 1072-1076, etc.). Otherwise he shows himself to be independent in comparison with previous expositors.

CPG 7950; PG 98, 741-1181; BS 7 (1966) 169-173; DHGE 21 (1986) 1464-1467 (extensive bibl.); ODB 2 (1991) 879-880; LTK³ 4, 997; I. Croce, *Per la cronologia della vita di S. Gregorio Agrigentino*: Bollettino della badia Greca di Grottaferrata, n.s. 4 (1950) 189-207; 5 (1951) 77-91; S. Gennaro, *Influssi di scrittori greci nel Comm. all'Eccl. di Gregorio di Agrigento*: Misc. di Studi di Lett. crist. ant., III, Catania 1951, 162-184; G. Stramondo, *Gregorio di Agrigento*, Catania 1952; E. Merendino, *Gli inediti nella tradizione agiografica di S. Gregorio di Agrigento*: OCP 45 (1979) 359-372; S. Leanza, *L'Ecclesiaste nell'interpretazione dell'antico cristianesimo*, Messina 1978; Id., *L'atteggiamento della più antica esegesi cristiana dinanzi all'epicureismo ed edonismo di Qohelet*: Orpheus n.s. 3 (1982) 73-90; Q. Cataudella, *La cultura bizantina in Sicilia*, in *Storia della Sicilia*, IV, Naples 1980, 1-56; G.H. Ettlinger, *The Form and Method of the Commentary on Ecclesiastes by Gregory of Agrigentum*: SP 8 (1985) 317-320; S. Leanza, *Sul Commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Gregorio di Agrigento*, in *Il cristianesimo in Sicilia dalle origini a Gregorio Magno*, ed. V. Messana and S. Pricoco, Caltanissetta 1988, 191-220; D. De Gregorio, *Gli insegnamenti teologici di S. Gregorio di Agrigento nel suo "Commento all'Ecclesiaste,"* Rome 1989; *Leontios Presbyteros von Rom, Das Leben des heiligen Gregorios von Agrigent*, Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar von A. Berger, Berlin 1994; BS 7, 169-173; Leonzio, *Vita di S. Gregorio Agrigentino*, intr., tr. and notes by D. De Gregorio, Agrigento 2000.

S. Leanza - A. Di Berardino

GREGORY of Antioch (d. 593/594). According to the historian *Evagrius Scholasticus, Gregory began his monastic career in the Byzantine monastery founded by *Abraham of Ephesus at *Jerusalem, of which he became abbot. The emperor *Justinian II (565–578) transferred Gregory to the *Sinai, where it seems he retained the position of abbot; here he opposed an attack on his monastery by some Arabs. According to *John Moschus, Gregory was also abbot for some time in the monastery of Pharan in *Palestine. In 569–570 he became patriarch of *Antioch, again by order of the emperor, who had deposed the former patriarch *Anastasius. Gregory was an influential figure in the ecclesiastical and political questions of his time. He opposed also the *comes Orientis*, for which he had to undergo vituperation and public interrogation. Before 588 he was asked to come to Constantinople in order to appear before a synod regarding various accusations, probably invented, and he was judged innocent. It is most likely that ecclesiastical successions were at the basis of such accusations. His intervention was requested during the mutiny of Roman troops then involved against the Persians; thereafter the emperor Mauritius asked him to open negotiations with them. Again, after a little while, by invitation of the same emperor, Gregory went to Martyropolis (Maipherqat) to persuade the Roman troops to continue their siege of the city. When the Persian King *Chosroes II sought refuge in his own dominion, Gregory and Domitian, metropolitan of Meliten, were sent to meet him and his guard in a border town. When Chosroes returned to *Persia and was restored to the throne, he sent Gregory a cross that he had carried away as booty from Sergiopolis. The patriarch of Antioch sent this cross and another which the king of Persia had sent to him to the sanctuary at Sergius, then he completed a tour of the countries along the frontier to bring back the *monophysites to the Chalcedonian faith. He died in 593–594 due to a medicine he took to calm the pains from gout. The previous patriarch, Anastasius, succeeded him.

In the 20th c. Gregory was recognized also as a homilist thanks to the studies that restored to him *homilies that hitherto had gone by another author's name. To judge by the five homilies that can now be attributed to him, the patriarch was a gifted orator, and for this reason they were translated into various Eastern languages. Three of the homilies, CPG 7385-7387, were preached in succession. The so-called *Oratio ad exercitum*, CPG 7388, seems, most probably, to be the work of *Evagrius Scholasticus, and the supposed homily on the "Protomartyr *Stephen," CPG 7389, which remains only in a *Georgian translation, seems more likely to be a letter.

CPG 7384-7390; PG 88, 1848-1866; PG 10, 1177-1189; PG 61, 761-764; PG 88, 1872-1884. L'*Oratio ad exercitum* is in Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez - L. Parmentier; *Evagrius. The Ecclesiastical History*, London 1898, repr. Amsterdam 1964, 229-231; for the supposed homily on the "Protomartyr Stephen," see N. Marr, *Le synaxaire géorgien. Rédaction ancienne de l'Union arméno-géorgienne*: PdO 19 (1926) 689-699, and for the panegyric of St. Stephen, see ibid., 699-715. S. Haidacher, *Zu den Homilien des Gregorius von Antiochia und des Gregorius Thaumaturgus*: ZKTh 25 (1901) 367-369; P. Goubert, *Patriarches d'Antioche et d'Alexandrie contemporains à S. Grégoire le Grand*: REB 25 (1967) 65-76; M. Aubineau, *Une homélie de Grégoire d'Antioche (570–593), retrouvée dans le Vaticanus gr. 1975*: Byzantion 42 (1972) 595-597; P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 41), Leuven 1981, 217-218,

250, 263; A. Battikha, DPAC 1, 1695-1696; P. Allen, *The Sixth-Century Greek Homily. Problems and Approaches*, in M.B. Cunningham - P. Allen, *The Homilist and the Audience. Studies in Christian and Early Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden 1998.

P. ALLEN

GREGORY of Cyprus. Born at Nastir in the 1st half of the 7th c., Gregory was a merchant until his conversion. He became a monk in Bet Huzaye (Susania or Khuzistan, in the S of present-day Iran), lived for a certain time in *Cyprus and then went to live in a monastery on Mount Izla, founded by *Abraham of Kashkar to the N of *Nisibis. He wrote three letters and seven treatises on the monastic life, of which only a treatise *On Holy Contemplation* has been published.

BO I, 170-174; DSp 5, 920-922; I. Hausherr, *Gregorii monachi Cyprii de theoria sancta* (OCA 110), Rome 1937. The *vita* is in A. Scher, *Histoire Nestorienne I/2* (PO 5), Paris 1909, 273-275. P. Bedjan, *Liber Superiorum seu historia monastica auctore Thoma, episcopo Margensi*, Paris-Leipzig 1901, 445; A. Mingana, *A New Document on Christian Monasticism*: Expositor 9 (1925) 365-378; I. Hausherr, *Origines de la mystique syrienne*: OCP 4 (1938) 497-520.

K. DEN BIESEN

GREGORY of Elvira (d. ca. 400). Around 359 he was elected bishop of Iliberis (Spanish Baetica). A fervent anti-*Arian, he did not sign the pro-Arian formula of faith at the Council of *Rimini (Jerome, *Chron.* s.a. 370). Around 380–385 he was head of the *Luciferians in the West. He was very old by 392 (Jerome, *Vir. Ill.* 105). He may have been alive still at the beginning of the 5th c. Until the beginning of the 19th c. the only knowledge of his literary activity was through *Jerome, acc. to whom he had composed some *homilies, *mediocri sermone et de fide elegantem librum*. Important studies by G. Morin and A. Wilmart, supplemented by MS discoveries, above all those of A.C. Vega, have established with certainty that the *De fide* and various writings of a homiletic character are Gregory's.

The *Tractatus de libris sanctarum scripturarum*, published in 1900 under the name of Origen (*Tractatus Origenis*) and subsequently attributed to Gregory, is a collection of 20 homilies on scriptural subjects: 19 are dedicated to a treatment of the OT, the last treats the *Holy Spirit based on Acts 1–2. *Tract.* 3 seems to depend on the Rufinian translation of *Hom. Gen.* 7,2-3, published around 403, which could imply that Gregory was still alive at that time. The *Tractatus de arca Noe*, also passed down under Origen's name, interprets the ark allegorically as a *typos* of the church and *Noah as a figure of Christ. The *Tractatus in Cantica Canticorum* presents in 5 books an interpretation of the *Song of Songs up to 3:4, understanding—acc. to the traditional *exegesis—the bridegroom as a figure of Christ and the bride as a figure of the church. There are also, of more restricted dimensions and still characterized by typological exegesis, the *Fragmenta tractatus in Gen. 3,22 et 15,9-11*, the *Expositio de psalmo XCI*, to which we may add with certainty some long fragments *De Salomone*, with an allegorical interpretation of Pr 30:19 and two short *Fragmenta expositionis in Ecclesiasten* (3:2 and 3:6).

Gregory's exegetical activity was aimed above all at the explanation of the OT, which was little known in the West by the mass of the faithful. Via a typological interpretation of a traditional character, he interpreted the facts and figures of the OT as a prefiguration of the facts and figures of the NT. In this line he distinguishes the *triplicem significantiam* (*Tract. script.* 5,1), i.e., the literal, typological and prophetical sense, and he combines influences of Asiatic origin with others of an Alexandrian character.

His *De fide* is an anti-Arian work. Gregory wrote a first anonymous version in 360 to refute the formula of faith of Rimini, and some years later, after *Constantius the pro-Arian emperor had died, he published a second redaction in his own name, in which he responded to some critiques by *Catholics who had accused him of *Sabellianism. He modified certain details of the previous text. Both versions have come down to us, the first was ascribed to *Ambrose, the second to *Gregory of Nazianzus. Here Gregory uses *Tertullian, *Novation, *Hilary and *Phoebadius for a defense of the Nicene **homoousios*, which shows some archaic flavor in the first edition and is corrected in the second version.

Of dubious attribution, besides the *De diversis generibus leprarum*, an allegorical interpretation of passages from Leviticus on leprosy, is a profession of faith known as *libellus fidei*, *fides catholica*, *fides Romanorum*: compared to the *De fide*, the theology of the Holy Spirit is more deeply explored and the anti-*Docetist Christology is influenced by the *Priscillianist controversy. If this text is by Gregory, it must be dated some years after the *De fide*, not before 380.

CPL 546-577; PLS 1, 352-527 (cf. 1743-1746); CCL 69, 1-283; ES 55-56; Patrologia III, 79-83 (bibl.); M. Simonetti, *Gregorio di Elvira. La fede*, Turin 1975; J. Aldazábal, *Influencia de Gregorio de Elvira y de Justo de Urgel en el Liber psalmographus hispánico*: Fons vivus, Zürich 1971, 143-161; BBKL II, 330-331; J.A. Molina Gómez, *La exégesis como instrumento de creación cultural. El testimonio de las obras de Gregorio de Elvira*, Universidad de Murcia, 2000.

M. SIMONETTI

GREGORY of Nazianzus (ca. 330–390)
I. Life - II. Works - III. Doctrine - IV. Influence.

I. Life. Doctor of the church (feast 2 January). His father, *Gregory the Elder, was bishop of Nazianzus (SW *Cappadocia) from ca. 325, after having been for a long time a *Hypsistarian, or, a follower of the Judaizing syncretism, "worshiper of the Most High" (PG 35, 992A and 45, 484A). His mother was the pious *Nonna, his siblings were Caesarius and *Gorgonia, by whom he had for nephews *Amphilochius, bishop of *Iconium, and Nicobulus. He was a close friend of *Basil the Great and *Gregory of Nyssa. After brilliant literary studies at Cappadocian *Caesarea, Palestinian *Caesarea, *Alexandria and *Athens, he received *baptism around 358 and made the decision to live the monastic "philosophy," but without deciding—as he had promised—to leave his family to join Basil, except for briefs stays, during which the two friends saw to their theological formation by studying the writings of *Origen (redaction of the **Philocalia*). Around Christmas 361 he was ordained a priest by his father; in 372 Basil forced him, for the needs of his own religious policies, to accept the episcopate at the postal station of Sàsima, but he refused to go to his see. In 374, on his father's death, he briefly ruled the church of Nazianzus, but soon he retired to Seleucia in Isauria.

When *Valens died (378), the Nicenes regained their hope of prevailing. The see of the capital had been since 351 in the hands of the *Arians. To regroup the small orthodox community influenced by Basil, despite the latter's death, they turned to Gregory, who settled in the house of a relative (chapel of the *Anastasis*). Gregory's human and religious gifts and the 22 memorable discourses from these years assured him an outstanding prestige immediately, but not without opposition from right and left. *Hagiography, too trusting in Gregory's own testimony and in the fame that he later obtained, usually closes its eyes to the objections raised by his policies—though prudent—as well as his *trinitarian doctrine. The support of the court and of *Meletius of Antioch, who in 381 prevailed on the emperor to call a council at Constantinople (which would later be numbered as the second ecumenical), only aroused against Gregory the reservations of Rome, Alexandria, the Arians and the *pneumatomachoi. At the unforeseen death of Meletius, Gregory was elected president of the council, but found himself at odds with the proposed creed, which he felt would only "cloud with bitter currents the sweet spring" of Nicaea (*De Vita sua*, 1707-1708; A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel*, Göttingen 1965, 253-270). He wanted a much clearer proclamation of the divinity and consubstantiality of the *Holy Spirit. On the other hand, he would have liked to satisfy the wishes of the Westerns for the succession to Meletius, but he succeeded only in discontenting both parties, and Rome refused to acknowledge his transference to the capital see. With profound bitterness Gregory was not slow to hand in his resignation to the emperor; after two years at Nazianzus, he had his cousin Eulalius elected bishop there (383), and he finally retired definitively to his estate of Arianzus.

His great sensitivity made him see facts and doctrines in such a personal way that his writings are made relatively easy to date and they constitute a sincere, if not impartial, documentation of his faith and of the evolution of his feelings. A characteristic trait of his temperament was flight in front of responsibility: entering a monastic community, the priesthood, the episcopacy, ecclesiastical struggles, the direction of the council were all occasions when his first and last impulse was withdrawal and in which letters, orations and poems express his irresolution and his effort to take up the role imposed upon him.

II. Works. *A. Discourses* (CPG 3010; PG 35 and 36). Tillemont and the Maurists classify chronologically the 44 discourses (plus no. 35, spurious), which go from his episcopal consecration (372) to his retirement (383). Some touchups to this order are necessary or possible. A complete edition—with opportune comments and introductions by SC—is underway. They were written in a quite refined style; some have been retouched for publication, which was therefore planned by the author. Many are jewels of patristics, valued highly since the 5th c.; Rufinus translated into Latin, after 400, nos. 2, 6, 16, 17, 26, 27, 38-40, with great praises: these are also of high priority for readers today. We cite in particular Discourse 2, *Apologia* (or *On the Priesthood*), from 362, which inspired *John Chrysostom (*De sacerdotio*); 41, *On *Pentecost* (379); 32 and 33 (summer 379), *On the Holy Spirit* and *On the Trinity*; 27-31 or *Theological Discourses* (summer 380), a coherent set on the spiritual conditions for knowledge of *God and the Trinity, which more than anything else earned Gregory the title of Theologian, to be taken in a literary and mystical sense, not at all professorial; 36 (*On Himself*) and 42 (*Final Farewell*) (sometime after 27 November 380 and before the summer of 381), rereadings of history from an apologetic point of view. We note also Discourse 21, *Panegyric of Athanasius* (379), intended not only to defend the Nicene cause, but also to reconcile the Athanasian party; and Dis-

course 43, the *Funeral Elegy of Basil* (1 January 382), an homage to his teacher and friend, as well as a reaction against the Basilian theological tendency that had prevailed at the Council of Constantinople. Several other discourses regard personal and familial circumstances; few are of an exegetical character. Gregory prefers to refer to Scripture by citing only a few words together rather than forcing himself to follow line-by-line. He was inspired more willingly by a solemnity, a dogmatic discussion or by his own religious experiences.

B. Letters (CPG 3032; PG 37, 21-388; ed. P. Gallay, *Gregor von Nazianz. Briefe*: GCS 53, Berlin 1969; Id., *S. Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres I-II*, Paris 1964–1967). There are 249 letters ascribed to Gregory, but a certain number of them are not his. They span from the year 359 to his last years at Arianzus (a period for which it is difficult to fix precise dates). It is often a continuing correspondence: twelve correspondents receive 2 letters, eight 3, four 4 (we include here Nectarius of Constantinople, without admitting the authenticity of Letter 88), five 5, two 6, one 7; besides his faithful friends: 8 are directed to Gregory of Nyssa and to the rhetorician *Eudoxius; 9 to Amphilochius of Iconium; 10 to Philagrius; 13 to *Olympius, prefect of Cappadocia II (we observe also that 5 are addressed to his assessor Asterius) and another 13 to the metropolitan of the same province, *Theodore of Tyana; finally there are 20 to Basil, not a surprising number even though direct contacts were frequent and though Basil was dead by 379. These letters are in general brief and pointed, of an even more refined elegance than that of the discourses. The MSS contain three *Theological Letters* (101, 102, 202), regarding *Apollinarianism, published by P. Gallay (SC 208, Paris 1974). To the letters we add the *Testament* (CPG 3033; PG 37, 389-396).

C. Poetry (CPG 3034-3039; PG 37, 397-1600; 38, 11-130). The poetic works of Gregory develop in the same stylistic line, though even more artificial. They are divided into the *Carmina dogmatica* (1-38), *moralia* (1-40) and *historica* (*De seipso* 1-99; *quae ad alios spectant* 1-8); *Epitaphia* (1-129) and *Epigrammata* (1-94). Two alphabetical poems of hortatory character, whose authenticity is probable, are missing in the PG, which, on the other hand, includes compositions of a later date. The whole adds up to 17,000 verses, many of which are void of inspiration; someone has irreverently compared this literary exercise, which is dated in particular during Gregory's retirement to Arianzus, to crossword puzzles done to kill time. Yet the ambition to engraft Christianity into the conventional Greek culture is not without interest and can lead the author to express his personality and his sentiments in an original and almost modern form (M. Pellegrino, *La poesia di s. Gregorio di Nazianzo*, Milan 1932). A critical edition of the poetry is in preparation, edited by M. Sicherl and J.T. Cummings. More important poems include H.M. Werhahn, *Gregorii Nazianzeni: Synkrisis Biôn*, Wiesbaden 1953; C. Jungck, *Gregor von Nazianz: De vita sua*, Heidelberg 1974; A. Knecht, *Gregor von Nazianz: Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen*, Heidelberg 1972. Among the nonauthentic poems are A. Tuilier, *Grégoire de Nazianze. La passion du Christ*: SC 149, Paris 1969.

III. Doctrine. Neither the eulogies of Athanasius or Basil, nor the critiques of *Julian the Apostate, the Arians, the Apollinarians or the Council of Constantinople can be taken for objective information. Not even Gregory's *exegesis, as penetrating as it may be, is much preoccupied by adhering to the biblical data. The work of the Holy Spirit unfolds gradually: "The OT manifestly proclaimed the Father, more obscurely the Son. The NT manifested the Son and gave a glimpse of the divinity of the Spirit. Now the Spirit has the right of citizenship among us and concedes to us a clearer vision of himself" (*Disc.* 31,26). "The Savior loaded his disciples with a multitude of teachings, but there were some which they could not immediately comprehend" (ibid. 27). Here Gregory consciously proclaims the Holy Spirit God and consubstantial, just like the Son. By the fact that he allows himself to be guided by expository coherence, he has the gift of balanced and clear formulae, more than the solicitude to gather the apostolic or traditional thought or to express the requirements of ecclesiastical experience. He loves to synthesize, to trace a *via media* between two excesses, which he fixes not as theorist, but as an attentive observer of discordant opinions. One word satisfied him: *procession*. Basil confessed that he was unable to define the difference between the generation of the Son and the Holy Spirit's mode of existence. Gregory proposed the term *procession* (*ekporeusis*) (*Disc.* 31,8), which is little more than a word, but it rendered great services. Gregory then, in a certain sense, goes beyond Basil, whose prudence he deplored, without understanding his truly theological motives. Nevertheless, it was the Basilian doctrine—a little attenuated by the understanding of Athanasius, for fear of *tritheism—that informed his own trinitarian conception. Against *Apollinaris, he pushed ahead in Christology and would be perhaps the principal source of *Neochalcedonian orthodoxy, though perhaps he was partially responsible for the grave difficulties that rendered it necessary; he is often cited

even by *monophysite polemicists. As for his admirable conception of the mystery of God, accessible to the intellect purified by grace, this is certainly an Origenian inheritance shared with Basil. Gregory, greatly gifted for contemplation, enriched it by a prolonged contact with the Platonic and *Neoplatonic ideal.

IV. Influence. Gregory's Cappadocian friends Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Amphilochius and his disciple *Evagrius of Pontus owed him much. *Jerome, who met him upon the occasion of the Council of Constantinople, was struck by his sane Origenism. His theological formulae rather quickly gained attention and respect. His works had a vast dissemination and—an exceptional occurrence—were the object of innumerable *scholia, esp. on account of their cultural (mythological) allusions, which interested the Byzantines. On these scholia, see CPG 3011-3031, 3042-3051; F. Lefherz, *Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz*, Bonn 1958.

CPG 3010-3125; PG 35-38. Recent editions, e.g., in SC, offer a good bibl. DSp 6, 932-971; P. Gallay, *Grégoire de Nazianze*, Paris 1959; J.M. Szymusiak, *Eléments de théologie de l'homme selon S. Grégoire de Nazianze*, Rome 1963; J. Mossay, *Perspectives eschatologiques de S. Grégoire de Nazianze*: QLP 1964, 329-339; Id., *La mort et l'au-delà dans S. Grégoire de Nazianze*, Louvain 1966; T. Špidlík, *Grégoire de Nazianze*, Rome 1971; H. Althaus, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Gregor von Nazianz*, Münster 1972; F. Trisoglio, *S. Gregorio di Nazianzo in un quarantennio di studi (1925–1965)*, Turin 1974; M. Kertsch, *Bildersprache bei Gregor von Nazianz*, Graz 1978; CPG/S 3010-3128; B. Wyß, *Gregor von Nazianz*: RAC 12, Stuttgart 1983, 793-863; J. Mossay, *Gregor von Nazianz*: TRE 14, 164-173; C. Moreschini, *Filosofia e letteratura in Gregorio di Nazianzo*, Milan 1997; Gregorio di Nazianzo, *Tutte le Orazioni*, ed. C. Moreschini, Milan 2000; J. McGuckin, *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus. An Intellectual Biography*, Crestwood, NY 2001; *Gregory of Nazianzus. Images and Reflections*, ed. J. Bortnes - T. Hägg, Copenhagen 2006; C. Moreschini, *Introduzione a Gregorio di Nazianzo*, Brescia 2006.

J. Gribomont

GREGORY of Nyssa (ca. 335/340–ca. 395)
I. Life and Works - II. Dissemination of writings: Editions - III. Doctrine.

I. Life and Works. Last of the great Cappadocians, brother of *Basil of Caesarea, but much younger, born between 335 and 340, bishop of Nyssa in 372, he died after 394. The chronology of his works is often subject to conjecture. As far as is known, he was not educated in any of the great intellectual centers. He presents himself as having been taught by Basil (*Ep.* 13,4) and by his sister *Macrina (Basil connected his religious formation with Macrina the Elder, Gregory's grandmother). His reading was vast: Greek literature, *Platonism (he read the *Phaedo*, the *Phaedrus* and the *Republic* of Plato, but also the manuals of *Middle Platonism derived from *Posidonius, from whom he learned Cicero; and, acc. to Daniélou, *Plotinus for mysticism, *Porphyry for logic and ontology, *Iamblichus for cosmology), *Stoicism and the Hellenistic sciences. He was often inspired by the ecclesiastical writers who preceded him, esp. *Origen, and by *Philo. He often developed the theses of Basil, but also of *Macarius. At the origin of all his works one can recognize a model that inspired him. Throughout his life he cultivated this bookish culture; he was not afraid to use his sources abundantly, without ever being servile. An elevated rhetorical formation can be recognized throughout.

When, around 355, Gregory's family turned to *asceticism, he found their devotion somewhat exaggerated at times (PG 46, 785A). He accepted ordination as a lector—and therefore *baptism—around 360. But he did not manifest the intention to follow the evangelical life as did his brother (Basil, *Ep.* 14,1), and *Gregory of Nazianzus reproves him for having rejected the sacred books and preferred, in his "drunkenness," the title of orator to that of Christian. He married (365?), and this led him later on to use particularly bitter terms with regard to the conjugal life.

Basil, having become bishop of *Caesarea in 370, called together all his collaborators, and his brother was promoted to the episcopal See of Nyssa, an unimportant village. He showed no administrative talent, and Basil refused to consider him, among others, for an important negotiation in Rome. From that time on, he demonstrated, more so than his brother, kindness toward the "old Nicenes," esp. for *Marcellus of Ancyra, whom Basil accused of *Sabellianism, despite the protection which the latter had found in *Athanasius and in *Rome. In 376 the *Arian opposition deposed Gregory under the pretext of economic misappropriations, so that he was forced to remain in exile until 378. When, in the same year, the emperor *Valens fell under the blows of the *Goths and *Theodosius I showed himself favorable to the Nicene party, Gregory found himself heir to Basil, who died on 1 January 379. The following were years of intense activity.

We know of only one work written by Gregory during the lifetime of Basil, the treatise *On Virginity*. It is a *panegyric of the ascetical activity of his brother, in some chapters inspired by the experience of his communities, but it focused on a philosophy of purity and of the impassibility of the incorporeal

nature. To judge from the different perspectives of the two brothers—in *dogmatic theology, in *exegesis, in *philosophy—and from certain anti-Origenist positions of the mature Basil (in the *Hexameron), the impression is given that Basil was fairly harsh toward his younger brother, and that his presence did not favor the free expression of Gregory's thought.

On the other hand, from 379, Gregory took an active part in the ecclesiastical reorganization at the Council of *Antioch, where he perhaps compromised in favor of the Marcellians. The trinitarian treatise *Ex communibus notionibus* is best explained in the light of this council. He also completed Basil's *Hexameron* with the important *De opificio hominis* (Easter 379; see Homily III *In sanctum Pascha*, of the same year), then with the *Hexameron*, an apology written at the end of the same year. Having gone to *Sebaste to put in order the succession of *Eustathius, who for a long time had opposed Basil, Gregory found himself constrained to act as bishop there for a long time, a duty which he then passed on to his brother Peter. The same year, after the Council of Antioch, Macrina died. Gregory gave his treatise *On the Soul and the Resurrection* the form of a dialogue with his dying sister. This literary form suggests that the work dates to the period in which the memory of the event was still vivid. The same may be said of the *Life of Macrina*. One cannot, however, insist on such chronological connections.

In 381 and 382, Gregory carried out an important role in the Councils of *Constantinople, where Theodosius designated him as one of the most important representatives of *orthodoxy, with whom communion was requested by the bishops of the region. At the same time, he responded to the great Arian theologian *Eunomius. Having been sent into exile and reduced to silence by the three books in which from 364 on Basil had refuted his *Apology*, Eunomius completed an *Apology of the Apology*. Gregory responded with a first book in 380, a second soon after (erroneously numbered 12B in the old editions, as in PG 45), a third treatise between 381 and 383 (soon divided into twelve books = 3-12 in PG 45); and finally a fourth treatise in 383, in response to a *Profession of Faith* of Eunomius (given as Book II in PG 45). Although Gregory's work is, on the whole, polemical and subtle, it constitutes a *summa* of Cappadocian theology. A philosophical introduction can be found in Mühlenberg; M. van Parys has promised an annotated edition of the last treatise for SC. Belonging to the same activity are the panegyric of Basil (1 January 381) and that of *Meletius of Antioch, given before the Council of Constantinople of 381; and, probably during the same council, on the occasion of the promotion of Gregory of Nazianzus to the capital see, the sermon improperly called *In propriam ordinationem*. A large number of his preserved letters also belong to these years of activity.

Constantinople had recourse again to Gregory for certainly functionary discourses in 383 (*De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti*) and in 385 (funeral discourses for the child princess *Pulcheria and later for the empress *Flaccilla).

Around 385 came a work of his maturity, the *Great *Catechesis*, a doctrinal *summa* for teachers who needed a system in their instructions. While there is a strong metaphysical foundation, Gregory was heir to an entire tradition of baptismal initiation concerning one God in three persons, *creation, the fall, the *incarnation, *redemption and the *sacraments of initiation. The last chronological point of reference concerns the 15 homilies *On the Song of Songs*, since these are dedicated to the deaconess *Olympias, with whom Gregory recalls the long years of friendly relations, which takes us necessarily to the 390s. It was thought possible to date another exegetical treatise to this period, the *Life of Moses*, which after having presented the *historia*, describes in a *theoria* the ascent of humans to God even into darkness, where they encounter the Lord who reveals himself. R.E. Heine has recently questioned this late date. Gregory gave his signature to the Council of Constantinople in 394, after which there is no trace of his activity. The measures taken by the episcopate of Asia Minor against the *Messalians at the Council of *Side (difficult to date) differ greatly from his benevolent and moderate approach: he was either dead or else no longer capable of imposing his own opinion.

Numerous works remain the date of composition of which is uncertain. These are above all dogmatic treatises. The work *Quod non sunt tres dei* (*Ad Ablabium*) is considered by Hübner to be a correction to the *Ex communibus notionibus* of 379. The *De fide sancta* (*Ad Simplicianum*) is mutilated. The authorship of the *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* is strongly disputed. On the other hand, too little considered is the treatise on essence and *hypostases, printed as *Letter* 38 of Basil, but which certainly contains the doctrine of Gregory, and is without doubt a relatively weak work of his youth (but after the death of Basil). Many patrologists have wronged Basil's strength by attributing this doctrine to him and using it to comment on his affirmations, which are much more nuanced. Other opuscula are connected more directly with the controversy on the *Holy Spirit: a sermon against the **pneumatomachi* and a

letter on the *Trinity (*Ad Eustathium* = Ep. 189 attributed to Basil). Others attack *Apollinaris and his followers; the one addressed to *Theophilus of Alexandria is certainly later than 385. Also worthy of note is a small treatise *Against Destiny*.

Among the exegetical works, particularly contrived is *The Titles of the Psalms*. Pushing to its limits his need to systemize, Gregory claims to find a progression in the placement of the 150 psalms, which leaves space for his genius at the cost of a proper understanding of the *Psalms. The exegetical school begun in Antioch radically refused the authority of these Psalm titles, and perhaps not by chance. One would like to believe that such a work was not simply a product of adolescence.

The eight *Homilies on Ecclesiastes* (comment up to 3,13) in a certain sense form a unity with the homilies on the *Song of Songs. A brief essay *De pythonissa* takes a position on a controversy that had by then become classical, abandoning the literalism of Origen, who had held that there was an appearance of Samuel's ghost. This abandonment of Origen is almost a paradox in the exegetical choices of Gregory, but even this exception is significant. While Gregory felt he was the heir of Alexandrian themes and methods, he was prepared to sacrifice anything that raised strong ecclesiastical opposition.

On the NT there exists a cycle of five homilies on the *Lord's Prayer and a similar cycle on the *Beatitudes. Finally, brief but important is the homily *In illud: Quando sibi subiecerit omnia (1 Cor 15,28)*, which boldly deals with Origen's **apokatastasis*, discussing at the same time the purpose of the incarnation. The so-called ascetical writings renew a discussion already treated from the exegetical point of view. Apart from the *De virginitate*, these are later works. The *De perfectione (Ad Harmonium)* is a work of his old age, and the *De perfectione (Ad Olympum)* comes after it. We would like to be able to date above all the *De instituto christiano.* From the time that this work and the *Great Letter* of ps.-*Macarius were properly edited (not forgetting what remains to be done), the close relation between the two has been has been recognized. Now that the priority of Macarius has been recognized, some hesitate to affirm that Gregory could have followed the *Messalian author so closely. The work appears rather to be from a disciple of Gregory, which would explain the Gregorian elements. The work is certainly full of Macarian features, but for studying its Nyssan character, these are not the features to consider.

The rest of Gregory's work is homiletic. Daniélou tried to determine the chronology of the liturgical sermons: one for *Epiphany (383), some for *Easter (but not Sermon II, which is by *Severus of Antioch), others for the *Ascension and *Pentecost (both in 388). The authenticity of a sermon for Christmas is affirmed by Usener, because it supposedly uses the **Protevangelium of James* (but this citation was already used by Origen and then Basil, so it must have become acceptable) and the term **Theotokos*, arguments that a majority of critics find unconvincing. The sermon *Adversus eos qui differunt baptismum*, delivered the day after Epiphany (381), just as that of Basil inviting the catechumens to baptism, also belongs to the liturgical cycle. The same can certainly not be said of the *panegyrics of the martyrs and saints, which have a local character. Above all worthy of mention is a *Life of St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, whose Origenian legend served as an ideal for the faith of the Cappadocians. The moral sermons deal above all with love for the poor, usury (in the footsteps of St. Basil), and fornication (on 1 Cor 6:18).

II. Dissemination of writings: Editions. Gregory was seldom translated into Latin, either because he came too late—after *Rufinus (although Chrysostom had translators)—or because his inspiration was too Hellenic, which is precisely what makes him interesting today. Nevertheless, the *De opificiio hominis* found two translators: in the 6th c. *Dionysius Exiguus and in the 9th John Scotus Erigena (who was also interested in *Maximus the Confessor and *Dionysius the Areopagite). The *Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus* also found a translator in S Italy. A few translations exist in other Eastern languages, esp. the homilies on the Song of Songs, the *Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes, as well as the *De opificio hominis* and the *De virginitate*. But Gregory did not have the great authority of the other two Cappadocians. He was not among the preferred doctors, and even in Greek the MSS are relatively few. Apart from a few partial editions in the 16th c., only in 1615 did Morel publish a complete Greek edition in Paris, which was mediocre, based on the MSS that he had at hand. In recompense, the modern era is elevating to Gregory an exceptional monument of critical erudition.

III. Doctrine. Many historians and philosophers have a deep admiration for Gregory, going so far as to consider him superior to the other Cappadocians. In particular, H. U. von Balthasar and J. Daniélou emphasized the value of his philosophy of knowledge and interiority that he maintains from the ancient inheritance and that he adapts acc. to the demands and suggestions of Christian faith. A.M. Ritter, G.C.

Stead, R. Hübner and others hold that Gregory was not successful in realizing a coherent synthesis. He makes extensive use of the partial expositions of the various schools, correcting them acc. to the Christian philosophical traditions, but it is pointless to seek a logical coherence between such diverse expositions. Where Basil was content to take advantage of the distinctions proposed by the philosophers, Gregory follows them in their analysis; and while he is careful to note the transcendence of the Christian God, nevertheless he does not have the Basilian prudence with regard to the limits that should be placed on philosophical ontology. All the Cappadocians can be considered heirs of the efforts of Origen, conscious of the dangers that threaten an all-too-daring synthesis. Basil is above all careful to respect the data of Scripture and *Tradition. Gregory safeguards something of Marcellus of Ancyra (Hübner) and even of his important adversary Eunomius. He remains, naturally, in the line traced out by Basil, but hopes to go further in scholastic explanation. Guided by excellent authors, capable of returning systematically to the sources, forced by controversies to consider deeply the points in question, he brings a notable contribution to theological elaboration, and it must at least be said that he pushes dogmatic theology to the construction of a Christian Platonism. Characteristic of his reflective effort is its mystical character, whatever the precise sense given to this term; it certainly refers to a knowledge connected to purity of heart. The connection with biblical *revelation, rendered difficult because of an exceedingly subtle use of allegory which does not enter into the authentic line of Origen, is nevertheless not without effect, and is strengthened by his ecclesiastical and monastic experience.

CPG/S 3135-3226; PG 44-46. *Translations*: Eng. - FC 58 (ascetical works); Fr. - SC 119 (*De virg.*), SC 1bis (*Life of Moses*), SC 178 (*Life of Macrina*); It. - S. Lilla, *La verginità*, Rome 1976; Id., *Fine, professione e perfezione del cristiano*, Rome 1979; Id., *L'anima e la risurrezione*, Rome 1981; C. Brigatti, *La vita di Mosè*, Alba 1967; R. Criscuolo, *Epistles*, Naples 1981; *Omelie sul cantico dei cantici*, ed. C. Moreschini, Rome 1988; *La Vita di Macrina*, ed. E. Giannarelli, Cinisello Balsamo 1988; *L'Uomo*, intr., tr. and notes by B. Salmona (Collana di Testi Patristici 32), Rome 1982; *La Grande Catechesi*, intr., tr. and notes by M. Naldini (Collana di Testi Patristici 34), Rome 1990; Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom, *La verginità*, intr., tr. and notes by S. Lilla (Collana di Testi Patristici 4), Rome 1990; *La vita di Mosè*, ed. M. Simonetti, Milan 1984; *Teologia Trinitaria. Contro Eunomio, Confutazione della Professione di Fede di Eunomio*, intr., tr., notes and apparatus by C. Moreschini, Milan 1994.

Studies: E. Moutsoulas, *Gregory of Nyssa* (bibl. up to 1968): Nea Sion 65 (1970) 141-194 (in Greek); M.M. Bergadá, *Contribución bibliográfica para el estudio de Gregorio de Nisa*, Buenos Aires 1970; H.U. von Balthasar, *Présence et pensée. Essai sur la philosophie religieuse de Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris 1942; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique. Doctrine spirituelle de saint Grégoire de N.*, Paris 1944 ([2]1953); J. Cuesta Janini, *La antropología y la medicina pastoral de s. G. de N.*, Madrid 1946; R. Leys, *L'image de Dieu chez Saint Grégoire de N. Esquisse d'une doctrine*, Brussels 1951; J. Daniélou, *La chronologie des sermons de G. de N.*: RecSR 29 (1955) 346-372; D.L. Balás, *Metousia Theou. Man's Participation in God's Perfections According to Saint G. of. N.* (SA 55), Rome 1966; E. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 1966; J. Gribomont, *Le panégyrique de la virginité, oeuvre de jeunesse de G. de N.*: RAM 43 (1967) 249-266; J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire*, Montpellier 1968; J.M. Shea, *The Church According to Saint Gregory of Nyssa's Homilies on the Canticle of Canticles*, Baltimore 1968; J. Daniélou, *L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse*, Leiden 1970 (collection of previous articles); M. Harl (ed.), *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*, Actes du coll. Chevetogne 22-26 Sept. 1966, Leiden 1971; H. Dörrie (ed.), *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*, Acts II coll. int., Münster 18-23 Sept., Leiden 1976; R.M. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Leiden 1974; R.E. Heine, *Perfection in the Virtuous Life*, Philadelphia 1975; F.L. Mateo Seco, *Estudios sobre la cristología de San Gregorio de N.*, Pamplona 1978; P. Pisi, *Genesis e phthorà. Le motivazioni protologiche della verginità in Gregorio di Nissa e nella tradizione dell'enkrateia*, Milan 1981; G.I. Gargano, *La teoria di Gregorio di Nissa sul Cantico dei Cantici*: OCA 216, Rome 1981; M. Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique. Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu*, Paris 1983; J.T. Cummings, *The Holy Death-Bed. Saint and Penitent*, in *The Biographical Works of Gregory of Nyssa. Proceedings of the Fifth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa*, Philadelphia 1984, 241-263; M. Altenburger - F. Mann, *Bibliographie zu Gregor von Nyssa*, Leiden 1988; D.L. Balás, TRE, 14, 173-181; H. Dörrie, RAC 12, 863-895; LACL 299-304; A. Meredith, *Gregory of Nyssa*, London 1999; H.R. Drobner, *Gregory of Nyssa as Philosopher. "De Anima et Resurrectione" and "De Hominis Opificio"*: Dionysius 18 (2000) 69-102; A. Meis - A. Castellano - J.F. Pinilla, *El dinamismo del encuentro entre Dios y el hombre en los comentarios al "Cantar de los Cantares" de Orígenes, Gregorio de Nisa y Juan de la Cruz*, Santiago de Chile 2000; N. Melikisvili, *Traduction des oeuvres homilétiques de Basile le Grand, de Grégoire de Nazianze, de Grégoire de Nysse et de Jean Chrysostome*, Tbilissi 2000; *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on the Beatitudes. An English Version with Commentary and Supporting Studies*, ed. H.R. Drobner - A. Viciano, Leiden 2000; *Discours catéchétique, Grégoire de Nysse*; texte grec de E. Mühlenberg (GNO III, IV); intr., tr. and notes by R. Winling, Paris 2000; *Lexicon Gregorianum. Wörterbuch zu den Schriften Gregors von Nyssa*, ed. F. Mann, Leiden 2001; *Semillas de contemplación. Homilías sobre el Cantar de los cantares; Vida de Moisés. historia y contemplación, de Gregorio de Nisa*, ed. T.H. Martín, Madrid 2001.

J. Gribomont

GREGORY of Tours (ca. 538–594). George Florentius, later called Gregory after one of his forefathers, was born around 538 in Clermont-Ferrand into a family of Roman origin. He entered an ecclesiastical career and was bishop of *Tours from 573 until his death (15 November 594). He was deeply involved in

the complicated political-ecclesiastical affairs in *Gaul at that time, even with personal risk on account of Queen Fredegund's hatred of him.

In spite of his Roman origin, his education was not extensive. He read little of either classical or ecclesiastical authors (*Eusebius, *Jerome, *Sulpicius Severus, *Orosius and little more), and had little grammatical preparation, a sign of the cultural decadence in Merovingian Gaul of which Gregory was well aware, even if at times he hid his *rusticitas* behind the *topos* of the contempt that Christians should have for beautiful form. But this awareness did not keep him from writing; in fact, he was a historian and writer of rare quality.

Except for a lost *Commentary on the Psalms* and the *De cursibus ecclesiasticis*, a description of the constellations and of divine and human *mirabilia*, his work is divided into two parts: those of hagiographic and of historical interest. Of a hagiographical character is a corpus of 8 books: *De gloria martyrum* (I) on Jesus, the apostles, the martyrs; *De miraculis S. Iuliani* (II); *De miraculis S. Martini* (III-VI); *De quorundam feliciosorum vita* (VII), dedicated to 20 holy men of the time, some known personally to him; *In gloria confessorum* (VIII), which completes book I, adding to the memory of the martyrs that of the confessors, i.e., of the saints who were not martyrs, chosen for the most part from monks in Gaul, esp. in the region of Tours. The work is composed organically as a sort of summa of the theme of hagiography, but the content ends up disappointing us when compared to the ambition of the program. Gregory is interested above all in miracles and relics of the saints, and by miracles he means even commonplace facts in addition to clearly fantastic miracles, so that the work often has more a superstitious than a pious character and is never historical.

Gregory manifests a quite different character as historian and narrator in the *Historiarum libri X*, usually referred to as the *Historia Francorum*. At the beginning, the work is presented as universal, and the first book extends from the creation of the world to the death of St. *Martin (397); but the following books concentrate on Gaul, rarely giving information concerning the neighboring regions, and the account becomes more and more particular as it approaches the age of the author: the last five books cover a space of only eleven years (580–591) and close with the death of King Guntram.

The historical perspective of Gregory is both political and religious: he laments the situation in Gaul (by then France) of his time, divided by various powers struggling against each other and prey to violence and anarchy, which do not respect even the rights of the church. By contrast, he looks back fondly on the strong and ordered Gaul of *Clovis, the initiator of the kingdom of the *Franks and protagonist of their conversion to Catholic Christianity. Compared to such merits, the savage crimes of which that king was guilty take second place, though Gregory relates them with care and the very success of *Clovis's policies is a guarantee of his divine favor for Gregory's somewhat barbarized moral sense. It is easy to speak of the fragmentary and anecdotal character of Gregory's work, but precisely through this we are presented with not just a quantity of historical facts but a vision of the whole of the life and the mentality of the period. And the apparent indifference, the bare essentiality with which he presents the facts, even the most atrocious, gives the work an uncommon dramatic depth in its tight, simple, direct representation of human passions and illusions.

CPL 1023-1032; PL 71; MGH (SRM) I, 1-2; G. Vinay, *S. Gregorio di Tours*, Carmagnola 1940; var. aus., *Gregorio di Tours*, Todi 1977; B. Vetere, *Strutture e modelli culturali nella società merovingia. Gregorio di Tours. Una testimonianza*, Galatina 1979 (bibl.); BBKL II, 339-340; M. Heinzelmann, *Gregor von Tours (538–594) "Zehn Bücher Geschichte." Historiographie und Gesellschaftskonzept im 6. Jahrhundert*, Darmstadt 1994; I.N. Wood, *Gregory of Tours*, Bangor 1994; A.H.B. Breukelaar, *Historiography and Episcopal Authority in Sixth-Century Gaul. The Histories of Gregory of Tours Interpreted in Their Historical Context*, Göttingen 1994; Patrologia IV, 304-314.

M. Simonetti

GREGORY THAUMATURGUS (ca. 213–ca. 270). The unanimous hagiographical liturgical literature places Gregory in the 2nd half of the 3rd c. in Asia Minor as bishop of *Neocaesarea in *Pontus and as a great evangelizer of that region. The eloquent nickname explains the great popularity that surrounded him and his memory immediately in the East and later on in the West as well. The most ancient and trustworthy information about him comes from *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 6,30), who presents him as *Theodorus, who also bears the name of Gregory, illustrious bishop in Pontus, a student of *Origen together with his brother *Athenodorus. Later (7,28) Eusebius speaks of the two brothers among the bishops who worked to unmask the heterodoxy of *Paul of Samosata without success. In *HE* 6,30 Eusebius adds that Origen had dissuaded the two brothers from the study of profane literature and had kept them at his school for five years. This period of discipleship under Origen is also spoken of in a biography in the form of a *panegyric that *Gregory of Nyssa composed around the end of the 4th c. It inte-

grates the little information given by Eusebius with local and mostly legendary hagiographical traditions; later anonymous biographies follow in the same path. Eusebius had acquired the information about Gregory's study under Origen from an oration, the *Panegyric to Origen*, which has in fact come to us under the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus ("Wonder Worker"). The author, about to take leave of Origen after several years in his school, thanks his teacher. The doctrine of the Logos is present in the oration, and Gregory praises Origen's teaching method. Based on this writing it was possible to identify as the Wonder Worker a Gregory who is the recipient of a letter, transmitted by the **Philocalia*, in which Origen exhorts him to study Greek *philosophy in order to put it at the service of the gospel.

Other than these writings, various others have come to us under the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus: the *Metaphrase of Ecclesiastes*, a very free paraphrase of this book of the Bible, looking to resolve in a manner compatible with Christianity the various passages contained in it that have hedonistic and Epicurean content; the *Canonical Epistle*, which examines problems regarding ecclesiastical discipline that were provoked by an invasion of the *Goths in Pontus; the *Exposition of Faith*, which has trinitarian content and insists on the traditional doctrine of the Logos, which Gregory of Nyssa gives in his biography of Gregory Thaumaturgus, clarifying that this doctrine was still prominent in the church in Neocaesarea (PG 46, 912-913); two brief treatises *To Theopompus, On the Impassibility or Passibility of God*, in translation in Syriac, and *To Evagrius* (or *Philagrius*), in epistolary form, which we have in Greek and in Syriac with various attributions of authorship, the latter dealing with the *Trinity, the former with *Christology, both with an evident *monarchian tendency; a passage of the lost *To Gelianus*, containing monarchian and specifically anti-Origenist doctrine. In addition to these writings, some authentic and others in any case involved in the difficult affair of which we are about to speak, there are others that are certainly false: the treatise *On the Soul to Tatian*, which was written by *Apollinaris, some *homilies and another writing, regarding which see CPG 1, 1772ff.

Until a few decades ago, scholars attributed to Gregory not only the *Metaphrase* and the *Canonical Epistle*, concerning which the consensus is unanimous but which offer little help in determining the doctrinal views of the author, but also the *Panegyric to Origen* and the *Exposition of Faith*, the latter confirmed by Gregory of Nyssa, the former by Eusebius. There were, however, some doubts with regard to the authenticity of the treatise *To Theopompus*, and many with regard to the treatise addressed *To Evagrius (Philagrius)*. But in 1976 and 1977, L. Abramowski and P. Nautin called into doubt the authenticity, respectively, of the *Exposition of Faith* and the *Panegyric to Origen*, and consequently also the identification of the Wonder Worker with the Gregory who received of the letter of Origen handed down by the *Philocalia*. H. Crouzel attempted to reply to this devastating criticism, but with little success, since some of the arguments put forth by the other scholars were quite strong: the *Exposition of Faith* is certainly inauthentic in its last part, which belongs to the trinitarian debate in the 2nd half of the 4th c., and perhaps the whole work should be considered spurious; further, the author of the *Panegyric to Origen* quite probably was named Theodorus, and we do not know what foundation Eusebius had for identifying him with Gregory Thaumaturgus, who in any case is distinct from the Gregory who received the letter from Origen. These results put in question the entire work, and therefore also the doctrinal views, of the Wonder Worker. The author's discipleship under Origen is also called into doubt since this had been confirmed doctrinally and culturally, both directly and indirectly, by his presumed authorship of the *Panegyric to Origen* and the *Exposition of Faith.*

On the other hand, the monarchian tendency recognizable in the treatises *To Theopompus* and *To Evagrius* fits well with the monarchian expression of the otherwise lost *To Gelianus*, certainly authentic since it is supported by the authority of Basil—only a few words but deeply significant since, in perfect antithesis with Origen, the Father and the Son are said to be two with regard to the ἐπίνοια but one with regard to the ὑπόστασις. The monarchian character of these three works can hardly be considered random. It should be added that the *Metaphrase of Ecclesiastes* resolves the difficulties of a moral character that this book of *Scripture presents, without ever departing from the literal sense, while Origen had resolved them resorting to his beloved allegorical method. Given all these facts, it is difficult to consider the Wonder Worker as a disciple of Origen, as Theodorus was, who is the likely author of the *Panegyric*. At this point we must ask whether the period of discipleship of Gregory under Origen should not be considered simply an idea of Eusebius, derived from the identification of the unknown Theodorus author of the *Panegyric* and Gregory the evangelizer of Pontus and bishop of Neocaesarea renowned in his time. But the questions proposed in this discussion are many; therefore, the whole matter should be considered *sub iudice*.

CPG 1, 1763-1794; PG 10, 963-1232; PG 46, 893-957 (Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita di Gregorio Taumaturgo*); *St Gregory Thaumaturgus. Life and Works*, tr. by M. Slusser, Washington DC 1998; *Remerciement a Origène*: ed. with Fr. tr. SC 148 (1969, ed. H. Crouzel); *Encomio di Origene*, It. tr. and comm. by M. Rizzi, Milan 2002; L. Abramowski, *Das Bekenntnis des Gregor Thaumaturgus bei Gregor von Nyssa und das Problem seiner Echtheit*: ZKG 87 (1976) 145-146; P. Nautin, *Origène. Sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1977, 83-86; 183-197; H. Crouzel, *Faut-il voir trois personnages en Grégoire le Thaumaturge?*: Gregorianum 60 (1979) 287-288; M. Simonetti, *Una nuova ipotesi su Gregorio il Taumaturgo*: RSLR 24 (1988) 17-41; Id., *Origene dalla Cappadocia ai Cappadoci*, in *Origene e l'alessandrinismo cappadoce (III-IV secolo)*, ed. M. Girardi and M. Marin, Bari 2002, 13-16.

M. Simonetti

GREGORY the Cappadocian (d. 345). A native of *Cappadocia, he studied at *Alexandria. A pro-*Arian, he was elected bishop of *Alexandria in 339 by the Eusebians in place of *Athanasius, who had to leave his episcopal residence 18 March. The election was irregular since Gregory had been ordained outside of Alexandria without the participation of Egyptian bishops. In any case, he took possession of the see with the support of the imperial military and was ferocious with Athanasius's faithful clergy. The anti-Arian Council of *Rome in 341 declared his election irregular, but with no practical results, similar to his ineffectual excommunication as an Arian leader by the Western bishops at *Serdica (343), even though Gregory did not participate in the council's works. He died 25 June 345.

DCB 2, 739; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim; DHGE 21, 1468-9.

M. Simonetti

GREGORY the Elder (275–374). Born around 275 in Nazianzus in Cappadocia. After having adhered in his youth to the Judeo-pagan sect of the *Hypsistarians or "Adorers of the Most High," he married *Nonna, with whom he had three children: *Gorgonia, *Gregory the Theologian and *Caesarius. Drawn probably by the example of his wife, he soon embraced the Catholic faith and became bishop of Nazianzus in 329. During his episcopacy he was involved in the doctrinal controversies that were dealt with in the councils of *Rimini and *Seleucia in 359. He died at almost 100 years of age at the beginning of 374 and was celebrated by his son Gregory in a famous funeral oration (*Oratio funebris in patrem*, PG 35, 985-1044).

CPG 3010; DHGE XXII, 14-15; A.W. Ziegler, *Gregor der Ältere von Nazianz, seine Taufe und Weihe. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte des IV Jhts*: Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift 31 (1980) 262-283; K.G. Bonis, *Le père de Grégoire de Nazianze était-il d'origine grecque ou juive?*: Θεολογία 53 (1982) 537-561; R. Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

P. Marone

GREGORY the Great (ca. 540–604)
I. Life - II. Works - III. Aspects of Gregory's thought.

I. Life. Gregory was born into a Christian family of the senatorial aristocracy, related to Pope *Felix III (483–492) (*In evang.* II, 38,15). Educated in the traditional schools of grammar and *rhetoric, he also studied basic concepts of natural science and Roman law (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* X, 1); whether he also acquired Greek is still debated: very likely (evidence: ibid. VIII, 28; X, 10) acc. to some scholars, for whom it is untenable that, having carried out diplomatic duties at the Byzantine court, he remained ignorant of the language used there (Petersen 1976, 124-133). According to others, it is very doubtful (Richards 1984, 44-45; Chadwick 2001, 658), given that Gregory explicitly denies it (*Ep.* VII, 29; XI, 55). The presence of the library instituted by Pope *Agapetus (535–536) on the Caelian, near the family residence, must have contributed to his knowledge of Christian texts, side by side with the classics. This dual cultural heritage emerges constantly but is balanced in different ways at different moments of his life.

Early in life he entered a political career, becoming *praefectus urbi*, then, after some hesitation, he decided to devote himself fully to God (*Moral.*, ded., 1), around 574–575, probably after the death of his father. Then, able to dispose of inherited patrimony, he founded six *monasteries in Sicily, in the territories inherited from his mother, and another one, named after St. Andrew, in the family palace on the Caelian, where he retired. Here he led an *ascetic life, guided by self-discipline, humility and meditation on *Scripture, which are recurring themes in all his writings. Many of his future collaborators entered this monastery, including *Maximian, who became bishop of *Syracuse, and *Augustine, who was later sent on a mission to *Britain. The rule of life adopted here was not necessarily that of St. *Benedict, as is often thought because of the author's interest in the saint. His monastic peace was lost when *Pelagius II ordained him deacon and sent him to Constantinople as **apocrisarius* to the emperor, Tiberius II at first, then from 582 Maurice. He was sent in order to solicit aid against the *Lon-

gobards in *Italy, who had arrived on the peninsula some ten years prior, and continued their incursions into the territories of the *Byzantine Empire, including Rome. In these years (ca. 579–586) to his diplomatic efforts was added the doctrinal controversy with the patriarch of *Constantinople, *Eutyches, on the *resurrection of the body, which ended with the imperial approval of the theory supported by Gregory (*Moral.* XIV, 56,72-57,77). Meanwhile, he became deeply involved in the interpretation of the book of Job, at the request of his group of friends, who were united by common spiritual interests. Among them was *Leander of *Seville. Gregory remained in contact with him after his return to Rome. There, Pelagius made use of Gregory in the political and ecclesiastical problems concerning, among other things, the Lombards and the question of the *Three Chapters (see the letter written to the bishops of Istria by Gregory on behalf of Pelagius: *Registrum Epistolarum* 2, MGH, ap. III, 3; Paul Diac., *Hist. Lang.* III, 20). The pontiff died 7 February 590, struck by bubonic plague following the flood of the Tiber in 589; a week later, Gregory organized a procession in the city, bound for S. Maria Maggiore, to implore from God the end of the plague (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* X, 1; Paul Diac., *Hist. Lang.* III, 24). Already esteemed for his role under Pelagius, he was acclaimed by the Roman people as Pelagius's successor and, after a few months, received imperial approval, followed by the episcopal consecration on 3 September 590.

From that time he began the series of letters, gathered in the *Registrum*, that document his pastoral, political and administrative activities, as well as his personal relationships. The collection has also preserved the synodal epistle (*Ep.* I, 24, February 591), sent, acc. to custom, to the other patriarchs, to reaffirm the common faith, the veneration of the four gospels and of the four councils, together with a reflection on the figure of the bishop typical of Gregory. Among his first letter recipients is also Teoctista, sister of the emperor, to whom he expressed his regret over his election (*Ep.* I, 5, October 590); now, in fact, he is diverted from the preferred contemplative *otium* and immersed in *negotia* of a worldly character, for which he feels inadequate, having to steer a decrepit and battered ship (*Ep.* I, 4).

Nevertheless, his previous political, legal and administrative experience must have helped him in the practical management of the church and the *Patrimonium Petri*, made up of territories scattered in different parts of Europe, often reduced on account of the barbarian invasions, but still widespread in the islands, esp. in Sicily. From here came most of the supply for the city of Rome, esp. wheat (*Ep.* I, 2; 70), that the church distributed each month to the citizens, esp. the poor (John Diac., *Vita Greg.* II, 26; cf. Arnaldi 1986, 25-30). This and other duties proper to the imperial administration, by this time effectively neglected, were taken up by the pontifical administration, under the direction and supervision of the pope. He also attempted to reform the church in a monastic direction, both within the Lateran curia and by supporting the appointment of monks as bishops as well as by founding monasteries in Rome (*Ep.* III, 17; IV, 18; VI, 44; IX, 138). In the city, he limited his architectural projects to the consecration of former *Arian churches for Catholic worship (S. Agata in the Suburra: cf. *Dial.* III, 30,2-3, S. Severinus: cf. *Ep.* III, 19), and the maintenance of existing ones, in particular, works in the sanctuaries of the respective basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul (John Diac., *Vita Greg.* IV, 68). In addition to the letters, the homilies on the gospels, particularly the first, delivered on the first Sunday of Advent in 590, just days after a heavy storm hit Rome with disastrous results, bear witness to the difficulties of the contemporary social and political situation. Such disasters were compounded by the problem of the Lombards throughout the entire period of his pontificate, with alternating periods of crisis. At the beginning of his ministry, at the death of the Arian king Authari (590), who had opposed the Catholic baptism of his subjects, Gregory communicated to the other bishops of Italy his missionary zeal for the conversion of the Lombards who were still *pagans or *heretics (*Ep.* I, 17). He expressed his opposition to them in some stories narrated in his Dialogues involving incidents of resistance on the part of Catholics, written at a critical period (593–594; for example *Dial.* III, 27-28).

On the political and civil front, he was forced, without the defensive support of the Byzantine court, to deal with first the threat of Ariulf, duke of Spoleto, then of Agilulf. The latter, reacting to the offensive of the Roman exarch, followed the example of the duke of Spoleto, marched on Rome and besieged it in late 593 and early 594. On this occasion, Gregory interrupted his *exegesis on Ezekiel, because he was unable, he said, "even to live" (*In Ezech.* II 10.24). From then on a succession of truces follow, not always successful: at times boycotted by the exarch Romanus (*Ep.* II, 38; V, 40), at times on account of the belligerence or excessive demands of the Lombard leaders (*Ep.* IX, 44; 196). When renewing negotiations for the cessation of hostilities, he relied on the mediation of *Theodelinda, the Catholic wife of Agilulf though an adherent to the

schism of the Three Chapters, and for this reason often encouraged her to move closer to the dogmatic position of the Roman Curia (*Ep.* IV, 4; 33; IX, 68; XIV, 12).

To the period of truce with the Lombards date the first fruits of the mission to the Anglo-Saxons (*Ep.* VIII, 29, July 598), undertaken in 596 by sending forty monks of St. Andrew on the Caelian, led by their prior, Augustine. This enterprise was undertaken, acc. to the declaration of the pope himself, because of his desire to meet the request of the islanders to be initiated in the Christian religion (*Ep.* VI, 51; 60), and perhaps in order to recover, no longer for political motives but religious ones, a former Roman colony that had been conquered by the Anglo-Saxons from the mid 5th c. The missionaries, arriving in the spring of 597, established themselves in *Canterbury with the support of Aethelberth, the king of Kent. They were followed in their work of *evangelization and supported from afar by the pope, as evidenced by the numerous letters sent to Augustine, the local rulers, and earlier to the *Franks, so as to obtain logistic support for the mission.

Relations with the kings (esp. with Queen Brunhilda, regent of Austrasia and Burgundy after the death of Childbert) and with Frankish clerics began some years before (595), when Gregory intervened in *ethical questions and the internal discipline of ecclesiastical organization, urging his recipients to combat any residual paganism (*Ep.* VIII, 4) and esp. the phenomenon of "simony," identified with awarding nobles devoid of any pastoral qualifications with high ecclesiastical duties (*Ep.* IX, 214; 216). While his interventions in Gaul were meant to be final and decisive, he was more sporadic and prudent with the *Visigoths of Spain, who had just converted en masse to Catholicism, following the example of the successor to the throne of Leovigild, *Recared. Gregory addressed a single letter of congratulations to him for this change of religion, for which he identifies him as a "king-shepherd," urging him to exercise the virtues proper to that model (*Ep.* IX, 229; see also I, 41 to Leander of Seville). Thus Gregory's approach to the individual Germanic rulers was calibrated differently, acc. to the different religious situations and his ability to intervene in them: if with respect to the conversion of the Visigoths he remained only a spectator, limiting himself to some advice on political *ethics, he played a directive role with respect to the Anglo-Saxons. This involved him in the ecclesiastical organization and pastoral guidance of the new converts, as evidenced by a letter of June 601, with guidelines for the clergy and the *liturgy (*Ep.* XI, 39) and the *Libellus responsionum* on issues raised by Augustine, transmitted by *Bede (*Hist. eccl.* I, 27), whose contested authenticity has found recent confirmation (Meyvaert 1986, 543-550; Chadwick in *Gregorio* 1991, 207-211). In this latter field, the pope did not necessarily impose uniformity with the Roman use, conceiving of the unity of the church more on the mystical plane (cohesion of the members of the body of Christ: *Ep.* IV, 3) than on a ritual level.

Another ecclesiological question debated between 591 and 596 was that of "*Donatism," or rather, of widespread demands for autonomy in some African churches, jealous of their traditional practices and hostile to any imperial or papal interference. This was understood by the bishop of Rome as a revival of heresy, against which he urged the local authorities, both ecclesiastical and secular, to intervene (*Ep.* I, 75; II, 39; IV, 35; VI, 36 and I, 72; 82; IV, 32; VI, 62) and finally even the emperor, entrusting to him the resolution of the conflict (*Ep.* VI, 64). Maurice was also involved when, from 595, Gregory argued against the epithet "ecumenical," adopted by the patriarchs of Constantinople *John and later (from 597) *Cyriac, since it seemed to him an act of pride, to which he contrasted the title, chosen by him, of *servus servorum Dei* (*Ep.* V, 37; 39; 41; 44; VII, 5; 24; 28; 30; VIII, 29; XIII, 41; 44). From the letters addressed to the *basileus* one can see, on the one hand, the loyalty of the pope toward the imperial authority, on the other, some differences of opinion with Maurice (*Epp.* III, 61; V, 36; 37; VII, 30). For this reason, in May of 603, Gregory demonstrated a renewed hope that Phocas would ascend the throne, a usurper, but in his eyes a potential restorer of justice and freedom (*Ep.* XIII, 32). Sometime later he addressed a letter to the Germans, or rather to Theodelinda, praising the Catholic baptism of her child and her efforts to mediate peace (*Ep.* XIV, 12). Later in 603, apparently not without good hope for the future, he was troubled by the return of the plague in Rome. The letter to the queen is among the last of the *Registrum*, interrupted in the beginning of 604 because of the pontiff's death, which occurred 12 March. This is the traditional *dies natalis* in the liturgy for Gregory. After the Second Vatican Council, the liturgical feast of the saint, to prevent its recurrence in Lent, was moved to 3 September, the date of his consecration as bishop.

His liturgical memorial developed early, at first outside Rome, where his tomb was originally in front of the old sacristy of St. Peter's Basilica (LP I, 66; John. Diac., *Vita Greg.* IV, 68), and finally, after several translations, in the Clementine Chapel of the present basilica. There is a vast hagiographic pro-

duction of a wide chronological and geographical range on him: a chapter in *Isidore's *De viris illustribus* (40), two *Vitae*, written respectively by Paul the Deacon during his stay at Monte Cassino (ca. 787) and by John the Deacon at the Roman curia (9th c.); older and almost contemporary productions are the *Vita* of the anonymous monk of Whitby (ca. 713) and wide digression devoted to Gregory by Bede in his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (*HE* II, 1). Also in an Anglo-Saxon milieu, a Northumbrian tradition regards him as a bridge between the local and the universal church (Chadwick 2001, 674). In the Carolingian period his authority was invoked to justify the adoption in the Frankish liturgy of the Roman chant attributed to him (*Antiphonale Gregorianum*), also because he reformed the *schola cantorum* of the Lateran. In addition, a liturgical book with prayers that probably are partly written by him is transmitted under his name (*Gregorian Sacramentary*: see Deshusses 1971, 50-53); finally, he was eulogized in the *Mart hier.* (from the late 7th c. onward) of Rabanus Maurus and Ado (9th c.), as well as several *menologia* and *synaxaria* of the Eastern church (see BS 7, 271-275).

II. Works. Among the writings attributed to Gregory by the MS tradition, those largely considered authentic belong basically to three genres: letters, exegesis, hagiography. In their various stages of composition they cover a time span between the eighties of the 6th c. and the death of the pontiff. The first are the *Moralia in Iob*, begun during his stay in Constantinople, completed in Rome before his election as bishop, with later occasional editing approximately up to the year 600. In the thirty-five books a complete interpretation unfolds, verse by verse, of the book of Job, considered from four points of view: literal, allegorical, typological and moral (*Moral.*, ded., 3). Similar criteria, which in general also apply to his other commentaries, are presented in the dedicatory letter to Leander of Seville, one of the addressees of this exegetical work, considered by Gregory providential. In fact, by a divine plan, the sorrow of Job finds in him an interpreter that is much more capable of understanding him, as he is similarly subject to suffering. He sees in Job not only the "type" of Christ, with his redemptive passion, but also that of the church, whose history is understood as the history of *preaching the gospel and of the subsequent trials (*Moral.*, praef. 7,16 and IX, 11,13), until the end of time, when, once the elect are gathered together from all nations, it will enjoy the eternal reward promised by the Lord (*Moral.* XXXV, 14.27).

This eschatological perspective is constantly present in the *Homilies on the Gospels* as well, composed between autumn 590 and early 592 for the liturgical assemblies gathered now in one, now in another, Roman church for the feasts of Christ and the saints. The forty sermons, preached sometimes in person, sometimes in moments of severe illness given to others to be read, were arranged in two volumes and revised in the final written draft by the author himself, who in this case, as for the *Moralia* (*Ep.* XII, 6), warns his readers, specifically here Secundinus of Taormina (*In evang.*, ded.), to beware of "pirated" copies, circulating without his permission and previous inspection.

If the audience of the homilies on the gospels is varied and changeable acc. to the occasion—in fact there are some sermons addressed only to bishops (e.g., *In evang.* I, 17)—the audience is more restricted, predominantly to the latter, for the *Regula pastoralis*, written probably between September 590 and February 591 and sent to his colleagues in the episcopate, such as John, bishop of Ravenna and dedicatee of the work, Venantius of Luni and Leander of Seville (*Ep.* V, 17 and 53). In the treatise, divided into four parts, he discusses the role of the *pastor*, also called the *rector*, *praedicator*, etc., together with his moral and spiritual requirements, and his conduct, balanced between contemplation and preaching, mindful of the different receptive capacities of the recipients.

The figure of the *praedicator* is also central in his *Homilies on Ezekiel*, given probably in late 593 and early 594 for a group of clerics and laypeople interested in exploring spiritual and theological issues of considerable complexity. The exegesis, reworked a few years later in two books of twelve and ten homilies, is incomplete. The author, assailed by multiple troubles and concerns on account of the Lombard attack on Rome and the surrounding areas, jumps from the first four chapters to Ezekiel's vision of the temple in the fortieth chapter, an object of curiosity to his audience (*In Ezech.* II, praef.), and then is forced to interrupt his meditation. Under circumstances so distressing, Gregory seems to have perceived a similarity between his situation and that of the *prophet in exile with his compatriots, whom he admonished to repent and return to God; the dreadful events of his time, acc. to the commentator, should in fact lead to repentance and purification (*In Ezech.* II, 6,22.24).

He also mentions these events in the *Dialogues*, composed around the same time as the *Homilies on Ezekiel*, but using various documents on the Italian saints of the period that had already been collected

for some time. Their lives and miracles are narrated in four books during the course of the dialogue between Gregory and the subdeacon Peter: a rhetorical device that allows him to frame anecdotes of a miraculous character within a deeper theological and ethical reflection, such as to dispel the "popular" character often attributed to the work. This is perhaps the main reason for doubts about the Gregorian authorship of this work; the tone is so different from his other works, sharing, however, with them some content in common: not only are some *exempla* from the *Homilies on the Gospels* and the *Dialogues* the same (e.g., Redempta and Romula in *In evang.* II, 40,11 and *Dial.* IV, 16,1-7), but some considerations about prophecy as well, and the role of the prophet, present both in the *Moralia* and in the commentary on Ezekiel, and above all, in the second book of the *Dialogues*, dedicated entirely to the life of St. Benedict (*Moral.* II, 56,89.91; *In Ezech.* I, 1,15 and 5,11; *Dial.* II, 21,3-4). This work on Benedict is exceptional for the hagiography of the period, even though the stories about other saints, mostly monks and bishops, have aspects of originality, esp. with respect to the criteria of selection, both geographically (Italy, esp. central) and chronologically (the contemporary *viri Dei*).

The commentary on the *Song of Songs dates from a few years later (594–ca. 600) or, acc. to another hypothesis (Fiedrowicz [3]2002, 259), to the years before the papacy. It was composed, as is also assumed for the *Commentary on 1 Kings*, from lectures given by Gregory to the monks of the Caelian, including Claudius, former abbot in *Ravenna, who later reworked the notes taken during his stay in Rome (between 595 and 598: cf. *Ep.* XII, 6, and the introductions of R. Bélanger, SC 314, 22-28 and of A. de Vogüé, SC 351, 33-40). This text has not come down to us in full (only up to Song 1:8), perhaps due to an accident in the MS tradition. It reworks exegetical ideas already present in *Origen, in *Augustine and *Aponius. He identifies the bridegroom with Christ and the bride with both the church and the *soul. Thus an ecclesiological and *tropological interpretation alternate systematically, proceeding from a single starting point: the spiritual blindness in which humanity has fallen after *sin, from which we are called upon to be redeemed by faith in Christ and by meditation on the word of Scripture that direct us to the love of God.

The commentary on 1 Kings is also incomplete, written up to the royal anointing of David (1 Kgs 16:13) in six books. He develops in particular monastic and ecclesiological themes concerning the priesthood, taking as a starting point the various typological meanings of the characters: e.g., Elkanah is a figure of Christ and of the monk wavering between the contemplative (Anna) and active life (Peninnah); Anna is a figure of the church, Peninnah of the synagogue; Samuel a figure of the Christian preacher converted from paganism, Saul of the newly ordained bishop, who subsequently falls; David is a figure of Christ and of the new bishop. The authenticity of the work has long been discussed. Originally identifying it as the last work by Gregory (SC 351, 38), Adalbert de Vogüé, editor of the critical edition for Sources Chrétiennes, is now more inclined to attribute it to Peter, a 12th-c. monk of the abbey of Cava, who nonetheless reused material and the style of Gregory (SC 432, 9-10 and SC 449, 9-10.20-23).

Many letters of the *Registrum*, esp. those on administrative matters, were prepared using conventional formulas by the **notarii* of the Lateran chancellery, to whom the pope himself dictated most of the letters attributed to him, with the exception, perhaps, of those of a more confidential nature. He also arranged the order of the collection in 14 books, one for each indiction that passed during his pontificate. The compiled codex was purposely kept in the archive (*scrinium*) of the Lateran, as had been the case for over a century for the collections of papal letters. At present the archetype is not known, but a reconstruction of the original *Registrum* would seem to contain 847 letters, to which are joined a dozen or so that have come down to us independently. These letters attest the variety of problems and projects of his episcopate, how they were perceived by Gregory and how they were addressed by him on a practical level, and thus reveal the face of a pontiff pressed by multiple duties, able to handle them with expertise on the political, legal and economic front, and yet always drawn by a longing for the quiet contemplation of the heavenly mysteries.

III. Aspects of Gregory's thought. From the beginning, the *spirituality of Gregory was characterized by the tension between contemplation and action, presented at times as difficult to reconcile, esp. because action, with its related concerns, removes one from the quiet necessary for concentrating on contemplation (*Ep.* I, 5; *In Ezech.* II, praef.). At other times he presented them rather as complementary, since the former inspires the love of God and neighbor, while the second expresses it in practice (*In Ezech.* II, 2,11). The contemplative meditation on the Word of God marks the *Weltanschauung* of the bishop, more oriented toward moral issues, which emerge from a profound interior inspection, than

toward purely theological ones. In this he differs from Augustine, but Gregory's study of him is frequently reflected in his thought.

The complementarity of contemplation and action unfolds in the life of Gregory and is programmatic in his conception of pastoral ministry. In fact, he recommends the first to the *praedicator* as necessary nourishment for a preaching ministry; to the latter, on the other hand, he calls also whoever has dedicated himself by vocation to a more withdrawn life, like the monks of St. Andrew on the Caelian, who were sent to evangelize the Anglo-Saxons. The preacher, bishop or monk is the spokesman for God's message to his contemporaries, and in this he inherits the task of the Old Testament prophet (*In 1 Reg.* III, 34; see also Benedict in *Dial.* II, 11-21). Like Augustine and other fathers, Gregory understood prophecy as the specific gift of examining the human heart and understanding God's message encrypted in the events of life (*In Ezech.* I, 1,1; *Moral.* XI, 20,31, cf. Aug., *Gen. ad litt.* XII, 9, Cassiod., *In Psalm.*, praef. 1). To this is connected the necessity of communicating the revelation received in order to guide souls to the Lord in repentance and the expectation of his coming. The link, then, between prophecy and preaching is intimate, developed in a particular way by Gregory, as well as the systematic examination of the former, based on scriptural passages analyzed acc. to the criteria of classical dialectic in the first homily on Ezekiel (*In Ezech.* I, 1,1-17). If the Old Testament prophets are the prototype of today's preacher, at the same time the preacher surpasses them, being born after the incarnation and so enjoying a higher degree of revelation (*In Ezech.* II, 4,12). Given this, the prophetic message in the Christian church no longer refers to a coming Messiah except in an eschatological perspective. The advent of Christ as judge, whom all should prepare to encounter, is a recurring theme in the writings of Gregory, whether addressed to the listeners of his homilies or the recipients of his letters (e.g., *Ep.* XI, 37 to Aethelberth). From this expectation of the coming Messiah derives the insistence on promoting the spread of the gospel, in order to increase the number of the elect to the total amount foreseen at the end of time (*Moral.* IV, 7,12). In addition, the members of this *ecclesia sancta universalis* include the "saints" of the Old Testament, and those Jews predestined, in the end, to be redeemed (*Moral.* II, 36,59 and *In Ezech.* I, 12,6, etc.). Also on account of this conviction, Gregory legally protects the Jews in Italy and, usually, exhorts his contemporaries not to force them to conversion (*Ep.* II, 45; V, 7; VIII, 25; IX, 196), which he advocates instead for the Germans who had settled within the borders of the former Western empire.

Therefore, his missionary zeal and the perception of a world in decline are interconnected, a vision often expressed in relation to natural and social disasters of the period (e.g., *In evang.* I, 1,1; *In Ezech.* II, 6,22; *Ep.* III, 29), issues that can be reconciled in a vision directed toward the transcendent, to which history and life on earth must aim, both in a spiritual sense (conversion and contemplation of the heavenly mysteries) and a temporal sense (preparation for the universal *judgment). From this consideration derives the warning to detach oneself from every earthly affection, characteristic of a monastic *asceticism that does not go so far as demonizing the material world or the body, but considers it a source of temptation and a burden; it is nonetheless of benefit to the extent that the limitations it imposes (sharply experienced by Gregory during his illness) attract those who want to elevate themselves inwardly to the humble recognition of human weakness and the need of the divine help (*Moral.* XIX, 6,12).

In this earthly life, which from the beginning is undermined by sin (*In cant.* 1), a divine pedagogy unfolds for the salvation of human beings, who, thanks to the alternation of adversity and prosperity, can progress spiritually (*Ep.* III, 51): in fact, the former provides the opportunity for repentance and purification, and the latter the opportunity for relief, which should never be separated from a vigilance against possible temptations, which are more insidious under prosperity than adversity (*Moral.* II, 43,68). Gregory asserts how in the *divina dispensatio* *justice and mercy, punitive discipline and tender indulgence are balanced (*In Ezech.* I, 1,18). Nevertheless he insists on our inability to comprehend God's ways, which defy any attempt to probe or to oppose them (e.g., *Moral.* XXIX, 29,56–30,57 and VI, 18,33). This view is consistent in his thinking, which is structured on the complementarity of opposites (e.g., *Moral.* XIX, 6,12; *In Ezech.* II, 2,3; cf. Walther 1941, 74-76; Straw 1988, 267-272). This characteristic still shows the sense of proportion typical of classical culture in an author who would have an authoritative influence in the Middle Ages, with his allegorical exegesis, his hagiographical and eschatological representations of the *Dialogues*, his *Bischofsideal* and the political role he established and extended for the papacy in the former Western empire. For this reason, the title of *consul Dei* inscribed on his epitaph is particularly apt (ICUR II, 4156, 15 and John Diac., *Vita*

Greg. IV, 68 and the Christianized meaning of *consul* in *Moral.* IV, 30,59).

Sources: CPL (1995), 1708-1721; CCL 140-144 (*Ep.*, *In evang.*, *In Ezech.*, *Moral.*, *In cant.*, *In 1 Reg.*); SC 251, 260, 265 (*Dial.*), 381-382 (*Past.*), 351, 391, 432, 449, 469 (*In 1 Reg.*); for the *Vitae* see CPL 1722-1723, BHL (1898-1899), 3636-3651; Suppl. (1911), 3636-3648; Novum Suppl. (1986), 3637-3651c.

Bibliography: (For bibl. references see those of R. Godding indicated below, the relevant reviews and additions, the works indicated in the manuals of patrology and the dictionaries and encyclopedias. Only the most recent contributions and those mentioned in the body of the article follow below in chronological order). R. Godding, *Bibliografia di Gregorio Magno (1890–1989)* (Opere di Gregorio Magno Complementi 1), Rome 1990. Entries on Gregory by V. Monachino, in BS 7, 222-278; R. Klein, in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 12, 608-612; S. Boesch Gajano, in EPapi 1, 546-574; M. Fiedrowicz, in LACL ³2002, 259-262.

Studies: J. Deshusses, *Le sacramentaire grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits* (Spicilegium Friburgense 16, 24, 28), Fribourg (Switzerland) 1971, 1979, 1982; M. Walther, *Pondus, Dispensatio, Dispositio. Werthistorische Untersuchungen zur Frömmigkeit Papst Gregors des Großen*, Bern 1941; J.M. Petersen, *Did Gregory the Great know Greek?*: Studies in Church History 13 (1976) 121-134; J. Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregroy the* Great, London-Boston 1980; P. Meyvaert, *Le Libellus responsionum à Augustin de Cantorbéry. Une oeuvre authentique de Saint Grégoire le Grand*, in J. Fontaine - R. Gillet - S. Pellistrandi (eds.), *Grégoire le Grand*, Paris 1986, 543-550; G. Arnaldi, *L'approvvigionamento di Roma ai tempi di Gregorio Magno*: StudRom 34 (1986) 25-39; F. Clark, *The Authorship of the Gregorian Dialogues. A Challenge to the Traditional View*: SP 18/4 (1990) 120-132; B. De Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, IV. *L'Occident latin*, Paris 1990, 141-185; L. La Piana, *L'Omelia in S. Gregorio Magno*: EphLit 104 (1990) 51-64; V. Paronetto, *Gregorio Magno e gli Anglosassoni*, Rome 1990; E. Pitz, *Papstreskripte im frühen Mittelalter. Diplomatische und rechtsgeschichtliche Studien zum Brief-Corpus Gregors des Großen*, Sigmaringen 1990; C. Azzara, *Gregorio, i Longobardi e l'Occidente barbarico. Costanti e peculiarità di un rapporto*: Bollettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo 97 (1991) 1-74; S. Müller, "*Feruorem discamus amoris." Das Hohelied und seine Auslegung bei Gregor dem Großen*, Diss. Theol. 46, St. Ottilien 1991; A. Bruzzone, *Sulla lingua dei "Dialogi" di Gregorio Magno*: Studi latini e italiani 5 (1991) 195-280; 6 (1992) 181-283; G. Cracco, *Francis Clark e la storiografia sui "Dialogi" di Gregorio Magno*: RSLR 27 (1991) 115-124; L. Giordano (ed.), *Gregorio Magno. Il maestro della comunicazione spirituale e la tradizione gregoriana in Sicilia*, Catania 1991; *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo* (SEA 33-34), Rome 1991; M. Banniard, *Viva voce. Communication écrite et communication orale du IVᵉ au IXᵉ siècle en Occident latin* (Collection d'Études Augustiniennes 25), Paris 1992, 105-179; Ch. Pietri - L. Pietri, *Église universelle et "respublica christiana" selon Grégoire le Grand*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes. Miscellanea Saxer*, Vatican City 1992, 647-665; P. Stefanetti, *Tipologia e teologia simbolica nelle Omelie sugli Evangeli di San Gregorio Magno*, Rome 1992; F.E. Consolino, *I doveri del principe cristiano nel "Registrum Epistularum" di Gregorio Magno*: Augustinianum 33 (1993) 57-82; M. Banniard, "*Zelum discretione condire." Langages et styles de Grégoire le Grand dans sa correspondance*, in *Papauté, monachisme et théorie politiques. Mélanges Marcel Pacaut* 1, Lyon 1994, 29-46; B. Calati, *Sapienza monastica. Saggi di storia, spiritualità e problemi monastici* (Studia Anselmiana 117), Rome 1994, 176-193, 315-364, 468-489; E. Gandolfo, *Gregorio Magno. Papa in un'epoca travagliata e di transizione*, Rome 1994; B. McGinn, *The Presence of God. A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, 2. *The Growth of Mysticism. From Gregory the Great to the Twelfth Century*, New York-London 1994, 34-79; G. Arnaldi, *Gregorio Magno e la giustizia*, in *La giustizia nell'Alto Medioevo (secoli V-VIII)* (Settimane del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 42/1), Spoleto 1995, 57-102; J.C. Cavadini, *Gregory the Great. A Symposium*, Notre Dame, IN 1995; M. Fiedrowicz, *Das Kirchenverständnis Gregors des Großen* (RQA, Suppl. 50), Rome 1995; L. Giordano, *Saggi di ermeneutica gregoriana*, Catania 1995; S.Ch. Kessler, *Gregor der Große als Exeget. Eine theologische Interpretation der Ezechielhomilien* (IThS 43), Innsbruck-Vienna 1995; P. Meyvaert, *Uncovering a Lost Work of Gregory the Great. Fragments of the Early Commentary on Job*: Traditio 50 (1995) 55-74; P. Riché, *Petite vie de saint Grégoire le Grand (540–604)*, Paris 1995; M. Doucet, *Modernité de Grégoire le Grand. Son travail de vérification des documents*: BLE 97 (1996) 119-135; G. Hofer, "*Victrix ratio" – "Vera philosophia." La "rationalitas" nei contenuti e nelle strutture argomentative di Gregorio Magno*: SM 37 (1996) 625-670; V. Recchia, *Gregorio Magno papa ed esegeta biblico* (Quaderni di Invigilata Lucernis 4), Bari 1996; Id., *Le "circumstantiae personarum" e la teologia della storia secondo la meditazione biblica di Gregorio Magno, Hom. in Ezechielem 2,1*: Invigilata Lucernis 18-19 (1996–1997) 201-241; A. de Vogüé, *L'auteur du commentaire des Rois attribué à saint Grégoire. Un moine de Cava?*: RBen 106 (1996) 319-331; F. Clark, *The Authorship of the Gregorian Dialogues. The State of the Question*: SP 33 (1997) 407-417; B. Judic, *Grégoire le Grand, un maître de la parole*, in R.M. Dessì - M. Lauwers (eds.), *La parole du prédicateur Vᵉ-XVᵉ siècle*, Nice 1997, 49-107; R.A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World*, Cambridge 1997; M. Simonetti, *Gregorio Magno e la nascita dell'Europa*: VetChr 34 (1997) 311-327; F. Clark, *Authorship of the Commentary In 1 Regum. Implications of A. de Vogüé's Discovery*: RBen 108 (1998) 61-79; E. Gandolfo, *Gregorio Magno, servo dei servi di Dio*, Vatican City 1998; L. Giordano, *Giustizia e potere giudiziario ecclesiastico nell'Epistolario di Gregorio Magno* (Quaderni di VetChr 25), S. Spirito (Bari) 1998; M. Schambeck, *Contemplatio als Missio. Zu einem Schlüsselphänomen bei Gregor dem Großen* (Studien zur systematischen und spirituellen Theologie 25), Würzburg 1999; C.E. Straw, *Gregory I*, in A.D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 402-405; Id., *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, Berkeley, CA 1988; M. Doucet, *L'ordo expositionis dans les Moralia de Saint Grégoire le Grand*: BLE 101 (2000) 99-120; S.Ch. Kessler, *Gregor der Große und seine Theorie der Exegese. Die Epistula ad Leandrum*, in *L'esegesi dei Padri latini. Dalle origini a Gregorio Magno* 2 (SEA 68), Rome 2000, 691-700; J. Stern, *Israel et l'Église dans l'exégese de saint Grégoire le Grand*, in ibid., 675-689; A. de Vogüé, *Du nouveau sur les Dialogues de saint Grégoire?*: Collectanea Cistercensia 62 (2000) 193-198; Id., *Les vues de Grégoire le Grand sur l'action missionaire en Angleterre*, in C. De Dreuille, *L'Église et la Mission au VIᵉ siècle. La mission d'Augustin de Cantorbéry et les Églises de Gaule sous l'impulsion de Grégoire le Grand*, Paris 2000, 55-64; H. Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society. From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, Oxford 2001, 658-674; G. Cremascoli, *L'esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno*, Brescia 2001; R.L. Wilken, *Interpreting Job Allegorically. The "Moralia" of Gregory the Great*: Pro ecclesia 10 (2001) 213-226; C. Ricci, *Mysterium dispensationis. Tracce di una teologia della storia in Gregorio Magno* (Studia Anselmiana 135), Rome 2002; M. Iadanza, *Il console di Dio. Pensiero e azione sociale nel Registrum Epistolarum di Gregorio Magno*,

Naples 2003; *Gregorio Magno nel XIV centenario della morte*, Accademia naz. dei Lincei, Rome 2004; G.I. Gargano (ed.), *L'eredità spirituale di Gregorio Magno tra Occidente e Oriente*, San Pietro in Cariano 2006.

C. Ricci

GREGORY the Illuminator (ca. 260–ca. 328). Saint, apostle of the Armenians. His life is recounted, not without anachronisms and contradictions, by the *History* of "Agatangelos" (ca. 490?), whose essential core is, nevertheless, believable, because it is confirmed by independent witnesses. According to the *History*, Gregory, of noble origin, embraced Christianity at *Caesarea in Cappadocia; when he returned to *Armenia, King Tiridates II had him tortured so that he might abjure the faith and, not succeeding, had him thrown into a pit, in which Gregory remained for 15 years. Meanwhile, the emperor *Diocletian fell hopelessly in love with Hripsimè, a Christian virgin who lived in a monastery. To save her, Gaianè, the superior of the monastery, took her, with 35 other nuns, to Armenia. At Diocletian's request, the fugitives were discovered by Tiridates, who himself fell in love with Hripsimè and, faced with her refusal, condemned her and her companions to martyrdom. Tiridates lost the use of his reason as a divine punishment. It was revealed to his sister Khosrovidukht' in a dream that only the intercession of Gregory could cure the ruler. The apostle, after having buried the holy martyrs, healed the king and converted him to Christianity, which became the official religion of Armenia. The homilies that Armenian tradition assigns to Gregory are spurious.

BS 7, 180-190; LTK[2] 4, 1206-1207; BBKL 2, 331.

S.J. Voicu

GUNDEMAR (d. 612). *Visigothic king, successor to Witteric after his assassination (610). During his reign he published two decrees that have been conserved and that declare the See of *Toledo the metropolitan of the ecclesiastical province of Cartagena. One is the agreement on the matter reached by the bishops of the province of Cartagena while united in Toledo in October 610; the other is the confirmation of the agreement on the part of the king. It has been held that these texts are apocryphal (G.B. Pérez, Baluze), but this suspicion is not accepted by Flórez.

Gundemar gave stability to Catholicism in his states and defended it from the Basques and the Byzantines.

Decretum de ecclesia Toletana: CPL 1234; PL 80, 179-184; PL 84, 482-484; C. García Goldaraz, *El códice Lucense de la Colección Canónica Hispana*, III, Rome 1954, 231-234; J.F. Rivera Recio, *Encumbramiento de la Sede Toledana durante la dominación vigótica*: Hispania Sacra 8 (1955) 3-34; E.A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, Oxford 1969, 159-160; L.A. García Moreno, *Historia de España Visigoda*, Madrid 1989, 145-147.

E. Romero Pose

H

HABAKKUK (iconography). The figure of Habakkuk in early Christian iconography is closely linked to the depiction of Daniel in the lions' den (Bel [Dan 14 Vg] 31-39). Habakkuk is unknown in Roman painting. He appears, no earlier than the 4th c., on Roman and Italic *sarcophagi, more rarely on Iberian and Gallic, almost always in a short, belted tunic, often in an *exomis,* his legs wrapped, approaching Daniel with food in his hand, on a plate or in a basket. The food is usually one or more loaves marked with a cross or, more rarely, a fish. The food Habakkuk brings is obviously a clear allusion to the salvific food; so the image of the prophet accentuates the concept of salvation already implicit in the portrayal of Daniel among the lions. At times the figure of an angel is inserted in the composition, generally opposite Habakkuk, as on a sarcophagus at *Arles (Ws. 122,3), where Habakkuk (bearded) and the angel (headless) are portrayed: the first offers fish, the latter bread. On the left side of a fragmentary sarcophagus from the mid-4th c. preserved at Brescia (Ws 208,10), the angel is depicted with a raised hand that seizes Habakkuk by the hair to carry him into the pit with Daniel (Bel 36): the prophet has a plate in his hand with fish and bread on it. The only pictorial evidence (late 4th c.) is that in the hypogeum of S. Maria in Stelle in Verona (Dorigo, fig. 4), in which Habakkuk has a plate with loaves of bread in his left hand and in his right a small amphora. Habakkuk appears on objects in ivory (e.g., a 6th-c. pyx at the British Museum: Volbach, n. 167), on some African lamps (Ennabli, nn. 32-46), in the codex of *Cosmas Indicopleustes (9th c.)—the prototype for which, however, is 6th c. (Stornaiolo, pl. 50)—and on other objects pertaining to furnishings of various sorts. Habakkuk is shown independently on a panel of the wooden door of St. Sabina at Rome (5th c.): at the far left the angel seizes Habakkuk by the hair as he is about to bring a plate with three loaves of bread to fieldworkers (Bel 33-36), here represented by a goatherd pasturing three goats (Jeremias, pl. 33).

The minor prophet Habakkuk—it is uncertain whether he is the same Habakkuk as in the episode with Daniel—is portrayed in a mosaic of Hosios David (mid-5th c.) at *Thessalonica (Volbach-Hirmer, pl. 135), in the 6th-c. codex of Rabbula (Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, pl. 7b) and with Nahum in the codex of Cosmas Indicopleustes (Stornaiolo, pl. 33).

DACL 6, 2, 1930ff.; BS 1, 8ff.; LCI 2, 204, C. Stornaiolo, *Le miniature della topografia cristiana di Cosma Indicopleuste* (*vat. gr. 699*), Milan 1908; W. Dorigo, *L'ipogeo di S. Maria in Stelle in Val Patena* (*Verona*): Saggi e Memorie di Storia dell'Arte 6 (1968) 9-31; *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*; *Rom und Ostia*, ed. F.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandemburg, Wiesbaden 1967; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1976; E. Ennabli, *Lampes chrétiennes de Tunisie*, Paris 1976; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom*, Tübingen 1980; M. Perraymond, *Abacuc e il cibo soterico: iconografia e simbolismo* (*Dan. 14, 33-39*): SMSR 16 (1992) 67-93; TIP 89-91.

D. Calcagnini

HADRIAN, emperor (76–138). Ruled 117–138, culminating a brilliant political career, having established himself as a person of vast culture (a typical product of the fusion of the Roman and Greek worlds) and a brave soldier. Hadrian succeeded Trajan, whose great-granddaughter Vibia Sabina he married. He traveled widely throughout the empire, had grandiose monuments built at Athens, Jerusalem, Rome (Hadrian's mausoleum) and other cities, as well as the famous Hadrian's Wall in Britain. He had the perpetual edict codified and reorganized the imperial administration. Possessing little religious spirit, he was nonetheless tolerant toward Christians: in a rescript to Minucius Fundanus, proconsul of Asia, he threatened punishments for anonymous denunciations and violence toward Christians, ordering that procedural rules be followed to arrive at condemnations, and this only for specific crimes (Just., *1 Apol.* 68; Eus., *HE* 4,9). Hadrian's rescript can be linked to Trajan's: with the latter, however,

those accused of Christianity could be convicted or acquitted based either on evidence adduced by the judge or by their own replies; Hadrian's rescript, rather, brought anti-Christian trials into the realm of common law, requiring accusers to prove the guilt of the accused, with provision for the punishment of calumniators. Trajan's rescript did not sanction false accusers because he wanted to facilitate the pardoning of apostates.

M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 151ff.; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 60ff.; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan 2004; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; E. Andreoni Fontecedro, "*Animula uagula blandula*": *Adriano debitore di Plutarco*: QUCC 55 (1997) 59-69; A. Ziólkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

HADRIAN, exegete (d. before 450). Syrian by birth, Hadrian, exegete of the school of *Antioch, is probably the same as the monk and priest of the same name, addressee of three letters of St. Nilus (PG 79, 225, 437 and 516). He lived in the 5th c. (probably died between 440 and 450) and was remembered by Cassiodorus (*Inst. div.* I, 10) among the *introductores Scripturae divinae,* after *Tyconius and *Augustine, and before *Eucherius and *Junilius. We have his *Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures* in Greek, which is a kind of biblical hermeneutic. (The term εἰσαγωγή appears here for the first time as the title of a book.)

In three sections Hadrian deals with figures of thought (including anthropomorphisms), of word and of construction (here adding a brief review of a wide variety of tropes). This work, which shows a fine sense of language and originality in the distinction of rhetorical figures, is a reasonable tool for the interpretation of Scripture.

CPG 6527. D. Hoeschen, Augsburg 1602 (= PG 98, 1271-1312); F. Goessling, Berlin 1887; Bardenhewer IV, 254-55; EC 1,335; G. Mercati, *Pro Adriano*: RBi 1914, 246-55; M. Fiedrowics, *Principes de l'interprétation de l'Écriture dans l'Église ancienne*, Bern 1998, 175-177; R. Sanz, *La introducción a las Sagradas Escrituras de el Monje. Edición crítica y estudio*, Tesi Ist. Patr. Augustinianum, Rome 2000.

A.V. Nazzaro

HADRIAN of Canterbury (d. late 7th c.). Native African, abbot at Nisida, near Naples, was appointed by Pope Vitalian in 668 to fill the office of bishop of Canterbury in England, which had been vacant. A man of study, Hadrian declined the post and suggested Theodore, a Greek living at Rome, as a person more apt for the task. Vitalian accepted the suggestion, ordaining Theodore bishop of Canterbury, but sent Hadrian to England with him to look after the doctrinal and cultural responsibilities of the mission. He was abbot at the monastery of Peter and Paul at Canterbury, and his teaching of the Sacred Scriptures was much praised.

DHGE 1,612; M. Lapidge, *The School of Theodore and Hadrian*: ASE 15 (1986) 45-72.

M. Simonetti

HADRIAN of Nicomedia (d. 303). Martyr under Domitian. On 4 March the *Mart. hier.* records an official of the Roman army under this name, martyred at the time of the emperor *Diocletian. Hadrian, a jailer who was struck by the faith and firmness of 23 Christian prisoners who were tortured, converted to Christianity, was arrested and condemned to death with them. According to the Greek *passio* (BHG 27-29), after his hands and feet were cut off, he was killed with a hammer in front of his wife, Natalia, who had supported and encouraged him during his imprisonment. His body, together with those of his 23 companions in martyrdom, was transported to *Byzantium by a certain Eusebius and buried in a place called Argiroupoli, where Natalia was also later buried. She wanted to be buried beside him, acc. to the classic practice that had nonetheless gained new significance in the Christian setting, that of the union and faithfulness of the beloved even in death and burial. Hadrian is thus also remembered 1 December, the day of Natalia's death. The saint of Nicomedia's cult spread quickly, including in the West; at Rome, Pope *Honorius (626–638) had a church built in his honor in the Senatorial Curia, and a diaconia was built there about a century and a half later. Its presence there next to the nearly contemporary church of S. Martina gave rise in the Middle Ages to the conviction that she, and not Natalia, was Hadrian's wife. The celebration of the saint 8 September, recorded in the martyrologies of Bede, Florus, and Adonis and accepted in the *Mart. rom.*, is probably due not so much to the translation of the relics to Rome, attested only relatively recently, as to the procession in honor of the Madonna starting in front of the church of St. Hadrian. Pope *Sergius I (687–701) designated this church as a gathering place and point of departure for the Marian processions of the Annunciation, the Assumption, Candlemas and Christmas. In the East Hadrian is celebrated 26 Au-

gust, both by the Greek and Armenian Synaxaria, while the Copts remember him 19 August.

AASS *Septembris*, III, 209-255 (Paris 1866); BHG 27-29e; BHL 3744-45e; BS I, 269-71; *Cath* V, 478-9; DHGE I, 608-10; LCI V, 36-8; LTK[3] IV, 1137; *Grande Libro dei Santi* I, 25-6.

V. Novembri

HADRIAN of Nicomedia (d. 315?). Martyr under *Licinius. The Greek synaxaria also celebrate another Hadrian, a martyr at the time of Licinius, almost unknown to Latins and inserted in the *Mart. rom.* by Baronius. According to the Greek *passio* (BHG 26), in many respects fantasy, Hadrian was the Christian son of the Caesar Probus (276–282). Having gone to Nicomedia to preach and to ask the emperor to end the persecutions, he was imprisoned and tortured for this, and ultimately beheaded. His brother, then bishop of Constantinople, took charge of his burial. The actual existence of this martyr is controversial: On the one hand, authoritative scholars, among them Delehaye (*Mart. rom.*), consider him a duplication of the other Hadrian, also a martyr at Nicomedia and buried at Constantinople, but at the time of *Diocletian; acc. to the Bollandists Pinius and Stilting, on the other hand, the two martyrs are to be considered different persons.

AASS *Augusti*, V, 808-11; BHG 26; BS I, 271; DHGE I, 610-11; *Prop.* AASS *Dec.*, 46; *Grande Libro dei Santi* I, 26.

V. Novembri

HADRUMETUM. Ancient Hadrumetum, made a *colonia* by *Trajan, was part of Proconsular Africa until *Diocletian, then made capital of the new province of Byzacena; renamed Hunericopolis under the *Vandals, Justinianopolis after the Byzantine reconquest, and is now the city of Sousse (Tunisia). Christianity arrived early at Hadrametum; some of its martyrs go back to the early 3rd c., some catacombs to the mid-3rd c. Of its martyrs we know Maiulus (Tertull., *Scap.* 3,5), Rutilius (Tertull., *Fug.* 5,3), Boniface and Thecla (DHGE 9,923), Felix (ibid., 16,904) and Victorinus (Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr.* 3,4–5,4 1), from the time of the Vandal domination. Of its bishops we know Polycarp (256), Abundantius (345–358), Philologus (397–411), the Donatist Victorinus, Felix (437), Servitius (484), Servus Dei (525) and *Primasius (553). A number of councils were held in the city: general councils for Africa in 397 and 507, provincial councils in 541 and 646. For monks of the local monastery disturbed by the problem regarding grace, Augustine wrote *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (426) and *De correptione et gratia* (427), which reestablished peace in the community. The Christian importance of the city was made clear by the five catacombs, now inaccessible, found there at the time of the French occupation. The early Christian era ended with the Arab attack of 647.

DACL 6, 1981-2010, LTK[1] 2, 671-2; DHGE 1, 705-801, passim; 22, 1493-1496; PWK 7/2, 2178-80; F. Leynaud, *Les catacombes africaines: Sousse Hadrumète*, Sousse 1910; A. Ferrua, *Hadrumetum. Le iscrizioni delle catacombe*: Aevum 47 (1973) 189-209; J.-L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine, vandale et byzantine*, Neuchâtel 1973, 151; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1981, 2, 261-264; Encyclopédie berbère, 22, Hadrumetum-Hidjaba, Aix-en-Provence 2000, 3307-3461.

V. Saxer

HAERESES, ADVERSUS OMNES. A short catalog of 32 heresies by an unknown author, in the past falsely attributed to *Tertullian because it was included as an appendix to *De praescriptione haereticorum,* for its similar theme. Scholars differ on whether it was written first in Greek and then translated into Latin, or vice versa. It must have been written at Rome in the first decades of the 3rd c. at the time of Pope *Zephyrinus (d. 217); some have attributed it to Zephyrinus or to his circle. Schwartz maintains that this catalog, composed in Greek at Rome at the beginning of the 3rd c., was translated into Latin and reworked in an anti-*Origenist sense by *Victorinus of Petovium, to whom *Jerome attributes a similar work (*De viris ill.* 74). This hypothesis was rightly rejected by M. Dulaey. It cannot be demonstrated that the author draws on the *Syntagma* of *Hippolytus; he does draw on *Justin and *Irenaeus; later writers also used the work. The author briefly expounds the heretical opinions of various personages, beginning with *Simon Magus, without drafting a refutation. To the heretics mentioned by Irenaeus he adds others such as Dositheus, Apelles, the two *Theodotuses (the tanner and the banker), *Praxeas, etc.

CPL 34; Verzeichnis, *Ps. TE hae*; CPPM II, 1621; PL 2, 61-74; CSEL 47, 213-226; CCL 2, 1399-1410; PLS 1, 29; Eng. tr.: ANF 3, 649-654; DTC 15, 2285; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt*, Leipzig 1884 (repr., Hildesheim 1963); A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Leipzig 1904, 2, 430-431; E. Schwartz, *Zwei Predigten Hippolytus*: SBA, Fasc. 3, Munich 1936, 38-45; J. Hausleiter, *Victorinus von Pettau*: PE 20, 614-619; PW 8A, 2, 2081-2085; *Nouvelle Histoire de la littérature latine*, ed. R. Herzog, Turnhout 2000, 5, 466-471; M. Dulaey, *Victorin de Poetovio*, Paris 1993, 45-50; R. Bratoz, *Il cristianesimo aquileiese prima di Costantino fra Aquileia e Poetovio*, Udine 1999.

A. Di Berardino

HAGIOGRAPHY

I. Sources - II. Questions of method - III. Holiness.

Hagiography is a branch of the historical disciplines with the purpose of the scientific study of the life, cult and legends of the saints. It is of primary importance for Christian *archaeology in its various specializations.

I. Sources.

1. *Calendars and martyrologies* (see separate entries).

2. *Liturgical books*. From the early 2nd c., first the martyrs, then saints of other types, were venerated and a cult grew up around them. For this reason all of the liturgical texts that pertain to the sanctorals are relevant for hagiography (e.g., *canons, *anaphorae, *sacramentaries, synaxaries).

3. *Documentary and narrative sources*. These include inscriptions, itineraries, diplomatic sources, chronicles, annals, *letters, memoirs, *panegyrics, *Acts* (authentic documents of the martyrs), passions (apologetic-catechetical documents), legends (romanticized passions), *vitae sanctorum, narrationes animae utiles* of the monastic milieu, **libelli miraculorum* (accounts of miracles at the tombs of the saints and written primary sources of pilgrimages), accounts of the finding, and translation of relics (i.e., the transfer of remains from one place to another).

II. Questions of method.

1. *Heuristics*. The first stage of hagiographical work is the research of documents (the saint's "dossier"), facilitated by the existence of *repertoria.* Still useful is the *Repertorium fontium historiae Medii Aevi.* Also useful are the catalogs of MSS of the great libraries (Vatican, Paris etc.), if one is looking for unpublished material on a saint. Indispensable as well are the specialized repertories (*Catalogi codicum hagiographicorum*) published by the Bollandists in the *Subsidia Hagiographica* of Paris, Brussels, Rome and the Vatican. The various hagiographical libraries—Latin (BHL), Greek (BHG) and Eastern/Oriental (BHO)—are useful for a first approach to both published and unpublished material. A review of recently cataloged hagiographical texts and MSS has appeared in the AB (1970ff.) under the title *Catalogues récents de manuscrits.*

2. *Textual criticism*. The critical text of the *Life*, the miracles, the finding or translation of a saint are established acc. to the usual rules of classical philology. Classification of MSS, their genealogy and evaluation of variants are done to determine, if not the original text, at least the common archetype for all surviving MSS. Textual-critical problems for hagiographical texts are nevertheless often unique. In the case of a unique MS, the editing must be diplomatic (with all the abbreviations and particularities of the text); ordinarily, however, not only are there numerous testimonies but also multiple recensions. The problem is then to present them as successive stages of a living text that has evolved and adapted to the various needs of those who use it. Once the critical text has been established, historical questions remain open: author, date, provenance, *Sitz im Leben* etc. The determination of the sources provides one of the essential criteria of historical criticism. All of this research makes possible a judgment on the literary genre of the hagiographical text, which makes possible a distinction between a reliable account or one that is rhetorical or one-sided, or a hagiographical romance.

3. *Critique of the cult*. One of the most difficult problems of hagiography consists of poorly or little-documented saints, whose very existence may sometimes be a question. H. Delehaye developed verification criteria for this problem: the "hagiographical coordinates." If certain conditions are met, the criteria allow a scholarly movement from the cult to the saint. The classical examples are provided by the Roman **Depositiones,* the **Calendar of *Carthage* or the *Syriac *Martyrology*. This method not only makes possible the distinction between homonymous saints, but also the ascertainment of the existence of a cult at the time of the document. The closer the document is to the time of the saint's death and to the sanctuary where he is buried, the stronger the guarantee of authenticity, not only of the cult, but also of the saint; one thus moves, using these criteria, from the cult to the saint. The coordinates can be in a funeral inscription, in local calendars, in itineraries, passions, lives and sacramentaries. Among these, the most important and authentic coordinates are the place of burial and the anniversary of the historical saint. Martyrologies are more difficult to interpret, as possibilities for error multiply the further one gets from the original sources. But even the errors in a document or a deliberate falsification tell us, not so much about the saint, but about the history of his cult and the intentions of his devotees.

III. Holiness. Hagiography is also necessary for clarifying the concept of holiness through the centuries. Areas to be considered include: holiness in paganism, Judaism and Christianity; the types of saints (martyrs, apostles, ascetics, virgins, bishops, soldiers), martyrdom as the basic model of all holiness; Christ as the protomartyr; the mission of the saint (nonviolence, martyrdom, witness to the faith, chastity, miracles); the intercessor saint; the patron saint;

hagiographical metaphors (*militia Christi,* athlete of Christ, etc.); the various types of veneration of the saints as compared with the cult of the heroes and with the Hebrew cult of the OT righteous (P.W. van der Horst, *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity,* Leuven 2002, 119-137); canonization; and special problems (suicide saints, tyrannicide, etc.).

Manuals: R. Grégoire, *Manuale di agiologia*, Fabriano [2]1996; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie. Ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire*, Brussels [2]2000; G. Philippart (ed.), *Hagiographies. Storia internazionale della letteratura agiografica latina e volgare in Occidente dalle origini al 1550*, 1ff., Turnhout 1994–. Encyclopedia: BS. Indexes: in the volumes of the Analecta Bollandiana. Sources: BHG; BHL; BHO; CPL 781-786; *Verzeichnis* 49-90. Archaeology: RivAC 71 (1995) 183-186. Iconography: LCI 5-8. Magazines: AB; Hagiographica.

LMA 4, 1840-1862; RAC 14, 1-183; RAC, Suppl. 1, 1171-1326; LACL[3] 311-313; H. Günter, *Legenden-Studien*, Cologne 1906; E. Lucius, *Les origines du culte des saints dans l'église chrétienne*, Paris 1908; L. Petit, *Bibliographie des Acolouthies Grecques*, Brussels 1926; H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938; G. Philippart, *Les légendiers latins et autres manuscrits hagiographiques*, Turnhout 1977; M. Puzicha, *Vita iusti* (*dial.* 2,2). *Grundstrukturen altkirchlicher Hagiographie bei Gregor dem Großen*, in E. Dassmann - K.S. Frank (eds.), *Pietas*, Münster 1980, 284-312; F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form*, Leipzig 1901, repr. Hildesheim 1990; E. Schurr, *Die Ikonographie der Heiligen*, Dettelbach 1997; N. Everett, *The Hagiography of Lombard Italy*: Hagiographica 7 (2000) 49-126; R. Henke, *Autobiographie und Hagiographie. Das Proöm des taciteischen "Agricola" und seine Nutzung durch Petrus Diaconus, Bibliothekar von Monte Cassino*: JbAC 44 (2001) 110-126; E. Elm, *Die Macht der Weisheit. Das Bild des Bischofs in der* Vita Augustini *des Possidius und anderen spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Bischofsviten*, Leiden 2003.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

HARMONIUS (3rd c.). Son of *Bardesanes. Like his father he composed hymns in *Syriac, into which he introduced Bardesanite doctrines. *Ephrem adapted new orthodox verses to Harmonius's old melodies, which remained in liturgical use (Soz., *HE* 3,16). Though Ephrem speaks of a son of Bardesanes, there is some doubt that his name was in fact Harmonius.

A. Camplani, *Rivisitando Bardesane*: Cristianesimo nella storia 19 (1998) 519-596.

E. Prinzivalli

HEALING of the MAN BORN BLIND

I. Literary sources - II. Iconography.

I. Literary sources. In addition to the healing of blind men in groups (Lk 7:21; Mt 15:30-31; 21:14), the NT records the following miracles related to blind men healed by Christ: one that occurred when he was leaving Capernaum, involving two blind men (Mt 9:27-31); another that occurred on a street in Jericho, also for a pair of blind men (Mt 20:29-34); the healing of the beggar Bartimaeus (Mk 10:46-52) or of an unknown blind man (Lk 18:35-43); again, a miracle in Bethsaida (Mk 8:22-26); and finally, one which took place near the pool of Siloam (Jn 9:1-41).

John's account has, before the imposition of mud mixed with saliva upon the eyes, the purification in the pool. Some fathers of the church, thinking primarily of this account, emphasize the baptismal symbolism of the miracle, because of the allusion which they found in it to the sacrament of illumination (Tertull., *Bapt.* V, 5; Ambrose, *Sacr.* II, 3,7 and *Myst.* 4,22-24; Chromat., *Serm.* 14; Cyprian, *Test.* III, 27 and *Ep.* 12,2). Others focus on the correspondence between the man born blind to the sinner from his birth, and the blind man illuminated to the man restored by the grace of baptism (Isidore, *Alleg.* 240; Bede, *In Io.* 9). For Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* V,15,13) and Augustine (*In Io.* 44,2) the washing in the pool of Siloam refers to the *lavacrum baptismale,* and what immediately precedes is to be identified with the catechumenate; for Ambrose (*Sacr.* III,11-15 and *Ep.* 80) it should be identified with humanity, whose heart had been blind, after Siloam opened their eyes. The miracle is also present in literature of a liturgical character; it is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (I,7,27) and in the two prayers of ps.-Cyprian (I,45; II,4) and appears later in the Roman biblical readings of the 7th c. for the liturgy of the catechumenal period. The same liturgical practice was carried out in Milan and Naples on Saturday of the third week of Lent (Magistretti, *Monumenta*, 151). In the Ambrosian liturgy the miracle of the healing of the man born blind enters into the prayers in the blessing of the baptismal font, bringing out its strict connection with the catechesis of initiation (ibid., 206).

II. Iconography. There are five iconographical groups of representations (De Bruyne, *L'imposition*, 144-150): (1) The blind man is standing, small compared to Christ, and lifts his arms in an act improperly said to be of prayer (Bisconti, *Contributo*, 17-27), while Jesus places his hands on the blind man's head. This is the most ancient iconography, prevalent in cemetery frescoes (Wp pls. 68; 70; II, 50), where apostles or spectators are never represented, and always present on *sarcophagi (Ws pls. 227,2; 157,2; 179,2; 39,1; 229,8). (2) Christ touches the eyes of the blind man. This form is unknown in painting, but is

the most recurrent in sculpture (Ws pls. 29,3; 113,1; 286,10; 228,5; 184,5; 112,2 and 3; 158,3; 111,1; 116,2; 111,3; 96; 86,3; 127,1; 184,1; 206,7; 214,8; 215,7; 218,1 and 2; 229,1; 233,9; 235,7; 252,1; 260,2; 126,1; 127,2; 212,2; 128,1; 228,6; 226,2; 40,1; 285,2; 126,1; 228,3; 92,2; 145,7 and 8; 291,1). In a small subgroup Christ puts his left hand on the head of the man, while with his right hand he touches the man's eyes or cheek, or else makes some other sign to indicate his words (Ws pls. 9,2; 99,1; 115,1; 292,1; 45,2; 122,2; 113,3; 197,5). (3) The blind man appears kneeling with his hands raised, both in painting (Wp II, 204, but also *see* Leper) and in sculpture (Ws pl. 114,1). (4) The blind man is sitting; this position is found in sculpture (Ws pl. 220,1) and in the minor arts (Salvatore, *Note*, 80). (5) Two blind men—three in a sarcophagus of Pretestato (Wp pl. 208,1)—hold themselves up or else use a staff. This iconography appears only in sculpture (Ws pls. 230,5 and 6; 230,3; 214,6; 231,2) and primarily in a group of sarcophagi "of Bethesda" (Simon, *Sur l'origine* 201-223). The representation of the miracle, as all biblical scenes represented in paleo-Christian art, fits perfectly into the theme of salvation and rebirth (Bisconti, *Sull'unità*, 731ff.). The popularity of the man born blind continued into Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages in literature (*Miracula Christi*, MGH, *Auct. Ant.* 10,412 and Prud., *Dittoch.* 129f.; *Apoth.* 686f.) and in art, as in the *Codex Purpureus Rossanensis* (Munoz, Il codex, 4f.) (4th c.) and on ivory, plaques, cruets and other miniatures (6th–9th c.) (Salvatore, *Note*, 83f.).

A. Muñoz, *Il codice purpureo di Rossano e il frammento sinopense*, Rome 1907; G. Morin, *Liturgie et basiliques de Rome au milieu du VII^e siècle d'après des listes d'Évangiles de Würzburg*: RBen 28 (1911) 303; M. Simon, *Sur l'origine des sarcophages chrétiens du type Béthesda*: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (1938) 202-223; L. De Bruyne, *L'imposition des mains dans l'art chrétien ancien*: RivAC 20 (1943) 144-150; M. Magistretti, *Monumenta veteris liturgiae ambrosianae. Manuale ambrosiano*, Milan 1944, S. Sabugal, *La curación del ciego del nacimiento* (*Jn 9,1-41*), Madrid 1977; M. Salvatore, *Note sull'iconografia del miracolo del cieco*: VetChr 16 (1979) 77-85; F. Bisconti, *Contributo all'interpretazione dell'atteggiamento di orante*, ibid. 17 (1980) 17-27; Id., *Sull'unità del linguaggio biblico nella pittura cimiteriale romana*, in Misc. S. Cipriani, Brescia 1981, 731-740; C. Ranucci, TIP, 200.

F. Bisconti

HEALING of TIBERIUS (*Cura Sanitatis Tiberii*). A Latin apocryphal writing which has many elements in common with the *Prophecy of the Savior*. It deals with the sending of Volusianus, the sickness and healing of Tiberius, and Pilate and the image of Christ brought to Rome by Veronica. The chapters on Nero, the letter to Claudius, the sections concerning Simon and the dispute with Peter, and finally the section on the death of Pilate in Armenia constitute an addition to the text itself. The work, which was popular in the medieval period, is difficult to date: perhaps 8th–9th c., perhaps 6th c.

CANT 69; BHL 4218; E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 1899, 173-189 (critical ed.). It. tr.: Erbetta 1/2, 381-387 (without the last chapters); Moraldi 2, 754-764; Pol. tr.: Starowieyski 1/2, 704-712.

M. Starowieyski

HEGEMONIUS (3rd–4th c.). Name linked to one of the first anti-*Manichean works, the *Acta disputationis Archelai cum Manete,* handed down in Latin from a Greek original, attested only fragmentarily by *Epiphanius in the *Panarion*. In the MS which contains the translation of this work, Hegemonius claims to have transcribed the debate, whereas Jerome (*De viris illustribus*) attributes the work to Archelaus himself. The text, minimally narrative, is essentially the account of two fictitious public debates between the (otherwise unknown) Mesopotamian bishop Archelaus and Mani, in which the bishop quite obviously has the upper hand. The account gives many elements related to Mani's doctrine and life which, once subjected to an attentive and severe criticism, may prove useful for the reconstruction of primitive Manicheism; a piece of information on *Basilides is of notable importance for the history of *gnosticism. Fragments of the work became part of the *History of the Church of Alexandria,* precisely in the section where it continues *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia ecclesiastica*.

CPG 3570-3571; CPL 122. Editions of the *Acta*: PG 10, 1429-1524; *Hegemonius. Acta Archelai*, ed. Ch.H. Beeson (GCS 16), Leipzig 1906. Eng. tr. and commentary: S. Lieu - M. Vermes, [Hegemonius], *Acta Archelai, Translation and Commentary* (Manichaean Studies IV), Turnhout 2001. On the evidence of the *History of the Church of Alexandria*: T. Orlandi, *Storia della Chiesa di Alessandria*. I-II, Milan 1968-1970; Id., *Coptic studies: 1. Encomio di Marco. 2. Le fonti copte di Severo di Ashmunein. 3. La leggenda di S. Mercurio*, Milan 1968; E. Spät, *The "Teachers" of Mani in the* Acta Archelai *and* Simon Magus: VChr 58 (2004) 1-23.

A. Camplani

HEGESIPPUS (mid-2nd c.). Writer, probably of Jewish origin, who went to Rome via Corinth during the pontificate of *Anicetus (155–166) and remained there until the pontificate of *Eleutherus (174–189). Known as the author of five books of *hypomnemata* ("memories"), intended to relate "the tradition, without error, of the apostolic preaching"

(see Eus., *HE* 4,8,2), in evident polemic against *gnosticism. Hegesippus is one of the sources of *Eusebius of Caesarea, who gives some fragments of him, mostly on the history of the primitive *Jerusalem community (*HE* II, 23, 4-18; III, 20,1-2; 32,3,6; IV, 8, 2; 22, 2-7). It is disputed whether Eusebius's statement on Hegesippus's activity at Rome (Eus., *HE* 4,22, 3) refers to the verification of the authenticity of the apostolic tradition preserved there, or to the compilation of a list of the bishops of Rome. It was Hegesippus who claimed that the various gnostic groups originated from Jewish sects (Eus., *HE* 4, 22, 3).

Quasten I, 254-255 (ample bibl.); W. Telfer, *Was Hegesippus a Jew?*: HThR 53 (1960) 143-155; N. Hyldahl, *Hegesipps Hypomnemata*: STh 14 (1960) 70-113; A. Lumpe, *Zum Hegesippsproblem*: ByzF 3 (1968) 165-167; H. Kemler, *Hegesipps römische Bischofsliste*: VChr 25 (1971) 182-196; L. Abramowski, *Diadoché und orthoi logoi bei Hegesipp*: ZKG 87 (1976) 321-327; M. Kropp, *Arabischäthiopische Übersetzungstechnik am Beispiel der* Zena Ayhud (Yosippon) und des Tarikä Wäldä-'Amid: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 136 (1986) 314-346, M. Durst, *Hegesipps Hypomnemata. Titel der Gattungsbezeichnung*: RQA 84 (1989) 299-330.

F. Scorza Barcellona

HEGESIPPUS, pseudo (De bello judaico). Under the name Hegesippus (derivation from Lat. *Josippus* = Gk. Ἰώσηπος) we have a free translation of Flavius Josephus's *De bello iudaico* (*Jewish War*), which in the MSS is attributed to *Ambrose. Composed in the 4th or 5th c. in a careful style, it reduces the seven books of the original to five, abbreviating but also at times amplifying the Greek text. It goes back to the same time as the translation attributed to Rufinus and, similar to it, is an important witness of the transmission of the Jewish historian's famous work. In it Hegesippus claims to have also worked on the biblical books of Samuel and Kings. Similar summaries also exist in various Eastern languages.

PLS I, 576; PL 15, 2061-2310; V. Ussani, *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae Libri V*: CSEL 66,1 (1932); K. Mras, *Die Hegesippus-Frage*: AA WW 95 (1958) 143-153; O. Michel - O. Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus, De Bello Judaico*, I, Munich [2]1962, XXX-XXXI; G. Rowekamp, LACL (2002) 315-316.

B. Studer

HEGUMEN. From the Greek ἡγέομαι ("I guide, am at the head of"). The term indicated the superior of a community of monks or a group of *anchorites (the superior of the idiorrhythmic monasteries on Mt. Athos is still called hegumen). "Hegumen" is synonymous with προεστώς = *praepositus* and is the equivalent in the Greek world of the Latin abbot (Nilus, *Ep.* 1, 34; 2, 64; Soz., *HE* 6, 20).

DACL 11, 1838-1840; DIP 3, 1075; P. de Meester, *De monachico statu iuxta disciplinam byzantinam* (Codificazione canonica orientale, Fonti serie II fasc. X), Vatican City 1942, 202ff.; Th. Spidlík - M. Tenace - R. Cemus, *Questions monastiques en Orient*, Rome 1999, 117-142.

M.G. Bianco

HELENA (d. 328/329). Fl. Iulia Helena, mother of the emperor *Constantine I, venerated as a saint in the Greek and Latin churches. Born probably at Drepanum in *Bithynia (which changed its name to Helenopolis under Constantine: Soz., *HE* 2,2,5; Procopius, *Aedif.* 5,2,1-5), of humble origins (*stabularia*); wife or concubine of *Constantius Chlorus, who sent her away so that he could marry—for reasons of state—Theodora, stepdaughter of the Augustus *Maximian. She returned in honor in 306, when her son Constantine recalled her to court at *Trier, and then went to live at Rome in the *palatio Sessoriano* (today S. Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome), where a basilica was built before 325. She received the title of Augusta, perhaps in 325, and her effigy was minted on coins; the province of Helenopontus is named for her. She was converted to Christianity by her son Constantine (Eus., *Vita C.* 3,47). Famous for her works of charity and assistance, as well as for promoting the building of new churches in Rome, Constantinople and Palestine. She took a journey to the East and to Palestine during 327/328 (ibid. 3,42-47). A tradition known to St. Ambrose (*De obitu Theod.* 41-48), and present in the 5th-c. ecclesiastical histories, attributes to her the discovery on Golgotha of the "true" cross of the passion, a fragment of which she brought back to Rome and placed in the basilica of S. Croce. Died perhaps at Constantinople ca. 329 (in the spring of that year her effigy ceased to appear on coins), soon after returning from the pilgrimage in Palestine. Her body was transferred to Rome, in the mausoleum now called Tor Pignattara, on the Via Labicana. The splendid porphyry sarcophagus is now in the Vatican Museums. Helena's cult as a saint spread quickly in both East and West, often associated with that of Constantine; their two figures beside the cross often appear on balance-weights—symbol of equity and justice—and on Byzantine coins also used as amulets.

H. Leclercq, DACL VI, 2126-2135; on the Ambrosian version of the *inventio* of the cross, see C. Favez, *L'épisode de l'invention de la Croix dans l'oration funèbre de Théodose par saint Ambroise*: REL 10 (1932) 423-429; coins with the image of Helena in J. Maurice, *Numismatique Constantinienne* I, Paris 1908; iconog-

raphy in E. Croce, BS 4, 992-995; S. Borgehammer, *How the Holy Cross Was Found: From Event to Medieval Legend*, Stockholm 1991; J.W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and Her Finding of the True Cross*, Leiden 1992; H. Pohlsander, *Helena: Empress and Saint*, Chicago 1996.

M. Forlin Patrucco

HELENUS (d. after 268). Bishop of Tarsus, 2nd half of 3rd c. We know from *Dionysius of Alexandria's letter to Pope *Sixtus II that Pope *Stephen excommunicated Helenus, *Firmilian of Caesarea (Cappadocia) and the whole regions of *Cilicia, *Cappadocia and *Galatia because they rebaptized heretics (Eus., *HE* 7,5,4). At the time of Pope *Cornelius, Helenus participated in, and probably presided over, a synod at *Antioch (perhaps in 253) against the *Novatian heresy (Eus., *HE* 6,46,3); he also attended two other synods of Antioch (264 and 268), which condemned *Paul of Samosata (Eus., *HE* 7,27-30); he presided over the final sessions of the second synod because of Firmilian's death. He was one of the most eminent bishops of his region. Date of death unknown.

BS 4, 999; G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate*, Louvain 21929, 295-315; J.A. Fischer, *Die Synode zu Antiochien im Frühjahr 253 (?)*: AHC 17 (1985) 243-251; Id., *Die antiochenischen Synoden gegen Paul von Samosata*: AHC 18 (1986) 9-30; 11.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

HELIODORUS (d. before 404). Bishop of Altinum (near Aquileia), saint. Feast 3 July. Renounced a military career to become a priest. Friend of *Jerome, he was, with *Rufinus, *Chromatius and others, part of the *ascetic community of *Aquileia (ca. 372); he followed Jerome to Syria but later returned to Aquileia and became bishop of Altinum. As such he took part in the Council of Aquileia (381). He and Chromatius, now bishop of Aquileia, kept up a correspondence with Jerome, then at Bethlehem, relying on his help for scriptural questions (Jerome, *Ep.* 48-49) and sending him copyists and financial help. Jerome dedicated the Vulgate Wisdom books to them both.

DCB II, 887-888; BS 4, 1076-1077; PCBE 2, 965-967.

E. Prinzivalli

HELIOGABALUS (204–222). Emperor (218–222), his real name was Varius Avitus Bassianus, a native of *Emesa in *Syria: he came from a family of hereditary priests of the local sun-god, El Gabal, whence his surname. Proclaimed emperor at only 14 years of age by the soldiers stationed in Syria, in opposition to Opellius Macrinus (Caracalla's murderer), this corrupt young prince tried to impose a distinctly Eastern form of government on the whole empire. Given his enthusiasm for the solar cult, of which he was a priest, he did not defend the old Roman religion: indeed, acc. to Aelius Lampridius (*Hist. Augusta: Vita Heliog.* 3, 3ff.), he displayed a resolve to fuse all religions, including the *christiana devotio,* with his cult of the Sun. He was tolerant, if not benevolent, to the Christians, not out of eccentricity but because this attitude corresponded to the political line of the Severi; indeed, Heliogabalus's murder in 222 did not influence this policy, which was continued by his cousin *Alexander Severus.

C. Giannelli - S. Mazzarino, *Trattato di Storia Romana*, II, Rome 1962; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, 237-239 and 434 (bibl.).; T. Optendrenk, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Elagabal im Spiegel der Historia Augusta*, Bonn 1968; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; M. Christol, *L'Empire romain du III^e siècle. Histoire politique (192-325 après J.-C.)*, Paris 1997; M. Frey, *Untersuchungen zur Religion und zur Religionspolitik des Kaisers Elagabal*, Stuttgart 1989.

L. Navarra

HELLADIUS of Caesarea (4th c.). Bishop of *Caesarea in Cappadocia, he succeeded *Basil in 379. Participated in the Council of *Constantinople (381) and the Synod of Constantinople (394), in which the schism between Agapius and Bagadius was resolved. At times his relations with *Gregory of Nyssa and *Gregory of Nazianzus were stormy, esp. when Helladius removed Sacerdos (Σακερδώς) from the direction of the hospice for the poor founded by Basil (Greg. Naz., *Ep.* 219-220).

DCB II, 889.

E. Prinzivalli

HELLADIUS of Tarsus (5th c.). Friend and fellow student of *Nestorius and a faithful companion of *Theodoret, Helladius is known to us through the Latin translation of seven letters, some of which, to tell the truth, are collective. The translation was done by *Rusticus, the Roman deacon deposed by *Vigilius in 550 and who, after an exile in Egypt, ended his days at *Constantinople in the convent of the *Acoemetae. For his collection Rusticus used the five-volume work *Tragoedia* by Irenaeus of Tyre, a loyal friend of Nestorius; from there he took Helladius's correspondence. In many letters addressed to *Alexander of Hierapolis, Helladius laments the intervention of the Egyptians. Before consenting, in

a synodal letter in common with the bishops of *Cilicia, to the provisions of Ephesus in a letter addressed to the emperors, Helladius had addressed a letter to Nestorius himself in which the nobility of religious sentiment shows to what extent he felt forced to acquiesce.

CPG 6435-6443; ACO v. 1, 4, Berlin 1922-23, letters 157, 199, 202, 218, 252, 281, 282; PG 84, 675-746.

M. van Esbroeck

HELLENISM and CHRISTIANITY. It was inevitable that the Christian religion should confront, from its very beginnings, the Greek culture that had permeated first the Hellenistic world and then the Roman Empire itself. While Christian authors all agreed in their radical rejection of Greek religion—its anthropomorphic polytheism and its mythology—their attitudes to Greek philosophy display a gamut of different nuances, which can be summed up in three distinct positions: from the 1st to the 5th c., Christian authors oscillate between (1) a rejection and total condemnation, (2) a moderate openness, (3) and an enthusiasm, leading even to an impassioned defense of Hellenic thought, not prejudiced by the conviction—inherited from *Hellenistic Judaism—of its substantial dependence on the Hebrew books (*see* *theft of the Greeks). The question of the various Christian authors' attitude to Greek philosophy must always be kept distinct from the presence in their thought of doctrines coming from the various Greek philosophical schools (*see* *Aristotelianism; *Platonism and the Fathers; *Stoicism and the Fathers). The case of *Tertullian shows that his rejection of any type of rapport with Greek philosophy does not correspond to a total absence in his thought of the influence of Stoicism. St. Paul had already put the Christian communities on guard against the errors and deceptions represented by philosophy, identified *sic et simpliciter* with human and wordly knowledge and hence condemned (see the famous passage of Col 2:8); philosophical knowledge is not just a source of deception (Col 2:8) but also puffs up (1 Cor 8:1) and is immeasurably inferior to God's wisdom (1 Cor 1:25). Both *Tatian and *Athenagoras show themselves to possess a fair knowledge of Greek philosophy; but whereas Tatian shows only contempt for it, since he considers it dependent on "barbarian philosophy" (*Ad Graecos* c. 1, 2-4: Schwartz, c. 31 p. 31, 4-5) and full of incongruities and contradictions (c. 25 pp. 26,28-27,9), Athenagoras (*Pro christ.* c. 6 pp. 6,13-7,29 Schwartz) appreciates the teaching of the major philosophical schools: with the intention of demonstrating to the emperor *Marcus Aurelius that there is no real irreconcilability between Christian monotheism and Greek philosophy. He emphasizes that Philolaus, Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics themselves had affirmed the existence of one God (see pp. 7,23; 7,27). Tatian's completely negative attitude reappears in the author of the *Cohortatio ad gentes,* who rejects the doctrines of all the philosophers, emphasizes their contradictions and reaffirms, from ch. 9 on, Moses's greater antiquity than the Greeks.

*Justin martyr explores the line that Athenagoras had begun to trace: the theory of the dependence of the Greek philosophers on Moses (see 1 *Apol.* 44, 8-9 p. 36,28-37,4 Krüger; I, 59-60 pp. 50-51) is for him a proof of the presence in everyone, and hence also in the Greek philosophers, of "seeds of truth" (1 *Apol.* 44, 10 p. 37, 4-5). Moreover, the Greek writers succeeded in attaining a faint knowledge of the truth, either thanks to their reason, the fragment of the universal *logos* innate in human beings (2 *Apol.* 8, 1 p. 67, 5-6; 13, 5 p. 72, 6-7), or by participation in the "disseminated" gifts of the universal *logos* itself, which functions as "sower" (2 *Apol.* 8, 3 p. 67, 11; 10, 2 p. 68, 17-19; 13, 3 p. 71, 28-30). So not only is there no real opposition between philosophy and Christianity, but we may even affirm a substantial identity between them ("all speak in imitation of our doctrines," 1 *Apol.* 60, 10 p. 51, 13-14; "what all have said well, belongs to us Christians," 2 *Apol.* 13, 4 p. 72, 1-2).

In no patristic author does the rejection of Greek philosophy take on such virulent tones as in Tertullian: *Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid academiae et ecclesiae? Quid haereticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quaerendum. Viderint qui stoicum et platonicum et dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt* (*De praescr.* 7, 9-11). The last sentence of this passage shows that around the mid-2nd c., attempts at a synthesis of Christianity and philosophy were already being made, of the kind done by Justin, in whose work Stoic and Platonic influences are undeniable. Tertullian does not hesitate to assert that philosophy is the origin of all heresies, *ipsae denique haereses a philosophia subornantur* (*De praeser.* 7, 2 cf. *De an.* 3, 1 *philosophis . . . patriarchis . . . haereticorum*), basing himself on the authority of St. Paul's passage, Col 2:8, cited in *De praescr.* 7,7. This total rejection of philosophy is not mitigated by the admission that agreement sometimes exists between the philosophers and Christianity, *plane non negabimus aliquando philosophos iuxta nostra sensisse* (*De an.* 2, 1),

and that Seneca often seems a Christian, *Seneca saepe noster* (*De an.* 20, 1). Tertullian's judgment of philosophy as the origin of all heresies is fully shared by *Hippolytus: all the leaders of the heretical sects drew on the philosophers (*Ref.* I, 4, 7-9 Wendland); in particular, *Valentinus appropriated Platonic and Stoic doctrines (*Ref.* VI, 3: 134, 9-11); *Secundus, *Ptolemy and *Heracleon "made use of the very teachings of the Greek sages" (*Ref.* VI, 4: 134, 13-14); and what *Basilides taught came not from Christ but from Aristotle (*Ref.* VII, 14: 191, 13-14 and 17-18). For Epiphanius, the various Greek philosophical systems should be counted among the heresies (*Pan.* 3, 1-9; 5, 1-8, 1: I 163-166 Holl); *Origen himself fell into heresy, deceiving his followers, because he was blinded by his excessive "Greek education" (*Pan.* 64, 72, 9: II 523, 14-18 Holl; see also H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 100).

If Athenagoras and Justin had laid stress on the substantial harmony between Christianity and the teaching of the various Greek philosophical schools, and if Justin had gone so far as to connect philosophy with the universal *logos*—i.e., with Christ himself—in *Clement of Alexandria we see a further and consequent development of this tendency. In him there is not just a great openness to Greek thought: aware of the fact that the Christian religion could never have become a theology without the decisive contribution of Hellenism, in books I and VI of the *Stromata* he does not hesitate to defend the latter before the members of his own Christian community, the *simpliciores,* who felt only diffidence and fear of it, considering it, like Tertullian, the origin of all heresy. Clement considered the Hellenistic-Jewish theory of the dependence of the Greeks on the OT—which develops with a great show of erudition in books I, V and VI of the *Stromata*—a further reason not to reject philosophy. (Ch. 25 of book I of the *Stromata* is very instructive on the theme.) Like Justin, whose subject matter he develops and enriches through motifs and images from Hellenistic-Jewish philosophy and Philo, he affirms that the Greek philosophers succeeded in knowing part of the truth, thanks either to the divine element present in the human being (the intellect, image of the *logos*) or to the direct inspiration of the *logos,* which, in the guise of a sower, lets fall the good seeds, depicted as a beneficent rain (*Strom.* I 37, 2); into all those who engage in philosophy a divine rain is infused (*Protr.* 68, 2: I 52, 2-4). The different systems of Greek philosophy, with the single exception of the Epicurean, are thus fragments of the truth—identical with the *logos*—separated from each other like the members of Pentheus's body (*Strom.* I 57, 1: II 36, 8-11); by proceeding to the reunion of the partial truths dispersed in the various systems, it is possible to attain contemplation of the absolute truth (*Strom.* I 57, 6: II 36, 31-37, 2). For this reason philosophy as a whole is a clear image of the truth, a gift of God to the Greeks (*Strom.* I, 20, 1: II 29-30). Thanks to its coming from the divine *logos,* it plays in human history the providential role of preparing the Greeks for Christianity, as the Mosaic law had done for the Jews. Clement also makes his own Philo's conception of philosophy as "handmaiden of theology": this relation between philosophy and Christian theology is fulfilled both in history (Greek philosophy is an anticipation of Christianity) and in the progress toward higher *gnosis* of the Christian who wishes to become perfect, since it is philosophy that, guiding the exegesis of Scripture, discloses its truer, recondite meaning (on all these points see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 9-59).

Origen, even more than Clement, is aware of the need for a deeper knowledge of the "classical" systems of Greek philosophy (Platonism, Stoicism, Aristotelianism), and also of the most important philosophical works of the first three centuries AD, in view both of the construction of a "Christian theology" and of the defense of Christianity against the attacks of its enemies. (His work *Contra Celsum* is the clearest evidence of this latter intent.) For this reason, as he himself says in a letter preserved by Eusebius (*HE* VI, 19, 13: II 562, 12-17), he did not hesitate to follow the lectures of an Alexandrian philosopher, who should probably be identified with *Ammonius Saccas (on Origen as Ammonius's pupil see Porphyry in Eusebius, *HE* VI, 19, 6: II 558, 26-27; Theodoret, *Graec. aff. cur.* VI, 96, PG 83, 977 B 1-5 and also W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 1 and H. Chadwick, 68). Origen's great erudition in the field of Greek philosophy is attested by Porphyry in Eusebius, *HE* VI, 19, 6-7: II 558, 26-560, 7 (but Porphyry is wrong in thinking him a pagan converted only subsequently to Christianity: see E.R. Dodds, *Numenius and Ammonius*, in *Les sources de Plotin, Entr. sur l'ant. class.* V, Geneva 1960, 31 n. 1) and by Epiphanius, who ascribes his heresies to this (*Pan.* 64, 72-79: II 523, 14-18 Holl). The deep commitment to the study of the various philosophers that characterized the school of which Origen was head—only the openly "atheist" authors were excluded—is recorded by *Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Panegyric to Origen* XIII, 150-153 (p. 158 Crouzel, SC 148, Paris 1969). A careful reading of *Contra Celsum* shows both the diligence that Origen put into the study of

philosophical works and their real assimilation: the citations of passages from Celsus are accompanied by a precise discussion, in which the criticisms often do not rule out the acceptance of certain doctrines of the Platonist philosopher (*see* *cosmos). And yet, as J. Quasten (*Patrologia* I, Turin 1967, 318) and H. Chadwick (102) have noted, Origen's attitude to Greek philosophy is much less amicable than Clement's, though he shares Clement's idea of the propaedeutic value of philosophy in the study of Christian doctrines and scriptural exegesis (see the letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus, c. 1, pp. 186, 10-188, 14 ed. Crouzel, SC 148; cf., e.g., Clement, *Strom.* I 28, 1: II 17, 33).

*Eusebius of Caesarea makes his own the thesis of Athenagoras, Justin and Clement on the substantial accord between Greek philosophy and Jewish wisdom (*Praep. ev.* X, 4, 1: I 567, 20-22: "Those of the Greeks who have approached philosophy in the best way and have had theological ideas above the vulgar opinions have not discovered any true doctrines different from those already in vogue among the Jews"). To prove this thesis, Eusebius first documents, in almost all of book X (chs. 4-14), the greater antiquity of the Hebrews than the Greeks, citing large sections of the works of Clement, Sextus *Julius Africanus, Tatian and Josephus; he then goes on in book XI (II, 5-81) to show the accord between Mosaic teaching and Greek thought, which depends on the former (this dependence is openly affirmed in *Praep. ev.* X, 14, 19: I 613, 12-13). As for Clement, so for Eusebius the highest teachings of Greek philosophy prepare Christianity in history: in the title (in GCS) of book XII of the *Praeparatio evangelica* it is said explicitly that Plato did not profess beliefs different from the Christian ones (II, 91).

St. *Basil the Great, in his *Address to the Young on How to Profit from Greek Letters* (ed. F. Boulenger, Paris 1935), shows great openness toward Greek literary works: the precepts of some secular authors agree with those of the gospel and are therefore useful also on the moral plane (see ch. 5). On St. *Augustine's great enthusiasm for *Neoplatonism before his conversion—analogous to that of Justin Martyr for the "*Middle Platonism" of the 2nd c.—and on his comparison between Neoplatonist and Christian doctrines esp. in *De civitate Dei, see* *Platonism and the Fathers. It is enough to record here that his judgment on the Neoplatonists recalls that of Athenagoras, Justin Martyr, Clement and Eusebius on Greek philosophy: there are no significant differences between Neoplatonists and Christians, *paucis mutatis christiani fierent* (*De vera rel.* c. XII); *apud platonicos me interim quod sacris litteris nostris non repugnet repertum esse confido* (*Contra Acad.* III, 20).

In the study of the relation between Hellenism and Christianity, another fundamental aspect must be borne in mind, that of the radically critical, contemptuous and polemical attitude of the pagan intelligentsia toward the new religion and the immediate apologetic reaction on the part of Christians, a phenomenon already present in the 2nd c. and that would continue until the late 5th c. Already *Galen, as R. Walzer has shown (see bibli.), does not hide his reservations regarding the Christian idea of faith. The criticism of Christianity assumed a radical and vehement tone in the *Truthful Discourse* of the Middle Platonist philosopher *Celsus (178) and in *Porphyry's great work *Against the Christians,* from the 2nd half of the 3rd c. The 4th c. saw a revival with the emperor *Julian, a follower of the Neoplatonist *Iamblichus, in his work *Against the Galileans,* composed at Antioch between 362–363 and to a large degree dependent on Porphyry. The Christian reaction was prompt and vigorous: Clement, when he elaborates his doctrine of *pistis,* is not unaware of objections against the idea of faith like those of Galen (see Lilla, *Clement of Alex.*, 118 n. 1); he probably has Celsus's theory of the *archaios logos* clearly in mind when he polemically sustains the dependence of the more recent Greek wisdom on the more ancient wisdom of the Eastern peoples, and esp. on that of the Hebrew people (Lilla, 31-41). Origen responds directly to Celsus in *Contra Celsum;* replies to Porphyry came from *Methodius of Olympus, Eusebius of Caesarea, *Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Philostorgius and, in the Latin West, *Arnobius. *Cyril of Alexandria and *Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote against Julian. Indeed, it is to Christian authors that we owe the preservation of fragments of the anti-Christian writings of Celsus, Porphyry and Julian, which would have otherwise been lost.

E. de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1906; E.R. Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*, London 1921; C.N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, Oxford 1944; J. Daniélou, *Message evangélique et culture hellénistique*, Tournai 1961; W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, Cambridge, MA 1961; A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963; E.R. Dodds, *Pagans and Christians in an Age of Anxiety*, Cambridge 1965; H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966; H. Crouzel, *Grégoire le Thaumaturge. Remerciement à Origène*, SC 148, Paris 1969, 68-70; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971; J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, London 1977; D. Wyrwa, *Die christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, Berlin 1983; M. Simonetti, *Cristianesimo antico e cultura greca*, Rome 1983; R. Berchman, *From Philo to Origen: Middle Platonism in Transition*, Chicago 1984; P. Hadot, *Exer-*

cices spirituals et philosophie antique, Paris 1987, 57-84; M.C. Bartolomei, *Ellenizzazione del Cristianesimo*, Methodus 12, L'Aquila-Rome 1994.

See also the following:

1. On Galen: R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians*, Oxford 1949, 14-15, 53 (taken from Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 118 n. 1).

2. On Celsus, Origen and the possible response of Clement to Celsus: L. Rougier, *Celse ou le conflit de la civilisation antique et du Christianisme primitif*, Paris 1925; A. Miura Stange, *Celsus und Origenes. Das gemeinsame ihrer Weltanschauung*, Beiheft 4 zur ZNW, Giessen 1926; R. Bader, *Der* Ἀληθὴς λόγος *des Kelsos*, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 33, Stuttgart-Berlin 1940 (collection of fragments of Celsus); C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos. Die polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 30, Berlin 1955; H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, tr. with intr. and notes, Cambridge 1965; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 34-41; H. Dörrie, *Die platonische Theologie des Kelsos in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit der christlichen Theologie*, NAWG Phil. Hist. Kl. 1967, 2 (= Platonica Minora, Munich 1976, 229-262); K. Pickler, *Streit um das Christentum: der Angriff des Kelsos und die Antwort des Origenes*, Regensburger Studien zur Theologie, Bern 1980; var. aus., *Discorsi di Verità: Paganesimo, Giudaismo e Cristianesimo a confronto nel Contro Celso di Origene*, ed. L. Perrone, SEA 61, Rome 1998; J.W. Hargis, *Against the Christians. The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*, PSt 1, New York 1999, 17-61.

3. On Porphyry: A. Harnack, *Porphyrius "Gegen die Christen" 15 Bücher Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate*: AKPA (1916), 1, 1-115; Id., *Neue Fragmente des Werks des Porphyrius gegen die Christen*: AKPA (1921) 266-284, 834-835; E. Nestle, *Die Haupteinwände des antiken Denkens gegen das Christentum*, in *Griechische Studien*, Stuttgart 1948, 597-660 (Aalen ²1968; It. tr. ed. G. Piccaluga, Florence 1973, 463-520); A. Meredith, *Porphyry and Julian Against the Christians*: ANRW II 23,2 (1980) 1119-1149; G. Rinaldi, *L'Antico Testamento nella polemica anticristiana di Porfirio di Tiro*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 97-111; Id., *Tracce di controversia tra pagani e cristiani nella letteratura patristica delle Quaestiones et Responsiones*: Annali della Storia dell'Esegesi 6 (1989) 99-124; Id., *Biblia Gentium. Primo contributo per un indice delle citazioni, dei riferimenti e delle allusioni alla Bibbia in autori pagani, greci e latini, di età imperiale*, Rome 1989; J.H. Hargis, *Against the Christians. The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*, PSt 1, New York 1999, 63-90.

4. On Basil: Basilio di Cesarea, *Discorso ai giovani*, ed. N. Naldini, Biblioteca Patristica 3, Florence 1984.

5. On Julian, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Mopsuestia: C. Neumann, *Juliani imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt*, Leipzig 1880; W.J. Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity: The Conflict Between Hellenic and Christian Wisdom in the Contra Galileos of Julian the Apostate*, AG 210, Rome 1978; A. Meredith, *Porphyry and Julian Against the Christians*: ANRW II 23,2 (1980) 1119-1149; P. Athanassiadi, *Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography*, Oxford 1981, London-New York ²1992; A. Guida, *Frammenti inediti del "Contro i Galilei" di Giuliano e della replica di Teodoro di Mopsuestia*: Prometheus 9 (1983) 139-163; Id., *La rinunzia evangelica ai beni: la polemica di Giuliano e la replica di Teodoro di Mopsuestia*: Sileno 10 (1984) 277-287; Id., *Teodoro di Mopsuestia. Replica a Giuliano imperatore*, Biblioteca Patristica 24, Florence 1994; J.H. Hargis, *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*, PSt 1, New York 1999, 91-127.

6. On the 4th c.: J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang der griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, Heidelberg 1929, Darmstadt ²1972, 90-177; A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963.

7. On Arnobius: P. Courcelle, *Anti-Christian Arguments and Christian Platonism*, in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, 151-192 (on Porphyry as the object of Arnobius response, see p. 156); E.C. Fortin, *The viri novi of Arnobius and the Conflict Between Faith and Reason in the Early Christian Centuries*, in var. aus., *The Heritage of the Early Church*, Essays in Honour of the Very Rev. Georges Vasilievich Florovsky, OCA 195, Rome 1973, 197-226 (on Porphyry, see p. 220).

S. Lilla

HELLENISTIC JUDAISM. Hellenistic Judaism refers to the encounter and fusion between the Jewish religion and Greek language, culture and philosophy which took place mostly in *Alexandria in Egypt in the period between the 3rd c. BC and the 1st c. AD. The first encounter on a large scale between Judaism and Hellenism occurred in the Greek translation of the OT known as the Septuagint, i.e., "translation of the Seventy" (on this translation, which is not only the work of various authors but also dates to different periods—its oldest nucleus is represented by the translation of the Pentateuch, carried out perhaps under Ptolemy Philadelphus, 283–247 BC—and on the later translations of Aquila, *Symmachus and *Theodotion, see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, III, Leipzig 1909, 424-442; R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs*, Paris 1954, 102-108). The *Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates* refers with a wealth of details to the facts which led to the "translation of the Seventy"; modern criticism has raised strong doubts concerning its historical value (see, e.g., Schürer, 424), and it should be considered a spurious work, composed between 200 and 100 BC (see Schürer, 611).

Given the spread of the Greek language and culture in the entire E Mediterranean from the beginning of the 3rd c. BC—the center of its dissemination being Alexandria in Egypt—it is no wonder that numerous authors of Hebrew race and religion between the 3rd c. BC and the 1st c. AD wrote their works directly in *koine* Greek, taking as models the products of classical and Hellenistic Greek literature, in which the different literary genres were already clearly established. It is not possible here to list even in summary fashion all the various exponents of this Hellenistic Jewish literature, which counts historians such as Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Malchus, the author of the second and third books of

the Maccabees, Tallus, Flavius Josephus, Justus of Tiberias, epic and dramatic poets such as Philo and Ezekiel, philosophers such as the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, Aristobulus, Philo of Alexandria and pagan authors who loved to write verses masquerading as "classics" but which in reality are of a clear Jewish stamp, such as ps.-Hecataeus, ps.-Phocylides, ps.-Menander and the author of the Sibylline verses. (An exhaustive and detailed treatment can be found in vol. III, p. 468-633, of the already cited and fundamental work of E. Schürer.)

We will, however, linger briefly over the major exponents of Hellenistic Jewish philosophy, which have enormous importance in the birth of Greek patristic literature and in which doctrines can already be discerned which anticipate *Neoplatonism by several centuries.

In the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus, composed in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. BC (see Schürer, 216-217), the motif of the self-revelation within the entire creation of the wisdom of God (1:9 and 1:19) is a clear prelude to the Philonian idea of the goods and graces which pour out like rain onto humankind (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 18-19) and to the Neoplatonic doctrine of the ἀπόρροια or ἀπορροή, concerning the pouring out into the universe of the overflowing power of the first and second hypostases.

The Wisdom of Solomon, composed after the Ecclesiasticus and prior to Philo (see Schürer, 508), reveals a strong Stoic imprint: in the wisdom of God which contains in itself an "intelligent, holy and subtle spirit" which traverses everything and stretches from one end of the universe to the other governing it in a just way (7:22-23; 8:1), it is impossible not to recognize the Stoic doctrine of the *Weltpneuma,* the immanent divine principle of the universe, identical with λόγος, with πῦρ, with πρόνοια and with fate, which fulfills the same functions (see SVF I, 87, 88, 153, 158, 159, 161, 530, 533; II, 310, 1009, 1029, 1033, 1035, 1037; II, 454: on the spirit which stretches from one extremity to the other); also Stoic is the idea of a providence which governs everything (Wis 14:1; see, e.g., SVF II, 634, 1106-1126), the designation of wisdom as τεχνῖτις (14:2; cf. the πῦρ τεχνικόν of SVF II 1027), the emphasis put on the four cardinal virtues (*Sap* 8,6-7; cf. Schürer, 508). The doctrine of the divine ἀπόρροια, which would have so much importance in Clement and in Neoplatonism, is already clearly formulated in Wis 7:25; and an obvious anticipation of the Neoplatonic theme of the μονή and the πρόοδος is found at 7:27: "despite remaining in itself, it renews everything and transferring itself into holy souls."

An important place in Hellenistic Jewish philosophy belongs to Aristobulus, who lived around the middle of the 2nd c. BC, at the time of Ptolemy VI Philometor (see Schürer, 512 and N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, TU 86, Berlin 1964, 38-40). The testimonies about him and his fragments—both present above all in Clement of Alexandria and in Eusebius and to a lesser degree also in Anatolius, Origen and the second book of Maccabees—have been collected and analyzed by N. Walter (7-9, 10-35; see also Schürer, 512-522). The attempts to deny the authenticity of the work of Aristobulus and his existence in the 2nd c. BC carried out by R. Simon, by H. Hody and later by A. Elter have been adequately criticized by L.C. Valckenaer, *Diatriba de Aristobulo Iudaeo*, Lugd. Bat. 1806, 19-29, by Schürer, 512-522 and by N. Walter. (For a history of the problem, see Walter, 1-5, where the references to the works of Simon, Hody and Elter can also be found.) Aristobulus was one of the main supporters—perhaps even the most important—of the idea, taken up again by Philo of Alexandria, by various Christian authors and also by Numenius (see Clement, *Strom.* I, 150,4; Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XI, 10,14 = Numenius, fr. 8 Des Places p. 51), of the dependence of the Greek philosophers and poets on the OT: in his work dedicated to Ptolemy Philometor he does not hesitate to affirm the existence of a Greek translation of the Hebrew books rather more ancient than that of the Septuagint (see Clement, *Strom.* I, 150,2 and Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 12,1 = F 3a and F 3 Walter, 7-8) nor to cite, as chapter 12 of book XIII of the *Praeparatio evangelica* shows, a long series of poetic fragments attributed to various classical Greek authors but in reality the work of a Jewish falsifier who acc. to Schürer (595-596) should be identified with ps.-Hecataeus, the author of a writing on Abraham and cited by Clement, *Strom.* V, 113,1. (On the entire question concerning the transmission of these falsified verses, present in Clement, *Strom.* V, 107,1-133,3, in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 12,1-16 and in the writings *Cohortatio ad gentes* and *De monarchia* falsely attributed to Justin Martyr—the spurious origin of some of which was already acknowledged by A. Scheck, *De fontibus Clementis Alexandrini*, Augustae Vindelicorum 1889, 40-47, by L. Valckenaer, 8-10, and by A. Boeckh, *Graecae tragoediae principum*, Heidelberg 1808, 146-164—see Schürer, 595-603 and esp. N. Walter, 150-261.) As Walter justly noted (10-11) great importance should not be given to the description of Aristobulus as a peripatetic, present in Clement, *Strom.* I, 72,4 (= T2 Walter) and in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 12,1 (= F 3 Walter), despite his admiration for the peripatetic ideal of *ataraxia* (see

Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 12,10: F 5 Walter); on the presence of this theme in Aristobulus see M. Pohlenz, *Klemens von Alexandreia und sein hellenisches Christentum*: NAWG 1943, 141, n. 1, and Walter, 11, n. 2.

In Philo of Alexandria, who lived toward the end of the 1st c. BC and the 1st half of the 1st c. AD, Hellenistic Jewish philosophy reached its highest expression. In his writings, which seek to be a "philosophical" interpretation of the books of the OT, the synthesis between Jewish religion and Greek thought seems perfect: the allegorical interpretation of the Scripture, seeking to reveal what for Philo is its more hidden and truer meaning, different from the literal, is conducted on the base of the Greek philosophy of the late Hellenistic period, characterized by a would-be cultural syncretism which is found later in the so-called Middle Platonism of the first two centuries AD and in Neoplatonism. The thought of Philo, in fact, receives and melts together into a single coherent system—which would have great influence on the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers—different elements coming from Neo-Pythagoreanism, peripatetism and esp. from Platonism and Stoicism. From Neo-Pythagoreanism comes the speculations on the numbers six, seven, ten and on the monad (Clement, *Strom.* 1,72,4: II, 46,17 designates Philo as πυθαγόρειος). Of peripatetic origin is the doctrine of virtue as the just mean. The veneration for Plato and for the formula ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν (*Theatetus* 176b); the accentuation of the transcendence of God; the adoption of the Platonic ideas considered not only as models of sensible objects and as κόσμος νοητός but also as thoughts of God contained in his mind; the tendency—present in *De opificio mundi*—to interpret the origin of the world not as a true and proper *creatio ex nihilo* but rather as the result of the intervention of the divine intelligence, imposing order, forms and qualities on preexisting matter, which was originally absolutely formless; the tripartition of the human soul; the doctrine of the virtue as a "harmony" of the soul; the celebration of contemplative life; and the use of terms from the mystery cults in the designation of the highest awareness of God are all characteristic elements of the Platonic tradition of the first two centuries AD. The concept of the λόγος understood as a divine principle diffused in all the universe and as a supreme law (νόμος) of nature is of clear Stoic derivation. Equally of Stoic origin is his idea of the universe as a well-ordered state, of which human beings are citizens. The doctrine of the λόγος as a summation of the ideas identical with the δυνάμεις which are spread everywhere reveals a syncretism of Platonism and Stoicism. Of Stoic origin finally is the division of the soul into seven parts, the definitions of the four cardinal virtues, the doctrine of the nature and origin of the passions—dating back to Posidonius—and the theme—this too present in Posidonius—of their control through reason which acts as pilot and chariot and the ideal of ἀπάθεια, taken from the oldest Stoicism. All these elements of Philonian ethics are found in the syncretistic Platonism of the first two centuries AD, while the adoption of the double ethical state, whose two steps are represented by μετριοπάθεια and by ἀπάθεια (the latter practically identified with ὁμοίωσις θεῷ) would become one of the fundamental characteristics of Neoplatonic ethics. (All the Philonian doctrines mentioned here are treated thoroughly in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, where their relationships with Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism are also demonstrated.)

In the *4 Maccabees*, composed in the 1st c. AD (see Schürer, 526), we find clear Stoic elements in the themes of the control and regulation of the passions on the part of reason, of the ὀρθός λόγος, of wisdom (σοφία) understood as the science of human and divine things and of their causes, of the law as education, of the four cardinal virtues and of the passions (1,13-35; 2,1-3,5). The propensity for the simple moderation of the passions and the explicit exclusion of their total destruction show that the author is under the influence not of the earlier Stoicism but the "middle" Stoicism of Panaetius and of Posidonius.

L.C. Valckenaer, *Diatriba de Aristobulo Iudaeo, philosopho peripatetico Alexandrino*, Lugd. Bat. 1806; A. Boeckh, *Graecae tragoediae principum Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis, num ea quae supersunt genuina omnia sint*, Heidelberg 1808; A.F. Daehne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*, Halle 1834; A. Scheck, *De fontibus Clementis Alexandrini*, Augustae Vindelic, 1889; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* III, Leipzig 1909; P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, Tübingen 1912; C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, Oxford [2]1913; K. Praechter, in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, Berlin 1926, I, 569-578; H.A. Wolfson, *Philo*, Cambridge, MA 1947; N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, TU 86, Berlin 1964; U. Früchtel, *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien*, Leiden 1968; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971; M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr.*, Tübingen 1966; Id., *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren: Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlichen Zeit*, Stuttgart 1976; Id., *Giudaismo ed Ellenismo*, Brescia 2001; M. Black (ed.), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, 3 vols., Edinburgh 1973–1987; A-M. Denis (ed.), *Introduction à la littérature religieuse Judéo-Hellénistique*, 2 vols., Turnhout 2000; A. Magris, *La Filosofia ellenistica. Scuole, dottrine ed interazioni col mondo giudaico*, Brescia 2001.

S. Lilla

HELVIDIUS (d. before 383). Perhaps a Roman layman, disciple of the *Arian Auxentius of Milan. According to *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 32), he disputed with the monk Carterius (the name is uncertain), who seems to have written an apology for the monastic life in which he referred to Mary's perpetual virginity. Helvidius replied with a work in which he tried to maintain that Mary had other children after Jesus. We know of Helvidius's work through *Jerome's refutation of it in *Adversus Helvidium de perpetua virginitate b. Mariae,* composed ca. 383. Both Jerome and Gennadius stress, among other things, the stylistic mediocrity of Helvidius's work.

F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son œuvre*, Louvain-Paris 1922, I, 94-100; G. Jouassard, *La personnalité d'Helvidius*: Mél. Saunier, Lyon 1944, 139-156; G. Rocca, *L'*Adversus Helvidium *di San Girolamo nel contesto della letteratura ascetico-mariana del secolo IV*, Bern 1998, 55-69.

S. Zincone

HEMORRHAGING WOMAN (iconography). The scene of the healing of the woman with a hemorrhage (Mt 9:20-22; Mk 5:25-34; Lk 8:43-48), which alludes to the profound sentiment of faith felt by Christians toward Christ's thaumaturgical divinity, is often confused, in figurative art, with that of the Canaanite woman (Mt 15:22-28; Mk 7:24-30), because of the similar attitude of the two women. In fact, in accordance with the biblical episode—of which iconography ordinarily depicts the key moment—the hemorrhaging woman is only portrayed when, bowing or kneeling, she touches the hem of Christ's garment and is healed. This scene can be recognized in a painting of the cemetery of Praetextatus (Wp 20), dated to the 3rd c. and thought to be the earliest example; it also appears five times at Marcellino e Pietro (Wp 1; 130; 99, 1; WMM, 815; A. Ferrua, *Una nuova*, 61). Various examples are found on Roman *sarcophagi from the time of Constantine (Ws 39, 1; 123, 2) until the 5th c. (Milan, S. Celso, Ws 243, 5); at Civita Castellana (Ws 143, 3); in Gaul and in Spain. The miracle of the hemorrhaging woman is also in the ivory chapel of Brescia (6th c.) and on the Pesaro pyx. It is thought that the prototype for the latter depiction is a bronze group described by Eusebius (*HE* 7, 18), preserved in the city of Paneas (Caesarea Philippi), where the miracle occurred. Some depictions thought to be of this scene are not (e.g., sarcophagus of St. Engracia = Bovini, *Sarc.*, n. 48, and a mosaic in S. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna [Volbach - Hirmer, 90]), since the kneeling woman has her hands folded and does not touch Christ's cloak.

DACL VI, 2200-2209; EC V, 316-317; LCI I, 312-314; G.P. Kirsch, *Cripte dipinte del cimitero dei SS. Pietro e Marcellino*: RivAC 7 (1930) 210; Benoit, *Sarc.*, nn. 2, 39, 45, 53; Bovini, *Sarc.*, nn. 3, 29, 30 (dubious); A. Ferrua, *Una nuova regione della catacomba dei SS. Marcellino e Pietro*: RivAC 46 (1970) 7ff.; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Märtyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 309, 313, 367, 369; M. Perraymond, *Il miracolo dell'emorroissa nell'arte paleocristiana*, in *Atti della V Settimana di Studi "Sangue e Antropologia. Riti e Culto,"* Rome 1984, 1719-1728; Id., *L'emorroissa e la cananea nell'arte paleocristiana*: Bessarione 5 (1986) 147-174; C. Stella, *Scheda n. 5b. li*, in var. aus., *Milano capitale dell'Impero Romano 286-402 d.C.*, Milan 1990; C. Ravara, *Scheda n. 107*, in A. Donati (ed.), *Dalla terra alle genti. La diffusione del cristianesimo nei primi secoli*, Milan 1996; J. Dresken-Weiland, *Repertorium der christlichantiken Sarcophage - II*, Mainz am Rhein 1998, nn. 124, 250, 4; M. Perraymond, *Emorroissa* (s.v.), in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 171-173.

M. Perraymond

HENANA of Adiabene (d. ca. 610). Native of the province of *Adiabene, as is indicated by the epithet which accompanies his name, *Henana studied in the school of *Nisibis, in the time of *Abraham of Beth Rabban (509–569), had as his master someone named Moses and then became professor himself. After reactions provoked by some of his expressions with regard to *christology, he was made to leave the city for a period of time by the bishop Paul. But he returned fairly quickly after the death of Abraham, since in 572 he became superior of the school. Henana lived until about 610. In christology, he was accused of supporting the doctrine of one hypostasis and two natures, though the few fragments which have come down to us do not sustain this accusation. In exegesis, he may have distanced himself from *Theodore of Mopsuestia in favor of the exegetical method of *John Chrysostom. In the liturgy, he is said to have had various hymns in the liturgical office suppressed (probably of *Narsai), because they were too imbued with *Nestorianism; but this is perhaps a polemical stereotype. Such tendencies and opinions provoked, in the long run, violent reactions from the official hierarchy, which was Nestorian, in particular from the *catholicoi* *Isho'yahb III (585), Sabrisho' (596) and Gregory I (605). Nevertheless, Sabrisho', in the course of his catholicosate (596–604), after an unfavorable first reaction, defended Henana against his fiercest enemies. This caused a revolution within the school, which a large number of students are said to have abandoned in protest. With the intention of restoring the school to its former prestige, Henana established new statutes and had them proclaimed by the bishop of Nisibis, Simeon (580).

According to 'Abdisho', Henana produced a large number of writings: commentaries on a number of OT books (Genesis, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, the Minor Prophets), commentaries on the gospel of Mark and on the letters of Paul; an explanation of the creed, of the mysteries (sacraments), of the solemnity of the Hosannas (Palm Sunday), of the feast of Golden Friday (Friday within the octave of Pentecost, when the miracle was read of St. Peter and the lame man at the Beautiful Gate: Acts 3:1-11), of the Rogations (the fasting of the Ninevites), of the finding of the holy cross; a homily on the Sunday of the Hosannas.

Of all these works, only the treatise of Golden Friday and on the Rogations remain complete (A. Scher PO 7, 7-10, 53-87), and a few fragments of commentary on the NT, preserved in the works of Isho'dad of Merv (or of Hedatta). In the Nestorian tradition, in particular from *Babai, he was accused of being an *Origenist, although little can be concluded about the truth of this accusation.

'Abdīšo', *Cat. lib. syr.* 69 (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* III, 1, Rome 1725, 81-84); Henana d'Adiabène, *Deux traités sur le Vendredi d'or et les Rogations*, in *Traités d'Išaï le Docteur et de Hnana d'Adiabène*, A. Scher (ed.), PO 7/1, Paris 1911, 53-82 (with Fr. tr.); Labourt 215-217, 269-280; Duval 348-349; Baumstark 127; Chabot 58-59; Ortiz de Urbina 168-169; A. Vööbus, *The Statutes of the School of Nisibis*, 1962, 91-105; A. Quacquarelli (ed.), *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, Rome 1989, 577f.; P. Maniyattu, *Feast of the "Pure Gold": A Study on the Theological Significance of the Feast of the "Friday Gold" Based on Henana of Adiabene's Commentary*: Christian Orient 16 (1995) 64-73; Patrologia V, 475-6; LTK3 4, 1420; LACL3 318-9.

J.-M. Sauget

HENANISHO (7th c.). A native of *Adiabene, he first studied at the famous theological school of *Nisibis with his brother Isho'yahb; both then became monks of the Great Convent on Mt. *Izla, founded by *Abraham of Kashkar in the 2nd half of the 6th c. After the customary journey to Jerusalem and among the Egyptian monasteries (Scetes), he abandoned the Great Convent and withdrew to the convent of Beth 'Abe, where he worked with *catholicos* *Isho'yahb III (ca. 650–657/658) on a revision of the Nestorian Hudra (divine office).

Author of a volume of philosophical definitions and of treatises on lexicography, Henanisho is known esp. for the celebrated *Paradise of the Fathers,* which he composed at the request of *Catholicos* George (658–680). It preserves in a Syriac translation *Palladius's *Historia Lausiaca,* *Rufinus of Aquileia's *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (here wrongly attributed to *Jerome), a systematic collection of **Apophthegmata Patrum* and various other minor collections of ascetic-monastic literature. The importance of this work resides not only in its being a Syriac witness to the great monastic works of the Greek tradition but also in the knowledge it gives us of some Syro-Eastern monastic works (*Abraham of Nathpar).

Duval 143-145, 253, 295, 371; Baumstark 201-203; Chabot 100-101; Ortiz de Urbina 149-150. Edition of the material relative to the *Historia lausiaca*: *Les formes syriaques de la matière de l'Histoire lausiaque*, ed. R. Draguet, CSCO 389, 398 (text), 390, 399 (tr.), Louvain 1978. On the importance of this text and on its various recensions, see C.C. Chahine, *Le témoignage de Thomas de Margâ sur les extraits d'Abraham Nethprâïâ dans le livre du Paradis de 'Nânîšo'*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 439-460.

J.-M. Sauget

HENOTICON. From the Greek Ἑνωτικόν ("unitive"). The edict of union promulgated in 482 under *Zeno in order to sanction in the empire, and in particular in *Egypt, *Libya and the *Pentapolis, the union between the *monophysites and the orthodox. Probably redacted by *Acacius patriarch of Constantinople and *Peter Mongus patriarch of *Alexandria between 471 and 489, the document referred to the Nicene Creed as the only definition of the faith, condemned *Nestorius and *Eutyches without entering into the question of the number of "natures" in Christ, exalted the memory of *Cyril and repudiated the Council of *Chalcedon (451) and the contribution that *Leo had given it. Universally accepted in the East and rejected by Rome, in 489 the Henoticon led to the *Acacian Schism.

Evagrio, *Hist. Eccl.* 3,14, PG 86, 2620-2625; E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431: Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*: ABAW 32/6 (1927) 52-54; S. Salaville, *L'Affaire de l'hénotique ou le premier schisme byzantin au Ve siècle*: Échos d'Oriènt 18 (1918) 225-266; 19 (1920) 49-68; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*: Glauben der Kirche 2/1 (1986) 279-358; E. Dovere, *L'enotico di Zenone Isaurico*: SDHI 54 (1988) 170-190; *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.I. Reinink - B.H. Stolte, Leuven 2002.

P. Marone

HERACLAS of Alexandria (d. ca. 247). Brother of Plutarch, to whom *Origen was close at the time of his martyrdom (Eus., *HE* 6, 3-4). Heraclas frequented the school of the "teacher of philosophical sciences" (*HE* 6, 19, 13), *Ammonius Saccas, five years before Origen. He then became a disciple of Origen, who took him on as collaborator and entrusted him with the preliminary lessons for begin-

ners, reserving the more advanced pupils for himself (*HE* 6, 15). But, in the light of later events, perhaps *Eusebius's information should be read less naively; i.e., this arrangement may have in some way been forced on Origen by *Demetrius. A priest before Origen, Heraclas always wore the philosopher's cloak and kept up an interest in philosophy (*HE* 6, 19, 14). *Julius Africanus in his *Chronology* attests Heraclas's great reputation as an intellectual. Later he showed ill will toward Origen and, when he succeeded Demetrius, maintained the measures taken against Origen until, acc. to *Photius (*Interr. Decem.* 9: PG 104, 1219-1232), he forced him to leave Thmuis, where Origen had taken refuge. His episcopate lasted 16 years, from 232 to ca. 247.

A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung . . .* , Leipzig 1893, 232.

H. Crouzel

HERACLEON (2nd c.). A disciple of *Valentinus, he belonged with Ptolemy to the great heresiarch's Italian school. Fragments of his *Commentary on the Gospel of John* are handed down by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV, 71; *Eclogae proph.* 25, 1) and *Origen (*In Iohannem*, esp. book XIII). At the center of Heracleon's doctrine is the Valentinian myth of the fallen spirit which, through Christ, becomes aware of its own origin. It is this myth that Heracleon tries to find in John's gospel through his *allegorical exegesis, which turns essentially on the figures of John the Baptist, the Samaritan woman and the centurion of Capernaum. Some scholars (e.g., H.Ch. Puech, G. Quispel) are also inclined to attribute to Heracleon the work in the *Jung Codex* (NHC I, 5) known as *Tractatus tripartitus*.

A.E. Brooke, *The Fragments of Heracleon*, Cambridge 1891; W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, 62-86; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici cristiani*, Bari 1970, 137-169; W. Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Giessen 1928; J. Mouson, *Jean Baptiste dans les fragments d'Héracléon*: EThL 30 (1954) 301-322; A. Orbe, *En los albores de la exégesis joannea*, Est. Valent. II, Rome 1955; Id., *Los primeros herejes ante la persecución*, Est. Valent. V, Rome 1956; E.H. Pagels, *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon's Commentary on John*, Nashville 1972; D. Devoti, *L'antropologia di Eracleone attraverso la figura del Battista*: Atti Acc. of the Sc. di Torino, vol. 107 (1972-73) 709-56; C. Blanc, *Le Commentaire d'Héracléon sur Jean 4 et 8*: Augustinianum 15 (1975) 81-124; D. Devoti, *Antropologia e storia della salvezza in Eracleone*: Memorie Acc. of the Sc. di Torino, serie V, vol. 2 (1978) 1-83; D.M. Scholer, *Bibliographia gnostica*, Leiden 1971 and successive *Supplementa*, ed. by Scholer and published annually in the journal *Novum Testamentum*; J.-M. Poffet, *Méthode exégétique de Héracléon et d'Origène*, Fribourg 1985; H. Strutwolf, *Gnosis als System*, Göttingen 1993, 114-125; A. Castellano, *Exégesis de Orígenes y de Heracleón a los testimonios del Bautista* (Anales de la Facultad de Teologia/ Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile 49,1), Santiago de Chile 1998; J. Holzhausen, *Die Seelenlehre des Gnostiker Herakleon*, in *Psyche-Seele-anima: Festschrift für Karin Alt zum 7. Mai 1998*, Stuttgart 1998, 279-300.

C. Gianotto

HERACLIAN of Chalcedon (6th c.). Presbyter and syncellus of the "Great Church" (Hagia Sophia, Constantinople), Heraclian, member of two Byzantine embassies to Rome (in 520 and 535) and of an orthodox (*dyophysite) commission which held a discussion with *Severian *monophysites in 532, seems to be identified with Heraclian, metropolitan of *Chalcedon (after 4 June 536), who dedicated a christological work (ample fragments in *Doctrina Patrum*) to *Soteric of Caesarea in Cappadocia and who was succeeded (before 5 May 553) by Constantine. *Maximus the Confessor cites a brief passage of his work *Against the Manichees,* which is mentioned by *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 85).

CPG 6800-6801; PG 91, 125 CD; Fr. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi*, Münster West [2]1981, 42-43, 134, 207-208, 216-217; E. Honigmann, *Patristic Studies* (ST 173), Vatican City 1953, 205-216; Beck, 372; L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (VI-VII c.), Rome-Louvain 1972, 68, 90, 92, 118; Grillmeier 2/2, 248-251, 324; Patrologia V, 144-145.

D. Stiernon

HERACLIDAS (or Heraclides) of Nyssa (5th c.). According to Honigmann's hypothesis, Heraclidas was the author of *recensio* B (or "metaphrastic text") of the *Historia Lausiaca,* whose primitive version, written by *Palladius ca. 418–419, has been handed down, acc. to Butler, in the MSS of family G. Compared to *recensio* G, the "metaphrastic text" (also 5th c.) is fuller, partly modified and results from a fusion of Palladius's work with another hagiographical text, the **Historia Monachorum* (CPG 5620). Heraclidas is described by the codices as bishop of *Cappadocia and in Latin versions as "the hermit" or "the Alexandrian" or even (but the chronology belies this) "St. Anthony's disciple." In the past his name was at times understood as a pseudonym of Palladius, at times identified with the last bishop of *Ephesus. Honigmann supposes that Heraclidas could be that bishop of *Nyssa whom *Photius mentions (*Bibl.*, cod. 52 = PG 103, 89) as the author of two letters against the *Messalian heretics, and whose episcopate can be dated between 431 and 440 (Bardenhewer 189). Heraclidas was certainly an admirer of *Evagrius and was not opposed to *Origenism, as some passages of *recensio* B of the *Historia Lausiaca* which do not ap-

pear in *recensio* G confirm. Honigmann also attributes to him the anonymous *Vita Olympiadis* (BHG 1374-1375), recently published by Malingrey: in fact, this work contains chronological references that take us back to Heraclidas's lifetime, and, being the result of a fusion between some elements present in the primitive text of the *Historia Lausiaca* and another work of Palladius, the *Dial. de vita S. Ioann. Chrysost.* (BHG 870), it seems to fit the literary activity of our author, who rewrote hagiographical texts in the metaphrastic manner. Despite the fact that all the codices of family A of the *Historia Lausiaca* mention Heraclidas, our present state of knowledge does not allow us to attribute to him with any certainty this further *recensio* of the work, also handed down under the title *Paradisus Heraclidis*.

CPG 6039-6040; C. Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1898-1904; H. Delehaye, *Vita Sanctae Olympiadis et Narratio Sergiae de eiusdem translatione*: AB 15 (1896) 400-423; 16 (1897) 44-51; A. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Lettres à Olympias. Vie anonyme d'Olympias*, SC 13 bis, Paris 1968; E. Honigmann, *Heraclidas of Nyssa* (*about 440 A.D.*), ST 173, Rome 1953, 104-122; Patrologia V, 154-155.

A. Labate

HERACLIDES of Cyprus. One of the 15 bishops of Cyprus at the end of the 4th c. to whom *Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria wrote a synodal letter concerning *Origen's condemnation, ca. 400 (Jerome, *Ep*. 92). We know nothing of his episcopal see or his life.

G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus* 1, Cambridge 1972, 251.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

HERACLITUS. The first of six writers—"ancient, orthodox and of virtuous zeal"—mentioned by *Eusebius (*HE* 5, 27; cf. Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 46). It is only a hypothesis that his lost work *On the Apostle* was an antignostic commentary on Paul's epistles. The dates given by Eusebius, 180–210, also seem uncertain.

W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*, Tübingen 21964, 150-153; 160-161.

S. Samulowitz

HERACLIUS (575–641). Byzantine emperor (610–11 February 641), born in 575, the son of Heraclius exarch of Carthage. By agreement with his father he overthrew the emperor Phocas, hated for his regime of terror, and founded, with his wife Eudoxia, a dynasty that remained stable for a century. He was engaged for some time in the project of transferring the capital to Carthage, in consideration of the complete insecurity of the Balkan peninsula, threatened by Slavs and Avars and by the advance of the Persians in Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Heraclius courageously promoted radical reforms: acc. to a theory (not universally accepted) of G. Ostrogorsky (*Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, Munich ³1963, 80-82), the most substantial of these were the setting up of military and administrative territories (*themes*) in Asia Minor, the institution of defensive military citadels garrisoned by *stratiotoi* (i.e., peasants enrolled in the army), the simultaneous reduction of mercenary troops and finally the reorganization of the financial administration. As in a crusade, the emperor put himself at the head of the army, which was trained by new methods. In 626 he freed *Constantinople, thanks to the Byzantine naval victory against the Avars; in 628 he defeated the Persian empire after six years of alternating fortune in war. In 630 Jerusalem was conquered. But Heraclius failed to stem the advance of the Arabs, favored by the separatist aspirations of the *monophysite population of Hither Asia: in 636 the Byzantines were beaten at Yarmuk in Syria; in 638 Jerusalem fell again; in 639/640 Armenia was occupied and the invasion of Egypt began. Beyond this military activity, in religious matters Heraclius made renewed efforts to lead the monophysite churches of Syria and Egypt back to union of the church with the empire. Timely help in this seemed to be offered by *monoenergism, held by the patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople (610–638), which recognized in Christ a single divine-human energy. *Cyrus of Fasi, consenting to Sergius's formula and for this named patriarch of Alexandria (631) by the emperor, promoted the reunification of the Theodosians of Egypt with the imperial church; the emperor also directed efforts to the monophysites of Armenia and Syria to facilitate their reunification with the same. But this doctrine of monoenergism was rejected by the monk *Sophronius, later patriarch of Jerusalem, so that in 638 Heraclius published the **Ekthesis,* a document composed by Sergius, in which he set aside the doctrine of the one energy and affirmed that of monothelitism, which was accepted unanimously by the Eastern bishops, while at Rome it appeared gravely problematic. Heraclius's grandson, the emperor *Constans II, retracted the *Ekthesis* in 648 and banned any discussion of one or two energies or one or two wills in Christ. In Heraclius's time Latin was deprived of the dignity of being the official language, and the empire was completely Grecized.

A.N. Stratos, Τὸ Βυζάντιον στὸν ζ' αἰῶνα, vols. 1-3, Athens 1965-1969; K. Bihlmeyer - H. Tuechle, *Storia della Chiesa*, 1, Brescia 1989, 355-358; H. Jedin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III, Milan 1983, 45-48; *The Reign of Heraclius* (*610-641*)*: Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. by G.I. Reinink - B.H. Stolte, Louvain 2002.

J. IRMSCHER - C. DELL'OSSO

HERACLIUS of Hippo (d. after 430). Deacon, then presbyter, of the church of *Hippo, known as the builder of the Memoria S. Stephani in that city and as *Augustine's successor-designate in 426; he also organized the conference-debate between Augustine and the Manichee Maximinus in 428. He appears in Augustine (*Ep.* 213, CSEL 47, 372-379; *Sermo* 356, 7, PL 39, 1577) and in the *Collatio cum Maximino* (PL 42, 709). We have two orations by him (PL 39, 1717-1786). We do not know if he actually succeeded Augustine.

DGHE 15, 662-663; PCBE 1, 356-358; P.-P. Verbraken, *Les deux sermons du prêtre Eraclius d'Hippone*: RBen 71 (1961) 3-21.

A. DI BERARDINO

HERACLIUS the Roman (d. after 308). The only evidence of Heraclius is in an epigram of Pope *Damasus (PL 6, 27A; ICUR IV, 9515; Diehl n. 963; Ferrua, n. 18; 18[1]; 18[2]) in honor of Pope *Eusebius in the catacomb of *Callistus. With the help of an inscription of a mere 8 verses, we can partially reconstruct the situation at Rome after the exile and death of Pope *Marcellus, exiled by the *tyrannus* *Maxentius (Ferrua n. 40) because of strong disapproval in the Roman community. After his departure, the community continued to be divided into opposing factions. Some months after his death Eusebius was elected (perhaps in 308), opposed regarding penitential discipline by a certain Heraclius. Damasus writes: *Heraclius vetuit lapsos peccata dolere* (Ferrua n. 18, v. 1), i.e., he headed the faction of those who had *apostatized during *Diocletian's persecution and now, with the return of external peace, wanted an immediate reconciliation and full reintegration into ecclesial communion without an adequate *penance. Eusebius demanded a penitential period. The division between the two factions must have been very severe, and included fratricidal clashes (Ferrua n. 18). Civil unrest must have been quite serious, since the emperor Maxentius exiled both Eusebius and Heraclius. Eusebius was sent to Syracuse, in Sicily, and died there the same year; all record of Heraclius was lost with his exile. Nothing in Damasus suggests that Heraclius was an antipope; he may simply have been an influential priest or deacon in the Roman community and thus in a position to lead the opposition.

Liber pontificalis, ed. L. Duchesne, 1, 164-167; G.B. De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, Rome 1870, II 201-208; I. Corsini, *I Lapsi e la deportazione in Sicilia di papa Eusebio*, Rome 1886; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 129-134 (Eusebius); 181 (Marcellus); see s.v. *Eusebio papa*: EPapi 1, 316.

A. DI BERARDINO

HERESIOLOGISTS. These are Christian authors who dedicated some of their works to listing, describing and refuting the various heresies of past and present. The first great heresy against which the church found itself fighting was that known as "*gnosticism" (a somewhat vague term among ancient authors, used to designate very diverse phenomena). The earliest heresiological works were therefore mainly antignostic works, which proposed to unmask the errors of the sectarians and oppose them with the right doctrine derived from the teaching of the apostles and their successors the bishops. The first we know of is *Justin (ca. mid-2nd c.), author of a Σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἱρέσεων, now lost, of which Justin himself tells us in another of his works (1 *Apol.* 26, 5), and a Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα σύνταγμα, also lost, which is cited by *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* IV, 6, 2; cf. also V, 26, 2) and by *Eusebius (*HE* 4,11,8-9; 4,18,9). Roughly his contemporary is *Hegesippus, author of a work in five books entitled Ὑπομνήματα, now lost (though some fragments are preserved in Eusebius; see *HE* 4,8,2), in which he presents the results of his journeys and research aimed at finding the authentic teaching of the apostles; the information collected in book V concerns mainly the gnostic heresy. But by far the most important heresiologist of the 2nd c. is Irenaeus of Lyons, author of an Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδονύμου γνώσεως (also known under the title *Adversus haereses*), in five books, which we possess entirely only in an old and very literal Latin translation, along with some fragments of the Greek original. The work is in two parts: the first (book I) describes the gnostic heresy; the second (books II-V) refutes it. Irenaeus brings together very detailed information esp. on the doctrine of the *Valentinian schools, information which constitutes an irreplaceable source for the history of the earliest gnosticism. *Hippolytus of Rome (early 3rd c.) is the author of two very important heresiological works. The first, titled Πρὸς πάσας τὰς αἱρέσεις (known also as *Syntagma*), now lost (but reconstructable, acc. to some scholars, based on the evidence of later heresiologists), is mentioned by Eusebius (*HE* 6,22), *Jerome

(*De vir. ill.* 61) and *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 121); it listed 32 heresies, and exercised a significant influence on the later heresiological tradition. The second, which survives incomplete, is titled Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος (also cited as *Refutatio omnium haeresium* or *Philosophumena*). Following in Irenaeus's footsteps, the author seeks to demonstrate the non-Christian character of the heresies; his treatment comprises two parts: in the first (books I-IV, of which II and III are lost), he treats of the various systems of pagan thought; in the second (books V-IX) he expounds the heretical doctrines of 33 gnostic sects, relating each to a pagan system discussed in the first part. Book X, which concludes the work, includes, in addition to a summary of what precedes it, a synthetic exposition of the true doctrine. Among Latin authors, *Tertullian made an important contribution to the heresiological tradition. The author of various polemical works (e.g., *Adversus Marcionem; Adversus Hermogenem; Adversus Valentinianos*), he also wrote a treatise entitled *De praescriptione haereticorum,* in which he proposed to definitively refute all the heretics by using the technical argument of the *praescriptio,* taken from Roman law. To this work is added a a spurious catalog of 32 heresies, titled *Adversus omnes haereses* (chs. 46-53)—attributed by some authors to Pope *Zephyrinus—which is usually considered a simple summary of Hippolytus's *Syntagma*.

The works of the older hereisologists reflect a doctrinal situation that was still quite fluid; but as the contents of doctrine were specified and articulated in a more complex way (thanks to the contribution of conciliar definitions and a continually developing theological reflection), the refutation of heresies required ever greater technical preparation and specialization, and was left to polemicists and controversialists. Later heresiologists (4th–8th c.) therefore limited themselves to presenting lists and summary descriptions of the heresies, from the origins to their own time. These works, which depend very closely on the writings of previous heresiologists, show increasingly less originality and are valuable mainly for their final parts, those dedicated to contemporary heresies which do not figure in the works of their predecessors. At the end of these lists is usually added a synthetic presentation of orthodox faith. *Epiphanius of Salamis (4th c.) is the author of the Πανάριον ("medicine chest," cited also as *Haereses*), whose title is explained by the author's intention to offer an antidote to those bitten by the serpent of heresy. In it he describes 80 heresies (of which the first 20 are from the pre-Christian period), drawing, for the older parts, on Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus. The number 80 was probably suggested by the 80 concubines of Song of Songs 6:8. A summary of this work was later published with the title Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις (*Recapitulatio*) and was used by *Augustine. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus wrote a Αἱρετικῆς κακομυθίας ἐπιτομή (*Haereticorum fabularum compendium*), in five books, in which he presents a brief description of all the heresies, from *Simon Magus to *Nestorius and *Eutyches (books I-IV), and a synthetic summary of the orthodox teaching of the church (book V). *Filaster of Brescia (late 4th c.) was the author of a *Diversarum haereseon liber,* in which he listed and described 156 heresies. The tendency, already manifest in previous heresiologists, to artificially inflate the number of heresies, probably to better articulate their details and stress their danger to faith, becomes particularly evident in Filaster.

Augustine too, in 428–429, wrote a *De haeresibus* in which, comparing Epiphanius and Filaster with each other, he enumerates and presents 88 heresies, from Simon Magus to *Pelagius and *Celestius; the work remained uncompleted by the second part, which was to have addressed how to recognize and so to avoid heresy (see *De haer.*, *proem.*). Closely dependent on Augustine's treatment was book I of the anonymous work known under the title of **Praedestinatus,* which lists 90 heresies, adding more or less false and fantastic information. To the last centuries of the patristic era belong the *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* of the Carthaginian deacon *Liberatus (mid-6th c.), a brief history of the heresies up to 553, and *John of Damascus's *De haeresibus* (late 7th c.). The latter is the second part of a trilogy titled Πηγὴ Γνώσεως and is based, for the first 80 chapters, mainly on Epiphanius's Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, and for chs. 80-100, on Theodoret of Cyrrhus's work; only for the last three heresies (chs. 101-103) does there seem to be an original account, probably added by another hand. The heresiological tradition knew further developments even after the end of the patristic era, both in the West and in the Byzantine world.

F. Oehler, *Corpus haeresiologicum*, 3 vols., Berlin 1856-61; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt*, Leipzig 1884 (facs. repr., Hildesheim 1963); K. Rahner, *Häresiengeschichte*: LTK V, 8-11. *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers - H.J. De Jonge (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 163), Louvain 2003.

C. Gianotto

HERESY – HERETIC. From the Greek αἵρεσις, which may derive from the middle αἱρέομαι ("to take") and αἱρέω ("to choose"). In Hellenistic Greek

"heresy" indicated the object of intellectual choice and of lifestyle—i.e., a doctrine or a school, as it was for the philosophical schools which, in Philo, Josephus and the LXX, indicate the various sects or currents existing in Judaism. In the latter the term also had a pejorative sense—perhaps meaning one who departed from the teaching of the rabbinic tradition—and was used by the Jews concerning Christians, considered "heretics" in the sense of those who had deviated from Judaism. The Jews, in turn, with their various sects (Pharisees, Sadducees, etc.), were considered "heretics" by Christians (Mt 16:6-12), meaning those who deviated from the true religion. "Heresies" and "schisms" are spoken of in the community of Corinth (1 Cor 11:18-19), and "heresies" in Gal 5:20 and 2 Pet 2:1. While it is difficult to specify the limits of the two terms, *heresy* connoted a deviation from the doctrine believed by the community and from its way of life, thus incorporating from the Jews the meaning of "heterodoxy." In the Greek world the terminology denoted only a choice among the various philosophical schools, without implying any judgment on it; it is in this sense that we must read passages in *Ignatius of Antioch (*Trall.* 6, 11), *Justin (1 *Apol.* 26, 8; *Dial.* 17, 1; 35, 3; 51, 2; 108, 2), *Hermas (*Simil.* 9, 23, 5), *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 66, 44 and 1, 19, 91). In pre-Nicene Christian authors, heresy meant a personal choice that includes novelty: with respect to the teaching of the gospel for Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3, 12, 11; PG 7, 905), and with respect to the doctrine of the apostles for *Tertullian (*De praescriptione*). Since it is a deviation from the *regula fidei* and from the discipline of the Teacher, it must be judged a novelty in belief (Tert., *Praescr.* 6, 2 and 42, 8). In this context, in antiquity *novitas* became a technical term for indicating heresy (Greg. Naz., *Oratio* XL, 42 on the Trinity; Aug., *Nupt. conc.* 2, 12, 25; *Retract.* 11, 33 on Pelagianism; Vinc. Ler., *Comm.* 1, 28).

In relation to schism, heresy was distinguished from it, but schism itself was seen as infected with heresy (Jerome, *Ep. Tit.* 3, 10-11) or as leading to it (Aug., *Civ. Dei* 18, 51; *Ep.* 93, 11,46; *C. Cresconium* 2, 7, 9), so much so that heretics and schismatics were put on the same level (Cypr., *Ep.* 69 and 70 on the Novatianists). In 1934 W. Bauer proposed the understanding of heresy as an original *datum* of Christianity from which orthodoxy emerged: among the various readings of Christianity, one prevailed and became defined as orthodox, though originally it was on a level with the others. The limits of such a reading of primitive Christianity are two: it applies to the Christian evidence the category of heresy then in use in the philosophies (i.e., as a possible choice in the search for truth); and it thinks of the orthodoxy/heresy dialectic as two aspects of the truth that are not just distinguishable but also capable of real separation. In Christianity the orthodoxy/heresy dialectic was different. To the original data of Jesus of Nazareth (*dicta et facta Iesu*) was given, as a guaranteed reading, the one possible reading of the direct witnesses, accepted as such in the community (apostles/disciples). Orthodoxy was attested on this line; outside of this track—later technically called "apostolic"—and excluded from it was heresy, which therefore was not defined except in relation to orthodoxy. The normative rule of this dialectic, on the common basis of sticking to what the apostles had received from Jesus, was beginning to be specified around points of reference: confessions of faith, rules of faith, creeds, authoritative decisions by leaders of the communities, i.e., bishops alone or meeting in synods (councils). Heresy, seen by some in antiquity as the fruit of an ambiguous cultural mediation with the philosophies of the time (e.g., in the Latin church this was the view of *Hippolytus and Tertullian), in more attentive spirits was also seen as useful for better understanding and deepening the datum of the Christian faith (e.g., the Cappadocian fathers for the Greek church and Augustine of Hippo for the Latin church), i.e., its "functionality" with respect to orthodoxy (Orig., *C. Celsum* 2, 27; 3, 12-13; 5, 61; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 7, 15, 89; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 16, 2, 1; 22, 24, 3). Regarding the determination of what constituted heresy, Augustine himself, to *Quodvultdeus, who had requested a manual of heresies for pastoral use (*Ep.* 221-224), reflected on the difficulty of defining it (*Ep.* 222, 2) and therefore of always being able to identify it. There was the danger of calling opinions heretical that were not so (*Ep.* 222, 2).

Despite these concerns, from the start there were readings of Christianity that were considered heretical, or unorthodox (Just., *Syntagma* [lost]; Hipp., *Refutatio omnium haeresiarum*; ps.-Tertull., *Adversus omnes haereses:* CSEL 47, 213-226; Anon., *Anacephaleosis;* Epiph., *Panarion* [after 375–376]; Filaster, *Diversarum haereseon liber* [380–390]; ps.-Jerome, *Indiculus de haeresibus* [before 428]; Aug., *De haeresibus* [428–429]; Arnobius, *Praedestinatus* [after 430]). From the 5th c. on, such manuals had the pastoral purpose of making heresies known, providing responses to them, and offering help in the face of new ones. In the Latin church, after Tertullian's *De praescriptione,* which showed how one became a heretic, Augustine proposed to write book II of *De haer.* on the question *quid facit haereticum?* but never wrote it.

In early Christian authors, heresy denoted not just an error on the logical level of faith but also a group that adheres to such an error. The heretic—placed by Paul among those who, in a Christian sense, were affected by a vice (1 Cor 11:18-19)—indicated one who had not made a right choice. This was the opposite of what it had meant for the Greeks; i.e., one who had made a right choice of a philosophy that for him constitutes the doctrinal rule regarding a people's customs, institutions and basic sensibilities (Sextus Emp., *Pyrrhon hypotyp.* 1, 16; ps.-Plato, *Defin.* 412a). The Christian heretic connoted a choice made outside the community's code of life: a private judgment that took no account of the community's judgment (the *ecclesia* in its catholicity) was considered biased (= heretic) and therefore not Catholic. Heretics were therefore indicated generically as "enemies of the faith" (Ambr., *In ps.* 118[119], 13, 6), connoting an adherence contrary to the faith of all. In this they were distinguished from schismatics, who connoted not so much a choice adhered to as a break or division in the community. If they came to be equated, this was because both heresy and schism threatened the unity of the Christian community. Augustine, who in 397 had asked Jerome for a list of heresies (*Ep.* 40, 6,9), distinguished between error and heresy: "If I regret something that is written [he said regarding Jerome], I retract it whether in the writings of a friend or in my own writings; but, for a Catholic, it is one thing to err in some truth, and another to establish or to hold the heresy of a great error" (*O. imp.* 4, 89). In qualifying a Christian as a heretic, Augustine required a bad will and obstinate adherence to the error, which later becomes evident when there is a clear knowledge of the *regula fidei* (*De pecc. orig.* 29, 34; *De bapt. c. Donatistas* 4, 16,23; *De gest. Pel.* 6, 18; *De anima et eius orig.* 3, 15,23). He thus did not think those born into heresy should be considered heretics, since their opinion "is not the fruit of their bold presumption, but of the inheritance they have received" (*Ep.* 43, 1): *Haereticus est, ut mea fert opinio, qui alicuius temporalis commodi et maxime gloriae principatusque sui gratia falsas ac novas opiniones vel gignit vel sequitur* (*De utilit. credendi* 1).

In relation to the Christian community, the understanding of *heretic* underwent a true evolution from Tertullian to Augustine. In Tertullian the heretic is allowed no *appellatio fraternitatis,* since "the heretic is no longer considered a Christian" (*Praescr.* 16, 2). They are equated, religiously, with the pagan and the Jew since, by their heresy, they have removed themselves from the vital Christian vehicle that is the apostolic link. The heretic is a corrupted Christian (*Praescr.* 12 and 13; 23, 5), though he or she can wholly recover through the church's *correptio* (*Praescr.* 12, 1 and 16, 2). *Cyprian sees heretics as those who, having lost their Christianity, lose also their possibility of salvation, because they put themselves outside of the church's unity (*De unitate*, 4; *Ep.* 55, 24). For Cyprian, to be able to return to the church the heretic, like the schismatic, needs to be rebaptized, a position rejected by Pope *Stephen (*Ep.* 74, 1-2, among the epistles of Cypr.). Augustine explores, in the context of the *Donatist polemic in *Africa, the fact that all the baptized, thanks to one and the same spiritual birth, are brothers and sisters, though they may live in a situation of separation (*De baptismo c. Donatistas* 1, 5,10; 6, cc. 30-34).

If, on the level of sacramental theology, the unity of all the baptized—and thus also of the heretic—as *fratres* was accepted thanks to Augustine, after the Constantinian change the heretic came to be considered a non-Christian on the social level (in the edict of 3 August 379, it is said of the Donatists: *cum nec christiani quidem habeantur,* CTh XVI, 5, 5) and so liable, from the point of view of public religion, to the penalties of *praescriptio* laid down for the crime of *superstitio*. The position of heretics increasingly acquired a civil connotation, sacramental penitential *correptio* being also now a fact of public church order. The heretic was no longer an internal matter for the Christian community, pertaining to the spiritual sphere and to freedom of religious conscience. Augustine's *Ep.* 93, of 407–408, to the Donatist bishop Vincent, is considered the substantial historical document of the post-Constantinian church's attitude to the heretic: he is a Christian dissident on whom even civil punishment may be inflicted. This was not to be considered purely a punishment, however, but a medicine of reform, and it could only be imposed after adequate instruction. This position matured in the context of the consciousness that any discussion regarding the Christian religion found its proper forum in the church, as *Ambrose said about the absurdity of discussing *de fide in consistorio* ("in heretical circles") rather than where it is prescribed (i.e., *in ecclesia*, *Ep.* 75, 17). The first heretic executed for his religious convictions has been wrongly named as *Priscillian (killed by the usurper *Maxentius in 385). In ancient times a heretic was publicly considered such after exclusion from ecclesial communion for a certain period of time, then ratified by official excommunication (Synod of Constantinople of 382, can. 6: Joannou 111, 50-51).

F. Oehler, *Corpus haeresiologicum*, Berlin 1856-1861; J. De Guibert, *La notion d'hérésie chez s. Augustin*: BLE 21 (1920) 369-382; W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten*

Christentum, Tübingen 1934 (²1964; Eng. tr. Philadelphia 1971); H. Pétré, *Haeresis, schisma, et leurs synonymes latins*: REL 15 (1937) 316-319; D. Balter (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Cambridge 1972; F. Winkelmann, *Grosskirche und Haeresien in der Spätantike*: Forschungen und Fortschritte 41 (1967) 245; L. Kolakowski, s.v. *Eresia*: Enciclopedia Einaudi, Turin 1978, V, 611-635; M. Simon, *From Greek hairesis to Christian Heresy*, in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition*, Th. hist. 53, Paris 1979, 101-116; J. McCluxe, *Handbooks Against Heresy in the West, from the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries*: JTS n.s. 30 (1979) 186-197; A. Benoit, *Irénée et l'hérésie. Les conceptions hérésiologiques de l'évêque de Lyon*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 55-67; M. Girardi, *Notizie di eresia, scisma e parasinagoga in Basilio di Cesarea*: VetChr 17 (1980) 49-77; V. Grossi, *L'iter della comunione ecclesiale nelle comunità di Tertulliano-Cipriano-Agostino*, in *Regno come Comunione*, Turin 1980, 59-100; R.S. Cole Turner, *Anti-Heretical Issues and the Debate over Galatians 2,11-14 in the Letters of St. Augustine to St. Jerome*: Augustinian Studies 11 (1980) 155-166; Rivista Augustinianum 25 (1985/3) (wholly dedicated to "heresy and heresiology"); A. Le Bolluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la litterature grecque II-III siècles*, I-II, Paris 1985; G. Barone-Adesi, *Eresie "sociali" ed inquisizione Teodosiana*, in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana* (VI Convegno internazionale), Rome 1986, 119-166; G. Puglisi, *Giustizia criminale e persecuzioni antieretiche: Priscilliano e Ursino, Ambrogio e Damaso*: SicGymn 43 (1990) 91ff.

V. Grossi

HERETICAL MONUMENTS. At the level of monuments, evidence of the many heretical sects which developed in the heart of early Christianity is generally scarce and, on the whole, ill-known. Among the various reasons for this phenomenon, the main one is the uninterrupted continuity of the Catholic Church, which from time to time destroyed, appropriated or even transformed monuments previously belonging to heretical sects (esp., of course, as far as applies to the official sphere), such that it does not seem accidental that a certain amount of evidence of the heterodox output has been preserved by small objects for essentially private use, and by inscriptions. Moreover, the difficulty of identifying heretical monuments has been underestimated—at least for certain sects, such as the *Arians—due to the nonexistence of patterns or ground plans of their own, rigorously distinct from orthodox ones. Indeed, if we were not informed by narrative sources of the Arian origin of some Theodorician monuments of Ravenna—e.g., the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo or the Arian baptistery (S. Maria in Cosmedin)—there would be nothing to indicate that they were Arian buildings or distinguish them from orthodox ones. Another equally important reason is the substantial paucity and fragmentary nature of studies on the subject, which—save some rare exceptions—besides making generally scanty contributions to the solution of the problem by hasty and superficial conclusions, have at times even helped to further confuse the matter.

Among heretical monuments we must first list inscriptions, found in fair number all over the *orbis christianus antiquus* and belonging to more or less all the sects. Among the many examples we will mention the acrostic epigraph of *Flavia Sophe* (Φλαβία Σόφη), found at Rome, *gnostic in content; that of Bassa (Βάσσα), *Manichean, found at Salona (*Bull. di archeol. e storia Dalmata* [1906] 118), and the *Novatianist one of Melanippus and Doxe (Μελανίππη and Δόζη) from Asia Minor (MAMA I, 174). Numerous *Montanist inscriptions come from Phrygia, Rome and Africa, which has also yielded some *Donatist epigraphical texts. Also from Asia Minor are at least two inscriptions belonging to the *saccophorae* or *apotactae* (MAMA I, 171 and 173); other epigraphs of various provenance, though of declared heterodox content, are not attributable to specific sects. Finally, nothing explicit of this sort seems to have survived related to the Arian heresy.

Numerous evidence of work of a heretical nature—mainly from gnostic contexts—is provided, as mentioned, by various minute objects (gems, amulets etc.), in which the name Yahweh is variously interwoven and combined with those of Ἰαῶ, Ἄβρασαχ, Solomon etc., and with complex symbols only partly solved. Yet, on account of their ambiguous variety—ranging from the properly religious sphere to that more generally or vaguely magical—and in the continuing insufficiency and difficulty of studies, even an uncertain attribution of the greater part of these objects to specific heretical sects remains as problematic as ever.

Important evidence of church buildings—in time reconsecrated to Catholic worship thus ensuring their survival—remain for the Arian sect. At Rome, the churches of S. Agata dei Goti, built by Ricimer in ca. 470, and S. Severino in Merulana, recorded only by a passage of *Gregory the Great (*Ep.* III, 19), are well known. To these it seems we must add, acc. to a recent hypothesis supported by good arguments, the vanished oratory on the "Monte della Giustizia," demolished at the end of the 19th c. (Testini, RivAC [1968] 219ff.). At Ravenna remain the old Arian cathedral with adjacent baptistery, and the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo, subsequently dedicated to St. Martin of Tours. Suggestions have been put forward, with more or less solid arguments, for various other basilicas such as S. Giovanni Maggiore at Naples, S. Eusebio at Pavia, S. Giovanni Battista at Cividale, S. Lorenzo Maggiore at Milan, the anonymous church with mosaic floor found on the

Rotter estate at Monastero (Aquileia), that, with baptistery, sited in the Piazza della Vittoria at Grado, the basilica of the S cemetery at Manastirine (Salona), and others.

Finally, we must consider hypogea. Even in the recent past, many of these were attributed to heretical sects or groups, but in fact only two, both at Rome, show heterodox characteristics for sure: the hypogeum of the Aurelii, on Viale Manzoni, in which were laid the followers of a sect difficult to specify, but characterized by a mixed doctrine of Christian and pagan elements (1st half of 3rd c.), and that of Vibia, on the Via Appia (3rd–4th c.), belonging to followers of the cult of Bacchus Sabazius. To these we must probably add that of Trebius Justus and another, anonymous, found more recently under the Schneider house, also on the Via Appia.

For the individual monuments considered, see bibl. under place names in this work. For the problem in general, H. Leclercq, in DACL, s.v. *Abraxas*, *Anges*, *Arianisme*, *Conciles*, *Gemmes*, *Gnosticisme*, *Hérésies*, *Manichéisme*, *Montanisme*, *Tertullien* etc.; C. Cecchelli, *Monumenti cristiano-eretici di Roma*, Rome 1944 (with bibl.). For inscriptions: F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato di epigrafia cristiana latina e greca del mondo romano occidentale*, Rome 1920, 454ff.; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1958, 524ff. (see also the updated bibl., ed. C. Carletti, facs. repr., Bari 1980, 825); F. Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IVe-Ve siècles): étude historique et doctrinale*, Paris 1978; W. Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, Macon 1997. For amulets: C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor 1950; A.A. Barb, in EAA, III, Rome 1960, 971ff., s.v. *Gnostiche gemme* (with bibl.). For Arianism: E. Demougeot, *Y eut-il une forme arienne de l'art paléochretienne*, in *Atti VI Cong. Intern. Archeologia Cristiana*, Rome 1965, 491-519; R. Giordani, *Probabili echi della crisi ariana in alcune figurazioni paleocristiane*: RivAC 54 (1978) 229ff. (with bibl.) For hypogea: P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma*, Bologna 1966, 142ff. and passim; A. Ferrua, *La polemica antiariana nei monumenti paleocristiani*, Vatican City 1991.

R. Giordani

HERMAS, *SHEPHERD* of (2nd c.). As it appears today, this book contains three great parts: the *Visions,* the *Mandates* and the *Similitudes* (or *Parables*): it is the work of a compiler who brought together and retouched two pre-2nd-c. books, of which one (corresponding to *Visions* I-IV) was the work of a certain Hermas and the other (*Vision* V, *Mandates* and *Similitudes*) anonymous. Both works seem to have had Hebrew sources. The first part (*Visions* I-IV) presents itself as half autobiography, half fantasy: an old woman (symbol of the church) appears to Hermas, assures him of the gravity of the sins for which he reproaches himself (*Vision* I), and entrusts him with a mission: he must make known the text of a book she gives him, which announces a day of pardon for Christians who have sinned after baptism, on condition that they repent (*Vision* II). In *Vision* III, Hermas sees a tower built with every kind of stone, some beautiful, others crumbling; the old woman explains that this is an image of the church, comprising in itself saints and repentant sinners; he must hasten to do penance since, once the tower is built, it will be too late. Then Hermas sees a monster approaching; a girl (in whom he recognizes the rejuvenated church) tells him it is the symbol of the great trial that is to come (*Vision* IV). In *Vision* V, the Shepherd appears and orders Hermas to write down his *Mandates* and *Similitudes*. The *Mandates* announce the 12 commandments toward God and neighbor: (1) faith in God the creator; (2) charity, simplicity; (3) love of truth; (4) chastity, marriage, second marriage; (5) patience and anger; (6) the two ways; (7) fear of God, but not of the devil; (8) actions to abstain from; good works to practice; (9) prayer; (10) sadness and joy; (11) true and false prophets; (12) wicked desires. The *Similitudes* appear as examples that serve to emphasize doctrinal or moral points. The Shepherd explains in turn to Hermas the parable of the elm and the vine, figure of the rich and the poor man: the elm supports the vine, which in turn adorns the elm (*Sim.* I); of the dry and green trees, symbols of sinners and the just (*Sim.* III-IV); of the vineyard, the master and the zealous slave (*Sim.* V); of the two shepherds, one representing the angel of pleasure, the other that of penitence (*Sim.* VI-VII). In *Similitudes* VIII-IX the church again appears under two symbols, the tree and the tower. The last *Similitude* concludes the work: Hermas must do penance and persevere, and teach salvation to others; until the tower is completed, it is time to do penance. This book, which was presented as a revelation, exercised great influence. Among other things, it contributed to the idea that sins committed after baptism could be forgiven, but only once—a limit maintained in the following centuries for public penance. The text found at Sinai in 1978 will lead to a greater knowledge of the text of the *Shepherd*, as will the Ethiopic version of the work.

CPG 1052; GCS 48; SC 53; DTC 6, 2268-2288; S. Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, Paris 1962; G.F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, Camden 1968; I. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, Leiden 1973; L. Cyril, *La christologie pneumatique de la Ve Parabole du "Pasteur" d'Hermas*: RHR 184 (1973) 25-48; A. Hilhorst, *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, Nijmegen 1976; S. Folgado Flórez, *Teoria eclesiale en el Pastor de Hermas*, El Escorial 1979; Ph. Henne, *Hermas en Égypte: la tradition manuscrite et l'unité rédactionnelle du Pasteur*: CrSt 11 (1990) 237-256; H.O. Maier, *The*

Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius, Waterloo, ON 1991; *Der Hirt des Hermas*, tr. and comm. N. Brox, Göttingen 1991; *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII: Erma, Il Pastore* (*Ia-IIIa visione*), ed. with intr. & critical comm. by A. Carlini, Cologny-Geneva 1991; Ph. Henne, *L'unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: tradition et rédaction*, Paris 1992; *Il Pastore di Erma: versione Palatina con testo a fronte*, crit. ed., with It. trans. and comm, by A. Vezzoni, Florence 1994; E. Dekkers, *Les traductions latines du "Pasteur" d'Hermas*: Euphrosyne 22 (1994) 13-26; C. Haas, *Die Pneumatologie des Hirten des Hermas*: ANRW 2, 27, 1, 552-586; R. Joly, *Le milieu complexe du Pasteur d'Hermas*: ANRW 2, 27, 1, 524-551; *Hermas, El Pastor*, introd., Sp. tr. and notes by J.J. Ayán Calvo, Madrid 1995; G. Lusini, *Nouvelles recherches sur le texte du "Pasteur" d'Hermas*: Apocrypha 12 (2001) 79-97.

P. NAUTIN

HERMENEGILD, martyr (d. 585). Son of Leovigild, the last *Arian *Visigothic king of *Toledo, and older brother of *Recared. In 579 Hermenegild married a Catholic, Ingunda, daughter of Sigebert, king of the Franks. Through the influence of Bishop *Leander of Seville, Hermenegild became a Catholic. He put himself at the head of the nobility, discontented with his father's despotism, and allied himself with the *Byzantines. When Seville fell into Leovigild's hands, Hermenegild was sent to *Tarragona and executed (585). *Gregory the Great made him a martyr, since he had refused Communion from an Arian bishop (*Dial.* 3,31; Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 5,38). The Spanish sources, however, speak only of the revolt, and not of Hermenegild's conversion (*Jn. Bicl., *Chron.*; *Isid. Sev., *Hist. Goth.* 49). His feast is 13 April in the historical martyrologies, 30 October in the *Synax. Eccl. CP.*

BHL 3850; BS 5, 33-47; LCI 6, 508-510; PLRE 3A, 449-450; B. Saitta, *Un momento di disgregazione nel regno visigoto di Spagna. La rivolta di Ermenegildo*: Quaderni catanesi di studi classici and medievali 1 (1979) 81-134; B. De Gaiffier, *Hispana et Lusitana*: AB 89 (1980) 157-158; M. Reyof thet, *La royauté dans la littérature latine de Sidoine Apollinaire à Isidore de Séville*, Rome 1981, 481-485.

V. SAXER - S. HEID

HERMETICISM. "Hermetic literature" is a sizeable corpus of writings of the Hellenistic era that were held to be revealed by the god Hermes. This god, who, in the allegories of esp. *Stoic myth, was interpreted as the λόγος (see, e.g., Annaeus Cornutus, *Compendium theologiae Graecae*, ch. 16, from the time of Nero), during the Hellenistic period was identified—since he was the inventor of writing and lord of speech—with the Egyptian god Thoth and thus also became the guarantor of the antiquity of the Egyptian wisdom tradition, which was widely esteemed and compared, if not preferred, to that of Greece (e.g., by the Egyptian historical Stoic allegorist Chaeremon of Alexandria, also of the Neronian period). Probably from the 3rd c. BC, writings of an occult nature, esp. astrological, which must have constituted a much larger corpus than the one that has reached us, began to circulate under the name Hermes Trismegistus ("thrice very great," hyperbole to show his exceptional power). Among the astrological writings is the *Liber Hermetis Trismegisti* (the text of which is preserved in a Latin MS of the British Museum, Harleianus 3731, ed. W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistus*: ABAW n.s. 12, 1936), which deals with astrology, esp. its theory of the decans, and whose oldest parts, acc. to Festugière (*Révélation*, I, 72ff., 112ff.), go back to the time of the Ptolemies. Its doctrine of the contemporary rising of the stars was studied by W. Hübner, *Die Paranatellonten* im Liber Hermetis, ZWG 59 (1975) 387-414. The *Liber* is a typical example of a popular type of Hermeticism, which includes those Hermetic works that reflect a "popular" religiosity: works on astrology, magic, magical medicine and botany, and alchemy. They qualify as Hermetic not because the share a particular doctrine or system of thought but simply by the attribution of their content to Hermes Trismegistus. Research has recently focused esp. on popular Hermeticism, linked to magic, and to the Hermiticism-astrology link (e.g., M. Waegeman, *Amulet and Alphabet: Magical Amulets in the First Book of Cyranides*, Amsterdam 1987; W. Hübner, *Uranoscopus: der verstirnte Sterngucker*: RhM 133 [1990] 264-274; Hermes Trismegistus, *De triginta sex decanis*, ed. CETEDOC, Turnhout 1994; M. Ullmann, *Das Schlangebuch des Hermes Trismegistos*, Ger. tr., Wiesbaden 1994; W. Hübner, *Grade und Gradbezirke der Tierkreiseichen: der anonyme Traktat "De stellis fixis, in quibus gradibus oriuntur signorum,"* Stuttgart 1995). Hermeticism linked to alchemy has also been studied: Hermès Trismégiste, *La Table d'émeraude et sa tradition alchimique*, préf. D. Kahn, Paris 1994; A. Faivre, *The Eternal Hermes: From Greek God to Alchemical Magus*, Grand Rapids, MI 1995.

Learned or philosophical Hermeticism, on the other hand, includes, besides a series of evidence and fragments left by the Fathers, three groups of writings: the *Corpus Hermeticum* (in Greek); the Latin translation, called *Asclepius,* of a lost Greek original, the *Logos teleios* or Perfect Discourse; some 30 extracts preserved in Stobaeus's *Anthologium* (ca. AD 500), of unequal length and value (some very short): the best known and most important for length, literary form and doctrinal content is the

Korē Kosmou, translated as "pupil"—or, less probably, "girl"—"of the world" (the former rendering is also preferred by H. Jackson, *Kore Kosmou. Isis, Pupil of the Eye of the World*, Chronique d'Égypte 61, 121 [1986] 116-135, and by the It. tr. *Ermete Trismegisto. La pupilla del mondo*, tr. and comm. by C. Poltronieri, intr. by G. Filoramo, Venice 1994). The fundamental edition of all this material remains *Hermès Trismégiste*, I-II, *Corpus Hermeticum*, *Asclepius*, text by A.D. Nock, tr. by A.J. Festugière, Paris ²1960; III-IV: *Fragments extraits de Stobée. Fragments divers*, text and tr. by A.J. Festugière for Stobaeus, text by A.D. Nock and tr. by A.J. Festugière for the fragments, Paris 1954; the It. tr. of all four volumes is by I. Ramelli, Milan 2004 (Festugière's tr. is included in Hermès Trismégiste, *Les trois révélations*, afterward by A. Verse, Paris 1998). The relevant classical study is that of A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I, *L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris 1944; Paris ²1981; II, *Le dieu cosmique*, Paris 1949; III, *Les doctrines de l'âme*, Paris 1953; IV, *Le Dieu inconnu et la gnose*, Paris 1954, followed up by Id., *Hermétisme et mystique païenne*, Paris 1967, It. tr. *Ermetismo e mistica pagana*, Genoa 1991. To the texts edited and studied by Nock and by Festugière should be added a Hermetic treatise found in Codex VI of *Nag Hammadi, the *De Ogdoade et Enneade:* also in the same codex is a version in Coptic of the final prayer of the *Asclepius*. Important studies are M. von Krause - P. Labib (eds.), *Gnostische und Hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und VI*, Glückstadt 1971; P. Mahé, *Le sens et la composition da traité hermétique "L'ogdoade et l'ennéade" conservé dans le Codex VI de Nag Hammadi*: RSR 48 (1974) 54-65; K.W. Tröger, *On Investigating the Hermetic Documents Contained in NHG VI*, in R. McL. Wilson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*, Leiden 1978, 117-121; J.P. Mahé, *Hermès en Haute-Égypte. Les textes hermétiques de Nag Hammadi et leurs parallèles grecs et latins*, I-II, Québec 1978-82; Id., *La voie d'immortalité à la lumière des* Hermetica *de Nag Hammadi et de découvertes plus récentes*: VC 45 (1991) 347-375; C. de Santis, *Gli scritti ermetici del VI codice di Nag-Hammadi*: SMSR 11 (1987) 57-65; A. Camplani, *Alcune note sul testo del VI codice di Nag-Hammadi*: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 349-368; Id., *Scritti ermetici in copto: l'Ogdoade e l'Enneade, Preghiera di ringraziamento, frammento del Discorso perfetto*, intr. tr. note, Brescia 2000; H.G. Bethge - U.U. Müller - U.K. Plisch, *Bericht über Editionen von koptischen Texten und Publikationen von Hilfsmittel*: ZAC 3, 2 (1999) 184-201. A Coptic fragment of the *Lógos téleios* has also been found, studied by J.P. Mahé, *Le fragment du "Discours parfait" dans la bibliothèque de Nag-Hammadi*, in *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi 1978*, ed. B. Barc, Québec-Louvain-la-Neuve 1981, 304-327; cf. Id., *Le "Discours parfait" d'après l'"Asclépius" latin*, ibid. 405-434.

The 17 treatises of the *Corpus Hermeticum* have significant differences among them, both formally and doctrinally. Firstly, they are addressed to different persons. Treatises IIA (of which we have only the title), IV, V, VIII, X, XII, XIII are addressed by Hermes to his son and disciple Tat; II, VI, IX, XIV by Hermes to his disciple Asclepius; I and XI are addressed by the *Nous* or Supreme Intellect to Hermes. XVI is a letter of Asclepius to a third disciple, Ammon; XVII is a fragment of a dialogue between Tat and an unnamed king, perhaps Ammon; finally XVIII, which betrays only a few suggestions of Hermeticism, is a *panegyric to the emperors, perhaps *Diocletian and his colleagues. The treatises of the *Corpus* also differ in form and literary genre: II, IV-VI and VIII-XIII are treatises of instruction in which a sage teaches his pupils (never more than three), either responding to their questions or in long monologues. XIV and XVI are also treatises of instruction, but in letter form. III is a cosmogonic fragment, influenced by the Genesis account (on gnostic OT exegesis: G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto, *L'interpretazione gnostica dell'AT*: Augustinianum 22 [1982] 53-74). VII is an example of popular preaching on salvific themes. Finally I, titled *Poimandres,* the most famous and important of the Hermetic treatises, is an aretalogy and describes a theophany, that of the Supreme Intellect, developing a broad cosmogonic framework (the cosmogony in the *Corpus Hermeticum* is investigated by J.P. Mahé, *La création dans les "Hermetica,"* RecAug 21 [1986] 3-53). *Nous* appears in a vision to the disciple Hermes and shows him the genesis of the spiritual and sensible worlds, strictly distinguished, and the emanation from the supreme God of two sons, Logos and Demiurgos, and finally that of *Anthropos,* the celestial First Man who, falling prisoner to the allurements of *Physis* ("Nature"), from it generates the first seven androgynous earthly men. The vision is meanwhile transformed into a dialogue which concludes in a new vision, in which is revealed to Hermes the destiny of the souls of the elect. At the end the disciple tells how he had begun to preach to humanity the revelation of salvation. The treatise ends with a solemn hymn of thanksgiving to God, analyzed in D.J.M. Whitehouse's dissertation, *The Hymns of the Corpus Hermeticum*, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA 1985, summ. in DA 46 (1986) 2231A. This treatise—not without Jewish influences, as demon-

strated by, e.g., M. Philonenko, *Le "Poimandrès" et la liturgie juive*, in *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité*, eds. F. Dunand - P. Lévêque, Leiden 1975, 204-211; Id., *Une utilisation du "Shema" dans le "Poimandrès"*: RHPhR 59 (1979) 369-372—has been the object of important studies, including R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Stuttgart 1966 (repr.); E. Haenchen, *Aufbau und Theologie des "Poimandres"*: ZThK 53 (1956) 149-191; Y. Shibatu, *The Place of Cosmogony in "Poimandres"*: JCS 28 (1980) 77-87; B.A. Pearson, *Jewish Elements in Corpus Hermeticum I ("Poimandres")*, in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*, eds. R. van de Broek - M.J. Vermaseren, Leiden 1981, 336-348; R.A. Segal, *The "Poimandres" as Myth: Scholarly Theory and Gnostic Meaning*, Amsterdam-Berlin 1986; J. Buechli, *Der Poimandres, ein paganisiertes Evangelium*, Tübingen 1987; J. Holzhausen, *Natur und Gottes Wille im hermetischen Traktat "Poimandres"*: Hermes 120 (1992) 483-489; P. Kingsley, *Poimandres*: JWI 56 (1993) 1-24; J. Holzhausen, *Der Mythos vom Menschen im hellenistischen Ägypten: eine Studien zum Poimandres (= CH 1.), zu Valentin und dem gnostichen Mythos*, Theophaneia 33, Bodenheim 1994, with extensive bibl. on 234-262; H.M. Jackson, *A New Proposal for the Origin of the Hermetic God Poimandres*: ZPE 128 (1999) 95-106 and J. Peste, *The Poimandres Group in the Corpus Hermeticum*, Göteborg 2002, and was translated by P. Scarpi, Venice 1987, and D. Tiedemann - M. Vollmer, Marburg 1990. Its importance is in the myth it narrates, in which theology, cosmogony and anthropogony are coherently interwoven; in the soteriological doctrine that Hermes is entrusted to preach at the end; and in the disciple's experience of knowledge (gnosis) and divinization. This is also true for treatise XIII (investigated by W.C. Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature*, Diss. Claremont, CA 1977, summ. DA 38 [1977] 2195A-96A) and for *De Ogdoade et Enneade*, both of which also narrate an experience of spiritual regeneration, though without a mythological framework like that of *Poimandres*. The other treatises of the *Corpus Hermeticum* confine themselves either to developing a dogma of a particular school (II, V, VI, VIII, IX) or presenting a synthesis of Hermetic topics (X, XI, XII, XVI, *Asclepius*).

The treatises of the *Corpus* also differ among themselves doctrinally. In some treatises, e.g., V, the world is penetrated by the deity to the point of identification with it, in a perspective that tends toward immanentism. The *kosmos* is therefore beautiful and ordered, acc. to the meaning itself of the Greek term, and participates in the divine goodness: thus, only through contemplation of the world—the living god—can one reach the invisible God. In other treatises, e.g., I, IV, VII, XIII and the Coptic writing, a dualistic and pessimistic perspective emerges in which the created world and generation are considered the fullness of evil (similarly, in the *Korē Kosmou* incarnation of souls is considered a punishment): in this case, this world is not the work of the first God, who is absolutely transcendent, but is created by a second god or Demiurge. In these pessimistic works there emerges a restricted sense of Hermeticism as a gnostic-type doctrine of salvation, which relates these writings to gnostic currents of the 2nd–3rd c. AD. But it is also possible to speak of Hermeticism in a more general sense, meaning that basic element, not strictly doctrinal in nature, which unites the two strands, optimistic and pessimistic, pantheistic and dualistic, traceable in the writings of the *Corpus Hermeticum:* it is a particular vision of the world, a certain attitude in which *pietas,* faith, has priority over the intellect, becoming its spiritual guide. *Deum novit qui colit* (inverting Seneca's famous formula *colit qui novit*, and anticipating St. Augustine's *credo ut intelligam*): he only knows God truly who submits the *aporiae* of the intellect to the certainty of faith, who joins *pietas* with gnosis (*eusebeia meta gnōseōs*). This accounts for the special atmosphere of many Hermetic treatises, immersed in a rarified aura of meditation which invites and often concludes with prayer—starting with the splendid hymn that concludes the *Poimandres,* aimed at stimulating, not only knowledge of God (gnosis), but also moral and spiritual elevation. Recently some important studies have been dedicated to the relationship between gnosticism and Hermeticism, *in primis* those of G. Sfameni Gasparro, *La gnosi ermetica come iniziazione e mistero*: SMSR 36 (1965) 46-61; Id., *Gnostica et Hermetica*, Rome 1982, but also G. van Moorsel, *Die Symbolsprache in der hermetische Gnosis*: Symbolon 1 (1960) 128-137; K.W. Tröger, *Die hermetische Gnosis*, in id. (ed.), *Gnosis und Neues Testament*, Berlin 1973, 97-119; Id., *Mysterienglaube und Gnosis in Corpus Hermeticum* XIII, Berlin 1971; P.A. Carozzi, *Gnose et sotériologie dans la "Korē Kosmou" hermétique*, in *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique*, eds. J. Ries - Y. Janssens - J.M. Sevrin, Louvain 1982, 61-78; F. Daumas, *Le fonds égyptien de l'hermétisme*, ibid. 3-25; J.P. Mahé, *Générations antédiluviennes et chute des éons dans l'hermétisme et dans la gnose*, in *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*, eds. R. van den Broek - T. Baarda - J. Mansfeld, Leiden 1988, 160-177; L. Kákosy, *Survivals of Ancient Egypt . . . Egyptian Influence on Gnosticism and Hermetism*, in *Studia in honorem L.*

Fóti, Budapest 1989, 263-287; J. Bregman, *Synesius, the Hermetica und Gnosis*, in *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, ed. R.T. Wallis - J. Bregman, Albany 1992, 85-98; R. Van den Broek - C. van Herrtum, *From "Poimandres" to Böhme. Gnosis, Hermetism and the Christian Tradition*, Amsterdam 2000.

Also related is the study of the presence of Hermeticism in Coptic texts, on which we have already provided bibliographical notes, and the discourse on the link between Hermeticism and Egyptian culture, from the genesis itself of the *Corpus Hermeticum* to later influences (e.g., W. Schmitt-Biggemann, *Isis und Osiris in Athanasius Kirchers "Oedipus Aegyptiacus"*: ARG 3 [2001] 67-88): P. Darchain, *L'authenticité de l'inspiration égyptienne dans le Corpus Hermeticum*: RHR 161 (1962) 175-198; Id., *La doctrine hermétiste et l'influence de la religion égyptienne*, summ. in RHR 163 (1963) 126-127; E. Iversen, *Egyptian and Hermetic Doctrine*, Copenhagen 1984; G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes*, Cambridge 1986; N. Makris, *Hermès Trismégiste et l'Égypte*: EPh (1987) 169-178; L. Fóti, *Hermès Trismégiste et la mythologie égyptienne*, in *Studia in honorem L. Fóti*, Budapest 1989, 9-27; B.A. Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity*, Minneapolis 1990; Th. McAllister Scott, *Egyptian Elements in Hermetic Literature*, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA 1991, summ. DA 53 (1991/2) 955A; J.G. Griffiths, *Possible Egyptian Elements in Tractate XIII of the Corpus Hermeticum*, in *Aspekte spätägyptischer Kultur: Festschrift Winter*, ed. M.M.J. Zeidler et al., Mainz 1994, 97-102; J.P. Mahé, *Preliminary Remarks on the Demotic Book of Thoth and the Greek Hermetica*: VC 50 (1996) 353-363; E. Oréal, *"Noir parfait," un Joe de mots de l'égyptien au grec*: REG 111 (1998) 551-565, in relation to the mention of the "Perfect Black" in the *Korē Kosmou*.

Besides studies on the Coptic texts, a particular group of studies on the reception of Hermeticism is linked to the Hermetic texts of the Armenian tradition, including M.G. de Durand, *Un traité hermétique conservé en arménien*: RHR 190 (1976) 55-72; J.P. Mahé, *Les "Définitions" d'Hermès Trismégiste à Asclepius (tr. de l'arménien)*: RSR 50 (1976) 193-214; J.P. Mahé, *Stobaei Hermetica XIX, 1 et les "Définitions hermétiques" arméniennes*: REG 94 (1981) 523-525; J. Paramelle - J.P. Mahé, *Nouveaux parallèles grecs aux définitions hermétiques arméniennes*: REArm 22 (1990-91) 115-134. Hermeticism also reached the Arabic world: A.F.L. Beeston, *An Arabic Hermetic Manuscript*: BLR 7 (1962) 11-23; A. Bausani, *Il "Kitab 'Ard Miftah an-Nujum" attribuito a Hermes. Prima traduzione araba di un testo astrologico?*: MAL 27 (1983) 81-141. Among other things, this gives an idea of the vastness of the spread of Hermeticism, not only geographically, but also through time and between cultures.

Recently a particular object of study has been Christian Hermeticism and the Latin translations of Hermetic works, with their spread in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. On Latin Hermeticism up to the Renaissance are C. Moreschini, *Dall'"Asclepius" al "Crater Hermetis." Studi sull'Ermetismo latino tardo-antico e rinascimentale*, Biblioteca di Studi Antichi 47, Pisa 1985; Id., *Per una storia dell'Ermetismo latino*, II, in *Le trasformazioni della cultura nella tarda antichità. Atti del convegno tenuto a Catania, Università degli Studi, 27 sett.-2 ott. 1982*, Coll. Storia 19, Rome 1985, 529-543. A series is dedicated to *Hermetica* in Latin: *Hermes Latinus* (e.g., vol. IV 1, eds. S. Feraboli - S. Matton, Turnhout 1994), and a series to medieval Hermetic works, Hermetica Mediaevalia, in which was recently published the important systematic bibliography of P. Lucentini - V. Perrone - A. Sannino, *I testi e i codici di Ermete nel Medioevo*, Florence 2001. The history of Hermeticism through the centuries can be found in the miscellany *Présence de l'Hermétisme*, Paris 1988.

The reception of Hermeticism in patristics—Greek, Latin, but also Syriac (as in the case of *Bardesanes, studied by H.J.W. Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa and the Hermetica*, in Id., *East of Antioch*, London 1984, no. XI)—has at different times been the object of study; among the most important studies are G. Sfameni Gasparro, *L'Ermetismo nelle testimonianze dei Padri*: RSLR 7 (1971) 215-251 and StudPatr 11 (1972) 58-64; A. González Blanco, *El problema de la ciencia en el Bajo Imperio. San Juan Crisóstomo y el Hermetismo*: HAnt 8 (1978) 201-214; L. Sturlese, *Saints et magiciens. Albert le Grand en face d'Hermès Trismégiste*: ArchPhilos 43 (1980) 615-634; W.C. Greese, *Corpus Hermeticum XII and Early Christian Literature*, Leiden 1979; J. Pépin, *Grégoire de Nazianze, lecteur de la littérature hermétique*: VChr 36 (1982) 251-260; W.C.H. Frend, *Pythagoreanism and Hermetism in Augustine's "Hidden Years"*: SP 21 (1989) 251-260; S. Lilla, *Le fonti di una sezione dell'omelia "De fide" di S. Basilio Magno*: Augustinianum 30 (1990) 5-19; R. Van den Broek, *Hermes and Christ: Pagan Witnesses to the Truth of Christianity*, in id. - C. van Herrtum, *From "Poimandres" to Böhme*, Amsterdam 2000, 115-144; C. Moreschini, *Storia dell'Ermetismo cristiano*, Brescia 2000, along with P. Arfé, *Cristianesimo ed Ermetismo*, in N. del Gatto (ed.), *Corso di perfezionamento in Storia del Cristianesimo Antico*, Naples 1999, 134-144. The *Krater* has also been studied by M.P. Nilsson, *Krater*: HTR 51 (1958) 53-58; H. and R. Kahane - A. Pi-

etrangeli, *The Krater and the Grail: Hermetic Sources of the Parzival*, Urbana 1965. Hermeticism has had an effect even in the modern period, studied, e.g., in R.S. Westman - J.E. Mc Guire, *Hermeticism and the Scientific Revolution*, Los Angeles 1977; *Hermeticism and the Renaissance*, eds. I. Merkel - G. Debus Allen, Washington 1988; *Das Ende des Hermetismus: historische Kritik und neue Naturphilosophie in der Spätrenaissance*, ed. M. Mulsow, Tübingen 2002 (Religion und Aufklärung 9).

Within the *Corpus Hermeticum,* specific attention has been dedicated to the *Asclepius* and its popularity. The treatise, whose codices and editions are indicated by H. Dannenfeld, *Hermetica philosophica*, in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, I, Washington, DC 1960, 145-147, with the *Addenda et corrigenda* of P.O. Kristeller, ibid. II, ibid. 1971, 423, has had some translations made and been commented upon after that of Festugière, such as the English edition of B.P. Copenhaver, Cambridge 1992, and the Dutch edition of G. Quispel, Amsterdam 1997. The most important recent studies on this treatise are: J. Schwartz, *Note sur la Petite Apocalypse de l'Asclepius*: RHPhR 62 (1982) 165-169; D.N. Wigtil, *Incorrect Apocalyptic: The Hermetic Asclepius as an Improvement on the Greek Original*, in ANRW, II, 17, 4, Berlin-New York 1984, 2282-2297; M. Bertolini, *Sul lessico filosofico dell'Asclepius*: ASNP 15 (1985) 151-209; J.S. Gersh, *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: The Latin Tradition*, I-II, Notre Dame, IN 1986, I, 329-387; A.M. Mazzanti, *L'uomo* methorios *da Filone all'Asclepius*: SMSR 12 (1988) 61-89; M. Philonenko, *O vitae vera vita* (*Asclepius 41*): RHPhR 68 (1988) 429-433; S. Gersh, *Theological Doctrines in the Latin Asclepius*, in *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, eds. R.T. Wallis - J. Bregman, Albany 1992, 129-166; V. Hunink, *Apuleius and the Asclepius*: VChr 50, 3 (1996) 288-308; M. Horsfall Scotti, *The Asclepius*: VChr 54, 3 (2000) 396-416; U. Luft, *Asclepius*: Acta Ant. Ac. Hung. 41 (2001) 323-329. There are also studies on the *Asclepius* in its Coptic and Eastern versions, such as those of J. Doresse, *Hermès et la gnose. À propos de l'Asclepius copte*: NT 1 (1956) 54-69, of P.A. Carozzi, *Hoc lumine salvati tuo* (*Asclepius 41*), in *Perennitas. Studi Asclepius Brelich*, Rome 1980, 115-138, which compares the final prayer of the *Asclepius* with the Greek and Coptic versions and some Christian liturgical prayers, and of M. van Esbroeck, *L'apport des versions orientales pour la compréhension de l'Asclepius dans les "Philosophica" d'Apulée*, in *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*, eds. M. Pavan - U. Cozzoli, Rome 1986, 27-35; and on its popularity in the patristic and mediaeval periods, such as those of P. Siniscalco, *Ermete Trismegisto . . . La fortuna di un passo ermetico* (*Asclepius 8*) *nell'interpretazione di scrittori cristiani*: AOT 101 (1966-67) 83-117, of J.P. Mahé, *Note sur l'Asclepius à l'époque de Lactance*, in *Lactance et son temps*, eds. J. Fontaine - M. Perrin, Paris 1978, 295 and that, which also resulted in an edition, of P. Lucentini, *Il commentario all'Asclepius del Vat. Ottob. Lat. 811*, in *Filosofia e cultura. Per E. Garin*, eds. M. Ciliberto - C. Vasoli, Rome 1991, 39-59; Id., *L'Asclepius ermetico nel secolo XII*, in *From Athens to Chartres*, ed. by H.J. Westra, Leiden 1992, 397-420; Id., *Glosae super Trismegistum. Un commento medievale dell'Asclepius ermetico*, in appendix the codices of the *Asclepius*: Anales de Historia antigua 62 (1995) 189-293.

Other editions and translations: S. Arai - Y. Shibatu, ed. and tr., *Corpus Hermeticum*, Tokyo 1980; A. Rossell, *Kore Kosmu. Traducció*: Anuari de Filologia Barcelona 10 (1984) 39-63; *Hermes Trismegistus, pater philosophorum: textgeschiedenis van het Corpus Hermeticum: tentoonstelling in de Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica*, Amsterdam 1990-1991; C. Moreschini (ed.), *Apulei Opera*, III, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1991, 39-86; *Corpus Hermeticum*, ed. R. Van den Broek - G. Quispel (intr. tr. comm.), Amsterdam 1996; *Tratados del Corpus Hermeticum*, intr. tr. notes by J. García Font, Barcelona 1997; *Das Corpus Hermeticum deutsch*, eds. C. Colpe - J. Holzhausen, tr. and intr. J. Holzhausen, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1997; *Das Corpus Hermeticum einschliesslich der Fragmente des Stobaeus*, tr. K.G. Eckart; ed. F. Siegert, Münster 1999; *Textos herméticos*, intr. tr. and notes X. Renau Nebot, Madrid 1999; *Hermetis Trismegisti Astrologica et divinatoria*, ed. G. Bos, Turnhout 2001.

Studies (not cited above): G. van Moorsel, *The Mysteries of Hermes Trismegistos*, Utrecht 1955; G. Zuntz, *Notes on the Corpus Hermeticum*: HTR 49 (1956) 73-78; D. Georgi - J. Strugnell, *Concordance to the Corpus Hermeticum I. The "Poimandres,"* Cambridge, MA 1971; A. González Blanco, *Misticismo y escatología en el Corpus Hermeticum*: Cuadernos de filologia clásica 5 (1973) 313-360; J.F. Horman, *The Text of the Hermetic Literature and the Tendencies of Its Major Collections*, Hammond 1974; H. Hornik, *The Philosophical "Hermetica,"* AOT 109 (1975) 343-392; J. Schwartz, *La "Koré Kosmou" et Lucien*, in *Le monde grec. À C. Préaux*, eds. J. Bingen - G. Cambier - G. Nachtergael, Brussels 1975, 223-233; D. Kaimakis, *Die Kyraniden*, Meisenheim 1976; L. Delatte - S. Govaerts - J. Denooz, *Index du Corpus Hermeticum*, Rome 1977; G. Filoramo, *Le religioni di salvezza nel mondo antico*, II, Turin 1979; F. di Carlo, *Letteratura e ideologia dell'Ermetismo*, Foggia 1981; H. Wingler, *Der Symbolbegriff des Neuplatonismus und sein Nachleben in der Hermetik*, in *Beiträge zu Symbol*, ed. M. Lurker, Baden-Baden 1982, 207-215; A. González Blanco, *Hermetism: A Bibliographical Approach*, in ANRW, II, 17, 4, Berlin-New York 1984, 2240-2281; J.P. Mahé, *Fragments hermétiques dans les Pap. Vindob. Gr. 29456 r° et 29828 r°*, in *Mémorial Festugière*, eds. E. Lucchesi - H.D. Saffrey, Geneva 1984, 51-64; F. Bonardel, *L'hermétisme*, Paris 1985; S. Focardi, *Anthropos ed eros nell'ideologia religiosa tardo-antica*: SMSR 9 (1985) 43-71; G.

Luck, *Two Predictions of the End of Paganism*: Euphrosyne 14 (1986) 153-156; H.J. Sheppard - A. Kehl - R. McL. Wilson, s.v. *Hermetik*: RAC 14, 780-807; A. Borgia, *Unità, unicità, totalità di Dio nell'Ermetismo antico*: SMSR 13 (1989) 197-211; S. Giversen, *Hermetic Communities*, in *Rethinking Religion*, ed. J.P. Sørensen, Copenhagen 1989, 49-54; J.P. Mahé, *Paraphrase de Sem et Corpus Hermeticum*, in *Études Coptes III*, Louvain-Paris 1989, 115-127; H.D. Betz, *The Delphic Maxim gnôthi sautón in Hermetic Interpretation*, in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, I, Tübingen 1990, 91-111; A.M. Mazzanti, *L'uomo nella cultura religiosa del tardo-antico*, Bologna 1990; G. Luck, *The Doctrine of Salvation in the Hermetic Writings*: Second Century 8 (1991) 31-41; M. Philonenko, *La "Korè Kosmou" et les "Paraboles" d'Hénoch*, in *Hellenismos*, ed. S. Saïd, Leiden 1991, 119-124; R. Valantasis, *Spiritual Guides of the Third Century*, Minneapolis 1991; R. Turcan, *Ammien Marcellin et l'hermétisme*, in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes*, I, Paris 1992, 403-410; B.H. Stricker, *Het Corpus Hermeticum*, Amsterdam 1993; P.A. Carozzi, *Praeparatio Hermetica*, in *International Association for the History of Religions. Congress Rome 1990*, Rome 1994; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Chaos e dualismo: la dialettica* chaos - kosmos *nell'ermetismo e nel manicheismo*: Cassiodorus 1 (1995) 11-28; R. Liedtke, *Die Hermetik*, Paderborn 1996; F.A. Janssen, *Ad fontes - On the Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica*: Quaerendo 27 (1997) 251-279; G. Löhr, *Verherrlichung Gottes durch Philosophie*, Tübingen 1997; A.M. Mazzanti, *Gli uomini, dèi mortali*, Bologna 1998; var. aus., *The Way of Hermes*, London 1999; A. Camplani, *Procedimenti magico-alchemici e discorso filosofico ermetico*, in *Il tardoantico alle soglie del Duemila*, ed. G. Lanata, Pisa 2000, 73-98; U. Luft, *Statuas dicis . . .* : Acta Ant. Ac. Hung. 40 (2000) 283-310; C. Moreschini, *Origini e autenticità dell'Ermetismo*: AION 22 (2000) 327-357; D. Porreca, *Hermes Trismegistus*: Archives d'histoire doctrinale 67 (2000) 143-158; V. Rebrik, *Hermetik und jüdische Überlieferung*, in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Farhus 1999*, ed. J.U. Kalms, Münster 2000, 298-301; A. Ribi, *Zeitenwende*, Bern-Frankfurt a.M. 2001.

G. Filoramo - I. Ramelli

HERMIAS, apologist. Christian author, perhaps 3rd c., of a work titled *Mockery of the Pagan Philosophers* (Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων; *Irrisio philosophorum qui extra sunt*): a polemical *libellus* of 10 chapters which, often sarcastically, lays bare the contradictions into which the pagan philosophers fall who take on the great themes of thought: God, the world, the soul, nature, the spirit. It is hard to establish with certainty when the work was composed; the terminus post quem is a brief reference to *Tatian. Many critics assign it to the 3rd c., almost at the close of primitive Greek apologetic. Its MS tradition is quite rich, but, apart from the 10th-c. *codex Patmius 202*, recent.

PG 6, 1169-1180; H. Diels, *Doxographi graeci*, Berlin ²1929, 651ff.; Ger. tr. A. di Pauli: BKVI 14, Kempten 1913; It. tr. E.A. Rizzo, Leghorn 1931 (with comm.); Fr. tr. R. Hanson - D. Joussot, SC 388, Paris 1993 (with bibl. on 91-94); A. di Pauli, *Die Irrisio des Hermias*, Paderborn 1907; L. Alfonsi, *Ermia filosofo*, Brescia 1947; J.F. Kindstrand, *The Date and Character of Hermias' Irrisio*: VChr 34 (1980) 341-357; R. Bauckham, *The Fall of Angels as the Sources of Philosophy in Hermias and Clement of Alexandria*: VChr 39 (1985) 313-380; J.H. Waszink: RAC 14, 808-815.

P. Siniscalco

HERMOGENES, bishop (5th c.). Bishop of Rhinocorura (Farma), city of Augustamnica Prima in E Egypt, near the border with Palestina Salutaris. He took part in the Council of *Ephesus in 431 (Mansi 6,874) as a supporter of *Cyril of Alexandria. He was sent with Lampetius to Rome by the Cyrillian bishops to obtain Pope *Celestine's support. Pope Celestine died (27 July 432) shortly before their arrival, but they attended the ordination of his successor, *Sixtus III (31 July 432), who through them responded to the Eastern bishops and encouraged Cyril in his fight against *Nestorius and his doctrines (Sixtus, *Ep.* 1: PL 50, 583). Of Hermogenes we have only one letter, written together with three other bishops, in which they lament the abuses committed in the context of the christological battles of the time. Hermogenes had contact with *Isidore of Pelusium, who addressed some letters to him (e.g., 1215 and 1253: SC 422, Paris 1997).

CPG 6445; PG 84, 745-746; ACO I,4, 159 (Collectio Casinensis, n. 219); ACO IV,3,2, 218; Mansi 6,874; M. Le Quien, OC, Paris 1974, 2,542 (repr. 1958); DCB 3,4, n. 7; DHGE 24,117; G. Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, Padua 1988, II 606.

A. Di Berardino

HERMOGENES, heretic (late 2nd–early 3rd c.). A painter by profession, he relocated from his native *Syria to *Carthage. *Theophilus of Antioch wrote a first treatise against him, now lost, but widely used by subsequent refuters. Tertullian wrote *Contra Hermogenem,* our main source of knowledge, and *De censu animae* (lost) on Hermogenes's theories on the origin of the *soul. Orthodox on the unicity of God and *christology, Hermogenes shows himself to be influenced by Greek philosophy when he affirms the eternity and preexistence of the matter from which God molded and ordered the world. Hence *evil does not derive from God but from uncreated matter. The soul also derives from matter and not from the breath of God.

A. Orbe, *Hacia la primera teología de la procesión del Verbo*, Estudios Valentinianos, I, Rome 1958, 270-280; F. Chapot, *L'hérésie d'Hermogène, Fragments et commentaire*: RecAug 30 (1997) 2-111.

E. Prinzivalli

HEROD (iconography). Depiction of Herod is rare in Christian iconography of the first centuries because of the unpopularity of episodes relating to the period before and after Jesus' death and to the tendency not to reproduce scenes linked in any way to the Passion. Thus Herod and the slaughter of the innocents are completely absent from the repertoire of paintings in the Roman catacombs and appear on very few *sarcophagi, each of which must be considered quite unique in its kind. For this reason it is hard to establish a precise iconographical type characterizing Herod, apart from the standard depiction of the military leader. In the Todi sarcophagus (Ws II, pl. LXXIII, 1), e.g., Herod appears standing, bareheaded, dressed in chlamys and breastplate, scepter in left hand, right hand in gesture of *adlocutio*. He is shown flanked by two soldiers and turning to the right toward the three *magi—i.e., at the moment of receiving the news of the birth of the new *Rex Iudaeorum*. The moment of the massacre is shown on a sarcophagus in the crypt of S. Massimino (Ws II, pl. XXXIX, 2): Herod enthroned, right hand in the usual gesture of *adlocutio;* in front, two soldiers holding babies. A female figure, certainly a mother, is part of the scene. While we could cite some other sculptural examples ascribable to the 4th c., the outstanding depiction is certainly the mosaic ordered by *Sixtus III (432–440) for the triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore, Rome, where Herod has given the order for the massacre and the mothers still clutch the babies in their arms. The scene reappears in later monuments from the 9th to the 12th c.

LCI 2, 247-248; Wp; WMM II, 771ff.; Nestori; B. Brenk, *Die frühchristlichen Mosaiken in S. Maria Maggiore zu Roma*, Wiesbaden 1975.

U. Broccoli

HESYCHASM. *Hesychia* or quiet, outer and esp. inner repose, eliminates passions and worries, not work or pastoral responsibility, though at times it tries to keep the latter at a distance. It is one of the aims of monastic renunciation, a condition of prayer. The motif, attested at the end of the 4th c. in Egypt and Cappadocia, grows in importance in Palestine and Sinai (*Dorotheus, *John Climacus). For the legislator *Justinian, hesychast is synonymous with *anchorite. Within Byzantine monasticism, hesychasm characterizes the tendency of Symeon the New Theologian, then of Gregory Palamas and, later, of the medieval Philokalia. The West has an analogous contemplative ideal, but less distinct from solitude and from the techniques of recollection.

I. Hausherr, *Hésychasme et Prière*, Rome 1966; DSp 4, *Erémitisme en Orient* (C. Lianine), VII, *Hésychasme* (P. Adnès); TRE 15, 282-289.

J. Gribomont

HESYCHIUS of Alexandria, exegete (3rd–4th c.). *Jerome alone gives us a profile of Hesychius (*praef. in. Paral.*; *praef. in. Evv.*; *adv. Ruf.* 2,27): he is said to have lived at *Alexandria ca. 300 and made revisions of the LXX and the NT: this data is much debated since it is difficult, though not impossible, to identify traces of such an intervention in the MS tradition. The **Decretum Gelasianum* (5,3,9) mentions the NT revision as *evangelia quae falsavit Hesychius* and declares it apocryphal. Hesychius cannot be identified with the bishop and martyr of the same name who died during *Diocletian's persecution (Eus., *HE* 8,13,7), nor with one of the bishops that protested against *Meletius (PG 10, 1565-1568).

F.G. Kenyon, *Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament*, in *Mémorial Lagrange*, Paris 1940, 245-250; S. Jellicoe, *The Hesychian Recension Reconsidered*: JBL 82 (1963) 409-418; A. Vaccari, *The Hesychian Recension of the Septuagint*: Bibl. 46 (1965) 60-66; G. Dorival (ed.), *La Bible grecque des Septante*, Paris 1988, 172.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

HESYCHIUS of Alexandria, lexicographer (5th- or 6th-c.). Pagan author who left us the largest lexicon of the Byzantine era that we possess, though it is transmitted in a single 15th-c. MS. The lexicon lists and explains rare or difficult Greek terms. His most important elements were taken from Diogenianus of Heraclea (2nd c.), including his precise alphabetical scheme, and from Apollonius the Sophist (1st c.). The lexicon was interpolated many times and expanded with Homeric glosses and articles taken from Cyril's glossary (early 8th c.). Later and less important are the interpolations from the *Onomastica sacra*.

K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* 1-2, Kopenhagen 1953 and 1966; H. Erbse: ByZ 48 (1955) 130-138; ByZ 61 (1968) 71-77; B. Marzullo, *La "coppia contigua" in Esichio*: Quad. Ist. Filol. Class. Univ. Cagliari 3 (1968) 70-87; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche-profane Literatur der Byzantiner* 2, Munich 1978, 35-39.

S. Samulowitz

HESYCHIUS of Castabala. Bishop of Castabala in *Cilicia Secunda, participated at the Council of *Ephesus (431), siding with *John of Antioch and

other bishops of the Eastern dioceses. We have two letters of which Hesychius was one of the subscribers: the first is addressed to the church of Hierapolis and seeks a disassociation from the theological positions of the Cyrillian faction; the second is addressed to John of Antioch and reaffirms the fidelity of Hesychius and other bishops to John. Also surviving is a letter sent by Hesychius to *Meletius bishop of Mopsuestia (PG 84, 770-771).

CPG 6447; DCB 3, 9s.

K. den Biesen

HESYCHIUS of Jerusalem (5th c.). We have little information on the life of this famous priest and exegete. *Theophanes (*Chron.* 83) tells us that Hesychius was in Jerusalem in 412; *Cyril of Scythopolis (*Vita Euthymii* 16,26) calls him "teacher of the church," "theologian" and "light in the distance." According to Pelagius (*In defensione trium capitulorum* 2,2) he was a pupil of *Eutyches and wrote against the Council of *Chalcedon, but it is improbable that this information is accurate. According to *Basil's *Menologion* (PG 117, 373), Hesychius commented on the whole Bible, generally adopting the Alexandrian method of *allegorical exegesis. His theology is all based on the Bible; he mistrusts philosophy. His *christology is anti-*Nestorian but does not adopt the terminology of *Cyril of Alexandria. He spoke clearly about the propagation of original sin, ecclesiastical penitence and Mary's perfect purity. Of his many works there remain: *Com. in Lev.* (Latin version), *Com. in Job* (24 homilies in Armenian version), *Epit. Proph., Capita XII proph., Interpretatio in proph. min.* (unpublished), *Collectio difficultatum et solutionum, De tit. Psalm.* (handed down under Athanasius's name), *Com. brevis Psalm., Com. magnus Psalm.* (handed down under Chrysostom), *Com. in Odas*. His 21 festal homilies are important for our knowledge of the liturgy and feasts at Jerusalem in the 5th c., and give us an idea of the brilliance of his style. Uncertain is his authorship of *panegryics on all of the martyrs and on John the Baptist, whereas the homilies on Luke, Longinus and Palm Sunday are inauthentic.

CPG 6550-6596; BS 5, 88-89; M. Aubineau, *Hesychius redivivus*: Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie 27 (1980) 253-270; K. Jüssen, *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen des Hesychius*, 1-2, Münster 1931-1934; R. Mennes, *Hesychius van Jerusalem*, Gent 1971; H. Savon, *Les Homélies festales d'H.*: RHR 197 (1980) 429-450.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

HESYCHIUS of Miletus (6th c.). Also called by his title *Illoustrios*. Son of the advocate Hesychius and of Philosophia, he flourished in the 2nd half of the 6th c., after the reign of *Justinian (527–565), of whom he speaks. He wrote three works. The *Roman and General History* (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 69), called *Chronicon* (Χρονικὴ ἱστορία) in *Suidas's lexicon, is a universal history from the reign of King Belus of Assyria to that of Anastasius I. Its six parts end respectively at the Trojan War, the foundation of Rome, the end of the Roman monarchy, Julius Caesar, the foundation of Constantinople and the death of *Anastasius I (AD 518). Though lost, some fragments survive; the most important—very long, perhaps an epitome—illustrates the earliest events of Byzantium up to *Constantine the Great: contained under the title *Patria Constantinopolis* in the Heidelberg MS Paradoxogr. Pal. 398, its first part concurs with George Codinus's Πάτρια. A second historical work is completely lost: a continuation of the first work acc. to *Photius (*cod. cit.*), it comprised the history of the reign of *Justin I (518–527) and the first years of *Justinian: dealing with contemporary events, it had a different character. Upset over the death of his son John, Hesychius broke off the work. A third work is important for our knowledge of Greek literature: *Nomenclator* (*Onomatologus*) *or Index of Persons Illustrious in Studies*, also lost. It brought together biographies of famous writers of the Greek world, organized by literary genre (poets, philosophers, historians, orators and sophists, grammarians and teachers, writers of various kinds) and classified in chronological order. The lives followed a well-defined and common model. The work, mainly philological and archaeological in character, did not include Christian authors, perhaps because Hesychius was a pagan, or perhaps because of his sources, about which we are uncertain. Between 827 and 857 a summary was made (widely used by Photius and Suidas) in which the chronological order was integrated with the alphabetical, and biographies of Christian authors were added, for which the anonymous compiler used Jerome's *De viris illustribus*. The work *A Biographical Dictionary of Learned Men* formerly attributed to Hesychius is a compilation of Diogenes Laertius and Suidas, made in the 11th or 12th c.

Hesychii Milesii opuscula duo quae supersunt, ed. J.K. Orelli, Leipzig 1820; C. Müller, FHG IV, Paris 1851, 143-177; *Hesychii Milesii Onomatologi quae supersunt cum prolegomenis*, ed. J. Flach, Leipzig 1882 (cf. P. Pulch: Philol. Anzeiger ed. Leutsch 12 [1882] 519-526); T. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, Leipzig 1901, 1-18; F. Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist. n. 390 (3-38); Krumbacher, 323-325; H. Schultz, *Hesychios*: PWK 8, 2 (1913) 1322-1327; Schmid, *Geschichte*: HAW VII, 2, 2, 1039-1041; M.E.

Colonna, *Gli storici bizantini dal IV secolo al XV secolo*, I, Naples 1956, 60-61; G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I, 471; F. Dölger, *Hesychios v. Milet*: LTK² V, 309-310; Quasten I, 4; S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina*, Milan 1975, 242-243; Altaner, 236; W. Spoerri, *Hesychios*: KLP 2 (1979) 1121-1122; *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, 1: *Hesychii Illustrii Origines Constantinopolitae . . .*, ed. Th. Preger, Leipzig 1989.

A. Labate

HESYCHIUS of Salona (4th–5th c.). Appointed bishop of Salona (Split) in 405. We know his exchange of letters with *John Chrysostom and Pope *Zosimus. Following an eclipse of the sun (19 July 418) and the appearance of a comet, Hesychius wrote to *Augustine asking for clarification of Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks and the end of time. Hesychius's letter, lost, can be reconstructed from Augustine's reply (*Ep*. 197), which refers to Jerome's interpretation and makes clear that the end of the world is unknown but will come after the proclamation of the gospel to all peoples. In his reply to Augustine, Hesychius expresses doubts about Jerome's explanation and holds the Lord's coming to be imminent, from the signs of the times foretold in Scripture. Augustine replied with *Epistle* 199, titled *De fine saeculi* (cf. *Civ. Dei* XX, 5, 4).

DCB 3, 8-9; J.J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia*, London 1969, 430-431; Storia del Cristianesimo 2, 534.

G. Pilara

HESYCHIUS the Sinaite (7th c.?). The name of the priest Hesychius has escaped oblivion thanks only to his *Spiritual florilegium,* transmitted under the title *Two Centuries on Sobriety and Virtue* (Paris [1]1563: PG 93, 1479-1544). This name also appeared, for the first time, in another florilegium composed only in the third quarter of the 13th c., that of the hieromonk Mark. Since the *Centuries* use the works of *John Climacus and *Maximus the Confessor, we conclude that Hesychius was later than them and therefore not before the 1st half of the 7th c.—but he could have been even later. According to part of the MS tradition, Hesychius was *hegumen of the monastery of the Burning Bush on Mt. Sinai. A short recension of the *Centuries* exists, with 24 chapters arranged in alphabetical order. This short form groups together some chapters of the *Centuries* but in fact only gives half the work. The problem of the dependence or relationship between these two recensions has not yet been finally resolved. The central teaching of the *Centuries* is the absolute necessity for any spiritual life of the practice of sobriety (or vigilance, lucidity), equivalent to Greek νῆψις, the one thing capable of progressively freeing the soul from its various passions and leading it, through purification and the union of divine silence, to permanent contact with God. The essential elements of this teaching can be found in other spiritual teachers, but what seems truly original in Hesychius's work is the important, absolutely indispensable place given to Jesus Christ in all our relations with God.

CPG 7862; *long recension:* PG 93, 1479-1544; Venice 1782, I, 127-152; Athens 1957, I, 141-173; *short recension:* M. Waegeman, *Les 24 chapitres "De temperantia et virtute" d'Hésychius le Sinaïte. Édition critique*: SE 19 (1977) 195-285; G.E.H. Palmer - P. Sherrard - K. Ware, *The Philokalia: The Complete Text Compiled by St Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St Makarios of Corinth*, I, London-Boston 1979, 162-198 [Eng. tr. of the long recension]; J. Kirchmeyer, *Hésychius le Sinaïte et ses Centuries*, in *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos 963-1963*, I, Chevetogne 1963, 319-329; M. Waegeman, *La structure primitive du traité "De temperantia et virtute" d'Hésychius le Sinaïte: deux centuries ou un acrostiche alphabétique?*: Byzantion 44 (1974) 467-478; DSp 7,10.

J.-M. Sauget

HETOIMASIA

I. Meaning and ceremonial - II. Basic attributes - III. Typology of figurative representations.

I. Meaning and ceremonial (Th. von Bogyay, 1960, 1971, 1972). The term *hetoimasia* (ἡ ἑτοιμασία) indicates in iconography the representation of the divine throne, modeled on the pagan representation of the *adoratio* of the sovereign, in which the throne appears with the royal insignia placed on the cushion. The image of the "empty throne" as symbol of the invisible divine presence was already present in Eastern and Mediterranean cultures. The ritual considerably influenced Roman ceremonial during the Theodosian era and, when Christians wanted to portray Christ's victory over *death, it inspired representations of *Christus Basileus*, enriching them with symbols that give it a dual interpretation: (1) divine presence, one or triune; (2) triumph over death and certainty of the second *parousia or return of Christ as Judge. Two prior facts made possible the assumption of the symbol of the pagan-imperial throne and its transformation into a Christian symbol: (1) the presence in the Bible itself of the celestial vision as a reflection of court ceremonial, in which the throne had a prominent place; (2) even before the time of *Constantine, the liturgy, esp. in Syria-Palestine, under the influence of the court ritual used in the epiphanies of Eastern divine royalty, had developed the ceremonial of the throne as defined in hetoimasia.

II. Basic attributes (Quarles van Ufford, 1971; Franke, 1972). Christian iconography drew on pagan iconography in the image of the *solium regale*, jeweled and footstooled, enriched by a purple cushion and a cloth laid on the cushion, interpreted as *sudarium Christi*. But the divine significance of the new representation also made use of various symbolic attributes: the insignia of victory, such as the jeweled cross, symbol of the Son of Man triumphant over death; the diadem or crown; the symbols of the four evangelists; the scroll of the seven seals; the lamb and the dove (the Logos, later the Holy Spirit). In this way the *eschatological-apocalyptic meaning of the representation—triumph over death—becomes obvious, to which would later be added the *soteriological sense of the expectation of Christ's return as Judge of the world in the *Secundus Adventus*. This aspect of judgment is translated in the classical Byzantine iconography of hetoimasia by placing the book of the gospel (no longer that of the Apocalypse) on the throne, to signify the invisible presence of Christ the Judge.

III. Typology of figurative representations. *1. Rome and Ravenna* (bibl. in Testini, 1976). At Rome, in the oldest surviving apse mosaic, that of S. Pudenziana, the theandric image appears enthroned as *magister et rex* among the 12 apostles, in a heavenly court that we may imagine as the heavenly Jerusalem; on high the jeweled cross, trophy of victory over death and *iudicii signum*, is flanked by the symbolic figures of the four evangelists. Almost coeval with the Roman apse, the lost mosaic composition of the apse of *Paulinus of Nola's basilica at Fondi, which he describes, unfortunately vaguely, in one of his poems, seems to have shown, between the dove and the *Agnus Dei*, a seat, perhaps by itself, with a cross cloaked in purple (see most recently, J. Engelmann, *Zu den Apsis Tituli des Paulinus von Nola*: JbAC 17 [1974] 21ff.). But a new statement of the cross-throne relationship is achieved in the mosaic image at the summit of the triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore (432–440): cheering witnesses Peter and Paul with the symbols of the four evangelists above; a *clipeus* containing a jeweled throne adorned with cloak and diadem laid on the cushion; below, on a footstool, the scroll of the seven seals; in front, as if suspended, a jeweled cross. This representation clearly brings together the motif of the parousia and that of the *Expositio Evangelii*, a direct echo of its recent institution at the Council of *Ephesus, which appears in the mosaic panel of the register of the martyrs in St. George's, *Thessalonica, and in a bronze relief on the central door of Hagia Sophia, *Constantinople. The mosaic depiction that occupies four lunettes in the chapel of S. Matrona in the church of S. Prisco at S. Maria Capua Vetere (late 5th–early 6th c.) shows a jeweled throne with a cushion on which lies the scroll of the seven seals; for the first time, a dove with nimbus perches on the back of the throne; the bull and the eagle, two of the symbols of the evangelists, stand one at each side, while the other two, the man and the lion, are in the opposite lunette. Opposite the entrance is depicted the nimbused Christ with the apocalyptic letters Α and Ω, while in the lunette above the entrance, acc. to a 17th-c. drawing, was a jeweled cross placed on Mount Paradise with 12 doves beside it, a translated image of the apostolic college. Almost contemporary with the mosaic of S. Maria Maggiore, the Samagher ivory casket (ca. 440), now in the Venice Archaeological Museum, shows on the front a representation of the throne, unfortunately damaged where the object on the cushion, probably a cross, would have been. Beside the Lamb on Mount Paradise at the foot of the throne, appear two groups of three apostles, framed by palms, which in a certain way foreshadow the representation of the throne *sedes Dei et Agni*, later developed, e.g., in the mosaic of the church of SS. Cosma e Damiano (526–530), *Rome. Here, in the *clipeus*, the jeweled throne is associated with the Lamb, on which lies a cross, and on the footstool, a scroll; beside the throne, the symbols of the evangelists have been replaced by candelabra.

At *Ravenna, the earliest example of hetoimasia is in the mosaic that decorates the dome of the Orthodox baptistery (430–450), divided into three registers: in the central *clipeus*, Christ's *baptism; in the second, 12 apostles with martyrs' crowns, as in the pagan ceremony of *aurum coronarium*; in the third, four altars flanked by two seats with diadem and four cross-bearing thrones with purple cloth and a gospel, which evoke the *Expositio Evangelii* in the council chamber. In the Arian baptistery (early 6th c.), the mosaic decoration of the dome, also divided into three zones, has at the center Christ's baptism in the Jordan; in the intermediate band, the Twelve bringing crowns to the jeweled throne, ideally positioned in the center with purple cushion and jeweled cross. Two monuments important for their uniqueness come from the first half of the 5th c.: the Tusculum sarcophagus now at Frascati, and a relief at Berlin. The former, most recently assigned to the 5th c. in the years after the Council of Ephesus (Testini, 1976), shows on the front, in the central frame, an undecorated seat on which lies a cloth which holds a cylindrical object (a cushion? the scroll of the law?); above the seat, but completely detached, is a crown with a six-rayed christogram. Lacking the

more qualified elements of a hetoimasia, the depiction simply evokes the *Expositio Evangelii*. The second monument, a relief preserved at Berlin and published by Brandenburg (*Ein frühchristliches Relief in Berlin*: MDAI(R) 79 [1972] 136ff.), who dates it ca. 400 (but, acc. to Testini, well into the 5th c.), shows a seat ornamented with precious stones, with a cushion bearing royal insignia onto which a dove descends; below, two animals raise their heads toward the throne. Though its difference from the Tusculum sarcophagus is evident, the uniqueness of the iconographical model, not to be identified with a hetoimasia, is clear.

2. *Byzantium.* For the Eastern area, among the examples of major interest we must mention a 5th-c. Coptic fabric with a depiction of a throne inside a crown or diadem; in the background is a construction of curtained columns, the whole completed by the presence at the sides of two girls. A completely particular variant occurs on a 4th-c. ivory pyx now in the Cleveland Museum of Art, where some would see the representation of a chalice on the alignment seat-codex-cross, while Testini sees it as a flattened dove. In the second quarter of the 7th c., the apse mosaic of *Zromi* in Georgia shows a hetoimasia still following the ancient pattern: the apostles pay homage to *Christus Basileus*; below him, what must have been a scene of hetoimasia in a medallion, of which survive part of the throne and a fragment of luminous circle which must have surrounded a hypothetical cross placed on it. Still to the first half of the 7th c. belongs the fresco decoration of the church of S. Maria di Castelseprio (G.P. Bognetti - G. Chierici - A. De Capitani D'Arzago, *Santa Maria di Castelseprio*, Milan 1948). In the socle of the apse remains part of a throne; above it is an open gospel book. The throne is in line with the image of Christ *Pantocrator* in the upper register and corresponds to the place actually occupied by the episcopal throne (Walter, 1970). Castelseprio substantially documents the further evolution of the celebration of the *Expositio Evangelii*, joined to the hetoimasia, which would survive in middle and late Byzantine art (see the contributions cited in the bibl., esp. those of von Bogyay).

RMA 8, 2172ff.; Th. von Bogyay, *Zur Geschichte der Hetoimasia*, in Akten des XI. Int. Byzantinistenkongresses, Munich 1960, 58ff.; RBK II, 1189-1202, s.v. *Hetoimasia*; LCI IV, 305ff, s.v. *Thron*; A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin*, Paris 1936; F. van der Meer, *Maiestas Domini. Théophanies de l'Apocalypse dans l'art chrétien*, Vatican City 1938; V. Quarles van Ufford, *Bemerkungen über den eschatologischen Sinn der Hetoimasia in der frühchristlichen Kunst*: BVAB 46 (1971) 193ff.; P. Franke, *Marginalien zum Problem der Hetoimasie*: ByzZ 65 (1972) 375ff.; P. Testini, *Il sarcofago del Tuscolo ora in S. Maria in Vivario a Frascati*: RivAC 52 (1976) 65ff.; Chr. Walter, *Iconographie des conciles dans la tradition byzantine*, Paris 1970; G. Hellemo, *Adventus Domini. The Eschatological Thought in the 4th Century. Apses and Catechesis*, Leiden 1989; L. Beschi, *I rilievi ravennati dei "troni"*: Felix Ravenna 127/130 (1984–1985) 37-80; R. Wisskirchen, *Mosaikprogramm v. S. Prassede in Rome Ikonographie und Ikonologie*, Münster 1990; Id., *Zum Gerichtsaspekt im Apsismosaik von S. Pudenziana/ Rom*: JbAC 41 (1998) 178-192.

L. Ungaro Testini

HEXAEMERON. This term indicates the work of the six days of creation acc. to the account in Gen 1. In this sense the adjective ἑξαήμερος occurs in *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 3, 5), while as a feminine noun the term appears in *Philo (*Leg. alleg.* II, 12) and later in *Theophilus of Antioch (*Autol.* II, 12), *Hippolytus (*Dan.* 2, 27, 8) and *Methodius of Olympus (*Symp.* 7, 5). The commentaries of *Origen and *Hippolytus on the *Hexaemeron* have been lost; *Jerome mentions these respectively in *Ep.* 84, 7 and *Vir. ill.* 61. *Basil's commentary (9 homilies) and that of *Ambrose (9 sermons, largely dependent on Basil's) have been preserved. Also notable, from the mid-7th c., is George of Pisidia's *Hexaemeron*, in nearly two thousand iambic trimeters.

DTC 6, 2325-2354; LTK² 5, 315; RAC 14, 1250-1269. M. Naldini (ed.), *Basilio di Cesarea. Sulla Genesi* (*Omelie sull'Esamerone*), Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Milan 1990, XXXIIff.

S. Zincone

HEXAPLA. Monumental edition of the OT, accomplished little by little by *Origen, who collected in six columns (in some cases four or eight), word for word, the Hebrew text (with a transcription in Greek script); the Greek versions by the Jews Aquila and Symmachus, exponents of the rabbinic traditions; the Septuagint, the traditional Christian text, a product of Alexandrian Judaism; and other less important translations or recensions. The work was obviously difficult to reproduce; the original, preserved in the library of Caesarea, was used by *Eusebius, *Jerome and others. It was edited by F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum . . . fragmenta*, Oxford 1875, from citations which differ greatly in authority. A 9th–10th-c. copy, rewritten, preserves some psalms, with an exegetical **catena*; it is reproduced and transcribed by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae*, Vatican City 1958. The so-called *Hexaplar Septuagint* is an Origenian edition of the LXX corrected from the Hebrew, with the addition, asterisked, of the missing elements, borrowed from Symmachus, and with the insertion of *obeli* before the elements proper to the Greek text; it was partly translated by Jerome,

and wholly into Syriac (Syro-Hexapla) with divergent marginal readings drawn from other translators. The hexaplar evidence is of greatest importance for the criticism and interpretation of the OT. On recent work see P. Nautin, *Origène*, Paris 1977 (which rejects various ancient evidence, e.g., for the presence of the Hebrew original); M. Caloz, *Étude sur la LXX origénienne du psautier*, Fribourg (S.) 1978.

CPG 1500; CPG/S 1500-1501; M. Harl - O. Munnich - G. Dorival, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*, Paris 1988; G. Dorival, *Esapla*, in *Origene: Dizionario*, Rome 2000, 138-141.

J. Gribomont

HIERACAS of Leontopolis (3rd–4th c.). This ascetic was one of the founders of monastic life in Egypt at the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th c. *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 67,1) praises his virtue and knowledge. As he was followed by many disciples, he soon found himself in conflict with the institutional church represented by Bishop *Peter of Alexandria, who accused him of sharing *Origen's ideas on the preexistence of souls and the resurrection in a spiritual body. Many fragments which have come down to us under the name of Peter clearly refer to Hieracas. Two of these are extracts from the Easter letter of 306. Hieracas was the author of Greek and Coptic writings in which he explained Scripture and also composed some canticles (*Pan.* 67,3).

P. Nautin, *École Pratique des Hautes Études, V*[e] *section, Annuaire*, t. 84 (1975-76) 312-314; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister ecclesiae: il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo*, Rome 2002.

P. Nautin

HIEROCLES SOSSIANUS (d. after 307). *Vir Perfectissimus* and governor of *Palmyra ca. 297 (CIL III 1,133). He was *auctor et consiliarius* of the *persecution in 303 (Lact., *De Mort. Pers.*, 16,2 and *Div. Inst.* V, 2,12), perhaps as *vicarius* of the East if, having become *ex Vicario Praeside*(*m*), he prosecuted the martyr *Donatus (303) (*De Mor. Pers.* 16,4). He was *praeses* in Bithynia until ca. 310, when he led the persecution as *praefectus* of Egypt (Epiph., *Pan.* 68,1,4-5, Eus., *De Mart. Pal.* 5,2-3, and papyri *Cair. Isid.* 69, *Oxy.* XLIII, 3120 and *P. Berol. Inv.* 21654).

Despite the doubts of Hägg, an anti-Christian work must be attributed to Hierocles, the Φιλαλήθης (Eus., *Adv. Hier.* 1-2), written ca. 312 (Bardy, Borzì) or ca. 303 (Barnes, Forrat). This work is lost but can be reconstructed from allusions to it in *Eusebius and *Lactantius. The accusations against Christianity were traditional, but the negation of Christ's divinity was original, with a comparison of his miracles with those of *Apollonius of Tyana related by Philostratus. Hierocles argues that if these do not attest to the divinity of Apollonius, neither do Christ's miracles prove his divine nature. Further, he considered *Peter and *Paul untrustworthy and uncultured compared to Damis, Maximus of Aegae and Philostratus (*Div. Inst.* V, 2,17); he opposed the conduct of Christ and Apollonius before the tribunal which judged them, and accused Christ of theft against the Jews (*Div. Inst.* V, 3,4).

CIL III 1,133; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 68,1,4-5; L. Duchesne, *De Macario Magnete et scriptis eius*, Paris 1877, 19; PWK VIII (2) 1395; G. Bardy, SC 53, 35-36; H. Maehler, *Zur Amtszeit des Präfekten Sossianus Hierokles*: *Collectanes Papyrologica*, *Festschriften H.C. Youtie*, II, Bonn 1976, 527-533; T. Barnes, *Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the "Great Persecution"*: HSPh 80 (1976) 242 f.; Id., *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, 165; M. Forrat, SC 333, 11-20; RAC 15 (1991) 103-109; T. Hägg, *Hierocles the Lover of Truth and Eusebius the Sophist*: SO 67 (1992) 138-150; E. De Palma Digeser, *Porphyry, Julian, or Hierokles?*: *The Anonymous Hellene in Makarios Magnes' "Apokritikos"*: JRS n.s. 53/2 (2002) 466-502; S. Borzì, *Sulla datazione del* Contra Hieroclem *di Eusebio di Cesarea. Una proposta*: Salesianum 65 (2003) 149-160.

S. Borzì

HIEROTHEUS. Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite presents Hierotheus as his teacher. In *Div. Nom.* 3,2 he is praised as superior to all other Christian sages after the *apostles and is depicted as attending the blessed Virgin's funeral. In *Div. Nom.* 2,9-10 and 4,15–17 two excerpts of Hierotheus's works are quoted. In the first the reference is to his *Elements of Theology* (Θεολογικαὶ στοιχειώσεις)—a pendant to the lost *Outlines of Theology* (Θεολογικαὶ ὑποτυπώσεις) by ps.-Dionysius—and in the second to his *Hymns on Love,* or Ἐρωτικοὶ ὕμνοι. It has been suggested that these are in fact works stemming from the school of *Edessa, or in any case from a *Syriac milieu, toward the end of the 5th c. It is also possible that these works of Hierotheus did not have an autonomous existence but are due to ps.-Dionysius himself. The portrait of Hierotheus that emerges is that of a sublime theologian and a mystic, παθῶν τὰ θεῖα, whose writings are δεύτερα λόγια, like a "second Scripture." The first excerpt treats the Christ-Logos, who maintains the harmony of the parts and the whole, being above both the parts and the whole, in terms that resemble *Clement's and *Origen's theology. The second expounds the gradation of love, whose different forms and powers are reduced to unity: the *Neoplatonic

motif culminates in the Christian principle of God-ἀγάπη. Love is a uniting force that moves all, from the Good to the last of beings and from the last of beings to the Good. In a catalog of Constantinople MSS (A. Possevini, *Apparatus Sacer*, Coloniae Agrippinae 1608, II, 46) there even appears a confusion between Hierotheus and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. Indeed, the latter affirms (*Div. Nom.* 3,2-3) that his works are but explications of Hierotheus's "synoptic" teaching, directed to the initiated.

Perczel has forcefully argued that the *Corpus Areopagiticum* is deeply influenced by Origen, esp. his Περὶ Ἀρχῶν and his commentary on John (*Le Pseudo-Denys, lecteur d'Origène*, in *Origeniana VII*, 673-710; *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Platonic Theology*, in *Proclus et la théologie platonicienne*, ed. A.P. Segonds-C. Steel, Leuven 2000, 491-532: 516-519; *God as Monad and Henad: Dionysius the Areopagite and the* Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, in *Origeniana VIII*, ed. L. Perrone, Leuven 2003, 1193-1209), and his tradition, esp. Evagrianism (*Une théologie de lumière*, REA 45 [1999] 79-120; *Pseudo Dionysius and Palestinian Origenism*, in *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church*, ed. J. Patrich, Louvain 2001, 261-282). Therefore, Origen's writings are called "theology" in the *Corpus Areopagiticum,* and Origen himself "theologian" (*Théologiens et magiciens dans le Corpus dionysien,* Adamantius 7 [2001] 54-75).

In this light, it is no accident that the monk Stephen Bar Sudhaile (ca. 480–ca. 543), a follower of Origen and *Evagrius and a supporter of the doctrine of **apokatastasis*, wrote a treatise on this subject in five *memre,* in Syriac, and titled it *Book of the Holy Hierotheus on the Hidden Mysteries of the House of God*. That Sudhaile was the author of this book was already known to Cyriacus of Antioch (8th c., quoted by Barhebraeus, *Nomocanon*, VII 9), to John of Dara (also 8th c.) in *On the Resurrection of Human Bodies* (IV 21), and to Barhebraeus himself in his *Mnarat Qudshe* and *Ecclesiastical History* (222 Abbeloos-Lamy), who also attests that many thought that the book was written by "the holy Hierotheus, the master of the holy Dionysius."

The *Book*, extant only in Syriac (MS. British Museum, Add. [Rich] 7189), pretends to have been written by Hierotheus, a disciple of St. Paul and teacher of Dionysius the Areopagite, to a disciple, addressed as "my child" or "my friend." A preface speaks of a supposed translation from Greek into Syriac, which should probably be seen as part of the literary fiction. Right from the beginning, the recommendation to keep the *Book* secret and not to divulge it among uninitiated people characterizes this work as esoteric. The author claims to have experienced more than once the mystical union with the supreme Good. Here, Sudhaile explains the nature of the Good and the ascent of the mind toward it, stating that "all rational essences glorify and love the Essence from which they were separated." For it is from the primordial Essence that the spiritual and material universe proceeded.

In the *Book,* Sudhaile embraces the idea of the eventual end of punishments in the next world, whose function is thought to be purifying rather than retributive. In line with *Gregory of Nyssa's view, the final restoration will include even the demons and the devil, whose redemption is minutely described in the *Book,* in a chapter titled *On the Repentance of Those Below.* Just like Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, Sudhaile found the main scriptural pillar for this doctrine in 1 Cor 15:28: in the end God will be "all in all," τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι. He even seems to have thought that all creatures will share God's substance in the end (and it is an Origenism of this sort, an exaggeration and systematization of Evagrianism, that seems to have been condemned in Constantinople in AD 553: see Pinggéra). Indeed, he depicted the spiritual resurrection, the mind's victory over the powers of evil—which is described as "not-being," as in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa—and its union with the Christ-Logos, also depicted as the "Great Intellect" (ܗܘܢܐ ܪܒܐ), and then—once Christ has handed the kingdom to the Father, acc. to 1 Cor 15:24-28—with the Spirit and the Father. At this point, all distinct existence will pass away, and only the Arch-Good will remain, from which the universal Essence (Syr. ܐܘܣܝܐ = Gr. οὐσία) and all individual existences had proceeded, by which all is sustained, and to which all beings tend. "No being will perish or be destroyed, but all will return and be sanctified and united" to the supreme Good. Even beyond ܚܕܝܘܬܐ or "unity" (which was the culmination of Origen's escalation of image-likeness-unity), the *Book* posits "mingling" (ܚܒܝܟܘܬܐ), where any duality between lover and beloved, glorifier and glorified, will vanish. Thus God "will be all in all." *Manichean elements have been pointed out in the *Book,* but the whole system of the *Book* is very far from positing evil as an antithetical principle equal to the Good. The metaphysical line is that of Origen, even if exaggerated, not that of *gnosticism and Manicheism.

*Philoxenus of Mabbug, in his *Letter to Abraham and Orestes,* who lived at Edessa, describes Sudhaile's thought as similar to that of *Isaac of Nineveh (*First Part* 28,202-205): the six days are this world, the seventh is the rest in She'ol, and the first day of the new week (Sunday) is the *anastasis-apokatastasis*.

Philoxenus was also concerned that Sudhaile's doctrine might render Christ's suffering and death superfluous—even though the apokatastasis in Origen is far from making them superfluous, but is rather based on them—and thought that his conception of the final consubstantiality of all with God was impious, also because it even entailed the eventual reabsorption of the three persons of the Trinity in one and the same Essence, from which the first divine emanation proceeded at the beginning.

For these ideas, Sudhaile had to leave Edessa and flee to *Palestine, near or in *Jerusalem, where the monastic environment was more favorable to Origenian thought. It is uncertain whether he returned to Edessa later, where Barhebraeus locates his *floruit* around AD 542 in his ecclesiastical history (215 Abbeloos-Lamy). On the same account, Sudhaile was also attacked by *Jacob of Sarug, who wrote a letter to him insisting on the eternity of punishment and on the parallel between "life everlasting" and "hell/fire everlasting" (in the Bible, the adjective is αἰώνιος, which does not mean "eternal, everlasting"; this is the meaning of ἀΐδιος, and only life is called ἀΐδιος in the Bible and in many Greek fathers, never death or punishment: *see* *eternity).

While Frothingham directly identified Hierotheus with Sudhaile and regarded the latter as the master of the author of the *Corpus Areopagiticum,* Louth thinks that Sudhaile's *Book of Hierotheus* is later than the *Corpus Areopagiticum,* which Sudhaile knew and by which he was inspired (also in the choice of names from the apostolic era for pseudonymity).

A confession of faith ascribed to Hierotheus and contained in an Arabic MS (Arab. Vatic. 409 f. 397) also displays elements of pantheism and mysticism that are to be found in Sudhaile's *Book*. A detailed commentary of the *Book,* which is extant, was authored by Theodosius of Antioch (9th c.), and Barhebraeus wrote an abridgment of it, to which he attached a commentary mainly derived from that of Theodosius. He joined the sections of the *Book* that deal with the beginning and the end; of course, *protology and *eschatology were closely related in the Origen tradition.

Perczel (*The Earliest Syriac Reception*) has recently suggested that Stephen Bar Sudhaile is the "brother Mor Stephen," who is mentioned in *Sergius of Resh'ayna's introduction to his Syriac translation of the *Corpus Dionysianum* (a translation that, acc. to Perczel, is much closer to the original Greek than the Greek textus receptus available to us now and ultimately based on the edition of *John of Scythopolis); Sergius wishes him to enjoy the *apokatastasis*. If this identification is correct, Stephen helped Sergius in his translation, which would also explain the shared vocabulary between this translation and the *Book of Hierotheus*. The Origenism of the *Book of Hierotheus* and of the introduction and translation of the *Corpus Dionysianum* by Sergius make it all the more likely that ps.-Dionysius himself belonged to an Origenian milieu.

Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, I, 303; II, 30-33; 290-291; A. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, III, 704–707; A.L. Frothingham, *Stephen Bar-Sudaili and the Book of Hierotheus*, Leiden 1886; *The Book of the Holy Hierotheus Ascribed to Stephen Bar-Sudhaile* (*c. 500 A.D.*), ed. F.S. Marsh, London 1927, Amsterdam 1979 reprint; A. Vööbus, *Discovery of New Manuscript Sources for the Book of Hierotheos: Very Important Finds for Syrian Mysticism*, RSO 49 (1975) 185-189; T. Jansma, *Philoxenus' Letter to Abraham and Orestes Concerning Stephen bar Sudaili*, LM 87 (1984) 79-86; D. Bundy, *The Book of the Holy Hierotheos and Manichaeism*, Augustinianum 26 (1986) 273-279; A. Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, London 1989, esp. 63-4, 69-70, and 78-98; K. Pinggéra, *Das Descensus-ad-inferos-Motiv im "Buch des Heiligen Hierotheus,"* in *Zu Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen*, eds. M. Tamcke - A. Heinz, Münster 2000, 181-194; Id., *All-Erlösung und All-Einheit. Studien zum "Buch des heiligen Hierotheus" und seiner Rezeption in der syrisch-orthodoxen Theologie*, Würzburg-Wiesbaden 2002; J. Dillon - S. K. Wear, *Dionysius the Areopagite and the Neoplatonist Tradition*, Aldershot 2007; E.D. Perl, *Theophany*, Albany 2007; K. Pinggéra, *Die Bildwelt im* Buch des heiligen Hierotheus—*ein philosophischer Mythos?*, in *Mystik—Metapher—Bild*, ed. M. Tamcke, Göttingen 2008, 29-42; *Rethinking Dionysius the Areopagite*, ed. S. Coakley - Ch.M. Stang, Malden, MA 2009 (with my review in RBL 2009), esp. I. Perczel: *The Earliest Syriac Reception of Dionysius*, 27-42; I. Ramelli, *Apocatastasi*, Milan 2009, ch. 2.

I. Ramelli

HILARIANUS, Quintus Julius (4th c.). The scarce information that we have concerning Quintus Julius Hilarianus comes entirely from his works, since he is almost unknown to all other literary sources. The first work that comes to us with his name is titled *De ratione Paschae et mensis* and was completed *in die isto III Nonarum Martiarum post consulatum Arcadii IV et Honorii III* (5 March 397). The second is titled *De Cursu Temporum* and was completed *in consulatu Caesarii et Attici die IX Kalendas Aprilis* (24 March 397). The *De ratione Paschae* deals with ecclesiastical computations and discusses problems connected with the determination of the date of Easter acc. to the path of the moon, though it does not contain any paschal table. From a cultural-historical point of view, it is worth observing that he follows the chronology of the Passion acc. to the Evangelist *John, affirming that Christ was immolated as the true paschal lamb *luna XIV, VIII Kal. Aprilis* (cf. *De ratione Pasch.* 5; 15). The *De cursu temporum* (or also

De mundi duratione) seeks to determine the duration of the world on the basis of scriptural data and without the help of useless profane science. He believes in the millenarian cosmic week and in millenarism: Christ died halfway through the sixth millennium, and between his death and the end of the world there are only 470 years, and therefore, from the time when he writes in 397, there are still 101 years until the coming of Christ (see *De cursu temp.* 17). The seventh day of the cosmic week marks the advent of the millenarian reign of Christ with the righteous on the earth, which will be followed by the universal judgment, the total destruction of the earth and the heavens, and the coming of the celestial Jerusalem.

In greater detail, in the 19 pages (ed. Frick) of the *De cursu temporum,* Hilarianus, keeping in mind the book of Genesis, recalls that creation took place in six days and that on the seventh day God rested; but thinking as well of Psalm 90 (89):4, cited in 2 Pet 3:8, he also recalls that before God a thousand years are as one day. Therefore, it seems logical to him that men will live on earth for six thousand years (i.e., six cosmic days), and when the seventh millennium begins (i.e., the seventh cosmic day of divine rest), the just will rise and for a thousand years they will live the *dies septimus et sabbatus aeternus,* while the wicked will live *cum poena*. At the end of the seventh cosmic day will occur the second resurrection and the definitive triumph of God and the good.

This conception is the fruit of minute calculations, worthy of the best patristic numerological tradition. From the creation of Adam to the flood there are 2,257 years; from the creation of the world to the liberation of the Hebrews from the slavery of Egypt, 3,699 years; from the creation of the world to the anointing of Saul as king, 4,300 years; from the creation of the world to the beginning of the Babylonian captivity, 4,814 years; from the creation of the world to the death of Jesus, 5,530 years (i.e., Jesus died in the sixteenth year of Tiberius). Thus, from the death of Jesus to the completion of 6,000 years, only 470 years remain, of which 369 have already passed and therefore 101 remain in order to complete 6,000 years. One cannot deny that Hilarianus Christianizes the pagan cycles of return (*nostoi*): "Socrates will again be condemned; he will again drink the hemlock," with the Christian typology of biblical figures: as Abraham and his descendants lived 470 years before being able to enter the Promised Land, so the followers of Christ will have to wait 470 years before the seventh millennium begins. For Hilarianus, the Bible contains all past history—*res gestae*—and all prophecy for the future—*res quae gerentur*.

It is difficult to deduce the ecclesiastical environment of Hilarianus from the linguistic and cultural data of the two works. Some elements might refer either to Proconsular Africa or to Gaul. An African origin might have a greater foundation if he could be identified with the recipient of the small work *De ratione Paschali* of the African bookkeeper *Agriustia. Yet even his name appears with the alternation Hilarianus/Hilarius.

CPL 2279, 2280; PL 13, 1097-1114; CPPM III/A 905; C. Frick, *Chronica minora*, I, Leipzig 1892, 153-174; H. Gelzer in *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*, II, 1, Leipzig 1880-1898, 121-129; U. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*, II/2, Turin 1928, 1143-1144; P. de Labriolle, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, I, París [3]1947, 437-438; E. Peterson, s.v.: EC 6 (1951) col. 1613; I. Lana, *Q. Giulio Ilariano e il problema della storiografia latina cristiana nel IV secolo*: 123 (1995) 73-89; I. Lana, *Q. Giulio Ilariano e il problema della storiografia latina cristiana del IV secolo*: Arachnion. A Journal of Ancient Literature and History on the Web, nr. 3 - <www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num3/ilana.html>.

V. Loi - B. Amata

HILARION of Gaza (291–371). Palestinian monk about whom nothing is known except the *Vita* written by *Jerome (PL 23, 29-64) before 396, whose historical truth is difficult to assess. While a student in *Alexandria he is supposed to have converted and become close to Saint *Anthony, whose temptations and asceticism he afterward copied near Maiuma. Disciples joined him in 329; he sought solitude in 360 in Egypt, Libya, Sicily and Dalmatia, and in the end died in Cyprus. Feast 21 October.

A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Vite dei Santi*, IV, Rome 1975, 72-142; N. Adkin, *Jerome, "Vita Hilarionis" 11, 13: "multis retro circensibus"*: Past/Present 54 (1999) 192-197.

J. Gribomont

HILARUS, pope (461–468). A native of Sardinia, when still a deacon he was sent together with other legates by *Leo the Great to the Council of *Ephesus in 449 (*latrocinium Ephesinum*), where he protested the condemnation of *Flavian of Constantinople and afterward, together with his companions, left the council. His behavior was highly praised by Leo (*Ep.* 44: PL 54, 827; cf. Prosp. Aq., *Chron. ad an. 449*: PL 51, 601-2; Theodrt., *Ep.* 116 and 118). In 455–456 he was appointed archdeacon and thus became a close associate of the pope. In this capacity, he wrote to Victor of Limoges to consult him on the date of the celebration of Easter (Thiel 2 and 3, 130f.). When on 19 November 461 he was elected successor of Leo, he retained his policy and spirit, both with the East-

ern and Western churches. His surviving writings are the address to the Roman council of 465 (Mansi 7, 959f.) and some letters—many have been lost—regarding various interventions in *Gaul and *Spain. With respect to Gaul he had confidence in *Leontius of Arles. He assigned him to oversee church discipline and resolve any possible difficulties. The letters sent to Spain deal with the bishops of the province of *Tarragona and their behavior. For these reasons, the *Liber pontificalis* rightly said of him that "he strengthened the power and primacy of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic See" (I, 242). It also records various works carried out by Hilarus in the Lateran and St. Lawrence Outside the Walls, monasteries built, and furnishings purchased for the various basilicas. Inscriptions attest to his construction work (Diehl 977-980; 1782). He died 29 February 468, but his feast is on the 28th since 468 was a leap year. He was buried in the basilica of St. Lawrence.

CPL 1662-3; PL 58, 12-32; PLS 3, 379-381; 441-443; Thiel 126-170; DTC 6, 2385-2388; Hfl-Lecl 2, 566-621; BS 7, 737-758; F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo nelle lettere dei Papi…* III/2: *Da Ilaro a Ormisda*, Rome 1946; Patrologia IV, 123-4; Epapi I, 442-447.

A. Di Berardino

HILARY (4th–5th c.). A Christian of Syracuse, before July 415 he sent a letter to *Augustine (in Aug., *Ep*. 156), in which he asks for explanations of certain topics dealt with by preachers in Sicily; Augustine responded to him (*Ep*. 157), refuting the *Pelagian doctrines contained in this preaching.

We might hypothesize the identification of Hilary with someone of the same name who in 428–429 writes to Augustine (*Ep*. 226) asking him about certain questions raised by the semi-Pelagians at *Marseille and in other places in *Gaul. This Hilary is certainly a layman (see *Ep*. 226,9) and had been in *Hippo before going to Gaul (see *Ep*. 226,10). At the same time as Hilary, *Prosper of Aquitaine sent a similar request to Augustine (among Augustine's letters: *Ep*. 225). Augustine responded immediately with *De praedestinatione sanctorum*.

Aug., *Ep*. 156; 226; PCBE 2/1, 986-7; CPL 262; DCB 3, 75-76.

E. Malaspina

HILARY, poet (5th c.). A native of *Gaul but must be clearly distinguished from the similarly named bishops of *Poitiers and *Arles. We know nothing of him except that he probably lived in the mid-5th c. He may be the author of two or three hexameter poems, which, both in tradition and by scholars, have been variously attributed, in particular to *Hilary of Poitiers. These poems are: *In Genesim ad Leonem Papam,* 198 verses concerning creation, the fall and the universal flood (CPPM 2, 2160); the *De Evangelio* on the birth of Christ and the visit of the magi (CPPM 2, 2162); he is probably also author of The *De martyrio Macchabaeorum,* of which there are two recensions (CPPM 2161; 2603; 2630).

CPL 1427; PL 50, 1275-1287 (*In Genesium*, *De martyrio M.*). The three works are found in CSEL 23, 1, 231-274. *Studies*: CSEL 23, XXVIII-XXIX; REAug 24 (1978) 365, n. 146; G. Gallo, *Uno scritto filopelagiano*: Aevum 51 (1977) 333-348; DHGE 24, 449-50; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975, 38-9; LACL 332.

A. Hamman

HILARY of Arles (ca. 401–449). He was born ca. 401 of a noble family (Genn., *Vir. ill.* 70) connected with the consular family of *Bishop Honoratus of Arles, as he himself affirms (*Sermo de vita Honorati* 4,8-11, Cavallin 51; 36,8-9, 75). The most widespread source—but not always trustworthy because of its extreme idealization of him—is a *Vita Hilarii,* probably written by a certain *Honoratus of Marseille around 475 (Cavallin). An anonymous biography of Bishop *Lupus of Troyes speaks of a sister of Hilary, Pimeniola, who was married to Lupus, and leads us to believe that Hilary, like Lupus, was a native of Belgic Gaul (*Vita Lupi* 1). After having been quite given to the world in his youth, he was converted by Honoratus to the ascetical life and conducted to *Lérins not before 420 (Pricoco, *L'isola dei santi*, 38). He remained on the island a few years, withdrawing a first time in order to follow Honoratus, called to the episcopal see of Arles, and then definitively in 430 or 431, when he himself was elected bishop of that diocese.

As bishop he immediately attained a position of preeminence in the Gallic church. He presided over the Councils of *Riez (439), *Orange (441) and *Vaison. He took part in harsh disputes, even with *Leo I, over the primacy of Arles. He remained faithful to his ascetic habits, not disdaining even manual labor (*Vita Hilarii* 11; Genn., *Vir ill.* 70; CIL XII, 949b). He died in 449 (*Chron. Gall.a.* 452, 134; Leo M., *Ep*. 40; PL 54, 815A) or shortly after (Gennadius), 48 years old (*Vita Hilarii* 24,2-3, Cavallin 100). Gennadius states that he wrote *parva*; the biographer attributes to him homilies, verses, a *symboli explicatio* and a large number of letters (*Vita Hilarii* 14,25f.). Recently the *Carmen de providentia* has been defended as his (PL 51, 617-638). Hilary is certainly the author of the *Sermo de vita Honorati,* a discourse which he delivered ca. 431 on the anniversary of the death of Honoratus, and which he probably rewrote in an

elaborate form, with a good knowledge of the precepts of rhetoric and biography.

BHL I, 579, n. 3882; CPL 500-509; PL 50, 1249-1292; *Vita sanctorum Honorati et Hilarii*, ed. S. Cavallin, Lund 1952; *Vie de Saint Honorat*, SC 235, Paris 1977; A.C. Cooper-Marsdin, *The History of the Islands of Lerins*, Cambridge 1913, 185-191; M. Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Litter.*, IV, 1, Munich 1920, 528-9; B. Kolon, *Die Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis. Eine eidographische Studie*, Paderborn 1925; K.F. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, n. 193, 182-3; L. Cristiani, *Lérins et ses Fondateurs*, S. Wandrille 1946; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, II, Paris [2]1966, 244-250; G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste*, Bonn 1964; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Munich 1965, 50-1; S. Pricoco, *Modelli di santità a Lerino. L'ideale ascetico nel "Sermo de vita Honorati" di Ilario di Arles*: SiculorumGymn. 27 (1974) 54-88; S. Gallo, *Uno scritto filo-pelagiano attribuibile a Ilario di Arles*: Aevum 5l (1977) 333-348; Honorat de Marseille, *La Vie d'Hilaire d'Arles.* Intr., Fr. tr. and notes by P-A. Jacob, SC 404, Paris 1995; S. Pricoco, *L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978; F.E. Consolino, *Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica*, Naples 1979, 51-61; Patrologia IV, 510-511; R. Nouailhat, *Saints et Patrons. Les premiers moines de Lérins*, Paris 1988; R. Numberg, *Askese als sozialer Impuls. Monastische-asketische Spiritualität als Wurzel und Triebleder sozialer Ideen und Aktivitaten der Kirche in Sudgallien im 5. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1988; C.M. Kasper, *Theologie und Askese. Die Spiritualität des Inselmönchtums von Lérins im Sudgallien im 5. Jahrhundert*, Münster 1991.

S. Pricoco

HILARY of Poitiers (beginning of 4th c.–ca. 367).
I. Life - II. Works

I. Life. The little that we know about Hilary's life we gather from his writings, as *Jerome did (*Vir. ill.* 100). His birth is placed by conjecture at the beginning of the 4th c. and his election as bishop of *Poitiers, around 350. The attempt has been made to find in the prologue of the *De Trinitate* his *itinerarium ad Deum,* beginning in paganism; but these are probably just *loci communes*. We find him for the first time in Béziers in 356 attempting to oppose the activity of the *Arians in *Gaul; he was deposed together with Rodanius of Toulouse and sent into exile in *Phrygia. There Hilary came to know the works of *Origen, which deeply influenced his spirituality and exegesis. Moreover, through contact with the *homoiousians, the anti-Arians and also the anti-Nicenes, he deepened his knowledge of the Arian controversy and became convinced that it was necessary to be on guard not only against the danger of Arianism but also the opposite error of *Sabellianism, and that it was possible to profess an orthodox *trinitarian theology even without basing it on the Nicene **homoousios,* which was in some respects ambiguous. Consequently, Hilary, above all in the *De synodis,* worked to reunite in one common front the anti-Arians of the West, who were Nicenes, and those of the East, who were anti-Nicenes. Enjoying a certain liberty of movement in his exile, he participated in the Council of *Seleucia (359) in the ranks of the homoiousians. In *Constantinople he attempted, without success, to have a public debate with *Saturninus of Arles, a defender of Arianism from Gaul, who had been a participant in the Council of *Rimini and was in Constantinople. Hilary was permitted to enter Gaul once again, but without being reintegrated into the episcopate. But Gaul had at this point already passed over to the authority of *Julian (361), and thus Hilary, enjoying complete freedom of movement, led the anti-Arian reaction, which culminated in the Council of *Paris (361). There he brought about the victory of a doctrinal position compatible with both homoousian and homoiousian theology and had moderate measures adopted with regard to the many who were forced to subscribe in Rimini to the Arian formula. We find Hilary again in 364 in *Milan, together with *Eusebius of Vercelli, attempting to expel the Arian bishop *Auxentius without success. Jerome dates his death to 367 (*Chron.* s.a.).

II. Works. The greater part of Hilary's literary activity was connected with the Arian controversy, but he also devoted himself to scriptural *exegesis. Containing doctrinal content is the *De trinitate* in 12 books (Jerome knew of this work as *Adversus arianos libri;* others, as *De fide*), which was written entirely during Hilary's exile (356–360)—the opposition to Sabellianism, evident already in the first books and foreign to the Western world, excludes the possibility that these books were written before going into exile, while the final chapters (XII, 55-56), on the Holy Spirit, discuss a topic that was known in the West only later. The first book is introductory and was added after the rest of the work had already been written. Books II-III, which treat the Arian controversy in a global manner, were conceived of as a work complete in itself; only later when Hilary had already begun to compose another anti-Arian work, were those books fused with this other work, constituting the initial part. This second part began with a confutation of the profession of faith which Arius had sent to *Alexander, and treated above all the relation of unity/distinction of the Father and the Son on the basis of passages of the OT (above all, the theophanies in Genesis) and the NT. In the final structure of the work, resulting from the fusion of the two writings, these themes occupy books IV-VII. Books VIII-XII treat in detail some of the principal

scriptural passages involved in the debate (e.g., 1 Cor 15:28; Pr 8:22) from which the Arians deduced the inferiority in nature of the Son.

Hilary avails himself of his knowledge of *Tertullian, *Novatian and, above all, homoiousian theology, but reelaborates their thought with great originality. He affirms the unity in nature and the distinction in person of the Father and of the Son. He conceives such unity as total compenetration of the one within the other, such that they differ only by their relation of origin: the Father has really generated the Son without losing anything belonging to his nature, and the Son has received and contains in himself everything belonging to the Father, whom he is equal to in *operatio, virtus, potestas, gloria, vita*. In order to distance himself from the Arians, who proposed the passion of Christ as a proof of his imperfect divinity, Hilary affirms the real but celestial body of Christ, capable of experiencing the passions but not pain (*Trin*. X,18,23). He is less interested in the Holy Spirit, who was less discussed at that time. He tends to consider the Spirit as a gift, a divine force, rather than as a person. In the final chapters of the work (XII, 55-56) he excludes the possibility that the Spirit is a creature, as Arians and **pneumatomachoi* held.

In the first months of 359, in preparation for the Council of Rimini, Hilary wrote the *De synodis* for the bishops of Gaul but also addressed himself to the anti-Arians of the East. In the first part, he examines the formulas of faith published from 341 to 357, resolutely condemns only the last, the *blasphemia Sirmiensis,* as it was openly Arian, and gives a benevolent interpretation to the others, seeking to demonstrate their compatibility with Western theology. In the second part, he compares the terms *homoousios* and *homoiousios,* interpreting the second as equal acc. to substance. He shows that both terms can be taken in an orthodox or a heterodox sense. He therefore invites Western supporters of the one term and Eastern supporters of the other to seek a common understanding beyond the differences merely of words and not of meaning. The rigorist *Lucifer of Cagliari criticized this work as being too open toward anti-Nicene Eastern theology, and Hilary had to defend himself in an apology, passages of which have been published at the foot of the page in the *De synodis* (Smulders recently brought to light two others). It is true that Hilary tries to minimize the doctrinal differences between Westerners and Easterners in order to favor an understanding, but the work taken as a whole demonstrates perfect awareness of the complex situation of the East and a rare capacity to view the situation in its essential points, without being led astray by additions and marginal aspects. In the West, this is almost the only case in which such a quality can be found.

Other works of Hilary dedicated to the controversy are interesting above all from a polemical and historical point of view. The so-called *Liber I ad Constantium* consists of two texts: a letter sent by the Western bishops of the Council of *Serdica (343) which invites *Constantius to stop the persecutions against those in favor of the Nicene Creed; and a narrative text in which Hilary tells of the irregularities of the Council of *Milan; this text was written before his exile (356). In the *Liber II ad Constantium,* written in 359 in Constantinople, he asks the emperor to consent to a debate between himself and the Arian Saturninus of Arles and not to approve the formulation of faith of Rimini. When he saw that his attempts were vain and that Constantius was determined in his support of the Arians, Hilary wrote a violent little work, *Liber contra Constantium,* in which he is considered worse than the most cruel persecutors of the past, *Nero, *Decius and *Maximian, because he was not an open enemy of the church, but a subtle oppressor. Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 100) says that it was written after the death of Constantius, but from the content it is clear that the author is still in exile and therefore Constantius is still alive. The *Contra Auxentium,* directed to the Catholic bishops, is a report on the unsuccessful attempt of Hilary and *Eusebius to act against the Arian bishop of Milan (364). It documents the shrewd reaction of Auxentius to the action of his adversaries and his attachment to the faith of Rimini. The *Fragmenta historica* is a collection of documents relating to the Arian controversy, published for the first time in 1598 (PL 10) and republished by Feder in 1916 (CSEL 65) on the basis of a larger number of MSS, with a new order and title (*Collectanea antiariana Parisina*). The first part (which contains the *Liber I ad Constantium* as well) unites documents relating to the Council of Serdica and to the following years, with ample commentary by Hilary. The second part is composed of documents relating to the Council of Rimini, to which are added letters of Pope *Liberius. The third part contains documents after 359 up to 366. It is thought that this documentation was taken by Hilary from the lost *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium, historiam Ariminensis et Seleuciensis synodi continens,* which Jerome speaks of—an unknown person is said to have removed from the *Liber* the documentation prior to the end of the 4th c. Some documents may not have been gathered by Hilary but rather added later: the letter of *Eusebius of Vercelli to *Gregory of Elvira is a forgery of the *Luciferians (*Frag.* A II); the

documents relating to *Valens, *Ursacius and *Germinius (A III; B V.VI) date to 366 and were likely not inserted by Hilary, who died in 367. As a whole, the work is of fundamental importance for knowledge of the entire central phase—the most complex—of the Arian controversy.

Hilary's exegetical activity began even before his exile, with the *Commentary on Matthew,* a rather small work which explains the principal facts recounted in that gospel in the form of an *opus continuum,* which does not present any trace of previous homiletic elaboration, as is the case for the other exegetical works of Hilary. The author prefers the *allegorical method, which makes clear, beyond the literal meaning, the spiritual significance. This spiritual meaning, developing points already present in the literal text, interprets the actions and words of Jesus in light of the consequences which flow from them, and Hilary perceives in them the prefiguration of the hostility of the Jews toward the church at its beginning, the abolition of the old economy, the preaching of the message to the pagans. The work presents us with a still imperfect trinitarian doctrine and traces of anthropological materialism (corporality of the soul). In the East, in contact with the work of Origen, Hilary was converted to *Platonic spiritualism, as is demonstrated by his *Commentary on the Psalms,* written probably during exile. The interpretation of just over fifty psalms has come down to us. The work was certainly larger, but we do not know if Hilary commented on the entire Psalter; even Jerome only knew of the work as incomplete. He states that it was derived from Origin's *Commentary on the Psalms*. A comparison is difficult because there are only a few passages remaining of Origen's work, even if some are long passages. It is, however, undeniable that Hilary, without lacking personal contributions, e.g., regarding trinitarian problems, nevertheless held close to the model from which he borrowed his principal theme: the Psalms prefigure the early life of Christ, from his birth to his resurrection and exaltation. The same hermeneutic principle, of interpreting the OT in relation to Christ and the church, is applied in the brief *De mysteriis,* which interprets a few famous episodes taken above all from Genesis and Exodus in a typically *Alexandrian manner. This work, probably dating to after his exile, was published in 1887 on the basis of a MS of Arezzo. This MS contains three hymns as well, the only ones remaining from the *Liber hymnorum* which Jerome mentions (*loc. cit.*). The three hymns, which have come to us more or less incomplete, treat different themes (*Ante saecula* is trinitarian, *Fefellit saevam* baptismal [?], *Adae carnis* christological) in strophes composed of various lyrical meters (asclepiadean, glyconic, iambic, trochaic) and in intricate form, in accord with the classicist canons for Latin poetry of the period. Hilary wrote them in order to give his faithful a doctrinal culture, and in doing so was the first in the Latin-speaking Christian world; but Jerome observes that the innovation did not have favorable results. Another hymn, *Hymnum dicat,* which has come down to us by another path, and which exalts Christ's work of redemption in trochaic meter, must not be considered authentic for reasons of language and style, even if its authenticity has at times been defended. Certainly spurious are two other hymns and a letter *Ad Abram filium*. Of the works known to Jerome, the following have been lost: beyond the *Liber contra Valentem et Ursacium* and a large part of the *Liber hymnorum,* the *Liber ad praefectum Sallustium sive contra Dioscorum,* and the *Tractatus in Iob,* derived from Origen, of which we know only scarce fragments, indirectly.

H.Ch. Brennecke, *Hilarius v. Poitiers*: TRE 15, 315-322; BBKL 2,835-840; M. Durst, *Hilarius*: LTK³ 5, 100-102; RAC 15 (1991) 139-167; *Hilary of Poitiers, St.*: ODC (1997) 769-770; M. Durst, *Hilarius von Poitiers*: LACL (1998) 293-296.

Editions and Translations: CPL 427-472; PL 9-10; PLS 1, 241-286; CSEL 22 (*Com. Ps.*), 65 (*Myst., Frag. Hist., Hymns*); SC 19bis (*Myst.*), 254.258 (*Com.Mt.*); CCL 62 (*Trin.*); Hilaire de Poitiers, *Contre Costance*, intr., crit. text, Fr. tr. with notes and index by André Rocher, Paris 1987 (SC 334); M. Milhau, *In Matth.*, Paris 1988 (SC 344 and 347); P. Smulders (ed.), *Hilary of Poitiers' Preface to His* Opus Historicum, Leiden 1995; J. Doignon, ChrSL 61, 1997; L.R. Wickham (ed.), *Hilary of Poitiers: Conflicts of Conscience and Law in the Fourth-Century Church: Against Valens and Ursacius: The Extant Fragments, Together with his Letter to the Emperor Constantius*, Eng. tr. with intr. and notes, from the edition by A. Feder in CSEL 65 (1916) 41-205, Liverpool 1997; Hilaire de Poitiers, *La Trinité*, crit. text by P. Smulders; intr. by M. Figura and J. Doignon; tr. by G.M. de Durand, Ch. Morel and G. Pelland; notes by G. Pelland, Paris 1999-2001 (SC 443, 448, 462); *Sancti Hilarii Pictaviensis episcopi* Tractatus super psalmos; In Psalmum CXVIII, ed. J. Doignon; with R. Demeulenaere, Turnhout 2002.

Studies: Patrologia II, 36-38 (bibl.); P. Smulders, *La doctrine trinitaire de s. Hilaire de Poitiers*, Rome 1944; C.F.A. Borchardt, *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle*, Den Haag 1966; E.R. Labande (ed.), *Hilaire et son temps.* Actes du Colloque de Poitiers, 29 septembre - 3 octobre 1968, à l'occasion du XVI[e] centenaire de la mort de saint Hilaire, Paris 1969; J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil*, Paris 1971; L.F. Ladaria, *El Espíritu santo en San Hilario de Poitiers*, Madrid 1977; P. Smulders, *Two Passages of Hilary's* Apologetica Responsa *Rediscovered*: Bijdragen 39 (1978) 234-243; L. Longobardo, *Il linguaggio negativo della trascendenza di Dio in Ilario di Poitiers*, Naples 1982; H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II.: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin-New York 1984; J. Doignon, *Quatre formules énigmatiques dans l'exégèse d'Hilaire de Poitiers*: VChr 38 (1984) 371-394; M. Figura, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Hilarius von Poitiers*, Freiburg-Basel-

Vienna 1984; L. Brésard, *Hilaire de Poitiers et le mystère de la naissance*: BLE 86 (1985) 83-100; J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers "Kirchenpolitiker"? À propos d'un ouvrage récent*: RHE 80 (1985) 441-454; J. Fontaine, *Les origines de l'hymnodie chrétienne latine d'Hilaire de Poitiers à Ambroise de Milan*: La MaisonD 161 (1985) 33-74; L.F. Ladaria, *"Dispensatio" en S. Hilario de Poitiers*: Gregorianum 66 (1985) 429-455; M. Canévet, *Le schéma de conversion dans le prologue du "De Trinitate" d'Hilaire de Poitiers et le livre VII des "Confessions" d'Augustin Problématique d'un temps*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 165-174; J. Doignon, *Scepticisme, lassitude et conversion chez Hilaire de Poitiers*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 175-184; M. Durst, *Die Eschatologie des Hilarius von Poitiers: ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Bonn 1987; J. Doignon, *Du nouveau dans l'exploration de l'oeuvre d'Hilaire de Poitiers (1983-1988). Recension critique de six ouvrages*: REAug 34 (1988) 93-105; J. Doignon, *Un témoignage inédit des "Tractatus super Psalmos" d'Hilaire de Poitiers contre l'hymnodie païenne*: RBen 99 (1989) 35-40; L.F. Ladaria, *La cristología de Hilario de Poitiers*, Rome 1989; J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers face à la mystique origénienne de la purification par l'amour*: REAug 36 (1990) 217-224; J. Doignon, *Sur la "descente" du Christ en ce monde chez Hilaire de Poitiers*: RHR 207 (1990) 65-75; J. Doignon, *Un cri d'alarme d'Hilaire de Poitiers sur la situation de l'Eglise à son retour d'exil*: RHE 85 (1990) 281-290; J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers témoin latin le plus ancien d'un texte rare du logion "Matthieu" 10,38*: RBen 101 (1991) 28-31; G. Pelland, *"Gloriam ex conspectu gloriae" (Hilaire, "Tr. ps." 118, heth, 8)*: Gregorianum 72 (1991) 757-763; D.H. Williams, *A Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers*: JEH 42 (1991) 202-217; J. Doignon, *L'Incarnation: la vraie visée du Ps 44,8 sur l'onction du Christ chez Hilaire de Poitiers*: RTL 23 (1992) 172-177; M. Milhau, *Différentes versions de titres ou de versets de psaumes rapportées par Hilaire de Poitiers "Tractatus super Psalmos"*: RBen 102 (1992) 24-43; T.D. Barnes, *Hilary on His Exile*: VChr 46 (1992) 129-140; T.D. Barnes, *The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitier*: Phoenix 46 (1992) 256-265; D.H. Williams, *The Anti-Arian Campaigns of Hilary of Poitiers and the "Liber Contra Auxentium"*: ChHist 61 (1992) 7-22; J. Doignon, *La connexion du spirituel et du charnel dans la méthodologie exégétique d'Hilaire de Poitiers. À propos d'un texte malmené d'"In psalmum" 1,17*: VetChr 30 (1993) 259-266; J. Doignon, *Touches origéniennes dans l'enseignement d'Hilaire de Poitiers sur Romains 7,23*: RSR 67 (1993) 53-59; J. Doignon, *La chair du Christ comme dépouille triomphale. Une lecture de "Col." 2,15 par Hilaire de Poitiers*: RSR 68 (1994) 447-452; P.C. Burns, *Hilary of Poitiers' Road to Béziers: Politics or Religion?*: JECS 2 (1994) 273-289; G. Vaccari, *La teologia della assunzione in Ilario di Poitiers: uno studio sui termini "adsumere" e "adsumptio,"* Rome 1994; J. Doignon, *Un terme difficile de "Col." 2,9 éclairé par Hilaire de Poitiers: "corporaliter"*: RBen 105 (1995) 5-8; J. Doignon, *Hilaire sur "Matth." 18,3: la "simplicité des enfants" ou un programme fragile pour croyants*: RSR 70 (1996) 307-312; M. Durst, *Nizäa als "autoritative Tradition" bei Hilarius: Stimuli. Festschrift f. E. Dassmann*, Münster 1996, 406-422; D. Bertrand, *L'impassibilité du Christ selon Hilaire de Poitiers, "De Trinitate" X*: Augustinianum 35 (1997) 349-357; Y.-M. Duval, *L'extirpation de l'arianisme en Italie du Nord et en Occident: Rimini (359/60) et Aquilée (381), Hilaire de Poitiers (367/8) et Ambroise de Milan (397)*, Aldershot 1998; L.F. Ladaria, *L'Esprit Saint chez Hilaire de Poitiers*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 69 (1998) 14-21; K. Madigan, *On the High-Medieval Reception of Hilary of Poitiers's Anti-"Arian" Opinion: A Case Study of Discontinuity in Christian Thought*: Journal of Religion 78 (1998) 213-229.

M. Simonetti

HILARY the Luciferian (4th c.). A deacon in Rome, he supported the position that it was necessary to rebaptize *Arians who had converted to the Catholic Church. According to the information *Jerome gives in the *Altercatio Luciferani et Orthodoxi* 27, he wrote *libelli* on the subject; when the *Altercatio* was composed, probably during Jerome's stay in *Antioch between 377 and 379, Hilary had already died. According to others, who place the composition of the *Altercatio* in *Rome in 382, Hilary died that year. Some identify him with *Ambrosiaster.

F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son oeuvre*, Louvain-Paris 1922, v.I, 56-57.

S. Zincone

HIMERIUS of Prusa (4th c.). Sophist, native of Prusa in *Bithynia in the early 4th c., son of the rhetorician Aminia, active mainly in *Athens, except for a period in *Antioch, when he was the guest of the emperor *Julian. He had distinguished pupils attend his Athenian school of rhetoric, such as *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nazianzus. His speeches were partly written for the occasion, partly made up as rhetorical exercises. Himerius was in strong competition with *Prohaeresius; he abandoned Athens for this reason and returned only after the death of his opponent. From his wife, who was also descended from philosophers and orators, he had a son, Rufinus, a promising orator who died young, and a daughter. We possess the titles of more than 70 speeches by Himerius, which partially survive complete, partially in fragments. They are valuable, as they often cite passages of classical lyric verse directly (Alcaeus, Sappho, Anacreon) and other poets which would otherwise be lost. He lived well into his seventies.

EI 18, 881-882; PWK 8, 2, 1622-1635; *Himerii Orationes*, ed. Colonna, Rome 1951: PLRE I, 436; H. Völker, *Himerios, Reden und Fragmente: Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Wiesbaden 2003.

M. Perraymond

HIMERIUS (Eumerius, Comerius) of Tarragona (4th c.). Bishop of *Tarragona. Around 384, with a letter that is now lost, he addressed Pope *Damasus, posing diverse questions dealing with discipline: how to behave toward *Arian groups, issues involving celibacy and so on. Pope *Siricius responded to this letter after 385, with a decretal (see Isid., *Vir. ill.* 3), which is preserved in the Iberian collection of canons. What Himerius asked the pope has not been

preserved, but it is possible to sketch out the content from the decretal sent by Siricius, which gives these rules on how to receive heretics into the church, on the baptism of the Arians, on the time and manner of baptism, and also laws on penitence, on the celibacy of monks and priests, on the age of ordination, and on the administering of penance. Siricius also ordered that the 14 chapters of the decretal be brought to the attention of the remaining bishops of *Spain, the bishops of *Carthage and *Baetica, as well as those in *Lusitania and *Gaul.

PL 13, 1131-1147; 56, 554-562; 84, 629-628; A.C. Vega, *El Primado romano y la Iglesia española en los siete primeros siglos*, El Escorial 1941, 31-38; J. Fernández Alonso, *La cura pastoral en la España romanovisigoda*, Rome 1955; B. Botte, *Les origines de la Noël et de l'Epiphanie*, Abbaye du Mont-César 1962, 49-50. M. Sotomayor, *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, I, Madrid 1979, 303 f.; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 50-53.

M. Díaz y Díaz

HIMYARITES, Book of the. These fragments, edited and translated by A. Moberg, *The Book of the Himyarites,* Lund 1924, narrate the martyrdom of Himyarite Christians in 523. A Yemenite tribe, the Himyarites (Gr. *Homēritai*, mentioned by Pliny the Elder and by the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*) dominated Arabia until 525, prospering through trade. Among the last Himyarite kings were Jews and Christians; the last, Yusuf As'ar (Ar. Dhu Nuwas), a Jew, persecuted the Christians, burned their churches and fought against the *Ethiopians of *Aksum; Sabaean money was coined which humiliated the Christians. In 523 the Christians of Najran, led by *Aretas, were besieged by Yusuf, conquered through deception and massacred. According to the Syrian *Simeon of Beth Arsham (Assemani, BO I, 364, via eyewitnesses) 2,000 Christians were burned in the church; others were later killed because they refused to deny "Christ and his Cross"; among the 4,000 martyrs were the matron Ruma and her daughters. Many perished in pits filled with fire, among whom were another Christian woman and her son. Aretas and 340 followers, killed by the king, were considered martyrs by the Greek, Latin and Russian churches. The Aksumite king Kaleb, exhorted by Constantinople, defeated Yusuf ca. 525. The events of Najran are narrated in the *Book of the Himyarites;* the relations with other texts on the persecutions of the Himyarite Christians in the 6th c., such as the *Martyrium Arethae,* have been studied: Shahîd notes interesting convergences with ch. 117 of the Ethiopian *Kebra Nagast,* in which the anti-Judaism is parallel to that of the *Book,* where Yusuf is a "crucifier," as the Jews (*zaqope*), e.g., are in the 4th–6th c. Syrian apocryphal *Doctrina Addai* or *Acta Maris*. In both, the Christian Kaleb is seen as a liberator and as pious; he and Yusuf took names of biblical heroes.

S. Smith, *Events in Arabia in the 6th Cent. A.D.*: BSOAS 16 (1954) 425-468; J. Ryckmans, *La persécution des chrétiens himyarites au VI^e^ siècle*, Istanbul 1956; P. Boneschi, *Le* Martyrium Arethae *et les monnaies sabéennes*: RStOr 39 (1964) 117-124; E. Budge, *History of Ethiopia*, Oosterhout 1966, 261-262; I. Shahîd, *The Martyrs of Najrân*, Brussels 1971; P. Devos, *Quelques aspects de la nouvelle letter . . . de Siméon de Bêth-Arshâm*, in *IV Congr. Int. di Studi Etiopici*, I, Rome 1974, 107-116; M. van Esbroeck, *L'Éthiopie à l'époque de Justinien: S. Arethas de Negran*, in ibid., 117-139; J. Harmatta, *The Struggle for the Possession of South Arabia Between Aksum and the Sasanians*, in ibid., 95-106; J. Trimingham, *Christianity Among the Arabs in Pre-Islamic Times*, London 1979, 287-307; I. Shahîd, *Byzantium in South Arabia*: DOP 33 (1979) 25-94; L. Van Rompay, *The Martyrs of Najran*: Orientalia Lovan. Analecta 13 (1982) 301-309; S. Brock - S. Harvey, *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, Berkeley, CA 1987, 100-121; J. Ryckmans, *Les rapports de dépendance entre les récits hagiographiques relatifs à la persécution des Himyarites*: Muséon 100 (1987) 297-305; A. Dihle, *L'ambassade de Théophile l'Indien*, in *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel*, ed. T. Fahd, Leiden 1989, 461-468; W. Müller, *Himyar*: RAC 15 (1989) 303-331; I. Shahîd, *The Martyrs of Najran: Further Reflections*: Muséon 103 (1990) 151-153; T. Mackintosh-Smith, *Yemen*, Woodstock 2000, 41-43; C. Dognini - I. Ramelli, *Gli Apostoli in India*, Milan 2001, cap. VII.

I. Ramelli

HIMYARITES, martyrs. The kingdom of Himyar (*Himyarites*, in Gr. *Homēritai*), the capital of which was Zafar, 130 km (80.8 mi) SW of today's Sanaa, occupied the S region of the Arabian Peninsula, the territory called Arabia Felix, and corresponds to today's Yemen. It was a land rich in incense, myrrh and other spices which were important in the Roman Empire for religious and funeral ceremonies, and therefore a large amount of such spices were purchased. In addition, merchants traveled through the Red Sea for the sake of business with India. The emperor *Constantius (338–361) sent Theophilos the Indian to the land of the Himyarites on a mission to obtain the construction of churches in Zafar, where there were therefore already Christians. Around 518, in order to relieve himself from the Christian Ethiopian protectorate, which was allied with the Roman Empire, King Yusuf As'ar Yathar (known as Dhu Nuwas and by other names as well), whose religion was Jewish, began to persecute Christians throughout his kingdom, not only at Zafar, the capital, but also in Hadhramaut, where there were various martyrs, and in the coastal cities. On the political level, this persecution reflects the

struggles between the Roman Empire (together with Ethiopia and Ghassanids) and the Persian Empire (and the Lakhmids). In Zafar, the members of an Ethiopian Christian garrison, though having received a guarantee of safe conduct, were killed with their priest Ababut; the church, with 280 faithful who had taken refuge there, was burned. There was a strong Christian presence in the N, in the city of Najran (Nagran or Nadjran). Since Yusuf realized the impossibility of conquering it, he then swore he would give full amnesty if the inhabitants surrendered. Convinced that they would not be able to resist for long, on the advice of their leader Abdullah ibn Kaab (Arethas, Harith), they surrendered. *Arethas was killed with 300 Christians; the church of Najran, filled with Christians—about 2,000—was burned; among those inside were many women. In the oasis of Najran the number martyred is said to have been 4,252 (other sources give a larger number); among the martyrs were also clerics of other regions. Many women, who for various reasons were saved, hurried in search of a voluntary martyrdom and offered themselves freely to their persecutors. Two letters of the bishop *Simeon of Beth Arsham (Syria) inform us in detail about the events; and various other ancient sources, among which is the fragmentary *Book of the Himyarites,* narrate the savageries carried out in that persecution. Their martyrdom is also recorded in the Qur'an (*Sura* 85, 4f.). When the news reached *Constantinople, the emperor pressed the Kaleb Ella Asheba (later S. Elesbaan) of Ethiopia to intervene with the help of the Byzantine fleet. In 525 this intervention put an end to the Himyarite kingdom, and the churches of Zafar and Najran were rebuilt.

AASS Octobris 10 (1986) 721-759 (martyrdom of Aretas; the text circulated in various Eastern languages); I. Guidi, *La lettera di Simeone vescovo di Beth-Arsham sopra "I martiri omeriti"*: Atti della R. Acc. dei Lincei III.7 (1881) 471-515; A. Moberg, *The Book of the Himyarites*, Lund 1924; S. Smith, *Events in Arabia in the 6th Century A.D.*: BSOAS 16 (London: University of London, 1954) 425-468; J. Ryckmans, *La persécution des chrétiens himyarites au sixième siècle*, Istanbul 1956; J. Ryckmans, *Le christianisme en Arabie du Sud préislamique*, in *L'Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà*, Rome 1964, 413-454; I. Shahîd, *The Martyrs of Najrân: New Documents*, Brussels 1971; P. Devos, *Quelques aspects de la nouvelle lettre, récemment découverte, de Siméon de Bêth-Aršâm sur les martyrs Himyarites*, in *IV Congr. int. di Studi Etiopici*, Rome 1974, I, 107-116; M. van Esbroeck, *L'Éthiopie à l'époque de Justinien: S. Arethas de Negran et S. Athanase de Clysma*, in ibid., 117-139; J. Harmatta, *The Struggle for the Possession of South Arabia Between Aksum and the Sasanians*, in ibid., 95-106; I. Shahîd, *Byzantium in South Arabia*: DOP 33 (1979) 25-94; J. Spencer Trimingham, *Christianity Among the Arabs in Pre-Islamic Times*, London-New York 1979, 287-307; L. Van Rompay, *The Martyrs of Najran: Some Remarks on the Nature of the Sources*: Orientalia Lovan. Analecta 13 (1982) 301-309; J. Ryckmans, *Les rapports de dépendance entre les récits hagiographiques relatifs à la persécution des Himyarites*: Muséon 100 (1987) 297-305; S.P. Brock - S.A. Harvey, *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, Berkeley, CA 1987 (ch. 4: *Women 'Martyrs of Najran'*); W.W. Müller, *Himyar*: RAC 15 (1989) 303-331; A. Dihle, *L'ambassade de Théophile l'Indien réexaminée*, in *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel*, ed. T. Fahd, Leiden 1989, 461-468; G. Fernández, *The Evangelizing Mission of Theophilus "The Indian" and the Ecclesiastical Policy of Constantius II*: Klio 71 (1998) 361-366; I. Shahîd, *The Martyrs of Najran: Further Reflections*: Muséon 103 (1990) 151-153; M. Piccirillo, *L'Arabia cristiana*, Milan 2002, 20-25; I. Shahîd, *The Martyresses of Najran*, in *Aegyptus Christiana. Mélanges d'hagiographie égyptienne et orientale dédiés à la mémoire du P. Paul Devos, bollandiste*, curauerunt U. Zanetti - E. Lucchesi, Geneva 2004, 123-133.

A. Di Berardino

HIPPO

I. The city - II. Councils.

I. The city. Hippo Regius, under French occupation, called Bona; today called Annaba. It was founded by the Phoenicians, a second residence of the Numidian kings (the name derives, perhaps, from this to distinguish it from Hippo Diarrhytus), a municipality and then a Roman colony under Caesar and Augustus. Excavations have brought to light an important forum, a temple, a theater, baths, villas, harbor settlements. Its port had commercial relations with Ostia. The territory of the *civitas* was vast, and its confines reached to 20 km (12.4 mi) from the city in the direction of Cirta, 40 km (24.9 mi) in the direction of Thabraca and Calama, 60 km (37.3 mi) in the direction Fussala (a city which has not been identified, but doubtless to the S). The city was conquered by the *Vandals in 431, retaken by the *Byzantines in 533; it fell under Arab domination between the 7th and 8th c.

Christian origins and first bishops. We do not know how Christianity arrived in Hippo. The first known bishop, whose name was Theogenes, participated in the Council of *Carthage of 256 (*Sent. ep.* 14). We must identify him with the Theogenes who is celebrated 26 January in the *Mart. hier.* and with the martyr of whom *Augustine speaks several times (*Serm.* 273,7; Mai 158,2 and perhaps Lambot 2?). If so, he died a martyr 26 January 259. Another group of 20 martyrs possibly fell victim to *Diocletian's persecution. They are mentioned several times by Augustine (*Serm.* 148, 257, 325, 326; Morin 2,3; *Civ. Dei* 22,8,10): the bishop Fidentius figures prominently among these, along with two women, Valeriana and Victoria. The date of martyrdom seems to be 15 November 304. In contrast, another

saint was not a martyr: Leontius, who established the basilica of the same name, where his memorial was celebrated (4 May) with a funeral banquet. Augustine knew of him as the bishop of Hippo in ancient times. We do not know when he lived or when he died (Aug., *Ep.* 29; *Serm.* 252,4; 260; 262; *Conc. Hippon. 427*).

Hippo at the time of Augustine. Augustine's predecessor at the cathedral of Hippo was named Valerius: a Greek by birth, not well-versed in Latin, he had Augustine join him as a priest in 392 (in this capacity Augustine participated and preached at the Council of Hippo in 393), then as coadjutor in ca. 395. Valerius must have died shortly thereafter, because Augustine participated in the Council of Carthage in 397 as bishop in charge. Thanks to him we know the religious situation of the city at the beginning of his episcopate. It was so dominated by the *Donatists that they were able to starve the Catholics by putting pressure on the bakers. Augustine, however, succeeded in reversing the situation. His work reveals to us the existence of a half-dozen urban and suburban shrines and of a few others in the diocese. The cathedral was the *basilica Pacis* or *Maior,* where the council of 393 was held, and where Augustine preached many of his sermons (*Conc. Hippon.* 393; *Serm.* 258, 325, 326). The *basilica Leontiana,* named for its founder, Leontius, is mentioned several times in his writings (*Ep.* 29; *Serm.* 252, 260, 262; *Conc. Hippon.* 427). To that one must add the funerary chapels of St. Theogenes, the 20 martyrs, the 8 martyrs (see above). In 424–425, at his own expense, he had the deacon *Heraclius construct a *memoria* destined to guard the relics of St. *Stephen, which he acquired a little before from *Evodius the bishop of Uzalis (Aug., *Serm.* 317-24, Wilmart 12,5; *Serm.* 79 and 94; *Ep.* 212; *Civ. Dei* 22,8,18-19,23). Other shrines were marked in the diocese: at Fussala (*Guelf.* 32), of Sts. *Gervasius and Protasius in the *villa Victoriana* at Argentarium, at Audurus, Gippi, Hasna, Mutugenna and Thiava. Augustine designated Heraclius as his successor, but we do not know if he actually succeeded him or not.

Hippo after Augustine. Even if *Possidius says that the episcopal see continued to be occupied during the Vandal occupation, not a single name has come down to us after Augustine. According to the *Thronos alexandrinus* the city maintained an ecclesiastical organization in the 8th c., and until the end of the 9th c., acc. to the testimony of Leo the Wise.

DACL 6, 2483-2531; Cath 5, 76163; LTK[2] 5, 376-378; EAA 2, 132-134; E. Mareil, *Hippone la Royale*, Alger 1954; Id., *Monuments chrétiens d'Hippone*, Paris 1958; O. Perler, *L'église principale et les autres sanctuaires chrétiens d'Hippone la Royale d'après les textes de saint Augustin*: REAug 1 (1955) 299-343; Id., *La découverte des monuments chrétiens d'Hippone*: Rev. d'Hist. eccl. suisse (Zeit. f. schw. Kirch.) 54 (1960) 177-188; H.I. Marrou, *La basilique chrétienne d'Hippone d'après les dernières fouilles*: REAug 6 (1960) 109-154; M. Pizzica, *Possidio e la caduta di Ippona*: Romanobarbarica 7 (1982-1983) 181-199; S. Lancel, *Études sur la Numidie d'Hippone au temps de saint Augustin. Recherches de topographie ecclésiastique*: MEFRA 96 (1984) 1085-1113; I. Gui - N. Duval - J.-P. Caillet, *Basiliques chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord*, Paris 1992, I, 346-349; W. Gessel, *Die Stadt des Aurelius Augustinus*: Augustiniana 40 (1990) 73-94; N. Duval, *Hippo Regius*: RAC 15, 442-466; M. de Vos, *Documentation archéologique à Hippone* (*Hippo Regius*), in *Augustinus Afer*, ed. by P.-Y. Fux - J.-M. Roessli - O. Wermelinger, Fribourg 2003, 401-411.

V. Saxer

II. Councils. The first plenary council of the African provinces (Proconsular, Numidia, Byzacena, Mauretania, Tripolitania), was held at Hippo 8 October 393 with *Aurelius of Carthage presiding, in the secretarium of the basilica Pacis. Augustine, who had been ordained a priest two years earlier, was sent to give the opening discourse (which he would revisit later, creating the treatise *De fide et symbolo*). From the acts of this council there exist only some fragments (Munier, *Cinq canons inédits*), but their substance passed into the Compendium of Hippo (*Breviarium Hipponense*), a collection of 37 disciplinary canons, composed by the bishops of *Byzacena in 397 and approved by the Council of Carthage 28 August of the same year. This collection constitutes an essential document of African legislation in its golden era. The greater part of the arrangements regards the status of clerics and the requirements for ordination, which could be conferred upon those older than 25 years, duly prepared (can. 1-2). Candidates had to have led all their family members to the Catholic religion, i.e., to have converted them away from the *Donatists (can. 17). All the duties of clerics of every rank were recalled, particularly as regards chastity (can. 16, 18, 24) and residency (can. 35); they were forbidden from commerce and from loaning at interest (can. 15, 22), from entering taverns, unless they were traveling (can. 26). Very rigorous norms defined the administration of justice (can. 6-9); severe penalties were levied against clerics who deserted the ecclesiastical tribunals (can. 10). The bishops were asked to respect the rights of their colleagues (can. 19) and not to carry out illicit ordinations (can. 19). They were prohibited from making voyages overseas, unless the primate had given his consent (can. 27).

The council, then, issued other canons, intended to regulate liturgical life and rites. At the altar, prayers had to be directed to the Father (can. 21).

The Eucharist required only bread and wine (can. 23). The rule regarding the eucharistic fast was defined. There was a prohibition against giving the Eucharist to catechumens (can. 3) and to the dead (can. 4); against administering baptism to the deceased (can. 4) and against administering it *in articulo mortis* too easily (can. 32). The power of priests was also defined regarding administration of penance (can. 30), the consecration of virgins and the preparation of sacred chrism (can. 34). Various measures were adopted to protect the virtue of consecrated virgins (can. 31) and of widows (can. 24). Banquets were prohibited in churches, save for motives of hospitality (can. 29). The council showed itself most vigilant toward the sons of clerics, so that their conduct would not tarnish the reputation of the church's dignitaries (can. 11-14).

To assure the observance of all these norms, the fathers of Hippo decided on an annual celebration of a general council of the provinces of Africa, each of which had to be represented by three delegates (can. 5), granting that Tripolitania would only send one, due to the distance.

This council took only one measure regarding the Donatists: clerics who reentered the Catholic Church would remain in their order, if they had not been rebaptized and if they had brought their faithful with them back to orthodoxy (can. 37).

Finally, it should be mentioned that the Council of Hippo defined the canon of the sacred books of the OT and NT (can. 36), which it then decided to submit to the approval of the churches across the sea (*Rome, *Milan).

Thirty-four years after the first plenary council of Africa, over which *Aurelius presided, still at Hippo, 24 September 427, the last of this series was celebrated: CCL 149, 250. The decisions of the previous councils were reread, particularly those of 419 and of 421, and were solemnly confirmed and inserted into the Register of Carthage, after having been revised hardly at all.

CCL 149, 248-253; Hfl-Lecl II, 1303-1308; Palazzini 1, 195-197; G. Bardy, *Conciles d'Hippone au temps de saint Augustin*: Augustiniana 5 (1955) 441-458; Ch. Munier, *Cinq canons du concile d'Hippone du 8 octobre 393*: RDC 18 (1968) 16-29; Id., *La tradition manuscrite de l'Abrégé d'Hippone et le canon des Écritures des églises africaines*: SE 21 (1972/73) 43-55; B. Neunheuser, *"Cum altari adsistitur semper ad Patre dirigatur oratio." Der Canon 21 de Konzils von Hippo 393, seine Bedeutung und Nachwirkung*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 105-119; J.E. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine*, New Haven, CT 1997; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999, 229-231; J.-A. Sabw Kanyang, *Episcopus et plebs, l'évêque et la communauté ecclésiale dans les conciles africains (345-525)*, Bern 2000.

Ch. Munier

HIPPOLYTUS (ca. 170–ca. 235)

I. The Hippolytan question - II. Writings attributed to Hippolytus and to the author of the *Elenchos* - III. Exegesis and doctrine.

I. The Hippolytan question. In *HE* 6,20,2, *Eusebius of Caesarea describes Hippolytus, mentioned together with *Beryllus the bishop of Bostra and *Gaius priest of Rome, as head of a church (καὶ αὐτὸς προεστὼς ἐκκλησίας), and in 6,22 he adds that Hippolytus had composed many commentaries, naming seven which were known to him and mentioning in particular a writing on Easter in which a paschal canon of sixteen years had been proposed, calculated up to the first year (επὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος) of the emperor *Alexander Severus. This information was largely confirmed by *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 61), who furthermore gives a richer list of Hippolytan writings, mostly exegetical. Between these two sources chronologically is the *Catalogus liberianus,* contained in the so-called **Chronography of 354*, which notes in the year 235 the exile to Sardinia of the bishop of Rome *Pontianus and of the priest Hippolytus, while the **Depositio martyrum*—this too found in the *Chronography*—records *Ypoliti in Tiburtina et Pontiani in Callisti* as 13 August. Some years later *Damasus placed in the cemetery named for Hippolytus, on the Via Tiburtina, one of his epigrams (n. 37 Ihm) in which it is said that the priest Hippolytus at first had passed to the heresy of Novatus (= *Novatian) but, when persecution came, returned to the Catholic Church and confessed his faith with blood. *Apollinaris of Laodicea, around the end of the 4th c., since he describes the writer Hippolytus as bishop of Rome, attests that in the East the fusion with the writer Hippolytus, of Greek speech and unknown origin, had already occurred; this fusion is confirmed also by other Eastern sources and was known also to Jerome, while the number of works transmitted under Hippolytus's name grew. In the West, in contrast, the hagiographic tradition of the martyr Hippolytus, largely legendary and having influenced a hymn of the *Peristephanon* of *Prudentius, partially joined the martyr with the mythic Hippolytus, son of Theseus, but was unaware of any literary activity. As time went on, while there were no mentions in the West, in the East we encounter the information of *Photius (cod. 121) on the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, as much as can be gathered of his *Capita contra Gaium* from the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* of Dionysus bar Salibi (12th c.), and the catalog of Hippolytan writings edited by the Nestorian Ebedjesu (14th c.). The latter two writings are in *Syriac. Around

the middle of the 16th c. a statue was discovered at Rome which was identified as that of Hippolytus. In 1553 the humanist Pirro Ligorio wrote that the statue had been found in very poor condition between the Via Nomentana and the Via Tiburtina, not far from Castro Pretorio; later he specified that the statue had been found among the ruins of a church dedicated to S. Hippolytus. Of the figure, seated on a throne, little was left, since almost all of the section of the body above the girdle had been lost. On the two sides of the throne, to the left of the viewer, had been inscribed the dates of the beginning of the paschal period for a cycle of 16 years, starting from the first year of the reign of Alexander Severus, repeated for seven cycles and including 112 years; on the opposite side the dates of the Easter Sunday for these 112 years. On the rear right post of the throne the titles of certain works had been inscribed. The indications of paschal chronology inscribed on the sides of the throne were immediately identified with those Eusebius had mentioned concerning Hippolytus, overlooking the fact that in Eusebius the sixteen years finish with the first year of Alexander Severus, while on the throne they begin with the first year of his reign, and Pirro Ligorio had the statue restored on the basis of this identification. It is currently situated at the entrance of the Vatican Library. Therefore, the literary heritage of the writer Hippolytus, who as we have said was identified in the East with the homonymous Roman martyr, was enriched with the works whose titles were inscribed on the post of the throne.

In 1851 the English scholar E. Miller published under the name of *Origen a work of *heresiological content, in ten books, with the second and third missing, which had been discovered a few years before in a codex of Mount Athos, today Paris suppl. gr. 464, under the title Φιλοσοφούμενα ἤ Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος (= *El*). It was quickly realized, based on the information contained in this work, that it could not be assigned to Origen because it was easy to recognize as the work of a Roman author, an enemy of Popes *Zephyrinus and *Callistus. D. Jacobi was the first to propose recognizing in him Hippolytus, bishop of Portus. In 1853 Döllinger published the monograph destined to mark a fundamental step in the complex itinerary of the Hippolytan question. Putting together—and forcing somewhat—all the data available, Döllinger joined into a single person Hippolytus the writer in Greek, the homonymous Roman martyr and the Roman author of the *El:* there resulted a prolific writer, mostly of exegetical works, a representative at Rome, in the initial years of the 3rd c., of the doctrine of the Logos and, for this reason, an adversary, not only of *Sabellius, heir of the radical *monarchianism of *Noetus of Smyrna, but also of Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus, who were also of monarchian sympathies. Expelled from communion with the Catholic Church of Rome, Hippolytus put himself at the head of his own small community. Arrested as a Christian in 235 together with Pope *Pontianus and sent to Sardinia, he died there. Later Pope *Fabian had the bodies of Hippolytus and Pontianus returned to Rome, and that of Hippolytus was later buried definitively in a cemetery along the Via Tiburtina. This person was considered the author, not only of all the writings, only partially extant, which the tradition attributed to Hippolytus, but also of the *El* and of all the works inscribed on the statue. Of the latter *Against the Greeks and Against Plato* and also *On the Universe* (Περὶ τοῦ παντός) were identified with the Περὶ τῆς παντὸς οὐσίας to which the author of the *El* refers as his own writing and of which some large fragments have been recognized, transmitted under the name of Josephus (Flavius) or Iosipos. Despite some opposition, this reconstruction was rapidly accepted among scholars and was enriched in 1910 by E. Schwartz, who proposed identifying with the *The Apostolic Tradition on Charisms,* marked on the statue, a work of liturgical and disciplinary character which has not reached us directly but which can be hypothesized and reconstructed on the basis of various liturgical works in different languages (Greek, Latin, Eastern languages), among which the Egyptian *Canons of Hippolytus* and the well-known *Apostolic Constitutions,* which through the large traits which they show in common prove that they all used this otherwise lost work. This hypothesis was also quickly accepted and completed the literary physiognomy of Hippolytus of Rome, a lettered schismatic and martyr.

Until the end of World War II this reconstruction was placed in doubt only in a negligible manner, but in 1947 the French scholar P. Nautin criticized it radically. The principal points of his criticisms were (1) doctrinal differences between the *El* and the *Contra Noetum* (= *CN*) known to be from Hippolytus, esp. concerning the Holy Spirit; (2) contradictions between the chronological dates contained in the works ascribed to Hippolytus; (3) psychological incompatibility of Hippolytus, an author of anti-Roman spirit, entirely devoted to the study of Scripture and the life of the church and hesitant to speak of himself, with the author of the *El,* very open to Greek philosophy, which he nevertheless condemned, and very prone to speaking about and promoting himself. Nautin proposed attributing to Hip-

polytus the writings which are extant or at least known under his name, while the writings written on the statue, with the addition of the *El* not mentioned there, should be attributed to a Roman author, to whom he gave the name Iosipos (Josipe), deducing this from the attributions of the Περὶ τοῦ παντός. This hypothesis immediately encountered very stiff opposition (Bardy, Botte, Richard, Capelle), centered esp. on the otherwise unknown Iosipos, and was set aside, despite the repeated replies of Nautin to his adversaries. But some of the arguments he proposed are clearly of important weight. Nor did the hypothesis of J.M. Hanssens, who proposed (1959) seeing in Hippolytus an Egyptian established at Rome, distinct from the homonymous martyr and still active in 351, have any noteworthy success. In 1976 the epigraphist M. Guarducci, in the course of research on an entirely different subject, while examining the statue which had been reconstructed as Hippolytus, reached the conclusion that originally it had been a feminine statue, and this conclusion was strengthened by later investigations. The woman to whom the statute had originally been dedicated was identified by Guarducci as the Epicurean philosopher Themista of Lampsacus. This shocking discovery provoked a series of questions and raised doubts about the widely spread reconstruction of Hippolytus of Rome. A series of studies, which took this as a starting point, resulted in various hypotheses, all of them critical of that reconstruction: Loi-Simonetti proposed distinguishing two Hippolytuses, one Eastern, author of the exegetical writings which have reached us under his name, and one Roman, author of the writings marked on the statue; A. Brent considered Hippolytus an Eastern writer who, having come to Rome, became part of the schismatic community of the author of the *El,* and after the death of the leader reconciled this community with the Catholic Church in Rome. In the meantime some special studies (Metzger, Markschies) reopened the discussion of the Schwartz hypothesis on the *Apostolic Tradition* and demolished the reconstruction of the work which Dom Botte had published.

The question is still very controversial, but certain points seem now to be solidly founded. (1) *CN* was written before the *El.* (2) The Hippolytus author of the *CN* must be kept distinct from the Roman author of the *El;* he was an Eastern writer, in all likelihood Asiatic, active between the end of the 2nd c. and the early years of the 3rd c., to whom belong, beyond the *CN,* some exegetical writings which have reached us, *David and Goliath, Commentary on Daniel, Christ and Antichrist, Commentary on the Song of Songs, Blessings of Isaac and Jacob and Moses.* To the Roman author of the *El,* active in the 1st decades of the 3rd c., should be assigned, beyond the *El,* the Περὶ τοῦ παντός and a Συναγωγὴ χρόνων which reached us anonymously, perhaps to be identified with the *Chronicles* inscribed on the statue. (3) Furthermore, the author of the *El* definitely knew some writings of Hippolytus: it cannot therefore be excluded, even if it appears improbable, that he knew him personally. (4) As for the *Apostolic Tradition,* whose few surviving fragments in Greek bear the title Διατάξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, if it ever existed as an independent work, it is not known when or where it was composed, and therefore it should be excluded from the discussions concerning the Hippolytan question. (5) Nothing authorizes us to believe that the titles of the works carved on the right rear post of the statue must be attributed to a single author. Among the questions which still remain under discussion, first of all the difficulty should be recognized of verifying the accuracy of the attributions of writings which are attested as belonging to Hippolytus but which have reached us only in a few fragments or sometimes only by title. The role played by the Roman martyr Hippolytus in the whole affair remains very cloudy, and it seems he must be considered a third person, distinct from the other two.

II. Writings attributed to Hippolytus and the author of the *Elenchos*. As mentioned above, besides the *CN,* five writings of exegetical character have been transmitted under the name of Hippolytus and have reached us in various languages. *David and Goliath,* in *Georgian translation, is a sermon which interprets the famous episode recounted in 1 Kgs 17, taking the two figures as prefigurations of Christ and the devil, with an interweaving of literal and *allegorical interpretations. *Christ and Antichrist,* preserved in Greek and Eastern translations, presents abundant scriptural documentation intended to demonstrate that at the end of time the Antichrist will reproduce negatively the works of Christ, deceiving the faithful. The *Commentary on Daniel,* unfinished in the Greek version and complete in a paleo-Slavic translation, interprets some episodes of the book of Daniel, among them that of *Susanna, presented as a figure of the church, with an *exegesis of mostly christological content, but interested in chronological calculations concerning the end of the world. The *Commentary on the Song of Songs,* in Georgian translation, interprets the Song from the beginning to 3:8, in an allegorical interpretation which takes the two lovers as prefigurations of

Christ and the church. The *Blessings of Isaac and Jacob,* in the Greek original and in *Armenian and Georgian translation, and the *Blessings of Moses,* in Armenian and Georgian translation, perhaps were originally part of a broad exegetical initiative, including also the *Blessings of Balaam,* now lost, aimed at interpreting passages of particular prophetic importance from the first books of the OT. The *Blessings of Isaac and Jacob,* erroneously attributed to *Irenaeus by the Greek text, interpret Gen 37, 27, 49; the *Blessings of Moses* interprets Dt 33. The interpretation is allegorical with systematically and exclusively christological interest. From the *Blessings of Jacob* we have, through the exegetical **catenae*, numerous Greek fragments which offer a christological interpretation of Gen 49 similar to that of the complete treatise but notably different in the details; they present an altogether more evolved type of exegesis. The *Contra Noetum* (*CN*), rather than the last part of the lost *Syntagma* against 32 heresies known to Photius, as many scholars have proposed, should be considered because of its evident internal characteristics a homiletic text of doctrinal content in which Hippolytus explains and refutes in detail the radical monarchian doctrine of Noetus of Smyrna and expounds his own, within the tradition of the Logos doctrine.

To the Roman writer hostile to Zephyrinus and Callistus whom we prefer to name simply the author of the *El,* without excluding that he too might have been called Hippolytus, besides the *El,* the two other writings mentioned above should also be attributed. The *El* (Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων), in ten books, of which the second and third are missing, transmitted under Origen's name, is a *heresiological work planned on the concept that heresies should be considered as the distorted results of the influence of Greek philosophy on Christian doctrine, so that each heresy, before being described, with frequent citations from heretical writings which we know only from this valuable source, is connected with a specific philosophical school: the *gnosis of *Valentinus with *Plato, that of *Basilides with *Aristotle, the *monarchianism of *Noetus with Heraclitus, and so on. In describing the latter doctrine, the author of the *El* gives us much information of a historical character on the doctrinal controversy in Rome in the 1st decades of the 3rd c., with particular attention to his personal battle with *Sabellius, *Zephyrinus and above all Callistus. We gather that, when he wrote this work, Callistus was already dead; therefore, the *El* should be dated after 222. In this writing the author refers to three other of his works. One, also of heresiological content, has vanished completely; another, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας, which has been identified with the work of an almost identical title marked on the statue, has been lost as a complete work but there remain some fragments transmitted, under the name of Joseph (Flavius) and of Iosipos, by *Photius and *John Philoponus, and a very long one contained in the *Sacra Parallela* of *John of Damascus. The work dealt with philosophical questions, in particular with the creation of the world and of humanity, concluding with the last judgment and the renewal of the world. A third writing, in which the author of the *El* says that he dealt with the 72 peoples enumerated in Gen 10, has been identified with a Συναγωγὴ χρόνων καὶ εντῶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἕως τῆς ἐνεστώσης ἡμέρας, transmitted anonymously, partially in Greek, entirely in Latin and Armenian translation, which has in turn been identified with the *Chronicles* whose title is marked on the statue. The content consists of a biblical chronology, which closes the age of the world at 6,000 years, just as in the *Commentary on Daniel* of Hippolytus and in *Julius Africanus, and is updated to 235, the year of the killing of *Alexander Severus; in the chronological framework are inserted information and notions esp. of a geographic character.

To these works, which are extant entirely or in part, even if often in translation, must be added certain other writings, many titles and various fragments of which have reached us under the name of Hippolytus. For the writings which have reached us intact but which cannot be attributed to Hippolytus, *see* *Hippolytus (pseudo), immediately following. As for the titles and fragments, we will mention esp. the titles which are found in Eusebius and in Jerome. In the former, beyond the paschal canon mentioned above, one reads (*HE* 6,22): *On the Hexaemeron, On That Which Follows the Hexameron, Against Marcion, On the Canticle, On Parts of Ezekiel, On Easter, Against All the Heresies.* Of these writings, beyond the paschal canon inscribed on the statue, only the *On the Canticle* has reached us. Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 61), beyond the titles gathered from Eusebius, knows many others. Here is his list: *In Hexaemeron et in Exodum, In Canticum canticorum, In Genesim et in Zachariam, De Psalmis et in Isaiam, De Daniele, De Apocalypsi, De Proverbiis, De Ecclesiaste, De Saul et Pytonissa, Contra Marcionem, De Pascha, Adversus omnes haereses et prosomilian de laude domini salvatoris, in qua praesente Origene se loqui in ecclesia significat.* Furthermore, in the preface of his *Commentary on Matthew* Jerome asserts that he knows a homonymous commentary of Hippolytus, and in *Ep.* 36,16 reports as deriving from the martyr Hippoly-

tus an interpretation of Gen 27 different from that which we read in the *Blessings of Isaac and Jacob* of Hippolytus. To these titles must be added the *Capitula adversus Gaium,* cited in the list of Hippolytan writings by Ebedjesu, many fragments of which have reached us in Syriac translation, various writings from which *Theodoret cut out some passages, including them in the *florilegium attached to the *Eranistes*: *On the Two Thieves, On Elcana and Anna, On the Great Ode*, *On the Beginning of Isaiah*, *On Psalm XXIII* etc., a *Syntagma* against 32 heresies known by *Photius, and still other titles and fragments. That is to say, from Eusebius on, the number of writings attributed to Hippolytus increases progressively, while nothing more is known concerning the author than what Eusebius already knew. This all seems suspect, and only with difficulty could all these attributions be considered valid. We gather that around the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th c. the name and work of Hippolytus enjoyed, in certain Eastern areas, great success, through which he was identified with the Roman martyr and was made into bishop of Rome or of Portus or also of Bostra (Arabia). This success has been explained (Prinzivalli) by pointing out the value of being able to use, in those areas, an exegetical figure crowned both by antiquity and by martyrdom, to oppose the prestige of *Origen, without, however, excluding that to strengthen the fame of Hippolytus occasional recourse had been made to the Alexandrian himself: in this sense the mention of Origen at the beginning of the sermon *De laude domini salvatoris* mentioned by Jerome should be understood. The difficulty of orientation among this great number of works derives from knowing only their titles and some fragments, i.e., too little to be able to judge concretely. We would not therefore have any hesitation in attributing with strong likelihood to Hippolytus the significant series of fragments on the Proverbs edited by Richard. In contrast, the attribution to him of the *Capitula adversus Gaium,* maintained recently by Prinzivalli and denied by Brent, appears less certain.

Let us add for compleness the titles engraved on the right post of the statue formerly considered as Hippolytus, even if—as we have pointed out above—we are not at all certain that these titles belong to a single author, rather than more than one, perhaps members of the small schismatic community constituted and directed by the author of the *El: On the Psalms, On the Ventriloquist, In Defense of the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse, The Apostolic Tradition on the Charisms, Chronicles, Against the Greeks and Against Plato* or also *On the Universe, Protrepticum to Severina, Demonstration of the Time of Easter According to the Table, Odes on All the Scripture, On God and the Resurrection of the Flesh, On the Good and Whence Evil Comes.* Some of these titles are new in the context of the question with which we are now occupied, others not so: the *Against the Greeks* etc. we have said to be identified with likelihood with the Περὶ τοῦ παντός of the author of the *El,* and so likewise, but with much greater uncertainty, of the *Chronicles* with respect to the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων also by the author of the *El*. The title *On the Ventriloquist* recalls that on the Pythonessa cited by Jerome. The writing *In Defense of the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse* has been identified with the *Capitula adversus Gaium.* The *Demonstration of the Time of Easter According to the Table* recalls the writing on Easter of Hippolytus and the paschal canon inscribed on the sides of the throne of the statue. In this matter, however, the discrepancy should not be underestimated between Eusebius and Jerome on the one hand, who state that the canon reached to the first year of Alexander Severus, and on the other the indication of the calculation on the statue, which begins at the first year of that emperor. This discrepancy, which is not a minor matter, could be clarified by hypothesizing that it is the result of an update of the calculation, which repeated in cycles of sixteen years, in order to render it more immediately useful for the members of the community of the author of the *El,* active precisely during the reign of Alexander Severus. In fact, once it has been demonstrated that the statue was not originally of Hippolytus and its celebratory intent therefore vanishing, which would have been, furthermore, abnormal in a Christian environment of that era, the presence of the paschal calculation on the sides of the throne can be understood as motivated by straightforward practical reasons: given the well-documented difficulty, for the Christians of the first centuries, in fixing exactly, year by year, the date of Easter, this calculation served to bring together on this point the members of the community to which the statue belonged, who must have been those of the community of the author of the *El*. According to this line of thinking, the titles of the writings marked on the rear post of the statue could have been the titles of writings by various authors which this community possessed.

III. Exegesis and doctrine. 1.1. The exegetical writings of Hippolytus, all dedicated to books of the OT, are the first which are known to have been written from within Catholic Christian circles, while in *gnostic environments *Heracleon's commentary to the gospel of John preceded them by several decades. The pioneering character explains certain de-

ficiencies and approximations, above all in the philological dimension of the exegesis and the relationship between literal and allegorical interpretation. As for the formal typology, these offer a certain variety: *David and Goliath* has a homiletic character and has been transmitted to us as a homily; some typical characteristics of the homiletic genre are found in the commentaries on Daniel and the Song of Songs, and given that their dimensions exceed that of a single sermon, they should be considered the result of a development of an organic series of sermons. As for the commentaries on the *Blessings of Isaac and Jacob* and the *Blessings of Moses,* on the other hand, every element which might suggest an originally homiletic use appears absent from the execution of the interpretation of the biblical text, broken, just as for Daniel and for the Song, into sections of various lengths, so that this, which is the most ambitious exegetical performance of Hippolytus, seems to have been dictated without having been preached beforehand. The same can be said for *Christ and Antichrist,* which is a proper treatise. Also the hermeneutical *ratio* applied by Hippolytus in the interpretation of the OT Scriptures offers a certain variety in regard to the relationship between literal explanation and *allegorical interpretation and, given the impossibility of establishing a relative chronology among them except for the priority of *Christ and Antichrist* to the *Commentary on Daniel,* we are not in a position to interpret this variety as the result of some gradual evolution of that *ratio.* In *David and Goliath* the basic typological interpretation, David = Christ, Goliath = the devil, is not developed systematically in detail, so that overall the interpretation of the biblical text appears to be largely of the literal type. In the *Commentary on Daniel* letter and allegory intersect differently: in addition to the chronological calculations intended to fix the date of the end of the world, we should note the interpretation through which Susanna represents a *typos* of the church and the two elders who attack her represent Jews and pagans. In the commentaries on the Song and on the *Blessings* the interpretation is exclusively allegorical: in that on the Song the two lovers are taken as signifying Christ and the church, a transposition of the Jewish interpretation which took them as symbols of Yahweh and Israel, and this symbolism is developed in a systematic way in the interpretation of the details; the same systematic procedure can be seen in the allegorical interpretation of the *Blessings,* which is also here of an entirely christological and ecclesiological content and develops thoroughly the theme of the enmity of the Jews toward the Christian community.

1.2. The doctrinal position of Hippolytus can be gathered above all from the *Contra Noetum* (*CN*), to which can be added certain passages of the commentaries. *Noetus, founder of so-called modalist *monarchianism, had intended to react to the divisive tendency which he noticed in the Logos doctrine, proposed by* Justin, *Athenagoras and others, accenting the traditional monotheism which the Christian church had inherited from Judaism. His syllogism goes as follows: God is one: Christ is God: therefore, he is the one God. The identification of God the Father with Christ resulted from this, in the sense that it was really the Father who suffered on the cross in the person of Christ (*patripassianism). After the detailed refutation of this doctrine Hippolytus added, in the second part of *CN,* his interpretation of the doctrinal controversy, in the sense that he adhered to the doctrine of the Logos, by then traditional in Asia, and developed it in an original way. Of that doctrine, which distinguished the Son, divine Logos, as an entity distinct from God the Father, generated from the latter for the purpose of the creation and governance of the world, he derived from his predecessors the affirmation of two distinct moments in the relationship between God and his Logos: one in which the latter is immanent in the former as impersonal thought, wisdom, potency, will; another in which he is generated as a personally distinct divine entity (10,1-4). Although generated and distinct from the Father before time, the Logos can only be defined Son proleptically, because he becomes perfect Son only when he incarnates (4,10; 10,4; 15,6-7; 16,3-7). In this accentuation of the significance of the *incarnation, understood as absolutely real and with all the limitations of the divinity which it brought (17,5; 18,1-2), we should probably see a stand against gnostic *docetism. If on the one hand Hippolytus points out against Noetus the distinction between the Father, who sends, and the Son, who is sent (4,11; 7,7; 12,2 etc.), on the other he must counter the accusation, raised against supporters of the doctrine of the Logos, of affirming two gods (14,2). In fact, he, despite affirming loudly and often the divinity of Christ Logos, defines him as other (ἕτερος) than the Father (11,1). He affirms along this line that whoever professes one God must not eliminate the οἰκονομία, through which God articulates into two, the Father and the Logos Son (3,4; 4,5.7.8 etc.). To better characterize the distinction he was the first to use the term πρόσωπον ("exterior aspect, dramatic mask, person"), adding, however, that their δύναμις is one (7,1; 8,2; 14,3). I.e., the unity of God is affirmed on a dynamic base, unity of will and operation, as Athenagoras had already done and in a little

while *Origen would confirm: in this order of ideas the interpenetration between God the Father and the Logos on the operative level is conceived by Hippolytus as complete, totalizing, in which the Logos is the will and potency of the Father (8,3; 10,1.3; 14,4.5; 4,11; 11,1.4 etc.).

Another important doctrinal novelty of *CN* is the space made for the Holy Spirit in the intertrinitarian economy. Actually, in the doctrine of the Logos the intradivine relationship tends to exhaust itself in the relationship between God and the Logos, which takes on all the mediation between God and the world: before Hippolytus, only Athenagoras had made some timid mentions of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father and the Son. Hippolytus, respecting the traditional profession of faith in the Father, in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, decisively accentuated the presence of the latter next to the other two, even if with imperfect coherence and harmony: to the πρόσωπα of the Father and the Son is added, as a third οἰκονομία, the grace (χάρις) of the Holy Spirit (14,2) and, with a reference to the baptismal formula of Mt 28:19, it is emphasized that the perfect adoration of God is only possible affirming Father, Son and Holy Spirit (14,7-8). The doctrinal reflection of Hippolytus also shows an important *eschatological dimension. The tension in this matter, always strong in the first three centuries of Christianity, was expressed in Asia esp. in *millenarist expectations, which just around the time of Hippolytus had had, in that region, a notable revival, perhaps following the *Montanist crisis. In the chronological calculations of the *Commentary on Daniel* Hippolytus reacts to the obvious risks of a social nature, apparent in this climate of tensions, clarifying that, the total duration of the world being 6,000 years, given that Christ was born 5,500 years after Adam, the end was still far off. But in this commentary Hippolytus reveals an ardently anti-Roman animus and here, but esp. in the treatise on the Antichrist, accentuates the meaning of this sinister eschatological figure, so he does present some typical traits of millenarist expectation. However, an explicit reference to the millennial reign of Christ, which constituted the ideological center of authentic millenarism, is missing in his writings, at least in those which have reached us, and in the final passage of the *Blessings of Moses* the beautiful description which he gives of the creation, renewed in a definitive way after the last judgment, takes up some typical elements of the traditional representation of the millennial reign of Christ on earth. Therefore, if on the one hand he avoids speaking about the millennium, on the other he projects it, with its burning, materialistic colors, onto the final and eternal repose of the just; and in the description he also oscillates between naive traits of hedonistic enjoyment, a typical millenarist inheritance, and the appeal to a more spiritual conception of the final condition of the just. As the exponent of an Asiatic culture then on the decline, Hippolytus feels the need to abandon certain positions of a materialist type, which appeared by then outdated in the light of the results of the controversies raised by the Montanist crisis, but he is not able to propose truly new alternative solutions and remains halfway, in an uncertain and ambiguous position between conservation and innovation.

2. The author of the *El* also adhered to the doctrine of the Logos, represented a little before him by Hippolytus, from whom—as we have pointed out above—he knew some writings, and he defended this doctrine at Rome against *Sabellius, who had inherited the radical *monarchianism of Noetus, and against the Popes *Zephyrinus and *Callistus, they too of substantially monarchian leanings and adversaries of the Logos doctrine. In the last part of *El* he proposed the monotheistic profession of a first and sole God creator and lord of all things, enlarging it, however, in a binary sense when he affirmed that this God, reflecting on himself, generated the Logos (never defined as son but as πρωτότοκος and πρωτόγονος παῖς [10,33,1.2.11]); the latter, having in himself the ideas first thought by the Father, effected the paternal design concerning the creation of all things, including humanity as the synthesis of all the substances. The Logos reacted to the sin of humanity with his pedagogical action, which developed through the work of the law and the prophets, and finally with the incarnation (10,33,1-13). It is the typical scheme of the Logos doctrine, from Justin on, including the double moment in the God-Logos relationship, as we pointed out in *CN*. In an antidivisive sense the author of *El* points out that the Logos, although generated, does not separate from the Father but remains within him. The Logos's divinity, derived from the generation of the Logos from the Father, is nonetheless mentioned very sparingly. His subordination to the Father is, however, emphasized forcefully: only the Father is defined as κύριος (10,32,1). But the doctrine of the author of *El* is characterized perhaps more by the silences than the explicit affirmations. The most important is the complete silence concerning the Holy Spirit and the divine spirit in general. This silence is meaningful inasmuch as first Hippolytus in *CN* and then *Tertullian in *Adversus Praxean* had spoken extensively of divine spirit in general and the Holy Spirit in par-

ticular. In contrast, the author of *El* speaks of spirit (πνεῦμα) only in the context of the creation, making it one of the traditional four elements of material reality, rather than the more common air (10,32,2). In this silence an intentional reserve can be identified both toward the ample emphasis on the Holy Spirit in Montanist environments, esp. in the Montanist Tertullian of the *Adversus Praxean*, and toward Callistus, bitter adversary of our author: Callistus had organized his profession of faith on the concept of πνεῦμα understood as divine substance, taken—as by Tertullian—in a *Stoic sense, i.e., materialist, within which the Father and the Son are identified. Faced with these different approaches to the concept of divine spirit, by Hippolytus and Tertullian on the one hand and by Callistus on the other, the author of *El* preferred not to take a position, completely renouncing any mention of spirit in reference to the divinity. We can see the same attitude concerning technical terminology. We have seen Hippolytus make use of πρόσωπον to characterize the individuality of Father and Son in the reciprocal relationship, and with the same meaning Tertullian had transposed πρόσωπον into *persona;* but Callistus had spoken in a monarchian sense of a single πρόσωπον of the Father and Son; therefore, the author of *El* preferred not to compromise himself, renouncing the use of the term, just as he avoided clarifying in what way God and his Logos, clearly distinct from each other since one generated the other, could constitute one God. Essentially, he seems to be walled into a defensive position, suggested by the results of the polemic with Sabellius and Callistus: explicit as to the general concept of the Logos doctrine but without pronouncing on the details about which there had been disputes.

While Hippolytus had been above all an exegete, the author of *El* was as open to philosophy as he was indifferent to the interpretation of the Scriptures. The citations which are found in the *El* are almost entirely not adduced by him but from the many and disparate heretical sources of which he had made use. In his other writings, also, the Scripture seems to be almost concealed. Perhaps this disparity compared with Hippolytus might, at least in part, depend on the fact that, in the 3rd c., in some churches in the East it was customary to hold community meetings during the week dedicated to the systematic study of Scripture, esp. the OT, while this practice is not attested, at this time, in the West. The interest of this author for the eschatological theme is concentrated in the final page of the Περὶ τοῦ παντός, but his description of the final felicity of the just seems to proceed from cosmological rather than *soteriological interest. However, what he himself recounts concerning his conflict with Callistus reveals strong interests of moral and disciplinary character. In fact, his detachment from the Roman Catholic community was motivated, beyond the dissent of a doctrinal character, by his ascetic and disciplinary rigor, which incited him to remove the sinner from the community, while Callistus—as he reproached him—was much more generous in readmission. At the basis of the disciplinary conflict between the two there was a different conception of the church. The church of Callistus is a community which seeks to open its arms as wide as possible in the intention of offering to all, even to the one who is struggling with his own conscience, a chance of recovery, even at the cost of accepting the tares along with the good grain: as the gospel parable states (Mt 13:24-30), the recovery will only be at the final judgment, because only God can evaluate the sincerity of the repentance of the sinner (*El* 9,12,22-23). In contrast, the church of the author of *El* is an elitist and aristocratic conception, understood as the community of a few perfect elect. On the doctrinal side, this demand is revealed in the affirmation of the christological doctrine of the Logos, which the openness to the influence of Greek philosophy characterized as a cultured doctrine, at least in its origins, and therefore destined *naturaliter* for a selected and restricted audience. On the disciplinary side a great moral rigidity corresponds with a consequent lack of understanding for the weaknesses of the neighbor and the refusal of postbaptismal penance. The openness on the cultural level was opposed to closure on the disciplinary level, and both of the opposed tendencies contributed to isolate a community structure which was restricted and entirely closed in on itself.

CPG 1, 1871-1924; PG 10, 584-952; C. Scholten, *Hippolytos II (von Rom)*: RAC 15, 492-551; I. von Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Callistus oder die römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts, mit Rucksicht auf die Schriften und Abhandlungen der Herrn Bunsen, Wordsworth, Baur und Gieseler*, Regensburg 1853; E. Schwartz, *Über die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen*, Strasbourg 1910; Id., *Zwei Predigten Hippolyts*, SBAW 1936, 3; A. Donini, *Ippolito di Roma*, Rome 1925; P. Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe. Contribution à l'histoire de la littérature chrétienne du troisième siècle*, Paris 1947; Id., *Hippolyte, Contre les hérésies. Fragment*, Paris 1949; Id., *La controverse sur l'auteur de l'"Elenchos"*: RHE 47 (1952) 5-43; Id., *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton dans les florilèges dogmatiques et chez les historiens modernes*, Paris 1953; J.M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte. Ses documents. Son titulaire. Ses origines et son caractère*, Rome [2]1965; J.M. Hanssens, *Hippolyte de Rome fut-il novatianiste? Essai d'une biographie*: Archivum historiae pontificiae 3 (1965) 7-29; *Ricerche su Ippolito*, Rome 1977 (V. Loi - M. Guarducci - E. Follieri - P. Testini - C. Curti - P. Meloni - M. Simonetti - J. Frickel); M.S. Troiani, *Alcuni aspetti della dottrina dello Spirito santo in Ippolito*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 615-632; A. Zani, *La*

cristologia d'Ippolito, Brescia 1984; Ippolito, *L'Anticristo* (*De Antichristo*), text and It. tr. by E. Norelli, Florence 1987; J. Frickel, *Das Dunkel um Hippolyt von Rom. Ein Lösungsversuch: die Schriften Elenchos und Contra Noetum*, Graz 1988; *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*, Rome 1989 (P. Testini - J. Frickel - V. Saxer - M. Guarducci - M. Simonetti - E. Follieri - S.J. Voicu); M. Guarducci, *San Pietro e Sant'Ippolito: storia di statue famose in Vaticano*, Rome 1991; J. Mansfeld, *Heresiography in Context: Hippolytus' Elenchos as a Source for Greek Philosophy*, Leiden 1992; I. Mueller, *Heterodoxy and Doxography in Hippolytus' Refutation of All Heresies*: ANRW II, 36, 6, 4309-4374; C. Osborne, *Sources of Significance in Hippolytus' Account of Greek Philosophy*: Apeiron 27 (1994) 225-242; A. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century*, Leiden 1995; A. Whealey, *Hippolytus' Lost* De universo *and* De resurrectione*: Some New Hypotheses*: VChr 50 (1996) 244-256; M. Simonetti, *Una nuova ipotesi su Ippolito*: Augustinianum 36 (1996) 393-414; J. Frickel, *Hippolyt von Rom: als Prediger verkannt*, in *Stimuli*: Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann, Münster 1996, 129-140; K. Alt, *Hippolytos als Referent Platonischer Lehren*: JbAC 40 (1997) 78-105; R.E. Heine, *The Christology of Callistus:* JTS 49 (1998) 56-91; W. Kinzig - C. Markschies - V. Markus, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis: Studien zur sogenannten "Traditio Apostolica," zu den "Interrogationes de fide" und zum "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis,"* Berlin 1999; E. Norelli, *Alcuni termini della "Confutazione di tutte le eresie"* (*"Elenchos"*) *e il progetto dell'opera*, in *Lingua e teologia nel cristianesimo greco*, ed. C. Moreschini - G. Menestrina, Brescia 1999, 95-123; G. Uríbarri Bilbao, *La emergencia de la trinidad inmanente: Hipólito y Tertuliano*, Madrid 1999; Hippolyt, *Kommentar zu Daniel*, ed. G.N. Bonwetsch, vols. 2, rev. ed., M. Richard, Berlin 2000; M. Simonetti, *Ippolito, Contro Noeto*, Bologna 2000; A. Stewart-Sykes, *Hippolytus, On the Apostolic Tradition*, New York 2001; J.A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus Between East and West. The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*, Oxford 2002.

M. Simonetti

HIPPOLYTUS (pseudo). Among the works handed down to us and which have arrived wholly intact and under the name of Hippolytus, but which cannot be attributed to him, three are of particular interest for their inherent traits: the homily known as *In sanctum Pascha* (*IsP*), the *Homily on the Psalms* (*HPs*) and the *Contra Beronem et Heliconem* (*CB*).

1. The homily *In sanctum Pascha* (*IsP*) has been passed down to us by various MSS under the name of *John Chrysostom, but also by a *palimpsest of Grottaferrata under the name of Hippolytus. The work was attributed to Hippolytus by Ch. Martin in 1926, while P. Nautin dates it to the middle of the 4th c., considering it to have been inspired by the *On Easter* of Hippolytus. Its exact situation has been determined by R. Cantalamessa, who placed it in connection with the paschal homily of *Melito of Sardis, found on a papyrus and published in 1936. The *IsP*, in fact, like the homily of Melito, belongs to the genre of Asiatic paschal homilies from the Quartodeciman observance. In the *Quartodeciman paschal liturgy there was a reading of Exodus 12, in which the institution of the Hebrew paschal feast is recounted—the work of Moses. The homily which followed the narration would transport the feast into a Christian sphere, recognizing in the Hebrew Passover the prefiguration of the Christian Passover: Christ is the true paschal lamb, who, with his sacrificial death, liberated the true Israel, i.e., the Christian people, from servitude in Egypt, i.e., from sin, and introduced them into the true Promised Land. In addition to this common theme the two homilies are related by their stylistic figures, for both were composed in an Asiatic rhythmic prose, very studied in its alternation of more or less rhetorically elaborate passages and, in the case of the first, characterized by a fixed play with the harmony of brief *cola* connected among themselves by anaphora, alliteration, rhyme and other rhetorical figures. If the entirety of the Quartodeciman paschal celebration was of Jewish imprint, this refined formal elaboration draws influence from the rhetorical norms of the Second Sophistic.

In this common context, *IsP* is marked, with respect to Melito's homily, by a greater attention to the detailed correspondence of the rite of the slaughter of the paschal lamb with the passion of Christ: the period during which the lamb is guarded (Ex 12:6) prefigures Christ's hours in prison before the high priest; the sacrifice of the lamb, which takes place in the evening, makes precise the hour in which Christ was put to death, and so forth. The homily places the relationship between the two Passovers into a larger context, centered on the Pauline Adam-Christ contrast, and the reason for the passion seen as a new creation superior to the original, which had been affected byAdam's sin. This last concept arose from two traditional themes: that of the cosmic dimension of Christ's cross, which is extended with his arms to the entire universe, and that of the recurrence, in springtime, both of the creation of the world and of the redeeming passion. Some doctrinal features of *IsP* present an archaic physiognomy: *binitarianism, pneumatic christology. All things considered, this homily should not be dated beyond the end of the 3rd c.

2. The *Homily on the Psalms* (*HPs*) has come down to us in the original Greek via the *catenae*, while in *Syriac translation it bears the name Hippolytus. The author, who is polemicizing against the error of a new heresy (1), initially explains in what sense all 150 Psalms of the Psalter must be attributed to David (2-8); then he goes on to demonstrate the validity of the titles which complete the Psalms as epigraphs, giving to many of these—by an *allegorical technique—a christological and ecclesial interpretation (9-17); he concludes with two brief allu-

sions to Psalms 1 and 2, without epigraphs, of which the first is referred to the nativity, the second to the passion of Christ (18-20). P. Nautin, to whom we owe the critical edition of *HPs* (1953), in the context of his hypothesis on Hippolytus-Iosipos (*see* *Hippolytus), attributed it to Hippolytus based on a series of verbal comparisons. M.J. Rondeau and V. Loi, however, attribute the homily to the author of the *Elenchos,* while A. Brent has hypothesized that there was a third author who belonged to the same Roman society as the author of the *Elenchos* and Hippolytus. As for the adversary against whom the *HPs* fights, one thinks of the *gnostics, the *adoptionists, and the partisans of the Roman presbyter *Gaius. The comparisons used to attribute the homily either to Hippolytus or to the author of the *Elenchos* are not very significant, while a series of arguments suggests a later date for this text. In fact, the exegetical technique which *HPs* emphasizes appears to be more developed than that of Hippolytus, who is hardly gifted on a philological level. For example, while Hippolytus affirms, in *David and Goliath* 5, that David personally composed all the psalms, in *HPs* the Davidic authorship is explained in a more sophisticated manner: the psalms are divided between David and other authors (Asaph, Idithun, other temple cantors), but the whole Psalter is assigned to him because "he was the cause of all these things: he chose the cantors, and since he was the cause, he is considered worthy of this honor, so that all that the cantors said should be accredited to David" (ch. 7). Given that in the area around Antioch, as well as in the West, the entire Psalter was attributed to David, while in the area near *Alexandria *Origen and *Eusebius preferred to split the psalms between David and other authors, the solution proposed in *HPs* appears to be a compromise between *Antiochenes and Alexandrians, and that brings it to a much later date than Hippolytus. Nautin has identified correctly the heresy against which the author of *HPs* battles as the affirmation that the titles of the psalms were not original and were not valid. Today, after the first part of the *Commentary on the Psalms* of *Diodore of Tarsus (CCG 6) was published in 1980 by M.J. Olivier, we are able to give a name to the adversary of the author of the *HPs:* Diodorus (CCG 6) actually observes that, as the Psalms were dispersed during the Babylonian exile, they were put back in order by chance, after the return from exile, during the time of Ezra, so that—in large part—erroneous titles resulted. Even without wishing to identify Diodorus precisely as adversary of the author of *HPs,* he should be placed in this polemical context and in this time period, which takes us to the end of the 4th c. The author of the homily, as we mentioned above, proposed a solution of compromise between Antiochenes and Alexandrians, and he might have been located in the Syro-Palestine region. The attribution, at least partial, of the homily to Hippolytus is explained by the intention of guaranteeing the exegetical teaching of Origen—while the polemic of the Antiochenes raged against him—concerning the validity of the titles of the Psalms, by a renowned and independent exegete.

3. The original Greek of the *Contra Beronem et Heliconem* has been handed down to us, under the name of Hippolytus, from the *Doctrina patrum,* a christological *florilegium of anti-*monophysite tendencies, composed during the 2nd half of the 7th c. The text is autonomous, while the Latin translation, a work of Anastasius the Librarian (9th c.), was inserted into a series of documents relative to the *monothelite controversy; more specifically, it is part of a dossier of documents placed together a long time prior, at the time of the controversy and little after the death of three illustrious victims of the reaction by the imperial authority to the antimonothelite opposition: *Maximus the Confessor, *Anastasius disciple of Maximus and *Anastasius the Apocrisarius. In one document of the dossier, Anastasius the Apocrisarius, in a letter to the monk *Theodosius of Gangra, writes that he is including a *kontakion* containing eight testimonies of St. Hippolytus, bishop of the port of Rome and Martyr of Christ, in favor of the doctrine which affirms two natures and two operations of Christ and condemns whoever professes one operation and one nature. That is in fact the content of the eight passages, of varying—sometimes notably—length, in which he battles against Beron, who is described as already adhering to the gnostic teaching of *Valentinus, who himself is otherwise unknown, and of his companions, who contend that the flesh which the Logos assumed would have worked the same deeds as the divinity (ταυτουργὸν τῇ θεότητι), thus confusing the two natures and operations of Christ.

Evidently this piece of writing cannot be attributed to Hippolytus and must be considered as one of the many falsifications composed in the context of the monophysite crisis by both parties in the conflict: this work was from the *dyophysite and dyothelite side. The eight texts, which Anastasius the Apocrisarius said he selected from a larger work, are closely connected to one another and seem to be a work complete in itself. Given this and other evident inaccuracies in the account of the Apocrisarius, one might wish to see him as the author of this falsification: however, a strong argument against this possi-

bility is the doctrinal content of the text, which forces one to place it in the first part of this controversy, that of the *monoenergites, while the Apocrisarius was active in the second phase of the controversy, that of the monothelites. Actually, Patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople, in order to seek a compromise solution to resolve the contrast between dyophysites and monophysites, had begun at first to cautiously spread a doctrinal formula which insisted upon the concept of a single operation (ἐνέργεια) of Christ in which the divine and human nature converged. Only after the intervention of Pope *Honorius (634), who sought to favor the concept of will rather than that of *energeia,* Sergius passed from the one operation (monoenergism) to the one will (monothelitism) of Christ incarnate, and in the **Ekthesis* published by the emperor *Heraclius in 638, the concept of one will was placed alongside that of one operation and became prevalent. Returning to *CB,* there is a battle in this text only against monoenergism, without antimonothelite implications, so that the falsified works must be situated chronologically sometime before 638.

From a doctrinal point of view, it should be emphasized that the unquestionable attitude at the base of *CB,* dyophysite and therefore antimonophysite and antimonoenergite, is presented by avoiding—in an almost systematic manner—the parallel placement of the divine and human action of Christ, as the antimonoenergite and antimonothelite leaders *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Maximus the Confessor were wont to do, and as, even earlier, we read in *Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum*. The author of *CB* actually prefers to emphasize that the Logos effected divinely, through his flesh, that which was proper to the divinity (PG 90, 179C), as the characteristics of each nature remained unaltered, distinct one from the other. In this manner the unknown author interprets the dyophysite doctrine, insisting much more upon the unity of the subject than in the distinction of the natures, in the spirit of Cyril, such that his interpretation ends up being much more unitive than those of Maximus and Sophronius. For this reason *CB* can be considered an expression of a dyophysite tendency, to be sure, and therefore antimonoenergite, beyond being simply antimonophysite, but formulated in a cautious and subtle manner, which contrasts with the explicit clarity of the radical dyophysites: a tendency we might describe as moderate, and as such destined to remain marginalized faced with the prevalence of contrasting radical tendencies, just as the *CB* has remained marginalized in the field of modern research on the monophysite controversy in general and of the monoenergite in particular.

CPG 1, 1882-1916; 2, 4611; P. Nautin, *Homélies Pascales, I. Une omélie monarchique sur la Pâque*, SC 27, Paris 1950 (ed. and Fr. tr.); Id., *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton dans les florilèges dogmatiques et chez les historiens modernes*, Paris 1953, 99-17; 161-183; C.Q. Reijners, *The Terminology of the Holy Cross in Early Christian Literature*, Nijmegen 1965; R. Cantalamessa, *L'omelia "In s. Pascha" dello Pseudo-Ippolito di Roma. Ricerche sulla teologia dell'Asia Minore nella seconda metà del II secolo*, Milan 1967; M. Simonetti, *Un falso Ippolito nella polemica monotelita*: Vetera Christianorum 24 (1987) 113-146; G. Visonà, *Pseudo Ippolito, In sanctum Pascha. Studio edizione commento*, Milan 1988; M. Simonetti, *Ippolito, Contro Noeto*, Bologna 2000, 140-146; Pseudo-Hippolyt, *Zum heiligen Pascha: das Zeugnis einer frühchristlichen Osterfeier aus der Zeit zwischen dem zweiten und vierten Jahrhundert = In sanctum Pascha*, tr., intro, comm. S. Hausammann, Schliern 2000.

M. Simonetti

HIPPOLYTUS of Bostra (3rd–4th c.?). A very obscure personage, named in the anti-*Chalcedon collection *Sigillum fidei* (*Knik Hawatoj*) (7th–8th c.) as the author of a list of questions on the *Trinity, which is contained in the collection. At the origin of this name there may be a misunderstanding of *Eusebius's report (*HE* 6, 20), which, following *Beryllus of Bostra, names a certain Hippolytus, "who was also bishop of another church," generally identified with the *Hippolytus (of Rome) by Eusebius (*HE* 6, 22). Whatever his origin may be, the name Hippolytus of Bostra had a certain notoriety in the East, esp. in *Armenian texts. Dionysius bar Salibi knew of him (CSCO, *Scr. syri* 18-20, 1, ed. I. Sedlacek). L.M. Froidevaux identified an anti-Nicene nucleus inside the list of questions *On the Most Holy Trinity,* and, accepting the attribution to Hippolytus of Bostra and placing him at the end of the 3rd c., reconstructed a hypothetical biography for him. The figure of Hippolytus of Bostra is one of numerous proofs of the confusion surrounding the name of *Hippolytus in antiquity.

L.-M. Froidevaux, *Les Questions et Réponses sur la Sainte Trinité attribuées à Hippolyte, évêque de Bostra*: RecSR 50 (1962) 32-73 (with text and Fr. tr.); Ch. Renoux, *Hippolyte de Bostra? Le dossier du Galata 54*: Muséon 92 (1979) 133-158; DHGE 24, 637-8.

E. Prinzivalli

HISPANIC LITURGY

I. Name, origins and evolutionary factors - II. The liturgical schools - III. Liturgical books.

I. Name, origins and evolutionary factors. The Hispanic liturgy, which has also been named "Mozarabic" and "Visigothic," was the autochthonous

liturgy which developed in *Spain, in a clearly defined way, starting from the 6th c., and which remained vigorous until its suppression, which took place during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073–1085). At the time of its full flowering, when, i.e., the kingdom of the Visigoths reached its maximum extension (7th c.), the Hispanic rite was celebrated in the entire Iberian Peninsula and in that region of *Gaul which was called Gallia Narbonese, in the area of the E Pyrenees.

The name Mozarab, created by the Arabs, probably between the 10th and 11th c., to indicate a small community of subjects, cannot in fact indicate a rite which, since it was already elaborated during the 5th–7th c. by the efforts of various metropolitan sees, is actually a product of the cultural flowering of the Hispanic churches of the Visigothic period.

Therefore it should be said that the name "Visigothic rite" is more accurate, at least as to historical precision. The rite spread beyond the Pyrenees to the farthest reaches of the kingdom of the Visigoths and attained its greatest development during their period of splendor. But it should not be forgotten that the Hispanic rite, like the *Gallican rite and together with it, developed on the basis of a liturgical heritage older than the invasion of the Visigoths; that the authors of the *ispanica liturgia,* except for *Ildefonsus of Toledo (d. 667), did not belong to the ethnic group of the *Visigoths, but were Hispanic-Romans rooted and trained in a profoundly Latin culture, despite local linguistic and literary peculiarities; and that, the Visigothic kingdom being until the year 589 officially *Arian, the nascent liturgy of Spain was built precisely as a great and continual confession of the Catholic faith before the provocations and persecutions of the Arian Visigoths. It is also necessary to keep in mind that, after the fall of the Visigothic kingdom and during the Arabic occupation of Spain, liturgical creativity was not completely stopped, even if it was less intense and of lower literary-doctrinal quality. We believe, however, that not even the adjective "Visigothic" is applicable to the rite we are describing, except, at most, as an indication of the historical period which saw and in a certain sense favored its greatest splendor. The Gallican liturgy and the Hispanic were born together, they began their self-affirmation by basing themselves on the same foundation—the liturgical heritage deriving above all from Latin Africa—and they arose due to the same historical phenomenon: the growth at Rome of the "libelli," an example of a liturgical creativity which was abundant but as yet free from any pretense of codification.

Among the documents of the *liturgia ispanica* the diptychs of the Mass have been preserved, which were possibly written in the course of the 3rd c. and which form the major representative of this traditional liturgical heritage, based on which the first variable texts of the eucharistic prayer have been composed. Of the venerable diptychs contained in the *Missale Mixtum* of Cisneros, we find resonances, both in the letters of *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258), and in the Acts of the martyrdom of St. *Fructuosus of Tarragona (d. 258), killed, like Cyprian, during the persecution of *Valerian.

The example of the Roman euchological school, of which some texts reached SW *Gaul and NE Spain toward the end of the 5th c.—as they had reached *Milan a little earlier—excited that creative emulation which apparently gave rise to both rites. The churches of Spain and of Gaul accepted from the Roman experiment the principle of the variability of the texts for the Eucharist. The positive effect of the great Roman innovation, the unusual fact that also the "preface" became a euchological piece which was variable in every celebration, inspired the new Hispanic-Gallican system to make variable also the two parts of the eucharistic prayer which included the account of the institution.

But neither the Gallican rite nor the Hispanic rite renounced thereby a scheme of the Mass which was indubitably the fundamental element of their ancient liturgical heritage. Thus they preserved the diptyches or common prayer and the kiss of peace between the liturgy of the word and the preface; around these elements they composed a whole series of variable pieces, in connection with the preface, the *post sanctus* and the *post pridie.* While, acc. to the Roman system, series of texts were produced which were isolated from each other—the two collects, the *super oblata,* the preface, the *postcommunio* and the *super popolum*—which were meant to be distributed throughout various points of the Mass, from the beginning of the celebration to the benediction of dismissal. The series of Hispanic-Gallican variable texts accumulated in the central part of the Mass (at least it was this way at first), corresponding to the role which the Eastern anaphoras play.

Between the individual variable pieces remained short fixed formulas, which served as a link from one variable piece to another. These linking formulas were nothing other than the remains of the ancient eucharistic prayers which belonged to the traditional liturgical heritage which we have mentioned.

The experience of this system, with which it was possible to create innumerable variations on the same theme and which at the same time succeeded

in giving a sense of compactness to the entire euchological complex, marked the character and the style of the Hispanic rite. It must also be acknowledged that, in this, the authors of the *liturgia ispanica* succeeded in guiding their own rite along a path of evolution which was much longer and more coherent than the authors of the Gallican rite had done. Without this experience of the euchological system for the composition of the Mass, the rich, harmonic and refined composition of the *Officium,* which the Hispanic rite gradually reached, would have been inconceivable. The same can be said of the composition of its *Liber ordinum* (pontifical-ritual).

It turns out that, in the successive formation of the Hispanic rite, the liturgical schools of three great metropolitan churches took part: Tarragona, see of the province of the same name; *Seville, see of the province *Baetica in the S; and finally *Toledo, capital of the Visigothic kingdom. It is possible that also Cartagena, see of the *Carthaginensis, and *Mérida, see of *Lusitania, also offered their contribution; but there is insufficient documentation on this point to either affirm or deny it. It is also possible that *Narbonne, too, see of Gallia Narbonensis, had a part; at least as a point of transition for the liturgical exchanges between Provence, the most active center of the Gallican rite, and Tarraconensis. The Narbonensis was furthermore the natural passageway toward Italy, and more specifically toward Milan. The only Iberian see which certainly remained outside of the work of forming the Hispanic rite was *Braga, metropolis of the Bracarense.

The great geographical extension of the area in which the Hispanic rite later developed is the primary point which helps explain its richness, beyond having a larger period of time to produce texts and chants, before it reached the phase of compiling its liturgical books: it is in fact a period of time which goes at least from the beginning of the 6th c. to the end of the 7th.

But there is still another important factor to consider. The period of greatest creative activity of the Hispanic rite took place chronologically later than in the other rites. For this reason, its authors were able to evaluate the liturgy with greater maturity of reflection.

A clear exponent of such an awareness of the value of the liturgy is the *De ecclesiasticis officiis* of *Isidore, the first treatise on liturgy, in which, together with the information gathered from local experiences, mention is made of the liturgical customs of other churches: Africa and Milan in an explicit way. Complementary to the Isidorian treatise are the valuable liturgical canons of the 4th Council of Toledo (633), composed by the same Isidore. The decrees concerning the celebration of Christian worship are no longer abstract regulations; every time there is a reasoned explanation which is often based on reflection on the historical and theological data of the liturgy. At this point the liturgy has already become theological-pastoral material. Worthy of study, for the same reason, is can. 1 of the 10th Council of Toledo (656), which institutes the feast of St. Mary on 18 December. It is probable that the author of this conciliar canon was Ildefonsus, who was at that time abbot of the monastery Agaliense dedicated to Sts. *Cosmas and Damian, close to Toledo, but who would later be archbishop of Toledo and author of many important liturgical texts.

II. The liturgical schools.
The school of Tarragona. For documented proof of the existence of a liturgical school in the see of Tarragona we must wait until the middle of the 7th c. *Eugenius archbishop of Toledo (646–657) wrote to archbishop Protasius of Tarragona, sending him the prayers for the office of St. Hippolytus, which Eugenius himself had composed at the request of Protasius; but at the same time he excuses himself for not having composed the votive Mass with which he had been charged, because he did not believe he could make anything better than what had been produced in Tarragona itself. However, the see and ecclesiastical province of Tarragona had occupied themselves with liturgy much earlier. Three of the councils of the region which took place during the 1st half of the 6th c., in which bishops of other metropolitan sees participated (Cartagena and Mérida), dealt with liturgical questions: Tarragona (516), can. 7; Gerona (517), can. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 10; Barcelona (540), can. 1, 2 and 5. In these councils particular attention was given to the organization of the Office, both for the structures of the morning Office, at that time in evolution, and for the way and care with which ecclesial prayer of the hours should be carried out (Tarragona, can. 7, Gerona can. 10, Barcelona can. 1, 2 and 5).

The school of Seville. The contribution of the province of Baetica to the formation of the Hispanic rite can be largely attributed to the two great Spanish figures of this period: *Leander (ca. 540–600), monk, and later bishop in the metropolitan see of Seville, and *Isidore (636), younger brother of Leander and his successor in the same Sevillan see. But it should be presumed that, before Leander and after Isidore, the Baetic school carried out positive activity in the institution of the local rite. Seville was, as it seems, the most important center of Roman-

Hispanic culture, and remained so until the fall of the Visigothic kingdom.

In his *De viris illustribus,* Isidore speaks of the liturgical work carried out by Leander. According to him, Leander composed songs for the liturgy of the word in the Mass and repertory of psalmic collects, published on two occasions. We believe we can identify, via internal criteria, the collects composed by Leander with those which have been gathered in the edition of the *Liber orationum psalmographus.*

The only liturgical text formally attributed to Isidore is the blessing of the lamp and wax for the paschal vigil, which initially made up a single text. But it is certain that his liturgical production, esp. eucologic, was copious. Nonetheless, not a few texts of Isidore have survived, both in the *manuale* and in the festive orational for the Office, and perhaps also in the *Liber ordinum*. We have already discussed the *De ecclesiasticis officiis,* an important work also for clarifying certain obscure points of the peculiarities of the Hispanic rite.

After the death of Isidore, the Sevillan liturgical school reentered anonymity. At this time began the most brilliant period of the school of Toledo. It should, however, be maintained that the liturgical work of the see of Seville did not die out with the disappearance of its two first and great figures of antiquity.

The province of Braga. The NW province of the Iberian Peninsula—the present Galicia, with part of N Portugal—had become the kingdom of the Suebians, rivals of the Visigoths, but also of Arian religion. The first mention which we have of a preoccupation with liturgy in the church of Braga is the letter of Pope *Vigilius, written in the year 538, in response to the archbishop *Profuturus of Braga. The two principal questions of Profuturus for Vigilius were, first, whether the eucharistic prayer at Rome was composed of variable texts, and, second, whether baptism was given at Rome with a single immersion. The response of Vigilius is not only the first historical document which testifies to the existence of a fixed Roman canon, but it also allows us to emphasize that the two questions to which he responds are indirectly indicative of the new practice which was spreading through the Catholic churches of the Visigothic kingdom, and that, confronted with this, the Catholics of the kingdom of the Suebians turned to Rome in order to prevent themselves from being pulled along by the liturgical evolution which was taking place within the kingdom of the Visigoths.

We do not know to what degree the orientation of Braga toward the Roman liturgy was inspired by the greatest figure of the Bragan church of this period: St. *Martin, the apostle of the Suebians (ca. 515–580), who participated in the Council of Braga in 561. The second part of this council is dedicated to liturgical and disciplinary decrees. After having affirmed the necessity of unifying the celebrations within the Bragan ecclesiastical province (can. 1, 2), the council imposed as a rule the observance of the indications of Vigilius concerning the celebration of the Mass (can. 4) and the administration of baptism (can. 5).

Another sign of the Romanization of the Bragan province can be seen in can. 12, which prohibits the use of texts of poetic composition. This certainly refers to the hymns of the Office, which were already being used in Gaul and in Visigothic Spain and which had perhaps entered the Bragan province through the exchange of texts for the monastic office. In fact, can. 1, calling for liturgical uniformity, refuses certain unspecified elements coming from monastic uses.

The 4th Council of Toledo and its school. This city, capital of the kingdom of the Visigoths, became, through their wish, also the metropolitan see of the province of Carthaginensis, despite the protests of the metropolitans of Cartagena.

The first proof of Toledo as capital must have been the interprovincial council of the year 633. This was also the most flourishing cultural period of the Visigoths, in the civil and administrative field, which coincided with the reign of *Sisebut (612–621), and with the presence and the effective direction of Isidore at the head of the same council. Isidore, in the last years of his life, was by then well-known to everyone as the most erudite man of his time. The council produced 15 canons dedicated to the liturgy, the principal goal of which was to give a certain compactness to the local peculiarities through which the churches of Spain distinguished themselves as much in the way of celebrating the Eucharist, divine Office and the liturgical year, as in the way of administering the sacraments.

It seems apparent that this was a formal attempt to unify the liturgy in all its particulars. But closely examining the texts of the canons, one sees that the council always remained with questions of principle and left open the possibility of observing these principles, with the distinction between the metropolitan sees in realizing the celebrations remaining firm. It is certain that the conciliar Fathers, in that moment, were entirely aware of possessing their own rite, different from those of the churches of other countries. In this sense it can very well be said that the 4th Council of Toledo constitutes the greatest act of affirmation of the Hispanic rite.

Furthermore, the city of Toledo developed a li-

turgical school, particularly through the efforts of three archbishops: *Eugenius II (646–657), *Ildefonsus (657–667), *Julian (679–690); three representative names of a school which was very productive, esp. from the middle of the 7th c. However, the largest part of the liturgical work of Toledo and its region has remained, as in the other cases, anonymous.

With the invasion of the Arabs, arriving from N Africa, which began in the year 711, the kingdom of the Visigoths fell. The occupation was rapid. In the year 719 it already extended to nearly the entire peninsula; the Arabs failed to penetrate only some mountainous zones of Cantabria and the W Pyrenees. In the *Marca Hispanica* the Roman-Frankish rite was soon introduced through the influence of the Benedictine monasteries, which were founded there as signs of the avant-garde of the liberation. But the ancient liturgy was preserved, not only in the Christian kingdoms of Castille and León, but in the kingdom of Navarre and also among the Christian communities who lived under the Arab yoke.

III. Liturgical books. The sources of the *liturgia ispanica* are the liturgical books, which can only approximately be compared to the Roman books or those of other Western liturgies. For this reason, the substitution of particular names by which they were classified in antiquity with those names attributed to liturgical books of other rites is not recommended. The precision of the historical nomenclature of liturgical books is an indispensable premise for dealing fundamentally with the formularies which are contained there and with the specific function for which they were destined.

As in all other rites, the Hispanic liturgical formularies had circulated for a long time from one church to another in little pamphlets or *libelli,* before they were redacted into liturgical books proper. The exchange of *libelli* between the various euchological schools of the peninsula was the only path for approaching a more or less unified liturgy within the larger Catholic Church of the kingdom of the Visigoths. The most active liturgical schools were familiar with, not only the texts of the other Hispanic metropolitan sees, but also the *libelli* coming from Gaul and Italy (Milan, Rome and Benevento).

The most archaic type of **libellus* was that which included repertories of texts of the same genre: antiphons, responsories, festival orations for the Office, euchological texts for the eucharistic celebration, etc. From the organized collection of these homogenous *libelli* derived the simple liturgical books, not complete, such as the *liber manualis* (or *manuale*) and the *liber orationum festivus*. The first, analogous to the Roman *liber sacramentorum,* contains the euchological texts for the eucharistic celebration, following the order of the liturgical year. The name *manuale* might indicate that this was originally a small book, derived from a primitive collection of eucharistic prayers; this was later integrated into the *liber misticus.* Of the *liber manualis* (or *manuale*) there is a single codex extant (Biblioteca Capitular di Toledo 35.3), of which Férotin published the text, making use at the same time of the *misticus,* the codices of which are numerous. The *liber orationum festivus* contains the euchological texts for the festive cathedral Office. In the context of a donation of liturgical books to the monastery of Sahagún (960) there is a clear distinction between the festive orational and another orational which bears the name *psalmographus* or *psalmogravus* (*see *Liber orationum psalmographus*). The adjective *festivus* must be interpreted in a very wide sense; i.e., this orational reproduces the euchological texts composed expressly for the times and feasts of the liturgical year. The festive orational, due to its absolute Hispanic uniqueness, cannot be compared to any other liturgical book of the other rites. It was conceived and elaborated to order a type of material which was richer and more complex than any other rite. Its compilation presupposes a parallel codification of the antiphonary, at least for the part of the antiphonary which reproduces the chants of the Office. Of the orational there are only two codices, of which one—the most ancient among Hispanic liturgical codices, probably copied at Tarragona before the year 731—is preserved in the Biblioteca Capitolare of Verona.

The *antiphonarium* includes the chants for the festive cathedral Office and for the eucharistic celebration. The only complete example of a pure antiphonary which is extant—codex 8 of the Archivo Capitular of the cathedral of León, of the 10th c.—has been considered the most valuable jewel of the MS tradition of liturgical music, as much for its form as for its content. It is the result of a very complex work of compilation, a splendid synthesis of a long chain of other partial or provisional compilations which preceded it; for this reason it is the work of a great master in the art of ordering systematically liturgical books, who had to continually harmonize two codifications as different and intricate as that of the chants for the Mass and that of the chants for the festival cathedral Office. The author has the merit of having gathered in the appendices (fol. 247-306) extremely varied repertories of chants for the Mass, for the cathedral Office and even for the monastic Office, which could not be arranged within the divisions by day and by time.

The *liber commicus* usually offered, ordered throughout the liturgical year, the three readings of the eucharistic celebration: prophetic, apostolic and evangelical. The name *commicus* is probably a derivation from *comes,* the name of an analogous Roman book; nevertheless, in the context of the Hispanic rite, the word, altered orthographically (*commicus*), takes on a new etymology: St. Julian of Toledo has it derive from *comma* and says that it should be called *commatus,* i.e., the book which collects passages.

As we have seen, for the festival cathedral Office two complementary liturgical books had been structured: the antiphonary and the festival orational. But for its celebration, other repertories were necessary for the canticles of the OT from the morning Office, the hymns for the evening and morning prayer, and the fixed psalms. Separate copies of the psalter and the *liber canticorum* exist, but there was a fairly widespread tendency to group into a single volume—*in una forma,* as the ancient catalogs say—the psalter, the book of canticles and the hymnal (*psalterium–liber canticorum–liber hymnorum*).

The *passionarium* orders the "passions" and other accounts, such as those of the discovery of the relics of the cross, following the calendar of the liturgical feasts and is conceived and ordered for the celebrations of the morning Office and of the eucharistic celebration. The *liber sermonum* contained the patristic sermons which were read after the gospel; this should not be confused with the *homiliaries, which come from the Roman-Frankish environment, ordered acc. to the Roman calendar, of which many copies were made in Spain during the 10th and 11th c.

In the ancient catalogs a *liber precum*—probably a *libellus*—is named, which cannot be identified. There were two types of *liber ordinum:* one called *minor* or *sacerdotalis,* which corresponded to the *rituale,* and the other *maior* or *episcopalis,* which practically corresponded to the *pontificale*. Its codification was prior to that of the Roman-Germanic pontifical, which had its predecessor, not by chance, precisely in the Hispanic *liber ordinum*. In the edition of Férotin, made on the basis of three MSS, it is necessary to distinguish three different parts: (1) the ritual-pontifical proper; (2) the full compilation of the celebrations of the Paschal Triduum; (3) the appendix with a series of votive Masses, almost always of a devotional character.

Beyond the simple liturgical books there existed *libelli mixti,* where chants and euchological texts, formularies for the Office and for the Mass, were put together. The pamphlet in this case contained the texts necessary for the celebration of a certain feast; it began with the antiphons, the hymn and the oration for the Vespers, then the entire Matins Office followed, and finally the texts for the eucharistic celebration. This type of *libelli* prepared the formation of the most important of the Hispanic *libri plenari,* the *liber misticus,* which gave day by day the Office and the Mass following the calendar. The adjective *misticus* is, in this case, derived from *mistus,* Hispanicized form of *mixtus* ("mixed, composed"). Although keeping in mind that this type of full compilation was reached for practical reasons, we must admit that it reveals a very interesting conception of the liturgical day: the ecclesial praise and the Eucharist constituted a "celebration" without rupture of continuity.

The *liber horarum* was another plenary book, which gathered the formularies for the celebration of the monastic Office.

Editions: Díaz, 155f.; *Liber commicus*: G. Morin, Maredsous 1893; J. Pérez de Urbel - J. González y Ruiz-Zorrilla, Madrid 1950–1955; *Liber manualis* (*Liber Mozarabicus sacramentorum*): M. Férotin, Paris 1912; *Antiphonariam*: L. Brou - J. Vives, Barcelona-Madrid 1959; *Liber orationum festivus*: J. Vives - J. Claveras, Barcelona 1946; *Liber misticus*: PL 85; J. Janini, Toledo 1982; *Liber ordinum*: M. Férotin, Paris 1904; *Liber Missarum*: J. Janini, Toledo 1982-1983.

Studies: DACL 12, 390-491; G. Prado, *Manual de liturgia hispano visigótica o mozárabe*, Madrid 1927; Id., *Historia del rito mozárabe y toledano*, Silos 1928; J.F. Rivera Recio, *La controversia adopcionista del s. VIII y la ortodoxia de la liturgia mozárabe*: EphLit 47 (1933) 506-536; A. Baumstark, *Orientalisches in altspanischer Liturgie*: OC 10 (1936) 1-37; J.F. Rivera Recio, *Gregorio VII y la liturgia mozárabe*: Revista Española de Teología 1 (1942) 3-33; F. Pérez, *San Gregorio VII y la liturgia española*: Liturgia (Silos) 3 (1948) 105-113, 323-330; L. Brou, *Liturgie mozarabe ou liturgie hispanique?*: EphLit 63 (1949) 66-70; Id., *Bulletin de liturgie mozarabe*: Hispania Sacra 2 (1949) 459-484; J. Pinell, *Boletín de liturgia hispanovisigótica*: Hispania Sacra 6 (1956) 405-428; Ch. Munier, *L'Ordo "De celebrando concilio" visigothique. Ses remaniements jusqu'au X s.*: RSR 37 (1963) 250-271; J.M. Mona, *Suplemento 1949-1964 al "Bulletin de liturgie mozarabe" de L. Brou*, in *Estudios sobre la Liturgia Mozárabe*, Toledo 1965, 22-31; Id., *Bibliografia general. Ediciones de textos, trabajos y repertorios*, ibid., 165-187; J. Pinell, *La liturgia hispánica. Valor documental de sus textos para la historia de la teología*, RHCE II, 29-68; Id., *Liturgia Hispánica. Historia. Fuentes para su estudio. El Ordo Catedral. El año litúrgico. El oficio monástico. Sacramentos y sacramentales. Características generales del rito hispanico*: DHEE 2, 1303-1320; J.M. Mora, *Nuevo boletín de liturgia hispánica antigua*: Hispania Sacra 26 (1973) 209-237; J. Aldazébal, *La liturgia hispánica*, in A. Fliche - V. Martin, *Historia de la Iglesia*, V: *El nacimiento de Europa*, Valencia 1974, 633-661; A. Ferreiro, *The Visigoths in Gaul and Spain A.D. 418-711: A Bibliography*, Leiden 1988; G. Ramis, *La liturgia exequial en el rito hispano-mozárabe*, Rome 1996; J. Pinell, *Liturgia hispánica*, Barcelona 1998; G. Ramis, *La iniciación cristiana en la liturgia hispánica*, Bilbao 2001.

J. Pinell

HISPERICA FAMINA. The title of this text means "Western language." The text has come to us in various, slightly different redactions and was composed in Ireland or in Wales in the 6th c. It represents the prototype of that kind of writing that was affected and obscure and which therefore took the name of *hisperism*. It is composed not in verse but in rhythmic prose with brief phrases. Their tendency is toward *Hermeticism, and this renders it difficult to understand the meaning of the text: the author praises the particular type of language which he is using, and perhaps in order to demonstrate its expressive qualities, he develops a series of themes: *De Caelo, De Mari, De Igne,* etc. It has been suggested that these are scholastic exercises of monks in this particular species of language which reminds one of certain passages of the grammarian *Virgilius Maro and of Adelmus.

CPL 1137 (bibl.) ed. Jenkinson, Cambridge 1908; E. Coccia, *La cultura irlandese precarolingia. Miracolo o mito?*: StudMed 8 (1967) 323-327; M. Herren, *The Hisperica Famina* (Studies and Texts 85), Toronto 1987, 94-103; W. Sayers, *Images of Enchantment in the "Hisperica Famina" and Vernacular Irish Texts*: Études Celtiques 27 (1990) 221-234; Ch.D. Wright, *The Three "Victories" of the Wind: A Hibernism in the "Hisperica Famina"*: Ériu 41 (1990) 13-25; Patrologia IV, 478-479.

M. Simonetti

HISTORIA ACEPHALA. The title of a succinct story of the events on the life of *Athanasius, written by a cleric in *Alexandria around the end of the 4th c. Since the beginning has been lost, it starts with the events of 342. It contains the account of the last three exiles of Athanasius, of the installation of the intruder *George the Cappadocian and of the failed attempt of *Lucius. This work, which also informs us sporadically about *Paul of Constantinople, is valuable for the precision of its dates and chronology, taken from the archives of the patriarchate of Alexandria, which contained the principal events in chronological order. We possess the work only in a Latin translation passed down in the Cod. Veronese LX (58) of the 7th c., together with other documents of the so-called *Collectio Theodosii Diaconi*.

Histoire acéphale et Index syriaque des Lettres festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie, intr., critical text, trans., notes by M. Annick, Paris 1985 (SC 317).

M. Simonetti

HISTORIA AUGUSTA. An "imperial history" or a history of the emperors from *Hadrian to Numerian. Thus, it extends from 117 to 284 (with an intermediary lacuna from 244 to 253). The work is a collection of short biographies, redacted by six authors, whose character is difficult to determine: Spartianus, Volcacius, Gallicanus, Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Trebellius Pollio and Flavius Vopiscus. The work, one part of which is dedicated to *Diocletian and another to *Constantine, has again recently been at the center of discussions regarding its chronology (in the first years of *Theodosius, 392–395, or in the first of *Honorius; after 405 or around 420), its sources (the work consciously looks to the great models of the past; scholars have indicated in particular an impressive series of authors which inspire the work), and its reliability as a historical document (ever more called into question: it is argued that it mixes truth with falsity—not invented falsity, but transposed from one point and one plane of reality to another, esp. in the last biographies). Also difficult to determine is the attitude of the work toward religion: According to some, it expresses a tendency which cannot be recognized; acc. to others, a propagan tendency aiming at a request for tolerance; acc. to others, it manifests hostility toward Christians, so much so that it appears as a *Historia adversus Christianos*. In Spartianus (*Sept. Sev*. 17, 1) is found the only information in our possession relative to the prohibition on conversion to Judaism and to Christianity which *Septimus Severus is said to have imposed. The opinions of historians are also divided on the truth of this information.

The (even recent) bibliography is immense, indicated, among other places, in A. Chastagnol, *Le problème de l'Histoire Auguste. État de la question*, in Historia Augusta Colloquium 1963, Bonn 1963, 43-71; Id., *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste avec un rapport sur le progrès de la H.-A. Forschung depuis 1963*, Bonn 1970; P. Siniscalco, *La storiografia del Tardo Antico*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, Rome 1981, 102f.; *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. H. Hohl, stereotype ed. of the 5th ed. (1971), with additions and corrections of Ch. Samberger and W. Seyfarth, vol. I, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997; vol. II—on the 3rd ed. (1971), Stuttgart 1997; *Scrittori della* Historia Augusta, intr., text and It. tr. of P. Soverini, Turin 1983; in Paris, from 1992 on, the publication of the ed., Fr. tr. and commentary in the Collection de l'Université de France-Les Belles Lettres (as of 2000, 5 vols. had been published); since 1995—"Antiquitas," Reihe 4—Beiträge zur *Historia Augusta* Forschung—commentaries on the work have been published. Among the numerous scholarly contributions, we refer the reader to the Atti del Colloquio Patavino, Rome 1963, and above all, the series of volumes with the title: *Bonner* Historia-Augusta-*Colloquium*, originally edited by A. Alföldi and J. Straub, Bonn 1964–. Since 1991 study conventions titled "Historiae Augustae *Colloquia-Nova Series*," have been held, no longer in Bonn, but in various cities, and the proceedings have been published, edited by various scholars. Here it is sufficient to cite a few articles, beyond the collections mentioned above, in which Christianity is considered: J. Burian, *Quasi in christianorum ecclesia* (*H.A., Aur. 20*, 5): Zprávy Jednoty Klas-

ickych Filologii, Praha 26 (1984) 14-20 (in Czech with a synthesis in German); B. Baldwin, *Gregory Nazianzenus, Ammianus,* scurrae *and the* Historia Augusta: Gymnasium 93 (1986) 178ff.; R. Turcan, *Héliogabale précurseur de Constantin?*: BAGB (1988) 38-52.

P. Siniscalco

HISTORIA MONACHORUM. The story of a journey to holy Egyptian Fathers, undertaken in 394 by a deacon with a group of laity, narrated to the community of the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem (*Melania and *Rufinus). The number of chapters (26) can vary in the MSS acc. to the criterion of division; they are often found mixed with those of the *Lausiac History,* which treats the same topic. Rufinus translated the *Historia* in 404, and already *Jerome attributed it to him (*Ep.* 133); but the translation was poorly edited. The Eastern versions still await study, which may hold surprises in store. The monastic characters enjoy a rather varied description, from 26 pages to a few lines: some are content with miracles and ascesis; others explain and exhort. Of great interest is the popular character of the stories (*see* *Timothy of Alexandria).

CPG 5620; A.J. Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, Brussels 1961; Id., *Les moines d'Orient IV/1*, Paris 1964 (the two works now united, with indexes, Brussels 1971). See also the study of R. Reitzenstein, *Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca*, Göttingen 1916; N. Russell, *The Lives of the Desert Fathers: The Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* (Cistercian Studies 34), London 1981; E. Schulz-Flügel, *Rufinus: Historia Monachorum* (Patristische Texte und Studien 34), Berlin 1990; M. Paparozzi, *Inchiesta sui monaci d'Egitto*, Milan 1981 (It. tr. of the Gr. text); G. Trettel, *Storia di monaci*, It. tr., Rome 1991; *L'Histoire des moines d'Égypte; suivie de la Vie de Saint Paul le Simple*, crit. ed. by M. Szkilnik, Geneva 1993; P. Cox Miller, *Desert Asceticism and "The Body from Nowhere"*: JECS 2 (1994) 137-153; D. Woods, *An Imperial Embassy in the Historia Monachorum*: JTS 48 (1997) 133-136.

J. Gribomont

HISTORIA TRIPARTITA. This expression refers to a *historia ecclesiastica* which several Christian writers have composed using three ecclesiastical histories written earlier by *Socrates of Constantinople, *Sozomen, a native of Palestine, and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. Works of this kind were composed by *Theodore the Lector (around 550), in 4 books and by the monk *Epiphanius Scholasticus (after 530) in 12 books; *Cassiodorus also put his hand to this latter work.

For the bibl., *see* *Epiphanius Scholasticus and *Theodore the Lector.

P. Siniscalco

HISTORIOGRAPHY, CHRISTIAN. Once the great *Diocletian persecution had come to an end, some works of Christian historiography became public which were destined to leave a path through the subsequent centuries. The Edict of *Galerius was issued 30 April 311, through which Christianity became a permissible religion (*religio licita);* *Constantine defeated *Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge 28 October 312. Precisely in that period, in all likelihood around 312, the first edition of the *Historia ecclesiastica* written by *Eusebius of Caesarea began to spread. A few years later, around 316, *Lactantius wrote the treatise *De mortibus persecutorum.* With the legal recognition of their religion, Christians immediately made themselves present in the field of historiography, setting forth models which until that point were unknown among the pagans. The African Lactantius delineated a framework, lacking any sympathy for the persecutors, which they had inexorably reached by divine wrath: he did so offering firsthand information and did not fail to treat political and social facts. In an even more conscientious and original way, Eusebius's *HE* desired to supply, and in fact did supply, a quantity of authentic evidence: he shaped a new approach to history, even from the methodological point of view, because he followed the new religion, which had definite demands that history must help satisfy. In history, on the one hand, God's design for human salvation is accomplished through the centuries, so it must highlight in an overall design the antiquity of the Judeo-Christian teaching (this is a task faced by the chronographies, and among the first writings of Eusebius, as is well known, a Chronicle was included); on the other hand, the writer of history also presents a model of providential history: precisely what Eusebius desired to do, taking as the object of his treatment the events of the church. Therefore, he offers episcopal lists of the most important communities; he speaks of some teachers as ecclesiastical authors; he does not neglect heretics; he treats the punishment received by the Jewish people following their treatment of Christ; he mentions some of the persecutions undergone by his coreligionists and the martyrs, and the final victory of Christianity. The apologetic and edificatory scope, therefore, is evident (the church was instituted by God in the battle against paganism until its cessation, the faithful are witnesses of this, and to be aware of this signifies not only comfort but also new strength and determination).

At the beginning of his work (see I, 1, 3-5), Eusebius observes, after having defined this project (mentioned above), in which he, for the first time,

prepares to travel down a path untrodden by others. His predecessors, he writes, will only show him in brief fragments the road that "his" history must run, thus to avoid errors and dangers. In other words, he is completely convinced that his work was one that no one until that time had thought of writing. Certainly some scholars have suggested possible models that he could have drawn from, among others, those established by the historiographies of the philosophical schools and *Hellenistic-Jewish historiography, which are well represented by Flavius Josephus. Still his is a history of a new type in the object considered, in the materials gathered and, as already mentioned above, in its methodology. From here one can catch a glimpse of the profound differences between classical pagan historiography and Christian historiography: the first is established on free judgment, of which the ancient historians were proud; the second is established on the authority of Sacred *Scripture (see A. Momigliano, in *The Conflict*, It. trans., 102).

On the other hand, the crisis of pagan historiography, which had unsuccessfully attempted a unitary interpretation of history, because it was unable to base itself on precise pieces of information, found in Christian historiography its proper solution: faith in the sacred books in fact supplied the necessary and sufficient means to establish the truth *de temporibus* (see S. Mazzarino, in *Il pensiero storico classico*, II, 1, 472-473). And what is more, pagan historiography was commonly considered acc. to Cicero's expression as *opus oratorium maxime*. The work was therefore rhetorical and moralistic (hence the abundance of invented speeches and the lack of original documents). Christian historiography, on the other hand, because of the primary objectives that were pursued, set aside these characteristics, developing others, without forgetting the *tradition with its formidable authority. Moreover, establishing as its own basis a historical-salvific event concerning all of humanity, ancient Christian historiography tended to be universal, thus abandoning one of the canons of the classical Theucydian historiography, which prescribed only the treatment of contemporary history, and also overcoming the supranational and cosmopolitan tendencies of the Hellenistic or Augustan era to encompass an even broader temporal and spatial horizon: it is not simply a memory of the past, but paradoxically it extends toward the future, because it emerges from a theological vision (see B. Luiselli, in *La storiografia ecclesiastica*, 526-527 and *passim*).

The findings and the innovations presented by Eusebius's *HE*, to note the most significant example from the begining of the 4th c, were born from a tradition that dates back to the very origins of Christianity. Although with different characteristics, the deeds recorded in the NT were, on this line, extremely significant. They pertain to episodes or events that in the complex of the Roman Empire were local, without importance, unknown to all those except to those who participated in them. Even for the gospel writers and for the redactor of the Acts of the Apostles, they formed a history that constituted a revolutionary event for the world and which subsequently became such for each person; it provokes an interior change for each person that leads outside history, upward, toward a time without end (see E. Auerbach, *Mimesis*, the It. trans., 50-53). From it flows the seriousness and the utmost care for the particulars: their knowledge and their memory become decisive for the one who approaches them.

Within this perspective, both the documents pertaining to the martyrs (*Acta* and *Passiones*) and the *hagiographies would deserve their own treatment: even though beginning from a specific historical nucleus—as shown by the most ancient documents of this genre—their character as "living" texts allows for the intervention of various hands in different times, for which it turns out to be very difficult or impossible to reconstruct its primitive and historically established physiognomy.

A noteworthy contribution to Christian historiography in the 4th c. was that made by the *Chronographies, which followed one after another from the earliest times: the universal and providential vision of history, the centrality assigned to OT and NT deeds, the correlation posed between the events of the history of salvation (*historia salutis*) and those of secular history represent the key elements which would then be assumed by later historians in a less sparse framework and in a more extensive and complete form. Thus, alongside the chronographical direction, which would continue to be cultivated for many centuries, the historical-narrative direction took shape. The influence of Eusebius's *HE,* esp. in the Eastern milieu of the Greek language, was vast. *Gelasius of Caesarea (d. 395) wrote a continuation of Eusebius's work, which, acc. to some scholars, served as a model for the last two books of *Rufinus's *Ecclesiastical History* (the preceding 9 books reproduced Eusebius's work in Latin, although with many editorial liberties; in this way, at the beginning of the 5th c., the magnum opus of the bishop of Caesarea began to circulate in the West). Some scholars have added that not only Rufinus but also other historians such as *Gelasius of Cyzicus, *George the Monk and *Socrates drew their work from the writings of Gelasius of Caesarea. Between 434 and 439, *Philip of Side,

in Pamphylia, published a *Christianikē historia* in 36 books and 864 parts, a work which must have presented itself as a true and proper encyclopedia drawn from the first chapters of Genesis to the year 426, i.e., the 12th year of the emperor *Theodosius II. Fragments of this work remain, some of which are important because they complete Eusebius's work with pages, e.g., pertaining to *Papias of Hierapolis. During the same years *Philostorgius's *Ecclesiastical History* (ca. 368–after 425) appeared in 12 books, which included the events between the beginning of the *Arian controversy (ca. 320) and 425: divided in two works, it reflects Eunomian and millennialist tendencies. The objective was clearly apologetic in favor of the more radical Arianism of *Aetius and *Eunomius, and therefore it must have preserved and preserves, for the remaining portions, Arian documents and testimonies.

Other writings of the same genre have been lost, such as the church history attributed to *Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. ca. 450), priest of *Jerusalem (with respect to this work, only a fragment pertaining to *Theodore of Mopsuestia has survived), Heliconius's *Abbreviated Chronicle*, Timothy of Beirut's *Ecclesiastical History*, the *Syndicon* of *Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea in *Thrace. Documents that have survived to our time include Socrates's *Ecclesiastical History*, which set itself forth as continuing Eusebius's work and in fact narrates, in seven books (each book corresponds to an emperor's reign), "church events," from the abdication of *Diocletian in 305 to the year 439, in which *Theodosius II assumed the consulate for the 17th time. He was very clear in his expression, well-informed, careful in chronology, even if not always correct with respect to doctrinal or disciplinary questions, in the last of which he seems to have been an extreme rigorist. He treated a crucial period of church history, which from the last Great Persecution and from the dawn of freedom extends to the full affirmation of the new religion, to the period of the tormented Arian controversy, to the bitter dispute between Egyptian monks on the images of God (does God have a human form or is he incorporeal?). And even the conflict between pagans and Christians—again violent at the end of the 4th c.—saw the likes of such important personages from Eusebius of Caesarea to *Athanasius of Alexandria, from *Basil of Caesarea to *Gregory of Nyssa, from *Gregory of Nazianzus to *John Chrysostom.

*Sozomen also composed an *Ecclesiastical History* between 439 and 450, including an introductory *Epitome* in two books (now lost), in which events were pursued from Christ until the overthrow of Licinius (323) and then from 324 (3rd consulate of Crispus and Constantine) onward. In this document he declares his own intention of wanting to continue Eusebius's work from the point where he had interrupted it (as if he wanted to redo the massive work done by Socrates, which is not cited) up to 439. In fact, the final book ends at 423, i.e., at the time of the death of *Honorius. The fruit of the archival work that led Sozomen into the libraries of the royal and ecclesiastical palaces of which he speaks is seen clearly in the information which he provides on many individuals and the events that involved them.

After him, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus in *Syria wrote an *Ecclesiastical History*, composed in five books around 450, that began like Sozomen's from the overthrow of Licinius and continued until 428, the year of *Theodore of Mopsuestia's death, in this way avoiding to the necessity of treating the *Nestorian controversy, in which Theodoret had actively participated. Many of the documents he cited with care were chosen with the objective of defending orthodoxy against heresy, beginning from the Arian heresy. Scholars have noted the specific concentration of the composition of many *Ecclesiastical Histories* in Greek toward the end of the reign of Theodosius (408–450) (see A. Momigliano, *L'età del trapasso*, 286ff.; an explanation was proposed in relation to the politics and the propaganda of this emperor: see L. Cracco Ruggini, *Pubblicistica e storiografia bizantina*, 156ff.). Only one chapter pertaining to Theodore of Mopsuestia has remained from Hesychius of Jerusalem's *Ecclesiastical History* (d. after 450).

After 475, Gelasius of Cyzicus compiled another *Ecclesiastical History* in three books pertaining to the Church of the East under Constantine, using many known preceding sources and explicitly mentioning them. Continuing on the work undertaken by a multitude of authors, *John Diacrinomenos, between 512 and 518, wrote a church history (now lost), in 10 books, which from the year 429 comes to the time of the emperor *Anastasius I (491–518). Likewise lost is the analogous work written by *Basil of Cilicia, in three books, written for the time between 450 and 540. Lost in the original Greek, but having come down to us incorporated in the universal Syriac *Chronicle*—from the creation to 568–569—of which books 3-6 of the 12 existing was the *Ecclesiastical History* written by the *monophysite *Zacharias Scholasticus (d. probably before 553). This pertains to the period from 450 to 491. Two further church histories come from the first decades of the 6th c. The first was *Theodore the Lector's compilation from the writings of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (**Historia tripartita*), pub-

lished in four books ca. 530; the second was the autonomous continuation, from 450 to 527, of the preceding work; only extracts of this latter work remain.

Written in Syriac was the *Ecclesiastical History*, in 18 books, which have been partially lost, of the monophysite author *John of Ephesus (d. 586), whose exposition begins from Julius Caesar and ends in 585. Last, another work of the same title progresses on a rigidly orthodox line, namely, that of *Evagrius Scholasticus in six books that begins from the Council of *Ephesus (431) and reaches until the 12th year of the reign of the emperor Maurice (593/594). He was the last true follower of Eusebius of Caesarea, a valuable source for the history of Christian doctrines. The impressive sequence of ecclesiastical histories in the Greek language that flourished in the 5th and 6th c., primarily on the path of Eusebius of Caesarea's work, presents a common characteristic: for despite chronological, contextual and doctrinal diversity, the perspective that the authors generally assumed was centered on the *Pars Orientis*. The Latin *Ecclesiastical Histories* were different. They possessed more balanced "ecumenical" gaps, but they offer only a few analogous works to the many that exist in the Greek language. The same was said of the writings of *Rufinus between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c. One could mention, in the 6th c., the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, for which it was believed for a long time that *Cassiodorus was partially responsible, choosing from the Histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret of Cyrrhus excerpta that Epiphanius Scholasticus had then translated into Latin; although it was recently maintained that Epiphanius himself read, chose and translated the Greek sources, while Cassiodorus restricted himself to "following him" in the work and adding to it a brief preface. The composition in 12 books took as a model that of Theodore the Lector and undoubtedly constituted an important point of reference for the Latin Middle Ages.

Western patristic authors preferred *Chronicles* over the ecclesiastical histories and another type of historical-literary composition, namely, the one pertaining to famous men, for which Jerome was a leader, with his very well-known treatise *De viris illustribus*. Although Eusebius, embracing the entire ecclesiastical life, desired to pass on the memory of individuals who "nobly held the governance of the most famous churches" and that of "those who in each generation through voice and writings were messengers of the divine word" (*HE* 1,1,1), Jerome, in 392, for the first time concentrated his attention in an exclusive manner on the most famous authors of in Christian literature who lived from the death of Christ to the end of the 4th c. His literary model was the text of Suetonius, who composed with the same title in the 1st half of the 2nd c.: but his objectives were different: alongside the historical intention, which was clearly expressed—Jerome desired that the memory of the life and works of the people that were of interest to him, among whom he would also mention pagans and heretics—one perceives the apologetic objective, bent on defending the church from the criticisms leveled against it. (See the prologue of the work.) The Christian writer faces a true and proper challenge: he maintained the wisdom and the dignity of Christian writings, which by that point had virtually achieved a secular history, in the face of the repeated accusations of pagans, who regarded such texts as *rusticae* and *simplices*—an attitude with which he wanted to interact in the face of the proclaimed superiority of pagan culture, perhaps to free himself from a critique of his work. In this respect, one cannot forget the events in which the treatise *De viris illustribus* was composed: years in which the emperor Theodosius's antipagan laws provoked a strong reaction from the pagan nobility, which ranged from the proclamation of Eugenius as the new Augustus, to the reopening of the pagan temples and ending with the Battle of Frigidus, which witnessed the tragic end of Eugenius himself, Arbogast and Nicomachus Flavianus the Elder.

Two criteria guided Jerome in the selection of the ecclesiastical authors considered: was the author a *scriptor ecclesiasticus* and a *vir illustris* among the Christian community, and one who bestowed to the memory of posterity some work with respect to Sacred Scripture? In other words, he attributed value to authors inasmuch as they were interpreters of the Bible; he brought attention to them inasmuch as they were exegetes of the sacred text. Moreover, he placed value on these writers in relation to the stylistic worth of the works that he mentioned. Thus he delineated 135 "portraits" or representations, dedicating the first to Simon *Peter and the last, as is known, to himself. And in his gallery, even heretics and schismatics, *Jews and a pagan (Seneca) have a place. More than 102 are Greek authors and 33 Latins, something which indicates an opening of cultural horizons and a capacity and desire to receive voices on two sides, confirming the depth of Jerome's learning and integration that he knew how to achieve between the *saeculares litterae* and the *Sancta Scriptura*.

It is commonly thought that the treatise *De viris illustribus* was translated into Greek by *Sophronius, Jerome's friend, who actually translated many of his

writings into Greek (see *De vir. ill.* 134); in all likelihood, it seems that such a translation was owed to a later individual of the same name. Nonetheless, it is important to emphasize how the Greek world came to know of Jerome's writings, which were subsequently spread through a peculiar event. In fact, around the mid-9th c., *Hesychius of Jerusalem's *Onomatologos* (6th c. AD), which originally collected only bibliographies of pagan Greek authors, underwent a revision through which the anonymous redactor also used the treatise *De viris illustribus:* through this means, the work appears in the compilations of *Photius and *Suidas.

In the Latin world, a multitude of historians followed the footsteps of the learned monk, continuing and updating the plan of identifying "famous men." The first was *Gennadius of Marseille, who was still alive at the end of the 5th c., at the time of Pope *Gelasius, to whom are owed many works against the heresies and a treatise *De viris illustribus,* which was composed over time until 480. Included therein are 101 profiles, some of which are not authentic, but are the work of subsequent unknown authors; as far as it seems, the final chapter is also spurious, which taking its cue from the last chapter of its model contains biographical information on Gennadius himself, information that nevertheless is reliable since it was written at a time and place close to that of Gennadius. The work faithfully followed the model set by Jerome, not including writers already introduced by him. It is not surprising therefore that the two documents circulated together, beginning from the MS tradition. But the comparison brings to light distinct characteristics. Gennadius considered with greater attention the doctrinal aspects in relation to the ecclesiastical events, attributing less importance to the literary elements; he also placed great importance on the figures of the monks both Eastern (from *Pachomius to *Evagrius of Pontus) and Western (from *Martin of Tours to *John Cassian); nor did he fail to emphasize writers from Gaul, his homeland.

*Isidore (560–636), bishop of Seville, also composed a treatise titled *De viris illustribus*, in which he privileged by far Latin authors with respect to Greek ones and restricted his horizon, giving attention to persons of a province, in the specific case of the province of Spain. He thus listed 33 "bio-bibliographic portraits," twelve of which were Spanish and six who were his contemporaries. It seems that this first series of portraits, around the 9th–10th c., was fused with another analogous composition; from this source the so-called broadened version had its origin, which includes 46 chapters, in addition to the *praefatio*. The bishop of Toledo *Ildefonsus (ca. 600–665) was the author of a work bearing a title identical to the ones preceding. The objective of this work was to supplement Isidore's treatise, within a framework, however, even more restricted and with a new interest. He provided information about individuals who had lived at Toledo and had been overlooked by Isidore of Seville (of the 14, a good seven were bishops of the city; the remaining were Spanish bishops, apart from *Donatus, a monk who had come to Spain from Africa), and he places attention on the figures presented as models of moral rectitude and Christian virtue, esp. among the monks, focusing more on their eloquence, thaumaturgical powers and, therefore, on the efficacy of their pastoral action, than on their literary merits. During the Middle Ages, it suffices simply to mention the names of Sigibert of Gembloux, Honorius of Autun or the anonymous Mellicensis who, several centuries removed, continued a tradition begun by Jerome.

Mention, though brief, should be made of a testimony of exceptional value found in the East, even if in a period by that lies at the limits, or even beyond the limits, of the patristic age. I am referring to the *Bibliotheca* of *Photius (820–891), a polymath, a teacher at the University of *Constantinople, then head of the imperial chancellery and the patriarch of Constantinople. The work is the fruit of research into writings completed at different times and jotted down on cards; it turns out to be a very rich mine of information for Christian authors—there are 157 chapters, traditionally called "codices," that speak about them (while 122 are dedicated to secular authors). It has been observed that of the ecclesiastical literature, nearly 100 of the works among those mentioned with various titles by Photius have been lost while only 60 are extant (among the pagan literature, ancient or Byzantine, the balance is less impressive: there are more than 90 texts that are no longer extant and only 30 that have been preserved). In the 10th c., one also stumbles upon another interesting work, *Lexicon* of Suidas, the author of which we know nothing about. The same name also appears as a Hellenization of the barbarian form *Suda*, which seems to be genuine. But with respect to the name, origin and even the very meaning of the work, many hypotheses have been proposed. According to some scholars, Suidas does not designate the name of the compiler but the title of the collection. It is a collection of 30,000 grammatical, etymological, historical, biographical, literary, geographic, scientific entries, arranged in alphabetical order. We certainly find ourselves confronted by a kind of encyclopedia. Now a portion of the immense work

pertains to terms of literary history; and it is a portion of exceptional importance because it allows us to know the titles of the works and the names of even less-known Greek authors who are otherwise unknown. Nevertheless, the information is not, as one can well understand, firsthand and frequently gives rise to much confusion and errors that are difficult to untangle.

Latin historiography took different routes from Greek historiography. In the first place, the ecumenical and universal approach was always alive: present in the chronographical compositions, it is present no less in those properly speaking historical narratives. One thinks of the grandiose and very rich exposition of the moments and the most important aspects of human history divided into six ages, made by *Augustine in his treatise *De civitate Dei;* one thinks of *Orosius's *Historiae adversus paganos* which began with Adam (and not from Abraham, as Eusebius of Caesarea had done in his *Chronicon,* to avoid the chronological difficulties created by the first chapters of Genesis) and reaches to the year AD 417, organizing the narration ideologically and structurally around the scheme of the four universal reigns, i.e., appropriating the model of the *translatio imperii*. With that Orosius came to value and exalt the Rome of the *tempora christiana,* which represented the last of the empires, the point of arrival for all ancient history. In his writings, one seems to have the theoretical premise for the institution of a renewed type of historiography, namely, that of a specifically Roman approach, which is placed alongside the universal historiography. Such seems to be the justification for the *Historia Romana,* now lost, of Quintus Aurelius Memmius *Symmachus, *Jordanes's *Romana* (in which universal history and Roman history coexist without difficulty) or later the *Historia Romana* of *Paul the Deacon or of Landulf the Wise (see B. Luiselli, in *La storiografia ecclesiastica*, 528ff.). Finally, reflecting again the tormented vicissitudes of the West in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, Latin ecclesiastical historiography emphasized another important aspect; namely, the one pertaining to the Germanic peoples, who by that point were located in Romania. There was thus born a succession of works that were of enormous importance for understanding the events of that time and the centuries to come: the *History of the Goths,* which was composed by *Cassiodorus during the years 525 and following, whose 12 books have been irrecoverably destroyed (but are known through the abbreviated reworking of it made by Jordanes), Jordanes's *Getica* to be precise (551); the *History of the Franks*, the magnum opus of *Gregory of Tours completed in 591; the *History of the Goths, Vandals and Suevi* (ca. 560–636); and also the two *Histories of the Longobards,* one written by *Secundus of Trent (lost) and the other written by Paul the Deacon, the anonymous *Origo gentis Langobardorum,* until the *Historia Brittorum* and the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum,* the last owed to Bede. But with these works, one has exceeded the chronological bounds of the Late Antique patristic age and is now in the milieu of the early Middle Ages.

Several traditions have been followed here: the tradition of the ecclesiastical histories, literary histories and, starting from a certain period, the tradition of the histories of peoples. But by framing it in this manner one is aware that the horizon could expand even more. Our treatment began with Eusebius of Caesarea and the time in which he wrote his *Ecclesiastical History*. Scholars know how important the memory of Christian origins was assigned to the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the writings of *Papias and *Hegesippus, of which Eusebius himself was a witness, how important the first outlines of Christian *Chronicles* were, and it would not be difficult to continue. And even for the subsequent age it is difficult to distinguish between history proper and literary history, hagiography, memories, etc. So too it is not easy to indicate among the Christian historiographers who effectively deserves the title of "historian" (see M. Quesnel, in *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, XV). These concluding observations are enough to underscore the complexity, richness and importance of Christian historiography, something which the reader will be able to better understand by making use of studies, even though limited in number, mentioned below.

The bibl. on the theme is vast. Here we shall only list a few contributions that were useful for the composition of this entry. E. Auerbach, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur*, Bern 1946; A. Momigliano, *Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del VI secolo d.C.*: RAL, serie VIII, vol. 9 (1956) 279-297 (= *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Rome 1960, 231-254); S. Mazzarino, *La fine del mondo antico*, Milan 1959; A. Momigliano, *Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.*, in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, 79-99, It. trans. Turin [2]1971, 89-110; A.A. Cameron, *Christianity and Tradition in the Historiography of the Late Empire*: CQ n.s. 14 (1964) 310-328; S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, 3 vols., Bari 1966; A. Momigliano, *L'età del trapasso tra storiografia antica e storiografia medievale (325–550 d.C.)*, in *La storiografia altomedievale*, Atti del conv. 10-16 aprile 1969, Spoleto 1970, 89-118 (= *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1975, 49-71); L. Cracco Ruggini, *Pubblicistica e storiografia bizantina di fronte alla crisi dell'Impero romano*: Athenaeum n.s. 51 (1973) 146-183; O. Giordano, *Jordanes e la storiografia nel VI secolo*, Bari

1973; T. Markus, *Zosimus, Orosius and Their Tradition: Comparative Studies in Pagan and Christian Historiography*, New York 1974; L. Cracco Ruggini, T*he Ecclesiastical History and the Pagan Historiography: Providence and Miracles*: Athenaeum n.s. 55 (1977) 107-126; Id., *Universalità e campanilismo, centro e periferia, città e deserto nelle Storie Ecclesiastiche*, in *La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità*, Atti del conv. di Erice (3-8 dicembre 1978), Messina 1981, 159-194; B. Luiselli, *Indirizzo universale e indirizzi nazionali nella storiografia latino-cristiana dei secoli V-VIII*, ibid., 505-535 (the entire volume of the Acts was useful for our subject); P. Siniscalco, *La storiografia nel Tardo Antico, in La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, Atti del conv. CNR, Roma 12-16 novembre 1979, Rome 1981, 99-122 (at pp. 115ff., see further bibl. pertaining to the subject treated); Id., *Roma e le concezioni cristiane del tempo e della storia nei primi secoli della nostra era*, in var. aus., *Roma, Costantinopoli, Mosca. Da Roma alla Terza Roma, Studi I*, Naples 1983, 31-62; Id., *Les Péres, source pour l'histoire, in Les Péres de l'Église au XXe siècle. Histoire-Littérature-Théologie. "L'aventure des Sources Chrétiennes,"* Paris 1997, 17-34 (the last three articles provided immediately above are now found in P. Siniscalco, *Il senso della storia. Studi sulla storiografia cristiana antica*, Soveria Mannelli 2003, resp. pp. 31-59, 61-103 and 345-364, along with other studies on the topic); H. Inglebert, *Les romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome. Histoire, christianisme et romanités en Occident dans l'Antiquité tardive (III^{e}-V^{e})*, Paris 1996; D. Mendels, *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity: An Essay on Eusebius' "Ecclesiastical History,"* Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge 1999; E. Carotenuto, *Tradizione innovazione nella storia ecclesiastica di Eusebio di Cesarea*, Bologna 2001; var. aus., *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles,* sous la dir. de B. Pouderon et Y.-M. Duval, Paris 2001 (the studies collected in the volume are of great significance for the topic described here); M. Sordi, *Dalla storiografia classica alla storiografia cristiana*, in *Scritti di Storia romana*, Milan 2002.

P. Siniscalco

HISTRIA (Istria, district of Constanta, in Dobrudja, on Lake Sinoe, Romania). This was the most ancient colony of the city of Miletus, in the 7th c. BC, on the banks of the Black Sea; reconstructed around the end of the 3rd c. AD, it became prosperous in the 4th c. The barbarian invasions, esp. of the *Huns, caused its decline. Later it recovered and became an episcopal seat. The city was abandoned toward the end of the 6th c. or at the beginning of the 7th. The city was inhabited by people of Greek origin, Romanized Getae and then Sarmatians, but all of Christian religion, as is clear from anthropological research done on human remains. Excavations, begun in 1914 and still in progress, esp. since 1989, have revealed a large number of buildings, among which are also the ruins of several Christian basilicas: there must have been at least four. One, in the large square, which seems to have been the episcopal seat, was one of the largest buildings of its kind in the Balkan Peninsula. The basilicas had a long history; the last was built during the period of the emperors *Anastasius and *Justinian (527–565) (a coin from the 5th c. establishes the terminus post quem), but later it was partially destroyed, at the end of the 6th c. It measured 60 m (197 ft) in length, 30 m (98.4 ft) in width in the transept, and 20 m (65.6 ft) in the nave; it had an atrium, a narthex, a transept with a large choir and an apse with annexes on the N and on the S. Numerous tombs have also been found belonging to the basilica from the years 570–600. Another basilica was situated in the SE corner of the city, next to the city wall—from which it derives its irregular shape. This basilica belongs to the last phase of construction of the city (6th–7th c.), but only three-fourths of its foundations remain. A rectangular space with an apse which is semicircular inside and pentagonal outside appears to be a hall used for worship, found in a large aristocratic dwelling (*domus*) of the Roman-Byzantine district (5th–6th c.), situated in the SE zone of the city; the *domus* could have been the residence of the bishop. The hypothesis is strengthened by the fragments of a multilobed white marble table found in the apse. A more ancient public building was also in the form of a basilica, and inside it were found gates decorated with crosses; it seems that this, too, was adapted for Christian worship. In the area to the W of the walls were found the ruins of a basilica *extra muros,* believed to be a cemetery basilica, which had two annexed asymmetrical areas beside the apse, probably with the function of *pastophoria*. Numerous pieces of architectural sculpture (capitals, columns and bases of columns, slabs, and balustrades for the gates, etc.), a little treasury of golden objects (small crosses, earrings, rings), golden and bronze buckles bearing the sign of the cross and also a large number of clay vases decorated with the sign of the cross and various different Christian symbols complete the inventory of the findings dated to the 4th–7th c.

I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; Id., *Christian Art in Romania*, 1, Bucarest 1979; N. Duval, *Revue archéologique*, 2, Paris 1980, 313f.; A. Suceveanu Alexandru, *Das römische Histria*, in *Histria: eine Griechenstadt an der rumänischen Schwarzmeerküste*, ed. P. Alexandrescu - W. Schuller, Konstanz 1990, 9-45; A. Suceveanu - M.V. Angelescu, *Nouvelles données concernant Histria à l'époque romaine*: Ktèma 19 (1994) 195-208.

I. Barnea

HOLY SPIRIT

I. NT and patristic pneumatology: characteristics and differences - II. The trinitarian baptismal formula of Mt 28:18-20 and reflection on it - III. Initial outlines of a theology of the Holy Spirit in the 2nd c.

between orthodoxy and heresy - IV. The development of pneumatology in the 3rd c. - V. The trinitarian formula of Nicaea and the uncertainties with respect to the Holy Spirit - VI. From Nicaea to Constantinople - VII. After the Council of Constantinople; from Augustine until the filioque controversy.

I. NT and patristic pneumatology: characteristics and differences. The theological doctrine pertaining to the Holy Spirit (pneumatology), which was developed and elaborated by the fathers of the church, is essentially based, though making extensive use of the speculative instruments from the Hellenistic world, on the pneumatological formulas of the NT. In turn, these formulas developed, with reference to the person *Jesus of Nazareth, confessed as the Christ (i.e., the Messiah of Israel who had finally come), various ideas with respect to the "Spirit of God" (*ruah Yahweh*) of the OT and so-called intertestamental Judaism.

In the OT, the "Spirit of God" was the one who, having descended primarily upon the kings and leaders at the moment of their *anointing (1 Sam 10:1; 16:3; see also Is 11:2ff.; Ezek 36:26-27; 37:1-14; Ps 51; etc.) then extended to the entire elect people as the promised gift for the Day of the Lord (Joel 3:1ff.). It was the Spirit who brooded over the original waters (Gen 1:2), the Spirit who was the one, acc. to Ezek 36:25, given by God, by means of a sprinkling with "clean water," that would renew the heart and the spirit of human beings. In Judaism, the Spirit of God was increasingly seen as a divine animating principle, identified with Wisdom (Wis 7:22ff.). And in the rabbinic tradition the Spirit was increasingly seen as the origin and cause of prophecy. In the dualistic vision of Qumranic Judaism, one finds a clearer formulation of the doctrine of the "two spirits," already mentioned in the OT (in the sense of "distinction of the spirits," Hos 9:7), a distinction that at Qumran and in related documents is shown as the presence of a good spirit, or spirit of the light, and one of an evil spirit, or spirit of darkness; both, however, were created by God and subject to him (I QS III, 18-19; IV, 23ff.).

Against this background and in light of reused materials already elaborated one finds the NT pneumatological statements. Two notes characterize and rule the extraordinary pneumatological richness of the NT considered on the whole: the christological character of this pneumatology and the variety of spiritual manifestations in which the community of believers in *Jesus Christ lives and is nourished. The christological pneumatology is a central theme of the presentation of the life of Jesus as narrated in the gospels and in other NT writings: from his conception "by the Holy Spirit" to his baptism with the descent of the Spirit upon him, from his miracles until his *resurrection and glorious enthronement and the sending of the disciples in the Spirit and the power of the Spirit. On the other hand, since "gifts of the spirit" (charisms) were divided in different ways among the faithful, the pneumatological manifestations within the community were felt and presented as a guarantee that God truly dwelt within it and, as a result, bore witness to its *eschatological character. Even the pneumatological manifestations within the community, then, substantially had a christological foundation in the sense that it was the spiritual power of the risen Christ who made the community that commemorates his presence in the Eucharist and in baptism, as a body of which Christ is the head. Therefore, the various dimensions of the Holy Spirit that appear in the writings of the NT, and in certain baptismal (Mt 28:19) and liturgical formulas and ways of greeting (2 Cor 13:13-14; Phil 2:1; 2 Th 2:13; 1 Pet 1:2), should be seen within this general context in order to be understood in their full import. It is from such formulas that patristic theological reflection on the *Trinity began, just as this reflection, esp. on the Holy Spirit, always favored the tendency to consider the formulas in themselves—for the reason that the various terms implied or could imply the theological-speculative points of view—rather than from the ecclesiological-charismatic point of view.

II. The trinitarian baptismal formula of Mt 28:18-19 and reflection on it. Among these various formulas, one in particular had decisive weight on the subsequent theological speculation on the Trinity and pneumatology during the patristic age, namely, that of Mt 28:18-19: "And Jesus came and said to them, 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'" This was, evidently, a baptismal formula, even if not the most ancient one (normally, acc. to the NT's attestations to this practice, baptism was originally conferred through [εἰς] the name or in [ἐν] the name or on [ἐπί] the name of Jesus: Acts 2:38; 10:48; Rom 6:3; 1 Cor 1:13-15; Gal 3:27). But the formula of Mt 28:19 would become at the end of the 1st to the beginning of the 2nd c. the most current and then the only formula used in the church. The transmission of it, even only as a simple formula, which contained a reference to the Holy Spirit, then constituted the basis for the entire subsequent trinitarian speculation until the First Council

of *Constantinople (381). And although until after the mid-4th c., the development of trinitarian theology would serve to define and clarify the meaning, role and reciprocal relationship between the Father and Son, the mere fact of uniting the mention of the Spirit, even without any specifics on subsequent identifications in that regard, established the basis of a proclamation of faith, for which the theological speculation found itself at a certain moment interested also, in a more precise way, in the Holy Spirit.

Regarding the development of the Fathers' theological reflection on the Holy Spirit inasmuch as the Spirit was mentioned alongside the Father and the Son, their reflection, as was said, emerged from the baptismal formula of Mt 28:19 and contributed various elements that can thus be described in the following way: (1) The idea of the inspiration of Scripture (earlier for the OT, then gradually the recognition of the New also as "Scripture"), an inspiration considered to be the work of the Holy Spirit; (2) reflection on the preexistence of Christ, which was already affirmed by *Paul (e.g., Rom 1:4: "who was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead, acc. to the Spirit of holiness," and then the subsequent formula, more articulated and complex, of Col 1:15-17 and subsequently developed in Phil 2:6-11; 1 Tim 3:16; Jn 1:1-2; 1 Jn 1:1ff.) and upon which the ancient patristic tradition worked so hard and insistently (e.g., Ign., *Ephes.* 17,1-2; and Hermas, *Sim.* 5,5,2; 9,1,1); (3) faith in the indwelling of the Spirit in the faithful, following various Pauline indications (e.g., Rom 8:11; 1 Cor 6:14), which, read back into formulas of the then-current philosophy (*Stoic for him), led certain authors to maintain that, to some extent, the "spirit" (πνεῦμα) that is in the human being could be identified or at least closely connected with the divine Spirit (Ign., *Ephes.* 8,2; Justin, *Dial* 4,1; 6,2; Tatian, *Orat.* 12; 13; and esp., but in a very deep and original way, Iren., *Adv. haer.* II, 33,5; V, 6,1; V, 9,1); (4) the presence of the Holy Spirit in the church: a theme already extensively present in the writings of Paul, *Luke and *John, which was developed esp. in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (*Magn.* 3,2; *Ephes.* 9,2; *Smyrn.* 13,1; *Phil.* intr.), taken to rigorously ascetic conclusions in so-called 2 **Clement* (14,3) and in an even more radical way, in the sectarian, *encratite and rigorous *gnostic groups.

The pneumatological development in the 2nd c. was so strong, in spite of what is might seem formally, that in certain cases (e.g., evidenced in certain passages of the *Shepherd* of Hermas, *Simil.* V, 5,2; IX, 11,1) the Holy Spirit seems to be considered a superior divine entity, identified with the Son of God (understood as the Son of God preexisting *ab aeterno*), placed alongside God the Father, which was then inserted in the mortal flesh of Christ. In this case, too, such pneumatology ends up in a rigorous *asceticism and an appeal to preserve human flesh "uncontaminated" through its relationship with the Holy Spirit.

These pneumatological themes, interwoven and used in various ways, were extensively present in the 2nd c., although they seem to lose their importance in subsequent ages. These were, however, emphasized and widely developed with more unilateral emphases in the movements that were already originally and only subsequently marginal with respect to the perspective delineated by the Great Church. One simply has to think of *Montanism, in which one finds an entire relaunching of the NT prophetic charismatism, in forms, however, sectarian or neo-apocalyptic and millennialist (which take up again the Jewish-Christian theme of ongoing prophecy), or following the mythical development, as in various gnostic movements. Here, esp. in the *Valentinian movement, are anticipated, even if in a contradictory and confused way, pneumatological themes of great importance—such as the idea of the Holy Spirit's "procession," his consubstantiality with the Son, his personal and autonomous character in a certain sense—all themes that the theology of the Great Church would recover, opening itself in a holistic way only much later.

III. Initial outlines of a theology of the Holy Spirit in the 2nd c. between orthodoxy and heresy. With the 2nd half of the 2nd c., theological speculation was destined to prevail in the Great Church, which was increasingly indebted to expressive and conceptual Hellenistic forms, and was primarily focused on clarifying the relationship between God the Father and the Son-Logos. The objective was to simultaneously preserve Jewish-Christian monotheism (the *monarchia* as it was called) and the divinity of the Son-Logos (extending esp. what was said in the Prologue of *John's gospel). From this moment onward the theology of the Holy Spirit—even in the writings of the Fathers such as *Irenaeus, on the one hand, and *Clement of Alexandria, on the other, which were still very sensitive to the richness of the pneumatological themes first outlined—became strictly subordinated to the primary problem of the clarification and the definition of the relationship between the Father and the Son. And it would substantially continue in this way until after AD 350.

The conceptual schema preferably applied to explain such relationships was deduced from the *Sec-*

ond Letter of ps.-Plato (312 E). This enigmatic passage stated: "Everything surrounds the king of all things, and everything exists for him, and all beautiful things come from him; the second things stand around the second; the third around the third." Now this text, starting at least from *Justin Martyr (*1 Apol.* 60,5-9; see also Athenag., *Leg.* 23,4), was connected to other Platonic texts (e.g., *Tim.* 36 B-C) and applied to Gen 1:1ff., in which one encounters the God who "says" (therefore the Word of God) and the Spirit of God who brooded over the waters: thus the ps.-Platonic formula appeared to be a useful schema to understand the existing relations between the Father (the first God), the Logos-Son (the second God) and the prophetic Spirit (the third God in order). Starting from this basis, subsequent definitions of how one must understand the Holy Spirit at times varied considerably. *Tatian called the Spirit "the servant [διάκονος] of God who suffered" (*Orat.* 13,3); *Athenagoras called the Spirit "the 'flowing out' [ἀπόρροια] of the Father" (*Legat.* 10,3-4; 24,1-2), placing it as a medium between the Father and the Son. *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* II, 15) regarded the Spirit as the third divine being and identified it with the "wisdom of God" and the "spirit [breath] of his mouth" (acc. to Ps 33:6) and his complete power. Irenaeus (*Demonstrat.* 5) also identified the Spirit with "Wisdom," "the hand of God" in creation and destined to lead creatures to perfection.

IV. The development of pneumatology in the 3rd c. With the end of the 2nd c. to the beginning of the 3rd, while the theology that applied itself to the study of the relationship between the Father and the Son was organizing itself in a more complete and structured way, the reaffirmation of God's unicity (*monarchia*) was integrated and balanced by the idea of its intimate functional organization (*oikonomia*), and in this way the theological status of the Holy Spirit began to be better defined, even if briefly. One can see this development in the writings of such authors as *Tertullian, *Hippolytus and esp. *Origen.

In the writings of Tertullian, the Spirit, the "third name of the deity" and "third in relation to God the Father and God the Son" (*Adv. Prax.* 30,5), was the "vicarious power" (*vicaria vis*) of the Son (*De praescr. haer.* 13,5), the sole testimony to the unicity of God, the only one capable of explaining the intimate divine life. Father, Son and Spirit were conceived of by Tertullian in a form of special conjunction through which they were united, but they are not to be identified, because there exists between them a similar relationship to that relationship that can exist between the root, branch and fruit, or rather between the spring, river and stream, or even between the sun, the ray and the point it touches (Adv. Prax. 8,7). The *trinitas* (Tertullian was the first to use the term in Latin, already found in Greek as τρίας in the writings of *Theophilus of Antioch [Ad Autol. II, 15], who, however, identified the Holy Spirit with wisdom, acc. to a theology that was clearly more ancient from that point of view) was so conceived as an outflowing (*decurrens*) from the Father through a series of intertwining and connected shifts that did not damage the unicity of God and saved the intimate complexity (*oikonomia*) of the divine life.

For Hippolytus, the Logos, the second *person (**prosōpon*) alongside the Father, rules over everything and in the Son is active in everything (*C. Noet.* 8), while the Spirit is that which is in everything: it is through the Holy Spirit that we believe in the Son (*C. Noet.* 12).

The trinitarian formulas of both Tertullian and Hippolytus therefore included the Trinity in a certain graduated way, of which the Holy Spirit is, so to speak, the final point that allows the full understanding even of the Father and the Son. But it was precisely to Origen to whom was owed the more complete and systematic formulation of this type of trinitarian theology and, therefore, of a special recognition even of the Holy Spirit. One must not forget that Origen intended to respond to various subtle theological questions which were emerging (e.g., with respect to the generated and ungenerated character of the Holy Spirit; or rather whether the Holy Spirit had his own *οὐσία, substance or essence, etc.). When facing these and other problems, Origen drew on the one hand from the trinitarian formula of Mt 28:19, and on the other, he took great pains to keep in mind the theological-rational methodology that forced him to make coherent conclusions. In brief, one can say that Origen's position consisted in understanding the Trinity as somewhat concentric circles inscribed within one another, the broadest of which is represented by the Father, the only unbegotten one, who rules over all creatures; the middle circle is represented by the Son-Logos, who rules over all rational creatures (logos-reason); the smallest on the inside is the Spirit, which rules over all spiritual realities (**Pneuma* = spirit; *De Princip.*, I, 5; 7). Origen's understanding of the Trinity was, as one can see, clearly graduated: but Origen's primary objective was that of clarifying the "operations internal" to the divine triad. For this reason the Holy Spirit did not turn out to be fully integrated in it (*De princ.* I, 2,13; 3 *passim*), but precisely because of the intimate richness of the intratrinitarian life, the spirit was destined, through its overflowing, to produce

sanctification (*De princ.* praef. 3; I, 1,3; 3,4; 5; 7; II, 7,2; 11,5; IV, 3,14). Hence Origen's attention to the "operations" of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, each being a fully "intellectual *hypostasis" existing and subsisting per se (*De princ.* I, 1,3) coming to have a specific function in the history of salvation. Originated through the mediation of the Logos, the Spirit is, for Origen, an inferior reality in relation to the one who was its origin (*De princ.* I, 3,5; In Jo. 2, 10,70–12,90).

V. The trinitarian formula of Nicaea and the uncertainties with respect to the Holy Spirit. Origen's graduated formula of the Trinity immediately appeared suspect and difficult to explain, in part because of the radicalizations given to it by his followers and as a result of the strong opposition of the monarchian theologies, which were alive and well within the conservative circles of the church (who feared compromising the proclamation of divine monotheism). The accusation of *subordinationism, which certainly went beyond Origen's specific objectives, seemed to compromise the theological essence of the Son with respect to the Father; but such difficulties were also inherent to the Holy Spirit. It is true, moreover, that from the mid-3rd c. until the first decades of the 4th and even beyond, the Holy Spirit's position often appeared unclear, and even more, poorly defined. There are signs of a return toward the ancient theology that identified the Holy Spirit with the superior Christ, who descended upon the earthly Jesus, or tendencies that defined it with a superior entity of value more or less mythical such as Melchizedek, who, acc. to the epistle to the Hebrews (7:1ff), had blessed Christ (in the blessing given to Abraham) and therefore appeared superior to Christ. At other times, one finds hints of a symbolic theology identifying the Holy Spirit simply with divine grace; or even more so, rigorously following the subordinationist tendencies deduced from Origen's formula, the Holy Spirit was understood as a creative power, a "thing" (or "reality") made or having come into existence by means of the Son; therefore, the Spirit is neither God nor the Son (see also in this regard, Eus., *De eccles. theol.* 3,6).

The definition produced by the Council of *Nicaea's *creed (325) had something to say about the relation between the Father and the Son, thus condemning *Arius and Arianism (which would, however, survive for at least another sixty years). The creed established, nonetheless, the new basis in view of the theological essence even of the Holy Spirit, although the formula of Nicaea with respect to the latter limited itself only to proclaiming: "and [we believe] in the Holy Spirit" (COeD, pp. 5, 18-19 = καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα = *et in Spiritum Sanctum*). And only in a subsequent age, in the thick of the Arian controversy which, after 360, among the various movements that debated the field, a movement came to light that also undertook to debate the essence of the Holy Spirit. This properly speaking pneumatological controversy, which came about as one of the many more or less spontaneous proliferations of the then-dominant Arianism, initially manifested itself in Egypt. The first to be informed about this matter and the first to provide information about it was, yet again, *Athanasius (*Epist. ad Serap.* 1,1). Its subsequent development, more directly including the Holy Spirit among the controverted and disputed realities, while shedding greater light on the problem of the Trinity as a whole, was decisive for the solutions that early on emerged from the Great Church, in bringing about a greater precision with respect to the Holy Spirit. The conclusion of the pneumatological controversy took place in the First Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381), which proclaimed the full divinity of the third person of the Trinity.

VI. From Nicaea to Constantinople. In the period between 325 to 381, various positions on pneumatology were recorded; initially, however, more ascetic, spiritual and pastoral, rather than properly speaking theological-speculative: this means that, even here, the dogmatic formula would intervene to bring theological clarity on the reality personally held within the church. Thus, e.g., in the writings of *Cyril of Jerusalem (esp. in *Catecheses* XVI and XVII), as well as in the writings of *Didymus the Blind (in his treatise *De Spiritu Sancto*, which has been lost in its original but preserved in Jerome's Latin translation), so too in the writings of other church fathers. The most systematic and organic speculation with respect to the Holy Spirit is found, however, in the writings of the major 4th-c. champions of orthodoxy, Athanasius and then the three great Cappadocian Fathers (*Basil of Caesarea, *Gregory of Nazianzus and esp. *Gregory of Nyssa). And in their writings one also finds a refutation of what had come to be called the "*pneumatomachian" heresy.

For *Athanasius—in his controversies against those who interpreted the expressions of the Scriptures pertaining to the Holy Spirit in a "figurative" sense (τροπικῶς) and whom he therefore called **tropici* (τροπικοί)—the Holy Spirit must be understood to be within the Trinity, in the sense of an internal circular movement within it (περιχώρησις;

intertrinitarian *circuminsessio*), and not as a "creature," as maintained by the *tropici* and as was then argued by *Macedonius and various *pneumatomachians*; the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son (*Letter to *Serapion*, passim). Basil also insisted, against the pneumatomachians, that the Holy Spirit is not a creature, that he is worthy of the same honor (ὁμότιμος) reserved for the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Spirit is to be placed on the same level (συντετάχθαι) as these, to be regarded along with them (to be numbered among them συναριθμεῖσθαι) and not to be regarded below them (ὑπαριθμεῖσθαι). Despite these affirmations, even Basil was accused by certain rigorous and intransigent theologians of being uncertain with respect to the divinity of the Holy Spirit: and in fact, one could note that Basil never called the Holy Spirit "God" (ὁ θεός). Further steps toward the recognition of the full divine status of the Holy Spirit were taken by Gregory of Nazianzus, who deepened the concept of intertrinitarian *perichoresis, affirming that the specific character of the Holy Spirit as that of "coming," "proceeding" (ἐκπορεύεσθαι) from the Father, being part of his substance and essence (οὐσία), just as the specific character of the Son-Logos is that of "being generate." But it was esp. in Gregory of Nyssa's controversies with *Eunomius and the *Macedonians, who accused the Cappadocian Fathers of falling into tritheism, that one reaches the clearest doctrinal resolution with respect to the Holy Spirit. Gregory of Nyssa took up a role of primary importance both through his various polemical-doctrinal writings and through the work performed at the Council of Constantinople (381). Gregory began from the operations (ἐνέργειαι) of the trinitarian persons, who are distinct but who bear witness to a sole essence (οὐσία); with respect to the Holy Spirit, it has the characteristic of being of God and of Christ, coming from the Father and being received by the Son (*De Spir. Sanc.* 2). Thus the Father is every power, the Son is the power of the Father and the Spirit is the spirit of the Son's power. Hence, just as it is necessary to direct supreme adoration (προσκύνησις) to the Father and the Son, so too it is necessary to do the same for the Spirit.

It was precisely in these terms that the council of 381 expressed itself, which, with respect to the Holy Spirit, mentioned it esp. in respect to the incarnation: "The Son of God . . . came down from heaven, incarnate by the Holy Spirit [σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου] and the Virgin Mary." Thus, further on it proclaims its faith "in the Holy Spirit who is [literally: "that which is, that reality that is": this is intended to express the neuter τό with respect to the κύριον] the Lord, the Giver of life [ζωοποιόν], the one who proceeds [ἐκπορευόμενον] from the Father [ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός], the one who with the Father and the Son is worshiped [συμπροσκυνούμενον] and glorified [συνδοξαζόμενον], the one who has spoken through [διά] the prophets."

The form of the Constantinopolitan Creed with respect to the Holy Spirit was likewise established on an entire series of expressions materially deduced from the NT (in the order they appear in the creed: Mt 1:20; Lk 1:35; Acts 28:25; 2 Pet 1:21; 2 Cor 3:17-18; 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:6; Jn 6:63; Jn 15:26; 1 Cor 2:12). Only the last two expressions "together worshiped" and "together glorified" were foreign to Sacred Scripture, but they were the fruit of various controversies against the pneumatomachian movements.

VII. After the Council of Constantinople; from Augustine until the filioque controversy. After 381, with the theological-dogmatic status of the Holy Spirit definitively fixed, pneumatology developed no further except in the sense of a primarily spiritual deepening and a deeper understanding of the contents of this very formula. This was primarily the theological contribution brought forth by the Westerners, who had expressed themselves in less abstract and schematic ways and formulas than those who generally made recourse to the writings of Greek theologians. Even before 381, *Marius Victorinus—starting from a clearly *Neoplatonist conceptual schema and taking as his point of reference the human *soul, in which being (*esse*), living (*vivere*) and understanding are given for the comprehension of the living being (*intelligere*) (*Adv. Arian.* 1,32; 62-64)—had understood the Holy Spirit as the one who in the dynamic of the divine life represents the "comprehension" of such a life, a comprehension of that divine dynamism: the Spirit is distinct from the Son as understanding is distinct from life, just as the voice is distinct from the mouth that speaks (*Adv. Arian.* 1,13; 3,16).

But it was *Augustine in his very organic formulation of the trinitarian question who, fully assuming as an explicative instrument the reality of the human soul, came to a formulation of the question of the Holy Spirit that has since remained classic, esp. for Western theology. Augustine begins from an irenic and incontrovertible premise, namely, the conviction that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one in "substance," although distinct as "persons": with respect to the distinction, for Augustine, this essentially arises from the operations, even if they are, in effect, common to the three persons. In this regard, the Holy Spirit is for him the common

gift (*donum: Trin*. V, 12,13; 15,16; 16,17) of the Father and the Son. This idea was established, in turn, on that typically Augustinian idea of relation (*relatio*), which, when referred to the *Trinity, was an instrument in overcoming the intrinsic limits to a theology like that of the Greeks who, insisting primarily on the distinction of persons, ran the risk of compromising the unity and the divine unicity. In this sense, the Holy Spirit represented for Augustine a certain "consubstantial and eternal *communion" (*communio consubstantialis et aeterna*: Trin. VI, 5,7) of the Spirit of the Father and the Son (Trin. XV, 27,50) who, although it can be called "friendship," is better called *caritas* (Trin. VI, 5,7), which is reciprocal with respect to the one or the other so as to merit the name of "love," although God-Trinity is entirely love (*Trin*. XV, 17,30: *Spiritus proprie nuncupatur vocabulo caritatis*; ibid., XV, 17,31: *ipse dilectio est*). For this reason, the Holy Spirit is substantially the one who gives the Trinity to humanity.

With the dogmatic formulation of 381 and, then, with Augustine's clarifications and theological interpretations, esp. for the West, patristic theology on the Holy Spirit substantially came to an end. There certainly survived in the writings of individual authors abbreviated trinitarian formulas, in which mention of the Holy Spirit is not followed either by the proper terms of the formula of Constantinople (thus in the baptismal creed of the *Coptic church from ca. 500) or by other theological-dogmatic clarifications (as in the creed contained in the 7th-c. Antiphonary of Bangor). However, with respect to the duration of more ancient formulas than that of Constantinople, it is difficult to give a definitive pronouncement since in certain cases they survived alongside the formula of 381, or rather were replaced at a certain point. Likewise, there subsequently flourished here and there reminiscences of Macedonian positions, more or less explicit and aware. One can find traces of them, e.g., in *Fulgentius of Ruspe's controversies against Fabian (see CCL 91 A, 761-873). Thus pneumatological ideas that present themselves as clearly ancient with respect to the dogmatic development of the times can be found, e.g., in the writings of the *Messalians, who attributed to the presence and action of the Holy Spirit an absolute centrality, at the expense of a balanced trinitarian theology: this was the result of a confluence in Messalianism, as in other radical spiritual movements, of extreme charismatic ideas.

As stated before, the pneumatology of the Great Church continued, on the whole, to deepen the preceding reflection on the Holy Spirit, adhering with rigor to the formula of 381, but in the specifically spiritual sense. If anything, it is where remnants or new uncertainties and perplexities with regard to the full acceptance of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed flourished that the Great Church went back to insisting, from the theological-speculative point of view, on a point destined to arouse disputes and divisions later on. This point pertained to the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son in addition to the Father. This concept, which was called the "double procession," did not materially appear in the creed of 381 but was in fact peacefully accepted already before the Council of *Constantinople. It was in the controversy against *Priscillian, or, better yet, those movements that were considered Priscillianist, that, between the end of the 4th and beginning of the 7th c., there developed in *Spain through an entire series of synods held at *Toledo, there emerged the tendency to insert in the creed an explicit mention of the Holy Spirit's procession also from the Son (*de Patre . . . et de Filio procedentem*, then, more synthetically, *Filioque*). This formula, which passed over to the churches of *Gaul and was welcomed into the chanting of the creed in the imperial chapel of Aachen (Aquisgranum) at the court of Charlemagne, was initially the object of many papal reservations. It was admitted, in fact, by *Rome, that the insertion was theologically well-grounded, but its explicit insertion into the creed was discouraged numerous times. But the insertion of the Filioque, also heavily supported through political pressures as well as through theological reasons, provoked strong reactions from the Greeks, first in the disagreement that arose between Latin and Greek monks from the monastery of St. *Saba, then within the *Byzantine Empire in the 9th c. with *Photius's controversy against the Latin church and the schism connected to the name of the patriarch of *Constantinople.

1. In general: πνεῦμα, πνευματικός: TWNT 6, 330-450 (TDNT 6, 332-451); RAC 9, 490-503; DTC 5, 676-829; number 9 of "Les quatre fleuves" dedicated to the Holy Spirit (contributions by Cazelles, A. Jaubert, F. Bolgiani, Fr. Rondeau . . .), Paris 1979; DSp 4, 1246-1283; Augustinianum 20/3 (1980) 429-686 (with bibl.); L. Dattrino - G. Di Nola, *Lo Spirito Santo nella testimonianza dei Padri e degli scrittori cristiani (I-V sec.)*, Rome 1999 (with historical-theological introduction and anthology of patristic texts); B. Studer, *La foi en l'Esprit Saint dans l'Église ancienne*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 10 (1998) 2-14; C. Granado, *Spirito Santo*, in *Letteratura patristica*, ed. A. Di Berardino, G. Fedalto, M. Simonetti, Cinisello Balsamo 2007, 1116-1134 (with bibl.). For the OT: H.B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, London 1912; H. Leisegang, *Pneuma Hagion*, Leipzig 1922; F. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im NT*, Gütersloh 1926; P. van Imschoot, *L'action de l'Esprit de Jahvé dans l'AT*: RSPh 23 (1934) 553-587; Id., *L'Esprit de Jahvé source de vie dans l'AT*: RBi 44 (1935) 481-501; Id., *L'Esprit de Jahvé et l'Alliance Nouvelle dans l'AT*: Eph. Theol. Lov. 22 (1936) 201-226;

G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, London 1936; Fr. Rüsche, *Das Seelenpneuma. Seine Entwicklung von der Hauchseele zur Geistseele*, Paderborn 1939; G. Verbeke, *L'evolution de la doctrine du Pneuma du Stoïcisme à St. Augustin*, Paris-Louvain 1945; H.J. Kraemer, *Der Ursprung des Geistesmetaphysik*, Amsterdam 1964; B. Studer, *La ricezione della pneumatologia biblica nella Chiesa antica*, in *Spirito, Eschaton e Storia*, ed. N. Ciola, Rome 1998, 19-33; J. Fernández Lago, *El Espíritu santo en el mundo de la Biblia*, Santiago de Compostela 1998; J. Elowsky, *We Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Ancient Christian Doctrine 4, Downers Grove, IL 2009.

2. *For the NT and the early church*: J. Lebreton, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité*, Paris 1927-28, 2 vols.; S. Hirsch, *Die Vorstellung von einem weiblichen Pneuma Hagion*, Berlin 1927; M. Goguel, *Pneumatisme et eschatologie dans le Christianisme primitif*: RHR 132 (1946) 124-169; 133 (1947-48) 103-161; C.K. Barret, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, London 1947; G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen 1955; H. Opitz, *Ursprünge frühkatholischen Pneumatologie*, Berlin 1960; W.-D. Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch. Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie*, Munich 1972; G. Ferraro, *Lo Spirito e Cristo nel vangelo di Giovanni*, Brescia 1984; M. Lubomirski, *Il ruolo dello Spirito Santo nel passaggio dall'uomo vecchio all'uomo nuovo secondo San Paolo*, Diss. Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Rome 1988.

3. *On 2nd-c. pneumatology*: K. Adam, *Die Lehre vom hl. Geiste bei Hermas und Tertullian*: ThQ 88 (1906) 36-61; A. d'Alès, *La doctrine de l'Esprit en St. Irénée*: RecSR 14 (1924) 497-538; P. Nautin, *Je crois à l'Esprit Saint dans la sainte Église pour la résurrection de la chair*, Paris 1947; Th. Rüsch, *Die Entestehung der Lehre vom hl. Geist bei Ignatius von Antiochien, Theophilus von Antiochien, Irenaeus*, Zürich 1952; H. Karpp, *Schrift und Geist bei Tertullian*, Gütersloh 1955; W. Bender, *Die Lehre über den hl. Geist bei Tertullian*, Munich 1961; A. Orbe, *Estudios Valentinianos, IV. La teología del Espíritu Santo*, Rome 1966; J.P. Martin, *El Espíritu Santo en los orígenes del Cristianismo. Estudio sobre I Clemente, Ignacio, II Clemente y Justino Mártir*, Zürich 1971; A. Meis Wörmer, *La fórmula de fe "creo en el Espíritu santo" en el siglo II: su formación y significado*, Santiago de Chile 1980; M. Balwierz, *The Holy Spirit and the Church as a Subject of Evangelization According to St. Irenaeus*, Warsaw 1985.

4. *The development of pneumatology in the 3rd c.*: a topic that has not been sufficiently explored. It is essential to consult the general works (e.g., Prestige, op. cit.) or the thematic studies (e.g., Kretschmar, Rüsch). For a general overview, see F. Bolgiani in the cit. n. 9 of "Les quatre fleuves." On Origen: F. Cocchini, *Lo Spirito santo e le Scritture in Origene*: Parola Spirito e Vita 38 (1999) 211-220.

5. *From Nicaea to Costantinople*: C.R.B. Shapland, *The Letters of St. Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*, London 1951; H. Dörrie, *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*, Göttingen 1956; M. Simonetti, *Studi sull'Arianesimo*, Rome 1965; A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*, Göttingen 1965; W. Jaeger, *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom heil. Geist*, ed. H. Dörrie, Leyden 1966; W.-D. Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, Hamburg 1967; G.L. Dossetti, *Il Simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*, Rome 1967; A. Laminski, *Der heil. Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen*, Leipzig 1969; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; M.A.G. Haykin, *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*, Leiden 1994; J.-R. Pouchet, *La réception du Traité de S. Basile sur le Saint-Esprit*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 69 (1998) 22-31; K. Demoen, *Metaphor and the Ancient Trinitarian Debate: Analogical Language in the Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen*, in *Faith and Fiction. Interdisciplinary Studies on the Interplay Between Metaphor and Religion*, eds. B. Biebuyck - R. Dirven - J. Ries, Frankfurt-Bern-Paris-New York 1998, 137-153; M.-O. Boulnois, *Du Père par le Fils dans l'Esprit: une approche du paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Aléxandrie*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 76 (1999) 33-44.

6. *After 381*: H.B. Swete, *On the History of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, London 1876; M. Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustins*, Munich 1927; F. Cavallera, *La doctrine de St. Augustin sur l'Esprit Saint à propos du "De Trinitate"*: RecTh 2 (1930) 365-387; 3 (1931) 5-19; J.B. Wolf, *Commentationes in S. Cyrilli Alexandrini de Spir. Sanc. doctrina*, Herbipoli 1934; M. Jugie, *De processione Spir. S. ex fonte Revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*, Rome 1936; Id., *Le schisme byzantin*, Paris 1941; U. Kury, *Die Bedeutung des Filioque-Streites für den Gottesbegriff der abendländischen und der morgenländischen Kirche*: Inter. Kirch. Zeitsch. 33 (1943) 1-19; E. Candal, *Il Filioque nei Concili di Toledo e L'aggiunta del Filioque al Simbolo*, in var. aus., *Incontro ai fratelli separati di Oriente*, Rome 1945, 217-229, 231-245; P. Galtier, *Le Saint Esprit en nous d'après les Pères Grecs*, Rome 1946; F. Leotta, *La persona dello S.S. nella dottrina di S. Agostino*, Rome 1948; F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism, History and Legend*, Cambridge 1948; Th. Camelot, *La tradition latine sur la procession du St. Esprit "a Filio" ou "ab utroque,"* in var. aus., *Russie et Chrétienté*, Paris 1950, 179-192; P. Hadot, *L'image de la Trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez St. Augustin*: SP 6 (1962) 409-440; Id., *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres*, Paris 1972; G. Bentivegna, *Effusione dello Spirito Santo e doni carismatici: la testimonianza di Sant'Agostino*, Messina 1990; V. Reale, *Lo Spirito Santo amore del Padre e del Figlio: alla genesi di una dottrina: la pneumatologia agostiniana fra il 387/8 e il 393*, Rome 1995; S. Zañartu, *El Espíritu y el Hijo en la fe de la Iglesia. Algunos alcances respecto a la controversia sobre el Filioque*: Teología y Vida 40 (1999) 278-311.

F. Bolgiani

HOMER

I. In the Fathers - II. Possible influence in the NT.

I. In the Fathers. By considering the modes and forms of the reception of the Homeric poems by Christian authors, we can measure their ability to confront Greek civilization as manifested in the work of its most authoritative and prestigious representative. Homer, whose work was present and received both praise and criticism of various kinds throughout the entire experience of Greek paganism, was at the center—with his critic Plato—of the encounter of Christianity with Hellenism, in a way not unlike what had earlier occurred in relations between Hellenism and Judaism. It should be recalled that Hellenistic Judaism had, besides the tragedian Ezekiel, at least three epic poets: Philo, Theodotus

and the mysterious Sosates, who flourished at Alexandria in the 1st c. B.C. (and is referred to with the revealing appellative *Ebraicus Omirus* only in the so-called *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, the early medieval Latin translation of the *Chronicle* of the *Theosophy* (P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia: An Attempt at Reconstruction*, Leiden, 2001, p. 104, ll. 218-219).

Homer's presence made itself felt in Christian literature, but in differing ways, from the moment in which the Greek *apologists of the 2nd c. posed the problem of the relationship between their new faith and the Greek culture in which they were raised. It is no accident that the name of Homer was invoked positively for the first time by *Justin, 1 *Apol.* 18,5, in support of the Christian truth of the judgment of the dead and punishment in the next world. But Justin also expressed appreciation of Socrates for having called for a ban of Homer and some other pagan poets from his republic (2 *Apol.* 10,6). This ambiguity characterizes in general the attitude of the Greek and Latin apologists toward Homer (see, e.g., *Minucius, *Oct.* 23,2; *Tertullian, *Ad Nat.* I, 10 and *Apol.* 14,4). We will not provide here a complete or systematic list of the citations of Homer in ancient Christian literature, much less of the allusions to him, which are not always easy to detect. More useful in this setting will be to indicate some privileged areas of the Christian use of the Homeric poems, making use where necessary of the ample panorama offered by Bartelink.

1. Homer is often considered, along with *Orpheus, the Sibyl, *Hystaspes, Hermes Trismegistus, as one of the "pagan" prophets of Christian revelation, esp. with regard to the two special themes of *monotheism and *eschatology. Particular importance attaches, in the context of antipolytheistic polemic, to the citation of *Iliad* II, 204: "The multiplicity of lords is not a good thing. Only one should be the lord" (as already in Philo, *Conf. ling.* 170; and then cf. *Tatian, *Or.* 14,1; ps.-Justin, *Coh.* 17; *Epiphanius, *Anc.* 104,3; *Cyril Alex., *C. Jul.* 7). For *Clement of Alexandria, Homer is an involuntary and unconscious prophet of Christian truth (*Paed.* I, 6,36,1) and, though representing the gods as subject to human passions, shows himself to know divine reality (*Strom.* V, 99-100 and V, 116-117). This line of interpretation finds confirmation in *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* II, 38) and in the *Cohortatio* of ps.-*Justin, as well as in Justin and Clement. Here, along with the critique of polytheism (ch. 2), appreciation is expressed for the poet's testimony regarding monotheism (ch. 17 and ch. 24 with the exegesis of the Homeric "catena aurea" of *Iliad* VIII, 18 ff.) and on the resurrection of bodies (ch. 28).

2. The significant analogies between Homeric poetry and Christian theology, and the various impressive similarities between biblical accounts and Homeric myths, are explained with recourse to the theory that Moses lived prior to Homer (the antiquity argument), and Homer had thus copied from the books of Moses (the plagiarism or literary theft argument). As early as Justin, Moses is said to be older than the Greek writers, and the Greek philosophers and poets are said to have drawn on the prophets (1 *Apol.* 44,8-9 and 59,1). Justin's disciple *Tatian was the first Christian author to explicitly maintain the chronological precedence of Moses with respect to Homer, considering these two figures as the two founders, the points of reference, respectively, of barbarian wisdom and Greek civilization (*Or.* 31), and from this he concludes that the myths of Homer are an imitation of the Mosaic texts (*Or.* 41). This is an apologetic argument of Hellenistic-Jewish origin (see Aristobulus in Eusebius of Caesarea, *P.E.* XIII, 12,13) aimed at highlighting the antiquity, and therefore the truth, of the biblical revelation (among the numerous texts, see also Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 21 and V, 14; Origen, *C. Cels.* I, 18; IV, 21 and VI, 7.43). Basing his work on that of the historian Diodorus Siculus, ps.-Justin puts forward the original theory acc. to which Homer learned wisdom from Moses during his sojourn in Egypt (*Coh.* 9 and 28). Of course, for a pagan polemicist like *Celsus precisely the opposite was the case: the biblical tradition is later than the truth of *paganism, of which it offers only a perverse caricature.

3. The figure of Homer, taken up by the orthodox polemicists in his specific function of prophet of some fundamental Christian truths, was nonetheless rejected by the same authors as the main source of inspiration of *gnostic doctrines. The gnostics did not confine themselves to distorting the meaning of Scripture, subjecting it to a forced treatment of transposition and adaptation completely analogous to that which the authors of *centos applied to material drawn from the Homeric poems (see *Irenaeus, *A.H.* I, 9,4 and II, 14,2; Tertullian, *Praescr. haer.* 39,3-5). They corrupted the content of Scripture itself through recourse to pagan doctrines, worked out in an exemplary manner by their "prophet" Homer (see the information on the *Valentinians in Irenaeus, *A.H.* I, 12,2; II, 5,4; II, 14,1-2; IV, 33,3; information on Naassenes, *Sethians, Peratae and *Simonians in *Philosophumena* V,7,30-41; V,8,1-3; V,8,34-35; V,20,10-20; VI,15-16; VI,19,1-4; cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* XXI,3,3). These accusations find explicit confirmation in *The Exegesis on the Soul* (NHC II, 6), whose

author, to illustrate the condition of the *soul fallen into the world, refers to two citations of the *Odyssey* regarding the exile of Ulysses on Calypso's island and of Helen at Troy. Notoriously, in Simonian gnosis Helen was the name of the divine *Ennoia*.

4. Beyond their irreconcilable theological differences, what orthodox and gnostic authors have in common in their handling of the Homeric material is recourse to *allegorical exegesis, an inheritance of the Hellenistic culture from which all without distinction drew inspiration, each in his own way. Already the pagan philosophers of the imperial age (*Stoics, Neo-Pythagoreans and *Neoplatonists) sought authoritative confirmation of their ideas in the work of the wise Homer (see, e.g., the *Homeric Problems* of Heraclitus, Cornutus's *Compendium of Greek Theology*, the interpretations of *Numenius of Apamea, ps.-Plutarch's treatise *On Homer*, and *Porphyry's commentaries on the *Styx* and on the *Cave of the Nymphs*, besides the *Homeric Questions*). Christians of Hellenistic formation also sought out the hidden meanings of the Homeric poems, of course rereading them in the light of Christian symbolism and of the corresponding biblical images.

The *Odyssey* presents some privileged cases of this Christian exegesis: (a) *moly*, the herb given by Hermes to Ulysses to render him invulnerable to Circe's deceits, now is the gospel message that Christ, the true Hermes, gives for the acquisition of gnosis and the person's divinization (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VII,16,95,1-3), and it is the instrument which makes it possible for intelligence to overcome the animal condition (Boethius, *Cons.* IV,3 *Metrum*); (b) the willow—"destroyer of the fruit"—is in its turn a symbol of chastity (*Methodius, *Symp.* IV,3). But it is esp. the episode of the Sirens and of Ulysses tied to the mast of the ship which moved the Christian writers to a long series of reinterpretations and variations on the theme, of dense theological and spiritual meaning. Clement of Alexandria first sees in the Sirens, not only an image of habits and pleasure (*Protr.* XII,12,118,1-4), but also of the risks inherent for the Christian in secular culture (*Strom.* I,10,48,6; VI,11,89,1; cf. ps.-Justin, *Coh.* 36,3; Basil, *Leg. lib. gent.* 4; Boethius, *Cons.* I,1). For the *Philosophumena* the Sirens represent the temptation to heresy (VII,13,1-3). Intentionally rejecting the Homeric model, Methodius declares in his turn to not want to listen, bound, to the deadly song of the Sirens, which he opposes to the chorus of the prophets and apostles and to the divine mysteries, knowledge of which is the source of salvation (*Lib. arb.* I,1-4). The reading of the Sirens in a "moral" key, which identifies them with worldly enjoyments and sensual pleasures, takes its place, from the 4th c., alongside that regarding heresy. The figure of Ulysses/Odysseus too is subjected to diverse reinterpretations acc. to the context. These exegetical developments are documented in texts of *Ambrose (*De fide* III, 1,4-5; *Exp. Luc.* IV,2,3; *Expl. Ps.* 43, 75), *Jerome (*Ep.* 22,18,2; 54,13,1; 117,6,4; *In Os.* II, *praef.*; *In Ier.* III, *praef.* etc.), *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 16,7; 23,30), *Maximus of Turin (*Hom.* 37), *Synesius (*Ep.* 142).

Less well known is the fact that the *Iliad* too was subjected to allegorical reinterpretation by Christian authors. *Origen's great familiarity with the Homeric poems is due to his youthful activity as a grammarian (*Eus., *HE* 6,2-3). Certainly the reading of Homer was a regular practice at the school of Caesarea, where all of the philosophers (except the atheists) and the Greek poets were studied (*Greg. Thaum., *Panegyric to Origen* 13). The Neoplatonist *Proclus (*In Timaeum* 20) has transmitted the vivid memory of a teaching of Origen (not the nonexistent pagan Origen, but the sole Christian Origen) on the sublime language of the Homeric poetry, and of the critical reaction of his disciple Porphyry, whose commentary on the *Timaeus* was in all likelihood the direct source of Proclus's information. For Origen, despite the inevitable moral and religious errors (*C. Cels.* IV,36; VII,54), Homer unquestionably remains a poet to be admired (IV,91), the best of the poets (VII,6). Origen in fact maintained—seemingly the first among the Christians to do so—the legitimacy and necessity of the allegorical exegesis of the *Iliad* and of the accounts regarding the Trojan War (*C. Cels.* I,42). He was moved, very probably in the lost *Stromata*, to interpret boldly, but with absolute coherence, the figures of Achilles and Hector as types of Christ and the devil respectively. As Proclus relates Porphyry's criticism of Origen regarding the Homeric style, similarly *Didymus the Blind's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* 9,10 cd, which we have in a papyrus of Tura (III, 279,2–281,24), reports Porphyry's scathing criticism of Origen's allegorical interpretation of the battles of Achilles and Hector (in the *Origeniana Sexta*, I have proposed to restore to Origen this exegesis, which was previously mistakenly attributed to Porphyry himself). We have here a concrete example of that type of application of pagan allegorical method to biblical doctrines that aroused so much indignation in Porphyry (see Eus., *HE* 6,19,8). After Origen, one finds a similar "christological" exegesis of Achilles (but without the corresponding "diabolical" interpretation of Hector) in *Constantine's discourse *Oratio ad Sanctos* 20,8-9.

The work of A. Carlini (SCO 46, 1996, 385-394) and A. Linguiti (CPF I, 1, Florence 1999, 623-629),

both maintainers of the traditional interpretation which attributes to Porphyry this paradoxical "allegory," not only do not propose any integration of the lacuna of the papyrus, but there conclusions are also seriously compromised by the inexplicable silence on all of these sources that instead converge in indicating Origen's authorship of the exegesis as reported by Didymus.

5. An important aspect of the influence exercised by Hellenistic Homeric philology on the techniques of Christian biblical hermeneutics is the transposition of the principle of exegesis that is immanent within the text, acc. to which Homer is explained by Homer (*Homeron ex Homerou saphenizein*: cf. Porphyry, *Quaest. hom.* su Z 201). In the Christian context the principle of the autohermeneutic of the biblical text was applied in an explicit and conscious way beginning with Clement (*Strom.* VII, 16,96) and Origen (*Princ.* IV, 2,4; *Comm. in Ps.* 1 in *Philoc.* II, 3), with the aim of illustrating obscure points of Scripture by recourse to other passages that were clear, thus overcoming its apparent contradictions and absurdities, esp. in polemic with heretics. Scripture is thus explained with Scripture.

6. One remains more or less skeptical of the attempt, which was not devoid of acute observations, made by MacDonald to interpret the apocryphal *Acts of Andrew* as an intentional Christian rewriting of the *Odyssey*, which aims to transmythologize the Homeric conception of the world into the Christian myth contained in the gospel and to propose a new series of alternative values (cf. the version of D. Dawson in International Journal of the Classical Tradition 2 [1995/96] 131-134). It is always difficult to verify and evaluate the importance of the literary and ideological impact of the Homeric poems in the absence of explicit citations or sufficiently clear allusions.

What is certain is that Homer has left ample traces of himself in the numerous literary reminisces present in the 4th-6th-c. Fathers (esp. Greek, but also Latin). And it could not be otherwise, if one considers that the reading of the Homeric poems was an obligatory subject of study at the grammar schools, which were attended by young Christians (even in Roman Africa: see Aug., *Conf.* I, 14 and 16). Precisely because of the awareness of the importance that the Homeric poems, along with the rest of pagan Greek literary production, had for scholastic education even among Christians, the emperor *Julian decided to exclude Christian teachers from teaching with the famous edict of 362 (see esp. his *Epist.* 55), which in reaction led to a comprehensive rethinking of the value of Homer for Christians and of the possible ways in which his work could be used. *Basil does not hesitate to recommend Homer's poetry, defending it in a hymn to virtue (*Leg. lib. gent.* 5), giving authoritative indication of the path to be followed.

Homer is amply present in the epic paraphrases of the biblical books such as the *Paraphrases of the Psalms* attributed to *Apollinaris of Laodicea, the *Paraphrases of the Gospel of John* attributed to *Nonnus of Panopolis (as well as, obviously, in his "pagan" poem *Dionysiaka*), the paraphrases of the Octateuch, Zechariah and Daniel of the empress *Eudoxia (author also of a paraphrase of the *Life* of *Cyprian of Antioch: see Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 183 and 184). But, besides its recovery in the epic paraphrases, the Homeric material is also widely found esp. in those new creations which were the **Homeric Centos* of biblical theme (*Homerokentra-Homerocentones*). Jerome is the first to mention the Christian Homeric centos, without naming names, and of course to express his lively opposition to a literary genre which in his view subjected the Word of God to an intolerable forcing of the text (*Ep.* 53,7). The pioneering collection of Homeric centos by the mysterious bishop Patricius nonetheless had great success in the Byzantine world, thanks also to the famous reworking of them by the empress Eudoxia. Nonetheless much ecdotic and exegetical work remains to be done so as to untie the very complex knots of an extremely problematic MS tradition, and to articulate the proper literary and theological placement of these works.

V. Buchheit, *Homer bei Methodios von Olympos*: RhM 99 (1956) 17-36; H. Rahner, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, Zürich 1957; J. Golega, *Der homerische Psalter. Studien über die dem Apolinarios von Laodicaea zugeschriebene Psalmenparaphrase* (SPB 6), Ettal 1960; J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux II^e et III^e siècles*, Paris 1961; H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche*, Salzburg 1964, 239-271; R.L. Wilken, *The Homeric Cento in Irenaeus, "Adversus Haereses" I,9,4*: VChr 21 (1967) 25-33; G. Glockmann, *Homer in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Justinus* (TU 105), Berlin 1968; N. Zeegers Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, Louvain 1972; J. Dummer, *Epiphanius von Constantia und Homer*: Philologus 119 (1975) 84-91; M. Scopello, *Les citations d'Homère dans le traité de "L'exégèse de l'âme,"* in M. Krause (ed.), *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, NHS 8, Leiden 1977, 3-13; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Homère dans les œuvres de Théodoret de Cyr*: Orpheus n.s. 2 (1981) 6-28; S.J.D. Cohen, *Sosates the Jewish Homer*: HTR 74 (1981) 391-396; A. Le Boulluec, *Exégèse et polémique antignostique chez Irénée et Clément d'Alexandrie: l'exemple du centon*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), StPatr 17/2, Oxford 1982, 707-713; J. Pépin, *The Platonic and Christian Ulysses*, in D.J. O'Meara (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, Albany 1982, 3-18 and 234-239; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Homer in den Werken des Kyrillos von Alexandrien*: WS NF 17 (1983) 62-68; R. Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian. Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 9), Berkeley-Los Angeles-

London 1986; B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, SBA 18/1-2, Basel 1987; J. Pépin, *La tradition de l'allégorie de Philon d'Alexandrie à Dante*, Paris 1987; A.J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*, HUTh 26, Tübingen 1989; P.F. Beatrice, *Porphyry's Judgment on Origen*, in R.J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta*, BETL 105, Louvain 1992, 351-367; F. Siegert, *Homerinterpretation - Tora-Unterweisung - Bibelauslegung. Vom Ursprung der patristischen Hermeneutik*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), StPatr 25, Louvain 1993, 159-171; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Homer*: RAC 16 (1994) 116-147; N. Hopkinson, *Nonnus and Homer*, in Id. (ed.), *Studies in the "Dionysiaca" of Nonnus*, Cambridge 1994, 9-42; D.R. MacDonald, *Christianizing Homer. The Odyssey, Plato, and the Acts of Andrew*, New York-Oxford 1994; Chr. Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin* (*Markell von Ankyra?*). *Ad Graecos de vera religione* (*bisher "Cohortatio ad Graecos"*), SBA 25/1-2, Basel 1994; P.F. Beatrice, *Didyme l'Aveugle et la tradition de l'allégorie*, in G. Dorival - A. Le Boulluec (eds.), *Origeniana Sexta. Origène et la Bible*, BETL 118, Louvain 1995, 579-590; S. Ackermann, *Christliche Apologetik und heidnische Philosophie im Streit um das Alte Testament*, SBB 36, Stuttgart 1997; R. Klein, *Die Bedeutung von Basilius' Schrift "ad adolescentes" für die Erhaltung der heidnisch-griechischen Literatur*: RQ 92 (1997) 162-176; P.F. Beatrice, *Diodore de Sicile chez les Apologistes*, in B. Pouderon - J. Doré (eds.), *Les Apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, Théol. Hist. 105, Paris 1998, 219-235; H. Chadwick, *Antike Schriftauslegung. Pagane und christliche Allegorese. Activa und Passiva im antiken Umgang mit der Bibel*, Hans Lietzmann Vorlesungen 3, Berlin-New York 1998; N. Pace, *Il canto delle Sirene in Ambrogio, Gerolamo e altri Padri della Chiesa*, in L.F. Pizzolato - M. Rizzi (ed.), *Nec timeo mori.* Atti del Congr. Int. di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della morte di Sant'Ambrogio, SPMed 21, Milan 1998, 673-695; A.-L. Rey, *Patricius, Eudocie, Optimus, Côme de Jérusalem. Centons homériques* (*Homerocentra*), SC 437, Paris 1998 (bibl.); M.D. Usher, *Homeric Stitchings. The Homeric Centos of the Empress Eudocia*, Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford 1998; Id., *Homerocentones Eudociae Augustae*, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1999.

P.F. Beatrice

II. Possible influence in the NT. Recently it has been proposed that traces of influence of Homer can be found even in the NT, and esp. in the gospels (in particular in those of Mk and Lk) and in the Acts of the Apostles. The main supporter of this thesis is Dennis MacDonald, who also proposed (in his *Christianizing Homer*) that the apocryphal *Acts of Andrew* could be seen as a Christianization of Homer. This hypothesis is grounded in the availability of Homer's text to NT authors, who, like their readers, probably learned to write Greek upon Homer; students were normally invited to paraphrase Homer at school. In *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, MacDonald argued that Mark constitutes a deliberate inversion of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* which transforms Homer's heroic values, proposing Jesus as a new hero. Mark emulated stories in both Homer and the OT, in order to present Jesus as more compassionate, powerful, noble and inured to suffering than Odysseus was for Homer. But also parallels with the *Iliad* are detected, e.g., between Mark's account of Jesus' crucifixion and Homer's account of the death of Hector, and between Mark's account of the burial of Jesus and Homer's account of that of Hector. As for the *Acts of Andrew,* MacDonald sees them as a transformative rewriting of the *Odyssey* in the light of Plato's denunciations of Homer, substituting the vices depicted by the poet with Christian virtues. At the end of these *Acts,* *Andrew is described as a kind of Christianized Socrates. Scholars have either enthusiastically accepted MacDonald's thesis, esp. in respect to the gospels, or rejected it.

D. MacDonald, *Christianizing Homer: The Odyssey, Plato, and the Acts of Andrew*, Oxford 1994; Id., *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, New Haven, 2000; Id., *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*, 2003; M. Mitchell, *Homer in the New Testament?* Journal of Religion 83,2 (2003) 244-261.

I. Ramelli

HOMERIC CENTOS (poetry). A literary genre consisting in the reuse of verses or half verses taken from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* which, sewn then together in a clever way by skilled poets and with minimal intervention on their part acc. to the epic model, recounts the chief events in the history of the NT, with a few brief mentions of the story of the creation of the world and original *sin. There are five redactions of the Homeric *centos, the first two of which are long and the other three brief. More specifically, the first, which contains 2,354 verses, was the fruit of the revision of a preexistent cento written by a certain presbyter Patricius, a revision completed by *Eudoxia, the wife of *Theodosius II (5th c.). The second—despite the fact that codex Paris. suppl. gr. 388, considers it a summary and attributes it to Patricius, Eudoxia, the philosopher Optimus and Cosmas of *Jerusalem—should preferably be seen as anonymous (Rey is of a different opinion). This redaction derives from the first with the addition of more than 700 original Homeric verses; it contains 1,957 vv., but the artistic skill is far inferior. The brief redactions a, b and g, each with about 600-700 verses, are epitomes and were intended exclusively for scholastic use. Only until a few decades ago did scholars hold the Homeric centos in contempt, showing little, if any, interest. The centos have recently undergone a significant reevaluation with regard to their textual criticism and exegesis. Recent studies have allowed scholars to verify that, esp. in the first redaction, the selection of Homeric verses was never haphazard but was governed by a signifi-

cant amount of attention given to the intertextual relationship with the two chief models, Homer and the gospels, and the arrangements established were often the fruit of an almost philological expertise. Moreover, apocryphal texts and patristic reflection in the Greek language had an influence on the Homeric centos. It was therefore a courtly literary genre, which aimed, however, at scholastic ends or merely entertainment (*divertissement*), among the highest expressions of the reception of classical texts in Late Antiquity and esp. of the fusion of the imaginary *pagan with Christian revelation.

Complete Edition: R. Schembra (ed.), *Homerocentones*, Turnhout 2007. Partial editions: A. Ludwich (ed.), *Eudociae Augustae . . . carminum Graecorum reliquiae*, Leipzig 1897 (a little less than 400 verses of the second redaction); A.-L. Rey (ed.), *Patricius, Eudocia, Optimus, Côme de Jérusalem. Centons Homériques*, Paris 1998 (II red.); M.D. Usher (ed.), *Homerocentones Eudociae Augustae*, Stuttgart - Leipzig 1999 (I red.). Commentaries: R. Schembra, *La prima redazione dei centoni omerici. Traduzione e commento*, Alessandria 2006; Id., *La seconda redazione dei centoni omerici. Traduzione e commento*, Alessandria 2007. For a thorough bibliography, see the complete edition and the commentaries.

R. Schembra

HOMILIARY

I. In general - II. Liturgical homiliaries - III. Greek and Eastern homiliaries.

I. In general. A homiliary is a collection of patristic *homilies, arranged acc. to the course of the *liturgical year: it is thus a liturgical book. Its essential purpose is worship. So the homiliary must not be confused with the *sermonarius* (which groups together *Sermones* or moralizing, edifying or *parenetic addresses) or the *legendarius* (an anthology of *hagiographical texts). Obviously this distinction is not always rigorously observed. Often the collections have a heterogeneous appearance, so that the liturgical book is often transformed into a "homiliary-legendary" or a "sermonary-homiliary." Furthermore, besides homilies properly so-called, these collections also accepted extracts from biblical commentaries and, more rarely, scriptural texts.

Their purpose, *catechetical and didactic before becoming devotional (as happened in the Carolingian era for a well-defined category of homiliary), was to explain the choice of texts to be proclaimed in a liturgical context. In most cases, the homiletic repertoire had a practical function: with the sacramentary and the biblical lectionary, the homiliary was the first prompt-book for preachers, making up for their deficiencies or easing their task. In referring to the works of the church fathers, the homiliary attests a particular moment in the history of dogma: it was the typical representative of the traditional exegesis expressed in the *homeliae Patrum*. The homiliary was thus a *florilegium that performed several functions: in modern times these would be specified in manuals, such as the *enchiridion asceticum, enchiridion patristicum, manuale praedicatorum* etc.

In both West and East, the homiliary depended on scriptural (lectionaries, systematic gospel commentaries), liturgical (which provided its general framework) and esp. patristic collections. We must always distinguish, alongside liturgical homilies, exegetical or dogmatic works in the form of homilies and homiletical florilegia not explicitly intended for worship. Finally, fragments of patristic homilies are found in the **catenae* and in conciliar and synodal acts (which are for the most part legal documents).

Obviously the homiliary depended on liturgical circumstances and reflected the order of the liturgical cycle at a precise date and for a local church, often yet to be identified. After the Carolingian "renaissance," it would be imposed on the Western church as part of the liturgical reform promoted by Charlemagne and Louis the Pius. But the Carolingian homiliary itself (whose most notable example is the collection of *Paul the Deacon) was modified by the churches that adopted it, partly because of the development of the sanctoral cycle; describing the liturgical homiliaries, therefore, is a complex undertaking, certainly not made easier by the taste for centonization! Later some religious orders (Cluny, Cîteaux, Chartreuse) adopted their own homiliary: this step was in line with the ecclesial mentality created by the Gregorian reform.

Alongside the liturgical homiliaries, some church fathers (or their disciples or admirers) arranged their own homilies acc. to a liturgical pattern: the texts were selected acc. to specific purposes: spiritual, catechetical etc., in such a way as to constitute a complete cycle of the office of preaching, *officium praedicationis,* sometimes aimed at specific categories of hearers. These collections, fictitious or occasional, tell us something of the Fathers' oratorical activity, but are not compilations methodically organized in dependence on the *Ordines Romani* (starting with the 6th-c. *Ordo XIV* and the various 8th-c. *Ordines XIII*), which would influence the main liturgical homiliaries.

II. Liturgical homiliaries. These comprise two groups. *1. Office homiliaries*. The custom of reading a homily during the liturgical hour of readings (Matins) is attested from the 6th c. These homiliaries show a

structure adapted to that end. They are known by the name of their copyist or compiler (e.g., Hagimund, Alan of Farfa, Paul the Deacon), their place of origin (St. Peter's) or the location of the MS (Wolfenbüttel, Toledo, Vienna etc.). These collections are the basis of an arrangement which remained in force until the reform of the Roman breviary promoted by Vatican II.

2. Mass homiliaries. The ancient episcopal privilege of preaching was extended to priests, esp. in *Gaul, from the 4th c. To forestall their lack of competence, some bishops (e.g., *Faustus of Riez, late 5th c.; *Caesarius of Arles, d. 542) composed florilegia of homiletic texts, which priests then read at the parish mass. A list of such compilations suggests the intense effort at that time by the pastors: *Gaudentius of Brescia (d. ca. 410), *Maximinus the Arian (d. early 5th c.), *Hilary of Arles (d. 449), *Salvian of Marseille (mid-5th c.), *Victor of Cartenna (5th c.), *Valerian of Cimiez (d. 455/460), *Museus of Marseille (d. ca. 461), *Avitus of Vienne (d. ca. 518), *Sedatus of Nîmes (d. early 6th c.), ps.-Germanus of Paris (6th c.), *Bede the Venerable (d. 735), Burchard of Würzburg (d. ca. 754), Florus of Lyons (d. ca. 860) etc.

With a relative abundance of texts and despite the limited selection of patristic authors (e.g., a prevalence of Augustinian texts), the homiliaries made their contribution to the emergence of a Christian culture. For several centuries they were the main instruments of knowledge of the church fathers: in the absence of libraries, many clerics, monks, nuns and laymen came in contact with patristic thought and the theology of the church through the liturgical homiliary. Much of the spirituality of the early Middle Ages felt the consequences of this. Only in the later Middle Ages were nonpatristic liturgical homiliaries compiled; the oldest homiliary of this kind written in a national language (Germanic) seems to belong to the Tyrolese canon Conrad: dated 1170, it is dedicated to the *plebeis et popularibus presbyteris*.

H. Barré - R. Grégoire, s.v. *Homéliaires*: DSp 7, 597-617 (with bibl.); R. Grégoire, *Les homéliaires du moyen âge. Inventaire et analyse des manuscrits*, Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, Fontes, VI, Rome 1966; Id., *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux. Analyse de manuscrits*, Spoleto 1981; H. Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre*, ST 225, Vatican City 1962.

R. Grégoire

III. Greek and Eastern homiliaries. While it can designate any collection of homilies, the term *homiliary* is applied in general to the collections which follow, wholly or in part, the order of the liturgical year. In the terminology created by A. Ehrhard for Byzantine homiletics, *Homiliar* ("homiliary") designates collections which concern the moveable parts of the year (from the period before Lent to the Sunday after Pentecost), in contrast to the *Panegyrika* ("*panegyrics") collections for the fixed feasts. But historically it is more appropriate to distinguish between hagiographical collections (perhaps already existing in the 5th c.) and festive homiliaries, which made their appearance presumably in the 6th c. The Greek MS tradition, which only exceptionally goes back before the 9th c., often attests collections of mixed type.

Festive homiliaries are completely lacking in the Coptic and Ethiopic area. In the other Eastern languages, onto a nucleus translated from Greek, either directly (into Syriac, Arabic, Armenian *čaṙentir*) or indirectly (in part from Armenian into Georgian *mravaltʿavi;* sometimes from Syriac to Arabic), are grafted texts of local provenance and adaptations due to the needs of the individual liturgical calendars.

The area of Greek and Eastern homiletic collections still awaits systematic study.

DSp 7, 597-618; A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen and homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche . . . ,* TU 50-52, Leipzig-Berlin 1936-1952; M. van Esbroeck, *Les plus anciens homéliaires géorgiens . . . ,* Louvain-la-Neuve 1975; H. Hennephof, *Byzantinische Homiliare und die byzantinische Geschichte*, in *Actes du XIVe Congrès international des Études Byzantines, Bucarest, September 1971*. II, Bucharest 1975, 113-120; J.-M. Sauget, *Littératures et manuscrits des chrétientés syriaques et arabes*, Studi e texts 389, Vatican City 1998; M. van Esbroeck - U. Zanetti, *Le manuscrit Érévan 993. Inventaire des pièces*: REArm n.s. 12 (1977) 123-167; U. Zanetti, *Homélies copto-arabes pour la Semaine Sainte*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 517-522; M. van Esbroeck, *Description du répertoire de l'homéliaire de Muš* (*Maténadaran 7729*): REArm n.s. 18 (1984) 273-280; A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991.

S.J. Voicu

HOMILY. In the patristic age, it is not easy to establish precise boundaries between the different genres of sacred eloquence; indeed, we meet words which cover technical concepts before designating a more limited meaning: such is the case of *tractatus*, *homilia*, *sermo*. The *tractatus* is a development, an exposition, a "treatise": it refers to a work methodically written and edited, with a didactic purpose. *Homilia* and *sermo* describe an oratorical composition, a piece intended to be proclaimed. These two genres of eloquence are distinct from spiritual conversation, *conlatio* or *colloquium*, which have an ascetic and mystical flavor. At a semantic and philological level, these distinctions must not be generalized, nor rigidly established. Even in *Augustine, the nuances of

terminology are a sign of this uncertainty: the *tractatus* is sometimes aimed at a popular, not particularly erudite audience, hence the denomination *populares tractatus*. The *liber*, or book, however, is a composition intended for a class of public or an individual reader who is well-educated and capable of grasping immediately the essence of the work. In the Latin Christian world, from the 4th c., *sermo* refers to any kind of preaching, whether catechesis in the strict sense, exegetical interpretation, *parenetic admonishment, circumstantial religious address or explanation of a rite. *Praedicare* is a technical term which, in the Christian world, would be confined to liturgical use. We also meet the address, *allocutio*; the discourse, *dictio*; the debate, *disputatio*; the lecture, *oratio* (a term which later took on the meaning of invocation, supplication); the laudatory discourse, *sermo panegyricus*. In the majority of cases, the point of contact between these different concepts is the use of Sacred Scripture. The homily was a liturgical act which took place during a sacred celebration; its written text transmits the essential thought (in some cases through the work of stenographers). In the patristic age and until the spread of printing, preaching enjoyed a privileged importance, in an age when written texts circulated slowly. Evangelization took place almost exclusively through preaching, i.e., the biblical homily, which was not normally aimed at solving problems of scriptural *exegesis. That role belonged to the *libri glossarum*, whose best-known example, from the Carolingian era, is the *Glossarium Ansileubi*, probably compiled in the monastery of Corbie. These anthologies fulfilled the function of modern encyclopedias.

Alongside patristic commentaries, preachers had at their disposal collections of extracts, two main categories of which are known. The first corresponds to the *homiliary-type, whose sermons are arranged acc. to the liturgical cycle (temporal and sanctoral); the second is either alphabetical or follows a list of topics (virtues, vices and other spiritual topics). To this group belong works like the *Liber scintillarum* of Defensor of Ligugé (7th c.) and the numerous collections of **Sententiae*, which are really anthologies of *dicta*, *testimonia*, *auctoritates*, *excerpta*, etc. of the church fathers and other writers, ecclesiastical or otherwise.

If we abstract from the homilies recorded in the NT, including the interpretations of parables given by Christ himself, what stands out is the undoubted presence of a regular homiletic preaching from the first Christian generations. Toward the mid 2nd c., *Justin's *1 Apology* describes the Sunday assembly, in which city-dwellers and those from the countryside met together to listen to the reading of prophetic and apostolic texts; then, the president of the assembly gave an *admonitio* and an *adhortatio*: the former interpreted the sacred text; the latter proposed some concrete applications.

The baptismal ritual of the *Ordo Romanus XI* (2nd half 6th c., or early 7th) provides for a homily after the proclamation of the gospel by the deacon. This was a normal pastoral procedure; patristic commentaries and sermons were also read. The Rule of St. *Benedict (1st half of 6th c.) and the *Ordines romani* attest it. Thus, e.g., reads the *Ordo Romanus XIII* (1st half of 8th c.): *Deinde leguntur sermones vel omelias catholicorum patrum ad ipsum diem pertinentes, id est Augustini, Gregorii, Hieronymi, Ambrosii vel ceterorum*: this is the custom of Christmas Eve. For the feast of St. Stephen, *Ordo Romanus XIII* specifies: *Legunt Actuum Apostolorum et lectiones orthodoxorum patrum ad ipsum diem pertinentes et similiter sermones ad ipsius celebritatem congruentes*. The liturgist refers to patristic collections, liturgical anthologies structured acc. to the unfolding of the liturgical year.

If this patristic presence guaranteed a secure theological basis, avoiding doctrinal improvisations and imprecision, we must nevertheless inquire into the concrete pastoral efficacy of such texts. In catechesis and basic evangelization, was the thought of the Fathers, coldly read or declaimed, really a digestible food for Christians little prepared to listen to a theological language that was sometimes already outdated? Was the terminology of a *Leo the Great, proclaimed in a country church, really capable of moving medieval hearts and opening them to contemplation of the mystery? The problem raised by the patristic homily is always that of the liturgical use of such a document during the eucharistic celebration and choral (or individual) psalmody, as a substitute for a "direct" homily. Effective evangelizers like St. *Eligius (d. 659) and St. *Boniface (d. 759) did not hesitate to mechanically repeat the sermons of St. *Caesarius of Arles (d. 542). In the 8th c., Alcuin (d. 804), dedicating his *Life of St. Willibrord* (d. 739) to Bishop Beonrad of Sens, specified: "In the first book, I have inserted a homily, hoping that it may be worthy of being preached by your venerable mouth": this homily was therefore proposed for the liturgical feast of Willibrord. Hagiography has preserved some homilies of saints: e.g., the *Life of St. Eligius* (d. 659).

So it is certain that the homily—read, recited from memory or personally composed—has always been present in the Christian liturgy; the compilation of the homiliary came later. Indeed, this collection was

not systematically and specifically planned, but was the result of an evolution of liturgical life itself.

In the West, homiletic literature was in Latin. This Latin culture, transmitted by means of the liturgy, accustomed clerics—the prime beneficiaries and most assiduous readers of the patristic texts—with monks and nuns, to concise formal expression, precision in their theological reasoning and firmness of catechetical doctrine. If patristic texts circulated in Latin in the West, the language of popular preaching followed the evolution of local languages. But Latin remained the official language of public worship in the Middle Ages, and long after; the *written* homily would therefore conform to this usage. Copyists transcribed patristic sermons and homilies, without translating them anew, but with some corruptions due to the spread of local linguistic peculiarities. Apropos of this, it would be interesting to analyze the textual variants of the Latin homilies, the most attested in the homiletic collections, with the aim of verifying the possible influence of the spread of Romance and Germanic morphological forms: perhaps we would encounter suggestive phenomena that would go beyond strictly grammatical and philological peculiarities, and would in some way concern the interpretation or exegesis of the thought of the Fathers and its contamination by contact with the new tendencies. Research of this kind would not be unrealistic, since it would find an analogous point of support in medieval biblical MSS.

Another problem is that of the *spoken* homily. Proclaimed in the vulgar or popular tongue, it could later be rewritten in Latin, with a view to circulation and publication. This occurred esp. in the 12th c.: we should cite here "the last of the Fathers," Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), along with many other medieval writers.

Referring to a biblical text just proclaimed, the homily examines the totality of that scriptural pericope or confines itself to interpreting a few of its verses: the preacher's freedom of inspiration is, here, the main criterion determining the content of the pastoral teaching. This immediate reference to Scripture, while introducing the audience or reader to the heart of the argument, ensures a link between the Word of God and the concrete reality of the liturgical act. St. Benedict provides for the reading of the whole of Scripture, both OT and NT, and these readings would be accompanied by apposite homilies. The choice of the Father to help the understanding of the sacred text was not left to individual judgment or chance improvisation, but followed precise requirements: the writer's fame, his Catholic sense of the church, his doctrinal rectitude.

Even with the *lectio continua* of Scripture, the homily did not intend to comment on the entirety of the sacred texts: in this the church took up the earlier tradition of the synagogue. Going beyond literal commentary (and so choosing, to this end, specific biblical texts), the homilist or preacher interpreted the pericope, penetrated its spirit, drew out its essential point and emphasized it, in accordance with the methodology typical of midrash. The patristic homily and medieval exegesis would always conform to this procedure. So *Jewish Christian hermeneutics would know the two kinds of midrash: *midrash haggadah* (paraphrase which is translation and interpretation—moral, historical, *allegorical or mystical—originating from the *targum) abounds in some Fathers such as *Jerome, *Origen, *Eusebius, *Clement of Alexandria, *Justin, *Aphraates, *Ephrem; *midrash halakhah* set out to apply the text to the concrete situations of life and, in a Christian transposition, would be the origin of the sermon.

The Fathers did not hesitate to develop a theme in successive homilies over two or more liturgical celebrations, with explicit reference to this occurrence: this is the case of *Peter Chrysologus and Augustine, to cite two notable examples. The pastoral intent was evident, and the benefit to catechesis undeniable. The ill fortune of the times, esp. due to abuses caused by tendentious and unprepared preachers, led to gradual abandonment of the reading of the Bible and devaluation of the homily; the decline of exegetical analysis corresponds to this. In the patristic era, the Word of God was the food of piety; exegesis, put forward in a homiletic and liturgical context, was adapted to the needs of the congregation. The abuse of allegory and symbolism took away the immediate didactic dynamism of God's Word, to the point that in 1080 Gregory VII found himself obliged to forbid public reading of the Bible in Slavonic, so as not to debase the sacred text and to respect the ancient *disciplina *arcani*. By this time a grave crisis of preaching had begun, which would only be resolved by the spread of the *artes praedicandi* and of new techniques followed by the mendicant orders (Dominicans and Franciscans)—as well as by followers of the heretical movements—and with the narrative genre of the *exempla*. The ancient heritage did not totally disappear, since the sacred rhetoric of the Middle Ages often returned to the pattern fixed by St. Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*. But this evolution corresponded to a different theological and philosophical structure: patristic theology, assimilated and enlivened by wisdom theology (or "monastic" theology), was now overtaken by scholastic theology. A new humanism led to new

forms of evangelization and catechesis, and the phenomenon emerged of a preacher who was not necessarily the "actor" of a liturgical celebration: this was the age of the "occasional sermon" (apologetic, moralizing, commemorative, laudatory, polemical), of the university sermon and of thematic preaching.

Ch. Mohrmann, *Praedicare-Tractare-Sermo*, in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, II, Rome 1961, 63-72; J. Leclercq, *La liturgie et les paradoxes chrétiens*, Lex orandi 36, Paris 1965, 205-227; J.B. Schneyer, *Geschichte der katholischen Predigt*, Freiburg i.Br. 1968; W. Schütz, *Geschichte der christlichen Predigt*, Berlin-New York 1972; C. Delcorno, *La predicazione nell'età comunale*, Florence 1974; R. Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux. Analyse de manuscrits*, Spoleto 1981 (with list of *incipitarii* intended to facilitate the identification of the homilies), 490-517 (alphabetical list of patristic homilies frequently cited or present in the homiliaries); J. Longère, *La prédication médiévale*, Paris 1983; RAC 16, 148-175; TRE 27, 244-248; G. Groppo, *Storia della predicazione e della catechesi antica e medievale*, Rome 1986; A. Monaci Castagno, *Origene predicatore*, Milan 1988; A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Barcelona 1991; M. Peinado Peinado, *La predicación del evangelio en los Padres de la Iglesia*, Madrid 1992; M. Banniard, *Viva voce. Communication écrite et orale du IV^e au IX^e siècle en Occident latin*, Paris 1992; S.M. Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homilies in Fourth-Century Christian Literature*, Atlanta 1991; E. Mühlenberg - J. van Oort (eds.), *Predigt in der Alte Kirche*, Kampen 1994; R. Étaix, *Homéliaires patristiques latins: recueil d'études de manuscrits médiévaux*, Paris 1994; F.J. Tovar Paz, *Tractatus, sermones atque homiliae: el cultivo del género literario del discurso homilético en la Hispania tardoantica y visigoda*, Cáceres 1994; F. Siegert, *Homily and Panegyrical Sermon, Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S.E. Porter, Leiden 1997, 421-443; *Preacher and Audience, Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homilies*, ed. M. Cunningham - P. Allen, Leiden 1998; H.O. Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, 2 vols., Grand Rapids, MI 1998; B. Studer, *Schola Christiana*, Paderborn 1998; M. Sodi - A.M. Triacca, *Dizionario di omiletica*, Turin 1998; A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching: A Search for the Origins of Christian Homily*, Leiden 2001.

R. Grégoire

HOMINE MISERO, De. Although associated with the name of *Columbanus, it is not generally considered authentic. It is a short sermon, composed in Ireland in the 5th c., which focuses its attention on the transitory nature of earthly things and invites all people to be humble, following the example of Christ.

CPL 1107; PL 80, 258-259; J. Laporte, *Étude d'authenticité des oeuvres attribuées à Saint Colomban*: Revue Mabillon 45 (1955) 1-34; C. Stancliffe, *The Thirteen Sermons Attributed to Columbanus*, in *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, ed. M. Lapidge, Studies in Celtic History, Cambridge 1997, 93-202.

P. Marone

HOMOIANS (Homoeans). "Theological group which, in the trinitarian discussions of the second half of the 4th century, occupied an intermediate position between the Nicenes and the Arians" (Brennecke). In contrast with the other terms which characterized the various groupings that formed in the trinitarian discussions of the 4th c. (*Arians, *homoousians, *homoiousians etc.), the term "homoians" (*Homeéns, Homöer, Homoean*) is not ancient, but was coined by modern scholars to specifically designate members of the episcopate, both Eastern and Western, who, with the events of 359–360, took a position in favor of the formula of faith put forth by the emperor Constantius, who defined the Son as like (*homoios*) to the Father acc. to the Scripture, thus distancing themselves from homoousians (= Nicenes), homoiousians and radical Arians (= *anomoians). Ancient Catholic polemicists and historians did not initially give a specific name to this group, except occasionally, in relation to the councils of *Seleucia (359) and *Constantinople (360), as Acacians (οἵ περὶ Ἀκάκιον), after their leader *Acacius of Caesarea; but in reference to later events, they defined them *tout court* as Arians, though distinguishing them, in the East, from the radical Arians of *Eunomius (anomoians). Modern scholars also use the name homoians to designate the group headed by *Eudoxius and *Euzoius, who dominated religious policy under *Valens and maintained a modest vitality even after the definitive victory of the homoousians (= Nicenes). The same name was attributed to the opponents, in the West, of the Nicene Creed of 325; at the time they were also called Arians. The meaning and popularity of this name in recent historiography derive from the conviction that ancient polemicists and historians in the Nicene camp had arbitrarily called Arians anyone who opposed the Nicene Creed in places where many, esp. in the East, were hostile to it, considering it of *monarchian tendency, though distinguishing themselves from Arians true and proper. Moreover, with respect to the clear doctrinal specificity that characterizes the other groups active in the mid-4th c. (homoousians, homoiousians, anomoians), the homoians seem to be much less specified in this sense: they included members of the episcopate who wanted to back the intentions and orientation of Constantius, who wanted to unify the majority of the episcopate on the basis of a profession of faith—as indeed had the councils of *Rimini (359) and *Constantinople (360)—sufficiently general as to be able to be interpreted in the widest variety of ways, and so to obtain maximum adherence. The same policy was later pursued in the East by Va-

lens. In short: they sought a formula with a mainly political meaning, doctrinally very unspecific, apt to disguise even a pro-Arian doctrinal position.

H.Chr. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1899; Id., *Homéens*: DHGE 24 (1993) 932-960; M. Simonetti, *Alla ricerca dei cosiddetti Omei*: Cassiodorus 2 (1996) 41-49.

M. Simonetti

HOMOIOSIS THEO. From the end of the 2nd c. on, the Hellenistic idea of the ὁμοίωσις θεῷ was used in patristic theology to illustrate a biblical theme which quickly became familiar to the baptismal catechesis: that of the creation of humanity acc. to the image of God. *Irenaeus remained attached to the primitive tradition, probably of Asiatic origin, acc. to which the whole human being, body and soul, is the image of Christ, God-man (*Adv. Haer.* V, 16, 1-2), and will therefore reach similitude with the immortal God in the resurrection of the flesh in all its human reality. *Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, following *Philo, returned to the *Platonic theme developed later by the *Stoics: the end of humanity is to be assimilated, as far as possible, to the divinity—to become just and holy with intelligence (*Theat.* 176A) by means of a virtuous life and through contemplation (*Rep.* VI, 13: 500c). Within contemplation, Clement includes understanding of Scripture, based on faith, and a virtuous life brought about esp. through the imitation of Christ (*Strom.* II, 100,3; III, 42, 1-2; VI, 77,5). A similar position is found in *Origen (*Princ.* III, 6). Later, under the influence of *Plotinus, who had integrated the theme of ὁμοίωσις θεῷ in his speculations of the double divinity, i.e., on the identification of the soul with the Spirit and the One, *Gregory of Nyssa developed a noteworthy synthesis in this regard. Whether he speaks of humanity's original state or final state, Gregory understands the ὁμοίωσις as similitude of the νοῦς with the divinity. But he understands this ὁμοίωσις as a dynamic and constant process in which each one of the redeemed is brought from the image in himself or herself, which is deformed by sin to the image reformed. The role of the incarnation of the Word is emphasized, along with the death of Jesus as the end of corruption and the beginning of glorification, the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist, as well as the perfect establishment of the body of Christ in the resurrection (Hübner).

The Platonic-Stoic theme of ὁμοίωσις θεῷ did not have a large presence in Latin theology. Yet Augustine, using the *Neoplatonic doctrine of inspiration in the sense that the image deformed by sin is renewed in a long process toward the reformed image (*Trin.* 12, 14,23; 14, 16,22–17,23), did not neglect the role of Christ the mediator and his resurrection (*Trin.* 14, 18,24–19,25). In the soul that returns as far as possible to God is seen the most perfect image of the *Trinity (*Trin.* 14,12,15).

RAC 4, 461-479; DSp 6, 812-822; 7, 1406-1424; BA 13, 689-693; G.B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform*, Cambridge, MA 1959; R.M. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Leiden 1974; H. Crouzel: TRE 6 (1980) 499-502; L. Scheffczyk: LTK[3] 4, 874 f.; L. Ayres, *The Christological Content of Trin. XIII*: AugStud 29 (1998) 111-139; M.T. Clark, *Image Doctrine*: Augustine (1999) 440-442; C. Markschies, *Gottebenbildlichkeit*, II: GRR 3 (2000) 1160-1163.

B. Studer

HOMOIOUSIANS (Homoeousians). The term is documented by *Arian witnesses writing in Latin (*homoeousiani*). The Greek equivalent is semi-Arians, but the term is tendentious, because the homoiousians were anti-Arians: at most, it can describe the homoiousian group which, after 360, would not recognize the divinity of the *Holy Spirit (*Macedonians). The homoiousians took their name from **homoiousios*, the distinctive term of their trinitarian definition, equivalent to *homoios kat' ousian* ("like acc. to essence, substance"). The sources of homoiousian theology must be sought in the trinitarian position of *Eusebius of Caesarea, who, though a *subordinationist, was averse to the radical theories of Arianism and affirmed the reality of Christ's divine sonship in the framework of the doctrine of the three *hypostases, without recourse to the Nicene **homoousios*, whose meaning was too open to *Sabellian *monarchianism. This doctrinal definition, continued by *Eusebius of Emesa, who toned down its subordinationism, was developed around 355 mainly in *Asia Minor, in opposition both to Sabellian and *Marcellian *monarchianism and to the radical Arianism (*anomoianism) resurgent at the time. The term *homoiousios* is first attested in the markedly pro-Arian formula of *Sirmium of 357, which forbade its use and that of *homoousios*. But in 358 the synodal letter of *Ancyra, signed by *Basil of Ancyra and *George of Laodicea and immediately confirmed by other documents, officially put forward the homoiousian trinitarian theology. (The surviving homoiousian documents are cited by *Epiphanius, *Pan.* 73.)

It gives *ousia* the meaning of individual substance, and thus distinguishes in the *Trinity not just three hypostases but also three *ousiae*, and cannot accept *homoousios*, which identifies the *ousia* of

the Son with that of the Father. *Homoiousios* (= *homoios kat' ousian*), affirming the Son's likeness with the Father as to substance, i.e., divine nature, is indicative of his full divinity and at the same time of his personal distinction from the Father. Father and Son differ from each other only by the relationship of origin: one generates and the other is generated; they are Father and Son in a real, not a metaphorical, sense; and from their mutual relationship (the Father is not so without the Son) we also infer that the Son is coeternal with the Father. Their unity is conceived in a dynamic way, as a unity of willing and acting.

The homoiousians, who maintained the validity of the Antiochene formula of faith of 341, were, after a momentary success (Council of Sirmium of 358), obliged by *Constantius to subscribe to the formula of *Rimini, which thwarted their doctrine (359–360). But they resumed the struggle against the Arians after Constantius's death (362), though no longer united in intention: some adhered to the Nicene *homoousios*, though interpreting it in the sense of *homoiousios* (Council of *Antioch of 363); others remained faithful to the Antiochene formula of 341. A further cause of division was the controversy over the Holy Spirit, which began in 360. Many homoiousians, adhering to the pure scriptural data, were uncertain of its nature and had difficulty in recognizing it as God; some of them came to consider it, like the Arians, as a creature. From the ranks of the homoiousians came *Basil of Caesarea, who succeeded, between 370 and 378, in reuniting a good many of the homoiousians under the authority of *Meletius of Antioch in recognition of both the Nicene *homoousios*, interpreted by him in an antimonarchian way compatible with the doctrine of the three hypostases, and the divinity of the Holy Spirit. But a group of homoiousians, headed by *Eleusius of Cyzicus, remained immovable in affirming the validity of the Antiochene formula of 341 and of the *homoiousios* and in denying the *homoousios* and the divinity of the Holy Spirit. They were called (ca. 380) Macedonians.

J. Gummerus, *Die homöusianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius*, Leipzig 1900; G. Rasneur, *L'homoiousianisme dans ses rapports avec l'orthodoxie*: RHE 1 (1903) 189-206, 411-431; Simonetti, 593; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988, 914.

M. Simonetti

HOMOIOUSIOS. From ὅμοιος ("similar, like") and οὐσία ("essence, substance"); thus, similar in substance. Together with ὅμοιος κατ' ουσίαν, which has the same meaning, it was a characteristic expression in *homoiousian theology.

M. Simonetti

HOMOOUSIANS. The term is attested in *Arian documents in Latin (*homousiani*); the Greek equivalent is ὁμοουσιαστής. Both indicate the anti-Arians who specifically professed the Nicene faith that hinged on the **homoousios*.

PLS 1, 704.

M. Simonetti

HOMOOUSIOS. From ὅμος ("same") and οὐσία ("essence, substance"; Lat. *consubstantialis*). The term was first used in a technical sense by the *gnostics and esp. by the *Valentinians: the spirit of humanity is consubstantial with God, the soul with the demiurge, matter with the devil. The first certain attestation of the term used in a trinitarian sense, to indicate that the Son is of the *same* substance of the Father—apart from a passage in *Origen which is of uncertain authenticity—is found in *Dionysius of Alexandria: accused by his *monarchian adversaries of refusing to admit that the Son is *homoousios* with the Father, Dionysius points out the nonscriptural origin of the term, declaring, however, that he is disposed to accept it in the general sense of "of the same genus, of the same nature." A piece of information, the veracity of which cannot be determined, relates that in the Council of *Antioch ca. 268 *Paul of Samosata's adversaries required him to proclaim the Logos *homoousios* with the Father. *Arius, however, did not grant that the Son was *homoousios* with the Father since this would mean that the divinity was divided into two parts. The term was inserted after long disputes into the Nicene Creed (325) with an anti-Arian intention, but it is unknown who proposed the adoption of this term: the term was in use among the monarchians so as to oppose the trinitarian doctrine of three *hypostases, which tended to distinguish three *ousia* as well, of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The term, however, was ambiguous, given the multiple possible meanings of the term *ousia* (general substance or particular substance) and also had implications of a materialistic nature. It was therefore unsatisfactory for many anti-Arians as well, and this explains why it was set aside by the various sides in conflict after Nicaea. Athanasius began to use it again in 355; it was imposed in the West, but raised strong disputes in the East. Of the *homoiousians prevalent there, some accepted it be-

tween 363 and 366, but they interpreted it in the sense of *homoiousios;* others rejected it, until *Basil of Caesarea rendered it compatible with the doctrine of the three hypostases by taking *ousia* in the sense of one substance, the divine nature common to the hypostases. With this meaning, the term was definitively confirmed by the Council of *Constantinople in 381.

W.A. Bienert, *Das vornicaenische homoousios als Ausdruck der Rechtgläubigkeit*: ZKG 90 (1979) 151-175; G.C. Stead, *Divine Substance*, Oxford 1977, 190-266 (bibl.); M. Simonetti, *Ancora su Homoousios a proposito di due studi recenti*: VetChr 17 (1980) 85-98; *The Homoousion* and *Homoousios with the Father*, in *The Incarnation: Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Costantinopolitan Creed, A.D. 381*, ed. by T.F. Torrance, Edinburgh 1981, 1-15 and 58-87; RAC 16, 364-433 (C. Stead); F. Ricken, *L'homooùsios di Nicea come crisi del Platonismo cristiano antico*, in *Storia della cristologia*, ed. by B. Welte, Brescia 1986, 89-119; R.M. Hübner, *Basilius von Caesarea und das Homoousios*, in *Essays in tribute to G. Chr. Stead*, Leiden 1993, 70-91, 663-671; Simonetti 161 (bibl.); P.F. Beatrice, *The Word "Homoousios" from Hellenism to Christianity*: ChHist 71 (2002) 243-272.

M. Simonetti

HONORATUS ANTONINUS (d. after 437). Bishop of *Constantine, in Africa, during the persecution of *Genseric, who intended to substitute the *Arian faith professed by the *Vandals for the Catholic faith. In ca. 437 he wrote an *Epistula cohortatoria* to Arcadius, a Spaniard exiled for religious reasons, exhorting him to remain firm in the faith and ready to face martyrdom, the numerous advantages of which he expounds. The letter refers to scriptural examples and contains the presentation, through images, of the Father-Son relationship in the Trinity.

CPL 426; PL 50, 567-570; Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 96 (ed. Richardson); PCBE 1, 75.

A. Pollastri

HONORATUS of Lérins and Arles (d. 429/430). Founder and first abbot of the *asceterium of *Lérins, then bishop of *Arles, his family was distinguished, reaching the heights of the consulate. He was born probably in the regions of N Gaul. While we are ignorant of the other basic facts of his life, his exemplary life as an ascetic and saint is fully known, thanks to the commemorative sermon given on the anniversary of his death by his relative and successor *Hilary, and thanks to the mentions of other writers. A legendary *Life* (12th c.) was adapted into Provençal by the monk Raymond Féraut in ca. 1300. Still a youth, Honoratus was converted to asceticism and undertook a journey to the East with his brother Venantius and the aged Caprasius. On the brother's death he returned to the West and, in the first years of the 5th c., took up residence at Lérins, an islet off the Provençal coast between Cannes and Antibes. A part was played in this choice by Leontius, bishop of nearby Fréjus, by whom, presumably, Honoratus was ordained presbyter. Not just the initial establishment of the community but also its subsequent growth is linked to Honoratus's activity. In late 427 or early 428 he was called to rule the diocese of Arles, succeeding not Patroclus (as was thought), murdered in 426, but the brief episcopate of a monk named Euladius or Helladius. He lived at Arles about two years, until his death in 429 or 430. Nothing remains of his writings. Of a Rule he had drawn up for the monks of Lérins, more than once hypothesized, no sure traces remain.

BHL 592, 3975-3979; Hilarii, *Sermo de vita Honorati*, ed. S. Cavallin, Lund 1952; A.C. Cooper-Marsdin, *The History of the Islands of the Lerins*, Cambridge 1913, 128-136; L. Cristiani, *Lérins et ses Fondateurs*, S. Wandrille 1946, 1-77; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Munich 1965, 49-50; DSp 7 (1969) 717-718; S. Pricoco, *Modelli di santità a Lerino. L'ideale ascetico nel "Sermo de vita Honorati" di Ilario d'Arles*: Siculorum Gymn. 27 (1974) 54-88; Id., *L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978; R. Nouailhat, *Saints et Patrons. Les premiers moines de Lérins*, Paris 1988; R. Nurnberg, *Askese als sozialer Impuls. Monastische-asketische Spiritualität als Wurzel und Triebfeder sozialer Ideen und Aktivitäten der Kirche in Sudgallien im 5. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1988; C.M. Kasper, *Theologie und Askese. Die Spiritualität des Inselmönchtums von Lérins im Sudgallien im 5. Jahrhundert*, Münster 1991; C. Leyser, *"This Sainted Isle": Panegyric, Nostalgia and the Invention of Lerinian Monasticism*, in W.E. Klingshirn - M. Vessey (eds.), *Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R.A. Markus*, Univ. of Michigan 1999, 188-206; M. Labrousse, *Saint Honorat d'Arles, moîne et évêque*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 79 (2000) 33-39.

S. Pricoco

HONORATUS of Marseille (5th c.). An Honoratus, bishop of *Marseille and correspondent of Pope *Gelasius I (492–494), an eloquent preacher and author of lives of the saints, is mentioned in *Gennadius's *De viris illustribus*—in a chapter, however, that is certainly apocryphal. It attributes to him the *Vita S. Hilarii,* a biography of *Hilary, bishop of *Arles from 428–440, well constructed and strongly governed by the rules of classical rhetoric. Although Honoratus's name does not appear in the MS tradition of the *Vita,* the good arguments adduced by scholars seem to confirm the attribution. The *Vita* was composed after 475 and before 496.

BHL 3882; CPL 506; PL 50, 1219-1246; S. Cavallin, *Vitae SS. Ho-*

norati et Hilarii, Lund 1952; Gennadius, *De vir. ill.* 101; M. Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Liter.*, IV, 2, Munich 1920, 565; B. Kolon, *Die* Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis. *Eine eidographische Studie*, Paderborn 1925; M. Corti, *Studi sulla latinità merovingia in testi agiografici minori*, Messina-Milan 1939; F.E. Consolino, *Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica*, Naples 1979, 61-68; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Darmstadt 21988, 50.

S. Pricoco

HONORATUS of Vercelli (d. 416?). Third bishop of Vercelli, after Eusebius and Limenius. In 355 he accompanied his bishop *Eusebius into exile. His election came about at *Ambrose's suggestion. At that time the church of Vercelli was passing through a period of turbulence due to the presence of two apostate and agitating monks from Milan. Ambrose intervened, first with a letter *Ad Ecclesiam Vercellensem* (*Ep.* 63: PL 16, 1239-1272), and then in person through the election of a worthy bishop. The newly elect came from the *cenobium founded by Eusebius. The designation of Honoratus brought peace to the local church. Later, he went to Milan to assist Ambrose at his death. Honoratus died 28 October of an unspecified year (ca. 416?).

Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii*: PL 14, 46; F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia. Piemonte*, Turin 1898, 421-423; F. Lanzoni, *Le origini delle diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 1039; EC 9, 135; BS 9, 1210; PCBE 2, 1005-1006.

L. Dattrino

HONORIUS (Flavius Honorius) (384–423). Western Roman emperor (393–423), born at *Constantinople 9 September 384, son of *Theodosius the Great; died 15 August (?) 423 at *Ravenna. He was twice consul (first in 386); in 393 he became Augustus; from 394 to 402 he resided at *Milan, from 402 at *Ravenna. Easily influenced, Honorius was under the thumb of his general *Stilicho, and then of the *comes et magister militum* Flavius *Constantius, husband of his sister *Galla Placidia, and finally of *Ambrose, bishop of Milan. He was unable to allay the tensions created with his brother *Arcadius after the division of the empire in 395. In 406 he had to suffer the crossing of the Rhine by strong German forces, and in 410 the taking of *Rome by *Alaric. Thanks to the ability of Constantius, coregent from 421, and other generals, he managed for a time to hold back further invasions by Germanic tribes, repel numerous attempts at usurpation and restore the status quo. He had the protection of the church at heart, and conceded privileges to clerics. He fought a hard antiheretical battle against *Donatists and pagans, though the reaction of the latter, represented quite effectively at Rome by the circle of *Symmachus, gradually acquired new vigor with the favorable circumstances. *Augustine and *Orosius had to refute pagan arguments which blamed Christianity for the present calamities. State measures, passed to alleviate the needs arising from the barbarian invasions, were ineffective. The regime's prestige was waning in *Gaul, while in *Britain only weak traces of it remained.

KLP 2, 121212-13; PLRE 1, 442; B. Bleckmann, *Honorius und das Ende der römischen Herrschaft in Westeuropa*: Historische Zeitschrift 265/3 (1997) 561-595; M. Kulikowski (ed.), *The Epistula Honorii, Again*: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigrafik 122 (1998) 247-252; J.F. Jordan Montes, *Los judíos en el reinado de Honorio*, in var. aus., *Congreso internacional. La Hispania de Teodosio: actas*, Valladolid 1998.

J. Irmscher

HONORIUS, pope (d. 638). Successor of *Boniface V (d. 25 November 625), Honorius was of a noble family of Campania: his father Petronius had been consul. The *Liber pontificalis* stresses only his vast religious building activity, but he was also interested in civil building, made possible economically by his sound administration of the church's patrimony (Jaffé 2001; 2013; 2031-2034; 2036). He even turned his house near the Lateran into a monastery. *Jonas of Bobbio, who knew him, calls him "wise of heart, shrewd in counsel, illustrious in doctrine, full of sweetness and humility" (*Vita s. Betulfi* 6: PL 87, 1063). Indeed, following *Gregory the Great's example, his pastoral activity was intense, as we deduce from his letters, which attest his measures in both East and West to have ecclesiastical discipline observed. He intervened effectively against Fortunatus, metropolitan of Aquileia-Grado, who had accepted the positions of the *Three Chapters. He continued Gregory's missionary work in *Britain by sending personnel and by a series of actions to improve the organization of those churches (Jaffé 2019-2023; Bede, *HE* 2, 19); he had no success with the Celtic Christians regarding computation of the date of the celebration of Easter.

But Honorius has been much discussed on account of his unhappy intervention in the *monothelite question with two letters to Patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople. Honorius was a convinced *Chalcedonian, thoroughly imbued with biblicism, more drawn to pastoral work than to theological subtleties and terminological distinctions. Though his intentions were orthodox, he used language which some considered heterodox. His language in fact gave rise to various interpretations in the monothe-

lite question. Though his successor *John IV (640–642) sought to give an orthodox interpretation to his positions, Honorius was condemned as a heretic by the 6th Ecumenical Council (Constantinople III) of 680–681, a condemnation accepted by Pope *Leo II, whose formula seems deliberately ambiguous. On more than one occasion *Maximus the Confessor, who had possession of original texts, defended the action and doctrine of Pope Honorius. The case has been much disputed, esp. since the 15th c., when Nicholas of Cusa revived it; many different explanations have been proposed.

CPL 1726-1727; Verzeichnis 383-384; PL 80, 469-482; PLS 4, 1656-1659; LP I, 323-327; III, 94; DTC 7, 93-132; DACL 13, 1231-1234; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 305-315; P. Galtier, *La première lettre du pape Honorius*: Gregorianum 29 (1948) 42-61; F.X. Seppelt, *Storia dei Papi*, I, Rome 1962, 210-217; P. Stockmeier, *Die "causa Honorii" und Karl Josef von Hefele*: ThQ 148 (1968) 405-428; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei Papi del secolo VII*, Milan 1971 (see Index); L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 198-204; G. Kreuzer, *Die Honoriusfrage im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit*, Stuttgart 1975 (see RSCI 35 [1981] 152-158); G. Schwaiger, *Die Honoriusfrage. Zu einer Untersuchung des alten Falles*: ZKG 88 (1977) 85-97; P. Conte, *Il significato del primato papale nei padri del VI concilio ecumenico*: Archivum Hist. Pont. 15 (1977) 7-111 (esp. 80-103); A. Thanner, *Papst Honorius*, St. Ottilien 1989; F. Winkelmann, *Die Quellen zur Erforschung des monergisch-monothelitisches Streites*: Klio 69 (1978) 551-559; M. Doucet, *Est-ce que le monothélisme a fait autant d'illustres victimes?*: Science et esprit 35 (1983) 53-83; E. Zocca, *Onorio I e la tradizione occidentale*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 571-615; Id., *Una possibile derivazione gregoriana per il "monotelismo" di Onorio*: Augustinianum 33 (1993) 519-575; DHGE 24, 1049-1050; LTK[3] 5, 766-768; Patrologia IV, 177-178; EPapi 1, 585-590.

A. Di Berardino

HONORIUS of Canterbury (d. 653). Monk of the monastery of St. Andrew in Monte Coelio, Rome. By invitation of Pope *Gregory the Great he went as a missionary to England. On the death of Justus (10 November 627) he was consecrated 5th bishop of *Canterbury (628?) by Paulinus of York who, with other missionaries, in 633 took refuge with him when forced to flee his see because of the victory of the pagan king Penda over Edwin king of Northumbria. On 11 June 634 Pope Honorius I, in a pontifical letter, granted the pallium to bishops Honorius and Paulinus and decreed the equality of their sees in such a way that, on the death of one of them, "the survivor will have authority to appoint a bishop in his place" (Bede, *HE* 2,18). So, at the death of Paulinus (d. 644), Honorius installed Ithamar as his successor. He died in 653 and was buried in St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury. Feast 30 September.

Cath 5, 928ff., CE 7, 129; BS 9, 1213ff.; DCB 3, 153; DHGE 24, 1058-1059.

A. Di Berardino

HONORIUS Scholasticus. It is difficult to identify this mid-6th-c. Honorius, who addressed to a certain Bishop Jordanes—not better identified and not to be confused with the author of the *Getica*—a brief composition in verse in which he repudiates the letters of Seneca in order to praise Christianity. In his *Rescriptum,* Honorius presents Jordanes as a teacher far superior to Seneca, since he has given Honorius the light of Christ.

CPL 193; Text of *Rescriptum contra epistolas Senecae ad Jordanem episcopum*, in F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, I, 2, Leipzig 1906, n. 666, 137-138; O. Plasberg, *Zum Senecagedicht des Honorius*: RhM n.f. 54 (1899) 144-149; E. Thomas (with the same title), ibid., 313-316; P. Faider, *Études sur Sénèque*, Gand 1921, 106-107.

S. Zincone

HOPE

I. Biblical foundations - II. The reappropriation of apostolic hope in the writings of the Fathers - III. Interaction with Greco-Roman culture.

I. Biblical foundations. The theme of hope is obviously at the center of the apostolic tradition: God is seen as the God of hope (Rom 15:13). Christians were opposed to pagans; i.e., those who did not possess any hope (1 Th 4:13). They themselves rejoice in hope (Rom 12:12), because Christ in them is the hope of glory (Col 1:27). This insistence on hope was without a doubt characteristic of the apostle *Paul. Nevertheless, although the term ἐλπίς (*spes*) is found almost exclusively in Paul's letters and is absent in the gospels, the idea of hope is present in the entire NT. In the same Pauline doctrine of hope are included the following ideas: waiting (ἀποκαραδοκία, προσδοκία) (see Phil 1:20), trust (πίστις) (see Rom 4:18) and persevering patience (ὑπομονή) (see Rom 15:4; 1 Cor 13:7; 1 Th 1:3). All these virtues, however, are also found in the other NT texts (see, e.g., Lk 12:36; 21:19; Jn 3:19-22; Heb 10:34ff.; Jas 1:1-4; 1 Pet 1:18-21). In reality, for the apostolic tradition, all faith in God and in his salvific presence in *Jesus Christ is only understood in the tension between the divine promises already completed (*iam*) and the trusting and persevering expectation of God's

definitive coming (*nondum*). According to Jesus himself, the kingdom of God is both already present (see Mt 12:28) and still to be awaited (see Lk 17:20-37). Therefore, developing a teaching on the true righteousness, Paul emphasized that, though having risen in baptism, we must hope in the resurrection (see esp. Rom 5:1-11). In fact, he traces hope in the resurrection that is not seen to the activity of the *Holy Spirit (Rom 8:23-27). He likewise saw in the apostolic ministry a model of hope (2 Cor 3:12-13; see Phil 3:1-17). Along the same lines, 2 Peter, perhaps the last document of the NT, exhorts its readers to expect, with a holy life, the day of the Lord (2 Pet 3:11-12; see 2 Tim 2:18).

There is no doubt that this teaching on hope is found within the entirety of the Bible, as it was understood at the time of *Jesus and the early church. All the books of the OT, esp. those of the *Psalms and the *Prophets, were thoroughly filled with trust in the divine promises, and the covenant of God with his people—indeed, in God himself (see esp. Ps 73[74]:23-28), who possesses the power to save the righteous and who, in his mercy, relents from the wrath deserved by the unfaithfulness of humanity. Thus the Jews with trust awaited for deliverance from daily necessities and physical and moral sufferings (see Ps 38[37]:16; 71[70]:5-6), possession of the Promised Land (see Ps 37[36]:29), return from the Exile (see Is 43:16-21), the coming of a savior (see Ps 87[86]), peace among nations, and finally, during times of persecution, even resurrection from the dead (see 2 Macc 7:14.20-23; Dan 12:1-3). This hope in God, attested by the Hebrew Bible, found an even more intense and more universal expression in the translation of the *Septuagint (LXX) (see RAC 1172-1175).

In apocalyptic *Judaism, on the one hand, hope in the divine promises was placed within the clearly dualistic horizon of the two aeons, a horizon oriented, i.e., decisively toward a future that came only from God, even toward a life beyond this world. On the other hand, rabbinic Judaism, which tended to make the definitive realization of hope in God depend on the exact observance of the law, could not fail to provoke a reaction from Jesus, who insisted on filial trust in God alone (Mt 5–7), and from Paul, who taught the righteousness of faith (Gal, Rom) (see Rengstorf 522-536). It was precisely in this reaction that the novelty of Christian hope was proclaimed. Keeping in mind the work with which God, in the glorious passion of his Son and in the outpouring of the Spirit of the Risen Christ, completed the prophetic promises, the Christian hopes in the parousia of the Lord and in the resurrection of the dead (see 1 Th 1:9-10); i.e., the realization of all things proclaimed by God through the mouth of his prophets (Acts 3:19-21).

II. The reappropriation of apostolic hope in the writings of the Fathers. A foundational theme like hope naturally had to draw the attention of ancient Christian authors, esp. those who drew inspiration from Paul's teaching. There is, however, a scholar who maintains that hope was not central in the writings of patristic authors before *Augustine of Hippo (Link 1160). That claim may be true if one only pays attention to the occurrence of the religious use of the terms ἐλπίς and *spes*. However, aside from the fact that these terms are found much more than dictionaries and indexes would lead one to think, the theme of hope would certainly not be lacking in a theology entirely dominated by the authentically Christian antithesis of the now (*iam*) and the not yet (*nondum*) and saturated even in its later expressions by the apocalyptic distinction of the two aeons. (See the two καταστάσεις in the writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia and the two *Civitates* in the works of Augustine.) Writers of the ancient church, however, certainly recovered the apostolic tradition of hope, not without always reinterpreting it. They developed it acc. to the pastoral, apologetic and spiritual demands, esp. acc. to those imposed by the continual interaction between Christianity and ancient culture. We note esp. that this reinterpretation was conditioned by the preference given for certain biblical texts, esp. the Psalms and Paul's Letters (Rom 5–8). Precisely in this field it is insufficient to call attention to the linguistic framework (*Wortfeld*) of the term ἐλπίς. One must also, and even more so, look at the biblical framework (*Schriftfeld*), in which the scriptural citations are placed together and thereby explained (see Tertull., *De res.* 23; Aug., *Spir. et litt.* 29-51).

The following examples that reflect the different theological and pastoral concerns of the first centuries show how much that principle is true. New emphases appear in the writings of those authors who had the pressure of encouraging the depressed faithful and warning the recalcitrant to conversion (RAC 1189-1192). Intervening in the community of *Corinth, which had been disturbed by certain disorders, the author of *1 Clement* reminds the readers that God only helps those who hope in him (11,1). The author esp. commends them to hope in the resurrection (27,1) and in the salvation reserved for the elect (57,2.7; 58,2-3). In times of discouragement and moral decadence, it was fitting to emphasize esp. the hope of conversion (μετάνοια), as it appears in the

2 Clement (1,1-7; 17,7), and the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (Sim. VI, 2,4; VIII, 7,2; VIII,10,2), in *Tertullian's treatise *De paenitentia* (10,7,4) and in some of *Origen's sermons (see *Hom. Jer.* 20,9).

Theological controversy with the *Jews led ps.-*Barnabas to stigmatize the vain hope of Israel (16, 2) and to reinforce the "hope in the life that is the beginning and the end of faith" (1, 6) and to exalt trust in the Lord (14,4.8; 6,3; 11,11) and in his cross (11, 8). Shortly after, *Justin Martyr, addressing the *pagans and *Jews, develops his theology of history (RAC 1192ff.), which was characterized by the tension between the two parousias (*1 Apol.* 52; Dial. 52) and by insisting on hope in the crucified Christ (see *Dial.* 44,4; 96,1).

No less important was the refutation of the 2nd-c. heresies (RAC 1195ff.). Against those that called into question the unity of faith, *Ignatius of Antioch did not cease to recall the common hope in Jesus Christ (*Eph.* 21,1; *Magn.* 11,1; *Trall.* inscr. and 2,2; *Philad.* 5,2, etc.). Facing the *Valentinians and *Marcion, who denied the salvation of the flesh (*salus carnis*), Tertullian emphasized the true passion of Christ, the only "hope of the world" (*spes totius orbis—De carne* 5, with the entire context), and defended the rule of hope (*regula spei*) with the "example of the Lord's resurrection" (*exemplum dominicae resurrectionis—De res.* 48; see 1,1). Reacting not only against the heretics, but likewise against the objections posed by the pagans, he did not hesitate to present hope as a characteristic of Christianity. More than once, in fact, he defined the Christian religion as "faith, discipline and hope" (see RAC 1206, with *Apol.* 39,1; *Nat.* I, 7,129-130; *Adv. Marc.* I, 21,3; *Praescr.* 26,9; *Res.* 48,2; *Orat.* 9,1-2).

*Irenaeus, who prepared the way for Tertullian's theology *salus carnis,* was perhaps less explicit with respect to the *spes resurrectionis.* However, understanding the history of humankind as an education of human freedom and as a process in which God becomes accustomed to human beings and vice versa (*Adv. haer.* III, 20,2; V, 32,1), in presenting the resurrection of the righteous as the fulfillment of the divine promises (*Adv. haer.* V, 32ff.), Irenaeus is also to be placed within the perspective of Christian hope (see *Adv. haer.* II, 28,3; V, 32,1: Rom 8:19-21).

During times of persecution, moreover, the invitation to trust in God—indeed, the commendation of persevering hope—could not be lacking, as shown by the writings of Tertullian, Origen and *Cyprian as well as the very acts of the martyrs (see *Spanneut*, 22-23, 81ff., 181-184). Cyprian's teaching is esp. precise in this regard (RAC 1211-1214). In fact, while Tertullian had primarily seen patient perseverance in suffering, Cyprian considered it as expectation, hope. In fact, acc. to Cyprian, the entire Christian life is nothing else than hope: *fiducia futurorum* (*De zelo* 16)—hope, however, that is engaged in this time and leads to Christ (see *De bono pat.* 13-21), the fulfillment of what began in baptism (*De mortal.* 1). Cyprian also borrowed from Tertullian's threefold description of Christianity, but preferred "patience" to "discipline" (see *Testim.* III, 45, with Rom 8:24-25; *De bono pat.* 13).

Both in difficult conditions and in times of peace, preaching, esp. baptismal catechesis, evokes both hope in God and in eternal life, explaining the dynamics of Christian faith, trust in the paternal goodness of God, of whom believers through baptism have become adopted sons and daughters, and the reality of the resurrection of the righteous (RAC 1121-1222). See, e.g., the *Tractatus de fide, spe et caritate* by *Zeno of Verona (*Tract.* 1,36; see *Tract.* 2,3), explanations of the Oratio Dominica by Tertullian (2-9), Cyprian (1.6.15), and *Peter Chrysologus (*Serm.* 71,11), as well as considerations of the conclusion of the baptismal creed in the writings of *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 2,5[7]; 18,1; see 16,3), Zeno of Verona (*Tract.* 1,2) or *Nicetas of Remesiana (*Lib.* 5,12 and 14: ed. Burn 51-52). One can add the writings of consolation such as the funerary speeches of *Gregory of Nyssa on *Meletius of Antioch (ed. Spira, Leiden 1967, p. 455) or *Ambrose on his brother *Satyrus (see 1,70ff.; 2,124.133-134).

From the end of the 3rd c., the monastic life appears on the scene (RAC 1222ff.). Some authors called it martyrdom of the will or conscience. Certain authors spoke of it as a "philosophy," or a "philosophy of patience" or even a "philosophy of hope" (John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 9,4: PG 54, 625-626). Within this framework, one can find exhortations to disregard the world and to trust in what is to come (see Basil of Caesar., *Ep.* 46,5-6; 174) or to the "angelic life," i.e., to Christian hope. Basil and other authors completely expected an attitude of hope in all the difficulties of monastic life (*Reg. fus.* 42; *reg. brev.* 207). This ideal of Christian perfection is characterized esp. through his Christocentricism. The monk who hopes seeks to conform himself to the Risen Christ (Basil of Caesar., *Hom. Ps.* 32,10; 69,5).

Moreover, the deepening of the theology of hope was favored by *exegesis that by that point had become more developed (RAC 1224ff.). The commentaries on the Psalms by Basil of Caesarea (*Hom. Ps.* 7,2; 33,4; 45,3, etc.), *John Chrysostom (*Expos. Ps.* 10,1; 124,1; 141,2) and naturally those of Augustine (see Occhialini); the commentaries on the *Song of Songs by Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrose;

the commentaries on certain passages from the gospels, e.g., on the Transfiguration (see *Hilary of Poitiers, *Com. Mat.* 17,1-9); and esp. the commentaries on the *corpus paulinum,* for the letter to the Romans (see Schelkle), 1 Cor 13:13 (the trilogy of faith, hope and charity, from *Polycarp's letter often cited from that point onward) and Hebrews 11–12 emphasized more than ever the biblical ideas on hope.

Finally, the testimony of hope in God and in eternal life, which is found in early Christian art, esp. in sepulchral art, is not to be overlooked (RAC 1244-1247). In addition to the symbols of paradise, the symbol of the anchor that is already found in Heb 6:19 was esp. prominent, a symbol which, along with other naval symbols, was obviously also mentioned by the Fathers (see Stumpf and Rahner).

III. Interaction with Greco-Roman culture. The numerous and various occasions that continually invited a reappropriation of the apostolic discourse on hope certainly in themselves led Christian authors to greatly deepen their reflection on this topic. These occasions esp. led Christian thought to distinguish more clearly between faith—as mere intellectual acceptance of the divine revelation—and hope, a trusting disposition before God. This theological development was benefited by the pressures of maintaining the orthodoxy of faith, which by that point was considered the foundation of the empire's unity (RAC 1218ff.). Likewise, the developments of the liturgy and monastic spirituality caused Christian hope to center on the resurrection of the dead, guaranteed by the *exemplum dominicae resurrectionis*.

Before moving on to a specific treatment of the most important authors for our question, it is important to cast a glance on the use of the terms ἐλπίς and *spes* in Greco-Roman literature (see Bultmann-Rengstorf; Woschitz; Van Menxel). In classical language, the term ἐλπίς had an ambivalent meaning: with added specifications it was clarified whether it pertained to good or bad hope. Indeed, in certain cultural contexts the term primarily acquired a negative sense, signifying, i.e., a hardly justifiable expectation, a vain and presumptuous hope. Thus, primarily in *Stoicism, acc. to which **apatheia* (i.e., freedom from suffering, passion or the emotions) must overcome hope, an uncertain conjecture (see Woschitz 174-175). One notes esp. the pessimism shown by Seneca for whom "hope is the name of an uncertain good" (*spes incerti boni nomen est—Ep.* 10,2). Nevertheless, there also existed more optimistic tendencies, esp. in the *Platonic tradition. The use of the term ἐλπίς was distinguished for a long time through the rational orientation. Only later, starting with Sophocles, was the idea of trust added to the chief idea of prognosis. As expectation, more or less justified, ἐλπίς pertains to future things whether auspicious or inauspicious. *Spes est exspectatio futurorum*. The idea of that which is to come was thematized by Plato, esp. in the Philebus, an ethical dialogue (39), and then adopted by *Aristotle, however, more so in his rhetoical than in his metaphysical writings (see Woschitz 118-130). According to their distinction, while memory refers to the past and sensation pertains to the present, hope concerns the future. In the Platonic tradition ἐλπίς could, however, also express the expectation of life in the hereafter. It is united to ἔρως, the impulse toward the beautiful and the good, and there finds its supreme fulfillment (see Simpos. 93e).

In the Christian gnosis of *Clement of Alexandria, hope occupies neither an important nor a fixed place with respect to faith and charity (RAC 1197-1200). It is defined as προσδοκία ἀγαθῶν, ἡ ἀπόντος ἀγαθοῦ εὔελπις (or προσδοκία ἀγαθῶν ἢ ἀπόντος ἀγαθοῦ ευνελπὶς—*Strom.* II,9,41,1, see II,6,27,2). At the level of the catechetical pedagogy, ἐλπίς, an expectance of good future things, along with fear, aroused by the fruits of divine providence (defended against the gnostics and perhaps against the Stoics), also prepares in a certain way for μετάνοια (repentance), for the fight against sin (ignorance) and, last, with love for gnosis (see Méhat 312-322, and also *Paed.* I, 10,91,2). In this process, which begins with faith, hope is in a certain way part of faith. Directed toward the past, faith is memory (μνήμη), but hope is open to the future. In any case, however, ἐλπίς is a knowledge coming from the Lord and from his promises (see Méhat 429-430, with the *Strom.* XI, 12, 53,1–55,6; V, 3,16,1; VI, 7,61,1). However, ἐλπίς is also found in the higher teaching relating to the process of the growth of the gnostics toward the perfect likeness with God (Méhat 456-475). Clement refers to the term of this transformation (μεταβολή) or this transposition (μετάβασις) not only the inheritance, rest, recompense, divine filiation, but also the realization of hope (ἀποκατάστασις τῆς ἐλπίδος), thus making understandable his concern of importing his ideal gnostic, who is certainly inspired by the Platonic tradition, into a gospel framework (see *Strom.* XI, 22,134ff.; I, 27,171,6). Moreover, uniting ἐλπίς to γνῶσις, he presents the first as an anticipated joy of the divine promises (Méhat 470, with *Strom.* VII, 7,47,4-5). Indeed, while arguing on philosophical *testimonia* with respect to hope in eternal life (Socrates, Plato, Empedocles and Parmenides), he leaves no doubt that the hope of "barbarian" phi-

losophy was established on the basis of baptismal regeneration (*Strom.* V, 2,14-15; see IV, 8,57,1; IV, 22,144,2-3; IV, 25,160,2-3; II, 9,41,2).

Although Origen (RAC 1200-1205) was esp. interested in the spirituality of the gnostic's inner growth and continual progress (see *Hom. Jer.* 13,3), he does not seem to have spoken often of hope (see Völker 65-66, 147-148, 158-159, who, however, like other scholars, barely mentions the theme of hope). Nevertheless, there is still a special interest in this matter. Rejecting in the treatise *Contra Celsum* the objections against the naive credulity and simplistic hope of the faithful, Origen defended the resurrection (see V, 14-24: SC 147, 48-74). He likewise refuted the claim that Christians allured people with vain hopes and mentioned in this regard the conformity of Christian faith with those who defend the immortality of the soul (*CC* III, 78-81: SV 136, 174-184). Living by means of faith in the word of God, Christians possess better hope from God (*CC* IV, 27: SC 136, 248). Indeed, Jesus Christ gave the example of patience to all those who suffer persecution because of faith (*CC* II, 25: SC 132, 352). The last theme found an even more eloquent expression in Origen's *Exhortation to Martyrdom* (see RAC 1201-1202, with the *Exhort.* 29: GCS Orig. 1, 25). The Alexandrian reception of the apostolic thought concerning hope also distinguishes Origen's exegesis all the more. Preaching on the first seven books the Bible, he turns to the themes of the journey to the desert, the spiritual fight and the continual ascent that pertains to hope (see the explicit texts, but they are rather rare: *Gen. hom.* 2,6: SC 7bis, 106-110; *Ex. hom.* 9,3: SC 321, 286-294; *Num. hom.* 14,2,4: SC 442,168).

Likewise, he broaches the theme of hope in his interpretation of the Song of Songs (see *Com. Cant.* II, 4,20; II, 8,33: SC 375, 340ff., 426) and of the Psalms (see, e.g., *in Ps 36 hom.* 5,1 and 6; *in Ps 38 hom.* 1,10) and also in his *Commentary on Matthew* (see 13,30; 12,1, etc.—RAC 1202-1203). The most noteworthy texts are found in the *Homilies on Jeremiah* and naturally in the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (RAC 1203ff.). Inserting himself on the path of the prophet Jeremiah, Origen maintained that those who repent with a sincere heart more easily reach hope of divine mercy (see *Hom. Jer.* 20,9: SC 238, 292). He understands, however, in a Christian sense the prophet's invitation to the conversion of the nations that have inherited the hope of Israel (*Hom. Jer.* 4,2: SC 232, 260). He interpreted the words of the prophet: "O God, do not your eyes search for faithfulness?" through the Stoic principle of the connection of the virtues, among which, however, he mentions esp. the Pauline triad of faith, hope and love (*Hom. Jer.* 6,1: SC 232, 328). Finally, in an eschatological vision Origen opposed the aversion of Israel, which Jeremiah lamented, to the enthusiasm of Christians, who do not look back, but go forward without stopping toward the mountain which is Christ (*Hom. Jer.* 13,3: SC 238, 58-62. See *Hom. Jer.* 15,6: SC 238, 126ff.: "Cursed is the one who trusts in man" [Jer 17:5]; the one who trusts in Christ, however, is blessed; *Hom. Jer.* 8,6: SC 232, 368ff.). Commenting, however, on the letter to the Romans, Origen discusses at length the chief affirmations in Rom 8:18-27 (*Com. Rom.* 7,4-6: FChr 2/4, 42-82). There he describes hope as the expectation of future good things (see FChr 2/4, 56.72). But, following the Apostle, he understands the things that are not seen, that are not known *facie ad faciem,* but only in *aenigmate,* things, however, spiritual and eternal, revealed by God (see FChr 2/4, 44.48.70), in concrete terms the divine adoption, the resurrection of the dead and the *redemption of the church, which is the body of Christ (see FChr 2/4, 60.68ff.). Precisely because Christians hope for invisible things and even more so in difficult situations, they must *exspectare per patientiam* (see also PA I, 7,5), and they are so much the more capable inasmuch as the *Holy Spirit intervenes within them (FChr 2/4, 63.78ff.). According to this exegesis of Rom 8, Christian are, therefore, those who hope, fideliter *credentia* (see *Com. Rom.* 4,4: FChr 2/2, 228, where Origen observes that in the Apostle's letters *fides* and *spes* are intertwined. The Christian hopes against hope, as did *Abraham. The Christian trusts totally in God (see *Com. Rom.* 4,6: FChr 2/2, 224-226). God therefore is not only the object of hope but also its grounds and guarantee (see *Com. Rom.* 9,11: PG 14, 1220AB). The measure in which Origen developed an entirely Christian concept of hope appears from the fact that he united it with the *profectus fidei* (*Com. Rom.* 4,6: FChr 2/2, 226, with 1 Cor 13:13).

Not even in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa (RAC 1226-1231), who also insisted more than Origen on spiritual progress, does hope seem to be the central theme (Völker 138). If anything, in the relatively few texts in which he uses the term ἐλπίς, he does so often in an ambivalent and therefore not typically biblical sense (see the table of contents and the index, SC 178, 300). Nevertheless, he reappropriated some traditional themes of hope. He emphasized not only the role of fear but also of hope in temptations (see *De virg.* 18,3: GNO 8/1, 318, and Daniélou 93-99). He recalls that the observance of the precepts pleases those who, now in hope, do good works and will fill in the future those who are worthy with glory, when they receive the fruit of a

good hope (*Ecc. hom.* 8: GNO 5, 441; see Völker 133). Moreover, he reveals the connection between baptism and hope (*Or. cat.* 40,8) and esp. the παρρησία that the baptized regain before the heavenly Father (*Or. dom.* 5.; see Daniélou 110-123). Naturally, Gregory does not cease to point to the hope of the resurrection (*Vita Macr.* 5: GNO 8/1, 375, 19-20), prefigured in the faithful acceptance of virginity (*De virg.* 14,4: GNO 8/1, 308-309).

Nevertheless, it is of greater importance that Gregory returns to ἐλπίς in the rather philosophical context of his thought, not without, however, Christianizing it every time in a decisive way. For Gregory, thrown into the intellectual movements of his time, the human being, the creature of God, cannot live without hope because, while the human being turns to the past (μνήμη) and feels the present, the human being also awaits the future (ἐλπίς). Only in the perfect human being, as in God himself, is there neither memory nor hope, i.e., as the Apostle says, neither faith nor hope, but only love will never end. The human *viator*, however, must hope. If anything, hope can also be in contrast to the memory of human beings when it rebukes them for their sins (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 92C-97A; see *C. Eun.* I, 372: GNO 9, 130; II [XII], 459: GNO 9, 344-345). But human beings in all their unstable existence are led by the εὐεργεσία of the Lord. When, therefore, human beings turn toward the future, this constitutes for them the hope of their expectations (*Or. dom.* 1: PG 44, 1124D-1125A). In this way, ἐλπίς no longer preserves that ambiguity of classical antiquity but expresses the Christian hope, which, committing itself in this time, leads to eternity. Moreover, the Christian, supporting his or her temporal existence in virtue of faith and hope, already anticipates in this life the grace of God (*De op. hom.* 22: PG 44, 208B-209A). Likewise, Gregory introduced ἐλπίς in the context in which it was particularly dear to him, i.e., that of ἔρως (Völker 221), thus inserting the entire spiritual process in a dynamic of hope. Ἔρως as the fervor of love which pushes the soul toward perfect union with God certainly resembles ἔρως as the irresistible impulse toward the absolute beauty of the Platonic tradition (see *De virg.* 5: GNO 8/1, 277-278). Nevertheless, in Gregory's thought, ἔρως assumed a deeply Christian meaning (see Daniélou 211-220). When Gregory, in fact, speaks of ἔρως toward the νύμφιος ἄφθαρτος ("the uncorrupted bridegroom"—*De virg.* 20: GNO 8/1, 328,8-9), it is placed in an entirely personal perspective, and he makes it depend on Christ's ἀγαπή, who gave his life for the life of humankind (see *Com. Cant.* II [1,7]: GNO 6, 61, 18ff. and *Ecc. hom.* 8: GNO 5, 422,11-426,7). He esp. showed that ἔρως will not come to an end even in eternity, because the divine infinity always opens to him new horizons (*Com. Cant.* 8: GNO 6, 246; see Daniélou 309-326). Now this ἔρως also includes ἐλπίς. In fact, Gregory calls the vision of God not only the fulfillment of every desire (ἐπιθυμία) but also the apex of every hope, the endpoint of all the divine promises (see *De virg.* 23,7: GNO 8/1, 343 and also 9,2: GNO 8/1, 287-289; 14,4: GNO 8/1, 308-309. See also Greg. Naz., *Or.* 11,7,10ff: SC 405, 344ff.). Last, presenting the paternal beatitude of the human being, he returns to the notion of ἐλπίς. The beatitude that includes the vision of God and divine filiation overcomes not only every human reflection (διάνοια) but also every expectation (ἐλπίς) (*De beat.* 7: PG 44, 1277A-C; see *De op.* hom., prooem.: PG 44, 128B). God is always bigger; for this reason human existence cannot but end in the perpetual praise of God's greatness (*Inscrip. Ps.* 1,9: GNO 5, 67ff.).

Like all his thought, *Augustine's doctrine of hope is also an expression of his personal and pastoral experiences (RAC 1231-1241). His work reflects (1) the encounter with philosophy which is at the origin of the search for the true wisdom (see *Sol.* I, 6,12-17; *Conf.* IX, 10,23); (2) the painful process of conversion marked by the tension between presumption and discouragement (see *Conf.* VI, 1,1; VIII, 3,6-7; VIII, 9,25); (3) the conflict with the *Manicheans which emphasized the critical issues of evil, the Christian understanding of the OT, and the resurrection (see *C. Faust.* 4,2; 11,7; *Util. cred.* 3,9; *Agon.* 24,26-26,28); (4) the pressure of preaching, esp. for *Easter, to show the *via ad patriam* and the *transitus ad Patrem* (Ep. 55; *Serm.* 261,1; *En. Ps.* 60,4) and for the feasts of the martyrs (*En Ps.* 121, 1; *Serm.* 280, 4-6) ; (5) interest in the Pauline Letters, esp. in Rom, Gal and Phil 3:12-20; (6) apologetic concerns, raised by the pagan objections (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 25-26; *Serm.* 241,8) and esp. by the disaster of 410 (*Serm.* 105); (7) the *Donatist controversy, in which there was a debate over the still imperfect church and the church called to perfection (see *C. ep. Parm.* II, 7,14; III, 5,27); (8) the anti-*Pelagian controversy, which made those engaged in it aware of the imperfection of the present righteousness (*in spe*) and the expectation of the heavenly righteousness (*in re*) (*Spir. et litt.* 36,64).

Among these different experiences, the first, however, were certainly the most decisive. Almost from the beginning, as clearly appears in the treatise *De vera religione,* three problems were imposed as determinative for Augustine's thought (see Lorenz 56ff.): (1) Questions pertaining to *beatitudo* (*Vera rel.*

1-10), which was understood as the enjoyment of God (fruitio Dei), the highest good (*summum bonum*), which includes the distinctions between *frui* and *uti, via* and *patria*, *spes* and *res*, as well as the entire dynamic of the *desiderium veritatis,* the *transitus ad visionem*, but also the *ordo caritatis* (see *En. Ps.* 91,1). (2) Questions pertaining to *malum*, the *origo mali* (*Vera rel.* 11-23), which include *creatio* and *providentia*, *libertas* and *gratia,* the history of the *duo amores* (with patience which must also undergo the presence of the wicked). (3) And questions concerning *auctoritas* and *ratio* (*Vera rel.* 24-55), and esp. *scientia* and *sapientia* (*Trin.* XII, 14,21-15,24), and therefore the entire structure of provisory knowledge, distinct from the eternal vision, which esp. characterizes the search without end, pertaining to the *Trinitas quae est unus Deus* (see esp. *Trin.* IX, 1,1, with Phil 3:13-15; XV, 28,51).

Within this framework, Augustine developed the concept of hope, clearly drawing inspiration from philosophical traditions, esp. Platonic ones. Nevertheless, he transformed no less clearly the philosophical approach by means of biblical data, taken esp. from the Psalms (see *En. Ps.*) and the Pauline Letters (see *Exp. prop. Rm.* 45 [53], with Rom 8:19-23, and *Serm.* 158), precisely acc. to some of his ministerial activities and personal research. In this way, he decisively oriented hope, the *exspectatio futurorum bonorum,* toward God, the guarantor and the goal of every trusting Christian expectation (see *Ench.* 2,8, to be compared with *Cic.*, *Tusc.* 4,80, and with *En. Ps.* 39,7). Likewise, he clearly oriented hope toward the resurrection of the dead by establishing it upon the *exemplum resurrectionis Christi* (see *En. Ps.* 70,11,10; 90,11,4, Ballay 206-230). Precisely because the human being, though having been baptized, has not yet entered the *gloria resurrectionis,* but is living in *corruptio* and remains therefore subject to *concupiscentia,* in conditions, therefore, that will be abolished in the final resurrection, his salvation exists only in hope (*in spe*), but not yet in actuality (*in re*) (see *Pecc. merit.* II, 9,11-10,12; *Spir. et litt.* 29,51; *Retr.* I, 14,2, etc.). In this sense, the Christian is essentially a person of hope (see *En. Ps.* 131,19—compare with thee earlier writings of Philo of Alexandria, in RAC 1178, Deterius 5: OEuvres 5,102ff.; Ambrose, *Parad.* 3,19: Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis Opera 2/1, 62). Christian hope makes up part of the *iustitia peregrinationis* (*Serm.* 158,8). Finally, hope is not only an expectation, neither is it only trust in the divine promises, but it is also patience (see Rom 8:25, which is cited many times: Ballay 223-230). Patience itself, however, would not be possible without the example of the crucified Christ and without the grace of the *Holy Spirit, who causes us to love righteousness, the unconditioned and complete acceptance of God's will (see *Spir. et litt.* 3,5; 18,31). This radical dependence on the divine promises, already accomplished in the Paschal mystery, allows a human being not to succumb either to presumption or to despair (see *En. Ps.* 61,20). On the other hand, the presence of the Holy Spirit incites almost a jubilation of hope within believers, a jubilation lived in the church and sung everyday in praise of God (see *En. Ps.* 145). Augustine thus reserved for hope a very broad space in his thought, but at the same time he gave it an authentically Christian meaning, even outdoing his predecessors, with the exception of Paul, his great teacher.

In conclusion, Christian thought concerning hope, which was established on the OT and contemporary Judaism, is different in two characteristics: The first characteristic possesses an entirely positive sense. Although in Greco-Roman antiquity, the words that express the idea of hope appear ambiguous, the hope of Christians will occur only as an expectation of future good things. It is not easy to explain why the expectation of the good was focused on life after death, esp. the resurrection. This development was certainly assisted by the apocalyptic distinction between the two aeons, interpreted by Christians as the tension between *iam* ("already") and *nondum* ("not yet"). The determining cause, however, was the Paschal experience in which faith in the resurrection of Christ became the reason for the hope of eternal life. Starting from the 3rd c., interest for the letter to the Romans definitively oriented the Christian theology of hope. Almost the entire patristic tradition, at least after *Justin Martyr, was then influenced by the Platonic tradition, acc. to which human nature requires purification and desires beatitude in God. The eschatological orientation of this tradition, which was deeply connected to the apocalyptic distinction between the two aeons, did not impede Christians from committing themselves in this world to also hope for temporal things, although always in view of God, as shown by the political theologians *Constantine the Great and *Eusebius of Caesarea as well as *Basil of Caesarea and Augustine.

The other characteristic of the Christian concept of hope consists in its certainty: Christian hope is no longer a more or less rational conjecture of the future. It is rather a solid conviction. This firmness was motivated by faith in the power of the creator of the world and in the faithfulness of the God of the fathers. Believing in the merciful love that God has shown in the fulfillment of his promises and finally

in the example of Christ's resurrection (*exemplum resurrectionis Christi*), Christians look with trust to what is to come. Here is the truly Christian hope. Nevertheless, even on the level of subjective disposition the understanding of hope was deepened thanks to interaction with those outside the Christian faith. The philosophical analysis of time (past, present, future) and the ancient doctrine of knowledge helped Christian thinkers to circumscribe more precisely faith in the historical action of God and the commitment of trust in the future. Moreover, comparing hope, a certain expectation of future good things, with the natural desire of the human being to find beatitude, Christians were able to understand hope better. These new experiences, however, made the tension between the order of creation and that of redemption more serious, i.e., between the human being who, created in the image of God, is a being that hopes and the human being who, destined to mutability, despairs because of his or her sins. Responding with his doctrine on the absolute necessity of grace and the love of righteousness, inspired by the Holy Spirit, Augustine causes not only the sinning human being's hope but also the hope of every creature to depend on God. His concept of the relationship between God and the human being certainly does not resolve the tension between fear and hope, humble trust in divine mercy and the capacities given by the Creator. To the contrary, he led it to apply itself, hoping against hope, as a pastoral work for all people. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the spiritual aspirations of the Greco-Roman milieu oriented the elaboration of the Pauline triad of faith, hope and love (1 Cor 13:13) and led Christians to define Christianity as a religion of hope, a hope, however, that is based not only on human nature but also and even more so on the resurrection of Christ.

W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen 1931; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique* (*Grégoire de Nysse*), Paris 1944; P. Stumpf, *Anker*: RAC 1 (1950) 440-443; W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, Wiesbaden 1955; K.H. Schelkle, *Paulus Lehrer der Väter*, Düsseldorf 1956; L. Ballay, *Der Hoffnungsbegriff bei Augustinus*, Munich 1964; H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche. Die Ekklesiologie der Väter,* Salzburg 1964, 237-564: *Antenna crucis* (Italian trans. Rome 1971); U. Occhialini, *La speranza della Chiesa pellegrina. Teologia della speranza nelle "Enarrationes in Psalmos." di S. Augino*, Assisi 1965; A. Méhat, *Étude sur les "Stromates" de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1966; R. Bultmann - K.H. Rengstorf, ἐλπίς: TDNT 2, 517-535; C. Becker, *Fides*: RAC 7 (1969) 801-839; L.J. Engels, *Fiducia*: RAC 7 (1969) 839-877; M. Spanneut, *Tertullien et les premiers moralistes africains*, Gembloux 1969; R. Lorenz, *Das vierte bis sechste Jahrhundert*, 1, in *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*, ed. K.D. Schmidt - E. Wolf, Göttingen 1970; O. Brabant, *Le Christ, centre et source de la vie morale chez s. Augustin*, Gembloux 1971; H.-G. Link, Hoffnung: Hist. Wörterbuch der Philosophie 3 (1974) 1157-1166; M. Spanneut, *Geduld*: RAC 9 (1976) 243-294; K.M. Woschitz, *Elpis-Hoffnung. Geschichte, Philosophie, Exegese, Theologie eines Schlüsselbegriffes*, Vienna 1979 (summ. in LTK[3] 5, 200-203); J. Janssens, *Vita e morte del cristiano negli epitaffi di Roma anteriori al secolo VII*, Rome 1981; L. Boros, *Aurelius Augustinus, Aufstieg zu Gott,* Olten 1982; F. van Menxel, *Elpis, Espoir, Espérance. Études sémantiques du vocabulaire de l'espérance dans l'Hellénisme et le judaisme avant le NT*, Berna 1983; B. Studer, *Das christliche Fest ein Tag der gläubigen Hoffnung*, in FS A. Nocent: Stud. Anselm. 95 (Rome 1988), 517-529; B. Studer, *Augustine and the Pauline Theme of Hope*, in W.S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, Dallas 1990, 201-221; A. Dihle (A), B. Studer (BC), F. Rickert (D), *Hoffnung*: RAC 15 (1991) 1159-1250 (bibl.; C: patristic part, foundational); G. Visonà, *La speranza nei Padri*, intr., tr. and notes by G.V., Milan 1993; F. Cocchini, *Romani* (exegetical writings on letter to the): (Diz.) Origene (Rome 2000), 415-418 (bibl.).

B. Studer

HORMISDAS, pope (d. 523). At the death of Pope *Symmachus (11 July 514), his deacon Hormisdas, a native of Frosinone who was ordained presbyter in 499, was elected to succeed him. He had been married (his wife entered the cloister) and had a son named Silverius, who wrote his father's epitaph (ICUR 2, 1, n. 15; Diehl 984, n. 184). Silverius became a subdeacon of the church of Rome, and later pope (536–537). Hormisdas took part in the Roman synod of 501 and occupied an important position in the Roman church during Symmachus's pontificate. Elected pope, he worked esp. to finally repair the *Laurentian Schism (LP I, 274: inscription); he took measures against the *Manichees (LP I, 270). He intervened in *Spain, where he charged John of Elche to be his representative, giving him norms to follow in ordinations (*Ep.* 25: PL 63, 421-423); for *Baetica and *Lusitania he charged Sallustius of Seville (*Ep.* 26: PL 63, 425-426). For Gaul, which had only recently become Catholic with *Clovis, he had links with *Avitus of Vienne and esp. with *Caesarius of Arles (Thiel 9; 22; 150). He managed, through a series of favorable circumstances, to end the *Acacian schism. During the revolt (513) of *Vitalian, who had asked the emperor *Anastasius to call a council, Anastasius wrote to Hormisdas inviting him to take part (CSEL 35, 499-500; 501-502). Hormisdas first consulted with King *Theoderic and with a Roman council, and then (in August) sent a legate to *Constantinople, with precise instructions (*indiculus*) and a formula of faith (*Regula rectae fidei Hormisdae*) which those who wanted to reenter into communion with Rome had to sign (CSEL 35, 520-522; DS 363-365). To bring the reconciliation to a conclusion, Hormisdas developed relations with some Eastern bishops.

Once the danger of Vitalian had passed, Anastasius became less conciliatory, though the movement for reunion continued to grow (Jaffé 780; 783; 785); for this reason he sent legates to Hormisdas and a letter to the Roman senate. The pope then sent a new delegation, which included *Ennodius of Pavia and Peregrinus of Misenum, but this obtained no positive results (Jaffé 720; 792-796). With Anastasius's death in 518, the accession of *Justin I (who was of orthodox faith and assisted by his nephew *Justinian as *comes*) and the election of the new patriarch, John II, the climate in the Byzantine capital changed. John communicated to Hormisdas that his name and that of Leo had been reinserted in the diptychs. At that time there was a close correspondence between Rome and Constantinople (letters largely preserved in the *Collectio Avellana*: CSEL 35).

Early in 519 Hormisdas sent another delegation, including Germanus of Capua, with the same *libellus* to be subscribed and a new *indiculus,* i.e., instructions which the delegation had to follow. At Easter (28 March 519), with the signing of the *libellus* by John and with the approval of the emperor, full communion was restored between the two churches and the schism ended, after 35 years of division (CSEL 35, 611). Now effort was made to secure the adherence of the other important sees of the East, in particular *Antioch and *Alexandria. At *Thessalonica a revolt broke out against the pontifical delegation. But the union was to be clouded by the Scythian (Dobrugia) monks, who wanted approval for the formula **Unus de Trinitate passus est de carne* (*see also* *theopaschites), the better to defend the Council of *Chalcedon and *Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum;* at first they were not well received by Justinian (CSEL 35, 644-645), but he soon began to support them and plead their cause with Hormisdas (CSEL 35, 645-646; 648-649). Meanwhile, some of them had gone to Rome, where they remained from June 519 to September 520. But Hormisdas, who initially hesitated to respond as he waited for the return of the delegation from the East, in September 520 withheld his approval because he did not consider the formula useful and thought the monks enamored of novelty (Thiel 124). He expelled them from Rome (ACO IV, 2, 54-55) and communicated his decision to the emperor. Justinian took no account of the Roman position. Hormisdas sent relics of Peter and Paul to the emperor; he died 6 August 523 and was buried in St. Peter's.

CPL 1683-1684; Verzeichnis 384-389; PL 63, 367-528; Thiel 741-990; CSEL 35, 495-742; LP I, 275-278; III, 90; DTC 7, 161-176; R. Cessi, *Lo scisma laurenziano e le origini della dottrina politica della Chiesa di Roma*: Archivio della Soc. Romana di storia patria 42 (1919) 5-229; W. Haacke, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma*, AG 20, Rome 1939 (see the reservations in RBen 53 [1941] 153); A. Lentini, *Il "libellus" portato a Bisanzio da Germano di Capua*, in *Il contributo dell'arcid. di Capua alla vita religiosa e culturale del Meridione*, Rome 1967, 343-349; C. Capizzi, *L'imperatore Anastasio I* (*491-518*), OCA 184, Rome 1969; S.M. Meo, *La dottrina mariana e le rispettive formule sintetiche dei Papi Ormisda e Giovanni II, del VI sec.*, in *De cultu mariano saec. VI-XI*, III, Rome 1972, 17-34; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII*, Milan 1971, 407-423 (see index); L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 29-102; C. Capizzi, *Sul fallimento di un negoziato di pace ecclesiastica fra il papa Ormisda e l'imperatore Anastasio I* (*515-517*): Critica Storica 17 (1980) 23-54; *Atti del Convegno su Papa Ormisda* (*514-523*)*: magistero, cura pastorale ed impegno ecumenico*, ed. C. Noce, Frosinone 1993; Patrologia IV, 134-137; *Germano di Capua* (*d. 541 ca.*). *Ambasciatore ecumenico a Costantinopoli e modello di santità per il Cassinate*, ed. F. Carcione, Venafro 1999; EPapi 1, 476-483.

A. Di Berardino

HORSIESI (ca. 305–ca. 390). Second successor of *Pachomius, after the brief rule of Petronius. We do not know his origin. Around 320 he attached himself to the disciples of Pachomius. Appointed superior at a moment of crisis which divided the monasteries, he was too meek and mild to succeed in imposing his authority; replaced by a "vicar general," Theodore, he withdrew to solitude, while in theory keeping his authority, which he resumed at Theodore's death. A Coptic text, not wholly believable, speaks of a visit by Horsiesi to *Alexandria at the time of Patriarch *Theophilus, with whom he discussed spiritual problems. Among the Pachomian documents translated into Latin by *Jerome is a *Liber Horsiesi,* lost in the Coptic and Greek text: rather than an organic literary composition, it is a homiletic work which takes up some catecheses and admonitions. Rich in biblical citations, it can be considered a spiritual testament appealing to fidelity. Many pages are addressed more specifically to superiors. The work's authenticity is undisputed, while the fragments found in Coptic seem to belong to later generations. The *Liber Horsiesi* has been translated into several modern languages, as it provides excellent evidence of Egyptian monastic ideas. Two letters have recently been discovered in the original Coptic, written on the occasion of the Pachomians' annual meeting. They deal, in an allusive style, with moral and disciplinary problems. Horsiesi may also have had a considerable part in drawing up the Pachomian rules and recording the life of the founder.

CPG/S 2367-2368; W.F. Crum, *Der Papyruscodex Saec. VI-VII der Phillipps-Bibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften* (Schriften der Wiss. Gesellsch. in Strassburg 18),

Strassburg 1915; A. Boon, *Pachomiana latina*, Louvain 1932, 109-147; M. Elizalde, *Libro de nuestro Padre S. Orsisio*: Cuadernos Monásticos 4-5 (1967) 245-279; P. Deseille, *L'esprit du monachisme pachômien, suivi de la traduction française des Pachomiana latina par les Moines de Solesmes*, Bellefontaine 1968; H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs*, Würzburg 1972; L. Cremaschi (ed.), *Pacomio e i suoi discepoli*, Magnano (VC) 1988; Patrologia V, 510-512.

J. Gribomont

HOSPITALITY, CHRISTIAN. From the beginnings of Christianity, the churches took up and exercised hospitality to its fullest impact, following the traditional pattern in the Jewish communities of the Diaspora, the nomadic civilization of the Near East and the maritime world of the Mediterranean. This involved heavy burdens for the communities, particularly those of the great commercial centers and transit towns. Despite the slowness of transport, and the fatigues and dangers of all kinds that threatened travelers in antiquity, there was much travel, by land and by sea, favored in part by the *pax romana*. The rudimentary structure of hotel services forced travelers to have recourse, if possible, to private lodgings, with more or less unknown landlords, toward whom they remained obliged on their return. This system, widespread in the Greek and Jewish world, particularly in the commercial areas, was transformed by the churches into a genuine institution. The first Christian missionaries could move about continually, using the system of the synagogue network. From this came the exhortation to mutual hospitality to favor the spread of the gospel, which was spread through preaching. *Paul recommends it to the Romans: "Practice hospitality" (Rom 12:13). And Paul himself makes abundant use of it in his travels, even as a prisoner: arriving at Puteoli, he sought out the brothers in the faith and stayed with them for seven days (Acts 28:13-14). Travel was an essential necessity for fulfilling Jesus' commandment: "Go out to all the world and preach the gospel." The **Didache* has a specific chapter on missionaries and on the conditions of hospitality (11,1-3), but also for nonmissionaries. An ethics of hospitality, with precise stipulations, was elaborated from 2-3 John (see also *Tertia Clementis*; Hermas, *Shepherd*, *Mand.* 11). The problem was, in a period of high Christian mobility, to distinguish exploiters of the system from those who truly had a right to use it. Trips were expensive, and the Christian had to make use of only what was essential, not having much money. This poverty also made them less a target of robbers.

A Christian who traveled was assured of being fraternally received by all of the communities which he had met along his itinerary, since he was furnished with *letters of communion (*litterae communicatoriae*), duly signed by his bishop, which he had to present to the brothers. We have many examples of these letters, which attest the traditional character of hospitality. Although exercised in the context of the local community, it had a universal dimension, incarnating the very unity of the church and, as Tertullian emphasized (*De praec. haer.* 20,8), the communion of Christians in one faith. The duty of hospitality was incumbent on the entire community, laity and clergy. Hermas considers hospitable bishops blessed (*Simil.* 9,27,25; cf. *Simil.* 8,10). Justin, writing from Rome, says that one of the purposes of the Sunday collection was to receive "guests who came from other countries" (*1 Apol* 67). The numerous early Christian texts that address the problem of hospitality prove the importance of this institution in the life of local churches (*Didache* 11-12; *I Clem.* 10-12; Just., *1 Apol.* 67; Luc. of Sam., *De morte Peregr.* 11-13; Tertull., *Apol.* 39; *Didascalia* 29-30). *Eusebius says that *Melito of Sardis wrote a work *On Hospitality* (*HE* 4,26,3), wholly lost.

It is not difficult to imagine that this generosity of the churches was sometimes abused by certain indiscreet brothers: the *Didache* sought to remedy this evil; *Lucian of Samosata derided the naiveté of Christians, who welcomed every new arrival. At the dawn of the 4th c., the so-called Council of *Elvira saw itself forced to take a harsh stance to prevent wandering Christians from defrauding the simple by showing false letters of communion and boasting of the title of confessor; in 394, the Council of *Nîmes warned against false Eastern clerics who were being maintained by the churches of *Gaul. But these abuses, always a possibility, did not discourage Christian charity, convinced of carrying out the commandment of the Lord Jesus (Mt 10:11ff.; Mk 6:8-13; Lk 9:2-6; 10:4-16), and intent on imitating the examples of Scripture (Abraham, Lot, Rahab, Zacchaeus, Simon, Martha and Mary), and in particular that of Jesus himself at the Last Supper (Jn 13). The tradition of hospitality continued all through the Constantinian era, with the creation of suitable buildings, intended for passing travelers; and it continued to hold a privileged place in monastic life.

D. Gorce, *Les voyages, l'hospitalité et le port des lettres dans le monde chrétien des IV^e et V^e s.*, Poitiers 1925; M. Marty, *Sur le devoir chrétien de l'hospitalité aux trois premiers siècles*: RHPhR 19 (1939) 288-295; RAC 8, 1061-1123; DSp 7, 808-825; L. Peña, *Hospederías sirias de los siglos IV, V, VI*: Liber Annuus 32 (1982) 327-334; A.J. Malherbe, *Hospitality and Inhospitality in the Church*, in *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, Philadelphia 1983, 92-112; N. Brox, *The Stranger in Early Christianity*: Theology Digest 41 (1994) 47-52; L. Padovese, *L'originalità cristiana.*

Il pensiero etico-sociale di alcuni vescovi norditaliani del IV secolo, Rome 1983; M. Maritano, *Insegnamenti e pratica dell'ospitalità nei Padri della Chiesa*, in *Nuova ospitalità per una nuova evangelizzazione*, Turin 1995, 21-75; C. Corsato, *I volti della carità nell'esperienza dei Padri*, Suppl. La Provvidenza n. 3, Padua 1997.

CH. MUNIER - A. DI BERARDINO

HUESCA (Lat. Osca, Oscensis, Spain). The correspondence between *Consentius and St. *Augustine informs us about the contamination of this church with *Priscillianism, at least in the person of its bishop, Siagrius. In the year 598 a provincial council was held in the city. We know its *Acts* thanks to the *Codex Aemilianensis;* redacted successively, they lack the signature of the bishops present, of whose number and identity we are ignorant. Its two canons, confirmed in the Council of *Terrassa in 614, prescribe that the bishops are to be vigilant over the moral life of the clergy and to hold an annual diocesan synod, at which the priests, deacons and the abbots of the monasteries in the diocese should be present as well.

Aug., *Ep.* 11* (Divjak); M. Moreau, *Lecture de la lettre 11* de Consentius à Augustin. Un pastiche hagiographique: Les lettres de saint Augustin découvertes par J. Divjak*, Paris 1983, 215-223; Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 280-281; Hfl-Lecl 3, 237; Palazzini 2, 170; Vives, *Concilios*, 158; Orlandís, *Concilios*, 242-244.

P. DE LUIS

HUMILITY, Patristic Writings on. Humility, or *tapeinophrosynē,* praised already in Pr 29:23, as exaltation in the glory of the Lord in contrast to the *hybris,* which instead humiliates, is based on the OT, on the creation of humanity from clay. Adam means "lump of earth," for which reason Abraham says that before God he is "dust and ashes" (Gen 18:27): the same derivation applies to *humilis,* "lowly, modest, humble," from *humus*, "earth, ground." The sin of humanity is conversely the pride of becoming "like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen 3:5). In the Hebrew Bible, the social category of the poor person and the religious category of the humble are often correlated; the poor person relies on God, who says: "But I will leave among you a humble and lowly people, and they will take refuge in the name of the Lord" (Zeph 3:12); "But for whom shall I have respect? The one who is humble and of a contrite spirit" (Is 66:2). Many Psalms join the prayers of the poor and those of the humble, who trust entirely in God. In the NT *tapeinophrosynē* is commended or attributed to Christians eight times, in the Acts of the Apostles in Paul's words (20:19: "serving the Lord with all humility") and in the letters of the Pauline corpus, where the term *tapeinophrosynē* occurs frequently: Phil 2:3, where it is contrasted to vainglory; Rom 12:16, where lenient treatment of the lowly is commended; 2 Cor 7:6, where God comforts the humble (*tapeinoi*)*;* in 10:1, where Paul says that he is humble before the recipients; in 11:7, where he says that he was humbled so that the Corinthians might be exalted (see 12:21). Ther term is likewise found frequently among the letters less universally received as coming directly from Paul's pen: Eph 4:2, where humility is associated to meekness and *agapē*; Col 2:23, where it is united to the divine worship and disregard of the body; Col 3:12, where it is exalted along with the Christian virtues of mercy, goodness, meekness and patience. Likewise, in 1 Pet 3:8, it is associated with mutual agreement, compassion and *philanthropia,* and in 5:5, it is said to obtain the grace of God, although God resists pride. In Jas 1:9 the whole person is invited to rejoice; God in fact grants grace to the humble but opposes the proud (4:6).

The model is obviously Christ, with his self-*emptying* (*ekenōsen*), his humility (*etapeinōsen*) and obedience (*hypēkoos*) to the point of death on a cross (Phil 2:7-8), a central idea in Pauline thought. *Jesus himself in Mt 11:29 sets himself forth as a model for Christians inasmuch as he is meek (*praÿs*) and humble (*tapeinos*) of heart, virtues that confer peace to our souls: in fact, the meek reenter the beatitudes along with the poor (Lk 6:20) in spirit (Mt 5:2). Jesus was also indeed the model of poverty (Mt 8:20; Lk 9:58); he came to serve (Mt 20:27-28; Lk 22:26-27) and gave an example of service and humility (Jn 13:2-17). The exhortation to be humble and like small children (Mt 18:4; see M. Berrouard, *Enfance spirituelle*, in DSp 4, 1959, 682-705) corresponds to Mt 23:12 and Lk 14:11 and 18:14: the one who exalts himself will be humbled; the one who humbles himself will be exalted: there one finds an echo of Jas 4:10 and 1 Pet 5:6, with the invitation to humble ourselves before the Lord, who in this case will exalt us. Another model of humility is naturally *Mary, as one can perceive from the Magnificat: God looked upon her humility (*tapeinōsin*) and has exalted the humble (Lk 1:48, 52).

Since the earliest days of Christianity, the terms *tapeinophrosynē* and *tapeinotēs* assumed a positive meaning, although often in the classical world they indicate a lack of importance and even worthlessness, and only rarely does one find the term "humility" used in a good sense, as is also the case with *humilitas*, which means low social condition, etc. (TLL 6, 3103-3119), but it does not have a moral and

religious connotation, even though at the ethical level, since the time of Herodotus and Aeschylus, the invitation to avoid *hybris* (i.e., arrogance that transgresses human limits) was alive and well; nevertheless, even Aristotle, in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (1123b5-1125a30), saw humility in a negative sense and contrasted it to magnanimity (W. Den Boer, *Tapeinos in Pagan and Christian Terminology*, in *Tria Corda, Scritti A. Momigliano*, ed. E. Gabba, Como 1983, 143-162; A. Dihle, *Demut*: RAC 3 [1957] 735-778; P. Adnès, *Humilité*: DSp 7 [1969] 1152-1164; S. Rehrl, *Demut*: TRE 8 [1981] 463-468). Precisely because of the high value that humility acquired in Christianity scholars have supposed that such names as Stercorius or Projectus, names that frequently appear in Christian epigraphs but are almost completely absent in pagan ones, were assumed for love of humility, even though it could be a late onomastic development, of an age in which Christian epigraphs were by then the majority, as observes I. Kajanto, *On the Problem of Names of Humility in Early Christian Epigraphy*: Arctos 3 (1962) 45-53.

Similarly, in early Christian literature outside the NT, humility is presented as an important characteristic of Christians in the authentic letters of *Ignatius of Antioch (1,10), *Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians,* where one also notes the conceptual transformation of the technical rhetorical term *tapeinōsis,* which in the Christian sphere became "humility" (I. Lana, *La cristianizzazione di alcuni termini retorici nella Lettera ai Corinti di Clemente*, in *Forma futuri*, Turin 1975, 110-118), and so too as well in the *Letter of *Barnabas*, 19,3, which in its moral section exhorts one to humility in all things, against pride and vainglory. Likewise in the 2nd c., in the writings of the so-called postapostolic fathers, the *Shepherd* of *Hermas praises humility, one of the virtues by which one recognizes whether a person has the Spirit of God, along with meekness, serenity, abstention from all evil and lust; with his humility, the good Christian calms the soul of his neighbor and brings it about that his neighbor prays for him (43,8; 56,7; see 18,6): humility can also be an expression of contrition, which subsequently pleads for God's mercy (66,4): patience and humility constitute the commandments of the Lord and life in him (73,6). The preaching of humility and humiliation by Jesus was at the center of *Marcion's attention, who saw therein a subsequent break instituted by Jesus with respect to the law, which was established on the principle of retaliation, a perspective which was inserted within his vision of the complete separation of the OT from the NT and the creator God with respect to the Father of Jesus (E. Norelli, *Note sulla soteriologia di Marcione*: Augustinianum 35 [1995] 281-305).

*Clement of Alexandria, in the late 2nd c., recalls the humility of Isaiah and Jeremiah in their manner of dress, as a sign of disregard for everything that is vain (*Paed.* II, 10bis, 113,1); he ascribes the praise of humility in terms close to the ones used by Christians to Plato, who affirmed that the one who humbles himself will be exalted (*Strom.* II, 22,132,1). Following the lead of Mt 11:29, Clement directly identifies humility with meekness (*praÿtēs*) (*Strom.* III, 6,48,3), the object of blessings, such that Christ belongs to the humble, not the proud (*Strom.* IV, 6,33,3). He also identifies humility with the great power of *agapē* before God (*Strom.* IV, 17,108,3). The exhortation to humility in *Strom.* IV, 8,66,2 contains a direct citation of Col 3:12, and in *Strom.* VI, 8,65,3 a paraphrase is given from the *Epistle of *Clement of Rome* to the Corinthians, which enjoins humility precisely to the most powerful in the community. In the *Extracts from Theodotus* (1,4,1), "great humility" is attributed directly to the Lord, who in virtue of it showed himself in the form of a human being and not an angel. Clement's disciple *Origen, who between the 2nd and the 3rd c., at Alexandria and then at Caesarea, developed his exegetical and theological teaching and maintained for the first time in complete form the doctrine of the *apokatastasis,* likewise wrote frequently about humility. From what remains extant from his work a good 32 occurrences of the terms *tapeinophrosynē* and *tapeinophrōn* can be found. He regarded deep humility as the disposition of the *orans* in *C. Cels.* VI, 15, where he cited Phil 2:8 with respect to Christ, who humbled himself to the point of death on the cross, and Mt 11:29 containing the words of *Jesus himself (likewise mentioned in *Sel. in Ps.*: PG 12, 1065, 1). Similarly, he comments on the Magnificat in his Hom. 8 on Lk 1:46, observing that humility is the lack of arrogance; it is a virtue with which it is fitting to look at God, who prefers humility over pride (frag. 163,7 on Lk). He cites Col 3:12 many times in his works, and in frag. 1 from the *Commentary on Romans,* he praises *Paul for having presented himself as a servant of Christ thanks to his "praiseworthy humility" which is given to him precisely for not having a slavish spirit of fear, but rather that filial spirit of service. In *Sel. in Ps.* 1428,26, humility appears in a list of Christian virtues: love, justice, sound judgment, temperance, knowledge and wisdom. The importance of humility is well understood if one considers that Origen states that the most grievous sin is pride (*Exp. in Prv.* PG 17, 169, 46), which the Lord opposes, and it is through humility that the humble obtain

the glory or *doxa* of God (ibid., 249, 1). Humility and meekness are opposed to wrath, just as temperance and self-control are opposed to personal craving (ibid., 252, 2): the virtues are opposed to other specific passions on the basis of the *Platonic schema of the irascible soul and the concupiscible soul, which must be governed by the rational soul.

In the 3rd c., *Hippolytus, with respect to whom one should recall the problem of distinguishing the Roman and Eastern versions, presents a reflection on the theme of humility, esp. in his commentary on *Daniel, where this virtue is praised many times in the prophet's character (II, 6; IV, 19.29): thanks to humility, *Daniel was regarded as worthy of the divine revelations (IV, 36). And in *De ben. Is. et Iac.* (32,4, l), *Jacob's humility is opposed to the pride of those circumcised who consider themselves to be the only ones who were justified. Likewise in the writings of *Eusebius of Caesarea, in the 1st half of the 4th c., some 10 occurrences attest to a meditation on the theme, esp. in the commentary on the Psalms, where perfect humility is said to be that of Christ (PG 24, 25), who is born in the human being from the encounter with God: in this way David humbled himself in considering God's greatness and his own nothingness (PG 23, 772). *Epiphanius of Salamis and *Athanasius of Alexandria reflected on humility, although with much less close attention.

Christian reflection on humility had already been particularly developed in the writings of Origen and was subsequently developed in the thought of *Gregory of Nyssa, who borrowed from the Alexandrian many philosophical aspects, among which were the doctrine of the *apokatastasis,* and with respect to our concerns, several lines pertaining to humility. The intensity of Gregory's meditation on this theme emerges from the 55 occurrences alone of the terms *tapeinophrosynē* and *tapeinophrōn:* oxymoronically, he presents humility as a "very high mountain," in the funerary speech for *Meletius (GNO IX: 449,14), and an oxymoron analogue is presented in the funerary speech for Flacilla (GNO IX: 480,19), where Gregory recalls the empress's "sublime humility" (see 488,13: the "sublimity of humility" also in *Infant*. 68,16), a virtue that is most praised in Scripture (488,5), acc. to the concept already seen in the writings of Origen. Humility, therefore, takes on all the Christian virtues, as in the case of Paul inasmuch as he was an imitator of Christ (*De perf. Christ*., VIII, 1: 196,17). The humility of the Son, which does not mean his lack of dignity or inferiority with respect to the Father, is obviously a point of debate in the works against *Arius and *Sabellius, where the concept occurs many times (III, 1: 82,1ff.; 85,1ff.). It also appears in the work against *Eunomius (III, 3,24), where mention is made of the critical passage on the humility and obedience of Christ, Phil 2:8, cited again along with Mt 11:29; similarly he takes up the theme in his commentary on the Song (VI: 126,13). In the sermons on the Beatitudes, Gregory reflects on "poverty of spirit," the object of the first of the blessings, and identifies it with "voluntary humility," to which the future kingdom makes a comparison and whose paradigm is Christ-Logos (PG 44, 1200, 49ff.). Likewise in the writings of Gregory, as already in Hippolytus, the patriarch Jacob, not by chance a *figura Christi,* is the example of humility, in opposition to the wrath of his brother Esau (*Adv. Maced.* III, 1: 111,7). In the *De instit. Chr.,* humility is one of the gifts of prayer, along with simplicity, love, strength and goodness (VIII, 1: 82,20). Gregory of Nyssa often underscores humility, accompanying it with a list of other virtues, in a context of struggle with the vices and evils, e.g., in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs and in Ep. 17,25. In the biography on his sister *Macrina (ch. 11) he refers to the life of the consecrated virgin as inspired "by the measure of humility." In the sermons on the Beatitudes (PG 44, 1217, 14ff.), associating the humility of the Logos to meekness, he parallels these virtues with those of a mother and establishes human humility in the awareness of the nothingness of our nature in the sight of God, and as a result of this, humility signifies for us a deep inner peace (Mt 11:29).

The other Cappadocian Fathers, esp. *Basil of Caesarea, present interesting reflections on humility; *Gregory of Nazianzus, however, uses the term only eight times. But in comparison to Origen and Gregory of Nyssa in this exaltation of humility as a fundamental Christian virtue, it seems that the only one who even compares is the latter's contemporary, namely, *John Chrysostom, who dedicated complete homilies to the soul's humility and who presents in his extant writings more than 150 occurrences of the terms *tapeinophrosynē* and *tapeinophrōn*, esp. in the *De Christi precibus,* the *De paenitentia* and in the eight homilies on Genesis, but it is truly a reflection that crosses the numerous and disparate works of John Chrysostom. The Origenian tradition, which is evident in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, is also present in the works of *Didymus the Blind and *Evagrius of Pontus. In the commentary on Job (cod. 121,17ff.), Didymus, as the exegete that he is, collects scriptural passages on humility, which serves as a proemium to the exaltation that comes from God, because the one who humbles himself will be exalted, and God grants grace to the humble.

In the *Comm. in Ps.* (201,28) Didymus likewise opposes humility to pride, *hyperēphania*, and in the commentary on *Genesis (see 70,26), humility, an example of which is *Jesus Christ, leads to the sublime height of God inasmuch as it causes the soul to grow like the wings of an eagle. He also incorporates lexical observations, as in *Fr. in Ps.* 272: *tapeinōsis* at times refers to humility, at other times it refers to the humiliation that one undergoes from one's enemies.

Evagrius of Pontus (in *Pract. prol.*, l. 15, and in *Inst.* PG 79, 1236) opposes humility to pride or *hyperēphania,* the "original evil." It is humility that leads *Abraham to say: "I am but dust and ashes" and causes the psalmist to sing that "unless the Lord builds the house, those who build it labor in vain." In *Pract.* 57,4, Evagrius associates the infinite desire tending toward humility, which recalls Gregory of Nyssa's *epektasis* and which is established on the awareness of our radical poverty and God's riches. The rich are saved with the giving of alms, which win for them God's agape, and the poor are saved through poverty itself, which teaches them humility (*In Prov.* 104,19), called the "unbreakable weapon" (*Aliae sent.* 63); the demons take refuge there because they see therein their annihilation (*exoudenōsis*), but in actuality it lifts humanity up to the pinnacle of philosophy (*Tr. ad Eul.* PG 79, 110), to heaven and the choirs of angels, to the lofty height of the virtues, and prevents one from falling from there (*Octo spir. mal.* PG 79, 1164). Evagrius offers many, even psychological, reflections of great subtlety on humility, in the context of the study of virtues and vices.

In the Syriac church, the author who most intensely meditated on the concept of humility as Christ's virtue and Christian virtue was *Ephrem, who in the Greek versions that have survived well exceeds 200 occurrences of the terms *tapeinophrosynē* and *tapeinophrōn*, and who also wrote a work titled *For the Defeat of Pride;* many passages on humility are also found in the *Sermo asceticus* and in the work *In Imitation of the Proverbs,* and numerous *parenetic works directed toward monks.

In the Latin church, in addition to the work of *Hilary of Poitiers and *Ambrose of Milan (Adnès, 1152-1153), the most profound consideration of the concept of humility is found in the writings of *Augustine, a topic that has been extensively examined by O. Schaffner (*Christliche Demut. Des hl. Augustinus Lehre von der Humilitas*, Würzburg 1959) and by Reddy. In homilies 55-59 on John, e.g., commenting on the episode of the washing of the disciples' feet, or in the *De fide et Symb.* (5,11), *Augustine reflected on the Lord's *humilitas,* which was manifest in his birth and earthly life until his death, a virtue which belongs to God himself and to Christians, although it is unknown to the philosophers, in whom, as he affirms in the *En. Ps.* 31,2,18, "one can in every place find the best moral precepts, but not humility: this virtue comes from another source, namely, Christ. What else does Christ teach us, except humility," the humility that derives from God, who was manifest in Christ and upon whom are established other virtues. (See P. Adnès, *L'humilité vertu spécifiquement chrétienne d'après s. Augustin*: RevAscMyst 28 [1952] 208-223; F. Moriones, *Jesu Cristo, redentor y maestro de humildad*: Augustinus 45 [2000] 147-190; P. Langa, *La humildad en la cristología de S. Agustín*, in *Tempus Implendi Promissa*, Pamplona 2000, 301-330; *Agostino di Ippona, L'umiltà dell'amore: il commento alla lavanda dei piedi*, intr., tr. and notes by A. Montanari, Milan 2002.)

*Paul was central in Augustine's reflection on humility, who referred to himself as the least among the apostles (1 Cor 15:9) and who praised Christ's humility (Adnès, 1150) esp. in Phil 2, which Augustine meditates on in a special way, seeing therein a twofold humiliation in the assumption of humanity and the death on the cross (see A. Verwilghen, *Christologie et spiritualité selon s. Augustin. L'hymne aux Philippiens*, Paris 1985). Christ is, therefore, referred to by him as the "humble God" (*Cat. rud.* 4,8), "the humble physician" (*Serm.* 22,1), "the teacher of humility" (*Joh. tr.* 25,16; 59,1; *Serm.* 61,1; 62,1), "the way," "the foundation" and the "norm of humility" (*resp. in Joh, tr.* 5,3; *Serm.* 69,2; 60/A,11 and 68,11). Christ's humility corrects the human sin of pride, which is an orientation toward oneself, i.e., more toward nothing than toward God (*Civ. Dei* XIV, 13); it is the antidote against the tumor of pride, and it is salvific (*Serm.* 285,4; *Doc. Chr.* 1,14; R. Arbesmann, *Christ the Medicus humilis in St. Augustine*, in *Augustinus Magister,* Congrès international augustinien, Paris 1954, II, Paris 1955, 623-629, which esp. studies Augustine's sermons). Salvation is accomplished through the humble assumption of humanity by Christ, who in this way, when acting as mediator, makes us participants in his divinity (*Trin.* IV, 4; Ep. 137) through the cross (*Serm.* 75,2; 63,1-2). The humility of the *kenōsis* is a model for our own humility (*Serm.* 68; *Ep.* 118), acc. to the connected idea which was very dear to Augustine—namely, that every good thing comes not from us but rather from God's grace. Moreover, the humility of Christ's humanity continues to manifest itself in its presence in all the poor and all the humble (*Serm.* 123,3; 236,3). Christian humility indeed acquires a new value (see

Ep. 153 to Macedonius and *Sermo* 142, edited and studied by A. Wilmart, *Un développement inédit*: RAscMyst 9 [1928] 282-290) and is one of the three traits that greatly characterize the Christian, along with charity and the interiority of the experience of God (J. Bonnefoy, *L'idée du chrétien dans la doctrine augustinienne de la grâce*: RecAug 5 [1968] 41-66). Inasmuch as it is a recognition of one's small stature, humility is always open to the power of grace. Especially commenting upon the Psalms, Augustine constantly maintained his attention toward these leading virtues of the Christian (A. Costa, *El camino de la humilidad en las Enarr. sobre los salmos*: Cuadernos monásticos [1987] 23-42). Likewise for Augustine, humility is the fundamental way of relating to God, as it appears, e.g., from *Ep.* 140 and 149 and *Civ. Dei* I, 19-29 (R. Dodaro, *The Secret Justice of God and the Gift of Humility*: AugStud 24 [2003] 83-96). And in relation to God, a special aspect of humility is that which the Christian teacher must always maintain, an awareness that the only teacher is Christ, as Augustine explains in the *De magistro* (A. Michel, *La parole et la beauté dans la conception augustinienne de l'enseignement*, in *Augustin*, ed. P. Ranson, Lausanne-Paris 1988, 102-112). And in relation to this teaching Augustine opts for *humilitas* also in style, and, following the treatise *De catechizandis rudibus,* sets forth an in-depth reflection on this point in book IV of the *De doctrina Christiana,* systematizing a model for Christian behavior, marked by simplicity and clarity, with the adaptation of the form to the argument and in general the imitation of the ways of Scripture. (On the *sermo humilis* in Antiquity, see the chapter by that name in E. Auerbach, *Literary Language and Its Public*, London 1965 [German orig. 1958].)

Likewise in the writings of Augustine, as in the case of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, the excellence of humility is measured on the basis of the gravity of its opposed vice (N. Torchia, *St. Augustine's Treatment of superbia*: AugStud 18 [1987] 66-80). Pride, in fact, is connected to *cupiditas* and the *dominandi libido,* and, finally, to that *contemptus Dei,* which is the opposite of *amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui civitas Dei,* which characterizes the Christian's disposition marked by humility and which is the code of the *civitas Dei* (D. MacQueen, *Contemptus Dei: St Augustine on the Disorder of Pride*: RecAug 9 [1973] 227-293, then in *Augustine*, ed. J. Dunn - I. Harris, II, Cheltenham 1997, 43-109). The conflict between humility and pride is found in *Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, where at lines 178-309, the two are allegorized by means of *David and Goliath (M. Philonenko, *Humilitas et superbia*: RHPhR 71 [1991] 115-119). In monasticism, humility is esp. commended and associated with obedience, on the model of Christ, and, vice versa, a special aversion is reserved for *praesumptio,* which in the monastic rules of the 6th and 7th c. appears very frequently (P. Miquel, *Praesumere-praesumptio dans l'ancienne littérature monastique*: RBen 79 [1969] 424-436). The theme of humility as a Christian virtue became so typical that it was united to the rhetorical topos of the *tapeinosis* for the *captatio benevolentiae* of the exordium in the writings of *Paulinus of Nola, who in the *Natalicia* begins precisely with an assertion of Christian humility (H. Junod, *Le poète chrétien selon Paulin de Nole*: REAug 21 [1975] 13-54). One of the few positive elements of *tapeinōsis* in the pagan conception is recovered here and united to the Christian tradition on humility, which is entirely positive, because it has as its model Christ and its rationale in the creaturely status of the human being: the sublime nature of humility in Christianity is grounded in the marvelous creation and even more marvelous redemption.

A. Wilmart, *Un sermon de s. Augustin sur le précepte de la charité*: RAscMyst 2 (1921) 351-372: sermo Jacques 2,10; Wilmart 2, with crit. ed. and study; J. Saint-Martin, *Humilité et perfection selon s. Augustin*: Bibliothèque augustinienne. OEuvres de s. Augustin 3 (1949) 456; P. Adnès, *L'humilité à l'école de s. Augustin*: RAscMyst 31 (1955) 28-46; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961; S. Witek, *Pensée antique gréco-romaine et conception chrétienne de l'humilité, Roczniki teolog.-kanon.*, Lublin, Univ. cathol. 18 (1971); J. Azcona, *La doctrina agustiniana de la humildad en los Tractatus in Ioannem*, Madrid 1972; J. Azcona, *Cristo camino humilde, según san Agustín*: Augustinus 18 (1973) 317-354; I. Jamieson, *Augustine's Confessions: The Structure of Humility*: Augustiniana 24 (1974) 234-246; M.-F. Berrouard, *"Toute ton humilité consiste à reconnaître ce que tu es"*: Bibliothèque augustinienne. OEuvres de s. Augustin 72 (1977) 797-798; M.-F. Berrouard, *Le Maître de l'humilité*, ibid. 798-799; A. Verwilghen, *Le Christ Jésus, source de l'humilité chrétienne*, in S. Augustin et la Bible, ed. A.-M. La Bonnardière, Paris 1986, 427-437, Eng. tr. *Jesus Christ: Source of Christian Humility*, in *Augustine and the Bible*, ed. P. Bright, Notre Dame, IN 1999, 301-312; G. Bonner, *Christ, God and Man in the Thought of St. Augustine*, in *God's Decree and Man's Destiny. Studies on the Thought of Augustine of Hippo*, ed. G. Bonner, repr. London 1987, 268-294; M. Harl, *La langue de Japhet: La Septante et le grec des chrétiens*, Paris 1994, 199; G. Schlabach, *Augustine's Hermeneutic of Humility*: Journal of Religious Ethics 22 (1994) 299-332; P.L. MacKinnon, *Augustine's City of God: The Divided Self,* in *The Divided Ciuitas, The City of God*, ed. D.F. Donnelly, New York 1995, 319-352; M. Neusch, *Initiation à s. Augustin, maître spirituel*, Paris 1996; D. Konstan, *Problems in the History of Christian Friendship*: JECS 4 (1996) 87-113; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria Gratiae. Se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce*, Paris 1996; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Agostino: tra Etica e Religione*, Brescia 1999; D.W. Reddy, *Umiltà*, in *Agostino, Diz. Encicl.*, ed. A. Fitzgerald, Rome 2007, 1414-1422.

I. Ramelli

HUNERIC. King of the *Vandals and the Alans of *Africa (477–484). His first wife was a daughter of the *Visigothic king *Theodoric I, but shortly after Huneric married *Eudoxia, the daughter of *Valentinian III, whom earlier his (i.e., Huneric's) father *Genseric had taken as a hostage. Having succeeded Genseric, Huneric was suspicious of and hostile to all possible claimants to his throne. He at first adopted a prudently conciliating political strategy toward *Zeno and *Odoacer, respecting the African-Roman *Catholics and persecuting the *Manicheans; but then, perceiving the weakness of the *Byzantine emperor, he persecuted the non-Arian population. In 472, Eudoxia fled to *Jerusalem. *Victor of Vita (*Hist. pers.* II, 3-4.39; III, 3-14) has preserved for us three of Huneric's edicts. He died after a famine and was not succeeded by his son Hilderic, but rather by his nephew Gunthamund.

PL 58, 203, 213, 235; MGH, *Auct. ant.* III, 1.14.22.40 (K. Halm); H.-J. Diesner: PWK *Suppl.* 10, 957-962; PLRE II, 572-573; H.-J. Diesner, *Zur Katholikenverfolgung Hunerichs*: ThLZ 90 (1965) 893-896; A. Roncoroni, *Sulla morte di re Unerico (Vittore di Vita, Hist. pers. III,71)*: RomBarb 2 (1977) 247-257; E. Malaspina, *L'idrovora di Unirico. Un epigramma* (A.L. *387 R.2 = 382 Sh.B.*) *e il suo contesto storico-culturale*: RomBarb 13 (1994-95) 43-56; N. Francovich Onesti, *I Vandali. Lingua e storia*, Rome 2002.

E. Malaspina

HUNS (Lat. *Hunni, Chunni*; Greek Οὖνοι, Χοῦνοι). The historical events surrounding the Huns can be said to be reasonably certain only if we consider the decades around AD 370, i.e., from the time in which they appeared from the steppes of the Don River until the disintegration of *Attila's empire.

The Huns originally inhabited the territories to the N of China; the most ancient pieces of information date back, probably, to the 6th c. BC. Chinese sources in fact state that the Huns descended from the Hiung-nu, a Mongolian population that had settled on the borders of the Chinese empire, in Kansu and in the S part of the Gobi Desert. Their importance was established esp. starting from the 3rd c. AD and over the course of the first decades of the 4th c., i.e., when bands of Huns were able to scale the Great Wall of China, invading central China to then occupy Beijing. Shortly thereafter, these Huns were defeated by the Avars, who were advancing from the N, and the Tibetans, who came from the S, and they moved W, to the N of the Caspian Sea and on the Volga River (4th c.). From this point, some of the Huns came to the S of the Aral Sea, in the direction of Persia, although the others, pushed by other populations, continued the march W, subjecting the Alans and the *Ostrogoths, and pushing the *Visigoths, who had been frightened by their advance, to the S of the Danube River, within the borders of the Roman Empire. For a certain period, the relations between the Huns, who did not yet even have a basic unitary organization, and the empire were by necessity rather cordial. They in fact remained divided into groups that were independent of each other, under their own leaders, and had the custom of selling their military services to the emperor, patrician or the rebel *magister militum*, and they were accustomed to fight against each other when employed by opposing factions. The situation changed when in *Pannonia, Uldin asserted his authority over all the Huns, being recognized as king, and subjected numerous Germanic populations. With Uldin and his successors, esp. Rua, the relations between the Huns and the empire, both of East and West, became even more intense. The Huns, in fact, helped the Romans—after receiving ever more conspicuous sums of money from them—against the barbarian leader Gainas, who had rebelled against the yoke of the Eastern part of the empire and was defeated and killed by Uldin. They also fought against the Goths of Radagaisus in the Battle of Faesulae of 406 and against the Visigoths of Ataulf during Alaric's undertaking in *Italy.

The relations with the Roman Empire of the West increasingly strengthened following the ascension of *Aetius Flavius, who in 409 was the emperor's hostage.

When the *magister militum* Felix took Pannonia from the Huns it was Aetius who restored it to them in 431. In the meantime the kingdom of the Huns was increasingly establishing itself as a state, and this was owed, probably, to the proximity and intense collaboration that then existed with the empire.

The first signs of attrition between Romans and Huns began to appear, however, esp. under Attila, who, after his brother Bleda had been killed, became lord of the territories between Germany, the distant Danish islands and the Aral Sea, all the while entertaining hopes of subjecting the empire to his rule. His attempt, however, failed following two events: his defeat at the Battle of the Catalaunian Plains, near Challons (451), which in fact denied him his conquest over *Gaul, and the intervention of Pope *Leo I (452), which did not allow him to invade Italy.

Upon Attila's death (453), there began in the Hunnic state a process of rapid disintegration, which very early on led to its disappearance; in the subsequent centuries other groups of Huns also disappeared, who were pushed into various regions of *Asia, perhaps even to India. For later generations, the Huns were a symbol of an unusual ferocity and

destructive fury, which left the inhabitants incapable of reconstructing anything solid in places where they had annihilated the forms of existing civilization at the moment of their arrival.

Dispersed hordes of populations that at some point we can call descendants of the stock of the Huns dispersed from Mongolia and China to Gaul, from the Siberian steppes and from the N oceans to the Caucasus Mountains, the Danube and the Alps.

The apex of their historical appearance was reached, as was said, with the advent of Attila, who ruled with authority and terror and not by solid political organization. From the sources it is unclear whether there were well-defined ties that connected the subjected peoples to him; there were no central officials nor governors of provinces outside the entourage of the court; moreover, he used the services of Roman officials. Justice was administered by the king himself before the door of his palace. No mention is made in the juridical sources of the legal norms or the customs of law. Neither did there exist a tribute system, given that the revenues were obtained through the extreme sums extorted from the Roman Empire. The capital of the Hunnic Empire, situated in a place unknown to us, was nothing more than a large village and houses, as well as the imperial palace itself; all of these were made of wood, even though well elaborated. Polygamy was widespread, and the women lived in apartments where they could receive guests.

From a religious point of view, we know from *Priscus that people regarded as a fetish a sword that was lost and then found at the time of Attila, as an omen of his rule over the world. The only form of culture was represented by the songs they sang during banquets held in honor of the sovereign.

In addition to war, the Huns showed themselves adept in commerce, which they practiced with the Hiung-nu of Mongolia, the Chinese, the Persians and the Indians. In the West, they engaged in commercial relations with the Romans.

Sources: Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae,* ed. G. Viansino, Milan 2002, XXXI; Priscus and Menander Protector, *Fragm. Histor. Graec.*, ed. Mueller, Paris 1851, IV; Jordanes, *Historia Gothorum*, ed. E. Bartolini, Milan 1999.

Studies: J. Deguignes, *Histoire générale des Huns*, Paris 1756-58; H.H. Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, London 1876-88; E. von Wietersheim, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung*, Leipzig 1881; A. Solari, *Gli Unni ed Attila*, Pisa 1916; *Popoli delle steppe: Unni, Avari, Ungari*, XXXV Settimana del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo, Spoleto 1988; L. Montecchio, *I Visigoti e la rinascita culturale del secolo VII*, Perugia 2006, 16-17.

L. Montecchio

HYDATIUS (395–470). Bishop of Chaves (Aquae Flaviae, in *Gallaecia) during the 1st half of the 5th c. He carried out political activity concerning the barbarian invaders, known there as the Suebians. His *Chronicon* continues that of *Jerome from 379 to 468. For more distant years, Hydatius uses written sources and preserves the universal character which had been present in Jerome's work. But the information successively becomes firsthand and tends to limit itself to *Spain and above all to Gallaecia—a sign of his isolation. His source is important for events of the 5th c. because of the scarcity of information. He lived in a period of political upheaval; he laments the destruction brought about by the barbarians and other calamities which remind him of those predicted by the prophets of the Old Testament. He has no illusions about the state of the empire and does not see any possible solution to the pitiful state of things. The text is preserved in only one MS with corruptions in its text and in its chronology, due in part to a different method of dating events.

CPL 2263; SC 218-219; C. Molè, *Uno storico del V secolo: il vescovo Idazio*, Catania 1978; J. Campos, *Idacio, obispo de Chaves: su Chronicon*, Salamanca 1984; S. Muhlberger, *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius and the Gallic Chronicle of 452*, Leeds 1990; R.W. Burgess, *"Chronicle of Hydatius" and the "Consularia Constantinopolitana": Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1993 (new ed. with tr. and comm.); C. Cardelle de Hartmann, *Philologische Studien zur Chronik des Hydatius von Chaves*, Stuttgart 1994; S. Bodelón, *Idacio: prodigios y providencialismo en su Crónica*: MHA 17 (1996) 117-132.

M. Simonetti

HYDATIUS of Mérida (4th c.). He immediately opposed *Priscillian and his followers with great tenacity, first at the Council of *Saragossa in 380. Later, he intervened before the civil power and obtained from *Gratian a decree which would be able to attack the Priscillianists under the accusation of *Manicheism. After the fall of Gratian and the usurpation of *Maximus, he worked in Trier, together with *Ithacius of Ossonuba, for the condemnation of Priscillian, who had in the meantime appealed to Maximus. Struck by the reaction which followed the execution of Priscillian, Hydatius avoided being removed from his episcopal charge by resigning spontaneously.

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, *passim*.

S. Zincone

HYGINUS, pope (d. 140). According to *Eusebius, his pontificate lasted four years, from 136 to 140 (*HE* 4,2). The *Liber pontificalis* indicates that his homeland was Greece and that he was the son of an Athenian philosopher and himself well versed in philosophy. According to *Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* III, 4,3), during his pontificate various *gnostics arrived in Rome from the East, among them the famous *Cerdo and *Valentinus. Yet their reception into the Roman community was opposed by the Roman clergy, so that they eventually left the city. Perhaps Hyginus composed a rule for the clergy and instituted the minor orders. He died a martyr (memorial 11 January).

LP I, 56-57 and 131; DTC 7, Paris 1927, 356-57; BS VII, 652 (A. Amore); LTK³ 5, 352-353; Epapi I, 219-220 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

HYGINUS of Cordoba (4th c.). He first called *Hydatius of Mérida's attention to *Priscillianism, concerning which he tried to keep a balanced position, far from opposite extremes. He did not take part in the Council of *Saragossa in 380, where, acc. to *Sulpicius Severus, he was formally reprimanded for his reluctance to excommunicate the Priscillianists (*Chron.* II, 47). A passage of *Ambrose (*Ep.* 30 [24],12; CSEL 82, 215) attests to Hyginus's presence in *Trier, where he was among the bishops who protested against the condemnation to death inflicted on Priscillian. For this reason, he was expelled from the city and exiled by the emperor *Maximus, in spite of his advanced age.

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, 27-28.

S. Zincone

HYMENAEUS of Jerusalem (d. after 268). Bishop who participated in the Councils of *Antioch in 264 and 268 against *Paul of Samosata. He appears as the first signatory of the letter sent to Paul by six bishops, at the conclusion of the council of 264, in a final attempt to convert him.

G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate*, Louvain 1929, passim, esp. 13-19 (letter of the six bishops); P. de Navascués, *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios. Estudio histórico-teológico del cristianismo antioqueno en el siglo III*, Rome 2004.

E. Prinzivalli

HYMN – HYMNOLOGY. Two texts from the Pauline Epistles (Eph 5:19 [18] and Col 3:16) seem to attest well that the senses are equivalent, whether proper or figurative, of the three terms concerning ancient liturgical chant, namely, "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs [the Greek text has *ōdais*]."

It is clearly emblematic of continuity and interference, in the most ancient Christian hymnology, between the biblical tradition, esp. the Psalms, and the Greco-Roman poetic and religious tradition of *hymnoi* and *cantica*. Most often taking the form of a choral lyricism and songs of thanksgiving and prayers directed to a divinity, religious hymnody was already a fundamental liturgical act of the civilizations of Classical Antiquity, from the Homeric hymns to Horace's *Carmen saeculare*. In relation to the double tradition, Jewish and Greco-Roman, Christian innovation consisted in the fact that such a poetic and musical celebration, among its many forms, was directed "to Christ as to a God" (Plin., *Ep.* 96 [97], 7: *carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere;* a text explained in the sense of a song by Tertull., *Apol.* 2,5: *ad canendum Christo ut Deo*). This is also seen in the very ancient **Phos Hilaron* (3rd c.?). This celebration of the "joyous light of holy glory / from the immortal heavenly Father / heavenly and blessed / Jesus Christ" (1st strophe) versified in three strophes of four members, written in ametrical Greek prose, as other Christian hymns of the 4th and 5th c. which have been found in the papyri. We also find anapestic formations (basic foot = two short + one long accented): see OxP 15, 1786 and AmherstP 1,2 (3rd c.?). *Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus,* in its famous final hymn called "Hymn of the Holy Savior," attests to the entrance of the Christian hymn into the metrical forms of ancient poetry. "The hymn is presented as a balanced set of systems or as unequal distichs of anapestic verses, of a relatively free character and thus, perhaps, almost popular" (H.I. Marrou and J. Irigoin, notes added to the translation and comments in SC 158, Paris 1970, 192-207). If we must be cautious of the term "popular hymnology" (this has an incontestable sense only if it refers to the "Christian people"), we must not entirely reject the hypothesis which accorded relevance, perhaps excessive, to heretics in the development of Christian hymnody, transformed into an instrument (a "medium") of theological propaganda: we know of some hymns of heterodox inspiration, and this detail recalls the ancient links between hymnody and kerygma. Those of Bishop *Synesius of Cyrene are at the same time Christian and *Neoplatonic. Latin (orthodox) hymnody effectively arises as a sort of "backlighting" of the *Arian question. Several au-

thentic fragments attest to this, from the first two masters of the genre: *Hilary of Poitiers (three hymns discovered in 1885 with the distich which probably served as an epigraph for a collection in a MS at Arezzo) and above all *Ambrose of Milan. His 14 (?) hymns, generally recognized today as authentic, create an abiding "fixed form," for one and a half millennia, for the liturgy in Latin: 8 strophes of 4 iambic dimeters (iambus = short syllable + long accented syllable), generally isosyllabic (8 syllables). The Ambrosian hymn is the Christian Latin hymn par excellence; but this liturgical tradition does not exclude, among the lettered ascetics, a double divergence of form and function.

The metric hymn is cultivated with greater variety (the use of Catullian and Horatian strophes and meters) for the purpose of devout meditation, either individual or collective: such are the 12 hymns of the *Cathemerinon* of *Prudentius. It verges on an exercise of (pious) style with the hymn by *Paulinus of Nola in honor of John the Baptist (*Carm.*, 6 in hexameter: it is a *laus*) or, above all, with the poor lyrical specimen of *Sidonius on St. *Saturninus of Toulouse (*Ep.* 9,16). *Fortunatus even dedicates to the cross some hymns which have justly remained celebrated in the liturgy. The medieval production is considerable and as yet little explored, though it affirms its personality in some lively regional liturgies, as in the Spanish hymnody until the Mozarabic period (9th–10th c.).

Editions: See, for the attributed pieces, the cited authors above s.v.; we cite here only some general collections and some anthologies: G.M. Dreves - C. Blume, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, 55 vols., Leipzig 1886-1922; A.J. Mason - A.S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns*, Cambridge 1922 (repr. Hildesheim 1966); W. Bulst, *Hymni latini antiquissimi LXXV, Psalmi III*, Heidelberg 1956; Th. Wolberg, *Griechische religiose Gedichte der ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte.* Bd. 1, *Psalmen und Hymnen der Gnosis und des frühen Christentums*, Meisenheim am Glan 1971 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 40).

Studies: Origins: J. Kroll, *Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria*, Programm der Akademie von Braunsberg 1921-1922 (2nd ed. repr. Darmstadt 1962 and 1968) remains fundamental. J. Schattenmann, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus*, Munich 1965; R. Deichgraeber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit, Untersuchungen zur Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*, Göttingen 1967; K.P. Joerns, *Das hymnische Evangelium. Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung*, Leiden 1971; M. Brioso Sánchez, *Aspectos y problemas del himno cristiano primitivo*, Salamanca 1972. History of Christian hymnody: M. Simonetti, *Studi sull'innologia dei primi secoli*: Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie Scienze Morali Ser. III, vol. IV, 6 (1952) 341-484; J. Szöverffy, *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung, Ein Handbuch*, 1, *Die lateinischen Hymnen bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1964; A. Michel, *In hymnis et canticis. Culture et beauté dans l'hymnique latine chrétienne*, Paris 1976; J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, Paris 1977; J. Fontaine, *Études sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence*, Paris 1980; Id., *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien. Esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du III[e] au VI[e] siècle*, Paris 1981; A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *"Psalmi, humni" and "cantica" in Early Jewish-Christian Tradition*: SP 21 (1989) 15-26; M. Lattke, *Hymnus: Materialen zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie*, Fribourg 1991; J. Fontaine et al., *Ambroise de Milan, Hymnes*, Paris 1992; J.A. McGuckin, *At the Lighting of the Lamps: Hymns of the Ancient Church*, Oxford 1995.

J. Fontaine

HYMN of the PEARL. In the *Acts of Thomas,* a work composed in *Syriac during the 1st half of the 3rd c., a poetic composition of considerable length and beauty is preserved, delivered by Thomas while he was in prison. This so-called *Hymn of the Pearl* was perhaps originally a narrative text of Babylonian Syria, since its language attests to a non-Edessan and preclassical Syriac. In the *Hymn* the son of an Eastern king speaks to us of the mission he has just completed in the West, with the aim of retrieving a valuable pearl. Here, after he has forgotten the task assigned to him, a letter arrives from his parents which reawakens his self-perception and allows him thus to gain the pearl. He brings it back to his country, and in this way he obtains his inheritance. The themes have been interpreted as parts of a spiritual or salvific affair.

Patrologia V, 439-40; A.F.J. Klijn, *The So-Called Hymn of the Pearl*: VChr 14 (1960) 154-164; G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*, Leiden 1967; H. Poirier, *L'Hymne de la perle des "Actes de Thomas." Introduction, texte, traduction*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1981; B. Colless, *The Letter to the Hebrews and the Song of the Pearl*: Abr-Nahrain 25 (1987) 40-55; K. Beyer, *Das syrische Perlenlied. Ein Erlösungsmythos als Märchengedicht*: ZDMG 140 (1990) 234-259.

K. den Biesen

HYPATIA of Alexandria (ca. 370–415). She lived in *Alexandria straddling the 4th and 5th c. in a particular historic moment which saw the rapid evolution of the relationship between church and empire. Christianity, no longer persecuted but rather openly favored starting from *Constantine, had become with *Theodosius, thanks to the edict of 380, the official religion of the empire. The power relationships were thus inverted, esp. after 392, the year in which paganism was in fact proscribed (*CTh* XVI, 10,12). At Alexandria, in particular, a growing hostility toward the pagan religion began at that time to rise, a hostility which, at least to a certain degree, was favored and

increased when *Cyril became bishop of the city (412). It is in this context that the dramatic account of Hypatia should be read and understood. Learned, having been educated in the school of her father Theon, she was a profound expert in mathematics, astronomy and geometry. It seems that the invention of certain scientific instruments should be attributed to her, such as the flat astrolabe, the hydroscope and the aerometer. In her writings, unfortunately lost, she commented on the works of Diophantus, Apollonius of Perga, Claudius Ptolemy and Euclid. A philosopher, she was considered by her contemporaries as the third great schoolmaster of *Platonism after Plato and *Plotinus. She taught in her city, perhaps occupying a seat of philosophy there (Marrou), and gathered around herself a scientific circle of scholars. *Synesius of Cyrene, who was her student, kept an emotional memory of this woman, famous for her profound culture, austere lifestyle and renowned beauty: "mother, sister, teacher and benefactress together, the height of everything which can be honored with words and deeds" (*Ep.* XVI).

The gifts just mentioned procured Hypatia a sincere esteem among a large part of her fellow citizens (not just pagan), but also brought about the preoccupied attention of Cyril and the hatred of bands of fanatics. The bishop, who already could barely tolerate the success of the *Neoplatonic teaching of Hypatia, seems to have held her responsible for the failure of his attempt at reconciliation with the prefect Orestes, an authority with which he had entered into conflict because of certain troubles which had taken place in the city (414–415), who was known to willingly seek the advice of Hypatia. Whatever role Cyril had in directing and inflaming public opinion, it is a fact that in the spring of 415 a band of *parabalani* monks, guided by a lector named Peter, attacked Hypatia while she was returning home, captured her, beat her, then dragged her body into a church, named *Caesareum,* and cut her flesh apart with sharp tiles. The remains were then carried to a place called *Cinaron* and burned. The school of Hypatia then dispersed, and no memory of her students remains except for Synesius, converted to Christianity and then elected bishop of Cyrene.

The particular events which distinguished the life and, above all, the death of this woman have caused her to be chosen as a symbol of various kinds of claims (freedom of thought, culture against obscurantism, feminism etc.) with the obvious consequences which this implies. Consigned to literature and poetry, but also elected as "patron" of scientific, philosophical or generically cultural circles, she is even today made the object of continual "rereadings," not always backed up by serious historical investigation. The principal ancient sources for knowledge of her tormented biography are however to be found in *Socrates Scholasticus (*HE* 7,15, 5), *Philostorgius (*HE* VIII, 9), *Damascius (*Vita Isidori*, cf. *Suda* 166 and Photius, *Bibliotheca* 181), *John Malalas (359), *John of Nikiu (*Chron.* 84. 100-102) and *Theophanes (*Chron.* 5906).

H.I. Marrou, *Sinesio di Cirene e il neoplatonismo alessandrino*, in *Il conflitto tra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel secolo IV*, *Saggi*, ed. by A. Momigliano, It. tr. Turin 1968, 141-164; PLRE 2, 575-6; M. Luzi, *Libro di Ipazia*, Milan 1978; M. Deakin, *Hypatia and Her Mathematics*: The American Mathematical Monthly 101, 3 (1994) 234-243; J. Rougé, *La politique de Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le meurtre d'Hypatie*: Cristianesimo nella storia 11 (1990) 485-504; E. Gajeri, *Ipazia, un mito*, Rome 1992; G. Beretta, *Ipazia d'Alessandria*, Rome 1993; S. Ronchey, *Ipazia. l'intellettuale*, in A. Fraschetti (ed. by), *Roma al femminile*, Rome 1994, 213-258; M. Dzielska, *Hypatia of Alexandria*, Harvard, MA 1995; H. Harich-Scharzebauer, *Hypatia von Alexandria. Das Kleid der Philosophin*: Metis 14 (1998) 31-38; L. Canfora, *Un mestiere pericoloso. La vita quotidiana dei filosofi greci*, Palermo 2000, 196-203; A. Petta, *Ipazia, scienziata alessandrina*, Milan 2004.

E. Zocca

HYPATIUS (ca. 336–446; feast 17 June). From a good *Phrygian family, he lived as a shepherd in *Thrace where, having become a monk, he dedicated himself to the care of the sick along with a soldier named Jonah. Around 400, having traveled to Constantinople, he reconciled with his father and took up residence, with some companions, in the Rufinian monastery, founded on the Asian shore, S of *Chalcedon, in 394 by the minister Rufinus (d. 395), later abandoned by the founding Egyptian monks (R. Janin, *Les Églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins*, Paris 1975, 36-40). There he became the *hegumen of an important community, protected by the court and rather close to the poor. He had influence with the emperor *Theodosius. He took the part of *Alexander the Acoemete against *Nestorius. His disciple *Callinicus wrote his life (ed. G.J.M. Bartelink, *Callinicus*, *Vie d'Hypatios*, SC 177, Paris 1971).

CPG 6042/BHG 760; A. J. Festugière, *Les Moines d'Orient* II, Paris 1961, 13-82; G. Dagron, *Les moines et la ville*: Travaux et Mémoires 4 (1970) 229-276; E. Woelfle, *Hypatios. Leben und Bedeutung des Abtes von Rufiniane*, Heidelberg 1984; Id., *Der Abt Hypatios von Ruphinianai und der Akoimete Alexander*: ByzZ 79 (1986) 302-309.

J. Gribomont

HYPATIUS of Ephesus (2nd half 5th c.–after 537/538). Metropolitan of Ephesus from 531. In 532 he

took part as spokesman of the Catholic bishops in the dispute with the *monophysites, the so-called *collatio cum Severianis,* called by the emperor. A year later he went as delegate of *Justinian to see Pope *John II and obtained his commitment to the *theopaschite formula together with the condemnation of the *acoemetae monks, who opposed this formula strongly. At the Constantinopolitan synod of 536 he spoke in the name of all the bishops present against the patriarch *Anthimus, who was deposed because of his monophysitism. Beyond an episcopal decree on Christian burial, which has been preserved carved on stone, Hypatius wrote Συμμικτὰ ζητήματα (*Quaestiones miscellaneae*) in which he answered the questions raised by Atramyttium, his colleague in the episcopate. Hypatius composed commentaries on the Psalms, on the Minor Prophets and on the gospel of Luke. In the theological disputes in which he took part, Hypatius always distinguished himself for the defense of the Council of *Chalcedon and the formula of the two natures. Therefore he can rightly be considered a Chalcedonian "of the strict observance" in the same way as *Leontius of Byzantium and *Heraclian of Chalcedon.

CPG III, 6805-6807; F. Diekamp, *Analecta patristica*, Rome 1938, 109-126 (the *decretum de mortuis sepeliendis* on p. 126; the fragments of the writings and the commentaries on pp. 127-153); P.J. Alexander, *Hypatius of Ephesus: A Note on Image Worship in the Sixth Century*: HThR 45 (1952) 177-184; J. Gouillard, *Hypatios d'Ephèse ou du Pseudo-Denys à Théodore Studite*: REByz 19 (1961) 63-75; S. Brock, *The Conversation with the Syrian Orthodox Under Justinian* (532): OCP 47 (1981) 87-121; J. Speigl, *Das Religionsgeschpräch mit den severianischen Bischöfen in Kostantinopel im Jahre 532*: AHC 16 (1984) 264-285; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, II/2, London 1995, 230-248.

J. Irmscher

HYPERECHIUS (5th c.). Absolutely nothing is known of the life of this holy monk, who lived with all likelihood in the 5th c. He left an *Exhortation to Monks,* a collection, preserved in Greek, of 160 spiritual sentences related to the exercise of the various monastic virtues (PG 79, 1473-1489). The alphabetic collection of the **Apophthegmata Patrum,* in the part dedicated to Hyperechius (PG 65, 429-439) has only preserved eight *logia,* coming from the *Exhortation*. A number of other *logia*, preserved in other anonymous and systematic collections of the apophthegmata, have been identifies through recent studies of the ascetic-monastic edifying literature.

CPG 5618; PG 79, 1473-1489; BS 7, 863-864; J.Cl. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum* (Subs. Hagiogr. 36), Brussels 1962 (see index); L. Regnault, *Les sentences des Pères du désert*, *Troisième recueil et tables*, Solesmes 1976, 242-243; Fr. tr. F. Poswick: Collectanea Cistercensia 32 (1970) 245-255.

J.-M. Sauget

HYPOSTASIS. As a technical term, *hypostasis* is found first in the Greek natural sciences, meaning sediment in a liquid. Behind this is a twofold idea, solidification and visibility, which appears in every use of the word, with one aspect or the other predominating. Thus, in the Greek Bible, *hypostasis* refers in particular to true reality (see Heb 1:3; 3:14; 11:1); the *Stoic tradition sees in the *hypostasis* the last individualization of the primordial essence; it is likewise present in *Neoplatonic tradition, i.e., from *Porphyry on—not yet in *Plotinus (Hammerstaedt 994 f.)—though on an entirely spiritual level and with a nuance of progression. The same is true for the technical use of the term which the Christian authors employ—always confronting the three traditions mentioned—in *trinitarian theology and then in *christology. Taken up by the *Origenian tradition, just as *ousia* (Hammerstaedt 1005-6) in order to emphasize the three divine realities in an anti-*Sabellian way (see Orig., *Cels*. 8,12; Jo 2,10,75), *hypostasis* found a more ample consensus in the Synod of *Alexandria (362). The Cappadocians, who contrasted the three *hypostases* with the one nature, the formula sanctioned also by the Council of *Constantinople (381) (COeD 24), nevertheless explained the term by emphasizing its characteristic aspect, individuality. Based on the new interpretation of the concept of *hypostasis,* Basil, and later *Cyril of Alexandria, compared the trinitarian usage with the Porphyrian doctrine of the three *hypostases* (Hammerstaedt 1029-30). In the same period, *Apollinaris of Laodicea introduced the term in christology, emphasizing by it the one reality of Christ. *Hypostasis* with this meaning became prominent through Cyril of Alexandria. Clearly distinguished from "nature," it entered also into the faith of *Chalcedon (DS 302). Nevertheless, in later discussions, in which there was an awareness that both of the natures in Christ, as *Nestorius had intended, must be hypostatic, i.e., individual, the Byzantine authors emphasized in the *hypostasis* the aspect of subsistence (καθ' ἑαυτόν), as well as that of characterizing property, so as to be able to use the term justly in both trinitarian theology and in christology (*see* *hypostatic union).

DTC 7 (1922) 369-437: TWNT 8, 571-588 (TDNT 8, 572-589); B. Studer, HWPh 3 (1974) 1255-1259 (bibl.); A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Freiburg 1979; A. de Halleux, *Personalisme ou essentialisme trinitaire chez les Pères cappado-*

ciens?: RTL 17 (1986) 129-155; 165-192; G. Bausenhart, "*In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde." Studien zum Beitrag Maximus des Bekenners zur altchristlichen Christologie*, Mainz 1992 (bibl.); H. Ziebritzki, *Hl. Geist und Weltseele. Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Tübingen 1994; J. Hammerstaedt, *Hypostase*: RAC 16 (1994) 986-1035 (fundamental); P. Hünermann, *Hypostase, hypostatische Union*: LTK³ 5, 371-373; L. Turcescu, *"Prosopon" and "Hypostasis" in Basil of Caesarea's "Against Eunomius" and the "Epistles"*: VChr 51 (1997) 374-395; M. Erler: RGG 3 (2000) 1980-1 (bibl.).

B. Studer

HYPOSTATIC UNION. In simple terms, the hypostatic union consists in the fact that the Son of God is the subject of everything that the Bible maintains about Christ, both the affirmations about the divine, and those concerning the human. Speaking with more precision, the theological statement "hypostatic union" expresses the concept for which the second *hypostasis* of the *Trinity was united to a perfect and concrete human nature in such a way as to constitute through it the principle of incommunicable subsistence and to be the subject of its natural and individual properties. The very subtle doctrine was conceived on the line with the "high *christology," which insists on the eternal preexistence of Christ, and esp. the doctrine on the *communicatio idiomatum* in the strict sense (God born and died, *Theotokos etc.), sanctioned also by the Council of *Ephesus (431). In a certain sense, it was also anticipated by those who insisted, like *Augustine, on the fact that the Son alone became incarnate (see Studer, *Una persona*). It is not, however, explicitly expressed in the faith of *Chalcedon, as is often claimed. It constitutes, instead, the nucleus of the perception of the faith of Chalcedon, which was reached substantially in the first decades of the 6th c. Three groups of bishops and theologians contributed to its intricate elaboration, although in a different way: the group of the so-called *monophysites in the entourage of *Severus of Antioch, who defended *Cyril of Alexandria's profound intuition, which was expressed with the christological formulas "the Logos suffered in the flesh," "one of the Trinity suffered," the "union acc. to the *hypostasis*" and even "one nature of the incarnate Logos"; the group of the so-called Neo-chalcedonians, which was represented esp. by *John of Scythopolis and *Leontius of Jerusalem, who had the onus of harmonizing thus the Cyrillian formulas with the Chalcedonian distinction between φύσις and ὑπόστασις; the group of the Chalcedonians with *Ephrem of Antioch and *Leontius of Byzantium, who sought to develop through the patristic tradition and the dialectic of that time the aforementioned distinction forwarded by the Council of Chalcedon (for the phases of the development of the doctrine, see Moeller, *Chalcédonisme*).

The doctrine of the hypostatic union, which resulted from these complicated and difficult discussions, was not received by the first group, who, however, emphasized the unitive intuition of *Cyril of Alexandria—also present in the faith of Chalcedon—as well as the distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις / φύσις (see Grillmeier, *Christus* II/2, 154). It was, however, accepted by the second group, which was more disposed to a doctrinal compromise, and also by the third group, which was much more integralist. It was even imposed by the emperor *Justinian as the sole faith of the empire. The 2nd Council of *Constantinople (553) also sanctioned it (DS 426). Subsequent authoritative theologians such as the author of the *De Sectis* and *Anastasius patriarch of Antioch attest the extent to which the hypostatic union became the common heritage of Byzantine orthodoxy. In the *monothelite controversy it was subsequently perfected in the sense that the second divine *hypostasis* was also declared to be the subject of the two wills of Christ, namely, the divine and human wills (DS 553-559). This affirmation also substantially held for the Latin churches. Already in 534, Pope *John II had approved the formula **Unus ex Trinitate passus est,* which in the end had anticipated the dogma of the hypostatic union (DS 401-402). The same also held true for *Boethius. Although having some difficulties with the condemnation of the *Three Chapters, Pope *Vigilius and esp. *Facundus of Hermiane and *Rusticus appropriated the doctrine of the Word subsistent in the human nature. *Gregory followed them, inasmuch as he accepted the authority of the fifth ecumenical council. The subsequent councils, similarly, in which the Westerners also participated, the Lateran Synod of 649 and the 3rd Council of Constantinople of 681, moved along the same lines. The complete reception of the faith of Chalcedon, however, would occur in the West only during the Middle Ages.

The particular explanations of the hypostatic union had to do with the request for a technical terminology that was valid both for the trinitarian mystery and the mystery of the *incarnation. Applying to christology the distinction φύσις / κοινόν and ὑπόστασις / ἰδιόματα, introduced in the 4th c. for the trinitarian faith, it risked conceiving of the divine *hypostases* as natures or essences, or rather of attributing natural characteristics to the *hypostasis* of Christ. On the one hand, theology needed a concept of individual human nature (φύσις ἰδική) and, on the other, it needed a concept of *hypostasis* purely

subsistent (καθ' ἑαυτὸν εἶναι) (Studer, *Gott*, 326-327, with references to Leontius of Byzantium, *Epilysis*: PG 86/2, 1971 CD.1945B, and Leontius of Jerusalem, *Adv. Nest.* I, 1: PG 86/1, 1414C. I, 20: PG 86/1, 1485B-D). Only with these two conditions in mind are we able to avoid both *tritheism and *theopaschitism. There is no doubt that these reflections remained very far from the *Bible; that is to say, they were very abstract and hardly *soteriological. Nevertheless, they intended to retain the ancient faith acc. to which neither an angel nor a man but God died for us. They even expressed an idea that was dear to *Augustine—namely, that our obedience toward God is supported by the obedience of the eternal Son, who became man (see Studer, *Gott*, 253ff.).

DTC 7, 437-568; LTK³ 5, 371-377 (with respect to the historical aspect, it remains inadequate). C. Moeller, *Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VIᵉ siécle: Chalkedon I*, Würzburg 1951, 637-720; S. Otto, *Person und Subsistenz*, Munich 1968; B. Studer, *Una Persona in Christo. Ein augustinisches Thema bei Leo dem Grossen*: AugR 25 (1985) 453-487; Grillmeier II/1-4, Freiburg 1986-2002 (see in the indexes the term hypostasis); B. Studer, *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der Alten Kirche*, Düsseldorf 1985, 262-283 (with studies and texts).

B. Studer

HYPSISTARIANS. *Gregory of Nyssa calls them *hypsistians*, having their name derived from ὕψιστον, inasmuch as they venerate God as the sole παντοκράτωρ, while not recognizing him to be Father (*Eun.* II: PG 45, 484). *Gregory of Nazianzus is, above all, the one who deals with them, given that his father had adhered to this sect before converting to Christianity; he calls them *hypsistarians*. Their doctrine presents itself as a collection of pagan and Jewish elements: from the former they took their veneration for fire and lights and rejected the cult of idols and sacrifices; from the latter they accepted the observance of the Sabbath and abstinence from certain foods, but circumcision was rejected (*Or.* 18,5: PG 35, 992).

C. Roberts - T.C. Skeat - A.D. Nock, *The Gild of Zeus Hypsistes*: HThR 29 (1936) 39-87.

F. Cocchini

HYSTASPES, Book of. The *Book of Hystaspes* is cited for the first time toward the middle of the 2nd c. AD, as an authoritative pagan prophetical work alongside the Sibyl and the biblical prophets, by *Justin Martyr, who informs us that its readers were liable to the death penalty (1 *Apol.* 20,1; 44,12). The *Book of Hystaspes* was notoriously a dangerous work and must have been particularly disquieting in the eyes of the political authorities because it contained, among other things, a prophecy of the end of the Roman Empire which is known to us from *Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* VII, 15,19). Lactantius reports from the same work another *eschatological prophecy, concerning the final salvific intervention of the supreme God in favor of pious and faithful men who invoke with groaning his protection against the impious and sinners (*Div. Inst.* VII, 8,1-2).

From this scarce information it is presumed with reasonable certainty that we are dealing with a *pseudepigraphic apocalypse of Zoroastrian origins, put under the ancient prestigious name of Hystaspes, father of Darius, contemporary of Zoroaster (6th c. BC), but composed in reality, like the contemporaneous apocalypse which *Elkesai had received from the Seres of Parthia (see Hippolytus, *Ref. omn. haer*. IX, 13,1 and IX, 16,4). This was during the time of *Trajan (beginning of the 2nd c. AD), occurring in the context of the confrontation between the Parthian Empire and the Roman Empire. In it the anti-Roman hatred and desire for liberty and revenge of the Mesopotamian world found expression. From this point of view, despite the notable analogies which it presents with the Jewish apocalyptic literature and its pseudepigraphic disguises (consider the prophecies of the book of Daniel or the Jewish *Sibylline Oracles*), the traditional hypothesis of a direct and exclusive Jewish origin appears completely unfounded (widespread between the 19th and 20th c., it has recently been defended, among others, by Gignoux and Flusser, who even considers it the source of the Johannine Apocalypse).

Also the current title, *Oracles of Hystaspes,* introduced by Windisch, should be rejected, as derived from an evident error in translation: the Greek expression *chrēseis Hystaspou* used by the Byzantine epitomator of the *Theosophia* (ed. Beatrice, 3) means in fact that in this work were contained not "oracles" (*chrēsmoi*/*vaticinia*, *oracula*) but "excerpts" (*excerpta*, extracts or citations) of the book of Hystaspes. The original title seems to have been rather *Book of the Wisdom of Hystaspes.*

The eschatological doctrine of the *Book of Hystaspes,* with its characteristic prophecy of the end of the Roman Empire, was perfectly integrated in the *millenaristic conception of Lactantius (this important aspect of the thought of Lactantius is unfortunately completely ignored by E. DePalma Digeser, *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome*, Ithaca-London 2000, with the negative consequences which are easy to imagine for the overall interpretation of the political theology of Lactantius

and its relationship with *Constantine). According to Lactantius, Hystaspes should be counted among the pagan prophets of the Christian truth (see *Epitome* 68,2), even if, in contrast to the Sibyl and Hermes Trismegistus, Hystaspes kept silence, through the trickery of the demons, about the fundamental doctrine of the salvific work of the Liberator sent by God. The silence concerning the Son of God is the proof that Lactantius, at the beginning of the 4th c., still had in his hands the original Zoroastrian redaction of the work.

But already from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. there are certain testimonies to the existence of a "Christianized" version of the *Book of Hystaspes* which pivots justly on the figure of Christ and his eschatological intervention. This version was elaborated in order to facilitate the penetration of Christian missionary propaganda in geographic areas marked by a strong Zoroastrian presence (Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia), analogously to what had been done through the false oracles of the pagan gods and of the Sibyls in the Greco-Roman world. *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*. VI, 5,42,3-43,2), our oldest source, reports that the apostle Paul (in all likelihood he is alluding to a lost section of the apocryphal *Acts of Paul*) invited his listeners to read the books of the pagans. Besides the Sibyl, they were encouraged esp. to read the *Book of Hystaspes,* where they would find confirmation of his preaching on the eschatological mission of the Son of God (For the interpretive problems posed by this Clementine passage, see Zamagni, 74-96.) Mani, heir of the Elkesaite tradition, knew this work and cited it as *Testimony of Hystaspes on the Beloved* (*the Christ*) in his *Book of the Mysteries* (see the *Fihrist* of al-Nadim, ed. B. Dodge, 797). Among the extracts of the Christianized version of the *Book of Hystaspes* reproduced in the 4th book of the *Theosophia,* there was the famous prophecy of Zoroaster to Hystaspes on the coming of the Messiah (ed. Beatrice, 73-74).

H. Windisch, *Die Orakel des Hystaspes*, Amsterdam 1929; J. Bidez - F. Cumont, *Les Mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque*, Paris 1938; J.R. Hinnells, *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman World: A Study of the Oracle of Hystaspes*, in E. Sharpe - J.R. Hinnells (eds.), *Man and His Salvation: Studies in Memory of S.G.F. Brandon*, Manchester 1973, 125-148; D. Flusser, *Hystaspes and John of Patmos*, in *Irano-Judaica: Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture Throughout the Ages*, ed. Sh. Shaked, Jerusalem 1982, 12-75; C. Colpe, *Hystaspes*: RAC 16 (1994) 1056-1082; M. Perrin, *Lactance et la culture grecque. Esquisse d'une problématique*, in B. Pouderon - J. Doré (eds.), *Les Apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, Théol. Hist. 105, Paris 1998, 297-313; P.F. Beatrice, *Le livre d'Hystaspe aux mains des Chrétiens*, in C. Bonnet - A. Motte (eds.), *Les syncrétismes religieux dans le monde méditerranéen antique*. Actes du Colloque International en l'honneur de Franz Cumont (Institut historique Belge de Rome. Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire anciennes 36), Brussels-Rome 1999, 357-382 (bibl.); C. Zamagni - A. D'Anna, *Accertamenti sul "Kerygma Paulou,"* in *Pietro e Paolo. Il loro rapporto con Roma nelle testimonianze antiche*: SEA 74 (2001) 67-123; P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia: An Attempt at Reconstruction,* VChrS 56, Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2001; Id., *Forgery, Propaganda and Power in Christian Antiquity: Some Methodological Remarks*, in *Alvarium. Festschrift Chr. Gnilka* (JAC-Erg. Bd. 33), Münster 2002, 39-51.

P.F. Beatrice

I

IAMBLICHUS (d. ca. 325). *Neoplatonic philosopher. He was born at Chalcis, in Celesyria (a region probably situated at the borders of modern Lebanon or in the N of Syria), in the 2nd half of the 3rd c., and he died around 325. The scarce information about his life derives from Eunapius (*Vitae Sophistarum* V, 10,17–17,7) and, in a very small part, from hints contained within his works. The biographical narration of Eunapius appears to be largely legendary, and the certain historic elements come down to two: Iamblichus was initially a student of one of the first disciples of *Porphyry, specifically of the peripatetic Anatolius; later he became himself a student of Porphyry, whom he succeeded in the direction of the Neoplatonic school.

From his works, which must have been extensive, four writings remain, making up part of a "collection of Pythagorean opinions," and specifically *The Life of Pythagoras, Protrepticus, De Communi mathematica scientia* and *In Nichomachi Arithmeticam Introductionem;* a treatise on the *Mysteries of the Egyptians;* large fragments of a *De anima* (preserved in the anthology of Stobaeus); and finally some letters *On Destiny* and *On the Dialectic*. Within the Neoplatonic school Iamblichus appears as an innovator who stands out clearly from his predecessors. While a profound harmony prevailed in *Plotinus between rationalism and mystical exigencies, in Porphyry a compromise was already seen between the Plotinian teaching and the new Pythagorean-Chaldean influences, and Iamblichus moves overwhelmingly to a new philosophical approach. If the fundamental point of Plotinian Neoplatonism had been the salvation of souls through the power of the *Logos,* which reveals Being and purifies from the passions, acc. to Iamblichus one approaches Being by means of magic rites, with the use of divination and occult practices, with incantations which force the gods to descend into the priests and into statues (*theurgy). It is possible that in this new systemization of the Neoplatonic philosophy by means of a series of complex rituals Iamblichus demonstrates a kind of reaction to the spread of Christianity, which he opposes with a new form of religious and ritual philosophy.

The work of Iamblichus had a very profound influence on later Neoplatonists, and in particular on the school of Athens, from Plutarch of Athens up to Proclus and Damascius.

Editions: *Protrepticus*, H. Pistelli (Teubn.), Leipzig 1888, É. Des Places, Paris 1989 (with Fr. tr.); *De communi mathematica scientia*, N. Festa (Teubn.), Leipzig 1891; *De Vita pythagorica liber*, L. Deubner (Teubn.), Leipzig 1937, M. Von Albrecht, Zurich-Stuttgart 1963 (with Ger. tr.); *In Nichomachi arithmeticam introductionem*, H. Pistelli (Teubn.), Leipzig 1894; *De mysteriis*, É. des Places, Paris 1966 (with Fr. tr.); *Iamblichi Chalcidensis Fragmenta*, J.M. Dillon, Leiden 1973 (with Engl. tr.); *Summa pitagorica: Vita di Pitagora; Esortazione alla filosofia; Scienza matematica comune; Introduzione all'aritmetica di Nicomaco; Teologia dell'aritmetica*, intr., It. tr., notes and apparatus by F. Romano, Milan 2006.

Studies: J. Bidez, *Le philosophe Jamblique et son école*: REG 32 (1919) 29-40; *De Jamblique à Proclus*, Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 21, Geneva 1975; H.J. Blumenthal - E.G. Clark (ed.), *The Divine Iamblichus*, *Philosopher and Man of Gods*, Bristol 1993; G. Shaw, *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*, University Park, PA 1995; D.P. Taormina, *Jamblique, critique de Plotin et de Porphyre. Quatre études*, Paris 1999; G. Staab, *Pythagoras in der Spätantike, Studien zu* De Vita Pythagorica *des Iamblichos von Chalkis*, Munich 2002.

M. Conti

IBAS of Edessa (d. 457). Bishop of *Edessa (*Osroene), ca. 435–457. He was a professor at the school of the Persians in Edessa at the time of *Rabbula (ca. 415–435), whom he accompanied to *Ephesus for the council of 431. A convinced anti-Cyrillian and partisan of *Nestorius and of the traditional positions of the school of *Antioch, Ibas (in Syriac Yehiba) was certainly not in good relations with his bishop, and because of this he was expelled from the school and from Edessa. While in exile he wrote the christological letter—though some doubt his

authorship—which was sent to Maris (CPG 6500), probably Mar Dadisho, bishop of Rewardasir in Persia. When Rabbula died in 435, at the time when the christological questions were passing through an acute stage, Ibas replaced him in the see of Edessa (435–457). Ibas was unable to bring about the unity of the clergy; in fact, he was accused of numerous faults by four of his priests in the synods held in Antioch (445 and 446); defended by a large part of his clergy, he was absolved by the Synods (or two sessions of the same council) of *Tyre and Beirut in 448/449, where the *Letter to Maris* was read. Among other things, he was accused of having called *Cyril of Alexandria a heretic. Ibas promised on this occasion to pardon his accusers and to occupy himself in pastoral activity. Upon his return to his see, he found popular opposition in favor of *monophysite doctrine. Absent from the turbulent Synod of Ephesus (*latrocinium*) in 449, he was condemned together with *Flavian of Constantinople, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and five other bishops. He was sent into exile and replaced in his see by *Nonnus. Just two years later, the Council of *Chalcedon, in 451, thanks to the Roman legates, recognized him as orthodox and reestablished him as head of his church, which he governed until his death on 28 October 457. The death of Ibas was certainly an opportunity to expel from Edessa his most enthusiastic supporters (professors and students), who fled to *Nisibis. The school of the Persians developed in this city when the school in Edessa was definitively closed in 489 by order of the emperor *Zeno.

According to the catalog of Abdisho of Nisibis, a *Commentary on Proverbs, Homilies* and *Hymns* were attributed to Ibas, as well as a polemical treatise. His letter to Maris, mentioned above (which is preserved only in a Greek translation, contained in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, and in a Latin translation), was finally condemned, at the time of the emperor *Justinian, by the Council of Constantinople in 553, which thus put an end to the painful question of the *Three Chapters (*Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas). With his disciples Kumi and Pruba, Ibas had translated from Greek into Syriac the commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Old and New Testaments, the works of *Diodore of Tarsus and of Aristotle.

CPG 6500-6501; ACO II, 1, 3 (*Ep. ad Marim Persam*), 227-229; 'Abdīšo', *Catalogus librorum syrorum*, 61 (Assemani 32-34; ACO IV, 3, 1, 265-266; ACO IV, 3, 2; *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Or. III, 1, Rome 1725, 85-86); Labourt 131-137, 254-261, *passim*; Duval 76-77, 247, 314, 341-342, 345; J. Flemming, *Akten der ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*, AAWG, Berlin 1917 (Göttingen 1970); R. Devreesse, *Le début de la querelle des Trois-Chapitres: la lettre d'Ibas et le tome de Proclus*: RSR 11 (1931) 543-565; A. d'Ales, *La lettre d'Ibas à Marès le Persan*: RecSR 22 (1932) 5-25; M. van Esbroeck, *Who Is Mari, the Addressee of Ibas' Letter?*: JTS 38 (1987) 129-135; Patrologia V, 191-192; S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-ecclesiastici in Oriente nella tarda antichità: Il II Concilio di Efeso* (449), Madrid 2001, passim.

J.-M. Sauget

IBERIA (Lat. *Iberia* or *Hiberia*). The ancients distinguished two Iberias. One was the territory also called Hispania, S of the Pyrenees (*see* *Spain); the other was one part of the area of the Caucasus, corresponding approximately to the E part of what is now the Republic of Georgia (Kartli) (Appianus, *Mithr*. 101), while the W part corresponds to Colchis. The two areas are separated by mountainous zones (Surami Ridge). The Iberia of the Caucusus was bordered to the E by Albania (Azerbaijan), to the S by Armenia and to the W by Colchis on the Black Sea. It was crossed by the river Kyros-Cyrus (today Mtkvari), which empties into the Caspian Sea. The principal city was Hermastus, which already in the High Middle Ages became Tifilis (Photius, Bibl., cod. 26b)—today Tiflis (Tbilisi). From the time of Pompey it was under Roman influence but from the 4th c. was controlled by Sassanian Persia. It was Christianized in the 1st half of the 4th c., becoming officially Christian around 337 due esp. to S. Nino (Nouné), a Roman prisoner. At that time, the king of the Iberians asked the emperor *Constantine for a bishop and priests and had the first Christian church constructed (see Ruf., *HE* I, 10: PL 21, 480-481; Theodoret, *HE* I, 23: PG 82, 972-974; Socr., *HE* I, 20: PG 67, 129-133; Soz., *HE* 2,7: PG 67, 949-955). The *Georgian language, formerly only oral, developed into a written language with the conversion to Christianity. For the literature and archaeology, *see* *Georgia.

PWK Suppl. IX, 1899-1911; RAC 17, 12-106; TRE 12, 389ff.; M. van Esbroeck, RAC, Suppl. 1985, 257-266; D. Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity. A History of Colchis and Transcausian Iberia 550-AD 562*, Oxford 1994; N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le Grand Schisme d'Orient*, CSCO 574, subs. 100, Louvain 1999; *Santa Nino e la Georgia. Storia e spiritualità cristiana nel Paese del Vello d'oro*, Atti del I Conv. Int. di studi georgiani, ed. by Gaga Shurgaia, Rome 2000; E.M. Synek, *Georgia's Conversion to Its Female Apostle*, in *Christianizing People and Converting*, ed. by G. Armstrong - I.N. Wood, Turnhout 2000, 3-13.

A. Di Berardino

ICONIUM

I. City - II. Councils.

I. City. Ikonion (Iconium, today Konya), acc. to Xenophon (*Anab*. I, 2,19) the westernmost city of

*Phrygia, in later authors the capital of Lycaonia (see Strab., *Geogr.* XII, 568c; Plin., *Nat. Hist.* V, 95: *urbs celeberrima*): see also Acts 13:51 and 14:1 (a populous city of Greeks and Jews) or else of Pisidia (Ammianus 17,2,1; Basil, *Ep.* 138). Under Claudius it had the name Claudiconium. It became a Roman colony at the time of *Hadrian (between 130 and 138) with the name Colonia Helia Hadriana Augusta Iconiensium. With the reform of *Diocletian the province of Pisidia was constituted with *Antioch as capital and Iconium as "the largest after the capital" (Basil, *Ep.* 138). Ca. 373 it was the metropolis of the province of Lycaonia, and *Amphilochius was the first metropolitan. It was Christianized in the apostolic era by Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14). A man named Hierax of Iconium was a martyr with *Justin in Rome in 163. The story of St. *Thecla is also set in Iconium. Bishops: Terence (martyr); Caronotus (martyr); Celsus (264–269); Nicomas; Peter (314); Eulalius (at Nicaea); Faustinus (372); John (375); Amphilochius (375–ca. 400, one of the great Cappadocians); Valerianus (431); Onesiphorus (449–451, at Chalcedon); Palladius; Theodulus; Theodorus; Paul (680); Elijah (692).

W. Ruge, *Ikonion*: PWK IX, 1, 990-991; W.M. Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul*, London 1907, 317-384; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford [2]1971, 127 and 135. For the bishops, see Fedalto 1, 266; DHGE 25, 761-796.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Councils. *Ca. 230–235*. In this period a council was held in Iconium which united bishops of Phrygia, *Galatia, *Cilicia and neighboring regions. *Firmilian of Caesarea (of Cappadocia) also participated, in order to examine the validity of baptism administered by the heretics, above all by *Montanists. The council decreed that such baptism was not to be considered valid, and therefore those upon whom it had been conferred had to be rebaptized.

376. In the context of the controversies of the *Arians and *pneumatomachoi,* a local council presided over by Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, friend and collaborator of *Basil, confirmed the validity of the Nicene Creed of 325, condemned the Arians and the *pneumatomachoi* and proposed a theology regarding the *Trinity and the *Holy Spirit which was perfectly orthodox and adhered to the theology of Basil. We know of it through the synodal letter which has come down to us (PG 39, 93ff.).

230–235: Hfl-Lecl 1, 1, 159-161; *376*: Hfl-Lecl 1, 2, 983; Palazzini 1, 175-177; K. Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern*, Tübingen 1904, 25; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988.

M. Simonetti

ICONOGRAPHY – ICONOLOGY. Especially after the research carried out in the 1930s by Aby Warburg, Fritz Saxl and Erwin Panofsky, the terms *iconography* and *iconology* delimit two different even if interdependent methods of investigation applied to the study of a figurative work. Iconographic investigation has as its immediate goal the verification and analysis of the elements which constitute any given figurative object, by which it individuates the scheme of the composition in all its components as well as attitudes and attributes of the characters; iconological investigation is concerned with interpretation and therefore with the attempt to understand the significance, whether clear or hidden, of a figure or of a composition. Thus, while iconography has a method which is above all analytic, iconology begins and proceeds in a synthetic process.

In the case of a figurative production such as that of Christian antiquity, strictly connected to the religious sphere and dense in conceptual content and cryptographic details, the application of iconographic and iconological methods are quite fitting, even if their application may be found to be rather complex, since they implicitly entail definition and evaluation of all the components which come together to bring about and give significance to a specific figurative "object."

It is well known that a large part of the figurative repertoire of the ancient Christian world derived directly from Sacred Scripture or at least took its inspiration from it; it is likewise known that the themes and content of the sacred texts were transmitted through catechesis and liturgical practice to the mass of the faithful, becoming in this way the inheritance of the community. There must nevertheless be kept in mind at least the possibility that in this process of transferring themes and contents from high to low, something might be lost or modified or receive some nuance in its relation to the receptivity, to the culture, to the social stratification, to the religious maturity of a given community. From this it follows that the literary text—already selective by its very nature, and yet an immediate or mediate reflection of organic and definite lines of doctrine—cannot by itself explain the entire interest of a figurative phenomenon.

In fact, the meaning of a given theme or of a single figure can change in relation to the environment and period to which it belongs; e.g., the meaning of the same scene can be different acc. to whether it is found in a cemeterial context or a building dedicated to worship, acc. to whether it belongs to the 3rd c. or to the age of *Constantine. Besides, even in the literary texts themselves there are not always

univocal interpretations; rather, it often happens that for the same theme different interpretations are proposed. Saying this should not underrate the importance of literary tradition in the interpretation of the figurative repertoire of Christian antiquity, since studies, even recent ones, have shown the necessity of looking at patristic *exegesis for the integral comprehension esp. of figurative themes with a biblical character. We wish only to call attention to the fact that a figurative phenomenon is the fruit of a convergence of diverse components, and even the paleo-Christian figurative production is the fruit of the convergence of differing elements, which naturally are sometimes difficult to individuate and evaluate in their context. This is even more significant when we consider that ancient Christian art—above all, that of its beginnings—is not refined, nor does it demonstrate any concern for an aesthetic purpose. Rather, it presents itself as an object which has a community as its origin, and has as its primary purpose the need to transmit a content that was new and in some aspects revolutionary in relation to the society in which it was elaborated.

Consult the individual iconographic themes both for their content and meaning as well as for bibliography.

C. Carletti

IDALIUS of Barcelona (d. ca. 689). Successor of *Quiricus, he was bishop of *Barcelona ca. 666–689. Represented by the deacon Laulfus at the 13th Council of *Toledo (683), Idalius participated personally at the 15th Council of Toledo (688) and on that occasion had a long conversation with *Julian concerning the state of souls after death, which led him to invite his interlocutor to write about the topic in the *Prognosticon futuri saeculi*. When the work was completed, in order to celebrate its publication and favor its circulation, he wrote to his friend Julian (*Ep. Barcinonensis episcopi ad Julianum toletanae primae sedis episcopum*) and to the metropolitan of Narbonne, Zunfredus (*Ep. Idalii ad Zuntfredum*).

Díaz 253-254; PL 96, 815-818; J.N. Hillgarth ed., CCL 115, Turnhout 1976, 1-7 and LIX-LXIII (concerning the MS tradition); U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 481.

P. Marone

IDOLATRY – IDOLS. Etymologically idolatry signifies the worship of idols and in a wider sense belief in idols and therefore polytheistic religion. In Scripture, the term *idol* designates a being which is either real or imaginary, a false divinity, venerated with acts of worship reserved for God; the idol is frequently the symbol of the *demon (Dt 32:17; Ps 106:36-37; 1 Cor 10:20). Outside of revealed religions, idolatry is a common cultural practice. An idol, as a representation-image of the divinity, is not identical with the divinity, despite the close relationship between the two, and the acts of worship are conceived only in virtue of this relation. The construction of temples and the creation of a corresponding priesthood and rites presuppose the idea of a presence of the god, even if indefinable, and his acceptance of acts of worship. The term *idol* is a diminutive, signifying a small image (Tertullian, *De Idololatria* 3). Quite rough in the beginning, it became more and more refined with the progress of civilization, eventually arriving at the summits of art, esp. Greek art. In ancient Christian literature, the evaluation of idolatry is decisively negative, apart from art. As the antithesis of the knowledge of God (*Methodius of Olympus, *The Banquet* VII, 6), it is the greatest of sins, a species of fornication that blinds human beings and leads them to perdition (*Apost. Const.* II, 23,1; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 16; *Didache* III, 4; Athan., *Contra Gentes* 29). The deliverance from its grasp comes about through the resurrection of Christ (Athan., *Contra Gentes* 1; *De Incarnatione* 30,6; 50,6), by means of baptism (John Chrys., *Hom. in I Cor.* 10:1) and with the blood of the martyrs (*Martyrium Theodoti* 3). The idol, a product of the imagination (Athen., *Legatio* 22, 5; 27,1), is a symbol of the pagan divinities, which Christians reject as beings which are dead and dumb (*Barn.* 4,8; 9,6; Just., *1 Apol.* 64,1; Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 6,3; Clem. Alex., *Protrept.* 4; Orig., *Ad mart.* 32; *Hom. Clem.* 11,13). It is opposed to truth (Athan., *De Incarnatione* II, 4), to the image (Clem. Alex., *Paed.* II, 8; *Hom. Clem.* 11,4) and the liberation which Christ brought (Just., *Dial.* 113,6; Athan., *De Incarnatione* 31,2). *See* *angel; *demon.

DTC 7, 602-669; EI 18, 708-709; DBS 4, 169-187; EC 6, 1578-1580; RAC 12, 828-895; RAC 13 (1986) 1113-1149; M. Pellegrino, *Studi sull'antica apologetica*, Rome 1947 (repr. 1977); J.-R. Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des Apologistes chrétiens de 270 à 361*, Rome 1954; J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique*, Paris 1961; R.P.C. Hanson, *Christian Attitudes to Pagan Religions*: ANRW II, 23, 2, 910-973; J.-M. Vermander, *La polémique des Apologistes latins contre les dieux du paganisme*: RecAug 17 (1982) 3-128; P.G. Christiansen, *The Great Conflict Revisted: Recent Work on Christianity and Paganism*: Helios 15 (1988) 133-149; R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, London 1988; M. Fédou, *Christianisme et religions païennes dans le "Contre Celse" d'Origène*, Paris 1988; A.J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretation of the History of Culture*, Tübingen 1989; P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron kreitton. Der*

Altersbewiese der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte, Tübingen 1990; M. Rizzi, *Ideologia e retorica negli "exordia" apologetici. Il problema dell'altro*, Milan 1993; D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*, Waterloo 1993; P. Borgen, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, Edinburg 1996; J. Smit, *"Do Not Be Idolaters." Paul's Rhetoric in First Corinthians 10:1-22*: NT 39 (1997) 40-53; *Les Apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. B. Pouderon - J. Doré, Paris 1997; *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. by M.J. Edwards et al., Oxford 1999.

E. Peretto

IDOLOTHYTE. A term coined by Hellenized Jews so as to avoid other terms, such as *hierothyte* and *theothyte,* which had a more sacred tone. In the NT (Acts 15:29; 1 Cor 8:1, 4, 7, 10; 10:19; Rev 2:14), the term designates the flesh of animals sacrificed to pagan divinities, which Christians and Jews might have occasion to eat when they accepted invitations to the houses of pagans or because they had bought it in the markets, where it was sometimes placed for sale. The problem was posed for the community at Corinth, because it sometimes happened that the *idolothyte* had not been consumed within the sacred area and the Christians did not realize it. The prohibition on eating this meat was deduced from the Jewish tradition and imposed out of respect for this tradition, which perceived demonic power in the cult of idols (Dt 32:16-17; Bar 4:7; *1 Enoch* 19,1; *Jubilees* 1,11). The legality of eating flesh already immolated to pagan gods (*hierothyte,* see Plat., *Sym.* 8,8,3), which Jews out of contempt called *idolothyte,* i.e., victim in idolatry, was not treated by Paul as a dogmatic problem. Rather, he passed judgment on a concrete discussion that existed within the community. He was not ignorant of the fact that private and familial/social events were celebrated with sacrificial offerings to a god followed by meals in company with friends and acquaintances served in rooms next to the sanctuary, yet constituting part of the area of the temple. His point of view is favorable to those who do not worry about the origin of the meat, since the idol is nothing (1 Cor 8:4). The strong (the *gnostic) and the weak (the nongnostic) coexist, but their consciences react differently: the strong avail themselves of their liberty and of their knowledge that an idol is nothing, while the weak are scandalized at this, since they are not yet completely freed from the relationship between the sacrifice and the idol. The weak would be led to a contradiction between interior conscience and external practice by the behavior of those who considered themselves free. Both of these had, in the past, carried out the idolatrous practice of eating meat sacrificed in the company of pagan friends and acquaintances. Their conversion to the faith did not cancel such a past, but it led them to a new consciousness and a new knowledge concerning the nature of an idol. Paul concludes that the individual's liberty ends when it becomes an obstacle for another person (1 Cor 8:8). Given the way in which Paul resolves the problem, it would seem that the cultic and religious character of the idolatrous sacrifice should not be transferred as a burden to the meal which follows, esp. if it was private, since its primary meaning was social, friendly, that of fraternally spending time together. His concern was that Christians not isolate themselves from society and exist as a ghetto (1 Cor 5:10). Foreign from the Pauline horizon is the idea of eating a god, of being invested with his energies or of mystical union with him. Prevalent, instead, is the social aspect, the occasion of pleasant socializing, a convivial spirit. In 1 Cor 10:19, Paul again considers the term *idolothyte,* which he speaks of as similar to *idol,* and affirms that the *idolothyte* does not in itself have any particular nature as such, since idols are absolutely nothing. But here the context is ritual: it is no longer a question of social conviviality but participation of a number of subjects in an act of worship directed to demons and not God. This is what Paul does not want: participation in the table of the Lord (eucharistic *koinonia*) is irreconcilable with participation in the table of demons. The prophetic tradition had insisted on the nonbeing of the gods of the nations, also called demons, which present the temptation of being the alternative to God (cf. Dt 32:7; Bar 4:7; *1 Enoch* 19,1; *Jubilees* 1,11).

DTC 7,670-682; DBS 4,187-195; EC 6, 1580-1581; W. Mundle, ϵἴδωλον: Dis. conc. bibl. N.T. Bologna 1976, 836-839; Gordon D. Fee, Εἰδωλόθυτα *Once Again. An Interpretation of I Corinthians 8-10*: Biblica 61 (1980) 172-197; W.L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth, The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*, Chico, CA 1985; B.N. Fisk, *Eating Meat Offered to Idols; Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Response in 1 Corinthians 8-10*: Trinity Journal 10 (1989) 49-70; B.W. Winter, *Theological and Ethical Responses to Religious Pluralism—1 Corinthians 8-10*: Tyndale Bulletin 41 (1990) 209-222; H. Hübner, ϵἰδωλϵῖον: Dis. Es. NT, Brescia 1995, 1025-1032; G. Barbaglio, *La prima lettera ai Corinzi*, Bologna 1995, 372-390.

E. Peretto

IGNATIUS of Antioch (d. ca. 110)

I. Transmission of the letters - II. Dating - III. The struggle against the sabbatists and the docetists - IV. Unity with the bishop - V. Theology of martyrdom.

In the years 110–111 the bishop Ignatius of Antioch was arrested and led to *Rome, where he expected *martyrdom. After crossing Asia Minor,

where he stopped in Philadelphia and *Phrygia, he arrived at *Smyrna, whose bishop at that time was *Polycarp, and he remained there a short time. He received a visit from the bishops of *Ephesus, Tralles and of Magnesia; he gave a letter to each of these churches. He also wrote to the Romans to announce his coming arrival. Next he traveled N, to Troas. There he wrote to the church of Philadelphia, the church of Smyrna and to Polycarp personally. These seven letters are preserved. We know that he was later led from Troas to *Philippi in *Macedonia, because some Christians of this city wrote to Polycarp and mentioned his passing through. We do not know whether he actually arrived in Rome and was put to death for the faith. Polycarp, responding to the Philippians, presumes that he died a martyr (9,2), yet without being certain (13,2). The same supposition was made at the time of *Eusebius, who notes that this is only "what is said" (*HE* 3, 36,3).

I. Transmission of the letters. Writing to Polycarp, the Philippians asked for a copy of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch. Polycarp enclosed with his response all the letters he knew (13,1). Because of its great interest, this collection was widely circulated. It was known by *Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* V, 28,4), by *Origen (*Hom. Lc.* 6,4) and by Eusebius (*HE* 3, 36), who enumerated all the parts that composed it, citing extracts: there were the seven letters of Ignatius of Antioch mentioned above, as well as the letter of Polycarp. Given the role played by the library of Eusebius in Caesarea in Palestine in the transmission of Christian texts, it is not surprising that these letters have come down to us. These were later translated into *Syriac in an abbreviated form. At the end of the 4th c., *Julian the Arian, posited as the author of the **Apostolic Constitutions,* made an interpolated Greek edition of the seven letters of Ignatius of Antioch, to which he added three other letters. Doubts concerning the authenticity of the middle redaction are also raised periodically, since a monarchic structure in churches of so early a period seems anachronistic. But the history of hierarchical organization in the Christian communities is different acc. to geographical areas and the letters place in relief the newness of episcopal monarchy.

II. Dating. The *Chronicle* of Eusebius mentions both the martyrdom of Ignatius of Antioch and the letter of *Pliny to *Trajan around the tenth year of his reign (AD 107), but one can see in *HE* (3,33,36) that Eusebius did not have precise chronological information either for Ignatius of Antioch or Pliny. Eusebius merely wished to situate the two events approximately: he placed the letter of Pliny under Trajan and hypothesized that Ignatius of Antioch had been arrested during the persecution which the letter of Pliny speaks of. Therefore, we cannot take this date as certain.

III. The Struggle against the sabbatists and the docetists. In his letter to the faithful of Philadelphia, Ignatius of Antioch speaks of a schism which has occurred in that church. Some members of the community had separated themselves from the bishop because they held that it was necessary to observe the sabbath. They had certainly attempted to spread their ideas among the nearby churches, because Ignatius speaks of this situation in his letter to the faithful of Magnesia as well. He also opposed those Christians who denied that Jesus Christ was really born, died and resurrected. One passage (*Magn.* 8,12) establishes a link between these two controversies. In fact, in order to prove that the sabbath had been abolished in favor of Sunday, Ignatius did not rely on any scriptural testimony. The only argument he offered was that Sunday was the day of the resurrection of Jesus; in his view, to refuse Sunday meant rejecting the reality of the birth, passion and resurrection of the Savior.

IV. Unity with the bishop. In the face of such disagreements, Ignatius preached first of all union around the bishop and the clergy. While earlier documents speak at times of a college of elders (presbyters), at others of one hierarchy with two colleges (bishops and deacons), the letters of Ignatius of Antioch are the first testimonies to a hierarchy with three levels: monarchical bishop, priests (presbyters) and deacons. The letters exalt above all the bishop, who is the vicar of God (*Magn.* 3,1; 6,1; *Trall.* 3,1) or of Jesus Christ (*Trall.* 2,1; *Eph.* 6,1); nothing can be done without him (*Trall.* 2,2; *Phil.* 7,2; 4,1); in particular, Christians must not get married without his consent (*Phil.* 5,2). It is the first mention of an intervention of the church in the matrimony of Christians, dictated above all by the desire to avoid mixed marriages.

V. Theology of martyrdom. Another recurring theme in the letters of Ignatius is that of martyrdom, esp. in the letter to the *Romans,* where Ignatius begs them not to do anything to impede his execution: "Let me be the meal of the beasts!" (*Rom.* 4).

A disciple must imitate his master; thus, Ignatius wants to follow Christ even in his passion (6,3); then he will be a true disciple (4,2; cf. 5,1.3), he will find Christ (5,3), he will find God (*Magn.* 14; *Trall.* 12,2;

13,3; *Rom.* 1,2). His sacrifice will benefit others as well: an "offering to God" (*Rom.* 4,2), he is a ransom for all (*Eph.* 21,1; *Smyr.* 10,2) and asks for the prayers of his correspondents. This concept of martyrdom is very much inspired by St. Paul and by *4 Macc.;* some expressions manifest the influence of Hellenistic philosophy as well: "Nothing of that which appears to the eyes is good" (*Rom.* 3,2); "There is no longer in me the ardor of love for matter" (*Rom.* 7,2).

Editions: CPG 1025-1036; P.Th. Camelot, SC 10 (Paris 1969), with Fr. tr.; F.X. Funk - K. Bihlmeyer - W. Schneemelcher, Tübingen 1970; *Die apostolischen Väter*, selected and tr. into Ger. by H. Ristow, Berlin 1964; J.A. Fischer, Darmstadt 1976, with Ger. tr.; W. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch.* Hermeneia, ed. by H. Koester, Minneapolis 1985.

Studies: RAC 17 (1996) 933-953; G. Trentin, *Rassegna di studi su Ignazio*: StudPat (1972) 75-87; K. Bommes, *Weizen Gottes. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Martyriums bei Ignatius von Antiochien*, Cologne-Bonn 1976; H. Paulsen, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien*, Göttingen 1978; P. Meinhold, *Studien zu Ignatius von Antiochien*, Wiesbaden 1979; R. Joly, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*, Brussels 1979; J. Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius the Martyr*, Rome 1979; C.P.H. Bammel, *Ignatian Problems*: JTS 33 (1982) 62-97; G. Carlozzo, *L'ellissi in Ignazio di Antiochia e la questione dell'autenticità della recensione lunga*: VetChr 19 (1982) 239-256; A. de Halleux, *"L'Église catholique" dans la Lettre ignacienne aux Smyrniotes*: EThL 58 (1982) 5-24; C. Munier, *Où en est la question d'Ignace d'Antioche?: bilan d'un siècle de recherches 1870-1988*: ANRW II, 2, 27, 359-484; W.R. Schoedel, *Polycarp of Smyrna and Ignatius of Antioch*: ANRW II, 2, 27, 272-358; C. Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*, Lewiston 1992; U. Neri, *Ignazio di Antiochia*, Bologna 1994; J. Rius-Camps, *Indicios de una redacción muy temprana de las cartas auténticas de Ignacio* (*ca. 70-90 d.C.*): Augustinianum 35 (1995) 199-214; R.M. Hübner, *Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien*: ZAC 1 (1997) 44-72; G. Schöllgen, *Die Ignatianen als pseudepigraphisches Briefcorpus*: *Anmerkung zu den Thesen von Reinhard M. Hübner*: ZAC 2 (1998) 16-25; M.D. Goulder, *Ignatius' "Docetists"*: VChr 53 (1999) 16-30; T. Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?: chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien*, Leiden 1999; H.J. Vogt, *Vertreten die Ignatius-Briefe Patripassianismus?*: ThQ 180 (2000) 237-251; C.T. Brown, *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch*, Bern 2000; *Ignasi d'Antioquia*; intr., rev. text, tr. with notes by J. Rius-Camps, Barcelona 2001; *Concordantia in Patres Apostolicos*. 6, Ignatii epistularum concordantia, ed. Á. Urbán, Hildesheim 2001.

P. Nautin

IGNATIUS of Antioch (pseudo) (4th c.). Bishop of Neapolis (*Anazarbus) who lived in an *Arian Antiochene environment in the 2nd half of the 4th c. There he was known by the name of Julian. He is the author of the *Epp. Interpolatae* (*Ad Ephesios, Ad Magnesios, Ad Trallianos, Ad Romanos, Ad Philadelphenses, Ad Smyrnaeos, Ad Polycarpum*) and of the *Epp. Suppositiae* (*Ad Mariam, Ad Tarsenses, Ad Antiochenos, Ad Heronem Diaconum Antiochiae, Ad Philippenses*), which are found in the Ignatian corpus. Probably long after the Council of *Constantinople (381) he composed the **Apostolic Constitutions* (Perler, Hannah, Brown), a normative text of a disciplinary and liturgical character, and it seems that he can be identified with Julian the Anomoian who wrote a commentary on the book of Job (Hagedorn), shortly before the advent of Theodosius I (379), in which the term **homoousios* is openly condemned.

CPG 1000.4, 1026, 1730, 1738, 2075; PG 5, 729-942; F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, I, Paderborn 1905; F.X. Funk - F. Diekamp, *Patres Apostolici*, II, Tübingen 1913, 83-268; R. Draguet, *Un Commentaire grec arien sur Job*: RHE 20 (1924) 38-65; DACL IV/1, 949; O. Perler, *Pseudo-Ignatius und Eusebius von Emesa*: HJ 77 (1958) 73-82; J.W. Hannah, *The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension*: Journal of Biblical Literature 79 (1960) 221-238; M.P. Brown, *Notes on the Language and Style of Pseudo-Ignatius*: Journal of Biblical Literature 83 (1964) 146-152; D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*: PTS 14 (1973) XXXVII-LVII.

P. Marone

ILDEFONSUS of Toledo (607–667). This archbishop of *Toledo in the 2nd half of the 7th c. is known to us, apart from his works, through three sources: the *Elogium* of Julian and the legendary *Vita* of Cixila, both archbishops of Toledo, in the 7th and 8th c. respectively, and finally a biography, even more suspect, written by Rodrigo de Cerrato in the 13th c. He was a monk in the monastery of Agali, outside the walls of the *Visigothic capital. Ildefonsus was ordained a deacon and later elected abbot (he signed the canons of the 8th and 9th Councils of Toledo in 653 and 655 with this title), lastly archbishop of the Urbs Regia from 657 to 667.

Some masses and hymns of the Mozarabic liturgy are attributed to him, as well as the composition of poems and epitaphs now lost. His *De virginitate perpetua beatae Mariae* is a polemical work written "against three opponents" of this belief: Helvidius and Jovinian (against whom St. Jerome had written two short works which Ildefonsus consulted), and a Jew. The treatise *De cognitione baptismi,* discovered in the 18th c., develops the traditional theology of this sacrament acc. to the Latin fathers; it had been a subject of dispute between Catholics and *Arians (single or triple immersion?). His *De progressu spiritualis deserti* (until recently incorrectly called *De itinere deserti*) develops the spiritual theology of conversion, following in the footsteps of the *Synonyma* of *Isidore.

In addition to a few letters (two of them ad-

dressed to Chirico of Barcelona), the most personal treatise is the *De viris illustribus,* which is at first glance a continuation of the homonymous treatises by *Jerome, *Gennadius and Isidore, but the work reveals a narrowed horizon and a shift of interest. Not only are these "famous men" all Spanish bishops (except the monk Donatus, who immigrated to *Spain from *Africa), but 7 out of 14 are bishops of Toledo. They are "famous" less for their literary and more for their moral, miraculous and pastoral achievements. The purpose is to raise the prestige of the archbishops of Toledo in opposition to the princes, in a likely crisis situation between the two powers (there was no national council in Toledo during the episcopate of Ildefonsus). In this "parochial" work the universalism of the church is no less in evidence than purely literary concerns. Chapter 3, however, gives valuable information about the exodus of African monks and their books to Spain in the 6th c. Ildefonsus is a believer in the rhymed and rhythmic "synonymic" style; perhaps for political reasons he does not say anything about the historical works of Isidore (too "Gothophile" in his eyes?).

CPL 1247-1257; PL 96, 53-208; ed. V. Blanco García, Madrid 1937 of the *De virginitate* and C. Codoñer, Salamanca 1972 of the *De viris*; S.A. Braegelmann, *The Life and Writings of Saint Ildefonsus of Toledo*, Washington, DC, 1942; J. Madoz, *San Ildefonso de Toledo*: EstEcl 26 (1957) 467-505; U. Domínguez del Val, *Patrología española* (appendix to the Sp. ed. of the *Patrologie* of B. Altaner), Madrid [4]1956, 103-107; Id., *Ildefonso de Toledo*: DHEE 2 (1972) 1188-1189; T.C. Akeley, *Christian Initiation in Spain c. 300-1100*, London 1967, 77-86; J. Fontaine, *El "De viris illustribus" de San Ildefonso, tradición y originalidad*: Anales Toledanos 3 (1970) 59-96; C. Codoñer Merino, *El "De viris illustribus" de San Ildefonso de Toledo*, study and critical ed., Univ. de Salamanca 1972, 7-86; J.M. Balleros Mateos, *El tratado "de virginitate sanctae Mariae" de San Ildefonso de Toledo. Estudios sobre el estilo sinonímico latino*, Toledo 1985; J.F. Rivera Recio, *San Ildefonso de Toledo. Biografía, época y posteridad*, BAC 466, Madrid 1985; P.J. Galán-Sánchez, *El "De viris illustribus" de Ildefonso de Toledo o la modificación del género*: Anuario de estudios teológicos 15 (1992) 69-80; L. Navarra, *Ildefonso di Toledo*, Rome 2003.

J. Fontaine

ILLUMINATION. The use of the Greek words φωτίζειν, φωτισμός, and the Latin *illuminare, illuminatio* as well as their synonyms, such as ἔκλαμψις, ἔλλαμψις, *illustratio, manifestatio,* is widespread in patristic works (Lampe 1504-1511; 433-434; 451: ThLL 7/1, 390-391). This is not surprising, considering that the symbolism of light, no less than in ancient religions, is essential in the biblical world, esp. in the later prophets (Is 42:6; 49:6), in the Psalms (Ps 119[118]: the light of the law), in the wisdom literature and in the Johannine writings (see the Lat. biblical texts in ThLL). Christian theology took up rather easily the biblical metaphors of light becaue it was confronted from the beginning with dualistic systems that distinguish light and darkness. *Gnosticism of the 2nd c. and later *Manicheism expressed their ideas on the return to the divine sphere of the divine particles fallen into matter, with the image of the struggle between light and darkness. From the 3rd c. onward, *Neoplatonism often clarified its philosophical and religious positions through the symbolism of light. Also to be considered are the mystery religions and various forms of astral cults, in particular that of the *Sol invictus* and the *Luna patiens*. The theme of illumination is to be found in the same *narratio* of the saving work of Christ. The glorious Lord appears as the Savior who, spiritually continuing the healing of the blind he did on earth, illuminates the world with his gospel (*1 Clem*. 59,2; Just., *Dial*. 122; Tertull., *Apol*. 21; Orig., *Hom. 4 in Lc*.) and the soul of the believer with the light of faith (*1 Clem* 36,2; Clem. Alex., *Ecl*. 5). The introduction of the Logos-*Christology, together with the increasing authority of the writings of *John, later induced Christian writers, esp. the Alexandrians, to attribute this work of illumination to the eternal Word (Clem. Alex., *Protr*. 114-115: Orig., *Cels*. 6,79). Next to the general theme, three particular topics should be noted: religious knowledge, conversion and Augustinian illumination. In their discussions of religious knowledge, the efforts of the *Alexandrians, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Evagrius and others reached a culmination in the synthesis of ps.-*Dionysius, who speaks not only of the light of darkness but also distinguishes the three ways of purification, illumination and union (Roques, *Univers*, 94-101). In the wake of particular biblical texts (Jn 9; Eph 5:14; Heb 6:4-6; 10:32), from the 2nd c. onward, conversion, sealed by baptism, was perceived as an illumination (Justin, *1 Apol*. 61,12-3; Clem. Alex., *Paed*. I, 6,25-31; Basil., *Hom*. 13,1; Greg. Naz., *Or*. 40,3,1; John Damasc., *Expos*. 82), and therefore Easter and Epiphany were celebrated as days of illumination (Greg. Naz., *Or*. 45,2; Jobius Mon., *Inc*. 2). Finally, it is remarkable how *Augustine, under the influence of Neoplatonism, developed the epistemological theory of illumination. Humanity assesses the truth of knowledge through the mysterious presence of the divine light within (*Solil*. I, 8,15; *Trin*. 12,15,24; 14,15,21)—i.e., the eternal Word (*Mag*. 11,38; *Trin*. 4,2,4), by which the light of human intellect was created and illuminated (Nash, 440). This theory had great influence all through the Middle Ages, until St. Bonaventure brought it to perfection.

Cath 5, 1215-1221; DSp 7,1330-1346; E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de s. Augustin*, Paris 1929; H. Rahner, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, Darmstadt 1957, 125-224 (It. tr. Bologna 1971); R. Roques, *L'univers dionysien*, Paris 1954; H. Turner, *Jésus le Sauveur*, Paris 1965, 35-52; W. Beierwaltes, in HWP 2 (1972) 712-717 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Gratia Christi*, 159-162; J.M. Rist, *Augustine*, Cambridge 1994; J. Weismayer: LTK[3] 3, 796ff.; R.H. Nash, *Illumination*, in *Augustine Through the Ages*, ed. A. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 438-440.

B. Studer

IMAGE

I. Theology of the image of God - II. Use and veneration of images.

I. Theology of the image of God. This issue is related to those of the "kinship" and "likeness" of humanity to God, as well as that of the "imitation" and "following" of God and Christ. It dominates the *Christology, *anthropology and spirituality of the Greek and Latin fathers. The sources are to be found in the Bible and Greek philosophy. For Plato, the sensible is the image of the idea, the human *soul is related to God—*Plato never defines it as the image of God, since the concept of image for him remains tied to the sensible world—and, as already formulated by the pre-Socratics, resemblance to God is the end of human life (*Theaetetus* 176 b): thus humanity can know God, because something can only be known by another thing similar to it. The Stoics have analogous ideas, as well as the *Middle Platonists, where the concept of an intermediary image appears with the divine Triad. The same is true in *Neoplatonism.

1. Christ, the image of God. This theme arises from Col 1:15 and implies a certain *subordinationism, which remains orthodox if it merely expresses the source of the second person without implying an inequality of power. But is Christ the image of God because of his dual nature or only by virtue of his divinity? In the first case, the human nature assumed by the Word would be, inasmuch as a revelation of God, a visible image of the reality of God. But proponents of the second view argue that God, being incorporeal, cannot have a corporeal image. The authors who attribute to the incarnate Word the quality of being the image of God are *Irenaeus, *Tertullian and, at least indirectly, *Marius Victorinus. Others attribute it only to the Word in his divinity, and Col 1:15 is interpreted by *Origen as "the invisible image of the invisible God." This dispute is linked to the problem of where one should place the image of humanity, whether on the whole it is formed of body and soul, or the soul alone. With respect to humanity the Word is an intermediary image, since humanity was created in relation to him. Many ancient Fathers see in the plural form of Gen 1:26 a dialogue between the Father and the Son, and identify this image with the Son, acc. to which humanity was created. For this reason, acc. to many, only the Son is called the "image," while humanity is only "according to the image" (κατ' εἰκόνα). The Word is an intermediary image between God and humanity not only in the moment of creation but also at every moment of spiritual progress accomplished through his grace and by imitating him: the human nature that he has assumed has the role of a second intermediate image, although, as a creature, and like all humans, it is "according to the image" or "an image of the image," and not simply the "image." That is the immediate model that the Word provides for humans to imitate. In the Son, his image, we contemplate the Father, and through him we come to know the Father (*Basil).

2. The Spirit, image of the Son. From the outset, the action of the *Holy Spirit is affirmed in spiritual progress, starting from participation in the image. But the quality of an image is attributed to the Holy Spirit for the first time in the *Expositio fidei* of *Gregory Thaumaturgus (PG 46, 916 D): he is the "perfect image of the perfect Son." It is found in *Athanasius, Basil, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Cyril of Alexandria, *John of Damascus. As an image of the Son the Spirit forms Christ in us, the perfect image of the Father.

3. Humanity according to the image. Humanity was thus created as an "image of the image" or "according to the image"—i.e., acc. to the Son, who is the image, and this participation in the image constitutes the essence of human nature. Since for most the image of God is the Word in his divinity, to the exclusion of his humanity, the expression "according to the image" does not apply to the whole human being, but the soul alone or, better, the *νοῦς*, the mind, his better part, the seat of knowledge, freedom, love and virtue, organ of spiritual and intellectual activity. The dignity of the image falls on the body only indirectly (Marius Victorinus), which becomes its sanctuary (Origen). Being "according to the image" is something imperfect, but dynamic, capable of progress and regression: it aims at reaching the perfection of its model. It is the principal foundation of the greatness and dignity of humanity.

a. Is this participation in God, constituted by the image, of a natural or supernatural order? In Irenaeus, who uses different expressions, the distinction between image and likeness corresponds in certain cases to that which exists between nature, i.e.,

the condition of being a creature, and grace. Tertullian distinguishes a likeness of nature and a likeness of grace. This concept is found in *Cyril of Jerusalem; in *Jerome, for whom the likeness is received at baptism; and in Marius Victorinus, who sees in this a spiritual quality that adds to the nature of the soul, which is an image. In contrast, *Clement of Alexandria, Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa make no distinction between the natural and supernatural: the image, therefore, is the desire for the supernatural and its seed; the natural, to some extent, is implicitly contained in the image. Contrary to some representations of Western scholasticism, which understand the supernatural as added above a "pure nature," it is rather, for Origen and Gregory, humanity's biological aspect that is added to the image possessing in itself the spiritual and intellectual aspect of the νοῦς or of the *mens*. The distinction is esp. clear in *Athanasius and more so in Cyril of Alexandria, who understands image and likeness in a double sense: first, reason oriented toward virtue; second, the gift of the Holy Spirit and participation in the divine nature. *Augustine reasons similarly and distinguishes two levels in the image: humans are *capax Dei* on account of their own nature, endowed with reason, on account of their immortality, and because of the natural knowledge of God that sin itself presupposes; humans become *particeps Dei* by means of the supernatural gifts.

b. One sometimes reads in the Fathers that the image is lost on account of sin. But when they turn their thoughts more specifically on that point, Origen, Athanasius, Basil and others believe that the image is indestructible: even when sin, acc. to Origen, hides it under a pile of opposing images, the image of the devil, of the world as identified with the devil, of Caesar as symbol of the prince of this world, or of the image of beasts, the former remains indelible in its orientation toward the supernatural, which constitutes its dynamism. Cyril and Augustine, on the contrary, who distinguish a double image or a double partition within the image, believe that the second image is lost because of sin, while the former persists. But for all the Fathers, the restoration of this image, either lost or covered up, is the work of Christ in his *incarnation and redemption, who transforms the human being into a child of God.

c. The distinction between image and likeness is therefore at times and to a certain extent that between natural and supernatural. But in Clement and esp. in Origen the image was received at the time of creation, as the beginning or seed for divinization, and the likeness, in agreement with Greek philosophers, is the goal or the outcome of spiritual progress in beatitude. Origen finds it in 1 Jn 3:2, "When he will manifest himself *we shall be like him,* for we shall see him as he is." Similarly, in Gen 1:26-27, when God speaks of likeness, he announced his intention to create human beings, but did not mention it when showing the execution of this plan; likeness is restricted to the end. *John Chrysostom also sees in likeness the development of the image. Many other authors, such as Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine, do not separate likeness from image. But, if we disregard the concepts used, they teach the same doctrine, inasmuch as divinization is always the ultimate goal of the image.

d. From image to likeness or divinization: this is the path of spiritual progress, in action and in knowledge. The achievements of *asceticism are the work of both divine grace and human effort: the virtues are acquired both by participation in Christ, who is all virtue and all the virtues, who forms the soul in his likeness and forms himself in the soul, and by imitation of God and Christ. This participation in the image allows the human being to know God: something is known only by that which is similar to it, and knowledge presupposes a shared nature between subject and object. God reveals himself through his creative act as through Scripture and the incarnation: however, there is no revelation other than when God manifests himself inside the soul, a manifestation of which the image is both the place and the means. Progress in virtue, developing the likeness with God and Christ, makes this understanding more profound, as it strengthens the soul in its shared nature with the divine. Finally, in the fullness of beatitude, the vision of God and Christ in their reality corresponds to the likeness and divinization, acc. to Jn 3:2. Conversely, the contemplation of God and of Christ develops the "second image": the transforming contemplation makes equal the one contemplating to the object of his contemplation. This is an example of a spiritual and intuitive knowledge rather than a discursive or logical kind. These two ways of knowing, however, should not be separated too strictly, nor should one refuse to see in the second a preparatory role for a spiritual vision.

e. All the Fathers emphasize the action of the three divine persons in the development of participation in the image. Marius Victorinus sees in the soul the image of the *Trinity because it is at once nature, life and thought; Augustine found it in the *mens,* because of its three main faculties, which he lists in different ways, such as memory, intelligence and will; *Fulgentius of Ruspe repeats his teaching.

These similarities are certainly the culmination of earlier speculation. Origen attributes the gift of being to the Father, reason to the Son, and holiness to the Spirit and conceives the generation of the Son by the Father as that of the will on the part of the intellect. Nevertheless, he never came to a clear conception of the image of the Trinity in humanity.

A. Strucken, *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen in der christlichen Literatur der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte*, Münster, 1913; E. Peterson, *L'immagine di Dio in S. Ireneo*: Scuola Cattolica 69 (1941) 46-54; A. Mayer, *Das Gottesbild im Menschen nach Clemens v. Alexandrien*, Rome 1942; R. Leys, *L'image de Dieu chez St. Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris-Brussels 1952; R. Bernard, *L'image de Dieu d'après St. Athanase*, Paris 1952; H. Merki, Ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ, *Von der platonischen Angleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor v. Nyssa*, Freiburg 1952; P.Th. Camelot, *La théologie de l'image de Dieu*: RSPh 40 (1956) 443-471; W.J. Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man According to Cyril of Alexandria*, Woodstock, MD 1957; H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*, Paris 1956; P. Hadot, *L'image de la Trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez Augustin*, SP VI, TU 81, 1962, 409-442; J. Kirchmeyer, *Grecque (Église)*: DSp 6, 812-822; G.A. Maloney, *Man, the Divine Icon*, Pecos, NM 1973; M. Aghiorgoussis, *Image as "Sign" (Semeion) of God: Knowledge of God Through the Image According to St. Basil*: Gr.Orth.Th.R. 21 (1976) 19-54; St. Otto, *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes bei Tertullian*: MThZ 10 (1959) 276-282; A. Solignac, *Image et Ressemblance* II. Pères de l'Église: DSp 7/2 (1971) 1406-1425; H. Somers, *Image de Dieu et Illumination divine*: AugM 1 (1954) 452-462; Id., *Image de Dieu: Les sources de l'exégèse augustinienne*: REAug 7 (1961) 1-15, 105-125; St.E. Szyzik, *Die geistiger Ursprünge der Imago-Dei-Lehre bei Ambrosius v. Mailand*: Theol. Glaube 53 (1963) 161-176; Ph.Th. Wild, *The Divinization of Man According to St. Hilary of Poitiers,* Mundelein, IL 1950; G. Maertens, *Augustine's Image of Man*, in *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought*, Studia G. Berbeke, Leuven 1976, 175-198; M. Perrin, *L'homme antique et chrétien. L'anthropologie de Lactance*, Paris 1981; J. Fantino, *L'homme image de Dieu chez saint Irenée de Lyon*, Paris 1986; A.G. Hamman, *L'homme image de Dieu. Essai d'une anthropologie chrétienne dans l'église des cinq permiers siècles*, Paris 1987; P. Nellas, *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person*, Crestwood, NY 1987; G. Robbins (ed.), *Genesis 1-3 in the History of Interpretation. Intrigue in the Garden*, Lewiston, NY 1988; K.E. Børresen (ed.), *The Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, Minneapolis 1995; A.G. Hamman, *L'homme, icône de Dieu, Textes choisis et traductions*, Paris 1998; F.G. McLeod, *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition*, Washington, DC, 1999; *A immagine di Dio. Modelli del genere nella tradizione giudaica e cristiana*, ed. by K.E. Børresen, Rome 2001; L. Manca, *Il primato della volontà in Agostino e Massimo il Confessore*, Rome 2002.

II. Use and veneration of images. One must distinguish the use of images for the decoration of churches, the instruction of the faithful, and as an aid to prayer, from the veneration of images properly speaking.

1. Before the Council of Nicaea. During this period, ecclesiastical writers were not willing to accept the use of and even less the veneration of images, although most of the time they expressed themselves indirectly: they took a stance in the fight against pagan idolatry, basing themselves on the anti-image texts of the OT. The real image of God is Christ, then humanity and the virtue that is in it: the temple of the Christians is the human body, the shrine of the image, or it is the universe. At times their rejection of idolatry leads them to oppose those same arguments that were later adopted by the defenders of the veneration of images. Of note are the following: *Tertullian (*De idolatria* 4,1; *Adv. Hermogenem* I,2), who also says (*De spectaculis* 23,5) that God, being the Truth, cannot accept what is false; *Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* IV, 62, 1-2), who specifies (*Strom.* VII, V, 28-29) that God cannot be contained; *Origen (*C. Cels.* VII, 62-67), *Minucius Felix (*Octavius,* 32), *Lactantius (*Inst. Div* II, 2). The early 4th-c. Council of *Elvira in canon 36 prohibited the display of paintings in churches.

One of the main reasons for this are the prohibitions of the OT, esp. considering that the *Decalogue is still valid in the new covenant, the prohibition to make images (the second commandment in Ex 20:4-5 or Dt 5:8-9). In fact, most of the Fathers before *Augustine follow the subdivision of the Decalogue by the Jews attested by *Philo (*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 15, *De Decalogo* 23) that distinguishes four commandments regarding God, one on the love of parents (the 5th), then five regarding one's neighbor, joining in the tenth all the sins of desire. This breakdown is attested in *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* II, 35), *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VI, XVI, 146, 1), Origen (*Fragm. Eph.* XXXI, *Com. Mt* XI, 9). In *Hom. Ex* VIII, 2, Origen writes that for some this second commandment is one with the first, but it may be a clarification of the translator *Rufinus, a contemporary of Augustine. The same division is found in the Fathers after *Nicaea, who do not draw the same conclusions: the *Synopsis Scripturae Sanctae* attributed to *Athanasius (PG 28, 297), the dogmatic poem 15 of *Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 37, 476), *Jerome (*Com. Eph.* III on *Eph* 6,2; *Com.Os.* III on *Os* 10,9-10), *Ambrosiaster (*Com. Eph.* on *Eph* 6,3), the emperor *Julian acc. to Cyril of Alexandria (*C. Julianum* V, PG 76, 733), *John Cassian (*Collatio* VIII, 23).

This position of the Fathers before Nicaea poses a problem: in fact, Tertullian as a *Montanist asserts, without blaming them too explicitly, that the "*psychici," i.e., the Catholics, have on some chalices a depiction of the Good *Shepherd (*De Pud.* VII, 1; IX, 12) and a great many paintings of the Roman catacombs date back to the 3rd if not the 2nd c.; those in the East in the baptistery of *Dura

Europos cannot be later than the 3rd c., because the city was destroyed in 256. So there is a discrepancy between the position of some writers and actual practice. It should also be noted that although the prohibition of images in the OT seemed absolute, in practice it was much less so; as shown by the cherubim on the Tabernacle (Ex 25:17-20; Num 7:89; Ezek 41:18-20). The Jews of the early centuries of our era did not observe the prohibition of images strictly as shown by their catacombs in Rome, the synagogue of Dura Europos and even the Galilean synagogues (cf. DBS 4, 199-232). The same discrepancy can therefore be seen.

2. In the 4th and 5th c. Two isolated cases of the 4th c. show strong opposition to images. Eusebius testifies (*HE* 7, 18, 2-4) to having seen a monument erected in Paneas to Christ by the woman with the hemorrhage of blood whom he had healed, and that the monument represented her with Jesus—some think that it was actually Asclepius—as well as paintings of Peter, Paul and Jesus: he did not reprove the makers of these images too harshly, attributing these things to pagan custom. However, when the empress *Constantia, sister of *Constantine and the widow of *Licinius, wanted to obtain from him an image of Christ, Eusebius rejected the request outright, saying that the human form of Christ was now completely deified, and could not therefore be represented (PG 20, 1545-50). In a letter to John of *Jerusalem, translated into *Latin by Jerome (51 in the correspondence of the latter), *Epiphanius reports that he found in Palestine, in a church in a village, a curtain on which was painted "the image of Christ or a saint." Faithful to Scripture he pulls the curtain down and asks John to put an end to these practices which are "against our religion." Nevertheless, other Fathers speak incidentally of images without showing the slightest disapproval. Sometimes they make reference esp. to the cross, not only of the wood of the original, which is venerated as a relic, but also of the "sign" that tends to be depicted more and more: the emperor *Julian, acc. to Cyril of Alexandria, and Cyril himself (*C. Julianum* VI: PG 76, 796ff.); *John Chrysostom (*Quod Christus sit Deus* 9: PG 48, 826); *Asterius of Amasea (*Hom XI in laudem S. Euphemiae*: PG 40, 333-334). Augustine (*Tract. in Jo.* 117, 3 on *Jo* 19; *Serm.* 99,9) and *Prudentius (*Apotheosis* 448) speak of the cross that the emperors wear on their crown. *Theodoret (*Graec. Af. Curatio* VI: SC 57, 285) also speaks of the veneration (γεραίρειν) of the sign (σημεῖον) of the cross: he is not referring in this context, therefore, to the relic of the cross. The evidence for paintings does not yet attest their veneration. They are scenes of the OT, like the sacrifice of Abraham, which moves *Gregory of Nyssa (*De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti*: PG 46, 572 C). Augustine attests that such images are represented everywhere (*C. Faust XXII, 73*); there are also figures of the NT such as the apostles, painted on vases acc. to Jerome (*Com. Jon.* IV, 6), and Peter and Paul with Christ, acc. to Augustine (*De cons. evang.* I, 10 [16]). Finally, the basilicas of the martyrs are full of depictions of their passions: Gregory of Nyssa describes that of the martyr Theodore, where an image of Christ was also included (*De S. Theodoro*: PG 46, 737 D); Asterius of Amasea describes that of Saint Euphemia (*Hom.* XI: PG 40, 333). *Basil invites painters to depict the martyr *Barlaam (*Hom. XVII in Barlaam mart.*: PG 31, 489). Similar paintings are mentioned by Prudentius (*Peristephanon* IX, 9ff.).

The image of St. Polemon stopped a prostitute (Greg. Naz., *Poemi morali X*, 802-807). *Paulinus of Nola wanted to build porches all frescoed with images in honor of his dear St. *Felix (*Poema* 27,511; *Poema* 28, 20-21), and his letter 32 to *Sulpicius Severus described the subjects he must represent, above all St. *Martin, in the basilica that he plans for Primuliacum. Gregory of Nyssa promoted these paintings, writing on the basilica of St. Theodore, because they are like a book that speaks to those who cannot read and they give rise to the desire for spiritual realities. Similarly, a letter of *Nilus to the governor Olympiodorus (IV, 61: PG 79, 577) dissuades the latter from introducing into the basilica that he wants to build representations of purely ornamental animals and plants: rather, he should represent scenes of the two Testaments designed to educate the illiterate and instill in them a burning desire for heaven. At the end of the 6th c., two letters of *Gregory the Great (IX, 105 and XI, 13: PL 77, 1027ff., 1128ff.) praise Serenus, bishop of *Marseille, for impeding in his diocese a superstitious worship of images, but censures him for their destruction and for having thus caused a division among his faithful: the letters emphasize the educational function of images.

3. Before and during the iconoclastic crisis. So far there had not been a liturgical veneration of images. The phrase of Basil, quoted in the Second Council of Nicaea: "The honor given to the image refers back to its prototype" (*De Spir. S.to* XVIII, 45) cannot be used to posit the liturgical veneration of images, because the council extrapolates it from its context, which deals with the theology of the image of God, in order to apply it to the veneration of images. Origen had rejected a similar argument made by the pagans to justify their idolatrous worship (*C. Cels.* VI, 14), but the dogma of the *incarnation, devel-

oped in earlier centuries through the crisis provoked by *Apollinarianism, *Nestorianism, the *monophysite heresy and its various offshoots provided a justification for the veneration of images. It is difficult to know when and how the representation of sacred images produced a liturgical veneration. Three canons of the Quinisext Council or *In *Trullo* of 692 treat this matter: canon 73 regards the veneration of the cross; canon 82 calls for the replacement of the symbolic and allegorical representations of Christ, such as the Lamb, with human figures; canon 100 provides rules for decency in sacred art. The iconoclastic currents also had as their main motive the fear of idolatry and prohibitions of the OT; some radicals demanded the complete destruction of images; others, more moderate, rejected their veneration, or accepted some images but not others. Abuses gave them their pretext, and political pressures, if not from Muslims or Jews, at least from the *Manicheans or *Paulicians, also played a role. The two crises were stirred and then muffled by the direct interference of the emperor. The initiative came from *Leo III the Isaurian in the fall of 725: the Patriarch *Germanus of Constantinople, who opposed him, was forced to abdicate in 729; he was supported by Popes *Gregory II and *Gregory III, who refused to acknowledge the imperial measures. Constantine V Copronymus continued the religious policy of his father and in 752 called an iconoclastic synod of 338 bishops in the Hieria palace, on the E outskirts of the capital: the council decreed the destruction of all images that were in churches, and following upon these decrees, Constantine violently persecuted the supporters of images. But after his death in 775 and that of his son Leo IV in 780, the latter's widow, Irene, regent because of the age of the child Constantine VI, prudently restored the veneration of images. A new council was called at Nicaea in 787, the seventh ecumenical council, which condemned the council at the Hieria and defended the veneration of images. Nevertheless, the crisis resumed in 813, with the advent of Leo the Armenian and continued under his successors Michael II and Theophilus. At the latter's death in 843, his wife, Theodora, regent for her underage son, restored the veneration of images, commemorating it with the Feast of Orthodoxy, which would from then on be celebrated 11 March every year. The two iconoclast crises were the occasion for theological reflection, developed in the first crisis by Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople, the monk George of Cyprus and esp. *John of Damascus in three discourses against the iconoclasts; during the second by Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople and above all by Theodore the Studite. They emphasized, as a consequence of the incarnation, the sacramental character of the icon, which on account of its participation in what it represents is a source of grace.

We list above all important articles with rich bibliographies.: *Iconoclasme* (C. Emerau) and *Images* (*Culte des*) (V. Grumel), in DTC 7, 575-595, 766-844 (see general tables 2, 2186-2192); RAC 14, 66-96; *Images* (*chez les Juifs*) (J.B. Frey), in DBS 4, 199-232. Furthermore: J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, Paris 1912, III, 435-483; V. Fazzo, *La giustificazione delle immagini religiose*, Naples 1977; Chr. von Schönborn, *L'Icône du Christ: Fondements théologiques*, Fribourg-Suisse 1976; L. Ouspensky, *La théôlogie de l'icône dans l'Église orthodoxe*, Paris 1980; A. Marino, *Storia della lesgislazione sul culto delle immagini dall'inizio al trionfo dell'ortodossia*, Rome 1981; J. Gutmann, *Early Synagogue and Jewish Catacomb: Art and Its Relation to Christian Art*: ANRW II, 21,2 (1984) 1313-1342; *Culto delle immagini e crisi iconoclasta*, Atti del convegno di studi (Catania 16-17 maggio 1984), Palermo 1986; P. Schreiner, *Der byzantinische Bilderstreit: kritische Analyse der zeitgenössischen Meinungen und das Urteil der Nachwelt bis heute*, Spoleto 1988; P. Prigent, *L'image dans le judaïsme*, Geneva 1991; H.G. Thümmel, *Bilderlehre und Bilderstreit: Arbeiten zur Auseinandersetzung über die Ikone und ihre Begründung vornehmlich im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Würzburg 1991; Id., *Die Frühgeschichte der östkirchlichen Bilderlehre: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit vor dem Bilderstreit*, Berlin 1992; E. Kitzinger, *Il culto delle immagini: l'arte bizantina dal cristianesimo delle origini all'iconoclastia*, Florence 1992; S. Bigham, *Les chrétiens et les images*, Montréal 1992; P. Corby Finney, *The Invisible God: The Earliest Christians on Art*, New York 1994; D. Menozzi, *La Chiesa e le immagini. I testi fondamentali sulle arti figurative dalle origini ai nostri giorni*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995; *Vedere l'invisibile: Nicea e lo statuto dell'immagine*, ed. L. Russo, Palermo 1997.

H. Crouzel

IMPERIAL CULT. The part that the imperial cult played in the conflict between the church and the Roman Empire is not easy to determine. One thing is clear: the imperial cult was a component of the Roman religion, and the Christian religion's intransigent monotheism, inherited from the Jewish tradition, condemned all pagan cults as genuine impiety; thus, it could not accept the various expressions of the cult. All of this became increasingly important from the 1st c., in both public and private religious life, continuing to gain strength in the 2nd and 3rd c. and provoking the invective of St. John's Apocalypse (Rev 2:20) and, later, the criticism of the Apologists (Just., *1 Apol.* 21,3; Tatian, *Or.* X, 4; Melito of Sardis: PG 5, 1226). *Tertullian spoke of it at length in his *Apologeticum* (22-35), emphasizing the clash between the Roman religion and patriotism, identifying refusal to participate in it as the decisive reason for the persecutions. His presentation, however, does not correspond to the facts. Examination of the *Acts of the Martyrs* shows that refusal to participate

in the cult is never the legal justification for the arrest and condemnation of Christians. Moreover, when this reason is not explicitly stated, the accusation sufficient for subjecting Christians to judgment and condemnation is the simple fact of being Christians, the *nomen christianum*. Nonetheless, in the procedure proposed by *Pliny the Younger and in part confirmed by *Trajan, the imperial cult served as a test for obliging Christians to proclaim themselves as such. Pliny asked those brought before him to invoke the gods, to offer a *supplicatio* with an offering of wine and incense to the emperor's image and to those of the gods, and, finally, to curse Christ. Trajan confirmed just the first of these tactics. The actions of the imperial cult, then, were not an end in themselves but a means for recognizing true Christians and an opportunity for those brought before the tribunals to save their lives by proving their loyalty to the emperor: a tragic dilemma, which could be fatal.

R. Boreux, *Le culte impérial dans les persécutions des premiers siècles d'après les Actes authentiques des martyrs*, Louvain 1948 (thesis); L. Cerfaux - J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*, Paris 1957; *Le culte des souverains dans l'Empire romain*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 19, Vendoeuvres-Geneva 1972; LTK³ 5, 41-42; TRE 15, 251-255; RAC 3, 284-294, 353-356, 1047-1093; F. Millar, *The Imperial Cult and the Persecutions*: Éntretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 19 (1973) n. 7; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain (IIᵉ-IIIᵉ siècles)*, III, *Église et Cité*, Paris 1979, 196-205; S.R.F. Price, *Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult*: JRS 70 (1980) 28-43; H.-J. Klauck, *Die religiöse Umwelt des Urchristentums*, 2, Stuttgart 1996, 17-74; I. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, Oxford 2002.

Ch. Munier

IMPIETY. The attitude of one who does not worship God or respect his laws. Its dominant note is the lack of a sense of duty conceived of as divine law. The Bible is unaware of impiety as an expression of theoretical atheism, but knows and condemns it as practical atheism, contempt of the God of revelation. In Rom 1:18 the coupling of impiety and injustice signifies an egregious unrighteousness. Elsewhere allusion is not to perverse doctrinal statements but to the moral and religious effects deriving from them (2 Tim 2:16), to the intentional breaking of rules and to worldly pleasures (Tit 2:12), and above all to great sinners (1 Pet 4:18; 2 Pet 2:5; Jude 15, 18). While for the classical Greek world the term defines various attitudes—contempt of the gods, esp. those who protect the city and guarantee treaties; contempt of relatives living and dead; absence from public worship and transgression of the order of the *polis*—in Judaism there is a rational simplification which combines under this term the defiant attitude of the flood generation (Gen 6:11; cf. Job 22:15ff.), the builders of the tower of Babel (Gen 11:4), the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah (Wis 10:6), the classical enemies of Israel—Pharaoh, the Canaanites, Sennacherib, Babylon, Antiochus Epiphanes—and the people of God themselves, whose history is studded with infidelity and idolatry. The essential component of impiety is not irreligion or atheism, but the positive will to do the opposite of what fear and reverence for God command. Impiety adds to contempt of God and his law a substantial tone of hostility and defiance, which manifests itself in acts of violence, pride and the obstinate refusal to recognize God in his works (Ps 19:1; cf. Rom 1:18-20). Paul speaks of the existence of the "man of impiety" par excellence (Satan), whose activity (mystery of impiety) is already at work in the world (cf. 2 Th 2:7); in the last times he will exalt himself above all and proclaim himself to be God (2 Th 2:3–4:8). The literature of Qumran adds a new note: the impious are all those who are not part of the community and who do not follow the "teacher of righteousness," including the impious priest. In patristic literature other emphases appear, esp. with regard to orthodoxy (cf. Iren., *Ad Haer.*, 1,15, 5; 16, 3; 27, 4; 2, 1,5; passim; Did., *Eun.*, 5, PG 29, 740; John Chrys., *Hom.* 78, 2 *in Jo*; Gel. Cyz., *HE*, 2, 23, 12; Theod., *Haer.*, 4, 12); they inherit from the OT the concept of idolatry, deception, violence, irreverence toward God and human beings, and perverse conduct (cf. Just., *1 Apol.* 4, 7; *2 Clem.*, 10, 1; Iren., *Ad. Haer.*, *passim*; John Chrys., *Hom.*, 20, 4 *in 1 Cor* 19, 3). The mass of people in general, however, were not accused of impiety in matters of legal observance.

W. Foerster, ἀσεβής, ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβέω: GLNT XI, 1486-1502 [Eng. tr. TDNT 7:185-191]; J. Schmid, *Empietà*: Enc. della Bibbia, II, Turin 1969, 1309; Lampe, 242-243; X. Léon-Dufour, *Empietà*, Diz. Teol. Bibl., Turin 1965, 285-288; H. Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh ⁴1954, 523-524, 857-858; B. Reynders, *Lexique compare . . . de l'"Adversus Haereses" de Saint Irénée*, Louvain 1954, s.v.

E. Peretto

IMPROPERIA (or REPROACHES). The Improperia of the Western liturgy of Good Friday have their antecedents in the Quartodeciman Easter homilies of Asia Minor. The anti-Jewish invective, present in those sermons, is a testimony to the increasing differentiation of the Christian community from its Jewish roots. The Jews celebrated the Passover by sacrificing the paschal lamb on a fixed date, 14 Nisan.

So did the Quartodeciman Christians, but in the lamb of the Jewish celebration of Passover they saw the figure of the crucified Lord and, in their Eucharist, the participation in the Passover of the Lord. The sociological reality of the two communities, already far from peaceful, came to a head at the simultaneous celebration of Easter/Passover. In the context of both celebrations, sections of the liturgy developed that, anchored in the theme of Easter/Passover (*pascha*), recalled the accusations typical of the prophetic indictment of the OT (*rîb* = strife, dispute), which articulated the contrast between the generosity of God and the ingratitude of the people. This prophetic indictment enumerating the benefits of Yahweh and describing Israel's infidelity was intended to make Israel's guilt clear. The Quartodeciman homilists, in particular *Melito of Sardis, adapted such indictment, making particular use of Jeremiah's indictment regarding the breaking of the covenant (Jer 2:4-13; 6:16-21 and 9:1-26). The recurrence of the old sins of Israel (infidelity) were recalled, along with the futility, or rather the falsity, of their worship no longer linked to the covenant. In the Quartodeciman vision, Christ, to free humans from their suffering, must suffer, but Israel is blamed for that suffering. The ingratitude of Israel to Jesus Christ after the disappearance of the anti-Jewish polemic became the topos of human ingratitude toward God, and those are the Lamentations (Improperia) of the Lord in the liturgy of the adoration of the cross on Good Friday.

L. Brou, *Les impropères du Vendredi Saint*: Revue Grégorienne 20 (1935) 161-179; 21 (1936) 8-16; 22 (1937) 1-9 and 44-51; V. Grossi, *Melitone di Sardi, Perì Pascha 72-99, 523-763. Sull'origine degli Improperia nella liturgia del Venerdì Santo*, in *Dimensioni drammatiche della liturgia medievale*, Rome 1977, 203-216.

V. Grossi

INCARNATION. Patristic theology formed the concept of the incarnation following the writings of John (Jn 1:14; 1 Jn 4:2). The noun σάρκωσις, though already used by *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer*. III, 18,3; 19,1) and by the *C. Noetum* (16), becomes widely used only in the 2nd half of the 4th c. during the *Apollinarian controversy (see Lampe 1224). The same is true of the Latin version *incarnatio* (see Braun, *Deus*, 302). Since the NT points to the same reality with a number of other expressions (see esp. Phil 2:6-11; 1 Tim 3:16; 2 Tim 1:10), Christian authors, in turn, present it with a variety of words: ἐνανθρώπησις (see DS 125, Athanasius), ἐνσωμάτωσις (esp. Origen, see Liébaert, HDG 51), παρουσία, ἐπιδημία (most frequent term in Origen, see Harl, *Origène*, 205) etc. (see Orig., *Princ*. I *praef*. 4; for Tertull.: Braun, *Deus*, 298-326; Athan.: SC 199, 93-139). At the same time, they considered it from different points of view: as a historical event in being born of *Mary (see the creeds), as the assumption of human nature (see the theological formulations), as the continued existence of the Logos in the flesh (ἕνωσις, κρᾶσις), as the mystery of salvation in a global sense (οἰκονομία, Irenaeus, *Tertullian).

This diversity of expressions and approaches alone demonstrates the complexity and centrality of the mystery of the incarnation in patristic theology. On the one hand, it had a difficult time reconciling this paradox of the Christian faith with objections regarding the immutability of God, a fundamental tenet of Greek philosophy (see Aug., *Ep*. 137), while at the same time it confronted the need for a savior free from the contamination of human sinful flesh. (See the patristic exegesis of Rom 8:3 against *docetic trends, as well as the subject of the virgin birth.) It was no less difficult to explain the intimate union of God with a complete human nature—namely, the coexistence of two wills in the one Christ. From the 2nd to the 7th c., this christological controversy made use of many intellectual and religious forces (*see* *Christology). Particularly noteworthy is the position of *Origen (see Studer, *Incarnation*, 227-228). In the wake of Irenaeus he developed the distinction between the divine and human in Christ, but not without theological reflections that bring one to acknowledge the one Christ. It is a pity that his doctrine on the soul of Jesus was too ambiguous to be widely accepted, because it grasps the crucial point of the encounter between God-the-Creator and man-the-created in Christ. Equally interesting is the fundamental assertion of *Augustine that only the Son became incarnate (*Trin*. I, 4,7-8) (see B.E. Daley). It forms the basis of the doctrine on the *hypostatic union which was elaborated in subsequent debates between the followers of *Cyril of Alexandria and the defenders of the faith of *Chalcedon (see Grillmeier II/1 and II/2).

On the other hand, the wealth of biblical and philosophical terms with which the Fathers were trying to express the mystery of the incarnation makes it possible to understand how this doctrine is right at the center of the Christian faith, to which in a more or less explicit way all the other mysteries must relate. The following facts are of particular note: early on there was a shift from an apocalyptic reflection, which had opposed the resurrection of Christ to the parousia, to that comparing the incarnation of the preexisting Word with the final resurrection of the dead (see Cantalamessa, *Problema cristologico*, 155-160). It is already mentioned in *Ig-

natius of Antioch (cf. *Eph.* 7,2; 19) and *Justin (distinction between the two parousias). This theology of the incarnation established itself during the antignostic controversy, in which Irenaeus and *Tertullian defended the *salus carnis,* the salvation of the whole human precisely with the belief in the real incarnation of God (see Studer, *Soteriologie*, 73-85). In this context, the incarnation is also included as a condition for death and then the resurrection (see Tertull., *Carn.* 6,6-7) and as the basis of the new birth for Christians (see Tertull., *Carn.* 17,2). This "incarnational" realism will later be the necessary prerequisite for the theology of the sacrifice of the one Redeemer (see Lyonnet, *Sin*, 196; 250-251). Along the same line, the whole Christian life, not just its beginning in baptism and its end in the resurrection, is seen as an imitation of the incarnation of the Son of God. This basic theme, based esp. on the letter to the Philippians (2:5-11), has found its most eloquent expression in the Augustinian theology in which the humility of God, demonstrated in the incarnation (*humanitas = humilitas*), is the only way to overcome pride and arrive at the love of God and neighbor, i.e., true righteousness, and in which the same incarnation is the model of the absolute free character of divine grace, without which one cannot imitate the humility of Christ, persevering to the end (see Studer, *Soteriologie*, 156-174). No less important is the relationship the Fathers recognize between the incarnation of the Word and the church. This is demonstrated in particular in the texts of Origen and Augustine, who, against the background of 1 Cor 6:17 and Eph 5:31-32, explain using the same matrimonial language for both the incarnation, as the union of the Word with the flesh, and the church as a union between Christ and Christians (see Schmid, RivAC 2, 555-558). In the ecclesiological context, the comparison between the incarnation and the Eucharist, which can be found from Justin onward (1 *Apol.* 66), deserves to be mentioned in a special way. It is also worth noting the comparison *Nemesius makes of the union in human beings of the body and soul with the incarnation, while *Gregory of Nazianzus and Augustine do the opposite (cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus*, 574ff., 602). In conclusion, one may recall Origen's theology of the mystery, acc. to which, while all created things symbolize the Word of God, the incarnation appears as the summary of the whole economy of salvation (see Harl, *Origène*, 143,200-204). Thus patristic theology foreshadowed the modern theory that the incarnation of the Word is the model of the relationship between God and humanity—indeed, of every relationship between the Creator and his creation (Rahner).

J. Schmid, *Brautschaft*: RAC 2, 528-564; T. van Bavel, *Recherches sur la christologie de s. Augustin*, Fribourg 1954; M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné*, Paris 1958; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum*, Paris 1962; J. Liébaert, *Christologie*: HDG III/1a, Freiburg 1965; S. Lyonnet, *Sin: Redemption and Sacrifice*, Rome 1970; R. Cantalamessa, in *Il problema cristologico oggi*, Assisi 1973, 143-197; B. Studer, *Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*: HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* I. (Freiburg 1979), II/1 (1986), II/2 (1989); H. Stickelberger, *Freisetzende Einheit. Über ein christologisches Grundaxiom bei Maximus Confessor und Karl Rahner*, in *Maximus Confessor*, ed. F. Heniger - Chr. Schönborn, Fribourg 1982, 365-373; B. Studer, *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der Alten Kirche*, Düsseldorf 1985 (It., Fr., Eng. tr.); R. Williams, *Jesus Christus*, II: Alte Kirche: TRE 16 (1987) 726-745 (bibl.); G. Madec, *Christus*: AugL I/5-6 (1992) 845-908 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Gratia Christi*, Rome 1993, espec. 74-79, 110-119; P. Hünermann: LTK³ 5, 498ff.; B.E. Daley, *Incarnation*, in *Augustine Through the Ages*, ed. A. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 445ff. (bibl.); B. Studer, *Incarnazione*: Orig. Diz. (2000) 225-229 (bibl.); C. Gunton: RGG 4 (2001) 141-142.

B. Studer

INCENSE. Resinous substance that is burned, emitting a smoke with a pleasant smell. Also known and used for purposes of worship by all the peoples of antiquity, including the Greeks and Romans. Together with other perfumes, it was used by the Jews for worship in the Mosaic tabernacle (Ex 30:34) and later in the temple for the offerings (Lev 2, passim). It was introduced in the Christian liturgy at a relatively late date, due to the hostility toward anything that could recall the pagan rites: see the precise positions of *Tertullian (*Apol.* 30) and *Augustine (*Enar. in ps.* 49,14). This did not prevent the use of incense in funeral rites (see Tertull., *Apol.* 42), and generally it was considered a symbol of prayer (in relation to Ps 141[140]:2: "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense") and of divine worship. We know that *Constantine gave to the Lateran Basilica incense burners to perfume the environment, but not for liturgical use, properly speaking (*Lib. pont.*, ed. Duchesne, 227), see *Egeria on the use of incense to scent the air in the church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem (*Peregr.*: CSEL 39, 73). It is believed that the use of incense in the liturgy began to establish itself in both East and West at the end of the 4th c.

DACL V, 2-21; EC VI, 1753-1755; LTK³ 10, 1024-1025 (*Weikrauch*); M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, I, Milan 1964, 390-394; B. Caseau, *Euodia: The Use and Meaning of Fragrances in the Ancient World and Their Christianization (100-900)*, Ann Arbor, MI 1994.

F. Scorza Barcellona

INCEST. The Latin term is formally the opposite of *castum*. The debate on the exact definition of *incestum* lasted for many centuries. In principle, it is an impure relationship with respect to what is *fas* (lawful): incest was described as sexual intercourse between certain family members or, as another example, with a vestal virgin. Regarding the former, with the great frequency or even prescription of certain types of endogamous marriages in the Rome of the Republican and archaic period, the range of incest within the family, although sanctioned by imperial laws with the penalty of *deportatio in insulam* for the *honestiores* and *verberatio* for *humiliores* but without penalty for the woman (Paulus, *Sent*. 2,26,15), was restricted to the closest degrees of relationship. New and different rules for the prohibition of marriage between blood relatives for the Christians came with the OT (Lev 18). That these restrictions of Jewish origin were extended to Christian converts from paganism is clear from Acts 15:20 and 29, where they are mentioned under the name of *fornication/*porneia*. Crimes of incest were also included in the latter technical term that includes all crimes in the whole area of sexuality; see the use of the word in 1 Cor 5:1-5. Some canons of councils, from the 4th c. onward, prohibit marriage between persons united by ties of affinity: Elvira (ca. 300) can. 61 and 66, Neocaesarea (between 314 and 325) can. 2, Orleans (511) can. 18, Epaone (517) can. 30, and others. These canons formulate bans and prescribe penances, but only Epaone requires the separation of the people involved, while Orleans 538 makes an exemption when there is no prior knowledge of the ban. The canons of Basil prohibit marriage between brothers- and sisters-in-law (23: requiring the separation of the couple; 78), between brother and sister (67: imposes the same penance as for murder; 75,79), prohibition extended to all the degrees of consanguinity (68: same punishments as for adultery), between stepchildren and the widow of the father (stepmother).

Ph. Moreau, *Plutarque, Augustin, Lévy-Strauss. Prohibition de l'inceste et mariage préférentiel dans la Rome primitive*: RBPh 56 (1978) 41-54; T. Cornell, *Some Observations on the "Crimen incesti": Le délit religieux dans la cité antique*, Table ronde, Rome, 6-7 avril 1978, Paris 1981, 27-37; Y. Thomas, *Mariages endogamiques à Rome. Patrimoine, pouvoir et parenté depuis l'époque archaïque*: RD 58 (1980) 345-382; Ph. Moreau, *Le mariage dans les degrés rapprochés: le dossier romain I siècle av. J.-C. – III siècle ap. J.-C.*, in P. Bonte (ed.), *Épouser au plus proche: inceste, prohibitions et stratégies matrimoniales autour de la Méditerranée*, Paris 1994, 59-78; C.S. De Vos, *Stepmothers, Concubines and the Case of* Porneia *in* 1 Corinthians 5: NTS 44 (1998) 104-114.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

INCORRUPTIBILITY. The terms ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία do not appear in the Septuagint, but only in the books of Wisdom and *4 Maccabees*. Humanity is made for incorruptibility (Wis 6:17-19). St. Paul places himself in this sapiential tradition (ἀφθαρσία: Rom 2:7; 1 Cor 15:42; Eph 6:24; 2 Tim 1:10; ἀθανασία: Rom 1:23; 1 Cor 9:25; 1 Tim 1:17; 1 Pet 1:4, 23; 3:4). Immortality and incorruptibility are attributes of the "incorruptible God" (Rom 1:23), who "alone is immortal" (1 Tim 6:16); whereas humanity, who was created to be incorruptible, was doomed to corruption on account of sin (Wis 2:23; Rom 1:23; 8:21; 1 Cor 15:42-54; 2 Cor 4:16; Gal 6:8; Eph 4:22; 2 Pet 1:4; 2:12). Therefore, the resurrection of Christ brings new hope for the resurrection of the body: this is the kerygma of 1 Cor 15. Because of Christ, who has been preserved from corruption (Acts 2:27, 31; 13:34-37), humanity may one day, through the word of the living God (Wis 6:19; 1 Pet 1:18, 23; 3:4), inherit incorruptibility (Rom 2:7; 1 Cor 9:25; 15:42-54; Eph 6:24; 2 Tim 1:10; 1 Pet 1:14).

1. The early church attached great importance to the gift of immortality and incorruptibility, synonymous with eternal life. The author of the *2 Clement* called Christ "Savior and founder of incorruptibility" (*2 Cl.* 20,5). Incorruptibility is a key term of the theology of *Irenaeus of Lyons (see P. Reynders, *Lexique de l'Adversus haereses de S. Irénée*, Louvain 1954; M. Aubineau, *Incorruptibilité et Divinisation selon saint Irénée*: RSR 44 [1956] 25-52 and A. Orbe, *Homo vivens*: Gregorianum 73 [1992] 205-268).

Y. de Andia has taken this term as the main theme of the anthropology of Irenaeus of Lyons (*Homo vivens. Incorruptibilité et divinisation selon Irénée de Lyon*: Études Augustiniennes, Paris 1986). Human perfection is conducted through a progression to incorruptibility (*Adv. Haer.* IV, 38,1-4), acc. to a certain "order": to the Father through the Son, "the Incorruptible Word" (*Adv. Haer.* III, 19.1), in the Spirit. Indeed, it is through union to immortality and incorruptibility (*Adv. Haer.* III, 18,7; 19,1-3; 20,1-2) that humanity participates in them both, and it is through the Spirit that the "pledge" of incorruptibility is given in the sacraments, and esp. the Eucharist. Finally, the vision of the Father grants incorruptibility (*Adv. Haer.* IV, 38,3). "The teaching on the resurrection of the body then emerges in its truth and its strength. It is this doctrine that we, for our part, believe in: God, by resurrecting our mortal bodies which will have undergone judgment, will make them incorruptible and immortal" (*Adv. Haer.* II, 29,2). Against the *gnostics who say that, based on the verse of 1 Cor 15:53, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit incorruptibility," Irenaeus gives an exegesis

of 1 Cor 15. The theological argument of Irenaeus is based on "the power of God"—the God of the gnostics, who does not resurrect the body is, for Irenaeus, "devoid of power"!—and bases his philosophical argument on the change of "qualities" (the corruptible becomes incorruptible) within the identity of the "substance."

2. After Nicaea, the deification of humanity is no longer mainly expressed through participation in incorruptibility. *Gregory of Nyssa shows, in his treatise on virginity, the relationship between virginity and incorruptibility.

3. The question of the incorruptibility of Christ's body after death was posed by St. *Augustine in his Letter 205 of October 420: "The divine power can therefore give bodies the visible and sensitive qualities that it wants without providing them all; it can put mortal members into an unalterable strength, so that they maintain their outward appearance without preserving their corruption; it is the same image without mortality."

4. The incorruptibility of the body of Christ was also established by *Athanasius: "Because of the descent in him of the Logos, the body does not corrupt acc. to the law of his nature; through the indwelling of the Logos of God, it is wholly devoid of corruption" (*De Incarnatione* 20,4, SC 199, 338-339; see also *Contra Arianos* III, PG 26, 444 C; *De tridui spatio*, *Epistula III*, and l'*Adversus Apollinarium*. See the studies of J. Lebourlier, *À propos de l'état du Christ dans la mort*: RSPh 67 (1963) 161-180 and of M. Canévet, *La mort du Christ et le mystère de sa personne humano-divine dans la théologie du IVᵉ siècle*: Quatre Fleuves 15-16 [1982] 71-92).

5. In the 5th c., the *aphthardocetist dispute (see M. Jugie, *Eutychès. Eutychianisme*: DTC 5,2, Paris 1924) caused *Severus of Antioch and *Julian of Halicarnassus to dispute the corruptibility of the body of Christ. The name "aphthardocetist" given to Julian, Gaianus and their followers, was an abusive term because they could not be accused of *docetism, having never denied the passibility of Christ during his mortal life. Their mistake was to believe that this passibility was a perpetual miracle because the body of Christ had every right to incorruptibility; this could be interpreted as a denial of the consubstantial nature of Christ's body with ours and, therefore, as a Eutychian *monophysitism. Julian, however, always denied being a disciple of Eutyches.

M. Jugie, *Eutychès. Eutychianisme*: DTC 5,2, Paris 1924; P. Reynders, *Lexique de l'Adversus haereses de S. Irénée*, Louvain 1954; M. Aubineau, *Incorruptibilité et Divinisation selon saint Irénée*: RSR 44 (1956) 25-52; J. Lebourlier, *À propos de l'état du Christ dans la mort*: RSPh 67 (1963) 161-180; M. Canévet, *La mort du Christ et le mystère de sa personne humano-divine dans la théologie du IVᵉ siècle*: Quatre Fleuves 15-16 (1982) 71-92; Y. de Andia, *Eucharistie et incorruptibilité*: Revue thomiste 85 (1985) 464-479; Id., *Homo vivens. Incorruptibilité et divinisation selon Irénée de Lyon*: Études Augustiniennes, Paris 1986; A. Orbe, *Homo vivens*: Gregorianum 73 (1992) 205-268.

Y. de Andia

INCUBATIO. The *incubatio* (Gk. ἐκοίμησις) was a divinatory and medical practice typical of the pagan world, which was inherited also in Christian culture. It consisted in sleeping in a temple with the purpose of having dreams, to be interpreted by the priests the day after, and being healed (see, e.g., Strabo 11,7,1; 16,2,35). It was esp. in sanctuaries of Asclepius, the so-called Asclepieia, or of Isis, that the *incubatio* took place: there were special rooms devoted to this practice, where patients would sleep, generally after purifying baths, fasting and sacrifices. For example, at Oropus, at the sanctuary of Amphiaraus, they had to fast one day and abstain from wine, and Pausanias (1,34,5) attests that the sacrifice of a ram was required; then one had to sleep upon its skin.

Plutarch (*Cons. ad Apoll.* 14,109C) designates the *incubatio* in a sanctuary as ἐγκοιμᾶσθαι καὶ ἰδεῖν ὄψιν ("sleeping inside and having a vision/a dream"), which could be done even on behalf of someone else, as in the case of two friends of Alexander the Great, who slept in a temple of Serapis instead of him during his last illness (Arr. *Exp. Alex.* 3,26,2; Plut. *Alex.* 76). Virgil (*Aen.* 7,81-101) describes the *incubatio* practiced by Daunus, Lavinia's father, who was doubtful about who would be the best husband for his daughter. He offered a sheep sacrifice, slept on the skin and received the apparition of Faunus, who advised him to give his daughter to Aeneas. In the same passage Virgil also says that Latinus too used to sacrifice sheep in that same place and sleep on their skins in order to get a response. In Sparta there was a temple of Pasiphae where divination through dreams was practiced. But the *incubatio* also took place in the temples of Zeus in Dodona (already attested in the *Iliad*, 16,235), of Mopsus in Mallus in Cilicia (Plut. *De orac. def.* 5,412A), of Pallas Hygeia in *Athens near the entrance to the Acropolis (Plut. *Per.* 13), etc. Accius in his *Brutus* (*ap.* Cic. *Div.* 1,44) described a dream of Tarquinius Superbus involving the sacrifice of a ram and a sort of *incubatio*, then the interpretation of the vision. Diodorus Siculus (1,53) ascribes the practice of *incubatio* in sanctuaries (ἡ ἐγκοίμησις ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς), aimed at knowing the future, to an Egyptian princess.

The most complete description of several Asclepieia comes from four orations by Aelius Aris-

tides, who visited them during seventeen years in the 2nd c. AD in hopes of recovering his health, and practiced purifying baths and the *incubatio*; he also describes many persons who frequented such sanctuaries. In the late 4th c. Jerome, *In Isaiam* 65, speaks of pagan *incubatio* as still existing in his day: *in delubris idolorum . . . stratis pellibus hostiarum incubare soliti erant, ut somnis futura cognoscerent. Quod in fano Aesculapii usque hodie error celebrat ethnicorum multorumque aliorum.*

In Christianity, the *incubatio* was practiced above all by *Montanists, who were convinced that dreams and visions, inspired by the Spirit, would complete the NT revelation. They used fasting, prayer and *incubatio* in order to facilitate them. Epiphanius (*Panarion* 49,1) reports that in *Pepuza, a Phrygian town, one of their prophetesses, Quintilla or Priscilla, during her sleep was visited by Christ in a vision: he looked like a woman, infused wisdom into her, and revealed to her that Pepuza was a holy place, where the heavenly Jerusalem had descended. From then on, both men and women practiced the *incubatio* there, in hopes of receiving a vision of Christ. Tertullian (*De Anima* 48,3) is a witness to the practice of fasting before the *incubatio: apud oracula incubaturis ieiunium indicitur,* and he also attests to the opposite phenomenon, of a deity that prevented people from dreaming during the *incubatio*: *Aristoteles heroem quendam Sardiniae notat incubatores fani sui uisionibus priuantem* (*De Anima* 49,2).

But also outside Montanist and *Donatist groups, the practice of *incubatio* is attested in Christianity, esp. in some particular places, such as the Cave of St. Michael at Mount St. Angel (Gargano, Puglia), or the Michaelion close to *Constantinople, at Hestiae, as we know from *Sozomen (*HE* II 3,9-12), who also recounts episodes of *incubatio* there resulting in a healing, either physical or spiritual. Similar episodes are attested for the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, where *Porphyry of Gaza was healed, and for the tomb of St. Euthymius in Palestine.

Sogni, visioni e profezie nell'antico Cristianesimo. XVII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Augustinianum 29 (1989); G. Otranto - C. Carletti, *Il santuario di San Michele Arcangelo sul Gargano dalle origini al X secolo*, Bari 1990; Id., *Culto e insediamenti micaelici nell'Italia meridionale*, Bari 1994; B. Näf, *Traum und Traumdeutung im Altertum*, Berlin 2004; P. Grossmann, *Late Antique Christian Incubation Centres in Egypt*, in *Salute e guarigione nella Tarda Antichità*, ed. H. Brandenburg, S. Heid, C. Markschies, Vatican City 2007, 125-140; T. Lehmann, *Felix medicus ed Ambrosius medicus. Vescovi, santi ed i luoghi di salvezza e guarigione fra IV e V secolo*, ibid. 149-164; C. Markschies, *Gesund werden im Schlaf – Einige Rezepte aus der Antike*, ibid., 165-198; R. Teja, *Cultos y ritos terapéuticos cristianos en la hagiografía de Oriente*, in *Cristo e Asclepio: culti terapeutici e taumaturgici nel mondo Mediterraneo antico tra cristiani e pagani*, ed. E. Dal Covolo - G. Sfameni Gasparro, Rome: LAS 2008, 129-159: 138-145.

I. Ramelli

INDEX OLEORUM. A list of names (*notula*) of Roman martyrs made (it is theorized) by a certain John, as it appears in the subscription: *Iohannis* (*sic*) *indignus peccator*. It is not impossible that he himself collected in individual vials portions of the oil from the lamps that burned at the graves of the martyrs in Rome. To each of the ampules were affixed the so-called *pittacia,* pieces of papyrus, on which was written the name of the martyr. According to the subscription, all the ampules were given as a gift at the time of *Gregory the Great to Queen Theodolinda, residing in Monza. These signs of Christian piety are kept today in the cathedral treasury of Monza: sixteen are still extant. The catalog of the names of the martyrs, even if of little value in relation to the topography of ancient Rome, is now considered an equally important document, although it is now considered a copy completed after the age of Gregory the Great and prepared, moreover, not in Rome, but at Monza.

L.A. Muratori, *Anecdota latina*, II, Milan 1698, 191-192; A. Sepolcri, *I papiri della basilica di Monza*: Archivio storico lombardo, s. 3a, 30 (1903) 241-262; R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, II, Rome 1942, 29-47; DACL 11, 2752-2761 (Monza); EC 6, 1799; Fliche-Martin V (1970) 523-524, n. 22.

L. Dattrino

INDICTION. The term is derived from *indicere* (to declare, proclaim, announce, or call an assembly; Gr.: *epinemēsis*); the *indictio* was the declaration of an extraordinary tax, a fiscal imposition. In the most ancient period, an extraordinary requisition of goods in nature (e.g. grain; *annona*), levied upon the possessors of provincial lands (Daremberg 2,468). With the intent of rationalizing the tax system, *Diocletian introduced the yearly *indictiones extraordinariae* (they had been arbitrary before); they were introduced in Egypt in 287, and then gradually in other provinces, with a five-year fiscal cycle (Jones, *Il Tardo impero*, 92-93; 174-175); starting in 312, the cycle was for fifteen years (Grumel, 192). From the time of *Constantine *indictio* was the law or edict by which the quantity of contribution (*capitatio, iugatio*) was imposed (*indictio, indicta, indictum*) annually. The edict was transmitted to the governors of the provinces, who then published it. In addition,

the term *indictio* came to have a double sense: (1) a period of fifteen years, beginning in 312, introduced by Licinius and marked by the **Chronicon Paschale;* the emperor *Justinian rendered it obligatory for dating official documents (Novella 47,2); (2) yet, above all, it was each fiscal year in the scope of the fifteen-year period (*indictio*) and always starting from 312, i.e., the number of indictions in the midst of the fifteen-year cycle. A calculation does not exist of the successive *indictiones,* understood as fifteen-year periods. Such a system was imposed immediately for dating documents: e.g., *Athanasius begins to use it already in 329 (II i.) in the festal letters (see A. Camplani, *Atanasio di A.*, *Lettere festali*, Milan 2003, 221). Thus, in this sense, the year 313 is the first *indictio,* the year 314 the second *indictio,* 315 the third, and so on; after the fifteenth year, it started over from the beginning. The system was used during the entire Middle Ages and was the most precise for dating, but it was not absolute, and thus to translate it into dates one had to make reference to other systems or facts. Some think the beginning is 313, but it depends on the manner of counting. There also exists a variation in the days which begin and end the *indictio*: (1) Byzantine indiction (Constantinian or of Constantinople): initially this went from 23 September (*Natalis Augusti,* the ancient Eastern commencement of the year, in some E provinces); in a later period, ca. 462, the beginning entered into effect on 1 September; the memory of the old beginning remained for a long time in the ecclesiastical year, which began 23 September in Byzantium (Grumel, 198-200); (2) in Egypt the date could vary in relation to the publication of the edict and of the harvest. For example, in 551 June of the fourteenth indiction in Egypt was the fifteenth indiction at Constantinople; (3) Bedan (of Bede, imperial or Western) indiction began 24 September; (4) Roman or pontifical indcition began 25 December. From the 11th c., it was the most observed in the West. From the time of Pope Gregory XIII (1572–1585) the indiciont began 1 January. Yet there are other commencement dates of the indiction which were used throughout the Middle Ages and by the tribunal of the Holy Roman Empire until its abolition (1806). Sometimes books on chronology still give the indictions to this day, for which 2014 would correspond to the seventh indiction (e.g., Lietz and Cappelli).

J. Gothofredus, *Ad Codicem Theodosii*, I, Lyon, CLXXIX-CLXXXII; ICR (1861) XVIIf.; A. Cappelli, *Cronologia, cronografia e calendario perpetuo*, Milan 1998, 5-6; CE 7, 467-468 (Grumel); EC 6, 1870-1871; E.J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London 1968, 78ff.; V. Grumel, *La chronologie*, Paris 1958, 192-206; A.H.M. Jones, *Il Tardo impero (284-602 d.C.)*, Milan 1973; R.S. Bagnall - K.A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, Leiden [2]2004.

A. Di Berardino

INFINITY – INFINITUDE. In Greek philosophy infinitude was generally not valued, as it was associated with indeterminacy. Finitude, and thus limitedness, was associated with the idea of order and perfection. This conception, which has its roots in Pythagoreanism, Parmenides and *Plato (whereas a more positive idea of infinitude was held by Anaximander, Anaxagoras, the atomists and Epicurus), found its paradigmatic expression in *Aristotle, acc. to whom nothing which has no limit (*peras*) is perfect, and the limit is the end (*telos*). According to Aristotle, there can exist nothing actually infinite, but only potentially. According to *Philo, on the contrary, God is infinite, and this notion, which is related to the biblical idea of the omnipotence of God, was taken up esp. by *Origen and by *Gregory of Nyssa. But their positive concept of infinitude has a precise correspondent in *Plotinus and in *Neoplatonism, and this is one of the many remarkable correspondences between Origen and Plotinus. For Plotinus, the One is characterized by an infinite power and richness. This is also why, acc. to Plotinus, it is impossible to grasp the One: “It is ridiculous to try to grasp and comprehend [περιλαμβάνειν] what is infinite by nature” (*Enn.* V 5,6,15). Likewise for Gregory of Nyssa it is impossible to grasp the Godhead because of its infinity.

Gregory is unequivocal in stating that “the Godhead is infinite” (*Or. cat.* 10). Infinitude is the mark and peculiarity of God vis-à-vis all creatures, both intelligible and sense-perceptible; God is the only being who is uncreated, and therefore also the only being who is infinite (*C. Eun.* III, vi, p. 209,19-21; iii, pp. 107-108; i, pp. 105-106). In his sixth homily on the Song of Songs, p. 174, however, infinitude is ascribed to “the intelligible and immaterial substance” as opposed to the sense-perceptible and material one, which is “included within given limits.”

God’s infinity, acc. to Gregory, is characterized by an infinite extension in time and by the immutability and infinity of the various traits that we humans ascribe to God. God’s infinitude is made possible by the absence of a principle that is equal and opposite to God, a feature that is typical of dualistic systems like *Manicheism. Such a principle would constitute a limitation of God. Once again, this concept is very close to that of Plotinus, who describes the One as lacking every dimension and number, in that it precedes numbers and is endowed with an infinite

power (*Enn.* VI 9,6,10; V 5,10,19-23;11,1-4). Plotinus explains, like Gregory afterward, that the infinity of the One's power derives from the absence of any other equal principle which could limit it. These details are very close to those offered by Gregory of Nyssa (*C. Eun.* I 231-236). Gregory also develops the notion of God's temporal infinitude, or better of God's transcendence in respect to time, which is a διάστημα, i.e., a dimension, typical only of creatures (*C. Eun.* I 362-364). The Creator is eternal and never had origins, unlike creatures. Similarly, Plotinus maintained that time pertains to the world soul, whereas the One and the Nous transcend time (*Enn.* III 7,3-4). The temporal infinity of God, or better God's transcending time, was already maintained by Origen (*Princ.* IV 4,1: only the *Trinity transcends every χρόνοι and every αἰών, whereas all the rest is measured against time and duration).

There is a close relationship between the idea of the infinitude of God and apophaticism. The Godhead, insofar as it is infinite, escapes every definition and delimitation, and every discursive knowledge which proceeds through definitions. Indeed, for Gregory, God's infinitude implies God's incomprehensibility, as the divine exceeds the limits of human intellect (*C. Eun.* I 364,369,373) and can be grasped only through faith (ibid., I 371).

This concept was already present in Origen and even in *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* V 12,81-82). Apophaticism is ultimately grounded in God's infinity and indeterminacy; for it is impossible for humans to apply any ὅρος, any limit or definition, to God. As Gregory explains in *Ad Ablabium,* God's nature is impossible to define and comprehend (ἀόριστον, ἀπερίληπτον), as its infinitude (ἀπειρία) eludes every definition and delimitation. Likewise, commenting on the Song of Songs, Gregory affirms that God's infinite nature (ἀόριστον) cannot be encompassed in the meaning of a name. All good that may be conceived about it resolves itself into infinity and indeterminacy; it remains indeterminate in the good and has no limit in itself.

Gregory's own conception of ἐπέκτασις entirely depends on the notion of God as infinite. Every soul is destined to elevation and infinite development, by always increasingly participating in divine Good (*De An.* 105AD), because the Good, who is God, "proceeds toward infinity" (ibid., 97A). This idea is also stressed in the fifth homily on the Song of Songs. God is the Good, and nothing can limit it, as evil is limited itself; as a consequence, the soul who participates in this Good experiences an infinite progression. The eighth homily is entirely focused on the theme of ἐπέκτασις as an infinite growth of the soul toward God's infinite nature, which remains always further and ungraspable.

*Hilary of Poitiers, who was deeply influenced by Origen, in his *Trin.* presents God as infinite in space, time and power, basing himself on Ex 3:14; Is 40:12; and Is 66:1-2. Hilary speaks of an *infinitas potens* of God. As for Origen himself, he surely considered at least God's wisdom to be infinite (ἀπέραντος). Even if one remains skeptical concerning two passages, *Sel. in Ps.* 144 (PG 12,1673) and *Fr. in Ps.* 70,14 and 138,7, at least another passage is surely authentic: *C. Cels.* III 77, in which Origen describes God as infinite and unlimited (τῷ ἀπείρῳ). In *De Or.* 27,16 God is said to be ἐξ ἀπείρων ἐπ' ἄπειρον. This also makes the authenticity of *Sel. in Ps.* 144 more likely, where it is declared that "there is no limit to God's greatness" (οὐκ ἔστι πέρας τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ) and God's providence extends ἐξ ἀπείρου ἐπ' ἄπειρον. Gregory of Nyssa will echo this in his *Antirrh. adv. Apol.* GNO III/1,156: "The greatness of God's power extends up to infinity"; in *C. Eun.* III 3,68: "the infinity of divine power"; and *Ep.* 3,20: "The power of the divinity is something infinite and impossible to measure."

It is on the basis of God's infinitude that it was possible to support the thesis of the ontological priority of the Good over evil. This is particularly clear in Gregory of Nyssa. In *Vit. Mos.* 5,5 he can affirm that virtue has no limit "because all that is good, by its very nature, has no limit." Gregory argues on the basis of the infinitude of God-Good and the finitude of evil that it will be impossible for any creature to advance in evil or remain in evil forever; for evil is limited, and once one has reached its utmost depth, one cannot but return back again to the Good, which is unlimited and has no end, because the Good is God. Moreover, since evil is pure negativity, it will not exsist forever, but will disappear, acc. to its own nature, which is nonexistence. For evil is no creature of God, but only the result of an error, of a bad choice of the free will of rational creatures. In *De hom. op.* 21, Gregory opposes the immutability (τὸ ἀμετάθετον) of God's will, which is always in the Good, to the mutability (τὸ τρεπτόν) of human will, which cannot stably remain in evil forever. He argues that, since evil is limited, an infinite progression in evil is impossible: "Therefore, after the utmost culmination of evil, there comes again the Good . . . even though we had crossed the boundary of evilness and had arrived at the apex of the shadow of sin, we shall return again to living in the light." A variant of this argument, based on the (very Origenian) notion of κόρος is expounded by Gregory of Nyssa in *De mortuis* (esp. in § 19 Lozza).

That human will may persist in evil forever is impossible, in that the desire for evil generates κόρος. Only the desire for the Good can endure eternally, because it produces satisfaction and contentment rather than κόρος.

God's infinity was held by *Gregory of Nazianzus as well (*Or.* 6,22; 38,7). He ascribes to God infinity in time (*Or.* 38,7-8), but this is only an aspect of God's general infinity. He too argues on the basis of Ex 3:14, and assimilates God to "an ocean of Being, infinite and unlimited." Gregory of Nazianzus also grounds apophaticism in the conception of God as infinite, and thus ungraspable (e.g., in *Or.* 38,7).

The notion of the soul's love for God as an infinite progression is taken up by *John Climacus, who in his *Ladder* 30,197-201 defines love as "an eternal progression."

E. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 1966; T. Boehm, *Theoria – Unendlichkeit – Aufstieg*, Leiden 1996; C. Apostolopoulos, *Aoriston*, Platon 51 (1999–2000) 109-188; I. Ramelli, *Gregorio di Nissa Sull'anima e la resurrezione*, Milan 2007; Id., *Apofatismo cristiano e relativismo pagano: un confronto tra filosofi platonici*, in *Verità e mistero fra tradizione greco romana e multiculturalismo tardo antico*, ed. A.M. Mazzanti, Bologna 2009, 101-169.

I. Ramelli

INITIATION, CHRISTIAN. The modern concept of Christian initiation refers to the unity between the sacraments of *baptism, confirmation and *Eucharist; in its largest sense, it can also include the catechumenal process of integration into the Christian life. In the Fathers, however, Christian initiation is not seen as the *catechumenate, but it refers to sacramental rites by which one receives the baptismal washing, the *Holy Spirit and the Eucharist; in this manner the catechumen becomes initiated. Nevertheless, one cannot speak of three distinct sacraments in the patristic era, because the whole was integrated in one liturgical moment.

We find the Latin term *initiatio* in reference to the Christian rites already in *Tertullian (*Apol.* 7,7). In *Alexandria, *Clement and *Origen use the Greek vocabulary of initiation: μυστήριον, τελετή, μυέω, μυσταγωγέω. Yet, given the link between this terminology and that of the mystery religions, normally the Fathers avoided it and sought to distinguish the Christian rites from the pagan mysteries; *Justin (1 *Apol.*, 54,6; 66,4) and Tertullian (*De praesc. haeret.* 40,1-4; *Bapt.* 5) attribute the analogies to the work of demons. In the catechesis of the 4th and 5th c. the vocabulary of initiation developed, at least that used by *Ambrose and *John Chrysostom in a sacramental sense. In the preaching of *Augustine and in his anti-*Donatist writings we do not find this term, but in other works the verb *initiare* appears to be used in a sacramental sense (*Conf.* I, 11,17; *Civ. Dei* XV, 26,1).

Beyond the language, there are similarities with the mystery initiation in the **Disciplina Arcani* and in other rites, but this does not mean that there is a dependence of one upon the others. The origin of the primitive rites of Christian initiation must be sought in baptismal practices and in the ritual meals of *Judaism, transformed acc. to Christian usage. One can gather from the NT that the first Christian communities received their new members through baptism, which was distinguished from the baptism of John, as it was linked to the reception of the Holy Spirit.

Baptism was the center of Christian initiation in the primitive church, but its administration was unthinkable without the gift of the Holy Spirit and communion of the body and blood of Christ. The ritual structure of this celebration was not homogeneous. In the West, at the beginning of the 3rd c. we find the presence of baptismal rites such as the *signatio,* the anointing and the laying on of hands; while, in the Syro-Palestine area, in the same era a prebaptismal anointing was practiced which was understood to confer the gift of the Holy Spirit. Even during the time of John Chrysostom, in *Antioch, there was no rite of postbaptismal anointing (*see* *catechesis; *catechumen – catechumenate; *baptism).

RAC I, 667-676; R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionem*, Leipzig-Berlin 1910; F.J. Dölger, *Antike und Christentum*, II, Münster 1930, 57-69; V, 1935, 165-175; K. Prümm, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch*, Freiburg 1943, 308-352; G. Kretschmar, *Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche*, in Leiturgia V, Kessel 1970, 1-348; P.-M. Gy, *La notion chrétienne d'initiation*: La MaisonD 132 (1977) 33-54; H.M. Riley, *Christian Initiation*, Washington, DC, 1974; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du II^e au IV^e siècle*, Spoleto 1988; C. Munier, *Initiation chrétienne et rites d'onction (II^e-III^e siècles)*: RSR 64 (1990) 115-125; M.E. Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation*, Collegeville, MN 1999, 1-158.

O. Jiménez

INNOCENT I, pope (d. 417). He belonged to the home environment of *Anastasius I (339–402) (see Jerome, *Ep.* 130,16). Innocent was called to govern the Roman church in a very difficult period: during his pontificate (402–417), the city of Rome was conquered (410) by *Alaric's troops, an event which had a profound effect on all, pagans and Christians alike; but Innocent acted as if he were indifferent to it (*Ep.* 36). At the same time the Latin church was shaken

up by the first phases of the *Pelagian controversy. In such a grave situation, Innocent showed himself a vigorous defender of Roman primacy. He took up the ideas regarding it which were already traditional, developed them and defined them more precisely. His letters (ca. 36) attest to this. Among these letters, of particular importance are those addressed to some bishops of *Italy and *Gaul, in which Innocent takes positions on disciplinary questions, asserting the conformity of all churches of the West with the *consuetudo* of the church of Peter, which he demands to be the last resort for the *causae maiores*. Along the same political lines, he founded the apostolic vicariate of Thessalonica, whose bishop was treated as a Roman vicar (*Ep.* 1; 13; 17; 18). Responding in 417 with three letters (*Ep.* 29-31) to the same number, written by African bishops, regarding the Pelagian affair, Innocent did not hesitate to affirm the supreme authority of the *Sedes Apostolica* in doctrinal matters (*Ep.* 29,1; 30,2). Informed by *Theophilus of Alexandria about the deposition of *John Chrysostom and questioned by the same, Innocent took the side of the bishop of *Constantinople, breaking communion with both *Alexandria and with *Antioch, thereby defending the hierarchical order of the major apostolic sees (*Ep.* 7,3; 19; 24). Also notable are the positions he took on baptism administered by heretics (*Ep.* 2), on penance (*Ep.* 6 and 25) and on the canonicity of Sacred Scriptures (*Ep.* 13). An evaluation of all these interventions must carefully consider the different conditions of each of the addressees of the letters, their reactions, the rank of authority employed, the motives (the authority of Peter, synodal legislation, ideology of *Roma aeterna*), but also the ideas of that time concerning the *communio fidei* and the *receptio* of dogmatic definitions.

CPL 1641-1643ff., with special editions; PL 20, 463-608 (Coustant, 1721); PL 84, 657-658; PLS 1, 793-796; W. Marschall, *Karthago und Rom*, Stuttgart 1971, 127-150; M.R. Green, *Pope Innocent I*: Diss., Oxford 1973; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975, 116-133; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, *passim*; Patrologia III, 550-553 (bibl. prior to 1978); var. aus., *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio*, Vatican City 1989; LTK³ 5, 514-515; L. Dattrino, *Sollecitudine pastorale di Innocenzo I*: Lateranum 64 (1998) 221-225; RGG 4 (2001) 159-60; LACL (2002) 349-50.

B. Studer

INNOCENT of Maroneia (6th c.). He was the replacement for the bishop of *Philippi Demetrius, who was sick, at the time of the talks organized at the end of 532 or at the beginning of 533 by *Justinian at *Constantinople, for finding common ground between the orthodox and the *Severians. The Severian party had six delegates on its side. Two documents from Innocent have come down to us in a *Latin translation: the first is a treatise on the events that followed upon the condemnation of *Nestorius, of which Pope *John II made use and to whom it is implicitly directed (ACO 11, 4, 68-69). The other is a letter sent to Thomas, a priest of the church of *Thessalonica, on the development of the talks mentioned above. Innocent therein shows himself a complete supporter of Justinian's politics. He defends a mitigated formula of the epithet "one incarnate of the Trinity."

ACO IV, 2, Berlin 1914, XVI-XXVI.

M. van Esbroeck

INNOCENTS, Feast of the. The memorial of the children of Bethlehem below two years of age who were massacred by Herod in his attempt to eliminate the king of the Jews, of whose birth he had been informed by the magi (Mt 2), is connected to the celebration of the birth of Jesus in some homilies on Christmas from the 2nd half of the 4th c., such as those of *Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 36, 311-334), *Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46, 1127-1150) and in the *Nativity sermon attributed to *Optatus of Milevis (PLS 1, 288-294). But between the end of the 4th and the 1st half of the 5th c., in the West, it was also connected to the feast of the *Epiphany, wherever that solemnity was dedicated to the adoration of the magi, as it was in *Africa or at Rome (see, e.g., Aug., *Sermones* 199 and 202; Leo the Great, *Tractatus* 31-38). The first homiletic texts regarding the massacre of the innocents which are of secure attribution go back to the 5th c.: see Maximinus Arianus (*Serm.* 8, posterior to the Nativity sermon attributed to Optatus of Milevis, which is surely evoked); *Peter Chrysologus (*Sermones* 152-153); *Basil of Seleucia (*Or.* 37). It is supposed therefore that a proper Feast of the Holy Innocents was introduced during the course of the 5th c., at diverse times, depending on the different liturgical uses of various environments, fixed on 28 December in Africa and at Rome (see *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Carthaginiensis,* from the beginning of the 6th c.; *Martyrologium hieronymianum*, 6th–7th c.), 8 January in the Mozarabic rite (see the calendars published by M. Ferotin, *Le liber ordinum*, Paris 1905, 450-451) and in the East, for the most part, 29 December, as in the *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* of the 10th–11th c. (in other calendars 26 or 27 December: at Jerusalem, in the 5th c., 9 or 18 May, around the Feast of the As-

cension, see PO 35, 72-73). There is a remarkable homiletic literature about the Holy Innocents, esp. in the Latin language, in which they are celebrated as the firstfruits of the martyrs.

DACL 7, 608-616; LTK[3] 10, 425 (*Unschuldige Kinder*); B. Botte, *Les origines de la Noël et de l'Epiphanie. Étude historique*, Louvain 1932; J. Leclerc, *Aux origines du cycle de Noël*: EphemLiturg 60 (1946); Chr. Mohrmann, *Epiphanie*: RSPh 37 (1953) 644-670 (= *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, I, Rome 1961, 245-275); *Innocents.* IV. *Culte.* Cath 5, 1575-1676: BS 7, 819-823; P. Devos, *Égérie à Bethlehem. Le 40e jour après Pâques à Jérusalem*: AB 86 (1968) 87-108; F. Scorza Barcellona, *La celebrazione dei santi Innocenti nell'omiletica latina dei secoli IV-VI*: StudMed 3af., 15 (1974) 705-767; Id., *La celebrazione dei santi Innocenti nell'omiletica greca*: Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata, n.s. 29 (1975) 105-135 and 30 (1976) 73-101; J. Lemarié, *Le Sermoin Mai 193 et l'origine de la fête des SS. Innocents en Occident*: AB 39 (1981) 135-150.

F. Scorza Barcellona

INSTANTIUS (4th c.). The bishop Instantius clung to the teaching of *Priscillian and, to support his activity and to give it more authority, together with his colleague Salvianus, consecrated him bishop of Avila. Struck by Gratian's decree against the *Manicheans, which was worded so broadly as to include Priscillian and his followers, he went into exile, so that he could not reenter *Spain thereafter until the annulment of *Gratian's decree. Instantius was denounced, along with Priscillian, at the Council of *Bordeaux (384); he was deposed from his episcopal see and thereupon, after Priscillian's condemnation to death, was exiled to the Isles of Scilly, close to Cornwall.

The theory of G. Morin that attributes to Instantius the authorship of anonymous writings passed down by a MS of Würzburg and published by G. Schepss in 1889 (CSEL 18) has not received widespread acceptance; recently H. Chadwick upheld the Priscillian authorship of many of these writings. The attribution of the *De Trinitate fidei catholicae* is uncertain and is to be placed, perhaps, among a Priscillianist circle.

CPL 785, 788; G. Morin, *Pro Instantio. Contre l'attribution à Priscillien des opuscules du manuscrit de Würzburg*: RBen 30 (1913) 153-173; M. Hartberger, *Instantius oder Priscillian?*: ThQ 95 (1913) 401-430; E. Buonaiuti, *Instanzio o Priscilliano?*: RivScRel 1 (1916) 41-53; J. Martin, *Priscillianus oder Instantius?*: HJ 47 (1927) 237-251; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, passim.

S. Zincone

INSTITUTUM NERONIANUM. It is difficult to specify exactly what kind of legal foundation the first phase of the persecutions against the Christians by the Roman Empire had (from the year AD 64 until 250), inasmuch as the historical sources are confusing regarding the subject. Some scholars have held to the existence of a general law against the Christians, which *Tertullian (*Ad nationes* 1,7,9) calls the *Institutum Neronianum,* but, in reality, it does not seem correct to speak of a repressive law against the Christians during the first two centuries. The document known as the *Institutum Neronianum* must not be considered as the legal basis of an anti-Christian policy of the successive emperors, but rather it responded to the Neronian aim of dispelling from his person the insistent accusations which fell upon him after the great fire of Rome (AD 64). In this manner, the measures adopted by Nero affected not only Christians but also representatives of other religious and philosophical sects, such as—basically—an entire series of the socially disaffected and destitute (vagabonds, beggars etc.), who were integrated into the urban population.

J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme dans l'empire romain*, Paris 1956, 65-74; P. Keresztes, *The Imperial Roman Government and the Christian Church I: From Nero to the Severi*: ANRW II.1.23 (1974) 247-310; N. Santos Yanguas, *Cristianismo e imperio romano durante el siglo I*, Madrid 1991, 36-57.

A. Viciano

INTERCESSION. In Roman law there was the legal institution of *intercessio,* which, in public law, consisted of a magistrate's veto against someone else (e.g., in the Republican period, a consul against his colleague by the principle of the *par potestas;* or by a tribune of the plebs. In the 4th c. Christian *intercessio* and asylum in the churches became important: these are two distinct practices, even though they were often complementary. *Intercessio* consisted in the intervention with the authorities in favor of someone in difficulty (not a simple recommendation, as often happened). Though this was not a true legal institution in the technical sense, it was acc. to the traditional Roman practice (Gaudemet, 282). The *intercessio* was efficacious if the authority of the mediator was recognized and respected by the authorities concerned with the matter. The Christian clergy by this time enjoyed an authority in the name of religion and not only by the figure of the intercessor as such, even if personal prestige had its importance (e.g., *Augustine, *Ambrose etc.). Someone intervened to abolish or to delay a sentence, or to give room for the amendment of the guilty; such an

intervention posed legal, moral and practical problems. Augustine elaborated his teaching on the issue and gave his responses above all in his letter to Macedonius (*Ep.* 152 and 153). Augustine considered it an episcopal duty (*officii sacerdotii nostri esse dicamus intervenire pro reis, Ep.* 153,1; *intercessionis officio, Ep.* 151,2). In the case of the murder of Marcellinus and his brother by the count Marinus, who feared that the intervention of the church would impede it (*Ep.* 151), the church's intervention was shown to be necessary. *Synesius of Cyrene refused the request of a certain Alexander, who adulterated wine and was arrested for fraud and put in prison (*Ep.* 121), because acc. to him the guilty had to be punished to purify the city.

The *intercessio* was born from the Christian concept of pardon in view of the reformation of the guilty. Asylum (*ad ecclesiam confugere*), however, consisted in receiving and protecting someone in a place held to be sacred: it was the special quality of the place that had to guarantee safety to whoever wished to make use of it. *Intercessio* and asylum were distinct practices, for which reason there could be a case, as sometimes occurred, in which only *intercessio* was invoked (if someone was in prison, in exile etc.) or in which asylum alone was granted. Still, asylum—if it allowed the fugitive to escape—normally involved also an *intercessio* before the authorities, in favor of the fugitive. The Council of *Serdica in 343, speaking of asylum in a church, also spoke of *intercessio*: "It is an honest thing that the bishops advance *intercessio* (*episcopi intercessionem praestant*) for those who are oppressed unjustly, for the poorly treated widow, or for the orphan who was spoiled of his goods" (can. 7). Also, as the person who took refuge in church—so it was thought—could be innocent, then there was a time of protection which was useful for proving one's innocence. The greatest episcopal activity of intervention can be seen in matters of penal justice, partially because of the conviction of the corruption of the judges and of the system, which takes into account class differences and the consequent oppression of the poor, or also because of the punishments, considered excessive.

The bishops felt themselves obliged to intercede on behalf of the condemned: Ambrose (*De off.* 2,21,102; *Expos. prol.* 118,8,41; *Ep.* 25,3; 40,25; 51,6; 61-62), Possidius (*Vita* 19,6; 20,2), Augustine (*Ep.* 134,1,3; 151,2; 151-153; *Sermo* 302,17; 114). The monks, esp. in the East in general and at *Constantinople in particular, powerful by means of their social and political influence, were considered the guarantors of true justice for the protection of the poor. Some bishops, e.g., *Rabbula of Edessa, wished to reserve intervention before judges to the clergy alone (see Barone Adesi, 260-261). The imperial reaction to the excessive intrusion of the monks was to respond by prohibiting the monks from going to the city (CTh 16,3,1, successively revoked by CTh 16,3,2 and proposed again, with modifications, in CI 1,3,22). The imperial legislation on the subject only intended to limit the actual application of the custom of ecclesiastical intervention, or that of the monks. In 392 the emperor *Theodosius (CTh 9,40,15 from 13 March, and CTh 11,36,31, from 9 April) warned the judges to be solicitous in the application of punishment and not to offer the excuse of ecclesiastical intervention for their delays; therefore, ecclesiastics should not be allowed to impede the fulfillment of sentences, by appeal or removal of the condemned. The law CTh 11,36,31 did not admit *intercessio* of the clergy for someone condemned or for one who confessed his guilt. In 398 Arcadius (CTh 9,40,16) forbade the clergy and monks from removing the condemned from their punishment *pro criminum immanitate* or from retaining the condemned with themselves (asylum), but, for humanitarian motivations, it conceded an appeal for greater guarantees. Once the time for recourse had expired, other clerical interferences were not admitted. The bishops had the responsibility of controlling the monks in judiciary matters (Barone Adesi, 244ff.).

Daremberg-Saglio III, 548-556; J. Gaudemet, *L'église dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1958, 282-283; G. Dagron, *Les moins et la ville. Le monachisme à Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcedoine (451)*: Travaux et Mémoires 4 (1970) 229-276; M. Bianchini, *Sui rapporti fra provocatio ed intercessio*, in *Studi in onore di G. Scherillo*, I, Milan 1972, 93-110; M. Moreau, *Le dossier Marcellinus dans Correspondence d'Augustin*: RecAug 9 (1973) 3-18; G. Barone Adesi, *Monachesimo ortodosso e diritto romano nel Tardoantico*, Milan 1990; O. O'Donovan, *Law, Moderation and Forgiveness*: Gregorianum 82 (2001) 625-636.

A. Di Berardino

INTERCESSIONS, GENERAL (Oratio Fidelium). The Intercession, or *oratio fidelium*, takes place within the liturgy of the Word. *Justin locates it after the sermon given by the presider of the assembly: ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καί εὐχᾶς πέμπομεν (*1 Apol.* 67). In connection with the baptismal liturgy, he mentions the intentions for ourselves, for those who have been enlightened and that everyone, wherever they may be, may remain faithful to his knowledge of the truth (*1 Apol.* 65). In Justin's understanding, the prayer of the faithful takes on the role of the response of the assembly, as a petition, to the Word of God proclaimed in the readings and explained in the homily. *Hippolytus of Rome ex-

cludes the catechumens from the *oratio fidelium* and from the kiss of peace which follows, since these actions presume baptism (B. Botte, *La Tradition apostolique*, LQF 39, 40). *Tertullian lists the intentions of the *oratio fidelium* which concern the reader of his *Apologeticum: Oramus pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum et potestatibus, pro statu saeculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis* (*Apol.* 39: CSEL 20, 91). The structure of the intercessions is different in East and West. *Serapion of Thmuis foresees two groups of prayers: one for the catechumens and the other for the faithful. In both, nonetheless, the intention is followed by a short prayer, similar to the structure of the Roman liturgy of Good Friday (Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum*, 65-67). In the eighth book of the **Apostolic Constitutions* we find three groups of intercessions in litany form. The first group concludes the liturgy of the Word and is recited by the catechumens, the penitents and the faithful in three separate groups. The deacon proposes the intention and the assembly responds *Kyrie eleison.* At the end, the bishop says the closing prayer and the faithful exchange the kiss of peace (Funk, *Didascalia et Constit. Apostol.*, 478-495). The second group of intercessions comes after the epiclesis and the third before communion (ibid., 511-517).

In the West, the distinction was maintained between the intercessions for the catechumens and those for the baptized. *Prosper of Aquitaine demands that they be celebrated in the same way throughout the world, and lists the particular intentions for which the entire church prays, in obedience to the divine command: for the infidels, the heretics, the penitents and the catechumens (*Auctoritates [Indiculus] de gratia* 8: PL 51, 209-210). In *Africa, acc. to the witness of *Augustine, the prayer of the faithful comes after the homily; this is why many homilies of Augustine end with the invitation: *Conversi ad Dominum* (59 times; cf. *Serm.* 26: PL 38, 26; *Serm.* 34: ibid., 213; *Serm.* 100: ibid., 605; *Serm.* 141: ibid., 778). The structure is that of the liturgy of Good Friday in the Roman rite. From the 6th c. the *oratio fidelium* disappears from the Roman Mass, except for Good Friday. Pope *Gelasius suppressed it, substituting the litanies known as the *deprecationes gelasianae* which contain 19 intentions with the response *Kyrie eleison* (Capelle, *Le Kyrie de la messe*). The practice existed at Jerusalem for the Vespers, when, acc. to *Egeria, the deacon proclaimed the intentions and the children sang in response *Kyrie eleison* (*Itinerarium*: CSEL 39,72). Inspired by the Roman practice, probably derived from the East, *Caesarius of Arles, at the Council of *Vaison in Provence, decreed, *ut in omnibus ecclesiis nostris ita tam sancta consuetudo et ad matutinum et ad missas et ad vesperas Deo propitio intromittatur* (can. 3: MGH, *Conc. Aev. Mer.*, 56-57). The Rule of St. *Benedict speaks of the *litania* for Lauds and Vespers, probably in the style of the Gelasian *deprecatio* (chs. 9 and 12). When the *deprecatio* was moved to the initial rite of the Mass, the intercession, or *oratio fidelium,* as a component of the liturgy of the Word disappeared. The reform of *Gregory the Great, characterized by the desire to shorten the celebration of the Mass, left the *deprecatio* out of the responses *Kyrie* and *Christe eleison* on workdays so as to allow the assembly to lengthen these two invocations.

B. Capelle, *Le Kyrie de la messe et la pape Gélase*: RBen 46 (1934) 126-144; Id., *L'intercession dans la messe romaine*: RBen 65 (1955) 181-191; P. Borella, *Oratio fidelium e dittici nelle Segrete dell'Offertorio*: Ambrosius 36 Suppl. (1960) 1-21; A. Nocent, *La prière commune des fidèles*: NRTh 86 (1964) 948-964; L. Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum romanae ecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, Rome 1960, ²1968 (Rer. Eccl. Docum. 4); P. De Clerck, *La "prière universelle" dans les liturgies latines anciennes*, Münster i.W. 1977 (LQF 62); J.A. Melloh, *The General Intercessions Revisited*: Worship 61 (1987) 152-162; var. aus., *La preghiera dei fedeli*: Riv. lit. 74 (1987) 1-141; J. Zimmermann, *The General Intercessions: Yet Another Visit*: Worship 65 (1991) 306-319.

A. Chupungco

INTERPOLATION. Interpolation is the simplest form of literary fraud. It is sufficient to take a writing and insert unpublished passages into it. The process was employed from the first Christian centuries, when certain Jewish texts were Christianized in this way, such as the *Ascension of Isaiah,* the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *2 Enoch.* The *Sibylline Oracles,* originally an incontestably Jewish work, were riddled with Christian compositions. For the entire patristic era we can follow the history of the interpolations, intended to provide credentials for innovative ideas or discredit an author. *Origen was one of the principal victims. *Rufinus was able to compose an entire book on the adulteration of Origen's works: interpolations which contributed to impugn his memory and doctrine. The letter of *Gregory of Nyssa against the pilgrimages to Jerusalem was particularly targeted by interpolators, who deformed it acc. to their personal views. The heretics, esp. *Apollinarists and *Luciferians, interpolated numerous texts to give credit to their own ideas.

G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence 1934, 217, 335, 348, 397; W. Speyer, *Fälschung*: RAC 7, 236-277; Id., *Die lit. Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, Munich 1971; R.M. Grant, *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature*, Westminster 1993.

A. Hamman

INTOLERANCE, CHRISTIAN. The concept of religious "tolerance" (and respectively "intolerance") emerged in the course of the debate on freedom of conscience provoked by the numerous cruel wars of religion in the modern period. It was clearly introduced, it seems for the first time, in the *Epistola de tolerantia* of the English philosopher John Locke (1689). This does not exclude that this category can be legitimately applied also in the study of the religious conflicts of Antiquity and the Middle Ages, provided that the distinctive environmental peculiarities and specific ideological and cultural presuppositions of these conflicts are kept clearly in mind. Among the ancients, at least in philosophical circles since the spiritual revolution carried out by the Sophists of the 5th c. BC, freedom of conscience in religious matters was not entirely unknown, and already at that time the problem of its compatibility with the undeniable "political" requirements of public worship. The persecution of individuals or of groups for religious motives on the part of the political authority (consider the trials for "atheism" and "impiety" or the repression of the baccanalia) and the violent oppression effected by one religious (or ethnic-religious) group on another, with recourse to various forms of coercion (e.g., the conflicts between pagans and Jews at *Alexandria), were not rare experiences in Greco-Roman Antiquity.

The Christians were involved in these problems, at first being persecuted, victims of Jewish and esp. pagan intolerance, but then in their turn also as persecutors. The arrival of the Christian religion in the end radically modified the terms of the problem in the passage from the ancient world to the Middle Ages. It should not be forgotten that to understand the real historical dimensions of the question it is not sufficient to start from the Constantinian era, as usually happens in the current bibliography; rather it is necessary to return to the events of the 2nd c.

1. Around the middle of the 2nd c., in a difficult situation of conflict with pagans and Jews, the anonymous author of the letter *Ad *Diognetum* (7,2-4) affirms that the Son was sent by God to save and persuade men, not to commit violence, since violence is not suitable for God. This teaching on religious liberty was repeated and justified in different ways by *Irenaeus (*Ad. haer*. IV, 37,1; IV, 37,3; IV, 39,3; V, 1,1), *Clement of Alexandria (*QDS* 10,2 and 21,2), *Hippolytus (*Ref. omn. haer*. X, 33,13), *Tertullian (*Apol.* 24,5-6; 28,1; *Ad Scap*. 2,2) and *Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* V, 19-20). To these noble declarations of principle, expressed by prestigious thinkers of the church of the martyrs, coherent behaviors in the Christianity of the first centuries did not always correspond. The Christians, while they requested tolerance for themselves in the periods of persecution, did not exert themselves to guarantee it in every case for others. A few years after the *Ad Diognetum,* in fact, the pagan philosopher *Celsus denounced the iconoclastic aggressiveness of the Christians toward statues of Zeus or Apollo (*ap*. Origen, *C. Cels*. VIII, 38), a sign that very early, even on this burning theme, contrasting convictions and attitudes were clear which gave rise to very strong tensions within the Christian community. At the beginning of the 4th c., e.g., the bishops gathered at the Council of *Elvira refused to count among the martyrs of the faith those Christians who had lost their lives following the destruction of the pagan idols (can. 60).

2. Things went much worse after the Constantinian change, in the sense that, from presumably sporadic and local episodes of intolerance, there was a turn to systematic actions which saw various emperors and bishops involved, each one with his specific responsibilities. The phenomenon of Christian intolerance assumed new and more vast dimensions precisely due to the conversion of *Constantine. In the course of the 4th c., thanks to the support offered by the emperors, orthodox Christianity was first recognized as a licit religion (with the Edict of *Galerius in 311 and with the Edict of Constantine and *Licinius in 313), and then as the religion of the state (with the edict of *Thessalonica decreed by *Theodosius I in 380). This new situation pushed the members of the clergy and the monks to intensify their aggressiveness not only toward the pagan component of society but also against the heretics and the Jews (heretics, Jews and pagans are the three religious groups which the Catholic Church confronts acc. to Augustine, *Sermo* 62,12,18). To obtain the conversion, even if forced, of these groups, or at least to neutralize their presence on the terrain, the Christians did not hesitate to destroy their worship places, in urban centers or in rural areas, supported by the imperial legislation, which became the preferred instrument for the judicial repression of religious dissent.

3. The study of the intolerance carried out by the Christians of the period which goes from Constantine to *Heraclius starts from a long series of Christian and pagan literary texts (historiographic works, biographies, homilies, apologies, letters, orations), and of archaeological discoveries which describe the violence and the prevarications perpetrated by Christian groups in different circumstances against pagans, heretics and Jews, and the reactions, sometimes bloody, which these aggressions provoked. Despite the difficulties of interpreting these sources,

there are multiple episodes which have been confirmed so far, and it is not possible to list them all here. It is enough to mention the systematic demolition of pagan temples, such as the temple of Zeus at *Apamea, the *Serapeion of Alexandria, the temple of Isis at Philae and the destruction of Jewish synagogues, such as those of *Callinicus and of Minorca. These devastations should be considered in the much larger context of the missionary and evangelizing mission carried out both in East and West by bishops and monks. Among these stand out *Martin of Tours, *Vigilius of Trent and the three martyrs of Anaunia, *Severinus of Noricum, *Benedict of Nursia, *George the Cappadocian, Marcellus of Apamea, *Porphyry of Gaza, *Theophilus of Alexandria, *Shenoute of Atripe, *Peter Mongus, *John of Ephesus. To this is added the bonfires of books of magic and pagan philosophy (the double condemnation of the anti-Christian treatise of Porphyry, first by Constantine and then by *Theodosius II and *Valentinian III, is famous), the persecutions inflicted by pro-*Arian emperors such as *Constantius II and *Valens on the "heretic" followers of the Nicene Creed, the execution of *Priscillian (the first execution of a bishop motivated by an accusation raised by other bishops), the assassination of *Hypatia, the capture and the torture of other prestigious pagan intellectuals such as *Hierocles and Horapollo (who would, however, later convert to Christianity to the grave disappointment of *Damascius), the ban on teaching imposed by *Justinian on heretics and pagans, the forced baptisms of the Jews imposed by Heraclius, etc.

4. The study of the legislation of the Christian emperors, from Constantine to Theodosius II, to repress every form of religious deviance, is essentially based on book 16 of the *Codex Theodosianus*. The legislation against the heretics is contained in *CTh.* XVI, 5; that which strikes apostates can be read in *CTh.* XVI, 7; finally *CTh.* XVI, 10 (*de paganis, sacrificiis et templis*) is directed at pagans. To the Jews is dedicated the material gathered in *CTh.* XVI, 8 and 9: on the one hand the legislator acknowledges as a general rule the traditional rights and privileges of the Jews and their leaders, but on the other hand inflicts a very severe blow on them with the prohibition on carrying out proselytism and on buying Christian slaves and submitting them, in addition, to circumcision. Many of these decisions were later taken up in the **Codex Justinianus* with the publication of even more restrictive norms. These sources, sometimes of controversial date and difficult to evaluate, belong primarily to the history of Late Antique Roman law. They testify to the substantial continuity of the repressive attitude toward those forms of religious dissidence that were considered esp. dangerous for public order and the security of the empire. It is not by chance that anti-*Manichean legislation had already been begun with an edict of a pagan emperor like *Diocletian. Certainly, however, one observes in this period a progressive stiffening of the laws, directed toward the definitive affirmation of the exclusively "orthodox Christian" character of the Roman-Byzantine Empire. The erudite investigation of the imperial legislation should not be separated, during historical analysis, from the study of the contemporaneous ecclesiastical legislation concerning the same problems.

5. Nevertheless, the phenomenon of Christian intolerance cannot be understood truly in all its historical and cultural extent if one ignores the study of the interventions of certain authoritative ecclesiastical writers who have been, in various circumstances and on different fronts, the real theoreticians of intransigence up to the theological justification of coercion. Here one does not refer only, as is evident, to apologists such as *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Firmicus Maternus, who exhorted the Christian emperors to demolish the temples and abolish by force the pagan cults, or historians such as *Rufinus of Aquileia, who spoke about the edification of the kingdom of God on the rubble of the Serapeion. One thinks above all of the preaching and work of the great bishops such as *Ambrose, *John Chrysostom, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Augustine, who profoundly influenced with their authority the practical orientations of the church in the centuries of the Christian empire. Each one of these pastors explains his own point of view with regard to the relationship that ought to be maintained with religious expressions that are incompatible with orthodoxy and adopts corresponding attitudes.

Ambrose, e.g., opposed the replacement of the statue of Victory (*see* *Altar of Victory) in the curia, and in the name of the superiority of Christianity pressured Theodosius strongly so that he would revoke the order to punish the Christians who had sacked the synagogue of Callinicus. The mild but inflexible Chrysostom preached no less than eight homilies against the Jews, using defamatory language full of insults and organized an expedition of monks in Phoenicia to raze pagan temples. Cyril of Alexandria expelled the Jews from Alexandria and was involved in a certain manner in the assassination of Hypatia.

Augustine represents perhaps the most interesting case because of his unique positions. He vied essentially with the problems posed by the three great

heresies rooted in the African church of his time, Manicheism, *Donatism and *Pelagianism, and by the survival of pagan worship. Multiple times he accepts and justifies the repressive action put into effect by the imperial power to obtain not so much the punishment of the heretics and the pagans or their forced conversion rather than their repentance and then their convinced return to orthodoxy. (Among numerous texts, see his *Ep.* 105,2,7-10 and *Ep.* 137,4,16 and his contemporizing exegesis of the *compelle intrare* of the parable of the feast acc. to the version of Lk 14:22-23 in *Sermon* 112,8, *Ep.* 173,10 and *Ep.* 185,6,24.) In *Civ. Dei* V, 24 Augustine calls "blessed" the emperors who put their power at the service of God to spread as far as possible true Christian worship. The pastoral and pedagogical intent explains his opposition to the indiscriminate use of violence and of extreme punitive measures such as the death penalty. With the Jews, on the contrary, Augustine shows himself to be remarkably "tolerant." For Augustine the Jews should not be eliminated since they are living witnesses, even if unwillingly, of the Christian truth of the prophecies of the OT (cf. *En. Ps. 58*, 21-22 on Ps 59[58]:12-14; *Civ. Dei* 18,46).

A particularly impressive example of the theology of intolerance is offered, at the beginning of the 6th c., by the *monophysite author of the **Theosophy*. The latter reports false oracles of Apollo who, with scourging language, prophesies the violent end of the ancient pagan cults (see, e.g., I, 5-6; I, 54-55 ed. Beatrice) and the punishment of the Jews (I, 53), and approves of the frightful divine vendetta against the "heretical" pro-Chalcedonian emperors *Leo and *Basiliscus (III B, 17-18).

6. As often happens, religious tolerance is an important value esp. for those who, being persecuted, are able to appreciate its benefits and invoke it for their protection. It is much more difficult to preach and practice tolerance when one finds oneself in a dominating position. This observation, valid for Christians, finds a precise parallel in the attitude taken in different moments by the representatives of the pagan intelligentsia. If the *Neoplatonic *Porphyry, on the eve of the great persecution of *Diocletian, maintains that Christians ought to be punished justly for their religious aberration which makes them particularly dangerous for the stability and survival of the empire, the senator *Symmachus, a century later, in the context of the *Reichskirche* and in completely changed conditions of the polemic with Ambrose, becomes in turn the champion of tolerance toward the pagan cults, recalling that there are many ways which led to the mystery of the divinity.

One should, finally, observe that the recourse of the Christians to more or less legal violence alternates with periods in which verbal aggression and ideological propaganda predominates in the quest for consensus. Certainly one must distinguish these actions acc. to times and places, and take into account their results, different acc. to religious groups and social classes.

Each of the three hostile fronts on which Christian intolerance was exercised—i.e., pagan, heretic and Jew—followed a different destiny. The polemic against paganism, extensively developed in the apologetic literature, led to its complete destruction, to the pure and simple disappearance of the cults and religious institutions of the ancient world (temples, priestly offices, sacrifices, oracles, mystery cults etc.). The heresies were condemned and their followers subjected to various forms of persecution and repression (confiscation of property, banishment, forced conversion, capital punishment). It can be said that the highest toll of violence is found in the behavior taken by Christians against their dissident brothers and sisters: as the emperor *Julian noted, the Christians tear each other to pieces like ferocious beasts (see Ammianus, XXII, 5,4). Paradoxically, the Jews are the group who received the relatively best treatment. Despite the violent attacks contained in the centuries-old literature *adversus Iudaeos,* and even among the enormous difficulties and humiliations imposed on them by Christian society and legislation, they succeeded in organizing themselves and in surviving, preserving their own identity in later centuries. How much, finally, of modern and contemporary anti-Semitism should be traced back, not only to Greco-Roman anti-Semitism, but also to, properly speaking, Christian anti-Semitism (NT, patristic and Medieval) constitutes a separate problem, an object for other studies.

F. Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IVe-Ve siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale*, Paris 1978; L. De Giovanni, *Chiesa e Stato nel codice Teodosiano. Saggio sul libro XVI*, Naples 1980; A.M. Rabello, *The Legal Condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire*: ANRW II, 13, Berlin-New York 1980, 662-762; W. Speyer, *Büchervernichtung und Zensur des Geistes bei Heiden, Juden und Christen*, Stuttgart 1981; K.L. Noetlichs, *Heidenverfolgung*: RAC 13 (1986) 1149-1190; R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400)*, New Haven-London 1984; A. Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*, Detroit 1987; P. Chuvin, *Chronique des derniers païens. La disparition du paganisme dans l'Empire romain, du règne de Constantin à celui de Justinien*, Paris [2]1991; W. Pakter, *Early Western Church Law and the Jews*, in H.W. Attridge - G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Detroit 1992, 714-735; P.F. Beatrice (ed.), *L'intolleranza cristiana nei confronti dei pagani*, Bologna 1993; F.R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529* (Religions of the Graeco-Roman World 115/1-2), Leiden-New York-Cologne 1993–1994; S. Bradbury, *Constantine and the*

Problem of Anti-Pagan Legislation in the Fourth Century: CPh 89 (1994) 120-139; P. Fredriksen, *Excaecati Occulta Justitia Dei: Augustine on Jews and Judaism*: JECS 3 (1995) 299-324; C. Ando, *Pagan Apologetics and Christian Intolerance in the Ages of Themistius and Augustine*: JECS 4 (1996) 171-207; P.F. Beatrice, *La christianisation des campagnes pendant l'Antiquité Tardive dans les régions méditerranéennes. Bilan des recherches et questions de méthode*, in J.-P. Massaut - M.-E. Henneau (eds.), *La christianisation des campagnes*. Actes du colloque du C.I.H.E.C. (25-27 août 1994), Brussels-Rome 1996, I, 9-35; O. Limor - G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos. Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Christians and Jews*, Tübingen 1996; P.R. Brown, *Christianization and Religious Conflict*: CAH XIII, 1998, 632-664; G. Stanton - G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, Cambridge 1998; P. Athanassiadi, *Damascius: The Philosophical History: Text with Translation and Notes*, Athens 1999; E. DePalma Digeser, *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome*, Ithaca-London 2000; H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*, Baltimore-London 2000; D. Frankfurter, *"Things Unbefitting Christians": Violence and Christianization in Fifth-Century Panopolis*: JECS 8 (2000) 273-295; P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia: An Attempt at Reconstruction* (VChrS 56), Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2001.

P.F. Beatrice

INTRAMURAL GRAVES. One of the most discussed aspects of recent urban archaeology is certainly that of intramural graves. The existence of the tombs within the city (an element of separation from the point of view of the urban landscape and with legal and religious repercussions which have still not been fully understood) nevertheless was already known in past centuries, but a series of imprecise interpretations, which had solidified in archaeological literature, had long misled scholars from a correct framing of the problem and an impartial critical analysis. Further analysis of the archive, connected to a firm understanding of the historical dynamics, has allowed in recent years—primarily thanks to the studies of Roberto Meneghini and Riccardo Santangeli Valenzani—to frame the debate on a new foundation, which in a short time has shown itself to be central to understanding the Late Antique and Early Medieval city. As much as has been possible to reconstruct on a limited basis with respect to the city of *Rome, we find that starting from the 2nd half of the 6th c., while going against a centureis-long solidified tradition and certainly in response to the Greek-Gothic conflict but also to an altered change of mentality for practical reasons and not secondarily economic, people began to bury the dead within the city, though not definitively abandoning burial in the catacombs. Even though the dynamics have not yet been fully understood, given the widespread nature of the phenomenon, the shift in burial areas could not help bringing about a marked change in the urban geography, at least at the level of simple visual perception, and it serves as an indicator for understanding the complex geographical dynamics. It should in fact be recalled, acc. to the account of *Zosimus (who wrote almost a century later), that as early as the siege of Rome by *Alaric in the autumn of 408, urban burials were made necessary by the inaccessibility of the suburbs (Zos. V, 39: τῆς δε πόλεως ἔξω θάπτεσθαι τῶν σωμάτων οὐ δυναμένων [πᾶσαν γὰρ ἔξοδον ἐφύλαττον οἱ πολέμιοι] τάφος ἦν ἡ πόλις τῶν τεθνεώτων, ὥστε καὶ ἄλλως εἶναι τὸ χωρίον ἀοίκητον, ἀρκεῖν τε, εἰ καὶ μὴ τροφῆς ἦν σπάνις, εἰς σωμάτων διαφθορὰν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναδιδομένην ὀσμήν). The origin of intramural burials seems, therefore, connected to exceptional moments and the emergencies caused by war, during which the usual funerary practices in the suburbs were curtailed. At the same time, however, one should not underestimate the ideological factor in the spread of the phenomenon, or rather the society's change in attitude toward death which began in the 5th c. and which saw the cemeteries penetrate the cities, favoring the invisible cohabitation of the living and the dead.

From the typographical point of view, the funerary interments, rarely elaborate in the case of the poor, are attested by different forms of burial: from the simplest in the least demanding holes dug in the earth and protected by large fragments of ceramic containers or pieces of different types of materials, to the most widespread tombs, often called in Italian *alla cappuccina* (because it resembles a monk's hood) with the body covered by two rows of tiles leaned against each other like a hut, to the most costly burials in semicylindrical brickwork "vaults" or in reused *sarcophagi that were more or less intact.

From the topographical point of view, the phenomenon of intramural graves—more apparent in growing numbers following ongoing discoveries—is seemingly characterized by constant capillarity and widespread presence, because the burials are located anywhere within the Aurelian Walls and tend to occupy all different types of buildings. The graves are found, in fact, overrun both within the abandoned monumental complexes such as some sectors of the Crypta of Balbus or a vast portion of the baths of *Caracalla, with respect to the margins of the streets and the piazzas that were still visited, such as the *Colosseum, or within the numerous formerly inhabited buildings, e.g., the insulae of the Via Anicia and the Via dei Simmachi, or even in the immediate neighborhoods or within religious buildings, as in the case of the recently excavated necropolis of the

Templum Pacis in the vicinity of the church dedicated to Sts. *Cosmas and Damian. The extremely low number of the attested graves is surprising, however, as some scholars have pointed out: in fact, burials of individual or small groups only rarely reach as many as twenty units. In all, the total number of graves we are aware of for the long period of time between the mid-6th c. and the end of the subsequent century do not amount to more than 400 units, a relatively low number that—even if in the incomplete data available to us and also not forgetting the likely heavy demographic decline—suggests that the communal sepulchral spaces of Rome for that period have not yet been fully identified.

See the foundational contributions of C. Lambert, *Le sepolture in urbe nella norma e nella prassi (tarda antichità - alto medioevo)*, in L. Paroli (ed.), *L'Italia centro-settentrionale in età longobarda.* Atti del Convegno, Ascoli Piceno, 6-7 ottobre 1995, Florence 1997, 285-293; R. Meneghini - R. Santangeli Valenzani, *Sepolture intramuranee e paesaggio urbano a Roma tra V e VII secolo*, in L. Paroli - P. Delogu (ed.), *La storia economica di Roma nell'alto medioevo alla luce dei recenti scavi archeologici.* Atti del Seminario, Roma, 2-3 aprile 1992, Florence 1993, 89-111; Id., *Corredi funerari, produzioni e paesaggio sociale a Roma tra VI e VII secolo*: RivAC 70 (1994) 321-337; Id., *Sepolture intramuranee a Roma tra V e VII secolo d.C. Aggiornamenti e considerazioni*: ArchMed 22 (1995) 283-290; Id., *Osservazioni sul popolamento di Roma tra V e VII secolo d.C. attraverso lo studio delle sepolture intramuranee*, in E. Sonnino (ed.), *Popolazione e società a Roma dal medioevo all'età contemporanea*, Rome 1998, 29-36; Id., *Intramural Burials at Rome between the Vth and VIIth Century AD*, in J. Pearce - M. Millet - M. Struck (eds.), *Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World*, Oxford 2000, 263-269; Id., *La trasformazione del tessuto urbano tra V e IX secolo*, in var. aus. (ed.), *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo Nazionale Romano Crypta Balbi*, Milan 2001, 30-33.

See also G.P. Brogiolo - G. Cantino Wataghin (eds.), *Sepolture tra IV e VII secolo*, VII Seminario sul tardoantico e l'altomedioevo in Italia centrosettentrionale, Gardone Riviera 24-26 ottobre 1996, Mantua 1998; G. Cantino Wataghin, *The Ideology of Urban Burials*, in *The Idea and Ideal of the Town Between Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne 1999, 147-180; M. Costambeys, *Burial Topography and the Power of the Church in Fifth- and Sixth-Century Rome*: PBSR 69 (2001) 169-189; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Strutture funerarie e edifici di culto paleocristiani di Roma dal IV al VI secolo*, Vatican City 2001, 134-137; M. Capponi - M. Ghilardi, *Scoperta, nel* Templum Pacis, *di un'area sepolcrale probabilmente contemporanea alla fondazione dei SS. Cosma e Damiano*, in F. Guidobaldi - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi (eds.), *Ecclesiae Urbis*. Congr. Int. di Studi sulle Chiese di Roma (IV-X sec.), Roma, 4-10 settembre 2000, Vatican City 2002, 733-756; K. Jonsson, *Intra-Mural Graves in Rome: Social Dimensions in Early Medieval Burial Practices*: Opuscula Romana 30 (2005) 85-95; M. Ghilardi, *Trasformazioni del paesaggio urbano. Il* Templum Pacis *durante la guerra greco-gotica (a proposito di Procop., Goth. IV 21)*, in M. Ghilardi - Ch.J. Goddard - P. Porena (ed.), *Les cités de l'Italie tardo-antique (IVe-VIe siècle). Institutions, économie, société, culture et religion*, Rome 2006, 137-148.

M. Ghilardi

IOCA MONACHORUM. This name indicates various texts of monastic origin, written in *Gaul starting from the 6th–7th c., consisting of a series of questions and answers on religious and other themes, in the form of riddles. The oldest text is the *Altercatio Adriani et Epictiti.* Here are some examples of question and answer: "What is the sky? Like a stretched skin. What is the sun? Splendor of the day and life of all. What is seen and not touched? The sun in the sky. Who died and was not born? Adam. Who gave and did not receive? Eve, milk."

DACL 7, 2569 2572; W. Suchier, *Das mittellateinische Gespräch Adrian und Epictitus nebst verwandten Texten*, Tübingen 1955; F. Brünhölz, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Munich 1975, 147-148 (cf. 527-528); CPPM IIA 3675; *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 301.

M. Simonetti

IONA, De (De Nineve). This text circulated together with the *De Sodoma* sometimes under the name of *Tertullian, sometimes under the name of *Cyprian. The two parts are like a diptych by the same author, who lived, acc. to the common opinion, at the beginning of the 5th c., acc. to others—e.g., Hexter—in the 6th. In some MSS one was located after the other. The attribution, however, is closely linked with the *De Sodoma*. The *De Iona* (incipit: *Post Sodomum et Gomorum viventia funera*) is composed of 105 verses and in the present state is mutilated. The poet, after having spoken of the patience of God waiting for the repentance of humanity, explains the adventures of the prophet Jonah.

CPL 1426; CPPM II, A, n. 2147; PL 2, 1108-1114; CSEL III, 3, 297-301; CSEL 23, 221-226; M. Dando, *Alcimus Avitus as the Author of . . . De Sodoma and De Jona, Formerly Attributed to Tertullian and Cyprian*: CM 26 (1967) 258-275; W. Antuono, *The Structure and Sources of Patience*: Medieval Studies 34 (1972) 411-413; *Versus de Sodoma*, intr., critical text, It. tr. and comm. by L. Moris, Bologna 1993; R. Palla, *Una trascrizione umanistica del Carmen de Iona*, in *Ad contemplandam sapientiam*, Studi in memoria di S. Lenza, Soveria Mannelli 2004, 523-532.

A. Di Berardino

IRELAND

I. Pre-Christian period - II. Christianization and monasticism - III. Culture.

I. Pre-Christian period. Ireland is the smaller of the two principal British islands, called in Greek "Pretanic islands" from the name "Pretans" (Gael. *Cruithin*), given perhaps by the *Celts of *Gaul to the ancient inhabitants of Albion and Hibernia (Lat.

Hibernia, Hiberio, Gael. *Eriu, Eire*). In Latin, starting from Caesar, the name Brittani (*Britanni, Brittones*) is limited to the population of the larger island, called Britannia. The Pretans were later called *Picti,* perhaps from the name of the hegemonic people in those islands during the Bronze Age; in addition to the Pretans, groups speaking a Celtic language of the *q* type (the Celts of Gaul and Britain spoke a language of the *p* type) entered Ireland around the 5th c. BC, perhaps coming from the Iberian Peninsula.

Ireland was never occupied by the Romans, but today archaeology underlines the presence on the island of Roman remains due to commercial relationships and brigandage; votive offerings of Roman coins from the 1st to the 4th c. AD and Roman jewelry from the 4th c. AD have been found at Newgrange (Co. Meath), a place famous for the grandiose pre-Celtic royal tomb (3000–2000 BC): but we cannot therefore hypothesize that this place—linked in Medieval traditions to ancient local paganism—was inhabited by Romans. From the 3rd c. AD Irish incursions and settlements occur in Britannia, where Roman administration had by then weakened. The Latins called the Irish at that time no longer *Hiberni* or *Iverni,* but *Scotti,* which *Jerome distinguished from the *Atecotti* (perhaps *aithech-thúatha,* i.e., "tribe subject to tribute") seen by him in youth in Gaul: these were perhaps tribes oppressed by the larger kingdoms (Tara, Connachta, Munster) and chased from the island after having taken sides for the losing Ulaid, a tribe of the present Ulster. Battles between rival tribes in Ireland are briefly spoken of by Tacitus (*Agr.* 24), who had information, through his father-in-law Agricola, about an Irish *rí* (lat. *regulus*) who had taken refuge in Britannia with the same Agricola. The geographer Philemon gathered information from merchants about Ireland before his expedition to Britannia in AD 43 (see Ptol., *Geogr.* 1,11,7). He is the basis for Ptolemy's knowledge of Hibernian toponomastics; Tacitus too speaks of *negotiatores* as the source of knowledge about the *aditus portusque* of Hibernia. The Hibernian colonies situated in W Britannia were also a meeting place between Gaelic and Latin civilizations, in a certainly more peaceful way than the deportations of Britanni into Hibernia (among these there was also the sixteen-year-old Patrick, future evangelizer of Ireland). Nevertheless, a certain intolerance for the overseas guests must have spread among the Britanno-Romans, if around AD 400 Cunedda chased with arms the foreign Scots back to their homeland (*Hist. Britt.* 14 and 62). To a family of this kind of Scots immigrants in Britannia *Pelagius perhaps belonged, and possibly, although with less likelihood, his disciple *Celestius.

The Celtic ethnic group mixed later with Anglo-Saxon elements at the end of the 8th c., following the Viking incursions on the Irish coasts (792–1014).

The Celts of Ireland lived in tribes (*túatha*), each of which elected its own king (*rí*), head of the army and representative of his people in the negotiations with other kings; he was assisted by a council of nobles (*áes dána*) and by jurists (*brithemoin*). The *druíd,* diviners and doctors, also supervised the instruction of the young. A group of tribes constituted a large kingdom, and the highest level was that of the "king of kings" (*árd-rí*), acknowledged, e.g., to the king of Tara. Every inhabited settlement (*dún* or *ráth*), on a circular plan, was surrounded by a rampart sealed with stones, and the king's *dún* constituted a meeting and assembly place. The nucleus of society—of rural character—was the family and not the individual: the king did not interfere in the internal affairs of the families, but regulated just the relationships between tribes. He was not a legislator or supreme judge, but the traditional laws were interpreted and applied by the *brithemoin,* who judged crimes committed within the *túath,* and had to enforce respect for the laws even in the absence of a state apparatus. The Irish annals, which collect oral traditions, place in the 5th c. Niall Noígiallach and his son Loegare, king of Connacht before being consecrated king of Tara (or *Temair*), to the N of present Dublin. Niall Noígiallach, founder of the Uí Néill, was the son of the king Eochu Mugmedón and of the Roman woman Cairenn (= Lat. *Carina*), stolen by him during a raid into Britannia; acc. to the Irish traditions Niall carried out a victorious expedition to the Alps (or perhaps rather in Armorica), and his nickname derives from the nine hostages which he obtained from the different tribes then existing in Ireland.

II. Christianization and monasticism. *Prosper of Aquitaine (*Chron.* 1307, MGH, *chron. min.* I, 473; cf. *Contra collatorem* 21: PL 51, 271 C) reports that in 431 Pope *Celestine I sent the deacon *Palladius as bishop to Ireland *ad Scottos in Christum credentes*—i.e., to an already-existing Christian community (perhaps in S Ireland). A year later—acc. to the Irish Annals but perhaps later—Patrick arrived on the island, disembarking acc. to tradition at Downpatrick and supported by the king of Tara Loegare, descnded from the Uí Néill. Between the 5th and 7th c. the Uí Néill became lords of the whole N of the island, absorbing Ulster, which also included Armagh where, acc. to tradition, Patrick founded his church and where he was supposedly buried; acc. to other sources (hostile to the Uí Néill now lords of Ar-

magh), Patrick was buried at Downpatrick. There is mention of three bishops who collaborated with Patrick: Secundinus (with his see at Tara), Auxilius (placed near Naas, the royal seat in Leinster) and Iserninus (finally established at Aghade, near Rathvilly, the seat of Crimthann king of Leinster). Patrick furthermore supposedly chose Baslick (*Basilica Sanctorum*), near Crúachu, capital of Connaught, as the see of a bishop for that church.

Even with the success of evangelization, pagan rites and beliefs persisted, such as the custom of the "marriage" of the king of Tara with his country (into the 5th–6th c.) or the rites of fertility for the inauguration of Emain Macha and of Crúachu. The canons of the Irish synods attest to the presence of druids (*aruspices*) in the Christian era also, and the veneration of St. *Brigid of Kildare seems to be linked with that of a homonymous local divinity (Cell Dara means "church of the oak"). According to tradition, Patrick also began a reform of the local legal system and fought against slavery (see his *Epistola ad Coroticum*), promoting the fusion between the victors and defeated whether in local battles or those with the British coasts. After the first forms of individual asceticism (masculine and feminine) attested already in the writings of Patrick, monasticism developed probably through the influence of Gallic monks (5th–6th c.). The first monastic settlements were small groups of cells, in an area on a circular plan, marked by a wall and with a cross at the entrance. In the Celtic ecclesiastical organization the monastery is the basis of the *ecclesia Dei* and the head of the church is often the abbot of the monastery (bishop or *doctor*); the bishop, when distinct from the abbot, sees to sacramental discipline and does not have a stable urban residence. The bishops were in fact above all itinerant, linked also by family ties to the population, just as the *túath* was more a tribal unity than a territorial one. In the 6th c. the clergy do not appear completely integrated within the local aristocracy, and in the next century it is primarily the abbots, not the bishops, who have jurisdictional power.

The different monastic foundations were often independent of each other and harmonized with civil institutions, as a city under the guidance of the abbot. The formation of monastic centers of enormous cultural and political, as well as religious, influence constituted the first presupposition for urban conglomerates: by their isolated position, in fact, some monastic centers continued to exercise a function as places of asylum even in the 12th c., during the Norman invasion; other population centers, in contrast, came into existence in connection with Scandinavian outposts (after the Viking invasions of the 9th c.).

Despite the variety, we can speak of an Irish monasticism, characterized by great austerity in its ascetic discipline, as is testified by the extant Penitentials. A reference point for Irish monasticism was St. *Finnian (d. 549), founder of Clonard; among his disciples were St. *Columba (d. 597), called Columb Cille (= "dove of the church"), missionary and founder of Derry, Durrow and Iona (Lat. *Iova* or *Iona*, a Scottish island, filial of Derry); St. Ciaran, founder of Clonmanoise (548); and the two *Brendans of Clonfert and Birr (1st half of the 6th c.). In the monastery of Bangor, founded by St. Congall (d. 601), St. *Columbanus was educated. Female monasteries were less numerous, but the foundation of St. Brigid of Kildare was famous (beginning of 6th c.): here, next to the female community, lived a male community under a bishop, and the two communities met for liturgical celebrations. The monasteries rose on islands or along uninhabited coasts or regions of the interior, and some of these developed important schools, presided over by a Fer Léginn (= man of doctrine), such as Clonmanoise and Clonard.

As late as the 7th c. a strong episcopal organization persisted, with a hierarchy of bishops under a "bishop of bishops" (in analogy with the hierarchy of the kings); in the 7th–8th c. Armagh had supremacy over all the churches and monasteries of Ireland. The episcopal sees were generally born around a pre-Christian center of religious attraction: so Armagh rose two miles from Emain Macha, a sanctuary of Macha, a pagan divinity, while Kildare was founded five miles from the pagan sanctuary of Knockaulin; in the same area there was also Kilcullen, indicated as the see of Iserninus, and not far away was Killashee, see of Auxilius.

The first Irish council of which we have mention is the so-called 1st Synod of Patrick, of 450 or 456, or acc. to others of the 6th c. This would have been presided by St. Patrick with the participation of Auxilius and Iserninus; it reflects a situation which might be that of the time of Patrick and offers disciplinary norms for clerics, monks and virgins (CPL 1102; Mansi VI, 513-520; L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*, SLH 5, Dublin 1963, 54-59). Also the so-called 2nd Synod of Patrick (456–465, but probably later) dealt with ecclesiastical discipline (CPL 1791; Mansi VI, 521-522; L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*, 184-197). Around 682–684 a council seems to have taken place, mentioned by *Adamnan (*Vita Columbae* 101 b); the canons of this council approved penalties for transgressors (Mansi XI, 1057-1060). Two conferences are also recorded, that of Druim Cett (575), with the en-

counter of two enemy kings in the presence of St. Columba; and that of Birr (697), at which the abbot of Iona, Adamnan, took part; to him is assigned the *Cáin Adomnáin* (Kenney 81), the oldest part of which dates back to the end of the 7th or the 8th c.: it was promulgated by the ecclesiastical and secular authorities together, to protect women, religious and children, in war and peace; it is established there that the fines for transgressions be sent to the community of Adamnan (*cáin* means "law" but also "tribute"). In the conference of Birr the Celtic church, through influence of the Northumbrian church, accepted the "Alexandrian" paschal calendar and the Roman tonsure observed by S Ireland, while the latter accepted the primate of Armagh over the whole island. Iona, however, accepted the Alexandrian cycle only in 716. The controversies over the tonsure and the date of Easter interfered for a long time with the missionary work of the Irish, esp. in N Britain. From the *peregrinatio pro Christo* Irish monasticism nevertheless developed a strong missionary dimension, esp. with Columba (from Iona to Britain) and Columbanus (from Bangor to the Continent) and with their disciples.

III. Culture. In general, there does not seem to have been opposition between Latin Christianity and Gaelic culture. The pre-Christian cultural tradition was preserved—between the 6th and 7th c.—in secular circles which were gradually becoming Christian (see *Hisp. fam.* 547-570), but distinct from the monastic schools. In these the *filid,* or poets/seers, were trained and active, and alongside them other intellectual figures such as the *bard* (another grade of poet), the *brithen* (judge), the *senchaid* (historian) and the *druí* (druid). In the 7th and 8th c. the *filid* reached an elevated position, with a hierarchy of seven ranks: custodians of the history of Ireland, they sang sagas, genealogies, encomiastic poems and myths, often rationalized in a Christian sense. In the Christian era it was possible to pass from the schools of the *filid,* marked by their erudite elitism, to the monastic ones and vice versa (see, e.g., Jonas, *Vita Columbani* 3,19-22). The *Hisperica famina* (lines 225-239), a work composed in a Celtic environment, probably insular (beginning 7th c.), shows students traveling through learned Irish circles (in Ireland or in the Scots colonies in N Britain), in search of good teachers of Latin rhetoric and hosted gratis by the Scots; the students were able to speak, not the Irish language, but the artificial *catena Ausonica*—i.e., a Latin language bound by grammatical rules and therefore not natural—while the native language of those students was perhaps the Celtic of Britain or Anglo-Saxon or even Frankish. For example, the Frankish prelate Agilbert studied biblical *exegesis in Ireland (see Bede, *Hist.* 3,7), before preaching to the Anglo-Saxons, and the first Latinization and Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons was promoted by the Irish (ibid. 3,3). They went to Ireland looking for monastic culture in a stable seat or else in search of secular culture while wandering (ibid., 3,27), like the groups of *lectores* who were still going to study Latin rhetoric in Ireland at the time of *Aldhelm of Sherborne (see *Ep.* 3 and 5), around 690.

A typical representative of "Christian druidism" is the aristocratic Columb Cille (St. Columba), member of a royal family of the NW: when he was still in Ulster, acc. to the legend, he copied the psalter of Finnian of Clonard in secret, and in the suit raised against him at Tara the king Diarmaid pronounced that just as a calf follows the cow, so every copy belongs to the owner of the original. A battle followed, but the *Cathach* (perhaps from the Irish *cath*, "battle") remained with Columba; today the MS, in Irish majuscule, is preserved in the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin (Lapidge-Sharpe 506). Like the **Book of Armagh* (Lapidge-Sharpe 354-360)—work of the scribe Ferdomnach, who was at Armagh between 807 and 808—this is not a book conceived for communication but a symbol to keep, because in Ireland the tradition remained predominantly oral for a long time. So the evangeliarums of Durrow (end 7th c.; Lapidge-Sharpe 516) and above all that of Kells (8th c.; Lapidge-Sharpe 520), with their miniatures, had many details which could be understood only by the authors, while for the people they were an object of marvel and veneration; both are today preserved in Trinity College in Dublin.

The first evidence of writing belongs to the pre-Christian and paleo-Christian era (4th–6th c.), present in sepulchral inscriptions found in the SW of Ireland: they document an archaic Irish language, closed to British and Gallic influences, and are composed in the ogham alphabet, twenty characters in the form of notches grouped in various ways, acc. to a distinction which seems marked by a certain knowledge of Latin grammar cultivated in druidic environments. The introduction of the Roman alphabet, through the work of Christian missionaries in the 5th c., was aimed in contrast at popularization; this work of spreading literacy is witnessed by the tablets of Springmount (6th–7th c.; Lapidge-Sharpe 505). The Latin alphabet was used first in the transcription of texts in Latin (such as the writings of Patrick, 5th c.) and not before the 8th c., as far as we know, for works in Irish; some MSS, however, preserve archaisms dating back to compositions of

the 7th and perhaps 6th c., when the flowering of the monastic *scriptoria* caused the substitution of a written literature for the ancient oral tradition.

On the occasion of the convention of Druim Cett (575) the *filid,* professional poets who had been banned by the kings of Ireland, acc. to tradition were defended by the intercession of Columb Cille, and the convention sealed their agreement with the church. A *rígollam* (poet of the 1st hierarchical rank), Dallán Forgaill, at the death of Columb Cille (597) composed his eulogy in rhythmic alliterative prose, the *Amra Choluimb Chille* (Kenney 212).

Irish culture therefore arose from the collaboration between monks and *filid,* and in the cultural synthesis (Gaelic and classical) that had developed in Ireland the peaceful enculturation of Christianity took place. The Latin acculturation of Ireland, which the *filid* had begun, continued. Next to the study of Holy Scripture the Irish monasteries demonstrated a notable commitment to intellectual work: they studied esp. the science of calculation (in order to calculate the date of Easter), grammar and rhetoric, with a Christianization of the traditional manuals. This culture reached Ireland in the 6th c. via contacts with insular Britannia and then also continental Britannia. The Irish monks accepted the profane authors with less diffidence than the monks on the Continent, who had had to combat Greco-Roman paganism; needing to learn Latin first of all as a means for knowing the Bible, the Irish monks went on to cultivate hymnography, history and rhetoric, without having to reject the latter out of respect for the *sermo humilis* of the Christian people, given that they spoke only the national language and not Latin. While in early Irish the oldest Latin loan words (5th c.)—concerning the semantic fields of navigation, commerce and the military—came from Latin as it was pronounced in Britannia, on the level of the written language the Hiberno-Latin offers a lexicon of rare words (Hellenisms, Hebraisms etc.) gathered from glossaries; it was constructed artificially on the basis of knowledge of grammar and rhetoric, giving rise to a Hiberno-British literary koine also called Hisperic Latin.

The *scriptoria* of the Irish monasteries spread books of instruction and prayer, and only later also texts in prose and verse (sagas, legal texts etc.) of indigenous literature; originally oral, this was received within monastic environments that, with the inevitable manipulations, transferred it to the written form typical of Christian culture or *légend* (Lat. *legendum,* i.e., tradition destined for reading rather than listening). The oldest Irish culture shows some characteristic traits, such as love for nature and for voyages, curiosity for *mirabilia,* the genre of the *visio,* the Penitentials, the genealogies, the *loricae.* In the genre of the *visio,* obscure but interesting is the *Baile Chuind* (= Ecstasy of Conn), with a list of the kings of Tara; it seems that it was composed during the reign of Fínsuechta Fledach (675–695) or a little before. Mixtures of paganism and Christianity can often be found in the Irish texts: this is so in the *Audacht Moraind* (= Testament of Morand), of the 7th c., which expresses the ancient pagan idea of the prosperity of the country being linked to the faithfulness of the king to the precepts of good governance, while a Christian text related to the *tecosca* or indigenous gnomic texts is the *Aipgitir Crábaid,* or "alphabet of piety" (Kenney 265), attributed to Colman moccu Béognai (d. 611), monk of Lismore. The *loricae* are enchantment formulas composed in imitation of ancient pagan compositions, pronounced by anyone who felt persecuted by enemies and Christianized with an initial invocation of the *Trinity. Famous among these is the *Fáeth Fiada,* or "cry of the stag" (Kenney 101), attributed to Patrick but not older than the 8th c.; the same pagan-Christian syncretism characterizes the oldest known *lorica,* that called "of Gildas" (inc. *Suffragare, trinitatis unitas;* CPL 1323), composed in Hisperic Latin by Laidcenn mac Baith Bannaig of Clonfertmulloe (d. 661). Like the *Amra Choluimb Chille,* the *loricae* are in rhythmic alliterative prose, called by the Irish *retoric* to indicate the foreign model of an elaborate idiom, imitated by the Irish writers in either Gaelic or Hisperic Latin; a typical example of this is the *Hisperica famina*.

The oldest proper meter, however, was probably—as in primitive Germanic poetry—that formed by alliterative hemistichs, while rhyme appeared in Irish poetry starting from the 7th c. In Latin syllabic poetry developed in Ireland at the end of the 5th c., in imitation of the Latin hymnography of the early Christian centuries, but much more variable in its metrical forms. The alphabetic hymn *Audite omnes amantes* (CPL 1101) might not be much later than Patrick; it was composed in his honor in rhythmic septenary trochaics and attributed to Secundinus (Sechnall); in Irish there is a biography of Patrick in verse attributed to the bishop Fíacc of Sléibte (inc. *Génair Patraicc;* Kenney 132): the hymn was composed perhaps in the 7th or 8th c. A Latin alphabetic hymn in octonaries is attributed to Columb Cille, the *Altus Prosator* (CPL 1131) and, with less likelihood, three other hymns (CPL 1132). Other poetic compositions are attributed to Columbanus (CPL 1113 and 1117-1118). The oldest remains of the Irish hymnography in Latin, in rhythmic verses with a

predilection for bisyllabic rhythm, are preserved in the *Antiphonarium of Bangor* (Lapidge-Sharpe 532 and 572-577), written between 680 and 691; the book—brought to Bobbio and today preserved in Milan (*Ambr. C. 5. inf.*)—collects various texts (hymns, antiphons, collects) of the 6th and 7th c. in use at Bangor. Partially similar content is present in two MSS of the 11th c., preserved in Dublin, witnesses of the so-called *Liber hymnorum* (Lapidge-Sharpe 542-564 and 578-591): for preservation, liturgical texts both in Latin and in old Irish, composed in Ireland or at least in use in the local liturgy, were gathered within this collection; among them is the *Celebra Iuda* attributed to Cuimíne Fota (*Cummineus Longus; CPL 1136), abbot of Clonfert in the 1st half of the 7th c.

Since Latin culture was a necessary instrument for access to the biblical, patristic and liturgical texts, Christianization and Latinization went hand in hand. In the monastic schools the classics were also appreciated, while knowledge of Greek was rare. The classics were known generally secondhand: but not Virgil, commented on perhaps by Adamnan (Lapidge-Sharpe 1235), nor Horace, better known in Ireland than on the Continent. The monastic culture was, however, founded primarily on the Bible and on the Fathers, so well assimilated that only now the Irish origin is being discovered of many works falsely attributed to *Jerome, *Augustine, *Cyprian etc. The difficulty of the Celtic authors in writing Latin was attenuated with the passage of time, as can be seen in the evident progress from Patrick to Columbanus. The difficulty of learning Latin made necessary the use of glosses, like that of Würzburg to the Pauline letters (8th c. at the latest; Kenney 461). The flowering of grammatical interest in Ireland is also documented by the *Versus cuiusdam Scotti de alfabeto* (mid-7th c.; CPL 1562), a collection of riddles (in hexameters) on the individual letters of the alphabet.

The exegetical studies followed the *Alexandrian school (moral and *allegorical interpretation), while the *Antiochene method was less popular (literal and historical interpretation: Ir. *stair*, Lat. *historia*). Furthermore, interest for symbolic details was characteristic for the Irish, as that for apocryphal literature. To the Alexandrian current belong the ps.-Hieronymian *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (CPL 632) written perhaps by Cummianus (ca. 632), and the *Ecloga de Moralibus in Job* (CPL 1716), an epitome of *Gregory the Great, by the abovementioned Laidcenn of Clonfertmulloe (d. 661). To the Antiochene current belongs the *De mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae* (CPL 1123) of the so-called Hibernian Augustine (ca. 655). The commentary on the Catholic Epistles preserved in the *cod. Augiensis 233*, copied from an Irish original (CPL 1123a), draws not only on patristic writings but also on learned Irishmen (Laidcenn and others). The ps.-Augustinian *Liber de ordine creaturarum* (CPL 1189) takes much knowledge of cosmology, anthropology, demonology, angelology and eschatology from Holy Scripture; it is attributed to *Isidore of Seville, but it is probably by an Irish author working around 650. The biblical cultivation of Jerome concerning the interpretation of Hebrew proper names is present in *Aileran the Wise (d. 665), monk of Clonard, who developed in an anagogic and moral sense the genealogy of Christ (CPL 1120), a genre much practiced in Ireland as an alternative to historiography in a stricter sense (annals, hagiography); see the *Additamentum de S. Columbae discipulis et cognatis* (CPL 1135).

Among the moral writings the *De duodecim abusivis saeculi* (CPL 1106) stands out, a treatise stigmatizing the customs of contemporary society (ca. 630–650), aimed particularly at laypeople; the anonymous author draws on both the *Etymologiae* of Isidore and on indigenous works, displaying similarity to texts in the vernacular. There are numerous writings from the 6th c. on the paschal calculation (see CPL 2302ff.); among these the *De controversia paschali* (CPL 2310), of ca. 632, is in the form of a letter addressed to Ségéne of Iona and to the hermit Béccén in defense of the Alexandrian cycle: the author, Cummian, perhaps abbot of Durrow, should not be identified with the Cuimíne Fota of Clonfert (d. 661–662), who is, however, the author of a Penitential (CPL 1882) and of the hymn *Celebra Iuda*, mentioned above. Perhaps from Irish authors are the anonymous *Disputatio de sollemnitatibus et sabbatis* (CPL 2278), attributed to Columbanus, and the *De saltu lunae* (CPL 2317), of a ps.-Alcuin, not earlier than *Bede.

The hagiographic production is abundant starting from the 7th c.; many *Vitae* were redacted at different times, leaving the final version extant. Especially the oldest *Vitae* do not offer much genuine information on the saint, but mostly hagiographic *topoi* and only accidentally historical information. The legend of St. Brigid is linked both to local druidism and to the veneration of Patrick, with the acceptance of the primacy of Armagh on the part of the S and the acceptance of the "Roman" observance on the part of the N; the most ancient text extant is perhaps the anonymous *Vita s. Brigidae* (CPL 2148), once attributed to Ultanus bishop of Ardbraccan, and today to Aileran: it probably depends on the same source (perhaps part of oral tradition) which

Cogitosus drew on, when around 650 or a little later he wrote another biography of the saint (CPL 2147), maintaining, however, the primacy of the church of Kildare; traces of such a common source could be present in the biography in Irish (*Bethu Brigte*), written in the 9th c. Cogitosus serves as a model for Muirchú moccu Machténi (d. after 697), author of a life of Patrick (Lapidge-Sharpe 303) which was commissioned from him by Áed bishop of Sléibte, at the moment when the latter was transferring his church from the jurisdiction of the kings of Leinster and Kildare to that of Ségéne, bishop-abbot of Armagh: the work of Muirchú is based on the *Confessio* of Patrick and on oral traditions; the hagiographic material gathered by Ultanus is referred to by the *Collectanea* of Tirechán, composed perhaps between 660 and 670 and little by little completed with *Notae suppletoriae* and *Additamenta* and *Notulae* (Lapidge-Sharpe 301). Alongside these texts about Patrick there is, in the *Book of Armagh* (807), the *Liber Angeli* (Lapidge-Sharpe 360), composed—at least in its present form—perhaps in the 1st half of the 8th c.: it is a Latin text—even if with many Hibernicisms—which refers to a revelation made by an angel to St. Patrick concerning the prerogatives of the primatial see of Armagh, with a recognition of the authority of Rome. Only a fragment remains of the *Vita* of St. Columba (CPL 1133) written by Cummineus Albus (Cuimíne Ailbe, d. 669), seventh abbot of Iona: this is found interpolated into the *Vita Columbae* (1133a), which was written between 692 and 697 by Adamnan, ninth abbot of Iona.

Ireland, outside the influence of Roman law, enjoyed a great flowering of canon law. The canonists were probably educated in the lay juridical schools: in fact, the canons of the 7th c., generally respectful of the indigenous culture, reveal the effort of fusion between ecclesiastical law and secular law. The latter is represented—in its most ancient phase—by the "Great tradition" (*Senchas Már*): compiled at the beginning of the 8th c., this collects legal texts of the 7th c. or even older. The ancient Irish ecclesiastical legislation is gathered on the other hand in the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* (CPL 1794), compiled at the beginning of the 8th c. by Cú-Chuimne of Iona and Ruben of Dairinis: it consists of canons promulgated by synods of the 6th–7th c. (synods of ecclesiastics, but in the 7th c. with the assistance of laymen), gathered by drawing on numerous written sources, among the most recent being Theodore and Adamnan. Furthermore the *cána,* laws generally attributed to some saint—like the above-mentioned *Cáin Adomnáin*—demonstrate a system of collaboration between ecclesiastical authorities and secular authorities, which would conclude with the beginning of the Viking invasion (ca. 830).

In the oldest Irish literature are texts in a mixed language, with phrases half-Latin and half-Gaelic. An interesting example of preaching to the people is the *Sermon of Cambrai* (Kenney 111), dated at the 2nd half of the 7th c. or else the beginning of the 8th c. (but preserved in a continental transcription): in this the biblical text is cited in Latin (probably there did not yet exist translations into Gaelic) as are the Fathers, while the commentary is done in the vulgar tongue.

Irish historiography expressed itself in the annalistic genre, which offered dates and names, but not an organic chronicle. The oldest extant annals are the *Annals of Four Masters,* of the 7th c., a little earlier than the more famous *Annals of Ulster* (Lapidge-Sharpe 592). In fact, in the first there is material perhaps from as early as the 2nd half of the 6th c., even if totally revised in the 9th; in the 2nd, the oldest part dates to the 7th c. Today one speaks of a *Chronicle of Iona* to indicate a material which must have entered the ancient Irish annals; this was probably written from 680 to 740, at the time of Adamnan, making use—for facts earlier than 680—of notes contemporaneous with the facts. The possibility is also considered today that there may have existed a *Chronicle of Bangor,* interested in the events of Ulster. These two chronicles could have furnished the oldest stratum of the Irish chronicles. In the *Annals of Ulster* there is also information from the *Chronicle of Kildare,* begun around 650. The historical data which can be found in the annals has been enriched with that of the genealogies, elegies and tributes composed by the *filid* in honor of their powerful protectors, and from the sagas with which they passed on the ancient indigenous legends. The cycle of Ulster collects material which is perhaps from the middle of the 7th to the beginning of the 8th c.; the oldest recension, born from the fusion of the two versions of the 9th c., is the version I, contained in a MS of ca. 1100 (*Lebor na hUidre*): this reports ancient oral traditions, perhaps from the beginning of the Christian era or, more likely, not earlier than the 4th c. AD.

Among the material, dating to the 7th c., contained in sagas in prose but above all in verse (ed. K. Meyer, *Conall Corc and the Corco Luigde*: Anecdota from Irish manuscripts 3 [1910] 57-63), the genealogies stand out: these are sometimes attributed to ancient and mythic poets, such as Find Fili or Laidcend mac Bairchedo, or else (with more verisimilitude) to authors of the 7th c., such as Luccreth moccu Cérai; the latter, e.g., wrote a long gene-

alogy (dating back to Adam), in verse, of Cú Cen Máthair, king of Cashel (d. 664–666), drawing on the *Etymologiae* of Isidore. The history of Ireland is narrated as the succession of colonization of different groups in the *Lebor Gabála Érenn,* of which some parts are preserved in the *Book of Ballymote* and in the *Book of Leinster*: the most ancient version was already circulating in the 8th c., but later revisions were superimposed on this until the end of the 12th c.

Introduction to the sources: J.F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*: I. *Ecclesiastical, An Introduction and Guide*, with addenda by L. Bieler, New York 21966; F.J. Byrne, *Seventh-Century Documents*: Irish Ecclesiastical Record 108 (1967) 164-182; T.P. Cross, *Motif-Index of Early Irish Literature*, New York 1969; M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*, Dublin 1985; F. Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law*, Dublin 1988; R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Dublin 1997.

Editions and translations of the sources: *Annals of Four Masters*, ed. J. O'Donovan, 7 vols., Dublin ²1856; *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, 6 vols., Dublin-London 1865–1901; *Cáin Adomnáin*, ed. K. Meyer, Oxford 1905; *Hymnodia Hiberno-Celtica saeculi V-IX* (Anal. hymn., 51), ed. C. Blume, Leipzig 1908, 257-364; *Lebor na hUidre*, ed. R.I. Best - O. Bergin, Dublin 1929; *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (*The Book of the Taking of Ireland*), ed. R.A.S. Macalister, 5 vols., Dublin 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1956; *Bethu Phatraic: Tripartite Life of Patrick*, ed. K. Mulchrone, Dublin 1939; *The Annals of Inisfallen* (*Ms. Rawlinson B. 503*), ed. S. Mac Airt, Dublin 1951; L. Bieler (ed.), *The Hymn of St. Secundinus*: PRIA 55C (1953) 117-127; *Sancti Columbani opera*, ed. G.S.M. Walker, SLH 2, Dublin 1957 (1970); *Adomnán's De Locis Sanctis*, ed. D. Meehan, by G.S.M. Walker, SLH 3, Dublin 1958; *Lebor na Cert*, *The Book of Rights*, ed. M. Dillon, Dublin 1962; L. Bieler (ed.), *The Irish Penitentials*, SLH 5, Dublin 1963: *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, Recension I, ed. C. O'Rahilly, Dublin 1976; Jonas, *Vita Columbani et discipulorum eius*, ed. M. Tosi, It. tr. E. Cremona - M. Paramidani, Piacenza 1965; *Hisperica famina*, ed. M.W. Herren, I-II, Toronto 1974–1987; *Bethu Brigte*, ed. D. Ó hAodha, Dublin 1978; *Corpus iuris Hibernici*, ed. D.A. Binchy, Baile Atha Cliath 1978; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, ed. A.B. Scott - F.X. Martin, Dublin 1978; *Bechbretha*, ed. T.M. Charles-Edwards - F. Kelly, Dublin 1983; *Annals of Ulster*, ed. S. Mac Airt - G. Mac Niocaill, Dublin 1983; *Adomnán's Life of Columba*, ed. A.O. Anderson - M. Ogilvie Anderson, Oxford ²1991; D.R. Howlett, *The Book of Letters of Saint Patrick the Bishop*, Dublin 1994; *Amra Choluimb Chille*, ed. Th.O. Clancy - G. Márkus, *Iona. The Earliest Poetry of a Celtic Monastery*, Edinburgh 1995, 104ff.; G. Cambrense, *Agli estremi confini d'Occidente*: *descrizione dell'Irlanda* (*Topographia Hibernica*), ed. M. Cataldi, Turin 2002.

History: K. Hughes, *The Church and Early Irish Society*, Ithaca, NY 1966; L. Bieler, *La conversione al cristianesimo dei Celti insulari e le sue ripercussioni nel continente*, in *La conversione al Cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'Alto Medioevo, 14-19 aprile 1966*: Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 14 (1967) 559-580; M. De Paor - L. De Paor, *Antica Irlanda cristiana*, It. tr., Milan 1969; A. Gwynn - R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses*: *Ireland*, London 1970; C. Thomas, *Britain and Ireland in Early Christian Times, AD. 400-800*, New York 1971; L. Laing, *The Archaeology of Late Celtic Britain and Ireland c. 400-1200 AD*, London 1975; J.F. Killeen, *Ireland in the Greek and Roman Writers*: PRIA 76 (1976) 207-215; P. Harbison, *Pre-Christian Ireland: From the First Settlers to the Early Celts*, London 1988; H. Mytum, *The Origins of Early Christian Ireland*, London-New York 1992; Ch. Harrington, *Women in a Celtic Church: Ireland 450-1150*, Oxford 2002.

Culture: L. Bieler, *Ireland*, *Harbinger of the Middle Ages*, London 1963; E. Knott - G. Murphy, *Early Irish Literature*, London 1966; E. Coccia, *La cultura irlandese precarolingia. Miracolo o mito?*: StudMed 8 (1967) 257-420; W. Meid, *Dichter and Dichtkunst im alten Irland*, Innsbruck 1971; Ch. Bowen, *A Historical Inventory of the Dindshenchas*: Studia Celtica 10/11 (1975/76) 113-137; D.A. Binchy, *The Pseudo-Historical Prologue to the Senchas Már*: Studia Celtica 10/11 (1975/76) 15-28; V. Law, *The Insular Latin Grammarians*, Woodbridge 1982; H. Löwe (ed.), *Die Iren und Europa in früheren Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1982; M. Richter, *Irland im Mittelalter: Kultur und Geschichte*, Stuttgart . . . 1983; P. Ní Chatháin - M. Richter (eds.), *Irland und Europa / Ireland und Europe. Die Kirche im Frühmittelalter / The Early Church*, Stuttgart 1984; E. Malaspina, *Patrizio e l'acculturazione latina dell'Irlanda*, L'Aquila-Rome 1984; Id., *Agli albori della cultura latina in Irlanda*: StudRom 33 (1985) 1-10; J. Stevenson, *The Beginnings of Literacy in Ireland*: PRIA 89C (1989) 127-165; R. & V. Megaw, *Celtic Art: From Its beginnings to the Book of Kells*, London 1989; D. Ó hÓgáin, *Myth, Legend and Romance: An Encyclopædia of the Irish Folk Tradition*, London 1990; D. McManus, *A Guide to Ogam*, Maynooth 1991; L. de Paor (Eng. tr., comm.), *Saint Patrick's World*: *The Christian Culture of Ireland's Apostolic Age*, Blackrock 1993; D. ó Cróinín, *The Irish as Mediators of Antique Culture on the Continent*, in *Science in Western and Eastern Civilization in Carolingian Times*, ed. by P.L. Butzer - D. Lohrmann, Basel-Boston 1993, 41-52; D. R. Edel (ed.), *Cultural Identity and Cultural Integration: Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*, Dublin 1995; P. Ní Chatháin - M. Richter (ed.), *Irland und Europa im früheren Mittelalter. Bildung und Literatur*, Stuttgart 1996; B. Luiselli, *La storiografia dell'Irlanda tardoantica e altomedievale: dalle tradizioni orali dei druidi alle tradizioni scritte degli intellettuali cristiani*: Cassiodorus 3 (1997) 153-174; J.M. Higgins, *The Dog in the Nighttime: Rome's Invasion of Ireland*: Studies in Latin literature and Roman history 9 (1998) 401-410; B. Luiselli, *I Celti dell'ultima Irlanda pagana e della prima Irlanda cristiana di fronte a Roma e all'Europa*, in *Memoria del passato, urgenza del futuro. Il mondo romano fra V e VII secolo.* Atti delle VI giornate di studio sull'età romanobarbarica, Benevento 18-20 giugno 1998, ed. M. Rotili, Naples 1999, 7-16; M. Richter, *Ireland and Her Neighbours in the Seventh Century*, Dublin 1999; L. Pernet, *Roma et Hibernia: le mobilier romain en Irlande et ses interprétations*: Chronozones 6 (2000) 10-23; D. Edel, *The Celtic West and Europe: Studies in Celtic Literature and the Early Irish Church*, Dublin-Portland 2001; Ph. Freeman, *Ireland and the Classical World*, Austin, TX 2001; B. Luiselli, *La formazione della cultura europea occidentale*, Rome 2003, 76-108, 137-156, 223-236.

E. Malaspina

IRENAEUS of Harpassus (6th c.). The author of a treatise *Contra synodum Chalcedonensem et tomum Leonis,* about which we are informed only by a citation of the title in a Greek anthology *Doctrina Patrum* of the 7th c. Two fragments, quoted a little later in the anthology, of a work by *Cyrus of Edessa,

probably written between 508 and 511, suggest that Irenaeus's treatise may be attributed to the same years.

CPG 7113; Diekamp, 312; E. Honingmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieur au VI^e^ siècle* (CSCO 127, Subsidia 2), Louvain 1951, 124-125.

K. den Biesen

IRENAEUS of Lyons (130/140–after 198)
I. Life - II. Works - III. Theology.

I. Life. The biographical information on Irenaeus comes, for the most part, from his works themselves, from which it was gathered by *Eusebius (*HE*, esp. in book 5); the other sources, whether ante-Nicene or later, do not offer anything new. Irenaeus, a native of Asia Minor, as a youth had heard the elderly *Polycarp at Smyrna (*Adv. haer.* III, 3,4; Eus., *HE* 5, 20,6-7: letter of Irenaeus to Florinus) which suggests that he was born ca. 130–140; the acquaintance with Polycarp is a key point in his comportment and doctrine, as it allows him to reach far back in the transmission of doctrine (*Adv. haer.* III, 3,4; III, 1,1, V, 33,4; *Ep. ad Flor.*: Eus., *HE* 5, 20,6; *Ep. ad Vict.*: Eus., *HE* 5, 24,6). It seems that Irenaeus spent a certain period of time at Rome also; however, around 177 he was at *Lyons in *Gaul. This community sent him to Rome to its bishop, *Eleutherus, to bring him the *Letter of the Martyrs* of Lyons (Eus., *HE* 5, 4,2); in the accompanying letter Irenaeus is called "presbyter," a title which might also indicate, in his case, the episcopal office (cf. P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II^e^ et III^e^ siècles*, Paris 1961, 43-49 and 93-95). In any case, on his return to Lyons, he was the successor of *Pothinus; during the pontificate of *Victor (189–198), he intervened to exhort him to patience and understanding with the bishops of Asia concerning the date of the celebration of Easter: this gesture is his last known act which can be dated in any way; we have nothing later. The report of his martyrdom is late.

II. Works. Two works of Irenaeus have reached us: (1) The *Adversus haereses,* preserved intact only in a literal Latin translation; an *Armenian translation of books IV and V; numerous fragments in *Syriac and different fragments in Greek which can be located through citations in later authors and in the *catenae* (Irenaeus was a widely read author). The intention of the work is "the unmasking and the refutation of the false gnosis" (as the title says in Greek); (2) the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching,* of which an Armenian translation was found at Erevan in Armenia only in 1904, published for the first time in 1907 (its existence was already known: see Eus., *HE* 5, 26). It is a short compendium of the Christian faith of a catechetical character. Two fragments of his letters also survive in Eusebius: to Florinus (*HE* 5, 20) and to Pope Victor (*HE* 5, 24). There is no precise information concerning other works.

III. Theology. The theology of Irenaeus is not born spontaneously, but in opposition to the heterodox. The heterodox, with mythic language and through a singular harmony of concepts, had developed the data of the Christian revelation: from the theological, prior to the generation of the Word and the creation of matter, to the cosmic and the *Historia salutis.* Irenaeus, as if forced by the *gnostics, and in particular by the *Valentinians, confronts almost all fields of revelation, but he does not try to know what God was doing before creating the world (II, 28,3), the manner of the generation of the Word (II, 28,6), the origin and manner of the *creatio prima* (II, 28,7), and other things of minor interest because, acc. to him, precise information is missing in the Scripture.

Doubtless, there are points of great importance where Irenaeus agrees with his adversaries. One preliminary point, formulated neither by them nor by Irenaeus, pertains to the constituent part of humanity called to salvation and gives us the key to their two antithetical constructions. Everything turns on the *Salus hominis.* The Word itself, together with the Spirit, is directed to the salvific mediation of humanity. God, known through vision, explains it and seals his destiny. The *Historia salutis* concerns the *anthropos* from his appearance in the world, across both Testaments, up to his maturity as perfected humanity through spiritual communion with God. To these themes, similar in Irenaeus and in the Valentinians, correspond two completely different conceptions.

On the one hand, gnosticism begins from the idea *homo verus = homo spiritualis*: the true *anthropos* consists only of that which is of the same nature as God. For this reason, only the physically divine *homo* is called to (true) *Salus,* through communion with God. The conception of Irenaeus, on the other hand, starts from the identity *homo verus = caro*: the true *anthropos* is only the body molded, from earth, to the image and likeness of God. For this reason, only the physically terrestrial *homo* (*caro, plasma*) is called to (true) *Salus,* through communion of the spirit with God. In the *religio mentis* of the Valentinians the *Deus verus = Deus ignotus* dominates; and, in a negative transposition, *Deus verus = non Demi-*

urgus. The Demiurge of the material world and Plasmator of visible humanity, father of the seven archons and planetary heavens, is the instrument of a higher Wisdom. The OT, dominated by him, is ignorant of the true God. According to Irenaeus, *Deus verus = Demiurgus;* there is no other God than Yahweh. The *Oeconomia salutis,* in acc. with its extreme poles—humanity and God—naturally has a different result. No one questions the Scripture.

For the gnostics, behind the immediacy of the letter, there is the meaning given in secret by the Wisdom of the unknown God. Both meanings of the revelation are true: the literal, which responds to the inspiration of the Demiurge; the spiritual, to that of the Wisdom. The gnostics, however, in their lifestyle (and also for their final *exegesis), remain faithful to the spiritual meaning and leave to the ecclesiastical crowd (successors of Israel) the immediate meaning. Accustomed to parallel double exegesis, they interpret the Scripture in their own way, without scruples, even making of the Demiurge himself an "animal" image of the true God, and find in their acts the image of the other superior spiritual beings.

In the exegesis of Irenaeus, against the Valentinians, one must always distinguish between its real value as an expression of Irenaeus's thought and its effectiveness faced with the gnostic doctrine, in most cases practically nonexistent. The relationship between humanity and its archetype takes on importance for the relationship between humanity and God. For the Valentinians, the truly spiritual *homo* was made in the image and physical (= consubstantial) likeness of the Only-Begotten; the visible *homo* was simply modeled by the Demiurge and by his archons in material substance. The *homo spiritualis,* having entered into the *homo materialis,* must submit to the laws of the latter, until he opens, in the fullness of time, to the gnosis of the Father, through the work of the Only-Begotten made man. For Irenaeus, in contrast, one and the same being was made in the image and likeness of God, and was modeled by the Demiurge (Gen 1:26-27 = Gen 2:7): the *homo-caro,* whose archetype is the substantial image of God—the Word—and also the substantial Likeness of God—the *Holy Spirit—visible in the glorious flesh of Jesus.

The Valentinian Adam was formed in the image of the preexisting divine Anthropos; that of Irenaeus in the image of the future second Adam. The glorious flesh of Jesus is not only the future paradigm of the first Adam, *homo = caro,* it is also physical mediator between the Demiurge (*Deus spiritus*) and humanity (*caro*): the Word, consubstantial with God the Father, and flesh, consubstantial with Adam. To the personal communion of *Verbo/carne*, the glorious Christ adds the physical (qualitative) communion of *Spiritus/carne*, through the dynamic perfection (*qualitas Spiritus*) of his flesh: thus, fully deified, he becomes the one who deifies, capable of pouring into his brothers and sisters (*secundum carnem*) the Spirit received at his anointing in the Jordan for their benefit. Both mysteries, the *incarnation and the glorification of the Word acc. to the flesh, can be seen in the formation and the destiny of Adam, read in the light of St. Paul. It does not matter that the image is prior in time to the paradigm. It certainly is not so in the predestination of God. Therefore, even before the drama of Paradise, faced with the simple human *caro,* issued from the two hands—Son and Spirit—of God, Irenaeus proclaims the great sacraments of the *historia salutis*: (1) Trinitarian: unlike other creatures, including the angels, made by the order of the Creator, humanity was modeled from virgin earth with the help of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, corresponding to the image and likeness of the Father; a work of clay, humanity resumes in the flesh, from the beginning to the end of the *oeconomia,* the works of God: *opera autem Dei plasmatio est hominis* (V, 15,2). (2) Christological: Adam announces in his flesh the two highest perfections of Christ the paradigm, the *personal*—Word made flesh—and the natural—flesh clothed in Spirit—synthesized as in the divinely perfect Anthropos in the glorious flesh of the Lord (IV, 20,2). (3) The history of the world: to bring out from the initial mud the body made God through the physical communion with the Spirit of the Father, the primordial *plasis* is not enough; because of the congenital incapacity of the *caro* to live acc. to the *Spiritus Patris,* a continual gradual *plasis* is needed, with the same two divine hands which began it in Adam: the *Spiritus Sanctus,* prophetic, in the OT shapes the *caro* and makes it capable of receiving, in the fullness of time, the Word, Son of God; the *Spiritus adoptionis,* that of the Son glorified in the flesh, in the NT carries on the formation of the *caro* so that in the final consummation it may receive the *Spiritus Patris* in its totality, and enter into perfect communion of life with the Creator. (4) Salvific: acc. to Mt 11:27, no one reaches salvation—immediate knowledge of the Father—apart from the mediation of the Son; nor does the Son intervene effectively in the salvation of humanity, unless he is first incarnated; nor is the incarnation of the Word enough to save his brothers and sisters if he is not deified in the body, through communion of the Spirit (i.e., the divine Life) with the Creator. Only then, and that is only when he is so

glorified with the glory which he had before the creation of the world, the same *Caro gloriosa* which was presented to the eyes of the Creator as an archetype of Adam, becomes the origin—through the effusion of his Spirit—of the deification of humanity, and is constituted mediator between God and humanity, between the *Spiritus Deus* and the *homo caro;* like one who receives *secundum carnem* from the Father the Spirit which he then pours into that of human beings, his brothers and sisters, disposing them toward the divine heights of his own life. (5) *Salus carnis*: what meaning has the *Salus spiritus*? The spirit, although within the person, is not the subject but the agent of salvation. Per se, not even the *Salus animae* is relevant, although in the composite human being salvation includes also that of the soul. Important above all is the *Salus carnis,* the effective fruit of the mediation of Christ. Since it is clear that salvation consists in the communion of life with God, it is clear that humanity will be saved first of all *secundum carnem*. Despite its terrestrial nature, the *caro,* rendered apt through history for the immediate vision of the Father, will see him with its own powers and sentiments (II, 30,7), in the summits, where the *caro gloriosa* of the Lord lives, above the angels (V, 36,3) who are not made in the image and likeness of God. His Demiurge, then, will finish the *plasis* begun in Adam, anticipated, as in its paradigm, in the glorious body of Jesus.

As the foundation of their *Oeconomia salutis,* an axiom was strongly perceived among the gnostics, but never formulated: ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ. In an economy of *Salus-gnosis,* if the object of the salvific knowledge is pure *Spiritus,* this can only be obtained by the spiritual. The divine from the divine. To this is added their respect for physical laws (II, 14,4). Without any difficulty in admitting—in a transitory phase—miracles of the natural order, these do not break, in the definitive phase, the harmony of the elements: to the spiritual corresponds the region of the *Spiritus;* to the animal, that of the *Anima;* to the material, that of the *Hyle*.

As for the principle *homo = anima,* from the times of *Justin, many ecclesiastics proceeded on another axiom, half formulated: *anima = imago Spiritus,* and therefore, *homo = imago* (*naturalis*) *Dei.* *Origen first, and later *Augustine, emphasized the affinity of substance between the psyche and God: as if the soul ordered itself in some way to its destiny of salvation through the vision of God; and *a contrario* as if the height of the beatific knowledge were put in danger by bringing in *homo = plasma,* or if that resulted in an anthropomorphism which would make of the Logos and the Holy Spirit—respectively image and likeness of God—the paradigm of the human *caro.*

Irenaeus reasons in an entirely different way. Closeness of substance compromises the liberality of the divine *dispensatio,* the implicit postulate of which is: the more the substance of humanity is distant in nature from the divinity, the more the divine will shine in the human economy, and the more this will be worthy of God. There is no consubstantiality (gnostic thesis), no affinity of any kind (Origenian thesis) between humanity and God, but antithesis and absolute diversity between the *caro,* called to salvation, and the Father—*Spiritus Patris*—who is its author. In the *dispensatio caro, Spiritus,* the power, wisdom, liberality and goodness of the Creator, shines better than in the others (*spiritus—Spiritus* and *anima—Spiritus*). The one who lifts up the flesh to gnosis of the Spirit reveals greater power than the one who does the same with spirits (Valentinian gnosis) or with rational souls (Origen and partisans of the *salus animae*): *nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur* (2 Cor 12:9). In the same way, through ways which can only be explained divinely, more wisdom shines in the deifying *plasis* of the earthly mud. In this way the munificence of God is realized better. The (personal and natural) embrace in Christ between the Spirit and the flesh is greater than, as Origen would have it, between the Spirit and the intellect (see Orig., *De princ.* II, 6,3). The same should be said of the final embrace, for the elect, between the flesh and the *Spiritus Patris.* He would be wrong who, in order to insist on the three components (see 1 Th 5:23) of the perfect human—*Spiritus-anima-corpus*—attributes to them an equal individual weight. Everyone admits in abstract the threefold division in this world. However, the Valentinians put the accent on the *Spiritus,* particular to the true human (*homo = spiritus*); the partisans of the *salus animae* do the same for the soul (*homo = anima*); Irenaeus, however, put the emphasis on the *plasma* (*homo = caro*). The gnostic anthropology is more pneumatology: soul and body accompany for now the *Spiritus,* but are alien to it. Origenian anthropology is more psychology: the *Spiritus* and the *caro,* united in the intellect (νοῦς), are alien to its essence. For the *homo = caro* of Irenaeus, the soul and the spirit are *of the human,* but they are not the human. One should never lose sight of this while reading Irenaeus, or before propositions like these: *Haec enim gloria hominis, perseverare ac permanere in Dei servitute* (IV, 14,1). He who perseveres in the service of God has already been and will soon be glorified by him *in carne* with his own glory. And in IV, 20, 7: *Gloria enim Dei vivens homo, vita autem hominis*

visio Dei. God establishes his glory by raising up humanity—*secundum carnem*—to his own Life and Glory, making of the contemplation of God the life of the human *caro,* at present inchoate, but in the end complete through the five senses.

Everything is governed by the perfect economy, which unites the two natures most distant from each other—the divine, or *Spiritus,* and the human, or *caro* (= material)—uniting them into a *deified flesh,* acc. to the standard of the *caro gloriosa* of the second Adam.

The grand lines of the *dispensatio,* founded by God on the human *caro,* surpass a priori the entire created being. The Creator does not force things, nor can a divine comportment be expected from the rational and free *plasma.* He raises the human to Paradise, to a temporary state, equidistant from the *athanasia* of God and from the corruption congenital to matter; and he grants humans preternatural gifts, which help them reach their destiny easily. To educate them to meritorious obedience, he gives them a commandment under penalty of death. The temptation of the enemy arrives. Adam disobeys God, submits to the will of the enemy, incurs death and is chased from the place and condition of Paradise. God, however, preserves him in his first blessing, curses the enemy, who brought him to sin, and announces the victory of the seed of the woman—the second Adam—over him.

The first sin reflects various aspects. *Toward God*: rebellion against his will, manifested in his commandment, and submission to the will of the enemy, manifested in his temptation; it is not an apostasy, but inexperience and ingratitude. The Creator does not castigate human beings by removing them definitively from himself; he castigates them with kindness, with the death which, by destroying them, renders it impossible for them to remain in sin. *Toward the enemy*: victory of the evil angel over humanity, doubly unjust, both because founded on a lie and because he enslaves a creature who belongs only to God; the fruit at the same time of his envy of humans and of his apostasy toward the Creator. *Toward the human race*: sin of nature; it is not the person who sinned, but the *caro*; the whole human race sinned, became hostile to God and submitted to the enemy. The last consequence of the transgression of the commandment of God (Gen 2:17) was death—*mors carnis*—from which the Creator had gratuitously exempted humanity. The consequence of the victory of the enemy was the capture of Adam and of his race under the power of the devil.

More than the relationship of the creature toward his Creator, Irenaeus, in the crime of Adam, underlines the victory of the enemy: directly over the preferred work of God and indirectly over his own Creator. He is not content only to rehabilitate humans alone before God; he intends also to rehabilitate them with a just and definitive victory over the enemy. Humanity—the *caro*—trespassed the commandment of God; and the *caro* will remedy the transgression by obeying the commandment of God. Humans fell from the state of life to that of death; humans will raise themselves from the state of death and pass to that of life. The same human race that had passed into the power of the enemy will liberate itself from this enemy, gaining the victory.

For all this, God could have employed other ways. He chose, rather, a very simple one, which fulfilled what had been announced in Gen 3:15, without modifying any of the great lines of the *historia salutis,* traced from the formation of Adam. God did not suddenly offer the remedy to sin, nor even to its consequences; he only announced this for an established time. Humans had to experience in their flesh the consequences of their error, or better, their condition as creatures, generously destined by the Creator, from their formation, to divine heights.

The prediction of Gen 3:15 did not introduce a new mediator into the world. To the ephemeral victory of the enemy over humanity corresponds the definitive triumph of humanity over the devil. The archetype of the protoplasm will also become humanity's reconciler before God and their redeemer from the slavery of the devil. A paradigm *a contrario* of the first Adam, the second will bring humans back to their original friendship with God, strip the prey from the enemy and finish with death: everything, through his obedience alone *in carne* up to the death on the cross.

God did not introduce a new mediator, but enriched with new aspects the ancient salvific mediation for humanity, having entered into the death and slavery of the evil one to be this. The aspects of the reconciling death on the cross, preceding the glorification of Christ in the flesh, leave intact the primordial lines of the mediation; they only serve to bring to light the highest perfections. The *doxa* which, in the case of the *dispensatio* of the nonguilt of humanity, had covered the flesh of Jesus from the moment of baptism in the Spirit, without having to undergo death on the cross, in the economy of sin makes itself known as *teleiōsis* linked to the passion and death on the cross (see Heb 2:9-10). The present economy takes nothing away from the first, but adds to it. God, by choosing death on the cross for the reconciliation of humanity, keeps present the antithesis between the tree of perfect knowledge and that of the cross;

their external form is the same. The Logos, invisible preserver (σωτήρ) of the world by way of his efficacy in restraining (συνοχή) evil, had to die on a cross to indicate in front of all the universal efficacy of his death, in obedience to the Father, similar—in the human salvific order—to the universal efficacy which, crucified in the cosmos, he exercises on the four parts of the world. The *plasma* had made itself an enemy of the *Plasmator*, and this *plasma* had to return to friendship with the *Plasmator*. However, for this the reconciliation with the Son by way of the incarnation was not enough. The flesh of Jesus does not enter into the sin of Adam, because it is virginal flesh; and for this reason it does not need to be reconciled. Rather, because it is *caro iusta* (V, 14 and 15), it can merit for its brothers and sisters both *reconciliation* with the Father, through obedience to him in the death on the cross (*in corpore carnis eius*: Col 1:22) and *redemption,* through the shedding of his blood; in this way the *caro iusta* reconciled with the Father the *iniusta* of Adam and his children. And at the same time it redeemed it, removing it at once from the power of death and the enemy.

Critics of Irenaeus have created great confusion in explaining his doctrine of redemption. In an anthropology like that of Origen (*homo = anima*), the dominion (slavery) of the devil over souls in hell is understandable. It is different in Irenaean anthropology (*homo = caro*). It can be understood in two ways: (1) The devil demonstrates his dominion over humans by bringing them all, based on his victory over Adam, to physical death, breaking the communion *caro-anima,* and preventing their conduct *secundum spiritum* toward God; (2) by his dominion over Hades, the devil keeps souls apart, preventing them from reuniting in the future with their respective bodies.

Human redemption can also be understood in two ways: (1) The Lord goes to physical death, separating the soul from the body, and offering his body for the redemption of the bodies "dead since Adam," and also his soul for the redemption of souls; Christ made this offering to the Father on behalf of his brothers and sisters; (2) shedding his blood, before death, the Lord presents it to the Father as the price of the redemption *of bodies and souls,* so that both may be reunited and, through the *resurrectio carnis,* he established the state of being necessary for human salvation. These two ways of understanding are perfectly compatible and correspond fully to Irenaeus's anthropology. The same should be said for the manner of understanding the domination of the devil over humans. There is no presumed domination of the devil over Hades (i.e., over the separate souls); and no redemption of these souls, apart from Christ, via a price: blood, offered to the devil and accepted by him (!). Expressions like (V, 2,1): *Non aliena in dolo diripiens, sed sua propria iuste et benigne assumens: quantum attinet quidem ad apostasiam, iuste suo sanguine redimens nos ab ea; quantum autem ad nos qui redempti sumus, benigne,* given the unjust aggression, on the part of the devil, against what does not belong to him, accentuate the just return of humanity from the hands of the apostate (and death) to those of the Creator, assuring definitively, with the pouring out of the blood of Christ (death and resurrection following), the restitution of Adam—in body and soul—to *human salvation*.

The sign of the complete triumph of the Redeemer over the enemy (i.e., over sin and death) is the personal resurrection of Christ, firstfruits of the dead, which is not the simple restitution of the human composite, but is a new and definitive *plasis* on the part of the *Spiritus Dei,* with absolute dominion of the divine life (*athanasia,* "incorruption, eternity") over the *substantia carnis.* This triumph consecrates Christ before the Father and humanity from two points of view: as the archetype of the first Adam, in divine flesh; as firstborn of the dead and conqueror of sin (the enemy, death). He unites two economies: the spontaneous one of Yahweh, preceding the decree of the redemption; and the complementary one, after this. God, with the parenthesis of the death and resurrection of his Son, remedies the fall of humanity and perpetuates forever the state of life to which humanity had been destined from the beginning. Far from correcting one economy with another, he enriches it with new profiles.

These are, in synthesis, the grand ideas of Irenaeus. Ideas notable for their simplicity, in an anthropology which is also simple, of Johannine flavor—affirmed with emphasis in the *homo-caro*—alien and also contrary to Hellenism, ideas developed with singular coherence in antithesis to the opinion of the Valentinians (and also of the ecclesiastics who defended the *salus animae*). It is not the theology of the unknown God, nor that of God the Father; but the theology of the Demiurge (of the material world) and *Plasmator* of earthly humanity. Nor is it even a theology of Christ, mediator between God *Spiritus* and spiritual human beings, nor between the God of the angelic intelligences and rational human beings; but it is the theology of the *caro Christi,* mediator between the *Plasmator* and his *plasma*: it is not the *salus spiritus* nor the *salus animae,* but the *salus carnis.* The work of God does not aim to create, nor to sanctify angels; still less to angelize humanity by eliminating the *caro;* but to perpetuate with eternal

life the humble *plasis* begun in Adam. In the end, as a conclusive synthesis, the great paradox *Caro* = *Deus* is articulated, anticipated, as in an archetype, in the firstborn of creation and of the dead.

Despite the powerful coherence of Irenaeus, and despite the fact that he, on the basis of the *salus carnis,* exemplifies the immense scope of the revelation, he clearly manifests, now and then, disparate ideologies, or at least tendencies. The stages into which he sometimes divides the OT correspond poorly to the linear vision of history (IV, 38,1ff.) as progress from the imperfect and infantile to the perfect and adult: the glorious *patriarchal* era of the friends of God, with the Decalogue carved in their hearts; the time of the (Mosaic) *law,* hard as the tables of the law itself and the people for whom they are adapted; the *prophetic* era (see III, 11,8). In the number of the Antichrist (666), in which the apostasy of the world is gathered in toto, Irenaeus sees three parts (V, 29,2): the times of Noah, encoded in the number 600; the times of pagan idolatry, encoded into the number 60; and those of the persecution of the prophets, encoded in the number 6. There is no space and time for encoding the apostasy of the NT: as if defection, very common in antediluvian times, diminished later, to vanish completely at the time of the gospel. The physical immortality of the soul, defined dangerously in II, 34,1—perhaps influenced by Justin (*Dial.* 5,1)—is presented better and definitively in V, 7,1. The decisive attitude of Irenaeus (V, 24,4) about the nature of the devil (*unus ex angelis his qui super spiritum aeris praepositi sunt*) and his apostasy through envy toward humanity: *invidens homini* [see Wis 2:24], *apostata a divina factus est lege* [cf. Plato, *Laws* IV, 715; cf. III, 25,5]: *invidia enim aliena est a Deo* [cf. *Phaedrus*, 247 a] contrasts with his reserve as to the nature and the fall of the angels (in II, 28,7). In an author so radically biblical and Johannine, the recourse to Plato concerning the apostasy of the devil *a divina lege* is disconcerting.

These anomalies, however, disappear before the absolute maturity and control concerning other issues, which were as complex as they were unexplored by prior tradition. Much of this is due to the rapid assimilation of the Johannine content—concerning the *caro Christi*—inherited from the presbyters; much also to the teaching of Justin. But the organic development of the revealed data, carried out against the Valentinian doctrine starting from the exegesis of Gen 1:26 and 2:7, is the very personal contribution of Irenaeus, which—for his instinctive adherence to Scripture, for his independence from Hellenistic postulates and for his profoundly human theology—deserved that continuing influence that history reserved for other less clear and profound theologies.

Editions: CPG 1306-1320; *Adv. haer.*: R. Massuet, PG 7; H.H. Harvey, Cambridge 1857; A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, SC 263 and 264 (I); 293 and 294 (II); 210 and 211 (III); 100 (IV); 152 and153 (V) with Fr. tr.; Armen. vers.: E. TerMinassiantz, TU 35,2; Ch. Renoux, PO 39, 1-164. Eng. tr.: ANF I, 309-589; It. tr.: E. Bellini, Milan 1980; *Adv. Haer.*: Eng. tr. D.J. Unger, rev. J.J. Dillon, New York 1992; *Dem.*: ed. E. Romero Pose, Madrid 1992; ed. A. Rousseau, SC 406, Paris 1995. *Demonstratio*: K. TerMekerttschian and S.G. Wilson, PO 12, 655-746 with Eng. tr., Fr. tr.: J. Barthoulot, PO 12, 747-802; L. Froidevaux, SC 62; It. tr.: U. Faldati, Rome 1923 and Milan 1980; V. Dellagiacoma, Siena 21968; E. Peretto, Rome 1981; Eng.: J.P. Smith, ACW 16. *Lexicon*: B. Reynders, CSCO 141.142/subs. 5.6 (*Adv. haer.*)*; Id.*, Chevetogne 1958 (*Dem.*)

Studies: F. Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus* (TU 46,2), Leipzig 1930; S. Lundström, *Studien* and *Neue Studien zur lateinischen Irenaeusübersetzung*, Lund 1943 and 1948; F.M. Sagrard, *La gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris 1947; A. Houssiau, *La christologie de saint Irénée*, Louvain 1955; A. Benoit, *Saint Irénée. Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie*, Paris 1960; G. Joppich, *Salus carnis. Eine Untersuchung in der Theologie des hl. Irenäus von Lyon*, Münsterschwarzach 1965; N. Brox, *Offenbarung*, *Gnosis und gnostischer Mythos bei Irenäus von Lyon*, Salzburg 1966; J.T. Nielsen, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons*, Assen 1968; J.I. González Faus, *Carne de Dios. Significado salvador de la encarnación en la teología de san Ireneo*, Barcelona 1969; A. Orbe, *Antropología de san Ireneo*, Madrid 1969; G. Jossa, *Regno di Dio e Chiesa. Ricerche sulla concezione escatologica ed ecclesiologica dell'*Adversus haereses *di Ireneo*, Naples 1970; A. Orbe, *Parábolas evangélicas en san Ireneo*, I-II, Madrid 1972; H.J. Jaschke, *Der Heilige Geist im Bekenntnis der Kirche. Eine Studie zur Pneumatologie des Irenäus von Lyon*, Münster 1976; P. Bacq, *De l'ancienne à la nouvelle Alliance selon S. Irénée*, Paris 1978; A. Orbe, *¿San Ireneo adopcionista? En torno a Adv. Haer. III,19,1*: Gregorianum 65 (1984) 5-52; S. Lundström, *Die Überlieferung der lateinischen Irenaeusübersetzung*, Uppsala 1985; A. Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo. Comentario al Libro V del "Adversus haereses,"* 3 vols., Madrid 1985-1988; A. Orbe, *Introducción a la teología de los siglos II y III*, Rome 1987; A. Orbe, *Deus facit, homo fit. Un axioma de San Ireneo*: Gregorianum 69 (1988) 629-661; A. Orbe, *Espiritualidad de San Ireneo*, Rome 1989; A. Orbe, *Gloria Dei vivens homo* (*análisis de Ireneo Adv. Haer. IV,20,1-79*): Gregorianum 73 (1992) 205-268; Y.M. Blanchard, *Aux sources du canon*: *le témoignage d'Irénée*, Paris 1993; R. Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret*: *Zur Rezeption und Wirkung des paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk des Irenäus von Lyon*, Tübingen 1994; A. Orbe, *El Espíritu en el bautismo de Jesús* (*en torno a san Ireneo*): Gregorianum 76 (1995) 663-699; A. Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo IV. Traducción y comentario del Libro IV del "Adversus Haereses,"* Madrid 1996; R.M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyon*, London 1997; R. Polanco, *El concepto de profecía en la teología de san Ireneo*, Madrid 1999; D. Wanke, *Das Kreuz Christi bei Irenäus von Lyon*, Berlin 2000; E.F. Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyon*, Cambridge 2001; M. Aróstegui Esnaola, *La amistad del Verbo con Abraham según san Ireneo de Lyon*, Diss. Pont. Univ. Gregoriana, Rome 2003.

A. ORBE

IRENAEUS of Sirmium (d. 304). Bishop of *Sirmium, in Pannonia, he suffered martyrdom during the persecution of *Diocletian and *Maximian. According to the texts preserved in the *Passio,* Irenaeus was married and had children. Arrested by the governor Probus, he resisted pressure, threats and the cruel tortures inflicted upon him. Although the people, with whom he was very popular, and his wife and children begged him to apostatize, he did not yield and was finally condemned to decapitation 6 April 304. On that date his memory is celebrated today in the Roman martyrology (formerly it was fixed on 25 March). The *Passio* has reached us in both Greek (BHG 948-951) and Latin (BHL 4466), but neither of the two recensions seems original: for Tillemont the Latin text imitated the minutes of the tribunal; for Simonetti the original text, today lost, was in Greek. Recently a church built in his honor has been discovered in Sirmium (the modern Sremska Mitrovica in Serbia).

Editions (*of the* Passio): *Passio* (or *Acta*) *Irenaei* in AASS, Mart. 3 (Venezia 1736) 555-557; R. Knopf - G. Krüger - G. Ruhrback, *Acta Martyrum*, Tübingen 41965, 103-105; H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, 294-301.

Studies: S. Le Nain Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'historie ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, Paris 1639-1712, 5, 250-254; DCB 3, 279-280; AB 68 (1950) 269-284; M. Simonetti, *Studi agiografici*, Rome 1955, 55-75; BS 7 (1963) 899-900; BBKL 2 (1990) 1326; F. Dolbeau, *Le dossier hagiographique d'Irénée, évêque de Sirmium*: AntTard 7 (1999) 205-214 (new ed. of the *Passio*).

M. Maritano

IRENAEUS of Tyre (d. after 448). Bishop of *Tyre, 5th c. He was a layman throughout his career, up until his episcopal election. A count of the empire, he accompanied his friend *Nestorius to *Ephesus (431) as a private individual. There he sought to oppose the summary procedure of the Cyrillians and traveled, in the name of the Eastern bishops, to *Constantinople to defend their counter-council before *Theodosius II. After many uncertainties, the emperor ratified the depositions brought by both parties. In 435, the year of Nestorius's exile, Irenaeus too was exiled to *Petra, after confiscation of his goods. Between 443 and 446, after the long exile, he was chosen by the bishops of Phoenicia as the metropolitan of Tyre, in a regular election, despite his prior condemnation and his double marriage. He was consecrated by Domnus of Antioch, but the hard opposition of the party of Dioscorus turned Theodosius II against him again. An edict of 17 February 448 deposed him, reducing him to the lay state. He always had the support of *Theodoret. During his exile he wrote the *Tragoedia,* a historical work on the first phase of the Nestorian controversy, lost, of which there survive extracts in bad Latin compiled by an anonymous partisan of the *Three Chapters (6th c.).

CPG 6471-6475; PG 84, 613-616; 84, 802-803; LTK³ 5, 585; DTG 7, 2533-2534; DHGE 25, 1480-1481; PLRE 2, 624-625; BBKL 2, 1326.

E. Prinzivalli

ISAAC of Amida (d. ca. 461). Among the nearly 200 homilies attributed to Isaac, and generally to "Isaac of Antioch," P. Bedjan has attempted to bring together 67 passages which should belong to an older Isaac. Originally from Amida, Isaac lived in *Antioch and also went to *Rome. According to the testimony of diverse Syrian historians, he composed many pieces about the secular games (*ludi saeculares*) which were celebrated in Rome in 404 and about the taking of Rome by Alaric in 410. As Baumstark shows, it would have been Isaac who wrote, too, about the earthquake of Antioch in 459, but in 461 he was surely already dead. Isaac, who was the student of *Zenobius, a disciple of *Ephrem at *Edessa, was ordained and withdrew to *Antioch. His homilies were inspired by *Eutyches and by *Nestorius. They contain, in addition, information on the ancient cult of the stars in Antioch. The *Trinity, the *incarnation and morals, however, remain his preferred themes. The attribution of the homilies proper to each of the Isaacs is not yet definite. The index of the homilies of Bedjan was augmented by S. Brock in 1987.

P. Bedjan, *Homiliae S. Isaaci syri Antiocheni*, 1, Paris 1903, I-XXII; S. Brock, *The Published Verse Homilies of Isaac of Antioch, Jacob of Serugh and Narrai*: *Index of the incipits*: Journal of Semitic Studies 32 (1987) 279-312.

M. van Esbroeck

ISAAC of Antioch (5th c.). A Syrian *monophysite author of the 2nd half of the 5th c., sometimes called Isaac the Great. The *Jacobite patriarch John bar Shushan (d. 1073) attributes to Isaac almost 60 metrical discourses and their parts, which in reality should be ascribed to three different Isaacs. James of Edessa, by the 7th c., already distinguished between one *Isaac of Amida, from the beginning of the 5th c., and two other Isaacs, both born at Edessa, one of whom was a monophysite, while the other was at first a monophysite, but then became "*Nestorian,"

or *Chalcedonian. (Isaac of Antioch was also confused with the Nestorian *Isaac of Nineveh by Arab translators and by compilers.) Isaac of Antioch was sometimes designated as Isaac of Edessa in virtue of his place of origin, but we, as does James of Edessa, call him the monophysite Isaac of Antioch lest we confuse him with the other of the same name from Edessa, who lived during the time of the bishops Paul (512) and Aesclepius (522), and is probably identifiable with the archimandrite Isaac, an author of homilies who lived in the era of *Nonnus, bishop of Edessa and who, so says Michael the Syrian, became a "heretic," or more precisely, a Chalcedonian. Isaac composed at Antioch a famous poem in 2,136 verses about a parrot capable of reciting the *Trisagion* with the added phrase, *qui passus est pro nobis* typical of the *theopaschite doctrine which is datable to the end of 470. The intent was to show that even animals render praise to God in the right form. In a corpus of more than 200 poetical works attributed to Isaac of Antioch, it is very difficult to distinguish his from those of Isaac of Edessa and of Isaac of Amida; Ducros even maintains that Isaac's entire corpus should be divided between Isaac of Antioch and Isaac of Amida, so that none would be attributed to Isaac of Edessa; nevertheless, the correct division will be possible and advantageous only when a complete and critical edition of the corpus is at our disposal.

G. Bickell, *S. Isaaci Antiocheni doctoris Syrorum opera omnia*, I, Giessen 1872, 84-175 for the poem on the parrot; P. Bedjan, *Homiliae S. Isaaci Syri Antiocheni*, I, Paris 1903, iii-x; E. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922, 63-66; S. Kazan, *Isaac of Antioch's Homily Against the Jews*: OrChr 45 (1961) 30-53; 47 (1963) 89-97; M. van Esbroeck, *The Memra on the Parrot by Isaac of Antioch*: JTS 47 (1966) 464-476; A. Abuna, *Adab al-lughat al-aramieh* (*Letteratura aramaica*), Beirut 1970, 202-204; Fr. Graffin, DSp VII, 2010-2011; L. Petit, DTC VIII, 8-10; LTK[2] 5, 772; X. Ducros, Cath VI, 116-118; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, II, 1013; E.G. Mathews, *On Solitaries. Ephrem—or Isaac*: LM 103 (1990) 91-110; S. Abouzayd, *Isaac of Antioch on Learning and Knowledge*, in *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992*, ed. R. Lavenant, OCA 247, Rome 1994, 215-220; R. Aubert, s.v. *I. D'Amid*; *I. d'Antioche* and *I. d'Édesse*: DHGE, XXVI, Paris 1997, 74-75 and 80; E.G. Mathews Jr., *A Bibliographical Clavis to the Corpus of Works Attributed to Isaac of Antioch*: Hugoye 5,1 (2002) 1-5.

I. RAMELLI

ISAAC of Edessa (5th–6th c.). Chronologically, Isaac is the third among the authors included in the works of Isaac "of Antioch." According to James of Edessa, he lived at the time of bishops Paul, in 512, and Aesclepius, in 522. In the beginning he was a *monophysite, later on he became a *Nestorian, which means—acc. to James—a *Chalcedonian. Michael the Syrian mentions the archimandrite Isaac, under Nonus the 31st bishop of Edessa, as the author of homilies, and states that he became a "heretic," i.e., a Chalcedonian. P. Bedjan points out that the third Isaac mentioned by James of Edessa is the same person of whom Michael the Syrian speaks and that he would have accepted the Council of Chalcedon in 451. It remains extremely difficult to distinguish which homilies of the *corpus Isaac(h)ianum* belong to Isaac of Edessa rather than to Isaac of Antioch.

P. Bedjan, *Homiliae S. Isaaci syri antiocheni*, I, Paris 1903, III-XXII.

M. VAN ESBROECK

ISAAC of Nineveh (the Syrian) (middle of the 7th c.). Monk and *Nestorian spiritual author. We do not know the dates of his birth or death. He was originally from Beth Qatraye (perhaps Qatar along the Persian Gulf) and was consecrated bishop of Nineveh by Catholicos George I (d. 680); but after five months in the episcopate he withdrew to the solitude of Beth Huzaye and, later, to the monastery of *Rabban Shabur. He practically went blind due to his intense study and ascetic practices, and he died at an advanced age. The controversy which arose at his death, regarding some of his affirmations—judged to be heterodox—did not prevent Isaac's writings from obtaining an immense success in *Nestorian monastic circles and even among *Jacobites. Beginning in the 9th c., his writings were translated from *Syriac into Greek and Arabic and found favor among other Eastern Churches, and thereafter in the Slavic world and in Latin countries. Isaac of Nineveh's work has been passed down to us in three series: (1) the First Series, 82 chapters or treatises (in Syriac *memrē*) published by P. Bedjan; (2) the Second Series, containing 41 chapters, the third and longest of which contains four "centuries" of headings or chapters; chapters IV-XLI have been edited and translated by S. Brock (see bibl.); some extracts of the four "centuries" and a treatise on the contemplation of the mystery of the cross have been published by Bedjan in an appendix to the 82 treatises; (3) the Third Series, containing 17 chapters (14 of which are new), translated into Italian by S. Chialà, with an English translation underway from S. Brock.

The spiritual doctrine of Isaac of Nineveh is linked to two sources of principal inspiration: *Theodore of Mopsuestia for dogmatic theology, and *Evagrius of Pontus (in his expurgated version) for

the theory of contemplation. One also notes the very clear influence of John the Solitary. Numerous borrowings in vocabulary and a specific terminology testify amply, among other things, to the tripartite division of the steps of spiritual progress into the somatic, psychic and pneumatic.

Editions of the 82 treatises: P. Bedjan, *Mar Isaacus Ninivita, De perfectione religiosa*, Paris-Leipzig 1909. Eng. tr.: A.-J. Wensinck, *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh*, Amsterdam 1923, repr. Wiesbaden 1967; Fr. tr.: J. Touraille, *Isaac le Syrien, Œuvres spirituelles*, Paris 1981. *Edition of the second series, chaps. IV-XLI*: S. Brock, *Isaac of Nineveh* (*Isaac the Syrian*) "The Second Part," Chapters IV-XLI, CSCO 554 (edit.), vol. 555 (tr.) 1995. It. tr.: P. Bettiolo, *Discorsi ascetici*, 1984; Id. *Discorsi spirituali*, 1985. *Edition of the third series*: S. Chialà, ed. and tr. (It.), *Isacco di Ninive, Discorsi ascetici, Terza collezione*, Magnano 2004.

Studies: Ortiz de Urbina 145-146; DSp 7, 2041-2054; K. Deppe, *Die Logoi asketikoi des Isaak von Nineveh*, in *P. de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte*, Göttingen 1968, 35-57; D.A. Lichter, *Tears and Contemplation in Isaac of Nineveh*: Diakonia 11 (1976) 239-258; P.T. Mascia, *The Gift of Tears in Isaac of Nineveh: A Transition to Pure Prayer and the Virtue of Mercy*: Diakonia 14 (1979) 255-265; S. Brock, *The Wisdom of Saint Isaac the Syrian*, Fairacres Publications 128, Oxford 1997; S. Chialà, *Dalla ascesi eremitica alla misericordia infinita: ricerche su Isacco di Ninive e la sua fortuna*, Florence 2002; *Œuvres spirituelles*, II, 41 *Discours récemment découverts*, ed. A. Louf, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 2003; I. Alfeyev, *La forza dell'amore. L'universo spirituale di Isacco il Siro*, Magnano 2003.

R. Lavenant

ISAAC of Persia (4th–5th c.). Syro-Eastern catholicos of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon between 339 and 410. He reorganized the Church of Persia after the persecutions of the 2nd half of the 4th c. and, with the help of *Maruta of Maiferqat, obtained recognition of Christians on the part of *Yazdegerd. Isaac, according to the acts of the Synod of Dadisho of 424, received "the principality of the priesthood over the divine people" after the see had remained vacant for 22 years. In 410 he called a synod in the capital, which laid the foundations for the autonomy of the Persian Church, with precise hierarchical and territorial structures, which is also recorded in the *Chronicle of *Arbela,* 67 K.: "Mar Yahballaha the patriarch invited all the bishops to come to him and to unite themselves for ecclesiastical affairs. Before this they had been brought together once during the time of Mar Ishaq and they had established that the see of Arbela would be a metropolitan and would oversee the numerous other sees," which are then listed in a detailed manner.

EC 7, 231-232; P. Kawerau, *Die Chronik von Arbela*, Louvain 1985, CSCO Syri 468 t. 200, 2: 67 and 92 n. 13-18; R. Aubert, *Isaac de Séleucie-Ctésiphon*: DHGE, XXVI, Paris 1997, 90-91; I. Ramelli, *Il Chronicon di Arbela: presentazione, traduzione e note*, Madrid 2002, 62-63.

I. Ramelli

ISAAC the Jew (d. after 378). A Jew who converted to the Christian faith, at *Rome he favored the side of *Ursinus against Pope *Damasus, against whom he filed a lawsuit, the motivation for which is unknown. Since he was unable to prove his accusations, he was exiled to *Spain by *Gratian (*Coll. Avell. epist.* 13,5). In 378 it was said that he had returned to Judaism (see the *relation* of the Council of Rome in Ambr., *Ep. extra coll.* 7,8-9; Mansi III, 626; see also Jer., *In Tit.* 3,9). *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 26) holds him to be the author of a work on the *Trinity and on the *incarnation, which Sirmond in 1630 identified in the *Fides Isaatis ex Iudaeo,* which had been discovered in a MS of Pithou and published for the first time: the *Fides Isaatis,* however, constitutes an extract, perhaps, of the work mentioned by Gennadius. On the basis of the linguistic, stylistic and doctrinal affinities between the *Fides Isaatis* and the works of *Ambrosiaster, Morin hypothesized in 1899 that the latter should be identified with Isaac, whose biographical affairs contain events corresponding to the data which emerge from the *Commentarii* and the *Quaestiones*. Following this identification—which obtained a notable success among scholars at the time, but which Morin later set aside and today holds little credibility—there has been the attempt to attribute to Isaac numerous other anonymous writings (see Bardenhewer III, 525).

CPL 189-190; CPPM II/A 15; 15a; 1065; PG 33, 1541-1546; CCL 9, 335-343; PLS 1, 654-655; G. Morin, *L'Ambrosiaster et le juif converti Isaac, contemporain du pape Damase*: RHL 4 (1899) 97-121; H. Zeuschner, *Studien zur Fides Isaatis. Ein Beitrag zur Ambrosiasterfrage*: Kircheng. Abhand., Breslau 8 (1909) 97-148; DTC 8, 1-8; A. Souter, *Fides Isaatis ex Iudaeo: A New Edition*: JTS 31 (1929–1930) 1-8; A. Hoepfner, *Les deux procès du pape Damase*: REA 50 (1948) 288-304; PCBE 1, 1159-1160.

A. Pollastri

ISAAC the Persian. Legendary founder, in the locality of Mâr Behnam (in Mesopotamia, 35 km [21.7 mi] to the SE of Mosul), of the convent of Beth Gubba, "House of the Grave," in Arabic Dayr al-Gub, visited by Muslims as the tomb of Hidr, Muhammad's father. It was a rather late site for pilgrimage and healings. According to one legend, not earlier than the 10th c., analyzed by Fiey, during the time of Queen Shirîn, a rich Persian merchant, Isaac, went on pilgrimage toward *Jerusalem with his sick ser-

vant, who was healed in the vicinity of Mâr Behnam. The merchant constructed a convent there which took the name of the grave which lay between the convent itself and Mâr Behnam, and which was situated "a stone's throw" from the martyrium of St. Behnam, a victim of the Persian persecutions of the 2nd half of the 4th c. At the origin of this legend there seems to have been not so much a convent as a hostel for pilgrims which was run by some monks.

J.M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, II, Beirut 1965, 579-581 and 607; S.P. Brock, *Notulae Syriacae. Some Miscellaneous Identifications*, LM 108 (1995) 69-78; R. Aubert, *Isaac le Persan*: DHGE, XXVI, Paris 1997, 89.

I. Ramelli

ISAIAH of Scete (and Gaza) (d. 491). An ascetic author with this name, who was present (in passing?) at Scetis in 431, is known through various Palestinian *monophysite sources. His biography was written by *Zacharias Scholasticus (ed. E.W. Brooks, CSCO 7/8, Paris 1907). There is good reason to attribute the *Ascetic Discourses* to him (ed. Augustinos, Jerusalem 1911, Volos ²1962; PG 40, 1105-1206; ancient Syriac translations, R. Draguet, *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon syriaque d'Abba Isaia*: CSCO 289-290 and 293-294, Louvain 1968; tr. by the monks of Solesmes, *Abbé Isaïe. Recueil Ascétique*, Bellefontaine 1970: other translations in Eastern languages, cf. CPG 5555/CPG/Suppl. 5555 with add.). Draguet, in his introduction to the *Syriac translation (see RHE 63 [1968] 843-857), wanted to distinguish between two authors: an Egyptian monk of the 4th c., still immune to the influence of *Evagrius, and a Palestinian monk (the editor of the whole?); critics hesitate to follow him in this partition. Isaac is the heir of the monasticism of Scetis, in particular of Poemen, and it is through him that the tradition of the *Apophthegmata of the Fathers—in part—has come down to us, also probably through his disciple and editor Peter. It is worth highlighting the fact that the collection of his discourses, quickly translated into Syriac, had included components borrowed from Evagrius and *Macarius. According to D.J. Chitty (JTS 22 [1971] 47-72), the Egyptian informants of Isaac are to be placed between the years 430–450. His work was used at Gaza (Barsanuphius and John) in the 6th c., and later by many Byzantines, Syrians (R. Draguet has published two commentaries [CSCO 326-327 and 336-337, Louvain 1972 and 1975]) and others. The Latin world does not know much of him. He represents a point of equilibrium and continuity.

CPG 5555-5556; outstanding article by L. Regnault: DSp 7, 2083-2095; R. Draguet, *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon d'Abba Isaïe*, CSCO 289, 290 (Script. Syri 120, 121) Louvain 1968; L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 287-295; Patrologia V, 277-278; Isaia di Gaza, *Ascetikón*, Naples 2003.

J. Gribomont

ISHAI (6th c.). Teacher at the school of *Nisibis and then, by the design of Mar *Aba (and thus before the latter's death in 552), "interpreter," or rector, of the school which Mar Aba had founded or restored in the capital of the *Sassanid Empire, *Seleucia-Ctesiphon. He wrote an *Explanation of the Martyrs,* which pertains to a literary genre that had somewhat spread in the schools and monasteries of the Eastern Church between 500 and 700. It seems that it was *Narsai at Nisibis who was the initiator of this new type of "explanations" or "causes," i.e., of theological treatises which illustrate the reasons for a certain liturgical or ecclesiastical celebration. The *Explanation (of the Commemoration) of the Martyrs,* celebrated on the Friday after Easter, is the only writing of Isaac which has come down to us. He was, otherwise, a man of the church, authoritative, well-esteemed, and he seems to have taken part in the Persian embassy to the court of *Justinian in 546/547.

DSpir 7, 2082; Patrologia V, 474-475; A. Scher, *Isaï, Traité sur les martyrs*, text with Fr. tr., in *Traités d'Isaï le docteur et de Hnana d'Adiabène sur les martyrs* (PO 7/1), Paris 1911, 15-52.

K. den Biesen

ISHO'BAR NUN (d. 828). Born ca. 744 at Bēt Gabbārē, near Mosul, Isho'bar Nun was a disciple of *Abraham bar Dashandad at the school of Bashosh in *Adiabene, taught briefly at the school of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon and became a monk in the monastery of *Abraham of Kashkar on Mt. *Izla, N of Nisibis. Later he lived at Baghdad and, for a fairly long period, in the monastery of Mar Elia at Mosul. It is not clear if he should be identified with Isho'dad bar Nun, bishop of Ram Hormizd, who is mentioned in the letters of the patriarch *Timothy I. On 6 July 823 Isho'bar Nun was consecrated catholicos of the Church of the East. He died 1 April 828. The extant writings, of which only a small part have been published, include a work which deals with questions concerning both OT and NT, a collection of canons, a grammatical work, some letters and fragments of some sermons.

Baumstark, 219; BO III/1, 165-166; E.G. Clarke, *The Selected Questions of Ishō bar Nūn on the Pentateuch*, Leiden 1962; E.

Sachau, *Syrische Rechtsbücher*, II, Berlin 1908, 119-177; M. Rendel Harris, *Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus*, London 1895, 96 (fragment of a commentary on the Scriptures in two vols.); D. Bundy, *The "Questions and Answers" on Isaiah by Išhō'bar Nūn*: OLP 16 (1985) 167-178; C. Molenberg, *An Eighth-Century Manual: Išhō'bar' Nūn's Questions and Answers on the Whole Text of Scripture as a Representative of a Genre*, in *IV Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 229), Rome 1987, 44-45; C. Molenberg, *The Interpreter Interpreted: Išo'bar Nun's Selected Questions on the Old Testament* (diss. Groningen, 1990), cf. A. de Halleux: Muséon 104 (1991) 208-210.

K. den Biesen

ISHOBOKHT of Rev-Ardashir (7th–8th c.). We know practically nothing about the personality of Ishobokht, beyond that which has been passed down to us by means of the MS of his legal books. He was consecrated by a Bishop *Henanisho without the specification of whether this meant Henanisho I (686–693) or II (694–701), even though critics today hold it most probable that it was the former. In the correspondence of the catholicos of Seleucia, *Isho'yahb III (647–657/658), mention is made of the autonomist tendencies of Rev-Ardashir, situated in Persia properly so-called, to the SE of the mouth of the Tigris. *Timothy I, catholicos (780–823), the first catholicos resident at Baghdad, had a translation made from the Persian into *Syriac of the six legal books of Ishobokht on matrimony, inheritance and contracts. The intent of this initiative was certainly to bring back to the Catholic world a church that had become perceptibly autonomous. Interest in Ishobokht's legal books is based on the fact that he draws heavily from *Pahlavi books of *Sassanid law, particularly the *Makitān-i-hazar dātestān,* adapting it directly to Christianity with scriptural citations: the triple law *Terisutha* in word, thought and work takes up the categories of Avesta: *hukhta, humata, hvarsta.* Even the distinction between *dinā* and *nāmōsā* is connected to the Pahlavi *dïn,* closer to knowledge than to religion (*din* in Arabic) in comparison with *nomos*. Ishobokht also wrote a book on the universe, of which only extracts remain, and he wrote another on meteorological criteria. He also occupied himself with *Aristotelian logic and with the concept of possibility. His attacks against marriages of consanguinity and against the teaching of the magi were so virulent that it prevented him from writing under the Sassanid regime. The allusions to Islam are, to the contrary, very rare. Ishobokht is an exceptional testimony of a Pahlavi Christian community which vanished completely.

E. Sachau, *Syrische Rechtsbücher*, III, Berlin 1914, VIII-XVIII and 1-201; E. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922, 215-216; J.M. Fiey, *Diocèses syriens du Golfe Persique*, in *Memorial Mgr. G. Khouridis*, Louvain 1969, 189-190; R. Aubert, *Isho'bokht*: DHGE, XXVI, Paris 1997, 175.

M. van Esbroeck

ISHO'DNAH of Basra (9th c.). Metropolitan of Prat d-Maishan (Basra) and author of a *History of the Founders of Monasteries in the Territories of the Persians and the Arabs,* also called *Liber castitatis,* a work written around 860. It is a collection of 140 short accounts on the life of the founders of Syro-Eastern monasteries which stretch from the 4th to the middle of the 9th c. Chapter 125 (126) contains one of the only biographical accounts of *Isaac of Nineveh.

Brockelmann, 234; Duval, 222-231; J.B. Chabot, *Le livre de la Chasteté composé par Jésudenah, évêque de Baçra*, Rome 1896 (Syriac text with Fr. tr.); P. Bedjan included this text in his *Liber superiorum seu historia monastica auctore Thoma, episopo Margensi*, Paris-Leipzig 1901, 437-517, with the title *Historia fundatorum monasteriorum*; J.-M. Fiey, *Išo'dnaḥ, métropolite de Basra et son oeuvre*: OS 11 (1966) 431-450.

K. den Biesen

ISHO'YAHB I, catholicos (d. ca. 595). Patriarch of the church of the East, originally from Bēt 'Arābāyē (the ecclesiastical province around the metropolitan see of *Edessa which also included the *Armenian areas S of Lake Van). He studied at the school of *Nisibis, of which he was rector from 569 to 571, when he became bishop of Arzōn. In 581–582 Isho'yahb was named catholicos through the wishes of *Hormisdas IV (579–590), after the election finished with dissent and discord. Threatened by the opposition of *Chosroes II (590–628), in 595 he tried to take refuge with the Arab king Nu'man of Hīrtā, who had just converted to the Christian faith, but died in Bēt Qūšī and was buried in one of the monasteries founded by the sister of the king, Hind. In the second of the 31 canons of the Synod of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon of 585, he defended the authority of the writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia; furthermore, the collection of the synodal acts of the church of the East has preserved a letter of Isho'yahb to Jacob bishop of Darai on the principal island of Bahrain, which contains 20 important canons and a confession of faith (see Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* for all these texts). In the letter he mentions his work, *Questions Concerning the Mysteries of the Church,* which he wrote while at the school of Nisibis and in which he comments, word for word, on the texts of the baptismal and eucharistic liturgy.

Baumstark, 126; BBKL 2, 1365-1366; BO III/1, 108-111; Duval,

349; J.B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale*, Paris 1902, 130-196; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 226), Louvain 1965; J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq* (CSCO 310), Louvain 1970; J.-M. Fiey, *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours* (CSCO 398), Louvain 1977; S.Y. Hermiz Jammo, *La structure de la messe chaldéenne du début jusqu'à l'Anaphore*, Rome 1979.

K. den Biesen

ISHO'YAHB II, catholicos (d. 644/646). Isho'yahb, born at Gdālā in Bēt 'Aramāyē, not far from Mosul, as a youth went to *Nisibis to study at its famous school. He left, probably in 596, when three hundred from the teachers and students abandoned the school in protest against the teaching of *Henana of Adiabene. He became a teacher and later rector of the school of Balad and despite being married was named bishop of that city. In 628, Isho'yahb became catholicos of the church of the East, after the see had remained vacant for 19 years. In 630 he encountered the emperor *Heraclius at *Aleppo, as leader of a Persian delegation called to negotiate peace with the victorious *Byzantine emperor. He offered him a profession of faith which was approved by *Sergius patriarch of *Constantinople and which won for him the invitation to celebrate the liturgy and give Communion to the emperor. This event excited lively criticism on the part of intransigent bishops, who considered it a betrayal of the theological tradition of the church of the East. Nonetheless, his future successor, *Isho'yahb III, then bishop of *Nineveh and particularly intransigent in his orthodoxy, wrote letters full of praise for the conduct of Isho'yahb II in this circumstance. He died in 644 or 646 in Karkā d-Bēt Slōk, where he had retired before the advance of the Arab armies. Isho'yahb was the author of a commentary on the Psalms, of hagiographic and monastic histories, mēmrē and letters. Extant is only a dogmatic letter to a certain Rabban Abraham of Bēt Madai, which adheres strictly to the doctrine of the church of the East, and an Arabic translation of the profession of faith which he presented to Heraclius.

Baumstark, 195-196; BBKL 2, 1366; BO II, 416-418 and III/1, 105-107; Duval, 369-70; E.A.W. Budge, *Thomas of Marga, Book of Governors*, London 1893, I, 35 and II, 4; A. Scher, *Histoire Nestorienne II* (PO 13/4), Paris 1918, 576-579; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 226), Louvain 1965; J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq* (CSCO 310), Louvain 1970; Id., *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours* (CSCO 398), Louvain 1977; L.R.M. Sako, *Lettre christologique du patriarche syro-oriental Īšo'yahb II de Gdālā (628-646). Étude, traduction et édition critique*, Rome 1983; Id., *Īšo'yahb II's Syro-Oriental Terminology and Its Significance*: Christian Orient 5 (1984) 134-141.

K. den Biesen

ISHO'YAHB III the Great, catholicos (d. 659). Born toward 580 in a village of *Adiabene, son of a great Persian landed proprietor, Isho'yahb studied at the school of *Nisibis. He entered the monastery of Bēt 'Abē, where he lived until 628, when *Isho'yahb II consecrated him bishop of *Nineveh and Mosul. The catholicos included him in the Persian embassy of 630 to the emperor *Heraclius. Around 637 he became metropolitan of *Arbela and in 649 catholicos of the church of the East. He was confronted with numerous difficulties, both inside and outside the church. Thus, he had to resolve the problem of the traditional separatist tendencies of the ecclesiastical province of Persia: he personally visited the metropolitan Simeon of Rewardashir, leader of a revolt against the see of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and succeeded in reestablishing the peace of the church. He sought to impede, probably in vain, the conversion of Arab tribes in the S of Mesopotamia and Oman and Bahrain to Islam; due to problems with the new Islamic authorities he even had to leave Seleucia-Ctesiphon and move his residence to the monastery of Bēt 'Abē. His attempt to found a theological school in the monastery failed because of the resistance of the monks to his academic aspirations. Therefore, a few months before his death in 657–658, Isho'yahb returned home. Great liturgical reforms are attributed to him, in particular of the calendar; he limited the number of anaphoras to the three still in use, those of the apostles *Addai and Mari, of *Theodore and of *Nestorius. A collection of 106 of his letters has been preserved; it is divided into three parts, which faithfully reflect his activities as bishop, metropolitan and catholicos. This epistolary is a very important source for our knowledge of the life of the church of the East in the first years of the Arab domination. He died in 659.

Baumstark, 197-198; BBKL 2, 1366-1367; BO III/1, 113-143; Duval, 370; E.A.W. Budge, *Thomas of Marga, Book of Governors*, London 1893, I, 24 and 31; II, 4-5 and 7-10; R. Duval, *Iso'yahb Patriarchiae III liber epistolarum* (CSCO 11 and 12), Louvain 1904-1905; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 226), Louvain 1965; J.-M. Fiey, *Isho'yaw le Grand. Vie du Catholicos nestorien Isho'yaw III d'Adiabène (580-659)*: OCP 35 (1969) 305-333 and 36 (1970) 5-46; Id., *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq* (CSCO 310), Louvain 1970; Id., *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours* (CSCO 398), Louvain 1977; J. Moolan, *The Period of Annunciation—Nativity in the East Syrian Calendar*, Kottayam 1985, 167-168.

K. den Biesen

ISIDORE, gnostic (2nd c.). Son and disciple of *Basilides, he continued the work of his father. He wrote a treatise *On the Adherent Soul* (see Clem.

Alex., *Strom.* III, 20,113), where he distinguishes two parts of the *soul, one superior and one inferior; the passions, with their perverse inclinations, are attached to the inferior soul and push it toward evil; but, humanity is able to fight back against this situation by means of the superior soul, which can control and dominate the inferior. He also wrote an *Ethica* (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III, 1,2) and an *Exegesis of the Prophet Parchor* (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 6,53), where he strains to demonstrate what the philosophers obtained from the prophets. (Parchor would be the source of *Aristotelian philosophy.)

W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, 38-44; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici cristiani*, Bari 1970, 91-98; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884 (repr. Hildesheim 1961), 195-230; H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, Leipzig 1924, 196-256; M. Tardieu, "Basilide le gnostique," in DPhA, 2:87-88.

C. Gianotto

ISIDORE of Alexandria (d. 404). Presbyter and *xenodochos* (in charge of the house of hospitality) of the *Alexandrian church. A man of great culture and a lover of peace, he had lived in solitude in the desert of *Nitria for a certain period, and always preserved a strong *asceticism. He had accompanied St. *Athanasius to *Rome, where he was ordained a priest. He was the confidant of his successor, *Theophilus of Alexandria, whom he proposed as bishop of the see of *Constantinople against *John Chrysostom. In the last years of his life he suffered persecution at the hands of Theophilus himself (see Pallad., *Dial.* 6: PG 47, 22 s.). He died at the age of 85 in 404.

Palladio, *Hist. Laus.* 1; *Dialogus* 6; Sozomen, *HE* 8, 12; BS 7, 957-959; LTK 5, 787; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'église d'Égypte au IVe siécle (328-373)*, Rome 1996, 414, 728 and 758.

A. Di Berardino

ISIDORE of Chios (d. 251). According to the legendary *passio* (BHG 960) of the 1st half of the 5th c., Isidore, enlisted in the imperial fleet and denounced as a Christian, suffered martyrdom at Chios at the time of the emperor *Decius (250–251). *Gregory of Tours (*De gloria mart.* 101), on whom depends the saint's praise found in the *Mart. Rom.,* narrates that his body was flung into a well on the island: thus the waters there acquired miraculous powers, and a basilica was built there in his honor. His relics were then transferred to *Constantinople by St. Marcian (BHG 1032-1033), priest and steward of Hagia Sophia, who placed them in the church of St. Irenaeus between 457 and 460. The most recent *passio,* composed at Constantinople, makes of Isidore a soldier born at *Alexandria and notes his provisional burial there by *Ammonius, and following that, the prodigious discovery on the part of a matron of *Ephesus. Isidore's Egyptian origin is rather probable, even judging by his name, and it is attested by other sources. In 1225 the Venetians transferred the relics that remained at Chios into the basilica of S. Marco, where the saint is still solemnly celebrated 16 April. From Venice they reached Zara and into Catalonia. Some inscriptions indicate the presence of Isidore's relics even in N Africa by the 5th and 6th c. His cult spread to *Rome, where a church in his honor existed in the 8th c. outside the *Porta Tiburtina*. The date of his martyrdom is recorded on 14 May by the *Menaion* and by the Greek synaxaries, by the Slavic Calendar, by those of the Sinai, of Rabban Sliba and of Silos, beyond those of the MS B of the *Mart. hier.*; the *Mart. Rom*. celebrates him 15 May, but mentions his memorial 5 February also, as do some Byzantine merologians. This last piece of information could be linked to the translation of his relics to Constantinople or to the dedication of one of his churches.

AASS, *Maii* III, 443-450 (Parigi); BHL 4478-4481; BHG 960-961; BS 7, 960-968; *Cath* 6, 151; LTK[3] 5, 617.

V. Novembri

ISIDORE of Pelusium (4th–5th c.). *Severus of Antioch, the oldest source who informs us regarding Isidore, speaks of him as a presbyter native to *Pelusium (see the letter of Severus to Zacharias of Pelusium, ed. E.W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the Select letters of Severus*, vol. 11/2 [translation], London 1904, 251) and, in the *Contra impium grammaticum* III, 39 (CSCO 102,182), he presents him as overflowing with divine wisdom and as a valiant exegete of Scripture. Isidore probably did higher studies at *Alexandria, and it does not seem that he traveled beyond Egypt; he was a monk in a monastery of Pelusium, though it appears that he was not abbot. This title, of which there are no remains in Isidore's very numerous letters, was attributed to him for the first time in the **Apophthegmata Patrum,* which carry six sayings of Isidore, drawn from his epistolary; one must note, however, that in this case the label "abbot" indicates rather the function of teaching the monks in the spiritual life, and not specifically the leader of a monastery. Isidore died around 435. Nicephorus Callistus (*HE* XIV, 53) presents him as a disciple of *John Chrysostom, toward whom Isidore certainly displayed a fervent admiration (see, e.g., *Ep.* V, 32);

*Photius (*Ep.* 11, 44) cites Isidore among the Christian masters of epistolography, alongside *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nazianzus.

Notwithstanding some reservations expressed recently (see U. Riedinger, *Neue Hypotyposen-Fragmente*, 157), one should not place in doubt either Isidore's historical existence or the authenticity of his ample epistolary, which consists of two thousand letters, which are brief for the most part; these, which encompass a vast period, from 393 to 433, treat various matters and are addressed to different people.

The corpus of Isidore's letters comes from *Constantinople, where they were collected, between 450 and 550, in the monastery of the *acoemetae. *Facundus of Hermiane probably knew of this collection (see *Defens.* 11,4); the Roman deacon *Rusticus translated 49 of the letters into *Latin.

In the epistolary, Isidore deals chiefly with exegetical questions. Grounded in the historical-literal method, he refutes excessive *allegorizing (cf. *Ep.* IV, 117) and demonstrates his measured equilibrium (cf. *Ep.* IV, 203). Many letters confront ascetic and moral points. Isidore, who identifies the kingdom of God with the monastic life (*Ep.* I, 129), insistently exhorts all to observe the commandments and to practice the virtues, not depending on a purely exterior attitude, rather above all the interior (*Ep.* I, 162): the moral and spiritual renewal of the church was dear to his heart. From a doctrinal point of view, Isidore reaffirms with force the fullness of Christ's divinity against the *Arians, through an accurate analysis of scriptural texts, clearly going back to the Council of *Nicaea, which one must neither take from nor add to (*Ep.* IV, 99); he reasserts the real humanity of Christ against the *Manicheans. In regard to the *hypostatic union, he speaks frequently of the unity of the Son in two natures (see *Ep.* 1,23; 303; 323; 405).

The letters of Isidore are written in a pleasant style, careful and rather simple; he displays a knowledge of classical Greek literature and a preference for the Atticizing style. In his epistolary, Isidore alludes to two of his discourses, one addressed to the Greeks, and the other written about the nonexistence of fate (*Ep.* II, 137; 228; III, 253); these have been identified respectively with *Ep.* V, 186 and *Ep.* III, 154.

CPG III, 5557-5558; PG 78, 177-1645. Partial ed. of the epistolary in SC 422, *Ep.* 1214-1413; SC 454, *Ep.* 1414-1700, acc. to the progressive order of the letters as it is presented in the Greek MS tradition. Ample bibl. on Isidore in Quasten II, 182-187. Among the numerous studies we call attention to: N. Capo, *De S. Isidori Pelusiotae epistularum recensione ac numero quaestio*: SIFC 9 (1901) 449-466 (ed. of three letters which are missing in the PG); C.H. Turner, *The Letters of Saint Isidore of Pelusium*: JTS 6 (1905) 70-86; K. Lake, *Further Notes on the Mss. of Isidore of Pelusium*: ibid., 270-282; R. Aigrain, *Quarante-neuf lettres de saint Isidore de Péluse*, Paris 1911; L. Bayer, *Isidors von Pelusium klassische Bildung*, Paderborn 1915; A. Schmid, *Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium*, Freiburg in der Schweiz 1948; U. Riedinger, *Neue Hypotyposen-Fragmente bei Pseudo-Caesarius und Isidor von Pelusium*: ZNTW 51 (1960) 154-196; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Observations stylistiques et linguistiques chez Isidore de Péluse*: VChr 18 (1964) 163-180; CM. Fouskas, *Saint Isidore of Pelusium and the New Testament*, Athens 1967; Id., *Saint Isidore of Pelusium, His Life and His Works*, Athens 1970; A.M. Ritter, *Isidore de Péluse*: DSp 7, 2097-2103; P. Evieux, *Isidore de Péluse. La numérotation des lettres dans la tradition manuscrite*: RHT 5 (1975) 45-72; Id., *Isidore de Péluse. État des recherches*: RecSR 64 (1976) 321-340; D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria in Five Letters of Isidore of Pelusium, Heirs of the Septuagint, Philo, Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, Festschrift for Earle Hilgert, 1991, 295-319; P. Évieux, *Isidore de Péluse*, Paris 1995; M. Kertsch, *Weitere Chrysostomos-Reminiszenzen bei Isidor von Pelusion*: JOEByz 46 (1996) 45-61.

S. Zincon

ISIDORE of Seville (560–636). From a great Hispano-Roman family (his father was named Severianus) originally from the region of Cartagena, but probably "transferred" to Seville following the Byzantine disembarkment (552, perhaps not until 555 at Cartagena), Isidore is the last of four children who all became monks and/or clerics: his sister Florentina was a cloistered nun, his brothers *Leander and *Fulgentius became, respectively, bishops of Seville and of Écija in Baetica, the most Romanized of the Spanish provinces (contemporary Andalusia). Educated under the guidance of his brother Leander and probably in the episcopal school of Seville (but a period in a monastic school is not at all excluded), the young Isidore received an education which was both classical and Christian, monastic and clerical: this explains from the beginning the breadth and complexity of his culture. He saw King *Leovigild unify *Spain and try in vain to impose *Arianism on all his subjects. Isidore's brother Leander conspired with the Byzantines without success in opposing Leovigild with the help of Leovigild's son *Hermenegild, who was a Catholic convert; Hermenegild was captured and executed in 585. Leander, however, later successfuly obtained the conversion of Leovigild's second son, King *Recared, and of the Arian *Visigoths, to the Catholicism of the Hispano-Romans (3rd Council of Toledo, in 589). Finally Isidore saw King Suintila chase the last Byzantine occupiers out of the S tip of Spain (in 621). These military, political and religious events profoundly marked the personality of Isidore. It was first of all in order to complete the national unification of the kingdom of Toledo, now Catholic, and to reorganize the church of Spain after two centuries of disorder and persecutions (invasion of the peninsula by Suevi, Alans, Vandals and, immediately

afterward, by the Visigoths starting from 409), that Isidore conceived and wrote his very diverse literary works. But he was at the same time a man of the church and of the state: that is clear from his visits to the ruling princes of Toledo, his literary friendship with King *Sisebut, his role as president and promoter of the 4th Council of Toledo, in 633, whose acts are a kind of ideal charter of the Visigothic church and of its relationship with the monarchy. He died in 636, leaving his largest work unfinished: the *Etymologiae,* which his friend and disciple *Braulio of Saragossa partially finished and published.

The *Versus in bibliotheca* which Isidore composed to serve as "legends" for the adornment of the bookshelves of his episcopal library could create a certain illusion as to the real extent of his classical and patristic culture. But the first of these distichs could be the point of departure for a just evaluation of his concept of culture: "Beyond many sacred works, behold many profane works: if you like some poetic composition, take it and read. See these fields full of thorns where roses abound: avoid the thorns and gather the roses." The sacred comes before the profane, but with an openness to poetic culture and an attitude of "anthologist" acc. to the traditions of Hellenistic erudition.

Thus we find an obsession with a "selection" of comprehensible texts, but also a taste for intellectual culture in itself—Medieval pragmatism and classical literary sense. (The first verse paraphrases a hexameter of Martial of Bilbilis [today Calatayud], a Spanish compatriot of Isidore.) It is less surprising, therefore, that the brother of Leander (to whom the friend *Gregory the Great had dedicated a prefatory letter for the *Moralia,* ending with an invective against the "rules of Donatus") was able to plan such a sizable profane work at that time. Isidore did it, furthermore, with the guidance of St. *Augustine and of *Cassiodorus, of the *De doctrina christiana* and of the *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum* (of which he knew only the second book).

The *Differences* and the *Synonyms* show the primacy of grammatical culture, instrument of good actions at the same time as eloquence. The *Tractatus on Nature* follows the lines of the ancient tradition of works on cosmography, of which it also follows the typical plan: but, faced with the phenomena, he adds to the profane scientific description their sacred allegorization, starting from exegetical and scriptural works. *The Origin of the Goths* is interwoven with the Chronicle, as a national history and a summary of universal chronology. It is the history, renovated from antiquity, of a people, providing the framework of a history of salvation in the footsteps of the Christian chronicles for which *Jerome had given the Latin prototype, translating and completing that of Eusebius. History, finally, of a Christian literature in Spain is found in *De viris illustribus* which carries on the works of Jerome and *Gennadius, but reducing the horizon to that of a province which became a nation.

The unfinished masterpiece of Isidore, which includes the sacred sciences on equal footing with profane knowledge, is his encyclopedia of *Etymologiae* in 20 books (the title *Origins* is due to modern editors). This compendium of ancient and paleo-Christian culture is organized from grammar to the most modest techniques, passing through the seven "arts" of the Hellenistic "encyclopedia," medicine, law, sacred knowledge and natural sciences. This immense material has, as its principle of division and presentation, that which could be called the four grammatical categories of the Isidorian understanding: gloss, analogy, difference and, esp., etymology, strengthened by the ancient (Varro) and biblical conviction that words offer the keys to things. The problem of the sources of the work is unresolved: it remains the primary problem, but it is partially unresolvable. These sources are biblical, patristic, classical, but in the latter case it is often a matter of different manuals, many of them irretrievably lost. This plurality of sources, minutely followed and combined, guarantees also the relative originality of their Isidorian "rewriting." Crumbs of knowledge? Yes, but in this way so much easier to understand by readers whose intellectual level was not often very high.

The "sacred" works are no less important than the "profane." The canonical collection *Hispana,* perhaps begun by Leander, and some liturgical sections demonstrate the almost technical contribution of Isidore to ecclesiastical reform and even liturgy. This orientation finds its complete expression in the treatise *De origine officiorum ecclesiasticorum*. The Isidorian ideal of pilgrimage to the sources is coherent here with that which animates the *Etymologiae* and the *History of the Goths* (ancient title still given by moderns to the *De origine Gotorum*). This goes along with the meaning of the definition in *Etym.* 1,20,1: *etymologia est origo*. But here this is applied to a properly Christian and also ecclesial object; from *Ambrose, this too is indirectly Ciceronian, as the variation of the title shows: *De officiis ministrorum.* The original moral sense has changed: here it is a matter of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and of the liturgy. These two meanings of *officium* were destined to a modern future. Next to a series of manuals which today would be called "biblical studies" (*Prooemia, Allegoriae, Quaestiones* on the two Testaments,

De ortu et obitu patrum etc.), it is necessary to make a special place for the polyvalent manual of *Synonyma sive lamentatio animae peccatricis.* This offers at the same time a manual of rhetorical enrichment of vocabulary through the ancient scholastic exercise of the "synonymic variation"; of spiritual formation to penitence and to conversion through the synonymic repetition of the same *sententia* (biblical sources: Jeremiah; and patristic: Cyprian; and, sometimes, classical: Horace); finally of an aesthetic model of a synonymic prose often rhythmic and rhymed: the work would remain for the Medieval readers the archetype of a kind of new artistic prose which John of Garland would call *stilus isidorianus.*

But the largest treatise, and "sacred" parallel to the *Etymologiae,* consists of the three books of the *Sententiae.* Isidore unfolds there, often in the form of synonymic repetition, in a style sometimes elliptical to the point of obscurity, in rather careless language constellated with "pre-Romanisms"—esp. syntactical—a triple theology: dogmatic, spiritual, moral, of Augustinian inspiration both directly and indirectly (via the *Moralia* of Gregory). It is a doctrine and religious ethic for the entire Visigothic society, from the poor to the princes, from monks to bishops: reflection and reform of a hard, heterogeneous, nonegalitarian society, in a kind of interpretation, oriented and classified, of the great Gregorian ethical and spiritual themes. But Gregorian mysticism is here simplified often into a modest and all the more imperative moralism. Here the contradictions of Isidore's thought are the echo of those of his times, but aggravated by an interior dissent between the classical of yesterday and the "today of God" in the Visigothic world, and even the Medieval tomorrow, dimly perceived. This is proved by the immense success, particularly outside Spain, of the entire work of Isidore, but esp. of the *Sententiae* and of the *Etymologiae,* which became the *vademecum* of scholars of every kind. Codicology is beginning to make it possible to trace the concrete spread of these different works, isolated or united in different corpora, through W Europe of the early Middle Ages. Their impact on Carolingian culture is still too poorly known, but the number of exemplars copied in the 9th and 10th c. alone is already eloquent.

Was Isidore "the last philologer of antiquity" or "the founder of the Middle Ages"? A false dilemma. He is above all a Hispano-Roman bishop, who was close to the king of Toledo as a sort of "primate" of the Visigothic church, a responsible pastor eager to respond in a profound way to the needs of his times, a spiritual "cofounder" of the Hispano-Gothic kingdom: his *Elogium of Spain,* a lyrical preface in a refined artistic prose which opens the treatise *On the Origin of the Goths,* shows it eloquently. A man of action and of thought who wanted to stay faithful to antiquity, while adapting to a world which was about to become entirely Medieval.

CPL 1186-1229; Díaz 1, 101-134; PL 81-84; PLS 4, 1801-1866; MGH, AA, 11,2 (historical works).

Some recent editions: *Etymologiae*, ed. Lindsay, Oxford 1911. New ed. in publication in the series "Auteurs latins du Moyen Âge," book II, ed. P.K. Marshall, Paris 1983; book IX, ed. M. Reydellet, Paris 1984; book XII, ed. J. Andrè, Paris 1986; book XVII, ed. J. André, Paris 1981; *De natura rerum*, ed. J. Fontaine, Bordeaux 1960; ed. F. Trisoglio, Rome 2001; *De viris illustribus*, ed. C. Codoñer, Salamanca 1964; *De origine Gothorum*, ed. C. Rodríguez Alonso, León 1975; *De origine ecclesiasticorum officiorum*, ed. C. Lawson, Madrid 1982; *De ortu et obitu patrum*, ed. Chaparro Gómez, Paris 1982; *Differentiae*, ed. C. Codoñer, Paris 1992; *Sententiae*, ed. P. Cazier, Turnhout 1998; P. Throot, *Isidore of Seville's Etymologies*, 2 vols., complete Eng tr., Napa, CA 2006.

Studies: F. Arévalo, pref. to 1803 ed.: *Isidoriana* (repr. in PL 82; it remains fundamental); *Miscellanea Isidoriana*, Rome 1936; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 2 vols., Paris 1959 ([2]1983); *Isidoriana. Estudios sobre San Isidoro de Sevilla en el XIV centenario de su nacimiento*, León 1961 (contains, under the signature of J. Hillgarth, an analytical and critical bibl. of Isidorian studies from 1935 to 1959); H.J. Diesner, *Isidor von Sevilla und das westgotische Spanien*, Berlin 1977 (recension J.F., in Gnomon 1981); J. Fontaine, *Cohérence et originalité de l'étymologie isidorienne*, in *Homenaje a El. Elorduy*, Bilbao 1978, 89-106; *Isidorus Varro christianas?*, Homenaje a MC. Díaz y Díaz, Madrid 1982; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville*: DSp 7, 2104-2116; J.N. Hillgarth, *Isidorian Studies*: StudMed 31 (1990) 925-973; P. Cazier, *Isidore de Séville et la naissance de l'Espagne catholique*, Paris 1994; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, III: *San Isidoro de Sevilla*, Madrid 1998; M. Gorman, *From Isidore to Claudius of Turin: The Works of Ambrose on Genesis in the Early Middle Ages*: REAug 45 (1999) 121-138; L. Navarra, *Interconnessioni letterarie e ideologiche di Cassiodoro e Isidoro storici dei Goti*: SMSR 23 (1999) 251-263; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville*: *genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths*, Turnhout 2000.

J. Fontaine

ISIDORE the Younger (7th–8th c.). Schindel has published, from a MS of the 13th c. from the library of Basilea, a manual on linguistic defects and qualities, *De vitiis et virtutibus orationis liber,* passed down under the name of Isidorus Iunior, who is otherwise unknown. According to Schindel the manual was composed in *Spain between the 5th and 6th c.; the anonymous author drew examples both from the Bible as well as from Christian writers (*Augustine, *Dracontius).

CPL 1555[a]; Verzeichnis, 581; U. Schindel, *Die lateinischen Figurenlehren des 5. bis 7. Jahrhunderts und Donats Vergilkommen-*

tar, Gottingen 1975, 209-241; *Dizionario di letteratura cristiana antica*, ed. by S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, Rome 2006, 522.

A. Di Berardino

ISOCHRISTS. The term means "equal to Christ." Within the *Origenist controversy, which broke out in the 1st half of the 4th c., a division arose: the monks of the laura of Firminus were branded by their adversaries as *protoktistoi* (believers in the preexistence of souls; Christ was created before the other beings: for this they were also called *tetraditi* [since they added another person to the *Trinity]), while those of the New Laura were referred to as *isochrists,* since they confessed that in the moment of the restoration (*apokatastasis*) all will be equal to Christ. The leader of this faction was *Theodore Askidas, who later became bishop of *Caesarea in Cappadocia and ordained different bishops in Palestine, among whom was *Theodore of Scythopolis (548). One of the members of the faction of the isochrists, *Macarius, was elected patriarch of Jerusalem. The opponents turned to the emperor *Justinian, who condemned the isochrists before the ecumenical council of 553. Thanks to the intervention of the emperor many of them abjured their doctrines; among these Theodore of Scythopolis, who for the occasion wrote the *Libellus de erroribus Origenis* (CPG 6993: PG 86, 232-236). The Christology of the isochrists, which was inspired by the *Alexandrian tradition, tended toward *monophysitism.

DTC 8, 112; F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Concil*, Münster i.W. 1899; B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'oeuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris 1983; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism*, Washington, DC, 1995, 239-240; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, Rome 2001, passim.

A. Di Berardino

ITALY

I. Spread of Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. Spread of Christianity. St. *Paul wrote (Rom 1:8), "Your faith is celebrated in all the world." The Christian community in *Rome was therefore known in the Christian world for its faith in the winter of 56–57, when Paul wrote perhaps from Corinth. There is just one anecdote about historical antecedents: the expulsion of the Jews from Rome on the order of Claudius, since they were involved in continual disorders "because of Chrestus" (Suetonius, *Claudius* 25). The first Roman Christians, as happened elsewhere, came from the synagogue, since the synagogue network offered a support to Christian missionaries. The text of Suetonius, if it really refers to Christ, is one of the most ancient and important documents, because it is a non-Christian testimony in which the name of Christ appears. The expulsion of the Jews is dated to 48–49 (Orosius, *Hist. adv. paganos* 7,6,15). *Eusebius writes that *Peter had arrived at Rome at the beginning of the reign of *Claudius (*HE* 2,14,6; 17,1), but this is not certain. In any case, Rome received the gospel in the years between 43 and 49 (Daniélou, *Nuova Storia della Chiesa*, I, 533). Paul arrived at Rome around the year 60. Peter and Paul, by the unanimous testimony of the sources, suffered martyrdom in the city. In 64 the victims of the persecution of *Nero were taken from the humblest social classes; but in the following persecution of *Domitian, in 95, there were members of noble and consular families, such as that of the *Acilli. But were they really Christians? Unfortunately the acts of the martyrs were written only after the middle of the 2nd c. (M. Sordi, *La persecuzione di Domiziano*: RSCI 16 [1960] 1-26; G. Penco, *Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, I, 19-21). A community of Christians prior to the arrival of Paul existed also at Pozzuoli (ancient Puteoli) and neighboring cities (Acts 28:13) (M. Adinolfi, *S. Paolo a Pozzuoli*: RivBib 8 [1960] 206-224; A. Maiouni, *La Campania al tempo dell'approdo di S. Paolo*, in *S. Paolo a Pozzuoli*, *XIX Centenario*, Naples 1961, 52-75). One can be certain that it was Rome which, with the arrival and through the death of the two apostles, constituted, in Italian territory, the determinant center for the spread of the Christian faith (G. Penco, *Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, I, 17). Rome was the meeting place for Christians from everywhere, esp. from the Eastern provinces, who often opened schools there and formed specific communities. The prestige of the Roman church shone not only in Italy but also in distant territories. At the beginning of the 3rd c. *Origen at the time of Pope *Zephyrinus (d. ca. 217) traveled to Rome to "see the most ancient church of the Romans" (Eus., *HE* 6,14,10).

When looking for Christian evidences outside the city of Rome, we must always distinguish between a Christian presence, for which we might have an archaeological or literary indication, and an organized community with a bishop. In some cases there might be only settled priests or missionaries. The existence of a martyr in a city is not always an indication of a community with a bishop at its head. The sixth canon of the Council of *Serdica established that "in general, it is not permitted to create a

bishop in a village or a small city, in which a single priest is sufficient; in fact, bishops should not be created in these places so as not to devalue the name and authority of the bishop." We may now indicate some cities with the oldest Christian presence. The consultation of the archaeological entries for the principal cities or regions will serve as a complement and completion of these brief notes.

Christianity at *Ravenna is shown by inscriptions dating back to the end of the 2nd c. or, at least, the beginning of the 3rd (G.B. De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Chris.*, 3-4, 4 [1979] 101-104 and pl. VII). St. *Apollinaris martyr, the first bishop, is celebrated as the founder, or at least as the organizer of the Ravennan church (Peter Chrysol., *Sermo* 128, PL 52, 552-553). In 343 Severus, twelfth bishop in the order of succession, was present at the Council of Serdica (Hfl-Lecl I, 749). Ravenna became more important when *Honorius established the seat of the Western empire there in 404. During the episcopate of *Peter Chrysologus, around 431, some churches of Emilia (Forlì, Faenza, Bologna, Modena) were removed from the jurisdiction of *Milan and added to Ravenna, whose bishop thus acquired the authority of a metropolitan (Peter Chrys., *Sermo* 175, PL 52, 657-662). If Lucillus of Verona, present at Serdica (343), was considered the sixth in that see, its first bishop, Euprepius, must have been from the middle of the 3rd c. The sees of Brescia, with Clateus, and Padua, with Prosdocimus, must date back to the beginning of the 4th c.

Another important see was that of Milan. Mirocles, sixth bishop, is listed as present at the Synod of Rome (313) and *Arles (314) (Mansi 2, 437 and 476; Hfl-Lecl 1,277). The episcopal see of Milan had already been established, therefore, in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. (Fliche-Martin-Frutaz, I, 493), but a settled bishop (Anathelon, or Anatolius or else Anatolon) must not be much earlier than the middle of the 3rd c. In Piedmont, Christianity spread during the 4th c. with episcopal sees. Up until 378 N Italy was still considered as directly obedient to Rome. Owing to the personal activity of *Ambrose (373–397) the authority of Milan was established over the entire region (Daniélou, *Nuova Storia della Chiesa*, I, 363; Fliche-Martin-Frutaz, III, 690-692). With the transfer of the imperial seat to Ravenna (404), the influence of Milan diminished, and meanwhile *Aquileia too became a third center in N Italy. Hermagoras was named its first bishop (MGH, *Scrip.*, 13, Series Patr. Aquil., 367). After the persecution of *Diocletian it became a center with strong ties to Venice and *Istria. *Theodore (ca. 308–319), fourth (or fifth) bishop in succession, appears in the list of the *Acts* of the Council of Arles (314) (Mansi 2, 476; CCL 148, 14). He had a basilica built with stupendous mosaics, a sign of the size and wealth of that community. About that church *Jerome writes: "The clerics of Aquileia are considered a group of saints" (*Chronicle*, year 374; GCS 47, 247). At the council of 381 the bishops were present from all N Italy (Bologna, Vercelli, Piacenza, Trento, Brescia, Emona [Ljubljana?], Lodi, Altino, Tortona, Genua, Pavia) (Hfl-Lecl II, 49-53).

In Naples the catacombs of St. Januarius have a hypogeum from the beginnings of the 3rd c.; therefore, the Christian presence must be somewhat earlier and was sanctioned by the sacrifice of many martyrs (G. Penco, 33ff., with bibl. for Campania, Calabria, Marche, Umbria, Puglia, Sicily). At Cimitile, near Nola, a Christian mausoleum of the 3rd c. with biblical scenes (*Adam and Eve, *Jonah) proves the existence of a community. At Syracuse, in Sicily, a well-organized Christian community already existed in the middle of the 3rd c. with **lapsi* in the persecution of *Decius (see Cyprian, *Ep.* 30,5: CSEL 3, 2, 553); the testimony of various cemeteries suggests the existence of a large community. Chrestus, the first historically verified bishop, invited by *Constantine to participate in the Council of Arles of 314, with two priests, with authorization to use the *cursus publicus* (Eus., *HE* 10,5,21-24), was present there with his deacon Florus. Syracuse had its martyrs, but the information about them is not certain; however, Lucy died during the persecution of Diocletian. Around her tomb a cemetery developed, and her veneration spread outside of Sicily as well. The martyrs of certain cities (Catania, Palermo) indicate the existence of communities, even if small, but they are not well documented by literary sources.

A comprehensive view of all Italy shows us a rather restricted number of dioceses in the north, and many more in the center and south. In compensation the N dioceses seem larger. At the end of the 3rd c. 16 dioceses existed; in the 4th c. 55 new dioceses were born; in the 5th c. another 155 were created. At the beginning of the 600s, Italy (including the islands) reached the number of 258 dioceses (Daniélou, I, 535).

Beyond the fundamental works, well-known, of Ughelli, Savio, Lanzoni; a series of volumes ed. by A. Caprioli on the Lombard dioceses, Brescia 1986–1987; J. Daniélou - H. Marrou, *Nuova Storia della Chiesa*, I, Turin 1970 (Appendix of G.D. Gordini, 531-545); G. Penco, *Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, I, Milan 1978; R. Budriesi, *Le origini del cristianesimo a Ravenna*, Ravenna 1970; A. Scholtz, *Il "Seminarium Aquileiense"*: Mem. stor. Forogiuliesi 50 (1970) 4-106; S. Tavano, *Aquileia cristiana*, Udine 1972; G. Bovini, *Antichità cristiane di Milano*, Bologna 1970; D. Mallarco, *Storia antica della chiesa di Napoli. Le fonti*, Naples, 1943; Id., *Le origini della chiesa di Napoli*, in *Miscellanea P. Paschini*, I, Rome 1948, 27-68; G. Bertelli, *Le diocesi di Amelia, Narni e Otricoli*, Spoleto 1985; *Il cristianesimo in Sicilia dalle origini a*

Gregorio Magno, ed. V. Messana - S. Pricoco, Caltanissetta 1987; O. Otranto, *L'Italia meridionale e Puglia paleocristiana*, Bari 1991; Id., *La cristianizzazione della Calabria e la formazione delle diocesi*: VetChr 32 (1995) 339-378; R. Bratz, *Il cristianesimo aquileiese prima di Costantino fra Aquileia e Petovio*, Udine 1999; A. Campione - D. Nuzzo, *La Daunia paleocristiana*, Bari 1999; A. Campione, *La Basilicata paleocristiana*, Bari 2000; R. Lizzi, *Christianization and Conversion in Northern Italy*, in *The Origins of Christendom in the West*, ed. A. Kreider, Edinburgh-New York 2001, 47-95; RAC 18 (2002) 1160-1202; P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis 2003; G. Otranto, *L'Italia meridionale tra cristianizzazione del territorio e rapporti col mondo bizantino*, in *Ad contemplandam sapientiam*, Studi in memoria di S. Lenza, Soveria Manelli 2004, 491-521.

L. Dattrino

II. Archaeology. *1. Venetia and Istria (Lat. Venetia et Histria).* Monumental proofs of Christian life in the region during the 3rd c. are completely missing, but the flowering of martyrs in the persecution of *Diocletian (many have certain proofs) shows that at least in the 2nd half of the 3rd c. there were Christian communities in the region. The fulcrum of Christianity was *Aquileia, with the oldest monumental remains of the entire Po Valley. Two parallel rectangular basilicas without apses, built by the bishop Theodore, present at the anti-*Donatist Council of *Arles (314), are noteworthy for the large mosaic areas, rich in scriptural and didactic values. The oldest dated sepulchral inscription is from 336, and the cemeteries were arranged along the Via Gemina, Annia and that named Iulia Augusta, where, furthermore, sepulchral structures have been recognized, such as the rectangular *memoria* in honor of St. Protus, "teacher of the Canzian saints" (acc. to the *Passio*), excavated at S. Canzian d'Isonzo (4th c.). The fervid Christian life of Aquileia is reflected in a series of basilicas gradually built on the site of the early basilicas, in the baptistery with a quadrangle plan and angular internal niches from the first years of the 5th c. and in many suburban basilicas, such as the basilica of Monastero, for a community of Easterners, of which the entire mosaic surface and part of the elevation is preserved. It is also reflected in the basilica of *alla Beligna* at a pre-Christian worship location (Belenus, the local instance of Apollo) on a T-cross plan and perhaps dedicated to the apostles (rich apsidal mosaic with twelve lambs), and the basilica Sts. Felix and Fortunatus tripartite, above the tomb of St. Fortunatus, who was a martyr with Felix at the dawn of the 4th c. Next to Aquileia there is Grado, a coastal fortress, born on an island on the orders of the Aquileians during the invasions. Above a small funerary basilica of the end of the 4th c. is arranged the nucleus of the present Duomo (consecrated by the bishop Elia in 579), which, in addition to the intact architecture, preserves the entire mosaic floor of the 6th c. Basilicas datable to between the 5th and 6th c. are attested on the island and on other islands of the lagoon (S. Maria delle Grazie, Piazza della Vittoria, Barbana, S. Giuliano).

In neighboring Istria, Parenzo is prominent with some suburban sepulchral chapels and with the two oldest rectangular worship spaces without apse, which preserve the mosaic floors (end of the 4th c.), followed by others, these two parallel, of which the tripartite, aligned with an octagonal baptistery, became that of the bishop Euphrasius, which, unique on the E shore of the Adriatic, preserves the festive mosaic decoration in the central apse and partially in the side apses. Near Parenzo is Orsera, where Late Antique buildings, later reused as worship spaces, have been excavated. Also Cittanova, whose parish church seems to preserve traces of the paleo-Christian tripartite cathedral, which had an octagonal baptistery. Pola has lost the great basilica which *Maximian, bishop of *Ravenna (546–556), built there, and it only preserves a Latin-cross martyrium, but it has the tripartite Duomo of the 5th c., which had on the side a single-halled basilica and in front a baptistery in a Greek cross.

Outside the walls, in the countryside and on the island of Brioni there are ruins or remains of other basilicas; at Nesactium two parallel basilicas of the 5th c. (no bishop, however, is known there); at Samagher a small basilica has yielded a remarkable box in sculpted ivory (today in the Museo Archeologico of Venice). Trieste has the mosaic floor of a suburban basilica on a cruciform plan and part of the mosaic flooring of the cathedral (5th c., expanded in the 6th, Bishop Frugifer). Near Trieste is St. Giovanni del Timavo with a tripartite basilica, perhaps built over a pre-Christian chapel (5th c.). In the present Friuli two Roman centers, having become episcopal sees, have particular importance: Forum Iulii (Cividale), whose octagonal basilica is known (5th c.) and Iulium Carnicum (Zuglio), where a basilica is attested of Adriatic type whose mosaic floor is preserved and, on the ridge of St. Peter, epigraphic remains and the ruins of a small basilica from the era of the invasions. The castrum of Ibligo (Invillino) should also be mentioned, where on Zuca Ridge in the first years of the 5th c. a basilica of Adriatic type was built with geometrical mosaic flooring and a *trichora* chapel with a central polygonal apse; the place was perhaps in relationship with the fortified locality on the neighboring Santino Ridge.

In lower Friuli, at St. Canzian d'Isonzo, is another basilica, with the tomb of the Canzian saints (4th

and 5th c.). Following the coast to the W, Concordia is the episcopal see richest with monumental presences: next to a small *trichora* perhaps from the middle of the 4th c. (worthy of note are the most ancient polygonal apses of the region), at the dawn of the 5th c. a tripartite basilica was built with internal apse; its mosaic floor is intact, while the *trichora*, elongated, became a martyrial basilica: the site has also yielded many sepulchral inscriptions and *sarcophagi. There follows Eraclea with a basilica (5th c.), and Equilium (Iesolo) with a basilica, which has yielded a mosaic floor with inscriptions from the first years of the 6th c., dedicated to the Madonna; then Torcello, which preserves from the ancient basilica the circular baptistery with two niches and a commemorative epigraph from 639.

In the interior, the see which shows the greatest vivacity is *Verona, with its episcopal basilicas: two, aligned, perhaps in succession, one from the end of the 4th c. (bishop St. Zeno), the other from the first years of the 5th, tripartite, with mosaics in the aisles and in the atrium and a long solea. The suburban basilicas are notable for their architectonic plan: that of St. Stephan built on a cruciform form, as perhaps the basilica of the apostles, which preserves the martyrium (chapel of Sts. Teuteria and Tosca) formerly on a Latin-cross plan. Also a suburban hypogeum, S. Maria in Stelle, should be mentioned, rich in frescoes and mosaics which should be dated to the 5th c.

Next, in terms of importance of its remains, is Vicenza. The suburban basilica of Sts. Felix and Fortunatus built on a funeral site—it preserves the body of St. Felix—first as a hall, then tripartite, with many mosaic sections (5th c.) has on the side the martyrium (chapel of S. Maria Mater Domini) with enclosed-cross plan, with figured wall mosaics from the end of the 5th c.; despite contrary opinions, the remains of a baptistery seem to point to it as the first cathedral see, later transferred inside the walls, as the slabs of mosaic floors with the dedications of the donors under the present Duomo attest.

The most certain paleo-Christian nucleus of Padua is the chapel on an enclosed-cross plan of St. Prosdocimus at S. Giustina, where the basilica, which was located here, seems to be completely lost (6th c.); another urban worship site is near city hall (mosaic inscription of Eutherius, 5th c.); perhaps a hypogeum was near the present St. Sofia; elements of sculpture from a paleo-Christian basilica dedicated to S. Maria are known at Ceneda (Vittorio Veneto), where the episcopal see of *Opitergium* (Oderzo) took shelter in the 7th c. Fragments of sepulchral inscriptions of the 5th c. come from here, which attest to the presence of a Christian community.

At Treviso a recent excavation has brought to light the mosaic floor of the circular baptistery (2nd half of the 4th c.) and at Feltria (Feltre) a circular baptistery in a suburban zone in front of the Duomo (5th c.).

Going up the valley of the Adige, at Tridentum (Trent), the cathedral rises outside the walls on the tomb of St. Vigilius (perhaps martyr in 405); it has revealed sepulchral epigraphs and mosaic floors assigned to the 6th c.; at Dos Trento, a refuge during the invasions, there is a basilica with a mosaic inscription (6th c.). At Bauzanum (Bolzano) a basilica of Adriatic type has been recognized below the Duomo. There are at least two paleo-Christian chapels in the Val di Non. As a result of a comprehensive examination, it can be affirmed that after the first architectonic and figurative expressions at Aquileia at the beginnings of the 4th c., few other sees have clear documentation of Christian art in the same century (Parenzo, Trieste, Concordia, perhaps Orsera, Verona, Treviso, S. Canzian d'Isonzo), while an intense presence was found in the 5th c. with activity attested in the 6th, when, in the 2nd half, favorable political conditions also animated the activity of the bishops of Aquileia-Grado, Parenzo, Trieste, Pola, and, in the interior of the region, Padua and Trent.

2. Liguria and Aemilia. Although the oldest monumental Christian remains in the Po Valley are at Aquileia, *Milan, from 285 capital of the Roman West, has a rooted tradition of a Christian community reunited in a cemeterial environment before the Constantinian edict.

The missionary action of Milan went in all directions, esp. in the time of Ambrose. Among the closest sees were Brixia, Laus Pompeia, Vercellae, Comum.

At Brixia (Brescia) two memorials built along the Via di Cremona, today below the church of S. Afra, in a funeral area, are perhaps the oldest attestation, but there are signs of other suburban worship centers. The first historically known bishop is Ursicinus, who signed at Serdica in 343, but from the mosaics we can tell that the double cathedral (S. Peter de Dom and S. Maria Maggiore) seems to be from the first years of the 5th c. On the axis of the N basilica is the baptistery, on a quadratic plan with eight deep internal niches. A basilica on Cidneo Ridge, S. Stefano in Arce, is perhaps *Longobard (Lombard), built around an older chapel. Brescia preserves precious ivories (the lipsanotheca of ca. 360, three ivory diptychs of the 5th c.), a purple evangeliarium of the 6th c., a fragmentary sarcophagus with columns and part of another on two levels in onyx with the passage of the Red Sea (4th c.).

At Laus Pompeia (Lodi Vecchio), the bishop

Bassianus built the cathedral and in 387 consecrated a suburban basilica to the apostles. At Vercellae (Vercelli) it is not clear if its first bishop, *Eusebius (middle of the 4th c.), exiled for his orthodox faith, is responsible for the cathedral constituted of two parallel basilicas, S. Maria Maggiore and the Trinity, which, in relationship with the dedication, had a triconch apse as in certain Egyptian basilicas. Near Vercelli is Desana, where a rich repository of goldwork from the 5th c. was found, including thirteen silver ligulae with Christian symbols.

At Comum (Como) the bishop *Abundius (d. 437) built the suburban basilica of the apostles, inspired by S. Simpliciano in Milan; almost contemporaneous is the cathedral of S. Euphemia, today under the Romanesque S. Fedele, which preserves on its axis the baptistery with niches spanned by curved arches and near which there was a mosaic (late 5th c.), perhaps of the *catechumeneum.*

Let us now follow the roads that start from Milan. To the N let us mention Modicia (Monza), which has Christian signs in the cruets of Palestinian pewter and in the phial with sanctified oil on the tombs of the martyrs in the catacombs of Rome sent by *Gregory the Great to queen *Theodelinda. Above Como, on the island Comacina, a refuge from the invasions, there remains a baptistery and a lost basilica of S. Euphemia, due perhaps to the bishop Agrippinus (6th c.); at Gravedona remains of a large quadratic baptistery with niches spanned by curved arch and slabs of mosaic flooring from the 5th c.; at Riva S. Vitale an intact baptistery on a quadratic plan with semicircular niches in the corners, which preserves many parts of the mosaic flooring of marble inlay. In the Val d'Olona, Castelseprio should be mentioned, with a basilica of Adriatic type, with an apse added later (6th c.), and an octagonal baptistery with fine walls; and on the foothills of the Alps, Bergomum (Bergamo), where the topographic documents are not very certain and center on a double suburban basilica on the tomb of St. Alexander (end 4th c.). In the territory of Bergamo there is Calcio, which reveals a mosaic of a basilica from the end of the 4th c.

Toward the W, Novara (ancient Novaria)—whose first bishop, *Gaudentius, is from the end of the 4th c.—has the most imposing paleo-Christian building of today's Piedmont: an octagonal baptistery with niches spanned by curved arches (beginning 5th c., Carolingian vault), which remained even after the ancient cathedral was replaced with the present one in the middle of the 19th c. Contemporaneous (397) is the episcopal see of Eporedia (Ivrea). In the S territory of the region, Ticinum (Pavia) has certain historical evidences, but modest monumental remains, due to the great vitality of the city in the Early Medieval period, and a few inscriptions (famous is that of *Ennodius, 521). There is certainly a double cathedral (S. Maria Maggiore and S. Stefano) and a basilica with triconch apse within the walls, to which many suburban basilicas should be added, such as S. Pietro in Ciel d'Oro and S. Giovanni Domnarum (6th c.). In the territory of Pavia, Laumellum (Lomello) preserves an octagonal baptistery with niches spanned by curved arches, the only paleo-Christian one (6th c.) well-preserved in the present Lombardy. At Cremona, under the Duomo there remains only a paleo-Christian mosaic, but the dedication of the cathedral (S. Maria and S. Stefano) suggests a double basilica. Before crossing the Po, at Mantua (Mantova) a mosaic of the 5th c., near the cathedral, attests a possible double cathedral (a contemporaneous sarcophagus, somewhat reworked, is in the present Duomo). Across the Po, Dertona (Tortona), one of the oldest dioceses of the region (Bishop Esuperantius is from the end of the 4th c.), has many sepulchral epigraphs, found along the road to Voghera, and it seems that an urban cathedral and a suburban basilica of the apostles have been attested. Going down along the Via Emilia we reach Placentia (Piacenza), whose first attested bishop is *Sabinus, present at the Council of Aquileia in 381: here the suburban basilica with a cruciform plan dedicated to Sts. Victor and Antoninus seems contemporaneous with him. At Fidentia (Fidenza) it can be said that the imported veneration of St. Domninus was consolidated in oratories of the 4th c. A noble attestation is given at Parma by a rich mosaic of the 5th c. excavated in front of the Duomo (and now in the crypt), documenting the existence of an urban cathedral of the city, while at Mutina (Modena) only a basilica of the 4th c. is attested, under the bishop *Theodulus. At Bononia (Bologna), the arrival of St. *Ambrose is recorded in 393, where its Bishop Eustasius enlivened worship with the transfer of the bodies of Sts. Vitale and Agricola to a suburban basilica, while to the bishop St. Petronius is due the constitution of that worship area of St. Stephan, called *Nova Hierusalem,* rebuilt multiple times. The urban basilica of S. Maria Maggiore seems later, in which only fragments from the 6th c. have been recognized.

In the extended region, which almost reaches the sea and is largely traversed by the main roads of the Po Valley, the Postumia and the Emilia, commercial exchanges and the imperial presence notably determined the Christian efforts. Beyond Medieval accounts, although there might have been Christian cemeterial structures prior to the Constantinian

edict, it is in the 4th c. that the churches consolidated, often animated by the apostolic vigor of St. Ambrose, who certainly exercised great influence on the Christian construction within the entire region. Milan is the city of the valley which above all others preserves notable remains of architecture and is the only one in the region which has wall mosaics. Around Milan, Monza and Brescia preserve examples of goldwork and ivory of great importance. After the affirmations of the 5th c., the invasions and political necessities halted the erection of monuments as testimonies, which began again with vigor in the Longobard era.

3. Alpes Cottiae. Christianity may have extended to the farthest reaches of the Po Valley due to the energies expressed from Milan, but also certainly from those from the Rhone Valley (across the Col de Montgenèvre more than the Col du Mont Cenis), where at Lyons around 180 St. *Irenaeus was bishop and there were martyrs under *Marcus Aurelius. Turin had martyrs under *Diocletian, Octavius, Adventor and Solutor, but a diocese with a see in the city was created only at the end of the 4th c. with St. *Maximus. It is not clear if he is responsible for the double cathedral (S. Giovanni and S. Maria), suggested by the Early Medieval one. Given certain dedications, some other urban basilicas must be admitted as contemporaneous or only a little later, while in the nearby Collegno a tripartite basilica from the middle of the 5th c. can be seen in S. Massimo, and at S. Ponso Canavese the Early Medieval baptistery has paleo-Christian roots, an octagonal plan with niches spanned by curved arches and a hexagonal basin.

At Monteu da Po, in the Roman center Industria a basilica of St. John is attested. Also at Hasta (Asti) a double cathedral dedicated to St. John and St. Mary seems likely, while at Alba Pompeia (Alba) there are only attestations of a diocese in the 5th c.

In the territory of Alessandria, at Ticineto, in a rustic villa, a hall with apse has been recognized in a funeral area which should be dated to the 5th c. In the province of Cuneo the dedications of the church of Busca suggest paleo-Christian presences, while at Revello the oldest Christian inscription of the region, dated to 341, should be mentioned. Interesting sepulchral inscriptions are known at Aquae Statiellae (Acqui); at Augusta Bagiennorum (Bene Vagenna), in the portico of the Roman theater a tripartite basilica of the 5th c. can be seen.

Across the Apennines, Albintimilium (Ventimiglia) has an architectonically Ambrosian baptistery; Albingaunum (Albenga) (which has traces of the paleo-Christian basilica in the cathedral) a baptistery based on the Milanese octagonal, which is the most notable paleo-Christian monument of the coast, preserves the mosaic vault of the 5th c. including the *radiato monogramma* of Christ. The city also has a small basilica in a funeral area, S. Calogero, built, it seems, at the end of the 4th c. and rebuilt many times, a mainland dependence of the abbey on the island Gallinaria, attested at least from the 6th c.

The other signs of Christian antiquity are modest: at Taggia perhaps a baptismal font; in the parish church of Finalmarina remains of the single-aisled basilica with an inscription dated to 517; at Noli by S. Paragorio epigraphic attestations of a basilica and remains of a baptistery of the 6th c.

At Genua (Genoa) a Bishop Diogenes was known in the middle of the 4th c., but the two cemeteries, S. Sabina and S. Stefano, are certainly Christian where there is an inscription from 493. Here the presence of bishops who had fled from Milan seems to have reinvigorated the cultivation of the saints venerated at Milan: the apostles, St. Laurence, Sts. Nazarius and Celsus.

On the Italian Riviera small basilicas, datable to the 6th c., are at Portofino, at Portovenere (S. Pietro), one on the island of Tino and at Palmaria; older is the cemetery of the parish church of S. Venerio near Migliarina, which can be referred to the end of the 4th c.

In general it can be said that only recently has attention been paid to the excavated remains of the oldest antique Christian presence in the N part of the region. The intense life of the Middle Ages and later centuries along the Ligurian coast has scattered a great deal: the intact baptistery of Albenga is the most valuable attestation. The research on the presence of the emigrated bishops of Milan in Genoa and along the coast will be of notable importance.

4. Alpes Graiae. The most important see of the region is Augusta Praetoria (Aosta), which seems to have had a more decisive Christian presence due to *Maximus of Turin (end of the 5th c.). However, for now the monumental attestations are later: the suburban basilica of S. Lorenzo, on a Latin-cross plan, stands out certainly for its Ambrosian contribution (1st half of the 5th c.); it is the site of many tombs of Aostan bishops. There are good reasons for maintaining that in the area of the present cathedral there existed in the paleo-Christian era a double basilica while, from a careful excavation, a pre-Christian sepulchral area has been recognized outside the walls, to the W of the city; it was used also in the Christian era with two *memoriae* and a small basilica with extended apse, perhaps dedicated to St. Genesius.

In the parish church of the nearby Saint-Vincent

a small funerary basilica (end 5th–6th c.) has been excavated above a bath area of a private villa.

1. Venetia and Istria: A. Gnirs, *Zur Frage der christlischen Kultanlagen . . . im Österreichischen Küstenland*: Jahreshefte des österr. archäolog. Institutes 19-20 (1919) Beibl. 185-196; P. Moro, *Iulium Carnicum* (*Zuglio*), Rome 1936; P. Verzone, *L'architettura religiosa dell'Alto Medioevo nell'Italia settentrionale*, Milan 1942; B. Molajoli, *La basilica Eufrasiana di Parenzo*, Padua 1943; M. Mirabella Roberti, *La sede paleocristiana di Orsera*: Annali Triestini 15 (1944) 31-120; Id., *Indagini del Duomo di Pola*: RivAC 23-24 (1947–1948) 209-229; var. aus., *La basilica dei Santi Felice e Fortunato in Vicenza*, Vicenza 1979; N. Rasmo, *La basilica paleocristiana di Bolzano*: Cultura Atesina 11 (1957) 7-12; G. Brusin - P.L. Zovatto, *Monumenti paleocristiani di Aquileia e di Grado*, Udine 1957; S. Tavano, *Aquileia*, *guida dei monumenti cristiani*, Udine 1977; M. Mirabella Roberti, *La basilica paleocristiana di San Giusto*, in *Festschrift F. Gerke*, Baden Baden 1962, 55-64; B. Forlati Tamaro, *L'ipogeo di S. Maria in Stelle a Verona*, in *Stucchi e mosaici altomedioevali*, I, Milan 1962, 245-259; Id., *Padova da Costantino ai Longobardi*, in *Padova antica*, Padua 1981, 285-289; G. Pavan, *Un'interpretazione del complesso paleocristiano di S. Giustina*: Boll. Musei Civ. Padova 57 (1968) 1-26; G. Cuscito, *La basilica martiriale paleocristiana di Trieste*: Atti e Memorie della Società Istriana di archeologia e Storia patria XVIII n.s. (1970) 37-68; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Considerazioni sulla basilica suburbana di Trieste*: Atti dei Civici Musei 6 (1969–1970) 101-112; R. Noll, *Ein Reliquiar aus Sanzeno im Nonsberg und das frühe Christentum im Trentino*: AAWW 109 (1972) 320-337; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Il battistero paleocristiano di Cividale*: AAAd 9 (1976) 91-101; var. aus., *Iulia Concordia dall'età romana all'età moderna*, Treviso 1978; G.P. Marchini, *Verona romana e paleocristiana*, in *Ritratto di Verona*, Verona 1978, 84-93; I. Rogger, *La basilica paleocristiana di S. Vigilio*: Studi Trentini di Sc. Storiche 53 (1974) 315-409; 54 (1975) 3-40; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Iulium Carnicum centro romano alpino*: AAAd 9 (1976) 91-101; Id., *La basilica paleocristiana di San Giovanni del Timavo*: AAAd 10 (1976) 63-73; F. Forlati - B. Forlati Tamaro, in *Il Duomo di Vicenza*, Vicenza 1976; S. Tavano, *Grado*, *guida storica e artistica*, Udine 1976; var. aus., *Da Aquileia a Venezia*, Milan 1981 (with contributions by Bertacchi, Cuscito et al.); G. Cuscito, *La basilica paleocristiana di Iesolo. Per lo studio dei primi insediamenti cristiani nella laguna veneta*, Aquileia 1983; Id., *Testimonianze archeologiche monumentali del cristianesimo antico fino al secolo IX*, in *Le origini del cristianesimo tra Piave e Livenza da Roma a Carlo Magno*, Vittorio Veneto 1983, 79-104; var. aus., *Le tracce materiali del cristianesimo dal tardo antico al Mille*, in *Il Veneto nel Medioevo. Dalla "Venetia" alla Marca Veronese*, coordinamento scientifico e grafico di S. Lusuardi Siena, disegni di P. Piva, Verona 1989, 89-328; var. aus., *La Chiesa concordiese 389-1989*, Pordenone 1989; P. Testini - G. Cantino Wataghin - L. Pani Ermini, *La cattedrale in Italia*, in *Actes du XI Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, I, Vatican City 1989, 5-229; var. aus., *Il territorio tra tardoantico e altomedioevo. Metodi di indagine e risultati*, ed. G.P. Brogiolo - L. Castelletti, Florence 1992; G. Cuscito, *Opilione e le origini del culto martiriale a Padova*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes.* Miscellanea in onore di Mons. V. Saxer, Vatican City 1992, 163-181; Id., *Ancora su Mauro "episcopus et confessor" e sul "locus duplicatus" di Parenzo*, in *Domum tuam dilexi.* Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori, Vatican City 1998, 185-210; var. aus., *Archeologia in Piemonte. Il Medioevo*, ed. L. Mercando - E. Micheletto, Turin 1998; G. Cantino Wataghin - C. Lambert, *Sepolture e città. L'Italia settentrionale tra IV e VIII secolo*, in *Sepolture tra IV e VIII secolo*, ed. G.P. Brogiolo - G. Cantino Wataghin: Documenti di Archeologia 13 (1998) 89-114; G. Cuscito, *Recenti testimonianze archeologiche sulla cristianizzazione del territorio tra il Friuli e l'Istria*: Aquileia Nostra LXX (1999) 73-104; G. Cantino Wataghin - S. Uggé, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Italia settentrionale* (*1993-1998*), in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi.* Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana, Bordighera 2001, 7-37; var. aus., *L'antica basilica di San Vigilio in Trento. Storia*, *archeologia*, *reperti*, ed. I. Rogger - E. Cavada, Trento 2001; var. aus., *Concordia Sagittaria. Tremila anni di storia*, ed. P. Croce Da Villa - E. Balestrazzi, Concordia 2001; G. Cantino Wataghin, *Istituzioni monastiche nel Friuli altomedievale*: *un'indagine archeologica*, in *Paolo Diacono e il Friuli altomedievale* (*secc. VI-X*). Atti del XIV Congr. intern. di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 2001, 281-319; M. Sannazaro, *Insediamenti rurali ed "ecclesiae baptismales" in Friuli: il contributo della ricerca archeologica*, ibid., 253-280; G. Cuscito, *Bronzi paleocristiani di Aquileia*: AAAd LI (2002) 379-414; var. aus., *Chiese e insediamenti nelle campagne tra V e VI secolo*, ed. G.P. Brogiolo: Documenti di Archeologia 30, 2003; G. Cuscito, *La cattedrale di San Giusto a Trieste*, Trieste 2003.

2. Liguria and Aemilia: F. Frigerio - B. Nogara, *Gli scavi e il mosaico della Soc. Bancaria Italiana in Como*: Riv. Archeol. Comense (1912) fasc. 63-64; F. Reggiori, *Dieci battisteri lombardi dal sec. V al sec. XII*, Rome 1934; G. Nocca, *Topografia di Ticinum all'epoca romana*, Bologna 1934; G. Chierici, *Il battistero di Lomello*: Rendic. Pont. Accad. Romana di Archeol. 17 (1940) 127-142; P. Verzone, *L'architettura religiosa dell'Alto Medioevo nell'Italia settentrionale*, Milan 1942; G.P. Bognetti, *Santa Maria di Castelseprio*, Milan 1949; A. Calderini - G. Chierici - C. Cecchelli, *La basilica di San Lorenzo Maggiore*, Milan 1951; A. Caretta, *Laus Pompeia*, Milan 1954; Id., in *S. Bassiano vescovo di Lodi*, Lodi 1975; F. Reggiori, *Il battistero di Riva San Vitale*, Bellinzona 1955; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Una basilica adriatica a Castelseprio*, in *VII Frühmittelalter Kongressakten*, Vienna 1961, 24-37; Id., *Un mosaico paleocristiano a Calcio*, in *Stucchi e mosaici altomedievali*, Milan 1962, 229-244; G. Panazza, *Le manifestazioni artistiche dal sec. IV all'inizio del sec. VII*, in *Storia di Brescia*, I, Milan 1963, 363-391; U. Chierici, *Il battistero del Duomo di Novara*, Turin 1967; F. Soliani Raschini, *Note sul battistero di Lomello*: Boll. Soc. Pavese di St. Patria 57 (1967); V. Viale, *Il tesoro di Desana*, in *Vercelli e il Vercellese nell'antichità*, Vercelli 1971, 71-77; M. Mirabella Roberti - A. Paredi, *Il battistero di San Giovanni alle Fonti*, Milan 1974; L. Caramel, *Le testimonianze paleocristiane*, in *Storia di Monza*, IV, Milan 1976, 84-116; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Un mosaico paleo-cristiano a Cremona*: Quaderni ticinesi di numismatica e antichità classiche 8 (1979) 279-288; M.C. Profumo, *Nota sulla topografia di Dertona paleocristiana*, in *Atti del V Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Cristiana*, Rome 1982, 199-210; var. aus., *Il territorio tra tardoantico e altomedioevo. Metodi di indagine e risultati*, ed. G.P. Brogiolo - L. Castelletti, Florence 1992; var. aus., *Chiese e insediamenti nelle campagne tra V e VI secolo*, ed. G.P. Brogiolo: Documenti di Archeologia 30, 2003.

3. Alpes Cottiae: U. Formentini, *Monumenti di Porto Venere*: Memorie Accad. Cappellini 15 (1934) 29ff.; G. De Angelis d'Ossat, *I battisteri di Albenga e Ventimiglia*: Riv. Studi Liguri 2 (1936) 207-250; F. Savio, *Revello e i suoi vescovi*, Turin 1938; L. Cimaschi, *Gli scavi all'isola del Tino e l'archeologia cristiana nel golfo della Spezia*: Giorn. Storico d. Lunigiana 14 (1963); Id., *La prima campagna di scavo alla pieve di S. Venerio*: Giorn. Storico d. Lunigiana 12 (1961) 23-46; D. De Bernardi Ferrero, *La chiesetta di San Massimo in Collegno*: Palladio 8 (1958) 121-138; L. Pejrani Boricco, *San Ponso Canavese*, *antica pieve e battistero*, in *Atti del V Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Cristiana*, Rome 1982, 151-

161; M.M. Negro Ponzi, *Villaro di Ticineto*, op. cit., 211-225; C. Casartelli Novelli, *Le fabbriche della cattedrale di Torino dall'età paleocristiana all'Alto Medioevo*: StudMed 9 (1970) 622-623; N. Lamboglia, *Albenga romana e medievale*, Bordighera 1981; F. Bolgiani, *La penetrazione del Cristianesimo in Piemonte*, in *Atti del V Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Cristiana*, Rome 1982, 37-61; G. Wataghin Cantino, *Problemi e prospettive dell'archeologia cristiana in Piemonte*, op. cit., 67-81; var. aus., *Il territorio tra tardoantico . . .* , op. cit.; var. aus., *Chiese e insediamenti nelle campagne . . .* , op. cit.; M. Marcenaro, *Il battistero paleocristiano di Albenga. Le origini del cristianesimo nella Liguria marittima*, Genoa 1993; var. aus., *Archeologia in Piemonte. Il Medioevo*, ed. L. Mercando - E. Micheletto, Turin 1998.

4. *Alpes Graiae*: Ch. Bonnet, *L'église cruciforme de Saint-Laurent d'Aoste*, in *Atti del V Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Cristiana*, Rome 1982, 271-295; R. Mollo Mezzena, *Il complesso cimiteriale fuori porta Decumana ad Aosta*, op. cit., 319-333.

M. Mirabella Roberti

5. *Etruria*. There are numerous evidences of underground cemeteries esp. in the S part of the region (Tuscia romana). With some exceptions (e.g., cemeteries of Chiusi and Bolsena) they are hypogea of modest size which repeat for the most part common characteristics also present in S Lazio (see below) and in the residual evidence of the territory of the Sabines and Paeligni (see below), which can be summarized as: limited extension, irregularity of excavation, reutilization of preexisting structures, the prevalence of uncrowded burials and the typical closure of the niches with tiles covered in mortar. In many cases these hypogea are linked to the cult of one or more martyrs, which has often led to the building of a sanctuary above.

In the diocese of Lorium there are three cemeteries connected to the cult of martyrs: the first of Sts. Rufina and Seconda at the tenth milestone of the Via Cornelia in the area today called Boccea; above the cemetery rose a structure next to which already at the beginning of the 6th c. the bishop of Lorium usually had his own residence, so much that he was named *episcopus St. Rufinae,* or else *episcopus ecclesiae Silvae Candidae* from the name of the place of the martyrdom of the two saints; the second cemetery is named for S. Mario, Marta, Audifax and Habakkuk, at around twelve miles from Rome, still on the Via Cornelia; and the third, for St. Basilides, began at the twelfth milestone of the Via Aurelia.

In the diocese of Acquaviva, in the countryside of Capena, underground cemeteries remain near Morlupo, at Monte della Casetta and at Rignano, the last of a relatively larger development, dedicated to a S. Theodora.

The hypogea of Vulci and that in the area of Nazzano are the surviving cemeterial monuments of the diocese of Tarquinii, while in the diocese of Forum Clodii, out of three cemeteries mentioned by the sources only that of S. Alessandro is known, near Baccano, near which the remains of an altar have been found also. In the dioceses of Sutri and of Nepi remain, respectively, the catacombs of S. Giovenale and of S. Savinilla—or of Ss. Romano and Tolomeo—the first of which reuses rooms of the Etruscan era.

Three hypogea—that of S. Eutizio, a second, anonymous, near Bassano under the church of S. Maria de Luco, a third, indicated as Salvatore of Rosello—appear in the territory of Ferento, while two modern subterranean buildings, one in the locality of Le Grotte, the other in the ancient countryside of Sorrina Nova, join the much more important complex of S. Cristina in the diocese of Volsinii (today Bolsena). This consists of three nuclei, today in communication among themselves, located around the tomb of the martyrs, and thus the catacomb proper, the so-called grotto of S. Cristina, with its annexes, and, in the NW zone, the so-called Longobard area.

A cemetery dedicated to Ss. Felicissima and Gratiliano is indicated in the diocese of Falerii, and finally at Clusium (modern Chiusi) two underground cemeteries remain; the anonymous one in the locality S. Caterina, consisting of two principal galleries which start from a trapezoidal oratory and into which run side passages at right angles; and the other, much better known, of S. Mustiola, consisting of a series of galleries which today encircle a small underground basilica, and which, acc. to inscriptions and graffiti, was built, in its original nucleus, prior to the religious peace. As for the aboveground areas, for the late Roman era some tombs of various typologies were identified in the last century in the urban area of the present Civitavecchia, while a much larger sepulchral area, of ca. 80 tombs, has been found recently on the Pionta Ridge near Arezzo, with documented use from the mid-5th to the mid-7th c. The documentation for the Lombard era is more abundant.

Other than discoveries of scattered tombs, found more or less throughout the region, organized cemeteries have been found in the area of Chiusi at the foot of the Arcisa Ridge in the countryside near Portonaccio; at Fiesole, in the area of a Roman temple, under the present Via di Riorbico; near Grosseto, the necropolises of Grancia and of Casetta di Mota. They are, mostly, sepulchers of rectangular or trapezoidal (anthropomorphic) form, partially excavated in the earth and partly built with large stone slabs, sometimes paved with bricks, which has restored, in addition to native material, rich Longobard funerary goods.

Less rich is the documentation concerning the primitive worship buildings in the region. At Perugia, in an extraurban area the so-called temple of S. Michele Arcangelo is known, on a central plan, commonly dated to the 6th c. At Chiusi, although not yet investigated, the ruins of a worship hall remain above the catacomb of S. Mustiola—it has been proposed as the primitive cathedral. Likewise, the results are not yet known of the excavations undertaken below the present Duomo to identify the presence or absence of an older worship building to which the capitals reused in the later building would have belonged.

At Arezzo, besides the already-mentioned funeral area, excavations have recently produced a three-aisled basilica with three apses, considered the Medieval *facies* of the church of St. Mary and St. Stephen.

More important is the evidence that concerns Florence. In the outer-urban area, a basilica of grand dimensions of a funerary character, placed above a Roman funeral area, has been found near the present church of St. Felicita. In the urban area, important excavations under the church of S. Maria del Fiore have yielded the remains of the church of S. Reparata in which different phases have been recognized, starting from the paleo-Christian—three aisles with a large semicircular apse and polychrome mosaic flooring, whose date is generally put between the late 5th c. and the beginning of the 6th—to Early Medieval renovations. It remains to establish with certainty the moment in which the church of S. Reparata acquired the dignity of a cathedral, an aspect which can be clarified when it is possible to read with better accuracy the archaeological information offered in the past by the structures under the baptistery of S. Giovanni. Among the evidences of the Early Medieval city, finally, the apsed building found under the Medieval church of S. Pier Scheraggio should be mentioned, which should be dated, as it seems, to the Longobard era. As for Pisa, the only monumental remains concern an octagonal building found in the area of the monumental cemetery (Camposanto) and identified as the primitive baptistery, datable, in all likelihood, to an era earlier than the 7th c.; while at Lucca the excavations have brought to light the ancient episcopal complex under the church of S. Giovanni and Reparata. This consists of a worship hall, of which the entire apse and part of the hall have been found, datable to the 5th c., but perhaps inserted in a preceding Christian worship spot. The same hall shows renovations from the Longobard era. To the left of the church is the primitive baptistery, consisting in a quadriconch building with a central basin, datable to between the 5th and 6th c.

The new investigations concerning the territory of N Lazio and Tuscany have led to the acquisition of new information, in particular to a better definition of the cemeterial evidence, as in the case of the catacomb of S. Theodora at Rignano Flaminio, of which a new sector has been investigated, or of the catacomb found near Visentium, on the lake of Bolsena, used between the 4th and 5th c.; important discoveries have been made at the cemeteries of S. Savinilla at Nepi, of S. Gratiliano and Felicissima at Falerii Novi and of S. Giovenale at Sutri. Of great interest is also the proposal to locate the oldest known sanctuary dedicated to the archangel Michael in the zone of Castel Giubileo, on the Via Salaria. A paleo-Christian worship building belonging to a rural settlement of S Etruria investigated at Mola di Monte Gelato, in the Faliscan countryside, has been attributed to the beginning of 5th c. and is found in conjunction with a funeral area, evidently used by the local community, which should possibly be considered in conjunction with the castrum Capracorum; a small hall belonging to a similar context is found in the zone of Ischia di Castro and is datable to the 6th–7th c. on the basis of the grave goods of the tombs annexed to it; another rural church was present in the territory of Orte (locality Le Cese), and a final one has been identified at Cava Santi, along the Via Amerina. The territory of Bracciano, finally, has been the object of a complete reexamination, with all its paleo-Christian presences, while an important archaeological investigation has taken place in the territory of the suburban diocese of Silva Candida.

In Tuscany new research has allowed a more precise definition of the catacombs of S. Caterina and S. Mustiola at Chiusi, and has led to the recovery of a catacomb on the island of Pianosa, beyond the identification of certain burials of the Longobard era near the cathedral of Pisa. In the Arezzo territory, however, the settlement phases of the Medieval parish church of Retina have been traced, placing its origin between the Late Antique and the Early Medieval period, and that of Pieve di S. Pancrazio at Sestino. Further investigations have brought new light, finally, to the Early Medieval phases of the cathedral of Roselle and of related funeral areas, in the area of Grosseto.

6. Umbria and Picenum. At Ancona three funeral areas of non-Christian origin have been found to date; they were doubtless used by the community starting from the 4th c. Since 1879 an oratory has been known, dedicated, as it seems, to a Flavius

Evintius Veteranus, with mosaic flooring, datable to between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c., around which there are tile-built tombs. A second area is that documented around and under the church of S. Maria della Piazza, with numerous tombs with walls of limestone sheets likewise covered with tile-built roofs, whose epigraphic and sculptural remains witness to its use up to the early Middle Ages. A third area is attested on the N face of the Astagno Ridge, with the discovery of ca. 60 tile-built tombs, all oriented N-S, perhaps to link to the *memoria S. Stefani*, known from the passage of St. *Augustine, whose location is still debated. To these three areas can be added the sepulchers discovered on Guasco Ridge in the area of the now-abandoned Roman buildings existing there, and certainly earlier than the basilica of St. Laurence (see below). At Osimo some finds consisting of sarcophagi and inscriptions, today preserved largely in the Duomo, have been linked to a funeral area connected to the memory of the martyr Florentius, mentioned in the Hieronymian Martyrology, perhaps also the site of the primitive cathedral.

At Tolentino the epigraph of the well-known sarcophagus of Fl. Iulius Catervius mentions a *panteum cum trichoro* built in honor of the deceased by his wife Severina—to whom the homonymous church was later linked. On a plan prior to the reconstruction work of the church in 1822 the monument is still visible. A memory of it remains in a small room called "prison of S. Catervio" dating to the Roman era, while scraps of a mosaic with the image of a peacock might be evidence of constructions of a Christian character linked to it.

In the ancient Cluana (today Porto Civitanova) around the church dedicated to St. *Maro—within which remains of mosaic floors datable to the 5th c. have been found—some sepulchers and epigraphic fragments indicate the presence of a Christian cemetery already in the 4th c. To the Longobard period belongs finally the necropolis of Castel Trosino which has yielded rich grave goods.

As for worship spaces, at Ancona the churches of S. Lorenzo and S. Maria della Piazza offer typical basilica iconography: the first, in the area of the *Capitolium*, after a period of abandonment indicated by the tombs already mentioned, is three-aisled, with apse, and coincides with the transverse arm of the present church of S. Ciriaco; it had an entrance at the level of the current chapel of the Crucified and an apse in that of the Madonna. The remains of the mosaic floor put it in the context of the 6th c. The other, in an area next to the port and within—very close to—the city walls, is also three-aisled, with an original apse in the central nave and a second added later to the right aisle. The abundant flooring remains document the double constructive phase in the context of the 5th and 6th c.

At Fano, under the present cathedral dedicated to the Virgin, during restoration work (1934–1938) a three-aisled building was found, with apse and intercolumns, perhaps an elevated presbytery and narthex. The mosaic decoration of the apse flooring offers a *cantharos* flanked by two peacocks from which acanthus branches issue, topped by a christological monogram, to be dated to the 5th or 6th c.

At Ascoli Piceno, in the constructions which make up the present episcopal complex, there have been attempts to read, although with sensibly different chronologies, earlier phases which, for the baptistery, isolated from the worship building, can be better concretized in the discovery of the ancient baptismal basin and in some profoundly rebuilt structures belonging to a probable apse.

At Teramo (*Interamnia Praetuttianorum*), in the area of the present church of S. Maria dei Pompetti (medieval S. Getulio), the remains of a triforium which reuses classical elements have been attributed to the ancient cathedral of S. Maria Aprutiensis, datable to the 6th c.

Remains of rooms with polychrome mosaic floors have been found recently at Monte Giove, in the town of Penna S. Andrea, and have been assigned with likelihood to a worship building dedicated to St. Peter, known from local tradition.

For the oldest era, as far as is known currently, Umbria does not permit us to define the extension and character of the located funeral areas. These, except for the small hypogeum barely seen below the church of St. Victor at Otricoli, and for that larger one—which even recent studies reveal as characterized by a notable duration in time and by a crowding of the burials—existing next to Villa S. Faustino (Massa Martana), are all, in the few identified, above ground.

At Narni the scarce evidence is linked to the burial of St. Juvenal and to that of the later bishop Cassius close to the urban walls and in the area below the present cathedral; while at Terni excavations of the 17th c. seem to have brought to light earthern tombs and sarcophagi connected with the memory of the martyr Valentinus. At Spoleto, on the other hand, different cemeterial nuclei witness to the presence of multiple areas with different functions around the circuit of the walls. From that of St. Peter, along the Via Flaminia, to the other of St. Gregory, considered the biggest of the city, to the burials linked to the traditional memory of St. Con-

cordius and St. Pontianus, to the supposed paleo-Christian areas around the church of St. Thomas, to that connected with the church of St. Sabinus, to that, finally, under the Church of the Holy Apostles, which has yielded sixteen stone sarcophagi with peaked roofs and others made of terracotta and in which the bishop Spes and members of the Spoletine church were buried.

At Foligno, below the contemporary cathedral of St. Felician, the discovery of tile-built tombs witnesses to the presence of an ancient funeral area linked to the memory of the martyr.

To a later era belong the necropolises of Nocera Umbra. The first, already known, is a vast Longobard cemetery, found at the end of the previous century, which yielded expensive funerary furnishings that can be assigned to a chronological range which goes from the late 6th c. to the entire 7th. To the same era another cemeterial nucleus can be assigned, in the present Piazza delle Medaglie d'Oro, which has been destroyed: a third, finally, in the area of Pettinara, is preserved for about a third of its extension and, although of the same period, should be assigned to the native population.

The architectonic evidence of the region is notoriously linked to the two famous monuments of the Spoletine diocese: the St. Salvatore of Spoleto and the so-called Temple of Clitunnus. The first—a three-aisled building with transept and apse closed by side chapels—is the result of various constructive actions, the first of which seems to date back to a period included between the end of the 4th and the 5th c. The other, although of debated date and purpose, offers an unusual typology which echoes that of a temple *in antis*. Still at Spoleto, the Church of the Holy Apostles should also be mentioned, with three aisles divided by pilasters and a transept with triple apse, and the room related to the monastery of St. Mark, of which the remaining mosaic floors agree with the chronology at the end of the 6th c. attested by the letters of Gregory the Great. As for the remaining territories, there are few surviving evidences of paleo-Christian monuments, whether in ruins or identifiable in later buildings. Thus at Otricoli, in the Podere Civitella, there remain ruins likely of an apse belonging to a building which an inscription from the 7th c. mentions as connected to a baptistery with a dedication by a Marcellus. Still at Otricoli, more ancient structures are evident in the church of the Madonna del Buon Consiglio, while in that already mentioned of St. Victor, near the course of the Tiber, today completely restructured, the only evidence remaining is the altar slab with inscription of the bishop Fulgentius and a cross between two lambs, which can be attributed to the mid-6th c. At Pesaro, finally, below and almost inside the perimeter itself of the present cathedral, the excavations have brought to light some structures and remains of mosaic flooring which have been attributed, although with much uncertainty, to the 6th c.

In the Marche the number of known tombs has grown, enriched by the identification of a small funeral area in the zone of Attiggio, near Fabriano (Ancona), attributed to the 6th–7th c. and similar in typology to the tombs of the necropolis of Castel Trosino; by the tombs of Esanatoglia (Macerata), which very likely was part of a cemetery linked to a worship building, and by the analysis of the cemetery of S. Emidio alle Grotte at Ascoli Piceno. New investigations have led to a better understanding of the Church of Holy Martyrs at Osimo, for which an origin might be linked to one or more venerated tombs; excavations have extended also to the monuments of the zone of Pesaro, where in addition to new and preexisting acquisitions of the cathedral, a paleo-Christian basilica has been identified at Colombarone, which probably should be recognized as the basilica of S. Cristoforo *ad Aquilam*. At the same time the reexamination of the evidence concerning the sarcophagus of Flavius Iulius Catervius at Tolentino has made it possible to identify some remains of the wall of the mausoleum in which it was originally kept, obliterated by the 19th-c. reconstruction of the cathedral, and to reconstruct its circular plan endowed with three grand niches. Next, of great interest is the recognition of a Late Antique phase which brought the fortification of the amphitheater of Ancona, which probably should be seen in connection with the events of the Greek-Gothic war. Near the same city, furthermore, at Montemarciano, an apsed building of the 3rd c., certainly destined to a worship function in the paleo-Christian era, was later occupied by burials, a clear indication of the presence of a settlement.

In Umbria, however, understanding concerning the catacomb of the Villa S. Faustino at Massa Martana has been enriched by the discovery of a small worship building, built at the same time as the funeral area in the 4th–5th c.

7. Sabines and Paeligni. The discovery, at Rieti, of some funerary epigraphs in the area of the present cemetery, outside the ancient Interocrina Gate, has suggested the presence of a funeral area also of a Christian character, in which the cult of St. Eleutherius developed, to whom a basilica, already known at the end of the 8th c., was dedicated.

A martyrial cult is documented from the 5th c. also at Amiternum (*Mart. hier.*, 24 July), where fur-

thermore the monumental location is very explicit. Here (today S. Vittorino) around the tomb of the martyr Victorinus, deposited in a mausoleum, developed, starting from the 4th c., an underground cemetery which was frequented without interruption and linked to the sanctuary above ground. In the hypogeum an intensive burial zone with the character of *retrosanctos* stands out, opposed to another with family rooms and isolated tombs. An aboveground cemetery is also documented in the suburban area of the ancient Forcona (today Civita di Bagno) near the primitive cathedral of the city dedicated to S. Massimo; and also at Corfinium, in the area of the so-called chapel of S. Alessandro—which was part of the complex of the cathedral of Valva—a group of burials on multiple levels which had developed around a mausoleum has recently been brought to light.

A catacomb which offers very similar characteristics to the hypogea of Lazio is known finally at Castelvecchio Subequo. This developed in two orthogonal arms, with burials in loculi and arcosolia closed by plastered brickwork, as well as *formae* on the floor. The epigraphic and ceramic finds place this hypogeum—perhaps not the only one—in the 4th c.; it is conjoined with an aboveground area, only partially identified, through the presence of earthen tombs marked off by walls and covered, in general, with large tiles.

As for the architecture, up to today monumental evidence earlier than the Middle Ages is scarce. Recent investigations of the area of the amphitheater of the ancient Amiternum have restored an apsed room with remains of mosaic flooring and evident traces of use on the part of the Christian community. At Casalbordino, in the diocese of Chieti, excavations conducted in recent years have brought to light a basilica consisting of an apsed hall with three aisles and mosaic floor, redone many times over the years and linked with the monastery of S. Stefano *ad rivam maris*. The initial chronology of the basilica seems to be located in the 4th c., with a first reconstruction datable to the 2nd half of the same century.

There are numerous updates concerning the funeral areas found in Abruzzo in recent years, among them the catacomb completed with an aboveground funeral area at Castelvecchio Subequo and the burials connected with the Benedictine monastery near the Abbey of Monte Santo at Civitella del Tronto; another burial nucleus characterizes the area of the church of S. Giovanni in Venere at Fossacesia, in association with ceramic materials of the 6th–7th c., while at Lanciano some tombs witness to a *Byzantine and Longobard habitation. In the early Middle Ages other cemeteries occupied the area next to the cathedral of Teramo and a zone of Penne, this too probably linked to the paleo-Christian cathedral. Remains belonging to an articulated ecclesiastical complex have appeared at Loreto Aprutino, in an area characterized by burials arranged outside a room which in the 6th–7th c. must have had worship functions, and other buildings, one of which was used as a baptistery; also the necropolises of Petrano and Santangelo, in the province of Chieti, used until the 8th–9th c., are likely an indication of the presence of an important worship complex. Other investigations have witnessed to the paleo-Christian phases of Alba Fucens, with testimonies concerning both worship buildings and funeral areas; the understanding of the episcopal complex of Corfinium has been increased, while at Sulmona the identification of a fresco attributed to the 8th c. contributes to the reconstruction of the building stages of the church of S. Gaetano. Attention has been paid, in particular during the most recent decades, to monastic settlements in Abruzzo, such as in the case of the investigations in the complex of St. Stephan *in Rivo Maris* at Casalbordino (Chieti), or for the reconstruction of the Late Antique and Early Medieval phases of the monasteries of S. Pietro at Campovalano and of S. Clemente at Vomano.

New evidence comes, finally, from Molise, where the most important intervention, still in progress, is studying the important monumental complex of S. Vincenzo at Volturno. Early Medieval cemeteries have come to light at S. Maria di Casalpiano near Casacalenda, where the tombs occupy the structures which belonged to a villa, and at Larinum, within the Roman amphitheater. Other investigations underway concern an *ecclesia baptismalis* at Monteroduni, near Isernia (M. Raddi).

8. Latium and *Campania* (*see also* *Rome). The oldest ancient witnesses to Christianity in Campania, as furthermore in general for the *orbis christianus antiquus,* are of a cemeterial nature both above and below ground. The former appear as a continuity in the use of preexisting funeral areas of a non-Christian character. In this sense it is naturally not possible to speak of innovations as to the typology of the burials, except in the symbolism of the decoration and in the epigraphic formulas belonging to them as, e.g., the discoveries of Ostia (S. Ciriaco at the 7th milestone of the via Ostiense; area of S. Ercolano; area of S. Aurea), of Portus and of Cimitile (Nola) demonstrate. As for the underground cemeteries, it is necessary to proceed acc. to a regional distinction depending on some local typologies.

In S Lazio, recent research has revealed a series

of small subterranean cemeteries, presumably linked to rural communities—Vico Moricino (Anagni), S. Ilario *ad Bivium* (Colleferro), Paliano, Subiaco—characterized by modest size, reuse of preexisting structures esp. the hydraulic ones, burials in closed loculi with structures covered in plaster, datable in most cases to an era not earlier than the 4th c. Next to these, some hypogea of the suburbicarian dioceses (S. Alessandro, in the diocese of Nomentum, cemetery of Zotico and *Ad decimum* for the diocese of Labicum, and of S. Senatore at Albano) offer a more articulated and complex iconography with the presence, sometimes, of venerated tombs (S. Alessandro, Zotico and S. Senatore) which modified their original structures and prolonged their life considerably.

Much more extensive are the cemeterial networks of the catacombs of *Naples, which offer a much more evolved aspect.

The continuity of life of the cemeterial complexes, even for many centuries after their original use, is connected furthermore to the insertion in them of a worship building of a martyrial character which modifies their nature and aspect, frequently giving life to very articulated settlements—presence of monasteries, *libraries, baths, **xenodochia* etc.—goals of pilgrimage and sometimes even cathedral sees which were later urbanizing factors in the formation of the Medieval city. This is the case, e.g., of the basilica discovered at Pianabella (Ostia) which testifies, in the present state of research, to a building of martyrial character with burial typologies which recall those of the basilica in honor of the martyr Agapitus at Palestrina, this too built in a funeral area and invested in all likelihood with the dignity of a cathedral; and those of the complex, also at Ostia, built around the *memoria* of S. Aurea, which gave rise to the Medieval burg of Gregoriopolis, which still exists. Also at Portus, on the borders of the noted necropolis of Isola Sacra, the complex linked to the cult of the martyr *Hippolytus would rise, later an episcopal see in the early Middle Ages, where a primitive *memoria* of a single aisle and apse, built in preexisting rooms, developed into a larger building with three aisles and probable annexes and, in the Medieval phase, a baptismal basin within the left aisle. (Excavations are in progress.) The sanctuary built above ground at the already-mentioned cemetery of S. Alessandro on the Via Nomentana was articulated over multiple venerated *memoriae* which conditioned its iconography and construction phases, which stretched into the Middle Ages. But the most spectacular example is constituted by the complex of Cimitile, near Nola, in whose cemeterial area *Paulinus, starting from the first memorial place of worship—the so-called E basilica—and by a grand apse to the W, built a grand complex around the tomb of the martyr *Felix. It was composed of a basilica with trilobate apse, the so-called basilica of the Holy Martyrs, the basilica of S. Calionio and that of S. Tommaso and of S. Stefano, as well as monastic buildings and various annexes. At *Capua the remains of four worship buildings can be recognized, starting from the so-called *basilica Apostolorum,* built under *Constantine, which lately has been identified with an apsed edifice with three aisles, in the center of the ancient city, near the Via Appia. Also urban is the church of S. Maria Maggiore, whose current plan on five aisles repeats perhaps the original, datable, based on the mosaic decoration, to the 2nd half of the 6th c. On the other hand, the church of S. Stefano Maggiore, with three aisles and three apses, rose in an extraurban zone, even if its use as a cemetery remains even today uncertain. Finally, above a funeral area, perhaps next to a primitive *cella memoriae,* rose a basilica dedicated to S. Prisco, with three aisles, which preserves, in the chapel of S. Matrona, large traces of the original mosaic decoration, generally dated to the end of the 5th c.

Of debated chronology within the context of the Longobard era—although with probable older original nuclei—are the complexes of Atripalda and Prata built above the funeral areas of the ancient Abellinum (Avellino). A basilica with five aisles, built above a Greek temple, offers, at Cuma, a baptistery with circular basin built in replacement of the apse. Finally, the baptistery of Nocera Inferiore is commonly dated to the 2nd half of the 6th c. It is on a circular plan with an apse to the W, an ample ambulatory divided from the central hall by fifteen paired columns, and a basin, which is circular within, octagonal outside, richly decorated and topped by a baldachino.

As for the territory of Lazio, S of Rome, in addition to the new information on the already-known monumental complex of S. Ilario *ad Bivium* (Valmontone), numerous investigations concerning the territory of Ostia appear to be of particular importance; among them is the recent identification of a large-scale basilica endowed with an annex of circular form, in which it has been proposed that the Constantinian cathedral with the related baptistery is discernible. Excavations have made it possible to discern precisely the phases of the catacombs of S. Senatore at Albano Laziale, while the localization of the martyrial basilica of Sts. Primus and Felician at Nomentum and that of the paleo-Christian ceme-

tery of Velletri were made possible thanks to the reexamination of the archival documentation. In contrast, at the catacomb of S. Quirico, near Paliano, stood a small church of which the remains have been found.

Also Campania was enriched with new paleo-Christian presences, such as the phase linked to the origins of the church of S. Paride at Teano and the architectonic complex next to the church of S. Vito at Sele (Salerno), where an ecclesiastical building datable to between the end of the 5th and the 6th c. can be identified. To the same chronological range can be assigned a funeral area attached to the basilica of S. Biagio, at Castellamare di Stabia. Further, a necropolis found in the area of a maritime villa at Torre del Greco (district of Sora) dates to the 2nd half of the 5th c., while another vast funeral area connected with a worship building which can be attributed to the 4th c. has been discovered at Atripalda. At Frigento, in contrast, information has been acquired on the Early Medieval phase of the church of S. Maria Assunta and in general on the settlement which belonged to it. Great attention has been paid also to the paleo-Christian activities of ancient *Capua (the present S. Maria Capua Vetere), in particular to the environs of the original baptismal building, the episcopal church and the catacomb of St. Augustine.

New investigations consistently add important contributions related to already-known monuments, such as the Neapolitan catacombs of S. Gennaro and of S. Gaudioso or the complex of S. Felice at Cimitile. Finally, at Naples again, in an area very close to the Duomo, the investigation of the complex of Carminiello ai Mannesi, a Roman *insula* which continued to be active into the 5th–8th c., is of great interest.

9. Apulia and *Calabria*. Although, for what concerns funeral areas, the observations formulated for the preceding region are valid, particular characteristics, also connected to the different geological nature of the terrain, are shown by a series of small hypogea located in Apulia (It. Puglia). Along the arc of the Gargano coast are different groups of subterranean cemeteries with technical and morphological characteristics in the excavation and in the construction of the tombs which recall examples from *Sicily and *Malta: loculi and arcosolia in natural cavities and in rock walls connected to aboveground areas with *formae* and sepulchers in rock with curved ribs, simple rooms and monumental areas with sarcophagi, sometimes furnished with a "baldachino" (e.g.: Siponto, sites Capparelli and Iunitite near Manfredonia; Mattinata, site Salatella near Vieste; Monte Pucci; Ischitella; Cagnano Varano). The same characteristics can be found also in some hypogea of the Matera area and of Canosa, where the complex of S. Sofia, which takes its name from the homonymous cemeterial church above, is articulated on two levels.

At Venosa (ancient Venusia), furthermore, next to Christian hypogea, the discovery of subterranean Jewish cemeterial nuclei offers interesting problems for the cultural relationships between the two religious communities.

Later, starting from the last quarter of the 6th c., the funeral areas linked to the presence of Longobard settlements (e.g., the necropolis of Benevento) acquire notable interest, for the particular typology of the burials and esp. for the custom of burying the deceased with personal grave furnishings, sometimes rather expensive. Further, these are alongside others, which recent studies are bringing ever more to light, belonging to native communities (e.g., cemeteries of Ruvo, Canne, in the territory of Matera, of Calle near Tricarico, Boscosalice near Pisticci and the locality of St. Peter Mandurino near Taranto).

As for the urban worship buildings, at Ventaroli the church of S. Maria in Foro Claudio, with three aisles and a *triforium* on the façade, seem to date to the 8th c.; the building, in contrast—consisting of a large apsed space with two lateral wings—seems to belong to the Longobard era (end 6th c.) and is today incorporated into the cathedral of Benevento. In the same city, the church (with two aisles and apse) of S. Ilario a porta Aurea ought to be assigned, it seems, to the 7th c. At Siponto a recent hypothesis proposes locating the baptistery, perhaps on an octagonal plan, on the site of the present church of S. Maria, on the axis with the homonymous cathedral basilica whose origin is commonly held to date to the end of the 4th c. In the late Roman era the presence of some small apsed oratories with tombs within, in the area around the forum of Herdonia, witnesses to the reuse of Roman public buildings.

At Canosa (ancient Canusium) the grand baptistery of S. Giovanni is known, on a dodecagonal plan, with four chapels on the axes and a curved atrium; it has a double ambulatory marked out by columns with a circular internal peribolus and a heptagonal basin, and seems to be datable, in this mature phase, to the 1st half of the 6th c; no monumental trace, however, is known from the hall of the cathedral, whether this is identified with that of S. Salvatore, which the sources place in front of the baptistery, or with the other nearby church of S. Maria, this too mentioned by literary texts. The religious topography of Canusium is completed with the church of S. Leucio, perhaps in the area of the ancient Capito-

lium, whose mosaic floor decoration is datable to the 6th c., and with the churches of S. Pietro and of S. Giovanni e Paolo, mentioned by the sources, and with that of S. Sabino in which reemployed paleo-Christian material abounds.

To the Longobard phase should be dated the abbey of the Holy Trinity at Venosa, completed by the presumed guesthouse partially attached to the façade of the church. At Trani, excavations have brought to light, under the present Duomo, a basilica of the 6th c. dedicated to the Virgin. It is a building with three aisles, with paired columns and mosaic floor, which shows various reconstructive interventions starting from the Longobard era. At Bari the investigations have also revealed a phase prior to that of the present cathedral. As for Egnathia, the episcopal complex with the basilica named for Bishop Rufentius was built in the urban center along a crossing of the Via Traiana. This consists of a basilica with three aisles preceded by a narthex. The baptistery, inserted in a complex of rooms annexed to the basilica and which, like it, reuses preexisting constructions, recalls, in its square layout and in the basins in the center, which join a rectangular basin with a semicircular bowl, typologies which not only are found at Salona but also are spread throughout Illyricum and the Greek Orient between the 5th and 6th c., a chronology which furthermore is confirmed by the remains of mosaic flooring of the hall. Still at Egnathia, the excavations have restored another worship building in two phases: the first with a single-aisled apsed hall, whose Christian character remains uncertain, datable to between the end of the 4th and the 5th c.; the second with three aisles and oriented apse, belonging to the centuries of the early Middle Ages.

A cruciform baptismal font and traces of contiguous buildings of uncertain definition is what remains at Belmonte near Altamura, while remains of a paleo-Christian basilica—which is perhaps the ancient cathedral—with fragments of flooring and columns, are present at Cannae. At Crepacore, near Oria, the church of S. Pietro is, acc. to a recent chronology, the church of a Byzantine *castrum*, which has been compared to some Sicilian churches and which shows analogies, in Apulia, with the crypt of the Annunziata at Erchie, the church of Seppannibale and with the Centopietre of Patù.

Perhaps the mosaics surviving in the vault and cupola of the church of S. Maria of Casaranello should be dated to the middle of the 5th c. This building, in the light of the latest discoveries, turns out to have had a cruciform plan with a remarkable extension of the nave, later flanked by two side aisles.

The church of S. Giovanni al Sepolcro at Brindisi dates back to a paleo-Christian building, later modified in the Romanesque era, while the church of S. Pietro at Otranto, on a cruciform plan inserted in an quadrangle, dates to the epoch of Byzantine domination. In Apulia some important discoveries have joined the already rich panorama of known paleo-Christian structures, as in the case of the architectonic complex of S. Giusto (Lucera), which can be attributed to the end of the 5th to the 6th c., which was made up of a basilica for worship, another with a funerary purpose, a baptismal building and other rooms, perhaps related to an episcopal see. Another worship building, however, active during the period between the 5th and 10th c., marked an area near Vaste (Lecce). An important find also took place at Faragola, a short way from Ascoli Satriano (Foggia), where together with conspicuous remains of the entire settlement a church emerged whose identity, it has been proposed, is that of the paleo-Christian basilica linked to the cult of S. Potito and the episcopal see of Ascoli. The results of the research conducted in the church of S. Maria of Siponto and in the cathedral of Barletta, furthermore, have made it possible to identify the paleo-Christian phases, as also for the church of S. Pietro at Crepacore (Brindisi) and the attached cemetery, today dated to the 7th c. A hypogeum characterized by arcosolium tombs and graves was, on the contrary, built between the end of the 4th and the 5th c. in the historic center of Taranto (in the area of the Palazzo delli Ponti). The remains of the basilica of the Savior at Canosa have also been identified, found in the area before the baptistery, while at Bitonto the paleo-Christian cathedral has been discovered below the Medieval one, and also the church of S. Apollinare at Rutigliano has yielded traces belonging to the Early Medieval phase. At Belmonte, near Altamura, finally, it has been possible to throw new light on the situation of an *ecclesia baptismalis* attested from the 5th to the 8th c.

Passing to Calabria, beyond various attestations of Early Medieval necropolises which have come to light in the province of Croton, at Bova Marina a settlement has been investigated which is attested up to the 6th–7th c., among whose buildings a Jewish synagogue has been recognized, datable to the 1st half of the 4th c.; at Catanzaro, however, a rustic villa of Late Antique era was occupied in the 6th and 7th c. by a necropolis which later in turn would give place to the church of S. Maria di Zarapotamo. In the zone of Castrovillari (*località* Sassone) an Early Medieval settlement is attested by the presence of a worship building and a necropolis with a monumen-

tal tomb; a church assigned to the Byzantine era and a cemetery of the 7th c. have been found at Presinace di Nocara, while at Taureana (Palmi) another small Early Medieval church is evident from some remains. Rooms have been investigated near Vibo Valentia, at the site of Piscino di Piscopio, belonging, it has been suggested, to an ecclesiastical complex in the 4th c. The presence of structures related to two worship buildings built from the 7th c. in the area of the cathedral of Rossano Calabro, finally, permits revising its date backward.

10. Lucania and Brutium. There are few monumental evidences of Christianity in this region: in the funerary context, the best known complex today remains the *sub divo* cemetery of Tropea, which developed, as it seems, around a surviving *cubiculum*, excavated in the rock, extensively rebuilt and enclosed in the present Palazzo Toraldo, formerly the *castrum* of the 4th c. From this area come the numerous epigraphs which constitute the Toraldo collection. In the same area, notes taken in the last century on the occasion of the demolition of the castle record the existence of a small single-aisled worship building, of an underground room and of a well with graffiti, including christological monograms.

The two *trichorae* of Policastro Busentino and of Padula seem to have had a sepulchral character, both reused successively in later worship buildings, the former being completed with a rectangular hall, apparently only in the Norman era. As for architecture, at Paestum the church of S. Annunziata has revealed, in the latest restoration (1962), a paleo-Christian phase represented, perhaps, by an iconography of three aisles with elevated presbytery—at least in a second phase—and annexed funeral area.

At Sala Consilina, the so-called baptistery of S. Severina, behind the present cathedral, is on a central plan with four rectangular arms on the principal axes, and recently it has been proposed to redate it back to the 4th c. The remains of a baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte, mentioned in a letter of *Cassiodorus (*Ep.* 8,33), are found in the ancient Marcellianum (today S. Giovanni in Fonte). It is a single-aisled room, with an avant-corps and apse, containing a large basin framed with pilasters which support a cupola, perhaps datable to the 4th c. At Padula, finally, the above-mentioned *trichora* was completed with a rectangular hall, therefore becoming the presbytery of the church of S. Nicola delle Donne.

In Basilicata new investigations have focused on the Late Antique settlement of Metaponto, with the worship complex earlier than the middle of the 4th c., constituted of the basilica and the annexed baptistery.

In general: For an overall view on paleo-Christian monuments, see P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, repr., Bari 1980, with updated bibl.; Id., *La cultura artistica in Italia nella Tarda Antichità*, in *La cultura in Italia nella Tarda Antichità e nell'Alto Medioevo*, Rome 1981, 787ff..; A.M. Romanini, *La cultura artistica in Italia nell'Alto Medioevo. Stato e prospettiva della ricerca*, ibid., 817ff. For S Italy in general: E. Bertaux, *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale*, Paris 1903, with update vols., Rome 1978. A. Venditti, *L'architettura bizantina nell'Italia meridionale*, Naples 1967; P. Testini - G. Cantino Wataghin - L. Pani Ermini, *La cattedrale in Italia*, in Actes du XI[e] Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne (Lyon - Vienna - Grenoble - Genève et Aoste, 21-28 settembre 1986), I, 1989, 5-229; *La storia dell'Alto Medio Evo italiano* (*VI-X secolo*) *alla luce dell'archeologia*, ed. R. Francovich - G. Noyé, Florence 1994; G. Bertelli, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana nell'Italia meridionale e insulare* (*1993–1998*), in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 111-144 (with updated bibl.); D. Mazzoleni, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana a Roma e nell'Italia centrale* (*1993-1998*), in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 39-62 (updated bibl. here).

5. Etruria: G. Maetzke, *Resti di basilica cimiteriale sotto S. Felicita:* Not. Scav., 1957, 282ff.; I. Belli Barsali, *La diocesi di Lucca*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, I, Spoleto 1959; F. Liverani, *Le catacombe e antichità cristiane di Chiusi*, Siena 1872; E. Stevenson, *Intorno alle escavazioni fatte in un ipogeo cristiano di Bolsena*: Not. Scav. 81 (1880) 30ff.; G. Maetzke, *Scavi e scoperte nel campo dell'archeologia cristiana negli ultimi dieci anni in Toscana e in Sardegna*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971, 311ff.; O. von Hessen, *Primo contributo all'archeologia longobarda in Toscana*, Florence 1971; M. Salmi, *Problemi dell'alto medioevo a Lucca*, Atti del V Congr. Int. di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1973, 449ff.; R. Farioli, *I mosaici pavimentali della cattedrale di Firenze*, Atti del III Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Trieste 1974, 373ff.; Id., *Note sulla primitiva cattedrale di Firenze: il problema dell'intitolazione*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, s. III, 5, 1975, 535ff.; F.K.B. Toker, *Scavi del complesso altomedioevale di S. Reparata sotto il Duomo di Firenze*: Archeologia Medievale 2 (1975) 161ff.; O. von Hessen, *Secondo contributo all'archeologia longobarda in Toscana*, Florence 1975; F.K.B. Toker, *A Baptistery Below the Baptistery of Florence*: Art Bullettin 58 (1976) 175ff.; G. de Marinis, *Lucca, scavo del battistero*: Archeologia Medievale 4 (1977) 247ff.; A. Fatucchi, *La diocesi di Arezzo, Corpus della scultura altomedievale*, IX, Spoleto 1977; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *La catacomba di Monte della Casetta nell'Agro Capenate*: RivAC 55 (1979) 7ff.; A.M. Giuntella, *La catacomba cosiddetta di Teodora a Rignano Flaminio*, ibid., 273ff.; J. Raspi Serra, *Abitati e cimiteri cristiani nella Tuscia*, Atti del IX Congr. Int. di Archeol. Crist., Vatican City 1979, 417ff.; A.M. Giuntella, *Note per la topografia di Sutri*: Archeologia Laziale, III (1980) 219ff.; var. aus., Atti del Convegno "Il paleocristiano nella Tuscia," Viterbo 1981; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *I cimiteri paleocristiani del Lazio 1, Etruria meridionale* (Monumenti di antichità cristiana, 2a serie, 10), Vatican City 1988; T.W. Potter - A.C. King, *Scavi a Mola di Monte Gelato presso Mazzano Romano, Etruria Meridionale. Primo rapporto preliminare*: Archeologia Medievale 15 (1988) 253-311; F. Marazzi - T.W. Potter - A.C. King, *Mola di Monte Gelato* (*Mazzano Romano - VT*): *notizie preliminari sulla campagna di scavo 1986-1988 e considerazioni sulle origini dell'incastellamento in Etruria Meridionale alla luce dei nuovi dati archeologici*: Archeologia Medievale 16 (1989) 103-119; C. Carletti - V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *La catacomba di S. Cristina a Bol-*

sena (Catacombe di Roma e d'Italia, 2), Vatican City 1989; N. Christie, *Three South Etrurian Churches: Santa Cornelia, Santa Rufina and San Liberato* (Archaeological monographs of the British School at Rome, 4), British School at Rome-London 1991; A.C. King - T.W. Potter, *Mola di Monte Gelato in the Early Middle Ages: An Interim Report on the Excavations 1986-89*, in *Papers of the Fourth Conference of Italian Archaeology*, 4, *New Developments in Italian Archaeology*, Part 2, Oxford 1992, 165-176; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *La catacomba di S. Savinilla a Nepi* (Catacombe di Roma e d'Italia, 4), Vatican City 1992; *Id.*, *Una nuova catacomba presso "Visentium" sul lago di Bolsena*: Rend. PARA 65 (1992–1993) 23-40; Id., *Monumenti paleocristiani del territorio di "Forum Clodi,"* in *Antichità tardoromane e medievali nel territorio di Bracciano*, Viterbo 1994, 243-274; Id., *La catacomba di S. Teodora a Rignano Flaminio* (Catacombe di Roma e d'Italia, 5), Vatican City 1995; Id., *I monumenti paleocristiani della via Flaminia* (*territorio laziale*) *nelle più recenti scoperte archeologiche*, in *Domum Tuam Dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 313-350; Id., *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana nel Lazio dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, I, 309-331 (bibl.); G. Bartolozzi Casti, *La catacomba di Pianosa: stato della ricerca*, in Atti del Convegno di studi "Pianosa: passato, presente, futuro" (Isola di Pianosa, 16-17 maggio 1997), Portoferraio 1997, 79-86; G. Guidoni, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Toscana dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983–1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, I, 249-266 (bibl.).

6. Umbria and Picenum: R. Mengarelli, *La necropoli barbarica di Castel Trosino*: Monumenti antichi della R. Accademia dei Lincei 12 (1912) 145ff.; G. Annibaldi, *Scavi e scoperte nel campo dell'Archeologia cristiana di Ancona*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971, 91ff. For an updated bibliographic synthesis, see also: L. Pani Ermini, *Ecclesia "cathedralis" e civitas nel Piceno altomedievale*, Atti Congr. di Studi su Istituzioni e Società nell'Alto Medioevo marchigiano, 1981; P. Pasqui - R. Paribeni, *Necropoli barbarica di Nocera Umbra*: Monumenti antichi della R. Accademia dei Lincei 25 (1916) 139ff.; M. Salmi, *La basilica di S. Salvatore di Spoleto*, Florence 1961; B. Toscano, *Aspetti urbanistici di Spoleto fra l'età paleocristiana e l'Alto Medioevo*, Atti del I Convegno di Studi storico-ecclesiastici, Spoleto 1976; L. Pani Ermini, *Il culto di S. Giovenale nell'Italia centrale. Le testimonianze monumentali*, Bollettino della deputazione di Storia patria per l'Umbria 75 (1978) 1ff.; C. Pietrangeli, *Otricoli*, Rome 1978; O. von Hessen, *Il cimitero altomedioevale di Pettinara casale Lozzi* (*Nocera Umbra*), Florence 1978; R. Giordani, *Scavi nell'ipogeo cristiano di Villa s. Faustino presso Massa Martana* (*Perugia*): Rend. PARA 57 (1984–1985) 145-168; R. Farioli Campanati, *La datazione del mosaico pavimentale della seconda fase della Cattedrale di Pesaro: l'identificazione del committente*, in *Atti del III Colloquio AISCOM* (*Bordighera, 6-10 dicembre 1995*), Bordighera 1996, 457-466; A. Nestori, *Il mausoleo e il sarcofago di* Flavius Iulius Catervius *a Tolentino*, Vatican City 1996; M. Luni, *La basilica cristiana di* Iohannis *riscoperta a Pesaro*, in *Domum Tuam Dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 529-542; P.L. Dall'Aglio, *Colombarone* (*PS*), in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 86-92; G. De Marinis - P. Quiri - L. Palermo, *Montemarciano* (*AN*). *Loc. Marina Alta*, in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 104-107; G. De Marinis - M. Silvestrini, *Esanatoglia* (*MC*). *Loc. Crocifisso*, in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 107-109; M. Nanni, *La necropoli di Attiggio. Fabriano* (*AN*), in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 96-99; M.C. Profumo, *Pesaro. Cattedrale*: *aula basilicale*, in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 77-86; A. Nestori, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana nelle Marche e in Umbria dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, I, 283-290 (bibl.).

7. Sabines and Paeligni: G. De Angelis d'Ossat, *Cimiteri antichi della via Valeria e del bacino del fiume Aterno*: RivAC 26 (1950) 86ff.; A. Ferrua, *Di una piccola catacomba a Superaequum dei Peligni*, ibid., 53ff.; var. aus., *La cattedrale basilica di Valva*, L'Aquila 1971; L. Pani Ermini, *Contributi alla storia delle diocesi di Amiterno Forcona e Valva nell'Alto Medioevo*: Rend. PARA 44 (1971–1972) 257ff.; M. Moretti, *Architettura medioevale in Abruzzo*, Rome n.d.; V. Santa Maria Scrinari, *Note di archeologia paleocristiana abruzzese*, Atti del IX Congr. Int. di Archeol. Crist., Vatican City 1978, 457ff.; L. Pani Ermini, *Il santuario di S. Vittorino in Armiternum. Note sulla sua origine*: Rivista di Archeologia 3 (1979) 95ff.; *San Vincenzo al Volturno 1. The 1980-86 excavations. Part I*, ed. R. Hodges (Archaeological monographs of the British School at Rome, 7), The British School at Rome-London 1993; *L'anfiteatro di* Larinum. *Iscrizioni, monete, sepolture*, ed. G. De Benedittis - A. Di Niro, Campobasso 1995; *San Vincenzo al Volturno 2. The 1980-86 excavations. Part II*, ed. R. Hodges (Archaeological Monograph of the British School at Rome, 9), The British School at Rome-London 1995; A. Staffa, *Una terra di frontiera: Abruzzo e Molise fra VI e VII secolo*, in *Città, castelli, campagne nei territori di frontiera, sec. VI-VIII*, Atti del 5° Seminario sul Tardo Antico e Alto Medio Evo in Italia Settentrionale, Montebarro 1994, ed. G.B. Brogiolo, Mantua 1995, 187-238; var. aus., *Le valli della Vibrata e del Salinello. Documenti dell'Abruzzo Teramano IV*, S. Atto di Teramo 1996; A. Staffa, *I Longobardi in Abruzzo* (*sec. VI-VII*), in *L'Italia centro settentrionale in età longobarda*, Atti del Convegno, Ascoli Piceno 6-7 ottobre 1995, ed. L. Paroli, Florence 1997, 113-165; A. Saladino, *I monasteri benedettini nell'Abruzzo interno: insediamenti, infrastrutture e territorio tra VIII e XI secolo* (Tardoantico e medioevo: studi e strumenti di archeologia), Rome 2000; *San Vincenzo al Volturno 3. The Finds From the 1980-86 Excavations*, ed. J. Mitchell - I.L. Hansen (Studi e ricerche di archeologia e storia dell'arte, 3), Spoleto 2001; D. Aquilano, Histonium: *testimonianze di edilizia tardoromana e paleocristiana*, in *1983-1993*: *dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 602-606; A.M. Giuntella, *Dieci anni di ricerche, nel campo dell'archeologia cristiana, in Abruzzo*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 571-596 (bibl.); L. Tulipani, *Il complesso cultuale di S. Stefano in Rivo Maris a Casalbordino* (*Chieti*), in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 597-601.

8. Latium and Campania: beyond the updating of Bertaux, op. cit., see: P.-A. Février, *Ostie et Porto à la fin de l'antiquité. Topographie religieuse et vie sociale*: MEFRA 70 (1958) 295-330; R. Calza, *La scultura e la probabile zona cristiana di Ostia e di Porto*: Rend. PARA 37 (1964–1966) 155-257; P. Testini, *Strutture murarie e fasi costruttive del santuario dei martiri nella catacomba di S. Alessandro a Roma*, Akten d. VII Intern. Kongr. f. Christl. Archaeologie, Vatican City-Berlin 1969, 711ff.; M. Rotili, *La basilica dell'Annunziata di Prata monumento d'età longobarda*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971,

401ff.; M. Marinone, *La decorazione pittorica della catacomba di Albano*: RIA 19-20 (1972–1973) 10ff.; P. Testini - M.L. Veloccia Rinaldi, *Ricerche archeologiche all'Isola Sacra*, Rome 1975, 41ff.; var. aus., *Atti del Convegno: Il Paleocristiano in Ciociaria*, Fiuggi 1977; R. Giordani, *Scavi nella basilica cristiana di Pianabella (Ostia Antica)*: Archeologia Laziale II (1979) 240ff.; S. Episcopo, *Saggi di scavo presso S. Aurea ad Ostia*: Archeologia Laziale III (1980) 228ff.; R. Giordano, *Scavi nella tenuta di Pianabella di Ostia Antica 1976-1977: La basilica cristiana*: Memorie Pont. Acc. Rom. Arch. 14 (1983) 77-78; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Scoperta della basilica di S. Ilario "Ad Bivium" presso Valmontone*: Rend. PARA 61 (1988-1989); L. Pani Ermini et al., *Recenti indagini nel complesso martiriale di S. Felice a Cimitile*: RivAC 69, 1-2 (1993) 223-313; *Il complesso archeologico di Carminiello ai Mannesi, Napoli (scavi 1983-1984)*, ed. P. Arthur, Galatina 1994; N. Ciavolino et al., *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Campania dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 615-664 (bibl.); V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana nel Lazio dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, I, 309-331 (bibl.); *Cimitile e Paolino di Nola, la tomba di S. Felice e il centro di pellegrinaggio: trent'anni di ricerche*, Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana (École Française, 9 marzo 2000), ed. H. Brandenburg - L. Ermini Pani, con la coll. di P. Barbini, Vatican City 2003.

9. Apulia and Calabria: beyond the works already cited in Bertaux, see: A. Quacquarelli, *Note sulle origini cristiane di Canosa di Puglia, S. Leucio e la catacomba inedita di S. Sofia*, Atti del VI Congr. Int. di Archeol. Crist., Vatican City 1965, 321ff.; F. Schettini, *Due monumenti paleocristiani inediti del Vulture e loro riflessi sull'architettura medioevale*: Archivio Storico Pugliese 19 (1966) 93ff.; W. Hermann, *Archeologische Grabungen und Funde in Bereich der Superintendenzen von Apulien, Lucanien, Calabrien und Salerno von 1956 bis 1965*: AA (1966) 255-367; D. Adamesteanu, *Scavi e scoperte paleocristiane in Basilicata*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971, 19ff.; C. Colafemmina, *Apulia cristiana. Venosa. Studi e scoperte*, Bari 1973; C. Carletti - M. Salvatore, *Ruvo di Puglia (Contr. Patanella): Saggi di scavo*, Bari 1977; M. Rotili, *La necropoli longobarda di Benevento*, Naples 1977; M. Salvatore, *Antichità altomedievali in Basilicata: La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, Rome 1981, 947ff.; C. Carletti, *Antichità paleocristiane e altomedievali in Puglia alla luce dei recenti ritrovamenti (1974–1979)*, ibid., 837ff.; A. Felle - D. Nuzzo, *Testimonianze paleocristiane in Puglia: recenti studi e ritrovamenti*: VetChr 30 (1993) 307-353; *San Giusto. La villa, le* ecclesiae, ed. G. Volpe, Bari 1998; F.P. Maulucci, *Faragola. Ascoli Satriano (FG)*, in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 147-149; A. Coscarella, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Basilicata e Calabria dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 781-792 (bibl.); L. Costamagna, *La sinagoga di Bova Marina (RC): una proposta di interpretazione delle strutture*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 795-808; C. D'Angela, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Puglia dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 725-732 (bibl.).

10. Lucania and Brutium: In addition to the works cited in Bertaux, see: P. Toraldo, *Un ipogeo cristiano ritenuto distrutto nel cimitero di Tropea*: RivAC 12 (1935) 329ff.; Id., *Una basilichetta cimiteriale a Tropea*, ibid., 13 (1936) 155ff.; V. Bracco, *Marcellianum e il suo battistero*: RivAC 34 (1958) 193ff.; W. Hermann: AA (1966) 255ff.; G. de Rosa, *La chiesa della SS. Annunziata a Paestum*: Rivista di Studi Salernitani 29 (1968) 181ff.; E. Arslan, *Recenti scavi a Botricello e Roccelletta*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971, 107ff.; L.G. Kalby, *Contributi e note su nuove documentazioni paleocristiane nella Campania meridionale*, ibid., 244ff.; *Venosa: un parco archeologico e un museo: come e perché*, ed. M. Salvatore (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche, 2), Taranto 1984; L. Spera, *Die Entstehung des frühen Christentum in der Basilicata nach den jüngsten archäologischen Funden*: RQA 88 (1993) 36-58; M. Salvatore, *La dinamica insediativa in Basilicata tra tardoantico e altomedioevo*, in *Studi in onore di M. D'Elia*, Spoleto-Matera 1996, 66-74; L. Bubbico - F. Caputo - A. Maurano, *Monasteri italogreci e benedettini in Basilicata*, 2 vols., Matera 1996-1997; A. Coscarella, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Basilicata e Calabria dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 781-792 (bibl.).

L. Pani Ermini - R. Giordani - A. Milella

11. Sicilia. The island is marked by an abundance of surviving monuments, by the variety and novelty of the typologies which reflect the multiple cultural experiences typical of the Mediterranean basin which flowed together and evolved here. The particular nature of the soil has certainly favored, from the earliest era, the use of underground burials, so much so that, for its size and variety, the subterranean cemeterial network of Sicily can be in some degree compared to the Roman, even if it differs from the latter in some particular characteristics.

In addition to *Syracuse, true and proper catacombs are found, above all, in the coastal zone, starting from the E coast where, in the territory of Augusta, in the district called Grotte del Monaco at the mouth of the Molinello, there is a grand catacomb whose origin is prior to the religious peace. Further S, along the S coast, in Cava d'Ispica, the catacomb of Larderia is marked by its ample extension, in a zone which also has numerous small hypogea and rock sanctuaries (see below). Proceeding to the W, on the Ereo plateau, nuclei different in their dimensions and articulation are found first in the area of Modica, then at Agrigentum, with the Fragapane catacomb, and again at Marsala and at Palermo, where the catacomb of Ponta d'Ossuna stands out as the largest structure, which for its size and type of excavation recalls the cemeteries of Syracuse.

Characteristic of the island is nevertheless a myriad of small hypogea which are spread with great concentration above all in the SE corner, both on the coast and in the interior: from the buildings of the E coast (Messina, Taormina, Catania, Lentini, Canicattini Bagni), to the group of Mount Lauro

(Monterosso Almo, region of Vizzini-Mineo-Grammichele, Licodia Eubea, Chiaramonte Gulfi), to those of the S coast (Cugni di Cassaro, Avola, Noto, Cittadella, Pachino, Rosolini, Cava d'Ispica, Scicli), the Ereo plateau (Ragusa), the valley of the Ippari (Comiso), the Camarina region (S. Croce Camarina), the plane of Gela and the region of Caltagirone. Less common is evidence in the remainder of the territory, which is divided between central Sicily (Mussomeli, Caltanissetta, Serra di Falco, Palma di Montechiaro, Naro and Agrigentum), the SW region (Selinunte, Mazara, Marsala), the NW coastal strip (Carini, Palermo) and the Aeolian archipelago (Lipari).

Most of these, even if with very varied articulations and developments, consist of large quadrangular rooms, sometimes also cruciform (e.g., Cittadella), which are characterized by a rich typology of burials among which the sepulcher with baldachino stands out for its originality and monumentality. This is constituted of a sarcophagus carved into the rock and joined with the vault of the room through four pilasters in correspondence with the corners. This type is very widespread in the hypogea scattered in the region between Ragusa and Noto on the SE tip of the island, apart from an exception, not yet clarified, with regard to Syracuse. Other types are constituted of sepulchers with sarcophagi carved in the rock and linked one to another, and of *arcosolii,* both of traditional type and of grandiose multiple tombs which are buried in depth in the walls so much as to constitute true and proper short ambulatories. A particular type of tomb, finally, is called "Siculian," excavated on the front of the rock, with an arcaded or rectangular opening.

Next to the underground cemeteries, Sicily has also produced, naturally, documentation of open-air funeral areas which do not present particular characteristics except in the mountainous areas through the use of the already-mentioned tombs of Siculian type and of the so-called Campanian type, this too carved into the rock.

The same reasons of historical and geographic order, which have been seen to determine the varied typology of the cemeterial structures, also influence the experience of the sacred architecture of the island.

In the basilicas on a longitudinal plan, although the iconography repeats substantially traditional floorplans in the building found at Salemi—of which only conspicuous remains of the mosaic flooring, in multiple phases, remain—elsewhere particularities in the final solutions can be found, such as in the polygonal apse of the church of Zitone, near Lentini, datable to the 5th c., or the triconch apse of the church of S. Pancrati at Cava d'Ispica and of S. Pietro *ad Baias* at *Syracuse that suggest rapport with the Greek and Egyptian environments. As for the connection with the external space of the building, the usual solution of the quadriporticus finished the church of Nesima near Catania, while an open problem is left by the four basilicas of S. Pietro of Ortigia (end 4th c.), S. Focà of Priolo (4th–5th c.), S. Giovanni of Palagonia (5th c.), S. Maria della Pinta at Palermo (6th c.), believed until a few decades ago to belong to a particular architectural type which shows the open flank of arches set on pilasters. Recent observations, however, suggest that this solution is only relevant to the basilica of Palagonia which, of a funerary character, would in that case find analogy with some cemeterial buildings of Georgia. As for the rest, the insertion of worship buildings above the cemeterial buildings, whether underground or open-air, finds many comparisons on the island, with a multiplicity of forms and typologies.

There are also various constructions on a cruciform or central plan. Among them, the two churches of S. Croce Camerina, named Vigna di Mare and Bagno di Mare (or S. Nicola), with rudimentary cupola constituted by conches arranged in rows on a Latin-cross plan, and the church of the Salvatorello—or Buonaiuto chapel—at Catania, on a central plan with projecting quadrifolium and vault placed on angular brackets (5th–6th c.); that of La Favorita, near Noto, quadratic on the outside and circular on the inside, with a cupola placed directly above the perimeter walls, or also that of S. Lorenzo at Pachino, a Byzantine rebuilding of a Greek temple, which uses the solution of pendentives in the joints of the cupola, offer evident Eastern and African influences; the latter reappear in the *trichorae* of Malvagno, Maccari and S. Teresa, near Syracuse, whose cupolas are placed on pendentive joints, with a date now from the late 6th c.

In the framework of the still surviving ancient architecture of the island enter also, naturally, the structures cut in the rock, of disputed date, but nevertheless in general rather later.

Research in Sicily has made it possible in particular to increase our knowledge of the cemeterial occupation of the island, as in the case of the private hypogeum Manomozza III, near Priolo Gargallo (Syracuse), used in the middle of the 5th c., or the necropolis of Lardia, with numerous Christian furnishings, used between the 4th and 5th c., and to which a small worship building was annexed in the 6th c.; next, a church, still of reduced dimensions, was identified in the late Roman-Byzantine settle-

ment of Giarranauti. More cemeterial evidence has emerged in the territory of Ragusa: a hypogeum and an aboveground sepulchral area attributed to the 3rd c. at Modica are joined to burials at S. Croce Camerina, whether near the church of Mezzagnone or close to Castello, which can be attributed, on the basis of the discovered funerary furnishings, the former to the 5th c. and the others to the 6th–7th c., the latter in connection with the remains of a worship building and of late Byzantine settlement. To the same chronological and cultural period belong also the grave furnishings found in the cemeterial nucleus of Chiaramonte Gulfi, while the 7th c. marked the abandonment of the cemeterial church of Kaukana, attributed to the era of *Justinian. Next, new investigations have focused on the sites of Sophiana (Caltanissetta), characterized by a necropolis with undisturbed monumental tombs which can be attributed to the 5th–6th c., and of Eraclea Minoa (Agrigentum), where above a necropolis of the 4th c. a cemeterial basilica was built, next to which other burials and a building also occupied with tombs have been identified. In the same province, at Fragapane, two hypogea, used between the 4th and 5th c., show traces of reuse in the Medieval period, when a furnace was installed in one while the other became a storeroom for materials. Interesting discoveries have also taken place at Marsala, where beyond a stretch of the necropolis of Lilibeo, with a splendidly decorated hypogeum where the tomb of Crispia Salvia found a place, three catacomb nuclei have been investigated in the *latomia* of S. Maria della Grotta, these too decorated, which show traces of use between the end of the 2nd and the 4th c. However, the construction of a large open-air cemetery at Piana degli Albanesi (Palermo), in the S. Agata district, characterized by burial mounds dates back to the 5th c. Less rich are the discoveries linked to worship edifices, among which stand out the discovery of a tessellated mosaic floor, dated to the 5th–6th c., which evidences the existence of an older basilica under the Cefalù cathedral of Roger II.

11. *Sicilia*: O. Garana, *Le catacombe siciliane e i loro martiri*, Palermo 1961; S.L. Agnello, *Bibliografia archeologica della Sicilia paleocristiana e bizantina*: Archivio Storico Siracusano 3 (1957) 143ff.; 5/6 (1959-1960) 203ff.; 7 (1961) 143ff.; 9 (1963) 143ff.; 10 (1964) 173ff.; 13/14 (1967-1968) 215ff.; Id., *Scavi e scoperte negli ultimi dieci anni in Sicilia*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971, 45ff.; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, op. cit., 271ff., 692ff. and bibl. 809-810.: Id., *La cultura artistica in Italia nella Tarda Antichità*, in *La cultura in Italia . . .* , op. cit., 810ff.; E.G. Picone, *L'ipogeo Manomozza III presso Priolo Gargallo*: Quaderni dell'Istituto di Archeologia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Messina 9 (1994) 141-163; L. Calabrese, *Kaukana e altri monumenti tardo antichi nel ragusano*, Ragusa 1994; M.R. Sgarlata, *Frühchristlichen Archäologie in Sizilien. Neue Forschungen und Entdeckungen*: RQA 90 (1995) 147-182; R.M. Bonacasa Carra, *Agrigento paleocristiana. Nuove scoperte*: Kokalos XLII (1996) 59-74; G. Di Stefano, *Scavi in alcune necropoli del Ragusano*, in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 145-147; R. Giglio, *Lilibeo (Marsala). Recenti rinvenimenti archeologici*, in *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Bordighera 2001, I, 149-154; S.L. Agnello, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Sicilia dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993*: *dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 809-819 (bibl.); R.M. Bonacasa Carra, *Recenti scoperte nell'area delle catacombe di Marsala*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 821-827.

L. Pani Ermini - R. Giordani

12. *Sardinia*. The near-total absence of literary sources for the paleo-Christian and Early Medieval periods restricts research to only archaeological documentation. From this emerges, first, the conclusion that in the territory of the seven dioceses, into which the island was divided at the time of *Gregory the Great, no monument is older than the end of the 3rd, or better, the beginning of the 4th c.; the earliest evidence found is in fact from the fragmentary front of a sarcophagus from Olbia with scenes of the sacrifice of Isaac and of *Daniel among the lions, produced in all likelihood by Ostian workshops. All the other monuments of the island, from the *cubiculi* of the cemetery of Bonaria to the sepulchers of the area of S. Saturno at Cagliari, to the catacombs of S. Antioco in the Sulcis peninsula, to the hypogeum of Bonorva, to the cemeteries of Tharros and of Cornus, up to those of *Forum Traiani,* of Porto Torres and of Olbia, have not yielded constructive elements, nor epigraphic materials or furnishings which might allow a date earlier than the epoch mentioned above.

The types of burials are varied, both in the underground and aboveground areas. The former have created, next to true and proper catacombs such as that of S. Antioco, individual *cubiculi* carved into the rock by joining several Punic chamber hypogea with galleries, such as in Bonaria Ridge at Cagliari or articulated as at Forum Traiani, at Porto Torres and at Bonorva, here also with the reuse of preceding sepulchers. Opposed to the communitarian character of the cemetery of S. Antioco is the familiar and private character of the other structures, acc. to what it seems can be inferred from the few burials in *arcosolii* which are regularly opened in the rock walls. The fresco decoration, still surviving in some hypogea, shows in general stylistic characters and themes in agreement with the contemporaneous pictures of

Roman environments with a predilection for floral motifs, acc. to a taste common in the *orbis christianus* of the 4th c., but also an independence in the iconographic elaboration of the same themes. Around the aboveground burials, the areas of S. Saturno and of Bonaria at Cagliari have produced, next to non-Christian mausoleums, at least in their original phase, tombs in brick covered with slabs or flat roof tiles, sarcophagi, "barrel" tombs and simple tile-built burials. The same typology is in the area of S. Gavino at Porto Torres, united with tumulus tombs with mosaic coverings which recall African examples and also at Cornus, where recent excavations have documented the presence of *mensae* for the *refrigerium*. Still in the cemeterial context the rich epigraphic material should be mentioned.

Not many places of worship prior to the 9th c. have been found on the island. The original nucleus of S. Saturno at Cagliari, which has a domed body adorned with cross arms, has been compared with the first construction phase of S. Giovanni in Sinis in the *suburbium* of Tharros. In addition to these structures (which show designs of a funerary and martyrial character) and the small church of S. Maria of Mesomundo near Siligo (also built on a central plan but subordinated to the iconography of the Roman bath in which it was built), the halls of Cornus, the basilica found under S. Gavino at Porto Torres and the church of S. Andrea Pischinapiu in the countryside of Narbolia (which too was built in a former bath building) are evidence of the only examples known today of buildings erected on a longitudinal plan. In particular, the two parallel and contiguous halls of Cornus, the second of which was transformed at a later time into a baptistery, show an iconography which reflects African characteristics, esp. in some phases of restoration whose execution has been tentatively attributed to the orthodox bishops who were refugees from Africa under the reign of Thrasamund (496–523). The baptismal pool in masonry, of octagonal form on the outside and cruciform on the inside, was topped by a baldachino as was that of the baptistery of Tharros, where unfortunately there are no remains of the episcopal basilica connected to it.

Also in Sardinia the recent finds in particular permit updating the framework of the information concerning the cemeteries: at Porto Torres, beyond a hypogeum and a columbarium, a paleo-Christian necropolis has been investigated in piazza Mameli and a late phase of a necropolis in the basilica of S. Gavino has been identified. In the territory of Sassari another necropolis of vast proportions has been discovered in the Montalè region, which can be dated between the 2nd and 4th c. and perhaps can be linked to an Early Medieval rock church; at Padria, on the other hand, a church was founded above a barrel tomb inside a space which would later be used for the insertion of earthern graves. Important results have emerged from the investigations of the archaeological area of Cornus, where in addition to much information on the cemetery and its worship complexes, new understanding concern the *insula episcopalis* has been achieved. A series of other important investigations, finally, has allowed us to specify the events in the construction of several monuments, such as for the sanctuary of S. Maria of Bonaccattu in the province of Oristano, built between the 6th and 8th c. in the area of a civil building; the *ecclesia baptismalis* of Nurachi, also in the same province, datable to the 6th c.; and the church of S. Nicola at Orroli (Nuoro) built in the Early Medieval era with a cruciform plan and a raised presbytery. For the original phase of the sanctuary of S. Antioco at Sulci, a date in the 5th c. has been proposed and the hypothesis has been advanced of a cathedral function. Specifications of the succession of phases have also been made concerning the sanctuary of S. Lussorio at Fordongianus, the church of S. Saturnino at Cagliari, and the church of Nostra Signora at Mesumundu in the province of Sassari.

12. Sardinia: R. Delogu, *L'architettura del Medioevo in Sardegna*, Rome 1953; P. Testini, *Il battistero di Tharros*, Atti del XIII Congr. di Storia dell'Architettura, Rome 1966, 191ff.; G. Maetzke, *Scavi e scoperte nel campo dell'Archeologia Cristiana negli ultimi dieci anni in Sardegna e in Toscana*, Atti del II Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Rome 1971, 311ff.; P. Testini, *Il complesso paleocristiano di Cornus* (*regione Columbaris*) *in Sardegna*, Actas del VIII Congr. Int. de Arqueología Cristiana, Vatican City-Barcelona 1972, 537ff.; L. Pani Ermini - M. Marinone, *Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Cagliari. Catalogo dei materiali paleocristiani e altomedievali*, Rome 1981; L. Pani Ermini, *Antichità Cristiana e Alto Medioevo in Sardegna attraverso le più recenti scoperte archeologiche*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, Rome 1981, 903ff. (with bibl.); A.M. Giuntella - G. Borghetti - D. Stiaffini, *Mensae e riti funerari in Sardegna: la testimonianza di Cornus* (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche, 1), Taranto 1985; *Il suburbio delle città in Sardegna: persistenze e trasformazioni*, Atti del III Convegno sull'archeologia tardoromana e medievale (Cuglieri 28-29 giugno 1986), Taranto 1986; *L'archeologia romana e altomedievale nell'oristanese*, Atti del Convegno di Cuglieri (22-23 giugno 1984), Taranto 1986; *Ampsicora e il territorio di Cornus*, Atti del II Convegno sull'archeologia romana e altomedievale nell'oristanese (Cuglieri, 22 dicembre 1985), Taranto 1988; *Le sepolture in Sardegna dal IV al VII secolo*, Atti del IV Convegno sull'archeologia tardoromana e medievale (Cuglieri 27-28 giugno 1987), Oristano 1990; L. Pani Ermini - P.G. Spanu, *Aspetti di archeologia urbana: ricerche nel suburbio orientale di Cagliari*, in *La "civitas christiana": urbanistica delle città italiane fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo: aspetti di archeologia urbana*, Atti del I seminario di studio, Turin 1991, ed. P. Demeglio - C. Lambert (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Quaderni, 1), Turin 1992; *Materiali per*

una topografia urbana: status quaestionis e nuove acquisizioni, Atti del V Convegno sull'archeologia tardoromana e altomedievale in Sardegna (Cagliari-Cuglieri 24-26 giugno 1988), Oristano 1995; P.G. Spanu, *La Sardegna bizantina tra VI e VII secolo* (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche, 12), Oristano 1998; A.M. Giuntella, *Cornus I, 1. L'area cimiteriale orientale* (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche, 13,1), Oristano 1999; Id., *Cornus I, 2. L'area cimiteriale orientale: i materiali* (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche, 13,2), Oristano 2000; P.G. Spanu, *Martyria Sardiniae: i santuari dei martiri sardi* (Mediterraneo tardoantico e medievale. Scavi e ricerche, 15), Oristano 2000; L. Pani Ermini, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Sardegna dal 1983 al 1993*, in *1983-1993: dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*, Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist., Cassino 2003, II, 891-920 (bibl.).

L. Pani Ermini - A. Milella

ITHACIUS of Ossonuba (4th c.). Together with *Hydatius of Mérida, he was among the most implacable adversaries of *Priscillianism from the Council of *Saragossa in 380. Having turned to the imperial authorities, together with Hydatius, he obtained from *Gratian a decree against the Priscillianists, accused of *Manicheism. Later he acted against *Maximus in order to have Priscillian condemned; following the reaction to the killing of Priscillian and of some of his followers, Ithacius was deposed from his episcopal rank.

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, passim.

S. Zincone

ITINERARIES. The Christian custom of pilgrimage to the Holy Places continued the Hebraic one to the tombs of the prophets in Palestine. Centers of Christian pilgrimage were the sanctuaries of the *terra sancta* and the tombs of the martyrs in the churches and catacombs of *Rome (edition: CCL 175-176), but there were places of pilgrimage across the entire Christian world. Only pilgrims coming from far away needed the written itineraries. Starting from the 4th c. voyages multiplied, giving rise to a specific literary genre: the travel guides and diaries, which have a particular interest for paleo-Christian topography. It is necessary to distinguish in this literature the purely geographic descriptions (the onomasticon of *Eusebius of Caesarea in the 290s [CPG 3466; CPL 581a]; the *Tabula Peutingeriana,* redacted from the 2nd to 5th c.; the mosaic map of Madaba of the late 6th c.; *Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia* of the 7th c.; other writings of the Byzantine era) from the works whose character is more hagiographic (Prudentius, *Perist.* [CPL 1443]; Paulinus of Nola [CPL 203] and Venantius Fort., *Carmina* [CPL 1033]), in which information of a topographic character is secondary.

1. Latin Palestinian itineraries. Authentic itineraries: (1) The **Itinerarium anonymum Burdigalense* of 333. (2) The *Itinerarium seu Peregrinatio ad loca sancta* of *Egeria of the years 381–384. (3) Letter 108, in which *Jerome describes in 404 the voyage which he took together with *Paula in 385. (4) An *anonymous writer, in the past called Antoninus of Piacenza (or Antoninus Placentius), took a trip with some companions in ca. 570; he wrote the account in his *Itinerarium*. There are two recensions of it: in both, the voyage begins at *Constantinople and stops abruptly at the Euphrates.

Descriptions of countryside and itineraries were compiled from the writings of earlier authors: (5) The *De situ Hierosolymae* of Eucherius, which certainly depends on Jerome and on Ps.-Hegesippus; if the author should be identified with Hegesippus of Lyons, the work is datable to between 444 and 450; otherwise it can be dated around the middle of the 7th c. (6) The *De situ Terrae Sanctae* of 518–ca. 530, attributed to a MS of a certain Theodosius who is believed to be of African origin because he calls the *Arians *Vandals. (7) The **Breviarius de Hierosolyma* of the beginning of the 6th c. (8) The *De locis sanctis,* of the Irish abbot *Adamnan of Iona (ca. 624–704), written in ca. 687–688, which recounts the voyage taken by a bishop of *Gaul named Arculf before 680, comparing his accounts with other earlier writings on the Holy Land. (9) The *De locis sanctis* of the Venerable *Bede, redacted around 702–703, using similar works of Jerome, ps.-Hegesippus, Adamnan and doubtless also ps.-Eucherius, is a description of the entire Near East, including Constantinople.

2. Greek Palestinian itineraries. The Greek itineraries of the Holy Land begin with that of Epiphanius Hagiopolites of the 8th–9th c.

3. Roman itineraries. (1) The **Depositiones episcoporum et martyrum* of 336; these are not itineraries in the strict sense; however, the locations of the tombs of popes and martyrs are reported in them, and for this reason they were useful also for pilgrims. (2) The *Notula de olea sanctorum martyrum* of the presbyter John who, commissioned by the Bavarian queen *Theodelinda, under the pontificate of *Gregory the Great, collected relics in Rome. It is not an itinerary, but a list of ampules containing oil taken from the tombs of the Roman martyrs. (3) The *Cymiteria totius Romanae urbis,* of the beginning of the 7th c., which describes only the 17 cata-

combs known at that time (see DACL 7, 1904–1905). (4) The *Notitia ecclesiarum urbis Romae,* probably written between 625 and 649 (n. 36-43 middle of the 8th c.); the mentioned churches are the suburban ones of the martyrs, classified clockwise acc. to the streets which they flank, from the Porta Flaminia to the Via Cornelia. A single urban church, that of Sts. John and Paul, is added at the beginning. (5) The *De locis sanctis martyrum,* redacted between ca. 635 and 645, lists the sanctuaries dedicated to the martyrs starting counterclockwise from the Via Cornelia, from the tomb of Peter; the work is completed with a list of 21 urban churches. (6) The *Itinerarium Malmesburiense,* which dates to ca. 648–682, inserted by William of Malmesbury in his *Deeds of the Kings of England.* In this work, too, the list begins from the Porta Cornelia, but proceeds normally clockwise. (7) The *Itinerarium Einsidlense,* written after 687 (the last part, the *Descriptio murorum,* under *Hadrian I [772–795]), so called from the MS in which it is preserved (Einsiedeln 326, 9th–10th c.). It contains different documents of an epigraphic and historical character, important for the history of Rome; the collection dates to the 8th c. (F.A. Bauer, *Stadt*, *Platz und Denkmal in der Spätantike*, Mainz 1996, pl. 18; *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo*, Milan 2001, 154-159; *Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit* 2, Mainz 1999, 607-609; *Christiana Loca* 2, Rome 2001, 248-249).

CPL 2324-2348; *Verzeichnis* 583-585; PWK 9, 2308-2363; RAC 19, 1-31; LMA 5, 772-775; LACL³ 363-365; Krumbacher, 409-427; J. Zettinger, *Die Berichte über Rompilger aus dem Frankenreiche bis zum Jahre 800*, Rome 1900; P. Thomsen, *Loca sancta. Verzeichnis der im 1. bis 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr. erwähnten Ortschaften Palästinas*, Leipzig 1907; G. Bardy, *Pèlerinages à Rome vers la fin du IVᵉ siècle*: AB 67 (1949) 224-235; J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims Before the Crusades*, Warminster 1977; D. Baldi, *Enchiridion locorum sanctorum. Documenta s. evangelii loca respicientia*, Jerusalem ²1982; F. Morgan Nichols - E. Gardiner, *The Marvels of Rome: Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, New York 1986; V. Saxer, *I Santi e i santuari antichi della via Salaria da Fidene ad Amiterno*: RivAC 61 (1990) 245-305; P. Testini, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Bari ²1980, 25-63; A. Külzer, *Peregrinatio graeca in Terram Sanctam*, Frankfurt a.M. 1994; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *"Itinera ad sanctos." Testimonianze monumentali del passaggio dei pellegrini nei santuari del suburbio romano*: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City - Münster 1995, 763-775; P. Maraval, *Récits des premiers pèlerins chretiens au Proche-Orient*, Paris 1996; N.R. Miedema, *Die Mirabilia Romae*, Tübingen 1996; H.R. Drobner, *Die Palästina-Itinerarien*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 293-354; M. Miglio, *Pellegrinaggi a Roma*, Rome 1999; D. Feissel, *Les itinéraires de Procope et la métrologie de l'antiquité tardive*: Antiquité Tardive 10 (2002) 383-400.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

ITINERARIUM BURDIGALENSE. The oldest Christian *itinerary for the Holy Places was composed by an anonymous author from *Bordeaux. He reports a voyage, which took place in 333–334, from this city to *Jerusalem: passing through N *Italy on the way, then through the valley of the Danube, he reached *Constantinople and from there continued through Asia Minor and Syria and finally arrived in Jerusalem: he remained many months in Palestine, visiting various biblical sites. On the way back, he traversed Macedonia, landed in Italy, passed through Rome and halted at *Milan. The author lists the different *mutationes* (post stations), the *mansiones* (inns) and the different distances; here and there he inserts biblical reminiscences and local traditions. It is more of a topographical list than a narration. The text is written in a simple and clear Latin, typical of the Roman *Itineraria,* and it is important for the topographical references and the traces of Jewish and Christian memories.

Editions: CPL 2324; PL 8, 784-796; Geyer: in CSEL 39 (1898) 3-33 (repr. 1964) = CCL 175 (1961) 1-26; O. Cuntz, *Itineraria Romana*, I, Leipzig 1929, 86-102.

Studies: H. Leclercq: DACL 7 (1927) 1853-1858; H. Leclercq: DACL 14 (1939) 76-78; B.K. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa*, Münster-Regensburg 1950, 89-110; 345-354; R. Gelsomino, *L'Itinerarium Burdigalense e la Puglia*: VetChr 3 (1966) 161-208; Patrologia III, Turin 1978, 532; C. Milani, *Strutture formulari nell'*Itinerarium Burdigalense (*a. 333*): Aevum 57 (1983) 99-108; TRE 16 (1987) 619-620 (s.v. *Jerusalem.* IV); L. Douglass, *A New Look at the Itinerarium Burdigalense*: JECS 4 (1996) 313-333.

M. Maritano

IZLA (Izala), Mount. Mount Izla (Izlo; Gr. *Izala*)—the name still used—is found in the S part of the mountain massif (Mons Masius) in SE Turkey, not far from the borders with Syria and Iraq, and to the NE of *Nisibis, in the area of the *Mons Gaugalion* (Sozomen 3,14,30). In the E part of the plateau is Tur'Abdin. It belonged to the province *Mesopotamiae*, whose capital was Nisibis. Through the defeat of *Julian in 363, E Mesopotamia was ceded to the *Sassanids (Ammianus 25,7-9 [commentary by J. Fontaine, Paris 1977, 257-258]; Lenski 161-162); the capital of the reduced province became Amida (today Diyarbakir); Nisibis was abandoned by the Romans and passed to the Sassanids. The border which was established, as it seems, was to the W of the River Mygdonis, to the W of Nisibis, on the Mons Masius (the entire mountain chain with Tur'Abdin) and on the River Nymphius (Bohtan Su) (see Palmer, XX-XXI). This border remained for a long time, practically until 520. The border limits

did not prevent the Christians from communicating among themselves, from traveling or from having a common spiritual and theological sentiment. The territory of Upper Mesopotamia was conquered by the Arabs in the course of the 7th c.

According to a tradition, in the 4th c. the Egyptian monk *Eugenius (Awgin) founded monasticism on Mount Izla; in later times a monastery with that name perpetuated his memory up to today (at 26 km [16.2 mi.] from Nisibis at 6 km [3.8 mi] from the village Girmeli). His nephew Malka (Malkē) founded another monastery to the N of the preceding monastery; another disciple, John the Bedouin (Arab), or Mar Yohannan, founded a third monastery 3 km (1.9 mi) farther N: *Jacob of Nisibis, later bishop of that city at the beginning of the 4th c., had a period of solitary life in the area. The region was inhabited by monks from then on, among whom there were also followers of *Severian theology, when the great monastery was founded before 570 between the two latter monasteries and N of Mirab. For his prestige and influence, Abram was considered founder of the great monastery and author of the Rule. It begins thus: "Because, ever since we began to live in this spot, the brothers who live here have worked and toiled excavating grottoes and building cells in which to live"; for these reasons they had decided to write the norms of behavior. This monastic Rule, the oldest preserved of Syro-Eastern Christianity, written in 570 (the monastery in those years was under Sassanid domination), was born as the fruit of an experience lived on the part of the community and would inspire later monasticism in the Mesopotamian world. The monastery became an important center of spirituality and theological culture, from which numerous founders of other monasteries would emerge (Chialà, 134-139), some sent by *Abraham himself (d. 586). The system of life in the great monastery resembled that of the Palestinian lauras. Abraham, through his efforts, came to be considered the "father of the monks of the entire Persian Empire." He was succeeded by *Dadisho (d. 604) and *Babai (d. 628), severe men who would write collections of Rules. Already with Babai the Great the monastery lost prestige, even if there always remained a community up to the first decades of the 20th c.

DIP 5 (1978) 286-287 (Vööbus); DHGE 26 (1997) 493-494 (Fiey); J.M. Fiey, *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants, des origines à nos jours*, CSCO 388, Subs. 54, Louvain 1977, 134-171; S. Brock, *Notes on Some Monasteries on Mount Izla*: Abr Nahrain 19 (1980/1) 1-19, in part. 3-4 (repr. in *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, London 1984, ch. XV); A. Palmer, *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier: The Early History of Tur 'Abdin*, Cambridge 1990; N. Lenski, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century*, Berkeley, CA 2002; D.A. Johnson, *Monks of Mount Izla: Origins of Christian Monasticism East of the Euphrates from the 4th to 6th Centuries from Aramaic Sources*, Napa, CA 2004; Sabino Chialà, *Abramo di Kashkar e la sua comunità*, Magnano 2004.

A. Di Berardino

J

JACOB (iconography). Cemeterial pictures illustrating the deeds of Jacob are found in a unique cubicle of the hypogeum of Via Dino Compagni at Rome. The three scenes represented—Jacob arriving in Egypt with his sons (Gen 46:5-27; Ferrua 1990, fig. 44), the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 48; Ferrua 1990, fig. 50) and the vision of Bethel (Gen 28:10-16; Ferrua 1990, fig. 48)—are located in a context of the 2nd half of the 4th c. Contemporaneous or a little earlier are some reliefs on *sarcophagus fronts in which the following scenes have been identified, but with little certainty: the blessing of Jacob by Isaac (Gen 27:1-42; Ws 116,1), the patriarch in sacred vestments (Ws 186,1) and Jacob with Rachel at the well (Ws 194,3). In the illustrations of the *Genesis of Vienna* (6th c.) the following scenes are depicted: Esau sells his birthright to Jacob (Gen 25:34), Isaac and Abimelech (Gen 26:8-12), Jacob and Rachel (Gen 29:15-30), the flight of Jacob and the fight with the angel (Gen 31:1-21), the destruction of the idols (Gen 35:2), the birth of Benjamin (Gen 35:16), the burial of Rachel (Gen 35:19) and the death of Isaac (Gen 35:27-29). The mosaic cycle of the right wall of the Roman basilica of S. Maria Maggiore (WMM 11-15) should be dated to the middle of the 5th c. The following scenes are recognizable: Isaac blesses Jacob (Gen 27:1-42), the dream of Jacob (Gen 28:10-16), Jacob before Laban (Gen 29:1-4), service in the house of Laban (Gen 29:18-21), marriage with Rachel (Gen 29:15-30), the division of the flocks (Gen 30:25-43), the departure (Gen 31), the fight with the angel (Gen 32:23-30), the encounter of Jacob with Esau (Gen 33:1-16), the rape of Dinah (Gen 34:1), the pact with the people of Shechem (Gen 34:5-19) and the sons of Jacob showing the bloody tunic (Gen 37:18-35).

LCI II, 370-383; W. von Hartel - F. Wickoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, Vienna 1895; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Rome 1956; G. Stemberger, *Die Patriarchenbilder der Katakombe in der via Latina im Lichte der jüdischen Tradition*: Kairos 16 (1974) 19-78; var. aus., *The Place of Book Illumination in Byzantine Art*, Princeton, NJ 1975; E. Kitzinger, *The Role of Miniature Painting in Mural Decoration*, in *The Place of Book Illumination in Byzantine Art*, Princeton, NJ 1975; L. Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe an der via Latina in Rom*, Münster 1976; J. Wilpert - W.N. Schumacher, *Die römischen Mosaiken der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV. bis XIII. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg i.B. [2]1976; 99-142; B.A. Al-Hadmani, *The Iconographical Sources for the Genesis Frescoes Once Found in S. Paolo f.l.m.*: Atti del IX Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana, Roma 21-27 settembre 1975, II, Vatican City 1978, 11-35; G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo. Secoli IV-X*, with bibl. update by M. Andaloro, Rome 1987; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la via Latina*, Florence 1990; D. Nuzzo, TIP, 188-190.

F. Bisconti

JACOB BARADEUS (d. 578). Jacob Burde'ân, the "ragamuffin," transformed through Greek and Latin into Jacob Baradeus, lived in the 6th c. and died 30 or 31 July 578. The "*Jacobite" church of *Antioch received its name from him. Son of a priest of Tulla, he withdrew to the monastery of Pesilta on Mt. *Izla. Toward 527–528 he was sent to *Constantinople with the priest Sargis to take care of the interests of the *monophysites. But in 542–543 Hârith ibn Gabala requested the empress *Theodora to attend to the pastoral difficulties among the monophysites. Both were ordained by *Theodosius of Alexandria, exiled like them, one as bishop of *Bostra and Jacob as bishop of *Edessa. It seems that immediately upon the death of Theodosius in 566, Jacob took upon himself the objectives of the patriarch. He effected a great number of ordinations: the later chronicles speak of 27 bishops and of thousands of priests. Theodora had in the meanwhile died, after 547, while Hârith passed away in 570. The tendency of some modern historians has been to present the Jacobite church and the activity of Jacob as that of a commissioned subversive, the founder of a new church, obeying the incitement of intrigues of the court of Theodora. This exaggerated picture does not correspond to the scarce documentation that we have. One can ask if Jacob himself realized that he was the

founder of a church. He simply responded to a pastoral emergency as a pastor. Nothing remains that can be attributed to him with certainty but a few letters, and some of these were written collectively. The profession of faith preserved in Ethiopian has not yet been certified as his. The homily on the Annunciation seems to be an autograph of Nūh Libaniota. One must limit oneself, therefore, to the later sources. The body of Jacob was transferred to the convent of Pesilta.

D.D. Bundy, *Jacob Baradeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources and a New Approach*: Muséon 91 (1978) 45-86; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Édesse: la première philosophie syriaque*, Paris 1992, 23, 138.

M. van Esbroeck

JACOB of Edessa (ca. 633–708). Jacob was born around 633 in the village of ʿEndebā, situated in the diocese of *Antioch. He studied Greek and the Holy Scriptures at the monastery of Qennešrīn, under the direction of Severus Sebokot and afterward went to perfect his Greek and Hellenistic culture at *Alexandria. He was named bishop of *Edessa by the patriarch of Antioch Athanasius of Balad (684–686). After failing in his attempt at reforming the monasteries of his diocese, Jacob abandoned his episcopal see after only four years and retired to the monastery of St. Jacob of Kaysūm (diocese of Antioch), where for eleven years he taught the Holy Scriptures, on the basis of the Greek text. But there too he had some difficulties with the monks and moved to the monastery of Tell ʿAddā, where he stayed nine years, employed above all in the revision of the *Syriac translation of the OT. At the death of Ḥabīb, who had succeeded him in the see of Edessa, Jacob took up possession of his first episcopal charge, but four years later, having returned to Tell ʿAddā to retrieve his books, died there 5 June 708. Worthy of note was his friendship, among others, with George, a bishop of the Arab tribes. Jacob surpassed the other authors of his time as much through the breadth and variety of his knowledge in different fields as through his great talents as a writer. As an eminent polymath—theologian, philosopher, exegete, historian and grammarian—he renovated, it can be said without exaggeration, Syriac studies in all these areas.

It is impossible to enumerate here with precision and detail all the works of Jacob and the editions and studies to which they have given rise. It is sufficient to note his principal works: the revision of the Syriac translation (*Peshitta) of the OT (it is the first systematic work of the Masorah of the Jacobites. Jacob added numerous marginal glosses to the text), comments and *scholia* on the Scriptures known thanks to the *catenae* of Severus. Although his **Hexameron* has been preserved, there are no more traces of his treatise on "the first cause, creative, eternal, omnipotent and not created which is God, preserver of all things." Jacob revised the *Chronicle* of *Eusebius of Caesarea and continued it (from the 20th year of *Constantine until 692). He made a new translation of the *Cathedral Homilies* of *Severus of Antioch, already translated by *Paul of Callinicum, and of the *Oktoiches* of the same Severus, this too already translated previously by the bishop *Paul of Edessa. Perhaps he also revised the Syriac translation of the works of *Gregory of Nazianzus, due to a certain abbot Paul, who must be distinguished from the Paul mentioned above. Jacob translated directly from Greek the apocryphal story of the Rechabites and composed a canonical treatise on the degrees of relationship that constitute an impediment to marriage (whose authenticity, however, has been questioned) as well as monastic canons.

In the field of *liturgy, many texts have reached us under his name: a revision of the liturgy of St. James, an *ordo* of baptism and of matrimony, a calendar, as well as various homilies (of which some are polemical in character). It is necessary, finally, to mention the activity of Jacob as a grammarian and lexicographer: a Syriac grammar (preserved only in fragments), letters to George, bishop of Sarug, on orthography, an *Enchiridion* (a catalog of technical terms of philosophy). It is easy to understand how Jacob earned, in the later tradition, the epithet *philoponos*.

ʿAbdīšōʿ, *Cat. Libr. Syrorum*, 165, ed. J.S. Assemani, BO 3, I, Rome 1725, 229 (gives only *Annales* and *Chronicon*: it is true that Jacob is not a Nestorian); Duval 374-376; Baumstark 248-256; Chabot 84-88; Ortiz de Urbina 177-183; DTC 8, 286-291; DB 3, 1099-1102; W. Baars, *Ein neugefundenes Bruchstück aus der syrischen Bibelrevision des Jakob von Edessa*: VT 18 (1968) 548-554; A. Vööbus, *The Discovery of New Cycles of Canons and Resolutions Composed by Jacob of Edessa*: OCP 34 (1968) 412-419; E.J. Revell, *The Grammar of Jacob of Edessa and the Other Near Eastern Grammatical Traditions*: PdO 3 (1972) 365-374; F. Graffin, *Jacques d'Edesse réviseur des Homélies de Sévère d'Antioche d'après le ms. syriaque B.M. Add. 12159*: Symposium Syriacum 1976 (OCA 205), Rome 1978, 243-255; S.P. Brock, *Jacob of Edessa's Discourse on the Myron*: OC 63 (1979) 20-36; TRE 16, 468-70; LTK² 5, 839-840; S.P. Brock: PdO 4 (1973) 429; 10 (1981-82) 353; 14 (1987) 324; A. Salvesen, *Spirits in Jacob of Edessa's Revision of Samuel*: Aram 5 (1993) 481-490; W. Adler, *Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography*, in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J.J. Reeves et al., Atlanta 1994, 143-171; A. Salvesen, *The Purpose of Jacob of Edessa's Version of Samuel*: Harp 8/9 (1995-96) 117-126; J.M. Fiey, *Jacques d'Édesse*: DHGE 26, Paris 1997, 663-664; D. Kruisheer - L. van Rompay, *A Bibliographical Clavis to the Works of Jacob of Edessa*: Hugoye 1, 1 (1998).

J.-M. Sauget

JACOB of Nisibis (d. 338 or a little later). First bishop of *Nisibis, from 308 (acc. to the chronicle of Elias of Nisibis, d. 1049) to 338. He built his church from 313 to 320 and in 325 was present at the Council of *Nicaea, where, acc. to *Athanasius, he was very active in the condemnation of *Arius. It seems that at Nicaea he was accompanied by *Ephrem, whom he established upon their return as interpreter of the Scriptures in his episcopal city. Ephrem praises him as a model bishop in the *Carmina Nisibena,* and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus wrote his biography in his *Philotheos historia*. We do not possess, as it seems, any of his authentic writings. Since Nisibis in the 3rd c. was included in Armenia, the Armenians consider Jacob as one of their own. They attribute to him the Armenian translation of the works of *Aphraates and have composed a legendary *Vita,* attributing to him, e.g., the discovery of the remains of Noah's ark. Even his friendship with *Gregory the Illuminator and his role in the evangelization of Armenia are controversial. The *Chronicon of *Arbela,* 48 and 51-52 K., also speaks at length about Jacob: "At this time a God-fearing man was patriarch of the City of the Borders, Jacob, who performed miracles like the apostles and wonders like the prophets. Thus, many times he passed entire nights in prayer like his Lord. And his vigils and his fasts were famous in every place. And he was truly a godly man"; when *Shapur II (309–379) besieged Nisibis in 332, Jacob—acc. to information from Ephrem—saved it: "He ascended onto the walls of the city and took up asking of the Lord that he either make him to die or save his people from the hands of pagans and from slaughter": the Lord sent a swarm of locusts which put the Persian army to flight. After his death, he still protected the city at the time of the third siege in 350. In 363, when Nisibis was ceded to the Persians by Jovian, after the defeat of *Julian the Apostate, his relics were transferred to Amida; the emperor John Tzimiskes (969–976) brought them to *Constantinople. The Syro-Eastern Church commemorates him the first Friday of the summer, and again 13 January or 17 April; the Armenian, 13 December; the *Mart. hier.* and the Latins, 14 July.

AASS Iulii IV 28-44; *Mart. hier.* 374 n. 16; *Mart. Rom.* 389 n. 8; *Syn. Eccl. Const.* 388-390; BHO 406-409; BHG I n. 769; P. Peeters, *La Légende de Saint Jacques de Nisibe*: AB 38 (1920) 285-373; P. Krüger, *Jacob von Nisibis in syrscher und armenischer Überlieferung*: LM 81 (1968) 161-179; J.M. Sauget, BS VI 411-412; J.M. Fiey, *Nisibe*, Louvain 1977, CSCO 388, Subs. 54, 21-26; P. Kawerau, *Ostkirchengeschichte*, I, CSCO Subsidia 451, Louvain 1983, 115-116; P. Kawerau, *Die Chronik von Arbela*, Louvain 1985, CSCO Syri 468 t. 200, 2: 48, 51-52; 70 n. 40; LTK[2] 5, 844; S.P. Brock, *From Ephrem to Romanos*, SP 20, Louvain 1989, 139-151; D. Bundy, *Jacob of Nisibis as a Model for the Episcopacy*: LM 104 (1991) 235-249; A. Salvesen, *Spirits in Jacob of Edessa's Revision of Samuel*: Aram 5 (1993) 481-490; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Nisibis*: TRE XXIV, 573-576; J.M. Fiey, *Jacques de Nisibe*: DHGE XXVI, 706; I. Ramelli, *Il Chronicon di Arbela: presentazione, traduzione e note*, 'Ilu Anejos VIII, Madrid 2002, 53-55.

I. Ramelli

JACOB of Sarug (ca. 450–ca. 521). Feast: 29 November among the Syrians, 5 April among the *Maronites. One of the greatest Syriac doctors, a native of Hawra, district of Sarug, in the outskirts of *Edessa, where he attended the famous school, which at the time of *Narsai (exiled in 471) was of a *Nestorian tendency. Like so many others, Jacob adhered to the faction of *Cyril of Alexandria and broke with the school. Despite numerous controversies about his orthodoxy, it is certain that he adhered to the views of *Severus of Antioch and that, after having been *periodeuta* (overseer of clergy), he was promoted to bishop in 519, just at the end of his life, as a moderate *monophysite, fit for reconciling Christians. His letters (to the monks of Mar Bass) show that he had to justify himself when confronted with criticisms of the more combative monophysites, but that he did so by adopting their point of view. He was a fertile poet, whose works (esp. *mēmrē* or rhythmic homilies) are even yet poorly studied. He knew Greek, but wrote only in *Syriac. P. Bedjan published five large volumes of his in rapid succession, *Homiliae selectae Mar Jacobi Sarugensis*, Paris-Leipzig 1905–1910, not counting other texts distributed in other editions: *S. Martyrii qui et Sahdona quae supersunt omnia*, Paris-Leipzig 1902, 614-865; *Acta Martyrum et sanctorum*, I, 131-136; III, 665-679; IV, 471-499, 650-655; VI, 650-689, Paris-Leipzig 1890-1896. The *Epistolae quotquot supersunt* were published by G. Olinder: CSCO 110, Louvain 1965; the *Homilies Against the Jews* by M. Albert: PO 38,1, Turnhout 1976; the work on the creation by P. Gignoux: PO 34, Paris 1968. Certain Arabic texts were printed at Cairo in 1905: *Kitab Maiamir.* Poetic texts are attributed to him in all the Syriac liturgical books, *Jacobite, Uniate or Maronite. The list of writings translated by various authors since 1852 would be long (e.g., in the Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, in "Orient Syrien"). A Vööbus (*Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Memre-Dichtung des Ja'qōb von Serūg*: CSCO 344-345, 421-422, Louvain 1973–1980) has undertaken a general inventory of the MS tradition. According to the tradition, Jacob composed 763 *mēmrē,* not to mention his letters. The problems of authenticity have hardly been faced, still less those of the chronology of his works.

Jacob was essentially inspired by the Bible, acc. to the Syriac tradition; he saw Greek theology above all through the school of Edessa. He tries to understand the mysteries of the revelation of the Son. His *Christology is interesting in order to complete our Western vision: it is based on an *anthropology, a conception of creation and of salvation. The study of R.C. Chesnut (*Three Monophysite Christologies*, Oxford 1976) is less successful on Jacob than on *Severus and *Philoxenus: themes are considered there as *gnostic which others would see as popular, perfectly normal within Syriac theology.

DSp 8, 56-60 (bibl.); LACL 370; TRE 15, 470-474; BBKL 2, 480-482; C. Vona, *Omelie mariologiche*, Rome 1953; T. Jansma, *Encore le Credo de J. de S.*: OrSyr 19 (1965) 75-88, 193-236, 331-370, 475-510; Id., *Die Christologie J. von S.*: Muséon 77 (1965) 5-46; P. Krüger: OS 1-6, 13 and 21 (1952-1972); OrSyr 2, 6 e 8 (1957–1963); F. Rilliet (ed.), *Jacques de Sarough: Six homélies festales en prose* (PO 43), Turnhout 1986; P. Sony Behnam, *La doctrine de Jacques de Saroug sur la création et l'anthropologie*, Rome 1989; Th. Kollamparampil, *Select Aspects of the Economy of Salvation in Christ According to Jacob of Serug*, Rome 1997; Id., *Salvation in Christ According to Jacob of Serugh: An Exegetico-Theological Study on the Homilies of Jacob of Serugh (451-521 AD) on the Feasts of Our Lord*, Bangalore 2001.

J. Gribomont

JACOB'S LADDER (iconography). The most ancient representation of this event, recorded in Genesis 28, is a picture in the synagogue near *Dura Europos dating back to the mid-3rd c. In a cemeterial area, only one example exists, namely, in the hypogeum of the Via Dino Compagni at Rome (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, pl. XCVII). Jacob lies on a pile of rocks; the field is indicated by trees. The angels are young, beardless and dressed in tunic and pallium. Lacking is the figure of God at the top of the ladder. The hypogeum is dated from the years 322–360. In miniature form there is only one example, attested in the Pentateuch of *Tours at the beginning of the 7th c., and for the sumptuary arts there is only one example, in the reliquary of Brescia from the 6th c.

J. Kollwitz, *Die Lipsanothek von Brescia*, Berlin 1933, 28, pl. 2; C.H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura Europos, The Synagogue*, New Haven 1956, 344, pl. XLIX; J. Porcher, in Id. - J. Hubert - W.F. Volbach, *L'Europa delle invasioni barbariche*, It. tr., Milan 1968, 128.

A.M. Di Nino

JACOBITE CHURCH. The term "Jacobite," which was originally coined by the Arabs, has today been replaced by neutral names such as "Syrian Orthodox," or, more appropriately, "Syriac Orthodox." Heirs of a rich cultural tradition, the Christians of *Syriac tradition were divided for the first time when the E Syrian region, situated in the interior of the *Sassanid Empire, rejected the results of the Council of Ephesus (431), in which *Nestorius and his *Christology were condemned. The western Syrians, principally situated in the east of the Byzantine Empire, formed their own doctrinal identity in rejecting the conclusions of the Council of *Chalcedon (451), and its definition of the two natures united in the hypostasis of the Word. The Christology formulated at Chalcedon appeared to them to contradict that theorized by *Cyril of Alexandria, of which their two most eminent theologians, i.e., *Severus of Antioch (d. 538) and *Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 523), were convinced proponents. Thus, as opposed to the other Eastern churches of a national character (Copt, Armenian, Ethiopian, Georgian), the demand for autonomy on the part of the Syriac Orthodox Church was not immediately and essentially the expression of a national sentiment or of a cultural appurtenance, given that Severus had had a Greek education and did not even know Syriac. Paradoxically it was precisely the *Hellenization of these Syrian Christians which pushed them to concern themselves with the christological discussions of the Byzantine schools. The periods of peace and prosperity known by the Orthodox Syrians have been obscured by hard trials that mark their history. At certain times the politics of the emperors protected the miaphysites, whether by approaching their christological doctrine, as does the **Henoticon* of *Zeno (482), or by nominating Severus to the see of *Antioch (512), done by the emperor *Anastasius, who showed himself ready to accept, under the influence of Severus himself, the formula "out of two natures," or, later (531, 535–536), when *Justinian convened two theological conferences to discuss the union, and then when he called the Council of Constantinople II (553), which chose a Neochalcedonian policy. Nevertheless, the pro-Western policy that Justin had adopted starting from his ascension to power (518–527) had been full of consequences for the Syriac Orthodox, since Severus was deposed (518), the greater part of his bishops were exiled and, starting from 521, the monks faithful to him were expelled from their monasteries.

From his exile in Egypt Severus continued to occupy himself with the problems which his followers had to face, establishing a permanent synod with some of the exiled bishops of his faction. The contacts that he had with his followers gathered in the mountains near Mardin had the goal of creating a permanent miaphysite hierarchy. This decision was

taken after the failure of the two theological conferences organized by Justinian, when Severus permitted John of Tella to ordain bishops and not only priests and deacons.

The situation risked becoming catastrophic, and the Syriac Orthodox were menaced with true extinction after the deaths of John of Tella (537) and Severus (538), given that the diocese of Antioch had no more bishops. At this point, through the urging of *Arethas, the Arab king of the Ghassanids, and under the pressure of *Theodora, wife of Justinian, the exiled patriarch of *Alexandria, *Theodosius, consecrated *Jacob Baradeus bishop of *Edessa (542–543), and Theodore bishop for the region of the Arabs. Jacob Baradeus was able to give his successors a hierarchical structure, creating thus an autonomous church, which would later (8th–9th c.) carry his name. A convinced proponent of the miaphysite cause, he ordained more than 27 bishops, and a great number of priests, but above all he named *Sergius patriarch of Antioch (557/558–561).

Already during the life of Jacob Baradeus, in the initial period of its existence, the Syriac Orthodox Church was lacerated by schisms. Thus, the successor of Sergius, Paul the Black (Bet Ukkamâ, 564–577), showed sympathy for Chalcedonian orthodoxy, inciting a schism with the Copts. The schism would last for decades and would not be overcome except thanks to the efforts of the patriarch Athanasius I, who, in 615–616, proposed a unified miaphysite theology of Severian inspiration. He founded two metropolitans at Tikrit and Mosul, which he then united into a single one, whose titular bore the name *mafrian* (which means "fecundator," probably for his power of ordaining bishops and of blessing the *myron*), and this thanks to the support of Shirin, wife of the king *Chosroes II (d. 628), and of the king's private teacher.

Another schism took place between the followers of Severus and those of *Julian of Halicarnassus and ended in 726, following the decline of the followers of Julian in Syria. After that, there were several schisms of short duration, the first, in the 8th c., following the creation of a rival patriarch to the legitimate one, and the second one, in the 9th c., due to a controversy about the fraction of the eucharistic bread. Even Michael the Great himself (1166–1199) had to tolerate the existence of a rival patriarch for more than a third of his reign. Under the reign of the patriarch Ignatius II (1222–1252) there was a conflict with the patriarch of Alexandria about some legal questions at *Jerusalem, but a compromise was found which allowed the coexistence of two bishops in the same city. Nevertheless, the longest schism, which lasted about two centuries (1292–1499), began out of the territorial division of the patriarchate, and brought about as a consequence the simultaneous existence of three, and later four, patriarchs.

Beyond these internal and interconfessional schisms, the Syriac Orthodox Church has suffered constrictions and pressures from the outside. Persecuted and deprived of legal status by the Byzantines, the Syriac Orthodox welcomed the Arabs, in the 7th c., as liberators. With the new conquerors, they were able to expand freely toward the E, as far as E Asia, to acquire new faithful. They also enjoyed an advantage due to their distance from the cities, which preserved them from the conversion imposed on the Chalcedonians by the Arabs. The latter, although demonstrating at first a tolerant attitude, did not delay in changing their policy, using coercive measures to force Christians to conversion. Thus some churches were transformed into mosques, extra taxes were imposed and the duties which were due from Muslims were doubled for the Christians. The fatal blow was inflicted by the conversion of the Mongols to Shiite Islam (13th c.) and by the invasions of Tamerlane (14th c.); the policy of extermination which followed provoked a great number of conversions of Christians to Islam. The Syriac Orthodox Church lost its literary tradition, and its places of worship and its monasteries were destroyed. At the end of the 16th c. the church did not have more than twenty dioceses and there were only 50,000 families in all. It did not yet enjoy an autonomous status on the legal and civil level, but depended on the Armenian Church of Constantinople until 1882, the date in which it was recognized as an autonomous entity. Nevertheless, despite all the exterior pressures, the Syriac Orthodox knew, in the 9th and 10th c., great personalities on the literary level, and in the 12th c., that which has been called the "Syrian Renaissance," with Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171), Michael the Great (d. 1199) and, later, bar-Hebraeus (d. 1286).

The relationships of the Syriac Orthodox Church with the Latin West were established by crusaders, by diplomats, and by missionaries and remained friendly. The first attempts to bring this church back to a union with Rome, including the Council of Florence (1442), were unsuccessful. Even the latest in time, which was organized with the metropolitan of Aleppo, Andrea Akidjan (1662–1677), had no result. Only with the patriarch Michael Jarweh (1783–1800) was a Syriac Catholic Church born with its own separate and permanent hierarchy. Starting from the 19th c. other communities, Protestant and Anglican, converted a small number of Syriac Or-

thodox Christians. This loss has been compensated by the acquisition of many Mar Thomas Christians from India, of Syro-Eastern confession (1665), even if difficulties of a jurisdictional kind have since arisen between them and the patriarchate from 1902, and these difficulties were resolved only after the initiative of the patriarch Ignatius Jacob III (1958). But again, from 1975, after the nomination of a *mafrian* from the East, who entered into conflict with the representative of the patriarch, the Christians of India split into a Malankara Syriac Orthodox Church linked to the patriarch, on the one hand, and an autocephalous Malankara Church, on the other. At present the two communities are represented at the World Council of Churches.

The Syriac Orthodox Church has been engaged since 1960 in ecumenical dialogue; it participates with the other non-Chalcedonian churches in the dialogue with the different Christian churches and communities. This dialogue has permitted the formulation of declarations on Christology together with the Catholics (esp. in 1971, 1973, 1988), with the Orthodox (esp. in 1989, 1990, 1993), with the Lutherans (1994) and with the Anglicans (1994). Official declarations on Christology crowned the encounters of the patriarchs of this church with the popes (Paul VI and Ignatius Jacob III, 1971; John Paul II and Ignatius Zakka Iwas, 1984). The Syriac Orthodox Church still maintains dialogue with the Chaldean Church (agreement in 1997) and with the Assyrian Church of the East (1997), and also with all the churches of Syriac tradition, which have been holding common meetings since 1994. The two Syriac Orthodox communities of India conduct on their own and separately a dialogue with Rome and with the Protestants and Anglicans. Presently the patriarchal residence is at Damascus (since 1959), after having known different seats: first in various monasteries, then, in 1924, at Homs. The patriarchs were able to reside at Antioch only for brief periods (in the 8th and in the 13th c.). From 1292 the patriarch bears the name "Ignatius." The church possesses bishoprics in the Middle East (Syria, Iraq and Lebanon) and in Turkey and a patriarchal vicariate in Jerusalem. After emigration to the United States, Canada, Australia and Europe, the church has instituted metropolitans, archbishops or vicars general. It is difficult to make a precise estimate of the number of the faithful, since the statistics presented by the sources vary from 150,000 to 430,000. There are around a million Syriac Orthodox in India, while the Syriac Catholic Church, whose patriarchal residence is in Beirut, counts around 110,000 faithful.

TRE 16, 482-485. E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle* (CSCO 127 = Sub. 2), Louvain 1951; Id., *Le couvent de Barsaumâ et le patriarcat jacobite d'Antioche et de Syrie* (CSCO 146 = Sub. 7), Louvain 1954; A. van Roey, *Les débuts de l'Église jacobite*, in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, II, Würzburg 1953, 339-360; P. Kawerau, *Die jakobitische Kirche im Zeitalter der syr. Renaissance. Idee u. Wirklichkeit* (BBA 3), Berlin 1960; Id., *Ostkirchengeschichte*, I, *Das Christentum in Asien u. Afrika bis zum Auftreten der Portugiesen im Indischen Ozean* (CSCO 451 = CSCO Sub 70), Louvain 1983; W. Hage, *Die syr.-jakobitische Kirche in frühislamischer Zeit nach orient. Quellen*, Wiesbaden 1966; Fr. Heiler, *Die Ostkirchen*, Munich-Basel 1971, 336-344, 550-553; D.D. Bundy, *Jacob Baradaeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources and a New Approach*: LM 91, 45-86; P. Chalfoun, *L'église syrienne catholique et le patriarche Michel Giarvé sous le gouvernement ottoman au XVIIIe siècle*: PdO 9 (1979-1980) 205-238; C. Selis, *Les Syriens orthodoxes et catholiques*, Turnhout 1988; A. de Halleux, *Orthodoxes orientaux en dialogue*: Irén 64 (1991) 332-357; Id., *Lointaines et proches: les Églises non chalcédoniennes*: Revue Cath. Intern. Communion 17 (1992) 51-66; LTK[3] 9, 1207-1211 (Chr. Cannuyer).

T. Bou Mansour

JAIRUS (iconography). The miracle of the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus (Mt 9:18-26 // Mk 5:21-43 // Lk 8:40-56) finds rare expression in paleo-Christian monuments. However, the very compromised fresco in the so-called *cubiculum clarum* of the Roman cemetery of Priscilla (Wp 123,2 = Nestori 1993, 26, n. 25) seems to refer to this episode. One can still make out the lower half of Christ in the act of performing the miracle on the girl, a strip of whose clothing can be seen descending from the sickbed; the piece seems to date back to the 1st half of the 4th c. On the front of a *sarcophagus of *Arles (Ws 1,38) two moments of the event are represented: the servants of Jairus, who announce the death of the girl, and the resurrection. A feminine personage at the feet of Christ can be identified as the mother or, less likely, as the woman with an issue of blood. The scheme is repeated in a very similar way in a sarcophagus in the Museo Pio Cristiano (Ws 123,3 = Rep. 7) and in the ivory casket in the museum of Brescia (J. Kollwitz, *Die Lipsanothek*, fig. 3). These monuments should be situated in the course of the 4th c.

Wp 296-297; Ws 303-304; J. Kollwitz, *Die Lipsanothek von Brescia*, Berlin 1933, 23-35; C. Rizzardi, *La pisside eburnea del tesoro della cattedrale di Pesaro*, Atti del VI Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana, Pesaro-Ancona 19-23 settembre 1983, Florence 1986, 609-620; C. Joslin Watson, *The Program of the Brescia Casket*: Gesta International Center of Medieval Art 20 (1981) 283-298; D. Calcagnini, *Una scena poco attestata nelle testimonianze del IV secolo: la resurrezione della figlia di Giairo*: Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni 59 (1993) 225-245; D. Calcagnini, TIP, 269-270.

F. Bisconti

JAMES the Great. Saint, apostle. Brother of *John the Evangelist, son of Salome (Mt 27:56; cf. Mk 15:40, 16:1) and Zebedee (Mt 10:2 and par.), whose profession as fisherman he followed (Mt 4:21-22), native to Bethsaida Julias (Jn 1:44). Zebedee and his two sons had formed a fishing consortium in the Lake of Gennesaret with the group headed by Simon *Peter (Lk 5:10). They also had dependents (Mk 1:20). The abandonment of the activity of fishing and the renunciation of the business, in which their father Zebedee was a key spokesman, took place after the miraculous catch narrated in Lk 5:4-11, clearly intended to justify the expression, "From now on I will make you a fisher of men." After the choice of Jesus, James appears in certain important scenes: he is present with Peter and John at the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus (Lk 8:51), at the Transfiguration on the mountain (Mt 17:1 and par.) and is very close to Jesus when he suffers in the garden (Mt 26:37 and par.). The last mention of James is in Acts 12:1-3. Herod Agrippa, wanting to suffocate the new Christian sect, but perhaps, more likely, to bind the Sanhedrin more closely to himself, agreed to the physical elimination of James and the imprisonment of Peter. This took place before Easter, around the end of March or the beginning of April in the year 42. The fact that James and Peter were targeted proves that the two were figures of the first rank of Christianity in *Jerusalem. James is the protomartyr of the apostles. According to J. Blinzler (Novum Testamentum 4 [1962] 191, 206), from the reading of Acts 12:1-3 and Jewish documents, the death of James was decreed by the Sanhedrin, of Sadducean inclination, with King Agrippa conniving, on the accusation of mass sedition. Therefore he was not decapitated, but run through with a sword (see Dt 13:15).

Legend has taken possession of the figure of James, but to a lesser degree than the other apostles, given the shortness of his life. *Clement of Alexandria (*Hypotyposes*, VII, in Eus., *HE* 11,9) relates the oldest legend: while he was being led to the tribunal for the trial, he converted the slave who accompanied him, with whom he then shared the grace of martyrdom. In the division of the world for evangelization Lydia fell to him (or Lydda in Palestine?). The oldest apocryphal literary testimonies which we possess are the *Acts* and the *Passion of Pseudo-Abdias*. These, guided by the gospel, narrate the calling of James; the conversion of two magicians, Hermogenes and Philetus, was suggested by 2 Tim 1:15; 2:17; they relate a long speech filled with biblical citations which partially agree and partially disagree with the Vulgate; the tone and content are polemical. The conjunction of these elements fixes the date of composition around the year 400. The first document which alludes to the preaching of James in *Spain is the Latin version of the Byzantine *Breviarium Apostolorum* (7th c.). It is an evident interpolation: the Greek original does not contain the information (Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 1884, II, 2, p. 214). The future legendary developments are grafted onto this interpolation. The first document which refers to the translation of the mortal remains of James to Compostella, on the other hand, is the *Martyrologium of Florus* (808–838) (see Ado [850–860]: *Libellus de festivitatibus SS. Apostolorum*, PL 123, 183).

BS 6, 363-388; Enc. bibl., Turin 1970, 3, 1012-1015; Cath 6, 252-253; Erbetta II, 541-548; O. Cullmann, *Courants multiples dans la communauté primitive. À propos du martyre de Jacques fils de Zébédée*: RecSR 60 (1972) 55-68; G. Schneider, *Gli Atti degli apostoli*, II, Brescia 1986, 127-143.

E. Peretto

JAMES the Great (apocrypha). James son of Zebedee and brother of *John the Evangelist, called the Great, is one of the most important apostles, often named in the books of the NT and the only one whose death (ca. 44) is described in the NT (Acts 12:1-3); *Eusebius also speaks about this event, citing Clement (*HE* 2,9); this information is taken up again by the writers of the Byzantine area; we find other information in Hippolytus of Thebes and in Epiphanius the Monk. The apocryphal tradition is rather thin. There is a Latin tradition (a *Passio maior,* independent or integrated into the fourth book of ps.-*Abdias and with some additions in the *Liber Calixtinus*). The Greek tradition is late and worthless. The Eastern tradition can be reduced to a group of Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopian texts on his apostolate with Peter, and the Armenian is late, with some reference to *Spain (CCAp 3, 267-288). The tradition of the apostolate of James in Spain has its most ancient witnesses in the *Breviarium of the Apostles* (7th c.) and in *Aldhelm; the rest of the texts, even if there are reminiscences of the patristic authors (to a Pope Leo?), come from the High Middle Ages.

CANT 272-273; BHG 767-768; BHL 4056-4085; BHO 415-422; Gr. text: J. Ebersolt, Paris 1902; It. tr.: Erbetta II, 541-548; Moraldi 2, 575-583; Lipsius 2, 2, 201-228; BS 6, 364-388; LCIK 23-39; R. Plötz, *Der Apostel Jacobus in Spanien zum 9. Jahrhundert*: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens 30 (1982) 19-145 (bibl.); A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 432-3; M. Starowieyski, *Legenda ęw. Jakuba Wiśkszego Apostoła*: Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne 8 (1995) 39-96 (bibl., Pol. tr. of the texts on James); Id., *La légende de saint Jacques le Majeur*: Apocrypha 7 (1996) 193-203; *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*. II, ed. P. Geoltrain - J.-D. Kaestli, Paris 2005, 773-778; 935-978.

M. Starowieyski

JAMES the Less. One of the twelve apostles, so called (Mk 15:40) to distinguish him from James the Great, son of Zebedee and of Salome and brother of John (Mt 4:21; Mk 1:19; Lk 5:10) and called before him to the apostolate. Elsewhere "James" is said to be son of Alphaeus (Mt 10:3; Mk 3:18; Lk 6:15), brother of the Lord (Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3; Gal 1:19), a pillar of the church of Jerusalem together with Peter and John (Acts 15:13; 21:18; Gal 2:9). Some evangelists (Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40, cf. 16:1) mention among the women present at the crucifixion of Jesus a Mary, mother of James and Joseph. The identifications above pose the problem of whether they all refer to the same person. While the Western Fathers identify James with the brother of the Lord, the Greek ones and also *Jerome distinguish him (Eus., *HE* I, 12; II, 1,2-5; 23,4-20; Epiph., *Haer.* 88,3; Greg. Nys., *Oratio III de Resur.*; Jer., *Comm. in Is.* V, 18,5-6). Gal 1:19 is the oldest testimony which puts the identification in doubt. The title of "brother of the Lord" is never found united to that of "apostle"; the Gospel says that "not even his brothers believed in him" (Jn 7:5). Now, it is not believable that there were also apostles among these "nonbelievers," despite the imperfection of their faith. If that is true, not all of the passages concerning James, brother of the Lord, can be referred to James (Mk 6:3; Mt 13:55; Acts 12:17; 15:13; 21:18; 1 Cor 15:7; Gal 1:19; 2,9; Jas 1:1; Jude 1:1). It was therefore the "brother of Jesus" who enjoyed great authority in the church of Jerusalem and was its head, perhaps in the absence of Peter. Well-liked in the city because of the rigorous observation of the law, he was not disturbed in the persecutions against the Christians. In *gnostic literature James the "brother of Jesus" plays a role of the first rank in particular in the *Gospel of Thomas* and in the two *Apocalypses* which bear his name. Jewish-Christian gnosticism discovered in him the perfect gnostic, who reveals what is just. Flavius Josephus (*Antiquities* XX, 9,1) and Eusebius (*HE* 2, 23,4-20) identify both the brother of the Lord and the apostle in the James whom Annas had stoned in the year AD 62 during the interregnum between the death of the procurator Festus and the assumption of power by Albinus.

DB 3, 1084-1088; S. Lyonnet, *Les témoignages de S. Jean Chrysostome et de S. Jérôme sur Jacques, le frère du Seigneur*: RecSR 29 (1939) 335-351; J. Bonsirven, *Jacques* (Epître de): DBS IV, 783-795; BS VI, 401-410; DACL VII, 2109-2116; Cath VI, 252-257; E. Peretto, *La Giustizia*, Rome 1977, 10-12, 74-77; var. aus., *Le lettere minori* (NT, 8), Brescia 1980, 32-34; P.-A. Bernheim, *Jacques, frère de Jésus*, Paris 1996; C. Gianotto, *Giacomo e il giudeocristianesimo antico*, in G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto, *Verus Israel*, Brescia 2001, 108-119; *James the Just and the Christian Origins*, ed. B. Chillon - C.A. Evans, Leiden 2000.

E. Peretto

JAMES the Lord's Brother (apocrypha). Brother of the Lord, perhaps son of Alphaeus (*see* *James the Less). James played an important role in the *Jewish-Christian community of *Jerusalem, esteemed by both Jews and Christians, mentioned by St. *Paul, who calls him "pillar of the church" (see Gal 1:19; 2:9; as well as Acts 12:17; 15:13-21—role at the "council of Jerusalem"). He is the author of one of the Catholic Epistles, about whose canonicity certain ancient authors had some doubts (it belonged, acc. to them, to the *antilegomenona*). His death is described by Hegesippus (Eus., *HE* 2, 23). The apocryphal tradition about James, which is rather thin, can be divided into two parts: biographical texts and other writings. There is an unpublished Greek passion (BHG 763y). In the 6th book of ps.-*Abdias there is a Latin passion; another passion exists in Coptic (in fragments), Arabic and Ethiopian; there is, furthermore, a *Passio* in Armenian and another in Georgian. Next to these biographical texts we have the famous infancy Gospel, the *Protevangelium of James* (*Birth of Mary*); it is not known exactly why this is attributed to James. There is an *Apocalypse of James Brother of the Lord* in Coptic and Arabic; a correspondence between James and Clement serves as the introduction to the ps.-Clementine books; another letter of James is found in the 1st codex of the writings of *Nag Hammadi; there is a letter of James to Quadratus in *Syriac; finally we have a *Dialogue Between John and James on the Soul.*

CANT 274-279, 23, 184, 209, 279; BHG 252-254; BHL 4086-4099; BHO 399-404; BS 6, 401-411; G. Cantinat: Catholicisme 6, 252-259; LCIK 7, 47-51; Lipsius 2, 29-257; var. aus., *S. Giacomo Minore, primo vescovo di Gerusalemme*, Jerusalem 1962; K. Beyschlag, *Das Jakobus-Martyrium*: ZNW 56 (1965) 149-178; W. Pratscher, *Der Herrenbruder Jakobus und die Jakobus-Tradition*, Göttingen 1987; R. Voorst, *The Ascents of James. History of a Jewish-Christian Community*, Atlanta 1989.

M. Starowieyski

JANUARIAN (4th–5th c.). Concerning the priest Januarian, a contemporary of *Evodius, we know that he wrote a letter to the abbot Valentinus, who had sent some of his religious to consult Januarian on the question of grace. In his letter, Januarian held that both the *inchoatio* and the *perfectio* of good works come from God; only the grace of the Redeemer separates anyone from the **massa perditionis*. From a trinitarian point of view, his affirmation that the Spirit *proceeds* from the Father is interesting, even if a little further on Januarian says that the Holy Spirit is *of* the Father and the Son. Also noteworthy in this letter is the attribution to *Paul of the letter to the Hebrews.

CPL 392; PLS 2, 335-341; PCBE 1, 581-2; G. Morin, *Lettres inédites de S. Augustin et du prêtre Januarien dans l'affaire des moines d'Adrumète*: RBen 18 (1901) 241-256.

S. Zincone

JANUARIUS and companions (d. 303). Januarius, patron of Naples, was bishop of Benevento under *Diocletian acc. to his passion, and suffered martyrdom with other Christians at Pozzuoli 19 September 303 acc. to the Carthaginian calendar and the *Mart. hier.* Numerous *passiones,* composed at different times, narrate the events of the martyrdom. He was supposedly decapitated together with the deacon Sossius (Sosso), and with Festus, Procolus, Desiderius, Eutyches and Acutius. The multiplicity of the topographic indications (Benevento and Pozzuoli) is doubtless indicative of the early spread of the cult of the saint, and perhaps conflates different persons who really existed, but lived in different times and places, all from Campania: at the Council of *Serdica (343) a Januarius, bishop of Benevento, participated, but he is not to be identified with our Januarius. The most ancient source, the letter of the priest Uranius (432), presents him as "bishop and martyr, glory of the church of Naples" (PL 53, 861). The name is inserted in the *Mart. hier.* (1st recension). The relics, discovered in 432, were transferred to Capodimonte by *John I, bishop of Naples, and gave the name to the catacomb; from there they passed in 831 to Benevento, in 1154 to Montevergine, in 1497 again to Naples. They are famous for the "miracle of St. Januarius" (liquefaction of the blood), attested since 1389.

BS 6, 135-151; DACL 7, 2125-2145; *Vies des SS.* 9, 395-398; LTK³ 4, 747-773; Cath 6, 345-347; BHL 4115-4119; LCI 7, 54-59; Uranius Presbyter, *Epistula de obitu S. Paulini*: PL 53, 861a; *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*: G. Waitz, *MGH Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI-IX*, Hannover 1873; H. Delehaye, *Hagiographie napolitaine*: AB 57 (1939) 6-64; D. Mallardo, S. *Gennaro e compagni nei più antichi testi e monumenti*, Naples 1940; D. Mallardo, *Il calendario marmoreo di Napoli*, Rome 1947; U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; *Studi Ianuariani*: Campania Sacra 20 (1989) 177-481; *Atti del Convegno di studi sulle reliquie di san Gennaro del 16 dicembre 1989*, Naples 1990; G. Grieco - M. de Priete, *Gennaro, il santo di Napoli*, Corle 1992.

V. Saxer

JEROME (ca. 347–419)

I. Life - II. Works.

The first quality of Jerome, as prince of translators, is having transmitted to the West the richness of Greek and Hebrew literature. A second quality, connected to the first, is to have possessed and communicated a literary culture very different from that of the other Latin Fathers. A third quality, not to be overlooked, is a spiritual exegetical and monastic, sensibility, a splendid Origenian inheritance, even if Jerome probably would have been irritated by such a definition. Finally, we remark on the human quality of an impassioned soul, excessive in his likes and dislikes, but certainly out of the ordinary.

I. Life. *Eusebius Hieronymus* was born on the borders of the Latin world, at Stridon, a Dalmatian fortress (destroyed by the *Goths around 376). His insistence, in his last years, on his own advanced age has caused it to be long maintained that he was born before 331, but this long chronology appears unlikely. After brilliant literary studies at *Rome, where he was also baptized, Jerome sought his fortune at *Trier, at the imperial court. It was there that he allowed himself to be conquered by the Eastern monastic ideal, the echo of which *Athanasius, in his Gallic exile, had conveyed to him. Toward 370, after having renounced a career as a functionary, he joined a group at *Aquileia which shared the same ideal: *Rufinus, *Bonosus, *Chromatius, *Heliodorus. In these years he personally recopied the great Christian classics, *Tertullian, *Cyprian, *Hilary, just as before he had assembled a literary Latin library which would remain one of his resources. The group, however, failed in integrating itself into the local church and dispersed. While Rufinus headed to the Egyptian desert and then with *Melania moved to Jerusalem, Jerome accompanied *Evagrius of *Antioch into Syria and profusely tested his strength in the desert of Chalcis. He practiced Greek, dedicated himself to Hebrew and made the acquaintance of powerful exegetes. But by adhering to the "little church" of *Paulinus, within which he accepted the priesthood (on the condition of not losing his own monastic freedom), he made his own life impossible, whether in the desert or in Antioch. With Paulinus and *Epiphanius of Salamis, his protector, he went to *Constantinople in the hopes of obtaining recognition of the "little church" from the council of 381. Here he entered into friendship with *Gregory of Nazianzus, a peaceful thinker above the partisan battles. Finally they continued in the direction of Rome, to seek the support of *Damasus there. The quick pen of Jerome, his knowledge of the East, his biblical knowledge, his adaptability in supporting the policies of the apostolic see won him the favor of Damasus, who made him his secretary. Meanwhile his monastic and Origenian spirituality opened access to the pious meetings of a group of

women of the high nobility, whose donations allowed him from then on to work without material preoccupations. For *Marcella and *Paula, as for Damasus, he saw himself constrained to deepen his familiarity with the Latin, Greek and Hebrew Bible and to make it his specialty.

Jerome had linked himself too much to Damasus and had made too many enemies for him to stay in favor under *Siricius after the death of Damasus: therefore, he departed again, this time for Bethlehem, after a long voyage in the company of Paula, with stops at *Cyprus, Antioch, a systematic visit of the Holy Land, then of monastic and learned Egypt (*Didymus, at *Alexandria). Jerome derived enormous benefit from the library of *Origen and *Eusebius, accessible at Caesarea. He sought further to continue a dialogue, already undertaken at Rome, with some rabbis. Bishop *John of Jerusalem had embraced an Origenist theology: this linked him to Melania and Rufinus, who had established themselves on the Mount of Olives, but opposed him to *Epiphanius and, as a result, to Jerome. The tension grew continually. Around 395 Jerome found himself in a difficult situation, practically excommunicated by the bishop of Jerusalem, menaced with expulsion by the prefect of the praetorium and almost without powerful friends. Nevertheless, he succeeded in reversing the situation, in causing Rufinus to return to the West, in finding support at Rome and esp. at Alexandria, where he made himself useful to *Theophilus, not only against Origenism, but also against *John Chrysostom, involved soon enough in the affair. The bonds of Jerome with Paulinus had always hindered him from sympathizing with *Theodore of Mopsuestia and with his exegetical school, certain qualities of which he must have appreciated. Nor did he offer any sympathy toward *Pelagius and his group, although they had shown in Rome a great interest in his works: when they took refuge in Palestine after 410, their relations with John of Jerusalem were enough to vex Jerome.

These years were darkened by the death of Paula and then of her daughter *Eustochium, by the fall of Rome, by the arrival of the refugees, and by his isolation as an old man. At least his relations with *Augustine, difficult at first due to his sensitivity, became more friendly, as they did with a good number of Western ecclesiastics, who paid homage to his knowledge.

II. Works. *1. Biblical translations.* In a timely enough manner the literary education of Jerome caused him to turn his attention to the Bible, and he realized that the existing Latin translations needed a systematic revision. With the support of Damasus (but without an official mandate, as it seems; in any case, this did not concern the entire Bible), he corrected, at Rome, the four Gospels (this is the text of the Vulgate) and the translation of the Psalter (the text has been lost). In Bethlehem he undertook a revision of the Greek Hexapla (the critical text fixed by Origen) of the Psalter (this is the so-called Gallican recension, included in editions of the Vulgate), then of the books of Solomon, Job, the Chronicles, perhaps of others too. But his examination of the erudite labors of Origen and Eusebius, of the translations of Aquila and *Symmachus, and, to a certain degree, of the Hebrew original, led him to go beyond this stage of criticism and to hazard himself on a terrain in which, as a Christian, he found himself entirely alone: a direct translation from the Hebrew original, with the help of the Jewish translations of Aquila and Symmachus. In 393 the Psalter (*iuxta hebraeos*) and Kings were finished, the Prophets in progress; Ezra, the Chronicles and the books of Solomon would follow. The Octateuch was completed only around 404, Esther the year later. Tobias and Judith were translated with a certain imagination, to please certain friends, but the other Deuterocanonicals he dismissed with a certain disdain. As for the NT outside of the gospels, Jerome did not return personally to his revisions from the Greek (in the absence of a fixed original?), and it was one of his disciples, perhaps *Rufinus the Syrian, who finished the edition which became the Vulgate, adopting the criteria of the teacher and respecting them with even more coherence.

Jerome, in fact, did not always keep to the same method of translation. He adhered to the original particularly in the difficult points, taking inspiration from the translation of Aquila; he took greater liberty in the narrations; he respected the vocabulary and formulas of the Septuagint (through old Latin translations) to a greater degree in more sacred passages, such as prophecies or prayers. Certainly he did not know Hebrew well enough to understand by himself the difficult passages, but he enjoyed excellent guides, lost for us, in the Hexaplar version, which relied faithfully on the Jewish schools. His Latin, already in itself of good quality, had the privileged position to become over time the biblical model for the entire West, to be absorbed and assimilated. It is not possible to understand the influence of the Bible through the centuries unless we know the traditional Greek and Latin translations.

2. The erudite works. Greek culture had prepared indispensable tools. Jerome put many at the disposal of the Christian West, esp. the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, which had supplied ecclesiastical history

with its structural models, in a comparison between sacred history and an awareness of the specifically Mediterranean past. Jerome adapted and continued it up to the year 378. Eusebius, after Origen and others, had also composed *Onomastica,* dictionaries of names of people and places, with the etymological interpretation so important then. Jerome produced from them a *Liber locorum* and a *Liber nominum*. Finally, from the *Ecclesiastical History* of the same Eusebius he created a *De viris illustribus,* or guide to Christian literature.

3. Biblical commentaries and theological syntheses. It seems that by his first stay in Antioch Jerome had discovered the Greek exegetes, esp. Origen. The influence of *Gregory of Nazianzus, then the requests of his disciples, reinforced his admiration, and there was a time when he entertained the ambition of translating all of Origen. The controversies with Rufinus and the discovery of the *veritas hebraica* cooled his enthusiasm, leading him to no longer emphasize his exegetical borrowings and to attack some of the doctrinal theses of Origen. But until the end, his commentaries took a great deal of material from translations of Origenian exegesis.

Starting from 381 he published some homilies of Origen on Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah; at Rome he offered to Damasus, with a lyrical preface, the homilies on the Song of Songs. Toward 390, he translated the homilies on Luke, to discredit *Ambrose's commentary (nourished by Origen); the same motive led him to the translation of Didymus on the Holy Spirit, in 387–390, in confrontation with the analogous treatise of Ambrose. *The Treatises on the Psalms* of Jerome are also (as V. Peri has recently demonstrated) a translation, even if a little adjusted, of the *Selecta in Psalmos* of Origen, but we are already post-400 and the name of the author is not mentioned. Other commentaries, at the beginning of the stay in Bethlehem, entail a great deal of adaptation as well as new materials, including commentaries on the letters to Philemon, the Galatians, the Ephesians, Titus and then on Ecclesiastes. The *Hebraic Questions on Genesis,* dependent to a large part on the Hexaplar material provided by the Origen, took on, around 392, a more Hebraizing orientation and displaced the center of attention. The commentaries on the Prophets, which would later keep Jerome occupied until his death (in an order which was not that of the sacred books: the Twelve Prophets, e.g., do not form a unity; Daniel, which is not based on a commentary but the erudite *Stromateis* of Origen himself, has an entirely distinct character) combine a textual study based on the Vulgate (supposedly identical to the Hebrew) and Hexaplar translations, with a spiritual study, whose principal source remains Origen. The commentary on Matthew, written rapidly in 398, is rather quite dry and preserves the record of numerous lectures. That on the Apocalypse (uncertain date) does not have a Greek original, and he limits himself to adapting the Latin commentary of *Victorinus of Petovium (d. 304). The homilies on Mark, on the other hand, seem to be a simple adaptation of Origen. A good number of letters, esp. among the older ones, aim at the edification of the addressees and are also inspired from the same Alexandrian sources.

4. Translations of polemical works. Certain letters, dating to the Origenist crisis, also appear to be translations of documents related to current affairs, letters of *Epiphanius of Salamis or, even more, of *Theophilus of Alexandria.

5. Monastic works. On the model of *Athanasius's *Life of Anthony,* translated by his friend *Evagrius of Antioch, Jerome conceived numerous ideal lives of holy monks: that of *Paul, the mythical predecessor of Anthony; of *Hilarion, a Palestinian disciple of Anthony; of Malchus, a romance which takes place in the desert of Chalcis. The *Pachomiana* (Coptic rules and catecheses, translated in a rush from a Greek version, after the death of Paula in 404) are on the contrary faithful documents, but not literary.

6. Correspondence. Jerome's gifts made him a brilliant letter writer, rich in biblical erudition and the spiritual treasures of the East, delicate with friends, caustic with enemies, fascinating, given to extremes, brilliant in his versatility. From him around 150 letters survive, beyond numerous others in the form of prefaces to his writings or translations. In the MS tradition these do not constitute a unity. Rather often the traits are forced, but many pages are anthology pieces, which have very often inspired painters.

7. Polemical treatises. From 382, despite the bonds which united the "little church" of Paulinus to *Lucifer of Cagliari, Jerome felt obligated to distance himself from this extremist and published the *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi.* The defense of virginity and of monasticism took place in the *Contra Helvidium* first, then in the two books *Contra Iovinianum,* and in both cases, without moderation. Later the Origenist controversy offered the occasion for two works of large scale, also dictated by passion and often unjust: *Against John of Jerusalem* and *Against Rufinus*. Finally, in old age, Jerome, champion of monasticism, wrote *Against Vigilantius,* and then *Against the Pelagians*. The satirical weapons of all these works are often taken from earlier writers, without necessarily touching on the exact positions of his adversaries.

CPL (ed. 1995) 203-226 [580-642]; PL 22-30; CCL 72-78 (with bibl.); *S. Hieronymi presbyteri Opera*, 3, Opera polemica. 4, *Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi*, ed. A. Canellis, Turnhout 2000; CSEL 49 and 54; B. Jeanjean, *Saint Jérôme et l'hérésie*, Paris 1999; *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe: Livres XVI-XVIII*, texte établi par R. Gryson et C. Gabriel, Freiburg i.B. 1999; *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* . . . recensuit R. Weber, Stuttgart [2]1975; Patrologia III, 203-233 (with bibl.); Obras completas: edición bilingüe, BAC, Madrid; *Studies*: TRE 15, 304-315 (Nautin); RAC 15, 117-119 (Hagendahl/Waszink); BBKL 2, 818-821; F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme*, Louvain 1922; F.X. Murphy, *A Monument to St. Jerome: Essays on Some Aspects of His Life, Works and Influence*, New York 1952; P. Nautin, RHE 56 (1961) 33-35; 69 (1974) 365-394; 74 (1979) 5-12; REAug 18 (1972) 209, 218; 19 (1973) 69-86; 20 (1974) 251-284; J. Steinmann, *Hieronymus, Ausleger der Bibel*, Cologne 1961; P. Antin, *Recueil sur saint Jérôme*, Brussels 1968; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome. His Life, Writings and Controversies*, London 1975; V. Peri, *Omelie origeniane sui Salmi*, Vatican City 1980; P. Hamblenne, *Jérôme et le clergé du temps: idéaux et réalités*: Augustinianum 37 (1997) 351-410; E. Prinzivalli, *"Sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga": Girolamo tra difesa dell'"Hebraica veritas" e polemica antigiudaica*: AnSE 14 (1997) 179-206; A. Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus*, Münster 1999; A. Canellis, *Les rapports de Paulin de Nole avec Jérôme au-delà de 400: la "Lettre" 39 de Paulin et le "Commentaire sur Joël" 1, 4 de Jérôme*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 311-335; R.E. Heine, *Recovering Origen's Commentary on Ephesians from Jerome*: JTS 51 (2000) 478-514; G. Folliet, *Tertullien, Jérôme et Augustin témoins latins de versions grecques différentes de Ps. 71, 18-19 (LXX)*: RBen 110 (2000) 181-198; B. Clausi, *Ridar voce all'antico padre: l'edizione erasmiana delle "Lettere" di Gerolamo*, Soveria Mannelli 2000; B. Conring, *Hieronymus als Briefschreiber: ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie*, Tübingen 2001.

J. Gribomont

JEROME of Jerusalem (beginning 8th c.). From the works of Jerome, described as a priest of Jerusalem, two fragments have reached us: one from a dialogue on the Trinity between a Jew and a Christian, and another in defense of the veneration of the Cross. The second fragment is preserved by *John of Damascus in the **florilegium* in his third treatise in defense of icons, and in the *florilegium* attached by Pope Hadrian I to his letter to the Byzantine emperor, in response to his invitation to the seventh ecumenical council. The brief fragment on the veneration of the Cross does not reveal a particularly coherent discussion, but refers to the veneration of liturgical objects in the OT.

CPG 7815; PG 40, 847-865; Mansi, 12, 1070-1072; B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Iohannes von Damaskos* III (PTS 17), Berlin 1975, 194; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre* (TU 139), Berlin 1992, 364. *Translations*: Ger.: H.G. Thümmel, op. cit., 144; Eng.: D. Anderson, *St John of Damascus, On the Divine Images*, Crestwood, NY 1980, 103-104; It.: V. Fazzo, *Giovanni Damasceno, Difesa delle immagini sacre*, Rome 1983, 185-186; *Vedere l'invisibile, Nicea e lo statuto dell'immagine*, ed. L. Russo, Palermo 1997, 23. *Studies*: P. Battifol, *Jérôme de Jérusalem d'après un document inédit*: Revue des questions historiques 39 (1886) 148-255 (argues for a single treatise); H.G. Thümmel, op. cit., 144-145 (argues against a single treatise); E. Amann in DTC 8 (1924) 983-985.

A. Louth

JERUSALEM

I. History of the Christian community - II. Liturgy - III. Patristic interpretations - IV. Archaeology - V. Councils.

I. History of the Christian community. Conquered by the Romans in 63 BC, Jerusalem experienced a period of particular prosperity under the reign of Herod the Great, who built there a theater, his royal palace, the Antonia fortress, parks and fountains, and began the rebuilding of the temple, which was completed AD 63 (Flavius Josephus, *Ant.* 20,9,7; *Jo* 2,20). From texts of the NT themselves it is clear that the first Christian community began its preaching at Jerusalem and suffered the first persecutions there: a first, in which Stephen was martyred (Acts 8:1), probably under the prefect Marcellus (ca. 36–37), and a second, under the king Herod Agrippa (ca. 44), in which James son of Zebedee met his death (Acts 12:1-19). While the first persecution, aimed esp. against the Hellenist members of the community, led to the evangelization of Judea and of Samaria by Christians who had fled from Jerusalem (Acts 8:1-8), the second probably provoked the definitive departure of Peter (Acts 12:17). While Tiberius Julius Alexander was procurator (46–48), the famine which struck the Mediterranean world (Acts 11:28) perhaps gave the occasion to Barnabas and Paul to go up to Jerusalem to bring the collection gathered at Antioch (Acts 11:29-30; 12:25). After the death of Herod (44), the leadership of the community passed to *James, until he too was martyred in 62 as a result of the persecution unleashed against him by the high priest Annas in a moment in which the post of Roman governor was vacant because of the death of Festus.

This early Jerusalem community consisted of the apostles, seven members dedicated to "service" (a term with which a rather broad activity is indicated, which embraced the fields of charity and of evangelization: Acts 21:8), the presbyters (Acts 11:30), assistants of the apostles also in taking decisions (Acts 15:2) and in liturgical activity (Jas 5:14), and prophets (Acts 15:32). In the summer of 49 the encounter among the apostles and the elders took place in which it was decided that the Christians coming from paganism did not need to undertake circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic law, as had

been proposed by Paul and Barnabas (Acts 15:2-12; Gal 2:1-10): this meeting is known as the "Council of Jerusalem."

The first open revolt of the Jews of Palestine against Rome broke out under Nero (66–70), and acc. to *Eusebius (*HE* 3,5,3) it was in this period that the Christians of Jerusalem fled to Pella in Perea. They were not in the city, therefore, when it was besieged by *Titus in the spring of 70: the temple was destroyed the 10th of the month of Ab (August) and the entire city sacked and razed to the ground in September (Flavius Josephus, *De bel. iud.* 6,4,3-7), only three towers remaining erect. The priestly class disappeared. Jerusalem remained under the control of a Roman garrison (*X Fretensis*), but little by little a few Jews and Christians returned to live there, as shown by the evidence offered by ossuaries and tombs of the time. The Sanhedrin, in any case, was transferred to Jamnia. A second revolt (132–135), provoked either by the plan of *Hadrian to build a Greco-Roman city on the site of Jerusalem and to replace the temple with a sanctuary in honor of Jupiter (Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* 69,12,1-2) or by an edict, also from the emperor, which prohibited circumcision (*Vita Hadriani* 14,2), led to the definitive destruction of Jerusalem, which gave way to a Roman colony named Aelia Capitolina of the province Syria Palaestina, a Hellenistic-Roman city in honor of the emperor Aelius Hadrian (*Chron. Pasch.*: PG 92, 615). It was further decreed that no Jew could even enter the zone around the city anymore, in order that none would be able to see it even from far away (Tertull., *Adv. Iud.* 13,3-4; Eus., *HE* 4,6; *Praep. ev.* 7,8,40). It seems that the edict of Hadrian was not always completely obeyed by the Jews, who managed on various occasions to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem and also to remain there. These must have been isolated cases, however, if *Origen still mentions how, at his time, the Jews did not inhabit Jerusalem (*Hom. 21,1 in Ios.*; cf. also Tertull., *Adv. Iud.* 13,28; Jer., *In Matth.* 23,38; 24,15; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 16,21; *En. in ps.* 124,3). Jewish religious life no longer took place at Jerusalem. The historic fact of the destruction of the temple and the fall of Jerusalem is often mentioned in Christian contexts, esp. in relation to the NT prophecies which refer to it: Orig., *Hom. 38 in Lc.*; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 10,11; Jer., *In Matth.* 24,1-2; John Chrys., *Comm. in Gal.* 2,6; *Hom. 76 in Matth.*

After 70, the Christian community had meanwhile returned to live in Jerusalem, but information is scarce. Eusebius gives the list of bishops who succeeded until Hadrian (ca. 132), mentioning their common origin from Judaism: Simon, Justus, Zacchaeus, Tobias, Benjamin, John, Matthias, Philip, Seneca, Justus, Levi, Ephrem, Joseph, Judas (*HE* 4,5; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 14,15; Epiph., *Haer.* 20). According to the witness of Hegesippus (Eus., *HE* 4,22) Simon was a cousin of the Lord and was martyred probably because of the accusations raised against him by certain Judaizing heretics (*HE* 3,22). After the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian and the following prohibition for Jews to return there, the bishops were all of ethno-Christian origin. It is again Eusebius who reports the list (*HE* 5,12): Marcus, Cassian, Publius, Maximus, Julian, Gaius I, Symmachus, Gaius II, Julian, Capito, Valens, Dolichianus, Narcissus. With Narcissus the data become more precise and more rich with details: his presidency, together with *Theophilus of Caesarea, of the episcopal meeting held in Palestine toward 190 on the occasion of the Easter controversy is mentioned (*HE* 5,23-25), as are miracles he performed and his abandonment of his episcopal see to dedicate himself to ascetic and to avoid certain calumnies which later turned out to be unfounded. Thus Dios was consecrated in his place, who was succeeded by Germanio and Gordius. Under the latter Narcissus reappeared; he was invited to return to his charge but, because of old age, wanted to associate to himself Alexander (*HE* 6,11-12), who died in prison at Caesarea, where he confessed the faith under *Decius (*HE* 6,39). He was succeeded, before the persecution of *Diocletian, by Mazabenes, Hymenaeus (*HE* 7,14), Zambdas and Hermon (*HE* 7,32). From 132 to 135 Jerusalem was officially a pagan city (Jer., *Ep.* 58,3), and it remained thus until the arrival of *Constantine, when it began to acquire a more properly Christian appearance (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 13,7): basilicas were built on the most important sites which recorded precise moments of the life of Christ and of the first community, the liturgy began to acquire a central post in public life, and pilgrimages became more frequent. Monasteries were built in Jerusalem itself, beyond those, already numerous, which existed around the city and in all Palestine.

An outline of the situation of the church of Jerusalem with respect to doctrinal aspects is found in the synodal letter sent in 400 from the bishops of Palestine to *Theophilus of Alexandria concerning the measures to be adopted during the Origenist controversy (Jer., *Ep.* 93; Mansi III, 989), while other details can be gleaned from the reports of the conference which was called at Jerusalem in 415 by the bishop John to calm the polemics raised by *Orosius and *Jerome concerning the preaching of *Pelagius (Oros., *Apol.* 3-7; Aug., *Gest. Pelag.* 55; Mansi IV, 307). The position of the bishop, who had never been a metropolitan but nevertheless enjoyed a particular

dignity, was acknowledged by can. 7 of the Council of *Nicaea, where, however, the superiority of the metropolitan of Caesarea was declared (Mansi I, 670). Later, the orthodox faith maintained during the *Arian crisis by the bishops Macarius (who had taken part in the Council of Nicaea) and Maximus —who, although he had signed the condemnation of *Athanasius at Tyre in 335 (Ruf., *HE* 1,7), reconvened a synod at Jerusalem in 346 to receive him with solemnity (Athan., *Hist. Ar. ad mon.* 28; Mansi III, 174)—in contrast to the pro-Arian tendencies of the metropolitans Eusebius and Acacius, and the fame of Cyril besides, certainly contributed to the growing authority and prestige which the church of Jerusalem enjoyed also with respect to Caesarea. Jerome reprimanded *John II, who succeeded Cyril in 386, for wanting to possess an independent *apostolica cathedra* (*Ep.* 72,10), but it was above all *Juvenal who tried to make the church of Jerusalem autonomous, ordaining bishops on his own initiative in Phoenicia and in Arabia. In 431 he unsuccessfully presented apocryphal documents to the Council of Ephesus which were intended to demonstrate the validity of the rights claimed for his church (Leo M., *Ep.* 119); later, in 451, at Chalcedon, he renewed the request to ascend to a patriarchate, and he obtained this, freeing himself from the jurisdiction of Antioch and annexing the three provinces of Palestine: *Caesarea, *Scythopolis and *Petra. Having returned to his see after the council (452), Juvenal clashed with the monks, a part of the clergy and the laypeople, who accused him of having adhered to the "apostasy" of Chalcedon and betrayed communion with Alexandria (Zacc. Rhet., *HE* 3): constrained to take refuge at *Constantinople, leaving the see to the usurper Theodosius, Juvenal was able to return there only in 453 thanks to a decree of *Marcian. But Juvenal was succeeded in 458 by Anastasius, openly *monophysite, who signed the encyclical of condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon (Evagr., *HE* 3,5) circulated by the emperor *Basiliscus for all the bishops to sign, above all to restore peace with the monastic environment. Pushed by the same motives, his successor *Martyrius agreed to adhere to the **Henoticon* (Evagr., *HE* 3,16), and this position seems to have been followed by the bishop Sallustius, who succeeded him in 486. After the death of the latter, however, his successor *Elias renewed relationships with Constantinople (Cyr. Scyth., *Vita Sab.* 50) and, although officially adhering to the *Henoticon,* showed a faith close to that of Chalcedon. This led him to refuse communion with *Severus of Antioch, successor of Flavian and a fervent monophysite. The latter succeeded in getting him exiled in 516 to Aila (op. cit., 56), and in his place John III was named (Theophanes C., *Chron.*: PG 108, 368), who, after having agreed, as a condition for his consecration, to anathematize the Chalcedonian Creed, was convinced by the monks Sabas and Theodosius not to keep his promise and, despite a period in prison, succeeded in bringing the faith of Chalcedon back to Jerusalem thanks to the strength demonstrated by the monks, almost all of whom had by then returned to orthodoxy (Cyr. Scyth., op. cit., 56). After the synod called at Constantinople in 518 by the emperor *Justin to restore Chalcedonian orthodoxy, a synod of approbation was held at Jerusalem 6 August (op. cit., 60). Another took place 19 September 536 under the patriarchate of *Peter, successor to John, to adhere to the newly antimonophysite conclusions of the synod called at Constantinople by *Justinian on 2 May (Mansi VIII, 1164-1176). Later, when Justinian in 543 wanted to have his edict of condemnation of the so-called *Three Chapters approved, the patriarch Peter refused, in as much as he found it contrary to Chalcedon (Facund., *Defens.* 14,4), and only because he was constrained did he finally sign it. Peter died in 552 in the middle of the *Origenist crisis. The faction of the Origenist monks had split into two and the sect of the *isochrists had elected Macarius (552), whom, however, Justinian almost immediately replaced with Eustochius. The latter sent three representatives to the Council of Constantinople of 553 and later had its decrees approved in a synod which was held in Jerusalem that same year (Cyr. Scyth., op. cit., 90).

During the pontificate of *Gregory the Great the church of Jerusalem was governed by Isaac (having succeeded *John IV, responsible for an attempt at rapprochement between the Armenian Church and orthodoxy). Isaac, the addressee of various letters from the pope, was exhorted by him to eliminate simoniacal practices that had become routine, and, thanks to frequent economic aid which Gregory sent, he built a hospice at Jerusalem for the pilgrims who were visiting Palestine in ever-greater numbers, going as far as Sinai (John Deac., *S. Greg. papae vita* 2,52). In 609 *Zacharias succeed him, under whose patriarchate, while *Heraclius was emperor, the Persian invasion took place. Led by Shahrbaraz, the Persians reached Jerusalem and besieged it: the city was taken 5 May 614, partially through the help provided by the Jews. Zacharias was led into exile in Persia (*Chron. Pasch.*: PG 92, 988), and the abbot *Modestus was installed in his place; furthermore, the relics of the cross which were preserved in Jerusalem (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 13,4) were taken into Persia, and only in 630, with the liberation from Persian

domination, were they led back by Heraclius into the city with a solemn ceremony (Niceph., *De reb. post Maur. Gest.*: PG 100, 913; Rab. Maurus, *Hom.* 70). Jews were again forbidden access to Jerusalem (Theophanes C., *Chron.*: PG 108, 677). After the death of Modestus there were three years of *sede vacante,* and thereafter the monk *Sophronius was elected patriarch, a strenuous opponent of *monoenergism. The list of patriarchs given by Nicephorus finishes with him (PG 100, 1036-1040). He convened a synod at Jerusalem in the last months of 634, during which a letter was composed to send to *Honorius, a true and proper profession of faith affirming the doctrine of the two natures (Mansi XI, 831-853). During the Arab invasion the cross was transported from Jerusalem to Constantinople. The caliph Omar, who had besieged the city, was able to enter peacefully in 638, thanks to the mediation of Sophronius (Theophanes C., *Chron.*: PG 108, 693).

DHGE 27, 1074-1145; DACL 7, 2304-2346; RAC 17, 32-718; Fedalto 2, 999-1013; J. Verheyden, *The Flight of the Christians to Pella*: EThL 66 (1990) 368-384; *The Book of the Acts in Its First Century Setting*, IV. *Palestinian Setting*, ed. R. Bauckham, Grand Rapids, MI 1995; G. Alon - G. Levi, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age*, Cambridge, MA 1984; K. Armstrong, *Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths*, New York 1997; J. Wilkinson, *Gerusalemme la Città Santa*, Rome 1999; G. Acquaviva, *La chiesa-madre di Gerusalemme. Storia e risurrezione del giudeocristianesimo*, Casale Monf. [2]2000; N. Belayche, *The Pagan Cults in Roman Palestine*, Tübingen 2001; J.W. Drijvers, *Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City*, Leiden 2004.

D. Stiernon

II. Liturgy. The sources, not numerous, for knowledge of the liturgical life of Jerusalem are diverse and from different times, reflecting its evolution. Among the principal sources, the following should be mentioned: the homilies of *Origen given at Jerusalem before 250, the *Catecheses* of Cyril and John, and the *Peregrinatio Egeriae,* the *Armenian and *Georgian liturgical MSS (5th–8th c.), the liturgical sermons of *Hesychius and *Sophronius (d. ca. 638) and the Syro-Palestinian lectionary. Some of these texts put in especial relief the most specific aspect of the Jerusalem liturgy: the reenactment of the salvation history celebrated in the same places where that history took place (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 13,4,38-39; 14,22; 16,4; *Peregr. Eg.*, CSEL 39, 82-86). Thus we have the appearance of basilicas wherever it was thought that a certain episode of the life of Christ or of other personages of the OT and the NT had taken place. The basilica of the Holy Sepulchre, built by *Constantine and inaugurated 13 September 335 under the bishop *Maximus (335–348), the date also of the *tricennalia* of Constantine, was important: the feast lasted eight days, and its development was influenced by Jewish traditions. Further, following the numerous discoveries of bodies of prophets and martyrs which took place in the 5th c., places of worship and occasions for individual liturgical celebrations were multiplied. Among these discoveries, the uncovering of the remains of *Stephen at Kefar Gamala, on the outskirts of Jerusalem, aroused extraordinary interest (Aug., *Tract. in Jo.* 120,4) thanks also to the description which the priest Lucian made of it, translated into *Latin by the priest *Avitus (Gennad., *Vir. ill.* 47). Often even theological controversies had repercussions on the liturgy: thus it seems that the feast of the *Theotokos, 15 August, was born after the Council of *Ephesus; *Juvenal of Jerusalem (424–457) introduced the feast of Christmas on 25 December certainly before 453, when he was deposed. The *monophysites opposed it for doctrinal motives, and it was in fact abolished, leaving only that of *Epiphany. In the feast on 25 December the human birth of Christ is celebrated, while at Epiphany the divine one; that meant separating the two natures in Christ and admitting two sons and hence falling into *Nestorianism. In the 6th c. there was still no Christmas at Jerusalem: there is the evidence of Nicephorus, Cosmas Indicopleustes and *Abraham of Ephesus, who in a homily of 553 talks about the Annunciation (see M. van Esbroeck: AB 86 [1968] 351-371). Many liturgical practices, in which pilgrims had taken part, spread also in their home regions.

DACL 7, 2374-2391; RAC 17, 706-712; H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem* (*vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert*), Vienna 1970; G. Winkler, *Einige Randbemerkungen zum österlichen Gottesdienst in Jerusalem vom 4. bis 8. Jahrhundert*: OCP 39 (1973) 481-490; S. Janeras, *À propos de la catéchèse XIV*[e] *de Cyrille de Jérusalem*: Ecclesia Orans 3 (1986) 307-318; J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Rome 1987; Id., *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*, Bramcote 1989; J. Schwartz, *The Encaenia of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Temple of Solomon and the Jews*: TZ 43 (1987) 265-281; G. Kretschmar, *Festkalender und Memorialstätten Jerusalems in altkirchlicher Zeit*: Zeitsch. der Deutschen Palästina-Verein 87 (1971) 167-205; Id., *Jerusalemer Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1988; G. Winkler, *Ungelöste Fragen im Zusammenhang mit den liturgischen Gebräuchen in Jerusalem*: Handes Amsorya 101 (1987) 303-315; E. Bermejo Cabrera, *La proclamación de la Escritura en la liturgia de Jerusalén. Estudio terminológico del "Itinerarium Egeriae,"* Jerusalem 1993; Ch. Renoux, *Origène dans la liturgie de l'Église de Jérusalem*: Adamantius 5 (1999) 37-52; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Anaphora of Catecheses Mystagogicae 5 and the Birkat ha-Mazon: A Study in Development*: Augustinianum 45 (2005) 309-347.

Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem: A. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121. I. Introduction aux origines de la liturgie hiérosolymitaine, lumières nouvelles,* PO 35,1, Turnhout 1969; A. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121. II. Édition comparée du texte et de deux autres manuscrits*, Turnhout 1971; C.

Renoux, *Les lectionnaires arméniens*, in *La lecture liturgique des Épîtres catholiques dans l'Église ancienne*, ed. C.-B. Amphoux - J.-P. Bouhot, Lausanne 1996, 53-74; C. Renoux, *Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie: Le Čašocʻ*, 3 vols., Turnhout 1989-2004.

Georgian Lectionary of Jerusalem: M. Tarchnischvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem* (*Ve-VIIIe siècle*). *I-II* (CSCO 188-189, 204-205; Iber. 9-10, 13-14), Louvain 1959-1960.

Syro-Palestinian Lectionary: A. Smith Lewis, *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, Containing Lessons from the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Prophets, Acts, and Epistles*, with critical notes by E. Nestle and a glossary by M.D. Gibson (Studia Sinaitica 6), London 1897; F.C. Burkitt, *The Old Lectionary of Jerusalem*: JTS 24 (1923) 415-424.

D. STIERNON

III. Patristic interpretations. The name Jerusalem is interpreted in Jewish contexts as "God has seen" (Gen 22:14; cf. also *Jub.* 18,10; *Gen. Rab.* 56,10; *Tos. Berakot* 1,15) or, referring to Gen 14:18, "vision of peace" (Joseph., *Ant.* I, 180; VII, 67). It is above all this second meaning which is taken up by the patristic tradition (Orig., *Hom. 13 in Ier.*; Aug., *Civ. Dei* XIX, 11) and referred either to the church (Greg. M., *In Ezech.* 8,6) or to the individual soul (Orig., *Com. Jo.* 10,28,174.176; *Hom. 13 in Ier.*; Prosper of Aquitaine, *Exp. Ps.* 124,5; Greg. M., *In Ezech.* 12,25). Its name "Daughter of Zion" (Is 1:8) is explained by *John Chrysostom in a purely geographic sense: "Since it is set at the base of the mountain," while that of "city of justice, faithful metropolis" (Is 1:26), never historically attributed to it, is justified in view of its future condition (*Com. Is.* I, 4.9). The destruction of the temple and the fall of the entire city are often interpreted in both Jewish and Christian contexts as punishments willed by God because of the sins of Israel, which for the Jews are the neglect of the sabbath and the recitation of the Shema (*Shab.* 119b), greed for money, failure to practice justice (Strack-Billerbeck, I, 366.937; II, 253), while for the Christians they are summarized in the refusal to accept Christ (Tertull., *Adv. Iud.* 13,26-28; *Adv. Marc.* 3,23; Orig., *Hom. 13,1* and *19,14 in Ier.*; Didymus, *In Zacch.* 4,190-192; Jer., *In Matth.* 23,38; *Ep.* 46,5; John Chrys., *Hom. 76,1 in Matth.*; Aug., *Civ. Dei* XVII, 10); the saying of Mt 12:25-26 is also understand allegorically as a referrence to the destruction of Jerusalem (Chrom., *In Mat. tract.* 49,5). The prophecies relative to the destruction of Jerusalem could, however, also refer to the persecutions suffered by the Christians (Cypr., *Fort.* 11) or to the soul in sin (Orig., *Hom. Lc.* 38,3-4). But it is above all the referrences to the "new Jerusalem" (Rev 21:2) or the "celestial Jerusalem" (Heb 12:22), which suggest to the Fathers the connection with the church, whether in its earthly dimension (Prosper of Aquitaine, *Exp. Ps.* 121,7), or in its eschatological one (Quodvultdeus, *Liber prom.* 3,3). Most of the prophetic texts which mention Jerusalem are referred by Christian interpreters to the church when it is a matter of salvation, to the historic city when they announce its punishment: thus Is 1:1-4 (John Chrys., *Com. Is.* II, 1), Is 54:1, cited in Gal 4:27 (John Chrys., *Com. Gal.* 4,4), Ez 16:4 (Chrom., *In Mt. tract.* 18,2, where Jerusalem is compared to the synagogue), numerous passages from Zechariah (Cyr. Alex., *Com. Zac.* 15.92-93.96). The Jerusalem named in the OT, since it is earthly, belongs to the OT, but as an image of the celestial Jerusalem belongs to the NT (Aug., *Ser.* 4,9). *Tertullian mentions a tradition, which he also knows from pagan testimonies, acc. to which, during the expedition of *Septimus Severus against the Parthians (197–198), a city remained suspended in the sky for 40 days, in Judea, which he identifies with the Jerusalem seen in a vision by Ezekiel (48:30-35) and by John (Rev 21:10): this is supposed to be the church, which will descend from the sky after the resurrection in the millenaristic kingdom (*Adv. Marc.* 3,24,3-5). The "new Jerusalem," as a figure of the church which receives believers coming from every race, is symbolized by the cloth which Peter saw come down from the sky acc. to Acts 10 (Chrom., *Serm.* 3,6), while the "Jerusalem from above" (Gal 4:26) represents God the Father and the celestial world of the souls which Jesus leaves when from the "divine condition" he becomes human (Orig., *Com. Mt.* 14,17; *Hom. Ier.* 10,7). *Augustine clarifies in how many ways the scriptural passages concerning Jerusalem must be interpreted: these can refer sometimes to the terrestrial Jerusalem, sometimes to the celestial one, sometimes to both; but while he gives examples of the first and last case (resp. 2 Kgs 12:1 and Jer 31:31-33), he does not offer any example for the second, suggesting that everything which is said of the terrestrial Jerusalem means something which through allegorical interpretation can also refer to the celestial Jerusalem (Aug., *Civ. Dei* XVII, 3). The double Greek transcription of the Hebraic name Jerusalem attested in the Gospels, *Hierosolyma* and *Ierousalēm,* is interpreted by the gnostic *Heracleon as referring to the two natures, psychic and hylic, a distinction which Origen reflects, although in an orthodox sense (*C. Io.* 10,131.210).

G. Fohrer - E. Lohse, Σιών κτλ: TDNT 7, 292-338; F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine*, Paris 1952; J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims Before the Crusades*, London 1977; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980 (with extensive bibl., 17-32); G. Sgherri, *Chiesa e sinagoga nelle opere di Origene*, Milan 1982, 407-414; *Gerusalemme*: Misc. C.M.

Martini, Brescia 1982; B. Lifschitz, *Jérusalem sous la domination romaine*: ANRW 2, 8, 444-489; Y. De Andia, *Jérusalem, cité de Dieu, dans l'Adversus Haereses d'Irénée de Lyon*, in *Pleroma. Miscelanea en homenaje al p. Antonio. Orbe*, ed. E. Romero Pose, Santiago de Compostela 1990, 281-298; P.W.L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?: Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1990; var. aus., *L'idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del medioevo*, Vatican City 2003.

F. Cocchini

IV. Archaeology. The present city occupies the plan decided on by Hadrian in 135, when he changed its name to Colonia Aelia Capitolina. Some investigations undertaken in the locality called Golgotha or Calvary and on the hill of Zion have revealed remains prior to the 4th c., when the construction of different sanctuaries began. On the occasion of restorations at the Holy Sepulchre a small cave was discovered on the E side of Golgotha, which ancient documents put in relation with the veneration of Adam already from the first centuries. In excavations in front of this cave there has been confirmation of the report of the sources concerning Hadrian's confiscation of the area in order to substitute pagan myths for Christian worship: pagan objects have been recovered, among them a small altar (Bagatti - Testa, *Il Golgota*, 35-40). On Zion, the traditional "tomb of David" had a second story; thanks to a small survey, it has been verified that it was built in the Constantinian era on the remains of a 1st-c. building. The arrangement on two levels calls to mind the two separated areas of *Dura Europos: one for the recitation of ritual prayers and baptism, the other for the eucharistic meal (Bagatti, *Alle origini della Chiesa.* I, 124-129). Of the buildings built in the Constantinian era, the most imposing was that built over the tomb of Christ. From the complex, which stretched from the Cardo Maximus of the city to the tomb of Christ and which included a basilica of five aisles, a portico which enclosed Calvary and the "rotunda" of the Anastasis, there remains part of the latter with a narthex to the E and three apses to the E, S, and W extending from the perimeter, which was polygonal in shape outside and circular inside. The building enclosed the Tomb of the Lord, today almost invisible, and was well lit by large windows arched at the top. Today there remains a stretch of wall reused in the Constantinian edifices, which from the *cardo* allowed access to the basilica of the martyrium, visible only in a small fragment of the apse (Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro*). On the Mount of Olives the Constantinian church of the Eleona, on a rectangular plan, has been rediscovered at the level of wall foundations (Vincent - Abel, *Jérusalem*, 337-360; Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 82-83), having risen above a cave which for centuries was the object of veneration (Testa, *Grotte dei Misteri*: SBF 14 [1964] 106-108; 117-8; 138-141). The church has, on the side, a room decorated with a mosaic of geometric designs and, in the middle, a quadratic basin which could be considered a baptistery contemporaneous to the church itself. At Gethsemane there are plans and remains of churches built in the 4th c., including the first example of a three-aisled basilica with three apses (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 84-5), and at Bethany, where the hall with three aisles, adorned with mosaic flooring in geometric designs, appears rebuilt on the same spot in the 6th c., displaced 13 m [42.7 ft] toward the E and with almost the same plan, near the tomb of Lazarus. An atrium divided the two holy places, much like at the Holy Sepulchre. The tomb had been venerated beforehand as well. The Church of the Ascension, contrary to what has been thought, had a circular plan with radial reinforcements, while the octagonal plan derives from the Middle Ages (Corbo, *Ricerche*, 97-114). On the S flank, a little oratory rises next to a tomb which is thought to be that of *Melania. To the 5th c. should be attributed also the churches of St. Stephen, on a rectangular plan with polygonal apse (Vincent - Abel, *Jérusalem*, 743-804; Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 77-78); St. John the Baptist, with a three-apse plan preceded by the narthex, above which in the Middle Ages was built another on the same plan (Vincent - Abel, *Jérusalem*, 642-668; Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 78-79); and the Tomb of the Virgin, which might go back as far as the 4th c., with apse toward the W and tomb of Mary in the center. A second apse was added to the E in the 6th c., when another church, later completely destroyed, was built above (Vincent - Abel, *Jérusalem*, 821-831; Bagatti - Piccirillo - Prodomo, *New Discoveries*). To the 1st decades of the 5th c. one must date the Church of the St. Sion, which bordered or enclosed the building of the Last Supper. The basilica of Shiloah goes back to the 6th c. (Vincent - Abel, *Jérusalem*, 860-864), as does that of the bath of Bethesda, built partly above a cave which supposedly had been used for the veneration of Solomon already for centuries. The church is bordered by a chapel adorned with a mosaic of a jeweled cross. From the large Church of St. Mary (the Nea), commissioned by *Justinian and dedicated in 543, only the apse and the SE corner remain and, nearby, cisterns which were part of the installations built around the church and an inscription which speaks of Justinian. On the SW slopes of Mount Zion there are the remains of a monastery and of a Byzantine church, built on the remains of that which is traditionally considered the house of

Caiaphas where Jesus was brought and where the episode of the triple denial of Peter also took place. Tombs excavated on the slope of the Mount of Olives in the period of the 1st–2nd c., on the basis of inscriptions and signs made on the ossuaries, used in the second burial, are believed to belong to the primitive church (Bagatti - Milik, *Dominus Flevit*, I; Testa, *Simbolismo*, 125-144, 426-513; Finegan, *Archaeology of NT*, 243-249; Cornfeld, *Archaeology of the Bible*, 285). Certain funeral chapels have mosaic floors with scenes of daily life (Orpheus, birds etc.), and one, on the Mount of Olives, has birds and crosses painted on the walls in a style dated to the 3rd c. Many Christian funeral inscriptions of the Byzantine period are collected in DACL VII, 2357-2374, to which one, in Latin, can be added, found at the Holy Sepulchre which reflects the spirituality of the pilgrims (Manns, *Une ancienne prière*: Augustinianum 20 [1980] 233-241).

Ain-Karem, the traditional birthplace of John the Baptist, took part in the life of Jerusalem. In the excavations in front of the church a statue of Venus was found. Since the village was Jewish a presence of the cult of Venus is unthinkable except as a reaction of pagans against earlier venerations. The example of Jerusalem, which saw Calvary confiscated and the establishment of the worship of Venus to supplant that of Christ, renders plausible a similar event in the village of Ain-Karem, where John the Baptist was venerated. Two Byzantine chapels remain here, and one in front of two tombs with mosaic floor with birds and a dedication to the martyrs. Another Byzantine chapel is found on the opposite ridge, called "the mountain." An intermittent excavation at Bethany has revealed a cistern transformed into a venerated cave, much visited by the faithful as the graffiti which covers the walls attests. The results of the excavation suggest that veneration began before the 4th c. and finished in the Byzantine era. Probably one of the final suppers of the Lord was commemorated there (Testa, *Grotte dei Misteri*: SBF 14 [1964] 128-131, 142-144).

H.L. Vincent - F.M. Abel, *Jérusalem nouvelle*, Paris 1914–1926; S. Saller, *Discoveries at St. John's, Ein Karim*, Jerusalem 1946; B. Bagatti, *Il santuario della Visitazione*, Jerusalem 1948; S. Saller, *Excavations at Bethany*, Jerusalem 1957; B. Bagatti - J.T. Milik, *Gli scavi del "Dominus flevit,"* I, Jerusalem 1958; E. Testa, *Il simbolismo dei Giudeo-cristiani*, Jerusalem 1962; Id., *Le "Grotte dei Misteri" giudeo-cristiane*: SBF 14 (1964) 65-144; V. Corbo, *Ricerche archeologiche al Monte degli Ulivi*, Jerusalem 1965; J. Finegan, *The Archaeology of the New Testament*, Princeton, NJ 1969; A. Ovadiah, *Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holy Land*, Bonn 1970; C. Coüasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem*, London 1974; B. Bagatti - M. Piccirillo - A. Prodomo, *New Discoveries at the Tomb of Virgin Mary in Gethsemane*, Jerusalem 1975; *Jerusalem*: EAEHL 2, Jerusalem 1976, 579-647; G. Cornfeld, *Archaeology of the Bible: Book by Book*, New York-London 1976; B. Bagatti - E. Testa, *Il Golgota e la croce*, Jerusalem 1978; A. Battista - B. Bagatti, *La Caverna dei Tesori*, Jerusalem 1979; Id., *Il Combattimento di Adamo*, Jerusalem 1981; F. Manns, *Une ancienne prière au Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 233-241; B. Bagatti, *Alle origini della Chiesa. I, le comunità giudeo-cristiane*, Vatican City 1981; V. Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro. Aspetti archeologici dalle origini al periodo crociato*, Jerusalem 1981; D. Bahat - C.T. Rubinstein, *The Illustrated Atlas of Jerusalem*, Jerusalem 1990; *Jerusalem*: NEAEHL 2, Jerusalem 1993, 698-804; *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed*, Jerusalem 1994; J. Wilkinson, *Gerusalemme la Città Santa*, Rome 1999; M. Biddle, *Il mistero della tomba di Cristo*, Rome 2000; G. Avni - J. Seligman, *New Excavations at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre Compound*, in *One Land—Many Cultures: Archaeological Studies in Honour of Stanislao Loffreda OFM*, Jerusalem 2003, 153-162.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

V. Councils. 1. The meeting held around the year 49 with the participation of Peter, James, Paul and Barnabas, on the conditions of admission of the converts from paganism.

2. A first synod was held around 190, presided over by *Theophilus of Caesarea, to resolve the question of the date of Easter.

3. The bishops, including *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Eusebius of Nicomedia, who a few days before had finished the Council of Tyre to the detriment of *Athanasius, met on 17 September 335, on the occasion of the inauguration of the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre in the presence of *Constantine. A letter was read in which Constantine affirmed that he had personally interrogated *Arius and his followers and had verified their correct faith, confirmed by a profession of faith attached to the letter. He suggested, therefore, readmitting them into the churches. The council adhered promptly to this request and sent notice of it to the churches of *Alexandria and Egypt, inviting them to put an end to the divisions within the church.

4. In 400 an episcopal meeting with regard to the *Origenist controversy (Mansi 3, 989).

5. In 415 concerning the *Pelagian question raised by the presence of *Orosius and *Jerome (Augustine, *De gestis Pel.* 55).

6. A local synod on 6 August 518 to approve the decisions of the Council of *Constantinople of the same year to restore *Chalcedonian orthodoxy (Cyr. Scyth., *Vita Sab.* 56; Perrone, 176-177).

7. In 536, with the patriarch Peter, to accept the antimonophysite decisions of *Justinian (Mansi 8, 1164-1176).

Hfl-Lecl 1, 666-667; Simonetti 128-129; DHGE 27, 1136-1145; RAC 17, 690; Palazzini 2, 126-132; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980; M.-É. Bo-

ismard, *Le "concile" de Jérusalem* (*Act 15,1-33*). *Essai de critique littéraire*: EThL 64 (1988) 433-440; *The Book of the Acts in Its First Century Setting*, IV. *Palestinian Setting*, ed. R. Bauckham, Grand Rapids, MI 1995.

M. Simonetti

JESU CHRISTO DEO ET HOMINE, De. This is a poem composed of 137 hexameters. It begins with a dedication to Christ: *Verbum Christe Dei, Patris caelestis imago. . . .* Actually, the whole life of Christ is reduced in the poem to four phases: the *incarnation and birth, the miracles, the redemption and the ascent into heaven. The poem lacks true inspiration, and yet where the description leads the author to the subject of nature, he loses himself in overblown rhetoric (see verses 22-26; 92-102). The author is still unknown. In the footsteps of Hartel, Hamman (PLS 3, 1135), with much uncertainty, refers to a "Victorinus or Victor, certainly distinct from Claudius Marius Victor": "Utrum existiterit saeculo V alter Victorinus aut Victorius qui a Claudio Victore differat, an illi assignanda sint De ligno vitae et De Jesu Christo, certum non est. Ita censet W. Hartel" (CSEL III, 3,30).

CPL 1459; ICL 17097; PLS 3, 1135-1139; Schanz IV, 1,159; EC 4, 1333. C. Magazzù, *Una nota al carme De Iesu Christo Deo et homine*, in *Hestíasis*, *Studi offerti a S. Calderone*, V, Messina 1988 (1995) 285-293.

L. Dattrino

JESUS CHRIST (iconography). Because of its function as a vehicle of ideas and means for affirming ideological and political directions, which it moreover shares with the entire artistic production of Antiquity, the art of the ancient Christian communities could not help but gravitate to the figure of Christ; and in this sense it is therefore entirely of a christological and christocentric character. This does not mean that the figurative culture of Christianity attempted the physiognomic representation of Christ from the beginning; rather, the human image of Jesus enters relatively late into the iconographic repertory of the community, and in rapport with the elaboration of themes primarily of a historical and narrative character. The theandric image appears having long been preceded by the almost exclusive use of symbols as, e.g., a passage of the *Paedagogus* of *Clement of Alexandria (III, 11,59-60) indicates; and nevertheless these symbols always allude to Christ's work in redemption.

However, at the basis of the lack of interest in the divine face, it seems one must suppose almost everywhere the Jewish heritage of aversion to sacred images which must have prevented from the beginning the transmission of a portrait of Jesus Christ; esp. significant in this regard is an order (can. 26) of the Council of *Elvira (ca. 306) in which the representation of images on the walls of churches is categorically forbidden: *placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere*; *ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur;* and a letter of *Eusebius to *Constantia (*Ep. II ad Const. Aug.*) concerning a representation of Christ, and in particular the peremptory tone with which the practice of representing divine images is declared in this letter, without qualifications, to be idolatrous. It is certain, in any case, that the ancients did not know the physical appearance of Jesus. Evidence expressing lack of knowledge about this is found in various Christian authors: the most ancient, such as *Justin, Clement of Alexandria, *Tertullian, *Ephrem the Syrian and *Origen, tend to support the thesis (which has remained without any reflection in the iconography) of the physical ugliness of Jesus, inspired essentially by Is 53:2, in which, however, the ugliness of the Messiah is nothing but an allegory of the sufferings which he would endure. Those writers belonging to a more recent era (*Gregory of Nyssa, *John Chrysostom, *Theodoret, *Jerome), however, referring to Ps 44(45):3, which alludes to the triumphs of the future Messiah, considered him to be handsome.

The oldest evidence for representations of Christ comes, therefore, from literary sources which mention images of Jesus Christ deriving from heterodox contexts, in particular Carpocratian *gnostics, and even pagan: the report is well known (it should, however, be considered scarcely reliable) acc. to which the image of Jesus Christ was preserved in the lararium of Alexander Severus, alongside the images of the best of the emperors and of Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana and Abraham (*Hist. Aug.*, *Alex. Sev.*, 29,2). As for orthodox contexts, images of the Good *Shepherd traced in gold leaf on the bottom of glass chalices are mentioned in a passage of the *De pudicitia* of Tertullian (X, 12), and images of the Good Shepherd (a widely known theme in the artistic culture of Classical Antiquity, but taken up by the figurative culture of the Christian communities, who charged it with a new meaning) also offer the first figurative representations which have reached us (e.g., the painting of a sepulcher in the *arenarium* of the cemetery of Priscilla, the decoration of the vault of cubicle Y of the so-called crypt of Lucina, among the catacombs of Callistus, the reliefs of the so-called philosophical sarcophagi etc.), in which, however, the repetition of the image ex-

cludes any possibility of an interpretation as a portrait and underlines rather its symbolic character. Meanwhile, its frequent association with that of the *Orans* (= the redeemed *soul, now in the condition of celestial beatitude) tends to recall to the minds of the faithful the two poles between which the process of salvation takes place: the Good Shepherd (Christ) who is its subject and the human soul which constitutes its object.

The mosaic representation of Christ-Helios which decorates the vault of the small mausoleum M, or "of the Julii" (dating to the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 4th c.) in the necropolis under the Vatican basilica, certainly brings back the idea of the artistic product as an instrument of ideological and political propaganda, and it seems it should be viewed on a polemical axis as a sharp opposition to the development of the veneration of the *Sol invictus* which, starting from the decades around the middle of the 3rd c., had encountered, for different reasons and with different intentions, particular favor in the environments of the court.

Sensitive, therefore, to the echoes and suggestions of the contemporaneous culture—on a religious level, a hierarchical monotheism was developing through the elaboration of a solar theology—the Christian culture reacted to this new and perhaps also dangerous orientation of pagan religiosity, and periodically contradicted it, appropriating in a certain way its very patterns, whether conceptual or iconographic, yet nevertheless opposing the invincible sun with the Christ-Helios, the *Sol salutis*, which leads to eternal salvation.

Likewise, connected to the development of the contemporary official iconography, and with obvious polemical intention, is the elaboration of the theme of Christ *magister* among the apostles. Between the end of the 3rd and beginning of the 4th c., *Diocletian, in an effort to restore solidity and compactness to the empire, definitively brought to its conclusion the long process of divinization of the emperor which had begun at least a century before. This new conception of the sovereign, from that point on completely assimilated by the ancient culture, found immediate echo and at the same time support on the figurative plane, where it appeared in monuments of an official character (see, e.g., the sculptural decoration of the Arch of Galerius, at *Thessalonica). In this way the iconographic repertory of the Christian community was enriched with a new theme, precisely that of Christ among the apostles, in competition with these directions of imperial propaganda as expressed by official art. Elaborated, as has been observed (Testini), as a further development of the concept of philosophy, into a concept of true philosophy and the true philosopher (Jesus the teacher) as the depository of that doctrine, this theme is born, as it seems from the oldest examples known to us at the present day (frescoes in the catacombs of Marcellinus and Peter, of Nuntiatella etc.), in funeral environments, from which it passes later to decorate halls of worship. In it Christians see the continuity and immutability of the divine law, before which they will present themselves at the moment of death; but besides this essentially eschatological content, the theme is explicitly opposed to the imperial iconography—of which it closely imitates the pattern—in an extremely meaningful moment which takes its place within the climate connected to the last great persecution: and after the religious peace, in connection with the political events and ideological orientations which result from it, the concept of the royalty of the Master will dominate there more and more.

This theme would later have, as will be seen, important developments. Meanwhile, still at the end of the 3rd c., in a perhaps more rigorously catechetical prospective, and coherent with the new tendencies matured in society, the theme of Christ the miracle-worker, of scriptural inspiration, was being developed; an image which spread rapidly both in painting and in funeral reliefs and would have particular success above all in the decoration of the continuous frieze *sarcophagi. Among the most ancient monuments in which this theme is represented should be mentioned sarcophagus 119 of the Museo Pio Cristiano in the Vatican and the celebrated polychrome slabs of the National Roman Museum, the latter of which—in which the Christ, for the first time at Rome, is of the bearded type—nevertheless remain in certain aspects a unicum without further developments. In this image Christ, dressed in tunic and pallium (the costume of sacred personages), is of youthful aspect without beard, of the type called Apollonian, of Hellenistic derivation—and therefore in surprising contradiction with the idea of a Messiah of disagreeable appearance widespread in the more-or-less contemporary literary culture—and is shown in the act of performing miracles, whether by the gesture of the imposition of hands (e.g., miracle of the multiplication of bread and fish, restoration of sight to the blind man) or by means of the *virga thaumaturgica* (e.g., miracle of Cana, again the multiplication of bread and fish acc. to a different design, resurrection of Lazarus).

The changed relationships, after the religious peace, between the political power and the church—the new role which the latter, as a result, comes to

play within the state, and the new motives for conflict which were quickly revealed between these two institutions—left evident traces in the iconography, which became a faithful mirror of this situation. In this context the already-mentioned motif of Christ teaching undergoes new elaborations: still in the Constantinian era, the motif of the celestial *basileus* surrounded by the apostolic college developed in imitation of the emperor surrounded by his *consistorium* and was furnished with the same attributes. A few years later the scene of Christ giver of the law to Peter (sometimes to Paul: e.g., sarcophagus of Pietro degli Onesti, in S. Maria Porto Fuori, in Ravenna) was formulated, of which the first examples seem to have come out of the Roman sarcophagus workshops. As for mosaics, the decoration of a niche in the mausoleum of Constantia at Rome should be mentioned, with a representation of the *Traditio Legis* (in the opposite niche is the theme of the *Traditio clavium*). However, probably because of the funeral context in which it stands and perhaps also because of its imperial commission—and if, as moreover now seems certain, this particular has not been altered by the numerous interventions undergone in the past by the monument—the expression *Dominus pacem dat* is substituted for the formula *Dominus Legem dat,* which normally appears on the *volumen* which Christ is handing to the prince of the apostles; so it should be referred to more as *Largitio pacis* than a *Traditio Legis.*

In the course of the 4th c. representations of Christ among the apostles—shown in their entirety or in a reduced number, *imago brevis* of the entire college—multiply in a notable variety of themes, among which should be mentioned that of Christ acclaimed by the apostolic college, Christ who receives the offer of the crown of martyrdom from the apostles, or Christ *kosmokrator*, enthroned, on the symbolic image of Coelus (see, e.g., the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, in the Museum of St. Peter's Basilica, datable by the inscription to 359); while that of Christ teaching surrounded by the twelve apostles still survives, such as is found in the right apse of the octagon of S. Aquilino, in S. Lorenzo Maggiore, in Milan (to be dated to the end of the 4th or, perhaps more likely, to the beginning of the 5th c.), in which it is above all the large *capsa* filled with books which suggests precisely a teaching scene. It is represented in the foreground in front of the figure of Christ who, Apollonian, haloed and beardless, and dressed in tunic and pallium, raises his right hand in the gesture of prayer. It is in this period when the type of the bearded Christ, the so-called Syro-Palestinian type, also begins to become more common.

Alongside these themes and in connection with the spread, now, of scenes of the Passion, a symbolic and noniconic representation of Christ likewise develops, understood as victor over death. Christ is symbolized by the christological monogram enclosed in a crown and completed on the sides by the apocalyptic letters (see, e.g., sarcophagus 171 of the Museo Pio Cristiano, the mosaic of the vault of the baptistery of Naples). By this point, the immediacy and simplicity of the older figures had been abandoned for some time, and the theological content of the christological representations also became more and more complex. It seems to reach its peak in the mosaic decoration of the apse of the basilica of S. Pudentiana in Rome (of controversial date between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c.), where, along the same vertical axis, a triple representation of Christ is found, which proceeds from the *Agnus Dei* below to the bearded Christ-Logos—custodian of the law who is the Ancient of Days of the Johannine Apocalypse, represented as the emperor in his council—and finally reaches the jeweled cross, token of victory and symbol of the triumphant Christ, which is flanked by the symbols of those who witness to his words via the Scriptures (i.e., the evangelists).

The long route taken by the image of Jesus Christ from the era of the first representations, of an allusive and symbolic character, is illustrated, finally, by two monuments which in fact refer in a certain way to those representations in their own themes: the so-called Good Shepherd in single vestment, up to today a unique example, in a mosaic floor panel of the oratory of *Aquileia; and the image of Christ the shepherd, in the lunette above the entrance of the mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna. Especially in the latter representation Christ, haloed and leaning on a high cross of gold, is dressed in a way—in a long purple tunic and pallium, recalling a regal vestment—that suggests the manifestation of the shepherd of the nations, guarantor of the salvation which he assures for humanity, just as he, as a shepherd, is the defender and custodian of his flock. The great shepherd and king has definitively abandoned the humble pastoral dress that, in a now-distant cultural and ideological context, characterized him in the oldest iconography.

If, in this *Ravenna mosaic, Christ retains in some way—even if profoundly modified—at least the echo of his original connotation as shepherd, in the contemporaneous (and rather heavily restored) mosaic of the triumphal arch of S. Paolo Fuori le Mura, in Rome—which is the oldest surviving composition of an apocalyptic tone—the biased diversity of the patrons (Pope Leo, together with Galla Pla-

cidia) who were inspired by different programs, gives rise to a new interpretation of the image of Jesus Christ, who is represented in the aspect of the judge; a type destined for great success.

To the 1st half of the 6th c. and to the reign of *Theodoric (and therefore to be referred to an *Arian context), belong the two series of thirteen mosaic panels each, in certain respects rather unique, which decorate the highest part of the central nave of the basilica of S. Apollinaire Nuovo in Ravenna. Here in the sequence on the left wall miracles and parables of Christ are represented. With his head surrounded with a cross-bearing halo, he wears a purple tunic and pallium and is of Apollonian type, young and beardless. In the opposite series, however, certainly contemporaneous but equally certainly due to different artists, episodes of the Passion (excluding however the crucifixion) and the resurrection are suggested. Here Christ, haloed and also dressed in purple, the emperor's own color, is in contrast constantly bearded (for the first time in Ravenna) and of an apparently more-advanced age, as if the ancient allegories of Is 53:2 and of Ps 44(45):3 had found their explicit figurative transposition in this series of panels in Ravenna. The motif, already mentioned above, of Christ the judge is found, now completely defined, in the decoration of the apse of the basilica of Sts. Cosmas and Damian in Rome, from the time of Felix IV (526–530), whose iconographic scheme, destined to have durable success, would return again (to be sure, as is natural, with different stylistic characteristics) in the apses of the Roman basilicas of St. *Praxedis and of St. *Cecilia, from the era of Pasqual I (817–824) and in that of St. Mark, from the time of Gregory IV (827–844); while, in parallel, the transposition of the fashions of imperial iconography into the theme of Christ as emperor, now specified in all particulars, spreads ever further and grows richer and richer. An example of this is the almost contemporaneous decoration of the apsidal basin of the basilica of St. Vitale in Ravenna, where, on a gold background, Christ, here of "Hellenistic" type, with the head surrounded by a halo in which the jeweled cross is inserted, and dressed in a tunic *clavata* and purple pallium, is seated on the throne and hands with the right hand the crown of martyrdom to *Vitalis—who, as the court ceremony demands, receives it with veiled hands—while in the left he holds the scroll with seven seals. The throne of Christ is here flanked by two angels of the angelic legion, just as the soldiers of the imperial guard flank the throne of the emperor. The theme of Christ who crushes the lion and the dragon, an iconographic transposition of Psalm 91(90):13, which appears, e.g., in the famous mosaic, largely restored, of the archepiscopal chapel of Ravenna (6th c.), in lamp decorations, or in numerous ivories, ought to be attributed, it seems, to anti-Arian, or more generally antiheretical, polemic.

Starting from the 5th c., the Christian iconographic repertory was meanwhile enriched by a new theme in the figurative arts: the crucifixion, up till then avoided by the artistic culture of the community, certainly because of the shameful quality connected in general with the punishment of the cross.

This theme was preceded (and in a certain way prepared for), in the course of the 4th c., esp. in cemeterial contexts, by scenes which represent the moments immediately prior in time to the act of the crucifixion, such as the *Judgment of Pilate* (e.g., the sarcophagus called "of the two brothers," in the Museo Pio Cristiano, in the Vatican, datable to around the middle of the 4th c., in which nevertheless the figure of Jesus Christ before the procurator is allegorically replaced by that of Isaac ready for his own sacrifice with which the immediately adjacent figurative theme of the monument, the sacrifice of Abraham, finishes; sarcophagus 171 of the same museum, a little later than the former). The theme is also represented by the coronation with thorns, and the episode of Simon of Cyrene, who takes on the weight of the cross (for both of these themes, see again sarcophagus 171 of the Museo Pio Cristiano), without, however, arriving yet at a representation of the crucified Christ. The step toward overcoming this true and real obstacle of psychological and moral character is constituted by the elaboration and spread, around the middle of the century, of a particular class of sarcophagi—called "of the *Anastasis*"—in which, in the center of the front and inserted in the context of the Passion, is the representation of the empty tomb of Christ, obtained by the representation of the triumphal cross, surmounted by the crown of martyrdom which surrounds the Christogram, and flanked by sleeping soldiers. From now on, therefore, the cross thus ascends to symbol of victory, which therefore cancels whatever ignoble or shameful associations were implied in its representation as an instrument of martyrdom, and opens as a result the way to the iconographic theme of the crucifixion.

Soon this would gather strength from the *monophysite polemic as well. It appears for the first time on a small ivory case preserved in the British Museum, but in provenance from N *Italy, and datable to around 420–430 (and it would not be by chance that it is still represented on an object for private use and therefore not destined to be shown to the public), and is immediately followed in time by

the almost contemporaneous wooden relief of the door of St. Sabina in Rome. Beardless in the first case, bearded in the second, Christ is naked and covered only by the *subligaculum* in both monuments. Dressed in a red *colobium* without sleeves, nailed with four nails to the cross, the Christ of the evangeliary of Rabbula, composed in Syria in 586, shows a wound in the side, sign of his death, and has the eyes open, symbol of the triumph over it. Finally, in the later majestic crucifixion executed acc. to a Syro-Palestinian iconographic scheme around 750, under the pontificate of Pope Zacharias, which decorates the chapel of the *primicerius* Theodotus (to the left of the presbytery of S. Maria antiqua in the Roman Forum), Christ, with short beard, haloed and dressed in the usual red *colobium, clavatum* and without sleeves, is represented alive between Mary and John, who are standing on the sides of the cross; while on an improbable second plane and in a smaller area the figures of *Longinus and of another soldier who offers the sponge are seen in relief.

R. Garrucci, *Storia dell'arte cristiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa*, 8 vols., Prato, 1873-1881; H. Bergner, *Der gute Hirte in der altchristlichen Kunst*, Berlin 1890, G.B. de Rossi, *Musaici cristiani e saggi dei pavimenti delle chiese di Roma anteriori al secolo XV*, Rome 1899; J.E. Weis- Liebersdorf, *Christus und Apostelbilder*, Freiburg i.B. 1902; G. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane*, Rome 1903; DACL, s.v.; RBK, s.v.; LCI, s.v.; G. Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malerein der kirchlichen Bauten vom 4.-13. Jh.*, Freiburg i.B. 1916; G. Stuhlfauth, *Die ältesten Porträts Christi und der Apostel*, Berlin 1919; J. Sauer, *Die ältesten Christusbilder*, Berlin 1920; A. Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin*, Paris 1936; J. Kollwitz, *Christus als Lehrer und die Gesetzübergabe an Petrus in der konstantinischen Kunst Roms*: RQA 44 (1936) 45-66; G. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*, 3 vols., Rome 1929–1936; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952, [2]1976; F. Gerke, *Christus in der spätantiken Plastik*, Berlin 1940; J. Kollwitz, *Das Christusbild des 3 Jh.*, Berlin 1953; P. Thoby, *Le Crucifix: des origines au Concile de Trente. Étude iconographique*, Nantes 1959 (Supplément 1963); Ch.R. Morey, *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library, with Additional Catalogues of the Other Gold-Glass Collections*, ed. G. Ferrari, Vatican City 1959; P. Testini, *Osservazioni sull'iconografia del Cristo in trono fra gli apostoli*, RIA 11 and 12 (1963) 230ff.; G. Matthiae, *Mosaici medievali delle chiese di Roma*, Rome 1967 (update, vol. I, secoli IV-X, ed. M. Andaloro, Rome 1987), Fr.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*, I, *Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967; A. Quacquarelli, *Il leone e il drago nella simbolica dell'età patristica*, Bari 1975; W.N. Schumacher, *Hirt und "Guter Hirt." Studien zum Hirtenbild in d. römischen Kunst von 2 bis zum Anfang des 4. Jh. unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Mosaiken in d. Südhalle vom Aquileja*: RQA Supplementheft 34, Rome-Freiburg-Vienna 1977; G. Matthiae, *Pittori committenti e fruitori nell'Italia altomedievale*, Rome 1978; R. Giordani, *Motivi cristologici nell'antica iconografia musiva*: Academia card. Bessarionis, Quaderno 2 (1981) 71ff.; Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale, 5, Rome 1994, s.v. *Cristo* and *Crocifisso*.

R. Giordani

JEWISH CHRISTIANITY. It is not easy to define what is meant by "Jewish Christianity," both because of the diversity of opinion among scholars and by the social-religious difficulties of the phenomenon itself. We can attempt to enumerate the various proposals by proceeding in a series of concentric circles, starting from the largest. For Daniélou all the midrashic inheritance of the church of the first centuries is included in Jewish Christianity. A smaller circle, but still very large, would include all the believers in Jesus the Messiah coming from Judaism, without distinction. A little smaller would be the area, within which Marcel Simon moves, of those converted Jews who observed the ceremonial Torah *de facto*, without imposition. Others, however, insisted on an observance *de jure* as necessary for salvation and wanted to impose it on the converted Gentiles also; their attitude was decisively anti-Pauline. From a doctrinal point of view we have those converted Jews, still observing the Torah, who accepted Christ as the Son of God, born of a virgin, as, presumably, the Nazarenes did, acc. to Pritz; while others restricted their faith to Jesus as Messiah, or else as the Prophet, awaited by their compatriots, but did not make the step to a *Christology or *soteriology "from above." The smallest circle is that of the *Ebionites, studied by H.-J. Schoeps. One should also mention *gnosticizing sects like the *Elkesaites. For clarity we will call "orthodox" those groups which later would be absorbed in the "great church" even if some, like the Nazarenes, were sometimes listed among the heretics.

This enumeration is not merely theoretical, because small groups of every type probably coexisted in the first two centuries within the Christian movement, still searching for its own identity faced with Judaism and paganism. It is obvious, therefore, that the sources for studying the Jewish Christian phenomenon are classified acc. to the above-mentioned varieties. First of all come the various writings of the NT, representing the different currents of the apostolic church, and in particular the book of Acts. The patristic witnesses follow, which go from *Justin to *Epiphanius and beyond, whether because they speak directly of the Jewish Christians or because they reflect their traditions. Direct sources are scarce. Three (or two) Jewish Christian gospels are known of which some fragments exist: *According to the Hebrews, the Nazarenes* and *the Ebionites*. Among the apocrypha the *Gospel of Peter,* the *Letter of the Apostles,* the *Ascension of Isaiah* and, in particular, the *Pseudo-Clementine Romance* are usually pointed out. Finally there are archaeological and iconographic sources.

Obviously all of the earliest believers came from Judaism, and as far as we can tell, the principal currents were represented among them: Pharisees (Acts 15:5), Sadducees (Acts 6:7), Hellenists (Acts 6:1) and, perhaps, Essenes also (see 2 Cor 6:14-18), all with their own *forma mentis* and a baggage of customs and traditions in practical life. The Jews called them Nazarenes (Acts 24:5), and at the beginning considered them as another sect next to those which already existed. They continued to live as Jews in all ways since they had no sense of leaving Judaism, just one of having entered into possession of the promises made to the fathers. They lived in *koinonia* acc. to the ideal of the Essenes; they attended the temple and were observant of the Torah and the *halakah*. But they preached that Jesus risen from the dead was the promised Messiah; they broke bread in private houses (Acts 2:42-48).

Even if the assertion that Jesus had risen from the dead and would return to judge the living and the dead excited wonder among the listeners, in the Pharisaic and apocalyptic environment of those times it was still acceptable. The source of polemic with Judaism and the birth of conflicts among the faithful themselves was, above all, the development of Christology and soteriology, based on the words of Jesus himself, on the reinterpretation of the OT and on the charismatic experience of the new community. The title of *kyrios* was attributed to Christ, which the Septuagint reserves for Yahweh. Furthermore, when converted Gentiles also began to take part in the community, mostly "God-fearers" who already attended the synagogue, the problem was immediately posed of the lawfulness of sitting down with those who were eating impure foods and, even more important, the question whether they could be considered members of the eschatological Israel without being circumcised. Some of the believers did not want to lose their Jewish identity, put at risk by the acceptance of these kinds of compromises; therefore, though remaining Nazarenes, they began to form the "right wing" of the new community and opposed both the activity and the theology of *Paul. Other groups, perhaps those coming from the Diaspora, with a more open mindset, but also observant Jews, opened up both to the "high" Christology in development and to the acceptance of faith in Christ as the only valid means of salvation for all. There would have been others too who were still undecided and sought clarity in the entire question. We can include *Peter among these (see Gal 2:11-16). This is the *Sitz im Leben* of the so-called Council of Jerusalem described by Luke in Acts 15 and by Paul in Gal 2. In his account, the author of Acts put together the radical decision of the meeting, i.e., the nonnecessity of the observance of the Torah and of circumcision, and certain later decisions made by the church of Jerusalem and circulated among the churches of Judea concerning the abstention from blood, from strangled meat, from meat sacrificed to idols and from immodesty (Acts 15:20). These clauses reflected the requests made to foreigners resident in Israel in Lev 17 and 18. We find echoes in Rev 2 and 3 and in the Fathers up to the 3rd c. Paul shows himself more flexible and uses the criterion of charity toward the "weaker brother" as a practical principle (1 Cor 8; Rom 14-15).

As the mission to the Gentiles grew stronger, the Jewish-Christian reaction began to change; the Jerusalemite "right wing" began a real persecution against Paul, while others, like the community of Matthew in Syria, while distancing themselves from the domination of the Pharisees after the year 70, reflected an open Jewish Christianity which gave a spiritual interpretation to the Torah on the model of Jesus' preaching. They accepted both the virgin birth and the divine Sonship of Christ. The Jewish Christianity reflected in the letters of Jude is apocalyptic; in the letter of James which speaks of "royal law" and "law of liberty" (1:25; 2:8) hints of polemic are found against certain Pauline assertions interpreted in a libertine sense. But extent to which a Jewish-Christian mind could rise to a high Christology and a vicarious soteriology emerges in the letter to the Hebrews, which includes a midrash of *Alexandrian type to convince a community, certainly of Jewish origin, to remain strong in the faith, which did not sacrifice anything inherited from the OT but rather completed and elevated it. 2 Peter, of the Petrine current, reconciles the Jewish Christianity of Jude with a prudent recommendation of the Pauline letters (2 Pet 3:16) and therefore has a high "canonical" value.

In the meantime the reaction of the synagogue against the Christian movement was becoming violent. James was killed, and the accusations made against Stephen in Acts 7, those of antinomianism and contempt for the temple, mirror the preaching of the Hellenists, first object of the persecution. The culmination was reached when, in the 90s, the twelfth of the eighteen blessings was rewritten to include the cursing of the *minim* and the *nozrim*. Such an action caused confusion among the believing Jews who felt themselves formally excluded from the synagogue, and some even returned there.

This situation is reflected well in the Fourth Gospel, the principal document of the Johannine community, which was primarily Jewish Christian, at

least initially. The diffidence toward Jesus shown by the "Jews who had believed in him" (Jn 2:23-25; 8:31-37) and his insistence to "remain in me" (8:31, 56; 15:4, 7) probably indicate either those of the community who had trouble accepting the high Johannine Christology or those who, shocked by the *birkat ha-minim,* had gone back to the synagogue. In fact, after the discourse on the bread come down from heaven in ch. 6 it is said explicitly that some found these words too hard and did not walk with him any more (6:60-70). It was "Peter and the Twelve" (the Great Church) who saved the situation. There were, however, other Jews who, like Nicodemus, were attracted to Christianity, partly because of the miracles which they saw, but were afraid to take the last step and receive baptism (3:3-8). This transition in both directions continued throughout the 2nd c. Therefore, while the Pauline scandal for the Jewish Christians was the nonnecessity of the law for salvation, the Johannine scandal was his Christology. However, an overly exaggerated Paulinism led to *Marcion, and Johannism taken too far finished in *docetism and *gnosticism. The most closed-minded Jewish Christians finished in Ebionitism.

One may ask, therefore, what the criterion was of the absorption of the moderates into the principal current of Christianity; or must we speak only of "Christianities" in the 1st c.? It is undeniable that different theologies existed, but if there were trajectories which finished in heterodoxy, there was also a kerygmatic backbone common to all the currents of which the terminus ad quem was the *regula fidei* announced by *Irenaeus, *Tertullian and others. The fact of the formation of the canon of the NT is not only a fact of history but also, and more so, theological. Assembling these books, of both Jewish-Christian and ethnic origin, presupposed a criterion of selection and parameters acc. to which a practice or a doctrine was or was not acceptable for the church. That is to say, a mutual relationship exists between the canonical selection and the rule of faith. In the 1st c. the ecclesial faith was still in development: one might run too far, remain behind or turn aside. The Ebionites suffocated in their rigidity, while the Nazarenes, although still insisting on a strict observance of the law, succeeded in keeping pace, avoiding the exclusivity of the former. Why, then, does *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 29) list them among the heretics even without accusing them of any erroneous doctrine? The most likely response, which is also valid for the Fathers prior to Epiphanius who reveal themselves dissatisfied with the Jewish Christians, is found in the fact of the continued attraction of the synagogue, with its symbolic rites, for the Christians, even those of Gentile origin. Much of the so-called anti-Semitism of the Fathers, even that of *John Chrysostom, was directed toward those Christians who were sitting on the fence and finished by being neither Jews nor Christians. Justin (*Dialogue* 47) expressed a moderate personal judgment on those who still practiced the law, but also mentions that others have a different opinion. And while the abstinence from meat sacrificed to idols prescribed in Acts 15 remained in vigor for the Fathers up to the *Apostolic Constitutions,* the observance of the Torah was so disapproved that even St. Thomas Aquinas, in his era, considered it a grave sin (*ST* 1-2, q 103, a 4).

H.-J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen 1949; M. Simon, *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire Roman*, Paris 1964; A.F.J. Klijn - G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*, Leiden 1973; R. Murray, *Defining Jewish-Christianity*: Heythrop Journal 15 (1974) 303-310; S.K. Riegel, *Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology*: NTS 24 (1977-78) 410-415; F. Manns, *Bibliographie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Jerusalem 1978; R.E. Brown, *Not Jewish-Christianity and Gentile-Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity*: CBQ 45 (1983) 74-79; R.A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity*, Jerusalem 1988; LTK[3] 5, 1049-1051; S.C. Mimouni, *Le Judéochristianisme ancien, essais historiques*, Paris 1998; F. Manns, *L'Israele di Dio*, Bologna 1998; G. Filoramo - C. Giannotto (ed.), *Verus Israel*, Brescia 2001; F. Blanchetière, *Enquête sur les racines juives du mouvement chrétien*, Paris 2001; var. aus., *Le Judéo-Christianisme dans tous ses états.* Actes du colloque de Jérusalem 6-10 juillet 1998, Jerusalem 2001; var. aus., *Il giudeocristianesimo* (Ricerche storico bibliche), Bologna 2002.

P. Grech

JOB

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. Although it seems that the figure of Job is almost absent from the works of the Fathers of the first two centuries (Clem. Rom., *Corinth.* 26 names him as a witness to the resurrection), with *Clement of *Alexandria in the East and *Cyprian of *Carthage in the West, the references to this personage, and therefore to the biblical book which bears his name and tells his story, begin to become frequent. Clement uses Job 28:22 to support the faith in the *descent of Christ to hell (*Strom.* VI, 45,1-2), while Cyprian presents Job above all as an example of humility, patience, generosity and endurance of sufferings understood as tests for the just (*Testim.* III, 1,6,14,54; *Op. et. elem.* 18). This use of the text and personage will return in other Fathers (Basil., *Ep.* 2,3; *Hom.* 20,7; *Hom. De grat.* 6; *Hom. Quod Deus* 5; John Chrys., *Hom. 10,4 in I Cor.* and the

entire work of Ambrose *Interpell. Job et Dav.*). Along these lines is the work in 35 books of *Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job,* a true and proper manual of ascetic theology where Job also becomes a "type" of Christ and of the church. *Origen, from whom no complete commentary on the book of Job remains (an echo of his interpretation seems to be found in the very few fragments of a *Tractatus in Job* of Hilary, see Jer., *Vir. ill.* 100), abundantly cites numerous passages from it. Job 14:4-5 occupies a special place in his works, always cited to demonstrate the difference between Christ and other humans concerning sin (*Hom. 8,3 in Lev.*; *Hom. 3,2 in Num.*; *Hom. 3,2 in Is.*; *Hom. 14 in Lc.*; *Comm. Rom.* 5,1.5.9; 7,18). This verse was taken up again by *Augustine, who found support here for his anti-*Pelagian doctrine on the universality of sin in every human being (*Cont. Jul.* V, 13,49; VI, 24,78; 26,83; *Cont. duas epist. pel.* IV, 4,4; 10,27; 11,31. On Job see also the *Adn. in Job*: CSEL 28/3, 509-628).

The discovery of the papyri of Tura has allowed the recovery of the first part of the commentary of *Didymus on the book of Job, relating to chaps. 1-11, even if it is filled with lacunae (see Didymos der Blinde, *Kommentar zu Hiob*, 3 vols., Bonn 1968) (*see* *Wisdom books).

DSp 8, 1218-1225 (with large bibl.); R. Draguet, *Un commentaire grec arien sur Job*: RHE 20 (1924) 38-65; G. Folliet, *Le fragment d'Hilaire "Quas Job litteras . . .". Son interprétation d'après Hilaire, Pélage et Augustin*, in *Hilaire et son temps*, Paris 1969, 149-158; D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*, PTS 14, Berlin 1973; G. Pani, *Una citazione di Lutero dal libro di Giobbe*: SSR 2 (1978) 367-380; W. Geerlings, *Hiob und Paulus. Theodicee und Paulinismus in der Theologie am Ausgang des vierten Jahrhunderts*: JbAC 24 (1981) 56-66; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme dans l'histoire de la patience chrétienne*: MSR 39 (1982) 101-130; J. Doignon, *Blessure d'affliction et blessure d'amour* (*Moralia 6,42*)*; une jonction de thémes de la spiritualité patristique de Cyprien á Augustin*, in *Grégoire le Grand*, Paris 1986, 297-303; J. Ziegler, *Iob 14,4-5a als wichtigster Schriftbeweis für die These "Neminem sine sorde et sine peccato esse"* (*Cyprian, Test 3, 54*)*, bei den lateinischen christlichen Schriftstellern*, Munich 1985; var. aus., *Le Livre de Job chez les Pères*, Strasbourg 1996; M. Perraymond, *La figura di Giobbe nella cultura paleocristiana tra esegesi patristica e manifestazioni iconografiche*, Vatican City 2002; *Job*: ACCS OT 6, ed. M. Simonetti - M. Conti, Downers Grove, IL 2006.

M.G. Mara

II. Iconography. The biblical personage, protagonist of the homonymous book of the OT, occurs in the paleo-Christian figurative repertoire as a prototype of every virtue and, in particular, a symbol of patience, of resignation to divine will and of the resurrection. The scene appears in about twenty Roman cemeterial pictures (some now lost) and in one in the mausoleum of the Exodus in El-Bagawat in Egypt. The oldest known example seems to be from the 2nd half of the 3rd c. (Wp 56), while the majority of the other frescoes date to the course of the 4th c. (only that of El-Bagawat dates to the 5th c.). Often the patriarch is alone, resigned and covered in sores, seated on the dunghill (Job 2:8), which usually resembles a rock or a bench. Sometimes his wife flanks him, covers her nose with the edge of her garment (Job 19:17) and pushes food to him with a cane (though this detail is unknown to the biblical text). Only at El-Bagawat are the three friends who come to visit the patriarch found (Job 2:11ff.). The scene is also attested in around a dozen Italic and Gallic *sarcophagi of the pre-Constantinian era (Job seated, his wife who pushes him food, a friend in the background). But Job should not be considered the figure found in a controversial scene (held by others to be the *cathedra Petri*) on a sarcophagus of the Museo Pio Cristiano (Ws 189). The patriarch is later represented in a gilded glass, now lost, of Neuss (Cologne), of which there survives a poor reproduction. In the Codex of Rabbula (586) and in other MSS, although the scene remains the same, numerous iconographic variants have been identified.

DACL VII, 2, 2554-2570; EC VI, 113; LCI II, 407-414; Le Blant, Sarc., 63, n. 61; 17, n. 17; 25, n. 35; H. Omont, *Peintures de l'Ancien Testament dans un manuscrit syriaque du VII[e] au VIII[e] siècle*: Monuments Piot XVIII (1909), 92, pl. VI, 5; G. Wilpert, *Restauri di sculture antiche e antichità moderne*: RivAC 4 (1927) 72-73; Ws 13,142, 1,2,3; 187,6; 189; Cecchelli, Rabb. Gosp., 79-82, f. 7 a; Ferrua, *Via Latina*, pls. VI, 1; C; LVIII, 2; M. Thérel, *La composition et le symbolisme de l'iconografie du Mausolée de l'Exode à El Bagawat*: RivAC 45 (1969) 228ff.; P. Porta, *Il sarcofago paleocristiano frammentario a colonne del Museo Cristiano di Brescia*: Atti III CongrNazArch-Christ, Trieste 1974, 333-345; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse and Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 273-279; 406-407; M. Perraymond, *L'iconografia di Giobbe nella catechesi dei primi secoli*: Bessarione 5 (1986) 175-193; M. Perraymond, *Giobbe* (s.v.), in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 190-191; M. Perraymond, *Giobbe: annotazioni iconografiche e tradizione esegetica*: Studi e materiali di Storia delle Religioni 67 (2001) 229-252; M. Perraymond, *La figura di Giobbe nella cultura paleocristiana tra esegesi patristica e manifestazioni iconografiche*, Vatican City 2002.

M. Perraymond

JOBIUS. Monk and Byzantine theologian (6th c.). We know nothing about this person, inasmuch as *Photius, the only source, limits himself to the work without saying anything about the author (*Bibl.*, cod. 232). He wrote a (lost) treatise *Against Severus* (of Antioch), simply mentioned by Photius, who on the other hand minutely describes and cites the other treatise (Οἰκονομικὴ πραγματεία) on the *incarna-

tion with particular attention to the motive and the difficulties of the mystery. According to Photius, Jobius, skilled at posing problems, is not so skilled at resolving them. Nevertheless, this work, of which other fragments have been transmitted by scriptural *catenae, constitutes evidence for the Byzantine theology at the *Justinian era which cannot be ignored.

CPG 6984; PG 103, 736-829; 86, 3313-3320. R. Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, III, Paris 1964, 153-227; DTC 8, 1486-1487; Beck 383; Grillmeier 2/2, 255.

D. Stiernon

JOBIUS the Apollinarist (end of 4th c.). He is known as a bishop from his signature on a brief text that *Leontius of Byzantium preserves for us as a *tomus synodalis* of a group of moderate *Apollinarists. Leontius cites from a treatise that he has seen, by a certain *Valentinus, precisely on the moderate group of Apollinaris's disciples. The text signed by Jobius consists in a brief confession of faith which does not lack particular nuances: the idea is refuted there of the flesh of Christ only as a covering for the Logos; a single nature is not affirmed; on the contrary, the text is based on explicit *dyophysite positions. In another fragment from Valentinus, given by Leontius, Jobius appears among those who find themselves in disagreement with the catechesis of *Timothy, head of the radical Apollinarist group.

CPG II, 3730; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinarios von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 157; frs. 286-287; 278-279; DTC 8, 1486.

E. Cavalcanti

JOHANNITES. Despite the explicit injunction of *John Chrysostom not to take his deposition as a pretext to divide the church (see Pall., *Dial.* 10), at *Constantinople a compact group of his followers contested the legitimacy of his successors *Arsacius and *Atticus. A similar phenomenon occurred at *Antioch against the bishop *Porphyry, imposed by the adversaries of Chrysostom at the death of *Flavian (404). The schism of the Johannites was reconciled in part with the official church around 417–418, when Chrysostom's name was reintegrated into the diptychs, but was completed only in 438, under *Proclus, with the triumphant return of the relics of the saint to Constantinople. The creation of the first corpus of Chrysostom's writings (already adulterated with the works of other authors) and the composition of spurious works aimed at obtaining the return of Chrysostom from exile and/or his rehabilitation are due to the Johannite milieu. The Antiochene Johannites seem to have played a similar role. Among the Johannite writings the *Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom* by the deacon Cosmas (ps.-Martyrius of Antioch) stands out.

T.D. Barnes, *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom* (BHG3 *871* = CPG *6517*): StP 37, 328-345; S.J. Voicu, *"Furono chiamati giovanniti . . .". Un'ipotesi sulla nascita del corpus pseudocrisostomico*, in *Philomathestatos: Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. B. Janssens - B. Roosen - P. Van Deun, OLA 137, Leuven 2004, 701-711.

S.J. Voicu

JOHN, deacon. In the 2nd half of the 6th c. the Roman deacon John composed an *Expositum in Heptateuchum,* a patristic *florilegium whose usefulness consists in having preserved fragments of ancient Christian texts, otherwise lost. G. Morin (*Jean Diacre et le pseudo-Jérôme*, 116-117) advances the hypothesis that this John could have published the ps.-Hieronymian revision of the commentary of *Pelagius on the Pauline letters, or that its author was the other John, a Roman deacon, who with all probability occupied the pontifical throne from 523 to 526 (but see the ed. of the above-mentioned ps.-Hieronymian revision, ed. A. Souter, in TSt IX, 3 [1931] VIIIf., concerning this). It seems that the same John, author of the *Expositum,* edited a *Collectanea* on the four gospels, and that perhaps he translated into *Latin the sixth book of the *Vitae Patrum,* while still a subdeacon.

CPL 951-952; *Expositum, in Heptateuchum*: fragm. in J.B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, I, Paris 1852, LV–LXIV; 278-301; *Analecta sacra et classica*, V (1), Paris 1888, 165-176; G. Morin, *Jean Diacre et le pseudo-Jérôme sur les épîtres de S. Paul*: RBen 27 (1910) 113-117.

S. Zincone

JOHN, evangelist and theologian. 1. The gospels (particularly John) and the Acts of the Apostles give us much information on John the Evangelist (called *Boanerges,* "son of thunder"), brother of *James, son of Zebedee, beloved disciple of the Lord, witness to the Transfiguration and to the prayer in the Garden of Olives; alone among the apostles he was under the cross, and to him Jesus confided his Mother; after the resurrection Jesus pronounced mysterious words on his long life (Jn 21:20-23).

Many writers of the patristic period speak of his life. His mission has been linked with Asia Minor and with *Ephesus, acc. to *Irenaeus, *Clement of

Alexandria and *Polycrates of Ephesus. According to legend, he suffered the persecutions of *Domitian and was led to *Rome, where he was put in a barrel of boiling oil (Tertullian, *De praescr.* 36; *Acts of John* of Prochorus) and passed a certain period of time relegated to the island of Patmos. *Papias distinguishes two Johns: the apostle, author of the gospel, and the presbyter, author of the Apocalypse and of the letters (Eusebius, *HE* 3,39,3). The patristic writers cite various episodes of his life—e.g., his encounter with *Cerinthus (*HE* 4,14,6), the story of his young disciple becoming a brigand (Clem. Alex., *Quis dives* 42) etc.

BS 6, 757-797; LCIK 7, 108-130; BHG 899-932; BHL 4316-4328; LTK³ 5, 866-871; W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*, Giessen 1932; M. Jugie, *La mort et l'assomption de S. Jean l'Evangéliste*, in Id., *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vierge*, Vatican City 1944, 710-726; F.M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1959; A. Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannes-Evangelium*, Oslo 1959; J. Colson, *L'énigme du disciple que Jésus aimait*, Paris 1969; M.E. Boismard, *Le martyre de Jean l'Apôtre*, Paris 1966; O. Cullmann, *Der joh. Kreis*, Tübingen 1975.

2. The ample patristic literature concerning John the apostle, called in Greek "the theologian," can be divided into three parts: (a) commentaries on biblical books under his name, i.e., on the gospel, on the three letters and on the Apocalypse; (b) homiletic texts on John; (c) texts concerning the life of John, in particular apocryphal texts.

a. For what concerns the Greek world, the most ancient commentary on the gospel of John is the lost one of the gnostic *Heracleon. In Greek there remain the commentaries of *Origen, *Theodore of Mopsuestia (in *Syriac translation), *John Chrysostom and *Cyril of Alexandria; fragments also exist of commentaries by *Didymus of Alexandria, *Eustathius of Antioch, *Theodore of Heraclea, *Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Ammonius of Alexandria, *Severus of Antioch and fragments in the Greek *catenae*. The poetic paraphrase of the gospel of John of *Nonnus of Panopolis should be added to these texts. For the letters of John, there are no Greek commentaries. The Greek church also had, from the times of *Dionysius of Alexandria, serious doubts on the canonicity of the Apocalypse; the commentaries on the Apocalypse are relatively rare: the scholia on the Apocalypse by Origen, the commentaries of *Oecumenius and *Andreaw of Caesarea, and those in Syriac of Dionysius bar Salibi (cf. CPG 5, index, 138-140).

As for the Latin church, we have only three commentaries on the gospel of John. The first is that of St. *Augustine and two anonymous Irish commentaries of the 7th c. Concerning the letters of John, there were strong doubts about accepting 2-3 Jn; nevertheless, the commentaries of Augustine, *Cassiodorus and *Bede remain. The commentaries on the Apocalypse are more numerous: by *Victor of Petovium (Pettau), the Donatist *Tyconius, *Primasius of Hadrumetum, *Luculentius, *Caesarius of Arles (formerly attributed to *Gennadius), *Apringius of Beja, Bede, ps.-Alcuin (7th c.) and ps.-Isidore of Seville (see CPL, index, 277).

b. There are a certain number of Greek sermons about John: those of John Chrysostom and ps.-John Chrysostom, *Cyril of Alexandria, and some Byzantine writers: Theodore the Studite, Nicephorus Blemmydes, Nicetas Paphlagon and others. The commentary of Augustine is composed of homilies.

BHG; BHL; BHO cited above; W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*, Giessen 1932; J.C. Elowsky, *John 1–10*, ACCS NT 4a, Downers Grove, IL 2006; Id., *John 11–21*, ACCS NT 4b, Downers Grove, IL 2007; W.C. Weinrich, *Revelation*, ACCS NT 12, Downers Grove, IL 2005.

c. Under the name of John there is a group of apocryphal texts. The most important are the *Acts of John;* we have about two-thirds of the text; into these *Acts,* generally orthodox, a gnostic fragment has been inserted, chs. 94-102, 109. The *Acts of John* constitute the oldest text of the five great *Acts* and were written between 150 and 200, probably in a *Syriac environment or in Egypt. In the text the voyages and miracles of John in Asia Minor (Miletus, Laodicea, Smyrna and in particular Ephesus) and his death (Gr. *metastasis*) are recounted. Their purpose is not polemical and not even catechetical; they aim to interest the pagans in Christianity. In the *Acts of John* we find romantic scenes (the story of Callimachus) or anecdotes on philosophy (the scene with the fleas) and poetical fragments (e.g., a hymn of the dancing Christ). Alongside these *Acts* there is a group of texts on John which might contain fragments of a primitive text: that of the partridge (see John Cassian, *Collat.* 24, 21-2), the *Letter* of ps.-Titus, P. Oxyrhinchus 850 and Clement of Alexandria (on the converted thief, mentioned above). The *Acts of John,* read in heretical circles by the *Manicheans (cited in the book of Manichean psalms) and by the *Priscillianists, had been condemned various times by the ecclesiastical writers and by the Council of *Nicaea II (757); later they were partially destroyed and replaced with other texts: orthodox reworkings or completely different texts, e.g., the *Acts of John* of ps.-*Procorus in Greek (but also in *Coptic, *Armenian, Arabic, Ethiopian, *Georgian, paleo-Slavic translations), or the *Life of John* in Syriac and Arabic, or the *His-*

toria Apostolorum Joannis et Jacobi in Armenian.

Nevertheless, they enjoyed a certain popularity; the drama *Callimachus* of Hrostwitha, a nun of Gandersheim (10th c.) confirms this. Another text was also popular, which was part of chs. 1-17 of the *Acts of John,* on the sojourn of John in Rome and of his passion in boiling oil, which gave rise to a liturgical feast—S. Johannis in oleo (6 May). The 5th book of ps.-Abdias is dedicated to John. There are, further, a Syriac and an Armenian *Life* of John and other texts: a *Passion* of ps.-Melito and a commentary of Symeon Metaphrastes. Next to these texts concerning the life of John there are texts under his name: an Arabic gospel, dealing with the whole life of Jesus; texts of apocalyptic character—alongside the canonical Apocalypse there are two others, an Ethiopian text, the *Mysteries of John,* and a book in Latin of revelations of John (of medieval Cathar origin but coming from Paulician circles); from gnostic circles comes the *Apocryphon Ioannis* of *Nag Hammadi (codices II, III, IV). Four texts of the *Transitus* of Mary appear under the name John; there exists further the *Dialogues of John with Jesus* (4th–5th c.) in Coptic. This shows the great importance of John in the orthodox and heterodox Christian tradition.

CANT 215-224.

Acts: in Lipsius Bonnet 2, 1, 151-216: read in this order: caps. 18-36, 87-105, 37-86, 106-115; the caps. 1-17 (sojourn in Rome) do not belong to the primitive *Acts*; fundamental ed. by E. Junod - J.D. Kaestli, CCAp 1-2, 1983.

Translations: Fr.: A.J. Festugière: Cahiers d'Orientalisme 6, Geneva 1983, 1-40; E. Junod - J.D. Kaestli, op. cit.; Id.: EApC 975-1037; It.: Erbetta 2, 27-131; Moraldi 2, 211-302, 583-609; Ger.: K. Schäferdiek, in Schneemelcher 2, 138-193; ps.-Prochorus: T. Zahn, Erlangen 1880 (Heidelberg 1975); It.: Erbetta 2, 68-110; Moraldi 2, 292-302 (summary); Pol.: M. Starowieyski: Studia Parad. 4 (1994) 131-202. Acta syr.: W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, Lo 1871 (Amsterdam 1968), 1-365, 2,3-60; Gospel: I. Galbiati, Milan 1957; L. Moraldi, Milan 1991 (It. tr.).

Apocryphon Joannis: *see* *Nag Hammadi.

Lipsius 1, 348-542; E. Junod - J.D. Kaestli, *L'Histoire des Actes apocryphes du III^e au IX^e siècle: le cas des Actes de Jean*, Lausanne 1972; Id., *Le dossier des Actes de Jean: état de la question et perspectives nouvelles*: ANRW II, 25, 6, 1988, 4293-4362; K. Schäferdiek, *Die Passio Joannis und die Virtutes Joannis*: AB 103 (1985) 367-382; G. Sirker-Wicklaus, *Untersuchungen zu den Johannesakten: Untersuchungen zur Struktur, zur theologischen Tendenz und zum kirchengeschichtlichen Hintergrund*, Bonn 1988; R.I. Pervo, *Johannine Trajectories in the "Acts of John"*: Apocrypha 3 (1992) 47-68; E. Plümacher, *Paignion und Biberfabel. Zum literarischen und popularphilosophischen Hintergrund von Acta Ioannis 60f. und 48-54*: Apocrypha 3 (1992) 69-109; J.N. Brenner, *The Apocryphal Acts of John*, Kampen 1995; P.G. Schneider, *The Mystery of the Acts of John: An Interpretation of the Hymn in Light of the Acts' Theology*, San Francisco 1991; F. Sieger, *Analyses rhétoriques et stylistiques portant sur les Actes de Jean et les Actes de Thomas*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 231-250; B.E. Bowe, *Dancing in the Divine: The Hymn of the Dance in the Acts of John*: JECS 7 (1999) 83-104; A. Jakab, *Actes de Jean: état de la recherche (1982-1999)*: RSLR 36 (2000) 299-334.

M. Starowieyski

JOHN, Gospel of. *Use and Interpretation in the Ancient Church.* The Fourth Gospel, traditionally attributed to the apostle John, son of Zebedee, was completed in its present form not later than AD 100. Although fragment 457 of the Rylands papyrus (P52) shows that the gospel was known in Egypt from AD 130, nevertheless there is little evidence of its use outside of *gnostic circles before 170. The only certain citation before the writings of *Irenaeus of Lyons is found in *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolycum* 11,22) ca. 170. *Ignatius of Antioch (d. ca. 107) could have been aware of the Johannine theological tradition, which acc. to certain authors would have had a *Syriac or *Antiochene stage of development, but he does not cite the gospel or allude to it; in fact, the silence with regard to John in the letter to the church in *Ephesus (traditional place of origin of the gospel) raises considerable doubt that Ignatius knew it. *Justin Martyr (d. ca. 165) does not explicitly cite the gospel, nor allude to it with clarity, a fact which is surprising if one thinks of his use of the concept of Logos. Although this concept primarily has affinity with contemporary *Stoicism, *Middle Platonism and the Judaic wisdom tradition, some reference to the Fourth Gospel would have reinforced the argumentation, whether in the *Apologies* or in the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*.

The lack of use of the Fourth Gospel and the silence regarding it in the first years of the 2nd c., normally considered "orthodox," could indicate either that the gospel was not known, or that there were hesitations in using it due to some suspicions concerning its orthodoxy. The available evidence, although scarce, points in the second direction. *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51) speaks of a sect called the *Alogi/Alogoi,* who rejected the concept of Logos and attributed the Fourth Gospel to *Cerinthus, a gnostic who, acc. to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* III, 11,1), was an adversary of the apostle John and with whom, as noted by *Eusebius (*HE* 3, 28,6), John had a confrontation in the baths of Ephesus. The fragment of an unknown gospel (Egerton Papyrus 2), together with some *Nag Hammadi treatises (e.g., *Gospel of Truth, Apocryphon of John, Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Philip, Treatise on the Resurrection, Tripart Treatise*) show that the gospel of John enjoyed a particular popularity in gnostic circles of the 2nd and 3rd c.

*Tatian, a member of the gnostic sect of the *encratites (ca. 170), composed a harmony of the four gospels, the **Diatessaron,* in which, it seems, the Fourth Gospel was used as a cornice within which the Synoptic material was adapted. But even more significant is the fact that the most ancient known commentary of a text of the NT is the commentary of *Heracleon, a *Valentinian gnostic, on the Fourth Gospel, written around 170; this commentary had such an influence that in the first years of the 3rd c. the Alexandrian Ambrose, a convert from Valentinian gnosis, commissioned from his protégé *Origen the composition of a commentary which would expose the falsities of the interpretation of Heracleon. The removal of suspicion and the acknowledgment of the Fourth Gospel as orthodox is probably due to Irenaeus of Lyons (d. around 190), as much for the affirmation of its apostolic origin and equality with the Synoptics as for, above all, his having used it as a principal weapon in refuting the heretical teaching of the gnostics. Irenaeus affirms that John wrote to establish the "rule of truth" in the church and asserts that he, citing it, has proved how the gnostics, who "made large use" of the Fourth Gospel, were completely wrong. The Muratorian *Canon, which must have come from the Western church at the end of the 2nd c. (although the matter is heavily disputed) reflects the fact that the existence of the Fourth Gospel caused problems within the church. The Canon says that it was through the encouragement of his fellow disciples that John wrote the gospel. Thus, not only is the authority of the apostle claimed for it, but also that of the entire group of the disciples, which implied also a preeminence over the Synoptics.

A new attestation of the growing popularity of the Fourth Gospel is found in the writings of *Tertullian of Carthage (d. ca. 220). In particular, in the *Adv. Praxean,* he attacks the primitive *Sabellianism which conflated Father and Son; a large section of this work contains a complete study of the gospel of John (op. cit., 26), and through its exegesis Tertullian demolishes the adversarial position affirming at the same time the doctrine of the distinctions in the unity of the divinity. This is also true for *Hippolytus, who combats a similar doctrine in the *Contra Noetum.* It seems that the Sabellians had conflated Father and Son on the basis of some texts taken principally from the Fourth Gospel, such as "I and the Father are one" (10,30), "Who has seen me has seen the Father" (14,9), "The Word was God" (1,1). These authors, together with *Novatian, who lived late in the 3rd c., show how the Fourth Gospel testified to the fact that the unity of Father and Son, which they did not deny, is such as to imply the distinction between them; the gospel therefore proclaims that the model of relationship between Father and Son is not that of identity but that of distinction within unity.

At the end of the 2nd c., at *Alexandria, *Clement affirms the preeminence of the Fourth Gospel as a "spiritual gospel" in comparison with the Synoptics, which relate simply "the material facts" (Eus., *HE* 6, 14,7). Like Irenaeus and others, Clement uses the gospel to refute gnosticism (*Excerpta ex Theodoto*). His successor, Origen, both in his commentary and in many other writings, underlines the supreme importance and the spiritual value of the gospel. He affirms that the gospels are "the firstfruits of all the Scripture, but that of John is the firstfruit of the gospels, and no one can grasp its meaning, unless he has reposed on the breast of Jesus and has received Mary from Jesus that she be his mother also" (*Comm. in Joh.* 1,4).

Most of the use and the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the 2nd and 3rd c. has as a point of departure the Prologue (vv. 1-18) with its concept of Logos. The speculation on this concept and the variety of ideas indicated by the Greek term *logos* contributed to the development of the imaginative gnostic systems, on the one hand, and of different apologetic-philosophical theologies, on the other. It might have been the aversion to every kind of speculation on the Logos which led the *Alogi* to the rejection of the Fourth Gospel and the Sabellians to the identification of God and Logos. Replying to the latter, Tertullian discussed different notions of Logos but, carrying his demonstration of the distinctions within the unity of the divinity further, left the concept of Logos in the background and concentrated on the relationship between Father and Son, which is the focal point of Johannine theology. Thus the reflection on the Logos opened the way for the Western (Latin) theology after Tertullian to reflect on Father and Son, their mutual unity and reciprocal distinction.

In the East the concept of Logos continued to play a central role, whether in the philosophical theology ("Christian Platonism") of Alexandria or in the more biblical and less philosophical tradition of Syria and Asia Minor (Antiochene). At Alexandria, and later at Caesarea, under the influence of the learned Origen, the Logos as preexisting divine being was described as the author of creation, having become in Jesus Christ the master and enlightener of human beings and the mediator of their salvation. The idea of the *subordination of the Logos to God was inherent in this philosophical system. The Logos is *theos* but not *ho theos* (Jn 1:1). Con-

nected with this emphasis was the difficulty of maintaining the reality of the humanity of Jesus: there were no doubts that the divinity of the Logos became flesh (Jn 1:14), even if it was that of a divinity of a subordinate rank, but it was difficult for the Alexandrians to admit the full and complete humanity in the *incarnation. Both of these problems became central in the controversies of the 4th c. The Antiochene tradition, on the one hand, as far as we can say based on the scarce testimonies of the 3rd c. or the beginning of the 4th which have reached us, interpreted the Logos not as an intermediate entity but rather in the light of the OT concept of the creative, revelatory and salvific "Word of Yahweh," enriched in content with the parallel ideas in the sapiential literature. With its greater emphasis on history, the Antiochene tradition underlined the full humanity of Jesus but had difficulty in distinguishing between Word and God. In other words, the monotheistic interest, inherited from Palestinian Judaism, militated against the idea of a personal or hypostatic distinction between God and the Word, between Father and Son. The theological antagonism between these two traditions was to a great extent a question of interpretation of the entire Fourth Gospel and of its Prologue in particular.

When the different theologies entered into conflict in the 4th and 5th c., many arguments concerned the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. The explosion of the *Arian controversy (around 317) at Alexandria led quickly to a large-scale conflict which involved all the different theological traditions of the Eastern empire, with repercussions also in the West. The Arians maintained that the Logos (Son) was a creature and that there was a time when the Logos did not exist. Having denied the eternity of the Logos, they reached the point of denying the fullness of the humanity of Jesus, so that the incarnation, for them, became "the incarnation of that which was not God in that which was not human." A study of the extensive material related to the controversy which has reached us—e.g., the polemics of *Athanasius against the Arians, the *Trin.* of *Hilary of Poitiers, the works of Eusebius of Caesarea against *Marcellus of Ancyra, those of *Basil of Caesarea and of *Gregory of Nyssa against *Eunomius—demonstrate the importance of the role played by the Fourth Gospel in the doctrinal debate of this period. The writing of the NT which Tertullian had found so useful at the beginning of the 3rd c. in demonstrating the distinction between Father and Son showed itself equally useful in the 4th c. in showing their unity against those who overexaggerated their distinction. The same thing is true also for the debates on the *Holy Spirit (e.g., Basil, *De Spiritu sancto;* Athanasius, *Eps. ad Serapionem*) and for the controversy on the doctrines of *Apollinaris (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus;* ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Apollinarium*).

Because it is the NT book in which the idea of the incarnation is most explicit, it is natural that the Fourth Gospel became central in the debates concerning the full divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ.

Together with the polemical use of the Fourth Gospel in theological attacks and counterattacks, a considerable number of commentaries on John saw the light in the 4th and 5th c., but unfortunately many are known only by name or in fragments. We know of commentaries by *Asterius the Sophist, an Arian of the first period (ca. 335), *Theodore of Heraclea (ca. 350), *Didymus the Blind (d. ca. 398), Apollinaris (d. ca. 390) and Ammonius of Nitria (d. ca. 370), but they are known principally through the *catenae* (see Wiles, 4-5). Some more ample commentaries have survived: that of *Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) in *Syriac translation and that of Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); also, the *Homilies on John* of *John Chrysostom (preached before 398) and *Augustine's *Treatises on John* (ca. 416)—although these last are primarily of a homiletic character, they contain exegetical material of great importance.

M. Comeau, *Saint Augustin: Exégète du quatrième évangile*, Paris 1930; W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannesverständnis im zweiten Jahrhunderte* (ZNTW, Beiheft 13), Giessen 1932; J.N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, Cambridge 1943; A. Orbe, *En los albores de la exégesis Johannea (Joh 1,3)* (Estudios Valentinianos 2), Rome 1955; T.E. Pollard, *The Exegesis of John X.30 in the Early Trinitarian Controversies*: NTS 3 (1956/57) 334-349; M.F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, Cambridge 1960; A.K. Helmbold, *The Nag Hammadi Gnostic Texts and the Bible*, Grand Rapids, MI 1967; M. Simonetti, *Giovanni 14:28 nella controversia ariana*, Kyriakon Festschr., Quasten, Münster 1970, I, 151-161; E. Pagels, *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon's Commentary on John*, Missoula, MT 1973; D. Pazzini, *Il prologo di Giovanni in Cirillo di Alessandria*, Brescia 1977; Id., *In principio era il Logos: Origene e il prologo del vangelo di Giovanni*, Brescia 1983; H.J. Sieben, *Exegesis Patrum: saggio bibliografico sull'esegesi biblica dei Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1983; Id., *Kirchenväterhomilien zum Neuen Testament: ein Repertorium der Textausgaben und Übersetzungen, mit einem Anhang der Kirchenvaterkommentare*, Steenbrugis 1991; G. Iacopino, *Il Vangelo di Giovanni nei testi gnostici copti*, Rome 1993; see also the publication: AnSE 11 (1994)–14 (1997); G. Lawless, *Desiderium sinus cordis est. Biblical Resonances in Augustine's Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis 40*: Augustinian Studies 48 (1998) 305-339; J.C. Elowsky, *John 1–10*, ACCS NT 4a, Downers Grove, IL 2006; Id., *John 11–21*, ACCS NT 4b, Downers Grove, IL 2007.

T.E. Pollard

JOHN, primicerius notariorum. A usurper in the West (423–425). Perhaps of *Gothic origin, John was *primicerius notariorum* in 423 when he took power at *Rome at the death of *Honorius. But not having obtained the acknowledgment of *Theodosius II and feeling himself threatened by *Boniface, usurper in *Africa, John sought the support of the *Huns through the mediation of *Aetius. In 425 he was imprisoned at *Ravenna and then killed. *Procopius (*Bell. Vand.* I, 3,6-7) remembers him favorably.

PLRE II, 594-595; O. Seeck, PWK IX/2, 1745-6; O. Ulrich-Bansa, *La monetazione di Giovanni (423-425 A.D.)*: NAC 5 (1976) 277-290.

E. Malaspina

JOHN I, pope (523–526). Of Tuscan origin, he succeeded *Hormisdas 13 August 523. As pope he found himself involved in the battles between *Theodoric and the Byzantine emperor *Justin, who sought to unify the empire from a religious point of view, acting above all against the *monothelites and the *Arians. Theodoric, protector of the Arian *Goths, forced Pope John, at this point sick, along with five bishops and four senators, to travel to *Constantinople to obtain from Justin the annulment of his decree along with the restitution of the churches to the Arians and the return to Arianism of the converts to Catholicism. John reached Constantinople, perhaps at the beginning of 526, and was received triumphantly, obtaining recognition of his supremacy from the patriarch of the city. He remained there several months, celebrating Easter there. The success of his mission was only partial, since Justin promised only the restitution of the churches. Upon his return to *Ravenna, Theodoric, now suspicious of everyone, had him locked in prison, where John died 18 May 526, and his body was carried to Rome. His name is linked to the date of the celebration of Easter, inasmuch as he accepted the advice of *Dionysius Exiguus, i.e., to follow the Alexandrian cycle of nineteen years, which became the usual cycle of the Latin church.

LP I, 104-107; 275-278; Gregorio M., *Dial.* III, 2-3; DTC 8, 593-595; BS 6, 926-927; Fliche-Martin IV, 550-1; M. Rosi, *L'ambasceria di papa Giovanni I*: Archivio della Soc. Rom. di Storia Patria 21 (1897) 567-584; B. Krusch, *Ein Bericht der päpstlichen Kanzelei an Papst Johannes I von 526 und die Oxforder Hs. Digby 63 von 814*, in *Festschrift Kehr*, Munich 1926, 48-58; L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini (VI-VII cent.)*, Rome-Louvain 1972, 101-103; Patrologia IV, 137-8; EPapi I, 483-487.

A. Di Berardino

JOHN II, pope (533–535). To prevent battles of succession, *Boniface II had designated his deacon *Vigilius, who would later be elected in 537, but having encountered strong opposition he had to withdraw the decree (LP I, 281), and at his death the Roman Mercurius was elected (31 December 532), who took the name John—the first example of a name change. He was a priest of the church of St. Clement, where evidence remains of his presence. The *theopaschite controversy (*see* *Hormisdas) began again on the part of the Scythian monks against the *acoemetae, who turned to the pope; also *Justinian sent him a profession of faith, which had already been published as an edict (CJ I, 8), and requested the condemnation of the acoemetae. The pope not only agreed with the emperor (CSEL 35, 320-328) but also sent a letter to the senate of *Ravenna (cf. RBen 78 [1968] 83), in which he gave explanations of the theological positions of Justinian (Mansi 8, 803-806; DS 401-402) and condemned the acoemetae. Furthermore, he requested the king *Athalaric to reinforce an earlier *senatus consultus* against simoniac elections (Cassiod., *Var.* IX, 15-16). He also had an epistolary exchange with *Caesarius of Arles. He died 8 May 535. Five letters from him survive.

CPL 1613-1614; Verzeichnis 398; PL 66, 13-31; ACO IV/2, XXVIII-XXXII and 206-210; LP 1, 285-286; DTC 8, 595-597; EC 6, 579-80; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 108-117; M.V. Anastos, *Justinian's Despotic Control over the Church as Illustrated by His Edicts on Theopaschite Formula and His Letter to Pope John II in 533*, in *Mélanges Georges Ostrogorsky*, II, Beograd 1964, 1-11; A. Chavasse, *Composition et date des recueils anciens passés dans la seconde partie du "Parisinus" Lat. 1771*: RBen 78 (1968) 82-86; S.M. Meo, *La dottrina mariana e le rispettive formule sintetiche dei Papi Ormisda e Giovanni II, del VI sec.*, in *De cultu mariano saec. VI-IX*, III, Rome 1972, 17-32; L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini (VI-VII sec.)*, Rome-Louvain 1972, 109-118; Patrologia IV, 141-142; Epapi I, 499-503.

A. Di Berardino

JOHN II of Constantinople (the Cappadocian), patriarch (d. 520). He was a priest and *syncellus* (spiritual counselor) at the time of *Timothy I, patriarch of *Constantinople, and his successor (518). Although of orthodox sentiments, he accepted the **Henoticon,* imposed by the emperor *Anastatius, but at the death of the latter (518) with the Catholic *Justin I rising to the throne, he came out in favor of the Council of *Chalcedon (451) and thereafter put back into the diptychs the names of Pope *Leo and Pope *Hormisdas, at that time on the throne of Peter. With the Endemusa Synod 20 July 518, he put an end to the *Acacian schism which had endured since 484

(publication of the *Henoticon*), and he contacted Hormisdas to reestablish ecclesiastical communion. The pope sent him a delegation to have him sign a *libellus fidei* and requested that the names of Acacius and his successors in the schism, along with the emperors *Zeno and Anastasius, be canceled from the diptychs (Mansi 8, 451.454-456). In the aforementioned synod the patriarch of Constantinople received for the first time the title of *ecumenical patriarch* (Mansi 8, 1041). He died in 520, while he, on behalf of Pope Hormisdas, was dealing with the *theopaschite question raised by the Scythian monks. Some letters from him survive.

CPG III, 6828-6835; ACO 111, 76-7; PL 63, 429, 443-444, 449-50, 480-481, 506-507; Hfl-Lecl 2, 1046-1053; DTC 8, 756; LTK 5, 1049; Cath 6, 511; Patrologia V, 435.

A. De Nicola

JOHN II of Jerusalem, bishop (d. 417). Successor of *Cyril as bishop of *Jerusalem (386–417). *Epiphanius, supported by *Jerome after 393, began the first *Origenist controversy against him, considered the protector of the Origenists. The principal documents come from Jerome: *Letter 51* (translation of a letter of Epiphanius) and *Contra Johannem Hierosolymitanum*. According to these sources and acc. to *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 30 [31]), John justified himself in a *memoria* addressed to *Theophilus of Alexandria. He was also involved in the *Pelagian controversy, having received Pelagius at Jerusalem and convened an assembly in this city concerning him, and having later taken part in the Council of Diospolis-Lydda (Diospoli) which declared Pelagius innocent. A confession of faith by John has reached us in *Syriac translation. Perhaps he is the author of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* attributed also to Cyril.

CPG 3620-3627; C. Caspari, *Ungedruckte . . . Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, I, Christiania 1866, 161-212 (all that remains of the writings of John); F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, Louvain 1922; P. Nautin, *L'excommunication de Saint Jérôme*: AEHE 80-81, fasc. 2, 7-37; E. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, Princeton, NJ 1992.

H. Crouzel

JOHN III, pope (561–574). A native of *Rome, he succeeded *Pelagius I (556–561). Son of a certain Anastasius, after 554 John probably wrote while a deacon an *Expositio in Heptateucum, Collectanea in IV Evangelia* and *Commentarii in epistulas S. Pauli* (see CPL 951-952), but this is not certain. He promoted the restoration of the catacombs of martyrs and continued the construction of the basilica of the Holy Apostles in Via Lata, begun by his predecessor. The era of John is dense with important and also dramatic events for the church, *Italy and Rome. *Narses, who had defeated the *Ostrogoths and removed the menace of Franks and Alemanni, controlled Italy on behalf of *Byzantium. According to the sources (LP, Paul the Deacon, Agnellus), it seems that the Romans did not care for the Byzantine general, esp. because of the hard repressions ordered by him after the disorder that had broken out in Italy at that time (see LP I, 305), and John seems to have acted to soften this attitude of the citizens and faithful of the city.

During his pontificate first *Justinian (565) and later Narses himself (570) died. Further, in 565 Alboinus had taken *Milan and had entered Pavia after a long siege, installing himself in the royal palace of *Theodoric. The next year the *Longobards (Lombards), now established in central Italy (Spoleto), aimed for Rome. After the dispute of the *Three Chapters John had reestablished ecclesial communion with *Africa and N Italy, but not with *Aquileia. He restored the bishops Salonius and Sagittarius to their sees (see Jaffé 1040). According to Chavasse, John compiled the so-called Leonine Sacramentary, contained in the *Codex Veronensis* LXXXV (80), during a retreat near the cemetery of Praetextatus. He died in 574.

CPL 1704; PL 77, 655, n. h; PL 77, 1348; MGH, *Ep.* I, 230; PL 72, 13-181 (apocryphal writings attributed to John); LP I, 305-307; H. Grisar, *Roma alla fine del mondo antico*, II, Rome 1943, 170 and *passim*; DTC 8, 597 and 1266; 13, 2406; 15, 1915; A. Chavasse, *Le Sacramentaire dit Léonien*: SE 37 (1984) 151-190 (on the codex *Veronensis* LXXXV, 80); J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 64; *Dizionario storico del Papato*, ed. Ph. Levillain, I, Milan 1996, 640-641; LTK³ 5, 943 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 537-539 (M.C. Pennacchio).

M. Spinelli

JOHN III Scholasticus (d. 577). Patriarch of *Constantinople (565–577). Born from a clerical family at Sirimis (Antioch) around 510–515, *scholastikos* (lawyer) by profession, he was ordained a priest by Domninus patriarch of *Antioch (545–559), who chose him as his *apocrisarius at *Constantinople. Called by the emperor *Justinian, acc. to the prophecy of St. *Simeon Stylite the Younger, to replace the deposed patriarch *Eutychius (31 January 565), he treated the latter and the *monophysites harshly, declaring their ordinations invalid. After his death (31 August 577), Eutychius, back in his see, did not spare the memory and the relatives of the defunct patriarch. His name remains linked to a double ca-

nonical collection: the *Synagogē of the Fifty Titles* and the *Collectio of the Eighty-Seven Chapters*. The *Catechetical Logos* on the *Trinity held in 570 and refuted by *John Philoponus (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 85) has been lost; it was perhaps identical with the *Mystagogia* which *John of Nikiu attributes to him (*Chronica*, ed. Zotenberg, 567). The identification of John Scholasticus with the historian *John Malalas should be discarded.

CPG 7750-7751; PG 103, 240; Grumel, *Regestes* 2, 250-259; Beck 422-423; ODB 2, 1067-1068; Patrologia V, 89, 94-97, 671-673.

D. Stiernon

JOHN IV, pope (640–642). Of Dalmatian origin and son of an imperial *scholasticus,* he was elected 4 August 640, but had to wait for the approval of the exarch of *Ravenna, by whom he was consecrated 24 December. In the meanwhile, with the other *servantes locum sedis apostolicae* and signing himself *Johannes diaconus et in Dei nomine electus,* he sent a letter to the Northern Irish to exhort them to celebrate Easter acc. to the Catholic custom and not the Jewish (PL 80, 601-602). In January 641 he condemned *monothelitism in a Roman synod (see Mansi 10, 607-610) and sent the *Acts* to the emperor *Heraclius and to *Pyrrhus, patriarch of *Constantinople, where the *Acts* perhaps arrived after the emperor was already dead (11 February 641). It seems, however, that in the meantime he had already distanced himself from the **Ekthesis* (see L. Magi, *La sede romana*, 205-6; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato*, 427). Pyrrhus responded confirming his monothelitism. John then sent to the emperor *Constantine III a long letter (*Apologia Honorii*: Mansi 10, 682-686), but when the messenger arrived at Constantinople *Constance II was emperor. In this letter the pope defended the memory of his predecessor and his orthodoxy explaining his letter to Sergius (*see* *Honorius) and criticizing Pyrrhus, who had used Honorius as an authority to propagate his doctrine. The emperor responded—his letter has reached us only in Syriac—in a very positive but ambiguous manner, professing his orthodoxy (L. Magi, *La sede romana*, 208-211).

John also gathered a great deal of money and sent the abbot Martin to Dalmatia and Istria, invaded by Avars and Slavs, to ransom Christian prisoners and recover the relics of the saints from the destroyed churches (LP I, 330). He died 12 August and was buried in St. Peter's.

CPL 1729-1731; Verzeichnis, 399; PL 80, 601-608; PLS 4, 1660-1662; LP I, 330; III, 94; Hfl-Lecl 3, 392-398; DTC 7, 108-109; 7, 123-124; 8, 597-599; Fliche-Martin V, 531 (cf. index); P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei Papi del secolo VII*, Milan 1971, 378-379.; 426-433 (cf. index); L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII cent.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 206-212; I. Nikolajeviç, *The Redemption of Captives in Dalmatia in the 6th and 7th Century*: Balcanicoslava 2 (Belgrade 1973) 73-79; Patrologia IV, 178-9; EPapi I, 592-594.

A. Di Berardino

JOHN IV of Jerusalem (d. 593/594). Formerly a monk of the *acoemetae at *Constantinople and patriarch of the Holy City from 574, he is known through a letter of Abas, catholicos of Albania (Caucasus), preserved for us in *Armenian and datable to between 574 and 577. John exhorts him to defend the *Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures of Christ and to reject the solicitations, coming from neighboring Armenia, to pass over to the *monophysite faith. Of particular interest are the profession of trinitarian and christological faith, free of expressions close to Neochalcedonianism, and the polemical impulses against the addition to the Trisagion of the formula ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς (John seems, furthermore, to know apocryphal letters to *Peter the Fuller, analogous to the collection of the *Collectio Sabbaitica* in ACO III) and against the *aphthartodocetist convictions of *Julian of Halicarnassus. The letter also contains a meaningful acknowledgment of the primacy of *Peter and the infallibility of his successors in the Roman see.

CPG 7021; *Epistula ad Abatem episcopum Albanorum*, ed. K. Ter-Mekerttschian: Ararat 29 (1896) 252-256; A. Vardarian, *Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief an den albanischen Katholikos Abas*: OC n.s. 2 (1912) 64-77; H. Hurter, *Ein Zeugnis aus dem 6. Jht. für die Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes*: ZKTh 34 (1910) 218-219; S. Salaville, *Un témoignage oriental en faveur de la primauté et de l'infaillibilité du pape an VI^e siècle*: EO 13 (1910) 171-172; *La "Narratio de rebus Armeniae,"* ed. G. Garitte (CSCO 132), Louvain 1952; R.W. Thomson, *Jerusalem and Armenia*, SP XVIII, Kalamazoo 1986, 77-91 (repr. in *Studies in Armenian Literature and Christianity*, Great Aldershot 1994); N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient* (CSCO 574, Subs. 100), Louvain 1999, 490-501; Grillmeier II/3, 168-174.

L. Perrone

JOHN IV the Faster. Patriarch of *Constantinople (d. 595). Born at Constantinople between 500 and 530, an engraver by profession, he was numbered among the clergy of Hagia Sophia after 505. A deacon and patriarchal treasurer, he succeeded, unwillingly, Eutychius (d. 5/6 April 582) in the patriarchal see. A man of great austerity (thus the name), he revealed himself to be intransigent concerning the

reconciliation of apostates, but enjoyed among *monophysite circles a reputation as a peacemaker. Around 585 he opened the controversy with the Roman see concerning the title of ecumenical patriarch, while the appeal to St. *Gregory I by the heresiarchs condemned by him provoked further tension with the apostolic see. He died in extreme poverty 2 September 595, the day the Byzantine church commemorates him. Some canonical collections are attributed to him.

CPG 7555-7560; DSp 8,586-589; ODB 2, 1049; RGG4 3, 522-523; Patrologia V, 97-100; J.H. Erickson, *Penitential Discipline in the Orthodox Canonical Tradition*: St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977) 191-206; M. Arranz, *I penitenziali bizantini*, Rome 1993.

D. Stiernon

JOHN V, pope (685–686). There is hardly any information about him. A native of Syria but a member of the Roman clergy, he took part in the delegation sent by Pope *Agatho (678–681) to the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople III), which condemned *monothelitism and signaled the reconciliation between the church of Rome on the one hand and the imperial court and the church of Constantinople on the other. John succeeded *Benedict II (684–685) and quickly obtained the imperial confirmation via the exarch of *Ravenna, thanks to this facilitation introduced by the emperor Constantine IV. He was consecrated 23 July 685. The only act of this pope recorded by the sources is the revocation of the privilege of consecrating the bishops of Sardinia, which the archbishop of Cagliari was exercising abusively. John died 2 August 686 and was buried in St. Peter's Basilica.

PL 96, 425-428; MGH 7, 410-412 (G.H. Pertz); LP I, 366-367; Jaffé I, 2128; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 620-631; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 315-317; New Catholic Encyclopedia 7, Washington 1967, 1008ff.; LTK³ 5, 943 (G. Schwaiger); Catholicisme 6, 474-475 (H. Chirat); Th.F.X. Noble, *La repubblica di S. Pietro. Nascita dello Stato pontificio (680-825)*, Genoa 1998, 45, 180-181, 184, 198 and 218; EPapi I, 625-626 (L.A. Berto).

M. Spinelli

JOHN VI, pope (701–705). Born in Greece, he succeeded *Sergius I (687–701) two months after the death of the latter and was consecrated 30 October 701. John had been elected despite the opposition of the emperor Tiberius III, who actually tried to eliminate him. During this pontificate the new exarch of *Ravenna Theophylactus marched on *Rome, earning for himself, however, the hostility of both the population and the army. The pope nevertheless protected him and acted to calm everyone's spirits. John carried out a similar mediating action faced with the Longobard Gisulph, duke of Benevento, who had become master of Sora and was lording it over the inhabitants. The pope persuaded him to spare them and obtained the release of prisoners with the treasure of the church. John also took interest in the archbishop *Wilfrid who, after having been restored to the episcopal see of *York by Pope *Agatho (678–681) in 679, was being opposed again. In the Roman synod of 704 John reestablished him for the second time in his rights, sending a letter in his favor (which survives) to the kings of Northumbria and of Mercia, Ethelred and Alfred. He died 11 January 705.

LP I, 383-384; MGH VI, 250 (W. Levison); *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, London 1882, 392ff.; DTC 8/1, Paris 1923-24, 599ff.; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 636, 688 and 726; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 408-410; P. Conte, *Regesto delle lettere dei papi del secolo VIII*, Milan 1984, 189-191; *Grande dizionario illustrato dei Papi*, Casale Monf. 1989, 232-233; LTK³ 5, 943 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 637-638 (L.A. Berto).

M. Spinelli

JOHN VI of Constantinople (d. 715). Deacon and librarian of the patriarchate, he became patriarch of *Constantinople in 712 and held this seat until 715, the year of his death (E.W. Brooks, *On the Lists of the Patriarchs of Constantinople from 638–715*: ByzZ 6 [1897] 53; Mansi 12, 190). The report of Zonara 14, 27 (see Theophanes, *Chron.* a. 6177) acc. to which John was deposed, is doubtful. The emperor Philippicus Bardanes, an obstinate *monothelite, deposed the solidly orthodox patriarch Cyrus in January of 712 and replaced him with John VI. After Philippicus's fall, it was John VI who crowned the new emperor *Anastasius II, who publicly repudiated the monothelite policy of his predecessor. As these new orientations were strengthening, in June of 713 John sent to the pope the *Epistula ad Constantinum papam,* a synodal letter in which he justified his conduct in having favored monothelitism, because having been constrained by the emperor, he had done so for prudence's sake, hoping to extract some good from him, but he remained inwardly orthodox; he asked pardon for his guilt and claimed to have sworn to orthodoxy in the presence of the Roman *apocrisiarii.

CPG 8000; PG 96, 1416-1433; Mansi 12, 196-208; Fliche-Martin V, 283-285; Grumel, Regestes 1, 250-1; EP 1, 641-647 (spec. 646); J.-M. Sansterre, *Le pape Constantin Ier (708–715) et la politique*

religieuse des empereurs Justinien II et Philippikos: Archivum Historiae Pontificiae 22 (1984) 7-29.

A. Labate

JOHN VII, pope (705–707). A native of Magna Grecia, son of a certain Plato, a Byzantine imperial functionary, he succeeded *John VI (701–705) and was consecrated 1 March 705. The new emperor *Justinian II sent him the *Acts* of the Council *in *Trullo* (or Quinisext) of 691–692, already rejected by Pope *Sergius I (687–701), for approval and possible corrections. On this occasion John behaved with a certain ambiguity, sending back the decrees to the emperor without introducing any modifications to them, so that it was uncertain whether the pope had intended to approve them in this way, as they were, or to reject them without further ado. John continued the mediating effort of his predecessor with the *Longobards (Lombards), obtaining from King Aribert the restitution of the ecclesiastical patrimony of the Cottian Alps. He defended monasticism and restored the abbey of Subiaco, destroyed by the Longobards. At Rome he promoted the construction or the restoration of various churches. In the chapel of the Virgin, at St. Peter, some fragments remain of the mosaics finished under his pontificate. He died 18 October 707. From John we have a letter to the bishops of Britain.

LP I, 385-387; DTC 8/1, Paris 1923-24, 600ff.; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 630-637; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 410-412; J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages*, London 1979, 211ff., 226, 244, 267 and 270; J.-M. Sansterre, *Jean VII (705–707): idéologie pontificale et réalisme politique*, in *Rayonnement grec. Hommages à Charles Delvoye*, Brussels 1982, 377-388; *Grande dizionario illustrato dei Papi*, Casale Monf. 1989, 234-235; *Dizionario storico del Papato* (Ph. Levillain), I, Milan 1996, 642-643; LTK³ 5, 943-944 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 638-640 (L.A. Berto).

M. Spinelli

JOHN (III) of Alexandria, bishop (d. 689). Bishop of *Alexandria between 681 and 689, when the Arab domination of Egypt was a fait accompli, but the relationships between Christians and followers of Islam were those of mutual respect. John in particular was in close contact with the emir Abd el-Aziz, in whose presence he held at least two disputes with representatives of the *Chalcedonian confession and the Jewish religion. The emir seems to have permitted him to see to the organization of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the restoration of sacred buildings. His homily *In Honor of St. Mena*, transmitted in Coptic, recalls the legend of the saint, but above all speaks of the sanctuary city, an important goal for pilgrimages from every part of Christendom (ed. J. Drescher, *Apa Mena*).

A. van Lantschoot, *Les "Questions de Théodore,"* ST 192, Vatican City 1957; J. Drescher, *Apa Mena*, Il Cairo 1946; Coptic Encyclopedia 4, 1337-1338.

T. Orlandi

JOHN ARKAPH (d. after 338). John, called Arkaph, bishop of Memphis (Egypt), 4th c. At the death of *Melitius he became leader of the Melitians. An enemy of *Athanasius, he began a campaign of accusations against him, including one of violence against Ischyras and another concerning the killing of the Melitian bishop *Arsenius of Hypselis. The innocence of Athanasius having been proven once, John, after a brief reconciliation, brought the accusations up again at the Council of *Tyre (335), in collusion with the *Eusebians. After the exile inflicted on Athanasius by the council, *Constantine also had John exiled in the hopes of a pacification (Athan., *Ap. c. Arian.* 61-69).

Simonetti, 113-114; 131; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996.

E. Prinzivalli

JOHN bar Aphtonia (475/480–537). Known through the biography written in Syriac by one of his disciples, who has remained anonymous (ed. F. Nau, *Histoire de Jean bar Aphtonia*: ROC 7 [1902] 97-135), John was born ca. 475–480, after the death of his father, rector at *Edessa, and for this reason he bears the name of his mother, Aphtonia. At the age of around fifteen he sought to enter into the monastery of St. Thomas at *Seleucia on the Orontes, but because of his young age he was allowed only to take care of guests and strangers, and he received the monastic habit only after seven years. Before dedicating himself to studies, he had to exercise, for a certain time, the profession of carpenter.

With the arrival of the emperor *Justin (518), the reaction against the anti-Chalcedonians soon made itself felt, and the bishop of Seleucia, Nonnus, had to leave his see and seek refuge with his own family at Amida; the *monophysite monks of the monastery of St. Thomas were chased out by their superiors. They chose John as their leader, and despite everything, they remained in the monastery, or they returned there fairly quickly, because in 528 John was still its *archimandrite.

The fight against the monophysites conducted by the patriarch of Antioch, *Ephrem, was still more violent, and this time John had to leave Seleucia for good, before 531. He went on to found on the left bank of the Euphrates, ancient Europos (Jerabis), the monastery of Qenneshrin, of which he was the first superior. John made of this monastery a center for studies of Greek and Syriac letters, where many generations of learned Hellenists were educated (such as *Thomas of Heraclea, Severus Sabokt, *Jacob of Edessa) and a center of ascetic life where the monophysite church sought a good number of its patriarchs.

During the reign of Emperor *Justinian I, John made many trips to *Constantinople, and around 531, in particular, because of his knowledge of Greek and Syriac, he was designated as the secretary of an assembly of orthodox and monophysite bishops who had come to discuss liturgical questions: the *Syriac account of the meeting has been published recently.

John died in 537, after having chosen his successor, Alexander, whom he recommended strongly not to suppress any of the precepts which were needed to govern the monastery of Qenneshrin. John apparently composed a commentary on the Song of Songs, of which nothing remains except fragments in as-yet-unpublished *catenae*. He is also the author of hymns which, once translated into Syriac (by the abbot Paul around 624), were added to the *Octatheucum* of *Severus of Antioch, like the *Vita* (at least the principal part) of this same patriarch.

Introductory studies: Duval 359; Baumstark 180-181; Chabot 73; Patrologia V, 225-226. *Editions*: *Vita di Giovanni*, ed. F. Nau, *Histoire de Jean bar Aphtonia*: ROC 7 (1902) 97-135; S.P. Brock, *The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian*: OCP 47 (1981) 87-121. See also J.W. Watt, *A Portrait of John bar Aphtonia, Founder of the Monastery of Qenneshre*, in H.W. Drijvers - J.W. Watt, *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, Leiden 1999, 155-169.

J.-M. Sauget

JOHN bar Kursos (482/483–538). Bishop of Tella. There are two biographies known of this personage, both dating to the 6th c. The first was written by one of his companions in the apostolate, Elias by name (ed. H.G. Kleyn, Leiden 1882); the second is one of the chapters of the *Lives of the Blessed Orientals* of *John of Ephesus (ed. E.W. Brooks, PO 18, 513-526). Born at Callinicus in 482–483, John first embraced a military career, which he later left to follow his vocation to religious life. Named bishop of Tella (or Constantina), he was consecrated by *Jacob of Sarug himself in 519. He was soon expelled from his diocese (521), at the time of the emperor *Justin and of the orthodox patriarch of *Antioch *Ephrem, because he was an overly ardent propagator of *monophysite ideas. He took refuge in a monastery of Mount Shigar. On returning from a voyage to *Constantinople around 533—the religious policy of the emperor *Justinian was more conciliatory—he was, however, arrested and imprisoned, first at *Nisibis, then at Antioch, where he died in 538 at the age of 55 years. He is remembered as a martyr in the *Jacobite calendar 6 November.

His literary work preserved in Syriac consists of *Warnings and Precepts* (28) in the form of canons directed to the clergy on liturgical questions (ed. C. Kuberczyk, Leipzig 1901; F. Nau, Paris 1906), of *Answers* (48) to questions posed by a certain priest Sergius on the *Eucharist (ed. Th.J. Lamy, Louvain 1859), a commentary on the Trisagion and a profession of faith addressed to the monasteries of his diocese. (The last two treatises are as yet unpublished.)

Duval 359; Baumstark 174; Chabot 70-71; Ortiz de Urbina 163.

J.-M. Sauget

JOHN bar Penkaya (7th c.). A monk of the Eastern church, born at Penek in Bēt Zabdai, John lived in the 2nd half of the 7th c.; he was a monk in the monastery of Mar John of Kamul, later in that of Mar Bassima, and he seems to have died in the monastery of Beth Dalyatha. This explains, perhaps, why the MS tradition has sometimes confused him with *John of Dalyatha. He wrote a work in 15 volumes, *Ktābā d-rēš mellē*, or *Summary of the History of the World,* which concludes in the year 686 and must have been completed before 693–694. The first four books deal with the history of the world up to Herod the Great; the fifth book speaks of demons; the sixth to eighth books discuss above all the typological interpretation of the OT; the ninth book deals with the cults of pagan peoples, providing important information on Zoroastrianism; the tenth to thirteenth books speak of the life of Christ and of his disciples; the fourteenth book deals with the story of the church up until the Arab conquest; the fifteenth book, finally, speaks of the events of the last decades of the 7th c. These last two books constitute an important contemporary source for our knowledge of the Arab conquests of the 7th c. Only the tenth to fifteenth books have been published, by A. Mingana, *Sources syriaques I*, Mosul 1908, 2-171; 172-203: Fr. tr. of book XV. S. Brock has published an Eng. tr. of the final section of book XIV and of the majority of book XV in *North Mesopotamia in the Late Seventh*

Century: Book XV of John Bar Penkāyē's Rīš Mellē: Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam 9 (1987) 51-75 (now in S. Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity*, London 1992). Among the works attributed to John there is an ascetic book, known as *The Merchant*: for a Fr. tr. of the first "century," see M. Albert, *Une centurie de Mar Jean Bar Penkaye*, in *Mélanges A. Guillaumont—Contribution à l'étude des christianismes orientaux*, Geneva 1988, 143-151.

Baumstark, 210-1; BO III/1, 189-90; Duval, 229-30; T. Jansma, *Project d'une édition du* Ktābā d-rēš mellē *de Jean bar Penkaye*: OS 8 (1963) 87-106; R. Beulay, *Précisations touchant l'identité et la biographie de Jean Saba de Dalyatha*: PdO 8 (1977-1978) 87-116 (esp. 88-102); H. Suermann, *Das arabische Reich in der Weltgeschichte des Joḥannan bar Penkaje*, in *Nubia et OC*: Festschrift C.D.G. Müller, Cologne 1987, 59-71.

K. den Biesen

JOHN CALYBITA (ca. 418–450). A son of the senator Eutropius, a general in the army, and of the noble *Theodora, he lived at *Constantinople in the 1st half of the 5th c. Around 430, at the age of twelve, acc. to a usual canon of lives of Christian saints, he left his family to enter a community of *acoemetae ("sleepless") monks, on the Bosphorus, where he lived for six years meditating on the gospel in rigorous asceticism. Then he left the monastery to live incognito as a beggar before the door of his father's house. Here the supervisor of the slaves, partly also to relieve the discomfort caused to the master of the house by the presence of the tramp, had a hut made for him (καλύβη, whence the nickname Calybita), which on his death, 15 February 450, was transformed into a basilica and became a pilgrimage destination. Only three days before dying did John Calybita allow himself to be recognized by his parents, showing them the golden gospel which they had given to him before his flight and thus obtaining their conversion. The family palace was then transformed into a hospice to receive the pilgrims who were coming to visit his tomb. His *Vita,* of which there are at least three versions preserved in Greek (BHG 868-69h), was translated into Latin around 870 by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who dedicated it to the future Pope Formosus (891–896). Perhaps also for this reason the construction of a basilica in honor of the saint on the Tiber Island (mentioned for the first time in 1016) is attributed to Formosus, where acc. to a tradition his relics were preserved, translated to *Rome due to the iconoclast crisis. Nevertheless, the presence of his body at Constantinople is attested around 1200 by the Russian pilgrim Anthony of Novgorod. The only evidence of the fortune of the veneration of John Calybita in the West, given that the Western medieval calendars do not mention the saint, is the great influence which his Latin *Vita* (BHL 4358) had upon that of St. *Alexius (BHL 286), also in Latin.

AASS, *Ian.* II, 311-320 (Paris 1866); BHL 4358b; BHG 868-869h; BHO 498-499; BS 6, 640-643; *Cath* 6, 444; PG 114, 568-581; LTK³ 5, 923; *Vies des SS.* 1, 305-307.

V. Novembri

JOHN CASSIAN (ca. 360–ca. 435). The principal Western exponent of the monastic tradition, born, acc. to the information furnished by *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* LXI), around 360 in Scythia (in Provence acc. to Marrou, Cappuyns and other moderns) to a noble family, Cassian received a thorough classical Latin education (*Conl.* XIV, 12), but other indications within his works and even more his free movements in the East suggest an excellent knowledge of Greek. There are few details of the life of Cassian which we know with precision and certainty. Around 378–380, when he was still a youth (*Inst.*, *praef.* 4: *pueritia nostra*), he entered a monastery in Bethlehem along with his friend *Germanus (*Conl.* I, 1; *Conl.* XIV, 5). Inspired by the contact with a famous Egyptian monk, Pinuphius—abbot and priest of a large monastery near Panephysis, who, fleeing from his fame, was received in the monastery of Bethlehem as a novice (*Conl.* XX, 1-2)—they received permission to go to Egypt (*Conl.* XVII, 5) to visit the famous monks there. It is impossible to determine with precision how many years they spent in Egypt, probably between ten and twenty. Cassian indicates (*Conl.* XVII, 30) that after seven years, they returned to the monastery of Bethlehem to obtain permission to remain in Egypt.

Initially they went to the monastery of Archebius at Panephysis in the Nile Delta with the plan of going as far as the desert of the *Thebaid "to visit as many as possible of those holy monks whose fame had scattered over all the earth" (*Conl.* XI, 1). Although Cassian described the customs of the monks of Tabennesi (*Inst.* IV, 1; *Conl.* XX, 1,2), it is disputed whether they ever reached the Thebaid: they might have been able to use literary sources. The longest stay of their Egyptian period was at *Scete (*Conl.* I, 1: *Cum in heremo Sciti*; *Conl.* X, 2). The only information given by Cassian which permits a precise dating (399) is the mention of the encyclical letter of *Theophilus bishop of *Alexandria, against the *anthropomorphites (*Conl.* X, 2). The violent religious conflicts which followed the letter and the accusa-

tions of "*Origenism" launched by Theophilus in the letter of 400 with persecution of the "long brothers" might have forced Cassian, together with Germanus and many other monks, to leave Egypt. Later he was at Constantinople, where he was ordained a deacon by *John Chrysostom (Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* LXI). In the aftermath of the latter's exile, instigated by Theophilus, a letter for the bishop of *Rome, *Innocent, was entrusted to Cassian and Germanus by the friends of Chrysostom (Pallad., *Dialog.* III, 3). In Rome he would have made the acquaintance of the archdeacon *Leo, future bishop of Rome, to whom he addresses himself in the preface of *De incarnatione*. It is unknown where he spent the following years, but around 415 he was in *Marseille, having been ordained a priest (Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* LXI), where he founded two monasteries, St. Victor for men and St. Salvator for women, and wrote in 420–428, in response to the requests of the bishops of S *Gaul, two works, the *Institutiones* and the *Conlationes,* to transmit in the West the authentic tradition of Eastern (and esp. Egyptian) monasticism. Toward the end of his life, in response to the request of Leo, he also wrote a polemical and doctrinal work, *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium.* According to Gennadius, Cassian died while *Theodosius (d. 450) and *Valentinian (d. 455) were emperors, but it is surmised that he was already dead around 435.

The different prefaces are important for understanding the literary genre and the structure of the two principal works of Cassian, the *Institutiones* and the *Conlationes*. In that placed at the head of the first work, after the dedication to "papa" Castor of Apt (bishop 419–426), Cassian compares himself to the architect Chiram (*1 Re* 7,13-14), called to aid in the construction of a spiritual temple; insists on the importance of experience, which earlier writers on monastic life did not have; and declares his intention to leave out miracles and wonders which do not contribute to the education to perfection of life. Rather, he tries to illustrate "the institutions and the rules of the monasteries, and esp. the origins and the causes of the principal vices, cataloged by our fathers themselves into eight, and, furthermore, the method of correcting them acc. to the counsels transmitted to us by them" (*Inst. praef.* 7). In reality the *Institutiones,* which do not have a title in the MSS, are divided into two parts, as indicated by this citation. The first four books are dedicated to the exterior person (*Inst.* 2,9,1)—i.e., to the customs of the Egyptian monks, monastic dress, the organization of the canonical hours of prayer etc.—and conclude with a long homily of Abbot Pinufius addressed to a young beginner which contains an important summary of the monastic path based on the cross of Christ. The last eight books are dedicated to the analysis and elimination of the eight principal vices: *gastrimargia* (V), *fornicatio* (VI), *philargyria* (VII), *ira* (VIII), *tristitia* (VIIII), *acedia* (X), *cenodoxia* (XI) and *superbia* (XII), which are seen as obstacles to the development of the contemplative life. In previous literature this list appears only in the works of *Evagrius of Pontus, who must have been an important source for Cassian. Evagrius is also the source for the description and the symbolism of the monastic habit in the first book. The detailed analysis of Vogüé shows how Cassian took information from multiple literary sources, including *Tertullian, *Cyprian, *Augustine, *Jerome, *Basil, *Eusebius and *Palladius.

To link the *Conlationes,* already foreseen in the *Institutiones* (*Inst.* II, 9,1), to the preceding work, Cassian introduces (*praef.* 1) the interpretation of the figure of Jacob who struggles against the carnal vices to earn the name Israel, which symbolizes the contemplative life: an interpretation which goes back to *Philo of Alexandria, but which was previously found in *Origen and *Ambrose. The *Conlationes* were published in three volumes of ten, seven and seven conferences respectively. The first is dedicated to Leontius, bishop of Fréjus and brother of Castor, and to the hermit Helladius; the second to Honoratus and Eucherius of Lérins; the third to four monks of the islands of Hyères: Jovinian, Minervius, Leontius and Theodore. In the preface to the third volume Cassian compares the 24 conferences to the elders of the Apocalypse, who will be able to enter in the cells to converse with the monks. This idea is linked to the observation in the preface of the *Institutiones* that spiritual science, "if it is not frequently sifted and elaborated in continuous contact with spiritual men, will quickly fade away" (*Inst. praef.* 5). In reality the *Conlationes* were conceived as spiritual exercises in the manner of the dialogues of Plato and Cicero, for pedagogic ends. Each conference is dedicated to a theme; e.g., the distinction between the goal and end of the spiritual life (*Conl.* I), discretion (*Conl.* II), the only true good of the soul or indifferent things (*Conl.* VI), prayer (*Conl.* IX-X), the contemplative life or the method of interpreting the Scripture (*Conl.* XIV), friendship (*Conl.* XVI), impeccability or the sins of the perfect (*Conl.* XXIII). Some themes belong to the philosophical and Christian tradition, while others reflect the controversies of the time, above all *Pelagianism (e.g. *Conl.* VI, XIII, XXIII), in which Cassian had taken a position against Pelagius, though different from that of Augustine and Jerome. The primary interest of Cassian always remains the development of the inner person

(*homo interior*, *Conl.* XVI, 22,2). With elegant language (Gennadius: *litterato sermone*) and a rich technical vocabulary which shows knowledge of classical and Christian writers in both Greek and Latin, Cassian created a new synthesis of the tradition which corresponds to his intention expressed at the beginning (*Inst. praef.* 7) to expound "everything which our predecessors have not taken into consideration." Hiding himself behind the façade of celebrated (but otherwise unknown) Egyptian monks, he succeeded in establishing the idea of a normative monastic tradition going back to the era of the apostles in Egypt, with more recent developments (*Anthony and anachoresis). In his last work, *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium libri VII,* Cassian, answering the request of Leo, tried to combat the heresy of *Nestorius, calling on an entire series of Western and Eastern writers for help: *Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, *Rufinus, Augustine, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Athanasius, John Chrystostom. In the work Nestorius seems to still be bishop of Constantinople, which suggests a date prior to August 430 when he was deposed.

Although Cassian is not venerated in the Western liturgical calendar outside of Marseille, because of conflicts with the Augustinian orthodoxy which was imposing itself at the time (Prosper of Aquitaine, *Contra Collatorem*) and because his name was included in the list of nonapproved books falsely attributed to Pope *Gelasius (*Decretum Gelasianum*) in the 8th c., his influence on Western monasticism was assured by the recommendation of his works at the end of the Rule of St. *Benedict. St. Dominic carried them with him everywhere in his voyages. The works of Cassian have been partially transmitted in Greek and are found in the *Bibliotheca* of *Photius (n. 197) and in the *Philokalia* of Nicodemus the Hagiorite and Macarius of Corinth. Cassian is venerated as a saint in all the Eastern Churches.

Editions: CPL 512-514; *Conlationes*, *De institutis coenobiorum*: PL 49, 477-1321; 53-476; CSEL 13, 1886; CSEL 17, 1888; *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium*: PL 50, 9-270; CSEL 17,1888; E. Pichery, *Les conférences*, (SC 42, 52, 64), Paris 1955-59 (repr. 1967-71); J.C. Guy, *Les institutions cénobitiques*, (SC 109), Paris 1959; L.M. and P.M. Sansegundo, *Instituciones*, *Colaciones*, Madrid 1957–1961; O. Lari, *Conferenze spirituali*, 3 vols., Rome 1965; L. Dattrino, *Le Istituzioni cenobitiche*, Abbazia di Praglia 1989; L. Dattrino, *L'Incarnazione del Signore*, Rome 1991; *John Cassian*, *The Conferences*, ACW 57, New York 1997; B. Ramsey, *John Cassian*, *The Institutes*, New York 2000; *Conferenze ai Monaci*, Rome 2000.

Studies: L. Wrzol, *Die Psychologie des Johannes Cassianus*: Divus Thomas 5 (1918) 181-213; 425-456; 7 (1920) 70-96; 9 (1922) 269-294; M. Olphe-Galliard, *Vie contemplative et vie active d'après Cassien*: RAM 16 (1935) 252-298; Id., *La pureté du coeur d'après Cassien*: RAM 17 (1936) 28-60; Id., *Cassien*: DSp 2, 214-276; S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico. Dottrina sulla carità e contemplazione*, Rome 1936; L. Cristiani, *Cassien, I-II*, Paris 1946; DHGE 11, 1319-1348; J.C. Guy, *Jean Cassien, Vie et doctrine spirituelle*, Paris 1961; O. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, Oxford 1950 ([2]1968); F. Prinz, *Cassiano Giovanni*: DIP 2 (1975), 633-638; K.A. Neuhausen, *Zu Cassians Traktat De Amicitia* (*Coll. 16*): *Studien zur Literatur der Spätantike*, ed. Ch. Gnilka - W. Schetter, Antiquitas 1/26, Bonn 1975, 181-218; H.-I. Marrou, *La patrie de Jean Cassien*, in *Patristique et Humanisme*, Paris 1976, 345-361; C. Leonardi, *Alle origini della cristianità medievale: Giovanni Cassiano e Salviano di Marsiglia*: Stud Med 18 (1977) 491-608; C. Tibiletti, *Giovanni Cassiano. Formazione e dottrina*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 355-380; Id., *Pagine monastiche provenzali. Il monachesimo nella Gallia del quinto secolo,* Rome 1990; Ph. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*, Oxford 1978; Patrologia III, 486-496; C. Leonardi, *L'esperienza di Dio in Giovanni Cassiano*: Renovatio 13 (1978) 198-219; V. Messana, *Povertà e lavoro nella paideia di Giovanni Cassiano*, Caltanissetta 1985; A. de Vogüé, *Les sources des quartre premiers livres des Institutions de Jean Cassien. Introduction aux recherches sur les anciennes règles monastiques latines*: StudMon 27 (1985) 241-311; M. Sheridan, *Jacob and Israel: A Contribution to the History of an Interpretation*, in *Mysterium Christ. Festschrift für Basil Studer*, Rome 1995, 219-241; Id., *The Controversy over* ΑΠΑΘΕΙΑ*: Cassian's Sources and His Use of Them*: StudMon 39 (1997) 287-310; Id., *Job and Paul: Philosophy and Exegesis in Cassian's Sixth Conference*: StudMon 42 (2000) 271-294; K.S. Frank, *Johannes Cassian und seine Schriften: Das ägyptische Mönchtum als spiritueller Mutterboden des abendländischen Mönchtums*: Erbe und Auftrag 73 (1997) 288-304; C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, Oxford 1998; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, tome VI: *Les derniers écrits de Jérôme et l'oeuvre de Jean Cassien (414–428)*, Paris 2002; S.D. Driver, *John Cassian and the Reading of Egyptian Monastic Culture,* New York-London 2002; C. Badilita - A. Jacab, *Jean Cassien entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, Paris 2003.

M. Sheridan

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM (d. 407)
I. Life - II. Works - III. Spirituality.

I. Life. John was born at *Antioch on the Orontes, in the province of Syria, at a date which is difficult to establish. Historians propose 345 or 349 or 354, but, in the absence of any absolutely certain reference point before 381, the year of his ordination as deacon, his year of birth remains uncertain. In any case, current preference leans toward 349. He belonged to a wealthy family: his father, Secundus, was a civil functionary in the administration of the military government of Syria; his mother, Anthusa, a widow at twenty, obtained a thorough education for him. In all likelihood John followed the lectures of the rhetorician Libanius and prepared himself for a career in the offices of the imperial chancellery. He himself recounts that, in this period, he passed his time in the tribunal and was passionate about theatrical entertainments. Nevertheless, he distanced himself

from these things little by little through the influence of a friend whom he calls Basil. Having received *baptism, he frequented the circle of *Diodore, future bishop of *Tarsus. There he dedicated himself to commenting on the Scripture and to an ascetic life in the world. *Meletius, bishop of Antioch, admitted him into his confidence and, probably in 371, nominated him lector. But his desire for perfection pushed him to leave the city for the surrounding deserts. First he put himself, for four years, under the direction of an old Syrian monk; then, longing to be forgotten by the world, he lived, for two years, alone in a cave, learning the Scriptures by heart. Privations and cold got the better of his health, and he was constrained to return to Antioch. In 381 Meletius allowed him to enter the *diaconate. Flavian, successor of Meletius, ordained him priest in 386.

For twelve years a priest of the church of Antioch, he fascinated the crowds with the splendor of his eloquence: thus the nickname "Golden-mouth," which was attributed to him in the course of the 5th c. The bishop of Constantinople *Nectarius having died 27 September 397, the court chose John. To obey the orders of the emperor, the count of Antioch set up an appointment with him at one of the ports of the city, without telling him the reason, and sent him to Constantinople, where he was ordained bishop 26 February 398.

From that moment John sought to repress abuses and reform society in order to lead it to a more faithful observance of the precepts of the gospel. But his demands provoked the hostility of those struck by his censures. The empress *Eudoxia and some women of the court, the bishops of various provinces and the monks who lived as they pleased in the city made coalition against him. *Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, put himself at their head, called the Synod of the *Oak, before which John was told to appear. Knowing the prejudices of the bishops, he refused to present himself. First he was deposed, in 403, and then called back. But it was only a truce. On Easter night in 404 serious disorders broke out, provoked by his enemies, during the baptism of the catechumens. The crowd invaded the churches and profaned them. Five days after Pentecost, 9 June 404, the emperor signed an order of exile, this time definitive. After a voyage of three months across Asia Minor, John arrived at Cucusus in Armenia: "the most deserted place in the world," he wrote. Three years passed, but his enemies did not disarm; rather, they decided to send him to Pithyus (Colchis), on the E shore of the Black Sea. Exhausted by these years of suffering and the forced marches imposed on him by the soldiers assigned to watch him, he died during the voyage, at Comanan in the province of Pontus, 14 September 407. His remains were brought back to Constantinople 27 January 438, and buried in the Church of the Apostles: *Theodosius II, son of Eudoxia and of Arcadius, at that time asked pardon for the persecutions which John had suffered at the hands of his parents (see Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* 5,36,2). According to a tradition the mortal remains of John now repose at Rome in the *Cappella del Coro* in St. Peter's Basilica. On 27 November 2004, Pope John Paul II gave to the patriarch of Constantinople some of these relics, which now repose in the Phanar.

II. Works. Every work of John Chrysostom responds to the demands, arising one by one, of his apostolate, so that it is necessary to follow in detail the course of his life in order to study his abundant literary output. Here we will limit ourselves to the essential. His thought has reached us in the form of exhortations to certain persons, or homilies on the occasion of particular events and liturgical feasts, or finally in a series of commentaries on the OT and NT, essentially in the form of homilies. This variety shows sufficiently that the teaching of John Chrysostom, although remaining coherent in its deepest inspiration, constantly adapts itself to the needs of the faithful.

Thus through three small treatises *Against the Adversaries of Monastic Life* we see two contemporary problems confronted. Above all, that of the education of young children in a world of corrupt customs. Sometimes this was resolved by entrusting young children to monks, to have them live in a morally healthy environment. But out of this came more or less forced vocations, with the disappointment of the parents. A certain hostility toward the *ascesis practiced in the deserts around Antioch was thus born; this hostility was reinforced by the persecution of *Valens in 375. This called for a defense of monastic life. Along the same line are the three *Exhortations to Stagyrius,* a young monk who, because of nervous exhaustion, doubted his own vocation, and the two *Exhortations to Theodore* (SC 117). The latter had abandoned the monastic life, giving in to the attractions of the young Hermione, whom he was setting about to marry. John reproves him for his infidelity: "Binding oneself to a celestial spouse and then leaving him to attach oneself to a woman constitutes an adultery, even if you call it a thousand times a marriage" (*Letter to T.*, II, 3).

Here should be added the two discourses *On Compunction,* or on remorse for past sins. These are

addressed to two monks, Demetrius and Stelechius, but John measures with severity the distance between the Christian ideal and the reality of an often mediocre life, whether among laypeople or monks. In one of the most interesting passages of the first treatise he expounds, inspired by Paul, the relationships between liberty and grace, thus refuting beforehand the entirely unjust accusations which had been made against him concerning this problem, taking from their context certain passages which seemed to give the primacy to human effort. Three works destined for female ascetic groups date back to this period: *On Virginity* (SC 125), *To a Young Widow* and *On Single Marriage* (SC 138). At the same time John denounced an abuse which had insinuated itself into the lives of certain clerics: the presence in their houses, on the pretext of protecting them, of consecrated virgins ironically called **agapetai*, or "beloved." Two treatises *On Suspicious Cohabitations* and *How to Observe Virginity* (CUF, see final bibl.) castigate in virulent terms the hypocrisy of such conduct. Thus from this era the passionate temperament of John Chrysostom appears. This explains the vigor of his reactions confronted with the weaknesses which discredited the clergy and betrayed his ideal. The six years passed in solitude had profoundly marked him and, even if his health did not allow him to remain there, he always aspired, for himself as for others, to the "angelic" life, that of the monks. Nevertheless, the multiple contacts imposed by his office as deacon put him in touch with the faithful; he began to know their needs and difficulties. Therefore the man whom Flavian, bishop of Antioch, called in 386 "to the dignity of priesthood" is a man already well aware of the concrete problems of Christians living in the world.

The MS tradition has preserved for us the *Homily Given on the Day of His Ordination* (SC 272). John Chrysostom offers to God the firstfruits of a rhetorical ability which he had put, for around twenty years, to the service of the church with a love "than which nothing stronger and more tyrannical can be imagined." From that moment the homilies follow in lockstep with the liturgical year. John Chrysostom preached Sundays, feast days and, during Lent, several times a week. Thus, in Lent 386, he composed eight sermons *On Genesis* (SC 433) and, in the summer, the first of the homilies *On the Incomprehensibility of God* (SC 28 bis) which, along with four others spread along the course of the following year, responds to the pretenses of the *anomoians to know God as he knows himself. Against the anomoians John composed other homilies, of which the last two were delivered at Constantinople (SC 396: homilies 7-12). In the meantime he attacked, in violent terms, those among the Christians who "Judaized," attracted by the ceremonies of the synagogue. On the occasion of the Jewish feasts of autumn and Passover he delivered the eight *Discourses Against the Jews*. Then the anniversary of the martyrs venerated in the city arrived. It was the occasion for the *Panegyrics of Saint Pelagia, of Saint Ignatius* and *of the Blessed Philogonius*. Finally, 25 December, John dedicated a homily to the feast of the *nativity of Christ, adopted a short time before by the church of Antioch.

This first year of priesthood has an exemplary value. The new priest knew how to respond from the beginning to the demands of the moment and of catechesis. It would always be so. In 387 it is possible to follow, day by day, through the homilies *On the Statues,* the fears of a people who rebelled because of the weight of taxes and were menaced with the worst punishments. To this same year belongs the first of the seven *Panegyrics of Saint Paul* (SC 300, see final bibl.), in which John expresses his own affection and admiration for him who was the model of his apostolate. The year 388 opens with a homily *On the Calends*. John opposes the disorders of which the festivals of the new year are the occasion. Next is the anniversary of the martyrs Babila, Iuventinus and Maximinus. Soon the orator begins the series of discourses *On the Rich Man and Lazarus*. The theme offers him the occasion to hurl himself against the insolent luxury of his compatriots and their hardness of heart toward the poor. The dates of the six homilies *On Uzziah* (SC 277) are disputed. John sees, in the attitude of the cherubim, a proof of the transcendence of God and warns his audience against the pride which ruined King Uzziah. Afterward he embarked on the long series of 67 homilies *On Genesis,* probably preached partly during Lent 388. As for the OT, John further commented on the text of Isaiah, up to 8:10 (SC 304) and the book of Job (SC 346, 348). From 390 are the 88 homilies *On the Gospel of John* and the 90 homilies *On the Gospel of Matthew*. During his pastoral mission at Antioch and Constantinople, John commented on the entire Pauline epistolary: recent studies (P. Allen - W. Mayer, see bibl.) have revealed that his homilies on Col, Phil and Heb contain material of both Antiochene and Constantinopolitan provenance. In all these works it is possible to study the exegetical method of John Chrysostom, preoccupied with keeping to the text and explaining it in the most minute details acc. to the tradition of the school of Antioch. The fecundity and conscience of the preacher are admirable, esp. since these commentaries did not prevent him from

delivering occasional homilies *On the Martyrs Berenice, Prosdoce and Domnina; On Diodore of Tarsus;* and *On the Martyr Julian.* It is thus clear how much he was linked to the heroic tradition of his church. John dedicated to the Psalms explanations which seem spread out in time, but the series is now incomplete; of the 150 Psalms, the commentary survives on only 50. Nevertheless, it is possible to find fragments of them in the *catenae.*

The sudden elevation of John to the see of Constantinople in 398 imposed new duties on him and put him in a particularly difficult situation. The weakness of his predecessor, Nectarius, and his taste for luxury had allowed an indolence to establish itself among the clergy that was incompatible with the ideal that John had continually preached and that he had set forth in the *Dialogue on the Priesthood* ca. 388-390 (SC 272). Furthermore, the inequality between giant fortunes and extreme miseries reminded Christians of the duties of the rich and the needs of the poor. Uniting action to words, John created works of benevolence thanks to the aid and the generosity of *Olympias, a highly placed lady of Constantinople who had become a deaconess. In this daily battle to put in practice the teaching of the gospel he attracted both love and hate. It was in this tense climate that he delivered the 55 homilies *On the Acts of the Apostles,* esp. since the external situation of the empire preoccupied him. We have the echo in the homilies *On the Fall of Eutropius, On Saturninus and Aurelian,* grand figures of the court whose heads Gainas, the *Arian chief, was demanding. The hostility around John grew.

Concerning his exile and his stay in Armenia there are valuable details in the letters addressed to those who had remained faithful to him, esp. to Olympias (SC 13 bis). Beyond the 17 letters which he wrote to her, John charged her to transmit to his friends two messages, prompted by the circumstances, in the form of treatises: the *Letter from Exile* (SC 103) and *On the Providence of God,* his last work (SC 79). The so-called *Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom,* of which some elements could date back to the 4th c., is not his.

III. Spirituality. Although Chrysostom's biographers reprove him for his fiery temperament and the excesses of language to which his intrepid zeal pushed him, the entirety of his work leaves the impression of a remarkable equilibrium. Certainly in his youth he desired absolute detachment for himself and preached the same to others, but his ministry as a priest, and later bishop, put him in contact with the entire Christian community in its diversity. A spirituality which corresponds to every state of life can therefore be extracted from his work.

This was not fixed in a theoretical treatise but animates his entire teaching. He was able to indicate with precision the position of the contemplative life within the church. The monks "are lighthouses which appear high above to those who approach from far away. Seated in the port, they attract all men to the calm which they enjoy, not allowing those who turn their gaze on them to sink" (*Hom. 14,3 on 1 Tim.* 3). But most Christians are called to live in the world. For them John traces the route, giving advice marked at the same time by an extraordinarily concrete sense of situations and by a genuinely evangelical impulse. The love of spouses for one another and the love of children blossoms within the family. While aligning himself with the tradition of a society which subordinated women to men, John found within Pauline theology the just measure of a reciprocity of thoughtfulness and love, basing the relationships between men and women on those between Christ and the church. A conversation, addressed to parents, *On Vainglory and on the Education of Children* (SC 188), affirms the importance, from the earliest years, of moral and religious training. The love of neighbor—slave or friend, poor or rich—has its source in the love of God. The preacher never stops pulling his audience toward concrete actions, in which beneficence is inspired by an act of faith: the poor man is Christ. The sacraments are the signs of a unity of which Christ is the foundation. Baptism is presented in the *Catecheses* (SC 50 bis, 366) as a *new birth.* The Eucharist, an action of grace and sacrifice at the same time, continues the real presence of God among human beings. John excels in emphasizing this mystery: "He whom the angels do not see without trembling and whom they do not dare to look at without fear for the radiance which blazes from him, we take him as food, we receive him, we become one body and one flesh with Christ" (*Hom. 82,5 on Mt.* 5). On the occasion of religious festivals the Christian community realizes its unity around the priest who celebrates the Eucharist with the entire people, and the church of heaven joins with that on earth. John never ceased inviting those who were listening to him to give glory, to give thanks, and his last words put a seal on his teaching: "Glory to God through all" (Palladius, *Dial.* 11).

The spirituality of John Chrysostom has preserved its value through the centuries, even if, because of a sumptuous eloquence to which we are no longer habituated, this immense work discourages commentators and translators. Because of the im-

possibility of mastering the whole, the status of theologian is denied to John Chrysostom, perhaps because he did not venture into audacious speculations and stayed within the limits of a perfect orthodoxy. It can at least be acknowledged that he is the most illustrious representative of the school of Antioch, whose *exegesis is based on the minute explanation of the texts. He is, furthermore, among the fathers of the church, the one who has best understood the difficulties, the trials of an authentically lived Christian life, whether in the monastery or in the world. His apostolic activity took place in the middle of a society which was not at all in harmony with the demands of Christianity. Despite everything, his message, with its charge of love for God and of love for people, has reached even us today in light of its gospel message.

Editions: Monumental edition of the complete works ed. by Montfaucon, 1718-1738, improved by the Benedictines in 1834 and reproduced in the *Patrologia graeca* of J.P. Migne, Greek-Latin text, vols. 47-64, Paris 1858-1860; J. Barelle, *Œuvres complètes*, Greek-French text, 19 vols., Bar-le-Duc 1865-1873. Editions of various works mentioned in this article: Coll. "Sources chrétiennes" (SC), Greek-French text, followed by the number of the vol.; Coll. of the University of France (CUF), Greek-French; Coll. "Pères dans la foi" (PF), only French, which has published, under the title *La conversion*, various homilies on this theme, Paris 1978, and, under the title *Homélies sur s. Paul*, the seven panegyrics on St. Paul, Paris 1980; finally *Omelie sull'oscurità delle profezie*, crit. ed., It. tr. and comm. by S. Zincone, Verba Seniorum n.s. 12, Rome 1998.

Translations: Eng.: LFC, 16 vols., Oxford 1839-1859; LNPF, New York 1888; *Homilies on Genesis*, Washington, DC, FC 74, 1986; FC 82, 1990; FC 87, 1992 (R.C. Hill); *Commentary on the Psalms*, 2 vols., Brookline, MA 1998 (R.C. Hill); *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, FC 96, 1998 (G.G. Christo); It.: *Commento al vangelo di s. Matteo*, 3 vols., Rome 1966-1967; *Commento al vangelo di s. Giovanni*, 3 vols., Rome 1969-1970; *Dall'esilio. Lettere*, Milan 1976 (R. Callegari); *Vanità—educazione dei figli—matrimonio*, CTP 7, Rome 1977 (A. Ceresa Gastaldo); *La vera conversione*, CTP 22, Rome 1980 (C. Riggi); *Il sacerdozio*, CTP 24, Rome 1980 (A. Quacquarelli), *Le catechesi battesimali*, CTP 31, Rome 1982 (A. Ceresa Gastaldo); *Commento alla lettera ai Galati*, CTP 35, Rome 1982 (S. Zincone); *L'unità delle nozze*, CTP 45, Rome 1984 (G. Di Nola); *Omelie per Eutropio*, Naples 1987 (F. Conti Bizzarro - R. Romano); *Panegirici su san Paolo*, CTP 69, Rome 1988 (S. Zincone); *Commento alla prima lettera a Timoteo*, CTP 124, Rome 1995 (G. Di Nola); *Contro i detrattori della vita monastica*, CTP 130, Rome 1996 (L. Dattrino); *Lettere a Olimpiade*, Letture cristiane del primo millennio 23, Milan 1996 (M. Forlin Patrucco); *Commento a Isaia. Omelie su Ozia*, CTP 162, Rome 2001 (D. Ciarlo); *A Stagirio tormentato da un demone*, CTP 163, Rome 2002 (L. Coco); *Omelie sul vangelo di Matteo*, CTP 170-171-172, Rome 2003 (S. Zincone); Ger.: *Kommentar zum Evangelium des hl. Matthäus*, BKV[2], vols. 23, 25, 26, 27, 1-238 (J.C. Baur); *Über das Priestertum*, ibid., vol. 27, immediately after *Commentary on Mt.* (A. Naegle); *Kommentar zum Briefe des hl. Paulus an die Römer*, ibid., vols. 39, 42 (J. Jatsch); *Kommentar zu den Briefen des hl. Paulus an die Philipper und Kolosser*, ibid., vol. 45 (W. Stoderl); *Kommentar zu den Briefen des hl. Paulus an die Galater und Epheser*, BKV[3], vol. 15 (W. Stoderl); *Taufkatechesen* I-II (Greek-German), Fontes Christiani 6/1-2, Herder 1992 (R. Kaczynski); *Acht Reden gegen Juden*, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, vol. 41, Stuttgart 1995 (R. Brändle - V. Jegher-Bucher); Sp.: *Homilías sobre el Evangelio de San Mateo*, 2 vols., Madrid 1955-1956, BAC 141, 146 (D. Ruiz Bueno); *Tratados ascéticos*, Madrid 1958, BAC 169 (D. Ruiz Bueno).

Studies: A. Puech, *S.J. Chrysostome et les moeurs de son temps*, Paris 1891; C. Baur, *Der hl. Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, I Antiochien, II Konstantinopel, Munich 1929-30; L. Meyer, *S.J. Chrysostome maître de perfection chrétienne*, Paris 1933; A.H.M. Jones, *St. John Chrysostom's Parentage and Education*: HTR 46 (1953) 171-173; G. Fittkau, *Der Begriff des Mysteriums bei J. Chrysostomus*, Bonn 1953; Ivo auf der Maur, *Mönchtum und Glaubensverkündigung in den Schriften des hl. J. Chrys.*, Freiburg 1959; A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne*, Paris 1959; *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin*, in Acts of the Colloquium of Chantilly 24 settembre 1974, Paris 1975; M. Gonzaga, *John Chrysostom and His Time*, London 1960; S. Zincone, *Ricchezza e povertà nelle omelie di Giovanni Crisostomo*, L'Aquila 1973; Id., *Giovanni Crisostomo. Commento alla lettera ai Galati. Aspetti dottrinali, storici, letterari*, L'Aquila 1980; O. Pasquato, *Gli spettacoli in s. Giovanni Crisostomo. Paganesimo e cristianesimo ad Antiochia e Costantinopoli nel IV* secolo, OCA 201, Rome 1976; R. Brändle, *Matth. 25, 31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomos*, Tübingen 1979; R.L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983; C. Militello, *Donna e Chiesa. La testimonianza di Giovanni Crisostomo*, Palermo 1985; M.A. Schatkin, *John Chrysostom as Apologist, with Special Reference to* De incomprehensibili, Quod nemo laeditur, Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt, *and* Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae, Analekta Vlatadon 50, Thessaloniki 1987; P. Allen - W. Mayer, *Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A New Approach to the Twelve Homilies* In epistulam ad Colossenses (*CPG 4433*): OCP 60 (1994) 21-39; J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom: Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*, London 1995; P. Allen, *The Homilist and the Congregation. A Case-Study of Chrysostom's Homilies on Hebrews*: Augustinianum 36 (1996) 397-421; P. Allen - W. Mayer, *Traditions of Constantinopolitan Preaching: Towards a New Assessment of Where Chrysostom Preached What*: ByzF 24 (1997) 93-114; G. Di Nola, *La dottrina eucaristica di Giovanni Crisostomo*, Vatican City 1997 (with a collection of passages with Greek text and It. tr.); R. Brändle, *Johannes Chrysostomus. Bischof, Reformer, Märtyrer*, Stuttgart- Berlin-Cologne 1999; M. Illert, *Johannes Chrysostomus und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum. Studien zu Theologie, Rhetorik und Kirchenpolitik im antiochenischen Schrifttum des Johannes Chrysostomus*, Zürich-Freiburg i. Br. 2000; M.M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, Tübingen 2000; W. Mayer - P. Allen, *John Chrysostom*, London-New York 2000; C. Tiersch, *Johannes Chrysostomus in Konstantinopel (398–404). Weltsicht und Wirken eines Bischofs in der Hauptstadt des Oströmischen Reiches*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 6, Tübingen 2000; O. Pasquato, *I laici in Giovanni Crisostomo. Tra Chiesa, famiglia e città*, Biblioteca di Scienze religiose 144, Rome [2]2001; L. Dattrino, *Il matrimonio nel pensiero di Giovanni Crisostomo*, Rome 2002; W. Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 273), Rome 2005; *Giovanni Crisostomo: Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo*. XXXIII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana. Rome, 6-8 maggio 2004 (SEA 93), Rome 2005.

A.-M. Malingrey - S. Zincone

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM (Latin Collection). Many works attributed to John Chrysostom have been transmitted in *Latin. Some of these texts were composed directly in Latin; in other cases it is a matter of translations from Greek. Among the most important collections can be mentioned (1) the so-called Collection of 38 Latin Homilies attested, at least partially, already by *Augustine around 422, which brings together authentic and spurious texts from various sources (either translated from Greek, among which appears a homily of *Severian of Gabala, or else produced in Latin, as well as works of Augustine, *Jerome and *Potamius of Lisbon); (2) a collection, already known to Erasmus, of 30 Latin sermons, attributed at first to *John "Mediocris," bishop of Naples, whose N African origin, around the 2nd half of the 5th c., was later postulated by Bouhot; (3) a collection of 22 homilies, perhaps made in Africa, which brings together already-known works and unknown translations. (4) Alongside these collections, there are an indefinite number of homilies and treatises translated from the Late Antique to humanistic period, concerning which research is still in progress.

General Bibliography: C. Baur, *L'entrée littéraire de Saint Chrysostome dans le monde latin*: RHE 8 (1907) 249-265; A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert* (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Benediktiner- Akademie 5), Munich 1948, 91-101; J.-P. Bouhot, *Les traductions latines de Jean Chrysostome du V[e] au XV[e] siècle*, in *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, Paris 1989, 31-39; S.J. Voicu, *Le prime traduzioni latine di Crisostomo*, in *Cristianesimo Latino e cultura Greca sino al cent. IV* (SEA 42), Rome 1993, 397-415.

(1) A. Wilmart, *La collection des 38 homélies latines de saint Jean Chrysostome*: JTS 19 (1918) 305-327; B. Altaner, *Augustinus und Johannes Chrysostomus*: ZNTW 44 (1952-53) 76-85 (repr.: Id., *Kleine patristische Schriften*, TU 83, Berlin 1967, 302-311); A. Wenger, *Le sermon LXXX de la collection de Mai restitué à Sévérien de Gabala*, in *Augustinus magister*, Paris 1954, 175-185; J.-P. Bouhot, *Version inédite du sermon "Ad neophytos" de S. Jean Chrysostome, utilisée par S. Augustin*: REAug 17 (1971) 27-41; W. Wenk, *Zur Sammlung der 38 Homilien des Chrysostomus Latinus* (mit der Edition der Nr. 6, 8, 27, 32 und 33), Vienna 1988.

(2) G. Morin, *Étude sur une série de discours d'un évêque [de Naples?] du V[e] siècle*: RBen 11 (1894) 385-402; M. Lambert, *Édition d'une collection latine découverte par dom Morin*: REAug 15 (1969) 255-258; J.-P. Bouhot, *La collection homilétique pseudo-chrysostomienne découverte par Dom Morin*: REAug 16 (1970) 139-146; A. de Vogüé, *Une citation de Cyprien dans le Chrysostome latin et chez le Maitre*: RBen 89 (1979) 176-178; Id., *Un écho de Césaire d'Arles dans la Règle du Maitre le Chrysostome latin et la Paggio Iuliani*: RBen 90 (1980) 288-289; Id., *Une sentence de Cyprien citée par le Maitre, le Chrysostome latin, Césaire et la Paggio Iuliani*: RBen 91 (1981) 359-362.

(3) F.J. Leroy, *Vingt-deux homélies africaines nouvelles attribuables à l'un des anonymes du Chrysostome latin* (*PLS 4*): RBen 104 (1994) 123-147.

(4) P.-P. Verbraken, *Deux anciennes versions latines de l'homélie sur l'aumòne CPG 4618 attribuée à Jean Chrysostome*, in *Antidoron. Hulde aan Dr. Maurits Geerard*, I, Wetteren 1984, 33-45; J.-P. Bouhot, *Ancienne version latine du sermon De Joseph et de Castitate d'un Pseudo-Jean Chrysostome*, ibid., 47-56; Id., *Adaptations latines de l'homélie de Jean Chrysostome sur Pierre et Élie* (*CPG 4513*): RBen 112 (2002) 36-71, 201-235; G. Persiani, *Notes sur les deux antiques versions latines de l'homélie chrysostomienne De Chananaea* (*CPG 4529*): Classica et Mediaevalia 49 (1998) 69-93.

S.J. VOICU

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM (pseudo)

I. Extent and circulation - II. Origins - III. Systematic attributions - IV. Intentional attributions - V. Localized texts - VI. Accidental attributions - VII. Anthologies and extracts.

I. Extent and circulation. In the absence of a systematic list, it can be estimated that there are more than 1500 ps.-Chrysostomic writings of which there is some mention. Beyond a few letters, the vast majority are in the form of homilies, of which many are anthologies or simply extracts which repeat preexisting homilies. These spurious homilies were composed and/or translated in almost all the languages of Christian Antiquity (Greek, Arabic, *Armenian, *Coptic, Ethiopian, *Georgian, *Latin, Old Slavonic, *Syriac, Syro-Palestinian and even Nubian). The most recent spurious homilies seem to go back to the 15th–16th c.

CPG, above all 4500-5197 (it leaves out almost all the secondary texts); RAC 18, 503-515; J.A. de Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum* = Documents, Études et Répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 10, Paris 1965 (almost 600 entries, only on published Greek texts); *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci*. I-VI, Paris 1968–1999 (they point out some unpublished texts and analyze Greek extracts and anthologies); J.A. de Aldama, *Historia y balance de la investigación sobre homilías pseudocrisostómicas impresas*: SP 7 (TU 92), Berlin 1966, 117-132; P.G. Nicolopoulos, *Hai eis ton Ioannen ton Chrysostomon esphalmenos apodidomenai epistolai*, Athenais 1973; A. Rigo, *L'Epistola ai monaci* (*e l'Epistola ad un igumeno*) *di uno Pseudo-Crisostomo: un trattato dell'orazione esicasta scritto nello spirito dello Pseudo-Macario*: Studi e ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano 6 (1983) 197-215; S.J. Voicu, *Fonti dell'omelia pseudocrisostomica "In adorationem uenerandae crucis"* (*PG 62, 747-754; BHG 415; CPG 4672*): OCP 58 (1992) 279-283.

II. Origins. Genuine and spurious texts attributed to John Chrysostom are found together in the first witnesses to his work: both types of writings were transmitted already in the so-called Collection of the 38 Latin Homilies used by *Augustine in the

Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum (around 420). In the imperial capital, the Johannine community produced intentional falsifications (esp. relating to the banishment of 404), alongside of which entire corpora of other authors were transmitted under the name John Chrysostom in Johannine circles in *Antioch and *Constantinople.

S.J. Voicu, *Pseudo-Giovanni Crisostomo: i confini del corpus*: JbAC 39 (1996) 105-115; Id., *In Pentecosten sermo 1 (PG 52, 803-808; CPG 4536): il problema dell'autenticità*: Historiam perscrutari. Miscellanea di studi offerti al prof. Ottorino Pasquato, ed. M. Maritano, Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 180, Rome 2002, 849-861; Id., *"Furono chiamati giovanniti . . ." Un'ipotesi sulla nascita del corpus pseudocrisostomico*, in *Philomathestatos: Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* . . . , ed. B. Janssens - B. Roosen - P. Van Deun, OLA 137, Leuven 2004, 701-711; Id., *La volontà e il caso: la tipologia dei primi spuri di Crisostomo*, in *Giovanni Crisostomo: Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo*. XXXIII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana. Roma, 6-8 maggio 2004 (SEA 93), Rome 2005, 101-118.

III. Systematic attributions. The known corpora of ps.-Chrysostomic homilies by unknown authors are the following: (1) three homilies of Antiochene provenance from the end of the 4th c.; (2) 37 homilies by an author of Cappadocian education (perhaps a disciple of *Basil the Great), but active in Constantinople around the year 400; (3) five homilies of Antiochene origin given at Constantinople around the year 400; (4) two homilies of Antiochene origin, perhaps from the 1st half of the 5th c.; (5) two Constantinopolitan homilies of the 2nd half of the 5th c. (perhaps by *Acacius of Constantinople); (6) a "plagiarizer," perhaps of the end of the 5th c.; (7) two anonymous homilies, perhaps of the end of the 5th c.; (8) two homilies which comment on Matthew; (9) two Lenten homilies prior to the 8th c.; (10) two Byzantine homilies on *John the Baptist; (11) the *De precatione orationes 1-2* (PG 50, 775-786).

(1) S.J. Voicu, *"Giovanni di Gerusalemme" e Pseudo-Crisostomo: Saggio di critica di stile*: Euntes Docete 24 (1971) 69-90; (2) Id., *Tracce origeniane in uno Pseudocrisostomo Cappadoce*, in *Origene e l'alessandrinismo cappadoce (III-IV secolo)*. Atti del V Convegno del Gruppo Italiano di ricerca su "Origene e la tradizione alessandrina" (Bari, 20-22 settembre 2000), ed. M. Girardi and M. Marin, Bari 2002, 333-346; Id., *Ancora due omelie pseudocrisostomiche di matrice cappadoce (CPG 4669 e 4966)*, in Ricerche patristiche in onore di Dom Basil Studer OSB (= Augustinianum 32, 1-2), Rome 1993, 476-477; (3) Id., *Une nomenclature pour les anonymes du corpus pseudo-chrysostomien*: Byzantion 51 (1981) 302, num. 16; (6) Id., *"Giovanni di Gerusalemme"* . . . , 90-100; (7) M. Simonetti, *Note su due omelie ariane pubblicate recentemente*, in Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella. II, Catania 1972, 417-423; (8) S.J. Voicu, *Une nomenclature* . . . , 302, num. 17; (9) ibid., 303, num. 19; (10) C. Datema, *Another Unedited Homily of Ps. Chrysostom on the Birth of John the Baptist (BHG 847i)*: Byzantion 53 (1983) 492-493. Among the spurious works attested in the 5th c. the *In natalem Christi diem* is isolated (PG 56, 385-394). The following merit a special mention: the liturgy, perhaps contemporaneous with Chrysostom, the Latin *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* (5th c.), the subordinationist homily *In operarios undecimae horae* (CPG 4763; V c.?) and some homilies on the *subintroductae* (*Ascetam facetiis uti non debere*: PG 48, 1055-1060; *De corruptoribus virginum*: PG 60, 741-744; *In evangelii dictum et de virginitate*: PG 64, 37-44). R. Taft, *The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer*: OCA 56 (1990) 5-51; for Eng. tr. of the *Opus imperfectum*, see *Incomplete Commentary on Matthew (Opus imperfectum)*, tr. J.A. Kellerman, ACT, 2 vols., Downers Grove, IL 2010.

IV. Intentional attributions. The corpora of some authors seem to have been intentionally attributed to John Chrysostom. Sometimes it is a matter of lending credence to heretics, as in cases like *Nestorius, *Apollinaris or perhaps Acacius of Constantinople (see above n. 5); at other times, as in the cases of *Proclus of Constantinople, *Leontius of Constantinople or *Severian of Gabala, the motivations are uncertain.

S.J. Voicu, *Nestorio e la* Oratio de epiphania *(CPG 4882) attribuita a Giovanni Crisostomo*: Augustinianum 43 (2003) 495-499; E. Cattaneo, *Trois homélies pseudo-chrysostomiennes sur la Pâque comme oeuvre d'Apollinaire de Laodicée* (Théol. Hist. 58), Paris 1981; S.J. Voicu, *Dieci omelie di Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Studi sull'oriente cristiano 5 (2001) 1, 165-190; Id., *Il nome cancellato: la trasmissione delle omelie di Severiano di Gabala*: RHT n.s. 1 (2006) 317-333.

V. Localized texts. Some ancient homilies can be localized. From Constantinople come: (1) *Laudatio apostolorum* (CPG 4970; unpublished; Church of the Holy Apostles, between 363 and 380; cf. S.J. Voicu, *Echi costantinopolitani di sant'Ireneo. Note su una pseudocrisostomica "Laudatio apostolorum" [CPG 4970]*, in B. Magnusson et al. [ed.], Ultra terminum uagari. Scritti in onore di Carl Nylander, Rome 1997, 357-366); (2) *In s. Thomam et in oeconomiam domini nostri* (CPG 4924); C. Datema - P. Allen, *BHG 1841s: An Unedited Homily of Ps. Chrysostom on Thomas*: Byzantion 56 (1986) 28-53; in the Great Church, around the middle of the 6th c., see C. Datema, *New Evidence for the Encounter Between Constantinople and "India,"* in C. Laga - J.A. Munitiz - L. Van Rompay, *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for His Seventieth Birthday* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 18), Leuven 1985, 57-65; (3) *In sanctum Thomam Apostolum sermo* (PG 59, 497-500; in 402, in St. Thomas of Drypia; see ibid., 59-60); (4) *De circo* (PG 59, 567-570; describes the Hippodrome and alludes to Marathonius; 4th–5th c.?).

From Antioch come: (1) *De proditione Iudae* (PG 50, 715-720; alludes to Daphne); (2) In illud, *Simile*

est regnum caelorum patrifamilias (PG 59, 577-586; alludes to Barlaam the martyr); (3) *De anathemate* (PG 48, 945-952; probably by Flavian of Antioch; it cites Ignatius of Antioch); (4) *Sermo de pseudoprophetis* (PG 59, 553-568; around 677; cf. A. Whealey, *Sermo de pseudoprophetis of Pseudo-John Chrysostom: A Homily from Antioch Under Early Islamic Rule*: Byzantion 69 [1999] 178-186).

VI. Accidental attributions. Some accidental attributions are due to errors in the MS tradition or to scribal conjectures: **Protevangelium of James,* *John the Faster, Anatolius of Thessalonica or John the disciple of Basil.

É. de Strycker, *De griekse handschriften van het Protevangelie van Jacobus* (Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse akademie voor wetenschappen. Klasse der Letteren 30, 1), Brussels 1968, 37; S.J. Voicu, *Basilio e pseudocrisostomo: nuovi accostamenti*, in *Basilio di Cesarea, la sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia*. Atti del Congresso internazionale (Messina 3-6 dicembre 1979), I, Messina 1983, 659-667 (cf. also L. Gambero, *Un'omelia pseudo-crisostomica sul Vangelo dell'Annunciazione*: Marianum 47 [1985] 517-535).

VII. Anthologies and extracts. The majority of the spurious works are "secondary" texts (extracts or anthologies of preexisting homilies). The number of those known has grown dizzyingly with the publication of the *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci*. The composition of the works of this genre had begun before the end of the 5th c., as Coptic translations attest. The *ethika* deserve a particular mention; i.e., the moral conclusions taken from the exegetical homilies (materially, but not formally authentic) and the numerous *Eclogues* of Theodore Daphnopates (10th c.).

S. Haidacher, *Studien über Chrysostomos-Eklogen* (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften 144, 4), Vienna 1902.

S.J. Voicu

JOHN CLIMACUS (or Scholasticus) (d. ca. 649). He was born before 579 and died around 649. His life is mostly unknown. It had been thought that he was of the 6th c., but F. Nau believed he was able to date his death to around 649 (*Notes sur la date de la mort de Saint Jean Climaque*: ByzZ 11 [1902] 35-37). His biographer Daniel (PG 88, 596-608) comments that John was a monk in community at Raithu, to the SW of the Sinai, and later a hermit, and that when he was sixty he was elected abbot of the monastery on the Sinai.

His name Climacus is a nickname taken from the work titled Κλίμαξ τοῦ Παραδείσου (Lat. *Scala paradisi*, "*Ladder of Paradise*"): "John of the Ladder": the Greek genitive was Latinized as the nominative *Climacus*. He was induced to write his work, when he was abbot, by another John, the superior of the monastery of Raithu. In 30 chapters or steps, he explains the vices that are dangerous for monks (1-23) and the virtues which distinguish them (24-30). John himself compares his work to Jacob's ladder or to the 30 years of the life of Jesus. The work found acceptance and success, attested by the existence of 33 Greek MSS and of a great number of *Latin, *Syriac, *Armenian, Slavic and Arabic translations. This circumstance makes a critical edition (as yet nonexistent) difficult. As an appendix a complement is united to the *Ladder,* a *Liber ad Pastorem* (PG 88, 1165-1209). The author expounds in it the duties of the superior of the monastery, inspired probably by the *Regula pastoralis* of *Gregory the Great, which had been translated into Greek around 600 by a patriarch of *Antioch.

John is a typical representative of the tendency which I. Hausherr has called the "Sinaitic school." The monastic ideal is **hesychia,* internal and external tranquility. The awareness of the "invisible war" against the *logismoi,* wicked thoughts, is the preliminary condition for continual prayer. In order to know the spirits of wickedness and the contrary virtues, John proposes numerous "definitions," short aphorisms which bring into relief all the principal aspects of the subject in question and which often synthesize the long experience of the monks. In fact, more than it might seem, John has a good acquaintance with the ancient Fathers, not only with the hermits of the Egyptian desert, but also with the Palestinians *Barsanuphius and *Dorotheus of Gaza.

John considers monastic life necessary for the church, not as an apostolate, nor as an "example" proposed visibly: the monks influence the life of the church by means of their leading "an angelic life, although they inhabit the material and corruptible body" (*Ladder*, step 1).

The *editio princeps* is that of M. Raderus, Paris 1633: PG 88, 596-1209. The ed. of the monk Sophronius of Rodosto is insufficient, Constantinople 1883. It. tr., Gentile da Foligno (Venezia 1491), L. Oliger (Florence 1912), Trevisan (Turin 1941: with Greek text which essentially follows Raderus), B. Ignesti (Siena 1955). Eng. tr., L. Moore, New York 1959.

CPG 7850-7853; DTC 8, 690-693; BS 6, 664-666; Cath 6, 445-6; DSp 8, 369-389; DIP 4, 1296-1297; A. Saudrau, *La doctrine spirituelle de st. Jean Climaque*: Vie Spirit. 9 (1924) 352-370; A. Colunga, *La Escala Espiritual de san Juan Clímaco*: Vida Sobrenatural 31 (1936) 269-277; J. Gribomont, *La "Scala Paradisi." Jean de Raïthou et Ange Clareno*: StudMon 2 (1960) 345-358; I. Hausherr, *La théologie du monachisme chez saint Jean Climaque*, in *Théologie de la vie monastique*, Paris 1961, 385-410;

W. Völker, *Scala Paradisi. Eine Studie zu Johannes Climacus and zugleich eine Vorstudie zu Symeon den Neuen Theologen*, Wiesbaden 1968; Ph. Savvopoulos, *Ekstatische Person als Bildungsziel bei Johannes Klimakos. Ein Beitrag zur griechisch-orthodoxen Pädagogik*, Frankfurt 1986; J. Chryssavgis, *Ascent to Heaven: The Theology of the Human Person According to Saint John of the Ladder*, Brookline, MA 1989; *L'Échelle sainte / Saint-Jean Climaque*, Fr. tr. by P. Deseille, Bégrolles-en-Mauge, Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1993; *Klimax oder Die Himmelsleiter / Heiliger Johannes vom Sinai*, Ger. tr., G. Makedos, Würzburg 2000; J.-C. Larchet, *"Die Leiter des göttlichen Aufstiegs" von Johannes Klimakos*: OS 49 (2000) 269-313; Patrologia V, 282-284; C. Benke, *Die Gabe der Tränen: zur Tradition und Theologie eines vergessenen Kapitels der Glaubensgeschichte*, Echter 2002, 29-90; C. Restagno, *Monaci e angeli secondo Giovanni Climaco*: Quaderni medievali 53 (2002) 69-86; *Giovanni Climaco e il Sinai*, ed. S. Chialà - L. Cremaschi, Magnano 2002; J. Chryssavgis, *John Climacus: From the Egyptian Desert to the Sinaite Mountain*, Aldershot 2004; *Giovanni Climaco, La scala*, It. tr. and notes by L. D'Ayala Valva, Magnano 2005.

T. Špidlík

JOHN Comes (5th c.). Lived at Antarados in the 5th c. and was a *comes sacrarum largitionum*—i.e., an official in charge of sacred gifts. In 431, as the report which he sent to *Constantinople witnesses, he went to *Ephesus to consign to the more than fifty bishops who had taken part in the 3rd Ecumenical Council a letter of the emperor *Theodosius II which invited them to put a definitive end to the controversies which had arisen within the Eastern church following the affirmation of the *Nestorian heresy.

CPG 8723-4; PG 84, 605-607; ACO I,I,3, I,I,7, 31-32, 67-68; PLRE II, 607.

P. Marone

JOHN DIACRINOMENOS (6th c.). An author originally from *Syria and of moderate *monophysite allegiance. He composed, after 512, a *Historia ecclesiastica* in 10 books, which covered the period from *Theodosius II (429) to the reign of the emperor *Anastasius I (491–518). Of this work nothing remains except mentions and citations collected by an anonymous compiler of the beginning of the 7th c., also responsible for the summary of the *Historia ecclesiastica* of *Theodore the Lector. The first five books of this work were known also to *Photius (*Bibliotheca* I, cod. 41). A recent attempt to characterize the writer emphasizes his hostility to *dyophysitism, the partisanship in confrontation with Cyrillian Christology, but also the distance from the attitudes of schism typical of *Severus of Antioch or of *Philoxenus of Mabbug.

Editions: *Theodoros Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen (GCS, neue Folge, 3), Berlin 1971, 152-157. *Studies*: Ph. Blaudeau, *Mémoire monophysite et besoins chalcédoniens. Quelques réflexions sur les vestiges de l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Jean Diacrinoménos*: Adamantius 7 (2001) 76-97.

A. Camplani

JOHN DRUNGARIUS. Catenist (6th–7th c.). There is no information on the life and work of this catenist who lived between the 6th and the 7th c., author of a *catena* for each of the four major prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel). In the prologue to the *catena* to Isaiah he declares that, being unable to understand the text of the prophet, he turned to the Fathers to elucidate the difficulties, in particular to *Origen, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Theodore of Heraclea, *Eusebius of Emesa, *Apollinaris and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. He observes, however, in order to distance himself from the accusations of heresy against them, that when these authors do not present their own doctrines, they offer interesting observations.

See Patrologia V, the chapter on the *catenae*; G. Dorival, *Des commentaires de l'Écriture aux chaînes*, in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris 1984, 360-386, esp. 368ff.

A. Di Berardino

JOHN MALALAS (d. after 565). The nickname Malalas is of *Syriac origin and means "orator" or "advocate." Little is known of his life. He was born in the region of *Antioch, where he was educated between 470 and 480; he spent time in Thessalonica and *Caesarea Philippi (Palestine) and later lived in *Constantinople. He was part of the imperial bureaucracy. Some scholars have proposed an identification with John Scholasticus (d. 577), who was elected patriarch of the imperial capital in 565. He wrote in popular Greek a *Chronography* or *Universal History* in 17 books of clear *monophysite leanings; in a second period he added an eighteenth book to it, this time orthodox (PG 97, 627-718), which concentrates on the capital, so that some think that the author is another person. His chronicle goes from the creation of the world until his time; the text, in the only preserved MS, ends at the year of 563 (instead of 574, as it was in the full work). The work presents itself more as a literary history than as a rigorous chronological treatment; it refers to Greek mythology in the section narrating the successions of peoples: the ancient East, the patriarchs, the Greeks, the Macedonians, the Romans. The first book has been reconstructed in part from Greek, Slavic, Latin, Ethiopian and Syriac fragments. Almost all the sources used

have been lost. This history had a large influence both in the East and in the West with translations in Syriac, Latin, Slovenian and Ethiopian.

CPG 7511 (with bibl.); Repertorium 6, 356; L. Dindorf, *Chronographia*: CSHB 15, Bonn 1831 = PG 97, 9-790; A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die römische Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas; Griechischer Texte der Bücher IX-XII und Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart 1931; Ioannis Malalae *Chronographia*, recensuit I. Thurm, CFHB 35, Berlin 2000; M.E. Colonna, *Gli storici bizantini dal cent. IV al XV cent.*, Naples 1956, 73ff.; A.-J. Festugière, *Notabilia dans Malalas*: RPh 52 (1978) 221-241; RPh 53 (1979) 227-237; E. Jeffreys - M. Jeffreys - R. Scott et al., *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation*, Melbourne 1986; R.D. Scott, *Malalas, The Secret History, and Justinian's Propaganda*: DOP 39 (1985) 99-109; E. Jeffreys, B. Croke and R. Scott (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas*, Sydney 1990; E.M. Jeffreys, *The Chronicle of John Malalas, Book I: A Commentary*, in P. Allen - E.M. Jeffreys (eds.), *The Sixth Century—End or Beginning*?, Brisbane 1996, 52-74; R. Scott, *Writing the Reign of Justinian: Malalas versus Theophanes*, ibid., 20-34; ODB 2, 1275; A. Laniado, *La Vie d'Hypatius de Gangres* (*BHG 759a*), *Jean Malalas et l'impôt du "xylélaion"*: AB 115 (1997) 133-166; BBKL 3, 468-473; I. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, Berlin 2000 (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 35).

J.-M. Sauget

JOHN MANDAKUNI (484–498). Armenian catholicos to whom 25 homilies are attributed as well as some prayers in the Armenian breviary. Current scholars ascribe these works more often to John of Cak'nut (7th c.).

S. Weber, *Ausgewählte Schriften der armenischen Kirchenväter*, II, Munich 1927, 29-269; Bardenhewer V, 206-208; Y. Tabakian, *Les homélies du catholicos Hovhan Mandakouni* (Catholicossat Arménien de Cilicie. Publication du Département de l'Éducation Chrétienne 65), Antélias 2000 (does not discuss the authenticity).

S.J. Voicu

JOHN MAXENTIUS (6th c.). Leader of the so-called Scythian monks, active 519–533 between *Constantinople and *Rome in favor of the *theopaschite formula **unus de Trinitate passus est*. It is uncertain if he should be identified with *John, bishop of Tomi (Thrace) between 530 and 550, author of a brief *Disputatio de Nestorianis et Eutychianis*. It is still uncertain if the names Maxentius and John should be applied to one and the same person, or whether they indicate two distinct figures, both belonging to the clan of the Scythian monks, the abbot Maxentius and the monk John. Maxentius John (as the Bodl. Laud. misc. 580 calls him, the only source which unites the two names) wrote in Latin, beyond some very short works (*Capitula contra nestorianos et pelagianos; Professio brevissima catholicae fidei; Brevissima adunationis ratio verbi ad propriam carnem; Responsio contra acephalos*), just two large works: the *Dialogus contra nestorianos* in two books and the *Responsio adversus epistulam quam ad Possessorem a Romano episcopo dicunt haeretici destinatam*. In the anti-*Nestorian work John Maxentius maintains a *Christology of *Neochalcedonian type, since he affirms the indispensability of the formula *unus de Trinitate passus est* and of extremist expressions of Cyrillian stamp, such as *una naturalis persona est idem Christus ex Trinitate,* to exclude a Nestorian interpretation of the Chalcedonian formula. In the *Responsio* he tries to reply to the very serious accusations which Pope *Hormisdas had made against the Scythian monks in the letter to *Possessor. In order to be free in his criticism, John Maxentius pretends to believe that the letter of Hormisdas is a falsification of heretics. Usually ascribed to John Maxentius is also the *Libellus fidei* which in 519 the Scythian monks presented to the delegates of Hormisdas at Constantinople and which the latter did not want to receive.

CPL 656-665; CCL 85A (bibl.); J.A. McGuckin, *The "Theopaschite Confession" (Text and Historical Context): A Study in the Cyrilline Reinterpretation of Chalcedon*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 35 (1984) 239-255; F. Carcione, *La controversia tra Ormisda e i monaci sciti sulla formula "Unus de Trinitate passus est carne": calcedonismo integralista e calcedonismo integrato a confronto*, in *Atti del Convegno su Papa Ormisda (514-523). Magistero, cura pastorale ed impegno ecumenico*, ed. C. Noce, Frosinone 1993, 57ff.; Patrologia IV, 190-191.

M. Simonetti

JOHN "MEDIOCRIS" of Naples (bishop 532/535–552/555). Author of a collection of 30 (or 31) Latin sermons transmitted under the name of *John Chrysostom. The attribution to John was first advanced and later dropped by Morin. The provenance of the homilies, composed around the 1st half of the 6th c., is uncertain (Africa? S Italy?). Their author used *Augustine; a relationship between them and the *Regula magistri* remains hypothetical.

PLS 4, 741-834; CPL 915; G. Morin, *Étude sur une série de discours d'un évêque [de Naples?] du VI^e siècle*: RBen 11 (1894) 385-402; Id., *Un essai d'autocritique*: RBen 12 (1895) 390-391; Id., *Études, textes, découvertes*, I, Maredsous-Paris 1913, 37-38; A. Vaccari, *La Bibbia nell'ambiente di S. Benedetto*: Biblica 29 (1948) 331-337; M. Lambert, *Édition d'une collection latine découverte par Dom Morin*: REAug 15 (1969) 255-258; J.-P. Bouhot, *La collection homilétique pseudo-chrysostomienne découverte par Dom Morin*: REAug 16 (1970) 139-146.

S.J. Voicu

JOHN MOSCHUS (Moschos) (d. 620/634). Or rather, John Eukratas. He was born perhaps at *Damascus, more likely in Isauria, before 550. He died in *Constantinople a little after having finished the redaction of his work between 11 November 620 and the spring-summer of 634 (Follieri), while acc. to Louth he died in *Rome. Before dying he gave orders to his friend *Sophronius to carry his body back to the Sinai, but he was buried in the monastery of St. Theodosius near *Jerusalem. A monk of the monastery of St. Theodosius, then later of the monastery of Pharan in Judea (ca. 568–578), he made a long pilgrimage to the East and later to *Italy as far as Rome, together with his disciple Sophronius, future patriarch of Jerusalem. With Sophronius's collaboration, he wrote the *Pratum Spirituale* (*Leimonarion*) (the Greek text was published by Fronton du Duc-Ducaeus, *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum*, II, Paris 1624 and by J.B. Cotelier, *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, II, Paris 1681, cf. PG 87, 3, 2847-3116; Fr. tr. M.J. Rouët de Journel, SC 12, Paris 1946, repr. 1960). The work shows traces of the literary genre of *Palladius, the *Historia monachorum* of *Theodoret, and generally the *Vitae Patrum;* it already reflects, however, a period of crisis which precedes the Persian and Arabic invasions and the divisions provoked between the monks by the christological controversies. It certainly remains an important collection of monastic narrations, fruit of so many pilgrimages, experiences and memories. John Moschus and Sophronius also together wrote a biography of the patriarch of Alexandria *John the Almsgiver (ed. H. Delehaye, AB 45 [1927] 19-25; the chap. I-XV are only a summary of the lost *Vita*). John Moschus is a defender of the *Chalcedonian church, and his friend Sophronius, starting from 633, became in Jerusalem one of the principal adversaries of *monothelitism, then a founder of the *Melkite Church.

CPG 7376-7377; DTC 10, 2510-2513; DSp 8, 632-640; DIP 4, 1284-5; M.H. Baynes, *The "Pratum spirituale"*: OCP 13 (1947) 404-414; E. Mioni, *Paterica dello pseudo-Mosco*: St. biz. neoell. 8 (1953) 27-36; H. Chadwick, *John Moschus and His Friend Sophronius the Sophist*: JTS 25 (1974) 41-74; *Il prato*, It. tr. and comm. by R. Maisano, Naples 1982; P. Pattenden, *The Editions of the Pratum Spirituale of John Moschus*: SP XV, 15-19; G. Pasini, *Il monachesimo nel Prato di Giovanni Mosco e i suoi aspetti popolari*: VetChr 22 (1985) 331-379; J.S. Palmer, *La vida monástica en el Pratum spirituale de Juan Mosco*, Madrid 1992; Id., *El monacato oriental en el Pratum spirituale de Juan Mosco*, Madrid 1993; Ph. Pattenden, *Some Remarks on the Newly Edited Text of the Pratum of John Moschus*: SP 18/2 45-51; E. Follieri, *Dove e quando morì Giovanni Mosco*: RSBN 25 (1988) 3-39; A. Louth, *Did John Moschos Really Die in Constantinople?*: JTS 49 (1998) 149-154; Patrologia V, 295-297.

T. Špidlík

JOHN of Aegeates. A miaphysite author of the 5th c. who should not be identified with John of Cilicia. Two fragments have been preserved of a letter from him to *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, in the *Syriac translation of the *Contra impium grammaticum* of *Severus of Antioch.

F. Nau, *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Église nestorienne* (PO 13/2), Paris 1916, 188-189; M. Richard, *La lettre de Théodoret à Jean d'Égées*, in *Opera Minora II*, Turnhout-Leuven 1977, n. 48.

K. den Biesen

JOHN of Antioch (d. 441/442). He was probably born at *Antioch, on an unknown date in the 2nd half of the 4th c. Educated together with *Nestorius and *Theodore (future bishop of Mopsuestia) in the monastery of St. Euprepius near Antioch, he was elected bishop of Antioch in 428, at the time when the *Nestorian controversy arose, to which his name is closely linked.

Having learned from Pope *Celestine of the decision taken in synod at Rome concerning Nestorius (Jaffé 373), John wrote a friendly letter to the bishop of *Constantinople to exhort him to accept the title of *Theotokos, and at the same time he charged *Andrew of Samosata and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus to refute the anathemas of *Cyril of Alexandria.

Called to the Council of *Ephesus (19 November 430), he traveled there with about forty Syrian bishops. Because of the different difficulties encountered during the voyage, the group reached the conciliar city only 24 June, by which time Cyril, without waiting for the Easterners, had already opened the session two days before and condemned Nestorius. With his group and other bishops offended by the procedure followed by the bishop of *Alexandria, John convened another synod of 43 (or 50) participants who met in a palace where John was staying and decided in synod to depose Cyril of Alexandria and *Memnon of Ephesus, considered authors of the heresies contained in the anathemas, and to excommunicate their followers. This sentence was communicated through fourteen documents, not only to the interested parties but also to the highest authorities of the empire, and to the clergy and people of Constantinople. Having refused, after three canonical summons, to appear before the Ephesian council proper, John was in turn excommunicated with 34 bishops of his party. *Theodosius II approved the condemnation both of Cyril and of Nestorius, which cheered John, convinced that the anathemas had thus been condemned, as he declared in a letter to the emperor in which he accepts

without hesitation the title of Theotokos and expounds the christological faith of his party in a formula which would be adopted three years later as a symbol of union. At *Nicodemia, in restricted sessions in the presence of Theodosius (September 431) in which John took part, no accord was reached. The emperor thereupon dissolved the council. On the route back to Antioch, John paused at Berea with the elderly *Acacius, later selected as mediator by Theodosius II, who also had an ultimatum concerning reconciliation brought to Cyril and John by his prefect Aristolaus. Difficult negotiations followed until Cyril accepted the attached formula of faith, slightly reviseed, in which the christological dogma was expressed in terms that would be taken up again by the Council of *Chalcedon. It remained to induce all the bishops of his party to accept this union. Certain "hard-liners," such as Theodoret, finally ceded, though without explicitly condemning Nestorius. With others, such as *Alexander of Hierapolis, obstinate in their opposition to Cyril, the efforts of John were in vain. He had to take action against them.

In the years 437–438, before giving his own assent to the *Tome to the Armenians* requested by the patriarch *Proclus of Constantinople, John wanted to protect the memory of his deceased friend Theodore of Mopsuestia. It was the last known act of the bishop of Antioch, whose death took place 441/442.

The written work of John is entirely included in the abundant correspondence exchanged in his own name and as a party leader in the years 430–438.

CPG 6301-6360; CPG 6301-6360; PG 84; Fliche-Martin IV, 216-261; M. Richard, *Théodoret, Jean d'Antioche et les moines d'Orient*, in *Opera Minora* 2, Turnhout-Leuven 1977, n. 47, 147-156; A. Grillmeier - H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, II, Würzburg 1951-54, *passim*; Cath 6, 525; L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, 195-299; Grillmeier 12, 484, 488, 497-498; RGG[4] 3, 522; W. Kraatz, *Koptische Akten zum ephesinischen Konzil* (TU 26/2), Leipzig 1904, 191-200.

D. Stiernon

JOHN of Antioch, chronicler (6th–7th c.). Author of a *Historia chronica,* a Christian history of the world from the creation of Adam until the ascent of the emperor *Heraclius in AD 610. The work has survived in fragments and an almost entirely indirect tradition (for the edition see Roberto and Sotiroudis). The little information we have regarding John derives exclusively from the reading of the fragments. He wrote in the first years of the reign of Heraclius, thus in the period 610–630. *Antioch, his homeland, is probably the place where he was educated: on this issue his dependence on the *Chronographia* of the Antiochene *John Malalas is a matter of great significance (see the very early E. Patzig, *Johannes Antiochenus und Johannes Malalas*, Leipzig 1891). The reference point for all the historical reconstruction for the years closest to him, however, is *Constantinople. It should be deduced from this fact that John wrote at Constantinople and addressed a public who lived in the capital.

There are numerous historical sources used in the *Historia*: in the cases of Herodian, Cassius Dio, *Zosimus, Priscus of Panium, Candidus Isauricus and Malalas himself, the work of John reveals itself as a valuable witness of indirect tradition (see, e.g., U. Roberto, *Sulla tradizione storiografica di Candido Isaurico*: Mediterraneo antico 3 [2000] 685-727). The abundance of sources (also in *Latin) suggests that the author had a furnished library in the capital at his disposition. The style of the work is very cultivated; the language and the vocabulary are still based on the classical tradition; and furthermore the adherence to the classicizing historiographic tendency is also expressed by the themes handled. To be precise, the work is a Christian history of the world in the form of a chronicle, which shows a striking interest in political questions, in particular the role of Rome in universal history. After the first two books dedicated to the synchronism between biblical history and Greco-Eastern history (acc. to the well-established method of Christian universal chronicle), and a book on the war of Troy, the attention is concentrated on Rome. In the course of the dense narration a historiographic reflection of great originality emerges: in fact, John exalts the history of republican Rome (which occupies at least 5 books of the work), and presents the men and values of that period as a model of political virtue and moral rigor for his contemporaries. It is interesting to note that the imperial history starting from Augustus is often described as a degeneration of the splendor of the republican era (on this theme see U. Roberto, *L'immagine di Roma repubblicana nella* Historia chronica *di Giovanni di Antiochia*: Romanobarbarica 18 [2003-2005] 351-370; L. Zusi, *L'età marianosillana in Giovanni Antiocheno*, Rome 1989). The tendency to describe political institutions, to deal with military issues and the functioning of the empire, on the one hand, and the solid classical culture, on the other, lead to the conclusion that John worked in Constantinople in the environment of the bureaucracy or in service to some institution of the capital. During the transition between Late Antiquity and *Byzantium, John of Antioch wrote a universal history turning still to the great classical historiographic tradition and, at the same time, reflecting

on the great political and cultural themes which marked the entire Late Antique period.

Repertorium 6, 278 (not found in the CPG); C. Müller, FHG 4, 535-622; 5, 27-38; K. Krumbacher 334-337; H. Hunger, *Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Munich 1978, I, 326-328; P. Sotiroudis, *Untersuchungen zum Geschichtswerk des Johannes von Antiocheia*, Thessaloniki 1989; *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*, intr., critical ed. and It. tr. by U. Roberto, TU 154, Berlin-New York 2005.

U. ROBERTO

JOHN of Apamea, "the Solitary" (5th c.?). An extremely prolific writer, to whom more than 90 texts are ascribed—including collections of aphorisms, dialogues, numerous letters, twelve biblical commentaries, *mēmrē*, doxologies and prayers—of many different origins but all of a monastic character, the greater part of which remain unpublished. Even if the entirety of this corpus cannot be attributed to a single author, it is clear that it comes from the same monastic environment, which seems to be that of *Apamea. From the moment when the first of these works was published, the interest in this spiritual author has not ceased to grow. Even if his precise identity remains unknown, the majority of scholars identify him with the John of Apamea mentioned by *Babai the Great in the margin of a citation of one of his letters. The christological vocabulary of the published writings, which present a post-Ephesian and pre-Chalcedonian orthodoxy, has permitted the dating of his activity to the 1st decades of the 5th c. Even if he seems to belong, therefore, to the Syro-Western tradition, his influence surpassed the ecclesiastical frontiers (as is the case for so many other spiritual writers), and both the MS tradition and explicit citations demonstrate that John was widely read and appreciated in the church of the East.

The *exegesis of John offers an ascetic-monastic reading of the Bible which includes neither Alexandrian *allegory nor Antiochene literalness. In fact, even if he is an exponent of an erudite asceticism which is nourished by the contributions of the Greek schools, John nevertheless opposes vigorously that which he considers "Hellenization" of the Syriac-language churches, i.e., to theological rationalism and the exaltation of beautiful oratory and dialectical ability. His manner of thinking and writing is deeply rooted in the *Syriac tradition, more precisely in that of *Ephrem and the school of *Edessa in general. It is possible that he knew the first Syriac translations of *Evagrius, but in the present state of knowledge his relationship with the latter is anything but clear.

The ascetic doctrine of John demonstrates, in fact, a great originality and had an enormous influence on the later developments of Eastern spirituality and mysticism. (It is enough to mention *Isaac of Nineveh, *Simon of Taybutheh, *Joseph Hazzaya and *John of Dalyatha). John distinguishes three orders in the spiritual life, which reflects his three-part anthropology, acc. to which the soul is a spiritual entity linked to the body and therefore situated at an inferior level to that of the spirit. These three orders of "corporality," "psychicality" and "spirituality" are three ways of feeling, thinking and acting which also can be presented as three successive stages of spiritual growth. In the first stage, the individual refuses to obey the commandments and is dominated by the desires of the body, while in the second he rises above the material world to fight against wicked thoughts and thus reach purity of the soul (*dakyūtā*). At that point the soul is free from the influences of the body (i.e., the passions) and advances to the last stage of "clarity" or "limpidity" (*šapyūtā*), which corresponds to the spiritual nature of humanity: a state of perfect readiness to receive the revelation of divine and eschatological mysteries.

Editions: S. Dedering, *Johannes von Lycopolis. Ein Dialog über die Seele und die Affekte des Menschen*, Uppsala 1936; L.G. Rignell, *Briefe von Johannes dem Einsiedler*, Lund 1941; L.G. Rignell, *Drei Traktate von Johannes dem Einsiedler*, Lund 1960; W. Strothmann, *Johannes von Apamea. Sechs Gespräche mit Thomasios. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Thomasios und Johannes und drei an Thomasios gerichteten Abhandlungen*, Berlin 1972; W. Strothmann, *Der Kohelet-Kommentar des Johannes von Apamea*, Göttingen 1988; M. Nin, *Comentario de Juan el Solitario a Ef 6,11*: StudMon 33 (1991) 207-222.

Translations: I. Hausherr, *Jean le Solitaire - Pseudo-Jean de Lycopolis. Dialogue sur l'âme et les passions de l'homme* (OCA 120), Rome 1939; S. Brock, *John the Solitary, "On Prayer"*: JTS 30 (1979) 84-101; R. Lavenant, *Jean d'Apamée. Dialogues et traités* (SC 311), Paris 1984; Holy Transfiguration Monastery, *The Ascetical Homilies of Saint Isaac the Syrian*, Boston 1984, Appendix D: tr. of the treatises *On Silence* and *On Prayer;* S. Brock, *The Syriac Fathers on the Spiritual Life* (Cistercian Studies 101), Kalamazoo 1987, 77-100: tr. of the *Letter to Hesychius*; M. Nin, *Il Commento di Giovanni il Solitario a Mt 5,3*: Harp 5 (1992) 29-37; M. Nin, *Juan el Solitario, Carta a Hesiquio*: Quadernos Monásticos 110 (1994) 367-390; M. Nin, *Memra de Juan el Solitario*: StudMon 37 (1995) 19-39. DSp 8, 764-772; Patrologia V, 459-60; Bettiolo, *Lineamenti*, 544-547; P. Harb, *Doctrine spirituelle de Jean le Solitaire (Jean d'Apamée)*: PdO 2 (1971) 225-260; P. Bettiolo, *Sulla Preghiera: Filosseno o Giovanni?*: Muséon 94 (1981) 75-89; A. de Halleux, *La christologie de Jean le Solitaire*: Muséon 94 (1981) 84-101; A. de Halleux, *Le milieu historique de Jean le Solitaire*, in *III Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 221), Rome 1983, 299-305; J. Martikainen, *Johannes von Apamea und die Entwicklung der syrischen Theologie*, in *IV Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 229), Rome 1987, 257-263; R. Beulay, *La lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, Chevetogne 1987, 95-127 (see the index also); M. Nin, *Giovanni il Solitario. Due dossologie cristologiche*, in *Mysterium Christi* (Studia Anselmiana 116), Rome 1995, 205-218.

K. DEN BIESEN

JOHN of Arles (7th c.). From this bishop of *Arles (658/659–668) we have a short *Epistula ad virgines* addressed to the nuns of the convent of St. Mary, situated within the walls of the city; it is an exhortation to the observance of the monastic life and above all on the times for fasts and the relationship with the laity.

CPL 1848; PL 72, 859-860.

A. Di Berardino

JOHN of Berytus (end of the 5th c.). Bishop in the last quarter of the 5th. c., known esp. through the *Vita of Severus of Antioch* written by *Zacharias Scholasticus (PO 2, 66.69.78). Zacharias and *Severus of Antioch both knew him personally between 474 and 491. Zacharias, who presents John as a follower of the *Chalcedonian party, relates two episodes in which he appears engaged in the fight against magic and necromancy. In the *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* (ed. Delehaye, Brussels 1902, 475, 37) he is cited as a collaborator of *Rabbula of Samosata (450–530) in founding a monastery. A brief Easter homily by him is preserved.

CPG 6720; SC 187 (ed. M. Aubineau), Paris 1972, 284-288, 296-299; Patrologia V, 184.

F. Scorza Barcellona

JOHN of Biclaro (d. ca. 621). Abbot of Biclaro and bishop of *Gerona (*Spain) in the 6th c., he was a *Goth of Catholic faith. Educated in *Constantinople and returned to his homeland at seventeen, he was a witness to the unification of Spain brought about by *Leovigild and to the conversion of Leovigild's son *Recared. His *Chronicon* reflects all these experiences; it continues that of *Victor of Tunnuna for several years, from 576 to 590. He is interested in events in the East, but above all he exalts the political and military achievement of Leovigild, whose killing of his son *Hermenegild he minimizes as well as his actions hostile to Catholics. It ends with the conversion of the Goths to Catholicism, which is the central ideal of his work, and the peace of the emperor Mauritius with the Persians.

CPL 1866, 2261; PL 72, 863-870; MGH, *Auct. ant.* 11, 211-220; J.N. Hillgarth, *Historiography in Visigothic Spain*, in *La storiografia altomedievale*, Spoleto 1970, 266-271; S. Grabowski, *Jan z Biclar i jego Kronika*: Meander 35 (1980) 63-73; A. Kollautz, *Orient und Okzident am Ausgang des VI. Jahrhunderts. Johannes, Abt von Biclarum, Bischof von Gerona, der Chronist des westgotischen Spaniens*: Byzantina 12 (1983) 463-506; Patrologia IV, 79-80; BBKL III, 286-287.

M. Simonetti

JOHN of Caesarea (d. after 515). We know little of this figure, who was called John Grammaticus (= schoolteacher), not even if he was from *Caesarea in Palestine or in Cappadocia. It is not certain whether he was present at a council of *Neochalcedonian orientation which took place at Alexandretta between 514 and 518 or whether he was charged with writing the synodal letter addressed to the emperor *Anastasius. His principal work was the *Apologia of the Council of Chalcedon,* written around 515, of which we know numerous passages adduced by *Severus of Antioch in the detailed refutation which he wrote of this work (the work of Severus has reached us only in *Syriac translation). Recent studies by Richard and others have assigned to John two short anti-*monophysite texts (*Capitula XVII contra acephalos; Adversus aphthartodocetas*), two anti-*Manichean homilies and two exegetical fragments on Jn 8:44 and 10:18. He made his name as an author with a *Disputatio cum Manichaeo*. John was one of the first representatives of the Neochalcedonian theology, since he accepted, together with the Chalcedonian formula, the **unus de trinitate passus est* and the Cyrillian anathemas in order to emphasize more effectively in Christ the unity of the subject in the duality of the natures.

CPG III, 6855-6862. CCG 1; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 325; J.A. McGuckin, *The "Theopaschite Confession" (Text and Historical Context): A Study in the Cyrilline Reinterpretation of Chalcedon*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 35 (1984) 239-255; Patrologia V, 260-262.

M. Simonetti

JOHN of Carpathus. Nothing is known of his life; in the MSS he is sometimes called a monk, but more frequently bishop of Carpathus (an island of the Sporades). He lived between the 5th and 7th c. He is the author of two spiritual writings: *Capita hortatoria ad monachos in India,* a "century" which teaches how to overcome the difficulties of the monastic life, and *Capita theologica et gnostica,* also commonly called *seconda centuria,* in which the author expounds how one proceeds from the ascetic life to the contemplative, whose summit is constituted by theological gnosis. Spurious are the *Narrationes variae de viris anachoretarum* and the *Florilegium de sacra eucharistia et de communione.* The *Capitula moralia* belongs to Elias Ekdikos. The spiritual doctrine of John depends on earlier spiritual writers, esp. *Evagrius (see Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 201). The author stresses the importance of ascetic life. The restoration of the image of God in humanity comes, for the concupiscent part, through ἐγκράτεια, and, for the irascible part, through ὑπομονή. Victory over the devil, which has a great role in the spiritual life, is

achieved through prayer in all its forms, by mortifications and, esp., by humility—i.e., by works of mercy and with fraternal charity. The ascetic effort is rewarded by God with the gift of *apatheia* and, thereafter, of contemplation.

CPG III, 7855-7859; PG 85, 791-826, 1837-1860; DTC 8, 753-4; EC 6, 592; Beck 452-453 and 817; LTK 5, 1049; Cath 6, 531; DSp 8, 589-592; Patrologia V, 155-6.

A. De Nicola

JOHN of Cellae (2nd half of 6th c.) (Kellia, to the SW of Alexandria, near *Scete). A *monophysite bishop, ordained by *Jacob Baradeus, in 567 he pronounced in *Alexandria the anathema against the writings of the tritheist *John Philoponus. In a letter to *Longinus, bishop of the Nubians, John promised to protect his clandestine movements in Egypt. In 575 he ordained the deacon Peter patriarch of Alexandria as successor to *Theodosius, after the Alexandrians had refused the Syrian archimandrite Theodore, ordained by Longinus.

CPG 7229 (anathema): CSCO 17, 160-161 (Syriac text): CSCO 52, 111-112 (Lat. tr.); CPG 7230 (letter to Longinus): CSCO 17, 277-278 (Syriac text of a fragment): CSCO 52, 194 (Lat. tr.); G. Furlani, *L'anatema di Giovanni di Alessandria contro Giovanni Filopono*, AAT 55 (1919-1920) 188-194; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*, CSCO 127 Subs. 2, Louvain 1951, 175, 183, 226-227, 232-233; DMGE 27, 185 n. 522; Patrologia V, 393.

F. Scorza Barcellona

JOHN of Dalyatha (1st half of the 8th c.); also called John Sabas, i.e., "the elder": a *Nestorian hermit of *Syriac speech, author of homilies and spiritual treatises (partially unpublished) and letters, in which he demonstrates dependence on *Evagrius. Accused (falsely) of *Sabellianism and, concerning the vision of God, of *Messalianism, his works were condemned around 786–787 by Patriarch *Timothy I. In the MS tradition his name has often been confused with that of *John bar Penkaya and of *Joseph 'Abdisho' Hazzaya (Nestorian monks respectively of 7th and 8th c.) as well as with that of Isaac of Nineveh.

DSp 8, 449-452; R. Beulay, *L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha: mystique Syro-Oriental du VIII^e siècle* (Théol. Hist. 83), Paris 1990; Id., *La collection des Lettres de Jean de Dalyatha*, PO 39, 3 (1978) 253-538; Id., *Jean de Dalyatha et sa Lettre XV*: PdO 2 (1971) 261-279; PG 86, 857-859 (cf. CPG 7868); B.E. Colless, *Le mystère de Jean Saba*: OrSyr 12 (1967) 515-523; Id., *The Mysticism of John Saba*: OCP 39 (1973) 83-102; P. Sherwood, *Jean de Dalyatha, Sur la fuite du monde*: Or-Syr 1 (1956) 305-312.

S.J. Voicu

JOHN of Damascus (ca. 650–749/750). Coming from a noble family, Arab but Christian, John must have been born around 650. After having been with his father in the service of the caliphs, he retired after 700 (the date is disputed) to the monastery of St. Sabas near Jerusalem. Ordained a priest by John, patriarch of Jerusalem (705–735), he taught, preached and continued the composition of his numerous works. He died at an advanced age (ca. 750) and was highly esteemed by the Byzantine church (see Nicaea II, a. 787) and from the 12th c. on also in the Latin church (Doctor of the Church in 1890). The writings, preserved in a very extensive MS tradition and soon translated into various languages, concern every field of theology. Among these *The Fountain of Knowledge* (*Dial. Prol.* 57) is certainly the most famous work. It includes three parts: *Capitula philosophica* (a kind of philosophical propaedeutic, with definitions of the Aristotelian and patristic tradition), the *Liber de haeresibus* (a hundred notes on heresies, eighty taken from *Anakephalaiosis,* attributed to *Epiphanius [CPG II, 3765], and twenty, including that on Islam, from other sources) and the *Expositio fidei* (*De fide orthodoxa*) (100 theological chapters on the *Trinity: 1-14; on the visible and invisible creation: 15-44; on *Christology: 45-81; on various questions, such as baptism and the veneration of the cross: 82-99; and resurrection: 100). In addition there are other writings of equally philosophical, polemical and dogmatic character. Among these the following deserve to be mentioned: the *Contra Jacobitas,* the *De duabus in Christo voluntatibus* and above all the three discourses against the iconoclasts, composed perhaps 741, without doubt the most original work. The exegetical and homiletic writings include a commentary on the Pauline letters, for the most part extracted from the commentaries of *John Chrysostom and unknown authors, and sermons on the birth and death (*De dormitione*) of *Mary, on the Transfiguration etc. Also to be noted is the treatise on fasting (the writings on the virtues and the vices as well as that on the eight spirits are not authentic), and the hagiographic writings which praise Barbara, Chrysostom and other saints. As for the *Sacra Parallela,* a biblical-patristic anthology on moral and ascetic life, it is unknown to what extent John contributed to it (see CPG III, 8056). The so-called *Romance of Barlaam* must be later than John (CPG III, 8120) (*see* Barlaam; Volk does not exclude John of Damascus). Finally John certainly took part in the composition of liturgical hymns (see CPG III, 8070).

The compilatory character of the writings of John does not escape any expert reader. In the *Dedicatory*

Epistle to the Fountain of Knowledge he himself announces that his general principle is that of not saying anything personal (*Dial. prol.* 60). For, whether in his principal work or in his other writings, not only does he take up the dialectical and theological terminology of the Fathers, their style of reasoning and method of dividing the assembled material, but he also cites patristic texts *in extenso*. Thus he has integrated in the *Expositio* a ps.-Cyrillian treatise on theology and economy (see the differing position of Volk, who accepts at least the influence of *Greg. Naz.), extracts of Nemesius and of *Maximus the Confessor. This assertion sounds negative, inasmuch as it indicates a lack of creative spirit in John. Nevertheless, the richness of the sources employed, even if secondhand, and the manner in which the well-chosen material is put in order demonstrates his ability and his profound knowledge of the material. This evaluation is reinforced if John is compared to other authors of the later patristic period on whom fidelity to the orthodox tradition, and partially also the scholastic goals of the writings, imposed this method of compilation. For John is superior to all (Beck 477), except perhaps *Maximus the Confessor, who did not deal with as many problems but showed a more independent and deeper spirit. Nevertheless, the influence of John on later theology has been considerable, though perhaps less on Byzantine theology than on Latin (Beck 480). As for theological thought, it should be noted that John inserted between theology and economy a long treatment of cosmological and anthropological problems. Thus he contributed to the development of the theological synthesis (Grillmeier). Worth considering among the individual theological ideas are the definitions of certain trinitarian notions, such as φύσις, ὑπόστασις and above all περιχώρησις, the distinction between the antecedent and consequent will of God, the explanations of the hypostatic union and of the two wills of Christ and above all the considerations on the veneration of images (von Schönborn).

Given that acc. to John all theological work should serve monastic life, understood as Christian perfection, his spiritual teaching should be considered his most important. Although it is more difficult to evaluate his influence on later spirituality than that on theology, in particular on Latin Scholasticism, the personal brilliance of John appears more clearly in the spiritual field, as is clear esp. from the homilies. In fact, his spiritual teaching reveals itself as extremely rich, and it is founded on the idea that the entire Christian life must orient itself toward the vision (θεωρία) of God, understood, however, less as Trinity than as divinity. The conditions of this contemplation are purity of heart (ἀπάθεια, ἐγκράτεια) and love (ἀγάπη), i.e., liberty toward God. To arrive at the height of purity and love, where God is contemplated, a double preparation is required, that of the πρᾶξις, a battle against vice and a perfecting of the virtues, and the θεωρία, intellectual deepening of the faith, provided it be orthodox. The polemic against the *monothelites and the *Manicheans induced John to specify also the role which human liberty and divine grace play in this work of purification or ascension of the soul. Finally, in the hagiographic and homiletic writings, but also in the treatises on images, John recalls that, in order to become more virtuous, Christians must associate with holy people, or rather the saints. This idea of imitation finds its most profound justification in the theology of the image. According to John, human beings, created in the image of God, are called to resemble God himself. They respond to this call, imitating the divine goodness and the virtues of all those who pleased Christ. In this way they enter into the economy of the images, founded on the eternal generation of the Word, perfect image of God, manifested in the theophanies of the OT and above all in the *incarnation of the Word, taken up later by all the saints, who did nothing other than imitate Christ. Precisely this final characteristic of the spirituality of John makes us understand his originality. Despite taking his principal ideas from the tradition of the Fathers, he succeeded not only in blending them into an equilibrated synthesis but also in impressing a rather personal note on his choices.

CPG III, 8040-8127; PG 94-96; B. Kotter: PTS 7 (1969); 12 (1973); 17 (1975); 22 (1981); XX (1988); P. Voulet, *Jean Damascène. Les Homélies sur la Dormition et la Nativité*, SC 80, Paris 1961; F. Gahbauer: SMGB 106 (1995) 133-174. - Bibliographies in CPG III, Kotter and in OS 16 (1967) 200-213; DSp 8,452-466. *Studies*: B. Studer, *Die theologische Arbeitsweise des Johannes von Damaskus*, Ettal 1956; Beck 476-486; B. Kotter, *Die Überlieferung der Pege Gnoseos*, Ettal 1959; K. Rozemond, *La Christologie de J.*, Ettael 1959; G. Richter, *Dialektik des J.*, Ettal 1964; A. Grillmeier, *Vom Symbolum zur Summa: Mit ihm und in ihm*, Freiburg 1975, 585-636; Th. Nikolaou, *Die Ikonenverehrung als Beispiel ostkirchlicher Theologie und Frömmigkeit nach Johannes von Damaskus*: OS 25 (1976) 138-165; C. von Schönborn, *L'icône du Christ*, Fribourg 1976; TRE 17 (1988) 127-132; B. Studer, in *Storia della Teologia*, Casale Monf. 1993, XX; V.S. Conticello, *Ps. Cyril's De SS. Trinitate*: OCP 61 (1995) 117-129; R. Volk, in LTK[3] 5, 895-899; B. Studer, in Patrologia V, 233-242 (bibl.); H.C. Brennecke, in RGG[4] 4 (2001) 534-5; LACL (2002) 387-399 (bibl.); A. Louth, *St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*, Oxford 2002.

B. Studer

JOHN of Ephesus (or of Asia) (ca. 507–589). John of Ephesus, a *Syriac writer but also knowledgeable

in the Greek language, a monk of *monophysite leanings, expressed his original talent both in hagiography and in historiography, creating in both genres a partisan literature, with a strong political-religious engagement. Born in the N of Mesopotamia in the jurisdiction of the metropolitan city of Amida around 507, his youth was marked by the teaching of two local ascetics, Abraham and Maron. After their death he entered the monastery of Mar John Urtaya in Amida. The persecutions against the monophysites forced him and the other monks to abandon the city and to wander in the Near East, even into Egypt. In 529 he was ordained a deacon by *John (bar Kursos) of Tella, he too in exile. He reached *Constantinople around 540, where many monophysites had taken refuge because of the position favorable to them of the empress *Theodora. Having entered into contact with the imperial court he received from the emperor *Justinian the charge of evangelizing Asia Minor. In the course of this mission, in 558, he was consecrated bishop of Ephesus by *John Baradeus, even if he probably did not have lasting contacts with his see, since his base of operations still remained the imperial capital. There, having become the key figure for the monophysites, esp. after the death of *Theodosius of Alexandria, he tried to mediate between the different currents in conflict. With the rise to power of *Justin II in 565 a period of persecutions against the monophysites began again. From this moment on John had to face exile and prison once again. Despite the situation, his literary activity was not interrupted, except by his death in 589.

Two works have sealed the fame of John as a Syriac writer of a notable level: the *Lives of the Oriental Saints* and the *Ecclesiastical History,* having reached us largely incomplete. Other works, having been lost, are known to us precisely from his own works: a description of the persecutions against the monophysites, above all those under *Ephrem of Antioch (529–544), and a piece on the negotiations between *Chalcedonians and monophysites shortly after 570. The *Lives of the Oriental Saints* collect 58 stories of ascetics known by John thanks to his travels and his multiple contacts, between 520 and ca. 560. The first 23 "*Vitae*" are those of the ascetics known in the region of Amida during his youth, while the following 24 deal with the figures with whom he entered into contact in Egypt and Constantinople, some of them of a certain historical importance, such as John of Tella and Jacob Baradeus; the last is dedicated to the monastery of Mar John Urtaya.

Critics have related these stories—frequently not linked to the biographical genre, but consistent in some episodes, enriched by a still problematical historical background—to the *Historia Lausiaca* of *Palladius or to the *Historia religiosa* of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. The *Ecclesiastical History* was divided into three parts. The first covered the period which went from Julius Caesar to the death of *Theodosius II, and is known via a few fragments transmitted by Michael the Syrian. The second reached up to 571, and has reached us thanks to ample citations; beyond that of Michael the Syrian are those of the *Chronaca* of ps.-*Dionysius of Tell-Mahre. The third, preserved almost completely, goes until 589. An engaged and partisan history, it reveals aspects of the persecutions against the monophysites and events which the Greek historiography of Chalcedonian orientation has hidden.

General Introductions: Duval 362-363 (and passim); Baumstark 181-182; DTC 8, 752-753; Chabot 74-76; Ortiz de Urbina 166-167.

Editions: *Lives of the Oriental Saints*, ed. E.W. Brooks, PO 17-19; *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. E.W. Brooks, CSCO 105-106, scriptores syri, 54-55; Ephrem-Isa Yousif, *Les Chroniqueurs Syriaques*, Paris-Budapest-Turin 2002.

On hagiography: S. Ashbrook Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and The Lives of the Eastern Saints*, Berkeley, CA 1990.

On historiography: J.J. van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, Proefschrift, Gröningen 1995.

A. Camplani

JOHN of Euboea (8th c.). John lived in the 1st half of the 8th c.: a chronological indication in the *Homilia in sanctos innocentes* (BHG 825) points to the year 744. Although he was younger, in the MSS he is frequently confused with *John of Damascus, who—as is known—attracted to himself, in the medieval tradition, many anonymous writings. He is indicated in titles sometimes as μοναχὸς καὶ πρεσβύτερος, other times as ἐπίσκοπος. If this qualification should not be ascribed to an error of the copyist—as F. Halkin maintains—the problem of the episcopal see remains open, which cannot be Euboea/Euboia, where no bishopric existed. F. Dölger has proposed—on the basis of the name indicated in the codex *Neapol.* 92 II 33—Εὐαρία (variants Εὐορία and Εὐδρία), today Hawarin near Damascus, and less probably Εὔροια in Epirus.

In addition to the homily on the Holy Innocents, we possess from him *Homilia in conceptionem Deiparae* (BHG 1117), *Homilia in Lazarum* (BHG 2220), *Passio S. Parascevae* (BHGa 1420 p). The *Laudatio S. Anastasiae* (BHG 83 b) and the Christmas

sermon Ὁπόταν τὸ ἔαρ ἐπέλθῃ (ed. S. Eustratiades, Neos Poimen 3, 1921, 23-42) do not seem to belong to him but to John of Damascus. The works of John of Euboea are folksy, free of all doctrinal character, with frequent biblical citations, careless in grammar and style: the exact opposite of that of John of Damascus. His aversion to Judaism is always present in the homilies.

CPG 8135-8138; PG 96, 1459-1508; F. Dölger, *Johannes "von Euboia"*: AB (Mélanges P. Peeters II) 68 (1950) 5-26; F. Halkin, *La passion de sainte Parascève par Jean d'Eubée*, in *Polychardia*. Festschrift Franz Dölger, Heidelberg 1966, 226-237; Beck 502-503; J.M. Hueck, *Johannes v. Euboia*: LTK³ 5, 904; D. Stiernon, *Jean d'Eubée*: DSp 8, 487; Patrologia V, 242-3.

A. Labate

JOHN of Gabala (beginning of the 5th c.). The *monophysite bishop of Gabala (or, acc. to Honigmann, Gabboula) in Syria Prima, he took part in the council called by the emperor *Justinian in 536 to resolve the division between the followers and the antagonists (monophysites) of the Council of *Chalcedon. A *Life of Severus,* patriarch of Antioch 512–518, is attributed to a John of Gabala (perhaps the same person), of which a fragment has reached us.

CPG 7525; Mansi 13, 184BC. *Translations*: Eng.: partial in C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1972 (repr. in Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 16, Toronto-Buffalo-London 1986, 44); It.: *Vedere l'invisibile, Nicea e lo statuto dell'immagine*, ed. L. Russo, Palermo 1997, 54; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et Évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Louvain 1951, 29.

A. Louth

JOHN of Lycopolis (d. 394/395). The *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* which dedicates its first chapter to him (ed. A.J. Festugière, Subs. Hagiogr. 34, Brussels 1960, 9-35; Fr. tr.: Id., *Les Moines d'Orient*, IV, 1, Paris 1964, 9-28) is the primary source which makes known this great ascetic of the *Thebaid, in close relationship with the emperor *Theodosius (a useful confirmation, as a chronological reference point, of the existence of the figure toward the end of the 4th c.) and whose various charisms (in particular the gifts of healing and prophecy) earned him the name "seer of the Thebaid." He is said to be of Lycopolis (Assyut), of Upper Egypt, because he was perhaps born there. The authors of the cited source visited John a little before his death. Here is the portrait which they have left of him: "The saint could be seen, already ninety years old, so exhausted in his entire body that, through the effects of asceticism, not even the beard had grown on his face. For he ate nothing other than fruit, and this only after sunset, despite his old age, since he had dedicated himself to numerous ascetical exercises, without having ever eaten bread, nor anything which is eaten after cooking" (ch. 17). Another author who speaks about him is *Palladius, who mentions a discussion held with John through an interpreter (*Historia lausiaca* ch. 35). St. *Augustine mentions the double prophetic response (*nuntium victoriae certissimum*) given by John to the consultations of the emperor Theodosius concerning the usurpers Maximus and Eugenius (*Civ. Dei* 5,26,1; cf. *De cura gerenda* 17,21). As for spirituality, above all his predilection for the practice of humility in all its forms, can be underlined and his insistence on the purification of the heart through the purity of intention, trained in continual struggle and stimulated by faith in the infinite mercy of God.

Did John leave any literary heritage? The problem has been raised (J. Muyldermans) concerning a rediscovered ascetic text in Greek. But it was definitively demonstrated (I. Hausherr, who based himself among other things on the works of the Swedish scholars S. Dedering and L.G. Rignell) that John of Lycopolis has nothing in common with the homonymous author under whose name numerous treatises of mystical spirituality have been transmitted in *Syriac (A. Baumstark has scrupulously edited the entire list).

BS 6, 818-822; I. Hausherr, *Jean le Solitaire* (*Pseudo-Jean de Lycopolis*). *Dialogue sur l'âme et les passions des homes . . .* (OCA, 120) Rome 1939; J. Muyldermans, *Un texte grec inédit attribué à Jean de Lycopolis*: RecSR 41 (1953) 525-530; Id., *À propos d'un texte grec attribué à Jean de Lycopolis*: ibid. 43 (1955) 395-401; L.G. Rignell, *Drei Traktate von Johannes dem Einsiedler* (*Johannes von Apameia*), Lunds Univer. Arsskrift NF Avd. 1,54,4 (1960); Coptic Encyclopedia 5,1363-1366. On the Coptic tradition: P. Peeters, *Une vie copte de S. Jean de Lycopolis*: AB 54 (1936) 359-381; P. Devos, *La servante de Dieu Poemenia d'après Pallade, la tradition copte et Jean Rufus*: AB 87 (1969) 189-208; Id., *Fragments coptes de l'Historia Monachorum* (*Vie de S. Jean de Lycopolis, BHO 515*): AB 87 (1969) 417-440; Id., *S. Jean de Lyco et la tentatrice*: AB 87 (1969) 441; Id., *Feuillets coptes nouveaux et anciens concernant S. Jean de Siout*: AB 88 (1970) 153-187; Id., *Saint Jean de Lycopolis et l'empereur Marcien. À propos de Chalcedoine*: AB 94 (1976) 303-316; Id., *De Jean Chrysostome à Jean de Lykopolis. Chrysostome et Chalkedon*: AB 96 (1978) 389-403. On the documentary papyri: C. Zuckerman, *The Hapless Recruit Psois and the Mighty Anchorite, Apa John*: Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists 32 (1995) 183-194; Ph. Luisier, *Jean de Lycopolis. Les derniers fragments réunis par le Père Devos*, in *Aegyptus christiana: mélanges d'hagiographie égyptienne et orientale dédiés à la mémoire du P. P. Devos bollandiste*, ed. U. Zanetti and E. Lucchesi, Geneva 2004, 175-193.

J.-M. Sauget

JOHN of Maiuma (or John Rufus) (d. after 515). John is above all known for his unique literary work whose long and very meaningful title deserves to be cited in its entirety: "*Plerophoriae,* i.e., testimony and revelations which God has made to the saints, concerning the heresies of his natures and concerning the prevarication which took place at Chalcedon; these were written by one of the disciples of St. Peter the Iberian, called the priest of Beit-Rufin, of Antioch, bishop of Maiuma of Gaza." This work was written around 515. In reality the name of *plerophoriae* was commonly given to collections of anecdotes and small polemical passages aimed at demonstrating the correctness of the position of the anti-*Chalcedonians. It is probable that the collection of John became the most famous and has kept the title by antonomasia.

Through this work we learn that John, called also John Rufus, was born into an Arab tribe of the S of Palestine, probably of Ashkelon. After having studied law at Beirut, he was ordained a priest at *Antioch, between 476 and 478, by the patriarch *Peter the Fuller, whose *syncellus* he became. When Peter was chased from his patriarchal see, John retired to Palestine, where he met *Isaiah the Solitary (or of Gaza) and *Peter the Iberian, monophysite bishop of Maiuma (452–489). He was at Jerusalem when Peter the Fuller, reintegrated in his charge, sent his synodal letter to Martyrius. He joined Peter the Iberian definitively (1 December 488), until he became his successor as bishop of Maiuma. John wrote the *Plerophoriae* (Πληροφορίαι) during the pontificate of *Severus of Antioch (512–518). The work was doubtless written in Greek, but only a few fragments remain in that language; however, two MSS transmit the complete *Syriac translation (ed. Nau, PO 8, 1, Paris 1911). In Coptic, fragments from many MSS have survived (see T. Orlandi, *Un frammento delle Pleroforie in copto*: Studi e Ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano 2 [1979] 3-12).

The work is a collection of 89 chapters of anecdotes (which can be compared to the *Lives of the Blessed Orientals* of *John of Ephesus) concerning the principal representatives of the monophysite church, immersed in a climate of the miraculous, embellished with visions, miracles and predictions. The goal of the work was to demonstrate that the Council of Chalcedon had been above all the revenge of the *Nestorians condemned previously at *Ephesus. Nevertheless, through the quantity of information which they offer on the history, geography and ecclesiastical life of the 6th c., the *Plerophoriae* enjoyed great success and were used discreetly by later monophysite historians, in particular in the *Chronaca* of the patriarch Michael the Syrian. John also wrote a *Life of Peter the Iberican,* his predecessor in the see of Maiuma (CPG 7505/BHO 955), and a *Panegyric of Theodosius, Bishop of Jerusalem* (CPG 7506/BHO 1178).

CPG 7507; F. Nau, *Jean Rufus, évêque de Maiouma. Plérophories*, PO VIII, 1, Paris 1912 (with Fr. tr.); E. Schwartz, *Iohannes Rufus, ein monophysitischer Schriftsteller*, in *Sitzungsber. der Heidelberger Akad. der Wissensch.*, phil. hist. Kl., 1912, Abh. 16; T. Orlandi, *Papiri copti di contenuto teologico*, Vienna 1974, 110-120; Id., *Un frammento delle Pleroforie in copto*: Studi e ricerche sull'Oriente cristiano 2 (1979) 3-12; DHGE 27,248-249; J.-E. Steppa, *John Rufus and the Vision of the Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway, NJ 2002.

J.-M. Sauget - T. Orlandi

JOHN of Naples (d. 432). He was the 14th bishop of *Naples, from 414 to 2 April 432. He had the mortal remains of St. *Januarius transferred from the Ager Marcian near Pozzuoli to the catacombs of Capodimonte. The priest Uranius, in the letter to Pacatus *De obitu Paulini* 11 (PL 53, 865), recounts that *Paulinus of Nola appeared in a dream to John predicting the imminence of his death, which came three days later. John was buried in the oratory where he had had the body of St. Januarius transferred. In the marble calendar of Naples the *Depositio* of John is 3 April, while in the *Mart. rom.* it is erroneously recorded 22 June. The *Vita S. Iohannis episcopi* (BHL 4417), written in the 2nd half of the 13th c., confuses this John (the first bishop of Naples with this name) with John IV, 44th in the episcopal list of the city.

BS 6, 929-930; LTK[3] 5, 1064; H. Delehaye, *Hagiographie napolitaine*: AB 59 (1941) 19-21.

S. Zincone

JOHN of Nikiu (d. after 700). An Egyptian bishop who lived in the 2nd half of the 7th c., he was the author of a universal history, written probably in Greek, but having survived only in Ethiopian translation. This began from Adam and Eve and narrated succinctly the events of Eastern, Greek and Roman history, and more fully those of the Byzantine period, with special reference to Egypt. It is a valuable source for the period of the Persian and Arabic invasions of Egypt, for which it offers information which the other sources omit. For earlier times, his principal source is the *Chronaca* of *John Malalas.

CPL 7967; H. Zotenberg, *La Chronique de Jean de Nikiu*: Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, 24, Paris 1913; R.H. Charles, *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, London 1916; Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1366-1367; Patrolo-

gia V, 408-409; DHGE 27, 379; A. Carile, *Giovanni di Nikius, cronista bizantino-copto del VII secolo*, in Fest. A.N. Stratos, Atene 1986, II, 358-398.

T. Orlandi

JOHN of Paralos (d. 610/620). An Egyptian, he was an author of works in Coptic who lived between the 6th and 7th c. After having been a monk in the important monastery of St. Macarius at Scete, under the hegumen *Daniel (485–ca. 575), he was named bishop of Paralos, an important city in the delta. He is remembered in the Coptic-Arabic sources as a fierce opponent of the heresies and apocryphal texts which existed at that time. Indeed, the only work from which fragments have reached us is a text (in the form of a homily) which argues against some apocryphal works. Those named in the surviving section are the *Investiture of Michael the Archangel* (to be identified with a text known in *Coptic, ed. Müller, CSCO 225-226), the *Kerygma Iohannis* (derived from the *Apokryphon Iohannis,* a well-known *gnostic text in Coptic, of the 4th c.?), the *Smile of the Apostles,* the *Teachings of Adam* and the *Counsel of the Savior*. Other homilies attributed to John of Paralos have survived in Arabic and Ethiopian.

A. van Lantschoot, *Fragments coptes d'une homélie de Jean de Parallos*, in Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, I (ST 121), Rome 1946, 296-326; Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1367-1368.

T. Orlandi

JOHN of Saint Martin (d. 680). The primary source is *Bede in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. A Roman archcantor, abbot of the little monastery of St. Martin, he was called, in his capacity as *primicerius,* to direct the *schola cantorum* as *archicantor* of St. Peter's Basilica. He owes his fame above all to having been a master of sacred music and author of liturgical texts. His name also remains linked to the works of *Benedict Biscop and *Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury. Both contributed, at the request of Popes *Vitalian (657–672) and *Agatho (678–681), to restoring order within that part of England which was at that time convulsed by liturgical conflicts and undisciplined clergy. Benedict Biscop then saw to the foundation of the monastery of Wearmouth (Northumbria), destined to render the entire region famous for its monastic schools. In his voyage to Rome in 678, he obtained from Pope Agatho permission to bring John back with him in order to promote sacred chant and the Roman liturgy. The presence of John also took on an official role when Theodore had him by his side at the synod celebrated at Hartfield (680). John had the function of papal legate. It was thus that the council became a verification of the orthodox faith and a sign of links with Rome. John then had the charge of bringing back to Rome the testimonies of the Anglo-Saxon church's fidelity (Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* IV, 17f.). While he was crossing France, struck by infirmity, he died (680). He was buried at *Tours.

CPL 1998 and 2015; C. Silva-Tarouca, *G. Archicantor di S. Pietro e l'Ordo Romanus da lui composto* (*a. 680*): Miscell. De Rossi I (Atti della Pont. Acc. Rom. di Archeol., 3a f., Memorie, I, 1), Rome 1923, 159-219, M. Andrieu, *Les "Ordines Romani" du haut Moyen Âge*, I, Louvain 1930 (Ordines XV-XIX); LTK 5, 1078; EC VI, 511f. (with bibl.); K. Hallinger, *Die römischen Ordines von Lorsch, Murbach und St. Gallen*, in *Universitas.* Festschr. A. Stohr, I, Mainz 1960, 466-477; DHGE 27, 554f. (n. 876).

L. Dattrino

JOHN of Saragossa (ca. 580–ca. 631). Mentioned by *Ildefonsus as *pater monachorum* and a great expert in the Holy Scriptures (*Vir. ill.* 6, PL 96, 201) and praised by his younger brother and disciple *Braulio as "master of common life through learning and holiness" (*Vita s. Emiliani, Ad Fronimianum presbyterum*, PL 80, 699). John was born around 580. After having been abbot, he became bishop of Saragossa in 619 and carried out his episcopal ministry at the time of kings *Sisebut and Suintila. He composed various liturgical offices, later lost, and an *Argumentum* or *Kanon inquirendae Paschalis solemnitatis,* which has been recognized in the treatise on the Roman system for calculating Easter preserved in a 10th-c. MS from La Rioja (Vega). He died ca. 631.

A.C. Vega, *El "Argumentum" o "Kanon paschalis" de Juan de Zaragoza ¿ha desaparecido?*: La Ciudad de Dios 172 (1959) 522-530; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 456-458.

P. Marone

JOHN of Scythopolis (Palestine) (6th c.). We have almost no information about his life, and for the most part his works have also been lost. He was exceptionally cultivated compared to his contemporaries, and wrote about theology in the 1st half of the 6th c., in conflict with the *monophysites, maintaining a doctrine of *Neochalcedonian type, since he integrated the Chalcedonian formula with the *theopaschite formula **unus de trinitate passus est*. We know of three antimonophysite writings: *Against the Aposchisti* (radical monophysites), *Apology of the Council of Chalcedon* and *Against Severus*. His *Scholia* to the writings of ps.-*Dionysius have been

joined to those of *Maximus the Confessor: it was possible to identify them thanks to a *Syriac translation of ps.-Dionysius, which was furnished with the *scholia* of John.

CPG III, 6850-6852; PG 4, 15-432, 527-576; Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 107; S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus*, Bonn 1962, 176-184; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 325; BBKL III, 567-568; B.R. Suchla, *Verteidigung eines platonischen Denkmodells einer christlichen Welt: Die philosophie- und theologiegeschichtliche Bedeutung des Scholienwerks des Johannes von Skythopolis zu den areopagitischen Traktaten*, Göttingen 1995; P. Rorem - J.C. Lamoreaux, *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite*, Oxford 1998; Patrologia V, 289-291.

M. Simonetti

JOHN of Shmun (6th–7th c.). Author of *Coptic literature, he lived in the 2nd half of the 6th c., at the time of the Alexandrian patriarch *Damian (d. 605). At first a cloistered monk, he was named bishop of Shmun (Gr. Hermopolis magna, Ar. Ashmunein) in Middle Egypt. With his works he wanted on the one hand to reinforce the validity of Coptic as a literary language and on the other to celebrate the glories of the Egyptian church, which was acquiring an ever more national character, in contraposition to the Byzantine church. For this he wrote an *Encomium of Mark* (the traditional founder of the Alexandrian church) and an *Encomium of Anthony*. Strong nationalistic overtones can be found in both.

G. Garitte, *Panégyrique de Saint Antonie par Jean, évêque d'Hermopolis*: OCP 9 (1943) 100-134, 330-365; T. Orlandi, *Un Encomio di Marco evangelista*, in *Studi Copti*, Milan 1968, 1-52; Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1369; Patrologia V, 572.

T. Orlandi

JOHN of Thessalonica (d. ca. 630). The successor of *Eusebius on the archepiscopal see of *Thessalonica (605), he supported his fellow citizens besieged by the Avars and, with his prayers, appears to have saved the city from an earthquake. He died shortly afterward. He was a popular preacher, and several homilies have been preserved in two recensions. One, on the dormition of the *Theotokos, is important in the history of the feast of the Marian mystery; another is on the "myrrh-bearing" women; and another is on the decapitation of *John the Baptist; while from the homily on the temptations of Jesus only a fragment remains. He also wrote a collection of the *Miracles of St. Demetrius,* patron of Thessalonica, of great value for the history of liturgy and the penetration of the Slavs into the Balkans.

PG 59, 635-644; 116, 1203-1324; BHG 499-516, 547h, 842t, 1144-1144g; BHG *Auct.* 500-510/13, 1056, 1056g, 1056gb; P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius*, Paris 1980; DSp 8, 778-780; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, 2, ed. G. Gharib, Rome 1988, 98-120; Patrologia V, 146-149.

D. Stiernon

JOHN of Tomi (5th c.). Bishop of Tomi (Scythia). He appears in the *Collectio Palatina* (PG 48, 1088) as the author of *sermones* against *Nestorians and *Eutychians. G. Morin has discovered a fragment of a work by John, *De duabus haeresibus Nestorianorum et Eutychianistarum,* perhaps to be identified with that mentioned in the *Collectio*. It is an interesting witness to the orthodox faith at the boundaries of the West, written in precise and lucid theological language. John is otherwise unknown.

CPL 665; CCL 85A, 234-239. G. Morin, *Le témoignage perdu de Jean*: JTS 7 (1906) 74-77; Beck, 375, n. 2.

E. Prinzivalli

JOHN PHILOPONUS (6th c.). Presumably of *Alexandrian origin, active more or less between 520 and 570. Despite being Christian, he dedicated much care to commenting on the works of Aristotle, and *Aristotelian realism influenced not a little his trinitarian and christological positions, which displayed a *monophysite character. He was a disciple of the Aristotelian *Ammonius and a study companion of Simplicius, who, however, had occasion to argue with the overly personal interpretation which John gave of Aristotle. The nickname (Philoponus = lover of labor) came to him from his great productivity, which was expressed in a great number of works, some of which have not reached us.

Many commentaries on works of Aristotle have reached us, along with some writings on grammatical and scientific themes, while various theological works, which here interest us more directly, have been lost, except for mentions and fragments. We lament esp. the loss of the *The Arbiter* or *On Unity,* in 10 books, which dealt with trinitarian and christological questions. Also treatises have been lost against the *Acephaloi,* against the Council of *Chalcedon, against John Scholasticus and against Iamblichus (who maintained that the statues of the gods were endowed with divine presence). Among the surviving works are *Against Proclus on the Eternity of the World,* where the arguments are refuted which the *Neoplatonist offered in favor of the eternity of the world, on an exclusively philosophical basis; and *On the Hexaemeron,* which maintains that Moses had taught at the begin-

ning of Genesis truths related to the creation which the Greeks brought to light only much later.

An exponent of a Christianity imbued with philosophical rationalism, John transferred his methodological orientation also to the trinitarian field. He transferred the equality nature = *hypostasis* ("person"), traditionally affirmed by monophysites in the christological area (in Christ a single nature corresponds to a single *hypostasis*), strengthened by the Aristotelian realism which considered only individual natures as concretely existing, into the trinitarian field, with the result of making three divine natures, distinct among themselves, correspond to the three divine *hypostases*. For this reason he was accused of tritheism not only by Catholics but also by the monophysites themselves. Clearly, however, it is purely a verbal tritheism. Furthermore, not only did John and his followers avoid speaking about three divinities, but they also explicitly affirmed their faith in the holy and consubstantial *Trinity, in a single essence or nature, in a single divinity, i.e., in a single God, not by number but by the immutable identity of the divinity (PG 86, 61).

CPG III, 7260-7282. R.R.K. Sorabji, *Johannes Philoponos*: TRE 17 (1988) 144-150; *John Philoponus*: ODC (1997) 896; B.R. Suchla, *Johannes Philoponus*: LACL (1998) 355.

Editions and translations: Les fragmentes trithéistes de Jean Philophon, ed. A. van Roey: OLP 11 (1980) 135-163; C. Wildberg (ed.), *Iohannes Philoponus, Against Aristotle, on the Eternity of the World*, Ithaca 1987; B.R. Suchla, *Commentarium*: NAWG (1995) 1.12.19-20; C. Scholten (ed.), Iohannes Philoponus, *De opificio mundi = Über die Erschaffung der Welt*, Freiburg 1997.

Studies: Th. Hermann, *Ioannes Philoponus als Monophysit*: ZNTW 29 (1930) 209-264; H.D. Saffrey, *Le chrétien Jean Philopone et la survivance de l'école d'Alexandrie au VIe siècle*: REG 67 (1954) 396-410; H. Martin, *Jean Philopone et la controverse trithéite du VIe siècle*: SP 5 (TU 80), Berlin 1962, 519-525; T. Soo Lee, *Die griechische tradition der aristotelischen Syllogistik in der Spätantike: eine Untersuchung über die Kommentare zu den analytica priora von Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Ammonius und Philoponus*, Göttingen 1984; R. Sorabji (ed.), *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, Ithaca, NY 1987; L. Siorvanes, *Science, Philosophy and Religion: Philoponus and the Search for Unity in Late Antiquity*: History of Science 26 (1988) 93-102; C. Wildberg, *John Philoponus' Criticism of Aristotle's Theory of Aether*, Berlin-New York 1988; T. Hainthaler - A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche 2/4*, 1990, 109-149; K. Verrycken, *The Development of Philoponus' Thought and Its Chronology*, in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed*, Ithaca, NY 1990, 233-274; K. Verrycken, *La psychogonie platonicienne dans l'oeuvre de Philopon*: RSPh 75 (1991) 211-234; B.R. Suchla, *Verteidigung eines platonischen Denkmodells einer christlichen Welt*, Göttingen 1995; C. Scholten, *Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift* de opificio mundi *des Johannes Philoponus*, Berlin 1996; C. Wildberg, *Johannes Philoponos*, in F. Ricken (ed.), *Philosophen der Antike*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Cologne 1996, 264-276; F.A.J. de Haas, *John Philoponus' New Definition of Prime Matter: Aspects of Its Background in Neoplatonism and the Ancient Commentary Tradition*, Leiden 1997; U.M. Lang, *Nicetas Choniates, a Neglected Witness to the Greek Text of John Philoponus' "Arbiter"*: JTS n.s. 48 (1997) 540-548; L.S.B. MacCoull, *A New Look at the Career of John Philoponus*: JECS 3 (1995) 47-60; G.D. Dragas, *The Date and Character of the Lord's Supper According to John Philoponus*: Kairos I, 179-191; L. Fladerer, *Johannes Philoponos, De opificio mundi: spätantikes Sprachdenken und christliche Exegese*, Stuttgart 1999; G.R. Giardina, *Giovanni Filopono matematico tra neopitagorismo e neoplatonismo: commentario alla* Introduzione aritmetica *di Nicomaco di Geraso*, Catania 1999; C. Wildberg, *Impetus Theory and the Hermeneutics of Science in Simplicius and Philoponus*: Hyperboreus 5 (1999) 107-124; B. Chiesa, *Filologia storica della Bibbia ebraica*, I: *Da Origene al Medioevo*, Brescia 2000, 104-109; S. Lilla, *Giovanni Filopono*: Patrologia V, 363-388; J. Schamp, *Photios et Jean Philopon: sur la date du* De opificio mundi: Byzantion 70 (2000) 135-154; H. Inglebert, Interpretatio christiana. *Les mutations des savoirs* (*cosmographie, géographie, ethnographie, histoire*) *dans l'Antiquité chrétienne* (*30-630 après J.-C.*), Paris 2001, 58-63; 87-88; 219-221; see John in the index, 618; U.M. Lang, *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon in the Sixth Century: A Study and Translation of the* Arbiter, Leuven 2001; M. Roueché, *Why the Monad Is Not a Number: John Philoponus and* In de anima 3: JÖByz 52 (2002) 95-133.

M. Simonetti

JOHN TALAIAS (d. 495/496). Patriarch of *Alexandria and bishop of *Nola. A Tabennesi monk (perhaps at Canopus, near Alexandria), he became a priest and *oikonomos* of the church of Alexandria, from where he was sent as a legate to *Constantinople in 478 to request the exile of the *monophysite *Peter Mongus; when the *Chalcedonian bishop *Timothy Salofaciolus had been reestablished at Alexandria, John was sent again as legate to *Zeno to ask him for guarantees for a pro-Chalcedonian succession in Alexandria's episcopal see. At the death of Salofaciolus (February 482), John succeeded him, but after only six months he had to leave the city due to political-religious intrigues. Supported by Pope *Simplicius (d. 483), John went to Rome, and in 484 he participated in the Roman council which on 20 July condemned *Acacius of Constantinople and Peter Mongus, who had by this time become bishop of Alexandria. Since the hostility of Zeno endured, in 490 Pope *Felix III assigned the episcopal see of Nola (= Cimitile, near *Naples) to John. When *Anastasius became emperor (11 April 491), John visited him seeking to obtain the restitution of the Alexandrian see. Back at Nola, he died after a few years (in 495/496 his successor Serenus was in charge). John should perhaps be identified with the John of Alexandria cited by *Photius (*Bibl.* 15a) as the author of an apology addressed to *Gelasius I (492–496), containing the condemnation of *Pelagius, *Celestius and *Julian of Eclanum.

Evagr., *Hist. eccl.* III, 12-18: PG 86, 2617-2636; Liberatus, *Brev.* 16-18: PL 68, 1020-1027; PCBE 2/1, 1063; DCB 3, 347-348; EC 6, 635. Ch. Pietri, *D'Alexandrie à Rome: Jean Talaïa, émule d'Athanase au Ve siècle*, in *Alexandrina: hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme. Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert*, Paris 1987, 277-295.

E. MALASPINA

JOHN the ALMSGIVER (d. 620). Even if the first biography of John written by his contemporaries *Sophronius the Sophist and *John Moschus has not reached us in its complete form, the *Vita* (CPG 7882) written by *Leontius bishop of Neapolis (the modern Limassol) of *Cyprus (7th c.) allows us, in compensation, despite its clear, edifying character, to establish the broad outlines of the life of this holy bishop (BHG 886; ed. H. Gelzer, Leipzig 1893).

John was born on the island of Cyprus, perhaps in Amathus itself, in the 2nd half of the 6th c., to a wealthy family. After an education corresponding to his social rank, he must have embraced a secular career, but on this point there is no precise information. All that is known is that after a short period of married life, John, a widower and without children, abandoned all his goods and dedicated himself completely to the service of God and to works of charity.

The earliest period of John's ecclesiastical life is not well known. He became a truly historic figure in the moment when the new emperor *Heraclius, conqueror of Phocas, called him to the *Melkite see of Alexandria (610) to succeed to the patriarch Theodore Scribo, assassinated some months earlier. John showed himself, from the beginning, to be an ardent defender of *Chalcedonian orthodoxy against *monophysitism. His activity was difficult in an environment not favorable to the Chalcedonians, but he obtained notable successes, also with the help of John Moschus. He dedicated all his effort to the formation of a sturdy and deeply virtuous clergy. The construction or reconstruction of the worship buildings necessary for his community was also dear to his heart. The main title of glory, however, for John, is his charity without limits, which won for him the title "the Almsgiver." He tried to reduce immediate misery with daily distributions to the poor, of whom he had had an accurate list compiled. He also did his best to more efficiently organize the struggle against every kind of social calamity, creating nurseries, orphanages and hospitals.

John did not limit his charitable activities to the populations of Egypt. The political events which followed the conquest of *Syria and *Jerusalem (614) on the part of Persians forced him to create new organizations for the welcome of refugees and to help the patriarch of Jerusalem *Modestus reorganize worship in the holy places. When, in its turn, Egypt was menaced by Persian invasion, John, feeling himself now paralyzed in his pastoral action, accepted the aid of the prefect Nicetas, nephew of Heraclius (who, furthermore, had not been uninvolved in his nomination to the see of Alexandria), to reach the capital of the empire. John, however, did not arrive in *Constantinople. Having reached, together with John Moschus and Sophronius, the island of Cyprus, his homeland, he halted and retired to Amathus, where he died soon after on 11 November 620, while John Moschus and Sophronius proceeded to *Rome and wrote a *Vita* of their friend. His body was buried in the church of St. *Tychon, an earlier bishop of the city. A *Vita* of St. Tychon is attributed to John (BGH 1859).

H. Usener, *Sonderbare Heiligen* I. *Der heilige Tychon*, Leipzig 1907, 111-149; H. Delehaye, *Une vie inédite de saint Jean l'Aumonier*: AB 45 (1927) 5-74; A.J. Festugière, *Léontios de Néapolis, Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 95), Paris 1974, 439-524; Eng. tr..: E. Dawes - N.H. Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints*, London-Oxford 1948, 207-262 (abbreviated). Bardenhewer, 5,135-137; BS 6, 750-756; RBBL 3, 251-253; J. Hofstra, *Leontius van Neapolis als Hagiograaf*, in A. Hilhorst (ed.), *De heiligenverering in de eerste eeuwen van het christendom*, Nijmegen 1988, 186-192; DHGE 26, 1255; E. Wipszycka, *L'économie du patriarcat alexandrin à travers les vies de saint Jean l'Aumônier*, in *Alexandrie médiévale* 2, ed. Ch. Décobert (Études alexandrines 8), Il Cairo 2002, 61-81.

J.-M. SAUGET

JOHN THE BAPTIST. On St. John the Baptist (called by the Greeks *ho Prodromos,* the Precursor) we have much evidence in the gospels. The most important pieces of evidence are his birth from Zechariah and Elizabeth (Lk 1:5-25, 39-56, 51-79), his apostolic activity, particularly the baptism of Christ (Jn 1:19-38), and his death (Mk 6:17-25); there is also a mention in Flavius Josephus (*Antiq*. 18,5,1). John is also mentioned in the apocrypha (*see* **Protevangelium of James*) and in the Qur'an. After his death his body must have been deposited at Sebaste, where he enjoyed veneration, but the tomb was partially destroyed at the time of *Julian the Apostate (Rufinus, *HE* 2,28, PL 21, 536). In the East many churches were founded in his honor, particularly in Palestine; this is confirmed by pilgrims (such as *Egeria), at *Alexandria and in the West (*Rome, *Ravenna); in particular many baptisteries were dedicated to St. John. We have evidence of veneration of St. John already in the 4th c.; this is confirmed by the homilies of St. *Augustine (11), *Peter Chrysologus, *Maximus of

Turin; *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ephrem, *John Chrysostom, *Hesychius, *Antipater of Bostra and many others; at *Byzantium Theodore the Studite, Michael Psellus and others; *Gregory of Tours lists the miracles of John the Baptist (*De gloria martyrum*, 11-19). We find testimonies on John the Baptist in the biblical commentaries, in the baptismal catechisms and finally in the monastic literature, where John the Baptist is considered, with Elijah and Elisha, one of the precursors of monasticism. Initially we have two feasts, one for the birth (24 June: the feast of the birth, calculated based on Christmas) and one for the commemoration of St. John the Baptist, observed 7 January, the day following the feast of the Baptism of the Lord (6 January). Furthermore, on August 29—the day of the dedication of the church of Sebaste—the decapitation of St. John was observed. Over time other feasts were born: 23 September the conception of John (among the Greeks), 24 September (among the Latins) the translation of the relics, the discovery of the body, of the head etc. The most ancient liturgical formula is found in the *Sacramentarium Leonianum* (6th c.).

The apocrypha of St. John the Baptist are not numerous. The three last chapters of the *Protevangelium of James* speak of the death of Zechariah and the flight of Elizabeth with John. There are some lives of John: in Greek, *auctore Marco*; in *Syriac, attributed to *Serapion of Thmuis (with an addition of miracles); an encomium in *Coptic, attributed to *Theodosius of Alexandria, of the 8th c., and a *Gloria Praecursoris* ascribed to *John Chrysostom. Four Greek passions also exist, which are generally faithful to the gospel narration with the addition of other elements. There existed also a *Book of John* (7th–8th c.), used by the *Mandeans.

CANT 180-185; BHG 831-867; BHL 4290-4315; BHO 484-495; H. Leclercq, DACL 7, 1926, 2167-2184; BS 6, 600-624; LCIK 7, 164-190; E. Malatesta - R. Marichal: DSp 8 (1974) 175-192; G. Aranda Perez, Coptic Encyclopedia 4, 1354-1357.

A. Mingana: Woodbrooke Studies 1 (1927) 234-287 (Serapion, with Eng. tr.); A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1913, 128-145, 335-351 (ps.-John, with Eng. tr.); K.H. Kuhn: CSCO 268-269/Copt 33-34, 1966 (encomium); Fr. tr. A. Boud'hors: EApC 1555-1576.

Studies:E. Razy, *St. Jean Baptiste sa vie, son culte et sa légende*, Paris 1886; G. Vitaletti, *Salome nella leggenda e nell'arte*, Rome 1908; J.A. Berends, *Studien über Zacharias-Apocryphen und Zacharias-Legenden*, Leipzig 1895; W.C. Till, *Johannes der Täufern der koptischen Litteratur*: MDAI(K) 6 (1958) 310-322; W. Speyer, *Der Tod der Salome*: JAC 10 (1967) 176-180; J. Daniélou, *Jean Baptiste témoin de l'Agneau*, Paris 1964; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, 2, Milan 1969, 441-444; E. Bammel, *The Baptist in the Early Christian Tradition*: NTS 18 (1971-1972) 95-128; D. Sheerin, *St. John the Baptist in the Lower World*: VChr 30 (1976) 1-22; E.F. Lupieri, *Giovanni Battista tra storia e leggenda*, Brescia 1988; Id., *John the Gnostic: The Figure of the Baptist in Origen and Heterodox Gnosticism*: SP 19 (1989) 322-327; Id., *John the Baptist in New Testament Tradition and History*: ANRW 26, 1, 430-461; F.A. Metzsch, *Johannes der Täufer. Seine Geschichte und seine Darstellung in der Kunst*, Munich 1989; C. Walter, *Salome and the Head of Saint John the Baptist*: REArm 23 (1992) 509-523; A. Castellano, *La exégesis de Origenes y de Heracleón a los testimonios del Bautista*, Santiago (Chile) 1998; E. Lucchesi, *Trois éloges coptes de Jean Baptiste attribués à Athanase, Théophile et Cyrille d'Alexandrie*: VChr 53 (1999) 323-4.

M. Starowieyski

JOHN THE BAPTIST (iconography). Considered the last and greatest prophet of the OT and precursor of Christ in preaching and in baptism, John the Baptist appears already in the 3rd c. in some cemeterial frescoes in the scene of the baptism of Christ, beardless, in a girded tunic or fascia (Rome, cemetery of Callistus, cubicle of the sacraments A3: middle of the 3rd c.; ibid., area of Lucina, cubicles XY: 220-230; cemetery of Domitilla: 2nd half of the 4th c.; cemetery of Pontianus, John the Baptist appears haloed: 4th c.). Equally ancient, the *sarcophagi usually show, on the contrary, the Baptist bearded and dressed only in the pallium (Rome, S. Maria Antiqua, sarcophagus: 3rd quarter of the 3rd c.) or in a lion skin (Rome, Museo Pio Cristiano, Vat., sarcophagus: last decade of the 3rd c.). In a corner between the columns of the lower level of the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus (359), Christ and John the Baptist are represented as lambs.

From the 5th c., next to scenes of baptism, which continued to be represented (*Ravenna, S. Giovanni in Fonte: middle of the 5th c.; London, British Museum, ivory casket: beginning 5th c.; Ravenna, Baptistery of the Arians: 6th c.; Ravenna, ivory throne of Maximian: 6th c.), scenes concerning his life began to spread, which frequently are confused with those from the life of Christ—annunciation to Zechariah or to Elizabeth, birth, song of Zechariah, flight of Elizabeth with John the Baptist as a child, murder of Zechariah—(Rome, S. Maria Maggiore, arch, mosaics: 432–440; Alexandrian Chronicle of the world, miniatures: 5th c.; Evangeliarium of Rabbula: 6th c.; Deir Abu Hennis near Antinoë, baptismal church, frescoes: 6th c.; Sinope, evangeliarium, Paris, Bibl. Nat. *suppl. gr.* 1286: VI c.). John the Baptist is also shown in the clothing of the prophet of the redemption (Rome, basilica of Sts. John and Paul on the Celian: 498-514; Rome, oratory of St. Venantius in the Lateran: 640–642), in the style of a standing ascetic (Kiev, icon: 6th c.), among the evangelists with allusion to the NT (Ravenna, ivory throne of Maximian: 6th c.), or again associated with Zechariah, with

Mary or with Gabriel (Poreč, Euphrasian basilica, apsidal mosaic: 543–544; Rome, basilica of S. Maria Antiqua, fresco: 649). Other episodes, too, are not unknown, like Mt 3:10, the Lenten preaching (Werden, near London, ivory casket: 5th c.) and the martyrdom with decapitation in prison (Sinope, evangeliarium: 6th c.) or the presentation of the head by the executioner during the banquet of Herod, usually to Salome (Alexandrian Chronicle of the world, miniatures: 5th c.; Sinope, evangeliarium: 6th c.; *Dittochaeon* n. 34: 400?).

As for the sacred buildings dedicated to him, in Palestine the existence of sanctuaries is attested from the end of the 4th c., e.g., in the locality where he baptized Christ at Qasr el-Jehud and above his tomb which was believed to exist at Sebaste (Jer., *Comm. in Osea* 1,1; *Comm. in Michaeam* 1,1: PL 25, 825 and 1156). At *Constantinople there were about fifteen sacred buildings, among which the church of Hebdomon, where *Theodosius had the head deposited (Soz., *HE* 7,21); at Rome around ten, e.g., the oratory of the Lateran Baptistery and, later, the homonymous basilica dedicated to the Savior and to the Baptist. St. *Benedict and *Theodelinda dedicated churches to him at Montecassino and at Monza.

EC 6, 515ff.; LCI 7, 164-190; Wp 237ff.; Wa I,21ff.; J. Myslivec, *Ikone des Johannes in der Wüste*: Seminarium Kondakovianum 6 (1933) 227-237; S. de Vito Battaglia, *L'art et saint Jean. L'intervention de l'ange*: L'Ill. Vat. 5 (1934) 824-826; R. Plus, *Jean-Baptiste dans l'art*, Paris 1937; M. Maynial, *L'iconographie de S. Jean-Baptiste depuis les origines jusqu'au XIVe siècle*, Paris 1943; E.D. Sdrakas, *Johannes der Täufer in der Kunst des christlichen Ostens*, Munich 1943; A. Masseron, *S. Jean-Baptiste dans l'art*, Paris 1957; L. Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Das Elfenbeinrelief mit Taufszene aus der Sammlung Maskell im British Museum*: JbAC 22 (1979) 195-204.

G. Santagata

JOHN the EGYPTIAN (d. after 536). The *monophysite bishop of Hephaestus. A Palestinian of Gaza, monk in Egypt in the convent of *Peter the Iberian, he was ordained bishop by *Theodosius of Alexandria around 534, but in 536 he was deposed and exiled to *Constantinople together with Theodosius himself. From there he secretly undertook various trips to Asia Minor, organizing a monophysite hierarchy and making himself the bearer of messages of other exiled bishops. *John of Ephesus, his future biographer (*Lives of the Oriental Saints* 25: PO 18, 526-540), was his travel companion; they had met in Rhodes. A letter from him in *Syriac is preserved, addressed to the *archimandrites of the East, but it is unpublished.

CPG 7200: F. Nau, *Littérature canonique syriaque inédite*: ROC 14 (1909) 48-49 (just the Fr. tr. of the letter); E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, subs. 2, Louvain 1951, 165-167; DHGE 26, 1495; Patrologia V, 390-1.

F. Scorza Barcellona

JOHN the PRESBYTER (1st c.). A person who lived in the apostolic or subapostolic age, the details of whose life are decidedly obscure. *Eusebius reports that *Papias, in his anxious search for knowledge of the first Christian period, sought information on what *Andrew or *Peter or *Philip or *Thomas or *James or *John or *Matthew or any other disciple of the Lord had said and on what *Aristion and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, had said (Eus., *HE* 3, 39,4). In the analysis that follows the citation of Papias, Eusebius notes that the former clearly distinguishes two Johns, one the apostle, listed among the group of the apostles, whose testimony belonged to the past and was passed on to those who heard them, while the second John is called presbyter and disciple of the Lord in parallel with Aristion, and their testimonies were given in person (ibid. 5). The hypothesis can be proposed that the account of Eusebius has been corrupted or that he has corrected the report of Papias, since he opposed the canonicity of the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to the presbyter John and not to the apostle (VII, 25,16). There are no arguments to credit the opinion that Eusebius falsified the report of Papias. John the Presbyter therefore cannot be other than a disciple of the apostles, probably of the Johannine circle, who lived at Ephesus and encountered Papias. Although the distinction of the two Johns helped Eusebius overcome the hurdle of the attribution of the Apocalypse, it must be admitted that Papias does in fact speak about two different people. An indirect argument in favor of the distinction can be seen in the dedication of 2 and 3 John, where the critics are agreed in supposing that the word "presbyter" can be completed with the word "John," but are not agreed on supposing the author to be the apostle John. In the *Adv. haer.* (II, 22,5; III, 3,4), *Irenaeus seems to have casually simplified the data from Papias, calling John apostle, author of the Fourth Gospel and disciple of the Lord, and does not even mention John the Presbyter, unless—but this seems unlikely—one wishes to see John in the source named "the Presbyter" (*Adv. haer.* IV, 27,1.2; 28,1; 30,1; 31,1; 32,1). The question on the identity between John the apostle and John the Presbyter remains open.

G. Bardy, *Jean le Presbytre*: DBS 4, 843-847; F.M. Braun, *Jean le*

Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne (Études Bibliques), Paris 1959, 357-364; A. Feuillet, *Le manque de sens critique d'Irénée et le problème des deux Jean: Introduction à la Bible*, II, Paris 1959, 650-652; J. Munck, *Zur Papiaszeugnis bei Eusebius, H.E. III, 39,3f*: HThR 52 (1959) 123-143; O. Merlier, *Le quatrième Évangile*, Paris 1961, 240-245, 446-447, R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (Herd. Theol. Komm. zum N.T. 13/3), Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 41970, 259-301; Id., *Il vangelo di Giovanni*, I, Brescia 1973, 96-100, 109-114; B.M. Ubach, *Giovanni il Presbitero*, Enc. della Bibbia, III, Turin 1970, coll. 1165-1166; U.H.J. Koertner, *Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, Göttingen 1983; J. Kuerzinger, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Neuausgabe und Übersetzung der Fragmente. Kommentierte Bibliographie, Regensburg 1983 (cf. L. Cirillo, *Un recente volume su Papia*: CSt 7 [1986] 553-563); W.R. Schoedel, Papias: ANRW 2, 27, 1, 235-270; M.-L. Rigato, *La testimonianza di Papia di Gerapoli sul "secondo" Giovanni e il contesto eusebiano: riscontri nel Nuovo Testamento*, in *Atti del VI Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni Apostolo*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 1996, 237-272.

E. Peretto

JOHN the SILENT (d. 559). Also called the *Hesychast or Sabaite, a saint. He was born at Nicopolis (Armenia Maior) in 454. Being left an orphan, he founded a monastery there at 18; at 28 he was elected bishop of Colonia (Taxara, Armenia). After a trip to *Constantinople, he retired at 38 to *Jerusalem to the hospital of St. George and, later, to the laura of St. Sabas, where, under the latter's guidance, he lived in continual seclusion and silence until his death (559). His disciple *Cyril of Scythopolis wrote his *Vita*. This is complete in the *Georgian version, but in the Greek text the death of the saint is missing.

CPG III, 7537; ed. Schwartz, *Cyrillos von Skythopolis*, TU 49, 2, 201-222; PO 21, 458-462; AASS *Mai* III, 14-18, 230-236; DACL 6, 2362-2365; LTK² 5, 1045f.; Cath 6, 423f.; BS 6, 904f.; Patrologia V, 293.

A. De Nicola

JONAH

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. The book of Jonah, among the Twelve Minor Prophets of the OT, has a narrative form, even if—acc. to the usual interpretation today—it is only a story or a parable. The personage of Jonah is known in the Bible from 2 Kgs 14:25: he was active at the time of Jeroboam II, toward the middle of the 8th c. BC. But the book was written later, about the 4th c. Its boundless universalistic thesis, in terms which appear to anticipate the NT, seems to react against the tendency of Ezra and Nehemiah: God wants the salvation of all, even the Ninevites; and mercy is demanded of Israel toward traditional enemies, on the model of the mercy of Yahweh. Even if it was considered historical for centuries, the story has a fictional character, today generally accepted: miracles are multiplied there to an extreme (the sudden appearance and then disappearance of the storm, the fish which swallows Jonah and preserves him intact for three days in his belly, the growth and instant withering of a plant) in such a way as to emphasize the sarcastic intention toward the only Israelite of the book, who is Jonah. The prophet is sent by God to Nineveh to announce the destruction, but instead of leaving for the East he sets out by sea in the opposite direction. In contrast with the disobedience of Jonah, all the creatures mentioned in the book are shown as obedient to the word of God, transmitted to them, even against his will, by the prophet: the polytheistic sailors, the king and inhabitants of Nineveh, and even the sea, the fish, the animals in act of penance, the plant which grew overnight, the worm which made it wither.

Probably because of the "sign" of Jonah—the only one of the prophets to whom Jesus compares himself and his own mission (Mt 12:39-41)—the book of Jonah is taken into account throughout patristic literature rather more than the other Minor Prophets. The history of its interpretation has two phases: the first is limited to allusions and references; the second is distinguished by the great commentaries. The first phase embraces the 2nd and the 3rd c.: the Fathers do not yet worry about gathering the global meaning and theological message of the book, but cite it, or refer to it implicitly, or introduce it as an argument to respond to questions which are more pressing and immediate for them. Thus, we see used as a polemic against the Jews in the *Letter* of *Clement of Rome (*1 Clem.* 7,7), and *Justin (*Dial.* 108); against the *gnostics, *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3,21,8; 4,9,2) and *Methodius of Olympus (*De resurr.* 11,24-25); *Tertullian uses it to demonstrate, against *Marcion, that also in the OT God practices mercy and repents of the threatened evil (*Adv. Marc.* II, 24,4-6). *Clement of Alexandria, who begins to recognize the universalism of the book, presents the Ninevites as an example of conversion for the pagans (*Protrept.* X, 99,4): Jonah is the persecuted just man, model of the true gnostic (*Strom.* II, 20,103-104). With *Origen there is the first commentary on Jonah, lost, but which left a clearly visible trace in later works. The attention with which Origen read the book seems clear from the *De oratione,* where (for the first time in a patristic writing) the disobedience of the prophet is noted—who in consequence runs the risk of death (*De orat.* 13,3)—and, later, his

lack of mercy (ibid., 13,4), after God had saved him.

In the 4th c., in the West, the signs of a complete *exegesis of the book are already clear. The continual resistance of Jonah to God is pointed out by *Zeno of Verona (*Tract.* II, 17,2); thus also the author of the *Liber quaestionum* in polemic with the *Novatians and the *Arians (*Quaest.* 102,4-8; 97,12: CSEL 50, 202-206.180). *Ambrose reads and explains the book of Job on Holy Thursday (*Ep.* 20,25-26: PL 16, 1001-1002), at the end of the Lenten penance, of which the Ninevites are the model. In the East the authors who deal with Jonah are rather numerous. With *John Chrysostom begins that exegesis which explains the disobedience of the prophet with the fear that the oracle of condemnation might be refuted by the facts, since God is merciful (*De statuis hom.* 5,6). The fast of the Ninevites is given as an example of communal prayer and conversion (*De incomprehens. Dei natura* 3,6; *In Gen. hom.* 24,6). The Cappadocian fathers move along this line, interpreting the triple immersion of the baptismal rite with the three days of the burial of Christ acc. to the sign of Jonah (see Basil., *De spir. sancto* 14,32); moreover, *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* II, 108-109) understands the sending of the prophet to Nineveh as an announcement of the future ruin of Israel. In this century the complete commentaries on the book of Jonah begin. *Jerome writes the *In Ionam* (PL 25, 1117-1152), one of his best exegetical works. The interpretation of the flight is noteworthy: Jonah refused to travel to Nineveh because he saw in his mission the rejection of Israel for the advantage of the pagans; this is perhaps the thesis of the lost commentary of Origen, of which there is a confirmation in Gregory of Nazianzus. *Theodore of Mopsuestia, who writes at *Antioch the commentary on the Twelve Prophets, explains the theological meaning of the book in this way (PG 66, 317-346): Jonah is familiar with the mercy of God and knows that if the Ninevites repent they will be pardoned. Thence the flight to impede the realization of the pardon (ibid., 325-328).

For the 5th c. the *In Ionam* (PG 71, 597-638) of *Cyril of Alexandria should be mentioned: the book shows the breadth of God's plan concerning all the pagan nations. Cyril is the only commentator who sees in this universal intention the motive for the mission of Jonah and thus blame for Jonah, who has sentiments unworthy of a prophet. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus in the commentary *In Ionam* (PG 81, 1719-1740) goes even further, asserting that Israel and the nations are complementary parts of a single plan of salvation: the mission of Jonah is that of revealing the God common to all humankind, a God who for love of sinners does not hesitate to afflict the just (ibid., 1740). Among the Greeks one could mention *Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Gennadius of Constantinople and *Basil of Seleucia, who in the *Homilies* underlines the pedagogy of God with the just and the sinners, and his bounty toward every creature (*Or.* 12-13). Basil was the first to explore the theological meaning of the castor plant, which demonstrates the tenderness of God toward all, even toward the reluctant prophet (*Or.* 12). Among the Latins *Augustine should be mentioned (*Ep.* 102,30-38: CSEL 34, 570-578): he takes up the thesis of Jerome but emphasizes the refusal of the prophet as a sign of the jealousy of the chosen people faced with the salvation of the pagans.

The book of Jonah enjoyed extraordinary popularity among the Fathers; the authors who cite it are numerous. In the first centuries the "sign of Jonah" of the gospel directed the commentators toward the christological interpretation: the passion of Christ, the prayer of the persecuted just man, the three days and nights in the tomb, the resurrection. God appears there as the almighty Lord who frees the prophet from death. Only with the exegesis of the entire book does the other reading progress, which goes from the recognition of the sin of Jonah to the awareness of a God of mercy, of a God who wants the salvation of every person, even of his prophet who remains the most difficult to convert.

Translations of the *In Ionam* of Jerome: It. tr. *Commento al libro di Giona* (Collana di Testi patristici, 96), ed. N. Pavia, Rome 1992; Lat. text and Fr. tr. *Sur Jonas*, SC 43, P. Antin (Paris 1956); *Commentaire sur Jonas*, SC 323, Y.-M. Duval, Paris 1985; Lat. text and Ger. tr. *Kommentar zu dem Propheten Jona* (Fontes Christiani, 90), S. Risse, Turnhout 2003; Pol. tr. *Komentarz do ksiegi Jonaszka*, Kraków 1998.

DBS 4, 1104-1131; Y.-M. Duval, *Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine. Sources et influence da Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*, Paris 1973; E. Biser, *Zum frühchristlichen Verständnis des Buches Jonas*: Bibel und Kirche 17 (1962) 19-21; Y.-M. Duval, *Les sources grecques de l'exégèse de Jonas chez Zénon de Vérone*: VChr 20 (1966) 98-115; Y.-M. Duval, *Saint Augustin et le Commentaire sur Jonas de Saint Jérôme*: REA 12 (1966) 9-40; W. Wischmeyer, *Das Beispiel Jonas. Zur Kirchengeschichtlichen Bedeutung von Denkmälern frühchristlicher Grabeskunst zwischen Theologie und Frömmigkeit*: ZKG 92 (1981) 161-179; P. Jay, *L'exégèse de Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe*, Paris 1985; U. Steffen, *Die Jona-Geschichte. Ihre Auslegung und Darstellung im Judentum, Christentum und Islam*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1994; R. Lux, *Jona. Prophet zwischen "Verweigerung" und "Gehorsam,"* FRLANT 162, Göttingen 1994; G. Vanoni, *Jona. Jonabuch*: LTK[3] 5, 985-987; H.-J. Zobel, *Jona. Jonabuch*: TRE 17, 229-234.

G. Pani

II. Iconography. The short book of Jonah, which narrates the adventures of the prophet charged with

carrying the divine message to the Ninevites, was a source of inspiration from the beginnings of Christian iconography. A prefiguration of Christ for having remained three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster like Jesus in the tomb (Mt 12:40), Jonah alludes to the resurrection and was among the best-known biblical figures. Some moments in particular of the story of the prophet are represented frequently: thrown from the ship into the stormy sea and swallowed by the sea monster; vomited by the sea monster onto the beach and, finally, resting under the shelter of *cucurbitae*. These scenes are often found united in cyclical compositions. Sometimes a fourth moment is added to these (esp. in Roman cemeterial frescoes), in which Jonah appears sad under the withered plant: this underlines his mission of spreading the message of salvation also among the Gentiles. The iconographic variations are very numerous, and it is not possible to enumerate all of them. Sporadically some new episode appears, such as Jonah sent to Nineveh, or in the act of climbing on the rocks, after having been vomited onto the shore. The prophet usually looks young, beardless and nude (among biblical figures, just like Daniel among the lions); only rarely does he wear a tunic *clavata,* or else tunic and pallium (e.g., in the floor mosaic of Beth Govrin, in Palestine, or in a miniature of f. 6*a* of the Codex of Rabbula). Standing and clothed, but with a different iconography and in a different context, Jonah is later represented among the prophets in the basilica of St. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna.

It has been remarked that the scenes of Jonah are attested in a smaller number in the East than in the West. However, in funeral painting, the prophet makes his appearance very early, around the 4th decade of the 3rd c., in the Crypt of the Sacraments and in the area of Lucina in the Roman catacombs of St. *Callistus. The compositions already contain all the elements which characterize them (Wp 26,1,2,3; 27,3; 38; 47,1,2). In the Roman cemeteries, the theme reoccurs in about seventy examples, about thirty of which refer to cycles of three or four episodes. A few times Jonah is found sad under the withered plant (e.g. Wp 235; Ferrua, *Via Latina* tv. LXXI, 1; Josi: RivAC 1928, fig. 21, 198), while in a single case, in a lost picture of the catacomb of *Domitilla (Wp 56), the prophet appeared troubled by the sun. Scenes of Jonah also adorn the later *cubiculi* or *loculi* of the Roman cemeteries; they are also known in different locales and regions of the *orbis christianus antiquus,* e.g., at Cimitile (3rd c.), in the catacombs of *Januarius at *Naples, in the cemetery of Bonaria at Cagliari (4th c.), in the mausoleum of the Exodus at El-Bagawat in Egypt (end 4th–5th c.), or again in a hypogeum of Sopianae, in *Pannonia Secunda.

The story of Jonah is already attested in some of the most ancient Christian *sarcophagi, such as that of S. Maria Antiqua (Ws 1,2; 3,1 = Rep. 747,1,2), from the 1st half of the 3rd c., and in numerous covers from the 2nd half of the 3rd c. up to the so-called sarcophagus of Jonah (Ws 9,3 = Rep. 35), in which the episodes of the prophet occupy a post of first rank on the front. He appears thrown into the sea from the ship, in which there are three sailors, swallowed and vomited by the monster, resting under the bower. Outside of Rome, the theme occurs with a certain frequency in the Iberic and Gallic sarcophagi. The lid of the sarcophagus of the church of Saint-Caprais d'Agen (Ws 168,4) testifies to its persistence in the figurative repertoire up to the end of the 6th c. Jonah appears in some African sarcophagi, such as at Naro-Hamman-el-Cif, where he is represented (with the legend *IONA*), between two images of Daniel (5th c.). As for sculpture, numerous altar slabs (or "tables") with historiated edges should be mentioned from diverse origins (Split, Athens, Smyrna, Laodicea), in which the usual episodes of the cycle can be identified.

Concerning mosaics, before the middle of the 3rd c. there is that of the mausoleum of the Julii in the Vatican necropolis, with Jonah thrown from the ship, while in the 2nd decade of the 4th c. three scenes of the cycle of Jonah constituted the principal decorative theme of the floor of the Theodorian S hall of *Aquileia, in a sea rich with fish and fishing cupids. The trilogy is represented also on a *loculo* decorated with mosaic in the Roman cemetery of Apronianus. Of late Constantinian era is the mosaic decoration of the mausoleum of Centcelles in *Spain, in which the three episodes of Jonah also appear (partially preserved). The prophet is found, furthermore, in a limited number of funeral floor mosaics (Thabarca) and of halls of worship, such as in the African basilica of Furnus Minus (5th c.), in which Jonah is shown tossed up (with the legends *IONAS* and *CETVS*). Three scenes (in two of which, however, the ship appears) are also inserted in the tesselation of the Palestinian basilica of Beth Govrin (4th–5th c.).

The resting scene, also often represented alone, is not foreign to the biblical text, but finds precise references (Jon 4:5-6). Aside from the polemics on the nature of the plant, already having arisen in Antiquity regarding the translation of the term *qîqāyôn,* in the paleo-Christian iconography a gourd is certainly depicted, with fruits hanging (a vine, however, appears in the above-mentioned f. 6*a* of the Codex of Rabbula). Sometimes, on the other hand,

some Roman funeral slabs show engraved only branches of *cucurbitae*, or isolated gourds, without other elements. Among the other classes of monuments with scenes of Jonah, numerous golden bases, bronze and terracotta lamps should be mentioned (esp. in *Italy, *Gaul and *Africa) and gems. Among the ivories are the Lipsanotheca of Brescia (2nd half 4th c.) and the pyx formerly of St. Ambrose in Milan (at the Hermitage Museum). The prophet expelled by the whale appears, furthermore, among the stuccoes of the baptistry of the orthodox at Ravenna (2nd half 5th c.), while on some African clay tablets of the museum of the Bardo (5th–6th c.) Jonah expelled can be identified and—perhaps—in the singular attitude of riding the sea monster. Recently a new hypothesis has been advanced (Testini), acc. to which the motive for the spread of this first cyclical composition of the paleo-Christian repertory, esp. Western, would have been a polemic against Jewish-Christianity, for which the scenes of Jonah would be an affirmation of the universality of the divine salvific message, extended to all the nations already in the OT.

Among the most recent discoveries, from Konya (Turkey) comes a relief of the beginning of the 5th c. furnished with legends in Greek, with the head of Jonah emerging from the jaws of the whale, rendered as a big fish. Other attestations of the iconographic cycle are found in the marble tables of the end of the 4th c., of varied provenance and mostly fragmentary, in which sometimes appear, besides the three usual ones, two other episodes (in one case, perhaps, boarding the ship and Jonah sad at the sight of Nineveh).

DACL 7, 2571-2631; EC 6, 428-429; LCI 2, 414-421; O. Mitius, *Jonas auf den Denkmälern des christlichen Altertums*, Freiburg i.B. 1897; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim*, Bonn 1957, 136-151; E. Stommel, *Zum Problem den frühchristlichen Jonasdarstellungen*: JbAC 1 (1958) 112-115; M. Lawrence, *Ships, Monsters and Jonah*: AJA 66 (1962) 289-296; A. Ferrua, *Paralipomeni di Giona*: RivAC 38 (1962) 7-69; P. Testini, in Atti IX CongrIntArchChrist Roma 1975, Vatican City 1978, 484-485; BACr s. II, 5 (1874) 150-152; P. Gauckler, *Catalogue des Musées et Collections archéologiques de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie. Musée Aloui*, II, Paris 1907, L 10, 11, 209; E. Josi, *Le pitture rinvenute nel cimitero dei Giordani*: RivAC 5 (1928) 198, fig. 21 (in reality, it is the catacomb of the via Anapo); G. Chierici, *Edifici sacri particolari*: Atti IV CongrIntArchChrist Roma 1948, 39, fig. 8; B.M. Apollonj Ghetti - A. Ferrua - E. Josi - E. Kirschbaum, *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di S. Pietro in Vaticano*, Vatican City 1951, 42; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden Baden 1958, fig. 73; Volbach-Hirmer, figs. 85-87, 75; L. Pani Ermini, *Note su alcuni cubicoli dell'antico cimitero cristiano di Bonaria in Cagliari*: Studi Sardi 20 (1966) 11-17; U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975, 47 and 63; M. Sotomayor, *Sarcófagos romano-cristianos de España*, Granada 1975, 122ff., 129-130, 148-149; A. Balil, *Frammenti di sarcofago cristiano nel nord-ovest della Penisola iberica*: RivAC 51 (1975) 313-316; G. Rinaldi, *I tre quadretti di Giona nel mosaico dell'aula teodoriana*: AAAd 8 (1975) 109-130; G. Foerster, *The Story of Jonah on the Mosaic Pavement of a Church at Beth Govrin (Israel)*: Atti IX CongrIntArchChrist Roma 1975, Vatican City 1978, 289-294; N. Duval - M. Cintas, *Basiliques et mosaïques funéraires de Furnus Minus*: MEFR Ant. 90 (1978) 871-949; H. Schlunk - Th. Hauschild, *Hispania antiqua*, Mainz 1978, 26 and 124; J. Speigl, *Das Bildprogramm des Jonasmotivs in den Malereien der römischen Katakomben*: RQA 73 (1978) 1-15; H. Sichtermann, *Der Jonaszyklus*, in *Spätantike und frühes Christentum, Ausstellungkatalog*, Frankfurt a.M. 1983, 241-248; D. Korol, *Die frühchristlichen Wandmalereien aus den Grabbauten in Cimitile/Nola. Zur Entstehung und Ikonographie alttestamentlicher Darstellungen* (JbAC, Ergänzungsbände 13), Münster 1987; C. Stella, *Lipsanoteca*, in *Milano capitale dell'Impero romano*, Milan 1990, 344-346; E. Chalkia, *Le mense paleocristiane*, Vatican City 1991; J. Dresken Weiland, *Reliefierte Tischplatten aus theodosianischer Zeit*, Vatican City 1991; Id., *Ein frühchristliches Jonas-Relief in Konya*: MDAI(R) 102 (1995) 405-412; A.M. Nieddu, *La pittura paleocristiana in Sardegna. Nuove acquisizioni*: RivAC 72 (1996) 245-283; M. Perraymond, *Ninive, la città del profeta Giona: iconografia, simbolismo, narrazione*, in E. Cavalcanti (ed.), *Il "De Civitate Dei." L'opera, le interpretazioni, l'influsso*, Rome 1996, 627-640; D. Mazzoleni, *Giona* (s.v.): TIP, 191-193; M. Dulaey, *Le signe de Jonas*, in Id., *Le berger divin*, in *"Des forêts de symboles." L'initation chrétienne et la Bible* (*Ier-VIe siècle*), Paris 2001, 85-111.

D. Mazzoleni

JONAS of Bobbio (ca. 600–after 659). Jonas, a *Longobard (Lombard) of Susa and monk of Bobbio (Piacenza), a monastery founded by *Columbanus (ca. 530–615), became in 618 the amanuensis of the abbot Attala (615–ca. 626). In 626 he accompanied the third abbot, Bertulf (626–ca. 640), on his trip to Rome. In the era of this abbot he was asked to write the *Vita Columbani* (ca. 642); for this purpose he traveled to Gaul to meet acquaintances of Columbanus, given that he had not known him personally. Therefore he had an opportunity to draw on good eyewitness sources both at Bobbio and in other monasteries, esp. in *Gaul. The work is dedicated to Waldebert, abbot at Luxeuil and Bobeleno, the successor of Bertulf at Bobbio. He does not mention episodes which can discredit his subject, such as the dispute with *Gall when Columbanus left Switzerland, or his position—not orthodox—in the controversy on the date of Easter and on the *Three Chapters. Together with the figure of Columbanus, who occupies the first of the two books, his spiritual heirs are also put in relief; more precisely, in the second book, he discusses the disciples and successors (Attala, Eustace, Bertulf, Meroveus, "The miracles of Evoriacum" (Faremoutiers), the abbey founded by St. Burgundofara, whose brother was a monk at Luxeuil. Narrating the life of the successors of Columbanus, Jonas makes it clear that the work of Co-

lumbanus has not ended but continues in them. He describes with precision and in great detail the *peregrinatio* of Columbanus framed within the political and religious events of his time. He also wrote the *Life of John,* founder of the monastery of Réomé; the oldest redaction of the *Vita s. Vedastis episcopi Atrebatensis* is attributed to him.

CPL 1175 (1115); 1176 (2144); 1177 (2113) Kenney 48; BHL 742, 2773, 1478-1479, 1311-1312; *Repertorium Fontium Historiae Medii Aevi* VI, 433-434.

Editions: PL 87, 1011-1184; MGH, scr. mer. IV (1902) 61-152 (Krusch); *Jonas, Vita Columbani et discipulorum eius*, ed. M. Tosi, with It. tr. by E. Cremona and M. Paramidani, Piacenza 1965; M. Massani, *S. Columbano di Bobbio nella storia, nella letteratura, nell'arte*: Didaskaleion 6 (1928) 81-112; 6/2 (1928) 1-157; F.G. Nuvolone, *Il "Compendium Jonae," il "Sermo de charitate Dei ac proximi," il viaggio di Colombano a Roma e l'aggiornamento dell'orso.*

Editions and starting points for turther research: Archivum Bobiense 4 (1982) 91-165; A. de Vogüé. - P. Sangiani, *Jonas de Bobbio, Vie de saint Colomban et des ses disciples*, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1988; I. Wood, *The Vita Columbani and Merovingian Hagiography*: Peritia 1 (1982) 63-80; D. Bullough, *Colombano*: DBI 27 (1983) 113-129; A. de Vogüé, *En lisant Jonas de Bobbio. Notes sur la Vie de saint Colomban*: Studia Mon. 30 (1988) 63-103; I. Pagani, *"Iona" "Ionatus": a proposito della biografia di Giona di Bobbio*: SM 29 (1988) 45-85; M. Lapidge (ed.), *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, Woodbridge 1997; A. de Vogüé, *Regards sur le monachisme des premiers siècles: recueil d'articles*, Rome 2000.

A. Di Berardino

JORDANES (ca. 500–ca. 570). A historian, probably Alan by nationality, but certainly Gothic in soul and Roman in culture, of the 6th c. Biographical details are cloudy. It is certain that in the first period of his life he was *notarius quamvis agramatus* (i.e., ignorant of the *ars grammatica*) to the noble Gunthiges Baza, who belonged to the royal family of the Amali (or Amalings). It is likely that, having moved to *Italy, he entered *Cassiodorus's community at *Vivarium. Following a meditated *conversio* he became Catholic, probably from the "*Arian sect" against which, in his writings, he showed a particular aversion. There is no reliable evidence that he entered an Eastern monastery (but not even *Ravenna is excluded); likewise, his consecration as bishop of Croton is uncertain. Pope *Vigilius, his friend, mentions Jordanes among the bishops who in 551 supported the condemnation of Bishop Theodore of Caesarea; from this, it has been concluded that Jordanes took part in the escort which accompanied the pope in his exile at Constantinople.

His historical work, *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*, today commonly called *Romana,* is laid out as a compendium of universal history from Adam to *Justinian. Begun at the invitation of his friend Vigilius (perhaps the pope) and conceived as a history of human suffering, it was interrupted and taken up again around 551–552. The main sources are naturally Cassiodorus and the *Chronicon* of *Marcellinus *comes,* but it also draws on Florus, St. *Jerome, *Orosius, Eutropius, Rufius Festus, Virgilius, Lucan, Livy, Strabo, Pomponius Mela and finally on all those authors, historians or not, in which it was possible to find an ideal relationship between Roman and barbarian culture. Furthermore, the use of passages taken from Tyrannius *Rufinus illuminates a remarkable effort in the study of the Holy Scripture: "The Jordanian reading of the sacred texts never failed to corroborate itself with the study of patristic literature of biblical exegesis" (Luiselli); further, the *Romana* appear as a historical-universal treatment, centered on biblical-Jewish and Eastern material, not without a human dimension. In the context of Christian-inspired Latin historiography, the work synthesizes the universal historical approach and the specifically Roman, which by then for some time had flowed into the Christian.

The second work of Jordanes, composed after the solicitations of his friend Castalius, bears the title *De origine actibusque Getarum* (*Getica*) and is in reality an epitome of the lost *History of the Goths* of Cassiodorus. In the course of the narration the historian reveals himself as a fervent promoter of the Amali dynasty, whose right to rule the *Goths he recognizes. It is a valuable source for the accurate description of the events concerning the *Huns, the *Visigoths up to Alaric II and the *Ostrogoths with Vitiges defeated by *Justinian. According to Jordanes, the only possibility of salvation for the Gothic kingdom in *Italy consisted in a loyal collaboration with the emperor of the East, Justinian.

Thanks to this pro-Byzantinism, the work supports the policy of Vitiges, who unconditionally supported the imperial policy in order to save his people. In this way Jordanes defended "the encounter between two peoples even if on a different level, even of submission of one toward the other" (Giunta). Animated by the intent of repacifying the *Romania* and the *Gothia,* Jordanes attempts to blur and mitigate the bloody conflicts between the two worlds: he contrasts the pacific Gothic flexibility with the rapacity of the Roman civil servants, attributing to the latter and to the emperor *Valens the guilt for the defeat of Adrianople (378) and for having introduced the Arian heresy among the Goths. He locates in the ferocity of the Huns the reasons

why the Ostrogoths were opposed to the Romans on the field of battle. He minimizes the extent of the sack of Rome by *Alaric, to whom he attributes religious piety. He grants to *Belisarius, finally, with realism, the merit of having put an end to the state of illegitimacy which had arisen in the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy after the death of *Theodoric.

From a linguistic perspective, the *Latin of both works of Jordanes is of great interest for the number of vulgarisms which infiltrated the vocabulary and syntax of even educated conversation; the style shows its Cassiodorian origin. The chief merit of Jordanes, who appears as one of the last historians of Rome, is to transmit a thoughtful Augustinian Christianity to historiography, of which he reevaluates the positive aspect against the negative conception of history.

Th. Mommsen, MGH AA V, 1 (1882); E. Bartolini, *Jordanes, Storia dei goti*, Milan 1991; F. Giunta - A. Grillone, *Iordanis De origine actibusque Getarum*, Rome 1991; O. Devillers, *Histoire des Goths - Jordanes*, Paris [2]1995; P.L. Schmidt, NP V, 1085-1087; Manitius, I s.v.; F. Giunta, *Jordanes e la cultura dell'alto medioevo. Contributo allo studio del problema gotico*, Palermo 1952; J. Svennung, *Jordanes und Scandia. Krit.-exeget. Studien*, Stockholm 1967; O. Giordano, *Jordanes e la storiografia del IV secolo*, Bari 1973; B. Luiselli, *Sul "De summa temporum" di I.*: RomBarb 1 (1976) 83-133; J.J. O'Donnell, *The Aims of Jordanes*: Historia 31 (1982) 223-240; L.M. Buonomo, *Introduzione alla lettura delle opere di Giordane*, in M.L. Silvestre - M. Squillante, *Mutatio rerum. Letteratura, filosofia, scienza tra tardo antico e altomedioevo*, Atti del convegno di studi (Napoli, 25-26 novembre 1996), Naples 1997, 115-169; A. Gillett, *Jordanes and Ablabius*, in C. Deroux, *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Paris 2000; A.S. Christensen, *Cassiodorus, Jordanes, and the History of the Goths: Studies in a Migration Myth*, Copenhagen 2002; A. Amici, *Iordanes e la Storia gotica*, Spoleto 2002.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

JOSEPH

I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. Spouse of the Virgin *Mary, putative father of Jesus, certainly Palestinian. The discrepancy between the Lukan genealogy (3:23-38) and the Matthean (1:2-16) has encouraged the appearance of the divergent hypotheses, despite the clear intention of the evangelists of putting Jesus into human history as the descendant of Abraham and David. While there are no mentions of the mother of Joseph, Mt 1:16, which puts Jacob as the last link, and Lk 3:23, which on the contrary names Eli, give information about his father. The discrepancy between Matthew and Luke indicates that the names are not to be taken literally. From the time of *Julius Africanus, who considered Jacob and Eli brothers on their mother's side (*Ep. ad Aristidem* 3: PG 10, 57), up to the most recent explanations which maintain that the two genealogies are records of the family of Joseph (Matthew) and of Mary (Luke), the problem remains open. According to *Hegesippus, Clopas (Jn 19:25; Mt 13:55) was the brother of Joseph (Eus., *HE* III, 11; 32,6; IV, 22,4). On the degree of relation with Mary the gospels are silent. Indirectly from Mark (6:3) and directly from Matthew (13:55), we are informed that Joseph was a *tektōn* (Vg *faber,* carpenter or woodworker); the wide signification of the term does not allow identifying his profession with precision. Neither from Luke nor from Matthew can the social condition of Mary at the moment of the annunciation be deduced. Joseph is called a "just man," or perfect Israelite, model Jew, obedient to the will of God.

The infancy gospels, read without prejudice, attest that the marriage between Mary and Joseph was a valid marriage, although virginal, within which Joseph played the role of Jesus' putative father. The apocrypha, in the absence of historic information, pursue the reconstruction of imaginative data; their doctrinal contributions do not modify what is recorded in the NT. The information provided by the **Protevangelium of James,* even if it could in theory be based on real facts, pursues two clearly identified goals: exalting the virginal maternity of Mary and reducing the role of Joseph to a representative of Mary and Jesus before the law (*Protevangelium of James*, 9,13-19), despite putting him within the story of salvation. The apocrypha which contain details concerning Joseph divide into two categories: on the one hand, the *Gospel of Philip* (17,91) and the *Acts of Pilate* (2,3-4; 16,2) gather beliefs widespread in late Judaism and consider Joseph the natural father of Jesus; on the other, the *History of Joseph the Carpenter* and the *Protevangelium of James* defend the virginal maternity of Mary and present the marriage of Mary and Joseph in a broad sense. Joseph, because a virtuous man, died very old (*History of Joseph the Carpenter* 15,1). Of the place of death and burial there is no trace. Other information is given by the apocryphal literature, but it is difficult to distinguish a real historical memory from a Christian midrash, and frequently the results are disappointing.

Nevertheless, for understanding certain passages of the Fathers and artistic expressions they cannot be neglected. The thought of the Fathers follows the evangelical data but is partially conditioned by the accounts of the apocrypha. Although no Father dedicated a work to the figure of Joseph, they have nonetheless left interesting observations. In the first centuries the preeminent effort was to explain the

marriage of Joseph with Mary (Jer., *Comm. in Matth.* 1,18) and the phrase "brothers of the Lord," said by some to be sons of Joseph from a prior marriage (see *Protevangelium of James*, 17; 18; Epiph., *Haer.* 27,7; 78,9), by others to be cousins of the Lord (Jer., *Adversus Helvidium* 19; Pet. Chrysol., *Sermo* 48,4; 49,4). *Augustine, appealing to Roman law, said that there was a true marriage between Mary and Joseph, because consent is its root (*De cons. evan.* II, 12,2; *De nupt. et conc.* I, 11,12; *Sermo* 51; cf. Ambr., *De inst. virg.* 6,41); *Hilary, *Jerome and others called it nominal, others considered it legal and still others only putative. All, however, agreed in affirming that Joseph lived in a chaste marriage with Mary (see Jer., *Comm. in Matth.* 12,49-50; *Adv. Helv.* 19). *Maximus of Turin expressed himself very clearly: "Joseph was the spouse of Mary, not the husband" (*Sermo* 53; PL 57, 639). When commenting or referring to the infancy gospels, the Fathers compared the figure of Joseph to Jacob, to the apostles who brought Christ to the gentiles, to the pastors of the church. As an earthly craftsman he recalls the craftsman of the Word, the heavenly Father (Pet. Chrysol., *Sermo* 48,3; 49,4. Anonymous, *Narratio de rebus Persicis*: PG 10, 101; ed. E. Bratke, TU 19,3, 1899, 12). Among Syriac Fathers, *Aphraates observes that Joseph transmitted to Jesus not the biological paternity but the paternity which came to him from Adam made valuable by the blessing of God (*Demonstratio* XXIII, 20: PS II, 64-65); *Jacob of Sarug interpreted his role as putative father, as a personal minister of God and as a screen for the virginity of Mary (C. Vona, *Omelie mariologiche di Giacomo di Sarug*, Rome 1953, 145-146, 214, 220-221, 260-261). *Ephrem emphasized that Joseph did not doubt the innocence of Mary because of her imperturbable serenity, of her prior purity and of the reception she received from Elizabeth (*Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant ou Diatessaron*, SC 121, 1966, 65-613). After Augustine in the West and *Basil in the East, interest in the figure of Joseph increased. In the Middle Ages it enjoyed a notable development aimed at exalting his dedication to Mary and Jesus. Walafrid Strabo considered the Holy Family as a soteriological unity: "The shepherds found Mary, Joseph and the child: by means of these three the world was saved" (*In Lucam* 2,16). Bernard of Clairvaux took up an idea of *Peter Chrysologus that sketched a parallel between Joseph of the OT (Gen 39:40-41) and Joseph of the NT and discovered in the marriage with Mary a symbol of the marriage of the humanity of Christ with the church (*Sermo* 146). He developed it and completed the intuition right down to the details (*Homilia secunda super "Missus est"*).

Cath 6, 970-979; BS VI, 1251-1287; DSp 7, 1289-1323; T. Stramare, *Figlio di Giuseppe di Nazareth: Problemi dell'infanzia di Gesù*, Rovigo 1972; Id., *Giuseppe "uomo giusto" in Mt 1,18-25*: RivBib 21 (1975) 287-300; X. Léon Dufour, *L'annuncio a Giuseppe*, in *Studi sui Vangeli*, Milan 1967, 85-108; G. Giamberardini, *S. Giuseppe nella tradizione copta*, Il Cairo 1966; E. Peretto, *Ricerche su Mt 1-2*, Rome 1970; *S. Giuseppe nei primi quindici secoli della Chiesa*. Atti primo simposio int. proclamazione di S. Giuseppe patrono della chiesa universale (Roma 29 XI–6 XII 1970) Rome 1971; A. Salas, *La Infancia de Jésus (Mt 1-2). ¿Historia o teología?*, Madrid 1976; T. Egidio López, *San José en los dos primeros capítulos de Mateo y Lucas*: Marianum 37 (1975) 537-539; B. Bagatti, *Historia Josephi Fabri lignarii e ricerche sulla sua origine*, Jerusalem 1978; L. Cignelli, *Le saint Joseph des judéo-chrétiens*: Cahiers de Joséphologie 28 (1980) 197-212; G.M. Bertrand - G. Ponton, *Textes patristiques sur S. Joseph*: Cahiers de Joséphologie 3-10 (1955-1965); G. Stramare, *Giuseppe nella S. Scrittura, nella Teologia e nel culto*, Casale Monf. 1983; Id., *S. Giuseppe nel mistero di Dio*, Casale Monf. 1992; Id., *Gesù lo chiamò padre. Rassegna storico-dottrinale su San Giuseppe*, Vatican City 1997.

E. Peretto

II. Iconography. In the decorative repertory of Christianity's first centuries the figure of Joseph occurs rather infrequently. The path of his iconography presents a development parallel to that of Marian iconography. Like Mary, Joseph too in fact enters into the iconographic repertory in scenes of the infancy cycle of the Lord and in christological scenes that glorify the incarnation of the Logos and the kingship of the Savior. In these representations the Virgin appears only as the mother of Christ, just as Joseph is represented as a providential element in the economy of redemption and later as spouse and putative father in the image of the Holy Father spread by the apocryphal narratives. Like that of Mary the iconography of Joseph undergoes a change, later, with the Council of *Ephesus (431) and the proclamation of the parthenogenesis. Mary is then exalted as the Queen of Virgins, as *Theotokos and, as such, she is represented seated on a regal and jeweled throne, taking the place of Christ at the center of the apsidal dome. No analogous development for Joseph corresponds to this development of Marian iconography. Joseph's role is preserved as participant, a role almost complementary to that of Mary, even if iconographically important.

There are numerous artworks in which the image of Joseph appears. Ignoring the chronology of the monuments and turning to the succession of the episodes based on the account of the gospels and the apocryphal sources, and particularly from the *Arabic History of Joseph the Carpenter* from the end of the 4th c. (B. Bagatti, *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii e ricerche sulla sua origine*, Jerusalem 1978) we mention the following:

1. *Dream and betrothal with Mary*, presented in succession, e.g., on the front of the sarcophagus of Le Puy (France) from the end of the 4th c. (Ws 26,1) and together on a sarcophagus cover of Arles (Ws 20,1). The mosaic of the triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, carried out during the pontificate of *Sixtus III (432–440), presents, on the contrary, in a single composition the scene of the Annunciation and that of the exhortation to Joseph, represented not asleep on a rock or stretched on a bed, as in the usual iconography, but standing in front of his house with the *virgula brevissima* in hand, which, acc. to the apocrypha (*Protevangelium of James*, VIII; *Ps.-Matthew*, VIII), miraculously flowered to show him that he should take Mary as wife (C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, pls. 49-52). The only painting with a representation of the dream, found at Deir-abu-Hennis (Egypt) (X. Leon Dufour, *L'annuncio a Giuseppe*, in *Studi sui Vangeli*, Milan 1967, 85-108), should be dated in the 5th c. A panel of the ivory throne of Maximian at Ravenna offers, in the 6th c., the last example of the scene of the dream (C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avori romano-orientali*, Rome 1936, 156ff., pl. XXIV).

2. *Trial by bitter water* with Mary as protagonist, which appears starting from the 6th c. next to other scenes of apocryphal inspiration exclusively in ivory relief, examples of which should be noted in the panel of the already cited throne of Maximian, in which, in addition to Mary and Joseph, an angel appears (Cecchelli, *La cattedra*, op. cit., 154f., pl. XXIII), in the Evangeliarium of Ečmiadzin (W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des Frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1976, n. 142 pl. 75) and in an ivory from the Uwaroff Collection in Moscow, in which Mary and Joseph are represented in front of a well (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, op. cit., n. 130, pl. 68).

3. *Trial by bitter water* with Joseph as protagonist, of which the representation of the Ravenna sarcophagus of the prophet Elisha or Pignatta, from the beginning of the 5th c., is unique (P. Testini, *Su una discussa figurazione del sarcofago detto del profeta Eliseo o Pignatta*, in FR 113-114 [1977] 319-337, fig. 1).

4. *Journey to Bethlehem*, represented on the basis of the account in the apocryphal sources, of which we know different versions: a picture from Deir-abu-Hennis (Egypt) from the 5th c. (H. Leclercq, s.v. *Antinoe*: DACL 1, 2349, fig. 599), a fresco of Bawit (J. Clédat, s.v. *Baouit*: DACL 2, 244) and five ivories of the 6th c. (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, op. cit., nn. 128, 142, 145, 174, pls. 67, 75, 77, 88), among which there is a panel of the already-mentioned throne of Maximian at Ravenna, where Mary, whose advanced pregnancy is rendered realistically, affectionately embraces Joseph's shoulders with one arm (Cecchelli, *La cattedra*, op. cit., 154f., pl. XXIV). Other than Jesus and Mary, the donkey also appears in these representations, on which the Virgin makes the trip; sometimes—e.g., on the Ravenna throne—an angel is also present.

5. *Nativity*. This is the scene which offers the greatest number of images of Joseph, although the putative father of Jesus does not appear in the representations of this period with great frequency. The identification with Joseph as the young figure dressed in an *exomis*, sometimes with a baculus, represented behind the Virgin—as in the sarcophagus of St. Trophime at Arles (Ws 242,1)—or behind the hut with a sickle in his hands—as in the sarcophagus of St. Celsus, in Milan (Ws 243,6)—does not appear sufficiently grounded: the dress, gestures and attributes of these figures would lead, if anything, to prefer their identification as shepherds. The oldest certain representations of Joseph in Nativity scenes are shown on ivories datable to the 1st half of the 5th c., a plaque located within the Victoria and Albert Museum in London and a diptych of the Treasury of the Cathedral of Milan (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, op. cit., n. 118-119, pls. 62-63), in which Joseph appears in work clothes, an *exomis*, seated on a block, with a saw in hand; sometimes thoughtful, as in a pyx of Werden (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, op. cit., n. 169, pl. 86), on two bronze Syro-Palestinian thuribles of the 7th c. (A. St. Clair, in *Age of Spirituality*, ed. K. Weitzmann, New York 1979, 626-627, n. 563, 564) and on some ampoules from Bobbio and from Monza (A. Grabar, *Ampoules de Terre Sainte [Monza, Bobbio]*, Paris 1958). More rarely Joseph is shown standing next to the child, as in a panel of the throne of Maximian (Cecchelli, *La Cattedra*, op. cit., 160, pl. 25) and in a miniature of the Syriac Evangeliarium of Rabbula (Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp*., 54f.).

6. *Presentation in the temple*, the only surviving representation of which is offered by the mosaic of the triumphal arch in the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome. Joseph is portrayed next to Mary, pointing out to her the prophetess Anna and the elder Simeon, who is approaching to receive the child in hands veiled with the pallium in sign of reverence (Cecchelli, *I mosaici*, op. cit., 219, pls. 53-58).

7. *Adoration of the magi*, a scene in which Joseph's certain presence, at least until the 6th c., is recognizable in only two monuments (in which he is shown as an old man, bearded, in a tunic and pallium): (1) a panel of the already-cited throne of Maximian, in which only a part of the scene appears, since the adjacent panel with the figures of the magi has been

lost (Cecchelli, *La Cattedra*, op. cit., 162, pl. 26) and (2) a representation of the ivory diptych of Ečmiadzin (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, op. cit., n. 142, pl. 375). Just as in the case of the young and beardless figure present in some representations of the Nativity, not a few doubts remain about the identification of Joseph as the figure, sometimes bearded, represented behind the seat of the Virgin in scenes of the adoration of the magi present on some sarcophagi, such as the so-called dogmatic sarcophagus of the Museo Pio Cristiano (Ws 96) or the sarcophagus of St. *Ambrose in Milan (Ws 188,2). Completely unacceptable, however, is the identification with Joseph of the figure shown behind Mary in the inscription of Severa in the Museo Pio Cristiano (E. Kirschbaum, *Eine vergessene altchristliche Gemme und das Epitaph der Severa*: RivAC 42 [1966] 189-200): pointing to a star qualifies it as an image of a prophet, not traceable to a historical figure, but a personification of the very concept of prophecy. In later representations of the adoration of the magi, as in the mosaic formerly in the chapel of John VII (705–707) of the old St. Peter's in the Vatican (G. Matthiae, *Mosaici medievali delle chiese di Roma*, Rome 1967, fig. 132) or in a fresco, contemporaneous, of S. Maria Antiqua (G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo. Secoli IV-X*, scientific update ed. by M. Andaloro, I, Rome 1967, fig. 81) the image of Joseph appears very similar to that of the Ravenna throne.

8. *Warning to flee to Egypt*, only hypothetically identified in a representation found in the triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, because of the damage to the mosaic (Cecchelli, *I mosaici*, op. cit., 220ff.; pl. 53).

9. *Flight into Egypt*. A very rare episode in the Christian art of the first millennium and, furthermore, when the Child is not represented, very difficult to distinguish from the journey to Bethlehem; among the few certain representations are (1) that of a golden case from Adana, of the 6th–7th c., in which Mary and Joseph appear haloed, and the goal of their voyage, Egypt, is clearly indicated by an inscription (D. Talbot Rice, *Arte di Bisanzio*, Florence 1959, fig. 66, 1), (2) that of a bronze plaque in the State Museums of Berlin (W.F. Volbach, *Einige Neuerwerbungen der frühchristslichen Sammlung*, in *Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen* 38 [917], 230ff., fig. 74) and (3) that of the mutilated fresco of S. Maria Antiqua, from the period of John VII (705–707) (Matthiae, *Pittura*, op. cit., 110).

10. *Adoration of Aphrodisius*, the pictorial translation of an episode from the flight into Egypt acc. to ps.-Matthew (XXII-XXIV), identifiable in a scene of the mosaic in the triumphal arch of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, which is unique in Christian iconography (Cecchelli, *I mosaici*, op. cit., 235, pl. 53).

P. Testini, *Alle origini dell'iconografia di Giuseppe di Nazareth*: RivAC 48 (1972) 271-347 (with prior bibl.); TIP 196-198.

M. Marinone

JOSEPH HAZZAYA (8th c.). Monastic author of the 8th c. who represents, along with *John of Dalyatha, the culmination of the mystical tradition of the Eastern church. For Joseph "the Seer," an extremely erudite monk, recapitulates this entire tradition in a truly systematic way, while John of Dalyatha constitutes its highest experiential and poetical expression. Almost everything known of the life of Joseph derives from a short biography, written by *Nestorius of Beth Nuhadra and included by *Isho'dnah of Basra in his *Book of Chastity.* Born between 710 and 713 in a Zoroastrian family of the city Nimrod, at the age of seven years Joseph was captured by the troops of the caliph Omar (717–720), who occupied Nimrod, and then sold as a slave, first to an Arab, and then to a Christian of Beth Nuhadra. The life of the monks of the monastery of John of Kamul—close to the village where his master lived—induced the boy to become a Christian. His master freed him, which allowed him to enter the monastery of Abba Sliba in Beth Nuhadra. Later, he lived as a hermit in the mountains of Beth Qardu until he took on twice—in periods interrupted by a further retreat into solitude on Mt. Zinai in Adiabene—the charge of superior in two monasteries, that of Mar Bassima and that of Rabban Boktisho. At the synod of 786–787, called by the catholicos *Timothy I (779–823), Joseph was censured on multiple points of his teaching, but it is not clear if he was still alive at that point. It seems, however, that he was later removed from his monastery, and that would be confirmed by the fact that he was not buried there, but in the monastery of Mar Atqen.

According to some sources Joseph's literary production was enormous: almost 1,900 texts have been attributed to him, only some of which have reached us. For unknown reasons he put some of his works under the name of his brother 'Abdisho', who had also become a Christian and a monk. His *Letter on the Three Steps of the Spiritual Life* is important; a long and a short form exist, and it has often been unjustly attributed to *Philoxenus of Mabbug. Parts of his *Chapters of Knowledge* have reached us which included 27 centuries and a long treatise *On the Nature of the Divine Essence,* while his commentaries on *Evagrius, ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, Abba

Isaiah and writings attributed to *Gregory of Nazianzus seem to be lost, as also his sermons, a *Paradise of the Oriental Fathers,* a monastic and ecclesiastic history of Persia and some exegetical writings. This incomplete list permits us already to see the breadth of Joseph's works, which beyond the above-named authors was also influenced by Antiochene theologians such as *Diodore of Tarsus and *Theodore of Mopsuestia, by texts of the first monastic generations such as the letters of *Ammonas and the writings of *John the Solitary (of Apamea), as also by more recent authors such as *Isaac of Nineveh and *Simon of Taybutheh.

Essentially, Joseph was a hermit who wrote for hermits, even when he lived in community. Despite his great erudition, his writings are not learned treatises, but the result of his spiritual guidance. Thus his *Book of Questions and Answers* is written in the form of a dialogue between teacher and student (a very popular literary genre in the Syriac monastic world) which probably constitutes a faithful reflection of his relationship with his disciples. We also find this personalized style in his letters, which always answer precise questions. Only his *Chapters on Knowledge,* which Joseph considered his main work, have a much more technical character and are more difficult to understand. This fact, then, pushed him to write the *Letter on the Three Steps of the Spiritual Life,* which constitutes a summary of his entire spiritual experience. Essentially, his vision of the spiritual life is based on the triple scheme first developed three centuries earlier by John of Apamea, which Joseph modifies to incorporate elements taken from other authors, above all from Evagrius.

Editions and translations: Īšōʿdnaḥ of Basrā, *Liber castitatis*, see P. Bedjan, *Liber Superiorum seu historia monastica auctore Thoma, episcopo Margensi*, Paris-Leipzig 1901, 437-517 (Ger. tr. in G. Bunge, *Rabban Jausep Hazzaya*); A. Mingana, *Early Christian Mystics* (Woodbrooke Studies VII), Cambridge 1934, 262-281 (text) and 148-184 (Eng. tr.): four mystical treatises under the name ʿAbdīšōʿ, 256-261 (text) and 178-184 (Eng. tr.): the "fifth letter"; R. Beulay, *La collection des lettres de Jean de Dalyatha* (PO 39/3), Turnhout 1978, Appendice II, 500-521 (ed. and tr. of letters 48-49 of the epistolary corpus of John, which should be attributed to Joseph); G. Bunge, *Rabban Jausep Hazzaya. Briefe über das geistliche Leben. Ostsyrische Mystik des 8. Jahrhunderts* (Sophia. Quellen östlicher Theologie 21), Trier 1982 (general intr. and tr. annotated with some important writings, including unpublished ones); P. Harb - F. Graffin, *Joseph Hazzaya. Lettre sur les trois étappes de la vie monastique* (PO 45/2), Turnhout 1992; E. Khalifé- Hachem, *Deux textes du Pseudo-Nil identifiés*: Melto 5 (1969) 17-59 (ed. and tr. of a version, still partial, but larger of the "fifth letter"); DSpir 8, 1341-1349; Duval, 227-228; Bettiolo, *Lineamenti*, 595-598; Patrologia V, 489ff.; R. Beulay, *La lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, Chevetogne 1986, passim.

K. den Biesen

JOSEPH of Arimathea (apocrypha). Joseph of Arimathea, mentioned only four times in the gospels (Mt 21:57; Mk 15:42; Lk 23:50; Jn 19:38), became an important figure in the apocrypha. From the 2nd part of the *Acts of Pilate* (11-16) and the apocryphal *History of Joseph of Arimathea,* we learn that he was arrested by the Jews and miraculously liberated by Christ himself on the morning of the resurrection. According to another text in Georgian (there are translations in Greek and Latin) Joseph was the founder of a church in Lydda. According to medieval legends he gathered the blood of Christ in the Holy Grail and was one of the apostles to *Gaul.

CANT 76-77, cf. 62; BHG 779r. AASS, Mai 2, 507-510; Tischendorf 459-470; Santos Otero 495-506 (with Sp. tr.). *Translations* (Greek *Narratio*): Engl.: Elliott 217-222 (frg.); It.: Erbetta 2, 397-401; Moraldi 1, 683-692; Craveri 401-409; Pol.: Starowieyski 1/2, 647-653, 739-747. *Translations* (Georgian *Narratio*): Fr.: M. van Esbroeck: Bedi Kartlisa 35 (1977) 108-131; Ger.: T. Kluge: OrChr 4 (1914) 24-48; A. Harnack, in SPAW 1901, 920-931. R. Gounelle, *À propos d'une refonte de la "Narratio Iosephi" jadis confondue avec les "Acta Pilati," et d'un drame religieux qu'elle a inspiré*: Apocrypha 5 (1994) 165-188; N. Tchkhivadzé, *Une traduction géorgienne d'un original perdu: l'histoire de l'apocryphe de l'Église de Lydda*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 179-191.

M. Starowieyski

JOSEPH THE CARPENTER, History of. A kind of panegyric of his putative father delivered by Jesus to his disciples on the Mount of Olives. Written probably in Greek (text lost) at the end of the 4th c.; the *Coptic translation (Bohairic, fragments in Sahidic) comes from the 6th–7th c.; it exists further in an Arabic and Ethiopian translation. The apocryphal text was composed in Egypt and demonstrates the birth of the cult of Joseph; it further constitutes an interesting example of popular piety and hagiography. The text, in 32 chapters, can be divided into two parts: the first discusses the events prior to the birth of Jesus and his childhood (the text is based on the **Protevangelium of James*); the second part is dedicated to the illness, death and burial of Joseph (*transitus*); in the latter part many Jewish-Christian concepts regarding eschatology are present. The *History of Joseph* is the only apocryphal text dedicated to St. Joseph and one of the rare patristic texts which mentions him; it is, finally, a witness to a certain veneration of St. Joseph in Egypt. This apocryphal text, translated into *Latin only in the 17th c. (Wallin), was already known by Isidore of Solanis (16th c.).

CANT 60; BHO 532; BHL 1, 660; BS 6, 1251-1292; LCIK 7, 210-221; Bisconti 196-198; var. aus., *Joseph*, DSp 8, 1974, 1289-1308.

Editions: Coptic text: P. de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, Göttingen 1883, 1-37; T. Lefort: Muséon 66 (1953) 206-223; Arabic: A. Battista - B. Bagatti, *Edizione critica del testo arabo della "Historia Iosephi fabri lignarii" e ricerche sulla sua origine*, Jerusalem 1978 (with It. tr.); Ethiopian: E. Isaak: Journal of Studies Ps. Epigr. 6 (1990) 3-125 (with Eng. tr.). *Translations*: Eng.: Elliott 111-117 (frg.); It.: Erbetta 1,2, 186-205; Moraldi 1, 313-352; A. Battista - B. Bagatti, see editions; Craveri 227-260; Fr.: P. Peeters, in *Évangiles apocryphes*, 1, Paris 1924, 191-245; T. Lefort, see above; Lat.: Tischendorf 122-139; Pol.: T. Hergesel, in Starowieyski 1/559-577, 882-883.; Sp.: Santos Otero 333-352; Ger.: Morenz, see below; Schneider 272-283. J. Seitz, *Die Verehrung d. hl. Joseph in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung bis zum Konzil von Trient dargestellt*, Freiburg 1908; G. Klameth, *Über die Herkunft der apokryphen "Geschichte Josephs des Zimmermanns"*: Angelos 3 (1938) 6-31; S. Morenz, *Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann*: TU 56 (1951) (cf. P. Devos: AB 70 [1952] 282-285); T. Lefort, *À propos de l'"Histoire de Joseph le Charpentier"*: Muséon 66 (1953) 201-223; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, 2, Milan 1955, 338-341; G. Giamberardini, *San Giuseppe nella tradizione copta*, Il Cairo 1966 = *Saint Joseph dans la tradition copte*: Cahiers de Joséphologie 17 (1969); P. Gauthier, *La Vierge Marie d'après l'"Histoire de Joseph le Charpentier,"* in *De primordiis cultus mariani*, 4, Rome 1970, 353-369; M. Canal Sánchez, *S. José en los libros apócrifos de NT*, in *San Giuseppe nei primi 15 secoli*, Rome 1971, 123-149; B. Bagatti, *Il culto di S. Giuseppe in Palestina*: Cahiers de Joséphologie 19 (1973) 564-573; F. Manns, *Le portrait de Joseph dans l'Histoire de Joseph le Charpentier*, in Id., *Essais sur le Judéo-Christianisme*, Jerusalem 1977, 94-105.

M. Starowieyski

JOSEPH the HEBREW (iconography). Favorite son of the patriarch Jacob and of Rachel (Gen 37; 39–48; 50). Already in *Tertullian he was seen as a prefiguration of Christ, because he was sold by his brothers as Christ was by a disciple (*Adv. Marc.* III, 18: PL 2, 346). The comparison returns later in *Ambrose (*De Joseph Patriarcha*: PL 14, 641), in *Cyril of Alexandria (*Glaphyra in Gen.* VI: PG 69, 283f.) and in *John Chrysostom (*Homil.* 62 *in Gen.*: PG 54, 532-540). Rarely shown as an isolated image, he always appears inserted in scenes from his very eventful life, narrated with a wealth of details. The most ancient iconographic attestation is found, around the middle of the 3rd c., in the pictures of the synagogue of *Dura Europos, in the scene of Jacob's blessing of his twelve sons (C.H. Kraeling, *The Synagogue. The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final report VIII, 1*, New Haven, CT 1956, 221f., pls. XXXIV, LXXIV). At *Rome, around a century later, among the frescoes of a *cubiculum* in the anonymous catacomb in Via Dino Compagni, two episodes from the life of Joseph are found: the dreams (Gen 37:5-10) (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, 50, pl. XCVI) and the encounter with his brothers in Egypt (Gen 42:6-8) (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, 52, pl. XXI, 1); in the same *cubiculum* two other scenes are pictured which are linked with the story of Joseph: the blessing of Jacob of his grandsons Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph (Gen 48:1-20) (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, 50, pl. XXV) and the arrival of Jacob in Egypt (Gen 46) (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, 52, pl. XXVIII). On the lid of a Vatican *sarcophagus, from the middle of the 4th c., two events are shown from Joseph's tormented history: the extraction from the well and the sale to Ishmaelite merchants (Gen 37:28) and the sale of grain in Egypt (Gen 42:25) (*Rep.* n. 690); also on a sarcophagus lid preserved at Rome in the Palazzo Massimo the episode is present of the sale of Joseph to the merchants, with the bloody tunic resting conspicuously on the well (A. Recio Veganzones, *Tapa de sarcófago con escenas de José en el Palacio Massimo de Roma*: Antonianum 47 [1972] 431-454). Again the bloody tunic, in this case shown to Jacob, appears in the mosaic decoration of the cupola of the Centcelles mausoleum (A. Recio Veganzones, *Il mausoleo di Centcelles [Tarragona] del 350-355 ca.: lettura ed interpretazione iconografica di alcune scene musive del registro "B" della cupola*, in *Domum tuam dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 709-737).

In the decorative programs of houses of worship, dominated by representations of episodes of the OT and NT chosen to express the concept of the *concordantia* between the two testamentary covenants, acc. to the Paulinian expression *in veteri novitas atque in novitate vetustas* (Paul. Nola, *Carm.* 28, 175), scenes of Joseph's life must have been represented frequently, so as to constitute one of the best-attested biblical cycles, because of its richness in christological and ecclesial symbolism. Four episodes from the story of the patriarch, illustrated by as many *tituli historiarum* written by Ambrose, appeared among the scenes which decorated the *basilica martyrum* in *Milan (R. Pillinger, *Die Tituli Historiarum*, Vienna 1980, 31-34). Two episodes, commented on by the *tituli* of *Prudentius (*Dyttochaeum*, 6-7), were found among the OT scenes of a basilica of *Spain, probably from *Saragossa. Also at Nola, in the basilica of St. *Felix, acc. to the testimony of *Paulinus, incidents from Joseph's life were represented (D. Korol, *Die frühchristlichen Wandmalereien aus den Grabbauten in Cimitile/Nola*, Münster 1987). Basing himself probably on the decoration of the basilica of St. Apollinare at Ravenna, *Elpidius Rusticus, in the 1st half of the 6th c., composed a *titulus* on the *concordantia* between Joseph betrayed by his brothers and Christ betrayed by Judas. The tormented adventures of Joseph appeared among the stories of the OT painted on the walls of the central nave of the basilica of the three emperors of S. Paolo furi le Mura, which can be assigned to the intervention of *Leo I (440–461), vanished today but transmitted by water-

colors of the 17th c. (M. Guj, *La concordia Apostolorum nell'antica decorazione di San Paolo fuori le mura*, in *Ecclesiae Urbis. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi sulle Chiese di Roma*, III, Vatican City 2002, 1873f.). Episodes of the life of Joseph appear among the mosaics of the middle aisle of S. Maria Maggiore (C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, 143). A mosaic of the basilica of S. Maria di Cami at Majorca, of the 5th–6th c., offers the only surviving testimony in a house of worship to a scene of Joseph, who is here clearly identified by an inscription with his name (P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana, siglos IV-VI*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967, 214f., pl. 36).

A very detailed history with various episodes from the patriarch's life is represented on ten splendid panels of the ivory throne of *Maximian at *Ravenna, from the *Justinian era (C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avorii romano-orientali*, Rome 1936, 111-149, pl. XVII-XXI). Individual episodes decorate, then, a number of ivory objects dating between the 5th and 6th c. (see, e.g. W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1976, n. 172, 191, pl. 54, 57). The scene shown on a ceramic plate of the 4th c. in provenance from Tunisia is unique, with Joseph besieged by the wife of Potiphar (Gen 39:12) (G. Vikan, in *Age of Spirituality: Late Antique and Early Christian Art: Third to Seventh Century*, New York 1979, 464, n. 415), as is that of a marble fragment from the martyrium of *Seleucia, from the end of the 5th to the beginning of the 6th c., with the patriarch in prison who interprets the dreams of the cupbearer and baker of the king (Gen 40:7-18) (ibid., 465, n. 416). The cycle of Joseph's life is frequently found represented, between the 5th and 7th c., in MSS as well, among which are the Vienna Genesis, particularly rich in episodes (H.L. Kessler, in *Age of Spirituality*, op. cit., 458, n. 410), the Cotton Bible, the Ashburnham Pentateuch, the Vatican Greek Octateuchs 746 and 747; and in textile, as, e.g., in the Coptic Golenischev (J. Strzygowski, *Orient oder Rom*, Leipzig 1900, 113, fig. 44) or in the one, perhaps of Antiochene provenance, on which three episodes of the patriarch's story are shown (G. Vikan, in *Age of Spirituality*, op. cit., 462, n. 413).

DACL 7, 2643ff.; EC 6, 790-791; G. von Rad, *Die Joseph Geschichte*, Neukirchen 1954; BS 6, 1245ff.; RBK 3, 655ff. In particular for the iconography: C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avorii romano-orientali*, Rome 1936, 111ff., LCI 2, 423ff.; A. Recio Veganzones, *Tapa de sarcófago con escenas de José en el Palacio Massimo de Roma*: Antonianum 47 (1972) 431-454; A. Recio Veganzones, *Il mausoleo di Centcelles (Tarragona) del 350-355 ca.: lettura ed interpretazione iconografica di alcune scene musive del registro "B" della cupola*, in *Domum tuam dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 709-737; TIP 198-200.

M. Marinone

JOSHUA

I. Typology of the Joshua cycle - II. Iconography.

I. Typology of the Joshua cycle. The typology of Joshua-Jesus, common among the Fathers, is founded above all on the perfect homonymy of the two personages (Heb. *Jehoshua;* Gr. Ἰησοῦς). Implicit already in Heb 4:8-14 (where, however, there is the opposition between Joshua, "who did not enter into repose," and Jesus, "who penetrated into the heavens"), it occurs for the first time explicitly in *Epist. Barn.* 12,8, and has the largest and most successful development, in anti-Jewish polemic, in *Justin (*Dial.* 75,1-3; 89,1; 113,1-7) and in *Origen (*Hom. Jos.*), for whom Joshua, who succeeds Moses and introduces Israel into the Promised Land, is a type of Jesus, who replaces Moses, and of the gospel, which succeeds the law and introduces the new spiritual Israel into eternal salvation, to which the law was not able to lead (in parallel, the death of Moses is seen as a symbol of the abrogation of the law, now dead: Orig., *Hom. Jos.* 1,3; 2,1). An analogous interpretation can be found in *Cyprian (*Testim.* 2,21), *Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 3,15; 3,18; 4,7; *Adv. Iud.* 9 and 10), *Irenaeus (*Demonstr.* 40), *Eusebius (*HE* 1,3 and *Demonstr. evang.* 4,17), *Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* 4,7), *Hilary (*Tract. myst.* 2,6), *Augustine (*Contr. Faust.* 12,32), *Jerome (*Ep.* 53), *Prudentius (*Cath.* 12,169) etc. In the *Hom. Jos.* of Origen, the tropological or psychological interpretation also occupies a notable place, acc. to which Joshua, who leads Israel to victory defeating kingdoms, cities and enemies, is a type for Jesus, who guides the soul to the spiritual victory over the vices and passions (*Hom. Jos.* 1,7; 9,1; 13,1-4).

The book of Joshua offers the Fathers the opportunity for another apt typology: that of Rahab and her house as a type of the church, and of the scarlet ribbon hung from her window (as a sign for the Hebrews, who had to save only the house of Rahab in the destruction of Jericho) as a type for the salvific blood of Christ. We have the most ancient witness to this typology in *Clement of Rome (*Cor.* 12): "The hospitable Rahab having received the spies, she hid them . . . and they indicated to her a signal: to hang from her house a scarlet ribbon. Obviously they did this because by means of the blood of the Lord there would be redemption to all those who believe and hope in God." Later the same typology is taken up by

Justin (*Dial.* 111,3-4), who develops it by comparing the scarlet ribbon of Rahab to the blood of the paschal Lamb, sprinkled by the Hebrews on the lintels of the doors in Egypt in order that it serve as a signal to the devastating angel. This too was a type of the salvific blood of Christ. Later it was further developed by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20,12) and Origen (*Hom. Jos.* 3,4-5), who add, alongside the christological typology (scarlet ribbon = blood of Christ), the ecclesiological one (Rahab as type of the church). For Irenaeus the three spies hosted by Rahab are a figure of the three persons of the *Trinity; for Origen the house of Rahab, the only one which is saved with its inhabitants in the total destruction of Jericho, is a type of the church, outside of which there is no salvation; the same interpretation is in Cyprian (*De unit. eccl.* 8 and *Ep.* 69,4). The ecclesiological interpretation is thus oriented in an eschatological sense: Jericho becomes a type of this world and the destruction of Jericho a type of the end of the world and the last judgment, when only the church (the house of Rahab) will be saved. This interpretation, already present in Origen and Cyprian, was extensively developed with millenaristic overtones by *Hilary (*Tract. Myst.* 11,9-10) and later by *Gregory of Elvira (*Tract. Orig.* 12,9-26) with a comparison of the house of Rahab to the ark of Noah, which only was saved in the flood, this too a figure of the unique salvation within the church. It is significant that both in the ecclesiological and in the eschatological interpretation the background christological typology is present, of the scarlet ribbon as a type of the blood of Christ. A rapid and dense synthesis of the three interpretations (christological, ecclesiological, eschatological), which reveals the contemporary use and influence of the preceding patristic sources, is found in *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* XXVI, 132-149). Later writers (Caes. of Arles, *Serm.* 116; Fulg. of Ruspe, *De remiss. pecc.* 20-21) up to the medievals (Pasc. Radb., *Expos. in Matth.* I, 1; Rup. of Deutz, *Comm. in Jos.* 10 etc.) prefer to emphasize the ecclesiological typology. The complex typological significance of the entire episode of Rahab is nevertheless univocal and constant among all the interpreters: it signifies that salvation can be obtained only within the church and through the merits of the redeeming blood of Christ. To this interpretation Origen adds the psychological interpretation, rarely repeated later (Jer., *Ep.* 22,38; Caes. of Arles, *Serm.* 116), acc. to which the harlot Rahab is a figure of the sinful soul which lives in the vices and passions, until it opens to receive Jesus into itself (*Hom. Jos.* 1,4: spies of Joshua = the angels, messengers of Jesus).

Finally, in the ecclesiological typology, the theme of the *casta meretrix* is notable, which unites Rahab, a prostitute and not Hebrew, to other figures of prostitutes taken as types of the church, formed of Gentiles and ex-sinners. This theme, already implicit in Justin (*Dial.* 111,3-4), is specifically developed by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20,12, with an effective referral to Mt 21:31: "The publicans and the prostitutes will proceed you into the kingdom of God"), by Origen (*Hom. Jos.* 3,4; Rahab and the *uxor fornicaria* of Hosea as types of the church, in opposition to the synagogue), by Hilary (*Tract. Myst.* II, 5: again Rahab and the *uxor fornicaria* of Hosea united as in Origen), by Gregory of Elvira (*Tract. Orig.* 13: with comparison of Rahab to Mary Magdalene and again a citation of Mt 21:31), by Jerome (*Comm. in Os., Prol.*: the *uxor fornicaria* of Hosea, Rahab and the woman who anointed Jesus at Bethany, *figura ecclesiae de peccatoribus congregatae*) etc.

PL 219, 88 (Latin Fathers); F. Hummelauer, *Josué*, Paris 1903, 118-119; J. Daniélou, *Rahab, figure de l'Église*: Irénikon 22 (1949) 26-45; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri,* Paris 1950, 203-256; A. Jaubert, *Origène. Homélies sur Josué* (SC 71), Paris 1960, intr.; H.U. v. Balthasar, *Casta meretrix*: Sponsa Verbi, Brescia 1969, 189-283 (for Rahab more specifically 207-223); Josua-Rolle, *Codex Vaticanus Pal. Graec. 431: facsimile* (Codices e Vaticanis selecti 43), Graz 1983-1984 (commentary by O. Mazal); F. Langlamet, s.v. *Rahab*: DBS 9, 1079-1084; A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Biblia Augustiniana. AT II, Livres historiques*, Paris 1960; G. Otranto, *La tipologia di Giosuè nel "Dialogo con Trifone ebreo" di Giustino*: Augustinianum 15 (1975) 29-48; C. Nardi, *Giosuè nel primo cristianesimo*: Rivista di Ascetica e Mistica 23 (1982) 147-159; S. Leanza, *Aspetti esegetici dell'opera di Paolino di Nola*: Atti del Convegno nel XXXI cinquantenario della morte di s. Paolino di Nola (431-1981), Rome 1983, 67-91; R. Scognamiglio, *Giosuè nell'esegesi dei Padri*: Parole di Vita 31 (1986) 127-134; 221-229; 296-302; 357-364; 32 (1987) 144-151; 295-301; 372-377; J.A. Novotný, *Les fragments exégétiques sur les livres de l'Ancien Testament d'Eusèbe d'Emèse*: OCP 57 (1991) 27-67; R. Scognamiglio - M.I. Danieli, *Origene*, *Omelie su Giosuè*, Rome 1993; R. Scognamiglio, in *Origene*, *Dizionario*, Rome 2000, 195-197.

S. Leanza

II. Iconography. Scenes relating to the deeds of Joshua appear in the mosaics of the left wall of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome, dated by consensus to the middle of the 5th c. (WMM, pls. 21-27). The following episodes are shown there: the passage through the Jordan and the exploration of Jericho (Josh 2:1-22); the appearance of the angel to Rahab, who aids the spies (Josh 5:10-15); the destruction of Jericho and the ark carried by Levites (Josh 6:1-25); the conquest of the city of Ai (Josh 7:1-29); Joshua putting the Amorites to flight (Josh 10:1-12); the battle of Gibeon (Josh 10:12-14); Joshua punishing the rebel kings (Josh 10:15-17). Not too different, in their iconographic layout, are the 23 miniatures that figuratively comment on the so-called *Scroll of Joshua*

(*Vat. Palat. gr.* 431), a 10th-c. copy of an archetype datable to the 6th c. This evokes the acts of the leader from Josh 2:15-16 to Josh 10, but must have included the entire story, given that the beginning and the end have been lost. The stylistic connotations, which relate it to the *Genesis of Vienna,* reveal a classical-Hellenistic stamp.

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Il rotulo di Giosué. Cod. Vat. Palatino greco 431, riprodotto in fototipia e fotocromografia a cura della Biblioteca Vaticana*, Milan 1905; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Rome 1956; J. Wilpert - W.N. Schumacher, *Die römischen Mosaiken der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV. bis XIII. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg i.Br. [2]1976; K. Weitzmann, *The Joshua Roll: A Work of the Macedonian Renaissance* (Studies in Manuscript Illumination 3), Princeton, NJ 1948; J.G. Deckers, *Der alttestamentliche Zyklus von S. Maria Maggiore in Rom*, Bonn 1976; S. Spain, *The Program of the Fifth Century Mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore. Diss. in the Department of Fine Arts at New York University, 1968*, Michigan City, IN 1990; C. Curci, TIP, 193-195.

F. Bisconti

JOSHUA the STYLITE, Chronicle of. Work by an author, probably *Edessan and miaphysite, written possibly between 510–520. The chronicle narrates "the history of the needy times which struck Edessa, Amida and all of Mesopotamia" in the years 495–506. J.S. Assemani indicates Joshua the Stylite, monk of the monastery of Zuqnin (a town near Amida) as the work's author (*Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 260-283). Indeed, toward the end of the 8th c., the chronicle was incorporated by a monk of that monastery into the so-called Chronicle of Zuqnin (or Chronicle of ps.-Dionysius of Tell-Mahre) as its fourth section. However, it seems clear that the author wrote his work in Edessa, and his possible relationship with the monastery of Zuqnin remains unknown.

Baumstark, 146; BO I, 260-283; Duval, 177-178; Patrologia V, 422; J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Denys de Tell-Mahré, quatrième partie*, in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences philologiques et historiques*, fasc. 112, Paris 1895 (Syriac text with Fr. tr.); J.-B. Chabot, *Incerti auctoris chronicon pseudo-dionysianum vulgo dictum* (CSCO 91 & 104), Paris 1927 & 1933, facs. ed. 1952-1953 (tr.: vols. 121 and 507); W. Wright, *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite Composed in Syriac A.D. 507*, Cambridge 1882 (Syriac text with Eng. tr.); H. Leclainche, *Crises économiques à Édesse (494-506) d'après la chronique du ps. Josué le Stylite*: Pallas. Annales: Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail 16 (1980) 89-100; A. Palmer, *Who Wrote the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite?*, in *Lingua restituta orientalis: Festgabe für J. Assfalg*, Wiesbaden 1990, 272-284; A. Luther, *Die syrische Chronik des Joshua Stylites*, Berlin-New York 1997 (Ger. tr. with study).

K. den Biesen

JOVIAN, emperor (331–364). Roman emperor from 363 to 364. Proclaimed Augustus by the army, after the death of *Julian (26 June 363), he made peace with the Persians, whom his predecessor died fighting, a peace which *Ammianus Marcellinus (*Hist.* XXV, 7,13) judged shameful: for the Romans had to abandon five provinces beyond the Tigris, Nisibis and fortified places on the Mesopotamian border and in the neighboring zones. His religious policy was favorable to the Christians, while renouncing forms of intolerance against the pagans (from whom he even received praises; see Themistius, *Or.* 5,67; *Or.* 7). He restored to the church privileges abrogated by Julian and concerned himself with the unity of the Christian faith divided between *Athanasians and anti-Athanasians, desiring as much peace and concord as possible. He died in Bithynia, after only a few months of rule, 17 February 364; he was born in Moesia in 331.

O. Seeck: PWK 9, 2006-2011; A. Nagl: PWK 7, A 2, 2198ff.; E. Stein - J.-R. Palanque, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Paris-Bruges 1959, I, 170-172; 186-7; G. Bardy: Fliche-Martin III, 1, 310-313; P. de Labriolle, ibid., 236-237; S. Mazzarino, *L'Impero romano*, III, Bari 1973, 725ff.; G. Wirth, in *Vivarium*. Festschrift Th. Klauser: JbAC 11, 353-384; A. Demandt, in *Handbuch Altertumswiss*, 3, 6 (1989) 109ff.; H.-U. Rosenbaum: BBKL 2 (1992) 735-740; s.v. *Iovianus*: RAC 18 (1998) 811 and 820; P. Siniscalco, *Gli imperatori romani e il cristianesimo nel IV secolo*, in var. aus., *Legislazione imperiale religione nel IV secolo*, Rome 2000, 108-109.

P. Siniscalco

JOVINIAN (d. before 406). A monk who moved to *Rome (from N *Italy?). Vexed by the thesis of a particular reward due to virginity or fasting, he insisted on the identical baptismal grace in all and opened the question of merit, then that of the perpetual virginity (*in partu*) of Mary. He pushed consecrated virgins toward marriage. In 390 or a little later (Siricius, *Ep.* 7: PL 13, 1168-1172), the reaction of the monastic party, esp. of *Pammachius, the friend of *Jerome, led to the condemnation of a dozen friends of Jovinian. Invited to intervene in the debate, *Ambrose and one of his synods condemned Jovinian (PL 16, 1124-1129). Two polemical books *Contra Iovinianum* of Jerome (PL 25, 211-338), however, provoked scandal because of their exaggeration, and his letters 48-50 had to mitigate their effect. *Augustine (*De bono coniugali* and *De sancta virginitate*) would take up a more moderate position. It has been possible to point out the "evangelical" (*ante literam*) character of Jovinian's doctrine, but it is difficult to know it exactly, since his *Commentarioli* have been lost (frags. in W. Haller, *Jovinianus*, Leipzig 1897; cf. F. Valli, *Gioviniano*, Urbino 1954). Jovinian was exiled by *Honorius in 398.

DSp 8, 1469-1470; DIP 4, 1300-1301; BBKL 3, 740-742; Y.-M. Duval, *L'affaire Jovinien. D'une crise de la société romaine à une crise de la pensée chrétienne à la fin du IV[e] et au début du V[e] siècle*, Rome 2003.

J. Gribomont

JOVINUS (2nd half 4th c.). As *magister equitum,* in 361 he led a part of the army of the emperor *Julian in *Italy (*Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rer. Gest. L.*, XXI, 8,3). He was later sent to Illyricum and was part of the commission of *Chalcedon which judged the crimes committed by functionaries of the emperor *Constantius. Julian transferred him in 362 to *Gaul with the charge of *magister militum per Gallias*—to Reims to be precise, a point of strategic importance, where Jovinus remained until 370. After Julian's death, he continued to serve the imperial cause under *Jovian and then under *Valentinian I; in 366 he fought the Alamanni with success (Amm. Marc., *Rer. Gest. L.*, XXVII, 2,1-9) and was rewarded with the consulate (367). He built the church of St. Agricola at Reims, where a dedicatory inscription is preserved, located on his sarcophagus (MGH, *Scriptores* XIII, 419).

CPL 1486; DACL 7, 2745-2752; PLRE 1, 462-463; DNP 5, *Flavius Iovinus* 1, 1094.

G. Pilara

JUBILEE. The Levitical legislation concerning the jubilee year (Lev 25) found scarce echo in biblical-Hebrew literature. Apart from texts such as Is 61:1-2 (repeated in Lk 4:16-30), or 11Q Melchizedek, it is in reality only with Hellenistic Jewish authors such as *Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus that the theme begins to receive ample and meaningful treatment. Philo in particular underlines in numerous texts that the jubilar remission (*aphesis*) of debts with the restoration of patrimonies to their legitimate owners is an act of justice and grand *philanthrōpia* (see, e.g., *Congr.* 89; *Decal.* 164; *Virt.* 97-100; *Spec. leg.* II, 86-123; *Quaest. Gen.* III, 39). Through the mystical *exegesis of the number fifty, which is at the same time the number of the Jubilee and the symbol of liberty (*eleutheria*), Philo then uses the liberty of the soul from sin (*eleutheria*) to delve into the jubilar theme, expressly linking the number fifty, symbol of purity and virginity, with the celebration of the Pentecost every fifty days on the part of the Therapeutes (see, e.g., *Mut. nom.* 228; *Congr.* 108-109; *Quis rer. div.* 273; *Sacr.* 122; *Spec. leg.* II, 176-178; *Quaest. Gen.* II, 5; *Vita cont.* 65; *Vita Mos.* 80). The word *iobelos* means liberty (*eleutheria*) also for Flavius Josephus (*Ant. iud.* III, 282-283).

Philo certainly influenced later Christian tradition. *Clement of Alexandria, in fact, also knows that the Jubilee puts forward every fifty years the same restitution of property prescribed by the law for the sabbatical year (*Strom.* II, 18,86,6). The relationship between Jubilee and Pentecost seems implicit in the exegesis of those who interpreted the fifty cubits of the breadth of Noah's ark as a symbol of hope and of remission (*aphesis*) in the Pentecost (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 11,87,2). Alongside this "Alexandrian" tradition, one must consider the "Syro-Asiatic" tradition represented in the 2nd c. by *Theophilus of Antioch. According to what *Jerome writes (*Ep.* 121 *ad Algasiam* 6), in the commentary on the Lukan parable of the unfaithful servant (Lk 16:1-8), Theophilus had affirmed that the number fifty is the particular number of penitents, acc. to the Jubilee and acc. to the Lukan parable of the two debtors to whom respectively five hundred and fifty denarii were remitted (Lk 7:41-42). The juxtaposition of the Jubilee—this would be the most ancient appearance of the word in a Christian text—with the Lukan parable of the two debtors reveals how the idea of Jubilee had been reinterpreted very early in the Asiatic environment, already in the course of the 2nd c., in a penitential sense, plausibly as part of the orthodox recovery of the OT legislation in the context of the anti-*Marcionite polemic. But it is only with *Origen that the articulated elaboration of a true and proper Christian theology of the Jubilee begins, in which both the preceding exegetical traditions find an adequate place. In numerous texts Origen dwells on the penitential interpretation of the number fifty and of the Hebrew Jubilee, the jubilar year in which is celebrated the remission of debts, i.e., of sins (see, e.g., *Com. Ps.* in PG 12, 1073 C-1076 B; *De Princ.* II, 11,5; *De orat.* 27,14; *Hom. Gen.* 2,5; *Hom. Num.* 5,2,2-3; 25,4; *Com. Matth.* XV, 31). The Hebrew Jubilee is for Origen the shadow, the prefiguration of the Christian Pentecost (see fr. in GCS 1/2, 138-139 and esp. *Com. Matth.* XI, 3). To explain the value of the number fifty, alongside numerous supporting biblical texts, Origen also turns to the parable of the two servants (Lk 7:41-42), the gospel passage which, not by chance, will return very frequently in later sources.

With Origen the foundations are laid for the later developments in different Greek and Latin Christian authors such as *Athanasius (*Ep. fest.* I), *Hilary of Poitiers (*Instr. Psalm.* 10-12; *In Ps. 118*, 3,7; 4,5; 5,6; 20,6), *Didymus the Blind (*In Ps. 50*, 1.2, par. 533), *Ambrose (*De Noe* 33,123; *De Ioseph* 3,14; *Apol. David* 8,41-42; *In Ps. 118*, 5,11; *Exp. Luc.* 3,16; 5,94; 8,23.25)

and Jerome (*Com. Amos* II, 5,3; *Com. Es.* 16,58; *Ep.* 78,14). Numerous other exegetical and homiletic texts up to the 4th c. are worthy of note, such as *Basil, *Ep.* 260; *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 41,2; *Ambrosiaster, *De Psalmo L*; *Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In Lev.* VIII, 25; *Cyril of Alexandria, *De adorat.* XVII; Maximinus, *Hom. VII in Pentecoste*; *Eucherius of Lyons, *Form. spir. int.* 9; *Cassiodorus, *Exp. Ps.* 50, 21.

Above all, the passages of *Gregory the Great on the *iubilaei requies,* i.e., on the eschatological value, beyond the penitential and moral ones, of the Jubilee (see, e.g., *Hom. Ez.* II, 5,15; 7,4; *Mor. Iob* 16,55,68; 23,11,21; 35,8,16), would exercise a decisive influence on Medieval Latin exegesis, such as that of *Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* V, 37,3-4; VI, 18,4-5) and *Bede the Venerable (*Hom. II, XVII dominica Pentecostes*). In this way, through monastic mediation and biblical commentaries, one would arrive in AD 1300 to the institution of the first Christian Jubilee.

A systematic history of the interpretations of the Hebraic Jubilee in Antique and Medieval Christianity still remains to be written.

P.F. Beatrice, *Il Giubileo ebraico nell'esegesi biblico-patristica e medievale*, in *I Giubilei nella storia della Chiesa*. Atti del Congr. Int. 23-26 giugno 1999, Vatican City 2001, 11-29; D.P. O'Brien, *A Comparison between Early Jewish and Early Christian Interpretations of the Jubilee Year*, in M.F. Wiles - E.J. Yarnold (eds.), SP 34, Leuven 2001, 436-442; R. Quinto, *Giubileo e attesa escatologica negli autori monastici e nei maestri della "Sacra Pagina"*: Medioevo 26 (2001) 25-109.

P.F. Beatrice

JUDAEOS, ADVERSUS. This is one of the first ancient sermons in Latin which many scholars have falsely attributed to *Cyprian. The style of the language is rather simple, since it collects passages of the Holy Scripture in order to invite the Jews to conversion. Despite the title, *Adversus Iudaeos,* the content of the text avoids every intellectual polemic while exhorting the Jews to believe in Christ, the sacrament of God. For this reason the author insists from the beginning of his sermon that his interlocutors use the eyes and ears of the faith to perceive and understand the spiritual things unknown to many educated men.

In the context of salvation the sermon shows how the Jews have renounced the covenant with God the creator, persecuting the prophets in order to turn to idolatry. Despite everything, God offers reconciliation to all through his Son Jesus. Combating the Father himself in the Son, the people refused the heir, cruelly killing the innocent Son on the cross. Because of this incredulity, the people exulted with joy while he was about to die. But beyond all expectations Christ resurrected from the dead and inaugurated the new covenant for all peoples. From that point all sinners may without fear become participants in it though penance. Therefore the invitation to conversion and baptism of the Jews is now more than urgent. All told, the teaching of the sermon shows the divine mercy in Christ who loves the Jews despite their sin.

As can be seen, the sermon justifiably shows a strong link with the liturgy. The vivacity of style truly suggests a text which is directly addressed to a Jewish community at the beginning of the Christian era. Even if the date of composition cannot be established with exactness, current research locates it with great probability in the 3rd c. While Quasten fixed its date around 260, D. van Damme thought it more likely to locate it before 212; in this case it would be the oldest sermon in Latin. However, this fact does not help us resolve the problem of the identification of the author. Even if scholars have abandoned the false opinion which attributed the text to Cyprian, the question still remains without a response. On this subject it does not appear superfluous to consider the article of the same D. van Damme, who in 1966, beyond the similarities with the language of *Melito and *Irenaeus, pointed out some indications of vocabulary links with the *De scorpiace* of *Tertullian to underline the use of a common Greek source: *Tatian's *Diatesseron*. Such a rapport of texts has the advantage of removing the hypotheses which tend to look for the presumed author of the sermon in the works of Latin authors before Tertullian such as Apollonius Martyr and Pope *Victor.

CSEL, 3, 3 (1871) 133-144; Patrologia I, 600; E. Peterson, *Pseudo-Cyprian. Adversus Iudaeos und Melito von Sardes*: VChr 6 (1952) 33-43; D. van Damme, *Pseudo-Cyprian, Adversus Iudaeos: The Oldest Sermon in Latin?*: SP 7 (TU 92), Berlin 1966, 299-307; W. Horbury, *The Purposes of Pseudo-Cyprian, Adversus Iudaeos*: SP 18 (1993) 291-317.

M.W. Libambu

JUDAISM

I. History of Judaism from AD 70 to 425 - II. Rabbinical literature - III. Liturgy - IV. Anti-Christian controversy.

I. History of Judaism from AD 70 to 425. It is understandable that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in the year 70 and the fall of Masada three years later caused a true religious and socio-

political upheaval in Judea. The Herodian dynasty disappeared with the death of Agrippa II and Berenice; the Zealots who had escaped the slaughter fled into Egypt and Cyrene, where they kept the spirit of rebellion alive; *Vespasian closed the temple of the Jews at Leontopolis, not far from Memphis, lest it serve as the focal point for revolutionary meetings. In the homeland, apocalyptic groups interpreted the defeat as a cosmic disaster; the common people were overwhelmed by a spirit of defeatism, and not a few became Christians; the Sadducees, linked to the temple, lost their influence. The Pharisees saved the situation by interpreting the defeat as a punishment of God for the failure to observe the Torah and for social divisions. Since the messianic times had not yet arrived, it was good to submit to the emperor and to begin to rebuild a society founded on strict observance of *halakah* and on the spirit of unity: *hesed,* in a social sense, replaced sacrifice: "It is mercy that I wanted, not sacrifice" (Hos 6:6). According to tradition, Johanan ben Zakkai, a disciple of Hillel, having fled besieged Jerusalem hidden in a bier, was allowed by Vespasian to found a rabbinical school at Jabne (Jamnia), on the Mediterranean coast, where a reorganization of Judaism from the doctrinal and legal viewpoint began and which later obtained a certain agreement from *Rome. This academy, transferred around 132 to Usha, in Galilee, and later to Tiberias, was mostly Pharisaic of Hillelian tendency; initially it was not much appreciated in the Diaspora both because of its political moderation and because of its hegemonic impulses. At its head was the patriarch (*hanasi*), and 71 ordained members constituting the new Sanhedrin. There was a break between Pharisaism before 70 and the rabbinism of Jabne and Usha, but there is not doubt that the latter was the child of the former. Fraternities of *haberim* assured a very strict observance of the *halakah*. Gradually the Sanhedrin would dominate all Palestine and the Diaspora grounding all Judaism in talmudic unity. A certain closure began not only toward Hellenistic culture but also toward those intertestamental and apocalyptic writings which had contributed so much to the variety within Judaism. Certain cities in Palestine, such as Jabne and Lydda, connected among themselves, became fortresses of rabbinical culture. In the 1st half of the 2nd c. the biblical canon was also closed, with the exclusion of pseudepigrapha.

Vespasian changed the tax of a half shekel, paid for the support of the temple by men only, into the notorious *fiscus judaicus* of two denarii for the maintenance of the temple of Capitoline Jove imposed on every Jew above three years old.

In the Diaspora things took a different tack. Beyond the fact that the rabbinical domination of Jabne was not voluntarily accepted by all the Jews, the Zealot and apocalyptic elements who had fled from Palestine into Egypt and Cyrene incited continual winds of rebellion. One must keep in mind that the social situation of the Jews in the Diaspora was always precarious. Despite the privileges received from various emperors—the right to observe their religion with all its rules, to keep the sabbath, to send the collections for the temple in Jerusalem protected as if they were the goods of a Greek temple, to have common meals, exemption from military service etc.—the Jews did not enjoy the sympathy of the people either because of jealousy of their privileges or because of their separation and isolation from the rest of the population. Although they made public donations for the benefit of the city as a *captatio benevolentiae,* social equilibrium remained precarious.

Consequently, in the last year of *Trajan the Jews of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Cyrene and Cyprus, profiting from the withdrawal of Roman troops employed in the war planned against the Parthians, rose up against the oppressors. The troops of Lucius Quietus subdued Mesopotamia while Quintus Turbus subdued Cyrene and Egypt. The Jewish population of Alexandria was decimated and their synagogue destroyed. The Jews of Cyprus were expelled with a permanent ban on returning there. The spirit of rebellion returned, headed by two brothers, Julian and Poppas, to Palestine too, after the hopes of a hypothetical reconstruction of the temple had been dashed, but Quietus checked this revolt as well and put the two brothers to death (*polemos shel Kitos*). As a sign of mourning, Jewish wives were no longer crowned, and after Bar Kokhba the wedding procession was also omitted. Even Rabbi Aqiba did not approve of this rebellion, saying that the messianic times had not yet arrived. However, when Simon bar Kokhba, in 132, began the great revolt against the Romans in Judea, it is said that it was Aqiba himself who gave him the nickname Bar Kokhba, Son of the Star, with a messianic reference to Num 24:19, against the opinion of the more moderate rabbis. The causes of this war under Hadrian were multiple: the plan to rebuild a Hellenistic Jerusalem as *Aelia Capitolina,* social reasons, revival of messianic hopes, the questioning of circumcision and the unpopular governor Tineius Rufus. The war, with an enormous army, caught the Romans by surprise. At first even Jerusalem had to be evacuated and the governor was taken prisoner. But Hadrian took time to prepare himself well and sent Julius Severus, who,

avoiding encounters in the open field, made the various Palestinian cities surrender by surrounding them and starving them out. The defeat was a true disaster for the Jews and marked the end of Judea. *Aelia Capitolina,* with the temple of Jupiter in place of the Jewish temple and another to Venus on Golgotha, was built on the site of Jerusalem; the province was named *Syria Palestinae*; many inhabitants were sold as slaves, and the Jews were banned from the area of the city except for the 9th day of Ab to mourn its destruction. Circumcision was prohibited because it was considered equivalent to castration, and the rabbinical schools were closed. The refugees from Judea caused many socioeconomic problems in Galilee, and the Pharisees had to defend the poor from the abuses of the usurers, but at the same time the *haburoth* distanced themselves more from the *am ha-aretz*. Both the Christians and the Jews interpreted the defeat as a punishment from God, but while the Christians considered it the abandonment of the Jews by God, the Jews thought it rather to be a sign that they were not sufficiently worthy of God's kingdom.

Hadrian's successor, Antoninus Pius, mitigated the anti-Jewish legislation, retaining the prohibition on entering Jerusalem and circumcising proselytes. Still, their political choices were often mistaken: in the war between Romans and Parthians they were favorable to the Parthians, and during the battle between *Septimius Severus and Niger they supported Niger. Despite this, Septimius Severus, although renewing the prohibitions of Antoninus Pius, granted them, like the other provincials, admission to all public offices (*honores*) compatible with the indications of the Torah and therefore not violating their religion. There were occasionally, as often happens among political rebels, Jewish bands of violent men who circled about as bandits. The rabbis condemned them but consoled themselves with the idea that the destroyers of the temple of Jerusalem would one day be destroyed themselves by the Parthians.

A new period opened with the *constitutio antoniniana* of *Caracalla, which granted Roman citizenship to all the inhabitants of the empire, so that also the Jews became "Romans." His successor, *Heliogabalus, a Syrian, substituted Baal for Capitoline Jove in his pantheon, adding it alongside the God of the Jews and the Christians, to the understandable resentment of both. The Jews fought side by side in the army of *Valerian (d. 260) against the Parthians, and this gave them an opportunity to remove many prejudices, even if the rabbis warned of the danger of religious syncretism. *Diocletian (284–305) was favorable to the Jews and exempted them from those acts of worship that were obligatory in certain circumstances for the pagans. In all this period, despite the prohibitions and limitations, many proselytes were attracted by Judaism, not a few from among the Christians also.

The situation changed, however, when the empire became Christian. The so-called *Edict of Milan in 313 granted to Christianity the same rights as the other religions, thus causing a change in the notion of "religion" prevailing up to then. Although the empire, now in the process of Christianization, produced legislation intended to reduce paganism, the Jews still enjoyed a discrete liberty; this situation remained until *Justinian. After the Council of *Nicaea it was insisted that Christians not participate in the worship of the synagogue. But it was the **Codex Theodosianus* which imposed limits on the Jewish religion to reduce its influence on Christians: e.g., a Hebrew who persecuted a coreligionist converted to Christianity was liable to be burned alive (16,8,1); the Christian slaves of a Jew would be liberated (16,9,2); the privilege of not serving in municipal offices, such as the *decurionatus*—which initially had been an honor but then had became a burden because of the public expenses involved—was revoked (12,1,100); burning an effigy of crucified Haman during the feast of Purim, an ancient tradition which was interpreted as an insult to Christ, was prohibited (16,8,18); the Jewish patriarch was prohibited from building synagogues and judging Christians (16,8,22); admitting Jews to public service except the office of advocate and the *decurionatus* was prohibited (16,8,24); all, Christians, Jews and heretics, were barred from celebrating public games on Sunday or other Christian holidays (15,5,6); and converts to Christianity could not be disinherited (16,8,28). Furthermore, the **Codex Justinianus* prescribed that Jews could not act as witnesses in trials against Christians (1,5,21); the *Novellae* of Justinian (146) banned the Mishna and rebuked any who denied the resurrection, the existence of the angels or the last judgment. On the other hand, the *Codex Theodosianus* favored the Jews since it forbade the invasion of the synagogues on the pretext of seeking sanctuary there (7,8,2); it maintained the right of the Jewish leaders to excommunicate or release from excommunication their underlings (16,8,8); the right of Jewish merchants to establish their prices without interference from Christians was reaffirmed (1,9,9); the jurisdiction of Jewish tribunals concerning the Jewish law was maintained (2,1,10); it established the prohibition on converting Jews with the promise that once they became Christian they would not need to pay their debts to their coreligionists, re-

maining furthermore excused from juridical trials (9,45,2); it prohibited damaging synagogues and granted the exemption from appearing in tribunals as witnesses on the sabbath (16,8,20); contrary to the previous legislation, Jews could possess Christian slaves, provided these were free to practice their religion (16,9,3); permission to return to Judaism was granted to those who had been seduced into conversion with material promises (16,8,23). All these laws reflect the very complex socioreligious situation after the Constantinian change.

In the war against the Parthians in 351 under *Constantius II, part of the army in Palestine had to be maintained by the inhabitants, with a consequent violation of the sabbath. This provoked a revolt, led by a certain Petronius, which was suffocated by the Romans and led to the destruction of many synagogues and academies. As a result many rabbis emigrated to Babylon.

The Babylonian diaspora was as old as the exile, and the Jews who had remained there had always maintained close relationships with those of Palestine. The exiliarch was the figure corresponding to the patriarch and had a great deal of power. Separate Jewish communities had been formed, at Sura, Pumpadita and in other cities, culturally and politically independent, where the population lived from agriculture and commerce. In the 3rd c., having survived a period of persecution which had endured several decades, the Jews accepted Persian legislation, and theological academies in close collaboration with those of the homeland arose, within which the Babylonian Talmud was born.

*Julian the Apostate favored the Jews; he abolished the *fiscus iudaicus,* promised to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, repudiated the taxes which the emperor Constantius wanted to impose on them and freed them also from the tribute to their patriarch.

The Jewish patriarchate was abolished in 425 under Gamaliel VI. The Jews, by their own will or through opposition, were marginalized, sometimes victims of public insurrections; they then dedicated themselves to the study of the Torah and of medicine; synagogues were legally protected, but the construction of new ones was blocked. They could not hold command posts within the Roman army. With the abolition of the patriarchate the disintegration of Judaism began.

II. Rabbinical literature. The study of the different currents of Judaism in the first centuries must necessarily begin from the intertestamental literature. Here we limit ourselves to the rabbinical literature in the period of the fathers of the church. The notion of midrash is fundamental for understanding these writings. Already in the continual reinterpretation of the OT, an interpretative *traditio* grew up around the *traditum;* it later finished by being inserted into the biblical text itself. From the period of the Hasmoneans, however, other traditions were formed in the Pharisaic environment whether of a *halakic*—moral-legal-liturgical—character or of a *haggadic*—theological-narrative—character. The traditions of the Pharisees, later attributed by the rabbis to an unwritten law coming from Moses, were meant to serve as a "fence around the Torah" to make its transgression more difficult. This midrashic material was transmitted orally in the rabbinical schools after AD 70 through the efforts of the **tannaim*. Perhaps it was also written in partial collections, but the definitive written compilation was the Mishnah of Yehuda ha-Nasi, made around the year 200, which quickly became the "new testament" of Judaism. It was divided into six orders subdivided into treatises. From the *tannaim* come further a complementary collection with the same divisions—the *tosefta;* the *mekilta,* a commentary on Exodus; *Sifra* on Leviticus; *Sifrei* on Numbers and Deuteronomy. All were written in Hebrew and often carried the imprint of authoritative rabbis such as Aqiba, Meir, Yishmael and others. The study of the Mishnah and the other traditions continued for two centuries thanks to the *amoraim* and issued in two great commentaries on the Mishnah: the *Palestinian Talmud* (ca. 430) at Tiberias, and the *Babylonian Talmud* (ca. 500), which incorporated in themselves also *baraita,* i.e., rabbinical traditions which had remained outside the tannaitic writings. The midrash of the talmudim was of a more *haggadic* nature than the preceding one. The *amoraim,* and, after them the rabbinical generation of the *gaonim*, also produced the *midrash rabbah, haggadic* commentaries on each book of the Pentateuch and on the *hamesh megilloth,* i.e., the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Qohelet and Esther. Furthermore, homilies of famous rabbis, including Rab Kahana, are preserved from this period. At this time, since Hebrew was no longer understood by the people, paraphrases in Aramaic were made which contained much of the midrashic material, called **targums*. The *qabbala* literature, which excited so much interest among Christians in the Renaissance, is later, but the roots can already be found in the period described. All this literature, added to the apocrypha of the OT, to Qumran, to *Philo, Josephus and the other Hellenistic writings, constitutes the corpus of our knowledge of Judaism in the first centuries. The Christian fathers, with rare exceptions, did not know the rabbinical literature

directly, partly because it was written either in mishnaic Hebrew or in Aramaic, but many echoes of current midrash reached them from converted Jews or Christians who attended the synagogue.

III. Liturgy. Given the impossibility of offering sacrifices after the destruction of the temple, worship passed to the synagogue. It was essentially a "liturgy of the word" which included the *tefilla,* i.e., the eighteen blessings, a first progressive reading of the Torah, the *seder* (a triennial cycle in Palestine, annual in Babylon), a second reading from the prophets, the *haftara,* followed by the homily, the recital of the Shema and the final blessing of a priest, if present. The prayer of the eighteen blessings, also called *amida* because it is recited standing up, is the most solemn, as old as the temple in certain sections, but which reached its definitive form under Rabbi Gamaliel II.

The Shema ("Hear O Israel") is composed of three biblical passages: Dt 6:4-9, the divine unity; Dt 11:13-21, the principle of retribution; Num 15:36-41, the precept to wear the fringes. They are preceded by two *berakoth* ("blessings") and followed by a final one or two. This profession of faith constitutes the creed of Israel. The blessing of meals and the *qaddish,* which sanctifies the divine name and is recited different times both in the synagogue and privately, also occupy an important place among the prayers of the Israelites. The current book of prayer (*siddur*) dates back essentially to the 11th c.

Beyond the sabbath, the Jewish feasts, which are calculated acc. to the lunar calendar, are (1) 14 Nisan (March–April), *Pesach* (Esth 12) (the contemporary ritual dates back to the 10th c. but has its roots in the talmudic period when sacrifices could no longer be offered, now recalled by the roast lamb and the hard-boiled eggs). Originally a feast of shepherds and peasants who offered the firstfruits, it came to commemorate the exodus from Egypt and the invocation of the messianic times. Only the circumcised take part, and for validity the narrated *haggada* has to include necessarily the meaning of *pesach* ("he has passed over our houses"), of the bitter herbs and the unleavened bread. The feast lasts seven days. For seven weeks after Pesach the omer is observed (Lev 23:15-16), which, contrary to our "paschal time," is a time of mourning and marriages are not celebrated. (2) *Pentecost* (Ex 13:16; 34:22; Dt 16:9-10) falls 50 days after Pesach. It was the feast of the harvest offered to the divinity but came to signify the covenant and, in the 2nd c., the gift of the law and the testament with Noah. (3) *Hanukkah*, from 25 Kislev (November–December) lasts eight days and commemorates the rebuilding of the temple destroyed by Antiochus IV acc. to 1 Macc 4:5ff. and 2 Mac 10:5. It is the feast of the eight lights, which are still lit today. (4) 14 Adar (February–March), *Purim*, is celebrated to recall the liberation at the hands of Esther. (5) 15–22 Tishri (September–October) is the *Feast of Booths* (Ex 23:16; Lev 23:43) and of the autumn harvests. One stays in huts or under canopies to recall the sojourn in the desert. The original ceremonies took place around the altar of the temple. (6) *Yom Kippur* (Lev 16) asks for reconciliation between humanity and God, between human and human. When the sacrifice was no longer possible, only the ethical significance of penitence remained. The *kol nidre* and the *aboda* are sung in order that unfulfilled vows may be set aside, and prayers are said for the dead.

Yom Kippur falls on 10 Tishri, while 1 Tishri is *Rosh Hashana*, or the beginning of the new year (Num 29:1; Lev 23:24), which recalls both the creation and the final judgment. One fasts 9 Ab (July–August) for the destruction of the temple, 3 Tishri for the killing of Gedalia, 10 Tebet (December–January) for the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem and 17 Tammuz (June–July) also for the destruction of Jerusalem. Naturally, the sabbath, which begins Friday night, is a day of total repose and of prayer and joy.

IV. Anti-Christian controversy. We will limit ourselves to expounding the classic points of the rabbinical texts. J. Maier has raised questions about some of these texts, but the majority of the authors still consider them valid. Let us begin with the twelfth prayer of the *tefilla,* the *birkat ha-minim,* the "blessing" of the heretics. This was composed at Jabne in the 90s by Samuel the Little under Gamaliel II. There are two versions, one Palestinian (from the *geniza* of Cairo), the other Babylonian. The first recites: "For the apostates there is no hope, and may you quickly annihilate, in our days, the insolent domination [= Rome]; and may the Nazarenes and the heretics die suddenly, be canceled from the book of life and not be counted among the just. Blessed be you, Yahweh, who bends the proud." The Babylonian version does not mention the Nazarenes, only the *minim* are cursed, the "heretics" in the sense of sectarians, which included however the Jewish Christians, i.e., the Nazarenes, but not all the Christians. Those originating from paganism were simply *goyim,* at least in Palestine. A *min* could not act as a preceptor in the synagogue, since a Christian who did this would curse himself and his own. However, a *min* is still a Jew. This excommunication weighed heavily on the Christians, and not a few returned to the

synagogue; this is the context for the insistence of the Fourth Gospel that the followers of Christ "remain in me." The *nosrim* are the Christians coming from Judaism (see Mt 2:23; Jn 9:22; 12:42; 16:2; Acts 24:5; Justin, *Dial.* 16,47,96,137; Origen, *In Ps 37* (*36*) II, 8 and in Talmud B Taanit 27b). The Palestinian version which included the Nazarenes explicitly is probably older since the Christian menace had not yet arrived in Babylon and the term *min* would have included Christians as well, as is confirmed by other controversial passages contained in the Talmud. These texts are generally discussions on the messianic meaning of biblical verses, as occurs in the *Dialogue with Trypho,* perhaps interpreted in a messianic way at first (e.g., Ps 110) but later, for polemic ends, in reference to historic events. Their messianic interpretation returns in the era of the *gaonim* when the virulence of the controversy had attenuated.

One must observe that mention of Jesus or of his disciples makes up a minimal part of the Talmud, partly due to the fact that in the period in which Hebrew books were sequestered by Christians, these passages were erased or hidden under another name. Jesus, e.g., is called "the Nazarene" only a few times; more often he is called "Ben Pantera" or "Ben Stada," son born of fornication (*Shabb.* 104b: *Sanh.* 103a). Other examples of this polemic are as follows: *T. Shab.* 13,5 records a rabbinical discussion on whether the *gilionim* (Hebraization of *evangelia*) and other books of the *minim* which contained the name of God could be or should be saved from a fire on the sabbath; *Pes.* 56: the Shema, originally recited sotto voce by the Jews, later had to be pronounced out loud because of the *minim. T. Chull.* 2,21 prohibits Jews, their slaves or animals from letting themselves be cured by *minim. Shab.* 116a forbids taking refuge in the house of the *minim,* but not in a pagan temple, to save one's own life, since, while the pagans do not know God, the *minim* know him but dishonor him. *T. Chull.* 2,20-1 says that one can accept meat from the Gentiles (meat sacrificed to idols?) but not from the *minim,* and not even bread and wine (the Eucharist?) or fruit. The sons of the *minim* are "bastards" (*mushammer*), and the sons of the Jews should not be educated by these *minim.* Commerce with them is also prohibited. *T. Shab.* 13,5 warns against the books of the *minim* which cause hostility between Jew and Jew, between Israel and God, because God hates all those who hate Israel.

Besides these explicit expressions concerning the *minim,* fairly clear references to the doctrine of the Christians are found, particularly concerning their pretense to be the new Israel, the fact that they consider Jesus as the new Moses, that they admit "two powers" in Heaven (or would that be the *gnostics?), that God has a son, that the OT now belongs to the church and that the (oral) Torah does not come from Heaven. The rabbinical polemic was directed toward those Jews who were letting themselves be dazzled by the Christians or who had become such. Also the Christian polemic *adversus* **Judaeos* was not always directed against the Jews but against those Christians who were attracted to the synagogue, who visited it on feasts and the sabbath or, worse, had converted to Judaism. The fathers of the church did not have a firsthand knowledge of the rabbinical writings, which were written in Hebrew and Aramaic; their knowledge was indirect, through converted Jews or those who visited the synagogue. Much less direct was the knowledge among the Jews of the Christian books, the lecture of which was prohibited to them. It was a knowledge "by hearsay" or through those Christians who returned to the synagogue.

G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, 3 vols., Harvard, MA 1927; J. Bonsirven, *Le judaïsme palestinien*, 2 vols., Paris 1934; H.L. Strack - P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 6 vols., Munich 1956–; K. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, Cambridge 1969; S. Safrai - M. Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, I, Philadelphia 1974; J. Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*, Darmstadt 1978; F. Mussner, *Il popolo della promessa per il dialogo cristiano ebraico*, Rome 1979; E.E. Urbach, *The Sages*, 2 vols., Jerusalem 1979; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, Philadelphia 1981; J. Maier, *Jüdische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum in der Antike*, Darmstadt 1982; H.L. Strack - G. Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, Munich 1982; C. Di Sante, *La preghiera di Israele*, Casale Monf. 1985; H.G. Kippenberg - G. Wewers, *Testi giudaici per lo studio del NT*, Brescia 1987; F. Manns, *Leggere la Mishna*, Brescia 1987; M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Philadelphia 1988; A.J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees*, Elmington 1988; G. Alon, *The Jews in their Own Land in the Talmudic Age*, Harvard, MA 1989; N.R. Glatzer, *Geschichte der talmudischen Zeit*, Neukirchen 1981; J. Maier, *Storia del giudaismo nell'antichità*, Brescia 1992; S. Frieman, *Who's Who in the Talmud*, London 1995; J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, Edinburgh 1996; R.J. Zwi Werblowsky - G. Wigoder, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, Oxford 1997; H.-M. Döpp, *Die Deutung der Zerstörung Jerusalems und des zweiten Tempels im Jahre 70 in den ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christus*, Tübingen 1998; W. Horbury, *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy*, Edinburgh 1998; J.L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, Harvard, MA 1998; J. Maier, *L'Israele di Dio: Sinagoga e Chiesa alle origini cristiane*, Bologna 1998.

P. Grech

JUDAIZERS. Judaizing has one distant historical motivation and one less so. Following the decree of rehabilitation of the Jews issued by Ahasuerus (Xer-

xes 486–465 BC) many people became Jews (Esth 8:12, 17); Paul accused Peter of ambiguity, because with his conduct at *Antioch he was inducing the pagans to Judaize (Gal 2:14). In both texts the meaning of the word "Judaize" indicates living in the manner of the Jews, embracing their laws and customs. A careful examination nevertheless allows the identification of differences which are not merely of nuance. Esther reveals paths of proselytism among the nations in a pagan context (see Mt 23:15; Jn 7:35) crowned with success; in Galatians the historical context is different: a faction of Jews converted to Christianity wants to restore vigor to the Mosaic law within the Christian community and hopes to obtain two goals: induce the ethno-Christians to accept certain Mosaic precepts and cool the missionary zeal of Paul and Barnabas by putting in doubt the results obtained. For Paul and Barnabas did not impose legal observances on converts from paganism and ruled out the supposed necessity of passing through Judaism to reach Christianity. Outside the borders of Palestine, this seemed normal (see Acts 14:26-15,3), but not at Jerusalem, where Peter had to justify the direct acceptance of Cornelius (Acts 10–11) and where the development of the church among the Gentiles was received with certain reservations (Acts 15:7-9). The group, opposed to Paul and a source of disorder with its insistence on the permanent necessity of the Mosaic law and of circumcision to reach Christ—ultimately unsuccessful—has entered history with the name of "Judaizers." From the account in Acts 15:1-5, this seems to have been composed of converted Pharisees, not yet having liberated themselves from their legalistic mentality and of strict observance, having come on their own initiative to Antioch to impose and defend their theses: "If you do not get circumcised acc. to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1). At Jerusalem the same language is heard (Acts 15:1) before the clarification, and one presumes that it comes from the same figures or from Judaizers belonging to the same circle.

Despite being defeated in the confrontation in the heart of the Christian community over the missionary activity adopted by Paul and his group toward the pagans who accepted the faith, the Judaizers did not abandon their point of view. The most resounding result of the Jerusalem assembly was the recognition of the equality of Jews and pagans before the grace of salvation and the surpassing of the law for all Christians. The characteristics of the Judaizers operating in the communities of Galatia were not substantially different from that of the Judaizers of Jerusalem. Faithful to rabbinical ideas, they presented Christ as an auxiliary to the law and to righteousness; they reaffirmed the absolutes of the law, undermining the teachings of Paul at their root, countering his apostleship (see Gal 1:15-16; 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8), accusing him of not being an apostle from the beginning and emphasizing that his doctrine and conduct had been contested at Jerusalem. The Judaizers had the full right to appeal to the mother church in Jerusalem, where Jewish practices were still in honor but were going beyond the limits of the accord reached there and were undermining the very foundation of the message sent to the ethno-Christian churches, which proclaimed salvation in the name of Jesus, and not under the law (Acts 15:9-11).

They were not only disturbers of the peace of the community, but also false prophets, who reduced the saving action of Jesus to the promotion of legal observance (Acts 15:5). Paul's accusation against them counts as a gesture of liberation of Christianity from the law, from the renewed Pharisaism and as an invitation to follow Christ (Gal 2:14; 4:31; 5:1; 6:13). While there is insufficient evidence from 1–2 Corinthians to conclude the presence and activity of the circle of the Judaizers, one cannot exclude *a priori* that the adversaries which Paul faced in this community were Judaizers; their typical charges are found: not being an apostle from the beginning, being the latest arrival (2 Cor 10:1-17; 11:22-23). The letters do not make evident the doctrinal points on which they insisted. Since this was a community with a strong ethnic component, it was probably not a matter of circumcision, nor of other observances, but of prejudices or of conduct to be maintained in determined circumstances (2 Cor 3:13-18; 4:2-4).

The call of Jewish practices was always lively in the following centuries; hence the polemic of the fathers of the church to not *Judaize*—i.e., to resort to Jewish observances, e.g., the sabbath. *Justin, in the 2nd c., wrote that "some want to live in the observance of the prescriptions of Moses and nonetheless believe in Jesus crucified, acknowledging him as the Messiah of God" (*Dialogue* 46,1). Justin accepted this type of Christian and defended them against those who condemned them, because they are "brothers born from the same womb" (47,2). Much of the literature *Adversus Iudaeos* in reality was aimed at those Christians who observed the Jewish feasts and their ceremonies, resorted to the Jews to receive any kind of blessing, performed purifications and oaths in the synagogues, socialized with the Jews. Already the Council of *Elvira established that "those who cultivate the earth be admonished not to allow the Jews to bless those fruits which they have

received from God through the action of grace, so that our blessing may not seem false and ridiculous. If anyone, despite this admonition, continues [in such a practice] may he be completely excluded from the community of the Christians" (can. 49). *John Chrysostom criticized and reproved that type of Christian in the city of *Antioch, where there was a strong Jewish community. Furthermore, the passage of Christians over to Judaism was prohibited by the civil authorities (CTh 16,7,3; CTh 16,8,29 = CI 1,9,16).

Flavius Josephus, *Jewish War* III, 454.463; J.B. Colon: *Judéo Chrétiens*: DBS 4, 1305-1311, H. Schlier, *Lettera ai Galati*, Brescia 1966, 16-23; W. Gutbrod, Ἰουδαΐζειν, Ἰουδαϊσμός: GLNT 5, 1174-1176 (TDNT 3, 383). L. Randellini, *La Chiesa dei Giudeo-cristiani*, Brescia 1968; C. Gancho, *Giudaizzanti*: Enc. della Bibbia, III, Turin 1970, col. 1221-1223; I. Greco, *I giudeo-cristiani nel IV secolo*, Jerusalem 1982; R.L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Theory and Reality in the Late Fourth Century*, Berkeley, CA 1983; G. Dagron, *Judaïser*: Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991) 359-380; R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA 1995; F. Cocchini, *La "lettera," il "velo" e l'"ombra": presupposti scritturistici della polemica antigiudaica di Origene*: AnSE 14 (1997) 101-119; A. Monaci Castagno, *Ridefinire il confine: ebrei, giudaizzanti, cristiani nell'*Adversus Iudaeos *di Giovanni Crisostomo*: AnSE 14 (1997) 135-152; Id., *I giudaizzanti di Antiochia: bilancio e nuove prospettive di ricerca*, in F. Filoramo - C. Gianotto, *Verus Israel*, Brescia 2001, 304-338; G. Scimè, *Giudei e cristiani nei discorsi di San Pietro Crisologo*, Rome 2003.

E. Peretto

JUDAS ISCARIOT (apocrypha). Judas Iscariot is always named last in all the lists of the apostles in the NT. In 2006 an incomplete *Gospel of Judas* was published, an apocryphal work of the *gnostic sect of the *Cainites, who venerated Cain as a hero. The MS (Codex Tchacos which originally had 62 pages) of the 3rd–4th c. also contains a recension of the *First Apocalypse of James* and of the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (both present at *Nag Hammadi) and fragments of a text called for the moment *Book of Allogenes;* this was discovered around 1970 near El Minya in Egypt and is written in Sahidic *Coptic—like the other Coptic writings of Nag Hammadi—but the original was Greek. At the end of the 2nd c., *Irenaeus knew a *Gospel of Judas* (*Adv. haer.* I,31,1), also cited by *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 38,1: PG 41, 658) and by *Theodoret (*Haer. fab*. 1,15). Its composition should be dated before 180, but not as a writing dating back to Judas himself. The *Gospel of Judas* is not a narration of the life of Jesus, but a collection of sayings attributed to Jesus and short secret dialogues between Jesus and Judas, to whom "everything is revealed." In contrast to the canonical gospels, it reevaluates Judas as the only one who really knew who Jesus was and from where he came: "You come from the immortal kingdom of Barbelo; I am not worthy to pronounce the name of the one who sent you." To him alone, and not to the other apostles, three days before Easter, Jesus revealed "the mysteries of the kingdom," esp. those of a cosmological character of gnostic inspiration. Judas is the one who would sacrifice the humanity which Jesus wears. The apocryphal work does not present Judas as a revolting traitor but as one who acts on the request of Jesus himself to hand him over to the authorities. His betrayal, viewed positively, contributes to the liberation of the spirit of Jesus from the constraints of his physical form, and therefore Judas "completed a good action for our salvation" (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 38,3: PG 41, 656); he will be superior to the other apostles despite the fact that he will be "cursed for generations."

There are no *Acts of Judas,* but he is often mentioned in apocryphal texts. In the *Arabic Gospel* he is presented as a demoniac child. According to the Ethiopian *Death of Pilate* Judas was the brother-in-law of Barabbas. His betrayal is generally described acc. to the gospels, with the exception of the strange legend in the *History of Joseph of Arimathea* and in some codices of the *Acts of Pilate* (history of Judas and the cock). According to the Muslim *Gospel of Barnabas,* Judas died on the cross in place of Jesus. From this information it can be concluded that in the patristic period there was no fixed tradition on Judas. For the fathers of the church Judas was represented as a type of the condemned. The legend transmitted by Jacobus de Voragine in the *Life of Saint Matthias* in the *Legenda Aurea* as well as in the Greek *Vita* published by Istin presents Judas on the model of Oedipus (he killed his own father and took his mother as wife). According to Jacobus de Voragine, the account was taken from an *Apocryphal History* and is native to the Middle Ages, when the figure of Judas excited great interest.

CANT 39; Erbetta I,1, 291-2; D. Bergamaschi, *Giuda Iscariota nella leggenda, nella tradizione e nella Bibbia*: Scuola Cattolica 15 (1909) 292-303; 423-435; 574-580; W. Creizenach, *Judas Ischarioth in Legende und Sage des Mittelalters*, Halle 1875; P.F. Baum, *The Medieval Legend of Judas Iscariot*: Publication of the Modern Languages Association of America 31, series 24 (1916) 480-632; P. Lehman, *Judas Ischariot in der lateinischen Legendeüberlieferung des Mittelalters*: SM 2 (1929) 289-346; J.H. Klauck, *Judas*, Freiburg 1987; RAC 19, 972-982 (on the Cainites); F. William, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I* (*Sects 1-46*), Leiden 1987, 248-255; *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, ed. W.J. Hanegraaff, I, Leiden 2005, 227-229; *The Gospel of Judas,* ed. R. Kasser, M. Meyer and G. Wurst with additional commentary by Bart D. Ehrman, Washington, DC 2006; J.M. Robinson, *The Secrets of Judas: The Story of the Misunderstood*

Disciple and His Lost Gospel, San Francisco 2006; J. Monserrat Torrents, *El evangelio de Judas*, Madrid 2006.

M. Starowieyski - A. Di Berardino

JUDAS ISCARIOT (iconography). Symbol by antonomasia of treason because of the crime with which he stained himself, Judas appears early in ancient Christian iconography. The scene is composed of different incidents: (1) Judas receives the price of his treason; (2) the kiss; (3) the restitution of the thirty denarii; (4) the hanging. The first scene and the last two never appear on the *sarcophagi but preferentially in miniatures. The most ancient representation of the betrayal of Judas is found on the sarcophagus of Servanne (Ws 15,2 = Benoit, *Sac.* XVI, 2) from the end of the 4th c., where the two successive scenes of Judas's approach to Christ (Jn 18:3-18) and the kiss (Mt 26:41-50; Mk 14:43-45; Lk 22:47-48) are represented together. The kiss scene by itself is, however, rather more frequent. The most ancient example is on the sarcophagus of Verona (Ws 150,2) from the end of the 4th c. and in a group in *Arles such as the sarcophagus of *Hydria Tertulla* (Benoit, *Sarc.* II) and that of the Samaritan (Benoit, *Sarc.* II), both datable to the 2nd half of the 4th c. The entire cycle of Judas in four scenes is found in the reliefs of the columns of the 4th-c. ciborium in St. Mark's in Venice. Also from the 4th c. are the scenes of the kiss and the return of the money to Caiaphas in the mosaics of St. Apollinare Nuovo in *Ravenna. As for the miniature of the purple Codex of Rossano, between the middle of the 5th and the 6th c., the return of the denarii and the hanging appear; in the Evangeliarium of Rabbula (586), on the other hand, are Judas approaching Christ and the hanging. In the sumptuary arts, the most ancient example is the scene of the hanging in an ivory of the British Museum from the early years of the 5th c. The same scene is in the Diptych of *Milan from the end of the 5th c. and in the ivory casket of Brescia from the 4th c. There exists, finally, a series of Christian inscriptions where deprecatory expressions against tomb robbers can be read. The most ancient, *cum Iuda partem habeat* (Diehl 3845), goes back to the end of the 4th c. and was found in the cemetery of St. Agnese. A *habeat partem cum Iuda Iscariota* (Diehl 3847) of the 7th c. from Cartagena and an inscription in Greek from Argos, ἐχέτω τὸ ἀνάθεμα τὸ τοῦ Ἰο<ύ>δα, should also be mentioned.

DACL 8, 264-279; EC 6, 690-691; LCI 2, 444-448; H. Hursch, *Das Bild des Judas Ischariot im Wandel der Zeiten*: Akten VII KongrIntchristlArch, Vatican City 1971, 565-573; J. Kollwitz, *Die Lipsanothek von Brescia*, Berlin 1933, 15, pl. I, 32, pl. II; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden-Baden 1958, pl. 188; Volbach-Hirmer, 75, fig. 92; Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.* fol. 12 a, 66; D. Pallas, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1959 à 1973*, Vatican City 1971, 309; F. De Maffei, *Il Codice purpureo di Rossano Calabro: la sua problematica e alcuni risultati di ricerca*, Rossano 1978, 261; M. Perraymond, *L'iconografia di Giuda Iscariota e i suoi risvolti evangelici*: SMSR 14 (1990) 67-93; Id., TIP 195-196.

A.M. Di Nino

JUDAS KYRIAKOS. A martyred bishop of Jerusalem. The *Vita* and the *Passio* which we have for him do not have any historical significance; they are completely legendary. *Eusebius (*HE* 4,5) mentions a Judas as fifteenth and last Jewish-Christian bishop of Jerusalem at the time of Bar Kokhba (132–135). The two figures are probably identical. According to the legend, Judas was a relative of St. *Stephen, protomartyr, and appears as a protagonist in the legend of the *inventio crucis*.

BHO 233-236; BHG 465; BHL 4169.7022-7025; BBKL III, 762; H.J.W. Drijvers - J.W. Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross: The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac*: CSCO 565 (1997); S. Heid, *Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems*: JbAC 32 (1989) 41-71; Id., *Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende*: AB 109 (1991) 73-108; S. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross Was Found: From Events to Medieval Legend*, Stockholm 1991; J.W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding the True Cross*, Leiden 1992.

S. Samulowitz

JUDAS THADDAEUS. In the catalog of the apostles he is always mentioned with James (Mt 10:3; Mk 3:18; Lk 6:16; Acts 1:13) and carefully distinguished from Judas Iscariot (Lk 6:16; Jn 14:22). The textual tradition reveals uncertainty: the codices D K substitute Lebbeus for Thaddaeus, the codices E F G L have both nicknames, and the codices a b g h q of the *Vetus Latina* write "Judas the Zealot." Judas Thaddaeus or Lebbeus is presented by Luke (Lk 6:16; Acts 1:13) in the catalog of the apostles with the patronymic "Judas of James," the equivalent of "son of James." It is deduced from this that he has his own characterization (Thaddaeus-Lebbeus; of James), and is distinct from the Judas, brother of James, Simon and Joseph (Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3). The data of the NT delineate a Judas Thaddaeus, making up part of the group of the apostles; a Judas Iscariot, who betrayed the Master; a Judas, brother of the Lord, and of James, Simon and Joseph; and a Judas/Jude, author of the Catholic epistle. This letter begins: "Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." Aside from other considerations of criticism, this indication is too feeble, since it allows one to iden-

tify the author with several of the mentioned figures. The omission of the title "apostle," the distance which he seems to put between himself and the apostles, the frequency in classical and also Christian Antiquity of the phenomenon of pseudonymity and the possibility that the expression "brother of James" means "brother in the faith of James" leave open the attribution of the letter and indicate that an initially clear tradition was slowly obscured, when the identification of the author of the letter with Judas the apostle was attempted.

Legend took hold of Judas the apostle, who in the Last Supper asked Jesus why he had reserved his manifestation to them, leaving the entire world in the dark (Jn 14:22), and made of him the bridegroom of the wedding of Cana. Similarly tradition, which assigned him Palestine and the surrounding regions as his preferred field of apostolate, pushed him as far as Arabia to the S, into Persia and Mesopotamia to the E, and into Armenia in the N.

According to some information he died at Edessa in the time of King Abgar; acc. to other information he was martyred at Arado, close to Beirut. The Latin church celebrates his feast 28 October, together with Simon; the Greek church 19 June; the Armenian 16 February; and the Coptic 2 July.

Eusebius, *HE* I, 13,11-22; IV, 5,5; Jerome, *In Matt.* X, 4; Nicephorus Call., *HE* II, 40; G.S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, III, 2 (Rome 1728) VIII-XIV; P. Douny, *Simon et Jude, apôtres*, Paris-Brussels 1947; P. De Ambroggi: EC 6, 693-695; K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe*; *Der Judasbrief*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1964, 140-143; J. Blinzler, *Judas Taddäus*: LTK[3] 5, 1026; E. Peretto: BS 6, 1152-1153; U. Vanni, *Lettere di Pietro, Giacomo, Giuda*, Rome 1974, 176-180; R.J. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, Edinburgh 1990; Id., *The Letter of Jude: An Account of Research*: ANRW II, 25, 5, 3791-3826; for the exegesis of the Fathers, see H.J. Sieben, *Exegesis Patrum: saggio bibliografico sull'esegesi biblica dei Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1983; Id., *Kirchenväterhomilien zum Neuen Testament: ein Repertorium der Textausgaben und Übersetzungen, mit einem Anhang der Kirchenvaterkommentare*, Steenbrugis 1991; see also the journal "Annali di storia dell'esegesi" 11 (1994) – 14 (1997). In particular, see G. Bray, ed., *James, 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude*, ACCS NT 11, Downers Grove, IL 2000; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionnaires chrétiens dans l'Empire iranien*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002, 61-71.

E. Peretto

JUDAS THADDAEUS (apocrypha). Judas, penultimate in the lists of the apostles, is frequently confused with *Judas Iscariot, with Judas Thomas, with *Simon and with *Addai. According to *Eusebius (*HE* 1, 12,2 and 13,11f.), Thaddaeus was one of the Seventy. According to the *Armenian tradition (e.g., *Faustus of Byzantium), Judas Thaddaeus was the apostle of Armenia, but the entire documentation concerning this apostolate is very complicated. According to ps.-Abdias (VI, 7-23—he is treated together with Simon) Judas Thaddaeus and Simeon fought with magi in Persia and consecrated *Abdias as the first bishop of Babylon. In the *Acts of Thaddaeus,* composed at the beginning of the 7th c., Judas Thaddaeus is linked to the legend of Abgar and is presented as the evangelizer of *Edessa and therefore is presented in iconography with the favorite of Christ. Judas Thaddaeus is also considered one of the Seventy or else the bridegroom of Cana.

CANT 284; BHG 1703-1705; BHL 7749-7754, 8011; BHO 1141-1145; LCI 8, 423-427; BS 6 (1965) 1152-1157; M. van Esbroeck: AB 80 (1962) 430-1; Id., *Le roi Sanatrouk et l'apôtre Thaddée*: REArm 9 (1972) 167-169, 241-283; Id., *L'apôtre Thaddée et le roi Sanatrouk*, in Atti del II simposio int. "Armenia-Assiria," Venezia 1988, 93-106; A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 436-7; A. Palmer, *Les Actes de Thaddée*: Apocrypha 13 (2002) 63-84.

M. Starowieyski

JUDEA, Desert of. A territory which lies in the SE part of Palestine toward the Dead Sea. It is called this in Mt 3:1, which points it out as the place of the temptations of Jesus. It becomes the center of the Jewish resistance, esp. at Masada, at the time of the revolt of Bar Kokhba against *Rome (130-135). In the desert of Judaea, better called Desert of the Jordan, there was the community of *Qumran, where the Dead Sea Scrolls were found. The Christian monks of Palestine, in the desire to find ever more isolated spots, established monasteries, which go by the name *laurae. The first laura was founded by *Gerasimus, considered the founder of monasticism in the area, around 455; at one point it counted seventy cells spread over a certain distance. The monastery consisted of a church, kitchen, refectory and warehouse. The monks had to stay isolated five days in their cells, where they also worked, but they came together Saturday and Sunday. Among the laurae were those of Calamon, founded around 450, Elijah (the "monastery of the eunuchs"), John the Baptist at the end of the 5th c. etc. Among the most important were the laura of St. *Euthymius (d. 473) founded in the 5th c. at Mishor Adummin, and that founded by St. *Sabas in the valley of the Cedron. *Cyril of Scythopolis (545–555) lived in the first; he gives information on Euthymius, a native of Melitene in Cappadocia, and his foundation in the *Vita Euthymii;* his church was dedicated 7 May 428. The monastery was located not far from the road that led from Jerusalem to Jericho. For this reason it was easily accessible to numerous pilgrims; the monastery grew in number of monks and economic prosperity.

Many monks from this laura occupied important posts in Christian communities. St. Sabas too spent some time in this laura. Since 1920 excavations have been carried out which have brought to light the remains of different monasteries. The laurae founded by St. Chariton (4th c.) and by St. Sabas (5th c.) are still active.

B. Flusin, *Miracle et Histoire dans l'oeuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris 1983; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314–631*, Oxford 1994; Y. Hirschfeld, *Holy Sites in the Vicinity of the Monastery of Chariton*, in *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents*, ed. F. Manns - E. Alliata, Jerusalem 1995, 297-311; J. Patrich - B. Arubas - B. Agur, *Monastic Cells in the Desert of Gerasimus near the Jordan*, ibid., 277-296; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism*, Washington, DC 1996; D. Bar, *Christianisation of Rural Palestine During Late Antiquity*: Journal of Eccl. History 54 (2003) 401-421; Id., *Rural Monasticism a Key Element in the Christianization of Byzantine Palestine*: HTR 98 (2005) 49-65 (rich bibl.).

A. Di Berardino

JUDGMENT
I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Fathers. That Christ would return to judge the living and the dead is an affirmation repeated numerous times in the Apostolic Fathers (*Barn.* 7,2; *2 Clem.* 1,1; Polyc., *Phil.* 2,1) to confirm the faith of the earliest communities in the *parousia of the Lord and in his function as judge ("the justice of the judgment is the beginning and the end of our faith": *Barn.* 1,6), based on NT passages, among which Mt 25:31-46 stands out, with the separation of the just from sinners as of sheep from goats on the basis of the works performed in this life (L.J. Frahier, *Le jugement dernier: implications éthiques sur le bonheur de l'homme: Mt 25,31-46*, Paris 1992, bibl. 411-422). The theme of Judgment therefore appears closely connected with that of the parousia and the resurrection of the dead, and recalls the Johannine Apocalypse, for which see, e.g., the study of J.W. Mealy, *After the Thousand Years: Resurrection and Judgment in Revelation 20*, Sheffield 1992 (JSNTSup 70); in general for the eschatological theme of the judgment in the NT, see the acts of the convention *Weltgericht und Weltvollendung: Zukunftsbilder im Neuen Testament*, ed. H.-J. Klauck, Freiburg i.B. 1994. Later, the Fathers normally speak of judgment (κρίσις, *iudicium*) meaning the universal judgment, even if with time a reflection on the particular judgment won some space. In fact, already in the Apostolic Fathers there are references here and there to the idea of individual judgment (in the sense of retribution) immediately after death. Thus St. *Peter and St. *Paul, acc. to *Clement, went directly to the "holy place" to find there the company of the martyrs and saints (*1 Clem.* 5,4-7). Likewise, the elders of Smyrna knew that *Polycarp received "the crown of immortality" at his death (*Mart. Pol.* 17,1). In general, however, the judgment is universal and final. Christ the judge will separate the good from the evil to eliminate the confusion in which they lived on earth (*1 Clem.* 18,1; *2 Clem.* 17,4-7). Destruction and death will constitute the destiny of the wicked, the impenitent, false teachers and those who have refused God (e.g., Ign., *Pol.* 2,3). At the same time, acc. to Clement (*1 Clem.* 16,3), the sky and the earth will melt like lead in a furnace; and *Hermas (*Vis.* 4,3) announces that the present world will perish in blood and fire.

To these observations the *apologists add considerations of a more general character. *Theophilus appeals to the authority of the pagans themselves, seeking parallels in their texts and invoking, as proof of the existence of a judgment, the Sibyl and the poets (*Ad Aut.* II, 36-38), while *Justin recalls the legend of Minos and Rhadamanthus (1 *Apol.* 8). Furthermore, they tend to insert the reflections on the universal judgment within a natural theodicy which might be more agreeable to the pagan mentality: as Theophilus observes, "If I call him Lord, I call him (at the same time) judge" (*Ad Aut.* I, 3). Precisely because humanity is free, contrary to what fatalism teaches, it is necessary to think of a system of wrongs and retributions which has its guarantor in God and its executor in Christ (Just., 1 *Apol.* 43-45). This examination will take place at the parousia; only in Justin (*Dial.* 5,3) does there seem to be a hint at a particular judgment at the moment of death.

These themes reoccur in the antiheretical polemics of *Irenaeus and *Tertullian. The latter, e.g., observes, against *Marcion, that justice and goodness are two inseparable attributes of God the legislator (*Adv. Marc.* 1,26); that the existence of the judgment, known to the pagans themselves (*Apol.* 47), is demonstrated by reason and follows as a consequence of divine omniscience (*De spect.* 20), adding (*De test. an.* II, 6) that it is one of those fundamental religious truths in which the spontaneous testimony of the soul is sufficient.

Also in this area *Origen, while remaining faithful to tradition, offered several significant contributions, inserting his reflections on the judgment within the tension, characteristic of his thought, between the desire to preserve traditional doctrine and that of reinterpreting it in a spiritual way so that it could also be accepted by more educated believers. The just judgment of God is an article of faith of the

preaching of the church (*De princ.* III, 1,1); it is a basic motive for moral conduct and a confirmation of free will, as it does not have the goal of terrifying but of stimulating the will to flee evil (*Contra Cels.* VIII, 48). Also in Origen a doctrine of an intermediate place appears, through which souls pass as if in a school (*quodam eruditionis loco . . . auditorio vel schola animarum, De princ.* II, 11,6). But the true judgment is the universal one which will take place at the end of the world. At that time there will be a definitive separation between the good and the evil (*Contra Cels.* IV, 9); everyone will be judged acc. to their works, in conformity with the traditional image of a tribunal (*Com. Rom.* II, 1-2). Without wanting to minimize the traditional description of the parousia, Origen nevertheless tends to reinterpret the realistic details in an *allegorical perspective. The throne of the judge signifies the majesty of Christ; the register where wrongs are recorded is none other than the ensemble of our thoughts and our acts, carved in the depths of conscience (*Com. Rom.* IX, 41). For this reason the judgment will be instantaneous (*Com. Mt.* XIV, 9). Christ will not appear in a certain place: he will manifest everywhere, and human beings will present themselves before his throne in the sense that they will render homage to his authority. They will see themselves as they are, and in the light of such knowledge the good and the bad will be finally and forever distinct (*Com. Mt.* LXX). Up to *Augustine, the Greek and Latin fathers moved along these lines, sometimes preferring a spiritual interpretation, sometimes, as in the case of the Latins, taking a generally more ancient tone. They speak, however, of judgment in the singular, as of an absolute reality, which has a meaning known to all. To justify it, they refer to the principle already mentioned acc. to which, given that a just distribution of rewards and punishments will not be possible on earth, one must accept that there will be one in the world to come (see, e.g., John Chrys., *De diab.* 1,8; Ambrosiast., *In Rom.* II, 3,6). In the footsteps of Origen, then, it is mentioned that wrongs are written on the conscience of human beings (Cyr. Jer., *Cat.* XV, 25). For *Basil it will be the face of the judge himself that brings the divine illumination that spreads light into our guilty hearts (*In Ps.* 48,2).

For the Latin fathers of the 3rd and 4th c., the judgment coincides with the parousia, acc. to a now solid tradition (see, e.g., Ambr., *De fide* II, 12,100-106). Furthermore, they tend to distinguish people into three categories: the just, who do not need to be judged; the impious, who already have been; and the Christians, whose life is a mixture of good and evil and who alone will undergo the judgment (see Hilar., *In Ps.* I, 15-18; Ambr., *In Ps.* I, 51-56: in both cases, the starting point is provided by Ps 1:5 and Jn 3:18). Later *Ambrose reveals Origenian influences. In fact, the judgment takes place within the conscience itself of the sinner and as a result of the knowledge of God (*Ep.* 2,9-10; 73,3). In this perspective the thrones on which the divine judge sits along with the apostles are also interpreted metaphorically (*In Luc.* X, 49).

Multiple times, Augustine affirms the truth of belief in the divine judgment and justifies it amply in *Civ. Dei* XX. The judgment of God, in fact, takes place continuously in history; but since it is not always evident, God has reserved a day in which his wisdom and justice will be proclaimed together before all. The judgment belongs in fact to Christ. Sometimes Augustine is led to interpret certain details in an allegorical sense: thus, the book which will be opened signifies the conscience of each individual whose sins will reemerge all together in the memory; but generally a literal interpretation prevails. All humanity will submit to the judgment of Christ: thus he denies the idea, mentioned earlier, that certain categories of humanity will not have to appear.

J. Rivière, art. *Jugement*: DTC 8, 1721-1828; V. Herntrich - F. Büchsel, κρίνω, in TWNT III, 920-955 (TDNT 3,921-954) ; J. Loosen, art. *Gericht. Zeugnisse des kirchl. Lehramtes*: LTK² 4, 731-734; EC 6, 727-735; H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre bei Paulus*, Leipzig 1930 (Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 19); A. Descamps, *Les justes et la justice dans les évangiles et le christianisme primitif hormis la doctrine proprement paulinienne*, Louvain 1950; J. Goubert - L. Cristiani, *Les plus beaux textes sur l'au-delà*, Paris 1950; var. aus., MySal, XI, Brescia 1978; A. Orbe, *Cristología gnóstica: introducción a la soteriología de los siglos II y III*, I-II, Madrid 1976 (Biblioteca de autores cristianos 384-385); M.E. Stone, *Signs of the Judgement, Onomastica sacra and the Generations from Adam*, Chico, CA 1981; M. Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund*, Münster 1990 (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. N.F. 23); B. Opalinski, *Pelagius and Romans 3–5: Examining Grace and Human Effort*, paper presented at of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, 22-25Nov. 2003; J. Tloka, *Griechische Christen—Christliche Griechen*, Tübingen 2005; M.B. Moser, *Teacher of Holiness*, Piscataway, NJ 2005; A. Becker, *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom*, Philadelphia 2006; P. Tzamalikos, *Origen: Cosmology and Ontology of Time*, Leiden 2006.

G. Filoramo - I. Ramelli

II. Iconography. A group of artworks present in Roman funeral monuments has been interpreted by Wilpert as judgment scenes: from the singular representations of the hypogeum of Vibia to the slab with the inscription of Theodolus found in the cemetery of St. Marcus and St. Marcellianus, to a painting in

the cemetery of Cyriaca at the Ager Veranus, to a fresco in the cemetery of St. Hermes on the Via Salaria. Among these, only the last displays a "judiciary" apparatus, but it should be specified that if one must speak of judgment this is certainly not *in fieri,* since that would not be coherent with the nature of primitive Christian art, pervaded by the fundamental concept of the saving work of Christ and therefore, by its own intrinsic exigencies, alien to any kind of pessimism, but rather it must be considered a judgment already passed with favorable results, and therefore the representations must be taken as scenes of *receptio* of the soul on the part of Christ in Paradise. To the monuments mentioned by Wilpert should be added a relief in the catacomb of St. Victorinus in Amiternum, a picture in the arcosolium of Marcia in the Cassia catacomb at Syracuse and perhaps another painting also at Syracuse in the catacomb of St. John. The iconographic formulation of the mentioned scenes is not fixed and therefore repeatable, but elaborated on different occasions in different ways: the only constant and qualifying element seems to be the gesture of Christ, who welcomes the soul into his kingdom.

L. Pani Ermini, *Il santuario di S. Vittorino in Amiternum. Note sulla sua origine*: Riv. di Archeol. 3 (1979) 98f.

L. Pani Ermini

JULIA of Antioch (4th–5th c.). The information which we possess today on this *Manichean "elect," who lived between the 4th and 5th c., comes entirely from a single source: the *Life of Porphyrius, Bishop of Gaza,* written by his deacon Marcus (CPG III, 7622). In this text it is narrated (37, 85-91) how Julia, a follower of Mani, originally from *Antioch, had begun in the year 400 carrying out in *Gaza, in *Palestine, an active and successful effort of propaganda, an effort which was aimed primarily at neophytes. The bishop of the place, *Porphyry, having learned what was happening, immediately summoned the woman to interrogate her. She, after having "confessed" (87,4: *homologein*) her own origin and adherence to Manicheism, although energetically warned concerning her teaching, refused to renounce it in any way, showing herself ready on the contrary to confront an adversary. The encounter, fixed for the next day, saw Julia, accompanied by four disciples, defending herself with conviction and competence, but in vain. For the bishop, irritated by having heard so many "blasphemous things," launched a curse of a magical flavor against her (89,7-10), whose effect did not delay in making itself felt: the cursed woman, having collapsed to the ground, paralyzed and deprived of the capacity for speech, died in a short time, despite the incantations pronounced in her ear by her companions. The latter, for their part, shocked by the event, anathematized Mani and converted, along with numerous pagans.

According to the most recent criticism (M. Scopello), the writing—despite displaying a state halfway between historic reconstruction and romantic account—once purged of the polemical and propagandistic excesses, permits the observation of the habits and methods of the Manichean "mission" in the act. For it reveals clearly how Manicheism had developed rather early a notable activity of proselytism from which women were anything but excluded (cf. also in this regard the pastoral letter attributed to Theonas of Alexandria [*Papyrus Rylands* 469, l. 29-35], which dates to 280), but rather exercising roles of clear distinction and responsibility; next it allows one to see the level of organization which supported this same propaganda, often planned in the most minute details (see ibid.), whether on the economic level (Julia uses riches to convince the persons with whom she comes in contact and enjoys in any case an indisputable financial support: 85,6-7), or on that of prior investigation of the terrain (the *electa* knows exactly toward which individuals or groups to orient herself for a first attempt) and, not least, of persuasive technique. For Julia demonstrates choosing a gradual approach, "door to door," to win (acc. to the text "surreptitiously"—*hypeiselthousa*) the confidence of her listeners. For this purpose she avoids declaring, at least at first, her own religious adherence, and rather seems to put the figure of Christ at the center of her own discourses. To this is added the fact that the entirety of the preaching, by her and her companions, is described as profoundly anchored in a markedly pagan cultural system with appeals to philosophical argumentation and to knowledge of an astronomical and astrological character. All this confirms the known framework of Manichean universalism, as well as its capacity to adapt itself to the environments with which it entered in relation. The accusation then, directed at Julia and at her companions, of practicing *goēteia* and of being *pharmakoi,* although it could be considered almost a polemical *topos,* should today be analyzed in the light of an objective fact which is now better known to us. For it is probable that the various accusations connected with magic took their origin from the misunderstanding, more or less intentional, of the medical expertise often demonstrated by the adepts of the sect (and inherited from Mani), an expertise joined by a sought-after ability

in the preparation of pharmaceutical remedies on the basis of plants and herbs (see Epiph., *Panarion* 66,3,7). Thus the act of the disciples, bent over their suffering teacher, could also receive interpretations different from those of the author. For current knowledge of peculiar *gnostic practices permits us to suppose that they, far from attempting *thaumaturgic incantations, were practicing a specific Manichean rite, which consisted in murmuring prayers in the ear of the dying, which would allow the soul to traverse unharmed the passage to the beyond, suggesting the necessary passwords to pass through the spheres and to avoid the traps of the *archons*. In this case the companions of Julia in her proselytizing mission would have been "elect," inasmuch as the knowledge of the power of the *nomina* was reserved to these alone (see *Acta Archelai*, ed. Ch. Beeson, GCS 16, Leipzig, 1906, 19, 18-22), and that would add an additional reinforcement to our reconstruction of the structure of the Manichean "mission."

In conclusion it is possible to say that the most recent studies reveal widespread interest in this figure, her dramatic story and, above all, the text which transmits it.

Marc Diacre, Vie de Porphyre, évêque de Gaza, ed. H. Grégoire - M. Kugener (Belles Lettres. Collection Byzantine), Paris 1930; P. Peeters, *La vie géorgienne de saint Porphyre de Gaza*: AB 59 (1941) 65-216; M. Scopello, *Julie, manichéenne d'Antioche* (*d'après la* Vie de Porphyre *de Marc le diacre, ch. 85-91*): Antiquité Tardive 5 (1997) 187-209 (with a new tr. of the chapters concerning Julia, 189-190); Id., *Femmes et propagande dans le manichéisme*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 83 (2001) 35-44 (partially on Julia, p. 37-40).

E. Zocca

JULIAN, Apollinarist (end 4th c.). The *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi* preserves the fragment of a letter which it attributes to Julian, disciple of *Apollinaris, and says that it was written in response to the "codisciple" *Polemon (Lietzmann, *fr.* 180,277). A treatise of the master is addressed to Julian, of which the same *Doctrina Patrum* preserves fragments (Lietzmann, *fr.* 150-152, 247-248). The fragment of the letter takes up the same themes as the fragments of the treatise, in particular the theme of the ὁ θεῖος νοῦς αὐτοκίνητος, concerning the works and sufferings of Christ and his unique nature and substance. The fragment of Julian's letter might suggest that he came to agree with Polemon, chief of the extreme Apollinarist party, following the interpretation of the treatise which Apollinaris addressed to him (see Lietzmann, 40f.; 153).

CPG 3720; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904; F. Diekamp, *Doctrina patrum*, Münster 1907, 380, XX.

E. Cavalcanti

JULIAN, Arian (4th c.). At the end of the 19th century, when the studies of the *catenae* began, H. Usener and later L. Dieu attributed to *Julian of Halicarnassus the entirety of the fragments of a *Commentary on the Book of Job,* traceable in the *catenae* (see H. Lietzmann, *Catenen*, 28-34 and L. Dieu, *Fragments dogmatiques de Julien d'Halicarnasse*, 192-196). This attribution was repeated also when a *Prologue* in an Armenian translation to that commentary was published (P. Ferhat, *Der Jobprolog*, 26-31). In 1924, R. Draguet took up the question on the occasion of his studies of Julian of Halicarnassus and judged for the first time that the attribution was not justified. From internal examination he deduced that one should think of an *Arian author of the 4th c. On this track, D. Hagedorn, after looking over the direct and indirect tradition and the complex problem of the different attributions, reconstructed the commentary on Job and produced the critical edition in 1973. He identifies the author with the Julian to whom certain MSS attribute the *Prologue,* and establishes the spatio-temporal location of this author through a comparative study of the *Commentary on Job* with the *Apostolic Constitutions* and with the ps.-Ignatian letters. These writings are assigned by Hagedorn to the same author, Julian, who is placed in an Antiochene Arian environment between 357 and 379–381. To Julian are also attributed the *85 Canons of the Apostles,* which originally were part of the **Apostolic Constitutions.*

CPG II, 2075; H. Lietzmann, *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte und handschriftliche Überlieferung*, Freiburg 1897, 28-34; D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*, Berlin 1973; R. Draguet, *Un commentaire grec arien sur Job*: RHE 20 (1924) 38-65; Id., *Julien d'Halicarnasse*: DTC 8, 2, 1931ff.; P. Ferhat, *Der Jobprolog des Julianos von Halikarnassos in einer armenischen Bearbeitung*: OC n.s. 1 (1911) 26-31.

E. Cavalcanti

JULIAN (the Apostate), emperor (331–363). Flavius Iulianus Augustus, the Apostate (ἀποστάτης and also παραβάτης = "transgressor"), Roman emperor. He was born at *Constantinople in 331 to Julius Constantius and Basilina. Julian and his brother Gallus were the only survivors of the slaughter of all the Constantinians ordered by *Constantius between 337 and 338. Educated at Nicomedia under the care

of the bishop *Eusebius, he was influenced by the Scythian eunuch Mardonius, a fervent admirer of classical culture and follower of philosophical abstraction; it was a strange type of upbringing which later conditioned the tormented difficulties of the emperor and, in short, every act of his life. The tutor having died, Constantius, thinking that the two youths might become a dangerous menace, isolated them in Cappadocia at Macellum in 344. Julian found refuge in the study of classical literature, attracted at the same time by Judaism and Christianity. He received baptism very quickly, reached the lectorate and for a certain time cultivated the idea of embracing ecclesiastical orders. The writings of his maturity preserve traces of the sincerity of the ideas which animated this intense period of study and reflection. In 351 Constantius, with a tactical change of opinion, made his cousin Gallus Caesar, while Julian was recalled to Constantinople, where he grew interested in *Neoplatonism. But the idyllic parenthesis only lasted three years; in 354 Gallus was decapitated and Julian was called upon to refute charges of secret anti-imperial views. Saved by the intervention of the empress, Julian was sent into forced residence at *Athens; there, despite encountering personalities like *Gregory of Nazianzus and *Basil of Caesarea, he was influenced decisively by the philosophers Ierius and Diogenes, from which a *metanoia* emerged, aimed at a return to paganism. After a period of ambiguous oscillation, Julian gradually detached himself from the religion of Christ, which he abandoned in a definitive and official form during a series of visits to the most celebrated pagan sanctuaries of Greece.

Meanwhile the serious political situation persuaded Constantius to call his cousin to the court; in 355 he married the sister of the empress Helena and, in front of the troops, received military investiture at *Milan; he then departed in the direction of *Gaul, deprived of real powers, but accompanied by officials who had the task of watching him. Although in particularly precarious military conditions, Julian defeated the Alamanni at Strasbourg (357); besieged the Franks and conquered Paris; reordered, in 358, the administration of the province, reducing taxes and exercising a more just fiscal oversight; subdued the Salian Franks; and reestablished free navigation on the Rhine. During this period Constantius, while he was defeating the Quadi and the Sarmatians, proved himself inept at settling the religious controversies which had sprung up almost everywhere in the empire. Faced with the Persian threat which menaced the Roman borders in Mesopotamia, it was necessary to strip the western command, where Julian by now enjoyed the unconditional favor of the troops. During the military revolt which followed, Julian, although reluctant, was declared Augustus through elevation on the shields acc. to the Germanic custom (360). Declared deposed by Constantius, Julian tried in every way to avoid the inevitable civil war, but this was made possible only by the unexpected death of the emperor which took place in 361, when he was already preparing to march in the direction of the West. The enthusiasm was enormous with which Julian was received at Constantinople, where the new emperor, who declared himself "Greek among the Greeks," immediately began a series of reforms aimed at lightening the vexatious tax burden, at reducing personal privileges, at distributing honors with equanimity, at moralizing the military administration by imposing a return to a more iron discipline. But the empire had by now entered into a fatal decline, and Julian was fully conscious of the irreversible crisis, of which he thought to identify the now triumphant Christianity as the main responsible party. In the last attempt to stop its further development, Julian restored the Hellenic religion, passing from a first phase of toleration to true and proper persecutions against the Christians.

Particularly important are the edicts on the return home of bishops exiled from Constantinople, on teachers and on funerals. With the first it is possible to measure the good faith with which the emperor sought to return to the principles sanctioned by the *Edict of Milan, but the reaction of the pagan element was not such as to allow illusions about the possibility of peaceful coexistence. Faced with the necessity of a choice, Julian hardened his anti-Christian policy and provoked the reorganization of pagan worship. The edict on teachers, with which it was decreed that the classic authors could be read and commented only by those who believed in the gods, while it removed from teaching the most cultivated and thoughtful spirits of the time, sanctioned de facto the confessional state. But paganism, now crystallized in antiquated cultural forms, was incapable of expressing the noble intentions of the emperor who, however, in the reorganization of the priesthood and the forms of worship, imitated despite himself the by-now consolidated Christian customs and above all sought to spread the NT idea of repentance as the unique possibility of redemption. Nor could the pagans understand the intimate spirituality of the emperor, who showed that he attached greater importance to the principles of charity, of ascetic perfection, of an exquisitely spiritual theology rather than to the acquisition of goods and material honors.

Faced with the extremism of the reactionaries,

Julian did not know how or did not want to impose his will completely. Besides the serious religious problem, new unsettling signs were arriving from the tortured Danube borders, but the emperor sought first of all to resolve the Persian problem. After a series of courageous endeavors, 26 June 363, having pushed far into enemy territory, he was struck mortally by a javelin. He died pronouncing noble words on the immortality of the soul, incapable of seeing, even to the end, that the empire had reached its sunset and that he himself, with his attempt at restoration, had only hastened the end.

Of his writings let us mention eight orations, around eighty letters, two satires, the *Antiochicus* or *Misopogon* and the *Banquet of the Caesars,* two *panegyrics for the emperor Constantius, that for the empress Eusebia, the fragments of the polemic *Against the Galileans* and the *Letter to the Athenians*. His commentaries on the campaign in Gallia and another on the wars against the Germans have been lost.

Sources: Beyond the works of Julian himself, Ammianus Marcellinus and the ecclesiastical historians: Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, Libanius, Themistius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Eunapius, the *Panegyric* of Mamertinus (*Gratiarum actio Iuliano*). J. Bidez - F. Cumont, *Iuliani imperatoris epistulae leges poemata fragmenta*, Paris 1922. J. Bidez supervised later the ed. of all the letters. The *Contra Christianos* was ed. by C.J. Neumann, Leipzig 1880; there are many It. tr. esp. Rostagni (Turin 1920); note also W.C. Wright, *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, 3 vols., Cambridge-London 1913-26; G. Rochefort, *A Themistius*; *Contre Heracleios le cynique*; *Sur la mère des Dieux*; *Contre les cyniques ignorants*, Paris 1963; C. Prato - D. Micalella, *G. Imperatore, Contro i Cinici ignoranti*, Lecce 1988; E. Masaracchia, *G. imperatore, Contra Galilaeos*, Rome 1990; M. Caltabiano, *L'epistolario di Giuliano Imperatore*, Naples 1991; C. Prato - A. Marcone, *G. Imperatore*, *Alla madre degli dèi e altri discorsi*, Milan [5]1997; I. Tantillo, *La prima orazione di G. a Constantius*, Rome 1997; R. Guido, *G. imperatore, Al Cinico Eraclio*, Galatina 2000 (= 2002). The index of epigraphic texts is in De Ruggiero, *Dizion. epigr.* IV, s.v.

Studies: PWK X, 26-91 and Suppl. 8, 755f.; A.R. Birley, NP VI, 10; P. Allard, *Julien l'Apostate*, 3 vols., Paris 1900; S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del IV secolo*, Rome 1951; E. Vacchina, *Flavio G. l'apostata*, Rome 1971; G.W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate*, Cambridge, MA 1978; A. Selem, *G. l'Apostata nelle Storie di Ammiano*, Rome 1979; S. Scicolone, *Aspetti della persecuzione giulianea*: RSCI 33 (1979) 420-434; G. Bonamente, *G. l'Apostata e il Breviario di Eutropio*, Rome 1986; D.M. Cosi, *Casta mater Idaea: G. l'Apostata e l'etica della sessualità*, Venezia 1986; G. Vidal, *G.*, It. tr., Milan 1990; P. Athanassiadi, *G.: ultimo degli imperatori pagani*, It. tr., Genoa 1994; F.E. Consolino et al., *Pagani e cristiani da G. l'Apostata al sacco di Roma*. Atti del Conv. int. di studi, Rende, 12-13 novembre 1993, Soveria Mannelli 1995; C. Franco, *L'immagine di Alessandro in G. imperatore*: Studi Classici e Or. 46 (1997-98) 637-658; *G. imperatore, le sue idee, i suoi amici, i suoi avversari*. Atti del conv. int. di studi, Lecce 10-12 dicembre 1998, Galatina 1998, with many very important essays; C. Buenacasa, *La política religiosa del emperador Juliano y los Valentinianos. Los privilegios de la Iglesia entre los años 361-372*, in *Homenaje el Profesor Montenegro. Estudios de Historia Antigua*, Valladolid 1999, 737-748.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

JULIAN of Brioude (d. 250?). There are two *Passiones* of this famous martyr of Brioude in the Auvergne, the older of which offers more reliable information. *Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* 3,7) and *Gregory of Tours (*Libri Octo Miraculorum*, 2), who was very attached to the veneration of Julian, mention him. Born at *Vienne, he fled during a persecution (perhaps that of Decius) to Brioude, where he was decapitated. His head was brought to Vienne while his body was buried at Brioude. In the 5th c. a basilica was built on the tomb of Julian, which became the most important sanctuary in the Auvergne. Eligius of Noyon decorated his tomb.

BHL 4540-4542; BS 6, 1191; P. Cubizolles, *S. Julien de Brioude, martyr*, Brioude 1987; M. Vieillard-Troiekouroff, *Les monuments religieux de la Gaule d'après les oeuvres de Grégoire de Tours*, Paris 1976, 65-70.

S. Samulowitz

JULIAN of Cos (d. before 460). Born in *Italy and educated at *Rome, bishop of Cos (the island of Cos or else Cos in Bithynia). He took part in 448 in the Synod of *Constantinople. He was one of the legates of *Leo I to the Council of *Chalcedon (451). For supporting Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople who sought to have can. 28 of the council acknowledged, concerning the primacy of his see, he was reproved by Leo, but he did not lose his confidence. He was the first permanent papal representative at the imperial court, charged with watching over orthodoxy and providing information to the pope; further, he was also employed in the translation of contemporary synodal acts. He died at Constantinople before 460.

ACO II/5 (34) 66,1-39. - T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, London 1941; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979, 114-118; LTK[3] 5, 1079f.; Ph. Blaudeau, *Vice mea. Remarques sur les représentations pontificales auprès de l'empereur d'Orient dans la seconde moitié du V^e^ siècle* (452-496): MEFRA 113 (2002) 1058-1123; DHGE 28, 523-524.

B. Studer

JULIAN of Eclanum (386–454). Son of the bishop Memor, at around 30 years of age (in 416) he was consecrated bishop of Eclanum (the ancient Quintodecimo, Aquaputida in Apulia, today Mirabella Eclano near Avellino in Campania). He was already known to *Augustine due to his friendship with his

father (*Ep.* 101; *C. Iulianum* 1,4,12), who had been his guest in Hippo in 408 (*Ep.* 101,1-4 requested for Julian *De musica* and Augustine expressed the wish to have the son Julian as a guest). Julian had paraphrased the *Chronicon* of *Sulpicius Severus (*Op. imp.* 5,24; 7,1-4). He became famous in the church when in 418 he refused to sign the *Ep. Tractoria* of Pope *Zosimus, which confirmed the condemnation of the *Pelagians, and wrote 2 letters to the pope to request explanations, accusing at the same time the church of Rome of prevarications and of collusion with *Manicheism (*Contra 2 ep. pelag.* 2,3,5). His request was not accepted, and furthermore he ran into the same condemnation as 18 Italian bishops who had also refused to sign the *Tractoria* (Aug., *C. Iulianum* 3,1-4). He turned then to the *comes* Valerius of Ravenna, who passed the request to Augustine. The latter answered him with the 1st book of *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (he wrote the 2nd after the response of Julian contained in the 4 books *Ad Turbantium*). Meanwhile, Augustine began to respond systematically to Julian: to the 2 letters of Julian (to Rufus and to the Romans) which Pope Boniface had sent him, with the work *Contra duas ep. pelagianorum;* to the 4 books to Turbantius with the *Contra Iulianum;* for the refutation of the 8 books of Julian (*Ad Florum*) written in response to the 2nd book of Augustine's *De nup. et conc.,* he waited until the end of his life (*Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem opus imperfectum*), without, however, completing it (he finished refuting 6 of the books). Beyond the polemic with Augustine, Julian also had a sizeable exegetical activity, along the lines of the *Antiochene school, both as an exegete (Commentary on the Minor Prophets and on Job) and as a translator (*Th. Mopsuesteni in psalmos*: CCL 88, 1978). Attempts to reconcile him with the Church of Rome met with no success, and he died in exile, perhaps in Sicily. The polemical activity of Julian with Augustine is filled with acrimony: he reproves Augustine over many things, both on a familiar and personal level as well as concerning what is the proper interpretation of Christianity. He accused him of denying free will, of devaluing the importance of the law in the Christian life, of resurrecting Manicheism with his defense of original sin, denying, as a result, both the goodness of marriage and the very goodness of human sensibility because it is infected with "concupiscence." His accusations against Augustine were radical and global and, perhaps, for that reason received a detailed and meticulous response from Augustine himself.

The work of Julian should be studied for its literary value (style, language and models employed); for its *exegesis (from his use of the biblical text close to the circles of Aquileia, to his exegesis which favored an Antiochene approach); for its theological method. Concerning theological method, of the 3 common sources of theological research (the Scriptures, *ratio* [reason] and the authority of holy men), he puts *ratio* in 1st place because it constitutes intrinsic argumentation compared to the extrinsic ones of the Scriptures and authority. He writes: *Quod ratio arguit, non potest auctoritas vindicare* (Aug., *Opus imp.* 2,16). It escaped Julian, "architect of the Pelagian dogma" (Aug., *C. Iulianum* 6,11,36), however, that the primacy of reason is of the order of the presuppositions for logical knowledge and not of judgment in itself. As for his theological thought, esp. notable in him is the depth on the ethical plane (nature and goodness of sensibility and therefore of marriage) of the basic principle of Pelagian theology, that of the creation. However, compared to Augustine, he lacks a global vision of the Christian mystery whose historical trajectory starts from the creation, passes through the two Adams and ends at the eternity of God. The discussion with Augustine (between a Punic and an Apulian orator *Op. imp.* 6,18) took place above all on the exegetical plane and that of method: the hermeneutical key (*Op. imp.* 2,22), the role of the doctrinal authorities within the church (*Op. imp.* 2,1, the appeal above all concerned *Ambrose), and the theological points of contact (Augustine reproached Julian, noting that the idea of the Christian people as a witness to the Christian faith was alien to him and that in his arguments he was not preserving the universality of the redemption in Christ [*Op. imp.* 2,188]).

CPL 773-777; Verzeichnis, 414-416 and see esp. Patrologia III, 463; PL 44; CCL 88A (1977); CCL 88 (1978); A. Brückner, *Julianum von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus* (TU 15/13), Leipzig 1897; G. Bowman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar Zu den Propheten Osee, Joel und Amos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese*, Rome 1958; H.I. Marrou, *La canonisation de Julien d'Eclane*: Hist. Jahrbuch 77 (1958) 434-437 (= Festchrift B. Altaner); F. Perago, Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Napoli 10 (1962-1963) 143-160; F. Refoulé, *Julien d'Eclane, théologien et philosophe*: Rec-SR 52 (1964) 42-84, 233-247; N. Cipriani, *Aspetti letterari dell'Ad Florum di Giuliano d'Eclano*: Augustinianum 15 (1975) 125-167; Y.-M. Duval, *Julien d'Eclane et Rufin d'Aquilée. Du concile de Rimini à la répression pélagienne. L'intervention impériale en matière religieuse*: REAug 24 (1978) 243-271; Patrologia III, 460-464; N. Cipriani, *Echi antiapollinaristici e aristotelismo nella polemica di G. d'Eclano*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 373-389; Ph.L. Barclift, *In Controversy with Augustine: Julian of Aeclanum on the Nature of Sin*: Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 58 (1991) 5-20; N. Cipriani, *Introduzione*, in *Opere di S. Agostino*, NBA XIX/1-2, Rome 1992 and 1994; M. Lamberigts, *Julianum of Aeclanum: A Plea for a Good Creator*: Augustiniana 38 (1988) 5-24; Id., *Iulianus* IV: RAC 19, 149-150, 483-505; Id., *Recent Research into Pela-*

gianism with Particular Emphasis on the Role of Julian of Aeclanum: Augustiniana 52 (2002) 175-198; Ch. Pietri, *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604)*, I. (A-K), Rome 1999, 1175-1186; J. Lössl, *Te Apulia genuit* (*c. Iul. imp. op. 6,18*). *Some Notes on the Birthplace of Julian of Eclanum*: REAug 44 (1998) 223-239; Id., *Julianum von Aeclanum. Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werk, seiner Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung*, Leiden 2001; Id., *Julian of Aeclanum on Pain*: JECS 10 (2002) 203-243; M.C. Pennacchio, *L'esegesi patristica di Osea nei secoli IV-V. Teodoro di Mopsuestia, Teodoreto di Ciro, Cirillo di Alessandria, Girolamo, Giuliano di Eclano* (SEA 81), Rome 2002; R. Villegas Marín, *En polémica con Julián de Eclanum: por una nueva lectura del "Syllabus de gratia" de Próspero de Aquitania*: Augustinianum 43 (2003) 81-124; A.V. Nazzaro (ed.), *Giuliano d'Eclano e l'Hirpinia Christiana*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Mirabella Eclano 4-6 giugno 2003), Naples 2004.

V. Grossi

JULIAN of Halicarnassus (d. after 527). Bishop of Halicarnassus of *monophysite creed, around 510 he collaborated with *Severus of Antioch to foment at *Constantinople the disorders which led to the deposition of the patriarch *Macedonius. The antimonophysite reaction which followed the arrival to the throne of *Justin (518) forced him to take refuge, along with Severus, in Egypt. Already during the stay in Constantinople Severus had had occasion to define the body of Christ before the resurrection as corruptible (*phthartos*). Not convinced, Julian, around 520, wrote in Egypt a *Tomus* to demonstrate that the body of Christ had always been, by nature, immune to corruption, suffering and death. He sent the work to Severus so that he might examine it; the latter maintained his original position and replied in this sense, and the resulting polemic led to the rupture between the two friends. This ended around 527, and Julian, already old when he went to Egypt, must have died shortly after. Because of this controversy, beyond the *Tomus,* he wrote *Additions to the Tomus,* an *Apology* or *Discourse Against the Manicheans and the Eutychians, Against the Blasphemies of Severus*. All these works have been lost. We gather information and extensive fragments of them from the refutation which Severus wrote of the first 3 works, which has reached us in *Syriac translation; we add to them the accompanying letters of the first two works addressed to Severus and some other fragments derived from other works. Julian was immediately classified as a radical monophysite, in the sense that, acc. to him, the incarnation of the Logos had provoked an alteration of the characteristics of the body of Christ—i.e., its incorruptibility—and therefore his followers were named *aphthartodocetists; but the studies of Draguet have notably altered this judgment. In fact, while Severus minimized the effects which the sin of Adam had produced in his descendants and thought that Adam was created *ab origine* corruptible and mortal, Julian thought that Adam was created incorruptible and immortal, and that corruptibility and mortality were the consequences of sin. Therefore, given that Christ was immune from sin, his body, like that of Adam before sin, was immune to corruptibility, passibility and mortality, while Severus maintained that the body of Christ had assumed these gifts only after the resurrection. With this Julian meant to maintain, not as he was accused, i.e., that the sufferings of Christ had only been apparent, but rather that Christ, naturally immune to suffering and death, had suffered and died of his own will. With the idea of voluntary corruptibility and mortality Julian thought he had reconciled the reality of the passion and death of Christ with the absence in him of original *sin. The doctrine of Julian had a certain following in various regions of the East, esp. in Egypt, where one of his friends, *Gaianus, succeeded for a little while in occupying the patriarchal see of *Alexandria. For this reason the Julianists were also called Gaianists.

CPG III, 7125-7127; CSCO 244-245; DTC 8, 1931-1940; R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche*, Louvain 1924; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*, (CSCO 127 Sub 2), Leuven 1951, 125-131; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, II.2, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1989, 83-116; TRE 16, 739, 29-41; H.U. Rosenbaum, *Julianos v. Halikarnass*: BBKL 3 (1992) 792-794; R. Kany, *Julianos v. Halikarnassos*: LTK³ 5, 1078; *Julian of Halicarnassus*: ODC (1998) 909; LACL (1998) 362.

M. Simonetti

JULIAN of Serdica (5th c.). Bishop of *Serdica. He took part in the Council of *Ephesus (431), taking up the defense of *John of Antioch, which he maintained until his death (Mansi 4, 1411; 5, 767; Theodoret, *Ep.* 170). With him Julian signed the letter to the church of Hierapolis (Mansi 5, 776).

CPG 5798; ACO 1, 1, 7, 139-140; C. Hole: DBC 3, 472; DHGE 28, 531-532.

S. Borzì

JULIAN of Tabia (5th c.). Bishop of Tabia, he played a primary role in the acknowledgment of the *monophysite theses of *Eutyches and in the condemnation of Flavian during the "latrocinium of Ephesus" (449). He took part in the Council of *Chalcedon in 451 (Mansi 6, 571, 546, 1092; 7, 147, 404). He informed the emperor *Leo of the death of Poterius (458) (Mansi 7, 616). He wrote many ser-

mons, preserved in *Georgian and Old Russian, and a sermon on the baptism of Christ, this too known in Georgian.

CPG 6155; J.W. Dawis: DCB 3, 472, n. 21; K. Kekelidze, *Monumenta Hagiographica Georgica. Pars prima, Keimena*, t. I, Tiflis 1918, 10-15; M. von Esbroeck, *Les plus anciennes homéliaires géorgiens* (Publication de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 10), Louvain-la-Neuve 1975, 73, 297f.

S. Borzì

JULIAN of Toledo (642–690). Bishop of Toledo. Felix, his successor, wrote his *elogium* (PL 96, 445-452), without speaking of his family; a later source, well informed, the *Mozarabic Chronicle* of 754, considers him a descendant of Jews: a rather surprising bit of information, but which might be true. He was trained in the school of the Toledan bishopric, under the guidance of the bishop *Eugenius. He received tonsure toward 668 and in January of 680 was consecrated bishop of Toledo. He participated in some way in the deposition of King Wamba and the election of Ervig, with whom he collaborated and toward whom he was always a good friend.

During his government four Toledan councils were held (from 12th to 15th), and he always presided. He obtained that the diocese of Toledo should always be the first see of all *Spain. His conception of the Church of Spain as a single entity, with the see of Toledo at its head, probably provoked his famous conflict with Rome. In the name of the Church of Spain, he confirmed the Acts of the 6th Ecumenical Council, and for this he was censured by Pope *Benedict II, who reproached him for several perilous expressions in the *Apologeticum,* composed by him to defend those acts, and which at a later time was ratified in all its parts by the 14th Council of Toledo. In 688, the 15th Council of Toledo approved a new text by Julian, where he insisted on the formulas used in the *Apologeticum*; the council adopted it, harshly censuring the Roman theologians who chose not to understand the theological subtleties, although orthodox, of the first text of Julian. The Church of Spain's awareness of itself was about to provoke a conflict with Rome with consequences unforeseeable at that time. The certainty and exactness with which Julian treated the writings of the Fathers is the best demonstration of his intellectual capacity and of the richness of the library of the church of Toledo. Preoccupied by the problem of the ecclesiastical unity of the *Visigothic monarchy, Julian strove to definitively unify the Spanish liturgy (*see* *Hispanic liturgy), imposing common norms and rites, which were put in practice in 682–683. He supervised the classical and theological education of his clergy one on one, given that he himself, in all likelihood, was responsible for some lessons of the *Grammatica*, which survive in a mediocre elaboration.

He died in 690 and was buried in the Toledan church of St. Leocadia, where the councils of Toledo customarily met.

In honor of *Idalius of Barcelona he composed a treatise on the last things, in the form of a *catena* of patristic texts: the *Prognosticon futuri saeculi,* which was popular in the Middle Ages. At the request of King Ervig, as part of anti-Jewish polemics, he wrote three books—*De comprobatione sextae aetatis*. To facilitate biblical studies, he wrote two books *Antikeimenon,* where he tried to explain the contradictions between the two testaments. His *Historia de Wamba,* where he narrates the rebellion of Paul, general of *Gaul, against that king, was perhaps born from political pressures. Its appendices (*Insultatio in tyrannidem Galliae* and *Judicium*) taken as a rhetorical whole reflect a propagandistic tone. The warm elegy of *Ildefonsus, which he added as an appendix to Ildefonsus's treatise *De viris illustribus*, should be read in light of his political stance in which he sought to exalt the church of Toledo—a policy, furthermore, already begun by *Ildefonsus.

Recently a letter in verse has been attributed to him, addressed to a certain bishop Modoenus, in which metric poetry is preferred to rhythmic (Bischoff). On the other hand, on the base of the *elogium* of Felix many other writings are considered the work of Julian, concerning which, however, criticism has not yet provided a definitive pronouncement. This is the case of the *Liber responsionum,* the *Liber carminum diversorum,* the *Liber sermonum,* the *Excerpta de libris S. Augustini,* but also of the *Libellus de divinis iudiciis,* the *Liber missarum,* the *Liber orationum* and the *Liber plurimarum epistolarum.*

CPL 1258-1266; Díaz 264-277; PL 96, 43-44, 453-800; PLS 4, 2289-2292; CCL 115; M.A.H. Maestre Yenes, *Ars Juliani Toletani Episcopi*, Toledo 1973; F. Görres, *Der Primas Julian von Toledo* (680-690): Zeitschrift fur wissenschaftliche Theologie 46 (1903) 524-533; Z. García Villada, *Historia ec. de España*, II, 1, 96-106, 149-160; A. Veiga Valina, *La doctrina escatológica de S. Julián de Toledo*, Lugo 1940; J.F. Rivera Recio, *San Julián, Arzobispo de Toledo*, Barcelona 1944; J. Madoz, *San Julián de Toledo*: EstEcl 26 (1952) 36-69; Id., *Fuentes teológico-literarias de S. Julián de Toledo*: Gregorianum 33 (1952) 399-417; J.N. Hillgarth, *El Prognosticon futuri saeculi de S. Julián de Toledo*: AST 30 (1957) 5-61; B. Bischoff, *Ein Brief Julians von Toledo über Rhythmen, metrische Dichtung und Prosa*: Hermes 67 (1959) 247-256; A. Robles Sierra, *Fuentes literarias del Antikeimenon de Julián de Toledo*: Escritos del Vedat 1 (1971) 58-135; MC. Díaz y Díaz, *La fecha de implantación del oracional festivo visigótico*: Boletín Arqueologico (Tarragona) 113-120 (1971/2) 215-243; DHEE 2,

1259-1260; J. Campos, *San Agustín y la escatología de San Julián de Toledo*: Augustinus 25 (1980) 107-115; M. Strohm, *Der Konflikt zwischen Erzbischof Julian von Toledo und Papst Benedikt II*: Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum 15 (1983) 249-259; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 389-453.

M. Díaz y Díaz

JULIAN POMERIUS (5th–6th c.). A native of Mauretania, he settled in S *Gaul, perhaps due to the difficulties following the *Vandal invasion, and lived at *Arles in the 2nd half of the 5th c., becoming famous there for his teaching and his rhetorical expertise. He was in contact with the illustrious figures of his time, such as *Ennodius of Pavia, *Caesarius of Arles (whose teacher he was when, in 498, Caesarius left the monastery of *Lérins to settle at Arles) and *Ruricius of Limoges. The latter (*Epist.* II, 10) calls him abbot, while ps.-Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 109) says he was a presbyter of the Gallican church. Ps.-Gennadius and *Isidore of Seville (*Vir. ill.* 25) attribute numerous writings to him. Only the treatise has reached us, in three books, *De vita contemplativa,* once attributed to *Prosper of Aquitaine, now claimed for Julian Pomerius with general agreement. The title is more properly adapted to the first book, while the second and third confront the broad theme of the Christian virtues and the appropriate means for practicing them.

CPL 998; PL 59, 415-520; *The Contemplative Life*, Eng. tr., M.J. Suelzer, Westminster, MD 1947, repr. New York 1978; *La vita contemplativa*, It. tr., M. Spinelli, Rome 1987; *La vie contemplative*, Fr. tr., R. Jobard - L. Gagliardi, Paris 1995. *Studies*: F. Degenhart, *Studien zu Iulianus Pomerius*, Eichstätt 1903; J.C. Plumpe, *Pomeriana*: VChr 1 (1947) 227-239; É. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, III, Paris 1965, 78-80; C. Tibiletti, *La teologia della grazia in Giuliano Pomerio. Alle origini dell'agostinismo provenzale*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 489-506; M. Spinelli, *Il sacerdos docens nel De vita contemplativa di Giuliano Pomerio*, in *Crescita dell'uomo nella catechesi dei Padri* (*età postnicena*), ed. S. Felici, Rome 1988, 287-300.

S. Pricoco

JULIUS AFRICANUS (d. 240). Sextus Julius Africanus, a native of Aelia Capitolina (*Jerusalem), was an official under *Septimius Severus. We know that Alexander Severus charged him with organizing a library at *Rome in the Pantheon. He was at *Alexandria at the school of Heracles and made the acquaintance of *Origen. We find him later in *Palestine, at Nicopolis, where he died around 240. There are only fragments surviving of the two principal works composed by him: the *Chronicles,* starting from the creation of the world up to 221, put side by side in a synchronic form biblical dates and events with the events of Greek and Roman history. Julius Africanus, who compiled the work with probably millenarist intentions, fixed the duration of the world at 6,000 years and the birth of Christ at the year 5,500. *Eusebius, who opposed his millenarist understanding, profited from his material, which appears to us to be assembled with little critical sense. The *Kestoi* (*Embroideries*), in 24 books, were, as the title says, a miscellaneous work, in which the author treated the most varied themes: medicine, magic, military art. It must have been a work of mostly profane subjects, which constituted at that time an exceptional case for a Christian author. Beyond fragments of a letter to Aristides, which treats the gospel genealogies of Christ, his letter to Origen has reached us intact, together with the latter's response, concerning the episode of Susanna in the book of Daniel. Julius Africanus maintains that this episode, of which the Hebrew text is not known, but only the Greek one, was originally composed in Greek. The arguments adopted in support are disparate: next to obvious naivetés on the condition of the Jews in Babylon, on the citation of passages of the OT in other OT works etc., they contain pointed arguments, such as when he points out that certain wordplays present in the Greek text could hardly derive from a Hebrew original. In fact, as far as we can tell from the little left in our possession, the cultural and critical education of Julius Africanus does not seem homogeneous, alternating between information with very little critical evaluation and sharp and important intuitions. His *Chronicles,* although connected with the millenarist idea, already declining at his time, represented a novelty, proposing in the Christian context the idea of a history extended to cover the entire duration of the world and, in this sense, they mark the beginning of an important literary genre.

PG 10, 63-94; Quasten I, 399-400 (bibl.); J.R. Vieillefond, *Les "Cestes" de Julius Africanus. Étude sur l'ensemble des fragments avec édition, traduction et commentaires*, Florence-Paris 1970; H. Chantraine, *Der metrologische Traktat des Sextus Iulius Africanus, seine Zugehörigkeit zu den* KESTOI *und seine Authentizität*: Hermes 105 (1977) 422-441; F.C.R. Thee, *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*, Tübingen 1984; BBKL III, 819-824.

M. Simonetti

JULIUS CASSIAN (2nd c.). An *encratite, of unknown origin, he lived around the middle of the 2nd c. and is known to us essentially through the testimony of *Clement of Alexandria, who mentions two of his

works, the Ἐξηγητικά and the Περὶ ἐγκρατείας ἢ περὶ εὐνουχίας. Thus we know that in the Ἐξηγητικά, in a similar way to *Tatian, on whom he probably depended, and following a preceding Jewish-Alexandrian tradition, he maintained the chronological priority as well as the spiritual superiority of Moses and the "Hebraic philosophy" (and therefore also Christian) compared with pagan wisdom. A passage from this text was cited literally by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* I, 101,2-107,6 (reproduced by Eus., *Praep. evang.* X, 12,1-4). In the Περὶ ἐγκρατείας ἢ περὶ εὐνουχίας (*Continence or Perfect Chastity*), on the other hand, inspired as to the title by Mt 19:12, he defended encratitic ideas, on the basis of *Platonic or Platonizing concepts (e.g., the preexistence of the soul, fallen and imprisoned in the body) and of *gnostic (*Valentinian) ascetic concepts.

Making use of the *Gospel According to the Egyptians* (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III, 13,91,1-93,3), Julius Cassian rigorously forbade the generation of children, while he considered the flesh of Christ only apparent.

F. Bolgiani, *La tradizione eresiologica sull'Encratismo II. La confutazione di Clemente d'Alessandria*: AAT 96 (1961–1962) 537-664; P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milan 1978, 222-242 (which connects the doctrine of original sin to Cassian, without, however, considering that this doctrine was already widely present in late Judaism); *Atti del Convegno "La tradition de l'Enkrateia,"* Milan 20-23 aprile 1982, Milan 1985; RAC 5, 343-365; LACL 409.

F. Bolgiani

JULIUS I, pope (337–352). Involved in the post-Nicene controversies, Julius defended *Athanasius against the party of *Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Eusebians, as Athanasius himself called them. In a synod which united more than fifty bishops, among whom were also Alexandrian representatives (340/341), he recognized almost as supreme judge the authority of Athanasius, whom the Eusebians had wanted to replace with *Gregory of Cappadocia, as well as that of *Marcellus of Ancyra, who had confessed his faith with the Roman symbol (DS 11). Due to the Eastern protests, expressed above all by the synod held in 341 on the occasion of the dedication of the great church of *Antioch (Athan., *Synod.* 21), the emperors convened an "ecumenical" council at *Serdica (342/343). After the departure of the Easterners, the Westerners, under the guidance of *Ossius, approved the opinion of Julius. On this occasion they also accepted the right of the bishops, condemned in whatever provincial synod, to appeal to the Roman see (Mirbt, n. 272-274). Although the decisions of Serdica were not accepted by the Easterners (Mirbt, n. 275)—and indeed not even confirmed in the West—they nevertheless reflected the new ecclesiology which had developed in those very complex controversies during which Julius had anticipated the papal theory, founded both on the authority of Peter and that of Nicaea (Athan., *Apol.* II, 21-35: Mirbt, 271). According to the *Liber pontificalis* (36), Julius reorganized the Roman chancery and had two basilicas (St. Maria in Trastevere; St. Apostolorum) and some cemeteries built.

CPL 1627. Athanasius, *Apol.* II, 21-35; *Ep.* 2; AASS Apr. 2, 1675, 82-86; Jaffé 61, 30f. - J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain: IVe et Ve s.*, Paris 1958; V. Monachino, *Il primato nella controversia ariana*, in *Saggi storici intorno al Papato*, Rome 1959, 17-90; W. Gessel, *Das primatiale Bewusstsein Julius I. im Lichte der Interaktionen zwischen Cathedra Petri und den zeitgenössischen Synoden*, in FS H. Tüchle, Paderborn 1975, 63-74; Simonetti, 135-209; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, 187-237; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979, esp. 359-362; J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*: PTS 39, Berlin 1994; LTK3 5, 1083; B. Studer, *Eusebius e i rapporti con la Chiesa di Roma*, in E. dal Covolo et al. (ed.), *Eusebius di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, Rome 1997, 181-189; RGG 4 (2001) 695-696; LACL (2002) 410.

B. Studer

JULIUS of Aqfahs. Julius of Aqfahs (Khevehs, prov. of Minieh, Egypt) passes for the author of a cycle of Egyptian hagiographic legends. He supposedly got himself assigned to the prefect of Egypt as a secretary in order to be able to approach the martyrs, listen to their declarations, be present at their martyrdoms, bury their bodies and write their *Passions*. All the typical motifs of the epic *Passions* appear in them: beyond the eyewitness and the burier of the martyrs, who is then Julius himself, there is the sadistic magistrate, torturers appear with chains, the tortures are multiplied, and the martyrs die and revive many times before dying definitively. Julius himself at the end becomes a martyr. In the account of his *Passion*, the *Coptic hagiographic legend reaches the utmost unlikelihood: Julius dies six times and revives five times before receiving the crown of martyrdom. The goal which the author sets himself is not only to justify the conversion of the governor Armenius, and not even to put Julius above the other martyrs, but also to ensure, due to divine omnipotence, the corporal integrity of the martyr at the resurrection of the dead. There is reason to fear that the cult of which Julius ended up being the object is merely the product of a legend without any historic foundation. His feast is fixed as 19 September.

BS 6, 1226-1231; *Atti di Giulio di Aqfahs*, ed. R. Cerulli, CSCO

190.191, Scr. Aet. 37.38, Leuven 1959; Th. Baumeister, *Martyr invictus*, Münster/W. 1972, 116-117; U. Zanetti, *Une pseudo-homélie d'Alexandre d'Alexandrie sur S. Jules d'Aqfahs* (*CPG 2017*): AB 115 (1997) 130-132.

V. Saxer

JULIUS of Puteoli (5th c.). According to two letters of *Leo I (*Ep.* 28,6; 33,2), Julius, bishop of Puteoli (Pozzuoli), together with the presbyter Renatus and the deacon Hilary, were part of the delegation which represented the apostolic see at the Synod of *Ephesus in the year 449, in which, against the indications of the **Tomus ad Flavianum,* brought by the delegation to the East, *Eutyches was rehabilitated; Flavian, however, was condemned and mistreated.

See the editors' notes in PL 54; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, London 1941, 238ff.

B. Studer

JUNILIUS (6th c.). A learned African active in the middle of the 6th c., he dedicated to *Primasius the *Instituta regularia divinae legis,* a small introductory manual for the interpretation of the Holy Scripture, which the author declares to have received from *Paul of Nisibis. With a dry and precise style, new for this literary genre, and in the form of questions and answers, Junilius treated the number of the sacred books, the authors, form, content etc. The details on *typos*—i.e., on the criteria of *allegorical interpretation—are interesting. The work is characteristic of an era which now conceived of culture above all in a manualistic and encyclopedic form.

CPL 872; PL 68, 15-42; Moricca III, 2, 1482-1485; B. Marotta Mannino, *Gli "Instituta" di Giunilio: alcuni aspetti esegetici*: AnSE 8/2 (1991) 405-419; BBKL III, 883-885.

M. Simonetti

JUNIUS BASSUS (317–359). Son of Junius Bassus, praetorian prefect (318–331) and consul in 331, he died shortly after his nomination as prefect of *Rome, receiving baptism as a neophyte, perhaps on his deathbed (Ammianus 17,11,5: *qui recens promotus urbi praefectus, fatali decesserat sorte;* see Prudentius, *Contra Symm.* 1,558-560), 25 August 359. This information is gained from the inscription placed on the upper edge of the *sarcophagus, which indicates his social condition (*vir clarissimus*), his age and the date of death, his office (prefect of the city, his most important charge, which also included leadership of the senate), and his Christian faith (*iit in Deum*). An inscription on an architrave which mentions him has recently been found in the Forum of Caesar (*praefectus Urbis Iunius Bassus*), witnessing to a Late Antique restoration not known before now. His name is linked to the sarcophagus found in 1597, which is now in the Museum of the Treasury of St. Peter's in Rome, considered the king of Christian sarcophagi. Understanding it, in the richness of its representations of biblical scenes, requires knowledge of the biblical exegesis of the time, when *allegory was the normal mode of interpretation. On this exegetical background, it is very elaborate from a stylistic and iconographic point of view, a product of sophisticated thought, where there is ample use of typology and allegory, which allows the artist to represent on the sarcophagus a great profusion of biblical themes.

PLRE 1, 155 n. 15; E. Struthers Malbon, *The Iconography of the Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus*, Princeton, NJ 1990.

A. Di Berardino

JUSTICE. *See* *RIGHTEOUSNESS (Justice)

JUSTIFICATION. Justification is the focal point of the problem of Christian salvation, because it contains the grace which saves. It involves the Scripture, dogmatics, history and spirituality.

In the Scripture the terms *just—justice—justify—justification* are rich with different nuances. Especially in St. Paul, where four aspects can be distinguished:

1. Christological. The justification of humanity is Christ, "who became for us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor 1:30). He merited it and is its model, and is both the efficient and final cause. For "as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man's act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all" (Rom 5:18).

2. Charismatic. Justification is a gratuitous gift of God. "Since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; they are now justified by his grace as a gift" (Rom 3:23-24). "For no man will be justified in his sight by deeds prescribed by the law," but "man is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law" (Rom 3:20, 28).

3. Dynamic. Justification is a seed destined to grow and to bear rich fruits: "Speaking the truth in love, we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ" (Eph 4:15).

4. Eschatological. Justification begins here on earth and is interior but will have its fulfillment only

in Heaven, after the resurrection, which will see the destruction also of "the last enemy . . . death" (1 Cor 15:26). For we have been saved (Tit 3:5), but "in hope" (Rom 8:24); adopted (Gal 4:5), but we are waiting for adoption (Rom 8:23); renewed (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:5; Eph 4:23), but we must renew ourselves day by day (2 Cor 4:15); regenerated (Tit 3:5), but we are waiting for the regeneration (Mt 19:28).

Justification, therefore, is a large and complex notion which includes the present and the future and is essentially, even if not exclusively, eschatological. It includes both the remission of sins, which is "full and total," "full and perfect" (Aug., *De pecc. mer. et rem.* 2,7,9) and the interior renewal or "new creation" (Gal 6:15; cf. Eph 2:10). The "new creation" indicates and possesses richness and profundity which theological teaching has brought out. Among others: the restoration of the image of the Triune God in humanity, whose image, "immortally impressed on the immortal nature of the soul" (Aug., *Trin.* 14,4,6), was discolored, deformed, obscured, wounded, although not destroyed, by sin: by means of justification it is "renewed from oldness, reformed from deformation, beatified from unhappiness" (Aug., *Trin.* 14,13,18; 14,16,22); the divine sonship: "You have received a spirit of adoption . . . and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ" (Rom 8:15-17); the "righteousness/justice of God" (Rom 3:21), "not that with which God himself is just, but that with which God renders us just" (Aug., *Trin.* 14,12,15); participation in the divine nature: "He has given us the precious and very great promises, so that through them you may . . . become *participants in the divine nature*" (2 Pet 1:4) through which God becomes the life of the soul just as the soul is the life of the body (see Aug., *Enarr. in ps.* 70, *serm.* 2,3; *Serm.* 65,5-8; *In Jo. Ev.* tr. 19,11-13); deification, which is a concept and expression dear to the fathers of the church, esp. but not only of the East: "He who justifies is the same who deifies . . . and that by the grace of adoption, not by the nature proceeding from generation" (Aug., *Enarr. in ps.* 49,2); indwelling of the *Holy Spirit (1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19-20), through which God, who is everywhere with the presence of divinity, is not everywhere with the grace of indwelling, but only in those who mysteriously make up his temple, as is the case with baptized children (see Aug., *Ep.* 187); friendship with God through the charity which the Holy Spirit diffuses into hearts (Rom 5:5): the Triune God (Jn 14:23) is present in the just "as the known in the knower and the loved in the lover" (St. Thomas, *ST*, I, q. 43, a. 3); the last effect of justification will be the resurrection of the flesh when the entire person, like Christ, will be a "new creation," that is just and immortal.

In history the nature of justification has been questioned indirectly by the *Pelagians and directly by the Lutherans. The Pelagians, with the doctrines of an original *sin that is spread by imitation (of Adam) and of *impeccantia* and of grace given acc. to merits, deformed the Pauline notion of grace. The Lutherans insisted on St. Paul, but, starting from an opposite notion of original sin, reached the point of leaving in shadow or denying an aspect, the interior, that is also essential part of justification. The internal renewal is considered by Lutherans to occur in the realm of the sanctification of the individual as a result of justification, which they view forensically rather than as a process.

Catholic doctrine passes between these two extremes. The most solemn and important document of this doctrine is the *Decree on Justification* of the Council of Trent, which contains not only the clarification of the controversial questions but also a synthesis of the dogmatic and spiritual doctrine of salvation: nature, gift, causes of justification; preparation, nourishment, observance of the divine commandments; the possibility of losing it, the obligation of reacquiring it, trust in God, who "does not abandon if he is not abandoned"; fruits of justification or doctrine of merits, which are also a gift of God, but do not exclude—but rather, includes—the free cooperation of humanity, which grace provokes and accompanies.

Already St. Augustine, at the beginning of the 5th c., had illustrated this same doctrine in substance when, in the Pelagian controversy, he maintained that justification was necessary, because we are all born sinners; is gratuitous, because it is a gift of God which we cannot merit; is interior, because it forgives all sins entirely; is progressive, because, after the justification, the *mortalitas* and *infirmitas* remain which prevent the perfection of the just person from being perfect: for perfection will not arrive until "death has been swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor 15:54). Justification, finally, is the foundation of the merit of good works, which are therefore a merit, indeed, but gratuitous, since God, "crowning our merits, crowns his gifts" (*Ep.* 194, 6 and 19).

δικαιοσύνη, TWNT 2,194-214 (TDNT 2, 192-219); DTC: *Justification* 16, 2042-2227; *Dizionario dei concetti biblici del NT*, It. tr., Bologna 1971, 799-808; M. Flick - Z. Alszeghy, *Il vangelo della grazia*, Florence 1967; P. Grech, *Le idee fondamentali del NT*, Rome 1968; H. Küng, *La giustificazione*, Brescia 1969; J. Auer, *Il Vangelo della grazia*, It. tr.., Assisi 1971; M. Flick - Z. Alszeghy, *Fondamenti di una antropologia teologica*, Florence 1973; *Mysterium salutis*, 9, Brescia 1975; B. Drewery, *Deification*, London 1975; A. Trapè, *Introduzione generale a*: s. Agostino,

Natura e grazia, NBA 17/1, Rome 1981, 7-215; M.A. Seifrid, *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme*, Leiden 1992; A.E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, Cambridge ²1998.

A. Trapè

JUSTIN, gnostic (2nd–3rd c.). The only source for knowledge about this *gnostic who lived between the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd c. AD is represented by *Hippolytus, *Ref.* V, 23-27 (125,3–133,24 Wendland) and X, 15 (276,10–277,14); chap. 15 of book X is nothing other than a succinct summary of the system exposed more amply in the long chap. 26 of book V (126,29–132,23). In chap. 24 (126,2-5) Hippolytus says he obtained the information which he is about to repeat from the *Book of Baruch* of Justin. The latter believed in three principles: the absolute Good, which was masculine, Elohim, likewise masculine, and a feminine Eden, a girl in her upper part and spider below. From the union between Elohim and Eden the twelve angels of Elohim and the twelve angels of Eden were born, destined to form the terrestrial paradise of Genesis. The third angel of Elohim is Baruch, who found his symbol in the tree of life of Gen 2:9, while the third angel of Eden, Naas, principle of evil, of transgression and of sin, is symbolized by the tree of knowledge of good and evil and by the serpent (see Gen 2:9 and 3:1). The creation of humanity derives from the combined activity of Elohim and Eden: while Elohim breathes the spirit into him, Eden gives rise to his soul and body. Elohim suddenly realizes the existence of a Good superior to himself, rises toward it, surpassing the limit of the sensible world, and remains near it, obeying its invitation; Eden, abandoned, unleashes her anger on the sensible world and on humanity, putting their πνεῦμα to a hard test through Naas, who rapes both Eve and Adam. To save the πνεῦμα which originated from himself, Elohim, who now can no longer leave the Good, sends his third angel into the world, Baruch, who in the OT is symbolized by God, who speaks to Adam and Eve and to Moses. Jesus too is tempted unsuccessfully by Naas, who finally has him crucified. In *Ref.* V, 24 and 27, Hippolytus reproduces the formula of the gnostic oath used by Justin's sect; to describe the object of the higher gnosis Justin (chap. 24, 125,25-26; cap. 27, 133,4-5) turns to the famous passage of 1 Cor 2:9 just as *Clement of Alexandria does, *Strom.* V, 40,1 (on this coincidence cf. E. Baert, FZPhTh 12 [1965] 462 and S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 181). In *Ref.* V, 27 (133,6-12) Hippolytus also records the difference, established by Justin, between the living water which is spoken of in Jn 4:10, destined for the πνευματικοί and for Elohim, and the material water, destined for the χοϊκοί and the ψυχικοί.

W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, 27-33; A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I, 1, Leipzig 1893, 169; G.R.S. Mead, *Frammenti di una fede dimenticata. Brevi studi sugli gnostici*, Milan 1909, 144-147; E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et gnosticisme*, Paris 1913, 187-194; J.P. Steffes, *Das Wesen des Gnostizismus und sein Verhältnis zum Katholischen Dogma* (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte XIV, 4), Paderborn 1922, 128-133; E. Haehnchen, *Das Buch Baruch: Ein Beitrag zum problem der christlichen Gnosis*: ZTK 50 (1953) 123-158; W. Foerster, *Das Buch Baruch*, in *Die Gnosis*, I, Zürich-Stuttgart 1969, 65-79 (Eng. tr. W. Foerster, *Gnosis: A Selection of Texts*, transl. by R.McL. Wilson, Oxford 1972, 48-58); A. Orbe, *Hacia la primera teología de la procesión del verbo* (Estudios Valentinianos I/1) AG 99, Rome 1958, 232-245; Id., *La Christología de Justino gnóstico*: Estudios Eclesiásticos 47 (1972) 437-457; R.M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, London-New York 1959, 19-25, 41-42; H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, *Die mythologische Gnosis*, Göttingen 1964, 335-341; R. Haardt, *Die Gnosis, Wesen und Zeugnisse*, Salzburg 1967, 98-105; M. Simonetti, *Note sul libro di Baruch dello gnostico Giustino*: VetChr 6 (1969) 71-89; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen 1973, 133-134, 154, 276, 330; K. Rudolph, *Die Gnosis Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion*, Göttingen 1978, 158-160 (in Eng. tr. by R.McL. Wilson, Edinburgh 1983, 144-147); H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, Stuttgart 1985, 156-168; J. Montserrat-Torrents, *La philosophie du Livre de Baruch de Justin*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), SP 18,1, Kalamazoo 1985, 253-261; LTK³ 5, 1111; RAC Suppl. 1 (2001) 990. Cf. also the bibl. note of M. Maritano in G. Bosio - E. dal Covolo - M. Maritano, *Introduzione ai Padri della Chiesa* (*secoli II e III*), Turin 1991, XXV.

S. Lilla

JUSTIN I, emperor (450–527). Born in 450 at Bederiana in Illyria in a peasant family, Justin arrived in *Constantinople around 470, entered the army and fought against the Isaurians, the Persians and against the rebel Vitalian. In 518, after the death of *Anastasius I, he became emperor. Immediately after his coronation, under the pressure of monks of Chalcedonian orientation—among whom were the *acoemetae, who had organized a popular uprising and forced the patriarch *John II to recognize *Chalcedon, to reject the **Henoticon* of *Zeno and to restore communion with the see of Rome—he saw himself forced in 519 to ratify this decision with an edict, by which he resumed relations with Pope *Hormisdas. The pope sent his legates to Constantinople with a *Regula fidei Ormisdae,* in which the Council of Chalcedon and the **Tomus Leonis ad Flavianum* were recognized, while anathemas against *Nestorius, *Eutyches, *Dioscorus and other *monophysite leaders were decreed. Justin forced all the bishops to adhere to the faith of Hormisdas, adopting repressive measures against the dissenters.

This change provoked uneasiness in the empire and, in external politics, tensions with the king of the *Ostrogoths, *Theodoric, who viewed this alliance between the pope and the emperor with displeasure. His nephew *Justinian exercised great influence on the emperor in directing his political and religious choices; a few months before his uncle's death Justinian received the title of Augustus and was crowned by the patriarch; the two emperors immediately promulgated a very severe law against heretics. He died in August 527.

RAC 19, 763-778; A.A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge, MA 1950; K. Bihlmeyer - H. Tuechle, *Storia della Chiesa*, 1, Brescia 1989, 331-337; H. Jedin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III, Milan 1983, 17-27; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa II/1*, Brescia 1996, 431-448; var. aus., *Storia del Cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, 3, Rome 2002, 142-153.

C. Dell'Osso

JUSTIN II, emperor (565–578). Nephew of *Justinian I, in 552 he was commander in chief of the Palatine guard and then Caesar at odds with the son of *Germanus, cousin of Justinian, also named Justin. In 565 he became emperor and had to witness in 568 the invasion of *Italy on the part of the *Longobards (Lombards), the occupation of Cordoba in 572 on the part of the *Visigoths, while the N African positions and the Danube borders resisted and he had to defend himself against the Persians at the cost of harsh wars.

Under him a favorable period for the *monophysites began: the monophysite bishops in prison or in exile were released and could return to their sees. He applied himself, with the mediation of his legates, to resolve the internal quarrels among the monophysites and allowed *Jacob Baradeus to hold a conference at *Constantinople, but after months of discussion no result was reached, so he made an attempt with a *Henoticon* (567) in which he repeated the formulas of *Zeno, the *Three Chapters were condemned, the monophysites were amnestied, the rehabilitation of *Severus was recommended and the Council of *Chalcedon was cited only in the last phrase. But the monophysites, under the pressure of their monks, did not accept the document. The emperor then prepared a new redaction of the edict which recognized the single nature of the Word made flesh and spoke of a mental distinction of the two natures, without mentioning either the Council of Chalcedon or Severus. This edict was imposed by force and gave rise to a series of persecutions which faded away only when the emperor little by little fell into madness and in 574 the prefect of the Palatine guard, Tiberius, was taken into the coregency. In the last years he was influenced by his wife Sophia, niece of Justinian's wife *Theodora.

RAC 19, 778-801; P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam*, 1, Paris 1951, 51-54; H. Jedin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III, Milan 1983, 44-45; Storia del Cristianesimo 3, 436-442.

C. Dell'Osso

JUSTIN MARTYR (d. before 167). Justin, apologist of the 2nd c., was born at Flavia Neapolis, modern Nablus, in *Palestine (1 *Apol.* 1,1). The search for truth carried him successively to the *Stoic, peripatetic, Pythagorean and *Platonic philosophical schools (*Dial.* 2,1-6) and finally to Christianity, "the only certain and worthy philosophy," which was revealed to him by "a very old man" (*Dial.* 3-8). After conversion (132–135; Bagatti 322), Justin went to *Rome, where he wrote (ca. 148–161; see 1 *Apol.* 1,46) his *Apologies* (2 *Apol.* was originally an appendix or a later edition of the first) addressed to *Antoninus Pius (emperor 138–161), and the *Dialogue with Trypho,* the oldest surviving Christian apology addressed against the Jews (the introduction and part of chap. 74 are lost). This is later than the *Apologies* (*Dial.* 120,6). These are the only works which survive from him, already known to *Eusebius (*HE* IV, 18,2,6), and preserved in a single MS of 1364 (*Paris. Gr.* 450). For the lost works, see 1 *Apol.* 1,26; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* IV, 6,2; Eusebius, *HE* IV, 11,8-9; IV, 18,3-6. Among the disciples of Justin was *Tatian the Syrian (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 28,1). According to the authentic *Martyrium SS. Justini et sociorum VI,* Justin was put to death under Rusticus, prefect of Rome 163–167. Beyond these two certain works some fragments remain (CPLG 1078). Moreover, various works are attributed to him. A *De resurrectione* (CPG 1081) might well be his acc. to some (see Sanchez). Others are certainly spurious: (1) *Oratio ad Graecos* (CPG 1082; RAC 19, 858f.); (2) *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (CPG 1083; RAC 19, 861f.); (3) *De monarchia* (CPG 1084; RAC 19, 859); (4) *Epistula ad Zenam et Serenum* (CPG 1085; RAC 19, 866); (5) *Confutatio dogmatum quorundam Aristotelicorum* (CPG 1086); (6) *Quaestiones Christianorum ad Graecos* (CPG 1087; RAC 19, 870); (7) *Quaestiones Graecorum ad Christianos* (CPG 1088); (8) *Epistula ad Euphrasium sophistam* (CPG 1089; RAC 19, 871). Wrapped in his philosopher's mantle (*Dial.* 1,9), Justin was the first Christian to use *Aristotelian categories, to use philosophical terminology in Christian thought (Falls, FC 6, 17) and to reconcile faith and reason.

The central theme of Justin is the creative and salvific plan of God, ἡ οἰκονομία, manifested and completed by the Christ-Logos: the wisdom of the ancients finds its place within this divine plan (Bourgeois). His basic premise is that human reason (λόγος) is a participation in the Word (Λόγος): in every person there is a "seed [σπέρμα] of the Logos" resulting from the action of the "Word which gives the seed [σπερματικὸς Λόγος]" (2 *Apol.* 7,3: 13,3). Justin turned to this Stoic-Platonic notion (his concept is more akin to *Middle Platonism than it is to *Stoicism: the terminology, i.e., is Stoic, but the underlying thought is *Platonic: Andresen 157-195; Daniélou 42-43; Barnard 96-99; Holte 115-117; the concept was taken from Philo) to explain that "Christ is the firstborn of God, the Word, in whom everyone is a participant, and all those who live in conformity with the Logos are Christians such as, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus and others like them" (1 *Apol.* 46,2-3). The incomplete and obscure truths of the Greek philosophers were only "seeds of the Logos." *Jerome and *Augustine refined this notion, developing the theme of the *captiva gentilis* (to be purified) and the *spoliatio aegyptiorum* (use of the pagan truths).

Given that the criterion of truth is antiquity, Justin, as before him the Jewish apologists, insisted on the fact that the philosophers had borrowed from the prophets and Moses (1 *Apol.* 59,1-6; 60,1-7). Justin (1 *Apol.* 60,1-7) identifies Christ with the world soul of Plato (*Timaeus* 36 b), extended in the form of a cross (X) which Plato supposedly took from Num 21:7-8. The Word, "numerically distinct" (*Dial.* 61,11) from the Father, is differentiated from the world soul, in turn distinct from the supreme Intelligence in which Middle Platonism saw the first God (see Albinus, *Epitome* X, 3). The Middle Platonists tended to transform the mythical demiurge of Plato into a mind transcending the world and referred to it (see *Timaeus* 28 c) as "Father and Creator of the world" (see 2 *Apol.* 6,1-2; *Dial.* 60,2; Norris 46-48). The Logos is God born from God, like a fire lit from another fire or like the light which flows from the sun (*Dial.* 128). The Son is preexistent: "We adore him [the Father] and the Son having emerged from him [τὸν παρὰ αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα]."

In Christ the Christians have the fullness of knowledge and revelation (2 *Apol.* 10,1): "Our doctrine surpasses every human teaching because we have the Logos in his entirety in Christ, who was made manifest for us, body, reason and soul." The Logos is the creator of his own humanity (1 *Apol.* 22,2; 32,10). Christ, Son of God, is the eternal law (αἰώνιος νόμος) and the new covenant (καινὴ διαθήκη) for the entire world (*Dial.* 43,1; cf. 11,2; 51,3). Justin was the first true theologian to formulate a Christocentric theology of history (Jossa 176). There are other contributions for which Justin was a pioneer. He was the first Christian author to deal with Gen 1:1-2 (1 *Apol.* 59,1-5; 60; 62-64: Nautin 62-67); he put Mary in opposition to Eve, speaking about the divine plan (ἡ οἰκονομία) of redemption through the Virgin Mary (*Dial.* 100; 120,1; Otranto 11); he organized the oldest collection of heretical doctrines in his (lost) *Syntagma* against all the heresies (1 *Apol.* 26,8); he was the first to attribute the theophanies of the OT to the Logos "in human form" (*Dial.* 61,1; 68,10); he spoke of a *dilatio inferni* and of a general *she'ol* (*Dial.* 5; 80); he departed from the limits of the **disciplina arcani* to describe in detail the Christian rites of *baptism and the *Eucharist (1 *Apol.* 61-67); he introduced the theory of the double state of the Word (2 *Apol.* 6,3). "In Justin we encounter for the first time citations from semi-formal professions of faith" (J.N.D. Kelly, *Creeds*, 71). Justin was also one of the first Christian authors to formulate an exegesis of the presence of the Word-Messiah in the Law and the Prophets (*Dial.* 26-140; de Margerie 37-63). He explicitly mentioned the priesthood of the faithful (*Dial.* 116); testified to the catechumenate (1 *Apol.* 61,2), the emergence of the NT corpus (1 *Apol.* 66,3) and the veneration of angels (1 *Apol.* 6); and gave a theological interpretation of the Eucharist: he spoke of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, referring to Mal 1:11 (*Dial.* 41; 117). The Eucharist is offered as a memorial of the body and blood of Christ (*Dial.* 70,4).

According to Justin (*Dial.* 88,4), "Christ was born and was crucified for humanity which, by the transgression of Adam through the serpent's deception, had fallen under sentence of death." The demons are the sons of the fallen angels: "The angels transgressed and had relations with women and from them came sons, called demons" (2 *Apol.* 5,3). For Justin the devil fell from grace when he tempted Eve (*Dial.* 124,3), and in another passage he identified the Leviathan of Is 27:1 with Satan (*Dial.* 112,2). The goal of the demons is to reduce men and women to be their slaves and assistants (1 *Apol.* 14,1). The demons are the founders of paganism, before the coming of Christ and, after his coming, of the heresies (1 *Apol.* 25; 26). The demons are "exorcized by many of us Christians in the name of Jesus Christ" (2 *Apol.* 6,6) and are subject to his name (*Dial.* 30,3). Justin is the first among Christian authors to define the devil and delineate his grim mission (Fernández 158-160).

The eschatology of Justin underlines the second coming of Christ: he coined the phrase "the second

coming": τὴν δευτέραν παρουσίαν (1 *Apol.* 52,3; 14,8; 51,2). Human history is oriented toward the *parousia. First, the resurrection of the saints alone will take place; the millennium will follow, i.e., the reign of the saints for a thousand years in *Jerusalem. At the end of the millennium will be the resurrection of the wicked, followed by the final judgment (*Dial.* 80,5; 81,4; 132,1). "The *millenarism* of Justin seems to owe more to Jewish apocalyptic than to the Johannine Apocalypse" (E. Pietrella 41).

Justin reflects the eclectic Middle Platonism of his day (Andresen, ZNTW 157-195; W. Schmid 163-182). His writings are not "a spotless amalgam of Plato and biblical faith." Platonism was a preparation for the gospel, but the gospel came first (Barnard 170). He tends toward *subordinationism (2 *Apol.* 6,3; *Dial.* 56,4) and his pneumatology puts in relief the notion of the divine δύναμις: the invisible power of God operating in creation and in history (Martin 328-332). The greatest importance of Justin is that he is the first Christian writer after *Paul to recognize the universalistic implications of Christianity. With his characteristic doctrine of the Logos, he recapitulated in a single vigorous movement the entire history of humanity, which finds its consummation in Christ.

CPG 1073-1089 (see also the Supplementum).

Bibliography: A. Wartelle, *Bibliographie historique et critique de saint Justin, philosophe et martyr, et des apologistes grecs du IIe siècle: 1494-1994: (avec un supplément)*, Paris 2001.

Editions and translations: (1) *Apologies*: J.C.T. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum*, I-V, Jena, repr. 1968; E.J. Goodspeed, Göttingen 1915, repr. 1950; A. Wartelle, Paris 1987; M. Marcovich, Berlin 1994; Ch. Munier, Fribourg 1995. *Translations*: Fr.: Wartelle; Munier; G. Archambault - L. Pautigny, Paris 1994; Eng.: ANF vol. I; FC 6 (1948); W. Barnard (ACW 56), Mahwah, NJ 1997; It.: I. Giordani, Rome 1962; G. Girgenti, Milan 1994; C. Burini, Rome 2001; Sp.: H. Yaben, Madrid 1943, and D. Ruiz Bueno, Madrid 1954; (2) *Dialogue*: Goodspeed, op. cit., 90-265; M. Marcovich, Berlin 1997. *Translations*: Fr.: G. Archambault - L. Pautigny; It.: Giustino, *Dialogo con Trifone*, intr., tr. and notes by G. Visonà, Turin 1988. DSp 8, 1640-1647; S. Heid: RAC 19, 801-874; H. Meyer, *Geschichte der Lehre von den Keimkräften*, Bonn 1914, 80-93; J. Quasten, *Patrology*, I, Westminster, MD 1950, 198-219 (It. tr. Turin 1980, I, 175-194, more recent bibl.);

Studies: W. Schmid, *Frühe Apologetik und Platonismus*: FS O. Regenbogen, Heidelberg 1952, 163-182; C. Andresen, *Justin und der mittlere Platonismus*: ZNTW 44 (1952/53) 157-195; Id., *Logos und Nomos*, Berlin 1955; G. Aeby, *Les missions divines de saint Justin à Origène*, Fribourg 1958, 6-15; R. Holte, *Logos spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin's Apologies*: STh 12 (1958) 109-168; A. Orbe, *La Unción del Verbo*, Rome 1961, 21-89; P. Prigent, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament*, Paris 1964; N. Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum. Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins*, Copenhagen 1966; R.A. Norris, *God and World in Early Christian Theology*, London 1966, 33-56; A.J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, Leiden 1967; L. Barnard, *Justin Martyr, His Life and Thought*, Cambridge 1967; E.R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr*, Jena 1968 (repr.); J.P. Martín, *El Espíritu Santo en los orígenes del Cristianismo*, Zürich 1971, 163-332; P. Nautin, *Genèse I, 1-2, de Justin a Origène*, in *In Principio*, Paris 1973, 62-67; J. Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, London 1973 (It. tr. Bologna 1976); R. Joly, *Christianisme et philosophie. Étude sur Justin et les apologistes du IIe siècle*, Brussels 1973; C. Mazzucco - E. Pietrella, *Il rapporto tra la concezione del millennio dei primi autori cristiani e l'Apocalisse di Giovanni*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 38-41; G. Otranto, *Esegesi biblica e storia in Giustino (Dial. 63-84)*, Bari 1979; B. Bagatti, *S. Giustino e la sua patria*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 319-331; W. Rordorf, *La Trinité dans les écrits de Justin Martyr*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 285-297; D. Bourgeois, *La sagesse des Anciens dans le mystère du Verbe. Évangile et philosophie de saint Justin*, Paris 1981; E. Chat, *Die Opferlehre des Apologeten Justin; religionswissenschaftliche Studie*, Bonn 1981; M. Fédou, *La vision de la Croix dans l'oeuvre de saint Justin, "philosophe et martyr"*: RecAug 19 (1984) 29-210; H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition. Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen*, Oxford 1984; O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition. Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, Leiden 1987; G.A. Nocilli, *La catechesi battesimale di San Giustino martire*, Bologna 1990; A.-G. Hamman, *Essai de chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres de Justin*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 231-239; G. Girgenti, *Giustino martire: il primo cristiano platonico: con in appendice "Atti del martirio di San Giustino,"* Milan 1995; P. Merlo, *Liberi per vivere secondo il Logos: principi e criteri dell'agire morale in San Giustino filosofo e martire*, Rome 1995; M. Maritano, *Giustino martire e gli eretici negatori della maternità di Maria*: Augustinianum 37 (1997) 285-301; G. Otranto, *La polemica antigiudaica da Barnaba a Giustino*: AnnSE 14 (1997) 55-82; G. Valenti, *Alcune osservazioni su Giustino martire, i Samaritani e la città di Neapolis*: SMSR 22 (1998) 245-273; A. Rudolph, *"Denn wir sind jenes Volk . . .": die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht*, Bonn 1999; R. Hanig, *Tatian und Justin: ein Vergleich*: VChr 53 (1999) 31-73; Ph. Bobichon, *Les enseignements juif, païen, hérétique et chrétien dans l'oeuvre de Justin Martyr*: REAug 45 (1999) 233-259; S.J.G. Sanchez, *Justin, apologiste chrétien: travaux sur le "Dialogue avec Tryphon" de Justin Martyr*, Paris 2000; T.J. Horner, *Listening to Trypho: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho Reconsidered*, Leuven 2001.

R.J. De Simone

JUSTIN MARTYR (pseudo). Various works have reached us attributed to Justin, besides numerous fragments. Three of these have titles similar to some of those cited by *Eusebius (*HE* 4,18) in the list of works which he considered to have been written by the Apologist; however, in their contents they do not coincide at all or only in part with the description given in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.

It is possible to distinguish the *De resurrectione* (*DR*), whose attribution to Justin is still debated today; the oldest apologetic-propagandistic tracts; the works of *Antiochene context; and the *Epistula ad Zenam et Serenum*.

1. The *DR* (*CPG* 1081) (10 chapters) can be reconstructed for the most part thanks to three ample

excerpta inserted in Greek *florilegia deriving from the *Sacra Parallela* (such extracts constitute the most conspicuous part of the fragments transmitted with Justinian attribution). The work is structured rhetorically acc. to the plan of an apologetic speech (*DR* 1: proemium; *DR* 2: *narratio*; *DR* 3-9: *argumentatio*, divided into *refutatio*, 3-4, and *probatio*, 5-9; *DR* 10: epilogue). It confronts three objections to the faith in the resurrection of the flesh, i.e., of the material part of humanity: the impossibility of the reconstitution of the flesh once decomposed; the inappropriateness that the flesh be resuscitated; absence of a promise of the resurrection of the flesh. The deniers of the resurrection linked two supposed aporias to the second of the objections: the return, with the resurrection, of sexual functions and physical defects. All these criticisms seem to come from educated Christians, influenced by *Middle Platonism and also by *Galen. (This would explain, among other things, the preliminary insistence of the author of the *DR* on epistemological questions, with a partial coincidence with the Galenic position.) They believed in one God, creator and savior; in the fact that Jesus rose from the dead with a spiritual body; and that in the future, believers would participate in the same resurrection. They used both the OT and the proto-Christian work, with particular attention to those of *Paul. *Irenaeus also took issue with them (*Haer* V, 2,2-3,3; 5,1-2; 31,1-35,2). To such adversaries the author of the discourse opposes a demonstration of the possibility, appropriateness and promise of the resurrection of the flesh founded on arguments taken either from the content of the faith, or from sensible or intellectual commonplaces, or from the Greek cultural tradition, chosen acc. to a precise strategic (exclusion of proofs of doubtful argumentative effectiveness with the adversaries) and epistemological (choice of arguments that respected the demands for certainty of the adversaries) plan. The author of the *DR* aims, therefore, not only at opposing but also at convincing his adversary, through a discourse which can be legitimately defined as "doctrinal apology."

The *DR* does not furnish explicit references to places or people. From the internal analysis, the context in which to locate the polemic is most likely Rome of the 70s-80s of the 2nd c. The author of the *DR* has sometimes been identified with Justin (Pouderon), with one of his students and collaborators (D'Anna), or with Athenagoras (Heimgartner).

2. Apologetic-propagandistic works: *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (CPG 1083), *Oratio ad Graecos* (CPG 1082), *De monarchia* (CPG 1084). The *Cohortio* (38 chapters) is a protreptic treatise, in which the harmony of the biblical authors, inspired by the same Spirit, is opposed to the contradictions of the Greek philosophers and poets. There are numerous citations of Greek authors, often taken from anthologies. The harsh polemic against the doctrine of the Platonic ideas, derived, acc. to the author, from misunderstanding the texts of Moses, sought to undermine as well the Platonizing interpretation given to Moses in the Alexandrian environment. The coincidence, studied by Riedweg, of the stylistic characteristics of the *Cohortio* with those of authentic fragments of *Marcellus of Ancyra reliably confirm the attribution of the work to Marcellus.

The *Oratio* (5 chapters) is a short treatise in which a Christian, converted from paganism, criticizes the divinities of the Greeks, whose behavior is marked by licentiousness, and invites others to conversion. There are no poetic citations. The *De monarchia* (6 chapters) is a treatise aimed at demonstrating that the ancient Greeks sometimes reached the point of recognizing the existence of the one true God. The work does not have a strong Christian character. There are many citations, including spurious ones, of classic poets, taken from anthologies. Both of the works are generally held to date to the 3rd c.

3. Works of Antiochene context: Four works of a single author, of Antiochene training, have been transmitted under the name of Justin: *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* (CPG 6285), *Quaestiones Christianorum ad Graecos* (CPG 1087), *Quaestiones Graecorum ad Christianos* (CPG 1088), *Confutatio dogmatum quorundam Aristotelicorum* (CPG 1086). They are dated between the 4th (Harnack attributes them to *Diodore) and 5th c. (attributed by many scholars to *Theodoret, whose name appears in one MS of the *Q. et r. ad orthod.*). The longest work is the *Q. et r. ad orthod.* (146/161 questions, acc. to the MSS): beyond exegetical problems of every kind, numerous objections coming from pagan anti-Christian tradition are confronted, so that the work also plays an obvious apologetic role. The other two little works are of a polemical antipagan character (5 questions for the Greeks, 15 for the Christians), which focus on dogmatic arguments. The *Confutatio* is a treatise criticizing *Aristotelian cosmology. An *Expositio rectae fidei* (*CPG* 6218) has also been transmitted under Justin's name; it is a treatise on the *Trinity and the *incarnation, which can be attributed with certainty to *Theodoret, thanks to some citations by *Severus of Antioch in *Contra impium Grammaticum* 3,1,5.

4. The *Epistula ad Zenam et Serenum* (*CPG* 1085) is a little treatise of Christian asceticism, of a Stoicizing character, dated 4th–5th c.

Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi (ed. J.C.T. Otto), *volumen* III (*Iustinus philosophus et martyr*), *tomus* II (*Opera Iustini addubitata*), Jena [3]1879, *tomus* III (*Opera Iustini subditicia*), Jena [3]1880 (ed. of all the pseudo-Justinian works); *Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela* (ed. K. Holl) (TU 20,2), Leipzig 1899, 32-55 (ed. of many of the fragments).

De resurrectione: *Pseudo-Giustino*, *Sulla resurrezione* (ed. A. D'Anna), Brescia 2001; M. Heimgartner, *Pseudojustin—Über die Auferstehung*, Berlin-New York 2001; B. Pouderon, *À propos de l'ouvrage recent . . .* : Apocrypha 13 (2002) 245-256.

Apologetic-propagandistic works: N. Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e^ siècle*, Louvain 1972; W.C. van Unnik, *The Character of Early Christian Apologetics in the Pseudo-Justinian Oratio ad Graecos*, in Id., *Sparsa collecta*, Leiden 1983, III, 106-113; C. Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin* (*Markell von Ankyra?*), *Ad Graecos de vera religione* (*bisher "Cohortatio ad Graecos"*), I-II, Basel 1994; P.W. van der Horst, *Plato's Fear as a Topic in Early Christian Apologetics*: JECS 6 (1998) 1-13.

Works of Antiochene context: G. Bardy, *La littérature patristique des "Quaestiones et responsiones" sur l'Écriture sainte*: RB 42 (1933) 211-219; M.G. Crepaldi, *Pseudo-Giustino*, *Confutazione di alcune dottrine aristoteliche*, PhD thesis, Padua 1987; J.P. Martín, *El Pseudo-Justino en la historia del aristotelismo*: Patrística & Mediaevalia 10 (1989) 3-19; L. Perrone, *Sulla preistoria delle "Quaestiones" nella letteratura patristica*: AnSE 8 (1991) 485-505; M.G. Crepaldi, *En arché: una confutazione cristiana della dottrina aristotelica del tempo* (*Ps. Iust. Confut. 31-38*), in G. Casertano (ed.), *Il concetto di tempo*, Naples 1997, 173-182.

A. D'Anna

JUSTINA (d. after 388). The widow of Magnentius, she married *Valentinian I around 370. Her second husband having also died in 375, she devoted herself to inspiring and supporting the politics of her son *Valentinian II, above all after the death of *Gratian. Always favorable to the *Arians (on her pro-Arian attitude see Ruf., *HE* 2, 15; Socr., *HE* V, II; Soz., *HE* VII, 13; Philost., *HE* X, 7), whose creed she shared. She opposed *Ambrose on many occasions, even though he had supported her independence and that of her son against the imperial pretensions of the usurper *Maximus, going to *Trier in the autumn of 383 and negotiating with Maximus for the young Valentinian to stay in *Italy. For some details, matching the hagiographic style, concerning an insurrection organized by Justina against Ambrose, see Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii* 11. An allusion to Justina represented in the biblical figure of Jezebel might be present in *Ep.* 20,14-19 of Ambrose. Following the invasion of Maximus in 387, she fled with her son to *Thessalonica (Zos., *Hist. nova* IV, 43; Oros., *Hist. adv. paganos* VII, 35,4; Theodrt., *HE* V, 14), to *Theodosius, but was able to return to Italy in 388, where she died shortly after the reestablishment of Valentinian II as emperor of the West.

J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1933; PLRE 1, 488-489; PCBE 2/1, 1209-1211.

M.G. Mara

JUSTINA of Padua. martyr (d. 304). According to the oldest *Passio,* of the 11th c., Justina, belonging to a distinguished Paduan family, was executed under *Diocletian and *Maximian; perhaps she should be identified with her Justina of Trieste. The body of the martyr was buried outside the *pomerium* to the E of the city near the Roman theater. The *Mart. hier*. does not mention her. The oldest attestation of her veneration is the basilica *ad corpus* which the *vir clarissimus et inlustris* Opilius had built at Padua around 500 (CIL 5, 3100), on the site of the present basilica. *Venantius Fortunatus knew the tomb of the saint and the basilica, decorated with scenes from the *Vita* of St. Martin (*Vita Martini* 4,672-674). Her image appears in the procession of martyrs in St. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna and in the intrados of the apse of the Euphrasian basilica of Parenzo.

Two inscriptions attest her veneration at Rimini in the 6th–7th c. and at Como in 617. Her name is found in the canon of the Ambrosian Mass, written around that same time.

The witnesses to her veneration are therefore certain and ancient, but the details of her life are late and without value. In the *Passio* of the 11th c. there is only one bit of reliable information: the burial of the saint 1,000 feet from the city. In the medieval liturgical books her feast is inserted 7 October.

BHL 4571-4575; BS 6, 1345-1349; LCI 7, 253-255; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 911-912; A. Barzon, *Padova cristiana dalle origini all'anno 800*, Padua 1955; G. Prevedello, *S. Giustina di Padova*, Padua 1972; 641-644; G. Cuscito, *Martiri cristiani ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Udine 1992, 101-107.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

JUSTINIAN, emperor (482–565). Flavius Petrus Sabbatius Iustinianus, Roman emperor of the East. Born in 482, of a peasant father, at Tauresium near Bederiana in Illyria (an unknown location), Justinian was called to the court at *Constantinople by his uncle *Justin. He received a comprehensive education there and, during the reign of Justin, was his most authoritative advisor. He began joint rule with his uncle 1 April 527 and assumed full power in August when his uncle died. In 525 he married the former actress *Theodora, who exercised a notable in-

fluence on Justinian, both in private and in political life. Taking advantage of the middle class, in the city and in the countryside, Justinian systematically pursued the internal and external restoration of the *imperium romanum*. In 529, with the ban on teaching philosophy and the consequent closure of the Academy in Athens, he reinforced the unity of the state; in 532, drawing up a "perpetual" peace with the king of the Persians *Chosroes I, he guaranteed himself freedom of action in the West; at the same time the bloody repression of the "Nika" revolt silenced the forces of opposition whether in the heart of the ancient aristocracy or among the plebeian masses of the capital. The sumptuous reconstruction in the years 532–537 of Hagia Sophia, which had been burnt in the Nika revolt, and the publication of the *Institutiones* (manual of Roman law) and of the *Digesta* (collection of opinions of illustrious jurists, with normative force) in 533, which, together with the **Codex Iustinianus* already published in 529, were united later with the *Novellae* (later legislation of Justinian) in the *Corpus iuris civilis,* equally served the reinforcement of the state and of the imperial absolutism, also with regard to the church and its hierarchy.

The legislative effort also revealed reforming tendencies. Postulating an absolute bond of peasants to the land, the *Corpus* resisted the progressive socio-economic developments which had already begun, but nevertheless opposed slavery (whose economic significance was already considerably reduced) on the basis of the principles of Christian humanitarianism. Furthermore, the Christian church was also involved in the program of restoration. The *Imperium romanum* and the Christian *oecumene* were considered identical.

Strengthening the empire, spreading the true faith and annihilating heretics were a single project; to accomplish it, with the effective armies which the generals *Belisarius and *Narses had organized, Justinian conducted a harsh offensive war for more than twenty years. In 534 the *Vandal state of N Africa, of *Arian faith, fell. The next blow was struck in *Italy at the supremacy of the *Ostrogoths, they too were Arians: in 536 *Rome was taken, in 540 *Ravenna. Violation of the peace treaty contracted with Chosroes inaugurated in the East a long period of war as well. Only in 562 was it possible to negotiate peace, at the cost of heavy tributes. Rome had to be temporarily abandoned, while Ravenna, residence of the Byzantine governor (exarch), remained a seat of central power, and was adorned with the churches of St. Vitale, St. Apollinare Nuovo, St. Apollinare in Classe and St. Michael in Affricisco. In 552 the king of the *Goths, *Totila, was defeated on the Via Flaminia; in 554 the *Pragmatic Sanction* annulled the measures of Totila in favor of slaves and colonists and reintroduced Byzantine administration in Italy. In the same year a Byzantine army occupied SE *Spain. The Mediterranean again became an internal sea of the empire. With the territorial expansion commerce also developed; the imperial regime tried to maintain a positive balance of trade. Textiles, utensils and jewelry were exported, coming above all from Syrian and Egyptian workshops.

When Byzantine monks discovered the secret of silk manufacture, production, processing and marketing of the valuable product became a state monopoly. Craft production for practical and artistic purposes prospered, and thus also the production of artistic books of both spiritual and profane content.

In literature—e.g., in the *Histories* of *Procopius and in the *Epigrams* of Agathias and of *Paul the Silent—elements of the classical tradition were introduced. At the same time, new contents appeared in new forms in the rhythmic-accentuative ecclesiastical prose of *Romanus Melodus and in the *Universal Chronicle* of *John Malalas, he too coming from Syria like Romanus.

Justinian was perfectly aware of the atmosphere of divinization which surrounded his imperial authority. The Christian church nevertheless found in him not only its patron and defender but also its guide. Just as he ruled the state in all its functions, in the same way Justinian governed the church, considering the hierarchy dependent on him. That the emperor possessed the effective competence is attested by his theological writings, whose positions, characterized by the *Neochalcedonian theology, are in fact original. There remain a treatise against the *monophysite doctrine, dating to the years 542/543, an *expositio fidei* of 551, a more recent edict against the *Origenian doctrine that concludes with twenty anathemas, and finally a reply of the emperor to a pamphlet which had attacked the condemnation of the *Three Chapters. It seems that Justinian also distinguished himself as an author of ecclesiastical hymns.

The period of Justinian's reign has been discussed as the classic epoch of Byzantine *Caesaropapism. The emperor, as theocratic sovereign, considered himself authorized to determine dogma and ecclesiastical discipline down to the tiniest details, making them serve political ends. The *theopaschite formula, e.g., met his approval, and to facilitate the reunion of the Severian monophysites with the church of the empire he promoted a religious discussion at Constantinople in 532 (*Collatio cum Severianis*), which, however, had no success. Under the impulse of his

wife Theodora, he conspired to have the deacon *Vigilius seated in Rome. In 543 he issued an edict in which 9 propositions of Origen, contained in the *De principiis,* were condemned, and he had Origen's name added to the list of heretics that the bishops and abbots had to anathematize during their entry into office. He intervened in the dispute over the *Three Chapters, concerning which, moved by zeal for dogmatizing, he accepted the proposal of *Theodore Askidas, bishop of Caesarea and very influential at the court, to condemn the heads of the Antiochene school. Making another attempt at reunification with the monophysites, he published a treatise in 543 in which he flung anathemas against *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and *Ibas of Edessa, called more simply the Three Chapters. Given the serious discontent arising after the publication of the edict, Pope Vigilius and the emperor decided in 550 to call an ecumenical council, but because of further quarrels with the emperor the pope did not participate in the work of the council, which was celebrated at Constantinople between May and June 553. In this council, later acknowledged as ecumenical, the condemnations of the Three Chapters and Origenism, including *Didymus of Alexandria and *Evagrius of Pontus, were confirmed.

The era of Justinian, appearing to posterity as a golden age, survived its creator only a short time. The dream of a universal empire was lost under new barbarian incursions, and it took a century before the Byzantine state could consolidate itself again.

CPG III, 6865-6893; PG 86, 1, 913-1152 (for the most relevant texts see, most recently, E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*, Milan [2]1973); PL 63, 430-510 (CSEL 35, 592-743), PL 66, 14-43, PL 69, 30-328, PL 72, 919-1110; *Corpus iuris civilis*, eds. Th. Mommsen - F. Krüger - R. Schöll - G. Kroll, 3 vols., Berlin 1908-1912; RAC 19, 668-763; B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 1, Berlin 1960 (not continued); J. Irmscher, *Das Zeitalter Iustianians*: Živa Antika 13/14 (1964) 171-186; R. Browning, *Justinian and Theodora*, London 1971; Ἰ. Ἐ. Καραγιαννόπουλος, Ἱστορία βυζαντινοῦ κράτους, 1, Thessaloniki 1978, 368-605; H. Jedin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III, Milan 1983, 17-43; K. Bihlmeyer - H. Tuechle, *Storia della Chiesa*, 1, Brescia 1989, 348-355; R. Marin Conesa, *Cristianismo y aculturación en la política de Justiniano*: Antigüedad y Cristianismo 7 (1990) 541-549; J.A.S. Evans, *The Age of Justinian*, London 1996; O. Mazal, *Justinian I und seine Zeit. Geschichte und Kultur des Byzantinischen Reiches im 6. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 2001; var. aus., *Storia del Cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, 3, Rome 2003, 373-406; Patrologia V, 54-89.

J. Irmscher - C. Dell'Osso

JUSTINIAN of Valencia (d. 547). From a family of the province of *Tarragona which had given several bishops to the church (*Justus of Urgel, Elpidius of Huesca and Nebridius were his brothers), he was bishop of Valencia from 527 to 547 (Isid., *Vir. ill.* 20). It seems that he was a good preacher, a father to the monks and a builder of churches: an activity which he was able to perform only due to the prestige and education received, thanks to his family, during the *Arian monarchy of the *Visigoths. *Isidore records him as the author of a treatise addressed to a certain Rusticus (*Liber responsionum ad quemdam Rusticium de interrogatis quaestionibus*) and divided into five parts concerning trinitarian, christological and disciplinary questions. There have been attempts to reconstruct this treatise starting from the *De cognitione baptismi* of *Ildefonsus of Toledo. Furthermore, a sermon which has reached us as a work of Pope *Leo in honor of St. *Vincent has been attributed to Justinian, although with much caution. Surviving, however, is his epitaph in verse (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Christ.* 1871, n. 409).

A. Helfferich, *Der westgotische Arianismus*, Berlin 1860; P. Glaue, *Zur Geschichte der Taufe in Spanien*: Stzb. Heidelberg Phil. hist. Kl. 4 (1913) 10, 1-23; A. Braegelmann, *The Life and Writings of Saint Ildefonsus of Toledo*, Washington, DC 1942, 60-96; A. Linage Conde, *Tras las huellas de Justiniano de Valencia*: Primer Congreso de Historia del País Valenciano, II, Valencia 1981, 353-363; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 348-350.

P. Marone

JUSTUS of Canterbury (d. ca. 627). Monk of Roman origin. With *Mellitus, *Paulinus and Rufinian, he was part of the second mission sent by St. *Gregory the Great to England to help St. *Augustine (601), who consecrated him bishop of Rochester (Kent) in 604. The restoration of paganism by Eadbald forced Justus to retreat among the Franks (618). In 624 he succeeded Mellitus as fourth bishop of Canterbury, and *Boniface V sent him the pallium with a letter full of praises. *Bede (*Hist. eccl.* I, 29; II, 3-5; II, 7; II, 17-18) and Gregory (*Ep.* 11) inform us about Justus's stay in England.

DCB 3, 592-593; W.H. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, I, London 1861, 100-110; AASS *Nov.* IV, Brussels 1925, 532-537; P. Grosjean, *Le faux de 606 provient-il de Cantorbéry? Date de la lettre des ss. Laurent, Mellitus et Justus aux Irlandais*: AB 64 (1946) 231-244; BS 7, 28-29; PCBE 2, 1223, n. 10.

E. Romero Pose

JUSTUS of Lyons (d. ca. 400). Deacon of the church of *Vienne and later bishop of *Lyons, where he was a holy and zealous shepherd. Perhaps he took part in the Council of *Valence in 374 and that of *Aquileia in 381. On his return from Aquileia, be-

cause of a bloody uproar which had broken out in the city, he renounced his office and retired to Egypt, where he lived as a hermit. He was visited by the priest Antiochus, who would be his third successor at Lyons. His mortal remains were repatriated and deposited in the church of the Maccabees which took his name (as did the neighborhood). His tomb was quickly the object of intense popular veneration; *Sidononius Apollinaris (d. 469) speaks of it in a letter (*Ep*. V, 17,3-4). His feast is celebrated 14 October.

AASS *Sept*. I, 365-376; BS 7, 31-32; Cath 6, 123f.; *Topographie chrétienne de la Gaule*, IV, *Province ecclésiastique de Lyon* (*Lugdunensis prima*), Paris 1986, 27-28.

A. Hamman

JUSTUS of Toledo (d. 633). Monk and then abbot in the monastery of Agali (close to *Toledo). A man of great eloquence, he became archbishop of *Toledo around 630. Concerning the inescapable responsibilities of a pastor of souls, he dedicated to Rechilanus, his successor in governing the monastery of Agali, a work which has not reached us (Ildef., *Vir. Ill.* 7). A treatise *De aenigmatibus Salomonis* has been attributed to him, which today, however, is believed to have been composed by *Taio of *Saragossa (Vega, Étaix). He died young in 633.

CPL 1235; Díaz 135; A.C. Vega, *Tajón de Saragoza: Una obra inédita*: Ciudad de Dios 155 (1943) 174-177; Id., ES 56, Madrid 1957, 411-419; R. Étaix, *Note sur le De aenigmatibus Salomonis*: MSR 15 (1958) 137-142; U. Domínguez del Val, *El "De aenigmatibus Salomonis" ante la crítica*: Ciudad de Dios 163 (1960) 139-143; Id., *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 468-471.

P. Marone

JUSTUS of Trieste (d. 303?). The famous *Hieronymian Martyrology*, compiled in the Venetian area around the middle of the 5th c., records a St. Justus for 2, 3, 8 and 16 November, but on none of these dates is he referred to Istria, let alone to Trieste, but rather to *Africa or *Capppadocia, to *Capua or to *Caesarea in Mauretania. The editors of the *Hieronymian* consider the repetition under these dates of a single original report, which could be that of 2 November, taken from the *Passio* of the martyr venerated at Trieste (*Passus est autem beatissimus Iustus sub die IV nonas novembris*). Among the *Passiones* which transmit the martyrdom of the Triestine saint between the time of the Antonines and that of *Diocletian, the *Passio* of St. Justus would be the most reliable and sincere, derived as it seems from the official minutes of the trial or from notes of witnesses (acc. to the judgment of V. van Hooff, to whom is due a first critical edition of the *Acta Sanctorum Novembris* in 1887). Every attempt to get the young Justus to abjure having failed, the magistrate pronounced the death sentence against him, and the torturers drowned him in the waters of the gulf. The priest Sebastian, *per visum commonitus,* found his body next to the shore of the sea, near the suburban location where the remains of a cross-shaped martyrial basilica have recently come to light (5th–6th c.). After Van Hooff, however, more recent scholars have leaned toward distancing the composition of the *Passio* from the facts narrated in it, therefore denying its historical reliability. The great Bollandist H. Delehaye had expressed his reservations on the account of the martyrdom and, in more recent years, V. Saxer and R. Grégoire proposed locating the composition in the Carolingian period, perhaps under the guidance of a more ancient nucleus. Recently, however, S. Di Brazzano has published a new critical edition and, taking account of the presence of MS witnesses of the 9th c. already corrupted in some places, has excluded this possibility. Thus, along the lines of V. Ussani, he has proposed assigning the text to the 6th c., in a period of particular dynamism such as that of the bishopric of Frugifer, first historically noted bishop of Tergeste.

As for the relics of Justus, one should observe that just as in the 10th c. frequent attestations are found of their presence in the cathedral on the Capitoline Hill, they were found there in 1624 by Bishop Scarlicchio under the altar of the saint, together with the little *sarcophagus in Aurisina limestone with a pitched cover with angular acroteria, probably of Late Antique manufacture, which until 1624 contained the silver urn (12th–13th c.) with the relics of Justus, now in the chapel of the treasury. The recent examination of the skeletal remains attributed to him have proven that these belong to the same individual of a rather advance age and masculine sex, in agreement with the indications of the *Passio,* where Justus is called *vir Dei,* contrary to the later iconographic tradition which settled on showing him as a beardless youth.

H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels 1933, 330; G. Cuscito, *San Giusto e le origini cristiane a Trieste*: Archeografo Triestino 31-32 (1969-70) 3-36; Id., *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 106-124 (with bibl.); V. Saxer, *L'Istria e i santi istriani Servolo, Giusto e Mauro nei martirologi e le passioni*: Atti e Memorie della Società Istriana di Archeologia e Storia Patria 22 n.s. (1984) 60ff.; G. Cuscito, *Le origini cristiane a Trieste fra tradizione agiografica e riscontri archeologici*, in *La tradizione martiriale tergestina. Storia, culto e arte*, ed. V. Cian - G. Cuscito, Trieste 1992, 47-93; R. Grégoire, *Le passioni degli antichi martiri di Trieste*, in *La tradizione mar-*

tiriale . . . , op. cit., 97-111; S. Di Brazzano, *Passio sancti Iusti martyris*: Atti e Memorie della Società Istriana di Archeologia e Storia Patria 98 (1998) 57-85; DHGE 28, 63.

G. Cuscito

JUSTUS of Urgel. A Spanish exegete, in the middle of the 6th c. he wrote a *Commentary on the Song of Songs,* short and entirely unoriginal, in which he offers the traditional interpretation which sees in the two spouses the symbol of Christ and the church and develops this theme in the thousand variations already codified by a long interpretative line (*Hippolytus, *Origen etc.).

CPL 1091-1092; PL 67, 961-994; Moricca III, 2, 1518-1519; J. Aldazábal, *Influencia de Gregorio de Elvira y de Justo de Urgel en el Liber psalmographus hispánico*: Fons vivus, Zürich 1971, 143-161; Patrologia IV, 68.

M. Simonetti

JUVENAL (4th c.). Manuscript B of the *Mart. hier*. mentions Juvenal, along with three martyrs of the Via Nomentana, Eventius, Alexander and Theodolus, on 3 May. Belisarius dedicated a monastery to him near Orte (Duchesne LP 1, 296). *Gregory the Great speaks of a Juvenal martyr—not necessarily in a strict sense—and bishop of Narni in Umbria, whose tomb still existed in his own times (*Dial.* 4,12; *Hom. in Ev*. 37,9). In the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* a prayer appears in his honor. According to the *Passio* of the 7th–8th c., Pope *Damasus ordained Juvenal, a doctor and priest of N African origin; he died in peace 3 May, the feast of the discovery of the holy cross. Veneration has encouraged the identification of Juvenal as bishop of Benevento as well, while the relics of Juvenal of Fossano might belong to yet another man named Juvenal identified with him.

BHL 4614-4616; BS 6, 1069-1070; LCI 7, 260; E. Wuescher-Becchi, *Das Oratorium des hl. Cassius und das Grab des hl. Juvenalis in Narni*: Römische Quartalschrift 25 (1911) 61-71; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 402-404; L. Pani Ermini, *Il culto di S. Giovenale nell'Italia centrale. Le testimonianze monumentali*: Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria 75 (1978) 1-29; A. Amore, *Problemi agiografici relativi a S. Giovenale di Spoleto*: *Studia Historico-Ecclesiastica*, Misc. L.G. Spätling, Rome 1977, 169-181.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

JUVENAL of Jerusalem. Bishop of *Jerusalem (422–458), he took advantage of the christological controversies between 431 and 451 to increase the authority of his episcopal see. At *Ephesus in 431, he sided with *Cyril against *Nestorius; and in 449, again at Ephesus, he sided with *Dioscorus of Alexandria against *Flavian in favor of *Eutyches. But at *Chalcedon, in 451, given the new situation created by the antimonophysite reaction, he abandoned Dioscorus to his fate and signed the decisions of the council. He obtained in this way, in the session of 26 October, an extension of the bishop of Jerusalem's authority over the three Palestines, so as to make of his see a fourth patriarchate next to those of *Constantinople, *Antioch and *Alexandria. At his return home, violent outbursts provoked against him by *monophysite monks forced him to flee to Constantinople, and only the support of the militia allowed him to regain possession, with force, of his throne.

CPG III, 6710-6712; E Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*: DOP 5 (1950) 211-279; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 325; Patrologia V, 255-256.

M. Simonetti

JUVENCUS (1st half of the 4th c.). Gaius Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus composed around 330 a hexametric paraphrase of the gospel of *Matthew with supplements from the other Evangelists (esp. from Luke), the *Euangeliorum libri IV,* which transform the evangelical *narratio* into an epic story through a constant imitation of Virgilian poetry.

*Jerome informs us on this poet in two places: in one (*Ep.* 70,5), he says that Juvencus, who lived under *Constantine, was the first to put the story of the Lord into verse (*uersibus explicauit*) not fearing to transpose the Word of God into the highest literary forms of the pagan human word (*nec pertimuit Euangelii maiestatem sub metri leges mittere*); and in the other (*Vir. inl.* 84), he says that the priest, belonging to a very noble family, composed four books transposing the gospels into hexameters almost literally (*quattuor euangelia hexametris uersibus paene ad uerbum transferens quattuor libros composuit*). This second judgment has influenced modern critics, who have insisted too much on the slavishly literal character of the activity of Juvencus, presented as a laborious and insipid versifier. In reality, in the difficult task of inaugurating a poetic genre, the Spanish priest had to reckon, on the one hand, with the sensitivities of those who considered it a profanation to submit the words of Jesus to the laws of classical verse, which had sung the obscenities of the pagan gods, and, on the other, with the simplicity of the Semitically incisive language of the gospel text. In contrast with *Paulinus of Nola or with *Sedulius,

more inclined to *ekphraseis,* to rhetorical and pathetic amplifications, as well as to exegetical and meditative elaborations, Juvencus adheres more closely to the evangelical *narratio,* which he versifies *paene ad uerbum.* The paraphrase of Juvencus, therefore, can easily be called literal or grammatical, on the condition that with such a definition one intends only to underline the pronounced fidelity of the *Euangeliorum libri* to the original sacred text and the attention to scrupulous exactness in historical and doctrinal detail, and not the poor quality of a versification free from all poetic worth.

Employing with conscious mastery the two privileged instruments of paraphrase—i.e., *abbreviatio* and *amplificatio*—the Spanish poet composed a work which is not only the first example of a successful paraphrase in the field of ancient Christian poetry but also a meaningful example of an epic catechism aimed at readers nourished by the poetry and spirituality of Virgil. It is in this attempt to convert the cultivated aristocracy to the Christian message that Juvencus takes his place in the cultural-religious policy of Constantine. On the level of compositional practice, Juvencus—while respectful of the letter of the original text—omits Hebraic toponyms and patronyms, eliminates the Semitisms of the gospel language, obliterates the geographic and genealogical details present in the evangelical account, and replaces the original Palestinian landscapes with the landscapes of ancient *Italy sung by Virgil, effecting what Poinsotte calls *politique du silence,* intended to de-Judaize the biblical story and underline the universality of Christianity. The tendency to eliminate secondary figures from the evangelical account contributes, furthermore, to better illuminate the figure of Christ, the protagonist of the poem. The suppression of narrative elements of the original is nevertheless compensated with *amplificationes*; the ancient poetry of nature penetrates into the interstices of the evangelical account, even when the parables of Jesus do not offer particular opportunities. With his paraphrase Juvencus, beautifying the Holy Scripture with rhetorical ornaments (*ornamenta terrestria linguae*; see 4,805), intended, on the one hand, to win for Christianity the most culturally elevated social classes and, on the other, to offer to catechumens and Christians a pious reading, centered on meditation and prayer.

To give an idea of the importance and the originality—on the cultural level not less than the religious one—of the paraphrastic work it is necessary to point out the *praefatio,* which cannot be ignored by anyone who wishes to correctly evaluate all the Christian poetic *genera,* including paraphrase.

Considering that nothing in the world is immortal, Juvencus points out splendid human enterprises, of which the poets increase the glory and prolong the memory (v. 1-8). The glory of the poets is no less durable; of the classics only the two greatest are mentioned, the Smyrnean Homer and sweet Virgil, born on the banks of the Mincius (v. 9-14). So, if the glory of the profane poets is almost eternal, who sang of fictitious things, full of lies, how much more do Christian poets deserve immortal glory, who sing of true things (v. 15-18). The Spanish priest therefore declares that he will sing the *Christi uitalia gesta* (v. 19-20) in the hope of escaping the eternal fire on the day of judgment (vv. 21-24). The *praefatio* finishes with an invocation of the *Holy Spirit which substitutes for the traditional one to Apollo and to the Muses: "May the Holy Spirit inspire the mind of the poet who girds himself to sing things worthy of Christ and wash his mind with the waters of the sweet Jordan, the baptismal river par excellence" (vv. 25-27: *Ergo age! sanctificus adsit mihi carminis auctor/Spiritus, et puro mentem riget amne canentis/dulcis Iordanis, ut Christo digna loquamur*), in contrast to pagan bards, who had composed things worthy of Phoebus (Virg. *Aen.* 6,662: *quique pii uates et Phoebo digna locuti*), obtaining residence in the blessed seats.

Finally, the paraphrase will propitiate salvation for its author, just as the governmental action in favor of Christianity will guarantee to Constantine immortal glory in the *diuina saecula*. However, the happy result of the paraphrase is explicitly attributed to the religious peace established by Constantine, who therefore has a place of honor, next to Christ, at the end of the poem: 4,806-808: *Haec mihi pax Christi tribuit, pax haec mihi saecli / quam fouet indulgens terrae regnator apertae /Constantinus*. The parallelism *pax Christi / pax saecli* defines the ideological importance of a poetic experiment in which the gospel and Virgil agree without dissonances under the pen of a provincial aristocrat having become a priest.

CPL 1385. *Editions*: PL 19, 53-346; J. Hümer, CSEL 24, 1891.

Exegetical Commentaries: H.H. Kievits, Groningen 1940 (l. I); J. De Wit, ibid. 1947 (l. II) - *Concordantia*: M. Wacht, Hildesheim 1990. Gr. tr.: A. Knappitsch, Graz 1910-1913 (4 fasc.); Sp. tr.: M. Castillo Bejarano, Madrid 1998.

Studies: H. Nestler, *Studien über die Messiade des J.*, Passau 1910; F. Laganà, *Giovenco*, Catania 1947; L. Stroelecki, *Studia prosodica et metrica*, Krakow 1949, 14-49 (on the synaloephe); H. Hansson, *Textkritisches zu I. mit vollständigem Index verborum*, Lund 1950; M. Donnini, *Annotazioni sulla tecnica parafrastica negli* Evangeliorum libri *di Giovenco*: Vichiana 1 (1972) 231-249; Id., *Un aspetto dell'espressività di G.*

L'aggettivazione: ibid. 2 (1973) 54-67; Id., *L'allitterazione e l'omeoteleuto in G.*: Ann. Fac. Lett. Perugia 12 (1974-75) 128-159; A. Longpré, *Aspects de métrique et de prosodie chez J.*: Phoenix 29 (1975) 128-138; I. Opelt, *Die Szenerie bei Iuvencus*: VChr 29 (1975) 191-207; J.-M. Poinsotte, *Juvencus et Israël. La représentation des juifs dans le premier poème latin chrétien*, Paris 1979; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 67-80; Id., *"Dominus lucis": un titre singulier du Christ dans le dernier vers de J.*, in *Mem. A.-J. Festugière*, Geneva 1984, 131-141; S. Costanza, *Da Giovenco a Sedulio. I proemi degli "Evangeliorum libri" e del "Carmen Paschale"*: Civiltà Classica e Cristiana 6 (1985) 253-286; Chr. Ratkowitsch, *Vergils Seesturm bei Iuvencus und Sedulius*: JbAC 29 (1986) 40-58; P. Flury, *Juvencus und Alcimus Avitus*: Philologus 132 (1988) 286-296; W. Kirsch, *Die lateinische Versepik des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1989, 84-117; M. Castro Jiménez, V. Cristóbal, S. Mauro Melle, *Sobre el estilo de J.*: Helmantica (1989) 211-219; M. Testard, *J. et le sacré dans un épisode des* Euangeliorum libri IV: Bull. Ass. G. Budé (1990) 3-31; E. Borrel Vidal, *Las palabras de Virgilio en J.*, Barcelona 1991; P. Orbán, *Die Versifikation von Lk 1, 5-80 in den* Euangeliorum libri quattuor *des Iuvencus. Eine analyse von Juvenc. 1, 1-132*: ZNTW 83 (1992) 224-244; G. Campagnuolo, *Caratteri e tecniche della parafrasi di Giovenco*: VetChr 30 (1993) 47-84; M. Flieger, *Interpretationen zum Bibeldichter Iuvencus. Gethsemane, Festnahme Jesu und Kaiphasprozess* (*4, 478-564*), Stuttgart 1993; R. Fichtner, *Juvencus. Taufe und Versuchung Jesu in den* Evangeliorum libri quattuor *des Bibeldichters Juvencus* (*1, 346-408*), Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994; D. Ertmer, *Studien zur althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Iuvencusglossierung*, Göttingen 1994; G. Simonetti Abbolito, *Scritti vari*, ed. C. Curti - B. Clausi, Catania 1995, 97-154; W. Röttger, *Studien zur Lichtmotivik bei Iuvencus*: JbAC 24 (1996); E. Colombi, Paene ad verbum. *Gli* Evangeliorum libri *di G. tra parafrasi e commento*: Cassiodorus 3 (1997) 9-36; Id. *Sull'uso delle preposizioni negli* Evangeliorum libri IV *di G.*, in Discentibus obvius. Omaggio degli allievi a D. Magnino, Como 1997, 9-21; Id., *Poesia ed esegesi cristiana*: *interferenze tra i Vangeli di Matteo e Luca negli* Evangeliorum libri *di Giovenco*, in G. Mazzoli - F. Gasti (ed.), *Prospettive sul Tardoantico*. Atti del Convegno di Pavia (27-28 novembre 1997), Como 1999, 151-156; Id., *Iuvenciana I*: Vet-Chr 37 (2000) 235-269; R. Palla, *La parafrasi di Matth. 7, 13-14 negli* Evangeliorum libri *di Giovenco*: Boll. Badia Greca Grottaferrata 52 (1998) 19-29; A.V. Nazzaro, *Poesia biblica come espressione teologica: fra tardoantico e altomedioevo*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, Florence 2001, 119-153 (pp. 130-152 are dedicated to a comparative analysis of Iuvenc. 1, 224-270 and Sedul. 2, 73-133); Id., *L'Annunzio dell'Angelo a Maria* (*Lc 1, 26-38*) *nelle riscritture metriche di Giovenco* (*1, 52-79*) *e Paolino di Nola* (Carm. *6, 108-138*), in A.M. Taragna (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale.* Atti del II Conv. int. di studi, Perugia 15-16 novembre 2001, Alessandria 2004; Id., *La visita di Maria a Elisabetta* (*Lc 1, 39-56*) *nelle riscritture metriche di Giovenco* (*I 80-104*) *e Paolino di Nola* (Carm. *6, 139-78*), in U. Criscuolo (ed.), Societas Studiorum. *Per Salvatore D'Elia* (Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Filologia Classica Francesco Arnaldi), Naples 2004, 423-440. *On the* praefatio: P.G. van der Nat, *Die* Praefatio *der Evangelienparaphrase des J.*, in *Romanitas et Christianitas*, Amsterdam-London 1973, 249-257; F. Quadlbauer, *Zur* Invocatio *des I.*: Grazer Beiträge 2 (1974) 189-212; R. Palla, Aeterna in saecula *in Giovenco*, Praefatio *17*: Studi Classici e Orientali 26 (1977) 377-382; F. Murru, *Analisi semiologica e strutturale della* praefatio *agli* Evangeliorum libri *di G.*: WS 14 (1980) 133-151; R.W. Carrubba, *The Preface to Juvencus' Biblical Epic: A Structural Study*: Amer. Journ. Philol. 114 (1993) 303-312; K. Thraede, *Anfänge frühchristlich-lateinischer Bibelepik: Buchgrenzen bei Juvencus*, in M. Salvadore (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale*, Alessandria 2001, 13-23.

A.V. NAZZARO

K

KERYGMA. The term *kērygma* (“proclamation/preaching”), in the NT, as already in the Greek world, indicates both the content of the message and the act itself of announcing, or else the nucleus itself not only of the gospel, but also of the whole primitive Christian community. Elements which constitute the kerygma are first of all the death and resurrection of Christ, which, in the moment itself in which they are announced, realize in the life of each believer that salvation of which they speak (see 1 Cor 1:21; 2:4). The kerygma thus becomes both a historical and eschatological reality. In the NT there are various formulations of the kerygma inserted both in discourses pronounced by Peter (Acts 2:14-36; 2:38-39; 3:12-26; 4:8-12; 10:34-43) or by Paul (Acts 13:16-41), which give some biographical information on Christ, and in other passages which, however, are free of any mention concerning characteristics or events of the life of Jesus. In the latter case the so-called historical section of the kerygma (i.e., that part which historicizes the figure of Jesus) is used acc. to the scheme of “humiliation/glorification,” where the humiliation is seen in the announcement of the incarnation (and in this case also speaks of preexistence: Rom 10:6-9; 1 Cor 8:6; 2 Cor 8:9; Phil 2:6-11; Col 1:15-20; Heb 1:2f.) or else directly in the moment of death (Rom 1:3-4; 1 Tim 3:16; 1 Pet 3:18). For the Fathers of the first centuries the term *kerygma* indicates the entirety of the mystery of Christ (Hermas, *Sim.* 8,3). The “seal of the kerygma” is baptism (*Sim.* 9,16). For *Irenaeus, kerygma is constituted of what was preached by the apostles and their disciples concerning God the creator; Jesus Christ, his Son; the *Holy Spirit and the “economy,” including the advent, the virgin birth, the passion, resurrection, ascension, return of Christ and recapitulation, resurrection and universal judgment (*Adv. haer.* I, 10,1). This kerygma is “diligently kept” (*Adv. haer.* I, 10,2-3). But heretics too propose their own kerygma (e.g., Carpocrates: Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 25,3). *Origen mentions, however, that the kerygma of the Christians is public, known to all in its constitutive elements which once again are the virgin birth, the crucifixion, the resurrection of Christ and the eschatological judgment (*C. Cels.* 1,7). The content of the kerygma will show itself to be divine to the degree that the person who announces it is a person of little account (ps.-Chrys., PG 64, 25; see also Orig., *C. Cels.* 1,62). In the widest meaning of “preaching,” the term *kerygma* is found in *Eusebius (*HE* I, 10,1), for whom the entire activity of Christ is also included in the term *kerygma* (*HE* I, 10,7; III, 24,7) as well as the salvific and missionary activity of the primitive apostolic community (*HE* II, 1,13; 9,4; 22,4; IV, 8,2). The content of the kerygma is in this case the “kingdom of the heavens” (*HE* II, 14,6) or “the truth” (opposed to the “lying science” of the heretics: *HE* III, 32,8), but the expression “kerygma of truth” also indicates the main activity of *Polycarp (*HE* IV, 14,8) and of the bishops of Rome (*HE* V, 6,5) up to *Victor (*HE* V, 28,3).

GLNT 5, 472-482 (TDNT 3, 683–718); J.M. Robinson, *Kerygma e Gesù storico*, Brescia 1977; J.I.H. McDonald, *Kerygma and Didache: The Articulation and the Structure of the Earliest Christian Message*, Cambridge 1980.

M.G. Mara

KINGDOM of GOD (developments of the formula in the first three centuries). In the NT, outside the synoptic tradition of the sayings of *Jesus, the formula βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ/τῶν οὐρανῶν (“the kingdom of God/ of the heavens”) gradually vanished. It was rarely used by the apostle *Paul (13 times in the 13 Epistles); it occurs twice in the gospel of *John and another two times in the book of Revelation; eight times in the Acts of the Apostles, once in the Epistle to the Hebrews and another time in the Epistle of *James: in all, there are 27 occurrences contrasting with the more than 60 appearances of the term in the gospels of *Mark, *Matthew and *Luke.

If we then pass to the writings immediately after the NT and the *Apostolic Fathers, the absence of the term is almost complete, with the exception of *Justin Martyr's first *Apologia* and the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*.

There is only one reference in *Athenagoras's *Plea for the Christians,* where God and his Son's heavenly kingdom is compared to the empire of *Marcus Aurelius and his son *Commodus, who have a hand on everything: "O great emperors," one reads, "from your state you can make an argument for the heavenly kingdom. In fact, like you, father and son, all things have been given into your hand when you received the empire from on high (because 'the soul of the King is in the hand of God,' says the prophetic Spirit), so too the entire universe is subjected to the only God and the Word, the Son, who is in his presence, understood as inseparable" (*Plea* 18,2). As one can see, Athenagoras spoke here of the *basileia* ("kingdom") understood not so much as "a future good," but as the sovereign power of the Creator who is above all things. Even the *basileia* of the Caesars comes from on high (ἄνωθεν), and in fact—as it is said in Prov 21:1—"The king's heart is a stream of water in the hand of the Lord; he turns it wherever he will." Thus Athenagoras's reference to the "prophetic Spirit" leads to a decisive relativization of Caesar's power. One must recognize, however, that this representation of God the creator and Lord, firmly anchored in the biblical tradition, is harmonized with great difficulty with the abstract concept of God, which is elaborated as a general rule in Athenagoras's *Plea*.

The references of *Justin Martyr's first *Apologia* pertain primarily to the conditions of belonging to the kingdom of God. Thus 1 *Apol.* 15,2 cites Mt 18:9 ("It is better for you to enter life with one eye . . ."); 1 *Apol.* 15,4 cites the mention of castration for the sake of the kingdom in Mt 19:12; 1 *Apol.* 15,16 uses Mt 6:33 ("But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well"). Again 1 *Apol.* 16,9, appeals to Mt 7:21 and places as a condition of belonging to the kingdom one's adherence without reservation to the will of the *Father: it is necessary to be converted, "to be born again," in order to enter the kingdom; in this perspective 1 *Apol.* 61,4 freely cites from Jn 3:3. Last, there is a passage from the *Apologia* that does not contain a direct reference to *Scripture. One reads therein: "We were instructed that in the beginning he [God], being good, made all things from unformed matter for humankind; who, if with their works show themselves worthy of his design, we have learned that they will be deserving of rest with him, reigning together with him, having become incorruptible and impassible. Because, as in the beginning when they did not exist he created them, thus we believe that those who choose things that are pleasing to him will be worthy of incorruptibility and of dwelling with him" (1 *Apol.* 10,2-3). This last citation is revealing. It demonstrates that in any case Justin's reference to the preaching of Jesus on the kingdom is more formal than real. If it is true that the reference to the Scriptures and the word of the Lord effectively resists the transformation of the Christian faith into philosophy, hope in the promised salvation finds its expression less in the NT concept of *basileia* than in the Greek concepts of immortality, incorruptibility, eternal life and full knowledge.

Finally, we refer to the *Dialogue with Trypho*. It has numerous OT testimonies (*testimonia*) pertaining both to the promise of the kingdom (*basileia*) and the future realization of it. Justin freely cites the prophecy of Nathan to *David (2 Sam 7:14-16), and another passage that makes reference to the same context (*Dial.* 118,2; 68,5). Moreover, he mentions various "royal *psalms" or "psalms of feasts and liturgies," and attributes the prophetic announcement of Christ's royalty to these: specifically Ps 24 (*Dial.* 36,3-6; 85,1-4; 100,4; 127,5); Ps 45 (*Dial.* 38,3-5; 56,14; 63,4-5; 76,7; 86,3; 126,1); Ps 47 (*Dial.* 37,1); Ps 72 (*Dial.* 34,2-6; 45,4; 64,6; 76,6-7; 121,1-2); Ps 99 (*Dial.* 37,3-4; 64,4); Ps 110 (*Dial.* 19,4; 32,3-6; 33,1-2; 36,5; 45,2-4; 56,14; 63,3; 76,7; 83,1-4; 96,1; 113,5; 118,1; 127,5) and last Ps 132 (*Dial.* 68,5). Even the prophetic citations pursue the same objectives such as Is 7:10-17 with respect to the Messiah's virgin birth (*Dial.* 43,5-8; 66,2-3; 67,1; 68,6-7; 71,3; 84,1-3) or Is 43:15 (*Dial.* 135,1). But of particular importance in the *Dialogue* is a frequent reference to Dan 7:9-28 (*Dial.* 31,2-7; 46,1; 76,1; 79,2; 86,1; 110,2; 118,1; 120,4). Therefore, the conclusions that one gathers from the analysis of this *testimonium,* which was so widely used by Justin, can be generalized in order to offer a "hermeneutical key" to the entire OT dossier adopted for this point.

At ch. 31, Justin cites the passage under discussion in its entirety. It is the longest citation from *Daniel in Christian writings of the first two centuries. In that passage, Justin precedes and follows the citation with a few comments, which are sufficient, however, for clarifying the objectives of the citation itself. The objection that Trypho formulates at the beginning of ch. 32 is interesting: "This"—i.e., Dan 7—"and other similar Scriptures," Trypho observes, "invite one to await the one who, like a son of man, receives the eternal kingdom in glory and power from the Ancient of Days: but that one, your supposed Christ, was entirely without honor and glory,

to such an extent as to incur the ultimate curse of the divine law. In fact, he was crucified" (*Dial.* 32,1). Justin's response is not expected: unveiling the objectives of the citation from Daniel, he demonstrates that the glorious destiny of the Son of Man and the inauguration of his kingdom refer to the second coming of Christ. In a study entirely dedicated to the exegesis of Daniel and the church of the first three centuries, R. Bodenmann asked why Justin in ch. 31 of the *Dialogue* cited more than 20 verses of Dan 7. For the specific demands of the controversy with Trypho, it would have been enough for him to cite only verses 13-14, which specifically contain the description of the solemn investiture of the Son of Man. He was able to find only one answer to this question: Justin intended to focus the reader's attention on the preceding circumstances of the glorious coming of the Lord, and, without compromising himself before the civil authorities of the time, he wished to suggest that such circumstances were already at their developed stages. Therefore, Justin presented the context of Dan 7:13-14 in such a way that a Jew or a Christian—in contradistinction to a "noninitiated" person—could without much difficulty discern the author's message.

We can summarize the message in these terms: one must only await the coming of the one who will bring forth blasphemies against the most high, and who must maintain power "for a time, more time and a half time." (Justin did not explain this formula, but Bodenmann, following the path of *John's book of Revelation and the *Adversus haereses*—the testimonies of the Danielic tradition that are in every sense closer to Justin—maintained that it equaled three and a half years.) After this event, the Roman Empire would be destroyed and the Messiah would return (R. Bodenmann, *Naissance d'une Exégèse. Daniel dans l'Église ancienne des trois premiers siècles*, Tübingen 1986, 227-231). I shall add three considerations to Bodenmann's conclusions.

1. The frequent recourse to the Old Testament testimonies (*testimonia*) without a doubt places the concept of *basileia* present in the *Dialogue* in the biblical and historical-salvific dimension and articulates its stages of realization by notably distinguishing the first coming of Christ in the humility of the cross from his definitive glorious *parousia. This certainly prevents one from simply reducing Justin's biblical discussion on the kingdom to a *Middle Platonist and *Stoic philosophical concept. Nonetheless, Justin did not develop, starting from the OT concepts, a theological elaboration established on the corresponding adequate recovery of the Synoptic tradition of the sayings of Jesus: precisely because—as we will have the opportunity to see—even in the *Dialogue*, as in the *Apology*, this recovery is more formal than real. All of this did not allow Justin to do what *Origen did 70 years later, i.e., the reconfiguring—in the context of a much more mature scriptural *exegesis—of eschatological interpretations foreign to the preaching of Jesus as much as they were disturbing for the imperial authorities.

2. Certainly, the discussion on the kingdom found in chs. 31-39 of the *Dialogue* was not immune to chiliast conclusions: here and elsewhere in Justin's writings it is actually possible to identify a confusion between the heavenly *basileia* proclaimed by *Jesus and the millennial kingdom preached by the Jewish tradition. The doctrine of the millennium would be clearly explained at the end of ch. 80, and even identified—probably by the catalyst of the controversy against eschatological, *gnostic spiritualism—as an undeniable element of Christian *orthodoxy: "I," Justin states, "and those who are entirely orthodox, maintain that there will be a resurrection of the flesh and one thousand years in Jerusalem reconstructed, adorned and enlarged, as the prophets *Ezekiel, Isaiah and others affirmed" (*Dial.* 80,5).

3. If Bodenmann's interpretation is right, the apocalyptic citation of Dan 7 undoubtedly masks the spirit of retaliation against Caesar's kingdom that Justin had shrewdly put to rest in the *Apology* addressed to the emperor and his heirs.

Then, with respect to the NT testimonies, among the sayings of Jesus on the kingdom, Justin used Mt 4:17 (*Dial.* 51,2) and Mt 11:12-15 (*Dial.* 51,3); and three times in a substantially identical way, Mt 8:11-12 (*Dial.* 76,4; 120,6; 140,4). In addition to these citations, which illustrate the coming of the *basileia* in Christ's first and second *parousia, there are not lacking in the *Dialogue* some references to Jesus' words on the indispensable moral conditions for those belonging to the kingdom. In fact, the special attention given by the cultural climate surrounding the topic of the destiny of the individual and the voluntary exercise of virtue for assimilation to God and the divine led Justin to grasp more than anything else the ethical implications of Jesus' preaching on the kingdom of God. Last, there is a passage in which Justin discusses the kingdom of God without making a direct appeal to the Scriptures. He throws in Trypho's face the fact that the "high priests of the Jewish people did everything they could so that Jesus Christ's name would be profaned and smeared with blasphemies in every part of the earth." "But God," Justin continues, "would show that the sordid lies that you hurled on all those who became Christians in the name of Jesus should be removed from

us: and this will occur when he will call all to life and will establish every one of them [the Christians]—incorruptible, immortal and free from all pain—in the eternal and indestructible kingdom; the others [their adversaries] he will send into the eternal punishment of fire" (*Dial.* 117,3). In this passage—which in truth remains rather isolated in Justin's works—the hope of the kingdom matches the Greek philosophical ideals of *aphtharsia* ("incorruptibility"), *athanasia* ("immortality") and *apatheia* ("impassibility"). Accordingly, he withdraws the historical-salvific tension and forwards the Middle Platonist conception of assimilation to God and the divine through the voluntary exercise of virtue. The development of individual ethics, which rests in turn on the privileged consideration of the individual's destiny and judgment (in fact, it is well known how dear to Justin, even for its apologetic relevance, was the theme of the irreproachable conduct of Christians), corresponds to the tendential fall of the eschatological horizon. In sum—with the analysis of the most important texts already exhausted—we can confirm that not even in the *Dialogue with Trypho* did Jesus' preaching on the kingdom find an elaboration that was adequate and coherent with the historic-salvific revelation of the Bible. In Justin's debate with Trypho—or rather in the confrontation between 2nd-c. Christianity and *Judaism—the pertinent OT testimonies were not always correctly reread in deep agreement with the Synoptic tradition of the sayings of Jesus. In turn, the NT preaching itself on the kingdom tended to be received more in the function of the voluntary exercise of virtue—which corresponds to the attainment of the award—than the function of divine, efficacious and salvific grace. Thus, on the one hand, one can detect the temptation to assimilate the biblical doctrine of the kingdom to Greek philosophical concepts, and on the other hand, the definitive *basileia* of the Son, who is seated at the right hand of the Father, remains confused with the millennial kingdom of Christ and his righteous ones in the heavenly *Jerusalem descended to earth. This does not mean that in the writings of the Greek *Apologists there was a development in the millennialist sense of the concept of the kingdom of God: neither in the writings of *Tatian nor in *Athenagoras nor in *Theophilus can one find a belief in the millennial earthly kingdom of the righteous with Christ. Justin places some scriptural citations in a context in which it is difficult to determine whether the author intended to speak of a millennial kingdom or of God's eternal Lordship in heaven.

But one can hypothesize that an adequate theological elaboration of Jesus' preaching on the kingdom of God by the 2nd-c. Apologists could have reassessed the ambiguous doctrinal holes such as the expectation of the millennial kingdom of Christ. And still, one can rightfully ask if one of the elements of misunderstanding between empire and the church before the Constantinian turn was not determined, on the Christian side, by an insufficient theological elaboration of Jesus' sayings on the *basileia*.

E. dal Covolo, *Escatologia e apocalittica nei primi secoli cristiani. Il Regno di Dio e la sua attesa negli apologisti greci del II secolo*: Salesianum 62 (2000) 625-643 (exhaustive bibl. throughout); Ch. Grappe, *Le Royaume de Dieu: avant, avec et après Jésus*, Geneva 2001.

E. dal Covolo

KISS, HOLY. A highly meaningful gesture acc. to the context in which it occurs, the ways and times in which it is given and received, the persons or things involved, etc. A kiss may indicate love, affection, friendship, homage, protection, welcome, subjection, respect or veneration. Today we use a single word to express all these various meanings, whereas in Latin there was more than one; *Isidore of Seville wrote: *Pacem amicis, filiis osculum dari dicemus, uxoribus basium, scorto savium, item osculum caritatis, basium blanditiae, savium voluptatis* (*Diff.* 1,398). Even in a Christian setting the kiss had various meanings acc. to the context. It was esp. a sign of fraternity and unity (Tertull., *Ad uxorem* 2,4; *De orat.* 18; Ambrosiaster, *In 1 Cor.* 16,20), going back to the beginnings of Christianity (Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Th 5:26; 1 Pet 5:14). Its more common meaning was that of a greeting, but for Christians it expressed something more. During the liturgy a kiss of peace was exchanged, but only among the faithful and not with catechumens, **lapsi* or penitents (see *Apos. Trad.* 18; Counc. of Laodicea, can. 19; Aug., *Contra litt. Pet.* 2,23), and without distinction of the sexes (see Just., 1 *Apol.* 65; Athen., *Legat.* 32; Clem. Alex., *Paed.* III,11; Tertull. *Ad uxor.* 2,4; Counc. of Laodicea, can. 19). When at a later time men and women were separated, the kiss of peace was exchanged only among those of the same sex (*Apos. Con.* II, 57,17; VIII, 11,9). The exchange took place at different times in different regions: in the West, customarily before communion (see Pope Innocent, *Ad Decent.* 25, PL 20, 553). A kiss was also exchanged on other liturgical occasions, where it always seals something that has already occurred: after baptism (*Apos. Trad.* 21; *Testam. D.N.J.* 2,9; *Can. of Hippo.* 19; Cypr., *Ep.* 59); after the ordination of a bishop (*Trad. Apost.* 4; *Const. apost.* VIII,5,10); and in the wedding

rite during the act of "betrothal" (Tertull., *De virg. vel.* 11; Ambr., *Ep.* 41,18), where the kiss also took on a legal value (CTh III,5,6).

DACL 2, 117-130; EC 2, 661-665; RAC 8, 505-519; E. Scerbo, *Il bacio nel costume e nei secoli*, Rome 1963; K. Thraede, *Ursprung und Formen des "hl. Kuss" im frühen Christentum*: JbAC 11/12 (1968-69) 124-180; G.W. Clark, *Cyprian's Epistle 64 and the Kissing of Feet in Baptism*: HTR 66 (1973) 147-152; C.G. Mor, *Simbologia e simboli nella vita giuridica*, in *Simboli e simbologia nell'Alto Medioevo*, Spoleto 1976, I, 15-29; J. Le Goff, *Les gestes symboliques dans la vie sociale. Les gestes de vassalité*, ibid., II, 679-779; N.J. Perella, *The Kiss Sacred and Profane: An Interpretative History of Kiss Symbolism and Related Religioerotic Themes*, Berkeley, CA 1969; W. Klassen, *The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines*: NTS 39 (1993) 122-135; G. Cipriani, *Il vocabolario latino dei baci*: Aufidus 17 (1992) 69-102; L.E. Phillips, *The Ritual Kiss in Early Christian Worship*, Cambridge 1996; R. Calatayud Gascó, *Beso humano y osculo cristiano*, Valencia 2003.

A. Di Berardino

KNIK' HAWATOY (Seal of faith). An extensive and important Armenian christological *florilegia composed at the beginning of the 7th c., probably at the request of the *catholicos Comitas. Next to Armenian authors, it cites numerous Greek and *Syriac works, in general taken from preexisting *Armenian translations.

Knik'hawatoy ěndhanowr sowrb ekełœec'woy yowłłap'ar ew s. hogekir harc'n meroc'dawanowt'eanc'yawowrs Komitas kat'ołikosi hamahawak'eal ("Seal of the faith of the holy universal church, of our holy orthodox and inspired Fathers, composed in the days of the catholicos Comitas"), S. Ēčmiacin 1914; J. Lebon, *Les citations patristiques grecques du "Sceau de la foi"*: RHE 25 (1929) 5-32.

S.J. Voicu

KOINE. A language based on the Attic dialect of the Athenian area, mixed with the language of the Cyclades, Ionia and the Ionic colonies on the N part of the Aegean Sea; it was common to various Greek ethnic groups, having established itself from the 4th c. BC at the cost of local dialects (Boeotian, Doric, etc.) from which it received influences, becoming the language generally spoken, but also easier due to grammatical simplifications. The vocabulary was enriched, some words changed their meaning and even the orthography underwent modifications. This language was also introduced into Macedonia, becoming with time the official language under Philip II and also taking on local elements. This common form of the language (*koinē*) was spread by Alexander the Great through his troops and the founding of colonies, creating a linguistic unity. It was a lingua franca, spoken by different peoples who did not renounce their local languages. The NT, like the Greek translation of the OT, is in this language. The NT Koine shows a fusion of the Attic dialect, which is preponderant, with the dialects of the NE of Greece and preserves strong traces of Semitic contaminations. An eclectic language, it enriches its vocabulary with words borrowed from other languages not just as a lexicographical fact, but also a semantic one. It coins new words, willingly compounds them and loves diminutives. In grammar and syntax it tends toward simplification, modifies the declensions, abandons some classical forms, such as the dual, and privileges the prepositions since the declensions and their cases had lost their original expressiveness. In the conjugations of the verb there are new and popular forms, more frequent use of periphrastics, the taste for normalizing irregular verbs, for making the conjugation uniform and for transforming intransitive verbs into transitive verbs. The differences with classical Greek so far pointed out, which are not all of them, are the emblematic signs of the decline of forms and of linguistic impersonality and the prevalence of popular speech over the academic and literary, but also of a language in evolution. Some Christian authors, such as *Basil and *John Chrysostom, tried to use the Attic dialect, with a certain success. The Christians, in the official language, in the Middle East adopted a form which rejected popular forms. The written language changed little up to the 9th c., while the spoken language underwent profound transformations.

DBS 3, 1320-1369; M. Zerwick, *Graecitas biblica*, Rome [4]1960; *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, W. Bauer - W. Arndt - F. Wilbur Gingrich - F. Danker, Chicago 1979; F. Blass - A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen [12]1965 (Eng. tr. of 10th ed.: R.W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago 1961); E. Springhetti, *Introductio historica grammatica in graecitatem Novi Testamenti*, Rome 1966; Cath 6, 1803-1807; J. O'Callaghan, *Koiné*: Enc. della Bibbia 4, Turin 1970, cols. 488-492; R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, Cambridge [2]1983 (ch. 2 on Greek at the time of the Roman Empire); V. Bubenik, *Dialect Contact and Koineization: The Case of Hellenistic Greek*: International Journal of the Sociology of Language 99 (1993) 9-23; S.E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield [2]1994 (1992); N. Basile - P. Radici Colace, *Sintassi storica del greco antico*, Bari 1998.

E. Peretto

KOINONIA. Among the Fathers of the first centuries the term *koinōnia,* used in a religious context, indicates mostly a relationship of vital character which is established (1) within the trinitarian con-

text, (2) between God and humans, and (3) in the relationships among humans.

1. In the trinitarian context the knowledge of the *koinōnia* of the Father with the Son is recognized as the aspiration of every Christian (Athenag., *Leg.* 12,2), but the existence of a *koinōnia* of nature between the Spirit and God is also proclaimed (Basil., *Spir.* 30), and between the Spirit and the Father and the Son (Basil., *Spir.* 38). The *gnostics, on the basis of Jn 1:1, acknowledge a *koinōnia* between God, the Principle and the Logos with the Father (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,8,5).

2. The *koinōnia* between human nature and divine nature takes its beginning from *Origen in the *incarnation of Christ, but is destined to extend to all those who follow his teachings (*C. Cels.* III, 28). Virginity is seen as *koinōnia* with the *Holy Spirit, from which is born life and incorruptibility (Greg. Nyss., *Verg.* 13,3), just as the ecstasy into which humans can enter, while praying is *koinōnia* with the Holy Spirit (Did., *In Gen.* 15,12). Following mostly Pauline passages, the *koinōnia* between God and humans takes place, acc. to the Fathers, thanks to the mediation of Christ particularly in the *Eucharist, which is itself also indicated at the same time with the term *koinōnia* (Dion. Ar., *E.h.* III, 1; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 23,23). But more or less all the rites of Christian initiation have the goal of realizing this *koinōnia* (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 20,3.6). Also among the gnostics the formulas of initiation offer a *koinōnia* with the powers (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,21,3).

3. Among humans, *koinōnia* is spoken of when the same dogmas of the faith are accepted (Theodrt. *H. rel.* II, 16; III, 17), and it is for this reason that communion with heretics is forbidden (Leontius Const., *Hom. pasc.* I, 8: SC 187, 382). In the Latin context the *communio,* or *concordia* or *unanimitas,* is seen above all as a characteristic of the church (Cypr., *De unit.* 4; *Ep.* 11,3; 45,1; Aug., *Ep.* 49,2); it is a participation and reflection of the *koinōnia* existing between the Father, the Son and the Spirit (Cypr., *Or.* 23).

Ecclesial *koinōnia* can never be abandoned by the believer, even if faults are verified in it (Aug., *Ep.* 44,11). It is from the spiritual *koinōnia* which links humans to one another that the necessity is born of realizing a material *koinōnia* as well (*Barn.* 19,8), but the most complete experience of such a *koinōnia* extended in all directions is that which is found in monastic environments, where the monks attempt to put into practice the communitarian ideal described in Acts 4:32 (see Chrom., *Serm.* 1,7; 31,4; Aug., *Mor. eccl. cath.* 1,21,67; *C. Faust.* 5,9; *Praecept.* 2-4.8; Cass., *Conl.* IV, 21,3).

GLNT 5, 693-726 (TDNT 3,789-809); DSp 8, 1750-1758 (It. tr. in one volume, Turin 1982); H. Pétré, *Caritas. Étude sur le vocabulaire latin de la charité chrétienne*, Louvain 1948; A. Matellanes, *Communicatio. El sentido de la comunión eclesial en San Cipriano*: Communio 1 (1970) 19-64, 347-401; P.C. Bori, *Koinonia: l'idea della comunione nell'ecclesiologia recente e nel Nuovo Testamento*, Brescia 1972; J. Heinz, *Koinonia. "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus*, Regensburg 1982, 206-231 (in the Fathers); P. Tamburino, *Koinonia. Aspetti ecclesiologici del cenobitismo pacomiano nel IV secolo*, Rome 1989; Fr. Reni - A. Vásquez Vizcaya, *La "Koinonia" en la literatura patrística de los siglos II y III. Estudio sobre la evolución de una doctrina*, Rome 1993; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*: *The Monasteries of Palestine, 314-631*, Oxford 1994; Y. Hirschfeld, *The Judaean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period*, New Haven, CT 1992; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Washington, DC 1995.

M.G. Mara

KORIUN (1st half of 5th c.). An Armenian author, around 445 he wrote a life of his teacher Mesrob, the inventor of the Armenian alphabet, handed down in two different redactions. The work contains some autobiographical cues, from which we learn that Koriun was part of a group of the first Armenian translators of the Scriptures and of works of the Greek Fathers.

LTK² 6, 556-557; M. Abegjan, *Koriywn, Vark' Maštoc'i* [*Koriun, Vita di Maštots*], Erevan 1941 (repr. with Eng. tr. and concordance, ed. B. Norehad - K.H. Maksoudian); V. Inglisian, *Das Leben des hl. Maschtotz von seinem Schuler Koriun*, Vienna 1963; B. Norehad, *Koriun*, *The Life of Mashtots*, New York 1964; C. Gugerotti, *L'invenzione dell'alfabeto in Armenia*: *teologia della storia nella* Vita di Maštoc' *di Koriwn*, in C. Moreschini - G. Menestrina, *La traduzione dei testi religiosi.* Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 10-11 febbraio 1993 (Religione e Cultura 6), Brescia 1994, 101-126; G. Winkler, *Koriwns Biographie des Mesrop Maštoc'. Übersetzung und Kommentar* (OCA 245), Rome 1994.

S.J. Voicu

L

LABOR

I. Labor law - II. Christians and trades - III. Employers and workers.

I. Labor law. Faithful to the Jewish tradition (Gen 2:15; Ex 20:9; Sir 38:29-35; *Pirke Aboth* 2,2) and the New Testament (Mt 10:10; Mk 6:3; 13:1f.; 24:45-51; 1 Cor 4:12; 1 Th 2:9; 2 Th 3:10-12; Eph 4:20), the Fathers rehabilitate labor in all its forms and recall the obligation of it. For them, labor is a divine institution written into the work of creation. "Man"—Irenaeus writes—"received from God his hands to maintain and to work. Whoever participates in the art and wisdom of God, participates also in his power" (*Adv. haer.* V, 3,2). Through their labor, humans continue in some way the labor of God; like God, they must use wisdom, strength and beauty. The greater part of the Fathers are even clearer in underlining that labor allows humans to assure their own sustenance and that of their families; and that it contributes to the prosperity of the state (Arist., *Apol.* 15; Tertull., *Apol.* 42,1-2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 25-26). *Augustine, in turn, sketches an ethics of labor: labor is a commandment of God; every person, therefore, physically sound, must see to his or her own maintenance with his own work. Even the monk cannot escape this duty with the pretext of needing to attend to contemplation (*De opere monachorum*, 1,2; 16,9). A summary apologetic underlines, with a certain redundance, the esteem which the first Christians, on the example of Jesus and Paul, had for manual labor, condemning all forms of laziness and parasitism, and opposing, in favor of labor, the equivocal vagabondage of certain pagan intellectuals. It is not, though, correct to advance a clear contrast between the attitude of the Fathers and that of the Greco-Roman world, declaring the latter voluntarily hostile to manual labor and entrusting it entirely to slaves. The criticisms of manual labor raised by Xenophon, Isocrates and Cicero seem like a rather banal literary topos; in fact, these same authors are favorable to the labor of the fields, which fortifies the body and spirit, and is indispensable to the good of humanity. On the other hand, it is good to mention that Classical Antiquity never thought that manual labor was in itself degrading, but manual activity was condemned in its more humiliating forms in the measure to which it ruins the body, subjecting it to intolerable weights, enervates the spirit, and leaves no time for friendship, family life and social life. Antiquity did this in order that the true nature of "servile" labor might emerge more clearly. In the same way it is not correct to try to find in the Fathers clarifications on the legal or financial conditions of the ancient economy, on the mechanisms of production and exchange. The Fathers do not have a "social doctrine"; they do not provide models applicable in themselves to the world of labor or capable of providing a Christian criterion for economic life. Rather, they look principally to the moral aspect of labor and of the professions. They do not minimize the painful character of labor (Iren., *Adv. haer.* V, 33,2; Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 115,1), but strongly underline its irreplaceable dignity and greatness; with their labor, humans participate in the work of the Creator, and imprint in this way a personal seal on their creations; they become aware, in the completed work, of their qualities, of their *savoir faire* and of the talents which are their own. *Clement of Rome describes the satisfaction of the worker who has done his or her work well (*1 Clem.* 34,1); the Christian epitaphs exalt the merits of good workers. And nonetheless, labor is not the whole of humanity. It is not a goal in itself, but a means which people must know how to use well (Hermas, *Vis.* III, 6,5-7; *Mand.* X, 1,1-4).

II. Christians and trades. The majority of the Christians of the pre-Nicene era belonged to modest classes; among them were numerous slaves. Farmers or artisans, they lived from the fruit of their labor, continuing to carry out their trades from before

their conversion (1 Cor 7:20). *Tertullian attests that the converts came from the most varied professions: soldiers and sailors, farmers and merchants (*Apol.* 42,2-3; see also *To Diognetus* 5,4; Orig., *C. Cels.* I, 29; III, 56-58). Christians were forbidden only the trades which were in direct relationship with idolatry, violence and immorality. For this reason, the *Apostolic Tradition* refuses baptism to the sculptors and builders of idols, to gladiators, to charioteers and to actors. The world of theater and dance fell under the same reprobation. It goes without saying that the world of prostitution and everything that belonged to it were excluded from Christianity. Tertullian dedicated an entire treatise, *De corona,* to the art of arms, which he claims Christians should not exercise. His extreme position has never been accepted by the authority of the church.

III. Employers and workers. The Fathers accept the social situation of their time; they do not contest the inequality which exists between the worker who needs a salary to live and the employer who offers work. They limit themselves to moral considerations, without great originality of thought; sometimes, however, they also express, with brutally energetic tones, the principles which should guide this relationship. *Clement of Alexandria, citing Dt 24:15, recalls that "the Scripture teaches that it is necessary to pay on the same day the agreed salary" (*Strom.* II, 85,1). The *Sibylline Oracles* repeat the invective of James against owners who cheat workers of their salary, threatening them with the worst punishments, "Since the straits of the harvesters have reached the ears of the God of Hosts." And Clement adds: "The unjust are nourished for the day of slaughter" (II, 30,74). The Fathers leave the care for fixing the just salary to the conscience of the employers and to their fear of the judgment of God. They limit themselves also to urging workers to fulfill their duty in the best way, without laziness and without negligence.

A.T. Geoghegan, *The Attitude Towards Labor in Early Christianity and Ancient Culture*, Washington, D.C. 1945; H. Holzapfel, *Die sittliche Wertung der körperlichen Arbeit im christlichen Altertum*, Würzburg 1941; W. Bienert, *Die Arbeit nach der Bibel*, Stuttgart 1954; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IIe-IIIe s.)*, Paris 1979, 83-88; RAC 1, 585-590; TWNT 2, 645-647 (TDNT 2, 643-652); S. Felici (ed.), *Spiritualità del lavoro nella catechesi dei Padri del III-IV sec.*, Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 75, Rome 1986; B. Van den Hoven, *Work in Ancient and Medieval Thought: Ancient Philosophers, Medieval Monks and Theologians and Their Concept of Work, Occupations and Theology*, Amsterdam 1996; A. Quacquarelli, *L'educazione al lavoro. Dall'antica comunità cristiana al monachesimo primitivo*, in *Res christiana: temi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1999, 9-22.

Ch. Munier - G. Pilara

LACTANTIUS (ca. 260–ca. 330). The principal source concerning the life and works of Lucius Caecilius (Caelius, acc. to other witnesses of the MS tradition of his works) Firmianus Lactantius is *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 80): "Firmianus, also called Lactantius, disciple of Arnobius, taught rhetoric at Nicomedia, where he had been called under the emperor Diocletian, together with the grammarian Flavius whose books on medicine written in verse survive; due to the scarcity of pupils, since the city was of Greek speech, he dedicated himself to the activity as a writer. From him we have a *Symposium,* which he wrote as a young man in Africa, and a *Hodoeporicon* [i.e., the description of a journey] from Africa to Nicomedia written in verses and another book titled *Grammaticus;* furthermore, the wonderful book on the wrath of God, the seven books against the pagans and the epitome of the same work, whose text has reached us without the first part, two books dedicated to Asclepiades, a book on the persecution, four books of letters to Probus, two books of letters to Severus, two books of letters to his disciple Demetrianus and the book on the divine work or on the creation of humanity dedicated to the same disciple. In extreme old age he was in *Gaul the teacher of the Caesar Crispus, the son of Constantine, who was later killed by his father." He was probably born around 260 in Proconsular *Africa, where Jerome makes him the disciple of the rhetor *Arnobius of Sicca (see also *Ep.* 70,5). He converted to Christianity perhaps in *Bithynia, as it seems from some elements of his theological culture. At Nicomedia he almost certainly knew *Constantine, a forced guest at the court of *Diocletian. He was constrained to abandon the city together with his profession of rhetor during the persecution of Diocletian. After Constantine had become emperor, he was called to *Trier in Gaul as preceptor of Crispus and perhaps also as counselor to the emperor, whose letters and laws written in that time seem to be under the influence of Lactantian language and thought.

We do not know, however, how long he remained in Gaul, nor the date of his death, to be located perhaps at Trier around 330. Of the many works listed by Jerome, extant are the *De opificio Dei,* the *Divinae institutiones,* the *De ira Dei* and the *De mortibus persecutorum,* which almost certainly should be identified with the *De persecutione* cited in the *De viris illustribus*. Also attributed to Lactantius, starting from Gregory of Tours (*De cursu stell.* 12), are the 85 elegiac distichs of the poem *De Ave Phoenice*. In the treatise *De opificio Dei* the beauty and the perfect functionality of the human body are described, exalting, in polemic with the Epicureans who denied it,

the existence of divine Providence. In the prologue and epilogue there are allusions to the persecution of Diocletian, by which it seems that the little work was written between 303 and 305. It was precisely during the raging of the persecution, as he himself declares (*Div. inst.* V, 2,2), that he conceived the project of a great apologetic work, the *Divinae institutiones,* in defense of Christianity, a project which he realized between 306 and 313, but not in a definitive form, as is evident from some traces of reelaboration; it was probably finished during his stay at the court of Constantine in Gaul. The work is structured in seven books: (1) *De falsa religione,* (2) *De origine erroris,* (3) *De falsa sapientia philosophorum,* (4) *De vera sapientia et religione,* (5) *De iustitia,* (6) *De vero cultu,* (7) *De vita beata.* He speaks about divine wrath in a specific work, the *De ira Dei,* announced in the *Divinae institutiones* (II, 17,4-5), to demonstrate, in polemic perhaps with his master Arnobius and certainly against the *Stoics, who wanted a purely benevolent Providence, and against the Epicureans, who maintained the indifference of any eventual existing divinities, that God is moved by sentiments of benevolence toward the just and wrath toward sinners. At the court of Constantine, with the intention of political-religious propaganda against Licinius, probably between 318 and 321, Lactantius composed the *De mortibus persecutorum,* to testify to future generations the avenging justice of God, who had punished the principal persecutors of the Christians. In all likelihood he composed the *Epitome* of the *Divinae institutiones* after the *De mortibus persecutorum,* summarizing its principal themes, but then also adapting it to the new political-religious reality which had come into existence under Constantine.

The merits and the limits of Lactantius as a Christian writer and thinker, of Ciceronian mold, have been expressed fleetingly by Jerome both in his letter to *Paulinus (*Ep.* 58,10): "Oh, if Lactantius, almost a river of Ciceronian eloquence, had been able to maintain our cause with the same facility with which he overturned that of our adversaries!" and in his letter to Magnus (*Ep.* 70,5): "Arnobius published seven books against the pagans, as did his disciple Lactantius, who also composed two works, on the wrath and the creative work of God, in which you will find, if you would read them, an epitome of the dialogues of Cicero." Lactantius himself, in the introduction to the *Divinae institutiones,* declares that he wishes to illustrate the Christian truth with the splendor of eloquence, since elegance and beauty of expression attract readers and move their emotions, thus making acceptance of the truth easier (*Div. inst.* I, 1,7-10; cf. III, 1,1-2; V, 1,9.11; V, 4,1-2). In Lactantius's work the philosophical-religious eclecticism joins or juxtaposes conceptions of Platonic, Stoic, Pythagorean origin with elements of the Jewish-Christian tradition. A conception results which could be accused of theological, anthropological and cosmological dualism (*Div. inst.* II, 8.9.12), but Lactantius expressly affirms that the first cause of the cosmic conflict between light and darkness, between life and death, between good and evil, is the very creative will of God who wanted two antagonistic spirits, one the principle of good, the other the principle of evil. A clear limit of the Lactantian theology is, however, the identification of the generation of the Word with the process of divine "spiration," so that he does not distinguish the Word, firstborn spirit of the Father, from the *Holy Spirit, as a third autonomous person of the trinitarian mystery. Reserve should also be held regarding his description of the millenarian kingdom of Christ on earth. But despite the limits both of his theological thought and stylistic and linguistic originality, sacrificed to the intentional imitation of Cicero, he has great importance in the history of Western literature and culture, having been the first Christian thinker to attempt a systematic exposition of his faith, addressing himself to the cultivated classes of the Roman world, not renouncing its cultural and literary tradition, rather exerting himself to join it with the moral and religious message of Christianity. From a purely historical-literary point of view he was the first Christian writer in Latin who attempted to illuminate the Christian teaching, promoted by him as the true philosophy and the true wisdom, with the splendor of eloquence and classical culture. Without doubt Lactantian eloquence is exceptionally vibrant and overwhelming, but there are times in which it becomes impassioned and emotional, ironic and biting, dramatic and incisive. He excels among Christian writers for purity of language and classical elocution, while accepting vocabulary together with semantic and syntactic links particular to postclassical Latin literature or borrowed from the *sermo cottidianus,* as well as suggestions from Christian, biblical and liturgical language.

CPL 85-92; PL 6-7; CSEL 19 (S. Brandt, 1890); 27 (S. Brandt - G. Laubmann, 1897); M.C. Fitz-Patrick, *Lactantius' De ave phoenice*, Philadelphia 1933; E.H. Blakeney, *Lactantius' Epitome of the Divine Institutes*, London 1950; J. Moreau, *Lactance. De la mort des persécuteurs*, III, Paris 1954 (SC 39); H. Kraft - A. Wlosok, *Lactantius. De ira Dei. Vom Zorne Gottes*, Darmstadt 1957; A. Wlosok, *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis*, Heidelberg 1960; H. Hross, *Lactantius. Divinae Institutiones. Fünftes Buch*, Munich 1963; F. Corsaro, *Lucii Caecilii Firmiani Lactantii De mortibus persecutorum*, Catania 1970; V. Loi, *Lat-*

tanzio nella storia del linguaggio e del pensiero teologico preniceno, Zürich 1970 (Bibliotheca Theologica Salesiana, Ser. I, n. 5); E. Heck, *Die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius*, Heidelberg 1972; P. Monat, *Lactance. Institutions Divines. Livre V*, Paris 1973 (SC 204-205); M. Perrin, *Lactance. L'ouvrage du Dieu créateur*, I-II, Paris 1974 (SC 213-214); Id., *L'homme antique et chrétien. L'anthropologie de Lactance (250-325)*, Paris 1981; E. Lamirande, *Lactance*: DSp IX (Paris 1976), col. 48-59; M. Perrin (ed.), *Lactance et son temps. Recherches actuelles*, Paris 1978; P. Monat, *Lactance et la Bible*, Paris 1982; Id., *Institutiones divines*, livre I, Paris 1986 (SC 326), livre II, Paris 1987 (SC 337); Chr. Ingremeau, *La colère de Dieu*, Paris 1982 (SC 289); R. Teja, *Sobre la muerte de los perseguidores*, Madrid 1982; H. Kraft - A. Wlasok, *Vom Zorne Gottes*, Darmstadt 41983; J.L. Creed, *De mortibus persecutorum*, Oxford 1984; Cetedoc, *Thesaurus Lactantii* (Concordanze), Turnhout 1998; *Autour de Lactance, Hommage à P. Monat*, éds. J.-Y. Guillaumin - S. Ratti, Besançon 2003.

V. Loi - B. Amata

LAIDCENN (or Laidcenn mac Buith Bannaig) (d. 661). A clever interpreter of the Scripture, known for this reason also as *sapiens* or *sanctus confessor*, he was a monk of Cluain Ferta Mo-Lua (Clonfert-Mulloe) and died in 661. He wrote the *Egloga,* which constitutes a sort of summary of the *Moralia in Iob* of *Gregory the Great, and part of the MS tradition attributes the *Lorica* to him, otherwise held to be the work of *Gildas, a prayer which invites every creature (cherubim, seraphim, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, virgins, confessors etc.) to unite with Christ to build a crown which will be able to protect every single part of the body from the evil one, focusing attention on private prayer and presupposing a certain knowledge of the medical and magical literature of antiquity.

Egloga: CPL 1716; M. Adriaen (ed.), CCL 145, Turnhout 1969; L. Gougaud, *Le témoignage des manuscrits sur l'oeuvre du moine Lathcen*: Revue Celtique 30 (1909) 37-46; R. Wasselynck, *Les compilations des Moralia in Job du VII[e] au XII[e] siècle*: RTAM 29 (1962) 5-32; C.D. Wright, *Biblical Commentaries—Old and New Testaments*, in *Sources of Anglosaxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*, ed. F.M. Biggs - T.D. Holl - P.E. Szarmach, Binghamton 1990, 90-123.

Lorica: CPL 1323; J.H.G. Grattan - C. Singer, *Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine*, Oxford 1952, 130-147; PLS 4, 1260-1261; L. Gougaud, *Études sur les loricae celtiques*: BALAC 1 (1911) 265-281 and 2 (1912) 33-41, 101-127; M. Esposito, *The Lorica of Lathcen*: JTS 30 (1929) 289-291; G.S. Mac Eoin, *Invocation of the Forces of Nature in the Loricae*: Studia Hibernica 2 (1962) 212-217; M.W. Herren, *The Authorship, Date of Composition and Provenance of the So-Called Lorica Gildae*: Ériu 24 (1973) 35-51.

P. Marone

LAMB. The importance of the term *lamb,* associated with that of the goat and the sheep, is immense in Christian literature, both due to the affection inspired by the little lamb and what that expresses, and for the other economic, social and political dimensions which produced a plurality of meanings in various cultural settings, which later came together, almost universally, in the language of Christian religious worship.

Patristic *exegesis is based on the meaning and original symbolism of the Hebrew term *kebes* ("lamb"), which is in contrast with *tso'n* ("sheep or small livestock"). The Greek term ἀμνός (*amnos,* Lat. *agnus*) indicates a young sheep, sometimes a yearling, or an animal for the sacrifice; ἀρέν (*aren,* Lat. *ovis, aries*) also indicates a lamb to be slaughtered, while pathetic overtones attach to the diminutive ἀρνίον (*arnion,* Lat. *agnellus*), "little lamb"; πρόβατον (*probaton,* Lat. *pecus, ovis, quadrupes animal domesticum*), instead, is generic, and can indicate a single sheep or domestic livestock.

All this semantic variety comes together in the christological designation of Jesus as the Lamb, the Son of God. Whereas the figure of the sheep and its independence with respect to the flock (see Mt 18:12-14; Lk 15:4-7) is preferred in *gnostic imagery, among Christian authors the lamb always preserves a particular christological aspect of tenderness, and enters into (1) the symbolism of suffering, as with the lamb led to the slaughter; (2) eschatological symbolism, as with the lamb on mount Zion; (3) the deprecatory, sacrificial and expiatory dimension, as with the lamb who bears and takes away sin; (4) the paschal typology, as the summation, synthesis and exaltation of the pneumatic (the spiritual pastures), christological (Christ the Lamb) and theological (God the Shepherd) aspects of the salvific event, brought to fulfillment in Christ.

In the biblical tradition of the priestly writings, the lamb is the preferred sacrificial victim, whether in the form of a burnt offering or a simple offering (Lev 9:3; Num 15:5), or in the purification of the people or of individuals (see Lev 14:10).

Jesus, the true Lamb (Jn 1:29, 36; Acts 8:32; 1 Pet 1:19), the Lamb of God, is the counterpart of the unnamed servant of God who patiently suffers like a lamb led to the slaughter and is silent before his shearers (Is 53:7; cf. Acts 8:32-35). Taking into account the fact that the Aramaic *talia* can mean both lamb and young man or servant (*puer*), it is natural to see in Jesus the perfectly unitary semantic realization of the lamb and of the servant of God, persecuted like Jeremiah (Jer 11,19) and killed for the expiation of the sins of his people.

The *arnion* of the Apocalypse is the Lord worthy of adoration, the one who opens the seals, but also

the *lamb slain,* who has redeemed people of every race with his own blood (Rev 5:9-10). He is the wrathful lamb (Rev 6:16), but also the lamb who celebrates the wedding feast. This *heavenly lamb* is the same as the paschal lamb (Rev 5:9-10), simultaneously sacrificed and triumphant. He is the lamb in his redemptive death, but the victorious lion in the liberation of the people of God from the powers of evil (Rev 5:5-6; 12:11).

The Christian writers are extremely faithful to the divine Word, concentrating primarily on the christological and eschatological symbolism of the lamb (see Ex 12:3-13 and 1 Cor 5:7), on its typologies of sacrifice and atonement (cf. Is 53:7), particularly redemptive and universal (Jn 1:29 and Rev 5:8), relating the biblical data in vivid messianic typologies.

Beginning with the philosopher and apologist Justin, a long series of authors consider the lamb and the banquet of the exodus as the prefiguration of the immolation of the flesh of the paschal lamb, and of the eucharistic banquet of Christ (Just., *Dial*, 40; Melito, *Peri Pascha* 5; 67; 71; ps.-Hippolytus, *In Sanctum Pascha* 2, 20; 32; 40; Origen, *Hom.* 13 *in Lk*; *Peri Pascha*, 9: see Nautin, SCL 36, 84, n. 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 10,18; Cyprian, *Ep.* 63, 12, 2; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* IV, 26, 36-39; Gaudentius, *Tract.* III, 21; Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* IV, 162; Cyril Alex., *In Io.* 7; Gregory Ill., *Tract.* IX; *Passio Andreae* 6; Gelasius Cyz., *Hist. Eccl.* II, 31, 6). The contexts are various, but the statements are repeated like a refrain providing the cadence for Christ's triumphal procession. "How could there have been reconciliation between God and the human race if the mediator between God and humanity had not taken upon himself the debt of all? . . . Among all people, only in our Lord Jesus Christ, the true spotless lamb, have all been crucified, all put to death, all buried and all also risen" (Leo the Great, *Letter to the Emperor Leo*, 4-5).

Just as the blood of the lamb saved the Jews, so the blood of Christ will save humanity (Cyprian, *Ad Demetr.* 22; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* IV, 26, 41-42; Gaudentius, *Tract.* VI, 11; Gregory Ill., *Tract.* IX). He is the true sacrificial lamb, offered for the sins of the world (1 Pet 1:19; Melito, frg. *in Gen.*; Clement Alex., *Paedag.* 1, 51; frg. of the *Chron. Pasc.* 14-15: GCS III, 216,20–217,7; Origen, *In Io.* VI, 51-52; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69; Cyril Jer., *Catech.* 19,3; Theodore Mops., *Io.* 1, 29). Lamb of God is his name par excellence (see Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1. 5, 24, 4; Origen, *Com. in Io.* VI, 52; Gaudentius, *Tract.* II, 14.17; ps.-Ambrose, *Hymn* 62).

"We have therefore become, in the blood of our redeemer, the people of his conquest, just as the people of Israel was once rescued from Egypt through the blood of the lamb" (Bede, *Comm. 1 Pet*, 2).

"The mystery of Easter is new and old, timeless and in time, corruptible and incorruptible, mortal and immortal. Old acc. to the law, but new acc. to the Word; in time acc. to the figure, eternal acc. to grace. Corruptible through the slaying of the lamb, incorruptible through the life of the Lord; mortal by his burial in the earth, immortal by his resurrection from the dead. The law is old, but the Word is new; the figure is in time, grace in eternity. The lamb is corruptible, the Lord incorruptible: sacrificed as a lamb, he was raised as God. Because 'like a sheep he was led to the slaughter' [Is 53:7], but he was not a sheep; 'like a silent lamb' (Acts 8:32), but he was not a lamb. . . . I—he says—am the Christ. All of you, therefore, come, families of humanity covered with sin, and receive the forgiveness of sins. Because I am your forgiveness, I the Easter of salvation, I the lamb sacrificed for you. I am your redemption, your life, your resurrection" (Melito of Sardis, *Peri Pascha*, 2-6; 39-40;100-103).

The liturgy, in proclaiming Christ the true paschal lamb (*preface of the Mass of Easter*), echoes a very ancient tradition going back to the very origins of Christianity and to the preaching of Paul, who exhorts the faithful of Corinth to live as unleavened bread in sincerity and truth, because our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed (1 Cor 5:7).

The symbolism of the lamb, therefore, also had great importance in the catacombs and in the first places where Christians were able to publicly profess their religion.

In basilicas after *Constantine, the lamb polarizes the visible dimension of the trinitarian and ecclesial mystery: cross and lamb indicate the victim; purple background and palm branches indicate the triumph (Paul. Nola, *Lett.* 32,10). The divine lamb is sometimes on a mountain from which flow the four rivers of Eden—the holy evangelists, with twelve sheep, the apostles—arranged symmetrically, coming out of Jerusalem and Bethlehem: i.e., from the holy city, seat of the holy temple, where the paschal lamb was sacrificed, and from the city made holy by the birth of the Lamb, the Son of God.

R. Cantalamessa, *L'omelia "In S. Pascha" dello Ps.-Ippolito di Roma*, Milan 1967, 306-312; V. Loi, *La tipologia dell'agnello pasquale e l'attesa escatologica in età patristica*, in *Fons vivus*, Misc. Lit. Don Eusebio Maria Vismara, Rome 1971, 125-142; J. Jeremias, ἀμνός: TWNT 1, 342-44 (TDNT 1, 338-341); Lampe, ἀμνός, 89-90; M.P. Ciccarese (ed.), *Animali simbolici. Alle origini del Bestiario cristiano.* I, EDB 2002.

V. Loi - B. Amata

LAMBAESIS (Lambaesis, in Numidia, today Tazoult, in Algeria). This city was situated on the NW slope of the Aurès Mountains, which divide the fertile plateau from the Sahara Desert, where one of the few passes toward the S could be controlled. Born as a military fortress in AD 81, it became the seat of the general quarter (*Principia*) of the *III Legio Augusta* from 115–120, and of the *legatus,* who commanded a vast territory, which included the S of Numidia as far as Fezzan. *Hadrian passed in review in 128, giving a speech 1 July, part of which survives on an inscription (CIL 8, 2532, 18042 = ILS 2487, 9133-9135). The legion, dissolved in 238 by Gordian III, was reconstituted in 253 by *Valerian. Near the encampment, about a km to the SW, at the time of *Marcus Aurelius, the city developed, under Latin law, becoming a *colonia* in the 2nd half of the 3rd c. Around 198 it became capital of the new province of Numidia (*Africa Nova*), which was substantially a military territory, and only later of the *Numidia Militaris*. Lambaesis in the course of the 4th c. lost importance to the advantage of *Constantine (Cirta) 140 km (87 mi) to the N, which became capital of the reunited province of Numidia in 314, and to the advantage of the neighboring Timgad (Thamugadi) as a military center. Christianity arrived in Lambaesis at the end of the 2nd c., and it became an episcopal see. The first known bishop is Privatus, deposed as a heretic by a council of 90 bishops at *Carthage during the time of *Donatus, bishop of Carthage, and of Pope *Fabian (Cypr., *Ep.* 59,10); he appealed to *Rome. He was succeeded by *Januarius, who participated in the Council of Carthage of 1 Sept 256 (*Sent. Ep.* 6), the last name known. Several letters of Cyprian are addressed to him. The bishop of Lambaesis appears as the head of the Numidian episcopate, and his prestige is due to the rank of the city and not the importance of the Christian community; at the beginning of the 4th c. the role of primate fell to the oldest of the province. As episcopal see it disappeared in the course of the 4th c., since its bishop was not present at the Conference of Carthage in 411 and was never mentioned. There is no information on struggles between Catholics and Donatists. We encounter martyrs at Lambaesis already at the beginning of the 3rd c., since *Tertullian praises the *praeses legionis* for having the Christians decapitated without torturing them (*Scap.* 4). Christians of other cities, too, were tried and condemned at Lambaesis, as the seat of the governor of the province, since only he could condemn anybody to death. The *Passio Mariani, Iacobi et soc.* (BHL 131) situates the death of these martyrs, coming from the area of Cirta, at Lambaesis in 259; the *Acta Mammarii* (BHL 5205-5206) say they were native to the city. The martyrs mentioned in this passion must doubtless be identified with those who appear in the *Mart. hier.* for 23 Feb. Some Christian vestiges still exist, while the remains of the ancient city are abundant.

DHGE 1, 752-753; PWK 12, 539-541; DACL 8, 1067-1075; Y. Le Bohec, *La troisième légion Auguste*, Paris 1989; Id., *Tertullien, De corona, I: Carthage ou Lambèse?*: REAug 38 (1992) 6-18; A. Ferlenga, *Africa. Le città romane*, Milan 1990, 52-57; I. Gui - N. Duval - J.-P. Caillet, *Basiliques chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord*, Paris 1992, I, 145-147; Y. Duval, *Lambèse chrétienne. La gloire et l'oubli*, Paris 1995; F. Rakob, *Die Bauphasen des Groma-Gebäudes im Legionslager von Lambaesis*: Römische Mitteilungen 108 (2001) 7-40.

V. Saxer - A. Di Berardino

LAMBERT (d. 705). Bishop of Maastricht and evangelizer of the pagans of Toxandria from 670 to ca. 705, he is venerated as a martyr having been killed, acc. to a tradition (PL 160, 133), for having publicly accused Pippin II of adultery. From 675 to 682 he took refuge in the monastery of Stavelot to escape the persecutions and intrigues of the master of the palace and left there to be named bishop (Hrabanus Maurus, *Martyrologium*, PL 110, 1169). His successor, St. Hubert, built a basilica in his honor at Liège, where he transferred the episcopal see.

G. Kurth, *Saint Lambert et son premier biographe*: Annal. de l'Acad. d'Archéol. de Belgique 3 (1876) 5-112; W. Lampen: BS 7, 1079-1080 (with further bibl.).

F. Cocchini

LAMP. While during the entire late Roman period lamps (of clay, metal, glass) constituted the most widespread instrument for domestic illumination, after the 7th c. the archaeological evidence documents a near total disappearance of clay lamps, despite the sources continuing to mention them during the entire Byzantine period, in favor of the spread of candles (Kazhdan-Buras 1991). In the Christian environment the lamp, with its immediate practical functionality and its evident link with the symbolic values of light, has always played a fundamental role. Already in the early Middle Ages the *Novella* 67 of *Justinian (AD 538) recommended the creation of appropriate revenues for the maintenance of church illumination (Buras 1991). The church environment is the only one which offers the possibility of a morphological and functional analysis of its lamps, thanks to a careful study of the lists of gifts present in the *Liber pontificalis* among the information on the construction and decoration of

the religious spaces. The internal order of the lists and certain details on the location of the lamps permit the identification of three different types of manufacture: the *coronae,* the *canthara cereostata* and the *phara canthara*. The *coronae,* the most important and precious, also called *phara canthara, phara coronata, coronae pharales* or *canthara,* are chandeliers generally of silver, sometimes of gold, in the form of cylindrical crowns with dolphin applications rising from the upper rim and to whose tails rings are soldered which support glass vials for the provision with oil. Placed in elevated positions, hanging or affixed, they were used for the illumination of the altar and of the *confessio*, therefore of the presbytery including not just the apse but also a good part of the central nave. The *canthara cereostata,* also called briefly *cereostata* or *canthara,* are in contrast lamps for candles, in general of brass or bronze, sometimes silver, and these too, hanging, are placed in the section of the central nave toward the entrance, to the two sides of the *solea*. The last category, the simplest and the most frequently neglected, that of the *phara canthara* or simply *phara,* is composed of hanging oil lamps, of a less-articulated workmanship compared to the first category and without dolphins. Rarely in silver and brass, generally of bronze, they were destined for the side aisles and were sometimes divided into unequal groups causing greater artificial illumination of the right aisle.

Among the special lamps a weighty and precious *corona,* generally of gold, also called *corona quae est pharus cantharus* (LP, I, 176, 182) fixed the spot of the mobile altar (to be placed probably not at the entrance of the apse but further ahead in the aisle), therefore illuminating the focal point of the space. At the feet of the altar there were in contrast two or more great candelabra of brass or bronze, heavy and not easily moved. In the 5th c., in contrast, the candelabras were of silver and much lighter, probably therefore placed on the altar as part of the liturgical furnishings.

In particular buildings such as oratories or baptisteries, despite the limited space, the same type of illumination was sought as was used in the basilicas around the altar or venerated place. A type of special lamp not present in the large basilical spaces is the *lucerna aurea* with ten or twelve flames, which in the 4th c. we find cited at Rome for the crypt of S. Lorenzo and for the baptistery near S. Agnese, and in the 5th c. for that of the Lateran (Geertman 1988).

Catalogs: M. Conticello de' Spagnolis - E. de Carolis, *Le lucerne di bronzo*, Vatican City 1986; M.T. Paleani, *Le lucerne paleocristiane*, Rome 1993; C. Pavolini, *Le lucerne tardo-antiche di produzione africana*, Rome 1993.

Studies: H. Geertman, *Forze centrifughe e centripete nella Roma cristiana*: Rend. PARA 59 (1986/1987) 63-91; H. Geertman, *Liber Pontificalis come fonte archeologica*: RivAC 63 (1987) 367-371; H. Geertman, *L'illuminazione della basilica paleocristiana secondo il Liber Pontificalis*: RivAC 64 (1988) 135-160; A. Kazhdan - L. Buras, *Lighting in Everyday Life*: ODB 2, 1228; L. Buras, *Lighting, Ecclesiastical*: ODB 2, 1227-1228; C. Pavolini, *Lucerna. Mediterraneo occidentale*: EAA, *Secondo supplemento*, III, Rome 1995, 454-464; A. Bonanni, *Lampada e lampadario*: EAM VII (1996) 558-569; D. Stiaffini, *Il vetro nel Medioevo. Tecniche, strutture, manufatti*, Rome 1999.

C. Loasses

LAMPSACUS, Council of. In this city on the Hellespont many *homoiousian bishops met in 364. After two months of discussion they invalidated the pro-*Arian formula of faith of *Rimini and the decisions of the Council of *Constantinople in 360. They affirmed again the validity of the *Antiochene formula of 341, integrated with the proposition of the *homoiousios* (= similar acc. to the *ousia*) to bring out the distinction of the divine *hypostases. They rehabilitated the bishops deposed at Constantinople and established that, in the case of controversy upon their return to their sees, regional councils would decide the matter.

Hfl-Lecl 1, 974-976; Simonetti 394; Palazzini 2, 224; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988.

M. Simonetti

LANGUAGES of the FATHERS. Greek was the universal language of the primitive Christian gospel proclamation (one thinks of the Letters of Paul and the other writings subsequently included in the canon) and of the most ancient Christian literature: from the so-called Apostolic Fathers to the *Apologists of the 2nd c. It was in fact the language of the Hellenized world, in which sphere it expressed not only Greek thought but also a part of both Jewish and Roman thought. By way of example, the evangelists Mark and John were Jews; *Clement and *Hermas lived in Rome; *Justin Martyr, from a pagan family, was born in *Palestine and then lived for a long time in the capital of the empire, where he died; *Tatian was Syrian; but, despite their very diverse geographical and cultural settings, all of them wrote in Greek. It was much the same among the pagans of the first centuries of the Common Era, as we see in the cases of Favorinus or Apuleius, *Suetonius or Aelian, and indeed the emperor *Marcus Aurelius, who in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. wrote his *Meditations* in Greek.

When we speak of Greek we mean, in reference

to this period, the *κοινὴ διάλεκτος, that language spoken in the Hellenistic East and in the cosmopolitan cities of the West, which bore the stamp of ancient culture and above all the capacity and adaptability of a tool suited to express very complex and subtle ideas. With reference more specifically to the Greek used by Christians, we notice at the same time the influence of the Hellenized Jewish idiom, which made itself felt in the early church through the OT version of the LXX. Greek was therefore the oldest medium which the Christian community used across the whole empire in evangelization, liturgy and internal organization. Only beginning from the 2nd c. did the communities of the West gradually replace it with Latin.

The Greek Christian authors, representing such a large part of ancient Christian literature, perhaps do not constitute a homogeneous group precisely because the language they used was not at all unusual. The "classical" language of the Cappadocian Fathers is very different from the style of *John Malalas or of the popular Greek of numerous monastic writings. We see no less difference between the **Didache* or Clement of Rome, with their biblical hue, and, e.g., *John Chrysostom or *Cyril of Alexandria (see *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G.W.H. Lampe, pref., VI).

The first Christian Latin literature appears about halfway through the 2nd c. and takes the form of translations (as happened long before, outside the Judeo-Christian tradition). These translations were of the Sacred Scriptures. *Augustine of Hippo speaks of this (see *De doctrina christ.* II, 12,16), affirming that in the early times of the faith there were innumerable translators of the Bible from Greek to Latin (although his chronological reference *primis fidei temporibus* is very vague). From the *Acta Scilitanorum,* a document which recounts events that occurred in 180, we learn that the witnesses possessed *libri et epistulae Pauli viri iusti* (12), which, given what we may suppose was their basic level of education, would in all probability have been in translation. Between the 2nd and 3rd c. the works of *Tertullian indicate with relative certainty that he had Latin texts before him. Cyprian in the *Testimonia* (ca. 250) gives us a large number of fragments which show that by this time the Latin version of the entire Bible was both completed and widely known. At around this period, the Roman priest *Novatian made use of a European *Vetus latina* (*itala*) and an African one (*afra*).

The motive is clear in this case of making the sacred text accessible to those who were not capable of understanding it. The translated texts kept very close to the originals, and therefore introduced calques from the Greek, coining grammatical forms and new syntax which bear the mark of the biblical language, as well as introducing certain Hebrew idioms and lending new meanings to existing Latin words. Shortly before 200, true and proper Latin Christian literature was born, very late in respect to its Greek counterpart. (To explain this, scholars have proposed various hypotheses: the first Latin-speaking Christians were *illitterati homines*; their silence is to be attributed to an unwillingness to clothe in the form of paganism a system of thought so far from it; the necessity of evangelization being the sole measure, Christians began to use Latin so as to penetrate those milieus where no other language was known.) According to what we learn from *Jerome (see *De vir. ill.* 53; also see ibid., 34 and 42), the oldest Latin writer comes from the heart of the empire: *Victor, bishop of Rome between 189 and 198, African by origin, and with whom the process of Latinization of the church began, a process which would end only in the 4th c. with the introduction of the new language in the liturgy. After him Jerome mentions *Apollonius, senator and martyr under *Commodus (193–211), and then *Tertullian and *Minucius Felix (but modern scholars are not in agreement over giving chronological precedence to the first—who certainly worked between the last decade of the 2nd c. and the 1st two decades of the 3rd).

Here it is sufficient to note that, particularly during recent decades, there has been much study of the origin and characteristics of the Christian use of Latin, among others the research of the Swedish school led by Einar Löfstedt and the Dutch school begun by Jospeh Schrijnen and continued by Christine Mohrmann and her pupils. Notwithstanding the reservations advanced by authoritative critics, esp. in relation to the theories proposed by the last two scholars (about the genetic interpretation of Christian Latin, the historical-linguistic validity of the classification of words directly or indirectly influenced by the new religion, the syntactical evolution of "Christian Latin," etc.), the information we now have about Latin Christian texts is impressive, enormously increasing our knowledge of them and our capacity to interpret them.

The primitive Christian East used other languages besides Greek: Coptic, Syriac, Georgian, Armenian, Arabic and Ethiopian. (See the article of S.J. Voicu in the bibl.) Each of these languages has its own story and particular characteristics, which it is not possible to investigate or illustrate here.

It is sufficient to observe that Coptic Egyptian is a language in that there are elements of Ancient

Egyptian (which was spoken in its last period from the 7th c. BC to the 5th c. AD). Ethiopian is part of a group of Semitic languages similar to S Arab dialects. *Ge'ez*, or classical Ethiopian, may be found in epigraphic sources of the 3rd c. and was used for a great many Christian writings.

Syriac, together with Mandaean and Jewish-Babylonian, is one of the three Eastern dialects which descend from Imperial Aramaic, the lingua franca spoken from the Nile to the Indus during the Achaemenid Empire. Although it was replaced by Greek at the time of the conquest of Alexander the Great, Syriac continued to develop and, more than that, at the end of the period of Hellenistic domination, reached a level of literary refinement which gave birth to a substantial body of works between the 2nd and 13th c. AD. With the Arab domination from the middle of the 7th c. AD, Syriac gradually disappeared as a commonly spoken language; we find it only in learned milieus, like Latin in the late medieval period in the West. As for Armenian, the creation of its alphabet, which has remained the same up to the present day, was initiated by Mesrop Mashtots (ca. 361–ca. 439), his work encouraged by the head of the Armenian Church of his time, Sahak the Great (350–438), and by the Arsacid king Vramshapuh. The Armenians were able in this way to know the Bible better, and to take part in the liturgical rites with greater cognizance. This occurred 400 years before Methodius and Cyril accomplished the same work for the Slavs. The vernacular was thus introduced into all aspects of the life of the Armenian Christian community.

The Georgian language, which is found after AD 450, belongs to the SW or Kartvelian group of Caucasian languages. Its alphabet went through various stages of evolution—from majuscule to minuscule to Mkhedruli ("knightly"), which appears in the codices of the 10th c. onward and is still in use today. From the mid-5th c. we find translated into Georgian the Psalter, books of the NT and also original works. The whole body of works endowed with a distinctive stamp a country and people who recognize their very roots in Christian Late Antiquity.

In the family of Semitic languages, Arabic constitutes with Ethiopian the SW group, which in turn subdivides into N and S, the last of which—esp. after the Muslim conquest—almost completely disappears. From N Arabic descends the classical Arabic, which became very widespread, in line with the expansion of Islam; in its turn, it gave birth to various dialects. Each of these languages yielded its own literature, which—as a rule—have several general characteristics in common: They consist almost exclusively in religious literature; they grew up in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, between the 4th and 10th c., first as a translation of biblical texts, then ecclesiastical, from Greek, on which terrain they had their principal root (cf. *Omelie copte*, 5-6, ed. T. Orlandi). Among those who write in Coptic we should note *Pachomius (4th c.) and *Shenoute (end 4th–5th c.); in Syriac authors such as *Aphraates (1st half of 4th c.) and *Ephrem (4th c.), of whom we have letters, exegetical works, dogmatic sermons, exhortatory and lyrical, and also *Cyrillona (end 4th–5th c.), Balai and many others. With a clear intention of freeing their people from Byzantine and Syriac domination, *Mesrob and *Eznik (both 5th c.) wrote in Armenian. To the time of *Honorius and *Arcadius we may date the Georgian version of the Scriptures, while chants and patristic translations in that language used in the liturgy should probably be placed much later (from the 8th c. onward).

As for Ethiopian, very little remains of the original from the *Aksumite period (a Christian inscription of King Ezana [1st half of 4th c.], later the inscription of Ham [7th–8th c.] and those of King Daniel [10th or 11th c.]), while a group of works translated from Greek survives from the 4th c. and later, naturally including biblical texts. For Christian Arabic, in the period preceding the rise of Islam—i.e., before 630—we should mention the numerous poets from Bedouin tribes and above all the stable Christian populations of N Arabia and the Syro-Palestinian area (among which poets Adi ibn Zaid [5th–beginning of 6th c.] is the most famous). In the subsequent period we should note, among others, Theodore Abu-Qurrah (750–830), the celebrated representative of Arab Christian literature during the iconoclasm crisis, heir to the thought of *John of Damascus, and contemporary of Theodore the Studite (d. 826). He constitutes an important link between the Greek Fathers and writers of his own language: he writes in Arabic for the Arabs, reflecting the mentality and thought typical of Syriac areas bordering the Eastern Roman Empire.

Two useful books for work in Christian Greek and Latin are A. Biaise - H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Strasbourg 1954 and G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961. Studies and monographs include J. Schrijnen, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein*, Nijmegen 1932 (the first volume of many in the series "Latinitas Christianorum primaeva," containing studies by scholars linked to the school of Nijmegen); G. Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'Église ancienne*, I, Paris 1948; Chr. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens*, 4 vols., Rome 1958ff.; E. Löfstedt, *Late Latin*, Oslo 1959. From 1962 the following series, also at Nijmegen: "Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva." Also see V. Loi, *Origini e caratteristiche della latinità cristiana*, Rome 1978; *Omelie copte*, ed. T. Orlandi, Turin 1981 (see p. 5 for bibliographic informa-

tion on the Coptic and related literature of the Christian East); S.J. Voicu, *Lingue orientali e patristica greca. Sussidi bibliografici*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 205-215; LACL 650-656.

P. Siniscalco

LAODICEA, Councils of. Under *Theodosius the Great (347–395) a council was called at Laodicea in Phrygia (see prologue of the *Cod. Vindob. Hist. graec.* 7, 11th–12th c.), whose canons, in addition to the Greek and Latin collections, are also reported by *Gratian (*Decretum* XVI, c. 11), who, however, raises some doubts about this date. In fact *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (ca. 393–ca. 458), citing can. 35 (*In Col.* II, 18), presents the council as an event contemporaneous with himself (after 430), which seems to be confirmed by the tenor of some canons which are a summary of preceding legislation which had entered the canon tradition of Phrygia (see can. 35, which condemns the cult of the angels, widespread in the region; cf. Theodoret, *In Col.* II, 18: PG 82, 614).

There are 59 canons in the collection of 50 titles of *John Scholasticus (ca. 550) and in that of *Dionysius Exiguus. They aim at opposing superstition (can. 36), for fear of which the veneration of the angels is also opposed (can. 35); they regulate public penance (can. 2); they limit second marriages (can. 1) and mixed marriages (can. 10, 31); they discipline the celebration of baptism (can. 45-47), of chrism (can. 48), of marriage (can. 52-53), and the conferral of the orders (can. 3, 5, 11, 44) of the priesthood (can. 13) and of the episcopate (can. 12, 57); they submit the clergy to the bishop (can. 41, 42, 56); they give dispositions concerning liturgy (can. 14, 16-17, 18-19, 27-28, 49, 58-59.) and discipline (norms of behavior, fasting, sanctification of Sunday: can. 29-30, 50-51, 54-55); and they dissuade Catholics from having relationships with heretics (can. 6-9, 31-34, 37-39).

Between 478 and 481 (most likely in 481) another council met, whose *Acts* have not survived, to deal with the case of Stephen, bishop of Antioch, who was brought before the emperor of the East *Zeno, accused of being a *Nestorian by the followers of the *monophysite Peter the Fuller. Stephen had been deposed, but the council recognized his innocence and reestablished him in his see.

For the first council: *Sources*: Lauchert 72-79; Joannou 1, 2, 1027-1055. *Studies*: DTC 8, 2611-2615; DDC 6, 338-343; Hfl-Lecl 1, 2, 989-1028. *For the second council*: Mansi 7, 1022; Palazzini 2, 229; *I canoni della chiesa antica*, ed. A. Di Berardino, I, Rome 2006, 335-352.

C. Nardi

LAODICEANS, Letter to the. A *Letter to the Laodiceans* is mentioned by St. Paul (Col 4:16); in the Muratorian *Canon it is considered a *Marcionite work; it is found in some codices of the NT. This letter of the 2nd c. was identified with the Letter to the Ephesians (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 5,11-17; Epiphanius, *Haer*. 42,9,3; 42,123; Theodoret, *Col* 4,16), used by the Marcionites. *Filaster of Brescia (*Haer.* 89) and *Jerome (*De viris ill.* 5) confirm the existence of this letter. We cannot confirm a relationship between that letter and the one existing today; the typically Marcionite elements are missing, but the texts of the OT are missing too; the role of St. Paul is emphasized, which might be related to the Marcionites. Our text is confirmed in the *De divinis scripturis* of ps.-Augustine (5th–6th c.), by *Victor of Capua, who inserted it in the Codex Fuldensis, and by *Gregory the Great. The letter exists in Latin, but the original language is Greek. It consists of about a hundred texts of St. Paul, particularly from Philippians and Galatians; it emphasizes moral problems.

Erbetta 3, 63-67; Moraldi 3, 78-81, 91-92 (bibl.), 95 (tr.); Starowieyski 3, 51-54, 355 (bibl.); Elliott 543-546.

M. Starowieyski

LAPSI, Problem of the. After *Tertullian (*Praescr.* 4) had spoken of remaning steadfast in persecutions, *Cyprian, at the outbreak of the persecution of *Decius, turned to the two verbs *stare* and *labi* as characteristic of the constant (*Ep.* 14,2: *inconcussa fide stantes*) and of those who, in some way, failed (*Ep.* 11,8: *lapsorum poenitentia reformetur*). The latter must submit to an adequate penance and make a public confession of guilt in front of the community (*exomologēsis*), after which they can receive the imposition of hands by the bishop and clergy and be readmitted to the *Eucharist (*Ep.* 15,1; 16,2). All failures must be investigated truly as to their gravity (*Ep.* 15,3), so that it is possible to establish an adequate penance: for this a synod was necessary (*Ep.* 17,3), which was possible only at the end of the persecution (*Ep.* 15,2). Cyprian curses with bitterness the lax priests, who without alerting the bishop, and without an adequate penance or confession of guilt, readmit the lapsed to the Eucharist (*Ep.* 15,2; 16,2). Even the letters of intercession of the martyrs (who died in the persecution giving the witness of their own blood) must be examined one at a time (*Ep.* 16,3; 26,1). Whoever readmits the lapsed in anticipation blocks the execution of penance and the possibility that they might become worthy of God's pardon, leading them back in this way to the fall (*Ep.*

16,2-3). Only those *lapsi* who have proven to have completed the penance, or who are sick, can make the confession of guilt to any priest, and, in extreme cases, even to a deacon, and so return in peace to God (*Ep.* 18,1).

The Roman clergy, temporarily without bishop, agreed with this procedure (*Ep.* 8,2-3 and 30,3-8); they expected, however, a regulation from their future bishop. The neighboring bishops also supported this provisional pastoral letter concerning penance (*Ep.* 30,8). In a future synodal council, laity who remained solid in the faith were also to take part (*Ep.* 30,5). After the end of the persecution, however, Cyprian, supported by the agreement of Rome, sent to his community a longer and more systematic exposition on the lapsed in 36 chapters. He explained clearly (as before in the letter of the Romans addressed to him 30,3) the different position of the lapsed: some Christians spontaneously participated in sacrifices offered to idols (*Laps.* 8); others drank wine offered to idols, even leading their children to this (*Laps.* 9); still others fell into weakness under tortures (*Laps.* 13); and finally others, after a first moment of error through fear, confessed their faith, becoming victorious martyrs (ibid.). The letter of the Roman clergy (*Ep.* 30) names in the first place those who obtained false *libelli* (certificates of sacrifice to the idols), without, however, having actually sacrificed to them. These were judged as having participated in the sacrifices offered to the idols (*Ep.* 30,3). In this way two categories were established: the *libellatici* and the sacrificers (*Ep.* 55,17). Although *Ep.* 30 spoke of "devastating ruin" (*Ep.* 30,3.5) and Cyprian himself in 251 had compared the lapsed to the dead (*Ep.* 15,2; *Laps.* 30), the next year he made a clarification: we should not consider them as dead, but as almost dead (*semianimes*); and in justification of this he adduced the fact that some deniers later confessed again the faith, even becoming martyrs (*Ep.* 55,16). Cyprian did not modify his position on the lapsed, but described their state in a different way. In the meantime, *Novatian had made clear his total refusal of the readmission of the apostates, based on the fact that they were spiritually dead and therefore could no longer be saved. The unknown author of the *Ad Novatianum* also calls attention to the apostates who later became martyrs and simply says that all the lapsed, still in penitential state, could be considered on equal footing with them (*pares*: *Ad Novat.* 7,1). This audacious simplification was directed toward unmasking a false biblical argument adopted by the Novatians. If even a single *lapsus* became a martyr, not all the lapsed can be reproved as wood, hay or straw (1 Cor 3:12). If the lapsed act so as to be readmitted to the Eucharist, they do not do this without a personal initiative; therefore, they cannot be compared to those dead in combat, but to the severely wounded, who, struggling in the field with their last bit of strength, are saved (*Ad Novat.* 6,2) when they are helped and cared for. *Dionysius of Alexandria reproved Novatian for "having exiled completely the Holy Spirit, although a hope remains that he might remain in them or return there" (Eus., *HE* VII, 7). Dionysius does not wish to judge if the lapsed are dead or if they have completely lost the Spirit, nor pardon them if they do not do penance. But in practice he answered the question of the lapsed in the same way as Cyprian: they should be guided to penance and then granted reconciliation. The same problems appeared in a particular way during the persecution of *Diocletian; however, the accumulated experience made the solution easier, but struggles were not absent among rigorists, those who were lax, and those who wanted to apply a consolidated pastoral practice.

A. Portolano, *Il dramma dei "lapsi" nell'epistolario di Cipriano*, Naples 1972; M.R. Macina, *Un modèle pour délier les divorcés mariés: l'"admission provvisoire" des lapsi par Cyprien de Carthage († 258)*: Le Supplément 165 (1988) 94-134; H. Heuden, *La première année du schisme mélitien "305/306"*: Ancient Society 20 (1989) 267-280; A. Martin, *La réconciliation des lapsi en Égypte. De Denys d'Alexandrie à Pierre d'Alexandrie, une querelle des clercs*: RSLR 22 (1986) 258-269; Id., *Athanase et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996.

H.J. Vogt

LAPSU SUSANNAE, De. *Gennadius of Marseille (*Vir. ill. 22*) mentions an *Ad lapsam virginem libellum* among the works of *Niceta of Remesiana (d. 414). Perhaps it is the same work of ps.-Ambrose *De lapsu Susannae* (*De lapsu virginis consecratae*), which also appears among the letters of ps.-Jerome (*Ep. 20*); it is different, however, from *Ad lapsam virginem epistula* (CPL 652). As for the anonymous text, it is an energetic admonition against a virgin, Susanna, who broke her vow, seduced a lector and finally killed her child. It is a rant devoid of content in an exaggeratedly rhetorical style.

CPL 651; CPPM II A 869; II B 3580 and 3695; H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller*, Freiburg [4]1995, 647-648; E. Cazzaniga, *De Lapsu Susannae* (*De Lapsu Virginis Consecratae*), Turin 1948.

S. Samulowitz

LATE ANTIQUITY. One of the extensively treated and discussed themes at the international level of historical scholarship in the last few decades is with-

out a doubt the period referred to as Late Antiquity. The birth of this historiographical concept, today broadly applied in research on the ancient world, is owed to the debates that arose within the research of the history of classical art: we owe, in fact, the art historian Alois Riegl the honor of having first formulated the concept of Late Antiquity as an autonomous period of history of ancient art (*Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn*, Vienna 1901). Opposing primarily the position of empirical positivism, maintained in the field of art history by the Hamburg architect Gottfried Semper and his followers—who tended to reduce works of art to mechanical products conditioned by concomitant external factors—and rejecting the Winckelmannian concept of the *Dekadenz* of late Roman art rooted in Enlightenment historiography, Riegl proposed, acc. to a continuity perspective of history, that each era had its own and idiosyncratic *Kunstwollen* ("will of art"). In this sense he attributed to Late Antiquity and the artistic productions conceived and elaborated in that historical juncture a value and autonomous excellence that rescued it from the critical judgment that had usually been leveled against it. Nevertheless, a rigid periodization to isolate the Late Antique phenomenon in time becames necessary, and Riegl, as a clear witness to the complexity of defining the correct chronology, was himself uncertain whether to begin the art of Late Antiquity with the age of *Marcus Aurelius or with the *Edict of Milan, though eventually he resolved his own positions in favor of the Constantinian age, while the end of the period was identified as the ascent of Charlemagne.

The reception of Rieglian thought in the context of the history of ancient art was initially very limited, and archaeology's first critical discussion of his work could in effect be considered the long review published in 1929 by Guido von Kaschnitz Weinberg during the publication of the new edition of the journal *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* edited by Emil Reisch in 1927 (see Gnomon 5 [1929] 195-213). During those years, Rieglian thought on Late Antiquity began to be received and discussed, while not lacking those who, inheriting the terminology coined by the Austrian scholar, distorted the original chronological framework—significantly lowering the historiographical horizons of Late Antiquity—and pushed toward including even the Trajan era in late Roman art, considering the famous historiated column one of the first artistic manifestations of Late Antiquity (see A. K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die Trajanssäule. Ein römisches Kunstwerk zu Beginn der Spätantike*, Berlin - Leipzig 1926). On the level of historical research, after the attentive analyses and assessments of Otto Seeck (*Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, I-VI, Berlin-Stuttgart 1897-1920) and Ernst Stein (*Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches. I: Vom römischen zum byzantinischen Staate, 284-476 N. Chr.*, Vienna 1928; Id., *Histoire du Bas-Empire. II: De la disparition de l'Empire d'Occident à la mort de Justinien, 476-565*, Paris-Brussels-Amsterdam 1949), on the Italian side, it was Santo Mazzarino—in his book on *Stilicho (published in 1942, but its initial composition dated back to his thesis discussed in 1936) and research on the social history of the 4th c. (*Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo. Ricerche di storia tardo-romana*, Rome 1951)—that bore the merit of having individuated Late Antiquity as an autonomous historical period with a "positive" value, an age in which the world changed and "turned toward a new form," thus freeing the field from the preconceived ideas of Enlightenment historiography.

Subsequent reflections of scholars from different methodological approaches have contributed to better define the real importance of Late Antiquity (with respect to Mazzarino, see the articles contained in the volumes *Antico, tardoantico ed era costantiniana*, I-II, Bari 1974-80), but paradoxically some refinements have triggered a perilous interpretive system that today generally tends to identify this age as the absolute creator of models and the root of numerous and primary aspects of the modern world. In addition to such an intrusive "rhetoric of modernity," another aspect, which in our days heavily catalyzes the attention of historians, is certainly the one connected to periodization. This phenomenon has therefore led scholars to add to the original and customary Rieglian periodization several decades back in time (to the point of including the final years of the 2nd c.) and, something perhaps more disturbing for the apparent dissolution of the Early Middle Ages, several centuries forward in time, reaching to include within the idea of Late Antiquity even the 10th c.

K.F. Stroheker, *Um die Grenze zwischen Antike und abendländischen Mittelalter*: Saeculum 1 (1959) 433-465 (= *Germanentum und Spätantike*, Zürich-Stuttgart 1965, 275-308); H.-I. Marrou, *Décadence romaine ou antiquité tardive? III^e-VI^e siècle*, Paris 1977; A. Heuss, *Antike und Spätantike*, in J. Kunisch (ed.), *Spätzeit. Studien zu den Problemen eines historischen Epochenbegriffs*, Berlin 1990, 27-88; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Il Tardoantico: per una tipologia dei punti critici*, in A. Carandini - L. Cracco Ruggini - A. Giardina (ed.), *Storia di Roma. III. L'età tardoantica. I. Crisi e trasformazioni*, Turin 1993, XXXIII-XLIV. The bibliography, moreover, is very vast and continually growing. For important and well-documented frameworks offering an overall perspective, with abundant bibliography, see the investigations done by M. Mazza, *Di Ellenismo, Oriente e Tarda Antichità. Considerazioni a margine di un saggio* (*e di un con-*

vegno): Mediterraneo Antico 1 (1998) 141-170, and A. Giardina, *Esplosione di tardoantico*: Studi Storici 40, 1 (1999) 157-180. Limited to the artistic aspects, and esp. geared toward the reception of the concept of Late Antiquity in Italian historiography of the first decades of the 20th c., M. Ghilardi, *Alle origini del dibattito sulla nascita dell'arte tardoantica. Riflessi nella critica italiana*: Mediterraneo Antico 5 (2002) 117-146. For an extensive and recent panorama on the world of Late Antiquity, see also G.W. Bowersock - P. Brown - O. Grabar (eds.), *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, Cambridge, MA-London 1999; for the lines of research on Late Antiquity and for the debate among scholars of ancient history, see the studies by D. Vera, L. Cracco Ruggini, E. Fentress, A. Schiavone, C. Lepelley and G. Bowersock in *Antico e tardoantico oggi*: RSI 114, 2 (2002) 349-379.

M. Ghilardi

LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF GREEK TEXTS. During the classical period, translations had some special characteristics: in reality we possess few true and proper translations from pre-Christian times; some of the paraphrases such as those of the poetical works have come down to us (e.g., those of the writings of Quintus Ennius, Lucius Accius, Statius Caecilius and Catullus), whose works were translated on account of their very nature. In addition to Cicero's translations of Plato's writings, we do not have many other examples.

Already during the Christian era, starting from the year 180, some *Acts* of the martyrs mentioned several sacred books which, in *Africa, must have been in Latin. This fact would demonstrate the precedence of the *Afra* family of the first Latin translations (*Vetus Latina* or rather *Veteres Latinae*) over the *Itala* family. Scholars use the *Vetus Latina* to refer to a collection of non-Hieronymian translations, generally before the so-called *Vulgata,* which depend on the Septuagint version for the OT and the original Greek of the NT. The work of gathering these pre-Hieronymian versions was undertaken by Sabatier (1743) and then continued with new information by the *Vetus Latina Institute* from the Abbey of Beuron, which continues to publish enormous volumes of this Herculean undertaking. The sources used are citations from the Latin Fathers, ancient biblical MSS (many of which are fragmentary or palimpsests) before the 8th c., medieval Bibles that continued to transmit archaic models until the 13th c., glosses, liturgical texts etc. The *Vetus Latina* is important primarily insofar as it reflects the Septuagint version.

With Jerome all these versions were reviewed in various ways and were also integrated with the translations of entire books made by Jerome himself in his great project that today we recognize as the *Vulgata*; this, however, is mistaken, because not all of the Hieronymian text is in the Vulgate, nor is the entire Vulgate Hieronymian. The characteristics of these texts have been illustrated by Blatt: the Hieronymian texts (acc. to his scrupulous rule of translating word for word, because everything in the sacred texts, even the order of the words, is a mystery: *Ep.* 57,5,2) are very literal translations, but the *Veteres Latinae* also possess this characteristic: Jerome, therefore, is not solely responsible for the literalism of the biblical translations.

Numerous apocryphal texts (gospels, acts, apocalypses; *4 Esdras*) have accompanied the canonical books; their traces are more sporadic. It is difficult to determine the dates of the translations or the milieus that influenced them. An abundant list is supplied (6th c.?) by the *Index de libris non recipiendis* (**Decretum Gelasianum*); the texts were presented by Lipsius-Bonnet, but many were enriched by the most recent discoveries; see, e.g., the *Transitus* of the Virgin, A. Wilmart (ST 59, 323-369) and A. Wenger (*L'assomption de la T.S. Vierge*, Paris 1955, 245-256).

A characteristic of the ancient Latin versions of patristic texts was that, in contradistinction to the biblical texts, which demanded great fidelity, the translator felt himself to be completely free in his translation. According to an ancient account that narrates how a translation of *Dionysius the Areopagite was made, a Greek monk read the text out loud, a second monk orally translated it into Latin, and a third, immediately, wrote out the translation (Dekkers).

*Calcidius's chief characteristic (4th c.), however, was the exacerbation of literalness: when *Ossius asked him for a translation of *Plato's *Timaeus* (the first Christian translation of this work), he bent the Greek words in such a way that in order to make sense of them it was necessary to make use of another text, either the original or a translation. We will not make reference here to the Greek translations of Latin patristic texts, which are far less numerous.

It has been thought that the Roman community translated *1 *Clement* as early as the 2nd c. There exist two versions of the *Shepherd* of *Hermas. With respect to *Polycarp, chs. 10-14 have survived in Latin; a similar phenomenon holds for *Irenaeus's *Adversus haereses.* From the writings of *Clement of Alexandria, there remains the *Adumb. in ep. cath.* (GCS 3), which has been lost in Greek.

The great era of translations was the age of *Rufinus and *Jerome, who worked esp. in the East, and who saved *Origen and other authors whom Greek copyists, however, wished to make disappear, or at least allow to perish. During the same period, the *Arians, for their part, saved the other works of Ori-

gen (*Commentary on *Matthew*). The *Pelagians or those who sympathized with this movement were esp. interested in the work of *John Chrysostom or the commentaries of *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Some homilies delivered by *Basil and *Gregory of Nazianzus drew the attention of Rufinus, as well as Basil's *Asceticon*, whose *Hexameron,* after having been used by *Ambrose, was translated by Eustathius.

Monastic literature represented a notable center of interest. *Evagrius of Antioch and an anonymous individual translated into Latin *Athanasius's *Life of Anthony* immediately after its publication. Numerous minor writings were translated, while Western visitors went to search for information while undertaking pilgrimages in the East, and some "Latin Easterners" (John *Cassian, a native of *Scythia) used and elaborated a vast amount of information.

*Boethius (480–524) had the intention of translating all the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and from this unfinished project, there remain translations of Aristotle's *Categories, De interpretatione, Topica* and *Sophistic Refutations* (and the now lost *Posterior Analytics*); he also translated *Porphyry of Tyre's *Isagoge* for Aristotle's *Categories*; these translations followed the original verbatim.

*Cassiodorus (490–583) and his collaborators at the *Vivarium are an example of an organized literary cooperation, although he himself corrected the translations of others: these versions are full of rhythmic clauses, which is not very common in translated literature. One notes, therefore, a more developed literalism, in comparison to the preceding translations, and one perceives therein a better understanding of the Greek language in comparison to the medieval translators.

Around the mid-6th c., the Roman deacons *Pelagius and *John, two future popes, translated an excellent collection of *Apophthegmata,* a treasure to which others also returned. The controversies with *Constantinople that followed the Council of *Chalcedon led to once again undertaking and improving the translations of the Byzantine canonical collections. Many translations followed, and it is difficult to orient oneself in the subsequent works. One must mention esp. the work of *Dionysius Exiguus, who was also a Scythian who had come into the service of the holy see (d. ca. 550). Such Africans as *Facundus of Hermiane also performed the role of translator.

At the end of the 9th c., *Anastasius Bibliothecarius put himself once again at the service of the Roman curia for systematic translations. In *Gaul, John Scotus Erigena, Irish by culture, was able to translate *Gregory of Nyssa and Dionysius the Areopagite. These exceptional individuals became very famous already during their own time. Nevertheless, in different eras, a good number of anonymous individuals showed themselves capable of rendering in Latin short hagiographical, homiletic and ascetic texts. Southern Italy was not the only place where the two cultures met.

In brief, it was fortunate for a Greek author to be translated into Latin, inasmuch as the translations were indispensable means of cultural mediation. Moreover, medieval Latin cited and knew only the Greek authors translated into Latin. Then, Erasmus and the humanists such as Reuchlin, who was also known by his name translated into Greek, Capnio (1455–1522), also did a huge amount of work in translation.

Moreover, Rufinus, Jerome and others not only brought knowledge of Greek authors but also often saved their writings. The Latin versions, ancient and literal, are often excellent testimonies to the originals, and are important for knowledge about the transmission of the text. One simply has to think of the case of Irenaeus, with extensive portions of the *Adversus haereses* which have been retranslated into Greek in the edition of the SC, thanks to the literalism of the Latin and *Armenian translation.

P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Versionis Antiquae seu Vetus Italica*, Reims 1743 (repr. Turnhout 1976), F. Blatt, *Remarques sur l'histoire des traductions latines*: Classica et Mediaevalia 1 (1938) 217-242; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident*, Paris ²1948 (Eng. tr. Cambridge, MA 1969); A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der christl. Literatur in der lat. Kirche bis zum XII. Jahrh.*, Munich-Passing 1949; B. Fischer (ed.), *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron*, Freiburg 1952–; E. Dekkers, *Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins*: SE 5 (1953) 193-233; S. Lundström, *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der christlichen Latinität*, Lund 1955; Ch. Munier, *Les sources patristiques du droit de l'Église du VIIIᵉ au XIIIᵉ s.*, Mulhouse 1957; J. Gribomont, Patrologia III, 188-203 (bibl.), C. Mohrmann, *Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church:* VChr 11 (1957) 11-36; P.O. Kristeller - F.E. Cranz (eds.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries: Annotated Lists and Guides*, I, Washington D.C. 1960; F. Weissengruber, *Epiphanius Scholasticus als Übersetzer*, Vienna 1972; A. Ceresa-Gastaldo, *A proposito dell'edizione di antiche versioni latine di testi patristici greci*: VetChr 10 (1973) 47-50; R. Hirsch, *Early Printed Latin Translations of Greek Texts*, in *The Printed Word: Its Impact and Diffusion*, London 1978, 1-6; J. Gribomont, *Le traduzioni. Girolamo e Rufino*: Patrologia III, 185-240; P.-M. Bogaert, *La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge. Aperçu historique, état des questions*: RTL 19 (1988) 137-159; 276-314; B. Kytzler, *Fidus Interpres: The Theory and Practice of Translation in Classical Antiquity*: Antichthon 23 (1989) 42-50; V. Brown (ed.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Translations and Commentaries: Annotated Lists and Guides*, VII, Washington D.C. 1992; VIII, Washington D.C. 2003; *Cristianesimo latino e cultura greca sino al sec. IV*, XXI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 7-9 maggio 1992 (SEA 42),

Rome 1993; J. Berlioz, *Identifier sources et citations*, Turnhout 1994, 47-74; F. Cardini - C. Vasoli, *La conquista della lingua e della letteratura greca. Traduzioni latine di testi greci*, in *Storia della letteratura italiana*, ed. E. Malato, III, *Il Quattrocento*, Rome 1996, 62-66; W. Berschin, *Traduzioni dal greco in latino* (*secoli IV-XIV*), in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 1023-1033; P. Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*, Cambridge 2004.

A. Hamman - J. Leal

LATIN, CHRISTIAN

The notion and the existence of a Christian Latin are not accepted by all scholars. In general there is agreement that it expresses the contents of the Christian religion in a form and language marked by particular novelties and differences with respect to the Latin used by the classical pagan authors. In fact, in analyzing the evidence from its first expressions, it is easy to detect that there are two kinds of documents of Christian literature, very different from one another: the first is fairly close to the origins and better reflects the situation of the pastoral ministry, with its need to stay close to the people and to be understood by the people, using perhaps the everyday *sermo vulgaris*; the second group, in contrast, closely reflects the rhetorical teaching of the pagan schools, with a more educated language, even academic, rhetorical and rhythmical, later adopted by the magisterium of the church and of the pontifical curia, in this too heir of the imperial chancellery. One can therefore speak of different Christian Latins: liturgical, patristic, ecclesiastical, canonical and scholastic, with particularities and forms proper to each. Christian Latin appears as a universal category that embraces all the linguistic manifestations of the new Christian religion, with literary genres common to Latin literature or its own, from the poetry of the *elogia* and the *carmina,* to the prose of apologetics, homiletics, history, apocalyptic, epistolography.

In reality the new religion induced not only new notions and new words or renewed meanings in the Latin lexicon but also a new way of conceiving the very capacity of expression and communication among persons and peoples.

The origins of Christian Latin are almost wrapped in mystery, but they can reasonably be situated as early as the 2nd c., given that the development of the Christian consciousness of the Latin communities is evident in the popular piety expressed in a mature form in the plastic, pictorial and architectonic arts, esp. in the catacombs, in the 3rd–4th c. Certainly at the beginning the proclamation of the gospel was made in Greek, and Greek was the language of the liturgy in the first Christian communities in the West (and this explains the survival of Greek liturgical formulas, even after its abandonment as liturgical language in the West, formulas which furthermore remain unaltered, one can say, up to our days), even if the attempts to translate sacred texts from Hebrew into Latin are documented, in continuity with the efforts of translation of the Jewish communities of the Diaspora. (This explains the numerous Hebraisms remaining in the liturgy and in later versions of the sacred texts.) As early as the 3rd c., there were, esp. in *Africa (and perhaps also in *Gaul), rather lively and culturally prepared Christian communities, at the point of making of Christian Latin a *vulgata* language, rendered familiar by liturgy and preaching, acquiring the capacity of fully expressing the religious and emotional sentiment of the adherents of the new religion, and this Latin, even if it does not appear very different from the Latin used by the contemporaneous pagan authors, nevertheless offers some individual characteristics, taken both from liturgical use and from the rhetorical education given in the schools from which the Christian authors came.

The characteristics of mature Christian Latin therefore depend on the notable linguistic contributions made by Christian authors, starting from that fundamental one made by *Tertullian held to be, rightly or wrongly, the founder of Christian Latin, having created over 900 neologisms, some of which have had a large and durable influence. These individual characteristics of the Latin of the Christian communities of the West in the 2nd–5th c. concern lexicographical, semiological and syntactic aspects and phenomena.

Among the *lexicographical* phenomena, the Hebraisms, Hellenisms and neologisms—i.e., the words borrowed from the Hebrew and Greek languages or formed *ex novo* through the normal processes of Latin suffixation—have particular importance. These are the vital proof of a community, which also distinguished itself from pagan society linguistically, through the effect of its own discipline, worship and doctrine, and therefore responded to its own needs and the particular situations of its religiosity, creating its own mode of expression, which flanked and lived with the *sermo cottidianus, rusticus, militaris,* of other analogous environments. The process of distinction and separation of the language from contemporaneous common use led, in short, directly to the affirmation *de facto* and *de jure* that Latin too was a sacred language, equal to He-

brew and Greek, through the majestic prejudice that the liturgical language had to be worthy of the divinity and had to be adapted to express sublime truths, such as, in particular, the theological truths and the prayers which rise from earth to heaven through the ministry of a priest. Hebrew was in fact held to be a sacred language since it had been the language of the people of God, ancient Israel, and the Scriptures had been given in it, the divine Word given to Moses and the prophets. Greek, too, was a sacred language since it had been the vehicle of the evangelization of the peoples of the Mediterranean and the NT had been written in Greek; in addition almost all of the OT had been translated into Greek, widely spread and known as the *Septuagint* (*LXX*). Latin, finally, was acknowledged as the third sacred language, equal in dignity to Hebrew and Greek, because it was the language of the successor of Peter and of the Roman Church, *Caput Urbis et Orbis,* as well as its liturgy or rite named precisely Latin or Roman.

Regarding vocabulary, scholars have sought to distinguish in Christian Latin, to be accepted with reservations, four categories of lexical and semantic innovations, denominated direct and indirect, complete and partial Christianisms.

1. Direct complete Christianisms are proper and completely Christian words, such as the names of the days of the week—*feria secunda, tertia, quarta, quinta, sexta, sabbatum, dies dominica*—to avoid the names of the week linked to the pagan divinities of the Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jove, Venus, Saturn, the Sun; these denominations last to this day in liturgical use. Some Hebrew acclamations and formulas reflect the attachment to the tradition and the effort to translate as faithfully as possible the divine message; still alive today in the liturgy are *amen, alleluia, hosanna, sabaoth* together with proper and common names such *cherubim, gehenna* (*infernus*), *iubilaeus annus, manna, messias, seraphim, Iacob, Iesus, Ioseph, Maria*. Names within a Greek matrix or composed on Greek examples were equally coined or preserved, such as *acolythus, anastasis* and *resurrectio, anathema* and *anathematizare, angelus, apologia* (*apologeticum*), *apostata, apostasia* and *apostatare, apostolatus* and *apostolus, archangelus, archidiaconus, archipresbyter, baptismus* or *baptismum, baptista, baptisterium, baptizare; catechumenus, chrisma, Christus, Christianismus, Christianitas, christianizare, Christianus, clerus, coemeterium, coenobium, diaconus* and *minister, ecclesia, eleemosyna, epiphania, episcopatus* and *episcopus, ethnicus, eucaristia, evangelium* and *evangelizare, haeresis, idòlum* (*idoleum, idolium*), *laicus, latria, liturgia, martyr* and *martyrium, monacha, monachium, monachus, monasterium, patriarcha* (*-es*) and *patriarchatus, presbyter* and *presbyteratus, presbyterium, propheta, prophetia* and *prophetizare, salmista, psalmodia* and *psalmus, pseudoapostolus, pseudopropheta, schisma* and *schismaticus, synaxis, synodus.*

Some Hellenisms were not relevant to either Christian doctrine or liturgy, but survived as relicts of the era in which Greek was the language of the Scriptures and the liturgy, as, e.g., the words *abyssus, arrabon, brabium, exstasis, scandalum* and *scandalizzare.* Lexicographical calques coined in perfect equivalence to the Greek words of the sacred texts are *benedictio* from *eulogia, primogenitus* from *prōtotokos, resurrectio* from *anastasis, revelatio* from *apokalypsis* and *unigenitus* from *monogenēs*.

2. Direct partial Christianisms are words particular to Christians but only partially Christian, since they were used by Christians to indicate new realities, unknown to the pagans. Among these stand out the words and verbs suffixed with *-fico, -mentum, -tela, -tia, -tura,* of vulgar imprint, such as *benefico, corruptela* and *incorruptela, creatura, documentum, firmamentum, incorruptela, metatura, potentia, sufferentia, supplementum, sustinentia* (*exspectatio*); the words *adinventio, aedificare* and *aedificatio, benedicere, caritas, communio, confessio, confessor, confiteor, coetus congregatus, consilium, contribulare, conversio, cornu, devotio, devotus, dominicum, dormire* (*in Domino*), *eructare, factum, fidelis* and *infidelis, fides, fortitudo, gentilis, gentilitas, gratia, humilis, humilitas, incarnari, incarnatio, incarnatus, inventum, iustificare, lapsus, libertas, mediatio, mediator, mediatrix, missa, orare, oratio, paganitas* and *paganus, peccatum, reconciliatio, regenerare, regeneratio, regeneratus, reparatio, resurrectio, robur, salus, salvare, salvatio, salvator* and *servator, salvum facere, sanctificatrix, sanctificatus, sanctificus, stips collata, susceptor* (*adiutor*), *templum, tribulatio, viaticum, virtus, vigor, vivificatus.*

One may also add the composite adjectives such as *immarcescibilis, incommutabilis, indeficiens, indeflexibilis, indesinens.* Following the regular procedures of Latin neology, one passes from the particularly meaningful terms of Christian ideology or discipline to a notable enrichment and semantic dilatation. For example, from the equivalence of Greek *sarx* with *caro* were created *carnalis* and *carnaliter;* from that of *hagios* with *sanctus* came *sanctificator, sanctificatio, sanctificare;* from *zōopoiein* with *vivificare* were coined *vivificatio, vivificator.* The semantic calques are often justified by a partial coincidence of meaning of the Greek terms with the Latin equivalents, such as *diathēkē* with *testamentum* (*foedus*), *doxazein* with *honorificare, lytron* with

redemptio, mystērion with *sacramentum*. To make the biblical message accessible to the culturally humblest members of the community, the Christian preachers did not flee from terms and constructs of vulgar Latin, which the proponents of classicist purism rejected in the *usus scribendi* and *loquendi.*

The oldest interpretations of the sacred text reflect the different linguistic experiences of the first Christian generations which were received, transmitted and systematically developed in families of words, such as *incarnari, incarnatio, concarnari, concarnatio* concerning the incarnation of the Son of God; *figuraliter, praefigurare, praefiguratio* from the term *figura* with the acceptation of the Greek *typos* equivalent to "prefiguration," "symbolic meaning" concerning the persons and events of the OT. Equally accepted lexicographical groups such as *ecclesia catholica, vita aeterna,* and syntactic groups such as *terra promissionis* ("promised land") *plebs fidelium* ("Christian community"), *operari iustitiam* ("do good works"), *operari virtutes* ("perform miracles"), and even biblical metaphors and images, consecrated by the liturgical use and rendered familiar by preaching and catechesis or by personal meditation on sacred texts. The direct Christianisms became of common use among Christians and popular expressions entered the liturgy. *Augustine cites at least ten times, above all in his discourses, *Sursum cor habeamus,* and *Erimus et nos gloria in excelsis Deo.*

3. The indirect complete Christianisms are the words which are entirely but not inherently Christian, which do not concern strictly Christian realities but which are found only in Christian authors, such as those suffixed with *-ntia, -tas, -tio* (*destructio, dormitio, tribulatio*), *-tudo, -tus;* think of substantives used as adjectives, of adjectives used in place of a genitive or of an adverb, of terms such as *apostolicus, caelestis* (*-ia*), *catholicus-catholici, fideles, gentilis (-es), haereticus, hibernum, incensum, increduli, indeficienter, ineffabiliter, laicus, matutinus, peccator, praepositi, relicta, salutare, superlevare, superexaltare, superextendere, superglorificare, supersperare, terrena.*

4. The indirect partial Christianisms are pagan words often used by Christians. Think of the preference given to *ambulare* compared to *ire,* to *honorificare* compared to *honorare,* to *manducare* compared to *edere* and to *salvator* compared to *conservator* or *servator.*

Among *semiological* phenomena one should include the notions intimately connected with Christian doctrine, life and sentiments. Think of all the vocabulary relative to the theme of salvation and to the mystery of the redemption such as *mediatio, mediator, mediatrix, salus, salvare, salvatio, salvator, sanctificare, sanctificatio, sanctificator,* and the adaptation to a Christian sense of words like *clarificare, corruptibilis, destructor, imperfectio, incorruptio, indeficienter, ineffabiliter, infatigabiliter, miserator, mortaliter, mortificare, operator, transgressor, tribulatio, trucidator.*

As for *syntactic* phenomena, the influence of the vulgar language is notable, particularly in the preference given to the syntagmata proper to the language of the people, such as the notable preference given to analytic constructions with *qualiter, quia, quod, quoniam* and a finite mood of the verb, compared with the accusative with infinitive more frequent in the Latin of the authors; think of the favor given to the periphrastic futures or the extension of the use of the *de* and the *in* with instrumental ablative: *delectari in, laetari in, percutere in virga, in nomine Domini, gladium in manu sumere.* Next to the accentuated use of infinitive prepositions with *quod* and causal ones after the *verba dicendi* and *sentiendi*, one should mention the frequency of constructs of the type *dicere ad, loqui ad*; pleonasms of the type *clamaverunt dicentes* (Mt 8:29); *locutus est eis dicens* (Jn 8:12); the transitive use of intransitive words, such as *benedicere aliquem*; some particular syntagmata, of the type *credere in aliquem, maior ab angelis, dico enim vobis quod, iurare ut, facilius est ut.* Worth a mention also is the collective use of adjectives: *Negat Manichaeus . . . sed Arrianus confitetur* (Aug., *Ser.* 183,1,1); of present and past participles having become substantives: *credentes, diffidentes, dormientes* (*mortui*), *collecta, relicta, incensum, praepositi*; of substantives used as adjectives: *populus peccator* (Hier., *In Eccl.* c. 1140 B); of the adjective as complement of specification: *apostolica praecepta, divina misericordia; dominica indignatio, dominica mandata, dominicus dies;* of the adjective in the place of the adverb: *domum matutinus ascendit*; of the accentuated use of abstract words: *obsecro te ignoscas tarditati meae* (Hier., *Ep.* 99,2); *te universa fraternitas salutat* (ibid.); *sanctitas vestra* (Aug., *Psal.* 25,2,1.5).

Therefore, precisely in the biblical translations one can find the matrix of a great part of the lexicographical, semantic and syntactic phenomena peculiar to Christian Latin starting from Tertullian, who was largely heir to a linguistic tradition, which, through missionary preaching, liturgical and catechetical preaching and the translations of biblical passages for the liturgy, has consolidated in the churches of the West from the oldest phases of the Latinization of the Christian communities. Certainly this creativity was largely strengthened by the linguistic-literary activity of *Hilary, cultural bridge

with the East, of Jerome, translator of the Bible, and of Augustine, thinker, preacher and writer. To the authority of these figures is due the affirmation of the language of the biblical tradition in the Latin literature of Christian inspiration, and to their genius is due also the creation of numerous neologisms which were affirmed in the Christian linguistic tradition.

F. Ozanam, *Comment la langue latine devint chrétienne*, Œuvres Complètes, II, Paris 1855, 117-147; H. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, Marburg [2]1875 (repr. Munich 1965); G. Koffmane, *Geschichte des Kirchenlateins*, I-II, Breslau 1879-1881 (repr. 1966); E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Uppsala 1911; S.W.J. Teeuwen, *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian*, Paderborn 1926; E. Leitl, *Das Latein der Kirche*, Munich 1927; J. Schrijnen, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein*, Nijmegen 1932 (It. tr. Bologna 1977); Chr. Mohrmann, *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin*, Nijmegen 1932; M. Schuster, *Altchristliches Latein*, Leipzig 1933; J. Schrijnen - Chr. Mohrmann, *Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian. I-II*, Nijmegen 1936-37; Chr. Mohrmann, *Introduzione generale*, in G.J.M. Bartelink (ed.), *Vite dei Santi*, *Vita di Antonio*, Fondazione Valla, Milan 1974, XIII; the articles published by Mohrmann on Christian Latinity are gathered in the volumes *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, I, Rome 1958 (repr. 1994); II, Rome 1961; III, Rome 1965 (repr. 1979); IV, Rome 1977 (repr. 1994); W. Matzkow, *De vocabulis quibusdam Italae et Vulgatae Christianis*, Berlin 1933; M. Flad, *Le latin de l'Église, étudié d'après la grammaire et la liturgie*, Paris 1938; J. de Ghellinck, *Latin chrétien ou langue latine des chrétiens?*: Les Études Classiques 8 (1939) 449-478; M.A. Sainio, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der christlichen Latinität*, Helsinki 1941 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, 47/1); F. Di Capua, *Osservazioni sulla lettura e sulla preghiera ad alta voce presso gli antichi*: RAAN n.s. 28 (1952) 59-99; M. Dilworth, *The Syntax of Christian Latin*: Clergy Rev. (London) 43 (1958) 462-474; Id., *The Morphology of Christian Latin*: ibid. 45 (1960) 88-97; Id., *The Vocabulary of Christian Latin*: ibid. 51 (1966) 349-369 and 429-447; E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig-Berlin [4]1959, It. tr. *La prosa d'arte antica*, I-II, Rome 1986; R. Braun, "*Deus Christianorum." Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, Paris 1962; Id., *Origini e caratteristiche della latinità cristiana*, Rome 1978; S. Marsili, *La latinité chrétienne. Développement et introduction de la langue chrétienne*: La MaisonD 86 (1966) 127-140; V. Loi, *La latinità cristiana nel "De Trinitate" di Novaziano*: RCCM 13 (1971) 136-177; A.N. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*, repr. New York 1971; G.M. Mir, *Latinitas christianorum propria*, I: Latinitas 19 (1971) 233-248; II-III: Latinitas 20 (1972) 10-20 and 180-200; G.L. Leone, *Latinità cristiana. Introduzione allo studio del latino cristiano*, Lecce 1971; J. Bastardas, *El latín de los cristianos. Estado de su problemática*: Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Helénicos 7,2 (1973) 5-17; G. Romaniello, *La formula "Ite missa est" e il significato della parola "Missa,"* Latina 1975; E. Malaspina, *Gli studi sulla latinità cristiana* (1951-1978), I-II: Cultura e Scuola (Rome) 18 (1979) n. 71, 40-47, n. 72, 64-70; C. De Meo, *Lingue tecniche del latino*, Bologna 1983; G. Caliò, *Il latino cristiano*, Bologna 1985; C. Codoñer Merino, *Latín cristiano, ¿lengua de grupo?*: Nova Tellus 3 (1985) 111-126; P. Serra Zanetti, "*Sermo humilis" negli autori latini cristiani*, in *Orientamenti recenti della critica nella lettura dei testi latini*, Bologna 1988, 51-59; L.F. Pizzolato, *Metodi di ricerca nella letteratura cristiana antica*, in B. Amata (ed.), *Cultura e Lingue Classiche* 2, LAS, Rome 1988, 105-115; J. Oroz Reta, *Del latín cristiano al latín litúrgico: algunas observaciones en torno al* Itinerarium Egeriae: Latomus 48 (1989) 401-415; B. Amata, *Quaestio de linguarum studio in Ecclesia*: Latinitas 3 (1989) 210-217; Lingua Patrum, I. *Bibliographie signalétique du latin des Chrétiens*, Turnhout 1989; B. Luiselli, *Il linguaggio della "evangelizatio pauperum" nella chiesa latina antic*a, in *La tradizione patristica. Alle fonti della cultura europea*, Florence 1995, 31-58; V. Grossi, *Dal "sermo humilis" delle traduzioni latine della Bibbia alla teologia agostiniana dell'evangelizzazione*, in L. Padovese, *Atti del VI Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni Apostolo*, Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano, Rome 1996, 273-291; S. Sconocchia - L. Toneatto (ed.), *Seminario Internazionale sulla letteratura scientifica e tecnica greca e latina* 1, Trieste 1993; 2. Bologna 1997.

V. Loi - B. Amata

LATRONIANUS (d. 385). A follower of *Priscillian, he was executed at *Trier together with Priscillian himself and others. *Jerome praises him as a well-trained poet, worthy of being compared to the ancient authors, and records his poetical works, composed in different meters (*Vir. ill.* 122).

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976, 144; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, 98, 210, n. 102.

S. Zincone

LAUDATIO SANCTI MARTINI. An anonymous sermon (*laetemur in Domino*) of the 6th c., from *Gaul, in honor of St. *Martin of Tours, composed for the *dies natalis* of the saint. The text is an exaltation of the festival day, in which everyone should rejoice.

CPL 480; PLS 4, 602-604; B.M. Peebles, *Saint Martin et son temps*, Rome 1961, 237-249; A. Lambert, *Le premier panégyrique de St Martin*: Bulletin de St-Martin et de St-Benoît 32 (1924) 316-320.

A. Di Berardino

LAUDE MARTYRII, De. An anonymous work in the form of a sermon which dates probably to the 3rd c. Contrary to what was thought until a few years ago, this text does not belong to *Cyprian and even less to *Novatian. In its content, the text can be divided into three sections: an introduction (1-3), a part concerning the greatness of martyrdom in response to three questions (*quid sit*, *quantum sit*, *cui rei prosit;* 4-12) and finally a part on the foundation of martyrdom (13-24). In fact already in this text there are the principal components of the definition of martyrdom: the suffering, the blood and the crown. The author praises the greatness of the glory which Christ gives to his disciples after having suf-

fered for him. That is to say that the full meaning of martyrdom cannot be understood without reference to Christ. Therefore, martyrdom is first of all the confession of faith in Christ: *quod confessio vocis unius Christi perpetua confessio seruetur* (see Lk 12:8). Such a confession has the particularity of being the moment of manifesting the virtues so as to participate in eternal felicity while the enemies of Christ are consumed by eternal fire. Yet the martyr truly acquires a dignity for all eternity (*dignitas martyrii*). Everything depends on the level of our love for Christ: the more we love him, the more we are able to imitate his love for us (1 Cor 7:7; 1 Cor 11:1). Therefore, the martyrs are pushed by divine love to become imitators of Christ, pouring out their blood for him (*pro eo fundere sanguinem metius*). The author radicalizes his teaching, saying that those who love Christ do not love the world (*qui amat Christum, non amat saeculum*). In short, the foundation of martyrdom is love for Christ. Only those who truly love Christ can die for him. Since, in imitation of Christ, the martyr accepts torments to receive the title of inestimable glory linked to the resurrection (Col 2:20), martyrdom is a title of glory (*titulus gloriae*) and of dignity (*titulus dignitatis*), which cannot be obtained without corporal torments (Mt 19:29).

CPL 58; PL 4, 816-834; CPPM 4559; W. Hartel: CSEL, 3, 3 (1871) 26-52; H. von Soden, *Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung. Geschichte ihrer Entstehung und Überlieferung*, Leipzig 1904 (= TU, N. F. 10, 3), 214-216 (pls. IV and V); H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*, Bonn 1926, 334-357; Patrologia I, 600-601; G. Mercati, *Opere minori* 2, ST 77, 184-191; Eng. tr.: R.E. Wallis, ANL 13; ANF 5, 579-587; M. Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian's Treatise*, Oxford 1961; M. Bévenot, *The Oldest Surviving Manuscripts of St. Cyprian Now in the British Library*: JTS 31 (1980) 368-377; M. Marin, *Problemi di ectdotica ciprianea. Per un'edizione critica dello pseudociprianeo de aleatoribus*: VetCh 20 (1983) 141-239; L. Ferreres, *Index verborum et locutionum quae in Ps. Cypriani "De laude martyrii" opuscolo inveniuntur*, Barcelona 1999.

M.W. Libambu

LAUDES DOMINI (317–323). The anonymous hexameter poem in 148 verses, "located between casual poetry and the encomium of a mythological hero" (Smolak), is the first example in Latin of a poetic account of a nonbiblical miracle. It is a miracle which took place in the region of the Edui in *Gaul: a man puts his deceased wife in a large sepulcher, where he reserves a place for himself as well. At his death, the tomb is opened and the woman greets her husband with a hand gesture. The macabre *narratio,* under many aspects already medieval, is interpreted as a testimony of the imminent second parousia. Starting from the miraculous event, the poet sings the praises of the Lord and of his redemptive work. The poem, stitched with Virgilian reminiscences, finishes with the prayer to Christ, that he may assure victory and joy to emperor *Constantine, in virtue of his exemplary conduct of life and pro-Christian legislation (v. 143-148: *At nunc tu dominum meritis, pietate parentem, / imperio facilem, uiuendi lege magistrum / edictisque parem, quae lex tibi condita sancit, / uictorem laetumque pares mihi Constantinum! / Hoc melius fetu terris nil ante dedisti / nec dabis*: *exaequent utinam sua pignora patrem!*). The eulogy would be taken up and developed later by *Juvencus in the close of his paraphrastic poem (4,806-812).

CPL 1386.

Editions: PL 6, 45-50; 19, 379-386 (Arevalo); 61, 1091-1094 (Fabricius); W. Brandes, *Über das frühchristliche Gedicht* "Laudes Domini," Braunschweig 1887, 5-10; P. van der Weijden, *Laudes Domini*, Paris-Amsterdam 1967 (text, Dutch tr. and comm.); A. Salzano, *Laudes Domini*. intro., text, It. tr. and comm. (Università degli Studi di Salerno. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 23), Naples 2001.

Studies: G. Bardy, *Les* Laudes Domini *poème autunois du commencement du IVe siècle*: Mémoires Ac. Sc. Arts B.L. de Dijon (1933) 36-51; A. Frisone, *Sancti poetae*: Helikon 9-10 (1969) 673-676; I. Opelt, *Das* Carmen De laudibus Domini *als Zeugnis des Christentums bei den Galliern*: RomBarb 3 (1978) 159-166; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 101-102; K. Smolak, *La poesia cristiana latina tra il quarto e il quinto secolo*: Salesianum 62 (2000) 26.

A.V. Nazzaro

LAUDES EUNOMIAE. A Parisian MS of the 11th c. (*Parisinus* 8319) has transmitted two short poems to us, in which the praises of Eunomia, who consecrated herself to God, are sung. The title of the first is *Laus domnae Eunomiae sacrae virginis.* It is composed of five distichs (Incipit: *Plena Deo, moderata animo . . .*), and resolves into a paraphrase of the concept of the wise virgin (Mt 25:1-13). The other component, of 25 somewhat irregular verses (Incipit: *Fulgens Eunomia decensque virgo*), sings the glory of the blessed woman and ends with a prayer. In the context allusions are not absent to the nobility, perhaps even royalty, of Eunomia's origins. There are no proofs that this is Eunomia, daughter of the rhetor Nazarius of Bordeaux (4th c.).

CPL 1422a; PLS 3, 1430; ICL 12055; F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia latina*, I, 2, Leipzig 1906, 252, nr. 767-768; E. Galletier, *Panégyriques latins*, II, Paris 1952, 147; L. de Camargo Schnetzer, *Ensaio sobre a historia da moral e da arte lirica na Grecia*: Rev. Hist. 37 (1968) 3-31 (also discusses Eunomia).

L. Dattrino

LAURA (λαύρα = narrow path). A monastery, esp. in Palestine, composed of a group of single cells for semihermits united under the guide of a single superior, therefore like a village of monks with the church at the center. The cell dwellers met together only on Saturday and Sunday to celebrate the liturgy and receive the Eucharist which they carried with them. Later the term *laura* came to indicate also the grand monasteries. The oldest and most famous lauras were built in Palestine in the 4th–5th c. by *Euthymius and by his disciple *Sabas, defender of *Chalcedonism, founder of the Great Laura called Mar Saba. The separation of the *Origenist monks from the Great Laura gave rise to the New Laura to the S of Bethlehem. The role played by these lauras in the defense of Chalcedonism and in the Origenist question is important.

Cyril Scythop., *Vita Sabae* 90; Evagrius Schol., *HE* 2,21 (PG 86, 2477-2478); EC 7, 858-860; DACL 8, 1961-1988; DIP 5, 499-500; J. Pargoire, *L'Église Byzantine de 527 à 847*, Paris 1905; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VIe siècle*, Paris 1925; Y. Hirschfeld, *The Judean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period*, New Haven, CT 1992.

M.G. Mara

LAURENTIUS, antipope (d. after 507). At the death of Pope *Anastasius II (d. 498) there were two factions in *Rome: one favorable to the Eastern politics of the deceased pope and the other against. The pro-Byzantine party elected the presbyter Laurentius, titular of St. Prassede (22 Nov 498), while the other, on the same day, nominated the deacon *Symmachus at St. John Lateran. As uproar broke out in Rome between the two factions, the Arian king *Theodoric called the two contenders together at *Ravenna, where Symmachus was recognized as pope. He called a council in Rome which met 1 March 499, and in which Laurentius also participated as priest of St. Prassede. He signed the *Acts* (Mansi 8, 235) and then accepted the bishopric of Nocera in Campania. The opposition to Symmachus continued, encouraged by Probinus and Festus; the two senators actually achieved the return of Laurentius in 502, who proceeded to take possession of all the churches, except St. Peter's, which remained loyal to Symmachus; Laurentius was excommunicated in a Roman synod. There followed years of anonymous writings and accusations, struggles and massacres before Theodoric, convinced by the Alexandrian deacon Dioscorus, in March 507 recognized only Symmachus, and Laurentius was constrained to retire to the villa of his friend Festus. Thus the Laurentian Schism was ended, and its supporters gradually diminished; peace returned completely only under *Hormisdas (514–523). A follower of Laurentius made a version of the **Liber pontificalis,* of which remain part of the biography of Anastasius and material against Symmachus (LP I, 44-46).

LP I, XLIII-XLIV; 44-46; III, 88-90; EC 8, 1545; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VIe siècle*, Paris 1925, 113-128; Fliche-Martin IV, 424-437; A. Alessandrini, *Teodorico e papa Simmaco durante lo scisma laurenziano*: Archivio Soc. rom. di Storia Pat. 67 (1944) 120-207; R.I. Harper, *Theodoric and the Laurentian Schism: An Aspect of Fifth Century Church and State*: Southern Quarterly 4 (1965) 123-143; Ch. Pietri, *Le sénat, le peuple chrétien et les partis du cirque à Rome sous le pape Symmaque* (498-514): MEFR Ant. 78 (1966) 123-139; P.A.B. Llewellyn, *The Roman Church during the Laurentian Schism: Priests and Senators*: ChHis 45 (1976) 417-427; T. Sardella, *Società, Chiesa e Stato nell'età di Teoderico. Papa Simmaco e scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996; Epapi I, 473-475; PCBE 2, 1244-1246.

A. Di Berardino

LAWRENCE (Laurence) (1st half of 5th c.). Bishop of Novae, on the lower Danube (lower Moesia; now Svishtov, Bulgaria), at the beginning of 5th c. One of the few Latin writers of Eastern Romania (CPL 644-645; PL 66, 89-124), author of the tracts *De poenitentia* and *De elemosyna;* translator of *John Chrysostom (*De Chananaea*: CPG 4529). He insists on the remission of sins not through the sacred minister but by the means of good works. God has determined two periods of penitence, one from Adam to Christ and the other from Christ onward, through *baptism (*remissio publica*), while *remissio privata* is the fruit of penitence. We know no more of him, but today a number of scholars identify him with Lawrence, third bishop of Novara.

G. Morin, *L'évêque Laurent de "Novae"*: RSPh 26 (1937) 307-317; DSp 9, 402-404; J. Gribomont: Novarien. Ass. Studi di Novara 18 (1988) 151-180; LTK³ 3, 687 (Laurence of Novara).

J. Gribomont

LAWRENCE (Laurence), Roman martyr (d. 258)
I. Biography - II. Archaeology

I. Biography. Lawrence was inserted as a martyr in the **Depositio martyrum* 10 Aug; as deacon (archdeacon in the second family of MSS) in the *Mart. hier.* The two documents mention his tomb in the Via Tiburtina, with the second adding a cemetery named after him. *Constantine had a basilica built *ad corpus* (*eius*). *Prudentius dedicated to him his second "crown" (*Perist.* 2), in which the martyr is presented as the first of the Levites. In these documents the oldest facts about his cult are to be found,

which already show some development: martyr, deacon, archdeacon. This progression seems to owe to legends which grew up around the saint. Their primitive form is attested by St. *Ambrose of Milan, by Prudentius as already noted, by *Augustine of Hippo, by *Maximus of Turin and by *Peter Chrysologus. We find echoes of it in the oldest liturgical books of *Rome (*Sacr. Leon.*), *Gaul (*Miss. Goth.*) and Spain (*Orat. visig.*). In these Lawrence is archdeacon of Sixtus II (257–258), who distributes the wealth of the church to the poor, and suffers martyrdom on a gridiron: in all probability, however, he was decapitated together with Sixtus, as were the other contemporaneous martyrs. In all these accounts we find already the famous dialogues between Lawrence and the pope, the judge and the executioner. In ca. 500, the passion was incorporated into the cycle of Polychronius, which combines in a vast narrative, in episodes, details of the Roman saints (and non-Roman saints), from the end of July to the middle of August. To the Constantinian basilica dedicated to him, the foundations of which were rediscovered during World War II, another basilica was added underground by *Pelagius II (579–590). The present basilica, oriented in the opposite direction to the latter, is from the 13th c. In Rome, the cult of the saint saw a great flowering; no fewer than 34 churches bear his name. From Rome, the cult spread across the West.

AASS Aug. 2, 1735, 485-532; BHL 708-712; ad novum Suppl. (1986) 518-521; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *S. Lorenzo e il supplizio della graticola*: RQA 14 (1900) 159-176; Id., *Note agiografiche* 5, ST 27, 65-82; 33, 147-178; AB 51 (1933) 34-98; DACL 8, 1917-1961; LTK³ 6, 88-89; BS 8, 108-129; LCI 7, 374-380; LMA 5, 1757ff.; R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, 2, Rome 1962, 1-146; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 95; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 204-206, 212-216, 225-227; E. Giannarelli - A. Benvenuti, *Il diacono Lorenzo fra storia e leggenda*, Florence 1998.

V. Saxer

II. Archaeology

1. Shrine. The **Depositio martyrum* and the *Mart. hier.,* as also the itineraries for the city of Rome of the 7th c., are in agreement in placing the tomb of Lawrence in the Via Tiburtina. According to sources, including a *Passio* (perhaps of 5th c.) and the *Liber pontificalis,* the remains of the martyrs were placed *in agrum Veranum,* within the crypt of a cemetery subsequently named after him. Near the tomb and above ground, *supra arenario cryptae,* the emperor Constantine had a basilica built (LP I, 181), spoken of by the sources until the mid-9th c., when Leo IV (847–855) restored it, and of which we have only a few vestiges. It was a large building, referred to often as *basilica maior,* with three aisles, the lateral aisles continuing around the apse, so making a continuous ambulatory: a cemeterial basilica of the so-called cruciform type, its particular planimetry, recalling a circus, corresponding to a very limited group of basilicas built in the Roman suburbs at the time of Constantine and his successors. The emperor also undertook work on the tomb of Lawrence, probably surrounding it with plutei and decorating it with marble, but this work, set out in the *Liber pontificalis,* cannot easily be reconstructed. Constantine then constructed *grados ascensionis et descentionis,* two flights of stairs, one to descend to the tomb of the martyr and the other to ascend, so making access easier for visitors by creating a one-way route which was both rapid and direct. At the end of the 6th c., Pope *Pelagius II (579–590), probably following a rockslide which had affected the cemetery area around the tomb of Lawrence, built a new basilica, this time *ad corpus*—i.e., immediately over the tomb—destroying in the process a part of the galleries of the catacomb which surrounded the crypt of the martyr and cutting into the adjacent hill. Pope Honorius II (1216–1227) made a radical transformation, building a new church to the W of the Pelagian basilica: the structure of the 6th-c. basilica, its apse having been demolished, became the presbytery of the new basilica. Several times restored over the course of the centuries, and particularly after the devastating bombing of 1943, the present basilica of St. Lawrence Outside the Walls is formed substantially from the Pelagian-Honorian complex.

2. Iconography. In the depictions of St. Lawrence in the first centuries of Christian art, the saint always appears as young, with an ample tonsure, with or without beard. Frequent attributes are the cross carried on the shoulders, the triumphant sign of the martyr as a perfect imitator and follower of Christ (*trophaeum Christi*); the book, sign of a deacon, but taken along with the cross evocative also of the doctrine and the faith for which Lawrence had suffered martyrdom; and the gridiron, instrument of his passion. With cross and book Lawrence appears in a picture in the catacomb at Albano (Rome) from the end of the 5th c. (M. Marinone, *La decorazione pittorica della catacomb di Albano*: RIA 19-20 [1972-73] fig. 20), one of the earliest images of him; it is also the first iconographic evidence in the West of the deacon's stole (M. Marinone, *Un'antica testimonianza iconografica sull'uso della stola diaconale in Occidente*: EphLit 90 [1976] 87ff.). The catacomb of St. *Januarius in Naples contains a fresco (6th–7th c.) depicting Lawrence with the crown of martyrdom

in his hands, symbol of victory and of his heavenly reward (U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1974, 102, fig. 69). The oldest representation of the martyrdom of Lawrence, even if the triumphal meaning of the scene prevails over the narrative intention, is believed to be a lunette mosaic in the mausoleum of Galla Placidia in *Ravenna, where the holy deacon is pictured next to a gridiron (F.W. Deichman, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden-Baden 1958, plates 5-7; F. Bisconti, *Dentro e intorno all'iconografia martiriale romana: dal "vuoto figurative" all'"immaginario devozionale,"* in *Martyrium in multidisciplinary perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans*, Leuven 1995, 291). In fact, a brief note in the biography of Sylvester in the *Liber pontificalis* reveals that the decoration which Constantine provided for the tomb of Lawrence included scenes relating to his passion (LP I, 181). We find a representation analogous to that of the mausoleum of Galla Placidia, even if more complex and rich in detail, in the *Sucessa* gold medallion once kept in the Vatican Museums where a figure identified with Lawrence is stretched out on a gridiron between two executioners, in the presence of a magistrate; its authenticity, however, is much in doubt (F. Bisconti, *Riflessi iconografici del pellegrinaggio nelle catacombe romane*, in *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie*, Münster 1995, 552ff.). From the end of the 6th c. there is the splendid mosaic image in the absidal arch of the basilica of St. Lawrence Outside the Walls, from the time of Pelagius II (579–590) (G. Matthiae, *Mosaici medievali delle chiese di Roma*, Rome 1967, 152ff.). A depiction of Lawrence has also been identified in the catacomb of St. Valentine in Rome, in the fresco of a procession of saints in the vestibule, from between the middle of the 7th and the first years of the 8th c. (Nestori, 2, n. 1; J. Osborne, *The Roman Catacombs in the Middle Ages*: PBSR 53 [1985] 312). More evidence of the vast popularity of Lawrence's cult is to be found in his frequent appearances on so-called gold glass, where a glass container is decorated with a thin layer of gold, not only for the purposes of decoration, but also—esp. when decorated with images of saints and martyrs—for protection of the loculi in the catacombs (see C.R. Morey, *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections*, Vatican City 1959, nn. 36, 40, 240, 283, 344, 460).

On the shrine: R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, II, Vatican City 1962, 1-147; G. Matthiae, *San Lorenzo fuori le mura* (Le chiese di Roma illustrate, 89), Rome 1966; S. Serra, *San Lorenzo fuori le mura*, in L. Pani Ermini (ed.), *La visita alle "Sette Chiese,"* Rome 2000, 101-112.

On the iconography: DACL 8, 1925ff.; EC 7, 1542ff.; BS 8, 121ff.; LCI 7, 374ff.; L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, III: *Iconographie des saints*, Paris 1958, 789ff.; G. Kaftal, *Iconography of the Saints in Central and South Italian Schools of Paintings*, Florence 1965, 644f.

M. Marinone

LAWRENCE (Laurence) of Canterbury (saint; d. 619). Priest and monk, probably of St. Andrew's on the Caelian (Rome), Lawrence was sent with other monks to Britain in 597 in the first mission planned by Pope *Gregory the Great (d. 604) for that region. In 601 he returned to ask the pope for new missionaries, and then went back to the island with a second group of monk-evangelizers and the archiepiscopal pallium for St. *Augustine of Canterbury (d. 604/605), with whom he was by then the principal collaborator. With Augustine he is considered one of the first founders of the church in England, developed on a monastic model. From 26 (28?) April 604/605 he was archbishop of *Canterbury, succeeding Augustine. As bishop in an Anglo-Saxon area, Lawrence did not succeed in overcoming differences with the Britons in respect to liturgical rites, esp. in relation to the date of Easter, as we see from a letter sent in the years 610–618, inviting the Britons to accept Roman usages. Lawrence always remained faithful to Rome. In 616 he met with a series of difficulties with King Eadbald of Kent, supporter of paganism; Lawrence therefore relocated to Gaul, but an appearance of St. Peter, reproaching him for his departure and abandoning his diocese, caused a rapid development of the situation. The king converted, and Lawrence took up his pastoral activity once more. He died 2 Feb 619, and on that day is celebrated locally in the liturgy.

Bede the Venerable, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, I, 27,33; II, 4-7 (ed. B. Colgrave - R.A.B. Mynors), Oxford 1969, 78, 114, 144-148, 152-156; William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum anglorum*, I; PL 179, 1443AB; BHL 4741-4742; EC 7, 1548; P.B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*, Regensburg 1873-1886 (anastatic reprint Graz 1957), 182; P. Grosjean, *Recherches sur les débuts de la controverse pascale chez les Celtes*, 6. *Le Faust de 606 prouvient-il de Cantorbéry? Date de la lettre des SS. Laurent, Mellitus et Justus aux Irlandais*: AB 64 (1946) 231-239; BS 8, 129-134; PCBE 2, 1261-1263; L.E. von Padberg, *Mission und Christianisierung: Formen und Folgen bei Angelsachsen und Franken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1995, 247-248.

R. Grégoire

LAWRENCE (Laurence) of Milan. Bishop of Milan (486–508; on his dates, see Stein-Palanque, 127, n. 1).

*Ennodius of Pavia, his relative and for some time his secretary, gives us scanty and allusive hints as to his life and activity (see *Dictio* I: PL 68, 263-267; and *Carmina* II, 8, 12, 56 and 60 and elsewhere: see index of CSEL 6, 624-625). Lawrence, once elected bishop, found himself involved in the fight between *Odoacer and *Theodoric, lending his support to the latter, for which he was consigned to prison; he was freed after the victory of Theodoric. With *Epiphanius of Pavia he went to *Ravenna to ask Theodoric to revoke a particularly vexing law (see Ennodius: CSEL 6, 363). In the Roman schism, following the election of *Symmachus, Lawrence supported Symmachus against the priest *Laurentius and also helped him financially in his journey to Ravenna. He participated in the three sessions of the Roman synod of 502, convened by the king, to end the Roman schism. He was the first to sign the synodal decision of 23 Oct 502. He devoted himself to charitable works, and undertook construction and restoration projects in *Milan. He was patron of a certain *Arator, probably the poet; he fostered education by founding a school of higher learning in Milan.

BS 8, 148-149; PCBE 2, 1239-1242; F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia. La Lombardia*, I, Milan 1913, 32-33, 185-217; F. Lanzoni, *Le Diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 1021-1023; E. Stein - J.-R. Palanque, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Paris-Bruges 1949; *Storia di Milano*, I, Milan 1953, 382-390, II, Milan 1954, 3-22; M. Cagiano de Azevedo, *Milano da Sant'Ambrogio a Desiderio*: Notizie Chiostro Monastero Maggiore 3-4 (1969) 35-52.

A. Di Berardino

LAY – LAYMAN – LAITY. The word *lay* (*layman/laity*) is borrowed from the Greek λαικός and the Latin Graecism *laicus* which derives from the substantive λαός ("people"). The category "people" has great importance in the OT, in the relationship which Israel has with YHWH and in the relationship which it has with other peoples. In Ex 19:5-6 one reads, in the promise made by God to Moses: "If you wish to hear my voice and preserve my covenant, you will be for me a possession among all the peoples, because all the earth is mine! You will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation"; and in Dt 7:6, in the speech given to the people by Moses, before dying, to remind them of past events and to increase their fidelity to the covenant of Sinai, it is written: "You are a people sacred to the Lord your God; the Lord your God chose you to be the privileged people among all the peoples who are on the earth." The vocation and the promise of God are thus addressed to Israel as a "people." For the service of the sanctuary, however, just one tribe is chosen, that of Levi, and just one family, that of Aaron, receives the priestly function with a special consecration.

When, with the passage of time, worship came to be celebrated in a single temple, the temple of Jerusalem, it was given exclusively to the high priest to offer the sacrifice in the holy of holies, one single day of the year, the solemn day of atonement. In this way the high priest was clearly separated from the priests in general, and the priests as well were separated from the people, even if the sacerdotal function is certainly intended to render glory to God (but no less to open to the people the possibility of communion with God and communion with all). In the NT the word *laos* indicates either Israel or the church (see Acts 18:10; Rom 9:25; Heb 4:9; 1 Pet 2:10), while the word *laikos* does not appear. Jesus does not belong to the tribe of Levi, and therefore he is not a priest acc. to the law, and no one believes him to be one in the events of his life nor in his death, which took place outside of any ritual environment, an object of execration, not a source of blessing for the people. He is never named "priest" (*hiereus*), except in the letter to the Hebrews, in which he is designated "priest" acc. to an order superior to that of Aaron; and his sacrifice is said to be offered once for all time. Other NT passages attribute (common) priesthood to the entire community of the believers, in a collective aspect, through participation in the mission of Christ, without any attempt to put this in relationship with the apostolic—or, if one insists, ordained—ministry, understood as the power of representing the mediation of Christ. In the NT, however, the term *klēros* does not designate that part of the community which has the responsibility for governing, but that portion of men and women who participate in the promise of God from the moment in which they are marked by the seal of the Spirit. To be sure, the *klēros* as a whole is entrusted to the care of "overseers," of "elders," who have nothing to do with the Jewish priests and who come from the people. Within its context, however, multiple functions flourish which correspond to vocations or often to charisms received from above.

If the OT maintains a system of separation—between priesthood and laity, between worship and life—the NT suppresses this system and replaces it with a dynamism of participation and communion. Christ became similar to and supportive of all; fulfilling the will of the Father, he became obedient to death on the cross. Two characteristics therefore distinguish his offering: fellowship, which brings with it the shared responsibility for the good of all, and filial obedience. And these seem to be the characteristic traits of life in the early church, even for the laity.

To mention just a few authors, the word *laikos* in Christian literature appears for the first time, as far as we know, in *Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians* (40,5), dating to the end of the 1st c. The term, referred to people and not to things, is used in relationship with the Jewish sacerdotal hierarchy and indicates a category of persons in relationship with the sacerdotal category. The author exhorts the preservation of the order established in the church of God, acc. to which everyone should fulfill a function which is different but nevertheless complementary toward those exercised by other members of the same body. The focal point remains that of achieving harmony, of realizing unity, acc. to the divine plan.

An aspect which *Ignatius of Antioch, at the beginning of the 2nd c., and *Justin (after the middle of the 2nd c.), emphasize: no separation is made within the community, to which everyone belongs through baptism not as an isolated individual but as a person who is part of a body. Around AD 220 the situation, acc. to surviving evidence, was changing. *Clement of Alexandria distinguishes the laity from the clerics—divided into "presbyters" and "deacons"—but associates them all with the same discipline.

For the first time in the *Latin of Christians, the word *laicus* occurs with *Tertullian, formally borrowing from Greek in a rather interesting context. He exalts the figures of the confessors and the martyrs—who are usually laypeople—who reveal the work of the *Holy Spirit and are considered charismatic people. To the martyrs in particular is reserved the gift of prophecy, independent of the function which they exercise in the church. In two writings which are separated by some years, the *De praescriptione haereticorum* and the *De pudicitia*, he raises an important question, which concerns our subject, that of the relationship between the institutional church and the church of the Spirit. In the first of the two treatises Tertullian affirms that all the churches have their origin from the apostles and take the faith from there; therefore, all are first, all are apostolic; they constitute a single church, of which tradition is the hinge, and of which the successors of the apostles, i.e., the bishops, are guarantors. In the *De pudicitia,* a work which expresses Tertullian's new position in favor of *Montanism, he rejects the institutional church and appeals to a church of the Spirit, to whose authority alone he recognizes *potestas,* incarnated by the new prophets. The ordained ministry is put aside to leave space for charisms, and the *ius sacerdotale* is assigned even to lay men and women.

The Syriac **Didascalia* (2,34,5ff.; 35,1ff.), composed toward 230, insists on the submission of the laity to the bishop and on their duty to bring him the fruits of their labor (in this way the ordained ministry is relieved from material preoccupations) and on the necessity of not judging the way in which the bishop himself manages the property offered to him; but the same work (see 2,26,1) addresses the laity, calling them the "elect church of God"—"catholic church, sacrosanct, royal priesthood, holy multitude, chosen people, bride adorned for the Lord God."

With *Cyprian, in the middle of the 3rd c., the church appears clearly structured: the presbyters must dedicate themselves to divine worship and not be distracted by profane occupations; they are distinct from the *plebs* ("common people"), whose consensus nevertheless takes on notable importance in moments, even decisive ones, of the life of the community, next to the council of priests and deacons formed around the bishop. In the 3rd c. emerges therefore, in my judgment, the question of the position of the laity, at the time in which the church defined itself better as an institution. This happened because of organizational necessity, due also to a period of peace and religious tolerance which made it easier to increase the number of faithful, but posed serious problems for those responsible in the Christian community. Other elements, however, seem to have influenced this process: the OT model which showed a separation between the priestly caste and the people; the form of Roman society and its pyramidal organization; the suggestion deriving from *Platonic and *Neoplatonic philosophical reflection with its structure directed from above to below. (*Dionysius the Areopagite shows the ecclesiastical hierarchy as an image of the celestial hierarchy.)

Critics have interpreted this ecclesiastical course in different ways: some have emphasized the contrast between NT times and the later centuries characterized by a grave antinomy between clerics and the laity, as if the people of God were divided into two parts, almost as if the hierarchy found itself systematically opposed to the laity. Other scholars have noted that, if in the earliest period, the accent on Christian identity prevailed—i.e., on the awareness of belonging to a single body in a dimension of both mystery and communion—between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd c. there appeared the category of laypeople, distinct from that of priests and deacons. This did not, however, eliminate the consciousness of belonging to the same mysterious reality, which has its focal point in baptism, that link of grace with the Lord Jesus, through the participation in the triple *munus* as priest,

prophet and king. It is enough to think of the weight of the Christian *plebs*, also in later times, in the choice of bishops and, esp., outside the church, of the essential role which, from the earliest periods, the laity had in "mission"—i.e., in the spread of the gospel message, which has marked its history.

With the "Christianization" of the empire the process of distinction and distancing between clergy and laity accelerated, starting from the legislation emanating from Constantine which created many privileges for ordained ministers: their education and even their lives were influenced by it; their status was defined; the steps of the clerical *cursus* were defined; the churches governed by them received economic goods and landholdings; the number of priests multiplied, so much that not a few bishops worried about the phenomenon, which of itself made the fulfillment by the laity of functions and services rendered to the community diminish (it is significant that, in the middle of the 5th c., Pope *Leo I forbade anyone, monk or lay, to teach or preach in his church, except for the ministers of the altar [see *Epist.* 119,6]; an expression which suggests that in certain churches and on certain occasions the laity also taught or preached, as some ancient sources attest). It is not by chance that in this new situation an extraordinary flowering of forms of monastic life took place, already present for some time in the Christian world. These, in the variety of their expressions, have a challenging character: They show a movement of protest of the "secularization" of the clergy; they give rise to a demanding ascetical conception of baptism; and they recover a strong eschatological sense. Originally monasticism was a lay estate and did not wish to give rise to any other spirituality than that inspired by the gospel, understood in its radical simplicity. Later, esp. in the West, the monk was ordained, and this did not always take place in view of a community to serve. For its part, monastic spirituality exercised a strong influence on the fabric of the church and offered itself as an example for all its members, even for the laity. To the prevalence of a clergy which marginalized the laity, was added, on the side of spirituality, an essentially monastic approach, which in the end reduced the laity to a "minority," preventing them from creating the conditions necessary for the development of their own potentialities. With the fall of the political, civil and social structures of the Roman Empire, in the West the classical school system, which had lasted until that time, disappeared. Episcopal, monastic and presbyterial schools were born, which had the goal of receiving young men destined to become priests or monks and of furnishing them first with a religious education, which was also joined with an elementary literary education, otherwise unobtainable. The language, too, marked this situation: *litteratus* corresponds to *clericus; illiteratus* or *idiota* or *rudis* corresponds to layperson. (And among the "clerics" should be counted in the first rank the monks who transmitted the classical and patristic heritage—Greek and Latin—to medieval Christianity; a privilege which was not limited to just male monasteries, but extended to female ones as well.)

Despite the conditions which have been mentioned, in the church no one lost the sense of the essential unity of the people of God, the faith in the one and equal church, in which the laity as priests, kings and prophets have a post of honor the same as all the baptized, and the bishops and priests, without forgetting the ministry which they fulfill, also belong to the people of God. *Augustine of Hippo, e.g., makes himself a spokesperson for the latter reality when in a sermon (340,1), turning to his people, he observes: "It terrifies me what I am for you, while it consoles me what I am with you. Because, for you I am a bishop, with you I am a Christian. The former is a name of an assumed office, the latter of grace; the former is a name of danger, the latter of salvation." It is like an underground stream which runs hidden to reemerge in the early and then later Middle Ages. Think, e.g., as early as the 9th c., of Jonah of Orléans and of his *De institutione laicali,* a true "code" of spirituality for the layperson, which corresponds to the Rule of Aachen for the *ordo clericorum* or to the Benedictine rule, compliance with which was imposed on all monks. Think, later, toward the middle of the 12th c., of the *Epistula apologetica* of Anselm of Havelberg, who emphasized that what was important was not the "state of perfection," but the "perfection of the state"—i.e., the response to the will of God and to the personal vocation. Or again, think of the *Liber de aedifixio Dei,* where Gerhoch of Reichersberg brings to light the responsibility that all Christians have through their baptims. Think of the great ecclesiastical reforms of the 11th and 12th c. and also of the blossoming later of lay movements of great importance. To understand these events it is perhaps necessary to distinguish a sociological level—on which there is indeed a separation between the clerical or monastic state and lay state—from a spiritual level—on which, despite everything, no fractures take place or even substantial situations of "inequality" and where the substantial unity of the people of God is recognized as well as the "equality" which reigns between the baptized in building up the

body of Christ, despite the distinction of functions.

M. Yves - J. Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*, Paris 1953; E. Lanne, *Le laïcat dans l'Église ancienne*, in var. aus., *Ministères et laïcat*, Taizé 1964, 105-126; H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'Éducation dans l'Antiquité*, Paris [6]1964 (It. tr., Rome [2]1994) 431ff.; F.L. Pizzolato, *Laicità e laici nel cristianesimo primitivo*, in var. aus., *Laicità. Problemi e prospettive*, Atti del XLVII Corso di aggiornamento culturale dell'Università Cattolica, Milan 1977, 57-83; A. Vanhoye, *Prêtres anciens, Prêtre nouveau selon l'Ancient Testament*, Paris 1980 (It. tr. Leumann [Turin] 1985); A.M. Erba, in var. aus., *Dizionario di spiritualità dei laici*, Milan 1981, s.v. *Laico (storia del)*, 369-373; J. Gaudemet, *I laici nei primi secoli della Chiesa*: Communio 13/83-84 (1985) 12-25; A. Faivre, *Les laïcs aux origines de l'Église*, Paris 1984 (It. tr. Cinisello Balsamo 1986); J. Fontaine, *The Practice of Christian Life: The Birth of the Laity*, in var. aus., *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, New York 1985, 453-491; P. Siniscalco, *Laici e laicità. Un profilo storico*, Rome 1986; A. Faivre, *Naissance d'un laïcat chrétien. Les enjeux d'un mot*: FZPhTh 33 (1986) 391-429; P. Siniscalco, *I laici nei primi secoli del cristianesimo*, in *Il laicato nella Bibbia e nella storia*, ed. P. Vanzan, Rome 1987, 91-105; P. Bovati, *I laici nell'Antico Testamento*, ibid., 29-45; A. Vanhoye, *I laici nella Lettera agli ebrei*, ibid., 47-56; M. Adinolfi, *I laici nella Prima lettera di Pietro*, ibid., 57-66; E. dal Covolo, *I laici nella chiesa delle origini*, in var. aus., *Laici per una nuova evangelizzazione*, Leumann (Turin) 1990, 41-54; A.M. Ritter: TRE 20, 378-385 (bibl. on p. 383-385); A. Faivre, *Ordonner la fraternité. Pouvoir d'innover et retour à l'ordre dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1992 (large bibl. on p. 455-511); M. Vergottini, *La teologia e i "laici." Una ipotesi interpretativa e la sua recezione nella letteratura*: Teologia 18 (1993) 166-186; P. Siniscalco, *Universalità e nazioni in scrittori cristiani antichi. Qualche osservazione a partire dai termini* "laos" *e* "ethne" *in Paolo*, in var. aus., *Atti del I Simposio di Tarso su S. Paolo Apostolo*, Rome 1993, 31-45; *Laici e laicità nei primi secoli della Chiesa*, ed. E. dal Covolo - F. Bergamelli - E. Zocca - M.G. Bianco, Milan 1995; J. Werbick: LTK[3] 6, 589ff., s.v. *Laie*.

P. Siniscalco

LAYING-ON of HANDS. The laying-on of hands (or of one hand) is a gesture with several meanings adopted by the Christian communities for almost all sacred rites: the act of baptism, exorcism, the reconciliation of penitents, confirmation, several blessings (of the sick, monastic rituals), but esp. for conferring ministries. The laying-on of hands preexisted in the pagan and Jewish religions. Here the presence of the rite will be treated in Judaism and Christianity.

Judaism. The basic meaning of the laying-on of hands can be summed up as a blessing (a symbol of the grace granted by God, and not the communication of a fluid, as in paganism). The oldest example is Jacob imposing his right hand on Ephraim and his left on Manasseh, while crossing his forearms (Gen 48:14). The laying-on of hands is also found in the context of sacrifices (e.g., Lev 1:4; 3:2-13; 4:4-33) or the apotropaic rite of reconciliation in which the high priest lays hands on the scapegoat loaded with the sins of Israel, which is then chased into the wilderness (Lev 16:21), or as a gesture that confers the spirit (Num 27:21).

NT writings. The laying-on of hands is an act of blessing (Mk 10:16) and a gesture of healing (e.g., Jesus in Mk 6:5; Lk 4:40; the disciples in Mk 16:18; Acts 28:5). The hands are imposed in order to confer a ministry (the seven elders in Acts 6:1-6; other examples: 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6)—but not to confer a charism (1 Cor 12). Hands are imposed as well to give the Spirit (which, in the NT sources, is not to be confused with a charism; Acts 8:15-17; 19:6).

Western liturgies. The laying-on of hands is the privileged gesture of all major ritual acts: in the rite of Christian initiation hands are imposed on the catechumens (*Apos. Trad.* Coptic 19), at the time of the baptismal act itself (*Apos. Trad.* Frag. Veron. 21 *manum habens in caput eius impositam, baptizet*) and confirmation (*Apos. Trad.* Frag. Veron. 21: *oleum sanctificatum infundens . . . et imponens manum in capite*). *Tertullian identifies the imposition after baptism with the bestowal of the Spirit (*De bap.* 8). The bishop lays hands on penitents to reconcile them (e.g., *Stat. Eccl. Ant. 20*: *reconciliari per manus impositionem;* cf. Cyprian *Ep.* 19,2; 74,1). *Augustine describes this act as a prayer that gives the *Holy Spirit (*De bap.* 3,16,21). Throughout the course of their penance, priests lay their hands on penitents at specified intervals. In the West, orders properly so called (bishops, priests, deacons) are conferred by the laying-on of hands (*Stat. Eccl. Ant.* 90-92), but not the lower ministries, contrary to the practice in the East, where the imposition of hands is used for the creation of ministers as a whole, but with two radically different meanings: the laying-on of hands, given inside the sanctuary (altar), is currently defined as *cheirotonia* in the case of major orders, and as *cheirothesia,* conferred outside the sanctuary (altar) in the case of a subdeacon, lector, monk or the abbot of a monastery. The imposition of hands is frequently depicted in Christian iconography in the wider context of gestures of the hand or hands: the posture of the *orans, dexterarum iunctio* in marriage, and later joined hands, *Maiestas Domini, Dextera Dei* and the laying-on of hands proper.

DTC 7, 1302-1425; DACL 7, 391-413; RAC 13, 402-482; F.J. Dölger, *Der Exorcismus im altchristlicher Taufritual*, Paderborn 1909; J. Coppens, *L'imposition des mains*, Paris 1925; J.A. Jungmann, *Die lateinischer Bussriten*, Innsbruck 1932; L. de Bruyne, *L'imposition des mains dans l'art chrétien ancient*: RivAC 20 (1943) 113-278; E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum u. im NT*, Göttingen 1951; M.A. Siotis, *Die klassische und die christliche Cheirotonie in ihrem Verhältnis*, Athens 1951; C. Vogel, *Chirotonie et chirothesie*: Irenikon 45 (1972) 7-21, 207-238; M. Paternoster, *L'imposizione delle mani nella Chiesa primitiva.*

Rassegna delle testimonianze bibliche, patristiche e liturgiche, fino al sec. quinto, Rome 1977 (²1983); J.K. Coyle, *The Laying on of Hands as Conferral of the Spirit: Some Problems and a Possible Solution*: SP 18/2 (1989) 339-353; G. Cavalli, *L'imposizione delle mani nella tradizione della chiesa latina: un rito che qualifica il sacramento*, Rome 1999.

C. Vogel - A. Fitzgerald

LAZARUS, RISEN (iconography). A demonstration of faith in the omnipotence of Christ and in the certainty of the resurrection after death, the resurrection of Lazarus was not represented in conformity with the complex gospel account. In fact, Lazarus is represented normally as a mummy (in the most ancient representations he can be nude: Rome, cemetery of *Callistus, cubiculum A6 of the sacraments: 3rd quarter of the 3rd c.), standing on the threshold of a funeral monument, which from the 4th c. perhaps recalls the tomb venerated in Bethany, and is in front of Christ armed with the *virga* or represented in the act of speech, and accompanied or not by one or both of the sisters and by some apostles. (In the cemetery of Via Dino Compagni at Rome he is surrounded by a crowd of people: cubiculum C, 2nd quarter of 4th c.) Wilpert lists more than fifty examples in painting (e.g., Rome, cemetery of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus: 2nd half of the 3rd c.; cemetery of Priscilla, Greek chapel, cemetery of Callistus, so-called red sepulcher: 2nd half of the 4th c.) and as many on *sarcophagi (e.g., Rome, Museo Pio Cristiano Vat., the so-called sarcophagus of Jonah: last decade of the 3rd c.; ibid., the so-called sarcophagus of the two brothers: in the aedicule Lazarus is missing, 2nd third of the 4th c.; ibid., the so-called dogmatic sarcophagus: 2nd quarter of the 4th c.). The scene was etched on inscribed *tabulae* (Rome, cemetery of Priscilla: end of the 3rd. c.), represented on lamps (*Carthage, *Alexandria in Egypt), on gilded glass (Rome, Bibl. Vat., Museo Sacro, collection of gray glass plates, Lazarus is lying down; ibid., cup collection), on ivories (Brescia, Museo Cristiano, lipsanoteca: 4th c.; ibid., diptych of Boethius, painting on reverse: 6th c.; Milan, Tesoro del Duomo, diptych: 5th c.), on works of goldsmithery (Brivio, silver *capsella*: 5th c.), or even woven on fabric acc. to *Asterius bishop of Amasea (PG 40, 166). Perhaps from *Trier is the decoration of the sarcophagus of *Paulinus, of which a pierced clipeus is preserved with Christogram and a garland with Alpha and Omega, a scene of the original *sin and one of the resurrection of Lazarus (*Frühchristliche Zeugnisse* 71). He appears also in biblical cycles, as attested by, among others, the distich written by Prudentius for a basilica of *Saragossa (PL 60, 106) and the mosaic scene in St. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna (6th c.). In contrast, the purple Codex of Rossano follows the text of John (grotto, Christ with the apostles, the two sisters, two Israelites who flee in terror, while another, holding his nose, looses the bandages of Lazarus: 6th c.), on which depends the Coptic Gospel of the Bibl. Nat. of Paris (ms. copt. n. 13, fol. 253V).

E. Iosi: EC 7, 995f.; H. Meurer: LCI 3, 33-38; Wp 40-1; G. Schneider-Graziosi, *Il labaro costantiniano e la risurrezione di Lazzaro sopra due marmi del cimitero di Priscilla*: NuovoBullArchCr 19 (1913) 131-141; Ws II, 302-3; E. Mâle, *La résurrection de Lazare dans l'art*: Rev. des Arts 1 (1951) 44-52; R. Darmstädter, *Die Auferweckung des Lazarus in der altchristlichen und byzantinischen Kunst*, Bern 1955; A. Hermann, *Ägyptologische Marginalien zur spätantiken Ikonographie*: JbAC 5 (1962) 60-66; *Frühchristliche Zeugnisse im Einzugsgebiet von Rhein und Mosel*, ed. Th.K. Kempf - W. Reusch, Trier 1965; J.St. Partyka, *La résurrection de Lazare dans les monuments funéraires des nécropoles chrétiennes à Rome*, Varsovie 1993; TIP 201-2.

G. Santagata

LAZARUS of Pharp (Łazar Pʻarpecʻi; 2nd half of the 5th c.). Author of a *History of the Armenians* between 387 and the death of Peroz king of Persia (484), which sought to extend the *Histories* of *Agathangelus and of *Faustus of Byzantium. He also composed a long letter to the governor Vahan Mamikonian, in which he defends himself from accusations of heresy and irregular conduct leveled at him by a group of rival clerics.

Bardenhewer V, 187-189; Patrologia V, 603; R.W. Thomson, *The History of Łazar P'arpec'i* (Occasional Papers and Proceedings), Atlanta 1991; B. Owlowbabyan, *Łazar P'arpec'i, Hayocʻpatmowtʻyoun; Tʻowłtʻ Mamikonyanin* (Lazzaro di Parp, *Storia degli armeni; Lettera a Mamikonean*) (Erevani Petakan hamalsaran), Erevan 1982; V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, II, Paris 1869, 253-368.

S.J. Voicu

LEANDER of Seville. A Latin ecclesiastical writer (Cartagena ca. 545–Seville ca. 600), Leander, on the death of his father, became the head of his family, taking care of the education of his younger brother *Isidore. After embracing religious life, he strove to spread Catholicism among the *Visigoths, succeeding in converting Hermengild, son of king *Leovigild, who in 582 took up arms against his rebel son and had him killed and ordered that Leander be exiled to *Constantinople. (There Leander met *Gregory the Great, who dedicated the *Moralia in Iob* to him.) A little later, however, Leovigild repented and recalled the bishops exiled by him, and entrusted his son

*Recared to Leander (from 584 archbishop of Seville), in order that he guide him in the difficult succession and initiate him into the Catholic faith. The new Sevillian bishop called the 3rd Council of Toledo (589), which, among other things, officially ratified the conversion of King Recared.

His epistolary and the anti-*Arian works have been lost. Only two writings have reached us: the closing discourse of the 3rd Toledan Council (*In laudem Ecclesiae*) and a monastic rule (*De institutione virginum*) dedicated to his sister Florentina, a significant work in the context of ascetic literature and valuable for the familiar tone and the acute observations contained in it.

Taking part in the opposition between Hispano-Roman and barbarian culture, between the Catholicism of the dominated and the Arianism of the dominators, Leander found himself at the roots of that evolutive process which would make of Spain a unitary state both on the religious and the political level. The importance of Leander's historic role was recognized less by his brother Isidore than by Pope Gregory the Great, whose friendship and esteem led him to carry out decisive actions in the events of Spain in the 2nd half of the 6th c. The conversion of the Visigoths, brought about under Leander, opened a new phase of Spanish history: the racial, cultural and religious fusion would be very rapid, and in the successive centuries the Hispano-Roman aristocracy would boast of their descent from the Goths.

At the time, Leander saw only the positive aspects of the event: this is clear not only from his closing discourse at the Council of Toledo but also from the response of Gregory the Great to one of Leander's letters in which he informed him about the conversion of the king and the council itself (Greg. M., *Reg. Ep.* 1,41). The eloquence of Leander has been compared, with obvious exaggeration, to that of *John Chrysostom: the bishop of Seville, buoyed by the successes of the present, raised a hymn to the unity of the church, neglecting to point out the policy of Recared which tended to absorb the church into the state, a policy that would give rise to the established Visigothic church centrifugal thrust from Rome.

Leander passed the last decade of his life rather in shadow. Information about it is almost nonexistent. Dying around 600, he left the contest with Arianism successfully concluded, but that between church and state as unresolved as ever.

CPL 1183-1184; PL 72, 873-898; 84, 360-361; A.C. Vega, *El "De institutione virginum" de S. Leandro de Sevilla*, El Escorial 1948; J. Madoz, *De inst. virg.*: AB 67 (1949) 407-424; J. Campos - J. Roca, *Santos Padres Españoles, II: San Leandro, San Isidoro, San Fructuoso. Reglas monásticas de la España visigoda*, Madrid 1971; J. Madoz, *Varios enigmas de la "Regla" de San Leandro descifrados por el estudio de suas fuentes*: Misc. G. Mercati I, Rome 1946, 265-295; A. Mundò, *Il monachesimo nella penisola iberica*: Sett. Studi Spoleto IV, 1957, 73-108; K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten . . .* , Berlin 1967; E.A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, Oxford 1969; B. Jiménez Duque, *La espiritualidad romano visigoda y mozárabe*, Madrid 1977; R. García-Villoslada, *ed., Historia de la Iglesia en España*, I, Madrid 1979; L. Navarra, *Interventi di Leandro di Siviglia negli sviluppi storici e religiosi della Spagna visigotica: aspetti positivi e limiti*: SSR 4 (1980) 123-134; Id., *In margine a due citazioni di Isaia nell'*Homilia in laudem Ecclesiae *di Leandro di Siviglia*: SMSR 11 (1987) 199-204; J. Velázquez Arenas, *Index grammaticus del* De Inst. Virg. *de san L. de S.*: Faventia 10, 1-2 (1988) 81-102; Id., *Las citas bíblicas del* De inst. virg. *de san L. de S.*: Mélanges V. Bejarano, II, Barcelona 1991, 799-811; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-cristiana*, II, Madrid 1998, 431-478; *Leandri Hispalensis Episcopi De inst. virg. et contemptu mundi*: *léxico Latino-Español*, M. Martínez Pastor (ed.), Hildesheim-Zürich 1998; A. Gómez Cobo, *La* Homelia in laude Ecclesiae *de Leandro de Sevilla: estudio y valoración*, Murcia 1999.

L. NAVARRA

LECTIO DIVINA. This expression of the *Rule of St. Benedict* (48,5) indicates a monastic exercise of great spiritual and cultural importance, the daily application of several hours to the reading of the Bible and (*Rule*, ch. 73) to the greatest monuments of the tradition of the Fathers. This is the effect and the cause of the monastic libraries, with a well-regulated substantial plan, with alternating prayers (esp. liturgy) and work (permeated with *meditation which prolongs reading and prayer). In the Middle Ages an entire humanism derived from this, which is today not lacking in appeal. *Lectio divina* is not properly study; it is linked to a synthesis of the love of letters and the desire for God; literary delight for its own sake is felt as a guilty distraction, but its subordination to true piety favors and legitimizes authentic taste, the spiritual sense of beauty and openness of the person to the maturity of brotherhood and to whatever related to the Word of God, starting from grammar and music (psalmody). What had damaged the classical pretensions to culture had been the cult of form, of convention, as well as the vanity of the rhetor; humility, sincerity and the search for God were the remedy which allowed recovering what was valuable in it.

Long before the appearance of the Benedictine formula, this private exercise can be recognized in the spread of the communitarian *lectio* of the Bible. Some psalms, such as 19 (18) and esp. 119 (118), were already not only its subject matter, but also its means of expression, as was a large part of the Wisdom literature. Whatever the veneration of the Greek

philologians for Homer, of the philosophers for Plato or Pythagoras, their *lectio* of the authors was never able to create within an audience the same disposition to listen. One might, with better reason, compare the Christian *lectio* with the Buddhist or Islamic familiarity with the sacred texts, despite the many differences which should be attentively observed. Within the church the first group in which a continual and devout reading of the Bible can be found is probably that of the disciples of *Origen; his extraordinary influence on preaching and theology is well known. Certainly they practiced, on a grand scale, textual criticism (*see* *Hexapla) and philosophical reflection; but when these sciences are subordinated to an encounter with God and a reading of faith, do they perhaps counter *lectio divina*? To judge from the results, one might believe that also *Tertullian, *Cyprian, *Hilary and other teachers had an analogous familiarity with the sacred books; for *Ambrose and *Augustine the fact is well documented.

The texts concerning Egyptian hermits seem to suppose that they read little, meditated continually on texts heard in liturgical events or learned by heart, and gave voluntarily to the poor the price of their only book. But in this point of view there is perhaps something systematic and excessive. In *Pachomian monasticism a rule foresaw a penance for whoever left his own book open, at noon, to the sun; and the catecheses of the superiors are full of various biblical citations, esp. of the prophets and the sapiential books. At a perhaps modest level, they appear to live completely apart from secular culture, as it seems. But do hagiographic documents tell all? The so-called gnostic library of *Nag Hammadi must have belonged to Pachomians, as documents found in their bindings demonstrate. Was this still *lectio divina*?

The direct heir of the Origenist tradition would be *Jerome (and his friends, like *Rufinus). D. Gorce has brought out remarkably the enthusiasm displayed by the the circle of devout women from within the Roman aristocracy for biblical culture and the spirituality which promoted the multiple editions and translations of this group. In contact with the Greek Christian libraries, this enthusiasm demonstrated a breadth of views much larger than the purely monastic environments, thus constituting a reserve which the West would draw on for centuries. It must moreover be confessed that the munificence of the holy noblewomen permitted the reservation of much time for study and assured furthermore the multiplication of the copyists. *Basilian monasticism, with its insistence on labor and on charitable works, left perhaps less space for intellectual activities. The intellectual stature of the Cappadocians or of *Evagrius seem to constitute an exception in this environment. As the Byzantine world suffered less decline than the West, the monks did not see themselves constrained to collect secular culture and join it with the spiritual and liturgical tradition. Nevertheless, ascetic and hagiographic literature, christological controversies and sacred poetry found in the Byzantine monasteries also implies a field which supposed a real cultural quality.

In the churches of Syria and of Armenia, one of the most fertile and intelligent occupations was the translation and assimilation of Greek Christian literature; an osmosis followed which would last longer than in the West.

Without identifying it with *lectio divina,* the artistic vitality in the various regions of the Christian world manifested in turn the breadth of knowledge, their perfect assimilation, the human equilibrium reached by a Christian culture of which this was, with its voluntary (and involuntary) renunciations, the principal instrument.

DSp 9, 470-487; D. Gorce, *La "lectio divina." S. Jérôme et la lecture sacrée*, Paris 1925; H. de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit*, Paris 1950.

J. Gribomont

LENT. The term *Lent* derives from the Latin *quadragesima,* which in turn corresponds to the Greek noun *tessarakostē*—i.e., "a period of forty days/the fortieth day." This term was used in the 4th c. with two distinct meanings; it can refer to (1) the period that unites *Easter to the Feast of the Ascension, or the very day of the *Ascension; (2) a period of *asceticism that precedes Easter. The latter is the meaning drawn from the majority of its occurrences, esp. in the 1st half of the 4th c. To emphasize the framework of issues that concern the origin and meaning of Lent, it would be good to present a few preliminary clarifications. In the first place, one should emphasize that different terms can also refer to Lent from *tessarakostē,* e.g., to *tessarakonthēmeros askēsis,* a phrase that appears in *Eusebius of Caesarea's *De solemnitate paschali.* Second, one should note that two occurrences of the term have raised many questions among scholars and are actually excluded by the majority of scholars from those that are useful for reconstructing the history of Lent: (1) the occurrence in *Origen's *Homilies on Leviticus* (X, 2), in which he emphasizes that Christians have different periods of fasting, Lent included (*habemus enim quadragesimae dies ieiuniis consecratos, habemus*

quartam et sextam septimanae diem ["we have days consecrated to fasting for Lent, we have the fourth and sixth day of the week"]), a claim that is considered by many to have been *Rufinus's interpolation into Origen's text; (2) that of the 5th canon of the Council of *Nicaea (325), which recommends that church authorities hold the first of two annual synods before the "*tessarakostē* of Easter," an expression which, from a quick comparison with the conciliar practice of the 4th and 5th c., seems to be interpreted in reference to the Ascension. Last, obstacles to the reconstruction of this period's understanding of asceticism have been posed by the disconcerting varieties of Lenten practice such as one attested to by *Socrates (*HE* V, 22), when he affirmed that at *Rome fasting was done for three weeks, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday (which seems to be erroneous); that the Christians of Illyricum, *Greece and *Alexandria prolong the period for the six weeks that preceded Easter. Others, however, though they began seven weeks before Easter, fast three weeks, each for five days. Having completed this imprecise list of Lenten practices, he asks how such diverse practices could pass under the same name of *tessarakostē*, a quandary that was also shared by *Sozomen (*HE* VII, 19,7-9), who added a very significant detail for us; namely, that at *Constantinople Lent lasted seven weeks.

As one can see, this period of asceticism has raised not a few problems since antiquity as well as the practice and meaning to which modern research has added a few more problems: the question of its genetic relationship to the period of prepaschal fasting; the relationship between its content and the variety of its practice; and last, its original position in the calendar of the liturgical year. The idea that Lent was an expansion of fasts of the Paschal Triduum or Holy Week today does not find supporters, because it is clear from the sources that Lent was qualitatively different and, even with respect to its content, cannot be reduced to these. However, to better address such questions it is helpful to deal briefly with the first reliable evidence with respect to the practice of Lent that we have, such as that provided by *Eusebius of Caesarea in his *De solemnitate paschali*, a work edited some time after the Council of Nicaea, which refers to a period of six weeks, probably including Holy Week; by the festal letters of St. *Athanasius, the chronology of which, recently established, allows one to maintain that Athanasius was not only familiar with the observance of Lent at Rome during his second exile (starting from 339/340), as was believed for a long time, but was actually aware of it a few years earlier, in the initial phase of his episcopate, if not entirely before. Both authors did not understand by the term *Lent* a fast that lasted forty days, but a forty-day period of asceticism that included fasting as its central element, along with prayer, vigils, acts of charity and the welcoming of strangers. From Athanasius we gather that fasting must be interrupted on Saturday and Sunday and that the last week of Lent coincides with Holy Week. Both in the writings of Athanasius and in Eusebius, Lent has as a model the fasting of *Moses and *Elijah, while the reference to *Jesus' fasting in the desert appears only later in the writings of other authors. From these early testimonies, one can conclude that originally there was no mathematical correspondence between the "forty days" of the Lenten period and the number of days of actual fasting: rather, it was a period of asceticism that included fasting, among others practices (V. Peri).

There are various theories with regard to the origin of Lent and its place in the calendar of the liturgical year. Precisely in relation to Athanasius's Festal Letters (acc. to the old chronology) and the practice of baptism in *Alexandria, a new hypothesis has been proposed that has found great success among scholars in liturgical studies. R.-G. Coquin has collected a series of statements offered by medieval Egyptian authors, from the 9th to the 14th c., who attempted to describe the original order of the liturgical time starting from *Epiphany, the feast of Jesus' baptism: acc. to such authors, Lent in ancient times was observed starting from the day after Epiphany, in conscientious imitation of Christ who, once baptized, went into the desert, and that Lent concluded with the conferral of baptism on catechumens, although the week of Easter was celebrated separately and without baptism; only at a later time did Lent join with Easter week. Coquin hypothesized that this information can have some foundation, and he connected this liturgical reform to the paschal question debated during the Council of Nicaea. T.J. Talley followed Coquin on this path but with a very different conclusion. Talley emphasized the fact that there is no evidence concerning the paschal celebration of baptism at Alexandria: this absence, strengthened by other arguments, lends credence to the post-Epiphany placement of the original Lent. Despite the success of this hypothesis, it has been demonstrated that some of its most important elements lack any substantial foundation. The evidence of the aforementioned medieval Egyptian authors derives this from a totally abstract form of reasoning worked out by the same authors: because in *Egypt the baptism of Jesus was celebrated on 6 Jan, from this fact the medieval authors could

conclude that the original Lent, conceived precisely as a memory of Jesus' fasting in the desert after his baptism, must be practiced starting from 7 Jan. The other factor that makes this hypothesis less convincing is that there is no lack of evidence concerning the conferral of baptism in Egypt during Easter.

According to other authors, Lent was instead a period of fasting—arising in some areas between the 3rd and 4th c. and made official at Nicaea or shortly after—that would always be, by its nature, tied to the chronologically adjustable feast of Easter. More recently, C. Renoux maintained, based on a hypothesis concerning the chronology of the *Homilies on Samuel* preached by Origen at Jerusalem and the information of the lectionaries that can be attributed to the same city, that there had to exist in the diocese a cycle of readings read, we do not know with what frequency, for a period of forty days. In sum, *Jerusalem, and nearby Caesarea of which Eusebius spoke in his work on Easter, could have been at the origin of a liturgical period that, characterized by specific biblical readings and conceived as a time of repentance and conversion, would have then been enriched by numerous ascetical practices, in particular, fasting. Nevertheless, H. Buchinger has raised a few doubts on this reconstruction.

It is precisely the contradiction noticed between the terms *tessarakostē* and the actual number of days of fasting, generally less, as well as the push toward ever more demanding forms of asceticism that catalyzed already in the 2nd half of the 4th c. this stiffening of Lenten practice. In the East, e.g., at Constantinople and *Antioch, the six weeks did not include Holy Week, but preceded it, thus altogether forming a period of seven weeks. Later, during the Byzantine era, this cycle of seven weeks was made to be preceded by an eighth week, in which a partial form of fasting was begun that only took into consideration abstention from meat. At *Jerusalem, on the explicit evidence of the *Peregrinatio Egeriae* (27,1), as early as the end of the 4th c. the Lenten period would last eight weeks even if subsequent evidence attests that in the 5th c. it consisted of seven weeks (or was reduced to this number). In Egypt, the passage from a length of six weeks to eight occurred in the 1st quarter of the 7th c., shortly before the Arab invasion. At Rome, the typical six weeks of the Alexandrian model were not prolonged by a few days, and the interruption of fasting occurred only on Sunday, and not also on Saturday, although *Milan even in this regard seems to have followed the Alexandrian model more closely.

C. Callewaert, *La durée et le caractère du carême ancien dans l'Église latine*, in Id., *Sacris Erudiri: fragmenta liturgica collecta*, Steenbrugge 1940, 449-506; A. Chavasse, *La préparation de la Pâque à Rome, avant le Vᵉ siècle, jeûne et organisation liturgique*, in *Mémorial J. Chaine*, V, Lyon 1950, 61-80; Id., *La structure du carême et les lectures des messes quadragésimales dans la liturgie romaine*: La MaisonD 31 (1952) 76-119; V. Peri, *Lo stato degli studi intorno alla origine della Quaresima*: Aevum 34 (1960) 525-555; R.-G. Coquin, *Une réforme liturgique du Concile de Nicée (325)?*, in *Académie des inscriptions et Belles-lettres - Comptes rendus*, Paris 1967, 178-192; E. Lanne, *Catéchèse et initiation chrétienne dans la tradition pachômienne*, in *Mystagogie. Pensée liturgique d'aujourd'hui et liturgie ancienne*, Conférences Saint Serge, 39ᵉ Semaine d'Études liturgiques, Paris 1990 (It. ed. A.M. Triacca - A. Pistoia, Rome 1993, 145-162); T.J. Talley, *Le origini dell'anno liturgico*, Brescia 1991; A. Camplani, *La Quaresima egiziana nel VII secolo: note di cronologia su Mon. Epiph. 77, Manchester Ryland Suppl. 47-48, P. Grenf. II 112, P. Berol. 10677, P. Köln 215 e un'omelia copta*: Augustinianum 32 (1992) 423-432; Id., *Sull'origine della Quaresima in Egitto*, in *Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Coptic Studies*, Rome 1993, II, 107-121; M. Metzger, *Le lien du carême à Pâques dans les Constitutions apostoliques*: Ecclesia Orans 14 (1997) 71-77; C. Renoux, *Origène dans la liturgie de l'Église de Jérusalem*: Adamantius 5 (1999) 37-52; P.F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, Oxford ²2002, 183-185; H. Buchinger, *Origenes und die Quadragesima in Jerusalem. Ein Diskussionbeitrag*: Adamantius 13 (2007) 174-217; Id., *Zur Frühgeschichte der Quadragesima: Ein neuer Blick auf ein altes Problem und seine Lösungsvoschläge*: Archiv f. Liturgiew. (2005); S.J. Voicu, *Da "Digiuni Santi" a "Grande Settimana": mutamenti terminologici nelle Lettere festali di Atanasio*: Augustinianum 47, 2 (2007) 283-297; D.M. Gwynn, *Athanasius of Alexandria: Bishop, Theologian, Ascetic, Father*, Oxford 2012.

A. Camplani

LEO I, emperor of the East (401–474). Born in Thrace in 400, he was a soldier; he had obtained the rank of tribune and commanded a garrison of little importance in Selymbria, when the influential Alan general Aspar had him proclaimed emperor in 457. Leo was the first emperor of the East to be crowned by the patriarch of *Constantinople. He married Verina, the sister of *Basiliscus. After his ascent to the throne, he raised Ricimer to the dignity of *patricius* and Maiorianus to the dignity of *magister militum;* he sought to affirm his sovereignty over the empire of the West and to establish its unity with the empire of the East. He did not succeed, however, in advancing this political line very far. He proved his orthodoxy (for which the Byzantine chroniclers called him the Great) in the defense of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon (451) against the Egyptian *Timothy Aelurus, aspirant to the episcopacy, and against the pretensions of Aspar. To counterbalance the strength of Aspar, Leo had founded, as early as 460, a new militia composed mostly of Isaurians, the *excubitores.* In 471 Aspar was defeated. An expedition against the kingdom of the *Vandals in *Africa, organized in 468 with great expenditure of means,

failed through the ineptitude of Basiliscus, who held its supreme command. In the capital, meanwhile, the Isaurian influence had grown in place of the Germanic influence that up until then predominated. The Isaurian chief *Zeno, who had married Ariadne, daughter of Leo, became in 474 coregent with his son Leo II, and then emperor when the latter, in the autumn of the same year, died.

The emperor Leo I was above all a soldier, far from theological disputes; the dispute with his powerful patron Aspar gave him enough to do; therefore, he gave only a little attention to questions concerning the Council of Chalcedon. Timothy Aelurus thought that he could demand from Leo that he call a new council to revise the decision of Chalcedon. His insistences did not have success, inasmuch as the emperor ordered an inquiry tasked with clarifying whether Timothy Aelurus should be recognized as legitimate patriarch of *Alexandria and whether the deliberations of Chalcedon should be vigorously maintained. The responses to these requests, contained in the *Codex Encyclius,* pronounced against the recognition of Timothy, and only one of these rejected the Council of Chalcedon. Leo, however, applied a policy of delay and perhaps on the suggestion of the general Aspar maintained Timothy in the see of Alexandria, although the pope was pushing him to act against him. Only in 460 did the emperor decide to exile Timothy first to Paphlagonia and later to the Crimea and installed in his place *Timothy Salofaciolus, who did not succeed in restoring ecclesial unity in Egypt.

PWK 12, 1947-196. Ἐ. Καραγιαννόπουλος, Ἱστορία βυζαντινοῦ κράτους, 1, Thessaloniki 1978, 283-297; H. Jedin, *Storia della Chiesa*, III, Milan 1983, 4-6; K. Bihlmeyer - H. Tuechle, *Storia della Chiesa*, 1, Brescia 1989, 334-335.

J. Irmscher - C. Dell'Osso

LEO I, pope (440–461). Called "the Great" by posterity, Leo was bishop of Rome under rather difficult political and ecclesiastical conditions. The W part of the Roman Empire was about to collapse under barbarian invasions. Despite the external threats, the court of *Ravenna still preserved a certain authority. The situation of the court of *Constantinople was much better, but nonetheless rather confused at certain moments. Within the Christian community, in addition to the imposition of the principle of traditional orthodoxy, a life was affirmed whose forms, both liturgical and disciplinary, were organized by fixed formularies and precise canons, and theology was taking stock on the most fundamental questions; i.e., the *incarnation and the relationship between divine grace and human liberty. Cultural life was still flowering, as in particular the contemporary monuments of Ravenna and Rome itself demonstrate.

In contrast with the historical importance of the Late Antique period in which Leo lived, his biography is poorly known, esp. the years prior to his episcopate. Biographical information, rather scarce, emerges from some hints in the **Liber pontificalis,* from some references of *Augustine, *Prosper and *John Cassian and esp. from the letters emanating from the pontifical chancellery. From these documents his Tuscan origin is clear and that he received, probably at Rome, an optimal education. As a young cleric, it seems, he was sent in 418 to *Carthage. Named archdeacon around 430, he carried out an important activity at the Roman episcopal curia. He induced John Cassian to refute the *Christology of *Nestorius. He convinced the bishop of Rome to engage more in the battle against *Julian of Eclanum and even contacted *Cyril of Alexandria in this matter. Sent on diplomatic mission to Gaul, he learned there that he had been elected successor of *Sixtus III. He was ordained bishop of Rome 29 Sept 440. His episcopal ministry, to which he applied himself from the beginning with all pastoral care, took place on different levels. In the first place, Leo acted as bishop of the Roman community: in his preaching, and in the organization of the liturgy and monastic life. In particular he took a position against the *Manichees, present in Rome, obtaining against them in 445 from *Valentinian III the renewal of the old anti-Manichean laws. He also embellished houses of worship, as the inscriptions of the Lateran basilica and on the triumphal arch of St. Paul still attest today.

His activity for orthodoxy and ecclesiastical discipline in the W part of the Roman Empire was no less important. This is attested by the letters written to different bishops on the date of baptism (*Ep*. 16), on the conditions of clerical life and the administration of ecclesiastical property, the interventions against *Pelagianism (*Ep*. 1 and 2) and *Priscillianism (*Ep*. 15), as well as the epistles which concern the relationships both with *Arles and with *Thessalonica.

The relationships with the Eastern churches took place almost exclusively on the level of universal communion in the faith, more exactly concerning the controversies before and after the Council of *Chalcedon (451) and at the same council (*Ep*. found in the conciliar acts). Among these letters stand out esp. *Ep*. 28, the so-called **Tomus ad Flavianum* (449); *Ep*. 102-106, 114, in which Leo congratulates the Eastern authorities and the synodal fathers for the success of the council and communicates its re-

sults to the Western bishops; *Ep*. 124 in which he admonishes the Palestinian monks to accept fully the faith of Chalcedon; and *Ep*. 165 in which, writing to the emperor Leo, he defends the synodal decisions as conforming to the *Nicene faith and the entire tradition (458).

Fighting almost his entire life for orthodoxy and the peace of the church, Leo never ceased acting also on the political plane, as the situation of the "imperial church" of that time demanded. In the West he did not limit himself just to working for the unity of the faith, foundational as it was for political unity. He acted also for his fellow citizens menaced by the *Hun and *Vandal invaders. In the relationships with the civil authorities he encountered a favorable attitude at the court of Ravenna (v. *Ep*. 11). The relationships with the court of Constantinople were rather different. In the ecclesiastical field itself Leo had to leave the initiative largely to the imperial authorities. He did not hesitate to recognize even a certain sacerdotal dignity to the emperor, whose duty was to exert himself for the *concordia* of the churches in the interest of the empire itself. Nevertheless, refusing can. 28 of Chalcedon, Leo did not fail to remind *Marcian of the distinction between religion and the state, demanding liberty of action for the church and affirming with vigor the primacy of the apostolic see. All this pastoral action was always animated by a lively awareness of papal dignity and authority. Requesting acknowledgment of his high mission in service of all the churches, he never forgot his total dependence on Christ, true Lord of the church. This dialectic, which has been described as *moderatio* (H. Rahner), characterized his attitude toward his high calling that directed his entire life, both on the practical and on the doctrinal plane.

The documentation to which we owe our knowledge of the life and thought of Leo consists essentially of letters and sermons. These writings are distinguished by refined style, by rhythmic prose, by purity of language, by concise expression and clarity of ideas. In them, by means of Latin rhetoric, he reaches a perfect coalescence between theological and spiritual content. It is in fact a characteristic of Leo to be able to express acc. to the Roman style the Christian ideas which were dear to him and which he had taken above all from *Ambrose and *Augustine. The letters, in the composition of which the apostolic chancellery obviously collaborated, have been preserved in different canonical collections, whose beginnings date back certainly to the times of Leo himself. This fact, which includes many problems of authenticity and of textual criticism, should not be neglected, if one desires to reach a just evaluation of Leo's papacy itself. Unfortunately a complete critical edition of Leo's letters is still lacking. The sermons, however, which concern the entire liturgical year of the Roman community of that time, are today accessible in a modern critical edition, in which some sources are indicated (Augustine, *Chromatius, *Gaudentius etc.) as well as their use in the letters of Leo himself. Further study of their relationships with the liturgy and the Bible, as well as Roman rhetoric, is, however, necessary.

Despite their clear and exquisite form, the writings of Leo could not be said to contain a very original *theology.* Nevertheless, thanks to their concise character they allow a better affirmation of certain ideas of the Latin theological tradition, esp. of Augustinian thought. This is true in his methodological approach to interpreting the *narratio* of the facts of salvation history and to undersanding the relationship between reading of the Bible and liturgical celebration. In his dogmatic approach, two aspects are fundamental. On the one hand, Leo developed a synodal practice that could be understood both on the local and Western level and on the universal level. He recognized in particular the right of the emperor to call and direct the universal synod and sanction its decisions. Despite accepting the singular authority of the Council of Nicaea he was open to conciliar pluralism. Defending the authority of Chalcedon, he put the council of 451 on the level of that of Nicaea (Sieben). On the other hand, he confirmed his dogmatic positions using patristic texts, attributing a particular authority to the fathers of the church (cf. *Ep*. 165,10; *see* *argumentation, patristic). As for the doctrinal content, although following the tradition strictly, adhering both to the *consensus omnium,* as well as the *norma vetustatis,* Leo was able to provide extensive evidence for certain fundamental doctrines. In the christological field, partially using Eastern sources as well, he reached a notable equilibrium between the duality of the natures and the unity of the person. Nevertheless, he did not succeed in making explicit how the unity of Christ is founded on the fact that only the second person of the *Trinity was incarnated (*Serm*. 64,2). When he presented his Christology in a liturgical context, he was able, in contrast, to emphasize in the clearest way possible its soteriological implications. This is true even in the sense that he returned continually to speak of the presence of Christ, Lord and Savior, in the church. United intimately to its head, the church never ceases to be a communion of saints, built and nourished by the sacraments, rendered effective by the priesthood of Christ himself (*Ep*. 80,2; 108,2). The presence of Christ is finally

the raison d'être of the universal ministry of the bishop of Rome. Being the vicar and heir of Peter, united in a unique way to Christ, the pope guarantees the *integritas* of the church, both on the level of the *communio sacramentorum* and on that of the *societas sanctorum*. However, he does it also in the *concordia sacerdotum* (*Ep.* 14,11), together with the *collegium caritatis* (*Ep.* 5,2; 6,1; 12,2). Finally, it is obvious that Leo has developed in a Roman way precisely this doctrine concerning the trilogy of Christ, Peter and pope. He demonstrates in this field his *moderatio,* resting the authority of the bishop of Rome on the Nicene canons as they had been received by the Roman tradition (*corpus romanum* of *Serdica) and considering the favorable result of the Council of Chalcedon as a new epiphany of Christ.

Posterity has venerated Leo as a fascinating preacher and an organizer of the Roman liturgy. Above all, it has seen in him the great ancient promoter of the Roman primacy and the pope of the council of 451. According to E. Caspar, Leo, attached to the ecclesiastical tradition, earned the title of "Great" less than *Gregory I, oriented toward the future. H. Rahner, in contrast, underlines his singular *moderatio*.

CPL 1656-1661; PL 54-56; PLS 111, 329-350; A. Chavasse, *S. Leonis M.R.P. tractatus septem et nonaginta*: CCL 138 and 138A (1973). For the partial ed. of the letters and the modern tr., see Patrologia III, 566; It. tr., ed. M. Naldini et al., 6 vols., Florence 1997–. BS 7, 1232-1278; HDG III/2a, 200-212. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* 1, Tübingen 1930; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, London 1941; A. Lauras, *Études sur S. Léon le Grand*: RSR 49 (1961) 481-499 (review bibl.); Patrologia III, 557-578 (large bibl.); J. Fellermayr, *Tradition und Sukzession im Lichte des römisch-antiken Erbdenkens*, Munich 1979; P.A. McShane, *La Romanitas et le Pape Léon le Grand*, Paris 1979; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979; P. Stockmeier, *Leo*: M. Greschat (ed.), GK 11, Stuttgart 1985, 56-70; B. Studer, *Una persona in Christo*: AugR 25 (1985) 453-487; Id.: TRE 20 (1990) 737-741; W. Blümer, *Rerum eloquentia*, Frankfurt 1991; M. Naldini (ed.), *I sermoni di Leone Magno fra storia e teologia* I, Florence 1997, bibl., ed. G.M. Vian, 215-244; L. Casula, *La cristologia di san Leone Magno. Il fondamento dottrinale e soteriologico*, Milan 2000 (bibl.); LACL (2002) 447-449; M. Ronconi, A maiestate humilitas*: il rilievo della retorica nella teologia di Leone Magno*, Rome 2005.

B. Studer

LEO II, pope (682–683). A Sicilian like his predecessor *Agatho (678–681), he was consecrated a year and a half after the death of the latter, after the return to *Rome of the delegates of the 6th ecumenical council at *Constantinople and the confirmation of the papal election on the part of the emperor Constantine IV Pogonatos. Leo ratified the decrees of the council, which included the condemnation both of *monothelitism and of Pope *Honorius I (625–638), judged guilty of negligence for not having stifled the monothelite heresy in its infancy. In a letter to the emperor the pope does not, however, consider Honorius a heretic, as in contrast the anathemas of the council declared. Other letters of Leo refer to conciliar decisions, aimed at illustrating and spreading them. With this pontifex a period of understanding and harmony with the Byzantine court and the church of the East began for Rome and Latin Christianity, after preceding tensions and misunderstandings. Leo also took care of propagating in the West the *Acts* of Constantinople, sending the "regionary notary" Peter to *Spain so that he might consign them to the king and Hispanic clergy for their approval and implementation. At Rome Leo rebuilt the ancient diaconia of St. George in Velabro and restored the church of St. Bibiana. The **Liber pontificalis* records his eloquence and knowledge of the Scriptures, of Greek and of chant, together with his charitable efforts for the poor.

CPL 1738; PL 96, 399-420; Mansi 11, 1050-1058; LP I, 359-362; Jaffé I, 240-41; Hfl-Lecl 3, 512-515; H. Quentin, *Les originaux latins des lettres des papes Honorius, S. Agathon et Léon II relatives au monothélisme*, Misc. Amelli, Montecassino 1920, 71-76; DTC 9/1, 301-304; BS 7, 1280-1282 (P. Rabikauskas); J.N.D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 78-79; *Dizionario storico del Papato* (Ph. Levillain), II, Milan 1996, 848-849; LTK[3] 6, 822 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 617-620 (E. Susi).

M. Spinelli

LEO III the Isaurian. Emperor of Constantinople (717–741). Of Syrian (and not Isaurian) origin, he was born in a humble family at Germanicia (Commagene), from where, around 690, he moved with his parents to Thrace. Made *prōtospatharios* by Justinian II (705–711), he was promoted to *stratēgos* of the Anatolians by Anastasius II (713–715), whose succession he usurped (18 April 716), having himself crowned at Hagia Sophia 25 March 717. Victorious over the Arabs with the help of the Bulgars (siege of *Constantinople, winter 717–718) and over the Khazars (in Asia Minor in 740), he tried twice to depose, even assassinate, Pope *Gregory II, who opposed his fiscal measures. His name is above all linked to the opening, in 726, of the struggle against the sacred images (iconoclasm) following the volcanic eruption of Thera (Santorini) interpreted as a divine warning. After the deposition of the patriarch St. *Germanus (January 730), Leo replied to the resistance of *Gregory III with the annexation of E Illyricum, Byzantine Italy and Sicily to the patriarchate of Constantinople, thus

opening a serious schism with the Roman church.

In 711–712 he issued an edict which constrained the Jews to receive Christian baptism. In 740 he promulgated a new codex, the *Ecloga*. He died 18 June 741.

EC 7, 1137-1138; Cath 7, 745-746; D. Stein, *Der Beginn der byzantinischen Bilderstreiten und seine Entwicklung bis die 40. Jahre des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Munich 1980; ODB 2, 1208; K. Schenk, *Kaiser Leon III*, Halle 1880; S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm During the Reign of Leo III*, Leuven 1973.

D. Stiernon

LEO of Bourges (d. after 453). Bishop of Bourges in the middle of the 5th c., he composed, with Victorius bishop of Lemans and Eustochius bishop of Tours a letter *ad episcopos et presbyteros infra tertiam provinciam constitutos.* The three prelates had just participated in the Council of *Angers, 4 Oct 453, and gave notice of their common decision to forbid to clerics recourse to civil tribunals.

CPL 483; PL 54, 1239-1240 (in the critical ed. of Quesnel it is inserted among the *Ep. Leonis*). Sirmond reprinted it and restored it to Leo of Bourges: *Concilia Galliae*, CCL 148, 136; Duchesne, Fastes, II, 244-245; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, II, Paris 1966, 142; Patrologia III, 496-497.

A. Hamman

LEO of Sens (d. before 541). Bishop of Sens, represented by Orbatus at the Council of Orléans in 533, he personally intervened in the council of 538. He wrote a letter to Childebert (d. 538), in which he requested that the bishop of Meaux (CPL 1075) be placed under him, while the city was found in the dominion of Theudebert. He is also identified with that Bishop Leo who, with Heraclius of Paris and Theodosius of Auxerre, sent a letter to *Remigius of Reims, in 512, to protest against an overly light sanction adopted toward a priest. We possess the reply of Remigius (PL 65,966). Leo is mentioned in the *Hieronymian* and *Roman Martyrology*. His feast is celebrated 24 April.

Ep. ad Childebertum: CPL 1075; PL 68, 11; MGH, *Ep.* 3, 437-438; CCL 117, 489-491; BS 7, 1227-1228.

A. Hamman

LEODEGAR of Autun (d. 678). A highly regarded person with great prestige, he was elected bishop of *Autun after 660. In a council held at Autun after this date he prescribed to the monks who depended on him to follow the rule of St. Benedict. He had a role of first importance in the intricate political events of his time and for this reason entered into conflict with the master of the palace Ebroin, who had him ferociously tortured, deposed from the episcopal dignity and then killed (678). He was immediately venerated as a martyr, and his popularity was attested by a flowering of texts concerning his martyrdom. Under his name there is an extant letter, in which he, about to die, consoles his mother in tones reflecting a deep, sincere Christian faith.

CPL 1077-1079b; CCL 117, 503-508; BS 7, 1190-1193; R.E. Reynolds, *Bischof Leodegar und das Konzil von Autun*, in H. Mordek (ed.), *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken - Festschrift für Raymond Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag*, Frankfurt 1992, 71-92; I.N. Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450-751*, London 1994, 113-115, 225-242; Patrologia IV, 346-347.

M. Simonetti

LEONARD, saint (6th–10th c.?; feast 6 Nov). A hermit at Nobiliacum (= S. Léonard de Noblet, Limousin), about whom there is no historical information, but only legends of the 11th c. (BHL 4862-4879). Folk veneration concerning him is rather colorful. He is regarded as the patron of the imprisoned and of peasants.

J. Gribomont

LEONIDES (2nd–3rd c.). Father of *Origen. Among the victims of the persecution of *Septimius Severus, *Eusebius (*HE* VI, 1-2) mentions Leonides (an Ionic form, not Leonidas which would be a Doric form), "who is called the father of Origen." Does this expression mean that Eusebius was not sure if this was really the name of the father of Origen, or that he owed his own notoriety to his son? He was decapitated, which allows us to suppose that he was a Roman citizen. Father of seven children of whom Origen was the oldest, he had instructed him in both Greek letters and in sacred letters. His martyrdom indicates that he was an important personality in the church of *Alexandria. Perhaps he was a professor of grammar (literature), and perhaps it was precisely his teaching which the son took on after his martyrdom. The latter, who in a letter to his father in prison exhorts him to courageously confess the faith, refers to his martyrdom in *Hom. Ez.* IV, 8.

A. Rousselle, *La persécution des chrétiens à Alexandrie au III^e siècle*: RD 52 (1974) 222-251; P: Nautin, *Origène. Sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1977; E. Norelli, in *Origene*, ed. A. Monaci Castagno, Rome 2000, 293-294.

H. Crouzel

LEONTIUS, Armenian (d. 454). Martyr. Leontius (Łewondios or Łewondes), Vanandēcʻi, priest and disciple of *Mesrob and *Sahak: we have information about him from *Koriun (*Vita di Mesrob*), *Lazarus of Pharp (*Armenian History* 39-42), *Elisaeus (*History of the Armenian War and of Vardan* III, 5-8). He dedicated himself to sacred studies at *Constantinople, where he was the bearer of a letter of the Armenian bishops and priests to the patriarch *Proclus, a letter of which he is perhaps the author, on the writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia (the letter survives in Syriac translation, ed. P. Bedjan, *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, Paris-Leipzig 1910, 594-596; a Greek retranslation ACO IV, 2 [1914] XXXVII-XXXVIII; Fr. tr. in R. Devreesse, *Le début de la querelle des Trois Chapitres*: RSR 11 [1931] 550-551). Having returned home, he attended to the translation of the Scripture and of ecclesiastical authors. At the synod of *Artaxata (449) he was one of the principal supporters of the resistance to the de-Christianization decree issued by the king of Persia Yazdegerd II. After the battle of Avarair (451) he was captured together with the principal representatives of the Armenian nobility and clergy, and tried at the court of the king. Imprisoned with his companions, in 454 in a second trial together with them he refused to abjure, and suffered martyrdom after atrocious tortures. The feast of Leontius and of his companions, called "Leontian martyrs" (the catholicos Joseph, Isaac bishop of Rstunik, the priests Muse and Arsen, the deacon Kagiag), is celebrated by the Armenian church in the week after Septuagesima Sunday.

EC 7, 1169f.; BS 7, 1328-1332.

F. Scorza Barcellona

LEONTIUS, Armenian (2nd half of the 8th c.). Priest and historian, author of a *History of Mahomet and of His Successors and of Their Conquests, Especially in Armenia,* in which he describes the Arab occupation between 635 and 789. For the first part Leontius follows the history of *Sebeos; for the second part he presents himself as eyewitness.

Patrologia V, 604-605; G. Chahnazarian, *Histoire des guerres et des conquêtes des arabes en Arménie par . . . Ghévond, vardabed arménien*, Paris 1856; G. Chahnazarian, *Aršavank "Arabac" i Hays arareal Łevond vardapeti Hayocʻ*, Paris 1857; [K. Ezeanc'], *Patmowtʻiwn Łevondeay meci vardapeti Hayocʻ*, Sanktpeterburg 21887; [K. Patkan'jan], *Istorija Khalifov vardapeta Gevonda*, Sanktpeterburg 1862; E. Filler, *Quaestiones de Leontii armenii Historia*, Leipzig 1903; Z. Arzoumanian, *History of Lewond the Eminent Vardapet of the Armenians*, Los Angeles 1982.

S.J. Voicu

LEONTIUS, hegumen (8th c.). Hegumen monk of the Roman monastery of St. *Sabas on the Aventine and author of the biography, not very reliable with numerous anachronisms, of Bishop *Gregory of Agrigentum (BHG 707-707 and PG 98, 549-716, today edited by Berger). According to Berger it was written between 750 and 830, although there was a Leontius who took part in the Lateran council of 649. The author knew the city of Agrigentum (*Vita Greg.* 1: PG 98, 551); like so many other Greeks, he lived at *Rome (see PG 98, 545: the list of the abbots of St. Sabas redacted by Morcelli). According to Leontius, Gregory was born in the vicinity of Agrigentum; through papal nomination, he became bishop of Agrigentum; however, Leontius does not give the chronological coordinates to date him and not even the name of the pope in the period of the trial launched against Gregory. The text of the biography of Gregory has been abridged notably by Simeon Metaphrastes (PG 116, 189-269).

PG 98, 549-716; *Leontios Presbyteros von Rom, Das Leben des heiligen Gregorios von Agrigent.*, crit. ed., tr and comm, A. Berger (Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten 60), Berlin 1994; BS 7, 169-173; Cath 5, 231-232; Patrologia V, 169-70; Leonzio, *Vita di S. Gregorio Agrigentino.* Intr., It. tr. and notes by D. De Gregorio, Agrigento 2000; Y. de Andia, *Le monastère de Saint-Sabas à Rome: Relations théologiques entre l'Orient et l'Occident aux VIIe et VIIIe siècles*: POC 50 (2000) 279-296.

A. Di Berardino

LEONTIUS, presbyter of Jerusalem (6th c.?). Some Greek MSS transmit under the name of Leontius of Jerusalem two homilies published among the spurious ones of *John Chrysostom. The two works are different in style, since *In Samaritanam* (PG 59, 535-542) raises literary pretensions absent from *In parabolam Samaritani* (PG 62, 755-758), which departs little from the *allegorical *exegesis of the parable. It is therefore probable that they are treatises of two authors of the same name. Due to their provincial MS transmission the two homilies must be prior to 700. Since it alludes to the definition of *Chalcedon, *In Samaritanam* must be later than the 5th c. Occasionally the homily 3, *In ramos palmarum*, of *Leontius of Constantinople has been attributed to Leontius of Jerusalem.

CPG 7911-7912; M. Richard, (rec. a B. Marx, *Procliana . . .* , 1940): Mélanges de science religieuse 1 (1944) 189, n. 4; M. Aubineau, *Une enquête dans les manuscrits chrysostomiens: opportunité, difficultés, premier bilan*: RHE 63 (1968) 5-26; CCSG 17, 110 and 151.

S.J. Voicu

LEONTIUS of Antioch (d. 358). Of Phrygian origin, disciple of *Lucian of Antioch. Remaining faithful to the doctrine of the master (Philost., *HE* 2,15), he had pro-*Arian sympathies. He was elected bishop of *Antioch in 344, after the deposition of Stephen because of a scandal. *Athanasius, who mentions him multiple times among his bitterest enemies, holds against him castration and cohabitation with the *virgo subintroducta* Eustolium. In 350 he presided over a council at Antioch which decreed not to communicate with Athanasius, who had returned to Alexandria, but only with George. His sympathy for Arianism reached the point that he, around 355, ordained *Aetius, leader of the radical Arians, as deacon; but faced with the reaction of the people he recalled him from office. In general he maintained a prudent attitude so as not to exacerbate the conflicts between the factions which divided Antiochene Christianity.

DCB 3, 688; F. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV[e] siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996, 439 and passim.

M. Simonetti

LEONTIUS of Arabissus (today Yarpuz, in E Turkey). Bishop around 600. Two of his homilies survive on the resurrection of *Lazarus: one transmitted with lacunae, the other cited by *Photius.

P. Henry, *Photius, Bibliothèque*, VIII: (*"Codices" 257-280*), Paris 1977, cod. 272; K.-H. Uthemann, *Die Lazarus-Predigt des Leontios von Arabissos* (*BHG 2219u*): Byzantion 69 (1989) 291-353 (text and tr.: 332-353; intro.: 320-328).

S. Voicu

LEONTIUS of Arles (5th c.). Bishop of *Arles from ca. 461 to 475, after *Ravennius. In 473 (or 475) he called the Council of Arles to condemn the errors of the presbyter *Lucidus, concerning *grace and *predestination, which *Faustus of Riez had pointed out to him in *Ep.* 1. Pope *Hilarus wrote him various letters (*Ep.* 4-7. 9 = PL 58, 20-24 and 27; Jaffé 552, 553, 554, 556, 562), to resolve some cases of ecclesiastical discipline. A letter of Leontius to Hilarus is a falsification of J. Vignier (d. 1661) (PL 58, 22-23).

CPL 653a, 1662; Duchesne, *Fastes* I, 120-133, 257; Cath 7, 381-382 (bibl.); É. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, II, Paris 1966, 92, 97, 163-164 and passim.

M. Maritano

LEONTIUS of Byzantium (d. ca. 543). The problem of identifying this author remains open in our day due to the fact that the patristic sources mention various persons who in the 1st half of the 6th c. bore this name and because we do not yet have a critical edition of the works commonly ascribed to him; i.e., the *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* (first book of the collection edited by the same author and improperly said to be his), the *Dialogus contra Aphthartodocetas* (the second book of the collection), the *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* (the third book of the same collection), the *Solutio argumentorum a Severo obiectorum* and the *Triginta capita contra Severum*.

From the works we know that he was a "monk," "ascetic," "hermit" and named "abba Leontius"; furthermore, in the exordium of the third book of his collection the author affirms having been a young member of a *thiasos* of followers of *Diodorus of Tarsus and of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, from whom he later distanced himself due to the work of "heavenly grace" and with the help of some "inspired men."

Scholars generally identify Leontius of Byzantium with the monk of the same name mentioned in some documents of the era of *Justinian and in the biographies of the ascetics of the 6th c. of *Cyril of Scythopolis, acc. to which Leontius was a monk of the New Laura near *Jerusalem, disciple of *Nonnus and one of the heads of the *Origenist party in *Palestine; in 531 he accompanied *Sabas to *Constantinople on a mission to the emperor, and there he was discovered and condemned by the old man of God for having revealed his own Origenist convictions. However, his clever defense of the Council of Chalcedon won for him acclaim by authoritative persons in the court. Between 537 and 540 he was again in Palestine to support the forces of the Origenists and to favor their hegemony. In 540 he was at the head of a band of Origenist monks, who attacked with rudimentary arms the Great Laura. Only an eclipse prevented them from reducing to ruins the monastery of St. Sabas. According to Cyril of Scythopolis, he died a little after the promulgation in Palestine of the edict of Justinian against *Origen (Feb 543).

This presentation of Leontius of Byzantium as a strong Origenist activist has been questioned recently by various scholars. In this sense both the identification of Leontius with the "monk and *apocrisarius of the fathers of Jerusalem" (ACO IV, 2, 170, 5-6), present in 532 at the conference of union with the *Severians (*Collatio cum Severianis*) following *Hypatius of Ephesus, and the other which identifies him with the homonymous *hegumen and representative of the desert monks registered among the participants of the antimonophysite synod of 536 (ACO III, 130,24) underline the antimonophysite

and pro-Chalcedonian activity of Leontius, so that this author would be located in the Constantinopolitan area, working hand-in-hand with the action which the *acoemete monks, custodians of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon and supporters of the Chalcedonian *Christology, carried out in the same area. In other words, he should be considered one of those theologians defined as "strict Chalcedonians."

Leontius left various controversial writings which reflect themes and preoccupations proper to the contemporary christological debate. To the polemic against the *monophysites are dedicated the *Contra Nestorianos et Euthychianos,* in which he proposes to refute the "two opposed extremes": *Eutychianism and *Nestorianism, but in reality it is a fundamentally anti-Severian work, the *Solutio argumentorum a Severo obiectorum,* in which he replies to the objections raised to the preceding work, and the *Triginta Capita contra Severum.* The second book of the collection composed by him—i.e., the *Dialogus contra Aphthartodocetas,* is directed against those who shared the ideas of *Julian of Halicarnassus, maintaining the incorruptibility (*aphtharsia*) of the human nature of Christ; while the third book, *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos,* is a refutation of the thought of Theodore of Mopsuestia. His authorship of the *Adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum* remains uncertain, in which the falsifications of some patristic texts used by the monophysites are denounced, in reality traceable to *Apollinaris of Laodicea and his disciples, while it is today certain that the *De Sectis* cannot be attributed to Leontius due to the strong doctrinal differences with his other writings.

The nature of the theological convictions of Leontius has been the object of different studies, and ideas have been changing along with the research procedures through the course of the 20th c., with contrasting results: from *Cyrillian and *Neochalcedonian positions (Loofs) scholars have passed, after having clearly distinguished him from Leontius of Jerusalem, to acknowledging his rigorously *dyophysite orientation (Richard, Moeller); subsequently the Origenism of his theology has been emphasized to the point of considering it heterodox and *Evagrian (Evans), to later return again to positions of orthodoxy acc. to the strict Chalcedonians (Dell'Osso).

Even if the character of polemical writings imposes a certain caution on the systematic reconstruction of Leontius's thought, it is certain that logical rigor and the controversial capacity which mark it make him one of the most important interpreters of the 6th c.; in him we find almost all the themes of the Christology of his time: from the defense of the formula of Chalcedon, which accents the permanence and the distinction of the two natures, to the mode of the union of the two natures, which happens κατ' οὐσίαν, maintaining that the end of this union is the *hypostasis of Jesus Christ, who is the effect of the essential union of the two natures just as a single human individual is the result of the union of the soul and body, it remaining true that the subject of this union is the Logos. For this Leontius focuses on the historical concreteness of the person of Jesus Christ in all the complexity of his mystery. In this research effort he finds sustenance in the reflection of the Cappadocian Fathers and not that of Cyril of Alexandria, in contrast to the *Neochalcedonian theologians who were his contemporaries. Keeping in mind the symmetrical presentation of the two natures, following the teaching of *Leo the Great, it does not seem possible to claim that the two natures of Christ are united in a *tertium quid,* which would be individuated in the νοῦς of Evagrius.

There have also been different interpretations regarding the term ἐνυπόστατον which in relation with ὑπόστασις offers the conceptual model for understanding the rapport between human and divine nature in the Logos: from the attribution of a dynamic value to the prefix *en* by which the term would express a direction through which two independent substances enter into an existential relationship (Loofs), to the more widespread interpretation acc. to which with ἐνυπόστατον Leontius meant "that which is concretely existing" in the Logos—i.e., the human nature of Christ—which would then be "*enhypostatized" in the hypostasis of the Logos (Daley, Grillmeier). Recently a new interpretation has been proposed through which this term would mean "the essential qualities of the two natures" which coexist perfectly in the unique "hypostatic" or personal reality of Jesus Christ (Dell'Osso), therefore the so-called doctrine of the *enhypostasia* of human nature in the divine hypostasis of the Logos should not be assigned to him. The accentuation of the full and perfect humanity of Christ in contrast with those who maintain the incorruptibility (*aphtharsia*) of the assumed flesh is confirmed by the soteriological doctrine of Leontius. In fact, the identity of nature and the way of suffering of the *Kyrios* not only make him a model to imitate but also create the possibility of imitating him on the part of all people.

CPG 6813-6820; PG 86, 1268-1396, 1901-1976; F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, Münster 1907, 155-164. Critical ed. in prep. for CCG (B.E. Daley); It. tr. Leonzio di Bisanzio, *Le opere*, ed. C.

Dell'Osso, (CTP 161), Rome 2001. F. Loofs, *Leontias von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche* (TU 3, 1-2), Leipzig 1887; J.P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz. Studien zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen*, Paderborn 1908; DTC 9, 400-426; R. Devreesse, *Le florilège de Léonce de Byzance*: RSR 10 (1930) 545-576; E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (TU 49, 2), Leipzig 1939; M. Richard, *Léonce de Jérusalem et Léonce de Byzance*: MSR 1 (1944) 35-88; Id., *Léonce de Byzance était-il origéniste?*: REByz 5 (1947) 31-66; Ch. Moeller, *Le chalcédonisme et le néo chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI^e siècle*: CGG I, 637-720; S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffes* (diss.), Bonn 1962; S. Otto, *Person and Subsistenz. Die philosophische Anthropologie des Leontios von Byzanz*, Munich 1968; S. Rees, *The Literary Activity of Leontius of Byzantium*: JTS 19 (1968) 229-242; D.B. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology*, Washington, D.C. 1970; J.J. Lynch, *Leontius of Byzantium: A Cyrillian Christology*: ThS 36 (1975) 455-471; B.E. Daley, *The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium*: JTS 27 (1976) 333-369; P.T.R. Gray, *The Defence of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*, Leiden 1979; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980; Id., *Il "Dialogo contro gli aftartodoceti" di Leonzio di Bisanzio e Severo di Antiochia*: Cristianesimo nella storia 1 (1980) 441-442; H. Stickelberger, *Substanz und Akzidens bei Leontius von Byzanz*: ThZ 36 (1980) 153-161; I. Fracea, *Ho Leontios Byzantios. Bios kai syngrammata. Kritikē theōrēsēe*, Athens 1984; A. Tuillier, *Remarques sur les fraudes des Apollinaristes et des Monophysites*, in *Texte und Textkritik*, Berlin 1987, 581-590; A. Grillmeier, II, 2, 190-241, Freiburg 1989; D.B. Evans, *Leontius von Byzanz*: TRE 21 (1991) 5-10; B. Kettern, *Leontios von Byzanz*: BBKL 4, 1494-1498; B.E. Daley, *"A Richer Union." Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ*, Leuven 1993, 239-265; J.C. Lamoreaux, *An Arabic Version of Leontius of Byzantium's Thirty Chapters*: Muséon 108 (1995) 343-365; B.E. Daley, *Leontios von Byzanz*: LTK³ 6, 838; K.-H. Uthemann, *Definitionen und Paradigmen in der Rezeption des Dogmas von Chalkedon bis in die Zeit Kaiser Justinians*, in *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zu Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, ed. J. Van Oort - J. Roldanus, Leuven 1997, 95-106; K.-H. Uthemann, *Kaiser Justinian als Kirchen Politiker und Theologe*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 5-83; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, Rome 2001; C. Dell'Osso, *Still on the Concept of Enhypostaton*: Augustinianum 43 (2003) 63-80; C. Dell'Osso, *Il calcedonismo: Leonzio di Bisanzio*, Monopoli 2003.

C. Dell'Osso

LEONTIUS of Caesarea (d. after 325). Seventh known bishop of *Caesarea of *Cappadocia. In the synod held at Caesarea in 314 he consecrated bishop *Gregory the Illuminator, apostle of *Armenia. He was present at the Councils of *Neocaesarea and of *Ancyra. In 325, at Nazianzus, while he was traveling to *Nicaea to assist at the council, he received Gregory's father as a catechumen (PG 35, 1000). He played an important role during the Council of Nicaea together with Eupsychius of *Tyana (Mansi 2, 835; 858-9; 863; 867; 870-1). He was charged with transmitting the conciliar decisions in Cappadocia and the neighboring provinces (Mansi 2,882). His fame and orthodox doctrine are attested by *Athanasius in a letter to the Egyptian bishops (PG 25, 556). In the 9th c. the memory of Leontius was still alive in his city; the testimony of the priest Gregory of Caesarea proves it, acc. to whom the relics of the bishop were preserved intact. This led Baronius to insert him in the *Roman Martyrology* on the date of 13 Jan, although his name does not appear in other calendars.

Martyrologium Romanum, Rome 1586, 26-27; AASS *Ian.*, I, Anversa 1643, 781-782; EOMIA passim (see index), 53.10; G. Garitte, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange* (ST 127), Vatican City 1946; P. Ananian, *La data e le circostanze della consacrazione di S. Gregorio Illuminatore*: Muséon 74 (1961) 43-73, 317-360; G. Garitte, *La Vie grecque inédite de S. Grégoire d'Arménie (Ms 4 d'Ochrida)*: AB 83 (1965) 233-290; Cath 7, 375-377; BS 7, 1314-1315; M.-M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors v. Naz.*, Bonn 1960, 111-112; Fedalto 1, 20.

L. Perrone

LEONTIUS of Constantinople (6th c.). Presbyter, author of at least 37 homilies, some of which are still unpublished. The only chronological indication which can be inferred from his work is the mention of an earthquake, identified as that of Constantinople in 557 (*hom.* 1). The number of his homilies is debated (14 for C. Datema and P. Allen; 25 for M. Sachot; 37 for S.J. Voicu, *Dieci omelie*), which have been "published" under different names (Leontius and *John Chrysostom, but also *Amphilochius of Iconium, *Athanasius of Alexandria, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Hippolytus of Rome, *Proclus of Constantinople, *Severian of Gabala, *Timothy of Jerusalem or of Antioch). Almost all of the homilies were delivered for important feasts: birth of *John the Baptist (*hom.* 1 and 22), Christmas (*hom.* 12 and 36), Holy *Innocents (*hom.* 29 and 35), *Epiphany (*hom.* 15 and 27), *Presentation in the Temple (*hom.* 20, 23 and 25), *Lent (*hom.* 30), *Lazarus Saturday (*hom.* 2 and 26, perhaps 16), Palm Sunday (*hom.* 3 and 31), Holy Week (*hom.* 4-7, perhaps 28 and 32), *Easter (*hom.* 8-9 and 33), *Mid-Pentecost (*homm.* 10 and 18), Sunday of the man born blind (*hom.* 24), Pentecost (*hom.* 11 and 13), Transfiguration (*hom.* 14 and 21), Exaltation of the Cross (*hom.* 34), beheading of John the Baptist (*hom.* 37); the context of the *hom.* 17 (*In Psalmum* 92) and 19 (*In lacum Genesareth*) is uncertain. From these texts, little studied, Leontius appears as a cultivator of rhetoric and ornate prose, coiner of neologisms and lover of fictitious dialogues. His polemic against the Jews is constant, but,

as with that against paganism, not very original. The explicit antiheretical ideas are directed against local groups (Marathonians: *hom.* 8 and 13; Novatians: *hom.* 30; Sabatians: *hom.* 9) or else they are anachronistic (Arians: *hom.* 2, 8, 14). His Mariology was little developed; clear references to the controversies after the Councils of *Ephesus (431) and of *Chalcedon (451) are missing, as if Leontius adhered to the positions promoted by the **Henoticon*. The identification of some of his sources (Asterius Sophist, Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Physiologus*) reinforces the impression that Leontius was more a follower than an original thinker.

CPG 7887-7900; C. Datema, *When Did Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, Preach?*: VCh 35 (1981) 346-351; S.J. Voicu, *Dieci omelie di Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Studi sull'oriente cristiano 5,1 (2001) 165-190 (p. 186-189: list of the homilies); C. Datema - P. Allen, *Leontii presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae*, CCG 17, Turnhout-Leuven 1987 (*hom.* 1-14); J. Noret - Cetedoc, *Thesaurus Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani. Enumeratio lemmatum cum concordantiis* (Corpus Christianorum. Thesaurus Patrum Graecorum), Turnhout 1992 (*homm.* 1-14).

Partial editions and studies: B. Capelle, *Les homélies liturgiques du prétendu Timothée de Jérusalem*: EphLit 63 (1949) 5-26; M. Aubineau, *Hésychius de Jérusalem, Basile de Séleucie, Jean de Béryte, Pseudo-Chrysostome, Léonce de Constantinople: Homélies pascales . . .* (SC 187), Paris 1972, 339-468 (*homm.* 8-9); M. Sachot, *Les homélies de Léonce, prêtre de Constantinople*: RecSR 51 (1977) 234-243; P. Allen - C. Datema, *Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople—A Compiler?*: JÖByz 29 (1980) 9-20; M. Sachot, *L'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Transfiguration CPG 4724, BHG 1975: Contextes liturgiques, restitution à Léonce, prêtre de Constantinople, édition critique et commentée, traduction et études connexes* (Publications Universitaires Européennes s. XXIII: Théologie 151), Frankfurt a.M.-Bern 1981 (*hom.* 14); F. Scorza Barcellona, *Un'omelia pseudocrisostomica inedita sui santi Innocenti* (BHG *827c* = CPG *5075*), Rome 1984 (*hom.* 35); C. Datema - P. Allen, *Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople and an Unpublished Homily of Ps. Chrysostom on Christmas* (*BHGa 1914i/1914k*): JÖByz 39 (1989) 65-84 (*hom.* 36); S.J. Voicu, *Pseudoippolito, In sancta theophania* (*CPG 1917; BHG 1940*) *e Leonzio di Costantinopoli*, in *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 30), Rome 1989, 137-146 (*hom.* 27); W. Kinzig, *Erbin Kirche. Die Auslegung von Psalm 5,1 in den Psalmenhomilien des Asterius und in der Alten Kirche* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-hist. Kl. 1990, 2), Heidelberg 1990, 96-102; S.J. Voicu, *Due testi pseudocrisostomici per l'epifania* (*BHGn 1944t e CPG 4522*) *e Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata 44 (1990) 271-279 (*hom.* 15); P. Allen - C. Datema, *Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, Fourteen Homilies Translated, Introduced and Annotated* (Byzantina Australiensia 9), Brisbane 1991; J.H. Barkhuizen, *Amphilochius of Iconium, Homily 3: On the Four-Day [dead] Lazarus: An Essay in Interpretation*: Acta Patristica et Byzantina 5 (1994) 1-11 (*hom.* 26); P. Allen, *Reconstructing Pre-Paschal Liturgies in Constantinople: Some Sixth Century Evidence*, in *Philohistôr. Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii*, ed. A. Schoors - P. Van Deun (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 60), Leuven 1994, 217-228; S.J. Voicu, *Pseudo-Anfilochio e Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Orpheus 25 (2004) 101-112.

S.J. Voicu

LEONTIUS of Jerusalem (6th c.). Monk and polemicist generally dated to the 6th c. He is considered the most organic interpreter of *Neochalcedonianism. His theological stature grows in proportion with the lessening of that of *Leontius of Byzantium, with whom he has been confused in the past. Nothing is known of his life: his identification with the homonymous monk of Palestine, present at *Constantinople at the conference with the *monophysites in 532 and at the synod of 536, is contested along with that of Leontius of Byzantium. A new examination of the historical indications which can be gathered from the writings leads, however, to the conclusion of a later date, putting his activity between 614 and 640 (Krausmüller). He is the author of two polemical works against the traditional adversaries of the Chalcedonian theologians, composed one after the other: the *Contra Monophysitas*, a collection of 63 aporias, with a patristic *florilegium, which has reached us in fragments; and the *Contra Nestorianos*, a voluminous treatise in 8 books, the last of which is missing. The principal polemical target is represented in every case by the *Christology of *Antiochene origin. His reflection unites in the most completed form the typical elements of Neochalcedonian Christology: the authority of *Cyril of Alexandria taken globally, with the consequent use of a double terminology, both monophysite and *dyophysite, the acceptance of the *theopaschite formula and the doctrine of the **enhypostasis* of the human nature of Christ in the *hypostasis of the Logos. In fact, the relationship between nature and hypostasis in Leontius of Jerusalem presents elements of both novelty and contradiction. In the ontological analysis, on the one hand, next to the definition of the hypostasis as "separately existing," the notion seems to persist of "nature endowed with individual properties" taken from the trinitarian theology of the Cappadocians. On the other hand, he sought to overcome the limits of the concept of φύσις as nature in an abstract and generic sense, introducing the term φύσις ἰδική, a nature with "idioms" ("attributes") both for the humanity and for the divinity of Christ. The union of the two natures, concretely existing in the hypostasis of the Logos, leads therefore to a σύνθεσις or greater composition of their "idioms." His furtherance of the anthropological paradigm—the conjunction of soul and body in human beings—as a model of the union in Christ reflects the accentuation of the unity in the hypostasis. This also profoundly influences the soteriological conception, dominated by the theme of θέωσις: the divinization, which because of the

*hypostatic union envelops the humanity of Christ (the Κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος, acc. to a characteristic expression of Leontius of Jerusalem), extends through his humanity to all people and in the final analysis to all nature.

CPG 6917-6918; PG 86, 1400-1901. Critical ed. in prep. per CCG (P.T.R. Gray). F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche* (TU 3, 1-2), Leipzig 1887; M. Richard, *Léonce de Jérusalem et Léonce de Byzance*: MSR 1 (1944) 35-88; Ch. Moeller, *Textes "monophysites" de Léonce de Jérusalem*: EThL 27 (1951) 467-482; S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffes*, diss., Bonn 1962; S. Otto, *Person und Subsistenz. Die philosophische Anthropologie des Leontios von Byzanz*, Munich 1968; A. Basdekis, *Die Christologie des Leontius von Jerusalem. Seine Logoslehre*, diss., Münster 1974; A. Grillmeier, Ὁ Κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος. *Eine Studie zu einer christologischen Bezeichnung der Väterzeit*: Traditio 33 (1977) 1-63; P.T.R. Gray, *The Defence of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*, Leiden 1979; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980; L. Abramowski, *Ein nestorianischer Traktat bei Leontius von Jerusalem*, in *III Symposium Syriacum*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1983, 43-55; P.T.R. Gray, *Leontius of Jerusalem's Case of a "Synthetic" Union in Christ*, SP 18/1, Kalamazoo 1985, 151-154; K.P. Wesche, *The Christology of Leontius of Jerusalem: Monophysite or Chalcedonian?*: St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 31 (1987) 65-95; Grillmeier II/2, 286-327; P.T.R. Gray, *Through the Tunnel with Leontius of Jerusalem: The Sixth-Century Transformation of Theology*, in P. Allen - E. Jeffreys (eds.), *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, Brisbane 1996, 186-196; K.-H. Uthemann, *Definitionen und Paradigmen in der Rezeption des Dogmas von Chalkedon bis in die Zeit Kaiser Justinians*, in *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, ed. J. van Oort - J. Roldanus, Leuven 1997, 54-122; J. MacDonald, *Leontius of Jerusalem's "Against the Monophysites" as a Possible Source for Justinian's "Letter to the Alexandrian Monks"*: Byzantion 67 (1997) 375-382; D. Krausmüller, *Leontius of Jerusalem, A Theologian of the Seventh Century*: JTS 52 (2001) 637-657; C. Dell'Osso, *Leonzio di Bisanzio*, Rome 2001.

L. Perrone

LEONTIUS of Neapolis (590–ca. 650). Little is known of the life of Leontius, bishop of Neapolis (the modern Limassol) on *Cyprus, in the first half of the 7th c.; perhaps he should be identified with the Leontius of Neapolis present at the council of the Lateran in 649. He is primarily known as a hagiographer, having written the lives of two saints of his native Cyprus: (1) *Life of *John the Almsgiver* (CPG 7882) patriarch of *Alexandria in 610–620, personally known to him. This biography, which gives a valuable description of life of Alexandria in the 2nd decade of the 7th c., has reached us in three versions in different languages, and was translated into *Latin by Anastasius Bibliotecarius; (2) *Life of Saint Spiridon of Tremithous* (CPG 7884; BHG 1648a), the bishop in the 4th c. of Tremithous on Cyprus. Today it is thought that this work has been lost, although it has been affirmed by Garitte that an anonymous *Vita* preserved in a MS at Florence (*Laur.* XI, 9), which is based on a lost *Vita* of St. Spiridon in iambic verses, is actually the *Vita* of Leontius. Furthermore he wrote the *Life of Simeon the Fool* (CPG 7883; BHG 1677-1677bb), a Syrian saint, born at *Edessa and who passed the last part of his life at *Emesa. In this *Vita,* as he himself explains, Leontius used both written and oral sources: scholars are in disagreement as to who these sources were, even if it has recently been affirmed, by Krueger, that the written source was none other than the account contained in Evagrius's *History of the Church* of (IV, 34). The *Vita* of Leontius is important because it is the first of the genre of a "fool for love of Christ" (*see* *saints, foolish), a type of saint that was to become popular in Byzantine society. There are also two homilies preserved: one on the prophet Simeon and the other on the *Mid-Pentecost (CPG 7880-7881). Both *John of Damascus and the fathers of the seventh ecumenical council cite long passages from Leontius's fifth book (or homily) against the Jews, in which he defends the veneration of the cross, images and the relics of the saints against the Jewish accusation of idolatry (CPG 7885). The arguments of Leontius are based on the OT and the examples it gives of veneration of people and things, esp. in the context of the adoration in the temple.

H. Gelzer, *Leontios' von Neapolis, Leben des heiligen Johannes des Barmherzigen, Erzbischofs von Alexandrien*, Freiburg i.B.-Leipzig 1893; P. van den Ven, *La Légende de S. Spyridon, évêque de Trimithonte*, Louvain 1953, 104-128; G. Garitte, *L'édition des Vies de saint Spyridon par M. van den Ven*: RHE 50 (1955) 125-140, esp. 136-139; N.H. Baynes, *The Icons before Iconoclasm*: HTR 44 (1951) 93-106; L. Rydén, *Bemerkungen zum Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis*, Uppsala 1970; A.J. Festugière - L. Rydén, *Léontios de Néapolis, Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre*, Paris 1974; O. Kresten, *Leontios von Neapolis als Tachygraph? Hagiographische Texte als Quellen zu Schriftlichkeit und Buchkultur im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert*: Scrittura e civiltà 1 (1977) 155-175; L. Rydén, *The Holy Fool*, in S. Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint*, London 1981, 106-113; R. Browning, *The "Low Level" Saint's Life in the Early Byzantine World*, in S. Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint*, London 1981, 117-127 (= Id., *History, Language, and Literacy in the Byzantine World*, London 1989, no. VIII); V. Fazzo, *Giovanni Damasceno, Difesa delle immagini sacre*, Rome 1983, 75-80 and 163-167; V. Déroche, *L'Authenticité de l'"Apologie contre les Juifs" de Léontios de Néapolis*: BCH 110 (1986) 655-669; J. Hofstra, *Leontius van Neapolis als Hagiograaf*, in A. Hilhorst (ed.), *De heiligenverering in de eerste eeuwen van het christendom*, Nijmegen 1988, 186-192; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre* (TU 139), Berlin 1992, 340-353; D. Krueger, *The "Life of Symeon the Fool" and the Cynic Tradition*: JECS 1 (1993) 423-442; D. Krueger, *Symeon the Holy Fool. Leontius's* Life *and the Late Antique City*, Berkeley, CA 1996; *Vedere l'invisibile.*

Nicea e lo statuto dell'immagine, ed. L. Russo, Palermo 1997, 39-43; Patrologia V, 244-248.

A. Louth

LEONTIUS of Tripoli, martyr (d. 304). We know the cult of this martyr better than his life. In the 5th c. he is mentioned by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (SC 57, 335); *Melania the Younger in 417 visited his sanctuary in Tripoli (SC 90, 226-228), which replaced a pagan temple (BHO 563) and had become a center of pilgrimage in Phoenicia (the practice of **incubatio*). Also *Peter the Iberian (BHO 955), *Severus patriarch of Antioch (who recounts the legend of the saint in his homilies, 27 and 50, delivered 18 June 513 and 514: PO 35, 358-367; PO 36, 558-573; cf. PO 2, 79 and 92), and the *anonymous pilgrim of Piacenza (CCL 175, 129) visited this site. The legend developed in three stages: (1) A first *Passio* of the soldier Leontius and the monk Publius (under *Diocletian) of the 5th c., composed in Greek and today lost in its original language, preserved only in a *Syriac translation (BHO 563) and a *Georgian one (Kekelidze, *Monumenta* 2, 62-63), accentuates the epic character of the personage; it is attested 18 June 513 and 514, by the homilies 27 and 50 of Severus. (2) A 9th-c. *Passio* of the soldiers Leontius, Hypatius (Hypatus) and Theodulus executed under *Vespasian (BHG 986-987d), to which the synaxaria refer. (3) A third *Passio* makes Leontius an Arab martyr, of whom Egyptian and Coptic sources speak (BHO 1170). At *Constantinople his feast was celebrated 18 June in two churches with his name; at *Jerusalem 14 Nov in the *Aphthonion,* near Gethsemane. The mentions in the *Mart. hier.* (19.3, 22.11, 24.12) are uncertain; Baronius inserted him in the *Mart. rom.* 18 June.

BS 7, 1325-1328; K. Kekelidze, *Monumenta Hagiographica Georgica* 2, Tiflis 1946; G. Garitte, *Textes hagiographiques orientaux relatifs à Saint Léonce de Tripoli*: Muséon 78 (1965) 313-348; 79 (1966) 335-386; 81 (1968) 415-440; P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient*, Paris 1985.

S. Heid

LEONTIUS Scholasticus (De Sectis) (6th/7th c.). In the MS tradition of the *De sectis,* a work of heresiological and controversial character composed between the 6th and the beginning of the 7th c., the name of Leontius Scholasticus is found, who might be either the true author or, keeping to the tenor of the introductory heading, the one who transcribed the oral teachings of an "abbot Theodore." M. Richard was the first to propose associating him with *Theodore of Raithu, author of the *Proparaskeuē*. The theses of Richard have encountered agreement esp. concerning the relationship between the *De sectis* and *Leontius of Byzantium: important differences in the use of key terms such as **enhypostatos* and **hypostasis* and a reserved attitude toward the appeal to the anthropological paradigm (on the contrary amply used by Leontius of Byzantium), lead to differentiating the author of the *De sectis* from his Constantinopolitan homonym. It is therefore not possible to consider the *De sectis* as the reworking of a prior work of Leontius of Byzantium (a thesis maintained in his time by Loofs), although it takes into account some of his writings and more generally shares with the latter a line of strict *Chalcedonianism, far from contemporary Neochalcedonian solutions.

The text includes ten "lessons" (*praxeis*), which from the formal point of view recall the lecture notes of the commentators of *Aristotle. The first defines the concepts of "substance," "nature," "*hypostasis," "person," putting after this the exposition of "theology" and the "economy." It is a summary of the Bible and of the historical-salvific plan up to the *incarnation. In relationship with the "faith" of the church it then denounces the principal trinitarian (*Sabellianism and *Arianism) and *christological (*Nestorianism and *monophysitism) heresies. Opposing the ecclesiastical doctrine to these errors, the author underlines how this occupies a middle position. The second lesson has for its subject the biblical canon and the theological errors of the Jews and Samaritans who both maintain the *mia physis* and the *mia hypostasis* in God. The third lesson delineates Christian eras from the *Nativity to *Constantine and later, listing the fathers of the church and the heresies combated by them. It should be pointed out that for the author the Council of Chalcedon constitutes the decisive moment of the second period. The fourth lesson illustrates the heresies of *Macedonius, *Apollinaris, Nestorius and *Eutyches, and records the reasons for the exile of *Dioscorus (his support for Eutyches). It should be noted here how the text can barely hide its sympathy for two "great men," *Diodore of Tarsus and *Theodore of Mopsuestia. The fifth lesson introduces the factions created following the Council of Chalcedon and recalls the new problem of tritheism. From the sixth to the ninth lesson the author responds to the criticisms of those who for reasons of historical, philosophical or patristic character were refusing to accept the Council of Chalcedon, while in the tenth he deals with the more recent errors of the *Gaianites, *Agnoetae and *Origenists. He dedicates particular attention to the first, showing again significant

points of contact with the argumentation developed by Leontius of Byzantium in the *Dialogus contra Aphthartodocetas,* but without reproposing his identification of Julianism as a radical monophysitism.

CPG 6823; PG 86, 1193-1268; M. Waegeman, *Het traktaat de sectis* (*Ps. Leontius Byzantinus*). *Textkritische uitgave en vertaling*, diss., Gent 1982; F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, Leipzig 1887; J.P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz*, Paderborn 1908, 5-20; S. Rees, *The "De Sectis": A Treatise Attributed to Leontius of Byzantium*: JTS 40 (1939) 346-360; M. Richard, *Le traité "De sectis" et Léonce de Byzance*: RHE 35 (1939) 695-723 (= *Opera Minora* II, Turnhout-Leuven 1977, n. 55); Id., ΑΠΟ ΦΩΝΗΣ: Byzantion 20 (1950) 191-222 (= *Opera Minora* III, n. 60); J. Speigl, *Der Autor der Schrift über die Konzilien und die Religionspolitik Justinians*: AHC 2 (1970) 207-230; M. Waegemann, *The Text Tradition of the Treatise* De Sectis (*Ps. Leontius Byzantinus*: L'antiquité classique 45 (1976) 190-196; Id., *The Old Testament Canon in the Treatise* De Sectis: L'antiquité classique 50 (1981) 813-818; M. van Esbroeck, *Le* De Sectis *attribué à Léonce de Byzance* (*CPG 6823*) *dans la version géorgienne d'Arsène Iqaltoeli*: Bedi Kartlisa 42 (1984) 35-52; Id., *La date et l'auteur du* De sectis *attribué à* Léonce de *Byzance*, in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Prof. A. van Roey*, Leuven 1985, 415-424; Grillmeier II/2, 514-523.

L. Perrone

LEOVIGILD (d. 586). King of *Visigothic *Spain from 567, and after the death of Liuva in 572, the only Visigothic king in the Iberian Peninsula. He improved his fortunes both by annexing, at the expense of the Byzantines, to his kingdom the contiguous kingdom of the Suebians of *Gallaecia (585) and by taming the N populations. He also fought in *Gaul. Very early he joined his two sons, Hermengild and *Recared, to his reign. Under him the Iberian Peninsula was unified. The rebellion of his son Hermengild (580–584), who had converted from *Arianism, traditional among the Visigoths, to Catholicism and who was defeated and killed, pushed Leovigild to adopt anti-Catholic measures, sanctioned by an Arian council held at *Toledo in 580. To facilitate the passage of the Catholics to Arianism, he exempted them from being rebaptized—as was the custom until then—imposing on them only the imposition of hands. In the final analysis he sought to create better relationships with the majority of the population, who were Catholic. The fruits of this policy were gathered by Recared, who converted to Catholicism in contrast to his father. Leovigild improved the Codex of Euricus, annulling the law which prohibited marriage between *Goths and Romans.

K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen*, Berlin 1967; B. Saitta, *Un momento della disgregazione del regno visigoto di Spagna: la rivolta di Ermenegildo*: Quaderni Catanesi 1 (1979) 81-134; A. Maya, *De Leovigildo perseguidor y Masona mártir*: Emerita 62 (1994) 167-186; A. Ferreiro, *The Visigoths in Gaul and Spain A.D. 418-711: A Bibliography*, Leiden 1988; Id., *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society*, Leiden 1999; R.L. Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus in the Visigothic Kingdom, 589-633*, Ann Arbor, MI 2000.

M. Simonetti

LEPER (iconography). Iconography concerning the healing of lepers (Mt 8:2-4 // Mk 1:40 // Lk 5:12-16; Lk 17:11-19) appears almost nonexistent, or at least difficult to identify, given that, as happens in the representations of Job, the effect of the wounds produced by the malady is not expressed figuratively, and because that in these scenes the event is shown with the healing having already taken place, alluding obviously to the overcoming not only of physical but also of spiritual imperfection.

However, some paintings in the catacombs of *Rome have been interpreted in this sense: two in the cemetery of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter (Wp 129,2; Wp 68,3), one in the hypogeum of Nunziatella (Wp 74,2), one in *Domitilla (Nestori 1993, 125, n. 31) and one in an anonymous hypogeum of the Via Latina (Wp 265). All these paintings can be placed in a time period from the end of the 3rd c. to the middle of the 4th. Of these, only for Nunziatella does this reading seem admissible, if it is referred to the gospel passage which recalls the incident in which one of the ten healed lepers returns to offer thanks; in this scene, in fact, a kneeling man with raised hands is visible next to Christ.

It does not seem, in contrast, that the miracle should be recognized in one of the polychrome slabs preserved in the Museo Nazionale Romano, as Wilpert supposes (Ws II, 302). The episode is expressed in a clearer and more defined manner in 5th-c. ivories and miniatures; see a clarifying example in a diptych preserved at London (*Age of Spirituality*, 500, n. 450).

J. Wilpert, *Ein Cyclus christologischer Gemälde aus der Katakombe der heiligen Petrus und Marcellinus*, Freiburg i.Br. 1891; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frommigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 73, 300, 368, 441; var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, New York 1979, 500; F. Bisconti, *Contributo all'interpretazione dell'atteggiamento di orante*: VetChr 17 (1980) 17-27; Id., *Sull'unità del linguaggio biblico nella pittura cimiteriale romana*: Miscell. S. Cipriani, Brescia 1981, 45ff.; E. Dinkler, *Christus und Asklepios*, Heidelberg 1980, 15ff.

F. Bisconti

LEPORIUS (d. after 428/431). Leporius, called the precursor of *Nestorius in the West, was a monk at

*Marseille. Because of his christological errors—he had difficulty admitting that God was born and died; therefore, he defended an overly forced christological dualism—he was expelled by *Proculus, his bishop. He took refuge in *Africa with *Augustine (ca. 418). The latter succeeded in putting him back on the path of orthodoxy. The *Libellus emendationis* in which Leporius retracted his erroneous opinions was sent, together with a benevolent letter of Augustine (*Ep*. 219, in 426 or 421), to Proculus. This document, of Augustinian stamp, offers valuable evidence of the Latin *Christology which, at that time, accepted two natures and one person in Christ. While *John Cassian spoke out severely against Leporius, Augustine showed himself more indulgent, indicating that such cases should be resolved in a fraternal dialogue.

CPL 515; CCL 64, 94-123; F. Gori: AugR 34 (1994) 201-206; P. Glorieux, *Prénestorianisme en Occident*, Tournai 1959 (with other documents, regarding the case of Leporius); A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Freiburg 1979, 661-665 (bibl.); F. Gori, *"De Trinitate" pseudoatanasiano nel Lib.*: AugR 31 (1991) 361-380; V. Grossi: Lat 58 (1992) 11-45; LTK³ 6, 844; LACL (2002); T. Krannich, *Von Leporius bis zu Leo der Grossen*, Tübingen 2005.

B. Studer

LEPTIS MAGNA. Leptis Magna (Lepcis Magna; modern Lebda, Libya), Roman from 25 BC, *colonia* under *Trajan, fatherland of *Septimius Severus (193–211), was decorated in the 2nd c. with magnificent monuments: forums, baths, secular basilicas, circuses, amphitheaters, aqueducts. Because of the combined effect of the barbarian incursions and the advance of the sand, it began to decline in the 4th c., and fell completely into ruin with the Arab invasion. The systematic excavations conducted after 1920 by P. Romanelli and R. Bartoncini have brought to light, in addition to profane monuments, some Christian sanctuaries: a small three-aisled basilica, with semicircular presbyterial bench and altar protruding into the nave, surrounded by a balustrade; on the side a baptistery of quadratic plan with a circular basin; a second basilica, inserted at the time of *Justinian in the profane basilica ordered built by Severus, and dedicated to the Virgin (Procop., *Aedif.* 6,4), this too with a baptistery to the side. We know little of the Christian history of Leptis Magna. Under the name *Archias Leptitanus* (PG 5, 1489-1490) a small fragment has been published on the celebration of Easter fixed on Sunday. Audollent believed it to be authentic (DHGE 3,1528); however, it is certainly to be attributed to *Irenaeus of Lyons (H. Jordan, *Wer war Archaeus?*: ZNTW 13 [1912] 157-160). Therefore, this bishop should be deleted from the list of Leptis Magna. The first certain bishop is Dioga, who was represented by his colleague from Oea at the Council of Carthage of 1 Sept 256 (*Sent. Ep.* 83-85). Other known bishops are Victorinus (393), the *Donatist Salvianus and Callipedes (484).

EC 7, 1190-1191; LTK² 6, 973; R. Bartoncini, *Una chiesa cristiana nel Vecchio Foro di Lepcis*: RivAC 8 (1931) 23-52; *Atti del IV Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia cristiana*, Studi di antichità cristiana 16, Vatican City 1940, 264-270; EAA 4, 572-594; J.B. Ward-Perkins, *The Several Buildings of Lepcis Magna: An Architectural Survey*, London 1993; E. Savino, *Città di frontiera nell'Impero romano: forme della romanizzazione da Augusto ai Severi*, Bari 1999.

V. Saxer

LÉRIDA. The correspondence between *Consentius and St. *Augustine informs us concerning the contamination of this church by *Priscillianism, at least in the person of its bishop, Siagrius. Bishops: Sagitius (d. 419), Andrew (d. 540), Februarius (d. 546), Polypius (d. 589), Julian (d. 592), Aemelius (d. 599), Fructuosus (d. 633-638), Euredus (d. 683). In the year 546 (the date 524 should be rejected) a council was convened, presided over by the metropolitan Sergius of *Tarragona; its *Acts* bear the signatures of seven other bishops and a presbyter representing another bishop. It promulgated sixteen canons, which show influences from the Gallican councils of *Agde (506) and Orleáns (511), and which intend to affirm ecclesiastical discipline. These canons bring out the problems provoked by the coexistence of *Arians and *Catholics, the difficulties in the relationship between the hierarchy and the monks, and finally the disagreement between Christian morality and the life of the laypeople and the clerics, including the realm of sexual matters.

Aug., *Ep*. 11 (Divjak); M. Moreau, *Lecture de la lettre 11 de Consentius à Augustin. Un pastiche hagiographique*, in *Les lettres de saint Augustin découvertes par J. Divjak*, Paris 1983, 215-223; Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 279-280; Vives, *Concilios*, 50-60; G. Martínez Díez, *La colección canónica hispana*, IV, Madrid 1984, 287-311; Orlandís, *Concilios*, 124-131; J. Yeguas i Gassó, *El concili provincial visigótic de Lleida en el 546*: AST 67/2 (1994) 525-535; M. Guallar Pérez, *Los concilios tarraconenses celebrados en Lérida*, Lérida 1975.

P. de Luis

LÉRINS. In ancient times Lerina or Lerinus or also Planasia (due to its flat topography), archipelago be-

tween Cannes and Antibes composed of two principal islands (Sainte-Marguerite and Saint-Honorat) and two tiny ones (Tradelière and St-Féréol). The archipelago was inhabited in antiquity, first by the Ligurians and later on during the Roman period. The smaller of the two principal islands (the perimeter is ca. 3 km [1.9 mi]) of the Provençal coast became, in the first years of the 400s, seat of a monastery—a small monastic center, among the oldest in the West—founded by *Honoratus, later bishop of *Arles. Today it bears his name: Saint-Honorat. In the succeeding decades ascetics of great personality and mostly of aristocratic extraction flowed there, even from distant regions; they made of it the most active and prestigious ascetic center of Provence and created new forms of teaching and of Christian and monastic spirituality there, sometimes considered—falsely—infected by the so-called *semi-Pelagian heresy. Of an ancient Lerinian rule, dating back to the founder himself, about which there have been multiple hypotheses, no certain testimonies remain. According to A. de Vogüé (SC 297, 21-177) this should be identified with the *Regula quattuor Patrum,* the first and largest of the *Regulae SS. Patrum,* a collection of five short writings, sometimes extremely short, which have reached us anonymously and without any indication of either time or place of redaction. The *Regula quattuor Patrum* is composed of four discourses (five, in a later redaction), attributed to famous Egyptian ascetics (*Serapion, *Macarius, *Paphnutius and again Macarius), under whose names Honoratus, Caprasius, his companion in the first ascetic wanderings and later in the settlement at Lérins, and the diocesan bishop Leontius of Fréjus are celebrated. Lérins provided a large number of bishops to central-southern *Gaul in the 5th and 6th c., among whom, in addition to Honoratus himself, we can mention *Eucherius of Lyons, his son *Salonius of Geneva, *Maximus and *Faustus of Riez, *Hilary of Arles, *Lupus of Troyes, *Caesarius and Virgilius of Arles. Some of them, and others like *Salvian of Marseille (see Pricoco: Siculorum Gymnasium 29 [1976] 351-368) and *Vincent, the author of the *Commonitorium,* were among the most notable ecclesiastical writers of their time. In the 7th c. the abbot Aigulf replaced their rule with that of St. Benedict, but he was killed for this act. In the following centuries, through the changed conditions of the region and the Saracen incursions, the monastery declined. It seems that in the 8th c. the abbot Porcarius II and the monks were massacred by the Saracens. Lérins was sacked multiple times by pirates of diverse origins. During the French Revolution the island was confiscated and sold at auction. Repurchased in 1859 by the bishop of Fréjus, it is today the seat of a Cistercian abbey with about thirty monks of various nationalities.

L. Alliez, *Histoire du monastère de Lérins*, Paris 1862; H. Moris, *L'Abbaye de Lérins. Histoire et monuments*, Paris 1909; A.C. Cooper-Marsdin, *The History of the Islands of the Lerins*, Cambridge 1913; L. Cristiani, *Lérins et ses Fondateurs*, S. Wandrille 1946; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Munich 1965, 47-87; S. Pricoco, *Modelli di santità a Lerino*: Siculorum Gymnasium 27 (1974) 54-88; Id., *L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978; A. de Vogüé, *Les Règles des Saints Pères. Intr., Texte, tr. et notes*, SC 297-298, Paris 1982; Id., *Aux origines de Lérins: la règle de saint Basile?*: StudMon 31 (1989) 259-266; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Darmstadt [2]1988; R. Nouailhat, *Saints et Patrons. Les premiers moines de Lérins*, Paris 1988; R. Nürnberg, *Askese als sozialer Impuls. Monastische-asketische Spiritualität als Wurzel und Triebfeder sozialer Ideen und Aktivitäten der Kirche in Sudgallien im 5. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1988; M. Clavel-Lévêque - R. Nouailhat, *Les premiers moines de Lérins: régulation et normalisation du christianisme*, in Mélanges Pierre Lévêque, Paris 1990, IV, 99-113; C.M. Kasper, *Theologie und Askese: die Spiritualität des Inselmönchtums von Lérins im 5. Jahrhundert*, Münster 1991; M. Labrousse, *Saint Honorat fondateur de Lérins et évêque d'Arles: étude et traduction de textes d'Hilaire d'Arles, Fauste de Riez et Césaire d'Arles*, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1995; P. Moret, *Planesiai, îles erratiques de l'Occident grec*: REG 110 (1997) 25-56; C. Leyser, *"This Sainted Isle": Panegyric, Nostalgia and the Invention of Lerinian Monasticism*, in W.E. Klingshim - M. Vessey (eds.), *Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R.A. Markus*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 188-206; C. Scherliess, *Literatur und "conversio": literarische Formen im monastischen Umkreis des Klosters von Lérins*, Bern 2000; F. Prinz, *Zur neuesten Forschungsgeschichte von Lérins*, in *Munera amicitiae. Studi offerti a S. Pricoco*, Soveria Mannelli 2003, 372-378.

S. Pricoco

LETTER (Epistle). Born in the immediacy of real life, early letters had no literary pretensions, serving an intermediary function, putting two persons separated by distance into communication with one another (*epistula sermo absentium*: Ambr., *Ep.* 66,1 and 47,4). The private letter is therefore as old as writing itself; while the transformation of the letter into a literary genre occurred much later, taking place with the composition of the first *epistolaries*, which were indeed collections of private letters, but destined for publication. According to the circumstances and the subject matter, the letter was then set into well-defined rhetorical modules, respecting a whole series of precise rules, as is testified by the epistolaries of Cicero and of Seneca, and codified in the treatise of Julius Victor (*Ars rhet.* 27). The distinction between private letters (*litterae*), addressed to a specific person in a personal form as a means of simple communication, and public letters (*epistulae*), composed with a view toward publication in an inten-

tionally literary tone, is already clear in the epistolary of Cicero (*Fam.* XV, 21,4) and deepens later in Christian literature. However, very many private letters, theoretically confidential, have also reached us, sometimes published by the authors themselves, who gathered them into collections.

In the Christian society of the first centuries, epistolography, characterized by essentially practical goals in comparison with the contemporary pagan literature, was cultivated with attention and special care, often being the only method of keeping the contacts alive between the pastor and the distant Christian community. This is the case, e.g., of the letters included in the NT, originally addressed to a particular community, then circulated throughout the Christian world for the edification and support of the faithful; and of some writings of the subapostolic era, such as the letter sent by *Clement of *Rome to the church of Corinth around 96, in which the form and the style reflect a *first attempt at* literary elaboration; or the corpus of the seven *Ignatian letters, in which the thirst for martyrdom and the profound religious enthusiasm are translated into lyrical and powerfully original language. The internal organization of the church soon required the development of an ample epistolary correspondence of official tenor (the episcopal letters), intended to safeguard the purity of doctrine and to offer to the Christian community the normative criteria for the preservation of orthodox faith. These are true and proper "open letters," informational and instructional writings which have only the epistolary form in common with the letter; the form has furthermore become an accessory ornament, in which the mention of an addressee serves as a mere literary pretext to develop a theme of general interest. Apart from the case of the letter to the Hebrews, in which every reference of a personal character is missing, it is enough to cite the *Epistle of Ps.-*Barnabas,* a true and proper doctrinal treatise with strong moral preoccupations, engaged in anti-Jewish polemic on the basis of *allegorical *exegesis; the *Letter to Diognetus,* one of the highest examples of Christian apologetic, which illustrates to the pagan addressee the superiority of the new religion in prose animated by a burning faith and supported by a perfect knowledge of rhetoric; the gnostic Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* is a clever work of heretical propaganda preserved by *Epiphanius (PG 41, 558-568), written in a prose of admirable formal elegance.

Christian epistolography, both in Greek and Latin environments, developed in an entirely particular way between the 3rd and 5th c., strongly reflecting the influences of the rhetorical schools; the letter as a literary genre took on, then, all the formal characteristics of artistic prose, practiced as the most appropriate means of putting one's own literary talent to the test. *Ep.* 51 of *Gregory of Nazianzus to Nicobolus can be considered a true and proper epistolographic treatise, a testimony to the lively interest for the genre in his time, in which with lucid clarity the criteria are enumerated which should inform the composition of a letter. The formal preoccupations are particularly evident in the great Christian epistolaries of the 4th c.: the three Cappadocians and *John Chrysostom among the Greeks prove it, as do *Ambrose, *Jerome and *Augustine among the Latins. In these epistolary collections—whose publication was often undertaken by the author or while the author was still alive—there is place for both the *familiares* letters, intimate correspondence in which Christian friendship often produced moments of lyrical effusion, and the *negotiales* letters, official correspondence in which the most varied doctrinal and disciplinary questions are faced; these letters are always valuable historical documents, which throw light on the political-religious events of the era, offering precise information on incidents, persons and situations otherwise unknown to us.

Let us mention finally that, on the example of the rhetor Ausonius who was his teacher, *Paulinus of Nola introduced into Christian literature the artistic form of the epistle in verse, of epithalamic and consolatory content, in which the alternation of meters and the frequent Virgilian reminiscences testify to the strict dependence on the classical tradition.

Some kinds of Christian letters have a specific goal: (1) The festal letters, typical of the Alexandrian church; i.e., the letters concerning the correct date of the celebration of Easter, sent at the beginning of the year by the bishop of Alexandria to all the dioceses depending on him and some sees around the Mediterranean. These letters—starting from *Dionysus in the 3rd c. until the 8th—were reproduced in many copies in the episcopal chancellery in the original Greek. In reality they did not limit themselves to an announcement, but also confronted contemporary themes. Other sees, also, such as Rome, wrote letters to indicate the date of the next Easter, but they never had a similar importance. (2) The *litterae communionis,* which had different purposes: their bearer had obtained an attestation from his bishop, who guaranteed his orthodoxy and therefore his acceptance on the part of other Christian communities. (3) Synodal letters redacted by a synod to announce the results to the faithful and to other bishops. (4) Letters of recommendation of various kinds, such as the letters of intercession to the civil authorities to re-

quest mercy toward some disgraced unfortunate.

The letter was easy to falsify, a very delicate problem, and they were in fact falsified. Very different is *pseudepigraphy, when the true author attributes the text to another personage of the past. (For this problem, *see* *falsification.) St. Paul affirmed that letters were circulating under his name (2 Th 2:2), and Jerome lamented that letters were attributed to him which were not his (*Apologia* 3,25).

DACL 8, 2683-2885; PWK Suppl. V, 186-220 (Stuttgart 1931); RAC 2, 564-585; AL 2, 893-1057; G. Ghedini, *Lettere cristiane dai papiri greci del III e IV secolo*, Milan 1923; D. Gorce, *Les voyages, l'hospitalité et le port des lettres dans le monde chrétien des IV*[e] *et V*[e] *siècles*, Paris 1925; A. von Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung des Apostel Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christ. Briefsammlungen*, Leipzig 1926; A.H.R. Bastiaensen, *Le Cérémonial épistolaire des chrétiens latins*, Nijmegen 1964; G. Scarpat, *Epistolografia. Introduzione allo Studio della Cultura classica*, I, Milan 1972, 475-512; G. Tibiletti, *Le lettere private nei papiri greci del III e IV sec. d.C. Tra paganesimo e cristianesimo*, Milan 1979; Chan-Hie Kim, *Form and Structure of Greek Familiar Letter of Recommendation*, Ann Arbor, MI 1985; A.J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, Atlanta, GA 1988; P. Cugusi, *L'epistolografia*, in *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, II, Rome 1989, 379-441; L. Mondin, *Per la storia dell'epistolografia latina tardoantica: le lettere di Ausonio*, in *Miscellanea di studi in occasione del 50° anniversario di fondazione dell'Istituto*, Rome 1990, 107-149; S. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und seiner Kreis: prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart 1992; Ph. Bruggisser, *Symmaque ou le rituel épistolaire de l'amitié littéraire*, Fribourg 1993; F. Morenzoni, *Epistolografia e "artes dictandi,"* in *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo*, Rome 1994, II, 443-463; M. Zelzer, *Der Brief in der Spätantike: Überlegungen zu einem literarischen Genos am Beispiel der Briefsammlung des Sidonius Apollinaris*: WS 107/108 (1994-1995) 541-551; M. Naldini, *Il cristianesimo in Egitto. Lettere private nei papiri dei secoli II-IV*, Florence 1998; *Letters of Condolence in Greek Papyri*, ed. and tr. J. Chapa, Florence 1998; C. Conybeare, *Paulinus Noster—Self and Symbols in the Letters of Paulinus of Nola*, Oxford 2000; B. Conring, *Hieronymus als Briefschreiber: Ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie*, Tübingen 2001; *Il "Liber epistolarum" della cancelleria austrasica* (*sec. V-VI*), text, It. tr. and comm. by E. Malaspina, Rome 2001; E. Giannarelli, *Un genere letterario senza confini: l'epistolografia negli autori cristiani di IV e V secolo*, in *Forme letterarie nella produzione latina di IV e V secolo*, ed. F.E. Consolino, Rome 2003, 33-52.

M.P. Ciccarese

LETTER About SUNDAY. Sunday is the center of the Christian liturgical celebration; festive repose is not required, but only worship; the imperial laws imposed that on this day there be no spectacles. In the 5th c. the law on the sabbath repose began to be applied to Sunday. In the context of this evolution is located the *Letter About Sunday,* which was supposedly sent by Christ and fell from the sky (at *Rome in St. Peter's or at *Jerusalem or at *Bethlehem, acc. to the redactions). This prescribes that every baptized person should honor and celebrate Sunday, while "the man is cursed who does not honor the holy day of Sunday from the ninth hour of Saturday until dawn on Monday" (Erbetta, 117). The original of the text must have been Greek, but it had enormous diffusion in a constellation of translations in various languages, revisions and adjustments. The *Latin version was strongly condemned by Licinianus of Cartagena (d. around 602). Presumably the letter was written between the 5th and 6th c.; acc. to the opinion of van Esbroeck it was written in Jerusalem in the middle of the 5th c.

CANT 311; F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, Madrid 1940, I, 121-123; Erbetta 3, 11-118; M. Bittner, *Der vom Himmel gefallene Brief Christi in seinem morgenländischen Versionen und Rezensionen*, Vienna 1906; A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios apócrifos*, Madrid 1963, 664-679; DACL 3, 1434-1546; M. van Esbroeck, *La lettre sur le dimanche, descendue du ciel*: AB 107 (1989) 267-287.

A. Di Berardino

LETTER of LENTULUS (so-called). A fragment of a chronicle transformed into a letter (both forms exist) of an unknown Lentulus, who describes the exterior form of Christ, completing therefore the gospels and the apocrypha. This description is not the first (a list is in E. von Dobschütz) but the most popular in the West, and it survives until today in popular culture. The text comes from the 12th–14th c., linked to the cult of the humanity of Christ, developed in this period. The text was published for the first time by Ludolf of Saxony (d. 1378) in his *Life of Jesus*. There are translations into various languages: Greek, *Syriac, *Armenian, Irish, paleo-Slavic etc.

CANT 310; BHL 4151-2; E. v. Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*: TU 18 (1898) 308-330; Tr.: Eng. Elliott 542; It. Erbetta 3, 137; Moraldi 3, 11-20; Pol.: Starowieyski 3, 112-114; J.N. Pérès, *Untersuchungen im Zusammenhang mit der sogenannten "Epistula Lentuli"*: Apocrypha 11 (2000) 59-75.

M. Starowieyski

LETTER of the CHURCH of LYONS and VIENNE. A summary and large sections of this letter have been preserved by *Eusebius (*HE* 5, 1-4). It was written a little after the persecution of 177, in the name of the Christians of *Vienne and *Lyons, very likely by *Irenaeus (see SC 100, 260-261), who was himself originally from *Smyrna. It was addressed to the churches of *Asia and *Phrygia and contained a long account of the passion of the martyrs of Lyons. It has often been believed that it was written exclusively for this purpose, but the summary which Eusebius gives of

the conclusion of the letter (*HE* 5, 3-4) demonstrates that it was intended to intervene in a conflict which had originated in those churches on the question of whether the *lapsi* should be pardoned or not; it showed, on the example of the martyrs of Lyons, that indulgence should be exercised. This suggests that the church of Lyons had received messengers from the churches of Asia who had come to report the controversy and to request help. The letter was accompanied by a note written by the martyrs themselves and by a list of them (preserved by *Gregory of Tours).

P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens*, Paris 1961, 33-64; A. Audion - T.D. Barnes et al., *Les martyrs de Lyon*, Paris 1978, 129-133, 155-166, 249-256; J. Pouilloux (ed.), *Les martyrs de Lyon* (*177*), Paris 1978.

P. Nautin

LETTER TO SIGEBERT III or CLOVIS II (ca. 645). Living in 7th-c. Gaul, an anonymous author wrote a letter ca. 645 to King Sigebert III (d. 656) or his brother Clovis II (d. 657) in a typically Merovingian Latin, exhorting him to govern always bearing in mind the fundamental values of the Christian ruler as displayed in the biblical kings *David and *Solomon, as well as in his ancestors Childebert I (d. 558) and *Chlothar I (d. 561).

CPL 1306; PL 87, 653-658; W. Gundlach, ed., MGH, Epp. III, Berlin 1892, 457-460; repr. in CCL 117, Turnhout 1957, 491-496; Patrologia IV, 350.

P. Marone

LETTERS (apocryphal). Among the apocrypha of the NT is a group of writings called "Letters." Some of these letters are treatises (*Epistle of Ps.-Titus, Letter of the Apostles*), fragments of works (**Letter of Lentulus*), historical accounts (*Letters of Pilate and Herod*), reports (*Anaphora Pilati*) and finally texts in the form of true and proper letters such as the correspondence of Christ and Abgar, of Seneca and Paul, the letter of St. Paul to the Alexandrians, to the Laodiceans or even the correspondence of St. Paul with the Corinthians. Some of these letters make up part of another apocrypha. (The correspondence with the Corinthians is part of the *Acts of Paul;* the correspondence of Christ and Abgar is linked with the *Acts of Thaddeus.*) Some letters are found in multiple apocrypha: the letter of Pilate to Claudius is found in the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii,* in the *Gospel of Nicodemus,* in the *Acts of Peter and Paul* etc. Some letters are orthodox, others not, as e.g., the gnostic letters in the collection of texts of *Nag Hammadi (letters of James). The letters can be employed as introductory texts (the letters of Jerome and Heliodorus in the *Gospel of Ps.-Matthew,* the letters of Peter and Clement in the *Ps.-Clementines*). The **Letter About Sunday* makes a special case—a letter sent by God himself. In the collections of apocrypha normally medieval letters too are found, such as those of Mary (to the inhabitants of Florence or Messina) or also the so-called **Letter of Lentulus*.

CANT 305-311; see also the part dedicated to the apocryphal letters of the great collections of apocrypha: of Schneemelcher (vol. 2), Elliott, Erbetta (vol. 3), Moraldi (vol. 3), Starowieyski (vol. 3) and the crit. ed. of the texts in which they are inserted.

M. Starowieyski

LETTERS of COMMUNION

I. Letters of communion among the churches - II. Letters of communion for Christians who travel from their own church to another - III. The varied names of the letters of communion.

As *Ignatius of Antioch said (*Ep. ad Smyrn.* 8,2) already at the beginning of the 2nd c., where there is a bishop, a local church exists, with its autonomy and its episcopal monarchy. In reality the different churches did not coexist juxtaposed among themselves, but they were united through a unique communion which joined in itself hundreds of bishops—with their churches—into a great body. Words such as κοινωνία, εἰρήνη, ἀγάπη, *communio, communicatio* or *pax,* together with many others, allude to the same concept of unity, manifested fundamentally in the eucharistic communion, although there are also links of belonging to the catechumenate or the *ordo paenitentium.* To preserve the unity of all the churches, formed in communion, the church—or, better put, the episcopate—took advantage, from the beginning, of documents of an epistolary character, both to validate the communion between the churches—or between the different bishops—and to guarantee communion to Christians, lay or ecclesiastical, who transferred from one church to another.

I. Letters of communion among the churches. *Tertullian (*De praescr.* 36,4) uses the verbal form *contessero* to refer to the full cohesion and connection existing between the Roman church and the African churches: the use of classical legal language relative to the contracted bonds of association is adapted to express the belonging to the same faith and the same society. *Cyprian (*Ep.* 59,9) notifies his colleague Cornelius of the names of the orthodox African bishops so that not only the Roman but also the other bishops might know whom they should

deal with for the reception and dispatch of letters of communion. The Council of *Antioch (268) informed Pope *Dionysius and Bishop *Maximus of Alexandria that the successor of *Paul of Samosata was *Domnus, so that the latter might receive letters of communion from the two great sees. These testimonies show how, in communion, the apostolic churches—and esp. the Roman—were, for a long time, a clear reference for the others; this because the *communio* had two aspects, the sacramental and the legal-customary. As a matter of fact, a church that was in communion with Rome was also in communion with the entire *Catholic Church; *Ambrose (*Ep*. 5 [*extra coll.*], 4) formulated this principle clearly in affirming that the rights of communion come from the Roman church. This communion which has its vertebral column at *Rome was employed, with force, in the different religious and political conflicts, particularly in *Africa divided between Catholics and *Donatists: Optatus (*C. Parm. Donat*. 2,3) says that through an exchange of letters all the bishops lived in communion with the bishop of Rome and each other.

Even if it is not possible to specify their frequency, the interecclesial letters of communion must have been written above all when changes in the possession of the sees took place: Cyprian (*Ep*. 45,1) informs the African bishops of the election of Cornelius and invites them to send letters to the Roman bishop; *Theophilus of Alexandria (*apud* Jerome, *Ep*. 98,26) notifies the episcopate of his patriarchate of the names of the new Egyptian bishops so that they might exchange letters of communion with one another. In general terms, the bishops had to be up to date on who their legitimate colleagues in other sees were. In principle, every titulary of an episcopal see should have had available a list of bishops who were in communion with him; this was true, at least, for the most important churches, esp. for the Roman and, starting from the 4th c., for the metropolitan churches.

II. Letters of communion for Christians who travel from their own church to another. As happened for any integrated social group in the Roman Empire, each local church had to keep, in normal circumstances, a register of its members. For the functioning of the entire church the correct distribution of the Christians within a territory was fundamental, from the catechumens to the bishop—with two great groups, the baptized and the clerics—including the categories which corresponded to irregular situations—e.g., that of penitents—all of which normally brought with them the loss of communion. This register, actualized or reproduced in the diptychs or liturgical books, was the axis around which the life and religious practice of the members of any society turned. The Christians who, for whatever reason, left their church—in which they had received baptism or were still to receive it—and went to another had to demonstrate both their communion and their category in order to maintain their rank with the functions which were proper to them and, in addition, assure themselves of material assistance in case of necessity.

The first canon on this subject belongs to the first Council of *Arles (314): baptized provincial governors had to obtain letters of communion before arriving in the place where they were to exercise their charge (can. 7). The Council of *Antioch (341) also alludes to the obligation of these "passports": no stranger can be received ἄνευ εἰρηνικῶν (can. 7). The individual letters of communion were, without doubt, used long before these canons were formulated, in which the importance appears reflected which these documents had for the episcopate. There are some brief missives of communion, on papyrus or parchment, preserved in the Egyptian desert and dated, by paleography, between the middle of the 3rd and the beginning of the 5th c., which were written between ecclesiastics to recommend the baptized and the catechumens who traveled from one place to another. This Egyptian correspondence demonstrates how both the presbyters—or, perhaps, also the deacons—and the bishops could grant or receive such letters when the travelers were laypeople. In accordance with what was established at the Council of Antioch, concerning the stipulation of the canon through which the rural priests could not grant letters of communion, nothing is said about urban priests or those closer to the bishop. Passing on to the 4th c., the wish is evident to consider the concession of letters of communion as a special competence of the bishop: so stipulates can. 7 of a Carthaginian council (345–348), in reference both to laypeople and to clerics. The later synodal or papal decisions in this regard, with exclusive reference to ecclesiastics or to the people, insist that it should be the corresponding bishop who gives the letters of communion. However, from the end of the 4th c., some African councils established that the bishops could not travel without letters attesting their rank: this practice was still alive, in general terms in the *Gaul of the 5th and 6th c., considering that some pontiffs—and in particular *Zosimus and *Pelagius I—wanted to centralize to the supermetropolitan bishops or their vicars the concession of letters of communion to any cleric.

The progressive increase of this control is also made evident by the fact that some resolutions imposed, from the beginning of the 5th c., that in the letters of communion there be present, together with the signature, the date of Easter of the year in question, with the adaptation of the paschal calculation in use in the imperial chancellery. Repeated disputes of a normative character allude to the consideration that this habit must have grown in the receiving churches in order to avoid possible deceptions—the Council of *Nîmes (394 or 396) or the *Ep.* 129 of *Basil of Caesarea reveal that frauds were habitual. In the *Canones apostolorum* (can. 33) it is prohibited to receive foreign bishops, priests and deacons without letters, and it is decreed that, if they should have the letters with them, they must exhibit them to avoid every possible trickery, although it then specifies that the fact of not having such letters is sufficient to motivate the exclusion from communion, but not from physical provisioning. In this regard, *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Orat.* 4; *C. Iul.* 1,111) and *Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.* 5,16) recount that Julian wanted to gain the goodwill of foreigners through a sort of imitation of the Christian practice of the letters of communion.

III. The varied names of the letters of communion. In relation with the letters of communion, can. 11 of the Council of *Chalcedon (451) stipulates that only the poor should receive εἰρηνικαί, and that the συστατικαί should be conceded to persons of note. This distinction in the quality of the bearer, between simple letters of communion and letters of recommendation—the latter more personal and less stereotypical—reveals how much the letters granted to travelers could present, among themselves, notable differences as to their redaction, extension and content, although all had a common principle in demonstrating that their bearer was in communion with their own church and, therefore, in requesting to obtain communion—lay or ecclesiastical—in the receiving church. In all cases they were letters of communion to be included despite how short or long they might be, in the great and varied group of the letters of recommendation or of introduction. In other words, the letters of communion were always of recommendation (συστατικαί), and many letters of recommendation were at the same time letters of communion (εἰρηνικαί).

This aspect explains why the letters of communion are referred to by Greek patristic and conciliar sources with the terms εἰρηνικαί, κοινωνικαί and συστατικαί. However, it is at the same time evident how every letter of communion is, in its turn, included in the larger category of canonical letters, the reason for which said letters are also, with a certain frequency, designated as κανονικαί. These terms have, logically, their Latin equivalents: *pacificae, communicatoriae, commendaticiae* and *canonicae*. Another very common Latin designation is *formatae,* an adjective derived from *formo,* and alluding, therefore, to the fact that the letters of communion usually conformed to a predetermined disposition, redaction or form, a fact already demonstrated in the Egyptian letters discussed above. It is necessary nonetheless to point out another consideration linked to the fact that in some Gallican councils the term *apostolia* emerges, an expression which probably alludes to the apostolic communion. In addition, the letters of communion are designated, sometimes, through the generic terms *litterae* or *epistolae*—*epistolia* furthermore appears in some Latin texts—in the same manner as the Greek sources, where, often, they are simply mentioned with the term ἐπιστολαί or another similar word.

From this vocabulary a technical or specific use of the same cannot be recognized, certainly: the use of these designations does not allow us to differentiate modalities or categories within the letters of communion. All the Greek designations listed above are documented during the first half of the 4th c. The same thing does not seem, however, to happen in the Latin environment; the term *pacificae* appears from the time of *Damasus and *canonicae* in Latin translations of Greek canons. As for the adjective *commendaticiae*—the exact translation of συστατικαί—it is not attested in canons originating in Latin until the 2nd half of the 5th c. On the other hand, *communicatoriae* exists in Latin texts from the beginning of the 4th c. until the times of *Augustine; from the end of the 4th c. in the West the term *apostolia* is documented, although the verbal adjective *formatae,* much used starting from the Theodosian era, imposed itself clearly.

C. Fabricius, *Die* Litterae Formatae *im Frühmittelalter*: Archiv für Urkundenforschung 9 (1926) 39-86, 168-194; H. Leclercq, *Litterae commendatitiae et formatae*: DACL 9, 2, 1571-1576; L. Hertling, Communio. *Chiesa e papato nell'Antichitá cristiana*, Rome 1961; M. Naldini, *Il cristianesimo in Egitto. Lettere private nei papiri dei secoli II-IV*, Fiesole [2]1998; T.M. Teeter, *Letters of Recommendation or Letters of Peace?*, in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses*, II, Berlin 1997 (Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 3), 954-960; J. Vilella, In alia plebe*: las cartas de comunión en las iglesias de la Antigüedad*, in *Correspondances, Documents pour l'Histoire de l'Antiquité Tardive*, Lyons 2009.

J. Vilella

LEUCIUS CARINUS (3rd c.?). A person otherwise unknown, *Epiphanius speaks of one Leucius, disciple of John and enemy of the gnostic *Cerinthus (*Adv. Haer.* V, 1,6: PG 41, 897) and therefore among the orthodox (see *Pacian of Barcelona, PL 13). However, some apocryphal *Acts* circulated under his name as early as the 4th c., which were used in *Africa by the *Manicheans, and not accepted by the *Catholics (Augustine, *C. Faustum* 30,4; *Acta disp. cum Felice* 2,6: PL 41, 539; *De fide c. man.* 38: PL 41, 1150; *Filaster, *Haer.* 88,6; Pope *Innocent, *Ep.* 1,6). These texts may have been composed in the 3rd c. They were known also in the East (Epiphanius, *Adv. haer.* 2,6: PG 41, 898). Turibius speaks only of the *Acta Johannis* attributed to Leucius (PL 54, 694). The **Decretum gelasianum* condemns the *libri omnes, quos fecit Leucius, discipulus diaboli* (Mansi 8, 150) without offering a list of them. Ps.-Melito, living in the 5th–6th c., identified the writer Leucius with the disciple of John (*De transitu Mariae*, prol.). The *Acts of Pilate* consider Leucius and Carinus as different people. At the time of *Photius the two names were united to refer to one person; in fact, he speaks of having read a volume of Leucius Carinus containing *The Travels of the Apostles,* i.e., of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas and Paul (*Bibl.,* cod. 114). Photius's judgment on the content and the style of the work is markedly negative.

Erbetta 2, 16-20; E. Junod - J.-D. Kaestli, *Histoire des Actes apocryphes des apôtres du III^e au IX^e siècles: le cas des Actes de Jean*, Geneva 1982, 137-143; *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Scheneemelcher, Westminster 1992, II, 87-100.

A. Di Berardino

LEX ROMANA BURGUNDIONUM. This compilation was issued by the king Gundobad of Burgundy (474–516), perhaps after his defeat at the hands of *Clovis, for the Roman subjects of his kingdom. It applied to the Burgundians as the **Lex Romana Visigothorum* applied to the *Visigoth kingdom. It was also based on Roman statutes: the Gregorian, Hermogenian and Theodosian Codes, the sentences of Paul, and the institutes of Gaius. Its sources are reworked in a unitary text that is frequently based on *interpretationes* that are either identical or very close to those that accompany the text of the Roman-Visigothic law. The collection, however, is not so important or useful as the *Lex Romana Visigothorum,* neither from the point of view of knowledge of Roman law, nor from that of the history of medieval law.

CPL 1803; MGH, Leges III, 525; B. Saitta, *I Burgundi* (413-534), Catania 1977, G.L. Falchi, *La codificazione del diritto romano nel V e VI secolo*, Rome 1989; A. De Palma, *Lessico della Lex Romana Burgundionum*, in collaboration with G. Melillo - C. Pennacchio, Naples 1992, 11-247; G. Bauer-Gerland, *Das Erbrecht der Lex Romana Burgundionum,* Berlin 1995.

A. Di Berardino

LEX ROMANA VISIGOTHORUM – Breviarium Alaricianum. A compilation of Roman *leges* and *iura,* made on order of Alaric II (484–507), son of *Euric, in *Gaul and promulgated on 2 Feb 506. Before the start of the 16th c. it was called *Lex Romana Visigothorum,* but today more commonly *Breviarium Alaricianum*. Alaric had it compiled for the Roman subjects of his kingdom, but not for the Goths, because he did not want Gothic law to apply to the Romans. The compilation was approved and confirmed by the bishops. A copy was sent to every *comes* (*ut in foro tuo nulla alia lex neque iuris formula proferri vel recipe praesumatur*), while the original was kept in the capital, *Toulouse.

The authors of this collection (bishops and nobles) were interested solely in legislation relevant to them, and so overlooked texts no longer topical. They drew esp. from CTh, from the *Novellae* in that code, from the Gregorian and Hermogenian codes, from the sentences of Paul, from the Epitome of Gaius etc. The laws are accompanied by an *interpretatio,* to make them comprehensible. The breviarium is very important for the knowledge of Roman law and had great importance in medieval Europe.

CPL 1800; M.-B. Brugguière, *Littérature et Droit dans la Gaule du V^e siècle*, Paris 1974; G.L. Falchi, *La codificazione del diritto romano nel V e VI secolo*, Rome 1989; R. Lambertini, *La codificazione di Alarico II*, Turin 1990, 1991² (IURA 41 [1990] 163-168); R.W. Mathisen, *The "Second Council of Arles" and the Spirit of Compilation and Codification in Late Roman Gaul:* JECS 5 (1997) 511-554.

A. Di Berardino

LIBANIUS (314–393/404). Greek rhetorician and sophist, pagan, born at *Antioch of Syria in 314. He studied rhetoric in Athens at the school of the African Diophantus, alongside *Basil the Great and *Gregory of Nazianzus. He taught at *Constantinople, at *Nicomedia and finally in Antioch (354), where he died (393 or 404). He was an admirer and friend of the emperor *Julian, whom he had known at Nicomedia and whom he supported in his attempt to restore pagan Hellenism. At Antioch he had among his pupils *Amphilochius of Iconium, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and perhaps *John Chrysostom (Soz., *HE* VIII, 2,5ff.); of this last he was a

great admirer (Soz., *HE* VIII, 2,2; Isid. Pel., *Ep.* II, 42), although Chrysostom rebutted *Or.* 60 of Libanius with his *De s. Babyla* (ch. 1.8ff.) and in 21 discourses *On the Statues* dealt in the opposite way with the same question which Libanius treated in his defense of the citizens of Antioch before the Emperor *Theodosius I (*Or.* 19-23). Libanius left a great quantity of works: discourses (of which eight, *Or.* 12-18 and 24, relate to Emperor Julian), declamations, oratorical exercises and letters; in all these an interest in the form prevails. The authenticity of his correspondence with Basil (Foerster XI, 572-597; PG 32, 1077-1100) is the object of many discussions.

Libanii opera, ed. R. Foerster, 12 vols., Leipzig 1903-1923; PWK 12, 2485-2551; P. Petit, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IVe siècle après J.-C.*, Paris 1955; A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne*, Paris 1959; H.-U. Wiemer, *Libanios und Julian: Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Politik im vierten Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Munich 1995; KLP 3, 612-615 (bibl.).

A. Pollastri

LIBELLI MIRACULORUM. Brief contemporary narrative accounts of miracles, written or related by those directly affected by them, or by eyewitnesses. The start of the tradition is linked to the spread of the cult of St. *Stephen. The first example may be reckoned the letter of *Severus of Minorca (BHL 7859; PL 41,833-854; dated 3 Feb 418), which recounts several miracles that occurred on the island, bringing about the conversion of Jews. The second is the *De *miraculis Sancti Stephani,* a collection of accounts of healing miracles worked through the relics of the saint, which is contained in two small books dating from about 425. *Augustine of Hippo, desiring to gather together and publicize miracles of his day, called for the preparation of *libelli* to be read publicly to the people for their edification. Many of these miracles were recounted in the *De civitate Dei* (22,8). The strategy of reading the *libelli miraculorum* publicly, favored by Augustine and widespread in the other African churches, created a climate of expectation and enthusiasm; sometimes they were read in the presence of those cured, so that everyone could see, touch and hear them (*Sermon* 319,8). In Hippo alone, in the space of less than two years, about seventy physical healings were recorded, with Augustine certain even then that "not many of the miracles have been written down" (*Civ. Dei* 22,8). The collection of miracles continued also in the following centuries (see Vuolo).

H. Delehaye, *Les premiers 'libelli miraculorum'*: AB 29 (1910) 427-434; Id., *Les recueils antiques des miracles des saints*: AB 43 (1925) 5-85; 305-325; BA 37,835-837; A. Vuolo, *I "libelli miraculorum" tra religiosià e politica* (Napoli, sec. IX-XII), Naples 1990; Id., Yvette Duval, *Sur la genèse des Libelli miraculorum*: REAug 52 (2006) 97-12 ; J. Meyers, *Les miracles de saint Etienne. Recherches sur le recueil pseudo-augustinien* (*BHL 7860-7861*), *avec édition critique, traduction et commentaire*, Turnhout 2006.

A. Di Berardino

LIBELLUS. The term *libellus* has a great variety of meanings, extending from the diminutive of *liber* (book), to that of a piece of defamatory writing, to that of a bill of indictment. As a technical term it indicates an act or a document relating to the exercise of authority, in either a petition made to someone in authority or a certificate released by that authority. In the specifically Christian context, we can distinguish three types of *libelli*: (1) a *libellus* in the form of a certificate, (2) *libellus pacis,* (3) *libellus missarum*.

1. *Libellus*. A certificate released, during the *Decian persecution, by the Roman authorities, in which it is attested that a certain person had sacrificed to the gods (often obtained by paying). In its structure it followed a formulary typical of a rescript: the text of the petitioner who affirmed having offered the sacrifice, the names of the witnesses and the signature of the competent official of the place. Many *libelli* have been found, since 1893 onward, in the Egyptian desert (see DACL 6, 317-332; 9, 80-85), the last published in 1991. In general, they were issued to everyone. However, *Cyprian gives the name *libellatici* to those Christians who had obtained the *libellus* either by paying or by other means, without having actually made the cultic act to the gods, as had the *thurificati* and the *sacrificati*, who had thus formally committed apostasy (see Cypr., *Ep.* 20,2: CSEL 3, 527; Ep. 55 [passim]: CSEL 3, 624-648). The fault of the *libellatici* was considered less serious than the other two categories, but was still a fault which had to be expiated by penance (*see *lapsi*, problem of the).

2. *Libellus pacis*. During the Decian persecution those who had apostatized in some way had to undergo canonical penance; some, however, wanted to be reconciled immediately (see Cypr., *Ep.* 19,2: CSEL 3, 525; *Ep.* 34,1: CSEL 3, 566; *Ep.* 55,4: CSEL 3, 626). In these circumstances the *martyres* or *confessores* (terms at the time interchangeable) passed letters of recommendation for the *lapsi* to the leaders of the community, acc. to a practice by then well established. However, at least in this case, certain abuses emerged: collective recommendations (see Cypr., *Ep.* 23: CSEL 3, 536); letters given without specifying who was to be reconciled (Cypr., *Ep.* 15,4: CSEL 3, 516); letters granting reconciliation independently, disregarding the bishops, etc. The contention of Cyprian—

a position common among bishops, while recognizing the value of the *libelli pacis* properly issued—was that all the *lapsi* had to undergo public penance.

ThLL 7, 1262-1270; Cath 7, 542-544; PO IV, 112-124; XVIII, 354-379 (with bibl., 354 and 379); J.-R. Knipfing, *The Libelli of the Decian Persecution*: HTR 16 (1923) 45-90; P. Roasenda, *Decio e i libellatici*: Didaskal. 5 (1927) 31-68; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III[e] siècle*, Vatican City 1969; J.R.P. Keresztes, *The Decian Libelli and Contemporary Literature:* Latomus 34 (1975) 761-781; W.L. Leadbetter, *A Libellus of the Decian Persecution:* Horsely, New Documents . . . II (1982) 185-186; G.W. Clarke, *The Letters of Cyprian of Carthage*, III-IV, New York 1986-89, IV (see index); J.R. Rea, *The Oxyrhinchus Papyri*, LVIII, London 1991, n. 3929; R. Selinger, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Decius, Anatomie einer Christenverfolgung*, Frankfurt a.M. 1994.

A. Di Berardino

3. *Libelli missarum*. The more complex liturgical books, like the sacramentaries, found their preparatory phase in the so-called *libelli missarum,* booklets that contained liturgical formulas of various types for a particular diocese or locality, but not the canon, which was fixed, nor the readings or sung parts; they were intended for a specific feast of a community, for votive Masses, or for texts of a particular type (antiphons, prayers, responsories). These were an intermediary stage between extemporary celebrations and the fixed formulas of the sacramentary. Many of these forms subsequently found their way into much larger collections. For example, the *Sacramentarium veronense* (or *leonianum*), composed between 558 and 590, is a collection of these *libelli*. They were written for the most part in times of controversy. Those which are extant belong to the 4th–7th c. In the various rites, they circulated freely and permitted an exchange of liturgical forms among the various churches, so favoring the process of liturgical unification, both within the individual rites themselves and among them.

CPL 171a-174; 199; 656; 667; 775b (778); 813; 1358; 1493; 1600 (169°); 1690; 2018; 2284; C. Vogel, *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire du culte chrétien au moyen âge*, Spoleto 1964, 30-42.

E. Romero Pose

LIBER DIURNUS. This text, which bears a title that is not original (*Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*), was formed from a collection of formularies used in ecclesiastical documents. The collection is not very extensive: the formulas are contained in three codices, all approximately of the same length: 99 are found in in the so-called Codex V; 100 in Codex C; and 106 in Codex A. All originate from across an extended period, beginning with some pre-Gregorian formulas. The greater part of them, however, belong to the period from the pontificate of *Gregory the Great (590–604) to that of Hadrian I (772–795). According to some scholars the formularies were in use in the pontifical chancery, perhaps to indicate the usual beginnings and conclusions of the various letters sent by the pontiffs. More recently it has been suggested that the source is indeed of Italian tradition, but that the codices available to us are in fact private copies, prepared for the use of schools and with a scope, both in nature and interest, purely canonical.

CPL 1626; PL 105, 9-120; DACL 9, 243-244; EC 7, 1262-1267; Altaner 504; H. Foerster, *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, Bern 1958; L. Santifaller, *Liber diurnus. Studien und Forschungen*, Stuttgart 1976; Id., *Liber Diurnus*, Vatican City 1981; M. Palma, *L'origine del codice Vaticano del Liber Diurnus*: Scrittura e civiltà 4 (1980) 295-310; T. Frenz, *I documenti pontifici nel Medioevo e nell'Età moderna*, Vatican City 1989, 45-47; Repertorium 7, 260-263 (extensive bibl.)

L. Dattrino

LIBER GENEALOGUS. Work of an anonymous chronographer, the *Liber Genealogus* (or *De Genealogiis Patriarcharum* or *Origo humani generis* acc. to the various recensions) enumerates and illustrates with concise notes the generations of the human race from Adam to Christ, having as its main source the texts of the canonical Scriptures, but sometimes also apocryphal texts, such as the *Libri Generationis,* the chronological schema inspired by the *Chronica* attributed to *Hippolytus. The work seems to have been composed in Roman *Africa at the beginning of the 5th c., between 405 and 427; recension B at least seems to be the work of a *Donatist. Some brief chronological notes, by a different author, have been added subsequently covering the period from Christ to year XVI (455) or XXIV (463), acc. to the different recensions, of *Genseric, who is presented as the antichrist in the first edition.

CPL 2254; PL 59, 523; Th. Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, I, Berlin 1892, 154-196; C. Frick, *Chronica minora*, I, Leipzig 1893, 2-27, 133-152; P. de Lagarde, *Septuaginta-Studien*, II, Göttingen 1892, 5-41. Monceaux IV, 101ff.; T. Ayuso Marazuela, *Los elementos extrabíblicos de la Vulgata:* EB 2 (1943) 152-160; B. Fischer, *Algunas observaciones sobre el Codex Gothicus de la R.C. de S. Isidoro de León y sobre la tradición española de la Vulgata*: Arch. Leon. 5 (1961) 5-47; H. Inglebert, *Les romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome*, Paris 1996, 599-604.

V. Loi - B. Amata

LIBER GRADUUM. A collection of ascetical discourses written in an elegant form of *Syriac, con-

tained in their entirety in the 12th-c. cod. *Syr* 201 of the National Library of Paris, which attributes the *Liber Graduum* to a Syriac author not far in time from the apostles. Other codices (in the British Museum), containing only a number of the discourses, ascribe them to *Evagrius of Pontus or to the monk *John of Lycopolis or the hermit Philo. The work in fact presumably comes from the last years of the long period of persecution initiated by *Diocletian (303) and concluding with the death of *Licinius (324). There are frequent references to a persecution said to be inhuman in its ferocity, which could certainly be that of Diocletian rather than the ones begun from 344 onward by the Persian kings. The author of the work presents the different types and styles of life which correspond to different forms of union with God. A distinction among humans is made between the just (those who do not renounce the world) and the perfect (those who renounce the world, marriage and the good things of the world, and are admitted into immediate union with God). These last follow the hard ways (humility, poverty, chastity of heart and of body), while the others follow easy paths running parallel to the hard way, which, while not bringing them directly to the city of God, at least save them from eternal death. The work is not so much didactic or dogmatic as it is homiletic and exhortatory, and presents a form of theological and religious syncretism of which it is not always easy to identify the components (*gnosticism, *Neoplatonism, *Messalianism or Euchitism).

M. Kmosko, *Liber graduum*, PS I, 3, Paris 1926; DSp 9, 749-754; R. Terzoli, *Il tema della beatitudine nei Padri siri,* Brescia 1972, 149-177; A. Guillaumont, *Situation et signification du "Liber Graduum" dans la spiritualité syriaque:* OCA 197 (1974) 311-322; DIP 5, 641-642; A. Kowalski, *Perfezione e giustizia di Adamo nel* Liber Graduum, Rome 1989; L. Wickham, *Liber Graduum Revisited:* OCA 247 (1994) 177-187; D. Juhl, *Die Askese im* Liber Graduum *und bei Afrahat: eine vergleichende Studie zur frühsyrischen Frömmigkeit,* Wiesbaden 1996; LACL (2002) 455.

M.G. Bianco

LIBER MONSTRORUM. A collection dedicated to the description of creatures from Greco-Roman mythology; it begins: *Primo namque de his ad ortum sermo* (or: *De oculto orbis terrarum situ*). The unknown author, addressing himself to an equally unknown reader, describes thus the subject matter of his work: *De occulto orbis terrarum situ interrogasti, et si tanta monstrorum essent genera credenda. . . .* Some of the titles, illustrating the contents of the work, are as follows: From book 1: 8. *De hypocentauris*; 18. *De barbosis hominibus*; 22. *De barbosis mulieribus*; 23. *De pigmeis*. From book 2: 23. *De belua quae abuit bina capita*; 33. *De tauris ignem flantibus*. Among the various hypotheses of the date of composition the most probable seems to be that of Backx, who dates the work from the 2nd half of the 7th c. into the 8th. The author may be Anglo-Saxon (or possibly Irish), and is acquainted with the Rhine estuary and its legends.

CPL 1124; M. Haupt, *Opuscula*, II, Leipzig 1876, 218-252; C. Bologna, *Liber monstrorum*, Milan 1977 (with It. tr.); A. Thomas, *Un manuscrit inutilisé du "Liber monstrorum":* ALMA I (1924) 232-245; S. Backx: Latomus 3 (1939) 61; F. Porsia, *Note per una riedizione ed una rilettura del "Liber monstrorum"*: Annali Fac. Lett. Bari 15 (1972) 315-338; C. Bologna, *La tradizione manoscr. Del Liber monstr.: appunti per l'edizione critica:* Cultura neolatina 34 (1974) 337-346; A. Knock, *The "Liber monstrorum": An Unpublished Manuscript and Some Reconsiderations:* Scriptorium 32 (1978) 19-28; M. Lapidge, *Liber monstruorum*: SM n.s. 23 (1982) 151-192; P. Lendinara, *Il "Liber monstruorum" e i glossari anglosassoni*, in *L'immaginario nelle letterature germaniche del Medioevo,* Milan 1985, 203-225; A. Orchard, *The Sources and Meaning of the "Liber monstruorum,"* in *I "Monstra" nell'Inferno Dantesco*, Spoleto 1997, 73-105.

L. Dattrino

LIBER ORATIONUM PSALMOGRAPHUS. The only evidence of the ancient *psalmographus* that has been preserved is a double page only just readable, currently in the Archivo Histórico Nacional di Madrid (folder n. 7, frag. 1484B).

We know, however, that the *psalmographus* was a book that contained psalm collects, which were used in the cathedral Office, esp. when the Office was not festal. Most of the texts of the *psalmographus* may be found either in Psalters that contain psalm collects along with antiphons, or in the *misticus* codices, which reproduce ferial days, *de quotidiano*; a certain number of psalm collects are found incorporated into the festal prayer book, and finally, into the *liber horarum*. The *psalmographus* is not properly a liturgical book, nor was it ever compiled as such. It was always considered as a collection of texts from which each small local church could choose prayers day by day, corresponding to the psalms that were recited in the Office. The literary and doctrinal influence of the collects of the *psalmographus* on the other euchological repertoire of the Office was significant.

The author, whom we can identify with *Lazarus of Seville, had wanted to follow a tradition that had produced consummate texts, such as the so-called *Visita nos,* an African series, and the Italian *Effice nos.* His great models, however, were solely literary texts: no liturgy had incorporated them into the celebration of the Hours. The Spanish collects, however, were officially accepted into the *Hispanic liturgy,

and opened a new path to local liturgical creativity.

An author of the Carolingian era—who knew at least the Italian series, the most widespread in that period—using the Spanish collects of the *psalmographus,* produced another series of collects *Domine apud quem,* which, although it remained incomplete, spread to *Gaul, Great *Britain and *Germany. This Carolingian series, published by Wilmart-Brou, reflects in a very irregular way the original Spanish texts.

A. Wilmart - L. Brou, *The Psalter Collects from V-VI Century Sources,* London 1949; P. Verbraken, *Oraisons sur les 150 psaumes*, Paris 1967; J. Pinell, *Liber Orationum Psalmographus. Colectas de salmos del antiguo rito hispánico. Recomposición y edición critica*, Barcelona-Madrid 1972; Id., *Fragmentos de códices del antiguo rito hispanico. III-IV-V: Reliquias del Psalmographus:* Hispania Sacra 25 (1972) 185-208; M.S. Gros, *El fragment del "Liber Psalmorum" hispànic Vic. Mas. Ep. mas 259*: Rev. Catalana de Teologia 2 (1977) 437-452; V. Viguesa, *El concepto de fe en las oraciones sálmicas leandrianas*: RET 28 (1968) 297-318; J. Aldazábal, *Influencia de Gregorio de Elvira y de Justo de Urgel en el Liber Orationum Psalmographus:* Fons Vivus Misc. E. Vismara, Zürich 1971, 143-161; J. Pinell, *Le collette salmiche: Liturgia delle Ore:* Quaderni di Rivista Liturgica 14 (1972) 269-286; J. Aldazábal, *Doctrina eclesiológica del Liber Orationum Salmógrafo. La Iglesia como "posesión adquirida por Cristo" y "nave de salvación"*: RET 32 (1972) 3-45; Id., *La doctrina eclesiológica del Liber Orationum Psalmographus*, Rome 1974; D. Borobio, *La doctrina penitencial en el Liber Orationum Psalmographus*, Bilbao 1977; J. Madoz, *Escritos inéditos: San Leandro de Sevilla:* EstEcl 56 (1981) 415-453; F. Segala, *Immagini della beatitudine del "Liber Orationum Psalmographus": studio analitico-dottrinale*, Pontificio Istituto S. Anselmo, Rome 1984.

J. Pinelli

LIBER PONTIFICALIS (Gesta romanorum pontificum). The *Liber pontificalis* consists of a series of mainly biographical details, of varying value, relating to the bishops of Rome. The archaeological, topographical and liturgical notes are far and away its most important and interesting component. The *Liber pontificalis,* properly so-called, and available in the second edition (the first has been lost), begins with information about *Peter and finishes with fragmentary details of Stephen V (885–886). It is necessary to distinguish several redactional strands: that which goes from *Vita Petri* to Pope *Silverius (536–537) was compiled under Pope *Vigilius (537–555). From this period and until the fragment of the *Vita* of Stephen V, the contents have been written by contemporaries, except the *Vitae* which cover the years from 537 to 579, written by an author who probably lived under *Pelagius II (579–590).

The *Liber pontificalis,* again properly so-called, was then extended until the pontificate of Honorius II (d. 1130) inclusive, along with somewhat meager lists which often give only the duration of the pontificate, and which vary in tenor from one MS to another. The classification of these MSS is very difficult. The best works containing extensions of the *Liber pontificalis,* and also bearing its name, are those of Pandulf (Vat. lat. 3762), called also the *Liber pontificalis* of Petrus Guillermus, the librarian of the abbey of Saint-Gilles (Gard, France), who had made a copy of it, and the *Liber pontificalis* edited in 1925 by J. March acc. to a *codex Dertusensis* (Tortosa, Spain). The *Liber pontificalis* proper was preceded by a list of the **Depositiones episcoporum Romanorum* (255–352), contained in the **Chronography* of 354, as well as by two catalogs, of which the most important is the *Liberian Catalog* (composed under Pope *Liberius, 352–366).

L. Duchesne LP, 2 vols., Paris 1886-1892, anastatic reprint, ibid. 1955, completed by a 3rd vol. ed. C. Vogel, ibid. 1957; T. Mommsen, in MGH, Berlin 1898 (up to AD 715); DACL 9, 355-466; O. Bertolini, *Il "Liber Pontificalis,"* in *La storiografia altomedievale*, Spoleto 1970, 387-455; C. Vogel, *Le Liber Pontificalis dans l'édition de L. Duchesne. État de la question*, in *Mons. Duchesne et son temps*, Rome 1975, 99-127; H. Geertman, More veterum. *Il "Liber Pontificalis" e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma nella Tarda Antichità e nell'Alto Medioevo*, Groningen 1975; Th.F.X. Noble, *A New Look at the Liber Pontificalis*: Archivum Hist. Pont. 23 (1985) 347-358; R. Davis, *The Book of Pontiffs* (*Liber pontificalis to AD 725*), *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, trans. with intro., Liverpool 1989 ([2]2000); R. Davis, *The Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes:* (*Liber Pontificalis*)*: The Ancient Biographies of Nine Popes from AD 715 to AD 817*, trans. with intro. and comm., Liverpool 1992; R. Davis, *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes* (*Liber Pontificalis*), Liverpool 1995; Patrologia IV, 148ff.; H. Geertman, *Hic fecit basilicam: studi sul "Liber Pontificalis" e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestro a Silverio*, Leuven 2004.

C. Vogel

LIBER XXI SENTENTIARUM. The *Liber XXI sententiarum* is in the group of works that surrounds the figure of *Augustine of Hippo. It is a very complex document, comprising reading notes, philosophical discussions, a letter, a brief poem and reflections on writings composed before his election to the episcopate. According to the definition of F. Dolbeau, the *Liber* is a "doubtful" work: not apocryphal because it does not contradict at all the thought of Augustine, on the contrary having close points of connection with his works, but neither authentic, because neither Augustine during his life nor his disciples after his death were involved in its composition; most probably, this composite work is a mixture of authentic elements of the bishop of Hippo with the texts of his disciples.

F. Dolbeau has dealt with the historical problems of this text, analyzed its themes, provided information about the principal editors who have occupied

themselves with it and prepared a working text.

The *sententiae* are of different length, although they are mostly quite brief; for the most part they are in prose (the only exceptions being 2b and 16, the last a brief poem, in verses); *sententia* 3 gives almost in its entirety a passage of Augustine already known (*Letter* 246, in the *sententia* only the final salutation is missing); there are many references to other authors, of which Dolbeau gives detailed information.

The Sacred Scriptures have an important role in a number of the *sententiae*: the *sententiae* show that the paschal lamb of the exodus is a figure of Christ, as well as explaining the significance of certain numbers which recur in the sacred text (2a, 5). Theology too is drawn upon to explain the superiority of God over all creation and his existence before all ages, as well as providing reflection on the *Trinity and defining the work of the *Holy Spirit in the remission of sins (17b, 18, 20b, 21b). Specifically Christian themes are addressed in the *sententiae* on the resurrection and on risen bodies (7, 10). The nature of the soul is also considered: humanity is distinguished from the animals on account of it, the most excellent humans being those whose souls understand God; the intelligible and intellectual soul is defined; and the necessity of the simultaneous presence of faith, hope and charity in the human soul explained. Human thoughts are explained in terms of the soul's movement (6, 8, 15a, 19a). Then, next to properly moral themes, we find more generic and less specifically religious questions: The propensity to the blessed life, the teaching that wise pagans can work wonders, the divisions and subdivisions of philosophy, an invitation not to sin, the attempt to explain logically that which does not come from God, the nearness of humanity to the rest of creation, including the angels, the definition of the will, a list with an explanation of the types of virtues, the joy fully appreciated which comes after having suffered, and the inclination toward God always present in those who obey him (1, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14a, 14b, 15a, 16, 17a, 21a).

PL XL 725-732; CPL 373; F. Dolbeau, *Un poème philosophique de l'Antiquité tardive: De pulchritudine mundi. Remarques sur le Liber XXI sententiarum* (CPL 373): RecAug 42 (1996) 21-43; Id., *Le liber XXI Sententiarum* (*CPL 373*)*: édition d'un texte de travail:* RecAug 30 (1997) 113-165.

D. Nuzzo

LIBERATUS of Carthage (6th c.). A Carthaginian deacon who wrote, around 560–565, a *Breviarium causae nestorianorum et eutychianorum*. Making succinct use of various records, some of which had been gathered firsthand, but also inserting certain documents in full, Liberatus tells the story of the christological controversies from *Nestorius to *Justinian, in order to justify the position of the Africans hostile to the condemnation of the *Three Chapters. The work is a mine of information esp. for the last phase of the controversy, in which the author was directly involved, even if his argument is clearly one-sided in defense of his own position.

CPL 865; PL 68, 969-1052; ACO II, 5, 98-141; Moricca III, 2, 1480-1482; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus im Glauben der Kirche*, II, 2, Freiburg 1989 (cf. index); Patrologia IV, 38-40.

M. Simonetti

LIBERIUS, pope (352–366). At the beginning of 350 the political situation of the empire was radically altered. With *Constans assassinated, *Constantius II defeated the usurper Magnentius, becoming the only emperor. Not understanding the new conditions, Liberius intended to continue the synodal politics of *Julius I, which had seemed so promising in the period of the *partitio imperii*. Appealed to by Eastern bishops and certain Egyptian opponents of *Athanasius of Alexandria, he convened a synod at *Rome to address the issue of Athanasius. Not succeeding, he asked the emperor to call a council at *Aquileia. However, Athanasius was condemned by both the Synod of Arles (353) and that of *Milan (355). The emperor even tried to win Liberius over to his own policies. Because the pope did not consent, the emperor made him come to Milan and then in 357 sent him into exile in *Thrace. Cowed by suffering in a cold and distant country, Liberius gave way little by little to the will of the emperor, as his four letters attest, preserved for us by *Hilary of Poitiers (*Frag. Hist.* 4,6). Constantius permitted him to return: first to *Sirmium (358), then to Rome, where the people welcomed him as the true bishop, obliging *Felix II (antipope), who had succeeded him, to leave the city. Even if Liberius probably did sign the Sirmium formula of 351, which was fundamentally orthodox, and not that of 357 (see Simonetti, 236), his yielding to the emperor was in any case considered by his contemporaries, such as Athanasius and Hilary, as a grave failure. After the death of Constantius, when *Julian's policy of political tolerance opened up the way for theological developments, Liberius manifested himself clearly in favor of the *Nicene faith in a letter to the bishops of *Italy (362–363) and in a response to the Eastern bishops (366). His name lived on in the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, called the Liberian basilica, although we can-

not be sure that the church built by him was in the same place (Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, 25-28). The difficulties which emerged after his death show how his weak governing had caused a relaxation in the ecclesiastical discipline in the community of Rome.

CPL 1628-1631; CCL 9, 121-123; CSEL 14, 320-321; 327-331; CSEL 65, 89-93; 155ff.; 164-173; CSEL 71, 423-426; BS 8, 17-22; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, esp. 237-268; J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums,* PTS 39, Berlin 1994, 231-243; T.D. Barnes, *The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers*, in Id., *From Eusebius to Augustinus*, Aldershot 1994; J. Doignon, in Herzog 5, § 592; E. dal Covolo - R. Uglione - G.M. Vian (eds.), *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, Rome 1997 (491); LTK³ 6, 894-895; LACL (2002) 456-457.

B. Studer

LIBERTAS MONACHORUM. The collection of an anonymous compiler (a monk from France or S *Italy, probably early medieval). The texts, as we have them, are presented as *sententiae* of the Council of *Carthage of 525 or as additions to that of 535. Two letters are also inserted: one of *Gregory the Great, the other by ps.-Gregory. Among the codices, the *Vat. lat.* 5845 and 428 of the National Library in Madrid are recommended.

H. Mordek, *Libertas monachorum. Eine kleine Sammlung afrikanischer Konzilstexte des 6. Jahrhunderts:* ZRGKan 72 (1986) 1-16; S. Kuttener, *The Council of Carthage 535: A Supplementary Note:* ZRGKan 77 (1987) 346-351 (adds other MSS).

A. Di Berardino

LIBRARIES, Christian. Ranked among the greatest centers of Christian theological culture during the late 2nd and 1st half of the 3rd c. were, first, *Alexandria in Egypt, then *Caesarea in *Palestine and *Jerusalem. *Clement and *Origen taught at Alexandria, where a scriptorium and a library were attached to the school; Origen also founded the *school of Caesarea.

The library of Jerusalem was founded by the city's bishop *Alexander, who also contributed to the school of Caesarea, where the library was famous for its abundance of volumes, on which *Eusebius drew when compiling his *History*. In *cenobia founded in the East from the 2nd half of the 4th c.—esp. in Egypt, but also in Palestine—there were also important libraries. In the West (e.g., in *Gaul), esp. through the influence of *Martin of Tours, collections of books—the indispensable equipment of educational organizations—were gathered in cenobitic institutions.

Notable among private libraries was that of *Augustine, which the city of Hippo preserved until the *Vandal irruptions. There is not a wealth of information on the history of the origins of the Roman ecclesiastical libraries. Until *Innocent I, in fact, data on the formation of archives yields little light, though the information itself goes back to the pontificate of *Anterus (235–236). This lack of information is due in part to the destruction of the archives themselves, esp. during the time of *Diocletian's persecution. In any event, the library of the apostolic see must have been well stocked with materials for some time—and not just this library—if, shortly after the mid-5th c., Pope *Hilary was occupied with creating two new libraries *ex novo*, probably in the cloister of S. Lorenzo al Verano. In Rome, from the late 5th through the 6th c., the organization of the archive of the apostolic see underwent continual improvements, already begun with *Julius I's organization in the 1st half of the 4th c. and the reorganization in the 2nd half of the same century by *Damasus, with *Jerome's help. At the Lateran there is a clear distinction between the archive and the library: they are located in different places. Popes like *Gelasius I (492–496), under whose name was issued the decree *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, and *Agapetus I (535–536), creator of the library near the slope of Scaurus on the Caelian Hill, gave a considerable boost to the establishment of theological and humanistic culture in the city. Finally, the reuniting of the papal libraries at the Lateran, accomplished by *Gregory the Great in the late 6th and early 7th c., increased the importance of the pontifical library of the apostolic see among all Roman libraries; the first certain mention of this library, however, attesting its existence at the time of *Sergius I (687–701), is from the pontificate of *Gregory II (715–731).

In the 7th c., moreover, Rome became a center of cultural attraction of undoubted importance; the young frequented its schools and the book trade flourished, with a lively contribution from Greek culture. Between the 6th and 7th c. in the West, thanks esp. to the monks of the Benedictine order, schools, *scriptoria* and libraries became ever more numerous. In *Italy there was *Cassiodorus's monastery at *Vivarium in Calabria, closely tied to St. *Benedict. At Bobbio St. *Columbanus, thanks in part to the valuable contribution of the *Longobard (Lombard) kings (the barbarians, beginning with *Odoacer and then with *Theodoric, had never neglected the organization of education in their territories), founded an abbey which quickly became famous for its school of writing and its valuable library. New libraries were also founded in *Gaul; *Spain owed its strongest cultural boost to the work of St. *Isidore, whose library was in the archiepisco-

pal palace of *Seville, and whose bibliographical knowledge was so vast as to suggest an immense collection of materials *in loco* for consultation. Finally, the libraries of St. *Columba's numerous monasteries in Scotland and the very important library at the cloisters of Iona, and the libraries at Lindisfarne, in NE England, and at Canterbury and Jarrow, also in England, and those at centers such as Fulda and Mainz in Germany, and at St. Gall in Switzerland do not exhaust a subject that really requires much fuller treatment.

E. Edwards, *Libraries and Founders of Libraries*, London 1865; T. Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken*, Leipzig 1890; L. Perotti, *Dizionario statistico geografico delle biblioteche italiane*, Cremona 1907; G.H. Hörle, *Frühmittelalterliche Mönchs und Klerikerbildung in Italien*, Freiburg im Br. 1914; A. Hessel, *Geschichte der Bibliotheken*, Göttingen 1925; F. Milkau - G. Ley, *Handbuch der Bibliothekwissenschaft*, Leipzig 1940; G. Massimo, *Il portico e la torre di Papa Zaccaria: considerazioni sull'episcopio lateranense*: Alma Roma 1 (gennaio-aprile 2001) 3-40 (a larger and revised contribution on the subject by the same author is currently being printed in the "Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte").

M. Cecchelli

LIBYA

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. Origins of Christianity. Libya is the coastal region of N *Africa. In ancient times the designation, attested at least as far back as the 3rd millennium BC, referred to the whole of Africa as it was then known, from the Nile to the Atlantic (Herod., II, 10; Plin., *Nat. hist.* V. 1), acc. to the tripartite vision of the world—Europe, Libya and Asia—known also by Christian historians (Eus., *De vita Const.* III, 7; Theod., *HE* I, 25,12; V, 1,2). In the patristic period, however, the term refers to a much more restricted area, in fact even more restricted than is present-day Libya, owing to the exclusion of Tripolitania, which belonged to Roman Africa: i.e., the part of the Diocesis Aegyptiaca territory situated between *Egypt and the more southerly curve of the Great Sirte (Gulf of Sidra). The city of Arae Philaenorum was the boundary between the two *partes* of the Roman Empire, the W one with its *Latin language, and the E (Byzantine) one which used *Greek (Eus., *Mart. Palaest.* XIII, 11; Philost., *HE* V, 10 and 12; Soz. *HE* I, 1,2 and II, 2,5). *Ammianus Marcellinus writes that "in ancient times" Libya constituted the last of the three parts of Egypt, along with Egypt properly so-called, and *Thebaid, adding that, in a previous epoch—perhaps he is alluding to the division of the Diocesis Aegyptiaca by *Diocletian in 297—the *Pentapolis was separated off from Libya *sicca*. So he distinguishes between the following:

1. *Libya Pentapolis* with Cyrene, *civitas antiqua sed deserta* (from Cyrene, in the classical sources, the name of Cyrenaica was given to the province) and the other cities: Tolmeta, Arsinoe, Taucheira, Darnis and Berenice; Apollonia, the port of Cyrene, is missing, which in the Hellenistic period—along with Berenice, Arsinoe, Ptolemais (Tolmeta) and Cyrene had made up the Cyrenaic Pentapolis (Plin., *Nat. hist.* V, 5, writes that Arsinoe was also called Taucheira; cf. Strab., XVII, 3,20).

2. *Lybia Sicca* (called Mareotis Libya or Marmarica elsewhere) with the *municipia pauca et brevia* of Paraetonium, Chaerecla and Neapolis (*Res gestae* XXII, 16,4-5; ed. W. Seyfarth, 288).

In the *Synekdemos* of Hierocles (527–528), taken up again in the 7th c. by George of Cyprus, we find Libya ἄνω, i.e., upper (a term which appears also in the patristic sources: Athan., *De sententia Dionysii* 5; *Hist. Arian.* 8 and 71: PG 25, 713C, 485C, 777D; Philost., *HE* I, 8: PG 139, 1368B), made up of the above-named cities of the Pentapolis (Sozusa, named first, refers to ancient Apollonia, and Adriana to Darnis) and Libya κάτω, i.e., lower, with the cities of Paraetonium, Zygra, Zagylis, Pedonia, Antiphrae, Darnis (removed from the Pentapolis) and Ammoniace (ed. Honigmann, 47-48, nn. 732[8]-733[5]).

In the Bible, Libyan Jews coming from Cyrene and the surrounding area appear repeatedly (Mt 27:32; Mk 15:21; Lk 23:26; Acts 2:10; 6:9; 11:20; 13:1). Later tradition attributes the early preaching of the gospel there to Simon of Cyrene, to the disciple Lebbaeus (Thaddaeus), to the witnesses of the *Pentecost glossolalia (Acts 2:10) or to St. Mark. We lack precise details of the initial spread of Christianity in Libya, where ecclesiastical authority, exercised from *Alexandria, seems to have left little space for the autonomy of bishops of the Metropolitan cities.

*Dionysius of Alexandria wrote a letter to Ammonius of Berenice against *Sabellius, who was of Libyan origin, and another to *Basilides, bishop of the Christian community (*paroikon*) of the Pentapolis. The first of these bishops was sent into exile in the Libyan desert under *Decius, the second under *Valerian (Eus., *HE* VII, 26,1 and 3; XII, 11,5.10.23). Libya also had martyrs (Eus., *Mart. Palest.* XIII, 11), among whom we should note Macarius under Decius (Eus., *HE* VI, 41,17), and Theodore of Cyrene under Diocletian (BS 12, 245-248). Libya was the cradle of Sabellianism, and also in some sense of Arianism because it was the homeland of *Arius, who counted among the Libyan bishops no fewer than six of his supporters, for the most part of the

Pentapolis (Philost., *HE* I, 8: PG 139, 1368B); among these, his most determined advocates were Secundus of Pentapolis, bishop of Ptolemais, and Theonas of Marmarica, who were condemned to exile with him at the Council of *Nicaea of 325. As well as the orthodox Serapion of Antipyrgus and Titus of Paraetonium, some other bishops who had previously compromised with the heresy also participated in the council; i.e., Zopyrus of Barca (the port of Tolmeta) and Dachios of Berenice (E. Honigmann, *La liste originale des Pères de Nicée*: Byzantion 14 [1939] 45, nn. 15-18; cf. 31-32). Canon 6 of the council confirms the traditional authority (jurisdiction) of the bishop of *Alexandria over Libya and over the Pentapolis (COeD 8).

In the ecclesiastical documents this last province is not always clearly distinguished from Libya without qualification (Athan., *Apol. c. Arian.* 37; Socr., *HE* II, 24,7; Soz., *HE* III, 21,1 and 3; VII, 19,7 etc.) or is included in the appellation—in the plural—the Libyas (Athan., *Hist. Arian.* 70; *Apol. c. Arian.* 56; *Pro fuga sua*; *Ad Const.* 27: PG 25, 557. 777A. 557B. 653A. 629B; *Ep. syn. Sard.*: PG 25, 352A etc.). Among the 94 "Egyptian" bishops present at the Council of *Serdica (ca. 343) we can include almost the entire Libyan episcopate (Athan., *Apol. c. Arian.* 50: PG 25, 337C–339B; Mansi 3, 68), with the exception of Piso of Darnis, who was with the Eastern bishops gathered at Philippopolis (Mansi 3, 198B). Under *Constantius II (after 350), *Athanasius's Libyan supporters were exiled to the Great Oasis or the Upper Oasis, and those from Thebaid to Ammoniace, in Libya (Athan., *Apol. ad Constantium* 32; *De fuga* 7; *Hist. Arian.* 14: PG 25, 637C. 653A. 387B. 380A). Arius of Petra and *Asterius of Arabia were banished to Upper Libya (Athan., *Hist. Arian.* 8: PG 25, 713C).

An *anomoian synod gathered at *Constantinople under *Julian (361–363) had bishops who took part "from both Libyas": Serras of Paraetonium, Stephen of Ptolemais and Heliodorus of Sozusa (Philost., *HE* VII, 6; VIII, 2). At the same time (the spring of 362) the Nicene bishops Gaius of Paraetonium and Marcus of Zygra were present at the Athanasian synod of Alexandria (Athan., *Tom. ad Antioch.* 10: PG 26, 808B). In the sphere of Libyan monasticism, Stephen and Moses stand out (Pall., *Hist. Laus.* XXIV, 1 [= XXX] e LXXXVIII, 1 [= XXXIX, 4]: PG 34, 1089C, 1195C; cf. Philost., *HE* VI, 28,3; VI, 39,20).

The second canon of the Council of Constantinople (381) alludes to the Libyan hierarchy under the generic name of the Egyptian bishops (COeD 27). At the Constantinopolitan synod of 394 (the case of Bagadius and Agapius) we find Probatius of Berenice (Gerland-Laurent, *Corpus notitiarum episcopatuum*, I, 1, Bucharest 1935, 8).

The most noted personality of the Libyan Pentapolis is without doubt *Synesius of Cyrene, bishop of Ptolemais, whose correspondence (above all letters 67 and 76 to *Theophilus of Alexandria) and the *Catastasis* are of great importance for the history of both secular (barbarian incursions) and religious (events in the diocese of Erythron) Cyrenaica in the first decade of the 5th c. In the acts of the ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431) we find the names of bishops from the Pentapolis, of Olbia, Dysthis, Barca and Taucheira, and that of their coworker from Lower Libya Daniel of Darnis associated with Sopater, bishop of the unidentified Septimiace in Libya (Gerland-Laurent, *Corpus notit.*, I, 94, 95, nn. 267-272). In the so-called *Latrocinium *Ephesinum* (the Robber Council) of 449, Dioscurus of Alexandria enjoyed the support of the bishops of Erythrum, Taucheira, Sozusa, Tisila (?), Barca and Cyrene, in the Pentapolis, and of Antiphrae, Zygra and Zagylis in Lower Libya (E. Honigmann, *The Original Lists of the Members . . . of the Robber-Synod and the Council of Chalcedon*: Byzantion 16 [1942-1943] 37, nn. 128, 129, 133-139, 141, 144).

Dioscurus was accused of having diverted the grain destined for the Libyan churches (Mansi 6, 1013, 1025), a charge made by the Council of Chalcedon (451), at which Theophilus of Erythrum, together with twelve Egyptian bishops, refused to condemn *Eutyches (Mansi 7, 49B; ACO II, 1,2,111, n. 11).

Apollonius of Antiphrae and Maximus of Zagylis, having taking refuge in Constantinople with other Egyptian bishops after the killing of *Proterius of Alexandria (457), signed a petition to the emperor *Leo I (Mansi VII, 530BD) and took part in a patriarchal synod (458–459) against *simony (PG 85, 1620CD).

John of Zagylis, a determined opponent of Chalcedon, took up the controversy in 482 (or shortly afterward) with the patriarch of Alexandria *Peter Mongus, over the **Henoticon* (Liber., *Breviarium* 18: PL 68, 1025AB).

At the second Council of Constantinople (553), we find George of Ptolemais and also Emilianus of Antipyrgus (Mansi 9, 176AB. 191B. 392AC; ACO IV, $7,6^{14}$, 22^{27}, . . . 227^{32}). Under the patriarchate of *Eulogius of Alexandria (580–608) we read of Theodore, bishop of Darnis, and Leontius of Apamea, bishop of Cyrene (John Moschus, *Prat. spir.* 148 and 195: PG 87, 3012C, 3077A). Further, a Theodore "metropolitan of the Libyan Pentapolis" is mentioned in a document of the 7th c. (J. Maspéro, *Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine*, III, Le Caire 1915, n. 67168). In Libya, therefore, as in Egypt, we can note a certain

duplication of the hierarchy after the advent of *monophysitism.

The walls of the principal Libyan cities, damaged by barbarian incursions, were restored by *Justinian, who also transformed a church into a synagogue and two monasteries into citadels (Procop. Ces., *De aedif.* VI, 2; ed. Haury, III, 173-174). During this era, the jurisdiction of the Alexandrian patriarchate extended to *Carthage, "great metropolis of W Libya" (*Notitia Alexandrina* [fictitious]: ByzZ 2 [1893] 26). Nevertheless, Libya did not long resist the Arab invasion (643) that precipitated the decline of Christianity in the region.

Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, II, Paris 1740, 618-638; PWK 23, 156-169; DACL 3, 3220-3227; DB 2, 1177-1184; EI 10, 417-432; 11, 52-62; F. Rovere, *Il cristianesimo in Cirenaica:* Libia 3 (1955) 43-52; Enc. Univ. dell'arte 1, 81-85; RBK 1, 218-227; LTK[2] 6, 702-703; KLP 3, 410-411, 628-632, 1040-1041; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford [3]1971, 349-362, 495-498; F. Tordeur, *Libye, royaume des sables*, Geneva 1970; G.F. Paci, *Bibliografia archeologica della Libia 1974-1977 e 1978-1979: Quaderni di archeol. della Libia* 10 (1979) 105-118; 11 (1980) 139-146; E. Alföldi Rosenbaum—J. Ward Perkins, *Justinianic Mosaic Pavements in Cyrenaican Churches*, Rome 1980; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana,* Bari [2]1980, 707.710.830; J.M. Reynolds, *Byzantine Buildings, Justinian and Procopius in "Libya Inferior" and "Libya Superior"*: Antiquité Tardive 8 (2000) 169-176.

D. Stiernon

II. Archaeology. After the earthquake of 365 there is evidence of an increased intensity of construction work, even if from the 4th and 5th c. there is little remaining: some Christian structures were rebuilt over the existing ones. The *Justinian era, however, saw a richer growth, particularly in mosaic floors, of which outstanding examples are still extant, reflecting their particular historical-political context. It is still difficult to date certain buildings, partly because they were worked on subsequently. About fifty churches and six baptisteries have been identified: three are at Apollonia, two are at Cyrene, one at Ras el Hilal, two at Latrun, two at Qasr el Lebia, one at Tolmeta, one at Taucheira and one at Benghazi (Berenice). The religious architecture of Cyrenaica is distinctive, with impressive façades, particularly outside the built-up area, and very solidly constructed. Influences are varied, but liturgical exigencies have naturally shaped the form of buildings dedicated to Christian worship.

Among the oldest buildings we should note the W basilica I (constructed over a previous one) and the E basilica of Apollonia (from the 5th c., owing to the apse mosaic), the port of Cyrene, and the E basilica of Tocra, ancient Taucheira (see Stucchi, *Architettura cirenaica*), which have in common certain architectural features peculiar to the region, particularly apses enclosed within rectilinear walls and *pastophoria.* I am not convinced by the hypothesis of a trussed roof, implying the use of wood, because the normal supports used in this area are pillars, correlated with the barrel vault: the use of columns is less frequent, and, in any case, the span is modest. The structure was therefore built to sustain a heavy roof, usually made of local stone, as is demonstrated by the W basilica II of Tolmeta and that of Siret el Rheim. This was the only material used in buildings in this area, rather than brick, which needed kilns and therefore wood. The use of blocks of stone for wall construction has created a very particular architectural style, in which longitudinal plans dominate, and buildings with a centralized plan—in general baptisteries or martyria—are of a limited size. This has restricted the iconographic variety which characterized other regions of the Mediterranean. The apertures are few and small: Cyrenaic architecture values volumetric compactness over chromatic effects. Against this background we should note some important historical developments; in particular the "cathedral" of Cyrene, built in the 5th c. with an apse at the E, but then added to in the 6th c. by a second apse at the W, in the vestibule, making the building part of the substantial group of African churches with apses opposite each other (see Duval, *Églises*). In this case, as is more common, the second apse has been inserted subsequently. Here too we have one of the rare examples of N African influence on Cyrenaic architecture, since for historical reasons the Cyrenaic church fell more within the Alexandrian orbit, resulting in more explicit references to Christian Egyptian architecture.

Among recent discoveries, there is the fortified basilica of Sidi Khrebish (see Lloyd-Sear, *Sidi Khrebish Excavations*, 5-12) and other Christian buildings mentioned by S. Stucchi, some still awaiting excavation. Some of these churches, we may note, have small baptisteries (see Goodchild, *Chiese e battisteri*, 205-223), frequently following a centralized plan, quadrangular or triconchal, like that of the E basilica of Apollonia; however, differing from the greater number of baptisteries of the Mediterranean, the surviving baptisteries of Cyrenaica are always contained within the church itself, without really giving them a separate autonomy, and so corresponding in this respect to a tradition found in Egypt and Palestine. An interesting aspect of the Cyrenaic architecture from the proto-Byzantine period is to be found in the civil sphere, of which certain outstanding examples remain: we should note the so-called triconch house of Tolmeta (see Stucchi,

Architettura cirenaica), part of a complex containing numerous different rooms. This ancient practice of inserting a triconchal hall, usually fulfilling the role of an audience room, can be found in numerous buildings across different parts of the empire, in both civil (see the cases in Constantinople, Qasr ibn Wardan in Syria etc.) and religious (e.g., the episcopal palace of Bosra, in S Syria) contexts. However, the triconch style was widely used at the time and did not have a certain fixed function, but was adapted rather for various types of buildings regardless of their function.

Another interesting example is that of the so-called palace of the *dux* at Apollonia (see Goodchild, *Fortificazioni e palazzo bizantini*, 225-250), where the arrangement of the (remaining) rooms of the lower floor recall the structure of the palace of the Byzantine governor at *Ephesus (see Vetters, *Ephesos*).

Little remains of decorations and capitals, but important finds include Proconnesian marble, such as the columns and capitals at the E basilica of Latrun (ancient Erythrum), while at the W basilica on the same site the marble is probably Thasian. The most common capitals are the so-called Theodosian, which we find, e.g., in the basilica at Apollonia (see Widrig-Goodchild, *The West Church*, 70-90): examples of this form, typical of the mid-5th c., were sometimes reused in later reconstructions of previous churches, for which they had originally been made.

Along with mosaic flooring we also find *opus sectile* of the highest quality, a fact which emerges from examination of remaining fragments: I refer particularly to the pieces from the basilica in Apollonia (W church) (see Widrig-Goodchild, *The West Church*, 70-90), and of Ras el Hilal (see Harrison, *A Sixth Century Church*, 1-20), very similar to each other, probably made by the same artisans at about the same period (it is likely that both are pre-Justinian).

In mosaic flooring, large mosaic carpets are the norm, following a unitary and often highly precise design with symbolic motifs: in this complex and developing field, which has aroused great interest, special mention must be made of the mosaic floor of the church of Qasr el Lebia (ancient Olbia), dated to 540 by an inscription which mentions the city of Olbia, which was partly reconstructed in the time of Justinian with the name of Nea Teodorais. The catechetical interpretation that has been advanced for this mosaic (see Guarducci, *La più antica catechesi*) is in my opinion somewhat forced, as are some supposed architectural references which in fact are purely generic (e.g., the façade of a gabled building which has been linked, purely hypothetically, to the western-style façade of the Theodosian Hagia Sophia, which did not even exist in 540, having been destroyed during the Nika revolt of 532: rebuilt under Justinian, it was solemnly dedicated on 27 Dec 537.

In my judgment the Qasr el Lebia mosaics, considering their typological themes, show great affinity with the Nebo mosaics (not forgetting that a comparison with the Gerasa mosaics has already been made by E. Alföldi Rosenbaum and J. Ward Perkins): in this case, Egypt, usually a constant reference point for the Cyrenaic area, gives us very little material for comparison, as its remaining mosaic floors are fragmentary and indeed few in number.

The Justinian era (527–565) is the golden age of Cyrenaic art: after the Arab invasions of 642 the Christian artistic tradition never recovered, as the sources attest. In any case, in this interesting area of proto-Byzantine art we lack any comprehensive study, covering not only architecture but also the arrangement of cities, architectural sculpture and sculpture more broadly, and the historical, documentary and epigraphic sources: work on the mosaic floors of the Justinian era should lead us to hope that similarly in-depth study will also take place in other fields. The excavations undertaken, both before and after World War II, have been somewhat patchy, meaning that we cannot easily determine the history of the buildings. The article of Duval (*Les monuments*) summarizes our knowledge of the Christian remains of Cyrenaica.

J.B. Ward Perkins - R.G. Goodchild, *The Christian Antiquities of Tripolitania*, London 1953; W.M. Widrig - R.G. Goodchild, *The West Church at Apollonia in Cyrenaica:* PBSR 28 (1960) 70-90; R.M. Harrison, *A Sixth-Century Church at Ras el Hilal in Cyrenaica:* PBSR 32 (1964) 1-20; R.G. Goodchild, *Chiese e battisteri bizantini della Cirenaica*: CCAB 13 (1966) 205-223; Id., *Fortificazioni e palazzo bizantini in Tripolitania e Cirenaica:* ibid., 225-250; H. Vetters, *Zum Byzantinischen Ephesos*: JÖBG 15 (1966) 273-287; S. Stucchi, Cirenaica (Christian period): EAA Suppl., Rome 1970, 219-221; N. Duval, *Les églises africaines à deux absides*, II, Paris 1973, 287ff. (Cyrene); M. Guarducci, *La più antica catechesi figurata: il grande mosaico della basilica di Gasr Elbia in Cirenaica:* MAL 18/7 (1975) 659-686; S. Stucchi, *Architettura cirenaica*, Rome 1975; J.A. Lloyd - F. Sear, *Sidi Khrebish Excavations, Benghazi*: Society for Libyan St. 6th An. Rep. 1974-1975, 5-12; E. Alföldi Rosenbaum - J. Ward Perkins, *Justinianic Mosaic Pavements in Cyrenaican Churches*, Rome 1980; D.E.L. Haynes, *An Archaeological and Historical Guide to the pre-Islamic Antiquities of Tripolitania*, Tripoli Department of Antiquities [4]1981; *Cyrenaica in Antiquity*, ed. G. Barker - J. Lloyd - J. Reynolds, Oxford 1985; *Sidi Khrebish: Excavations at Sidi Khrebish Benghazi* (*Berenice*), London 1985; N. Duval, *Les monuments d'époque chrétienne en Cyrénaïque à la lumière des recherches récentes, Actes du XI[e] Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne*, Rome 1989, III, 2743-2796; D.J. Mattingly, *Tripolitania*, London 1995.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

LICENTIUS (d. after 395). Born like *Augustine at *Thagaste (Aug., *De beata vita* 1,5), and his disciple and friend; son of *Romanianus, the benefactor of Augustine, and relative of *Alypius (*Ep.* 27,5-6). He was also at Cassiciacum in 386, despite his young age, taking part in the philosophical discussions at the retreat. He is an interlocutor of Augustine in *Contra Acad.*, in *De beata vita* and in *De ordine*. He converted to Christianity with his master, but when he was baptized is not known to us. For a time he lived at *Rome in order to undertake the *cursus honorum*. He loved poetry. One of his poems, containing 154 hexameters, is found among the works of Augustine, to whom he describes his difficulty in reading Varro, his happy memories of time spent together and his hopes for the future. Augustine (*Ep.* 26) and *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 8 and a *carmen*) wrote to him, exhorting him to live a better life.

PL 33, 103-107; *Poetae lat. minores*, Leipzig 1886, VI, 413-420; M. Zelzner, *De carmine Licentii ad Aug.,* Arnsberg 1915; G. Bardy, *Un élève de saint Aug.*: L'Année Théol. Aug. 14 (1954) 55-79; Patrologia III, 292-294; PCBE 1, 640ff.; U. Pizzani, *Il "Carmen Licentii ad Augustinum" e i "Disciplinarum libri" di Varrone reatino*: Helmantica 44 (1993) 497-515; Id., *Presenze classiche nel "Carmen Licentii ad Augustinum,"* in *La poesia tardoantica e medievale*, Atti del I Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Macerata, 4-5 May 1998, ed. M. Salvadore, Alessandria 2001, 85-125; *Licentii Carmen ad Augustinum*, intro., text, trans. and comm., ed. M. Cutino, Catania 2000.

A. DI BERARDINO

LICINIANUS of Cartagena (d. after 600). Friend of *Severus of Málaga and *Eutropius of Valencia, and in all probability shared his early formation with them at the monastery of Servitanum. He was also a friend of *Leander of Seville. Bishop of Cartagena, he had difficult relations with the Byzantines who dominated in the region. He was engaged in theological problems connected with the *Arian heresy. He died at *Constantinople some time after 600, probably poisoned. Rigorist, relatively well educated in literary terms, he wrote numerous letters (Isid., *Vir. ill.* 29). Of these we have only three: one is addressed to Pope *Gregory the Great, asking for a copy of his *Moralia,* a second to the deacon Epiphanius, considering in some detail the immortality of the soul, and the third to Vincentius, bishop of Ibiza, admonishing him for having believed in the authenticity of a letter of Christ supposed to have fallen from heaven.

CPL 1097: Díaz 44-46; PL 72, 689-700; J. Madoz, *Liciniano de Cartagena y sus cartas*, Madrid 1948; J. Madoz, *Un caso de materialismo en España en el siglo VI*: RET 8 (1948) 203-230; M.J. Aguilar Amat, *Licinanea Gallicana*: Carthaginensia 3 (1987) 306-310; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana,* II, Madrid 1998, 332-346.

M. DÍAZ Y DÍAZ

LICINIUS (d. 324). Valerius Licinianus Licinius, a native of Dacia, an officer who had distinguished himself in Galerius's Persian campaign of 296–298, was named Augustus in 308 at the conference of Carnuntum, without having first held the position of Caesar, contrary to the constitutional principle of the tetrarchy created by *Diocletian. After the death of *Galerius and the elimination of the "usurper" *Maxentius, in 313 *Constantine and Licinius granted liberty to the Christian religion, the so-called *Edict of Milan. It was on the occasion of their meeting in *Milan that Licinius married Constantia, the half sister of Constantine: Valerius Licinianus Licinius was born of this marriage. In April 313 at Campus Ergenus he defeated *Maximinus Daia, who died the same year. Hostility between Licinius and Constantine began as early as 314 (Cibalae in Pannonia) and dragged on for a decade, originating both in power conflicts and in political-religious disagreements: Licinius, who at first had been favorable to the integration of the Christians in the religious life of the empire, began to rely increasingly on the pagan power base of the *pars Orientis,* and had begun to promulgate laws hostile to the Christians. The decisive encounter was at Chrysopolis in 324, concluding in the complete defeat of Licinius, and leaving Constantine sole emperor.

O. Seeck: PWK XIII, 1, 1926, 222-231; H. Feld, *Der Kaiser Licinius*, diss., Saarbrücken 1962; S. Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, Bari [2]1973, 590ff.; T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, Cambridge 1982; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie,* Darmstadt 1990, 294-297.

M. FORLIN PATRUCCO

LICINIUS of Tours (d. 520). Bishop of the metropolitan see of *Tours from 508 to 520, signatory of the First Council of Orléans (Mansi VIII, 356) and with the bishops Melanius of Rennes and Eustochius of Angers sent a letter to two priests of Breton Armorica, Lovocatus and Catihernus, warning them of certain abuses committed by priests who went from house to house celebrating Mass, and by women called *conhospitae* (cohabitants with the clergy) who assisted at the eucharistic celebrations.

CPL 1000a; PLS 3, 1256-1257; L. Duchesne, *Lovocat et Catihern, prêtres bretons du temps de saint Mélaine:* Revue de Bretagne et de Vendée (1885) 3-16; N. Chadwick, *The Colonisation of Brit-*

tany from Celtic Britain: Proceedings of the British Academy 51 (1965) 235-299; L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IVe au VIe siècle. Naissance d'une cité chrétienne*, Rome 1983, 188-190; G. Muschiol, *Famula Dei. Zur Liturgie im merowingischen Frauenklöster*, Münster 1994, 217-218.

P. Marone

LIFE

I. Types of life - II. Life as a philosophical concept.

God is living (Josh 3:10; Ps 42:2), the source of life (Ps 36:9). *Jesus is also life (Jn 14:6) and gives us life in abundance (Jn 10:10). The person who believes in him crosses from death to life (Jn 5:24). The Fathers were aware that the calling to "eternal life" (ζωή in contradistinction to βίος, life in time) signifies participating in the divine life, being "divinized" and "deified." This corresponds to the internal logic of God's "humanization" (Iren., *Adv. haer*. III, 19,1). As a result the "spiritual life" is life in the *Holy Spirit, who becomes the third constituent element of the Christian's personality (the *trichotomia* of the Greek Fathers). "The perfect human being is composed of three elements, flesh, soul and spirit" (Iren., *Adv. haer*. V, 9,1: Harvey, vol. 2, p. 342). The spiritual life is, therefore, a participation in the trinitarian life.

The *Bible easily crosses from the concept of life to that of the soul. The key term, therefore, of monastic spirituality, "the salvation of the soul," signifies, as in *Scripture, the victory of eternal life (see 1 Pet 1:9; Heb 10:39). It comes to its fullness in the future age. The term *life,* then, in the writings of the Fathers, is essentially eschatological. Inasmuch as it is more contemplative, the Eastern tradition is more eschatological, setting forth the end of life already in this land, the *theoria,* the vision of God.

I. Types of life. In contradistinction to the term *zōē,* the Greek word *bios* signifies an established way of living and the concrete realization of life. (The distinction is lacking, however, in Latin and the term *vita* signifies both things.) Hence the difficulty of the "types of life," whose treatment goes back already to the *Republic* (519c-520c) and *Plato's other dialogues, *Aristotle (*EN* X, 7-10) and the *pagan culture of the Hellenistic age, which was then adopted by Latin thinkers and poets (Lucretius and Horace). This difficulty is foreign to the world of the NT, but Christian writers deduce it from the pagan world, just as they do other elements of ethics. *Clement of Alexandria described the journey that must lead from praxis to gnosis, and the one who is the only pedagogue, i.e., the Logos, who became flesh, shows that virtue is simultaneously practical and theoretical (*Pedagogue* III, 9,4). Elsewhere (*Strom*. IV, 23,152,3) Clement describes the contemplative life as "the mode of the existence in which we deal with ourselves, rendering worship to God and through sincere purification contemplating the holy God in a holy manner." For the relationship between "contemplation" and gnosis, one should examine Clement's teaching on the matter. *Origen seems to have been the first to identify the figure of the active and contemplative life in the two persons of Martha and *Mary, Rachel and Leah. He also sets forth a tripartition: ethics, physics and *epoptika,* which corresponds to the three biblical books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and *Song of Songs (*Commentary on the Song of Songs*, prol.: SC 375, 128).

*Evagrius of Pontus adopted this division, even though he was also aware of the bipartition of practical life and gnostic life; the gnostic life is divided in turn into *physikē* (spiritual knowledge of natures, the *logoi* of things: an idea that would be adopted by *Maximus the Confessor), *theologikē,* i.e., contemplation of the *Trinity (see *Practical Treatise*: SC 70-71, and *Gnostic Treatise*: SC 356). *Gregory of Nazianzus in many of his poems (e.g., *Comparatio vitarum*) describes the opposition between theoretical and practical life, and sets forth an intermediary way between that of the solitaries and that of those who are mixed within the world, by deciding to meditate as the first and to make himself useful as the second (*Autobiography* 280-312); praxis is also necessary because it is the preliminary step that leads to *theoria,* contemplation.

*Augustine knew of two schema, namely, those that go back to pagan philosophy. In the summary of the history of philosophy found in *Civ. Dei* VIII, 1-8, he affirms that the study of wisdom is carried out in the exercise of contemplation. *Socrates was great in active life; Pythagoras, in the contemplative; Plato united both and divided them into ethics, physics and logic; logic teaches us to distinguish truth from falsehood and to draw near to contemplation. Plato, therefore, discovered the *ratio intellegendi* and the *ordo vivendi* (VIII, 4). Later (XIX, 1); he distinguishes between *vita otiosa* and *vita negotiosa* and *vita ex utroque genere temperata*. Among these virtues, Varro (whom Augustine follows at this point) affirms that Antiochus of Ascalon gave preference to the third. In XIX, 19 Augustine gives a Christian interpretation to this tripartition, accepting it substantially, even though he emphasizes that each one of the three can equally lead to beatitude. One must observe that this third genus is not so much a "mixed" life as much as it is a composite life of the two preceding types. Not even the monks, therefore,

must withdraw from the duties of the church (*Ep.* 48,1-2), while the bishops in their ministry must not fear to "get their hands dirty" (*Tractates on John* 57,3-4). The distinction, therefore, between active and contemplative life does not imply any opposition. The contemplative life is "preferable" only because it recalls and anticipates eternal life; true contemplation will be reserved, in the final analysis, to the celestial life because it will be fully realized only in that condition (*Contra Faustum* XXII, 52-58; *Trin.* I, 10,20; *Serm.* 169,14,17; 103; 104,7 etc.). Moreover, the active life assumes its entire value in following Christ (*Serm.* 78).

Similarly, *John Cassian, whose writings were esp. read during the Middle Ages, faces the problem, but his *Collationes* follow a more rigorous logic. In *Collatio* XIV he treats, following the influence of Evagrius's terminology, the *scientia actualis*—i.e., *praktikē*—and the *scientia spiritalis,* which is the *theoretikē*. According to John Cassian, one cannot truly reach the contemplative life without first having passed through the active life: the active life can exist without the other, but the same does not hold the opposite way, because the active life implies the elimination of vices and the acquisition of virtues (XIV, 2-3). The active life is divided into many "professions," such as those of the life in the desert and the purity of heart, although others seek the cure and direction of their brothers within the cenobium, just as the abbot John of Thmuis. Similarly, others dedicate themselves to the service of charity in the hospitals or in the houses established for the reception of the poor and the suffering, as did Macarius, who built a hospice at *Alexandria. Cassian then exhorts one to stay resolved in the choice that has been made and assures us that all must become perfect (XIV, 5-6). Perfection is based, in effect, on charity, just as Paul had also taught (XXIII, 5, which cites Rom 9:3-4). Holiness, therefore, is not the sole prerogative of the *anchorites.

Scientia spiritalis or theoretical *scientia* requires the interpretation of the Scriptures, acc. to history and the Spirit, in conformity to the traditional distinction of *exegesis. The question is asked whether this *scientia spiritalis* belongs solely to the anchorites, but those whom John Cassian presents do not belong simply to the "absolute" anchorites because they gather at more or less frequent intervals for the *collationes* and probably the Sunday synaxes (XIV, 4). Cassian, moreover, maintained that the fight with the vices was exercised at each level of the spiritual life, and thus in practical life, which is therefore not transcended when one reaches the theoretical life. Given this, Cassian recognizes that the monks who have made the secret of the desert and the purity of heart the objective of their life (XIV, 4) have reached the apex of charity in the habitual exercise of *scientia spiritalis*. Having been delivered from numerous concerns, they already anticipate in their earthly life the final end of the Christian life.

Even *Gregory the Great (who having also exercised a very large influence on medieval spirituality) emphasized the importance of the contemplative life (*Mor.* VI, 37,56-57; X, 8,13; XXII, 6,11; XXVIII, 13,33; *In Hiez.* I, 3,9-13; 5,12; II, 2,7-11; *Reg.* I, 4,9; 2,7). In *Cant.* 9, Gregory adopts Origen's tripartition, which was mentioned above, but he also insists on the union of the two types of life in the activity of the men of the church, the *rectores* or the *praedicatores;* for this reason scholars are uncertain whether Gregory maintained the primacy of the contemplative life or the next life, even though the term *vita mixta* is lacking from his writings. In any case the two lives both have their place in the reality of the church; the active life has the objective of love of neighbor, although the contemplative life seeks love in the presence of God: for this reason, in and of itself, the contemplative life is better, but it cannot eliminate the other; both have been produced by the grace of God, and Christ has provided the example of both. There exists a mutual relationship between the two, and both remain imperfect in this life because the same contemplation will reach its complete deployment in the heavenly state. Gregory's primary interest is, therefore, esp. directed to the union of the two lives, their interaction; certainly, both lives cannot be exercised at the same time, but the temporal intervals dedicated at one point to one and at another to another are less important than the intention of the mind, when animated by the love of God and neighbor. Gregory's position, therefore, seems similar to that of Augustine.

II. Life as a philosophical concept. This theme appears in Origen's writings as a Christian transformation of the *Platonism that was contemporaneous to him. Origen does not take his point of departure from the philosophical idea of *being*, but rather from the biblical concept of *life*. Christ is life in and of itself, he states with a lexical formulation that was typically *Middle Platonist, although the Father is above life, such that, from a conceptual point of view, Christ is the source of life; he does not exist through participation in life but is life inasmuch as he generates life, which is in relationship to those who exist, and these exist thanks to participation in him (*Comm. on John* frag. 2).

The concept of life is more developed in the phi-

losophy of *Marius Victorinus. According to Victorinus, the triad of being, life and thought is situated within the intelligence, i.e., the second Plotinian hypostasis, and represents its various aspects in which it is manifested. Such a reality, which sets itself forth in and of itself, is developed, therefore, in three distinct moments; moments, so to speak, of a unique movement, which is the dynamism of intelligence; given that these three elements are at the same time "each one also one" (*Enn.* VI, 2,8,32), thanks to the interpenetration of unity and otherness. What is heavily emphasized is the sphere of life and movement. Victorinus, in this regard, mixes this idea with that of Aristotle, who affirms (*Met.* 1072 b27) that being and thought are both life. Nevertheless, for *Plotinus the movement of life or the soul is self-propelled, and, as such, being lives and thinks "in and of itself"; i.e., it is precisely life and thought, immovable, directed toward themselves, and in a state superior to that in which they will find themselves when they are manifested. Adopting the use Plotinus made of the three terms that would subsequently constitute the triad being-life-thought, one must first observe the opposition between the unity of the first hypostasis, the One, and the multiplicity of the second, i.e., the intelligence, which from within presents itself in the triple form of being (rest), life (movement of exteriorization) and thought (movement of return to being).

With *Porphyry one perceives a further elaboration of the triadic schema imposed by his teacher Plotinus, even if we are not, however, able to affirm that he reached the point of hypostasizing the moments of being, life and thought, given that we do not possess his entire philosophical literary production. On the basis of some testimonies of later *Neoplatonist philosophers, Porphyry showed himself to be less faithful to the teaching of his master, inasmuch as he came to the point of identifying the Father of the triad with the First Principle, or rather, the One; for the "orthodox" Neoplatonists, however, the triad was assimilated to the figure of the one-many, i.e., the second One, on the basis of the exegesis of the *Parmenides*. In the writings of Porphyry, one does not have a "vertical," or rather "hierarchized," triad, but a horizontal triad, in which all the members are at the same level. Already in frag. 27 of the *Chaldean Oracles,* which can be compared to *Comm. in Parm.* IX, 1ff., he presents the triad, but it is directed by a monad. The *Chaldean Oracles* at various times present formulations in which the Father, the Power and the Intelligence appear connected in various ways among each other, as three members of a triad (frag. 4 and frag. 26). The author of the *Commentary on the Parmenides,* therefore, anticipated the triad understood in the theological sense, for whom being becomes understandable in act: both Marius Victorinus and the Cappadocian Fathers—primarily *Gregory of Nyssa—were able to adapt the trinitarian teaching to the Neoplatonist concept of the One: Porphyry showed the way. The great opponent of Christians, at least on this point, obtained approval from the best thinkers in the Christian church, although he was rejected by his own Neoplatonist followers.

TWNT 2, 833-844, 850-853, 856-874 (TDNT 2, 832-843, 849-851, 855-872); DSp 3, 1376-1398; 4, 1257-1272; 6, 808-872; H. Biedermann, *Der eschatologische Zug in der ostkirchlichen Frömmigkeit*, Würzburg 1949; G. Gruber, ΖΩΗ. *Wesen*, *Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes*, Munich 1962; T. Špidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*, OCA 206, Rome 1978, 29ff., 49ff., 66ff.; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004.

C. Moreschini

LIGHT (symbolism). The theme of "light" is very common, albeit with very different meanings and uses, across the religious spectrum to refer to the divine nature and its manifestation in mystical experiences, understood as an "illumination." In the OT tradition the symbolism of light occurs in relation to the idea of the revelation of God and knowledge of him on the part of humanity (see Ps 36:9: "In your light do we see light"). This is developed in late Jewish apocalyptic literature and finds one of its most significant expressions in the doctrine of the *Qumran community. Here, the theme of light, contrasted with that of darkness, is used in an ethical sense as a figure of the good, of truth and of adherence to the covenant with God. "Prince of Lights" is the name given to the angel placed over the good, contrasted with Belial, the "Prince of Darkness," chief of the bad angels and of those who follow his example.

In the NT literature it is the gospel of John above all which makes use of this symbolism to express acceptance of the incarnate Word, who himself is the "Light which enlightens every person." The opposite image of darkness represents hostility and humanity's rejection, a choosing to remain in sin. The idea of a light seen after the immersion of Jesus at his baptism in the Jordan, a motif which appears in the *Gospel of the *Ebionites* and the *Diatessaron* of *Tatian, seems to be connected with the revelation of his divinity, thus a parallel with the transfiguration. The idea of light as the expression of a divine event is present in Lk 2:9 in relation to the nativity, where it is said that "the glory of the Lord shone"

(περιέλαμψεν) on the shepherds. It is to this symbolism that the ancient definition of baptism as "illumination" (φώτισμα, φωτισμός) refers, which appears in *Justin (1 *Apol.* 61,12) and *Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag.* I, 6,26), and already underlies Heb 6:4 and 10:32, where the baptized are called the "enlightened" (φωτισθέντες). Although the reasons for this designation for baptism are not entirely clear, the hypothesis of Daniélou is not without justification (*Théologie du Judéo-christianisme*, It. trans, 323), acc. to which it is linked with primitive baptismal practice which connected the baptism of Jesus with the manifestation of light. The image of "eternal light" expresses the idea of eternal heavenly beatitude reserved for the just. In the tradition of the Eastern church the symbolism of light is fundamental in the sphere of mystical experience, as a sign of the intimate union of the soul with God and of its knowledge of him.

H. Leclercq, see entry *Lumière*: DACL 9, 2698-2702; V. Lossky, *Théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient*, Paris 1944; J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-christianisme* (*Histoire des doctrines avant Nicée I*), Tournai 1958 (It. trans. Bologna 1964); S. Agrelo, *Algunos precedentes culturales de la simbología cristiana de la luz*: Antonianum 47 (1972) 96-121; D. Brenner, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung. Interpretationen zur Vorgeschichte der Lichtmetaphysik*, Bonn 1976; M.-M. Davy - A. Abécassis - M. Mokri - J.-P. Renneteau, *Le thème de la lumière dans le judaïsme, le christianisme et l'Islam*, Paris 1976; G. Filoramo, *Luce e Gnosi*, Rome 1980; Id., *Pneuma e luce in alcuni testi gnostici*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 595-613; S. Poque, *Le langage symbolique dans la prédication d'Augustin*, Paris 1984; D. Masson, *L'Eau, le Feu, la lumière*, Paris 1985; H.H. Malmede, *Die Lichtsymbolik im Neuen Testament*, Wiesbaden 1986; M.-M. Davy - J.P. Renneteau, *La lumière dans le christianisme*, Paris 1989; W. Röttger, *Studien zur Lichtmotiv bei Iuvencus*, Münster 1996; L. Gosserez, *Poésie de lumière. Une lecture de Prudence*, Leuven 2001.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

LIGHTHOUSE. This symbol of the final approach to harbor, of peace and of tranquility, which is reached after the stormy voyage of life, is an image well known to ancient funerary art, by which it is generally portrayed, following the suggestion of the form of the lighthouses of Ostia and of Alexandria, as a tower of three or four receding stories (sometimes with a bridge on the lower story and windows on upper stories), with the shining flame at the summit (Reddé, *La représentation des phares*, 845-872); among the most famous examples, the representation occurring in a mosaic of the Isola Sacra should be mentioned (G. Calza, *La necropoli del Porto di Roma nell'Isola Sacra*, Rome 1940, 169-170). This iconography and this expression of the classical tradition are inherited by Christianity, within which the image of the lighthouse acquires new meanings: it symbolizes the divine harbor of salvation which the soul of the deceased hopes to reach, guided by the divine light of Christ (echoes of this concept in Hermas, *Vis.* III, 2,4 and 3,3-5; Clem. Alex., *Protr.* VIII, 84,1-2; Id., *Paedag.* III, 9,59,1; Orig., *In Gen hom.* IX, 1; Cypr., *Mort.* 26; Greg. Nyss., *Vita Moysis* = PG 44, 301c. On Christ-sun, Christ-light, see F. Dölger, *Sol Salutis* etc., Münster in Westfalen 1925 and, recently, Guarducci, *La più antica catechesi,* 673-674). With this meaning we find it in a notable number of funeral monuments—esp. epigraphs—sometimes alone (ICUR III, 7350c; IV, 10804), sometime alongside of the inscription (ICUR I, 2003, 3888; II, 4616, 5973; J. Wilpert, *Beiträge zur christlichen Archäologie:* RQA 20 [1906] 15, tv. 5, n. 6), sometimes associated with a ship, i.e., with the means with which the voyage toward the celestial harbor is completed (ICUR VI, 15609; VII, 19729; Stuhlfauth, *Der Leuchtturm*, 153, fig. 6). The inscription ICUR IV, 12088 presents the name of the deceased, *Adeodata,* curiously engraved on the inside of the building. The image of the lighthouse seems to occur, even if mutilated, in two fragments of *sarcophagi of the 4th c., one preserved in the Museo Pio Cristiano (Rep 134) (where the famous figure of the ship-church, with Christ and the evangelists on board, is represented), the other at S. Maria in Trastevere (Rep 750), in which the lighthouse provides the background for a scene involving Jonah. In the same figurative context the lighthouse is also represented in a lid of the Museo Nazionale Romano (Rep 794b). The image of a lighthouse represented on a life of the Museo della Catacombe di Pretestato (ICUR V, 15259) must allude, in all likelihood, to the business career exercised by the deceased, as can be deduced from the presence, alongside the building, of two cargo ships loaded with amphorae, for which the artist has taken care to reveal, in a macroscopic way (evidently for immediate comprehension), the form—the Dressel 20—characteristic of the oil-bearing amphorae coming from S *Spain. The figure of the lighthouse still occurs, in lamps of the Late Antique era (Stuhlfauth, *Der Leuchtturm*, 159-162) and, in mosaic, in the floor of the basilica of Gasr Elbia in Cyrenaica, from the *Justinian period (Guarducci, *La più antica catechesi*, 672-674).

G. Stuhlfauth, *Der Leuchtturm von Ostia:* MDAI (R) 53 (1938) 139-163; H. Leclercq, s.v. *Phare*: DACL XIV, 671673; G. Stuhlfauth, *Das Schiff als Symbol der altchristlichen Kunst*: RivAC 19 (1942) 111-141; H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche. Die Ekklesiologie der Väter*, Salzburg 1964, 551-552; M. Guarducci, *La più antica catechesi figurata: il grande mosaico della basilica di Gasr Elbia in Cirenaica*: MAL 18 (1975) 659-686; M. Reddé, *La représentation des phares à l'époque romaine*: MEFR (Ant) 91 (1979) 845-872; M. Bonino, *Barche, navi e simboli navali nel cimitero di*

Priscilla: RivAC 59 (1983) 307-309; F. Bisconti, *Arte e artigianato nella cultura figurativa paleocristiana*, in *Res Christiana. Temi interdisciplinari di Patrologia*, Rome 1999, 74-76; L. Gambassi, s.v. *Faro*: TIP, 177-180; D.L. Balch C. Osiek (ed.), *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, Grand Rapids, MI 2003.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

LIGNO CRUCIS, De. A brief poem of 69 hexameters. Its attribution to a poet of the name of Victorinus (CPL 1458) is very doubtful, as we know nothing for certain of him. It is better to consider it as anonymous, from the 4th or 5th c., and *Gaul as its place of origin. This allegorical and didactic text depicts Golgotha, from which the tree of life (Christ) rises; its top reaches to the heavens; its branches extend over all the earth, symbolizing the twelve apostles, whose preaching has given new life to the world. The second part describes the mass of humanity coming forward to purify itself, and quench its thirst, at the spring (*baptism) that bursts out from the foot of the tree. The poet concludes on a moral note: for many salvation is assured, but not for all, because not all will persevere: *Hoc lignum vitae cunctis credentibus* (v. 69). Other titles have often been substituted for the now-preferred title: *De Pascha, De Cruce, De ligno vitae*.

CPL 1458; PL 2, 1113-1114; CSEL III, 3, 305-308; *Poésie latine chrétienne du Moyen Âge, IIIe-XVe* siècles (Textes recueillis par H. Spitzmuller), Bruges 1971, 1170-1173; EC 4, 1288; A. Roncoroni, *Ps. Cipriano, De ligno crucis:* RSLR 12 (1976) 380-390; Patrologia III, 320; CPPM 2, 544.

L. Dattrino

LINUS, pope (67?–76?). *Irenaeus of Lyons and *Eusebius of Caesarea, giving the first list of bishops of Rome (*Adv. haer.* III, 3; *HE* V, 6,1; cf. III, 2 and 4), present Linus, in 67, as the first successor of *Peter. According to Irenaeus it was Peter and *Paul who consecrated Linus, identifying him with the Linus mentioned in 2 Tim 4:21. The LP informs us that Linus was born in Volterra in Tuscia, and says that his pontificate lasted nine years, up to the year 76. He exercised his office in difficult times, under the emperors *Nero, Galba, Vitellius and *Vespasian, and among other things helped the Jewish Christians who took refuge in *Rome after the fall of *Jerusalem in 70. He laid down that women should cover their heads in church, and consecrated twelve bishops and ordained eighteen priests. The liturgical documents of the Roman church number him among the martyrs, remembering him on 23 Sept. Certain works have been ascribed to him without foundation, among which are *Martyrium beati Petri apostoli a Lino conscriptum* and a similar work on the apostle *Paul.

LP III, 321; *Martyrium beati Petri apostoli a Lino episcopo conscriptum* (BHL 2, Brussels 1900-1901, n. 6655); *Martyrium beati Pauli apostoli a Lino conscriptum* (Bibliotheca Hagiografica Latina, II, n. 6570); DACL 9, Paris 1930, 1195-1198; DTC 9, 772 (E. Amann); E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* I, Tübingen 1930, 1-18; BS 8, 56-58 (A. Amore - C. Moccheggiani Carpano); LTK3 6, 946; EPapi I, 194-197 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

LITURGICAL DIALOGUE and DIDASCALIA. Liturgical dialogue consists in the invitation or instruction of the priest or deacon to which the assembly responds. Its solemn form, that which opens the eucharistic prayer, goes back to the time of the *Traditio Apostolica,* which gives its three elements: *Dominus vobiscum—Et cum spiritu tuo, Sursum corda—Habemus ad Dominum, Gratias agamus Domino—Dignum et iustum est* (Botte [ed.], *La Tradition apostolique . . .* LQF 39, 12).

The first element, *Dominus vobiscum* with the response *Et cum spiritu tuo,* is found in other parts of the Mass and in other liturgical celebrations. Basically a greeting that opens the eucharistic celebration, it is like the greetings found at the beginning and end of *Paul's epistles and that were used in the East (*Const. Apost.* VIII, 12,4: ed. Funk, 497; *Anaph. in Cat. Myst. VI Theod. Mopsuest.*: Hänggi-Pahl [ed.], *Prex Eucharistica*, 214; *Anaph. Ioan. Chrys.*, ibid., 225). *Augustine explains *Dominus vobiscum* as a familiar greeting to the assembly: *Post salutationem quam nostis, id est Dominus vobiscum, audistis . . . a sacerdote: Sursum cor* (*Trin.* XIV, 12: CCL 50/A, 444). The response *Et cum spiritu tuo* was probably inspired by the Pauline doctrine on the spiritual nature of the Christian. *John Chrysostom explains it acc. to the indwelling of the *Holy Spirit in the souls of Christians, the Spirit who assists both the assembly and (*et*) the priest in the participation and ministry of the eucharistic celebration (*Ep. 2 ad Tim. Hom.* X, 3: PG 62, 659; *De sancta Pent. Hom. I*, 4: PG 50, 458).

The second element is proper to *Rome and *Milan, while *Africa sometimes used *Sursum cor*. The Eastern liturgies have more varied formulations, but all are related to the formula of the *Trad. Apost.: Sursum mentem* (*Apos. Con.* VIII, 12,4: Funk, 497), *Sursum mentem et corda,* at *Antioch (John Chrys., *De poenit. hom.* 9: PG 49, 345; spurious and late), *Sursum in excelsis sint cogitationes et mentes mostrae* (*Anaph. Cyrilli Hier. seu Alex.*: Hänggi-Pahl,

Prex Eucharistica, 285), *Sursum sint mentes, intellectus et corda omnium nostrum* (*Anaph. Xysti*, ibid., 311), *Sursum habete corda vestra cum timore divino* (*Anaph. Cyrilli Alex*., ibid., 337), *Attollamus mentem et corda,* at Jerusalem (*Eutymni testimonium*: B. de Montfaucon, *Analecta Graeca*, 62), *Attollite corda vestra,* in the Ethiopian church (*Anaph. Patrum nostr. Apostolorum*: Hänggi-Pahl, 114) and *Sursum corda habeamus* (*Anaph. I. Chrys*., ibid., 225). Only the Spanish formulation is different: *Aures ad Dominum* (*Missale Mixtum I*: PL 85, 1155). The Fathers explain the expression *Sursum corda* as an exhortation from the outset to a worthy participation in the sacred mysteries: thus in *Cyprian (*De orat. dom.* 31: CSEL 3/1, 289), Augustine (*De ver. relig. III*, 5: CSEL 77,8), *Caesarius of Arles (*Sermo* 22,4: PL 39, 1969), *John Cassian (*Conlatio 9 de oratiome*: PL 49, 786), *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. Myst.* V, 4: PG 33, 1111) and John Chrysostom (*De poenit. hom. 9*: PG 49, 345; spurious and late). A reference by Augustine to this exhortation is interesting: *Illud quod inter sacra mysteria cor habere sursum iubemur, ipso adiuvante id valemus, quo iubente admonemur* (*De bono viduit.* 16: CSEL 41,328). The people's response *Habemus ad Dominum,* acc. to Cyril of Jerusalem, should correspond to the reality of those who are in relationship with the Lord: and if this is not possible continuously, at least at this moment they should make an effort to do so (*Cat. Myst.* V, 4: SC 126,152). The same idea is found in Augustine: *Non lingua sonet, et conscientia neget, et quia hoc ipsum, ut sursum habeatis cor* (*Serm.* IV 3: PL 46, 836). In the *Trad. Apost.* the second element of the dialogue and its response are reserved to the eucharistic celebration; in the rite of lighting the lamps during the common meal, therefore, he says that *Sursum corda* is not said *quia in oblatione dicitur* (Botte, *La Tradition apostolique*, 64).

The third element of the liturgical dialogue, *Gratias agamus Domino—Dignum et iustum est,* is a combination of Jewish and Greco-Roman formulas. According to the Mishnah, the Jewish head of the family must invite participants, after the blessing of the cup, to give thanks to God (Danby, *The Mishnah*, I divis., Zeraim, Berakoth 7,3,8). The assembly's response, however, is taken from the acclamation used by Greeks and Romans: *Dignum et iustum est* or ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον, esp. for the election of the emperor. Some scholars, however, trace the origin of this response to Jewish morning prayer (Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*, 22-25). The formula appears, with slight variations, in all the Eastern anaphorae (Cyr. Jer., *Cat. Myst.* V, 5: PG 33, 1114; John Chrys., *In Matthaeum hom.* 25,3-4: PG 57, 331-332; Aug., *Ep.* 213,1-6: PL 33, 966-968; *Serm.* 68,5: PL 38, 439): in each case the idea is to give the whole prayer a solemn eucharistic dimension. The response, explains Cyril of Jerusalem, shows that our giving thanks is ἄξιον πρᾶγμα καὶ δίκαιον, although God's action toward us goes beyond the dictates of justice: ὑπὲρ τὸ δίκαιον.

The *didascalia,* or instructions, are invitations to prayer or to perform certain gestures or movements during a liturgical celebration. The earliest examples are *Sursum corda* and *Gratias agamus Domino,* discussed above. Normally the Roman liturgy assigns the didascalia to the priest, as we see in the prayer of Good Friday or in the invitations to the Lord's Prayer or the orations of the one who presides. Both Eastern and Western liturgies abound in examples of instructions, esp. regarding the assembly's bodily position or movements during the celebration. Some examples: *Flectamus genua, Levate, humiliate capita vestra Deo; offerte vobis pacem; aspicite ad Orientem;* ὀρθοί πρόσκωμεν, στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου (Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum*, 64; Ἡ θεία λειτουργία, 70, 100). Other instructions concern the dismissal of the assembly at the end of the Mass, such as *Ite, missa est,* and that of catechumens after the gospel and the homily. Until the 12th c. the Ambrosian liturgy preserved the formula: *Si quis catechumenus, si quis Iudaeus, procedat; cuius cura non est, procedat.* Still today in the Byzantine liturgy the deacon pronounces the formula dismissing the catechumens after the gospel (see Ἡ θεία λειτουργία, 78). At the time of Caesarius of Arles, the people either did not understand the deacon's *didascalia* or ignored them, and Caesarius complains: *Rogo et admoneo vos, fratres carissimi, ut quotiescum—que iuxta altarium a clericis oratur, aut oratio diacono clamante indicitur, non solum corda sed etiam corpora fideliter inclinatis. Nam dum frequenter sicut oportet, et diligenter adtendo, diacono clamante "Flectamus genua" maximam partem populi velut columnas erectos stare conspicio* (*Serm.* 77: CCL 103,319).

Under the influence of the liturgical movement, which had used the *didascalia* as a catechetical tool for explaining the parts of the liturgy, the Sacred Congregation of Rites (*Instr.* 3 Sept. 1958: AAS 50 [1958] 657) officially recognized the role of the modern "commentator," who now shares responsibility for the *didascalia* with the president of the assembly.

Liturgical dialogue: C. Bouman, *Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer*: VChr 4 (1950) 94-115; I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Hildesheim 1962; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl (eds.), *Prex Eucharistica*,

Fribourg (CH) 1968 (Spicil. Friburg., 12); B. Margansky, *Praefatio precis eucharisticae* (*In luce Patrum et Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum considerata*), Rome 1971; H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, Oxford [12]1977.

Didascalia: A. Martimort (ed.), *L'Église en prière*, Tournai 1961 (It. tr. Rome [2]1966), 132-133; Η ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΙΟΑΝΝΟΥ ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΥ, Rome 1967; L.C. Mohlberg, *Liber sacramentorum romanae aecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, Rome 1960, 219-268; M. Pellegrino, *Sursum cor nelle opere di sant'Agostino*: RechAug 3 (1965) 179-206; R. Taft, *The Dialogue Before the Anaphora in Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgy*: OCP 52 (1986) 299-324; Th. Maas-Ewerd, Brevissimis verbis *in die Messfeier einführen: Zu einer Frage liturgischer Praxis*: Klerusblatt 67 (1987) 321-326; A. Gelston, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Anaphora and Mystagogical Catechesis 16*: SP 26 (1991) 21-33.

A. Chupungco

LITURGICAL FURNISHINGS. The expression *liturgical furnishings* refers to the whole complex of elements, fixed or movable, suitable for the specific functions and use of every kind of church building. Movable furnishings include those pertaining to ritual, such as vessels, patens, *amulae,* books for reading or singing and furniture.

Fixed liturgical furnishings refers to all those elements that divide the sanctuary from its vestibule and annexes and delineate the spaces for clergy and faithful, including those pertaining more directly to the altar, readings and homily. All elements of fixed worship furnishings were executed in masonry, marble, marble and metal, wood or metal (esp. silver and bronze).

Most of these furnishings, esp. *soleae* or balustrades, were fashioned with masonry elements of modest height and normally adorned with pictorial decoration. Often handwork in stone or marble was used for the same purpose, such as plutei, chancel screens, or small columns at intervals, often embellished by simple (or sometimes elaborate) decoration.

In Christian churches typically the areas whose functions were plainly recognizable and in which fixed liturgical furnishings were mainly used were the vestibule, the main body of the church (and *pastophoria*, if any), crypts, entry narthex, baptistery, and *catechumenon* and *chrismarion*, if present.

Starting from the vestibule: typically in buildings with four porticos a fountain was installed in the center for ablutions; at times there were more than one basin, for the same purpose. When a separation of the exonarthex from the portico was desired, metal gates were often used, or a masonry fence. In the main body of the church, around the base of the apse, in addition to wooden chairs there were also masonry steps as in an amphitheater (*subsellia*) for the presbyters, with the bishop's seat at the center, which might also be of stone, marble, wood or ivory; it was often adorned with floral, animal or cruciform decoration, or with scenes taken esp. from the OT and NT and the apocryphal gospels, as on the famous cathedra of Bishop *Maximian of Ravenna. Ordinarily in the early Christian period there was only one altar; the reason for the seven altars of the Roman Lateran basilica is not yet known. An altar was also set up in the crypt. In martyrial basilicas there could also be more than one altar, as, e.g., to St. Valentinus on the Via Flaminia, in the Roman suburb. A ciborium was placed on the altar, to indicate the focal point of the ceremony. The altar, when not of masonry, could also consist of a marble table or an assemblage of plutei or decorated chancel screens, or of a *sarcophagus, acc. to a choice dictated also by the placement of its relics. Regarding ciboria, we have information on the use of wooden ciboria, like that cited in the Roman **Liber pontificalis* in the early Christian church of St. Susanna at Rome, but more often elements of marble ciboria have been preserved, esp. from the Early Medieval period. Ciboria or baldachins might cover the altar like a pavilion set on small columns, or rest directly on the latter (as, e.g., over the cemetery chamber of St. Alessandro on the Via Nomentana). Other articles, coordinated with the altar, were used to hold offerings or lamps.

The presbyteral area was delimited by a balustrade made of plutei and topped by an iconostasis replete with statues and protected by gates, sometimes in silver. Access to the presbyteral area was only through the central aisle, at times even more narrowly marked off by parapets or low masonry elements that formed the so-called *solea* (probably one of the first *soleae*, if not the oldest known, was that of the Lateran basilica).

Tables and cathedrae were also set up in annexes, e.g., in baptisteries or chrismarions. A silver stag that gushed water for the execution of the rite was sometimes placed in baptismal basins, also delimited by sculpted parapets; they were also covered with a marble baldachin held up by columns. (The roofs of these baldachins were often covered with silver leaf.) Another important element of fixed liturgical furnishing was the ambo; for our period there are examples of notable quality in Asia Minor, often datable to the time of *Justinian.

Regarding movable liturgical furnishings, for ease of reference we will list all the best-known types alphabetically, clarifying their function where nec-

essary and giving some well-known examples from our period.

Amae—amulae. Containers for wine or water; *amulae* were similar to contemporary Mass cruets (Greg. Gr., *Ep*. I, 42). There are also examples of metal *amulae*. Some 5th-c. examples are preserved at the Vatican Museum.

Antependia. Related to modern altar frontals; we have late examples of them.

Basins. For water (DACL, II, 602-608): the priest used them to wash his hands during the Mass and before the consecration (Tertull., *Apol.* 39). Often confused with patens, basins are more concave and sometimes have a handle. The Stûma paten is a basin.

Bells—handbells. The latter were common in Celtic monasteries; in the 8th c. abbots used them to call the monks (DACL, III, 2, 1954-1982; 1982-1991). We have late examples of the former.

Book. See *book.

Cathedra. See *cathedra.

Censer or *thurible*. Similar to the modern container in which incense is burned. In old inventories it is often given the Greek name θυμιατήριον or the Latin names *thuribulum* or *acerra*. Examples are in the Cyprus treasure (7th c.). Round or polygonal, with or without foot, but always with chain.

Chalices. Initially, it is probable that a common *poculum* (drinking vessel) was used for the eucharistic consecration; this was sometimes in the form of a goblet or a glass or silver *cantharus* without handles. Later we have (1) chalices for consecration or oblation (*scyphi* or *calices maiores*), like that offered by the empress Theodora in the mosaic of St. Vitale, Ravenna; (2) chalices for the Communion of bishop and faithful (*calices minores* and *calices ministeriales*); (3) *calices baptismales,* whose form is not documented but which are mentioned as early as *Innocent I (LP I, 221), to contain milk and honey after the Communion of neophytes. There are possible examples of these objects in the Vatican Museum collections (G. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma*, 156). We must bear in mind that the various chalices are not always recognized, esp. when they are not goblet-shaped with a more or less tall stem and so are not those used by the priest. Chalices in the form of a wide cup with handles and short stem were probably more suitable for offering to the faithful. Among *calices minores* is that of Amiens (5th–6th c.), of glass with two handles; the famous *Antioch chalice seems more suited to offerings or to the distribution of Communion than to use by the priest (Braun, *Altar*, tv. X, 4,30).

Colum—colatorium—colum vinarium. Strainers used for the purification of wine before the Eucharist. The Canoscio treasure (5th–6th c.) has a fine example in the form of a perforated spoon (F. Volbach, *Canoscio*, 310).

Comb. Before approaching the altar, the priest said a particular prayer and tidied his hair with a suitable comb. These were of wood, ivory or bone, even decorated with secular subjects.

Coronae (lit. "crowns"). Legend says that those around the ciborium of Hagia Sophia at *Constantinople were donated by Constantine. They had a votive character and were hung from the ciborium, of gold and silver with precious stones and pendant cross at the center, acc. to Early Medieval examples. Those of the museums of Cluny and Madrid were part of the treasure of the *Visigothic church of Guarrazar in Spain. At Monza are *Longobard and Carolingian examples (DACL VI, 2,1842-1859; XI, 2,2769-2770; Schlunk, 3 11-20).

Cross. See *cross - crucifix.

Diptych. See *diptych.

Eucharistic dove. Boxes in the shape of a dove used to keep bread for the Eucharist. Since citations in the LP are unclear, our sure examples all postdate 1000, though we have ancient pyxes with a dove mounted on top.

Ewers. These objects must be connected with the baptismal liturgy and with the *pelvis baptismi* mentioned more than once in the LP, since we have no mention of any washing of hands. For this operation the larger *amae* could serve (see above).

Fans. Used to keep insects away from the sacred elements, circular with gilded decoration, sometimes in relief, as at *Aquileia, or with ivory framework (DACL V, 2,1923; 16 10-25).

Host-irons. Used for the unblessed unleavened bread (DACL V, 1,1366-1368).

Icon. See *iconography - iconology.

Lamp. According to the *Testamentum Domini,* every part of the church must be illuminated (I, 19). We distinguish two types of *lamps: (l) fixed and (2) movable or portable.

1. Fixed lamps. We know that from the 4th c. great metal circles (*coronae*) were used, from which glass oil lamps were hung (one of these, perhaps 8th c., was found in St. Saba, Rome, suspended from an iron hook: Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma*, 159, fig.). We also have small Coptic examples: either a tall circle with an arm to hold the glass bulb inside it, or a flat circle pierced so as to be able to insert the same bulbs. *Egeria saw something similar in the Holy Sepulchre (*Itin*. 24,4); *Prudentius (*Cath*. V, 141-144) mentions lights hanging from the ceiling by ropes, which may be related to the type mentioned above. At any rate,

the LP speaks of heavy expenses for the *servitium luminum*. The names for lamps are various: *fara, phara, fara canthara, fara coronata, coronae, regna buttae, butrones* or *buttones,* and then *gabatae* which could be in the form of a *canistrum* like that of S. Martino ai Monti, Rome (5th c.). Circular lamps often had the christological monogram and cross, and a plate with dedicatory inscription. A fine example, perhaps 5th c., is in the Museo delle Terme, Rome (C. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma*, 93). A hanging lamp in the form of a basilica was found at Orléansville (DACL, II, fig. 1443-1444).

2. *Movable lamps*. These served esp. to illuminate the altar. The names vary acc. to type: *candelabra, cereostata, cereofala, candelae, lucernae,* and apply to candles with molded stem and base with feet, or oil lamps with one or more spouts. Among examples of the latter from the early Christian period with Christian subjects (though not always found in churches), we would highlight that in the Uffizi, Florence, and another in the Florentine Archaeological Museum (C. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma*, 92; 68, fig. 49). The material of these lamps could be bronze or terracotta, but also silver, iron, brass or glass. Their forms also varied, even drawing on mythological fauna, but were often decorated with Christians symbols or the christological monogram. The name *donarium* could also be connected with objects for illumination; they were called *anathemata signocristata* (Lat. gift/offering marked with a crest) if they had the christological monogram.

Knife, eucharistic. Used for the preparation of the bread for the sacrifice (the Greeks use one in the prothesis, in the form of a lancet). Our examples are all late (DACL, VIII, 1,1234-1237).

Lectern. Often connected with the ambo, but could be of wood or metal. Names are: *pluteus, lectricium, legitorium, analogium* (DACL VII, 2,2493-2496; Braun, *Altar*, II, 150).

Metretas (LP I, 176, 187). Used to hold oil for lamps. We have no sure examples.

Missorium. Precious plates on which the bread to be consecrated was placed. By their name, they may be connected more with the notion of a gift, *quod mittitur*, than with the idea of a meal and a plate (classically *discus*). That of Theodosius, preserved at Madrid, is famous. Generally round, but sometimes rectangular, their decoration could also be inspired by secular subjects (DACL IV, 1,1173-1191).

Organ. We have some figurative evidence of these, but the church did not use them, using only vocal singing (illustrations in the Utrecht Psalter notwithstanding) (DACL VII, 1,1161-1169).

Pails (*small and large*). Some of these were used for holy water (G. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma*, 94).

Parasol, liturgical (Lat. *Umbella*). A famous papal parasol was that of John VII (8th c.), now lost, with subjects drawn by Grimaldi.

Paten. In earthenware, metal or glass, a fairly deep plate, sometimes with a handle, to better distribute the Eucharist. The LP also mentions gold and silver *patenae chrismales* for the chrism of baptism and confirmation. There are numerous examples, including the well-known patens of Riha and Stûma, but for the latter, *see* above: *basin*.

Pax. Identified with tablets decorated with images for the kiss of the faithful; examples are late.

Pyx. Also called *turris, arthoforion, buxis,* this was a container for the eucharistic species. Also used for relics (Braun, *Reliquiäre*, 47-55).

Reliquary. Saints' remains were preserved in *arcellae* or *capsellae*. Various types of reliquaries are preserved in the chapel of the *Sancta Sanctorum* in the Lateran. We will point out the best-known forms, noting that sarcophagi could be used for the same purpose. (1) *Pyxes*. *See* above. *Capsae,* derived from funerary urns, are often confused with pyxes. Their forms and materials vary. The early Christian ones of Brivio (oval) and Brescia (ivory) are well known. (2) *Reliquary vases*. That there was such a use is demonstrated by that with the head of St. Sebastian, though the deposition of that relic dates from the 9th c. (3) *Staurothecae*. For the relics of the cross, sometimes in the form of a cross, like that of Justin II. The *encolpion,* which had an individual use and consisted of a pectoral cross containing a relic, may be considered a reduction of this type. (4) *Ostensorium*. Should not be confused with *staurothecae,* whose contents were exposed to the faithful only on extraordinary occasions. It is recorded that some reliquaries could, in turn, be provided with a protective case.

Spoon. Generally consisted of a stem, to the end of which was attached a spatula, sometimes very shallow. Could also be of bone, with incisions and decorations (Braun, *Altar*, 265). The Vatican Museum has some early Christian silver spoons (C. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma*, 300).

Stoup for holy water. Part of the fixed rather than the movable furnishings, and examples are late, but there were vessels for holy water that could be moved (DACL II, 1,758-771; Righetti, *Storia lit*., I, 463-468).

Tabernacle. Portable tabernacle for holding the reserved sacrament to be taken to the sick, recalling the OT tabernacle in which the presence of the Lord resided.

Theca for hosts. Typically in the form of a box with sliding cover, found after 1000.

A very ample bibliographical view of the subject until 1960 is in C. Cecchelli, *Vita di Roma nel Medio Evo. Le arti minori e il costume*, Rome 1960. Among later studies, see esp. W.F. Volbach, *Il tesoro di Canoscio: ricerche sull'Umbria tardo-antica e preromanica. Atti del II Convegno di Studi Umbri - Gubbio 24-28 maggio 1964*, Perugia 1965; J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar*, Munich 1924; Id., *Die Reliquiäre des christlich. Kultus*, Freiburg 1940; Th. Mathews, *An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and Its Liturgical Uses*: RivAC 38 (1962) 73-95; S. De Blauw, *Architecture and Liturgy in Late Antiquity and Middle Age: Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship*: Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 33 (1991) 1-34; S. De Blauw, *Cultus et decor. Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale. Basilica Salvatoris. Sanctae Mariae. Sancti Petri*, voll. I-II, Vatican City 1994; H. Geertman, *More veterum. Il Liber Pontificalis e gli edifici di Roma nella tarda antichità e nell'alto Medioevo*, Groningen 1975; H. Geertman, *Nota sul Liber Pontificalis come fonte archeologica*, in *Quaeritur inventus colitur.* Miscellanea in honore di p. U.M. Fasola, vol. I, Rome 1989, 349-361; F. Guidobaldi, *Strutture liturgiche a Roma tra IV e VII secolo*, in *Materiali e tecniche dell'edilizia paleocristiana a Roma*, ed. M. Cecchelli, Rome 2001, 171-190.

M. Cecchelli

LITURGICAL YEAR

I. The primitive nucleus of Easter - II. Development of the Easter cycle - III. The Christmas feasts and cycle - IV. Ordinary time.

The point of departure of the liturgical year is the death of Jesus on a Friday, and his resurrection on "Sunday." The "the Lord's day" thus became the oldest and most authentic feast (*see* *Sunday). The liturgical year contains feasts with provenance both Jewish (Easter, Pentecost) and pagan (Christmas, Epiphany). With its Sundays and its cycles of Easter and Christmas, the liturgical year was also called *temporale/proprium de tempore,* arranged acc. to the feasts of the martyrs and saints *sanctorale/proprium de sanctis*. The movable cycle of Easter formed around the primitive nucleus of Easter, based on its date. A second, later nucleus comprised the connected feasts of Christmas and Epiphany, which pulled into their orbit the feasts of the saints already in existence to form a new cycle, this time fixed. The remaining periods of the year outside the two cycles were divided into the *quatuor tempora*.

I. The primitive nucleus of Easter. The first Christians celebrated *Easter acc. to Jewish practice for Passover and, like the Jews, observed Easter/Passover on 14 Nisan, in memory of the exodus, but with the difference that the new and true Paschal Lamb was Christ (1 Cor 5:7). Because the date of the Hebrew feast of Passover did not always fall on a Sunday, but varied, the Christians also celebrated Easter from year to year on different days of the week. It was quickly established, however, that the day of the resurrection would fall each year on a Sunday, obvious as it was that, like the weekly Easter, the annual Easter should also be moved to coincide with a Sunday, in this case the Sunday following 14 Nisan. Detached from its Jewish roots, the Christian Easter had its own rites: mourning over the death of Christ and joy for the resurrection, both motives celebrated during the Easter vigil until dawn. Two days of complete fasting preceded the Easter vigil, followed by fifty days of rejoicing. The Easter vigil was a day consecrated to the commemoration of the twofold event: *Pascha staurōsimon, Pascha anastasimon*. This closely followed the primitive Sunday vigils (DACL 15, 3108-3113), and like them was composed of alternating readings and chants, though it was distinguished from them by the celebration of *baptism and the eucharistic synaxis, which were by antonomasia the sacraments of the Lord's Pasch.

II. Development of the Easter cycle. From the 4th c. the feast of Easter acquired such importance as to become the hinge of a cycle which prepared for and completed it. This development followed two basic tendencies: one historical and the other pastoral. The historical tendency related the Easter cycle to the historical stages of the passion and resurrection of Christ; the pastoral used the liturgy for the spiritual edification of the faithful.

1. *The "historicization."* The 4th-c. stational liturgy of *Jerusalem led to the historicization of the Easter cycle, which spread to all countries via pilgrims. The particular characteristic of the liturgy of Jerusalem was the fact that all the accounts recorded in the gospels concerning the Lord's sufferings, from the day before Palm Sunday until the visit of the women to the tomb, were recalled in Masses dedicated to those events. These celebrations and the related readings were adapted "exactly to the place and time" (concept of mimesis). The celebration at the sacred places led to a lengthening of the one Easter celebration, which now embraced all aspects of the redemption through the celebration of the preceding days, the events of which are recounted in the gospels. Elsewhere also, toward the end of the 4th c., the Easter vigil was being lengthened into a *Triduum Sacrum,* with the three paschal days of Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday dedicated to the memory of the passion, death and resurrection. *Ambrose and *Augustine already speak of the *Triduum Sacrum* of the crucified, buried and risen Christ, even though for them also, Easter in a proper sense was the Easter

vigil, which Augustine calls *mater omnium vigiliarum*. Things were similar in late 4th-c. Asia Minor, when *Gregory of Nyssa preached the "three holy days" during the Easter vigil.

2. *The Easter vigil*. Around the basic rites of the vigil—which remain baptism and *Eucharist—revolve other rites that serve to highlight these two. The blessing of the paschal candle (*laus cerei*) is attested from 384 by *Jerome, in his letter to the deacon Praesidius of Piacenza; the *Exultet* of the Roman liturgy almost certainly goes back to Ambrose of Milan. Doubtless the readings and prophecies underwent variation in number and length, but they correspond to the primitive usage of the Sunday vigils. The blessing of the baptismal water, which became general in the 3rd c., presupposes that the practice of baptizing in running water had fallen out of use. The accompanying prayer draws its themes from biblical *typology; that of the Roman liturgy may go back to the 3rd–4th c. The formulary of the Mass, whose structure preserves some primitive traits, is only attested from the period of the first sacramentaries.

3. *The period of preparation*. Christians prepared for the feast during a preliminary period that gradually lengthened, in the first instance for pastoral reasons (RAC 7, 512-518). Other than the fast on Friday and Saturday before Easter, for the earliest period it is difficult to say what else might have occurred. At the beginning of the 4th c. the fast before Easter lasted six days in the East, three weeks at Rome. *Athanasius of Alexandria introduced the Lenten fast in 334 in Egypt (*Ep. fest.* 6,13), already known to *Eusebius (*Solemn. pasch.* 4) and practiced also in the West (Rome). Toward 381–384 *Egeria mentions this regarding Jerusalem. Jerome mentions it regarding Rome ca. 384 (*Ep.* 24), Ambrose tells us of the practice in Milan. By the late 4th and early 5th c. *Lent was generally known: its observance advanced with the transformation of the Easter vigil into the great annual baptismal celebration, and with the institutionalization of the catechumenate and the illumination, the 40-day period of immediate preparation for baptism, which was celebrated on the eve of Easter (baptismal catecheses of *Cyril of Jerusalem). From the 5th c., the reconciliation of public sinners centered on the end of Lent—Holy Thursday at Rome—since the heaviest part of the penitential practice took place during Lent. The entire community united with the two groups, catechumens and penitents, who were most involved in Lent, so as to prepare for Easter with penance, fasting, religious practices and liturgical celebrations. In the end, Lent (*Quadragesima*) was lengthened to the *Sexagesima* (in the 6th c.) and the *Septuagesima* (in the 7th c.), the *Sexagesima* referring to the approx. 60 (actually 57) days before Easter and *Septuagesima* referring to the approx. 70 (actually 64) days before Easter. They followed *Quinquagesima* (50 days), the last Sunday before Lent.

4. *The post-Easter period*. Easter week was entirely dedicated to the deeper instruction of the neophytes (mystagogical catecheses of [ps.-]Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, *Theodore of Mopsuestia). On Sunday *in albis* the neophytes left off their white garments and resumed their normal dress, and left the places reserved for them near the altar. Pentecost day and the period of 50 days of liturgical joy between Easter and Pentecost both go back to the Jewish tradition (Acts 2:1). From the beginning, the day of Pentecost was celebrated like the weekly day of the resurrection of Christ, whereas the period of 50 days of joy is expressly attested only from the 2nd c. (*Ep. apost.*). The linking of the day of Pentecost with the celebration of the descent of the *Holy Spirit was done perhaps in the 3rd c. Pentecost was originally the solemn conclusion of the period of 50 days of joy which, acc. to Ambrose, "must be celebrated like Easter," given that they "are like a single Sunday" (*in Luc.* 8,25). In Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine (Jerome, Egeria, *Doctr. Addai*), the *ascension of Christ was celebrated on the 50th day along with the sending of the Spirit, until, toward the end of the 4th c., the event was historicized and the ascension alone was celebrated on the fortieth day, thus separating it from the complex of the paschal event, as also occurred with the sending of the Spirit.

III. The Christmas feasts and cycle. The date of Christ's birth was unknown, and thus at their origin, the feasts of his coming to humanity were not aimed at celebrating an anniversary but at opposing the pagan feasts of the winter solstice, fixed at 6 Jan in Egypt and Arabia, and 25 Dec at Rome. To these were added old and new feasts to form a second, fixed cycle.

*1. *Epiphany*. Celebrated 6 Jan, the name attesting an Eastern origin, Epiphany arose in Egypt in the 2nd c. but did not spread until the 4th c. C. Mohrmann considers it "a typically ideological feast," celebrating the various manifestations of our Lord: his birth, the adoration of the shepherds and magi, his baptism, the miracle at Cana. It is marked by the blessing of the waters and is called τὰ φῶτα in the East, where, when the Roman feast of Christmas spread, it essentially commemorated the baptism of Christ. In the West Epiphany essentially became the feast of the adoration of the magi.

2. **Christmas*. Christmas is of Roman origin: it appears in the **Chronography of 354*, where the civil calendar cites it as 25 Dec: *Natale Invicti* (*Solis*), in the **Depositio martyrum*, of 336: *VIII kal. ian. natus Christus in Bethleem Iudeae*. The oldest *iconographical depictions of the adoration of the shepherds and the magi are also Roman, because originally Christmas, like Epiphany in the East, was the feast of the birth of Christ along with his adoration by the shepherds and the magi, a meaning still preserved in *Africa at the time of *Optatus of Milevis. The feast was introduced in the East simultaneously with the spread of Epiphany in the West. The three Masses of Christmas are attested at the time of *Gregory the Great.

3. *The Christmas cycle*. Includes in the first place the octave of the feast. In the East, as attested by the *Syriac calendar of 411, St. Stephen was celebrated 26 Dec, Sts. John and James the 27th, and Sts. Peter and Paul the 28th; in the West, acc. to the *Mart. hier.*, St. Stephen the 26th, St. John the Evangelist and St. James, brother of the Lord the 27th, the Holy Innocents the 28th. 1 Jan, as the eighth day after Christmas, had to oppose the pagan New Year celebrations; as the feast of the Circumcision (in *Gaul from the 6th c., from the 10th c. at Rome), it was in keeping with the historicizing tendency of the liturgy. Forty days after Epiphany, 14 Feb, the *Hypapante* was celebrated at Jerusalem (*Peregr. Egeriae* 26), the meeting of the Lord with his people, the latter symbolized by Simeon and Anna (Lk 2:21-40). After the introduction of Christmas the feast was moved to 2 Feb, definitively from 561–562 by a law of Justinian. In the 5th c. the feast was connected to a procession of lights from *Bethlehem to Jerusalem, similar to an official act in which the population of a city sets out to receive an important person with candles and torches. Introduced at Rome in the 7th c., this feast, with its procession from St. Hadrian to S. Maria Maggiore, replaced the pagan tradition of the *amburbale* (RAC 16, 946-956).

4. *Advent* (RAC 1, 118-125). Begun in Gaul and *Spain, from the 4th/5th c., for ascetical reasons: as a preparation for both Epiphany (the date of baptism!) and Christmas. The Councils of *Tours in 563 and Mâcon in 581 and some passages of *Gregory of Tours (d. 594) attest a kind of "Lent" in preparation for Christmas. From the 6th c. we find the formularies *de adventu Domini* in the Roman sacramentaries; they emphasize the expectation of the eschatological coming, and the awaiting of God as King. The length of this period has varied: four weeks acc. to *Bede's homiliary, five acc. to the Gelasian *Sacramentary*, Amalarius and *Paul the Deacon. In the *Hispanic liturgy Advent began 17 Nov; in the *Ambrosian liturgy 11 Nov. The liturgical formulary for the period and its significance were fixed with the Carolingian reform. Advent above all commemorates the coming on earth of the Messiah, with a particular emphasis on the role played in this by the Virgin Mary. This explains the many readings and Marian formulas of the Masses; of particular note in the Hispanic calendars is the feast of the *Expectatio partus B.M.V.*, 18 Dec.

IV. Ordinary Time. The greater part of the liturgical year falls outside of the cycles of Easter and Christmas, and received an order based on different criteria and at different times.

1. The *quatuor tempora* are weeks of fasting, prayer and penance: the weeks after Pentecost, after the third Sunday of September, after the third Sunday of Advent and after the first Sunday of Lent (from the 7th c.). The pagans had various celebrations corresponding to the four seasons as moments in agricultural life. According to Janini the *quatuor tempora* are seasonal celebrations, going back to Pope *Siricius (384–399), on the occasion of the controversies over fasting; their regulation was a compromise between the continual fasting practiced by the ascetics and the attacks made on them by *Jovinian (condemned in 390). According to Morin, the establishment of these fasts in correspondence with the four seasons was to have the fast of Pentecost coincide with the *feriae messis*, that of September with the *feriae vindemiales*, and that of December with the *feriae sementinae*.

2. In the ancient liturgy the *Sundays per annum* after Epiphany and Pentecost were designated by different expressions: in the *Liber commicus* Hispanic *dominici quotidiani*, in the Sélestat Lectionary (*dominicae*) *cottidianae*. The Roman liturgical books related them to the feasts of the most important saints: *post natale apostolorum*, *post s. Laurentii*, *post s. Angeli*. The Gallican books of the 8th–9th c. introduced the continuous numbering of 24 Sundays after Pentecost.

CPG vol. 5, 147-151 (*index liturgicus*); RAC 7, 756-763; 16, 1109-1118; M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia liturgica* 2, Milan [3]1969; *Handbuch der Ostkirchenkunde* 2, Düsseldorf 1989, 65-87, and 97-99 (bibl.); H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 1, Regensburg 1983; Th. Klauser, *La Liturgia nella Chiesa occidentale. Sintesi storica e riflessioni*, It. tr., Turin (n.d. but 1972), 118-126; H.R. Drobner, *Die drei Tage zwischen Tod und Auferstehung unseres Herrn Jesus Christus*, Leiden 1982; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, Portland 1986, 304-314 (liturgical readings); J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Rome 1987; Ch. Jones et al. (eds.), *The Study of Liturgy*, New York [2]1992, 455-472; M. Kunzler, *La Liturgia della Chiesa*, Milan 1996,

507-593; A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Scientia Liturgica* 5, Casale Monf. ²2000, 169-370; FCh 20, 84-104 (Egeria); PO 35,1 (Armenian lectionary).

V. Saxer - S. Heid

LITURGY

I. Christian liturgy - II. Liturgy and the Fathers - III. Liturgy and tradition - IV. Liturgical language - V. Improvisational prayer - VI. Liturgy of the Hours - VII. Monastic liturgy - VIII. Eastern liturgical books - IX. Western liturgical books.

I. Christian liturgy

1. Vocabulary. Derived originally from the Greek via its Latinized form, the term *liturgy* etymologically means public service (λήϊτος ἔργον), and its uses are many and diverse in ancient Greek, "worship service" not being, by any means, the most common meaning. Its use in the LXX to translate the Hebrew terms *shereth* and *avodah,* when these designate worship and its ministers, guided the meaning which it took in Christian Greek and above all in the NT. From the 4th c. λειτουργία refers more specifically to the eucharistic celebration; its religious value is often reinforced by means of the qualifying adjective *divine liturgy*. Translated in Latin by *servitium, ministerium* and above all *officium,* from the Renaissance onward the Greek word is often transcribed as a technical term to indicate Christian worship organized under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical authorities, and, as public acts of the church, regulated by them. This use became more general, however, only from the 19th c. onward, and not until 1947 did the magisterium of the Catholic Church propose a doctrinal definition of the term (*Mediator Dei* 20), taken up and refined by Vatican II (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* 7).

2. Specific character of the Christian liturgy. The principal resonances of the pre-Christian Greek term, adopted as it had been by the LXX to indicate acts of worship, were well adapted to indicate the specific nature of Christian worship; i.e., its public character, involving the ecclesial community as such and not only a limited number of "ministers of worship" as found in other religions. It must be associated with the term *ecclesia,* which, as much for the meaning which it had received in the cities of ancient Greece as for its etymology (from καλέω: "call, convoke"), designates a task, and indeed a responsibility, of the community. The *ecclesia* is a community gathered together by the Word of God—and more precisely by Christ, who is this Word incarnate—to constitute an "assembly" (*qahal*) whose primary function is to fulfill a sacerdotal ministry (Ex 19:6). The moments and ritual acts which properly make up the liturgy are supremely expressive of what happens in the entire life of the ecclesial community, for in them, the agency of Christ working through his Spirit realizes that "sign and instrument of a very closely knit union with God and the unity of the whole human race" (*Lumen Gentium* 1), which is none other than "the church as the universal sacrament of salvation" (ibid., 48). Every Christian liturgy may be called "sacramental," in the technical sense that the word *sacrament* has taken on—i.e., a visible sign in which the "mystery of salvation" is both symbolized and made present, that mystery which is the return to God, in the form of sacrifice, of the whole creation. Therefore, acc. to the diversity of its various expressions, all Christian liturgy is fundamentally paschal, finding its roots and its orientation in the "Pasch" of Christ, accomplished and manifested above all in his passion and resurrection.

3. The Christian liturgy in the patristic period. Two acts of the Christian community are characteristic and constitutive of the liturgy from its origin: *baptism and the *caena Domini* ("Lord's Supper"/ *Eucharist). Together these represent "Christian initiation" as we find it expressed in the great "mystagogical catecheses" of the 4th c. (*Cyril of Jerusalem, *John Chrysostom, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ambrose of Milan) and spoken of in many tractates and sermons, from the *De baptismo* of *Tertullian onward. The oldest collection of liturgical texts together with accompanying directives of the church is the **Apostolic Tradition* attributed to *Hippolytus (beginning of 3rd c.), which had a great influence in both East and West, containing also rites for the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons, some formulas of benediction, and various prayers. All this was taken up and developed in the region of *Antioch in about 380 in the vast compilation known as the **Apostolic Constitutions,* as it was in other ancient documents: the **Didache* (perhaps the beginning of the 2nd c.), the **Didascalia Apostolorum* (originating from N Syria, start of 3rd c.) and a Jewish Christian euchologion. At the end of the 4th c. a new feature emerges, previously little known: a service of psalms and prayers for morning and evening. This tradition, which developed in the monasteries, grew into the *Liturgy of the Hours*: an act of praise, and also of meditation, increasingly adding poetic texts alongside scriptural and patristic readings, thus enriching the psalmody. Much more time would be necessary, well beyond the patristic period properly so-called, for this to take the liturgical form of the seven sacraments, the rites of consecration of

persons, churches, and objects, and of funeral rites. Yet progressively, developments in the celebration of the paschal mystery came to constitute the cycle of the liturgical year, including its preparation in Lent and unfolding in Pentecost, the multiplication of commemorations and anniversaries, and in the West the celebration, prolonged for several weeks, of the manifestation of Christ the Lord, including expectation (Advent), *Nativity and then the *Epiphany. All these developments, however, do no more than draw out the many and various aspects of the one "paschal mystery" from which springs the whole Christian liturgy.

A. Romeo, *Il termine λειτουργία nella grecità biblica*: Misc. Mohlberg, II, Rome 1949, 467-519; C. Vagaggini, *Il senso teologico della liturgia*, Rome 1957, Cinisello Balsamo [6]1999; J.-A. Jungmann, *Early Liturgy*, Notre Dame, IN 1959; H. Schmidt, *Introductio in liturgiam occidentalem*, Rome 1960; O. Casel, *Il mistero del culto cristiano*, Turin 1966; P. Fernández Rodríguez, *El término liturgia. Su etimología y su uso*: Ciencia Tom. 97 (1970) 143-163; J.T. Burtchael, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities*, Cambridge 1992; S. Rosso, *Un popolo di sacerdoti. Saggio di liturgia fondamentale*, Rome 1999; *Liturgia*, ed. D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca - C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001, 1037-1054.

I.-H. Dalmais

II. Liturgy and the Fathers

1. The Fathers as witnesses (and sources?) of the liturgy. If and how the Fathers may be considered sources for the elaboration of liturgical texts is a question that can only be considered by studying particular texts of individual Fathers. That they are special witnesses of the liturgy as used in the different churches of their time is clear from an examination of their writings on the subject: The **Didache,* the first *Apologia* of *Justin (ch. 61), the tracts of *Tertullian on *baptism, *penance and *prayer, and that on prayer by *Cyprian, the **Apostolic Tradition* attributed to *Hippolytus, the **Didascalia Apostolorum* and the **Apostolic Constitutions,* the catecheses of *Cyril and of *John II of Jerusalem, of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *John Chrysostom, the *Festal (or Easter) Letters of *Athanasius, the Euchologion of *Serapion of Thmuis, the **De mysteriis* and *De sacramentis* of *Ambrose of Milan, and the instructions to the neophytes of *Gaudentius of Brescia, *Zeno of Verona and *Augustine of Hippo (*see* *mystagogy).

We can find from time to time important evidence of texts and other liturgical details in the writings of the Fathers, e.g., in biblical commentary on the liturgical texts of the Bible (e.g., Jn 6; 1 Cor 11; Mt 28:19-20); in Augustine's commentary on the *Lord's Prayer, *Ep.* 54 (on criteria for liturgical practice) and in his frequent allusions to the *Sursum corda* that introduces the eucharistic prayer, as well as in his reference to the significance of the *kiss as a reminder of fraternal sharing and communion.

2. Liturgy as norm of life. The examples just mentioned indicate clearly how the Fathers understood the liturgy not only as an act of worship but also as a norm of Christian life, esp. in the preaching of the Easter mystery. Other examples can easily be added, such as the insistence of Augustine on forgiveness and reconciliation in speaking about the *Pater noster* that precedes Communion. In a broader sense, the link that the Fathers constantly affirm between liturgy and the Christian life may be seen particularly in two recurring themes: prayer, while being an expression of faith and of religious sentiment, must be translated into works—in this sense, says Augustine, we can carry out the precept to pray always; second, that the celebration of the Eucharist is communion not only with Christ, who gives us his body to eat, but also with our brothers and sisters, with whom we make up the one body of the Lord. We also find exhortations to that purity of spirit and body required for participation in the Eucharist, and an invitation to offer oneself in sacrifice in union with Christ; this is esp. true in the *Acts* of *martyrs and in the literature on martyrdom more broadly.

In a broader sense, the impact of the liturgy on the Christian life is shown in the instruction to catechumens and neophytes on the fundamental duties of a Christian, in the Fathers' explanation of the significance of the baptismal liturgy.

3. The liturgy as norm of belief. The first to consider this was B. Capelle in a paper given at the 1st International Conference on Patristic Studies (published in 1954) on "the authority of the liturgy in the Fathers," which should be referred to for a full treatment of the subject: here we will consider only its key points (*see* *argumentation, patristic).

This "authority" was stated by *Prosper of Aquitaine in a celebrated formula: *legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi,* that, applied first by its author to the controversy with the *Semi-Pelagians, was then elevated into an absolute principle, making "the liturgy a governing criterion in matters of faith" (Capelle, 6). In this Prosper is in debt to his master Augustine, who himself used this criterion in his dispute with the *Donatists and against the *Pelagian Celestius in connection with the exorcisms in the baptism of infants. Believed to be of apostolic origin, the norm may without doubt be dated early, certainly to the *Didache,* and then is continuously present in the texts that regard the place of the liturgy in the context of the discipline and organization of the community: the *Apostolic Tradition,* the Syriac *Di-*

dascalia of the apostles, as well as the *Apostolic Constitutions* all manifest this idea in different ways. Among the Fathers who took inspiration from this criterion *Origen should be mentioned: using it in an arbitrary way, he attributed later practices to the apostles and invested them with mysterious symbolic meanings. In the *Dialogue of Origen with Heraclides*, a work only discovered in 1941, Origen founds his trinitarian doctrine on the eucharistic prayer and also discusses prayer directed to Christ. Further he begins a tradition of "double" exegesis that comments on the liturgy as it does on the Bible. Subsequently, Tertullian elaborated a theory of *consuetudo,* also basing it uncritically on an apostolic tradition that made it obligatory. Elsewhere, however, he denies the value of the tradition, as does *Cyprian of Carthage in his dispute over the question of the baptism of heretics with Pope *Stephen, the latter energetically reaffirming the binding nature of the apostolic tradition in force in those churches enjoying particular authority. This had already been the position of *Irenaeus of Lyons in relation to doctrinal matters of primary importance. One aspect of the liturgy on which the Fathers laid great emphasis, beginning with Origen, was the questioning on the faith which preceded baptism, regarding the mystery of the *Trinity; this also applies to other liturgical formulas such as the doxologies and the eucharistic *anaphoras. In this respect the testimony of St. *Basil is esp. significant. Thus the liturgy, present as a dynamic force giving life to the tradition, became a *locus theologicus*. More than this, it worked by means of "ritual acts, with their essentially sacred character: putting into action the Christian mystery, bearers of divine grace, organs of prayer, they direct the whole of life and guide the religious perspectives of the faithful" (Capelle, 20).

Finally, the Fathers see the liturgy as "a sure testimony of doctrine, and so, by virtue of this same function, an official witness to its developments," an expression of the truth that should be received by the Christian faithful (ibid.). The historical process which we have outlined was not a uniformly happy one: an empiricism springing from polemic, an overly mystical approach which did not take into account the nature of development over time, and the literary form of the hieratic texts all contributed at times to making the witness of the Fathers less precise and clear; however, this witness is of considerable importance when it is valued and studied critically.

4. Characteristics of the liturgical piety of the Fathers. Here we summarize some considerations set out in the *Dizionario liturgico,* in both the first edition and the second of 2001. These characteristics are not exclusive to the Fathers, though they are particularly accentuated and consistent in their writings. The piety of the Fathers as it is expressed in the liturgy is nourished and inspired by familiarity with the Bible, directing their response to the divine mystery, and also shaping the expression of their thoughts and sentiments in preaching or writing. They come to the Bible with varying exegetical criteria, but certain core, and in fact common, features emerge: attention is paid to grasping not only the sense of the words but also the *intention of God*, indeed God himself; the unity of the OT and of the NT, founded on the unity of the principal Author of the Bible and of the divine plan as it is expressed there in various ways; the centrality of Christ, essential to the understanding of the Bible, and to the liturgy, as Augustine says: *per Christum hominem ad Christum Deum* (*In Io. Ev. tr.* 13,4); the centrality of the church, recipient and interpreter of the Word of God, acc. to the famous saying that "the church makes the Eucharist, the Eucharist makes the church," i.e., makes the liturgy. The eucharistic prayers are addressed to the Father through Christ in the *Holy Spirit. Theological discussions of the 4th c. brought as their consequence a greater Christocentrism (see J.A. Jungmann, *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet*, Münster [2]1962). Liturgical piety is dominated by the presence of Christ conjoined with the idea of *hodie* ("today"), i.e., when celebrating feasts such as Nativity, Epiphany and Easter.

The liturgy was lived and practiced by the Fathers in an attitude of *objective piety*. This is not to say that the Fathers did not know the intimate fervor of personal contact with God, but in the sense that liturgical piety is founded on faith in the revealed mystery and learned from the Bible and the tradition of the church, with little concession to an effusion of sentiment, which would take a greater place in later eras. The contemplation of the mystery orients and stimulates the life of the Christian, so that we may speak of a *dynamic sense* of the liturgy, from which sprang that ideal of lived faith which inspired the Fathers and which they instilled into the faithful.

Their liturgical piety is also characterized by *the place of the community,* founded theologically on the reality of the church as body, as *Christus totus,* placing the Eucharist at the center of the action of worship, celebrated by the bishop in union with his clergy. The same community emphasis is found in the preparation for and celebration of baptism, as it is of prayer in its various forms. The concept of *mysterion* was applied first to *exegesis, and only later in the 4th c. to the liturgy.

As the Fathers meditate on the history of salvation and on the truths of the faith, we find alive in them a sense of mystery, of that which is sacred and which comes from God, accepted by humanity without fully understanding it, but rather adoring, praising, thanking; this is present both in those Fathers of a more traditionalistic tendency, not knowing or otherwise rejecting a rational examination of the revealed truth, and in those more intrepid ones committed to a more speculative approach. A profound sense of mystery was for them a safeguard of orthodoxy, and of a spirit of faith and of prayer, encouraging an attitude of humble and profound adoration in the liturgy. Finally, in both those Fathers who provide specific evidence of liturgical traditions, such as St. Ambrose, St. *Leo I, and St. *Gregory the Great, and also in those sources characterized by more general themes common to the patristic period, we note a marked emphasis on the *word,* characteristic of Greco-Roman culture, although varying of course acc. to the background and purpose of the author.

The relevant sources have been collected together by E. Lodi (ed.), *Enchiridion euchologicum fontium liturgicorum*, Rome 1979; B. Capelle: RTAM 27 (1951) 5-22 (with bibl.); J.A. Jungmann, *La liturgie des premiers siècles jusqu'à Grégoire le Grand*, Paris 1962; M. Pellegrino: *"Sursum cor" nelle opera di sant'Agostino*: RecAug 3 (1965) 179-204; Id., Introduzione ai *Discorsi* di s. Agostino, I, Rome 1979 (NBA 29), XLIX-LII; A.M. Triacca, *Liturgia e catechesi nei Padri. Note metodologiche:* Salesianum 47 (1979) 257-272; M. Jourjon, *Catéchèse et liturgie chez les Pères:* La MaisonD 140 (1979) 41-49; *Dizionario liturgico,* Rome 1981; E. Mazza, *La mistagogia. Una teologia della liturgia in epoca patristica,* Rome 1988; *I Padri della Chiesa e la teologia: in dialogo con Basil Studer,* A. Orazzo (ed.), Cinisello Balsamo 1995; B. Studer, *Der christliche Gottesdiensteine Mysterienfeier*, in *Studia Anselmiana* 113, Rome 1993, 27-45; Id., *Die doppelte Exegese bei Origen*, in *Origeniana Sexta,* Leuven 1995, 303-327; Id., *Liturgia e Padri,* in A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Scientia liturgica,* I, Casale Monf. 1998, 67-106; J. Rexer, *Die Festtheologie Gregors von Nyssa: ein Beispiel der reichskirchlichen Heortologie,* Frankfurt a.M. 2002.

M. Pellegrino

III. Liturgy and tradition. The tradition (from *tradere*) is none other than the truth present explicitly and implicitly in Sacred Scripture and considered as dynamically transmitted by means of the church's magisterium. Viewed in this way, the binomial "liturgy and tradition" contains three levels already present in antiquity: the *liturgical tradition*; the so-called *liturgical traditions* and the passage of a determinate "deposit of the faith as celebrated" from generation to generation, or even from culture to culture: the *tradition of the liturgy*.

1. The liturgical tradition. The liturgical tradition is not so much the material transmission of the faith in guaranteed formulas, but rather the *depositum fidei* present both in the church's self-reflection and in the fabric of its life in a given period, vivified and celebrated by liturgical action. There is a symbiosis and an exchange between the "deposit of faith" and the liturgical actions, which can be summed up in the saying inspired by ch. 8 of the *Indiculus de gratia Dei* or *Capitula Caelestini* I (422-432) (PL 51, 205-212) and which is taken up in the *De vocatione omnium gentium*, I, ch. 12 (PL 51, 774ff.) of *Prosper of Aquitaine (?): *legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*. Beyond the varied and sometimes contradictory interpretations of this principle (e.g., Federer and De Clerck), without doubt we celebrate what we believe, and moreover what is celebrated has its impact on faith as lived. So the liturgy is simultaneously the concrete deposit of the celebrated faith and that which, over the course of time, brings about a new and organic development. The liturgical tradition thus means simultaneously vitality and immutability. This prevents a falsification or even betrayal of what is perennial in the deposit of faith, which the church preserves and renews, transmits and celebrates in the liturgy. There is another saying which comes to us from antiquity and which has a liturgical context and object: that of *Stephen I (254–257), preserved in *Ep.* (74) *ad Pompeium* of *Cyprian (d. 258), which is usually quoted thus: *nihil innovetur, quod traditum est tenete* (ed. Hartel, CSEL 3/II, 799; PL 3, 1175A). So the liturgy, as it is a primary part of the Christian tradition, is substantially immutable. Progressively, the liturgical tradition did not leave to chance the choice of rites and words (form and formulas) with which to communicate and vivify its unchanging content. Thus the liturgical tradition is by its essence that which others, elsewhere, in another way, have celebrated or will celebrate. This is of course not forgetting that there are changeable elements, rites and formulas, which are subject to the authority of Christ and of the "transmitters" par excellence: the apostles and their successors. The liturgical tradition (παράδοσις) and the apostolic succession (διαδοχή) are intimately united.

2. The liturgical traditions. Drawing on the great ancient metropolitan sees (*Jerusalem, *Antioch, *Alexandria, *Constantinople; *Rome, *Milan, *Ravenna, *Aquileia etc.), linked as they were to the memory and ever-increasing authority of holy bishops, and because of the necessity of adaptation to different cultures, as well as of different forms and formulas that allowed the liturgical tradition to be authentically preserved in all its vitality, there grew up increasingly different liturgical traditions. Beyond these varying manifestations, the one common (= catholic) liturgical tradition was continued in the new

peoples who submitted to the Christian faith. From the primordial unity (the single root of Jewish-Christian worship) with an inherent tendency to living growth and continual deepening of the deposit of faith, we arrive at a multiplicity of liturgical expressions. In other words, the universality of the liturgical tradition is made present in the particular contexts of the different liturgical traditions. Their formation passed through a series of phases. In both East and West, there was a period of gestation characterized by an incipient creativity, both textually and in the way that liturgical periods were structured (the weekly rhythm marked by the *dies Domini*; the annual one centered on Easter). For different reasons (theological exigencies, enrichment by other cultures, political developments, transmission from one language to another etc.), it gave way to a period of true and proper liturgical creativity, both in respect of texts and the structure of the liturgical cycle, as well as in the celebration of the *mysteria*/"sacraments," leading to the codification or crystallization of liturgical types and families, also called liturgical traditions.

We customarily divide these, acc. to their geocultural and geocultic expansion, into Eastern (*Africa E of Cyrenaica and the East) and Western (Africa W of Cyrenaica and western Europe).

A. The Eastern liturgies. These have a common feature: they use fixed *anaphoras for the celebration of the "divine liturgy" (= *Eucharist), whatever feast is being celebrated; but every rite, acc. to which the Eastern liturgies are distinguished, possesses a greater or lesser number of anaphoras. The particular rites proper to the Eastern liturgy are separated fundamentally into two groups, corresponding to the two ancient patriarchs of *Antioch and *Alexandria.

(*1*) *The Antiochene group.* Here, the structure of the anaphora has a common characteristic: the prayers of intercession for the members of the church (living or dead) conclude the anaphora, and the *epiclesis—i.e., the invocation of the *Holy Spirit to come down upon and consecrate the offering—is placed after the institution narrative and the *anamnesis and memorial. Antioch with its patriarch extended over territories of the Roman Empire and over others subject to the Persians, and, farther, as far as India. Thus the Antiochene group includes two types of rite with features which are more or less marked, but in any case are certainly numerous.

The Eastern-*Syriac type (which has experienced a sort of isolation from the rest of Christianity, given the dominion of the Persians and non-acceptance of the decisions of the Councils of *Ephesus and *Chalcedon) falls under the Nestorian rite (with the anaphoras of *Addai and Mari, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Nestorius). The epiclesis is placed shortly after the prayers of intercession, and not before as in the other Syriac rites. It should also be noted that the anaphora of Addai and Mari does not contain an institution narrative. The language is Syriac. This Eastern-Syriac tradition, acc. to the latest evidence, underwent a subsequent branching off into the Chaldean rite and the Syro-Malabar rite. The Eastern-Syriac rites underwent dramatic development which reached its apex in the 6th–7th c. This development was accompanied by intense evangelizing and missionary work, with the spreading of (Nestorian) Christianity as far as *China and Java.

The Western-Syriac type contains four basic rites: that properly called Antiochene, the *Maronite, the *Armenian and the *Byzantine. The Antiochene properly so called has of course Antioch at its fulcrum, which was the first center after *Jerusalem, from which Christianity spread. The liturgical *Greek of Antioch is known from the preaching of *John Chrysostom, in part from the **Didascalia Apostolorum* (3rd c.) and also from the **Apostolic Constitutions*. The liturgy of Jerusalem and of *Palestine was very similar to that of Antioch, even if the anaphora of St. James has only come down to us by a later text. Evidence of the Jerusalem liturgy may be found in the catecheses of *Cyril of Jerusalem and of his successor *John, in the *Itinerarium* **Egeriae* (*Eteriae*), in the Armenian and *Gregorian lectionaries (5th–8th c.), and in the various documents of the *Melkite rite, a variation on the Antiochene tradition but with considerable influence from the Byzantine rite. In fact, after the Council of Chalcedon (451), one part of the Antiochene Church adhered to the rite of the Byzantine emperor. The *monophysite *Jacob Baradaeus (d. 578) strengthened the monophysite hierarchy with the rite named after him, Syriac-Antiochene-*Jacobite. After the invasion of the Arabs under Dionysius Bar-Salibi (d. 1171), the Antiochene rite underwent a restructuring: while the hymnography of *Ephrem was preserved, and also the ancient anaphora of St. James, under Michael the Syrian (12th c.) we find uses unknown in any other rite. With rites extraordinary both in number and quality, we note also a marked attempt at enculturation. A variant of the Syriac rite of Antioch is the Maronite rite, in use from the 7th to the 8th c. in the community of Lebanon, linked to the monastery of the monk John *Maro (known from the correspondence of John Chrysostom). He knows a very archaic anaphora of St. Peter Sarar, related to the Chaldean liturgy of Addai and Mari. After the Crusades this rite was

subjected to a pronounced Latinization.

Within the orbit of the Antiochene rite we also find the *Armenian rite. The origins of the church in Armenia date to St. *Gregory the Illuminator, who gathered Christians together coming from Caesarea in Cappadocia. In 384 under the *catholicos *Sahak (Isaac) an Armenian liturgy came into being, under influence from Antioch, but also later from *Constantinople and the Eastern-Syriac tradition. With the Armenian Council of *Dvin (506), the Armenians adhered to monophysitism. Subsequently the Armenian rite opened up to Latin usages.

The *Byzantine rite, connected to Antioch and with notable affinity with the Antiochene Syriac rite, took its form in the imperial city: *Constantinople, the "new Rome." With can. 28 of the Council of Chalcedon (451), Constantinople was recognized as the center of the dioceses of *Asia, *Pontus, *Thrace and all the areas under the barbarians. The prayers of intercession occur after the epiclesis, as in all the liturgies of the Western-Syriac type. When the divine liturgy (Mass) is not celebrated, there is a liturgy of the "*presanctified." Rich in its poetic tradition and hymnography, it accorded great importance to the veneration of images after the victory over iconoclasm. Open to the spiritual traditions of the different peoples using the rite (the subdivisions of the Byzantine rite: Greek, Slavic, Georgian, Ukrainian, Albanian, Italic) resulted in a great theological richness, esp. in relation to the dogmas of the Councils of *Nicaea (325), Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451).

(2) *The Alexandrian group*. Here, the prayers of intercession come before the *Sanctus* in the anaphora, or rather before the thanksgiving. They possess two epicleses: a brief one before the institution narrative, and a longer one, analogous to that in the Antiochene group, after the *anamnesis or memorial.

The origins of the church in Alexandria are dated back to St. Mark. The first reliable evidence of liturgical practice in Egypt is to be found in writers from the 4th c.: *Athanasius of Alexandria, *Macarius, *Didymus, *Timothy; and even more so in the 5th c.: *Theophilus of Alexandria, *Synesius of Cyrene, *Isidore of Pelusium, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Socrates Scholasticus, *Sozomen and in the so-called Egyptian Church Order. Before the monophysite schism, Egypt shared the common language of Greek, used by the more educated. With the condemnation of Patriarch *Dioscurus at the Council of Chalcedon (451), and the decree of the same council (can. 28) which removed from Alexandria its status immediately after Rome, granting this to Constantinople, a liturgical rivalry grew up: on the one side with the Greek language, shown in the papyrus of Deir-Balizeh (7th c. but the text dates to the 6th c.), the Euchologion attributed to *Serapion (d. 362), bishop of Thmuis and friend of Athanasius, the anaphora of St. Mark, dating from the 3rd–4th c., and in fragments of prayers written on papyrus or pottery (still in the course of being discovered and read); on the other side, a liturgy in the *Coptic language, with three anaphoras: that of St. Cyril, St. *Gregory of Nazianzus and St. *Basil. The Alexandrian group includes the Coptic rite and the *Ethiopian rite. The Coptic rite, a result of the monophysite schism and so following the christological controversies, has its origin in the 5th c. In loyalty to the sometimes ambiguous christological formulas of Cyril while opposing Chalcedon, and promoting the culture of the Coptic-speaking population, it adhered to monophysitism (or more properly from their point of view, miaphysitim) and was subject to influence from the Eastern-Syriac rite. In fact, the anaphoras of St. Cyril (which are traced back to that of St. Mark), of St. Basil (Coptic, not the Byzantine anaphora of the same name) and of St. Gregory are all of the Syriac type. Among influences on the anaphora of St. Mark we should note that of St. James. For the various sacramental rites we find prayers typical of the Syriac tradition. From the 9th c. the Bohairic dialect was the official liturgical language of Alexandria, used by both Greeks and Arabs. In this liturgy there is a notable monastic influence. Among the Alexandrian group we should also count the Ethiopian rite, which is only known to us from late MSS. Ethiopia, evangelized as early as the 4th c. by monks sent from Alexandria (*see* *Frumentius), developed a poetically inspired version of the liturgy of Alexandria, with some very noteworthy Marian hymns and a collection of eighteen anaphoras, most of which, however, are not Alexandrian by type. The liturgical language of Ethiopia is *ge'ez,* today almost defunct. Contrary to the use of other liturgies, it employs many apocryphal texts. Other characteristics are four readings at Mass: the Trisagion sung immediately before the gospel; the prayer of intercession inserted before the anaphora; the multiple "Amens" with which the faithful variously intersperse the formula of consecration; the "Our Father" which follows Communion as an act of thanksgiving.

B. The Western liturgies. These include (1) the Roman rite, (2) the African rite, (3) the Ambrosian rite, (4) the Hispanic-Visigothic (Mozarabic) rite, (5) the Gallican-Gothic rite, (6) the Italic rites (Campanian-Beneventan, Aquileian, Ravennan) and (7) the Celtic rite.

(1) *The Roman rite.* The Roman rite was origi-

nally the liturgy in use in the metropolitan see of Rome and her suffragan dioceses. Obviously this had replaced the Greek liturgy common to the Christian world of the first two or three centuries. Typically the formation of the rite is linked to the work of Popes *Damasus (366–384), *Innocent I (402–417), *Gelasius I (492–496), *Vigilius (537–555) and *Gregory the Great (590–604), all of whom were saints, and whose pastoral activity was strongly marked by the creation of liturgical texts. From information in the **Liber pontificalis* where we learn that Damasus decided that Latin should be used in the Roman liturgy, to the work of revising the *Latin translation of the Scriptures that Damasus entrusted to *Jerome, to the compilation of the **libelli missarum* detailed in the so-called *Leonine sacramentary* (or better, the *Veronese Sacramentary*) from MS LXXXV of the Chapter library of Verona, to the ancient *Gelasian Sacramentary,* and then to the *Gregorian Sacramentary,* we find a great flowering of liturgical compositions that bear witness to the progressive development of the Roman rite. This rite established itself fairly rapidly throughout *Italy, and then from the 8th–9th c. also beyond the Alps, first spontaneously, and then, with Charlemagne, by way of imposition. It has a set euchologion, a marked harmony of composition as well as a dense theological content, and only one eucharistic prayer, the "Roman Canon." Beyond this, the system of selecting passages for the celebration of the Word of God, the psalmody and the festal cycle—with an emphasis on the veneration of the martyrs—demonstrate the vitality of the rite. Its truly embryonic phase is visible already in the **Apostolic Tradition* (215); we find details of its early history in the *Liber pontificalis,* the formulas of the *Liber diurnus* and above all the letters of the popes.

(2) *The African rite* is the liturgy as celebrated in Latin Africa from the time of *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) and in the 5th c. with *Augustine (d. 430) subject to some reordering. This may be seen in his *Ep.* 55 and 56 *ad Ianuarium*. But with the invasion of the *Vandals and then the advent of the Arabs (Muslims), the African-Latin rite was not able to pass beyond the first phase of gestation to a more definitive formation. Elements of the ancient African rite can be found in the Hispanic-Visigothic and Gallican liturgies. The acts of the martyrs of Scillium (180) and the *Passion of Sts. Perpetua and Felicity* (203) show how early the liturgy was celebrated in Latin. Its sources are found in the writings of *Tertullian (d. after 220), Cyprian of Carthage and, as well as Augustine, in *Optatus of Milevis (d. 390?), *Victor of Vita (d. after 484), *Ferrandus of Carthage (ca. 523). *Gennadius (ca. 475) names one Voconius, bishop of Castellanum, as author of a sacramentary. The African councils of the 4th and 5th c. speak of liturgical *libelli*. There was also an important series of psalm prayers in use in Latin Africa.

(3) *The Ambrosian rite*. From the *Liber notitiae sanctorum Mediolani* written between 1304 and 1311, which makes use of ancient sources, we learn that Bishop *Simplicianus of Milan (d. 401) had completed the work *ubi sanctus Ambrosius non impleverat* and that another Milanese bishop, *Eusebius (ca. 449–452), had composed *multos cantus ecclesiae* following St. *Ambrose (374–397). His biographer, *Paulinus, says that it was under Ambrose (374–397) that *antiphonae, hymni ac vigiliae* were introduced for the first time. Ambrose made use of popular alternating liturgical chant (see Aug., *Confess.*, 9, 7, 15) and composed other liturgical texts (see Wal. Strab., *De reb. eccl.* 25,22). The "*Ambrosian liturgy" is therefore that which either nominally or actually goes back to St. Ambrose, and which was used in the metropolitan of Milan (and also extended to the 10th Roman region). Besides, there was always the conviction that Ambrose was, in the Milanese church, the *primus, id est maximus, metropolitanam, regens cathedram* (MGH, Scrip. VIII, 37). Thus the expression in a sermon (*Contra Auxentium* 18) of Ambrose on the heritage he had received from his predecessors *Dionysius (ca. 349–ca. 360), *Eustorgius (d. ca. 349) and Merocles (d. ca. 316), *atque omnium retro fidelium episcoporum* (*Ep.* 20,18: PL 16, 1055), came after his death to be applied without hesitation to Ambrose himself, so much so that *Gregory the Great (590–604) addressed the clergy of Milan with the expression *sancto Ambrosio deservientibus clericis* (MGH, Ep. II, 266).

(4) *The *Hispanic-Visigothic rite*. With the invasion of the Arabs (711), the harmonious development of the Hispanic-Visigothic rite rapidly ended. This rite had two traditions: the N and the S, centered respectively on *Seville-*Toledo and *Tarragona. The tradition of the S focused on the euchological school of Seville, counting among its leaders St. *Leander of Seville (ca. 540–600), and his successor and brother St. *Isidore (d. 636), who at the 4th Council of Toledo (633) succeeded in passing fifteen canons dedicated to the liturgy and its particular local form, defending its autonomy against the Roman rite, restricting the influence of the 2nd Council of *Braga (572), which, with the authority of St. *Martin of Braga (c. 580) and the ruling of can. 12, had begun the liturgical Romanization of the Iberian Peninsula. In fact, both because of political events and owing to the other liturgical center of

Toledo, the Hispanic-Visigothic liturgy saw its apogee, including the creation of books proper to the rite. The three great archbishops stand out in the Toledan school: St. *Eugenius II (646–657), St. *Ildefonsus (657–667) and St. *Julian (679–690).

The school of Tarragona in the N had its own euchological production (the oldest series of morning blessings, *completuria* series etc.) centering particularly on the figure of St. *Justus of Urgel, bishop in the 1st half of the 6th c. More than this, the 7th can. of the Council of *Barcelona (540) gives some evidence of the local liturgical tradition. It has links with the *Gallican liturgy of Provence.

From the 8th to 11th c. the Hispanic rite underwent a particular development (Hispanic-Mozarabic) until its suppression with the measures of the Council of Burgos (1080), called by Alfonso VI, king of Castiglia and Léon, under pressure from the legate of Pope Gregory VII.

(5) *The Gallican-Gothic rite.* The Gallican-Gothic rite developed in the S of *Gaul from the 5th c. until its disappearance owing to the penetration and imposition of the Roman rite under Charlemagne. It underwent various attempts at codification, shown in its liturgical books (the Gothic Missal, the Gallican Missal etc.) but never arrived at a definitive formulation. It was subject to some Eastern influences (*Lyons had as bishops St. *Pothinus [d. 177] and St. *Irenaeus [d. ca. 202], both from the East; also note the letter from the churches of *Vienne and Lyons to those of *Asia and *Phrygia), as also from Africa (consider influence of the thought of Augustine; the repercussions of African controversies in Provence etc.), and from the liturgy in use in N Italy and in *Spain. We find evidence of the rite in the various liturgical-sacramental decisions of councils and from Fathers of that area. Among them we count *Hilary of *Poitiers (d. 367), who in his *Tractatus Mysteriorum* (SC 19) gives evidence of special liturgical uses (perhaps found in the *Gothic missal*?). According to the testimony of *Gennadius of Marseille (d. 505) the presbyter *Museus of Marseille (ca. 459), initially on the order of his bishop Venerius (d. 452) and then of his successor Eustasius of Marseille, prepared a lectionary (*lectiones totius anni*), a responsorial (*responsoria psalmorum capitula*) and a sacramentary (*sacramentorum egregium non parvum volumen*) (see *De vir. ill.* 79: PL 56, 1103). From a letter of *Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Auvergne (Clermont-Ferrand) (d. 480–490) to Bishop Magethius (*Ep., Lib.* VII, 3: MGH, *Auct. ant.* 8), we learn that Sidonius had composed *contestatiunculae,* commonly identified with the Gallican *contestationes* (prefaces in the Roman liturgy). These would later be brought together in a *libellus missarum* of *Gregory of Tours (d. 594) (MGH, *Scrip. rer. Merov.* I, 1, 67-68). In his turn Sidonius Apollinaris says that Claudianus, a priest of Vienne (d. ca. 460), had prepared a selection of readings for liturgical commemorations for the entire year (see MGH, *Auct. ant.* 8, 63). We can also deduce that *Caesarius of Arles (d. 543) contributed to the formation of the Gallican liturgy. The *Expositio orationis dominicae* and *Expositio symboli* of *Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers (597–ca. 600), relate to local usages in preparation for Christian initiation (cf. MGH, *Auct. ant.* 4, 1, 221-229; 253-258). Finally, in the *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae,* attributed erroneously to St. *Germanus of Paris (d. 576), and which goes back to the 1st half of the 8th c. (Burgundy), we find the last remnants of a Gallican liturgy, now almost completely Romanized.

(6) *The Italic rites.* Other than the Roman and Ambrosian rites, ancient Italy had its own proper liturgical traditions, linked to particular Fathers. In the S we have the *Campanian,* tracing itself to *Paulinus of Nola (d. 431) (educated in Gaul and author of a *Liber Sacramentorum*: PL 58, 1087), characterized by a system of proper readings; as in the case of nearby *Capua, with its famous *Codex Fuldensis,* with set gospel pericopes, that date back to the edition prepared under *Victor, bishop of Capua, between 541 and 546. Similarly we find local uses at Benevento and at Naples. In N Italy, apart from the Ambrosian rite, we find the Aquileian rite, linked to *Rufinus (345–410), who was born and lived at Aquileia and who handed on a special form of the baptismal *Credo*; and to Fortunatian (d. after 360), who is said to have composed a list of passages *titulis ordinatis* (acc. to *De vir. ill.* 97 of Jerome); and also to Valerian, who wrote to Ambrose, *alexandrinae ecclesiae semper ordinem dispositionemque tenuimus* (PL 16, 949); and finally to the pastoral-liturgical work of *Chromatius of Aquileia (d. 407–408). This liturgy, as in the case of the other Italic rites, is still being studied, and we do not yet know what treasures may be hidden there. Gravitating around the exarchate and with its center of influence in *Ravenna, we have the Ravennan rite: attested in the *Rotulus* of Ravenna, it finds its high points in the work of *Peter Chrysologus (ca. 425–ca. 451) and in the *Liber Sacramentorum* of *Maximian (546–556).

(7) *The Celtic rite.* In the 6th and 7th c. the progressive Christianization of Ireland and the missionary activity of monks on the island of Great *Britain and then afterward on the Continent (*see* *Columbanus) were accompanied by special liturgical usages, contained in normative sources (Antiphonary of Bangor etc.) that indicate links with three other

rites: the liturgies of Rome, Milan and Gaul (esp. the *Missale Bobbiense*). The only typically Irish-Celtic liturgical texts are the hymns, where the influence of the local poetic tradition is evident.

This great flowering of liturgical traditions in Christian Antiquity (of East and West) gave way to a process of standardization in the East (with progressive enculturation and adaptation—the activity of the brothers Cyril and Methodius, 9th c.) and in the West a diversification of various proper usages in dioceses and religious orders, at the same time moving toward unification with the Roman liturgy (the Ambrosian being an exception). In light of this, we must recognize the important creative liturgical work of the church fathers who, in faithfulness to their community in Christ, had the remarkable gift of combining a fidelity—built on prayer—to the *depositum fidei,* with a dynamic understanding of the concrete needs of peoples and cultures.

3. *The tradition of the liturgy*. The transmission of the one perennial liturgical tradition through different and changeable liturgical traditions from one generation of the faithful to another—more apparent in ages more distant from our own—saw the phenomenon of liturgical self-determination in vogue, which explains the marked proliferation of different traditions. In other words, the local churches of the larger metropolitan sees saw a progressive and organic formulation of the deposit of faith expressed in a concrete liturgical context, and lived by successive generations of Christians in these *ecclesiae* spread throughout the world. The faith thus celebrated had been received from the "fathers in the faith," constantly renewed by means of the Spirit of God, who renews the treasure contained in a sound vessel, but renews too the vessel and those who use it (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 24.1)

K. Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube. "Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi"* (*Tiro Prosper von Aquitanien*). *Eine Theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung,* Freiburg (Sv.) 1950; A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée. Principes et méthodes pour l'étude historique des liturgies chrétiennes*, Chevetogne-Paris [3]1953; Y.M.-J. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions* (Eng. tr.), New York 1967; C. Vagaggini, *Il senso teologico della liturgia*, Rome [4]1965, 496-508; B. Botte, *Riti e Famiglie liturgiche*, in A.G. Martimort (ed.), *La Chiesa in preghiera. Introduzione alla liturgia*, Rome [2]1966, 16-36; A.M. Triacca - S. Marsili, *Introductionis generalis in liturgiam quaestiones selectae*, Rome 1968, 5-42; A.M. Triacca, *Introduzione generale alla liturgia*, Pont. At. Ans., Rome 1971-1972, 16-27; P. De Clerck, *"Lex orandi, lex credendi." Sens originel et avatars historiques d'un adage équivoque:* Questions liturgiques 59 (1978) 193-212; the work contained in A.M. Triacca - A. Pistoia (eds.), *La liturgie expression de la foi*, Rome 1979; R.A. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite*, Collegeville, MN 1992; *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, ed. P.F. Bradshaw, Collegeville, MN 1997; A.J. Chupungco, *Liturgia e inculturazione*, in *Scientia liturgica*, Casale Monf. 1998, 345-388; S. Ferguson, *Visita Nos. Reception, Rhetoric, and Prayer in a North African Monastery*, New York 1999; C. Alzati, *Ambrosianum mysterium: la Chiesa di Milano e la sua tradizione liturgica*, Milan 2000; *Liturgia*, ed. D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca - C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001 (different entries: bizantina, gallicana, liturgie locali antiche, orientali [liturgie]); E. Mazza, *La celebrazione eucaristica*, Bologna 2003; M. Smyth, *La liturgie oubliée. La prière eucharistique en Gaule antique et dans l'Occident non romain*, Paris 2003.

IV. Liturgical language. The faith of believers in Christ has had and has its supreme expression in worship, its own language and rites making up the communal liturgical celebration which has its fulcrum in the commemoration of the Lord's Supper. The offering of thanks to God—*Eucharist—has always been an act at the heart of the Christian life from the very beginning of the church. Spontaneous creativity and religious enthusiasm necessarily characterized paleo-Christian assemblies, giving birth to particular forms of prayer, such as acclamations, doxologies, hymns and litanies, which were subsequently institutionalized in the rituals and sacramentaries. The origin of these forms in spontaneous prayer and their developments in the oral tradition may be glimpsed in the formulas, fixed for the first time in the **Apostolic Tradition*. It seems certain that the oldest Christian community had at its disposal a great number of prayers and religious songs from the biblical tradition, in the first place the *Pater noster* (see *Lord's Prayer) and the psalms, along with the songs and various prayers spread throughout the texts of the OT and NT. NT exegesis has of course highlighted the existence of community hymns in the letters of St. Paul, who in passages following a hymnic structure (Phil 2:6-11; Col 1:15-20; Eph 2:14-16) were inspired by hymns used in the liturgy. *Tertullian, writing at the very end of the 2nd c., says that during liturgical assemblies improvised songs were sung under the inspiration of the *Holy Spirit, or springing from the creative genius of those present (*Apol.* 39,18). The liturgical refrains "Amen" and "Alleluia" (we find an implicit reflection of this latter cry of exultation and joy in Rev. 9:1ff.), the *Kyrie eleison* (see Ps. 6:2; 9:13 etc) and the Trisagion ("Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth!" (see Is 6:3) all take their origin from the OT tradition. Scripture also inspired Christian doxologies, expressions of praise which in the Hebrew tradition concluded certain prayers, and which were adopted by the earliest Christians for use in euchological contexts, as well as hymns, psalms, litanies and eucharistic *anaphoras. It was for the president, in the early Christian tradition, to improvise prayers addressed to God in the name of the community, drawing on religious

sentiment, charismatic inspiration and the enthusiasm of the community in choosing the most appropriate words adapted to the particular celebration. The *Apostolic Tradition* is the first evidence of normative written euchological liturgical formulas, but it is thought that for a long time the written text provided only a commonly received guideline on which to base personal formulations, which were continually adapted to the assemblies and the individual circumstances. Adoration and prayer were promoted in this shaping of liturgical language acc. to the biblical and ecclesiastical background. Looking at the euchological formulas of the *Apostolic Tradition* and in other liturgical compilations, we can identify some common traits of liturgical language as such:

1. A tendency toward conservatism, inspired by the biblical tradition, with recourse to euchological and doxological formulas derived from both OT and NT, and by images and metaphors from that tradition; the adoption of particular terms of the biblical and Christian tradition. (In other words, every religious culture based on religious texts tends to make "sacred" the languages in which that text is written: this is the case with Hebrew in the synagogue liturgy in the Jewish Diaspora, with Greek in the LXX or the books of the NT, and with Byzantine Greek or Old Church Slavonic in the Eastern churches.)

2. The use of foreign vocabulary that in the traditions of the community had acquired some particular religious significance. (In the Greek and Latin liturgical languages, for instance, we find *maranatha, hosanna, alleluia, amen, sabaoth, Kyrie.*)

3. Stylization in the structure of sentences and figures of speech, with a predilection for both synonymous and antithetical parallelism, the anaphora, paronomasia. The first generation of Western Christians used Greek, and only in the 4th c. did the church of Rome substitute Greek with Latin in the anaphora of the Mass in those parts of the liturgical celebration directed at the ethical-religious instruction or edification of the faithful. So it was the didactic parts of the celebration (readings, homilies, litanies, standard repeated phrases) that were first Latinized. In these parts of the liturgy, doxologies, acclamations and hymns in the Latin language were therefore formed with their roots in the Bible and the language of the Christian communities. But a tendency was very quickly established to base the euchological formulas, properly so called, on solemn hieratic texts, traditional in ancient Roman prayer. In the canon of the Mass cited in *Ambrose of Milan's *De Sacramentis* one can clearly identify the tendency to use stylistic devices from old Roman sacred language; but it is above all in the so-called *Sacramentarium gelasianum* that the stylistic forms of this prayer are applied systematically, determining that style of solemn hieratic prayer that would shape the euchological forms of the Roman liturgy for centuries: i.e., a liking for precise juridical formularies, a constant striving for measured cadences in the structure of sentences, a tendency to build up synonyms, the presence of antithetic and synonymous parallelism, and an attempt to make the language sonorous by alliteration and rhyme. But if the stylistic structure of the prayer was influenced by the sacral tradition of Rome, the vocabulary and images of the Christian liturgical language were combined with the tradition of ancient Christian prayer, so that liturgical Latin remained faithful to Christian Latin, in fact becoming an important form of it. Only when paganism was definitively defeated and little more than a historical memory, without ethical or religious or indeed affective resonances, was liturgical Latin conformed to the classical tradition, accepting both terms and metaphors originally peculiar to pagan religion.

Latin liturgy may be divided into three groups: (1) the biblical Latin of the different versions of the Scriptures in that language, translated from Hebrew or Greek, keeping so close to the Latin original, sometimes resulting in somewhat forced syntax; (2) ritual Latin, used in the texts for the administration of the sacraments, in the celebration of Mass, in other rites and blessings, in the celebration of the divine office or Liturgy of the Hours, of the *carmina*, with a great variety of expression and effort to express the sublime reality of the *religio nova*; and (3) martyrological, hagiographical Latin, found in the *Acts* and passion accounts of the martyrs, or in the *Lives* of the saints: this can with reason be considered part of liturgical Latin because these acts and legends in general could also be read in communal worship, concluded with appropriate doxologies and acclamations. Liturgical Latin may therefore be seen as the finest offering of Christian Latin. Its language is always simple but reaches high points of perfection and musicality in its prefaces and collects, where the words are skillfully chosen and used to obtain the correct rhythm or the phrase or *cursus,* called *planus* ("level") if of the type *sèrvitus tènet, omnìpotens Dèus, règna caelòrum,* i.e., a pentasyllabic line as if a cretic followed by a trochee; called *tardus* ("late"), if of the type *èsse cognòvimus,* i.e., a six-syllable line as if composed of two cretics; called *velox* ("quick") if of the type *glòriam perducàmur, Dòminum confitémur*, i.e., a seven-syllable line as if with a cretic followed by two trochees/spondees;

and called *trispondaic* if of the type *tèrra veneràtur*; *dùce revelàsti*, i.e., a six-syllable line as if formed by a paeon followed by a trochee.

In liturgical Latin we very frequently find the rhetorical device of the hyperbaton put to musical effect: *Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Deus,* hanc *tuis fidelibus* voluntatem; accepta *reddantur* officia; perpetuo, *Deus, Ecclesiam tuam pio tuere* favore; *ad* resurrectionis *perveniat* claritatem. Anaphora is also employed: *digna omnes intellegentia comprehendant,* quo *lavacro abluti,* quo *spiritu regenerati,* quo *sanguine sunt redempti* (2nd Sunday after Easter). Equally frequent is the chiasmus: *Deus, per quem nobis et* redemptio *venit et praestatur* adoptio (5th Sunday after Easter).

On the great tradition of liturgical Latin we may paraphrase what Paul VI said with regard to the restored Divine Office in the Constitution *Laudis canticum:* "The church has continued to raise up on the earth, with constancy and faithfulness which stretch across the centuries, with a marvelous variety of forms, that song of praise which is sung without end in heaven and which has been brought to earth by Christ, the High Priest."

G. Manz, *Ausdrucksformen der lateinischen Liturgiesprache*, Freiburg i.Br. 1941; M. Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, I, Milan 1945; Chr. Mohrmann, *Quelques observations sur l'évolution stylistique du Canon de la Messe romaine*: VChr 4 (1950) 1-19; Id., *Le latin liturgique*: La MaisonD 23 (1950) 5-30; Id., *Sakralsprache und Umgangssprache*: Archiv für Liturgiewis 10 (1968) 344-354; F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo nella prosa liturgica e il "Praeconium Paschale,"* in *Scritti Minori*, I, Rome 1959, 441-459; Id., *Preghiere liturgiche. Poesia ed Eloquenza*, in ibid. II, Rome 1959, 86-115; A. Quacquarelli, *Retorica e liturgia antenicena*, Rome 1960; L. Leone, *Latinità cristiana*, Lecce 1971, 85-108; A. Bastiaensen, *Sur quelques oraisons du Missel Romain*, in *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann. Nouveau recueil*, Utrecht 1973, 140-163; Ph. Bernard, *Les latins de la liturgie (antiquité tardive et Moyen-Âge): Vingt-cinq années de recherches* (1978-2002): ALMA 60 (2002) 77-170.

V. Loi - B. Amata

V. Improvisational prayer. In respect to the formulation of prayers (= euchology) and rites, the paleo-Christian era has two basic tendencies, which in turn relate to different periods: that of creativity, spontaneity and liberty of liturgical expression, followed by a gradual linguistic and ritual formulization resulting in fixed forms and formulas. Of course the two periods cannot be clearly distinguished. The first period (1st–3rd/4th c.) saw improvisational prayer, spontaneous creativity and varied forms of proliferation of rites. Although the different traditions all came from a common Jewish-Christian origin, in adapting to new cultures into which Christianity came they took shape under the influence of the particular religious instincts of the converted peoples. Similarly, creativity in prayer, with the movement from Aramaic to *Greek, to *Coptic and *Syriac, and with that from Greek to *Latin, progressively gave way—for various reasons—to a period of compilation and standardization of written formulas. This then is the second period (3rd/4th–6th/7th c.), that of the production of set prayers, in the context of the great Latin-Roman and Greek-Eastern literary traditions, the influence of the great Eastern Fathers (*Basil, *John Chrysostom etc.) and Western (*Ambrose of Milan = *Ambrosian liturgy; *Leander = Hispanic-Visigothic liturgy; *Leo, *Gelasius, *Gregory = Roman liturgy; *Peter Chrysologus = Ravennan liturgy; *Chromatius = Aquileian liturgy), as well as of the principal metropolitan sees (*Jerusalem, *Antioch, *Alexandria, *Constantinople; *Rome, *Milan, *Seville, *Lyons, etc). We obviously have nothing more than indirect evidence of the existence of improvisational prayer. We read of "glossolalia" (see 1 Cor 14:1-33), a free form of spontaneous formulation of prayer in (liturgical?) assemblies; of traditional forms of Jewish origin, but adopted now in a new spirit (see Eph 5:18-20). These forms completely free of set schema gave way over time to fixed forms, as seen in the (hymn) texts of prayers found in the NT (see Lk 1–2; Eph 1:5-14; Phil 2:5-11). While the Scriptures remained the main source of liturgical prayer (= scriptural *centonization—see also Eus., *Vita Constantini* IV, 34-37: PG 20, 1182-1187; GCS I, 130-132), "prophets" were allowed to give thanks for as long as they wished (*Didache* 10, 7 as against 1 Cor 14:26, 32-33). We should not understand that such spontaneity was absolute. It seems that Jewish formulas provided a certain inspiration (*Shema*; *Shemoneh Eshreh*; the *berakoth*; see Mt 11:25-26; Jn 1:41; 1 Cor 14:16) as the times of prayer proper to the synagogue were observed (see Acts 2:46; 3:1; 10:9; 16:25). We may be quite sure that the first fixed formulas, varied as they were, took their root from the *symbola fidei* used in a liturgical-baptismal context (see DS 1-76). The same may be said of doxologies and acclamations (see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 240-250) and fragments of early liturgical formulas in the "Acts of the Martyrs," in inscriptions and in the works of the Fathers. The first legal document we have describing Christian worship is the **Apostolic Tradition* (ed. Botte = LQF, 39) (ca. 215), which after giving a text for an *anaphora (ch. 4) adds (ch. 9): "The bishop should give praise as we have indicated. But it is not necessary that he says the very words we have provided, as if he had to recall them from memory, when he is giving thanks to God. Each should pray acc. to his own capacity. If someone succeeds in praying solemnly and at length,

it is good. If another prays briefly, he is not to be prevented from doing so, provided his prayer is right and conforms to orthodoxy."

It was indeed the question of orthodoxy which played a decisive part in bringing improvisation in liturgical prayers to an end in favor of fixed formulas.

It is common to find canonical norms presented as attempts to suppress improvisation in liturgical prayer, in the first place those from the Council of *Hippo of 393, dispositions included later in those of the Council of *Carthage in 397 (can. 21-28; Mansi 3, 922-933). In the same tone we find those from the 2nd Council of Milevis of 416 (can. 12; Mansi 4, 330). That the practice of improvisation continued even while the first liturgical **libelli* were circulating (e.g., those mentioned in the so-called *Sacramentarium Veronense [Leonianum]*) we learn from, e.g., the *Vita* of *Gregory of Tours written by *Sidonius Apollinaris (d. 480). Gregory, finding himself without a *libellus* for the celebration, instead improvised and by so doing aroused the amazement of those present, not so much by his improvising (which must have still been a common practice) but because to those assisting it seemed like hearing an angel (MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.* I, 1, 67-68; see another episode in PL 71, 1074-1077). It is thus better to see in the African canonical rulings not so much a desire to put an end to improvisation but rather to regulate a practice implemented and recognized as good, from both pastoral and dogmatic points of view; so that only a bishop or priest who was a *frater instructior* (can. 21: Council of Carthage), *prudentior* (can. 12: Council of Milevis) or *doctior* (Aug., *Bapt.* VI, 25,47: CSEL 51, 323; see also Id., *Contra litt. Petil.* 2,30,68: CSEL 52, 2, 58) could improvise compositions which were competent in literary terms, as well as dogmatically orthodox and acceptable stylistically. The composition of prayers thus remained linked to authors whose "words" were conformed to the "holy words" with which the *sacra* must be celebrated. The anonymity which surrounds the majority of ancient liturgical compositions and the fact that they were often referred to the great Fathers (Ambrose, John Chrysostom, Leo, Gelasius, Gregory) (thus the law of excellence) reflect the same perspective that we find in the canonical dispositions.

Considering this fact of improvisation and the progressive movement to a fixing of forms and formulas, we recognize an aspect of the early liturgy which, without its being realized, followed a practice already typical in the synagogue. At the same time, the biblical inspiration of the first fixed texts reflects a Jewish practice adopted by primitive Christianity. However, improvisation also indicates the process of taking formulas out of their Jewish context, granting them in the Christian community a new meaning "in spirit and truth." This phenomenon, then, was intended both to preserve and advance the authentic Christian tradition. At the beginning this was done by apparently self-contradictory references to "improvisation" at the same time as "faithfulness to the biblical text." This is because, contemporaneous with enculturation of the deposit of faith, there was the exigency of being faithful to the tradition. This was in fact the motivation both for improvisation and for the process of establishing fixed normative texts.

E. Bourque, *Étude sur les sacramentaires romains*. I. *Les textes primitifs*, Rome 1948, 1-77; T. Klauser, *Kleine Abendländische Liturgiegeschichte*, Bonn 1965, 11-48; 180-182; A.M. Triacca, *"Improvvisazione" o "fissismo" eucologico. Asterisco ad un periodico episodio di pastorale liturgica:* Salesianum 32 (1970) 149-164; L. Bouyer, *L'improvisation liturgique dans l'Église Ancienne*: La MaisonD 111 (1972) 7-19; C. Vogel, *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire du Culte Chrétien au Moyen Âge*, Spoleto [2]1975, 20-42; E. Cattaneo, *Il culto cristiano in Occidente. Note storiche*, Rome [3]1978, 17-183; H.A.J. Wegman, *Geschichte der Liturgie im Westen und Osten*, Regensburg 1979, 15-46; B. Neunheuser, *Storia della liturgia attraverso le epoche culturali*, Rome [2]1983, 15-55; A. Budde, *Improvisation im Eucharistiegebet. Zur Technik freien Betens in der Alten Kirch*: JbAC 44 (2001) 127-141.

A.M. Triacca

VI. Liturgy of the Hours. The prayer of the Hours is witnessed to in the daily life of Christians, in the organization of monastic communities and in certain sanctuaries.

Precise evidence of the Liturgy of the Hours as recommended or imposed on all Christians goes back to the beginning of the 3rd c. *Tertullian speaks of morning or evening prayer as *legitimae orationes*—i.e., as prayers which conform to a law, or at least to an established usage. He also makes mention of the prayer of Terce, Sext and None (*De oratione* 24-45). At the same period, the **Apostolic Tradition* offers a true timetable of daily prayer: prayer in the morning, imposed on all the faithful, the prayers of Terce, Sext and None, corresponding to the crucifixion and death of Christ, the evening prayer before the night's rest, and then the prayer during the course of the night itself, linked with the idea of the "rest" of the whole universe (*Tr. Apost.* 41). A little later, *Cyprian of Carthage gives a spiritual theology of the times of prayer: acc. to him, the triple series of Terce, Sext and None evokes not only the moments of the crucifixion but also the mystery of the *Trinity; morning and evening prayer accompany the rising and the setting of the sun, because for the Christian "Christ is the true son and the true day"; finally, prayer during the night responds to the gospel call

to stay awake (*De oratione* 34-36). In this way, over the course of the 3rd c. the Western church was already establishing, at least for fervent Christians, an *orarium* of prayer, connected to the natural cycle of day and night, to the paschal mystery and, to a certain extent, to the trinitarian mystery. For the East we find similar evidence in *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7,7) and *Origen (*De orat.* 12).

Nascent monasticism, which attempted to realize the Christian ideal to the most perfect extent possible, took up and then expanded this *orarium*. On the one hand, eremitic monks were striving, in meditation and prayer, to live according to the recommendation of St. Paul to "pray constantly," and therefore had no need to keep to certain hours of prayer. As the abbot Isidore declared: "When I was young, in my cell, there were no limits to prayer: day and night were my times of prayer" (Isid., *Apophthegmata* 4: PG 65, 220). *Cenobitic monasticism, on the other hand, required a structured approach. In the monastery of *Pachomius, as we learn from the rule translated by *Jerome, the brothers came together to pray in the morning, at midday and in the evening; before going to bed, they recited in each "house" an office which contained six prayers and psalms; finally, in the course of the night, everyone came together for a solemn synaxis, including psalmody, prayers and readings (*Regula* 20-28; ed. A. Boon, *Pacomiana Latina*, Louvain 1932, 17-20).

St. *Basil, whose system of the cenobitic life was largely inspired by the Pachomian rule, expanded the pattern of conventual prayer, with eight offices, rather than five; after the first prayers at dawn, the monks gathered for Terce, Sext and None; at the end of the day they celebrated a synaxis of thanksgiving; before going to sleep, they recited psalm 90; at midnight they rose for an act of common prayer; they came together again, before dawn, for final evening prayers (*Reg. fus.* 37,3-5). This importance given to liturgical prayer seems to be a consequence of the centrality of the "social" in Basil's monastic conception: for him the community is not so much the means that allows the spiritual life of each to flourish, but rather the end toward which the activity of each must be directed: the members are at the service of the monastic community.

A monk of the name Alexander lived at first as a hermit on the banks of the Euphrates and then founded in *Constantinople, at the end of the 4th c., a monastery of 300 monks. He may be regarded as the champion of the *laus perennis*: taking to the letter the command to "pray constantly," he divided his numerous community into three groups who alternated their prayers in the church, and thus established a literally continuous celebration day and night. For this unbroken act of praise these observant monks took the name of "*acoemetae" (those who never sleep).

In the West, the model of St. Benedict is rightly called a balanced form of observance. Choral office held only a limited place in Benedictine monasticism. Each day, in addition to the night vigils, Benedict prescribed the seven hours now traditional: Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, Compline (*Regula* 16). Each of these day offices contained three or four psalms, a brief reading and a prayer; the vigils were composed of two nocturns, each of which included six psalms and a biblical or patristic reading. Liturgical prayer played an essential role in the life and cohesion of the community; it nourished and expressed the spiritual life of the monk; at the same time, it left time for liberty in private prayer. Thus we see the role played by monasticism in the development of the Liturgy of the Hours. It did not invent a new timetable of prayer, but rather reinforced and organized traditional practices, inspired by both the natural rhythm of day and night and by that of work and sleep; it tested this form of prayer and "canonized" it through its own experience. This prayer of the hours, whose character and breadth correspond well to the monastic life, would later be commended or imposed, without those changes which would prove necessary to the clergy who served in the churches.

About the mid-4th c. some great sanctuaries, visited by numerous pilgrims, instituted a form of liturgical prayer corresponding to the significance of the place, as well as to the desire of the faithful to pray there with special fervor.

Of the daily liturgy of *Jerusalem we are very well informed thanks to the *Diary of a Pilgrimage* of *Egeria who was in the Holy Land from 393 to 396. Every day in the church of the Holy Sepulchre (Anastasis) four offices were celebrated. Before the cock crowed, there was a vigil office which lasted until daybreak, in which men and women religious, intrepid pilgrims, and a few priests and deacons participated; they alternated psalms, hymns and antiphons; at dawn, the morning hymns were intoned and the bishop arrived with his clergy: he said a prayer, gave his blessing, then concluded the office. Shorter but similar offices were held for Sext and None, also with the bishop present at their conclusion. At the end of the afternoon there was the *lucernare*: all the faithful carried lit candles and sang psalms; after the arrival of the bishop, a deacon began a long universal prayer; the liturgy concluded at night-

fall with a procession to Calvary (*Diary*, ch. 24).

In 4th-c. Rome, it seems that the Daily Office was celebrated in the then recent basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, and in the Lateran, by communities that served those churches and ministered to pilgrims. From the 5th c., monasteries were established next to these great basilicas to celebrate the liturgy solemnly and frequently, responding to the expectations of pilgrims. In the titular and parochial churches, however, only Lauds and Vespers were celebrated, and the Roman clergy protested when, in the 6th c., the pope wanted to impose the daily celebration of Vigils. The clergy of Rome argued, with reason, for a distinction to be made between the office of the monks, that intended for pilgrims and that appropriate for parish priests.

From this brief historical summary we can draw some conclusions. The celebration of the liturgy implies a theology of time: cosmic or universal time, human time, salvific time. The organization of the Daily Office corresponds to the rhythm of life and to the ecclesial function of the particular community that celebrates it. In the time of the Fathers, the Liturgy of the Hours was not understood as a clerical obligation but rather as an activity necessary for every fervent Christian community. In general the Bible and esp. the psalms, notwithstanding their pre-Christian origin, constitute the essential element of this dialogue between humanity and God.

M. Marx, *Incessant Prayer in Ancient Monastic Literature*, Rome 1946; J.M. Hanssens, *Aux origines de la prière liturgique. Nature et genèse de l'office des matines*: AG 57, Rome 1952; I. Hausherr, *Comment priaient les Pères*: RAM 32 (1956) 33-58, 284-296; J. Pinell, *El Oficio hispánico-visigótico*: Hispania Sacra 10 (1957) 385-427; P. Salmon, *L'office divin: histoire de la formation du Bréviaire* (Lex Orandi 27), Paris 1959; A. Hamann, *Le rythme de la prière chrétienne ancienne*: La MaisonD 64 (1960) 6-28; B. Botte, *Les heures de prière dans la Tradition Apostolique et les documents dérivés*, in *La prière des heures* (Lex orandi 35), Paris 1963, 101-115; O. Rousseau, *La prière des moines au temps de Jean Cassien*: ibid., 117-138; B. Capelle, *L'Opus Dei dans la Règle de S. Benoît*: ibid., 139-147; J. Mateos, *L'office monastique à la fin du IVe siècle: Antioche, Palestine, Cappadoce*: OC 47 (1963) 53-88; C. Vagaggini - G. Penco, *La preghiera nella Bibbia e nella tradizione patristica e monastica*, Rome 1964; P. Salmon, *La prière des heures (du Ier au Xe s.)*, in A.G. Martimort, *L'Église en prière*, Paris [3]1965, 811-858; J. Gelineau, *Les Psaumes à l'époque patristique*: La MaisonD 135 (1978) 99-116; Ph. Rouillard, *Prière et communauté dans la Règle de S. Benoît*: Notitiae 16 (1980) 309-318; Id., *Tempi e ritmi della preghiera nel monachesimo antico*: Vita consacrata 16 (1980) 659-669; R. Taft, *La liturgie des heures en Orient et en Occident*, Turnhout 1991; M. Ajjoub, *Livre d'heures du Sinaï*, SC 486, Paris 2004.

PH. ROUILLARD

VII. Monastic liturgy. The term *liturgy* needs to be understood in the light of the process of historical development, taking many centuries, which led to the clear distinction established by the Council of Trent, and so familiar to us, between liturgical and nonliturgical. In the same way, in using the term *monastic* we must remember that the form of monasticism in different places and periods varies significantly.

The invitation of Jesus to "pray always" (Lk 18:1) and the Pauline exhortation to "pray constantly" (1 Th 5:17) were applied to the monastic life as a call and invitation to an ideal of continual prayer. Thus to pray constantly was for *Benedict of Nursia as it was for *John Cassian (*Conl.* 9,2,1) the purpose of the monastic life. This way of understanding and living the practice of prayer we find already in nascent form in the first generations of Christians. A vivid awareness of their **koinōnia* ("communion") in Christ was expressed not only in their lives but also in their assemblies of prayer, where the *ecclesia* manifested—with liberty of form—its own nature and its needs.

In the earliest church, the liturgy consisted mainly of the *Eucharist, and until the 4th c. there were no fixed texts, places or vestments. We find the first liturgical formulas in the **Didache* must be read in the light of the affirmation of *Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 67,5): whoever presides at the liturgical sacrifice (θυσία) must pray "according to his capacities." The formularies of the **Apostolic Tradition* (ca. 215) recognize the right of the bishop to use the text as a model, therefore with liberty, rather than as an obligatory formula (n. 10). From the mid-4th c. to the end of the 7th c. formulas came to be fixed, thus bringing into existence the varied liturgies of the East and the West: the Antiochene liturgy, with two different forms in Greek, the Eastern-Syriac and the Western-Syriac, attested in the preaching of *John Chrysostom, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, by the **Didascalia Apostolorum* (3rd c.), and by the **Apostolic Constitutions* (the Jerusalem liturgy, very near to the Antiochene, is characterized by pilgrimages to the holy places, as witnessed esp. in the *Pilgrimage of Egeria* and the catecheses of *Cyril of Jerusalem); the Egyptian liturgy, attested by *Clement of Alexandria, *Origen, *Athanasius, *Cyril of Alexandria and by the *Sacramentary* of Serapion (4th c.); the Roman rite, attested from the end of the 4th c. and contained in the Leonine, old Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentaries, as well as in the *Liber pontificalis;* the Ambrosian rite; the Mozarabic rite; the Gallican rite, of which we find details in *Caesarius of Arles and Gregory of Tours.

Apart from the question of the extent of eucharistic participation and corresponding sensibility in the early monks (see E. Dekkers, *Les anciens moines*

cultivaitent-ils la liturgie?: La MaisonD 51 [1957] 31-54), we know that both *anchorites and *cenobites shared the eucharistic faith of the ecclesial community of the time (see Cassian, *De inst. coenob.* III, 2,1; III, 3,8-10; V, 26,1). The case of *stylites and *dendrites and of monks who passed several decades without human contact did not represent the normal form of monastic life, where there was an invitation to communicate daily (*Hist. mon.* 8,56-57.59-60). Monastic communities that did not have a priest among their members participated in the Eucharist of the local church: this was the system adopted by *Pachomius at the beginning of the founding of his community, by *Jerome for his community and for the community of *Paula at Bethlehem. Later, in order to overcome the difficulties which arose, priests from among the local clergy were invited to celebrate the Eucharist in monasteries. When priests wanted to become monks, reactions varied: the *Rule of the Master* and the *Rule of the Four Fathers* did not accept priests; Pachomius and Benedict did accept them, but it is not clear if they were able to celebrate Mass; sometimes monk-priests would not exercise their priesthood *propter verecundiam et humilitatem* (Girol., *Ep.* 51,1). Later we find increasingly that some monks would receive orders, and this practice became general.

The fathers of the church are unanimous in affirming and developing the idea that the whole Christian life should be a prayer (see Tertull., *De ieiun.* 10; *De orat.* 23; Cypr., *De orat.* 35; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6,12; 7,7), but it was also necessary to consecrate particular moments to prayer acc. to the divisions of the day which characterized social life (see Tertull., *De orat.* 25,23; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 7,7; Cypr., *De orat.* 34). These times of prayer were understood increasingly as connected with the mysteries of the life of Christ (see *Apos. Con.* 8,34; Athan., *De virgin.* 12.16.20; Cass., *De instit. coenob.* 3,3; Basil., *Reg. fus.* 37), and toward the end of the 4th c. the schema of daily prayer was divided into seven separate services (see Ps 119:164); this practice was recommended in the *Apostolic Tradition* even for the individual prayer of the laity. Under the determining influence of monasticism this division shaped the structure of the Divine Office (Bened., *Reg.* 16). The *Opus Dei* (Bened., *Reg.* 19) is a *servitium sanctum,* paying to God his due without expectation of recompense, offering thanksgiving and praise, the soul filled with those sentiments which instinctively well up before the one who is incomprehensible, holy, mysterious, a source of spiritual fascination—sentiments of adoration and compunction, joy and tears, in a word *ferventissimus amor,* of *reverentia sanctissimae Trinitatis*. The office was not only a monastic phenomenon; parishes and cathedrals also had their own *cursus,* acc. to their particular needs. The offices of different churches, existing as early as the 3rd c. in Rome, are amply documented by *Hilary, *Ambrose of Milan, *Augustine of Hippo and *Paulinus. The report we have of the journey of *Egeria tells us of the Jerusalem liturgy at the end of the 4th c., a liturgy in which hymns and antiphons occupy an important place.

O. Casel, Λειτουργία-*munus*: OC 3,7 (1932) 289-302; E. Raitz von Frentz, *Der Weg des Wortes "Liturgie" in der Geschichte*: EphLit 55 (1941) 74-80; N. Lewis, *Leiturgia and Related Terms*: GRBS 3 (1960) 175-184; J. Mateos, *L'office monastique à la fin du IV^e^ siècle*: Antioche, Palestine, Cappadoce: OC 47 (1963) 53-88; var. aus., *La preghiera nella Bibbia e nella tradizione patristica e monastica*, Rome 1964; E. von Severus, *Monastische Liturgie*: Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 9 (1965) 278-319; B. Calati, *La preghiera nel medioevo monastico occidentale: La preghiera*, II, Milan-Rome 1967, 435-503; A. Veilleux, *La théologie de l'abbatiat cénobitique et ses implications liturgiques*: Vie Spir. suppl. 86 (1968) 351-393; Id., *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pacômien au IV^e^ siècle*: SA 57 (1968); E. von Severus, Monastische Liturgie: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 15 (1973) 201-219; J. Gribomont, *Rome et les moines*: La MaisonD 115 (1973) 135-140; A. de Vogüé, *Le prêtre et la communauté monastique dans l'antiquité*: La MaisonD 115 (1973) 61-69; A. Hamman, *Liturgie, prière et famille dans les trois premiers siècles chrétiens*: Questions Liturgiques 2-3 (1976) 81-98; J. Dubois, *Office des Heures et Messe dans la Tradition monastique*: La MaisonD 135 (1978) 61-82; G. Penco, *Il monachesimo fra spiritualità e dottrina*, Milan 1991, 125-141; LTK[3] 6, 972-984; Dizionario Enciclopedico del Medioevo 2, 1066-1068 (P.-M. Gy).

M.G. Bianco

VIII. Eastern liturgical books. If by a liturgical book we mean a book containing the official texts for the celebration of public Christian worship, and if a liturgical book of the primitive church is one used up to the first eight or nine centuries of the Christian era, then of such works we possess almost nothing today. This does not mean that we do not know many things about the Eastern rites, or at least of some of them, over the course of those centuries; but few of the sources we have to reconstruct the liturgy of that epoch may truly be classified as liturgical books in the strict sense of the term.

The primitive liturgical prayers were for the most part extempore, improvised for a particular occasion and assembly. From *Justin Martyr we know that the president of the eucharistic assembly improvised the great prayer "according to his capacity." There can be no doubt that this improvisation followed a generally recognized outline and indeed certain rules, the application of which nonetheless was subject to marked variation; and every so often a *leitourgos* would write down the prayers that he

was accustomed to using: examples of this are the *Apostolic Tradition at the beginning of the 3rd c., *Serapion of Thmuis during the 4th c. and the anonymous author of the very old version of the *anaphora known to us as the Eastern Syriac prayer of Sts. *Addai and Mari, probably of the 3rd c. But at first, and then indeed for a long time, these written sources were not "official liturgical texts" in the modern sense, but simply something distinct from the improvisations from which they originated. According to Anton Baumstark, "These improvisations owed their origin to the actions of individuals and did not go beyond the limits of the community. At the most, it might be possible to find in certain communities, as the tradition incontrovertibly attests, editions of liturgical texts which owed their existence to the person who had prepared or edited them. This is not only the case for those responsible for the liturgy in certain metropolitan or patriarchal sees, such as *Basil of Caesarea, *Nestorius of Constantinople or *Severus of Antioch, but also of bishops of smaller cities, like *Serapion of Thmuis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *John of Bostra, contemporary of Severus of Antioch. Worship as celebrated in the great ecclesiastical centers continued for a long time to have an exclusively local character; . . . in both Rome in the middle of the 5th c. and in Jerusalem in the 8th c. the liturgical text is so closely linked to the place that it could not have been used elsewhere" (*Comp. Lit.* 18). The development of a fixed liturgy from that which was extempory, and therefore of the preparation of "official liturgical texts," seems to have been connected with the growing need to delegate to priests the function which had in ancient times belonged to the bishop as president of the assembly. The collection of prayers of Serapion, whatever may be its real origin, is a good example of the type of book which had to be produced in this situation: these would come to be called later by the Greek word *euchologion*. In the later Byzantine rite, the euchologion contained those parts of the sacramental rites, and other services, required by officiating ministers. The oldest Byzantine euchologion which has survived is the so-called Codex Barberinus (Vat. Barb. Gr. 336 [III, 55]), which almost certainly goes back to the beginning of the 9th c.

From the considerable number of books needed today for the celebration of the Byzantine Divine Office, the *horologion,* containing the ordinary of the office, and which forms only one part of the *Temporale* and *Sanctorale,* may be found in just one MS falling within our period and definition, and that is no older than the 9th c. (Sinai gr. 864: SC 486). The *triodion* (properly *triodion katanyktikon*), containing special offices for Lent and Holy Week, is found in three MSS, one certainly of the 10th c. (Crypt. Δ.β. VIII [300]) and two of the 10th or 11th c. (Sinai 734-735 and Sinai 755); the last-cited also contains the *pentekostarion* (properly *triodion charmosynon*), which gives the rites for the Easter period. Of the *sticherarion* (essentially a compendium of antiphons called *stichera*) there is only one MS which can with certainty be dated before 1000 (Crypt. E.α. VII [292]). Much of the material contained in these and in other similar liturgical books can also be found in older sources, but the more recent certainly cannot be considered as "liturgical books" acc. to our definition.

The *kanonarion* or *typikon* (the somewhat later name but much more commonly used) corresponds almost exactly to the Western *ordo* (in the ancient, not the modern sense): it is a list of liturgical services for the use of those who participate in them, gathering into one book all the rubrics of the various services for each day over the course of the year. As such, it is without doubt the most important of the various liturgical books for the historian trying to reconstruct the early Christian liturgy, and thus demands particular attention. Fortunately it is possible to map the development of the *typikon* with some precision, despite its complexity, from the end of the 4th c. onward. In the East the original *stratum* reflects the influence of Jerusalem. We have valuable information on the usage in Jerusalem in the late 4th c. from a document which, although it is not in any sense a liturgical book, is nonetheless important and worthy of mention: the *Pilgrimage of Egeria* or *Travels of Egeria,* a classic example of the way in which a great part of our knowledge of ancient liturgy derives from nonliturgical sources.

We have two further documents which are justly described as *Armenian and *Georgian lectionaries. (It would be neither useful nor appropriate to try to distinguish between *kanonarion* or *typikon* and a lectionary.) From its appearance, the first would seem to be datable to the 9th or 10th c. (Paris, Bibl. Nat. Arm. 44; and Erévan 985), but the experts agree that these represent much older rites; this applies also to a different MS of 1192 (Codex Jerus. Armen. 121). The same observation applies to the MS of the Georgian lectionary (Paris, Bibl. Nat. Georg. 3, 10th–11th c.; Sinai 37, end of the 10th c.; Mestia 635, 10th c.; Kala, 10th c.).

A MS from *Jerusalem of 1122 (Pat. Hier. Hagios Stauros 43) also clearly reflects rites from a much earlier period. The document also shows the influence upon the Jerusalem liturgy of the Great Church of *Constantinople.

There are two MSS of the oldest version we have of the "Typikon of the Great Church" (of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople): Pat. Hier. Hagios Stauros 40, of the mid-10th c., and Patmos 266, said by Baumstark to be partly from the beginning and partly from the end of the 9th c., but dated by Mateos (and more probably accurately) to the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th c. This typikon is of very great importance, being the most substantial individual source we have of the "cathedral" rite of Constantinople. Of the three monastic traditions which had a marked influence on the Byzantine rite—Sabaite, Sinaite and Studite—there is no *typikon* extant from our period, although much can be reconstructed from later documents if it is connected with older indirect testimony.

Space prevents a detailed examination of the first documents of the Eastern rite beyond the Byzantine, but in any case complete MSS from our period are rare or even nonexistent, and reconstruction work is necessary.

On the MSS, see S.E. Assemani, *Bibl. Apost. Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus*, Rome 1756–1758; var. aus., *Codices Vat. Graeci*, 4 vols., Vatican City 1923–1950; K.W. Clark, *Checklist of Manuscripts in St. Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai*, Washington, D.C. 1952; Id., *Checklist of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates in Jerusalem*, Washington, D.C. 1953.

General collections and editions of texts: J.A. Assemani, *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae*, 13 vols., Rome 1749–1766; E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, 2 vols., Paris 1716, reprinted Frankfurt a.M. 1847, anastatic reprint 1970; F.E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (only the volume on the Eastern liturgies was published), Oxford 1896; var. aus., *Anaphorae Syriacae quotquot in Codicibus repertae sunt, cura Pont. Inst. Studiorum Orientalium editae et latinae versae*, Rome 1939–1973; A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex Eucharistica. Textus e Variis Liturgiis Antiquioribus Selecti*, Fribourg 1968, [3]1998; E. Lodi, *Enchiridion euchologicum fontium liturgicorum*, 2 vols., Rome 1979.

General works: Massimiliano, Principe di Sassonia, *Ritus Missae Ecclesiarum Orientalium S. Romanae Ecclesiae Unitarum*, Regensburg 1907–1908; Id., *Praelectiones de liturgiis orientalibus*, 2 vols., Freiburg i.Br. 1908–1913; J.M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus: Missa rituum orientalium*, 3 vols., Rome 1930–1932; A. Raes, *Introductio in liturgiam orientalem*, Rome 1947; A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée*, Chevetogne [3]1953 (Eng. tr. *Comparative Liturgy*, London 1958), with a vast bibliography. For Egeria, *see* *Egeria. For Jerusalem and the development of the *typikon*: A. Smith Lewis, *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary* (Studia Sinaitica 6), London 1897; F.C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum*, Oxford 1905; K. Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskij Kanonar VII veka*, Tbilisi 1912; F.C. Burkitt, *The Old Lectionary of Jerusalem*: JTS 24 (1922–1923) 415-424; Id., *The Early Syriac Lectionary System:* Proceedings of the British Academy 11 (1923) 1-38; J.B. Thibaut, *Ordre des offices de la Semaine Sainte à Jérusalem du IV*[e] *au X*[e] *siècle*, Paris 1926; G. Peradze, *Zur vorbyzantinischen Liturgie Georgiens*: Muséon 42 (1929) 90-99; Id., *Les Monuments Liturgiques Prébyzantins en Langue Géorgienne*: Muséon 45 (1932) 255-272; G. Kretschmar, *Die frühe Geschichte der Jerusalemer Liturgie*: Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie 2 (1956) 22-46; G. Garitte, *Le Calendrier Palestino-Géorgien du Sinaiticus 34* (*X*[e] *siècle*), Brussels 1958; M. Tarchnischvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem* (CSCO 188-189, 204-2055), Louvain 1959–1960; A. Renoux, *Un manuscrit du lectionnaire arménien de Jérusalem* (*Cod. Jerus. Arm. 121*): Muséon 74 (1961) 361-385; Id., *Un manuscrit du lect. armén. de Jérus.* (*Cod. Jerus. Arm. 12*) *- Addenda et corrigenda*: Muséon 75 (1962) 385-398; Id., *Liturgie de Jérusalem et lectionnaires arméniens. Vigiles et année liturgique*, in Cassien-Botte, *La Prière des Heures*, Paris 1963, 167-199; R. Zerfass, *Die Schriftlesung im Kathedral-offizium Jerusalems* (LQF 48), Münster i.W. 1968; A. Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121: I. Introduction aux origines de la liturgie hiérosolymitaine. Lumières nouvelles* (PO 35, 1 = 163), Turnhout 1969; Id., *Le Codex Erévan 985: une adaptation arménienne du Lectionnaire Hiérosolymitain*: Armeniaca. Mélanges d'études arméniennes, Venezia 1969, 45-66. On the Byzantine rite: J. Goar, *Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum*, Paris 1647, anastatic reprint Graz 1960; A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie Liturgičeskikh rukopisei khranjaščikhsja v Bibliotekach Pravoslavnago Vostoka*, 3 vols.: Typika I, Kiev 1895; Euchologia, Kiev 1901; Typika II, Petrograd 1917; Id., *Typica, Addenda et corrigenda*: Trudy Kievskoj Dukhovnoj Akademij 3 (1896) 527-545; H. Delehaye, *Synaxarium ecclesiae constantinopolitanae* (Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum novembris), Brussels 1902; A. Dmitrievskij, *Drevneišie Patriaršie Tipikoni: Svjatogrobskij Ierusalimij i Velikosj Konstantinopolskoj Tserkvi*, Kiev 1907; I. Karabinov, *Postniaja Triod*, St. Petersburg 1910; M. Skaballanovič, *Tolkovij Tipikon*, 2 vols., Kiev 1910-13; V. Beneševič, *Opisanie grečeskikh rukopisei monastyria svjiatoi Ekateriny na Sinae*, 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1911-17; A. Baumstark, *Das Typikon der Patmoshandschrift 266 und die altkonstantinopolitanische Gottesdienstordnung*: JLW 6 (1926) 98-111; A. Strittmatter, *The "Barberinum S. Marci" of Jacques Goar*: EphLiturg 47 (1933) 329-367; N. Cappuyns, *Le Triodion. Étude historique sur sa constitution et sa formation* (thesis of the Pont. Ist. Or. Stud.), Rome 1935; O. Strunk, *The Byzantine Office at Haghia Sophia*: DOP 9-10 (1955–1956) 175-202; J. Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix n. 40, X*[e] *siècle*, 2 vols. (OCA 165-166), Rome 1962–1963; A. Kniazeff, *La lecture de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament dans le rite byzantin*, in C. Botte, *La prière des Heures*, Paris 1963, 201-252; J. Mateos, *Un horologion inédit de saint-Sabbas. Le Codex sinaïtique grec 863* (*IX*[e] *siècle*): Mélanges Eugène Tisserant 3 (ST 233), Vatican City 1964, 47-76; Id., *Évolution historique de la liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome*: POC 15 (1965) 333-351; 16 (1966) 3-18, 131-161; A. Jacob, *Histoire du formulaire grec de la liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome*, Louvain 1968; F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts* (OCA 187), Rome 1970; C. Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Its Origin and Evolution*, Allendale, NJ, no date (1972?); G. Bertonière, *The Historical Development of the Easter Vigil and Related Services in the Greek Church* (OCA 193), Rome 1972; M. Arranz, *Les grandes étapes de la liturgie byzantine: Palestine, Byzance, Russie. Essai d'aperçu historique*, in A. Pistoia - A. Triacca, *Liturgie de l'Église particulière et liturgie de l'Église universelle* (Bib. Eph. Lit., Subsidia 7), Rome 1976, 43-72. For the Eastern rites other than the Byzatine, see bibl. in A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée*, op. cit. On the issue of MSS and the reconstruction of texts, see W.F. Macomber, *The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*: OCP 32 (1966) 335-371; J.M. Sánchez Caro, *Eucaristía e historia de la salvación. Estudio sobre la plegaria eucarística oriental* (BAC 439), Madrid 1983; *La grande veglia bizantina*, tr. with notes by S. Parenti,

Padua 1984; R. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, Collegeville, MN [2]1986; P. Yousif (ed.), *La bibliographie classifiée de la liturgie syrienne orientale*, Rome 1990; *Petit Dictionnaire de l'Orient Chrétien* (PDOC), J. Assfalg - P. Krüger (eds.), Turnhout 1991; R. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History*, American Essays in Liturgy series, Collegeville, MN 1992; H. Paprocki, *Le Mystère de l'Eucharistie*, Paris 1993; M. Nin, *The Liturgical Heritage of the Eastern Churches*, in P. Pallath (ed.), *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, Rome 1994; E. Velkovska, *Lo studio dei lezionari bizantini*: Ecclesia Orans 13 (1996) 253-272; *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, ed. S. Parenti - E. Velkovska, 2nd ed. revised with It. trans. 2000; Patrologia V, 675-683; *Liturgia*, ed. D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca - C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001, 283-296, 1385-1403; M. Ajjoub, *Livre d'heures du Sinaï*, SC 486, Paris 2004.

W.J. GRISBROOKE

IX. Western liturgical books. By liturgical book we mean a book which the celebrant uses for carrying out the various acts of worship (sacraments and benedictions) in different historical epochs. Compositions intended for study or private use are therefore not properly speaking liturgical books, even if such texts include contents which in their own right are truly liturgical.

A. The oldest liturgical books are the **ordines* and the *sacramentaries, all dating from *Gregory the Great onward (d. 604). Before this date we have only the liturgical-canonical collection called the **Apostolic Tradition* (ca. 220), the lost Greek original of which comes to us only in *Latin translation called the Hauler or Verona fragments (*Veronensis* 55), a specimen of a Roman ritual translated under *Damasus (ca. 380) and probably intended for a bilingual liturgy. (Rome changed from Greek into Latin at about this time.) From the period before the sacramentaries several eucharistic formularies are extant.

B. The **libelli missarum* consist of the formularies of the Mass (collects, prefaces, *Hanc Igitur, postcommunio*), excluding the *canon missae*. The only collection we have of these formularies antedating the *libri sacramentorum* are in Veronensis 85, improperly called the "Leonine Sacramentary," compiled in about 550. (Some parts taken in isolation date from earlier than this.) The unknown author of this work collected together and grouped, acc. to the months of the civil year, certain Mass formularies from the Lateran archive, intended for the bishop of Rome and celebrants in the suburbicarian churches.

C. The *ordo* (pl. *ordines*) is a small book of varying dimensions, containing instructions for the carrying out of various liturgical actions (not including the formularies themselves) and meant to be used to guide the celebrant. As such, the *ordo* was the indispensable counterpart to the sacramentary. The *ordines,* approximately fifty in number, are available to us only in certain Roman or Franco-Roman collections, dating from between ca. 700–800 to 1000. They describe the ceremony for the *Eucharist, for an imperial coronation, for the dedication of churches (with the ritual for the enshrining of relics and the consecration of altars). There are also directories for the *Temporale,* the Liturgy of the Hours, monastic meals and for the *Diligentia* and a directory for liturgical vestments.

D. The *sacramentary* was a liturgical book for the use of the celebrant, and him alone, covering all the liturgical functions. It contained formularies for different rites, excluding instructions on how to execute the sacred functions. Ancient sacramentaries therefore do not correspond precisely to any of the liturgical books presently in use, not even after the reform of Vatican II, for they contained in some respects more material than the modern missal or pontifical, but in other respects less. These are the principal types:

1. The sacramentary called the *Old Gelasian* (*Vaticanus Regin. lat.* 316), transcribed in about 750, not far from Paris, probably in the monastery of Chelles. We have here a French edition of an authentically Roman book, brought from Rome a century before by French pilgrims. The structure of the sacramentary has two characteristics which remain constant in the Gelasian family, different from the Gregorian families: its division into three books, and the separation of the *temporale* from the *sanctorale* in two distinct series. The archetype of the *Vaticanus Regin. lat.* 316, of Roman origin, was composed in all probability between 628 and 715; i.e., between the oldest possible date of the most recent feast (the *Exaltatio Crucis* on 14 Sep) and the beginning of the pontificate of *Gregory II (715–736), because it does not yet contain the Thursday Lenten Masses instituted by that pope.

2. The *Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary,* otherwise called the Sacramentary of Pepin the Short, the archetype of which was most probably composed in a Benedictine monastery in Gaul, and in strict relation to the cult of St. Projectus (Prix), perhaps at Volvic (Auvergne) or Flavigny (Burgundy), probably during the period of residence of Pope Stephen II (754–760) with Pepin the Short. Its compiler is unknown (Remigius of Rouen? Chrodegang of Metz?). Its arrangement and overall plan are the same as the Gregorian sacramentary (Masses of the *temporale* and those of the *sanctorale* linked together in a single series). The objective of the compiler seems to be fairly clear: to combine together the Old Gelasian sacramentary (*Vaticanus Regin. lat.* 316) and the Gregorian *Paduensis* type, thus elimi-

nating local liturgies in favor of the Roman rite, and also to suppress—in areas already Romanized—the rivalry between the supporters of the two different sacramentaries. Its use was very brief (between 705 and 784/791). The intention of the editor was not achieved, and the new book in fact only contributed further to the liturgical anarchy that already reigned.

3. The Gregorian sacramentaries are of two classes and—differing from the Gelasian family—have neither a division into three books nor the distinction between the *sanctorale* and the *temporale*.

The *Gregorian sacramentary of the Paduan type* (*Paduensis* D. 47), drawn up in about 841–855 in E Belgium (Aix-la-Chapelle? Liège? Cologne?), supposes a Roman prototype compiled between 683 and 687, brought N of the Alps by a French pilgrim who was an admirer of the Roman liturgy, before the reform of Pepin the Short.

The *Gregorian sacramentary of the Hadrianum type* dates from the epoch of the Carolingian reform. Paul Warnefred (*Paulus Grammaticus* or *Paulus Diaconus*) received from the Aachen reformers the mission to petition Pope Hadrian (772–795) for a "pure" (*immixtum*) Gregorian sacramentary, i.e., free from post- (or extra-) Gregorian additions. In early 786 the pope satisfied Charlemagne by entrusting John of Ravenna with a copy of a Gregorian sacramentary, dating from between 731 and 735—the only one, it seems, in his possession—which was lodged in the Palatine library as an authentic text. The volume sent by Hadrian I into the Frankish kingdom was practically unusable, because it had been composed for the personal use of the bishop of Rome for celebrations on the Stational days in the Roman basilicas. There was therefore a pressing need to complete it.

4. The integrated *Sacramentarium Hadrianum*. In the years 801–804 the Carolingian reformers (Alcuin? Benedict of Aniane?) added to the *Hadrianum* a full *Supplement,* which—as well as filling some lacunae in the Roman original—contained a series of votive Masses and benedictions of Frankish provenance. The *integrated Hadrianum* represents therefore a hybrid Roman-Frankish liturgy, standing at the origins of what is called the Roman liturgy.

5. The "Gelasianized" or "mixed Gregorian" sacramentaries of the 10th and 11th c. are the result of a fusion of the *integrated Hadrianum* with the *Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary,* along different lines: direct, "exuberant," even eccentric.

E. The *missal* appeared after the end of the 10th c. and combines, for practical reasons, the *eucharistic order* and *eucharistic formulas* (= rubrics and formulas). The *Plenary Missal* contained, further, an epistolary, an evangeliary and an antiphonary of the Mass. This new liturgical book sanctioned the separation of worship from the community, granting to the celebrant all the functions of the community at prayer.

F. The *pontifical* is a liturgical collection born in theory of the combination of the *noneucharistic order* with the formulas corresponding to those of the sacramentary. Imperfect specimens appear beginning in the 9th c.; from the 10th c. the number of pontificals multiplies.

1. The *Romano-German pontifical of the 10th c.,* prepared in the scriptorium of the Benedictine monastery of St. Alban's Abbey, Mainz (Germany), between 960 and 961–963, is a dense and complex compilation that unites didactic elements (homilies, *expositiones missae, symboli, orationis dominicae*) with eucharistic formularies, more properly at home in missals, and with noneucharistic *ordines* of various periods with their formulas *in extenso*. The *Romano-German pontifical of the 10th c.* provided in detail all the sacred functions celebrated in Western churches during the 9th and 10th c. Representing the convergence of old traditions, it also lies at the root of all pontificals of the following centuries, including the *Pontificale romanum* (in the form antecedent to the changes of the Vatican II). Apart from its very wide dissemination and use in the Western churches, it quickly came to Rome, on the occasion of the residence of the Holy Roman emperor Otto I in Italy (961–965; 966–972) and ended up being considered an authentically Roman book. A copy of the *Romano-German Pontifical* was certainly in use in the apostolic city from 996 and 1002 (preserved in the *Cassinensis* 451 and the *Vallicellianus* D.5).

2. The *Roman pontificals*. With Gregory VII (1073–1085), the stream of liturgical books from beyond the Alps gradually dried up. Rome took the initiative, and thus ended the epoch in which "the government of our church was given to the Germans" (*tempus quo Teutonicis concessum est regimen nostrae Ecclesiae*: Gregorio VII, *Regula canonica*). The *Romano-German pontifical* remained, however, the common source of the Roman pontificals of the 12th and 13th c.

3. Guillaume Durand, bishop of Mende (ca. 1293–1295), in the S of France, had compiled a *Tripartite Pontifical,* to which the Western schism, above all under Robert of Geneva (Clement VII: 1378–1409) and Pedro de Luna (Benedict XIII: 1394–1402), assured success in displacing the 13th-c. pontifical or *pontifical of the Roman curia* which was brought by the popes to Avignon from 1305. The *editio princeps* of the pontifical, prepared by A. Patrizi Piccolomini and Giovanni Burchard of Stras-

bourg (Rome, 1485), reproduces *ad litteram* the tripartite pontifical of Guillaume Durand.

Now that we have reviewed the cycle of sacramentaries, we can consider the progress of the liturgy in the West: (1) from Rome the *ordines* made their way to the Frankish counties; (2) from the Frankish countries there is a migration toward Austria and the countries of the Rhine, with progressive hybridization; (3) from the Rhine Valley, after the reworking done at St. Alban of Mainz, the Romano-German compilation accompanies the Ottos to Rome; (4) from Rome the pontifical follows the popes to the banks of the Rhone (1305); (5) from Avignon the pontifical returns to Rome *iterum;* (6) at the dawn of the modern era, after a rich history but under the form which had been definitively given to it by G. Burchard, the pontifical spread throughout the Latin Christian world.

G. The book called the *rituale* contains the ceremonies, with the corresponding formularies, of the noneucharistic parts of worship celebrated by the priest, but excluding functions reserved to the bishop. The *rituale* in its pure form appeared in the 11th c. Theoretically the *rituale* is an extract of the pontifical, but in fact it has a very long and complex history (and even prehistory), starting with small versions for personal use and extending to collections of votive and festal texts, as well as to stand-alone versions.

H. The *antiphonaries* are of two types: the antiphonary of the Mass and the antiphonary of the Divine Office (breviary) that contain antiphons and responsories, and also, toward the end of the medieval period, psalms, hymns and, in general, the various parts of the *graduale.*

I. The *graduale* in the proper sense includes the music for choirs singing at Mass. In the Frankish countries, the *graduale* contained only the music sung by the cantor alone, on the steps (*gradus*) of the ambo, therefore corresponding in its function to the Roman *cantatorium*.

J. The *lectionary*. From the end of the 5th c. to the beginning of the 6th there were four different systems for indicating pericopes (liturgical readings of determinate length) to accompany the eucharistic celebration, which continued in use up to the 14th c. They were as follows: marginal notes, lists (*capitularia*), lectionaries properly so called with the text *in extenso* of the epistles and the gospels, and then lectionaries within the missal (epistolary, evangeliary, then a complete lectionary). In practice and commonly the epistolary refers to the series of readings other than the gospel, either in lists or texts *in extenso*. The evangeliary refers, analogously, to readings from the gospels. The lectionary of the Mass (as distinguished from the lectionary of the Divine Office) includes at the same time the epistolary and the evangeliary.

K. The *Capitularia evangeliorum* (lists of gospels passages) may be divided, acc. to the nomenclature of T. Klauser, into four basic groups: type Π (pure Roman, ca. 645), type Λ (pure Roman, ca. 740), type Σ (pure Roman, ca. 755) and type Δ (Frankish-Roman, ca. 650, completed in about 750 in the Frankish kingdoms).

L. The *homiliaries* are divided into three types: commentaries on the gospel pericopes for Matins; homilies for the readings of the liturgical year; homilies in the form of edifying sermons. These collections are attested in the paleo-Christian era (*Cassiodorus, *Caesarius of Arles, the Arian *Maximinus), as also in the case of *Germanus of Paris and the Venerable *Bede. One of the most important homiliaries is that composed by Warnefred (*Paulus Grammaticus* or Paul the Deacon) at Montecassino between 786 and 797, on the request of Charlemagne, which in two books provides chosen texts from the Fathers (principally *Augustine of Hippo, *Ambrose of Milan, *Jerome, *Leo I and *Gregory the Great). When the sermons and homilies were inserted in the breviary (II and III nocturns), the *homiliaries* had outlived their use and disappeared as distinct works.

Editions: M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vols., Louvain 1931–1961 (Ordo I-L); Id., *Le Pontifical romain au moyen âge* (R.P. of 12th–13th c., Pont. of Guillaume Durand), 4 vols., Vatican City 1938–1941; C. Vogel - R. Elze, *Le Pontifical romano germanique du X^e^ siècle*, 3 vols., Vatican City 1963–1972. The majority of the sacramentaries have been published in the collection of L.C. Mohlberg, *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum documenta. Series Maior et Series Minor*, Rome 1956–, and in the series of the Henry Bradshaw Society, London 1890–.

Studies: V. Leroquais, *Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits*, 4 vols., Paris 1924; Id., *Les Livres d'Heures*, 3 vols., Paris 1927; Id., *Les Bréviaires*, 6 vols., Paris 1934; Id., *Les Pontificaux*, 4 vols., Paris 1937; Id., *Les Psautiers latins*, 3 vols., Paris 1940–1941; Id., *Supplément*, Paris 1934; T. Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum I. Typen*, Münster i.W. 1935; K. Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores* (Spic. Friburg. Subsidia I), Fribourg 1963; R. Grégoire, *Les Homéliaires du moyen âge*, Rome 1966; C. Vogel, *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire du culte chrétien au moyen âge*, Bibl. Studi medioevali, I, Spoleto-Turin [2]1975; E. Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques: le moyen âge des origines au XIII^e^ siècle*, Paris 1993; *Scientia Liturgica*, ed. A. Chupungco, vol. V, Casale Monf. 1998; *Calligrafia di Dio. La miniatura celebra la parola*, ed. G. Canova Mariana, Modena 1999.

C. Vogel

LITURGY and the BIBLE. The liturgy and the Bible have been mutual influences upon each other. On

the one hand the NT, after it had reached its canonical form, was naturally an influence on the development of the liturgical rites, as was, for that matter, the OT. On the other hand, in earlier periods of church history, the primitive forms of the rites left their own imprint on the formation of the NT. This is most evident in those passages of letters which explicitly discuss contemporary liturgical practice (e.g., 1 Cor 11:17-34); but the influence of the liturgy extends also to less obvious contexts. It is thought with good reason that Paul took certain passages, in the forms of hymns, from liturgical sources (such as the christological hymns of Phil 2:6-11 and Col 1:15-20), as also the prayer "come, Lord," "maranatha" (1 Cor 16:22; cf. Rev 22:20). Probably the same applies to certain professions of faith, such as Rom 1:3-4 and 1 Cor 15:3-7, which seem to derive from baptismal catechesis. The gospels show a similar tendency: thus the formulation of the command to baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28:19) very likely derives from the baptismal practices of the late 1st c. The oldest practice seems to have been baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ" (see Acts 2:38; 1 Cor 1:13; W.F. Flemington, *New Testament Doctrine*, 105-109). Moreover, O. Cullman has shown that the probation against "hindering" the children (Mk 10:14; cf. Mt 3:14; Acts 8:36; 10:47; 11:17) echoes a phrase in a baptismal liturgy. Many descriptions of initiation given by Luke in Acts seem to be attempts to show how the church adapted its rites to varying circumstances. The account of the Last Supper in the Synoptics, apparently showing the rite in an earlier stage of development than 1 Cor 11, seems to reflect the liturgical practice at the time of the evangelists. It is also held that the Lord's Prayer, at least in the Matthean version (Mt 6:9-13), represents a contemporary liturgical reworking of the original words of the Lord. F.L. Cross has suggested that 1 Peter is actually the text of a baptismal liturgy, although most scholars prefer to think of it as a baptismal homily which incorporates some material from the liturgy itself. A great part of Revelation is structured in the form of a heavenly liturgy modeled not only on the worship of the Jewish synagogue but also on the Christian practice of the time, esp. in the description of the heavenly court (chs. 4–5), with the elders gathered around the throne, the Lamb (the Eucharist), the hymns, the (eucharistic) prayer of benediction and the reading of the scroll.

The influence of the liturgy on the composition of the NT has also, perhaps, worked at a deeper level. A. Guilding has tried to show how the Fourth Gospel has been composed as a commentary on a cycle of OT readings in Jewish synagogue worship; M.D. Goulder has shown a similar liturgical origin in the case of the gospel of Matthew.

We have also to see how the church has used the Bible in forming its own rites. G. Winkler has proposed that Christian baptism (whether or not the practice of baptism by immersion as a rite of initiation derived from a historical command of Jesus) in its oldest forms was influenced by the desire of the first Christians to imitate the baptism of Jesus himself in the Jordan, implying a sharing in the royal priesthood conferred by his messianic "anointing." Jesus was revealed at the moment of his baptism as "Messiah" (i.e., "anointed"), and his baptism itself could be described as an "anointing" (Acts 10:38): a fact which seems quickly to have led to the association of a rite of anointing with the baptismal liturgy. The interpretation of baptism as union with the death and resurrection of Jesus (Rom 6:3-4) may be explained by recalling that Jesus described his passion as his "baptism" (Mk 10:38; Lk 12:50). Even the Eucharist, which seems to take its origin from the historical command of Jesus, "do this," would not have been given by him as a fully structured rite. L. Bouyer and others have shown that the Eucharist, as celebrated in the ancient church, was modeled on a combination of Jewish thanksgivings for food (*berakoth*) combined with synagogue worship, with its readings, blessings and prayers. The ritualization of the Eucharist, which came later, never obliterated the traces of its Jewish origins. As the principal meaning of the word *Eucharist* indicates, its core remains the prayer of thanksgiving (i.e., the blessing of God) which continued to be strictly conformed to Jewish synagogue blessings, introduced by a dialogue ("We give thanks . . .": εὐχαριστήσωμεν) as used in the synagogue (see Bouyer, *Eucharistie*, 109-118). The Christian church has also taken from Jewish worship the practice of including biblical readings in the liturgy. The synagogue rite of readings included two texts, taken respectively from the Pentateuch and the Prophets, following a fixed calendar. Lk 4:16-21 describes how Jesus read a passage from Isaiah and commented on it in the synagogue at Nazareth; Acts 13:14-16 says that Paul preached in a synagogue "after the reading of the Law and the Prophets." The theory acc. to which the lectionary of readings in Palestine was structured on a three-year cycle is a subject of dispute among scholars. It appears also that the Psalter was cyclically read. From the earliest times Christian worship adopted this Jewish practice. The Pauline author tells Timothy to "attend to the reading [presumably the public reading of Scripture], to preaching, to teaching" (1 Tim

4:13). It is probably the case that the letters of the apostles were intended to be used in a similar liturgical setting (see Col 4:16; 1 Th 5:27).

It is not clear, however, if such public reading was originally separated from the Eucharist. The first clear evidence of a connection between the two is found in the account of the Sunday liturgy given by *Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 67): "The memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, for as long as time permits." Evidently a fixed lectionary had not yet been established. At the time of the **Apostolic Constitutions* (from the *Antioch area in the 2nd half of the 4th c.) we find prescribed a "reading of the Law or of the Prophets and of our letters, Acts and gospels" (VIII, 5,11; in another section, II, 7,5, the book of Wisdom is added, along with a rather unclear statement which may mean that two OT readings were sufficient). It seems it was around this period that readings began to be chosen acc. to a lectionary rather than simply at the whim of the celebrant, at first for the Lenten catechesis and then for the whole year. The old *Armenian lectionary gives readings for the entire year as celebrated in 5th-c. *Jerusalem: the catechetical readings coincide almost exactly with those of *Cyril of Jerusalem from the previous century. G.G. Willis has reconstructed the lectionary of Hippo at the time of St. *Augustine. At least at the beginning of the 3rd c. there was a rite of *ordination of readers (*Tradizione Apostolica* [Botte] 11).

The recitation of psalms was also part of the eucharistic liturgy. It seems it was the common usage to insert a psalm between the readings (Tertull., *De anima* 9,4; Basil, *In Ps.* 28,7; Ambr., *Ep.* 22,4.7). *Basil (ibid. 29,1) and Augustine (*Confess.* X, 33,49-50) speak of the added fascination of the words of psalms when sung. Psalms were also sung at other moments of the Eucharist, e.g., at the offertory (Aug., *Retract.*: CSEL, II, 37) and at Communion (Cyril Jer., *Cat. Myst.* V, 20; Ambr., *De Elia* 10,34).

The reading of the Scriptures and the recitation of psalms also found a place outside the celebration of the Eucharist. The monastic and cathedral offices had at their heart the recitation of the Psalter acc. to a scheme of *lectio continua*; biblical songs and readings could also be included in the Office. Toward the end of the 4th c., the pilgrim *Egeria recorded numerous details of the Office in Jerusalem, celebrated in a form which seemed to combine monastic and cathedral elements (*Peregr.* 24).

Another element of both eucharistic and other celebrations was the singing of hymns. Many of the ancient authors reveal a true poetic talent: among those best known, *Ambrose of Milan owes relatively little to the Scriptures, but *Ephrem the Syrian's works have a much more biblical tone.

Of great importance in the liturgy of the word of the Eucharist were the homilies. Very often they took the form of a commentary on the Scriptures, arranged so as to cover an entire biblical book. Egeria tells us that the bishop of Jerusalem (presumably Cyril) dedicated the first five weeks (perhaps it should be "four"?) of the daily Lenten catechesis to the exposition of "the whole Bible, beginning with Genesis, explaining first the literal sense of each passage, and then interpreting it acc. to the spiritual sense" (*Peregr.* 46,2). These catecheses have been lost, but we do have the Lenten catechetical discourses of Cyril (the *Catecheses* and the *Mystagogical Catecheses*), each of which bears a reference to an appropriate biblical reading.

As was inevitable, the Jewish calendar based on the OT was replaced by a Christian calendar based on the NT. The "Lord's day," the celebration of the *resurrection, took the place of Saturday as the focal point of the week. In the annual cycle, the Christian celebration of *Easter became the principal feast, perhaps even as early as the end of the 1st c. Later, Lent and *Pentecost were linked to it. The *Nativity-*Epiphany cycle owes its origin to the desire to establish a Christian equivalent of the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, or of the solar festivals of the pagan world, connected with the winter solstice.

The significance of these feasts was increasingly linked with Jewish feasts and the history of Israel. The authors of the NT themselves had already moved in this direction. Christ is "our Passover" (1 Cor 5:7). Baptism is an "antitype" of the salvation of eight persons enclosed in the ark, by water (1 Pet 3:21). The experiences of the exodus (the cloud, the sea, the manna and the water from rock) are described in the language of Christian initiation and the Eucharist (1 Cor 10:1-4). From the 2nd c. there was a growth in preaching on the Pasch (e.g., *Melito, ps.-*Hippolytus, *In Sanctum Pascha*), which used OT themes in a christological perspective, thus casting light on the meaning of the Christian celebration. It is evidence of the first stage of Christian *exegesis.

The Fathers, following the example of the NT authors, frequently use this typological language to explain the relationship between the Christian sacraments and their OT prefigurations. Historians often distinguish this typological exegesis from the use of allegory. This last is described by J. Daniélou as "Christian philosophy and morals presented through a series of biblical images, as the Stoics did in presenting their philosophy and morals in a series of Homeric images" (*Sacramentum futuri*, 48). For

example, explaining the account of sin in Genesis, Ambrose says that Adam represents the mind and Eve the senses; sin is the mind which gives itself to pleasure, the flood is the correction of the mind through teaching (*De Abr*. 2,1). A type, on the other hand, is, acc. to Daniélou, "a reference to a historical event meant to give ground for hope in another analogous event" (*Sacramentum futuri*, 45). The NT authors have based their use of scriptural typology on two different theories. One of these entails a theology of the providence of God working in history: the events of the OT "happened to them τυπικῶς and were written for our instruction" (1 Cor 10:11). The other explanation is metaphysical and framed in terms of a Platonic ontology: the furnishings of the temple are "copies [ὑποδείγματα] of the heavenly things," and the old law is a "shadow of the good things to come" (Heb 9:23; 10:1).

Τύπος means literally "seal," "stamp," and αντίτυπος refers to the impression which corresponds to the original. The Christian writers, using this terminology, extended the meaning but made it less precise. They applied the concept to the relation between the historical Jesus and his continuing communion with the church in the liturgy: the expressions *typos* and *antitypos* are sometimes applied indiscriminately to the second term of the relation. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem can call the eucharistic bread both "type" (*Cat. Myst.* IV, 3) and "antitype" (ibid., V, 20) of the body of Christ. He also uses the terms εἰκών, μίμησις, κοινωνία, ὁμοίωμα, μέτοχος and σύμβολον in the same way as type and antitype to express the typological relation. For example, the anointing of Aaron in the OT occurs τυπικῶς, as σύμβολον of the "reality" (ἀληθῶς) of the Christian sacrament of confirmation (*Cat. Myst.* III, 6). The sacramental rite (of baptism) is the image or imitation of our participation in the reality of the sufferings of Christ (II, 5); similarly the sacramental species of the Eucharist are the "antitype" of the body and blood of Christ (V, 20). *Theodore of Mopsuestia adds an eschatological dimension, seeing the sacrament as that which confers the type (presumably τύπος is the Greek work underlying the Syriac) of the reality of the resurrection in which we will partake in heaven (*Hom. Cat.* 13,15). Some Fathers connect their typology so closely to an ontological foundation that, e.g., Ambrose affirms that the Christian sacraments are older than the Jewish ones, because their prefigurations are earlier (*De Sacr.* I, 23; IV, 10), and that the real dove that Noah sends out from the ark is only an appearance of such if compared to the reality of that "like a dove" which descended on Jesus at the Jordan (*De Myst.* 25).

Daniélou has written numerous studies on the way that the Fathers used the OT as a source of typology for the Christian liturgy. Many of the ancient homilists, such as *Tertullian, *Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem and Ambrose, have put together collections of types of baptism—e.g., the primordial waters of creation, the ark of Noah, the exodus, the water Moses made sweet with his rod and that which he made to spring out of the rock, the baptism of Christ in the Jordan, the water of Cana, the bathing of Naaman in the Jordan, the healing of the paralytic at the sheep gate (Jn 5), and the dove that Noah sent out of the ark. Among the types of the Eucharist are the sacrifice of Abel and of Melchizedek (both mentioned in the ancient eucharistic prayers and represented in art), the manna, the paschal meal, the water that sprang from the rock, the paschal lamb and the "banquet" prepared by the Lord in Ps 23. The Song of Songs was also used frequently in the liturgy and represented a particularly rich source of typology.

O. Cullmann. *Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments*, Zürich 1948; W.F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, London 1948; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri: Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*, Paris 1950; Id., *Bible et Liturgie*, Paris 1951; F.L. Cross, *1 Peter, A Paschal Liturgy*, London 1954; N.M. Denis-Boulet, *Le calendrier chrétien*, Paris 1959 (Je sais, je crois, 112); A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*, Oxford 1960; G.G. Willis, *St. Augustine's Lectionary*, London 1962 (Alcuin Club 44); L. Bouyer, *Eucharistie: théologie et spiritualité de la prière eucharistique*, Tournai 1966; J.A. Lamb, *The Place of the Bible in the Liturgy:* The Cambridge History of the Bible, I (ed. P.R. Ackroyd - C.E. Evans), Cambridge 1970, 563-586; A. Renoux, *Le Codex arménien Jérusalem 121*: PO 35 (1969) 1-215; 36 (1971) 143-388; M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, London 1974; A.-M., La Bonnardière, *La Bible "liturgique" de Saint Augustin*, in *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris 1975, 148-160; G. Winkler, *The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications*: Worship 52 (1978) 24-45; G.J. Cuming, *The Divine Office: The First Three Centuries*, and W.J. Grisbrooke, *The Formative Period-Cathedral and Monastic Offices: The Study of Liturgy* (eds. C. Jones - G. Wainwright - E. Yarnold), London 1978, 353-369; *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris 1984; *Le Monde latin antique et la Bible*, ed. J. Fontaine - Ch. Pietri, Paris 1985; *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, ed. A.-M. La Bonnardière, Paris 1986; E.H. van Olst, *The Bible and Liturgy*, Grand Rapids, MI 1991; J.T. Burtchael, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities*, Cambridge 1992; G.G. Willis, *A History of Early Roman Liturgy*, Rochester 1994; B. Studer, *Die doppelte Exegese bei Origen*, in *Origeniana Sexta*, Leuven 1995, 303-327; Id., *Die patristische Exegese, eine Aktualisierung der Heiligen Schrift*: REAug 42 (1996) 520-553; C. Vagaggini, *Il senso teologico della liturgia*, Cinisello Balsamo [6]1999, 428-475; Id., *L'esegesi patristica: un incontro con Cristo*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 321-344; A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching: A Search for the Origins of the Christian Homily*, Leiden 2001; *Liturgia*, ed. D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca -C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001, 256-283.

E. Yarnold

LIUTPRAND (ca. 690–744). Of the more important of the *Longobard kings. He succeeded his father Ansprand in 712. His policies were essentially directed at pacifying a kingdom at that time disrupted by grave internecine conflicts between the Longobards and the Romans. His attachment to the Catholic faith was unshakable: he confirmed the papal *patrimonium* of the Cottian Alps, built churches and monasteries, and transported the bones of St. *Augustine of Hippo from *Sardinia to Pavia. He brought about a notable increase in private law and in the protection of human life. He set limits to private vendettas within families, adding to the *wergild* the confiscation of the property of the guilty party. Above all, he showed juridical maturity in requiring evidence of conscious intentionality to prove a crime. From 713 to 715 he pursued his legislative activity which translated into fifteen *volumina* (divided into 153 chapters) of laws, marked by a strong religious spirit and the principles of natural law, intended above all to integrate the Edict of Rothari.

After some years of rule characterized by peaceful coexistence with the Byzantines, collaboration with the Venetians and the pope, and by his marriage with Guntrud, daughter of the duke of Bavaria (through whom he consolidated his friendship with Charles Martel), there followed years of military exploits after 727. Initially he invaded the Exarchate, then led an offensive in central and S *Italy and then against the duke of Fruili. Pope Gregory II, understanding that these actions could lead to the unification of Italy under the Longobards and to territorial continuity from the N possessions as far as Benevento, preferred to reach an agreement with the Byzantines of *Ravenna, although he was in dispute with them over the iconoclasm question, and so instigated a rebellion of the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento against Liutprand. Liutprand arrived with his forces near Rome but, threatened with excommunication, made an agreement with the pope, giving him Sutri, marking in effect the birth of the temporal power of the papacy. In 739 he fought against Transemund, duke of Spoleto, who took refuge in Rome; Liutprand threatened the city for a second time. Pope Gregory III consequently asked for help from Charles Martel, king of the Franks, without however receiving it, on account of the obligations with Liutprand negotiated when he had given him help against the Arabs. Around 740 Liutprand began talks with the Greeks from which he might have been able to create a new political order in Italy contrary to the interests of the pope, but Pope *Zachariah forced him to sign the Treaties of Terni (742), in which he committed himself to a twenty-year peace and to restoring the conquered territories (certain cities of Umbria). He died in January 744 while preparing for new campaigns of conquest. His body was translated in the 12th c. to the church of St. Peter in Ciel d'Oro in Pavia.

A. Lizier, EI 21, 317; M. Roberti, *Liutprando re e longobardo*: RIL n.s. 16 (1952) 91-102; B.R. Motz, *L'attività guerriera di re Liutprando nei primi quattordici anni di regno*, Cagliari 1954; G. Fasoli, *I Longobardi in Italia*, Bologna 1965; P. Delogu, *Il regno longobardo*, in G. Galasso, *Storia d'Italia*, I. *Longobardi e Bizantini*, Turin 1980.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

LOMBARDS. *See* *LONGOBARDS

LONGINUS (d. after 580). First bishop of the Nobatae, *monophysite, died after 580. Longinus was a priest at *Alexandria. His name is found among the first missionaries sent to evangelize the tribe of the Nobatae which had been recently converted to Christianity (536). The first phase of the mission was undertaken by an Alexandrian priest named Julian, between 537 and 545. After this, the Empress *Theodora wanted to consecrate Longinus as bishop of the Nobatae; *Theodosius, the monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, wanted instead to keep him nearby, lending him assistance in his old age. After the death of Theodosius, Longinus was consecrated at *Constantinople (2 June 566), but shortly afterward entered into a dispute with the imperial court and for three years did not succeed in leaving the capital. In the end he fled to the region of the Nobatae in Nubia, where he worked fruitfully for six years (569–575). In this period he ordained *Theodore bishop of Alexandria. He then tried, first in Syria and then in Alexandria, to gain acceptance for Theodore's ordination, but without success: finally he returned to his episcopal see in 577. The new patriarch of Alexandria, *Damian, declared him a heretic and deposed him; the Nobatae remained faithful to their bishop, and the tribe of Alwah was so attached to the person of Longinus that they would only accept conversion from him (John of Ephesus, *HE* IV, 51-53). This was the last work of Longinus. The tribe which had been Christianized by him was made subject to the see of Alexandria in the person of Theodore, the patriarch he himself had consecrated. We have three fragmentary letters in *Syriac of Longinus: (1) *Ep. ad archimandritas*; (2) *Ep. ad Johannem ex Beth Hanina*; (3) *Ep. ad Paulum Antiochenum*. According to *John of Ephesus (*HE* IV, 53), Longinus was proud of hav-

ing healed many from the "disease of the *phantasia* of *Julian" of Halicarnassus.

CPG III, 7217; CSCO 17, 241-244 (text); 103, 168-170 (Fr. tr.); E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, CSCO 127, 224-229; I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 17, 84-86, 241-244; Id., CSCO 103, 58-59; 168-170; A. van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, Louvain 1994, 252-254; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian tradition*, 2/4, Westminster 1996, 259-289; S.G. Richter, *Studien zur Christianiesirung Nubiens*, Wiesbaden 2002.

G. Ladocsi

LONGINUS (apocryphal)
1. Longinus (from Gk. *lonchē,* "lance") is identified in apocryphal texts with the centurion at the foot of the cross (Mt 27:54: *Letter of Pilate to Herod*), or with the soldier who pierced the side of Christ (Jn 19:34: *Acts of Pilate*, 10,1), called Petronius in the *Gospel of Peter*. According to *Gregory of Nyssa (*Epist.* 17: PG 46, 1061-1064), Longinus was bishop in *Cappadocia, and was martyred by decapitation. The legend of Longinus developed in the medieval period and was connected with the legend of the Holy Grail. His lance was said to have been discovered by the empress *Helena and brought to *Constantinople.

BHG 988-990c; BHL 4965; BHO 685; BS 8, 89-95; LCIK 7, 410-11. Acts: PG 93, 1546-1550; 115, 32-44; Starowieyski 1, 688-90

2. Another Longinus, philosopher and historian, author of the apocryphal correspondence about the magi with the emperor Augustus, in *Syriac and Arabic. The text of the letter was inserted into the chronicles and into Eastern histories.

CANT 309; Starowieyski 349-351; 878 (bibl.). N. Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Quatre pièces apocryphes néotestamentaires en version syriaque*, in *III Symposium Syriacum 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures*, ed. R. Lavenant, OCA 221, Rome 1983, 65-77.

M. Starowieyski

LONGOBARDS (Lombards). A people of Germanic origin, belonging to the W group (Frisians, Angles, Saxons). Their claimed Scandinavian origin, attested in the sources (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* I, 1), is legendary; modern research places their original location in the planes of the lower Elbe (Bardengau). The etymology of the name is unsure: Paul the Deacon calls them *Winili,* while others link the name Longobards to a custom of wearing a long beard (Isid., *Etym.* IX, 2,95) or to the use of the halberd (*Kögel*), which, however, was never their traditional weapon. The events of the prehistoric phase of the Longobards are obscure and uncertain. According to the account given in the sources, the Longobards, guided by the kings Ibor and Aion, emigrated to Scoringa and Mauringa, where they defeated the *Vandals: archaeological research puts this appropriation of territory in the mid-2nd c. BC. Beaten in Germany by Tiberius, in AD 5 (Velleius, *Hist.* II, 106) the Longobards joined with the Marcomanni and then the Cherusci, led by Arminius (Tacitus, *Ann.* II, 45), whose nephew they helped to regain the throne (47). In 165, prompted by pressure from other peoples, they made a foray into *Pannonia. Thereafter the sources are silent right up to the 5th c.

The account of Paul records their migration to the lands of the Burgundians, the conflicts with the *Vulgares* and the Burgundians, their occupation under King Gudeoc of the lands of the Rugii, already beaten by *Odoacer (end of 5th c.) and those of the Huns. The kings Tato and Waccho brought the power of the Longobards to its peak with the victories over the Heruli and the Swabians and the alliance with the Byzantines (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* I, 20; *Orig.* 3). Following this alliance they engaged with the *Goths in *Italy, obtaining in exchange an annual tribute, and the lands of Noricum and Pannonia (546). They participated in the battle of Tadinae (Gualdo Tadino) which saw the death of Totila (552). As allies of the Byzantines they fought against the Franks and the Persians (for these events the source is Procop., *B.G.* IV, 18-26). They then defeated the Gepids (567): their king Cunimind was killed, and his daughter Rosamund constrained to marry the victor, Alboin (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* I, 27; Greg. Tours, *Hist. Fr.* IV, 41).

Shortly afterward, pursued by the Avars, the Longobards entered Italy (568), where they were to become the dominant force for more than two centuries. Alboin created a kingdom with its capital in Pavia. Alongside this a number of dukedoms sprang up, among which the more important were Trent, Tuscia, Spoleto and Benevento, which were almost independent of the central power. Disagreements between the dukes was to weigh heavily on the subsequent history of Longobard rule. Jealous of their independence, the dukes tried to remove themselves from the royal kingdom, thus creating instability and contributing to the progressive disintegration of Longobard hegemony. Alboin, killed in 572 as the result of a plot coordinated by his wife Rosamund, was followed by Cleph (573–575), whose own death gave way to a decade-long interregnum. King *Authari (584–590) strengthened royal authority with the institution of the *demanium,* the personal dominion of the sovereign; one of his successors, Ro-

thari, introduced the first organic legislation (643). Conflicts with the church as well as the impatience shown by the dukes toward the central power nonetheless resulted in a long period of semianarchy. *Liutprand (712–744) appeared to reaffirm royal sovereignty, but the dispute with the church culminated in political defeat (ceding the city of Sutri, of the exarchate and the Pentapolis). His successor, Aistulf (749–756), was defeated by the Frankish king Pepin, called into Italy by Pope Stephen II; shortly afterward the victories of Charles, son of Pepin, over Desiderius (754–774) at Pavia and over Adelchis at Verona (774) brought the era of Longobard domination to an end.

The political organization of the Longobards always remained rudimentary, despite contacts with the more advanced and complex systems of the Roman world. Its fulcrum was an assembly responsible for the election of the sovereign, who in fact governed increasingly with the assumption of absolute royal power. In possession of military and judicial authority, the king was assisted by his officers, chosen from among the *gasindii*. The administrative system was based on groups of families (*fare*) from which the military contingents were chosen. The territory was divided into various administrative areas, governed by dukes appointed by the king. The personal estates of the sovereign were administered by the officials of the court, the gastalds. Longobard law, based initially on ancient custom (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* IV, 44), was reformed with the Edict of Rothari (promulgated 22 Nov 643 at Pavia); from this came the introduction of an indemnity, or *wergild*, payable to the injured party, and the introduction of the use of documentary proof rather than the barbaric ritual of a duel in penal cases. The fiscal system was equally primitive, based on taxation in kind, particularly affecting Roman landowners (Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* II, 32). The economy was based largely on agriculture; commercial activity flourished esp. in *Ravenna and Venice. The units of currency were the *soldo,* the *tremisse* and the *siliqua* (1/20th of a *soldo*). The division of civil society was based on the different degrees of liberty: the *arimanni,* who enjoyed all full rights, were followed by the *aldii* and the *massarii,* in a state of subjection, as well as the *servi regii, servi ecclesiae, servi ministeriales.*

We have contemporary information about the culture of the Longobards: in several places Paul the Deacon speaks of sagas and traditional songs. They were notable for the manufacture of furnishings and also jewelry. The language, of which we have only limited evidence, was similar to German. In respect to religion, the Longobards were originally linked to the pagan cults (Odin, Freya) but then welcomed Christianity, probably brought to them by peoples of the East (Rugii, Gepids, Goths), although they embraced the *Arian heresy. The supposed letter of *Justin (548) in which they are declared Catholics is not reliable. In fact, under Christianity Longobards were never unified in religious matters, as the different creeds of their kings attest: the Arian Alboin (murdered in 572), who was married to the catholic Clotsinda and to the Arian Rosamund, was eventually succeeded by Authari (584-590), under whose reign his wife Theodelinda and the pope, *Gregory the Great, began the conversion of the Longobards to Catholicism. The son of *Theodelinda and Authari, Adaloald, was baptized 7 April 603, in the basilica of St. John of Monza. Although held back to some extent by the Arian bishops, Catholicism was successful among the Longobards, one of the results of which was the disappearance of the national language. Nonetheless, there were adherents to Arianism among the Catholic Adaloald's successors, such as Arioald and Rothari. Afterward, the conflict between the catholic and the Arian groupings contributed to hastening the disintegration of the Longobard kingdom.

The principal sources include: Velleius, *Hist.* II, 106; Tacitus, *Germ.* 40; Id., *Ann.* II, 45-46; ibid., XI, 17; Strabo, *Geogr.* VII, 1,3; Ptolemy, *Geogr.* II, 16; *Origo gentis Langobardorum*, MGH, *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI-IX*; *Historia Langobardorum codicis Gothani*, ibid.; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ibid.; *Edictum ceteraeque Langobardorum leges*, MGH, *Leges* IV; *Gregorii I Papae registrum epistolarum*, ed. Edwald-Hartmann, 1887-1889; A. Zanella, *Paolo Diacono, Storia dei Longobardi*, Milan 1991, with bibl.; M. Schönfeld, PWK XII, 678-687; A. Lizier, EI 21, 470-478; F. Cognasso, EC 7, 1518-1528; M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Barbarian West*, Oxford 1966; N. Cilento, *Italia meridionale longobarda*, Milan 1966; E. Bernareggi, *Attività economiche e circolazione monetaria in età longobarda nella testimonianza delle Charte*: RIN 72 (1970) 117-137; O. Bertolini, *Roma e i longobardi*, Rome 1972; J. Jarnut, *Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Langobardenreich in Italien (568-774)*, Bonn 1972; E. Bernareggi, *Struttura economica e monetazione del regno longobardo*: NAC 5 (1976) 331-376; H.J. Diesner, *Zur Langobardischen Sozialstruktur, Gasindii und Verwandtes*: Klio 58 (1976) 141-186; G. Pepe, *Il medioevo barbarico in Italia*, Turin [6]1977; P. Delogu, *Il regno longobardo*, in G. Galasso, *Storia d'Italia*, I. *Longobardi e Bizantini*, Turin 1980; B. Luiselli, *La società longobardica del secolo VIII e Paolo Diacono storiografo tra romanizzazione e nazionalismo longobardico*, in Zanella, op. cit., 5-48; *Langobardia*, ed. S. Gasparri, texts by P. Cammarosano, Udine 1990; N. Christie, *The Lombards. The Ancient Longobards*, Oxford 1995.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

LORD'S PRAYER (Our Father). Mt 6:9-13 and Lk 11:2-4 contain the text of the Lord's Prayer in two

slightly different forms: *Matthew's is longer and entered liturgical use (e.g., *Did.* 8,2); *Luke's is shorter but is inserted in a context that presents the occasion in which Jesus taught it (Lk 11:1-2). For centuries, people have asked for reasons accounting for the variants in Luke and Matthew. *Origen poses the question by asking himself if these are the same prayer, first uttered in the longer text, then repeated to one of the disciples, or if the two versions correspond to two different prayers with common parts (*De or.* 18,2-3); *Augustine believes that Lk 11:2-4 is an abbreviated form of Mt 6:9-13 (*Enchir*. 30,116).

The Lord's Prayer immediately became a liturgical *prayer and was recited three times a day (*Did.* 8). Toward the middle of the 4th c., several sources attest to the recitation of the Lord's Prayer during the celebration of the *Eucharist (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 23,11; Ambr., *De sacr*. 5,4,24; 6,5,24; Jerome, *Adv. Pel.* 3,15; Aug., *Serm*. 58,10,12). Moreover, Christian authors immediately made the connection between the Lord's Prayer and *baptism: *Tertullian writes a treatise *On Prayer* for *catechumens in which he devotes a large amount of space to the Lord's Prayer; *Cyprian writes about this in the *De dominica oratione*, a treatise that comments on the Lord's Prayer, making explicit references to the condition of the baptized (*De domin. or.* 9; 10; 18); Augustine attests to the use of the *traditio* and the *redditio orationis dominicae* that followed the *traditio* and *redditio symboli* during the imminent preparation for baptism (*Serm*. 56,1,1; 57,1,1; 58,1,1; 59,1,1).

Patristic *commentaries on the Lord's Prayer take Matthew's text as their point of departure, probably because of its connection with liturgical use. We find systematic commentaries on the Lord's Prayer in texts of various literary *genres (Tertull., *De orat*.; Cypr., *De dom. or.*; Orig., *De orat*.; John Cass., *Conl.* 9,18-25), *catecheses directed to catechumens or *neophytes (Theod. Mops., *Hom. catech.* XI: ST 145, 281-321; Chrom., *Serm*. 40; Aug., *Serm.* 56-59; Peter Chrys., *Serm*. 67-72; Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 147), catechetical homilies that explain the eucharistic liturgy (Cyr. Jer., *Catech*. 23,11-18; Ambr., *De sacr*. 5,18-30; 5,24), *homilies or treatises primarily devoted to explaining the Lord's Prayer (Greg. Nyss., *Or. dom*. 2-5; ps.-Quodv., *Sermo de dom.or.*: PLS 3, 299-303; ps.-John Chrys., *Om. de or. dom.*: ed. Bouhot: *Augustinianum* 20 [1980] 69-78; ps.-John Chrys. lat., *Sermo* 28: PLS 4, 817-821; Max. Conf., *Or. dom*.; Ven. Fortunatus, *Expos. orat*; Peter of Laod., *Or. dom*.), commentaries or homilies on all or part of Matthew (John Chrys., *Hom. 19 in Mat*. 4-7; *Hom. In Mt*. 19,3-5; Jerome, *In Matth*. I,6,9-13; Chrom., *In Matth*. 28, *olim* 14; Aug., *De Serm. Dom*. II,4,15-11,39; *Opus imp. in Mt. Hom*. 14; ps.-Aug., *Serm*. 64 and 65: PL 39, 1866-1871), or on Luke (Cyr. Alex., *Comm in Lc. 11,2-4, hom*. 71-77), texts with different literary features (Augustine, *Ep*. 130,11,21-23; *Enchir*. 30; *Persev*. II,4-VII,15; Sedulius, *Carm. pasch*. II,231-300; *Op. pasch*. II,17).

From the initial invocation ("Our Father") to the individual petitions, each commentary reveals the individual commentator's interests, their mutual influence and the situation of the community in which they lived. Thus, e.g., one can sense Tertullian's ardent desire as he awaits the *parousia (*De orat.* 5), Cyprian's insistence on unity among *brothers, which he considered greater than *martyrdom (*De dom. or.* 24), Augustine's deep reflection on theological issues such as *sin and *temptation in his long commentary on the fifth and sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer (*Serm*. 56,7,11–14,19; 57,8,8–12,12; 58,5,6–9,11; *Persev*. V,8-VII,15). These writers place great importance on certain elements: the adoption as sons of *God (commenting on the initial invocation), the need for the sanctification of Christians which gives *glory to God's *name (1st petition), the connection with the *parable of the debtors (Mt 18:23ff.; 5th petition), the difference between diabolic temptation and the temptation/testing of the faithful believer (6th petition). Most commentators place the "kingdom" of the second petition into the future (Tertull., Cypr., Theod. Mops., Chrom., Aug., *Opus imp. in Mt*., Sedul., Cyr. Alex., Caes. Arles); others, however, sense the tension between the kingdom as already actualized and the kingdom as not yet fully completed (Orig., Greg. Nyss., Ambr., Peter Chrys.), or they simply place the interpretations side by side (John Chrys., Jerome, Cassian, Venantius Fortunatus). Regarding the petition for "bread" (4th petition), certain writers understand it in an entirely material sense (Greg. Nyss., John Chrys., Theod. Mops., *Opus imp. in Mt*., ps.-Aug.); others identify it with Christ in the Eucharist (Cyr. Jer., Ambr., John Cass., Peter Chrys., Ven. Fort.); Augustine interprets it as Christ the truth and the Word of God (cf. Caes. Arles): this latter *exegesis was already present in Origen. Numerous *Fathers, furthermore, accept both the material and spiritual meaning of the bread (Tertull., Cypr., Sedul., ps.-Quodv., Peter of Laod.), favoring the first (Cyr. Alex.) or the second (Jerome, Chrom., Max. Conf.).

F.H. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, Texts and Studies 3, Cambridge 1891; J.P. Bock, *Die Brotbitte des Vaterunsers. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis dieses Universalgebetes und einschlägiger patristisch-liturgischer Fragen*, Paderborn 1911; G. Walter, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Vaterunser-Exegese*, TU 40/3, Leipzig 1914; DBS 6,788-800; C. Vona,

"La quarta petitio dell'oratio dominica nell'interpretazione di antichi scrittori cristiani," in: *Convivium Dominicum*, Catania 1959, 217-255; A. Hamman, *Le Pater expliqué par les Pères*, Paris 1962; *Le notre Père*: La MaisonD 85 (1966) 7-100; J. Carmignac, *Recherches sur le "notre Père,"* Paris 1969; W. Rordorf, "Le "pain quotidien" (Matth. 6,11) dans l'exégèse de Grégoire de Nysse," *Augustinianum* 17 (1977) 193-199; V. Grossi, *Tertulliano-Cipriano-gostino. Il Padre nostro*, Rome 1980; DSp 12, 388-413; K.B. Schnurr, *Hören und Handeln. Lateinische Auslegungen des Vaterunsers in der Alten Kirche bis zum 5. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg B. 1985; S. Sabugal, *El padrenuestro en la interpretación catequética antigua y moderna*, Salamanca [6]2006 (It. tr.: *Il Padrenostro nella catechesi antica e moderna*, Palermo [3]1985); M.-B. von Stritzky, *Studien zur Überlieferung und Interpretation des Vaterunsers in der frühchristlichen Literatur*, Münster 1989; A.G. Hamman, *Le Notre Père dans l'Église ancienne: choix de textes des Pères de l'Église*, Paris 1995; TRE 34, 504-529 (bibl.); M. Philonenko, *Le Notre Père: de la prière de Jésus à la prière des disciples*, Paris 2001.

A. Pollastri

LOT (iconography). Lot, the biblical figure and nephew of Abraham, whom he accompanies to the land of Canaan (Gen 12:14ff.), a symbol of the just person who, living righteously among a sinful people, merited escape from the extermination of Sodom (Wis 10:6; 2 Pet 2:6-8). His first iconographic appearance is in the tombs of Via Dino Compagni in Rome (Ferrua, *Vita Latina*, plate XXX) in the act of fleeing from a flaming Sodom (Gen 19:24-26). On Lot's right is his wife, by now a pillar of salt. The catacomb is dated between 320 and 360. The mosaic panels which adorn the left wall of the central nave of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome represent the only depiction of the separation of Abraham from Lot. These mosaics date from the time of *Sixtus III (1st half of the 5th c.). A single example appears on the homonymous sarcophagus from St. Sebastian (Rep. 188), where Lot appears in tunic and pallium, with a beard, leading his daughters by the hand. Behind him is his wife, already hardened. There follows, to the right, a scene that has been variously interpreted as the entrance of the angels to the house of Lot, or the arrival of Lot at Zoar. The *sarcophagus, which marks the beginning of the so-called beautiful style, can be dated ca. 340. As for illuminated MSS, the scene of Lot may be found in the 6th-c. Vienna *Genesis* (fol. 9, plate 19), where we also find depicted angels who warn Lot of danger, and also in the Tours Pentateuch (fol. 18), of the early 7th c.

DACL IX, 2521-2527; LCI III, 107-112; L. von Hartel - S. Wickhoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, Vienna 1895, pl. IV; L. De Bruyne, *Il sarcofago di L. scoperto a S. Sebastiano*: RivAC 27 (1951) 111; J. Porcher, in J. Hubert - J. Porcher -W.F. Volbach, *L'Europa delle invasioni barbariche*, Milan 1968, 128; G. Bovini, *Mosaici paleocristiani delle chiese di Roma (secoli III-IV)*, Bologna 1971, 153; U. Könen, *Die brennenden Stadt: Sodom in spätantiken Darstellungen*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès Intern. d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, II, Vatican City 1989, 1356-1367; TIP 204-205; M. Dulaey, *Lot et sa femme*, in Id., *Le berger divin, in "Des forêts de symboles." L'initiation chrétienne et la Bible (I^er-VI^e siècle)*, Paris 2001, 229-241.

A.M. Di Nino

LOVE. The Greek terms that can cover different semantic areas of the concept of "love" are ἀγάπη (affection-love), στοργή (parental love), φιλία (friendship-love) and ἔρως (passionate love); in Latin they are basically *caritas* and *amor* (less closely, also *benevolentia* and *pietas*). In Hesiod's *Theogony* 120-122 and in the ancient Orphic cosmogonies, Eros, as a cosmic deity, is one of the first beings that appeared, either from Chaos and Gaia, or from Night and Tartarus. In Orphic Hymn 58, still in the 2nd c. AD, Eros is invoked as "the possessor of the keys of all things." Empedocles made of Love (Φιλότης) the cosmic force opposite to Enmity (Νεῖκος). Love becomes a *pathos* in the Sophists, e.g., in Gorgias's *Encomium Helenae,* where it is depicted as so powerful as to free its victims from any responsibility. *Plato developed an important and strongly influential theory of love (esp. ἔρως) in his *Symposium* and, partially, also in his *Phaedrus*. His "ladder of Eros" describes the progressive ascent of love: from love for a beautiful body to love for the beauty of all bodies, then love for the beauty of all souls, laws, sciences, up to the only science that has absolute beauty as its object, where the soul finds its good and happiness (*Symp.* 210A-E; *Resp.* 7,521DE). While vulgar Aphrodite is the love that does not see anything beyond the senses, celestial Aphrodite is the love that transcends sense-perceptible beauty and points to the noetic and eternal (*Symp.* 180D; *Phaedr.* 237E). In Diotima's myth of Eros in Plato's *Symposium,* love's mediating function between time and eternity, human and divine, contingent and absolute, sense-perceptible and intelligible is patent. Eros loves beauty and wisdom, but precisely because it is itself deprived of these. Plato stressed the human side of love, which, even if it is intellectual and spiritual and oriented toward the noblest and purest objects, is always a mark of lacking something; he is not interested in divine love; i.e., God's love for the beings that are inferior to the divine level. Plato's *Symposium* closely inspired both *Methodius's *De virginitate* and *Gregory of Nyssa's *De anima et resurrectione,* which is primarily an imitation of Plato's *Phaedo*. Indeed, Daniel Boyarin in the collection of essays *Toward a Theology of Eros* edited by Burrus and Keller criticizes Nygren's interpretation of the

Symposium, arguing that Nygren was incorrect to conflate the concept of the "heavenly eros" described in Pausanias's speech with the more asceticized Eros theorized by Diotima, which must also be regarded as Plato's own view on Eros. This distinction has escaped other scholars as well, but is particularly relevant to the present discourse, as, acc. to Boyarin, Platonic love as defined by Diotima is in fact close to Christian love in the conception of ascetics in Late Antiquity. I find this reading convincing: it suggests there is no opposition but rather continuity between Plato's *Symposium* and Methodius's *De virginitate*.

*Aristotle did not ascribe love to God, who in his view has no interest in humans, but considered God to be the object of love as a final cause. Moreover, in interpersonal relationships, Aristotle put love as a necessary component in friendship (φιλία), the highest form of which is oriented not to usefulness or to pleasure but to the good of the beloved person. Both the early *Stoics and the Epicureans regarded friendship between wise men as the most important interpersonal relationship. But Middle and Late Stoicism, at least from Antipater of Tarsus onward, valued married love as a common path to virtue, characterized by concord (ὁμόνοια) and love (φιλία). There was a whole literary genre Περὶ γάμου, numbering among its representatives, e.g., Antipater, Hierocles, Seneca, Musonius and Plutarch as the author of Γαμικὰ παραγγέλματα. There were also many works *On Passionate Love,* Περὶ Ἔρωτος, e.g., by Cleanthes and Chrysippus; Plutarch wrote a Περὶ Ἔρωτος as well, now fragmentary, and an Ἐρωτικός, in which he dealt with the transformation of Eros into *philia* in marriage. The notion of *philia* was closely related to that of *oikeiōsis,* particularly developed by the Stoics, and esp. to the so-called social **oikeiōsis* (in turn connected with the theory of "duties," or better, "appropriate acts" [*kathēkonta*]), the theory of which Hierocles the Stoic offers one of the most remarkable examples. There exists a debate among scholars about the notion of *philia* in the Greco-Roman world: Konstan has argued that *philia* was not only a social and formal bond, even of political nature, but also, and above all, a deep spiritual bond, reciprocal, and based on love for the other's virtue.

In the OT, the term ἔρως occurs only twice, in Pr 7:18 and 30:16, and the love terminology rather revolves around the terms ἀγάπη/ἀγαπᾶν. But God's love is directed to Israel as in a spousal relationship, always challenged by Israel's lack of fidelity (Amos). Israel, immediately after the *Shema*, receives the commandment to "love [ἀγαπήσεις] the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength" (Deut 6:5), in that it receives God's love: τὸ ἀγαπᾶν Κύριον ὑμᾶς (Deut 7:8). According to the most widespread interpretation, both Jewish and Christian, God's love for Israel (or the church) or for each human soul finds its highest expression, in the OT, in the Song of Songs. But God's love extends to all creatures: ἀγαπᾷς τὰ ὄντα πάντα, because God created them and keeps them in existence through his Spirit (Wis 11:23-26). In the Psalms, the psalmist, in turn, constantly proclaims his love for God and exhorts all to love God: ἀγαπήσατε τὸν Κύριον (Ps 30:24).

In the NT, the "commandment of love" is central: loving God and one's neighbor is said to subsume the whole Law and all the Prophets, i.e., all of the OT. The Synoptic gospels report Jesus' quotation of the *Shema* from Deut 6:4-5 in combination with the commandment to love the neighbor as oneself in Mt 22:37-40: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and all your soul and all your mind: this is the main and first commandment. And the second is similar to this: You shall love your neighbor as yourself. It is on these two commandments that the whole Law and the Prophets depend." Likewise in Mk 12:29-33: "The first commandment is: 'Hear, O Israel: the Lord is our God, the Lord is one, and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind and with all your strength.' And the second is the following: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no commandment greater than these. . . . [They are] more important than all burnt offerings and sacrifices." This combination makes of love the central focus of every relationship to God and other human beings. In Lk, the story of the good Samaritan (10:29-37) is told immediately after the citation of the double-love commandment (Lk 10:27-28). In the same gospel, Jesus extends the love commandment even to one's enemies: "Love [ἀγαπᾶτε] your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. . . . Your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High, who is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked. Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful" (Lk 6:27-28, 35-36). The commandment of loving even one's enemies is given also in Mt 5:43-45, with a reference to Lev 19:18: "You have heard that it was said: You shall love [ἀγαπήσεις] your neighbor and hate your enemy, but I say to you: Love [ἀγαπᾶτε] your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be children of your Father who is in heaven, who has his sun shine forth over the wicked and the good, and he pours his rain over the just and the unrighteous." It is clear that the commandment

of love for all humans is based on the presence of Christ in each human being (Mt 25:40-45).

In Jn, if possible, love is even more central. God's love is presented as the motive of the whole salvific economy in Jn 3:16: "God so loved [ἠγάπησεν] the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life." In Jn 13:1 God's love is transposed to Christ's love: "Jesus, . . . having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end." In Jn 14:31 Jesus' words "I love the Father," ἀγαπῶ τὸν πατέρα, are a true *hapax* in the whole of Scripture. Of course, in John too the love commandment is expressed, and this with emphasis, in 13:34: "A new commandment I give you, that you love one another [ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους] even as I have loved you [ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς]," although this was already said in Lev 19:18. The same commandment is repeated, with an explanation, in Jn 15:12-17: "This is my commandment, that you love [ἀγαπᾶτε] one another just as I have loved [ἠγάπησα] you. No one has greater love [ἀγάπην] than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends." In Jn 15:9-10 Jesus exhorts his disciples: "Abide in my love [ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ]. If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love [αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ]." Jn 16:27 is the sole exception in the verbal usage, for it employs φιλέω: "The Father himself loves [φιλεῖ] you, because you have loved [πεφιλήκατε] me." In all of Jn the evangelist is called "the disciple whom Jesus loved [ἠγάπα]," and in Jn 21 Jesus, before handing his sheep to Peter, tests only one thing: his love, and this three times, with three questions that balance Peter's threefold denial: "Simon son of John, do you love me?" Peter's love for Jesus will have as a direct consequence that he will die for him as a martyr, as is foretold in the same chapter.

The same focus on love returns in the first letter of John, where love is the only definition of God: "God is love [ἀγάπη], and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them" (1 Jn 4:16). God is love first of all because love unites the Father, the Son and the Spirit. Our love imitates God's love. Those who say, "I love God," and hate their siblings are liars; for those who do not love a brother or sister whom they have seen, cannot love God, whom they have not seen. Those who love God must also love their brothers and sisters (1 Jn 4:16, 19-21). Both the gospel and the first letter of John particularly insist on the idea of abiding in love, both reciprocal love and God's and Christ's love. The absolute centrality of love in John comes as no surprise on the part of the author, to whom the very definition of God as ἀγάπη is due. Nevertheless, in the Johannine literature the commandment of loving one's enemies appears less stressed.

For Paul, ἀγάπη is the central dimension of Christian existence (see Gal 5:6). It is the greatest of all virtues; a famous hymn is even devoted to it in 1 Cor 13:1-13, acc. to which, if one has everything else, including faith itself, but lacks ἀγάπη, one lacks all. "Love is patient; love is kind; love is not envious or boastful or arrogant or rude. It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice in wrongdoing, but rejoices in the truth. It bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Love never falls [ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε (ἐκ) πίπτει]" (1 Cor 13:4-8). Love never ends, and in the telos only ἀγάπη will remain. Paul is adamant that absolutely nothing will separate us from God's love: "I am convinced that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love [ἀγάπης] of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom 8:38-39). Love is eternal like God. And what counts for Christians and their salvation must be πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, "faith that is active through love."

There can be no doubt that both the LXX and the NT always use ἀγάπη and ἀγαπάω to express both God's (and Christ's) love for us and our love for God and for each other. There is no use of στοργή nor ἔρως (apart from the exception I have already indicated for the OT). But στοργή is implicit in God's parental love, which is present in both the OT and the NT, and in Jesus' love, which is parental as well: he compares himself to a hen or another bird with chicks all gathered under her wings (Mt 23:37: ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας; see Lk 13:34) and, esp. in John, calls his disciples "small children," τεκνία, παιδία. Likewise, Paul depicts himself as a father and even a mother of those whom he has converted: he calls himself πατήρ, saying that his disciples may have many teachers but not many fathers, since he is their only father who begot them into the faith. But he also has maternal instincts or σπλάγχνα, generates his spiritual babies, his τεκνία, in a painful childbirth (Gal 4:19), and gives milk to his little children (1 Cor 3:2). In addition to this deep parental love (στοργή), also passionate love or ἔρως is present in the Bible, and is strongly implied in the mystical reading of the Song of Songs and in God's spousal relation to Israel in the prophets, too. So, ἀγάπη is lexically preponderant, but all forms of love are present in God acc. to the Bible. The Fathers will remember this. Moreover, Platonic fathers will have to face a fundamental difference between Plato's conception of love and Christian love:

Platonic Eros is an acquisitive force, whereas Christian love is gift and has its first example in God, who is Love itself, always overflowing, to the point that it offers the Son for the salvation of humanity. God was the first to love us, in a completely gratuitous way, which also explains the creation.

In early Christian literature, the love for God and for one's neighbors is identified with the way of life in opposition to the way of death (e.g., *Epistle of Barnabas* 19). *Clement of Rome and *Ignatius developed the meaning of ἀγάπη also with the help of biblical *exegesis, the former in *Ep. ad Cor.* 49-55, the latter in *Ep. ad Eph.* 3; *Ep ad Rom.* 7. According to Polycarp, following Christ means "to love what he loved" (*Ep. ad Phil.* 2,2). Ignatius, remarkably, uses not only ἀγάπη but also ἔρως, in reference to his ardent love for Christ, which is leading him straight to martyrdom: in his *Epistula ad Romanos* 7 he writes, in reference to Jesus: "My Love [ἔρως] has been crucified."

*Origen of Alexandria seems to have been the first to fully develop the theme of mystical ἔρως and the mystical marriage between Christ and the soul, in his commentary on the Song of Songs—a work in which, acc. to *Jerome, Origen, who had already outclassed all other exegetes, outclassed himself—and in many other places, also taking up Plato's conception of love, as is reflected in his very choice of the ἔρως/ἐρᾶν terminology along with the ἀγάπη vocabulary. It is from Origen that *Gregory of Nyssa would derive his own use of ἔρως in reference to the intensity of the love between the soul and God. The theme of the mystical marriage between the soul and Christ is developed by Origen in many passages, among which are some that comment on the parable of the ten virgins, such as *Comm. in Matth.* 17,33 and *Comm. in Matth. ser.* 63 and 64: Origen speaks of the "Logos-bridegroom," a theme that will be taken up also by Methodius. The ἔρως theme in Origen is not simply a yielding to Plato, but it must be read, and completely transfigured, in a mystical light. The principal goal of a saint's love is "the knowledge of Christ's love" (*In Eph.* 15). The unity in love that will obtain again in the end was lost at the beginning: this is explained by Origen in various passages, one of the most representative of which is *Princ.* 2,8,2-3, where he reports the traditional etymology (attested in Aristotle, *Chrysippus and *Philo) of ψυχή from ψῦχος, ψῦξις, "cold; getting cold." For, the νόες, getting cold in their love for God, became souls and turned to sin. This "getting cold" is a lack of love for God. And lacking love, for Origen, is the most serious sin; it marks an estrangement from God. It is provoked by the pride of believing that we are worthy of the Good, which instead comes only from God, who thus deserves all our love. The estrangement from love brought about a different habit as well: that of doing good not for love, but out of fear, acc. to a distinction that has Pauline roots and is typical of Origen. Those who are motivated by fear instead of love in their actions are spiritually immature persons. With an antithesis inherited from Philo and Paul, in *Hom. in Gen.* 7,4 Origen draws a distinction between those who adhere to God willingly and out of love, as children of the free woman (Sarah), and those who do so out of fear and for threats, as children of the slave (Hagar). These are also those who believe that God punishes sinners out of anger.

Thus, acc. to Origen, the beginning was marked by an estrangement from love, and its partial replacement with fear; the end will be the voluntary recovery of perfect love. What is more, acc. to Origen, it will be love that, in the end, will prevent all rational creatures from a new fall (*caritas omnes creaturas continebit a lapsu*), although this does not at all mean that rational creatures will lose their free will. Indeed, in *Comm. in Rom.* 5,10,158-240 Origen begins with a refutation of those who thought that Christ's sacrifice would have to be repeated over and over again—an accusation that was curiously leveled against him during the "Origenistic controversy," whereas it is clear that Origen himself disavowed it. The point of Origen's opponents is based on the possibility of ever new falls on the part of rational creatures. Origen is adamant that this is not at all what he personally teaches and in fact cannot be the case (*easdem etiam in futuris saeculis dispensationes a Christo repetenda esse arbitrantur. Sed ad haec nos breviter prout possumus respondebimus*). Origen's reply is grounded in two main tenets: (1) it is impossible that Christ's sacrifice should be reiterated, because, even though it occurred once and for all, its effectiveness was such as to reach absolutely all rational creatures and all times (αἰῶνες); therefore, there will be no need to repeat it (5,10,235-236 and 187-195). Hence, it is also clear that for Origen the salvation of all rational creatures entirely depends, not on a metaphysical necessity, but on Christ's cross. (2) It is not the case that the fall of all rational creatures, humans and angels, will take place over and over again, indefinitely, because there will come an end to all αἰῶνες, which will be the *apokatastasis*, and in that condition no fall will occur any longer, since perfect love (ἀγάπη) will prevent this, although all rational creatures will retain their free will: *Quod autem sit quod in futuris saeculis teneat arbitrii libertatem ne rursum corruat in peccatum brevi nos sermone apostolus docet dicens:*

"Caritas numquam cadit." Idcirco enim et fide et spe maior caritas dicitur, quia sola erit per quam delinqui ultra non poterit. Si enim in id anima perfectionis ascenderit ut ex toto corde suo et ex tota mente sua et ex totis uiribus suis diligat Deum et proximum suum tamquam se ipsam, ubi erat peccati locum? . . . caritas omnem creaturam continebt a lapsu, tunc cum erit Deus omnia in omnibus. . . . Tanta caritatis vis est ut ad se omnia trahat . . . , maxime cum caritatis causas prior nobis dederit Deus qui unico filio suo non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit (5,10,195-226).

Origen quotes 1 Cor 13:8: ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε (ἐκ) πιπτει. Love will prevent new falls because perfect love excludes all possible sin. To the objection that ἀγάπη could not impede Satan's fall, or Adam's, Origen replies that this took place not in the *apokatastasis*, but before the manifestation of Christ's ἀγάπη: *vel ille qui Lucifer fuit et in caelo oriebatur vel ille qui immaculatus erat a nativitate sua et cum cherubin positus labi potuit antequam erga beneficia Filii Dei caritatis vinculis stringeretur* (5,10,227-230). At the beginning, love was not yet perfect: it will be really perfect only in the telos, and thanks to Christ's work. This is also one of the reasons why Origen thought that the end would be not only similar to, but even better than, the beginning. In this passage Origen also argues against one of the typical assumptions of the supporters of eternal damnation; namely, that one rational creature's free will may endure forever in the rejection of the Good. Origen in his reply has recourse to love, again. Indeed, he responds with Paul's revelation that absolutely nothing will be able to separate us from God's love, not even death, thus, a fortiori, not even our free will: *Ad hunc namque perfectionis gradum ascenderat apostolus Paulus et in hoc stans confidens dicebat: "Quis enim nos separabit a caritate* [=ἀγάπη] *Dei quae est in Christo Iesu? . . . neque vita neque mors neque praesentia neque futura neque angeli neque virtutes neque altitudo neque profundum neque creatura alia poterit nos separare a caritate Dei quae est in Christo Iesu domino nostro.' Ex quibus omnibus evidenter ostenditur quod, si haec omnia quae enumeravit apostolus separare nos non possunt a caritate Dei . . . , multo magis libertas arbitrii nos ab eius caritate separare non poterit* (5,10,212-222). If not even death, not even angels and demons will be able to separate us from God's love, neither will human free will be able to do so, because God's love overcomes all. For, "even if this faculty is part of the natural order, love's power is so great as to draw everything to itself [*tanta caritatis vis est ut ad se omnia trahat*], to lead all together to itself, and to overcome all powers. . . . Therefore, rightly, love that alone is greater than all the rest will prevent every creature from a new fall. Then God will be "all in all" [*ideo merito caritas, quae sola omnium maior est, omnem creaturam continebit a lapsu. Tunc erit Deus omnia in omnibus*]. The souls will then be enflamed by God's love, being in God, just as the soul of Christ is, of which Origen speaks in *Princ.* 2,6,6: "That soul which, like iron on fire, always dwells in the Logos, always in Wisdom, always in God, all that it does, feels and comprehends is God. Therefore, we cannot say that it is liable to alteration and change, because it is incessantly inflamed by the union with the divine Logos and has acquired the possession of immutability." All souls will achieve this condition in the *apokatastasis*, and will be inflamed by divine love.

Origen's model was followed by Gregory of Nyssa, not only in his commenting on the Song of Songs as an *allegory of the mystical love that unites Christ to the church and Christ to each soul, but also in his use of the ἔρως terminology in reference to divine love. He too finds that a particularly intense (ἐπιτεταμένη) ἀγάπη can be named ἔρως, as he actually does in his homily 13 on the Song of Songs, where he calls Christ the "fiery arrow of ἔρως" and "archer of ἔρως." *Gregory of Nazianzus, too, would follow Origen's vocabulary and conception of love: he described the deep affective relationship between him and *Basil in terms of φιλία, but also, repeatedly, ἔρως and πόθος, passionate love and intense desire. In chapters 19-20 of *Or.* 43 the deep intensity of their affection, oriented toward God, constitutes the norm of their love (ἔρωτος νόμος). This is why Gregory can say that he and Basil had as their guide "God and desire" (θεῷ καὶ πόθῳ). Even after Basil's death, Gregory confesses that while speaking he fears to be overwhelmed by his πόθος.

In his *Homilies on the Song of Songs* Gregory of Nyssa naturally focuses on the theme of spiritual love. In his fourth homily he mentions the definition in 1 Jn 4:8, that God is love (ἀγάπη), which he mentions again in his seventh homily, where God is said to be both "Mother" and ἀγάπη, and in the last sentence of Homily 12: "But God is ἀγάπη, as John says." At the beginning of Homily 13, Gregory declares love to be the main factor of both Christ's sacrifice and our salvation: "It is out of love for us sinners that Christ died. . . . For God is love, as it was said: the love that enters one's heart through the arrow of faith. . . . This dart is faith, which is active through love." God is love, and the soul that submits to God's love is saved, because, as Origen already maintained, voluntary submission to God coincides with salvation: the soul "wishes to enter the house . . . then, once it has done so, it leaps again

to what is greater. For it wants to be subjected to Love [ἀγάπη]. But Love [ἀγάπη] is God, as John stated: if the soul submits to God, this is its salvation" (Homily 4). For, as Gregory explains soon after, the soul's continual ascent in love for God fulfills God's will, which, acc. to 1 Tim 2:4, consists in the salvation of all human beings.

Gregory thinks that this will shall certainly be realized, and its fulfillment will take place through love: "The discourse is an exhortation, in the form of an oath, to let love always grow and increase, until the will is filled with the One who wants all human beings to be saved and to reach the knowledge of truth. . . . Love must be always awake and alert, until the bridegroom's will is fulfilled: and this will of his is that all human beings be saved and reach the knowledge of truth." This passage, moreover, clearly indicates that the doctrine of *apokatastasis* is alive and well even in Gregory's last works. Notably, in Homily 7 the same universally salvific will is ascribed also to the church, who "imitates the Lord in wanting all human beings to be saved and to reach the knowledge of the truth." The same idea returns toward the end of Homily 10, where God's will is identified with the salvation of all humans, realized by Christ also thanks to the adherence of our free will. (This conception is the same as Origen's: the Good must be chosen freely, but all in the end, after the due purification, will choose it freely.) Christ says, "'My food is that I do my Father's will.' Now, what is God's will is evident: 'God wants all human beings to be saved and to reach the knowledge of truth.' Thus, food for Christ consists in our salvation. Our own fruit is our free will." Gregory, like Origen, strongly insists on the fact that our own adherence must be free, e.g., in Homily 12: "Resurrection would not have been effective if it had not been preceded by voluntary mortification. . . . The mortification of bodily passions, which had its origin in the innermost heart, *for a free decision*."

Outside his *Homilies on the Song of Songs,* Gregory of Nyssa mostly uses the term ἀγάπη in reference to divine love, both the love of God and Christ for humans and vice versa. Especially in his *De anima et resurrectione,* he must face a question: if all passions (πάθη) are to vanish in the end, and the ideal of impassibility (ἀπάθεια) will be attained by all, how is it possible that love remains in the end? The solution is simple: ἀγάπη will remain even in the *telos* because ἀγάπη is no passion, no πάθος. As Macrina explains, desire and anger, which correspond to Plato's major subdivisions of the human soul, are per se neutral movements of the soul: if they are governed by reason, they will not serve vice, and will produce, not passions (πάθη) but good emotions (εὐπάθειαι). Love cannot be eliminated as a πάθος; otherwise, we could not tend to God; even anger can be used positively, as an arm against evil (60A–68A), but while this and other movements of the soul will be extinguished in the end, because they will be useless, love will remain: our love for God, and God's love for us (96A). That ἀπάθεια does not exclude love, which will remain after our perfecting, is repeated by Gregory also in his Homily 1 on the Song of Songs: the soul "must gaze at the inaccessible beauty of divine nature, and love it as much as is proper to the sympathy of the body toward what is consanguineous to it, but transforming its passion into ἀπάθεια. Thus, once every corporeal attitude has been extinguished, our minds burn out of love only for the Spirit, fomented by that fire which the Lord came to bring upon earth."

In *De anima*, 92A–96A, Macrina affirms that, after the purification of the soul through the imitation of God, hope, memory and desire will vanish (ἐλπίς, μνήμη, ἐπιθυμία), which were necessary in this life but will be unnecessary in the next, just as they are unnecessary to God, who desires nothing, needs nothing and is beyond all goods: only love (ἀγάπη) will remain, or a "loving disposition" (ἀγαπητικὴ διάθεσις, 93C), which is the only force that relates the soul to God: a "loving movement and activity" (ἀγαπητικὴ κίνησις τε καὶ ἐνεργεια) from which any desire (ἐπιθυμία) is excluded (93C–96A). Similarly, Gregory in *De mortuis* (GNO 9,62) states that in the next world, after the destruction of our body oppressed by passions, our desire or ὁρμή will be directed to its true object: "For love, there, will be incessantly directed to the true Beauty" (ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὁ ἔρως τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ κάλλους ὁ ἄπαυστος). In the same work Gregory indeed explains that it is impossible that human free will remain in evil forever, because the desire for what is evil cannot endure forever, insofar as satiety [κόρος] and tedium appear. Only the desire for the Good can last forever, because it produces satisfaction without creating κόρος: "Our appetite [ὄρεξις], purified from all these things, will orient itself toward one single object of will, desire and love. It will not entirely abolish our natural impulses to these things, but it will reorient them toward participation in immaterial goods. For there will be an incessant love for true Beauty, a laudable desire for the treasures of Wisdom, the beautiful and noble love for glory that is achieved in the communion of God's kingdom, a sublime passion that will never find satiety and will never be deluded, in its good desire, by the satiety [κόρος] of these objects."

In Homily 13 on the Song of Songs, indeed, Gregory defines ἔρως as "an intense ἀγάπη" (GNO VI 383, 9: ἐπιτεταμένη ἀγάπη ὁ ἔρως λέγεται). And in Homily 1 on the Song of Songs he invokes Scripture in support of his own use of ἔρως for the soul's love for God: "Wisdom clearly speaks in the Proverbs, when it describes love [ἔρωτα] for divine Beauty: this love is irreproachable: it is a passion without passion for incorporeal realities [ἀπαθὲς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων τὸ πάθος]" (GNO 6,23,12). To stress that divine ἔρως is not to be confused with earthly and corporeal ἔρως, Gregory even speaks of an opposition between these two forms of ἔρως: "Love for God arises from realities that are opposed to those for which corporeal desire arises," ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων τῇ σωματικῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τὸ θεῖον ἔρωτα γίνεσθαι (GNO 6,192,1).

Our strong love for God, however, will never equate to God's love for us. All of God's actions and decisions in respect to us are motivated exclusively by this love. This is why Gregory can say: "It is not the case that God's judgment, as its main purpose, brings suffering to sinners, but, for its part, . . . it brings about only what is good, by separating this from evil and by attracting the sinner to itself, in view of his or her participation in beatitude. It is rather the violent separation of what was mixed that turns out to be painful" (*De anima* 100C). The more the soul is immersed in sin, the more difficult and painful will be the process of liberation, but this process, far from being considered by Gregory as an eternal perdition, is an action performed by God out of love for the soul. Macrina explains: "It seems to me that the soul must suffer whenever God's power, out of love for human beings, extracts what belongs to it from the ruins of irrationality and materiality. For, to my mind, it is not out of hatred, or for punishment against a sinful life, that sinners experience pains at the hands of the One who claims and attracts to itself all the beings that came into existence thanks to it and for it. The Godhead, indeed, as its main and best purpose, attracts the soul to itself, who is the source of all beatitude; though, as a collateral phenomenon, the above-mentioned state of suffering arises for those who are pulled in such a way." God's primary will is not punishment, but the attraction of the soul to the Good, originating from God's love. Now, if all of God's actions are motivated by love, it is because God is ἀγάπη itself: John's definition is repeated by Gregory in his Homily 7 on the Song of Songs: "God is neither male nor female: for how could it be possible to conceive of anything of this kind concerning the nature of God, when not even for us, who are human beings, this characteristic does not endure forever, but, when all of us are one and the same thing in Christ, we shall take off the marks of this physical difference, together with the whole old ἄνθρωπος? . . . If we call God 'Mother' or 'Love,' we are not mistaken; for God is love [ἀγάπη], as John has stated."

Gregory manifestly takes up Origen's demonstration that in the *apokatastasis* love will prevent further falls because "Love never falls [ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει]." In *In illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius*, 13-14 (Downing), Gregory declares that "nobody will fall out of the kingdom of God" (μηδενὸς ἀποπίπτοντος). Gregory also recovers Origen's opposition between love and fear—which Origen in turn drew from Paul—the final vanishing of fear and triumph of love, and the emphasis on unity in love. In Homily 15 on the Song of Songs, Gregory insists, like Origen and on the basis of Paul, that "God will receive each one in his or her order, attributing [rewards or purifications] to each one acc. to his or her deserts." Then Gregory quotes Paul's words in Rom 8:35 and 38-39, also cited by Origen: "Nothing will ever be able to separate us from the love of God in Jesus Christ: neither life nor death, neither present nor future, nothing else among all existing things." And, after underscoring the difference, already emphasized by Origen, between doing good for love and doing it for fear, he declares: "But if, as it is written [1 Jn 4:18], love [ἀγάπη] will completely chase out fear, and fear, by transforming itself, will become love, then it is found that what is saved constitutes a unity [μονὰς τὸ σῳζόμενον] thanks to its being connatural with what is the only Good [ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸ μόνον ἀγαθὸν συμφυΐᾳ], and all are reciprocally unified [πάντων ἀλλήλοις ἑνωθέντων] in perfection" (GNO 6,466-467). Perfection is given by the Holy Spirit, who already in Origen has this function. For Jesus "said that all will be one and the same thing, naturally joined to the One who is the only true Good, so that, thanks to the unity in the Holy Spirit, as the apostle says, they will be joined all together in the bond of peace, and all will become one body and one spirit, thanks to the one hope to which they have been called. . . . For all souls of every class have in common the rush to reach this beatitude," because "the natural impulse toward what is blessed and praised is common to all . . . until, when all who look at the same *telos* of their desire have become one and the same thing, no evil [κακία] will remain in anyone. Then God will be all in all," because "all, thanks to reciprocal union, will be united in the communion with God in Jesus Christ."

That the final union of all rational creatures in the *apokatastasis* will be a work of love is made clear by Gregory in *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum* 1.9: "The pas-

sage in which it is said, 'Love the Lord with sweet-sounding cymbals' seems to me to illustrate the union of our nature with the angels. For, when human nature will be restored to its original condition, the union of angelic and human, with their reciprocal encounter, will produce that sweet sound of thanksgiving. . . . For this is the sense of the union of one cymbal with the other: one is the angels' ultramundane nature, and the other is the humans' rational nature. Sin separated them from one another, but when *God's love has united them again,* they will again make that hymn of praise resound." Already Origen indicated that the τέλος will be unity or ἑνότης, and that "the unity is achieved through love and truth [δι' ἀγάπης καὶ ἀληθείας]" (*Fragm. in Jer.* 28).

For it is love that led Christ to incarnation, as Gregory explains: "Out of love for us, who for our foolishness were corrupted in our being, Christ accepted to be created like us, in order to lead again toward the Being [εἰς τὸ ὄν] what had ended up with being outside the Being [τὸ ἔξω τοῦ ὄντος γενόμενος]" (*De vita Moysis*, 2,175). No one will remain "outside the Being" (ἔξω τοῦ ὄντος): this, because the Being coincides with the Good and with God, is tantamount to saying what Gregory asserts in his *In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius*: that no being will remain "outside the number of the saved" (μηδὲν ἔξω τῶν σωζωμένων).

An author who knew Origen's work well, and whose work was well known to Gregory of Nyssa, was Methodius (end of the 3rd—beginning of the 4th c.), whose *Symposium,* a dialogue, is closely inspired by Plato's dialogue of the same title. Like that of Plato, Methodius's work is also devoted to love, and in particular to spiritual love, whose chief expression is the ascetic life in which chastity and virginity are a core aspect. The final hymn to the Christ-Logos is dedicated to the celebration of chastity: here this theme is linked to the recovery of the original beatitude in the *telos*. Indeed, the ideal proposed is, "while staying in the world, not to be in the world, but to have reached, in one's mind and will, the congregation of those who are in heaven." Methodius delineates love as an ascending ladder of perfection, which leads to unity with the mystic bridegroom. This is clearly inspired by Plato's ladder of Eros in his *Symposium,* in a constant ascent to the Good itself (αὐτοαγαθόν), whose visible image is Beauty (καλόν).

This reading of Plato's *Symposium* was certainly suggested to Methodius by Origen. The latter understood this dialogue of Plato's as an exhortation to a spiritual ascent, which is the same that is offered by Methodius. In the prologue to his commentary on the Song of Songs, Origen indeed refers to Plato's *Symposium* when he speaks of learned Greeks in search of the truth on the nature of love, who wrote many things, also in the form of dialogues, showing that "the essence of love is nothing but the faculty for leading the soul from earth to the utmost heights of heaven, and that it is impossible to reach the utmost happiness unless one is motivated by the desire of love" (*non aliud esse amoris vim nisi quae animam de terris ad fastigia caeli celsa perducat, nec ad summam posse beatitudinem perveniri nisi amoris desiderio provocante*). That Origen is speaking of Plato is even clearer from what he adds: *Quaestiones de hoc quasi in conviviis propositae referuntur, inter eos, puto, inter quos non ciborum, sed verborum convivia geruntur.*

It is obvious that there is no opposition between Plato's treatment of love in his *Symposium* and Methodius's treatment of pureness, chastity and virginity, ἁγνεία, and παρθενία in his own *Symposium,* all the more in that the ideal of virginity in Methodius's view is much deeper and broader than the simple preservation of physical integrity, and that Plato's love finds its development in the mystical love for Christ. Chastity, which is even assimilated to martyrdom in Methodius (*Symp.* 7,3), has its example in Christ, who "preserved incorrupt in virginity the flesh that he took upon himself. . . . The Logos, with its incarnation, became the supreme virgin, just as it is the supreme Shepherd and Prophet of the church" (1,5). This virginity must be understood not only in a physical sense but also, and eminently, in a spiritual sense: it reflects the purity of the soul that tends to its union with Christ-Logos, the divine bridegroom. In 1,1 Methodius explains that "it is not enough to preserve one's body unsullied, because we should not show greater care for the temple than for God's image, but we should care for our souls." The consecrated virgin should be holy "both in her body and in her spirit."

Likewise, in 6,3 the necessity of keeping one's senses pure is attached to virginity, and in 6,2 virginity is considered in a spiritual sense as the best way to recover the image of God, which is present in all human beings, in all its pureness, acc. to a conception that will be particularly developed by Gregory of Nyssa, along the lines of Origen. For virginity is "to maintain this beauty intact and inviolate, as it was formed by God, who created it, imitating the eternal and intelligible nature of which the human being is image and likeness [εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις] and will become a glorious and holy image, will pass on from here to heaven, to the city of the blessed, and will become a glorious and holy image, and will dwell

there as in a sanctuary." The eminently spiritual nature of virginity, which preserves the image of God in us, is manifest in 2,6, where the human being is said to be the "rational and living image" of God the Creator, and in 6,1, where the soul, in that it is in the image of God, is said to have a rational beauty. In 4, chastity is said to be the best way to "restore [ἀποκαθίσημι] the human being to heaven, and lead it to incorruptibility and reconciliation with God." It is a "means of salvation that guides our lives," which was given us by God as a "most glorious help."

In the third speech among those presented by the virgins, St. Paul's admonitions are mentioned: Paul himself is presented as "the bride of Christ and mother of the believers," and his preference for virginity over marriage is praised. In the second speech, the reader is reminded that marriage too was instituted by God, although we should always keep our mind oriented toward the transformation of our bodies into the likeness of angels, when human beings "will no more marry, acc. to the infallible words of the Lord." It is esp. in 5,4,5 that Methodius explains in a detailed way what spiritual virginity is: it is the greatest decision of all, one's entire consecration to the Lord, "when not only do I endeavor to maintain my flesh pure from any venereal union, but also to refrain from other kinds of sins: if I close my ears to calumny and open them to God, I have offered my ears to God; I keep my heart pure by offering all my thoughts to God . . . abstaining from haughtiness and anger." In the final dialogue between two virgins, Gregorion and Eubulion, the former observes that it is necessary to preserve pure not only the body but also the heart, which the Holy Spirit inhabits.

The final Hymn to the Christ-Logos himself is a sort of mystical epithalamium, describing the mystical love that characterizes the choice of virginity. In all of it, and in all of the *Symposium,* esp. in Agatha's speech, the echo of the gospel parable of the wise virgins is at work. The epithalamium genre also explains the rich terminology concerning marriage and love that characterizes this hymn: notably, it comprises not only ἀγάπη, but also ἔρως and πόθος. This hymn celebrates Christ's mystical marriage, not only with the church, but also with each soul, acc. to both exegetical lines found in Origen's commentary on the Song of Songs. In Methodius's *Symposium,* the theme of individual love between the soul and Christ is present, not only in the final hymn, but already in the course of the dialogue (in 6,2 and 6,5), where the soul, thanks to this love and its mystical union with Christ, obtains the crown of incorruptibility and immortality, woven with the flowers of wisdom. Christ passionately loves (ἐράω) the beauty of chastity or ἁγνεία (1,39).

The soul's love for the Logos and its beauty is specifically described by Methodius as an "intense desire" (πόθος), in strophe E of the final Hymn: the Logos' beauty is designated as χάρις, which is not only beauty but also the main performer of salvation, for both Paul and Origen. It is not mere chance that in the same passage another fundamental soteriological conception of Origen's appears: the notion, founded on 1 Cor 15:28—one of Origen's favorite passages in support of his theory of universal salvation—that God will be all good things (πάντα) in the perfection of *apokatastasis*. In *Comm. in Io.* 1,9,52, moreover, Origen applied this idea specifically to Christ in the context of a reflection on his ἐπίνοιαι: "We shall understand how Jesus is many good things" (συνήσομεν πῶς πολλὰ ἀγαθά ἐστιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς). Methodius, in turn, presenting the life characterized by love for the Logos as a preparation and prefiguration of the *apokatastasis*, states that Christ is all good things (πάντα) for the soul absorbed by his love. Gregory of Nyssa, too, drew on Origen's equation between Christ and all good things, just as he took from Origen the use of 1 Cor 15:28 in support of the *apokatastasis*: "All hope for good things [πᾶσα ἀγαθῶν ἐλπὶς] lies in Christ, in whom we have learned that there are all the treasures of good things [ἐν ᾧ πάντας εἶναι τοὺς θεσαυροὺς τῶν ἀγαθῶν]" (*De vita Mos.* 2,248).

Gregory of Nyssa was inspired by Methodius's *Symposium,* and of course by Origen, for his *De virginitate,* which, as Gregory himself states, is an encomium (*prol.* 1, GNO 8/1,248). Like Origen and Methodius, Gregory describes virginity and ascetical life, for both men and women, as a mystical marriage with Christ. Like Methodius, moreover, Gregory also stresses that virginity is much more than mere physical purity and indeed encompasses all aspects of ascetical life (18,5, GNO 8/1,320-322).

It is no accident that such a positive evaluation of spiritual ἔρως, and the wish to find its justification in the Bible, is evident in authors who were mystics, such as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and, as I shall show, ps.-*Dionysius. They all had a good knowledge of Plato, too, and transposed his discourse on ἔρως to the Christian spiritual plane.

*Evagrius of Pontus, who, at the end of the 4th c., was strongly influenced by both Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, and was one of the main supporters of the doctrine of *apokatastasis*, in his *Letter to Anatolius* 61 and 65 joined this doctrine to his theory of love, making love the revealer of the image of God in each human being, of the eviction of evil, and of the even-

tual *apokatastasis*: "Love makes God's image, conformed to the archetype, evident to us in each human being, even when the spirit of evil endeavors to degrade someone before you. . . . A time will come in which evil will be consumed." This is perfectly consistent with Evagrius's main tenet in his *Kephalaia Gnostika*: "There was a time when evil did not exist, and there will be a time when, likewise, it will no more exist, whereas there was no time when virtue did not exist, and there will be no time when it will not exist. For the germs of virtue are impossible to destroy" (1,40-41).

*Diadochus of Photice also connected love to the theology of the image, and—following Origen—he did so precisely through the final and voluntary attainment of each one's likeness to God. In ch. 4 of his *100 Chapters on Spiritual Perfection* he states that "every human being is created in the image [εἰκών] of God. The attainment of likeness [ὁμοίωσις] to God is conceded to those who submit their freedom to God through a great love. We do not belong to ourselves anymore, when we are similar to the One who, through love, has reconciled us with God." Likewise in ch. 78: "God's grace, by means of baptism, with infinite love resumes to draw the lines of the divine image in order to bring the image [εἰκών] in the human being to the future perfect likeness [ὁμοίωσις]."

The soul's love for God seen as an infinite progression, along the lines of Gregory of Nyssa's conception, will be found again, e.g., in *John Climacus, who defines love as "an abyss of light, a spring of fire: the more it gushes, the thirstier it makes those who are already thirsty. . . . This is why love is an eternal progression" (*Ladder of Paradise* 30, 197-201).

Among the Latin Fathers, it is surely *Augustine who offers the most developed theology of love. In his writings, both *caritas/diligere* and *amor/amare* are used and play a substantial role, although sometimes they seem to be equivalent. In the Latin translations of the Bible, both in the Vulgate and in the *Vetus Latina,* which of course was used by Augustine, both terms are represented, but with an overwhelming prevalence of *caritas* and *diligere,* which regularly render ἀγάπη and ἀγαπᾶν. *Caritas* is also the term that Augustine often uses in his homilies, when he addresses his audience with *caritas vestra,* "your love." When he speaks of reciprocal love among Christians, he generally uses *caritas*: e.g., in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* Augustine never uses *amor,* but he uses *caritas* twice, in 14,32 in a quotation from Paul, where Paul had ἀγάπη (*Si enim propter cibum frater tuus contristatur, non iam secundum caritatem ambulas. Noli cibo tuo illum perdere, pro quo Christus mortuus est*), and in 14,35 in his own comment on this passage (*Apparet igitur, ut opinor, quo fine a carnibus et a vino sit abstinendum. . . . Ad comprimendam delectationem. . . . Ad tuendam infirmitatem, propter illa quae sacrificantur atque libantur. Et quod maxime commendandum est, propter caritatem, ne imbecilliorum ab his continentium offendatur infirmitas*).

If *caritas* is designated for interpersonal relationships, *amor* denotes a strong love for God or for oneself (here I see the same connotation of ἔρως as a strong ἀγάπη that I have pointed out in Origen's and Gregory of Nyssa's linguistic use): *amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui* is opposed by him to *amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei*; the first builds up the "city of God," whereas the second has built the earthly city (*Civ. Dei* 14,28). And in *De doctr Chr.* 3,10 he proposes the synthesis of "love and knowledge of God and of one's neighbor." Human perfection and the good for each human being is attained when, by the increase of the love thanks to which we live well, the other love, due to which we live badly, diminishes, until we are restored to perfection and the whole of our life is transformed into good" (*Civ. Dei* 11,28).

Drawing on 1 Jn 4:20 Augustine in his *Homilies on the Gospel of John* 17,8 explains that it is through love for neighbor that one can see God. In these homilies (123,4-5), Augustine, in agreement with his contrast between *amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei* and *amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui,* opposes loving Christ to loving oneself and the other things in the world. It is notable that, while in Jesus' question to Peter and Peter's answer Augustine uses *diligere* and *amare* respectively, acc. to the Latin translation of the gospel, in his own comment he uses *amare* in reference to loving oneself or Christ, as he also does in *De civitate Dei: Qui hoc animo pascunt oves Christi ut suas velint esse non Christi, se convincuntur amare, non Christum, vel gloriandi . . . non obediendi et subveniendi et Deo placendi caritate . . . apostolus gemit sua quaerere non quae Iesu Christi. Nam quid est aliud, "Diligis me? Pasce oves meas," quam si diceretur: Si me diligis, non te pascere cogita, sed oves meas sicut meas pasce, non sicut tuas; gloriam meam in eis quaere, non tuam; dominium meum, non tuum; lucra mea, non tua, ne sis in eorum societate qui pertinent ad tempora periculosa, seipsos amantes, et caetera quae huic malorum initio connectuntur? Cum enim dixisset apostolus: Erunt enim homines seipsos amantes, secutus adiunxit: Amatores pecuniae, elati . . . Haec omnia mala ab eo velut fonte manant, quod primum posuit: seipsos amantes. Merito dicitur Petro: Diligis me? Et respondet: Amo te*

. . . *Non ergo nos, sed ipsum amemus* (§ 5).

Indeed, soon afterward, Augustine stresses the difference between loving oneself and loving God, but at the same time he explains that loving God indeed coincides with loving oneself, since God's love includes all other forms of love: *Quisquis seipsum, non Deum amat, non se amat; et quisquis Deum, non seipsum amat, ipse se amat.* Whenever we love, we love God; by loving another person, we love God in that person. This is because God is the *summum bonum*. Augustine's homilies on John and 1 John are a reflection on God's being Love and on divine love. Loving our neighbor is a function of our love for God, ignited by the Holy Spirit. In *De doctrina Christiana* Augustine explains: "Whoever . . . justly loves his neighbor should so act toward him that he also loves God with his whole heart, with his whole soul and with his whole mind." Augustine strongly influenced the development of the theology of love in Western Christian tradition; his *ama et fac quod vis* will remain as an emblem of his thought. In Burrus's edited volume, Karmen MacKendrick highlights the intrinsic consistency of Augustine's thought on love, contra Nygren, who deemed it an inconsistent synthesis of incoherent motifs (eros and agape: see below).

Ps.-Dionysius (following Origen and Gregory, and also *Plotinus, who uses the term ἔρως when he wishes to stress the intensity of love (*Enn.* 1,6,7; 5,2,1; 6,4,5; 6,5,12) insists on his "erotic" transposition of 1 Jn 4:8 and 4:16 in *Div. Nom.* 4,12-14 (pp. 155-62). John's very definition of God as ἀγάπη is turned into God's ἔρως, as God is both object and subject of universal love. The mystic author begins with stating that "all tend toward, desire and love what is beautiful and good [τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἐφετὸν καὶ ἐραστὸν καὶ ἀγαπητόν]. It is because of this Beauty and Goodness and for its sake that worse beings ardently love [ἐρῶσι ἐπιστρεπτικῶς] those which are better." It is God who created all beings with this desire for what is beautiful and good. Here, ps.-Dionysius adds that, since his discourse is true, it must also take the liberty of saying that "the divinity itself, the creator of all, in turn, out of exceeding goodness, strongly loves all creatures [δι᾿ἀγαθότητος ὑπερβολὴν πάντων ἐρᾷ], makes all, leads all to perfection, embraces all . . . and God's passionate love [ὁ θεῖος ἔρως] is good, directed to what is good and motivated by the good."

The author explains that God's creative initiative itself was due to God's goodness and love: "This *beneficial strong love* [ἔρως] for all beings, which preexisted them in exceeding goodness, did not permit itself to remain sterile in itself" (155). Now, this mystic author is well aware that the use of the word ἔρως in reference to God might easily arouse perplexities and criticisms: for this reason, he blames those who attach themselves to mere words or even just sounds of words, and do not understand that—as Gregory of Nyssa had already explained—ἔρως in reference to God has nothing to do with sense-perceptible realities, but it has a highest and mystical meaning (156). In 157 ps.-Dionysius adduces the same passage from Scripture that was already adduced by Gregory of Nyssa for the same purpose, i.e., Pr 4:6-8, in which ἔρως is prescribed, but ἔρως for Wisdom (of course he cites from the LXX, where v. 7 is absent); then he puts forward the Song of Songs, which he calls "theology of love" because the love it sings is divine; and finally Ignatius's aforementioned description of Christ as "his love," precisely ἔρως: "Let those who denigrate the term ἔρως listen, that I may not give the impression of subverting the divine Scripture with my argument: Scripture says, 'Love her passionately [ἐράσθητι αὐτῆς] and she will preserve you; fortify her, and she will exalt you; honor her, that she may embrace you,' and all the other things that are sung in the theology of love [κατὰ τὰς ἐρωτικὰς θελογίας]. In fact, some of our sacred sages even thought that the name ἔρως is more divine [θειότερον] than the name ἀγάπη. Divine Ignatius writes: 'My Love [ἔρως] has been crucified.' Thus, let us not fear this name, ἔρως."

Ps.-Dionysius then explains the reason why both Scripture and the early Fathers used ἔρως in reference to divine love, and not only ἀγάπη: "Those who spoke of God seem to me to have deemed the names ἔρως and ἀγάπη synonymous, but to have reserved true ἔρως for divine love, because of their extraordinary innate knowledge. Indeed, it is not only we, but Scripture itself, that celebrates true ἔρως as worthy of God. But most people cannot properly comprehend that the ἔρως ascribed to God is primary, simple and has a unique meaning [τὸ ἑνοειδὲς τῆς ἐρωτικῆς θεωνυμίας]; instead they have slipped down to the divisible, corporeal and separable ἔρως, which is not the true ἔρως, but only a phantom of true ἔρως, or better, the result of a degeneration from it. For most people cannot grasp the uniqueness and simplicity of the one divine ἔρως. . . . According to those who correctly listen to the divine words, the names of ἀγάπη and ἔρως have the same meaning, conferred to them by the sacred authors throughout the divine revelation" (157-58).

Next, our mystical author, along the lines of Origen, and of Plato as well, describes the nature of divine love (158-59): "It has a force that unifies all, ties all together and strongly keeps all together in beauty

and goodness; it preexisted all thanks to is beauty and goodness . . . divine ἔρως is also ecstatic [ἐκστατικός], in that it does not allow lovers [ἐραστάς] to belong to themselves, but they belong to those whom they love. . . . This is why also the great Paul, when he fell prey to divine ἔρως and participated in its ecstatic force, said with an inspired mouth: 'It is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me.'" As ps.-Dionysius comments, Paul was a true "ecstatic lover [ἐραστής]." But not only human beings who love God "go out of themselves" into ecstatic love: God does the same in divine ἔρως: "It is necessary to dare say this, too, for the sake of truth: even the divinity who is the cause of all with its love [ἔρωτι], for the excess of its loving goodness [δι' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ἀγαθότητος] goes out of itself with its providence directed to all beings [εἰς τὰ ὄντα πάντα], and is similarly enchanted by goodness and love and passion [ἀγαπήσει καὶ ἔρωτι]. . . . Therefore, those who are expert in theology call God 'jealous,' because of God's immensely good love [ἔρωτα] for the beings, who provoke his loving eagerness [ἐφέσεως ἐρωτικῆς] to jealousy. . . . What is lovable [ἐραστόν] entirely belongs to the beautiful and the good, and love [ἔρως] dwells in what is beautiful and good, and has its cause in the beautiful and the good."

In 160 finally ps.-Dionysius addresses the question of God's being both object and subject of love: "But why did the theologians call God sometimes ἔρως and ἀγάπη, sometimes desirable [ἐραστόν] and lovable [ἀγαπητόν]? It is because of love that God is the cause, the initiator and, so to say, the progenitor; and, as for being lovable, God is so personally; so, in one way, God is moved, and, in another way, God moves. They call God desirable [ἐραστόν] and lovable [ἀγαπητόν] as beautiful and good; on the other hand, they call God ἔρως and ἀγάπη as the moving force that uplifts everything, the only Beauty and Goodness itself, being a sort of manifestation of itself through itself, good emanating unity among the elect, simple loving movement [ἐρωτικὴν κίνησιν], moving itself, acting upon itself, preexisting in goodness, from goodness rising up to all beings, and returning again to the good."

Because God is infinite, for ps.-Dionysius, just as for Gregory of Nyssa, divine love also exists. Ps.-Dionysius, indeed, goes on to say: "Hence, divine love [ἔρως] shows its infinity and lack of a beginning [τὸ ἀτελεύτητον καὶ ἄναρχον], like an eternal circle revolving around goodness: from the good, in the good and toward the good." At this point, in 161, ps.-Dionysius reports what his teacher and "initiator to the divine mysteries" (ἱεροτελεστής) said about divine love, again called ἔρως: his view is that love is a unifying force, not only directed from the worse to the better in the form of desire (as in Plato), but also from equal to equal, and from the better to the worse in the form of Providence: "Let us conceive of love [ἔρως], either divine or angelic or intellectual or psychic or physical, as a unifying force that keeps those involved in it together, and moves the superior beings to providential care for those which are more in need, and the equal to a reciprocal relationship."

What this theologian taught is that all these forms of love have their source and beginning in God, who is love (again, ἔρως): "Now, let us reduce all these kinds of love to the one and single love [ἔρωτα], which comprises all these and is the father of all these. First, we must reduce all love from the many forms to two loving forces [ἐρωτικὰς δυνάμεις], which are governed by the absolute and incomprehensible cause of all love [ἔρωτος], which transcends all, and to which the whole love [ἔρως] of all beings tends, in conformity with the nature of each being. Now, reducing even these two forces, in turn, to unity, let us say that one simple force is that which moves itself to a sort of unifying mixture, beginning from the Good and down to the last of beings, and from the latter back again up to the Good through all beings. This simple force revolves from itself, through itself, and upon itself, and develops toward itself always in the same manner."

Maximus the Confessor (d. 662) also joined ἀγάπη and ἔρως in his description of divine love and human love for God. He devoted a whole work to love, the *Centuries on Spiritual Love*. Love for God is prayer (2,1: "The person who truly loves God also prays with no distraction"), and a classification of human forms of love shows that the best kind is that which is motivated by God: "Human beings love each other for the following reasons . . . : for the sake of God, as the virtuous loves all, and the person who is not yet virtuous loves the virtuous; or because of nature, as parents love their children and vice versa; or for vainglory, as a person who is glorified loves those who glorify him; or due to an attachment to the earthly goods, as a person who loves a rich person because he receives good things from him; or due to an attachment to satisfaction, as a person who cares for the belly and what is below the belly. The first motive is praiseworthy, the second is neutral, the others are passional" (2,9).

Perfect love, which returns good for evil (2,49), is without passion, ἀπαθής, in conformity with Gregory of Nyssa's view (2,10: "Perfect love entails loving each human being in the same way"; 2,30: "The person who is perfect in love and has reached the cul-

mination of freedom from passions . . . contemplates the nature of all human beings, which is one and the same, considers all in the same way and treats all in the same manner. For this person, indeed, there is neither Greek nor Jew, neither male nor female, neither slave nor free, but Christ is all in all"; 2,25: "ἀπάθεια does not exclude love in the least, but rather generates it"). And yet, although true love is without passion, it is described by Maximus not only as ἀγάπη but also as ἔρως, an ἔρως without passion: just as in Gregory of Nyssa it is ἔρως not because it is a passion, but due to its intensity. "When someone's mind is continually turned toward God, its appetite enormously increases toward divine ἔρως, and its impulsive part is totally turned toward divine ἀγάπη. It becomes totally illuminated thanks to its enduring participation in divine splendor, and, after tying the impassioned part of the soul to itself, is oriented to a divine ἔρως that does not cease and to an ἀγάπη that has no end, because it has completely moved away from earthly things to the divine" (2,48).

The same connection is evident in 3,67: divine love can be depicted as a passion only metaphorically, as a blessed passion, in order to describe in human words the intensity of this love: "The blessed passion of saintly love is necessary, which binds the soul to the spiritual visions, and persuades it to prefer the immaterial things to the material ones, the intelligible [νοητά] and divine things to the sense-perceptible. Love for God is no passion proper, because all passions of the soul are sublimated in this love (3,98): "A perfect soul is that whose passional power turns completely toward God."

*Isaac of Nineveh, a Syriac mystic of the 7th c., made of divine love the gist of his theology and soteriology. Like Gregory of Nyssa, he maintained that what we consider as punishments, since they have God's love as their motive, not only cannot be eternal, but are not even punishments: they rather are a purification, and suffering is only—just as in Gregory of Nyssa's view—a side effect of God's primary purpose: "God corrects with love, never punishes, and only wants that his image [i.e., the human soul] recovers its health; he does not harbor resentment" (*Spiritual Teachings*, nr. 260 in the Slavic *Philocalia*). Universal salvation is made by Isaac to depend on God's immense merciful love, which always cares for all: "God's loving care always surrounds all human beings, but it can be seen only by those who have purified themselves from their sins and every moment have God on their minds" (*Hom.* 5,B64). Isaac even considers Christ's death on the cross to be nothing but an expression of God's infinite love, as a passage from the so-called second part of his work shows: "If zeal had been appropriate to amend humanity, why would God the Logos have had to take on a body in order to return the world to the Father, using kindness and humility? And why did he let people stretch him on the cross for the sake of the sinners, handing his sacred body to suffering for the world? For my part, I declare that God did all this for no other sake than in order *to make his love known,* so that, thanks to a greater love originating from this awareness, we could be conquered by his love, because of the demonstration of the power of the kingdom of heaven, which *consists in love,* through the Son's death." Likewise in *Kephalaia* 4,78: "The purpose of our Lord's death was not our redemption from sins, or any other purpose, but it was only in order that the world might acquire an awareness of God's love for the creation. Had it been aimed simply at the remission of sins, it would have been enough to redeem us in some other way."

Isaac regards not only Christ's death but also his incarnation as motivated by pure love: "The true vision of Jesus Christ our Lord consists in becoming aware of the meaning of his incarnation out of love for us and *inebriated with love* for Christ" (14,30; see also 14,48). Just as love is the true motive of Christ's cross, so it is also the true motive of hell, as is clear from chap. 39: "Even for the affliction and condemnation in Gehenna, there is some hidden mystery: the wise Creator has taken the evilness of our actions and our will as a point of departure for his future success, using this as a way of perfectly realizing his salvific will, which remains hidden both to angels and to humans and is also hidden to those who are being punished, whether they be demons or humans, for the whole period for which the punishment itself lasts"—which evidently means that there will be an end to this punishment—"if we were to say or think that *all that which concerns Gehenna* is not indeed *full of love and impregnated with compassion,* this would be an opinion full of blasphemy and an offense to God our Lord. If we even say that he will hand us to the fire in order to have us suffer, to torment us and for all sorts of evil, we attribute to the divine nature a hostility to rational creatures, whom he made by grace, and the same is the case if we affirm that he thinks or acts out of spite, as though he wished to avenge himself. Among all of his actions, there is none that is not *entirely motivated by mercy, love and compassion:* this is the principle and the end of God's dealing with us" (39,22).

*John of Dalyatha, an Eastern, Syrian mystic of the 8th c. who deeply loved symbols and was strongly influenced by the Origenian tradition, including ps.-Dionysius and Isaac himself, developed

at length the themes of God's love and of mystical love for God. The latter is evident in *Ep.* 7,1-2: "Understand, my brother, this mystery which is the life of heavenly beings, and will be ours, too, just as it is theirs, in the unending *aiōn*. Let us be tormented by the love for the One who is Beauty: this is the end of all our labor. Blessed are those who are inebriated with your love, my God! . . . Taste and see, my brother, the sweetness of our good Father . . . who appears in those who love him and fills them with wonder for his Beauty." The angels, who take care of human souls, reflect God's love, which can be seen esp. in discourse 7, *On the Love of Holy Angels,* influenced by ps.-Dionysius and Origen. The guardian angel is called by John "the Angel of Providence," who fondly loves the soul entrusted to him (see also discourse 14, *On Prayer*).

Mystical love of Christ and mystical marriage of the soul with Christ, acc. to Origen's and Gregory of Nyssa's allegories of the Song of Songs, are themes that are dear to John. In *Ep.* 11,1 he highlights the soul's love for Christ and its reciprocation: "At the end of combat, the crown with which Christ crowns the person who loves him is the vision of the Holy Trinity: blessed are you, O fighter. . . . Your king will heal your wounds . . . will restore your worn-out limbs, afflicted due to love for him. . . . Those limbs were immersed in the blood of their wounds out of love for the most handsome Bridegroom, but already in this life they shine forth with the eternal glory which he gives them as a token." God's purifying fire is that which "destroys and consumes all tumult and sin" and is also identified with "the fire of Your Love, by which all heavenly powers are inflamed," acc. to a set of ideas that are also found, in a synthetic form, in the prayer at the end of his letters, which is a real synthesis of the core concept of his mystical theology: love, fire, beauty, light, wonder, the angels' role, mercy, God's appearing in one's heart to disperse the enemies—i.e., the powers of evil. It is no accident that John quotes Rom 8:35-39, acc. to which nothing will be able to separate us from God's love. This quotation repeatedly occurs in John of Dalyatha; e.g., in *Ep.* 31,4, or in the prayer following *Ep.* 42. Many times he insists on God's love, to which "nothing can be compared" (*Ep.* 47,8) and which is ineffable: "Whoever attempts to speak of God's love declares his own ignorance, unaware that it is utterly impossible to do so" (*Ep.* 34,1). John praises God's salvific love: "Glory to the abundance of your ineffable love," which always leaves "the door open," which "lets us exit the prison in which we have imprisoned ourselves, even when we would not want to: may your power prevail over us, O merciful Father" (*Ep.* 5,4). The solitary's suffering is the dimension of divine universal love (*Ep.* 30,3).

Anders Nygren in his *Agape and Eros* underscored the difference between *eros*, which is self-centered and human, and *agape*, which is selfless and divine (30-35): acc. to him, they "belong originally to two entirely separate spiritual worlds, between which no direct communication is possible." Even if Platonic Eros is a sublimation of "vulgar Eros," nevertheless "there is no way, not even that of sublimation, which leads over from Eros to Agape." Different from Eros, agape is God-centered, an overflow of love, and a sacrificial gift that descends on humans and renders them worthy of love and capable of loving selflessly. Nygren reconstructs the history of these two concepts from classical Greek philosophy, through its influence on Judaism, the early church and up to the Reformation. According to Nygren, the Fathers and medieval Christian authors before Luther elaborated syntheses of *agape* and *eros* in which *eros* absorbed *agape* and distorted it, esp. in the case of ascetic or mystical authors. The examples that Nygren produces are precisely Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, in whose works I have pointed out the use of ἔρως, understood as an intense ἀγάπη, also in the divine sphere. But he esp. attacks Augustine's theology of *caritas* and ps.-Dionysius's theology of ἔρως. Nygren distinguishes the active human subject of desire (*eros*) and the receptive human subject of faith (*agape*).

But in Gregory of Nyssa's perspective, e.g., *agape* is active while being receptive at the same time: it is a continual tension of the soul toward God. And in the end, too, when all will be bound by *agape* which will prevent further falls, all will have chosen voluntarily and happily to remain attached to the supreme Good. As for God's *agape*, although it is oblational, it is certainly not passive, but very active, so much that it even produced the whole creation. According to Nygren, only ἀγάπη is authentically Christian love (92). Ἔρως is completely different from ἀγάπη also because ἀγάπη is unmotivated, indifferent to value: it loves regardless of the value of the loved, in whom it creates value. Ἔρως, instead, loves its objects only because they are worthy of love; it has distorted authentic Christian faith when theologians have embraced it, which, in Nygren's view, happened "when Christianity tried to express itself in Platonic terms" (54). Nygren believed that Christianity was pure only in its New Testament origins—which he supposed to be alien to Hellenistic influence—whereas subsequently an "infiltration" of strong elements of the Hellenistic conception of Eros took place, until a "syncretistic confusion" occurred due to the "Helle-

nization of Christianity" (with an evident adoption of Harnack's terminology and ideology).

Now, this is clearly the widespread but unjustified presupposition that philosophy in general, and Platonism in particular, is incompatible with Christianity and "polluted" it from outside: see my *Origen, Patristic Philosophy, and Christian Platonism: Re-Thinking the Christianization of Hellenism*, VigChr 63,2 (2009). *Eros*, thus, in Nygren's view, characterized the Greek philosophy of Aristotle, Plato and the gnostics, and denotes an acquisitive love which responds and aspires to the beauty or perfection of its object. Properly speaking, only God can love in a purely *agapic* sense, which is displayed in his work of redemption—i.e., God's gift of his only begotten Son to redeem sinners, who were his enemies. Classical philosophy cannot conceive of purely selfless love or a God who is characterized by such a love. For the gnostics and later Christians who were influenced by them, God provides redemption because he longs for fellowship or praise from his creation, or because he needs to restore his creation to the original order to please himself. This, I observe, is certainly not the case with either Origen or Gregory of Nyssa, who are very clear that God's creation was not motivated by any need.

According to Nygren, the synthesis between Christianity and Platonism produced aberrations calling for a reformation and a recovery of the pureness of *agape*, uncontaminated by *eros*; this reformation came with Luther, after the Fathers and the medieval authors. (In the Middle Ages, acc. to Nygren, monasticism, legalism and ritualism are examples of human attempts to reach up to God in the *eros* attitude, rather than glorying in God's descending to humans in the *agape* attitude.) It is Luther to whom Nygren devoted the last chapter of his book. Luther instituted a sort of "Copernican revolution," in Nygren's expression; he corrected Augustine's view that the supreme Good is attained through a complete synthesis of *agape* and *eros*: *caritas*. Augustine's emphasis upon God's unmerited descent to humanity represents the *agape* element of *caritas*. His emphasis upon the necessity of virtue in humanity's ascent to God represents the *eros* element of *caritas*. However, in Nygren's view, this makes *caritas* an inauthentic Christian love. Whereas Catholicism had built the doctrine of salvation through "faith formed by love" (739-740), Luther emphasized salvation "by faith alone" in the God who is *agape* and whose "love has made a new way for itself down to lost humanity. Once for all, and in a decisive manner, this has come to pass through Christ" (741). It is worth recalling that also for those Fathers whom Nygren criticized, Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, the whole soteriology and even the eschatological *apokatastasis* depend on Christ: if we eliminate Christ, no salvation is possible, let alone universal salvation. Nygren's position was favored by the Reformed theologian Karl Barth.

Benedict XVI, instead, in his encyclical *Deus Caritas Est* maintained that both *eros* and *agape* are aspects of divine love and related to the *logos* and the teachings of Jesus. *Agape* is descending, oblative love in which one gives of oneself to another; *eros* is ascending, possessive love which seeks to receive from another, but both belong in Christian love and are good, although *eros* is in danger of being downgraded to sex if it is not balanced by Christian spirituality. In section 7 this is made clear: "*Eros* and *agape*—ascending love and descending love—can never be completely separated. The more the two, in their different aspects, find a proper unity in the one reality of love, the more the true nature of love in general is realized. . . . On the other hand, man cannot live by oblative, descending love alone. He cannot always give, he must also receive. Anyone who wishes to give love must also receive love as a gift. . . . Yet to become such a source, one must constantly drink anew from the original source, which is Jesus Christ, from whose pierced heart flows the love of God. . . . Only in [the way of contemplation] will he be able to take upon himself the needs of others and make them his own." Ibid. 9-10: "God loves, and his love may certainly be called *eros*, yet it is also totally *agape*. . . . This is not only because it is bestowed in a completely gratuitous manner, without any previous merit, but also because it is love which forgives. . . . In Jesus Christ, it is God himself who goes in search of the 'stray sheep,' a suffering and lost humanity. . . . His death on the Cross is the culmination of that turning of God against himself in which he gives himself in order to raise man up and save him. This is love in its most radical form."

R. Lagerborg, *Die platonische Liebe*, Leipzig 1926; H. Arendt, *Der Liebesbegriff bei Augustin. Versuch einer philosophischen Interpretation*, Berlin 1929; A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros: The Christian Idea of Love*, tr. P.S. Watson, Chicago 1953 [*Eros und Agape*, Gütersloh 1930-1936]; P. Tillich, *Love, Power, and Justice: Ontological Analyses and Ethical Applications*, Oxford 1954; C. Spicq, *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament*, I-III, Paris 1958–1959; J. Burnaby, *Amor Dei: A Study of St. Augustine's Teaching on the Love of God*, London 1960; J. Colson, *Agapè chez St. Ignace d'Antioche*, London 1961; H.U. von Balthasar, *Glaubhaft ist nur Liebe*, Einsiedeln 1963; L. Robin, *La théorie platonicienne de l'amour*, Paris [2]1964; J. Vanier, *Amitié et amour chez Aristote*, Paris 1964; G. Outka, *Agape: An Ethical Analysis*, New Haven 1972; G. Vlastos, *The Individual as Object of Love in Plato's Dialogues*, Princeton 1973; R. Kieffer, *Le Primat de l'Amour. Commentaire épistémologique de 1 Corinthiens 13*,

Paris 1975; J.-L. Marion, *Prolégomènes à la charité*, Paris 1986; W. Klassen, *Love: NT and Early Jewish Literature*, in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary,* IV, New York 1992, 381-396; V. Brümmer, *The Model of Love: A Study in Philosophical Theology*, Cambridge 1993; E.A. Johnson, *She Who Is*, New York 1993; B. Gerhardsson, *The Shema in the New Testament*, Lund 1996; C. Osborne, *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love*, Oxford 1996; D. Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge 1997; S. Pricoco (ed.), *L'Eros difficile. Amore e sessualità nell'antico cristianesimo*, Soveria Mannelli 1998, esp. E. Prinzivalli, *Desiderio di generazione e generazione del desiderio: Metodio di Olimpo e le polemiche sull'eros fra III e IV secolo*, 39-66; P. Esler, *Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory*, Biblical Interpretation 8 (2000) 325-357; Agostino di Ippona, *Amore Assoluto e 'Terza Navigazione,'* ed. G. Reale, Milan 2000[2]; A. Fabris, *I paradossi dell'amore fra grecità, ebraismo e cristianismo*, Brescia 2001; B.V. Brady, *Christian Love*, Washington, D.C. 2003; W.G. Jeanrond, *Biblical Challenges to a Theology of Love*, Biblical Interpretation 11 (2003) 640-653; V. Burrus-C. Keller (eds.), *Toward a Theology of Eros: Transfiguring Passion at the Limits of Discipline*, New York 2006; I. Ramelli, *Gregorio di Nissa Sull'anima e la resurrezione*, Milan 2007; Id., *Note per un'indagine della mistica siro-orientale dell'VIII secolo: Giovanni di Dalyatha e la tradizione origeniana*, "'Ilu" 12 (2007), 147-179; Id., *L'Inno a Cristo-Logos nel* Simposio *di Metodio di Olimpo*, in *Motivi e forme della poesia cristiana*, Rome 2008, SEA 108, 257-280; Id., *Transformations of the Household and Marriage Theory Between Neo-Stoicism, Middle-Platonism, and Early Christianity*, RFN 100 (2008) 369-396; Id., *Simon Son of John, Do You Love Me? Some Reflections on John 21:15*, NovT 50 (2008) 332-350; B. Zorzi, *The Use of the Terms* ἁγνεία, παρθενία, σωφροσύνη *and* ἐγκράτεια *in the* Symposium *of Methodius of Oympus*, in VigChr 63,2 (2009) 138-168; I. Ramelli, *Origen, Patristic Philosophy, and Christian Platonism: Re-Thinking the Christianization of Hellenism*, in VigChr 63,3 (2009).

I. Ramelli

LUCIA (Lucy) of Syracuse (d. 304). The tomb of Lucia still exists in the catacomb at *Syracuse which bears her name. The oldest evidence of her cult is the inscription of Euschia, who died on her feast day at the beginning of the 5th c. Some decades later the virgin Lucia was inserted in the *Mart. hier.* for 13 Dec and from here passed into all calendars, martyrologies and sacramentaries. Monasteries with her name existed in Syracuse and in *Rome at the time of *Gregory the Great (*Ep.* 7,36; 9,44; 11,15; *Dial.* 4,13). During this period her cult also grew in Rome, where the same pope is said to have inserted her name in the canon of the Roman Mass (a formulary for the Mass of the saint may in fact be found in the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum*); following this, Pope *Honorius I built the church of St. Lucia in Selci. Lucia enjoyed such prestige in 7th-c. Rome that one legend put her birthplace in the city (Sansterre 1, 152). Her name was also inserted in the canons of *Milan and *Ravenna. We find an image of her in the procession of martyrs in the mosaic in St. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna. The *Passio* of the 6th c. is pure hagiographical fiction without any historical value: it recounts that Lucia, already engaged to be married, accompanies her sick mother to the tomb of St. Agatha; she renounces marriage (that St. Lucia pulled out her eyes to send them to her fiancé is a later element in the story), is cruelly tortured (topos of the undying life) and is martyred during the persecution of *Diocletian. Medieval accounts of the translation of her relics, full of contradictions, suggest that her relics were brought to Venice and Corfinio and from there to Metz. A play on words on Lucia's name resulted in the appellation "the saint of light [*lux*]."

BHL 4992-5003; 995-996; *Verzeichnis* 74; BS 8, 241-257; LCI 7, 415-420; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926, repr., Rome 2000; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 105-107, 632-633; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938, 65-66; V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, Vatican City [2]1963, 175-179; S.L. Agnello, *Recenti esplorazioni nelle catacombe siracusane di s. Lucia*: RivAC 30 (1954) 7-60; 31 (1955) 7-50; J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne* 1-2, Brussels 1980; V. Messana - S. Pricoco (eds.), *Il Cristianesimo in Sicilia dalle origini a Gregorio Magno*, Caltanissetta 1987; *Euplo e Lucia 304-2004*, eds. T. Sardella - G. Zito, Catania 2006.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

LUCIAN of Antioch (d. 312). *Eusebius (*HE* 4 6,3) describes him as a priest of *Antioch, learned in sacred science, martyr during the last persecution. We know in fact that he was responsible for a revision of the Greek text of the OT and suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia 7 Jan 312. *Jerome (*Vir. Ill.* 77) refers, without giving details, to his **libelli* on the faith and his letters. We know that Lucian taught *Arius and also important supporters of his, called co-Lucianists, among whom was *Eusebius of Nicomedia. In this sense *Alexander of Alexandria (in Theod., *HE* I, 4), writing in an anti-Arian letter which traced the Arian heresy to Judaizing *adoptionism, says that Lucian was the successor to *Paul of Samosata and was excommunicated by the Antiochene community for the duration of three episcopates.

This sparse and inconsistent evidence has resulted in some divergent and indeed doubtful positions on the part of modern scholars. For a long time Lucian was thought to be the founder of the literalist exegetical school of *Antioch, rather than the allegorical approach followed by the Alexandrian school: but the information we have does not allow this conclusion, the school of Antioch proper starting only with *Diodore of Tarsus many decades after Lucian's death. Beyond this, Alexander's testi-

mony has made Lucian seem a disciple of Paul of Samosata and a promoter of his heresy, as such caught up in the reaction against Paul, and excluded for many years from the community. On this account he would have been readmitted shortly before suffering martyrdom.

But this reconstruction cannot be reconciled with the fact, indicated by Alexander and otherwise shown to be right, that Arius and his co-Lucianists were disciples of Lucian. In fact, Arius's doctrine of radical *subordinationism is connected with a Logos theology and appears antithetical to *monarchianism, either *Sabellian or adoptionist. Recent attempts to link Arius and Paul of Samosata hardly seem convincing; and the decisiveness and consistency with which the co-Lucianists supported Arius is proof that his teaching was in broad terms anticipated by Lucian, who conversely can only with difficulty be considered a disciple of Paul. The connection between Arius and the adoptionists was made by Alexander for polemical reasons on the grounds that both undervalued—albeit in different ways—the divinity of Christ. Disconnecting Lucian then from Paul, and basing ourselves on the pre-Arian character of his teaching as on the persistence of monarchianism in Antioch after the condemnation of Paul—seen from the connection between Paul and Eustathius—we may suppose that Lucian taught a radical subordinationism in Antioch which anticipated Arius, therefore opposing Paul's monarchianism. He was condemned then in the wake of the response to the condemnation of Paul for having given new impetus to monarchianism in Antioch, lacking, however, the radical elements of Paul's thought.

Into this reconstruction we may insert the claim, found in sources of the *homoiousian party, acc. to which Lucian was the author of the formula approved by the Council of Antioch in 341, clearly of *Origenist inspiration and undoubtedly orthodox, even if in moderate subordinationist language. Many modern scholars do not accept this claim or argue that the original text of Lucian must have been so profoundly altered as to have made it unrecognizable. Yet the indications that this claim is correct are not few; and on account of the orthodoxy of the text it may be considered—in the context of the various *libelli* on the faith to which Jerome refers—that which Lucian composed in order to be readmitted into the community after a long period of exclusion.

Quasten I, 402-404; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur S. Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936; M. Simonetti, *Le origini dell'arianesimo*: RSLR 7 (1971) 319-330; H.Ch. Brennecke, Lucianus von Antiochien: TRE 21 (1991) 474-479; *Lucian of Antioch, St*: ODC (1997) 1001-1002; T. Böhm, *Lucianus von Antiochien*: LACL (1997) 405-406; D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, Cambridge 1982; R.D. Williams, *The Quest of the Historical Thalia*, in R.C. Gregg (ed.), *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments: Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Cambridge 1985, 1-35; J.R. Busto Saiz, *The Biblical Text of Malachias Monachus to the Book of Wisdom*, in N.F. Marcos (ed.), *La septuaginta en la investigación contemporanea*, Madrid 1985, 257-269; W. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien*, Bonn 1986; R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988, 79-84; H.C. Brennecke, *Lucianus von Antiochien in der Geschichte des Arianischen Streites*, in Logos. Festschrift f. L. Abramowski, Berlin 1993, 170-192.

M. Simonetti

LUCIAN of Carthage (3rd c.). This confessor, who lived at the time of the Decian persecution (250), appears in the correspondence of *Cyprian (*Ep.* 21-23, 27). He was compromised by his granting declarations of indulgence to the *lapsed: he issued them either blank, with no name, or collectively, or even bearing the names of the dead. The *Calendarium Carthaginense* has *Ss. Luciani et Vincenti martyrum* listed for 1 Feb. It is difficult to ascertain if he should be identified with one of the Lucians listed in the *Mart. hier.*

V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III^e siècle*, Vatican City ²1984, 316-317.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

LUCIAN of Kefar Gamala (d. after 415). Lucian, a priest of a village called Kefar Gamala (Beth-gamal) 20 miles from *Jerusalem and not far from Lydda-Diospolis, in 415 found the relics of the first martyr St. Stephen (Acts 6–7). *John II, bishop of Jerusalem, received a visit from the priest informing him of the revelation that had been made to him in respect to the relics. He was commissioned with finding them, which he duly did. John, participating at that time in the Council of *Diospolis which met to make a pronouncement on *Pelagius, left Diospolis immediately with two others, and, having identified the relics, on 26 Dec 415 transferred them solemnly to the Church of Zion in Jerusalem, the church where the saint had been ordained. John then had the basilica of St. Stephen built near the Neapolis Gate (today the Damascus Gate), where the relics were placed 15 May 438 or 439. Lucian had kept for himself some bones of lesser importance, which he distributed among friends and which subsequently arrived in the West. He also wrote a report of the events (BHG 1648x-1648y); this too arrived in the West. After this

we know nothing further of Lucian. The Byzantine church at Beit-Jimal is certainly not to be identified with the martyrium of St. Stephen at Kefar Gamala.

E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*, Tübingen 1904, 156-160; J. Martin, *Die revelatio S. Stephani und Verwandtes*: Historisches Jahrbuch 77 (1958) 419-433; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 245-246; P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient*, Paris 1985, 266-267; P.H.F. Jakobs, *Reste einer byzantinischen Siedlung bei Beit-Jimal*: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City-Münster 1995, 873-880.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

LUCIAN of Samosata (d. 190). Writer and Greek philosopher, lived in the 2nd c. AD. Born in about 120 at Samosata, a city in N Syria, on the right bank of the Euphrates, he had tried other professions before embarking on a brilliant career as rhetorician, speaker, versatile writer and novelist, a follower of the itinerant teachers of the Second Sophistic. He was in *Rome, *Asia Minor, *Antioch, Samosata, *Athens (where in all probability he lived for some years) and then in Egypt, where he died ca. 190. Very quickly he gained a vast readership who greatly admired his pungent style, as well as his appealingly uninhibited spirit, always ready to provoke public opinion with paradoxes, bizarre tales and original literary forms. Lucian derided and scorned everything which sprang from mere convention and from an uncritical *forma mentis:* thus his attacks on historiography, literature and even on philosophy, to the extent that they were products of such a mentality. The lucid and cutting force of his intelligence was unleashed in his observation of human beings, their weaknesses, their limitations, their vain agitations, without however believing in the possibility that the world could improve; and in this absence of moral indignation his satire differs from analogous forms in classical literature. 82 works and a collection of epigrams are attributed to him, among which we find essays of considerable literary merit, oratorical preambles, encomiums, *laudationes, controversiae* and judicial defenses, jokes and grammatical polemics, writings on philosophy including practical philosophy, as well as parodies and satires, invectives and polemical tracts, mimes, and other compositions.

In respect to Lucian's views on Christianity, of special note is his *De morte Peregrini,* which presents itself in a form of a letter, and which contains a ruthless attack against a certain complex and undoubtedly interesting figure who in 165 mounted a stake in order to voluntarily burn himself alive. The **libellus* is directed most of all against the Cynics, who held Peregrinus Proteus to be a new Hercules; but there are many allusions to the person of Jesus, and to his followers, including their way of thinking and of living. (Lucian presents them as victims of Proteus's deception.) Peregrinus's history is a strange one: born in Hellespontus, he converted to Christianity in Palestine, where he became a prophet and a leader of the community; imprisoned, he refused to apostatize, and was released by a Roman magistrate. Accused of parricide by his compatriots of Parium, he sought to silence them by giving his property to the pagan community. His relations with the Christians broke down, for some reason which is unknown to us. Following this we find him in *Egypt, where he followed Cynic asceticism in its strictest forms, in *Italy (from where he was expelled for having insulted the emperor) and finally in Greece, where he attempted to foment a revolt against the Roman authorities. It was there, during the Olympic games, before an applauding crowd, that he committed suicide in a spectacular manner, and became the object of a cult.

The account of Peregrinus's Christian period is of real interest, for in this phase he gained credit and indeed renown in the Palestinian community. We learn from Lucian (see *De morte Peregrini* 12-13) that the Christians were always ready to lend material and other help to fellow believers in prison or otherwise in difficulty, that they feared nothing in the face of torture and death, on the contrary approaching death with complete faith in their espoused beliefs, beliefs which to the mind of the pagan seemed unprovable: a reaction shared by *Galen, *Celsus and *Marcus Aurelius. Lucian makes no more than a few references to the Christians—it may be said that he shows a psychological curiosity about them (see E.R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian*, 105)—and yet, in the context of the few pagan testimonies that we have about Christianity, they are not to be undervalued.

Lucien de Samosate. Œuvres complètes, ed. E. Chernberg, Paris 1934; *Luciani Opera*, ed. M.D. MacLeod, Oxford 1972–1987; C. Gallavotti, *Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale*, Lanciano 1932; M. Caster, *Lucien et la pensée religieuse*, Paris 1937. On Peregrinus (as well as on Lucian), see E.R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*, Cambridge 1965, 59-63, 120-121 and passim; H.D. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament*, diss., Mainz 1957; M.D. MacLeod, in ANRW II, 34, 1362-1421; G. Anderson, in ANRW II, 34/2, 1422-1447; M. Weissenberger, *Literaturtheorie bei Lukian*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996; I. Ramelli, *I romanzi antichi e il cristianesimo: contrasti e contatti*, Madrid 2001, 143-161.

P. Siniscalco

LUCIDUS, presbyter (d. after 474). We learn of Lu-

cidus from Bishop *Faustus of Riez (*Ep.* 1 and 2, and *Grat.* prol.). Lucidus was a priest from the S of *Gaul who in the 2nd half of the 5th c. aroused the suspicions of Faustus for certain ideas he held regarding *grace and *predestination, carrying *Augustine's thought to extreme consequences. Faustus attempted, first, to induce him to retract by putting before him certain anathemas to sign, then the question was discussed at a number of councils (Councils of *Arles and *Lyons, of uncertain dates, between 470 and 474), where the theses of Lucidus were condemned, and to which Lucidus submitted. The whole episode, which is difficult to reconstruct, was part of the long, protracted controversy between Augustinians and anti-Augustinians in the S of Gaul.

CPL 963; PL 53, 681-685; CSEL 21, 3-4 and 161-168; MGH, *Auct. ant.* 8, 288-291; DTC 5, 1020-1024, and *Tables* 3036; É. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, 2, Paris [2]1966, 83f. n.44, 145, 289; 3, Paris 1965, 371-372.

A. Pollastri

LUCIFER–LUCIFERIANS. Lucifer (d. 370) was bishop of Cagliari, and represented Pope *Liberius at the Council of *Milan in 355, which was due to consider the question of *Athanasius of Alexandria. On that occasion he wrote to *Eusebius of Vercelli asking him to participate in the council. Lucifer was among the few who did not bow to the will of the emperor *Constantius in that he did not sign the condemnation of Athanasius. Deposed and exiled, he was sent first to Germanicia (*Syria) and Eleutheropolis (*Palestine) and finally to *Thebaid. During his exile he had occasion to criticize the *De synodis* of *Hilary, which seemed to him too moderate in its attitude toward the opponents of the Nicene faith. When in 362 the emperor *Julian permitted those exiled by Constantius to reenter their sees, Lucifer, instead of taking part in the council announced by Athanasius in *Alexandria, went to *Antioch, where the anti-*Arian community was divided between *Meletius and the priest *Paulinus. The partisans of Paulinus were intransigent Nicene adherents. Lucifer endorsed their position, consecrating Paulinus as bishop in opposition to the legitimate bishop Meletius, thus aggravating the local *schism. Eusebius of Vercelli, coming from Alexandria, did not approve of Lucifer's action. Annoyed by this, as by the light measures taken by the Council of Alexandria toward those who had compromised with Arianism, Lucifer returned to *Sardinia via *Naples and *Rome. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 95) says that he died under *Valentinian I (364–375).

Lucifer addressed Constantius in five violently worded polemical **libelli* published during the years of his exile: *De non conveniendo cum haereticis, De regibus apostaticis, Pro sancto Athanasio* in 2 books, *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus* and *Moriendum esse pro Dei filio* (355–361). From a brief correspondence between Lucifer and the *magister officiorum* Florentius, we learn that Lucifer had seen that the first three of these were sent to Constantius, who, astonished at the offensive tone used in respect to him, asked Lucian whether he was truly their author. Lucifer confirmed this, but the emperor did not take any particular action as a result. In his writings Lucifer defends Athanasius, argues against contact with heretics (whom he puts on a level with pagans), declares himself ready to die for his faith and above all attacks Constantius, whom he compares with the worst tyrants of the OT. The scriptural support which Lucifer adduces for his various positions is of such a quantity that his *libelli* may be properly called scriptural *florilegia. They are interesting examples of Latin translations of the Scriptures prior to Jerome, and notable linguistically as they are rich in popular language; less so for their doctrine, as the defense of the Nicene faith is reduced to a few stereotypical formulas.

The name "Luciferian" was given to the most intransigent supporters of Paulinus against Meletius at Antioch. In Rome in around 380, it was also given to certain strict orthodox partisans of Nicene orthodoxy who had not approved of the moderate steps taken by the Council of Alexandria and subsequent councils against those who, despite having signed the pro-Arian formula of *Rimini, intended to return to orthodoxy; for this reason they would not enter into communion with Pope *Damasus, who tormented them in various ways. They established contacts with analogous schismatic communities of rigorous anti-Arians present in various Eastern and Western cities. Their leaders were *Gregory of Elvira in the West and Heraclides of Oxyrhynchus in the East. We do not have proof that it was actually Lucifer who began this schism, and their being called Luciferians may be derived rather from the fact that they followed a model of anti-Arian intransigence typical of Lucifer.

As a result of the hostile attitude of *Catholics toward them, in 384 the Luciferians sent to *Theodosius, in the name of the Roman priests *Faustinus and *Marcellinus, a *Libellus precum* in which they set out in detail their miserable situation in Rome, *Trier, Eleutheropolis, *Oxyrhynchus, etc. and asked that they be left in peace. Theodosius gave them what they asked in a rescript. Subsequent to this date we have no precise information about them. There

are some literary fake documents, springing from a Luciferian context and probably Spanish in origin, intended to win support for their sect: a letter of Eusebius of Vercelli to Gregory of Elvira and two letters of Athanasius to Lucifer. Perhaps it was at least partly in this milieu that the compilation known as the ps.-Athanasian *De trinitate* was composed.

CPL 112-118; PL 13, 767-1049; CSEL 14; CCL 8 (bibl.); Patrologia 3, 61-65 (bibl.); M. Simonetti, *Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiano*: Atti del convegno di studi religiosi sardi, Padua 1963, 67-81.

M. Simonetti

LUCILLA (d. after 312). A noble and rich women, of Spanish origin, resident at *Carthage, supporter of groups and individuals from whom sprang the *Donatist schism. Before the persecutions of *Diocletian she had been reproached by *Caecilian, deacon of the bishop *Mensurius, because she was accustomed to kiss the relics of a martyr at the moment of receiving Communion (Opt. Milevis, *De schismate* I,16). After the death of Mensurius (311/312), Lucilla sponsored through donations the party of Numidian bishops who were gathered at Carthage to declare the episcopal consecration of Caecilian invalid and to elect a new bishop, who was to be *Maiorinus, servant of Lucilla and already lector in the deaconry of Caecilian (*Gesta apud Zenoph.*: CSEL 26, 196-197).

Monceaux 4, Paris 1912, 16-19; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford 1952 (²1971), 18-21; A.C. de Veer, *Le rôle de Lucilla dans l'origine du schisme africain*, BA 4e Série, Traités antidonatistes, 4, 799-802; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 233-235; PCBE 1, 649.

F. Scorza Barcellona

LUCINIUS (Baeticus) (d. ca. 390). Friend of *Jerome, a layman, interested in having good biblical codices at his disposal; possessing financial means, Lucinius sent scribes from Baetica in Palestine, in order to transcribe Jerome's originals. On this occasion he put various questions to Jerome in a letter which was subsequently lost and thus known only through Jerome's reply (*Ep.* 72). He died in about 390, as shown by the letter of condolence which Jerome sent to his wife, Theodora (*Ep.* 75).

J.M. Bover, *La Vulgata en España*: Estudios bíblicos I (1941) 18-22; T. Ayuso Marazuela, *La Vetus Latina Hispana*, I, Madrid 1953, 513; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 91-92.

M. Díaz y Díaz

LUCIUS I, pope (d. 254). His pontificate lasted a very short time, about eight months, between the spring of 253 and the beginning of 254 (Eus., *HE* 7, 2). Immediately after he was elected emperor, Gallus had him arrested and condemned to exile. After the death of Gallus and under the new emperor *Valerian, Lucius was able to return to Rome. He had a correspondence with *Cyprian (*Ep.* 61 and 68). The LP puts his place of origin in *Rome, and also presents him as a martyr, beheaded on the order of Valerian (see I, 153). This fact is doubtful, because Valerian began his anti-Christian persecution only in 257; i.e., three years after the death of Lucius. Besides, the Roman church venerated him from the 4th c. only as a confessor, entering his name in the **Depositio episcoporum* and not in the *Depositio martyrum*. Lucius intervened on the question of the **lapsi*, with the moderation of the Roman see proper to that subject. He wrote several letters on the matter which have been lost (on his apocryphal letters see Jaffé, 122). Lucius was buried in the cemetery of St. *Callistus. The *Roman Martyrology* commemorates him 4 Mar.

Cyprian, *Ep.* 61,1,1; 61,3,1-2; 68,5,1; Eus., *HE* VII, 2; 10,3; LP I, XCVI-XCVIII, CXLVIII, 66-69 and 153; G.B. De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea cristiana*, II, Rome 1867, 62-70; G. Mongelli, *La Chiesa di Cartagine contro Roma durante l'episcopato di S. Cipriano*, Miscellanea Francescana 1959, 104-121; BS 8, 286-287 (A. Amore - Cl. Mocchegiani Carpano); O. Limone, *L'opera agiografica di Guaiferio di Montecassino*, in Monastica. *Scritti raccolti in memoria del XV centenario della nascita di S. Benedetto (480-1980)*, III, Montecassino 1983, 77-130 (*Passio sancti Lucii papae*); LTK³ 6, 1085 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi I, 278-281 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

LUCIUS of Adrianople (d. after 343). Bishop of Adrianople about 330, deposed by the *Eusebians at an uncertain date in the context of the reaction against Nicaea. Returning to his see on the death of *Constantine I (337), he was expelled again, taking refuge in Rome, as did *Athanasius, *Marcellus and others. *Sozomen (*HE* III, 12) affirms that he was exonerated of the accusations made by the Eusebians through the agency of the Western bishops gathered at *Serdica (343). Lucius returned to Adrianople, but following the commotion there he was sent away again in chains, and died shortly afterward.

DCB 3, 753.

M. Simonetti

LUCIUS of Alexandria (d. after 380). Third *Arian bishop of *Alexandria. Elected shortly after the

murder of *George (Dec 361), but unable to go to Alexandria and receive consecration, he remained in *Antioch. Subsequently, with the support of the emperor *Valens, in 367 he reentered Alexandria by night, going to the house of his mother. The pagan, Christian and Jewish population—still remembering George—wanted to kill him, and only with difficulty did he manage to survive through the intervention of the civil authorities. After this the Arians took him to Samosata, where he left bad memories beause of his systematic persecution of the clergy. At the death of Athanasius (373) he again took possession of his see with the support of the emperor Valens, while the orthodox *Peter II fled to *Rome. Lucius persecuted the orthodox, esp. monks. At the death of Valens in 378 he was expelled, taking refuge with *Demophilus of Constantinople, whom he followed into exile in 380. We possess a fragment of an Easter discourse of his, which presents a *Logos-sarx* Christology (F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi*, Münster i.W. 1907, 65, XV).

Simonetti, passim; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle* (328-373), Rome 1996, 593ff., 790ff.; A. Lukaszewicz, *Un moine en exil*: JJP 28 (1998) 85-94.

E. Prinzivalli

LUCULENTIUS (6th c.?). An author of unknown place or date, perhaps from Vandal *Africa or *Italy, of whom we have a collection of 18 sermons commenting on passages of the NT, esp. Pauline texts; to the series of the PL should be added two sermons discovered subsequently, published respectively by Müller (PLS 4, 1416-1420) and by Lemarié, who adds the text of a sermon on the gospel of Luke 24:36-47. Lemarié advances the hypothesis that the author is from the Carolingian period owing to his dependence on late authors, but it could also be the contrary (see Bouhot: REAug 28 [1980] 351). His commentary is of a literal and historical character, in a simple yet precise style, written without any oratorical artifice.

CPL 953; PL 72, 803-860; A. Müller, *Ein neues Fragment aus dem Schriftkommentar des Luculentius*: ThQ 93 (1911) 206-222; Stegmüller 5408-5418; Moricca III, 2, 1555-1556; V. Bulhart, *Textkritische Studien zu Luculentius*: WS 59 (1941) 148-149; W. Affeld: Traditio 13 (1957) 388 (MSS); J. Lemarié, *Deux fragments d'homéliaires conservés aux archives capitulaires de Vich, témoins de sermons pseudo-augustiniens et du commentaire de Luculentius sur les Évangiles*: REAug 25 (1979) 85-105; H. Müller, *Das "Luculentius"-Homiliar. quellenkritische Untersuchungen mit Teiledition*, Vienna 1999.

A. Di Berardino

LUGDUNUM. *See* *LYONS

LUKE, Evangelist. The Luke-Acts narrative is the realization of an organically conceived plan by a single author—namely, Luke—for the benefit of the catechumen Theophilus, or whoever may lie hidden beneath that name, a person at the margins of the church but nevertheless a sympathetic and keen observer of its life. The author did not have it in mind to explain what he narrated, but rather to provoke sympathy and understanding in a reader who had come into contact with Christian teaching. The gospel and Acts also set out to demonstrate to the Roman authorities that the new religion had as much right to exist as had the Jewish religion, to which it was intimately connected. The underlying conviction is that the same economy of salvation orients both Christianity and Judaism, and that the ineluctable will of God, which has entered history in the person of Jesus, son of Mary, connects the present to the past and opens up a new future. This temporal connection is present from the very beginning of the narrative, where in the case of Zechariah (Lk 1:18-20) we see clearly that the plan of God, following its own sovereign course but not in opposition to the social situation of the protagonists, continues in its course—with varying emphases—throughout the gospel, in contexts both favorable (Lk 4:42-44; 5:15; 7:7-19) and hostile (Lk 4:28-30; 7:31-35; 8:34-37). The book of Acts itself actualizes the parable of the mustard seed which becomes a tree (Lk 13:18-19; Mt 13:31-32) and the promise of the *Holy Spirit which makes of Peter an orator (Acts 2:14-36), a thaumaturge (Acts 3:1-10) and a worker of miracles (Acts 5:19). The death of Stephen is the seed from which germinates the conversion of Paul (Acts 7:55-8:3).

In the context of the passing on and first interpretations of the teaching of Christ undertaken by the NT authors, Luke's own emphases mark a break with the established constitution of contemporary political-religious society. In the Greco-Roman and Semitic worlds, both of which had close links to the pagan culture which gave priority to a materialist ethic, women were regarded as possessing a limited dignity and social standing. Among prophets, however, and wherever there was attention to revelation, women could not be held to possess inferior status. That being said, no other writing of the NT gives such value and preference to women: Elizabeth (Lk 1:13-60), Anna (Lk 2:36-38) and the holy women (Lk 8:1-3), Martha and Mary of Bethany (Lk 10:38-42), the widow of Nain (Lk 7:11-17), the sinner who anointed Christ (Lk 7:36-50), the woman who was

bent over (Lk 13:10-17), the women who accompanied Jesus to Calvary (Lk 23:27-31), the housewife (Lk 15,8-10), and the widow who troubles the unjust judge (Lk 18:1-8) form a great mosaic, every piece of which grants to the woman a specific mission. With profound affection and sincere devotion Luke paints his picture of Mary, most-favored of God and loved by men, in the double optic of virgin and mother. As the mother of Jesus she is honored by Elizabeth (Lk 1:42-45) and by an anonymous hearer of the Lord (Lk 11:27-28). In the Acts she is mentioned in the context of the Christian community praying in expectation of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:14). Motifs similar to these in other NT writings are both few and of less significance.

Patristic use of the Lukan writings was not always attentive to Luke's values and distinctives; cultural background and religious sensibility resulted in the emphasis now of one aspect and now of another. According to *Jerome, "among the evangelists, Luke is distinguished for a notable knowledge of the Greek language" (*Ep.* 20,4: PL 22, 378). Jerome's flattering judgment must be mitigated and interpreted within the context of *Koine and not in comparison with high Greek literature. Nonetheless the Fathers were from the beginning aware of the Lukan corpus, mentioning it along with the other evangelists as well as commenting on it. The oldest testimony, on which a certain tradition was founded, is that of *Irenaeus of Lyons: "Luke, a companion of Paul, wrote down the gospel which the latter preached" (*Adv. haer.* III, 1,1: SC 211, 24). The Irenaean formulation of this information includes more data and has been accepted by critics with a certain reserve. Irenaeus returns to Luke insistently, speaking of his journeys with Paul (Acts 16:10-28,16; the "we" passages), the declarations of Paul (Col 4:14; 2 Tim 4:10-11) and defending the unity and integrity of the work against the mutilations of the *Marcionites and the other *gnostics (*Adv. haer.* III, 14: SC 211, 258-274). Irenaeus's attestations are important on account of the period from which they come (end of the 2nd c.) and because they take up previous traditions present in *Asia Minor which had been brought to *Gaul. We cannot, however, overlook the fact that Irenaeus—ignoring Lk 1:1-4 and on the model of Col 4:12-14 and Phil 23-24, where Luke is in the group of collaborators of Paul (2 Tim 4:10-11)—says that he is a secretary of the apostle, attentive to his interpretation of the gospel message. At the same time we should note that the biblical texts to which Irenaeus refers contain interesting information: Luke is not of Jewish stock, he is a doctor, he collaborates with Paul, and with Paul he meets Mark on several occasions.

Notwithstanding the many problems that it poses, the Muratorian *Canon does give us authoritative information on the origins of the NT. In lines 2-8 it says: "In the third place the gospel of Luke. Luke was a doctor, who after the ascension of Christ Paul took with him on account of his knowledge of law; he wrote with Paul's approval what was true. Not having seen the Lord in the flesh, and according to what he was able to learn of events, he begins his account from the birth of John." In lines 34-39 he mentions the origin of the Acts: "The Acts of all the apostles were written in one book. Luke intimates to the excellent Theophilus that all these things had happened at that time, and this he shows clearly omitting the passion of Peter and the departure of Paul from Rome for Spain." The Muratorian Canon, clearly dependent on the biblical passages relating to Paul and Luke, identifies Luke as the companion of Paul with the author of the gospel and the Acts. From 200 onward we find Luke referred to more frequently.

*Tertullian, without any polemical note, defends the integrity of the Third Gospel and sets out the characteristics of the author, among them that he was not part of the college of apostles but moved in their circles (*apostolicus*), that he was a disciple and follower of Paul, mentioning that while Marcion fabricated a gospel of his own under the pseudonym of Paul, Paul conformed his gospel to that of the apostles who had preceded him, concluding: "If he who was the light of Luke asked confirmation of his faith and preaching from the authority of his predecessors, so much more I would ask that the gospel of the disciple be founded on the authority of his master. . . . The gospel of Luke is commended to us on account of its deriving from Paul" (*Contra Marcionem* IV, 2,4-5).

Tertullian does not contribute anything additional to Irenaeus or the Muratorian Canon, on which he seems to depend, but he speaks out of a tradition which had by then established itself. The decision of Marcion to prepare a gospel under the name of Paul without doubt hints at the early link made between Luke and Paul, whose supposed origination of the Third Gospel aroused a particular affection for it in Marcion and his followers.

With *Origen the problem of the attribution of the Third Gospel has been overcome. *Eusebius, referring to his biblical canon, observes: "The third is the gospel of Luke which was praised by Paul and composed for believers coming from the Gentile peoples" (Eus., *HE* VI, 25,6). Origen is not the only writer who states that Luke composed his gospel for the Gentiles, but he also preached a series of 39

homilies on the text (SC 87) that, as the first known commentary, has had a considerable influence on the history of spiritual theology as well as providing some important insights that proved crucial at a later time. Among the most important to mention are devotion to the person of Jesus, spiritual combat and the battle between Satan and Christ for dominion over the world (*Hom.* 30; 31), the discernment of spirits (*Hom.* 1), the human vocation to become a perfect image of the Creator (*Hom.* 8; 34) and angelology (*Hom.* 12; 13). Medieval writers, and above all those from the monastic tradition, frequently appealed to Origen, esp. in the translations of *Jerome and *Rufinus and the *Sententiae* of *Evagrius. The homilies of Origen are of great significance on account of the historical period in which they were composed, the group for whom they were composed (the catechumens) and for the exegetical method which stands out both for its moderation and its concrete style (see Origène, *Homélies sur Luc*: SC 87, 91).

Eusebius, tracing a profile of Luke, gives some information which adds to our knowledge: "Luke, Antiochene by birth, had regular contacts with the apostles as well as with Paul, whose friendship he enjoyed. Having learned from them the art of healing souls with the gospel, he wrote on the instruction of those who, from the beginning, were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word, having investigated everything from the very origins [see Lk 1:1-4]; in the Acts he recounts what he himself had seen" (Eus., *HE* III, 4,6).

Most frequently alluded to is Luke's Antiochene origin; the stated frequent contacts with the apostles reflect more the hagiographer than the historian. A picture of the evangelist established, he attempts some exegesis of Luke from a historical perspective, which thanks to OT references opens up avenues for broader study (see Lk 1:33 linked to Ps 88:36-37: PG 24, 532). There are sufficient fragments from the commentary to indicate the type of applied exegesis (PG 24, 529-606).

To the 4th c. belong the anti-Marcionite prologues to the gospels; that for Luke contains information compatible with that recorded in previous centuries. Luke: "a doctor, author of the gospel, disciple of the apostles, follower of Paul up to his martyrdom; served the Lord with an unblemished life; celibate and without children, he lived until eighty-four years old in Boeotia, full of the Holy Spirit. The gospels already having been composed, that of Matthew in Judea and that of Mark in Italy, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he wrote his gospel in the region of Achaia. He explains at the beginning that the other gospels were written before his, but that it was necessary to relate in more detail to the Greek faithful the whole economy of salvation"; then he wrote the Acts of the Apostles (see M.J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Luc*, XV-XVII). The anti-Marcionite prologues identify Luke with the author of the Third Gospel and also of the Acts, and offer some biographical data not previously supplied. As the apostolic age became more remote, the biography of Luke was enriched until it reached the point of legend.

Given the details that we find in the Bible and the Christian tradition we can sum up the historically plausible evidence as follows. Luke did not know Jesus during his earthly ministry; he is with Paul at Rome during the first (61–63) and the second (65–66) periods of captivity. A doctor (Col 4:14), he sends greetings to Philemon (v. 24); a converted pagan, he is with Paul when all others have left him between 65 and 66 (2 Tim 4:11). From the Acts we learn that he is with Paul during the second journey, from Troas to Philippi, and in the third, from Philippi to Jerusalem, during the detention of Paul at Caesarea and during his removal to *Rome (Acts 16:10–28:16). In the Acts the city of *Antioch is mentioned with particular interest: he describes events there (Acts 11:19-26), refers to the teachers and prophets to be found there (Acts 13:1-3), to its role as a center from which emanated the church's mission to the world beyond Palestine (Acts 14:26-28; 15:1-35); here for the first time the faithful were given the name Christians (Acts 11:26). As a writer of the golden age, Luke explains his intentions in his prologue which he then puts into effect in his work. He has made contact with everyone who had a part, from the beginning, in that series of events in which Jesus of Nazareth was the principal actor. The order in which what follows is arranged is not strictly chronological. He works on the basis of Mark when the earlier gospel is connected to the schema of primitive preaching; i.e., from the Galilean ministry to the programmatic discourse (Lk 3:1–4:30; 4:31–6:19), from the discourse in parables to the journey to Jerusalem (Lk 8:4–9:50), and finally in the ministry in Jerusalem (Lk 18:15–21:38); he knows a series of sayings available also to Matthew, but which he uses in different ways (Lk 9:51–18:14); he introduces passages of his own which have come to him as a result of his research. The most esp. Lukan parts of the text are to be found in the journey to Jerusalem or "great insertion" (Lk 9:51–18:14), where Luke gathers together the most beautiful parables of Jesus. The infancy narratives (Lk 1–2) have nothing in common with those of Matthew (1–2): they are Christian pre-

history, and the characters are presented as Jews who are looking ahead to the new religion.

Luke knows the canons of narrative of his time: he knows that an event, whether it is important from the outset or whether it becomes so subsequently, must be set in its historical context. The birth of John the Baptist is dated to the time of Herod the Great (Lk 1:5), that of Jesus from the reign of the emperor Augustus (Lk 2:1): the appearance of the precursor and the beginning of the ministry of Jesus are synchronized with dates from both Roman and Greek history (Lk 3:1-2). The overall plan is determined by the great insertion (Lk 9:51–18:14), where Luke adopts but somewhat modifies Mark's geographical schema, which orients Jesus' activity toward Jerusalem. This harmonious and well-integrated whole is, after the infancy narrative (Lk 1–2), divided into three great sections marked by specific geographical and theological characteristics: (1) Lk 3:1–9:17—messianic manifestation in Galilee—(2) Lk 9:18–19:27—messianic journey toward Jerusalem (great insertion)—(3) Lk 19:28–24:53—the Messiah in Jerusalem, taking possession of his city and of his temple, founding his kingdom, followed by the passion and resurrection. Within this structure there are several themes synchronically designed to show that Jesus is King and Messiah, or even more fittingly, Lord-Messiah (Lk 2:11). Luke, the only evangelist who extends the narrative of the mission of Jesus to that of the church, reveals his distinctive and indeed original principle of continuity. This originality may be seen in the plan of salvation history divided into three periods: that of the OT, summed up in Lk 1–2, characterized by the presence of the prophets and of the Baptist (see Lk 16:16); the central period, concerned with the person of Jesus, to whom the gospel is devoted; the period of the church, of which the Acts of the Apostles describes the beginnings insofar as they could be recorded, serving also as a pointer to what was to come. The unfolding of events after the resurrection of Jesus led Luke to distinguish these three periods linked by his central conviction: the presence of God in history.

To this universal vision Luke connects certain underlying themes. *Jesus the Son of God,* who reveals himself progressively throughout the narrative in words and deeds, from the initial proclamation which describes him as filled with the Holy Spirit (Lk 1:35; 2:40, 52; 4:1, 14, 18) to the confession of Peter, who calls him "the Christ of God" (Lk 9:20), to that of the Father, who presents him to the whole of humanity as "the firstborn Son" (Lk 9:35), to his capacity to give freely of himself (Lk 9:31, 51; 13:32), up to the death that opens to him the way of glory (Lk 22:69; 24:49; 21:25-27). *The gathering of the people*: Jesus preaches to Israel, which in response to him divides both before and after the resurrection (Lk 2:34-35; Acts 2–4; 5:33-40), and also to the socially marginalized (Lk 2:8-10; 4:18; 6:20-26; 5:20-32; 8:1-3). *The way of the disciple*, which consists in conversion (Lk 5:32; 12:54-13:9 etc), which is an act of faith in confessing the Lord Jesus (Lk 1:20,45; 7:50; 8:12-13) combined with prayer and charity (Lk 11:1-13; 6:27-42; 10:25-37). This way, notwithstanding the commitment it requires, is full of light and joy. *The eschatological prophecy*: Jesus announces his return at the end of time as Son of Man, when the time of the church will come to its completion (Lk 9:26; 12:35-48; 17:23-37; 18:8). This conviction checks the impatience in awaiting the parousia, which had affected certain proto-Christian groups, and gives way to the realization of the plan of salvation, a work falling preeminently to the church (Lk 2:11; 3:22; 4:21; cf. Acts, passim).

From ancient tradition, the prologues and Irenaeus we can put the date of composition of the Lukan writings to after the death of Paul, in about 67, and indicate the probable place as Achaia. The prophetic description of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 (Lk 19:27, 43-44; 20:20-24; 23:28-31) is much more explicit and precise than that of Mark (13:14-19), and the accounts of Flavius Josephus (*Jewish War*, V, 4.6; VI 1-5) and *Tacitus (*Hist.* V, 11-13) lead us to suppose that Luke knew those events and that they made a deep impression on him. The gospel therefore was probably composed after the destruction of Jerusalem sometime around 80. It is probable that to the prophecy of the fall of the Holy City included by Mark (13:14-19) Luke added those clarifications which transformed a prediction into a prophecy *ex eventu*. The conclusion of Acts, which ends after the first Roman imprisonment of Paul (62–63), cannot be regarded as a decisive argument for dating the composition of the gospel before 62. A careful examination of Acts 28:30-31 suggests that Luke concludes in the way he does not owing to any lack of material but simply because he has completed his own plan. In this way additional credence is given to Irenaeus and the anti-Marcionite prologue in which Luke's writings are dated to after the death of Paul.

The patristic authors were not able to engage with the problems which historical criticism has raised in connection with Luke in more recent times, but rather, in their commentaries and homilies, they threw into relief the message that the evangelist imparted in his own particular style. Apart from Origen and Eusebius, Luke aroused the interest of ecclesiastical writers both Greek and Latin. Among them

we should note particularly *Titus of Bostra (d. 378), who delivered homilies on the whole gospel; his exegesis is sober, moderate, avoiding the use of imagery. He adopts the same interpretative technique as the *Against the Manicheans,* where there is special attention to the sacred text in its treatment of the truths of the *incarnation and of the virgin birth (TU 21/1). In a series of homilies *Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) drew from the gospel some lessons for Christian conduct. Notwithstanding that only some of these have been preserved in the original language—only three complete homilies—the Syriac version (6th–7th c.) gives us 156, while the fragments from the *catenae*, apart from not being completely authentic, emphasize their anti-*Nestorian character and so obscure the text by using it in an extraneous controversial context (PG 72, 475-950; CSCO 70; 140; TU 34, 1b). Among the Greek writers there are no other continuous commentaries. Relatively frequently we find homilies delivered on feasts of the Lord or the Virgin Mary, as well as fragments of homilies gathered in the *catenae* (see R. Devreesse: DBS I, 1181-1194); it is not rare that Luke is cited in letters which treat the incarnation or the virgin birth in theological depth. The Greek patristic tradition, even that which comes to us from important writers (*John Chrysostom, *Athanasius of Alexandria, *Basil, *Gregory of Nazianzus), had given pride of place to *Matthew and *John. Origen's early interest in Luke did not subsequently yield the attention which might have been expected. Broader consideration of Luke would have to wait until the Byzantine era.

In the Latin patristic tradition, the first continuous commentary is that of *Ambrose, originating in a series of homilies given in different contexts, then collected together by the author and substantially reworked to provide a veneer of continuity. Ambrose, while mindful of the systematic development of the biblical text, takes up exegetical insights from Origen's homilies on Luke and Hilary's commentary on Matthew. The christological hermeneutic combines the approaches of the Antiochene and Alexandrian schools, to which Ambrose adds a pastoral concern to highlight, esp. where the text allows it, the errors of the *Arians, the *Sabellians and the *patripassians. Presupposing historical and literal interpretations, he emphasizes symbolic and *allegorical *exegesis, through which he more easily achieves moral and pastoral application of the text. The commentary, also of great importance in literary terms, has its reference point in the person of Christ, the God-man, and establishes the roots of a devotion to the humanity of Christ which was to capture the attention of medieval mysticism.

*Augustine, who tends to favor the gospel of John, as we see from many discourses which make up the collection of 124 tractates (CCL 36, 1954), took up only a few Lukan themes, comparing them either with Matthew (Sermon 51 on the genealogy of Christ) or acc. to the subject under consideration (Sermon 98 on the resurrection of the son of the widow of Nain [Lk 7:11-17]; Sermon 99 on the woman who was a sinner [Lk 7:36-50]; Sermon 100 on following Christ [Lk 9:57-62]; Sermon 101 on the plentiful harvest [Lk 10:2-61, PL 38, 594-661]). The Christmas discourses cannot really be considered exegetical homilies on Lk 1–2, because Augustine's aim is to identify in these chapters certain themes of particular value for the edification of the faithful (see Sermons 194-196: PL 38, 1115-1125). Augustine also devoted the second book of the *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* to Luke, of which in 51 short chapters some salient points are discussed. The sermons are pastoral and exhortative, with Augustine striving to apply the biblical texts to the Christian life, more than they are exegetical.

Sharing Augustine's interest in Luke but differing in interpretation, *Peter Chrysologus and *Gregory the Great draw truths of pastoral significance from the texts. Notwithstanding doubts over the authenticity of certain discourses, those considered genuine by critics allow us to say that between 425 and 450 in *Ravenna Peter Chrysologus tried to overcome the tensions in the city which followed the end of the Council of *Ephesus of 431. Sermons 22-27 put forward rather emphatically some points connected with Lk 12; the mission of John the Baptist occupies sermons 86-94; the annunciation and birth of Christ, with reference to Matthew 1–2, are the subject of sermons 140-144 and 147-150, where pastoral concerns give way to dogmatic ones (PL 52, 259-278, 441-469, 575-599). Of the forty homilies of Gregory the Great on the gospels, seven are devoted to Luke. They have the merit of providing at the beginning the complete gospel text, the subject matter of the homily, and the basilica in which it was preached, as well as the circumstances and details of its delivery. Together with his homilies on Ezekiel they reflect the events of 590 and 591 (PL 76, passim). In many respects Gregory makes his own the pastoral interpretation of those who commented on the gospel before him.

In the medieval period we find a continuous commentary on Luke by *Bede the Venerable, which may be dated between 709 and 715. As with other writers of the period, he takes up Jerome, Augustine and in particular Ambrose, with whose exegesis he intermingles his own penetrating observations. Having set out in the first place the theory of the four

senses of Scripture (historical, moral, allegorical, mystical) he moves for the most part with ease from one to the other, esp. when he leaves the line of the great Fathers to do exegesis of his own (see the explanation of the word *Iesus*, CCL 120, 58). The commentary on Luke, together with that on the Apocalypse considered a model in particular for their richness of content and allegorical and moral interpretations, has enjoyed great success both at the time and subsequently, esp. in monastic settings. In his homilies on Lukan pericopes the style is the same, with greater *parenetical and moral application of the gospel (CCL 120, 1960). The commentary of Bede, written between 780 and 785 at the height of the Carolingian era, was followed by a smaller commentary by an anonymous Irish monk who had emigrated to S Germany, at the time of the pious and learned Irish bishop Virgilius of Salzburg (d. 784). The interpretative technique is typical of the period: having cited a verse from the gospel, sometimes consisting of only a few words, he gives one or two interpretations, and then gives the most commonly accepted one, with attention to the multiple senses. The authorities to whom he appeals are *Pelagius, Ambrose, Jerome, Bede, Gregory the Great and *Isidore of Seville. In style and exegetical method the work reflects the *Expositio Quattuor Evangeliorum*, widely read and appreciated in educated Irish circles. The Latin text used is basically the Vulgate, but also frequently incorporating material from the *Vetus Latina* (CCL 108C, 1973, IX-XI).

Patristic and medieval commentaries: Origen: *Homiliae in Lucam*, PG 13, 1799-1902; PL 26, 219-306 (trs. Rufinus); SC 87, Paris 1962; Cyril Alex.: *Explanatio in Lucam* (CPG 5207): PG 72, 475-950; Ambrose (CPL 143): *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*, PL 15, 1525-1850; CSEL 32/4, 1892; CCL 14, 1957, 1-400; SC 45 and 52, 1956 and 1958; Bede (CPL 1356): *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, PL 92, 301-634; CCL 120, 1960, 5-425; Anonymous, Irish: *Commentarium in Lucam*, CCL 108C, 1974, 3-101; Theophylact: *Expositio in Lucam*, PG 123, 683-1126; M.J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Luc*, Paris [7]1948; L. Cerfaux - J. Cambier, *Luc* (*Évangile selon saint*): DBS V, 545-597; G. Lomiento, *L'esegesi origeniana del vangelo di Luca*, Bari 1966; B. Rigaux, *Testimonianze del Vangelo secondo Luca*, Padua 1973; var. aus., *L'Évangile de Luc. Problèmes littéraires et théologiques*, Gembloux 1973; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2 vols., New York 1979; W. Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, Zürich 1980; E. La Verdière, *Luke*, Wellington 1980; R.E. Brown, *La nascita del Messia secondo Matteo e Luca*, Assisi 1981; F. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950–1983)*, tr. K. McKinney, Allison Park, PA 1987; M.D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2 vols., Sheffield 1990. For the exegesis of the Fathers, see H.J. Sieben, *Exegesis Patrum: saggio bibliografico sull'esegesi biblica dei Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1983; Id., *Kirchenväterhomilien zum Neuen Testament: ein Repertorium der Textausgaben und Übersetzungen, mit einem Anhang der Kirchenväterkommentare*, Steenbrugis 1991; also see the journal "Annali di storia dell'esegesi" 11 (1994)–14 (1997); A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus*, Tübingen 2003. In particular, see *Luke*, ed. A. Just, ACCS NT 3, Downers Grove, IL 2003.

E. PERETTO

LUKE, Evangelist (apocryphal). For a long time the tradition seemed content with the role of Luke as a "secretary" and companion of Paul (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3,1,1; cf. *Acta Pauli* 14), identifying him with the physician of the same name of Col 4:14 and affirming his Antiochene and pagan origin (Eus. Caes., *HE* 3,4,6; *Suppl. ad quaest. ad Stephanum* 4), as well as his being celibate (*Prologo antimarcionita*; Jerome, *In Matth.*, praef.) or numbering him among the 70 or 72 disciples sent by Jesus (Lk 10:1; see Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.* 51,11, followed by some MSS of the Greek-Syriac list of the apostles). The traditions about his preaching are contradictory: *Dalmatia, *Gaul, *Italy, *Macedonia (Epiphanius, ibid.; cf. the list of ps.-Epiphanius: Greece, Rome and Italy). According to the *anti-Marcionite Prologue* (4th c.) Luke died in Bithynia; it seems to be owing to a confusion between Bithynia and Boeotia that the later traditions record that he died (of natural causes) when bishop of Thebes in Greece, also locating his tomb there (list of the apostles of ps.-Epiphanius; see also the *Acts of Titus* 6). In the apocryphal texts Luke rarely appears: together with the apostles in the *Dormitio Pseudo Ioannis* 13 and in the lists of the apostles and disciples. A *Martyrdom of Luke* which circulated in anti-Chalcedonian circles remains, in four different languages: *Syriac, Bohairic *Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopian (perhaps behind the Syriac and Coptic lies an original Greek text, now lost); this document, which locates Luke's apostolate first in *Dalmatia and then in Proconnesus, is an amalgam of familiar incidents: healings; destruction of images of idols at the invocation of the name of Jesus; trial before Nero (perhaps at Constantinople); miracle of a reattached limb; conversion of the first executioner, who suffers martyrdom together with Luke; the recovery of the corpse which had been thrown into the sea. Further, a Coptic text attributed to *Basil of Caesarea transcribes the full text of a letter of Luke on the construction by the apostles of the first church in honor of the Madonna. The Byzantine traditions relating to Luke multiply after the translation of his relics, now in Padua, from *Achaia to *Constantinople (336) and their placement in the basilica of the Holy Apostles (357). If one disregards the fanciful reference that Nicephorus Callistus (14th c.) attributes to *Theodore the Lector (5th c.), the first traditions about Luke as a painter date to the 8th c. (*Andrew

of Crete; *John of Damascus etc.).

CANT 290-294; BHG 990y-993t; BHL 4970-4977; BHO 567-571; BS 8 (1967) 188-222; LCIK 7, 447-464; *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, ed. de F. Bovon - P. Geoltrain, Paris I, 1997; II, 2005: I, 176; 1172-1177; II, 470, 476, 612, 959-978 (martyrdom, with bibl.); F. Kellner, *Sterbeort und Translation des Evangelisten Lukas und des Apostel Bartholomaeus*: ThQ 87 (1905) 596-608; D. Woods, *The Date of the Translation of the Relics of Ss. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople*: VChr 45 (1991) 286-292; M. Chaîne, *Catéchèse attribuée à S. Basile de Césarée. Une lettre apocryphe de S. Luc*: ROC 23 (1922-23) 150-159, 271-303; M. van Esbroeck, *La première église de la Vierge bâtie par les Apôtres*, in *Aegyptus Christiana. Mélanges d'hagiographie égyptienne et orientale dédiés à la mémoire du P. Paul Devos, bollandiste*. Curauerunt U. Zanetti - E. Lucchesi (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 25), Geneva 2004, 1-18; M. Bacci, *Appunti sulla nascita, moltiplicazione e decadenza delle immagini di culto attribuite a San Luca*: Bollettino d'Arte 79/88 (1994) 73-92; Id., *Il pennello dell'Evangelista. Storia delle immagini sacre attribuite a San Luca* (Piccola Biblioteca Gisem 14), Pisa 1998; *Luca Evangelista. Parola e immagine tra Oriente e Occidente*, Catalogo della mostra, ed. G. Mariani Canova, Padua 2000; M.P. Billanovich, *Un'antica tradizione sul luogo della morte di S. Luca: Beozia o Bitinia?*: Italia medioevale e umanistica 41 (2000) 127-137; R.W. Burgess, *The Passio S. Artemii, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke*: AB 121 (2003) 5-36; G. Zampieri, *La tomba di San Luca evangelista. La cassa di piombo e l'area funeraria della Basilica di San Giustina in Padova*, Rome 2003.

S.J. Voicu

LUPUS of Troyes (d. 479). Born in Toul in about 395 to an aristocratic family, he received a good education. In ca. 418 he married Pimeniola, sister of *Hilary of Arles. After six years of marriage, with mutual agreement they renounced the conjugal life in order to devote themselves entirely to God: Lupus went to the *cenobium of *Lérins, placing himself under the direction of the founder, *Honoratus. After a year, traveling to Mâcon so as to give away his possessions to the poor, he passed through Troyes and was made bishop there in 426/427. Continuing to live a monastic life, he showed himself a zealous pastor, generous to the poor and tireless in defense of his people during the barbarian invasions. In 429 he accompanied *Germanus of Auxerre to *Britain to combat *Pelagianism and obtained many conversions by preaching and through miracles. He then returned to Troyes and took up again the pastoral care of his diocese. When in 451 *Attila with his Huns invaded *Gaul, Lupus persuaded them to spare the city from destruction.

*Sidonius Apollinaris wrote him four letters (*Ep.* VI, 1.4.9; IX, 11 = PL 58, 551; 554; 558; 626). Lupus himself, along with Bishop Euphronius, wrote a letter to *Thalassius of Angers on questions of ecclesiastical legislation. After 52 years in the episcopate, this great bishop commended his soul to God on 29 July 479, the day of his feast.

Editions: CPL 988 (*Ep. ad Thalassium*) PL 58, 66-68 (*Ep.* 1 is a Vignier forgery); Munier, in CCL 148, 140-141. See also CPL 989: *Vita s. Lupi* (cf. BHL 5087), in MGH *Script. Mer.* 7 (1920) 284-302. *Studies*: E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, II, Paris 1966, 301-304; BS 8 (1966) 390-391; Patrologia III, 498; A.H. Hubert, *Studien zur sozialen und kirchlichen Führungschicht Galliens: Germanus von Auxerre, Lupus von Troyes und Trierer Bischöfe des 5. Jahrhunderts*: Jahrbuch für westdeutsche Landesgeschichte 19 (1993) 17-41; I. Crété-Protin, *Église et vie chrétienne dans le diocèse de Troyes du IV^e au IX^e siècle*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2002.

M. Maritano

LUSITANIA

I. History - II. Spread of Christianity - III. Archaeology.

I. History. Province of Hispania created by Augustus (27 BC) in Hispania Ulterior. It enjoyed imperial rank and included three legal *conventus: Emerita* (Mérida, Badajoz), *Pax Iulia* (Beja, Baixo Alentejo) and *Scallabis* (Santarem, Ribatejo). With the reform of *Diocletian (284–297), Mérida became the capital of the *diocesis Hispaniarum,* the prestige of the province increasing as a result of this promotion and the power of aristocratic landowners intermarried with the *Theodosian dynasty, responsible for the vain attempt to defend the peninsula from German invaders (406–409). Once the barbarians had crossed the Pyrenees, the Lusitanian territories suffered widespread devastation. In the period of King Rechila (441–448), the Suevi controlled important Lusitanian centers, such as Mérida and Mértola (*Myrtilis,* Baixo Alemtejo), finally occupying even *Seville. The campaign of Theodoric II (456) and the occupation of Santarem by Sunieric (460) halted their advance. Euric then sent a powerful army to curb the Suevian occupation of Mérida, Santarem, Olisipo (Lisbon), Cauria (Coria) and Salmantica (Salamanca). Thus, far from imperial control, Lusitania remained separated into two parts, the Suevic (to the N of the Duero) and the Visigothic (to the S). Following the defeat at Vouillé (507), the *Visigoths entered Hispania in huge numbers, many settling in Lusitania. The region enjoyed a certain autonomy until two events in the reign of *Leovigild resulted in *Toledo gaining increased control: the rebellion of *Hermenegild (579–584), supported by the Lusitanian aristocracy, and the annexation of the Suevian kingdom (585). Nevertheless, Lusitania played the leading role in a number of rebellions, such as that of Witteric, a noble Lusitanian *Goth who participated in (and

betrayed) the Meridan revolt against *Recared (587), and who took the throne (603–610) after having risen against Recared's son, Liuva II; in exchange, the action against Sisenand (ca. 633) failed. After the Battle of the River Guadalete and the capture of Toledo by Gebel El Tariq (711), resistance against the Arabs in the Lusitanian cities was brief and ineffective, esp. in Mérida, which was incorporated into the Islamic dominions in 713.

II. Spread of Christianity. From the conciliar acts we know of the episcopal sees of Mérida, Elbora (Talavera de la Reina), Ossonoba (Faro), Lisbon, Abela (Ávila), Beja, Conimbriga (Coimbra), Viseum (Viseu), Egitania (Idanhaa-Velha), Lamecum (Lamego), Coria, Salamanca and Caliabria (to the E of Salamanca). We know little for certain of the process of Christianization of the province. The new religion was spread by pilgrims, soldiers and merchants, with the garrison of the Legion VII Gemina (at Mérida and along the Vía de La Plata) and the colonies of Jewish and Eastern traders (at Mérida and Lisbon) playing a certain role. The first document relating to Christian *Spain (Cypr., *Ep.* 67) attests to the existence of a bishopric at Mérida (254) and another at León-Astorga, and also speaks of the problems of the *libellatici* who *apostatized during the persecution of *Valerian (254–258). In the 4th c. the persecution of *Diocletian (303–311) brought a noteworthy martyr, *Eulalia, to Mérida, around whom grew up one of the most important martyr cults on the peninsula. At the end of the century (384), there is evidence of the presence of an Arian bishop, *Potamius of Lisbon (Marcellinus and Faustinus, *Libellus precum*). The *Priscillian heresy left its mark in Lusitania, since Priscillian pretended, fruitlessly, to the see of Mérida and subsequently obtained that of Ávila, which he himself had created. During the 5th c. the Lusitanian church faced jurisdictional problems deriving from the division of the ecclesiastical province between the Suevi and the Visigoths, and the presence of Arian bishoprics at Mérida and Viseu (which disappeared during the reign of *Recared). One of the principal figures of the epoch was *John of Bíclaro, a Catholic Goth born at Santarem and exiled by Leovigild, founder of the monastery of Bíclaro, bishop of Girona (ca. 591), and author of a *Chronicle* which inspired *Isidore of Seville.

III. Archaeology. The paleo-Christian remains of the province are complicated to understand because there is little scope for architectural contextualization, and also because it is difficult to relate them to nearby towns. Further, the chronology is very problematic, as we have to rely on architectural criteria. However, most of the churches date from between the 6th and 7th c. Most common are rectangular plans with one aisle (Milreu, Ibahernando, Vera Cruz de Marmelar, Santa Olalla and Portera) or three (Torre da Palma, Alconétar, Idanha-a-Velha, San Gião de Nazaré, San Pedro de Balsemão, El Gatillo de Arriba), whereas a Greek cross plan (Valdecebadar de Olivenza) or composite types (Santa Lucía del Trampal) are rarer. Many of these churches have a baptistery (Milreu, Alconétar, Torre da Palma, Valdecebadar, El Gatillo), in some cases contemporary with the building of the church, in others added subsequently. Opposing apses containing choir seating (Alconétar, Torre da Palma) and triple apses (Vera Cruz, Santa Lucía) are peculiar to Lusitanian religious architecture. In the 5th c., Eastern and African influences are more important (as in the cases of opposing apses), documented in the *villae* of Milreu, La Cocosa and Torre de Palma, which are churches and martyria converted into rural Christian centers and possible "patronage parishes." The sources mention the existence of monasteries such as Aquis (*Conc. Tolet.* XII [680]), which has caused some to hold that a number of these churches may have been monastic (San Gião, Santa Lucía), shown perhaps by their private areas and gates of wall height.

P. de Palol Salellas, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana* (*siglos IV al VIII*), Madrid-Valladolid 1967; J. Vives Gatell, *Inscripciones Cristianas de la España Romana y Visigoda*, Barcelona 1969; L. Caballero Zoreda - F. Arribas, *Alconétar en la vía romana de La Plata. Garrovillas* (*Cáceres*), Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España 70, Madrid 1970; H. Schlunk, *La iglesia de S. Gião cerca de Nazaré. Contribución al estudio de la influencia de la liturgia en la arquitectura de las iglesias prerromanas de la Península Ibérica*, Actas do II Congresso nacional de arqueología, Coimbra 1971, 509-582; Th. Ulbert, *Die westgotenzeitliche Kirche von Valdecebadar bei Olivenza* (*prov. Badajoz*): MM 14 (1973) 202-216; H. Schlunk - Th. Hauschild, *"Hispania antiqua." Die Denkmäler der frühchristlichen und westgotischen Zeit*, Mainz a.R. 1978; Th. Ulbert, *Früchristliche Basiliken mit Doppelapsiden auf der Iberischen Halbinsel. Studien zur Architektur- und Liturgiegeschichte*, Archäologische Forschungen 5, Berlin 1978; M. Sotomayor Muro - T. González García, *La Iglesia en la España romana y visigoda*, Historia de la Iglesia en España I, ed. R. García Villoslada, Madrid 1979; E. Cerrillo Martín de Cáceres, *La basílica de época visigoda de Ibahernando*, Cáceres 1983; S.J. Maloney, *Excavations at the Early Christian Church of Torre de Palma. Final Report*, Louisville, KY 1989; L. Caballero Zoreda et al., *La iglesia de época paleocristiana y visigoda de El Gatillo de Arriba* (*Cáceres*): Extremadura arqueológica 2 (1991) 471-492; Id., *La iglesia de época visigoda de Santa Lucía del Trampal, Alcuéscar* (*Cáceres*): Extremadura arqueológica 2 (1991) 497-523; J. Vilella Masana, *Roma, Cartago i la cristiandat hispana segons l'epístola 67 de Cebrià*: Homenatge a M. Tarradell, Barcelona 1993, 883-887; A. Fuentes Domínguez, *Extremadura en la tardía Antigüedad*: Extremadura arqueológica 4 (1995) 217-237; L.A. García Moreno, *Historia de la España visigoda*, Madrid 1989; C. Godoy Fernán-

dez, *Arqueología y liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas* (*siglos IV al VIII*), Barcelona 1995; P. Mateos Cruz, *La cristianización de la Lusitania* (*ss. IV-VII*): *Extremadura en época visigoda*: Extremadura arqueológica 4 (1995) 239-263; A.M.C.M. Jorge, *L'épiscopat de Lusitanie pendant l'Antiquité tardive* (*III-VII siècle*), Lisboa 2002; R. Teja Casuso (ed.), *La Hispania del siglo IV. Administración, economía, sociedad, cristianización*, Bari 2002.

P. Maymó i Capdevila

LUXORIUS (5th–6th c.). Latin poet and *grammaticus* (or rhetor) who lived at the end of the 5th and at the beginning of the 6th c. in *Vandal Africa in the time of King Hilderic (523–530; see *Anthol. lat.* 194, Riese) and Gelimer (496–534). His texts present difficulties of reconstruction. He seems to be a Christian (*Anthol. lat.* 340,13), even if in one poem he accuses a certain deacon of drinking too much. It appears that he held an official post of importance, because in one MS he carries the title *spectabilis,* although this may be only an honorary title. His one hundred or so epigrams included in the *Salmasian Anthology* follow different meters and are inspired by the poet Martial and also Statius. There is also a Virgilian cento (*Anthol. lat.* 18, Riese), acc. to the fashion of Late Antiquity. Eleven of these refer to the games of the circus, with their traditional divisions, and to other types of spectacle, but gladiatorial sports had by then died out. Luxurius reveals personal interest and participation in these sports; he is a witness to the continuation of these entertainments during the Vandal period. The epigrams are important in the study of aesthetics, literary linguistics and the social life of Vandal Africa at the beginning of the 6th c. Moreover, Luxurius testifies to the existence of *schools. He also writes on grammatical topics.

CPL 1517; ed. F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia latina* I, 1, Leipzig 1894, 33-221; M. Rosenblum, *Luxorius: A Latin Poet Among the Vandals* (with tr.), New York 1961; I.K. Horváth - F. Kurucz, *Luxorius költeményei latinul és magyarul*, Szeged 1963 (text with intro. and notes); ed. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina*, I: *Carmina in codicibus scripta*, Fasc. I: *Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina*, Stuttgart 1982; *The Epigrams of Luxorius*, tr. R. O'Connell, Philadelphia 1984; *Luxurius*, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1986; V. Tandoi, *Luxoriana*: RFIC 98 (1970) 37-63 (observations on the editions of M. Rosenblum and F. Kurucz - I.K. Horváth); G. Laville, *La vita del circo ed altri spunti di realtà quotidiana negli epigrammi di Lussorio*: AAP 23 (1974) 271-286; J. Veremans, *L'asclépiade mineur chez Horace, Sénèque, Terentianus Maurus, Prudence, Martianus Capella et Luxorius*: Latomus 35 (1976) 12-42; B. Löfstedt, *Bemerkungen zu Luxorius*: AClass 23 (1980) 97-105; R.W. Garson, *Observations on the Epigrams of Luxorius*: MusAfr 6 (1977/78) 9-14; S.T. Stevens, *The Circus Poems in the Latin Anthology*, in *The Circus and a Byzantine Cemetery at Carthage*, ed. J.H. Humphrey, Ann Arbor, MI 1988, I, 153-178; H. Laaksonen, *L'educazione e la trasformazione della cultura nel regno dei Vandali*: L'Africa Romana 7/1 (1990) 357-361; L. Zurli, *Esegesi e critica del testo: qualche esempio da Luxorius*: GIF 45 (1993) 29-46; M. Giovini, *La "vedova allegra" Paula e i giocatori di dadi Ultor e Vatanans nei carmi 304, 318 e 328* (*Sh. B.*) *di Lussorio*: SIFC 19, 3rd ser. (2001) 190-226.

A. Di Berardino

LYCIA and PAMPHYLIA. Lycia—a mountainous region of SW *Asia Minor—bounded to the N by Caria, to the E by Pamphylia, and to the W and S by the Mediterranean. It had as its principal cities Xanthos, Telmesso, Myra, Patara and Phaselis. The country, inhabited first by the Solymi and then by the Termilae—who came from Crete—was subsequently conquered by Lycus, son of the Athenian king Pandion. It belonged to the Persians, then to Alexander, then to the Diadochi and finally to the Rhodians (190–168 BC). It was annexed to the empire as a province under *Claudius, but kept its own customs and maintained the traditional form of confederation of cities which each year kept the *koinon* (a feast of a religious character) under the presidency of the Lyciarch. Pamphylia, in S Asia Minor, located between Lycia, *Cilicia, and Pisidia and traversed by the Taurus Mountains, had as its principal cities Attalia, Olbia, Side, Perga, Aspendos and Ptolemais. It was originally called Mopsopia, but its name is perhaps connected with the diversity of races to which it owes its colonization (from *pan* and *phylē*). Subject to the Persians, then to Alexander and to the king of *Syria, it was given by the Romans to Eumenes of Pergamon after the defeat of Antiochus the Great, and returned finally to the Romans in AD 133, to whom it had been bequeathed, along with the rest of the kingdom of Pergamon. Anthony gave up part of it, along with Lycaonia and *Galatia, to the Galatian king Amyntas: at his death, in AD 24, under Tiberius, it became a Roman province, to which Claudius later added Lycia; the union of the two territories under one governor lasted at least until the era of *Constantine (313); after that the two provinces were divided. In the *Diocletian reorganization it was included in the diocese of *Asia and the prefecture of the East, its capital Aspendos. The cities of Lycia and Pamphylia saw significant growth in Late Antiquity, with Christian constructions including churches.

The origins of Christianity in the region are very ancient; the list of bishops present at *Nicaea in 325 lists twenty-five bishops for Lycia, Pamphylia and Isauria: in proportion to the number of names given for Bithynia (11) this indicates a greater degree of Christianization of the W over the E parts of Asia Minor. The most ancient bishop of whom we know

in Lycia was in the city of Myra: one Nicander, chosen by St. Titus; for Pamphylia, it was Nestor, bishop of Side in the mid-3rd c. (Gams, *Ser. episc.*, 449-450).

D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ*, Princeton, NJ 1950, 529-530, 576-579, 663, 1386, 1533; H. Deeter, *Lykia*: PWK 13, 2270-2291; W. Ruge, Pamphylia: ibid., 18, 3, 354-407; A.D. Macro, *The Cities of Asia Minor Under the Roman Empire*: ANRW II, 7, 2, Berlin-New York 1980, 672; Dizionario Epigrafico IV (1983) 2273-2304; *Studies in the History and Topography of Lycia and Pisidia: In Memoriam A.S. Hall*, ed. D. French, London 1994; G. Fowden, *Religious Developments in Late Roman Lycia: Topographical Preliminaries*, in *Landscape and Settlements: Use and Influence of Routes*, Paris 1990, 343-372; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia*, II, Oxford 1993, 58-59; C. Foss, *The Lycian Coast in the Byzantine Age*: DOP 48 (1994) 1-52.

M. Forlin Patrucco

LYONS

I. The city - II. Origins of Christianity - III. The church of Lyons from the 4th to 6th c. - IV. Council.

The name of Lugdunum, very frequent in *Gaul, designates in the first place the city at the meeting point of the Rhone with the Saône, today called Lyons.

I. The City. Founded in 43 BC by Lucius Munatius Plancus (CIL 10, 6087; Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 46,50), it had three principal nuclei: (1) Lugdunum, on the hill of Fourvière. Established by the Romans, with its *forum vetus* and *forum novum,* basilicas, temples, theaters, aqueducts, walls and to the S of all these, the circus. (2) Condate (Gallic name which means confluence), on the S bank of the Saône, at the point where the river, to the S of the Croix-Rousse and after the section where it runs from E to W, having connected with the Rhone, heads SSW. It is in this Gallic town that in 12 BC the federal sanctuary of the Three Gauls was set up, making the city their capital; nearby, in AD 19, C. Julius Rufus, priest and head of the federation, constructed an amphitheater. The sanctuary features two winged victories set on columns on either side of the altar. An image of the sanctuary appeared on the reverse side of the Gallic coins minted at Lyons. (3) Canabae, an island situated downstream from the confluence, formed by the two arms of the Rhone. Today it is the area called Bellecour-Perrache, and the meeting point of the rivers is further downstream. At the S meeting point were the residences of the international shipping merchants, otherwise occupied with storehouses and potteries.

Beyond these three agglomerates, the residential districts of the sailors of the Saône and the Rhone stretched along the two rivers, and above Condate, an industrial zone.

Apart from the rivers, the city was also at the intersection of a number of land routes: from the E, via Bourgoin, the road from *Italy entered; from the S, via *Vienne, that from Narbonensis; from the W, via Feurs, the road from the Atlantic, which began at Saintes; from the N, via Bourg-en-Bresse, that of the Rhine; and along the Saône, that of the Seine.

The territory subject to the city corresponded to the population of the Segusiavi. Yet, as the table of Peutinger tells us, Lyons is also *caput Galliarum;* and as capital of the Three Gauls (Belgian, Celtic, Aquitanian) each year on 1 Aug received the delegates of the cities who declared their loyalty to *Rome and participated in the cult of Rome and of Augustus. Finally Lyons gave its name to a province, which was more or less equivalent to Celtic Gaul; i.e., the territory between the Loire, the Saône, the Marne, the Somme and the sea. In the 4th c. the Lyonnaise province was subdivided into Lugdunensis I with Lyons as capital, II with Rouen, III with Tours and IV with Sens. The Christian history of Lyons was to unfold in close connection with the development of its political and civic importance.

II. Origins of Christianity. The first evidence of Christianity in Lyons appears with the martyrs of 177. A letter about them is written in the name of "the servants of Christ, pilgrims in Vienne and Lyons of the Gauls, to their brothers who are in Asia and Phrygia" (Eus., *HE*, 5,1,3): these Christians made up "two churches" (ibid., 13). The letter tells us of a dozen of the martyrs along with their names; two of them deserve particular mention: Sanctus "the deacon from Vienne" (ibid. 17) and *Pothinus, "charged with the ministry [διακονία] of the episcopate" in Lyons (ibid., 29); they belong to a group of persons who have "established what is here" (ibid., 13). In brief, from the particular links that unite the two churches of Gaul with those of Asia Minor it is legitimate to deduce a relationship of historical dependence: Lyonnaise Christianity is of Asiatic origin; this is confirmed by the origin of certain members of the church, their particular religious tendencies and by the biography of *Irenaeus. This Christianity is recent, because its foundations are all still alive at the time of persecution; its organization is of an archaic type, as the expression "deaconship of the episcopate" used for Pothinus shows. It is also very probable that the communities of Lyons and of Vienne were alone in Gaul in having an embryonic hierarchical structure: this seems to be behind the mention of the παροικίαι κατὰ Γαλλίαν in

Irenaeus's intervention before *Victor I, at the time of the controversy over the celebration of Easter (Eus., *HE* 5,23,3).

The two churches present us with some specific questions. The first regards the geographical origin of the letter, if we can still take seriously the thesis acc. to which the Gauls in question are those of Asia Minor. The second deserves more serious attention: the geographical origin of the Christians of Lyon themselves. In this respect the thesis of their Asiatic origin deserves more nuance, taking account of the influences from Rome. Finally there is the problem of their *Montanism, which is connected in turn with the hierarchical organization of the primitive churches. Instead of Montanism properly so called, it is usual today, for essentially chronological reasons, to speak of pre-Montanism in a period in which prophecy was not yet considered heretical, and in which the *charisms and their hierarchical parallel had not yet been eliminated from the institutional hierarchy. The writings of Irenaeus show that a decade later in Lyons this development had taken place. One may wonder whether the shift from prophecy to heresy accomplished by Montanus was not unconnected with the general triumph of the monarchian episcopate.

The details of the outcome of the persecution are unclear: if perhaps the church of Lyons was decimated, survived and adopted a new leader in the person of Irenaeus, who found himself in Rome in 177, on a mission to *Eleutherus, and also made an appeal to Victor (see above), showing himself worthy of his name "since he prayed for the peace of the churches" (Eus., *HE* 5,24,18). He speaks little of his own church: a "barbarian language" is spoken there—i.e., different from Greek. We can be sure that he died at the beginning of the 3rd c., but we do not know in what circumstances: certain later traditions make him a martyr. We have to await the year 254 before hearing again of the church of Lyons in the person of its bishop Faustinus (Cypr., *Ep.* 68,1).

III. The Church of Lyons from the 4th to 6th c. We know in part the history of Christianity in Lyons after the peace of the church, thanks to *episcopal lists and archaeological remains.

1. Episcopal lists. The list of bishops is preserved in a number of medieval MSS deriving from a catalog of the 9th c.: Duchesne reckoned them trustworthy. Of some bishops, however, there are only the names: Verus, Julius, Ptolemy, Maximus, Tetradius, Martin, Senator. Others are known thanks to other sources: Zachary, in the *Mart. Adon.* figures as the bishop of Vienne, which is a duplication of Zachary of Lyons, unless it is the other way around; Elias, mentioned by *Gregory of Tours (*Gl. Conf.* 61), who places him "in the time of the pagans," a truly meager piece of evidence; Vocius, on the occasion of the Council of *Arles (314); Verissimus, on that of *Serdica (343); Elpidius, in the *Mart. Adon.* (2 Sep). The information on others is more extensive; we will look at several, excluding *Justus (end of the 4th c.) and *Eucherius (d. 16 Nov 449/450), who have separate entries in the *Encyclopedia*. Nicetus (d. 2 April 573) was the great-uncle of Gregory of Tours, to whom he taught the rudiments of grammar, when he was a priest, and the rules of the ecclesiastical life, when he had become a bishop. He also ordained him as a priest. These familial and personal links induced his great-nephew to write a biography of Nicetus (inserted in the *Vitae Patrum* 8) and two accounts in other places (*Hist. fr.* 4,36; *Gl. conf.* 60). These last were intended to complete the anonymous *Life,* written in ca. 590, by order of Aetherius (BHL 6088). We also learn some details from his epitaph (E. Le Blant, *Inscr. chrét. de la Gaule*, I, Paris 1856, 57-60). Yet despite all these sources, however well we know the character of the saint, we are poorly informed about his episcopal activity. It is from other documents that we know him to have been present at the Councils of *Paris (558) and Lyons (570, 572).

The last bishop of the 6th c. was Aetherius. Excluded, to the advantage of Priscus, from the immediate succession to Nicetus, he was elected at the death of the former, between 586 and 589. At this latter date he was the first signatory on a collective episcopal letter intended to end a conflict which had broken out in the monastery of the Holy Cross of *Poitiers, founded by *Radegund (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Fr.* 9,41). His name appears twice more in Gregory of Tours (ibid. 10,28; *Vitae PP.* 8,8), and once in a *Life* of St. Outrille of Bourges (BHL 839). He is the addressee of several letters of *Gregory the Great (Jaffé 1436, 1747, 1830, 1872). It is him, not an Aetherius bishop of Arles (who in fact never existed), who ordained *Augustine of Canterbury bishop (Bede, *HE* I,27). The anonymous *Life* of St. Nicetus was written at his request (BHL 6088); he died in 602 (Fredeg., *Chron.* 22: PL 71, 618).

2. Archaeological remains. No trace has been left of the buildings used for Christian worship prior to the peace of the church, and those that remain posterior to it have not been easy to interpret.

A. Necropolises. The fact that the inscription of *Euteknios*, found at St. Just in 1974, is not clearly Christian but neither with any certainty pagan (which is a shame, because it is apparently of an early

date, 3rd c.), correlates with other pre-Constantinian inscriptions of Lyons, none of which contain unequivocally Christian elements. For the same reason the Christianization of the necropolises may be fixed in the 4th c. In the 5th c. the first dated Christian inscriptions appear.

B. The episcopal complex. The texts report the *Ecclesia Lugdunensis,* the work of *Patiens. Sidonius Apollinaris describes its building and dedication; for its inauguration *Faustus of Riez delivered a sermon, which is difficult to identify (CSEL 21, 232-238?). In the 8th c. the episcopal complex included a number of different buildings: (1) The Church of St. Stephen (BHL 1418), the roof of which was repaired by Leidrad (MGH, *Ep. car. aev.* 2,542-543): it was to here, between 806 and 837, that the relics of Speratus, *Cyprian and *Pantaleon were transferred (*Mart. Flor.* 17.7); (2) The Church of the Holy Cross, the foundation of which MS 925 at the University of Bologna attributes to Arigius (M.-C. Guigue, *Obit. Egl. prim. Lyon*, Lyon 1902, 111); (3) The *domus ecclesiae,* enlarged and elevated in height by Nicetus at the beginning of his episcopate for himself and his clergy (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Fr.* 4,36), and restored by Leidrad (op. cit.)

C. Other churches. In addition to the episcopal complex, it will suffice to list the twenty or so churches which are found in the texts. (1) St. Eulalia, afterward St. George, with a female monastery; (2) St. Paul, founded by Sacerdos, perhaps in the 6th c. (3) Church of the Holy Maccabees, afterward St. Just: Sid. Apoll., *Ep.* 5,17; *Mart. hier.* 14.7, 4.8; 14.8, 2.9; 14.10, 21.10. The tombs of Just, Albinus, Patiens, Antiochus and Elpidius were excavated in 1971. (4) St. John, afterward St. Irenaeus, attributed to Patiens. (5) Ainay, Basilica of the Holy Apostles, place of the burning of the martyrs of 177. (6) St. Laurence of Choulans, excavated. (7) St. Nicetus (see the details on the bishop above). (8) St. Michael, founded by Queen Caretena (d. 506). (9) St. Maria (Greg. Tours, *Gl. conf.* 64). (10) S. Elias (ibid., 61). (11) Island of Barbe, upstream from Lyons (*Vit. PP. Jur.*, etc.). (12) St. Peter (BHL 837). (13) Hospital (Council of Orléans, 549). (14) Monastery (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Fr.* 10,8). (15) Tomb of a matron (Greg. Tours, *Gl. conf.* 63). (16) Church of the Apostles (*Mart. Adon.*). (17) *Monasterium novum*. (18) Hospital of St. Romanus. (19) Hospital of St. Genesius. (20) St. Vincent.

PWK 13, 1718-1723; DACL 10, 1-402; LTK^2 6, 1250; Cath 8, 50-56; *Les Martyrs de Lyon (177)*, ed. J. Rougé - R. Turcan, Paris 1978; *La topographie chrétienne de la Gaule*, Paris 1980, 33-57; *Le diocèse de Lyon*, ed. J. Gadille, Paris 1983; A. Audin, *Gens de Lugdunum*, Brussels 1986; *Province ecclésiastique de Lyon (Lugdunensis Prima)*, ed. P.-A. Février et al., Paris 1986; *Lyon dans les textes grecs et latins: la géographie et l'histoire de Lugdunum de la fondation de la colonie (43 avant J.-C.) à l'occupation burgonde (460 après J.-C.)*, ed. J.-C. Decourt - G. Lucas, Paris 1993; J.F. Reynaud, *Lugdunum christianum: Lyon du IV^e au VIII^e s.: topographie, necropolis et édifices religieux*, Paris 1998.

V. Saxer

IV. Council. A new council was held in Lyons 470–475, under the presidency of the bishop, *Patiens, to combat new errors which had arisen since the Council of Arles of 470.

CCL 148, 161; Griffe II, 231; Palazzini 2, 282-283.

Ch. Munier

M

MACARIUS (4th–5th c.). Friend of Rufinus. *Rufinus of Aquileia, returning to *Rome in 397, translated, on the request of one Macarius, whom he called *vir desideriorum*, *Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen*, *Origen's *De principiis*, and wrote his own work, *On the Falsification of the Books of Origen*. Macarius was an aristocrat and a cultured Roman Christian. According to *Gennadius, Macarius had himself written a book *Adversus mathematicos* (*De viris ill.* 26), now lost. Rufinus, moreover, states that Macarius was interested in astrology. He perhaps may be identified with Macarius, friend of *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 49; cf. Aug., *Ep.* 259,1), whom *Palladius mentions in connection with *Pinianus (*Historia Lausiaca* 62).

PCBE 2, 1346-1347; P. Lardet, *Saint Jérôme contre Rufin*, SC 303, Paris 1983, 41*ff.; M. Simonetti, *L'attività letteraria di Rufino negli anni della controversia origeniana*, in *Storia ed esegesi in Rufino di Concordia*, Udine 1992, 89-107; R. Armacker - E. Junod, *Pamphile, Eusèbe de Césarée, Apologie pour Origène*, SC 465, Paris 2002, 14-18.

A. Di Berardino

MACARIUS (Simeon) (active 385–430, in the region of *Antioch). For a long time a certain voluminous and poorly edited spiritual work was attributed to *Macarius of Egypt, circulating in part under the name of Macarius (the Blessed), but in fact practically anonymous. On account of the fact that in some cases it bears the name of *Simeon (sometimes "the Stylite"), Dörries has proposed to identify him with Simeon of Mesopotamia, one of the exponents of *Messalianism condemned at Antioch in about 400. This work, in any case, contains the greater part of the propositions of Messalianism condemned in 426 and 431, as well as explaining and justifying them. Perhaps the name of Macarius of Egypt was introduced to avoid the accusation of the Messalian heresy; perhaps the author's true name was Simeon. The work, of great evocative power, but not artistically edited, has come down to us only with difficulty through recensions undertaken in about the 11th c. by *hesychast monks (CPG 2410-2427; PG 34); establishing the authentic text is not easy. The editions in circulation do not go beyond the medieval redactions, and we await from the synthesis of these a reconstruction of the original. There are three collections: H. Berthold, *Makarios/Symeon. Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung* I, Berlin 1973 (2 vols.); H. Dörries - E. Klostermann - W. Kroeger, *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarius*, Berlin 1962 (this is the second type, the most widespread and best known, an anthology); E. Klostermann - H. Berthold, *Neue Homilien des Makarios/Symeon. I. Aus Typus III*, Berlin 1961. Some texts appear beneath the name of Ephrem. Some minor compositions also exist, which in part still await publication. Since some of these texts are unpublished, and, moreover, the most important MSS were discovered only recently, critical analysis and interpretation of the whole may bring happy surprises. Simeon takes his inspiration from the experiences and terminology of *Eustathius of Sebaste and from the response of *Basil of Caesarea, which he accepts, but not without reservation. His relations with *Gregory of Nyssa are also friendly and fruitful, but Simeon is less intellectual, his spirituality more experiential. Toward *John Chrysostom and the Antiochenes one notes a greater coldness. We are far from Egyptian monasticism, both in vocabulary and approach. *Alexander the *Acoemete is more representative of the Macarian movement, while showing himself more active on the plane of social demands.

Various works of Macarius (Simeon) have been mixed up with the MS tradition of a number of saints, in particular Basil, Isaiah and Mark. The spiritual homilies have had a strong influence on *hesychasm, on Arabic and Slavic spirituality, and, in the West, on Protestant pietism and Methodism. They lead not only to a living experience of prayer but also to an evangelical poverty, to the renuncia-

tion of worldly cares, to gentleness, to humility. The interior battle is observed with a penetration that psychology cannot but admire. At a literary level, too, these documents, in style both popular and spontaneous, reveal an aspect of Eastern Christianity and of its interior experience that the formal traditionalism of Byzantine culture frequently hides from us. The late publication of these documents invites us to attentive study committed to learn their relation to their cultural and religious counterparts.

CPG 2410-2427; DSp 10, 27-43; TRE 21, 730-735; E.A. Davids, *Das Bild vom neuen Menschen*, Salzburg 1968; H. Dörries, *Die Theologie des Makarios/Symeon*, Göttingen 1978; V. Desprez, Ps. Macaire. *Œuvres Spirituelles* I, SC 275, Paris 1980; W. Strothmann, *Schriften des Makarios/Symeon unter dem Namen Ephraem*, Wiesbaden 1981; Id., *Die syrische-Überlieferung der Schriften des Makarios*, 2 vols., Wiesbaden 1981; Id., *Textkritische Anmerkungen zu den Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios-Symeon*, Wiesbaden 1981; H. Berthold, *Die Ursprünglichkeit literarischer Einheiten im Corpus Macarianum*, in *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, ed. F. Paschke, Berlin 1981, 61-76; G.A. Nuna, *P'sevdomakaris t'hzulebat'a k'art'uli versia*, Tblisi 1982; *Makarios-Symposion über das Böse. Vorträge der Finnisch-deutschen Theologentagung in Goslar 1980*, ed. W. Strothmann, Wiesbaden 1983; R. Staats, *Makarios-Symeon, Epistola Magna. Eine essalianische Mönchsregel und ihre Umschrift in Gregors von Nyssa De instituto christiano*, Göttingen 1984; C. Stewart, *"Working the Earth of the Heart": The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431*, Oxford 1991; F. Fitschen, *Messalianismus und Antimessalianismus*, Göttingen 1998; S. Burns, *Divine Ecstasy in Gregory of Nyssa and Pseudo-Macarius: Flight and Intoxication*: Greek Orthodox Theological Review 44 (1999) 309-327; LACL 467-468.

J. Gribomont

MACARIUS I of Jerusalem (bishop 314–333). One of the most tenacious adversaries of *Arius at the Council of *Nicaea. In 326 the emperor *Constantine I wrote him a letter in connection with the construction of a basilica of the Holy Sepuchre, indicating that the church should be greater than all others, asking him to indicate the number of workers, the type of material and the sum of money necessary (Eus., *Vita Const.* 3.31-32). According to the legend, dating from the 2nd half of the 4th c., Macarius helped *Helena to identify the true cross (Rufinus, *HE* 10).

DCB 3, 765; EC 7, 1740; LTK³ 6, 1220; BS 8, 421-425; S. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross Was Found: From Event to Medieval Legend*, Stockholm 1991; J.W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding of the True Cross*, Leiden 1992, passim.

S.J. Voicu

MACARIUS II of Gerapolis. Bishop of Gerapolis from 563 to 575, and the author of a letter addressed to an Armenian Catholic (*Ep. ad Vertanem catholicum Armeniae*).

CPG 7020; V. Hakobian, *Kanonagirk' Hayoc'* II, Erevan 1971, 216-229.

P. Marone

MACARIUS of Alexandria (d. 394/400). To reconstruct the life of Macarius of *Alexandria, we need to recall that the tradition about him and *Macarius of Egypt has been confused because of the great fame they both enjoyed—based on the numerous miracles recounted by the sources—the fact that they bear the same name, lived at the same time and in nearby places, and moreover that they knew each other. This may be seen in the Latin version of the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* (ch. 29) and in the Greek version (ch. 23). At least five sayings refer to Macarius of Alexandria (PG 45, 71-442), and in one of these both of them are referred to. *Sozomen (HE III, 14) calls Macarius the "Citizen," recounting that, like Macarius of Egypt, he lived in his hermitage up to his ninetieth year, having spent seventy years of his life there.

G. Bunge, *Évagre le Pontique et les deux Macaire*: Irénikon 56 (1983) 215-227; 323-360; Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1489-1490; LTK³ 6, 1219; LACL 468.

F. Aleo

MACARIUS of Antioch (bishop after 649 until 681). He never succeeded in taking possession of the Antiochene see owing to the presence of Arab invaders. He died in *Rome in 685. Head of the *monothelite party at the Third Council of *Constantinople (680), the *Acts* of which pass down to us his extensive *Profession of Faith* and the texts of some of his speeches. His sources are *Gregory Thaumaturgus (from the life by *Gregory of Nyssa) and the symbol of 381.

CPG 7625; ACO II, 2, 1, 218-230 and 506-507; Mansi 11, 349-360; J. Rissberger, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis des Patriarchen Makarius von Antiochien des Hauptes der Monotheleten auf den sechsten allgemeinen Konzil*, Offenbach 1940; Patrologia V, 228-229; LACL 468.

S.J. Voicu

MACARIUS of Egypt (d. 386/390). The name of Macarius, "the Blessed," was common among the monks of the 4th c. In one collection of sayings (PG 45, 71-442), at least thirty-nine refer to Macarius of

Egypt, also called the Great. According to *Socrates Scholasticus (*HE* IV, 23), Macarius of Egypt was born shortly before 300 in Upper Egypt and was austere (ἀυστηρός). According to * Palladius of Helenopolis (*Hist. Laus.* 17), he left home at the age of thirty and, taking refuge in the hermitage of Scete, remained there until his ninetieth year, prematurely (παιδαριογέροντα) surpassing the other monks in virtue and wisdom.

A document in the Coptic language, containing *The Virtues* of Macarius and a *Life of Macarius, the Father of the Monks of Scete*, attributed to *Serapion of Thmuis, underlines the intimate relationship that united Macarius of Egypt to *Anthony, an assertion that, even if it is of doubtful accuracy, should be kept in mind when assessing the monasticism of Scete. We learn from this source interesting information about Macarius's youth, the village where he passed his childhood, Tchitchber, in the Nile Valley, not far from Wadi-Natrun, i.e., Scete. It is related how the young Macarius was a camel-driver who smuggled salt, gaining him the epithet "Macarius the Camel-Driver." The *Life* also recounts another anecdote which became famous, and which entered into the *Synaxarion*: that of the girl who attributes her pregnancy to Macarius, who is therefore expelled by the inhabitants of the village, near which he then lives as a hermit.

According to *Sozomen (*HE* III, 14), he was ordained priest for the monks of Scete, at the age of forty. From *Rufinus of Aquileia, we learn about a persecution of the desert monks, instigated by the Arian bishop of Alexandria *Lucius, after the death of *Athanasius, in the forty-sixth year of his priesthood, therefore 373. In these circumstances, acc. to Socrates (*HE* IV, 24) and Sozomen (*HE* VI, 24), Macarius took refuge in the region called Bucoli or Elearchia, in the N of the delta. Rufinus, passing through the monasteries of *Nitria and Scete in 374, on his journey toward Palestine, assures us that he met personally both Macarius of Egypt and *Macarius of Alexandria (*HE* II, 4). In the Latin version of *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* attributed to Rufinus (ch. 28)—an account of a journey undertaken in Egypt in the winter of 394–395—the Egyptian, called "Macarius, the disciple of Anthony," is presented as inaugurating monastic life at Scete, in Upper Egypt. *Evagrius of Pontus (*Cap. Prac. ad Anat.* 93-94) also tells us that, before 399, the year of his death, he met Macarius of Egypt in the hermitage of Scete. Evagrius has preserved about ten sayings, some of which Macarius appears in. Palladius, however, never met Macarius, because the monk had died one year before Palladius arrived in the desert. Landing at Alexandria in 387, after spending a year in the desert and three in Alexandria, he arrived at the hermitage of Kellia in 391. The death of Macarius would fit therefore in 390 or 386.

Modern philology at the start of the nineteenth century has cast doubt on the attribution to the monk of Scete some writings placed under his name, such as the *Homiliae Spirituales* and the *Epistula Magna*. The most important objection to his authorship derives from the particular ascetic doctrine of those works. The central doctrine of these writings placed under his name is a mystical union of the devout with the Holy Spirit, a theme not found in the sayings. Moreover, the very precise references in these writings to *Stoic and peripatetic thought are also absent from the sayings.

Palladius and Rufinus do not record any writings of Macarius, nor do they make mention of any philosophical works by him. The same may be said of *John Cassian, Socrates, Sozomen and for the authors who would seem best qualified to do so, such as *Jerome and Evagrius, and the Cappadocian fathers, who seem to be unaware of the existence of the *homiliae* and *epistulae* attributed to Macarius. Only *Gennadius of Marseille (*De Scr. Eccl.* X) mentions an *Epistula ad Filios Dei*; its attribution to Macarius, however, is not certain. It seems, however, that it can be traced to the monastic context of Scete.

In the sources Macarius of Egypt is confused with *Macarius of Alexandria, because they bear the same name and lived at the same period and in nearby places. Socrates (*HE* IV, 23) informs us that Macarius of Alexandria, unlike Macarius of Egypt, was of a friendly disposition, and talked amiably with young aspirants to the ascetic life. They both suffered under the persecution of Bishop Lucius and took refuge in the N of the delta. Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 18) says that he met Macarius of Alexandria in his hermitage at Kellia, where, in Upper Egypt, in the desert of Nitria, 40 km from Scete, he lived for nine years, showing that he knew him well, and letting it be understood that he lived with Macarius until the latter's death, which took place three years after Palladius arrived, therefore 394 or 400. Evagrius of Pontus also knew him personally from Kellia, and at least one saying from his collection (*Cap. Prac. Ad Anat.* 98) seems to refer to Macarius of Alexandria.

J. Stiglmayr, *Makarius der Ägypter auf der Pfaden der Stoa*: ThQ 92 (1910) 88-262; C. Flemming, *De Macariis Scriptis Aegyptii Quaestiones*, Göttingen 1911; D.A. Wilmart, *La Lettre spirituelle de l'abbé Macaire*: RAM 22 (1920) 361-377; L. Villecourt, *La date et l'origine des "Homelies Spirituelles" attribuées à Macaire*: CRAI (1920) 250-258; Id., *La Grande Lettre Grecque de Macaire,*

ses Formes textuelles et son Milieu littéraire: ROC 22 (1921) 29-56; E. Amélineau, *Histoire des Monastères de la Basse Égypte*, Annales du Musée Guimet 25, Paris 1925, *Introduction*, XXXIII; 47-118; 119-208; E. Amann, *Macaire d'Égypte*: DTC 9, 2, Paris 1927, 1454-1455; H. Dörries, *Symeon von Mesopotamien. Die Überlieferung der Messalianischen "Makarios" Schriften*, (TU 55/1,1), Leipzig 1941; E. Peterson, *Macario il Grande*: EC 7 (1951) 1740-1741; A. Guillaumont, *Le problème des deux Macaires dans les Apophthegmata Patrum*: Irénikon 48 (1975) 40-59; V. Desprez, *Le Ps.-Macaire*: SA 70 (1977); A. Guillaumont, *Macaire d'Alexandrie ou le Citadin*: DS 10 (1979) 4-5; Id., *Macaire d'Égypte ou le Grand*, DS 10 (1979) 11-13; Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1491-1492; U. Zanetti, *Le Testament spirituel de saint Macaire*: Irénikon 74 (2001) 179-201; T. Vivian, *Saint Macarius the Spiritbearer: Coptic Texts Relating to Saint Macarius the Great*, Crestwood, NY 2004.

F. Aleo

MACARIUS of Jerusalem (bishop 552 and 563/564–574/575). His first election was not confirmed by *Justinian, who, suspecting him of *Origenism, gave preference to Eustochius. At the deposition of Eustochius, he reoccupied the see of *Jerusalem after having anathematized *Origen, *Evagrius of Pontus and *Didymus.

DCB 3, 765; DTC 11, 1759; L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche,* Brescia 1980.

S.J. Voicu

MACARIUS of Magnesia (around 400). Probably the homonymous accuser of Heraclius of Ephesus at the Synod of the *Oak (Constantinople, 403; see Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 59). Author of the *Apocriticus*, an imaginary diatribe lasting five days between a pagan and a Christian, which text, full of lacunae, is a response to a source which has thematic echoes of the *Contra Christianos* of *Porphyry of Tyre; in the responses of the Christian one glimpses, apart from an anti-Jewish polemic, criticism of the literalism of the *Antiochene school and a defense of *allegorical interpretation, articulated around the concept of *oikonomia*; the *Christology points to a date toward the end of the 4th c. Of his commentary on Genesis (consisting of at least 17 homilies?) there remains only a fragment.

CPG 6115-6118; DSp 10, 13-17 (cf. PG 10, 1343-1406); R. Goulet, *Macarios de Magnésie, Le monogénès. Introduction générale, édition critique, traduction française et commentaire.* I-II (Textes et traditions 7), Paris 2003; F. Corsaro, *Le Quaestiones nell'Apocritico di Macario di Magnesia*, Catania 1968; C.J. Larrain, *Macarius Magne* Ἀποκριτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας. *Ein bislang unbeachtetes Exzerpt*: Traditio 57 (2002) 85-127; M. Featherstone, *Opening Scenes of the Second Iconoclasm: Nicephorus's Critique of the Citations from Macarius Magnes*: REB 60 (2002) 65-111; G. Schalkhausser, *Zu den Schriften des Makarios von Magnesia*, TU 31,4, Leipzig 1907; R. Waelkens, *L'économie, thème apologétique et principe herméneutique dans l'Apocriticos de Macarios Magnès*, Louvain 1974; V. Ugenti, *Noterella sul significato di* μαθητεία *in Macario di Magnesia*: Rudiae 12 (2000) 203-208; V. Ugenti, *Spigolature patristiche (Girolamo e Tertulliano, Macario di Magnesia)*: Orpheus n.s. 22 (2001) 259-266; E.D. Digeser, *Porphyry, Julian, or Hierokles? The Anonymous Hellene in Makarios Magnēs' Apokritikos*: JTS 53 (2002) 466-502 [who believes the pagan is Heraclius]; LACL 468-469.

S.J. Voicu

MACARIUS of Tkow (d. 452). Monk and bishop of Tkow (town of Upper Egypt), who acc. to the Coptic tradition was a follower of *Dioscorus at *Chalcedon, lending him support in the fight against his adversaries. Having returned to Egypt after the end of the council, and taking refuge in Canopus, he did not wish to submit to Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum* and was killed by order of an imperial functionary. A homily *In Honour of Michael the Archangel* in Coptic is attributed to him (ed. Lafontaine) which, apart from the customary praise of the angel, contains a long invective against women.

Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1492-1494; D.W. Johnson, *A Panegyric on Macarius Bishop of Tkow*, *CSCO* 415-416, Louvain 1980; G. Lafontaine: Muséon 92 (1979) 301-320.

T. Orlandi

MACEDONIA. At the time of the administrative reform of *Diocletian and *Constantine I, the province of Macedonia extended between *Epirus and *Thrace: from the first it was separated, to the W, by the Pindus mountain range, and Mount Grammos, and then by a line that passed to the E of the Lake of Lychnis (*Achris*), not far from the city of the same name; the boundary with Thrace to the E was the Nestos River, which runs from the Rhodope Mountains into the Aegean. To the N it was bounded by Dardania, Praevaliana and Dacia Mediterranea; the boundary follows an ideal line which, running NE until S of Skopje and then SE, connects the Vestiskos, Skardos, Orbelos, Rhodope and Emos Mountains. To the S it bordered the sea and the mouth of the river Pineios (near Tempe), following a curved line that, extending to the W of Olympus and to the S of the Haliacmon River, arrived at the Pindus (Papazoglou, *Quelques aspects*, 328-338; Theocharidis 44). The Macedonian territory was crossed, from Epirus to Thrace, by the Via Egnatia, which passed through the cities of *Nicaea, Cellae, *Edessa, *Pella, *Thessalonica, *Apollonia, Amphipolis, *Philippi, Neapolis and Akoutisma. When, however, *Constantinople became the capital of the empire, this great

Roman artery lost some of its importance (Lemerle, *Philippes*, 71-72; *Invasions*, 274-276).

Macedonia proper, as defined above, constituted a province of the diocese of the same name that at the beginning of the 4th c. included the provinces of Macedonia, *Thessaly, *Achaia, the two Epiri, Praevalitana and *Crete (Rufo Festo, *Breviar.* VIII; cf. Lemerle, *Philippes*, 77; Theocharidis 46). In the last quarter of the 4th c. the diocese of Macedonia included the following provinces: Achaia, Macedonia Prima, Crete, Thessaly, Old Epirus, New Epirus and part of Macedonia Salutaris, and was subject to a vicar (*Notit. Dignit.* I, 34 and III, 7; Seeck 2 and 9; cf. Lemerle, *loc. cit.* and *Invasions* 265-271; Theocharidis 91-95; Pallas, *L'illyricum*, 62-63). Macedonia Salutaris was suppressed before 412 (Papazoglou, *La Macédoine Salutaire*; Theocharidis 91-95). In the *Synekdemos* of Hierocles (527-528) mention is made of Macedonia Secunda. To Macedonia Prima belonged the city of Thessalonica (the capital), Pella, Europo (today Bozatzi, on the right bank of the Axios in the province of Imathia), Dion, Berea, Larissa (not that of Thessaly), Heraclea Lyngou (which Honigmann identifies with Florina), Nicaea (near modern Velusino, Macedonia), Heraclea Strymonos (today Zervochori), Serrai, Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia (Arnea, near Chalkidiki), Neapolis (Kavalla), and the islands Thasos and Samothrace (Hierocles, *Synekd.* 638, 1a-641,9; Honigmann 14-15). Remaining outside were the ancient Macedonian cities of Caesarea (ancient Aiane) and Diocletianopolis (ancient Argos Orestikòn, today Chroupista), belonging now to Thessaly (Theocharidis 94). To Macedonia Secunda belonged the cities of *Stobi (the capital), Argos (present-day Stari Grad?), Pelagonia (Heraclea Lyncestis) (Hierocles, *Synekd.* 641,1-641,9; Honigmann 15-16), all in modern Macedonian territory; also remaining outside was the territory of old Astivos (present-day Bragalnitsa), to the NE of Stobi, included in Dacia Mediterranea (Theocharidis 95). Macedonia Secunda, created between 479 and 482, was suppressed between 535 and 545 and her cities passed again to Macedonia Prima.

The diocese of Macedonia constituted part of the administrative district of Illyricum, which, with its center at *Sirmium, in *Pannonia II, belonged to the *Praefectura praetorio Italiae*. With the bipartition of Illyricum (395 or 396), Macedonia was added to Eastern Illyricum (*Praefectura praetorio per Illyricum*), which, separated from the West, was annexed to the empire of the East. The use of Greek prevailed, contrastingly with Western Illyricum, where the ordinary language was Latin. In the Macedonian region a marked Latin presence was to be found at Stobi and Philippi (Theocharidis 32). The administrative center of Eastern Illyricum was Thessalonica. When Pannonia II was annexed to Eastern Illyricum (427 or 437), the administrative center was transferred from Thessalonica to Sirmium until its destruction by the Huns (441 or 442), when Thessalonica reacquired the role of capital. In about 535, the center of Eastern Illyricum was transferred to Justiniana Prima, but it is not certain if this transfer was ever implemented (Lemerle, *Philippes*, 76-83; Theocharidis 43-59, 72 and 95-103). The diocese of Macedonia as an administrative district lasted until the end of the 8th c. or the beginning of the 9th (Lemerle, *Invasions*, 265-271; Theocharidis 220-231). For a long time Macedonia was devastated by barbarian invasions, from the end of the 4th c. with the invasion of the *Goths (379, 380, 388); there were other invasions a century later, when Stobi was destroyed (479), and subsequently until 482. In the years 454, 493, 499 and particularly in 517 Macedonia was invaded by Hun tribes, to be followed, in the following century (540 and 558-559), by the Slavs (Lemerle, *Invasions*, 277-287; Theocharidis 86-88 and 125-158). From the end of the 6th c. there succeeded a series of Avaro-Slav invasions (578, 597, 600-603, 616, 618 and around 630) which concluded with the settling of the Slavs in the territory of Macedonia (Popoviç, *Les témoins* e *La descente*; Lemerle, *Philippes*, 113-118; *Invasions*, 287-308, *Les plus anciens recueils*, 174-189; Theocharidis 140-158 and 179-189).

Christianity was introduced into Macedonia by the apostle Paul who, coming from Asia Minor, landed at Neapolis (Act 16:9-11); from there he passed to Philippi (Act 16:20-40), Amphipolis, Apollonia (Act 17:1), Thessalonica (Act 17:1-10) and Berea (Act 17:10-14). Soon the Christian faith began to spread among the other cities of Macedonia (1 Th 4:10; cf. Harnack 624). *Ignatius of Antioch is said to have passed through Neapolis, Philippi and other Macedonian cities, being led as a prisoner to *Rome (*Martyr. S. Ign.*: PG 5, 984). In the 2nd decade of the 4th c., Christianity grew surprisingly in Macedonia (Arnobius, *Adv. gent.* II, 12; PL 5, 828; cf. Harnack 539 and 951-952), acquiring political weight, which Constantine the Great seems to have taken account of in his rise to power (Theocharidis 82-86). The Christian community in *Edessa is ancient, where it seems that the Pauline preaching on the resurrection was developed with particular fervor (Pallas, *Investigations*, 5). Especially at Thessalonica, the martyr St. *Demetrius (for the hagiographical questions relating to him: Theocharidis 59-82; *see* also *Thessalonica) was held in fervent veneration. Apart from the saints martyred at Thessalonica, one learns

of Mucius, priest of Amphipolis, who was brought to Constantinople, where he suffered martyrdom (Delehaye 163-175 and 225-232; Harnack 791). Under *Licinius 40 virgins suffered martyrdom with the deacon Ammon, at Beroia, near Berea (Delehaye 194-207; Harnack 788; Theocharidis 39); very probably, however, the place in question is the homonymous city of Thrace (Delehaye 207-209), otherwise called the "city of Trajan" or Augusta Traiana or Irenopolis (today Stara Zagora in Bulgaria). The Macedonian church was organized with its center at Thessalonica because of the importance the city had assumed during the imperial administration, its bishop being head of all the bishops of Eastern Illyricum. It was placed under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Rome, and the metropolitan of Thessalonica functioned as the pope's vicar, esp. from *Innocent I (412) onward (Max Herz. z. Sachsen 60-61 and 90-92; Grumel; Theocharidis 103-125 with recent bibl.). Eastern Illyricum, and with that Macedonia, was removed from the jurisdiction of Rome and annexed to the patriarchate of Constantinople in the year 732 or 733 (Theocharidis 232-235; Pallas, *L'Illyricum*, 70-73; on the Macedonian church and on its organization: Konidaris, Ἐκκλησ. ἱστορ. I, 506-509; on its bishops, on the basis of the acts of the councils and of *Par. Gr. Cod.* 1555A: Ἐκκλησ. ἱστορ. I, 509-510; Id., Αἱ μητροπόλεις, 41-42 and 94 and *Die neue*, 258).

Surviving paleo-Christian remains or those recently discovered in the cities of Macedonia Prima mentioned by Hierocles can be found at *Thessalonica; at Dion, a basilica from the 1st half of the 5th c. reconstructed in the 2nd half of the 6th c. (Pallas, *Monuments*, 77-80); at Berea (Pallas 80-81) and nearby (Pallas 81); at Edessa, three basilicas to the S of the city (Pallas 82-88); at Serrai and its hinterland (Pallas 90); at *Philippi; at Amphipolis four basilicas (Pallas 90-106) and another church, following a centralized plan, circular on the outside, hexagonal on the inside (on the city: Papazoglou, *Eion*); on the island of Thasos, a basilica following a Greek cross plan (Lemerle, *À propos*; Hoddinott, *Early*, 106-108) and other simple basilicas (Pallas 121-125; Hoddinott 181-183), and on the island of Samothrace. Monuments in places where the identification with cities mentioned by Hierocles is uncertain: Eleutheropolis, near Philippi; Podochorion; Prosotsani; Alora (or Aralo, Pallas 87); Boskochorion near Kozani: a basilica with three aisles (Hoddinott, *Early*, 183-184); Akrini near Kozani: a *martyrion* with three apses (Pallas 88-89; Grabar); Nikiti in Chalkidiki: three basilicas (the third is noteworthy). Among the cities of Macedonia Secunda: at *Stobi, at Palikura near Stobi (Hoddinott, Early, 185-186); at Bargala (Aleksova-Mango, Aleksova); at Pelagonia, the old *Heraclea Lyncestis*, various basilicas at Sudovol (Hoddinott, *Early*, 202-204) and Ramenska Tumba (Cambi), all in modern Macedonia. In Bulgarian Macedonia: a basilica at Sandanski (Hoddinott, Bulgaria, 183-185 and 287-290). The paleo-Christian buildings of Macedonia, esp. those far from the great cities, are for the most part ornate, with mosaic floors (G. Cvetković-Tomašević; Kolarik, passim).

H. Delehaye, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie*: AB 31 (1912) 161-300; M. Herz. z. Sachsen, *Das christliche Hellas*, Leipzig 1918; A. Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig [4]1924; G.I. Konidaris, Αἱ μητρόπολεις καὶ αἱ ἀκχιεπισκοπαὶ τοῦ Οἰκουμενικου Πατριαρχείου καὶ ἡ τάξις αὐτῶν, I, Athens 1934; P. Lemerle, *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale*, Paris 1945; E. Kitzinger, *A Survey of the Early Christian Town of Stobi*: DOP 3 (1946) 81-162; P. Lemerle, *À propos d'une basilique de Thassos et de Saint-Jean d'Éphèse*: Byzantion 23 (1953) 531-543; F. Papazoglou, *Eion-Amphipolis-Chrysopolis*: Zborn. Rad. Viz. Inst. 2 (1953) 7-22; G.I. Konidaris, Ἐκκλισιαστική Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλλάδος, I, Athens 1954; P. Lemerle, *Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans depuis la fin de l'époque romaine jusqu'au VIII[e] siècle:* Rev. Hist. 211 (1954) 265-308; F. Papazoglou, *La Macédoine Salutaire et la Macédoine Seconde*: BAB 52 (1956) 115-124; R.E. Hoddinott, *Early Byzantine Churches in Macedonia and Southern Serbia*, London 1963; V. Grumel, *Les origines du Vicariat apostolique de Thessalonique d'après les premiers documents pontificaux*, Actes XII Congr. Int. Ét. Byz. (1961) II, Beograd 1964, 451-461; B. Aleksova - C. Mango, Bargala: A Preliminary Report: DOP 25 (1971) 265-281; R.F. Hoddinott, *Bulgaria in Antiquity*, London-Tonbridge 1975; D.I. Pallas, *Investigations sur les monuments chrétiens de Grèce avant Constantin*: CArch 24 (1975) 1-19; Vl. Popoviç, *Les témoins archéologiques des invasions avaro-slaves dans l'Illyricum byzantin*; MEFR Ant. 87 (1975) 445-504; B. Aleksova, *Ranohristijanskata bazilika vo Bargala*: Zborn. Arch. Muz. 6-7 (1967-74) Skopje 1975, 21-35; J. Wiseman - Dj. Mano-Zissi, *Stobi: A City of Ancient Macedonia*: Journ. Field Archaeol. 3 (1976) 269-302; D.I. Pallas, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1959 à 1973*, Vatican City 1977; N. Cambi, *Unpublished Excavations and Finds of Early Christian Period in Yugoslavia*, Atti IX Congr. Int. Arch. Crist. (1975), II, Vatican City 1978, 141-156; A. Grabar, *Une forme essentielle du culte des reliques et ses reflets dans l'iconographie paléochrétienne*, JS 1978, 165-174; Vlad. Popoviç, *La descente des Koutrigoures, des Slaves et des Avares vers la mer Égée: Le témoignage de l'archéologie*, CRAI 1978, 596-648; Fan. Papazoglou, *Quelques aspects de l'histoire de la province de Macédoine*, in ANRW II, 7, 1 Berlin-New York 1979, 302-369; G. Cvetković-Tomašević, *Mosaïques paléobyzantines de pavements dans l'Illyricum oriental: Iconographie, symbolique, origines*: Rapports présentés au X[e] Congr. Int. d'Archéol. Chrét., Thessaloniki 1980, 283-347; R.E. Kolarik, *The Floor Mosaics of Eastern Illyricum*, in Rapports présentés au X[e] Congr. Int. d'Archéol. Chrét., 173-203; D.I. Pallas, *L'Illyricum oriental: Aperçu historique*: Θεολογία 51 (1980) 62-76; G.I. Theocharidis, Ἱστορία τῆς Μακεδονίας κατὰ τοὺς μέσους χρόνους (285-1354), Thessaloniki 1980; P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils de miracles de Saint Démétrios*, II, *Commentaire*, Paris 1981; D. Feissel, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédonie du III[e] au VI[e] siècle*, Paris 1983; I. Mikulčič, *Frühchristlicher Kirchenbau in der S.R. Makedonien*: CCAB 33 (1986) 221-251; C.S. Smively, *Apsidal Crypts in Macedonia: Pos-*

sible Places of Pilgrimage, in Actes du XI[e] Congrès Int. d'archéologie chrétienne, III, Rome 1989, 1179-1184; G. Gounaris, *L'archéologie chrétienne en Grèce de 1974 à 1985*, ibid., 2687-2711; K. Hattersley-Smith, *The Early Christian Churches of Macedonia and Their Patrons*: ByzF 21 (1995) 229-234; EAM 8 (1997) 65-71; RBK 5 (1995) 982-1220; C.J. Downing, *Wall Paintings from the Baptistery at Stobi, Macedonia and Early Depictions of Christ and the Evangelists*: DOP 52 (1998) 259-280; *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, V, 32-96.

D.I. Pallas

MACEDONIUS (4th–5th c.). *Vicarius Africae* in the years 413–414. There are two extant letters of his addressed to *Augustine (in the letters of Aug., 152 and 154), and two of Augustine to Macedonius (153 and 155): others (only one?) have been lost (cf. *Ep.* 152,1 and 154,3). Augustine had written to him asking a favor for Bishop Boniface, and Macedonius took the opportunity to ask him if it was lawful for bishops to practice *intercessio* before judges, in favor of the guilty party. Macedonius willingly accepted to do this if the request came from worthy persons. Augustine responded with a long letter (153) which sets out to justify the positive value of episcopal *intercessio*, which he considers a duty for a bishop in the light of gospel forgiveness, and implies hatred for sin and love for the sinner, respecting of course the validity and necessity of human justice, yet tempered by mercy. Macedonius was also a reader of the works of Augustine (*Ep.* 152,3; 154,2). Augustine appreciated Macedonius's meekness and wisdom, and also his interest for the social and religious good of the people. In this spirit Macedonius promulgated a decree in favor of the return of the *Donatists into the unity of the church (*Ep.* 155,4,17).

PLRE II, 697; PCBE I, 659-661; K.K. Raikas, *The State Juridical Dimension of the Office of a Bishop and the Letter 153 of St. Augustine to Vicarius Africae Macedonius*, in *Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana*, SEA 58, Rome 1997, 683-694; M. Moreau, *La magistrat et l'évêque. Pour une lecture de la correspondence Macedonius-Augustin*, in *Hommage à Serge Lancel*, ed. B. Colombat - P. Mattei, Grenoble 1998, 105-117.

A. Di Berardino

MACEDONIUS, bishop. Bishop of Mopsuestia, Cilicia. He belonged to the party of *Eusebius of Nicomedia; he followed, from *Nicaea onward, all the phases of the *Arian controversy, up to the middle of 4th c. He was one of the six commissioners charged by the Council of *Tyre (335) with the inquiry on the alleged illicit conduct of *Athanasius of Alexandria. In 345 he was part of the Eastern delegation which presented the **Ekthesis makrostichos* to *Constans and in 351 subscribed to the first formula of *Sirmium.

Simonetti, passim; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV[e] siècle* (328-373), Rome 1996, passim.

E. Prinzivalli

MACEDONIUS I – MACEDONIANS (d. after 360). Macedonius was a priest at *Constantinople around 335, and was at odds with the bishop, *Paul, whose own tumultuous and complicated history intersected with his own. He replaced Paul on the episcopal seat when the latter was for the fourth time banished from Constantinople in 344; but when Paul reentered the city in 346, Macedonius was all but deprived of authority until ca. 350, when his rival was definitively expelled from the city and Macedonius acted cruelly toward Paul's supporters. In these years Macedonius promoted the spread of ascetical ideals and the rehabilitation of heretics. Of *homoiousian bent, he participated in the Council of *Seleucia (359) and was deposed by his adversaries at the Council of Constantinople (360). We find him still active in 362 against the *Arians. He was considered to be among the initiators, around 360, of the dispute about the *Holy Spirit, because along with other homoiousians he was said to have refused to recognize the Spirit's divine character.

The first group of homoiousians of Constantinople and the neighboring areas, gathered around Macedonius, were called Macedonians; but from ca. 380 the name came to indicate those who, while not being Arians, refused to recognize the divinity of the Holy Spirit (*see* *Pneumatomachi). These were rather numerous in the area of the straits; they came, having been invited, to the Council of Constantinople in 381, headed by *Eleusius of Cyzicus and Marcianus of Lampsacus; but they refused to subscribe to the Nicene Creed and thus abandoned immediately the work of the council. They were active in the course of the 5th c. Since those homoiousians who did not wish to adhere to the Nicene *homoousion* merged with the ranks of the Macedonians, they were characterized not only by a refusal to recognize that the Spirit is God but also by the affirmation that the Son is *homoiousios* with respect to the Father: a perfect resemblance, but without implying identity of substance. As for the Holy Spirit, it seems that some of them defined him as a creature, but others preferred to remain vague: they recognized him as *theion*, not as truly and properly God.

DCB 3, 775-777; F. Loots, *Zwei macedonianische Dialoge*: Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. (1914) 526-551; P. Meinhold, *Pneumatomachoi*:

PWK 41, 1066-1101; F. Loofs, *Die Christologie der Macedonianer*: Geschichtliche Studien für A. Hauck, Leipzig 1916, 64-76; Simonetti 592; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988, 915; BBKL 5, 597-599.

M. Simonetti

MACEDONIUS II of Constantinople, saint (d. 25 April 516). Nephew of Patriarch *Gennadius, and scevophylax of Hagia Sophia, Macedonius was designated by Emperor *Anastasius (495) to replace the deposed patriarch of Constantinople, *Euphemius, who had been banished to Eucaita. Notwithstanding imperial pressure, he refused to condemn the decisions of *Chalcedon, although he had signed the **Henoticon*. Then, in 511, having been tricked, he signed a profession of faith that made no reference to *Ephesus or Chalcedon. Following this he made a solemn declaration accepting the latter council and condemning its opponents. He was subsequently arrested by Anastasius and exiled to Eucaita (11 August 511), from where he was transferred to *Gangra in 515, where he died on 25 April 516, the date on which he is commemorated in the Byzantine *Synaxarion*.

V. Grumel, *Regestes*[2], 181-192; BS 8, 442-444; C. Capizzi, *L'imperatore Anastasio I* (491-518), Rome 1969; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 186-237; Grillmeier 2/2, 31, 79, 249, 257, 319.

D. Stiernon

MACRINA. A common name (145 *Macrinos* and 50 *Macrina* are known), borne by at least two illustrious ladies of the family of *Basil the Great.

1. Macrina the Elder, d. ca. 340. Disciple of *Gregory Thaumaturgus at *Neocaesarea in Pontus, she was forced, during the persecutions, despite the nobility of her family, to live in hiding with her husband. Mother of Basil the Elder, grandmother of Basil the Great and of a family of saints. It was to her that Basil (*Ep.* 204,6; 223,3) attributes the vigor and orthodoxy of his own faith.

2. Macrina the Younger (ca. 327–379), virgin, sister of Basil. Her brother *Gregory of Nyssa gives an account of her life, attributing to her a dialogue on the resurrection, strongly inspired by *Plato, and showing a high esteem for her spiritual influence and her learning. Like her grandmother, a celebrated example of Christian womanhood. It is strange that Basil never mentions this sister.

CPG 3166, 3149; PG 46, 960-1000; P. Maraval, *Grégoire de Nysse. Vie de S. Macrine*, SC 178, Paris 1971; Id., *Encore les frères et les sœurs de Grégoire de Nysse*: RHL 60 (1980) 161-165; A. Momigliano, *Macrina, una santa aristocratica vista dal fratello*, in *Le donne in Grecia*, ed. G. Arrigoni, Bari 1985, 331-344; *La Vita di S. Macrina*, intro., tr. and notes, E. Giannarelli, Turin 1988; Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita di Santa Macrina*, intro., tr. and notes, E. Marotta, Rome 1989.

J. Gribomont

MACROBIUS (d. after 365). *Donatist bishop of *Rome, successor of Encolpius. According to *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 5), before passing to the Donatist church he had been a Catholic, and had written a book *Ad confessores et virgines* which was mistakenly identified with the *De singularitate clericorum* of ps.-*Cyprian. Of Macrobius we do have the *Passione Isaac et Maximiani* in which, under the form of a letter addressed to the faithful of *Carthage, he narrates the martyrdom of two Donatist laymen during the Macarian persecution of 347 (acc. to the traditional dating, or in 346, as the most recent editor demonstrates), instigated, acc. to the usual Donatist explanation, by the Catholic **traditores*. Macrobius died shortly after 365 and was succeeded as Donatist bishop of Rome first by Lucian and then Claudian. We do not have evidence to verify the title of martyr given to Macrobius in the *explicit* of his *Epistula*.

CPL 721 (BHL 4473): PL 8, 767-774; DSp 10, 56-57; Monceaux 5, 82-98; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford [2]1971, 185-187; PCBE 1, 662; P. Mastandrea, *Papiri di martiri donatisti (BHL 4473 e 5271)*: AB 113 (1995) 39-88; V. Saxer, *Afrique latine*, in G. Philippart (ed.), *Hagiographies: histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, I, Turnhout 1994, 64-66; F. Scorza Barcellona, *L'agiografia donatista*, in M. Marin - C. Moreschini, *Africa cristiana. Storia, religione, letteratura*, Brescia 2002, 131-133.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MACROBIUS (4th–5th c.). The only certain date we have in the life of Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius is that he lived between the end of the 4th c. and the start of the 5th c. On the basis of the sparse biographical details contained in his works an attempt has been made to reconstruct, as far as is possible, the principal stages of his political and literary career. However, in this reconstruction scholars have not yet reached agreement. Since the publication of the important monograph of Flamant the tendency is to identify Macrobius the writer with the proconsul of Africa Theodosius Macrobius, who held his position from November of 408 until August of 410. Supposing this identification, it has also been thought that Macrobius was originally from Africa (Numidia), but this conclusion is purely hypothetical.

Three works of Macrobius have come down to us: the *De differentiis et societatibus Graeci Latinique verbi*, the *Saturnaliorum libri VII* and the *Commentariorum in Somnium Scipionis libri duo*. The first is a work purely grammatical and philological in character, showing more than anything else the author's erudition. The second takes the form of an extended dialogue in which the Platonic model converges with the later dialogues of Aulus Gellius and Athenaeus. On the first day of the dialogue, which acc. to scholars may be dated to 383–384, the characters discuss various subjects, while on the two following days all the discourses focus on the works of Virgil, who becomes the point of departure for reflections on philosophy, law, rhetoric and philology. The author shows remarkable erudition, but above all of interest is his rereading of *Neoplatonic philosophy, which becomes an interpretative key for understanding both the material and the spiritual worlds. These same elements of profound erudition and understanding reality in the light of Neoplatonic philosophy are also to be found in the last work of Macrobius, the commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis*, which is of great importance in part because it preserves a part of the lost *De republica* of Cicero.

Editions and translations: L. Jan, *Macrobii Opera*, Quedlinburg-Leipzig 1848-1852; J. Willis, *Macrobius*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1970; N. Marinone, *I "Saturnali" di Macrobio*, Turin 1977; L. Scarpa, *Macrobii Ambrosii Theodosii "Commentariorum in Somnium Scipionis libri duo,"* Padua 1981; M. Armisen-Marchetti, *Macrobe: Commentaire au Songe de Scipion*, Livre I, Paris 2001.

Studies: T. Whittaker, *Macrobius or Philosophy, Science and Letters in the Year 400*, Cambridge 1923; A. Cameron, *The Date and Identity of Macrobius*: JRS 56 (1966) 25-38; H. De Ley, *Macrobius and Numenius: A Study of Macrobius, "In Somn." I.c.12*, Brussels 1972; J. Flamant, *Macrobe et le néo-platonisme latin, à la fin du IVᵉ siècle*, Leiden 1977; B.C. Barker-Benfield - P.K. Marshall, *Macrobius*, in *Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L.D. Reynolds, Oxford 1983; A. Saggioro, *Il sacrificio pagano nella reazione al Cristianesimo: Giuliano e Macrobio*: AnSE 19 (2002) 237-254.

M. Conti

MACROBIUS (early 5th c.). *Donatist bishop of *Hippo who succeeded Proculeianus in about 406, and was present at the Council of Carthage in 411. Macrobius had had the Catholic subdeacon Rusticianus (or Rusticanus) rebaptized after he had been excommunicated by his bishop and joined the Donatist church. *Augustine addressed Macrobius on this occasion to express his disapproval (*Ep.* 106). Macrobius defended himself, claiming to have followed the practice of his predecessor (*Ep.* 107 of the correspondence of Augustine). Augustine responded with a second letter taking up the Donatist question more broadly (*Ep.* 108): from this letter we learn that at the moment of his installation Macrobius had reacted against the excesses of the *circumcellions. Later, however, Macrobius had recourse to the circumcellions to occupy the Donatist churches closed by *Honorius, and had had a certain Donatus rebaptized, who was accused of the murder of a priest (Aug., *Ep.* 139, 2).

DCB 3, 780-781; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford ²1971, 73, 272, 291-292; PCBE 1, 662-663.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MACROCOSM and MICROCOSM. As G. Calogero has shown (EI 21, 802), the expression μικρὸς κόσμος (Latin: *microcosmus*) used of humanity seems to go back to Democritus (fr. B 34 Diels, II ⁶1952, p. 153). The parallelism between the individual living being called the "small universe" and the "great universe," the cosmos, is found clearly formulated in *Aristotle (*Phys.* 8,252a 24-27). It is to *Stoicism, however, that we may primarily attribute the emphasis on the correspondence between the universe, composed of the divine and rational principle which governs and permeates it, the *logos*, and matter, and then humanity, equally governed by reason (*logos*), a fragment of the universal *logos*, and equipped with a material body: in SVF II 634 the *cosmos is presented as an animated and rational living being, governed by the intelligence-ether which runs through it, just as the human being is permeated by the soul, which, when it has the function of guide, takes the name of intelligence. These Stoic ideas are taken up by Philo who establishes a precise parallelism between the function of the *logos* of the universe and that of the mind of humanity (*De opif. m.* 69), and who, referring to the Stoics, expresses himself thus: "Some have felt confidence to grant equality between the smallest of living beings, man, and the whole world, having observed that each of them consists of a body and a rational soul; consequently, by virtue of this correspondence, they have called man a 'microcosm,' and the 'great man' the universe" (*Quis rer. div. her.* 155). *Plotinus sees a strict correspondence between his three metaphysical hypostases (the one, the intelligence and the soul) and the immaterial structure of human beings, characterized also by these three elements (*Enn.* V, 1,10 [284,5-6,10-13], V, 1,12 [286,4-5]). The Stoic-Philonic conception is accepted in full by *Gregory of Nyssa (*De an. et res.*, PG 46, 28 B).

R. Allers, *Microcosmus from Anaximandre to Paracelsus*: Traditio 2 (1944) 318-347; G. Calogero, *Macrocosmo e microcosmo*: EI 21, 802-803 where a more extended bibl. may be found (cf. p. 803; Calogero, however, mentions neither Philo nor Gregory of Nyssa, and for Aristotle and the Stoics his account is lacking in precision); M. Harl, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* [Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 15], Paris 1966, 69-71; *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, 5, 540-542; J. Jouanna, *L'interprétation des rêves et la théorie micro-macrocosmique dans le traité hippocratique "Du Régime": sémiotique et mimésis*, in *Text and Tradition: Studies in Ancient Medicine and Its Transmission Presented to Jutta Kollesch*, ed. K.-D. Fischer et al., Leiden 1998, 161-174; *Ressembler au monde: nouveaux documents sur la théorie du macro-microcosme dans l'antiquité orientale*, ed. Ph. Gignoux, Turnhout 1999; S. Lilla, *Neuplatonisches Gedankengut in den Homilien über die Seligpreisungen Gregors von Nyssa*, Leiden 2004, 28, 36 n. 111.

S. Lilla

MEDABA. Town on the hills of Moab and repeatedly mentioned in biblical texts as "Medeba" (Num 21:30; Josh 13:9,16; 1 Chr 19:7; 1 Macc 9:35-36), its name also occurs in the Mesha stele. Recently, excavations undertaken on the "tell" of the city have demonstrated that human occupation of the site had begun as early as the fourth millennium BC, and the numerous ceramic items recovered datable to the Iron Age (9th–7th c. BC) attest that Madaba was heavily populated in this period as well, to which both the biblical texts and the Mesha stele refer.

Reoccupied in modern times in the last decades of the 19th c. by Bedouin Christian families, the city owes its reputation to the numerous mosaics in the churches and the buildings that have been discovered, the workmanship and beauty of which suggest a true and proper "school of Madaba" at work in the region.

The highest expression of this school is certainly the so-called Map of Madaba: a mosaic floor in the church datable to the 6th or 7th c. AD, which must originally have represented a large geographical region, extending from *Tyre and Sidon in the N down to the Nile Delta in the S, taking in the *Sinai Peninsula, and bounded on the W by the Mediterranean and on the E by the desert. The large extant piece of this mosaic, discovered in 1896 during construction work for the church of St. George and now visible within that church, with its vignettes of cities and more than 150 toponyms, is a unique artifact, artistically, epigraphically, historically and geographically, as well as biblically.

Other churches and buildings with mosaic floors have been discovered and studied more recently. We must mention those near to the paved road from the Roman period which runs through the center of the city, some of which are now within the delimited "archaeological area," which may be visited: the church of the Virgin and the hall of Hippolytus, the church of the Prophet Elijah and the crypt of St. Elianus; the church of the Sunna'; the church of the Holy Martyrs; the "Burnt Palace." At a greater distance there is the church of the Apostles and that which must have been the "cathedral" of Madaba.

Of great importance in the area is Mount Nebo with the churches of the ancient city and also the Moses Memorial, a sanctuary which recalls the vision of the Promised Land granted by God to the prophet before he died (Dt 34:1-5). Ma'in, Massuh, Umm al-Rasas (the biblical Mephaath) and Zizia are other places in the diocese of Madaba in which churches with mosaics and inscriptions have been found, permitting reconstruction of the ecclesiastical and artistic history of this important center of the *Arabian Province in the *Byzantine and Umayyad eras.

M. Piccirillo, *Chiese e Mosaici di Madaba*, Jerusalem-Milan 1989; Id., *The Mosaics of Jordan*, Amman 1993; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata (eds.), *Umm al-Rasas–Mayfa'ah. I. Gli scavi del complesso di Santo Stefano*, Jerusalem 1994; P.M. Bikai - T.A. Dailey (eds.), *Madaba: Cultural Heritage*, Amman 1996; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata (eds.), *Mount Nebo. New Archaeological Excavations 1967–1997*, Jerusalem 1998; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata (eds.), *The Madaba Map Centenary 1897–1997*, Jerusalem 1999; A. Michel, *Les églises d'époque byzantine et umayyade de Jordanie (Provinces d'Arabie et de Palestine) V-VIII siècle. Typologie architecturale et aménagements liturgiques (avec catalogue des monuments)*, Turnhout 2001; M. Piccirillo, *L'Arabia cristiana*, Milan 2002; B. Hamarneh, *Topografia cristiana ed insediamenti rurali nel territorio dell'odierna Giordania nelle epoche bizantina ed islamica: 5.-9. sec.*, Vatican City 2003.

C. Pappalardo

MADAUROS. A city of *Numidia (also Madaura; today near the present village of M'Daourouch), as the crow flies 25 km (15.5 mi) to the S of *Thagaste, city of Apuleius (ca. 125–171/180). *Augustine of Hippo studied at Madauros from ca. 365 until 369, at which time it was a small center of studies and a thriving town, partly owing to the now-defunct cultivation of olives. It was a Roman colony for veterans at the end of the 1st c.; in the 4th c. we know of two statues of the god Mars. It was occupied by the *Vandals and went into decline; reusing previous materials, a fortress was constructed in the Byzantine period, between 534 and 536, over the theater and a part of the baths, a sign of its decadence. In a now-barren landscape, there are substantial remains from the Roman period (forum, theater, baths, Roman basilica, shrines, arches and also the remains of two Christian churches). At the beginning of the 5th c. the population was largely pagan, for Maxi-

mus of Madauros, professor of grammar (and, perhaps, also of Augustine), writes that "the market-place of our city is protected by a great number of beneficent deities; we see this and we can establish it" (*Ep.* 16,1 among the letters of *Augustine of Hippo). Again in about 408 the curia is largely composed of pagans (see Aug., *Ep.* 232,1-2). The first certainly Catholic bishop we hear of in 407 is Placentinus (PCBE 1, 876-877); at the conference of *Carthage of 477 there is also a *Donatist bishop, Donatus (PCBE 1, 314, n. 39); while it seems we should rule out the presence of a Catholic bishop at the Council of Carthage in 345–348 (DACL 10, 898), because *Madaurensis* in the MS is a correction of Maginensis (Antigonus: PCBE 1, 72). The last bishop we know of is Pudentius in 484 (PCBE 1, 934). Maximus of Madauros speaks of the strange Punic names of the martyrs venerated by the Christians (*Ep.* 16, in the letters of St. Augustine), but this does not mean that they were from Madauros, as some authors have maintained (Allard, Duchesne, Monceaux, Harnack). Augustine responds that "the Catholic Christians, who have a church in your city, do not worship any dead person" (*Ep.* 17,5). The epigraphic material on the pagan religious life of the city is abundant, the Christian much less so.

DACL 10, 886-914; M. Leglay, *Saturn africain*, I, Paris 1961, 361-364; O. Perler, *Les voyages de saint Augustin*, Paris 1969, 125-128; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, II, Paris 1981, 127-139; P. Mastandrea, *Massimo di Madauros (Agostino, Epistulae 16 e 17)*, Padua 1985.

A. Di Berardino

MAGI (the kings). The number, identity, provenance and disposition of soul of those simply described as Magi who came from the East to *Bethlehem to adore Jesus (Mt 2:1-12) were the object of numerous interpretations on the part of the Christians of the first centuries, which were then passed on to successive eras and established in the tradition as a literary and iconographic heritage. As early as *Origen (*Hom. Gen.* 14,3) we find the Magi connected with the three persons who in Gen 26:27-29 confer with Isaac: it is logical to think that the threefold number of the Magi, accepted with few exceptions by the subsequent tradition, is derived from the three gifts they offer to Jesus. That the Magi are royal figures is supposed by *Tertullian (*Marc.* III, 13,8), based on the application of Ps 71:10, 15 to the gospel text. The most common opinion on the provenance of the Magi is that they were *Persian: *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 77,4; 78,1; 88,1) and Tertullian (*Marc.* III, 13,8; *Adv. Jud.* 9) have them as coming from *Arabia, with reference (explicit in Tertullian) to Psalm 71. A Chaldean origin, proposed by some authors, is associated with the prophecy of the birth of Jesus identified by the Magi in the apparition of the star, assuming the Chaldean use of divination by observation of the stars. From Origen onward (*Contra Cels.* 1,59; *Hom. Num.* 13,7; 15,4), it was quite common to affirm the descent of the Magi from Balaam, the diviner who in Num 24:17 announces the rising of the star of Jacob, sometimes identified with the star of gospel account.

In this context the adoration of the Magi represents the recognition of the divinity of Jesus, and that from the moment of the appearance of the star, or at least of the meeting with Jesus in Bethlehem. The gifts take on, in this light, a symbolic value which is principally christological, indicating the nature and status of him whom the Magi had come to adore: gold, incense and myrrh indicate respectively kingship, divinity and the mortal condition (humanity, but also death and burial, and therefore implicitly the passion). The first testimony of this symbolic interpretation of the gifts is that which we read in *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. Haer.* III, 9,2), destined to achieve widespread acceptance. Other authors, however, as alternatives or additions to this christological interpretation, proposed a symbology of what the faithful, on the example of the Magi, can and must offer to Christ: various virtues (faith, chastity, purity of heart etc.) and devout acts (prayer, mortification, almsgiving). In later ages there was no lack of global interpretations intended to find in the three gifts a symbol of threefold entities or concepts: the three theological virtues, the three worlds, the three senses of Scripture, the three parts of philosophy. From the 6th c. the gospel account was magnified into legends, rich in detail and widely diffused: thus in two Syriac texts, the *Book of the *Cavern of Treasures* (6th. c.) and the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel Mahre*, called the *Chronicle of Zuqnin* (8th c.), in which the Magi offer to Christ the gifts hidden by Adam in a cave and reserved to the person who would be heralded by a mysterious star. In these legends the names of the Magi are already referred to, which would later become fixed as Balthasar, Gaspar and Melchior. The *Chronicle of Zuqnin* was drawn upon as a source by the ps.-Chrysostomic author of the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* (5th c.).

H. Kehrer, *Die heiligen Drei Könige in Literatur und Kunst*, I-II, Leipzig 1908-1909; DB 4, 543-552; BS 8, 494-528; Cath 3, 1816-1823; DACL 10, 980-1067; L. Olschki, *The Wise Men of the East in Oriental Tradition*: Semitic and Oriental St. 11 (1951) 375-395; U. Monneret de Villard, *Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangel-*

ici, ST 163, Vatican City 1952; J.C. Marsh-Edwards, *The Magi in Tradition and Art*: Irish Ecclesiastical Record 85 (1956) 1-9; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *Die drei Weisen aus dem Morgenlande und die Anbetung der Zeit*: Antaios 7 (1965) 234-252; W.A. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte der Auslegung von Matth. 2,1-12*: TZ 31 (1975) 150-160; Enc. delle Religioni 3, 1816-1823; *Die Heiligen Drei Könige. Darstellung und Verehrung*, Cologne 1982; R. Deichting, *Sedulius Scottus. Ein "Heiliger König mehr" aus dem Abendland*, in H. Löwe, *Die Iren und Europa in früheren Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1982, 866-875; F. Scorza Barcellona, "*Oro e incense e mirra" (Mt 2,11). L'interpretazione cristologica dei tre doni e la fede dei magi*: ASE 2 (1985) 137-147; Id., *"Oro e incenso e mirra" (Mt 2,11). II. Le interpretazioni morali*: ASE 3 (1986) 227-245; Id., *La notizia di Marco Polo sui Re Magi*: Studi e Ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano 15 (1992) 87-104; R.C. Trexler, *The Journey of the Magi. Meanings in the History of a Christian Story*, Princeton, NJ 1997; F. Cardini, *I Re Magi. Storia e leggende*, Venezia 2000; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionnaires chrétiens dans l'Empire iranien*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002, 111-117; R. Favaro, *Sull'iconografia bizantina della stella dei Magi a Betlemme*, in *La Persia e Bisanzio*, Atti dei Convegni Lincei 201, Rome 2004, 827-863; S.J. Voicu, *Prima del presepe. Magi e pastori nei racconti antichi*, Rome 2004; Th. Schmidt-Kaler, *Der Stern und die Magier aus dem Morgenland. Der Stern von Bethlehem im Lichte der historischen Astronomie*, in *Il contributo delle scienze storiche allo studio del Nuovo Testamento*, ed. E. dal Covolo - R. Fusco, Vatican City 2005, 254-313.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MAGIC. If magic is the "art of producing extraordinary effects out of proportion to the methods which it employs," then it is without doubt connected to religion. From Eastern religions astrologers and magi overran the Roman Empire, offering remedies, given remuneration, for certain illnesses or for predicting the future. Astrology allowed one to know the future, magic to intervene in events using a variety of means; but also the Romans, drawing on Etruscan tradition, practiced certain divinatory arts, in particular haruspicy. Some of these practices had recourse to the occult sciences, while others were connected strictly to the cults and sacrifices. In the Roman tradition, from the time of Sulla onward, it was not easy to distinguish between black, harmful magic from that which was harmless. In the course of the 4th c. the emperors had prohibited recourse to private divination. *Constantine I also tried to distinguish between that magic which was subject to grave punishment—namely, those magical arts that were damaging to health or which offered bribes with love spells—and that which was innocent, which sought to offer remedies for suffering bodies or to help in agricultural cultivation (CTh 9,16,3).

Christian Antiquity presents us with two issues: the accusation of magic directed at Christians and the response given to this, and then, further, the existence and survival of magical practices within Christianity. Suetonius defines the Christian religion as *malefica*. A serious accusation, considering how the Romans notoriously feared curses, the evil eye, the unleashing of occult forces through incantations, drawing lots or magic potions. The trial of Apuleius allows us to glimpse the dread which magic inspired. Judaism had already been subject to the charge of magic. We know that at the time of Christ Jewish magicians were spread across the Greco-Roman world (Juvenal, *Sat.* III, 13; VI, 542-547; Lucian, *Trag.* 174); the Jews indeed were specialists in magic and exorcism. In Ephesus they used even the name of Jesus (Acts 19:13). The rabbinic tradition in its turn attempted to discredit Christ by presenting him as a sorcerer. *Justin Martyr refutes this calumny (*Dial.* 69,7; 108,2; *1 Apol.* 30). There is an identical accusation in the *Ps. ep. Pilati ad Claudium* and in the gospel of Nicodemus. From the Jews this charge passed to the pagans, who accused Christ of being guilty of charlatanism and Christianity of magic, as the Apologists relate (Latt., *Div. Inst.* V, 3,19; Just., *1 Apol.* 30; *Recogn.* I, 58,1; Orig., *Contra Celsum* 7,69). It is true—and confirmed by Justin Martyr—that *Simon Magus traveled to Rome and with the help of the demons worked magical miracles (Just., *1 Apol.* 26,1-3; 56,2; *Dial.* 120,6). The same accusation is made of *Peter and *Paul (Philostratus to Eusebius). *Tertullian was obliged to defend Christianity against the same accusation (*Ad ux.* II, 4,5). It reemerged at the time of *Julian the Apostate (*Socr.*, HE III, 13,11,12). To this charge, the Christians responded that magic is demonic and that Christianity represents precisely a break with the demons and so with magic (Justin, Tertullian, *Cyprian of Carthage, *John Chrysostom; Aug., *De doc. christ.* II, 35-36). Exorcisms before and after baptism had as their purpose the expulsion of demons.

The boundary between magic, astrology and superstition is not easy to trace. New converts did not easily abandon practices, objects, formulas, imprecations and incantations to which they were profoundly attached. The *Trad. Ap.* in fact excludes from baptism magi, astrologers and fortune tellers (ch. 16). There should be no surprise that in certain Christians tombs we find *defixionum tabellae*, *dirae*, *imprecationes*, *devotiones*, esp. in Africa (see *Amulets).

For their part the Christians created "magical crosses," formulas for warding off evil powers or imprecations against them. They Christianized amulets like the scarab, engraving an image of Christ upon them (Dölger, AC 2, 230-240). Even the sacred texts, above all the beginning of the four gospels, were seen to possess a "magical" efficacy. The *Verbum caro factum est* preserved from lightning. The women of *Constantinople wore the gospel as a pen-

dant around the neck (John Chrys., *In Mt. hom.* 8,3). Amulets, formulas such as *ABRASAX, magical symbols on Christian tombs, magical nails, phylacteries against occult powers—none of these had waned in popularity by the time of John Chrysostom, Augustine and *Caesarius of Arles, who fought without respite against these survivors of paganism. The *Canons of Athanasius* (cans. 72 and 73) and the Councils of Orléans in 511 (can. 30), Auxerre in 573 (can. 41), and Clichy in 626 (can. 16) did the same. From time to time the accusation of magic was resorted to in order to attack someone, as in the case of the proceedings against *Athanasius and against *Priscillian of Avila.

See the following entries in DACL: *Adjuration, Amulettes, Imprécations, Phylactères*; F. Dölger: AC 2 (1930) 153-176; 3 (1932) 81-100; 4 (1933-1934) 188-228; A.A. Barb, *La sopravvivenza delle arti magiche*, in *Il conflitto tra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel IV secolo*, Turin 1968, 111-137; A.G. Hamman, *La vie quotidienne en Afrique du Nord au temps de saint Augustin*, Paris 1979, 170-193; D.E. Aune, *Magic in Early Christianity*: ANRW II, 23, 2 (1980) 1507-1557; L. Desanti, *Sileat omnibus perpetuo divinandi curiositas. Indovini e sanzioni nel diritto romano*, Milan 1990; G. Luck, *Arcana mundi. Magia e occulto nel mondo greco romano*, Rome 1997; *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, ed. M. Meier - R. Smith, Princeton, NJ 1999; N. Janositz, *Magic in the Roman World. Pagans, Jews and Christians*, London 2001; F. Dolbeau, *Le combat pastoral d'Augustin contre les astrologues, les divins et le guérisseurs*, in *Augustinus Afer*, ed. P.-Y. Fux et al., Fribourg 2003, 167-182; M.W. Dickie, *Magic and Magicians in the Graeco-Roman World*, London-New York 2003.

A. Hamman

MAGNUS, martyr. Magnus was a common name, borne by many martyrs: Magnus and his companions Aquilinus, Geminus, etc.; Magnus of Avignon; Magnus of Caesarea in Cappadocia; Magnus of Milan; Magnus deacon and Roman martyr at the time of Pope Sixtus; Magnus of Terni, etc. The cult of a Magnus, martyr, was widely spread. The best known is Magnus venerated at Trani and in the southern-central part of the Via Appia on 19 August, attested as early as the *Mart. hier.* (codex *Epternacensis*) at *Fabrateria* (*Vetus*, modern Ceccano in Lazio, or the *Nova* in the area of S. Giovanni Incarico) and also found in the Gelasian Sacramentary. Magnus, born at Trani, of which he became bishop, was martyred on returning from a pilgrimage to *Rome, at Fabrateria, where he had dedicated himself to the evangelization of the territory. In the Middle Ages his relics were brought to Anagni. Simonetti regards the saint of Trani and the martyr of Fondi as two different people. Luongo prefers not to duplicate the saint, holding that the cult began at Fabrateria and then spread to the surrounding area (Fondi, Aquino) and then also elsewhere.

M. Simonetti, *Sulla tradizione agiografica di S. Magno di Trani*, in *Il paleocristiano in Ciociaria*, Rome 1978, 97-131; Id., *Un testo inedito su san Magno di Trani*, in *Paradoxos Paideia*, Milan 1979, 42-54; G. Luongo, *Agiografia fondana*, in *Fondi tra antichità e Medioevo*, ed. T. Piscitelli Carpino, Fondi 2002, 193-250; *Magno di Trani. Memoria e culto di un martire paleocristiano nelle Valli del Liri e del Sacco*, ed. F. Carcione, Venafro 2004.

A. Di Berardino

MAGNUS MAXIMUS, emperor (d. 388). Following the revolt which broke out in Britain in 383, the Spaniard Magnus Maximus was proclaimed emperor; to him passed the army of *Gratian, who in the same year was defeated and killed. Keen to win the favor of the Catholic clergy, Magnus referred the *Priscillianist question to the Council of Bordeaux (384), where Priscillian and his followers were condemned. Priscillian having subsequently appealed to the tribunal of the emperor, Magnus Maximus decreed his death, along with certain of his companions. For this Magnus Maximus was sharply reproached by some bishops, among whom *Ambrose, who, for the second time, presented himself at *Trier as ambassador of *Valentinian II. In 387 Magnus Maximus invaded Italian territory, forcing Valentinian to flee; *Theodosius came to his defense; having established his official residence at Milan, Magnus Maximus moved to the East and advanced into Illyria. The following year he was beaten by Theodosius at Petovium on the Drava and killed at *Aquileia. We have two letters of Magnus Maximus, one to Valentinian II against the *Arians and the *Manicheans, and another to Pope *Siricius.

CPL 1593-1594; PL 13, 591-594; CSEL 35, 88-91; PLRE 1, 588; M.V. Escribano, *Iglesia y Estado en el Certamen priscilianista*, Zaragoza 1988.

S. Zincone

MAIORINUS (early 4th c.). First lector of the church of Carthage at the time of Bishop *Mensurius (there is much discussion regarding the date of his death); he was succeeded in 311 (though many propose an earlier date) by *Caecilian, *persona non grata* to the matron *Lucilla and many others, esp. the bishops of *Numidia. The opponents then elected Maiorinus (312), constituting thus the *pars Maiorini* (Aug., *Ep.* 88,1). Under his name was redacted the *libellus ecclesiae catholicae, criminum Caeciliani traditus a parte Maiorini* (Aug., *Ep.* 88,2). Maiorinus ordained other bishops, extending the

strength of his *pars*, and died before the Council of *Arles of 314 after a brief episcopate. He was succeeded by *Donatus, who gave his name to the secessionist movement.

PCBE 1, 666-667; K. Clancy, *When Did the Donatist Schism Begin?*: JTS 28 (1977) 104-109; B. Kriegbaum, *Kirche der Traditoren oder Kirche der Märtyrer? Die Vorgeschichte des Donatismus*, Innsbruck 1986; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000, passim.

A. Di Berardino

MALABAR. From the Augustan era onward there are frequent and reliable references to commercial links with the SW coast of India, where archaeologists have discovered numerous landing berths, such as the much-frequented one at Muziris, known to Pliny the Elder and identifiable with Cranganore; but a commercial land route also existed, where the *Tabula Peutingeriana* indicates a temple of Augustus and where *numismatic discoveries document Roman coinage from the first empire; there is also evidence of legations from India to *Rome and vice versa, from *Augustus to *Aurelian. The first evangelization of India is attributable by tradition to St. *Thomas—who is said to have preached also in Parthia and in Mesopotamia—and to St. Bartholomew. (The Malabar tradition recorded by the Portuguese in 1533 mentions the arrival of Thomas, Bartholomew and *Judas Thaddeus in Malabar.) The first has a particular link with *Edessa, traditionally evangelized by Thomas or by his disciple Thaddeus-Addai, a center for the propagation of Syro-Aramaic Christianity, and to which in the Severan period the relics of Thomas were solemnly translated. The bricks of the tomb of St. Thomas at Mylapore have the same dimensions as those of a nearby Roman station of the 1st c. AD (A. Schurhammer, *The Malabar Church*: OCA 196 [1970] 99-101). In the *De vitis Apostolorum* his preaching moves toward the East: the Parthians, the Medes, the Persians, the Bactrians, the Magi and the Indians, among whom he died.

Toward the of the 2nd c., we find the apparently historical mission of *Pantaenus, *Stoic philosopher and *Alexandrian Christian learned in the Scriptures and in secular literature, teacher of *Clement and founder of the catechetical school of the **Didaskaleion* of Alexandria, who, sent by the bishop of the city, Demetrius, traveled by sea to India, by invitation of certain Indian Christians. There he is said to have found groups possessing the "Hebrew" gospel of Matthew brought there by Bartholomew, which Pantaenus took back to Alexandria (Eus., *HE* V, 10; Hier., *Vir. Ill.* 36; *Ep.* 70,4). The mission of Pantaenus seems to be indirectly corroborated by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I, 71,3; III, 60,2) and by Hippolytus (*Philos.* 24) who, shortly afterward, give information originating directly from India, the first speaking of the Buddhists, of the women of the monastic order founded by the Buddha and of the *Semnoí*, an honorific title of the ascetical Indians, the second presenting the doctrine of the Vedic *brahman* certainly transmitted by Christian sources, given the emphasis on God as *logos* and as light. *Bardesanes and *Plotinus too reveal a detailed knowledge of India, derived in the first place from a meeting with the chief of an Indian delegation, which had arrived in Syria AD 218, to Elagabalus, the object of which was probably a flourishing commerce with the coasts of Malabar (Stobeo I, 3,56): Bardesanes did not only name the Indians in the *Liber legum regionum*, but also dedicated to India a work which was read by *Porphyry (*FHG* III, 719 frags. 1-3; Porphyry, *Sullo Stige*, ed. C. Castelletti, Milan 2006, 126ff., 245ff.), disciple of Plotinus, who for 38 years had wanted to travel to India, perhaps to imitate *Apollonius of Tyana, and who himself presents convergences of thought with the *Upanishad*, traceable perhaps to a *gnostic source.

The Jewish-Christian matrix of the evangelization of Malabar is clear also in the name of the local Christians, *Nazrani mahapilla* ("great Nazerene sons," the name of the Jewish-Christian guardians of the "Hebrew" Matthew), and in that which was for centuries their ecclesiastical language, *Syriac, as well as in particular liturgical uses (e.g., the celebration of the paschal meal with unleavened bread, the baptism of children after 40 days, the absence of sacred images) and in the jurisdictional dependence of the Indian church, after *Constantine, on that of Persia, suffragan of *Selecuia-Ctesiphon, dependent itself on Edessa until 424. Among the eucharistic *anaphoras of the church of Malabar one of the most important is that of *Addai and Mari, evangelizers of Edessa, and in the *Acta Thomae* Jesus is termed "nazirite," Thomas sings in "Hebrew" and is understood by an Indian flautist who is evidently Jewish, and goes to India with the merchant Habban. There is reliable evidence from the Constantinian era, with new missionaries in India Ulterior and Interior; Bartholomew, on the other hand, acc. to Rufinus (HE X, 9), is supposed to have traveled to India Citerior, where in preaching he brought the gospel that Pantaenus was to find; on his return, he went to Greater *Armenia (also acc. to the *De Vitis Apostolorum*). In 325 John, bishop of Persia and of Great India, was charged with notifying the Indians of the

decisions of *Nicaea. *Frumentius went there to preach, invited by *Athanasius of Alexandria after 328. The celebrations of Constantine reached as far as India, and Indian delegations were sent to Julian. In about 340, *Theophilus was sent to India by *Constantius II and there effected reforms among the Christians. In 345, 72 families of the church of Persia, including ecclesiastics, led by the merchant Thomas Kinayi, were sent to Malabar by the *catholicos* of Seleucia-Ctesiphon and established themselves at Muziris, since the church of Malabar, which had remained isolated even through the *Sassanid persecution, had a structure which did not correspond to the Nicene canons as reported by John. Later, David of Charax (Basra) from the Sassanid Empire went to preach in India.

The term *Malabar* is a Portuguese deformation of a poorly understood appellation. The language is Malayalam, of the Dravidian linguistic group. *Cosmas Indicopleustes, in 520–525, bears witness to a Christian presence on the island of Socotra, in Male (= Malabar) and at Kalliana (= Ceylon), whose bishop was ordained in Persia. Sabrisho I (596–604) took India and China into his jurisdiction. It seems that the diocese of Rev-Ardashir independently influenced the Christian groups of Malabar. Numerous crosses have been discovered with Pahlavi inscriptions from 7th to the 8th c. Already in the 16th c. travelers from the West—above all the Portuguese—found on the SW coast of India the church of Malabar and that of Malankara. Certainly historical are Mar Thomas (ca. 795–824), the cited Mar Sabrisho and Mar Peroz (ca. 880). The first was ordained in Baghdad by Timothy I: similar movements correspond to the parallel exodus of the Persians repulsed by Islam. The tomb of St. Thomas is mentioned in 833, on the occasion of the delegation sent by Alfred the Great of England. Bar Hebraeus seems to be the first to have used the expressions "Christians of St. Thomas" in contrast with those of Mari, dependant on Baghdad. With the Synod of Diamper (20 June 1599) we find the Latin tampering with the ancient Syriac usages and the almost total destruction of the apocryphal Syriac books. Beyond the Catholic hierarchy, in the two rites, today there exists, from 1964, the Eastern *catholicos*, and the metropolitans of Mar Thomas.

M. Medlycott, *India and the Apostle St. Thomas*, London 1905; J. Dahlmann, *Die Thomas-Legende*, Freiburg i.B. 1920; J.R. Farquhar, *The Apostle Thomas in North India*: BJRL 10 (1926) 80-111; *The Apostle Thomas in South India*: BJRL 10 (1926) 20-50; A. Mingana, *The Early Spread of Christianity in India*: BJRL 10 (1926) 435-514; K.T. Joseph, *The Malabar Christians*, Trivandrum 1929; U. Monneret de Villard, *La fiera di Batne e la traslazione di s. Tommaso a Edessa*: RAL 6 (1951) 77-104; J.W. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas*, Cambridge 1956; R.P. Placid Podipara, *Les Syriens du Malabar*: OrSyr 4 (1956) 375-423; E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India*, Bombay-Calcutta-Madras 1957; A.F.J. Kljin, *The Acts of Thomas*, intro., tr. and comm., Leiden 1962; A. Fischer, *Pantainos*: LTK 8, 24; A. Hammann, *Le Sitz im Leben des Actes de Thomas*, TU 88, Berlin 1964; A.M. Di Nola, ed. G. di Hildesheim, *La storia dei Re Magi*, Florence 1966; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Edessa und das jüdische Christentum*: VChr 24 (1970) 3-33; B. Ehlers, *Kann das Thomasevangelium aus Edessa stammen?*: NT 12 (1970) 284-317; A.M. Mundadan, *Sixteenth Century Traditions of St. Thomas Christians*, Bangalore 1970; A.D. Smelik, *Aliquanta ipsius Thomae*: VChr 28 (1974) 290-294; Erbetta II, 307-374; M. Bussagli, *I re Magi*, Milan 1985, 63-70 and passim; A. Dihle, *L'ambassade de Théophile l'Indien ré-examinée*, in *L'Arabie pré-islamique*, ed. Th. Fahd, Leiden 1987, 461-468; A. Magris - M. Piantelli, *Plotino e l'India; l'India e Plotino*: Annuario filosofico 6 (1990) esp. 120-135; J.R.K. Fenwick, *The Malabar Independent Syrian Church*, Bramcote (Nottingham) 1992; J. Madey, *La chrétienté de Saint Thomas en Inde*: Irénikon 65 (1992) 24-41; S.C. Mimouni, *Pour une définition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme*: NTS 38 (1992) 161-186; V.C. Samuel, *The Growing Church. An Introduction to Indian Church History*, Kottayam 1992; J. Teixidor, *Bardésane d'Édesse*, Paris 1992, 39; H. Wybrew, *L'Église Mar Thoma en Inde*: Irénikon 65 (1992) 451-461; J. Kolangaden, *The Historicity of Apostle Thomas*, Neelanchavil, Kolazhy, Trichur 1993; J. Perumattam, *Fr. Placid and the Missionary Expansion of the Syro-Malabar Church*: ChrOr 14 (1993) 64-75; J. Kollaparambil, *The Persian Crosses in India Are Christian, Not Manichaean*: ChrOr 15 (1994) 24ff.; Id., *The Identity of Mar John of Persia and Great India*, in *VI Symposium Syriacum*, ed. R. Lavenant, OCA 247, Rome 1994, 281-297; S.C. Mimouni, *Le judéo-christianisme syriaque*, in *VI Symposium Syriacum*, 269-280; L. Moraldi, *Gli apocrifi del NT*, II, Casale Monf. 1994, 303-428; P. Pallath (ed.), *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, Rome 1994; P. Gignoux, *The Pahlavi Inscription of the Mt. Thomas Cross (South India)*, in var. aus., *Solving Riddles*, Winona Lake, IN 1995, 411-422; K. Hermes, *Countdown to 1999. Die Synode von Diamper (1599) im Spiegel der verschiedenen Kirchen der südindischen Thomaschristenheit*, in *Syrisches Christentum weltweit*, eds. M. Tamke et al., Münster 1995, 325-340; K. Valuparampil, *Margasastra of the Acts of the Apostles and the Mar Thomas Nasranis of India*: ChrOr 16 (1995) 15-28; I.H. Dalmais, *Les chrétiens de St Thomas et le Prêtre Jean*: Harp 8/9 (1995/1996) 393-395; J. Kolangaden, *The Historicity of Apostle Thomas' Evangelization in Kerala*: Harp 8/9 (1995/1996) 305-327; B. Schmitz, *Das Indienbild in der syrischen Thomasliteratur*: Harp 8/9 (1995/1996) 105-116; A. Dihle, *Indien*: RAC 18, 1-56; C. Velamparampil, *The Celebration of the Liturgy of the Word in the Syro-Malabar Qurbana: A Biblico-Theological Analysis*, Kottayam 1997; G. Menachery, *The Nazranies*, Trissur 1998; X. Koodapuzha, *Christianity in India*, Kottayam 1998; P. Vazheeparampil, *The Making and Unmaking of Tradition: Towards a Theology of the Liturgical Renewal in the Syro-Malabar Church*, Rome 1998; G. Appassery, *Raza. Qurbana of Nazrani*, Delhi 2000; I. Ramelli, *Linee generali per una presentazione e per un commento del Liber Legum Regionum*: RIL 133 (1999) 311-355; Id., *La missione di Panteno in India*, in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica*, Alessandria 2000, 95-106; Id., *Bardesane e la sua scuola tra la cultura occidentale e quella orientale*, in *Pensiero e istituzioni del mondo classico nelle culture del Vicino Oriente*, Alessandria 2001, 237-255; C. Dognini - Id., *Gli Apostoli in India nella Patristica e nella letteratura sanscrita*, Milan 2001; P. Schneider, *L'Éthiopie et l'Inde: interférences et confusions aux extrémitès du monde antique (XVIII^e siècle avant J.C.)*, Rome 2004.

I. Ramelli

MALCHION of Antioch. Saint (feast 28 Oct). The only sources for his life are *Eusebius (*HE* 7,29,1-2 and 7,30,1-71) and, depending on him, *Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 71). Malchion was a priest and head of a school of rhetoric at *Antioch; he was esteemed for his purity of faith. At the Second Council of Antioch (268), he unmasked the errors of *Paul of Samosata and was one of the authors of the *Letters*, written in the name of the council, to the bishops *Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria.

Bardenhewer II, 276-278; DTC 9, 1765-1766; EC 7, 900-901; Quasten I, 401; LTK² 6, 1325-1326; BS 8, 584-585; Altaner 215; P. de Navascués, *Paolo de Samosata y sus adversarios*, Rome 2004, passim.

A. De Nicola

MALCHUS of Philadelphia (5th c.). *Photius speaks of having read a *Storia bizantina* (*Byzantiaca*) of the Christian *Sophist chronicler Malchus of Philadelphia (from Syria, as the name is Semitic) in seven books, which narrate the events of the years 473/474 up to 480. For these years it is an important and reliable source, perhaps because he draws on the evidence of trustworthy observers. In reality, acc. to the *Suidas, the account stretches from *Constantine up to *Anastasius (491). Photius himself testifies that the books he had read must have been preceded by others, which he had not seen. The preserved portion (in the Suidas and esp. in the *Excerpta de legationibus* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus) narrates the events surrounding the emperors *Zeno (474–491) and *Basiliscus (475–476). The author shows interests in the *Ostrogoths and in Italian affairs until the death of the emperor Nepos (480). Photius appreciates the style of the historian.

Repertorium 7, 415-416; PLRE 2, 703-704; B. Baldwin, *Malchus of Philadelphia*: DOP 31 (1977) 91-107; L.R. Cresci, *Problemi storici e filologici del testo di Malco*: Atti dell'Ist. Veneto di Scienze, Lettere e Arti 138 (1979–1980) 509-520; Id., *Malco di Filadelfia, Frammenti*: Byzantina et Neo-Hellenica 9 (1982) 69-121 (text, comment. and tr.); R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, III, Liverpool 1983, 404-455; Id., *On the Ordering of the Fragments of Malchus' History*: Liverpool Classical Monthly 9 (1984) 152-153.

A. Di Berardino

MALTA. An island rich in Neolithic temples in a unique style. Colonized by the Phoenicians and then by the Carthaginians, passing under Roman dominion in AD 218, it was incorporated into the province of Sicily. St. Paul was shipwrecked at Malta (Acts 27:39–28:10) in about the year 60. The fact that Luke calls the inhabitants *barbaroi* indicates that the language then spoken was still Punic, despite the long Roman colonization. The place of the shipwreck is traditionally located at the Bay of St. Paul. In the vicinity is found the church of S. Pawl Milqgħi (St. Paul Welcomed) of 1666, but documented as early as 1488. The excavations of the Italian Archaeological Mission from 1963 onward have revealed one of the numerous Roman rustic villas with a residence and tools for cultivation of oil and wine, and a graffito with the name *Paulus*.

Malta has many tombs and catacombs cut in the limestone, with burial niches, *arcosolia*, canopied tombs with or without seats, and burials in the ground. Characteristic of Malta are the *triclinia* cut out of the rock. One finds both Christian and Jewish monograms, although of the Christian inscriptions only one is in Latin. The oldest of these tombs date from the Punic era, but the catacombs are today placed at the beginning of the 4th c. onward. There are many lamps with the *chi-rho* imported from *Africa. Archaeological research identifies a connection between the stone *mensae* and the tables used as altars. It seems that up to the 4th or 5th c. the Eucharist was celebrated either immediately before or after the *agape*, despite the universal prohibition promulgated barely a century earlier. Since after *Constantine the island came under the Eastern empire there are also probable traces of the Byzantine rite. The same Italian mission has found a chapel with a baptistery and, presumably, a monastery, which flourished 4th–5th c. The excavation is near to a chapel dedicated to the Madonna of the Snows, but the interesting fact is that this complex occupies the site and incorporates what remained of an ancient temple constructed in the 6th c. AD dedicated to Astarte then to Hera and Juno (with the inscription in Punic and in Greek). It would seem to be the temple plundered by Varro acc. to Cicero's accusation. This temple also was constructed on a preceding Neolithic one of the Tarxien period for the cult of the *dea mater*.

The first clear mention of a bishop of Malta is to be found in the letters of *Gregory the Great, who in 592 wrote to Lucillus; he then wrote in 598 to the bishop of Syracuse ordering him to depose Lucillus for some misdeed. A year later he sent another letter to the Roman *defensor Siciliae* telling him to order Lucillus and his son to return the property which they had taken from the church to Trajan his successor. Byzantine Malta was invaded by the Arabs in 870.

D.H. Trump, *Malta: An Archaeological Guide*, London 1972; V. Borg, *Malta and Its Paleochristian Heritage: A New Approach*, in *Malta: Studies in Its Heritage and History*, Valletta 1986, 46-86, with ample bibl.; J. Samut Tagliaferro, *Malta: Its Archaeology and Its History*, Narni 2000.

P. Grech

MAMAS (Mammas, Mammes, Mammet) of Caesarea. The hagiographical dossier on Mamas is very rich and includes, as well as two *panegyrics respectively by *Basil of Caesarea (BHG 1020) and by *Gregory of Nazianzus (BHG 1021), various *Passiones* and *Vitae* in Greek and in Latin, with recensions in *Syriac and in *Armenian (BHO 589-592). In 2002, Berger edited the pre-Metaphrastic Greek life (BHG 1019), which derives from a Greek *Passio* now lost, certainly from before 5th–6th c., of which numerous recensions exist in Greek (BHG 1017z; 1019a-1019q) and Latin (BHL 5192-5196). In 1940 Delehaye published the Latin text of a *Passio* (BHL 5191d), which uses the lost Greek text with the addition of a brief introduction (see B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium* II, 126-129). It is called "encyclical" as it appears to be a circular letter that the three bishops Euprepius, Cratone and Perigenes sent to all the Eastern and Western churches. From the Middle Ages we should remember the 733 hexameters of the *De vita et fine sancti Mammae monachi* (BHL 5197) which Walafrid Strabo wrote, on the request of three canons of Lagres, most likely between 837 (Brooke) and before 841 (Solinski). This is a true and proper *Heiligenepos* (Berschin) in which the *Vita* is preceded by a *praefatio* of 24 minor asclepiads and by an *oratio* of 20 hendecasyllabic Phalaeceans; it is further followed by a hymn in the Ambrosian style *in Natalem sancti Mammetis*, in iambic dimeters. It has been hypothesized that the *Vita* of Walafrid Strabo bears dependence on the peom *Waltharius* (P. Dronke, followed by Önnerfors; contra Schieffer). A *Passio* was also redacted by St. Godfrey, bishop of Landres, in 1164 (BHL 5198). There are numerous documents of a liturgical nature, such as the office contained in an original MS of St. Martial of Limoges, from the end of the 11th c., edited by Pörnbacher.

According to the account of the "encyclical" *Vita*, Mamas was a young man of twelve years who had lived with Thaumasius, the pious and charismatic bishop of *Caesarea in Cappadocia, at the time of the emperor *Aurelian (270–275). The bishop having died, he abandoned the city, in which an uprising against the Christians was raging, following a supernatural voice which had ordered him to go to the forest and preach the gospel to the *ferae silvarum*. The same voice enjoined him to strike the earth with a staff, from where a book miraculously appeared containing the four gospels. It became a means of his preaching among the animals, which on their part provided milk with which he prepared cheese to send to the Christians hidden on account of the persecution. (The motif of the cheese is taken up in the iconography.) His remarkable preaching to the beasts having become widely known, the governor of the region sent soldiers to arrest him on the accusation of *magic. Mamas converted them to Christianity, but wished in any case to go into the city, so that they could be baptized and so as not to escape martyrdom. He was subjected to numerous torments (among others he was immersed in a burning furnace) and was several times exposed to lions and leopards, by which he was, however, always spared. He died serenely, on his knees, after having preached the eternal damnation of the governor of the region, Alexander, who died on the same day, *cum cruciato nimio*. In subsequent developments of the legend, his belly is torn up by a trident, while in other recensions he is a hermit who dies as a martyr at an old age (Cignitti).

Mamas, whose historical existence there is no reason to doubt (Scorza Barcellona), was venerated in Cappadocia, in the sanctuary which rose up over his tomb, where he was solemnly commemorated on 1 Sept and the Sunday after Easter. The place and date of his primitive cult are reflected in the oldest sources we have: i.e., homily 23 *in Mamantem martyrem* of Basil of Caesarea, delivered on 1 Sept in a year between 370 and 373 (Troiano), and homily 44, *in novam Dominicam*, of Gregory of Nazianzus, given on first Sunday after Easter (probably 16 Apr) of 383. The two Cappadocians present the martyr as a simple shepherd, from a poor family, exalting his thaumaturgic powers. More particularly, Basil celebrates in Mamas the *penia met' eusebeias* and gathers numerous biblical *exempla* directed at showing the excellence of the condition of shepherds (Girardi); for Gregory, Mamas is "shepherd and also martyr," adding the information that he used to milk "the deer, which used to compete with each other to nourish that just man with an uncommon milk" (*Hom.* 44,12). In neither homily do any of the themes found in the *Passions* and the subsequent *Lives* appear; these themes were legendary amplifications probably intended to make of Mamas a sort of Christian Orpheus, capable of taming animals and living in pacific symbiosis with the wild beasts (Delehaye; Pörnbacher); he also absorbs some elements of the great mother of the gods, Cybele, and of her companion Attis (Hadjinicolaou-

Marava). Parallels are also drawn with Genesis (the power of Adam over the animals) and Exodus (the staff and more generally the model of Moses) and above all with the book of Daniel (the lions and the furnace) (Solinski).

The most common liturgical date of the feast of the saint is 2 Sept (Constantinopolitan Synaxarium; marble calendar of Naples; *Annus ecclesiasticus Graeco-Slavicus*, Armenian and Coptic calendars and liturgical books). The date of 17 August is recorded, though, on the basis of the *Passio* mentioned above, in the *Mart. hier.*, the historical martyrologies and the *Mart. Rom.* (Saxer).

From Caesarea the cult of Mamas spread to *Constantinople, where the body of the saint was translated in 11th c. and where three churches and a monastery were dedicated to him. There were subsequent partial translations of the relics to the West: if *Radegund succeeded in obtaining a finger for the Monastery of the Holy Cross of Poitiers (BHL 7049), the cathedral of Langres, in Champagne, which already possessed an arm of the saint, obtained the head (BHL 5199), which from 1205 has been preserved in what is the most important shrine to Mamas in the West. Other presumed relics are in Cyprus, Milan and Lucca. In Italy the cult of the saint established itself in Tuscany, Emilia-Romagna, Lazio and in the Veneto. Sanctuaries dedicated to him coincide often with the presence of water, and the martyr is invoked, among other reasons, for protection of maternity and nursing. Elsewhere he is considered protector from hail and able to tame the most ferocious animals. There is a copious iconography in both East and West, in which various episodes of his passion recur. Mamas is usually represented as a young man, surrounded by animals.

BHG 1017z-1022; BHG *Novum Auctarium* 1019-1022; BHL 5192-5199; BHL *Novum Supplementum* 5191d-5198d; BHO 589-592. AASS Augusti, III, Antverpiae 1737, 423-446; Basil. *Hom.* 23 (CPG 2868): PG 31, 589-600; *Basil of Caesarea, I martiri. Panegirici per Giulitta, Gordio, 40 soldati di Sebaste, Mamante*, It. tr. by M. Girardi, Rome 1999 (Collana di Testi Patristici 147), 115-128; Greg. Naz. *Hom.* 44 (CPG 3010, 44): PG 36, 608-621; *Gregorio di Nazianzo, Tutte le orazioni*, ed. C. Moreschini, Milan 2000, 1122-1133; H. Delehaye, *Passio sancti Mammetis*: AB 58 (1940) 126-141; A. Berger, *Die alten Viten des heiligen Mamas von Kaisareia. Mit einer Edition der Vita BHG* 1019: AB 120 (2002) 241-310; Walafrid Strabo, *De vita et fine sancti Mammae monachi*: MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, II, 259-296, ed. E. Dümmler; *Walahfrid Strabo: Zwei Legenden: Blathmac, der Martyrer von Iona (Hy); Mammes, der christliche Orpheus*, ed. M. Pörnbacher, Sigmaringen 1997; B. Solinski, *Le* De uita et fine sancti Mammae monachi *de Walahfrid Strabon: texte, traduction et notes*: Journal of Medieval Latin 12 (2002) 1-77; M. Pörnbacher, *Eine Offiziendichtung zu Ehren des hl. Mammes, Patron von Langres, in einer Handschrift aus Saint-Martial in Limoges (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5351)*, in *Scripturus Vitam. Lateinische Biographie von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart. Festgabe für Walter Berschin zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Walz, Heidelberg 2002, 903-913. A. Hadjinicolaou-Marava, *Hò hàgios Màmas*, Athens 1953; BS 8, 592-612 (B. Cignitti); G. Bernt, *Die Quellen zu Walahfrids Mammes-Leben*, in *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff zu seinem 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schulern*, ed. J. Autenrieth - F. Brunhölzl, Stuttgart 1971, 142-152; U. Dronke - P. Dronke, *"Barbara et antiquissima carmina,"* I, *Le caractère de la poésie germanique héroïque*, II, Waltharius-Gaiferos, Barcelona 1977, 66-79; R.M. Bret, *Les saints et les biches*: Présence Orthodoxe 43 (1979) 38-43; A. Önnerfors, *Die Verfasserschaft des Waltharius-Epos aus sprachlicher Sicht*, Opladen 1979, 37-51; R. Schieffer, *Zu neuen Thesen über den Waltharius*: Deutsches Archiv 36 (1980) 193-201; M.S. Troiano, *L'Omelia XXIII* in Mamantem Martyrem *di Basilio di Cesarea*: VetChr 24 (1987) 147-157; M. Brooke, *The Prose and Verse Hagiography of Walahfrid Strabo*, in *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives of the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, ed. P. Godman - R. Collins, Oxford 1990, 551-564; M. Girardi, *Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo. Scrittura e tradizione*, Bari 1990, 137-144; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter.* III, *Karolingische Biographie 750-920 n. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1991, 275-279; I. Moreira, *Provisatrix Optima: St. Radegunde of Poitiers' Relic Petition to the East*: Journal of Medieval History 19 (1993) 285-305; *Il grande libro dei santi. Dizionario enciclopedico*, II, 1283-1284 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

B. Clausi

MAMBRE VERCANOL, lector. According to tradition, the brother of *Moses of Khorene and one of the first group of *Armenian translators (5th c.) and author of a (now lost) history. It is not certain that the three sermons published under his name (two on the resurrection of Lazarus and one on the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem) belong to the same author. Inglisian (p. 174) puts him in the 7th c.

Bardenhewer V, 208-209; *Koriwn Vardapeti, Mambrēi Vercanołi ew Dawt'i Anyałit'i; matenagrowt'iwnk'*, Venice 1833, 35-93; *Mambrīi Vercanołii čark'*, Venice 1894; S. Weber, *Ausgewählte Schriften der armenischen Kirchenväter*, II, Munich 1927, 1-27.

S.J. Voicu

MANDEANS and MANDEISM. *Mandaje* ("gnostics") denominates the members of a religious community formed of small groups currently present in S Iraq and in Iranian Khuzistan, which shows itself to be the bearer of a very ancient tradition, similar to the systems of *gnosticism of the first centuries AD. This tradition is contained in numerous sacred books, written in a Semitic dialect (Aramaic-Eastern group), the origin and antiquity of which is much discussed. Among the most important is the *Ginza* ("Treasure"), the *Book of John* or the *Book of the Kings*, and a collection of hymns and prayers

(*Quolasta*), as well as numerous liturgical texts relating to the principal cultic acts of the community. Among these baptism (*masbuta*) is primary, celebrated each Sunday in running water. Other important rites are those for the consecration of the priestly group, who guide the faithful as representatives of the heavenly beings, and also the so-called *masiqta*, a funeral rite which guarantees to the soul the return to the divine world from which it comes.

Mandeism is a religion with a dualistic basis which proposes an opposition between the world of Life, populated by numerous divine beings (*Uthra*) above which is the supreme Father, variously denominated ("Life," "Great Life," "Father of Greatness"), and the inferior world of the Darkness with its chief the "King of the Darkness" produced by *Ruha*, the (feminine) Spirit of iniquity.

The creation of the world is the result of a collaboration between certain envoys of the kingdom of Light and the demoniacal entities, a collaboration which culminated in the molding of man, into whom a luminous and divine substance was introduced (the "Interior Adam").

Imprisoned in the material body as in a prison, this substance aspires to be liberated and to return to its original homeland. This is possible by means of the knowledge, transmitted by a heavenly messenger (*Manda d-Haijê*, the "Knowledge of Life") and the complex of ritual acts prescribed by the community. In relation to the fundamental role of baptism, an important place is given in Mandeism to John the Baptist, called "prophet of the Truth." In fact, the Mandean tradition reveals numerous elements of Jewish and Christian origin, although it also contains strong polemic both against Judaism (*Adonai* being described as the bad god, and Moses as the prophet of *Ruha*) and Christianity (Jesus is presented in a very negative light). Ample space is made in the life of the Mandean community for astrological ideas and magical practices, with the use of Amulets, talismans, formulas of exorcism and incantations.

One theory worthy of credence connects the origin of the Mandeans to a Jewish heterodox sect of Baptist character, progressively open to gnostic and Iranian influences, which traveled from Palestine to Mesopotamia around the 2nd c. AD.

L. Tondelli, *Il mandeismo e le origini cristiane*, Rome 1928; K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer*, I-II, Göttingen 1960-61; Id., *I Mandei*, in *Storia delle religioni*, ed. G. Castellani, Turin 1971, IV, 749-771; E. Lupieri, *I Mandei. Gli ultimi gnostici*, Brescia 1993; E.M. Yamauchi, *Gnostic Ethics and Mandaean Origins*, Piscataway, NJ 2004.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

MANI – MANICHEANS – MANICHEISM.
I. Mani and Manicheism - II. Manichean literature

I. Mani and Manicheism. Mani (or Manes) was born 14 April 216 near *Seleucia-Ctesiphon in Parthia, which had recently fallen under Persian control. At the age of four his parents, Patik (or Pattīg) and Maryam (Miryam) took him to live with the *Elkesaites, a branch of Jewish Christianity, through which Mani could have become acquainted with (in addition to Christianity) some of the *gnostic ideas that are to be found in his system. At the age of 12 he received a revelation from his divine twin or companion (*syzygos*), who told him of the battle between light and darkness, and bid him leave the Elkesaites. A second revelation at the age of 24 gave him the order to become a messenger of light and salvation. Following this, around 241, Mani undertook a journey which carried him to India and into contact with Buddhism. When *Shapur I (242–273) became king of Persia, Mani returned and presented himself at court to publicly announce his divine mission. The attitude of the king was encouraging (to such an extent that Mani dedicated to him his first writing, the *Šābuhragān*), and the new revelation was to extend itself over the following 30 years. Other journeys undertaken in this period could have driven Mani W, as far as *Egypt (*Alexander of Lycopolis, *Against the Teaching of Mani* IV, 20), and he charged his most intimate disciples, Addas (Addai or Adimanto), Thomas and Hermas, to carry out missions.

Shapur died in 273, followed by his successor Hormizd I in 274. The new king, Bahram I (274–276/277), probably under pressure from Zoroastrian believers, had Mani arrested. He died in prison, or was put to death, on 2 March 274 or 26 Feb 277. His death unleashed a wave of persecution against his followers, pushing them into exile both in East and West. In the East the successors of Mani at the head of the religion established their headquarters at Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Manicheism became the religion of state of the Uyghur people in Chinese Turkestan from 762 until ca. 840. From there it spread even further E, to Siberia, Manchuria and China. Moving to the W, Manicheism passed through *Syria and *Cappadocia, reaching *Carthage, *Rome and Egypt toward the end of the 3rd. c. In Roman territory Manicheism soon found opposition from successive governments, starting with *Diocletian (284–305). One reason for hostility toward the movement from the point of view of the civil authorities seemed to have been its origin in Persia, historical enemy of Rome; another was due to the fact that this religion undermined the very foundations of organized soci-

eties. There is no evidence of the existence of Manicheism in the West after the 6th c., but some of its ideas survived in "neo-Manichean" groups, such as the *Paulicians, the Bogomils and the Albigensians.

Since Manicheism lasted from the 3rd c. until at least the 17th c. and spread gradually in an area which stretched from Africa to China, it is not easy to separate the central nucleus of its doctrine from regional and chronological variations. Further, its very system of beliefs was extremely complex, and mediated by the use of allegories and symbol. To this may be added the fact that the precise relationship of Manicheism with other religions, and in particular Buddhism, Zoroastrianism and Christianity, has been long discussed. During the 19th c. and until the middle of the 20th c. the opinion was widespread that Manicheism was principally inspired by the Eastern religions. However, through the study of original documents, we now consider Manicheism and Mani himself as inspired more by some form of Christian ideas than from other sources. That said, the Christian elements were underlined to a greater or lesser extent by the teachers of this religion, acc. to the religious traditions of the geographical religion which it sought to convert. However, a nucleus of fundamental beliefs seems to have been shared by Manicheans in every place.

This system of beliefs takes its origin from a crucial question for all organized religions: why does evil exist? The response of Manicheism is a radical dualism. It proposes a cosmogony, or explanation of the world in which we live, on the basis of its origin and destiny, and in three moments or phases: the primordial separation of spirit and matter, of light and darkness, of good and evil; their mixture; and the final return of the two antagonists to their original spheres. In the first phase the two principles coexisted in total separation one from the other. One, completely good, manifested only positive qualities (peace, intelligence and so on) and dwelled in the kingdom of light, which is constituted by the substance of this principle. This principle is the God "with four faces," the Father of Greatness and Light. The other principle, the Prince of Darkness, is intrinsically evil and negative. Frequently called simply "matter" (in the Iranian sources Āz, lust or greed), this principle lives in the kingdom of his dark substance. Each kingdom is constituted by five trees or elements. In the kingdom of good these are the gentle breeze, the wind which refreshes, the bright light, the living fire and the clear water. The elements of the kingdom of darkness are the stifling smoke, the devastating fire, the destructive fire, the turbulent water and the obscurity of the abyss. On three sides the two kingdoms extend to infinity, but on their fourth side they touch each other.

The second (or middle) phase refers to the present condition of all things. It begins when, during the turbulence which is eternally present in the kingdom of darkness, the principle of evil rises to the boundary of darkness with light. Seeing the light, the principle of darkness desires it and invades it. In its defense the principle of good brings to birth a certain number of *Aeons, composed of the substance of light of the principle of good: the Mother of Life, the Great Spirit, and Primordial Man, with his five sons. After a long battle the principle of evil defeats the Primordial Man and seizes his light, although some of the powers of the principle of evil (demons, both masculine and feminine) are in their turn seized by the powers of the kingdom of light. This is the moment in which light and darkness, good and evil, come to be mixed together for the first time. At this point the principle of good sends other beings—the Friend of the Lights, the Great Architect, and the Living Spirit—to liberate the Primordial Man and to construct the material world with parts of the captured demons. They are successful in this operation, but some particles of light remain mixed with the darkness. Our present visible world, therefore, is constituted by this mixture of elements of light and darkness, so that everything we find pleasant in it is attributable to the presence of the imprisoned light, while all that is unpleasant is owing to the darkness, which is the prison of the light.

To the end of providing a way of liberating this imprisoned light, the principle of good takes two steps. In the first place the Father of Greatness creates a mechanism for freeing the light. This comprises the sun and the moon, considered as composed of the substance of uncontaminated light and having the function of being collectors of light which has been liberated. The two stars then send this light back via the zodiac, represented by a great windmill with twelve blades, to the kingdom of light. Material creation is therefore an act dictated by necessity, a means used by the substance of light to regain that which it has lost.

The second step consists in sending the "Third Messenger" to the captured demons in the cosmic battle and to tempt them to release the particles of light which they had seized. The "Third Messenger" achieves this by presenting himself to each of them under the aspect of a desirable individual of the opposite sex. The light thus freed is sent to the sun and the moon, and then to the kingdom of light through the Column of Glory, "the Milky Way." The particles

of the substance of darkness which escape from the demons are left to fall into the visible world.

Seeing these developments and their purpose, the principle of evil counterattacks, creating a rival to the Primordial Man. This outcome is achieved by making a male demon and a female demon devour the light fallen to the earth, and then making them copulate. Their union produces Adam, the first terrestrial man. Adam is a world in miniature, a *microcosm, because he contains in himself both light (the soul) and matter (the body). Then the demons unite again and produce Eve, the first woman. She is similar in composition to Adam, although she seems to contain less light than him. The first human couple, therefore, far from being a creation of God, is the result of a malicious initiative, and has the purpose of keeping as much light as is possible trapped in the material world, esp. through the generation of children.

To counter this new tactic of the kingdom of darkness, a "Jesus" is sent by the kingdom of light to reveal to Adam and Eve the knowledge (*gnosis*) of how to attain salvation. But the definitive revelation of how humanity can be saved has to come from Mani, who was convinced that the revelations of the founders of previous religions, esp. Buddha, Zoroaster and Jesus, although authentic, were incomplete; and that therefore it was his mission to bring to the world the fullness of revelation, by means of what he called the "Religion of Light." This is the reason for which the followers of Mani made reference to him as the one in whom resided the Paraclete.

Mani habitually called himself "the apostle of Jesus Christ." But in Manicheism the figure of Jesus does not at all have the centrality which he does in orthodox Christianity, because Manicheism includes numerous entities called "Jesus" or "Christ." *Augustine of Hippo makes reference to at least three (*Contra Faustum* XX, 11): Jesus the Splendor, identified with the liberated light and deposited on the moon and on the sun (which were therefore objects of devotion); the suffering Jesus, who in effect consists in the light imprisoned in our material world on the "cross of Light"; Jesus the "Son of God," who has come on the earth in human appearance and who appears to have suffered and died by the hand of Pilate. None of these Christs is in reality a savior, as they are all simply bearers of salvific knowledge. On the contrary, the Jesus of orthodox Christianity was considered false, and seen as a devil in disguise. This was the Jesus who was truly nailed to the cross, since he had a material body—something unthinkable for a being sent from the kingdom of light to accomplish a mission of salvation. Since human flesh has a malign origin, and is formed through procreation (an act which emulates the demonic conception of Adam and Eve), the "true Jesus" of Manicheism cannot be born of Mary, nor can he, in fact, be born at all.

In the Manichean vision, every living being on the earth is a microcosm of the primordial battle, as each contains both matter and the substance of light. This is true above all for human beings, who are all called to avoid as far as possible the consequences of this mixed condition. Yet it is not simply a question of avoiding the mixture: the liberation of the light from matter had to continue in this world by the action of those who had responded to the divine call. Manicheans were those who had heard this call clearly and knew how to respond to it. The full members of Manicheism were the elect (perfect, or saints), with a hierarchy of 12 apostles or teachers (such as Adimanto), 72 bishops (such as Faustus) and 260 priests (such as Fortunatus). Some E Manichean documents mention other titles such as cantors and scribes, but these may have designated functions limited to the cult, or concerning the organization of the life of the community. The other principal group in Manicheism was that constituted by the hearers (catechumens). This group included both women and men; however, it seems that only men could accede to the higher grades of the hierarchy. Above all the others was the *archēgos*, the successor of Mani.

The elect were the primary instrument by which the liberation of light from its material prison was effected. This was their most sacred duty, which was realized by digestion: in fact, one of the ironies of the system was in the fact that, although human bodies were considered to be of diabolic origin and were designed to facilitate the imprisonment of light in matter, some of them were in fact the direct instrument of salvation, i.e., the liberation of the light. Since the Manicheans thought that this light was present in all living beings to different degrees, the diet prescribed for the elect consisted esp. in certain cereals, vegetables and fruits, as also certain spices and juices, all identified by their bright color as containing most light. (Augustine mentions some of these foods in the *De Moribus Manichaeorum*, 13,29-16,53 and *Contra Faustum* V, 10.) Therefore, in Manicheism the elect were, in intent and in the end pursued, the true saviors. This is the reason why a rigorous asceticism was asked of them, since they, more than all the other members of the human race, had to be involved in matter to the least extent possible, while they performed their task of freeing as much light as they could. The ascetic codex which

the elect had to follow consisted in three "seals" and five "commandments." The "seal of the mouth" obliged them to vigilance over their own senses. The "seal of the hands" imposed vigilance over their actions and prohibited the killing of any living being, including vegetables killed by scything to obtain food. The "seal of the heart" meant not thinking of anything out of harmony with the kingdom of light and with the process of the liberation of light. The commandments prohibited ownership, lying, killing, illicit foods (such as meat), and they imposed purity (above all from sexual relations). The elect had to dedicate themselves to frequent prayer (seven times a day) and to the keeping of a more severe fast for about a quarter of the days of the year.

Since they could not have family links or possess anything, it was implicit that the elect (at least in the Western forms of Manicheism) moved constantly from one place to another. Moreover, as they were not able to kill any living being (including vegetables), nor gather their own food, others had to do this for them. This task fell to the hearers and constituted their principal religious duty. The hearers were subjected to a less exacting code of behavior. They had to avoid lying, homicide, stealing, adultery and neglect of their primary religious duties; however, they were able to do manual work, own property and "kill," i.e., harvest and prepare food, which they offered to the elect. Their diet was less severe. They had to observe fewer days of fast (fifty in total, probably Sundays) and dedicate themselves less frequently to prayer (four times a day). They could also marry (although also in their case procreation was not encouraged).

We possess many Manichean liturgical texts (psalms, prayers and readings) but little information on how the liturgies were carried out. We know that the Manicheans did not accept baptism in water, but practiced frequent penitential rites, probably every Monday, the holy day of the week. During the Monday service the hearers and the elect gathered in different groups. The principal liturgical feast of the Manicheans was the Bema, observed on the day of the death of Mani. It seems that this celebration had as its center a throne or high platform (*bēma* in Greek), which bore the portrait of Mani, and had five steps which led up to this (reflecting here the importance which this number in general had in the Manichean religion). On this occasion the *Living Gospel* was read. According to a Manichean source in Coptic (the ninth *Kephalaion*), the feast of the Bema was also the occasion to nominate new members of the elect and hearers in the community. The ceremony of initiation of the elect consisted of five steps: a sign of peace was given to the candidate, who clasped the right hand of each member of the elect present. Then he who presided over the ceremony led the candidate to the center of the ceremonial space (*ekklēsia*), which represented the universal Manichean church. There the candidate exchanged a kiss with each of the elect and offered them a sign of veneration. At the end there was the imposition of the right hand of the one who presided on the head of the candidate, the act which officially numbered the candidate among the elect. Essentially, the same rite was used to admit one of the elect to a higher grade of the hierarchy. We do not have any information about the rite of admission to the hearers.

According to the same source in the Coptic language, the importance given to the right hand had the purpose of recalling elements of the cosmological myth: before the Primordial Man went to battle, the Mother of the Living placed her right hand on him, then grasped his hand with hers. The Living Spirit does the same after the rescue and return of the Primordial Man. The scope of the rite was therefore eschatological: it signified both the sending of the member of the elect to discharge the duty of freeing the light, and his welcome in the kingdom of light after death. Although this description of the rite and its interpretation derive from a single source, there is no reason to think that this form of rite did not conform to the practice of Manicheans in other places and periods.

At death the elect were destined to have their substance of light begin its journey back to the kingdom of light; the destiny of the hearers was to be reincarnate as elect, and thus become eligible for salvation. After a conflagration lasting 1,468 years, as much light as possible would be liberated. All material bodies, along with the light imprisoned in non-Manicheans, was, however, destined to remain buried forever.

The third and last cosmological phase regarded the return to the order of the first phase. This was to happen when as much light as possible had been liberated from matter through the action of the elect. At that future time a great fire would erupt to complete the work of purification. Then the universe would disappear, the principle of evil and all the dark substance would be constrained to return to the reign of darkness, and would be newly and totally separated from the kingdom of light. But the reconstituted order would not be exactly that which it was at the beginning, since part of the light would be permanently imprisoned in the reign of darkness.

II. Manichean literature. One of the reasons Mani invoked to demonstrate his right to be a revealer was that he was the first founder of a religion to have left writings from his own hand. Various sources attribute to him seven works: the *Shabuhragan*; *The Great* (or *Living*) *Gospel*; the *Book of Giants*; *The Treasure of Life* (or *of the Living*); *Pragmateia* (or *Treatise*), perhaps the same writing known as the *Great Letter to Pattīg*); *The Book of the Mysteries* (or *Secrets*); and the *Letters*. These works formed the Manichean protocanon, although probably not all regions had access to all seven writings (e.g., it seems that Roman Africa knew only five). Attributed to Mani is also a book of pictures (*Ertank* or *Pictures*) to explain his doctrine to the illiterate. None of these works has survived in integral form, although we do have extracts from some of them. The works of the immediate successors of Mani could have constituted a deuterocanon: some of these were collections of *Psalms* and the *Kephalaia*.

Until the beginning of the 20th c. the knowledge of Manicheism was derived exclusively from evidence given by its opponents. The first to launch an attack against Manichean doctrines in a literary work was a pagan philosopher from Egypt, *Alexander of Lycopolis. Not long after this, orthodox Christians too voiced opposition to the writings, doctrines and beliefs of the Manicheans. Among these opponents we should number *Ephrem (the deacon) of *Nisibis in Syria, the author (perhaps called *Hegemonius) of the *Acts of Archelaus*, *Serapion of Thmuis (in Egypt), *Titus of Bostra (in Syria), *Epiphanius of Salamis (in Cyprus) and *Augustine of Hippo (in Africa). All these lived in the 4th c. and at the start of the 5th c. Other writers would engage in controversy with the Manicheans in subsequent centuries, in particular the Syrians *Severus of Antioch (6th c.) and *Theodore bar Koni (8th c.); the Arabs Wadih al-Ya'qubi (9th c.), an-Nadim (10th c.), al-Beruni (11th c.) and al-Sharastani (12th c.); *the Shkand-vimānīk Vishār* of the Persian Martan Farrux I Ohrmazddatan (9th c.); and the histories of the Chinese Buddhists Tsung-chien and Chih-p'an (12th c.). But we do not any longer have to base ourselves only on testimony of the polemicists. Today we have the good fortune to possess original documents of the Manicheans thanks to a number of discoveries made from 1904 onward in Turfan, in NW China. There have been other discoveries in Algeria in 1918, and in Egypt from the 1930s up to the present day.

Since it considered matter as synonymous with evil, and saw material creation as dictated more by necessity than by love, Manicheism repudiated the presentation of creation in Genesis, together with its creator (identified with the principle of evil). Manicheism in fact came to reject the OT itself, as it did everything which it considered "Jewish interpolations" in the NT. The proof of the malign origin of the rejected Scriptures was their content, because they presented a God who was subject to anger, jealousy, to the emotion of revenge, and they encouraged acts of immorality, such as the killing of enemies, polygamy and procreation. Nonetheless, the Manicheans attributed a revelatory character (albeit imperfect) to that which remained of the NT after its "decontamination." They felt a special affinity for the ideas of Paul, and were surely partly responsible for the rebirth in interest in the Pauline literature in the 4th c. Manicheism also made use of certain of the apocryphal works of the NT, such as the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Acts of John*; and they reworked some of them for their own purposes.

G.B. Mikkelsen, *Bibliographia Manichaica: A Comprehensive Bibliography of Manichaeism Through 1996*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia, 1, Turnhout 1997, contains quite a complete list of the studies on Manicheism, for which reason we cite only those published after the work of Mikkelsen: P. Mirecki - J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43, Leiden 1997; S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 45, Leiden 1998; S.G. Richter, *Die Herakleides-Psalmen*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Coptica I: Liber Psalmorum, Pars II, fasc. 2, Turnhout 1998; S. Clackson - E. Hunter - S.N.C, Lieu, eds., *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, 1, Turnhout 1998; W.-P. Funk, *Kephalaia I, Zweite Hälfte*, Stuttgart 1999–; J. BeDuhn, *The Manichaean Body in Discipline and Ritual*, Baltimore 2000; A. Magris, *Il manicheismo, Antologia di testi*, Brescia 2000; Z. Gulacsi, *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1, Turnhout 2001; J. van Oort - O. Wermelinger - G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 49, Leiden 2001; *Il manicheismo*, I, *Mani e il manicheismo*, ed. G. Gnoli, Milan 2003; D. Durkin-Meisterernst, *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, III, Turnhout 2004; Alexander of Lycopolis, *Contro i manichei*, Genoa 2005.

J.K. Coyle

MANNA. The episode of the manna (Ex 16:14-35), sent by God to satisfy the Hebrews in the desert, and therefore a symbol of the saving action of the Lord, received little attention in paleo-Christian art. We know of two examples of cemeterial art. One is in the Roman catacomb of Cyriacus, from the end of the 4th c. (Wp 242,2), where two men and two women are pictured gathering the manna which descends from heaven in the hollow of their *paenula*. The other scene is to be found on the ceiling of a

niche in the catacomb of the Jordani. In this case, however, the manna is not gathered in the hollow of clothing, but in a container thought to be a *gomor*, a measure of slightly less than 4 liters, which was a person's daily portion. The descent of the manna in the fresco, which dates from the 2nd half of the 4th c., is visible behind the man who gathers it. On the left side of a Gallican sarcophagus (Ws 97,2-3-7), decorated on all four sides with mosaic scenes, along with a column of fire and a star is distinguishable manna, and also quails which take on the same soteriological significance as the manna. The scene is also depicted in the wooden doors of St. Sabina in Rome (ca. 430).

DACL 10, 1416-1423; EC 7, 1973; LCI 2, 150-153; Volbach-Hirmer, 78, pl. 103; U.M. Fasola, *Le recenti scoperte nelle catacombe sotto Villa Savoia. Il "coemeterium Iordanorum" ad S. Alexandrum*, Actas VIII CongrIntArquCrist, Vatican City-Barcelona 1972, 273, pl. III, 10; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom*, Tübingen 1980, 34-35, pl. 30-32a.

A.M. Di Nino

MANSUETUS of Milan (7th c.). Fortieth bishop of *Milan, in 679 he held a provincial council on the *monothelite question and, in the name of the bishops present, sent a synodal letter to Constantine IV Pogonatos against monothelitism (the *exposition fidei* of the Milanese council is in PL 87, 1265-1267). The date of his death is uncertain. His cult dates from after the 13th c.

CPL 1170-1171; PL 87, 1261-1265; BS 8, 632; F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300 descritti per regioni: La Lombardia, I, Milano*, Florence 1913, 284-286.

S. Zincone

MANUMISSION into the CHURCH. A means of leaving slavery. The slave was liberated by the power (*manus*) of the master (*dominus*), with the concession of liberty (*datio libertatis*: Di. 1,1,4), and joined the category of freedmen. During the empire the *libertus* became *sui iuris* and *civis* (up to the 2nd c. it was not so). The freedman contracted obligations with his master, among which was assuming his name and respect, but also economic obligations acc. to the contractual conditions. Manumission took various forms (*manumissio inter amicos*, *in convivio*, *fideicommisaria* etc.). *Constantine introduced a new one: *manumissio in ecclesia*. *Sozomen, writing at the time of *Theodosius II, affirms that Constantine issued three laws on manumission in the church (HE 1,9,6). Of the three laws the CTh reports only one (CTh 4,7,1), of 321; a second is preserved in CI (1,13,1), both addressed to bishops (*Protegenes of Serdica and *Ossius of Cordoba); we do not have the first law, however; the two which have been preserved are only imperial rescripts in response to specific requests for clarification of a previous constitution. Bishop Protegenes, on the one hand, directly or indirectly, had addressed himself to the emperor (even if he was not at Serdica, because in the *subscriptio* the place of promulgation of the law is not indicated) to ask for clarifications. Ossius, on the other hand, having close relations with the emperor as his counselor in Christian affairs, could have himself advanced the *suggestio*, which then became an imperial response.

With this law (CI 1,13,1) Constantine established that it was possible to grant liberty to slaves in the church under the eyes of the community and in the presence of the bishop. The conditions for the validity were as follows: the presence of the people and of the bishop, and the signature of the *dominus*, a document signed by the bishop. This legislation had a social character, and we see its effects when persons of immense wealth dedicated themselves to an ascetic life toward the end of the century, e.g., *Melania. Manumission occurred during a liturgical function, i.e., on festal days. The law CTh 4,7,1 of 321 directed to Bishop Ossius of Cordoba, the ecclesiastical counselor to Constantine, added other concessions (*amplius concedimus*) to those above: all clerics were able to grant manumission to their slaves, not only in the way established in the preceding laws but also *etiam cum postremo iudicio*, before death, without requiring a precise formula and without witnesses. Liberty was obtained at the moment that the wish of who granted the manumission was publicly known. In any case this is properly a *manumissio extra ecclesiam*. This last law is the only reported by CTh in that it includes also CI 1,13,1. *Augustine (*sermo* 21,-7) describes how manumission occurs: "You bring your slave to the church for manumission. All are silent. Your attestation is read or your wish is declared. You declare your manumission of your slave as he has in all things been faithful to you. If your slave, to whom you have granted manumission, does not remain faithful to you and does not show himself worthy of your manumission by remaining faithful, you catch him with some fraud in your house, how did you cry out?" Augustine invites clerics to grant manumission to their own slaves. The rite of manumission was refined over time. The practice of manumission in the church was not introduced in all the Roman provinces simultaneously, but at different times. In *Africa manumission was introduced only after 401, since the bishops gath-

ered together at *Carthage in June and September of 401, among which was Augustine, were preoccupied to know the practice of the Italian churches, if the bishops applied manumission, and to ask the emperor for a law for it (can. 62, Munier, CCL 149, 168; cf. can. 82).

S. Calderone, *Costantino e il cattolicesimo*, Florence 1962; F. Fabbrini, *La Manumissio in Ecclesia*, Milan 1965; S. Calderone, *Intorno alla manumissio in ecclesia*, in *Studi in onore di G. Grosso*, IV, Turin 1970, 377-397; M.A. Levi, *La cittadinanza dei liberti*: Atti dell'Acc. Romanistica Costant. 4 (1981) 501-507; W. Waldstein, *Schiavitù e cristianesimo da Costantino a Teodosio II*: Atti dell'Acc. Romanistica Costant. 8 (1990) 123-145; J.A. Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*, Tübingen 1995; H. Grieser, *Sklaven im spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Gallien (5.-7. Jh.)*, Stuttgart 1997.

A. Di Berardino

MANUSCRIPT TRADITION. No work of the patristic period has comes down to us in the form of the original, i.e., a document copied or revised by the author. Between the original and us, the text has been transmitted through successive copies, citations of other authors, adaptations or translations. Reconstructing the various phases of this process of transmission, inserting them in the most general historical context, is to write the history of the text. The principal channel of transmission is constituted by the body of MS copies of the text itself, or direct MS tradition. The study of the MS tradition is intended to reconstruct, on the basis of the copies which have been preserved, a text which is as close as possible to the original; this involves a series of techniques elaborated and perfected in the course of nearly two centuries of theoretical discussion and practical applications. The *recensio*, gathering together all the sources, reconstructs the reciprocal relationship of dependence; to do this, the material evidence of dependence or nondependence is used (age of the copies, mutilations, misplaced pages), and also errors (modifications of the original text) which have been progressively introduced into the text as it becomes more distant from the original. There is also an attempt to establish a genealogical tree of copies (*stemma codicum*); logical rules allow the elimination of sources which are without value, arriving gradually to a text which is the closest possible to the original. In the terms of the *recensio* one does not usually arrive at a perfect construction of the text of the author; critical evaluation is then introduced (*emandatio* in the broad sense): on the basis of the context, of language and of the style of the author, a choice is made from the variants which the recension has not indicated should be eliminated, and one tries, by conjecture, to improve the text where one supposes that it is still defective. Classical stemmatic rules are difficult to apply where the copies are great in number, when many of these have been prepared or corrected, often repeatedly, on the basis of more than one original (*contaminatio*), i.e., when the author has published several editions of his work or when the copyists have liberally reworked the text to the point of creating several recensions of it. In fact, all these cases are encountered frequently for texts in the patristic era. Huge numbers of biblical MSS require appropriate analysis, all the more because contamination seriously complicates matters; in such cases, real progress is to be expected using computerized processing and related methods. We know, or have good reason to believe, that authors such as *Augustine of Hippo, *Athanasius of Alexandria and *Gregory of Nyssa put into circulation improved versions of a text which had already been published. Hagiographical texts, esp. when not supported by the authority of a great name, were adapted to the taste of the moment. Dogmatic tracts were often subjected, by different parties, to tendentious modifications: works not in perfect conformity with official doctrine were deliberately suppressed or, if they had been sufficiently copied, were lost (this is the case of numerous ante-Nicene authors); others, finally, were preserved in forms more or less modified (e.g., Irenaeus and a large part of the work of Origen). In brief, acc. to the case, editors find themselves faced with questions of various types: they try to resolve these by reconstructing, in the most detailed manner possible, the different phases of the history of the text which they study. The MSS are grouped acc. to their origin and inserted into the cultural context in which they were produced: this allows one to take account of certain textual particularities, to explain their genesis and to appreciate their value. The history of doctrines, language and literary styles brings to light recasting and the existence of recensions, and permits these to be contextualized in concrete circumstances. In the case of the Greek authors, the study of ancient versions, esp. Syriac, permits one to arrive at an earlier tradition than direct witnesses allow. A history of the text thus understood, at the same time both detailed and concrete, can make an important contribution to the history of a culture, of varying milieus and of different mentalities.

On the questions of method, two classics: P. Maas, *Textkritik*, Leipzig [4]1960 (It. tr. Florence [3]1972); G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence [2]1952 (repr. Milan 1988); more recent contributions are cited by S. Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, Eng. tr., Chicago 2005; description

of methods which use computerized processing: J. Duplacy, *Classification des états d'un texte. Mathématique et informatique: repères historiques et recherches méthodologiques*: RHT 5 (1975) 249-309. Panoramic view and reflections on the characteristics of the transmission of the patristic texts: H.G. Beck, *Zur Überlieferung der griechischen Patristik*: Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur, I, Zürich 1961, 494-510; T.C. Skeat, *La produzione libraria Cristiana dalle origini: papiri e manoscritti*, Florence 1976; *Centenaire J.P. Migne (1875-1975). Table ronde international sur l'édition patristique. Rétrospective et prospectives*: SE 22 (1974-75) 12-111; D. Harlfinger (ed.), *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, Darmstadt 1980; G. Cavallo (ed.), *Libri e lettori nel mondo bizantino. Guida storica e critica*, Rome-Bari 1982; A.G. Hamman, *L'épopée du livre: la transmission des textes anciens, du scribe à l'imprimerie*, Paris 1985; N.G. Wilson, *Le biblioteche del mondo bizantino*, in *Le biblioteche nel mondo antico e medievale*, ed. G. Cavallo, Rome-Bari [2]1989, 79-112; H.Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*, New Haven-London 1995; J.-C. Fredouille et al. (eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, Paris 1997, 581-589; F. Troncarelli, *Vivarium: i libri, il destino*, Steenbrugis-Turnhout 1998.

P. Canart

MAPINIUS of Reims (6th c.). Bishop of *Reims from 535 to 549, he was represented at the Fifth Council of Orléans of 549 by the archdeacon Protadius (Mansi IX, 138). Only two letters of his have come down to us (*Ep. Austrasicae* 11 and 15), one addressed to *Nicetius of Trier, in which he apologizes for being unable to participate in the Council of Toul of 550, giving us also information about that council, and the other to Vilicus of Metz, in which Mapinius commemorates the seventieth birthday of his correspondent.

CPL 1062; PL 68, 43-46; 71, 1165-1166; W. Gundlach ed., MGH, Epp. III, Berlin 1892, 126-127, 129; repr. in CCL 117, Turnhout 1957, 429-430, 433-434; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle*, Paris 1980, 179, 210-211, 218, 250; Patrologia IV, 303.

P. Marone

MAR MARI, Acts of. *Syriac apocryphal work in 34 chapters; it recounts the missionary activity of the apostle Mar Mari, companion of the apostles and one of the great evangelizers. The *Acts* begin with a description of the monument of Christ at Banias; it follows a reworking of the story of *Abgar and of the apostolate of *Addai, who nominates Mar Mari as his successor. The following chapters recount the story of the apostolate of Mar Mari and the miracles he worked during the voyage from *Edessa to *Mesopotamia and *Persia. Before his death Mar Mari named Papa as his successor; this section provides a revision of the beginning of the Christianization of these countries acc. to the perspectives of the 6th–7th c., during which the text was written. The historical value of the work remains an open question.

Editions: J.B. Abbeloos: AB 4 (1885) 42-138 (with Lat. tr.); P. Bedjan, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum syriace*, 1, Paris-Leipzig 1890, 45-94; Fr. tr., Ch. e F. Jullien, *Les Actes de Mar Mari*, Turnhout 2001 (intro., tr. and comm.); Ch. and F. Jullien, *Les 'Actes de Mar Mari': une figure apocryphe au service communautaire*: Apocrypha 10 (1999) 177-194; Id., *Apôtres des confins*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002, 77-78.

M. Starowieyski

MARA BAR SERAPION, Letter of. Mara, son of Serapion, a *Syriac learned man who had received a Greek education, esp. in philosophy, wrote a letter to his son, a student, after the conquest of Samosata by the Romans (AD 73). Here, Mara takes up the topic of the wise man persecuted by evildoers who are subsequently punished by God, and offers three examples: two Greek philosophers, Socrates and Pythagoras, and "the wise king of the Jews," who was killed by them, but who "is not dead, thanks to the new laws promulgated by him." As for his killers (with the same generalization applied to the Athenians who killed Socrates), they were deprived of their reign and dispersed everywhere. This certainly is a reference to Jesus and to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. Although a late dating has been proposed (McVey), and it has also been suggested that this letter is a mere rhetorical exercise that has nothing to do with Mara (Chin), on the basis of both historical and philosophical points I have argued that it was in fact composed by Mara toward the end of the first century AD and that it is replete with *Stoic motifs, especially typical of Roman Stoicism. Both Tieleman and Rensberger now agree on its Stoicism, its authenticity and its early date. Thus, this is very likely to be one of the very first pagan references to Jesus, probably even earlier than Tacitus. It is roughly contemporary with Josephus, whose *Testimonium* describes Jesus in the very same way, as a "wise man" (σοφὸς ἀνήρ) who was put to death by the leaders of his people, but who still lives in those who love him and saw him after his resurrection.

I. Ramelli, *Gesù tra i sapienti greci perseguitati ingiustamente in un antico documento filosofico pagano di lingua siriaca*, RFN 97 (2005) 545-70 (with review by S. Zurlo, *E da una lettera del 73 d.C. spunta il Salvatore*, Giornale 27.III.2005, 16-17); K.E. McVey, *A Fresh Look at the Letter of Mara bar Serapion to His Son*, in *V Symposium Syriacum Leuven 1988*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1990, OCA 236, 257-72; C. Chin, *Rhetorical Practice in the Chreia Elaboration of Mara bar Serapion*, Hugoye 9.2 (2006) 145-171; A. Merz – T. Tieleman, *The Letter of Mara bar Serapion: Some Comments on Its Philosophical and Historical*

Context, in *Empsychoi Logoi. Religious Innovations in Antiquity. Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst*, ed. A. Houtman – A. de Jong – M.W. Misset-van de Weg, Leiden 2008, 107-133; I. Ramelli, *Stoicismo romano minore*, Milan 2008, with critical essay, tr., comm. and biblio.; D. Rensberger, *Awakening Sleeping Texts: Reconsidering the Letter of Mara bar Serapion*, in *Aramaic in Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. P.V.M. Flesher – E.M. Meyers, Duke Judaic Studies Monograph Series 3, Winona Lake, IN 2010.

I. Ramelli

MARANATHA. An Aramaic term found in 1 Cor 16:22, and then again in the liturgical prayer that concludes the thanksgiving in the *Didache* (10:6), in two inscriptions (one Greek of the 4th–5th c. and one Latin of 7th–8th c.) and in can. 75 of the 4th Council of Toledo of 633. Modern critics interpret it either in the declarative sense "Our Lord has come / comes" (with past reference, to the incarnation; in the present, esp. to the liturgical context) or in the imperative sense "Our Lord, come" (the invocation of Rev. 22:20 seems be the Greek version). The difference lies in different ways of dividing the word: *Maran atha* or *Marana tha*. The Greek Fathers always translated it in the past tense, "Our Lord has come," from *John Chrysostom (*In Ep. I ad Cor. hom.* XLIV), who finds in it a confirmation of the kerygma of the resurrection, to other commentators on the Pauline epistle: *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who states that it is not a Hebraic but a Syriac word (PG 82, 373), *John of Damascus (PG 95, 705), Theophylact (PG 124, 793). Among the Latins it is *Ambrosiaster who gives it to mean the same as *venit* understood in the past tense (*In 1 Cor.* 16,22). *Jerome calls it a "Syrian word" (*De om. hebr.*). The eschatological significance of the imperative meaning may be based on the analogous expression ("until he comes") of 1 Cor 11:26: an invocation of the parousia of Christ in the context of the Lord's Supper.

K.G. Kun, see entry *Maranatha*: GLNT 6, 1249-1266 TDNT 4, 466-472); C.F.D. Moule, *A Reconsideration of The Context of Maranatha*: NTS 6 (1960) 307-310; U.B. Muller, *Prophetie und Predigt im Neuen Testament*, Gütersloh 1975, 201-211.

F. Cocchini

MARATHONIUS of Nicomedia (4th c). A deacon of *Constantinople, active in promoting the monastic life, he was ordained bishop of *Nicomedia by *Macedonius in ca. 342. He was, as was Macedonius, a promoter of the**homoiousion*, and it is thought that, as such, he was deposed from his episcopal seat after the Council of Constantinople of 360. He continued to collaborate actively with Macedonius in the promotion of the doctrine opposed to the divinity of the *Holy Spirit, so that its supporters were sometime called Marathonians, as well as *Macedonians.

DCB 3, 803; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988, 761-762; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 64 n. 37; 192, n. 85.

M. Simonetti

MARCELLA (mid 4th c.–early 5th c.). Roman matron, of the Marcelli family, Marcella lived from the middle of the 4th c. to the beginning of the 5th, and was linked to the milieu and form of Christian life which derived from St. *Jerome. From Jerome, who deals with her in numerous letters (23-29, 32, 34, 37-44, 46, 97, 127), and who honors her with a moving eulogy in *Ep.* 127, written two years after Marcella's death owing to a *tristitia incredibilis* which had taken hold of him, we know details of her life. Orphaned by her father at a young age and widowed after six months of marriage, Marcella with courteous firmness declined the offer of a new marriage with the consul Cerealis (358), notwithstanding the exhortations of her mother, *Albina. An acquaintance, in her youth, with *Athanasius, who was in exile in *Rome (340), through him she learned about *Anthony, the father of Egyptian monasticism, the monasteries of the *Thebaid, and *Pachomius and the way of life of virgins and widows who undertook to "be pleasing to Christ." Later (373) the presence in Rome of *Peter of Alexandria influenced Marcella to such an extent that, first among the Roman noblewomen, she made her *propositum monachorum*, living thus in her palace on the Aventine with her mother, Albina, and with other Roman noblewomen, including Asella, Principia, Marcellina, Lea and Sophronia. When Jerome came to Rome, Marcella had him as master and spiritual guide of her monastic group (382). She not only showed herself Jerome's diligent disciple (so much so that when absent from Rome Jerome addressed himself to her to resolve scriptural "disputes"), but was also acknowledged by him to be the cause of the resolution, in Jerome's favor, of the *Origenist question. The personality of Marcella—strong, free and balanced, amid her asceticism—as well as her marked competence in scriptural studies made of her monastery on the Aventine a center of intense monastic life which Marcella would not abandon, not even when she was invited by *Paula, *Eustochium and Jerome himself to move to Bethlehem

(Ep. 46 of 392/393). Only toward the end of the 4th c. did she move to the environs of Rome with Principia (the addressee of Jerome's *Ep.* 127). The sack of Rome by the *Visigoths of *Alaric saw Marcella again on the Aventine subjected to harsh tortures by the barbarians, while she succeeded in securing the safety of Principia. Led by the *Goths to the tomb of Paul, she died there some days later.

DCB 3, 803; DACL 10, 1760-1762; BS 8, 644-645; PCBE 2, 1357-1362; L. Pauthe, *Histoire de Ste Marcelle*, Paris 21884; Ch. Favez, *Trois disciples: Marcella, Fabiola. Paula*: Études des lettres 12 (1938) 218-232; A. Penna, *S. Girolamo*, Turin 1949, 74-85; L. Gutierrez, *St. Jerome and Roman Monasticism: A Historical Study on His Spiritual Influence*: Philippiniana sacra 10 (1975) 256-307; LTK 6, 1299; P. Nautin, *La lettre de Paule et Eustochium à Marcelle (Jérôme, Ep. 46)*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 441-449; St. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart 1992; Ch. Krumeich, *Hieronymus und die Christlichen feminae clarissimae*, Bonn 1993; G. Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*, Oxford 1994; S. Wittern, *Frauen, Heiligkeit und Macht: lateinische Frauenviten aus dem 4. bis 7. Jh.*, Stuttgart 1994; G. Jenal, Italia ascetica atque monastica. *Das Asketen- und Mönchtum in Italien von den Anfängen bis zur Zeit der Langobarden (ca. 150/250–604)*, Stuttgart 1995; B. Feichtinger, *Apostolae Apostolorum. Frauenaskese als Befreiung und Zwang bei Hieronymus*, Frankfurt a.M. 1995; A. Caruso, *Marcella dell'Aventino e il suo tempo*, Rome 1995; P. Laurence, *Marcella, Jérôme et Origène*: REAug 42,2 (1996) 267-293; M. Testard, *Les dames de l'Aventin, disciples de saint Jérôme*: BSAF (1996) 39-63; S. Letsch-Brunner, *Marcella: discipula et magistra. Auf den Spuren einer römischen Christin des 4. Jh.*, Berlin-New York 1998; N. Adkin, *The Letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella: Some Notes*: Maia 51 (1999) 97-110; N. Adkin, *Jerome on Marcella*: BStudLat 29/2 (1999) 564-570; A. Bernet, *Saint Jérôme*, Clovis 2002.

M.G. Bianco

MARCELLINA (2nd c.). Carpocratian. Follower of the gnostic *Carpocrates. She came to Rome under Pope *Anicetus (155–166) acquiring a large group of disciples (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 26,6).

DCB 3, 803-804; W.A. Löhr, *Karpokratianisches*: VChr 49 (1995) 23-48, esp. 35-36; P. Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis 2003, 319.

E. Prinzivalli

MARCELLINA (4th c.; d. 17 July 397/401). Older sister of St. *Ambrose of Milan, born probably at *Trier in about 330. To Marcellina, who on the Epiphany of 353 had received the *velatio* in the presence of Pope Liberius in the Vatican basilica, the bishop of Milan dedicated his *De virginibus*, considered the first organic treatise of spirituality and theology on the theme of Christian virginity. Also addressed to her are the *Letters* 20, 22, 41 of Ambrose. He told his sister of the events of Holy Week in 386, informing her of the tension that had arisen with *Justina (*Ep.* 20); he communicated to her the discovery of the bodies of the martyrs *Gervasius and Protasius, sending her a transcription of the homilies with which he had marked the feast (*Ep.* 22); he kept her informed of the reaction of *Theodosius after the fire at the synagogue and at the temple of the *Valentinians at Callinicus, and again after the homily in which he had illustrated to the emperor the difference that existed between the church and the synagogue (*Ep.* 41). In the *De excessu fratris Satyri* I, 33, written for the death of his brother, Ambrose records the grief of Marcellina. She died at Milan on 17 July during the episcopate of *Simplicianus, between 397 and 401, acc. to an ancient *Life of St. Marcellina* (BHL 5223). She was buried in the basilica of St. Ambrose, near to the tomb of her brother.

BS 8, 646-648; PCBE 2, 1365-1367; var. aus., *S. Ambrogio nel XVI centenario della velatio di Santa Marcellina*, Milan 1953; E. Bernasconi, *Nella villa di campagna di Santa Marcellina*, Milan 1959; C. Pasini, *S. Marcellina vergine*, in var. aus., *Dizionario dei santi della chiesa di Milano*, Milan 1995, 59; S. Spagnol - M. Dalpé, *Sainte Marcelline*, Sillery (Québec) 1996; M.C. Viggiani, *Santa Marcellina. Una nobile romana a Milano. Vita, opere e devozione della sorella di S. Ambrogio*, Genoa 2000.

M.G. Mara

MARCELLINUS, Luciferian. A priest of the *Luciferian community. Together with the Roman presbyter *Faustinus he addressed the **Libellus precum* to the emperor *Theodosius I in 384.

CPL 1571; PCBE II/2, 1368-1370.

M. Simonetti

MARCELLINUS, pope (d. 304). According to the **Depositio episcoporum* composed around 336 and included in the **Chronography* of 354, Marcellinus succeeded Pope *Caius on 30 June 296 (from 1 July, in the **Liber pontificalis*) and died in 354 during the Great *Persecution under the emperor *Diocletian, yet we cannot say with certainty that he suffered martyrdom. He was buried in the catacomb of *Priscilla next to the martyr Crescentius (LP 1, 162) and his tomb was well known. Since the *Depositio episcoporum* associates his *depositio* with 15 January, it is clear that Marcellinus was venerated in the Roman Church going back at least to around 336 (MGH, *Chron. min.* I, 70); nonetheless, his name is sometimes confused in the sources with his successor *Marcellus I (see BS 8,673; LP I, LXXI). Indeed, the *Liber pontificalis* adds that he relented during the

persecution, but then repented and suffered martyrdom on 31 March; the text dwells on describing his *apostasy. This information can be derived from a *Passio* of the late 5th c. that was written to exonerate Marcellinus and three of his priests and later his successors *Miltiades, Marcellus I and *Sylvester I from the accusation of **traditores*. At the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th c., the *Donatists spread the accusation against their reputation, yet it was refuted by *Augustine of Hippo and by the Conference of *Carthage in 411 (Aug., *C. litt. Petil.* II, 92,202; *De unico bapt.* XVI, 27; *Brev. Coll.* III, 9ff.). At the same point in time as the *Passio*, yet another falsehood was fabricated concerning the **lapsus* of Marcellinus, namely the proceedings of the Council of Sinuessa (Mansi I, 1249-1257; PL 6, 11-20), acc. to which he acknowledged his fault and condemned himself. The intent of this text was to establish the principle of *prima sedes non iudicabitur a quoquam*, during the struggles between Pope *Symmachus (498–514), the antipope *Laurentius and the *Ostrogoth king *Theodoric the Great.

AASS *April.* III, 412-414; LP I, LXXIIIff., XCIX, 162-163; III, 76; BHL 5223b, 5223d, 5223f; Hfl-Lecl I, 207-208; BA 31, 845-849; DTC 9, 1999-2001; BS 8, 651-653; DACL 10, 1762-1773; E.H. Röttges, *Marcellinus-Marcellus. Zur Papstgeschichte der diokletianischen Verfolgungszeit*: ZKTh 78 (1956) 385-420; A. Amore, *Il preteso "Lapsus" di Papa Marcellino*: Antonianum 32 (1957) 411-426; Id., *È esistito Papa Marcello?*: Antonianum 32 (1957) 57-75; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, I, Rome 1976, 392-393; T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge, MA 1981, 38-39, 303-304; G. Squittieri, *Cristianesimo e impero romano*, Salerno 1981, 278-281; F. Tolotti, *Le cimetière de Priscille. Synthèse d'une recherche*: RHE 73 (1988) 281-314; EPapi 1, 303-307.

A. Di Berardino

MARCELLINUS Comes (d. after 534). Marcellinus was of Illyrian origin, an *orthodox *Catholic, born perhaps near Skopje, a native speaker of *Latin and well versed in *Greek; he lived at *Constantinople, where he was a secretary of the future emperor *Justinian until 525–527. This little that we know of his life comes from some of his sayings and from passing references in *Cassiodorus (*Inst.* 1,17,1-2). He received the titles of *comes* and *vir clarissimus*, perhaps for his services and for his activity as a writer. He wrote the *Annales*, a Latin chronicle that begins in 379 with the accession of *Theodosius I to the throne, and in the first edition proceeds to 518, later revised and continued through 534, the date of the retaking of *Africa with the defeat of the *Vandal king Gelimer. Another author extends the chronicle to 548; this section is called the *Auctarium* or *Additamentum* (Mommsen, 104-108). Marcellinus is a well-informed author, esp. about the events beginning in 498. Constantinople was a place of privileged perspective, and he was able to gain access to primary sources. His attention is turned to both West and East, but beginning with 454–455 he concentrates increasingly on the *pars Orientis*. He relays numerous events connected to *heresies and the leading heretics; a significant portion concerns the bishops of *Rome. Marcellinus is the first author who refers to 476 as the "decline" of the Roman Empire in the West. He depends on *Orosius for the most ancient history; his work was employed by *Jordanes, the Venerable *Bede and Paulus Diaconus, and was used in the Irish annals. Cassiodorus mentions two of his other works: the first is preserved only in a fragment (*De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*); concerning the second, he affirms that it was a detailed description in four books of the cities of Constantinople and *Jerusalem (*Inst.* 1,25,1).

CPL 2270-2271; PL 51, 917-948; CPPM III/A 295; MGH, *Auct. ant.*, 11, 60-104; B. Croke, *The Chronicle of Marcellinus: A Translation and Commentary* (with a reproduction of Mommsen's crit. ed.), Sydney 1995; D. Bartonková, *Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes's Romana*: SPFB 12 (1967) 85-194; L. Várady, *Jordanes-Studien. Jordanes und das Chronicon des Marcellinus Comes. Die Selbständigkeit des Jordanes*: Chiron 6 (1976) 441-487; B. Croke, *A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point*: Chiron 13 (1983) 81-119; S. Teillet, *Des Goths à la nation gothique. Les origines de l'idée de nation en Occident du V*[e] *au VII*[e] *siècle*, Paris 1984; G.M. Pintus, *Eucherio di Lione nella cronologia di Gennadio e Marcellino*: Studi Medievali 25 (1984) 795-812; M. Gusso, *A proposito dell'uso di "interrex" nel "Chronicon" di Marcellinus Comes*: Critica Storica 28/1 (1991) 133-152; Id., *Contributi allo studio della composizione e delle fonti del Chronicon di Marcellinus Comes*: SDHI 61 (1995) 557-622; Id., *Index Marcellinianus: An Index to the Chronicon of Marcellinus Comes*, Hildesheim 1996; Id., *Il Chronicon di Marcellino Comes: a proposito di un libro recente*: Cassiodorus 3 (1997) 273-289; B. Croke, *Marcellinus on Dara: A Fragment of His Lost De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*: Phoenix 38 (1994) 77-88; A. Cameron, *The "Epitome de Caesaribus" and the "Chronicle" of Marcellinus*: CQ, New Series 51 (2001) 324-327; B. Croke, *Count Marcellinus and His Chronicle*, Oxford 2001.

A. Di Berardino

MARCELLINUS, Flavius (d. 413). *Tribunus* and **notarius*. Flavius Marcellinus was born probably at *Toledo; he had a brother named Apringius, a proconsul of *Africa (411–413). He was a man of culture, generous and aristocratic, with theological interests. Marcellinus exchanged letters with *Jerome (*Ep.* 126). He was a friend of *Augustine of Hippo, who wrote six letters to him (*Ep.* 128, 129, 133, 138, 139, 143) and dedicated three works to him: *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* in 412; *De spiritu et littera* in 412; and the first 2 books of *De civitate Dei* in 413. In

the *Pelagian controversy he had an important role; he was in fact the first to call the attention of Augustine to the Pelagian cause (Aug., *De gestis Pel.* 11,25). The emperor *Honorius commissioned him to moderate the debate between the *Catholics and the *Donatists at *Carthage in 411 (*CTh* 16,11,3), a duty that he fulfilled with great care and dedication. In moments of difficulty he enjoyed the support of Augustine. The Pelagians accused him of corruption, and this accusation led to his downfall. After the revolt of the usurper Heraclianus, the *comes* Marinus arrested him on the double accusation of corruption and of having played a part in the revolt. At the same time, on the basis of the same accusations, the authorities arrested Apringius. The interventions of the African bishops did not have a significant impact: both brothers were executed on 15–16 September 413. The imperial court later conceded the injustice of such a condemnation (*CTh* 16,5,55). On 6 April the Roman church venerates Marcellinus as one of its martyrs.

S. Lancel, *Actes de la conference de Carthage en 411* (SC 194, 195, 224, 373 and see the *Index personarum*, 1620-1621), Paris 1972-1991; PLRE II, 711-712; M. Moreau, *Le dossier Marcellinus dans la correspondance de saint Augustin*: RecAug 9 (1973) 3-181; PCBE 1, 671-688.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

MARCELLUS I, pope (d. 309). With the *persecution that raged in 303, the *Roman Church found itself in enormous difficulty over internal divisions. Pope *Marcellinus died on 25 October 304. The *Liber pontificalis* claims that the papal see was vacant for seven years, three months and twenty-five days (ed. L. Duchesne 1, 162). Such a claim does not agree with what the same *Liber* otherwise writes in connection with his successor Pope Marcellus (ed. Duchesne 1, 164), who acc. to the *Catalogus Liberianus* was elected four years later (T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* 76; see R. Bagnall, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* 150). The year of the election of Marcellus is still greatly debated, and it is variously given as 306, 307 or even 308.

The *Liber pontificalis* states that Marcellus is of Roman origin; the first edition portrays him as a son of Marcellus, his very own *name (ed. Duchesne, 72-73); however, the second edition portrays him as a son of Benedictus and *de regione Via Lata*. According to Mommsen, he would have been a simple presbyter who led the Roman community during the vacancy of the papal see after the death of Marcellinus and before the election of *Eusebius in 310 or 311. Albeit to varying degrees, Röttges and Monachino are moving toward accepting such a thesis. Moreover, the presbyter Marcellus, and not a Pope Marcellus, would have been the founder of the cemetery of Novella and would have been the source of the *titulus Marcelli*. In his translation and continuation of the *Chronicon* by *Eusebius, *Jerome omits the name of Marcellus, and treats Eusebius as the 29th bishop of Rome (GCS 47, 228). Since they depend on Jerome, many later lists continue to omit the name of Marcellus. *Augustine names the two pontiffs: *Gaius, Marcellinus, Marcellus, Eusebius, Miltiades, *Sylvester (*Ep.* 53,1,2; *C. Litt. Pet.* 2,02).

Another significant problem arises from the **Depositio episcoporum*, which links the commemoration of Marcellinus to 15 January (MGH, *Chronica minora* I, 70) but does not include Marcellus in the list. The **Depositio martyrum* makes no mention of the two popes. Meanwhile, the *Mart. hier.*, throughout its entire MS tradition, links 16 January with the deposition of the body of Pope Marcellus I in the catacomb of *Priscilla. The ancient sources locate the sepulchers in distinct and rather precise places: Marcellinus underground near the Roman martyr Crescentius, in the *cubiculum clarum* acc. to some MSS, and Marcellus in the upper basilica of St. Sylvester, acc. to the *Notitia ecclesiarum* from the middle of the 7th c. (R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, II, 77). We maintain that the sepulchral tradition, esp. the *Catalogus Liberianus* assembled only about a decade after the death of Marcellus, as well as the example of Pope *Damasus (366–384), who dedicated an epitaph to Marcellus and placed it near his *tomb in the basilica of St. Sylvester in the catacomb of Priscilla, is not capable of making up a bishop of Rome at a point in time so close to the narrated events. Thus Damasus explicitly claimed to have documentation for this (A. Ferrua, ICUR 6, n. 40; E. Diehl, n. 962). The Great Persecution under the emperor *Diocletian had resulted in many **lapsi* ("apostates"), who after the storm of persecution subsided wanted to be reintegrated into the community, on account of which "there arise furor, hate, discord, protest, rebellion, killing; the *peace is destroyed," acc. to the epitaph. At Rome in 306 the attitude of the emperor *Maxentius was favorable to Christians; therefore, the delay in replacing the deceased bishop seems to have depended entirely on internal dissensions. Then appeared the *tyrannus* Maxentius, who for the sake of public order (or rather simply for the internal peace of the church?) sent the bishop Marcellus into exile; if his intervention was motivated by ecclesial factors, this could be seen as an interference of secular power into the disciplinary affairs of the church.

The *Liber pontificalis* credits Pope Marcellus with the construction of the cemetery of Novella, named after a Roman matron, on the Via Salaria. The new cemetery was positioned at the front of the catacomb of Priscilla; it is mentioned as well in the *Gesta Liberii* (PL 8, 1389). The same *Liber* further credits Marcellus with a reorganization of the Roman Church for the sake of an improved response to the needs of penitents and to *converts from *paganism. According to the testimony of the epitaph of Damasus, Marcellus died in exile, but he was not martyred; his body was returned to Rome and buried in the catacomb of Priscilla, on the Via Salaria, as the *Mart. hier.* states: *Romae, via Salaria, in cimiterio Prescillae depos. sci Marcelli papae et conf.* (ed. G.B. De Rossi and L. Duchesne, [9]). In fact, Sylvester ordered the construction of a basilica above the catacomb of Priscilla, and in the basilica were gathered the bones of Pope Marcellus and much later also the epitaph of Damasus; if they had been brought back earlier, they would have been placed underground. Perhaps in the course of the 9th c. his body was transferred to the church of S. Marcello on the Via Lata (the present-day Via del Corso) (for the fate of his body, see AASS *Ian.*, ed. 1734, II, 4f.). Meanwhile, the **titulus Marcelli* reappeared in the 4th c.; indeed, *in ecclesia Marcelli* the presbyter *Boniface I was ordained bishop of Rome on Sunday 29 December 418, acc. to the account that *Symmachus the prefect of Rome sent to the emperor *Honorius (*Coll. Avellana*, *Ep.* 14,6: CSEL 35, 60; see *LP.* I, 228, n. 1). Subsequently, in the course of the 6th c. the **titulus* was confused with the pope of the same name, on account of which three presbyters present at the Roman *synod of 595 are of the *titulus sancti Marcelli* (MGH, *Epist.* I, 367). The apocryphal tradition also attributes three letters to Marcellus (Jaffe-Wattenbach, nn. 160-162; PL 6, 1091-1100).

Liber pontificalis, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1886, I, XCIXC, 164-166; III, ed. C. Vogel, Paris 1957, 6-7; 76; L. Duchesne, *La nouvelle édition du Liber pontificalis*: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire 18 (1898) 389-392 (on Marcellus); Id., *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, II, Paris 1907, 92-97; T. Mommsen, *Ordo et spatia episcoporum romanorum*: Neues Archiv 21 (1896) 335-357; Id., *Gesta Pontificum Romanorum* (an edition of the *Liber pontificalis)*, MGH, Berolini 1898, LIII-LV; O. Marucchi, *Il sepolcro del papa Marcellino*: Nuovo Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana 12 (1907) 107ff.; A. Profumo, *La memoria di S. Pietro nella regione Salario-Nomentana*, Rome 1916, 16-75; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papstums*, I, Tübingen 1930, 43-54, 97-101; H. Delehaye, *Commentarius perpetuus in Martyrologium Hieronymianum, Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, Brussels 1931, II, 2.42-43; E.B. Schaefer, *Die Bedeutung der Epigramme des Papstes Damasus I für die Geschichte der Heiligenverherung*, Rome 1932, 164-170; H.V. Schoenebeck, *Beiträge zur Religionspolitik des Maxentius und Constantin*, Klio, Supplement 43, Leipzig 1939; *Martyrologium Romanum ad formam editionis typicae scholiis historicis instructum, Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris*, Brussels 1940, 23-24; V. Monachino: EC 8, 16-17; DACL 10, 1754-1760; R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, II, Rome 1942, 128-129; E.H. Röttges: *Marcellinus-Marcellus*: ZKTh 78 (1956) 385-420 (the author upholds the common identity of Marcellinus and Marcellus, on the basis of which the papacy would have been vacant from 304 to 310); A. Amore, *È esistito Papa Marcello?*: Antonianum 32 (1957) 57-75; R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, Vatican City 1962, II, 207-217; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, 492 and 561; L. Gigli, *S. Marcello al Corso* (Le chiese di Roma, new series 29), Rome 1977, [2]1996 (updated edition); V. Saxer: Cath 8, 399-400; T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge, MA 1981; F. Tolotti, *Le cimetière de Priscille. Synthèse d'une recherche*: RHE 73 (1988) 281-314 (esp. 296-298); B. Kriegbaum, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Maxentius*: Archivum Historiae Pontificae 30 (1992) 7-52; R.B. Eno, *The Significance of the Lists of Roman Bishops in the Anti-Donatist Polemic*: VChr 47 (1993) 158-169; EPapi 1, 307-313.

A. Di Berardino

MARCELLUS of Ancyra (ca. 284–374). We know with certainty that Marcellus presided over the Synod of *Ancyra in 314, bound up with the problem of the **lapsi*. He also participated in the first *Council of *Nicaea in 325, even if his ideas did not garner the attention of the *synodists. Around 335, his rigid anti-*Arianism prompted him to write a refutation of *Asterius the Sophist who was by now already "elderly," and he exposed him to the attacks of *Eusebius of *Nicomedia. He supported *Athanasius of *Alexandria at the Council of *Tyre in 335, and he opposed the reinstatement of *Arius. Deposed in 336 by order of the emperor *Constantine I, he was accused of *Sabellianism by the followers of *Eusebius of *Caesarea, an accusation repeated by Eusebius himself (*Against Marcellus* and *On Ecclesiastical Theology*). Thanks to this controversy, we have received many highly important fragments of his works; Erich Klostermann has edited them. After the *death of Constantine I in 338, Marcellus attempted to regain his episcopal see. Yet he was not able to secure it, due to the favor that his adversaries were receiving from *Constantius II, an heir to the throne of Constantine I. He took refuge with Pope *Julius I at *Rome, where he found himself together with Athanasius, who had preceded him by about one month. In a letter to Julius I, transmitted to us by *Epiphanius of Salamis (*Haer.* 72,2,3), he defended himself against the charge of Sabellianism that had been leveled against him. As a result, the Roman synod in 340 declared him to be *orthodox, in the same way as Athanasius. The Eastern orthodox leaders, struck for the most part by his original ideas, openly *excommunicated

him in the third formula of *faith of the Council of *Antioch, promulgated in 341/342 in conjunction with the rites of consecration for the "Golden Church" of Constantine I.

A general synod, the Council of *Serdica in 341 or 342, did not succeed, primarily because the Eastern synodists refused to sit near Athanasius and Marcellus, whose presence was demanded and imposed by the Western synodists. The condemnation of Marcellus on the part of the Eastern bishops, issued at the Council of Serdica and reiterated at the Council of Philippopolis (ca. 343–347), is attested for us by a letter preserved in the *Historical Fragments* of *Hilary of *Poitiers. After taking a closer look at the dossier of Marcellus, the Westerners pledged to him their trust. Yet a new formula of faith on the part of the Easterners, the Fifth Arian Confession of 345, labeled the **Ekthesis Makrostichos* on account of its unusual length, condemned Marcellus, *Paul of Samosata and *Photinus (originally from *Galatia and bishop of *Sirmium) in even stronger terms. Paul and Photinus had effectively pushed the modalist doctrines of their teacher Marcellus to the extreme. Photinus was first censured by the *Makrostich* (no. 6): "The disciples of Marcellus and of Photinus, both from Ancyra in Galatia, reject the eternal subsistence of Christ, his divinity and his eternal reign, under the pretext of safeguarding the divine *unity, similar in this matter to the Jews." He was likewise condemned in 345 and in 347 by the synods of *Milan, convened by the Westerners. The same synodists, however, did not lash out at Marcellus: instead, it was Athanasius who refused to pledge his trust to Marcellus (Hilary, *Fragmenta* 2,21; Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. sacra* 2,37).

We do not know where Marcellus endured his exile. He lived until ca. 375, and his theological reputation did not improve. Writing to Athanasius in 371, *Basil of *Caesarea asks him to issue a condemnation of the "teaching pernicious and foreign to the true faith" of Marcellus (*Ep.* 69,2), while Epiphanius was not hesitant to judge him a notorious *heretic (*Haer.* 72,2,3). Recently, with more legitimate motivations, an opuscule titled *On the Holy Church* has been attributed to him. Dated to 360 or earlier, this brief work demonstrates that the doctrinal essence of Marcellus remained unchanged even after his refutation of Asterius the Sophist.

Attributions of ps.-Athanasian writings to Marcellus have not received wide acceptance. In particular, the attribution of the **tractatus* titled *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos* (PG 26, 984-1028), the most significant of these writings from a doctrinal point of view, lacks any basis.

Sources: CPG 2800-2806. The *Fragments*, followed by the letter of Marcellus to Pope Julius I, have been edited by E. Klostermann, GCS, *Eusebius Werke* IV, edited anew by G.C. Hansen in 1972, with the addition (pp. 255-263) of textual corrections, in particular those of F. Scheidweiler, *Marcel von Ancyra*: ZNTW 46 (1955) 202-214. The German translation of W. Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra. Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist. Sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament*, Halle 1940, is barely reliable. On the *tractatus* of ps.-Anthimus of Nicomedia, G. Mercati, *Anthimi Nicomediensis episcopi et martyris de sancta Ecclesia* (ST 5), Vatican City 1905, 87-98 and M. Richard, *Un opuscule méconnu de Marcel d'Ancyre*: MSR 6 (1949) 5-28 (Opera minora II, n. 33). Other attributions: E. Schwartz, *Der sogenannte Sermo maior de fide des Athanasius*, Munich 1925; F. Scheidweiler, *Wer ist der Verfasser des sogenannte Sermo maior de fide*: ByzZ 47 (1954) 333-357; H. Nordberg, *Athanasiana*, Helsinki 1912, 58-62; *Expositio fidei*: see Scheidweiler, op. cit.; *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*: see M. Tetz, ZKG 83 (1972) 145-194.

Studies: T. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra*, Gotha 1867; F. Loofs, *Die Trinitätslehre Marcells von Ancyra und ihr Verhältnis zur älteren Tradition*: Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1902) 724-781; RE 12, 259-265; M. Tetz, *Zur Theologie des Markel von Ankyra*: ZKG 75 (1964) 217-270; 79 (1968) 3-42; 83 (1972) 145-194; T.E. Pollard, *Marcellus of Ancyra, A Neglected Father: Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 187-196; M. Simonetti, *Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira*: RSLR 9(1973) 313-329; M.G. Rapisarda, *La questione dell'autenticità del De incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos di S. Atanasio. Rassegna degli studi*: Nuovo Didaskaleion 23 (1973) 23-54; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976; H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des "arianischen Streites" (337–361)*, Berlin 1983; J.T. Lienhard, *Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research*: ThS 43 (1982) 486-503; Id., *Acacius of Caesarea, Contra Marcellum: Historical and Theological Considerations*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 10 (1989) 1-22; M.J. Dowling, *Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Belfast 1987; G. Feige, *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner*, Leipzig 1991; A.H.B. Logan, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Antioch, Ancyra, and Nicaea*: JTS 43 (1992) 428-446; K. Seibt, *Markell von Ankyra als Reichstheologe*, Tübingen 1990; Id., *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra.* Berlin 1994 (see M. Simonetti: RSLR 31 [1995] 259-269); *Die Fragmente; Der Brief an Julius von Rom / Markell von Ankyra*, ed., intro. and tr. M. Vinzent, Leiden 1997; W. Kinzig et al., *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis*, Berlin 1999; J.T. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*, Washington 1999; A.H.B. Logan, *Marcellus of Ancyra (Pseudo-Anthimus), "On the Holy Church": Text, Translation and Commentary*: JTS 51 (2000) 81-112; K. Seibt, *Markell von Ankyra (ca. 280–374 n.Chr.) und Asterius Sophista (ca. 270–ca. 350 n.Chr.): Anmerkungen zu einer neuen Edition der Markell-Fragmente und der Epistula ad Iulium*: ZKG 111 (2000) 356-377; L.H. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed*, Turnhout 2002, 28-36; 42-46; S. Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325–345*, Oxford 2006.

C. Kannengiesser

MARCIA (2nd c.). Mistress of the emperor *Commodus, the husband of Bruttia *Crispina, acc. to

Cassius Dio she was favorable to the Christians (*Hist. Rom.* 72,4; see Herodian 1,16,4). This information seems to find confirmation in *Hippolytus of Rome (*Philosoph.* 9.12), acc. to whom Marcia obtained from the emperor the liberation of the Christians condemned to the mines of *Sardinia. Among them was the future Pope *Callistus I. *Eusebius of Caesarea writes that under Commodus, the Christians enjoyed peace and that there were numerous *conversions (*Hist. Eccl.* 5,21,1).

DCB 3, 813 f.; PWK 2, 2464-2481; DACL 10, 1825-1831; EC 8, 33-34; P. Keresztes, *Imperial Rome and the Christians*, I, Lanham 1989, 163-164.

V. Saxer

MARCIAN (Marcianus) (396–457). Marcian was the emperor of the East from 450 to 457. Born in 396 in *Thrace as the son of an ordinary soldier, he was also a soldier, and he participated in the Roman-*Sassanid War of 421–422. He then become a *domesticus* at *Constantinople in the service of Ardaburius (the *magister militum* of Emperor *Theodosius II) and his son Aspar, and he succeeded in reaching the level of *tribunus*. After the death of Theodosius, *Pulcheria chose him as her husband, in a mystical marriage rite, transporting him to the imperial throne. Marcian communicated his coronation both to *Valentinian II, emperor of the West, and to Pope *Leo I. He occupied himself above all with promoting the unity of the empire. In ecclesiastical politics he came under the predominant influence of Pulcheria, who died in 453. In the late autumn of 451 he presided over the Fourth Ecumenical *Council, the Council of *Chalcedon; in the session of 25 October, the only one in which the emperor participated, the *Symbolum chalcedonense* was approved. Leo protested against the 28th canon of the council. Although attributing the primacy of honor to the papacy, the canon recognized an equivalent status for the bishop of *Rome and the bishop of Constantinople. By will of the emperor, the jurisdiction of the bishop of Constantinople over *Thrace, *Pontus, *Asia and the missionary territories was established by law. Despite the sources of resistance against which it collided, the Council of Chalcedon established for the emperor the title of "protector of the true faith." The collapse of the *Hunnic Empire presented to Marcian the opportunity for colonization and for establishing a *foedera* with the barbarian populations. At the E borders of his empire, Marcian fought with success; in the West, in clashes with the *Vandals, he employed stall tactics. In this way he succeeded in improving the living conditions of the empire's peoples while gaining a good reputation for posterity; the Eastern church canonized him, together with Pulcheria. Marcian is remembered for his struggle against *Eutyches of Constantinople and the Eutychians, and for his vigorous defense of the formula of Chalcedon, which he upheld in every part of the empire by means of various imperial decrees issued after the convening of the council.

PWK 14, 1514-1529; I.E. Karagiannopoulos, Ἱστορία βυζαντινοῦ κράτους, I, Thessalonica 1978, 275-283; R.L. Hohlfelder, *Marcian's Gamble: A Reassessment of Eastern Imperial Policy Toward Attila A.D. 450–453*: American Journal of Ancient History 9 (1984) 54-69; M. van Esbroeck, *Une Lettre de Dorothée comte de Palestine à Marcel et Mari en 452*: AB 104 (1986) 145-159; Grillmeier 2/1, Freiburg i.B. 1986, 107-130; E. Dovere, *Constitutiones divae memoriae Marciani in synodo Calchedonensi*: AHC 24 (1992) 1-34; R. Lambertini, *Sull'esordio delle istituzioni di Marciano*: Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris 61 (1995) 271-284; R. Snee, *Gregory Nazianzen's Anastasia Church: Arianism, the Goths, and Hagiography*: Dumbarton Oaks Papers 52 (1998) 157-186.

J. Irmscher

MARCIAN, ascetic (ca. 310–ca. 390). In 1959 Jean Kirchmeyer presented a study to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford. He proposed a thorough examination of the writings transmitted in Greek under the name of Marcian, while instilling the expectation that the writings transmitted in *Syriac would be examined. On the matter of the Greek fragments, Kirchmeyer was inclined to think of a character of the 5th c. whom he identified with a Marcian of Bethlehem, born around 410, a *monophysite *ascetic who was active in the post-Chalcedonian controversies up to around 480, an era in which he would have evolved into a *Chalcedonian mindset, perhaps through the influence of the ascetic *Theodore of Mopsuestia, and he would have lived until about 492. Of this Marcian, the historians of the era bear witness, namely, *Cyril of Scythopolis (*Vita Euthymii*, ed. Schwartz [TU 49,2] 1939) and *Zacharias of Mytilene (*Hist. Eccl.* III, 3 [CSCO 87,107-108]). The year 1968 saw the posthumous publication of the wide-ranging work that Joseph Lebon had dedicated to the Syriac fragments attributed to a monk Marcian. Over many years, Lebon maintained an active interest in the notes and fragments attributed to Marcian. He did so presumably between 1909 and 1949, as becomes evident from a preface by Lebon himself, reproduced by the curator of the posthumous work, Albert van Roey, in the opening pages of the volume. Kirchmeyer took note of some of Lebon's articles on

the matter in question; but since a completed version of Lebon's investigations did not come to pass, the two projects remain unfortunately independent of each other. Out of 17 MSS in Syriac and Greek, Lebon selects 11 opuscules, of which 7 are in Syriac, 2 in both Syriac and Greek, and 2 in Greek only. A thorough examination of these fragments, on which Lebon gives the critical edition of the Syriac tradition, suggests a date between 362 and 382 together with a provenance in the region of *Antioch. In his *Religious History* (PG 82, 1283-1496), *Theodoret of Cyrrhus outlines the life of an ascetic Marcian, to whom he further makes reference in ch. 25 of the *Church History* (PG 82, 1189 A-B). The *Church History* suggests a date for him in the range between 361 and 378; his death could not be any later 390. Lebon concludes that it is all but impossible not to identify this ascetic as the author of the fragments, or at the very least as the author of most of them. In particular, the following fragments (with the numbering of Lebon) are attributed to the Marcian of the 4th c.: I (on penitence), II (ascetical), III (on baptism), IV, V, VII, VIII (ascetics) and IX (parenthetic). Concerning VI ("gives another *tractatus*") and to X-XI (Greek fragments, on faith), Lebon determines that is impossible to make an attribution.

CPG 3885-3900 *Suppl.* 226-227; J. Lebon, *Le moine s. Marcien* (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 36) Louvain 1968 (pp. IX-XII contain a full bibliographic review that surveys the numerous and complex related problems); J. Kirchmeyer, *Le moine Marcien (de Bethléem?)*: SP 5 (TU 80), Berlin 1962, 341-359; A. van Roey, *Remarques sur le moine Marcien*: SP 12, Berlin 1975.

E. Cavalcanti

MARCIAN, presbyter (d. 471?). The presbyter Marcian was a saint of *Constantinople. Of Roman origin and an adherent of the *Novatianist faith, he was attracted to *orthodoxy through the monk Auxentius of *Bithynia. Ordained priest by *Patriarch *Anatolius of Constantinople (449–458) and chosen as *oeconomus* of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia by *Patriarch *Gennadius (458–471), he dedicated his own family fortune to the construction of churches, including the church of St. Anastasia (459) and the church of St. Isidore, among others. He died during the construction of the church of St. Irene of Perama, probably in 471. The *liturgical commemoration, initially fixed at 9 September, was transferred to 10 January, the date retained as well by the *Mart. rom.*

BS 8, 689.

D. Stiernon

MARCIAN of Arles. *Cyprian of Carthage gives the name of this bishop of *Arles—the first that we know, thanks to a trustworthy contemporary document—as one that favored severity toward the **lapsi* (*Ep.* 68). His name does not appear in the list of the bishops of Arles.

L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, I, Paris 1907, 252-254; L. Duquenne, *Chronologie des lettres de saint Cyprien*, Brussels 1972, 28-30.

V. Saxer

MARCION – MARCIONISM

I. Doctrine - II. Works.

Marcion of Sinope (d. ca. 160) was an important *heretical theologian. In the estimation of Adolf Harnack, he was "the most significant figure between Paul and *Augustine" (*Marcion*, 314 [Fr. tr.]). Since his writings have been lost over time, the information that we have on the life and works of Marcion has reached us through indirect sources, from the numerous writings of his opponents. Seven short Latin prologues to seven Pauline letters have been preserved. The document is not from Marcion's hand, but probably of Marcionite origin. The most important sources are *Justin Martyr, *Irenaeus of Lyons and *Tertullian. Justin was Marcion's contemporary at *Rome, and the later authors greatly depend on him. He wrote the now-lost *Syntagma Against All Heresies*, in which he spoke profusely of Marcion, but at a later date he also mentioned him in the first **Apology.* Irenaeus, even when he does not actually name Marcion, frequently refers to him. Our principal source remains Tertullian's *Against Marcion* (207/212), which cites numerous passages in the **Antithesis* of Marcion. Other sources include *Clement of Alexandria, the *Elenchos* that is sometimes attributed to *Hippolytus of Rome and *Epiphanius of Salamis. Marcion grew up in Sinope (now Sinop) in the *Pontus region on the Black Sea. Supposedly excommunicated by his father (who must have been a bishop) for having seduced a *virgin, he came to symbolize the heretic who corrupts the virgin church. He made a fortune in trading arms. He was for some time a member of the Christian community at Rome, which he endowed with a sizeable patrimony. In 144 (the only precise date) he was excluded from that community, which restored to him the donation in its entirety; he then established a separate church that grew rapidly. He died around 160.

I. Doctrine. Marcion did not want to be the founder

of a new church, an innovator, and certainly not a prophet, but to preach the genuine and original message of Jesus in its purity, a message that he claimed was distorted by the church of his time. He finds the essence of this message in the *redemption of humanity, enacted through sheer compassion by God in Jesus Christ. With this perspective, he read the Holy Scriptures of the Christianity of his day, the OT, claiming that the God of whom it testifies is a Judge who is powerful and righteous, but also choleric, cruel, volatile and petty, able to claim, "I am he who causes the disaster (Is 45:7, see Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I, 2 etc.). Therefore, this God cannot be the same as the Father of Jesus Christ. This latter God is in fact "exclusively" benign, as he himself has demonstrated by sending Jesus Christ to us. Hence two corollaries arise, the fundamentals of Marcionite doctrine: (1) the benign God, Father of Jesus Christ, becomes distinct from the God of the OT, creator and lord of this world, and (2) the OT is to be rejected as the foundation of Christian faith. The character of the two deities is precisely indicated in the *Antithesis* (see below). One is expressed in gospel, the other in law; the first is benign, the other just, although not essentially bad; the first is a Savior, the second a Judge; one reveals his essence by sending his very own Son, the other by creating this fallen world. The difference between the two deities is revealed above all in their behavior toward human beings. Humanity is a creature of God the creator, his "image and resemblance," a being from his "substance." Nonetheless, this God permits that his creatures disobey the law and plunge into *death (see Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* II, 5). On the contrary, the "other" God, while not having contracted any obligation with human beings, who are beings of another God, has compassion that leads him to announce through Christ the remission of sins, without any punishment (see Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I, 23; I, 7). Whoever so believes is liberated from the chains of narrow legalism. To such persons is rendered possible a new life, without fear, in which, through grateful wonder in the face of the *love and *goodness of God, a new morality spontaneously emerges (see Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I, 27 and the prologue of the *Antithesis,* Harnack 256).

Also characteristic of the Marcionite ethic is a rigorous *ascesis, defined as a renunciation of desire for matter as the structure of this world and for the *temptations of matter, together with an abstinence from both marriage and procreation that seeks not to perpetuate the fallen world of God the creator. The work of Christ consists in the announcement of this *forgiveness and this love of God. To such an end it is sufficient that he assumes a *docetic body. The thugs of God the creator do not recognize him, and by crucifying him they give him the opportunity to go down into the underworld and to announce even there his message. The believers will come back to *life one day "with the *soul"; as a consequence, this doctrine does not allow a *resurrection of the *flesh (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I, 24).

II. Works. Marcion establishes his gospel on an exclusively biblical basis. He finds it only in the apostle Paul and in the gospel of Luke, treated as Pauline. Yet in his theory, these writings would not be preserved in their original form, but immediately after their redaction would have been falsified by the "Judaizers" or followers of the God of this world, acc. to criteria at their convenience including legalism and a juridical ideology. Marcion thus emends the Pauline letters he recognizes as authentic (Galatians, 1-2 Corinthians, Romans, 1-2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans = Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon), and also Luke, and he adapts them to his creed, making consistent expunctions and adding nothing! Thus he creates the first canon of NT writings. How these Scriptures were presented in the critical text established by Marcion is completely unknown. Certainly the underlying text was not the "Western" one, as Harnack assumes. The research on this problem is being radically redirected on the basis of new discoveries and concepts of NT textual criticism. Marcion justifies his *canon in the so-called *Antithesis*, a sort of "Introduction to the NT" for Harnack. The work is now lost. In this work, responding to the insinuations of his opponents, the author successively contrasts opposing statements at a *dogmatic and *exegetical level, concerning the redeemer God and the creator God and concerning their respective acts (see above and the refutations of the *Antithesis* in Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* II, 28).

Varying responses have recently been given to the question of whether Marcion had connections with the *gnostics. The predominant opinion seems to be that he knew gnostic Christians and that he was influenced by them, but not to the degree that one can group him with the gnostics. There are striking differences, esp. the negation of an immanent presence in the human person of an essence of divine being, as well as the exclusion of *myth as a basis for constructing doctrine. Marcion exercised a profound influence on the development of the doctrine of the church, putting it on guard against the real and present danger of his times, of the corruption of the **kerygma* in a legalistic sense. Yet such an influence has often been exaggerated. One can hardly name a

single element, either in dogma or in the development of the canon, that without him would not have been introduced or that would have been different. As a result the broader church expelled him, not only because of his distinction between two deities and for overbearing interventions into the text of the Holy Scriptures, but above all because of his entirely unsustainable *Christology—something that does not seem to have been emphasized strongly enough, esp. by Harnack. From such an insufficient Christology emerge other points of criticism. As Justin had already attested ca. 150, the Marcionite church expanded rapidly "even to the ends of the earth." Up until ca. 190, it constituted a true danger for the broader church. After this date the importance of the church diminishes, as it becomes partially absorbed by *Manicheism. In spite of this, and even though their very own doctrine prohibiting procreation constituted an obstacle to their growth, the Marcionite community persisted until the end of the 3rd c. in the West. In the East, it persisted even until ca. 450, particularly in the peripheral extent of the *Syriac language, and with greater vitality, as the refutations of and writings against heresies attest (*Ephrem the Syrian, *Rabbula of Edessa, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus). Marcionism exercises a notable influence even today, whether through the simultaneously positive and negative evaluation offered by Harnack, or in a broader sense through a belief system that is based primarily on individualistic faith and on the experience of salvation.

B. Aland: TRE 22, 89-101 (bibl.); LACL 463-485; A. Harnack, *Marcion, das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, Leipzig [2]1924 (reprinted Darmstadt 1960; Eng. tr. Durham 1990; Fr. tr. Paris 2003); E.C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, London 1949; U. Bianchi, *Marcion: Théologien biblique ou docteur gnostique?*: VChr 21 (1967) 141-149; H. von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Tübingen 1968, 173-194; J. Regul, *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe*, Freiburg 1969; J.G. Gager, *Marcion and Philosophy*: VChr 26 (1972) 53-59; B. Aland, *Marcion. Versuch einer neuen Interpretation*: ZTK 70 (1973) 420-447; A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen 1979, 378-395; A. Orbe, *En torno al modalismo de Marción*: Gregorianum 71 (1990) 43-65; Id., *Marcionitica*: Augustinianum 31 (1991) 195-244; C. Gianotto, *Gli gnostici e Marcione. La risposta di Ireneo*, in *La Bibbia nell'Antichità cristiana*, ed. E. Norelli, Bologna 1993, 235-274; G. May, *Marcione nel suo tempo*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 14 (1993) 205-544; E. Norelli, *Note sulla cristologia di Marcione*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 281-305; Id., *Marcione lettore dell'epistola ai Romani*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 14 (1995) 635-675; *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Marcion and His Impact on Church History*, ed. G. May et al., Berlin 2002; the Fr. tr. of the Harnack volume (Paris 2003) has a lengthy supplement on the works of Harnack and on scholarly developments, and a thorough bibliography.

B. Aland

MARCION (Vita Polycarpi). The *Martyrium Polycarpi* (21,1), the letter of the community of *Smyrna to that of Philomelion and to all the churches, states that "we have made available, through the efforts of our brother Marcion, a brief memoir" (20,1) of the turn of events that led to the death of *Polycarp. Yet Evaristus has actually redacted the text: "Evaristus, who has handwritten this letter" (*Mart. Poly.* 20,2). It is not clear whether the role of Marcion was that of having composed and dictated the text to Evaristus, or that of an eyewitness of the events. The letter, written in the name of the Christian community of Smyrna, inaugurates a literary genre in the testimony of the martyrs before the authorities and the people, drawing inspiration from the Jewish tradition (2 and 4 Maccabees). The preface exalts the courage of the martyrs, and represents the first usage of this terminology in a technical sense. The letter itself speaks of the courage of Germanicus, of the impudence of Quintus, who denounced himself and renounced the *faith, and above all it speaks of the wise conduct of Polycarp. The text stresses the fact that it is not necessary to seek martyrdom willingly by turning oneself over to the authorities.

CPG 1045; V. Saxer, *L'authenticité du Martyre de Polycarpe. Bilan de 25 ans de critique*: MEFRA 94 (1982) 979-1001; S. Ronchey, *Indagine sul martirio di san Policarpo*, Rome 1990; B. Dehandschutter, *The Martyrium Polycarpi: A Century of Research*: ANRW II, 27 (1993) 485-522; *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*, edited and annotated by G. Buschmann, Göttingen 1998.

A. Di Berardino

MARCIONITE PROLOGUES. In numerous MSS of the Vulgate, each of the Pauline Letters is preceded by a brief prologue that presents its recipients, place of composition and thematic scope. In 1907 D. de Bruyne (RBen 24 [1907] 1-16) identified a *Marcionite origin for the prologues to seven letters: Galatians, 1 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, Colossians, Philippians and Philemon. P. Corssen (ZNTW 10 [1909] 36-45 and 97-102) and subsequently A. Harnack (ZNTW 24 [1925] 204-218) went even further, attributing such an origin to the prologues that were positioned in front of the other Pauline letters. W. Mundle (ZNTW 24 [1925] 56-77) and M.-J. Lagrange (RBi 35 [1926] 161-173) argued against this hypothesis, treating them instead as paraphrases of the prologues that *Ambrosiaster placed in front of his commentary on the Pauline Letters, and thus dating them to the 4th c. Bardy (DBS 5, 877-879) revived the problematic status of the question, proposing to consider these texts apart from Marcionism. He pushed them back to the 2nd

c., even conferring with the scholarship of Harnack (ZNTW 25 [1926] 160-162), who identified a dependency on these texts in the Muratorian fragment (*see* *Canon, Muratorian). As a result, the question drew opponents and supporters of a Marcionite origin. Also discussed was the possibility that the prologues, at least those of the original core, had been composed in *Greek, and that they had been translated into *Latin once they reached the West, around the middle of the 3rd c. Today it is generally maintained that the prologues were already present in some MSS of the Pauline Letters in the *Vetus Latina* edition, and were later inserted into the Vulgate. This is the thesis of H. J. Frede (*Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, Freiburg 1964, 171-178; *Ein neuer Paulustext*, I, Freiburg 1973, 156-158), who has denied that the prologues have any connection to Marcionism. In 1970, K. Th. Schäfer (RBen 80 [1970] 7-16 and *Kyriakon. Festschrift J. Quasten*, Münster 1970, 135-150) resumed speaking of Marcionite prologues. He bolstered his hypothesis by studying the prologue to the letter to the Ephesians and a later prologue to the letter to the Laodiceans that de Bruyne reconstructed, and he wrestled with the interpretation of Ephesians in the writings of *Marius Victorinus. Subsequently, N. Dahl articulated a position against a Marcionite origin. Nevertheless, E. Norelli reasserted such an origin. Yet as Schäfer had already done, he credited the writing of the prologues not directly to Marcion but to one of his disciples. The hypothesis was advanced that these materials did not first appear as distinct introductions to individual letters, but rather as a unified text. The purpose of the text would have been to show the function that Paul assumed in the original Christian communities, and to correlate Christian origins to the adversarial relationship between Paul and the false prophets.

J. Wordsworth and H.J. White, *Novum Testamentum Domini nostri Iesu Christi latine*, II, Oxford 1913 (text of the prologues, each of which precedes one of the letters). In addition to the previous bibliographic citations, see N. Dahl, *The Origins of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters*: Semeia 12 (1978) 233-277; E. Norelli, *La tradizione ecclesiastica negli antichi prologhi alle epistole paoline*, in *La tradizione. Forme e modi*, Rome 1990, 301-324; V. Verheyden, *The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute*, in *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. De Jonge, Leuven 2003, 522-523.

A. Pollastri

MARCULFUS. It is disputed whether he is to be identified with the bishop of *Paris (644–657) or with the bishop of Meaux, or even whether he was a monk living in the 7th to 8th c. Marculfus, at the request of a bishop named Landry, wrote the *Formularum libri* II, a series of formulas intended to function as the compilation of various sorts of petitions, concessions of benefits and privileges, and other ecclesiastical and civil acts.

CPL 1833; PL 87, 695-756; Repertorium 7, 450f.; L. Levellain, *Le formulaire de Marculf et la critique moderne*: Bibliothéque École des chartes 84 (1923) 21-91; A. Uddholm, *Formulae Marculfi. Études sur la langue et le style*, Uppsala 1953; Id., *Le texte des Formulae Marculfi*: Eranos 55 (1957) 38-59.

M. Simonetti

MARCULUS (d. 346). Marculus was a *Donatist bishop of S *Numidia, and acc. to the Donatists a victim of the so-called Macarian persecution (in 347, acc. to the traditional dating, or in 346, as the most recent editor demonstrates). The account of his death is preserved for us in the *Passio Marculi sacerdotis donatistae*. Marculus was taking part in the delegation of ten Donatist bishops sent to the imperial representatives Paul and Macarius, in protest against the repressive measures that had been instituted against the *schismatic *African church. The meeting took place at Vegesela, a locality of *Numidia between Teveste and *Lambaesis; yet here the members of the delegation, on account of their insolent, judgmental attitude, were subjected to flogging. Marculus was then confined in the nearby fort of *Castellum Novae Petrae*, situated on a steep mountain, from which four days later he plunged, meeting his death in the rocks that stood below. At Vegesela, a basilica was erected in honor of Marculus. *Augustine of Hippo made the proposition that the supposed means of torture attributed to Marculus—like that which a bit earlier supposedly had victimized another Donatist bishop, Donatus of Bagai, found dead in a well—was not in conformity with Roman practice, bolstering the *Catholic opinion that this would have been a case of *suicide (see *C. litt. Pet.* II, 20,46; 86,195; *C. Cresc.* III, 49,54). Nonetheless, *Optatus of Milevis (III, 6) did not doubt that Marculus as well as Donatus had been killed.

CPL 720; BHL 5271; PL 8, 760-766 (*Passio Marculi sacerdotis Donatistae*); Monceaux V, 69-81; P. Cayrel, *Une basilique donatiste de Numidie*: MEFRA 51 (1934) 132-133; P. Courcelle, *Une nouvelle campagne de fouilles à Ksar el Kelb'*: MEFRA 53 (1936) 166-197; H. Delehaye, *Domnus Marculus*: AB 63 (1935) 81-89; PCBE 1, 696-697; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford ²1971, 179 and passim; E.L. Grasmück, *Coërcitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit*, Bonn 1964, 123-126; B. Quinot, *Marculus et Donatus, martyrs donatistes*: BA 30, 771-772; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVᵉ au VIIᵉ siècle*, Rome 1982, 158-160, 705; P. Mastandrea, *Le interpolazioni nei*

codici della "Passio Marculi": AB 108 (1990) 279-291; P. Mastandrea, *Papiri di martiri donatisti (BHL 4473 and 5271)*: AB 113 (1995) 39-88; V. Saxer, *Afrique latine*, in G. Philippart (ed.), *Hagiographies: histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, I, Turnhout 1994, 64-66; F. Scorza Barcellona, *L'agiografia donatista*, in M. Marin and C. Moreschini, *Africa cristiana. Storia, religione, letteratura*, Brescia 2002, 128-131.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MARCUS AURELIUS, emperor (121–180). Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the Roman emperor from 161 to 180, having received a superior education in *Rome with a particular emphasis on philosophical studies, ascended the throne by nomination of the Senate. He was joined in governance by his adopted brother, the coemperor Lucius Verus; he fought the Parthians and the *Germans. Pestilence, epidemics and superstitions cast a shadow over his reign. A violent popular reaction against the Christians, considered to be prophets of doom, arose in *Italy. Marcus Aurelius himself considered the Christians to be visionaries (*Medit.* XI, 3). *Athenagoras, *Melito, *Apollinaris and *Miltiades addressed *apologetic treatises to him. The *persecution happened not by an imperial edict but through the application of an imperial rescript of 176 against those that were disturbing the *peace with the introduction of new cults. The many victims included the apologist *Justin Martyr, the Martyrs of *Lyons in 177 and the bishop *Publius of Athens (*Eusebius of Caesarea, *HE* V, 1-2; IV, 23,2; 26,3). Marcus Aurelius died in 180 during renewed hostilities in the Wars on the Danube (166–175 and 177–180). Evidence of the philosophical and religious thinking of the emperor is reflected in his "meditations," originally titled *To Myself*. The column of Marcus Aurelius (cochleate like *Trajan's column) and the equestrian statue on the Campidoglio in Rome have passed down his imperial feats and solemn figure.

H.D. Sedgwick, *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography*, Oxford 1921; F. Carrata Thomes, *Il regno di Marco Aurelio*, Turin 1953; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 64 and 131ff.; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; F. Fontaine, *Marc Aurèle*, Paris 1991; P. Grimal, *Marc Aurèle*, Paris 1991; S. Jäkel, *Marcus Aurelius's Concept of Life*, Turku 1991; M. Ceva, *Marco Aurelio: Pensieri*, Milan 1994; P. Hadot, *La citadelle intérièure: introduction aux "Pensées" de Marc Aurèle*, Paris [2]1997; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano. Da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Bari 2000.

L. Navarra

MARCUS DIADOCHUS. Author of a *Sermo contra Arianos* that primarily defends the consubstantiality of the Son with the *Father, against the objections of the *Arians. The name of the author of the *sermon is otherwise unknown. Various attempts have been made to identify him with one of the many *Egyptian bishops with the name Marcus who flourished in the 4th c., excluding in any case the 5th-c. *Diadochus of Photice in the mountains of *Epirus.

CPG 6105: PG 65, 1149-1165; Bardenhewer IV, 1923, p. 186; Baumstark, p. 339, no. 5; Patrologia V, 344.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MARIANUS and JACOBUS (d. 6 May 258). The two are the heroes of an *African *Passio* of noteworthy literary value (BHL 131), written by a cleric who was their companion and friend. The model is the *Passio Perpetuae*; note, e.g., the visions during imprisonment. Arrested at *Cirta in *Numidia and after a judicial proceeding before the municipal authorities, they were transferred to *Lambaesis and brought before the governor, condemned to death and executed. According to both the *Calendarium *Carthaginense* and the *Mart. hier.*, they died on 6 May. The cult of the martyrs of Lambaesis must have been very familiar, given that *Augustine wrote a *sermon in their honor (*Sermo* 380). The *Vandal invasions and the other political vicissitudes of N Africa ensured that their *relics were translated to *Italy, where their cult spread. The relics were claimed by the cathedral of Gubbio; the relics of the other protagonists of the *Passio* were claimed by the nearby church of St. Secundus.

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *La Passio SS. Mariani et Iacobi*, ST 3, Rome 1900; Delehaye, PM 78-82; OC 382; G. Lazzati, *Gli sviluppi della letteratura sui martiri nei primi quattro secoli*, Turin 1956, 48, 190-200; F. Dolbeau, *Le légendier de S. Francesco de Gualdo*: Bolletino della Deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria 73 (1976) 168; V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 88-103; Id., *Afrique latine*, in *Hagiographies* I, ed. G. Philippart, Turnhout 1994, 43-47 (with bibl.).

V. Saxer and S. Heid

MARINA. The history and the cult of Marina have enjoyed a broad dissemination; a *Syriac MS that narrates her life dates back to 778. Every MS tradition (Greek, Latin, *Coptic etc.) locates Marina in different places, and sometimes even with the name "Maria." The essential elements of the legend tell us that a certain Eugenius, a widower, desired to enter a *monastery, and in order not to leave his little daughter in the world, he takes her with him, changing her name to "Marinus" and dressing her as a boy. After her father's *death, she remains in the monastery, al-

ways cross-dressing as a man. One day, she was sent on a mission with the other monks and stopped at an inn; the daughter of the innkeeper becomes pregnant and accuses Marinus, who considers himself culpable and asks for *forgiveness. Then he is expelled from the monastery, and he undergoes an extreme form of *penance. When her *body is washed after her death, it is discovered that Marinus was a *woman and therefore innocent.

BHL 5528-5530c; BHG 1163-1163e; Greek 614-615e; BS 1165-1170; M. Minghelli, *Santa Marina la travestita*, Palermo 2000.

A. Di Berardino

MARINUS. Numerous martyrs have been known by this name, among them (1) the monk Marinus, rediscovered in the 17th c. in the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Savin-sur-Gartemps (region of Poitou-Charentes); (2) the young Marinus of *Rome, celebrated on 26 December in the *Mart. hier.* and in the *Mart. rom.* and on 16 December in the *Synax. Eccl. CP* (BHG 2256); (3) the elderly Marinus of *Anazarbus in *Cilicia, martyred under the emperor *Diocletian, inscribed in the *Synax. Eccl. CP* on 8 August and 18 October (BHG 1171); (4) Marinus and Anianus, itinerant monks of *Ireland of the 7th–8th c., acc. to legend bishop and deacon, martyred in Bavaria on 15 November (BHL 5531-5535); (5) the soldier Marinus and the senator Asterius, martyred ca. 262 at *Caesarea Maritima on 3 March (*Mart. hier.*) or on 7 August (*Synax. Eccl. CP*); (6) Marinus, Secondinus and Fronto, martyrs at *Antioch on 16 November (*Mart. hier.*).

BHG 1171, 2256; BHL 5531-5541; BS 8, 1171-1183; LCI 7, 546-547.

V. Saxer and S. Heid

MARINUS of Constantinople (4th c.). Marinus was elected as bishop of *Constantinople by the *Arians at the death of *Demophilus (ca. 385). Like Demophilus, he was from *Thrace. Yet before long the same Arians replaced him with *Dorotheus of *Antioch in *Syria (*Socrates Scholasticus, *HE* V, 12), a man already quite elderly. He was the protagonist of a *schism among the Arians and each group with its own places of worship, arguing that the *Father had always been Father, even before the Son came into being, while Dorotheus and others were arguing that the Father had become as such only from the moment in which he had brought the Son into being. The Arian group that chose Marinus as its leader was called a member of the *psathyrianoi*, in the sense that one of its principal exponents, named Theoctistus, of Syrian origin, was a *psathyropōlēs* (a seller of cakes). This position was also accepted by the *Gothic bishop Selenas. The division also extended to other areas.

Socrates, *HE* V, 23; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988, 568.

M. Simonetti

MARIS of Chalcedon (d. after 362). A disciple of *Lucian of Antioch, Maris was from the very beginning (ca. 320) among the supporters of *Arius. He even supported him at the First Council of *Nicaea (325), although he subscribed to the anti-Arian formula of faith due to pressure from the emperor *Constantine I. He collaborated with *Eusebius of Nicomedia for the success of the opposition to the council, and at the First Synod of *Tyre (335) he was among the most active members in the condemnation of *Athanasius of Alexandria. In 342 he took part in a *Eusebian delegation sent to *Milan before the emperor *Constantius II, in an attempt to ease the tensions that flared between the Western supporters and the Eastern opponents of the council. Maris was one of the leading spokesmen of the Easterners at the Council of *Serdica, where the Westerners *excommunicated him for his support of Arianism. At a much later time, we find him at the Council of *Constantinople (360) that signaled the short-lived triumph of the politics of Constantius II in favor of moderate Arianism.

DCB 3, 833; Simonetti 592; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, see indexes; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 142-143; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, see indexes.

M. Simonetti

MARIUS MERCATOR (1st half of 5th c.). The information on his life is connected to *Pelagian polemic. In 418 he was at *Rome and knew *Celestius, who defended his positions before Pope *Zosimus. In 429 he was in *Thrace in a Latin *monastery, where he wrote his *Commonitoria* (= memorandum) on Celestius, Pelagius and *Julian of Eclanum, in which he defends the positions of the *Catholic Church against Pelagians and *Nestorians. After the condemnation of the First Council of *Ephesus against these groups, there is no longer any mention of him. Given his

anti-Pelagian convictions, Marius Mercator is generally thought to be of *African origin, but given the close relations that he reports around the family of Julian, he probably intends to uphold his fellow countryman. His writings, transmitted to us through the compilation made before 550 that is labeled the *Collectio Palatina* (ms. Pal. lat. 234 of the Vatican Library), are the *Commonitorium super nomine Coelestii* and the *Commonitorium adversum haeresim Pelagii et Coelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani*. The first work is more than a biographical compilation of events related to Celestius, and it relates a memorandum of what was circulating as Pelagian teaching. The second is a refutation of Julian's affirmations, crafted after the model of the refutation in *Augustine of Hippo. Two of his writings against *Theodore of Mopsuestia, related to us by Augustine (*Ep.* 193,1), have been lost. Considering the entire literary activity of Marius Mercator, we find that he wrote with the ecclesial and imperial contexts of *Constantinople in mind, thus preoccupied with the Pelagian problem in connection with the Nestorian problem. He left to us an invaluable testimony in Latin, not only of the Pelagian movement in the East but above all of the thinking of Nestorius.

PL 48, 63-172, ACO I 5, I, 3-70; S. Prete, *Marius Mercator, Commonitoria*, Bologna 1959; Id., *Mario Mercatore, I memoriali antipelagiani*, Siena 1960; Id., *Mario Mercatore polemista antipelagiano*, Turin 1958; O. Wermelinger, *Marius Mercator*: DSp 10 (1978) 610-615; V. Grossi: Patrologia III, 471-473.

V. Grossi

MARIUS of Avenches (d. 593/594). A bishop of Avenches (Aventicum) and of Lausanne, active in the 2nd half of the 6th c., Marius wrote a *Chronicon* in continuation of the one by *Prosper of Aquitaine. The work covers the span of time from 455 to 585. It is concerned with the deeds of the *Franks, *Burgundians, *Goths and *Longobards (Lombards), and in particular with the affairs of Burgundy, the author's own region. Marius is proud of his Roman ancestry, and in his work he finds satisfaction in emphasizing the *Byzantine reconquest of *Africa and of *Italy.

CPL 2268; PL 72, 793-802; MGH, *Auct. ant.* 11, 232-239; DCB 3, 835; BBKL V, 835-837; J. Favrod, *La Chronique de Marius d'Avenches*, Lausanne [2]1993.

M. Simonetti

MARIUS CLAUDIUS VICTORIUS. *See* *CLAUDIUS MARIUS VICTORIUS

MARIUS VICTORINUS (ca. 280–285; d. after 363). Gaius Marius Victorinus was of *African origin and a master of *rhetoric; establishing himself at *Rome, his great success merited a statue in the Forum. Around 355, at an advanced age, he converted to Christianity; we do not know for what reason. He vacated his academic post in 362, as a result of the edict of the emperor *Julian the Apostate that barred Christian professors from teaching. We do not have information on him after this date. He wrote many works, both before and after his conversion. The works of the first period, in a grammatical and philosophical vein (including commentaries on works of Cicero and Aristotle, as well as translations of Aristotle, *Porphyry of Tyre and perhaps *Plotinus), are not our current concern. We stop to consider only those of Christian content, the *theological and *exegetical works.

In the first group we include a series of anti-Arian writings, arranging them acc. to the chronological and logical order given by Pierre Hadot: (1) *Candidi Arriani ad Marium Victorinum de generatione divina*; (2) *Marii Victorini ad Candidum Arrianum*; (3) *Candidi Arriani epistola ad Marium Victorinum*; (4) *Adversus Arrium l. I* (part one; chs. 1-47). *Liber primus de trinitate*; (5) *Adversus Arrium l. I* (part two; chs. 48-64). *Quod trinitas homoousios sit*; (6) *Adversus Arrium l. II. De homoousio contra haereticos*; (7) *Adversus Arrium l. III. De homoousio*; (8) *Adversus Arrium l. IV. De homoousio*; (9) *De homoousio recipiendo*. Numbers 1-4 constitute a sort of dossier of letters between *Candidus the Arian and Marius Victorinus. In no. 1, Candidus presents the *Arian doctrine on the basis of themes and procedures of a *Neoplatonic type, and in no. 2 Marius Victorinus responds to him, presenting the *Catholic doctrine on the same philosophical basis. In no. 3 Candidus makes the counterargument, harkening back to the spokesmen for Arianism, Arius and *Eusebius of *Nicomedia, of whom he presents two letters in Latin translation. Marius Victorinus responds in no. 4, taking into account not only these themes but also the situation created in 358 with the overwhelming prevalence of *Basil of *Ancyra and of the *homoiousians. Pierre Nautin and Manlio Simonetti have demonstrated that Candidus is none other than a literary pretense of Marius Victorinus, who exploits this clever device for the sake of better presenting the discussion *in utramque partem*.

There is a sharp contrast in the formal plans of nos. 4 and 5, because Marius Victorinus completely abandons Candidus, all the while continuing to debate the homoiousians. Then no. 6 refers to the situation of the pro-Arians prevailing at the Council of

*Rimini in 359; in the defense of the *homoousios declared at Rimini, he is more balanced toward the homoiousians. Numbers 7-9 continue to develop the defense of the *homoousios*, but do so without close connection to the political situation that stabilized for some time after 359. Thus we date nos. 1-4 to 358–359, no. 5 to 360 and nos. 6-9 to 361–363. More or less contemporaneous to these writings, the *hymns *Adesto*, *Miserere Domine* and *Deus Dominus* contain a doctrinal argument. They follow an approximate rhythmical structure that does not allow for an interpretation based on classical meter. *Deus Dominus* accentuates Neoplatonic elements.

Having converted later in life, Marius Victorinus knew *Platonic philosophy much better than Christian theology. Therefore, although handling very technical arguments that involve the defense of the *Nicene *homoousios*, he frequently resorted to the Platonic and ended up in a solitary position within the Christian tradition. He conceives of the *Trinity as a double dyad. The first is defined as Father/Son, with the divine generation seen as a process of self-limitation and a qualification of God who is absolutely transcendent: Father/Son = *esse*, to be in potential/*sic esse*, to be in act (*Adv. Arrium* I, 29). In being in act the Son is activity, he is the being in action of the Father, who is being inclined toward himself: Father/Son = *esse/moveri*; *agere/operari*; *substantia/operatio*; *actio/motus* (*Adv. Arrium* I, 4.42; III, 3). The second pole of the dyad, the Son as *motus* in turn is articulated in two instances: Christ = *vivere*, *vita*; *Holy Spirit = *intellegere*, *sapientia*. As a line extends from a point, the *motus* (Son), developing from the *esse* (Father), first of all he (Christ) is *life, who then creates and vivifies the *world; then he is intelligence, wisdom (Holy Spirit), who then leads the world back to *God (*Adv. Arrium* I, 26; IV, 7). The splitting of the *motus* into *vita* and *intelligentia* is a process of separation from the Father, a descent, for creating the world, and in returning to the Father, an ascent, together with the world: *status progressio regressus* (*Hymn.* 3,71-73), in which the Holy Spirit has the function of rejoining the Son to the Father: *patris et filii copula* (*Hymn.* 1,4).

On the basis of this Platonizing interpretation of the Trinity, the relationship between the three divine persons is understood in the sense of true and proper identity, in which, however, each of the three has *potentiam suam* (personality, individuality) on the basis of the diverse *operationes*, by which each is other than the other two on the basis of the specific act that is inherent in his *potentia* (*Adv. Arrium* I, 13.18.41.59). In this way, Marius Victorinus defends the *homoousios* against the Arians, thus distancing himself from *Sabellianism, thanks to the distinction of the divine substance in three *existentiae*. He prefers the term *existentia* over *persona*, a term that he finds to be less individualizing.

After 362, Marius Victorinus wrote a series of *commentaries on Paul. With some lacunae, we have received the commentaries on Ephesians, Galatians and Philippians. He also wrote commentaries on Romans and on 1 and 2 Corinthians. He was the first to write a *Latin commentary on Paul. Although he did make recourse to *Greek sources (*Origin), he wrote everything on his own, being well qualified by his experience as a commentator on *pagan philosophical texts. Every commentary is preceded by an introduction in which the author explains the occasion and the content of the individual letters, although we have not received the introduction to Philippians. Each is based on sound textual criticism and explains the Pauline text in a literal way, without recourse to the sort of *allegorical interpretation that was treasured by the Greek commentators. In the process, Marius Victorinus accentuates the tone of Paul's antilegalistic polemic, and he tends to show antipathy for the *Jewish religion as well as a staggering ignorance of the OT. Furthermore, there are some who have detected in his commentaries the influence of the *Marcionite prologues to the letters of Paul. The theme of justification by *faith is also explored in depth. The devaluation of good works is viewed in the light of a Platonizing interpretation of the Pauline opposition of faith to works, understood as an opposition of intellectual, *contemplative activity to practical activity.

The MSS that have transmitted these exegetical writings to us claim for Marius Victorinus three works that are not his: *De verbis scripturae: factum est vespere et mane dies unus*; *Liber ad Iustinum Manichaeum*; *De physicis*. Yet as a whole his work had little resonance, due both to the not so perspicacious style and to the isolated position of his trinitarian reflection within the earlier and contemporaneous theological tradition. Only *Augustine would come to make use of such a concept: Holy Spirit, *copula* of the Father and of the Son; the human *soul, in the sense of *esse vivere intellegere*, an *image of the Trinity.

CPL 94-100; PL 8, 993-1310; SC 68-69 (theological works); CSEL 83 (id.); ed. Locher, Leipzig 1972–1976 (BT); F. Gori, Corona Patrum 8, Turin 1981 (Pauline commentaries); Patrologia III, 65-75 (bibl.); P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris 1971 (bibl.); W. Erdt, *Marius Victorinus Afer, der erste lateinische Pauluskommentator*, Frankfurt am M. 1980; G. Lettieri, *L'esegesi neoplatonica dei generi sommi del sofista: Plotino e Mario Vittorino*: AnSE 10 (1993) 451-493; G. Raspanti, *Mario Vittorino esegeta di S. Paolo*, Palermo 1996; N.

Cipriani, *Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini di Mario Vittorino*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 413-428.

M. Simonetti

MARK, Gospel of

I. The consensual tradition - II. The textual tradition - III. The use of the gospel of Mark in the ancient liturgy - IV. Exegetical interpretation.

I. The consensual tradition. The ancient church considered Mark and his gospel to be the authentic voice and the true interpreter of the *apostle Peter. This opinion came to be affirmed in the first centuries of Christianity and remained unchallenged through the entire span of the patristic era. The first testimony to the authorship of this gospel is given by Bishop *Papias of Hierapolis (*Eus., *HE* 3, 39,14-15). Precisely in *Phrygia, it was a common opinion that Mark was the author of the gospel, with an emphasis on the book's direct dependence on the preaching of the apostle Peter. A second testimony belongs to *Clement of *Alexandria, who seems to confirm the earlier *tradition and who describes Mark as a trustworthy and sincere narrator of the authoritative and widely recognized public teaching on Christ, of whom Peter made himself a spokesperson while he was at *Rome (*Hypotyposeis* [Fragments] VII). During the 2nd c. in the West and specifically in *Gaul, *Irenaeus of *Lyons, heeding the tradition coming out of Phrygia and *Egypt, left a written testimony on the tradition of *Smyrna that he himself had received concerning the identity of Mark (*Adv. haer.* 3,1,1). Even *Origen, who had a wide and direct knowledge of the *Palestinian, Alexandrian and Roman traditions, confirmed this opinion, advancing the hypothesis that the same Peter, in person, had told Mark what to put into writing. According to *Origen, these traditions show that Mark was the same person whom the apostle called "my son" in 1 Pet 5:13 (Eus., *HE* 6, 25,4-5).

The multiple traditions spread both in the East and the West, independent of each other but all appearing to promote and promulgate the same message regarding the authenticity of this gospel, seem to demonstrate that the church unanimously approved the promulgation of the text of the apostle Mark. Even *Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 8), an expert in the traditions coming out of Rome, *Dalmatia, Gaul, *Antioch, *Constantinople and Palestine, argues not only that the consensus on such a tradition was unanimous among all the churches right from the beginning but also that the validity of the evangelical message had a particularly elevated importance, since the same Peter had read and approved the work of Mark, who would have then promulgated it in Alexandria, the city of which he was the first bishop and where he died.

Therefore, by the time of *Augustine (*De cons. Ev.* 1,1,2-2,4), a universal and widely sustained tradition had developed over three centuries of precedent that the *Holy Spirit had inspired the precise transmission of the Markan gospel tradition from the *testimony of the apostles to the ecumenical fellowship of the church.

II. The textual tradition. As far as the textual tradition is concerned, it has always been evident that Mark presented a version of the good news that is shorter than *Matthew's version, but the premise of the literary dependence has not always been generally recognized. At least since the time of Irenaeus, it was assumed that Mark's gospel had been written after Matthew's gospel. As Augustine was inclined to think, one got the impression that Mark was nothing other than an abbreviated version of Matthew (*De cons. Ev.* 1,2,4; 3,3,6; 4,10,11). The opinion that Matthew and Luke are based directly on the text of Mark did not develop until the 19th c., and even though the majority of contemporary scholars are inclined to adopt such a solution, it continues to be discussed. The argument of those who lean toward a dependency of Mark on Matthew is still strong.

III. The use of the gospel of Mark in the ancient liturgy. The fact that Mark is frequently cited in the ancient literature demonstrates its use in every locality where the pastoral and missionary activity of the early church extended. The evidence, therefore, indicates that this text represented a normative component of the corpus of *liturgical resources in primitive Christianity. From the distant past the church included it in the *canon of the NT with a broad and seemingly unanimous consensus. From the beginning of the universal Christian witness, Mark has been mentioned as a part of the depository of resources for gaining knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Eusebius used to argue that the work of Mark obtained the approval of Peter's authority for the purpose of "being used in the churches" (*HE* 2,15,2). Jerome agrees with the claim that Peter "approved it and authorized its distribution for the reading in the churches" (*De vir. ill.* 8). No other gospel was received more clearly or with a broader consensus for its use in public worship. Augustine affirmed that Mark, who did not take part in the company of the *twelve, was chosen by the *Holy Spirit, along with Luke, to demonstrate that the wellspring of divine

*grace did not dry up with the twelve *apostles (*Discourses* 239,1). For his part, *John Chrysostom, in demonstrating that Matthew "composed his gospel in the language of the Hebrews," adds, "and even Mark, as they say, did the same on the request of the disciples in Egypt" (*Homilies on the Gospel of Matthew* 1,3).

IV. Exegetical interpretation. Mark presents some problems for the history of *exegesis. While there are a variety of verse-by-verse patristic *commentaries on Matthew, Luke and John, no complete commentaries on Mark have come down to us. Without doubt, at the exegetical level Mark was rather overlooked. With its emphasis on spiritual exegesis, a **Tractatus in Marci Evangelium* (CCL 78, 449-500) was first reckoned among the *Latin *homilies of Chrysostom and then attributed to Jerome. We do not know of any other commentary on Mark that predates the one from a writer of the 5th or perhaps the 6th c., known by the name of *Victor of Antioch (*Catena in Marcum*, in J.A. Cramer, *Catenae graecorum Patrum*, Oxford 1840, I, 263-477), who claims that he had no predecessors to his work. Whether the *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum* of *ps.-Jerome (PL 30, 589-644) dates to the 1st half of the 5th c. or after the 7th c. is a matter of debate. In the 8th c. there appeared the extensive commentary on Mark by the Venerable *Bede (d. 735).

In the end, if we want to retrace the footsteps of an exegetical principle followed by the Fathers in the reading and interpretation of this particular gospel, we have to sort out the distinct references that we find scattered in the homilies, letters and *tractati*, adhering to the controlling principle in early Christian exegesis, acc. to which every text is illuminated by the other sacred texts and by the essence of the history of *revelation.

H.M. Humphrey, *A Bibliography for the Gospel of Mark, 1954–1980*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, I, New York 1982; Id., *The Gospel of Mark: An Indexed Bibliography 1980–2005*, Lewiston, NY 2006; G. Wagner, ed., *An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament: Matthew and Mark*, Macon 1983; F. Neirynck, *The Gospel of Mark: A Cumulative Bibliography 1950–1990*, Louvain 1992.

Editions: CPL 594; Ps.-Jerome, *Expositio in Evangelium secundum Marcum*, PL 30, 560D-567B; Id., *Commentarium in Evangelium secundum Marcum*, PL 30, 589-644; PLS 2, 125-171; *Tractatus in Marci Evangelium*, CCL 78, 449-500; Victor of Antioch, *Catena in Marcum*, in J.A. Cramer, *Catenae graecorum Patrum*, Oxford 1840, I, 263-477; Bede, *In Marci Evangelium Expositio*, CCL 120, 431-648.

Studies: LTK³ 6, 1395-1404; J. Kuerzinger, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments*, Regensburg 1983; ed. H. Cancik, *Markus-Philologie. Historische, literargeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium*, Mohr 1984; P. Dschulnigg, *Sprache, Redaktion und Intention des Markus-Evangeliums*, Stuttgart 1984; F. Nerynck, *The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark*, in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, Leuven 1989, 123-175; F. Fendler, *Studien zum Markusevangelium: zur Gattung, Chronologie, Messiasgeheimnistheorie und Überlieferung des zweiten Evangeliums*, Göttingen 1991 (Göttinger theologische Arbeiten 49); R. Trevijano, *La obra de Papías y sus noticias sobre Mc y Mt*: Salmanticensis 41 (1994) 181-212; M. Cahill, *The Identification of the First Markan Commentary*: RBi 101 (1994) 258-268; D. Farkasfalvy, *The Papias Fragments on Mark and Matthew and Their Relationship to Luke's Prologue: An Essay on the Pre-History of the Synoptic Problem*, in A.J. Malherbe, F.W. Norris and J.W. Thompson (eds.), *The Early Church in Its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*, SNT 90, Leiden 1998, 92-106; *Marco*: BCP NT 2, Italian edition ed. G. Pilara, Rome 2003; T.C. Oden - C.A. Hall, eds., *Mark*, ACCS NT 2, Downers Grove, IL 2005 (1998).

G. Pilara

MARK, poet (7th c.). The only secure facts on the identity of the poet Mark can be assembled from a *carmen* of 33 elegiac couplets that he composed in praise of *Benedict of Nursia, and that Aimoin de Fleury inserted into his *Sermo in festivitatibus sancti patris Benedicti*. In this *carmen*, in which Monte Cassino is described and some marvelous deeds of Benedict are illustrated, reference is made to the life of *sin led by the author before he arrived on a *pilgrimage to Monte Cassino, where the *carmen* was composed after the death of Benedict (vv. 13-16 and 65-66). It is difficult to date the *carmen* and to place its author chronologically, about which *Gregory the Great is silent. According to H.S. Brechter, Mark would have been contemporaneous or nearly so to Paul the Deacon, who is the first author that mentions him (*Hist. Lang.* I, 26). Without proof, *Peter the Deacon maintains that Mark was a monk of Monte Cassino and a disciple of Benedict (*De vir. ill. Casin.* III, where he considers him to be an author of highly elegant verses: *De adventu Sanctissimi Benedicti ad Casinum, de situ loci constructioneque Coenobii*). It does not seem that Mark was a monk, as he appears to know the secular poets (Virgil, Propertius, Ovid, Statius), and he does not seem to have been educated at Monte Cassino. In his *carmen* that is characterized by formal elegance, stylistic clarity and metrical precision, Mark desires above all to celebrate that place where Benedict had worked; his verses are first of all a *prayer to the *saint, to whom the author devotes himself. Perhaps the *carmen* of Mark is a little later than the **Rule of Saint Benedict*.

CPL 1854; PL 80, 183-186; M. Galdi, *Il carme di Marco Poeta e l'apoteosi di San Benedetto*, Naples 1929; H.S. Brechter, *Marcus*

Poeta von Monte Cassino, in *Benedictus, der Vater des Abendlandes*, Munich 1947, 341-359; S. Rocca, *Versus in Benedicti laudem* (with text and critical apparatus): Rombarb 3 (1978) 335-363.

S. Zincone

MARK, pope (d. 336). His *pontificate lasted less than ten months, from 18 January to 7 October 336. According to the **Liber pontificalis*, he was of Roman origin, a son of a certain Priscus. Mark established that the bishop consecrating the pope would be the bishop of Ostia (LP I, 202; see Aug., *Brev. coll. cum don.* III, 16, 29: PL 43, 641). He ordered the construction of various churches in *Rome, including the basilica of S. Marco, incorporated much later into the Palazzo Venezia. Mark was buried in the *cemetery of the catacomb of St. Balbina (see Jaffé 181).

Eus., *HE* 10,5,18; LP I, 8-9, 80-81, 202-204; II, 47, 77; III, 81; A. Ferrua, *La basilica di papa Marco*: La Civiltà Cattolica 99 (1948) III, 503-513; BS 9, 699-700 (G.D. Gordini); J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 28-29; M. Cecchelli, *La basilica di S. Marco a piazza Venezia (Roma). Nuove scoperte e indagini*, in *Akten des XII. internationalen Kongresses für christliche Archäologie*, Münster 1995, 640-644; BBKL 5, 781-782; LTK[3] 6, 1407 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi 1, 333-334 (G.M. Vian).

M. Spinelli

MARK, Secret Gospel of. An alleged discovery—on the part of Morton Smith in 1958–1973, in the Mar Saba *Monastery near *Jerusalem—of two fragments of a secret gospel, cited in an otherwise lost letter penned by *Clement of Alexandria to a certain Theodore. Clement speaks of three gospels of Mark: the *canonical one; the second, a more extended version for the "perfect ones" in the *faith (the *Secret Gospel*); and finally a third, that would be an expansion of the "secret gospel" on the part of *Carpocrates of Alexandria. In historical terms, the "discovery" would harken back to a historical Jesus who was a bit of a libertine and *magician. This secret gospel has been accepted as authentic by prominent scholars, but has also been considered by others to be an all-too-clever and recent fabrication (JECS 11/2 [2003] 155-163). In any case, the *Secret Gospel of Mark*, if it is not a text of recent invention, could constitute a manipulation of the canonical gospel of *Mark on the part of a libertine sect in the final years of the 2nd c. For the most recent discussions of the issues, see works Carlson, Brown and Grafton in the bibliography.

New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher, Louisville 1991, I, 106-109; R. Trevijano, *La Bibbia nel cristianesimo antico*, Brescia 2003, 345-347; JECS 11 (2003) 133-163 (articles of Hendrick, Stroumsa, Ehrman); S. Carlson, *The Gospel Hoax: Morton Sminth's Invention of Secret Mark*, Waco, TX 2005; S.G. Brown, *Morton Smith as M Madiotes: Stephen Carlson's Attribution of Secret Mark to a Bald Swindler*, Journ. Study of Historical Jesus 6.1 (2008) 106-125; A. Grafton, *Gospel Secrets: The Biblical Controversies of Morton Smith*, in *The Nation,* January 26, 2009.

R. Trevijano

MARK of Arethusa (4th c.). Mark was a bishop of Arethusa (Er Rastan) in *Syria. He participated in a delegation led by *Eusebius of Caesarea that in 342 went to *Milan, to present to the emperor *Constantius II a formula of *faith derived from the formula of the Council of *Antioch in 341, in the attempt to heal the conflicts that arose in 340–341 between the Western supporters and Eastern opponents of the Nicene Creed. We find him in 359 as an opponent, together with *Acacius of Caesarea, of the *homoousians, and a developer of an intermediate theological line between these partisans and the radical *Arians. In this context he drafted the Fourth Formula of *Sirmium of 22 May 359, which defines Christ as like the *Father in all ways, acc. to the *Scriptures. It is not certain that he took part in the Council of *Seleucia in 359. At the accession of *Julian the Apostate to the throne, in the context of the anti-Christian acts of violence that were tolerated or favored by this emperor, he was cruelly tortured and killed by the *pagans who blamed him for the destruction of their *temples. His *feast is celebrated on 27 March.

DCB 3, 825; Simonetti 592; BS 8, 701; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 134-135; F. Sforza Barcellona, *Martiri e confessori dell'età di Giuliano l'Apostata: dalla storia alla leggenda*, in *Pagani e cristiani da Giuliano l'Apostata al sacco di Roma*, ed. F.E. Consolino, Soveria Mannelli 1995, 53-83.

M. Simonetti

MARK the Deacon. The author of the *Vita Porphyrii.* *Porphyry was bishop of *Gaza (395–420). In the *Vita* Mark appears as a calligrapher of *Asian origin who at *Jerusalem joined the monk Porphyry, who had become ill, occupying himself with distributing his belongings to the *poor. Healed as a result of such circumstances, ordained a priest and then becoming bishop of Gaza, Porphyry used Mark, by now his deacon, in missions to the emperor to solicit support in his commitment to the total destruction of *paganism. Mark acts as an eyewitness of the narrated events. Beginning in the 17th c., the critical scholarship has pointed to a series of inaccuracies within the *Vita Porphyrii*, as well as to a literary de-

pendence on the *Historia religiosa* of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, which suggest a date after 444–445 for the redaction of the *Vita Porphyrii*. The question becomes increasingly complicated by the discovery of a *Georgian *translation of the *Vita* based on a *Syriac text that is strikingly different from the *Greek text, and even this is reworked. It is supposed that the original *Vita Porphyrii* was written in Syriac, probably by the deacon Mark, and it is argued that the dates on Mark that are obtained from the redactions of the *Vita Porphyrii* in our possession must be taken with extreme caution.

CPG 6722; BHG 1570: PG 65, 1211-1262 (only the Lat. tr.); *Vie de Porphyre, évêque de Gaza*, ed. H. Grégoire - M.-A. Kugener, Paris 1930 (with a Fr. tr.); P. Peeters, *La vie géorgienne de saint Porphyre de Gaza*: AB 59 (1941) 65-216 (Georgian text and Lat. tr.); C. Carta, *Vita di san Porfirio scritta da Marco Diacono*, Jerusalem 1971 (It. tr. In addition to the introductions of the cited editions of Grégoire, Kugener and Peeters: F.-M. Abel, *Marc Diacre et la biographie de saint Porphyre*, Conférences de Saint-Étienne, Paris 1919, 219-284; J. Zellinger, *Die Proömien in der Vita Porphyrii und in der "religiosa historia" des Theodoret*: Philologus 85 (1930) 209-221; DACL 14, 1464-1504; M. Gigante, *Sul testo della "Vita di Porfirio,"* Studi medievali in onore di Antonio de Stefano, Palermo 1956, 227-229; J. Rougé, *Tempête et littérature dans quelques textes chrétiens*: Nuovo Didaskaleion 12 (1962) 55-69; BS 10, 1039-1043; DSp 10, 265-267; R. Van Dam, *From Paganism to Christianity at Late Antique Gaza*: Viator 16 (1985) 1-20; G. Mussies, *Marnard, God of Gaza*: ANRW 2, vol. 18/4, 2412-2457; M. Blume, *La Vie de Porphyre et les papyrus: quelques aspects de la vie municipale à la fin du IVe et au début du Ve siècle*: Chronique d'Égypte 66 (1991) 237-244; F. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370–529*, 1, Leiden 1995, 188-243; 246-282; M. Scopello, *Julie, manichéenne d'Antioche (d'après la Vie de Porphyre de Marc le Diacre, ch. 85-91)*: Antiquité Tardive 5 (1997) 187-209; Patrologia V, 275-277.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MARK the Gnostic (2nd c.). A disciple of *Valentinus, Mark the *Gnostic belongs to the E branch of the school of *Valentinus. According to the testimony of *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* I, 13-16), Mark taught in *Asia Proconsularis, adhering to the Valentinian doctrines on the *aeons. Characteristic are his speculations on the letters of the alphabet and *numbers. Irenaeus presents Mark as a *magician, who used to celebrate the *Eucharist with spells and wonders and who used to seduce many women. Not content to claim for himself the gift of prophecy, he used to pretend to be able to pass it on to others as well. His disciples (Marcosians) went on preaching journeys as far as *Gaul, and Irenaeus personally knew some of them. Irenaeus likewise comments that these disciples were making use of many *apocryphal writings that they themselves had composed.

The sources on Mark are presented in the original language and translated into German with analysis and commentary by N. Forster in *Marcus Magus. Kult, Lehre und Gemeindeleben einer valentinianischen Gnostikergruppe. Sammlung der Quellen und Kommentar*, Tübingen 1999. *Studies*: H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, Leipzig 1924, 326-349; F. Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, Leipzig ²1925, 126-133; M. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris 1947, 358-386; G. Casadio, *La visione in Marco il Mago e nella gnosi di tipo sethiano*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 123-146; LACL³ 490; Frede 1995, 695-719.

C. Gianotto

MARK the Hermit. The author of six *ascetical opuscules (I and II forming a single series of sentences) and two *christological opuscules. Critical editions and MSS also attribute to him some pieces belonging to *Marcianus or to *Macarius of Egypt (CPG 6090-6102; PG 65, 893-1140; J. Kunze, *Marcus Eremita*, Leipzig 1895). He came to be identified with a *monk named Mark in the vicinity of *Tarsus around 518, one whom *Severus of *Antioch compelled to endorse the declarations against *Nestorianism (= *Chalcedonianism) and *Messalianism. Hesse and Grillmeier, however, would place him prior to the First Council of *Ephesus (431) and even around 390. Durand notes that the author does not refrain from *allegorical *exegesis that employs 2 Peter (excluded from the biblical canon by *John Chrysostom, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus), and that he does not resemble *Macarius-Symeon (ps.-Macarius). Durand concludes that the author would have begun a monastic lifestyle twenty or thirty years before the council, and that he would have written the **tractatus* on the *incarnation immediately after the council in a secondary city of Asia Minor. He further notes an insistence on a *theopaschitism that was compatible with *orthodoxy. However, the author avoids typically *Alexandrian terminology such as **theotokos*.

CPG/S 379-380. 496; DSp 10, 274-283; O. Hesse, *Markos Eremites und Symeon von Mesopotamien*, Göttingen 1973; A. Grillmeier, *Marco Eremita e l'origenismo*: Cristianesimo nella storia 1 (1980) 9-58; J. Gribomont, *Marc l'Érémite et la christologie évagrienne*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 3 (1982) 73-81; M. le Moine, *Traités spirituels et théologiques*, translated Cl.A. Zirnheld, introduced by K. Ware, Bégrolles-en-Mauges 1985; G.-M. de Durand, *Marc le Moine, Traités* (SC 445-455), Paris 1999–2000.

J. Gribomont

MARO, anchorite monk (d. ca. 410). *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. ca. 466), the author of the *Religious History*, is the only historian or biographer roughly contemporary with the *anchorite Maro (Marūn) to tell us anything of his existence (*Hist. Relig.* chapters 16,

21 and 22; HE: PG 82, 1418). He withdrew to a mountaintop once used in pagan worship, where he put up a tent for himself, but spent most of his time in the open air, thus establishing a different form of eremitical life. His *asceticism and holiness won for him the gift of being able to heal both physical and spiritual ailments. This ability earned him a reputation that drew many crowds. Theodoret alludes to disciples of Maro—e.g., James—but he does not speak of a *cenobitic community as having gathered around Maro, still less of one under his direction. He died after a brief illness. His body was fought over by those who wished to have it. Later, the inhabitants of a nearby village managed to acquire it, and at the time of Theodoret's writing, Maro's tomb was a place of pilgrimage. We do not know the exact whereabouts of the holy anchorite's retreat near *Apamea (the modern city of Homs), in Syria Secunda.

A further detail of chronology is supplied by the same author, when he mentions the disciple named James of Cyrrhestica, who had been under Maro's direction thirty-eight years earlier. If one allows that the bishop of Cyrrhus wrote his *Religious History* about the year 444, Maro must have still been alive in 406. This conclusion does not, however, permit us to identify Maro with the priest of the same name to whom St. *John Chrysostom wrote a letter between 404 and 407 (*Ep.* 36: PG 52, 629), as there is nothing in that letter to suggest that the anchorite mentioned in the *Religious History* was ever a priest.

Did the presence of Maro's tomb in Cyrrhestica and its veneration result in the building of a monastery in the same place? No definitive answer has yet been given to this question.

It is not our intention to address here the problem of the relationship between Maro and the monastery N of *Apamea that shares his name—which was established in 452 through the generosity of the emperor—nor of the relationship that would make this community of the Maronite Church a direct descendant of the anchorite.

Théodoret de Cyr, *Histoire des moines de Syrie*, ed. P. Canivet - A. Leroy Molinghen, 2 (SC 257), Paris 1979; A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne: Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie*, Paris 1959, 295ff.; P. Canivet, *Le monachisme syrien selon Théodoret de Cyr*, Paris 1977 (esp. pp. 197–302). On the monastery of S. Maro, see P. Naaman, *Théodoret de Cyr et le monastère de S. Maroun*, Beirut 1971; B. Daou, *Le site du couvent principal de S. Maron en Syrie*: PdO 3 (1972) 145–151. Concerning Maro and his cult see BS 8, 1194–1200. It is not possible to give here a bibl. relating to the Maronite Church; the essentials are dealt with in M. Hayek, *Liturgie maronite. Histoire et textes eucharistiques*, Paris 1964 (esp. pp. 3–60); P. Dib, *Histoire de l'Église maronite*, 2 vols., Beirut 1962; DIP 5, 1002f.; LTK[3] 6, 1410.

J.-M. SAUGET

MARO, John (7th–8th c.). According to some later *Maronite traditions, he was the first Maronite patriarch of *Antioch (685–707). Some writings are ascribed to him, among which there is an *anaphora. Owing to the lack of objective information, he is to be considered legendary, perhaps confused with *Maro the anchorite.

BS 8, 1194-1200; Cath 8, 703.

S.J. VOICU

MARO of Edessa. *Anastasius the Sinaite (7th c.), in his *Hodegos* (XIII, 10, 98-111 and XXII), quotes texts—otherwise unknown to us—written by one Maro of *Edessa, a *monophysite author. Their authenticity is doubtful. Both *testimonia* presuppose the christological debates of the 6th c., and Anastasius claims he got his second citation at *Alexandria. The commentator of the Codex Vindobonensis theol. gr. 166 is clearly mistaken when he states that Maro had been the recipient of a letter in which *Ibas of Edessa gave an account of the Council of *Ephesus (431) and of *Cyril of Alexandria's alliance with the Eastern bishops (CPG 6500).

CPG 6986 and 7745; K.-H. Uthemann, *Anastasii Sinaitae Viae dux* (CCG 8), Turnhout-Leuven 1981, 255-256 and 304.

K. DEN BIESEN

MARONITES. A Christian community of Syrian origin. Its existence is said to go back to *Maro, a friend of *John Chrysostom (d. 407). St. Maro's Monastery was established by his disciples on the banks of the river Orontes, N of *Apamea (modern Homs) in *Syria. It enjoyed a great reputation, and its monks were among the staunchest defenders of the definition of *Chalcedon (451) during the christological controversies of the 6th c. For this reason about 530 of them were killed in 517. At the Council of *Constantinople a certain Paul was present as a delegate of the monastery of the "blessed Maro."

The region was invaded by the Arabs in 636. Cut off from the discussions and decisions of the Council of *Constantinople held in 680/681, which condemned *monothelitism, the Maronites remained attached to the old view and rejected the dyothelite (*see* *dyophysitism) formulas. They suffered persecution from the *monophysites (*Jacobites) and from the *Melkites. Owing to persecution by the caliph Al-Mamun (813–833), they moved into the mountains of Lebanon, and some eventually moved as far as Cyprus. The Lebanese mountains became

their spiritual center in about 939, when the patriarchate was transferred there from *Antioch. During the Crusades the Maronite Church entered into communion with the Church of Rome; in 1216 their patriarch, Jeremiah, was recognized as patriarch of Antioch, and since then the Maronites have remained in communion with Rome. It is remarkable that this union was total, not leaving behind any separate group.

The Maronite liturgy is of the West Syrian variety, although, like many of the Maronite Church's structures, has suffered heavy Latinization.

DSp 10, 631-644; DTC 10, 1-142; P. Dib, *L'église maronite.* I-II, Paris-Beirut 1930–1962; P. Naaman, *Théodoret de Cyr et le monastère de Saint Maroun*, Beirut 1971; Id., *Histoire de l'église maronite*, Beirut 1962; B. Daou, *Le site du couvent principal de Saint Maron en Syrie*: PdO 3 (1972) 145-152; J. Gribomont, *Documents sur les origines de l'Église Maronite*: PdO 5 (1974) 95-132; G. Sorge, *I maroniti nella storia*, Rome 1978; A.A. King, *The Rites of Eastern Christendom.* I, Rome 1947, 211-320; M. Hayek, *Liturgie maronite . . .*, Paris 1964; R. Hiestand, *Die Integration der Maroniten in die römische Kirche*: OCP 54 (1988) 119-152; H. Suermann, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche*, Wiesbaden 1998.

S.J. Voicu

MARRIAGE

I. Theology of marriage - II. Liturgical rites. - III. Iconography - IV. Spiritual marriage - V. Mixed marriages.

I. Theology of marriage. The patristic doctrine on marriage derives from the OT and NT, yet it has absorbed the influence of Greek philosophy (esp. *Stoic and *Platonic) and of Roman law. The church fathers rarely talk about a definition of marriage as an accord of two wills, the *pactio coniugalis* (Amb., *Inst. virg.* VI, 41). They have an implied understanding of this concept in Roman law (see *nuptiae sunt coniunctio maris et feminae, consortium omnis vitae, divini et humani iuris communication* [*Mod. D.* 23.2.1.]), in which marriage was distinguished from concubinage, precisely by the expression or suggestion of the *affectio maritalis* (a constitutive sign of marriage, along with the *domum mariti deductio*). Instead, it seems that certain church fathers make changes in emphasis as they interpret this juridical institution. *Ambrose of Milan stresses the consensual element; in the Middle Ages, the school of Paris known as the "consensualists" would do the same. *John Chrysostom retains the juridical effect of the expression of the *affectio maritalis* for the moment of the *copula carnalis*; compare the school of Bologna known as the "realist consensualists."

Yet the innovation of *Christianity consists in the fact that this accord is ratified by God, in accordance with Gen 2:23-24, the primary text that constitutes the model for every marriage. As the *nymphostolos* (Aster. Amasea: PG 40, 228 C) in the wedding ceremony, God leads the bride to the groom and ratifies their union. Here is the principle of unity and indissolubility. As Jesus says in Mt 19:4-5, this text is pronounced by God himself; it expresses the "law of marriage," acc. to *Origen, the school of *Antioch and others.

Thus the magisterial figures of Christianity in the early centuries were aware that matrimonial unions were regulated by their very own norms, as well as by the laws of state. However, the view of inequality in the pagan mentality of marriage was changing very slowly. The reason for it taking a long time is that even the lower social classes within Christianity felt the supernatural "bond" that was established by God and expressed in various ways (Theod. Mops., in Reuss, TU 61, p. 107). They knew that not only the wife but also the husband is connected to the joint party (John Chrys., *Hom. 1 Th* 5: PG 62, 425). In order to realize and strengthen this sentiment, the church fathers came to stress the religious value of marriage, formulated and expressed in Eph 5:21-33: marriage represents in time the image of the union of Christ and the church in eternity. In the subsequent development of the theology of marriage, *Augustine of Hippo argued that marriage is already a *symbol or sign of the *sacramentum magnum*, and that it reproduces the reality of the same (*De nupt. et conc.* I, 10 [11], 21 [23]). The explanations given by Augustine on the matter of the **sacramentum* of marriage do not completely correspond to the sacramental theory of later centuries, but nevertheless they sketch out the theory. In accordance with the religious character of marriage, in the later legislation of *Justinian, marriages no longer dissolve automatically in certain cases. As an example, in classical law an imprisonment of war dissolves a marriage, but in Justinianian law this does not occur.

Yet if marriage is the image of the union of Christ and the church, its purposes must also harmonize with the story of salvation. For this reason, procreation is clearly underlined as the aim of marriage. While the *Stoic influence plays a part, a distinctive argument is that procreation participates in the creative work of God. In any case, the recommendation of the apostle *Paul in 1 Cor 7:1-7 ("It is good for the man to abstain from the wife . . . but let every husband have a wife and every woman have a husband") presupposes that procreation is not the only element that justifies the conjugal union. The same recommendation also pertains to abstaining from carnal

*temptations. Yet the church fathers often misunderstood the verses in which the apostle admonishes us on how to abstain from sexual activity, "at most, only for the sake of prayer and only for a time" (1 Cor 7:5): this is interpreted as if sexual abstinence were a prerequisite of *prayer (Orig., *De orat.* 31,4; *Com. Mt.* XIV, 23; *Fragm. 1 Cor.* 12). The reasoning behind such an interpretation goes something like this: the church fathers, having read in the OT that there is a certain impurity in sexual relations, whatever may be the true significance contained in certain passages (e.g., Ex 19:14-15; Lev 8:33; 15:1-33; 1 Sam 21:5-6) and after having found a seemingly analogous exhortation in Heb 13:4 ("let the marriage bed be without stain") and a parallel statement in the gathering of the "chaste" in Rev 14:4 ("that shall be the saved among humanity"), still being bound by the pagan mentality of obligatory cultic *continence in the Greco-Roman cults, comparing everything with Paul's "saying" in 1 Cor 7:5 and seeing it as a mutual obligation to deny oneself in a joint agreement to dedicate oneself to prayer, came up with the idea of a "stain" that is inherent in even the most legitimate conjugal act.

Origen, e.g., sees here a "certain" impurity (*Com. Mt.* XVII, 35), yet clearly distinct from that of *sin, as the parallel sense of *Com. Rom.* IX, 1 and *Hom. Num.* XXIII, 3 indicates. This impurity is explained by the theological and metaphysical vision that presupposes it, to the effect that it is none other than an expression of a level that rises above the carnal condition. For Origen, the sensible realm is good, but it is a source of temptation for humanity. Along with egoism, it is inclined to claim the adoration that rightly belongs to "true" realities, the mysteries. The sensible is the visible likeness of the mysteries, weakening the impulse of the *soul, which has *mystery as its rightful end. Every sin is *idolatry, and the sin of idolatry constitutes the impurity that is present in the most legitimate sexual relations. *Jerome, deepening this theological vision with his peculiar shades of meaning, would declare in at least a few texts (*Adv. Iovin.* I, 7-8) that the conjugal act is sinful to the degree that it impedes prayer (see 1 Cor 7:5), but nonetheless is tolerable to the degree that it is less serious than *fornication. In *John Chrysostom one does not find the idea of impurity, but sexual relations are often seen as the "remedy of concupiscence," a concept taken more or less successfully from 1 Cor 7. For Augustine, above all in the *Contra Iulianum* III, 53, the conjugal act is in itself good, but with fallen humanity it is always connected in some degree to an evil called concupiscence. He offers the analogous idea (*Serm.* 51,13,22; *Serm.* 278,9,9) that the *tabulae nuptiales* were binding on procreation, but not on sexuality: *liberorum procreandorum causa*.

What has been described so far applied to young married couples. So what then can be said in defense of the elderly? For this group, one finds structures that are even more rigorous, considering that for its members the positive effects of marriage are experienced less with age. Procreation is no longer possible, and the temptations are no longer so strong (Orig., *Hom. Lc.* VI). All things considered, sexuality is not therefore treated as an important element of marriage. By way of illustration, even the *una caro* of Gen 2:24 is taken to mean the accord of will rather than a corporeal union, since this precept is formulated at the very moment in which the woman is fashioned in the *paradise of Eden. It is only after having been expelled on the basis of their sin, acc. to Gen 4:1, that "*Adam knew Eve as his wife" (Orig., *Fragm. 1 Cor.* 29). Therefore, it does not seem that the consummation of marriage plays a role in its juridical definition. The Roman jurist Domitius Ulpianus gave the formula, *nuptias enim non concubitus, sed consensus facit* [*Ulp. D.* 35.1.15]). In a similar sense, marriage is already ratified by the *sponsalia* prior to the *deductio in domum mariti* (Council of *Elvira, can. 54; Pope *Siricius, *Letter to *Himerius of Tarragona*). This position is not generally accepted by the church fathers, as seen by the fact that Ambrose and Chrysostom (see J.M. Soto, 71ff.), in contrast with Augustine (see, e.g., *Sermo* 51,12), do not treat the union of *Joseph and *Mary as a true marriage, on the basis of the renunciation of the sexual union.

Thus if sexuality is not an important element in itself, the other purpose of Christian marriage is all the more important. This is mutual love, a component of the Augustinian *fides*, which for Origen consists in "concord, agreement, harmony" (*Com. Mt.* XIV, 16), in imitation of the love of Christ for the church (*Com. Ct.* II, 1) and with the elimination of the egoist passion that seeks satisfaction of its own desire and contains within itself an element of the "unharmonious" (*Fragm. Eph.* 30).

Procreation, abstention from the temptations and mutual love are the positive effects of marriage. Still, they count for less than the positive effects of their counterpart, *virginity. To mention some negative arguments concerning marriage: 1 Cor 7:32-34 sets apart the liberty with which the continent person or the virgin can serve God from the servitude of the person who is married and must attend to the needs of the spouse. The married man belongs to the spouse, and the self-giving love that must be the basis of conjugal love moves beyond the desire of *chastity that would be incompatible with this rela-

tionship (Orig., *Fragm. 1 Cor.* 33). According to *Tertullian, marriage is an impediment in the relationship between human beings and God. And if marriage represents in time the union between Christ and the church in eternity (see above), virginity is already a here-and-now participation in this divine mystery, acc. to Mt 22:30 (Orig.: H. Crouzel, *Virginité*, 15-44). In this context, the hierarchy between virginity and marriage arises.

Countering the excesses of such a hierarchical interpretation, the church fathers defend the value of marriage against *encratites, *Marcionites, *Montanists, *gnostics (defense from *Clement of Alexandria and from Origen), *Novatians (from *Epiphanius), *Manicheans (from Augustine) and *Priscillianists. They also counter the excesses of some ascetics, as in the Council of *Gangra against *Eustathius of Sebaste. They insist that marriage is a path of salvation and must not be devalued. Indeed, Clement recognizes that marital chastity in a Christian context is more difficult than total chastity. Conjugal chastity consists in the performance of the acts of marriage "with order and at an opportune time" (Orig., *Fragm. 1 Cor.* 37). Even Tertullian, in his Catholic period, praises marriage in the *Ad uxorem*. One usually finds a corresponding treatment of virginity with respect to marriage, even if it is excessive (Jerome).

Be that as it may, if virginity has greater value than marriage, the question arises: So why not separate from the spouse for religious reasons, for the heavenly kingdom? Despite the biographical interpretation suggested by the γνήσιε σύζυγε in Phil 4:3, locating in the phrase the wife that Paul had left behind for his ministry, Clement and then Origen are resistant to the idea of spouses separating in order to live in continence. In this sense they are more faithful to the Pauline theology than their post-Nicene counterparts; it is noteworthy that Clement, Origen and again Tertullian fought against the heretics who tore up marriage for religious purposes. The post-Nicene fathers would eventually praise those spouses who led a life of continence, impose this lifestyle on the clergy and even accept the separation of spouses along the lines of *Basil of Caesarea, since one of the two could enter the religious life.

The tendency to equalize the joint parties of marriage is due to Christianity. In the society of Antiquity it is quite common that the wife—even in Christian families—almost becomes an *ancilla* of the husband (*dominus*) (Aug., *Confess.* IX, 9,19). This approach to equality is further detectible in the judgment on *adultery developed by the church fathers.

A. d'Alès, *La théologie de Tertullien*, Paris 1903; J. Peters, *Die Ehe nach der Lehre des hl. Augustinus*, Paderborn 1918; A. Moulart, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Paris 1923; H. Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Berlin 1927; B. Alvès Pereira, *La doctrine du mariage selon saint Augustin*, Paris 1930; G. Violardo, *Il pensiero giuridico di san Girolamo*, Milan 1937; Id., *Appunti sul diritto matrimoniale in Sant'Ambrogio*, in *Sant'Ambrogio nel XVI centenario della nascita*, Milan 1940, 485-516; O. Ghiacchi, *La dottrina matrimoniale di Sant'Ambrogio nel decreto di Graziano*, ibid., 523-551; N. Ladomerszky, *Saint Augustin, docteur du mariage chrétien*, Rome 1942; A. Reuter, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini doctrina de bonis matrimonii*, Rome 1942; G.H. Joyce, *Christian Marriage*, London [2]1948; W.J. Dooley, *Marriage According to Saint Ambrose*, Washington 1948; Ch.H. Naudet, *Position de saint Jérôme en face des problèmes sexuels*, in *Mystique et continences* (Études carmélitaines), Paris 1952, 306-356; H. Crouzel, *Virginité et mariage selon Origène*, Paris and Bruges 1963; J.P. Broudéhoux, *Mariage et famille chez Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1970; J.L. Larrabe, *El matrimonio cristiano como edificación de la ciudad de Dios según san Agustín*: La Ciudad de Dios 185 (1972) 671-689; M. Turcan, *Le marriage en question? Ou les avantages du célibat selon Tertullien*, in *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à P. Boyancé*, Coll. de l'École franç. de Rome 22, Rome 1974, 711-720; A. Treloar, *St. Augustine's Views on Marriage*: Prudentia 8 (1976) 41-50; J.M. Soto, *El matrimonio "in fieri" en la doctrina de S. Ambrosio y S. Juan Crisóstomo*, Rome 1976; R. Cantalamessa, ed., *Etica sessuale e matrimonio nel cristianesimo delle origini*, Milan 1976; R. Desjardins, *Une pastorale augustinienne du mariage*: BLE 77 (1976) 161-172; A. Orbe, *Los Valentinianos y el matrimonio espiritual. Hacia los orígenes de la mística nupcial*: Gregorianum 58 (1977) 5-53; M. Mees, *Clemens von Alexandrien über Ehe und Familie*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 113-131; J. Gaudemet, *L'interprétation du principe d'indissolubilité du marriage chrétien au cours du premier millénaire*: BIDR 81 (1978) 11-70; U. Navarrete, *Influsso del diritto romano sul diritto matrimoniale canonico*, in *Atti del Colloquio romanistico-canonistico* (Rome 16-18 February 1978), Rome 1979, 299-318; D.L. Balch, *1 Cor 7, 32-35 and Stoic Debates About Marriage, Anxiety and Distraction*: JBL 102 (1983) 429-439; P. Schmitt, *Le mariage chrétien dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin*, Paris 1988; O. Vannucchi Forzieri, *La risoluzione del matrimonio nel IV-V secolo. Legislazione imperiale e pensiero della Chiesa*: Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Toscana La Colombaria 50 (1985) 65-172; M. Sargenti, *Matrimonio cristiano e società pagana. Spunti per una ricerca*: SDHI 51 (1985) 367-391; C. Tibiletti, *Matrimonio e verginità in S. Agostino*, in *Fede e sapere nella conversione di Agostino*, ed. A. Ceresa Gastaldo, Genoa 1986, 27-42; E.A. Clark, *Adam's Only Companion: Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage*: RecAug 21 (1986) 139-162; H. Crouzel, *La concupiscence charnelle dans le mariage selon saint Augustin*: BLE 88 (1987) 287-308; J.A. Brundage, *Law, Sex and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*, Chicago 1987; J. Marcilla Catalán, *El matrimonio en la obra pastoral de san Agustín*: Augustinus 34 (1989) 31-117; D.G. Hunter, *On the Sin of Adam and Eve: A Little-Known Defense of Marriage and Childbearing by Ambrosiaster*: HTR 82 (1989) 283-299; M.D. Hart, *Reconciliation of Body and Soul: Gregory of Nyssa's Deeper Theology of Marriage*: ThS 51 (1990) 450-478; J. Gaudemet, *L'évolution de la notion de* sacramentum *en matière de mariage*: RDC 32 (1991) 71-79; J. Triantaphyllopoulos, *La definition du mariage par Modestin*: Nomos (1991) 53-79; P. Urso, *Il matrimonio del prigioniero in diritto romano*: SDHI 58 (1992) 85-142; C. Mazzucco, *Matrimonio e verginità nei Padri tra IV e V secolo: prospettive femminili*, in *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, ed. U. Mattioli, Genoa 1992, 119-153; E. Monjas Ayuso, *Visión*

del matrimonio en las obras de Tertulliano: Ad uxorem, De exhortatione castitatis *et* De Monogamia, in *Actas del VIII congreso español de estudios clásicos II*, Madrid 1994, 759-766; P.L. Reynolds, *Marriage in the Western Church: The Christianization of Marriage During the Patristic and Early Medieval Periods*, Leiden and New York 1994; D.G. Hunter, *Augustinian Pessimism? A New Look at Augustine's Teaching on Sex, Marriage and Celibacy*: Augustinian Studies 25 (1994) 153-177; L. Dattrino, *Il matrimonio secondo Agostino: contratto, sacramento e casi umani*, Milan 1995; W. Otten, *Augustine on Marriage, Monasticism, and the Community of the Church*: ThS 59,3 (1998) 385-405; B. Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage*, Berkeley 2001.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

II. Liturgical rites (wedding procedure and liturgy). The Christians of the early centuries did not live detached from society. They married like everyone and had children (Athenag., *Leg.* 33; Tertull., *Apol.* 42; *Diogn.* 5). Marriage was considered to be an earthly and secular reality, and like everything in life this institution was to be lived out in a Christian spirit.

As such, even in the formative Christianity of the early centuries (approximately until the era of *Constantine), marriage was not considered to be so much a legal matter but more of a social reality comprising two circumstances: the cohabitation of the joint parties and the so-called *affectio maritalis*, i.e., the couple's awareness of their experience of living together as a marriage. Even if a legally established form for contracting a marriage was not in existence, yet in order for society to consider cohabitation as a marriage (and not, e.g., a *concubinage), recourse was increasingly made to certain visible practices, namely, the *domum deductio* and the public expression of the consent of the joint parties in contracting the marriage. Indeed, an important element of the influence of Christianity is the tendency to treat marriage not as a simple social reality but more and more as a legal matter, so that from the time of Constantine an increasingly great importance was given to the legal documentation of marriage, e.g., to the *tabulae nuptiales* or *matrimoniales*. Although already in existence in earlier times, the *tabulae* contained important information on the joint parties and on the circumstances of the marriage. At the conclusion of the official act, they were read out in a loud voice before all the witnesses (see Tertull., *Uxor.* II, 3, I). The obligatory procedures, above all the *in domum mariti deductio*, were then accompanied by some pagan rites, though they were not constitutive components of marriage.

Since the church of the early centuries was not an institution that held its own jurisdiction, it did not have any effective methods to influence Christians in their marriages, except for verbal admonition. The first intervention of the church into the field of marriage is that of *Ignatius of Antioch. Even if his demand (to "marry only with the approval of the bishop" *Polyc.* 5,2) is a pastoral and not a juridical intervention, the bishops knew the writings of Ignatius and probably tended to assert the demand in their own communities.

One might surmise that the Christians of the first three centuries strove to eliminate the typical pagan elements that were not constitutive components of marriage from the wedding rites, perhaps replacing them with Christian practices. A seeming example is the coronation of the spouses: Tertullian (*De corona* XIII, 4) advises against mixed marriages (see section below) with pagans, particularly since they would cause the Christian party to be contaminated by idolatry. Yet the archaeological evidence testifies to certain pagan rites being adopted by the Christians, such as the coronation or the *dextrarum iunctio*. With the increasing disappearance of paganism, it was possible for these symbols to become neutralized or even Christianized; their survival is evident in later liturgies.

However, the Christianization of weddings came slowly. At *Alexandria in the time of Clement, it does not appear that weddings were even accompanied by a liturgical celebration. While over the course of time such liturgical activities did not become an indispensable part of the marriage ceremonies, beginning in the 3rd c. marriages were blessed by the church. Such use is found again in Tertullian, acc. to whom, if two believers marry each other, "the church unites them, the oblation confirms the marriage, the blessing seals it" (Tertull., *Ad uxorem* 2,8). The blessing thus had a role in the community or with the participation of the joint parties in the eucharistic rite, although the *Eucharist is explicitly introduced in connection with marriage only in the 5th c. with the *Praedestinatus* III. According to other sources, the participation of the joint parties is in an isolated act. The purpose of expressing the intent of marriage or even the consensus of the joint parties was to avoid the risk that their union would be treated as fornication or adultery (Tertull., *Pudic.* 4,4; see also *Monog.* XI, 1-2, where the writer speaks of "summoning" [*postulare*] members of the clergy to the marriage who "will unite" [will celebrate the union, *coniungere*]).

Certainly nothing allows us to make generalizations on the basis of what Tertullian wrote in the 2nd and 3rd c., or to assume that such rites were obligatory. Yet the treatment of the marriage of Christians moves in this direction. Indeed, it seems that in 4th-

c. Rome (Pope Siricius, *Letter to Himerius of Tarragona*, ch. 5, in the year 385), after or during the *sponsalia* but still before the *in domum mariti deductio* there took place a blessing of the betrothed on the part of a priest, after which the bishop of Rome considers the union to be no longer dissoluble.

Apart from the blessing, marriage was always valid as long as it did not contravene the basic rules of administering the constitutive components of marriage, namely, the expression of consensus through the *tabulae matrimoniales* and the expression of cohabitation with the *deductio in domum mariti*. The concept of ecclesial invalidity or validity was still not in existence. Proof of the nonessential and nonconstitutive character of blessing for the first Christians is given by the fact that while the first nuptials were celebrated with the blessing of God (*sub benedictione Dei celebrantur sublimiter* in *Ambrosiaster, *Comm. in Ep. I ad Cor.* VII, 40), the second nuptials were excluded from such a blessing. The sanctification of marriage *velamine sacerdotali et benedictione* (Ambr., *Ep.* 62,7), the prayers and even the blessings of the priests have the purpose of consolidating the union of marriage (John Chrys., *Hom. In Gen. 48,6:* PG 54, 443; Basil, *Hom. in Hexaemeron* VII, 5-6), thus taking the place of the prayers and sacrifices in pagan marriages. *Paulinus of Nola (early 5th c.) describes a liturgical rite: in the church the bride and groom receive the blessing of the bishop, who yokes their heads in the conjugal bond and spreads the veil over them, sanctifying them with the prayer (*Carm.* 25). According to Augustine, even the bishop must sign the *tabulae nuptiales* (*Serm.* 332,4). Nonetheless, the bishop probably assisted in the ceremony in a testimonial capacity and not with juridical functions. In later times, the ecclesial contribution becomes increasingly important. In this regard, *Hormisdas, who became pope in 514, decrees: *nullus fidelis occulte nuptias faciat, sed benedictione accepta a sacerdote publice nubat in Domino* (PL 63, 525), i.e., with a Christian spirit.

Along with the blessing, there is an external element that is carried from Christianity to the pagan concept of marriage. This is the prohibition against mixed marriages and the prohibition of marriages contracted with persons consecrated to God: virgins, widows and, beginning with the era of *Justinian, even priests and deacons from the time of ordination. The laws sanctioned by the Christian emperors were very severe, yet their functions were merely dissuasive in the sense that if the marriage was already contracted, tolerance was the rule. In the course of the first millennium, the church therefore becomes ever more aware that marriage, though regulated by civil norms, has a Christian meaning for the baptized. In the 11th and 12th c., after the recognition in the 10th c. of marriage as a sacrament, the church claims complete jurisdiction, with related consequences for the ritual component.

A.L. Ballini, *Il valore giuridico della celebrazione nuziale cristiana dal primo secolo alla età giustinianea*, Milan 1939; E. Schillebeeckx, *Le Mariage. Réalité terrestre et mystère de salut*, translated from the Dutch, I, Paris 1966, 211-247 (Eng. tr., *Marriage: Human Reality and Saving Mystery*, New York, 1965); J.P. Broudéhoux, *Mariage et famille chez Clément d'Alexandrie* (Théol. hist. 11), Paris 1970, 95-96; K. Ritzer, *Le mariage dans les Églises chrétiennes du premier au onzième siècle*, Paris 1970; M. Humbert, *Le mariage à Rome. Étude d'histoire juridique et sociale*, Milan 1972, 1-58; H. Crouzel, *Deux textes de Tertullien concernant la procédure et les rites du mariage chrétien*: BLE 74 (1973) 3-13; M. Marin, *Le* tabulae matrimoniales *in S. Agostino*: Siculorum Gymnasium 39 (1976) 307-321; H. Le Bonniec, *Le témoignage d'Arnobe sur deux rites archaïques du mariage romain*: REL 54 (1976) 110-129; C. Walter, *The "dextrarum junctio" of Lepcis Magna in Relationship to the Iconography of Marriage*: Antiquités africaines 14 (1979) 271-283; K. Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing: A Study of Christian Marriage Rites*, London 1982; H. Crouzel, *Liturgie du mariage chrétien au V^e siècle selon l'épithalame de S. Paulin de Nole*, in *Mens concordet voci. Misc. A.G. Martimort*, Paris 1983, 619-626; G.L. Falchi, *Osservazioni sulla natura della "coemptio matrimoni causa" nel diritto preclassico*: SDHI 50 (1984) 355-382; C. Castello, *Remarques sur des cas concernants le début du "iustum matrimonium"*: RIDA 32 (1985) 237-246; M. Della Luna, *Antiquitus libera matrimonia esse placuit. Profili evolutivi del matrimonio nel diritto romano e nel diritto moderno*: Atene e Roma 32 (1987) 126-136; L. Desanti, *Sul matrimonio di donne consacrate a Dio nel diritto romano cristiano*: SDHI 53 (1987) 270-296; J.M. Torres, *La tradición nupcial pagana en el matrimonio Cristiano según Gregorio de Nacianzo*: Studia historica. Historia antigua 8 (1990) 55-60; J. Evans Grubbs, *"Pagan" and "Christian" Marriage: The State of the Question*: JECS 2 (1994) 361-412; P.L. Reynolds, *Marriage in the Western Church: The Christianization of Marriage During the Patristic and Early Medieval Period*, Leiden 1994.

C. Tibiletti - L. Odrobina

III. Iconography. In the Christian iconography of the early centuries, the scene that figuratively communicates the sacrament of marriage is that of the *dextrarum iunctio.* Notwithstanding the Christianized context in which it appears, the scene remains substantially unchanged from traditional Roman iconography. The bride and groom, facing each other, hold out their right hands. The groom almost always holds in his right hand the roll (*tabulae nuptiales*, *libellus*), i.e., the official act of marriage; in turn, the woman turns her arm around the shoulders of the husband. It is the culminating moment of the wedding rite, but above all it is the representation of conjugal concord of fidelity beyond the grave. Beginning with the era of the tetrarchs, the scene appears on five-sectioned strigilated *sarcophagi. While it follows the pagan typology, it replaces the

mythological motifs in the corner panels with biblical scenes (Ws 156). Juno Pronuba, having become a personification of Concordia, appears in a fragment of a sarcophagus preserved at the Villa Doria Pamphili (Ws 86,1).

In the evolution of form from the late Constantinian era to *Theodosius I, Concordia disappears, and the two spouses come to be represented within a clypeus (Ws 128,2; 96) or within the valve of a conch (Ws 86,3; 91). In the act of joining, the right hands are configured on the width of a sarcophagus at Mantua, "at the gates of the city" (Ws 74). Another variation of the scene is constituted by the presence of Christ and of the hand of God crowning the bride and groom (Ws 74,3; 94,1). Here the motif of the coronation has a purely symbolic character, and it is connected to the triumphal iconography of the post-Constantinian era. Yet the most extensive documentation of marriage iconography is constituted by the decorative arts, above all from the 5th c., and in particular by gold glass (C.R. Morey, *Gold Glass*, pls. VI, 39; VII, 43; IX, 59). The intermediary figure who unites the bride and groom in marriage, placing their hands on their shoulders, constantly appears in the scenes that allude to marriage and also to the sacramental bond. Concordia, who appears in the early representations on funerary reliefs, is eventually replaced by Christ. *Iesus pronubus* is defined as the Christ present at the wedding of Cana in an epithalamium of *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* XXV, 15 1-2: PL 61, 636). Alternatively, Concordia is replaced by the father of the bride, who blesses the wedding, as in the mosaic on the right side of the nave in the basilica S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, where Jethro, priest and father, unites in marriage his daughter Zipporah with *Moses (A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, p. 47, fig. 133). We find an analogous structuring of the scene on a small silver plaque from Rocca di Papa (M. Borda, *Lares*, 32-33) and on a silver plate from *Cyprus, with the wedding of *David and Michal, datable to the first few centuries of the 7th c. (var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, 482). Christ is represented as sealing the sacramental act in the central medallions of two gold chains from *Syria (ibid., 283-284), and on some wedding rings of likely Eastern origin with the inscription in Greek, ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ and ΘΕΟΥ ΧΑΡΙϹ (DACL 10, 1940ff.; E.H. Kantorowicz, *Marriage Belt and Rings*, figures 1, 27-28).

Numerous as well are the *epigraphic witnesses concerning marriage. In both Greek and Latin funerary inscriptions from the 3rd to the 7th c., expressions concerning the marital life frequently occur. These include affirmation of fidelity, of Christian integrity in the conjugal life (ICUR VI, 11798), of incomparable love and of an affectionate wish that the spouse might rest with the saints in eternal *peace. Rarer expressions include the biblical term *costa* (Lat. for "rib"), which is used to designate the wife of a particular *Ianuarius diaconus* in the *Ad decimum* cemetery, on the Via Latina (ICUR VI, 15710). In the year 362, a certain *Viscilius* dedicates an inscription to *Niceni costae suae*.

DACL 10, 1873-1981; J. Wilpert, *La fede della chiesa nascente secondo i monumenti dell'arte funeraria antica*, Vatican City 1938, 249ff.; M. Borda, *Lares. La vita familiare romana nei documenti archeologici e letterari*, Rome 1947; L. Reekmans, *La "dextrarum iunctio" dans l'iconographie paléochrétienne*: Bull. Inst. Hist. Belge de Rome 31 (1951) 29-96; Id., *Dextrarum iunctio*: EAA 3, 82-85; C.R. Morey, *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections*, Vatican City 1959; A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins*, Princeton 1968, 47ff.; E.H. Kantorowicz, *On the Golden Marriage Belt and Marriage Rings of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*: DOP 14 (1960) 2-16; P. Testini, *Vita matrimoniale nelle iscrizioni funerarie cristiane*: Lateranum 52 (1976) 150-164; C. Frugoni, *L'iconografia del matrimonio nel Medio Evo*, in Atti della XXIV Settimana di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1977, 901-963; var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, New York 1979; J. Janssens, *Vita e morte del cristiano negli epitaffi di Roma anteriori al VII sec.*, Rome 1981, 112ff.; TIP 166-168.

A.M. Giuntella

IV. Spiritual marriage. The idea of a spiritual wedding and of a divine marriage predates Christianity. For example, *Philo of Alexandria teaches that when God enters into contact with the *soul, the soul receives a seed that produces as an effect the birth of *virtue (*De cherubim*, 42-52). For the Christians, marriage is a sacrament, i.e., an efficacious symbol of *grace, and the symbol itself becomes an *allegory of a more sublime spiritual reality. Now let us consider *ecclesiology and *sacraments, *eschatology, *virginity, and *mystical theology.

Ecclesiology. Right from the start, we find that the union of the man and the woman in the divine realm refers to the union of Christ with the church, the first union representing and indicating the second union. But if one considers the matter from above, from the summit and not from the base, it is not the union of Christ and the church that derives from the creation of the human couple, but on the contrary it is the man-woman relationship at the core of marriage that has in the Christ-church union its practical and living archetype, the supreme reason for its existence.

Eschatological perspective. A.C. Rusch (*Death as a Spiritual Marriage: Individual and Ecclesial Eschatology*: VChr 26 [1972] 81-101) has gathered together various texts (*Ambrose, *Methodius of Olympus,

*Gregory of Nyssa, acts of the martyrs). They lead us to the conclusion that in Antiquity, even *death had an aspect of a spiritual wedding.

Virginity. It is *Tertullian who is the first among the church fathers to adopt the expression *sponsa Christi* as a designation of the Christian virgin (see H. Koch, *Virgines Christi*, TU 31, 2, Leipzig 1907, 31). Beginning with the 3rd and 4th c., such an expression becomes the trend.

Mystical perspective. In the patristic tradition, there is a further interpretation that applies the idea of marriage to the peaks of the spiritual life. *Origen is the creator of this marriage mysticism.

DSp 10, 388-408; *Dizionario enciclopedico di spiritualità*, ed. E. Ancilli, Rome 1975, 1163-1168; T. Špidlík, *La concezione cristologica del matrimonio nelle liturgie orientali*, Bessarione, I, Rome 1979, 139-152; D. Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock*, Princeton 1995; B. Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage*, Berkeley 2001.

T. Špidlík

V. Mixed marriages. The distinction between a mixed marriage of a Catholic Christian and a non-Catholic Christian (with a prohibitive impediment) and a marriage of a Catholic Christian and a non-Christian with a disparity of religion (with a diriment impediment) arises at the end of the 12th c., with the work of the jurists *Gratian, Peter Lombard, Bernard of Pavia and Uguccione da Pisa. For the earliest era of Christianity, with such a distinction not existing, it seems legitimate to apply the label of "mixed marriage" equally to every marriage contracted between a Catholic Christian and a non-Catholic Christian, esp. since until the end of Christian Antiquity these marriages were not considered to be invalid, even if they were not encouraged. The problem of mixed marriages on a religious basis was not in existence in the pagan Roman world. The idea of repudiating such marriages comes from the OT, where there is relevant evidence of alternating rigorous and lax responses. At the beginning, these marriages carried a certain social reprobation, even though they were not forbidden. The standard of famous characters among the people was endogamy. After the destruction of the northern kingdom, the leaders of the southern kingdom, intending to resist the surrounding nations, establish the prohibition against marriage with these peoples, a prohibition of a political and religious nature (Dt 7:1-4). The ban relates to the return of the people from Babylon in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Intending that Hebrew society should be self-contained, the prophets expel the foreign wives to keep the husbands from sinning against God. The ban has a racial religious nature (Dt 23). The *Book of Jubilees* in the era of *Hellenism contains a prohibition that refashions Lev 18:21: the basis of the prohibition is a religious purity, and no longer a national one. After the destruction of the temple in *Jerusalem, the Judaic position gains new vigor. Such marriages come to be treated as nonexistent, yet as sexual unions. As such the idea took shape only after the separation of Christianity from *Judaism, so Christianity, when it first encountered the question posed by mixed marriages, did not have this model at hand to resolve the problem. During its first millennium, Christianity considers these marriages as valid, even if it discourages them.

The NT is not generally concerned with the problem of contracting mixed marriages, and this phenomenon probably did not often occur in the first years of Christianity. The cases taken into consideration are those in which a party to a marriage that was first contracted between two pagans converts and becomes a Christian. According to passages of the NT, the Christian must continue to live with the non-Christian, unless the non-Christian rejects the marriage (1 Cor 7:12-16).

After this transitional period, the church fathers, experimenting with our problem and not finding univocal norms in the NT, made recourse to specific biblical passages. Along with the dissuasive passages of the OT, they turned in the first place to 1 Cor 7:39, which specifies for the wife whose husband dies if she remarries she must do so only "in the Lord." They also turned to 2 Cor 6:14-16, where the apostle gives a general argument against relations maintained with pagans on an ethical and moral basis.

In the first two centuries of the patristic era, we do not find evidence on the matter of mixed marriages. They were not forbidden by the church and by the books of the NT (see the analysis given by Aug., *De fide et operibus* 19,35; *De adult. coni.* 1,25,31). Yet beginning in the 3rd c., some authors (and later on some councils) express their opposition to the matter, and they strive to dissuade the faithful from contracting such marriages if the non-Christian party does not want to convert. To a great degree they depend upon one another in various ways. Depending on the times and places in which the bans pertaining to the problem were formulated, the content of the prohibitions and of the dissuasions changed. Not all authors are solidly opposed to such practices; Chrysostom and Augustine are relatively permissive. While Chrysostom seems to allow the matter in one of his homilies, Augustine, while putting emphasis on the dangers of such unions and

strongly advising against them in actual practice, recognizes that in his time mixed marriages are no longer considered to be a vice because the NT does not speak against them. Otherwise there is a great variety of situations and opinions: the Christian groups for whom the bans are valid (Christian girls and/or boys, whether "common" or the children of clerics), the prohibited groups (pagans, whether "common" or even priests, then heretics, *schismatics and/or Jews), the sanctions for the transgressors (*excommunication for life or for some number of years), the sanctioned groups (the Christian girl and boy, or their parents), the scriptural passages on the basis of which the prohibitions or the dissuasions come to be formulated (passages from the OT and from the NT, above all those cited above), and the arguments in which these types of union were not advised (the equivalent of the *stuprum*, adultery of the soul, no association between a faithful and an unfaithful person, fornication of the members of Christ, *prostitution of the church of Christ with pagan *idols, various dissuasive examples of mixed marriages taken from the OT, danger for the *faith and the morals of the Christian, impossibility of the husband and wife praying together etc.).

The prohibitions of the councils are as follows: *Elvira (306), cans. 15-16 (17); *Arles (314), can. 11; *Hippo (393), can. 12; *Laodicea (2nd half of the 4th c.), cans. 10 and 31; *Chalcedon (451), can. 14; *Agde (506), can. 67; Orléans II (533), can. 19; Clermont (535), can. 6; Orléans III (538), can. 13; *Toledo III (589), can. 14; Toledo IV (633), can. 68; *in *Trullo* (692), can. 72. The texts that are relevant to our theme are found as follows: Tertull., *De corona militis* 13; *De monogamia* 7,39; *Ad uxorem* 2,3; ps.-Origen, *Philosophumena* 9,12; *Cyprian of Carthage, *De lapsis* 6; *Testimoniorum libri* III, 62; *Origen, *Fragm. in 1 Cor* 7,34-36; *Epiph. Sal., *Adv. haereses* II, 1,61,5; *Zeno of Verona, *Hom.* II, 7; John Chrys., *Hom. in Eph.* 20,5; *Hom. in 1 Cor* 19,3; Ambrosiaster, *Comm. in 1 Cor* 7,15; Ambr., *De Abraham* I, 9,81-86; *Ep. 62 ad Vigilium*; *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* 8,2-4; *Expositio psalmi 118,20,48*; Jer., *Commentarii in IV epistulas Paulinas*, *Ad Ephesios* 3,5; *Epistula* 107,1-2; *Commentarii in Isaiam* 7,19,23; *Ep.* 123,5; Aug., *De fide et operibus* 19,35; *De adult. coniug.* 1,25,31, *Ep.* 23; 33; 220; 252-255; 258.

The primary reason for opposition by the church to these marriages was the intention to protect the faith of the Christian spouse, the purity of the ecclesial community and the Christian education of the children born of the marriage. Along with these arguments, the authors also stress the theological dimensions of Christian marriage. As a type of the union between Christ and the church, such an interpretation is threatened by the possibility of a mixed marriage.

Along with the church, the Christian emperors also made laws concerning marriages between Christians and Jews. If the law of the CTh 16,8,6 dating to 339 punishes with death a very narrow group, probably for reasons not so much religious but rather economic (see Falchi), the law of CTh 3,7,2 dating to 388 sanctions on religious grounds the death penalty for all of these unions, putting them on the level of adultery for punishment. Therefore, the fact that the authors and the councils strove to dissuade the faithful, even after the law of 388, is a sign that the concept of invalidity does not yet emerge in this era. Centuries later (as seen in Zonaras and Theodore Balsamon), when the church already had complete jurisdiction in marriage and the concept of the *impedimentum dirimens* was already elaborated, the canons presented above are interpreted by this concept. The first council that truly declares as invalid a marriage contracted with a heretic is that *in Trullo* (692), signaling a fundamental turning point in the history of the prohibition in the East. This canon was never received in the West.

J. Köhne, *Über die Mischehen in den ersten christlichen Zeiten: die allmähliche Zunahme der Ehen zwischen Christen und Heiden*: Theologie und Glaube 23 (1931) 333-350; A.M. Petru, *Can. 14 Chalcedonensis Concilii irritatne matrimonia mixta?*: Angelicum 29 (1952) 130-133; Id., *De impedimento disparitatis cultus in iure orientali antiquo*, Rome 1952; P. Lombardía, *Los matrimonios mixtos en el concilio de Elvira*: Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español 24 (1954) 543-558; S. Solazzi, *Unioni di cristiani e ebrei nelle leggi del Basso Impero*, in *Scritti di Diritto Romano*, 4, Naples 1962, 49-53; J. Haiduk, *Mischehe. Eine pastoral-historische Untersuchung der Mischehe von der apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Agde (506)*, Düren 1965; P. Mahfoud, *Les mariages mixtes: étude historico-canonique*: Apollinaris 28 (1965) 84-95; R.G.W. Huysmans, *De ortu impedimentorum mixtae religionis ac disparitatis cultus*: Ephemerides Iuris Canonici 23 (1967) 187-261; W.W. Bassett, *The Impediment of Mixed Religion of the Synod in Trullo (A.D. 691)*: The Jurist 29 (1969) 383-415; J. Gaudemet, *La décision de Callixte en matière de mariage*, in *Sociétés et mariages*, Strasbourg 1980, 104-115; A. Del Castillo, *Los impedimentos para el matrimonio con paganos en el concilio de Elvira*: Hispania 42 (1982) 329-339; G. Torti, *Non debet imputari matrimonium. Nota sull'Ambrosiastro*: GIF 36 (1984) 267-282; M. Bianchini, *Disparità di culto e matrimonio: orientamenti del pensiero cristiano e della legislazione imperiale nel IV secolo dopo Cristo*: Serta Historica Antiqua 1 (1986) 233-246; G.L. Falchi, *La legislazione imperiale circa i matrimony misti fra cristiani ed ebrei nel V secolo*, in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana*, VII Convegno Internazionale, Naples 1988, 203-212; A.M. Rabello, *Il problema dei matrimoni fra ebrei e cristiani nella legislazione imperiale e in quella della Chiesa (IV-VI secolo)*, ibid., 213-224; M. Bianchini, *Ancora in tema di unioni fra barbari e romani*, ibid., 225-250; D. Ceccarelli-Morolli, *I matrimoni misti alla luce dei Sacri Canones del primo millennio*: Nicolaus 22/2 (1995) 137-143; H. Sivan, *Rabbinic and Roman Law: Jewish-Gentile/Christian Marriage in*

Late Antiquity: Revue des études juives 156 (1997) 59-100; L. Odrobina, *Ancora sul divieto dei matrimoni misti al concilio di Elvira*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale (secoli III-V)*. XXX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome, 3-5 May 2001, Rome 2002, 581-588; Id., *Le CTh 3,7,2 et les mariages mixtes*, Rome 2006.

L. Odrobina

MARSEILLE

I. The city - II. Christian origins - III. The church from 300 to 430 - IV. Marseille from the 5th to the 8th c.

I. The city. Founded by the Phoenicians in ca. 600 BC, it was conquered by Caesar in 49 BC and, though incorporated into the Roman province of Gallia Narbonensis, it remained *Gaul's most important Mediterranean port. Known as the "Athens of the West," where Roman youth would begin their study of Greek, it became Latinized in the 2nd c. AD. Economic and cultural decline began in the same c. and continued up to the time of the invasion of the Germanic tribes, when the havoc they caused to land travel gave renewed importance to seafaring. However, the later Arab invasions subsequently compromised traveling by sea, putting an end to trade in the Mediterranean.

II. Christian origins. The 11th-c. legend in which the resurrected St. Lazarus evangelizes the city and becomes its first bishop is a clumsy interpretation of the Christian antiquities to be found in the crypt of St. Victor. The inscriptions of *Volusianus and Fortunatus (CIL 12, 489) found at Marseille, as well as that of Q. Vetinius Eunetus (ibid. 611) found at Aubagne, are no longer considered to be specifically Christian, and so cannot shed light on the origins of Christianity in the city. Besides, the excavations carried out in the crypt of St. Victor in 1965 appear to have uncovered a Christian burial complex, and a tomb containing two martyrs, which F. Benoit dated to 250, based on a coin showing the emperor *Decius. The identity of the martyrs remains unknown, despite Benoit's suggestion of Volusianus and Fortunatus.

III. The church from the 300 to 430. The church in Marseille is first heard of in 314, when its bishop Oresius attended the Council of *Arles. However, it is only with *Proculus (381–428) that it fully emerges from obscurity. This bishop, together with two Gallic colleagues, took part in the Council of *Aquileia (381), and is one of the probable addressees of the letter sent by *Celestine I to the bishops of Provence (428). Meanwhile, he had himself officially recognized by the Council of *Turin (398) as having the rights of a metropolitan over the provinces of Gallia Narbonensis Secunda (Aix, Antibes, Apt, Fréjus) and Alpes Maritimae (Nice, Digne, Embrun). He effectively exercised these rights against the primatial claims of *Patroclus of Arles, founding the short-lived dioceses of Garguier and Ceyreste. During his episcopate, the first cathedral was built. Its baptistery, 23 m (75.5 ft) in diameter, is the largest in Provence. The monastery founded ca. 415 by St. John *Cassian at St. Victor was also built during his time as bishop.

IV. Marseille from the 5th to the 8th c. *Monastic life flourished in Marseille from the 5th c. It was at that time that the martyrium of St. Victor was organized, in which *Cassian had established the first monastic center: there survives an altar of classical construction. The monastery founded by Cassian produced many bishops for Marseille and S France. The monastery was also a center of Eastern-style theology, i.e., anti-*Nestorian, with little propensity for *Augustinianism. A women's monastery was also founded in the city, which later became St. Savior's Abbey. It was in this culture of *monasticism that the legend of St. Victor was born (BHL 8569ff.).

Among Marseille's important writers at this time are the priest *Museus, who composed a number of liturgical books during the episcopacy of Venerius (431–452); the rhetor *Claudius Marius Victorius, whose work *Aletheia* paraphrases Genesis; *Salvian, a native of *Trier, who, while in Marseille fleeing the Germanic invasions, wrote his *De gubernatione Dei* (ca. 440); *Gennadius (toward the end of the 5th c.), the author of *De viris illustribus*. He is also credited with having written the *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua*; and also *Paulinus of Pella, nephew of *Ausonius, who wrote the autobiographical poem *Eucharisticos* in 459, when he was 84.

After the vicissitudes of the 6th c., the church in Marseille reappears at the time of *Gregory of Tours and *Gregory the Great. It was at this time that the bishop Serenus gained notoriety for his iconoclasm. Among the other figures, mention should be made of *Theodore, who took part in the Council of Mâcon (585), and of Peter who was at the Council of *Paris (614). Marseille would have fallen into almost total obscurity were it not for the occasional appearance of an abbess's name on the odd sarcophagus here and there. Monastic life went into decline. We have not a single abbot's or abbess's name between 687 and 751, nor that of any bishop between 614 and 780.

J.H. Albanès, *Gallia christiana novissima*, vol. 2, Montbéliard 1889; DACL 10, 2204-2293; Cath 8, 714-722; J.R. Palanque, *Le diocèse de Marseille*, Paris 1967; P. Borraccino, *Sarcofagi*

palocristiani di Marsiglia, Bologna 1973; R. Boyer, ed., *Vie et mort à Marseille à la fin de l'Antiquité. Inhumations habillées des V^e et VI^e siècles et sarcophage reliquaire trouvés à l'abbaye de Saint-Victor*, Paris 1987; J.-C. Moulinier, *Saint Victor de Marseille: les récits de sa passion*, Vatican City ²1995; Id., *Autour de la tombe de saint Victor de Marseille: textes et monuments commémoratifs d'un martyre*, Marseille 2000.

V. Saxer

MARTIAL and BASILIDES. These two Spanish bishops, one from Mérida, the other from León-Astorga, had been deposed by a Spanish synod for serious failings (namely, apostasy during the *Decian persecution: they had obtained **libelli* of sacrifice), and were replaced by Felix and Sabinus respectively. Basilides fell ill and acknowledged his error; then, having done penance, was received back into communion, though as a layman. Martial was further rebuked for having taken part in a pagan funeral gathering, for having given his sons a pagan burial and for having engaged in a public act of idolatry, as confirmed by the *ducenarius* procurator. Having regained his health Basilides appealed to Rome against his colleagues' sentence, obtaining from Pope Stephen his rehabilitation and restoration to his former functions within the church. Spanish bishops had recourse to the Council of Cartagena against Basilides (254/255). The synodal letter addressed to the priest Felix and to the clergy of León-Astorga, to the deacon Elias and to the clergy of Mérida informs us about the question. The death of Pope Stephen must have made the sentence of deposition final.

Cyprian, *Ep.* 67; Monceaux 2, 54-56; Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España*, Madrid 1929, I, 1, 185-194; Cath 1, 1288; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III^e siècle* (Studi di antichità cristiana 29), Vatican City 1969, 15-20, 84-88; DHEE 1, 196.

V. Saxer

MARTIN I, pope (649–655). Pope Martin I was elected on the death of Pope *Theodore (14 May 649) during the full fury of the *monothelite struggles and a little after the publication of the *Typos* by the emperor *Constans II. He was a native of Todi, a deacon of the Roman Church, and had been **apocrisarius* in Constantinople. During this time he had become well-informed about the theological questions being debated and about the world of Constantinople. He immediately convoked and presided over a synod in Rome, which took place at the Lateran on 5 Oct 649, with the participation of mainly Italian bishops at first, but by the second session (8 Oct) the Eastern bishops had also arrived, e.g., Stephen, bishop of Dor in *Palestine, together with 37 monks and ecclesiastics, among whom was *Maximus the Confessor, who was much respected in Rome and who certainly had a major influence on the positions taken by the synod, which ended up approving whatever Pope Martin proposed. The presence of the Eastern bishops allowed the *Acts* to be recorded in both Latin and Greek, as indeed they have come down to us. The council reiterated the symbol of *Chalcedon with the addition of an article about the two wills and two operations in Christ (DS 500). It issued twenty anathemas and condemned both the **Ekthesis* of *Heraclius and the *Typos* (DS 501-522). So he sent out letters to both East and West, though not to the dissenters, in order to bring the adherents together (LP 1, 337; Jaffé 2058-2078). In response, the emperor, before the synod had finished, sent *Olympius the exarch of *Ravenna to impose the *Typos* and to arrest the pope; Olympius, however, having seen the difficulties, went off to Sicily. But in June 653 the new exarch *Theodore Calliope, under sufferance, had Martin arrested and sent to *Constantinople, which the pope reached only after a grueling journey. Once there, he was tried and condemned to death for political reasons. The sentence was commuted to exile in Cherson (Sebastopol) in the Crimea, where he died on 16 Sept 655. In his final two years he suffered atrocious torments and humiliations, which are known from his letters (Jaffé 2078-2081) and from the *Commemoratio* of an eyewitness (BHL 5594; PL 129, 591-604). During Martin's journey to Constantinople, the Roman Church had already elected his successor, *Eugenius I (LP 1, 341). His feast used to be celebrated on 12 Nov; since 1969 it has been celebrated on 13 April, the same day as in the Greek Church.

CPL 1733-1734; ACO II/I (1984) (cf. CPL 1174); PL 87, 119-212; Jaffé I, 2058-2080; PLS 4, 2004-2010; Mansi 10, 790-1188. - DTC 10, 182-194; BS 8, 377-381; Hfl-Lecl 3, 439-460; Fliche-Martin V, 236-243; 533-534; E. Caspar, *Die Lateransynode von 649*: ZKG 51 (1932) 75-137; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 329-465; P. Conte, *Il sinodo lateranense dell'ottobre 649*, Rome 1989; E. Menestò, *Martino I Papa*: Atti del 28° Conv. storico internazionale, Spoleto 1992; R. Riedlinger, *Die latein. Übersetzung der Ep. Encycl. Papst Martin I*: Philologia Mediolat. 1 (1994) 45-69; Patrologia IV, 180 (bibl.); LTK³ 6, 1425; LACL³ 491; EPapi 1, 598-603.

B. Studer

MARTIN of Braga (d. after 579). Known as the apostle of the Suevi (see Isid., *Vir. ill.* 8), Martin was born in the Roman province of *Pannonia, probably to a family of important Roman officials, which had links with *Gaul. We assume this from his acquain-

tance with *Gregory of Tours, who held him in high regard. He received a thorough literary education in Greek and Latin; this is attested by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* V, 37) and by *Paschasius of Dumium (*Apoth.* prologue.); it is also presumed by *Venantius Fortunatus (*Ep.* V, 1).

He lived a long time in the East, where he was ordained priest. His arrival by sea in *Gallaecia, presumably after being urged by the emperor *Justinian, coincided with the translation of the relics of St. *Martin of Tours to Orense. (These events, fortuitously recorded, are presented by Gregory of Tours as having happened at the same time through Providence.) Upon the arrival of the relics, the son of the Sueve king (whom Gregory names Carrarico) was healed of his illness, whereupon the king renounced his *Arianism and had Martin made a bishop. Martin founded a monastery at *Dumium, near Braga, of which he was abbot and probably abbot-bishop. Before 572, he became metropolitan of Braga, and as such presided over the Second Council of *Braga, summoned by order of King Miro. Being of a rigorist bent, he found the Christianization of the Suevi to have been deficient: pagan hangovers masquerading as mere folklore; a lack of formation among the faithful and their complete isolation; further, certain tendencies of *Priscillianist origin enjoyed great favor. A particular spirituality was attached to this, which Martin fought against by making use of his classical education and knowledge of the Greek pastoral system.

At first he was reluctant to write, only later turning his mind to it with a specific pastoral end in view. Familiar with Seneca, he summarized the moral treatises in his small book titled *De Ira*, dedicated to Vitimer, bishop of Orense, and in his *Formulae vitae honestae*, dedicated to King Miro. He also composed a series of very short catechisms, in which he locates the essence of spirituality, like *Cassian, in humility and self-discipline. These are titled *Pro repellenda iactantia*, *De superbia*, *Exhortatio humilitatis*. Mention must also be made of his *Sententiae Patrum Aegyptiorum*, written for the formation of monks, which contains spiritual maxims translated from Greek and perhaps intended for personal use in the monastery at Dumium. He wrote two treatises, one dedicated to Bishop Polemius titled *De correctione rusticorum*, which contains various considerations about the popular customs of Gallaecia; the other, *De trina mersione*, was intended for a bishop by the name of Boniface; it defended the practice of triple immersion at *baptism. In addition, three other items are attributed to Martin: *De Pascha*, on the method of calculating the date of Easter; two poems in honor of St. Martin; and the epitaph for his tomb.

CPL 1079c-1090; Díaz 20-30; PL 72, 21-52; 74, 387-394; 84, 574-586; C.W. Barlow, *Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia*, New Haven, CT 1950; M. Martíns, *Correntes da filosofía religiosa em Braga*, Porto 1950, 215-286; var. aus.: Bracara Augusta 8 (1957); L. Ribeiro Soares, *A Linhagem Cultural de sâo Martinho de Dume*, Lisbon 1963; G. Martínez Díez, *La colección canónica de la Iglesia sueva: los Capitula Martini*: Bracara Augusta 21 (1967) 224-243; A. Fontán, *Martín de Braga: un testigo de la tradición clásica y cristiana*: Anuario de Estudios Medievales 9 (1974-9) 331-341; M.J. Pinheiro Maciel, *O De Correctione Rusticorum de S. Martinho de Dume*: Bracara Augusta 34 (1980) 483-561; Martino di Braga, *Contro le superstizioni*, ed. M. Naldini, Florence 1991; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 375-430.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

MARTIN of Tours (316/317–397). Born in Sabaria in the Roman province of *Pannonia in 316/317, he was an officer's son "and, in his youth, pursued a military career, serving in the cavalry under the emperor *Constantius, and then under Caesar Julian" (*Vita Martini* 2,1). For this information we rely on *Sulpicius Severus's letter. Leaving the army in 356, he departed for Worms in order to meet *Hilary of Poitiers. He probably organized secret anti-*Arian missions in Illyricum, and spent some time as an *anchorite on the Ligurian island of Gallinara. From 361 he was superior of a community of *ascetics in Ligugé, 11 km (6.8 mi) SE of *Poitiers, perhaps on property belonging to *Hilary's family. This is the first monastic foundation in Europe that can be dated. Although he did not wish it, he became bishop of *Tours.

For twenty-five years he carried out evangelization in the pagan countryside of the mid-Loire region. He did this from his two bases, one pastoral, the other ascetic: the bishop's palace at Tours and the monastery at Marmoutier (4 km [2.5 mi] upriver from Tours, on the N bank of the Loire). As a missionary and a miracle worker Martin had a considerable role in Christianizing urban, Gallo-Roman society (judging from an inscription to *Foedula*, which reads, "baptized by His Greatness Martin" at *Vienne in the Dauphiné, on the River Rhône, S of *Lyons), but esp. among the people of the countryside: there, in his own churches (so, at Levroux in the Indre region, or at Mont-Beuvray, S of Morvan), he dealt systematically with the Celtic peasantry's old paganism (by now in its more or less Romanized form). He was warmly welcomed by the provincial aristocracy, who had been won over by monastic *asceticism, but also became an intrepid defender of the poor (e.g., he defended those imprisoned by

Count Avitus for not paying their taxes) and of the persecuted (note his appeal—like that of *Ambrose—to the usurper *Maximus at *Trier attempting to rescue the heresiarch *Priscillian and his disciples from being judged by the "secular arm"). He died at Candes in 397, despised by many clergy but held in honor by many of the laity and ascetics.

The cult of St. Martin began while he was alive (the *Life of St. Martin* by *Sulpicius Severus undoubtedly predates the saint's death, if only by a little) and was commensurate with the wide extent of his apostolate. It stretched from Normandy to Aquitaine and from *Trier to *Vienne by way of Chartres and *Paris; the diffusion of his cult followed on the spread of early Gallo-Roman monasticism (which was founded on the Egyptian model, involving strict *ascesis, *mysticism and *miracle working, with community structures that were not so rigid or "regular"). He was a man of quite rough manner and a visionary, not intellectual (despite what Sulpicius would have us believe), and given to prophetic gestures of charity (he shared his military cloak with a poor man at the gate of Amiens: *Life of St. Martin* 3). It is difficult to discover the Martin behind Sulpicius's hagiographical portrait. His cult at *Tours was associated after *Clovis's time with the political ascendancy of the Merovingian dynasty and radiated throughout Gaul. Of places named after a saint, "St. Martin" was, in France, by far the most common; this was also the case in the rest of Europe, esp. in Italy. The mosaic craftsmen of the church of S. Apollinare Nuovo in *Ravenna placed St. Martin at the front of the martyrs' procession, and St. Benedict consecrated a chapel to him in place of a pagan temple on top of Monte Cassino.

Principal source: the three works (*Life of St. Martin, Letters, Dialogues*) by Sulpicius Severus, which medieval copyists often grouped together under the title *Martinellus*; Ch.E. Babut, *Saint Martin de Tours*, Paris 1912 (hypercritical); C. Jullian, *Notes gallo-romaines*: REA 24 (1922) 37-47; 25 (1923) 49-55; *Saint Martin et son temps*, Mémorial du XVI^e^ centenaire des débuts du monachisme en Gaule (361-1961), SA 46, Rome 1961, in particular J. Fontaine, *Verité et fiction dans la chronologie de la "Vita Martini,"* 189-236; Id., *Martin de Tours*: DSp 10 (1980) 687-694; Cl. Stancliffe, *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*, Oxford 1983; L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IV^e^ au VI^e^ siècle: naissance d'une cité chrétienne*, Rome 1984. See also the bibl. below the entry *Sulpicius Severus*; R. Van Dam, *Images of Saint Martin in Late Roman and Early Merovingian Gaul*: Viator 19 (1988) 1-27; S. Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin: Legend and Ritual in Medieval Tours*, Ithaca, NY 1991; J.-P. Delville - M. Laffineur Crépin - A. Lemeunier, *Martin de Tours: du légionnaire au saint évêque*, Liège 1994; *XVI^e^ centenaire de la mort de Saint Martin: Conférences martiniennes (October 1996)*, Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Touraine 62 (1997); R. Pernoud, *Martino di Tours*, Milan 1998.

J. Fontaine

MARTINA. "Martina, unfortunately, is one of the very few Roman saints of whom it must be admitted that even her existence cannot be proved." This disappointing conclusion from Pio Franchi de' Cavalieri summarizes the problems posed by the cult and legend of Martina.

It is thought she was a martyr of the 3rd c. who died at the time of *Alexander Severus (222–235). As far as her cult is concerned, the oldest attestation comes from *Honorius I (625–638), who dedicated a church to her in the Forum. Her feast, listed in the *Capitulare Evangeliorum* (740), is on 1 Jan. Her *Passio* comes from the same century, but is of no historical value.

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *S. Martina*: RQA 17 (1907) 232-236, then in ST 222, 49-62; T. Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum*: LQF 28,59 n. 9, 173 n. 9; BS 8, 1220-1221; BBKL 5,935-936.

V. Saxer

MARTYR – MARTYRDOM

I. Christian martyrdom - II. Cult of martyrs, saints and relics - III. Acts, passions, legends - IV. Inscriptions relating to the martyrs - V. Iconography.

I. Christian martyrdom. The main period of martyrdom in the early church was during the first three centuries of the first millennium, when Christianity was still considered a *religio illicita* in the Roman Empire, and was often *persecuted. After *Constantine, there were to be more martyrs: martyred heretics (the first was *Priscillian of Avila) and Christian martyrs in countries not belonging to the Roman Empire (e.g., the persecutions in Persia between 309 and 438); moreover, martyrdom was to receive a spiritual interpretation, esp. in monastic circles: any physical or mental suffering in a believer is considered to be a kind of martyrdom (A. Solignac).

1. The meaning of martyrdom. It is frankly amazing that the term "witness" (*martys*) in Christian vocabulary began, during the 2nd c., to exclusively signify a believer who suffers and dies for his faith; a mere witness had already become a "confessor" (see Eus., *HE* 5, 2, 3-4). The only plausible explanation for this change in terminology is to admit that the very spectacle of martyrdom was considered a kind of "testimony": the suffering and death of the martyr are a manifestation of the power of the resurrection, because in the martyrs Christ suffers and conquers death. Indeed, the martyrs are bearers of the Spirit. They have visions, and miracles happen around them; their martyrdoms also have a propitiatory nature: not only are their own sins forgiven (baptism of

blood: Tertull., *Bapt.* 16; Orig., *Exh. mart.* 30; *Trad. Apost.* 19), but also the whole community of believers is to benefit from them (they give reconciliation to penitents: Tertull., *Ad mart.* 1; Cypr., *Ep.* 23, etc.; they repel the devil's power: Ignat. Ant., *Eph.* 1,1; *Mart. Pol.* 1,1; Orig., *Comm. Joh.* VI, 281-283; they intercede for the living: see the inscriptions on martyrs' tombs). The martyrs are "with the Lord" (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 33, 9; Hipp., *Comm. Dan.* II, 37, 3; Tertull., *Scorp.* 10, 12; *De res.* 43; *De an.* 55).

2. Non-Christians and martyrs. In the pagan world the testimony of the martyrs was received in two ways: with indifference and contempt, or with clear admiration that might even lead to conversion.

a. Contempt. For *Tacitus, Christians were "resolute in their hatred for the human race" (*Annals* XV, 44, 6); while *Pliny the Younger saw in them "rebelliousness and invincible obstinacy" (*Ep.* X, 96, 3) and *Marcus Aurelius a "vulgar effrontery" with which they face death (*Meditations* XI, 3, 3; Epict., *Dissert.* IV, 7, 6). Such negative reactions might sometimes have been caused by the behavior of the Christians in question. Indeed, in some accounts of martyrdom we find offensive language being used against persecutors (*Mart. Polic.* 11, 2; *Acta Carpi . . .* 40; *Passio Perp. er Fel.* 17; 18, 4; *Mart. Pionii* 4). Behavior allegedly at odds with that of Jesus on the cross (Lk 23:34; words repeated by Stephen, Acts 7:60 and by James the brother of the Lord; see Eus., *HE* 2, 23, 16). Furthermore, some Christians, in their eagerness to make known the depth of their faith and reach their heavenly reward, demonstrated at times an excessive desire for death. This did not only occur among the *Montanists (Tertull., *De fuga* 9, 4; *De anima* 55, 5), but among the church's members too (Tertull., *Ad Scap.* 5; *Apol.* 50, 1).

b. Admiration. By contrast, the assuredness of the martyrs could also arouse the interest and admiration of pagans, as *Tertullian observes: "When faced with the demonstration given by the martyrs, who is not caused to wonder what lies underneath? And once he has discovered, who does not become an adherent, and once an adherent, who does not long to suffer?" (*Apol.* 50, 15: perhaps Tertullian here offers us the reasons for his own conversion). Justin claims to have been converted by observing the courage of the martyrs: "Seeing them fearless before death . . . , I thought it impossible that they lived in vice and in the love of pleasures" (2 *Apol.* 12). The testimonies of those who witnessed martyrdoms are numerous: the man who brought James son of Zebedee to trial (Eus., *HE* 2, 9, 2-3); the soldier Basilides, present at the martyrdom of *Potamiana (*HE* 6, 5, 3); the soldier Pudens with regard to the martyrdom of *Perpetua and her companions (*Passio Perp. et Fel.* 16; 21). *Hippolytus writes: "At the sight of these prodigious events, everyone is filled with amazement . . . and a great number of those drawn to the faith by the martyrs become martyrs of God themselves" (*Com. in Dan.* 2, 38).

So, it is indeed true that Christian martyrdom in the first centuries had a missionary effect, as Tertullian famously expressed it: *plures efficimur quotiens metimur a vobis: semen est sanguis christianorum* (*Apol.* 50, 13; *Ad Diog.* 7, 7-9).

H. v. Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, Göttingen 1936 ([2]1964); M. Simonetti, *Studi agiografici*, Rome 1955; M. Lods, *Confesseurs et martyrs. Successeurs des prophètes dans l'Église des trois premiers siècles*, Neuchâtel-Paris 1958; T. Klauser, *Christlicher Märtyrerkult, heidnischer Heroenkult und spätjüdische Heiligenverehrung. Neue Einsichten und neue Probleme*, Cologne-Opladen 1960; N. Brox, *Zeuge und Märtyrer. Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie*, Munich 1961; M. Pellegrino, *Le sens ecclésial du martyre*: RSR 35 (1961) 151-175; P.Y. Emery, *L'unité des croyants au ciel et sur la terre*, Taizé 1962; S. Pezzella, *Gli Atti dei martiri. Introduzione a una storia dell'antica agiografia*, Rome 1965; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973; W. Rordorf - A. Solignac, *Martyre*: DSp 10, 717-735; T. Baumeister, *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums*, Münster 1980; Id., *Genèse et évolution de la théologie du martyre dans l'Église ancienne* (Traditio Christiana 8), Berne 1991 (It. tr. Turin 1995); D. Boyarin, *Dying for God*, Stanford, CA 1999; S.T. Pinkaers, *La spiritualité du martyre*, Versailles 2000; A. Di Berardino, *Il modello del martire volontario, in Euplo e Lucia*, 304–2004, ed. T. Sardella - G. Zito, Catania 2006, 63-105.

W. Rordorf

II. Cult of martyrs, saints and relics. Originally, there was no difference between the rites used in the cult of the dead and that of the martyrs, as the latter is derived from the former; nor is there any between those of martyrs and saints who are not martyrs, because, very early on, the latter were associated with the former by a common veneration. Furthermore, there was no difference originally between the cult of the saints (martyrs and nonmartyrs) and the cult of their relics, which were considered to be the sign of their presence and the instrument of their action, spiritually speaking, among the living. This is because all these religious practices grew out of each other, like the branches of a tree from a single root.

1. The single root. From the cult of the dead any traditional practices not incompatible with the Christian faith were transferred to the cult of the martyrs. The same thing happened with regard to specifically Christian customs in the cult of the dead, born of the desire to correct and complement pagan customs.

These general observations are confirmed by

particular cases. Funerals are mentioned only in exceptional circumstances (*Act. Cypr.* 5, 6). Reference to spices in the *Acta* of the martys (besides those used for embalming) became a hagiographical cliché, but nonetheless reflects a real custom (*Act. Eupl.* II, 3, 3). Mention of the place of burial frequently occurs in the *Passions* from Africa (*Act. Cypr.* 5, 6; *Act. Maximil.* 3, 4; *Act. Fel. Thibiuc.* 6, 2), and the practice is confirmed in the **Depositio episcoporum* and the *Depositio martyrum* in *Rome. The same goes for the date of death, the recording of which was recommended by Cyprian (*Ep.* 12, 2; 39, 3). This practice is also confirmed by the *Depositiones* in Rome. All these data, taken together, give us the same impression: in the cult of the martyrs all the previous funerary customs that could be kept continued to be used.

The most striking example of this conservative tendency is to be seen in the custom of libations and funeral banquets, which the Christians of Rome practiced on behalf of their dead who were buried in the immediate vicinity of Peter (tomb γ), in honor of Peter and Paul (see the *triclia* inscriptions at S. Sebastiano). The same thing occurred in *Spain (Cypr., *Ep.* 67, 6), although in *Africa *Tertullian and *Cyprian prohibited their faithful from observing this custom. At St. Peter's Basilica in Rome it still existed at the end of the 4th c. (Aug., *Ep.* 29, 10).

2. The cult of martyrs. Just as Christian practices relating to the cult of the dead were derived from a common root, so were the practices relating to the cult of the martyrs. But from the 2nd c. they began to diverge. We learn this from hagiographical literature, which originated at this time. The religious practices described in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, the veneration expressed toward the martyrs of 177 in the joint letter from the churches of *Lyons and *Vienne, and the religious practices that presuppose the hagiographical documents from Africa show how, even in its origins, the cult of the martyrs took on both a communitarian (or even intercommunitarian) dimension, and a liturgical one. (These texts were read out.) In the 3rd c. Cyprian clearly attests to the Christian practice of celebrating the *Eucharist on behalf of the martyrs; he also affirms that the practice has ancient roots (*Ep.* 12, 2; 39, 3). It is linked, on the one hand, with the anniversary of the deceased, as may be gleaned from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* and from the letters of Cyprian and, on the other hand, with the tomb, in the vicinity of which the rite was celebrated. Again this is known from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, as well as from the Roman *Depositiones*, esp. the *Depositio martyrum*. Regarding the character of this Eucharist on behalf of the martyrs, it is necessary to underline, first of all, how it possesses the same character as every other Eucharist; i.e., right from the very dawn of Christianity, it has always been eschatological, inasmuch as it is at once the *anamnesis of Easter (death and resurrection of the Lord) and an expectation of his coming (1 Cor 11:26). This would have been particularly marked during the martyr liturgy. Furthermore, precisely because of this, the Eucharist celebrated on the anniversary of martyrdom sometimes retained a secondary meaning, that of intercession for the martyrs, which we see as an archaic survival in Cyprian (*Ep.* 12, 2; 39, 3) and in the Liturgy of St. *John Chrysostom (F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, 131, 1.12 ff).

The 4th c. represents a period of change with regard to the cult of the martyrs. First, any lingering elements that might have permitted the belief that the church was praying on their behalf were eliminated. *Augustine states that we must not pray for them, since the martyrs are already in the glory of God; rather, it is they who pray for us. The religious acts on behalf of the martyrs do not make them equal to God, but leave them in their human condition of dependence on the Lord, even if the holiness they achieved through martyrdom renders them worthy of our veneration, and they can be our advocates with God (Aug., *Serm.* 285; *De Civ. Dei* 8, 27). The second important change relating to the cult of the martyrs consists in the gradual suppression of funerary banquets on their behalf. By the time Augustine arrived in *Milan with his mother (*Confess.* 6, 2), *Ambrose had forbidden them. Augustine himself, after his return to Africa, launched his own campaign against them (see Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques*, 133-147). Third, it is to be noted that a special liturgy for the martyrs was developed, characterized by large gatherings of people, in which the banquets were replaced by prayer vigils, with a selection of readings taken from the Bible and of a hagiographical nature, accompanied by special chants, circumstantial discourses or *panegyrics popular in the East, while in the West the *Passions* were commented upon. In the 4th c. great basilicas were constructed in honor of the martyrs (Rome, *Jerusalem), sometimes with one or more annexes to welcome pilgrims who had traveled long distances (Kalaat Seman, Tebessa [Thebaste] etc.).

3. The cult of nonmartyr saints. Up to the end of the 4th c. only the martyrs were objects of honor and cult, but once the persecutions were over, the equivalent of the martyrs was created. The first apparently derived from the liturgical use of readings from diptychs during the Eucharist. At Rome in 336

readings of this kind were the *Depositio episcoporum* and the *Depositio martyrum*. What was inserted during the Mass is known from the letters of *Innocent I to *Decentius of Gubbio, of *Boniface I to *Honorius, and of *Leo the Great to *Anatolius (DACL 4, 1051, 1063). In the *Cal. Carth.*, from the beginning of the 6th c., the two series are together, and this corresponds to a final stage in the evolution, when a distinction no longer exists between martyrs and bishops from the point of view of cult. This stage is arrived at, in Rome and Milan, at about the same time as the *Communicantes* in the canon of the Mass presents a unified series of both martyrs and nonmartyr saints (DACL 4, 1066). It is precisely because of this same reasoning that *Basil the Great and *Martin of Tours were ranked with martyrs, without having shed their blood. There is another reason, though: as well as being bishops, they led a life of asceticism and virginity, and the development of ideas in the 4th c. tended more and more toward regarding this kind of life as equivalent to martyrdom. *Anthony (*Vita Antonii* 91), *Hilarion (Soz., *HE* 3, 14) among the ascetics who became popular thanks to the *Vitae Patrum*, and, among women, *Radegund, Batilde, Gertrude of Nivelles and Austreberta of Pavilly showed how asceticism and virginity went hand in hand and were reasons for being venerated first by the faithful and then by the church. *Gregory of Tours in his minor hagiographical *opuscula* and *Gregory the Great in his *Dialogues* can also give us a picture of their country and period toward the end of the 6th c.

4. The cult of relics and images. In origin the cult of relics formed a single whole with the cult of the mortal remains of the saints. The body was interred whole in the tomb, where it received the honors established by tradition. It was not possible to divide the body up, nor to remove any part of it, nor transfer it; *a fortiori* no sale of relics could have been carried out. These practices were prohibited by the *Codex Theodosianus*, based on the ancient legislative norms contained in the twelve tables. Indeed, bones that had been dispersed were to be reunited, as far as possible, and kept together with the rest of the body. Even if this typically Roman legislation and practice was not found throughout the empire, they served to justify the refusal on the part of those in the West to divide up the bodies of the saints, and to justify substitution for them representational relics that had touched or been close to the bodies (*brandea*). By contrast, in the East, they were more tolerant in this regard. Translation of relics and dividing them up became commonplace, beginning with those of St. *Babylas of Antioch (351–354), and thereafter these customs passed on to *Constantinople (where they became a typical feature) and to the rest of the East. In the 2nd half of the 4th c. some relics arrived in N Italy from the East, and this could perhaps explain the spread (almost the fashion) of the practice of translating relics. St. Ambrose became a promoter of the practice in that region. Undoubtedly, the finding of the relics of St. Stephen (415) caused in the West the most profound and most long-lasting change by reason of their diffusion everywhere. We have an excellent example of it in St. Augustine, whose initial indifference to the cult of relics was transformed in the last years of his life into active and informative promotion. The final stage in the development of the practice in the West comes with Gregory of Tours, and in the East with *John of Damascus. The hagiographical works of Gregory were entirely orientated toward the cult of relics, and they form a catalog of the miracles worked by them. His *Historia Francorum* also presents numerous hagiographical anecdotes. John of Damascus (*De fide orthodoxa* 4, 15) sums up the Greek theology supporting the cult of relics, and his works form a prelude to that of Thomas Aquinas, as far as this question is concerned: since it is the temple of God on earth, the body of a saint receives the "honor of veneration" (προσκύνησις τιμητική), which should be given to all those who demonstrated such a dignity; since this dignity is a reflection of divine glory, the honor it receives redounds ultimately to God himself. What John of Damascus says concerning relics, he also says of images. However, the latter element is typical of the East, where the difficult iconoclastic period was soon to begin. In the West, it is not until the Middle Ages that the cult of images develops along similar lines.

RAC 14, 111-136; Storia del Cristianesimo 3, 968-1009; E. Lucius, *Les origines du culte des saints dans l'église chrétienne*, Paris 1908; F. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*, Giessen 1909; Delehaye OC 50-140; Id., *Sanctus*, Brussels 1927; A. Grabar, *Martyrium*, Paris 1943; V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, Vatican City ²1963; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* 2, Milan ³1969, 396-470; A. Amore, *Culto e canonizzazione dei santi nell'antichità cristiana*: Antonianum 52 (1974) 38-80; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980; O. Pasquato, *Religiosità popolare e culto ai martiri, in particolare a Costantinopoli nei secc. IV-V, tra paganesimo, eresia e ortodossia*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 207-242; J. Camarero Cuñado, *La figura del santo en la liturgia hispanica*, Salamanca-Madrid 1982; P. Brown, *Il culto dei santi*, Turin 1983; Ph. Harnoncourt - H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit 2,1*, Regensburg 1994, 87-134; M. Lamberigts - P. van Deun (eds.), *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Louvain 1995; G.W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome*, Cambridge 1998; A. Dihle, *Theodorets Verteidigung des Kults der Märtyrer*, in E. Dassmann (ed.), *Chartulae*, Münster 1998, 104-108; W. Jacobsen, *Altarraum und Heiligengrab als liturgisches*

Konzept, in N. Bock et al. (eds.), *Kunst und Liturgie im Mittelalter*, Munich 2000, 65-74; A. Legner, *Reliquien in Kunst und Kult*, Darmstadt 1995; A. Angenendt, *Heilige und Reliquien*, Munich [2]1997; V. Saxer, *Il culto dei santi nelle diocesi suburbicarie di Roma in età paleocristiana*, in S. Boesch Gajano - E. Petrucci (ed.), *Santi e culti del Lazio*, Rome 2000, 13-59; E. Ofenbach, *Sulle orme dei santi a Roma. Guida alle icone, reliquie e case dei santi*, Vatican City 2003; S. Heid, *Märtyrer oder Mörder? Friedensliebe und Kampf christlicher Glaubensstreiter*: Carbones 2 (2003) 47-64.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

III. Acts, passions, legends. The literature relating to the martyrs received different names: *Acts* are documents that record the decisions of the judicial authorities regarding the death sentence given to the martyrs; *Passions* and *Martyria* are of a somewhat narrative character and deal with the martyrs' last days and death; *Legends* are accounts that contain more fanciful elements than historical truth. Even if these definitions are, at least in part, conventional, still the concept of *literary genre* is applied even to hagiographical literature. The concept is normally used in nonreligious literature, and has been common in hagiography only since the 20th c., and in biblical criticism only since the end of the 20th c.

1. Brief history of textual criticism regarding the martyrs. The Bollandist H. Delahaye used the retirement forced upon him by World War I to expound the theory of this hagiographical criterion and apply it to martyr literature. In it he distinguished historical passions from *panegyrics, and the latter from epic passions. All possible contaminations were highlighted in these principal genres. About thirty years later, Canon R. Aigrain, in a manual that has already become a classic, gave a didactic exposition of these ideas. G. Lazzati, a little later, developed them further: limiting himself to writings from the first four centuries, he determined the limits and the historical and liturgical conditions for establishing their authenticity, and he peeled away what had been overlaid toward the end of the period owing to different attitudes. Finally, the work of G. Lanata regarded the *Acts* as procedural documentation in virtue of which Christians had been condemned to martyrdom. One had thus arrived, after a gradual limiting of the material, at a fine-tuning of criticism of the documents concerning the martyrs, and at a separation of all the liturgical, redactional and novelistic passages present in the literary form from the authentic factual kernel. From the analysis of these criteria it became clear the panegyrics did not belong to the same literary genre as acts, passions and legends. The characteristic these three documents have in common is the fact that they contain narrative texts which describe, more or less faithfully, what happened to the martyrs from the time they appeared before the tribunal until the execution of the sentence passed on them. And it is in virtue of this criterion that the texts must be included in this literature.

2. Passion narratives. The oldest text in this genre is the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (BHG 1556). It is generally agreed that the martyrdom occurred in 167, which makes it possible to date the letter that records it to 170. The Christians of *Smyrna encourage the confreres of Philomelia, who had asked for information on the death of their bishop *Polycarp, presenting him as a martyr acc. to the gospel. This is the leading idea inspiring the composition of the letter, which was furthermore considered a circular letter that the inhabitants of Philomelia were asked to make known to all the Catholic communities. From the very start, the account of the martyrdom is structured like a demonstration and presented as a circular letter.

The same occurred with the letter of *Lyons. Indeed, the churches of *Lyons and *Vienne each inform their sister churches in *Asia and *Phrygia of the events of 177, in which a very large group of Christians from both cities fell victim (BHG 1573). The text is edited acc. to the epistolary style of the first Christians, and aims to show that martyrdom is equivalent to combat, that the martyrs are the combatants of God, that the devil is the enemy and that the persecutors are his troops. When the enemy believes he has annihilated them, at that moment they are victorious because they have imitated Christ's own humiliation and exaltation, and that with him they have become faithful and truthful witnesses. In these ideas we are able to recognize the basic theme of the Christian understanding of martyrdom, already sketched out in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and which receive a biblical setting of exceptional richness in the letter of Lyons. This does not remove the fact that modern criticism is generally in agreement with *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 5, 1, 2) when it recognizes in this document a fidelity to history that matches its desire to be spiritually edifying. The letter also constitutes a source of primary value for the history of the origins of Christianity in Lyons.

These literary models gave impulse to the proper series of martyrdoms and passions found in both the Greek East and in the Latin West. The term *Martyrion* stands at the head of the accounts dealing with *Justin and his companions in ca. 163–167 (BHG 973); with *Apollonius in ca. 183–185 (BHG 149); with Carpus, Papylus and *Agathonice in 250 (BHG 294); with *Agape, Chionia and Irene in 304 (BHG 34); and with *Euplus in 304 (BHG 629-630).

These texts are principally indebted to earlier hagiographical traditions, in their respect for historical accuracy and in their concern for an apologetical presentation, but all together they usher in a new literary form. The epistle was abandoned in favor of an account, pure and simple; in addition, the balance between history and apologetics was about to tilt in the direction of the latter. In other words, these texts often preserve elements, more or less important, of the judicial acts, but the rhetorical elements with which they are mingled become ever more prominent. The importance of and concern for the testimony, as given and reported for its own sake, began to disappear, giving way to a fresh presentation of the Christian faith. Christian apologetics became militant in its defense of Christian identity, and began to attack the other religions of the day, i.e., paganism and Judaism. This new attitude, proper to apologists from *Athenagoras to *Tertullian, was introduced in the martyrdoms written in Greek, in which it became almost universal. In the meantime, the passions written in Latin, which were mainly from Africa, had a different purpose and followed a separate line of development. These involve the passions of Perpetua (BHL 6633), of *Marianus and Jacobus (BHL 131), of *Montanus and Lucius (BHL 6009), of the martyrs of *Abitina (BHL 7492), of the *Donatist martyrs (BHL 2303b, 4473, 5271). This choice of texts allows us to discern two periods in ancient African hagiography.

The first includes the passion of Perpetua, that of Marianus and James, and that of Montanus and Lucius, belonging in large part to the 3rd c., in which visions have a very important role. The *Passio Perpetuae* is the first of the group in the earlier period. The passions coming from that period all share another characteristic: accounts of visions are autobiographical, written by the martyrs themselves and incorporated into the whole by the final redactor. Finally, the *Passio Perpetuae* reveals an apologetical intention on the part of the redactor to show that the martyrs' visions are equivalent to a prophetic charism, and that their autobiography constitutes a text inspired in the same way as the canonical Scriptures, and destined like them to be read in the liturgy. The same intention underlies all the literature on visions.

The second period consists of the Donatist hagiography. It includes passions of martyrs who died prior to the *schism, but who, after some embellishment and addition, were adopted by the sect (e.g., the *Passio Saturnini*, BHL 7492). Then there are the passions of the Donatists proper, who are presented in different ways (accounts, sermons, letters), all of which were intended to show that the Donatist church was the church of the martyrs, and so the only true one, whereas the Catholic Church was the false one and the church of traitors (**traditores*). It can be seen that not only did the passions of the martyrs become tools for polemic and propaganda, but they also served to establish the criteria of orthodoxy. Ideology became more important than history.

3. Judicial acts. During the same era there appeared and developed the literary genre of the judicial acts, which consist of the dialogues, of variable length, between the martyr and the judge. The redaction of these records conforms to the customs of the chanceries of Roman courts. Such customs are known about because of a number of verbal records used in Antiquity: the case of *Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus., *HE* 6, 40; 7, 11, 1-19), *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (CSEL 26, 185-197), *Acta purgationis Felicis ep. Aptung.* (CSEL 26, 197-204), *Gesta collationis Carthaginensis* (SC 194, 195, 224); or recent papyrus findings (U. Wilcken - L. Mitteis, *Grundzüge und Chrestomatie der Papyruskunde*, Leipzig-Berlin 1912). Resorting to the public archives in which the documents were kept was possible, and is a well-attested practice (Aug., *Serm. Denis* 19, 18). Did one resort to the archives in order to obtain information on the acts of the martyrs? To answer this question affirmatively the acts of Taracus, Probus and Andronicus are usually adduced (BHL 7981), the redactor of which affirms that he obtained, for a sum of gold, a copy of the public acts of the proceedings relating to them. H. Delahaye was inclined not to give much credence to this example, while R. Aigrain felt it was possible to resort to it. For his part, G. Lanata admitted it in principle, but thought that the particular case in BHL 7981 had been invented. In any case, even supposing there was no deceit on the part of the redactor, these acts constitute a unique example from which one cannot generalize, and therefore other explanations are preferred. In the case of brief, single hearings whose existence is only known about because of the public nature of the case, it is to be imagined that what was put into writing were the remembrances of one or more of the witnesses who had heard the proceedings with their own ears. In the case of multiple or prolonged hearings, there was nothing to stop the same witnesses from taking down the questions and answers and using them in their own versions of events with more freedom than an official chancellor, except perhaps the fear of betraying themselves as Christians.

Since the custom of transmitting the acts had become a general practice, what might we conclude regarding the cases? Being Christian was a crime punishable by death; only provincial governors (in

Rome, the prefect of the city or the prefect of the Praetorium) had *jus gladii* and were able to pass a capital sentence. So, Christians who lived in a city that was home to a governor were handed over to his court, and this might shorten the interval between the investigation of the case and sentencing. Thus we see some cases concluded in a single session (*Acta Scillitanorum*, BHL 7527), though usually there was more than one session: the acts of *Phileas indicate there were certainly five sessions in his case (AB 81, 12). Perennius had granted three days' reflection to *Apollonius (BHG 149); Saturninus proposed thirty for the *Scillitani martyrs. If after this period the accused persisted in calling himself or herself a Christian, the magistrate, aided by counsel, passed sentence and the chancellor transcribed the act of condemnation onto a tablet, which the magistrate read to the condemned in front of everyone (*ex tabellis recitare*). The sentence was carried out immediately. In the case of Christians living outside provincial capitals, they appeared first before the municipal body whose duty it was to investigate the case (*cognitio pro tribunali*) in order to verify the defendant's identity and affiliation (where appropriate, within the hierarchy) with Christianity. A verbal record (*Acta*) was drawn up, made into a dossier (*elogium*), which was sent to the governor together with the defendant (which was the most common occurrence), or one had to await the governor's arrival in that place, if he was in the process of performing an inspection (*Acts of Pionius*, BHG 1545). The *Acta* were read in the presence of the governor, and the defendant was able to confirm or retract his previous statements. He was then condemned or released depending on the case.

The circumstances of the case could vary: the governor could preside *in secretario*, i.e., privately, in his office, or *pro tribunali*, in open court. The municipal authorities investigated the case in a public place; for *Pionius, in the forum at *Smyrna. The investigation could include the *quaestio*, i.e., torture (*quaestio per tormenta*), and the course of the inquiry itself was left to the governor's initiative, who also enjoyed the power of postponing a condemnation, or of not facilitating an inquiry (Tertull., *Ad Scap.* 4, 3-5). Often the governor behaved with courtesy toward the defendants, as in the case of Perennius with Apollonius, of Paternus with Cyprian, and of Culcianus with Phileas. Saturninus also in no way wished to condemn the Scillitani, and believed an out-of-court settlement possible. But the difference lay in this: in the face of pagan syncretism, Christian monotheism was intransigent; hence the reply of the Scillitani and of Cyprian: for such a just cause, there is no need for deliberation!

Judicial acts, from the point of view of their most authentic nature, vividly show us the abyss that separated two worlds, between which opposition and incomprehension had a reciprocal permanence, despite strict and diverse relations; although usually dormant, opposition and incomprehension erupt in periods of crisis.

Judicial acts had the same purpose as the *Passio Perpetuae*, which was produced, as its compiler explicitly admits, to be read during the liturgy. The opening is well known: dating in accordance with the division of the Roman month the consular year, indication of the place, questioning to confirm the defendant's identity. These formulas were often preceded by a title or preamble, in Christian texts, in which the appellation "martyr" or "blessed martyr" was applied to the saint, a title unknown in the public chanceries; or, in the acts of Justin, by a reference to the circumstances of the martyrdom, during the time of the "impious and idolatrous persecutions" (an expression that is equivalent to a kind of Christian signature on the document, but which in no way affected the essence of it). In the course of the acts other features may be noticed: the hero is always described as "martyr"; the minutiae of the verbal proceedings may be abbreviated; the Christian character of the martyr's replies is carefully underlined; the relation of the audience is completed by an account of the execution. Finally, the end of the text, given the doxology it contains, has a distinctly liturgical style. All these touches do not change the substance of the original document, but merely give it a Christian context.

Based on the type of minor edit, we are able to distinguish two series of judicial acts. On the one hand, the acts of the Scillitani martyrs (BHL 7527); of Cyprian (BHL 2037); of *Maximilian (BHL 5813); of *Marcellus (5253-5255), of *Fructuosus, Augurius and Eulogius (BHL3196); and on the other hand, the acts of Justin (BHG 973); of Apollonius (BHG 149); of Carpus, Papilus and Agathonice (BHG 294); of Agape, Chionia and Irene (BHG 34); and of Euplus (BHG 629-630). While acts in Latin (except those of Fructuosus, preserved in a 4th-c. edition) follow with great fidelity the general development of judicial acts, those in Greek witnessed an evolution very early on. Only those of Justin (preamble aside, which dates from the 4th c.), and already to a lesser extent those of Apollonius, consist for the most part of court documents, which do still exist in other acts, but in a context in which the editor intervenes more and more, until by the time of the *Martyrdom of Pionius* (at the end of the 4th c. or beginning of the 5th) only

two chapters out of twenty make reference to the verbal proceedings. This evolution prepared the ground for the imaginative renderings of the *Passiones*.

4. *Epic and fictional legends*. These represent a genre of document in which the historical part was reduced in favor of purely fantastic elements. They approached epic literature or historical novels, and could merge with the common genre of folklore.

This tendency to transform hagiographical texts into fiction is evident in documents that are indisputably historical in essence. In the passion that deals with Apollonius, the Roman martyr of 183–185, his name has been changed to Apollo, the contemporary of St. Paul (Acts 18:24; 19:1; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:4; Tit 3:13), Perennes the prefect of Rome becomes Perennius, proconsul of Asia, though that splendid province was in fact unknown to him; in the *Armenian version (BHO 79), Apollonius keeps his name but the proconsul of Asia loses his, becoming Terence, together with his office, becoming prefect or chiliarch. In the *Martyrdom of Pionius* (BHG 1546), there are not only chance examples resulting from textual transmission, but also alterations that affect the substance of the document. The author of the text claims to base himself upon writings of the martyr (σύγγραμμα) and upon notes from the court (υπομνήματα), and in fact some fragments do remain, but the author's input is as blatant as in the visions of Catherine Emmerich, edited by C. Brentano. Yet more problematic is the case of the *Martyrdom of Dasius* (BHG 491): if we take the account of the Saturnalia, which serves to frame the martyrdom and gives it much local color, the martyrdom is reduced to a few commonplaces with no historical consistency.

The story of *Dasius introduces us to the properly epic passions, a genre whose characteristics have been fully discussed by H. Delahaye. These as a rule comprise conventional characters (emperors, magistrates, murderers, eyewitnesses, gravediggers) and scenes (interrogations, torture, miracles, resurrections), elements of which the Egyptian passions indulge in for the sake of apologetics, with the intervention of *Julius of Aqfahs, who appears as a judge's secretary, burier of martyrs and redactor of their passions, before becoming himself the hero of his own passion. These passions are comparable to epic, as they are guided by the same need to exalt the hero by the multiplication of his accomplishments and the difficulty of them.

Together with epic passions, from the 3rd c. on fictional passions developed. The hagiographical romance was able to take on all the forms of the secular romance. The most famous Christian adventure story is without doubt the Clementine drama known as the *Recognitiones*. Pope *Clement, who was without a shadow of doubt a genuine historical figure and the author of the Christian literature from the last years of the 1st c., is transformed by St. Peter's preaching and by his own into a hero looking for his scattered family. To this genre also belong the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (BHG 1710). The author of this romance was dismissed as a liar, despite his protestations to have written it for love of the apostle. However, the very height of improbability is reached with the adventures of the general Placidas, who died with the name Eustace or Eustachius (BHL 2760-61), unknown in the prosopography of the Roman army. As much could be said of numerous saints who were transformed into soldiers.

Similar to the adventure story is the idyllic romance: in place of the sexually explicit dramas typical in Antiquity, Christians turned them into edifying stories. The *Passion of Marcian of Caesarea in Mauretania* (BHL 5256-5257) focuses exclusively on *virginity. The story of St. *Cecilia carries this theme further: the heroine promises on her wedding night to remain a virgin, and gets her husband to respect this promise (BHL 1495). The account is a tracing from the end of the 5th c. of a scene recounted by Victor of Vita (*Hist. pers. Afr.* I, 30-35), in which the protagonist is one Maxima from Africa. The account makes use of Roman martyrs and characters as its heroes, whose tombs were known and could be venerated by anyone, while the church in Trastevere, named St. Cecilia's, actually bears the name of its foundress and illustrates a historical process well known in Roman churches, i.e., the making of founders of churches into saints. As for the story of *Alexius (BHO 36-44; BHL 289), it develops a theme that has earned fame over the years, the theme of the young spouse who leaves his wife on his wedding night in order to pursue a life of poverty and begging for the love of Christ. Similar edifying themes abound in hagiographical literature, and from the martyrs these themes passed to saints who were not martyrs. One may cite, *inter alia*, the martyrdom that purifies the soul from sin; innocence persecuted till death; the forgiveness of offenses pushed so far as to despise oneself; the martyrdom of charity whereby an innocent person takes the place of the condemned; the actor who allows himself to be involved in conversion as a joke; the virgin disguised as a man in a male convent, whose identity is discovered only after her death.

This development brings with it a confusion in the literary genres, such that the boundary between hagiography, fictional writing, folklore and myth becomes blurred. This brings us to a point where genu-

ine saints have become wizards, and where myth has assumed the form of the lives of the saints. One of the most curious phenomena in this evolution is the creation of hagiographical cycles: a saint, who gives his name and a fictitious unity to the whole, is surrounded by a group of other saints who have been put together in the calendar (cycle of Polychronius for the saints from the end of July to the middle of August) or in topology (St. Sebastian's, *The *Four Crowned Martyrs*). This process is familiar to novelists like A. Dumas, Balzac or Bourget.

In conclusion, one can see that hagiographical literature covers a domain as wide and varied as secular literature: documents only just or barley sketched out, or roughly reworked; stories composed in order to instruct and edify coreligionists, or with an explicitly apologetic or polemic purpose; work of pure fantasy in which history serves as no more than a handle for the imagination's acrobatics. Upon this stage of variable consistency tread characters whose historical worth is itself varied: next to authentic and recognizable martyrs, charted acc. to well-known and verifiable coordinates, there are those whose features, disfigured by hagiography, have become unrecognizable under several coats of paint caused by constraints of literary form or by transformation into legendary figures; and there are also some invented deliberately, using characters from fables, romances, myths and other fictional literature.

The duty of hagiographical criticism is to apply the notion of literary form to this varied oeuvre, and to do so with sufficient discernment as to be able to distinguish in the end what is truly historical.

BHG; BHL; BHO; CPL 2049-2248; Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller* 49-90; S. Döpp - W. Geerlings (eds.), LACL 470-477; H. Delehaye, *Légendes hagiographiques*, Paris 1927; B. de Gaiffier, *La lecture des Actes des martyrs dans la prière liturgique en Occident*: AB 72 (1954) 134-166; Id., *La lecture des Passions des martyrs à Rome avant le IXe s.*: AB 87 (1969) 63-78; G. Lazzati, *Gli sviluppi della letteratura sui martiri nei primi quattro secoli*, Turin 1956; G. Wiessner, *Zur Märtyrerüberlieferung aus der Christenverfolgung Schapurs II*, Göttingen 1967; G. Lanata, *Gli Atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973; G. Caldarelli, *Atti dei martiri*, Milan ²1996; A.A.R. Bastiaensen et al., *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, Milan 1987; G.A. Bisbee, *Pre-Decian Acts of Martyrs and "Commentarii,"* Philadelphia 1988; Th. Baumeister, *La teologia del martirio nella Chiesa antica*, Turin 1995; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, Brussels ²2000, 132-155, 417-421.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

IV. Inscriptions relating to the martyrs.

1. Types of inscriptions. For the development of the cult of the martyrs, which affected the diversification of epigraph writing from the 4th c. onward, we shall refer to the treatise by H. Delehaye, which is largely based on inscriptions. The following distinctions can be made:

a. Epitaphs of the martyrs. These are funerary inscriptions characterized by the mention of the title *martyr*, either singly, or together with the word *passus*, with the date and sometimes with details about the circumstances of the martyrdom. Epitaphs of martyrs, though common in Rome, where their cult remained for a long time attached to cemeteries (and so to the catacombs), were more rarely seen in places where the practice of translating their bodies and dispersing their relics was first known. However, few of these texts are contemporary with their burial: there are many late copies or new versions that were made when the tombs were embellished (inscriptions from Pope Damasus's time).

b. Inscriptions that indicate the presence of relics. Whether the relics are real (from the 4th c. in the East) or just symbolic (generally in the West *brandea* of cloth or consecrated earth), one or more inscriptions can serve to signal their presence and to make clear the circumstances of the *depositio*. Epigraphs can be distinguished acc. to the type and placement of the reliquary. When the reliquaries are large and visible or accessible (e.g., the reliquaries *ad oleum* in the East), the one and only inscription was written on the lid or body of the coffin. More commonly, in places where the reliquary was set under the altar or in its base (Greece and the West), three types of text can be found: (1) text written on the coffin, an *authentica*, which gives the name or names of the martyrs approved by ecclesiastical authority. Such an inscriptions may also be found away from the coffin or container; (2) the verbal account of the *depositio* with the name of the relics (more often *memoriae* than *reliquiae*), the designation of the saints, the word *positius* or *depositus*, the name of the bishop who performed the consecration (introduced by *ab* then by the expression *per manus*), the date, with just the day of the month (for the purposes of commemorations), or the precise year, sometimes also the name of the person who commissioned the tomb or of its donor; (3) when the authentication or verbal account of the *depositio* are not visible, the name of the martyr was simply displayed on the exterior with, in most cases, the date that serves for the commemoration. (See also the lists of the martyrs below.)

c. Dedications. The name of the venerated martyr often appears as part of a dedication or a votive formula—generally together with the name of the one making the dedication, and there is sometimes a prayer or the reason for the *ex voto*, and at the end the date—above the area dedicated to the martyrs. It

can be part of the same structure, but in that case the text may be written on the façade, on the architrave of the door, on a mosaic on the ground, etc.; besides words designating an important building (*basilica*, *ecclesia*), neutral terms are also found (*domus N. martyris*) or poetic terms (*sedes*), and often *memoria*, which is ambiguous in meaning, being both abstract (remembrance) and concrete (the commemorative object or monument itself) at the same time. The dedication may be fixed to something inside (altar, civory, enclosure, table, see below) or to some furnishing (esp. a lamp, corona, or metal votive cross).

d. Mensae martyrum. A category peculiar to Africa, but only sporadically documented elsewhere (e.g., at *Axiopolis in Scythia Minor), is that of the *mensae martyrum*, inscriptions on a molded rectangular or semicircular slab laid flat, with the name of the martyrs above introduced by the words *mensa*, *memoria*, *nomina*, or sometimes by a votive formula. The form is derived from a tradition of funerary *mensae* in many parts of Africa. But the *mensae martyrum*, all of which are of uncertain provenance, do not have a funerary character. They are not altars, as was long believed, and they do not indicate the presence of relics. Their purpose in a church has not been ascertained: are they merely *ex votos* or tables for offerings?

e. The inhumations ad sanctos *and the invocations of martyrs in epitaphs.* Very early on the custom developed of placing the deceased's tomb under the protection of a *patron*, who could intercede for him or her on heaven, either through proximity to the tomb or through a formula of invocation. For this there is the mention of the presence of the saint (*ad sanctum N.*) or else indication of the building dedicated to the martyr (*in basilica sancti N.*) in the epitaph; sometimes one comes across a simple invocation (*sancti N.N. orate pro nobis*).

f. Other categories. Apart from these categories, relatively clearly defined by evidence, geography and formulation, there are other references to the martyrs found in texts of different kinds: *elogia* written in verse (which can be confused with epitaphs or dedications, like the Damasus inscriptions in Rome), invocations or simple lists. Two terms have given rise to numerous discussions: *memoria* (see above) and *nomina*, which were once considered equivalent to relics. When the latter term precedes a list of names with or without a date, it must serve only to encourage or permit the commemoration of the martyrs (like the lists found on top of movable bases, e.g., diptychs attested by texts).

2. Geographical division. Inscriptions relating to the martyrs have been found in every country, and the principal manuals on Christian *epigraphy propose a classification of them. Up to 1920 the Latin texts were conveniently contained within a collection by E. Diehl. Two centers are favored for the number of inscriptions and their historic value: Rome, esp. with the famous "Damasus" series of inscriptions in verse collected by Pope Damasus (366–384) and engraved by Philocalus; and North Africa, where more than 300 varied texts are known, which reflect the particular development of the cult of the martyrs in that province. These texts, annotated until 1907 by P. Monceaux, are now in a new and more specialized edition (Y. Duval).

Studies: *1. On the cult of the martyrs*: H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels 1933; Id., *Sanctus*, Brussels 1927; H. Leclercq, DACL, s.v. *Martyrs*, 10, 2359ff., esp. 2494-2512; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980 (with a bibl. on the cult of the martyrs). *2. On inscriptions relating to the martyrs*: O. Marucchi, *Epigrafia Cristiana*, Milan 1910, esp. 152ff., 336ff.; C.M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik*, Munich 1917, 203ff., 338ff.; F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato di Epigrafia Cristiana*, Rome 1920, esp. 364ff.; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, IV (Epigrafia Cristiana), Rome 1978, 301ff.; P. Testini, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, esp. 480ff.; E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, I, Berlin 1925, esp. Part II, chs. XI-XII, and vol. IV, *Supplementum*, ed. J. Moreau - H.I. Marrou, 1967 (cf. A. Ferrua, *Nuove osservazioni alla Silloge del Diehl*, Vatican City 1981); A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Rome 1942; *The "Christians" for "Christians." Inscriptions of Phrygia*, Greek texts, tr. and comm. by E. Gibson, Missoula, MT 1978; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, Rome 1982; Ch. Pietri, *Grabinschrift*: RAC 12, Stuttgart 1983, cols. 514-590; *Inscriptiones Christianae Italiae*, vols. I-X, Bari 1985-1995 (= ICI); D. Mazzoleni, *Epigrafi del mondo cristiano antico*, Rome 2002.

N. Duval

V. Iconography

In the oldest Christian art, proverbially joyful and positive, there is an avoidance of sad and violent scenes pertaining, e.g., to the *passio Christi*, with the exception perhaps of the so-called *Coronatio* scene at the catacombs of Pretestato (Wp 18) and those which symbolically reproduce the holy sepulcher on the so-called passion *sarcophagi (Saggiorato, *I sarcofagi*, passim). For the same reason, early scenes showing the martyrdom itself or *pro tribunali* are rare when compared with those which depict their apotheosis, coronation or entry into heaven. *Prudentius informs us of some pictorial decorations that include scenes of martyr hagiography and, in particular, the martyrdom of St. John the Baptist (*Dittochaeon* XXXIV, vv. 133-136), of St. Stephen the Protomartyr (*Dittochaeon* XLIV, vv. 177-180), the crucifixion of Christ (ibid. XLII, vv. 165-168) and the massacre of the Holy Innocents (*Dittochaeon* XXIX, vv. 113-116). Again Prudentius describes the scenes

that decorate the outside of a *martyrion*-like building at Imola showing the passion of St. Cassian (*Perist.* IX, vv. 8-20) and a cycle that figuratively describes the tomb of *Hippolytus in the Roman catacomb of the same name (*Perist.* XI, vv. 123-151). Of interest from the Eastern Fathers are the testimony of *Gregory of Nyssa, which records the representation of the martyrdom of St. *Theodore, and that of *Asterius of Amasea, which gives us a precious and vivid description of a representation of St. *Euphemia's execution. Among the depictions that survive today, that which adorned a part of the intrados of an arcosolium of the Cimitero Maggiore on the Via Nomentana in Rome was considered significant (Wp 224, 2). It can be dated to the 2nd half of the 4th c. Once interpreted as the miraculous conversion of Papias and Maurus while they were leading *Sisinnius to martyrdom (evidenced by the presence of Christ with a **virga*), the scene is today understood to be the representation of a double Petrine theme (Bisconti, *Dentro e intorno*). On a stray fragment of painted plaster, now housed at the Roman cemetery of St. Thecla (Nestori, 144-145, n. 5) and datable to around the middle of the 4th c., one can see a female figure in the *orans* position and a male figure that is grabbing the woman and trying to drag her away. All this suggests the violent action of martyrdom, or as the only possible alternative, an illustration of the episode of Susanna harassed by one of the elders (Santagata, *Su due discusse figurzaioni*, 7ff.).

In the top pane of the right-hand wall of the confessional of Ss. Giovanni e Paolo on the Caelian Hill is painted a scene of *decollatio*, performed by two executioners—in typical military tunics—on three figures kneeling down, blindfolded, with their arms tied behind their backs (Prandi-Ferrari, *The Basilica*, 128). It seems opportune to recognize in the three figures, of which one certainly shows female characteristics, the hagiographical group *Crispinus, Crispinianus and Benedicta. (The last was associated with the two greater martyrs by a late *passio* legend.)

At the beginning of the 5th c., mosaic images appear depicting the martyrdom of St. *Thecla in the mausoleum of El-Bagawat in Egypt; there is also a symbolic one of the martyrdom of St. Laurence in the mausoleum of Galla Placidia in *Ravenna (WMM III, 49), the plan of which is substantially repeated in the *Successa* medal in the Vatican Museum.

In the Roman cemetery of Calipodius on the *Aurelia vetus*, a pictorial document is preserved, albeit in a very fragmentary condition, which can be dated to the 7th–8th c., and which captures certain moments relating to Pope *Callistus's execution, who is buried there (Nestori, 1993, 153, n.2). It does so in a manner typical of the narrative cycles that embellish basilicas and martyria of that period. Throughout the 4th c. and part of the 5th, a theme developed relating to the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul. We refer to the *decollatio Pauli*, which appears about the middle of the 4th c. particularly on the so-called passion sarcophagi (Rep. 26, 57, 61, 189, 201, 212 a, 215, 377, 667, 680). The scene sculpted on the slab of *Elia Afanacia* preserved in the cemetery of Pretestato seems to be a scene depicting religious initiation rather than a Christian martyr event (AC III, 212 = Rep. 558).

But the most interesting document of sculpture left to us is without doubt the design created on a marble pedestal of the ciborium in the basilica Pope *Siricius had built over the tomb of the martyrs *Nereus and Achilleus in the Roman cemetery of *Domitilla (Fasola, *La basilicaI, 46, fig.10*); here one can make out Achilleus (further indicated by a caption in Vulgar Latin: *ACILLEVS*) at the moment when, already degraded and disheveled, he receives the mortal blow from his murderer. In conclusion, we recall an interesting clay element in the depiction of the martyrdom of St. *Eulalia of Mérida in Hispania, probably a product of *Visigothic art (Recio Veganzones, *Probable representación*, 77ff.), and a painting in the cemetery of St. *Januarius in Naples (Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro*, 68) merely hypothetically interpreted as the martyrdom of St. Stephen.

AC 3, 212; U.M. Fasola, *Osservazioni su una pittura del cimitero Maggiore*, in *Miscell. G. Belvederi*, Vatican City 1954–1955, 287-302; Id., *La basilica dei SS. Nereo ed Achilleo e la catacomba di Domitilla*, Rome (n.d.), 46; A. Prandi - G. Ferrari, *The Basilica of Saints John and Paul on the Caelian Hill*, Rome 1958; A. Saggiorato, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani con scene di passione*, Bologna 1968; A. Nestori, *La catacomba di Calepodio al III miglio dell'Aurelia vetus e i sepolcri dei papi Callisto e Giulio I*: RivAC 47 (1971) 199-212; U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; P. Testini, *Di alcune testimonianze relative ad Ippolito*, in *Ricerche su Ippolito*, Rome 1977, 55-60; J.W. Salomonson, *Voluptatem spectandi non perdat sed mutet*, Amsterdam-Oxford-New York 1979; A. Recio Veganzones, *Probable representación martirial de Santa Eulalia de Mérida en la plástica visigoda*, in *Misc. A.P. Frutaz*, Rome 1980, 77-96; G. Santagata, *Su due discusse figurazioni conservate nel cimitero di S. Tecla*: Esercizi 3 (1980) 7-14; F. Bisconti, *Scene di martirio nell'arte paleocristiana romana*: Mondo Archeologico 47 (1980) 37-40; F. Bisconti, *Dentro e intorno all'iconografia martiriale romana: dal "vuoto figurativo" all'"immaginario devozionale,"* in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans*, Louvain 1995, 247-292; Id.: TIP, 278-279.

F. Bisconti

MARTYRIO MACHABAEORUM, De. A Latin poem of 394 hexameters (its title varies: *Versus in natali Machabaeorum martyrum*; *De fratribus sep-*

tem Machabaeis, Schanz, Gesch, 159). Various attributions link it with *Hilary of Poitiers, *Hilary of Arles, *Victorinus (CPL 1428) or Cyprianus Gallus (CPPM 2161). Two redactions of this little poem exist (CSEL 23, p.240ff.). On the one hand, it is certainly later than the 4th c., as it cites not only Victorinus of Petovium (Petau), but also *Primasius of Hadrumetum; on the other hand, it must be earlier than the 6th c. The subject matter is taken directly from the biblical text (2 Macc 7:1-41). However, apart from strong resonances on the subject of the prize reserved for God's faithful people, only a few traces remain of the theological richness enjoyed by the sacred page (creation *ex nihilo*, 7:28; resurrection, 7:9-14; reward of martyrdom, 7:36; punishment of the persecutor, 7:17 and 35). The rest of the poem is limited to a paraphrase of the biblical text.

CPL 1428; BHL 5112; CPPM 2, 2161; 2603; 2610; 2630; PL 50, 1275-1286; CSEL 23, 240-254 // 255-269; BHL 759 n. 7; Schanz IV, 1, 159. For full information on the cult relating to the Maccabean brethren see M. Schatkin, *The Maccabean Martyrs*: VChr 28 (1974) 97-113.

L. Dattrino

MARTYRIUS (Sahdona) (7th c.). *Nestorian monk and bishop, today known mainly because of the studies of P. Bedjan and A. De Halleux, who published what is left of Martyrius's works, scattered among MSS in several libraries (see CSCO 200, I-XVI). The MSS appear under the name of Mar Turis (*Martyrius*), which it seems ought to be identified with the Nestorian Sahdona, as known also from other sources. Originally from a village in the mountain regions near Kirkuk (in Iraq), he was a monk of Bet Awe around 635–640. He suffered exile for his christological ideas. He must have had a solid theological training in the school at *Nisibis since he was also familiar with the Cappadocian Fathers. His christological works are lost; there remain some spiritual writings. His principal work is the *Book of Perfection*, composed when he was 28 and partly lost; in it he expounds his ascetical ideas: it is important for our knowledge of the spiritual doctrine of Nestorian monasticism in Persia during the 7th c. Five letters and some short *Maxims of Wisdom* by him also remain.

DSp 10, 737-742; P. Bedjan, *S. Martyrii, qui et Sahdona, quae supersunt omnia*, Paris-Leipzig 1902; A. de Halleux: CSCO 200-201 (1960) (for his life, see intro. in vol. 201, I-XVIII); 214-215 (1961); 252-255 (1965): Fr. tr., ed. and tr. de Halleux; S.P. Brock, *A Further Fragment of the Sinai Sahdona Manuscript*: Muséon 81 (1968) 139-154; A. de Halleux, *Un chapitre retrouvé du Livre de la perfection de Martyrius*: Muséon 88 (1975) 253-296 (Fr. tr.); A. de Halleux, *La christologie de Martyrios-Sahdona dans l'évolution du nestorianisme*: OCP 23 (1957) 5-32; Id., *Martyrios-Sahdona. La vie mouvementée d'un "hérétique" de l'Église nestorienne*: OCP 24 (1958) 93-128; L. Wehbé, *Textes bibliques dans les écrits de Martyrios-Sahdona*: Melto 5 (1969) 61-112; J.-M. Fiey, *Iso'yaw le Grand. Vie du catholicos nestorien Iso'yaw III d'Adiabène (580-659)*: OCP 36 (1970) 5-46; BBKL 8, 1177-1179; LACL[3] 491-492.; Patrologia V, 478-479; J.A. McGuckin, *The Book of Mystical Chapters: Meditations on the Soul's Ascent from the Desert Fathers and Other Early Christian Contemplatives*, Boston 2002.

A. Di Berardino

MARTYRIUS of Antioch (bishop 459–470/471). Chalcedonian bishop, deposed by *Peter the Fuller. He is the addressee of a canonical letter from *Gennadius of Constantinople about the rituals to be used in reconciling heretics. The following were wrongly attributed to him: an *Encomium of John Chrysostom*, preached at *Constantinople in 407–408 to pro-Chrysostom audiences, and some fragmentary *Erotapokriseis*.

CPG 6517-6518; PG 47, cols. XLIII-LII; CSCO 84, 237; 88, 164; NPB 2, 552; F. van Ommeslaeghe, *La valeur historique de la Vie de S. Jean Chrysostome attribuée à Martyrius d'Antioche (BHG 871)*: SP 12 (TU 115), Berlin 1975, 478-483; M. Wallraff, *L'epitaffio per Giovanni Crisostomo (Ps. Martirio). Inquadramento di una fonte biografica finora trascurata*, in *Giovanni Crisostomo tra Oriente e Occidente*, Rome 2005.

S.J. Voicu

MARTYRIUS of Jerusalem (bishop 478–486). A monk of Cappadocian origin who lived at *Nitria in *Egypt. In 457 he moved to *Palestine to live in the desert of *Judea (*Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euth.* 32) and to join the laura of *Euthymius. In 478 he was elected patriarch of *Jerusalem, cultivating good relations with the anti-Chalcedonians (*monophysites). His policies succeeded in reestablishing ecclesial communion. We have a letter written by him to *Peter Mongus and a brief sermon, which appear in the *Ecclesiastical History* of *Zacharias Scholasticus. The sermon was preached during the ceremony of reconciliation with the monophysites, which entailed the acceptance of the first three ecumenical councils with no explicit condemnation of the Council of *Chalcedon (451) or of the **Tomus ad Flavianum* by Pope *Leo.

CPG 6515; CSCO 83, 220-223 and 237-238; 87, 153-155 and 164; L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 127ff.; Patrologia V, 257-258.

S.J. Voicu

MARTYROLOGY

I. Ancient martyrologies - II. Medieval martyrologies - III. Roman martyrology.

It is necessary first of all to distinguish between a calendar and a martyrology. As both types of document are in the form of a list of saints (or of martyrs originally) and follow the order of the Roman Calendar, at times they were assimilated with each other: thus there are some who make no distinction in speaking of a martyrology and of the Syrian Compendium (which is a calendar), or in speaking of a calendar and the Martyrology of Carthage. But they are two distinct genres. The calendar, on the one hand, provides only one name per day of saints relating to a single church, like the calendars of Carmona, Naples and Oxyrhynchus. The martyrology, on the other hand, generally gives several names each day and includes feasts, whatever their origin may be, as is the case with the *Mart. rom.* A further distinction must be made between ancient martyrologies and medieval or *historic* ones. The former only give the date and place of the feast together with the name and title under which it is celebrated. Historic martyrologies add to these dates further information about historical events to do with the saint (hence the designation *historic*), which are usually drawn from the *Life* or from some other source of a historical or literary nature. In both types of martyrology, next to the anniversary of the saint other feasts are also indicated: findings and translations of relics, consecrations of bishops, dedications of churches or altars and also—though very rarely—the saint's conception and birth (Christ, the Virgin, John the Baptist).

I. Ancient martyrologies. The oldest known martyrology is Syrian, from 411 (London, *Addit.MS 12150*; ed. AASS, *Nov.*II, 1, pp. L–LXIX; PO 10, 7-26). It is a translation of a Greek original composed at *Nicomedia about 360–362, and makes particular use of the *Collection of Ancient Acts of the Martyrs* of *Eusebius of Caesarea. It embraced the eastern part of the Roman Empire and became one of the principal sources for *Jerome's own martyrology. The *Mart. hier.* was composed in S Italy (in the Aquileia region?) between 431 and 450. It constitutes the first example of a universal martyrology and was compiled using three main sources: (1) the Roman **Depositio martyrum* and *Depositio episcoporum*; (2) the Syrian martyrology; (3) the antecedent of the *Carthage martyrology. At Auxerre in 592 a new edition was made, characterized by its additions relating to *Gaul found at the end of each day's list. For this reason it became known as the Gallican edition; all the MSS surviving from the *Mart. hier.* date back to this one. They are divided into two groups: one group represented only by the *Epternacensis* (begun in the 8th c.), the second group comprising all the others (*Bernensis*, *Laureshamensis*, *Wissemburgensis*, from the end of the 8th c., etc.). The diplomatic edition of the four MSS was made by Duchesne in 1894 (AASS *Nov.*, II, 1), the critical edition in 1931 by H. Quentin, and a critical commentary by H. Delehaye (AASS *Nov.*, II, 2). These two editions are fundamental for any scientific work on ancient hagiography. The Carthage martyrology dates back to 505–523/535: it is derived from a combining of the *Depositio martyrum* and *Depositio episcoporum* of Carthage, to which notes were added about universally known African and non-African saints. The first editing of the document might be dated to the 2nd half of the 4th c., which became without any doubt the version used in the *Mart. hier.* together with African lists of various origin.

II. Medieval martyrologies. The first medieval martyrology was compiled by Bede (d. 735), and was based on a copy of the *Mart. hier.* that has similarities with the *Epternacensis*. Next came the martyrologies of the Carolingian period: the anonymous martyrology of Lyons from ca. 800; the two editions by Florus of Lyons from 806–838; the work of Adon of Vienna (the *Parvum Romanum*, falsely attributed to him, and his own martyrology in three editions from 850-870); last, the martyrology of Usuard of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, which continuously evolved between 850 and 877, of which the *MS.lat.13745* in Paris is the copy that was used by the author himself. Other medieval martyrologies exist, but are of only minor importance. This literature taken as a whole has been studied by H. Quentin, while J. Dubois dedicated himself to the martyrology of Usuard.

III. Roman martyrology. Usuard's martyrology had such success in the Middle Ages that it ended up being considered as the *Mart. rom.* In fact, it was a Roman copy of Usuard's martyrology (that of St. Cyriacus) of which C. Baronius produced an edition at the behest of Gregory XIII, which appeared in 1584. Of the later editions it suffices to mention those of Benedict XIV in 1748, of Pius X in 1913 (the official martyrology) and of the Bollandists in 1940 (AASS, *Prop.Dec.*). The commentary on the last of these limits the risk of indiscriminate employment of the martyrology. Although it does not have beginners in mind, it remains an indispensable tool for scholars able to use it. It served as a basis for the postconciliar

reform of the Roman calendar, though not always made use of with discretion.

CPL 2028-2046; Repertorium Fontium Historiae Medii Aevi 7, 493-503; LMA 6, 357-361; J.B. de Rossi - L. Duchesne, *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (AASS Nov. 2,1), 1894; A. Urbain, *Ein Martyrologium der christlichen Gemeinde zu Rom*, Leipzig 1901; H. Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen âge*, Paris 1908; J.P. Kirsch, *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalender im Altertum*, Münster 1924; B. de Gaiffier, *De l'usage et de la lecture de Martyrologe*: AB 79 (1961) 40-59; J. Dubois, *Le martyrologe d'Usuard*, Brussels 1965; Id., *Les martyrologes du moyen âge latin*, Turnhout 1978; J. Dubois - G. Renaud, *Le martyrologe d'Adon*, Paris 1984; V. Saxer, *Baronio e il Martirologio romano*: Antichità paleocristiane e altomedievali del Sorano (Sora 1985) 115-126; Ph. Harnoncourt - H. auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 2,1, Regensburg 1994, 55-58; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, Brussels [2]2000, 11-106, 404-414; V. Saxer, *Santi e Culto dei santi nei martirologi*, Spoleto 2001; P. Ó Riain, *Four Irish Martyrologies*, London 2002; D.A. Bullough, *York, Bede's Calendar and a Pre-Bedan English Martyrology*: AB 121 (2003) 329-355.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

MARUTA of Maiferqat (4th–5th c.). Maruta, notwithstanding the fact that his biography and his writings rather than shedding light, cast more shade upon him, remains a fundamental character in the evolving drama of the Persian church at the beginning of the 5th c., i.e., after the period of anti-Christian persecution by the *Sassanids. A Roman citizen, he studied first the natural sciences and devoted himself to medicine. After commencing a career in administration, thereby following in his father's footsteps, whom he was to succeed, he suddenly changed course and took holy orders. He soon became, it would appear, bishop of Maiferqat during the reign of *Theodosius I (375–395). Under Theodosius and his successor Arcadius (395–408), Maruta was charged with several missions to the Persian emperor, the king of the kings. Hence, in 399, Maruta was sent to the newly enthroned *Yazdegerd I, and would have exerted a strong influence upon the election of the new *catholicos* by getting Isaac (Ishaq) chosen. According to tradition, it was after this mission, or one following, that Maruta was to carry back the relics of the martyrs from the persecutions under *Shapur II and deposit them in his episcopal city, Maiferqat. For this reason it would become Martyropolis (city of the martyrs). Today, after many opposing opinions have been formed, there is general acceptance of the attribution to Maruta of a 4th-c. collection of passions of Persian martyrs. The other action that renders him a decisive figure is his participation in 410 in the synod of Persian bishops that took place at *Seleucia-Ctesiphon: there a form of the Nicene Creed and its canons were approved, adapted to local circumstances. By this act the Persian church was placed in an ideal position for interaction with the churches of the Greek East. However, the name of Maruta does not appear among the signatories at the Council of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (424): it could be legitimately concluded that by this time Maruta had already died.

BS 8, 1305-1309; Duval 122, 123, 159; Baumstark 53-54 (and passim); Chabot 41, 81-82; Ortiz de Urbina 51-54; J. Noret, *La vie grecque ancienne de S. Maruta de Mayferqat*: AB 91 (1973) 77-103; O. Braun, *De sancta Nicaena Synodo. Syrische Texte des Maruta von Maipherkat*, Münster 1898, 34-40; A. Vööbus, *The Canons Attributed to Maruta of Maipherkat and Related Sources* (CSCO, *Script. syri* 191-192), Louvain 1982 (canons); M.-J. van Esbroeck, *Abraham le Confesseur (V^e s.) traducteur des Passions des martyres perses - À propos d'un livre récent*: AB 95 (1977) 169-179; L. Ter-Petrossian, *L'attribution du recueil des Passions des martyrs perses à Maroutha de Maypherqat*: AB 97 (1979) 129-130; P. Bruns, *Bemerkungen zur Rezeption des Nicaenums in der ostsyrischen Kirche*: AHC 32 (2000) 1-22; L. Sako, *Le rôle de la hiérarchie syriaque-orientale dans les rapports diplomatiques entre la Perse et Byzance aux V^e-VII^e siècles*, Paris 1986.

J.-M. Sauget - A. Camplani

MARUTA of Tagrit (d. 649). Born at Šūrzaq in the neighborhood of Bālād in Persia, Maruta studied in various *monophysite schools of the *Sassanid Empire, which he then left for the Byzantine Empire. There he studied for ten years in the monastery of Mar Zakkai at Kallinikos (today Rakkah, in *Osroene) and for another three years in the monastery of Bēt Regūm. In 605 he returned to Persia, where he became a teacher in the monastery of Mar Mattai at Mosul. When in 628/629 the West-Syrian *catholicos* Athanassos I named him *mafrian* of Tagrit, Maruta became the first of the dignitaries who would later govern the diocese of Tagrit and its twelve suffragans and perform a role analogous to that of the *catholicos*. Maruta died in Tagrit in 649. His successor, Denha, wrote one of the *Lives* of Maruta (published by Nau), in which he gives a list of his writings. One of his homilies, on the blessing of holy water at Epiphany, has been published (Brock), as has his account of the development of *Nestorianism in the Eastern church, which was incorporated into the chronicle of Michael the Syrian (12th c.).

Baumstark, 245; BO I, 418-419; Duval, 373-374; F. Nau, *Histoires d'Ahoudemmeh et de Marouta* (PO 3), Paris 1905, 61-96; S. Brock, *The Homily by Marutha of Tagrit on the Blessing of the Waters at Epiphany*: OC 66 (1982) 51-74; M. Kmosko, *Homilia in "Dominicam novam" Maruthae adscripta*: OC 3 (1903) 384-415; J.B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, Paris 1900, 1910, I, 424-429 (text) and II, 435-440 (transl.).

K. den Biesen

MARY

I. Mary, mother of Jesus - II. Feasts of Mary - III. Iconography

I. Mary, mother of Jesus. While sometimes taking account of *apocryphal texts, the church fathers develop their reflections on Mary above all in the light of biblical material, testimonies of *faith among the Christian people and *liturgical practice. They always consider Mary in light of the *incarnate Word and treat the matter not in a systematic way, but only *in contesto*, commenting on the salvific event of Christ, explaining the faith, advocating Christian holiness and refuting *heresies. Each one is like a tessara of the entire mosaic that depicts particular doctrinal subjects and the *ethical figure of the Mother-Virgin. In the early years, they did not yet assemble theological terms that were adequate to express the *christological *mystery and the dignity of the Mother of God. Nonetheless, by correctly interpreting the witnesses of *Scripture and *tradition, they opened the way to successive developments in Mariology, addressed popular *piety and countered erroneous opinions. Here I present some of the major developments in patristic Mariology.

*1. The postapostolic age up to the First Council of *Nicaea (325).* *Ignatius of Antioch (d. ca. 110) is the first author to include mariological doctrine within the *dogmatic heritage of the church. He affirms the double generation of Christ, *eternal from *God the *Father and earthly from Mary (*Eph.* 7), thus paving the way for the definitions to come from *Chalcedon. He treats Mary as a participant in the divine project and the history of salvation: her *virginity, her conception and the *death of the Lord are "three great mysteries" (*Eph* 19,1). Against the *docetists, he defends the reality of the incarnation of Christ (*Smyrn.* 1), and as a presupposition for a right understanding of the divine motherhood of Mary, he recalls the *communicatio idiomatum*: "Our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived in the womb of Mary, from the branch of *David, yet through the work of the *Holy Spirit, acc. to the salvific plan of God" (*Eph.* 18,2). *Justin Martyr (d. around 165) defends above all the *virginitas* of Mary before the *birth of Jesus, against the *pagans who were rejected it as a *myth and against the Jews who did not recognize the fulfillment of the prophecy of Is 7:14 (LXX) applied to Mary (*Dial.* 84). For starters he introduces the antithetical parallelism Eve-Mary (*Dial.* 100,5), showing the importance of Mary in the story of salvation and her ethical figure as a model of obedience and acceptance of the Word of God. *Irenaeus of Lyons (d. 202) plays an important role in the history of Mariology. He places Mary in a unique position at the center of incarnational *soteriology and the plan of salvation. He elaborates the double theme of a *recapitulation and a closing of the circle, developing the contrast between Eve and Mary, who unties the knot of the disobedience of Eve, becoming the *Causa salutis* for herself and for humanity (III, 22,4) and *Advocata Evae* (V, 19,1; *Epid.* 33). He introduces the use of other *epitheta ornantia* that would converge much later in the litanies, and he opens the door to the inclusion of Mary in the *creed (*Adv. haer.* I, 10,1). Irenaeus dwells on the prophecy of Is 7:14: it is the "sign of the Virgin" that becomes as well a "sign of human salvation." Christ in his incarnation has *purified the womb of the Virgin (IV, 33,11), and he must be acclaimed as the "Immanuel of the Virgin," namely, as Savior (I, 19,1). To profess in faith the virginal motherhood of Mary is a necessary presupposition for participating in salvation.

*Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215) upholds the perpetual virginity of Mary (*Paed.* 1,6,21), also appealing to the **Protevangelium of James* (*Fragm. In Iud. ep.*: GCS III, 206), and he correlates the maternal role of Mary and the maternal role of the church: these give to the faithful the Word of *Truth, by which they bear fruit (*Strom.* 7,16). A parallel of Mary-Church is recognizable as well in the so-called *Inscription of *Abercius* (before 216): "The faith sustains me above all and offers me a Fish of the Fount, very large and pure, that a holy virgin had caught. And she gave this *fish to her friends, to eat forever" (DACL 1,69-70). *Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235) defines an "incorruptible wood" that formed the Ark that is the Lord (*Fragm. in Ps.* 22: GCS II, 41), alluding to a sinless purity. In the **Traditio Apostolica* (attributed to Hippolytus), the author places Mary within the central event of the incarnation, both in the verbal formulations of faith (*Trad. Ap.* 21) and in the eucharistic celebration (*Trad. Ap.* 4). Against the docetists and *gnostics, *Tertullian (d. after 220) vigorously affirms the realism of the incarnation: Christ has assumed from Mary a true human body, not an apparent one (*De carne Chr.* 19). He explicitly affirms the virginity of Mary before the birth, but seems more hesitant about the virginity in and after the birth (*De monog.* 8,2; *De virg. vel.* 6,3; *De carne Chr.* 23). *Origen (d. 254) argues that Mary is always a virgin, holy in body and spirit. For women, she is the "firstfruits of virginity" (*Co. Mt.* X, 17). Moreover, she is a model for every Christian who gives birth to the Christ in his or her own *soul (*Co. Mt.* frag. 281: GCS XII, 126 and *Hom. Lc.* 22,3), who meditates on the divine Word (*Hom. Lc.* 6,7) and who advances toward the peaks of perfection (*Hom. Lc.* 7,2). His

interpretation of the "sword" in Lk 2:34 as Mary's doubt at the foot of the *cross (*Hom. Lc.* 17,6-7) would later influence *Basil of Caesarea and *Cyril of Alexandria. An invocation of Mary transmitted through a *papyrus of the end of the 3rd c., the **Sub tuum praesidium*, expresses faith in the protection of Mary, "mother of God" (θεοτόκος). With the declaration that "Christ has assumed *flesh and has been made man" and with the christological *confession (**homoousios*), the First Council of Nicaea (325) paves the way for the affirmation of the divine motherhood of Mary. In his address to the fathers of the council, the emperor *Constantine I gives the definition Θεοῦ μῆτερ (Eus., *Ad coetum Sanct.* 11,9: PG 20, 1265 A-B).

2. Up to the fifth ecumenical council (**Constantinople 553*). In this era marked by the christological controversies, the two most ancient Marian dogmas were established: the divine motherhood and the perpetual virginity of Mary. The church fathers exalt Mary as a model of the Christian and *ascetic life, define her parallelism with the church, promote her cult and oppose its abuses, and inaugurate new Marian themes (Dormition/*Assumption and immunity from sin).

2.1. The title θεοτόκος first appears in the context of *Alexandria, perhaps already in Origen (*Co. Rom.* 1) on the basis of the testimony of *Socrates Scholasticus (*HE* 7,32). Patriarch *Alexander of Alexandria (d. 328) and *Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373), followed by the Cappadocian Fathers, plant it in the soil of Christian thought. For Basil of Caesarea (d. 379), Mary has offered her collaboration, because "the flesh as bearer of God" was placed within human lineage (*Ep.* 261,2). For *Gregory of Nazianzus (d. ca. 390), the appellative θεοτόκος is a secure criterion of orthodoxy: whoever does not so believe "separates himself from the divine being" (*Ep.* 101). Thus Gregory confirms the integrity of the human nature of Christ, born "of a holy virgin . . . entirely God and completely man (*Poem. Dogm.* I, 10,21-23) in opposition to the *Apollinarians and *Arians, who were not assigning proper significance to θεοτόκος. *Nestorius (d. after 450), asserting that the two natures in Christ are conjoined in an extrinsic way, proposes the title χριστοτόκος as a compromise between θεοτόκος and ἀνθρωποτόκος. Meanwhile, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), apprehending in Christ a sole *hypostasis through which the two natures are united in the one person of the incarnate Logos, demonstrates that Mary is "Mother of God," as provided by the *communicatio idiomatum* (*Ep. 2 ad Nest.:* ACO I, 1,1,25-28). The First Council of Ephesus (431) solemnly sanctions this title (CoeD 40-42), and the Council of Chalcedon (451) confirms it as a consequence of the *hypostatic union. Christ, consubstantial with the Father through his divinity, is consubstantial with us through his humanity, having been born of Mary (CoeD 86). Thus Mary guarantees the authenticity of the human nature, distinct from the divine nature even after the union of the two natures. In this way the canons of the Second Council of Constantinople (553) set forth the divine motherhood (CoeD 114-116 and 121-122).

2.2. The perpetual virginity is promulgated in the East above all by the Cappadocian Fathers and by *Epiphanius of Salamis (d. 403), and in the West by *Ambrose of Milan (d. 397), *Jerome (d. 419) and *Augustine of Hippo (d. 430). Basil attests that the faithful "refuse to hear that the Mother of God ceased at a certain moment of her life to be a virgin" (*Hom. in s. Chr. gener.* 5). *Gregory of Nyssa (d. 392), making reference to Lk 1:34, seems to hypothesize a sort of offering of *chastity by Mary (*In nativ. Dom.*: PG 46, 1140); Augustine seems to do the same (*Serm.* 186,1 e 291,5). Jerome engages in polemic against *Helvidius and *Jovinian, deniers of the perpetual virginity of Mary, calling upon arguments from Scripture, philosophy, convenience and the silence of the gospels (*Adv. Helv.* 4-8.14s.19; *Adv. Iovin.* 1,32). *Zeno of Verona points out the tripartite formula *before–during–after the birth* (*Tract.* 1,54,5). Pope *Leo the Great (d. 461) asserts that in giving birth to Christ, "the inviolate virginity of the mother did not know concupiscence" (Ep. 28,4). Highly significant is the insertion of the formula *ex Maria virgine* into the *Symbolum* of Nicaea and Constantinople, at the conclusion of the second ecumenical council of 381 (ACO 2/1/II,80), in the wake of analogous expressions in local baptismal *symbola*. The *perpetua virginitas* of Mary is ratified at the fifth ecumenical council (Second Council of Constantinople, 553): "Whoever does not believe that the Word of God has two natures, one from the Father, immaterial, before time and *ab aeterno*, the other in the latter days when, descended from the heaven, he takes up flesh in the womb of the holy woman, the venerable and always-virgin Mary mother of God [ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας] from whom he was born, let this person be *anathema" (CoeD 114).

2.3. Mary is presented as a model for Christians and esp. of consecrated virgins, going all the way back to Origen (*Co. Mt.* 10,17), then by Athanasius (*De virginibus*), and above all by Ambrose (*De virg.* 2,6-15) and Jerome (*Ep.* 22,38). The ethical figure of Mary is exemplified by her discernment (Eph. Syr., *Hymn de Eccl.* 48), her courage at the foot of the

cross (Ambrose, *De inst. virg.* 6,49) and esp. her faith (Aug.: *fides in mente, Christus in ventre*: *Serm.* 196,1; Leo the Great, *Serm.* 26,1), her discipleship in Christ that renders her more blessed than being the mother of Christ (Aug., *Serm.* 72A,7 = *Denis* 25,7), and other virtues. Even *John Chrysostom (d. 407), although attributing some imperfection to Mary, nonetheless holds her up as the *example of the woman who overcomes human weaknesses (*Co. Io.* 20-21).

2.4. The relationship between Mary and the church (already sketched out by Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1,6,21 and *Strom.* 7,16) is developed, esp. in the West. Ambrose is the first to institute a parallelism of *type between the church and Mary, both virgins, spouses and mothers (*Exp. Lc.* 2,7). *Chromatius of Aquileia (d. ca. 407) proposes a complementary relationship between Mary and the church: "The church is united in the upper room [of the cenacle] with Mary, who was the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers. One cannot therefore speak of the church if Mary, the mother of the Lord, is not present with his brothers" (*Serm.* 30,1). For Augustine, Mary is included in the church as a holy and preeminent member (*Serm.* 72A,7 = *Denis* 25,7) through a relationship of similitude. She brings forth the Christ while the church gives spiritual birth to the faithful in the *sacraments (ibid.). She cooperates with and is an example for the church (*Virg.* 6,6).

2.5. The fact that Mary has been closely connected to Christ in the plan of salvation and in her sublime holiness, as well as the plea of *intercession to her as intermediary, support an ever-increasing *devotion to Mary. Mary is mentioned in the eucharistic prayer as early as the 2nd–3rd c. (see *Trad. Ap.* 4), as well as in various liturgical invocations and intercessory supplications. Gregory of Nazianzus is the first to refer to the efficacious recourse to Mary on the part of the virgin martyr *Justina in her hour of mortal danger (*Or.* 24,9-11). Gregory of Nyssa is the first to recount a Marian apparition (*Vita Greg.*: PG 46, 912). The historian *Sozomen (d. after 450) reports that at Constantinople during the time of Gregory of Nazianzus, "a divine Power" was distributing various graces, and adds: "One believes that this was the Mother of God, Mary" (*HE* VII, 5). However, the abuses of devotion to Mary needed to be curbed. Epiphanius protests against the tendency to attribute a latreutic worship to Mary: "Even though Mary is the one who is full of *grace and holy and worthy of veneration, she does not merit this adoration" (against the supposed *Collyridians of Arabia, in *Haer.* 79,7). Parallels from the history of religion and borrowings from other cults, such as those of Isis, Artemis and pagan mother-goddesses, were firmly rejected by the church fathers. Yet the feminine element of pagan religiosity constitutes a cultural predisposition, as seen in the transformation of the city of Ephesus from a cultic site of the goddess Artemis into a Marian center. All things considered, it is important to make a clear distinction between analogy and genealogy—in other words, between similarity of religious phenomena and identity of origins.

2.6. The church fathers introduced two other Marian themes. In 374, Epiphanius posed the question of the final destiny of Mary, perhaps stimulated by contemporary apocrypha of the Assumption. He gathers together various hypotheses, but he does not make a pronouncement, not being able to claim clear testimonies of Scripture or of tradition: "We do not know whether she was dead and was buried" (*Haer.* 78,11). The immunity of Mary from original *sin is another problem discussed by the church fathers. *Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387) believes that at the annunciation, Mary was sanctified by the *Holy Spirit through welcoming Christ (*Cat.* 17,6). So also, Gregory of Nazianzus argues that likewise at the annunciation, Mary was preveniently purified (προκαθαρθεῖσα: *Or.* 38,13) in both soul and body by the Holy Spirit, in order to pass onto the Son a flesh absolutely immaculate. The increasing use of *epitheta ornantia* such ἄχραντος and *immaculata* and esp. the Marian attributes "holy" and "all holy," together with the antithetical parallel Eve-Mary, favor the conviction that Mary was not subject to original sin. Augustine, drawn into the problem of Mary's holiness by *Pelagius, affirms against the opinion of his adversary that Mary, *propter honorem Domini*, is the only woman without sin (*De nat. et gratia* 36,42). Against the argumentation of the Pelagian theologian *Julian of Eclanum, who consigned even Mary to the power of the devil through the force of original sin, Augustine hesitated in his response (*Op. imp. c. Iul.* 4,122). On one hand he did not want to negate the universal transmission of original sin (even through the presumed theory of *traducianism) and undervalue the necessity of the *redemption, but on the other hand he did not want to undermine the spiritual splendor of Mary.

3. Up until the end of the patristic era. The two most ancient Marian dogmas are reaffirmed, whether in the writings of the church fathers of this final period, or in the documents of the magisterium, esp. in the Lateran Council of 649: "If anyone does not confess, acc. to the holy fathers, that the holy mother of God and always virgin and immaculate Mary [. . .] has conceived, without seed, by the Holy Spirit, very God the Word, and without cor-

ruption has generated this Word, leaving intact her virginity even after the birth, let him be condemned" (DS 503). Yet most of all the church fathers concentrate on the person of Mary and her biographical elements, from conception to the glorious conclusion of her life, such that these elements start to take shape as theological themes. They develop an abundant *homiletical literature that exalts the virgin Mother of God, and add Marian feasts to the liturgical calendar.

3.1. In the East the hymnographer *Romanus Melodus (d. 560) presents Mary, in the most significant moments of her earthly life, together with the Son and invokes her intercession as mediator on behalf of humanity (*Hym. Nat.* II, 11). Also the famous *hymn **Acathistus* (Gk. *Akathistos*, 5th–6th c.) celebrates Mary as virgin and spouse, and as the one who succors humanity. In his *Homily of the Assumption*, *Theotecnus of Livias (near Jericho; d. ca. 600), while also employing *narratives of the Assumption, accounts for the elevation of Mary to heaven with biblical and theological arguments. In his *Homily on the Dormition*, *Modestus of Jerusalem (d. ca. 632) asserts that the body of Mary, through having brought forth the Christ, has not experienced corruption. Furthermore, the fathers of this final period seek to clarify the elevation of Mary to heaven, relating it to the dogmas of her divine motherhood and of her perpetual virginity. They discern the very close connection between the truth of the Assumption and that of the Immaculate Conception, thus introducing the axiom *assumpta quia immaculata*. They connect her presence in heaven with her maternal intercession, and they invoke her as Queen, placing their trust in her powerful intervention for obtaining grace. Furthermore, as evidences of Mary's bodily assumption, they interpret her empty tomb and the absence of *relics of the holy Virgin. With discretion, they make reference to various apocrypha of the Assumption that circulated since the 6th c. in different versions. The Easterners arrive with difficulty at a total comprehension of the later dogma of the immaculate virgin as a *praeservatio*, but they stress the Assumption/Dormition and heavenly mediation of Mary. Patriarch *Germanus of Constantinople (d. 733) promotes Marian piety and the veneration of images, and treats the Assumption as the crowning of the divine motherhood (*Hom. I in Dorm*). *Andrew of Crete (d. 740) excludes Mary from the corruptibility of the body (*Hom. II in Dorm.*). *John of Damascus (d. 749) glorifies Mary as the one who dispenses grace and an everlasting benediction for humanity (*Hom. I in Dorm.*).

3.2. In the West, *Gregory of Tours (d. 594) is the first to describe the Assumption of Mary (*Mirac. lib.* 1,4), and he recounts the numerous events attributed to the intervention of the blessed Virgin (ibid., 1,9) that contribute to the development of devotion to the Mother of God. *Isidore of Seville (d. 636) ascribes various titles of biblical derivation to the name of Mary (*De ortu et ob. Patr.* 111), presents her as a figure par excellence of the church (*All.* 139) and influences the *Visigoth liturgy, similarly characterized by a conspicuous Marian element. *Ildefonsus of Toledo (d. 667) strenuously defends the virginity of Mary (*Libell. de virg. s. M.*), and to the "Lady" he consecrates himself as "servant" (ibid., XII, 2.7), thus revealing a new layer of Marian *spirituality. An obstacle to the acceptance of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was the conviction that only a procreation without libido (as with Christ) would have been able to guard against original sin, as well as the opinion of Augustine that her biological origin or "vitalization" would have come about by means of the procreating act (*conceptio activa*) of the parents, while the origin of the soul or "animation" (*conceptio passiva completa*) would have occurred only 40 days after the bodily procreation. Patristic theology did not manage to resolve the problem as it was defined. A window is opened by the Venerable *Bede (d. 735), who interprets the sanctification of *John the Baptist in the womb of his mother Elizabeth (Lk 1:41) as a liberation *a peccatis omnibus*, and thus implements the *argumentum a fortiori* in the case of Mary (*Hom.* 13: PL 94, 208; *Hom.* II, 19: CCL 122, 325).

Furthermore, in this final period, the iconoclastic struggles were overcome, and in the West many typical Marian feasts were borrowed from the East. The Mary-church parallel experienced a gradual reaffirmation with the *ipsa conteret* of Gen 3:15, and with the *allegorical interpretation of Scripture, esp. in the *commentaries on the *Song of Songs in the medieval period. Moreover, an extraordinary blossoming of Marian literature appeared. Especially in the homiletical literature, there was a trend toward the historic figure of Mary. As she was considered in her role of "glorious Lady" and her *virtues were exalted, Marian devotion increased. The church fathers deserve recognition for having identified and elaborated all the essential elements of the doctrine of Mary. Over the centuries they have become guides and interpreters of the faith and of the devotion of God's people, all the while demonstrating their *love for the Virgin Mother of God.

For a nearly exhaustive Marian bibl., see G. Besutti, *Bibliografia mariana*, 9 vols., Rome 1950–1993 (the last volume is ed. by E. Toniolo). For a collection of Marian patristic texts in Latin or Greek, see E. Casagrande, *Enchiridion Marianum Biblicum*

Patristicum, Rome 1974; S. Alvarez Campos, *Corpus Marianum Patristicum*, 8 vols., Burgos 1970–1985. Only with Italian translation, see var. aus., *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, 4 vols., Rome 1988–1991 (currently the most complete anthology of texts in It. tr.). For studies of patristic Mariology: G. Jouassard, *Marie à travers la patristique*, in H. du Manoir (ed.). *Maria*, I, Paris 1949, 71-157; C. Balić, *Testimonia de Assumptione Beatae Mariae Virginis ex omnibus saeculis*, Rome 1948–1950; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *La mariologia nella patristica orientale*, in P. Sträter (ed.), *Mariologia*, I, Turin 1952, 81-102; H. Rahner, *La mariologia nella patristica latina*, in Sträter, *Mariologia*, I, 129-170; W. Burghardt, *Mary in Western Patristic Thought*, in J.B. Carol (ed.), *Mariology*, I, Milwaukee 1955, 109-155; A. Wenger, *L'Assomption de la Très Sainte Vierge dans la Tradition byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle*, Paris 1955; W. Burghardt, *Mary in Eastern Patristic Thought*, in J.B. Carol (ed.), *Mariology*, II, Milwaukee 1957, 88-153; F. Spedalieri, *Maria nella Scrittura e nella tradizione della Chiesa primitiva*, 2 vols., Messina 1961–1975; H.V. Campenhausen, *Die Jungfrauengeburt in der Theologie der alten Kirche*, Heidelberg 1962; D. Fernández, *Doctrina mariologica antiquorum Patrum occidentalium*, in var. aus., *De Mariologia et Oecumenismo*, Rome 1962, 179-216; W. Delius, *Geschichte der Marienverehrung*, Munich 1963, 35-148; H.C. Graef, *Maria. Eine Geschichte der Lehre und Verehrung*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1964; L. Cignelli, *Maria nuova Eva nella patristica greca (sec. II-V)*, Assisi 1966; I.M. Alonso, *La espada de Simeon (Lc 2,35a) en la exégesis de los Padres*, in *Maria in Sacra Scriptura*, IV, Rome 1967, 183-285; T. Koehler, *Maria nei primi secoli*, Vercelli 1969; var. aus., *De primordiis cultus mariani*. Acta congressus mariologici-mariani in Lusitania anno 1967 celebrati, 6 vols., Rome 1970 (various contributions for the patristic era); J.A. de Aldama, *María en la patrística de los siglos I y II*, Madrid 1970; T. Koehler, *Storia della mariologia* I-VI, Pallanza 1970–1977; R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega en el siglo V*, 3 vols., Dayton 1971–1973; var. aus., *La Virgen María en los Padres de la Iglesia*, Buenos Aires 1979; var. aus., *Marie (Vierge)*: DSp 10,409-482 (It. tr.: *Maria è il suo nome*, Rome 1985); G. Söll, *Storia dei dogmi mariani*, It. tr., Rome 1981; T. Koehler, *Storia della mariologia*, in S. De Fiores and S. Di Meo (ed.), *Nuovo Dizionario di Mariologia*, Cinisello Balsamo ²1988, 1385-1405; Institutum Marianum Regensburg, R. Bäumer and L. Scheffczyk (ed.), *Marienlexikon*, 6 vols., St. Ottilien 1988–1994; E. Peretto, *Mariologia patristica*, in A. Quacquarelli (ed.), *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, Rome 1989, 697-756; S. Felici (ed.), *La mariologia nella catechesi dei Padri (età prenicena)*, Rome 1989; id. (ed.), *La mariologia nella catechesi dei Padri (età postnicena)*, Rome 1991; Ch. Pietri, *Les premières images de Marie en Occident*, in *Quaeritur inuentus colitur*: Miscellanea in onore di Padre Umberto Maria Fasola, Vatican City 1989, II, 587-603; L. Gambero, *Maria nel pensiero dei Padri della Chiesa*, Milan 1991; S.C. Mimouni, *Dormition et Assomption de Marie. Histoire des traditions anciennes*, Paris 1995; R. Calì, *I testi antimariologici nell'esegesi dei Padri*, Caltanissetta 1999; E. Peretto, *Percorsi mariologici nell'antica letteratura cristiana*, Vatican City 2001. Beginning in 2001, the journal *Theotokos* dedicates volumes to patristic Mariology. There are also various guides to the history of dogma, and numerous monographs on the Mariology of individual fathers (among which see the previously cited 9 vols. of Besutti).

M. Maritano

II. Feasts of Mary. The *memoria* of the Virgin quickly took hold in the Christian *tradition, through its mentioning in the gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Galatians (4:4), and the 2nd-3rd-c. apocryphal literature. The collection of biographical episodes is an early preview of the devotion that has adorned the centuries, and it is remarkable that an indisputable allusion came to be formulated in Gal 4:4, where the proclamation has connotations of a deliberate summary of Mary's role. Not all of the feasts of Mary that punctuate the liturgical calendar have a clearly defined origin. Some are based on the *Bible, while others suggest a tradition that perished at a certain point in time. The celebrations of the Annunciation and of the divine motherhood focus on Mt 1–2 and Lk 1–2, and they join those of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption to form the four great solemnities. Even though the Apostolic Exhortation of Pope Paul VI titled *Marialis Cultus* (1974) restored and remembered this ancient Catholic liturgical cycle, we cannot pinpoint the historical point of reference for the latter two feasts. The evolution of the Marian feasts does not always correlate with their intrinsic significance, and frequently it does not depend on biblical or patristic criteria. Some feasts appear in the biographical cycle of Mary, others do not; those that do not, while connected to particular needs and circumstances, still have a broader liturgical significance. Following a biographical and chronological criterion with respect to Mary, one can draft the following list: (1) The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 December). The feast celebrates how Anna conceived Mary in her womb, without the contraction of original *sin. The first signs of the feast appear in the 7th-8th-c. *Byzantine Church. In the West it is first affirmed during the 9th c. within the territories under Byzantine occupation, and later in the rest of Europe. For Roman Catholics, it is a dogma of the faith defined by Pope Pius IX in 1854. (2) The Divine Motherhood of Mary (1 January). *Proclus of Constantinople (d. 446) dedicates a discourse to this feast (PG 65, 679). The basis is Holy Scripture. The divine motherhood of Mary was solemnly proclaimed at the First Council of Ephesus (431). (3) The Annunciation of Our Lord Jesus Christ (25 March). The feast functions as a feast of the Lord and of the Virgin through the very close connection established by Scripture and by tradition: the *angel announces to Mary that she will be the Mother of the Savior (Lk 1:28-38). It originated in the 4th-c. East, with the date of 25 March first appearing in the **Chronicon Paschale* of 624; in the West, the same date appears in the Gelasian and the Gregorian *sacramentaries. Pope *Sergius I (687–701) of the so-called Byzantine papacy led a great revival of this feast. (4) The Assumption of Mary to Heaven (15 August). Better known in the Byzantine Church by the name of *koimēsis* ("dormition," "sleep"), the feast

was celebrated in *Rome from the time of Sergius I. The date of 15 August appears in an edict of the Byzantine emperor Maurice (582–602). The subject was explained in different ways. In the East, the central event is the falling asleep of the Madonna on earth for the purpose of her eternal waking up to God; in the West, the heart of the matter is the assumption into heaven in soul and body of the Virgin Mary.

To these four solemnities are matched other feasts that come under the category of remembrances. The Nativity of Mary (8 September) is very early, probably originating in *Jerusalem; in the 5th c. a basilica was constructed on the presumed site of her birth in Jerusalem. In the West, the Visitation of Mary (31 May), a feast suggested by Lk 1:39-46, arrived between the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th c.; first assigned to 2 July, it entered the Western liturgical calendar after the year 1000. Probably arising at the end of the 5th c., the Presentation of the Lord in the Temple (2 February) is a joint remembrance of Christ and of the Virgin. The "*monophysite" East, in particular the *Armenian Church, celebrates it 14 February, in order to maintain the connection of 40 days with Christmas Day 6 January. The feast is known by the name of Hypapante. In the 7th c. it arises in the West. The Presentation of Mary in the *Temple (21 November), traced back to the 8th c. in the East, is celebrated from the 11th c. in the West.

By perusing the liturgical calendars of many dioceses, clerical congregations and various religious institutions, one notices that the Marian festivals celebrated throughout the universal church and reported in the many official liturgical texts are not numerous, and that the universally received festivals have a foundation in the Bible or in ancient tradition. The widespread diffusion of Marian piety is simultaneously the effect and the cause of celebration. In both the popular origin and the ecclesial affirmation of the festivals, a considerable part is played by the attraction that the figure of the Mother of the Lord has always exerted on the heart of the faithful.

E. Campana, *Maria nel culto cattolico*, Turin 1941, 135-383; var. aus., *La Madonna nel culto della Chiesa*, Brescia 1966; I. Deug-Su, *La festa della Purificazione in Occidente (sec. IV-VIII)*: Stud Med 15 (1974) 143-216; G. Gharib, *La festa bizantina dell'Immacolata Concezione*: Mater Ecc. 10 (1974) 200-205; I. Calabuig, *Immacolata Concezione*: Servizio della Parola 73 (1975) 323-339; J. Polc, *La festa della Visitazione e il Giubileo del 1300*: RSCI 29 (1975) 149-172; A.H.M. Scheer, *Aux origines de la fête de l'Annonciation*: Quaest. Lit. 5 (1977) 97-169; A.M. Roguet, *La fête de la Présentation*: Cah. Mar. 22 (1977) 11-17; *Hypapante*: Cath V, 1142-1143; *Assomption* (liturgie II): Cath I, 952-953; *Messe della Beata Vergine Maria. Raccolta di formulari secondo l'anno liturgico*, Vatican City 1985; G. D'Onorio De Meo, *Dottrina culto e devozione alla Madre del Signore*, 2 vols., Rome 1991; Ch. Renoux, *L'Annonciation du rite armenien et l'Épiphanie*: OCP 71 (2005) 315-342.

E. Peretto

III. Iconography. Mary enters into the repertoire of Christian art as Mother of Christ. In this sense, she occupies a singular place in the scenes of the infancy of the Lord, yet all the scenes aim at the glorification of the *Logos*, his *incarnation, his royalty and the universality of his power. Thus they are christological rather than Marian representations. The earliest scenes, connected to a funerary context, only indirectly allude to the incarnation. In fact, they are associated with the prophecies of the OT pertaining to the birth of Jesus from a Virgin, or they represent the *aurum coronarium* of the Magi to the child, a new Lord of the universe. From the 1st half of the 4th c., in the triumphal context engendered by the religious peace, fully realistic compositions predominate over the scenes of prophesying, capable of directly re-creating the reality of the earthly itinerary of Jesus. For many of the scenes related to the *infantia Salvatoris*, the details of the figural episodes, given the brevity of the *canonical texts, turn out to be derived from the apocryphal narratives. With their storytelling richness, these apocrypha better respond to the demands of popular veneration, to the desire to humanize facial expressions as well as events, reducing them as much as possible to the real-life dimensions of ordinary people. Beyond the depictions of the infancy of the Lord, Mary is present in the representation of the miracle at *Cana, if only rarely. Then she is present alongside Christ, even in the earliest scenes of the *crucifixion, with the pious *women at the sepulcher, and in the images of the *Ascension and of *Pentecost. With the First Council of Ephesus (431) and the solemn proclamation of the parthenogenesis, the iconography of the Madonna departs entirely from the existing repertoire. Glorified as Queen of the virgins and as **Theotokos*, Mary assumes an ever-increasing prominence in the figural repertoire. At first, the introduction in the first person of the figure of the Virgin required that the previously formulated schemes be adapted to the new iconography, through the elaboration or modification of some traditional components and the addition of enrichments suited to better exalting her figure. Therefore, it would be considered natural to insert a theme expected and to some degree prepared by popular devotion and by the same figural tradition, even more so than by the solemn theological proclamations. Meanwhile, particularly in the Eastern regions the apocryphal compilations suggested the creation of new scenes that

not only significantly enriched the repertory but also quickly came to transform this highly relevant development into its essence. In this sense, the Christocentrism that characterizes the iconography prior to the First Council of Ephesus gradually yet inevitably extends to a Marian preeminence. The Virgin assuming the position of Christ at the center of the apsidal conch of the basilica, seated like her Son upon a royal jeweled throne, is a clear manifestation of this tendency.

1. Mary in the images of the christological cycle. Putting aside the chronology offered by the monumental edifices, by tracing the succession of episodes within the narrative of the gospels and of the apocryphal texts, a listing of christological representations in which Mary appears include the following: (a) the*prophecy that Jesus would be born of a Virgin; (b) the *Annunciation; (c) the visit to Elizabeth, evidenced by two different formulations: (1) the meeting (e.g., in the *mosaic of the 6th-c. Euphrasian basilica at *Porec: Wellen, *Theotokos*, p. 42, fig. 6d); (2) the embrace (e.g., in a caisson of the archiepiscopal throne of *Maximian at *Ravenna: Cecchelli, *Cattedra*, 182ff.); (d) the sleep of *Joseph; (e) the ordeal of the bitter water; (f) the wedding; (g) the journey to *Bethlehem ; (h) the *Nativity; (i) the adoration of the *Magi; (j) the adoration of the shepherds; (k) the *presentation in the temple; (l) the flight into Egypt; (m) Christ among the teachers: examples for the early period are the Milan diptych (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, n. 119), an ivory relief in the British Museum (Dalton, 51 n. 293), and miniatures of the gospel book of Corpus Christi College (Beissel, *Evangelienbücher*, p. 87, pl. 21); (n) the *wedding at Cana; (o) the crucifixion; (p) the *pious women at the sepulcher: dubious in the scene at *Dura Europos; Mary is identified with the figure of the woman cloaked in purple, in a miniature of the gospel book of Rabbula (Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, 69ff.); (q) the *ascension; (r) *Pentecost.

2. Separate images of Mary.

a. Mary on the throne. In the lost great mosaic of the apse or of the interior façade of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome, commissioned by Pope *Sixtus III (432–440) after the First Council of Ephesus, Mary was depicted with the child upon a throne with five martyrs approaching, each one bearing a *crown. This theme, based on an imperial *typology of the *aurum coronarium*, had already been attributed to Christ and was now being further extended to Mary (Ihm, *Apsismalerei*, 55). During the same period, there was an image of Mary and the child adorning the apse of the great basilica of S. Maria Suricorum at Santa Maria Capua Vetere, perhaps surrounded by vine tendrils (see Ihm, op. cit., p. 55). At Rome, the scheme of the Virgin enthroned with the child among *saints is presented in a 6th-c. fresco of the catacomb of Commodilla (WMM, pl. 136; Russo, *Affresco di Turtura*, 35ff.).

b. Mary enthroned between angels. In ivory diptychs from the late 5th to early 6th c., Mary appears on high together with Christ enthroned among the chief *apostles and archangels (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, nos. 137, 142, 145, 156). The scene makes its way into the art of *icons and of mosaics, as demonstrated by the icon of the Madonna among angels and two saints at the monastery of Mt. Sinai (Kitzinger, *Icons*, pp. 132ff.) and by the lost mosaic of the basilica of St. *Demetrius at *Thessalonica (Sotiriou, *Basilikè*).

c. Maria Regina. The name derives from the inscription that accompanies an image of this type in the church of S. Maria Antiqua at Rome. The type portrays Mary in royal garments, with a diadem, a *loros* and other characteristic attributes of imperial costume. The type is definitely of Western origin. Indeed, in the Byzantine world, notwithstanding the extension to the Virgin of imperial insignia legitimated by a long tradition connected to the symbology of *apotheosis, and notwithstanding the imperial acclamations addressed to her along with the associated acts of devotion that were taking place before her images conveyed by the icons, the attribution to Mary of insignia directly connected to earthly power must have seemed tantamount to a violation of her essence as *Theotokos*. The situation is different in the West, where an early representation *in nuce* of the theme of Queen Mary is to be recognized in the various scenes in the mosaics of the triumphal arch of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome, commissioned under the pontificate of Sixtus III, showing the Virgin dressed in royal garments woven in gold and studded with jewels, with angels surrounding her (Cecchelli, *Mosaici*, plates XLIX, LII, LIX). Moreover, the type functions explicitly in the silver reliquary from Grado of the 5th–6th c. (Zovatto, *Capsella*, 119ff.), with Mary enthroned, a cruciform scepter and a *monogrammed *nimbus. A version codified by the time of the 6th c. appears in the fresco of the church of S. Maria Antiqua at Rome, in which Mary with the child in her womb, dressed in a complete imperial costume, is seated on a throne under a *baldacchino* which two angels approach, in the ceremony of the *aurum coronarium* (WMM, pl. 133-134). At the end of the 6th c., the theme is reiterated by the icon of the church of S. Maria in Trastevere, also at Rome (Andaloro, *Tavola*, 139ff.).

d. Maria lactans. *Coptic frescoes, datable to the 7th and 8th c., represent Mary enthroned between two angels, in the act of breastfeeding the child (Wellen, *Theotokos*, 163ff.). The existence of an iconographic type of the Madonna *lactans* is confirmed by an apocryphal letter of Pope *Gregory II to the Byzantine emperor *Leo III the Isaurian (717–741), included in the proceedings of the seventh ecumenical council (the Second Council of Nicaea; Mansi 12, 966f.).

e. Maria orans. On some gold-glass pieces of the 4th to 5th c., Mary with her name inscribed is represented in the **orans* position, sometimes between Peter and Paul or with other saints (see, e.g., Morey-Ferrari, *Gold-glass*, n. 265). The same theme recurs in one panel of the wooden door in the basilica of S. *Sabina at Rome (Wellen, *Theotokos*, figure on 201).

f. Mary standing with the child in her arm. The earliest instances of this type, derived from the icon of the Monastery of the Panagia Hodegetria at Constantinople that is supposed to have been painted by St. Luke himself, are given by a miniature contained in the *Syrian gospel book of Rabbula dated to 586 (Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp*., 48ff.) and by the icon of the Pantheon at Rome dated to 609 (Bertelli, *Pantheon*, 24ff.). Keeping in mind that the painting on wood in the Pantheon is only a fragment of a much larger painting, we see that in these depictions the Virgin is shown in full view, with the child in her arm and her face encircled by a large nimbus.

O.M. Dalton, *Catalogue of Early Christian Antiquities and Objects from the Christian East in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography of the British Museum*, London 1901; S. Beissel, *Geschichte der Evangelienbücher in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1906; C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avori romano-orientali*, Rome 1936; G.A. Sotiriou - M.G. Sotiriou, Ἡ Βασιλική τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Athens 1952; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten des Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952; P. Zovatto, *La capsella di Grado con l'immagine di Maria Regina*: Aquileia Nostra 24-25 (1953–1954) 119-128; E. Kitzinger, *On Some Icons of the Seventh Century*, in *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Mathias Friend Jr.*, ed. K Weitzmann, Princeton 1955, 132-150; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956; C.R. Morey - G. Ferrari, *The Gold-glass Collection of the Vatican Library with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-glass Collections*, Vatican City 1959; C. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei vom vierten Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des achten Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden 1960; C. Bertelli, *La Madonna del Pantheon*: Boll. d'Arte 46 (1961) 24-32; G.A. Wellen, *Theotokos. Eine ikonographische Abhandlung über das Gottesmutterbild in frühchristlicher Zeit*, Utrecht and Antwerp 1961 (biblio.); C. Bertelli, s.v. *Maria*: EAA 4, 839-851; Id., *La Madonna di S. Maria in Trastevere*, Rome 1961; R. Lange, *Das Marienbild der frühen Jahrhunderte. Iconographia Ecclesiae Orientalis*, Recklinghausen 1969; J. Lafontaine Dosogne, *Iconographie de l'Enfance de la Vierge dans l'empire byzantine et en occident*: Scriptorium 25 (1971) 155ff.; G.A. Wellen, s.v. *Maria, Marienbild*: LCI 3,156-161; F. Rademacher, *Die Regina Angelorum in der Kunst des frühen Mittelalters*, Düsseldorf 1972; A. Grabar, *L'Hodigitria et l'Eleusa*, Zbornik za likovne umetnosti 10, Novi Sad 1974, 3-14; M. Andaloro, *La datazione della tavola di S. Maria in Trastevere*: RIA 19-20 (1972–1973) 139-215; J. Lafontaine Dosogne, *Iconography of the Cycle of the Life of the Virgin*, in P.A. Underwood, *The Kariye Djami* 4, Princeton 1975, 161-194; G. Bovini, *L'immagine della Vergine nelle opere d'arte ravennati d'età paleocristiana*: CCAB 1975, 87-109; A. Grabar, *Les images de la Vierge de tendresse. Type iconographique et thème*: Zograf 6 (1975) 25-30; M. Tatič Djurič, *Eleousa. À la recherche du type iconographique*: JÖBG 25 (1976) 259-267; A. Grabar, *Remarques sur l'iconographie byzantine de la Vierge*: CArch 26 (1977) 169-178; E. Russo, *L'affresco di Turtura nel cimitero di Commodilla, l'icona di S. Maria in Trastevere e le più antiche feste della Madonna a Roma*: Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano 88 (1979) 35-85; 89 (1980–1981) 71-150; G. Schiller, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, 5 vols., Gütersloh 1966–1986; P. Amato, s.v. Arte, in S. De Flores and S. Meo, *Nuovo Dizionario di Mariologia*, Cinisello Balsamo 1985, 138-154; A. Quacquarelli and F. Bisconti, *L'iconografia mariana antenicena e i suoi presupposti*, in S. Felici (ed.), *La Mariologia nella catechesi dei Padri (Età prenicena)*, Rome 1988, 241-256; U. Utro, *L'immagine di Maria nell'arte delle origini. Dalle prime raffigurazioni al Concilio di Nicea (325)*: Theotokos. Ricerche interdisciplinari di Mariologia 11 (2001) 455-480; many entries in Marienlexikon, e.g., 2, 318ff.; 2, 598-602; 2, 657; 5, 11ff.; 5, 142-143; U. Utro: TIP 212-215

M. Marinone

MARY (patristic literature). The patristic literature concerning *Mary can be divided into two parts: (1) *biographical-*apocryphal, and (2) *homiletical-*theological. Both categories are dependent on the internal life of the church, and more precisely from its *dogmatic development and its doctrinal controversies. The Council of *Ephesus (431) proved to be a milestone for the development of Marian doctrine and *liturgy, but it is also particularly relevant for the development of Marian literature (homiletics, *poetry), while the development of biblical *exegesis favors the emergence of a poetical Marian *symbolism. The other important councils for such development are the Council of *Chalcedon (451), with Pope *Leo the Great's **Tomus ad Flavianum*, and the Second Council of *Nicaea (787) regarding the veneration of *icons.

The first category is Marian texts of a biographical and apocryphal genre (in the broadest sense of the term)—i.e., those that speak of the life of Mary. First of all, we encounter the apocryphal texts that speak of Mary's parents, her *nativity, her dedication in the temple, her wedding with *Joseph, the birth of Jesus and the *flight into *Egypt. To this group of texts belongs the **Protevangelium of James* of the 2nd c. (in ancient MSS, the *Genesis Marias*, *The Birth of Mary*), which upholds the *chastity of Mary against Jewish and *pagan attacks. There exists

another writing, titled *Genna Marias*, cited by *Epiphanius of Salamis (*Haer*. 26,12,1-4) and used by the *Sethians. From the *Protevangelium*, other later texts proceed: the *Gospel of ps.-Matthew* and *The Birth of Mary*, both *Latin; the infancy gospels in Arabic, *Georgian and *Armenian; and many other texts. The apocryphal writings do not address the role of Mary during the public ministry of Jesus. Mary makes an appearance during the passion: certain MSS of the *Acts of Pilate*, the *Ethiopic text called the *Gospel of Gamaliel*, the texts of *Cyriacus of al-Bahnasa and the Arabic texts all present Mary's laments during the *via crucis* and beneath the *cross.

A. Mingana, *Lament of the Virgin*: BRL 12 (1928) 459-488; 427-458 (Arabic text, Eng. tr.); M.A. van Oudenrijn, *Gamaliel*, Freiburg 1957 (Eth. text, Ger. tr.).

There exists as well a large group of apocryphal writings of the 5th and 6th c., and even later but with many more traditional elements, concerning the dormition (death) and the *assumption of Mary (**Transitus Mariae*; *Dormitio Mariae*). These apocrypha exist in various languages (*Greek, Latin, *Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopic and esp. *Syriac), and are ascribed to *John the Baptist, *Melito of Sardis, *Evodius of Antioch, *Theodosius of Alexandria, an obscure Eutimius (**Euthymian History*) or to anonymous writers. In a letter to Bishop Titus, ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite speaks of the *transitus* of Mary. Some of these texts exist in the form of a story, other in the form of a homily (Theodosius, ps.-*Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyriacus). The *transitus* texts have profoundly influenced the Christian *iconography of both East and West.

CANT 100-177; texts on the assumption, in It. tr.: Erbetta 1/2, 409-635; Gk .texts in Fr. tr.: S.C. Mimouni, S.J. Voicu, Paris 2003; as well as Moraldi, Craveri, Starowieyski. *Studies*: A. Wenger, *L'Assomption de la Tres Sainte Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du Ve au VIIIe s.*, Paris 1955; M. van Esbroeck, *Aux origines de la Dormition*, Norfolk 1995 (a collection of articles); S.C. Mimouni, *La tradition de la Dormition et de l'Assomption de Marie*, Paris 1995 (*see* **Transitus Mariae*).

To the Marian apocrypha also belong the **Apocalypse of Mary*, stemming from the *Apocalypse of Paul*, in Greek, Arabic, Georgian, Syriac and Old Slavonic versions. The text narrates the journey of Mary through heaven and through hell, and her *intercession on behalf of sinners. The *Apocalypse of Mary* was particularly popular in medieval *Byzantium and among the Slavs.

CANT 327-330; BHG 1050-1054; BHO 646-654; Apocalypse of Mary in Romanian: M. Ruffini, Florence 1954; A. Wenger, *Foi et piété en Byzance*, in *Maria*, ed. H. du Manoir, 5 (1958) 257-282; S. Mimouni, *Les Apocalypses de la Vierge: état de la question*: Apocrypha 4 (1993) 101-112 (bibl.). It. tr.: Erbetta 3, 447-470; Moraldi 3, 257-282; Polish tr.: Starowieyski 3, 279-293.

The Vitae of Mary: the earliest is that attributed to *Maximus the Confessor (7th c., CSCO 478-479/ Iber 21-22, 1986), preserved in Georgian (the question of its authenticity is still open), followed by those of the monk *Epiphanius (8th c.; see ed. Dressel, 13-44), John Geometres (10th c.; A. Wenger, *Assomption de la T.S. Vierge . . .* , Paris 1955, 363-415), Symeon Metaphrastes (10th c.; B. Latišev, *Menologii anonymi byzantini . . . fragmenta*, St. Petersburg 1912, 345-383) and a *Nestorian *vita* (E.A.W. Budge, *The History of the Blessed Virgin Mary . . .* , 1-2, London 1899, 3-146, 3-160). The *Catecheses* of the ps.-*Cyril of Jerusalem constitute a short *vita* of Mary. In the Middle Ages, this genre grew in popularity with both the *vitae* in prose and the metrical *vitae*. Also belonging to this group are the accounts of *miracles pertaining to particular churches (Blachernai and Chalkoprateia being two examples in *Constantinople) or stories of miracles (such as the Ethiopic stories: BHO 655-661).

CANT 90-96; S. Mimouni, *Les Vies de la Vierge: état de la question*: Apocrypha 5 (1994) 211-248 (biblio.); It. tr. in *Vite di Maria*: *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, Rome 1989, 2, 185-287 (Maximus); 979-1019 (Symeon Metaphrastes); *Catecheses*: Erbetta 1/2, 604-615.

There exist numerous other apocrypha that contain Marian topics. Passages from some of these texts were read aloud in *liturgical celebrations and in some of the festivals associated with the events that the texts describe. For example, from the *Protevangelium* derive the feasts of the Presentation of Mary, of the Conception of Mary by Anna, and of the Annunciation to Joachim and Anna.

The second group of passages on Mary are the texts of a doctrinal and liturgical type, inserted into other texts or sometimes independent. In the literature prior to the Council of Ephesus, the documents on Mary usually occur as sections of other works; from 431 they appear instead as independent works. The only independent Marian work prior to the Council of Nicaea is the aforementioned *Protevangelium*; in the 4th c. the first Marian homilies appear, the **tractatus* of Jerome titled *On the Perpetual Virginity of Mary*, and a poetic text, the **Psalmus responsorius*. The first evidence of Marian doctrine is found in the *Letters* of *Ignatius of Antioch; in the *Dialogue with Trypho* of *Justin Martyr; in the writings of Melito of Sardis; in the polemical *tractati* of *Tertullian; in the writings of *Irenaeus of Lyons and *Hippolytus; and in the works of *Origen (in the ex-

egetical and homiletical *tractati*, esp. in the *Homilies on the Gospel of Luke*, and in polemical *tractati*). In the 4th c., the Marian theme also appears in the *tractati* on virginity (*Athanasius, *Ambrose); *Jerome writes the aforementioned Marian *tractatus* against *Jovinian; and there is a resurgence of the *Psalmus responsorius*. Another important Marian work is written in the 7th c. by *Ildefonsus of Toledo. Passages concerning Mary are found throughout the works of *Augustine, and they also appear in the works of *John Chrysostom. The Marian theme frequently occurs in the texts connected to the Nestorian controversy (*Cyril of Alexandria, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Nestorius), but esp. in the documents of the synods and of the ecumenical *councils. Of particular importance are the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus in 431 and of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (*Tomus ad Flavianum*). Abundant references to Mary are found in homilies and in *commentaries on the first two chapters of the gospel of *Luke, in the first chapter of the gospel of *Matthew and in some passages of the gospel of *John (wedding feast at Cana, Mary at the foot of the cross, etc.). The Council of Ephesus subsequently develops the Marian homiletical tradition; one particular genre synthesizes homiletics and poetry. The development of the Marian homiletical tradition is concomitant with the growth of Marian *devotion, with the rise of new Marian feasts and with the construction of churches dedicated to the Virgin, decorated with important frescoes and *mosaics. The principal feasts for which homilies are preserved include the Annunciation (Evangelismos; 25 March), the *Nativity of Mary (28 September), the Presentation of Mary in the Temple (Eisodos; 21 November), the Dormition (Koimesis; 15 August), the Conception of Mary by Anna (8 December), and the *Synaxis of the *Theotokos (26 December), together with the liturgy of the *Akathistos*/**Acathistus* (5th Saturday in *Lent). There are also feasts of *dedication for the Marian churches, including two churches in Constantinople: Blachernai (where the vestments of Mary are enshrined) and Chalkoprateia (where the cincture of Mary is preserved). The feasts of the *Nativity of Our Lord and of Hypapante (Feast of the Presentation, 2 February) also had a certain Marian content, and as a result we find Marian elements in the homilies for these feasts. An enormous number of Marian homilies are preserved, and some of them remain to be edited. The most famous Greek authors are *Proclus, *Theodotus of Ancyra, *Atticus, *Hesychius, *Antipater of Bostra, *Modestus, *Sophronius, *Germanus of Constantinople, *Andrew of Crete, *John of Damascus, *John of Euboea and *Photius. There are also a great number of Byzantine writers, including Theodore the Studite and Neophytus the Recluse. There is a group of anonymous homilies, such as those of ps.-*Gregory Thaumaturgus and ps.-*John Chrysostom. In the West we have homilies with strong Marian accents, including those of Augustine, Leo the Great and even *Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna, not to mention High Medieval texts. Some of these homilies have important theological content, but often they also demonstrate significant artistic merit. Alongside these homiletical texts we find Marian texts of a rather speculative and polemical sort, such as those incorporated into the works of *Cyril of Alexandria, as well as the *tractatus* of Ildefonsus, *On the Perpetual Virginity of Mary*.

The birthplace of Marian poetry is *Syria in the 2nd c., with the **Odes of Solomon*; *Ephrem the Syrian wrote many Marian poems, and other Syrian poets such as *Jacob of Sarug (5th c.) followed in his footsteps. Probably in the 3rd c. the oration **Sub Tuum praesidium* arose. The first Marian poem in Latin is the *Psalmus responsorius* of the 4th c.; poetic passages are found in the works of *Juvencus, *Sedulius and others. The great tradition of Marian poetry develops in the *Byzantine empire of the 6th c., with the *kontakia* of *Romanus Melodus and other poets; particularly beautiful is the anonymous hymn *Akathistos*, sung or recited even today in the Eastern rites. The *kanon* emerged in the 8th c.; its leading poets included Andrew of Crete and John of Damascus. In the West, Marian poetry was cultivated by *Venantius Fortunatus and by *Aldhelm; *Bede left behind some Marian *hymns. Marian liturgical texts are found in books both Eastern (collections of *troparia*, *kontakia* and *kanones*) and Western (*sacramentaries and missals). The artistic richness of the Marian literature—esp. the homilies and poetry—flows out of the development of biblical *allegory, in the sense that the OT prefigures the persons and events of the NT. Authors discovered a new artistic landscape, as Mary assumed comparisons with characters (Eve, Rachel, Judith etc.), connections with events and associations with objects (as in the *hortus conclusus* and *porta aperta*). Does not such artistic and literary wealth deserve greater attention?

BHG 3, 1046-1161; BHL 5334-5414; BHO 611-681; BS 8, 814-962.

The most important series of Marian texts is J.J. Bourassé, *Summa aurea de laudibus Beatissimae Virginis Mariae Dei Genitricis sine labe conceptae*, 1-13, Paris 1862–1866; O. Bardenhewer, *Marienpredigten aus der Väterzeit*, Munich 1936; H. Barré, *Prières anciennes de l'Occident à la Mère du Sauveur*, Paris 1963; D. Casagrande, *Enchiridion marianum biblicum patristicum*, Rome 1974 (Gk. texts with Lat. tr., Latin texts, and

indexes); S. Alvarez Campos, *Corpus marianum patristicum*, 1-8, Burgos 1970–1985 (the most complete series of Gk. texts, texts in Eastern languages with Lat. tr., Latin texts, and indexes); var. aus., *Testi mariani del primo millenio*, Rome: 1, 1988, ed. G. Gharib, Gk. texts; 2, 1989, ed. G. Gharib, Greek and early Byzantine texts; 3, 1990, ed. L. Gambero, Lat. texts; 4, 1991, ed. G. Gharib, with Eastern, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic texts; (It. tr., bibl.).

Studies: G. Jouassard, *Marie à travers la Patristique*, in *Maria* 3, Paris 1949, 69-157; M. Gordillo, *Mariologia Orientalis*, Rome 1954; F. Spedaglieri, *Maria nella Scrittura e nella tradizione della Chiesa*, Messina 1962; D. Montagna, *La lode alla Theotokos nei testi greci dei secoli IV-VII*, Rome 1963; R. Caro, *La Homilética mariana griega en el siglo V*, 1-3, Marian Library Studies, 3-5, Dayton, OH 1971–1973; G. Söll, *Storia dei dogmi mariali*, Rome 1981 (It. tr. is preferred over the original); E. Peretto, *Mariologia patristica*, in *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1989, 697-756; Theotokos vol. 1-2 (2001); 1-2 (2002) and ff. *Liturgy*: M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, 2, Milan 1969, 348-395; M. Augé, in *Anamnesis* 6, Genoa and Milan 1989, 229-245. *Bibliography*: G. Bessutti, *Bibliografia Mariana*, Rome 1950–. *Encyclopedias*: *Nuovo dizionario di Mariologia*, ed. S. De Fiores, Rome 1985; M. O'Carroll, *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of Blessed Virgin Mary*, Wilmington [2]1986; *Marienlexikon*, 1-6, ed. R. Bäumer and L. Scheffczyk, St. Ottilien 1988–1994. Many interesting studies concerning Mary in the patristic era are found in the work titled *Maria*, 1-8, ed. H. du Manoir, Paris 1949–1971.

M. Starowieyski

MARY MAGDALENE. In the canonical gospels, we find a trio of female figures: the anonymous sinner (Lk 7:36-50), Mary of Bethany, sister of Lazarus (Lk 10:38-42, among others), and Mary Magdalene (Lk 8:2; Mk 15:47 [and par.]; Jn 20:1-10, among others). In the West, these three women were subsumed into the figure of Mary Magdalene (*Gregory the Great, *Homil. in Evang.* 33,1), while the East continued to distinguish Mary Magdalene from Mary of Bethany. Mary Magdalene was celebrated in the East on the "Sunday of the three Myrrhbearers" (the third Sunday of *Easter), as we find in the homilies of *Gregory of Nyssa. The tomb of Mary Magdalene was in *Ephesus, next to the grotto of the *Seven Sleepers, after 449 but before the 6th c., since *Gregory of Tours mentions it (*De gloria martyrum* 29); the information is confirmed a century later by *Modestus of Jerusalem (*Photius, Cod. 275); in the 9th or 10th c., the *relics of Mary Magdalene were then translated to *Constantinople. In the West, Mary Magdalene was praised or mentioned a good many times by *Augustine, *Leo the Great and *Gregory the Great. The development of the legend and cult of Mary Magdalene belongs to the Western medieval era, but already in the patristic era various texts dedicated to Mary Magdalene arise. In gnostic circles there arise the *Questions of Mary Magdalene*, cited by *Epiphanius (*Haer*. 26,8,1-3), and the *Gospel of Mary* [*Magdalene*], preserved in papyri fragments, both *Coptic (P. Berol 8502) and *Greek (P. John Rylands 463 and P. Oxy 3525). The first work contains a dialogue of Jesus with the disciples; in the second, Mary narrates a *revelation received from the Redeemer, who loved her more than the other women. In the Greek texts of the Pontius Pilate cycle, Mary Magdalene appears as an accuser of *Pilate, writes a letter and then goes to *Rome. After her return to *Jerusalem, she becomes a disciple of Peter. Finally, chased from Jerusalem, she goes to *Marseille (*Gospel of Nicodemus* - vers. B, *Letter of Tiberius to Pilate*, *Anaphora Pilati*, *Life of Mary Magdalene* and the Byzantine historians Michael Glykas, George Kedrenos, Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos and others). In these texts, Mary Magdalene assumes the role once held by *Veronica in the *Latin literature. In Coptic there exists a *homily on Mary Magdalene, translated from the Greek and attributed to *Cyril of Jerusalem, a rather peculiar pairing of the legend of Mary Magdalene with the text of the **Cave of Treasures*.

CANT 30; 32; 72-73; BHG 1161x-1162c; BHL 5439-5513; CPG 1223. A Greek *Vita*: F. Halkin: ABol 105 (1987) 5-23; LCIK 7, 516-541; BS 8, 1078-1107; V. Saxer, *Les saintes Marie Madeleine et Marie de Béthanie dans la tradition liturgique et homilétique orientale*: RSR 32 (1958) 1-37; Id., *Le culte de Marie Madelaine en Occident, dès origines à la fin du Moyen-Âge*, Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire 3, Auxerre and Paris 1959; M. Geerard, *Marie-Madeleine, dénonciatrice de Pilate*: SE 31 (1989–1990) 139-153. Gospel of Mary Magdalen: A. Pasquier, Québec 1983; A. Recio Veganzones, *María Magdalena, protagonista de la escena "Mulieres ad sepulcrum Domini," en la iconografía sepulcral de Occidente (siglos IV-V)*, in *Memoriam Sanctorum venerantes*, Misc. Victor Saxer, Vatican City 1992, 667-688; J.Y. Leloup, *Il Vangelo di Maria*, Gorle 2000; *Which Mary? The Marys in Early Christian Tradition*, ed. F. Stanley Jones, Atlanta 2002; K.L. King, *The Gospel of Mary of Magdala: Jesus and the First Woman Apostle*, Polebridge 2003; E.A. de Boer, *The Gospel of Mary: Beyond a Gnostic and a Biblical Mary Magdalene*, Edinburgh 2004; D. Good, *Mariam, the Magdalen, and the Mother*, Bloomington, IN 2005.

M. Starowieyski

MARY of Egypt. The core of her legend, probably merely fictional, is the oral account of the 6th c., circulated among *Palestinian monks, of a woman who was leading a solitary life at *Jerusalem. Taking refuge in the desert of the river Jordan, she lived to *expiate her sins. One day it happened that she was discovered by a traveling *anchorite, who reported her life story (*John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow* 179; *Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Cyr.* 18). ps.-*Sophronius wrote out an independent version (CPG 7675) on the model of the *Vita* of St. Paul the Hermit, written by *Jerome, in which the *saint becomes an

*Egyptian prostitute who makes a *pilgrimage to Jerusalem. She tries to enter into the atrium of the Rock of Calvary at the church of the Resurrection, during the exaltation of the *cross. She has a *conversion experience in the presence of an *image of the Mother of God. This very late *Vita* became decisive for Byzantine and *Latin *hagiography. The cult quickly arrived at *Rome (acc. to the AASS Apr. 1, 72 under Pope *Hormisdas). In Europe, a great number of churches were dedicated to the saint. Her feast is 1 April in the Byzantine Synaxaria, in the Typicon of St. Sava, and in the *Syriac *calendars; it is 2 April in the Western *martyrologies.

BHG 1041-1044; BHO 683-687; BHL 5415-5421; BS 8, 981-994; LCI 7, 507-511; BBKL 16, 985-986; K. Kunze, *Studien zur Legende der heiligen Maria Aegyptiaca im deutschen Sprachgebiet*, Berlin 1969; Id., *Die Legende der heiligen Maria Aegyptiaca*, Berlin 1978; E. Poppe and B. Ross, *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular Hagiography*, Dublin 1996.

V. Saxer and S. Heid

MARYS (the three). There were four women present at the foot of the cross: (1) *Mary, mother of Jesus (Jn 19:25); (2) *Mary Magdalene (Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40; Jn 19:25) (= Mary of Bethany?); (3) Mary, mother of *James (the younger/less) and of Joseph/Joses (Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40) and possibly the wife of Clopas (Jn 19:25); (4) Salome (Mk 15:40), mother of the sons of Zebedee (Mt 27:56)—namely, the apostles *James and *John—and perhaps a sister of Jesus' mother (Jn 19:25). Ado of Vienne inserted Salome in his *Parvum Martyrologium Romanum*, following Mark, on 22 October. As the pious "Myrrhbearers," Mary Magdalene, Salome and Mary (mother) of James, appear in the *Synax. Eccl. CP* following the *apostles and disciples of the Lord on 30 June. The reference to Mary of Clopas, presented in the *Mart. rom.* on 9 April, is of unknown origin, while the reference of 25 May to *Maria Iacobi* (Mary of James) is connected to the *relics claimed by both the city of Veroli and the commune of Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer in the Camargue (BHL 5429, 5434). The combined cult of the trio consisting of Mary Clopas, Salome and Mary Magdalene developed in the 13th c., through the legend in which the three once journeyed with Martha and Lazarus to Provence. A legend of the 11th c. developed the theme of the three Marys, daughters of Anna, but born of three different husbands: *Trinubium Annae* or *De tribus Mariis et tribus maritis* (BHL 505, 5431).

BS 8, 972-977; 11, 583-586; LCI 7, 545; ed. F.S. Jones, *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition*, Atlanta 2002.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

MASONA (Massona, Mausona) of Mérida. *Metropolitan bishop of *Mérida from 570 to 606. A descendant of a noble family of *Goths. His apostolic work provoked the *Arian king of the *Visigoths, *Leovigild, who designated Sunna as the Arian bishop of Mérida, a highly educated man and a hardline Arian.

Finding an incentive in both the Catholic conversion and the rebellion of *Hermenegild, Masona took a very tactful stance in the face of these events. He did so only from a religious perspective; from a political perspective he did not give any support to Hermenegild. In fact, Mérida was subject to the rule of the rebellious prince. King Leovigild was intent on securing the collaboration of Masona, but he did not succeed. As a result, he first provoked a public theological debate between Sunna and Masona, and then exiled Masona for three years. Only after 584 did Masona return to his episcopal office. He participated in the Third Council of Toledo (589) and in the Provincial Synod of Toledo held in 597. Although we do not know the date of his death, it is often placed after 605, on the basis of the date of a letter that *Isidore of Seville addressed to him; the letter is probably authentic, although this is still a matter of debate.

In addition to participating in anti-Arian polemic, he established numerous churches in Mérida, and above all a **xenodochium*, a combination of a hospital and a hostel for foreigners. He also created a monetary fund for loans to needy members of his church. His *virtues and his industriousness received special attention from a cleric of Mérida who wrote the *Lives of the Fathers of the Church of Mérida* sometime around 650. Masona did not leave behind any writings.

F. Görres, *Mausona Bischof von Mérida*: Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 28 (1885) 326-332; J. López Prudencio, *San Masona Arzobispo de Mérida, colaborador en el cimiento de la Hispanidad*, Badajoz 1945; J.N. Garvin, *The Vitae Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium*, Washington 1946, 426-429, 445-449; R. Collins, *Mérida and Toledo: 550–585*, in *Visigothic Spain*, Oxford 1980, 189-219.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

MASS

I. The term *Mass* - II. The first four c. - III. From the 5th to the 8th c. - IV. Deviant forms of celebration.

I. The term *Mass*. The word *Mass* (*missa*) derived from *missio* ("dismissal"), which in *Roman times indicated the conclusion of a meeting or the dismissal of some group (*Avitus of Vienne, *Ep.* 1: PL 59, 199).

Western Christians adopted the same terminology for the solemn formal dismissal of the *catechumens (e.g., of the penitent) and only later and secondarily for the dismissal of the *faithful at the conclusion of the *eucharistic *assembly. Around the 5th c. the word began to be applied not only to the action of the dismissal but also to the entire eucharistic celebration. Probably the first use of *missa* in this latter sense is that of *Ambrose (*Ep.* 20: PL 16, 995). With the disappearance of the catechumenate at the end of the 5th c., there remained only one dismissal in the eucharistic *liturgy, that of the faithful at the end of the celebration. The word thus began to be almost exclusively related to the entire action of which the dismissal was the final act; however, references to *missa* in the sense of dismissal are found also until the 7th c.

II. The first four c. *1. From the *apostolic age until the *Apostolic Tradition. The first Christian communities spoke of the eucharistic celebration with the expression "breaking of the *bread" (1 Cor 10:6; Acts 2:42; 20:7; *Didache*, 14,1; Ign., *Ad Eph.* 20,2), a term derived from the Jewish *tradition of breaking the bread as an introductory act to the meal. One must inevitably conclude that the eucharistic framework was that of the Jewish evening meal ritually modeled on the Passover meal. Most probably the eucharistic action was that of bread-meal-*chalice. The combination of a liturgy of the Word with the breaking of bread appeared rather early (Acts 20:7), but it did not seem to remain prominent until the separation of the eucharistic action from the true and actual meal, at the end of the 1st c. The ritualized action that resulted reduced the scheme of the seven actions of the Last Supper to one ritual of four actions: (1) preparation of the bread and *wine; (2) *prayer of thanksgiving; (3) breaking of the bread; (4) *Communion. The meal in common gradually assumed another meaning (for the poor, *see* *agape), but it was not known as "agape" until the 2nd c. Already at the end of the 1st c., the term *Eucharist* began to refer to the breaking of the bread (Ign., *Smyrn.* 7.1; 8.1; *Eph* 13,1; *Phil* 4,1), and this action was transferred to *Sunday morning. That led to another concealed weakness of the presentation of the meal and, thus, to the emphasis on the prayers of thanksgiving. The description of the Eucharist in the **Didache* challenges every attempt at clarification. What can be affirmed with certainty is that it concerns a Sunday celebration with breaking of the bread and rendering thanks, preceded by confession, and in which the bishops (presidents) and deacons/minister (*see* *diakonia – diaconate) assumed important roles. The first concrete description of the eucharistic liturgy is that of *Justin, ca. 150 (*1 Apol.* 65-67) in *Rome: readings of apostles or of *prophets; *homily; (dismissal of the catechumens); prayer of *intercession; *kiss of peace; preparation of the elements (bread, wine, water); improvised prayer of thanksgiving; Amen; Communion (two types); collection on the part of the most affluent. The *tradition that he who had the ministry of the presidency recited the prayer of thanksgiving in the name of all is already affirmed and the emphasis is more on the thanksgiving than on the *sacrifice. The liturgical language was *Greek. The Eucharist described by the *Apostolic Tradition*, attributed to *Hippolytus, comprised the greeting of peace, preparation of the bread and wine, eucharistic prayer (suggested text), breaking of the bread, distribution. His *baptismal Eucharist comprised two more supplementary chalices, one of *milk and honey and the other of water, linked to the original convivial structure. Without doubt, the Eucharist of Hippolytus also included readings, a homily and the return of the catechumens.

2. From the 3rd to the 5th c. Three considerations facilitate the comprehension of this period: (1) in the 3rd and 4th c. there was not a uniform liturgical action, but rather a fixed frame that included Scripture readings, the singing of *psalms (Aug., *Confess.* IX, 14), return of the catechumens, prayer of the faithful, eucharistic prayers with the *Amen* as the final response, breaking of bread and Communion. (2) The texts of the 3rd and 4th c. are also flexible and open to adaptation and creativity. (3) In the 3rd c. the distinction between the various liturgical centers was not yet clearly defined. The **Didascalia Apostolorum* (starting in the 3rd c.) briefly describes the eucharistic liturgy of a community in *Syria in the N; there were biblical readings, singing (or reciting?) of psalms and offering of the Eucharist, and if a bishop was present as a visitor, the presiding bishop invited him not only to preach but also to take part in the consecration of the elements (*Didasc.* II, 58; Funk I, 168). The Eucharist of *Tertullian at *Carthage, celebrated to all appearances every day and early in the morning, can be generally pieced together: readings (above all scriptural), sung psalms (?) in responsorial form, homily, dismissal of the catechumens, prayer with raised hands, concluded with the *Lord's Prayer, kiss of peace, presentation of the bread and wine on the behalf of the faithful, prayer of thanksgiving over the elements, Communion (two types) obligatory for all and with the response "Amen." Whoever did not participate in Communion could not be present. Milk and honey were included between the gifts for the Mass of initiation. From the testimony of *Cyprian, bishop in 249–258 (*Ep.* 63,16;

De or. Dom. 18), it is evident that, between small groups, everyday Eucharist in Carthage was still united to an evening meal, even though Cyprian expresses his disapprobation for the hour of the celebration and establishes that the time for the Eucharist must be the morning. It seems very probable that the liturgical language in North *Africa must have been *Latin since the times of Tertullian, which would have largely anticipated the introduction to Latin in Rome.

The 4th c., starting from the *Edict of Milan (313), bore witness to an unprecedented spread of Christianity, a development that encouraged the evolution of fixed forms typical of the subsequent centuries. Buildings constructed expressly for worship permitted the large-scale organization of the liturgy (basilica worship), allowing it to be informed by the surrounding culture. The distinction between various liturgical centers had become *de rigueur* by now, with *Alexandria and *Antioch dominating the East. The most authoritative texts of the 4th c. are the *Euchologion* of *Serapion of Thmuis (Alexandrian, liturgy of St. Mark; Funk II, 159-179) and the **Apostolic Constitutions* (Antiochene, liturgy of St. James; Funk I). The *Euchologion* of Serapion indicates the normal scheme of readings, homily, prayers of intercession, eucharistic prayer, breaking of the bread, Communion and prayer after Communion. The prayer before the readings, the one after the homily, the wide development of prayers of intercession, the invocation of the Word in the place of the habitual *epiclesis and the reading of the diptychs after the story of the institution are notable, however. Even though book VIII of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (late 4th c.) is based on the *Apostolica Traditions*, the liturgy of the Mass is profoundly different from the alleged one of Hippolytus. The liturgy of the Word includes four biblical readings and the homily, the dismissal of different groups (catechumens, penitents etc.), each one after a prayer and the benediction of the bishop, and concludes with a bipartite prayer of the faithful (litany of the deacon and prayer of the bishop), accompanied by the kiss of peace. The liturgy of the Eucharist begins with the ablution of the hands and the preparation of the gifts and continues with a complex *anaphora (with *Sanctus*); rather than the *Pater noster* another diaconal litany precedes the prayer of the bishop in preparation for Communion; the announcement of the Communion is greeted in response with a hymn from the assembly, and during the Communion they sing Ps 33; the prayer of thanksgiving and the final benediction follow Communion.

Even though the *Jerusalem rite is fundamentally the Antiochene one, the development of the city as a liturgical center reflects its character as the destination of pilgrimage. However, when *Byzantium (*Constantinople) became the Eastern imperial capital after 330, the liturgical center of the East moved gradually to this city. Here the basic Antiochene rite was elaborated under the influence of the ceremonial of the imperial court and of the Christian reaction against *Arianism, with its emphasis on the divinity of *Christ and a growing sense of *sin. From here grew the gradual separation of the liturgical action from the assembly and the development of the iconostasis. The eucharistic celebration is particularly characterized by a highly elaborate rite of preparation (*proskomidē*), by two processional entrances ("little," before the readings, and "great," to carry the gifts from the prothesis to the altar) and by the use of the anaphoras of *Chrysostom and *Basil. From the 4th c. on, the liturgy of Constantinople gradually became one of the preeminent rites of the Eastern church.

The Mass of N Africa at the end of the 4th c. (*Augustine; see Van der Meer, 388-402) coincides for the most part with the Roman one, with a few traits that distinguish it in respect to that of *Tertullian: the bread of *exorcism is given to the catechumens before the dismissal; the diptychs are read before the eucharistic prayer; the "Our Father," the kiss of peace and the benediction of the people follow the breaking of the bread; during the communion Ps 33 is sung (DACL, 633-635). The canons of the synods of *Hippo (393) and of Carthage (397) indicate that the liturgical texts were not yet fixed at this time (Mansi III, 884, 895, 922). The 4th c. also bore witness to the definitive adoption of Latin as the liturgical language in Rome, a process concluded around 380 when the Roman *Canon was said in Latin rather than in Greek (*see also* *Ambrosian Liturgy; *anaphora; *Eucharist; *anamnesis; *Gallican liturgy; *Hispanic liturgy; *Addai; *Egypt [liturgy]; *Armenian rite; *Basil, Liturgy of; *Basil of Caesarea [liturgy]; *Celtic liturgy; *Ethiopia [liturgy]; *liturgical year; *liturgy).

III. From the 5th to the 8th c. From the end of the 4th c. to the start of the 5th, the Roman Mass began with the greeting of the minister and the initial collect or prayer. Before the *gospel there were two readings (OT, NT) with the singing of the gradual psalm inserted, which was followed by the Alleluia. Following the gospel were the homily and the prayer after the readings. The dismissal of the catechumens was followed by the prayer of the faithful and the kiss of peace. During the offertory the faithful bore

the gifts to the altar while the offertory psalm was sung. Then came the prayer over the offerings, the preface and the canon, the breaking of the bread, the *Pater noster* and the *commixtio* of the consecrated bread and wine. During the distribution of the Communion a psalm was sung. The prayer after Communion was followed by the benediction (prayer *super populum*) and by the dismissal (*Ite missa est*). In the next 200 years a few changes were introduced into this scheme that gave the final structure to the eucharistic celebration of the Roman Church for subsequent centuries. With the decline of the catechumenate (4th–5th c.), the dismissal of the catechumens fell gradually into disuse, and the prayer of the faithful was suppressed (probably starting with *Gelasius I, 492–496) and replaced with a liturgy of petition of Eastern origin with the acclamation-response *kyrie eleison*, inserted at the beginning of the rite of the Mass. From the time of *Gregory the Great (590–604), the litany disappeared, with the exception of Sundays and feast days, and only the acclamation *kyrie eleison* remained. The removal of the prayer of the faithful must have been without doubt the occasion in which the kiss of peace came to be placed before Communion. The responsibility for the relocation of the Lord's Prayer immediately after the canon must certainly belong to Gregory the Great. The canon itself must have received its definitive form at this time. Certainly the *Gloria* existed in Latin in Rome before the 6th c., but it could only be intoned by the bishop. The singing of the **Agnus Dei* in accompaniment to the rite of the breaking of the bread was introduced at the end of the 7th c. by *Sergius I (687–701). The description that the *Primus Ordo Romanus* gives of one stational Mass of the pope at the end of the 7th c. indicates the slow liturgical decline that had begun (Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani*, II, 67-108). The preparatory prayers of the bishop (previously private and silent) were introduced into the Mass as specifically spoken aloud; what had been originally songs of the assembly were performed now by a *schola cantorum* and the clergy; it seems that there was no homily; the prayer of the faithful was removed, there was no clear distinction between liturgy of the word and eucharistic liturgy; the offertory procession had given place to a collect on the part of the clergy; Communion of the faithful was not considered an integral part of the celebration for a long time, and those who didn't commune left early; in other words, the clarity of the old Eucharist had become obscured by a sumptuous ritual derived from the imperial court. The dissolution of the liturgical assembly had had its beginning, and that, together with the clericalization of the ministry, reduced the eucharistic liturgy to a rite performed by clergy on behalf of passive spectators.

IV. Deviant forms of celebration (see DTC 10, 947-955). In the past there were attempts at eucharistic celebration that did not follow the essential scheme in use in the churches. We mention a few of them: the *Ebionites, holding that Jesus was only human, celebrated the *mysteries with unleavened wafers and water only once a year (Iren., *Adv. haer.* V, 1,3: PG 7, 1123: Epiph., *Panarion*: PH 41, 432). The *docetists refrained from the Eucharist, because they did not accept Christ as incarnate (Ign., *Ad Smyr*. 7,1). *Mark the Gnostic, to demonstrate that he possessed the *aeon Charis, would consecrate the wine, turning it purple and increasing its volume with "medicines" (Iren., *Adv. haer.s* 1,7; Hippol., *Ref. omn. haer.*: GCS 26 [1916] 170-172; Epiph., *Pan.*: PG 41, 583-586; *Anacephalaiosis*: PG 42, 853). The *Ophites venerated the serpent as the figure of Christ and used it to consecrate the bread (ps.-Tertull., *Adv. omnes haereses:* CSEL 47, 216, 13; Epiph., *Pan.:* PG 41, 647; ps.-Jer., *Ind. haer.*: PL 81, 637; Aug., *De haer.*: PL 42, 28; *Praedest.*: PL 53, 592).

The *Encratites imitated the mysteries of the *Catholics, celebrating them with water because they abstained from wine (Epiph., *Pan.*: PG 41, 854). Perhaps they are connected with the *Severians, a sect that prohibited the use of wine, inasmuch as it was a seed of the devil and of woman (Epiph., *Pan.*: PG 41, 834; *Anacephalaiosis*: PG 42, 683; Aug., *De haer.*: PL 42, 30). The *Marcionites also used only water (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 18, 4f.). The practice of using only water spread in ancient times and was combated also by Cyprian (*Ep.* 63) (*see* *Aquarians). The *Cataphrygians, a generic name that indicated seven different *Montanists, with designations depending on their characteristics, celebrated *Easter by combining the bread to be consecrated with the blood of a one-year-old male child (see Epiph., *Pan.*: PG 41, 878: Quintillian; *Anacephalaiosis*: PG 42, 863; Filaster, *Div. haer.*: PL 12, 1166; ps.-Jer., *Ind. haer*: PL 81, 641; Aug. *De haer*.: PL 42, 30; Montanists, PL 42, 31: Pepuziani-Quintilliani; *Praedestinatus*: PL 53, 596). The *Artotyritae also belonged to the Montanist category, and they offered in oblation bread and cheese, the gifts of the first men (Epiph., *Pan.*: PG 81, 641: Quintilliani; Filaster, *Div. haer.*: PL 12, 1186; ps.-Jer., *Ind. haer.:* PL 81, 641; Aug., *De haer.*: PL 42, 31: Pepuziani; *Praedestinatus*: PL 53, 597). The elect of the *Manicheans took as Eucharist bread sprinkled with human semen to liberate the divine essence contained in it (Aug., *De haer.*: PL 42, 36; *Praedestinatus*: PL 53, 602). Finally, the Aquarians offered in the

chalice only water, differing from every other church. Perhaps the name doesn't indicate anything more than the Ebionites or the Encratites (Filaster, *Div. haer.*: PL 12, 1188; Aug., *De haer.*: PL 42, 42; *Praedestinatus*: PL 53, 609).

Primary sources: F.X. Funk, ed., *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum,* Paderborn 1935, 2 vols. (Le *Constitutiones* SC 320, 329, 336); M. Andrieu, *Les "Ordines Romani" du haut moyen âge,* Louvain 1931–1961, 5 vols.; B. Botte (ed.), *La Tradition Apostolique,* Paris 1946, [2]1968 (SC 11, 11bis); new ed., *La Tradition Apostolique de saint Hippolyte, essai de reconstitution,* Münster 1963 (LQF 39); E. Peretto, *Pseudo-Ippolito, La tradizione Apostolica,* Rome 1996; J.P. Audet, *La Didachè, Instructions des Apôtres,* Paris 1958; G. Visonà, *La Didache,* Milan 2000; Ambrose of Milan, *Des sacrements, Des mystères. Explication du symbole,* ed. B. Botte, Paris 1961 (SC 25 bis); L. Deiss, *Springtime of the Liturgy: Liturgical Texts of the First Four Centuries,* Collegeville, MN 1979 (Also pub. as *Early Sources of the Liturgy,* 1967); E. Lodi, *Enchiridion euchologicum fontium liturgicorum,* Rome 1979.

Basic References: H. Leclercq, *Messe:* DACL 11,1 (1933) 513-774; var. aus., *Messa:* EC 8 (1952) 757-830; CE 9,419-426; LTK[3] 7,162 (s.v. *missa).*

Secondary Sources: F.E. Brightmann, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I (the sole edited volume), *Eastern Liturgies,* Oxford 1896; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London 1945, [2]1952, [3]2005; A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée*, rev. B. Botte, Chevetogne [2]1953; J. Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great*, London 1960; H. Schmidt, *Introductio in Liturgiam Occidentalem*, Rome 1960; F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop*, London 1961; J. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia*, Vienna [5]1962; C. Mohrmann, *Missa: Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, III, Rome 1965, 351-376; A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique et vie sociale*, Paris 1968; N.M. Denis-Boulet, *La messa*, in A.G. Martimort (ed.), *La Chiesa in preghiera* (It. tr.), Rome [2]1966, 279-483; M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, III, Milan [2]1966; J. Jungmann, *The Mass,* Collegeville, MN 1976; W. Rordorf et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, New York 1978; H. Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper, A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, tr. (from the German) with appendices by D.H.G. Reeve, Leiden 1979; var. aus., *Anamnesis 3/2: La liturgia eucaristica*, Casale Monf. 1983; D. Callam, *The Frequency of Mass in the Latin Church ca. 400:* ThS 45 (1984) 613-650; B. de Margerie, *Eucharistie et communauté dans le contexte de la Règle de saint Augustin*: Augustiniana 41 (1991) 507-530; M. Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft, Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristliche Mahlfeiern*, Tübingen 1996; *Scientia liturgica*, III, *L'eucaristia*, Casale Monf. 1998; A. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists, Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford 1999; P. Carlotti - M. Maritano (eds.), *L'Eucaristia nel vissuto dei giovani*, Rome 2002, 217-261: *L'eucaristia nella vita dei cristiani dei primi secoli*; P: Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, London [2]2002, 118-143; V. Raffa, *Liturgia eucaristica*, Rome [2]2003; E. Mazza, *La celebrazione eucaristica*, Bologna 2003.

P. Fahey

MASSA. A rather common term in the writings of *Augustine (O. Rottmanner, *Der Augustinismus*, 2) and is followed by a word such as *luti* ("of filth"), *peccati* ("of sin"), *irae* ("of wrath"), *mortis* ("of death"), *damnata* ("damned") etc. to indicate the human race corrupted by sin. There has been much discussion on the origin of this expression; indeed, it is thought that there is a contamination with the *Manichean word *bôlos* (a great ball encapsulating the damned and the demons, which is also called *massa* in the *Acta Archelai*). But an analysis of the *Contra Felicem*, in which Augustine reuses the Manichean term and utilizes the word *massa* without suggesting any identity in meaning between the two would seem to exclude such a hypothesis (R. Jolivet and M. Jourjon, BA 17, 788-789). Furthermore, Pincherle draws attention to the essential difference between the use of the term by the Manichees and by Augustine: among the former it is eschatological in meaning; in Augustine it is soteriological. A dependency on *Ambrosiaster by Augustine (*Comm. Rom.* 5,12) has been variously and copiously evaluated (Buonaiuti, Casamassa, Leeming, Pincherle). The term comes from Scripture, from Rom 9:21 to be precise. In this verse, in most cases, Augustine refers in those contexts in which the expression is present; and in *Ep.*186, 6, 19 he makes clear that in many codices *massa* is a translation of the word φύραμα in Rom 9:21, at other times translated by *consparsio* or *conspersio*. But Augustine was also familiar with a positive sense the term had: in fact, it appears at least 25 times (M.G. Mara) followed variously by *purgata* ("purged"), *candida* ("white"), *beata* ("blessed") or *sanctorum* ("of the saints").

An analysis of the works in which one or other (negative or positive) interpretation of the term occurs leads to the following observation: in the negative sense, Augustine indicates humanity lost in *Adam and living on the sixth day (and in this case these works are situated thematically within the sphere of grace and free choice); in the positive sense the discussion concerns humanity redeemed in Christ and destined with him for rest on the seventh day (in this case, it is the *Donatist polemic that is the point of reference in these works). Moreover, Augustine many times mentions the martyrs as a *massa candida* (*Serm.* 306; 311, 10; *Enarr. in Ps.* 49, 9; 144, 17), so called because of their number and their glory. According to *Prudentius (*Periseph.* 13, 76) their name would indicate the manner of their martyrdom: being the martyrs of Utica, they would have been covered with lime during the persecution of *Valerian. But it is not out of the question that *massa candida* is the name of a place near Utica where the martyrdom took place.

O. Rottmanner, *Der Augustinismus*, Münich 1892; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *I martiri della Massa Candida*, ST 9, Vatican City

1902; E. Buonaiuti, *Manichaeism and Augustine's Idea of "Massa perditionis"*: HThR 20 (1927) 117-127; A. Casamassa, *Il pensiero di sant'Agostino nel 396–397, i "Tractatores divinorum eloquiorum" di Retract. I, 23, 1 e l'Ambrosiastro*, Rome 1919; B. Leeming, *Augustine, Ambrosiaster and the massa perditionis*: Gregorianum 11 (1930) 58-91; A. Pincherle, *La formazione teologica di Sant'Agostino*, Rome 1947, 188ff.; M.G. Mara, *Agostino di Ippona: massa peccatorum, massa sanctorum*: SSR 4 (1980) 77-87; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, Rome 1982, 176ff., 477-478, 672-673, 700-702; G. Folliet, *"Massa damnata"—"Massa sanctorum" chez Saint Augustine*: Revista Augustiniana 33 (1992) 95-109; BA 71 (1993) 865-866.

M.G. Mara

MATHEMATICI. In the world of *Late Antiquity, this term referred to the interpreters of the science (*mathēsis*) of *astrology, who were capable of formulating "remedies" for the use of those seeking consultation, together with personal horoscopes and behavioral guidelines for attracting positive astral influences and avoiding negative influences.

Experts in the divinatory and *oracular arts enjoyed great popularity throughout the empire and often suffered persecution by the public authorities for possessing occult and *evil powers. In their antiastrological and antioracular rhetoric, the church fathers were prone to give highly negative judgments against the practices of the mathematici. Remarkably, *Augustine of Hippo acquired broad familiarity with astrology and practiced the related art of divination during the long stage of his *Manichean militancy. Yet in actually observing that the astrological predictions were wrong, he discovered one of his reasons for making a definitive break from Manicheism. Once he became a bishop, he employed doctrinal arguments and pastoral action to contest the astrological beliefs and associated practices that were quite common even among Christians.

F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among Greeks and Romans*, New York and London 1912; G. Bezza, *Arcana mundi. Antologia del pensiero astrologico antico*, Milan 1995; var. aus., *Les Astres.* Actes du Colloque International de Montpellier 23-25 mars 1995, I-II, Montpellier 1996; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Fra astrologi, teurgi e Manichei: itinerario agostiniano in un mondo che si interroga su destino, male e salvezza*, in L. Alici - R. Piccolomini - A. Pieretti (ed.), *Il mistero del male e la libertà possibile (IV): ripensare Agostino*, Atti dell'VIII Seminario del Centro Studi agostiniani di Perugia, SEA 59, Rome 1997, 49-131, repr. with changes in Id., *Agostino. Tra etica e religione*, Brescia 1999, 75-142.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

MATRISTICS. This term is introduced in order to correlate the Greco-Roman enculturation of ancient church fathers (mainly 3rd-5th c.) with the N European enculturation of medieval church mothers (mainly 12th-15th c.), both considered to be leading agents in the formation of Christian theology (Børresen - Vogt 1993, 153-339; Børresen 2000; eds. Børresen - Cabibbo - Specht, 2001, 203-218; Børresen 2002, 142-272). Following the 20th-c. collapse of androcentrism in Western civilization, the female half of humanity is increasingly focused in biosocioeconomic and cultural sciences. Among the humanities, studies of religion are at the scholarly forefront by applying male or female "genderedness" as a main analytical category (Bynum 1991; ed. King 1995; eds. King - Beattie 2004). This innovative approach highlights the connected interaction between psychophysical sex and sociocultural gender, which is equally fundamental for women and men. Consequently, the initial accent on women's studies has shifted to inclusive gender studies. Applied to the Christian tradition, human discourse on God and humanity is understood in terms of verbalized male or female experience. In a context of doctrinal history, where most church fathers were bishops exercising apostolic authority, the term *matristics* is an oxymoron. Since women are excluded from priesthood and episcopacy on the basis of their gender, women's God-language did not function as authoritative theology, but was relegated to edifying spirituality. Despite their invocation of charismatic empowerment, female prophets and mystics were not institutionally authorized church mothers (eds. Minnis - Voaden 2010).

In this context, the medieval debate on women's *impedimentum sexus* is essential and well researched. Despite women's sexless *imago Dei*, their bodily subordination in this world makes the female sex a God-given impediment to ordination. Since a practicing priest needs a sexed body, only human males are deemed capable of representing the excellence of Christ and therefore bear the requisite sacramental symbolism (Minnis 1997; Raming 2001, 2004; Martin 2002). In consequence, the recent emulation of patristic and matristic theology results from the epistemological revolution of feminism, where men are deposed from their traditional status as exemplary human beings (Børresen 1995; ed. Børresen 2004).

Since 1970 research on women in the Christian tradition has proliferated. In 1993 my extensive review of 553 selected studies of the period from Antiquity to the 15th c. covers the fields of theological anthropology, sexology, canon law, history, hagiography and women writers (Børresen - Vogt 1993, 11-127). A comprehensive list of female authors from the same period, termed matrology, with text edi-

tions and selected translations published since 1800, is presented by Kadel (1995). An exhaustive survey and analysis of practically all extant sources concerning women in early Christianity, with a complete bibl., is provided by Jensen (2003), accompanied by a collection of texts (2002). Equally important is Trevett's thorough study of women in 1st- to 2nd-c. Christian texts (2006). Women's factual influence in mainstream Christianity and diverse fringe movements is now explored in a wide range of studies on Christian Antiquity.

Female liberation from subordinate sex roles by means of virginal defeminization is a central theme (Giannarelli 1980; E.A. Clark 1986, 1999; Petersen-Szemerédy 1993; Elm 1994; Feichtinger 1995; Cooper 1996; ed. Levine 2008). Women's redemptive identification with Christ through ascetic "becoming male" is an important factor (Mazzucco 1989; Aspegren 1990; Vogt 1993, 217-242; Cloke 1995). A comparison with pre-Christian chastity as practiced by the *virgines Vestae* is pertinent (Stahlmann 1997). Antagonism between love of God and sexual activity is documented to be equally fundamental in Christian and in so-called *gnostic sources (Sfameni Gasparro 1984). A similar topic of alienated femaleness is found in ancient Greek protology (Songe-Møller 2002). This fateful impact of *enkrateia* on Christian sexology is analyzed by Rousselle (1983, 1988), also with an accent on medical theories (1998). Brooten's diligent study on female homoeroticism also provides ample documentation of general attitudes to sexuality in early Christianity (1996).

Concerning hagiographical models for women, the shift from apostolic *Thecla (Jensen 1995; Davis 2001) to enclosed Macrina is important (Albrecht 1986; Silvas 2008). Texts from Eastern Christianity are studied by Synek (1994) and from the Syrian East by Brock and Harvey (1998). Lives of Roman holy women are presented by Wittern (1994). Apocryphal literature is analyzed from the perspective of sexual continence as a liberatory device (Burrus 1987).

Documentation of women's religious activity in the Greco-Roman world remains indispensable (Kraemer 1992; Clark 1993; eds. Kraemer - D'Angelo 1999; ed. Kraemer 2004; eds. Lefkowitz - Fant 2005). Women's status in Greco-Roman Palestine is analyzed by Ilan (2006) and in the Mishnah by Wegner (1988). When Brooten (1992) interprets the epigraphical evidence for women leaders of synagogues in a functional rather than honorific sense, she makes the necessary distinction between male Jewish attitudes toward female humanity and women's history. Clarifying women's roles in the house churches of earliest Christianity is equally useful (MacDonald - Tullock 2005). The documentation of female ministries in early Christianity is very solid, esp. concerning the ordination of female deacons (Eisen 1996, 2000; Madigan - Osiek 2005). Female priests and bishops are attested in fringe groups (*see* *Montanism). This actualization of eschatological gender equivalence already on earth is carefully studied by Trevett (1996). Like the few extant texts of women from *Late Antiquity, sayings of the prophets Prisca and Maximilla are preserved through the Christian tradition, together with Sayings of four desert mothers (Vogt 1993, 193-216), the diary of the martyr *Perpetua (Dronke 1988; Hefferman 2012) and the biblical paraphrase of the aristocratic matron *Proba (Clark - Hatch 1981; Margoni-Kögler 2001). *Jerome's collaborator, the learned *Marcella, is studied by Letsch-Brunner (1998). Much material has not been considered worthy of transmission and is therefore lost, the 17th-c. discovery of Perpetua's diary in her *Passio* is quite symptomatic.

From the early medieval period onward more female authors were preserved, mainly erudite nuns in N European monasteries (Dronke 1988; eds. Minnis - Voaden 2010; eds. Børresen - Valerio 2011, 2012, 2013). It is important to observe that the term *matristics* only applies to women writers who reshape previous God-language, thereby participating in the continuously enculturated formation of Christian doctrine and symbolism. This creative interplay between patristic innovation and matristic achievement is particularly visible in the gradual attribution of fully human Godlikeness to women (ed. Børresen 1995). The historical process of overcoming Christianity's fundamental incompatibility between divinity and femaleness is acted out through three main stages. In early Christian *anthropology, women were promoted to exemplary manhood by redemptive incorporation into Christ. From the 3rd c. onward "feminist" church fathers, like *Clement of Alexandria and *Augustine, managed to include women as Godlike already from creation. With a combined *Stoic and *Platonic exegesis of Gen 1:26-27b; 1 Cor 11:7; and Gal 3:28, the *imago Dei* was defined as a sexless privilege, and therefore accorded to women despite their non-Godlike femaleness (Børresen 1995; Børresen 2002, 15-89; eds. Børresen - Prinzivalli 2013).

In the Middle Ages, both male and female writers made an important shift in traditional *Christology, from incarnate *vir perfectus* to womanlike *kenōsis* (see Eph 4:13 and Phil 2:7). This imagery of suffering vulnerability was then applied to Christ's human nature, whereas his divinity continued to be andromorphic (Bynum 1982; Newman 1995). In

consequence, women could identify with the redeeming Christ without gender reversal and serve as God's chosen instruments by mystical gifts and prophetic charisma.

Thereby discarding the ancient strategies of "becoming male" in Christ or claiming sexless image quality, medieval church mothers like Hildegard of Bingen (d. 1179) and Julian of Norwich (d. after 1416) sought to provide a model of female Godlikeness at the divine level by metaphorical feminization of the Godhead.

The exceptionally gifted abbess Hildegard represents a culmination of women's monastic culture, which declined when higher learning was transferred from male and female monasteries to medieval universities, where women were excluded. This adversity, strengthened during the Renaissance and enforced by the Catholic Reformation, is already noted in a pioneering study on female monasticism (Power 1922). Proclaimed a female *Doctor Ecclesiae* in 2012, Hildegard's writings are available in critical editions (CCCM 43, 43A, 90, 91, 91A, 91B, 92). Her main theological work, *Scivias*, describes God's *Sapientia* as a preexistent female figure, who continuously shapes and upholds the whole universe. Starting from a previous sapiential tradition (1 Cor 1:23-24), where God's incarnate, suffering Son and God's revealing Wisdom converge, Hildegard is original in describing God's divine *Sapientia* as a model of Godlike female humanity, *feminea forma*. Her *Mariology is consequently rather subdued, although Mary as new Eve is a prime figure of human wholeness, realized by virginity (Gössmann 1995; Flanagan 1998; Newman 1998).

Recent studies on the beguine Mechthild of Magdeburg, who retired to the Benedictine monastery in Helfta (d. ca. 1282), mainly concern her literary creativity, but also clarify her innovative God-language (Heimbach 1989, Vollmann-Profe 2003; Keul 2007). Gertrude of Helfta (d. 1301 or 1302) is qualified as a German church mother because of her holistic trinitarian and Christocentric theology. Her works are available in critical editions (SC 127, 139, 143, 255, 331).

A paradoxical example of deviated matristics is given by the aristocratic widow Birgitta of Sweden (d. 1373). She was canonized by the Roman pope in 1391, and her insistence on God's command to return the papacy from Avignon was invoked against the French rivals. After the papal schism, Birgitta's canonization was canonically confirmed by Martin V in 1419. The critical editions of her *Reuelaciones* and *Opera Minora* are completed (SSFS 1956–2001). Birgitta's complete writings are also published in well-annotated translation (Saerby - Morris 2006, 2008, 2012, 2014). Instead of metaphorically feminizing the divine, like Hildegard and Julian, Birgitta seeks to divinize Mary by making her Christotypic (Morris 1999; Sahlin 2001). Therefore, she constructs an equivalent typology where Christ and Mary collaborate in the redemption of humankind. Birgitta's feminist intention is imitable, but her mariocentric amendment of man-centered Christology by making Mary a *coredemptrix* remains erratic. Nevertheless, Birgitta's original understanding of herself as a chosen instrument of God's continuous revelation, on a par with prophets, apostles and evangelists, can inspire female God-language (Børresen 2002, 171-230; 2004). When Birgitta was proclaimed copatroness of Europe in 1999, this matristic affirmation was obscured by pontifical mariology.

Describing Christ as Mother, the erudite anchoress Julian of Norwich attributes this quality not only to his human nature but also explicitly to his preexistent divine nature as second person of the *Trinity, where "our Mother Christ" is our "Mother God all Wisdom" (Heimmel 1982; Kolletzki 1997). Apparently less read in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, Julian's writings are fortunately preserved. The earliest surviving version of the short text was identified by chance in 1909, but the long text survived in 16th/17th-c. MSS and was already published in 1670. Written in the vernacular, Julian's work demonstrates her thorough knowledge of biblical, patristic and medieval sources both in Latin and in the vernacular. This breadth of learning indicates an advanced monastic training, eventually received as a Benedictine nun before becoming a recluse.

When mortally ill in 1373, Julian received a healing vision of God's all-embracing mercy, acted out through Christ's redeeming death on the cross (Nuth 1991; Baker 1994). Julian described and interpreted this crucial event in her *Showings* (eds. Colledge - Walsh 1978; eds. Watson - Jenkins 2006). It is important to observe that Julian's basic trust in universal salvation is strikingly opposed to Augustine's and later Luther's anguished seeking for a merciful God. In order to verbalize her experience of God's re-creating love: "that all things shall be well" (short text XV), Julian elaborates her original concept of divine Motherhood (Long Text 48, 52, 54, 57-63, 83). Placing Christ's metaphorical Motherhood in his unified divine humanity, Julian overcomes the gender hierarchy of traditional typology, which structures Catholic and Orthodox Christology, ecclesiology and Mariology. Here, God-given gender hierarchy is transposed from creation to redemption, so that Christ is the divinized new Adam, and

the church or Mary is his subordinate new Eve. Perspicaciously understanding the necessary interaction between gynecomorphic God-language and female Godlikeness, Julian describes trinitarian interaction in terms of human wholeness. In this manner, her use of both male and female metaphors to describe God anticipates the third stage of an inclusive *imago Dei*, where both women and men are defined as fully Godlike, as male or female human beings (ed. Børresen 1995, Børresen 2002, 231-246). Since the 20th c., this matristic pioneer of feminist theology is therefore valued as an exemplary church mother, both in intention and in doctrinal content.

It is important to observe that the holistic concept of human Godlikeness is a radically new enculturation of Western theological anthropology. Introduced by 19th-c. feminists as an argument for women's civil rights (Aasta Hansteen in 1878, Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1895), inclusive *imago Dei* was soon endorsed by early 20th-c. Protestant theologians, less from feminist motives than by rejecting the church fathers' Platonized anthropology. Apparently accepted in Catholic doctrine after the Vatican II, the patristic definition of asexual Godlikeness is still upheld in Orthodox theology. The resulting incoherence between an updated conception of the *imago Dei* and previous androcentric typology has recently been focused on by Catholic feminist theologians, and invoked to support women functioning as worship leaders (ed. Gross 1996; Demel 2004). In fact, when the medieval *impedimentum sexus* is preserved by the *Codex Iuris Canonici* (1983, canon 1024), it follows that Godlike women are deemed unable to function as Christlike priests (Børresen 2002, 275-308).

In historical perspective, it is essential to observe that the rising number of gender studies in theology display impressive female dismantling of male-constructed barriers. The obstacles raised by Christian anthropology, sexology and canon law were surmounted by many women, as seen in their history, writings and hagiographical accounts (eds. Minnis - Voaden 2010; The Bible and Women 2009–). The contradictory norms of men's creational priority and women's salvational equivalence were accepted as established by divine law (Børresen 1995; ed. Børresen 2004). It is remarkable that this androcentric gender hierarchy was apparently endorsed by all female writers whose texts have survived within the Christian tradition. Their works were transmitted by ecclesiastical establishments and often censured, redacted or translated by male confessors or clerics. This procedure can explain why no premodern female text challenges the axiomatic precedence of male humanity in the order of creation. Nevertheless, matristic writers demonstrate an assertive exploitation of salvational advancement, thereby preparing a new paradigm in the continuous formation of Christian tradition. From the third millennium onward eschatological gender equivalence is transformed to be normative already in the present world.

R. Albrecht, *Das Leben der heiligen Makrina auf den Hintergrund der Thekla-Tradition: Studien zur den Ursprungen des weiblichen Mönchtums im 4. Jahrhundert im Kleinasien* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 38), Göttingen 1986; K. Aspegren, *The Male Woman: A Feminine Ideal in the Early Church* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Uppsala Women's Studies, Women in Religion 4), Uppsala 1990; D.N. Baker, *Julian of Norwich: Showings from Vision to Book,* Princeton NJ 1994; S. Birgittae, *Reuelaciones extrauagantes,* SSFS, Ser. 2, V, Uppsala 1956; Id., Reuelaciones I-VIII, SSFS, Ser. 2, VII, 1-8, Uppsala 1971–2001; Id., *Opera Minora* I-II, SSFS, Ser. 2, VIII, 1-2, Uppsala 1972–1975; S.P. Brock - S.A. Harvey, eds., *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, Berkeley CA 1998; B.J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (Brown Judaic Studies 36), Chico CA 1982; Id., *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism*, Chicago IL 1996; V. Burrus, *Chastity as Autonomy: Women in the Stories of the Apocryphal Acts*, Studies in Women and Religion 23, Lewiston NY 1987; C.W. Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, Berkeley CA 1982; Id., *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*, New York 1991; K.E. Børresen - K. Vogt, *Women's Studies of the Christian and Islamic Traditions: Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Foremothers*, Dordrecht-Boston-London 1993; K.E. Børresen, *Subordination and Equivalence: The Nature and Role of Woman in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas: A Reprint of a Pioneering Classic*, Kampen 1995 (Updated ed. of Fr. original Oslo-Paris 1968); K.E. Børresen, ed., *The Image of God: Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, Minneapolis MN 1995; K.E. Børresen, *Matristics: Female Godlanguage in the Middle Ages*, in RHE 95, Louvain 2000, 343-362; Id., *Matristics: Ancient and Medieval Church Mothers*, in K.E. Børresen - S. Cabibbo - E. Specht, eds., *Gender and Religion: European Studies* (= *Genre et Religion: Études européennes*), Rome 2001, 203-218; K.E. Børresen, *From Patristics to Matristics: Selected Articles on Christian Gender Models*, Rome 2002; Id., *Religious Feminism in the Middle Ages: Birgitta of Sweden*, in L. D'Arcens - J.F. Ruys, eds., *Maistresse of My Wit: Medieval Women, Modern Scholars*, Making the Middle Ages 7, Turnhout 2004, 295-312; K.E. Børresen, ed., *Christian and Islamic Gender Models in Formative Traditions*, Studi e Testi TardoAntichi 2, Rome 2004; K.E. Børresen - A.Valerio, eds., *Donne e Bibbia nel Medioevo (secoli XII-XV): Tra ricezione e interpretazione*, La Bibbia e le donne 6,2, Trapani 2011; Id., *Medioevo II (siglos XII-XV). Entre recepción e interpretación*, La Biblia y las Mujeres 14. Medioevo y comienzo de la Edad Moderna, Estella (Navarro) 2012; Id., *Frauen und Bibel im Mittelalter: Rezeption und Interpretation*, Die Bibel und die Frauen 6,2, Stuttgart 2013; K.E. Børresen - E. Prinzivalli, eds., *La donna nello sguardo degli antichi autori cristiani: L'uso dei testi biblici nella costruzione dei modelli femminili di genere*, La Bibbia e le donne 5,1, Trapani 2013; E.A. Clark - D.F. Hatch, eds., *The Golden Bough, the Oaken Cross: The Vergilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba*, Chico CA 1981; E.A. Clark, *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, Studies in Women and Religion 20, Lewiston NY 1986; Id., *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and*

Scripture in Early Christianity, Princeton NJ 1999; G. Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*, Oxford 1993; G. Cloke, *"This Female Man of God": Women and Spriritual Power in the Patristic Age: 350–450 AD*, London 1995; C.F. Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge MA 1996; E. Colledge - J. Walsh, eds., *A Book of Showings to the Anchoress Julian of Norwich 1-2*, Studies and Texts 35, Toronto 1978; S.J. Davis, *The Cult of Saint Thecla: A Tradition of Women's Piety in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2001; S. Demel, *Frauen und kirchliches Amt: Vom Ende eines Tabus in der katholischen Kirche*, Freiburg im Breisgau 2004; P. Dronke, *Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua († 203) to Marguerite Porete (†1310)*, Cambridge 1988; U.E. Eisen, *Amtsträgerinnen im frühen Christentum: Epigraphische und literarische Studien*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 61, Göttingen 1996; Id., *Women Officeholders in Early Christianity, Epigraphical and Literary Studies*, Collegeville MN 2000; S. Elm, *"Virgins of God": The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford 1994; B. Feichtinger, *Apostolae Apostolorum: Frauenaskese als Befreiung und Zwang bei Hieronymus*, Frankfurt a.M. 1995; I. Fischer - C. de Groot - M. Navarro Puerto - A. Valerio, eds., *The Bible and Women: An Encyclopedia of Exegesis and Cultural History*, Trapani-Estella (Navarro)-Stuttgart-Atlanta GA, 2010–; several volumes of this international, four-language series are important for ancient and medieval Matristics: 5.1, K.E. Børresen - E. Prinzivalli, eds.; 5.2, E. Giannarelli - E. Synek, eds.; 6.1, F.E. Consolino - J. Herrin, eds.; 6.2, K.E. Børresen - A. Valerio, eds; S. Flanagan, *Hildegard of Bingen 1098–1179: A Visionary Life*, London, New York 1998; G. d'Helfta, *Œuvres Spirituelles I-V*, Sources Chrétiennes 127, 139, 143, 255, 331, Paris 1967, 1968, 1978, 1986; E. Giannarelli, *La tipologia femminile nella biografia e nell'autobiografia cristiana del IV secolo*, Studi Storici 127, Rome 1980; E. Gössmann, *Hildegard von Bingen: Versuche einer Annäherung*, Archiv für philosophie- und theologiegeschichtliche Frauenforschung, Sonderband, Munich 1995; W. Gross, ed., *Frauenordination: Stand der Diskussion in der katholischen Kirche,* Munich 1996; T.J. Hefferman, *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicity*, Oxford 2012; M. Heimbach, *"Der ungelehrte Mund" als Autorität: Mystische Erfahrung als Quelle kirchlich-prophetischer Rede im Werk Mechthilds von Magdeburg*, Stuttgart 1989; J.P. Heimmel, *"God Is Our Mother": Julian of Norwich and the Medieval Image of Christian Feminine Divinity*, - Literature, Elizabethan & Renaissance Studies 92,5, Salzburg 1982; H. Bingensis, *Scivias* I-III, CCCM 43, 43A, Turnhout 1978; Id., *Liber vitae meritorum* CCCM 90, Turnhout 1995; Id., *Epistolarium* I-III, CCCM 91, 91A, 91B, Turnhout 1991, 1993, 2001; Id., *Liber divinorum operum* CCCM 92, Turnhout 1996; T. Ilan, *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine: An Inquiry into Image and Status*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 44, Tübingen 2006; A. Jensen, *Thekla—Die Apostolin: Ein Apokrypher Text neu endeckt*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1995; Anne Jensen, *Frauen im frühen Christentum*, Traditio Christiana 11, Frankfurt a.M. 2002; Id., *Gottes Selbstbewusste Töchter: Frauenemanzipation im frühen Christentum?* Münster-Hamburg-London 2003 (1st ed. Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1992); Id., *God's Self-Confident Daughters: Early Christianity and the Liberation of Women*, Louisville KY 1996; A. Kadel, *Matrology: A Bibliography of Writings by Christian Women from the First to the Fifteenth Centuries*, New York 1995; H. Keul, *Mechthild von Magdeburg: Poetin, Begine, Mystikerin*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2007; U. King, ed., *Religion and Gender: New Perspectives*, Oxford 1995; U. King - T. Beattie, eds., *Gender, Religion and Diversity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, New York, London 2004; C. Kolletzki, *"Christus unsere wahre Mutter": feminine Konnotationen im Denken der Julian von Norwich*, Frankfurter theologische Studien 56, Münster 1997; S. Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions Among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World*, Oxford, New York 1992; R.S. Kraemer - M.R. D'Angelo, eds., *Women and Christian Origins*, Oxford, New York 1999; R.S. Kraemer, ed., *Women's Religions in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook*, Oxford, New York 2004; M.R. Lefkowitz - M.B. Fant, eds., *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook*, Baltimore MD 2005; S. Letsch-Brunner, *Marcella: Discipula et Magistra Auf den Spuren einer römischen Christin des 4.* Jahrhunderts (BZNW 91), Berlin-New York 1998; A.-J. Levine, ed., *A Feminist Companion to Patristic Literature*, Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings 12, London-New York 2008; M.Y. MacDonald - J. Tullock, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*, Minneapolis MN 2005; K. Madigan - C. Osiek, *Ordained Women in the Early Church: A Documentary History*, Baltimore MD-London 2005; M. Margoni-Kögler, *Women Promoting Literary Inculturation: A Case Study of the Aristocratic Roman Matron Faltonia Betitia Proba*, in K.E. Børresen - S. Cabibbo - E. Specht, eds., *Gender and Religion/ Genre et Religion: European Studies/Etudes européennes*, Rome 2001, 113-141; J.H. Martin, *The Ordination of Women and the Theologians in the Middle Ages*, in B. Cooke - G. Macy, eds., *A History of Women and Ordination* 1, Lanham MD-London 2002, 31-175; C. Mazzucco, *"E fui fatta maschio": La donna nel Cristianesimo primitivo*, Università degli Studi di Torino, Letterature 1, Turin 1989; A.J. Minnis, *De impedimento sexus: Women's Bodies and Medieval Impediments to Female Ordination*, in P. Biller - A.J. Minnis, eds., *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, York 1997, 109-139; A.J. Minnis - R. Voaden, eds., *Medieval Holy Women in the Christian Tradition c. 1100–c. 1500*, Turnhout 2010; B. Morris, *St. Birgitta of Sweden*, Studies in Medieval Mysticism 1, Woodbridge 1999; B. Newman, *From Virile Woman to Woman Christ: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature*, Philadelphia PA 1995; Id., *Sister of Wisdom*: *St. Hildegard's Theology of the Feminine, with a New Preface, Bibliography and Discography*, Berkeley CA 1998 (1st ed. 1987); J.M. Nuth, *Wisdom's Daughter*: *The Theology of Julian of Norwich*, New York 1991; G. Petersen-Szemerédy, *Zwischen Weltstadt und Wüste: Römische Asketinnen in der Spätantike: Eine Studie zur Motivation und Gestaltung der Askese christlicher Frauen Roms auf den Hintergrund ihrer Zeit*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 54, Göttingen 1993; S.S. Poor, *Mechthild of Magdeburg and Her Book. Gender and the Making of Textual Authority*, Philadelphia 2004; E. Power, *Medieval English Nunneries c. 1275 to 1535*, Cambridge 1922; I. Raming, *Priesteramt der Frau—Geschenk Gottes für eine erneuerte Kirche*, Münster-Hamburg-London 2001 (1st ed. Cologne 1973); Id., *The Priestly Office of Women: God's Gift to a Renewed Church* (2nd ed., in B. Cooke - G. Macy, eds., *A History of Women and Ordination* 2, Lanham MD-Toronto-Oxford 2004, 3-305); A. Rousselle, *Porneia: De la maîtrise du corps à la privation sensorielle, II^e^-IV^e^ siècles de l'ère chrétienne*, Paris 1983 (Eng. tr. *Porneia*: *On Desire and the Body in Antiquity*, Oxford 1988); Id., *La contamination spirituelle*: *Science, droit et religion dans l'Antiquité*, Paris 1998; D.M. Saerby, tr., B. Morris, introd., notes, *The Revelations of St. Birgitta of Sweden,* Vol. 1, *Liber Caelestis*, Books I-III; Vol. 2, *Liber Caelestis,* Books IV-V; Vol. 3, *Liber Caelestis,* Books VI-VIII; Vol. 4, *Regula Salvatoris, Sermo angelicus, Quattuor orationes, Revelationes extravagantes*, Oxford-New York 2006, 2008, 2012, 2014; C.L. Sahlin, *Birgitta of Sweden and the Voice of Prophecy*, Studies in Medieval Mysticism 3, Woodbridge 2001; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Enkrateia e antropologia: Le motivazioni protologiche della continenza e della verginità nel cristianesimo dei primi secoli e nella gnosticismo*, Stu-

dia Ephemeridis “Augustinianum” 20, Rome 1984; A.M. Silvas, *Macrina the Younger, Philosopher of God*, Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts 22, Turnhout 2008; V. Songe-Møller, *Philosophy Without Women: The Birth of Sexism in Western Thought*, New York-London 2002; I. Stahlmann, *Der gefesselte Sexus: Weibliche Keuschheit und Askese im Westen des römischen Reiches*, Berlin 1997; E.M. Synek, *Heilige Frauen der frühen Christenheit: Zu den Frauenbildern in hagiographischen Texten des christlichen Osten*, Das östliche Christentum, N.F. 43, Würzburg 1994; C. Trevett, *Montanism, Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*, Cambridge 1996; Id., *Christian Women and the Time of the Apostolic Fathers (AD c.80–160): Corinth, Rome and Asia Minor*, Cardiff 2006; K. Vogt, *The Desert Mothers: Female Asceticism in Egypt from the 4th to the 6th Century*, in K.E. Børresen - K. Vogt, *Women's Studies of the Christian and Islamic Traditions*, London 1993, 193-216; K. Vogt, *“Becoming Male”: A Gnostic, Early Christian and Islamic Metaphor*, in ibid., 217-242; G. Vollmann-Profe, ed., *Mechthild von Magdeburg: Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit*, Bibliothek des Mittelalters 19, Frankfurt a.M. 2003; N. Watson - J. Jenkins, eds., *The Writings of Julian of Norwich: A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman and a Revelation of Divine Love*, Turnhout 2006; J.R. Wegner, *Chattel or Person? The Status of Women in the Mishnah*, Oxford-New York 1988; S. Wittern, *Frauen, Heiligkeit und Macht: Lateinische Frauenviten aus dem 4. bis 7. Jahrhundert*, Ergebnisse der Frauenforschung 33, Stuttgart, Weimar 1994.

K.E. Børresen

MATTAI, mar. This man is said to have been one of the numerous monks who, at the time of the persecution of the emperor *Valens (364–378), left N *Syria (the region of Amida, acc. to the *Jacobite legend of mar Behnam) in order to seek refuge in a Persian city 30 km (18.6 mi) to the NE of Mossul.

At the end of the 4th c. or the beginning of the 5th, he is said to have founded a monastery on Jabal Maqlub in Iraq, which became the most prosperous of the many monasteries which were on this mountain, and the only one which has lasted until the present. It was soon inhabited by so many monks and hermits that it was called Tur Alpheph (“mount of thousands”). This “Athos of Assyria” was, at the cost of fierce struggles, one of the principal bastions of anti-*Nestorian resistance of the orthodox, then of the *monophysites, who established their hierarchy there in 540 (only later, in 629, at Takrit).

P. Sfair, art. *Beḥnam* in BS 2, 1079 (1962); W. de Vries, LTK² 7, 99; J.M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, Beyrouth 1965–1968, esp. II, 756-784.

F. Rilliet

MATTHEW, evangelist. We have little information from the NT concerning the evangelist Matthew-Levi, called a “publican”: only his name is found in the catalog of the apostles; we also have the description of his calling under the name of Levi (Mk 2:13-17). *Clement of Alexandria identifies him as Zacchaeus (*Strom.* 4,6,35). Concerning the place of his apostolate the ancient authors do not agree: *Palestine, where he preached in Hebrew (Eus., *HE* 3,24,6), Ethiopia (*Rufinus, *HE* 10,9; *Socrates, *HE* 1,19), among the Parthians (*Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 19,81), in Persia (*Ambrose, *In Ps* 45,21) and in other places. Matthew seems to have died a martyr. His relics are in Salerno. In patristic literature, esp. in apocryphal writings, there is a certain confusion of the names Matthew/Matthias.

The gospel of Matthew is said to have been written in Hebrew or Aramaic for Jews in Palestine and then translated into Greek; this version is said to be the *Gospel According to the Hebrews*, seen by *Jerome, as he himself relates. The gospel of Matthew is said to have been seen by *Pantaenus in India and the original Hebrew found by Barnabas in Cyprus and sent to *Constantinople. The gospel of Matthew was the most popular of all the gospels in the patristic era. It was commented on by Greek writers: *Origen (*Homilies* and *Commentary*), *John Chrysostom (his best commentary), ps.-*John Chrysostom (*Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, in Latin); in addition, fragments of commentaries of *Clement of Alexandria, *Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Athanasius, *Theophilus of Alexandria, *Basil the Great, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Theodore of Heraclea, *Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Epiphanius, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Anastasius of Antioch, *Severus of Antioch, *John of Damascus; fragments are also found in the Greek *catenae*. There are many Greek homilies on the gospel of Matthew, from the following writers: John Chrysostom, *Basil of Seleucia, *Eusebius of Emesa, *Gregory of Nyssa and others (see CPG 5, index, 132-136). In the Latin church we have the commentaries of *Ambrosiaster, *Hilary of Poitiers, ps.-Origen, *Jerome, *Chromatius of Aquileia, anonymous Irish commentaries and that of *Bede (see CPL, index, 777). There are numerous homilies on this gospel; the *Sermon on the Mount and the *Lord's Prayer are usually commented on acc. to the text of Matthew.

The apocryphal writings regarding Matthew are not many. In apocryphal literature it is difficult to know whether to attribute certain texts to him because of the confusion of the names Matthew/Matthias (as in the apocryphal writing *Acts of Matthew in the City of the Anthropophagi*). Book 6 of ps.-Abdias is dedicated to Matthew. There exists a Greek passion of Matthew with a Latin translation, Arab and Coptic passions, the *Acts of Matthew in the City of Kahenat* (an idealized city) and a commentary of Simeon Metaphrastes. Attributed to Matthew are a Latin gospel of the infancy (ps.-

Matthew), paraphrases of the *Protevangelium of James* with the addition of the chapters on the flight into Egypt. According to the letter preceding the text, this gospel was written by Matthew in Hebrew and translated by Jerome.

Acts: CANT 267-271, cf. 280-281; Lipsius-Bonnet 2, 1, 217-262; *A. in Kahenat*: A. Smith-Lewis, *Horae Semiticae* 3-4, London 1903, 83-94, 100-112 (with Eng. tr.); *Passio*: G. Talamo Atenolfi, *I testi medioevali degli Atti di S. Matteo*, Rome 1958 (with It. tr.). *Translations*: It. - Erbetta 2, 506-526; Moraldi 2, 709-713; Ger. - A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 414-417. *Gospel According to Ps.-Matthew*: CANT 51; BHL 5334-5342b; J. Gijsel, CCAp 9, 1997 (comm.); Fr. - EApC I, 107 140; Pol. - Starowieyski 1, 291-316—The only tr. on the text of Gijsel, which corrected much of Tischendorf's text. BS 9, 110-145; LCIK 7, 588-600. Lipsius 2, 2, 109-141; E. Massaux, *L'influence de S. Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant S. Irénée*, Louvain 1950; N. Acocella, *La traslazione di S. Matteo. Documenti e testimonianze*, Salerno 1954; A. Carucci, *L'Etiopia di S. Matteo*, Subiaco 1940; Id., *Etiopia di S. Matteo nella letteratura patristica (secolo III-VI)*, Salerno 1954; E. Pontieri, *Salerno "Civitas Matthaei"*: Atti dell'Accademia Pontiana 14 (1964–1965) 13-48 = Id., *Divagazioni storiche e storiografiche*, Naples 1964–1965, 59-124; R. Trevijano, *La obra de Papías y sus noticias sobre Mc y Mt*: Salmanticensia 41 (1994) 181-212.

M. Starowieyski

MATTHEW, Gospel of. The primitive community attributed the first gospel to Matthew. *Heracleon (Clem. Alex., *Strom*. IV, 9) and *Origen (*C. Celsum* I, 62)—among others—distinguished Levi from Matthew. According to *Eusebius (*HE* 3, 24,6), Matthew had evangelized the Hebrews, and, before departing for others peoples, he had left the gospel in writing in their mother tongue. In 387, *Jerome, in the preface to his *Commentary on Matthew* (PL 26, 20), left us the first list of Greek and Latin commentaries on Matthew. The gospel of Matthew appears as the most ancient and the first in the canonical list (**Didache*, *Ignatius of Antioch, *Papias, *Irenaeus). Even before it was commented on in the strict sense, the first gospel, esp. in certain passages, enjoyed a special privilege. One often referred to the *Sermon on the Mount acc. to the text of Matthew, and to the frequent use of certain passages such as Mt 5:28, 32, 39-42, 44-47; 7:12, 21, using the common (Western) text. The commentators did not develop the text, but were content to relate its true sense. They did not consider so much the accounts of the miracles, and occupied themselves with the doctrine rather than with literal citations. They went to Matthew for the teachings of Jesus which are the foundation of Christianity. Such we find in the writings of *Clement of Rome, *Barnabas, *Ignatius of Antioch, *2 Clement*, *Polycarp, the *Apocalypse, **Odes of Salomon*, **Shepherd* of Hermas, the noncanonical gospels, **Agrapha*, some *gnostic writings, *Aristides, *Justin, *Tatian, *Apollinaris of Hierapolis, *Athenagoras, *Theophilus of Alexandria, and the *Didache*.

*Greek and Latin commentators through *Bede (d. 735)*. 2nd-3rd c.: *Theophilus of Antioch, known through Jerome, who preserved, in *De Vir. Ill.* 11.25 and in *Ep*. 121,6, the interpretation of the dishonest steward; *Hippolytus, of whom we have only fragments; *Origen: fragments of homilies and a partial Latin translation of his commentary. 4th c.: fragments of the commentary of the Antiochene *Theodore of Heraclea. *Ephrem the Syrian gave great importance to Matthew in his commentary on *Tatian's **Diatessaron*. *Athanasius did not comment on Matthew, but he did gather texts on it. Only fragments of *Apollinaris have remained. *Didymus's commentary has been lost. 5th c.: *John Chrysostom's 90 homilies on Matthew are the most complete commentary of the patristic age. The fragments of *Theophilus of Alexandria, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and *Ammonius of Alexandria are of a *parenetic and homiletic character.

Among the Latins: 4th c.: The commentary of *Victorinus of Ptuj (Petovium) (Cassiod., *Inst.* 7), now lost, but used by Jerome. The commentary of *Hilary, which manifests the influence of Hippolytus, Theodore, Origen and Victorinus. The fragments which have been preserved of *Fortunatian of Aquileia and the treatises and sermons of *Chromatius of Aquileia, the commentaries and homilies of Jerome and the *Quaes. in Matth.* and *De Sermone in Monte* of *Augustine. 5th c.: *Eucherius of Lyons and *Arnobius the Younger.

The most ample commentary on Matthew in Latin and the most used in the Middle Ages is the incomplete *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, which contains passages of Jerome, Chromatius and *Leo I (the Great), has an *allegorical-symbolic character. This was the age of the pseudos, such as ps.-Peter of Laodicea and ps.-Jerome. In the Greek world, it is the age of the unexplored area of the *catenae*.

G. Wagner (ed.), *An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament: Matthew and Mark*, Macon, GA 1983; F. Neirynck - J. Verheyden - R. Corstjens, *The Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel Source Q: A Cumulative Bibliography 1950–1995*, Leuven 1998. *Editions*: Hippolytus: GCS 1, 195-208; Origen: PG 13, 829-1800; GCS 38, 1-299; 40/1, 1-703; 41. Anonymous writer of the 3rd c.: G. Mercati, ST 11 (1903) I, 1-49; Theodore of Heraclea: J. Reuss, TU 61 (1957) XXVI-XXIX. 55-95; Ephrem: ed. L. Leloir, CSCO 137, 145, 180 (Armen. tr.); ed. and tr. L. Leloir, Dublin 1963 (Syriac orig.); Athanasius: PG 25, 207-220; 27, 1364-1389; Apollinaris: J. Reuss, TU 61, XXIII, XXVI, 1-54; John Chrysostom: PG 57, 13-472; 58, 471-794; Theophilus of Alexandria: J. Reuss, TU 61, 151-152; Theodore of Mopsuestia: PG 66, 703-713; J. Reuss, TU 61, XXX-XXXIX and 153-269; Ammonius of Alexandria: PG 85, 1381-1392; J. Reuss: Biblica 22 (1941) 13-20; Hil-

ary: PL 9, 917-1076; CSEL 65, 232; 17, 383; SC 254, 258; Fortunatian: PLS 1, 216-219; CCL 9, 365-370, RBen 32 (1920) 160-174; Chromatius: PL 20, 327-368; CCL 9, 381-442; R. Étaix: RBen 70 (1960) 469-503; Jerome: PL 26, 15-218; PLS 2, 172-175; CCL 78, 503-506; Augustine: PL 34, 1071-1216 and 1229-1308; 35, 1323-1335 and 1365-1376; CSEL 43, 81-393; Eucherius: PL 50, 756-798; CSEL 31, 105-109; Arnobius: PL 53, 571-578; *Opus imperf. in Math.*: PG 56, 611-946; R. Étaix: RBen 84 (1974) 271-300; M. Simonetti, *Patrologia* III, 93 and 97; ps.-Peter of Laodicea: PG 86, 3323-3336; R. Devreesse, DB Suppl. 1, 1165-1167; ps.-Jerome: PL 30, 551-579; *Catenae* on Matthew: CPG IV, C 110. *Studies*: RGG IV, 809; LTK 6, 1477-1482; C.H. Turner, *The Early Greek Commentators on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*: JTS 12 (1911) 99-112; E. Massaux, *L'influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*, Louvain 1950; M. Simonetti, ed., *Matteo*, 2 vols.: BCP NT 1/1-2, Rome 2004–2006 (= Eng., *Matthew 1–13* and *Matthew 12–28*, ACCS NT 1a and 1b, Downers Grove, IL 2001–2002); J.A. Kellerman, tr., *Incomplete Commentary on Matthew (Opus imperfectum)*, 2 vols., ed. T.C. Oden, ACT, Downers Grove IL 2010.

E. Romero Pose - G. Pilara

MATTHIAS, apostle. Abbreviated nominal form of *Mattanjah* (= gift of Jahweh). He is the only person in the Bible to have this name. He was joined to the group of the apostles as a substitute for *Judas Iscariot, following an election in which they chose between him and Joseph Barsabas (Acts 1:15-20). After this episode, he is not spoken of again in Acts. Even if the vote of the community chose Matthias rather than Joseph, both possessed the necessary requirements which Peter mentioned in the discourse he gave before proceeding to the completion of the number of the apostolic college: They had been with Jesus from the baptism of John until the ascension; thus they could be faithful witnesses of the resurrection. Peter's effort to complete the group of the apostles even before the coming of the Holy Spirit shows the special divine providence which watches over the group, authentic depository of the mission of the Risen One. This is also the interpretation of *Eusebius, who states that Matthias was one of the 70 disciples (*HE* 1,12), which is not impossible. This ancient story soon attached itself to Matthias; he was sometimes identified with Zacchaeus (*Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 6,35), sometimes with *Barnabas (*Recog. Clem.* 1,60), sometimes with Nathaniel or others. The area he evangelized is not clearly indicated by the tradition, which speaks of *Palestine (where he is said to have been stoned as an enemy of the law of *Moses) and of Ethiopia (where he is said to have preached and suffered martyrdom). According to the *gnostic *Heracleon he died a natural death (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV,9).

The gnostic tradition knew some writings which pertained to him: The *Gospel of Matthias*, *The Traditions of Matthias*, *The Secret Discourses of Jesus and Matthias*, *The Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the Land of the Anthropophagi.* Scholars are uncertain whether one ought to read these as Matthias or Matthew; some unhesitatingly prefer Matthew. Matthias, patron of engineers and butchers, is commemorated 14 May in the Latin church and 9 August in the Greek church.

BHG 1229; BHL 5695-5719; BHO 733-741; BS 9,150-154; J. Renié, *L'élection de Matthias* (*Act 1,15-26*). *Authenticité du récit*: Rev. Bibl. 55 (1948) 43-53; P. Gächter, *Die Wahl des Matthias*: ZKTh 75 (1949) 318-346; EC 9,500-501; BS 9,150-153; LTK³ 6,1485-1486; Erbetta I, 1,288-290; II, 493-494; A. Weiser, *Studien zu Christsein und Kirche*, Stuttgart 1990, 161-173.

E. Peretto

MATTHIAS, apostle (apocryphal). According to the testimony of Acts, the only source in this regard, Matthias was elected in place of *Judas the betrayer (Acts 1:15-26). His name is often replaced with that of Matthew. *Eusebius holds that he was one of the 70 (*HE* 1,12,3), while in the ps.-Clementine writing *Recognitiones*, Matthias is identified with *Barnabas (1,60). Nicephorus (*HE* 2,40) and the apocrypha speak of his martyrdom. The area of his apostolate was *Ethiopia or Judea. His relics are in *Trier. Under the name of Matthias were some *gnostic apocryphal writings: the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Gospel of Matthias* and/or *The Traditions of Matthias* (we do not know whether these two titles referred to one work or two), which are mentioned by *Origen, *Clement of Aexandria, *Eusebius and *Hippolytus, speak of his work *Tradition* (*Paradosis*). According to the *Pistis Sophia* (44,19–45,19), Matthias wrote a gospel together with *Thomas and *Philip. *Clement of Alexandria cites an *agraphon* of Matthias (*Strom.* 3,26,3). Biographical texts are rare: *Acts* and *Martyrdom* in Coptic (and Arabic and Ethiopian translations), and the *Traditiones S. Matthiae Barti* (*Oratio Deiparae in regione Partorum*); in addition, there are fragments of a homily in Arabic and Ethiopian of ps.-*Cyril of Jerusalem, which recounts how *Mary helped Matthias in prison.

CANT 280-281; BHG 1229; BHL 5695-5719; BHO 733-741; BS 9,150-154; LCIK 7, 602-607; Lipsius 2, 2, 258-269. Lambertus Parvus de Legia, *De vita, translatione, inventione ac miraculis S. Matthiae Apostoli libri V*, tr. R.M. Kloos, Trier 1958 (medieval text); U. Holzmeister, *S. Matthias Apostolus*: VerbDom 24 (1944) 7-14; J. Renié, *L'élection de Matthieu*: RBen 55 (1948) 43-53; P. Gächter, *Die Wahl des Matthias*: ZkTh 71 (1949) 318-346; R. Laufner, *Matthiasverehrung im Mittelalter*: TrierTheolZeitschr 70 (1961) 355-360.

M. Starowieyski

MAURETANIA

I. Civil boundaries and history - II. Christian history.

Roman Mauretania included various African provinces of the Roman Empire. Its territory was equivalent to the present-day Morocco and Algeria, with the exception of the area of Constantine-Tebessa, which constituted *Numidia.

I. Civil boundaries and history. These provinces, after the Roman conquest, were Mauretania Caesariana (Algeria) with Caesarea (Chercell), and Mauretania Tingitana (Morocco) with Tingis (Tangier) as capitals. They depended directly on the emperor, and the governors carried out both civil and military functions. *Diocletian modified the boundaries, uniting Mauretania Tingitana to the diocese of Spain and dividing the rest of the territory into two parts: Mauretania Caesariana, which kept Caesarea, and Mauretania Sitifiana, to the E of the first and having Sitifis (Sétif) as its capital. During the *Vandal occupation, Mauretania was temporarily taken back by the Roman Empire around 442, and the imperial power was established there anew (*Novella Valentiniani*, CTh, ed. Mommsen-Meyer, t. 2, 96). But since maritime connections were precarious, Mauretania was again taken out of Roman influence. When it was reconquered around 540 by the Byzantines, they spoke of Mauretania I (Sitifiana) and II (Caesariana); this latter had been reduced to a stretch on the coast. In the 8th c. it came under Arab domination.

Scholars are still uncertain of the consistency and extent of the Christianization of Mauretania, in particular Caesariana. In fact, although this is well attested E of the area around Sétif and W of the region of Tiaret, it remains uncertain with regard to the area between Zabi and Columnata. This is due more to the rarity of exploration and of archaeological publications than to a real absence of evidence. Further, many buildings, already modest, have disappeared under modern agglomerations. Recent advances include a more detailed reconstruction of the basilica of Tarmount, excavated in the 1930s, as well as the identification of the ruins in Souk-El-Khemis with the site of Galaxia located on the road between Auxia and Equisetum.

II. Christian history. Christianity is attested in Mauretania from the beginning of the 3rd c.: *Tertullian speaks of Christians there who were persecuted by the governor (*Scap*. 4,3-6). *Cyprian affirms that (Proconsular) Africa, Numidia and Mauretania formed one ecclesiastical province (*Ep*. 48,3). The bishops of Mauretania did, in fact, take part in the general councils of Africa (*Sent. Epp. Praef.*). We know only two names of these bishops, but we do not know their sees: Iubaianus (*Ep*. 73) and Quintus (*Ep*. 71; 72,1; 73,1). This latter is specifically qualified as Mauretanian (*Ep*. 72,1). It is possible that other bishops of the period, whose sees we do not know, are from Mauretania. Christian archaeology in the region confirms the literary data. Already in the 3rd c., Caesarea contained a small Christian community, whose cemetery, acc. to Monceaux, may go back to the persecution of *Septimius Severus. In the funerary inscriptions of the 3rd c. found there, we find the olive, the anchor and the dove, but these symbols do not have a specifically Christian character. Specifically Christian, however, are two votive inscriptions of the 3rd c.: those of the *clarissimus* M.I.A. Severianus and of the priest Victor (CIL 8, 9585-9586). These inscriptions commemorate the gift of two funerary areas given to the community of the brothers. Not far away, in Tipasa, is the inscription of Rasinia Secunda, in all probability Christian, given its expressions. It is the most ancient in Africa, going back to 238 (CIL 8, 9289 and 20856). The city itself preserves necropolises to the E and to the W, one with the basilica of Alexander and the tombs of the *iusti priores* (CIL 8, 20903), of which the most ancient go back to the 3rd c.; while the other necropolis, with a martyrium and the basilica of St. Salsa, date to the 4th c. All these necropolises in Chercell and in Tipasa witness to the antiquity and the continuance within Christianity of funerary banquets.

Further information may be gathered from the passions of the martyrs. From the period of persecution prior to *Diocletian are the veteran Typasius (BHL 8354), the signifier Fabius (BHL 2818) and the centurion Marcellus (BHL 5254). This is the period in which the emperor Galerius, in order to render the military more steadfast, demanded of the soldiers and esp. of the officials that they participate in the ceremonies of pagan worship. Other martyrs are from after the persecution of Diocletian, and were victims of pagan popular riots. Such is the case of Marciana, who was from Rusuccuru (Taksebt), who died in Caesarea (BHL 5257), and of Salsa, a martyr of Tipasa (BHL 7467), who had provoked the popular fury by destroying some statues of pagan divinities. This information leads one to suppose that the pagan population in the city was still important.

A confirmation of the unequal distribution of the episcopal sees is possible thanks to the conferences of Carthage in 411/484, in which bishops of all of Roman Africa were present. In 411 there are numbered from Mauretania Sitifiana 12 Catholic bishops

and 18 *Donatists, plus, respectively, 4 and 3 doubtful; from Mauretania Caesariana 14 Catholics and 21 Donatists, plus 3 and 3 doubtful. Worthy of observation are the following: (1) The presence of bishops also from distant sees, e.g., Honoratus of Aquae Sirenses (Bou Hanifia, department of Oran); (2) the scarcity, however, of bishops from Mauretania Caesariana; (3) the predominance of the Donatists. But in 484, when Donatism had disappeared, 120 episcopal sees were present (plus 3 without bishops) of Mauretania Caesariana, and 42 of the Sitifiana. We can suppose that, with few exceptions, they had responded to the convocation of *Huneric. Especially the last list gives us an idea of the geographical repartition of the episcopal sees, particularly interesting with regard to the W Caesariana, in which the repartition corresponds perfectly to the criteria of Romanization and militarization of the country. The episcopal sees are placed in the three principal areas of Roman presence: (1) along the sea; (2) on a first line of defense, situated on Albulae (Ain Temuchet), Tasaccora (Sig, once St. Dionysius of Sig), Mina (Relizane); (3) above all, along a second line of military defense, from Numerus Syrorum (Lalla Marnia) to Columnata (Sidi Hosni, formerly Waldeck-Rousseau), passing through Ala Miliaria. These Christian communities could not long survive the disappearance of the Roman military.

PWK 14, 2344-2386; LTK[2] 7, 188-189; EC 1, 393-405 passim; SC 194, 195, 224; *Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae*: MGH, *Auct. ant.* 3/1, 63-71; S. Lancel, *S. Augustin et la Maurétanie césarienne: les années 418–419 à la lumière des nouvelles lettres récemment publiées*: REAug 30 (1984) 48-59; Id., II: *L'affaire de l'évêque Honorius (automne 419–printemps 420) dans les nouvelles lettres 22*, 23* et 23*A*: REAug 30 (1984) 251-262; P.A. Février, *Aux origines du christianisme en Maurétanie Césarienne*: MEFRA 98 (1986) 767-809; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, *Studi sui procuratori delle due Mauretaniae*, Cagliari 1989; N. Benseddik, *Nouvelles contributions à l'Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie*: L'Africa Romana 7 (1989–1990) 737-751; I. Gui - N. Duval - J.-P. Caillet, *Basiliques chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord*, Paris 1992; J.P. Laporte, *Deux basiliques chrétiennes de Maurétanie Césarienne Souk-el-khems (Galaxia?) et Tarmount (Aras) et les vestiges chrétiens de la région*: Antiquité Tardive 7 (1999) 371-382; N. Duval, s.v. *Africa*: EAM.

V. Saxer - A. Appella

MAURICE, martyr. Excavations in Agaunum (present-day Saint-Maurice, Valais), at the Great Saint Bernard Pass, have revealed a basilica of the 4th c. (constructed by Bishop Theodore of Martigny (*Octodurum*) leaning upon the mountain. This basilica was renovated in the 5th c., and stands in the midst of a cemetery of the same period. This is the most ancient witness to the cult of St. Maurice. His name appears in the *Mart. hier.* for 22 September. Scholars are divided on which to attribute the information to: some favor the Italian recension of the martyrology (after 415), others the Gallican (592). In the mid-5th c. *Eucherius of Lyons wrote the *Passio Acaunensium Martyrum* (BHL 5737), acc. to which Maurice was **primicerius* of the Theban legion martyred under *Maximian; from that period their relics were spread through the West. In 515 the king of Burgundy, *Sigismund, established a monastery in Agaunum, where the *Laus perennis* was carried out.

BHL 5737-5764; BS 9, 194-205; LCI 7, 610-613; BBKL 17, 918-919; V. Saxer, *Parler des martyrs une Bible à la main. L'usage de la Bible dans les Passions des martyrs d'Agaune*: Les Échos de Saint-Maurice 21 (1991) 80-115; D. Thurre, *Culte et iconographie de saint Maurice d'Agaune*: Revue suisse d'art et d'archéologie 49 (1992) 7-18; S.F. Girgis, *Saint Maurice, the Commander of the Theban Legion*, Bülach 1993; D. Woods, *The Origin of the Legend of Maurice and the Theban Legend*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 45 (1994) 385-395.

V. Saxer – S. Heid

MAURISTS. The Benedictine congregation of St. Maur, founded in Paris in 1621, used its centralized organization to promote theological work. Following M. Testière, the founder, G. Tarisse, the soul of the reform, "spent all his efforts to bring about a flowering of the sciences in the congregation." Under his impulse, the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Près in *Paris rapidly became a center of intense intellectual activity, consecrated to scholarship: a sort of academy for epigraphy, literature and theology in the 17th and 18th c. The library, which was one of the richest in patristic MSS in the world, and which was well cataloged and organized in a user-friendly manner, permitted research and scholarship. The most able religious in the various abbeys were chosen and educated in the mother house, so as to enter into a true group project. This permitted the development of a number of researchers whose names remain connected to the critical editions of the Fathers. The most illustrious was Jean Mabillon (1632–1707), "the most learned man in France." The editorial masterpiece remains that of the works of St. *Augustine (newer editions have now taken their place), carried out by Th. Blampin and P. Coustant. Other editors should be mentioned: J.L. d'Achéry, who published the *Spicilegium*; J. Du Frische: *Ambrose; Th. Ruinart: the Acts of the martyrs; R. Massuet: *Irenaeus; J. Martinianay: *Jerome; A. Touttée: *Cyril of Jerusalem; P. Coustant: *Hilary and the letters of the popes; D. Le Nourry: *Ambrose; J. Garnier: *Basil; Ch. and V. Delarue: *Origen; B. de Montfaucon: *Athanasius, *Eusebius and *John

Chrysostom; P. Maran: *Cyprian and *Justin; Ch. Clémencet: *Gregory of Nazianzus, completed by A.B. Caillau in 1840. The French Revolution suppressed the Abbey.

What is new in the editions of the Maurists is first of all the number of MSS consulted in Paris and in France, but also in Germany, the Netherlands, England, *Italy and *Rome. All the houses of the congregation were involved in the project. For the Greek texts, the apparatus is less rich. J. Garnier consulted some ten MSS for Basil, while there were thousands in the East, in Greece and in Russia.

In these editions, the *dubia* and *spuria* are accurately rejected and placed in the appendix. The critical sense was rarely defective. In the choice of variants, the Maurists were concerned more with the content than with the language. They carefully corrected the text with a sure hand and a refined ability, acquired through a long familiarity with the text and thought of the author, rarely equaled by more recent editors. Sometimes theological controversies had a decisive influence in their choices, esp. in the case of St. Augustine.

Despite making progress, the biblical references are not rigorous, but the introductions, notes and indexes, fortunately reproduced by Migne, are still valuable. The exemplary beauty of the typographical characters and the almost perfect correction of the text have been universally recognized. Preuschen stated that they are "the first reliable editions." Despite progress realized afterward, "we will make use of these for a long time still" (J. de Ghellinck).

The Maurists, at first focused on the history of monasticism, quickly enlarged their interests, dedicating themselves likewise to the *Gallia christiana* and the *Acts* of the martyrs. They established archives in many collections dedicated to Christian Antiquity: *Spicilegium*, in 13 vols., ed. by J.L. d'Archéry; *Vetera analecta*, in 4 vols., ed. by J. Mabillon; *Analecta Vetera* ed. by B. de Montfaucon; the *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, in 5 vols., ed. by E. Martène. The untiring Mabillon wrote, for the first time, a course in diplomacy, *De re diplomatica*, which constitutes a milestone in history (1681).

P. Tassin, *Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de S. Maur*, Brussels 1770; L. de Broglie, *Mabillon et la société de l'abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Près*, Paris 1880, 2 vols.; Id., *Montfaucon et les Bernardins*, Paris 1891, 2 vols.; R. Kukula, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus*: SAW 121 (1890) 1-106; 122 (1890) 1-66; 127 (1892) 1-48; 138 (1898) 1-81; DTC 10, 425-443; J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Âge*, II-III, Brussels 1947–1948; M. Laurain, *Les travaux d'érudition des Mauristes*: RHEF 43 (1957) 231-271; Cath 8, 966-980; DIP 5, 1082-1089 (bibl.); *Les Mauristes à Saint-Germain-des-Prés*, Actes du Colloque de Paris (2 déc. 1999), Paris 2001.

A. Hamman

MAURUS of Parentium (4th c.?). Much evidence has emerged by now which shows the falsity of the anonymous legend from Parentium which identified the African monk St. Maurus with the patron of Parentium. The strongest argumentation was offered by the epigraph discovered in Parentium in 1846 under the present-day altar of the Euphrasian basilica: it unequivocally attests to the episcopal dignity of Maurus, and also that he was the local bishop, when it affirms that his body was transferred to the urban basilica of Parentium *ubi episcopus et confessor est factus*. With regard to his martyrdom, this is attributed to the saint by a constant tradition going back at least to the mid-6th c., despite the epithet of *confessor* in the epigraph mentioned above; besides that, another acephalous inscription, which can also be dated between the 4th and 6th c., significantly defines his remains as *victricia membra*.

PCBE 2, 1436f.; G. Cuscito, *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquilea e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 124-146; Id., *I santi Mauro ed Eleuterio di Parenzo: l'identità, il culto, le reliquie*: Atti del Centro di Ricerche Storiche di Rovigno 16 (1985–1986) 33-59; Id., *Ancora su Mauro "episcopus et confessor" e sul "locus duplicatus" di Parenzo*, in *Domum tuam dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 185-210.

G. Cuscito

MAURUS of Ravenna (642–673). Archbishop of *Ravenna. He did not have good relations with *Rome. He refused to participate in the Lateran Council of 649, stating as his reason, in his letter to Pope *Martin, that the exarch had not yet arrived and the people and army of Ravenna had held him back for fear of the barbarians (PL 87,103). He rejected the **Ekthesis* and made a profession of faith in the two natures and two wills in Christ. He obtained from the emperor *Constans II, who was in Sicily, metropolitan rights over the bishops of Emilia and Romagna and autocephalous status, which rendered the church of Ravenna independent of Rome (*Liber Pont. Eccl. Rav.*: PL 106,676). Summoned by Pope *Vitalian, he responded by separating himself from Rome (PL 106, 672; Jaffé 2096-2097), which lasted until his death, in 673. More information on Maurus can be found in the *Liber pontificalis* of Agnellus (PL 106, 669-671).

CPL 1169; PL 87, 104-105. DTC 9, 303; 15, 3116; A. Guillou, *Régionalisme et indépendence dans l'Empire byzantin au VI^e siècle. L'exemple de l'exarchat et de la Pentapole d'Italie*, Rome 1969, 147-148; T.S. Brown, *The Church of Ravenna and the Imperial Administration*: EHR 94 (1979) 11-20; A. Guillou, *L'Italia bizantina dall'invasione longobarda alla caduta di Ravenna*, in *Storia d'Italia*, I, Turin 1980, 272-273; 280-281; 295; P. Corsi, *La spedizione italiana di Costante II*, Bologna 1983; EPapi 1, 606-609.

A. Di Berardino

MAXENTIUS, emperor (d. 312). Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maxentius, son of *Maximian Herculius, married to Valeria Maximilla daughter of *Galerius Caesar. On 28 October 306, he was proclaimed *princeps* by the Praetorian Guard in *Rome, where he enjoyed a huge following owing to his military achievements and to his shrewd and balanced religious policy aimed at tolerance; he enjoyed the same reputation in the rest of *Italy, *Africa and *Spain. In the spring of 307 he took the title of Augustus. He promoted important public works, including the building of the famous basilica on the Via Sacra. His father, desiring to return to power, wanted Maxentius to be styled Caesar, but only under his own authority as Augustus. Maxentius, confident of his own prestige, rebelled against him. Maximian granted the title of Augustus to *Constantine and gave him his daughter Fausta in marriage. At the encounter in Camuntum, Maxentius was declared a public enemy. He subdued the rebel Domitius Alexander in Africa (308). In 312 he suffered a decisive defeat at the hands of Constantine at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge by the gates of Rome. According to the historian Aurelius Victor (*De Caesar.* 40, 43) the battle was begun at a place called "ad Saxa Rubra" on the Via Flaminia. While fleeing, Maxentius drowned in the Tiber. From 306 Maxentius did not enforce the decrees of persecution against the Christians. He also intervened in the bitter conflicts of the Christian community in Rome occasioned by the reconciliation of those who had lapsed during the persecution: he exiled Pope *Marcellus. The disturbances did not cease, and so he further intervened, condemning both the new pope *Eusebius and his opponent *Heraclius to exile. Eusebius was sent to *Syracuse on *Sicily, where he died the same year (perhaps 309). At any rate Maxentius's intervention was not an act of persecution against the Christians, but rather an act of public and ecclesial peacemaking in the city of Rome. To Maxentius's credit he began a policy that recognized Christians and restored goods confiscated during the persecution by his father (see SC 195, 540-542).

E. Groag, PWK XIV, 2, 2417-2484; A. Pincherle, *La politica ecclesiastica di Massenzio*: Studi it. di fil. classica 8 (1929) 131ff.; discussion on the date of the battle of the Milvian Bridge (311?) in P. Bruun, *The Battle of the Milvian Bridge: The Date Reconsidered*: Hermes 88 (1960) 361-370; D. De Decker, *La politique religieuse de Maxence*: Byzantion 38 (1968) 472-562; T. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambrigde, MA 1981; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 291-293; B. Kriegbaum, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Maxentius*: Ann. Hist. Pont. 30 (1992) 7-52; M. Cullhed, *Conservator Urbis. Studies in the Politics and Propaganda of the Emperor Maxentius*, Stockholm 1994; H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*, Baltimore 2000; EPapi1, 313-316.

M. Forlin Patrucco - A. Di Berardino

MAXIMA (Maximilla) and DONATILLA. Maxima and Donatilla were two consecrated virgins of the *possessio Cephalitana* in Proconsular Africa who suffered martyrdom under *Anulinus. It has been thought since 1889 that the two sisters, together with another Christian woman, were venerated not only as martyrs but also as saints (*Sanctas tres Maxima et Donatilla Secunda bona puella* . . . ; DAC X, 2769f.). Their martyrdom took place when an imperial decree made it obligatory for all the Christians of the province to sacrifice to the gods in the *possessio Cephalitana* (*per omnem illam provinciam*). "Certainly we are not dealing with the Christians of the entire province of Proconsular Africa, nor with those of the city of Thuburbo (as the text that has come down to us might imply), but rather only the rural community of the *possessio Cephalitana*, a small community under the religious authority not of a bishop, but of priests and deacons" (ST 65, 78). The proconsul Anulinus went into the *possessio Cephalitana*. Its Christian population apostatized without any resistance out of fear of death. However, two young women, Maxima and Donatilla, were brought before the proconsul for questioning. They refused to apostatize or to sacrifice to the pagan gods. Anulinus had them taken to Thuburbo, where they were condemned to death by the sword. While they were being led to the place of their martyrdom, another young Christian woman, named Secunda, seeing them from her window, came down and joined the condemned. A later interpolator emphasizes that Secunda, after having abandoned and rejected her parents' wealth and all the pleasures of this world, threw herself from a very high balcony and died. As can be observed, this episode of decidedly *Donatist leanings was modified later on by a Catholic hand (see AB [1957] 119-237). The insistence on the immediate death of the young woman is probably an addition by a Donatist interpolator. "The Donatists indeed," writes Franchi de' Cavalieri, "approved of suicide committed for religious reasons, esp. suicide *per praecipitium*, and accorded those who so killed themselves the honors due to martyrs. However, it is clear Secunda's end did not please a Catholic hagiographer, who a little later thought to change the suicide into an action that was equally heroic but more correct from a Christian point of view" (ST 65, 87). Hence he wrote that the young girl did not die suddenly, but suffered a *passio* together with Maxima and Donatilla under the executioner's sword at Thuburbo. The later adjustments indicate perplexity about the reason for the condemnation, the trial, the pronouncement and carrying out of the sentence, and the death and burial place of the

young women. Other major interpolations further corrupted the ancient text to the extent of making it virtually unrecognizable: unconvincing questions and answers by the interrogator, **damnatio ad bestias* and burial in the amphitheater. The text of the *passio* was published by the Bollandists using the MS of codex 5306 in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris and the Martyrology of Adon.

BHL 5809; P. Allard, *Storia critica delle persecuzioni*, IV, Florence 1928, 417-420; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografiche*, ST 65, Vatican City 1935, 75-97; G.D. Gordini, *Massima, Donatilla e Seconda*: BS IX, 14-15; H. Leclercq, *Maxima, Donatilla et Secunda*: DACL X, 2769-2774; P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, III, Paris 1905, 148-151; G. Ricciotti, *L'era dei martiri. Il Cristianesimo da Diocleziano a Costantino*, Rome 1953, 121-123.

M.W. Libambu

MAXIMIAN (d. 434). Archbishop of *Constantinople (431–434). Of Roman origin and education, and fellow student with the future Pope *Celestine, he was incardinated in the church of Constantinople during the time of St. *John Chrysostom. After *Nestorius was deposed by the Council of *Ephesus (22 June 431), which was approved by *Theodosius II (August), between the two candidates to succeed him, the learned *Proclus of Cyzicus and the meek Maximian, the people of the capital chose the latter, known for his generosity to the Christian families not able to give a decent burial to their deceased. Ordained 25 October 431 by an episcopal delegation of the Ephesian synod (a delegation in *communion with St. Cyril), he sent his synodal letter (preserved) to Cyril and another letter (lost) to other bishops, including Pope Celestine, insisting on the validity of the Council of Ephesus and the condemnation of Nestorius. His few other acts concern the synodal deposition of four bishops who were followers of Nestorius (*Helladius of Tarsus, *Eutherius of Tyana, *Dorotheus of Marcianopolis and Himerius of Nicomedia) and the restoration of peace between Cyril and *John of Antioch. He died 12 April 434.

CPG 5770-5773; Grumel, *Regestes*², 66-75; G. Dragon, *Naissance d'une capitale*, Paris 1975, 471; Patrologia V, 28-29.

D. Stiernon

MAXIMIAN, Donatist (4th c.). Related to *Donatus the Great (Aug. *Ep.* 43, 9.26), Maximian was a deacon of *Parmenian, Donatist bishop of *Carthage. He was excommunicated with three other deacons by *Primian, who succeeded Parmenian in 391 or 392 for reasons unknown to us: perhaps Maximian had been a contender for the succession to the episcopal throne. Surrounding Maximian was a group that managed to gather 43 bishops together to hold a council at Carthage. They summoned Primian to a second council held in 393 at Cabarsussa in *Byzacena, at which about 100 bishops agreed to the deposing of Primian and elected Maximian to replace him. Primian responded with a council of 310 bishops, convoked in 394 at Bagai in *Numidia. Maximian was again excommunicated, together with those who had consecrated him, and the Maximianists were given a deadline to put an end to the *schism: if they did not submit before the prescribed dates, they would be admitted to penance only and deprived of every honor. Primian, having achieved no result, named three of Maximian's consecrators in the proconsul's presence—*Felician of Musti, Praetextatus of Assuras and Salvius of Membressa—to the effect that they should abandon their sees, but without success. A reconciliation with some of the Maximianists took place in 397 after the intervention of the *circumcellions led by Count *Gildo; the latter was allied to the Primianists thanks to the offices of *Optatus of Thamugadi (Timgad). Maximianist bishops presented themselves at the conference of Carthage, but were not admitted (Aug., *C. Iul.* III, 1, 5). The primary source for our knowledge of this movement is *Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps. 36, serm.* 2, 19-21. and Books III-IV of the *C. Cresc.*)

Monceaux 4, 57-62 and 129-132; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford 1952 (repr. 1971), 215-224; J.-P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine de Septime Sévère à l'invasion vandale*, Paris 1958, 223-225; E.L. Grasmück, *Coërcitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit*, Bonn 1964, 163-167; A.C. de Veer, *L'exploitation du schisme maximianiste par saint Augustin dans sa lutte contre le donatisme*, RecAug III, Paris 1965, 219-237; Id., *Les origines du maximianisme*: BA 31, 825-827; Id., *Le concile maximianiste de Cabarsussa*: BA 31, 786-789; Id., *Le concile primianiste de Bagai*: BA 31, 789-791; PCBE 1, 719-722.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MAXIMIAN, emperor (ca. 250–310). Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus, born at *Sirmium about 250. He excelled as a soldier and was made Caesar for the East in 285 by his companion *Diocletian; he was raised to the rank of Augustus in 286; he took the surname Herculius, just as Diocletian had taken Iovius, giving a religious feel to the new institutional attitude toward the empire. He put down a peasants' revolt in *Gaul (the *Bagaudae*), but did not manage to quell Carausius's insurrection in *Britain (involving the destruction of his fleet in 289). Only later, in 296, did Caesar *Con-

stantius Chlorus bring it under control. He met with Diocletian at Milan in 290/291; in 393 Constantius Chlorus became his Caesar. In 298 he was in *Africa; in 299 he celebrated the *vicennalia* with Diocletian in *Rome. Having reluctantly accepted abdication in 305, as imposed upon him by Diocletian, he retired to one of his villas, perhaps in Lucania; the success of his son *Maxentius, who was proclaimed emperor by the Praetorian Guard, spurred Maximian on to reclaim his own powers once his son had recalled him. In 307 he went to Gaul and proclaimed *Constantine Augustus and gave him his daughter Fausta to be his wife; in 308 he returned to Rome but was unsuccessful in deposing his son, who in the meantime had been enjoying popularity among the people, and so he returned to Gaul. At the encounter at Carnuntum in 308 he was constrained to abdicate. In 310 he took the purple for the third time and was defeated by Constantine near *Marseille (he appears to have killed himself).

W. Ensslin, PWK XIV, 2, 2486-2516; regarding his retirement, see S. Mazzarino, *Sull'otium di Massimiano Erculio*: RAL 8 (1953) 417-421; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 272-277; S. Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government AD 284–324*, Oxford 1996; W. Kuhoff, *Diokletian und die Epoche der Tetrarchie: das römische Reich zwischen Krisenbewältigung und Neuaufbau (284–313 n. Chr.)*, Frankfurt a.M. 2001.

M. Forlin Patrucco

MAXIMIAN of Bagai (beginning of 5th c.). Catholic bishop of Bagai (Ksar Baghai), which was a famous center of *Donatism in *Numidia (Aug., *C. Cresc.* 3, 47); previously, perhaps before he was a bishop, he had been a Donatist, but then joined the Catholic Church. He was the victim of Donatist aggression because of his having managed to obtain the legal restitution of a church in the *fundus calvisianus*: “While the bishop was at the altar, he was assailed with horrible violence and ferocious cruelty; he was beaten with rods and all manner of weapons and with the very altar table, which had been broken into pieces” (Aug., *Ep.* 185, 27). After his wounds had healed, he went to the emperor in *Italy to request that violent Donatists be quelled and that Catholics be protected; with other African bishops, he influenced the issuing of the “edict of union” of Feb 405 by *Honorius (CTh 16, 11, 2).

PCBE 1, 723-725; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999, 407f.

A. Di Berardino

MAXIMIAN of Ravenna (bishop 546–556). On 14 Oct 546 Pope *Vigilius, traveling to *Constantinople for discussion on the *Three Chapters, consecrated Maximian the 27th bishop of *Ravenna. He had been deacon at Pula and was well used to the high circle of the *Byzantine court. The ten years of his episcopate constitute the golden age of the church of Ravenna, which thanks to him was enriched with splendid monuments. Using his Istrian origins, and perhaps also his personal acquaintances, to his advantage, Maximian skillfully managed to make his way into the ecclesiastical province of *Aquileia and to affirm his authority in Istria as the representative of orthodoxy: actually, with Vigilius's absence from *Rome and Dacius's absence from *Milan, he found himself exercising a primatial role over *Italy in order to bring those churches that had embraced the schism of the Three Chapters back to Catholic unity. He also took charge of a collating of liturgical formulas, from which the Leonine *Sacramentary is possibly derived.

PCBE 2, 1446-1453; A. Chavasse, *L'œuvre littéraire de Maximien de Ravenne*: EphLit 74 (1960) 115-120; G. Cuscito, *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 286-287.

G. Cuscito

MAXIMIAN of Syracuse (d. 594). A great part of what we know about Maximian comes to us from the *Life of Gregory the Great* composed by *John the Deacon (PL 75, 59-242) and from the *Epistolary* of *Gregory the Great (CC 140). According to John the Deacon, Maximian was abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew founded in Rome by Gregory, which he entered while still a youth, dedicating himself to the monastic life there (*Life* I, 6). His time spent in the monastery fostered close ties between him and Gregory: Maximian accompanied the future pontiff to *Constantinople. When he had become pope, Gregory summoned Maximian, with some other monks, to live out the ascetic ideal with him; then he sent him as bishop to *Syracuse, with extensive powers over the whole of the Sicilian church (*Life* II, 11; Greg., *Ep.* II, 5). The letters Gregory wrote to Maximian (*Ep.* II, 5, 15, 21, 48; III, 12, 50, 53; III, 51; IV, 11, 12, 14, 36, 42) afford a rich account of the life of the Sicilian church and bear witness to the esteem in which the bishop of Syracuse was held by the pope. Maximian died in 594 (Greg., *Ep.* V, 20).

AASS, *Junii* II, 241-244; BS 9, 20-21; PCBE 2, 1453-1457.

A. Pollastri

MAXIMILIAN, martyr. Young Christian martyr killed in N *Africa at the end of the 3rd c. The event took place at *Tebessa in 295, acc. to the *Passio Sancti Maximiliani*, which is the source of our knowledge of Maximilian and considered reliable for the most part. Having been declared fit for duty, Maximilian refused to serve in the army, since for him acting as a soldier (*militare*) inevitably meant doing evil (*mala facere*). Notwithstanding all manner of argument by the proconsul Dio Cassius, Maximilian remained firm in his position, was condemned to death and beheaded at the age of 21 years 3 months and 18 days. As far as can be established from the document, we are dealing with a case of objection to military service. Recently, the Irish classicist David Woods has advanced the opinion that the *Acta Maximiliani* are a later fiction without any historical value for the tradition of the early church regarding military service. In fact, as early as 1965, E. Sandler (in PW, Suppl. vol. X, 680) had expressed the idea that the document was a fake of the 13th c., but without furnishing any proof for his theory. Woods indicated that in his opinion the date of composition was between 384 and 439. In support of this view Woods adduces a series of observations, in particular: the lack of evidence for the martyr's cult until the 11th c.; the historical contradictions, improbabilities and absurdities contained in the text; the assertion that the *Passio* relies on the later *Passio Theagenis*. The observations seem unconvincing when one takes account of the historical context (end of 4th c./1st decades of the 5th) in which Woods sets the *Passio Maximiliani*, and the specific terminology that is very difficult to reconstruct after the passing of so much time. Woods does not consider these two elements; but it is true in any case that the document is controversial, indeed puzzling.

Text of the *Passio* in H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christians Martyrs*, Oxford 1972 and in *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, ed. by A.A.R. Bastiaensen - A. Hilhorst - G.A.A. Kortekaas - A.P. Orban - M.M. van Assendelft, Milan 1987, 233-245; P. Siniscalco, *Massimiliano: un obiettore di coscienza del Tardo Impero*, Turin 1974; P. Brock, *Why Did St. Maximilian Refuse to Serve in the Roman Army?*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 45 (1994) 195-209; D. Woods, *The Origin of the Cult of St. Maximilian of Tebessa* (article of August 1999 is of 3 pages and and can be read on the website www.ucc.ie/milmart/maxorig.html, as referred to by P. Brock in the article *The Riddle of St. Maximilian of Tebessa*, Toronto 2000 (obtainable from the same author, Dept. of History, Univ. Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3G3).

P. Siniscalco

MAXIMILLA and PRISCILLA (2nd c.) (Priscilla is also called Prisca in *Tertullian). Followers of *Montanus, endowed like him with tongues, ecstasies and inspired speech, on account of which they were called "prophetesses." They were very highly regarded within *Montanism: Montanus and "his women" are often mentioned together as the highest authorities in the movement. They were, it is said, the first to leave their husbands when they were filled with the Spirit (Apollonius in Eus., *HE* 5, 18,3), in accordance with Montanist practice.

A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten*, Berlin 1980; A. Jensen, *God's Self-Confident Daughters: Early Christianity and the Liberation of Women*, Kampen 1996, 133-182 (original German 1992); Ch. Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*, Cambridge 1996, passim.

B. Aland

MAXIMINUS DAIA, emperor (d. 313). Gaius Galerius Valerius, better known as Maximinus Daia, was made Caesar by *Galerius in May 305 and was confirmed in that role in 308, together with *Constantine I at the meeting at Carnuntum, for the Eastern empire (*Syria and *Egypt) with the title of *filius Augustorum*. He was proclaimed Augustus (309) and recognized as such by Galerius. On the death of Galerius Augustus in 311, Maximinus took possession of his territory and united the whole of the East under his control. Defeated by *Licinius at Hadrianopolis (*Thrace) in April 313, he fled and killed himself in September of the same year at *Tarsus. He implemented a religious policy that was strictly pagan, having anti-Christian literature distributed in schools and attempting to set up an organization analogous to that of the church. To justify persecution he promoted the wishes of cities to expel Christians. Two inscriptions to that effect and with Maximinus's responses have been found (see Eus., *HE* 9, 10, 12).

J. Barini, *La politica religiosa di Massimino Daia*: Historia 2 (1928) 716-730; S. Filosi, *L'ispirazione neoplatonica della persecuzione di Massimino Daia*: RSCI 41 (1987) 79-91; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 288f.; S. Mitchell, *Maximinus and the Christians in A.D. 312: A New Latin Inscription*: JRS 78 (1988) 105-124; O.P. Nicholson, *The "Pagan Churches" of Maximinus Daia and Julian the Apostate*: JEH 45 (1994) 1-10.

M. Forlin Patrucco - A. Di Berardino

MAXIMINUS (MAXIMIAN) of Anazarbus. Metropolitan of *Cilicia Secunda (5th c.). After having protested in June of 431 against the hasty opening of the council presided over by *Cyril of Alexandria, he shifted at *Ephesus to the side of the synod united

behind *John of Antioch, who excommunicated St. Cyril. In the succeeding years, he was strictly allied with the position of the metropolitan of Cilicia Prima, *Alexander of Hierapolis, and was opposed to any attempt at reconciliation with Cyril, even breaking away from John of Antioch. Three letters have come down to us in the *Synodicon* of *Rusticus (in Latin): one to Alexander of Hierapolis on the conciliar position adopted by John of Antioch, another to Alexander on the defection of John of Germanicia and of *Andrew of Samosata, and a third to seek support at the synod that Maximian convoked at *Anazarbus in 433 to excommunicate Cyril again until such time as he signed the condemnation of the anathemas. Notwithstanding his pro-*Nestorian intransigence, he was not included in the list of bishops exiled for their opposition to the union of 433. He may have died before being affected by the relevant imperial decrees.

CPG 6449-6453; PG 84, 675, 721-725, 773-774; Patrologia V, 180-181, 184.

D. Stiernon

MAXIMINUS of Sinita (d. before 411). *Augustine, having been recently ordained priest, wrote a letter (*Ep.* 23, in 392/393) to Maximinus, the *Donatist bishop of Sinita, a place not far from *Hippo. He asked him his reasons for having "rebaptized" a Catholic deacon and invited him to an open debate. After some years Maximinus was converted to the Catholic Church when Augustine was in Sinita; in 407, they began together a journey of preaching to reestablish ecclesial unity. According to Dolbeau, *Sermon* 360—from among the sermons grouped together with Augustine's, which is by a Donatist convert who publicly makes amends for his fault—could have been composed by Maximinus. On the same occasion, Augustine's recently discovered sermon (Dolbeau 27, Magonza 63) was preached, in which Augustine says: "Even my revered brother and colleague Maximinus has been converted to the Catholic Church" (27,3: NBA 35/2, p. 737).

PCBE 1, 728; F. Dolbeau, *Par qui et dans quelles circonstances fut prononcé le Sermon 360 d'Augustin?*: RBen 105 (1995) 293-307; Id., *Augustin d'Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique retrouvés à Mayence*, ed. and comm., F. Dolbeau, Paris 1996, 304-310; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999, 247f.

A. Di Berardino

MAXIMINUS of Trier (d. 346). Bishop of *Trier in the 4th c. and defender of Nicene orthodoxy. Maximinus procured the return to Alexandria of *Athanasius, who had been exiled to Trier, as well as the return of *Paul, bishop of Constantinople, to his see. With the aid of Pope *Julius I and of *Ossius, bishop of Cordoba, he also succeeded in having the Council of *Serdica convoked in 342/343. The information in the first *Life* of Maximinus (8th c.) is probably false when it states that a council held at Cologne on 12 May 346, presided over by Maximinus, deposed *Euphratas, *Arian bishop of that city (CCL 148, 27-29). Maximinus died on 12 Sept 346 at Mouterre-Silly (near Loudun). According to his *Life*, Maximinus was transferred to Trier and buried by *Paulinus his successor in the basilica of St. John the Evangelist, which later took his name and became a Benedictine abbatial see (the *Mart. hier.* gives 29 May as the date of burial).

BHL 5822-5827; BS 9, 33-34; LCI 7, 619-620; BBKL 18, 893-895; N. Gauthier, *Topographe chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle*, 1, Paris 1986, 28-30; A. Neyses, *Die Baugeschichte der ehemaligen Reichsabtei St. Maximin bei Trier 1-2*, Trier 2001; H. Heinen et al., *Im Umbruch der Kulturen*, Trier 2003.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

MAXIMINUS the Arian (ca. 360/365–after 440). Maximinus is unique among Latin *Arians in that we are able to piece together something of him as a person. Born around 360–365 of *Roman rather than *Gothic parentage, he was bishop of an Arian community possibly in Illyricum, and was in *Africa in 427 among barbarian troops sent there to serve Rome. It was on this occasion that he had a public debate with *Augustine at Hippo (427 or 428). Only with difficulty can he be identified with the Arian leader of the same name in Sicily in 440. The *Dissertatio Maximini contra Ambrosium* is a composite text found in the *Cod. Paris. 8907*, and contains various Arian testimonies that comment on the Council of *Aquileia in 381. It was put together by Maximinus in about 395. The *Collatio Augustini cum Maximino* is a verbatim account of the discussion at Hippo in 427 or 428: in it Maximinus expounds at length the Arian doctrine inherited from *Wulfila and shows himself impervious to Augustine's refutation: it is a very important text for knowledge about Western Arianism. Various works found in the *Cod. Veron. LI* have been attributed to Maximinus by B. Capelle, which were previously thought the work of *Maximus of Turin. Three *tractatus* are doctrinal in nature, *contra haereticos*, *iudaeos*, *paganos*: by "heretics" Maximinus means Catholics whose teaching on the equality of the di-

vine persons is at odds with traditional Arian arguments. Less polemical are 15 homilies preached by Maximinus on important feast days (Epiphany, Easter, Ascension) or on the commemorations of the martyrs (St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Stephen, St. Cyprian): Maximinus frequently cites St. *Cyprian's writings in various of his works. A third category of writings is made up of 24 short *Expositiones de capitulis evangeliorum*, explanations of gospel passages of varying length and with no systematic arrangement: they deal with passages taken out of a larger context for use in the liturgy of some Arian churches. The interpretation of the sacred text does not ignore *allegory, but it has a preference for being literal. Recently, several works have been attributed to Maximinus, but without convincing reasons: the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* and a *Commentarium in Iob* of Arian authorship; on the other hand, the attribution to Maximinus of the *Cod. Veron. LI* and the homogeneity of its collected texts has been called back into doubt by R. Gryson (CCL 87, XIXf.). He believes some of these texts were written in *Vandal Africa.

CPL 692-702; PL 57, 781-806, 829-832; PLS I, 691-763; SC 267; CCL 87; Patrologia III, 90-93 (bibl.); J.M. Hanssens, *Massimino il Visigoto*: Scuola Cattolica 102 (1974) 475-514; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 92-250; G.M. Vian, *Predicazione ed esegesi nell'arianesimo latino: la raccolta di Verona*: AnSE 11 (1994) 533-544; Ibid., *Ortodossia ed eresia nel IV secolo: la cristologia dei testi ariani di Verona*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 847-858.

M. Simonetti

MAXIMINUS THRAX, emperor (173–238). Gaius Julius Verus Maximinus, born in *Thrace, Roman emperor 235–238. Son of a shepherd, he had a military career and came to power after he had *Alexander Severus murdered, together with his mother in *Germany. With Maximinus came an unforeseen interruption in Severus's policy of tolerance toward Christians. His brief persecution was not of a religious nature, but rather political and personal: he wished to strike at those who formed the *familia* of Alexander Severus (*Hist. Aug.*, *Vita Maximini* 9,7-8), "whose household was made up largely of Christians" (Eus., *HE* 6, 28). Those affected, among others, were Pope *Pontianus, *Hippolytus of Rome, and two friends of *Origen, the deacon Ambrose and the priest Protoctetus. According to some scholars, there was not a genuine and proper edict of persecution in 235: in the same year, the emperor became convinced that Christians, as such, did not constitute a political opposition and the "persecution" was ended. Furthermore, one ought to bear in mind that Maximinus, beset by military problems in the provinces that always kept him far from *Rome, did not have a religious policy (coins from his reign show the continuance of sun cults). In 238 the Senate declared him a public enemy: his own soldiers killed him at *Aquileia.

G.M. Bersanetti, *Studi sull'imperatore M. il T.*, Rome 1940; A. Calderini, *I Severi. La crisi dell'impero nel III secolo*, Bologna 1949, 127-132; A. Bellezza, *M. il Trace*, Genoa 1964; G.W. Clarke, *Some Victims of the Persecution of Maximinus Thrax*: Historia 15 (1966) 445-453; P. Keresztes, *The Emperor Maximinus' Decree of 235 A.D.: Between Septimius and Decius*: Latomus 28 (1969) 601-618; R. McMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100–400*, New Haven 1984; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; M. Christol, *L'empire romain du III[e] siècle. Histoire politique (192–325 après J.-C.)*, Paris 1997; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

MAXIMUS (d. after 416). Catholic bishop of an unknown see, probably serving the proconsul, who signed the synodal letter of the Council of *Carthage in 416 (Aug., *Ep.* 175, CSEL 44, 653), and possibly wrote to *Theophilus bishop of *Alexandria (*Ep. Ad Theophilum*, PLS I, 1092-1095) before 412, in order to inform him of decisions that were made in light of the crisis arising from the barbarian invasions. Unless it were another individual of the same name, Maximus may also have been the recipient of a letter from *Augustine, which is known to us only from the testimony of *Possidius (*Operum S. Augustini elenchus* 17, ed. A. Wilmart, Misc. August. II, 183).

P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris 1964, 60-64; PCBE I, 737.

P. Marone

MAXIMUS, antignostic. An antignostic writer of the 2nd c., whom we have knowledge of only because he is mentioned by *Eusebius (*HE* 5, 27) along with several other antignostic authors of the same period. According to Eusebius, Maximus's writings addressed the problem of the origin of evil and that of the creation of matter. None of his works have survived.

C. Gianotto

MAXIMUS, bishop of *Jerusalem (d. 348?). Sentenced to the mines during the time of persecution under *Maximinus Daia in *Palestine, though when precisely is not known (i.e., whether before or dur-

ing the period in which Maximinus Daia was emperor [311–313]), Maximus suffered various tortures which deprived him of an eye and left him with a mutilated left foot. Having survived this ordeal, which he endured for the Christian faith, Maximus acquired the title of confessor (*homologētēs*).

After his liberation he was consecrated to God. A date for his consecration, however, cannot be determined, and as a consequence it is not known whether he accompanied Bishop *Macarius of Jerusalem to the *Council of *Nicaea (325). Although historians are not unanimous in recognizing a first episcopal appointment of Maximus to the diocese of Diospolis, they do agree that he was the successor of Macarius to the see of Jerusalem, without, however, concurring on an exact date for this appointment. It is certain, in any case, that Maximus participated in 335 in the Synod of *Tyre, which was intended to resolve the case of *Athanasius of *Alexandria, and that he let himself be dragged into the company of accusers. He apparently modified his position afterward, because he did not participate in the semi-*Arian synod of *Antioch in 341, he fully adhered to the decisions of the Council of *Serdica in 343 (although it is not possible to affirm that he personally attended), and, above all, he officially and solemnly welcomed Athanasius, who had returned from exile, in a synod called for this very purpose in Jerusalem in 346.

Although Maximus might appear somewhat timid and ingenuous, he has always been considered faithful to the *orthodoxy of Nicaea and unfavorable to the Arians and semi-Arians of the time. Further proof of this is found in diverse claims which have circulated about a deposition of Maximus by *Acacius of *Caesarea (the metropolitan which had oversight of Jerusalem at the time). It seems that Acacius was unsuccessful in his attempt at deposing Maximus, and thus that Maximus remained in his see until his death, the date of which is also a matter of discussion. The year 348 can be accepted as most likely.

Acacius and his party did not entirely give up: they fervently opposed the nomination (and consecration) of *Heraclius, a candidate chosen by Maximus and a recognized anti-Arian, in favor of the installation of *Cyril to the post, a man they believed more favorable to the course which they represented.

It is interesting to note that in 335, during his pontificate, Maximus moved the cathedral of Jerusalem from Mount Zion to the martyrium of Calvary. He also initiated work on the towering basilica of Holy Zion.

Maximus has been included in the number of saints venerated in Jerusalem. He is considered such also by the Latin Church.

BS 9, 48-57; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, Rome 1974 (see index); R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 398ff.

J.-M. Sauget

MAXIMUS, martyr. From martyrologies and hagiographical documents it is possible to create of list of twenty-five martyrs with the name Maximus, but only a few of them are likely to be historical. With regard to some we know only their name: (1) the martyr of *Sirmium, 15 July (*Mart. hier.*, p. 376); (2) Maximus of Cyzicus, inscribed 6 Feb in the Synaxarion of *Constantinople (*Syn. Ecc. CP.* cols. 447-448); (3) Maximus the Illyrican, 18 Aug (ibid., cols. 907-908); (4) Maximus of *Caesarea in Cappadocia, mentioned by the *Syriac martyrology on 18 Tišrin (*Mart. hier.*, p. 607). Of others we have more secure information, but of variable reliability. This applies, e.g., to (5) Maximus, a young martyr of an African group, a victim of the *Vandal persecution, 2 July 483 (*Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr. Prov.*, CSEL 8, 108-114); (6) the lector of Durostorum, who died together with two companions during the persecution of *Diocletian (H. Delehaye, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie*: AB 31 [1912] 272). But for the great majority, historical facts have been obscured by legend. Such was the case for many Roman martyrs named Maximus, among whom it is sufficient to name: (7) he who appears in the legend of St. *Cecilia (*Mart. hier.*, pp. 43, 47, 104, 146); (8) the priest and martyr commemorated on 19 Nov (H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936, 44-45). Some have been duplicated, through the multiplication of places of veneration, such as (9) the martyr of *Apamea, venerated at Cumae (H. Delehaye, *Hagiographie napolitaine*: AB 57 [1939] 38; R. Calvino, *Una inedita inscrizione cristiana rinvenuta a Cuma*: Asprenas 7 [1960] 235ff.); (10) a Greek martyr, inscribed with different dates in different martyrologies: 6 and 7 April, 14 May and 19 Nov in *Mart. hier.* It is impossible to determine the date of his martyrdom and the place of his burial (BS 9, 37-39; 47; 73; 76-82; Cath 8, 993-994); (11) the companion of *Anthimus on the Via Salaria (*Mart. hier.*, pp. 247-248), with whom the companion of Castus and *Magnus should perhaps be identified (ibid., 487-488), and the copatron of the cathedral of Penne (F. Lanzoni, *Le Diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 370-371); (12) the Thracian martyr of 15 Sept or 19 Feb (H. Delehaye, Saints de Thrace et de *Mésie*, cit., 244).

S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-ecclesiastici in Oriente nella tarda antichità: il II concilio di Efeso (449)*, Madrid 2001, 144, 283.

E. Prinzivalli

MAXIMUS of Antioch (5th c.). Patriarch of *Antioch. He was successor to *Domnus, who was deposed by the Robber Council of *Ephesus (449). He should perhaps be identified with the Antiochene deacon named Maximus who was hostile to *John of Antioch, accusing him of weakness toward the *Nestorians. *Cyril wrote this deacon two letters encouraging greater moderation (*Ep.* 57-58). Maximus strove to have his suffragan bishops subscribe to the *Tomus ad Flavianum* and was recognized for his efforts by Pope *Leo. He participated in the Council of *Chalcedon (451), where he appealed the excommunication of his predecessor on principles of humaneness. In a meeting 26 Oct he subscribed a compromise with *Juvenal of Jerusalem regarding their respective jurisdictions, yielding the three Palestines to the new patriarchate of *Jerusalem, but retaining *Phoenicia and *Arabia (Mansi VII, 178-183). In 455/456 he was deposed by the *monophysites. He was succeeded by *Basil.

S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-ecclesiastici in Oriente nella tarda antichità: il II concilio di Efeso (449)*, Madrid 2001, 144, 283.

E. Prinzivalli

MAXIMUS of Riez (5th c.). Maximus was the second *abbot of the *cenobium of *Lérins and then bishop of Riez. Beyond passing references in *Eucherius of Lyons, *Sidonius Apollinaris, *Honoratus of Marseille (*Vita *Hilarii*) and *Gregory of Tours, his fame was spread by a *homily (*Homilia Maximi*), included in the so-called collection of *Eusebius Gallicanus but definitely written by *Faustus of Riez, as well as by a *Vita S. Maximi* of *Dynamius Patricius that was redacted around 585, packed with fabulous tales and essentially lacking in historical value. No longer very young, Maximus arrived at Lérins in some year prior to 427–428, if we assume that he was recognized and chosen by *Honoratus to be his successor; Honoratus was the abbot of the cenobium who now departed to become the bishop of *Arles. Maximus remained as abbot for seven years. Around 434, after having evaded the requests of numerous dioceses, he became the bishop of Riez (*Homilia Maximi* 1 and 8). He participated in the *Council of *Riez (439), First Council of *Orange (441), the Council of *Vaison in 442 and the third Synod of Arles. We do not know the date of his death.

BHL II, 855-856, nos. 5852-5853, 5857; Faustus, *Homilia Maximi* = Eusebius Gallicanus, *Collectio Homiliarum*, ed. F. Glorie, CCL 101, Turnhout 1970, 401-412; Dinamius, *Vita sancti Maximi, episcopi Reiensis*, ed. S. Gennaro, Catania 1966; A.C. Cooper-Marsdin, *The History of the Islands of the Lerins*, Cambridge 1913, 228-230; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, II, Paris [2]1966, 260-262; S. Pricoco, *L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978, 48-49; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Darmstadt [2]1988, 54-55; R. Nouailhat, *Saints et Patrons. Les premiers moines de Lérins*, Paris 1988, 163-164.

S. Pricoco

MAXIMUS of Saragossa (d. ca. 620). *Isidore of Seville (*Vir. ill.* 46) places among the leading lights of *Spain Maximus bishop of *Saragossa, who died around 620, of whom we know only that he participated in the provincial councils of *Barcelona and Egara (now *Terrassa), in 599 and 614. To Maximus are attributed many works in prose and in verse, among which are a brief history of Spain under the rule of the *Goths. Yet out of all his writings, only a few fragments of his historical works have come down to us, transmitted through the margins of the *codices of *Victor of Tunnuna and *John of Biclaro, edited by Mommsen under the title *Chronicorum Caesaraugustanorum reliquiae* (MGH IX, *Chronica minora*, II, 222-223). Under the description of *Maximus Caesaraugustanus*, Migne (PL 70) presents a letter of a Portuguese bishop that relates to the *Chronicon* and the table that follows immediately thereafter.

CPL 2267; Schanz IV/2, 630; Moricca III/2, 1491 (bibl.), 1520; Domínguez del Val IV, 455-456.

V. Loi and B. Amata

MAXIMUS of Turin (I) (d. after 412). Of Maximus we know only from *Gennadius of *Marseille (*Vir. ill.* 41); other information is inferred from his *sermons. Gennadius refers to him as bishop of *Turin and informs us that he died "while *Honorius and *Theodosius the Younger were reigning" (408–423); one can therefore suppose that he was born around the middle of the 4th c. In reality he was not of Turin (*Serm.* 33,1: "from the day when you first began to see me in your midst"), and we do not know from where and when he arrived. If he did not personally know *Ambrose of Milan (d. 4 April 397), he certainly pondered his writings, as is evident from the traces which we find left behind in the sermons. That he was a disciple of bishop *Eusebius of Vercelli (d. 1 August 371) has been confirmed on the basis of two sermons (7 and 8), yet these are not treated as authentic in the critical edition. Certainly he was bishop of Turin in September of 398, when a synod of bishops from N *Italy and *Gaul convened (*Serm.* 21 and 78). It appears that he was still alive in 412, if there was in this year the eclipse of the *moon of which he speaks in sermons 30 and 31 (see Gallesio, 9-10). Of no help

in pinpointing the chronology are the allusions to the barbarian invasions that menaced the city of Turin and the region of Piedmont, extending from the beginning of the 5th c. until the fall of the empire. Around the end of the 5th c., his remains were deposited in the new basilica of Collegno, a few kilometers from Turin. Gennadius makes a list of his works in 28 titles, some of which really constitute a sermon (*tractatus*, *liber*, **homiliae*) composed by Maximus, and he claims to have read many others that he does not recall, on various subjects. In PL 57 that reproduces the 1784 edition of B. Bruni, under the name of Maximus there occur 240 "homilies" or "sermons," in addition to an appendix containing works considered dubious or spurious (6 *tractati*, 31 sermons, 3 homilies and 2 epistles). The recent critical scholarship treats around a hundred of the sermons as authentic, the brevity of each one leading to the conclusion that they are extracts or summaries (see Opitz and Heggelbacher; see the end bibl.) on diverse subjects. In the vast majority of cases they follow the *liturgical year: Advent, *Nativity, Calends of January, *Epiphany, *Lent, *Easter, *Pentecost. Quite a few commemorate the *saints: *John the Baptist; the *apostles *Peter and *Paul; *Cyprian of Carthage; *Lawrence of Rome; the martyrs of Turin: Solutor, Adventor and Octavius; the *Roman martyrs Cantius, Cantianus and Cantianella; the martyrs of Trent: *Sisinnius, Martyrius and Alexander; as well as martyrs and saints in general. Some of the sermons comment on passages of the OT or of the NT, treating them generally as starting points for the exposition of moral themes. Whether of general interest or arising from particular occasions, these themes are also treated in other sermons that do not offer commentary on a particular pericope of *Scripture.

A *pastor more than a *theologian concerned with speculation, Maximus considers *preaching above all as a medicine for healing the wounds of the *soul and for bringing about *conversion. "*Prayer, acts of mercy and *fasting": the "weapons" that he recommends to the members of his diocese, frightened by the incursions of the barbarians, indicate the essential features of the Christian lifestyle. Prayer must be practiced not only on *Sunday, a day that remembers the Lord's resurrection, but on every day, morning and evening, with praise and thanksgiving, as a means of elevating the spirit and of obtaining necessary help from God. On fasting, above all during all of Lent, Maximus is very strict, with the condition that it is accompanied with a commitment to interior renewal and that whoever deprive themselves of something should be generous in helping the needy. It is above all with *almsgiving that one obtains the *forgiveness of *sins.

Maximus severely chastises the hypocrisy of Christians who observe the fast but, oblivious to the fact that their servants are brothers and sisters in Christ, treat them in an inhumane way. He is no less severe with the public officials who tolerate corruption out of financial greed, and even more severe with the vultures who buy up at a low price from the barbarian invaders the bounty of their raids. Other abuses denounced by the bishop are the *superstition that induces hysterical behavior among the crowds when they see a lunar eclipse, the persistence of *pagan cults particularly in the countryside and the indifference of Christians who should strive to eliminate them. Although admitting that some church officials behave in an exemplary manner, he does not neglect to harshly reprimand those who fail to attend church and those who allow themselves to become entangled in worldly business rather than attending to their work of ministry, or those who exploit the ministry as a source of profit and react badly when the bishop reproaches them.

More attentive to moral problems, by temperament and out of a sense of necessity in dwelling on this area, Maximus speaks as a master of the *faith. Although on guard for lingering traces of *Arianism, he does so not for the sake of entering into theological controversies but for the sake of edification, reclaiming received truths esp. through *commentary on the biblical texts. In his preaching, a noteworthy place is occupied by the vision of the church, the church of the saints, above all of *Mary, whose *virginal motherhood he exalts. In the sermons based on the annual cycle, the *liturgy is a matter for *meditation on the *mysteries which are being commemorated. Particularly significant is the way in which Maximus reflects on the *sacraments of *baptism and *Eucharist. He "displays the ability to transport his audience to the very place from which the sanctifying energies of the Christian sacrament burst forth: the very person of Christ and his salvific work all addressed to us. He contains within himself a prefigurement of the entire sacramental *economy," through which "Christ can be and has been directly called *sacramentum*" (Visentin, 40; Heggelbacher, 17). Theological reflection finds a continual basis in the *Bible acc. to the normative criteria of the age, making the widest use of *typology and of *allegory: indeed, Gennadius praises Maximus for his constant attention to the divine Scriptures. Yet this method does not strip the meaning of a theology that contains an internal coherence, even though it is not systematic.

He pastored a young church, being recently disconnected from the church of Vercelli that had been

represented by *Eusebius. He also stood as one of a handful of fearless defenders of the *Nicene faith and of the person of *Athanasius of Alexandria, and heroically resisted the will of the emperor *Constantius II, who was a patron of Arianism. He knew how to give life to a community that, despite the deficiencies in religious practice and moral conduct denounced by the bishop himself, shows itself to be aware and alive. Not lacking a solid theological formation despite claims to the contrary, Maximus was above all a pastor attentive to the civil and religious situation in which he operated. He occupied himself with the struggle to eliminate the residual elements of paganism in the Christian community, to win over to the faith the rural populations who still held onto paganism, to warn the faithful against seductive *heresies and above all to help them live out fully their profession of faith. He strove to realize this goal with assiduous, Christ-centered preaching, in a practical way deducing from the Word of God directions for daily conduct. His clear and decisive language stirred up resentment among some in his audience, esp. within the *clergy. Yet the toughness is balanced by overtones of sincere and tender affection, as when he thinks it necessary to justify his absences, assuring the faithful that even then he carries them in his heart.

CPL 220-226b, PLS 3, 351-379; PL 57, 221-760 (B. Bruni 1784: still the standard work); A. Mutzenbecher: CCL 23 (1962) (an indispensable ed.); G.E. Ganss, *Selected Sermons of Saint Maximus and Saint Valerian's Homilies*, FC 17, Washington D.C. 1965; F. Gallesio, *Sermoni di s. Massimo di Torino*, Rome 1975. Studies that assume that the one and the other Maximus are identical, or that refer without critical comment to the edition of B. Bruni, have a limited value. U. Moricca, *La storia della letteratura latina cristiana* III/1, Turin 1932, 1023-1031; E. Crovella, *Massimo vescovo di Torino*, BS 9, 65-72; C. Benna, *S. Massimo di Torino*: Rivista Diocesana Torinese 2 (1934) 47-50, 62-67, 102-109, 121-124, 140-145, 185-191; H.G. Opitz, *Maximus von Turin*: PWK Supplementband VI, 290 (posits a single Maximus, denying the validity of Gennadius); P. Bongiovanni, *S. Massimo vescovo di Torino e il suo pensiero teologico* (diss., Pontificio Ateneo Salesiano), Turin 1952; A. Mutzenbecher, *Zur Überlieferung des Maximus Taurinensis*: SE 6 (1954) 343-372; Id., *Bestimmung der echten Sermones des Maximus Taurinensis*: SE 12 (1961) 197-293; Id., *Der Festinhalt von Weihnachten und Epiphanie in den echten Sermones des Maximus Taurinensis*: SP 95 (TU 80), Berlin 1962, 109-116; M. Pellegrino, *Sull'autenticità d'un gruppo di omelie e di sermoni attribuiti a S. Massimo di Torino*: Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 90 (1955/1956) 1-113; Id., *Intorno a 24 omelie falsamente attribuite a san Massimo di Torino*: SP 1 (TU 63), Berlin 1957, 134-141; Id., *La tipologia battesimale in San Massimo di Torino*: *l'incontro con la Samaritana e le nozze di Cana*: RSLR 1 (1965) 260-268; P. Visentin, *"Christus ipse est sacramentum" in S. Massimo di Torino*, in *Miscellanea G. Lercaro* II, Rome 1967, 27-51; O. Heggelbacher, *Das Gesetz im Dienste des Evangeliums: über Bischof Maximus von Turin*, Bamberg 1968; C.E. Chaffin, *The Martyrs of the Val di Non: An Examination of Contemporary Reactions*: SP 10 (TU 107) 1970, 263-269; G. Rossetto, *La testimonianza liturgica di Massimo I, vescovo di Torino*, in *Ricerche storiche sulla Chiesa Ambrosiana*, I, Milan 1970, 158-203; A. Sáenz, *La celebración de los misterios en los sermones de san Máximo de Turín* (diss., S. Anselmo, Rome), Buenos Aires 1970 (see Stromata 25 [1969] 351-411; 27 [1971] 61-103); J.P. Bouhot, *Note sur trois sermons anonymes*: REAug 20 (1974) 135-142 (CPL 1157 of Maximus of Turin); R. Étaix, *Trois nouveax sermons à restituer à la collection du Pseudo-Maxime*: RBen 97 (1987) 28-41; Id., *Homéliaires patristiques*, Paris 1994, 539-558; RAC V, 1094-1095; PCBE II/2, 1469-1470; A. Merkt, *Maximus I. von Turin: Die Verkündigung eines Bischofs der frühen Reichskirche im zeitgeschichtlichen, gesellschaftlichen und liturgischen Kontext*, Leiden 1997; F. Trisoglio, *La preghiera in S. Massimo di Torino*: SEA 66 (1999) 419-431; Id., *L'esegesi biblica in S. Massimo di Torino*: SEA 68 (2000) 655-673; Id., *Pietro e Paolo in S. Massimo di Torino*: SEA 74 (2001) 315-333.

M. Pellegrino

MAXIMUS of Turin (II) (5th c.). At a synod of *Milan in 451 and at one of *Rome in 465, there was in attendance a Maximus, bishop of *Turin. Many historians, treating as erroneous or modifying the *chronologies provided by *Gennadius of Marseille (*see* *Maximus of Turin [I]), identified him with the Maximus of whom these chronologies speak and through whom the literary inheritance has reached us. Today there is wide recognition of the existence of a second Maximus bishop of Turin, to whom is attributed the speech given probably in 453, on the occasion of the dedication of the *ecclesia maior* of Milan, after the destruction caused by the invasion of the *Huns in 452. Such a work commemorates the tragic events in which nevertheless can be seen the *justice and *goodness of God toward his *children. Explaining that the church as the people of God has greater value than the church as a building, the speaker exhorts his audience to the commitment of the Christian life and to *hope. He does so while acknowledging the bishop *Eusebius of Milan, who, returning after fleeing in the face of the invaders, has been able to restore this church now being dedicated, and he prays to the Lord to save and bless his people. It is a vibrant discourse of *faith and of pastoral sensibility from a bishop who participates in the affairs of the sister-city church with a noble, clear and vigorous style.

F. Dell'Oro, *Il discorso "in reparatione ecclesiae Mediolanensis" per la solenne dedicazione della "ecclesia maior" nell'anno 453*: Archivio Ambrosiano 32 (1977) 267-301 (where the earlier bibl. is carefully examined); PCBE II/2, 1471-1472.

M. Pellegrino

MAXIMUS the Confessor (ca. 580–662).
I. Life - II. Works - III. Doctrine.

I. Life. According to the *Vita* published in the PG, written in Greek and the earliest and most traditional source of information about the Confessor—albeit in strongly celebratory tones—Maximus was born in *Constantinople around 580 to a noble family close to the emperor. He completed a detailed and thorough course of study from 610 to 614, the year in which he entered the monastery, and he served as secretary to Emperor *Heraclius. In 1973, however, there was published a *Syriac *Vita* of Maximus, attributed to George of Resh'aina, dating from the 7th or 8th c., and of *monothelite provenance. According to this text Maximus, whose real name was Moschion, was born in Hesfin, in *Palestine, from the illegitimate union of a Samaritan merchant and a Persian woman. He was afterward entrusted to the abbot *Pantaleon of the Palestinian monastery St. *Charito, who was involved in 6th-c. controversies over *Origenism. He received the name Maximus and was initiated into Origenism.

It has been demonstrated that the Syriac *Vita* is the more trustworthy of the two; however, one can also easily reconstruct events in Maximus's life from the point at which he can be found in the monastery of Philippicus, in Chrysopolis, near Constantinople. There, in about 618, Maximus was acquainted with the monk *Anastasius, who became his faithful disciple and followed him in confession of the faith. In about 624–625 he left the monastery of Chrysopolis in order to enter that of St. George of Cyzicus. This was perhaps the period of composition of his earliest important works: the letter on charity to John the Chamberlain (evidently known at court), the *Libro ascetico*, the *Centuries on Charity* and the *Quaestiones et dubia*. Around 626 the attack of the Persians and the Avars forced Maximus to travel to Crete, where he defended Chalcedonian orthodoxy against certain *monophysite bishops. He then established himself in the monastery Eucretas in *Africa, close to *Carthage, where he met, among other exiles, *Sophronius, the future patriarch of *Jerusalem and champion of orthodoxy in the earliest phase of the monothelite controversy.

The early years of Maximus's sojourn in Africa were probably quite peaceful, and he wrote during this period almost all of his better-known works: the *Ambigua ad Iohannem*, the *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, the *Commentary on Our Father*, the *Mystagogia*, the *Quaestiones ad Theopemptum*, the *Centuries on Theology and Economics*, as well as some pamphlets and letters. He also established relations with certain governors in Africa, Peter the Illustrious and George, who stood against monophysitism. Beginning in 633, however, Maximus became involved in the controversy over monoenergism. *Sergius, the patriarch of Constantinople, instructed *Pyrrhus, *hegumen of the monastery of Philippicus, to exhibit to Maximus the *Psephos*, which was a declaration by Sergius—a partial correction to the *Pact of Union* of the same year in which he had confessed "one energy alone," i.e., the sole divine operation of Christ—calling on *Cyrus patriarch of *Alexandria not to permit anyone to speak about either one or two energies in Christ, while maintaining at the same time a preference for monoenergism. The controversy also had political motivations: the emperor sought a formula which would facilitate the reconciliation of all Christians and would permit the monophysites of *Syria and *Egypt to reunite with the church, thus consolidating the empire and improving defense against Persian threats. Maximus was not convinced, and invited Pyrrhus to explain the notion of "energy" in relation to the certainty of Christ's two natures in *hypostatic union. Maximus found himself increasingly involved in the controversy, and from 638, the year in which Sophronius died and the emperor promulgated the **Ekthesis*, an exposition of the faith in monothelite terms, he found himself decidedly on the front lines. From this point forward his writings were entirely dedicated to polemics and deeper insight into these theological questions, always in defense of *Chalcedonian dogma. For Maximus, denial of Chalcedon constituted the root of the new heresy, because monoenergism and monothelitism were nothing but newer versions of monophysitism.

An important moment in the controversy was the public dispute held in Carthage in 645 between Maximus and Pyrrhus. We possess the full text of this dispute. In 646 Maximus traveled to *Rome, where already several popes, in particular *John IV, had condemned the *Ekthesis*. The emperor *Constans II, a supporter of monothelitism, in an attempt to end the controversy, promulgated in 647 the *Typos*, which forbade discussion on the question of the number of wills in Christ. But Pope *Martin I, recently elected, convened the Lateran Synod in Oct 649, without the consent of the emperor, at which the *Typos* was condemned. Maximus, though only a monk, participated actively in this labor, drafting some of the *Acts*, and even signing the decisions of the synod. Confronted with a refusal to compromise on the part of Pope *Martin and of Maximus, and after several failed attempts to gain their support, the emperor, in about 653, had them arrested and brought to Constantinople. Martin was tried, publicly exposed in the pillory, imprisoned in 654 and died in exile in Sept of 655. Maximus was tried in May of 655, and exiled to Bizya in *Thrace. Follow-

ing further, and vain, attempts on the part of the emperor to induce Maximus to accept a compromise, he was first deported to Perberi, then in 662 he underwent a second trial and was condemned by a monothelite synod to flogging and amputation of his right hand and tongue, the organs with which he had defended his doctrine. He was finally deported to Lazica on the shores of the Black Sea, where he died on 13 Aug 662. The Third Council of Constantinople, the sixth ecumenical, rehabilitated and canonized his doctrine on the two wills and energies of Christ in 680.

II. Works. The following works probably date to the years 624–626: the *Capita de caritat*e, four centuries of opinions in which charity is presented as the synthesis of all the commandments as well as the very nature of God, and in which anthropological themes are intertwined with others of a theological-metaphysical nature; the *Liber asceticus*, a dialogue between a young brother and an older monk in which the theme of *agape* is developed; some *Quaestiones et dubia*.

Almost all of his major works most likely date to the time of his stay in Africa, before the monothelite controversy: the *Mystagogia* (a symbolic-mystical interpretation of the liturgy and architecture of the place of worship), the *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (on various topics, like the *quaestiones et responsiones*), the *Quaestiones ad Theopemptum*, the *Orationis dominicae brevis expositio* (an explanation of the Our Father), the *Ambigua ad Iohannem* (perhaps the most important work written from a speculative point of view, in which he addresses issues of various kinds: the doctrine of the *Trinity, *Christology, *soteriology, apophatic and cataphatic theology, refutation of Origenism and other errors, exegetical questions and questions of a spiritual nature), collected and published along with the shorter *Ambigua ad Thomam*, in which he discusses problems concerning the Trinity and the *incarnation, and recovers, contra monophysitism, ps.-*Dionysius's expression "theandric energy." Also dating to these years are the *Capita theologica et oeconomica* (in which again fundamental issues are addressed: the transcendence of God, the temporality and spatiality of the creature, the ways of perfection, the mystical ascent, the metamorphosis of the Logos, *eschatology); the *Epistula secunda ad Thomam* that further clarifies the themes of the *Ambigua*, and many of the *Letters*.

Directly related to the fight against heresy are the majority of the *Opuscula theologica et polemica* and the *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, consisting of the *Acts* of the public dispute that Maximus and Pyrrhus sustained at Carthage in 645 in the presence of ecclesiastical and civil authorities in North Africa. In this dispute Maximus demonstrates that he has already developed a mature and complete doctrine of the will. At the end of the dispute Pyrrhus recognized his error. He seems later to have followed Maximus to *Italy, where he publicly renounced his former beliefs, only to return to them once he was established at *Ravenna near the imperial exarch. Also attributed to Maximus is a *Life of the Virgin* existing in *Georgian translation, though he no longer receives consistent credit for a pamphlet titled *De anima*. Annotations on the *Corpus areopagiticum*, received under the name Maximus, are now generally attributed to *John of Scythopolis, though it is difficult to establish the authorship of them. It is generally denied today that the Confessor is the actual author of a series of *Hymns* collected under his name in the PG.

III. Doctrine. The Cappadocians, ps.-Dionysius and *Evagrius are the most direct sources of Maximus's thought, but he knew well the entire Greek patristic tradition, including Origen, and pagan philosophy, esp. *Aristotle and the *Neoplatonists. The hinges of Maximus's thought are undoubtedly the defense of the christological dogma of Chalcedon and the idea of the participation of all beings in the *Logos*. The economy of salvation is based on the incarnation of the divine *Logos*, the reality of which is continually affirmed in defense of the dogma of Chalcedon against the monophysites and monothelites through stringent logical and psychological analysis. He demonstrates that the monothelites, building on the error of monophysitism, confuse nature with the hypostasis, and so fail to distinguish between absolute opposition and relative contrariety with respect to the will. The will, a natural faculty, is not to be confused with its operation, with the direction impressed upon it by the hypostatic *tropos*. The nature (a concept coinciding in part with that of *Logos*) is dynamic, and is endowed with operation, and each nature has its own corresponding operation. But the hypostasis imparts to the natural operation the *tropos*, orientation and determines the unification. So in Christ, a complete man provided with an entire human nature, there must be recognized a human will, in perfect accord with the hypostatic divine *tropos*, but not a *gnōmē*, a term referring to a will in the condition of fallen nature, subject to uncertainty and oscillation. Maximus also incorporates the Dionysian notion of *theandry*, interpreting it precisely as the union com-

pleted by the hypostasis of the two natures and operations, not confused but inseparable. Maximus also develops the traditional theme of the deification of humanity in relation to the christological foundation of creation and redemption.

The historical incarnation of the Logos in Christ is preceded and prepared by the "incarnations" of the *Logos* in the *logoi* of beings created at the time of creation and in the *logoi* of Scripture. This threefold incarnation produces an economy of salvation which is not motivated solely by the fall of humanity but is capable of furnishing the key to comprehend the significance of the entire cosmos. Through the incarnation of Christ, and the mediation between various levels of nature, in which humans also participate, the work of recapitulation is completed, i.e., the return of the *Logos* to the natural *logoi*. In the divine *Logos*, the *logoi* of all creatures regain their principle of union with God. In this sense also the role of the church, which unites humans and returns them to God together with the entire universe, is understood. Maximus was a precursor and inspirer of the decisions of the Council of Constantinople in 680 and a champion in the fight against heresy in the last great christological controversy during which he decidedly took the side of the Church of Rome, which affirmed that Maximus "holds the keys of the orthodox faith and confession," and opposed the attempts of the empire to control the church. He was a teacher of spirituality, and a philosopher and theologian capable of elaborating a comprehensive vision of theology, cosmology and anthropology, and of formulating a vocabulary adequate to the defense of orthodoxy. Maximus has been transmitted to the West through the translations of John Scotus Eriugena and has remained a point of constant reference for the theology and spirituality of the East, from *John of Damascus to Gregory Palamas to the great Orthodox theologians of the 20th c.

CPG 7688-7721. *Editions*: almost all the works are collected in PG 90 and 91; also: *Epistula secunda ad Thomam*, ed. R. Canart: Byzantion 34 (1964) 427-445; *Vita siriaca*, ed. S. Brock: AB 91 (1973) 299-346; *Life of the Virgin*: CSCO 478-479, ed. M.J. van Esbroeck, Louvain 1986. Other editions: Critical text of the *Ambiguum 47*, ed. E. Jeuneau, in *Jean Scot, Commentaire sur l'Évangile de Jean*, SC 180, Paris 1972, 390-394; *Expositio in psalmum LIX*, ed. P. Van Deun, *Maximi Confessoris opuscula exegetica duo*, CCG 23, Turnhout 1991, 3-22; *Expositio orationis dominicae*, CCG 23, 27-73; *Mystagogia*. Text ed. G.C. Sotiropoulos, Ἡ μυσταγωγία τοῦ ἁγίου Μαξίμου τοῦ ὁμολογητοῦ, Athens 1978; *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, CCG 7, Turnhout 1980, and CCG 22, Turnhout 1990; *Quaestiones ad Theopemptum*, ed. M. Gitlbauer, *Die Überreste griechischer Tachygraphie im Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1809*, Vienna 1878; *Quaestiones et dubia*, ed. J.H. Declerck, CCG 10, Turnhout 1982; *Liber Asceticus*, ed. P. Van Deun, Turnhout 2000; Ambigua ad Thomam una cum epistula secunda ad eundem, ed. B. Jannsens, CCG 48, Turnhout 2002 (Eng. tr,).

Translations: It.: *Capita de caritate*, in A. Ceresa-Gastaldo (ed.), *Capitoli sulla carità*, Rome 1963; *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, in *Umanità e divinità di Cristo*, ed. A. Ceresa Gastaldo, Rome 1979, 99-156; *Mistagogia*, tr. by R. Cantarella, in *S. Massimo Confessore. La Mistagogia ed altri scritti*, Florence 1931; *Liber asceticus* in ibid. and in *Umanità e divinità di Cristo*, ed. A. Ceresa Gastaldo, Rome 1979, 23-62; *Ambigua*, ed. C. Moreschini, Milan 2003; Fr.: *Disputatio Byziae*, tr. by J.-M. Garrigues, in *Le martyre de saint Maxime le Confesseur*: Revue thomiste 76 (1976) 427-447; *Relatio motionis*, ibid., 415-424; *Epistula ad Anastasium monachum discipulum*, ibid., 444-445; *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, tr. by E. Ponsoye (ed. J.C. Larchet), Paris-Suresnes 1992; *Ambigua*, tr. by E. Ponsoye (ed. J.C. Larchet), Paris-Suresnes 1994; *Expositio orationis dominicae*, ibid., 63-93; *Epistulae*, tr. by E. Ponsoye (ed. J.C. Larchet), Paris 1998; *Opuscula theologica et polemica*, tr. by E. Ponsoye (ed. J.C. Larchet), Paris 1998; *Quaestiones et dubia*, tr. by E. Ponsoye (ed. J.C. Larchet), Paris 1999; Eng.: *The Ascetic Life*; *The Four Centuries on Charity*, ed. P. Sherwood, New York 1955; *The Earlier Ambigua of S.M.C.*, tr. by P. Sherwood, Rome 1955; *Ambigua to Thomas and Second Letter to Thomas*, tr. by J. Lollar, Turnhout, 2009; Spanish: *Centurias sobre la caridad*, intr. by A. Costa, tr. by P. Sáenz, Victoria 1990.

Studies: The bibl. for Maximus has gradually expanded, esp. in recent times. Here mention is made only of classic studies or, among recent ones, those which are more broad: I. Hausherr, *Philautie. De la tendresse pour soi à la charité selon M.C.*, Rome 1952; P. Sherwood, *The Earlier Ambigua of Saint M.C. and His Refutation of Origenism* (Studia Anselmiana 36), Rome 1955; H.U. von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners*, Einsiedeln 1961 (It. tr. Milan 1976); W. Völker, *Maximus Confessor, als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1965; L. Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of M.C.*, Lund 1965 (Chicago-La Salle [2]1995); L. Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos. The Vision of St. M.C.*, Crestwood, NY 1984. For bibl. prior to 1987 refer to: M.L. Gatti, *Massimo il Confessore. Saggio di bibliografia generale ragionata e contributi per una ricostruzione scientifica del suo pensiero metafisico e religioso*, Milan 1987. Dopo il 1987: D. Staniloae, *Commento agli 'Ambigua,'* Paris-Suresnes 1994, 373-540; J.-C. Larchet, *La divinisation de l'homme chez Maxime le Confesseur*, Paris 1996; B. De Angelis, *Natura, persona, libertà. L'antropologia di M.C.*, Rome 2001; J.C. Larchet, *S. Maxime le C.*, Paris 2003.

B. De Angelis

MAXIMUS the Cynic (d. after 382). Charlatan archbishop of *Constantinople (380–382). Of Alexandrian origin, he claimed to be a Cynic philosopher converted to Christianity and a *confessor who had been scourged for the faith. In reality he had been tried several times and ultimately exiled for shameful crimes.

In *Corinth he led an immoral life masked by false asceticism. Returning from exile and arriving in Constantinople toward the end of 379, he was welcomed with joy by *Gregory of Nazianzus, who was

at that time bishop of the capital's Nicene minority and was unaware of Maximus's past. Gregory made the self-styled *homologētēs* with the "magnificent red hair" his intimate friend and confidant, even praising him in public, though without naming him (*Orat.* 25). Following this Maximus seems to have gone to *Alexandria in order to gain the confidence of Archbishop *Peter, succeeding to the point that Peter sustained, against Gregory, Maximus's candidacy as the legitimate bishop of Constantinople. He returned to the capital, where he gained the support of sailors and Egyptian bishops, and he was ordained secretly in the Anastasia one night in 380 when Gregory of Nazianzus was ill. Encountering hostile public opinion, he went to Emperor *Theodosius I, then in *Thessalonica (before 24 Nov), in order to obtain imperial support, but Theodosius was faithful to Gregory of Nazianzus and did not recognize his claim. Maximus then returned to Alexandria, where Peter, now convinced of Maximus's ambitious intentions, managed to get rid of him only with the help of the secular arm. The Council of Constantinople (381) examined his case and declared in its fourth canon that Maximus had never been a bishop. Expelled from the city, he presented himself to the Western bishops meeting at *Aquileia on 3 Sept 381, St. *Ambrose presiding, and succeeded in taking advantage of the good faith of the assembly, who supported him against *Nectarius, who had been elected by the Council of Constantinople as archbishop of that city. St. Ambrose even wrote on his behalf to the emperor. Later, however, being better informed, Ambrose abandoned Maximus, who was subsequently rejected by the Synod of *Rome in 382. The date of Maximus's death is not known. His book *Against the* **Arians*, which St. Jerome praised (*De viris illustribus*, 127), has not survived.

P. Gallay, *La vie de saint Grégoire de Nazianze*, Lyon-Paris, 1943, 159-170; J. Mossay, *Note sur Héron-Maxime, écrivain ecclésiastique*: AB 100 (1982) 229-236; F. Trisoglio, *Sant'Ambrogio e Massimo il Cinico*, in *Nec timeo mori*, Atti del Conv. Intern. di studi ambrosiani, ed. by L.F. Pizzolato and M. Rizzi, Milan 1998, 787-793.

D. Stiernon

MEDICINE, Lecture on. In room I of the catacomb of Via Dino Compagni we find a fresco which is unique in paleo-Christian iconography (Ferrua, plate 111). At the center of a group of people there is an elderly figure with a short shaggy beard, wearing a pallium like a Cynic; he has a serious expression, and is looking to his left, his right hand apparently pointing toward the image extending beneath him. To the left and right, on two levels, are young men also wearing palliums, seated in various ways. One of these, seated in the middle of the right-hand group, is touching the left arm of a nude male figure with a thin *virga*, extended flat on the ground and with an opening in his stomach. According to Ferrua, who published the discovery initially, the scene represents a lecture on medicine, or more precisely on surgery, since the figure lying on the ground seems alive, so representing the profession of the dead man buried there. There was immediate opposition to this view, followed by other scholars (Picard, Klauser, Corner, Proskaner) who suggested instead the creation of the first man (Hemple) or the representation of resurrection (Carcopino, Marrou, Artelt, Fink). Others, finally, identified in the fresco a philosophical meeting with Aristotle (Boyancé) or Socrates (De Bruyne). This interpretation, independent of the identification of the central figure with the pallium, is today considered most likely, above all when we consider the *maiestas Domini* depicted on the back of the opposing niche: on one side historic philosophy, on the other the true philosophy (Bisconti).

A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960 = Id., *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto via Latina*, Florence 1990; F. Bisconti - B. Mazzei, *Il cubicolo di Sansone nell'ipogeo di via Dino Compagni alla luce dei recenti interventi di restauro*: Mittelungen zur christlichen Archäologie 1 (1995) 45-73 (updated bibl.).

D. Calcagnini Carletti

MEDITATION. In Antiquity, the term *meditation* did not refer to a kind of prayer which was purely mental, but to a personal assimilation brought about through the continual recitation in a low voice of the sacred words drawn from the liturgy and *lectio divina*. Scripture (e.g., Josh 1:8; Ps 1:2) invites us often to repeat its words; likewise the law, in order to have it always on our mouth and in our heart (Heb. *hagah*). Along with the recitation of the text as it is, there are obviously also elementary and spontaneous invocations which constitute the material which the prophets use. In Lk 2:19, 51 *Mary is said to have "treasured in her heart" words and events. The exegesis of *Origen explains meditation with *ruminatio*, characteristic of pure souls.

Meditation carried out during manual labor and during movement was a characteristic practice of the *Pachomian monk, who must have therefore memorized a large portion of Scripture. The tendency of the spiritual, of whom *Evagrius is the personification, was to go increasingly beyond attention to the words and concepts in order to

concentrate on the simplicity of God. *John Cassian speaks in this way of *meditatio spiritualis*, action which belongs at the same time to the mouth and to the heart (*Inst.* II, 15,1). Even less than in the case of the *lectio* this is not so much a curious activity of the intelligence, but rather exercising vigilance over the intellect to a degree that goes beyond the complications of artificial technique. Even if the prayer of later orthodoxy is not entirely identical with this meditation, it is its authentic continuation. The luminous simplicity of this *ruminatio* on the divine word, far from inhibiting the cognitive faculties, has, in the course of the centuries, stimulated and guided them, in the same measure in which they sacrifice their own desires and ambitions so as to subject themselves to revealed models.

DSp 10, 906-914; E. von Severus, *Das Wort Meditari im Sprachgebrauch der hl. Schrift*: Geist und Leben 26 (1953) 365-375; H. Bacht, *Meditatio in den ältesten Mönchsquellen*: Geist und Leben 28 (1955) 360-373; F. Ruppert, *Meditatio-Ruminatio*: Erbe und Auftrag 53 (1977) 83-93 (= Coll. Cist. 39 [1977] 81-93); B. Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation*, London 1996.

J. Gribomont

MELANIA the Elder (ca. 340–before 408). A Roman matron, she became a widow at a young age, and then dedicated herself to an ascetical life. Around 372/373, leaving in *Rome her six-year-old son, Publicola, she traveled to Palestine passing through Egypt, where she met numerous ascetics and perhaps *Rufinus of Aquileia. She founded a monastery on the Mount of Olives. She lived an austere life, dedicated to the study of Greek Christian authors, among whom were *Origen, *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nazianzus. She was in contact with Rufinus, *Evagrius of Pontus and *Palladius. She returned to *Italy after about 30 years, in 399/400, in order to assist her granddaughter *Melania the Younger and *Pinianus, and then left again for *Sicily, and later for *Africa, where she stayed with *Augustine. Finally, she went to *Jerusalem, where she died, perhaps shortly before 408.

Jerome, *Ep.* 3,3; 4,2; 39,5; 45,4-5; 143,2; Rufinus, *Apologia c. Hieronymum* 2; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 28; 29; 31; 45; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 38; 46; 54; 55 (ed. C. Butler); DCB 3, 888f.; F.X. Murphy, *Melania the Elder: A Biographical Note*: Traditio 5 (1947) 59-77; PCBE 2, 1480-1483.

A. Pollastri

MELANIA the Younger (380/383–439). Born in 380/383 to the son of *Melania the Elder and his wife *Albina. Due to the opposition of her parents she was unable to dedicate herself to the monastic life, as she would have desired. She was given as spouse to *Pinianus, whom, after the birth and early death of two sons, she convinced to live in continence, supported in this intention by her grandmother Melania (the Elder). In spite of the opposition of her parents and of the senatorial class, in accord with Pinianus she sold possessions and valuable objects several times in order to help the poor, free slaves, and support churches and monasteries. In 407, at Nola, she celebrated, together with Albina and Pinianus, the feast of St. *Felix with the bishop *Paulinus, who praises her in *Carm.* 21 (vs. 833-844: CSEL 30, 185). In 408–409, accompanied again by Pinianus and Albina, she left for *Sicily, where she was in contact with *Rufinus of Aquileia. Following the sack of *Rome in 410 and fearing the approach of the *Goths, the group went next to *Africa and stayed with Bishop *Alypius in *Thagaste, where they received a letter from *Augustine (*Ep.* 124). The next year they went to *Hippo. In 417, Melania the Younger embarked, again with Pinianus and Albina, for the Holy Land, and they established their home in *Jerusalem. There the three met *Pelagius, whom they had already known in Rome, and in 418 they sent a letter to Augustine in order to inform him of Pelagius's desire to return to the church, and to intercede for him. Augustine responded by dedicating to them *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, in order to put them on guard against the ambiguities of Pelagius. They also visited Bethlehem, where they met *Jerome and the Egyptian monks. Finally, Melania the Younger went to Jerusalem, to the Mount of Olives, where she lived an ascetical life for 14 years. When Albina died, she founded a feminine monastery with 90 virgins, and when Pinianus died, she founded a masculine monastery at the church of the Ascension. After a trip to *Constantinople, which she took in order to meet her maternal uncle and convince him to abandon the pagan religion and receive baptism, she died in Jerusalem 31 December 439, the day on which she is commemorated in the *Mart. rom.* When she was at the point of death, the monk and priest *Gerontius to whom Melania the Younger committed the responsibility of directing all the monasteries which she had founded, wrote her *Life* (SC 90). Another source for Melania the Younger is *Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 61: ed. C. Butler).

DCB 3, 889; DACL 11, 209-230; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, passim; PCBE 2, 1483-1490.

A. Pollastri

MELCHIZEDEK. Though mentioned only twice in the OT (Gen 14:18-20; Ps 110:4), Melchizedek was already an object of speculation within the pre-Christian Jewish tradition (e.g., *1 QapGen* 22, 13-17; *11 QMelch*; *Phil. Alex., *Leg. All.* III, 79-82; *De congr.* 99; *De Abr.* 235; Joseph., *Ant. Jud.* I, 179-181; *Bel. Jud.* VI, 438-439). Due esp. to the letter to the Hebrews (ch. 7), which refers to Melchizedek in order to demonstrate the universality of the priesthood of Christ and his superiority in comparison with the Levitical priesthood, Melchizedek acquired great importance within Christian tradition. In the course of the 2nd c., he was at the center of an intense controversy between Jews and Christians, who used him to claim the primacy of the priesthood. As it was impossible for official rabbinism to claim Melchizedek in an exclusive manner, it ended up abandoning him to its adversaries, but not without depriving him of his priestly dignity, which was said to have passed over to Abraham (*bNed* 32b). The fathers of the church, following Heb, developed esp. the christological interpretation of Melchizedek (e.g., *Just., *Dial.* 33, 1-2; *Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* V, 9; *Orig., *Com. Joh.* I, 11; XIII, 146; XIX, 118; *Eus., *Dem. ev.* IV, 15,33-39; V, 3,7.13-20; *John Chrys., *In ep. ad Haebr.*). Independent of Heb, interpretation was developed in a eucharistic sense of the offering of the bread and wine by Melchizedek (e.g., *Clem. Alex. *Strom.* IV, 161,3; *Cypr., *Ep.* 63,4). At the same time there were heterodox speculations among the sects, considering him a heavenly "power" superior to Christ ("Melchizedekians": in *Epiph. *Pan.* LV, 1 = the group of *Theodotus the banker; in ps.-*Hippol., *Elench.* VII, 35-36; ps.-Tertull., *Adv. Haer.* 8; *Filast., *Haer.* 22.24), or even identifying him with the *Holy Spirit (Hieracas the Egyptian: in Epiph., *Pan.* LVII, 3,2-4). This tendency to consider Melchizedek a heavenly being, already present in Qumran (*11QMelch*) and, acc. to information given by *Jerome (*Ep.* 73,2), as well as in *Origen and *Didymus, reappears in *gnostic sources (NHC IX, 1: *Melchisedek*; *II Jeu* chs. 45-46; *Pistis Sophia*, chs. 25,27,112,128,131,139-140), where an important soteriological role is attributed to him. Traditional iconography developed the theme of the offering of the bread and wine as a symbol of the eucharistic sacrifice (S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna: mosaic, 4th c., where Melchizedek appears with Abel, Abraham, and Isaac; S. Vitale, Ravenna: mosaic, 6th c., where Melchizedek appears next to Abel) and the theme of the meeting with Abraham (in the Abraham cycles: S. Maria Maggiore, Rome: mosaic, 5th c.).

G. Bardy, *Melchisédech dans la tradition patristique*: RBi 35 (1926) 496-509; 36 (1927) 24-45; G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese*, Giessen 1927; H. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchisedekianer mit Untersuchungen ihrer Quellen auf Gedankengehalt und dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1928; M. Simon, *Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende*: RHPhR 17 (1937) 58-93; F.L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, London 1976; C. Gianotto, *Melchisedek e la sua tipologia. Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche (sec. II a.C.–sec. III d.C.)*, Brescia 1984; B.A. Pearson, *Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity and Gnosticism*, in M.E. Stone - T.A. Bergen (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, Harrisburg, PA 1998, 176-202.

C. Gianotto

MELETIUS of Antioch (d. 381). Of Armenian origin, friend of *Acacius of Caesarea, he was elected bishop of *Sebaste (Armenia) to take the place of the deposed *Eustathius (358 or 360). Due to the opposition of the people, who were faithful to Eustathius, however, he left his see and went to Beroea. He participated, either as bishop or as presbyter, at the Council of *Seleucia (359) in the ranks of the Acacians, and when, around the end of 360, the see of *Antioch was left vacant because of the transfer of *Eudoxius to *Constantinople, he was elected through the influence of Acacius. But a few months later, in a homily on Pr 8:22 delivered in the presence of *Constantius, he proposed an interpretation of the text which clearly tended in an anti-Arian direction, so that the *homoians dominating at the time had him deposed and exiled into Armenia. As the homily was formally in keeping with the formula of *Rimini (359), his exile must have been justified by adducing some pretext we do not know about, of an administrative or disciplinary nature. He returned to his see at the death of Constantius (362) and reorganized his community, which was more numerous than either the Arian community led by *Euzoius or that of the Nicene traditionalists led by *Paulinus (*schism of Antioch).

In 363 he presided at a small council at Antioch of homoian and *homoiousian proponents from *Syria, *Palestine and *Asia Minor, who accepted the Nicene *homoousios but gave it a homoiousian interpretation. When *Athanasius, shortly thereafter, went to Antioch to meet with him, Meletius avoided the meeting, since he was still influenced by the old enmity between Acacius and Athanasius.

The pro-*Arian politics of *Valens constrained him to go into exile twice, in 365 and 369. He returned definitively to his see upon the death of Valens (378). The exile added to his prestige as an anti-Arian leader and, even more, the fact that *Basil of Caesarea took his side (against Paulinus, Athanasius and the West) in the schism of Antioch and supported him with his influence.

A council of ca. 150 bishops, united at Antioch in 379, confirmed the role of Meletius as head of the Eastern episcopal see, in spite of the lack of the agreement of the West (and of *Egypt) concerning the Antiochene schism. On this occasion, he attempted to form an agreement with Paulinus, which we are not well informed of, and which had no result.

He presided over the Council of *Constantinople in 381, which sanctioned the triumph of his approach and that of Basil, who had recently died. He himself died while the work of the council was going on, after having solemnly installed *Gregory of Nazianzus as bishop of Constantinople.

CPG II, 3415-3425; F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, Paris 1905; Simonetti 592-593; F. Dünzl, *Die Absetzung des Bischofs Meletius von Antiochien 361 n.Chr.*: JbAC 43 (2000) 71-93; L.L. Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the* Codex Veronensis LX, Toronto 2004.

M. Simonetti

MELETIUS of Mopsuestia. Anti-Cyrillian bishop of *Cilicia II (5th c.). He was next to *John of Antioch at the synod of *Ephesus (431) which excommunicated *Cyril of Alexandria. Returning from Ephesus, he took part in the Synod of *Tarsus, which renewed the excommunication and was opposed to every attempt at reconciliation which did not involve the condemnation of Cyril's anathemas and the insertion of the name of *Nestorius in the diptychs, which is clear from the correspondence which he had with *Alexander of Hierapolis (five letters) and with *Theodoret. John of Antioch, who had deposed him because of his obstinacy, asked the emperors *Theodosius II and *Valentinian to exile him from Cilicia. He was therefore sent into exile in Melitene in Armenia, where he suffered much from the bishop *Acacius and where he died on an unknown date.

PG 6455-6467; PG 84, 706-707, 739-740, 752, 756-760, 769, 771-773, 777, 784-789, 794-796; PWK 15, 503; Patrologia V, 184-185.

D. Stiernon

MELITENE, Council of. Melitene or Metilene (Μελιτήνη, *Melitene*; today near Malatya), a city of *Cappadocia, was promoted by *Trajan (98–117), who made it the capital of *Armenia Secunda. Probably in 358 a council was held there in which *Eustathius, the bishop of *Sebaste, was deposed. He promoted forms of *monasticism which included excesses and oddities, and supported *subordinationist doctrines concerning the *Holy Spirit. *Basil the Great first admired Eustathius but later became gradually colder toward him to the point of an open rupture over the question of the Holy Spirit. Basil informs us in his letter 79 (and later in 163) *Ad Occidentales* that Eustathius was deposed by that council. He was succeeded by *Meletius, the future bishop of *Antioch. Since, in 359, Meletius participated in the Council of *Seleucia, the Council of Melitene must be placed in 358 or the year after. The term *Melitense* or *Metilense* (*concilium*) has erroneously led some to believe that the council was held in *Malta (*Melita*), but this hypothesis has no foundation in tradition. In 557 Melitene was the scene of the Byzantine victory over the Persian emperor *Chosroes I.

N. Coleti, *Sacrosancta concilia ad regiam editionem exacta*, I-XXIII, Venice 1728–1733, 2, col. 879; Mansi 1, 191; Palazzini 3, 97-99; Simonetti 411; J.-R. Pouchet, *Basile le grand et son univers d'amis après sa correspondence*, Rome 1992.

C. Nardi

MELITIUS of Lycopolis – MELITIAN SCHISM (4th c.). The Melitian *schism was caused by the last persecution in Egypt, which lasted from 303 until 312 with alternate periods of repression and tolerance. It was provoked by conflicting opinions about the position to take toward Christians who, after having renounced their faith in weakness, immediately sought to be readmitted into the community of the faithful. We are informed about this schism mainly by *Epiphanius (*Panarion* 68), but his evidence does not appear to be fully reliable.

While persecution was still going on and *Peter I of *Alexandria was imprisoned with the other bishops, Melitius acted as a spokesman for the rigorist tendencies toward the **lapsi* in opposition to Peter's moderation. They arrived at schism as soon as Melitius began to ordain bishops into sees that sat vacant because of the imprisonment or absence of the rightful holders. In this manner he was challenging and weakening the rights of the bishop of Alexandria over the other Egyptian churches. Peter, briefly at liberty before his final imprisonment and martyrdom, took strict measures against the fierce and numerous schismatics, who organized themselves into their own church. The schism continued under Peter's successors in the see of Alexandria, *Achillas and *Alexander; in at least some schismatic circles there emerged a developing opposition among indigenous *Copts against the Hellenizing element.

The *Council of *Nicaea (325) took moderate measures against the schismatics: Melitius retained

his office on the condition that he would not perform any more ordinations, and other bishops, priests and deacons retained their respective offices after having newly received the *laying-on of hands by Alexander. At the death of Achillas and Alexander, however, the Melitians sought to block the election of *Athanasius and the violent struggle resumed. Athanasius acted with severity and also with violence to the injuries caused by the schismatics, among whom the bishop *Arsenius and the priest Ischyras were particularly culpable. Twice the Melitians, guided by *John Arkaph (Melitius having died), brought an accusation of violence to *Constantine (332–334) against Athanasius, but without result. Finally the Melitians formed a union with the *Eusebians. At the Council of *Tyre (335), Arsenius and Ischyras's case against Athanasius was vindicated by his sentence and deposition. But the succeeding events, in which Athanasius established himself as a champion of the Egyptian church and the Orthodox against the *Arians and the emperor, greatly increased his prestige. As Athanasius rose in prominence, the Melitian position weakened. Gradually, they lost their vitality and importance.

E. Schwartz, *Die Quellen über den melitianischen Streit*, in *Gesammelte Schriften* 3, Berlin 1959, 87-116; F.H. Kettler, *Der melitianische Streit in Aegypten*: ZNTW 35 (1936) 155-193; H.I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, 2 vols., London 1924; A. Camplani, *In margine alla storia dei meliziani*: Augustinianum 30 (1990) 313-351; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e^ siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, 219-389; BBKL 5, 1213-1219.

M. Simonetti

MELITO of Sardis (2nd c.)

I. Writings - II. Doctrine.

One of the most important people of the 2nd c. and exponent of "Asiatic" culture (which accentuates corporeity and the "monist" conception of the universe). He united in himself hierarchical and charismatic authority as bishop, ascetic (see Polycrates, cited by *Eus., *HE* 5,24,2-8; also 4,13,8 and 26,1) and prophet (see *Tertullian, cited by *Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* 24). Around 170 he addressed an apology to *Marcus Aurelius. He visited the Holy Land in order to study the OT canon. He followed the *quartodeciman practice of Easter; he brought out the christological and soteriological aspect of this feast in his *Paschal Homily*. A productive theologian, renowned and read in later periods, he wrote many works (more than 20) on a variety of topics, but almost all have been lost.

I. Writings. *Eusebius compiled a list (*HE* 4, 26,1-14). Among those writings which have not come down to us are the *Eclogues*, a collection of scriptural *testimonia* concerning Christ; two books *On Easter*; *On the Way of Life and the Prophets*; *On the Church*; *Treatise on Sunday*; *On Human Faith*; *On Creation*; *On the Obedience of Faith*; *On the Senses*; *On the Soul and Body*; *On Baptism*; *On Truth*; *On the Birth of Christ*; *On Prophecy*; *On Hospitality*; *The Key*; *On the Devil*; *On the Apocalypse of John* (which is perhaps exegetical); and finally, *On the Incorporeal God*. Perhaps he also wrote a treatise *On the Cross* (see the frag. in *Syriac). The fragments coming from the *catenae* have been gathered by M.I. Routh, Otto (for the Syriac texts) and Goodspeed (for the Greek texts only): for their identification see O. Perler DSp 10, 980. Some fragments of the *Apology* have been passed down by Eusebius (*HE* 4, 26-27): Melito juxtaposes the coming of Christ and the beginning of the empire of *Augustus and sees a possible collaboration between the empire and the church. He presents Christianity as "our philosophy," thus as a speculative existential proposal, comparable to Hellenistic philosophies. A homily *On the Soul and Body* has come down to us almost complete (in Greek, in Coptic), which recent scholarship (see T. Orlandi) has again attributed to Melito. It narrates the creation of humanity, the effects of death after sin and the new creation brought to us by Christ's redemption, who, with his resurrection, reunited soul and body. The most important work which has come to us almost complete is the homily *Peri Pascha* (*On the Pasch* [Easter]), written between 160 and 170. It was found in 1936 and published by C. Bonner acc. to the papyrus in the collection of M.A. Chester-Beatty, with various Greek, *Coptic and Syriac fragments. There existed in part a *Latin translation (PL 54, 493). In 1960, M. Testuz published the nearly complete text of this treatise acc. to the papyrus Bodmer XIII. The homily unfolds as a full exegesis of Ex 12 (The institution of the Passover by *Moses), and presents the Paschal feast with a Judaizing and archaizing character: Its celebration is transferred to a Christian context; thus the Hebrew Pasch (Passover) was the prefiguration of the Christian Pasch: Christ is the true Paschal Lamb who, by his passion and death, has freed the true Israel, i.e., Christians, causing them to pass "from slavery to liberty, from darkness to light, from death to life, from tyranny to the eternal kingdom" (*On the Pasch* 68,489-493) and has led them into the true Promised Land. The Pasch of Christ, in which he suffered, has become "the Pasch of our salvation" (ibid., 69 and 103, 496 and 790). Melito emphasizes the ingratitude

of the Jewish people who refused their Savior, who was received instead by the pagans. The homily ends with the resurrection of Christ, described as a final apotheosis. The text is composed in carefully written rhythmic prose, characterized by corresponding brief structured *cola*, connected with each other in various ways: anaphora, rhyme, alliteration, antithesis, etc., with the aim of emphasizing every nuance of meaning. This refined formal elaboration manifests the influence of rhetoric of the Asiatic type of the Second Sophistic. (The apocryphal writing *De transitu Beatae Virginis Mariae*, in Latin translation, was falsely attributed to him, and cannot be dated earlier than the 4th c.)

II. Doctrine. The theological importance of Melito, esp. in his homily *On the Pasch*, is at the same time biblical, homiletic and liturgical. The biblical theology is oriented toward the relation between the two testaments in vital and dynamic continuity, since the same story of salvation is prefigured and then actualized. Christ is the center of this salvific plan: As man and God, he becomes present in history and introduces the eternal in time. The Pasch of the Asiatic tradition, of Johannine derivation, places at its culmination the salvific event of the cross and considers the Pasch as the natural corollary to the triumph of Christ over death. The "suffering" of man involves the "suffering" of Christ. (Consider the questionable etymology of Pasch relating it to *paschein* = suffer.) In the homily, the preexistence of Christ is clearly affirmed, as is his *incarnation through *Mary, his *descent into hell, original *sin as a "mark," because of which the soul is in the power of death.

The homily is also an interesting example of that particular type of paschal homily common in the area of Asia in the 2nd c. (See also the anonymous *In sanctum Pascha* attributed to *Hippolytus.)

R.M. Mainka, *Melito von Sardes. Eine bibliographische Übersicht*: Claretianum 5 (1965) 22-255; H. Drobner, *15 Jahre Forschung zu Melito von Sardes (1965–1980)*: VChr 6 (1982) 313-333 (bibl.). see CPG I, 1092-1098; I.C.T. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum* IX, Jena 1872, 374-378. 497-512; C. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis*, London-Philadelphia 1940; B. Lohse, *Die Passa-Homilie des Bischofs Meliton von Sardes*, Leiden 1958; M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII. Méliton de Sardes. Homélie sur la Pâque*, Cologny-Geneva 1960; O. Perler, *Sur la Pâques et fragments* (SC 123), Paris 1966; J. Ibáñez Ibáñez - F. Mendoza Ruiz, *Melitón de Sardes, Homilía sobre la Pascua*, Pamplona 1975; S.G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis, On Pascha and Fragments* (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford 1979; see also R. Cantalamessa, *I più antichi testi pasquali. Le omelie di Melitone di Sardi* . . . , Rome 1972. [see also CPL 1658, *sermo* 7, for a Latin tr. in PL 54, 493-494 and PL 56, 1134-1136, critically ed. by H. Chadwick in JTS n.s. 11 (1960) 76-82].

Studies: DSp 10 (1980) 880-981; A. Grillmeier, "*Das Erbe der Söhne Adams" in der Homilia de Passione Melitos*: Scholastik 20 n. 4 (1949) 481-502; B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner*, Gütersloh 1953; Patrologia I, 213-219 (bibl.); F. Trisoglio, *Dalla Pasqua ebraica a quella cristiana in Melitone di Sardi*: Augustinianum 28 (1988) 151-185; BBKL 5 (1993) 1219-1223 (ample bibl.); B. Czyzewski, *Le mystère de la Pâque selon Perì Pascha de Meliton de Sardes*, in N. Widok (ed.), *Veritatem desiderat anima*, Studia . . . B. Altanera, Opole 1995, 53-116; T. Orlandi, *La tradizione di Melitone in Egitto e l'omelia "De anima et corpore"*: Augustinianum 37 (1997) 37-50; L. Torraca, *L'omelia sulla Pasqua di Melitone*, in M. De Rosa (ed.), *Dives in misericordia. Studi in onore di S.E. Mons. G. Pierro*, Salerno 1997, 119-160; L. Cohick, *Melito of Sardis's "Peri Pascha" and Its" Israel"*: HTR 91 (1998) 351-372; A. Stewart-Sikes, *The Lamb's High Feast. Melito, Peri Pascha and the Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy at Sardis* (Suppl. to VChr 42), Leiden 1998; C. Dell'Osso, *L'apologia di Melitone di Sardi*: Rivista di scienze religiose 15 (2001) 239-257; J. Hainsworth, *The Force of the Mystery: Anamnesis and Exegesis in Melito's "Perì Pascha"*: St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 46 (2002) 107-146.

M. Maritano

MELKITES (from Syriac *mălkāyā* ["imperial"]). Term used in the area of *Syria, by their N Syrian adversaries, to indicate those Christians who, having accepted the definition of *Chalcedon (451), remained in communion with the patriarch of *Antioch nominated by *Constantinople. Dependence on the imperial see led to the almost total abandonment of the Syro-Antiochene rite. The term now designates the communities of *Byzantine rite which united to Rome in the 17th c., residents of the area of the patriarchate or depending on it. The Melkites produced many Christian texts in Arabic.

DTC 10, 516-520; Cath 8, 1115-1116; EC 8, 647-648; H. Husmann, *Die melkitische Liturgie als Quelle der syrischen Qanune iaonaie, Melitene und Edessa*: OCP 41 (1975) 5-56; J. Nasrallah, *Notes et documents pour servir à l'histoire du Patriarcat melchite d'Antioche.* I-II, Jerusalem 1965–1986; J. Nasrallah - R. Haddad, *Histoire du mouvement littéraire dans l'Église melchite du Ve au XX^e^ siècle: contribution à l'étude de la littérature arabe chrétienne.* I–IV/2, Louvain 1979–1989.

S.J. Voicu

MELLITUS (d. 24 April 624). Monk and abbot in *Rome, probably at St. Andrew's Monastery on the Celian Hill. Mellitus was put forward by St. *Gregory the Great (d. 604) to lead a group of monks to evangelize *Britain in 596–597. In 604 Mellitus was ordained the first bishop of London by St. *Augustine of *Canterbury (d. 604/605). He came to Rome in 609 with a few monks (*Justus, *Paulinus, Rufinianus etc.) to report to Pope *Boniface IV on his progress in evangelizing Britain and to clarify the facts of the controversy in that country over the date

of *Easter. He took part in the Roman Council of 27 Feb 610 regarding the monastic profession. Following disagreements with King Eadbald of Kent, Mellitus was compelled to take refuge in *Gaul in 616 with the three sons of the late King Sabert of the Eastern Saxons. He returned to his diocese in 619, and that year succeeded St. *Lawrence in the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. He died 24 April 624 and became the object of a local cult.

Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, I, 29-30; II, 3-7 (ed. B. Colgrave - R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1969, 104-108, 144-158); William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum anglorum*, I: PL 179, 1443 B; P.B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*, Regensburg 1873-1886 (facs. ed. Graz 1957) 182, 193; BHL 5896-5898; P. Grosjean, *Recherches sur les débuts de la controverse pascale chez les Celtes, 6. Le Faux de 606 provient-il de Cantorbéry? Date de la lettre des SS. Laurent, Mellitus et Justus aux Irlandais*: AB 54 (1946) 231-238; EC 8, 649; BS 9, 310-312; PCBI II/2, 1493; BBKL V, 1229-1230; L.E. von Padberg, *Mission und Christianisierung: Formen und Folgen bei Angelsachsen und Franken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1995, 247f., 151-157.

R. Grégoire

MEMBERS of the CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY. Christianity, by its very nature, is universal in its calling and mission, open to every social class and culture. Jesus revealed himself in solidarity with everyone, particularly with marginalized social categories such as the *poor or "people of the land." From the beginning, members of the Christian community were from various social classes. The poor and the humble constituted the majority in the community, as they did in the society, but there were also members from the higher classes: Sergius, proconsul of Cyprus, converted by Paul (Acts 13:7-12); Dionysius, member of the Areopagus in Athens (Acts 17:34); the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10:1ff.); Aquila and Priscilla, well-to-do tent makers (Acts 18:2-3.); Erastus, treasurer of the city of Corinth (Rom 16:23); Lydia, seller of purple in the city of Thyatira (Acts 16:14). At the beginning of the 2nd c., *Pliny the Younger, governor of Bithynia, reported to the emperor that the community of his province comprised many faithful of every age and social origin, including both men and women, slaves and Roman citizens, and rural and urban dwellers (*Ep*. X,96). In *Rome, *Carthage, *Lyons and *Alexandria, there were groups of a similarly diverse makeup. In Rome, members of the imperial court turned to Christianity toward the end of the 1st c. In the middle of the 2nd c., important individuals like *Ptolemy and *Lucius (see Justin, 2 *Apol*) and the senator *Apollonius were condemned as Christians. *Irenaeus recounts that in the community of Lyons, the gnostic *Mark went to see rich matrons (*Adv Haer*. I, 13,7). In Alexandria, *Clement dedicated his works *Quis dives salvetur* and the *Pedagogue* to the wealthy classes.

In the middle of the 2nd c. *Celsus denigrated Christianity, speaking disdainfully about "the religion of artisans and women" (Orig. *C. Cels.* III,55); in reality, however, intellectuals and the wealthy thrived in the new religion. Their number and their energy posed diverse problems and profound crises in Alexandria, Rome and Lyons, particularly when they were drawn into heterodox groups or gnostic thought (against which *Tertullian, Irenaeus and *Origen argued).

The fact that a growing number of cultured and well-off people entered the church meant that it had to adapt its discourse to a public shaped by Greek and Roman culture (*see* *Christianity and classical culture), a public with an elevated way of life that was esp. responsive to rhetoric. The dialogue between faith and *philosophy became ever more urgent. In response to this high culture, Christianity was presented as the perfection of human culture, the ideal life (*bios christianos*), and a whole range of doctrines was revealed as completely harmonized in Christ the Truth (this in contrast to *pagan philosophies which contained partial, propaedeutic truths). The *conversion of jurists and philosophers esp. favored the formation of an articulate theological language.

The *Acts of the Martyrs* of the 2nd and 3rd c. presents a quite varied Christian community: *clergy and *laypeople, men and women of every age and condition, masters and *slaves. *Justin was a philosopher by profession, *Blandina was a slave who was arrested together with a doctor and an aristocrat of Lyons. Apollonius spoke as an equal with the prefect. The *Scillitan martyrs were farmers, *Felicity was from a modest origin (if not a slave background) and *Perpetua was a lady from the upper class.

It is necessary to emphasize the importance and zeal of laypeople in the spread of Christianity. The majority of Greek *apologists were laypeople (like Justin of Rome) who were in contact with cultured circles. The activity of *Pantaenus, Clement and Origen in Alexandria shows that different social groups found themselves in the school of faith. This spread of Christianity to the various levels of the population depended on the ideal and real union of everyone in a common brotherhood: whether slaves or masters, rich or poor, the faithful were all brothers and sisters in the same faith. Social barriers were overcome or simply became less important within the community. It is this fact that converted Tertullian in Carthage (*Apol.* 39) and that similarly impressed the pagans: "See how they love each other."

The change in social order came from the gospel: the new order was based on equality before God and equality within the community of the faithful, in which all could attain spiritual offices acc. to their capacities and the *charism they received from God.

The number of Christians increased at the close of the 4th c. after *Constantine granted liberty to the church (*see* *Edict of Milan). *Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus* illustrates the social and cultural diversity of the candidates who prepared themselves for *baptism. Two social groups, however, resisted this movement: the aristocracy and the people in the countryside. The Roman nobility was one of the most active breeding grounds of resistance toward Christianity and of faithfulness to pagan traditions. Coins continued to represent the various divinities. Writings attest to the persistence of pagan feasts. *Symmachus, prefect of Rome, opposed the policies of the emperor and demanded the restoration of the *Altar of Victory in the curia. He had the support of the senate, the majority of whom had remained pagan. This occurred equally in the great cities of the empire such as *Athens and *Antioch. In *Africa the situation seemed somewhat better, but even so Augustine points out the resistance of the nobility (*Enarr. in Ps.* 54,13).

The countryside was another island of resistance, to the point that the term *paganos* seemed to signify both peasant and pagan. The *evangelization of the countryside received a decisive push from St. *John Chrysostom in the East, and from *Martin and *Victricius in Gaul, and it manifested itself fully at the close of the 5th c. The preaching of Augustine and *Maximus of Turin (*Hom.* 16, 100, 101, 102) referred to the persistence, even in the church, of popular and rural practices and superstitions.

The conversion of the masses created a degree of unity, joining the different Christian communities of the empire; and in its turn Christianity transformed the earthly city, imprinting itself on the rhythms of time and the prevailing sense of space, on human relations and literary forms. New models of life, like *monasticism, which formed in an effort to avoid the danger of accommodating to worldly values, spread even more. Thus, in institutions and in common practice, a new Christianity took shape, a shape that was united but not uniform.

J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain (IV–V s.)*, Paris 1958, [2]1989; P. Brezzi, *La composizione sociale delle comunità cristiane nei primi secoli dalle persecuzioni alla pace costantiniana*, Rome 1960, 132-179; E.A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century*, London 1960; P.R.L. Brown, *Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy*: JRS 51 (1961) 1-11; A. Hamman, *I cristiani del II secolo*, Milan 1974; J. Vogt, *Der Vorwurf des soziales Niedrigkeit des frühen Christentum*: Gymnasium 82 (1975) 401-411; R. McMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (AD 100–400)*, New Haven-London 1984, G. Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*, Eng. tr., Philadelphia 1978; J.-M. Salamito, *Cristianizzazione e vita sociale*, in Ch. and L. Pietri (eds.), *La nascita di una cristianità (250–430)* (*Storia del cristianesimo* 2), Rome 2000, 633-672; A. Madgearu, *A Note on the Christians' Presence in the "Sacer comitatus" Before 313 A.D.*: Aevum 75/1 (2001) 111-117.

M. Maritano

MEMNON of Ephesus (ca. 428–440). Archbishop of *Ephesus, possibly in 428 when the *Nestorian controversy arose. Prompt to defend the autonomy of his province (*Asia) against the intrusiveness of *Constantinople, he formed an alliance with *Alexandria, embracing the cause of St. *Cyril with the support of 100 Asian bishops. The third ecumenical *council (431) gathered in his city and the second session (10 July) took place in his episcopal house. At the arrival of *John of Antioch and the other Eastern bishops, he provoked disorder and prevented them from taking refuge in churches. The great candlelit *procession arranged by him for the streets of the city in honor of the victorious **Theotokos* seemed devised by Cyril of Alexandria. The deposition imposed on him by the synod of the Easterners and approved by *Theodosius II did not have practical effects. He remained in his diocese until 440 when the name of the successor appeared. In the Byzantine Synaxarion he is commemorated on 16 December together with St. *Modestus of Jerusalem. In the context of the Ephesian council, his letter sent to the clergy of Constantinople after the condemnation of *Nestorius was preserved. Together with St. Cyril he wrote to the council of Ephesus after having been deposed.

CPG 5790-5791; PG 77, 1463-1466; PWK 15, 654; Fliche-Martin IV, 205-206, 216, 218, 225, 232-233; BS 9, 315-316; J. Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église*, I, Rome 1962, 133; *Patrologia* V, 34.

D. Stiernon

MEMORIA – MEMORIA APOSTOLORUM. The term *memoria*, in technical Christian language, could designate a *liturgical commemoration (Aug., *Serm.* 311,3: PLS 2, 821-822; *Serm.* 273, 2; *C. Faust.* 20,21), a *funerary monument (we have numerous examples of this in *Augustine and in *African archaeology), *relics (Aug., *Civ. Dei* 22,8,11-13), or also a reliquary. The most frequent meaning, however, is that of monument (RAC 12, 422-427): in particular, a monument as a funerary chapel, of varying levels of importance—a chapel that can be just as much for a common deceased person (and his or her family) as

for a martyr. There are numerous African examples from this category.

At *Rome, however, the expression *memoria apostolorum* designates more particularly the worship site in the catacomb of St. *Sebastian dedicated in the middle of the 3rd c. to the memory of the apostles *Peter and *Paul. The numerous Greek and Latin graffiti traced on the walls, dating from the 2nd half of the 3rd c., indicate the type of cult that was present: the writings invoke the apostles, from whom *pilgrims hope for help (*in mente habete, petite pro*). They were commemorated by the *refrigerium* (*refrigerium feci, refrigeravi*). Indeed, on three sides of a square courtyard runs a porch with a bench along the wall; nearby is a well. The porch serves to shelter the pilgrims and not, as some still assert, the passersby, who would come to commemorate the funeral feast. In one corner of the courtyard rises a little stone table in honor of the apostles, on which offerings would be arranged for them. Did this table signify the place where the relics of apostles were deposited? Thümmel denies that the relics were transferred from the *Vatican and Via Ostiensis to the Via Appia, but doubts remain. Whatever the answer, the place appears in the *Depositio martyrum* as a place of annual commemoration of Peter (originally also of Paul), as of 29 June 259: *Petri in catacumbas . . . Tusco et Basso cons.* A cruciform basilica in honor of the apostles Peter and Paul (*basilica apostolorum*) was built at the time of *Constantine, with their names preceding that of St. Sebastian. Shortly after, Pope *Damasus (366–384) regarded the basilica as the place for their relics (not only for their memorial, as held by Delehaye OC 268): *Hic habitásse priús sanctós cognóscere débes, nómina quísque Petrí paritér Paulíque requíris* (A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 139-144); here *nomina* means *corpora* (N. Corte, *Ist der hl. Petrus im Vatikan?*, Würzburg 1957, 77-78). Obviously the tombs inside the basilica are placed *ad sanctos*, i.e., in proximity to the apostles. When the *Mart hier.* (and only in cod. *Bernensis*) records the celebration of 29 June *ad catacumbas*, the mention is no more than a scholarly record, because in the meantime the cult of St. Sebastian replaced that of the apostles.

F. Tolotti, *Memorie degli apostoli in Catacumbas*, Vatican City 1953; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980; W.N. Schumacher, *Die konstantinischen Exedra-Basiliken*, in J.G. Deckers *et al.*, *La catacomba dei santi Marcellino e Pietro. Repertorio delle pitture. Testo*, Vatican City 1987, 142-150; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Memorien für Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, Berlin-New York 1999.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

MEMORY

I. Rhetoric - II. Anthropology.

I. Rhetoric. Memory in *patristics has its own particular classification. According to ancient *rhetoric, after the *inventio*, the *dispositio* and the *elocutio* follows the *memoria*, after which comes the *actio* (the study of gesture and vocalization). For the *Fathers, memory takes root deeply in the *soul and is considered a part of wisdom. The monk *Anthony was illiterate, but memory took the place of *books in him, as Luke (2:19) says of *Mary. The understanding of memory as deep knowledge of the things that one possesses in the heart (note that to learn something "by heart" is the same as "by memory") is connected with Sacred *Scripture. For *Origen (*Hom. 21 in Lc.*), memory, which is the source of thought, is the same as the human heart, which is able to comprehend infinite things. *Leonides, Origen's father, wanted his son to memorize passages of Sacred Scripture daily so that, possessing it entirely, he could examine its deeper senses (Eus., *HE* 6,2,8-9). According to this view, one retains what one comprehends stored up within the *memoria* which, through *inventio*, adds to the richness of the thought and transmits it to *elocutio*. The passage from *cogitatio* to memory and from *inventio* to *elocutio* is continual. To the hermit Sisoes the Theban someone said: "Tell me a word." Sisoes responded: "What must I say! I read the NT and reflect on the OT" (*Apophth. Sis.* 35: PG 65, 404). For those like Sisoes, meditation on the Bible while striving to live each day as if Christ were present brings new life to the gospel. Since the OT is in the NT and the NT is in the OT, as *Augustine would say, all of Sacred Scripture passes through memory. Let us not forget that the *apostles transmitted the teachings of Jesus by memory; that by memory *Polycarp of Smyrna recalled the sayings and deeds that *John heard about the Lord (Eus., *HE* 5,20,5-6). And to ignore the meaning of memory acc. to the ancients—and, in particular, the fathers of the church—means to overlook the fact that the synoptic gospels convey the same material with a different *elocutio*. In the *catechetical schools, teaching on scripture was done through passages known to memory, which were connected to all the scriptural *narratio*. In the prose of the Fathers, one notes how certain patterns of expression, common to the writers of every time and place, are linked to memory. They serve to recall the continuity between their writings and biblical motifs. They are like the hinges that tighten the forces of the discourse, allowing it to take root in memory. Memory, finally, is a process that forms inside the person and develops in union with intelligence.

Psychology speaks today about efficient techniques for improving the memory: the technique of observation or selective perception; the technique of organizing the material to learn; the technique of distributing the effort of study. These are also the presuppositions of memory acc. to the school of classical-patristic rhetoric.

Kl. Dockhorn, *"Memoria" in der Rhetorik*: Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte 9 (1964) 27-35; G.B. Mathews, *Augustine on Speaking from Memory*: APQ 2 (1965) 157-160; T.H. Olbright, *Delivery and Memory*, in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S.E. Porter, Leiden 1997, 159-167.

A. Quacquarelli

II. Anthropology (*Memoria sui – memoria Dei*). With Augustine of Hippo *memoria / memoria sui* assumes, in Christian tradition, a particular meaning for religious *anthropology. He deepened the understanding of memory, inherited from *Aristotle (*De memoria et reminiscentia*) and esp. *Plotinus (*Enn.* IV 3,25-32 and 4,1-17; V, 3—entirely dedicated to the self-awareness of the thinking subject), in an ample space of time (the *Dialogues* are dated 386; *De Trinitate* was finished in 417) in the following writings: *De ordine* II, 2,7; *De musica* VI, 8,21; *De gen. ad litt.* XII, 16,33; *Confess.* X-XI; *Trin.* X-XI (under the psychological perspective), XIV-XV (under the theological perspective of the trinitarian *imago Dei* present in human beings as "memory").

Aristotle and Plotinus connect memory with knowledge of sensible things. For them, memory is involved in the process of *time and directed toward the past. It was seen as a function of the *soul that could not find a place in intellectual knowledge, which attends only to the contemplation of the **nous*. The soul, which in Plotinus occupies an intermediary place between the *nous* and the sensible world, insofar as it manages to address itself to the *nous*, knows itself also. Such knowledge moves nevertheless within a subject-object relationship and in a universe of essences in accord with the *Platonic tradition of the intelligible world.

Augustine also identified memory at the level of sensible knowledge, which consists in remembering and in imagining (*De musica* VI, 11,32; *Confess.* X, 8,12-14; *Trin.* XI, 6,10; XI, 5,8; 8,13-14; 10,17), namely, in the reproductive and restorative elaboration, which he indicates by the term *cogitatio* (putting together in order to contrast and compare intellectual and sensible information: *Confess*. X, 11,18; *Trin.* XI, 3,6). Nevertheless, departing from the common opinion that the treasure of memory is constituted by what is born in the recesses of the mind (the *notitae absconditae in abdito mentis*, *Trin.* XIV, 7,9), he formulated a new theory in the history of thought about memory: "memory of the present" and *memoria sui*.

Memory comes to be seen as a function that, in its essence, has a connection to the present and not to the past. In this perspective, time is valued not for its temporal succession but rather as an extension of the mind, namely like memory (*Confess.* XI, 25,33). This intuition brought Augustine to see memory as self-consciousness, as *memoria sui* pertaining to the sphere of intellectual preconceptual consciousness, i.e., at the transcendental level of human ontology, beyond the Aristotelian-Plotinian understanding of the sensible. Terms in Augustine synonymous with *memoria sui* are *scire* and *nosse*, namely, awareness of oneself that lies between memory and *cogitatio* (concepts as object of knowledge), where memory, seat of the soul (*Confess.* X, 25,36), identifies itself with its own *spiritus* (*De gen. ad lit.* XII, 16,33). The *memoria sui* is the original *notitia sui*, the *intelligentia sui*, the mind within the mind, the *animus* that senses itself: that knowing of oneself by the soul that is *scire se esse, se vivere, se intelligere, velle, memini* (*Trin.,* X). The soul experiences in this way, insofar as it is present to one's entire and whole self, one's identity with memory (*tanquam ipsa sit sibi memoria sui, Trin.,* XIV, 6,8). Augustine transforms the self-awareness of the soul into an anthropological category when he identifies it, referring to Gen 1:26, as humanity made in the "*image of God." At that point the *memoria sui* coincides with the *memoria Dei*, and memory reveals to humans something of their own unfathomable mystery. In the *Confessions* (bk. XI) Augustine develops the similarity between humans and God through his conception of time: extension of the soul and not the Aristotelian space-time succession. Through memory, humans, like God, who is not constrained within space-time limits, extend themselves into the past, the present and the future. In *De Trinitate* (in particular in book XIV, 8,11) one has in Augustine the transition of memory to *mens* which means that, in remembering, the image of the Trinity is revealed: not only as a potentiality but also as a participant in such an image, i.e., that in memory one knows and loves God and, through such knowledge and love, humanity recovers its true image. It is *memoria Dei* that becomes the source of understanding human life, namely, *memoria sui* as an image of the *Father (*mens*), of the Son (*intelligentia*) and of the *Holy Spirit (*amor*) (*Trin.* XV, 22,43).

DSp 10, 991-1002 (A. Solignac); G. Madec, *Pour ou contre la "Memoria Dei"*: REAug 11 (1965) 89-92; B.L. Zekiyan,

L'interiorismo agostiniano, Genoa 1981; N. Cipriano, *Memory*, in *Augustine Through the Ages*, ed. A.D. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 553-555.

V. Grossi

MENANDER (1st c.). We have limited information about the *gnostic Menander. We learn from *Justin (1 *Apol.* 26,4) that Menander, born in Capparatea in Samaria, had become the disciple of *Simon Magus. Having arrived in *Antioch, he had used his *magic arts to gain numerous followers, to whom he was promising immortality. Also, *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 23,5) affirms the Samaritan origin of Menander, providing further pieces of information on his teaching. Menander upheld the unknowability of the First Power; he claimed to be the Savior sent by the invisible powers for the salvation of men. The knowledge transmitted by him was to provide a way to conquer the angels who, sent by Thought, had created the world. Whoever was *baptized in the name of Menander would obtain resurrection and immortality.

W. Foerster, *Die "ersten Gnostiker" Simon und Menander*, in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le origini dello Gnosticismo*, Leiden 1967, 190-196; S. Pétrement, *Le Dieu separé. Les origines du gnosticisme*, Paris 1984, 431-448; M. Simonetti (ed.), *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, Milan 1993, 6-19.

A. Monaci Castagno

MENAS. *Patriarch of *Constantinople (536–552). Native of *Alexandria and director of the St. Sampson hospice of Constantinople, he was elected patriarch 13 March 536 as a replacement for *Anthimus, whom Pope *Agapetus, present in the *Byzantine capital, had dismissed from his patriarchal see. A singular fact: he was the same pope to order the newly elect to send out on that occasion (13 March) a profession of faith that renewed that of *Hormisdas and was particularly supportive of the doctrinal primacy of the church in *Rome. Agapetus died in Constantinople (22 April) soon after convening, together with Menas, the Byzantine synod to govern the case of Anthimus and the *monophysites. With the participation of the Western bishops and the papal retinue, the synod was held under the presidency of Menas and anathematized Anthimus and his followers (20 May–4 June 536).

The *Origenist agitation of the *Palestinian monks provoked an imperial reaction with an anti-Origenist decree underwritten by the Constantinopolitan synod, presided over by Menas (June 543). In 547, the synod confirmed in writing *Justinian's doctrinal edict against the so-called *Three Chapters, provoking Pope *Vigilius to break communion. Conducted to Constantinople (25 June 547), the Roman pontiff reconciled with Menas in 552 (after Feb 5) in the church of St. *Euphemia of Chalcedon after Menas gave him a profession of faith that acknowledged the four ecumenical *councils and declared his full accord with the Roman Church, while also asking pardon for the injuries unjustly inflicted on Vigilius. As at the moment of his election, Menas's death took place while the bishop of Rome was staying in Constantinople, 24 Aug 552, the day in which he is commemorated in the Byzantine synaxarion and the *Mart. rom.* During his pontificate the greatest churches of Constantinople were dedicated: Hagia Sophia (22 Dec 538) and Holy Apostles (28 June 550).

CPG 6923-6932; Grumel, *Regestes*[2], 232-243; EC 8, 668; BS 9, 318-319; L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini*, Rome-Louvain 1972, 124-148 and passim; Grillmeier 2/2, 183, 231, 350-351, 353-354, 388-389, 426, 474; *Patrologia* V, 45-46.

D. Stiernon

MENNAS, martyr (d. ca. 295). According to the **Chronicon Paschale*, Mennas was martyred in 295 (in *Egypt or in *Phrygia). The oldest evidence for the *saint is from the martyrium of the *Constantinian era built on the tomb, and replaced, during the time of *Athanasius (328–373), with a basilica. The sanctuary was expanded by *Arcadius (395–408), and near to it *Zeno (474–491) built a city whose ruins carry the name of Karm Abu Mina (Egypt). The great sanctuary in the desert of Mareotis near to *Alexandria was one of the most famous places for pilgrimage after the Arab invasion, as the gathering of the saint's miracles attests (CPG 2527); unfortunately, it reports few details on his local cult, and is based on *hagiographic and folkloric clichés. *John III of Alexandria, *patriarch of the *Copts from 677, may have written a Coptic encomium on the saint in which he recommended the *pilgrimage (J. Drescher, ed., *Apa Mena,* Cairo 1946). The popular spread of the cult is attested to above all by the "casks of St. Mennas" (with dust, oil?), made in the vicinity of the *sanctuary, but found in all the Mediterranean world: often the saint appears depicted on them in an attitude of *prayer, with tunic and mantle, and in the company of two camels. The oldest passion is of Phrygian origin: developed at Cotyaes in the province *Phrygia Salutaris*, on the model of the *panegyric of St. Gordius (Gordian) written by *Basil the Great, it makes of Mennas an Egyptian soldier who came to Phrygia, lived the solitary life and

endured martyrdom under *Diocletian. The monks of Karm Abu Mina were content with explaining how, in spite of everything, his *relics rested with them, making use of a *miraculous story that, in its turn, knew numerous developments. The feast of the saint is set as 11 Nov in *Mart. hier.*, in the Calendar of Oxyrhynchus, in the marble Calendar of Naples, and in the Alexandrian and *Byzantine Synaxaria. The historical martyrologies echo the Phrygian legend of the martyr. At the time of *Gregory the Great there existed in *Rome, near Ostia, a church in Mennas's honor, where Gregory delivered the *Hom. in Evang.* 2,35. In the 14th c. the relics were transferred to the church of St. Mennas in Cairo.

BHG 1250-1269; BHL 5921-5924; BHO 745-752; BS 9, 324-343; BBKL 5,1247-1249; RBK 3,1116-1158; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medioevo,* Florence 1926, rev. Rome 2000, 387; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom,* Luxembourg 1938, 74-76; Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae* 2, Rome 1982, 661-663; J. Christern, *Die Pilgerheiligtümer von Abu Mina und Qal'at Sim'an,* in H. Beck - P.C. Bol (eds.), *Spätantike und frühes Christentum,* Frankfurt 1983, 211-222; F. Jaritz, *Die arabischen Quellen zum hl. Menas,* Heidelberg 1993; E. Schurr, *Die Ikonographie der Heiligen,* Dettelbach 1997, 264-280; J. Witt, *Werke der Alltagskultur* 1. *Menasampullen,* Wiesbaden 2000; P. Grossmann, *Christliche Architektur in Ägypten,* Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2002.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

MENSA. Beyond the common meaning of "table," in the context of Antiquity the term *mensa* incorporated various cultic meanings.

1. Funerary mensa. The *mensa* is first of all a construction in brick, in the form of a table, erected above a tomb, that used to provide the full means for serving meals in honor of the *dead. The guests used to lie down on recliners placed around the table. This structure is particularly well known thanks to texts and *African monuments. Among the monuments of this type, one should point out the *mensa Cypriani* that used to mark *Carthage as the place of *Cyprian's martyrdom. Yet it was possible that similar *mensae* existed on the tomb of any deceased person, decorated with figures and *inscriptions referring to the meal. Often they used to contain a system for drawing and running *water over the tomb or even within it, as it was thought that on the inside the dead person took part in the **refrigerium* of the living. This type of cult was common to both the faithful departed and to the martyrs. With time, the funerary feasts were excluded from the cult of the martyrs (*Ambrose, *Augustine, *Zeno of Verona).

2. The eucharistic mensa. Indeed, the *Eucharist had its origin in a meal. For a long time it was celebrated on top of a table, similar in all probability to the small round tripod table depicted in a painting of a room of the *sacraments in the catacomb of St. *Callistus (Wp, pl. 41, 1). For a long time the altars were in wood, as demonstrated by the literary witnesses (*Optatus of Milevis, *Schism. donat.* 6,1; *Athanasius, *Hist. arian. ad mon.* 56); none of them have been preserved, but on the floor the holes in which the legs were mounted can still be detected (DACL 1, 3160). Altars in stone appeared rather quickly. In Provence, a number of *mensae* in marble are preserved, each with a depressed surface and decorative edge, and with either one or four legs: *Marseille, Abbaye Saint Victor, 5th c.; Auriol (department of Bouches-du-Rhône), preserved at Marseille, Musée Borély, 5th c.; Vaison-la-Romaine (department of Vaucluse), Cathédrale Notre-Dame de *Nazareth, 6th c. A similar altar is found at *Jerusalem on the Mount of Olives, where it functions as a lid for a chamber of *relics, excavated beneath the floor. Other altars take the form of a *blocco* (with the leg in brick), either with a *sarcophagus or a casket. All of them presume that relics are enclosed within.

3. Other mensae. The biography of Pope *Sylvester I in the **Liber pontificalis* indicates that the emperor *Constantine I *donated seven silver altars to the basilica of St. John Lateran. Since in an early Christian basilica there was one eucharistic altar, the hypothesis has been advanced that the seven altars did not constitute true and proper altars but rather tables designed to receive the offerings of the faithful. It is possible that some *mensae* in sigmate form (found in *Egypt, Africa and elsewhere) were designed for the same purpose.

DACL 1, 3155-3189; 11, 440-453; RAC 1, 342-343; AugL 1, 243-245; EAM 1, 436-444; LTK 7, 276-277; J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* 1, Munich 1924, 245-316; E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, Oxford [2]1962, 20-38; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 191-197, 302-304; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 578-581; Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae* 2, Rome 1982, 525-542 (*mensae martyrum*); ed. R. Temple, *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, London 1990, 62-66; E. Chalkia, *Le mense paleocristiane*, Vatican City 1991; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Memorien für Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, Berlin and New York 1999, 89-90.

V. Saxer and S. Heid

MENSURIUS. The bishop of *Carthage from ca. 303 to 308/309. During the *Diocletian persecution, Mensurius had maintained a moderate stance, restraining the enthusiasm for martyrdom that was exploding into spontaneous denunciations, as well as the fanaticism for the imprisoned faithful, esp. if

they were persons with an unproven Christian life. Accused of *traditio by hostile circles (see *Pass. Saturnini* 18.20) who were finding their support in the bishops of *Numidia who had little tolerance for the growing authority of the bishop of Carthage, Mensurius explained his conduct in a letter to *Secundus, bishop of Tigisis and primate of Numidia. He admittied to having hidden the sacred books and to having turned over the books of *heretics to the authorities (Aug., *Coll. c.D.* III, 13.25). At a date that is certainly earlier than the traditional reckoning of 311/312, and that acc. to scholars is placed at 305/306 or to 308/309, he was summoned to *Rome for the purpose of explaining why he did not consign to the authorities the deacon Felix, presumed to have been the author of an anti-imperial opuscule. Mensurius died during the return trip to Carthage. His successor was *Caecilian, whose *election provided a pretext for the *Donatist *schism.

Monceaux 4, 11-17; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford 1952 ([2]1971), 6-16 passim; PCBE 1, 748f.; S. Lancel, *Les débuts du Donatisme: la date du "protocole" de Cirta et de l'élection épiscopale de Sylvanus*: REAug 25 (1979) 217-229; Id., in SC 373, 1553-1557; Augustinus-Lexicon 2, 607-609; B. Kriegbaum, *Kirche der Traditoren oder Kirche der Märtyrer? Die Vorgeschichte des Donatismus* (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien XVI), Innsbruck 1986, passim.

F. Scorza Barcellona

MÉRIDA

I. The city and Christianity - II. The Council of Mérida (666) - III. Archaeology.

I. The city and Christianity. Mérida inherited the Roman *Augusta Emerita*, capital of the province of *Lusitania ever since the emperor *Augustus founded it in 25 BC in order to reward his soldiers who had fought in the region of Asturias. According to *Ausonius, it was the ninth city of the empire. The city issued coins during the entire Roman period. In 360, the consul Vettius Agorius *Praetextatus was governor of Lusitania. During the era of the invasions, it was occupied first by the *Vandals in 429, then the Suevi (Suebi, Suevians) in 439 and finally the *Visigoths in 469. After a hard-fought resistance, the city surrendered to the Muslims in 713.

We have documentation of the Christian *faith at Mérida only from 254, although it definitely had arrived in an earlier era: in his letter 67, *Cyprian speaks of a flourishing and organized community, with a *libellatic bishop *Martial, who was deposed and replaced by Felix. During the *Diocletian *persecution, the famous *Eulalia was martyred here.

Bishop Liberius of Mérida attended the *Council of *Elvira (ca. 303). Accompanied by the deacon Florentius, he attended the *Council of *Arles (314), to which Mérida was the only city of Hispaniae to send its bishop as a representative. As bishop, the same Florentius would later attend the Council of *Serdica (343) with *Ossius of Cordoba. Shaped by the strident opposition of its bishop *Hydatius, Mérida takes center stage in the early history of *Priscillianism. Its bishop Patruinus presided at the First Council of *Toledo (397–400), convened to condemn the practices of the Priscillianists and perhaps even some of their sympathizers. When we consider that even Bishops Hydatius and *Turibius of Astorga (Asturica) appealed to Bishop Antoninus of Mérida, asking him to intervene against a *Manichean sect (445), it is possible that by the middle of the 5th c., Mérida had already become a *metropolitan see. In any case, Bishop *Masona of Mérida signed his name as metropolitan of Lusitania, at the Third Council of Toledo in 589.

During the 2nd half of the 6th c., the church of Mérida was illustrious and rich, renowned for performing charitable and relief work, regardless of religious differences. Its prestige was great, esp. during the episcopate of the celebrated Masona. It explains why the Visigoth king *Leovigild strove to win it over to the *Arian cause, believing that such prestige would promote the cause of unifying his kingdom under the Arian faith. As a consequence of the Suevian expansion to the S, the metropolis of Mérida had lost some of the N territories of Lusitania; it would later regain them during the rule of the metropolitan Orontius and the Visigoth king Recceswinth.

Bishops: Martial (ca. 252); Felix; Liberius (ca. 303); Florentius (d. 343 or likely 357); Hydatius (379–ca. 385); Patruinus (400); Gregorius (402 or 403); Antoninus (445); Zeno (during the reign of the Visigoth king *Euric: 466–486); *Paul (d. 554); Fidelis (ca. 571); Masona (573–606); Nepopis (he assumed the see during the exile of his predecessor); Innocent (610); Renovatus (his successor); Stephen (633–638); Orontius (638–653); Profitius (d. 666); Festus (ca. 673); Stephen (681–683); Zeno (ca. 687); Maximus (688–693).

PW V/2, 2493-2496; DHEE 3, 1476-1477; D. Mansilla, *Orígenes de la organización metropolitana en la iglesia española*: Hispania Sacra 12 (1959) 271-275; E. Florez, ES 13; R. Collins, *Mérida and Toledo: 550–585*, in *Visigothic Spain*, Oxford 1980, 189-219; P. Mateos Cruz, *Augusta Emerita de capital de la* diocesis *Hispaniarum a sede temporal visigoda*, in G. Ripoll and J.M. Gort (eds.), *Sedes regiae (ann. 400–800)*, Barcelona 2000, 491-520; J.L. Ramírez Sádaba and P. Mateos Cruz, *Catálogo de las inscripciones de Mérida*, Mérida 2000; J. Arce, *Mérida tardorromana (300–580 d.C.)*, Mérida 2002.

II. The Council of Mérida (666). This was a provincial council, with Bishop Proficius of Mérida presiding. Eleven other bishops were present. Its 23 canons were intended to regulate the life of the church. Among these are particular canons that treat the relationships between the various *orders of the *clergy. From canon 8, we deduce the existence of another council at Mérida (ca. 650), famous for reinstating the borders of the ecclesiastical province and of the other dioceses, as they stood prior to the Suevian conquest. The canon of the First Council of Toledo (400) tells us of yet another council, but we know nothing about it.

Mansi 11, 31-46; Synoden 224-231 and passim; J. Arce, *Mérida tardorromana (300–580 d.C.)*, Mérida 2002.

P. de Luis

III. Archaeology. Christianization was slow and progressive, reaching back to the time of the first Christian *epigraph, dated to 381 (ICERV, n. 18). In the Visigothic era, the bishop of Mérida assumed secular *patronage (ICERV, n. 363), thanks to the enormous wealth of the see (*Vitae patrum Emeretensium* [hereafter VPE] 4,2) and to the episcopal monopoly over the cult of *Eulalia (VPE 5,8; see *Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, 3,4-5). The VPE indicates that Mérida was filled with churches and monasteries in the 5th–6th c., esp. under the leadership of Masona (VPE 5,3). In the *intramuros* zone, we clearly see the episcopal complex in proximity to the area of the present-day cathedral. Organized around an atrium, it was surrounded by the following: the cathedral of S. Jerusalén (VPE 4,9; 5,6; 5,11; 5,13), known as the cathedral of S. María de Jerusalén since the 2nd quarter of the 7th c. (VPE 4,9); the *baptistery, located in the annexed chapel of San Juan (VPE 4,9), in existence since the time of Bishop Fidelis; and a grand *episcopal palace (VPE 4,6), sumptuously rebuilt by Fidelis. We can probably add to the list the churches of San Andrés (now the Convento de Santo Domingo) and San Jacobo (an integral component of the Parador de Turismo connected to the Arch of *Trajan). Although in the same zone there are no Arian basilicas, the VPE (5,10-11) informs us that Sunna, the Arian bishop of Mérida, retained them in conjunction with a palace. In 587, the Visigothic king *Recared handed them over to Masona (VPE 5,11). In archaeological terms, we suppose the existence of three other basilicas.

Meanwhile in the *extramuros* zone were the *basilicae martyrum* (VPE 4,8 and 5,14) from the era of Fidelis: S. Lucrecia (VPE 4,7); S. Faustus (VPE 4,7); S. Lorenzo (VPE 4,10) and S. Cipriano (VPE 4,10). We may add the *basilicae martyrum* of S. María de Quintisina Quintilina (Quintilina), sometimes called S. María de Ureña, of the 7th c., five miles from Mérida (VPE 1); S. *Lucía (perhaps S. *Fabián and S. *Sebastián, united with S. Eulalia).

Yet the most important suburban basilica was the one that contained the *relics of the martyr Eulalia that were certainly first interred in the family mausoleum. At the beginning of the 4th c., a martyrium was built (Prud., *Perist.* 3,186) in the plan of a rectangular apse (13 x 9 meters [= 42.7 x 29.5 ft]); it was destroyed by the military leader Heremigarius in 429 (*Hydatius of Aquae Flaviae, **Chronicon* at 429). Shortly thereafter, a new basilica was erected (30 m [98.4 ft] in width) that incorporated the earlier edifice into the central apse with a tripartite façade. Fidelis restored it and added two towers (VPE 4,6). The new basilica served as a mausoleum for the bishops of Mérida (VPE 4,10; 5,15). Joined to this basilica were two monasteries (one for men and one for women), a **xenodochium* and various buildings. The men's monastery, in existence from the time of the bishop Paul (VPE 3,4), was an episcopal school (VPE 1); the women's monastery was documented in the year 661 (ICERV, n. 358). The *xenodochium* was built by Masona (VPE 5,3) between 571 and 605 (source confirmed by ICERV, n. 348); situated at a distance of 200 m (656.2 ft) from the basilica, it consisted of a patio flanked by corridors that connected with the monastery. Following the Muslim capture of Mérida (713), only four churches continued to be in use: the cathedral, the church of S. Andrés, and the *basilicae martyrum* of Sts. Eulalia (until the 9th c.) and Lucía.

Mérida constituted the leading *Iberian center for the production of decorative *sculpture in the late Roman and Visigothic eras.

In the 7th c. the see of Mérida held a territorial patrimony (VPE 5,13) constituted by many rural churches, some of which had a private foundation in imperial law (*Concilium Emeritense* [666], cans. 19 and 11). Casa Herrera (above a villa) and the church of S. Pedro de Mérida are particularly relevant. Casa Herrera (7 km [4.4 mi] N of Mérida) has a rectangular plan with three aisles, a choir, an antechoir, two lateral vestibules and facing apses. It was built in two phases. The first construction project dates to ca. 500 or early 6th c.; during the second project in the 2nd half of the 6th c., the baptistery was added that was originally only a rectangular pool. In the middle of the 7th c., the baptistery was flanked by two cruciform receptacles for holy water. The church of S. Pedro de Mérida (ca. 75 km [46.6 mi] E of Mérida) is dated to ca. 600. It has a square plan with three

aisles, a baptistery in the lateral aisle, a protruding rectangular apse, a gate that separates the liturgical and baptismal space from the faithful, and what seem to be lateral galleries.

For Mérida's zone of influence, we have documentation of churches along the network of primary roads leading N, following the Vía de la Plata (Alconétar: S. Olalla and S. Lucía del Trampal); leading E toward Toledo, in the Sierra de Montánchez (Ibahernando: San Cruz de la Sierra and El Gatillo de Arriba), and at Las Villuercas (a church at Portera and one at Berzocana). Furthermore, the *place names that mention Olalla (a corruption of "Eulalia") and Herguijuela (a corruption of "Ecclesiola/Igrejuela") seem to correspond to small Visigothic churches.

In addition to the monasteries founded by Masona (VPE 5,3), the sources mention two others: the "meager hut" of the abbot Nanctus (VPE 3) and the wealthy monastery of S. María de Cauliliana (*Coloniana*), 12.9 km (8 mi) from the city (VPE 2). Perhaps there were others in the environs of Montánchez and Las Villuercas, maybe even at S. Lucía del Trampal, a Visigothic basilica in Alcuéscar.

P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana: siglos IV–VI*: Madrid and Valladolid 1967; J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda* [=ICERV], Barcelona 1969; L. Caballero Zoreda and T. Ulbert, *La basílica paleocristiana de Casa Herrera, en las cercanías de Mérida (Badajoz)*, Madrid 1976 [Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España 89]; R. Collins, *Merida and Toledo: 550–585*, in *Visigothic Spain: New Approaches*, Oxford 1980, 189-219; R. Étienne, *Merida, capitale du vicariate des Espagnes*, in *Homenaje a Sáenz de Buruaga*, Madrid 1982, 201-207; M. Cruz Villalón, *Mérida visigoda. Escultura arquitectónica y liturgia*, Badajoz 1985; S. Andrés Ordax, *Huellas visigodas en la Baja Extremadura*, in *Historia de la Baja Extremadura*, I, Badajoz 1986, 187-227; T. Ulbert, *Nachuntersuchungen im Bereich der frühchristlichen Basilika von Casa Herrera bei Merida*: Madrider Mitteilungen 32 (1991) 185-207; C. Godoy Fernández and F. Tuset Bertrán, *El atrium en las "Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium." Una fórmula de la llamada arquitectura de poder*: Archivo Español de Arqueología 67 (1994) 209-221; J. Vilella, *Aportaciones de la epigrafía cristiana hispana no incluida en IHC ni en ICERV a la prosopografía cristiana del Bajo Imperio*, in *"Historiam pictura refert." Miscellanea in onore di Padre Alejandro Recio Veganzones O.F.M.*, Vatican City 1994, 615-623; E. Cerrillo, *Arqueología del cristianismo primitivo en la actual Extremadura*, in *Mérida y Santa Eulalia*. Actas de las Jornadas de Estudios Eulalienses, Mérida 1995, 89-103; P.C. Díaz Martínez, *Propiedad y poder: la Iglesia lusitana en el siglo VII*, in *Los últimos romanos en Lusitania*, Mérida 1995, 49-72; A. Fuentes Domínguez, *Extremadura en la Antigüedad Tardía*: Extremadura Arqueológica 4 (1995) 217-237; C. Godoy Fernández, *Arqueología y liturgia. Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII)*, Barcelona 1995; P. Mateos Cruz, *La cristianización de la Lusitania (ss. IV–VII): Extremadura en época visigoda*: Extremadura Arqueológica 4 (1995) 239-263; E. Sánchez Salor, *Mérida, centro de irradiación de formas de vida ascética en el siglo VII*: Helmantica 48 (1997) 183-204; P. Mateos Cruz, *La basílica de Santa Eulalia de Mérida: arqueología y urbanismo*, Mérida 1999; Id., *Augusta Emerita de capital de la* diocesis *Hispaniarum a sede temporal visigoda,* in G. Ripoll and J.M. Gort (eds.), *Sedes regiae (ann. 400–800)*, Barcelona 2000, 491-520; J.L. Ramírez Sádaba and P. Mateos Cruz, *Catálogo de las inscripciones de Mérida*, Mérida 2000; J. Arce, *Mérida tardorromana (300–580 d.C.)*, Mérida 2002; M. Sotomayor, *Sobre la arqueología cristiana en Hispania*, in *Santos, obispos y reliquias*. Actas del III Encuentro internacional "Hispania en la Antigüedad Tardía," Alcalá de Henares 2003, 85-99.

C. Buenacasa

MERITA. A Roman woman, probably martyred during the *Diocletian *persecution, buried in the cemetery of Commodilla on the Via Ostiense. Concerning the place of burial, a lost *inscription of 426 (ICUR II, 6077) attests that a certain Januarius acquired from the gravediggers Burdo, Micinus and Muscorutio a sepulcher *ante domna Emerita*. The tomb of Januarius is precisely within the confines of Commodilla, since the name Muscorutio most likely appears in another inscription of the same *cemetery (ICUR II, 6106). It is noteworthy that even the legendary account (*Passio SS. Virginum et martyrum Dignae et Meritae*) affirms that the two martyrs were buried at Commodilla, and that in the 2nd half of the 8th c. their *relics were translated into the church of S. Marcello. Emerita or Merita appears in two frescoes of the catacomb of Commodilla: one in the small basilica, the other in a columbarium in a gallery near the *sanctuary. In the first fresco from the middle of the 6th c., we see her represented as **orans* in the scene of the **Traditio clavium*, together with the Roman martyrs Adauctus (whose figure is missing due to the loss of plaster), and *Felix, as well as the protomartyr *Stephen (WMM, pl. 148, 149). In the second fresco she appears between Felix and Adauctus; near the female figure the name of MERITA is preceded by the letter A, most likely the remnant of the abbreviation SCA (*sancta*) (WMM, plate 150, 1). To these witnesses we must add the few remaining sections of a fresco, still visible in the small basilica of the cemetery, representing Christ, who crowns Felix and Adauctus in the presence of Merita (WMM, plate 150, 3).

BS 4, 531ff.; LCI 6, 57; AASS, *Septembris* 6, 302ff.; H. Delehaye, *Les Saints du cimitière de Commodilla*: AB 16 (1897) 30ff.; B. Bagatti, *Il cimitero di Commodilla o dei SS. Felice e Adautto presso la via Ostiense*, Vatican City 1936; J.G. Deckers, G. Mietke and A. Weiland, *La catacomba di Commodilla. Repertorio delle pitture*, Vatican City 1994.

D. Calcagnini Carletti

MEROBAUDES, Flavius. *Eloquentiae merito vel maxime in poematis studio veteribus comparandus*

(*Hydatius, *Chron.* 128, *Chron. Min.* II, MGH AA XI, p. 124), Flavius Merobaudes was of aristocratic ancestry (*natu nobilis*: ibid.) and generated his particular literary activity in the 2nd quarter of the 5th c., during the reign of the emperor *Valentinian III (425–455). Originally from *Baetica, which he left for *Ravenna (see *Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carm.* IX, 277-301), in 435 he received the honor of a bronze *statue in the Forum of *Trajan, erected in recognition of his *military and cultural merits. The dedicatory *inscription testifies to these merits (CIL VI, 1724 = ILS 2950: *aeque forti et docto viro*), on the basis of which he became a *vir spectabilis* and a *comes sacri consistorii*. One of them must have been the composing of a now-lost *panegyric on the commander in chief Flavius *Aetius (see *Pan.* I, fragment II A, 1 and 2f.). In 443, in the capacity of *magister utriusque militiae*, Aetius successfully led a rapid campaign against the Bacaudae, in the province of *Tarragona (CIL VI, 31983b and Hydat., *Chron.* 128). This is all we know for certain about him. Concerning his political position, a plausible theory is offered by Mario Mazza, who notes that Merobaudes had married the daughter of the senator Flavius Astyrius, a *magister utriusque militiae* during the years 441–443 and a consul in 449 (see PLRE II, 174f.). He would have been a spokesperson for the ideals and tangible interests of the Hispano-Gallic *possessores*, the class that was most directly threatened by the revolt of the Bacaudae, an expression of the social unrest among farmers and shepherds.

Until the beginning of the 19th c., the only known work of Merobaudes was the *De Christo*, a set of *carmina* in thirty hexameters on the double nature of Christ, human and divine. It was transmitted under his name by the MS that is unknown to us, but that Fabricius used as the basis of his edition of 1564. On the authorship of the *carmina*, published in 1510 by Camers among the works of *Claudian, refer to Th. Birt (MGH AA X, CLXXI f.). The part that has come down to us from the remaining output is revealed by Codex Sangallensis 908, a *palimpsest of the 5th–6th c., discovered by Niebuhr, who in 1823 was its first editor. We are dealing with six texts in all, from the years 440 to ca. 446. There are the fragments of two panegyrics. The first is written in prose. Contrary to the opinion of Niebuhr, F. Vollmer (praef. IIf.) has demonstrated that in this first example a preface in prose was once appended to the panegyric in verse. There are also four *carmina* of an encomiastic sort, with some missing verses. Since the texts have reached us in fragile condition, various reconstructions and interpretations inevitably arise.

The first panegyric, the dating of which wavers between 439 (PLRE II, 758) to shortly after 443, is a *gratiarum actio* (see Clover, *Merobaudes*, 34-36), written in prose on the model of *Pliny the Younger and *Ausonius. Merobaudes gives thanks for the conferring of a highest honor (*Pan.* I, fragment II A, 3-4: *evectus . . . ad honoris maximi nomen*). This was most likely the patriciate (Vollmer, 9; Clover, *Merobaudes*, 35-36). Yet Barnes (*Patricii under Valentinian III*) thinks of an honorary consulship, thus reviving a hypothesis of Ensslin (Klio 24 [1931] 483-486). Meanwhile, the second panegyric is in dactylic hexameters; its four remaining fragments total 197 verses. It was recited on 1 June 446 to celebrate the third consulship of Aetius. Drawing inspiration from Claudian, both in the epic-like tones and in the recourse to a *mythological framework, the poet extols the victorious campaigns of Aetius. He represents the *processus consularis* of Aetius as a celebration of the peace that he achieved for the empire by repressing the revolt of the Baucadae in 445. Further in the vein of Claudian, Merobaudes does not limit himself to exalting the outstanding virtues of his *patron, whose *ethical qualities are modeled on the portrait of Caesar by Sallust in *Cat.* 54 (see Zecchini). By accentuating the positive results that Aetius obtained, the poet justifies his *political choices, esp. the plan of integrating the *barbarians into the imperial ranks. *Carmen* IV, a brief poem of 46 hendecasyllables inspired by the *Genethliacon Lucani* of Statius (*Silv.* 2,7), celebrates the birthday of the second son of Aetius. It was intended to promote the image of the general, exalting the noble birth of his wife, and recalling how the baby was carried in the womb and nursed by Rome, his city of birth (*Carm.* IV, 29-33). The three remaining *carmina* are in elegiac couplets, and they all employ the device of *ekphrasis*. *Carmen* III is the description of a park that most likely belonged to the *vir illustris* Anicius Acilius Glabrio Faustus. *Carmina* I and II both allude to the *baptism of *Galla Placidia, the second-born child of Valentinian III, hence they date to a little later than 442 (see Clover, *Merobaudes*, 27-28; Monti). They celebrate the imperial family through the *ekphrasis* of the *mosaics that portray them. Still unsolved is the riddle of the *novus exul*, who in *Carmen* I bewails the sudden loss of his material possessions (v. 8 *amissas subito flet novus exul opes*) in the presence of the sovereign (v. 7 *pro praeside nostro*). As detailed by Bruzzone (p. 14 and n. 8), the most credible solution is Valentinian III. Bury and Gillet think that the sovereign would have been the emperor *Theodosius II. Another solution is the *Vandal prince *Huneric, the son of *Genseric and the promised spouse of princess Eudoxia the first-born of Valentinian III (Oost, 4-7; Clover, *Mero-*

baudes, 21), or even more likely the rebel Tibatto (Barnes 1974), the leader of the Bacaudae who was defeated and captured by Aetius in 437.

Editions: The *editio princeps* of Merobaudes, published at St. Gallen in 1823, rests on B.G. Niehbur: *Merobaudis carminum orationisque reliquiae,* followed in the next year by a revised edition (*Fl. Merobaudis carminum panegyricique reliquiae*, Bonn 1824). F. Vollmer then curated the edition of Merobaudes for the MGH (*Fl. Merobaudis reliquiae . . .* , Berlin 1905, MGH, AA XIV, 3-20). The text established by Vollmer (reproduced in the appendix, 60-69) is the basis for both F.M. Clover, *Flavius Merobaudes: A Translation and Historical Commentary*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1, Philadelphia 1971, and *Flavio Merobaude, Panegirico in versi*, ed. with intro. and comm. by A. Bruzzone, Rome 1999.

Studies: For general information on Merobaudes, in addition to the introductory pages of Clover and Bruzzone, see F. Lenz, “Merobaudes 3” in RE XV, I, 1039-1047; “Fl. Merobaudes” in PLRE II, 756-758; “Merobaudes” in S. Döpp and W. Geerlings (eds.), *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature*, 421; S. Bodelón, *Merobaudes: un poeta de la Bética en la corte de Rávena*: Helmantica 52 (2001) 51-73.

Other contributions: T.D. Barnes, *Merobaudes on the Imperial Family*: Phoenix 28 (1974) 314-319; Id., *Patricii under Valentinian III*: Phoenix 29 (1975) 155-170; J.B. Bury, *Iusta Grata Honoria*: JRS 9 (1919) 1-13; F.M. Clover, *Toward an Understanding of Merobaudes’ Panegyric I*: Historia 20 (1971) 354-367, currently reprinted in Clover, *The Late Roman West and the Vandals*, Aldershot (UK) and Brookfield (USA) 1993; F.E. Consolino, *Poesia e propaganda da Valentiniano III ai regni romanobarbarici (secc. V–VI)*, in Consolino (ed.), *Letteratura e propaganda nell’occidente latino da Augusto ai regni romanobarbarici*, Rome 2000, 183-189; A. Gillet, *The Date and Circumstances of Olympiodorus of Thebes*: Traditio 48 (1993) 1-29, in particular the appendix (*Imperial Relations in Merobaudes’s* Carmen) *I*, 26-29; A. Loyen, *L’œuvre de Flavius Merobaudes et l’histoire de l’Occident de 430 à 450*: REA 74 (1972) 153-174; M. Mazza, *Merobaude. Poesia e politica nella tarda antichità*, in var. aus., *La poesia tardoantica: tra retorica, teologia e politica*, Messina 1984, 379-430 (reprinted as *Il principe e il panegirista* in M. Mazza, *Le maschere del Potere. Cultura e politica nella tarda antichità*, Naples 1986, 149-207); S. Monti, *Per l’esegesi dei carmi I e II di Merobaude*: RAAN 41 (1966) 3-20; S.I. Oost, *Some Problems in the History of Galla Placidia*: CPh 60 (1965) 1-10 (4-7 on *Carmen* I); G. Zecchini, *L’imitatio* Caesaris *di Aezio*: Latomus 44 (1985) 124-142 (later republished, with light revisions, in G. Zecchini, *Ricerche di storiografia tardoantica*, Rome 1993, 163-179). On Aetius and his age, the current standard is D. Coulon, *Aetius*, Lille 2004.

F.E. Consolino

MEROVINGIAN COUNCILS. The councils took place in the 6th and in the 1st half of the 7th c. in *Gaul. They were characterized by their moralizing, civilizing and above all national function: besides the local questions (*clergy, *parishes, *laypeople, ecclesiastical *property, *works of charity etc.), they discussed important doctrinal problems (e.g., the doctrine of *grace in the 2nd Council of *Orange); they were strictly linked with political power and worked for the unity of the Frankish *church (for the history of Gaul in this period, *see* *Gaul and *Franks). Here we refer to those *councils for which we have the most information.

Orléans (511). This council was convened four years after *Clovis I, king of the Franks, had conquered Aquitaine, having considered it necessary to find an accord with the episcopal *authority in order to consolidate the unity of his kingdom. It dealt with the first national council of the Frankish church; it put forward 31 *canons concerning whether to grant *asylum to refugees in the churches, the obligations of *clerics and monks, the treatment reserved for *heretical clerics, the *liturgical practices of the *ascension and of *Lent, the management of ecclesiastical property, *alms to give to the *poor and the sick. It seems that the first 10 canons must have been at the initiation of King Clovis.

Epaone (517). After the conversion of *Sigismund, king of the *Burgundians, to *Catholicism, this kingdom abandoned *Arianism; in 517 at Epaone (locality of uncertain identification, perhaps in Savoy) a council was held in order to improve ecclesiastical customs; 40 canons were established. *Avitus of *Vienne presided over the council; *Viventiolus of *Lyons and other bishops participated in it. It established, between them, that clerics could not acquire property, but only give it to the church; that heretics could be readmitted into the church community only after penitence; the *ordination of *deaconesses was abolished.

Lyons (518–523). Held after the death of Avitus of Vienne (5 Feb 518) and before 523, to judge Stephen, head of finances for the kingdom of Burgundy. After the death of his wife, he had married her sister Palladia. Presided over by Viventiolus, it was characterized by a strong conflict between the bishops and King Sigismund, impatient with ecclesiastical interferences. Four of the promulgated canons are about the sentence of Stephen and Palladia, who were readmitted into the church for *prayer only after the reading of the *gospel.

Arles (524). Convened on the occasion of the dedication of the church of St. Mary, presided over by the bishop *Caesarius of Arles, it published four canons on the questions about sacred ordinations.

Carpentras (527). Presided over by Caesarius of Arles, it addressed Agricius, bishop of Antibes, who, violating a decree of the council of Arles of 524, had ordained a certain Protadius without adhering to the year of withdrawal and preparation prescribed for the ordained. The accused did not present himself and was prohibited for a year from the celebra-

tion of *mass. The council also dealt with the income of rural parishes.

Orange (529). The second held in this city, this council gathered on the occasion of the dedication of a *basilica built by the prefect of the magistrate Liberius, who participated in the work with Caesarius of Arles and another 13 bishops. His purpose was to end the *semi-Pelagian controversy with the reaffirmation of the doctrine of *Augustine. The *Acts* consist of 25 canons, and a preface and profession of faith written by Caesarius. This last emphasized that all the *baptized could and must fulfill their duties, uniting their efforts with the grace of God. In the final *Definitio fidei*, forming part of canon 25, it affirms, *Hoc etiam secundum fidem catholicam credimus, quod post acceptam per baptismum gratiam omnes baptizati Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quae ad salute(m) animae pertinent, possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere* (CCL 148A, p. 63, can. 25, 205-208). The Catholic theology of grace is based on the provisions established by this council, the decisions of which were approved by *Boniface II in 531.

Vaison (529). Under the presidency of Caesarius of Arles, Vaison was concerned with the disciplinary questions of the clergy, but of minor importance, set out in five canons (the fifth canon orders the addition of *Sicut erat in principio* after the *Gloria*).

Marseille (533). The first council held in this city. Presided over by Caesarius of Arles, it dealt with the bishop of Riez Contumelius, who was accused of carnal *sins and of misuse of ecclesiastical property. A confessed criminal, he was sent to a *monastery to do penance. Pope *John II, in a letter, ordered that he be deposed, not only shut up in a monastery. The matter was then entrusted to a tribunal by Pope *Agapetus.

Orléans (533). Gathered in the 22nd year of King Childebert and presided over by Honoratus of Bourges (chronological elements confuse this council with another held in 536), in 21 canons it dealt with problems connected to the *discipline of the clergy, declared unlawful marriage to a Jewish man or woman, and called for the expulsion from the church of any Catholics who had returned to *paganism or who had eaten food offered to *idols.

Clermont (535). This council was convened in Clermont in Auvergne, with the consent of King Theodebert I, to deliberate against moral laxity and abuses, esp. of the clergy. It confirmed the old canons and promulgated another 16. The bishops, among whom was Honoratus of Bourges, prohibited every conjugal relation for ecclesiastics and reaffirmed the absolute prohibition of marriage between Christians and Jews.

Orléans (538). Its 36 canons constitute an interesting legislative whole: they reconsider the clergy, the relations with Jews, the property of the church, the punishment of the heretical followers of *Bonosus bishop of Naissus. The council was presided over by Lupus, metropolitan of Lyons.

Orléans (541). Promulgated 38 canons on problems similar to the preceding council and fixed precise norms for Lent.

Orléans (549). Convened by King Childebert I. Bishops from all the ecclesiastical provinces participated: it was therefore the first council on a truly national scale. It promulgated 24 canons. In the first, in accordance with the apostolic see, was the condemnation of *Eutyches and *Nestorius; the others give prescriptions to the bishops, to the clergy and to monks, and the right of asylum in the church for indicted slaves is reaffirmed.

Eauze (551). Presided over by Metropolitan Aspasius (thus the council was titled *Synodus Aspasii episcopi*), it was held in the city of Eauze, and in seven canons it ruled on the ordination of deacons and priests, recommending that the people know the names in advance in order that they could formulate any objections.

Paris (552). Convened by King Childebert I, the council focused on Saffarac the bishop of *Paris, who was charged with grave sins, judged, condemned and banished to a monastery.

Arles (554). In seven canons, it addressed liturgical provisions and clerics who were despoiling church property.

Paris (556–573). The precise year of this council's convening is uncertain. Under the guidance of *Germanus bishop of Paris, it was concerned with the usurpation of ecclesiastical property and with incestuous marriages.

Saintes (561–567). Convened by Leontius of Bordeaux to depose Emerius, bishop of Saintes, whose election due to King *Chlothar I had not been approved by the metropolitan. But Charibert, successor to Chlothar, exiled Heraclius, elected to the post of Emerius, and condemned the bishops who had participated in the council to pay a fine. We have information about it in *Gregory of *Tours (*Hist. Franc.* IV, 26).

Tours (567). Gathered by the bishops of the kingdom of Charibert I, who in 28 canons fixed precise rules for provincial councils, for the removal of women from monasteries, and concerning "canonical clerics." Canon 20 alludes to the *haeresis Nicolaitarum*.

Lyons (567–570). Held in the sixth year of the reign of Guntram, it issued six canons for judging abuses and crimes committed by some bishops and

established rules on disputes between bishops and on the validity of wills of clerics even if they differed from civil laws.

Paris (573). From Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* IV, 47) we know that this council intervened in the dispute between the sons of Chlothar I, King Guntram and King Sigebert. The latter, having founded a bishopric at Châteaudun, made it consecrate the first titular, Promotus, by Egidius of Reims, while the jurisdiction for such an appointment should have turned to the metropolitan of Sens, who was found in the kingdom of his brother Guntram. About the council there are two letters joined, one to Egidius of Reims, the other to King Sigebert: the first condemned the consecration of Promotus; the second was, however, more moderate.

Paris (577). Having lost the documents of this council, our source is Gregory of Tours, who in *Hist. Franc.* V, 18 informs us that the Fathers, gathered in Paris in 577, focused on Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen, accused by King *Chilperic I of many crimes. The king gave to the Fathers a "book of apostolic canons," which ratified the suspension of episcopal functions to whoever had been found guilty of homicide, adultery or perjury. According to some, there is an allusion to can. 25 of *Canones apostolorum*. The king obtained from the council the condemnation of Praetextatus.

Châlon-sur-Saône (579). Also for this council we have only the information provided by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* V, 27): it renewed the sentence against two bishops, Salonius and Sagittarius, guilty of adultery and homicide.

Berny (580). Convened by King Chilperic in order to judge Gregory of Tours, accused of having defamed the queen Fredegund by attributing to her sexual relations with Bertram, bishop of Bordeaux. The Fathers recognized Gregory's innocence and excommunicated his slanderer, Leudast, Count of Tours.

Mâcon (581–583). The bishops of the kingdom of Guntram in 20 canons deliberated on disciplinary problems of clerics, on women's monasteries and on the immunity of the clergy facing the civil tribunal.

Mâcon (585). The second council held in this city in obedience to the will of King Guntram was not a national council, since the bishops of Childebert II's kingdom did not participate. Presided over by Metropolitan Priscus of Lyons, it promulgated 20 canons, concerning public ecclesiastical rights (reaffirming, among others, the *privilegium fori* for the clergy), morals (condemnation of incest), liturgical life of the priests and of the faithful. It is not known whether it was discussed in this council that *woman has a rational soul. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* VIII, 20) reports that one bishop present maintained that the term *homo* could not be attributed to women.

Narbonne (589). Presided over by the bishop of Narbonne, Migetius, this council, convened by the *Visigoth king *Recared, disseminated 15 canons containing rules of conduct for clerics; liturgical prescriptions (abbreviations of long *psalms, singing of the **Gloria* after every psalm); and precautions against fortunetellers, soothsayers and sorcerers.

Auxerre (561–605). This is the only diocesan synod of that period from which documents are preserved. Presided over by Bishop Aunacarius, it promulgated 45 canons with prescriptions to the clergy and the people (condemnation of adultery and incest, prohibition against working on *Sunday, prohibition against witchcraft etc.).

Paris (614). The most important of the Merovingian councils, convened by *Chlothar II and held in the church of St. Peter in Paris. Numerous bishops participated. The 15 canons promulgated were concerned with episcopal appointments (can. 2), the privileges and property of the church (declared inviolable), legal actions brought to the clergy, and the impediments to marriage between blood relations (can. 14).

Clichy (626–627). Ordered by Chlothar II, the council gathered in the basilica of St. Mary in Clichy. It disseminated 28 canons, the last of which is interesting for its novelty: no candidate could be elected as successor of a bishop who was not from the same place.

Châlon-sur-Saône (647–653). Convened by Clovis II, king of Neustria, this council disseminated 20 canons, many of which confirmed previous measures for the clergy. Notable was the agreement with *Nicaea and *Chalcedon in can. 1 and the prohibition against selling slaves outside the kingdom so that they would not end up under Jewish masters (can. 9).

Bordeaux (662–675). Held under Childeric II, one of the three sons of Clovis II. Three metropolitans of Aquitaine, 13 bishops, 2 abbots and some laymen gathered close to the city of Bordeaux, in the church of St. Peter in *castrum Modogarnomum*: they promulgated 4 canons condemning the worldly behavior found among the clergy.

Saint-Jean de Losne (673–675). Ordered by Childeric II, king of Neustria and Burgundy. The council promulgated 22 canons with rules of behavior for bishops and clerics. (Among others, it was clarified that the bishops could not elect their own successor and must preach to the people every Sunday.)

Concilia aevi merovingici, ed. F. Maassen: MGH I (Hannover 1893); Hfl-Lecl II, 2; *Concilia Galliae A.511–A.695,* ed. C. de Clercq: CCL 148A (Turnhout 1963); Palazzini, under the names of the individual cities; O. Pontal, *Histoire des conciles merovingiens,* Paris 1989; J. Gaudemet - B. Badesvant (eds.), *Les canons des conciles merovingiens (VIe–VIIe siècle),* Paris 1989; P. Mikat, *Die Inzestgesetzgebung der merowingisch-frankischen Konzilien (511–626/ 627),* Paderborn 1994; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751,* Leiden-New York-Cologne 1995; R. Mathisen (ed.), *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul,* Aldershot 2001.

L. Navarra

MESOPOTAMIA (Roman province). Greek term that refers to the territory between the two big rivers, the Euphrates and the Tigris; the term is also used for all the alluvial territory starting from the mountains of the N; many ancient authors, however, exclude Babylon (the central part). Today it corresponds to the territory of Iraq and a part of Turkey. In a larger sense Mesopotamia includes the territory between the mountains of Zagros (Iran), the Anti-Taurus Mountains, the Plateau of *Arabia and the Persian Gulf (Iraq, E *Syria and the SE part of Turkey). Since it was an important strategic point between Syria, *Cappadocia and the East, Mesopotamia was colonized by the *Seleucids; it was an area of continual conflict between *Romans and Parthians during the 1st c. and the *Sassanids from the 3rd c. on. It was conquered by *Trajan (*prov. Mesopotamiae*), abandoned by *Hadrian, reconquered by Lucius Verus (*Osroene). *Septimius Severus reorganized the Osroene, where Abgar IX, a vassal king, was on the throne and set up the province with the capital *Edessa (today Urfa, in Turkey) that extened to the Tigris in 195. He then created the province of Mesopotamia in 198, with the capital *Nisibis (today Nusaybin, in Turkey), with military garrisons at Rasaina and Singara, which became, with Nisibis, *coloniae*. Portions of the province were lost in the 2nd half of the 3rd c.; under *Diocletian and *Galerius the province of Osroene (capital Edessa) was recreated to the W as was the province of *Mesopotamiae* (capital Nisibis) to the E and beyond the Tigris with the annexation of the NW satrapy of the Sassanid Empire (E Turkey until the Lake of Van). It is not easy to determine the exact borders of this province, which often underwent variations, but the two provinces were organized in relation to the river Tigris and to the rivers Khabour (ancient Chaboras) and Gaghgagh (Roman fortress in Gaddala). Following the defeat and the death of *Julian the Apostate in 363, in E Mesopotamia, Nisibis, Singara (Tunaynir, Beled Singara) and *Castrum Maurorum* were ceded by *Jovian (*Ammianus Marc. 25,7-9; Lenski 161ff.); the capital of the redimensioned province became Amida, the current Diyarbakir. In 363 the abandoning of Nisibis was very painful (*orientis firmissimum castrum*, Ammianus Marc. 25,8,14; see the comment by J. Fontaine, Paris 1977, 257), and the city was evacuated of its inhabitants: among those transferred was *Ephrem the Syrian. The population was replaced with 12,000 *Persians, thus the city's ethnic composition changed. The frontier that was established, it would appear, was to the W of the river Mygdonis, over the Mons Masius (*Tur 'Abdin) and along the river Nymphius (Bohtan Su) extending into the Mountains of Taurus. This frontier endured until ca. 520. The limits of the frontier did not prevent the Christians from communicating among themselves, from moving, and from having a common spiritual and theological ethos. The Christians under the Sassanid Empire often suffered persecutions. The territory of high Mesopotamia was conquered by the Arabs in the course of the 7th c.: with the Battle of Yarmuk in 636 they occupied Syria and in 639 Edessa.

J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq,* CSCO 310, Subs. 36, Louvain 1970; F. De Maffei, *Fortificazioni di Giustiniano sul limes orientale: monumenti e fonti,* in *The 17th Intern. Byzantine Congress,* New Rochelle, New York 1986, 237-277; G. Bell, *The Churches and Monasteries of the Tur 'Abdin,* intr. and notes by M. Mango, London 1982 (regarding the provincial and diocesan divisions); R.C. Blockley, *East Roman Foreign Policy: Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius,* Leeds 1992; F. Millar, *The Roman Near East, 31 B.C.–A.D. 337,* Cambridge, MA-London 1993; *Handbuch der Orientalistik.* 1, *Nahe und Mittlere Osten,* 42, *Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa and Osrhoene,* texts, transl. and comm. by H.J.W. Drijvers - J.F. Healy, Leiden 1999; G. del Olmo Lete - J.L. Montero Fenollós (eds.), *Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates,* Barcelona 1999; *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Parthian and Sasanian Periods: Rejection and Revival, c. 238 BC–AD 642,* Proceedings of a seminar in memory of Vladimir G. Lukonin, ed. J. Curtis, London 2000; S.K. Ross, *Roman Edessa,* London-New York 2001; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionnaires chrétiennes dans l'Empire perse,* Bures-sur-Yvette 2002; *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars: A Narrative History,* Part 2, *AD 363–628,* ed. G. Greatrex - S.N.C. Lieu, London 2002; N. Lenski, *Failure of Empire. Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century,* Berkeley, CA 2002; *Proceedings of the II Intern. Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East,* ed. I. Thuesen, I-II, Winona Lake, IN 2004.

A. Di Berardino

MESOPOTAMIA, Christianity in. Tradition associates the names Thaddeus/*Addai, Mari, *Thomas and *Bartholomew with the origins of Christianity in Mesopotamia. Addai is said to have been the first to evangelize *Edessa. Having gone to that city shortly after the ascension of Jesus, he converted King *Abgar "the Black," his nobles and citizens,

founded a church and established successors. The tradition concerning Addai is transmitted by *Eusebius (*HE* I, 13, and II, 1,6-7 in Greek), by *Moses of Khorene (II, 26-34 in Armenian), and in more extended form, by the Syriac *Doctrina Addai*, composed in the 4th–5th c. and based on traditions including ancient ones, as I explain in "Possible Historical Traces in the *Doctrina Addai*?" (paper presented at the International Meeting of the SBL, Groningen, 25-28 July 2004: Hugoye 9 [2006] §§1-24). Because the conversion of Abgar "the Black" around the mid-1st c. cannot be historically proven, the conversion of Abgar "the Great" around 200 seems more probable (for other possibilities, see C. and F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confines*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002, 124-125). It is attested by his contemporaries *Bardesanes of Edessa and *Julius Africanus, who lived at his court, and suggested by other sources. The **Chronicle of Edessa*, as well as other historical documents, provide evidence for the existence of a church and a Christian community at Edessa during his reign (see my *Edessa e i Romani tra Augusto e i Severi*: Aevum 73 [1999] 107-143 and *Traces*).

According to tradition, the apostolate of Addai was continued by Mari, who spread his preaching from Edessa to all of Mesopotamia acc. to the *Acts of (*Mar) Mari*, a *Syriac apocryphal writing of the 5th–6th c., rich in historical information drawn from traditions of the first two centuries and later sources. Mari, a disciple of Addai at Edessa, at the behest of his teacher and predecessor and thanks as well to the help of his disciples, is said to have preached, made converts and founded churches and schools from *Nisibis in *Osroene and Arbela in Assyria, through S Mesopotamia, Babylon, Susiana, all the way to Persia, evangelizing *Seleucia as well. His itinerary followed the course of the Tigris and took place between the missionary field of Addai, in the region of Osroene (Edessa and N Mesopotamia), and that of Thomas at the border of the Eastern empire, in the furthest area of Persia and in India. In ch. 31 of the *Acts of Mari* a description is found of how Addai had already evangelized merchants, who contributed to the spread of Christianity in Persia even before Mari arrived there. This seems to have some historical foundation, given the role carried out by merchants and by merchant roads in the evangelization of the East (see, e.g., Jullien, *Apôtres*, 215ff.). In fact, Christianity arrived in Persia early, probably from *Adiabene (*Persia). The so-called anaphora of Addai and Mari is one of the most ancient monuments of the Syro-Mesopotamian liturgy.

Finally, the origins of the church in Mesopotamia, India and Parthia are ascribed to Thomas and Bartholomew: To the first is attributed only Parthia in the tradition received by *Origen in *Eusebius (*HE* 3, 1); then in the sources there is a missionary journey which goes all the way to India, sometimes passing through the Iranian regions and the Bactrian region. The Indian tradition had great influence thanks to the *Acts of Thomas*, redacted at Edessa in the 1st decades of the 3rd c.The origins of the church in India, Mesopotamia, Parthia and Armenia are variously attributed to Bartholomew, acc. to Eusebius, already in the 2nd c. *Pantaenus, in his mission to India, found inhabitants in possession of the gospel of *Matthew in Hebrew or Aramaic, taken there by Bartholomew in the preceding century (see ch. 3-4 in my *Gli Apostoli in India*, with C. Dognini, Milan, 2001; Jullien, *Apôtres*, 43-52; 79-108).

The *Doctrine* also attests to the use of the **Diatessaron* of *Tatian, the Syrian disciple of *Justin, in Mesopotamia. This harmony of the gospels, composed in the 2nd half of the 2nd c., spread quickly in the Syro-Mesopotamian areas (see, e.g., T. Baarda, *Essays on the* Diatessaron, Kampen 1994; W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's* Diatessaron*: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship*, Leiden 1994; N. Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian*, Leiden 2003). The *Diatessaron* was later replaced by the *Peshitta (for the vast bibl. concerning this, see esp. I. Philips, *The Importance of the* Peshitta *in Syriac Tradition*: Harp 5 [1992] 67-91). In Edessa, *Rabbula in particular imposed the replacement. He was bishop from 411/412–435/436. Tatian is also one of the first supporters of *encratism, which spread widely in Syria-Mesopotamia, and can be considered as the form which Christianity assumed in those areas, acc. to S.R. Lloyd-Moffett ("The 'Heresy' of Encratism and the History of Christianity in Eastern Syria," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Atlanta, GA, 22-25 Nov 2003).

Turning from apocryphal *Acts* to historical documents, the epitaph of *Abercius attests to the presence of Christian communities in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. in Syria, at Nisibis and in general in the area of Mesopotamia beyond the Euphrates. The Christian Abercius writes that he took a trip to those regions in addition to Rome, and that he found people of the same religion "everywhere" (see, e.g., my *L'epitafio di Abercio*: Aevum 74 [2000] 191-206). At this time, the presence of Christianity in Mesopotamia is now certain. At Edessa not only was there a Christian community at the time of Abgar the Great, but also the school of *Bardesanes, which had tendencies that, though not entirely orthodox, were certainly Christian. The principal document passed down to us

from this school, in Syriac, apart from fragments in Greek translation, is the *Book of Laws of Countries*. There we find in the words of Bardesanes a witness to the wide dissemination of Christianity in the East at the end of the 2nd c., in Edessa, Hatra, Gilan and among the Galatians, in Parthia, Media and Persia, as far as among the Qushan (see H.J.W. Drijvers, *Bardaiṣan of Edessa*, Assen 1966; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Édesse*, Paris 1992; my own *Linee generali per una presentazione e per un commento del "Liber legum regionum"*: RIL 133 [1999] 311-355, with bibl.).

A noteworthy document for the centures between the end of the 1st and beginning of the 2nd to the 5th c. is the *Chronicle of *Arbela*. Its historicity has recently been reevaluated (see my *Il Chronicon di Arbela*, Madrid 2002, intr. and n. 5, as well as C. and F. Jullien, *La Chronique d'Arbèles*: OC 85 [2001] 41-83 and *Apôtres*, 132-136; my *Il Chronicon di Arbela: una messa a punto storiografica*: Aevum 80 [2006] 145-164). It was composed in the 6th c. and based on ancient sources—among these "Abel the Teacher," from which it drew information on the first bishops of Arbela and on oral sources. The *Chronicon* follows, bishop by bishop, the history of the church of Assyria, and between events of religious and political history, provides important information regarding the first spread of Christianity in Mesopotamia and the difficulties it encountered. The foundation of the church of Arbela is said to go back to Addai: The first bishop of Adiabene, Peqida, was ordained by Addai, who had converted him to Christianity, despite the opposition of his parents, who were pagan magi (ch. 1). At that time, the majority of Mesopotamia was pagan, as is evident also from the preaching of Peqida to the pagan crowds. If he became bishop after having listened to Addai for 5 years, this means that after having come to Osroene around the mid-1st c., Addai was still alive around the end of the 1st c. According to his *Acts*, Mari, the evangelist of Mesopotamia, was also in Arbela and in Adiabene, as well as in Nisibis, where he converted the local sovereign.

The successor of Peqida, Shemshon, was ordained at the beginning of the 2nd c. by Mazra, the bishop of Beth Zabdai, N of Adiabene, where there was already a Christian community. Abel also attests to the preaching of Mazra in the villages near Arbela, among the pagans. Mazra went to Arbela with merchants. Their role in the spread of Christianity in Mesopotamia is confirmed by other sources as well. In the *Chronicle* we also find information on the anti-Christian persecutions in Mesopotamia. Those of the Roman Empire did not reach the area E of the Euphrates, and the Parthian kings did not promote them, but the magi, the priestly cast of Zoroaster, attacked the Christians out of religious hostility, as is reflected in the *Acts of Mari* (concerning the magi, see at least M. Bussagli - M.G. Chiappori, *I Re Magi*, Milan 1985; G. Gnoli, s.v. *Magi*, in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. M. Eliade, IX, New York-London 1987, 80-81; A.F. De Jong, *Traditions of the Magi*, Leiden 1997; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *I tre saggi e la stella*, Rimini 1999; W. Burkert, *L'avvento dei Magi*, in *Da Omero ai Magi*, ed. C. Antonetti, Venice 1999, 87-111). They brought about the imprisonment and death of Bishop Shemshon in 123 because he preached among the pagans (ch. 2).

Among the converts to Christianity in Mesopotamia, already in the 2nd c. there were also nobles, such as Raqbakt (ch.3), a rich noble entrusted by the Parthian Vologases II with the governance of Adiabene. For fear of the king, he had his baptism carried out in secret, but supported the spread of Christianity in the neighboring regions. In this case as well it was not the political authorities who acted against him but the "pagan priests," the magi, who, in the period of *Antoninus Pius, in order to kill him, sent men to him pretending to be diplomats from Rome. Only because of the arrival of one true legate, on behalf of King Vologases, was he not killed. As a Parthian noble, he was required to go to Ctesiphon with his personal army, in order to help the king against the rebellious mountain dwellers. At that point, the magi, intent upon "striking at the heart" of the local Christian community, directed their efforts against the bishop of Arbela, Isaac, imprisoning him. But Raqbakt, as governor of Adiabene, ordered them from Ctesiphon to free the bishop, threatening with death whoever disobeyed. In ch. 4, the magi persecute the Christians of Adiabene, confiscating their possessions and bringing upon them other difficulties. The bishop of Adiabene, Abraham I, went to Vologases III in Ctesiphon, confident that he would obtain from the Parthian king a rescript in favor of the Christians, that the magi not oppress them unjustly.

Another noble who converted to Christianity was Razshah, prefect of a large village of Adiabene (ch. 5). The bishop Noah, fearing that he had been poisoned by the magi, hid in this village, in the house of this Christian noble. Then he went to the region of Nineveh and, having opposed their belief in a sacred tree (a pagan cult widely practiced in Mesopotamia and also attested to in the *Acts of Mari*), he was imprisoned by the pagans. Only in hiding did Noah return to Arbela, and upon his death it was not possible to elect a successor immediately, because of the hostility of the magi and the

pagans. The pagans arrived to seize the children of Christians and to pillage and oppress the Christians (ch. 5). It was due to the magi that the anti-Christian persecutions under the *Sassanids were brought about as well from 224 on. Already before the imperial edicts, there was a persecution looming from the pagans. E.g., in ca. 280 the bishop of Beth Zabdai—preaching against the passing nature of earthly kingdoms in *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, seat of the Persian kings with a strong concentration of pagans—was denounced by a pagan before the nobles of the king and had to flee. But the Christians of Ctesiphon had assistance within the royal household and succeeded, by means of gifts, in convincing a noble to rehabilitate the Christians in the eyes of the king.

However, while persecutions in the Roman Empire had ceased from *Constantine on, in 340, through the instigation of the magi, *Shapur II decided to "uproot from the earth the religion of the Romans," i.e., Christianity (ch. 12). He ordered the destruction of churches and the killing of Christians. The magi sought to strike esp. at clerical leaders, and led the patriarch of the East and 102 priests and deacons to the king after they refused to adore the sun (the Zoroastrian sun cult is recorded as competing with Christianity also in the *Acts of Mari*, 23-25), who were then decapitated. The persecution, in which many Christians, clerics and laypeople, were killed, lasted until 351, and its virulence depended on the severity of the local governors: e.g., in Adiabene the Mauhpata Pagrasp was very mild in the application of the edict, while his two successors were more intransigent. Under *Yazdegerd (399–420) and Bahram (420–438) there were still persecutions and a new war "between the pagan Persians and the Christian Romans," while Peroz (459–484), although pagan, helped the Christians and had as his counselor the learned theologian Barsauma of Nisibis.

The areas of Mesopotamia which were not under the control of the Persian Empire were not subject to persecutions. In the Osroene area, after Constantine there was a process of Romanization and Christianization, esp. of the Syro-Mesopotamian aristocracy, of which we see a reflection in the *Doctrina Addai*, acc. to A. Mirkovic (*Prelude to Constantine*, Berlin 2004). This (acc. to S.H. Griffith, *The Doctrina*) and many other documents, esp. synodal *Acts* and theological writings, also attest to the extensive dogmatic debate taking place in the church in Syria-Mesopotamia during that period, above all with respect to christological questions, in which *monophysites and *Nestorians were in opposition. We must keep in mind the profound influence exercised on the Christianity of Mesopotamia by *Ephrem (2nd half of the 4th c.), from the doctrinal and also ascetical point of view (see K. den Biesen, *Bibliography of St. Ephrem the Syrian*, Giove, Umbria 2002); Ephrem was also an exegete in Nisibis. An increase in the first spread of Christianity in the Persian Empire was checked due to the deportations of thousands of prisoners from the cities of Syria to Persia in the times of the military campaigns of *Shapur I against the Roman Empire, in 253–260. We learn from the synodal *Acts* of the E Syrian church that these Aramean and Greek Christians integrated well in Persia and established the ecclesiastical structure there.

The spread of Christianity in Mesopotamia is also shown in the construction of churches and monasteries. Around 140 "a grand church, excellently laid out" was erected at Arbela (*Chronicle of Arbela*, 3) and around 190 another (ch. 6 and 9). Both were standing at the time of the redaction of the chronicle. In the period of the Severi there was peace and prosperity for the Christians; in Adiabene, churches were built and monasteries flourished (ch.7). In the 5th c. the local bishop had 25 churches built in Adiabene and the church of Arbela renovated and decorated (ch. 18). Between the end of the period of the Severi and the beginning of the Persian domination, while persecutions were resumed in the Roman Empire with *Maximinus Thrax, in Mesopotamia there was peace and there were "many Christians"; not even Artaxerxes's order to construct temples of the sun led to persecutions (ch. 8-9). The church of Adiabene had "more than 20 bishoprics," accurately enumerated and corresponding to identifiable localities; nearby Nisibis, however, where Mari had preached and where Abercius attests to having seen a Christian community in the 2nd half of the 2nd c., and Seleucia-Ctesiphon, where Mari had also preached, did not have a bishop under the Parthians for fear of the pagans. But with the coming of the Persians, the Christians in these places had a pastor as well. In fact, Ganzeqan, a rich Christian general in the army of Shapur I, having come to know of the presence of "many Christians" everywhere in Adiabene, around 240 asked the bishop of Arbela to visit the Christians of Ctesiphon. The bishop went there and ordained a priest, remaining in the city for two years (ch. 9).

In the 5th decade of the 3rd c., the bishop of Beth Zabdai in Mesopotamia went to Adiabene and was amazed at the prosperity of the local church, at the "great number of Christians" and at the "greatness of the eparchy of Adiabene and its ecclesiastical and apostolic canons," which indicate organization and a presence of written texts. In fact, at that time, the episcopal throne of Adiabene began to be called "the

high see" and Adiabene the "eparchy." Already in the 4th decade of the 2nd c. a synod had declared Arbela a metropolitan see, having six suffragans (ch. 16), easily identifiable. In the *Chronicle*, the first patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon is named Papa bar Aggai, "the Aramean." (In the *Acts of Mari*, in an anachronism aimed at conferring prestige on the patriarchal see, he becomes the first successor of Mari in the see of Kuke.) He is said to have been nominated in 291 by the Mesopotamian bishops of Arbela and Susa upon the request of the inhabitants of Ctesiphon who still did not have a patriarch, although the city at that point already numbered many Christians. He died before 329. Ch. 11 narrates the attempt of the bishop to obtain primacy over the other Eastern bishoprics, giving as reason the political preeminence of his see. The priests of Seleucia disagreed, and the archdeacon Simeon, son of intimates of the king, united with two bishops, of Susa and of Karka de-Beth Selok, and wrote to the bishop of Edessa, a point of reference because of its antiquity and prestige. But other bishops wrote to Constantine, arguing that in the Roman Empire there were the patriarchates of *Antioch, *Rome, *Alexandria and *Constantinople, and it was just that there be at least that of Seleucia in the East.

The patriarchate of Papa is the first historically attested from the E Syrian patriarchal lists. The first known recension of these is that of Elijah of Damascus (on the see, see M. Moberg, *The Patriarchal See of Antiochia and Seleucia/Ktesiphon*: Harp 5 [1992] 99-109). His name is found in the most ancient E Syrian synodal *Acts*. The *Acts* of the synod of 424 indicate that the see of Seleucia already existed before Papa, as did the see of other episcopal cities such as Kashkar and *Beth Lapat. In fact, various lists mention 5 bishops before the patriarch. The sources associate the patriarchate of Seleucia either with Antioch or with *Jerusalem (see Assemani, BO, II, 387-397; Chabot, *Synodicon*, 47; Scher, *Histoire*, 236 [26]; Jullien, *Actes* 2001, 48-53; 227-236, Ramelli, *Atti di Mâri*, intr.).

The *Chronicle* also attests to the presence of Jews among the Christians of Mesopotamia. Abraham I, the third bishop of Arbela, was the son of a Christian of Arbela, but one who came from a family from Herda near the Hesna 'Ebraja ("fortress of the Hebrews") (ch. 4). Noah (or Noh), his successor, came from a Jewish family which had moved to Jerusalem in the 1st half of the 2nd c., where Noah came to know the Christians in the local community. Later he and his family came to Adiabene "because many Jews were there." Even around 300, the bishop John converted "many Jews" in Arbela (ch. 12). Other bishops were of pagan origins (chs. 1; 6), or Christian (chs. 8-9; 11-12; 15; 17-19), or came from mixed families of pagans and Christians (chs. 10; 16). Also in ch. 30 of the *Acts of Mari*, e.g., the apostle is said to have evangelized "many Jews" on the banks of the Tigris. In fact, already around the 2nd half of the 1st c., Josephus (*JW*, pref.) witnesses to the presence of Jews among "Parthians, Babylonians, Arabs [such were the people of Osroene], Jews from beyond the Euphrates and Adiabene," and *JW* II, 16, expressly mentions the Jews of Adiabene. The Jewish presence is all the more interesting, as the first missionaries in Mesopotamia, who often followed the merchant roads in their travels, were certainly *Jewish Christians and often addressed the Jews, just as Paul, who had first preached in synagogues wherever he went. (Concerning the category of Jewish Christianity, see R.A. Taylor, *The Phenomenon of Jewish Christianity*: Vchr 44 [1990] 313-334; D. Marguerat [ed.] *Le déchirement*, Geneva 1996; S.C. Minouni, *Le judéo-christianisme syriaque*, in *VI Symposium Syriacum*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1994, OCA 247, 269-279; Id., *Le judéo-christianisme ancien*, Paris 1998; G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto [ed.], *Verus Israel*, Brescia 2001; G. Jossa, *Giudei o Cristiani?*, Brescia 2004.) Edessa played an important role as a center from which preaching spread and was later also a center of Christian culture.

Starting at the end of the 3rd c., Christianity in Mesopotamia had to deal with *Manichean preaching. (Concerning this topic, see at least H. Waldmann, *Mâni, das Christentum, und der Iran*, in *Lebendige Überlieferung. Festschrift H.J. Vogt*, eds. N. El-Khoury - H. Crouzel - R. Reinhardt, Beirut 1992, 356-364; C. Roemer, *Manis frühe Missionsreisen*, Opladen 1994; *Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico*, eds. L. Cirillo - A. van Tongerloo, Louvain-Naples 1997; *Studia Manichaica. IV*, ed. R. Emmerich - W. Sundermann - P. Zieme, Berlin 2000; cf. M. Tardieu, *Il Manicheismo*, It. tr., ed. G. Sfameni Gasparro, Cosenza 1988.) It seems that some apocryphal writings, such as the *Doctrina Addai* and above all the *Acts of Mari*, were redacted based on ancient traditions which long preceded them, in a context of anti-Manichean polemics. The itinerary of Mari in Mesopotamia coincides with that of Mani, even if in the opposite direction, and many centers in Mesopotamia are connected with both of them. The names of the disciples of Mari are similar to or identical with the names of the disciples of Mani: Adda, Papos/Papa, Tumis. The Mesopotamian baptist context which Mani came out of is reflected with precision in the *Acts of Mari*. (Groups of baptist Jewish Christians settled there at the beginning of the 3rd c., in S Meso-

potamia, esp. in Mesene.) The relation between the traditions of Mani and of Mari is studied by Jullien and Jullien (e.g., *Origines*, 27-40 and 72ff.; *Actes* 2001, 41-46). The anti-Manichean character of the *Doctrina Addai* was upheld by Drijvers (*Addai und Mari*). Manicheism spread rapidly in Mesopotamia and in Persia, due esp. to the support of Shapur I and of some local sovereigns such as Bat, the governor of Mesene, and quickly reached India and Egypt, where the first disciples of Mani, Pattiq and Adda, preached (see G. Gnoli, *L'esperienza manichea*, in *Potere e religione nel mondo indo-mediterraneo tra Ellenismo e tarda antichità*, Incontro di studio della SISR, Roma, 28-29 ottobre 2004, Rome 2009, 151-160).

In the *Chronicle of Arbela*, the Manicheans of Mesopotamia appear as instigators of the anti-Christian persecutions in the Sassanid period. Under Shapur II, there came the first edict of anti-Christian persecution in the East in 340 (concerning this, see W. Schwaigert, *Aspects of the Persecution of Christians in the Sasanian Empire During the Reign of Shapur II*: Harp 1,2-3 [1988] 72-82; A.V. Williams, *Zoroastrians and Christians in Sasanian Iran*: BJRL 78,3 [1996] 37-53). The chronicler records that those who convinced the king to promulgate the edict, and then not to revoke it, as he desired, and instead to force Christians to pay a double tax *pro capite*, were "the Jews and the Manicheans, who induced the magi." These were the supporters of anti-Christian persecutions, declaring that "Christians were all spies of the Romans and that they never came to know of anything connected to the Persian kingdom. They did not immediately write to their brothers there. . . . The Manicheans ridiculed us even more than the Jews and considered us the refuse of the people" (ch. 12, pp. 53-54 Kawerau). The same religious groups that supported this anti-Christian persecution attest once again to the high social status of many Christians in Mesopotamia, accusing them of being "rich" and of "glorying in a leisurely life" (ibid.). Still, as is stated by A. Panaino (*Regalità sacra e conflittualità politico-religiosa nell'Iran tardo-antico*, in *Religione e potere*, cit.), the persecutions were also fomented by intrigues in the court with Christian factions that furnished the Zoroastrians with denunciations of other Christians.

Christianity in Mesopotamia also had to deal with the *Marcionite heresy, which, after having been confined to Upper Mesopotamia between the 2nd and 3rd c., spread widely in Persia, as is spoken of by *Epiphanius (*Pan*. XLII, 1,1). This was probably due to the Syrians who were deported (see J.M. Fiey, *Les marcionites dans les textes historiques de l'Eglise de Perse*: LM 8 [1970] 183-188). It was combated by Ephrem and his disciples Zenobius and Paulonas (Assemani, BO, III, I, 63; 118-128). In the mid-4th c. *Aphraates (*Dem. de ieiun*. III, 9) presents Marcionism as a danger for the Christian communities, and the *Chronicle of Seert* sees it as one of the principal problems of the end of the 3rd c., in the period of the *catholicos* Papa (Scher, *Histoire*, 237 [27]).

The *Chronicle of Arbela* also speaks of the two most important cultural centers of ancient Christian Mesopotamia, about which we have many sources: in ch. 18 an ample excursus is dedicated to the school of Edessa, which in the mid-5th c. was directed by *Ibas. At his death, some of his disciples broke off and founded the school of Nisibis. The Nestorian Barsauma, metropolitan bishop of *Nisibis, brought *Narsai there, who had fled from Edessa, and he founded the school, a center for the promotion of Nestorianism. Many of the people of Adiabene studied in Nisibis; among these were three bishops of Arbela (chs. 18-20): Abbushta; Joseph, who was a disciple of Narsai and studied the exegetical texts of *Theodore of Mopsuestia; and *Henana, also a disciple of Narsai and author of exegetical works inspired by his teacher. During his episcopacy he went to Nisibis to settle some controversies. In 363 Jovian had ceded Nisibis to Shapur II—who had it recolonized by Persians—with the five trans-Tigritan provinces, which had become dioceses dependent on Nisibis.

Another important source is the *Cause of the Foundation of the Schools*, composed between 581 and 604 as an inaugural discourse at the opening of the courses of the school of Nisibis by *Barhadbeshabba, bishop of Halwan and scholar at Nisibis when Henana of Adiabene (d. 612) was active there, who was very much admired by him. According to Becker (*Fear*, 273-315), we cannot speak of a school of Edessa as an institution before the so-called school of the Persians. After the closure of this school by order of the emperor *Zeno in 489, the followers of the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia (392–428) went to Nisibis. Theodore was of the school of Antioch, and was venerated by the Syro-Nestorians, who considered him "the Exegete" par excellence. His writings were condemned posthumously in the 2nd Council of *Constantinople in 553, together with those of his teacher *Diodore of Tarsus (see Becker, *Fear*, and Ramelli *Barhadbəšabbā*). Nestorius of Constantinople became a supporter of Theodore's teaching, which did not admit of a *hypostatic union of the divine nature and the human nature in Christ. In the school of Edessa, on the initiative of the bishop Ibas (d. 457) and of his disciples, the works of Theodore were translated from Greek into Syriac in the 1st half of the 5th c. In the 6th c., some bishops of Edessa, e.g., *Jacob Baradeus, in

order to combat Nestorian ideas, adopted theses influenced by monophysitism and the idea of the prevalence in Christ of the divine nature over the human nature. In 482, the **Henoticon* of Zeno, inspired by *Acacius of Constantinople and immediately condemned by Pope *Felix III, sought to bring about unity once again around the Nicene Creed, but it was opposed by monophysites and *Chalcedonians, who reaffirmed the dual nature of Christ. At Edessa, already a center for the study of the theology of Theodore and of the Nestorian line of thought, monophysitism entered in.

*Monasticism in the Syro-Mesopotamian area seems to have ancient roots. The *Chronicle of Arbela*, ch. 7, speaks of monasteries in the period of the Severi. The *Life* and *Letters* of St. *Anthony, soon translated into Syriac, had a notable influence there, as did the lives and sayings of the other fathers of the desert, the **Historia Monachorum* and the *Historia Lausiaca*, which explains the strong Egyptian influence on Syro-Eastern monasticism, and the insertion in the *Life of Ephrem* of a visit which he made to the holy men of Egypt. *Evagrius of Pontus (d. 399) was very important. His *Kephalaia Gnostica* were commented on by *Babai the Great. Also important was the corpus of ps.-*Dionysius, composed in Syria in the late 5th c., translated by *Sergius of Resh'ayna, and immediately spread with success among the monophysites (see J.M. Hornus, *Le corpus dionysien en syriaque*: Parole de l'Orient 1 [1970] 69-93; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004, 687-704). Also important was *Stephen Bar Sudhaile, the Origenist author of the *Book of Saint Ierotheus* (the presumed teacher of the Areopagite: see A. Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, Wilon, CT 1989).

Monasticism in Mesopotamia had not only an ascetical role—in conformity with the line of Ephrem or *Aphraates and reflected also in the *Doctrina Addai* and in the *Acts of Mari*—but also a cultural role, and was soon connected with schools and centers of learning. The school of Nisibis itself, directed acc. to the *Statutes* (see A. Vööbus, ed., *The Statutes of the School of Nisibis*, Stockholm 1962, and analyzed by Becker, *Fear*, 77-97, 169-203), was regulated after the manner of a monastery (Gero, *Barsauma*, 67). Its statutes are comparable with those of a monastery founded in 571 on Mount *Izla by Abraham and Kashkar, who studied at Nisibis. The monastery was later directed by *Dadisho and *Babai the Great, a Nestorian of the 6th–7th c., supervisor of monasteries and author of ascetical precepts (G. Chediath, *Mar Babai the Great: Some Useful Counsels on the Ascetical Life*, Kottayam 2001). Both the monastery and the school were directed by a head and an assistant. In both institutions the members, monks or students, focused their lives on work and prayer. No student in the school was allowed to remain alone in his cell to study, eat, etc. The monastic orientation, however, was less intellectual. There the prayer of the heart was developed (see S.P. Brock, *The Prayer of the Heart in the Syriac Tradition*: Alliance for Internat. Monasticism, Bulletin 72 [2001] 49-57), and sometimes in the monastic circles there was a criticism of "philosophy" (the study of the logical works of Aristotle) and of the *eskolaye*, e.g., in Dadisho or in Shem'on d-Taybutheh, a monastic author of the late 7th c. who considered philosophical education and logic (both of which these monks had studied) as a stage of the spiritual life anterior to the contemplative life. But *Thomas of Marga compared the monks of his day to the ancient philosophers, projecting onto the latter the way of life of the monks.

From the late 6th to the late 8th c. the monasteries were also centers of production of literary works. An example is *Isaac of Nineveh, whose thought appears Evagrian. There were many monastic schools in the Syro-Mesopotamian area. These offered an elementary education required by the elites of the church of the East. There was, e.g., the school of the monastery of Babai the Great, or that of Daniel the Penitent around 570–580, or that of Mar Abda, mentioned in the *Chronicle of Seert*. This last existed from the late 4th c., and its founder sent his students to study in Edessa. It was destroyed around 460–480 by order of the Persian Peroz. The school of Hirta was founded by Qiyore, a disciple of Mar Aba, and Barsauma studied there, the metropolitan of Nisibis in the 7th c. Other schools, founded at the end of the 6th–beginning of the 7th c., were not dependent on one local church or monastery. Independent in this way was the school of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, founded, acc. to the *Chronicon of Seert*, by the *catholicos* Mar Aba (540–553), and the school of Arbela, said to have been founded by the bishop Abraham in Henana with Paul the Lector (see Ramelli, *Chronicon di Arbela*, and D. Gutas, *Paul the Persian on the Classification of the Parts of Aristotle's Philosophy*: Der Islam 60 [1983] 231-267), and, perhaps, the schools of Kashkar and of Balad.

One place of learning and asceticism was the school founded near a *martyrion* at the entrance of the city of Nisibis, where professors and students of the school of Nisibis came to teach. The schools of the country were not associated with large ecclesiastical or monastic centers. They introduced the students to Scripture, basic literature and exegesis; from there the students went on to the monastic

schools. An important figure in these small schools was *Babai of Gbilta at the beginning of the 8th c. His student Abraham became in turn a celebrated master. (See, e.g., S. Beggiani, *Intr. to Eastern Christian Spirituality: The Syriac Tradition*, London 1991; S. Elm, "*Virgins of God*," New York 1994; F.H. Griffith, *Asceticism in the Church of Syria*, in *Asceticism*, eds. V.L. Wimbush - R. Valantasis, New York 1995, 220-245; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du monachisme*, IV-V, Paris 1997–1998; var. aus., *Le monachisme syriaque*, I, *Patrimoine Syriaque, Actes du Colloque V*, Antelias 1998; G. Blum, *"In der Wolke des Lichtes"*... *Spiritualität und Mystik des Christlichen Ostens*, Erlangen 2001; Becker, *Fear*, 316-359, esp. for the relation with the schools, and 126-154 for the important reception of the logic of Aristotle in the Syro-Mesopotamian schools and the use of Aristotle, esp. his logic, "Neoplatonized," received both by Edessa and by Nisibis, thanks also to Sergius of Resh'ayna [d. ca. 536], who translated into Syriac the Greek Neoplatonic commentators on Aristotle.) Both centers spread Greek philosophy in Mesopotamia. (See S. Brock, *From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning*, in *East of Byzantium*, eds. N.G. Garsoian - T.F. Mathews - R.W. Thomson, Washington, D.C. 1982, 19-34; H. Hugonnard-Roche, *L'Organon, Tradition syriaque et arabe*, in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, I, ed. R. Goulet, Paris 1989, 502-528; E. Hunter, *The Transmission of Greek Philosophy via the "School of Edessa*," in *Literacy, Education and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond*, eds. C. Holmes - J. Waring, Boston 2002, 225-239.) When the school of Athens was closed, various professors came to live in Harran, near Nisibis, and were able to influence the culture of Nisibis. At the beginning of the 6th c., W Syrian scholars, including translators and commentators of Aristotle, began to move to Persia.

Some basic sources: J. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, Rome: I, 1719; II, 1721; III, I, 1725; III, II, 1728; repr. Piscataway, NJ 2002 ; Id., *De Catholicis seu Patriarchis Chaldaeorum et Nestorianorum commentarius*, Rome 1740; 1775; repr. Piscataway, NJ 2004; *Synodicon Orientale*, ed. J.B. Chabot, Paris 1902; *Histoire nestorienne inédite (Chronique de Séert)* I/1, ed. A. Scher, in PO, IV, Paris 1907, 215 [5]–311 [101]; *I/2*, in PO, V,2, Paris 1907, repr. Turnhout 1981, 219 [107]-344 [242]; *II/2*, in PO, VII,2, Paris 1950, 97 [5]-203 [111]; *II/2*, in PO, XIII,4, Turnhout 1983, 427 [16]-639 [319]; *Mar Barhadbšabba 'Arbaya. Cause de la fondation des écoles*, ed. Id., in PO, IV, 1908, 316-404 (repr. 1981); W. Witakowski, *Chronicles of Edessa*, OS 33-35 (1984–1986), 497-498; *Les Actes de Mâr Mâri*, eds. C. and F. Jullien, CSCO 602, Syri 234-235, Louvain 2003; *Chronica Minora*, I-II, eds. J.B. Chabot - I. Guidi, CSCO 1-4, Syri, 1-4, Louvain 1904; repr. 1955; *Die Chronik von Arbela*, ed. P. Kawerau, CSCO 468, Syri, 200, Louvain 1985; A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mâri*, Oxford 1991; *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti* (CC), ed. M. Geerard, Turnhout 1992, 65-70 (*Legenda Abgari Regis Edessae*); 147-152 (*Acta Thomae*); *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, tr. of the Syriac of the *Doctrine d'Addaï* par A. Desreumaux; tr. of a Gk tr. by A. Palmer; tr. of an Ethiopian tr. by R. Beylot, Turnhout 1993; I. Ramelli, *Atti di Mâri*, intr., tr. and comm., Brescia 2007, with ample documentation. Recent studies on archaeology in the ancient Near East, e.g., *Proceedings of the II Intern. Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*, ed. I. Thuesen, I-II, Winona Lake, IN 2004; *Near Eastern Archaeology*, ed. S. Richard, Winona Lake, IN 2005.

Some important studies other than those cited in the text: A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, CSCO 266 Subs. 26, Louvain 1955; J.M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, I-III, Beirut 1965–1968; Id., *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq*, CSCO 310 Subs. 36, Louvain 1970; Id., *Nisibe*, CSCO 388, Louvain 1977; Id., *Pour un Oriens Christianus Novus: Répertoires des dioceses syriaques*, Beirut 1993; B. Segal, *Edessa, the Blessed City*, Oxford 1970; Piscataway, NJ ²2001; K. Schippmann, *Grundzüge der parthischen Geschichte*, Darmstadt 1980; A. de Halleux, *Die Genealogie des Nestorianismus nach der früh monophysitischen Theologie*: OC 66 (1982) 1-14; R. Macina, *L'homme à l'école de Dieu: d'Antioche à Nisibe*: POC 32 (1982) 87-124; 263-301; 33 (1983) 39-103; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Addai und Mâni*, in *III Symposium Syriacum*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1983, OCA 221, 171-185; M. van Esbroeck, *L'Apôtre Thaddée et le roi Sanatrouk*, in *II Simposio Int. Armenia-Assiria*, eds. M. Nordio - B.L. Zekiyan, Venice 1984, 84-106; M.L. Chaumont, *La Christianisation de l'Empire iranien*, CSCO 499 Subs. 80, Louvain 1988; A. Desreumaux, *La* Doctrina Addai: Apocrypha 1 (1990) 249-267; J. Teixidor, *La filosofía traducida. Crónica parcial de Edesa en los primeros siglos*, Barcelona 1991; V. Desprez, *L'ascétisme mésopotamien au IVe siècle. I: Saint Éphrem*: Lettre de Ligugé 258 (1991) 3-19; *II: Aphraate*: Lettre de Ligugé 259 (1992) 5-15; S. Gero, *Barsauma*, CSCO 426, Louvain 1991; M. Sartre, *L'Orient romain*, Paris 1991; G. Troupeau, *Le rôle des syriaques dans la trasmission et l'exploitation du patrimoine philosophique et scientifique grec*: Arabica 39 (1991) 1-10; F. Millar, *The Roman Near East, 31 B.C.–A.D. 337*, Cambridge, MA - London 1993; M. Esbroeck, *Neuf listes d'apôtres orientales*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 109-199; S.P. Brock, *L'Église de l'Orient dans l'Empire sassanide*: Istina 40 (1995) 25-43; H.J.W. Drijvers, *East of Antioch*, London 1984; Id., *Nisibis*: TRE 24, Berlin 1994, 573-576; J.W. Drijvers - A.A. MacDonald, *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, Leiden 1995 (here esp.: H.J.W. Drijvers, *The School of Edessa*, 49-59 and G.J. Reinink, *Edessa Grew Dim and Nisibis Shone Forth*, 77-89); J. Yacoub, *Babylone chrétienne: géopolitique de l'église de Mesopotamie*, Paris 1996; J.C. Reeves, *Heralds of That Good Realm. Syro-Mesopotamian. Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*, Leiden - New York - Cologne 1996; P. Bruns, *Bischof Rabbula von Edessa*, in *VII Symposium Syriacum*, ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1998, OCA 256; A. González Blanco - G. Matilla Séiquer, *Romanización y Cristianismo en la Siria-Mesopotamia*, Murcia 1998; I. Ramelli, *Alcune osservazioni sulle origini del Cristianesimo nelle regioni ad Est dell'Eufrate*, in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale*, eds. R.B. Finazzi - A. Valvo, Alessandria 1998, 209-225; Id., *Abgar Ukkâmâ e Abgar il Grande alla luce di recenti apporti storiografici*: Aevum 78 (2004) 103-108; G.J. Reinink - A.C. Klugkist (eds.), *After Bardaisan: Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity*, Louvain 1999 (here esp.: J.F. Coakley, *The Patriarchal List of the Church of the East*, 65-83); J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *I tre saggi e la stella. Mito e realtà dei Re Magi*, Rimini 1999; G. del Olmo Lete - J.L. Montero Fenollós (eds.), *Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates*, Barcelona 1999; U. Possekel, *Evidence of Greek Philosophical*

Concepts in the Writings of Ephrem the Syrian, CSCO 580, Louvain 1999; Id., *Formative Christianity in Edessa: The Communal Structure of the Early Bardaisanites*, paper presented at Annual Meetings of the AAR and SBL, Atlanta, 22-25 November 2003; W. Baum - D. Winkler, *Die apostolische Kirche des Ostens. Geschichte der sogenannten Nestorianer*, Klagenfurt 2000 (Eng., tr., *The Church of the East. A Concise History*, London 2003); M. Illert, *Johannes Chrysostomos und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum*, Zürich-Freiburg i.B. 2000; R.F. Schedinger, *Tatian and the Jewish Scriptures*, CSCO 591 Subs. 108, Louvain 2001; J.N. Bremmer (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*, Louvain 2001; C. and F. Jullien, *Les Actes de Mâr-Mâri, l'Apôtre de la M.*, Turnhout 2001, Apocryphes 11; Id., *Mâr Mâri, l'Apôtre de Babylone*, Turnhout 2001; Id., *Aux Origines de l'Église de Perse: les Actes de Mâr Mâri*, CSCO 604 Subs. 114, Louvain 2003; S.K. Ross, *Roman Edessa*, London - New York 2001; M. Tamcke (ed.), *Orientalische Christen zwischen Repression und Migration*, Münster 2001; D. Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA 2002; J. Madey, *The Hierarchy of the Churches of East and West Syriac Traditions*, Kottayam 2002; D. Taylor, *Bilingualism and Diglossia in Antique Syria and M.*, in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, eds. J.N. Adams - M. Janse - S. Swain, Oxford 2002, 298-331; S.H. Griffith, *The* Doctrina Addai *as a Paradigm of Christian Thought in Edessa in the Fifth Century*: Hugoye 6,2 (2003) 1-46; M. Paikatt, *Virginity: The Celestial Life. A Study on Virginity in the Genuine Works of Mar Aprem of Nisibis*: Christian Orient 13 (1992) 164-185; E.I. Yousif, *Les philosophes et traducteurs syriaques. D'Athènes à Bagdad*, Paris 1997; Id., *Les chroniqueurs syriaques*, Paris 2002; *La floraison des philosophes syriaques*, Paris 2003; *Riches Hidden in Secret Places*, ed. T. Abush, Winona Lake, IN 2004, for the history and religion of ancient Mesopotamia; K. Butcher, *Roman Syria and the Near East*, Los Angeles 2004; A.H. Becker, *Fear of God and Beginning of Wisdom: The School of Nisibis and Christian Scholastic Culture in Late Antique Mesopotamia*, Philadelphia 2006; I. Ramelli, *The First Evangelization of the Mesopotamian Regions in the Syriac Tradition*: Antiguo Oriente 3 (2005) 179-202; Id., *La première évangélisation de la Mésopotamie*, in Int. Conference of the EASR, Bucharest 20-23 September 2006.

I. Ramelli

MESROB (Mesrop) (ca. 361–439/440). Mesrob Maštoc' (Mashtots) was the originator of the *Armenian alphabet. The *Life* written by his disciple *Koriun records that, after some years of military service, he received *baptism in adulthood and embraced the *monastic life, dedicating himself to the *apostolate among the *pagans. Convinced of the necessity to possess the *Scripture and *liturgical books in Armenian, Mesrob adopted the alphabet (probably derived from Aramaic) of a certain Daniel for awhile; noting the insufficiency, he devised a new alphabet, which he rendered with great precision with a classical phonetic system. Under his guidance his followers provided the first "classical" Armenian translations of the Scriptures and of liturgical and *patristic texts. Mesrob himself translated only the book of Proverbs.

According to an unreliable tradition, Mesrob composed also the *Georgian and *Albanian (Albanian Caucasus) alphabets.

His works (*homilies and *letters) were handed down, with some problem of authenticity, under the name of *Gregory the Illuminator.

BS 9, 374-379; PLRE 2, 759; DSp 10, 1070-1074; G. Winkler, *Koriwns Biographie des Mesrop Maštoc'*, tr. and comm., OCA 245, Rome 1994; S. Weber, *Ausgewählte Schriften der armenischen Kirchenväter*, I, Munich 1927, 233-318; N. Akinian, *S. Maštoc' vardapet. Keank'n ew gorcowněowt'iwně . . .*, Vienna 1949 (pp. 431-473: Ger. summ.) G. Sevak, *Mesrop Maštoc'. Sozdanie armjanskikh pis'men i slovesnosti,* Yerevan 1962. *On the alphabet*: R.H. Hewsen, *On the Alphabet of the Caucasian Albanians:* REArm 1 (1964) 427-432; S.N. Mouraviev, *Les caracteres danieliens:* REArm 14 (1980) 55-85; Id., *Les caracteres mesropiens:* REArm 14 (1980) 87-111; Bardenhewer 5, 197-202; S.N. Mouraviev, *La forme interne de l'alphabet albanais caucasien et la phonologie de l'oudien:* Muséon 93 (1980) 345-376; F. Feydit, *Considérations sur l'alphabet de saint Mesrop et recherches sur la phonétique de l'arménien,* Vienna [2]1982.

S.J. Voicu

MESSALIANS (Euchites). The premonastic manifestations of poverty (*see* *poor – poverty), of contempt for the world and of purifying *prayer did not always fit harmoniously into society and into the hierarchical *church. Around 360 and 374, *Ephrem and *Epiphanius denounced the dangers of the Messalians ("men of prayer": the term is *Syriac) or Euchites (the same in Greek), who refuted work and *discipline. The synods of *Side and of *Antioch (ca. 390) used these names to stigmatize a group that seems to have been formed by *Eustathius of Sebaste and that had been in cordial relations, if tense at times, with *Basil and *Gregory of Nyssa. The most noted exponent was *Macarius (Simeon), whose *Asceticon* was condemned at *Constantinople (426) and at the Council of *Ephesus (431). Later the Messalians, who were not aiming to constitute a rebellious sect, were condemned again several times in Syria and in *Armenia. The extreme wing was manifested in the ascendency of the Bogomils and of the Cathari; the *monastic wing influenced *hesychasm and all of Greek, Russian and Eastern *monasticism.

DSp 10 (1980) 1074-1083; I. Hausherr, *L'erreur fondamentale et la logique du messalianisme:* OCP 1 (1935) 328-360 (= Études de Spiritualité orientale: OCA 183, Rome 1969, 64-96); J. Gribomont, *Le dossier des origines du messalianisme: Epektasis,* (Mélanges J. Daniélou), Paris 1972, 611-625; A. Louth, *Messalianism and Pelagianism:* SP 17, Oxford 1982, 127-135; C. Stewart, *"Working the Earth of the Heart": The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431*, Oxford Theological Monographs, Oxford 1992.

J. Gribomont

METEMPSYCHOSIS

I. In the first three c. - II. In the East from the 4th to the 8th c. - III. In the West from the 4th to the 7th c.

The passage of a single *soul into successive and different *bodies, both human and animal or plant, for punishment, for purification, for liberation from the chains of the material realm (*metempsychōsis/metensōmatōsis*) was a *quaestio* discussed in the philosophical writings on the soul and was accepted by the Orphics; by Empedocles, Pythagoras and Plato; and by the *Middle Platonists and *Neoplatonists (see Steenter, Dörrie). Already Aristotle had rejected as senseless the "fantastic constructs of the Pythagoreans" on the basis of which "a soul at random enters into a body at random," affirming that, as every art must employ the right instruments, so then "the soul must possess its own body" (*De an.* 1,3, 407b21). The satirist *Lucian of Samosata mocks the multiple reincarnations of Pythagoras (*Gallus* 20). Metempsychosis was also accepted by some heterodox Christians, who erroneously reinterpreted biblical passages, such as Mt 11:14 and 17:12 on *Elijah/*John the Baptist, Mt 15:21-28 on the Canaanite woman ("It is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs") and Rom 7:9 ("I was once alive apart from the law"). It was also accepted by others who misinterpreted the resurrection, by followers of esoteric Jewish teachings, by *gnostics (*Carpocratians, *Basilidians) and by *Manicheans. The church fathers always disputed the possibility of metempsychosis, drawing on arguments based on reason and on the Bible.

I. In the first three c. *Justin Martyr (d. ca. 165), who had passed through various philosophical schools, is the first church father who directly addresses metempsychosis, showing its presuppositions to be faulty (the *natural* immortality and affinity of the soul with the divinity and vision of God through connaturality), and arguing that in animal bodies the human soul would neither have an awareness of being punished nor could it live with a dynamic inclination toward God (*Dial.* 4,4-7 and 5,5). An underlying reason for this repudiation is based on the idea of the intrinsic unity among the constitutive elements of the human being (see *1 Apol.* 8,4; see also *De Res.* 8), acc. to which the soul cannot change its own body without distinction.

*Theophilus of Antioch (d. 185) recalls that Plato (see *Phaedr.* 248d) contradicts himself when he claims the immortality of the soul and then the transmigration of souls into other human and even animal bodies. To those who are intelligent, such a teaching appears to be terrible and vain (*Autol.* III, 7). *Hermias (ca. 200), in a sarcastic style, reveals his dismay over an indefinite and changing essence: Is it a man? Is it a beast? Is it a shrub? (see *Irrisio*, 4: SC 388, 101).

*Irenaeus of Lyons (d. 202) engages in polemic against the gnostic Carpocrates, who interprets the words of Christ in Mt 5:20 (the debtor does not leave the prison until he has paid the last cent) in a sense that is favorable to metempsychosis. The sacred text is twisted to a "preconceived" theory: "Everyone passes incessantly from one body to another" in order to wipe out his or her debt and is liberated from the necessity of entering into a body (*Adv. haer.* I, 25,4). Irenaeus objects that the gnostics use sacred texts as if they were mosaic tiles that come from a common image, yet are fabricated into another image. However, the true Christian recognizes the mosaic tiles and does not confuse the silhouette of the crafty fox with the portrait of the king (*Adv. haer.* I, 9,4). Furthermore, he rejects the passage of the soul into successive bodies "on the basis of the fact that souls do not have any memory of previous events" (*Adv. haer.* II, 33,1), nor have they drunk the water of oblivion for forgetting the past life (see Plato, *Rep.* X, 621a). Therefore, to claim that it is the body that causes forgetfulness is nonsense, because the soul would be unable to remember anything whatsoever. When in fact the eye is diverted from an object, the object would be completely forgotten. In fact, it is the soul that rules over the body, just as the artist masters his instrument (*Adv. haer.* II, 33,3-4). Irenaeus therefore proves the anthropological inconsistency of the theory of reincarnation (*Adv. haer.* II, 33,2-3). Even the Lord, in the story of Lazarus and the rich man (Lk 16:19-31), teaches us that "souls do not pass from body to body, but keep the same mold to which they are joined and remember the works that they have performed here [on earth]" (*Adv. haer.* II, 34,1). The profound reason for the rejection of metempsychosis lies in human nature, created by God in its essential identity and unity of soul and body: "As each of us receives his own body from God's making, so also do we each have our own soul" (*Adv. haer.* II, 33,5). Therefore he pits the Christian vision of the resurrection against reincarnation: human beings, written into the book of life, "will rise from the dead, having their own bodies, their own souls and their own spirits, into which they shall be willed by God" (*Adv. haer.* II, 33,5). Therefore the inalienable oneness of the human person, created by God with a specific soul (that has a beginning and receives an indestructible life, enduring as long as God so wills: *Adv. haer.* III, 34,2-4), harmonized with a specific body (destined for resurrection and then for eternal life), opposes with its

integral identity the belief in reincarnation.

*Clement of Alexandria attributes the theory of metempsychosis to the Egyptians (*Strom.* VI, 4,35,1: see Herodotus II, 123,2) and mentions the theory of "those who believe that souls are introduced into bodies and are bound to them and poured into them [passing from one body to another]," immediately adding a striking indication of his clear opposition: "Against them we will have another occasion to speak, when we will consider the soul" (*Strom.* III, 13,3; however, we have no evidence that such a work was ever written). Clement also alludes to the Platonic myth (see *Phaedon* 81c and *Phaedr.* 248c) of the soul that loses its wings and plunges down here into the world (*Strom.* III, 13,2 and 19,93,3), yet he counters, "The soul is not sent from heaven down here in a negative sense, since God directs everything to a better end (*Strom.* IV, 26,167,4). He then cites the theory of *Basilides, who supposes that "the soul, which sinned in another life, stands under castigation in this life" (*Strom.* IV, 12,83,2; see also 12,88,1) and in consequence interprets the biblical text "God punishes the disobedient even unto the third and fourth generations" (see Dt 5:9; Num 14:18) as referring to reincarnations: *ensōmatōseis* (*Exc. Theod.* 28). In a polemic against the preexistence of souls (held by Basilides and others), he proposes a creationism of souls (*Ecl. Proph.* 17; *Strom.* V, 13,87,4) and objects that the retribution of prior *sins to this life would be a negation of the didactic role of divine *providence and a negation of free will, and would annihilate faith and love (*Strom.* IV, 12,84,1-88,5).

*Tertullian (d. after 220) is radically opposed to metempsychosis, from an anthropological and moral perspective. After having tended toward this theory proposed by Plato (in connection to memory: *An.* 23,5-6), he roundly rejects it (*An.* 28-35). The first attack is directed against the person of its inventor, Pythagoras, who recalls various reincarnations: Aethalides, Euphorbus (Pythagoras remembers his shield; Tertullian inquires, but in what way? with a trick or through magic?), Pyrrhus and Hermotimus (*An.* 28). Then he refutes the affirmation of Plato (see *Phaedr.* 72a) that the living proceed from the dead: in fact, the creation proves the contrary, and the original law is not changed (*An.* 29). Furthermore, if metempsychosis were plausible, the total number of human beings would always be the same, because the number of the souls of the living and of the dead would be constantly equal. Yet in the course of history the human population is always increasing (*An.* 30). If the living proceed from the dead as individuals from individuals, how would the birth of twins be possible, assuming that two or more souls proceed from a single soul? Furthermore, if human beings die at different ages, why do they not return to the same ages at which they had left the earth, but instead are always born as infants? Why do they not also resume the former temperaments and the old inclinations? Yet the example of Pythagoras proves the contrary of this proposition: He like Euphorbus was a fighting spirit; like Pyrrhus he used to eat fish; like Aethalides and Hermotimus he used to eat beans; while like a philosopher of Samos he used to prefer peace, was vegetarian and had even been prohibited from crossing a field of beans. Why then have other philosophers not remembered their previous incarnations? (*An.* 31).

Moreover, Tertullian refutes the most radical form of metempsychosis, the one found in animal bodies, by referring to Empedocles, who used to affirm that he had been a sapling and a fish (see *fr.* B 117 Diels-Kranz). In fact, it is impossible that a human soul could take the place of an animal soul without undergoing changes, because the characteristics and qualities of a human being and of an animal are not only diverse but often even contrasting. When the Holy Scriptures liken human beings to the beasts of the earth, the intent is the similarity of natural qualities (Ps 48:21) rather than of substance, which is absolutely different (*An.* 32). Furthermore for Tertullian, the repudiation of metempsychosis is also necessary from the perspective of morality and retributive justice. If the souls do not remain the same, the sense of justice vanishes; if a human being finds himself to be an animal, he is diminished in his merits. Thus if the souls of murderers were reincarnated in bodies of animals (such as sacrificial animals), they would receive a punishment more lenient than the punishment provided in human law (torture and *death), not to speak of the divine law (*An.* 33). Finally, Tertullian recalls some proponents of metempsychosis: *Simon Magus (who would have ransomed his companion Elena) and Carpocrates (*An.* 34,1-35,4). The identification of Elijah with John the Baptist (Mt 17:12) is due to the fact that the latter figure possesses the spirit and the strength of the former (see Lk 1:17), each of which can be transferred by the will of God, but not the soul and the *flesh that are the substances proper to each human being (*An.* 35,5-6). Tertullian counters reincarnation with resurrection: following the example of Christ, raised from the dead with his own earthly body (*Carn. Chr.* 24), every human being will rise again as his own body that will be reunited to his own soul (*Ad nat.* 1,19,3-4). Every human being will return to live in a body, the same body possessed during the earthly life, not in other human or animal bodies (*Res.* 1), always preserving the same identity (*Apol.* 48). The human being recov-

ers the original nature and faculty of memory, because "there cannot exist any true judgment if there is no presentation of the very individual who has merited the undergoing of the sentence," without undergoing reincarnations in animal bodies (*Test. An.* 4,1-2). In order to be judged by God, the human being must be in the integral state of the person who has acted in this world. The union of the soul and of the body in the process of history necessitates the same union in order to receive the recompense (or punishment) at the resurrection.

*Minucius Felix (beginning of the 3rd c.) recounts that the philosophers who simultaneously uphold the immortality of the soul and the soul's reincarnation into different bodies are twisting the truth. If they then also propose metempsychosis into animal bodies, they present a theory "not worthy of the seriousness of philosophy" (*Oct.* 34,6-7).

According to *Hippolytus (2nd–3rd c.) the Carpocratians teach that souls pass from body to body, until they have exhausted all their sins (*Ref.* VII, 32: see Iren., *Adv. haer*. I, 25,4); meanwhile, the teachers say that "since the coming of the Savior, the transmigration of souls has ceased" (*Ref.* VIII, 10,1-2). In one textual fragment the author affirms that Christians do not wait for the reincarnation (*ensōmatōsis*) but rather the resurrection of their bodies with their own souls (*Contra Gentes*, frag. 2,47).

*Origen (d. 254) has sometimes been presented as a "Christian" proponent of reincarnation. The opposite is true: he repeatedly refuted it, and he has been falsely accused of professing it. He expressly recounts among the supporters of metempsychosis Empedocles (*C. Cels.* 5,49; 8,53; see 3,75), Pythagoras (*C. Cels.* 5,49; 6,8; 8,30) and above all Plato (*C. Cels.* 1,20; 4,17); groups of Christians who interpreted biblical passages in this sense (*Fr. Pr*: PG 13, 17f.; *Princ.* 1,8,4; *Res.* 2: PG 11, 94; *Fr. Lc* 1,17; *Hom. Ier* 16,1; *Co. Mt* 7); gnostics such as Basilides (*Co. Rm* 5,1; 6,8; *Ser. Mt* 38); and Jews who adhered to secret teachings (*Co. Io* 6,10,64; *Co. Mt* 10,20).

For Origen, such a theory is not philosophically defensible: the body, determined specifically by the soul of which it is an instrument (*Princ.* 3,6,6; see *C. Cels.* 4,58), is always related to this soul and is not able to be changed. Also from the perspective of logic and ethics, it would be absurd and unjust that souls "sinned in one body and are punished in another" (*Strom. Fr.*[?], in *Jerome, *C. Io. Hier.* 26; see *Princ.* 2,10,8; *Res.* 1: PG 11, 91f.). Most of all, it is impossible for a human soul to transmigrate into animal and plant bodies, because the human being has been made ontologically as a principal and primary creature (*Princ.* 2,9,3; *C. Cels.* 4,74; *Fr. Ps* 1,3: PG 12, 1089) of the first order in the creative work of God, while the animals are supplementary, secondary creatures who came into being in a different, ancillary way (*Princ.* 1,2,1), for the benefit of humanity (*Co. Ps* 1,3; *C. Cels.* 4,99). Therefore, human beings are neither determined by nor dependent on creatures that are molded in a complementary fashion. Even at the end of the world, God will be all in all (1 Cor 15:28) only in the rational creatures, not in the animals (*Princ.* 3,6,2). Human souls and those of the animals are not of the same species: the soul has been created "in the image" of God (Gen 1:27), and therefore "it is impossible that a nature made 'in the image of God' completely loses its own characteristics and assumes others, shaped in the image of who knows what, in the irrational animals" (*C. Cels.* 4,83). Animals do not participate in the rationality belonging to human beings, but act on the basis of natural instinct (*Princ.* 3,1,3; *C. Cels.* 4,81.83.88).

A human soul cannot suffer the loss of sensibility or rationality as a punishment, transmigrating into plant or animal bodies (*C. Cels.* 3,75): in such a case, the same punishment would lack sense, and the conversion would be unattainable (because it lacks reason, an essential instrument for becoming aware of faults and for changing behavior). The human being must serve the sentence in its own human body (*Co. Mt* 13,17). Furthermore, the behavior of animals is instinctive; therefore, it has neither ethical relevance, nor moral imputability, nor the possibility of ascent or of spiritual improvement. Instead, the human being suffers judgment when transgressing the natural tendencies (*C. Cels.* 4,99); he or she is able to progress or regress in virtue (*Co. Mt* 10,11). Finally, only the human body is destined to rise again: therefore, having been the seat of the rational soul, at death it receives the due honors (*C. Cels.* 8,30), while the body of the animals is thrown away (*C. Cels.* 4,24); at the resurrection the qualities of the body are replaced: from corruptible and mortal to incorruptible and immortal (*C. Cels.* 4,19; 5,24; 7,32).

Only in an *allegorical sense are human beings, through the vices and the *virtues, comparable to the animals (*Dial.* 14; *Co. Mt* 11,17): it is about moral assimilation, not physical transmutation. The divine image in the human being is able to be obscured by *sin and superimposed by demonic or bestial images, but it can never be obliterated (*Hom. Gn* 13,4; *C. Cels.* 2,11; 4,25.83). Neither does a particular human soul pass into another human body. Every soul is harmonized with its own body (*Princ.* 2,10,1; *C. Cels.* 1,33); the sould cannot animate simultaneously two different bodies (*Fr. Lc* 1,17; *Co. Mt* 10,20). To every individual body there must correspond a different name (*Co. Io* 6,11,71; *Co. Mt* 10,20; 13,2).

Origen opposed the theory of metempsychosis also on the basis of biblical arguments. The angel Gabriel (Lk 1:17) does not speak of the "soul" of Elijah, but of his "spirit" and of his "power" (*Co. Io* 6,11,66; *Co. Mt* 13,2): in these are the identity of mission and of prophetic charisma, not a transmigration of the soul of Elijah into the Baptist (*Co. Io* 6,11,71; 6,13,78; *Co. Mt* 13,2; *Hom. Lc* 4 [Greek]). If acc. to the theories of the proponents of metensomatosis, it is due to sin that a soul must undergo transmigration, for what sin did the soul of Elijah need to pass into John? Therefore it is "a most obvious lie" that Elijah, so perfect for not experiencing the death common to all persons (because he was lifted up to heaven), was required to satisfy the penalty of metensomatosis (*Co. Mt* 7, in Pamphilus, *Ap. Or.* 10).

Origen interprets the saying of Jesus to the Canaanite woman, "It is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs" (Mt 15:26) and the reply of the woman, "even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their masters' tables" (Mt 15:26-27) in an *allegorical mode: the bread is a *symbol of the nourishment of those who, spiritually evolved, are the children, and the crumbs represent the nourishment of those who, hardly evolved like the Canaanite woman, are similar to the dogs, and then declares, "Others, strangers to the doctrine of the church, even imagine that the souls pass from bodies of human beings to bodies of beasts, acc. to their various wrongdoings. We do not find this concept at all in the Holy Scriptures, and we declare that there is a passage from a more spiritual state to a less spiritual state, and that one undergoes this passage due to so much carelessness and negligence" (*Co. Mt* 11,17).

He rejects the idea of *Basilides, based on Rom 7:9 ("I was once alive apart from the law"), in order to affirm that this phrase referred to the time in which the human being was living in an animal body that was not falling anew under the law (*Co. Rm* 5,1), taking notice that the apostle Paul refers to one and the same life. At the same time, he does not accept the idea that here there is no other castigation if not the transmigration of the soul after death, because in this way the salutary fear of future penalties is eliminated from human beings and *impiety flourishes (*Ser. Mt* 38). Furthermore, he affirms that Christians practice abstinence not on account of the myth of metempsychosis, but in order to mortify the body (*C. Cels.* 5,49; 8,30). Children are baptized not for wrongs that the soul committed in a different body but because this soul has been brought forth in a body subject to sin (*Co. Rm* 5,9). Christians speak of resurrection, certainly not because they have "misinterpreted the teaching on metempsychosis," as the pagan Celsus reasons (*C. Cels.* 7,32). In fact, the body does not change in substance, but in attributes (*C. Cels.* 7,32; cf. *Princ.* 3,6,6). Here there is an identity between an earthly body and a glorious body (*Str. Fr.*[?], in Jerome, *C. Io. Hier.* 26; *Co. Mt* 17,30).

Against the gnostics, Origen proposed the idea of the preexistence of souls in order to explain the variety of human situations (*Princ.* 1,7,4). However, he always clearly distinguished ensomatosis—i.e., the descent of the soul into the human body—from metensomatosis (*Co. Io* 6,14,86; *C. Cels.* 5,29; see also 4,17). Ensomatosis has been fulfilled through the first sin (*Princ.* 1,6,3) or in order to aid human beings (*Princ.* 2,6,3; 4,3,12; *Hom. Ez* 1,1; *Co. Io* 2,31,186-190): the body is assumed on the basis of merits and demerits that are antecedent to the earthly birth. Metensomatosis—the passage of a single human soul into successive and several bodies: human, animal, astral (*Princ.* 1,8,4; *Co. Io* 6,10,64; *Co. Rm* 5,1; 6,8; *Co. Mt* 11,17; *C. Cels.* 1,20)—is entirely refuted by Origen and is considered "foolishness" (*C. Cels.* 3,75), "a false teaching" (*Co. Mt* 10,20) and "alien to the church of God, not handed down from the *apostles, nor made known by the Scriptures" (*Co. Mt* 13,1). In fact, for Origen, the body—a sign of creatureliness and a sort of "genetic code"—always accompanies the soul in the various ages from the creation to the **apokatastasis*; presenting itself anew in successive worlds, the body always remains the same body, though from time to time it assumes qualities (spiritual, ethereal, physical) adapted to the worlds in which it lives, on the basis of the progress or regress of the soul. In the resurrection, the identity between an earthly body and a spiritual body is assured by the permanence of the corporeal substance (*Princ.* 2,1,4; 3,6,6), by a "form" (*eidos*) (*Fr. Ps* 1,5: PG 12, 1093), by a "seminal principle" (*logos spermatikos*) (*Res.* 2: PG 11, 93; *C. Cels.* 5,23). Also the theory of the "vehicle of the soul" (compare in Methodius, *Res.* 13,17-18), a corporeal wrapping that acts as a bridge between the soul and the body after the death of the human being, reinforces this identity.

During the Origenist controversies (from the 4th to 6th c.), some writers accused Origen of having upheld metensomatosis, or of selectively employing or wrongly interpreting or twisting biblical texts. They misrepresented the moral comparison of sinners to beasts or the idea of successive worlds, and they presented Origen as a supporter of pagan teachings in order to denigrate him.

*Pamphilus (*Ap. Or.* 5.9) and an anonymous author cited by *Photius had already cleared Origen of such accusations. Yet for polemical reasons, they were taken up again by Jerome in the 4th c. (*Ap. c.*

Ruf. 2,12; 3,39-40; *Ep*. 124, 3.4.7.14) and by *Justinian in the 6th c. (*Ep. ad Menan.*).

II. In the East from the 4th to the 8th c. *Basil of Caesarea (d. 379), employing an *exegesis of Gen 1:24 (in the Septuagint: "the earth produces a living soul"), confirms the difference between the soul of beasts and the soul of human beings. The first is "none other than the earth: one should not believe that it existed prior to the substance of the body of the beasts, nor that it subsisted after the dissolution of their flesh" (*Hexam. Hom*. VIII, 2), while the second is made in the image of God. Therefore, he bitterly criticizes the philosophers who put their souls and the souls of the dogs on the same level, and claim to have lived previously as animals. Writing such nonsense, they show themselves to have less sense than fish (*Hexam. Hom*. VIII, 2).

*Gregory of Nazianzus (d. ca. 390), after affirming that the human soul is "the breath of God, celestial by nature" (*Poem. Dogm*. I,1;VIII,1), demonstrates the difference between the nature of the flesh and the immortal form. He denies that the soul is shared by all, and finally labels it a "vain joke of the unwise to claim that the soul, *good or *evil, emigrates, as a reward of virtue or punishment of sins, into other bodies suited to the preceding life" (*Poem. Dogm*. I,1;VIII,32-35). In fact, moral reasonings of a wise wild beast or of a talking tree have never been observed; the human soul would not be able either to expiate sins, or to figure out which body it had first or which it had later. Another grave error is to assume that oblivion of the preceding life covers the memory of the human being (*Poem. Dogm*. I,1;VIII,41-53)

*Gregory of Nyssa (d. 392) refutes the proponents of the preexistence of souls or of the body. He affirms that such persons have not yet been liberated from the fables of metempsychosis in animal bodies. If the soul falls into a bestial nature, it cannot advance in virtue—not present in the irrational beings—and so it will sink always lower. It will be transformed into nonbeing, and it will be impossible to return to that which is better. If the soul were to proceed from a shrub, one would have to say that the life of a tree is more worthy than the first state of the soul (*Opif*. 28). According to Gregory of Nyssa, the supporters of metempsychosis offend the human species, claiming that the soul of the human being is identical to that of the irrational being, changes bodies, transmigrates through animals or even through plants, and then arises anew all the way to human nature (*An. et res*.: PG 46, 108). Gregory asserts instead that in the resurrection, "along with the soul, the same body grows again, put in order again by the same elements" (*An. et res*.: PG 46, 110), and it does not proceed to fall into other bodies. Those who "make out the soul to transmigrate in different natures confound the peculiarity of the nature and mix everything together: rationality and irrationality, sensory faculties and the absence of sensations" (ibid.). If it were so, one would have to conclude that "all things are but one thing, and that in the beings there exists but one sole nature, mixed up in a confused and indistinct way, without any peculiarity distinguishing a thing (ibid.; see also *Nemesius of Emesa, *De nat. hom*. 2: PG 40, 582A). The soul cannot either preexist or transmigrate through other bodies, because it is formed at the same time that its own body is formed (see *An. et res*.: PG 46, 125). If then the pagan philosophers declare that "the soul passes from one body to another, even transforming itself into an irrational nature," they do not offer sound teaching (*Vita Mos*. II, 39-40).

*Epiphanius of Salamis (d. 403) identifies as proponents of the transmigration of souls certain Greek philosophers (*Stoics, Platonists and Pythagoreans: *Pan. haer*. 5-7), and various heretics (Carpocratians: *Pan. haer.* 27,4-5; *Valentinus the Gnostic, Colorbasus, all the gnostics and the Manicheans: *Pan. haer*. 42,11,15, *ref.* 24d). He also recognizes that every person endowed with good sense rejects transmigration as absurd. Against the Manicheans, who claim metempsychosis for castigation and *purification (*Pan*. 66,28: see also *Hegemonius, *Acta Arch*. 10), he objects that it is not plausible that the soul can flow into a tiny seed and that it awaits contact with the body of the parents through their desire. He also rejects the idea that individuals are born from a different species (a human being cannot proceed from a dog, nor vice versa: every species reproduces the elements of the same species!), or that souls transmigrated into inferior bodies acquire consciousness (*Pan*. 66,55).

*John Chrysostom (d. 407) refutes a teaching "absurd and an offense to human dignity, to insist that the souls of the human beings are transformed into flies, mosquitoes, shrubs" (*In Io. hom*. II, 2: PG 59, 31); and he argues that the soul is demeaned by insisting that it can transmigrate into animals (*In Io. hom*. II, 3: PG 59, 33). He ridicules this theory (*In Act. hom*. 4,4: PG 60, 48), and considers it a gain that in his time such theories have waned (*In Io. hom*. II, 2: PG 59, 32).

Centuries later, *John of Damascus (d. ca. 750) no longer mentions the hypothesis of a return to earthly life. Instead, he simply says that for human beings there is no possibility of repentance after

death (*Fide orth.* II, 4; *C. Manich.* 75). When it departs the body, the soul can no longer mutate from the condition in which it was found (*C. Manich.* 37).

III. In the West from the 4th to the 7th c. *Lactantius (d. 325) deems it wrong to affirm the teaching of reincarnation (*Div. Inst.* 3,18). Through ignorance some affirm that "we have entered into the light to serve the sentence for wrongdoings committed" (ibid.). He asks, "What wrongs could we commit and where could we commit them, if we did not even exist?" (ibid.), and he refutes anecdotes and imaginary tales of earlier lives as concocted by Pythagoras (ibid.). Thus the passage into other animal bodies is useless, because it is not necessary to introduce old souls into new bodies (in fact, the Creator can always create new souls after the first souls) and it is impossible, since the soul endowed with intellect is not able to change the nature of its condition, just as fire is not able to leap down (*Div. Inst.* 3,19). The opinions of Pythagoras on the reincarnation, even in animal bodies, are surely ridiculous and unworthy of being seriously refuted (*Div. Inst.* 7,12). Would it not be preferable for human souls to be extinguished with the body, rather than being condemned to other bodies of animals (*Epit.* 31,8: SC 335,138)? The poets then invented the river of oblivion, because the souls, mindful of earlier tribulations, would never want to return to the earth (*Div. Inst.* 7,22).

*Ambrose of Milan (d. 397) insists that the transformations of human beings into animals must be interpreted in a symbolic or ironic sense (*Exc. Fratr.* 2,127-129). Such stories are "unworthy of faith and are incongruous" (*Exc. Fratr.* 2,130) and are inconceivable in a real sense. In fact, a creature made in the image of God cannot be changed into a bestial figure, since the faculty of reason, not the appearance of the body, is in the likeness of God, and "nature does not permit such a thing, and if it did permit it, *grace would certainly not permit it" (ibid.).

*Jerome (d. 419) alludes many times in his writings to metempsychosis (often even employing the corresponding Greek word: see, e.g., *In Mt.* 2,11,14-15 and 2,14,1-2; *Ep.* 124,4.7.14; *C. Iovin.* 2,6; *Ap. c. Ruf.* 1,20), acc. to which the souls fallen from heaven, on the basis of differences in merits, suffer in the bodies the penalties of past sins (*Ep.* 120,10), clothed in previous bodies (*Ap. c. Ruf.* 2,12, e 3,39 [= *Ep. adv. Ruf.*]), even animal bodies (*Ep.* 124,3-4; see also 98,7). He cites the various reincarnations of Pythagoras (*Ap. c. Ruf.* 3,40 [= *Ep. adv. Ruf.*]; *C. Vigil.* 1; *C. Iovin.* 2,37). He defines as "vain and scandalous" the teaching that the souls, for certain past sins, have been buried in human bodies for the purpose of *expiation (*Ep.* 130,16). He demonstrates its contradictions: the souls of human beings and of beasts cannot be of the same substance and proceed from the same creator. In what way for the salvation of a single human body would two thousand swine perish? (*In Mt* 2,8,31); the souls of human beings are much more precious than those of the beasts (*Tr. Mc.* 1,1,31: CCL 78,467). He explains that John the Baptist is called Elijah, not because he was his reincarnation, but because he had his grace and power, and he lived in the same austere way and carried out an analogous mission: the Baptist prepared the first coming of Christ, as Elijah will prepare the *second coming (*In Mt.* 2,11). Unfortunately, not precisely comprehending the ideas of Origen, Jerome accused him of having professed metempsychosis (*Ap. c. Ruf.* 2,12; 3,39f.; *Ep.* 124,3.4.7.14).

*Augustine of Hippo (d. 430) rejects every form of metempsychosis defended by either the Manicheans or the philosophers (above all of Pythagorean and Platonic inspiration). Regarding the first group, he severely criticizes such a theory, because it is based on a false concept of God and of the soul, that acc. to the Manicheans "is none other than the same substance of God, indeed is identical to that which is God" and is entangled with all sorts of weeds and little worms, and into these it is able to transmigrate (*Gen. litt.* 7,11,17; see *En. Ps.* 140,11; *C. Adim.* 12,1-2). Yet Augustine objects, "God is absolutely immutable and *incorruptible" (*Gen. litt.* 7,11,17; see also *Mor. Man.* 2,12,25), and the soul is not a particle of God, because it is subject to change (*Ep.* 166,2,3). Therefore such a theory is shown to be irrational and detestable, due to the incompatibility between the supposition of the soul's divine nature (a supposition that would require immutability) and the various changes to which the soul is subjected through continuous transmigrations into different bodies (*Gen. litt.* 7,11,17). Furthermore, the action of Christ, who treated human beings differently from animals and trees, controverts similar ideas (*Mor. Man.* 2,17,54).

Augustine demonstrates the absurdity and contradictions of the Manicheans, if metempsychosis in animal and plant bodies were to be accepted: killing an animal, one would be committing a homicide, if the human soul were incarnated therein (*C. Adim.* 12,2). In animals, human souls can neither acquire *truth or wisdom, nor progress morally, nor even perceive the divine precepts (*Mor. Man.* 2,16,39 and 2,17,53-57). Great importance would be given to things rather than to persons (one is more merciful to a piece of bread than to the poor person left to die of hunger: *En. Ps.* 140,12; see also *C. Faust.* 5,10). As

a result, if certain principles have consequences that provoke behaviors contrary to both the natural and divine law, they are false. Yet Augustine hopes that the Manicheans can repent of their nefarious errors (*Nat. bon*. 42; *Ep. fund*. 1 and 27).

Regarding the second group, Augustine rejects the teachings of various philosophers who claim metempsychosis in various bodies, whether human or animal; among these he features Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus and *Porphyry of Tyre, who accepts only the transmigration into different human bodies. For Augustine, such ideas proceed from wanting to explain the problem of human suffering (*Sermo* 165,5,6; 240,4,4) and from theorizing cycles that repeat without end (*Civ. Dei* 12,13,1). A fundamental presupposition for every theory of metempsychosis is the preexistence of souls and their fall into bodies for sins committed in a preceding life. Augustine categorically affirms, "I do not believe at all, I do not allow, I completely disagree that souls sin in a preceding life from where they would come to be cast into the prison of the bodies" (*Ep.* 166,9,27; cf. *Gen. litt*. 10,7,12). He declares that a Catholic Christian cannot accept this sort of hypothesis (*An. et eius orig*. 3,8,11) on the basis of the authority of Scripture (*Pecc. merit*. 1,22,33). As St. Paul says (Rom 9:11), those who are not yet born here have not performed anything good or anything evil (*Pecc. orig*. 2,31,26; *Sermo* 165,5,6; *Ep*. 190,1,4), even though they have the contagion of the sin of *Adam, transmitted to his descendants (*Ep*. 217,5,6; *Sermo* 217,5). Besides, it is quite different to have sinned in Adam and "to have sinned who-knows-where, but without a relation to Adam" and to become cast into a body as in a prison (*Ep*. 166,9,27). He is surprised that Origen espoused the idea that souls, having distanced themselves from God, are fallen from heaven and confined in bodies as in a prison. As a result, the world would have been created to repress evil and not to produce good (*Civ. Dei* 11,23). Against the theory of the preexistence of souls, Augustine responds that "there is innate in the soul a sort of natural longing to govern the body (*Gen. litt*. 12,35,68; see also 7,25,36) and that "the complete nature of a human being certainly consists in the spirit, the soul and the body: so whoever wants to treat the body as extraneous to human nature is out of his mind" (*An. et eius orig*. 4,2,3). In fact, God gives a new spirit to every human body, so that this same body might be transformed into a better state at the moment of the resurrection (*Gen. litt*. 10,14,24). Furthermore, the same human experience contradicts the opinion of the person who thinks that souls must be placed within bodies that weigh them down in proportion to the merits or demerits of a previous life (*Gen. litt*. 1,22,31-32, where he also cites the example of someone that was zealous in *faith, even though he had a miserable body).

Augustine rejects metempsychosis in bodies of different species, from human beings into animals and vice versa. The substance of the rational soul cannot change itself into the substance of an irrational beast (*Gen. litt*. 10,4,7; see also 7,10,15). The rationality and the essence of the human soul are also inalienable, inasmuch as there is a substantive and nonaccidental relationship between mind and rational knowledge (*Sol.* 2,12,22 and 2,13,24 and *Imm. an*. 8-9). The similarity of habits and of behaviors among human beings and animals must be interpreted in a metaphorical, not a literal sense: human being remains always human, even if one behaves like a beast (*Gen. litt*. 7,9,13). Animals act on instinct, not because in them there are degraded human souls (*Gest. Pelag*. 6,18). Thus "beasts always keep the habits of the beasts" (*Gen. litt*. 7,10,15): animal behaviors come closer to the animal model than to the human model; the similarity of character and behavior among human beings and animals is only by way of analogy. Therefore, if human behavior and animal behavior have peculiar and distinct characteristics, it follows that human nature and animal nature preserve in substance their peculiarities: neither are they interchangeable, nor can one be transformed into the other. If some philosophers have set forth the theory of the transmigration of human souls into bodies of beasts, they were probably intending to affirm that, through their wrongdoing, some human beings were becoming similar to the beasts in this earthly life. Thus they were attempting to turn evil persons away from their insane passions (*Gen. litt*. 7,10,15). If the Scriptures compare human beings to beasts (see Ps 48:13), they are referring to the present life of persons who conduct themselves in an unreasonable way (*Gen. litt*. 7,10,14). If the psalmist asks God not to abandon a human being to the beasts (see Ps 74 [73]:19), he desires that his soul not be abandoned into the power of scandalous persons who are similar to the beasts (see Mt 7:15), or even into the power of the *demon, defined as a lion and a dragon (Ps 91 [90]:13) (*Gen. litt*. 7,10,14). One must therefore conclude that the transmigration of a soul from a beast into a human being "is an opinion absolutely contrary to the Catholic faith" (*Gen. litt*. 7,9,13). The fact that someone recalls having lived in a body of a beast is due either to a lie or to a diabolical illusion (*Gen. litt*. 7,11,16). These are deceptive reminiscences similar to hallucinatory images (*Trin*. 12,15,24). Furthermore, on the basis of good sense,

Augustine adds that, if we have passed through various reincarnations, the memory of them would be an experience common to many or to just about all, as are *dreams—but this is not so (ibid.).

Furthermore, the same transmigration into different human bodies is not credible: if some persons, even those who have not been instructed, know how to give precise answers, the reason is not due to the fact that in an earlier life they had known the answers and then forgotten them, but because in these persons there shines the light of eternal reason in which they contemplate the immutable truths (*Retr.* 1,4,4; see also *Trin.* 12,15,24; *Ep.* 7,2). Against some heretics who lean on the Scriptures for endorsement of metempsychosis, affirming that John the Baptist was the reincarnation of Elijah, Augustine objects that the Forerunner is called Elijah because he possesses the same spirit and pursues an identical mission (*In Io. tr.* 4,5); and as the spirit of Elijah has been passed to Elisha (see 2 Kgs 2:15), who clearly already possessed his own spirit, so also the same spirit of Elijah has come upon the Baptist, without his spirit having transmigrated into the Forerunner (*Quaest. Hept.* 4,18).

Augustine likewise shows the contradictions and the absurdities of the theory of metempsychosis and of continuous cycles (even for those who like Porphyry of Tyre limit the incarnations to human bodies and do not include beastly bodies: *Civ. Dei* 10,30). The saints would live in a state of real unhappiness and of fictitious happiness; therefore, the happiness of the souls in paradise would not be inalienable: in fact a life cannot "be exceedingly happy if it does not live in the absolute certainty of its own eternity" (*Civ. Dei* 10,30). If instead the soul must return to the terrestrial world, "it moves incessantly through a false happiness and incessantly returns to a true unhappiness. It cannot in fact be true happiness because it does not have assurance of its own eternity" (*Civ. Dei* 12,13; see also 12,20). Therefore the philosophers (Platonists) are wrong in affirming that the souls at the height of the heavens, having forgotten the past evils, desire to return in order to assume a body and suffer the miseries of the present age (*Sermo* 240,4 e 241,4): it would be an "insane desire" (*Sermo* 241,5, citing Virgil, *Aen.* 6,721). Furthermore, Augustine criticizes the concept of reincarnation as a form of punishment, through which the body would be the prison of the soul (*Serm.* 240,4). In this case, such a theory contradicts Platonic teaching (see *Tim.* 29b), where it is affirmed that the mortal and immortal beings are a necessary condition for the goodness and the beauty of the world (*Civ. Dei* 12,26). Therefore, if the creation cannot be anything but good and have existence, even as mortal persons do, it is a "divine *gift" (*Civ. Dei* 12,26); also the body in itself is good and cannot assume the function of an instrument for punishing the soul. Even the gods, who acc. to Plato are the architects of the human body (*Tim.* 41 a-d), would not be benevolent creators, but "makers of shackles and builders of prisons" (*Civ. Dei* 12,26). One cannot therefore admit that reincarnation is a punishment for sins.

The church cannot accept the endless alternation between states of blessedness and of punishment (*Haer.* 43). Christ is risen from the dead, and death no longer has any power (Rom 6:9), and "we after the resurrection *will always be with the Lord*" (1 Th 4:17), recalls Augustine (*Civ. Dei* 12,13,2). We should adhere to the "sublime truths taught to us by the saints" and not to the "enormous insanities invented by learned persons," when they affirm that the souls, purified and having become wise, "return in the body through love of the body" (*Sermo* 241,6). Therefore, concludes Augustine, it is much more reasonable to believe that "souls return a single time to their own bodies, rather than returning many times to other bodies" (*Civ. Dei* 10,30). Otherwise, once the earthly life has ended, one can neither search for what he has neglected to obtain nor claim to have earned before God what he has neglected to complete in this world (*Civ. Dei* 21,24,5; *Ench.* 29,110). After the last day, when a person dies, one does not mend the evil done: all is finished (*Sermo* 19,6 e 170,10). One receives only the recompense of one's actions (*In Io. tr.* 44,6). It is the time of judgment and no longer of mercy (*Ep.* 140,35,81). Therefore, the souls will be "tormented or glorified in the same flesh with which they lived here" (*An. et eius orig.* 2,4,8), in the same bodies in which they had committed the actions (*Cat. rud.* 25,46). The Lord assures us that "the blessed souls will live in eternity with the same flesh for ever" (*Civ. Dei* 22,27). Christ in the resurrection, as head of humankind, has shown us what the just must await (*Sermo* 241,1). In fact "in order for the souls to be happy, one must not abandon every body, but receive a body immune from the process of becoming" (*Civ. Dei* 22,26).

*Peter Chrysologus (d. after 450), after citing the words of Lk 1:17 (John the Baptist will precede the Christ with "the spirit of the power of Elijah"), hastens to point out, "Nobody, when hearing these words, thinks of metempsychosis" (*Serm.* 88,6), and he explains that the Baptist lives with the spirit of Elijah and walks with his power, because in his way of living and in his virtues, he is a perfect representation of these realities (ibid.)

*Gregory the Great (d. 604), although without di-

rectly pointing to metempsychosis, clearly explains that the contradiction between the texts concerning Elijah (Mt 17:12-13: Jesus affirms that Elijah has come, referring to John the Baptist; Jn 1:21: the Baptist claims that he is not Elijah) is only apparent, not real. This is explained in the light of Lk 1:17: the Baptist "was Elijah in spirit, he was not Elijah in person. That which Jesus says of the Spirit, John denies of the person" (*Hom Ev*. VII, 1).

Conclusion. For the fathers of the church, metempsychosis is a theory to reject, because it safeguards neither the specificity of the human being as a rational creature (quite different indeed from the irrational creature), nor his unique position as bearing the "image of God." Furthermore, this manner of presupposing that the material world and the body have negative value, treating the body as an instrument of punishment, does not offer a precise concept of retributive justice (in one body a person flourishes, and in another one is punished). Finally, in a precise interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, one does not find texts for backing up such ideas. The Christians pitted the resurrection, of which Christ is the firstfruits, against metempsychosis: the body remains always the same, but puts on new and superior qualities and rises from the earth as a spiritual body.

Bibliography: J. Bjorling, *Reincarnation: A Bibliography*, New York and London 1996.

Studies: L. Bukowski, *La réincarnation selon les Pères de l'Église*: Gregorianum 9 (1928) 65-91; DTC 10 (1929) 1574-1595; L. Bukowski, *L'opinion de Saint Augustin sur la reincarnation des âmes*: Gregorianum 12 (1931) 57-85; W. Stettner, *Die Seelenwanderung bei den Griechen und Römern*, Stuttgart 1934; H. Dörrie, *Kontroversen um die Seelenwanderung im kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus*: Hermes 85 (1957) 414-435; A. Orbe, *Textos y pasajes de la Escritura interesados en la teoria de la Reincorporación*: Estudios eclesiásticos 33 (1959) 77-91; H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin [12]1966; J. Daniélou, *Metempsychosis in Gregory of Nyssa*, in D. Neiman and M. Schatkin (eds.), *The Heritage of the Early Church*, Essays in honor of G.V. Florovsky, Rome 1973, 227-243; Cath 9 (1980) 36-45; K. Hoeheisel, *Das frühe Christentum und die Seelenwanderung*: JbAC 27/28 (1984/85) 24-46; L. Scheffczyk, *Die Reinkarnationsgedanke in der altchristlichen Literatur*, SBA 1985, Heft 4, Munich 1985, 1-39; C. Schönborn, *Quelques notes sur l'attitude de la théologie paléochrétienne face à la réincarnation*, in C.-A. Keller (ed.), *La réincarnation. Théories, raisonnements et appréciations. Un symposium*, Bern 1986, 159-180; H. Frohnhofen, *Reinkarnation und frühe Kirche*: Stimmen der Zeit 207 (1989) 236-244; C. Schönborn, *Risurrezione e reincarnazione*, Casale Monf. 1990; M. Maritano, *Giustino Martire di fronte al problema della metempsicosi (Dial., 4,4-7 e 5,5)*: Salesianum 53 (1992) 231-281; M. Introvigne (ed.), *La sfida della reincarnazione*, Milan 1993, 159-234; M. Krüger, *Ichgeburt. Origenes und die Entstehung der christlichen Idee der Wiederverkörperung in der Denkbewegung von Pythagoras bis Lessing*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996; P. Cantoni, *Cristianesimo e reincarnazione*, Leumann (To) 1997; TRE 31 (1999) 1-6; L. Lies, *Origenes und die Reinkarnation*: ZKTh 121 (1999) 129-158, 249-268; M. Maritano, *Argomenti "filosofici" di Origene contro la metensomatosi*, in L. Perrone (ed.), *Origeniana Octava*, Leuven 2003, 503-535.

M. Maritano

METHODIUS of Olympus (d. 311). Thought to have been bishop of Olympus in Lycia, Methodius is known to have died a martyr in Euboea in 311. Nevertheless, we know little more about his life. He studied at *Origen's exegetical school but did not accept Origen's theories on the indefinite succession of worlds, the preexistence of souls and the *resurrection of the flesh. He adopted an *ascetic and mystical typology, interpreting sacred history as progressive revelation. This teaching was set forth in his exegetical works that have survived in small fragments (e.g., on Leviticus and Proverbs) and in his commentaries on *Genesis and the *Song of Songs that are now lost. In his surviving writings we find a totalizing anthropology: the righteous person will be resurrected in the image of Christ with a glorified body identical to the mortal body. Freedom has been bestowed on humanity, because their actions were meritorious. These themes appear in the surviving Slavic versions of his works: *Aglaophon* or *On the Resurrection*, *On Free Will*, and *On Life and Rational Action*. The only work surviving in the original Greek is the *Symposium* or *On Virginity*, a dialogue that deals extensively with this issue and contains various prophetic images of a biblical tone. The term *hagneia* ("virginity") is intended in the original sense of the unity of the soul reaching out for the embrace of the divine Bridegroom: virginity of spirit more than of body. The first act in three scenes focuses on the theme of humanity. The second develops the teleological mystery. In the third, Tisiana projects into the eschatological period of truth the symbolic prophecies of the OT, thus arguing against Asian millenarianism. In the epilogue, Domnina sings that now the age of the Spirit has arrived. At the end, Thecla returns to the scene to sing about the eschatological exodus, recalling the stages of divine teaching.

PG 18, 9-408; CGS 27 (1927); PO 22, 5, 631-889; SC 95; A. Zeoli, *S. Metodio. Il banchetto delle dieci vergini*, Florence 1952; J. Farges, *Les idées morales et religieuses de Méthode d'Olympe*, Paris 1929; R. Devreesse, *Anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque: Méthode d'Olympe*: Biblica (1935) 166-191; M. Margheritis, *L'influenza di Platone sul pensiero e sull'arte di Metodio d'Olimpo*, in *Studi dedicati alla memoria di Paolo Ubaldi*, Milan 1937, 401-412; G. Lazzati, *La tecnica dialogica nel Simposio di Metodio d'Olimpo*: in ibid., 117-124; F. Baduina, *Doctrina S. Methodii Ol. de peccato originali*, Rome 1942; V. Bu-

chheit, *Studien zu Methodios von Olympos*, TU 69, Berlin 1958; M. Pellegrino, *L'inno del Simposio di S. Metodio Martire*, Cuneo 1958; H. Crouzel, *Les critiques adressées par Méthode et ses contemporains à la doctrine origénienne du corps ressuscité*: Gregorianum (1972) 679-716; C. Riggi, *Vita cristiana e dialogo liturgico nel Simposio di Metodio (6,5)*: Salesianum 37 (1975) 503-545; C. Riggi, *Teologia della storia nel Simposio di Metodio di Olimpo*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 61-84; F. van de Paverd, *Confession (exagoreusis) and Penance (exomologesis) in De Lepra of Methodius of Olympus*: OCP 44 (1978) 309-341; Id., *Paenitentia secunda in Methodius of Olympus*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 459-485; C. Tibiletti, *L'ambiente culturale cristiano riflesso nel Simposio di Metodio*, in Id., *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Rome 1983, 99-133; C. Tibiletti, *Metodio d'Olimpo*, in Id., *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Rome 1983, 134-195; E. Prinzivalli, *L'esegesi biblica di Metodio di Olimpo*, Rome 1985; C. Riggi, *La forma del corpo risorto secondo Metodio in Epifanio (Haer. 64)*, in S. Felici (ed.), *Morte e immortalità nella catechesi dei Padri del III–IV secolo*, Rome 1985, 75-92; L.G. Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ*, Washington, DC 1997; E. Prinzivalli, *Desiderio di generazione e generazione del desiderio: Metodio di Olimpo e le polemiche sull'eros fra III e IV secolo*, in S. Pricoco (ed.), *L'eros difficile: amore e sessualità nell'antico cristianesimo*, Soveria Mannelli 1998, 39-66; K. Bracht, *Vollkommenheit und Vollendung: zur Anthropologie des Methodius von Olympus*, Tübingen 1999.

C. Riggi

METHODIUS of Olympus (pseudo). To Methodius, the bishop of Olympus in *Lycia who probably lived between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th c., is attributed a *Dialogue on the Orthodox Faith* in five books, passed down to us in *Greek and in the *Latin version of *Rufinus of *Aquileia. In this work, *Adamantius defends the orthodox doctrines of the church against the *gnostic and *Marcionite doctrines presented by various spokespersons. Since Adamantius was the nickname of *Origen and these five books broadly refuted gnostics and Marcionites, the work was attributed to Origen and hence it was translated by Rufinus. In reality the author is not Origen, but rather a thinker who polemicizes against the ideas of Origen and who for this purpose avails himself of the works of *Methodius of Olympus, who in the *Aglaophon e peri tes anastaseos* ("On the resurrection") and in the *Symposium e peri hagneias* ("On virginity") had refuted Origen's tendencies toward an overly spiritualist opinion (ed. with intro. and comm. by H. Musurillo and V.-H. Debidour, *Methode d'Olympe. Le banquet*, Paris 1963, SC 95). The historical references contained in the Greek version allude to a time after the end of the *persecutions, and in the Greek they depart from the corresponding passages in the version of Rufinus. At one time, this was thought to demonstrate that the passages in question in the Greek version were *interpolations. Later on it was supposed that the Greek was original, and that it was actually Rufinus who changed the passages containing references to an age following the end of the persecutions.

Finally, around 690–692 an anonymous author wrote (in *Syriac, as Reinink has demonstrated) an *Apocalypse* under the name of Methodius, relating therein the events of his own age, esp. the spread of Islam, in the form of *predictions that were posited to have been made by the bishop of Olympus three centuries earlier. Ps.-Methodius, in reaction to the Islamic conquest initiated from the Near East, offers a panorama of the situation in the Mediterranean in the 2nd half of the 7th c.; he greatly influenced medieval Christian *eschatology. He describes the coming of the *Antichrist and his rule, along with the invasions of Gog and Magog, here presented as the descendants of Japheth imprisoned by Alexander the Great, but destined to escape and to position themselves as the leaders of their peoples and to invade the land of Israel, preparing the end of the world. Furthermore, he describes the final tribulations, even introducing new elements such as the last Roman emperor, who is a messianic figure destined to return at the apocalyptic era up to the end of the medieval period (see P. Alexander, *The Medieval Legend of the Last Roman Emperor and Its Messianic Origin*: JWI 41 [1978] 1-15). In the Syriac preface, which is not present in the Greek and Latin versions of the *Apocalypse*, it is said that the contents of this work were supposed to have been revealed to Methodius on the mountain of Senagar (Singara). By way of analogy, around the year 700, and in reaction to the beginning of the Islamic invasion, another apocalyptic work was written by a Christian of the Near East and attributed by the MS tradition to an earlier author: the *De consumatione mundi* of ps.-*Hippolytus (PG 10, 904-952), a work that greatly depends on the *De Antichristo* by *Hippolytus (see Alice Whealey, *De consummatione mundi of Pseudo-Hippolytus:* Byzantion 66 [1996] 461-469).

A.C. Lolos, *Die Apokalypse des Ps.-Methodius*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976, 46-140 (redactio 1) and 47-141 (red. 2); Id., *Die dritte und vierte Redaktion des Ps.-Methodius*, Meisenheim am Glan 1978, 22, 25-38, 40-75 (red. 3) and 23, 39-69, 76-78 (red. 4); G.J. Reinink, *Ismael, der Wildesel in der Wüste. Zur Typologie der Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius*: ByzZ 75 (1982) 336-344; Id., *Pseudo-Methodius: A Concept of History in Response to the Rise of Islam*, in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East*, I, ed. A. Cameron and L.I. Conrad, Princeton 1992, 149-187; R.G. Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish, and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam*, Princeton 1997; *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius: die ältesten griechischen und lateinischen Übersetzungen*, ed. W.J. Aerts and G.A.A. Kortekaas, Leuven and Paris 1998, CSCO

569-570 Subs. 97-98; W.E. Kaegi, *Gigthis and Olbia in the Pseudo-Methodius Apocalypse and Their Significance*: ByzF 26 (2000) 161-167; A. Külzer, *Konstantinopel in der apokalyptischen Literatur der Byzantiner*: JÖByz 50 (2000) 51-76; J.V. Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*, New York 2002; *Dizionario di letteratura cristiana antica*, Rome 2006, 608.

I. Ramelli

METRODORUS. In connection with two anonymous writers against the *quartodecimans, *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 115 and 116 [PG 103, 389ff.]) mentions a certain Metrodorus, author of a paschal *computation based on the lunar cycle of nineteen years, i.e., the metonic cycle (cycle of golden numbers), multiplied by the annual cycle of the days of the *week, namely, the cycle of twenty-eight (7 years x 4 leap years; after twenty-eight years the same annual cycle of the days of the week begins anew), such that the computation results in a paschal cycle of 532 years, beyond which with the year 533 the paschal new *moon and the *Sunday of *Easter fall on the same days of the first year of the cycle, and thus following. Metrodorus caused the cycle to begin with the inauguration of *Diocletian's reign in 284, which was commonly used in *Egypt for calculations, esp. in astronomy, and which had commenced with the beginning of a metonic cycle. According to Syncellus, this cycle was discovered by *Annianus, a *monk and *chronologist of *Alexandria who lived between the 4th and 5th c. (CPG III, 5537; see DHGE 3, 282). In fact, after 235 lunations, a metonic cycle, the paschal new moon results in about one and a half hours of difference with respect to the beginning of the preceding cycle, and therefore after 28 metonic cycles this difference surpasses 40 hours. Since this cycle was not entirely precise, one can make the conjecture that Metrodorus, probably also a man of Alexandria, lived at a time when the stated difference between the actual new moon and the one given by the computation was already detectable. Thus he would have attempted to correct the error of the church *calendar by using his own calculations; Photius claims that this computation of his had never previously been used. According to this hypothesis, Metrodorus would thus have lived between the 6th and 7th c. In the West, the paschal cycle of 532 years was introduced in 462 by *Victorius of Aquitaine (*Gennadius of Marseille, *De vir. ill.* 87 [122]: PL 58, 118, n. 88).

Th. Mommsen, MGH, *Auct. ant.* 9, Berlin 1892, 677ff.; Bardenhewer 4, 541 and 624; DCB 3, 911.

A. De Nicola

METROPOLITAN. Although not always, usually the territorial organization of the church is modeled on the civil Roman organization that was subdivided into prefectures, dioceses and provinces. These three multiplied in number during the reign of the emperor *Diocletian. The *metropolis* was the capital of the *provincia* (*eparchia*), where the governor (*praeses* or *iudex*) resided. In the course of the 3rd c., the bishop of the capital city likewise gained importance in the system of ecclesiastical organization. The *preaching of the first Christian missionaries was concentrated in the major cities that in turn were becoming centers of expansion into the surrounding territories. The apostle *Paul preached at *Ephesus; it is from Ephesus, the coastal capital of the *provincia Asiae*, that the gospel reached the inland cities. The Pauline Letters, the Revelation to St. John and the letter of *Pliny the Younger to the emperor *Trajan (*Ep.* 10,96) help us to discern the means by which Christianity spread into the surrounding territories. Canon 58 of the *Council of *Elvira already speaks of the *prima cathedra episcopatus* as an instrument of *communion. This **cathedra* could have been the metropolitan see, and in the *Spain of the time it also could have been the see of the most elderly bishop of the province. Canon 4 of the First *Council of *Nicaea signals the first instance of the term "metropolitan bishop" (*mētropolitēs episkopos*) (see ACO I,i, 3, 3; Pope *Leo I, *Ep.* 106: PL 54, 1003-1004). This constituted a rare expression, because the other expression was preferred: "the bishop of the metropolis." However, the substantive term "metropolitan" (*metropolita*) of canon 6 was becoming increasingly common. The Latin versions of the canons imitate the Greek term: *metropolitanus episcopus* (EOMIA I, 116 and 258); alternatively, they employ a paraphrase or even the substantive term *metropolitanus*. In both canons 4 and 6 of Nicaea, the figure of the metropolitan bishop emerges: in every region, the confirmation of the election of a bishop falls upon the metropolitan bishop (can. 4); "In *Egypt, in *Libya and in the *Pentapolis [Cyrenaica and *Libya] let the ancient practice be maintained by which authority over all these provinces is due to the bishop of *Alexandria," while *Rome prevailed for *Italy and the city of *Antioch prevailed for *Syria; canon 6 stipulates that the nomination of a bishop requires the consent of the metropolitan.

Canon 9 of the Council of Antioch in 341 describes the responsibilities of the metropolitan in detail: "The bishop of each province must recognize that the bishop who presides at the metropolis is charged with the care and oversight of the entire province, since all who have business to conduct

converge in the metropolis. As such it has been established that this man has the precedence of honor, and acc. to the ancient rule decreed by our fathers, the other bishops cannot do anything without him, except for what pertains to the particular district and to the surrounding countryside. . . . However, beyond all of this, one cannot do anything without the consensus of the metropolitan bishop, nor can one of the other bishops decide anything without the consensus of all the other bishops (compare cans. 11, 15, 19 and 29; see also Council of *Laodicea [363–364], can. 12). The *Canons of the Apostles* affirms that "it is necessary that the bishops of each region know who among them is *prōtos*, that they consider him as the head, and that they not do anything of importance without his consent" (can. 51). There was affirmed the principle of "territorial accommodation," namely, of the system of ecclesiastical organization modeled on its civil counterpart, by which if the juridical status of a city was changing, the change would occur to the same degree in an ecclesiastical setting (Council of *Chalcedon, can. 17; see F. Dvornik, passim). The consequence was that such a principle could extend as well to the system of metropolitan organization: if the imperial authority was dividing a region into multiple provinces, this could happen to the same degree in the system of ecclesiastical organization, even if there was an attempt on the ecclesiastical side to preserve the form of precedent.

Thus did *Basil attempt to do on the occasion of the division of *Cappadocia (*Greg. Naz., *Oratio* 22). Pope *Innocent I was exhorting the bishop of Antioch to preserve the ancient pattern of organization (*Ep.* 18). Moreover, some were plotting, through recourse to the imperial authorities, to divide a civil province in order to obtain two corresponding ecclesiastical provinces. Canon 12 of the Council of Chalcedon expressly condemns this practice, affirming that he who succeeds in doing so should be content only with the title of honor, while "it is evident that the privileges apply to the true metropolis." The council accepted that the city of Chalcedon honored herself with the title of metropolis, but without change to the metropolitan prerogatives of *Nicomedia (ACO II,i, 2, 157 [353]); yet on the other hand it rejected the creation of an ecclesiastical province of Berytus at the expense of *Tyre, acc. to the principle that there should be a single metropolitan within the boundaries of the civil province of Phoenicia Prima (Mansi 7,94). Otherwise, the fathers of the councils affirmed that the imperial regulations that ran counter to the canons lacked validity (Mansi 7,90); such a principle was immediately accepted by the emperor, who affirmed that "all the customary sanctions that run counter to the ecclesiastical canons" were invalid (CI 1,2,12).

Nevertheless, in some areas there were varying standards. Such was the case in Roman *Africa. The see of *Carthage was also the see of the metropolitan. Meanwhile the primate of *Numidia was the most senior in years since ordination, regardless of the episcopal see; this arrangement engendered disputes over seniority. Taking the place of moral and intellectual capacities, seniority diminished the influence and prestige of the primatial office. The Council of *Turin in 398 was compelled to settle some disputes among the bishops of *Gaul: one involving the bishop *Proculus of Marseille, who was interfering in the province of *Narbonensis, and another between the sees of *Arles and *Vienne (cans. 1 and 2). The disputes point to the fact that the organizing system was not well defined.

DACL 11, 786-790; Coptic Encyclopedia 5, 1611-1612; EC 8, 914-915; Niermeyer 882; H.J. Schmitz, *Die Rechte der Metropoliten und Bischöfe in Gallien vom vierten bis sechsten Jahrhundert*: Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht 72 (1894) 3-49; K. Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgange des vierten Jahrhundert: ein Beitrag zur Rechts und Verfassungsgeschichte der Kirche*, Münster 1901; C.H. Turner, *Metropolitans and Their Jurisdiction in Primitive Canon Law*, in *Studies in Early Church History*, Oxford 1912, 71-96; P. Batiffol, *La prima cathedra episcopatus du concile d'Elvire*: JTS 26 (1924) 45-48; E. Herman, *Appunti sul diritto metropolitico nella Chiesa bizantina*: OCP 13 (1947) 522-550; H. Grotz, *Die Hauptkirchen des Ostens von den Anfängen bis zum Konzil von Nikaia (325)*, OCA 169, Rome 1964; F. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*, New York 1966; C. Vogel, *Circonscriptions ecclésiastiques et ressorts administratifs civils durant la première moitié du IV[e] siècle [du concile de Nicée (325), au concile d'Antioch (341)]*, in *La géographie administrative et politique d'Alexandre à Mahomet*, Strasbourg 1979, 273-291; G. Orioli, *Gli arcivescovi maggiori: origine ed evoluzione storica fino al secolo settimo*: Apollinaris 58 (1985) 615-627; L. Örsy, *The Development of the Concept of "Protos" in the Ancient Church*: Kanon 9 (1989) 83-97; P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils*, Crestwood 1996.

A. Di Berardino

METRUM IN GENESIN (440–461). The *Metrum in Genesin* is a *rhetorical and didactic *paraphrase of the first six chapters of the biblical Genesis. The MSS transmit it under the name of Hilarius, a *Gallic *poet who is not to be confused with either *Hilary of Poitiers or *Hilary of Arles. The short *carmen*, probably unfinished in 198 hexameters, is preceded by a proem in three elegiac couplets, containing the *dedication to the *antistes Christi* (probably Pope *Leo I), the statement of the theme (the *opus Dei*), and the decisive declaration of the poet's incapability and of the subject's importance. The *carmen*

opens with words that echo the *eucharistic preface (v. 7 *dignum opus et iustum semper tibi dicere grates*), sound a tone of justification for having rendered a Christian theme in poetical verse, and actually describe the poet as a *priest. Hilarius takes a cue from *Scripture alone, and then develops a non-literal and spiritual *exegesis that culminates in the suggestive *typological allusion to Christ and baptism. In describing the *creation, the poet deftly employs the poetic *lexis* of Virgil as well as rhetorical devices, esp. the device of apostrophe, and he incorporates the influence of concepts in ancient cosmology, esp. those in the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In the final analysis, acc. to Smolak, the poet of the *carmen* follows the model of Lucretius. This would represent a sort of counterpoint to the invocation of Venus Genitrix in the first book of *De rerum natura*: the God of the OT, the father of humanity, replaces Venus, queen of the natural world and mother of the Romans.

CPL³ 1427. *Editions*: PL 50, 1287ff.; R. Peiper, CSEL 23, 1891, 231-239. *Studies*: M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1891, 188-192 (under "Hilarius von Arles"); S. Gamber, *Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au Vᵉ siècle*, Paris 1899, 17-19 (and passim); K. Smolak, *Unentdeckte Lukrezspuren*: WS 86, n.s. 7, (1973) 216-239; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975, 39; K. Smolak, *La poesia cristiana latina tra il quarto e il quinto secolo*: Salesianum 62 (2000) 19-39; M. Roberts, *Creation in Ovid's "Metamorphoses" and the Latin Poets of Late Antiquity*: Arethusa 35 (2002) 403-415.

A.V. Nazzaro

MICHAEL the ARCHANGEL. The archangel Michael, the name meaning "he who is like *God," mentioned for the first time in the book of Daniel (10:13-21; 12:1) as the defender of the people of Israel, is along with *Gabriel and Raphael one of the only *angels mentioned in the Bible. He fights against Satan for the body of *Moses (Jdt 5:9); in heaven Michael and his angels fight against the dragon (Rev 12:7). In some *apocryphal texts, including the **Ascension of Isaiah*, *Assumption of Moses* (see *Origen, *De princ.* 3,2,2) and *Enoch*, he appears as the "commander in chief." The ancient church considered him to be a defender of Christians against the *pagans and a protector against Satan, esp. at the time of death. Michael, once protector of Israel, becomes protector of the church, the head of the celestial armies, healer, a guide in the afterlife, etc. (see Saxer).

The cult of *Saint Michael surged in *Phrygia (*Asia Minor), as he was venerated as a healer. Some *sanctuaries were constructed near wells, whose waters came to be considered *miraculous. A renowned *Michaelion* was at Chairotopa near Colossae, and there were various oratories dedicated to him in Phrygia, Pisidia (*Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Ad Col.* 2,18: PG 82, 613) and *Bithynia (*Procopius , *De aedif.* 5,3). Canon 35 of the so-called Council of *Laodicea (ca. 363–364) condemns the cult of angels. At *Constantinople in the 6th c., some ten churches dedicated to St. Michael existed (Janin 28-50). To the emperor *Constantine I was attributed the foundation of one of these churches, the *Michaelion* to the N of the city at Hestiae where the angel had appeared. It was a place of miracles and of the practice of **incubatio*. *Sozomen, who speaks on this matter, was familiar with this *Michaelion* (*HE* 2,3). In *Egypt, the veneration of St. Michael resurged during the 4th c. with numerous cultic sites (*Didymus, *Trin.* 2,8: PG 39, 592) and subsequently various festivals were celebrated.

The cult of Michael also spread in the West; prior to the 9th c., he was the only angel in whose honor a feast was celebrated. The Leonine, Gregorian and Gelasian *Sacramentaries assign the feast of St. Michael to 29 September. Pope *Boniface IV (608–615) dedicated the chapel of *St. Michaelis inter nubes* on the sepulchral mound of the emperor *Hadrian; the site would later be called Castel Sant'Angelo. His cult developed esp. after the "apparitions" at the time of Pope *Gelasius I (492–496) on the Monte Sant'Angelo of the Gargano Peninsula in Puglia, if not earlier, as Otranto argues. At the end of the 5th c., churches dedicated to the archangel arose at Larino and Potenza. As early as the 6th c., a sanctuary was constructed on the spot of a pagan cult. With the victory of the *Longobards (Lombards) over the *Byzantines at Siponto in 650, his cult spread further, and Monte Sant'Angelo became one of the most famous of all *pilgrimage sites, esp. for the two important feasts of 8 May (the apparition and the victory of the Longobards) and of 29 September (*dedication of the church). The basilica of S. Michele Arcangelo was constructed at *Rome on the Via Salaria. In the early years of the 6th c., sanctuaries were built in *Gaul: in 506 at *Lyons, in 512 at *Arles, around 550 at Limoges, among others. In the 8th c., the cult developed at Mont-Saint-Michel in Normandy and exhibited a dependency on the cult in Puglia.

AASS, Sept. 8, 1972, 4-123; BS 9, 410-446; LTK³ 7, 227-232; R. Janin, *Les sanctuaires byzantins de saint Michel*: Echos d'Orient (1954) 28-50; J.P. Rohland, *Der Erzengel Michael, Artz und Feldherr: zwei Aspekte des vor- und frühbyzantinischen Michaelskultes,* Leiden 1977; J. Lemarié, *Textes liturgiques concernat le culte de Saint Michel*: SE 14 (1963) 277-283; ed. C. Carletti and G. Otranto, *Il santuario di S. Michele sul Gargano dal VI al IX secolo: contributo alla storia della Langobardia meridionale*, Bari 1980; A. Troiano, *L'arcangelo guerriero: San Michele e il*

"*culto speciale" del papa e della Chiesa*, Foggia Edizioni "Michael," n.p.. 1989; C. Carletti - G. Otranto, eds., *Culto e insediamenti micaelici nell'Italia meridionale fra tarda antichità e medioevo*, Bari 1994; V. Saxer, *Jalons pour servir à l'histoire du culte de l'archange saint Michel en Orient jusqu'à l'iconoclasme*, in *Noscere sancta: miscellanea in memoria di Agostino Amore OFM*, Rome 1995, 357-426; P. Bouet - G. Otranto - A. Vauchez, eds., *Culte et pèlerinages à Saint Michel en Occident: les trois monts dédiés à l'archange*, Rome 2003.

A. Di Berardino

MICHAEL the ARCHANGEL (iconography). Together with *Gabriel and Raphael, Michael is one of the *angels specifically mentioned in Holy *Scripture. In *Daniel he is remembered as "one of the chief princes" (10:13) and in *Revelation as the archangel that struggles against the *demon and as he who plays a preeminent role in the angelic hierarchy (12:7-8).

Going back to the earliest examples of visual representation, Michael reflects the individual traits that were attributed to him by Holy Scripture. In the *mosaic of the presbytery in the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna (6th c.), he is represented as the guardian of the church, together with Gabriel. With a young and winged appearance, he wears the military costume of high rank, the chlamys, and with his right hand holds the spear of the thrice-written ΑΓΙΟϹ. Contemporaneous with the mosaic of Ravenna is a *diptych in the British Museum (W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters,* Mainz [3]1976, n. 109, pl. 159), in which Michael is represented with a *cross-bearing orb and a long *baculus*, attributes that identify him as a divine messenger and a guide for the *souls of the departed. According to G. de Jerphanion, the type of Michael trampling the dragon would have been distinguished by the *Coptic artistic production, yet it did not appear before the 9th c., at least in the West. One of the most ancient witnesses seems to be provided by a small ivory table in the Kunstgewerbemuseum of Leipzig (Volbach, no. 222, pl. 103), in which Michael, wearing military costume and standing, is in the act of crushing the dragon. Yet the most famous witness of this *iconographic type is the bronze door of the *sanctuary of Monte Sant'Angelo in Gargano (1076). In one of the panels decorated in niello, the archangel clothed in imperial vestments crushes the demon prostrated at his feet. Throughout the medieval era, this iconography was widely disseminated, joined to the iconography that represents Michael as the weigher of souls.

DACL 11/1, 903-907; LCI 3, 255-265; M. de Fraipont, *Les origines occidentales du type de Saint Michel debout sur le dragon*: Revue belge d'Histoire de l'Art et d'Archéologie 7 (1937) 289-301; G. de Jerphanion, *L'origine copte du type saint Michel debout sur le dragon*: CRAI (1938) 367-381; P.E. Schramm, *Sphaira – Globus – Reichsapfel*, in *Mélanges en honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu*, Strasbourg 1956, 429 (attributes of St. Michael); C. Lamy-Lassalle, *Les archanges en costume impérial dans la peinture murale italienne*, in *Synthronon*, Paris 1968, 189-198; O.F.A. Meinardus, *Der Erzengel Michael als Psychopompos*: OC 62 (1978) 166-168; G. Bertelli, *La porta del Santuario di S. Michele a Monte Sant'Angelo: aspetti e problemi*, in S. Salomi (ed.), *Le porte di bronzo dall'antichità al secolo XIII*, Rome 1990, I, 293-305; P. Belli D'Elia, *L'iconografia di san Michele o dell'arcangelo Michele*, in M. Bussagli and M. D'Onofrio (ed.), *Le ali di Dio. Messaggeri e Guerrieri alati fra Oriente e Occidente*, Cinisello Balsamo 2000, 123-125; R. Giuliani, under "Angelo," in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 106-109.

C. Carletti

MICHAEL BADOQA, the researcher (6th c.). An *exegete and teacher in the Church of the East, Michael Badoqa (or Michael Malpana) studied at the school of *Nisibis; he probably departed in 596, when 300 professors and students abandoned the school in protest against the teaching of its headmaster, *Henana of Adiabene. He was an esteemed exegete and the author of *Questions Regarding the Text of the Bible*, a work that filled three volumes and that would come to be cited by the later hermeneutical tradition, including the great *Syriac-Arabic dictionary of Bar Bahlul (10th c.), the *Book of the Bee* by Solomon of Basra (13th c.) and the *Garden of Delights* (*Gannat Bussame*; 13th c.). Four christological **tractati* of Michael have been preserved, published in the critical edition of L. Abramowski and A.E. Goodman: one titled *On Mary the Theotokos* (IIIa), one against *Cyril of Alexandria (IIIb), one against the Severians (*Severus of Antioch—IIIc) and one against the Julianists (*Julian of Halicarnassus—IIId). The MS tradition further attributes to him a writing on *dreams, a *tractatus* on humanity as a microcosm and a polemical work against Western Syriac theology.

Baumstark, 129; BBKL 16, 1066; BO III/1, 147; A. Baumstark, *De causis festorum*: OC 1 (1901) 333-334; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 226), Louvain 1965, esp. 104, 278-279 and 309; L. Abramowski - A.E. Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts, Cambridge University Library Ms. Oriental 1319*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1972.

K. den Biesen

MIDDLE PLATONISM. This term designates the current of Platonic thought dominant in the first two centuries of the imperial age and destined to bear fruit in the 3rd c. in *Neoplatonism. It has two chief characteristics: a strong religious aspect, per-

fectly in harmony with its age, and cultural *syncretism. Plato—often associated with Pythagoras—is considered its greatest theologian, he who more than any other managed to penetrate into the esoteric knowledge of an absolutely transcendent divinity, far from the sensible world, most difficult to know and ineffable; he knew how to create a type of absolute philosophy. Middle Platonism is an exposition and interpretation of this "absolute philosophy," thus anticipating the primary intention of Neoplatonism. Notwithstanding the often vehement polemics with regard to *Aristotle and the *Stoics, not to mention Epicurus (e.g., Plutarch and *Atticus), such a type of "expository exegesis" did not systematically rule out Pythagorean, peripatetic and *Stoic teachings; rather, it closely combined them with more genuinely Platonic teachings of the ancient Academy. Thus, in Middle Platonism as well, there continued the eclectic tendency, which was already present in the Stoic Posidonius (2nd c. BC) and "in the academic" Antiochus of Ascalon (1st c. BC) and characteristic of Neoplatonism as well. In the case of Plutarch of Chaeronea, his syncretism is not only philosophical but also religious: in its theological-metaphysical conceptions one can observe Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic elements, as well as elements taken from Egyptian religion, the religion of Zoroaster and from Greek mythology. Thus the highest god is identical with the Good in *Rep*. VI 509b; with the One of the second hypostasis in *Parmenides*; with the absolute immutable being formed from the ideas; with the beautiful, the intelligence, the demiurge, the good **anima mundi* ("world soul") in the tenth book of the *Laws*, and is influenced by Platonic-Aristotelian conceptions: its identification with the intelligible par excellence and the attributes "principle," "free of mixture," "first," "ungenerated," "incorrupt," "pure," "simple," "free of passions." At the same time, however, this god is identical with the Egyptian god Osiris and the good principle of Zoroaster. The *logos*, as this term is used by the Stoics, is the sum of the *logoi*, the rational and spermatic principles which, combining with matter, generate sensible objects. The *logos* is the law and harmony of the universe. The doctrine of primordial matter—identified with the "receptacle" of Plato's *Timaeus* and with the Egyptian goddess Isis, and defined as privation of forms and qualities—is identical with that found in Aristotle, in Stoicism and in Antiochus of Ascalon. The conception of the sensible universe, identified with Horus, the son of Isis and Osiris, and dominated by the rational soul or *logos*, reproduces that of the *Timaeus* and of the Stoics. Finally, the principle of evil is identified on the one hand with the evil principle of Zoroaster, with Set and with Typhon, and on the other hand with the "indeterminate dyad" of the Pythagoreans and the evil *anima mundi* of the tenth book of Plato's *Laws*.

Apart from Plutarch of Chaeronea, one of its most significant exponents, Middle Platonism includes figures such as the orator Maximus of Tyre, *Celsus, the great antagonist of Christianity against whom *Origen thought it necessary to write one of his major works, Eudorus of Alexandria, Nicostratus, Atticus, Calvisius Taurus, Apuleius and Alcinous (J. Whittaker demonstrated, in Phoenix 28 [1974] 450-456 = *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, XXI, that Alcinous, and not Albinus, is the correct name of the author of the *Didaskalikos*—an exposition of Platonic philosophy—edited by C.F. Hermann in the 6th volume of the Teubner edition of Plato, Leipzig 1884, 152-189, and more recently by J. Whittaker, *Alcinoos*, Paris 1990). Connected with this is the source for the 3rd book of Diogenes Laertius, which also contains an exposition of Platonic philosophy, and the source used by *Hippolytus in his exposition of Platonic teachings (*Refutatio* I, 19: GCS pp.19-23). *Philo of Alexandria, too, can be said to belong to this type of philosophy (*see* *Hellenistic Judaism).

It is not possible here to give a detailed exposition of the thought of the individual exponents of Middle Platonism. (The most complete introductory bibl. for all the "Middle Platonic" philosophers and their teachings is still that of K. Praechter, in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, Berlin 1926, 524-556.) Nevertheless, a comparative study of the various authors permits a general account of the basic positions of this eclectic Platonism. The first principle, generally presented as intelligence (νοῦς/*nous), is described in concepts and terms taken both from Platonic dialogues (esp. the *Symposium*, the *Phaedrus* and the *Timaeus*) and from Aristotle. The transcendence of this principle is emphasized with respect to other beings; the absence in it of form, color and size, as well as its ineffability; attributes are applied to it such as "ungenerated," "incorruptible," "immutable," "pure," "first," "principle," "exempt from mixture," "exempt from passion" (see above, regarding Plutarch). These philosophers consider a negative procedure, which consists in taking away any possible name, the most appropriate in approaching this principle. Conceived as a νοῦς in conformity with what is stated in the *Timaeus*, in the *Philebus* and in book (Λ) of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, this "first god" (on the "Middle Platonic" origin of this expression,

see *Platonism and the Fathers, with regard to Origen) contains in itself the Platonic ideas, which are presented as its thoughts, just as they were presented by the exponents of the ancient Academy and Antiochus of Ascalon.

There are, however, some cases—Celsus is typical—in which, under the influence of *Rep*. VI 509b and of Aristotle, Περί εὐχῆς (fr. 46 Rose) he is placed above ουσία and intelligence, a teaching which will become foundational for *Neoplatonism, from Plotinus on (see Whittaker, Ἐπέκεινα νοῦ και οὐσίας: VChr 23 [1969] 91-104). Under the "first god" and the "ideas" are the *anima mundi*—which Plato speaks of in the *Timaeus*, in the *Philebus* and in the 10th book of the *Laws*—governor of the sensible universe and endowed with intelligence; the Stoic *logos*, conceived as a divine power emanating from the first principle and containing in itself the Platonic ideas, by now identified with the Stoic *logoi* and destined to be united to matter. Since this is the supreme law of the universe, the force that holds it together and makes of it a harmonious whole is practically identical with the *anima mundi*, as is the case for Plutarch and Atticus. Moreover, the ungenerated primordial matter—this is the true meaning of the receptacle (ὑποδοχή) of Plato's *Timaeus*—is considered to be deprived originally of all forms and qualities and destined to receive in itself the marks impressed upon it by the ideas or *logoi*, which function as a seal. (This is how the various elements and qualities, and the sensible universe itself, take their origin.) The two following observations arise spontaneously with regard to this metaphysical system: (1) The Platonic ideas, while retaining their transcendence and immutability and their function as "models," are no longer static archetypes. They are identified on the one hand with the thoughts of God; and on the other—as in the case of Plutarch, Philo and Atticus—together with the divine δύναμις and the Stoic λόγοι, they assume a preeminently dynamic function in the production of the universe, analogously to what had already occurred in Antiochus of Ascalon. (2) With the one exception of Eudorus, the idea of *creatio ex nihilo* is absolutely foreign to this type of philosophy. It appears in only a few neo-Pythagorean circles (*see* *Platonism and the Fathers with regard to Epiphanius), in *Ammonius Saccas, and in the patristic authors from *Clement of Alexandria and Origen on. Unformed and ungenerated matter is one of the three fundamental principles (ἀρχαί), the others being God and the ideas. According to the interpretation of the *Timaeus* given by Plutarch and Atticus, only the sensible world can be said to be "generated," as a result of the imposition of the forms and of order on primordial matter (but other authors such as Taurus, Celsus, Alcinous and Apuleius, just as Aristotle and the ancient Academy, consider even the universe to be "eternal").

Humans must on the one hand moderate with reason—the charioteer of the *Phaedrus*—the passions which arise in the irrational parts of the soul, and which are often, as *Posidonius and *Galen taught, strictly dependent on the dispositions of the body (here again the ideal of μετριοπάθεια, formulated by the middle Stoicism of Panaetius and Posidonius, and combined, as for Plutarch, Alcinous and Philo, with the Aristotelian doctrine of virtue as μεσότης). Virtue itself is considered, acc. to Platonic teaching, "the harmony of the soul," and, in accordance with Plato and the Stoics, it is self-sufficient in the possession of happiness. On the other hand, humans must attain to θεωρία, or contemplation, which consists in the possession of wisdom or σοφία, defined in Stoic terms as "knowledge of things divine and human." Only in this way can they reach the supreme ideal indicated by Plato (*Theaetetus* 176b) as ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν—"likeness to God as much as possible," which is often combined with the Pythagorean ἕπου θεῷ—"follow God" (see C. Andresen: ZNTW 44 [1952–1953] 163). It was this type of philosophy which exercised a decisive influence on the apologists of the 2nd c. AD (*Athenagoras, *Justin Martyr, the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*), on *Clement and on Origen himself. The judgments on the various philosophical schools, the admiration for Plato and Pythagoras, the characteristic elements of the teaching concerning the transcendence of God, the teaching concerning the ideas as thoughts of God contained in his intelligence and in his *logos*, the view of the origin of the universe as coming from the imposition of the forms and of order upon ungenerated matter, unformed and deprived of all qualities and unordered by the *logos*, the teaching on the origin of the passions and of the control of them as well as the teaching on virtue, can be found in all these patristic authors (even if Clement refuses to see in matter a true and proper "principle," and Origen rejects the classical Middle Platonic conception of uncreated matter). Concerning all these points, *see* *Platonism and the Fathers.

On the influence of Middle Platonism on patristic authors of the 2nd–3rd c.: H. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus*, Berlin-Leipzig 1932; C. Andresen, *Justin und der mittlere Platonismus*: ZNTW 44 (1952–1953) 157-195; J. Daniélou, *Méssage évangelique et culture hellénistique*, Tournai 1961 (It. tr. Bologna 1976); A. Wlosok, *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis*, Heidelberg 1960; J. Whittaker, Ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας: VChr 23 (1969) 91-104 =

Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought, London 1984, XXI; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971. On Middle Platonism in general see K. Praechter, in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, *Die Philosophie des Altertums*, Berlin 1926, 524-556; A.M.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, IV, Paris 1954, 92-140; Ph. Merlan, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 53-83; J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, London 1977, ²1996; M.O. Young, *Justin, Socrates, and the Middle-Platonists*: SP 18 (1989) 2, 161-166; Alcinoos, *Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*, intr., text established and comm. by J. Whittaker, et traduit par P. Louis, Paris 1990; S. Lilla, *Introduzione al medio platonismo*, Rome 1992 (with ample bibl.); F. Romano, *Il neoplatonismo*, Rome 1998; J.P. Kenney, *Ancient Apophatic Theology*, in *Gnosticism and Later Platonism*, ed. J.D. Turner - R. Majercik, Atlanta 2000, 259-276; var. aus., *Arrhetos Theos. L'ineffabilità del primo principio nel Medioplatonismo*, ed. F. Calabi, Pisa 2002; G. Reale, *Storia della filosofia greca e romana*, 7: *Rinascita del platonismo e del pitagorismo, Corpus Hermeticum e Oracoli Caldaici*, Milan 2004.

S. Lilla

MID-PENTECOST. From the 5th to the 7th c. there existed a feast on the Wednesday of the fourth week of *Easter, thus marking the middle of the fifty days after Easter. It was celebrated in *Milan and in *Aquileia, where it most probably had its origin. It was also celebrated in *Constantinople, *Jerusalem, *Antioch, *Cyprus, *Crete and perhaps also in *Spain, attested by the *homilies of *Peter Chrysologus, *Leontius of Constantinople, *Severus of Antioch, *Leontius of Neapolis (Cyprus), ps.-*Amphilochius of Iconium and ps.-*John Chrysostom, as well as from various *sacramentaries, lectionaries, *homiliaries, missals, pentecostaries and *itineraries. The *gospel of the day was Jn 7:14-31, which begins, "About the middle of the feast Jesus went up into the temple and taught," chosen perhaps precisely because of the beginning words *iam autem die festo mediante*. The feast therefore presents *Christ as the Messiah (mediator), teaching to the Jews the gospel as the new law. Apart from this text the homilies often concerned the healings of the paralytic (Jn 5:1-18) and of the man born blind (Jn 9:1-41) on the *sabbath and polemicized against the incredulity of the Jews. Mid-Pentecost survived only in the *Eastern *Greek, Slavic, Romanian and *Arab churches. The limited spread of the feast, topographically as much as chronologically, is probably explained by the fact that it could not form part of the general line of development of the paschal cycle—i.e., to explain the various steps of the historical *mystery of salvation acc. to their historic order—and did not have theological content specifically adapted to the paschal season.

G. Morin, *L'antique solennité du* Mediante die festo *au XXV^e jour après Pâques:* RBen 6 (1889) 199-202; N. Nilles, *Mitte-Pfingsten:* ZKTh 19 (1895) 169-177; C.L. Feltoe, *Adversaria liturgica: B. In mediante die festo:* JTS 2 (1901) 130-137; H. Leclercq, *Mediante die festo:* DACL 11/1 (1933) 188-193; P. Borella, *La solennità "In mediante die festo"*: Ambrosius 19 (1943) 61-66; H.R. Drobner, *Die Festpredigten der Mesopentecoste in der Alten Kirche:* Augustinianum 33 (1993) 137-170; Id., *Wurzeln und Verbreitung des Mesopentecoste-Festes in der Alten Kirche:* RivAC 70 (1994) 203-245.

H.R. Drobner

MILAN

I. Christian and archaeological origins - II. Councils.

I. Christian and archaeological origins. The medieval tradition recounts that St. Barnabas the *apostle preached the *gospel in Milan (it specifies his *baptismal font in a fountain near the church of St. *Eustorgius) and consecrated the first bishop, St. Anathalon. It also recounts that a Valerius Philippus donated to the second bishop *Caius a *hortus* to build a cemetery and a house near the Via di Vercelli, where the third bishop, Castricianus, built the first *domus ecclesiae* in the time of *Gallienus or of *Aurelian. This information is not without historical value, esp. if the first martyrs whom St. *Ambrose praised date back to *Diocletian's persecutions (303–304): Victor, *Nabor and Felix, Mauretanian soldiers killed at Lodi whose bodies Maternus (seventh bishop) buried in Milan right along the road to Vercelli. And here St. Ambrose built his first basilica, consecrating it in 386 with the bodies of two other martyrs, *Gervasius and Protasius. Meanwhile on the road to Rome the basilica of the Apostles was also built, where the relics of St. *Nazarius were laid around ten years later. After the battle of *Constantine and *Licinius, the celebrated imperial rescript was issued in Milan, which is called the Edict of Constantine or the *Edict of Milan. This extended freedom of religion to Christians. In the *council that gathered in *Rome in the same year, and in that of *Arles in 314, Mirocles the seventh bishop of Milan was present. He must have been responsible for the first cathedral (S. Maria, which St. Ambrose called *basilica vetus*) and the first baptistery, built near the ancient walls and now under the Duomo. They were followed in the middle of the 4th c. by the great basilica of five aisles (*basilica nova*), dedicated to the Savior and then to St. *Thecla, built perhaps by the bishops *Eustorgius and *Dionysius.

St. Ambrose, the bishop who followed *Auxentius's twenty-year *Arian episcopate, added the baptistery to this basilica, building it octagonally like

the full-immersion baptismal font. He himself had to fill in the history of the Milanese church (as well as that of other churches) with his apostolic, political and diplomatic action. Also he was responsible for much construction: four suburban basilicas must be attributed to the energetic episcopal action of the saintly bishop, in addition to the baptistery. The first is the kind we see in the *cemetery *ad martyres* (later called St. Ambrose), tripartite with 26 columns (the oldest nearby chapel of St. Victor preserves mosaics from the 5th c., where the only sure picture of St. Ambrose resides). Contemporary with that is the basilica of the Apostles (later St. Nazarius), in an open cross plan on the Via di Roma (first of its type in the Po Valley; it preserved in relics a famous *capsella* decorated in silver with scenes from the OT and NT, now in the treasury of the Duomo). Next followed that of St. Dionysius on the Via di Bergamo, a hall with two sepulchral niches on the sides; and finally that of the Virgins (later St. Simplicianus) in the plan of a cross, ample and with encircling portico, on the Via di Como and the Via di *Rhaetia. Around these basilicas, ample cemetery spaces have provided many sepulchral inscriptions (while those monuments are noted by the Silloge of Lorsch). Other tombs and inscriptions (and the *sarcophagus of *Cervia Abundantia*) came from the cemetery near the tomb of St. Victor in the enclosure of *Maximian. The basilica of St. *Lawrence on the Via di Ticinum (Pavia) exhibits a central plan and must have been considered a palatine basilica, erected perhaps by the will of *Theodosius along with his family mausoleum (it includes distinguished wall mosaics attributed to the end of the 4th c. and beginning of the 5th c.): it is the most sumptuous and symmetrical basilica in the Christian West. There is one large *sarcophagus of high quality in Milan—that with *Christ between the ranks of the apostles on a background at the doors of the city in the basilica of St. Ambrose (end of the 4th c.). There are important Christians ivories: one depicts the risen Christ. The memorable painted tombs are traceable to the 5th c.

*Augustine, the greatest spiritual conquest of Ambrose, resided in Milan, and in 400 *Rufinus of Aquileia, the translator of *Origen, was also present for a debate on *Origenism with *Eusebius of Cremona: Milan was the capital of the Western empire and was a center of culture. But the invasion of *Alaric, defeated at Pollentia by *Stilicho, persuaded *Honorius to move the capital to *Ravenna, while the successive invasions (*Attila) pushed the bishop of Milan to take shelter in Liguria. Thus Milan lost that prestige that it enjoyed for more than a century and that the active Martinianus, elected in 423, and Eusebius, who gathered the council there in which the condemnation of *Eutyches was confirmed, had nobly sought to preserve.

DACL 2, 983-1102; EC 8, 987-995; EAA 5, 1-6; F. Reggiori, *La basilica ambrosiana. Ricerche e restauri 1929–1940,* Milan 1941; A. Calderini, *Le basiliche dell'eta ambrosiana in Milano:* Ambrosiana (1942) 137-164; A. Frova, *Pitture di tomba paleocristiana a Milano:* Boll. d'Arte 36 (1951); A. Levi, *L'architettura paleocristiana a Milano.* Actes VIe Congres Et. Byzantines, Paris 1951, 67ff.; A. De Capitani d'Arzago, *La chiesa maggiore di Milano, Santa Tecla,* Milan 1952; E. Villa, *La basilica ambrosiana degli apostoli:* Ambrosius 39 (1963) suppl. n. 2; M. Cagiano de Azevedo, *Sant'Ambrogio committente d'arte:* Arte Lombarda 8 (1963) 55-76; G. Traversi, *Architettura paleocristiana milanese,* Milan 1964; M. Mirabella Roberti, *La basilica di San Simpliciano:* Arte Lombarda 12 (1967) 155-158; Id., *Topografia e architettura anteriori al Duomo di Milano.* Atti Congr. intern. sul Duomo di Milano, I, Milan 1969, 31-41; A. Palestra, *I cimiteri paleocristiani milanesi:* Archivio Ambrosiano 28 (1975) 23-47; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Milano romana,* Milan 1984; var. aus., *Milano capitale dell'impero romano 286–402 d.C.,* Milan 1990; G. Fedalto, *Rufino di Concordia tra Oriente e Occidente,* Rome 1990, 140-143; var. aus., *Felix temporum reparatio.* Atti del Conv. archeol. int. "Milano capitale dell'impero romano," ed. G. Sena Chiesa - E. Arslan, Milan 1992; G. Cuscito, *L'area cemeteriale di S. Lorenzo Maggiore. Per il corpus delle iscrizioni paleocristiane di Milano:* Epigraphica LV (1993) 75-102; Id., *Il recinto di S. Vittore al Corpo fuori Porta Vercellina. Per il corpus delle iscrizioni paleocristiane di Milano:* Archivio Storico Lombardo 119 (1993) 407-441; Id., *Il cimitero presso S. Celso. Per il corpus delle iscrizioni paleocristiane di Milano,* in *Historiam pictura refert,* Vatican City 1994, 175-195; Id., *Il cimitero milanese a S. Eustorgio: revisione del materiale epigrafico paleocristiano. Per il corpus delle I.C.I. su Mediolanum:* Rivista Archeologica dell'Antica Provincia e Diocesi di Como 176 (1995) 123-169; Id., *Materiali epigrafici paleocristiani dal cimitero a S. Simpliciano. Prolegomena ad ICI—Mediolanum,* in *XLII Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina,* Ravenna 1995, 255-274; var. aus., *La citta e la sua memoria. Milano e la tradizione di sant'Ambrogio,* Milan 1997; PCBE 2, 1925-1940.

M. Mirabella Roberti

II. *Councils. *345.* Four Eastern bishops (*Demophilus, *Eudoxius, *Macedonius and Martyrius) gathered in Milan to present a formula of faith (the **Ekthesis makrostichos*) to the emperor *Constantine and to other bishops gathered there. It was a formula accompanied by eight articles, which offered explanations and in which *Marcellus of *Ancyra, *Paul of Samosata and *Photinus bishop of *Sirmium were condemned. The synod met in the *basilica Vetus* in the presence of the emperor. The Western bishops accepted Photinus's condemnation. Nevertheless, the Eastern bishops, not wanting to accede to the request of their Western counterparts to condemn *Arianism, abandoned the meeting.

347 (or 349). Another council, perhaps gathered in Milan, renewed the condemnation of Photinus and received a note from *Ursacius of Singidunum

and of *Valens of Mursa, who requested the *communio*; thus they wrote a letter to Pope *Julius.

355. Council ordered by Pope *Liberius, after that of *Arles in 353, favorable to Arianism; many Western and a few Eastern bishops were present, as well as the pro-Arian emperor *Constantius; for this reason *Eusebius of Vercelli did not want to participate, not having faith that there would be a good outcome against Arianism. In fact, the council requested the condemnation of *Athanasius. Popular uprisings having broken out, however, the meetings were moved from the church to the imperial palace: the condemnation of Athanasius was signed by all, except Eusebius of Vercelli, *Lucifer of Cagliari and Dionysius of Milan, who were exiled, while the Arian *Auxentius was elected to the position of the latter.

380. Council celebrated under the presidency of *Ambrose to examine the charges aimed at the *virgin Indicia for having violated her commitment to *chastity. They recognized her innocence in the end.

386. In this year *Valentinian II issued a law to favor the followers of the Council of *Rimini, but in reality to oppose Ambrose. These gathered a small assembly of bishops to be sure of their support base as a moral force to oppose the emperor.

390. In *Gaul there was strong dissent between those in favor of *Felix the new bishop of Trier and the anti-Felicians (*Martin of Tours, *Proculus of Marseille and, it seems, *Simplicius of Vienne). These requested the peaceful intervention of Ambrose, who convened a council in Milan. The council failed miserably. From then on Ambrose did not want to become involved in Gallic councils (see *De obitu Valentiniani* 25).

393. Council gathered to condemn *Jovinian—already condemned in Rome in 390—who refuted the value of *ascesis and virginity, to which he was opposed. The council sent a letter to Pope *Siricius: Ambrose may have been the author. Furthermore, the question of *Bonosus was also addressed on which no returning judgment was issued, referring to what was established at the Council of *Capua in 392, where Ambrose had been present and where he had deferred the case to the bishops of *Macedonia and *Thessalonica. The Council of Capua was another unfortunate attempt to resolve the thorny question of the *schism of *Antioch after the deaths of *Meletius (d. 381) and of *Paulinus (d. 388), even though numerous Western bishops had participated.

451. Provincial assembly of 16 bishops from N Italy to gain knowledge of the results of the ecumenical Council of *Chalcedon of 451: a letter from Pope *Leo was read along with his **Tomus ad Flavianum*; the condemnation of the Eutychian doctrines was renewed. In the synodal letter to Pope Leo there were no names of the bishops of *Aquileia and Ravenna.

679. *Mansuetus, archbishop of Milan, who had the position until the exile in Genoa of the Milanese church, gathered a council of his clergy and their suffragans, to respond to the invitation of the emperor of the East, Constantine IV, in preparation for the 3rd ecumenical Council of *Constantinople (681–682), to examine the *monothelite doctrine. On the occasion, *Damian, not yet bishop of Pavia, drafted a letter in Greek directed to Emperor Constantine IV. Now for the first time since the schism of the *Three Chapters, the suffragan bishops met again around the metropolitan.

345: Palazzini 3, 102; Fliche-Martin III, 166-168; Simonetti 189ff. *347*: Palazzini 3, 103; Hfl-Lecl 1, 348-350; Simonetti 201, 202 note 108 (for the problem between Milan and Sirmium). *355*: Palazzini 3, 103-104.; CPL 109; Hfl-Lecl 1, 872-877; Simonetti 218-221, 381; G. Corti, *Lucifero di Cagliari,* Milan 2004, 63-85. *380*: Ambrose, *Ep.* 5: PL 16, 930-937; F. Martroye, *L'affaire Indicia. Une sentence de saint Ambroise,* in *Mélanges P. Fournier,* Paris 1929, 503-510; V. Busek, *Der Prozess der Indicia*: ZRG (Kan. Abt.) 29 (1940) 447-461. *386*: Ambrose, *Ep.* 21; J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain,* Paris 1929, 148; F.H. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose,* Oxford 1955, 283. *390*: Ambrose, *Ep.* 51; Fliche-Martin III, 495; Palanque, op. cit., 231. *393*: Palanque, op. cit., 261-262, 545-546; Dudden, op. cit., 393-402. *451*: Mansi 6, 527-528; Leo the Great, *Ep.* 97; Palazzini 3, 105-106: Hfl-Lecl 2, 628. *679*: CPL 1170-1171. PL 87, 1261-1265 (Mansi 11, 203-208); *Expositio fidei*: PL 87, 1265-1267 (PL 13, 651-655); G.P. Bognetti, *Storia di Milano,* II, Milan 1954, 190-193; DBI 32, 343-345.

A. Di Berardino

MILITIA. Military terms and comparisons find their *Sitz im Leben* not in the Judeo-biblical literature but in the Greco-Roman world. St. *Paul loved military images: the panoply (Eph 6:11,13), the sense of service, mobilization. He defines the Christian as a soldier of Christ (2 Tim 2:3). It follows that Christianity is a militia. If the term itself is not used, on the other hand, the comparison is found already in the 1st and 2nd c. (*1 Clem.* 37; Ign., *Ad Polyc.* 6,2; *Ad Smyrn.* 1; *Mart. Pol.* 2,4).

Son of a centurion, *Tertullian not only used military images but also availed himself of military terms and *miles* to characterize the Christian condition. Thus also *sacramentum* and *statio*. He spoke at times of *militia*, of *militia Christiana*, of *militia Christe* and *Dei*. The image expresses the conflict for the faith against the adverse forces of the *flesh and *demons (*De orat.* 29,3), with the help of spiritual arms. The image of *militia* reached its highest point in the 3rd c. (Mohrmann). In the *funerary scenes on *sarcophagi the soldiers that took their oath on

the book that held the apostolic corpus symbolized the faithful of the celestial emperor (Pietri), suggesting the image of the *militia Christi*.

After the Constantinian peace the term *militia* was used in *monastic and *ascetic environments. The ascetic struggles using the arms of *prayer and penitence (Orig., *Iud. Hom.* 7,2). The image became a cliché in monastic literature of the struggle of the monk against Satan, against the *world and against his own personal tendencies (*Vita Antonii*; Serap., *Ad monach.* 11; Aug., *De op. monachorum*, 22, 26; Cass., *Instr.* 5,18,2). In *Vita Hilarii*, *militia* is a technical term for the monastic life (3,11; 4,14; 26,6). In the **Rule* of St. *Benedict the word designates service in obedience to Christ the King (prol.).

The Greek term στρατεία occurs less frequently and indicates *baptism in *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Procatech.* 1) and the service of the martyr in *Chrysippus of Jerusalem (*Enc. In Theod.*: AASS, *nov.* 4,56). The noun recurs often to characterize the Christian who serves in the army of God, above all starting with the 4th c. (*Act. Pauli* 4; 6; Isid. Pel., *Ep.* 3), or in the army of Christ (Clem. Alex., *Prot.* 11; Eus., *HE* 8, 4,3; John Chrys., *In 2 Tim. Hom.* 4,1,11). It is moreover synonymous with being a monk (John Chrys., *In Matth. Hom.* 59,3).

TWNT 7,701-703 (cf. TDNT 7, 701-713, esp. 710-713); Lampe 1263; DSp 10,1210-1223 (bibl.); A. Harnack, *Militia Christi*, Berlin 1905 (fundamental study) (Eng. tr.: Militia Christi*: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries*, tr. and introd. G.D. McInnes, Philadelphia 1981); C. Pietri, *Le serment du soldat chrétien. Les épisodes de la* militia Christi *sur les sarcophages:* MEFRA 74 (1962) 649-664; Ch. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens,* III, Rome 1965, 279-289; A. Zumkeller, *Biblische und altchristliche Leitbilder des klösterlichen Lebens im Schrifttum des heiligen Augustinus:* Augustiniana 17 (1968) 5-21; G. Luongo, *Desertor Christi miles:* Koinonia 2 (1978) 71-91; C. Corbellino, *Il problema della "militia" in Sant'Ambrogio:* Historia 27 (1978) 630-636; V. Buchheit, *"Militia Christi" und Triumph des Märtyrers (Ambr. hymn. 10 Bulst-Prud. per. II 1-20),* in *Kontinuität und Wandel. Franco Munari zum 65. Geburtstag,* Hildesheim 1986, 273-289; A. Benoît, *"Militia Christi": remarques sur les images militaires utilisées dans le christianisme ancient:* Ktema 19 (1994) 299-307; S. Pricoco, Militia Christi *nelle regole monastiche latine,* in *Paideia cristiana: studi in onore di Mario Naldini,* Rome 1994, 547-558; J. Fernández Ubiña, *Cristianos y militares. La Iglesia antigua ante el ejército y la guerra,* Granada 2000.

A. Hamman

MILK and HONEY. The expression "land flowing with milk and honey" in the OT indicates the Promised Land (e.g., Ex 3:8, 17; 13:5; 33:3; Lev 20:24). Honey was used in the rituals of the Egyptian temples of the Greco-Roman era, as can be inferred from the scenes and texts inscribed on the walls of the temples of Edfu and Dendera. Some mystery cults used a mixture of milk and honey as a drink. For the sect of the Naassenes (*see* *Ophites - Naassenes), milk and honey indicate the mysteries tasted by those who are perfect (*Philosophumena* 5,8). The symbolism of drinking milk and honey takes on different meanings: first of all, that of the fulfillment of the messianic promises, which are approached via *baptism; this is an eschatological interpretation (the entry into the promised land takes place sacramentally). From this derives the meaning of new birth in baptism, a christological interpretation, acc. to various authors and contexts, or it may simply indicate the Eucharist, in the sense that this is expressed with the symbol of milk.

The oldest Christian writers likened the intake of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist to the nursing of a baby at the mother's breast. The *Epistle of Barnabas* (6,8-19) explains allegorically the milk and honey and the newly baptized drink from a cup containing honey and milk, the food of the newborn, which indicates faith in the promise and the Word. The *Odes of Solomon* (4,9-10) imply a liturgical use of the mixture. In various sources the cup of milk and honey is associated with baptism and the *Eucharist, since it happens after baptism, as described in the *Traditio Apostolica*, which records that the newly baptized participate in the bread and wine and also drink from a cup of mixed milk and honey "in order to indicate the fulfillment of the promise, made to the fathers, which it called 'a land flowing with milk and honey,' which Christ has given as his flesh, from which the believers are nourished, like children" (ch. 21). The texts depending on this document continue to affirm that the newly baptized drink the cup of milk and honey, because "they are reborn as newborns, since newborns take milk and honey" (*Canons of Hipp.* 19,15); but the *Canons* add that later the Christians will consume milk and honey as a memorial of the coming age.

For *Clement of Alexandria milk indicates the Logos (*Pedag.* 1,51,1; 3,98,3, vv. 42-47), which is the food of the newly baptized, to whom one gives milk (which is either the first instruction or solid food): "If in fact we have been regenerated in Christ, he who has regenerated us nourishes us with his own milk, i.e., with the Word" (*Pedag.* 1,49,3); "With milk, therefore, i.e., with the food of the Lord, we are nourished immediately upon being born; and immediately upon being regenerated, we receive the hope of final rest, the announcement of the heavenly Jerusalem, where, it is written, milk and honey flow and under the material symbol we receive the promise that the holy one is also there"

(*Pedag.* 1,45,3). Milk has a purifying value together with water (*Pedag.* 1,50,3-4); mixed with honey it has an effect of purification (*Pedag.* 1,51,1). *Tertullian attests to the antiquity and the widespread use of the drink in relationship with baptism at the beginning of the 3rd c. (*Adv. Marc.* 1,14,3; *De corona* 3,3). The use, in connection with the paschal baptism, is confirmed also in the conciliar canons of the African church (*Brev. Hipp.* 23b; *Reg. ecc. carth.* n. 37 [Munier CCL 149, 1854]), carrying with it the meaning of new birth. The *collectio Hispana*, which repeats the African conciliar texts, leaves out the reference to the cup, because at the end of the 6th c. in *Spain it was not used.

*Jerome attests to its use at *Rome (*Altercatio Lucif.* 8: PL 23, 164) to symbolize spiritual infancy. According to the testimony of *John the Deacon, most likely the future pope (523–526), the rite of drinking milk and honey was still in use in the 6th c. at Rome. The cup was given to the newly baptized, since, communicating with the body and blood of the Lord, they had received the "land of resurrection" (*Ep. ad Senarium* 12: ST 59, 177; PL 59, 405-406); but this also symbolizes the sweetness of the new birth and the consecration to an incorruptible life. For the paschal vigil the *Sacramentarium Veronese* gives the blessings of the milk and honey (ed. Mohlberg, Rome 1956, 26). We know the rite of this drink was not widespread because the *Syriac tradition offers no testimonies to it (Kilmartin p. 260); the third canon of the *Canons of the Apostles* prohibits anybody "to bring to the altar other things, such as honey or milk or else in place of wine any other beverage." The Ethiopian church has preserved the rite of drinking milk and honey to this day.

Righetti IV, 78; A. Sallinger, *Honig*: RAC 16, 433-473; W. Wilmart, *La bénédiction romaine du lait et du miel dans l'euchologe Barberini*: RBen 45 (1933) 10-19; S. Agrelo, *Leche y miel. Notas de teología bautismal*: Antonianum 55 (1980) 352-367 (above all in the *Traditio Apostolica*); A. van den Bunt, *Milk and Honey in the Theology of Clement of Alexandria*, in *Fides Sacramenti. Sacramentum Fidei. Fest. Smulders*, Assen 1981, 27-39; J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie als Milch in frühchristlicher Zeit*: ZKT 106 (1984) 1-25, 169-185; J.D.M. Derrett, *Whatever Happened to the Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?*: VChr 38 (1984) 178-184; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle*, Spoleto 1988; R. Triomphe, *Le lion, la vierge et le miel*, Paris 1989; A. Goulon, *Quelques aspects du symbolisme de l'abeille et du miel à l'époque patristique: héritage antique et interprétations nouvelles*, in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes: mélanges offerts à J. Fontaine*, Paris 1992, 525-535; E.J. Kilmartin, *The Baptismal Cups Revisited*, in *Eulogema: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft*, Rome 1993, 249-267; M. Zecchi, *On the Offering of Honey in the Graeco-Roman Temples*: Aegyptus 77 (1997) 71-83; E. Engelbrecht, *God's Milk: An Orthodox Confession of the Eucharist*: JECS 7 (1999) 509-526; M.-J. Pierre, *Lait et miel, ou la douceur du verbe*: Apocrypha 10 (1999) 139-176; M.A. Haller, *La carta di Juan Díacono a Senario*: Cuadernos Monasticos 137 (2001) 189-206.

A. Di Berardino

MILLENARISM. This belief (in Greek, *chiliasm*), widespread in the first centuries of Christianity, maintained that before the final judgment and the end of the *world there would be a first *resurrection of only the righteous. In the heavenly *Jerusalem descended to earth they would enjoy a millennium of happiness and great abundance of every good thing together with Christ. Often this term was connected to another belief, originally independent, which fixed the duration of the earth at 7,000 years.

At the roots of millenarism was the Jewish belief in the future messianic reign intended as a political and material dominion. In fact, millenarism spread initially in an *Asian environment, where Christianity was strongly influenced by Judaism and assumed distinctly materialistic hues. In addition to various prophetic passages that described the future messianic reign, the document at the root of millenarism was put together from Rev 20–21. There it speaks of the first resurrection, that of the righteous, of their thousand-year reign with Christ and of the descent to earth of the celestial Jerusalem, all resplendent with gold and gems. At the beginning of the 2nd c., millenarian beliefs were attested by *Papias of Hierapolis and by the Judaizing gnostic *Cerinthus: great abundance of earthly goods and fecundity of men and of the earth; the second insisted also on the lawfulness of carnal pleasures and on the continuation of Jewish practices. *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 80) affirms the millenarian idea as that of Christians who are completely *orthodox, but does not hide that many disputed it. We know that *Melito was also a millenarian, while *Irenaeus connected millenarism with the 7,000 years of the duration of the world, and in the sense that the seventh millennium would be exactly that of the earthly reign of Christ with the righteous (*Adv. haer.* V, 33-35). *Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* III, 24), following, Irenaeus, insisted above all on the abundance of spiritual goods. In the Johannine *Apocalypse the millenarian idea entered a strongly anti-Roman context, which does not appear in the authors recorded above. For them, the theme of the millennium is an element of faith and culture, which in Justin and Irenaeus has evident polemic implications against the eschatological spiritualism of the gnostics, and enters an organic and totalized vision of the history of the world, devoid of eschatological expectations and enthusiasms.

Such enthusiasms were instead typical of the *Montanists: their movement was founded on the conviction that the millenarian age had already begun and that the heavenly Jerusalem had descended into the *Phrygian village of Pepuza. Millenarism spread in the Asian environment far beyond the Montanist area, but the connection between them made it so that the anti-Montanist reaction began to distance itself from millenarism as well: *Hippolytus and *Cyprian presented a cultural *facies* of a millenarian type, but not actually the theme of the millennium. All the same, the decisive reaction against millenarism came from the *Alexandrians, who proposed a much more spiritual conception of Christian eschatology: *Origen (*Princ.* II 11,2-3) refutes the literal interpretation of Rev 20–21 and gives it an *allegorical interpretation, thus eliminating the scriptural foundation of millenarism. In the 2nd half of the 3rd c. the spread of Alexandrian culture signaled the end of millenarian ideas in the East: *Dionysius of Alexandria had argued strongly against millenarian convictions within the *Egyptian community (in Eus., *HE* 7, 24-25); but at the end of the century such convictions were still defended by *Methodius (*Symp.* 9,1.5), who revised them in a spiritualistic sense. The millenarism of *Apollinaris of Laodicea (2nd half of the 4th c.), of which we know almost nothing, appears to be nothing but a relic.

Millenarism also took root in Western areas influenced by Asian materialism. In the middle of the 3rd c., *Commodian reclaimed the theme of 7,000 years, of which the last 1,000 is the millennium (*Instr.* II, 35,8ff.), and saw in it the sign of the failures caused by the invasion of the *Goths (*Carm. Apol.* 805ff.), where the king of the Goths is identified with Apollyon of Rev 9:11. At the end of the 3rd c., *Victorinus of Petovium also presents the theme of 7,000 years in a millenarian sense (PL 5, 309) and gives us the earliest commentary on the *Apocalypse. *Lactantius describes the millennium with colors of the age of gold from pagan poetry (*Inst.* VII, 24). But in the West the spread of *Platonic spiritualism also signaled the end of millenarism: *Ambrose no longer presented the distribution of the history of the world in seven millennia; *Jerome argued against millenarism (PL 24, 627ff.) and revised the literal interpretation that Victorinus had furnished of Rev 20–21, in an allegorical and antimillenarian sense; *Augustine recaptured the theme of the seven ages of the world, but redeemed it from the duration of 1,000 years per age and from every millenarian influence. Yet the *hope, the vision of a future earthly age of peace and prosperity, did not die entirely from the minds of the people of *Late Antiquity and of the Early Middle Ages, preparing underground abrupt chiliastic awakenings in the Low Middle Ages and the modern era.

L. Gry, *Le millénarisme dans son origine et ses développements,* Paris 1904; A. Luneau, *L'histoire da salut chez les Pères de l'Eglise,* Paris 1964 (bibl.); M. Simonetti, *Il millenarismo in Oriente da Origene a Metodio* in *Corona gratiarum* (Festschrift Dekkers), Bruges 1975, 37-58; var. aus., *Il millenarismo cristiano e i suoi fondamenti scritturistici:* AnSE 15 (1998).

M. Simonetti

MILTIADES, apologist. His activity was in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. and, acc. to the anonymous adversary of the heresy of *Artemon, before the episcopate of *Victor in *Rome (ca. 189–198) (see Eus., *HE* 5, 28,4). All of his rich production in defense of Christianity and of *orthodoxy has been lost. The anonymous anti-*Montanist said he was author of a work summarized by him, which would have deserved a reply on the part of the Montanists and in which Miltiades would have explained the argument acc. to which "a prophet must not speak in ecstasy" (see Eus., *HE* 5, 17,1). Eusebius (*HE* 5, 17,5) records two books by him *To the Greeks* and two *To the Jews*, as well as an *apologia* in favor of "the philosophy" of which Miltiades was a follower, i.e., the Christian religion; he would have directed it against the "lords of this world," in whom the emperors *Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus may have been recognized. Tertullian (*Ad. Val.* 5,1) included him among the refuters of the *Valentinian heresy similar to the *heresiarchs, inserting him after *Justin and before *Irenaeus. He also considered him against the Montanist Proculus and defined him, with the intent of praise, as a "Sophist of the churches." However, the anonymous adversary of the heresy of *Artemon mentioned Miltiades after Justin and before *Tatian and *Clement of Alexandria among those writers who, engaged against pagans and heretics, would have professed the divinity of Christ.

I.C.Th. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi,* IX, Jena 1872 (repr.: Wiesbaden 1969), 364-373; A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten* (TU, I, 1-2), Leipzig 1882, 278-282; Id., *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius,* I, Leipzig 1893, 255-256; II,1, Leipzig 1897, 361-362; P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste,* Paris 1913, 162-175; R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century,* London 1988, 90-91; E. Norelli, *Parole di profeti, parole sui profeti. La costruzione del montanismo nei frammenti dell'Anonimo antimontanista,* in G. Filoramo (ed.), *Carisma profetico. Fattore di innovazione religiosa,* Brescia 2003, 107-130 (esp. 113).

V. Zangara

MILITIADES, pope (310–314). Probably of Roman origin. In a synod gathered at Lateran (313) in the name of the emperor, he made a decision together with other bishops against the *Donatists in favor of *Caecilian. *Constantine had certainly established him *iudex datus* in view of the traditional prestige of the Roman Church. However, when the Donatists did not accept the sentence of Miltiades, the emperor convened a synod himself without concern for the collaboration of the pope.

W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church,* Oxford 1952; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana,* Rome 1976 (esp. 160-167); LTK³ 7, 262; EPapi 1, 317-321.

B. Studer

MINISTRIES (ordained ministers)

I. Problems and aspects - II. The earliest evidence - III. From the beginning of the 3rd c. to the Council of Nicaea - IV. The Eastern Fathers after the Council of Nicaea - V. The Latin Fathers from the 4th c.

I. Problems and aspects. Every reconstruction of the origin of Christian ministries faces the scarce and scattered sources of the first two centuries. For this reason, the sources themselves and the proposed hypotheses about the origins of ministries are differentiated (theological and sociological theories; worship ministries among pagans and Jews; the οἰκοδεσπότης as model; the concept of the *ordo* and *representatio*). The development of ministries is complex, but not arbitrary. From the 2nd c., the homogeneity and strength of the tripartite-hierarchical ministries are already evident in the East and West. (In a city there are deacons, presbyters and only one bishop.) Indeed, the theology of ministries is complex: the will of Christ as servant of all—the OT priesthood—the christological theology that sees in Christ, human and divine, the true priest of the new covenant (R.A. Greer, *The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews*, Tübingen 1973; RAC 16, 4-58). The theses of some Protestants about the illegitimate Hellenization of Christianity where the ministries of the first centuries are rendered sacred are incoherent and tend to detach Christianity from its Jewish roots. The existence of ministries expresses the self-awareness of early Christianity as the one church founded by Christ. Without ministries, which are themselves in communion, there is no church; yet the *gnostics instead negate the constitutive meaning of ministries for the church (RAC, Suppl. 1, 373). "Ministries" refers to the diaconal, presbyterial and episcopal "office" with a proper commitment to be faithful to the tradition (παραθήκη) of the apostolic witness and to exercising proper disciplinary authority; whereas, the services of "prophets" and "teachers" cannot possess a specific leadership power (RAC, Suppl. 1, 365). A purely cultural ministry without authority is effectively unthinkable ("prelate," "hegumen," "pastor," ἄρχοντες-priests and ἀρχόμενοι-faithful). Reflection on the sources of ministerial authority is central for Christianity (God, Christ, *successio apostolica*, which were all against the doctrinal tradition of the gnostics). From the beginning, there are many criticisms among the Fathers regarding titles, but it is not clear what they practically do to guarantee the quality of the candidates. Recently, the sociology of ministries has been thoroughly investigated on the basis of quantifiable sources (inscriptions, etc.).

II. The earliest evidence. On the basis of the NT and the **Didache* (15,1-2), mention of bishops and deacons (*see* *diakonia - diaconate), selected by the community, perform a ministry (*leitourgia*) that is probably distinct from "prophets and teachers." This obscure and controversial text should be compared with Acts 13:1-3, where a group of "prophets and teachers" performs a *leitourgia*, laying hands on *Paul and *Barnabas and sending them out as missionaries by the *Holy Spirit. For the institution of bishops and deacons, the author uses the verb *cheirotonein*, which will later be habitually used for *ordination by *laying-on of hands. But it is not certain that it means this here. Although *Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians* does not explicitly speak of ordination (*cheirotonia*, *order – ordination) but describes the ministry (*leitourgia*) of bishops and *presbyters (the two words seem to designate the same ministers) that succeed and follow the rules established by the apostles (44) and conform to the prefigurations of the OT (40-41 and 43); these same ministers are called deacons (42,4-5); the other ministries (41,1) must be performed only in obedience to those who are successors of the apostles (see A. Jaubert in SC 167, intr., pp. 78-86). The *Shepherd* of *Hermas considers helping the needy (*Mand.* 2,6; *Sim.* 2,7 and 10) and obeying the commandments (*Mand.* 12,3,3) as a *diakonia* conferred to everyone; nevertheless, deacons and bishops have a special responsibility (*Sim.* 9,26-27) in the ministry of charity.

For the 2nd c., we must cite the *Letters* of *Ignatius of Antioch and *Polycarp. A special rite of ordination is not explicitly mentioned, but their church is structured as a hierarchy in three distinct degrees: bishops, presbyters, deacons. It is the first time that the word *diakonos* clearly designates an official min-

ister that is inferior to the bishop and presbyters. This hierarchy is presented as essential; without it one cannot speak of the church (*Tral.* 3,1). Around mid-century, *Hegesippus, in fragments preserved by *Eusebius, certainly considers *James the brother of the Lord as the first bishop of *Jerusalem, but also as high priest (Eus., *HE* II, 23,4 and 6; III, 5,2; IV, 22,4). A passage from the *Acts of *Peter* (ca. 190) gives credence to a rite of the laying-on of hands that Jesus himself had performed for the institution of the twelve apostles (*Acta Petr.* X, ed. Vouaux, 296-297). In the works of *Irenaeus, the two titles of bishop and presbyter seem to be applied to the same ministers, while deacons are the successors of those seven whom the Twelve had instituted through prayer and the laying-on of hands, acc. to Acts 6:1-6 (*Adv. haer.* I, 26,3; III, 12,10; IV, 15,1). Bishops are the successors of the apostles (IV, 26,2); they have a "certain *charism of truth" that is connected with the *grace of the "perfect knowledge" received by the apostles on the day of *Pentecost (III, 1,1; IV, 26,2); they must be the "faithful servants of Christ" (IV, 26,3-5); they have a role of presiding over the liturgical *assembly, and esp. in the celebration of the *Eucharist (*Letter to Victor*, in Eus., *HE* V, 16-17).

III. From the beginning of the 3rd c. to the Council of Nicaea. Great weight is given to the evidence of the **Apostolic Tradition*, the most ancient ritual preserved for ordinations, a ritual that has inspired almost all *liturgies up until our times, and that has even had a large influence on later canonical legislation. By now the triad bishop-presbyters-deacons makes up the *clergy, and to them the *ordination by the *laying-on of hands is reserved. However, it is evident that the rite is considered as effecting a *grace (spirit, **pneuma*) specially destined for the performance of the corresponding ministry. Other ministries are recognized and instituted (*widows, *virgins, readers, *subdeacons), but without formal ordination (*cheirotonia*). The role of the bishop is central: it is he who ordains, he is at once head and high priest, he is the successor of the *apostles and participates in the Spirit which they received from Christ. Presbyters also participate with the priesthood and act as advisors and assistants in governing the people. Deacons do not have the priesthood: they are at the service of the bishop for their duties (see J. Lécuyer: RSPh 41 [1953] 30-41).

The *Syriac **Didascalia of the Apostles* is often placed in the 1st half of the 3rd c. The work is important because of a description of the rights and duties of the bishop, esp. in the pastoral attitude that he must have toward sinners. He is assisted by presbyters and deacons, whose functions are described in terms that recall *Ignatius of Antioch (see A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hiérarchie*, Paris 1977, 118ff.).

The great Alexandrian writers of the 3rd c., *Clement and *Origen, have numerous references to ordained ministries, but these indications are scattered throughout their works (see G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'Église de saint Irénée au concile de Nicée*, Paris 1947, 118ff.; J. Lécuyer: VetChr 7 [1970] 253-264). In Latin-speaking *Africa, *Tertullian has a few references to ordained ministries; for the *Catholic period of his writings, see *De praescr. haer.* 41,5-8 (see G. Bardy: Vie Sp. Supplém. 58 [1939] 109-124). One can gather many texts by *Cyprian regarding the episcopate, but here again they are only occasional: see esp. *Ep.* 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 etc. (Hartel). Christ is the origin of the episcopate, while the diaconate was instituted by the apostles: *Ep.* 3,3,1. Cyprian does not explicitly mention the rite of laying-on of hands except for the ordination of the episcopate (see V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du 3e siècle*, Vatican City 1969, 98). Among the writings that were attributed to Cyprian, we must mention the *De aleatoribus*, which is probably by an African bishop at the end of the century (CPL 60). The author has a very high view of the episcopate: through the laying-on of hands, the bishop has received the *Holy Spirit, and the rite is compared to that *charism or spiritual gift which was conferred upon *Timothy recorded by St. Paul (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6). The continuity of the episcopate with the mission of the apostles is affirmed by Clarus, bishop of Mascula, at the council convened by Cyprian in the autumn of 256 (*Sent. Episc.* 79).

IV. The Eastern Fathers after the Council of Nicaea. It is evidently impossible to consider every patristic reference which increases in number from the 4th c. onward; so we must limit ourselves to the most important ones; we will omit the texts of the *councils, although these are quite numerous. St. *Athanasius applies to his own ministry as bishop the charge of Paul to Timothy (*Apol. ad Const.* 26). His teaching on the episcopal ministry is particularly clear and vigorous in the *Letter to Dracontius* (PG 25, 525ff.). For the powers of the presbyter regarding the *Eucharist and *ordination, see the texts regarding the famous incident of Ischyras, esp. the *Second Apologia Against the Arians* 11-12. In the following century, in *Egypt, *Cyril of Alexandria considers the ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons in relation to the celebration of the Eucharist, where the priest represents Christ (*De ador. in sp. et ver.* X and XIII; *In Malach.*: PG 71, 853-854 etc.).

In *Cappadocia, *Basil of Caesarea, in his *Canonical Letters* (188, 199 and 217) to *Amphilochius, explains the *canonical rules of the church, the majority of which regard the ordained clergy. More important for us is the testimony of *Gregory of Nazianzus: we have his famous *Apologetic Discourse*, which explains his escape after being ordained to the priesthood on Christmas in 361 (*Orat.* 2); there are many reflections on the priesthood in it, on the qualities that it demands, on pastoral duties, on the difficulty and demand of preaching, etc. (see the *Introduction* by J. Bernardi: SC 247, Paris 1978, 7-10). One could add a certain number of poems, esp. *On His Life* (*Carm.* lib. II, sect. 1, XI), some **Letters* (182,5 and 183,6), *Discourses* 6, 9, 12: in the latter, Gregory compares the ordination of the bishop and presbyters to the consecration of *Aaron and his sons. *Discourse* 40,26, *On Baptism*, contains an important text on the "character" of the minister who baptizes (PG 36, 396bc). On this last point, cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat. in diem luminum* (PG 46, 581-584). There are many teachings about ordained ministries in the collection known as the *Apostolic Constitutions* which was probably compiled in the *Arian context of *Syria toward the end of the 4th c. These are *charisms given by *God for the service of the community (VIII, 1). The rules of *ordination are attributed to the *apostles (VIII, 4-7 for the bishop; VIII, 16 for the presbyters; VIII, 17-18 for the deacons); but *James of Jerusalem was ordained bishop by the Lord and by the apostles (VIII, 35). The three ordained ministries correspond to the OT distinction between high priest, ordinary priests and Levites (VIII, 46, 1-6). At the beginning of these ministries, Christ himself instituted the apostles as high priests, and they instituted the other *orders; only the bishops, who succeed the apostles, can ordain (VIII, 46, 13-15). In the ordination of the bishop, beyond the *laying-on of hands, there is a placing of the gospels upon the head of the ordinand (VIII, 4,6). This new rite, also mentioned by Palladius in his *Life of Chrysostom* (XVI), is explained by *Severian bishop of Gabala: it is a sign of the coming of the *Holy Spirit, which descends on the head of the bishop as it did on the day of *Pentecost upon the apostles (PG 125, 533; cf. J. Lécuyer: EphLit 66 [1952] 369-372).

In the patriarchate of *Antioch, *Theodore of Mopsuestia describes the liturgical functions of bishops, priests and deacons in his *Catechetical Homilies*. Moreover, in his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul*, preserved in Latin, he compares the *grace of ordination with that which Timothy received by the laying-on of hands (ed. Swete II, 149-150; 196); deacons also receive an ordination before the altar (ibid., 128 and 132). These ordinations confer a charism or **pneuma* destined for the service of others (ibid., 98); it is to this *pneuma* that the faithful make allusions when they respond to the celebrant: "and with your *spirit*" (*Hom. Cat.* XV, 37-38) (see J. Lécuyer: RecSR 26 [1949] 494-498; OnSyr 6 [1961] 390). This last point is made by *Chrysostom in a *Homily on Pentecost* (PG 50, 458-459). The *pneuma* of pastors, acc. to him, is given through the laying-on of hands, and this rite goes back to the apostles (*In Act. Hom.* 14,3; 15,1; 27,1-2; 28,1); it is this same charism that is given also to Timothy (*In 1 Tim. Hom.* 5,1; 13,1; *In 2 Tim. Hom.* 2,2). Also deacons receive a charism through their ordination (on their place and role in the church, see *Mélanges liturgiques Dom Botte*, Louvain 1972, 295-310). But the more important work for our purposes is *De sacerdotio* by Chrysostom, of which there are numerous editions and translations, and is considered one of the most valuable treasures of patristic literature. The author is probably inspired by *Orat.* 2 by Gregory of Nazianzus; like him, he justifies himself for shirking the responsibilities of the priesthood, and he insists on the greatness and the difficulties of this ministry, on the *virtue and holiness that it requires, esp. the demand and dangers of preaching; he concludes with being unworthy of this dignity and justifies his escape in this way (see the *Introd.* and the edition by A.M. Malingrey: SC 272, Paris 1980. See also, the *Homily* 1, preached by Chrysostom when he was ordained a priest [ed. Malingrey, ibid.] and the *Homily on the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius*: PG 49-50, 588-589). The teaching of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus is very close to that of *Chrysostom: see esp. his *Commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles* (PG 82, 816c and 832d), and numerous passages of the *History of the Monks of Syria* (3,11; 13,4; 15,4), where the idea appears that these monks perform ministries and ordination. Finally, we must mention the many passages from the *Cathedral Homilies* of *Severus of Antioch; see *Hom.* 55, 80, 99, 116: PO 4, 20, 22, 26.

The *Syriac-speaking *Fathers can be linked to the writers of the patriarchate of Antioch. Around the year 340, *Aphraates expresses an idea that will have great success: Jesus, who laid hands on the apostles to give them the Holy Spirit, has himself received the inheritance of the OT priesthood through the laying-on of hands by *John the Baptist, at his baptism (*De persec.* 10 and 13; *De acino* 20; *De monachis* 13). St. *Ephrem fruitfully takes up these ideas: *cheirotonia* goes back to God's laying hands on *Moses at *Sinai (Ex 33:32); through *Aaron's line the charism was transmitted to John the Baptist, who

laid his hands on Jesus, who at that time ordained the apostles, instituting the *sacrament of *Orders (*Hymn. contr. haer.* XXII, 18-19: CSCO 170, 81-82; *Com. in Diatessaron*: SC 121, 94-95). This teaching on the continuity with the OT, which constituted the perspective of the Syriac church of *Antioch, direct heir of the early *Jewish-Christian church, would have an important echo in the Syriac *liturgies of ordination. We also must add the short Greek work *On the Priesthood* sometimes presented as the final book of Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio*, but it is probably by St. Ephrem. The laying-on of hands for ordination, acc. to this work, gives the priest an unction of the Spirit just like the apostles on the day of Pentecost; the author evokes, after *Peter and *Paul, the great priestly figures of the OT; we need to venerate the priests, even if their virtue does not measure up as high as their dignity (PG 48, 1067-1070). The Syriac poet *Narsai also has a teaching on the priesthood that ties in with that of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ephrem (see Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*: TSt VIII, 4, 8, 21, 31, 63-65 etc.).

In *Palestine, *Eusebius of Caesarea teaches that the *Eucharist is a spiritual *sacrifice that Christ continues to offer through his ministers (*Dem. Ev.* V, 3,18-19); they represent Christ, who is in them, each acc. to his role (*HE* X, 4,68-69). *Cyril and *John of Jerusalem, in their *Catecheses*, describe the role of priests, servants of Christ, who are ministers of *baptism with bishops and deacons (*Cat.* 17,25); with the bishop they perform the eucharistic *liturgy (*Cat. myst.* 5,2). There is little in *Epiphanius: he clearly distinguishes the three degrees of the ministry: the bishop that only ordains, priests and deacons, to which he adds subdeacons (*Ep.* 51, in the letters of Jerome); he is one of the first testimonies of an ecclesiastical law in favor of the *celibacy of ordained ministers (*Haer.* 59,4). For *Hesychius of Jerusalem, priests are the representatives of Christ, and it is he who acts in them (*In Levit.* 9,22 and 21,6); so they must imitate his holiness (*In Levit.* 22,1-3 and 22-25).

The author known as ps-*Dionysius had a huge influence on the *theology and *spirituality of ministries: see esp. *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* and the *Letter to Demophilus*. The hierarchy of the church (bishop-priest-deacon) imitates the hierarchy of the heavenly spirits, and Jesus is its origin (*Eccl. hier.* I, 2-3; V, 1ff.). At the apex is the bishop, on whom the priests and deacons totally depend (V, 1,5-6). Three ministries are conferred by a special consecration (V, 2) that he connects with the descent of the Spirit upon the apostles at Pentecost (V, 3,5).

V. The Latin Fathers from the 4th c. *Hilary of Poitiers occasionally refers to ministry (*In Ps.* 134,27; 138,34; *Fragm. Hist.* II, 16. Cf. J. Lécuyer: Année Théol. 10 [1949] 322-323). *Ambrose of Milan advocates a very rich teaching in *De officiis ministrorum*, but also in numerous passages throughout his writings (see R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon saint Ambroise*, Louvain 1968; on the episcopate, DSp IV, 894; on deacons, see *De off.* II, 28 [on the deacon St. Lawrence]; on the liturgical functions of ministers, many details are in *De sacramentis* and in *De mysteriis*). There is a new development at the end of the 4th c.: St. Jerome and the anonymous author known as *Ambrosiaster, almost with the same terms, refuse to see the episcopate in an *order* superior to that of the presbyterate, except for the powers that are reserved to it: its *ordination is merely a ceremony, without sacramental value. Behind this position, the authors want to reappraise the role of Roman deacons who considered themselve superior to presbyters. Their common response is simple: in this case, deacons would be superior to bishops, since between priest and bishop there is no difference in jurisdiction. Consequently, the very *spirituality of the bishop tends to be reduced to a "duty of status." Also, presbyterial ordination occupies a discrete place in St. Jerome; his *Letter 52 to *Nepotianus* could have been a substantial tract on presbyterial perfection, but limits itself, through childish literary games, to some prudent pastoral advice and to commonplaces on the study of *Scripture and preaching. In St. *Augustine, there are wonderful texts on the episcopate, but which, in due proportion, are also valid for all priests, deacons and religious superiors: the bishop is the "servant of the servants of God" (*Ep.* 217). There are also numerous *letters (*Ep.* 21, 22, 29, 142, 208, 288) and *sermons (*Serm.* 339 and 340) for the consecration of new bishops (*Serm.* Guelferb. 32: PLS 2, 637ff.). Sermon 355 reveals the lives of the clergy of *Hippo living in community with their bishop: one can see the care of Augustine for the good reputation, the life of *poverty and *prayer of his clergy. The *ordination of bishops, priests and deacons is performed through the *laying-on of hands like that of *Timothy (*Contr. Lit. Petil.* II, 106); this rite produces a lasting effect, which is often described as **sacramentum* (*ordinationis*) and lasts even when the minister is a sinner or distances himself from his functions (*De bon. coniug.* 34,32); ordination is never repeatable, hence, it is a *sacramentum* given through consecration (*Contr. Ep. Parm.*, II, 13,28); thus the demand for holiness on the part of ministers (*Contr. Lit. Petil.* II, 30) (see J. Pintard, *Le sacerdote selon saint Augustin*, Paris 1960).

Despite his insistence on the miraculous and wonderful, the *Life of St. *Martin* by *Sulpicius Severus offers information on the idea of ministers and esp. a bishop who was living at the start of the 5th c.; we should add the three *Letters* by the same author. In the same way, there were also *Lives* of St. *Honoratus of Arles written by his successor Hilary, of St. *Hilary of Arles written by Reverentius, and of other bishops written by *Venantius Fortunatus. In *Leo the Great, the *Sermons* for his episcopal ordination or his anniversaries (*Serm.* 1-5, in CCL 138) took care to join the priesthood of ministers together with the common *priesthood of the whole church. According to *Letter* 9,1, the ordination of bishops occur only on *Sunday, the day in which the Holy Spirit descended upon the *apostles. St. *Gregory the Great also happens to give a very particular place to ordination in his *Regula Pastoralis*, whose value remains intact, not only for bishops, but for all ministers who participate in their pastoral role. The advice that is given could have been adapted, as J.C. Hedley claims, to the pastoral formation of all clergy (*Lex Levitarum*, London 1905). In the six books of *Expositiones in Librum Primum Regum*, Gregory begins from the real *anointing of Saul and David, commenting extensively on the spiritual unction conferred upon pastors by ordination, the *grace they receive and their responsibility (IV, 114ff.; ed. Verbraken CCL 144); in them it is Christ who speaks (IV, 122 and passim). The author interprets the prescriptions by Paul in 1 Tim 5:22 as ordination (IV, 139). Through ordination, ministers receive an interior strength by the Holy Spirit like the apostles on Pentecost (IV, 189). At the most supreme degree of the priesthood, the bishop receives a fullness of grace, so he must give of his fullness, like *Moses to the seventy elders (VI, 65). Although the exterior rite is performed by one man, it is the Holy Spirit who transforms and fortifies the one who receives the *Order (VI, 96).

RAC Suppl. 1, 350-401; J. Colson, *Ministre de Jésus-Christ ou le sacerdoce de l'évangile*, Paris 1966; A. Vilela, *La condition collégiale des prêtres au III^e^ siècle*, Paris 1971; J. Lécuyer, *Le sacrement de l'ordination*, Paris 1983; J. Zmijewski, *Paulus—Knecht und Apostel Christi. Amt und Amtsträger in paulinischer Sicht*, Stuttgart 1986; J.-C. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au X^e^ siècle*, Paris-Padua 1988; L. Padovese, *I sacerdoti dei primi secoli. Testimonianze dei Padri sui ministeri ordinati*, Casale Monf. 1992; S. Felici (ed), *Sacerdozio battesimale e formazione teologica*, Rome 1992; R.R. Noll, *Christian Ministerial Priesthood: A Search for Its Beginnings in the Primary Documents of the Apostolic Fathers*, San Francisco-London 1993; M. Lochbrunner, *Über das Priestertum. Historische und systematische Untersuchung zum Priesterbild des Johannes Chrysostomus*, Bonn 1993; E. Dassmann, *Ämter und Dienste in den frühchristlichen Gemeinden*, Bonn 1994; J. Ysebaert, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der Alten Kirche*, Breda 1994; E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive*, Rome 1996; Id., *Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche in Egitto dalla fine del III all'inizio dell'VIII secolo*, in A. Camplani (ed), *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, Rome 1997, 219-271; E. Cattaneo, *I ministeri nella chiesa antica. Testi patristici dei primi tre secoli*, Milan 1997; C. Dauphin, *La Palestine Byzantine. Peuplement et populations* 2, Oxford 1998; P. Terbuyken, *Priesteramt und Opferkult bei Juden und Christen in der Spätantike*, in E. Dassmann (ed.), *Chartulae*, Münster 1998, 271-284; G. Kretschmar, *Das bischöfliche Amt*, Göttingen 1999; G.L. Müller, *Der Empfänger des Weihesakraments. Quellen zur Lehre und Praxis der Kirche, nur Männern das Weihesakrament zu spenden*, Würzburg 1999; S. Heid, *Celibacy in the Early Church*, San Francisco 2000; A. Hoffmann, *Kirchliche Strukturen und Römisches Recht bei Cyprian von Karthago*, Paderborn 2000; R. Godding, *Prêtres en Gaule mérovingien*, Brussels 2001; T. di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma nel medioevo*, Rome 2002; G. Schmelz, *Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten nach den Aussagen der griechischen und koptischen Papyri und Ostraka*, Leipzig 2002; T.C.G. Thornton, *High-Priestly Succession in Jewish Apologetics and Episcopal Succession in Hegesippus*: Journal of Theological Studies 54 (2003) 160-163.

J. Lécuyer - S. Heid

MINUCIUS FELIX. An *apologist, active during the final decades of the 2nd c., or in the 3rd c. Quite a few clues lead to the conclusion that Minucius was of African origin. From a *pagan family, he converted to Christianity, and it is evident that in *Rome he took up the profession of a lawyer (*Lactantius [*Div. Inst.* V, 1, 21f.] and *Jerome [*De vir. Ill.* 58; *Ep.* 70, 5] refer to him as *causidicus*), rather than that of a magistrate (see *Octavius* [2,3], a passage that would not exclude this 2nd hypothesis). A single apologetic work, the *Octavius*, has survived to this day, as the 8th book of the *Adversus nationes* of *Arnobius the Elder (through the copyist's mix-up between the original title and the ordinal number). As is the case for the Arnobian text, the sole exemplar is the codex of the 9th c. (*Paris. lat. 1661*) in which it has been passed down through the ages (although the *cod. Bruxellensis 10847* is a copy of the previous MS, it presents some noteworthy emendation). The *Parisinus latinus 1661*, written in minuscule, is so full of errors that it is frequently unintelligible. Notwithstanding the dire poverty of the MS tradition, the critical editors of the *Octavius* have undertaken the difficult task. Since the publication at Rome in 1542 by Fausto Sabeo of the *Editio princeps*, once again at the end of the 7 books of the Arnobian works, many corrections have been made. Adding to these corrections, through the numerous critical editions that have recently appeared, is a long list of conjectures.

The text contains a dialogue among three friends

who head out to Ostia, thanks to the autumn recess: Cecilius, a pagan, and Octavius and Minucius, both Christians. Minucius himself recalls in detail how Octavius, by means of this conversation, had won over Cecilius to the Christian faith. As the dialogue opens, Octavius has died and Minucius sketches in chap. 2 an affectionate and moving portrait of Octavius. Overall, 40 chaps. long, the dialogue first sets forth the declamation of the pagan character in defense of his own religion (chaps. 5-15), and then the response of Octavius, who demonstrates the existence and the providence of God, defends the beliefs of the Christians (particularly beliefs concerning eschatology) and refutes polytheism. Thus the polemical strain follows on the heels of the apologetic strain, in occasionally novel ways in the context of analogous works by 2nd- and 3rd-c. writers. Minucius turns his attention to moral rather than doctrinal arguments; scriptural citations are not given, and even Christ is not mentioned in an explicit fashion. Ciceronian and Senecan influences are noteworthy. Such an apologetic method seems to be a conscious choice on the part of the author, who intends to address a cultured pagan audience (of which Cecilius is a representative) and to be convincing with arguments that are familiar and well known to this group. This is also confirmed by the literary aspect, by beginning with the *genre of *dialogue that offers "to the writer valuable formal resources, in the structuring of the scene, guided by Minucius with exquisite artfulness, in the presentation of the characters, in the capability of these resources to illustrate and sustain the essential thesis, with all the benefits of eloquence" (M. Pellegrino, Intr. A *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, 39). The work has an important significance for historical documentation: it is a vivid example of the clash between two different worlds, destined in the end to meet each other and come together as one. In a remarkable way, the defense of paganism and the attack against Christianity, both carried out by Cecilius, function as valuable testimonies. Indeed, it is remarkable to consider that these words faithfully reflect the arguments that pagans used in their confrontations with the new movement that was being inspired by Jesus.

It is an arduous and controversial problem to identify the dating of the *Octavius*. The vast majority of critics agree in locating its composition between the 2nd half of the 2nd c. and the 1st half of the 3rd c., between the reign of *Marcus Aurelius and that of *Alexander Severus. (A few scholars contend that the work is subsequent to the *Quod idola dii non sint*, situating it alongside the works of *Cyprian.)

To the degree that some of the previously discussed questions are more relevant for resolving the matter, emphasis is due on the connections between Minucius and Tertullian, and more specifically on the connections between the *Octavius*, on the one hand, and the *Apologeticum* and the *Ad nationes*, on the other. The numerous affinities of argument and of form (the shared features have excluded various hypotheses of a common source) have been variously deemed to support the dependence of Tertullian on Minucius, or vice versa. Even today, the dispute is unresolved. In the 19th c., quite a few scholars maintained the priority of Minucius; in the 20th c., perhaps the supporters of the priority of Tertullian have prevailed, although there has not been a lack of scholarly voices for the opposing argument. There is a great number of considerations to be taken into account. Since none of them have proved to be decisive, it is difficult to make a judgment. Nonetheless, amid the many factors of uncertainty or of varying interpretations, it is necessary to highlight one in favor of the priority of Tertullian: the Christian literary tradition. *Jerome, in particular, clearly affirms in *De viris illustribus* (53) that Tertullian is the first of the Latin writers, after Victor and Apollonius, while in a number of other passages he makes mention of Tertullian before Minucius (see *De vir. ill.*, 58; *Ep.* 48,13,4; 60,10; 70,5; *Comm. In Isaiam*, praef. 8).

*Lactantius (*Div. inst.* V, 1,21ff.) first cites Minucius, then Tertullian and Cyprian. His discourse, inserted in a sort of lineup of the Latin apologists, does not seem to carry any intention of delineating a chronological order, since it formulates judgments of merit and seems to position them in an ascending scale. It certainly does not affirm a chronological precedent of one author over another.

From a passage of the *Octavius* (36,2) we know that Minucius was planning to write a work on the theme of destiny. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 58) effectively tells us of a book, titled *De fato vel contra mathematicos*, that was circulating under the name of Minucius, yet he places its authenticity in doubt on the basis of its style being judged inferior to that of the known works. Concerning the bibl., it is significant that in recent decades the level of interest in Minucius Felix has notably increased, as is evident in the following references.

Editions: CPL 37; PL 3, 231; CSEL 2, 3; Corpus Script. Latin. Paravianum (ed. M. Pellegrino), Turin 1950; Les Belles Lettres (ed. J. Beaujeu), Paris 1964 (²1974); E. Paratore, Bari 1971; B. Kytzler, Leipzig 1982, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig ²1992; M. Pellegrino, P. Siniscalco, M. Rizzi, Turin 2000 (with It. tr. and full comm.).

Translations: *Fr.*: J.P. Waltzing, Louvain ³1914; J. Beaujeu, Paris 1964; *It.*: D. Basai, Milan 1929; U. Moricca, Rome 1933; E. Para-

tore 1971; *Eng.*: J.H. Freese, London 1919; G.H. Rendall, Cambridge 1960; *Dutch*: H.U. Meyboom, Leiden 1929; P.H. Damsté, Amsterdam 1936; *Sp.*: S. de Domingo, Madrid 1946; *Ger.*: A. Müller, 2BKV, Kempten 1913; B. Kytzler, Stuttgart 1977.

Studies: J.P. Waltzing, *Lexicon Minucianum*, Liège 1909; E. Behr, *Der "Octavius" des Minucius Felix in seinem Verhältnis zu Ciceros Büchern "De natura deorum,"* (diss.) Jena 1870; F. Kotek, *Anklänge an Ciceros "De natura deorum" bei Minucius Felix und Tertullian*, Progr. Vienna 1901; F.X. Burger, *Über das Verhältnis des Minucius Felix zu dem Philosophen Seneca*, (diss.) Munich 1904; S. Colombo, *Osservazioni sulla composizione letteraria e sulle fonti dell'Octavius*: Didaskaleion 3 (1914) 79-121; H.J. Baylis, *Minucius Felix and His Place Among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church*, London 1928; R. Beutler, *Philosophie und Apologie bei Minucius Felix*, (diss.) Königsberg 1936; M. Pellegrino, Intr. a *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, Turin 1947; E. Paratore, *La questione Tertulliano-Minucio*: Ricerche Religiose 18 (1947) 132-159; G. Quispel, *A Jewish Source of Minucius Felix*: VChr 3 (1949) 113-122; P. Frassinetti, *Minucio Felice e le redazioni dell'Apologeticum tertullianeo*, In memoriam A. Beltrami: Miscellanea Philologica, Genoa 1954, 83-96; A. Kurfess, *Neues zur Prioritätsfrage Tertullian-Minucius Felix*: Orpheus 1 (1954) 125-132; G.W. Clarke, *The Historical Setting of the Octavius of Minucius Felix*: JRH 4 (1967) 267-286; C. Becker, *Der "Octavius" des Minucius Felix*, Munich 1967; Altaner 148-149 and 611; A.J. Cappelletti, *Minucius Felix y su filosofía de la religión*: Revista Venezolana de filosofia 19 (1985) 7-62; C. Tibiletti, *Il problema della priorità Tertulliano-Minucio Felice*, in *Hommages à René Braun, II: Autour de Tertullien*, eds. J. Granarolo - M. Biraud, Nice 1990, 23-34; K. Müller, *Rytmische Bemerkungen zu Minucius Felix*: Museum Helveticum 49 (1992) 57-73; S. Bodelón, *El discorso anticristiano de Cecilio en el Octavio de Minucius Felix*: Memorias de Historia Antigua 13/14 (1992/1993) 247-294; M. Rizzi, *Ideologia e retorica negli "exordia" apologetici. Il problema dell'"altro,"* Milan 1993, 151-170; H.A. Gärtner, *Die Rolle und die Bewertung der skeptischen Methode im Dialog Octavius des Minucius Felix*, in *Panchaia. Festschrift f. K. Thraede*, Münster 1995, 141-147; F. Chapot, *Les grands orientations des travaux sur l'Octavius de Minucius Felix*: Vita Latina 150 (June 1998) 18-28; S. Deléani, *Minucius Felix, Octavius 32*: Vita Latina 150, 44-53; A. Fürst, *Der philosophiegeschichtliche Ort von Minucius Felix' Dialog 'Octavius'*: JbAC 42 (1999) 42-49; E. Heck, *Minucius Felix, der erste christliche Ciceronianer*: Hyperboreus. Studia classica V (1999) 306-325; C. Ingremeau, *Minucius Felix et ses "sources": le travail de l'écrivain*: REAug 45 (1999) 3-20; V. Sanz Santacruz, *Filosofia y teología en el "Octavius" de Minucio*: Scripta teologica 31 (1999) 345-365; A. Fürst, *Die Selbsterkenntnis des Skeptikers im Octavius des Minucius Felix*: ZAC 4 (2000) 270-281; E. Heck, *Frustula minuciana. Textkritisches zum "Octavius"*: Wiener Studien 114 (2001) 483-499. For additional references, see the volume (in which Minucius Felix is also considered) *Chronica Tertullianea et Cyprianea 1975–1994. Bibliographie critique de la première littérature latine chrétienne*, ed. R. Braun, F. Chapot, S. Deléani, F. Dolbeau, J.-C. Fredouille, P. Petitmengin, Paris 1999, and for successive years to the index *Chronica Tertullianea et Cyprianea* that appears every year REAug.

P. Siniscalco

MIRACLE. In the Christian writings of the 1st c., miracles (*dynameis*, *sēmeia*, *terata*, *thaumasia*, *paradoxa*), including those performed by Jesus in his role as faith healer and exorcist and those constituted by his extraordinary birth and by his resurrection, assume a role of the highest significance in the definition of his identity as Messiah and Son of God. Such writings share with the OT faith in God—Lord of nature and of history who continuously intervenes in both realms acc. to his providential design—and with marginal apocalyptic Judaism the idea that the actions of Jesus, inasmuch as they are manifestations of divine power in victory over the evil powers that are active in the earthly order, are signs of the nearness of the divine reign.

These same writings guard the actions of Jesus against a different and hostile interpretation: he had performed his healings and exorcisms not by the "finger of God" (Lk 11:20) or acc. to the "Spirit of God" (Mt 12:28), but "in the name of Beelzebub, prince of the demons" (Lk 11:15). The gospels preserve the record of a conflict of interpretations that was still an internal Jewish matter. With the spread of Christianity beyond this religious and cultural setting, and with the conversion to Christianity of persons educated in the Hellenistic *paideia*, the debate over miracles concerning the decisive question of the demonstration of the divinity of Jesus took on new elements.

This is a debate in which the terms change, whether with changing historical and cultural circumstances or on the basis of literary criteria. As for the 2nd and 3rd c., the topic of miracles prevails in the apologetic writings. At a time when Christians struggled to avoid being the target of persecutions, the apologetic strategy primarily consisted in making the Christian faith plausible with respect to the virgin birth, the resurrection of Jesus and the miracles that he performed, by drawing attention to analogous stories that were at the foundations of traditional cults around divinized men (heroes). Thus *Justin Martyr (*1 Apol.* 21) mentions the "sons of Zeus," in order to support the plausibility of the divinity of Jesus on the basis of these traditions. The *True Doctrine* of *Celsus, written during the same turning point in history, places in doubt or ridicules not only those aspects of the life of Jesus (virginal conception, reality of the resurrection, appearances to the disciples after his death) on which the Christians relied for the demonstration of his divine nature, but also criticizes the miracles performed by Jesus for either not having occurred or for being indebted to the magical arts that he acquired during his stay in Egypt. In order to emphasize the high tone of contradiction between the faith of Christians in Jesus and their rejection of the cult of heroes, the biographies and the outstanding accomplishments

of these men are compared with the much more modest and minor accomplishments of Jesus (*C. Cel.* III, 22-41). Celsus's criticism also contains arguments of a philosophical nature. On the basis of the *Middle Platonic concept of God, he maintains that the incarnation is contradictory and impossible, and he negates the concept of God's omnipotence that upholds Christian faith in miracles. Celsus acts here as a spokesperson for a hotly debated problem in the peripatetic and *Platonic schools of philosophy: the concept of nature, and the necessary and immutable laws that govern it. Galen, e.g., was critical of the Jewish idea of God's omnipotence. He observes that for Moses it seems sufficient to say that God has created everything in order to uphold that which for him is completely possible, even to make a horse or a bull out of ashes. Meanwhile, continues Galen, some things are by nature impossible and God cannot act against nature (Gal., *Us. Part.* XI, 14; see Grant, 130). Celsus similarly affirms that God cannot perform evil or irrational acts, since he is the rational principle of everything that exists (*C. Cel.* 5,14).

*Origen, for his part, agrees in criticizing a concept of divine omnipotence that has no restrictions: the power of God cannot be without limits, since that which does not have limits cannot be known. Moreover, God cannot do things against nature, neither against justice, because otherwise God would not be God; nonetheless, he can do things "beyond nature" (*C. Cel.* 5,23). With this affirmation, Origen defends the philosophical possibility of the gospel miracles. That these are really miracles, namely, manifestations of the intervention of a divine Power and not the result of magical arts, is proved by the moral integrity of him who performs them and by the beneficial impact, brought to completion in salvation, that such acts have on the beneficiary (*C. Cel.* 3,22.25.42).

In writings that are less directly devoted to the apologetic task, Origen shows his skepticism for the true efficacy of the argument for miracles. The lavish works of the Lord were able to instill faith in his contemporaries, but not in successive generations that were inclined to treat them as "myths" (*Comm. Jn.* II, 34,204). For this reason he emphasized above all the *allegorical significance of these stories: the stories of healings allude to the healing of those who have been freed from every illness through a work of the Logos (*Comm. Jn.* I, 33,206). The idea that the miracles were limited to the apostolic era was rather common. *Victorinus of Petovium (*Comm. Ap.* 10,2) affirms that these miracles had the purpose of overcoming unbelief, but that now, with the growth of the churches, the same function is performed by the interpretation of Scripture. *Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 5,23) is astonished to read in *Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 2,21,2) that miracles continued to be performed up until the author's own day.

It is also noteworthy that in the 2nd and 3rd c. as well, in a *pagan setting, the philosophical treatises coexisted with other literary *genres in which much space was granted to the "miraculous." Consider the biographical profile of Plato that opens the treatise *De Platone et eius dogmate* by Apuleius, or the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* by Philostratus, or even the *Life of Pythagoras* by *Porphyry. These are texts in which the philosopher revives the theme of the "divine man" whose distinctive features include the miraculous birth, the healings, the prophecies, the ascension into heaven etc. This is a literature in which the miraculous is a function of propaganda and a defense of a philosophical school or of a protagonist who is caught in a contest of rivalry between schools or in polemic.

In a similar way but in a Christian context, along with Origen's attentiveness to the philosophical debate and concentration on the interior transformation of individual persons, there were texts circulating (even those of a propagandistic character) with great success, texts in which the thaumaturgical and the miraculous take on a central role. I am referring in particular to the apocryphal *Acts of the Apostles* in which the apostles perform extraordinary miracles that demonstrate the superiority of the God of the Christians over other gods and thus lead to conversion.

Beginning in the 4th c., important changes occurred, particularly in connection with the enormous growth of the cult of saints and with the spread of mysticism. It would seem that in preceding years, miracles, either as the object of debate over the figure of Jesus or in the legendary stories about the apostles, generally looked back on Christian origins from a distance. (There are exceptions; consider the citation from Irenaeus.) In the new century, contemporary miracles that arise from the works of living saints or through the bodies of saints (*see* *relics) take on prime consideration. It is also interesting to note yet another area of change: the role played by the leaders of the churches and by the prominent members of elite society in promoting not only the practice of the cult of saints but also the lives of saints and their miracles through writings of a lofty and sometimes extremely refined tone. One thinks of *Athanasius of Alexandria, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Sulpicius Severus, *Paulinus of Nola and *Jerome. The *Life of Anthony* (between 355 and 361) serves as a point of

reference for much of the subsequent hagiographic literature. Although it closely connects *ascesis and thaumaturgy, the work reveals an awareness of the main terms of the debate over miracles, and of the possible dangers which the accentuation of this element in constructing the life of a saint can engender. In ch. 38 it upholds the prevalence of ascesis over miracles, in the sense that one is the result of human striving and the other is a divine gift. Beginning with the 4th c., the "contemporary" miracles gain the attention of ecclesiastical writers who write of and publicize them. This is true even for a writer who at least up to a certain point in his life had shown little interest in this topic. The case of *Augustine is illuminating. In *De vera religione* (387–391) and in *De utilitate credenda* (391–392), he argues that the miracles of the apostles, necessary for affirming faith in Christ, are finished in the sense that their repetition would make them banal and ordinary. The affirmation is all the more significant in that he does not seem to assign any value to the miracles that *Ambrose reports to have occurred at Milan in 386 during the transference of the relics of *Gervasius and Protasius, a transference with which Augustine had otherwise assisted. Five years later, Augustine (*Serm.* 320-324, *Civ. Dei* XXII, and in the *Retractationes*) accepts the contemporary miracles, the stories of which he gathers together in **libelli* that he intended to be read out to the faithful. In parallel fashion, drawing attention to the *miracula quotidiana* of the natural world (*Serm.* 126,3,4) and affirming the supremacy of the interior miracles of spiritual conversion, he continues to act as a spokesperson for the concept of miracles that tends to relativize the importance of contemporary miracles.

The case of Jerome illustrates another interesting feature: his three *Vitae* of *Malchus, *Paul and *Hilarion abound with miracles. In the eyes of scholars, some of the miracles are so extravagant that they cancel out any historical value in the narrative accounts. There is an exception to this pattern in the text of *In Memory of Paul.* Like the preceding works, it consists of a description of a "monastic" saint, but the miraculous component is absent. The difference in strategy reveals a shifting literary purpose that recognizes in the miraculous element the most appropriate means for a literature of edification, intended for a popular audience that is different from the literary audience around Paul. To judge from texts such as the *History of the Monks of Egypt* by *Rufinus of Aquileia (early 5th c.), the *Lausiac History* of *Palladius (419–420) and the *Religious History* of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (beginning of 5th c.?) that assemble biographies of Egyptian and Syrian monks and in which the miraculous is overflowing, it would seem that this very element remained important in efforts to promote the monastic movement, as well as in the penetration of its ideals among an audience whose members were not directly involved in its way of life.

We should not conclude that all the ecclesiastical writers took the same position regarding contemporary miracles. In the *Life of *Macrina*, written by Gregory of Nyssa, the miraculous component is reduced to a minimum, while the whole context is concerned with ascesis. In the next century, *Hilary of Arles recounts the life of *Honoratus (430–431) without the miraculous, explicitly arguing that the virtues that he practiced constitute his miracles.

Beginning in the 6th c., ecclesiastical writers appear to abandon any reservations over miracles, and it is in this era that the literary genre of miracle stories gains ground. An example is the eight *Libri miraculorum* by *Gregory of Tours. Yet even this age is not monolithic. An interesting case study is *Gregory the Great, who at the end of the century and in certain passages even restates the spiritual convictions of the early church. According to *Hom. Ev. 1,4,3* and *In Iob* 27,18,36, the *miracula visibilia* were indispensable in apostolic times, but now they have become rare, with the *merita operum* being more essential than the *signa virtutum*, even if these continue to take place. Yet in other writings, such as his *Dialogues* that recount the miraculous deeds of Italian *viri Dei*, he seems instead to embrace without reservation the favorable trend toward the miraculous, even if in points of emphasis he differs from Gregory of Tours. While Gregory of Tours recounts miracles by placing the emphasis on the actual event and on its immediate effects, the writer of the *Dialogues* seems to treat the actual event as incidental to and indicative of the underlying moral (see Uytfanghe). It is also noteworthy that in the era that we are considering, the miraculous is not at all limited to the usual literary genres of hagiography (biographies, collections of miracles, stories of translations of relics), but is "pervasive" in the sense that even other genres could not resist its allure. Let it suffice to contrast the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius with the subsequent histories under the same title by *Socrates Scholasticus, *Sozomen and Theodoret of Cyrrhus in the East, and with the *Libri historiarum* by Gregory of Tours in the West. It is in this genre of writing that the political function of thaumaturgy becomes clearer. Over the course of time, the miraculous legitimizes the emperor's rule, the orthodox faith, ecclesiastical and monastic claims of all

sorts, etc. In the narrative of history, the miraculous displaces the exposition of an argument either in favor of or against a certain reality, or it displaces the realistic explanation of events.

H. Delehaye, *Les recueils antiques des miracles des saints*: AB 43 (1925) 5-85; 305-325; R.M. Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought*, Amsterdam 1952; ed. C.F.D. Moule, *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*, London 1965; C.H. Talbert, *Biographies of Philosophers and Rulers as Instruments of Religious Propaganda in Mediterranean Antiquity*: ANRW 18,2 (1978) 1619-1651; *Hagiographies, cultures et sociétés (IV–XII siècles)*, Paris 1981: in particular the contributions of L. Cracco Ruggini, *Il miracolo nella cultura del tardo Impero*, 161-204, and of M. van Uytfanghe, *La controverse biblique et patristique autour du miracle et ses répercussions sur l'hagiographie dans l'Antiquité tardive et le haut Moyen Âge latin*, 205-233; H.C. Kee, *Miracle in the Early Christian World: A Study in Sociohistorical Method*, New Haven-London 1982; H. Remus, *Pagan-Christian Conflict over Miracle in the Second Century*, Cambridge, MA 1983; F. Mosetto, *I miracoli evangelici nel dibattito fra Celso e Origene*, Rome 1986; W.D. McCready, *Signs of Sanctity: Miracles in the Thought of Gregory the Great*, Toronto 1989; R. Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*, Princeton, NJ 1993; S. Boesch Gajano - M. Modica (ed.), *Miracoli*, Rome 1999.

A. Monaci Castagno

MIRACLES of JESUS (in Ethiopic, *Ta'amra Iyasus*). An Ethiopian *apocryphon. This is a vast Ethiopian collection of stories concerning the life of Jesus, and it represents a tradition that is reasonably faithful to the *Arabic Gospel of John* (8th c.?); it is even possible that both works proceed from a common source. The *Miracles of Jesus* has been amplified with the insertion of other texts and by additions to the text itself (e.g., stories of the infancy or the history of *Abgar). The translation probably appeared during the 14th c. The work has enjoyed great popularity in *Ethiopia, and it has even been employed in the liturgy, from which derive numerous codices with variations in the sequence of texts and with differing numerations. The number of "miracles" varies between 40 and 88. The *Miracles of Jesus* employs a text of the gospel that is akin to the *Vetus Syra*.

CANT 45 (bibl.). *Editions*: S. Grébaut: PO 12 (1919) 550-662; 14 (1920) 767-844; 17 (1923) 783-857; ROC 21 (1918–1919) 100-103; 203-213; 33 (1920–1924) 57-61 (up to miracle 30, the baptism and the temptation of Christ, i.e., up to the [33rd] 44th miracle of the *Arabic Gospel of John*, which has 45 miracles); Id., ROC 16 (1911) 225-265; 356-367; 21 (1918–1919) 94-99; A. Vööbus, *Ta'amera Iyasus. Zeuge eines älteren äthiopischen Evangelientypus*: OCP 17 (1951) 462-467; V. Arras - L. van Rompay, *Les manuscrits éthiopiens des "Miracles de Jésus"*: AB 93 (1975) 133-146; W. Witakowski, *The Miracles of Jesus: An Ethiopian Apocryphal Gospel*: Apocrypha 6 (1995) 279-298.

M. Starowieyski

MIRACULIS S. STEPHANI, De. The discovery of the *relics of St. Stephen (at Kefar Gamala in 415) and their proliferation in *Africa after 418 precipitated miracles in various localities. Possidius compiled the *libelli miraculorum* for Calama, and *Augustine compiled them for Hippo; these writings tell of the healings carried out through the intercession of Stephen. Augustine tells of some seventy being compiled at Hippo around 427 (*Civ. Dei* 22,8,21), and many more at Calama. Only one of the accounts has been preserved; it was redacted by a Paul of Cappadocia who was cured at Hippo (*Sermo* 322,2). The *libelli* of Uzala in Africa Proconsularis were first ignored. Once the local bishop Evodius had given his approval and Augustine had intervened (PL 41, 833-854), they were officially sanctioned. These "Miracles of St. Stephen" constitute excellent written testimony not only of the African cult of protomartyrs but also of the cult of relics that was very rapidly developing in Africa.

CPL 391; BHL 7860-7861; H. Delehaye, *Les premiers libelli miraculorum*: AB 29 (1910) 427-434; Id., *Les recueils antiques des miracles des saints*: AB 43 (1925) 74-85; V. Saxer, *Morts martyrs reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 246-254; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, II, Rome 1982, 626-627; AugL 2, 1158ff.

V. Saxer

MISAEL (Misahel) (d. after 537). A 6th-c. *monophysite. Around 518 he became a **cubicularius* in the Eastern imperial court (*Jordanes, *Romana* 360: MGH, *Auct. ant.* 5,47; *Marcellinus Comes, s.a. 519; Sev. Ant., *Ep. sel.* 1,17; 11,1; CSCO 7, 10). He was a friend and correspondent of *Severus of Antioch, who even helped to restore the finances of his church (Sev. Ant., *Ep. sel.* 11,1). *Zacharias Scholasticus dedicated a number of biographies to him, including one on *Peter the Iberian (*Vita Isaiae*: CSCO 7, 10). Together with Amantius he was an opponent of the emperor Justin in 518, thus he was exiled to *Serdica (Jordanes, *Romana*; John Mal. fr. 23). He then became a deacon and lived at *Constantinople, as one can deduce from the letters of Severus of Antioch (*Ep. Sel.* 1,63; 3,3; 3,4). He died after 537, the date of a letter of Severus (*Ep. sel.* 1,63).

PLRE 2, 763f.; E.W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch*, London 1902–1904; B. Croke, *The Chronicles of Marcellinus*, Sydney 1995.

A. Di Berardino

MITHRAS – MITHRAISM. A part of the common Indo-Iranian religious heritage (see Vedic Mitra,

commonly connected with Varuna), the god Mithras continued to occupy an important place in Iranian religion after its monotheistic reformation by Zoroaster, in the form of a Yazata, one of the beneficent beings in the sphere of Ahura Mazda. Celebrated in the 10th Hymn (Yasht) of the Avesta as the protector of justice and of contracts, Mithras, whose name means "covenant," appears therein as a celestial and luminous divinity connected with the sun; a protector of livestock, who guarantees good pasture, and of just humans; an enemy of the wicked and an avenger of their offenses. The cult of Mithras spread throughout many of the regions subject to the Achaemenid Empire, esp. Asia Minor, due to the work of the Magi, or *Magusei*, priests of the Zoroastrian religion deeply immersed in Babylonian astrology. This setting, penetrated also by Hellenism, is likely the locus of an important phase in the development which led from the ancient Iranian cult of Mithras to the formation of W Mithraism as a mystery religion. In fact, beginning in the late 1st to early 2nd c., we witness in the Roman Empire the spread of a cult, initiatory and esoteric in character, and centering on Mithras, which preserves certain aspects of its original form (connections to the heavens and the sun, an association with the notion of justice), but which assumes new functions, both cosmogonic and soteriological. The documents that reveal Roman Mithraism and its mysteries are mostly archaeological, epigraphic and artistic-monumental in nature, whereas the few literary sources consist mostly of short and allusive notices in works by Christian authors, to whom the cult of Mithras appears a diabolical "counterfeit" of Christian rites and concepts. The basic task of the god, illustrated by numerous figurative monuments (statues, bas-reliefs, paintings) which adorned the back walls of the cult's location (the Mithraeum, commonly underground, or at least imitating a grotto by the use of various devices and therefore also called a *spelaeum*), consists in the slaying of a bull (tauroctony), which takes on a cosmogonic character or at any rate serves to promote life and the fecundity of the cosmos. Indeed, often from the tail of the slain animal emerge ears of wheat, while a number of animals (dogs, scorpions, snakes) attend the scene and appear to delight in the beneficial effects of the bull's blood. The tauroctony is portrayed as a positive act, commonly situated in a large cosmic setting (the sun, the moon, the seven planets and the twelve signs of the zodiac are present at the event), which recognizes other divine realities, related in various ways to Mithras himself (the Sun, Heaven and the Ocean, *Tellus*, Saturn). One very important figure on the religious horizon of Mithras is the so-called *Leontocephalus*, a human figure with the head of a lion, wrapped in (seven) serpentine coils, whose attributes (scepter, keys, celestial orb) characterize him as a cosmic force, not hostile but formidable, and at any rate needing to be surpassed in view of an *ascensus* to a superior celestial sphere. In this sense the interpretation of the Mithraic ideology seems to point to the scheme of a "ladder" to seven doors attested by Celsus-Origen (*C. Cels.* 6,22). These doors in fact correspond to the seven planetary heavens, evoked in many figurative monuments and implied by the very system of the seven initiatory levels.

The Mithraic community, which was restricted to men, in fact envisaged seven progressive orders (*corax* "raven," *nymphus* "bridegroom," *miles* "soldier," *leo* "lion," *perses* "Persian," *heliodromus* "courier of the sun"), culminating in the highest level, *Pater*, with priestly functions and in close relationship with Mithras. Each initiatory level related to a planetary heaven and a respective tutelary divinity. Furthermore, the passage from one level to another was in some measure configured as corresponding to the movement in the celestial *ascensus.* The initiatory ritual envisioned numerous purifications and tests, even cruel ones, of endurance, while the communal liturgy consisted of a banquet wherein the *Pater* and the *Heliodromus* played the part of the guests, representing Mithras and the Sun, while the other initiates played the part of the servants. Justin (1 *Apol.* 66) tells of bread and water offered to the initiates, while *Tertullian describes the coronation rite which takes places during the initiation of the *miles* (*De cor.* 15; *De praescr. haer. 40*). The religious ethos of Mithraism consists of a strong ethical obligation during one's earthly life through the affirmation of truth and justice, following the god, who has known how to fulfill the mission entrusted to him by a higher power in order to guarantee life and cosmic order. This results, above all, in the inscriptions that accompany the paintings of the Roman Mithraeum of St. Prisca, wherein a soteriological perspective appears to be expressed in relation to the shedding of blood.

The mystery cult of Mithras achieved notable growth in the Roman Empire, being esp. well-received by soldiers and functionaries of state administration, and without ever becoming the official religion of the state enjoyed the favor of the public authorities. It offered to its followers well-being in this life and, in all likelihood, specific guarantees even for the life to come.

F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, I–II, Brussels 1896–1899; M.J. Vermaseren, *Corpus In-*

scriptionum et monumentorum religionis mithriacae, I–II, The Hague 1956–1960; U. Bianchi (ed.), *Mysteria Mithrae*, Rome-Leiden 1979; R. Merkelbach, *Mithras*, Königstein/Ts. 1984; W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge, MA-London 1987; J.R. Hinnells (ed.), *Studies in Mithraism: Papers Associated with the Mithraic Panel Organized on the Occasion of the XVIth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions, Rome 1990*, Rome 1994; R.L. Gordon, *Image and Value in the Graeco-Roman World: Studies in Mithraism and Religious Art*, Norfolk 1996; A. Mastrocinque, *Studi sul mitraismo (il mitraismo e la magia)*, Rome 1998; P. Scarpi (ed.), *Le religioni dei misteri, II, Samotracia, Andania, Iside, Cibele e Attis, Mitraismo*, Milan 2002; E. Sanzi, *I culti orientali nell'Impero romano. Un'antologia di fonti,* Cosenza 2003; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Misteri e teologie. Per la storia dei culti mistici e misterici nel mondo antico,* Cosenza 2003.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

MODESTUS (2nd c.). Anti-*Marcionite writer of the era of *Marcus Aurelius (161–180). In the estimation of *Eusebius of Caesarea, "He knew, better than anyone, how to reveal for the world the errors of the heresiarch," namely, Marcion (*HE* 4,25). His works have been lost. *Jerome informs us that his popularity was such that many pseudegrapha circulated under the name of Modestus (*Vir. Ill.* 32).

A. Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*, Leipzig [2]1924 = Darmstadt 1996, 317-318 (Fr. tr. Paris 2003).

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

MODESTUS of Jerusalem (d. ca. 630). Patriarch of Jerusalem. Modestus was *hegumen of the famous Palestinian monastery founded in the previous century by St. *Theodosius (d. 529) at the time of the conquest of *Syria and *Palestine by *Chosroes II and his general Romizanes (or Shahrbaraz). It was *Zacharias the orthodox patriarch who selected Modestus for a mission to Jericho with the aim of sending *Byzantine military reinforcement and thus attempting a last defense of the Holy City. The Persian army entered Jerusalem nevertheless (May 614), burning churches and massacring a portion of the population. They sold the survivors as slaves or carried them off to Persia. Among this latter group was Patriarch Zacharias. Up until 622 the Christians of Palestine were subject to both the tyranny of Persian occupation and the vengeance of the Jews.

Yet the situation changed with the first military victory of *Heraclius. Together with freedom of worship, the Christians recovered their churches and monasteries. They even obtained permission from Chosroes to rebuild, as much as they could, the buildings which lay in ruin. Even though he had expelled the Jews from Jerusalem, Chosroes was nevertheless more favorable to the *monophysites than to the *orthodox. It was therefore absolutely necessary that a trustworthy personality take the reins of this community, whose spiritual head remained in exile. It was at this moment that Modestus assumed the responsibility. He proved perfectly suited to the task both spiritually and materially. Specifically, he was a very wise rebuilder, focused on preserving structures in their original form whenever possible. Modestus was assisted considerably in his activities by aid sent from the patriarch of Alexandria, *John the Almsgiver.

The decisive victory of Heraclius was concluded with the treaty of Arabissus (July 629). In addition to the evacuation of all conquered lands, Heraclius demanded the return of the relics of the Holy Cross, which a Christian in the retinue of Chosroes was able to save from destruction and which Heraclius transferred personally to Jerusalem, which he entered on 21 March 630.

In the meantime, Zacharias had died in exile. In light of the work accomplished by Modestus, the emperor saw in him the chosen successor to the deceased patriarch. The reign of Modestus was of extremely short duration, since he died, it seems in the same year, on a return voyage from Syria, or at least on one of his many travels in Palestine. His body was transported to Jerusalem.

Even if the Greek biography of Modestus, published by Loparev in 1892 (BHG 1299 and 1299a), is pure fiction, more can be believed concerning the details of his activity furnished by Antiochus, a contemporary monk of the *laura of St. *Sabas; by Eustachius of Ancyra (PG 89, 1421-1427); or by Eutychius, the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria (933–940), in his *Annals*, preserved in Arabic (CSCO, *Script. arab.* ser. 3, 6 and 7).

According to *Photius, in his *Bibliotheca* (PG 104, 244-245), Modestus is the author of three homilies. Their authenticity has been placed in serious doubt, and the only one published in full is on the dormition of *Mary (PG 86, 3277-3312). Here echoes of the claims by the church of Jerusalem to possess the tomb of the Virgin can already be heard. The homily, however, is reminiscent rather of an author of the late 7th if not early 8th c., according to the conclusions of M. Jugie (*The Death and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin*, Rome 1944, 139-150).

DTC 10, 2047-2048; *Vies des Saints* 12, 532-536; BS 9, 525-526 (the typographical error which has replaced "Theodosius" with "Theodore" in the name of the monastery wherein Modestus was hegumen requires correction); Beck 454-455; R. Henry (ed.), Photius, *Bibliothèque*, VIII, Paris 1977, 118-120; F. Macler,

Histoire d'Héraclius par l'évêque Sebêos, Paris 1904, 70-73 (with Fr. tr.); G. Garitte, *La sépulture de Modeste de Jérusalem*: Muséon 73 (1960) 127-133; D. Bertetto, *S. Modesto di Gerusalemme dottore dell'Assunzione*: Mater Ecclesiae 8 (1972) 154-162; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. G. Gharib, Rome 1989, II, 121-137; Marienlexikon 4, 495-496.

J.-M. Sauget

MOESIA (Mysia). A region of the Balkan Peninsula, bordered on the S by *Thrace and the Haemus Mons (now Stara Planina in Bulgaria and Serbia, i.e., the Balkan Mountains), on the SW by *Macedonia, on the W by Illyria and *Pannonia, on the N by the Danube, and on the E by the Black Sea (Pontus Euxine). Thus in general terms, ancient Moesia coincided with the modern-day territories of NE Serbia and N Bulgaria. In etymological terms, the name derives from the designation of the Thracian ethnic tribe of Moesi (Mysoi). When Moesia was organized as a province during the era of Roman domination, the name designated the population in general terms, without regard to its original meaning along ethnic lines, as we find in Pliny the Elder (*Nat. hist.* III, 149): *provincia quae Moesia appellatur . . . in ea Dardani, Celegeri, Triballi, Timachi, Moesi, Thraces* . . . , such that the designation *Moesicae gentes* lost its strictly ethnic meaning. Moreover, the spelling of the ethnic name itself varies: Moesi, Mysoi, in a rather political and territorial sense.

Having conquered Macedonia around the middle of the 2nd c. BC, in 148 the Romans organized the territory as a province. Meanwhile, the various Thracian tribes that were living to the N of the Haemus Mons remained beyond Roman domination. Rome was compelled to fight them for a long time, finally in 29 BC overcoming their resistance and subjugating them under its rule. Subsequently the territory between the Danbue and the Haemus Mons became subject to the power of Rome, and in the year AD 15 the region was organized as the province of Moesia. The new province assumed an exceptional significance for Rome and its defense of the Danubian *limes* against the invasions of the various "barbarian" tribes. Roxolani, Bastarnae, Scythians and others were advancing from the N and NE, crossing over the great river to rape and pillage the local communities. In order to bolster this defense, around AD 85 the province was split into Moesia Superior (E Serbia) with the city of Naissus (Niš) as its administrative and military center, and Moesia Inferior (comprising N Bulgaria, as well as *Scythia Minor, today's region of Dobruja) with the capital at *Tomis (today's Constanța/Kjustendza). The line of demarcation between the two new provinces was formed by the river Ciabrus (today Tsibritsa), and in a broader sense by the region between Ratiaria (Archar on the Danube in Bulgaria) and Almus (Lom on the Danube). The region along the lower Danube remained particularly vulnerable. A great *vallum*, intended to impede the invasions, was constructed between *Axiopolis (Cernavodă near the river in Romania) and Tomis.

The province of Moesia Inferior assumed prime importance at the beginning of the 2nd c., during the reign of *Trajan (98–117). The emperor embarked on a long war against the Dacians (101–106), beyond the Danube. Episodes from this war are memorialized in the sculptural reliefs of Trajan's column at *Rome, and on the **Tropaeum Traiani* in Adamclissi, Romania). Upon the death of the Dacian king Decebalus in 106, Trajan organized the conquered territory as a Roman province, building fortifications and setting up Roman colonies that would come to play a considerable role in the Romanization of the nation. In order to better assure the physical link with this new province of *Dacia, the emperor pursued a fervid building campaign in Moesia, including fortifications, streets with *mansiones* and *mutationes*, and bridges with defensive ramparts. Up to the present day, these construction projects have often been commemorated under the name of the emperor Trajan; it turns out that in some cases they were not of his making. The emperor Trajan pursued considerable activity in the territories placed under Roman power. First to be built were the various roads that were necessary to facilitate military links, commerce and the *travel of government agents. The principal roadway artery was the so-called Via Diagonalis. It ran from *Singidunum (Belgrade), crossing through Naissus (Niš), *Serdica (Sofia), Philippopolis (Plovdiv) and Adrianopolis (Edirne of Turkey, known as Odrin in Bulgarian) before arriving at *Constantinople. It traversed only a part of the province of Moesia but most of the province of Thrace. Another Roman road followed the Danubian *limes*: from Singidunum, crossing through Bononia (Vidin in NW Bulgaria), proceeding to the E, reaching the region of the Danube delta and running along the shore of the Black Sea, it arrived at the Bosporus. Streets of minor importance were constructed in the interior of Moesia. One road departed from the colony of Novae (near the Bulgarian city of Svishtov on the Danube), extended S, crossed over the Haemus Mons, arrived at Philippopolis and met up with the Via Diagonalis. Even today, the pass in Bulgaria through the Haemus Mons bears the name Trayanov Prokhod, in perpetual memory of Trajan. Inasmuch

as these roadway arteries were constructed and organized in a solid manner and a rational way, we find that there are still considerable remains of these arteries visible in quite a few localities, and that a good number of modern roadways follow the general layout of Roman times.

No less important than the network of roads was the process of urbanization begun by Trajan. The local population was sparse in areas through which roads did not pass, and typically the form and organization of small villages were rather poorly designed. Nonetheless, some villages were established as *municipia*, and therefore had open squares, paved roads, aqueducts, and imposing public and religious edifices. With the exception of a few urban centers that have arisen in recent times, most of the cities in contemporary Bulgaria have preserved their original centers from the era of Roman domination. We can precisely date the foundation and growth of some of these urban centers to the time of Trajan, including Nicopolis ad Istrum (ruins at 20 km [12.4 mi] N of the city of Veliko Tarnovo, next to the village of Nikyup, a Serbian corruption of the classical name) and Marcianopolis (ruins W of Varna near Reka Devnya; acc. to ancient witnesses, named after Trajan's sister Marcia). The city of Nicopolis flourished right up until its destruction at the hands of *Attila. In honor of the emperor, some of these urban centers even received the gentilitial honors of the imperial family, as in Colonia Ulpia Traiana Ratiaria and Colonia Ulpia Oescensium. In fact, none of the Roman emperors of the following centuries matched the fame of Trajan. Judging from the testimonies of written medieval sources, we conclude that the name of the emperor was one of the divinities venerated by the *pagan Slavs in the Middle Ages. After coming under Roman domination, the region of Moesia unfortunately did not enjoy perpetual tranquility. The Thracian people badly endured the rule of foreigners, and more than once their rebellion led to a bloody outcome.

However, the defense of the Danubian *limes* was not always well organized. More than once, the local population endured suffering in the invasions of the "barbarian" tribes and peoples, who came from the N of the Danube and penetrated the region to the S. Some of these invasions arrived peacefully or established rather "friendly" relations with the local people, who sometimes treated the invaders as allies against Roman rule. The situation undoubtedly led to a decrease in the local population and at the same time to a certain change in its ethnic composition. Therefore, it seems impossible to claim that already in the first centuries of the Christian era the territory of Moesia represented a "deserted region" as a consequence of the invasions or even epidemics. (In fact, the pestilence raged more than once.) The place names and the names of bodies of water that remained intact until the end of the Middle Ages are eloquent testimony against such a claim. A great ethnic and administrative change occurred in 271. Facing the advance of the *Goths and other tribes, the emperor *Aurelius decided to evacuate the province of Dacia, and he transferred the civilian Roman population to the S of the Danube. In the process, Moesia was reorganized into two new provinces that bore the translocated name of Dacia: Dacia Ripensis (capital at Ratiaria) and Dacia Mediterranea (capital at Serdica). In only approximate terms were they demarcated by the existing territories of Moesia Superior and Moesia Inferior. Yet the most disastrous ethnic change occurred in the 1st half of the 5th c., as a result of the repeated and ruthless invasions of the *Huns. A part of the local population either was massacred, deported as *slaves of war or forced to abandon their homes, taking refuge in the mountains and remote locales.

The great "Germanic crisis" provoked by the penetration of a conspicuous number of *Ostrogoths and *Visigoths (installed in the Balkan territories as federated and mercenary populations, or simply as unwanted conquerors) did not benefit Moesia at all. At the time of the emperor *Valens (364–378), numerous divisions of Visigoth soldiers, crossing over the Danube and passing through Moesia, penetrated Thrace, where in alliance with the Ostrogoths and Huns they mercilessly devastated the country. The attempt of the emperor to oppose their formidable resistance failed miserably: in a battle occurring on 9 August 378, the emperor himself perished. During the 5th c., the Germanic menace reached its height, esp. due to the presence of two military leaders of the Goths, Theodoric Strabo and *Theoderic Amaling, and their divisions. Initially received into the imperial service, they rather quickly demonstrated a clearly hostile attitude. However, the government of Constantinople enjoyed a respite from their menace, with the death of Theodoric Strabo in 481. For his part, the Eastern emperor *Zeno (474–475, 476–491) succeeded in persuading Theoderic to abandon Moesia, where he was sojourning with his military divisions, and to leave in 488 for *Italy in order to combat *Odoacer. With Odoacer conquered in 493, Theoderic became known as "the Great," establishing the kingdom of the Ostrogoths that spanned a golden age until his death in 526.

After its liberation from the Goths, however, the relief of the Eastern Roman Empire did not endure

for long. Right at the end of the 5th c. and at the beginning of the 6th c., during the reign of the Eastern emperor *Anastasius (491–518), new invaders appeared on the Danubian frontier—the Slavs—this time more numerous and more tenacious. The situation on the Danubian frontier took a particularly tragic turn during the reign of *Justinian I (527–565). As the Slavs prosecuted the emperor's campaign in the E against the *Persians and in the W against the Goths of Italy, they were obliged to leave the Balkan Peninsula without an adequate defense. The line of fortifications, built by imperial order around the middle of the 6th c., remained without garrisons and thus incapable of stopping the mass of Slavs who were descending from the N and from the NE.

In the 2nd half of the 6th c., the invaders no longer contented themselves with penetrating and then departing with extraordinarily lavish booty and slaves, and remained for longer periods of time. In this way, the second phase of their invasions and occupation of the Balkan regions began. The internal political and military crisis that *Byzantium experienced at the beginning of the 7th c., with the assassination of the emperor Maurice and the coup d'état of the usurper, Emperor Phocas, even further facilitated the process of penetration and settlement of the Slavs. Around the middle of the 7th c., the ethnic composition of the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula was already radically changed. Some decades later, the Bulgarian nation arose in 681. The true center of the new state was precisely in Moesia Inferior and Scythia Minor.

In the new country, the Slavs and the early Bulgarians embraced the rich heritage of the past. Even after the long "barbarian" invasions, the remains of the material civilization were always imposing. The heritage of the spiritual civilization, received from the remnants of the traditional population that stayed on during the invasions, took on prime importance. First of all, this spiritual heritage comprised elements of the ancient place names and names of bodies of water; then it constituted a Christian tradition that developed over the centuries. Thus the idiosyncrasies of the Slavic language transformed the name of the city of Serdica (Sofia, the Bulgarian capital) into Sredets. A great number of rivers conceal the classical name in the modern name: *Margus*-Morava, *Ciabrus*-Tsibritsa, *Timacus*-Timok, *Oescus*-Iskŭr (Iskar), *Assamus* (*Asemus*)-Osam, *Augusta*-Ogosta, *Utus*-Vit (Vid), *Ieterus* (*Iatrus*)-Yantra (Jantra), *Tondzus*-Tundzha etc.

When it comes to the propagation of Christianity, numerous indications further testify to the continuity between *Late Antiquity and the High Medieval period. Not being geographically distant from Constantinople, *Thessalonica and *Philippi—the three great centers of ancient Christianity—Moesia inevitably felt their influence, even in the early Christian era. Thanks to multiple sources of evidence from *epigraphic and other written sources, we know of the existence of various Christian centers and their *ecclesiastical organization around bishops, priests and deacons. For the presence of Christians in Moesia, it is significant that the Council of Serdica was held in 343/344. We find various buildings of Christian worship, including basilicas and cruciform churches, in numerous localities of Moesia, though often as ruins. Melettina experienced martyrdom at Marcianopolis. We count the remains of more than 80 churches in today's Bulgaria, which incorporates Moesia Inferior as well as Thrace. In Thrace, the *Greek language was predominant, together with the language of the Thracians. In Moesia, *Latin prevailed as the *liturgical language of the Christians. The information provided by some *Byzantine authors leads us to conclude that certain Christian communities and their clergy must have persisted until the era of the "barbarian" invasions (6th–8th c.).

We should not treat the official *conversion of the Bulgarian people to Christianity in 865 as an accidental occurrence, but rather as the result of a long evolution over centuries, the roots of which we find in Greco-Roman Late Antiquity. In writing the history of Christianity in Bulgaria, we should not overlook the tenacity of the *Arian bishop *Wulfila (ca. 311–383). For a number of years during the 1st half of the 4th c., he lived at Nicopolis ad Istrum among the "lesser Goths."

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain*, Paris 1918; B. Gerov, *La romanisation entre le Danube et les Balkans* (in Bulg. with a Fr. summary): Godišnik (or Annual) of the University of Sofia, Faculty of History and Philology, 45/4 (1948/49) 1-92, part I; 47 (1950/52) 17-122; 48 (1952/53) 307-415, part II; V. Velkov, *Die Stadt im spätantiken Thrakien und Dakien des IV. bis VI. Jahrhunderts* (in Bulg. with a Ger. summary), Sofia 1959; B. Gerov, *L'aspect éthnique et linguistique dans la région entre le Danube et les Balkans à l'époque romaine*: Studi Urbinati new series 1-2 (1959) 173-191; V. Beševliev, *Spätantike und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien*, Berlin 1964; M. Fluss, *Moesi, Moesia*: PWK 15, 2347-2411 (with sources and bibl.); R.F. Hoddinott, *Bulgaria in Antiquity: An Archaeological Introduction*, London 1975; Id., *The Thracians*, London 1981; I. Dujčev, *Testimonianze epigrafiche archeologiche sul paleocristianesimo in Bulgaria*: Atti dell'Accademia pontificia di archeologia 53/54 (1980–1982) 181-205; J. Fitz, *L'administration des provinces danubiennes sous le Bas-Empire romain*, Brussels 1983; C. Poulter, ed., *Ancient Bulgaria*, Nottingham 1983; R. Pillinger, *Monumenti paleocristiani in Bulgaria*: RivAC 61 (1985) 275-310; *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Kultur Bulgariens zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. R. Pillinger, Vienna 1986; V. Velkov, *Wulfila und die Gothi minores in Moesien*: Klio 71 (1989) 525-527; R.L. Dise, *Cultural*

Change and Imperial Administration: The Middle Danube Provinces of the Roman Empire, New York 1991; K. Ilski, *Bischofslisten der Kirchenprovinz Moesia*, in *Prosopographica*, ed. L. Mrozewicz and K. Ilski, Poznan 1993, 237-245; *Moesia christiana: Anfänge und Entwicklung*: Eos 82 (1994) 67-84; Id., *Moesia christiana: die Epoche der christologischen Auseinandersetzungen*: Eos 82 (1994) 291-310; *Limes*, ed. G. Susini, Bologna 1994; B. Gerov, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien*, Amsterdam 1997; A. Poulter, *L'avenir du passé: recherches sur la transition entre la période romaine et le monde protobyzantin dans la région du Bas-Danube*: Antiquité Tard 6 (1998) 329-343.

I. Dujčev

MONACHIS PERFECTIS, De. Anonymous homily composed in the Iberian Peninsula at the end of the 6th c. It comes to us with the writings of *Valerius of Bierzo and for a certain amount of time was considered as the work of Valerius of Bierzo (Fernández Pousa).

Concerning monasticism, which not everyone agrees was morally and physically insulated from the world, this homily was probably written by a well-informed bishop on the matter, and shows that the monks fully reach their virtuous ideals by living in the city, in contact with other people and esp. exposed to temptations.

Díaz 59; R. Fernández Pousa, *San Valerio*. Obras, Madrid 1944, 122-129; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Anecdota wisigothica*, I, Salamanca 1958, 80-87; Ibid., *Un tratado monástico interesante*: Revista Española de Teología 17 (1957) 26-30; U. Domínguez del Val, *La homilía "de monachis perfectis," un tratado de teología sobre la vida monástica*, in *Bivium*, Homenaje a M.C. Díaz y Díaz, Madrid 1983, 55-56; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 383.

P. Marone

MONARCHIANS – MONARCHIANISM. *Tertullian uses these terms to refer to *Praxeas and the *patripassians (*Adv. Prax.* 10,1) as proponents of the *heresy of divine monarchy (*monotheism). Modern scholars prefer to use the term to also refer to another branch of heretics called the *adoptionists. But it is important to be clear that for Christians, faith in God alone was inherited from Judaism as a distinctive character of their religion from the beginning in contrast to *pagan polytheism. However, they had to reconcile that monotheistic faith with their faith in the divinity of Christ, the Son of God; and the theological reflection on this point came about in the 2nd c., in order to elaborate the doctrine of the divine Logos, which conceived Christ as divine Logos, united with the *Father but still distinct from and subordinated to him, interpreter of his will to the created *world. This conception seems to many to be effectively ditheism, conceding too much to Greek *philosophy: against this view, and against *gnostic speculation about the Logos, a monarchian reaction developed that was rigidly monotheistic but radicalized in two directions: first, what is referred to in modern terms as "adoptionism," which considers Christ as simply a charismatically gifted human, who was "adopted" as the Son of God by virtue of his merits; and *patripassianism (modalism, in modern terminology), which considered "the Son" merely a name and the mode in which the Father manifests himself.

Of the two movements, both of them being considered heretical for different reasons, adoptionism was not initially strong: it began at the end of the 2nd c., in *Rome with the work of *Theodotus of Byzantium (called the Tanner), and continued from there by *Artemon (ca. 230–250). But it vigorously took hold in *Arabia (*Beryllus of Bostra) and in *Antioch with *Paul of Samosata (ca. 260–270). In the middle of the 4th c., it was represented by *Photinus of *Sirmium. Patripassianism encountered a better reception: begun at the end of the 2nd c., by *Noetus in *Smyrna, exported to Rome, it thrived in the 1st decades of the 3rd c. (*Epigonus, *Cleomenes, *Praxeas, *Sabellius). Under the name of Sabellianism, it spread throughout *Egypt in the middle of the 3rd c., and from there to various places in the *East.

Alongside these radical forms of monarchianism, but not to be confused with them, a more generic monarchianism existed. It intensely affirmed monotheism and was characterized by the suspicion and aversion to the theology of the Logos, which in polemics with radical monarchianism always continued to develop. In that sense, if radical monarchianism was condemned at Rome, a generically oriented monarchianism remained as the faith of the community. And in the East, this monarchian sensibility strongly opposed *Origen's theology: the monarchian believers accused *Dionysius of Alexandria at Rome (ca. 257), but they were not heretics (i.e., not Sabellians). Probably in this context it was affirmed that the Son is **homoousios* with the Father, in opposition to the theologies of the Logos, which affirmed two **ousai* ("substances") of Father and Son. It is difficult to know the precise character of this monarchianism, because it only rarely found a way to express itself at a literary level—e.g., at the start of the 4th c., with *Eustathius of Antioch (while the contemporary *Marcellus of Ancyra was a much more radical monarchian), and because the Logos theologians found it easy to silence their monarchian adversaries with the heresy of Sabellianism, without distinguishing between moderates and rad-

icals. However, this need for divine monarchy notably influenced, against the radicalization of the Logos theology represented by *Arius, the decisions of the Council of *Nicaea, and consequently the final formulation of trinitarian theology, emphasizing the unitary component.

J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958, 115-126; M. Simonetti, *Sabellio e il sabellianismo*: SSR 4 (1980) 7-28; G. Uribarri Bilbao, *Monarquía y Trinidad: el concepto teológico "monarchia" en la controversia "monarquiana,"* Madrid 1996; Id., *La emergencia de la Trinidad inmanente: Hipólito y Tertuliano*, Madrid 1999; M. Simonetti, *Monarchia e Trinità. Alcune osservazioni su un libro recente*: RSLR 33 (1997) 623-642.

M. Simonetti

MONASTERIES, DOUBLE. In a strict sense, this refers to communities composed of both monks and nuns, under the same authority. In a wider sense, it refers to communities distinctly composed of men and *women, but united by proximity and common tasks. Often they began with the conversion of a whole *family to *asceticism (including *children, servants and *slaves, unless they deliberately refused) that offered to *God their house and inherited property. This was the case with the family of *Basil and his friends. Double monasteries were opposed by *Justinian in 529 and 543, by the Second Council of *Nicaea in 787, and again in subsequent instances. Often they prohibited new ones from starting up, but tolerated the already existent ones. The reiterated condemnation shows their limited efficacy. In the West, the more prominent cases belong to medieval times. Not infrequently the authority was in the hands of the *abbess, while the monks preferred to dedicate themselves to religious service.

DIP 6, 51-52; S. Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster*, Münster 1928; G. Barone Adesi, *Monachesimo ortodosso e diritto romano nel Tardoantico*, Milan 1990.

J. Gribomont

MONASTERY. The Greek word *monasterion*, already used by *Philo in reference to Jewish *ascetics, is first referred to as the isolated *cell of a solitary monk in the 4th c., but then later to a community dwelling. Monasteries obtained financial privileges early on due to their *poverty, social utility, holy character and, after the Council of *Chalcedon, the recognition by bishops of their rights and duties that can vary (imperial, patriarchal monasteries; in the West, exemption etc.). The authority of the superior is recognized to a certain extent over goods and persons, and early on they become first-rate economic, cultural, artistic and esp. spiritual centers.

DIP 6, 48-51; A. De Meester, *De monarchico statu iuxta disciplinam byzantinam*, Vatican City 1942, index 456-457; G. Barone Adesi, *Monachesimo ortodosso e diritto romano nel Tardoantico*, Milan 1990.

J. Gribomont

MONASTIC HABIT. A religious habit proper to the regular clergy did not exist in early Christianity. Only modesty in dress was recommended to clergy, and they were forbidden to wear long hair. The tonsure, practiced in the East from the 4th c., arrived much later in the West. The late medieval councils were the first to prescribe style and colors in clergy dress, until the Council of Trent peremptorily prescribed the wearing of an appropriate habit. The monastic habit, however, was used from the beginning of the movement, as both an instrument of humility and a distinctive sign of the monastic state. It was also given a mystical interpretation, at the root of which was the concept that the change in clothes signified the change in mentality and conduct. *John Cassian (early 5th c.) develops this theme in the first book of the *Institutes*. Some years earlier *Sulpicius Severus portrayed *Martin of Tours dressed in a bland outfit and a black pallium (*Dial.* II, 3,2), calling the crowd of monks that followed his funeral train the *agmina palliata* (*Ep.* 3, 19). The hairshirt, *camelorum saetis*, was common (see Paul. Nola, *Ep.* 29, 1), the use of which seems to have led in some circles to a kind of Eastern arrogance, and it was thus rejected by Cassian (*Inst.* 1,3). Monastic dress also spread beyond the *asceteri*, so much so that in 428 Celestine prohibited its use by bishops and clergy (*Ep.* 4,1, PL 50, 429ff.). The great early legislators referred to the monk's dress. The *Rule of Pachomius* (16, PG 40, 949) alludes to a style proper to monks (σχῆμα ἀποτακτικόν); *Basil recommends for them poverty and modesty in dress (*Reg. fus. tract.* 22 and 23); the *Reguli magistri* and *Benedict, who each have a chapter *de vestiario* (RM 81; RB 55), ascribe to the monk the use of tunic and hood (*cuculla*). After Benedict this type of dress became established, whereas the dress of laypersons changed radically.

P. Oppenheim, *Das Mönchskleid im christlichen Altertum*, Freiburg 1931; L. Cristiani, *Essai sur les origines du costume ecclésiastique*: OCP 13 (1947) 69-80; M. Augè, *L'abito religioso*, Rome 1977; M. Boulding, *Background to a Theology of the Monastic Habit*: DR 98 (1980) 110-123.

S. Pricoco

MONASTICISM

I. Origins - II. The East - III. The West.

I. Origins. At the beginning of the 4th c., the moment in which the church reconciled itself with the *world, there arose a resistance movement to return to the ancient opposition that renounced the world. The protagonists were the so-called *apotaktitai*, *apotaktitoi*, *apostolikoi* (**apostolici*). This phenomenon manifested itself esp. in places where Hellenism, which was by now on the wane, had long suppressed a venerated indigenous wisdom, in *Syria and *Egypt. Instead, N *Asia Minor, still poorly acculturated to Hellenism, underwent Mesopotamian influences. The effect of these social factors cannot be overlooked, esp. the impact as well of Eastern religions or **gnosis*. To the extent that some saints gave a precise direction to the movement, this set free its gospel inspiration and made it one of the strongest forces in the church, even if it often deviated and tended toward sectarianism. It followed an extremely strict *ascetic conception of *baptism, centered on continence, *poverty, a life of *prayer and a *Jewish-Christian "prophetic" tradition, which in Syria became the institution of the "sons of the covenant." With the Greek term *monachos*, documented in Egypt (*papyri) starting from 324 and indicative of those belonging to the class (*tagma*) of celibates which abandoned their own homes and (in part) their own assets, sharing to a certain extent the dignity of *clergy, the movement assumed a well-defined form. Two important figures, *Anthony and *Pachomius, guaranteed its success and established the model for all the churches in two preeminent types: the solitary monk (*anchorite) and the *cenobite monk who lives in the *community (**koinonia*) of an organized group. Dependent, if not always upon local clergy, at least upon the forward-looking *authority of *Athanasius, they came under the *discipline of the church and they found countless valuable disciples. By means of *Macarius the Egyptian, among others, Anthony (d. 356) imposed his ideal on the semianchorism (eremitic colonies) of Nitria and *Scete. His *biography, composed by Athanasius, was soon translated into various languages and had a normative influence. The struggle that Athanasius himself had against the state church and the elite classes notably facilitated his alliance with monasticism and the formation in the church of a voluntary and popular army, poor and enthusiastic, charismatic, held in great esteem in the eyes of the masses.

The ancient history of the term *monachos* sheds light upon the origins of its establishment in the *desert. From the Jewish versions of Aquila and *Symmachus (see esp. Ps 67:7 in the commentary of *Eusebius: PG 23, 689B) and the apocryphal *Gospel of *Thomas*, it would seem that, moving from the Aramaic and *Syriac equivalent, we must recognize that from the 2nd c., it had a great semantic impact: "unique, loved by God in a unique way, likened to the unique Son." It cannot be claimed that in the 4th c. the vocabulary still preserved such a theological meaning.

Even in Egypt not all monks were reducible to eremitic and cenobitic models. The evidence speaks continually of "deteriorating" types, which are most likely the persistence or recurrence of primitive, anarchist formulas, rather unstable, tending toward begging, and not without the pretence of imposing themselves upon bishops and the public. This spiritual liberty, when it resolved into a refusal to follow in the footsteps of more prestigious saints, evidently risked deviation, and at worst, becoming bandits (*see* *Circumcellions).

II. The East. In the 4th c., Asia Minor and *Constantinople witnessed an evolution that did not depend upon Egypt. Already by 340, *Eustathius of Sebaste led a movement that entered into conflict with *Eusebius of Nicomedia and the official church (Council of *Gangra). This occurred in *Pontus and, through the deacon *Marathonius, even in the capital at the time of *Macedonius. *Basil the Great's adherence to this group provided a profoundly evangelical and ecclesial development, under a strict cenobitic form focused on service to the *poor, disciplined *labor, regular adoption of priestly *ministry and even of the episcopate. The activity of the Cappadocians went beyond this movement to Nicene *orthodoxy and philosophical humanism. Naturally, there was no small number of extremists, which was difficult to monitor. Through *Macarius/Simeon these would constitute the group denounced as *Messalians by the Council of *Side (ca. 390) and then by the Antiochene hierarchy. However, Macarius remained vigilant to do as much as possible to keep this group in the church and to combat abuse.

Basilian norms spread throughout Syria and *Palestine; however, they encountered—as we see from the *Religious History* of *Theodoret—a much more rigid *ascesis, which seems not to have tolerated anything of the conventional way of life (housing, cooking food, use of clothing) and tended toward a primitive life. Some Syriac writings attributed to *Ephrem portray this extremist ideal.

Egypt in the 2nd part of the 4th c. became the "classic place" of monasticism and attracted visitors, esp. from the East (*Rufinus, *Melania, *Jerome,

*Evagrius of Pontus, *Palladius, *John Cassian), due to the fame of holy monks, of their spiritual teaching and well-conducted literary propaganda. Although the *Life of Anthony* (Athanasius) and certain **apophthegmata* are used to portray a typical monastery that would have been rough, uncultivated, if not directly anti-intellectual, other indications suggest a very different reality, a rich spiritual tradition created by the fusion of Greek philosophical currents with the interpretation of Scripture, which one finds in different ways and degrees in every monastic context in Egypt.

Basic elements of this tradition, founded on the interpretation of Scripture by the great Alexandrian authors (*Philo, *Origen, *Didymus), would be the prerequisite for the possibility of making spiritual progress, the struggle against the passions and thoughts (*logismoi*) which blocked the way to contemplation and union with God, the idea of *askēsis* (spiritual exercises) and esp. the study and interpretation of Scripture. The *Letters* of Anthony and of *Ammonius, the Coptic fragments of *Paul of Tamma (4th c.) and later *Rufus of Shotep (end of 6th c.) show that they were not merely a tradition of Greek elites (Didymus, Evagrius). There is no shortage of indications of the same tradition in the Pachomian literature. Norms belonging to Pachomius indicate that it was obligatory to learn to read.

The literature of visitors (**Historia monachorum in Aegypto* and the *Historia Lausiaca*) shows the same tradition as well as an interest in the amazing wonders that occurred among the monks. Although a major part of the Coptic literature was lost over the centuries, the fragments belonging to the monastic libraries bear witness to the intellectual and spiritual life of the monks. Toward the end of the 4th c., Evagrius of Pontus brings to Scete a Cappadocian and philosophical formation, and rediscovers the Alexandrian tradition. But right away after his death (399), the patriarch Theophilus struggled against *Origenism, the weapon of his own authority and ambition that would end with the deposition of *John Chrysostom some years later. The *Origenist controversy would cast a large shadow on Egyptian monasticism.

Already in Palestine in the 1st half of the 4th c. (*Hilarion, Chariton), monasticism obtained an inheritance of the different monastic spiritual currents. Not to mention, for the moment, the Latin settlements in *Jerusalem or *Bethlehem, *Gaza saw *Isaiah succeeded by *Barsanuphius and *John, then *Dorotheus, while the desert of *Judea, whose monks ended up resolutely adhering to Chalcedon, also had its own center of prestigious holiness, around *Sabas and *Euthymius (biographies written by *Cyril of Scythopolis). In turn, Mount *Sinai took over with *John Climacus and others. From *Armenia, *Georgia, *Persia, *Arabia and *Ethiopia, monastic elites came here to be formed and brought back with them to their own lands some spiritual, liturgical and cultural traditions. In the meantime the imperial laws and then the hierarchy (Council of Chalcedon) attempted to put the monastic world in order and subject it to the bishops. The whole discipline (novitiate, profession, poverty vows, restricted travel, separation from *women, obedience) would also be consolidated even if the internal crisis of *monophysitism did not contribute to such consolidation. In the 6th c., the Origenist crisis also came to disturb Palestinian monasticism and to indirectly cause a cultural regression. To compensate, numerous monks entered the episcopate and expanded their own interior lives thanks to their pastoral functions.

III. The West. One of the distinct aspects of Western monasticism, with its cultural dependence on the East, is its ecclesiastical character, its link with the basilicas and worship. The regular canons would be its newest manifestation, but nearly all of monasticism was influenced by it. The first contacts with Egyptian monasticism took place with the exile of Athanasius, with the exile of *Eusebius of Vercelli and *Hilary in Asia Minor, then with *Jerome's and *Rufinus's choice of the East, their ascetic *letters, their translations (*Life of Anthony*, *Rules* of Basil): all document its Eastern origins. The first decisive moment of adaptation, which developed spontaneously but uninterruptedly, was the *Life* of *Martin, then the experience and *rule of *Augustine, then *Lérins and John Cassian, who transmitted, among other things, the theory of Evagrius on *contemplation. S *Gaul of the 5th c. was the lively center whose influence radiated as far as *Ireland and produced a good number of rules. In the 6th c., the primacy belonged to central and S *Italy, with the *Reguli magistri*, then with the *Rule* of St. *Benedict, while that of *Eugippius was almost verbatim that of the already-existing documents. Of the Roman *monasteries, Benedict preserved a well-structured *liturgy and efficient community organization, in which the *abbot directed both the law of the household and *spirituality. The role that the *Rule* of Benedict plays in *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*, together with the strengths internal to the *Rule* itself, subsequently contribute to its adoption in Gaul, *Britain and *Germany, before returning to dominate in Italy. In this progression there is no need to see a propagation imposed from on high. In general the foundations, having arisen autonomously, became Benedictine because they

saw in Benedict and in his work the requisites of a model: and each one was Benedictine in its own way. They assumed first-rate importance in the church and in society, gaining the favor of the authorities because, in the chaos caused by the invasions, they constituted the active regenerative cells that prepared the culture of the Middle Ages.

DSp 10, 1524-1617; DIP 5, 1672-1742; K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*, Tübingen 1936; H.G. Evelyn White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi 'n Natrûn. Part II: The History of the Monasteries of Nitria and of Scetis*, New York 1932; G.M. Colombás, *El monacato primitivo*, 2 vol., Madrid 1974–1975 (It. tr., *Monacato primitivo*, Milan 1990); S. Pricoco, *L'isola dei Santi: il cenobio di Lerino e l'inizio del monachesimo in Gallia*, Rome 1978; K.S. Frank, *Askese und Mönchtum in der alten Kirche*, Darmstadt 1975; F. Prinz, *Askese und Kultur*, Munich 1980; G.M. Colombás, *Il monachesimo delle origini*, Milan 1994; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'Antiquité I–VII.* (Patrimoines du christianisme), Paris 1991–2003; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314–631*, Oxford 1994; E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive* (SEA 52), Rome 1996; M. Sheridan, *Il mondo spirituale e intellettuale del primo monachesimo egiziano,* in *L'Egitto cristiano: aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica* (SEA 56), Rome 1997, 177-216; *Regole monastiche d'Occidente*, ed. E. Bianchi, Turin 2004.

J. Gribomont - M. Sheridan

MONAZONTES. From the Greek verb μονάζω, indicates those who live solitary lives, or monks. According to Dom Toutée (PG 33, 36.485.486), *monazontes* was used by *Cyril of Jerusalem to refer to monks that lived in the city, and *monachi* referred to monks who withdrew to the *desert, but perhaps the distinction was not so clear. *Egeria uses both terms *monazontes* and *monachi* indifferently (*Peregr.* 24,1.12; 25,2.6.7.12; 49,1). *Cassian uses *monazontes* synonymously with *monachi* to indicate the hermit's ancient kind of life separated from the *world (*Conl.* 18,5,4). In an encyclical *letter, *Athanasius preserved in an *epigraph that the non-*Arian monks of *Alexandria called themselves μονάζοντες and μοναχοῖς (CIG IV, n. 8607 pl. XII; see de Jerphanion, *La vraie teneur d'un texte de s. Athanase rétabli par l'epigraphie: l'Epistula ad monachos*: RecSR 20 [1930] 529-544).

J. Leclercq, *Études sur le vocabulaire monastique au moyen âge*, Rome 1961 (SA 48); F.E. Morard, *Monachos, moine: Histoire du terme grec jusqu'au IV^e siècle. Influence biblique et gnostique*: FZPhTh 20 (1973) 332-411; Id., *Monachos: une importation sémitique en Egypte?*, SP, Berlin 1975 (TU 115), 242-246; E.A. Judge, *The Earliest Use of Monachus for "Monk" (P. Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism*: JbAC 20 (1977) 72-89; A. Guillaumont, *Aux origines du monachisme chrétien*, Abbaye de Bellefontaines 1979.

M.G. Bianco

MONICA (331–387). The details about her life come from the writings of her son *Augustine, esp. the *Confessions* and the Cassiciacum *Dialogues* (the texts have been gathered in *S. Agostino, Mia madre*, ed. A. Trapè). She was born in 331 in Thagaste (now Souk Ahras) in *Africa, in the highlands of *Numidia. She was strictly raised in a devout *Catholic family. She married *Patricius, who was a *pagan and a member of the town council. She was twenty-three years old when Augustine was born; apparently he was the firstborn. She had at least another son, *Navigius, and a daughter whose name we do not know. She was a young, intelligent and strong-willed *woman, devout in the faith, and she prayed diligently—she was an exemplary Christian wife and mother. She was widowed around the age of forty after helping in her husband's *conversion; she was completely dedicated to the education of her *children and at the service of the "servants of God" (*Confess.* 9,9,22).

Her discrete hard work is worthy of particular admiration, a woman of few words and many prayers, for the conversion of her son Augustine, who became a fierce *Manichean after being a Catholic *catechumen. She followed him to *Carthage, *Rome and *Milan. She assisted him there through his interior struggles, conversion and *baptism. Soon after, they returned to Africa. At ancient Ostia, during a rest from their *journey, she was struck with a fever and died piously around October of 387. She was fifty-six years old. She was buried there acc. to her wishes, and her relics were transported to the church of St. Augustine in Rome, under Pope Martin V (9 April 1430), where they are venerated.

In addition to her many natural gifts, Monica also had mystical experiences (*Confess.* 6,1,1; 6,13,23). Particularly worthy of note is the *ecstasy at Ostia amply and magisterially described in the *Confessions* of her son (9,10,23-25).

BS 9, 548-558; DACL 11, 2232-2256; F.-H. Bougaud, *Histoire de sainte Monique*, Paris [12]1901; M.G. Dorè, *Monica la mamma che salva*, Brescia (n.d.); L.A. Delastre, *Sainte Monique*, Lyon 1960; A. Trapè, *S. Agostino, Mia Madre*, Rome [3]1983; G. Falbo, *Vita di S. Monica*, Rome 1980; I. Cacciavillani, *Mamma fino a diventare santa. La vicenda umana di Monica alla ricerca del figlio Agostino*, Padua 1986; M. Dulaey, *Songe et prophétie dans les Confessions d'Augustin. Du rêve de Monique à la conversion au jardin de Milan*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 379-391; E. Lamirande, *Quand Monique, la mère d'Augustin, prend la parole*, in *Signum pietatis*, Fest. C.P. Meyer, Würzburg 1989, 3-19; R. Holte, *Monica, "the Philosopher"*: Augustinus 39 (1994) 293-316; M. O'Rourke Boyle, *Divine Domesticity, Augustine of Thagaste to Teresa of Avila*, Leiden 1996, passim; F. Vattioni, *Ancora l'etimologia di Monica*: Augustinianum 36 (1996) 183-184; D.F. Wright, *Monica's Baptism, Augustine's Deferred Baptism, and Patricius*: Augustinian Studies 29 (1998) 1-17. For the epitaph of

Anicio Auchenio Basso, see A. Casamassa, Rend. PARA 23 (1952–1954) 271-273 (reproduced in *Scritti patristici*: Lateranum [1955] 217-218); W. Wischmeyer, *Zum Epitaph der Monica*: Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte 70 (1975) 32-41; F. Vattioni, *L'etimologia di Monica*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 583-584. For the translation of the relics, see Bolla di Martino V in L. da Empoli, *Bullarium Ordinis erem. S. Aug.*, Rome 1628, 258. For the discourse that the pope delivered on that occasion, see A. Casamassa, *L'autore di un preteso discorso di Martino V*, in *Miscellanea Pio Paschini*, Rome 1949, 109-125; PCBE 1, 758-762; G. Saginario, *Monica mia madre*, Rome 2005.

A. Trapè

MONOENERGISM – MONOTHELITISM. These teachings surface during the 6th and 7th c. in the context of attempts made in the East to reach a compromise between *monophysitism and *dyophysitism. Already at the beginning of the 7th c., during the reign of *Heraclius, the patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople (d. 638) confronted the christological issue by emphasizing the concept of energy (*energeia*) instead of nature—i.e., the energy and activity of Christ derived singularly from his person (*hypostasis*), rather than from his two natures. In this way, Sergius could speak of the one energy of Christ, without referring to only one nature, like the monophysites wanted. He started to cautiously popularize this teaching, gaining supporters from the Eastern episcopate and adherents from not only the *Chalcedonian dyophysites but also the monophysites. Cyrus, a *Melkite (Chalcedonian) patriarch from Alexandria, imposed the teaching in Egypt (633). Despite opposition from *Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem 634–638, and from a monk named *Maximus, who would later be called the Confessor, Sergius decided to reach an agreement with Rome and wrote to Pope *Honorius, praising all that he had accomplished in the East and asked if, in order to avoid a semantic argument, he might abolish the terms "one-energy" and "two-energies" and affirm that the Only-Begotten had worked (*energein*) in divine and human ways and that every energy, divine and human, derives inseparably from the one and the same incarnate Logos. Honorius approved of Sergius's advice to abolish the terms because it was enough to affirm that all of Christ's actions, divine and human, were the work of one single subject and for this reason only one will. In a synodical letter, Sophronius explained the concepts of energy and activity in terms of nature, rather than person, and affirmed that just as Christ has two natures so he must have two energies. He had little success after his edict (634/635), which ratified the prohibition of speaking of one or two energies of Christ. In 638, *Heraclius circulated a response to Honorius's letter called the **Ekthesis*, a new edict inspired by Sergius, which set aside the terms of nature and energy and affirmed the perfect harmony of the human and divine will in Christ as one unique will, leaving the two natures unmixed in the unique person of the incarnate Logos. The desire to reach an agreement with the monophysites was frustrated by the Arab conquest of Syria and Egypt, the regions in which they were more numerous. Despite this and the opposition by Maximus—who insisted that if the two distinct wills in Christ, divine and human, are not affirmed, then the two distinct natures are also abolished—the *Ekthesis* was vigorously maintained also by the successors of Heraclius, until *Constans published the *Typos* (648) with which he prohibited the discussion of one or two operations and wills of Christ.

Rome had already taken a position of strict Chalcedonian observance in 640–641 with *John IV against monothelitism. When Constans published the *Typos*, *Martin I gathered a council of predominantly Italian bishops in the Lateran (649), which condemned both monothelitism and the *Typos*. Constans reacted fiercely and arrested Martin when the opportunity presented itself. Martin was transported to *Constantinople, put on trial, mistreated and exiled to Crimea (653–655). Even Maximus was tortured and exiled (662). Given the political situation determined by the Arab invasion, the clash seemed to have lost its raison d'être, but it continued for many years, until Constantine IV reconciled with Rome following the Third Council of Constantinople (680–681), which condemned monoenergism and monothelitism, together with a good number of their supporters, living and dead, and grasped that two wills and two energies inseparably exist in Christ.

DTC 10, 2307-2323; Fliche-Martin V, 169-184, 193-197, 228-248; M. Doucet, *Est-ce que le monothélisme a fait autant d'illustres victimes? Réflexions sur un ouvrage de F.-M. Léthel*: Science et esprit 35 (1983) 53-83; M. Simonetti, *La controversia cristologica nel VI e VII secolo, in Martino I papa (649–655) e il suo tempo*, Spoleto 1992, 85-102; Fr. Winkelmann, *Monoenergetisch-monotheletischer Streit*: TRE 23 (1994) 205-209 (bibl.)

M. Simonetti

MONOGRAM. A particular character resulting from the conjunction and partial interweaving of letters in one or more words. It is not, however, a link or abbreviation, summarizing their characteristics. Monograms occur in different settings, esp. Christian inscriptions relating to funeral, votive and liturgical accoutrements (capitals, dosserets,

plutei) and often in *rings and *seals. Other than the many forms of monograms with the name of Christ (*see* *epigraphy, Christian), noted examples tend to refer to more masculine anthroponyms (feminine anthroponyms appear more frequently on jewelry) and, in minor cases, acclamations (*in pace* and the like).

Simpler but less common monograms include examples where the word's initial letter surrounds or is surrrounded by the other letters reduced in size. The more popular monograms are based on the interlacing of letters, exploiting common elements, like vertical or horizontal strokes, so that one element can be read many times and in different ways. From this it can be seen that since no definite rules are followed in formulating monograms, examining and interpreting them can prove difficult, with a variety of dubious and equivocal results. One should bear in mind the case of the Roman slab from the cemetery of Priscilla, now in the Vatican Museum (Zilliacus, *SyllInscrChristVetMusVat*, 107) where the monogram can be resolved in any one of thirty different ways. Or the monogram engraved on the threshold of the four-sided portico of the *Memoria Apostolorum* in Rome (ICUR V, 13277), which can be differently read *Constantinus*, *Constans* or *Constantius*. (The second option seems preferable to me.)

The quadrate or square monogram, defined by the regularity of its composing elements, is already noted in the classical period, but it finds wider use from the 4th to the 5th c. Besides the numerous examples on graveyard stones and Roman basilicas (see the famous monogram of John II on the *plutei* of the in *schola cantorum* of St. Clement, ca. 533–535), one thinks of the monograms of Bishop Frugiferus in St. Justus in Trieste (5th c.), of Neon in St. Vitale in Ravenna (5th c.), of Bishop Euphrasius in Parenzium (6th c.), of Elias and of the donor Ioannes in St. Euphemia in Grado (6th c.). There is no lack of monograms in the East—esp. in Greece, Syria and Palestine.

H. Leclercq: DACL XI, 2369-2391; E. Josi: EC VIII, 1307-1308; F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato di epigrafia cristiana latina e greca del mondo romano occidentale*, Rome 1920, 60; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1958 (Bari [2]1980), 352-354; P. Bruun, *Symboles, signes et monogrammes*, in *SyllInscrChristVetMusVat*, 2, Helsinki 1963, 126-129 and 156-166; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux del'Empire byzantin*,V, Paris 1963–1972; V. Gardthausen, *Das alte Monogramm*,Wiesbaden 1966; J.E. Hartmann, *Greek Numismatic Epigraphy*, Cambridge 1969; F. Manns, *Les sceaux byzantins du Musée de la Flagellation*: SBF 26 (1976) 213-271; A. Ferrua, *La polemica antiariana nei monumenti paleocristiani*, Vatican City 1991, 37-50, 61-62; E. Dinkler von Schubert, ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ *Vom "Wort vom Kreuz" (1 Kor. 1,18) zum Kreuz-Symbol*, in C. Moss - K. Kiefer (eds.), *Byzantine East, Latin West. Art-Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*, Princeton, NJ 1995, 29-39; D. Mazzoleni, *Origine e cronologia dei monogrammi riflessi nelle iscrizioni dei Musei Vaticani*, in I. Di Stefano Manzella (ed.), *Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano* (Inscriptiones Sanctae Sedis 2), Vatican City 1997, 165-171; D. Mazzoleni, *La produzione epigrafica nelle catacombe romane*, in V. Fiocchi Nicolai - F. Bisconti - D. Mazzoleni, *Le catacombe cristiane di Roma*, Regensburg 1998, 159; C. Carletti, *Un monogramma tardoantico nell'epigrafia funeraria dei cristiani*, in *"Domum Tuam Dilexi." Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 127-142; D. Mazzoleni, *Monogramma* (s.v.): TIP, 220-223.

D. Mazzoleni

MONOGRAMMA CHRISTI, De. This work is a brief description of the monogram of Christ in its Greek form. Three interwoven letters must be drawn out: X′ (600) + I′ (10) + S′ (6) = 616. The author, in fact, declares that there is a numerical design in this figure, from which the name of Christ can be derived (*Redactus autem in monogramma, id est, quasi in unam litteram, et notam et nomem et numerum facit hoc signo*). Morin, the editor of the little pamphlet (*Anecd. Mareds*., 194), attributes the interpretation to *Jerome, even if what is written cannot hide a certain kabbalistic tendency (*Hieronymi de monogramm*., 229). Haussleiter denies this reading (124, note 4) and also rejects the dating of the pamphlet as contemporary with Jerome. Incipit: *Hic est sapientia et intellectus . . .*

CPL 637; CPPM 2, 940; PLS 2, 287-291; G. Haussleiter, CSEL 49, 124; G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana* II, 3 (1903) 194-198; Id., *Hieronymi de monogrammate*: RBen 20 (1903) 225-232; Id., *Études, Textes, Découvertes*, Paris 1931, 20ff.; EC 4, 1427; H.I. Marrou, *Autour du monogramme constantinien*, in Mélanges E. Gilson, Toronto-Paris 1959, 411ff.

L. Dattrino

MONOIMUS, gnostic. An Arab who lived in the 2nd c. (ca. 150–ca. 210) whose name is perhaps a Hellenized form of the Semitic *Menahem*. Monoimus is mentioned by *Theodoret in the *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium* (I, 18,) and in the *Philosophumena* (VIII, 5-8) as a follower of *Tatian the Assyrian. In a letter to Theophrastus recorded by *Hippolytus, he wrote that you should not seek God in creation but in yourself—since human beings are a microcosm of the universe—in your mind, in your understanding, in your soul and body, and, by beginning with yourself, you find the way out of yourself. The *Stoic language used by Monoimus is evident in the letter, esp. in his recollection of the doctrine of *oikeiōsis* ("appropriating, familiarizing yourself with something"), where he affirms that God "absolutely appropriates unto himself every-

thing that is within you." Monoimus, whose cosmological conceptions appear to be Pythagorean, introduced the use of the term *monad* into a *gnostic context: the world began with the Monad or Iota, from which emerged the Dyad, the Triad etc. all the way up to the Decad—stages already constituted within the Monad, which is absolutely simple and infinitely unfolding itself and identified by Monoimus, on the one hand, as the gnostic *aeons* and, on the other hand, as the phases of creation in Genesis. The plagues of Egypt are interpreted *allegorically as symbols of material creation, but they are not seen as evil: "The whole world and all the causes of creation constitute a Passover, i.e., a feast of the Lord, since the Lord rejoices in the conversion of creation" (*Ref.* VIII, 7). Each element—as in the Pythagorean-*Platonic tradition, acc. to Monoimus—is associated with a geometric figure, each of which originates from a number derived from the Monad. There is an overlap between the Greek tenfold schema—to which Monoimus also connects the ten *Aristotelian categories—and the Hebrew sevenfold schema. *Hippolytus's report seems to correspond to two versions of the gnostic text found in the *Nag Hammadi Library called the *Epistle of Eugnostos*, where the same sequence of Monads to Decads is described. The *Eugnostos* shares an affinity with another gnostic text, the *Sophia of Jesus Christ*, where the Monad also shows up. Monoimus makes many references to the NT, like Colossians and an allusion to the Prologue in John's gospel, where Monoimus reflects upon the creation of the Son-Logos. His use of the expression "man" and "Son of Man," also found in the gospels, could suggest a link with the Naassenes (*see* *Ophites – Naassenes). In fact, Monoimus describes the first principle as both Father and Mother, and his phrase "Father and Mother, the two immortal names," seems to be taken from a Naassene hymn. A possible common ancestor for this terminology is in the *Apophasis Megale* of *Simon Magus. For Monoimus, even the six powers responsible for creation resemble the six "roots" of Simon. Moreover, the contrast that Monoimus makes between the "Son of Man" and those "born of woman" is found also in the ps.-*Clementine *Homilies*, II, 17.

Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism, ed. W.J. Hanegraaff, in collaboration with A. Faivre, R. van den Broek, J.P. Brach, Leiden 2005, 2800-2801.

I. Ramelli

MONOPHYSITISM – MONOPHYSITES. From μόνος meaning "only one," and φύσις meaning "nature." The word refers to those who affirm only one nature in Christ, instead of two (human and divine) as sanctioned by the *Chalcedonian Council (451). Although the term was coined very late, it is vague because the affirmation that Christ has only one nature has been explained in ways both compatible and incompatible with orthodoxy. Toward the end of the 4th c., the first monophysites were *Apollinaris of Laodicea and his disciples. They claimed that Christ has only one nature—in the sense of material nature as the source of activity—and that the humanity assumed by the divine Logos would have lacked a soul (or *nous*, the seat of rationality). This claim was made in order to reaffrim the unity of Christ that was put in question by some anti-Arian polemicists (mostly in an Antiochene context) who excessively stressed the distinction between Christ's human and divine natures. The teaching of Apollinaris was condemned by Catholics, but its form, "the One Incarnate Nature of God the Logos," was passed on through his disciples to *Athanasius and was adopted by *Cyril in the controversy with *Nestorius and constituted the basis of the famous 12 anathemas. He used nature (*physis*) to refer to a concretely subsistent individual (*hypostasis*, *persona*) and explained the formula in a way that if one could imagine the two natures of Christ (human and divine) before the union, then one could imagine only one subsistent nature resulting from the union—in other words, only one hypostasis, the Logos. This allowed him to attribute all of the human characteristics as united to, but not intermingled with, the divine characteristics, so as to affirm Christ as fully human and fully God in one single subject, the divine Logos.

The teaching was based on the Cyrillian formulation but apparently not explained with the precision of Cyril, and it spread throughout *Constantinople in 445 by the elderly and influential monk *Eutyches. Without naming names, this teaching was already refuted by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus in his *Eranistes* (447), as rendering the humanity of Christ useless—an accusation directed at Eutyches in 448 by *Eusebius of Dorylaeum. On 22 November, Eutyches was brought before a small council of bishops in Constantinople, with the local bishop *Flavian presiding. Eutyches denied the *docetism of Apollinaris and Valentinus, which diminished the humanity of Christ, but he affirmed that Christ is not *homoousios* ("consubstantial") with us and that the two natures before the union resulted in only one nature after the union. Eutyches's thinking was more confused than erroneous, but the council condemned him because he, like Apollinaris and *Valentinus, denied

the real humanity of Christ. The condemnation elicited violent reactions in Cyrillian contexts, where they saw it as a condemnation of the monophysite *Christology of their teacher. The reaction eventually brought about the Council of *Ephesus (449) launched by *Dioscorus of Alexandria and backed by the emperor *Theodosius II, which rehabilitated Eutyches and condemned his adversaries, Flavian and Theodoret. Dioscorus used the same formulation as Cyril, "the One Incarnate Nature of God the Logos," so as not to diminish the reality of the humanity of Christ and his consubstantiality with us. But his language became incomprehensible to the Eastern *dyophysites (Antiochene) and to the West (*Leo the Great), and the violence which he had used against his rivals had created a very bad reputation. The sudden death of Theodosius, followed by *Marcian and *Pulcheria coming to power, allowed them to support the dyophysite counterreaction: the Council of Chalcedon (451) condemned Dioscorus and sanctioned the formulation which said that in Christ the human nature and the divine nature coexist, without intermingling or change, united in one hypostasis (of the Logos). This formulation is based on a different conception of nature than that of Cyril. The two natures of Christ are concrete and individual, but are considered in themselves, abstracting from the subject in which they are grounded—which is solely that of the Logos.

Chalcedon represented a compromise between Antiochene dyophysitism and Alexandrian monophysitism, but it did not satisfy in any way the monophysites, who reacted strongly to the council's decisions. In fact, they were predominantly in *Egypt, but numerous in Syria, and throughout many regions in the East. The basis of their opposition, often launched by ignorant and intolerant monks with the deepest sense of popular piety, was to provoke religious figures to become hostile toward oppressive political powers and to promote the revival of the native Syrian and Coptic element in opposition to the Greek cultural hegemony. In Egypt, their resistance was unstoppable. In 457, the Catholic bishop *Proterius was murdered in Alexandria by a ferocious mob, and he was replaced by a monophysite named *Timothy Aelurus, who occupied the episcopal seat twice, although his reign was interrupted by a long exile, and he was succeeded by another monophysite named *Peter Mongus (477). The monophysites made their presence known elsewhere, even in the center of dyophysite Christology (Antioch), and they managed to impose their will with the help of *Peter the Fuller, who inserted the expression "you were crucified for us" into the *Trisagion* hymn which has a clear monophysite meaning (ca. 485).

The emperor could not ignore these conflicts, as they provoked public upheaval and weakened the unity of the empire. After an initial overture to the monophysites by the usurper *Basiliscus (475), whose *Enkyklion* condemned Chalcedon and Leo the Great's **Tomus ad Flavianum*, *Zeno published the **Henoticon* (482) with the blessing of Patriarch *Acacius of Constantinople, which required the signatures of all the bishops: this clever compromise formulation reaffirmed the validity of the Nicene symbol—confirmed at Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431) and in the 12 anathemas of Cyril—much to the chagrin of the Antiochenes. Avoiding the term *nature*, it affirmed that Christ is consubstantial with the Father acc. to his divinity and to us acc. to his humanity, stressing Christ's integrity and reality. It also condemned Nestorius and Eutyches, and even those who defended the authority of Chalcedon. The Christology put forward by the document was orthodox, and it took into account the fact that many monophysites did not share the radical positions of Eutyches and that their target had become the Council of Chalcedon. The *Henoticon* was signed by many bishops in the East, from Peter Mongus in Alexandria, to Peter the Fuller in Antioch, and *Martyrius in Jerusalem. But it was opposed by all the dyophysites because they would not renounce the decisions of Chalcedon. It was condemned for the same reason in Rome by *Felix III (484), marking the beginning of the *Acacian schism. It was also opposed by radical monophysites in Egypt affiliated with Peter Mongus, who were called the *acephali, meaning "without a head or leader," which would later be used to define, like the Eutychians, the monophysites in general. The politics of Zeno continued with *Anastasius (491), despite the resistance of the dyophysites, who were strong in Constantinople and in Asia Minor, as well as in the W regions of the empire and were supported by Rome. Precisely for their sympathies toward Chalcedon the bishops of Constantinople *Euphemius (496) and *Macedonius (511) were deposed. The monophysites reinforced their positions during the failed attempts to reconcile with Rome in the time of *Gelasius (ca. 495) and *Hormisdas (515). Uncontested in Egypt, they conquered many areas in Syria and Palestine due to the activity of *Philoxenus of Mabbug, a Syrian who did not know Greek, and *Severus, who was the most important monophysite theorist and polemicist. During his time in Constantinople (508–511), Severus popularized monophysite ideas, and he was eventually elected as

bishop of *Antioch in 512, while *Elias of Jerusalem was deposed for having refused him Communion. Upon the death of Anastasius (518), the religious situation remained unsettled despite the apparent harmony posed by the *Henoticon*: Egypt was monophysite, and in Syria the monophysites were prevalent, though the Chalcedonians still remained vital there, while remaining dominant in the other regions of the empire.

In the 2nd half of the 5th c., monophysitism not only spread but also evolved doctrinally, with the result of splitting into different branches, which, for our purposes, we will identify as two main groups: real monophysitism and verbal monophysitism. Real monophysitism believed that the union of Christ's two natures into one was accomplished through a change in the component parts. Some of them believed that the body of Christ was only apparent or from heaven, others believed that his body was absorbed by divinity like a drop of honey in the sea, others thought that the divinity of the Logos was annulled in the humanity of Christ, still others thought that humanity and divinity were mixed together to form one composite made up of a human part and a divine part. All these forms of real monophysitism have been labeled as Eutychian because Eutyches, more in caricature than in reality, was considered as the one who claimed that the human nature was altered in the union. For the same reason, Eutyches was condemned by representatives of verbal monophysitism, also called Severian because its most important exponent was Severus (others were Timothy Aelurus and Philoxenus of Mabbug). In fact, the Severians were technically monophysite insofar as they used the Cyrillian slogan "the One Incarnate Nature of God the Logos" to indicate that the nature of Christ that results from the union is one concrete and individual subsistent nature, in other words, one hypostasis (*persona*). But on the other hand, these verbal monophysites believed that in this nature (*hypostasis*), all the human and divine properties continued to subsist, inseparably, but also without intermingling and alteration, so that Christ was fully human and fully God in one unique subject, in this way consubstantial with the Father as God, and with us as human. Fixed upon the exclusive meaning they attributed to *nature*, they believed that Christ had derived from two natures, but that he did not subsist in two natures, as the Chalcedonian expression has it, because they considered this affirmation as equivalent to that of two persons or *hypostases*, and thus Nestorian. For this reason, they rejected the Council of Chalcedon and Leo's *Tome*. Within this form of monophysitism were the so-called *aphthartodocetae, followers of *Julian of Halicarnassus in his dispute with Severus, who distinguished themselves with the belief that the body of Christ was impassible and immortal by nature and had suffered only by the will of the Savior. Then on the basis of an equivalence between nature and *hypostasis*, *John Philoponus claimed that in the Trinity, we must distinguish three natures as we distinguish three *hypostases*. This idea, however, was purely nominal tritheism since Philoponus also claimed that the Trinity is constituted of only one God. Other minor distinctions among the Severians do not need mentioning here.

With *Justin coming to power (518) and then his nephew *Justinian (527), imperial politics radically changed. The political conflict that arose with the *Henoticon* had benefited only the monophysites without securing the religious peace. The realization of this fact encouraged Justin, an Illyrian and thus a Chalcedonian, to reestablish the Chalcedonian faith everywhere and to reach an agreement with Rome to put an end to the Acacian schism; this was why he submitted to the grave conditions imposed by Pope *Hormisdas (519). Only in Egypt were the monophysites too strong to be disturbed, and Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus, among others forced to abandon their sees, found refuge there. But Justinian was convinced that it was possible to reach an agreement with the monophysites, even more so now that he thought it indispensable to perfect, in the anti-Nestorian sense, the Chalcedonian faith. In this line of thought, he and other theologians (like *Leontius of Jerusalem) spread the teaching that modern scholars call *Neochalcedonianism, which integrated Chalcedonian doctrine with the 12 anathemas of Cyril, while the christological formula **unus de Trinitate crucifixus* was imposed and taught for some years with little success by Scythian monks. The failure of a conference held in Constantinople in 533 between monophysites and Chalcedonians did not alter the emperor's orientation, who went so far as to get the *acoemetic monks condemned as Nestorians (534) and brought Severus to Constantinople (535). Inevitably in 536, under pressure by Pope *Agapetus, Justinian was forced to take radical measures against the monophysites by sending their leaders into exile. Even in Alexandria a Chalcedonian bishop was put in place, *Paul of Canopus, who was ferocious against his adversaries (537). But the attempt to fence monophysitism out of the episcopate was in part frustrated by the bishop of *Edessa *Jacob Baradeus, who, escaping from public authorities, traveled all over the Eastern regions, consecrating a group of monophysite bishops to compete with

the Catholic episcopate. From his name the monophysites were called *Jacobites, while the Chalcedonians were called Melkites, meaning imperialists. Another attempt made by Justinian toward the monophysites brought about the *Three Chapters controversy (Council of Constantinople 533), which was the postmortem condemnation of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and *Ibas of Edessa, who were all hated by the monophysites because they had inspired and supported *Nestorius. Another serious crisis erupted with the death of the emperor (565), and religious peace became only a vague mirage.

*Justin II, the nephew and successor of Justinian, returned to the political project of openness toward the monophysites and published a first (567) and a second (571) *Henoticon*, in which he made large concessions, without explicitly rejecting the dyophysite teaching of Chalcedon. But a conference of monophysite leaders held in Callinicum in 567 refused to sign the first *Henoticon*, and an attempt to forcefully impose the second ended with inconclusive results. Tiberius (576–582) and Maurice (582–602) maintained a very moderate attitude toward the monophysites, leaving things more or less as they were, with the result that they, though suffering from profound schisms and internal rivalry, were preserved and promoted. In 616, under *Heraclius, there was reconciliation between the monophysite churches in Egypt with those in Syria.

When this reconciliation occurred, the Persian invasion was already underway. Before being driven out by Heraclius they ruled over Syria for eighteen years (611–629) and over Egypt for eleven years (618–629). The Persian administration left the Christians in peace with all their diverse confessions while supporting the monophysites because they were rightly considered as being hostile toward the emperor. So when Heraclius reconquered those areas he found that monophysitism was as strong as ever. He offered once again to compromise with them, publishing the *Ekthesis* (638) at the suggestion of and with assistance from Patriarch *Sergius of Constantinople, which declared that in Christ there is one will, two distinct natures in the unique person of the incarnate Logos (*see* *monoenergism – monothelitism). But when the document was published, the Arab invasion was already underway in Syria and Egypt and both ended in 639. The Arabs took advantage of the state of disorder and internal discord caused by the religious controversies which had radically weakened the loyalty of the monophysite population. Cases of real and utter betrayal were not lacking, esp. in Egypt, where there were those who considered it better to be ruled by the invaders rather than the emperor. The Arabs were fundamentally tolerant of Christians, so that the monophysites could live in peace, destined for a long life, even if it was difficult and grim. But those monophysites amid the regions under the emperor existed in small numbers, and once they were separated from the strength of the movement, they quickly lost their vitality.

DTC 5, 1582-1609 (s.v. *Eutychès*); 10, 2216-2251 (*Monophysisme*); J. Lebon, *La christologie du monophysisme syrien*: CGG 1, 425-580; II, 95ff. (in the CGG there are other articles that refer to monophysitism); W. DeVries, *Primat und Communio bei den syrischen Monophysiten*, Rome 1940; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites,* Louvain 1951; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972 (bibl.); L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980 (bibl.); P. Allen, *Monophysiten*: TRE 23 (1994) 219-233 (bibl.).

M. Simonetti

MONOTHEISM. As opposed to polytheism, monotheism affirms only one God to the exclusion of every other, a teaching that one finds in Judaism, while henotheism admits belief in one God as well, but reconciles this belief with the existence of other deities of lower rank, as found in a variety of classical pagan philosophies. The fundamental categories for the study of monotheism and henotheism in classic Antiquity, both Jewish and Christian, were already defined by scholars like A. De Broglie (*Monothéisme, hénothéisme, polythéisme*, Paris 1910), the historian of religions R. Pettazzoni (e.g., *Mitologia e monoteismo*., Rome 1951) and E. Peterson (*Eis Theos: epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Göttingen 1926; Id., *Der Monotheismus. als politisches Problem*, Leipzig 1935). More recently, a theoretical treatment of these concepts has been offered by B. Gladigow (*Polytheismus und Monotheismus.*, in M. Krebernik - J. van Oorschot [eds.], *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients*, Münster 2002, 3-20).

Faced with pagan polytheistic religion, as expressed in its myths and sacred rites, Greek philosophy began very early with Xenophanes to speak of *theos* in the singular in order to offer a critique of Greek mythological religion (A. Lefka, *The Xenophanean Religious Thought*: Kernos 2 [1989] 89-96); later, with *Aristotle, *Met.* A5, 986b24-25, it began to identify God, ὁ θεός, with the One, τὸ ἕν, although Xenophanes seems to also include contemporary as well as traditional gods, as pointed out, seeing it perhaps anachronistically as a contradiction (see H. Versnel, *Thrice One: Three Greek Experiments in*

Oneness, in B. Nevling Porter [ed.], *One God or Many*, Casco Bay, ME 2000, 79-164, 98-106). There is an affinity then with henotheistic thought, which was expressed particularly in *Platonic or *Stoic philosophy, where a divinity imposes itself as *summus deus* and the others are often considered allegorically as merely partial manifestations (see I. Ramelli, *Allegoria*, I, Milan 2004): this is verified in the development of paganism, whether in Platonic transcendentalism or in Stoic immanentism, albeit in diverse ways, as, e.g., in Hinduism. Despite the profound differences between Platonic metaphysics and the Stoic refusal of transcendence, the affinity also suggests, from the perspective of monotheism and providence, that the Stoic teachings regarding God and *pronoia* are rooted in Plato, particularly in *Timaeus*, rather than in Aristotelian concepts—so hypothesizes D. Sedley, *The Origins of Stoic God*, in *Traditions of Theology*, ed. D. Frede - A. Laks, Leiden 2002, 41-84: more specifically, 41-42, 65, 80-81, following the work of H.J. Krämer).

Given that pagan thought never reached the doctrine of creation out of nothing, it remained fundamentally alien to monotheism in the strict sense, since its concept of the divine (θεῖον, which absorbs the personal θεός as one of its manifestations) is structurally more open to pluralism, even when at its peak it put forward a supreme divinity. According to Acts 17:16-34, St. Paul was the first Christian to reconcile philosophical theology in Athens—not without citing the Stoics—by preaching the Christian God as the *agnostos theos*. Although this seems to be a god among gods, Paul proclaimed him as unique and the Creator (K. Sandnes, *Paul and Socrates: The Aim of Paul's Areopagos Speech*: JSNT 50 [1993] 13-26; R. Penna, *Paolo nell'Agorà e all'Areopago di Atene*: Rassegna di Teol. 36 [1995] 653-677; F. Brenk, *Mixed Monotheism? The Areopagos Speech of Paul*, in *Le monothéisme: diversité, exclusivisme ou dialogue?*, ed. C. Guittard, Paris 2006). This was a difficult dialogue in Athens, in the middle of the 1st c., that was interrupted with the proclamation of the resurrection, since it not only reconciled the unique Christian God with the *summus deus* of philosophers—which Philo had already done for Judaism, which Sterling suggests is an influence of Philo on Paul's theology (G. Sterling, *Hellenistic Philosophy and the NT*, in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the NT*, Leiden 1997, 313-358; 330-334)—but it also proclaimed the resurrection and divinity of Christ, even if Paul does not directly identify him with God in this instance, which indeed complicated the discourse.

However, engagement with Greek philosophy continued with apologetics, where we find monotheism decisively affirmed, alongside the more inclusive henotheism of pagan philosophy. The terms ἑνότης and ἕνωσις are already used in the Apostolic Fathers, esp. in *Ignatius of Antioch, as expressions of monotheism, together with the verb ἑνοῦν, and are found in the *apologists, particularly in *Athenagoras, to indicate the inseparability of the three beings that form the unique divine nature (*Suppl.*12). And in polemics with the pagans, *Tertullian repeatedly insists in the *Apologeticum* upon the absolute uniqueness of God, which excludes every other divinity, even inferior ones (17,1; 18,2; 23,11; 24,1), as does *Minucius Felix, *Oct.*10,3, who defines the Christian God as "unique and solitary." At the same time, in pagan writings, esp. in *Middle Platonism, where the Ideas of Plato tend to be conceived as Ideas of God, there develops a major emphasis upon henotheism: like Apuleius, *De Plat.* I, 5, attributing the doctrine of the uniqueness of God to Plato, or at least the doctrine of the supremacy of God that reigns over every other inferior divinity; in Plutarch the One supreme God (εἶ ἕν, *De E*, 393AB) is reconciled with the lesser deities, following the guidance of his teacher Ammonius, who saw God as the One, Creator, perfect Good and Beautiful—and then Eudorius identified the One or εἷς with the Supreme God, ὁ ὑπεράνω θεός (*ap.* Simpl. *Phys.* 181, 7-30 Diels): v. H. Dörrie - M. Baltes, *Der Platonismus in der Antike*, IV, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1996, 209-213; 473-477.

A particular literary development of henotheism during the Aurelian and Constantinian age is the solar theology and panegyrics. For example, in Firmicus Maternus, the Sun *optimus maximus* that closes the first book of *Mathesis* is the *summus deus*, superior to other gods (I, 10,14); also this supreme god is unnamable (V *pr.* 3), acc. to a Middle and *Neoplatonic tradition that has more or less introduced an apophaticism. Similar conceptions of the *summus deus* superior to all others is expressed in the pagan panegyrics to *Constantine (e.g., IX, 26; X,7), providing a relative reconciliation between henotheism and Christianity vague enough that even the Christian side was tempted, in particular by *Lactantius, though in a rather superficial way from a theological point of view. Especially in *Late Antiquity, with Neoplatonism and its developments—if the notion of the divine, strictly associated with the Good already linked by Plato, is enriched by the introduction of infinity, finally understood in a positive sense—pagan thought was tinted with a henotheistic religiosity (*Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, ed. P. Athanassiadi - M. Frede, Oxford

1999, in particular M. West, *Towards Monotheism*, 21-41, and the discussion of T.D. Barnes, *Monotheists All?*: Phoenix 55 [2001] 142-62). See also M. Frede, *Monotheism and Pagan Philosophy in Later Antiquity*, 41-68: 41-44, who substantially attributes monotheism to all ancient philosophies except Epicureanism.

Some scholars, like H. Dörrie, have spoken of two antithetical religions, Christian and Neoplatonic; and other scholars, like G. Stroumsa (*Fin du sacrifice. Les mutations religieuses de l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris 2005), have directly called into question whether in Late Antiquity, in the comparison between pagans and Christians, it is truly correct to oppose polytheism and monotheism. In fact, it is essential to recall the category of henotheism. In particular, Neoplatonic henotheism increasingly emphasized the absolute transcendence of the One, and at the same time structured the divine progressively into ever more complex hierarchies, as in Proclus (see I. Ramelli, *Proclo*, in *Enciclopedia Filosofica*, ed. V. Melchiorre, Milan [2]2006), often organized in triads that were rooted in the divine triad of the Middle Platonic Pythagorean Numenius. (For the hierarchy of the first and second gods in the Middle Platonism of the 2nd and 3rd c. AD, see Dörrie - Baltes, *Platonismus*, III, 1993, 92-93, 335-336). Frede, in the above-mentioned *Monotheism and Pagan Philosophy*, sees no contradiction in the Platonic triads with respect to monotheism, since they could be considered a composite hypostasis of the one God.

In fact, it is not primarily from the pagan world that Christianity derived its absolute monotheism, but rather from the Hebrew biblical tradition, where—after the emergence of Yahweh from Elohim (J. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*, Leuven 1990; [2]1997)—the Mosaic commandments begin precisely with the uniqueness of God to the exclusion of all other deities, as is repeated in the *shema*, the synthesis of Jewish theology: *Adonai Elohenu, Adonai Echad*, "the Lord our God, the Lord is One." This monotheism arrived after that which many scholars appropriately call monolatry, which does not deny the existence of gods among other peoples, but reserves worship for their God only: to such exclusive worship is added the belief that their God was the Creator of the heavens and earth and was the greatest and most powerful, the sovereign God (H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, Philadelphia 1966, 67 and 99). Philo reconciled Jewish monotheism with Platonic thought in a synthesis that patristic philosophy had yet to carry out, which was quite demanding—esp. regarding creation—and basically defined Jewish monotheism with the concept of monarchy, whereby "monarchy" in Philo normally indicates monotheism, a vocabulary passed on to Christian apologists like *Justin (*Dial. Tryph.* I, 3), *Tatian (*Or. ad Gr.* 14,1.29) and *Theophilus (*Ad Aut.* II, 4.28); indeed, Justin and *Irenaeus wrote tracts *On the Monarchy*.

Some developments of Jewish religious thought, such as the kabbalah, however, contain elements of tension in respect to a strict monotheism, like the Sephirot, in which God's hiddenness is manifested acc. to the 13th-c. Zohar, and by virtue of which all things exist: the first of them is the Nothing or Abyss, from which Wisdom and Intellect flow. Although, rabbis like Azriel of Gerona, in the same period, or Moshe Chaim Luzzatto in the 18th c. feel the necessity to attempt to reconcile the doctrine of the Sephirot with Jewish monotheism. Another difficulty in respect to absolute monotheism appears in the 13th c. with ps.-Hai, who instituted a triad inside the same hidden kabbalistic divinity, but not without a Christian trinitarian influence (Wainwright, § 7.1).

Returning to the decisive monotheism of the Jewish era, and particularly to that of the 1st c. AD (see L. Hurtado, *First-Century Jewish Monotheism*: JSNT 71 [1998] 3-26): In order to maintain Jewish monotheism, Christianity (see, Id., *One God, One Lord*, Edinburgh 1998; *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. C. Newman, Leiden 1999), while acknowledging the divinity of the Messiah, as well as that of the *Holy Spirit, had to confront the huge dogmatic trinitarian and christological problems, leading to the definition of God as one nature in three Persons, and Christ as one Person with two natures, divine and human. Thus, heresies like *monarchianism and *Arianism can be considered as fundamentally inspired by the desire to preserve an absolute monotheism like one finds in Judaism (see R. Lorenz, *Arius judaizans?*, Göttingen 1979). In fact, Arius felt the primary necessity was to preserve the absolute unity and transcendence of God, as found in *Ep.* 2,1,3. The oneness of God was, in his view, threatened by the emergence of the figure of the Son, and, like the monarchians, he wanted to restore it to its absoluteness. However, unlike them, Arius felt the affirmation of the real distinction of three divine ὑποστάσεις in Origenistic-Alexandrian theology kept him from embracing a modalist solution, which considered the Son as a modality of manifesting the Father. He had only then to exclude the Son from the realm of divinity, in order to maintain a complete unity in God. In this way, the slight *subordinationism of *Origen (but it seems like Origen was the first to use ὁμοούσιος in reference to the Son) reached a much greater depth. The Arians could not acknowledge a generation of the Son from the sub-

stance of the Father, since this would have introduced a schism into the divine substance, which must remain absolutely simple and one; therefore, the Son is not begotten, but—not without an allusion to Plato's *Phaedrus*, 245C—created (γενητόν) by the Father ἀγένητον. Using the Middle Platonic notion, Arius affirmed the preexistence and absolute supremacy of the simple divine Monad in respect to the creaturely Dyad (the Son), as seen in frag. 2 of the *Thalia*: "The Monad has always existed, while the Dyad did not exist before coming into existence."

Neo-Arians like Aetius and *Eunomius were disposed to acknowledge with the *Nicenes that the Son was begotten (γεννητόν), but they also thought that if one wishes to preserve the absolute unity of God, one must acknowledge that God, unbegotten, cannot share the same substance of the begotten Son. It is a different position from that of Arius and characterized by *anomoianism (a difference of nature between Father and Son, which results in ἀνόμοιοι), but always motivated by the desire to preserve monotheism, conceived by Arians and neo-Arians in a very rigid way (see R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius*, Oxford 2003). In this polemic against neo-Arianism and esp. Eunomius, the Cappadocians adopted a better definition of the trinitarian doctrine that safeguarded monotheism, while acknowledging the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit: *Gregory of Nyssa explained the orthodox trinitarian doctrine, in *Ad Graecos de communibus notionibus* and in *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dii* (tr. and comm. G. Maspero, *La Trinità e l'uomo*, Rome 2004), officially proclaimed by *Gregory of Nazianzus at the Council of *Constantinople in 381: to acknowledge the three divine Persons does not mean acknowledging three gods, since God is one in substance, in divinity, in power and will, while he is triune in the Persons or *hypostases* (see L. Turcescu, Prosopon *and* Hypostasis *in Basil of Caesarea's* Against Eunomius *and the Epistles*: VChr 51 [1997] 374-395). Thus Gregory concludes his treatise *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dii* : "Since the idea of cause differentiates the *Hypostases* of the Holy Trinity, acknowledging with reverence the distinction between existing without a cause and being caused, and since . . . the divine nature is immutable and indivisible, we rightly proclaim the Godhead alone to be one and God alone to be one along with all other names that could be ascribed to God" (see L. Ayres, *Not Three People*: Modern Theology 18 [2002] 445-474).

Ancient philosophy: C. Moreschini, *Monoteismo cristiano e m. platonico nella cultura latina di età imperiale,* in *Platonismus und Christentum. Festschrift H. Dörrie*, Münster 1980, 131-160; F. Downing, *Ethical Pagan Theism and the Speeches in Acts*: NTS 27 (1981) 544-563; L. Napolitano, *Eudoro di Alessandria: monismo, dualismo, assiologia dei principî*: MusPat 3 (1985) 289-312; W. Wainwright, *Monotheism*, in *Rationality, Religious Belief, and Moral Commitment*, ed. R. Audi - W. Wainwright, Ithaca, NY 1986; J. Mansfeld, *Compatible Alternatives: Middle-Platonist Theology and the Xenophanes Reception*, in *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. Mansfeld - R. van der Broek - T. Baarda, Leiden 1988, 92-117; H.S. Versnel, *Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism*, Leiden 1990; J.P. Kenney, *Mystical Monotheism: A Study in Ancient Platonic Theology*, London 1991; M.J. Edwards, *Xenophanes Christianus?*: GRBS 32 (1991) 219-228; G. Filoramo, *Il m. tardo-antico*, in *Figure del sacro*, Brescia 1993, 109-125; C. Eucken, *Die Gotteserfassung im Symposiondes Xenophanes*: WJA 19 (1993) 5-17; B. Wisniewski, *La conception de dieu chez Xénophane*: Prometheus 20 (1994) 97-103; E. Heitsch, *Xenophanes und die Anfänge kritischen Denkens*, Stuttgart 1994; C. Schäfer, *Xenophanes von Kolophon*, Stuttgart 1996; *One God or Many? Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World*, ed. B.N. Porter, Casco Bay, ME 2000; A. Lebedev, *Xenophanes on the Immutability of God*: Hermes 128 (2000) 385-391; D. Runia, *The King, the Architect, and the Craftsman: A Philosophical Image in Philo*, in *Ancient Approaches to Plato's* Timaeus, ed. R.W. Sharples - A. Sheppard, London 2003, 89-106; J. Dillon, *Plutarch and God*, in Frede-Laks, *Traditions of Theology*, 223-237; D. Sedley, *The Origin of Stoic God*, in *Traditions of Theology*, 41-83; H.J. Klauck, *Pantheisten, Polytheisten, Monotheisten*, in *Religion und Gesellschaft im frühen Christentum*, Tübingen 2003, 3-56; Id., *The Religious Context of Early Christianity*, Minneapolis 2003, 331-428; W. Wainwright, *Monotheism*, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 2005 [http://plato.stanford.edu], esp. §§ 1 and 7; *Gott und die Götter bei Plutarch*, ed. R. Hirsch-Luipold, Berlin 2005, esp. R. Hirsch-Luipold, *Der eine Gott bei Philon von Alexandrien und Plutarch*, 141-168, for a treatment of Philo's monotheism and Plutarch's henotheism, see F. Brenk, *Plutarch's Middle-Platonic God*, 27-50.

Hebraism and Judaism: T. Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, New York 1960; F. Eakin, *The Religion and Culture of Israel*, Boston 1971; S. Quinzio, *Monoteismo ed ebraismo*, Rome 1975; *The Early Kabbalah*, ed. J. Dan, New York 1986; G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, Princeton, NJ 1987; *Monotheismus und Christologie: zur Gottesfrage im hellenistischen Judentum und im Urchristentum*, ed. H.J. Klauck, Freiburg 1992; *Ein Gott allein?*, ed. W. Dietrich - M. Klopfenstein, Freiburg 1994; *The Triumph of Elohim: From Yahwisms to Judaisms*, ed. D.V. Edelman, Kampen 1995; J.J. Collins, *Natural Theology and Biblical Tradition: The Case of Hellenistic Judaism*: CBQ 60 (1998) 1-15; G. Scarpelli, *Il Dio solo: alle origini del monoteismo.*, Rome 2003; J. Assmann, *Die Mosaische Unterscheidung, oder der Preis des Monotheismus*, Munich-Vienna 2003; *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. L.T. Stuckenbruck - W.E.S. North, London-New York 2004; *Monotheismus Israels und christlicher Trinitätsglaube*, ed. M. Striet, Freiburg 2004; A. Lemaire, *La nascita del monoteismo*, Brescia 2005.

Christianity: R. Arnou, *Unité numérique et unité de nature chez les pères, après le Concile de Nicée*: Gregorianum 15 (1934) 242-254; B. Krivocheine, *Simplicité de la nature divine et les distinctions en Dieu selon Grégoire de Nysse*: StPatr 16 (1985) 389-411; L. Hartmann, *Johannine Jesus-Belief and Monotheism*, in *Aspects on the Johannine Literature*, ed. L. Hartmann - B. Olsson, Uppsala 1987, 85-99; A. Manaranche, *Il monoteismo cristiano*, Brescia 1988; L. Zagzebski, *Christian Monotheism*: Faith and Philosophy 8 (1989) 3-18; *Le ragioni di Abramo: razionalità e*

fede nel monoteismo, LII Convegno del Centro di Studi Filosofici di Gallarate, aprile 1997, ed. S. Biolo, Turin 1999; R. Bauckham, *God Crucified*, Grand Rapids, MI 1999; B. Duvick, *The Trinitarian Tracts of Gregory of Nyssa*, in *Gregory of Nyssa: Homilies on the Beatitudes*, ed. H.R. Drobner - A. Vinciano, Leiden 2000, 581-592; R. Stark, *One True God: Historical Consequences of Monotheism*, Princeton-Oxford 2001; *Ist der Glaube Feind der Freiheit? Die neue Debatte um den Montheismus*, ed. T. Söding, Freiburg 2003; *Il Dio di Gesù Cristo e i monoteismo*, ed. M. Crociata, Rome 2003; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004, esp. 25-36; 240-241; 507-512; M. Wallraff, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*: MediterrAnt 6 (2003) 531-536; J. Duponcheele, *Comprendre l'homme pour penser Dieu: dialogues critiques sur la raison pure croyante dans les monothéismes*, Paris 2005; *Das Gewaltpotential des Monotheismus und der dreieine Gott*, ed. P. Walter, Freiburg 2005.

Arianism: G.C. Stead, *The Platonism of Arius*: JTS 15 (1964) 16-31; M. Simonetti, *Studi sull'Arianesimo*, Rome 1965; Id., *Arianesimo latino*, Spoleto 1967; Id., *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; M. Meslin, *Les ariens d'Occident*, 335-430, Paris 1967; É. Boularand, *L'hérésie d'Arius et la 'foi' de Nicée*, I-II, Paris 1972; T. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, I-II, Cambridge, MA 1979; *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, ed. R. Gregg, Cambridge, MA 1985; H. Brennecke, *Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin-New York 1984; *Scripta Arriana Latina*, Turnholti 1982; R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987, [2]2001; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988; T. Böhm, Die *Christologie des Arius*, St. Ottilien 1991; C. Kannengiesser, *Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians*, Aldershot 1991; *Papers of the XI International Conference on Patristic Studies*, ed. E. Livingstone, I-V, Leuven 1993; P. Widdicombe, *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius*, Oxford 1994; D. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene-Arian Conflicts*, Oxford 1995; M. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*, Oxford 1996; R.E. Rubenstein, *When Jesus Became God*, New York 1999; R. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford 2000; *Augustini Contra sermonem Arrianorum; Sermo Arrianorum*, ed. M. Suda, Vienna 2000; F. Pilloni, *Teologia come sapienza della fede: teologia e filosofia nella crisi ariana del IV secolo*, Bologna 2003; var. aus., *L'Uno e i Molti. Rappresentazioni del divino nella tarda antichità*, ed. M.V. Cerruti: Annali di Scienze religiose 8 (2003) 95-195; Vigilio di Tapso, *Contro gli ariani*, ed. P. Guidi, Rome 2005.

I. RAMELLI

MONTANUS – MONTANISM (2nd c.). Montanus, a prophet who suddenly revealed himself in *Phrygia ca. AD 155–160, claimed to be the mouthpiece of the *Holy Spirit and the *Paraclete incarnate as promised in Jn 14:26; 16:7. He founded Montanism.

The motivations of his claim are unknown, but his way was paved by the widespread unease among Christians of his time whose anticipation of the end times had diminished and whose spiritual fervor had declined, i.e., among those aware of becoming lukewarm in contrast with the Christian life of former times. The numerous writings of Montanus and his two most important followers, the prophetesses *Maximilla and Prisc(ill)a, are lost; only a few directly transmitted *oracles remain. What we do know about Montanus and the movement he founded comes from indirect sources (esp. Eus., *HE* 5, 14-19, and Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48f., which draw on early anti-Montanist writings). Montanus is inseparable from the "new prophecy" movement (which subsequently his adversaries pejoratively called "Montanism").

Characteristics and teachings of Montanism. Above all, the most characteristic traits are speaking in tongues and a spiritual language tending toward *ecstasy and enthusiasm. Montanus, as well as Prisc(ill)a and Maximilla (but no one else), professed to be the voice of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Thus, they speak with the authority of this Spirit and elicit unconditional *faith and absolute obedience from their followers. They denied all ecclesiastical *authority. In their prophecy, they pronounced the imminent end of the *world, which Maximilla predicted would occur immediately after her death. The wars that broke out under *Marcus Aurelius were interpreted as warning signs. As preparation for the end, a rigorously ascetic morality was required, with a ban on marriage (subsequently only remarriage), severe *fasting, substantial *almsgiving of every kind; *martyrdom was encouraged, *flight from *persecution was prohibited. The New *Jerusalem of Rev 21:1-10, descending from heaven, would be located at Pepuza or Timione (Phrygia). The believers must be found there at the Lord's coming. No heretical position was assumed on a dogmatic level: they remained in orthodox territory. It was only later that it was claimed otherwise. That the Montanists also professed the bodily *resurrection is explicitly attested. The movement was restorative, even reactionary, not so much interested in theological matters and rather naive. It was nourished by the ancient prophetic and apocalyptic traditions. With recourse to the authority of the Paraclete, the aim was to reawaken and restore the ancient situation of the church: efficacy of the Spirit, speaking in tongues, anticipation of the end times, rigorous ethics.

History of the movement. The teaching of Montanism was difficult to critique dogmatically and created problems for the church, which found it hard to combat effectively. Several synods met in *Asia Minor (probably the first in the history of the church: Eus., *HE* 5, 16,10; *Anonymous *Antimontanist) to check the dangerously rapid expansion of the movement, which was also well organized. The point of the whole matter was whether they should

consider the "new prophecy" as a real manifestation of the Spirit or as demon possession. The traditional ways of unmasking false prophets (see the signs in the *Didache) were not sufficient or did not affect the movement. Neither a desire for clearer discussion nor the claim that the Montantists had unduly influenced "consenting" bishops to join them was enough (Eus., *HE* 5,16,17). Nor were they able to obtain results with an appeal to the OT and NT. In fact, Montanus claimed that the Paraclete spoke through him, and that he was above the authority of the Holy *Scriptures.

The movement, nevertheless, was *excommunicated from the church in those Asia Minor synods and was thus forcibly reduced to a sect. What ruined them was their own claim, which conflicted with the church's desire to safeguard the *tradition (canonical rules, profession of faith, office). Still, the sect expanded further in the West. In *Rome it seems that its recognition was considered for a long time (ca. 177–178), but was later prevented by *Praxeas (Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* 1). In *Gaul followers of Montanus were well known in this same period, and their prophetic talents made a great impression. The martyrs of *Lyons wrote *letters in favor of the Montanists (evidently against the opinion of other sectors of the community) to the community of *Asia and Phrygia and to Bishop *Eleutherus of Rome urging them to be reconciled. With the death of Maximilla (179), the end of the world did not occur as she had prophesied, but the movement was not completely abandoned, and their frenetic anticipation for the end gradually diminished (see the letter from *Firmilian to Cyprian, *Ep.* 75,10).

A new phase of Montanism began (ca. 200) characterized by an increased moral rigor. With this, the development by which Montanism gradually undid itself within the church was prepared. In this situation, the movement realized that the prophetic spirit which the early church had experienced before could not have success. The most important representative of second-generation Montanism was *Tertullian, who, in 207, joined the Montanists because of its strong and rigorous ethic. The numerous *ascetic and dogmatic writings of his later period do more to illuminate the Montanist Tertullian than to provide a portrait of the movement. However, even Tertullian explicitly recognized the salvation-historical function that Montanus had claimed. With him as the Paraclete, a new phase of divine *revelation would be opened beyond that of the NT.

Naturally, the subsequent history of the movement is less significant. The Montanists are mentioned again by later ecclesiastical writers, appearing in the lists of *heretics, and regular mention is made in imperial laws against heretics, until the 6th c. However, this does not necessarily indicate the movement's survival in any significant way. Only in Phrygia, and esp. in Pepuza, it seems that the Montanist church continued to thrive. Pepuza was the governing headquarters of the sect with an intercommunal organizational structure (Jerome., *Ep.* 41,3-4). In the 4th c., *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 49,1,2-4) speaks of some Montanists that slept in the temple in order to receive apparitions of Christ (*see *incubatio*). At the end of the 4th c. in a **Dialogue Between a Montanist and an Orthodox*, two anonymous characters debate a series of problems connected with the "new prophecy" and in particular the existence of prophecy after Christ, the doctrine of the *Trinity, the Paraclete and the prophetic power of *women.

DSp 10, 1670-1676; P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme*, Paris 1913; Id., *La crise Montaniste*, Paris 1913; A. Faggiotto, *L'eresia dei Frigi*, Rome 1924; W. Schepelern, *Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Tübingen 1929; H. Kraft, *Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus*: ThZ 11 (1955) 249-271; K. Aland, *Bemerkungen zum Montanismus und zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie: Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe*, Gütersloh 1960, 105-148 (with ed. of the Montanist oracles); see also op. cit., 149-164; H. v. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Tübingen 1968, 257-268; T.D. Barnes, *The Chronology of Montanism*: JTS 21 (1970) 403-408; A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten*, Berlin 1980; R. Braun, *Tertullien et le montanisme: église institutionelle et église spirituelle*: RSLR 21 (1985) 245-257; V. Grossi, *A proposito della conversione di Tertulliano al montanismo. De pudicitia I*, 10-13: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 57-70; B. Czesz, *La "tradizione" profetica nella controversia montanista*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 55-70; G. Visonà, *Il fenomeno profetico del montanismo*: Ricerche Storico/bibliche (1993) 149-164; R.E. Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*, Macon, GA 1989; Ch. Markschies, *Nochmals: wo lag Pepuza? Wo lag Tymon*: JbAC 37 (1994) 7-28; W. Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphical Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, Macon, GA 1996; S. Elm, *"Pierced by Bronze Needles": Anti-Montanist Charges of Ritual Stigmazation in Their Fourth-Century Context*: JECS 4 (1996) 409-439; Ch. Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*, Cambridge 1996; A.M. Berruto, *Millenarismo e montanismo*: AnSE 15/1 (1998) 85-100; T. Baumeister, *Die prophetische Bewegung des Montanismus als Minderheit in Christentum, in Ethische und religiöse Minderheiten in Kleinasien*, ed. P. Herz - J. Kobes, Wiesbaden 1998, 99-112; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism*: JEH 50 (1999) 1-22; J.C. Poirier, *Montanist Pepuza-Jerusalem and the Dwelling Place of Wisdom*: JECS 7 (1999) 491-507; A.M. Berruto, *Dialogo di un montanista con un ortodosso*, Bologna 1999.

B. Aland

MONTANUS of Toledo. Bishop 522–531; first among Toledo's bishops to act as metropolitan. He

presided over the Second Council of *Toledo (ca. 527). With a *letter to the faithful of the church in Palencia, and another to *Turibius the monk, he took part in the struggle against *Priscillianism and the regulation of the powers conferred upon priests. Both letters were evidently given much consideration by contemporaries, as they are preserved in the *Hispana* *canonical collection as an appendix to the Second Council of Toledo. Montanus was an eloquent and careful administrator. *Ildefonsus (*Vir. ill.* 2) admired him for the notable prestige the diocese of Toledo acquired after his work.

CPL 1094; Díaz 4-5; PL 65, 51-60; 84, 338-342; DHEE 3, 1725; J.F. Rivera Recio, *Encumbramiento de la sede toledana durante la dominación visigótica*: Historia Sacra 8 (1955) 3-34; U. Domínguez del Val, II, 354-356.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

MONTANUS, LUCIUS and COMPANIONS. The *Cal. Carth.* places the execution of Montanus and Lucius on 23 May and that of *Flavian on 25 May, protagonists of the passion BHL 6009. The dates agree with the passion and are confirmed by the *Mart. hier.*; the passion gives the year as 259. The *Passio Montani* belongs to the literary group of African passions that have certainly been influenced by the *Passio Perpetuae* (autobiographical documents, *visions of martyrs), whose substantial authenticity is certain. However, the *Passio Montani* fully agrees with all that we know from other sources about *Valerian's persecution. The *Mart. rom.*, that assigns their feast day to 24 February, is mistaken about the meaning of one of the numerous errors of the *Mart. hier.*

P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Gli Atti dei SS. Montano, Lucio e compagni*: RQA 8 (1808), repr. ST 221, 199-292; DACL 11, 2522-2529; *Vies des SS.* 2, 499-506; BS 9, 572-576; V. Saxer, *Afrique latine*, in *Hagiographies* I, ed. G. Philippart, Turnhout 1994, 47-49.

V. Saxer

MONTIBUS SINA ET SION, De. A tract written in Vulgar Latin, erroneously attributed to *Cyprian. The place of composition is unknown. If one accepts the hypothesis of a dating prior to 240 proposed by Altaner (Patrologia, 181), then the suggestion that the author could have known Cyprian and that he was in some way dependent on him falls short. Alternately, J. Daniélou (*La littérature latine*, 369) and C. Burini (*I due monti Sinai e Sion*, 14-17) maintain that the author's Jewish-Christian origin is not sufficiently demonstrable, and we cannot exclude the possibility that he could be a pagan convert to Christianity. The complete title is *De duobus montibus Sina et Sion adversus Iudaeos*. The author expounds a general hermeneutical principle: The OT is a figure of the NT, since Jesus Christ fulfills in reality that which was prefigured in the OT (*Quae in vetere testamento figuraliter scripta sunt, per novo testament spiritaliter intelligenda sunt, quae per Christum in veritate adimpleta sunt*). Mount Zion represents the NT; Sinai, the OT. Through this *allegorical method, the discourse presents and carries outs a quite unpredictable range of allegorical speculation on the most diverse topics.

CPL 61; CPPM 2, 551; PL 4, 989ff.; CSEL 3, 3, 104-119; C. Burini (ed.), Pseudo Cipriano, *I due monti Sinai e Sion*, Florence 1994; G. Mercati, in *Opere Minori*, II (ST), Vatican City 1937, 195-197; EC 4, 1428-1429; A. Stuiber, *Die Wachhütte in Weingarten*: JbAC 2 (1959) 87-89; Altaner, Patrologia, 181; Quasten, Patrologia I, 601; J. Daniélou, *La littérature latine avant Tertullien*: REL 48 (1970) 357-375, and esp. 368-375; J.E. Bruns, *Biblical Citations and the Agraphon in Pseudo-Cyprian's Liber de montibus Sina et Sion*: VChr 26 (1972) 112-116; E. Romero-Pose, *El tratado "de montibus Sina et Sion" y el donatismo*: Gregorianum 63/2 (1982) 274; A.M. Laato, *Jews and Christians in De duobus montibus Sina et Sion: An Approach to Early Latin Adversus Iudaeos Literature*, Abo (Finland) 1999.

L. Dattrino

MOON. Along with the Christian appropriation of the rich symbolism of the sun already present in the pagan world (see the mosaic depiction of Christ with a cruciform halo as Helios, *Sol novus* and *invictus*, in the mausoleum of the *Iulii* within the Vatican necropolis, 3rd c.), Christianity of the first centuries saw a parallel development in which the principal motifs of the lunar and ancient astral cult, both certainly pre-Hellenic in origin, were adapted to express the mysteries of the new faith.

First of all, the moon came to represent humanity, not only as an object of the redemption in Christ, but also as called to welcome in love his salvific action and cooperate with it. Helios and Selene, the son and the moon—the original and unfailing light on the one hand, and on the other that which is reflected and inconstant, destined to be extinguished when it meets the bridegroom and brother so as to be reborn in splendor—is for *Theophilus of *Antioch an image of the great mystery (see Eph 5:32) of God and humanity (*Ad Autol.* 2,15); more explicitly, for *Origen (*Hom. Gn* 1,5-7) this figure relates to Christ and the church. According to H. Rahner, "Everything which subsequently in theology and in Latin and Greek mysticism is said about the church as a 'spiritual moon' is to be referred directly or indi-

rectly to Origen." To the moon, called "Queen of heaven," acc. to an original interpretation of Jer 44:17, and to the stars in general, Origen along *Platonic lines attributes a spiritual and even rational soul, and a will subject in obedience to the Creator (*Princ.* 1,7,2-3), also affirming that each is assigned an angel (*Hom. Ier.* 10,6); he considers the moon and stars as affected by sin, as are the rest of creation, and for this reason bound by corporeality, even though they are heavenly and luminous (*Princ.* 1,7,4-5); in his polemic against star worship, he states that the Christian may not address prayers to the stars, but should consider them participants in the universal prayer of praise (*Cels.* 5,11); in response to the pagan charge of not venerating the sun, moon and stars, Origen affirms that the Christian looks at them always with the greatest reverence (*Cels.* 5,13), in short because of their exalted symbolic value. These themes are taken up also in *Orat.* 7.

For *Methodius of Olympus (*Symp.* 8,6-8) the moon at the feet of the apocalyptic woman (see Rev. 12:1-16) is the image of a humanity still in the psychic state, which the church then generates in *baptism to be pneumatic, spiritual and conformed to Christ: in the sacramental washing the regenerated are like the moon (σελήνη) in that, acc. to a weak assonance, they shine with a new light (νεὸν σέλας) and are called newly lit (νεοφώτιστοι). The ecclesiological symbolism of the moon in its various phases—waning, waxing, shining bright—is frequent in *Ambrose of Milan: the obscuring refers to the defection of Christians in time of persecution, and the increasing light to the church's greater glory in virtue of the sacrifice of the martyrs (*Hexam.* 4,2,7); in a more radically christological approach, it can symbolize the voluntary self-annihilation of the Word: *annuntiavit luna mysterium Christi* (*Hexam.* 4,8,32). Finally, the moon recalls the transitoriness of the whole of creation and its yearning for rebirth (*Hexam.* 4,8,31), and in this sense *Tertullian (*Res. mor.* 12,3) had listed it among the natural symbols of *resurrection. In the direct line of tradition which follows Origen we find *Cyril, *Ammonius and *Anastasius the Sinaite.

*Augustine too understands the alternation of the moon's darkening and lightening *allegorically in relation to the different phases of the trials of the church: not only martyrdom but also the clash with paganism, the detraction and calumny of its adversaries, and the persistence of the *sin of carnal men within it—all are reasons for its temporary darkening (*Enarr.* Ps. 10,4). In reference to the enduring belief in the influence of the Zodiac on human destiny, some authors—among whom are Methodius and Ambrose (in the passages already cited) and *Zeno of Verona (*Tr.* 1,38)—describe the baptized as freed from the constraint of the stars, which should be read in light of the conviction that the lunar regions, luminous and spanned by the unchangeable glow of the ether, is opposed to the darkness and predetermination which reigns in the sublunar world.

Against this background may be placed the somewhat different motif of the darkening of the sun and moon at the death of Christ as a sign of the mourning of creation (which seems to develop Lk 23:45 by combining it with Is 24:23), attested to for the first time by *Alexander of Alexandria (*Sermo de anima et corpore* 6: PG 18, 599C), but which may, acc. to H. Rahner, go back to *Melito of Sardis; this idea would find extensive expression in exegesis and in figurative medieval art.

DACL 1/2, 3018-3025 (*Croix 4. Les astres et la crucifixion*); 9/2, 2707-2710; J. Pépin, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne* (*Ambr.*, Exam *1,1,1-4*), Paris 1964; H. Rahner, *Mysterium lunae*: ZKTh 63 (1939) 311-349 and 64 (1940) 61-80, 121-131; Id., *Miti greci nella interpretazione cristiana*, Bologna 1980 (orig. ed. Zürich 1957), 107-121; 175-197; Id., *L'ecclesiologia dei Padri. Simboli della Chiesa*, Rome 1971 (orig. ed. Salzburg 1964), 145-287.

F. Pieri

MOPSUESTIA, Council of. In the polemical climate that led to the calling of the 5th ecumenical *council—*Constantinople II (5 May–2 June 553)—and the condemnation of the *Three Chapters, the emperor *Justinian (528–565) gave orders to the synod of bishops of *Cilicia Secunda to make inquiries at Mopsuestia regarding the veneration of Bishop *Theodore (b. ca. 350, bishop of Mopsuestia 392–428) to respond to the perplexities of those who found it irregular to condemn a dead bishop in the *communion of the church. At the council held at Mopsuestia (17 June 550) and presided over by the metropolitan of Justinianopolis (province of *Galatia) in the presence of eight bishops and the imperial representative Marthamis, some witnesses, evidently tampered with, declared that the name of Theodore was never put in *diptychs: in this way, the *furor theologicus* not only followed Theodore after his death but also prepared for his condemnation at the Council of Constantinople in 553.

Mansi 9, 274-289: Hfl-Lecl III, 1, 38-40: Fliche-Martin IV, 467; Palazzini 3, 139-140.

C. Nardi

MOS MAIORUM. From the very beginning to the twilight of the Roman Empire, the *mos mairoum*

constituted one of the foundations of political and social life. The concept did not lose its importance even after written legislation had developed to a greater degree, remaining as both a source of the body of law and the principle of interpretation of the laws. Thus when we consider both the role of *tradition in *Judaism and the rise of the traditions of the church fathers around the end of the 4th c. (see Macrob., *Sat.* 3,8,9; Symm., *Ep.* 3,2), it is not surprising that *Tertullian (*De Coron.* 4,5; *De virg. vel.* 1,1), *Augustine of Hippo, *Leo the Great and *Vincent of Lérins treat the concept of ecclesiastical *consuetudo* in a way that evokes Latin *rhetoric, esp. that of Cicero (see Ulp., *Frag.* 1,4: *Mores sunt tacitus consensus populi larga consuetudine inveteratus*). Augustine (*Ep.* 36,1,1; 55,19,34) and Leo (*Ep.* 6,6) fuse the *consuetudo universae Ecclesiae* and the *mos traditum* (*ecclesiasticum*) with the authority of the Bible and of the synodal canons, making reference to the trilogy that was at the foundation of Roman life: religion, senate and the very *mos maiorum* (see Ehrhardt, *Metaphysik* 1, 276). In the writings of Leo, the same triad appears: synodal law, decretal law and custom (see *Ep.* 129,12,5; 19,1). It is important to remember that the concept of *consuetudo* is distinct from "tradition" as "transmission" of the gospel, and that it incorporates a sense of *veritas* ("*truth") and of *ratio* (Becker 249-250).

RAC 3 (1957) 379-390; H. Rech, *Mos maiorum*, (diss.) Marburg 1936; A. Ehrhardt, *Politische Metaphysik von Solon bis Augustin*, Tübingen 1959; P. McShane, *La romanitas et le Pape Léon le Grand*, Paris 1979; H.J. Becker, *Gewohnheit*, III/1: *Antike und Alte Kirche*: TRE 13 (1984) 248ff.; A. Zumkeller, *Consuetudo*: AugLex 1 (1994) 1253-1266 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Schola Christiana*, Paderborn 1998, 62-65 (bibl.).

B. Studer

MOSAIC

I. Techniques and materials - II. The floor mosaic - III. The wall mosaic.

I. Techniques and materials. In the age of *Late Antiquity, the mosaic techniques applied to floor decoration (*opus tessellatum*) and to wall decoration (*opus musivum*) continued to develop, already broadly explored in the Greco-Roman age. On the walls, the laying of the mosaic took place directly: the sketching of the figural design (in sinopite) was made on the first layers, then covered at the base with the larger *tesserae*, on which was placed the color design that served as a guide for putting the smaller *tessellae* into place. The texturing of the surfaces now appears finer than in the past, and the dimensions of the tesserae vary, for closer adaptation to the design and for rendering the details. Colored glass becomes the most common material: the fabrication of *pasta vitrea* produces flat sheets, from which tesserae of the desired size are cut. Also in use are tesserae of marble for rendering skin tone, tesserae of terracotta (in the age of *Constantine) and tesserae of mother-of-pearl. With sporadic examples in the imperial age, the use of gold and silver tesserae finally assumes fundamental importance. A foil of gold or of silver is placed on a wedge of transparent glass that is contained by a fine layer of *pasta vitrea*, very clear and still molten, that undergoes a firing. The use and the diffusion of materials reveal the difference in function assigned to the mosaic in the West and the East. *Pasta vitrea* and natural stone complement the Roman illusionistic tradition in the West. Gold and silver tesserae are employed in the East, in order to obtain the effect of a uniform background that tends to express hierarchy and an unearthly setting. The tesserae are placed in the binding mortar and angled toward the base, namely, toward the observer, in such a way as to adjust the intensity of light and to avoid the effect of a uniform and distracting mirror. The Christian ritual space exalts the mosaic as a "picture into eternity," and the decorative system exploits the symbolism of the masonry structure that since the advent of religious peace has become a trophy of victory and an official, public monument of the Christian community.

II. The floor mosaic. *1. The West.* During the late empire, the necessity of covering increasingly extended surfaces with mosaics, esp. floor surfaces, results in a heightening of chromaticism to great effect. Along with a reduction of the figural repertoire, there is a greater prevalence of the geometric mosaic in imitation of a carpet. In fact, during the imperial age the insertion of the emblem in the geometric weaving overtook the floor surface and its two-dimensional quality. Beginning in the 4th c., there is a development in the technique of the geometric carpet mosaic that underlines the unity and the solidity of the floor. At the same time, the style of this decorative system evolves in very different directions in the West and the East. In an iconographic sense, the evolution contributes to the transformation of the pagan repertoire. In some cases worldly symbols are reinterpreted in light of Christian doctrine and are used as the means of its propagation, while other symbols are reduced to simple decorative elements inserted in the geometric carpet mosaics. As an illustration of this idea, note the evolution of the geometric mosaic at *Aquileia. In the Theodorian com-

plex of the N and S halls (around the 2nd decade of the 4th c.), we have the first attempt to tackle a grand floor cycle of figural and symbolic elements. The warp of the geometric carpet juxtaposes scenes as if they were verses in a narrative, and contraposes concepts along with symbolic animals (N hall, perhaps the worship hall). These two devices heighten the didactic function of the mosaic representation. The aniconic tone and the total absence of any reference to three-dimensionality are characteristic of the geometric mosaics that appeared increasingly from the 5th c. in Aquileia; note some mosaics of the so-called oratories, perhaps only private spaces, of the 1st half of the 4th c., such as the mosaic of the Good Shepherd in the post-Theodorian basilica that was superimposed on the N hall in the year 370, or the apse of the basilica of Beligna, dated to 390. The geometric mosaic also appeared in the entire area of Aquilean influence, esp. during the 4th c. and following, up to the 7th c.; note the churches of Grado, including S. Maria delle Grazie (first phase dated to 420–440) and S. Eufemia (1st part of the 5th c.), and the various examples in Venetia, in *Histria including the Euphrasian basilica (2nd half of the 6th c.) at *Parentium (modern Poreč), and in the ancient provinces of *Rhaetia, *Noricum and *Pannonia. In the figural representation, notably at Aquileia, the portrait is configured with a striking dark line that represents the profile of the faces, accentuating an expressionistic sense of pathos. Especially noteworthy are the 14 donors on the floor of the S Theodorian basilica (early 4th c.). The prevalence of line over volume responds to a precise tendency that begins in the 5th c., with increasingly simplified and reduced figures that favor decorative geometrization.

In the evolution of the geometric floor mosaic, the production at *Ravenna takes on a particular connotation. As well as a greater sensibility for color, one notices here, above all in the era after *Justinian, the connection between the articulation of the surroundings and a rigorous separation of the ecclesial space from the zone of the geometric decoration, with a similarity to African and Palestinian compositional schemes.

The African workshops assume a particularly active role, and they broadly influence the Western Roman world and the Hellenistic-Roman world. Right from the end of the 3rd. c., typical themes of N African production are imported into Italy, esp. in connection with the cycles of the *latifundia*. A wide use of polychromy and realism prevails in representations of hunting and entertainment scenes, configured in a greater number of registers, with figures freely painted in the background. In this context, Sicily assumes a particularly strategic position, in which the mosaics document a convergence and a coexistence of diverse experiences and cultural traditions. The most notable examples are the mosaics of the Villa of Piazza Armerina (most likely from the 1st decades of the 4th c.). The Italic tradition lives on in the continuous narration and in the rotation of minor scenes around to two major scenes, as in the so-called small hunt. On the other hand, there are elements that anticipate compositional schemes belonging to African mosaic production of the hunting subject, such as the absence of an apparent narrative sequence and the tendency of overlapping scenes in the "great hunt."

Recently, new contributions to the knowledge of Sicilian production come from the discovery of other villas of significant size and rich decoration, such as those of Tellaro and of Patti (2nd half of the 5th c.) that refer to the same stylistic features of Piazza Armerina, as well as to the geometric mosaics found at Carini (province of *Palermo, datable to 320–360). A common element of the various island mosaics is the geometric carpet designs. Like the figural examples, they heighten the sense of expressionism and chromaticism, and result from the direct influence or presence of African workers onsite. This pattern is confirmed by the floor decoration of ritual spaces such as the churches of the Pirrera district in the town of S. Croce Camerina and the church of S. Michele in the town of Salemi (late 5th–early 6th c.).

In other areas, the distinctive features of African production are assimilated by the local tradition. In the Theodorian hall at Aquileia, the scene of *Jonah at sea among cupids and fishermen, rendered with liveliness and spontaneity in the placement of the elements, is a unique example of figural representation on the floors of religious settings. Especially during the 4th c., such settings avoid realistic subjects. In the so-called palace of *Theodoric at Ravenna (late 5th–early 6th c.), circus or amphitheater scenes are inserted into a definite architectonic space. The hunting scene is subsumed in a landscape. The mythological scene with the representation of the seasons alludes to the fertility of nature, and the decoration is well suited to the function of the triclinium. Realistic subjects imported from *Africa are also common in *Gaul. On the Iberian Peninsula, the production is more complex. Here we see the influence of both the Roman tradition (emblematic designs and mosaics in black and white) and the Gallic tradition (polychrome mosaics that are divided into panels), the latter being connected at the beginning of the 3rd c. with the African tradition. In

Africa, building on the demand of the ecclesiastical leadership for floor decoration of religious settings, geometric and floral ornaments predominated in the course of the 4th and 5th c. (basilicas at *Hippo, Dermech of *Carthage, *Timgad, *Tebessa etc.), along with very simple tomb mosaics (*Sétif). Furthermore, one often finds a typical funerary mosaic in basilicas and in ancillary spaces such as baptisteries and chapels, differentiated acc. to locality. The Christian symbolic tradition appears in nonfigural panels in the guise of a crowned *monogram, or an epitaph surrounded by floral elements. The latter appears in the church of the priest Felix near Kélibia (Cap Bon), paved with fifty panels in two series that date to the end of the 4th and through the entire 5th c. On one hand, we see that the use of the panels did not favor the production of large-scale compositions. On the other hand, a strong reluctance to represent sacred figures on the surface of the ground led to a rich array of aniconic patterns.

After the Byzantine reconquest, abstract decoration persists. Yet figural subjects of animals, flowers and plants begin to appear, even in religious settings. A very important example is the floor of the basilica at *Sabratha, from the age of Justinian, decorated with a large expanse of tendrils that bloom from a central *kantharos* and coil around birds. The symmetrical decorative scheme is directly connected to the styles of *Constantinople and the Hellenistic East. We see a reflection of this very typical African work in nearby *Spain, where rare examples of funerary mosaics appear, perhaps commissioned directly by African immigrants. In the churches of the Balearic Islands, floor mosaics, which some consider patterned after African work, appear, with floral and animal designs that surround large central panels containing subjects of paradise or mythological scenes. The mosaics are dated to the 6th c. and later, and they respond to the significant increase of new themes in a religious setting.

2. *The East.* The innovations that began in the 3rd c. with the mosaics of N Africa continue in the mosaic work of *Antioch, a city that seems to have become a means of transmission and a place of exchange between the West, the East and Africa. Certainly, the Hellenistic tradition is much more rooted here and persists longer than in the West. Nevertheless, the changes that first occurred in the 4th c. clearly appear in the middle of the 5th c., notably in the mosaic of the Villa of Constantine the Great. The scenes of hunting are placed in registers around a central nucleus, and the composition of the figures is free. The abstraction of the geometric designs in imitation of a carpet accentuates the absence of spatial depth; in this sense there are connections with the "Eastern" tradition, in particular the Iranian tradition. In contrast with the African production, a well-known hunting mosaic at *Apamea demonstrates the persistence of the Hellenistic tradition in the plasticity and the three-dimensionality of the figures. Around the same time but in *Syria and Jordan, mosaics in imitation of a carpet with a geometric and floral subject are very common, and the animals are configured within a heraldic scheme. In order to comprehend the transmission of certain figural themes from the East to the Roman West, it is essential to take into account the various forms of patronage. The ruling class in the East is completely similar to that in the West: not surprisingly, its members prefer themes such as those represented in the Megalopsychia hunt mosaic of Antioch. Here the central medallion features a bust of a woman that probably commemorates the generosity of the owner, a patron of the amphitheater depicted in the mosaic; on the border there is represented the city of Antioch with a clear allusion to the civic patriotism of the patron. Meanwhile, the mosaic decoration in the peristyle at the Great Palace of Constantinople exemplifies the imperial contribution. Here we find Hellenistic schemes as well as more recent innovations: groups of figures are placed in various registers over a uniform and white background, and the themes are mythology and fantasy. There are various conjectures on the dating of these mosaics (450–550 as well as 530–700), but the most likely attribution seems to belong to the age of Justinian. Certainly, one can say that from the 5th c. the mosaic decoration in the East (Syria, *Palestine, Greece, Aegean islands, the Balkans) develops with an increasing interconnection between figural subjects and geometric and botanical designs. Meanwhile, the age of Justinian ushers in an apparent return to three-dimensionality, emphasizing the borders around the central inlay and seeking a dynamic balance between the background and the figures contained by it. We find evidence of the Byzantine influence in the decoration of church floors, until this time predominantly aniconic.

From the 4th to 7th c., floral elements, animals and figural panels frequently appear, reworking already familiar subjects. In the church of the Multiplication of the Loaves and the Fishes at Tabgha (5th c.?) in Galilee, we find wide panels with Nilotic scenes in the transept. In other cases, the same subjects represent the landscape of paradise, acc. to what the sacred texts suggest. An example is the map mosaic at *Madaba (2nd half of the 6th c.): the animals, placed along the sides of the surfaces and

separated from the trees, surround a female bust of Megalopsychia. Additional scenes of hunting are found in the nave of the Theotokos chapel (7th c.) on Mount Nebo, as well as in the martyria of *Seleucia and of Mopsuestia, where the ark of Noah is represented. Also simple rural or pastoral scenes become reinterpreted as Christian (e.g., in the monastery at Beit She'an [*Scythopolis], in a funerary chapel of the 6th c.). Finally, classical myths are transposed, such as the myth of Orpheus, in a chapel at *Jerusalem. Also in churches we find topographical and cosmographical elements worked out in the perspective of ecclesiastical politics: the church is a microcosm. In the case of the basilica dedicated to Saint Demetrius, at Nicopolis of Epirus, a landscape with trees and birds, surrounded by water, represents the earth surrounded by the ocean. In a simpler fashion at Gerasa, in the churches of St. John the Baptist and of Saints Peter and Paul, the familiar Nilotic landscape (1st half of the 6th c.) alludes to the cities of *Egypt. At Madaba, the floor is even covered by a map of Palestine and adjoining lands. The contemporary mosaic decoration in the synagogues of Palestine provides an interesting contrast: symbols and scenes pertaining to Judaism are introduced, together with the Christian and classical repertoire. In the synagogue at Gerasa, the scene of Noah is brought to life by a lively procession of animals (6th c.); in the synagogue at *Gaza the myth of Orpheus is represented; and in the synagogue at Beth Alpha the cycle of the Zodiac is associated with the seasons, with the chariot of the Sun at the center.

III. The wall mosaic. It is disputed whether churches before the religious peace included iconic decoration: the frescoes of *Dura Europos remain for now a *unicum* with a baptismal theme. Therefore, we understand why, until the end of the 3rd c., the examples of wall mosaics on a Christian subject are rare and are limited to funerary contexts. The most significant example at *Rome is the mosaic of the vault of mausoleum M (of the Julii) in the Vatican necropolis (dated no earlier than the 2nd half of the 3rd c.). Vine stocks, growing from four angular clusters, frame the central image of the quadriga, driven by the *Christus-Helios*, a new *Sol iustitiae* or *Sol salutis*. On the walls, the surviving sketches preserve the scenes of the fisherman and of Jonah. The tesserae are small and made of enamel; the lively style is associated with the Hellenistic tradition. After the Constantinian peace, there was a dramatic increase in the laying of mosaics as an ornament for apses and walls, in Christian churches (basilicas and baptisteries), and in the buildings erected above or next to the tombs of martyrs (martyria). In the mausoleum of Constantine at Rome (dated to the middle of the 4th c.), the repertory of the surviving mosaics of the annular vault represents the point of transition from floor decoration to wall decoration. The alternating sections with geometric ornamentation, with vine stocks and with glimpses of the grape harvest, form the so-called *asarōton*, or unswept floor, that is typical of the Hellenistic repertoire. Through Renaissance watercolors and written descriptions, we also know about the decoration of the cupola, essential for understanding the relationship between the function of the decorative architectonic component and the symbolism of the decoration. The spherical vault is divided into twelve sections by caryatid candlesticks, adorned with scenes of the OT and NT set in seascapes and river views, in accordance with a lively Hellenistic style. We find the same decorative scheme in the spherical vault of the mausoleum of Centcelles in Spain (2nd half of the 4th c.), with the addition of the personifications of the seasons, and now accompanied by hunting scenes spread all around the lower section of the same spherical vault. Quite differently, we find a representation of Christ's triumph in the cupola of the baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte at *Naples (late 4th c.–early 5th c.). Upon a dark blue background with gold stars, enclosed within an opulent frame of birds surrounding a phoenix and clusters of fruit, the hand of the Eternal crowns the Christogram and nimbus with the flanking apocalyptic letters of Α and Ω. The same elements recur in the decoration of the baptistery of Albenga (middle of the 5th c.). Yet in the decoration of the basilica in Casaranello (located between Gallipoli and Leuca; 5th c.), a gold cross replaces the Christogram.

In the famous mausoleum of Galla Placidia at Ravenna (2nd quarter of the 5th c.), the hemispheric cupola, adorned with a full 800 stars with their light shining toward a centrally placed Latin cross, now presents the distinctive style of the workshops at Ravenna. The coexistence of different traditions characterizes this style: the court tradition expressed by the scenes of the Good Shepherd and by the martyrdom of St. *Lawrence, a tradition that is more effective in offering an impressionistic rendering of the bodies and faces of the *apostles. At the same time, the frontally placed deer prefigure the heraldic schemes of Byzantine art. During the 4th and 5th c., the decoration of the church building, increasingly assimilated to the imperial hall, mimics theological controversies or accommodates messages of religious policy. In this iconographic context, new en-

sembles enter the traditional repertoire: the *hetoimasia* represented by the *Solium regale*, with a suppedaneum (footstool), cushion and drape (the *sudarium Christi*), and the *insignia Christi* placed on the cushion. Here, the trophies of the triumph of Jesus over death reinforce the eschatological meaning with the soteriological meaning of the *Secundus Adventus* or **Parousia* of the Judge of the world. Replacing the theanthropic image is the book of the gospel, placed on the cushion for the first time in the center of the assembly at the Council of *Ephesus (431). At Rome, the *Magister et Rex* image of Christ on a throne amid the apostles should be placed within the most ancient apsidal mosaic compositions of the Constantinian age. Let us begin with the mosaic of the Vatican basilica of St. Peter, with its division into two zones: in the upper zone, on a gilded and starry background, the Christ enthroned between *Peter and *Paul acclaiming him; in the lower zone, a royal throne bearing the cross and, below, the mystic Lamb. In all probability, even the original mosaic decoration in the apse of the *ecclesia Salvatoris* of the Constantinian age (later known as St. John Lateran) was intended to represent a theophany. In a vertical arrangement, a *clipeus* with the bust of a bearded Christ rises above a cross on the mountain of paradise. The face of Christ has been adapted from the ternary scene (Christ—Peter—Paul) in a lunette of the catacombs of S. Domitilla (2nd half of the 4th. c), wrongly thought to be heterodox on the basis of the superimposed inscription, QUI FILIUS DICERIS ET PATER INVENIRIS.

At *Milan, we find the same representational scheme in the apsidal mosaic of the chapel of S. Aquilino (late 4th c.), perhaps a mausoleum that was annexed to the basilica of S. Lorenzo. We find a confirmation of the reconstructive hypotheses for the now-lost mosaic figurations in the apsidal mosaic of the basilica of S. Pudenziana, where there is a close connection between a theanthropic image and a cross, *victoriae et iudicii signum* (*hetoimasia*). The original elements of this church are the personifications, placed by the shoulders of the apostles, of the two *ecclesiae* (*ex-circumcisione*, *ex-gentibus*), representing the continuity and unity of the old and new divine law. In stylistic terms, they are comparable with the personifications of the basilica of S. Sabina (432–440) in the characterization and liveliness of the facial qualities. These last elements, together with the spatial depth given to the scene, point to the connection of the works with the Roman court style of the age of the emperors *Theodosius and *Honorius.

Yet the culmination of the connection between cross and throne is the outstanding achievement of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore (432–440). The representation at the center of the triumphal arch unifies the motifs of the *Expositio Evangelii* and the *Parousia*. Among the scenes of the *Infantia Salvatoris* that unfold on the triumphal arch and that all lead to the exaltation of the Virgin Theotokos, the most significant are certainly the scenes of Queen Mary adapted from the **Protevangelium of James* and the highly solemn *Epiphany with entirely royal symbolic components. Thus the decoration of the triumphal arch assumes the significance of an official monument (dedication by Pope *Sixtus III) following the Council of Ephesus and spiritual testimony. The double series of squares, adorning the walls of the central aisle with scenes from the lives of *Abraham and *Jacob, *Moses and *Jesus, reveals that the compositional schemes derive from MS illumination. Through their liveliness and chromaticism, they continue the Hellenistic-Roman tradition of narration.

The decoration of the chapel of S. Matrona in the church of S. Prisco at S. Maria Capua Vetere (late 5th–early 6th c.) perhaps derives from the Roman prototype. We observe the latest development of the scene of the *hetoimasia*: as a symbol of the *Holy Spirit, the *dove is added to the head of the throne, while the *cross placed on the mountain of *paradise is accompanied by twelve doves, alluding to the company of the apostles.

The mosaic decoration of the baptistery of the orthodox and of the much later baptistery of the *Arians at Ravenna, together with the oratory of St. John the Evangelist at Rome (next to the Lateran baptistery, 461–468), affirms the system of dividing the cupola into sections that culminate in the figure of Christ at the center as the *imago mundi*, the emanation of the *Logos*. In the case of the oratory, Christ appears instead in the form of the mystic *Lamb. In terms of style, the images of the baptistery of the orthodox lack depth, yet still retain a certain liveliness, while the images of the baptistery of the Arians more clearly betray a flattening and stylization of the image. Although the oratory faces a similar problem, the sectional division of its cupola is sustained by the exuberance of the bunches of flowers and the chromatic liveliness of the early Christian vaults.

The theme of the *Expositio Evangelii* finally reaches its defining moment in the cupola mosaic of the rotunda of St. George at *Thessalonica. Amid the architectonic structures, the emerging image incorporates a "furniture piece," interpreted as a table or throne, that bears a cushion upon which is placed a book (compare the orthodox baptistery). The

chronological attribution of the mosaic to the middle of the 5th c. would fit well with the individuation of the Virgin in an unfinished figure among the apostles. As we have already noted at S. Maria Maggiore, the Virgin begins to claim a position of prestige in the mosaic representations of this century. In a Byzantine context, the church of Hagia Sophia at Constantinople (6th c.) provides a much later confirmation of the integration of mosaic image and architectural space. The cupola repositions the *Christos *Pantocrator* in the central *clipeus*, and in the second zone, the apostles and the Virgin between two *angels.

The influence of the definitively Byzantine style, articulated during the 5th and even further in the 6th c., is particularly evident in the production at Ravenna. The city on the Adriatic creatively refashions the foreign influences gained through the cosmopolitan connections of the imperial court, even temporarily positioning itself as a bridge between the East and the West. In the most noteworthy monument of Justinian, the church of S. Vitale, we see the touch of Hellenistic-Roman master craftsmen in the mosaics of the medallions and lunettes of the presbytery, where the scenes of the OT are animated and represented in an environment characterized by naturalism. The triumphal arch, apse and side walls constitute a cycle of images based on the heavenly and terrestrial courts. In the apse, the representation of *theophany shows the beardless Redeemer on a turquoise blue globe between two angels, with various majestic figures placed on a common level and on a unified gold background. The walls counterpoise the court of Justinian on the left with the court of *Theodora on the right, engaged in the ritual act of offering liturgical vessels with figures in strict frontal view, static and incorporeal. Of outstanding stylistic value is the portrait of the bishop *Maximian, placed at the side of the emperor. The schematism of the figural construction is accentuated in the realization of the basilica of S. Apollinare in Classe (around the middle of the 6th c.). An underlying sketch has revealed that the apsidal decoration followed a variation from the initial figuration. The most interesting part is the dome: at the top, a jeweled disk contains the cross, at the center of which stands Christ flanked by *Elijah and Moses, an allusion to the transfiguration on Mount Tabor; at the bottom, at the center of a flowery valley of paradise, stands the solemn and hieratic figure of St. *Apollinaris, an early example of representing a saint in an apsidal hemisphere.

The Euphrasian basilica at Parentium (535–543) provides a significant thematic comparison. The Virgin and Child dominate in the apse, at the center, with various figures at the sides, arranged acc. to a hierarchical order; at the top, above the Virgin, Christ upon a globe. The basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo offers further confirmation of the role assumed by the Virgin in the liturgical gathering, and then in the figurative repertoire. In the second phase of its decoration, the basilica betrays both a stiffening of the earlier style and a certain provincialism, evident in the ideas of the saints and martyrs (attributed to the age of Justinian or the years following 560), first in the ensemble of Christ between angels and then in the ensemble of the Virgin with Child. Fixedness and flattening empty the figures onto a uniform and gilded background lacking depth.

Many apsidal mosaic achievements in Rome definitely confirm the Byzantine stylistic elements. On one hand is the decorative scheme that privileges the figure of the Virgin or of the saint, a fulcrum of the liturgical action; on the other hand is the alignment with the Byzantine model, even in the techniques used for the mosaics. The apses of the churches of S. Lorenzo and S. Agnese exemplify flattened figures, a monochrome and abstract background on the walls, a statuary pose, a profusion of garments, attributes and jewels, and the presence of the *patron. With its Roman expressive vigor, the basilica of Sts. Cosmas and Damian provides a partial exception to this rule. In the dome of the apse, with Christ as a celestial emperor who walks solemnly through the clouds, the two chief apostles present the two titular saints along with Pope *Felix, who offers up the church of St.*Theodore. And yet in the central *clipeus* of the triumphal arch, a Byzantine scheme and language are detectable in the figural placement of the *Agnus Dei* upon a jeweled throne, on which rests a cross; this constitutes a further development in the representation of the throne *Sedes Dei et Agni*. In the church of St. Theodore, the apsidal mosaic (dated to the 2nd half of the 6th c.) accommodates the Redeemer offering a blessing at the center, seated on a starry globe, flanked by Peter and Paul, who introduce various saints including the soldier St. Theodore. A bit later, the mosaic decoration of the Pelagian basilica of S. Lorenzo (578–590) shows for the first time a theophany on the triumphal arch: Christ on the throne carries the cross, with the flanking Peter and Paul who are presented as clearly separate from the offering saints. The figure resembles the *pantocrators of the churches of S. Teodoro and S. Vitale, and of the Euphrasian basilica at Parentium. Nevertheless, the protagonist of the apsidal mosaic had to be the martyr St. Lawrence, in the position of **orans*, acc. to the iconography that

was spreading in the East (e.g., St. Demetrius at Thessalonica, with panels portraying various saints, 6th–7th c.) and at Ravenna. Otherwise, in the apsidal mosaic of the church of S. Agnese (625–638), the statuary *orans* image in sumptuous vestments of a "basilissa," stands isolated on an abstract gold background. In the apse of the oratory of S. Venanzio (642–649), we find a vertical succession, following the scheme already adapted at Parentium. At the top, we see the bust of the bearded Savior and the Virgin *orans*, who is surrounded by numerous saints in side-by-side position connected to the construction of the church; the side walls extend the procession of martyrs, who are placed on horizontal fasciae. In confirmation of the close connections with the Byzantine artistic world, right in this very mosaic we detect a particular method of apportioning the tesserae imported from Constantinople: minute tesserae for the figures, larger tesserae for the ground and broad interstitial spaces that allow the white of the stucco to emerge.

In harmony with the changing conception of the church building, the mosaic compositions of the following centuries continued to increase the prevalence of gold along with increasingly bolder tones.

Studies: Essential, beyond the voices of encyclopedias and dictionaries in current use, are the following works: M. van Berchem and E. Clouzot, *Mosaïques chrétiennes du IV*[e] *au X*[e] *siècle*, Geneva 1924; H.P. L'Orange and P.J. Nordhangen, *Mosaik. Von der Antike bis zum Mittelalter*, Munich 1960. For reports and updates on discoveries, refer to: *Atti dei Congressi Internazionali di Archeologia Cristiana* (VI, Ravenna 1962, 1965; VII, Trier 1965, 1969; VIII, Barcelona 1969, 1972; IX, Rome 1975, 1978; X, Vatican City 1984; XI, Rome 1989; XII, Vatican City 1991; XIII Split, Vatican City 1998); *Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique; La mosaïque gréco-romaine*, I, Paris 1963 (1965); *Deuxième Colloque international pour l'étude de la mosaïque antique*, Vienna 1971 (1975); Atti del III Colloquio internazionale sul mosaico antico, Ravenna 1983; *VI Coloquio internacional sobre mosaico antiguo: Palencia-Merida, octubre 1990*, ed. C.M. Batalla, Guadalajara 1994; *Fifth International Colloquium on Ancient Mosaics, Held at Bath, England, on September 5-12, 1987*, ed. R. Ling, Ann Arbor, MI 1995; Bollettini dell'AIEMA (Association Internationale pour l'Étude de la Mosaïque Antique) 15, 1994/1995; 16, 1997, with bibl. for 1994–1995, and in particular, the tribute to M.A. Alexander, with an extensive bibl., esp. on the mosaics of Tunisia, including Christian examples; Atti dei Colloqui dell'AISCOM (Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico) and for the general picture on Italy, see: R. Farioli Campanati, *Il mosaico in Italia dalla fine della Tarda Antichità al Medioevo: nuove conoscenze dai Colloqui AISCOM*, in Atti dell'VIII Colloquio dell'Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico (AISCOM), ed. F. Guidobaldi and A. Paribeni (Florence 2001), Ravenna 2001, 27-36 (hereafter cited as AISCOM VIII, 2001). *L'edificio battesimale in Italia. Aspetti e Problemi*, Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana (Genoa, Sarzana, Albenga, Finale Ligure, Ventimiglia, 21-26 settembre 1998), ed. E. Russo (Istituto Internazionale di Studi Liguri - Bordighera. Atti dei Convegni, V), Florence 2001, 2 vols.: many entries analyze the various aspects of the baptismal iconography, including evidence from wall and floor mosaics (in particular the contributions of G. Wataghin Cantino, D. Mazzoleni, G. Bertelli, M. Falla Castelfranchi, V. Fiocchi Nicolai, S. Gelichi, F. Bisconti, G. Cuscito, G. Binazzi, L. De Maria, A. Casentino, C. Rizzardi, C. Martorelli, G. Volpe, A. Biffino, R. Giuliani); M. Piccirillo, *L'Arabia cristiana. Dalla provincia imperiale al primo periodo islamico*, Milan 2002.

General themes: F. Betti, *La pittura a Roma dal IV al IX secolo*, in Crypta Balbi (2001) 122-131; the author analyzes the pictorial decoration at Rome, making reference to the figural mosaic systems pertaining to ritual spaces and their retracing in iconographic and stylistic development; W. Tronzo, *The Shape of Narrative: A Problem in the Mural Decoration of Early Medieval Rome*, in *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, XLVIII (27 aprille–1 maggio 2000), Spoleto 2001, I, 457-487: the author captures the narrative dimension of the Christian spiritual culture, and naturally makes reference to the principal mosaic cycles that have been preserved (S. Maria Maggiore, S. Sabina), and to those that have been lost yet are documented (S. Pietro, S. Paolo fuori le mura); *Art, cérémonial et liturgie au Moyen Âge.* Actes du Colloque de 3[e] Cycle Romand de Lettres, Lausanne and Fribourg, 2000, ed. N. Bock, P. Kurmann, S. Romano, and J.-M. Spieser, Rome 2002; of particular interest: J.G. Deckers, *Der erste Diener Christi. Die Proskynese der Kaiser als Schlüsselmotiv der Mosaiken in S. Vitale (Ravenna) und in der Hagia Sophia (Istanbul)*, 11-70: the author analyzes the iconographic motif of the *adoratio* of Christ, esp. in the mosaic programs of the churches of S. Vitale and S. Sofia; *Arte e iconografia a Roma dal Tardoantico alla fine del Medioevo*, ed. M. Andaloro, S. Romano, Milan 2002: interesting contributions on the literature of specific iconographic themes, written by curators and others; E. Concina, *Le arti di Bisanzio. Secoli VI–XV*, Milan 2002: the full and careful examination of the history of Byzantine art is not divorced from mosaic evidence, above all wall mosaics, whether in the East or in the West; the author does not overlook any significant evidence and the argument is extended as well to significant examples in the production of proto-Byzantine floor mosaics and of icons. *Specific entries*: on the catacombs: L. Cuppo Csaki, *Qui filius diceris et pater inveniris: il mosaico "dello scalone" nella catacomba di S. Domitilla a Roma*: Atti AIEMA VII (1999) 777-794; F. Bisconti, *Mosaici nel cimitero di S. Gaudioso: revisione iconografica e approfondimenti iconologici*: Atti AISCOM VII (2001) 87-98; L. De Maria, *La storia di Giona nella chiusura mosaicata di un loculo del Cimitero di Aproniano*: Atti AISCOM VII (2002) 141-152; R. Giuliani, *Un arcosolio mosaicato nelle catacombe di S. Ermete sulla via Salaria Vetus*: Atti AISCOM VII (2001) 153-166; S. Maria Maggiore: B. Brenk, *La tecnica dei mosaici paleocristiani di S. Maria Maggiore a Roma*, in *Medieval Mosaics*, ed. E. Borsook et al., Milan 2000, 139-148: the author reconsiders the entire mosaic cycle in light of direct observations and treats it as the output of entirely Roman workers (in contrast with the mausoleum of Constantine); furthermore, the author considers the mosaic inscription dedicated to Sixtus III on the triumphal arch to be contemporary with the figural repertory, in which case the pope would be the original patron of all the mosaics; *I mosaici paleocristiani di Santa Maria Maggiore negli acquerelli della Collezione Wilpert*, ed. Nestori and F. Bisconti, Vatican City 2000, XXXV-23.

Technique: P.J. Nordhagen, *The Technique of Italian Mosaics of the Fourth and Fifth Century AD*: AAAd 13 (1978) 259-265 (with bibl.). For a careful and thorough examination of the

application of the mosaic: P.J. Nordhagen, *Mosaico*: EAM 8, 563-574 (hereafter cited as Nordhagen 1997): in particular, the results obtained through the use of new technologies; the invention first of gold leaf, and then in the 5th c. of silver leaf, both in a Roman context, but enhanced by Eastern achievements in the early Byzantine mosaics; the prevalent use of tesserae of *pasta vitrea* with colors actually based on the traditional palette of Greco-Roman painting, in an Eastern setting; the introduction in the human figures of white stone tesserae for the exposed parts of the body in contrast with the colors of the clothing and of the decorative motifs in general, and the introduction of the figural border realized with gold tesserae (seen as well in the Rotunda of St. George at Thessalonica); the outstanding technical skill achieved in the play of light on the surfaces of the mosaic, and in the case of tesserae with gold leaf for applying them on the walls, a reduction of half the number, with significant savings. On the general character of technique: *Medieval Mosaics: Light, Color, Materials*, ed. E. Borsook, F. Gioffredi Superbi and G. Pagliarulo, Milan 2000: in particular, refer to the contributions on the theme of the perception of color in Antiquity and in the age of *Byzantium, to the techniques of fabricating the mosaic materials in the light of chemical and mineralogical investigations, as well as to the specific mosaic materials of S. Maria Maggiore and of S. Clemente, and to the more general theme of the connection between architecture and mosaic art (E. Schwarzenberg, L. James, M. Verità, B. Brenk, G. Basile, L. Trizzino). See also: *I Mosaici. Cultura, tecnologia, conservazione.* Atti del Convegno di Studi Scienza e Beni Culturali, XVIII - 2002 (Bressanone), ed. G. Biscontin and G. Driussi, Venice 2002: numerous entries on the results of analyzing degradation, and a study of the means of execution for various types of both well-known and lesser-known mosaics.

For cataloging with photography and infrared reflectography: A.M. Iannucci, N. Santopuoli, and L. Seccia, *Il nuovo atlante dei mosaic del Battistero Neoniano: catalogazione fotografica e riflettografica*, in XIV Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina. Seminario internazionale di studi sul tema "Le grandi isole del Mediterraneo orientale tra tarda antichità e medioevo." In memoria di Luciano Laurenzi (Ravenna 1998), ed. R. Farioli Campanati, Ravenna 2001, 333-359 (hereafter cited as XIV Corso Cultura, 2001).

Floor mosaics: Aquileia and the surrounding region: to begin, G. Brusin and P.L. Zovatto, *Mosaici paleocristiani delle Venezie*, Udine 1963; S. Tavano, *Mosaici cristiani nell'area aquileiese*: AAAd 2,2 (1972) 237-272 (with an outstanding chronological chart); R. Farioli, *Mosaici pavimentali dell'Alto Adriatico e dell'Africa Settentrionale in età bizantina*: AAAd 5 (1974) 285-302 (for the similarities and contrasts with Africa); L. Bertacchi, *Architettura e mosaici*: *da Aquileia a Venezia*, Milan 1980; see also various contributions to AAAd 1 (1972) and AAAd 8 (1975). A critical and bibliographic update in R. Farioli Campanati, *Mosaico pavimentale paleocristiano*: EAA, Suppl. II, 3, Rome 1995, 815-821: the author turns to the relationship between the articulation of the carpet mosaic and sacred space; the weaving of the mosaic is adapted in fact to the disposition of the spaces, e.g., geometric motifs repeated in the corridors of the lateral aisles, motifs with curvilinear development in the apses: thus architectonic lines, spatial function and mosaic motifs are interwoven. The geometric figures are developed acc. to rigorous rules of measure and proportion, prevalent in the West; in the East, iconic motifs are affirmed during a first phase, then avoided with the edicts of Theodosius the Great, but then they later return in animal and plant weavings, until the profusion of the "emblem" and "pseudo-emblem" in the age of Justinian. Thus messianic concepts are represented by animals at peace, in a heraldic position between fruit trees or on the sides of a vase that represents the fountain of life (the facing griffins appear in this way); or the vineyard of the Lord comes to be symbolized by the introduction of grape bunches, with the four rivers of paradise and the seasons, acc. to the nexus of peace—seasons—life.

Aquileia: *I Mosaici della Basilica di Aquileia*, ed. G. Marini, with texts by G.C. Menis, G. Marini and D. Venuto, Rovigo 2003. The largest uninterrupted carpet mosaic (760 m² [909 yd²]) is covered by a rich and masterly documentation in photographs with the community at Aquileia being in a close relationship with the *Didaskaleion of Alexandria in Egypt. The documentation highlights the excellent technique of execution for the mosaics, the naturalism and the iconographic schemes that still derive from the classical world, all revitalized to represent the gospel, even through the image of the primitive terrestrial "paradise."

Rome: *Dall'antichità al Medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo Nazionale Romano Crypta Balbi*, ed. M.S. Arena, P. Delogu, L. Paroli, M. Ricci, L. Saguì and L. Vendittelli, Venice 2001 (hereafter cited as Crypta Balbi, 2001); with general entries (Betti) as well as specific entries on a few Roman churches in light of recent investigations (Guidobaldi, Pentiricci, Episcopo, Cecchelli).

Ravenna: R. Farioli, *Pavimenti musivi di Ravenna paleocristiana*, Ravenna 1975 (with bibl.); F. Berti, *Mosaici antichi in Italia, Regio VIII, Ravenna I*, Rome 1976; R. Farioli Campanati, *I mosaici pavimentali della chiesa di S. Giovanni Evangelista in Ravenna*, Biblioteca di "Felix Ravenna," 8. Pavimenti musivi medievali in Val Padana, Ravenna 1995. For an interesting rereading of the famous mosaic cycle in S. Apollinare Nuovo: S. Lusuardi Siena, *Teodorico*: EAM 9, Rome 2000, 118-125; D. Longhi, *La cronaca di Agnello come fonte per la ricostruzione dell'immagine epurata dal timpano del Palatium, in S. Apollinare Nuovo*: Atti AISCOM 7 (2001) 99-108; P. Novara, *Storia delle scoperte archeologiche di Ravenna e Classe*, Ravenna 1998; G. Montanari, *Ravenna. L'iconologia. Saggi di interpretazione culturale e religiosa dei cicli musivi*, Ravenna 2002.

Petra (Jordan): R. Bartoloni, *Splendidi mosaici di Petra Bizantina*: Archeologia Viva (nov.-dic. 2000) 14-15: important discoveries made of a Byzantine basilica (three discernible phases: 450–500, 500–550, 600) during a mission at *Petra sponsored by the American Center of Oriental Research. The basilica is near the Temple of the Lions, with pavement in slabs of marble and stone in geometric compositions, and in the lateral aisles there is a complex system of medallions, with borders in vine stocks that branch out from a vase that is placed in the central aisle. There are also objects and indigenous animals (peacocks, elephants, giraffes, horses, boar), human figures and personifications that are identifiable on the basis of Greek inscriptions.

**Sidi Jdidi* (a Byzantine province, today inland of Hammamet, perhaps the city of Aradi): A. Ben Abed, M. Bonifay, M. Fixot and S. Roucole, *Les basiliques chrétiennes de Sidi Jdidi*: RivAC 76 (2000) 555-587: two basilicas have been discovered, the N one presents a floor covered by funerary mosaics bound together with decorative fasciae, the altar presents a great botanical crown and leafy branches inhabited by birds (1st quarter of 5th c.); in the S basilica the apse presents a geometric, polychrome mosaic floor, a panel with a Latin inscription and

a *kantharos* that is flanked by peacocks and from which proceed some vine stocks; in addition, there are preserved panels with *alpha* and *omega* and *chrismon* and other animal and plant elements (beginning of the 5th c., rebuilding 2nd quarter of 6th c.); see a contribution by the same authors in Atti AIEMA VII (1999) 267-284.

Madaba (Jordan): M. Piccirillo and E. Alliata, *The Madaba Map Centenary (1897–1997): Travelling Through the Byzantine Umayyad Period* (Collectio Maior 40), Jerusalem 1999: the volume celebrates the anniversary of the map mosaic of Madaba (6th c.) with the representation of the territory contained between the Jordan River and the Nile delta, in its connections with OT and NT history.

Africa: general works: L. Foucher, *Inventaire des mosaïques de la Gaule et de l'Afrique, II Tunisie, III Algérie*, Paris 1913, 1925; K.M.D. Dunbabin, *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa*, Oxford 1978 (with a broad overview of the connections between West and East, and an updated bibl.). For the theme of the hunt and of the cycles of the *latifundia*: J.W. Salomonson, *La mosaïque aux chevaux de l'Antiquarium de Carthage*, The Hague 1965; T. Sarnowski, *Les representations de villas sur les mosaïques africaines tardives*, Warsaw 1978. For the major decorations in ritual spaces: E. Marec, *Monuments chrétiens d'Hippone*, Paris 1958; M. Fendri, *Basiliques chrétiennes de la Skhira*, Paris 1961. For funerary mosaics: N. Duval, *Le Mosaïque funéraire dans l'art paleochrétien*, Ravenna 1976 (of general interest); Atti del VII Colloquio Internazionale sul Mosaico Antico (AIEMA), *Il Mosaico greco-romano* (Tunis 1994), Tunis 1999, 2 vols.; G.P.R. Metraux, *Mosaics, Liturgy and Architecture in the Basilica of Dermech I, Carthage*, in Atti dell'VIII Colloquio Internazionale per lo Studio del Mosaico antico e medievale (AIEMA), ed. D. Paunier and Chr. Schmidt, (Lausanne 1997), Lausanne 2001, 434-443.

Sicily: for the connections with Africa found amid the various contributions of A. Carandini, see: *La villa di Piazza Armerina, la circolazione della cultura figurativa africana nel tardo impero*: Dialoghi di Archeol. 1 (1967); G.Ch. Picard, *Rapports de la Sicile et de l'Afrique pendant l'Empire Romain*: Kokalos 18-19 (1972–1973) 108-111; N. Duval, *Sulla villa del Tellaro*: Kokalos 22-23 (1976–1977) 634-635. For Piazza Armerina: S. Settis, *Per l'interpretazione di Piazza Armerina*: MEFR Ant. 87 (1975) 873-994 (with bibl.); H.J. Marrou, *Sur deux mosaïques de la ville romaine de Piazza Armerina*: Christiana Tempora (Collection de l'École Française de Rome) 35 (1978) 253-295; A. Carandini, A. Ricci, and M. De Vos, *Filosofiana: la villa di Piazza Armerina: immagine di un aristocratico romano al tempo di Costantino*, 2 vols., Palermo 1982. On the subject of the new Sicilian villas, see: S.L. Agnello: Archivio Storico Siracusano n.s. I (1971) 145-147; II (1972–1973) 101-102; G. Voza, *Mosaici della villa del Tellaro. Archeologia della Sicilia Sud-Orientale*, Naples 1973; Id., *L'Attività della Soprintendenza alle Antichità della Sicilia Orientale II*: Kokalos 22-23 (1976–1977) 551-576. For the mosaics of Carini, see: R. Camerata Scavazzo, *Mosaici pavimentali di Carini*: Arch. Class. 29,1 (1977) 134-160. For S. Croce Camerina, see: G.V. Gentili, *La basilica bizantina della Pirrera (di S. Croce Camerina)*, Ravenna 1969. Other sorts of interesting comparisons are found in R. Moreno Cassano, *Mosaici paleocristiani di Puglia*: MEFR Ant. 88 (1976) 277-373.

Cyprus: D. Michaelides, *Archeologia paleocristiana a Cipro*: XIV Corso Cultura (2001) 179-239; M. Demetrios, *Some Characteristic Traits of a Mosaic Workshop in Early Christian Cyprus*, in Atti dell'VIII Colloquio Internazionale per lo Studio del Mosaico antico e medievale (AIEMA), ed. D. Paunier and Chr. Schmidt (Lausanne 1997), Lausanne 2001, 314-325.

For the provinces of both the Western and Eastern empire, see the contribution in the *Atti dei Congressi* and of the cited "Colloques." In addition: *Spain*: P. de Palol Sabellas, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana, siglos IV–VI*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; J. González Navarrete, *Mosaicos Hispánicos del bajo imperio*: Arch.Esp.Arq. 45-47 (1972–1974) 419-432. *The East*: E. Kitzinger, *Stylistic Developments in Pavement Mosaics in the Greek East from Constantine to Justinian*, in *La mosaïque* I, cited, 341-351. *Antioch*: D. Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavement*, Princeton, NJ 1947; I. Lavin, *The Hunting Mosaics of Antioch and Their Sources*: DOP 17 (1963) 181-286. *Apamea and Spain*: J. Balty, *La Grande Mosaïque de Chasse du Triclinos*, Fouilles d'Apamée de Syrie. Miscellanea 2, Brussels 1969. *Lebanon*: M. Chehab, *Mosaïques du Liban*: Bull. du Musée de Beyrouth 14-15 (1958–1959). *Cilicia*: L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien I: Frühchristliche Mosaiken in Misis-Mopsuhestia*, Recklinghausen 1969. *Palestine*: for the churches, see: M. Avi-Yonah, *Mosaic Pavements in Palestine*: Quarterly Dep. Ant. Pal. II (1932–1933), III (1933–1934); for the synagogue of Beth Alpha: E.L. Sukenik, *The Ancient Synagogue of Beth Alpha*, Jerusalem 1932. *Jordan*: see M. Piccirillo, *Mosaici di Giordania*, Jerusalem 1982.

For a bibl. of a general nature on the Eastern world, see the Atti del VII Colloquio Internazionale sul Mosaico Antico (AIEMA) (Tunis 1994), *Il Mosaico greco-romano*, Tunis 1999, 2 vols. (hereafter cited as Atti AIEMA, VII, 1999), in particular: M. Piccirillo, *Ateliers de mosaïstes entre le Mont Nebo et Kastron Mefaa dans le territoire de Madaba (Jordanie)*, 127-140; N. Duval, *Rapport sur les mosaïques "chrétiennes" d'Algerie*, 251-266; G. Canuti, *Iconographia e iconologia nei pavimenti musivi absidali delle chiese del Vicino Oriente*, 759-776. Atti dell'VIII Colloquio Internazionale per lo Studio del Mosaico antico e medievale (AIEMA) (Lausanne 1997), ed. D. Paunier and Chr. Schmidt, Lausanne 2001, 2 vols.; R. Farioli Campanati, *I mosaici pavimentali della Basilica di Mitropolis a Gortyna nell'ambito della produzione musiva di Creta*, 261-265 (also in XIV Corso Cultura [2001] 83-121); M. Demetrios, *Some Characteristic Traits of a Mosaic Workshop in Early Christian Cyprus*, 314-325; G.P.R. Metraux, *Mosaics, Liturgy and Architecture in the Basilica of Dermech I, Carthage*, 434-443; M. Piccirillo, *Mosaici tardo-romani e ommaiadi. Nuove scoperte in Giordania. 1994–1996*, 444-458; Atti AISCOM VIII (2001); note esp. the following contributions: F. Mosca and P. Puppo, *Osservazioni su alcuni mosaici pavimentali a schema geometrico della Basilica Eufrasiana di Parenzo*, 175-183; F. Maselli Scotti, *Aquileia, il complesso paleocristiano: stato attuale dei mosaici e loro valorizzazione*, 185-190.

Wall mosaics: to the general works one might add F.B. Sear, *Roman Wall Vault Mosaics*: MDAI Erg. H 23 (1977), esp. for the mosaics discovered in catacombs and hypogea (Rome and Naples). *Rome*: J. Wilpert, *Die römische Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchl. Bauten von IV bis XIII Jahr.*, Freiburg 1916; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Rome 1956; G. Matthiae, *Mosaici medioevali delle chiese di Roma*, Rome 1967. Concerning the development of apsidal decoration, see: Ch. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei von vierten Jahr. bis zur Mitte des achtes Jahr.*, Wiesbaden 1960; J. Engemann, *Zu den apsis-Tituli des Paulinus von Nola*: JbAC 17 (1974) 21-46; P. Testini, *Il sarcofago del Tuscolo ora in S. Maria in Vivario a Frascati*: RAC 52 (1976) 65-108 (with an updated bibl. on the mosaics sharing the theme of the *hetoimasia*). *Ravenna*: F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna, Hauptstadt*

des spätantiken Abendlandes I, Ravenna Geschichte und Monumente, Wiesbaden 1969; *II, Kommentar 1–3*, Wiesbaden 1974–1976; Id., *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden-Baden 1958. *Greece*: S. Pelekanidis, *Gli affreschi paleocristiani ed i più antichi mosaici parietali di Salonicco*, Ravenna 1963; M. Vickers, *The Date of the Mosaics of the Rotunda at Thessaloniki*: PBSR 38 (1970) 183-197 (see Testini, op. cit., notes 13, 34, 39, 76). For a general picture of the development of mosaics in the Byzantine era, see W.Fr. Volbach, *Frühchristliche Kunst, Die Kunst der Spätantike in West- und Ostrom*, Munich 1958; D. Talbot Rice, *Arte di Bisanzio*, Florence 1959. A critical and bibliographic update in F. Bisconti and D. Mazzoleni, *Mosaico parietale cristiano*: EAA, Suppl. II, 3, Rome 1995, 821-827: the authors retrace the development of wall decoration in funerary contexts and esp. in an ecclesial context. Attention is given to some achievements in a catacomb setting, where the mosaic has the function of indirectly lighting the setting (as with an arcosolium in the catacombs of S. Domitilla, or in the catacomb of S. Gennaro and the catacomb of S. Gaudioso at Naples). Among the great Christian achievements, attention is given to the debate on the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore and their actual link to Sixtus III: M. Andaloro points out other possible exegetical connections to works of *Augustine of Hippo and of *Leo the Great (however, the works of Leo are dated after the completion of the mosaics); see M. Andaloro, *Aggiornamento scientifico e bibliografico*, in G. Matthiae (ed.), *Pittura romana nel Medioevo - secoli IV–X*, Rome [2]1987, a highly valuable work for all mosaic production (for S. Maria Maggiore, esp. 74-81, but note the counterargument of Brenk, in *Medieval Mosaics*, ed. E. Borsook et al., Milan 2000).

L. Ungaro Testini

MOSES

I. In patristics - II. Iconography.

I. In patristics. Moses, a figure of primary importance in the OT esp. in relation to the constitution of the people of Israel and the gift of the law, was understood by the ancient Christian writers, as were many other characters of the first economy, in essentially christological terms. In particular, he was understood as a prophet and type of Christ. Along this line, the Fathers found themselves having to balance a positive evaluation of Moses and everything connected with him—in particular the law in light of the controversies with the *gnostics, *Marcionites and *Manicheans (Aug., *C. Faust.* 22)—with a glorification (think of the place that Moses occupies in the works of *Philo, see A. Jaubert, *La notion d'alliance*, 375-452) that could threaten to overshadow the victory accomplished by Christ (on this balance, see Orig., *C. Cels.* 2,51-54). Thus their constant concern is to show how throughout his life Moses did nothing other than foreshadow Christ (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* 3,18,6-7; 5,11,8; Orig., *Hom. Num.* 7,2; Cyp., *Ad Fort.* 8; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 13,20). They also demonstrated how the gifts that were given to him by God, first of all, the law, were not for Israel alone but for all people (Tertull., *Adv. Iud.* 2,1). The ever-present anti-Jewish polemic had a tendency to compare Moses with other figures seen to be superior and more universal in nature: Christ, first of all, who received the covenant as heir, while Moses received it as a servant (*Barn.* 14,4-5; John Chrys., *Hom. Mt. 28,2*; Cyr. Alex., *In Jo.* 3,3); *Abraham who, unlike Moses (Ex 3:5), did not have to take off his shoes when he went up the mountain, not coming from Egypt and therefore not having "the bonds of mortality tied to his feet" (Orig., *Hom. Gen.* 8,7); *Joshua, who, contrary to Moses, could enter the Promised Land (Orig., *Com. Io.* 6,228-230; *Hom. Num.* 22,4; Tertull., *Adv. Iud.* 9,22; *Adv. Marc.* 3,16,4); *John the Baptist, acc. to the words of Christ himself (Cyr. Alex., *Catech.* 3,6); the *apostles, who at *Pentecost did not receive tablets of stone but the *Holy Spirit himself (John Chrys., *Hom. Mt.*1,1).

Moses's knowledge of Egyptian wisdom is recalled in Acts 7:22, on which foundation *Origen offers a historical-literal interpretation of the construction of *Noah's Ark (*Hom. Gen.* 2,2), while *Basil emphasizes its inferiority compared to the truth (*Hex.* 6,1; *De Leg. Lib. Gent.* 2: PG 31, 567). All the episodes from the life of Moses receive an interpretation consistent with the uniqueness of Christianity: the transformation of the rod (**virga*) (Ex 4:2ff.) is considered a symbol of the power of God to raise the dead (Epiph., *Ancor.* 96) or even a symbol of the death and *resurrection of Christ (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 18,12; Aug., *En. in ps.* 73,5; *Trinit.* III, 10,20); the episode of the bronze serpent (Num 21:8ff., recalled in Jn 3:14) is interpreted typologically in reference to Christ (Barn., 12,6; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* 3,18); his prayer with outstretched arms is a figure of the cross (Barn., 12,2; Cyp., *Ad Fort.* 8; Justin, *Dial.* 114,4) but also a model for worshipers (Orig., *Hom. Ex.* 3,3); the refusal of God to forgive the people despite the intercession of Moses (Ex 32:31) is explained as a sign of the impossibility of forgiveness for idolaters (Cyp., *Ad Fort.* 4; *De lapsis* 19). Moses is the law itself (Ambr., *In Luc.* 1,41) which, in passing from the synagogue to the church, loses its literal shell in order to gain the strength and greatness of the spirit (Orig., *Hom. Ex.* 2,4). His death, outside the Promised Land, is interpreted as consequence of his lack of faith demonstrated at Meribah (Num 20:10-12; cf. Orig., *Hom. Num.* 22,3; Basil., *Hom. in ps.* 48,9; Aug., *En. in ps.* 105,28) or as motivated by the divine will to avoid attributing the entrance into the Promised Land to Moses rather than to God (John Chrys., *Hom.* 5,4 *in Mt.*). It is as a dead man that he was called up from the underworld at the time of the transfiguration of

Christ, because Jesus was recognized as God even by the underworld (Chrom., *Serm.* 22).

In addition to being a type of Christ, Moses is also, for the Fathers, who follow the typology already present in Philo, a type of every believer who aspires to encounter God: this is the main theme of the work of *Gregory of Nyssa's *De vita Moysis*, and it is also found abundantly in other authors (Orig., *Hom. Jer. 18,2*; Jer., *In Jon.* 3,4; Ambr., *De paen.* 2,11; Aug., *Trinit.* II, 16,27-28; *Ep.* 147,13,32; Theodoret, *Orat. de car.* 31,5). He is the model teacher, because he knows how to calibrate his teaching acc. to his listeners' capabilities (Orig., *Hom. Num.* 27,12; *Hom. Lev.* 6,6; 16,2), a privileged example for bishops and monks (Severus of Antioch, *Hom.* 41). Taking off his shoes began that stripping-purification that would become total for every Christian at *baptism (Epiph., *Ancor.* 115). Finally, Moses is indicated as the author of the Pentateuch (Tertull., *Adv. Herm.* 19,1; Novat., *De Trinit.* 17,95; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 4,35; Basil, *Hex.* 1; John. Chrys., *Catech.* 3,18; Ambr., *Ex.* 2,5; Ruf., *De symb.* 35; Aug., *En. in ps.* 70,1,19; Greg. Gt., *In Ezech.* 1,1), and based on 2 Cor 3:15 his name is used as synonymous with the entire OT Scripture (Orig., *Hom. 7,2 in Gen*).

DSp 10, 1453-1471; BS 9, 626-628; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri*, Paris 1950, 131-200; var. aus., *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance*, Tournai 1955; A. Jaubert, *La notion d'alliance dans le judaisme*, Paris 1963; A. Monaci Castagno, *"Moyses stella est in nobis" (HomGen 1,7): l'interpretazione origeniana della figura di Mosè*: ASE 2 (1985) 161-174; M.I. Danieli, *La teologia e la spiritualità dell'esodo negli scritti di Origene e dei primi Padri monastici (III–V secolo)*: DSBP 18, Rome 1997, 53-76; Id., *Il cammino d'Israele nel deserto nella lettura di Origene*: Vita monastica 52/212 (1999) 7-31; *Omelie sull'Esodo. Lettura origeniana*, Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 174, ed. M. Maritano - E. dal Covolo, Rome 2002.

F. Cocchini

II. Iconography. The most ancient representations of Moses belong to cemetery iconography: Moses saved from the waters, at the burning bush, speaking with Pharaoh and leaving Egypt, crossing of the Red Sea, the miracle of the *quails, the miracle of the *manna, the miracle of the water gushing from the rock and receiving the law.

1. Moses saved from the waters (Ex 2:1-6). The scene appears for the first time in a fresco in Rome (325–350) in the catacomb of Via Dino Compagni (Ferrua, pl. 94). On the left, hidden by reeds, the sister of Moses; on the right, the daughter of Pharaoh, followed by two attendants; amid the waters, Moses in a sort of cradle.

2. Moses at the burning bush (Ex 3:1-6). Depicted in taking off his sandals (Ex 3:5) with his left or right foot on a little rise, Moses looks to the place from where the divine voice is coming. He appears this way both in paintings (e.g., Rome, *Coemeterium Maius*: Wp 168; Domitilla: Wp 230,1), as well as on Roman (e.g., Ws 206,1; 86,3) or provincial (e.g., Ws 206,2) *sarcophagi. Sometimes the hand of God is represented above (e.g., Rome, catacomb of Via Dino Compagni: Ferrua, pl. 64; Crypt of the Sheep in Callisto: Wp 275,2). In Vat. 178 (Ws 86,3) Moses takes his sandals off in front of four characters.

3. Moses speaking with Pharaoh and leaving Egypt (Ex 12:31-34). On the left side of a sarcophagus at *Arles (Ws 97,3), in addition to the confrontation between Moses and Pharaoh, the preparations for the exodus and Moses receiving the law are represented. The tomb dates from the late 4th c.

4. Crossing the Red Sea (Ex 14:21-31). In the late 4th c., this appears on 20 sarcophagi and in 3 paintings. The most ancient examples adorn the covers of sarcophagi (e.g., Ws 216,2; 209,1; 210,2), then the fronts, usually occupying the entire space (e.g., Ws 210,1; 209,3). In the composition, in addition to Moses with the *virga* that divides the waters, there appear, together or in part, the pillar of fire (Ex 13:21-22); the Jews fleeing preceded by Miriam, Moses's sister, who plays the tambourine; Pharaoh, who comes out of a city door on a chariot followed by knights; the Egyptians with Pharaoh swept away by the waters. Under the horses appear sometimes personifications of the earth or the Red Sea. The representation in the so-called Chapel of the Exodus at El-Bagawat (mid-4th c.) has specific symbolic value in the context of the other frescoed scenes. In the two Roman frescoes, the pillar of fire is represented independently (catacomb of Via Dino Compagni: Ferrua pl. 75, 98) and is associated with Moses's receiving the law. The scene symbolically alludes to salvation and bears resemblance in its composition to the relief of the Arch of Constantine with the Battle of the Milvian Bridge.

5. Miracle of the rock (Ex 17:5-6). In the earliest period (Rome, Priscilla, Greek chapel: Wp 73) Moses is depicted beardless in a tunic and pallium, while with the *virga* he strikes the rock of Horeb, from which flows the water that quenches the thirst of the Hebrews, sometimes depicted as *bibentes*. Often the *bibentes* are dressed in military *clothing (e.g., Ws 127,1; 215,6), in which case Moses is identified with *Peter, who strikes the rock, and finishes by taking on the iconographic characteristics of the apostle. The Moses-Peter combination finds itself as a rule in the so-called Petrine trilogy (Fount-Arrest-Rooster), whose earliest example is probably Vat. 119, dated between the late 3rd and early 4th c. (Ws 9,3). The

scene clearly alludes to the necessity of *baptism, which frees us from original *sin.

6. *Moses receives the law* (Ex 24:12-18). This is a common scene in sculpture, but rare in painting (Rome, Giordani: Fasola, pl. III,10; catacomb of Via Dino Compagni: Ferrua, pl. 98, 75). The main elements are Moses and the hand of God protruding from some clouds; Sinai is depicted as a small hill sometimes with a tree identified as an olive tree (Ws 205,3). The episode is often found to the left, rarely to the right (Ws 195,4), on sarcophagi with a central *clipeus*. Sometimes there is present a third character in tunic and pallium, identified by Wilpert as the angel mentioned in the speech of Stephen (Acts 7:38) (Ws 91; 205,5). On the sarcophagus of Servannes (Ws 15), the scene is very rich in details; in addition to Moses, *Aaron and the people, both men and women, appear. Sometimes Moses holds a scroll in his left hand (Ws 180,2) that, acc. to Wilpert, indicates his knowledge.

The repertoire of depictions of Moses is richer in nonfunerary art: in addition to the representations already mentioned, the mosaics of the right aisle of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome (mid-5th c.) have representations of Moses with the daughter of Pharaoh (Ex 2:10), the marriage of Moses with Zipporah (Ex 2:16-21), the waters of Marah (Ex 15:22-23), the battle with the Amalekites (Ex 17:8-13) and the death of Moses (Dt 32:48-50); all new scenes in Paleo-Christian art. Of particular interest in these mosaics are the crossing of the Red Sea, the burning bush, both of which have already been examined, and Moses among philosophers, whose source is not the OT but probably the speech of St. Stephen (Acts 7:22) or Josephus (*J.A.* 2,9,7). Also in Rome, the wooden door of St. Sabina from the 5th c. should be mentioned (Jeremias pls. 15; 20; 30), where many scenes depict the life of Moses (e.g., the water of Marah, the crossing through the Red Sea, Moses receiving the law). Outside of Rome, in S. Vitale in *Ravenna (mid-6th c.), a scene depicts Moses at the burning bush and receiving the law (Deichmann, pls. 316, 317). Among ivories, the valuable reliquary of Brescia (mid 4th c.) has well-known scenes (e.g., Moses taking off his sandals) and new ones such as Moses's killing of the Egyptian (Ex 2:11-12) and the incident of the golden calf (Ex 32:4-5). Representations of Moses also appear on other objects in ivory (St. Petersburg pyx: Volbach, n. 190) or in silver (Thessalonica reliquary: Panayotidi-Grabar, fig. 7), in miniatures (Ashburnham Pentateuch, from the 7th c.: Gebhardt pls. 14-20; codex of *Cosmas Indicopleustes (9th c., but from a 6th-c. prototype: Stornaiolo, pl. 25).

A testimony in itself is the synagogue of Dura Europos: here the frescoes with Moses saved from the waters, Moses leading the Jews out of the city and the crossing of the Red Sea are the most ancient (before AD 256) and interesting in regard to Moses iconography.

DACL 11, 1648ff.; BS 9, 629ff.; LCI 4, 298ff.; Ws 237ff.; P. v. Moorsel, *Il miracolo della rupe nella letteratura e nell'arte paleocristiana*: RivAC 40 (1964) 221ff.; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 196ff.; C. Rizzardi, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani con rappresentazione del passaggio del Mar Rosso*, Faenza 1970; O. v. Gebhardt, *The Minn. of the Ashburnhampentateuch*, London 1883; C. Stornaiolo, *Le miniature della topografia cristiana di Cosma Indicopleuste (vat. gr. 699)*, Milan 1908; J. Kollwitz, *Die Lipsanothek von Brescia*, Berlin-Leipzig 1933; C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956; C.H. Kraeling, *The Synagogue: The Excavations at Dura Europos* (Fin. Rep. 8), New Haven 1956 (repr.); U. Fasola, *Le recenti scoperte nelle catacombe sotto villa Savoia. Il "Coemeterium Iordanorum ad S. Alexandrum"*: *Actas VIII Congr. Intern. Arqueol. Crist.*, Vatican City-Barcelona 1972; M. Panayotidi - A. Grabar, *Un reliquaire paléochrétien récemment découvert près de Tessalonique*: Cahiers Archéol. 24 (1975) 33-48; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz [3]1976; A.M. Nieddu, *Miracolo della fonte*: TIP 216-219; U. Utro, *Mosè*: TIP 223-225; C. Sanmorì, *Passaggio del Mar Rosso*: TIP 245-247.

D. Calcagnini Carletti

MOSES of Khorene (Movsēs Xorenac'i). Author of *History of the Armenians*, which presents itself explicitly as composed in the 5th c., but the text transmitted uses sources and forms no earlier than the 8th c. In some cases this discrepancy is due to subsequent editorial interventions. Also attributed to Moses of Khorene are a treatise on rhetoric (*De tropis*) and a *Geography* (*Asxarhac'oyc'*), the second of which is now held to be written by *Ananias of Shirak (7th c.).

Patrologia V, 602-603; DSp 10, 1473-1475; M. Abegjan - S. Harowt'iwnean, *Movsēs Xorenac'i Patmowt'iwn Hayoc'*,Tiflis 1913; V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie.* II, Paris 1869, 45-175; R. Sgarbi, *Contributo allo studio delle fonti dell'opera* yaḷags Pitoyits' *attribuita a Mosè di Corene*: RIL 102 (1969) 78-84; R.W. Thomson, *Moses Khorenats'i, History of the Armenians*, Cambridge, MA-London 1978; G. Traina, *Il complesso di Trimalcione. Movsēs Xorenac'i e le origini del pensiero storico armeno* (Eurasiatica 27), Venezia 1991; E. Gulbekian, *Movsēs Khorenatsi and Ghazar P'arpetsi*: HA 108 (1994) 1-7; K. Balekjian, *Remarques sur les dits anachronismes dans le texte des manuscrits-copies de l'"Histoire de l'Arménie par Moïse de Khorène" et la philologie arménienne*, Montréal 1994; G. Traina, *Materiali per un commento a Movsēs Xorenac'i*, Patmowt'iwn Hayoc', *I-II*: Mus 108 (1995) 279-333; 111 (1998) 95-138; J.R. Russell, *Sound as Symbol: The Case in Pagan and Christian Armenian Poetics*: Mus 109 (1996) 113-126; A. Top'č'yan, *Firmilian's* Narration *as a Source for Movsēs*

Xorenac'i: REARm 27 (1998–2000) 99-115; Ph. Gignoux, *Quelle connaissance eut de l'Iran Movsēs Xorenac'i?*: Studia Iranica 28 (1999) 215-226.

S.J. Voicu

MOSES the Saracen. Hermit of the Egyptian desert of Arab origin whose feast falls on 7 February. According to *Socrates, *Sozomen and *Theodoret, he was called by Mavia, queen of Phoinikon, the widow of the king of the Saracens, to convert her realm by allowing himself to be consecrated bishop of the Saracens in exchange for peace with the Roman emperor *Valens (373–378): previously the Saracens had been allied with the Romans, then they rebelled under Mavia, and "they devastated all regions of the East." Moses acquiesced against his wishes because the Romans were in favor of peace. He was brought to Alexandria, where the *Arian bishop, Luke or Lucius, would have to ordain him. But Moses refused to have imposed on him a hand "full of blood," which had sent many people into exile or to death by wild beasts or fire. These actions against his brothers, Moses held, proved that the doctrines of the bishop were not Christian. Instead, Moses was consecrated by bishops who were in exile "in the mountains," and having concluded peace with the Romans, Mavia gave her daughter in marriage to Victor, the Roman army general. According to Devreesse, Phoinikon would be identifiable with al-Nakhla, midway between Suez and Aqaba: following the conversion of the Saracens aided by Moses, Christianity began to spread in the Negeb. "Saracen," Gk. Σαρακηνός, perhaps from the Arabic *Sharkeen*, "Eastern," was used by Greek writers of the early centuries to designate the bedouins from E Arabia, by others to indicate the Arabic tribes of *Palestine and *Syria (such as the designation of the *Osroene King *Abgar of *Edessa by Tacitus as *rex Arabum Acbarus*), by still others for the Berbers of NE *Africa.

R. Devreesse, *Le Christianisme dans le Sud palestinien*: RSR 20 (1940) 235-251, esp. 238-239.

M. van Esbroeck

MTSKHETA-SVETI TSKHOVELI. A city of ancient origin, which was the capital of *Georgia until the 7th c. (when the capital was transferred to Tbilisi) and, starting in 471, the see of the **catholicos*. According to the tradition passed on by *Rufinus (*HE* 1,10-11), the conversion of Iberia to Christianity took place at Mtskheta-Sveti Tskhoveli, the result of the work of St. Nino, who had a place of worship built there. (Sveti Tskhoveli means "living column," the column in the account of Rufinus.) This was probably a building of small proportions, so far as examinations of the remains of the buildings from the 4th c. in Georgia allow us to hypothesize. The Cathedral of the Holy Cross was built between 586 and 604 with the commission of Prince Stephen, who was portrayed as a donor on the outside of the building. The cathedral, with four domes, four angular areas and one large cupola, marked a historic step forward in the evolution of Georgian architecture, as it became the prototype for some of the most significant buildings in the region (e.g., the Sion of Ateni, 7th c.).

G. Čubinasvili, *I monumenti del tipo Ǧvari*, Milan [2]1974; D. Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity: A History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia 550 BC–AD 562*, Oxford 1994; N. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le Grand Schisme d'Orient*, CSCO 574, Subs. 100, Louvain 1998; *Santa Nino e la Georgia. Storia e spiritualità cristiana nel Paese del Vello d'oro*, Atti del I Conv. Int. di studi georgiani, ed. G. Shurgaia, Rome 2000; ODB 2, 1325.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

MUIRCHÚ (d. after 697). Irish author, called Moccu Machténi. Taking inspiration from Cogitosus (author of a *Life* of St. Brigid of Kildare), whom he calls his *pater*, Muirchù at the invitation of Aed, bishop of Sletty (680–700), wrote a *Life* of St. *Patrick, on the occasion of the aggregation of Sletty to the *paruchia* of Patrick, while he was abbot of Armagh Ségíne (662–688). The *Life* written by Muirchù, to which all the other biographies of Patrick go back, is riddled with legendary elements, often inspired by political-religious situations of the 7th c. It is contained in the *Book of Armagh* (Dublin, Trinity College, 52, copied in 807 by Ferdomnach) along with the *Collectanea* of Tírechán and other texts. He is locally commemorated as a saint 8 June.

Sharpe 1068; Lapidge-Sharpe 303; CPL 1105; J. Gammack: DCB 3, 999; L. Boyle: BS IX, 666-668; SLH 10 (1979), 62-122 (L. Bieler). E. Hogan, *Vitae S. Patricii*, Brussles 1886, 17-121; W. Stokes, *The Tripartite Life of Patrick with Other Documents Relating to That Saint*, London 1887, I, 269-300: *Liber Ardmachanus*, ed. J. Gwynn, Dublin 1913, 3-16, 39-40, 442-452; J.F. Kenney, *The Sources of the Early History of Ireland*, New York 1929, I, 128; L. Bieler, *Studies on the Text of Muirchú*: PRIA 52 (1950) 179-220; 59 (1959) 181-195; J.-M. Picard, *Structural Patterns in Early Hiberno-Latin Hagiography*: Peritia 4 (1985) 67-82.

E. Malaspina

MURATORIAN FRAGMENT. *See* *CANON, MURATORIAN

MUSANUS, polemicist. According to *Eusebius (HE IV, 28), Musanus wrote a very rigorous book for some Christians tending toward *encratism. This book has not survived, but it seems that Eusebius was still able to consult it. The dating of his activities remains uncertain, whether at the time of *Marcus Aurelius (Eus., *HE* 4, 21; see also Jerome, *Vir. Ill.* 31, which depends on Eusebius) or of *Septimius Severus (Eus.-Jer., *Chron*. XII year of Severus: GCS p. 212). His place of origin (*Egypt or *Asia Minor) is also uncertain.

DCB 3, 1003f.; LTK³ 7, 542.

A. Pollastri

MUSEUS of Marseille (d. ca. 461). Priest of Marseille who lived in the 5th c. and died around 461, highly educated and an expert in the Holy Scriptures. According to *Gennadius (*De vir. Ill.* 79 [80]), at the request of the bishop Venerius and then of his successor Eustathius, he composed a lectionary (*Lectiones totius anni*), a responsorial (*Responsoria psalmorum capitula*), a sacramentary and probably a collection of *homilies. Unfortunately the liturgical works of Museus are difficult to trace, and historians have struggled to reconstruct them. Two fragments of the responsorial are found in the National Library of Paris (New Acquisitions 1628).

CPL 1947. A. Stuiber, *Libelli Sacramentorum Romani* (Bonn 1950); G. Berti, *Il più antico lezionario della Chiesa*: EphLit 68 (1954) 147-154; Kl. Gamber, *Das Lektionar und Sakramentar des Musaeus von Marsilia*: RBen 69 (1959) 198-225; C. Vogel, *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire du culte*, Turin 1975, 25, 259, 290; Patrologia III, 499.

M. Maritano

MUSIC. If the ecclesiastical chant was widely practiced from the first few centuries of the spread of Christianity, it never brought about, at least in the patristic age, the rise of a corresponding musicological literature designed to inform us about the technique and execution of its theoretical presuppositions. Among the Greek Fathers, it is possible to grasp here and there scattered references to particular features of ecclesiastical chant and value judgments about the use of this or that instrument, but these are still isolated insights, never framed in a systematic treatment, inasmuch as they are short and concise. Nor is it possible to find any mention of chants from the primitive church from the many musicological treatises in Greek by authors such as Nicomachus, Gaudentius, Ptolemy and many others flourishing in the early centuries of this era. In the Latin West it is possible to speak of a real and genuine Christian musicological literature: works like *De musica* by St. *Augustine, *De institutione musica* by *Boethius, the musicological sections of the *Institutiones* of *Cassiodorus and the *Etymologiae* of *Isidore of Seville. However, these are works, in the wake of the encyclopedic tradition opened in *Rome by Varro, in which music is mostly treated as a mathematical discipline and detached, as such, from its artistic aspect. Thus, e.g., St. Augustine's *De musica*, while it offers us in its 6th book a prestigious essay of musical aesthetics of fundamental importance for the reconstruction of the first phase of the thought of the future bishop of Hippo, it tells us nothing concrete in the first five books (all focused on the arithmetic consideration of various meters) regarding the music of his time. The same is true for *De institutione musica* of Boethius that, though a constant point of reference for the theoretical speculations of medieval musicologists, it is not, in substance, anything but a work of mere scholarly compilation divorced from contemporary practice. No different in character are the later compilations of Cassiodorus and Isidore, even if in the latter—despite certain unique contradictions—it is possible to note here and there a greater concession to the practical aspect. It should be noted in conclusion that numerous witnesses testify to the interest of the Venerable *Bede in the art of sounds, even if the so-called *Musica theorica*, a systematic collection of *scholia* on the Boethian musical treatises, is unlikely to have been written by him.

F. Amerio, *Il De musica di S. Agostino*: Didaskaleion 7 (1929) 1-196; J. Quasten, *Music and Worship in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, Washington, DC 1983 (2nd ed. orig. German, Münster 1973); J. McKinnon, *Music in Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge 1987; Ph. Bernard, *Les chants liturgiques chrétiens en Occident, source nouvelle pour la connaissance de l'Antiquité tardive? Une archéologie musicale au service de l'histoire*: Antiquité tardive 3 (1995) 147-157; *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 572-576; AL 1, 724-728; E. Costa, *Canto e musica*, in Liturgia (Dizionari S. Paolo), Milan 2001, 302-328; P. Otala González, *El* De Musica *de san Agustín*, Valladolid 2005.

U. Pizzani

MUZIANUS (Mutianus) of Antioch (6th c.). Also called scholasticus ("school teacher") and excellent translator from Greek to *Latin, described by *Cassiodorus as *disertissimus*. At his request, at *Vivarium in Calabria he translated the 34 *Homiliae Hebraeos* of *John Chrysostom (*Inst*. 1,8,3: PL 70, 1120). Other translations, whose attribution to Muzianus is

uncertain, are lost, such as Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Acta Apostolorum* (*Inst.* 1,9,1: PL 70, 1122) and *Gaudentius's *De musica* (*Inst.* 2,5,1: PL 70, 1208). Generally he is identified with the *Mocianus scholasticus* against whom *Facundus of Hermiane wrote.

DTC 10, 2544 and 10, 978; PG 63, 237-456.

S.J. Voicu

MYSTAGOGY. In the Greek patristic literature, the term μυσταγωγία, with the related forms μυσταγωγέω and μυσταγωγός, has connections with the semantic development of the term μυστήριον. Initially it had the primary meaning of initiation into the mysteries (arcane things or teachings). Over time this came to refer to pagan rites and myths (see Iren., *Adv. Haer.* I,15,6; I,23,3 in Eus., *HE* IV,11,4f.) that were sometimes treated as a demonic imitation of Christian rites (see Just., *1 Apol.* 66,4). In Alexandrian theology, however, language for *mystery functions to describe both initial conversion and esp. the ascent of the *gnostic believer toward union with God (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 162,3: Orig., *C. Cels.* III, 60; *Com. Jo.* fr. 36). The Logos was presented as the hierophant that leads the μύστης into the light of God (see Clem. Alex., *Protr.* XII, 120).

This spiritual theme, already articulated in *Philo of Alexandria (see *Vita Moysis* III,3), would always be found in later authors. *Gregory of Nyssa is the most famous example in this regard (texts in Daniélou 189-193). The expanding cultural horizons of the 4th c. further contributed to a sacramental orientation, already suggested by the baptismal imagery of some earlier texts on spirituality (see Studer, *Mysterienfeier*, 29-32). In this sense preachers, esp. *Cyril of Jerusalem and *John Chrysostom, present the *catechetical lessons on *baptism and on the *Eucharist as mystagogy (Cyr. Jer., *Cat.* 19,11; 20,1), doing the same for the *sacraments themselves (Greg. Nyss., *C. Eunom.* 11: PG 45, 881C; *In diem luminum*: PG 46, 584C; John Chrys., *Hom. in Jo.* 85,3; PG 59, 463; *Cat. bapt.* 5,18: SC 50bis, 209; Cyr. Alex., *Comm. in Is.* 5,2: PG 70, 1196) or even for the words of institution in the *Eucharist (John Chrys., *Hom. in 1 Cor.* 27,4: PG 61, 229). It is quite remarkable how this sacramental meaning is profoundly interconnected with the spiritual meaning. According to *Basil of Caesarea, therefore, the mystagogy in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit brings to us the knowledge of God (*De Sp. s.* 29,75: SC 17bis, 516f.). The Latin patristic literature, while receiving the theme of the *mysterium* (μυστήριον), does not seem to have retained the term μυσταγωγία. Nonetheless, *Ambrose of Milan adopts the language for mystery in his catechetical writings on the sacraments (see *De myst.* I, 1,1). Also noteworthy is the fact that *Augustine of Hippo, in his paschal theology (*Ep.* 55), speaks of the divine eloquence that is articulated through the *sacramenta* ("*symbols, sacred signs"), whether in the Bible or in the liturgy, as an expression of the deepest love of God (see B. Studer, *Mysterienfeier*, 32-36, with Aug., *Ep.* 55,7[12f.], 10 [19]).

Lampe 890-891; H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, Graz 1954 (repr.), 6, 1312-1313; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et Théologie mystique*, Paris 1944; H.M. Riley, *Christian Initiation*, Washington 1974 (passim); J. Finkenzeller, *Die Lehre von den Sakramenten im allgemeinen*: HDG IV/1a, Freiburg 1980 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Der christliche Gottesdienst eine Mysterienfeier*: Stud. Ans. 113 (1993) 27-45; B. Studer, *Ambrogio di Milano, teologo mistagogico*, SEA 50, Rome 1997, 569-586 (bibl.); A. Wollbold: LTK³ 7, 570-571; RGG 5 (2002) 1635ff.

B. Studer

MYSTERY. Even if the etymological explanations of μυστήριον remain unclear, the fundamental meaning of the Greek concerns a secret that is to be hidden and that is to be shown only to the initiated. In this sense, the word is found primarily in the so-called mystery religions. *Plato, however, further applied the language of mystery to the concept of initiation into the most profound truths of philosophy. Yet the first Christian usage of μυστήριον does not derive from this double meaning. Instead, it grows out of apocalyptic Judaism, in which μυστήριον refers to the heavenly realities to be revealed at the end of the ages, but communicated in advance to a visionary. Thus in the *corpus paulinum* the term refers to the salvific design of divine knowledge, hidden in ages past, revealed in Christ, proclaimed by the apostles and fully manifested in the *parousia of the Lord.

This "Pauline" meaning, even if reduced to a single event in the life of Jesus, came to be constantly present in patristic theology. There is also a great degree of dependence on the "exegetical sense." In this concept, the events and characters of the OT, as anticipatory realizations of God's salvific purpose, are mysteries, types and figures of the underlying realities of Christ and of the church. This happens for the first time in *Justin Martyr, who introduces the concept into the framework of his theology in which history is directed by the Logos of God.

This usage finds its best expression in *Origen, for whom everything in both creation and history (first of all the Scriptures, and then the incarnation and the church) is a symbol and a mystery of the Logos.

Beginning with Justin, the pagan mysteries appear

in the literature, at first in an entirely negative sense as an imitation of Christian rites. Only in the 4th c. would this particular meaning of ritual receive a positive evaluation. *Athanasius, and most of all *Cyril of Jerusalem and the subsequent church fathers, would apply it to the Christian rites and to consecrated things, esp. the Eucharist. *John Chrysostom would provide further shades of meaning with a "tremendous" mystery. The same pattern is found in ps.-*Dionysius. Beginning with *Clement of Alexandria, the specifically philosophical sense makes its way into Christian theology. As time goes on, the language of mystery becomes a way of describing the spiritual ascension of the *soul toward the vision of the transcendent God. Although other layers of meaning tend to intrude, this developing sense of mystery no longer indicates just the secret teaching but also God's ineffable truth that is only knowable through God's gracious revelation. This is seen most clearly in *Gregory of Nyssa, who expounded the most elaborate doctrine of mystery. Finally, it is noteworthy that the multiple levels of meaning in the term μυστήριον are essentially passed over in the Latin renditions *mysterium* and **sacramentum*.

TWNT 4, 809-834 (TDNT 4, 802-828); J. Daniélou, *Le Mystère du culte dans les sermons de s. Grégoire de Nysse*, in *Vom christlichen Mysterium*, Düsseldorf 1951, 76-93; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la connaissance mystique*, Paris 1961; J. Finkenzeller, HDG IV/1a, Freiburg 1980, 4-23 (bibl.); E. Ruffini - E. Lodi, eds., *"Mysterion" e "Sacramentum,"* Bologna 1987; B. Neunheuser, *Mistero*: NDizLit (1988) 805-823 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Der christliche Gottesdienst eine Mysterienfeier?*: Stud. Ans. 113 (1993) 26-45 (bibl.); D. Zeller, in TRE 23 (1994) 504-526, esp. 519-522: *Mysterien und frühes Christentum* (bibl.); LTK[3] 7, 577-582, esp. 580 (E.M. Faber).

B. Studer

MYSTICAL BODY. The expression *mystical body* (of Christ) is part of contemporary theological language and refers to the church; as such, it draws its origins only marginally from the patristic tradition, although the 20th-c. theologians who systematically elaborated its content did so with ample recourse to the writings of the Fathers. The expression's importance is accentuated by its reception by the Catholic magisterium with Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis* (1943). The Pauline terminology on which it is based is "body (or flesh) of Christ," which has three possible applications: physical body of Christ (mortal: Col 1:22, and glorious: Phil 3:21), eucharistic body of Christ (1 Cor 10:16-17) and ecclesial body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27). The addition of the adjective "mystical" is a specification: in clear contraposition to "physical," it can refer to both of the other meanings, and in fact the history of the semantic content of the term *mystical body* displays an oscillation and a mutual relation between them. The first documented use is in the Latin translation of *Hesychius of Jerusalem's *Commentary on Leviticus*, written in the 1st half of the 5th c. (PG 93, 1070 C-D), and refers to the *Eucharist; Hesychius's use of the term is confirmed by a Greek fragment on the Psalms with the same meaning (μυστικὸν σῶμα, in PG 93, 1285 CD). Drawn from Hesychius, the expression reappears in Rabanus Maurus's *Expositiones in Leviticum* (9th c.) (PL 108, 492 D), becoming a common term within a few decades because of the discussions on the Eucharist at that time (Paschasius Radbert, Ratramnus and others): *mystical body* was used to indicate the sacrament—the true body—whose function was to build up the church. The use of *mystical body* in reference to the church and no longer to the Eucharist, already observable in the 12th c., was confirmed in the following century, clearly in order to emphasize eucharistic realism: the church is the mystical body, the Eucharist the true body. Systematic analysis of the possible ecclesiological implications of mystical body was begun in the 19th c. by theologians attempting to overcome an apologetic approach resulting from anti-Protestant polemic, which reduced the church to its visible/institutional aspect (J.A. Möhler, J.H. Newman, M.J. Scheeben); although Vatican I intentionally avoided designating the church the mystical body, research continued in the 1st half of the 20th c. (E. Mersch, S. Tromp and others), resulting in its acceptance by the Catholic magisterium. The patristic documentation drawn upon by these theologians clearly echoes their intended purpose: the affirmation of the status, at once visible/institutional (body) and invisible/spiritual (mystical), of the church; this double "nature" was never called into question in the patristic era, and thus all the applications of "body of Christ" to the church in the Fathers' writings were apt for the purpose: this accounts for the abundance, but also the heterogeneity, of the witnesses adopted. Moreover, these studies have made plain how the Fathers used the image of the body of Christ to illustrate various aspects of the relationship between "multiplicity" (of the faithful) and "unity" (of the church).

If the uniting of all the faithful in the body of Christ starts in *baptism and is manifest, acc. to *Irenaeus, in the profession of the same faith, guaranteed by the bishops, successors of the *apostles (*Ad. Haer*. IV, 33,8), the sacrament ordered to realizing the unity of the ecclesial body of Christ is the Eucharist: already in **Didache* 9,4 we find the image of the grains scattered on the mountain, gathered into a single loaf, to signify the effect of the Eucha-

rist, which gathers the faithful; appearing again in other liturgical texts (*Euchology of Serapion*; *Ap. Const.* VII,25,3; *Anaphora of Deir Balyzeh*), it was used to illustrate the close relation between the eucharistic body and the ecclesial body, together with the analogous image of the wine produced from different grapes (Cypr., *Ep.* 69,5,2; John Chrys., *Hom. 24 in 1Cor.*). *Augustine esp., grappling with the divisions caused by the *Donatists, developed its implications esp. in mystagogical contexts, explaining the Eucharist in this way: just as fire is needed to obtain the eucharistic bread from the dough, composed of grains (the faithful) and water (baptism), so the *Holy Spirit is necessary for the ecclesial body of Christ as the unifying element (*Ser.* 227; 229,1; 272; also in Gaudentius of Brescia, *Hom. Pas.* 2), almost the soul of the ecclesial body (*Ser.* 267,4; 268,2; *Tr. in Joh.* XXVI, 13-14). We thus arrive at the "ontological" unification of the ecclesial body (*Ser.* 229/A,1: *quod accipitis, vos estis, gratia qua redempti estis; subscribitis, quando "Amen" respondetis. Hoc quod videtis, sacramentum est unitatis*; similarly, *Ser.* 229,1; 272; also in *Cyril of Alexandria, as a reflection of the unity of the divine substance: *Tr. in Joh.* XI,11), the body of which Christ is the head and Christians the members (*Ser.* 45,5; 229/A; *Tr. in Joh.* XXVI,15).

The identification with the Eucharist implies that the sacrifice of the Head would at the same time be the sacrifice of the members, brought about by their death to the world to live in God, through temperance, *ascesis, and works of mercy (*De Civ. Dei*, X, 6): mere ritual participation in the Eucharist is not enough to truly belong to the body of Christ (*De Civ. Dei*, XXI, 25,3-4); by the same token, the sufferings of each member belong to the Head and to the whole body (*En. in Ps.* 61,4; 62, 2), just as the prayer of each member has its basis in that of Christ (*qui et oret pro nobis, et oret in nobis, et oretur a nobis*: *En. in Ps.* 85,1). For *John Chrysostom, mercy, expressed through almsgiving, guarantees unity beyond social divisions, precisely because the poor by their sufferings participate in a special way in Christ's sacrifice (*Hom. in 2Cor.* 20; *Hom. in Mat.* 50,3-4). In Augustine the Head/member distinction within the one body (*totus Christus*), which includes the saints of the OT (*De Cat. Rud.* III, 7), becomes a paradigm of biblical hermeneutics: taken from *Tyconius's *Liber Regularum* (*De Doct. Chr.* XXXI,44: the scriptural statements can refer to Christ/Head or to the members; XXXI,45: they can concern the true members of the body, saints, or the false members, sinners), the paradigm is applied in a particular way in the explanation of the Psalms (emblematic is a passage from *En. in Ps.* 100,3: *cantat enim hoc Christus; si solum caput cantat, a Domino est canticum hoc, ad nos non pertinet; si autem totus Christus, id est caput et corpus eius, esto in membris eius, adhaere illi per fidem, et per spem, et per caritatem; et in illo cantas, in illo exsultas; quia et ipse in te laborat, in te sitit, in te esurit et tribulatur*). Even now the members receive from the Head a participation in the *resurrection (*En. in Ps.* 100,3: *ille in te adhuc moritur, et tu in illo iam resurrexisti*), in view of the eschatological fulfillment (*Tr. in Joh.* XXVI, 17), as we find already in Irenaeus (*Ad. Haer.* II, 19,3), in *Origen (*Comm. in Joh.* X, 36,236-238) and esp. in *Hilary: if through baptism and the Eucharist the members already participate in the body of Christ, thanks to the *incarnation, the goal is glorification, possible because the Head has gone before them and awaits them in the resurrection (*Tr. in Ps* 13,4; 51,3).

S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, Romae 1937; S.J. Grabowski, *St. Augustine and the Doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ*: ThS 7 (1946) 72-125; E. Mersch, *Le corps mystique du Christ*, Paris [3]1951; H. de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum*, Paris 1949; M. Réveillaud, *Le Christ-Homme, tête de l'église. Étude d'ecclésiologie selon les* Enarrationes in Psalmos *d'Augustin*: RecAug 6 (1968) 67-94; B. Bruning - T.J. van Bavel, *Die Einheit des "Totus Christus" bei Augustinus*: C.P. Mayer, ed., *Scientia augustiniana*, Würzburg 1975, 43-75; J.M.R. Tillard, *Chair de l'Église, chair du Christ*, Paris 1992; S. Alberto, *"Corpus Suum mystice constituit" (LG7), La Chiesa corpo mistico di Cristo nel primo capitolo della "Lumen gentium,"* Regensburg 1996; S. Mirbach, *Ihr aber seid Leib Christi*, Regensburg 1998; V. Grossi, *Sant'Agostino. L'Eucaristia corpo della Chiesa*, Rome 2000.

A. Grappone

MYSTICISM – MYSTICAL THEOLOGY. The terms *mysterion* and *mystikos* signify something of a "hidden" quality and of a "secret," as they do in classical Greece. The mystical phenomenon primarily indicates a movement through an object, going above and beyond the limits of empirical experience. The Christian mystical literature is characterized by the connection with the "mystery" of Christ, with the divine design to "reunite everything in Christ" (Eph 1:9-10; Col 1:20-27). This corresponds to the intention hidden in the mind of God, which in the last days has been revealed through the historic event of the incarnate Logos, even if it continues to surpass human comprehension. In a comparative analysis, however, elements of "mystery" are already seen in *Plato, as in the *Symposium*, which speaks of the perfect and initiatory teachings (210a), and in the *Phaedrus*, which describes the contemplation of the supercelestial world (250b; 250e). The Platonic tradition had revived this element of "mystery." Plutarch defined the highest level of philosophy, namely theology, as "initiatory," and the knowledge of the

highest divinity as "initiation" (*Isis and Osiris* 382D; *Table Talk* VIII, 2,718CD). According to Alcinous, some teachings of Plato, as the famous passage of *Timaeus* 28c demonstrates, were reserved for the few (*Didask.* p. 179, 33-34), and the term "to be initiated" refers to the study of the highest level of philosophy (p. 182,8). The same tension appears in Maximus of Tyre (see *diss.* 4,5) and in Apuleius, who declares that he is dedicated to a great number of religions (*Apol.* 55,9). Of course, this and even greater tension is found in *gnosticism, which routinely employs the term *mystery* to indicate the knowledge of the highest reality at the heart of religion.

In consequence, does the Christian **theoria* derive from the Bible, or is it a philosophical legacy? Right from the start, we are faced with the problem of whether the experience of God is a purely intellectual phenomenon along the lines of philosophy (and more specifically along Platonic lines), or whether it is necessary instead to postulate a direct contact with God, above and beyond any form of mediation. In Christian thought, and most of all at the city of *Alexandria in *Egypt with its reception of many religious influences, the syncretism introduced a strong interest in the forms of religious expression. *Clement of Alexandria examines the matter in the 5th and 6th books of the *Stromata*. Otherwise, already the exegetes had tried to find something "suggestive" in a word, a number or an object. *Justin Martyr finds a typological meaning in the use of the words "rod" and "wood" (*Dial.* 86,1-6); for Clement, the biblical names are open to etymological interpretation (*Eclogae propheticae* 32). *Origen, at the end of the *Homilies on Numbers*, associates every "station" in the desert with an etymological analysis that reveals its true meaning for the ascent of the *soul. He defends his analysis by claiming that the name of each station of the Israelites' wandering in the desert, and the stage between one and another station, indicates the progress of intelligence and signifies the growth of the virtues.

Clement makes use of the symbology of mystery in order to demonstrate to his readers at Alexandria, who were certainly aware of the *pagan mysteries and their associated rites, that there is a new and Christian initiation. He sets out to portray Christianity by strongly emphasizing a mystical formulation, anticipating the argument of Origen. Fundamental to this task is the exhortation which concludes the *Protrepticus* (118,4–119,1; 120,1). Here Clement wants to demonstrate to the pagans the new, true mystery, the Christian mystery, the only one that can bring them purification and salvation, in contrast with the much more familiar Eleusinian mysteries. In this text, he modifies the pagan "mysteries" with a Christian sense: now the true Savior is the Logos of God, while the Christian is the new initiate who is distinguished and contrasted with the profane, in this case the pagan. Yet Justin had established a precedent, as has been noted. In fact, he had engaged in polemic against the pagan mysteries, in his days very prevalent and threatening to the Christian message, much more so than traditional religion (*1 Apol.* 54; 66). According to Justin, the cult of Mithras was a pagan forgery of the *Eucharist; the same idea is found in *Tertullian's treatise titled *De corona militis*. Instead, the true mystery is the one contained in Scripture.

Clement, therefore, sees the mystical aspect as being present in the knowledge of God: reaching God is an illumination. This is esp. highlighted by Völker, who emphasizes that acc. to Clement, the saint no longer sees through a mirror, but with absolutely clarity and pure vision, and he strives to become like God by remaining in a state of union with God (*Strom.* VII, 3,14,1). The true science, then, is the science of knowing God (II, 10,47,4), and therefore the science of God is a mystical phenomenon, in contrast with the thinking of the Greek philosophers. The "true gnostic," having passed through all the states of mystical experience, comes face-to-face with God (VII, 10,57,1). According to Lilla, however, this concept is not unique to Clement. He argues that not only did it spread through the Egyptian cultural context of the 2nd and 3rd c. but also that it has always been a feature of gnosticism. Moreover, gnosis has a strong esoteric component, acc. to which the innermost teachings are not to be revealed to everyone but are reserved for a few, and precisely for those who have been shown to be worthy of them. One finds this idea in Clement (*Strom.* V, 19,2-3; 56,3), who even cites Plato with passages from the *Republic* (494a), the *Theaetetus* (155e) and the *Epinomis* (973e), interpreting them in a sense of mystery. He finds confirmation in the saying of Mt 22:14 ("Many are called, but few are chosen"), to which he associates the saying of Socrates in the *Phaedo* (69c: "Many are those who carry the sacred basket to Bacchus, but the initiates are few"). He interprets Mt 10:26 in the same way: "There is nothing hidden from you that will not be manifested, and nothing covered that will not be revealed." Clement is often insistent on affirming that the gnosis is something hidden, to which only a few can arrive. The hidden quality of these teachings explains why he refers to them with the term "mysteries." In other contexts, the term is found in three passages of the synoptic gospels (Mt 13:11; Mk 4:11; Lk 8:10) and in Paul (1 Cor 2:7, Eph 3:3-4, 9). Yet the Jew-

ish wisdom tradition had already emphasized the quality of mystery in the highest teachings, namely, those that concern God (see Wis 6:22). Furthermore, such a concept constantly occurs in *Philo of Alexandria. It is likely that Clement was influenced by the Alexandrian tradition.

Furthermore, Origen maintains in *Against Celsus* (VII, 10) that revelation, enfolded in a material wrapping, is a "mystery" whose external features are "signs," "types," "images" and "symbols." The use of terms and concepts for mystery in defining the Christian revelation is most clearly evident in *Against Celsus*, the work in which Origen has to take on the corresponding pagan conceptions of mystery and contrast them with the Christian conceptions. He makes note that the existence of the mysteries was also known by the pagan philosophers, including the Pythagoreans (*Against Celsus* I, 7), and was also known throughout the Greek world (I, 9). Yet the Christians are also capable, and certainly no less so than the pagans, of examining and explaining the prophetic enigmas, the gospel parables and countless other things that have been given in symbolic terms, even if the vast majority of the faithful are not able to comprehend all of this in a rational way. In other contexts, the sages of *Egypt and *Persia also reached the same level of understanding. The initiations were present among the sages; they are interpreted "rationally" by the gathered members, while the popular celebrations are enacted in symbols. As Sfameni observes, the matter does not so much involve the Persian cults, among which there was no esoteric practice of initiation, but primarily the Mithraic mysteries that were familiar to Celsus (VI, 12).

Thus for Origen the rites of mystery and the mythic narratives that refer to them, together with the whole body of texts concerning religious traditions, contain a hidden lesson, comprehensible only through a kind of "rational" reading that requires a scrupulous application of the rules of *allegory. Therefore, he also employs the various terms of pagan language concerning mystery, such as *epopteia* ("illumination") and *mystagōgia* ("initiation"). *Baptism is treated as a symbol of purification, and in the symbolic sense it is not different from the preliminary purifications that exist in pagan rites. Origen distinguishes between persons who are "advancing" and those who are "commencing" in the way of salvation and of knowledge. The imagery of illumination and light allows him to clarify the process of deepening growth into Christian truth, in the manner of illumination found in the mystery cults. The same Platonic and Pythagorean teachings on the immortality of the soul contain a mystery that Christianity first accepts and then poses once again, yet with a new and greater degree of authority (*Against Celsus* III, 81). In a passage of his *Commentary on John* (VI, 3,15.16), he resorts to using a series of terms that possess a resounding echo of mystery, such as "perfect gnosis," "demonstration," "initiation" and "contemplation." Yet in this conception we must recognize Origen's intense interest in biblical *exegesis, considered to be the unique instrument for reaching comprehension of the divine revelation. In fact, it is repeated not only in his writing against Celsus but also in his homilies. Thus in the *Homilies on Genesis* he keeps restating, "to penetrate such a vast sea of mysteries" (IX, 1); "see how such a great cloud of mysteries pursues us" (X, 5); "all things that have been written are of the mysteries" (X, 2); "they are not told through the stories of history, yet they are woven into the mysteries" (X, 4); "seeing that all these great mysteries are concealed in the divine Scriptures" (XIII, 4). And in the *Homilies on Leviticus*, he says, "I am sure that in my exegesis the greatness of the mysteries surpasses my abilities. Yet even if I am not capable of treating everything, nonetheless we are aware that everything is full of mysteries" (III,8). With these words, Origen develops and accentuates, even in accordance with the ideas of his time, the famous Pauline declaration (1 Cor 2:6–3:4). The Logos is he who unveils the Christian mystery and allows human persons to be initiated by this renewing experience (see *Comm. on Mt.* XIX, 14; *Comm. on Jn* XIII, 25 ; XIII, 50 etc.).

The doctrine of mystery, proposed in general terms by Origen for the Christian religion, is revisited and expanded, yet limited to a personal experience of the knowledge of God by *Gregory of Nyssa, a follower of Origen. His adaptation is vividly described by the expression "stretching forward" (*epektasis*), taken from Phil 3:13. The mystical ascent is uninterrupted, due to the limitedness of the soul in tension with the unlimitedness of the object that the soul yearns to reach. This progression, when considered in the context of intellectual knowledge, already appeared in *Plotinus, who had placed the knowledge of the One at the summit of the ascent. The mystical experience, therefore, represents the highest level of knowledge of God, the peak of gnosis. Such knowledge, however, is a dark shadow. This is affirmed in *The Life of Moses*, where the same sense of interpretation is given to the darkness that surrounds Moses, who has climbed the mountain (Ex 26 and 27), and in a passage of the *Homilies on the Song of Songs* (XI, p. 322ff.). The dark shadow signifies the obscurity that surrounds the senses and

the faculty of reason, which are incapable of the knowledge of God, since this knowledge is altogether unreachable. Once having surpassed this first level of darkness, however, one will not gain an illumination of the reality of God: the human person always enters into the darkness, yet can never go out from it. This teaching finds precedent with Philo of Alexandria and in his concept of "sober drunkenness." The person who is capable of contemplating God moves out of earthly senses, as if drunk, but such drunkenness is in reality sober, since it permits a state of knowledge.

The concept that the word of God constitutes a mystery is extended to the very wording of Scripture by the great biblical philologist *Jerome. This is more significant than it may seem at first sight. In the translation of the Holy Scriptures, even the *ordo verborum* is a *mysterium* (*Epist.* 57,5,2). In this scheme, the premise that translation in general need not be *verbum de verbo*, but *ad sensum*, is no longer valid for Scripture, where one applies the norm of mystery.

The last of the great patristic theologians who treat the doctrine of mystery and of the mystical is *Dionysius the Areopagite in his *Mystical Theology*. Union with God is an experience that withdraws from any sensory or intellectual activity, by placing the highest divinity above and outside of any affirmation or negation, any word or thought. God appears as the one who is approached within the dark shadow of the unknowable, as in the experience of Moses at Sinai; the knowledge that one can have of God is the experience of not knowing. The mystical darkness is the expression of this reality; the entry into the darkness is represented by the total absence of word and thought. The first *Letter* also associates the knowledge of God with the experience of not knowing, and the fifth reprises the argument of the divine shadow, into which the person who wants to attain to the knowledge of God must enter. The way of negation, acc. to which one knows not that which God is, but only that which he is not, eventually finds resolution in not knowing and in silence. A person must become like God by going beyond human intelligence and by being reduced to a total unity. In the mystical union, the human mind loses its own identity and no longer belongs to itself, but only to the desired object that has attracted it. The themes of contemplation, ecstasy and shadows were developed and exploited through the path of ps.-Dionysius in the medieval period and by the Carmelite mystical teaching.

A particularly important component of the Christian mystical tradition is the one called the "mystical light." For Christians, it is certain that the divine mystery is made known through a revelation of the Spirit that takes place at different levels. One speaks of ecstasy in realizing the suspension of human faculties. The first step of ecstasy, acc. to the definition of prayer given by *Nilus of Ancyra, is "a total rapture of the spirit, outside the realm of the senses" (*Ad Magnam* 27: PG 79, 1004 A). In the state of ecstasy, human intelligence can forget everything that is not God. *Philoxenus of Mabbug (*Exhortation to a Jewish Convert*, 5: Fr. tr., M. Albert, OrSyr 6 [1961] 44) identifies ecstasy as the state of the soul that has been completely detached from everything that might distract it.

Ecstasy in *Evagrius is more radical; it derives from the theology of *apophasis*. This is the "infinite ignorance" in all partial notions or concepts, the state of "pure intellectuality." The intellect, image of God, becomes pure light: having reached this summit, the intellect "reflects the light of the Holy Trinity." But it does not go outside of itself: it is not a kind of "ecstasy," but rather of "catastasis." The entry into the life of gnosis constructs the imagery of mystical light.

DSp 2, 1862-1911; 10, 1861-1874, 1889-1984; H. Lewy, *Sobria ebrietas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik*, Giessen 1929; L. Bouyer, *Mystique. Essai sur l'histoire d'un mot*: La Vie Spirituelle 3 (1949) 3-23; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris ²1954; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique,"* Paris 1961; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, London 1971; T. Špidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*, OCA 206, Rome 1978, 23, 27, 327ff., 386ff. (bibl.); P. Serra Zanetti, *Una nota sul "mysterium" dell'"ordo verborum"nelle Scritture*: Civiltà Classica e Cristiana VI/3 (1985) 507-520; L. Rizzerio, *Clemente di Alessandria e la "physiologia veramente gnostica." Saggio sulle origini e le implicazioni di un'epistemologia e di un'ontologia "cristiana,"* Leuven 1996; Id., *L'accès à la transcendance divine sélon Clement d'Alexandrie: dialectique platonicienne ou expérience de l'"union chrétienne"?*: REAug 44 (1998) 159-173; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *La terminologia misterica nel linguaggio della rivelazione in Origene*, in *Lingua e teologia nel cristianesimo greco*, Atti del Convegno di Trento (11-12 dic. 1997), Brescia 1999; W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, Wiesbaden 1955 (*Gregorio di Nissa filosofo e mistico*, ed. C. Moreschini, It. tr., C.O. Tommasi, Milan 1993); S. Lilla, *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il platonismo cristiano*, Brescia 2005.

C. Moreschini

MYTHOLOGY. In the NT, the term μῦθος is always used in a negative sense (1 Tim 1:4; 4:7; Tit 1:14; 2 Pet 1:16); in 2 Tim 4:4 it is starkly contrasted with ἀλήθεια. The *antithesis μῦθος-ἀλήθεια, largely present in Greek thought and even in *Philo (*Exsecr.* 162), one also finds in Christian authors and in their polemics against *pagan mythological conceptions; e.g., *Origen claims that one must flee from myths in the

search for truth (*C. Cels.* VIII, 66). Christians frequently emphasized the immorality, *impiety, falsehood and absurdity of pagan myths. *Augustine observed how they are purely human inventions (*Civ. Dei* XVIII, 13) and have a negative influence on the education of young people (*Confess.* I, 16,25). The antimythological polemic was already underway with pagan writers like Euhemerus of Messene and Lucian of Samosata. Even *Plato had openly criticized traditional myths (cf. *Rep.* II, 377ff.; *Laws.* XII, 941b), as Origen observes (*C. Cels.* IV, 50). Euhemerus's theory claimed that the gods were only divinized dead men, and it was often used in Christian contexts (see Athenag., *Suppl.* 28-30; Theoph., *Ad Autol.* I, 9; Min. Fel., *Oct.* 21; Tertull., *Apol.* 10,3; 11,1; Firm. Mat., *De err. prof. relig.* 2,3). In their refutation of myths, Christian apologists also rejected their *allegorical interpretation (Aristides, *Apol.* 13,7; Tat., *Orat.* 21,2; Orig., *C. Cels.* V, 38; VIII, 67), calling into question the immorality of those stories that allowed pagans to cover up obscene things as if they were honest through the use of *allegory (Arnob., *Adv. Nat.* V, 43); not even on these terms were the myths accepted (Orig., *C. Cels.* IV, 48); the very different Christian narratives were contrasted with them (Just., *1 Apol.* 21,1; Tat., *Orat.* 21,1; Atenag., *Suppl.* 10,1).

However, we must also note that an apologist like *Justin expressed a clear condemnation of pagan myths but also sought to establish a parallel between some aspects of them with Christian concepts. As H. Rahner observes in regard to *1 Apol.* 22, "Justin [is led to] a daring feat of apologetics, in which he actually sets the Hermes-Logos [of the Greeks] and the Christian Jesus-Logos more or less side by side, saying: 'In this we are one with you' he writes 'we both regard the Logos, whom you call Hermes, as the messenger of God'" (*Greek Myths*, p. 196-197). In the same passage just cited, the apologist, always making reference to Jesus, continues: "In maintaining that he is born of a Virgin, we liken him to Perseus. In maintaining that he restored health to the crippled, the lame and those with birth defects, and raised the dead, we establish a resemblance with the wondrous attributes of your Asclepius" (I. Giordani, *San Giustino. Le apologie*, Rome 1962, 89). Naturally, this does not prevent Justin from strongly affirming that Christian doctrine is the only truth, earlier than every pagan writer, and that before the *incarnation of the Son of God some, instigated by *demons, anticipated him by selling their fantastical myths as history (*1 Apol.* 23).

The reinterpretation of some mythical themes in proto-Christian literature and art is very interesting—e.g., the motif of Odysseus bound to the masthead of the ship. This scene was depicted on Christian *sarcophagi, and came to signify that which bound the believer to the wood of the *cross, the door through which one enters salvation. This Christian reinterpretation of the myth of Odysseus and the Sirens pervades the writings of the fathers of the church, as Rahner has made clear (328ff.). There are diverse mythical themes that proto-Christian art reinterprets and uses for iconography such as the sun on the chariot of fire, the head of Medusa, Eros and Psyche, *Orpheus, as a guide for souls, Hermes in whom the Good *Shepherd is refigured.

GLNT 7, 537-630 (TDNT 4, 762-795); M. Carena, *La critica della mitologia pagana negli Apologeti greci del II secolo*: Didaskaleion n.s. 1 (1923) 23-55 (fasc. I) and 3-42 (fasc. III); H. Rahner, *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery*, London 1963; TRE 23, 597-678; V. Pyykkö, *Die griechischen Mythen bei den grossen Kappadokiern und bei Johannes Chrysostomos*, Turku 1991; M. Fiedrowicz, *Apologie im frühen Christentum*, Paderborn 2000.

S. Zincone

N

NABOR and FELIX. Milanese martyrs. Their feast is celebrated in *Milan on 12 July, following the passion. In the *Mart. hier.* the 10th and 11th are also mentioned, but these are erroneous duplications. The details given for the 10th contains corrupted details taken from the passion; acc. to this, the martyrs were of African origin, suffered martyrdom at Lodi, and their bodies were transferred from there to Milan. In the church named after them in Milan the bodies of Sts. *Gervasius and Protasius were found, whose cult subsequently eclipsed their own.

Delehaye OC 335-337; LTK[2] 7, 755; *Vies des SS.* 7, 268; BS 9, 689-693.

V. Saxer

NAG HAMMADI (writings of). Library of *Coptic translations of Greek writings, discovered accidentally by Muhammad 'Ali al-Sammân Muhammad Khalîfah in Dec 1945 near Nag Hammadi, Egypt (ancient Khenoboskion, between Siut and Luxor), to the N of Hamra Dom, near the city of Farshut. He found a broken jar full of *papyri, which were in part subsequently burned by his mother to stoke the fire. What remained was sold on the black market through traffickers in ancient artifacts, attracting the attention of the Egyptian government, and ending up in part in the Museum of Cairo, and in part purchased by the Jung Foundation on the counsel of the historian of religions G. Quispel, who studied photographs of the others in Cairo, discovering first the *Gospel of Thomas* and then other writings.

The library of Nag Hammadi contains thirteen codices, eight pages having been removed in *Late Antiquity and folded into the cover of the seventh, which has provided us with a complete text. Each codex, with the exception of the tenth, consists of a collection of relatively brief works, making a total of 52 treatises. Here is a schema of the principal treatises of the library: Codex I: *The Prayer of the Apostle Paul*; *The Apocryphon of James*; *The Gospel of Truth*; *The Treatise on the Resurrection*; Codex II: *The Apocryphon of John*; *The Gospel of Philip*; *The Hypostasis of the Archons*; *On the Origin of the World*; *The Exegesis on the Soul*; *The Book of Thomas the Contender*; *The Gospel of Thomas*; Codex III: *Eugnostos the Blessed*; *The Wisdom of Jesus Christ*; *The Dialogue of the Savior*; *The Gospel of the Egyptians*; Codex V: *The First Apocalypse of James*; *The Second Apocalypse of James*; *The Apocalypse of Adam*; *The Apocalypse of Paul*; Codex VI: *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles*; *The Thunder: Perfect Mind*; *Authoritative Teaching*; *The Concept of Our Great Power*; *The Prayer of Thanksgiving*; *Asclepius*; *The Discourse on the Eighth and the Ninth*; Codex VII: *The Paraphrase of Shem*; *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth*; *The Three Steles of Seth*; *The Apocalypse of Peter*; *The Teachings of Silvanus*; Codex VIII: *Letter of Peter to Philip*; *Zostrianos*; Codex IX: *The Thought of Norea*; *The Testimony of Truth*; *Melchizedek*; Codex X: *Marsanes*; Codex XI: *The Interpretation of Knowledge*; *A Valentinian Exposition*; *On Baptism*, *A-B*; *Hypsiphrone*; *Allogenes*; *On the Eucharist A-B*; Codex XII: *The Sentences of Sextus*; *The Gospel of Truth*; Codex XIII: *Trimorphic Protennoia*; *On the Origin of the World*. Of these, six are duplicated: *The Apocryphon of John* is present in three versions: II, 1; III, 1; IV, 1; two of *Eugnostos*: III, 3 and V, 1; two of *The Gospel of Truth* I, 3 and XII, 2; two of *The Untitled Text*: II, 5 and XIII, 2 (both to be found in the translation of H.G. Bethge - B. Layton, *On The Origin of The World* [*II, 5 and XIII*, *2*], in J.M. Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, [4]1996, 170-189). Six were already known before the discovery of the library, either in the Greek original (VI, 5: a passage from Plato, *Republic*, 588B-589B; VI, 6: a Hermetic prayer of thanksgiving; XII, 1: *The Sentences of Sextus*) or in *Latin (VI, 8 = *Asclepius* 21-29) or Coptic (II, 1 and parallels: *Apocryphon of John*, Giovanni; III, 4: *The Wisdom of Jesus Christ*) translations. Of the forty new treatises that remain, some (VIII, 1; IX, 1, 2, 3; X, 1; XI, 1, 2, 3, 4; XII, 2) are very fragmentary.

The contents of the library are therefore not specifically *gnostic. Alongside the passage of Plato and *The Sentences of Sextus*, we can note *The Teachings of Silvanus* (VII, 3), an example of Christian Wisdom literature, originating in all probability in a monastic setting. The *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* (VI, 1) do not contain any specifically gnostic themes, although certain motifs (the stranger, the journey, the hidden pearl) could be easily accommodated to a gnostic interpretation. The group of *Hermetic writings, VI, 6 (*The Discourse on the Eighth* [Ogdoad] *and the Ninth* [Ennead], tr. J. Brashler - P.A. Dirkse - D. M. Parrott in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, ed. J.M. Robinson. Leiden-New York [4]1996) is closely related to Tractate XIII of the *Corpus Hermeticum* on regeneration (see I. Ramelli et al., *Corpus Hermeticum*, Milan 2005, supplementary essay). The more properly gnostic writings include a great variety of genres: gospels, acts, letters, apocalypses, dialogues, tractates, discourses of revelation, prayers etc. They originate in various different sects. Some are from the circle of the *Valentinian school (I, 3: *The Gospel of Truth*; I, 4: *Treatise on the Resurrection*; I, 5: *The Tripartite Tractate*; II, 3: *The Gospel of Philip*) or have been influenced by it (I, 1: *The Prayer of the Apostle Paul*; I, 2: *The Apocryphon of John*). Others may be ascribed to groups of the *Sethian type, or in any case do not correspond to the classifications of the *heresiologists. *The Gospel of Truth* may be identified, acc. to Quispel, who published the first edition with his collaborators, with the work of the same name branded "full of impiety" by *Irenaeus of Lyons in his *Adversus haereses*. The *Testimony of Truth* narrates the history of Eden from the point of view of the serpent, which was venerated by the gnostics, esp. the *Ophites, as the guardian of knowledge. *The Thunder: Perfect Mind* contains a splendid poem, pronounced by a female divine power who looks down upon her opponents.

Many hypotheses have been advanced on the origin and nature of the Library, questions made more difficult by the fact that up to now archaeological digs *in loco* have not yielded any clarifying evidence. The collection was perhaps the library of a gnostic group or sect or even of an individual gnostic; or it could have been the documentation collected by a polemicist or heresiologist for the purposes of refutation; or, more simply, it could represent what remains of a more extensive library. Certain details, such as names of persons, titles and addresses, may be found in the material in which the codices have been wrapped, and these point to a monastic settling of the *Pachomian type, of about the mid-4th c. AD. It was supposed that at the time of the triumph of *orthodoxy, when heretical books were being outlawed and destroyed, a monk hid these papyri in a jar and then buried it, where it remained for 1,600 years.

Linguistic features suggest that more than one Coptic translator has been at work (which does not necessarily mean that there was more than one scribe responsible for the copies that we have). The existence of duplicates or writings in multiple versions shows that there must have been different translators, working on different Greek texts. Attempts to study the different "hands" of the copyists have suggested that the translations and transcriptions were brought to completion in the 4th c.: scholars are substantially in agreement in dating the translations at ca. 350–400. The origins are obviously older, but the problems of dating them are far from being resolved: some texts do not seem later than AD 120–150, as Irenaeus of Lyons, who writes in about 180, declares that "the heretics boast of possessing more gospels than in fact exist," and laments that in his time such writings circulated freely, from Gaul to Rome, to Greece, and to Asia Minor. Quispel and his collaborators, first to publish the *Gospel of Thomas*, conjecture a date of about 140 for the Greek; Helmut Koester, of Harvard University, suggests that the collection of *logia* of that gospel, even if it was compiled in about 140, could include some traditions even earlier than the canonical gospels, perhaps going back to AD 50–100 (see also W. Schrage, *Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition*, Berlin 1964, Beihefte zur ZNW 29, and the recent collection *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*, ed. R. Uro, Edinburgh 1998).

The study of the library has been made difficult by the complicated events which surrounded its acquisition by the Egyptian government and private concerns, such as the case of the first or Jung Codex, which takes its name from the Swiss foundation of that name, and which was translated by F.L. Cross, *The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus*, with three studies by H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, W.C. van Unnik, London 1955, then by W. Attridge (see bibl.) and finally by P. Nagel, *Der Tractatus tripertitus aus Nag Hammadi Codex I: Codex Jung*, Tübingen 1998 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 1). Today the library is kept in its entirety at the Coptic Museum of Cairo. In 1972 a facsimile edition was begun, finished in 1977, which has made the library accessible to all interested scholars. *The Facsimile Edition of The Nag Hammadi Codices*, published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction

with UNESCO, ed. S. Farid et al., Leiden 1972–1977; *Nag Hammadi Codices: Greek and Coptic Papyri from the Cartonnage of the Covers*, ed. J.W.B. Barns - G.M. Browne - J.C. Shelton, Leiden 1981 (Nag Hammadi Studies [NHS] 16). Several complete translations of the library have been published, two by research groups who have occupied themselves with editions of the text: *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, tr., intro. by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Claremont, CA, ed. J.M. Robinson, Leiden [3]1988; [4]1996. *Nag Hammadi Deutsch*, intro. and tr. by members of the Berliner Arbeitskreises für koptisch-gnostische Schriften, ed. H.-M. Schenke - H.G. Bethge - U. Ulrike Kaiser, Berlin-New York 2001 (GCS 8. Koptisch-gnostische Schriften 2). Also to be noted is *Textos gnósticos: Biblioteca de Nag Hammadi*, 1- tr. by A. Piñero - J. Montserrat Torrents - F. García Bazán - F. Bermejo - A. Quevedo, ed. de A. Piñero, Madrid 1997.

There has been continuous publication of different tractates of the library, usually with translations, the work mainly of three groups of scholars, of course not forgetting other editions.

The Coptic Gnostic Project under the direction of J.M. Robinson (see Id., *The Coptic Gnostic Library Today*: NT 14 (1967/68) 356-401), has published, with text, translation and commentary, in the series Nag Hammadi Studies [NHS], texts including the following: *N.H.C. III, 2 and IV, 2. The Gospel of Egyptians* (*The Holy Book of The Great Invisible Spirit*), ed. A. Böhlig - F. Wisse - P. Labib, Leiden 1975 (NHS 4); *NHC V, 2-5 and VI with 'Papyrus Berolinensis' 8502, 1 and 4*, ed. D.M. Parrott, Leiden 1979 (NHS 11); *NHC 9 and 10*, ed. B.A. Pearson, Leiden 1981 (NHS 15); NHC 1 (*The Jung Codex*) . . . , ed. H.W. Attridge, Leiden 1985 (NHS 22-23); *L'Exégèse de l'âme: NHC 2, 6*, intro., tr., comm. M. Scopello, Leiden 1985 (NHS 25); *NHC 2, 2-7: Together with XIII, 2, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926 (1), and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655*, ed. B. Layton, Leiden 1989 (NHS 20-21) [with: *Gospel of Thomas*, *Gospel of Philip*, *Hypostasis of the Archons*]; *NHC 8*, ed. J.H. Sieber, Leiden 1991 (NHS 31); *NHC 11, 12, 13*, ed. Ch.W. Hedrick, Leiden 1990 (NHS 28); *NHC 3, 3-4 and 5, 1 with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081: Eugnostos and The Sophia of Jesus Christ*, ed. D.M. Parrott, Leiden 1991 (NHS 27); *L'Exégèse de l'âme*: *NHC 2, 6*, intro., tr., comm. M. Scopello, Leiden 1985 (NHS 25). Additionally: *NHC VII*, ed. B.A. Pearson, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1996 (NHMS 30). Further, certain philological studies on the texts should be mentioned, such as *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of NHC II, 1; III, 1; and IV, 1 with BG 8502, 2*, ed. M. Waldstein - F. Wisse, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1995 (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies [NHMS] 33), with bibl. 199-209.

Berliner Arbeitskreise, mentioned above, ed. H.M. Schenke, has published in the series TU the following texts, all in critical editions with translation and commentary: *Die dreigestaltige Protennoia* (*NHC XIII*), ed. G. Schenke, Berlin 1984 (TU 132); *Epistula Jacobi apocrypha: die zweite Schrift aus NHC I*, ed. D. Kirchner, Berlin 1989 (TU 136); *Das Thomas-Buch* (*NHC II, 7*), ed. H.-M. Schenke, Berlin 1989 (TU 138); U.-K. Plisch, *Die Auslegung der Erkenntnis* (*NHC XI, 1*), Berlin 1996 (TU 142); *Der Brief des Petrus an Philippus: ein neutestamentliches Apokryphon aus dem Fund von Nag Hammadi* (*NHC VIII, 2*), ed. H.-G. Bethge, Berlin 1997 (TU 141) [also contains *Koptische apokryphe Apostelacten*, ed. O. v. Lemm]; *Das Philippus-Evangelium* (*NHC II, 3*), ed. H.-M. Schenke, Berlin 1997 (TU 143); *The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter*: *NHC VII, 3*, ed. H.W. Havelaar, Berlin 1999 (TU 144).

The research group of the Universities of Strasbourg and Laval directed by J.E. Ménard has published the following critical editions with translations, in the series Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi [BCNH]: *La lettre de Pierre à Philippe*, ed. J.E. Ménard, Québec 1977; *L'Authentikos Logos*, ed. Id., Québec 1977; *Hermès en Haute-Égypte*, ed. J.P. Mahé, Québec 1978; *La Protennoia trimorphe*, ed. Y. Janssens, Québec 1978; *L'Hypostase des Archontes* (*NH II, 4*), *suivi de Norea* (*NH IX, 2*), ed. B. Barc - M. Roberge, Québec-Louvain 1980 (BCNH 5); *Le II[e] Traité du Grand Seth*, ed. L. Painchaud, Québec-Louvain 1982; P. Claude, *Les Trois stèles de Seth: hymne gnostique à la Triade* (*NH VII, 5*), Québec 1983 (BCNH, Textes 8); *L'Évangile selon Marie: BG 1*, ed. tr. A. Pasquier, Québec 1983 (BCNH, Textes 10); *Le Traité sur la resurrection* (*NH 1, 4*), ed. J.E. Ménard, Québec 1983 (BCNH, Textes 12); *L'Exposé valentinien: les fragments sur le baptême et sur l'eucharistie*: *NH XI, 2*, ed. J.É. Ménard, ibid., 1985 (BCNH, Textes 14); *L'Apocalypse d'Adam: NH V, 5*, ed. F. Morard, Québec 1985 (BCNH, Textes 15); *Le livre de Thomas: NH II, 7*, ed. tr. R. Kuntzmann, Québec 1986 (BCNH, Textes 16); *La première Apocalypse de Jacques: NH V, 3. Le seconde Apocalypse de Jacques: NH V, 4*, ed. J. Veilleux, Québec 1986 (BCNH, Textes 17); *Le traité tripartite: NH I, 5*, ed. E. Thomassen - L. Painchaud, Québec 1989 (BCNH, Textes 19); *La sagesse de Jésus-Christ* (*BG 3; NH III, 4*), ed. C. Barry, Québec 1993 (BCNH, Textes 20); *L'écrit sans titre: traité sur l'origine du monde* (*NH II, 5 and XIII, 2 et Brit. Lib. Or. 4926 [1]*), ed. L. Painchaud, Québec-Louvain-Paris 1995 (BCNH, Textes 21); *Le Tonnerre*, *Intellect parfait: NH VI, 2*, ed. P.-H. Poirier, Québec-Paris 1995 (BCNH, Textes 22); *Le Témoignage véritable* (*NH IX, 3*): *gnose et martyre*, ed. A. & J.P. Mahé, Québec-Paris 1996 (BCNH, Textes 23); *Zostrien* (*NH VIII*), ed. C. Barry, Québec-Paris 2000 (BCNH, Textes 24); *La paraphrase de Sem* (*NH VII, 1*), ed. M. Roberge, Québec-Paris 2000 (BCNH, Textes 25); *Eugnoste* (*NH III, 3 et V, 1*)*: lettre sur le Dieu transcendant*, ed. A. Pasquier, Québec-Paris 2000 (BCNH, Textes 26); *Marsanès* (*NH X*), ed. W.P. Funk - P.H. Poirier - J.D. Turner, Québec-Paris 2000 (BCNH, Textes 27).

Among other critical editions of the texts of Nag Hammadi that are not part of the preceding groups and series, we can mention the following, which include translations and often introductions and commentaries: J. Doresse, *Le livre sacré du Grand Esprit Invisible ou L'Évangile des Égyptiens*, ed., tr., comm.: JA 254 (1966) 319-435; 256 (1968) 289-386; *The Hypostasis of The Archons*, ed., tr., comm. R.A. Bullard - M. Krause, Berlin 1970 (Patristische Texte und Studien 10); *Le Concept de notre grande Puissance* (*CG 6., 4*), ed., tr. P. Cherix, Fribourg-Göttingen 1982 (Orbis biblicus et orientalis 47); *The Apocalypse of Adam: NHC V, 5 Considered from Its Egyptian Background*, ed., tr. P.A. Linder, Lund 1991 (Lund studies in African and Asian religion 7).

Recently, indexes, concordances and bibliographies on the texts of Nag Hammadi have been published. A systematic bibliography, with annual supplements in NovT, we owe to D.M. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography*, 1948-79, Leiden 1971 (NHS 1); 1970-94, Leiden 1997 (NHMS 32), 1995-2006, Leiden 2009 (NHMS 65). A vocabulary and an index have been prepared by F. Siegert, *Nag-Hammadi-Register: Wörterbuch zur Erfassung der Begriffe in den Koptisch-gnostischen Schriften von*

Nag-Hammadi, mit Index, Tübingen 1982 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 26), as well as an excellent index which provides parallels with biblical literature: *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index*, by C.A. Evans - R.L. Webb - R.A. Wiebe, Leiden 1993 (New Testament Tools and Studies 18). Finally, the recent *Concordance des textes de Nag Hammadi Le codex VII*, by R. Charron, Sainte-Foy-Louvain-Paris 1992 (BCNH, Concordances 1); *Le codex VI*, by P. Cherix, Sainte-Foy-Louvain-Paris 1993 (BCNH, Concordances 2); *Le codex III*, by R. Charron, Sainte-Foy-Louvain-Paris 1995 (BCNH, Concordances 3); *Le codex I*, by P. Cherix, Sainte-Foy-Louvain-Paris 1995 (BCNH, Concordances 4); *Les codices VIII et IX*, by W.P. Funk, Sainte-Foy-Louvain-Paris 1997 (BCNH, Concordances 5); *Les codices X et XIA*, by W.P. Funk, Sainte-Foy-Louvain-Paris 2000 (BCNH, Concordances 6).

We should also mention the studies, papers of conferences and miscellanea devoted to the Nag Hammadi texts: some of them give a useful general *status quaestionis*, such as *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years*, ed. D. Turner - A. McGuire, Leiden 1997 (NHMS 44), with an extensive bibl. 497-531, and also *Les textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification: actes du colloque*, Québec 15-19 septembre 1993, ed. L. Painchaud - A. Pasquier, Québec-Louvain-Paris 1995 (BCNH, Études 3): traditionally gnosticism is divided into two principal strands, the "Valentinian" and the "Sethian," so that, e.g., the collection of essays edited by B. Layton, *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, divides into two volumes: I, *The School of Valentinus*, Leiden 1980; II, *Sethian Gnosticism*, Leiden 1981; others investigate particular aspects. Among the acts of conferences of the last twenty years we should mention at least M. Krause, *Die Texte von Nag Hammadi: Gnosis. Festschrift H. Jonas*, Göttingen 1978, 216-243; *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi*, Québec, 22-25 August 1978, ed. B. Barc, Québec-Louvain 1981 (BCNH, Études 1); *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Oxford, September 3rd-8th 1979, ed. M. Krause, Leiden 1981 (NHS 17); cf. M.V. Cerutti - D.M. Cosi - L. Saibene, *Il Colloquio di Louvain-la-Neuve su "Gnosticismo e mondo ellenistico" (11-14 marzo 1980)*: Aevum 55 (1981) 139-143; *Apocalittica e gnosticismo: atti del Colloquio internazionale*, Rome, 18-19 giugno 1993, ed. M.V. Cerutti, Rome 1995; *For the Children, Perfect Instruction: Studies in Honor of H.-M. Schenke on the Occasion of the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften's Thirtieth Year*, ed. H.G. Bethge - S. Emmel - K.L. King - I. Schletterer, Leiden-Boston 2002 (NHMS 54). A series of study days which are held regularly and include work on Gnosticism and Nag Hammadi is that of the *Études coptes*, being published gradually in the Cahiers de la Bibliothèque copte: the first volume of the series was *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte: Journée d'études coptes*, Strasbourg, 28 May 1982, Louvain 1983 (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque copte 1). Finally, owing to the increasing abundance of publications in this area, an entire section of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature was dedicated to *Nag Hammadi and Gnosticism* in Atlanta, 22-25 Nov. 2003, from which papers of particular note include: B.A. Pearson, *Basilides the Gnostic*; K.L. King, *Reading the Apocryphon of John Intertextually*; J.M. Asgeirsson, *From Demiourgos to Architekton: Intertextual Elements of Creation in Plato's* Timaeus *and the Thomasine Literature*; D.M. Parrott, *A Sethian Genesis in the Apocalypse of Adam (NHC V, 5)*; I. Dunderberg, *Genesis Exegesis in Valentinus's Fragment 4 and the Gospel of Thomas*; J.D. Turner, *Gnostic Readings of Plato's* Timaeus; E. Thomassen, *An Unknown Sayings Gospel (NHC XI, 1)*; L. Painchaud, *The Use of Parables in the Interpretation of Knowledge (NHC XI, 1)*; M. Kaler, *The Legendary Paul*. In the annual conferences of the Society of Biblical Literature sections are usually dedicated to Nag Hammadi. Many articles focused on the Nag Hammadi tractates have appeared in collections of essays on varied subjects: e.g., Y. Janssens, *Le concept de notre Grande Puissance (NH VI 4): une apocalypse gnostique?*, in *Acts of The Second International Congress of Coptic Studies*, ed. T. Orlandi - F. Wisse, Rome 1985, 83-88; the *Untitled Text*, the *Gospel of the Egyptian*s, the *Concept* and the *Apocalypse of Adam* have been analyzed by G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Tempo della storia e tempo della salvezza nello Gnosticismo* in *Theoretical Frameworks for the Study of Graeco-Roman Religions. XVIII*th *Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions, Durban (South Africa) 2000*, Thessaloniki 2003, 171-207; on the *Paraphrase of Shem* also by Gasparro, *Temi apocalittici nello Gnosticismo*, in *Millennium*, ed. R. Uglione, Turin 2002, 101-141: 117ff.

Among recent monographs on single tractates of the library or on common themes, we should note at least M. Tardieu, *Trois mythes gnostiques: Adam, Eros et les animaux d'Égypte dans un écrit de Nag Hammadi (II, 5)*, Paris 1974 (Études augustiniennes 51); A. Böhlig - F. Wisse, *Zum Hellenismus in den Schriften von Nag Hammadi*, Wiesbaden 1975; G. Filoramo, *Aspetti del dualism gnostico: mito, manifestazione e rivelazione nello 'Scritto senza titolo' del Codice Gnostico II di Nag Hammadi*, Turin 1978 (MAT, ser. V., II, 1978, 4); Id., *L'Attesa della fine: storia della gnosi*, Rome-Bari 1987, with bibl. 291-304; K. Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag- Hammadi-Traktate "Apokalypse des Petrus" (NHC VII, 3) . . . und "Testimonium veritatis" (NHC IX, 3)*, Leiden 1978 (NHS 12); Ch.W. Hedrick, *The Apocalypse of Adam: A Literary and Source Analysis*, Ann Arbor, MI 1980; J. Doresse, *Les Livres secrets des gnostiques d'Égypte*, Monaco 1984; J. Frickel, *Hellenistische Erlösung in christlicher Deutung*, Leiden 1984 (NHS 19); I.S. Gilhus, *The Nature of The Archons: A Study in the Soteriology of a Gnostic Treatise from Nag Hammadi (CGII, 4)*, Wiesbaden 1985; J.-M. Sevrin, *Le dossier baptismal séthien: études sur la sacramentaire gnostique*, Québec 1986 (BCNH, Études 2); C. Scholten, *Martyrium und Sophiamythos im Gnostizismus nach den Texten N.H.*, Münster 1987 (JAC. Ergänzungsbände 14); J.A. Williams, *Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic Gospel of Truth from Nag Hammadi*, Atlanta 1988 (SBL Dissertation Series 79); A. Böhlig, *Gnosis und Synkretismus*, I-II, Tübingen 1989; T. Onuki, *Gnosis und Stoa: eine Untersuchung zum Apokryphon des Johannes*, Freiburg-Göttingen 1989; W.G. Röhl, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums in christlich-gnostischen Schriften aus Nag Hammadi*, Frankfurt a.M. 1991; A. Böhlig - Chr. Markschies, *Gnosis und Manichäismus: Forschungen und Studien zu Texten von Valentin und Mani sowie zu den Bibliotheken von N.H. und Medinet Madi*, Berlin-New York 1994 (Beihefte zur ZNTW 72); R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, Leiden 1996 (NHMS 39; cf. also, recently, M.J. Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, Aldershot 2002); A. Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*, Leiden 1996 (NHMS 40), with bibl. 226-246; K. Rudolph, *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte: gesammelte Aufsätze*, Leiden 1996 (NHMS 42); S. Petersen, *'Zerstort die Werke der Weiblichkeit!' Maria Magdalena, Salome und andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften*, Leiden 1999 (NHMS 48); T. Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 2000 (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 2), bibl. 493-541; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, Québec-Louvain-Paris 2001 (BCNH, Études 6), with bibl. 761-788; F.E. Williams, *Mental Perception: A Commentary*

on NHC VI, 4: The Concept of Our Great Power, Leiden 2001 (NHMS 51); C. Markschies, *Gnosis*, Poole, Dorset 2003; K. King, *The Seven Revelations of John*, Cambridge 2006, who in pages 258-264 restates the thesis of the marked uniformity of gnosticism. Naturally there are many articles in journals which relate to the Nag Hammadi texts: G. MacRae, *The Apocalypse of Adam* (*First to Fourth Century*)*: A New Translation and Introduction*, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, New York 1983, 707-719; Y. Janssens, *L'Évangile des Égyptiens*: Muséon 100 (1987) 181-197; L. Painchaud, *The Redaction of the Writing Without Title* (*CG II* 5): SCent 8 (1991) 217-234; A. Camplani, *Sulla trasmissione dei testi gnostici in copto*, in *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, ed. A. Camplani, Rome 1997, 121-175 (codicology and the structure of the MSS.).

The well-known full collections of Italian translations are: *Testi gnostici*, ed. L. Moraldi, Turin 1982; *Gli apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento*, ed. P. Sacchi: I, Turin 1981; II, Turin 1989; III, Brescia 1999; IV, Brescia 2000. The story of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Library may be found, e.g., in *Gnostic Dualism in Asia Minor During the First Centuries A.D.*, I, publ. J.C. Gieben 1993 (The Light and the Dark: a cultural history of dualism 8), ch. III, *A Library in a Jar*, 8.

G. Filoramo - I. Ramelli

NAIN, SON of the WIDOW of (iconography). An episode not frequently depicted in paleo-Christian art, limited as it was to sculpture, with about twenty instances in *Gaul (e.g., Ws 26, 2/3; 227, 1/2) and *Rome (e.g., Ws 214, 2; 8, 4). The biblical account (Lk 7:11-15), containing numerous personalities, is adapted synthetically: Jesus, accompanied by at least one apostle, touches with a *virga* the body of the son of the widow of Nain, already prepared for burial (e.g., Ws 214, 2), underlining by his action the message of faith implied in the composition. The mummy is shown either in a *sarcophagus, sometimes strigilated and placed on leonine legs, or directly on the ground (Ws 128, 1). The mother also appears on some reliefs (Ws 8, 4; 225, 2; 26, 2/3). Sarcophagi bearing this scene were produced in the workshops of the first thirty years of the 4th c. (Ws 8, 4).

DACL 12, 1, 582ff.; LCI 4, 542ff.; Ws 304-306; Rep.; D. Calcagnini, *La resurrezione del figlio della vedova di Naim nell'iconografia del IV secolo*: Bessarione 5 (1986) 121-145; Id., *Resurrezione del figlio della vedova di Naim*: TIP 268-269.

D. Calcagnini Carletti

NAME (ὄνομα, *nomen*)

I. Greek usage - II. Biblical usage - III. Jewish post-biblical usage: Hellenistic Judaism and rabbinic literature - IV. Patristic and NT usage.

I. Greek usage. In Greek, ὄνομα indicates the name, at first, in *Homer, only of persons, which through commanding one seeks to obtain good omens and even things. As early as Homer, the term also means "renown," or "name" in contrast to "thing" (ἔργον, πρᾶγμα) or to "nature" (φύσις), acc. to a polarity emphasized by the Sophists. On the contrary, ὄνομα + genitive, esp. in poetry, could indicate either the thing or the person itself (ὄνομα Πολυνείκους = Polynices himself in Eur., *Phoen.* 1702). Finally, ὄνομα could have the grammatical function and meaning of "noun," "substantive" or more generically "word." From Homer onward we find an interest in etymology, which in Plato, after the discussions of the Sophists, was explored in its ontological foundations in the *Cratylus*—where in the end etymology is not regarded as a reliable way to knowledge—and became the main tool of the allegoresis of myths in a philosophical sense (see I. Ramelli, *Allegoria*, I, *L'età classica*, with G. Lucchetta, Milan 2004). This was esp. true in the *Stoic context, where the study of grammar was also developed, along with the distinction of the parts of a discourse, and in Chrysippus, where the differentiation between ὄνομα κύριον or proper name, which indicates the proper and particular essence (ἰδία οὐσία) and ὄνομα προσηγορικόν or appellative and common name, which indicates the common and general essence (κοινὴ οὐσία). In this context, already from Hesiod onward, who provides the etymology of the name of Aphrodite (*Theog.* 188-198), and amplified by the Stoics, attention was particularly directed to divine names and epithets, the number of which was in direct proportion to the power of the divinity (Menandr., *Rhet. Gr.* III, 445, 25-26); thus Aesch., *Ag.* 160ff. allows Zeus, the supreme god, to be invoked by the name which he prefers; and in *Apul.*, *Met.* XI, 15 Isis affirms: "My divinity is unique, but the whole earth honors it in different ways, with different cults, with different names." In *Hermeticism, however, the divine πολυωνυμία is transformed into ἐνωνυμία, for the one supreme god (ὁ θεὸς εἷς· ὁ δὲ εἷς ὀνόματος οὐ προσδέεται· ἔστι γὰρ ὁ ὢν ἀνώνυμος, "God is One, and the One does not have need, moreover, of a name: he who is is in fact without name," *Corp. Herm.* fr. 3; αὐτὸς ὄνομα οὐκ ἔκει, ὅτι πάντων ἐστι πατήρ, "He himself does not have name, since he is Father of all beings," ibid., V, 10). This idea was widespread in the imperial age, from *Middle Platonism onward (see Arrhetos Theos. *L'ineffabilità del primo principio nel Medioplatonismo*, ed. F. Calabi, Pisa 2002), and was taken up by the Fathers.

II. Biblical usage. In the biblical and patristic traditions, a name tends to express the essence of that which it designates. In the OT the name is indicated

with *šēm*, which occurs 770 times in the singular and indicates the proper name of humans, divine beings or animals, or of places or objects; it can also indicate renown and reputation. The giving of the name establishes a relationship of ownership between the giver and the receiver: e.g., children receive their names from the father, and animals from Adam, which thus inaugurates his dominion over creation. Some OT passages such as Ex 32:32ff., Ps 69:29, Is 4:3 and Ezek 13:9 formulate the idea, found subsequently in late Judaism and in the NT, that the names of the just are recorded in the *book of life. Since the name designates the person, etymology is frequently seen to be important: Nabal, as his name denotes, is a door (1 Sam 25:25); Isaac recalls the laughing of his parents (Gen 17:17; 18:12; 21:6) etc. God, moreover, changes the names of his elect when he gives them a mission: Jacob becomes Israel because he has "wrestled with God" (Gen 32:29); Abram become Abraham since he will be "father of nations"; and Sarai, Sarah, i.e., "princess" (Gen 17:5, 15). In the OT the name par excellence is that of God, represented by the sacred tetragrammaton YHWH, replaced in Hebrew, when reading, with *Adonai*, and in Greek with κύριος, attributed then in the NT to Christ: both appellations mean "Lord." The other names which are ascribed to God in the OT, such as *ʾēl šadday* (Gen 17:1), are simply substitutes and do not indicate the true name of God, which is of such importance that a commandment prohibits its being taken in vain (Ex 20:7; Dt 5:11) and that it is entrusted to the priests, even if in the OT one does not truly find a secret name of God, and *šēm* is often used with the prepositions *l* and *b*, "in the name of," followed by the name of God, *yhwh*, with verbs of invocation, speech, prophecy and blessing, guaranteeing the intervention of God relative to the act. David confronts Goliath *bešēm yhwh* (1 Sam 17:45); one's enemies are laid low *bešēm yhwh* (Ps 118:10-12). Already in the pre-Deuteronomic period the *šēm yhwh* was considered an autonomous form of revelation chosen by God (see Ex 23:20; Is 30:27). The veneration of the name of God is carried almost to hypostatization, so that it is held that while God lives in heaven (Dt 4:36), the *šēm yhwh* had a place on earth in which to reside—i.e., the temple (Ex 23:21; Dt 12:5; 14:24; Is 30:27; Ps 20:2; 54:3; 89:25; Mal 1:11). In the post-Deuteronomic period, in the Prophets and Psalms, the name of God often has the meaning of the honor or glory of God, and is connected with the exaltation of his power; in many cases it seems to be identified with God himself (e.g., Ps 7:18; 9:11; 18:50; 68:5; 74:18; 86:12; 92:2; Pr 18:10; Is 25:1; 26:8; Mal 3:16).

In the LXX, *šēm* is almost always translated as ὄνομα, even if sometimes it is rendered θρόνον or μνημόσυνον. The expression *bešēm* is found in several forms, acc. to the context: ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος (Esth 8:8), διά without ὄνομα (Esth 3:12; 8:10), ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι or ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι at various times in the books of Kings. It is revealing that the LXX differs from the Masoretic Text—unless the translators had a different version—introducing ὄνομα where the Hebrew is lacking *šēm*: e.g., in Ezek 43:7, a markedly anthropomorphic passage, the name of God is referred to and not God himself; in Num 14:21, to "I live" is added "and my name lives."

III. Jewish postbiblical usage: Hellenistic Judaism and rabbinic literature. In general in Hellenistic Judaism one notices a great importance given to names. In *Philo of Alexandria, *Decal.* 82, the name is defined as the shadow which accompanies the body, for which reason in the Decalogue God is mentioned first, and then his name; the name is the mirror of thought (*Vit. cont.* 78). Moses, interpreted as a type of one who possesses perfect knowledge, is never mistaken in his choice and use of words (θέσις τῶν ὀνομάτων, *Agric.* 1-2; *Cher.* 56). Because the origin of names goes back to Adam (*Op. mund.* 148; *Quest. in Gen.* I, 20-21), they correspond to the reality, and the exercise of etymology, which had a notable place in Stoicism, is taken up again in the service of allegoresis. Philo draws on Ex 3:14 in the LXX version, calling God ὁ ὤν; he observes that there is absolutely no name which is fitted to the nature of God (*Vit. Mos.* I, 75); God cannot be named, but simply is (*Somn.* I, 230 s.). As God is ineffable, his true name cannot be known by creatures (*Rer. div. her.* 170); the name of God given to men is κύριος ὁ θεός (*Mut. nom.* 11-12), but neither θεός nor κύριος, the divine names used in the Bible, indicate God's essence, but only his powers (*Somn.* I, 163; *Plant.* 85-86; *Leg. all.* III, 73), respectively that of sovereignty and that of grace. Obviously Philo knows the sacred tetragrammaton, the letters of which were inscribed on the diadem of the high priest (*Vit. Mos.* II, 132; cf. 114). Taking up the Stoic tradition, which he clearly has in mind, he asserts that the powers of the Being/Deity have several names (*Somn.* II, 254) and that wisdom is characterized by polyonymy (*Leg. all.* I, 43), which is proper also to the Logos, who is also called "name of God." In a negative sense, Philo also speaks of the improper names of God, declaring that he must not be invoked thoughtlessly, nor should we swear by him, as his nature is unknown to us, but only by his name (*Spec. leg.* IV, 40).

Josephus, for his part, avoids using in ordinary

speech not only the name of God but also that of Κύριος; for this reason, there are almost no literal biblical quotations. He shows the same reserve in the use of ὄνομα, to which Josephus prefers "appellation," προσηγορία: "God made known his appellation to Moses, which before had not reached man, and about which it is not licit for me to say anything" (*Ant.* II, 275-276). He does use ὄνομα to indicate the tetragrammaton inscribed on the front of the temple, before which even Alexander the Great is said to have bowed (*Ant.* III, 178; XI, 331); it is not said, however, whether the tetragrammaton is the ὄνομα which Jews invoke when their lives are in danger, in *J.W.* V, 438. Josephus, perhaps adapting to his Greek readership, does not now say that God inhabits the temple, but rather that there a part of the Spirit of God may be found (*Ant.* VIII, 114).

The reflection on the name of God continues in the Jewish pseudepigraphal literature and in rabbinism, contemporary to the church fathers. In Slavonic Enoch, part of the extraordinary knowledge granted to the author is that of the names of all plants and animals, and the name of Adam is interpreted in the sense of a cosmic being. The name of Eve, as in the case of Eve herself, is considered to have been taken from Adam. Ethiopic Enoch returns to the idea of the book of life: those whose names are stricken from it are lost forever. Particular attention is paid to the names of the saints, of the fallen angels, of the stars and of the "starry heavens." In these writings the name of God is also present, and esp. in *4 Esd*, where in particular the seven names of God are recorded, indicating his attributes; the angels sing forever "blessed the name of the Lord," the same in which the just triumph and will be saved (*Eth. Enoch* 50, 2). The "name of the Son of Man" is also glorified, the name pronounced before the creation of the stars (ibid., 48, 2-3), which indicates the eternal preexistence of the Son. In many cases the name of God is described in this literature as a mysterious power revealed to humanity by means of the angels, through which everything was created (*Eth. Enoch* 69, 13-21; *Iub.* 36, 7): it seems thus to be identified with the Logos.

In the rabbinic literature the various meanings of *šēm* are maintained; if during the biblical reading in the synagogue, on the one hand, the sacred tetragrammaton was read "Adonai," in the schools, on the other hand, when citing a biblical passage one said *haššēm*; while the tetragrammaton was pronounced in the temple cult, the strict rabbinic prohibition against uttering it resulted, with the passing of time, in lack of knowledge as to how precisely it should be pronounced. The rabbis called the tetragrammaton "name of four letters," but there were also references to 12 or 42 letters, or even one of 72 letters in the Midrash (*Gen. rabb.* 44 at 15, 14; *Lev. rabb.* 23 at 18, 3; *Pes. rabb.* 76 b).

IV. Patristic and NT usage. We should set the NT and patristic usage against this cultural background. In the NT ὄνομα indicates persons' names, reputations or the persons themselves, in Acts 1:15; Rev 3:4; 11:13. Many passages refer to the name of God, which is glorified through the work of Christ (Jn 12:28) which first of all, in the prayer of Jesus, must be hallowed (Mt 6:9 and parallels). In Mt 1:21-23 Jesus Christ receives the name chosen by God which expresses salvation, as for Philo, *Mut. nom.* 121, the name Jesus means "salvation of the Lord, " σωτηρία Κυρίου. This name of Κύριος, which in the LXX is always used of God, passes also to Christ (Phil 2:9; Rev 19:16). In Jn 1:1 Jesus, as the Logos, is set to become the name of God. In some passages of the NT ὄνομα is used in an absolute sense in the place of Jesus (Acts 5:41; 3 Jn 7). For the expression "in the name of" we find often ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. Jesus comes "in the name of the Lord/of the Father" (ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρός, Mt 23:39; Mk 11:10; Jn 10:24-25). The expression "in the name of" applies now to the Son of God: whoever believes "in his name" has life in his name and becomes a child of God (Jn 1:12; 20:31; 1 Jn 5:13): this is the name in which/through which (ἐν ᾧ) we can be saved (Acts 4:12). God the Father should be thanked "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Eph 5:20) and sends the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus Christ (Jn 14:26). This profound communion we find in Mt 28:19, where the names of the three persons of the *Trinity are united. *Baptism is celebrated "in the name of " (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ . . . Mt 28:19; Acts 2:38; 8:16; 19:5) with the meaning of "become the property of, " probably through the influence of the Semitic *lešēm*, with final value. The community furthermore prays "in the name of Jesus" (Jn 14:13-14; 15:16; 16:23-26), and that which the disciples ask in the name of Jesus Christ, he will do, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son (Jn 14:13-14). Not only faith but also good works are exercised "through the name of Jesus" (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, Mt 18:5 and parallels), as are miracles (e.g., Acts 3:6; 4:7; 16:18: ἐν ὀνόματι). The name of Jesus is itself the content of the gospel message (Acts 8:12; 9:15, 27). The admonitions and counsels of Paul are given "in the name of Jesus, " i.e., on his behalf (2 Th 3:6; 1 Cor 1:10): the disciples must suffer for (ὑπέρ) the name of Christ (Acts 5:41; cf. Acts 9:16), which is the "excellent name" pronounced over Christians since they

are the property of the Lord (Jas 2:7). In a negative sense, ὄνομα is associated with the beast and the harlot of Revelation. A change of name, as already in the OT, is also in the NT a sign of a special mission given by God, and here by Jesus Christ: Simon receives the name of Peter and the sons of Zebedee that of Βοανηργές or "sons of thunder" (Mk 3:16-17). In Rev 21:14 the names of the apostles are written on the twelve foundation stones of the new Jerusalem, and in 2:17 whoever receives a white stone written with a new name is transported to a new state of life in which his or her old sinful nature has disappeared.

The OT use, with all that it comports, constitutes the basis of the patristic reflections on name. The name of Jesus Christ is almost hypostatized in the *Shepherd* of Hermas (Sim. 9, 14, 15): τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ μέγα ἐστὶ καὶ ἀχώρητον καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον βαστάζει· εἰ οὖν πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ βαστάζεται, . . . "the name of the Son of God is great and uncontainable, and sustains the entire universe: if therefore the whole creation is sustained by the Son of God, . . ." from which the identification is evident between the Son and his name (see also *Sim.* 9, 12, 4-8; 9, 13, 2-3; *1 Clem.* 58, 1; 60, 4). The interpretation of the divine names, already practiced in the OT context, remained very important in patristic theology: one thinks of *De divinis nominibus* of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, in the 5th c., an important exponent of the negative theology already found in the Cappadocians—and, in a pagan setting, in *Plotinus—and heir to a tradition of reflection on the names of God and on their relationship with his essence. According to *Justin Martyr, the divine names derive from the divine action (2 *Apol.* 6, 2: ("'Father,' 'God,' 'Creator,' 'Lord' and 'Master' are not proper names, but appellations derived from his benefits"), and the different names correspond to different divine activities, as *Basil observes (*Contra Eunom.* I, 7), and to the various benevolent actions of God toward humanity, acc. to *Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra Eunom.*, ed. W. Jaeger, II, 242, 10). Thus, for ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, God "is without name, has many names, and is above every name" (ἀνώνυμος, πολυώνυμος, ὑπερώνυμος).

There had existed for some time a clear awareness that the ὄνομα, as a human word, cannot express the divine essence, something that no word can do fully, as *John Chrysostom confirms (*Hom. In Hbr.* 2, 2): the name θεός, "God, " is not the name of the divine essence, which is impossible to arrive at. Humans, in fact, do not know the word expressing the divine nature, which remains for us always inexpressible and transcendent, as Gregory of Nyssa observes (*Contra Eunom.*, ed. W. Jaeger, II 169ff). The idea is well present already in the apologists of the 2nd c., such as Justin and *Minucius Felix (18, 10), but also in *Clement of Alexandria and in (ps.-) Justin (*Cohort. ad gent.* 21): "No name can properly designate God [οὐδὲν ὄνομα ἐπὶ Θεοῦ κυριολογεῖ σθαι δυνατόν]: in fact, names serve to indicate and to distinguish objects, which are many and various. . . . But God, being one and one only [εἷς καὶ μόνον], has not deemed it necessary to give a name to himself [ὀνομάζειν ἑαυτόν]." The *Platonic Justin insists several times on the ineffability of God, as *Middle Platonic thinkers did at the same time, as was noted above, e.g., in 1 *Apol.* 10, 1: "God cannot be called with any name established by human beings [μηδενὶ ὀνόματι θετῷ]"; 61, 11: "No one can give a name to the ineffable God [ἄρρητος]"; 2 *Apol.*, 6, 1-3: "There exists no name established by human beings [ὄνομα θετόν] which is suited to the ingenerate Father of all beings; if one were to call him by any name, in fact, it means that one would have been before him who would have given him a name. . . . His Son, then, the only one who can be called properly [λεγόμενος κυρίως] 'Son,' i.e., the Logos . . . he is called Christ since he receives the anointing . . . in the same way also 'God' is a common name, an appellation [προσηγόρευμα], not a proper name [ὄνομα]."

In continuity with Justin, Clement affirms that God is "invisible and ineffable, " ἄρρητος (*Strom.* V, 12, 78, 3 and 81, 3). "It is not learnable nor expressible on the part of men" (*Strom.* V, 71, 5; cf. II 2, 5, 4, etc.). Precisely because of the difficulty of characterizing God, he has no name or he has all names, as *Gregory of Nazianzus explains in a hymn: "You are One, and all beings, and No One, being yet neither One nor all beings: or you have all names [πανώνυμε], what shall I call you?" The only true expression of the divine nature is his Logos, which is identified with Christ as early as the prologue of the gospel of John, and which for *Origen has a second body, next to that of Jesus in which ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, also in the Scriptures, the spiritual significance of which, contained in the body *littera*, is indeed the Christ, the Logos, the expression of God (see M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004, esp. 14-19, 32ff.).

DB 4, 1669-1677; LTK² 7, 780-783; ODC 720-721; KLP 4, 657-661; RGG³ 4, 1298-1306; *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon*, II, 1499-1502; H. Bietenhard, ὄνομα: GLNT 8, 681-794 (TDNT 5, 242-283); J. Fichter - Ch. de Morè Pontgibaud, *Sur l'analogie des noms divins*: RSR 19 (1929) 481-512; 20 (1930) 193-223; 38 (1952) 161-188; 42 (1954) 321-360; O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im A.T.*: BZAW 64 (1934); C. Mazzantini, *La questione dei "nomi divini"*: GM 9 (1954) 113-124; E. Sittig, *De graecorum nominibus theophoris*, Diss. Philol. Halenses, XX, pars I, 1911; K. Ruh, *Die mystische Gotteslehre des Dionysius Areopagita*, Mu-

nich 1987; F. García Bazán, *El Dios transcendente en Dionisio Areopagita*: Epimeleia 2 (1993) 169-188; B.R. Suchla, *Textprobleme in der Schrift* Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων *des Ps. Dionysius Areopagita*: Augustinianum 32 (1992) 387-422; Id., *Verteidigung eines platonischen Denkmodells einer christlichen Welt*, Göttingen 1995; Id., *Wahrheit über jeder Wahrheit*: ThQ 176 (1996) 205-217; H. Saffrey, *Les débuts de la théologie comme science*: RSPh 80 (1996) 201-220; G.K. Kaltenbrunner, *Dionysios von Areopag*, Zug 1996; S. Matthaios, *Kurion onoma*, in *Ancient grammar: content and context*, ed. by P. Swiggers - A. Wouters, Leuven 1996, 55-77; Y. de Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident*, Paris 1997; W. Beierwaltes, *Der verborgene Gott*, Trier 1997; P.L. Dickerson, *The Sources of the Account of the Mission to Samaria in Acts 8, 5-25*: NT 39 (1997) 210-234; J. Peláez, *Significado de la expresión "hagiastheto to onoma sou" en el evangelio de Mateo (6, 9)*: CFC(G) 8 (1998) 43-52; M.A. Vannier, *Aux sources de la voie négative*: RSR 72 (1998) 403-419; J.P. Williams, *The Apophatic Theology of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, 1-2*: Downside Review 117 (1999) 157-172; 235-250; M. Fattal, *Vérité et fausseté de l'*onoma *et du* logos *dans le* Cratyle *de Platon*, in *Ontologie et dialogue: mélanges en hommage à Pierre Aubenque avec sa collaboration à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire*, ed. N.-L. Cordero, Paris 2000, 13-31; J. Dietrich, *Negative Theologie bei Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagita und Mose ben Maimon*: Th&Ph 76 (2001) 161-184; J. Fischer, *The Theology of Dissimilarity*: JR 81 (2001) 529-548; A. Meis Wörmer, *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im* Höhenliedkommentar *Gregors von Nyssa und ihre Rezeption durch Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagita*: EThL 77 (2001) 73-107; M. Nasta, *Les êtres de paroles*, 2001; G. Gertoux, *The Name of God Y.EH.OW.AH Which Is Pronounced as It Is Written*, Lanham, MD 2002.

I. Ramelli

NAMES, CHRISTIAN. The first Christians, being of Jewish origin, had Semitic names (Simon, Zachariah, Judas, Barnabas, Thomas, Peter, John, Bartholomew, Elizabeth, Thaddeus etc.); quickly, however, pagans converted, keeping their names: the centurion *Cornelius (Acts 10:1-11); Saul, after the meeting with Sergius Paulus in Cyprus, always uses the Roman name *Paul (Acts 13:9); a companion of his is called Apollo (1 Cor 16:12); another Hermogenes (Rom 16:14); there is a Hermes (Rom 16:14), an Epaphroditus (Phil 4:18), a Phoebe (Rom 16:1). The newly baptized, being almost all adults, normally kept their previous names, whether Semitic, Greek, Latin, Punic, Syriac etc. For example, already in the 2nd c. (180) we find Punic and Roman names among the *Scillitan martyrs: Saturninus (a typical African name), Speratus, Cittinus, Narzalus etc. (*Atti e passioni dei martiri*, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen, Milan 1987, 100ff.). The pagan Maximus of Madauros criticizes the names of Christian martyrs of Punic origin: Mygdon, Sanae, Namphano, Lucita. Names of Punic origin were to disappear almost completely in the following centuries (N. Duval, 451). That of the African martyr Miggin, being very well known, became popular among N African Christians. The 86 signatories of the Council of *Carthage of 256 all have common names, except one Paul, also a pagan name, and a Peter (n. 72).

There is therefore no typical Christian nomenclature in the first centuries, because the newly baptized kept their names; and names were given to children acc. to the traditions of each people, with reference to their parents and forebears. For example, in the Roman tradition the daughter took the feminine version of the name of the father: a daughter of Tullius Cicero would be called Tullia. So also in the Jewish world, as we may deduce from the episode of *John the Baptist, in which those present observe: "None of your relatives has this name" (Lk 1:61). Moreover, the Christian community did not concern itself with imposing the practice of a particular type of name. Local traditions were followed. In fact, many names of Christians, and even of martyrs, had *cognomina* connected with the pagan divinities. As the author of the *Letter to *Diognetus* says (ch. 5), Christians were not distinguished in anything from the inhabitants of the empire other than in their way of life. In fact, many names of Christians referred back to pagan divinities (theophoric names), although perhaps the link, at least in the popular mind, was no longer perceived. While rejecting in a radical way every form of polytheism, the Christians did not concern themselves with using those names which had a strict religious connection. The fervent Leonides called his son Origenes ("son of Horus"); the brother of Ambrose was called Satyrus; in Roman *Africa the names Saturninus and Saturnina (from Saturnus) were common.

Neither were such names rare as Apollonius, Aphrodisia, Apollinaris, Artemidorus, Bacchus, Castor, Cerialis (from Ceres), Heliodorus, Diogenes, Dionysius and Dionysia, Erculea, Isidorus and Isidora (from Isis); Martialis, Martinus, Mercurius, Monica, Nemesianus, Serapio, Venerius etc. In the common sensibility these theophoric names had perhaps lost their connection with the divinity, but were given perhaps simply because they followed popular practice. Their use in epigraphy, however, shows itself to be less prevalent among Christians than it does among pagans, and their frequency diminishes progressively from the 1st decades of the 4th c. onward. Pope John (532–535) was at first called Mercurius: *Ioannes iunior qui et Mercurius* (LP 1, 141). Some names can appear specifically Christian because they were frequently used by Christians, such as Elpis and Irene (Εἰρήνη), although in fact they were also used by pagans (Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies*, 89), even if in lesser measure, such as Agape (Ka-

janto, *Onomastic Studies*, 113 s.), Redemptus, Cyriacus (Κυριακός) (a name much used in *Rome by the Christians) and others. Further, it was understandable that certain names which came into use in *Late Antiquity should be used by Christians without any particular significance: e.g., Gaudentius, Hilarus.

The emergence of a Christian nomenclature was slow, being progressively established from the time of *Constantine onward: on the one hand, we see a reduction of names of mythical origin—their use more kept up among pagans—and, on the other hand, we find the use of the glorious names of dead Christians and the spread of new names, sometimes specifically created by Christians in order to express particular sentiments and new ideas. A tradition of truly Christian names is rather patchy: in Late Antiquity many names disappeared from use, while others became popular among both Christians and pagans (Felix, Victor, Vitalis). Some names became Christian with the passing of time. In fact, the recourse to names which had become illustrious owing to the lives of particular figures, and the prestige that they enjoyed in the community, contributed significantly to the establishment of a Christian nomenclature. Mercurius became common among Christians because it was the name of a famous martyr: it was very popular in *Egypt. Other persons were venerated for having withstood martyrdom, and their cult sometimes spread beyond the confines of their own city and region: *Dionysius of Alexandria wrote: "I am of the opinion that there were many who bore the name of the apostle John, who, on account of their love for him, and out of admiration and zeal and desire to be loved by the Lord as he was, took to themselves his name, as many of the children of the faithful are called Paul or Peter" (Eus., *HE* 7, 25, 14). The name of Paul was common in the pagan world, while that of Peter was for all intents and purposes peculiarly Christian (used only rarely by the pagans); from it derive Petronia, Petrius and Petronilla. Dionysius writes in about the middle of 3rd c., but from the 4th c. the two names of Peter and Paul become ever more popular among Christians. Sometimes they are even taken together: in the cemetery of Priscilla a child is called Paulus Petrus (Ferrua, *Memorie*, 142f.). That of John is still more popular, esp. in the East, so much so that we know of several thousand persons with that name, which was used also for women (Ioannes, Iohannes, Ioanna, Iohanna); in the West it began to be introduced toward the end of the 4th c., when names taken from the OT also became popular, such as Abraham, Isaac, Daniel, Moses, Abel, Tobias, and esp. Susanna and Mary.

The cult of the martyrs was substantially a local phenomenon; there are few cases, at least proportionately, in which their relics and cult were brought to other geographical areas, fewer still to lands far away. A saint venerated in one region rarely enjoyed a cult and devotion elsewhere. Every church had its own calendar; those of large churches were easily established by imitation in their own region, and some of their saints acquired a more widely extended and popular cult. To cross a geographical area depended also on relations existing between the different cities and regions. For example, the commercial and social links between N Africa and Rome were very strong, so that the cults of some martyrs were exchanged: *Perpetua and *Cyprian were venerated in Rome, and, at *Carthage, Lawrence, Stephen and Sixtus. There were, however, few cultic links between far-flung regions: the only Roman martyr included in the *breviarium syriacum* is Xyxtus (Sixtus), a martyr of the 3rd c. Some names are more common in one region than in others: e.g., in Africa Donatus, Januarius, Felix; in Asia Minor Abercius, Thecla (found in Rome and Carthage), Ursula; in the Iberian Peninsula Vincentius, in Italy Laurentius. In the Roman church, in Late Antiquity, most Christians took the names of Laurentius, Petrus, Paulus, or Cyriacus, while many fewer took Marcellinus, Sixtus, Eutychius, Stephanus etc; among the most common women's names were Irene, Agape, Laurentia, Paula, Maria, Agnes, Thecla, Anna.

The 30th canon of the Arabic collection of *Nicaea (325), which required a Christian name to be conferred on the occasion of baptism, is a later redaction (Mansi 2, 961: *fideles nominagentilium filiis suis ne imponant*). The request supposes the common practice of infant baptism. In fact, from the 4th c. the practice spread among Christian families to confer the names of famous martyrs or important figures, and also to create new names relating to the Christian life or to the profession of faith: Adeodatus, Adeodata, Ambrosius, Anastasia (?), Beatus, Benedictus, Christophorus, Deogratias, Deumhabet, Deusdona, Domna, Dominica, Dominicus (which could be a Latin translation of Cyriacus), Habetdeus, Eucharistius, Reparatus (often used by Christians), Restitutus (?), Quodvultdeus, Quodiubet, Renata (?), Spesindeo, Theophylus, Theodolus, Theodosius, Theodorus, Theodora, Vincetdeus. Some of these names are typically African and can only be Latin translations of a Punic word, even if Adeodatus (very common in Africa) and Deusdona could, on the other hand, be Latin translations of the Greek Theodotus or Theodorus (Kajanto, *Onomastic Stud-*

ies, 101-103). Certain Christian names derive from liturgical celebrations: Quadragesima, Eulogia, Paschasia (Pascasia), Paschasius, Sabbatius. Natalis (Natalia), however, was common in a pagan context, as was Natalicus; Epiphanius does not seem to derive from the name of the Christian feast of the *Epiphany. Some names expressed a Christian virtue: Elpidius, Fides, Spes, Piste (Diehl 4104D), Caritas (Αγάπη), with their derivatives Adelphius, Agapetus, Caritosa. Other names were created to express a sentiment: Gaudentianus, Hilarius, Hilarus, Sozomenus, Victorianus, Vincentius. Other typically Christian names were Martyrius, Martyria. Certain names, although also used by pagans, had a different resonance for Christians, and for this reason were used more by them, expressing ideas of the new faith (Anastasia, Redemptus, Renatus, Liberatus, Gaudiosus etc.) or because they had been borne by some famous person; e.g., *Felicitas isto | clauditur infelix falso cognomine dicta* (ICUR I, 713); . . . *Anastasia secundum nomen credo futuram* (i.e., *vitam*) (ICUR II, 6130).

Although there is evidence of Christianizing names (e.g., Stephanus, Perpetua), note should also be taken of the historical evolution of names acc. to fashion and taste, including the introduction of new names and the revival of old ones. The prosopographical collections and Christian inscriptions manifest the popularity of certain names, as does the spread of the cult of certain saints, either locally or elsewhere.

After the mid-4th c. we find certain "names of humility, " such as Calumniosus, Credulus, Importunus and esp. Projectus, Stercorius (Κοπεύς). Kajanto has shown that the name Projectus (Projecticius) does not refer to the fact that the baby was abandoned (Kajanto, *On the Problem*, 47ff.) nor Stercorius that he or she was recovered from dung. Therefore, although not pleasant, these were not expressions of the lowliness of their bearers, even if they were more common in Christian epigraphy than pagan; rather, they started as nicknames then were used as names. We see the same phenomenon in modern languages (e.g., the Italians names Porcaro, Maiale etc.). Classical Roman nomenclature, by virtue of reference to a vast extended family, included for male *cives* the use of *tria nomina* (*praenomen*, *nomen*, *cognomen*), and for women *duo nomina*: the first was individual (there were very few) within the family, given nine days after birth (in epigraphs usually abbreviated), the second indicated the *gens* to which the child belonged (transmitted from father to son); the third was personal (a type of nickname) and took its inspiration from a physical characteristic, but then became used by the whole family. The *tria nomina* distinguishes the free man from a freedman and from a slave. In high society, during the first two centuries of the empire, polyonomy also became widespread, i.e., use of names composed from many elements. This system gradually declined, probably because the *praenomen* and then also the *nomen* had lost their meaning, the link with the *gens* having been lost; there was also the tendency to reduce names to what was necessary, and the need to register or indicate a dead person with their best-known name. After the Edict of *Caracalla, which extended citizenship to all the free inhabitants of the empire (212), the *constitutio antoniniana de civitate*, the process of simplification became more marked: the first to fall out was the *praenomen*, as early as 2nd c., then also the *nomen*, and then in Late Antiquity usually only the *cognomen* was used. In the 4th c., and also in the 5th, some aristocrats still used the *tria nomina*. Even important members of senatorial families, such as the consuls, often used a single name for reasons of convenience. Therefore, the use of a single name in Late Antiquity was not a measure of the social condition of the dead person, but a consequence of a change of practice; the use of the *tria nomina* is, up to a point, an indicator of antiquity, but not always. The *cognomen* was used most frequently. In inscriptions of the Greek language use of the *tria nomina* was much less common. However, as Kajanto has demonstrated, from the era of Constantine the use of a single name, with the disappearance of the *nomen*, became more marked (see *The Emergence*); further, in Christian inscriptions it is hardly ever mentioned whether the status of the deceased was that of slave or free (*Onomastic Studies*, 7-8).

A change of name, or at least the taking on of a new name, is rare in the early centuries. *Ignatius of Antioch assumed the title of Theophorus; *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) took that of Caecilius in thanksgiving to the person who had helped him in his conversion. Eusebius of Caesarea took on the additional name of the martyr *Pamphilus, his master. *Macrina secretly had herself called Thecla (Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Macrina*, 2: SC 178, 142). Some took a new name at the moment of baptism: in the cemetery of St. Valentinus we read (*Pasca*) *SII*, *qui nomen habuit Iuda* (Grossi Gondi, p. 82); *Iudas qui et Cyriacus* (LP 1, 167 and CVIII; PL 71, 179). Five Egyptians, at the moment of suffering martyrdom, a baptism of blood, wished to take the names of OT prophets (Eus., *De martyr. Palest.* 11, 7). The Fathers exhort the faithful to take the names of Christians. *John Chrysostom advises that ba-

bies should not be given the names of their parents or forebears, but those "of the just, of martyrs, of bishops and of apostles," because this can encourage imitation of them (*Sermo de vana gloria* 47-49: SC 188, 146 s.; cf. *Homil. XXI in Gen.* 21, 3: PG 53, 179; *Hom. in Matth.* 52: PG 69, 365). Chrysostom notes that many in *Antioch gave the name of the great *Meletius to their children (*Hom. de S. Meletio*: PG 50, 515). *Theodoret writes that giving the names of martyrs to children assures their protection over them (*Graecarum affect.* 8, 67: SC 57, 334).

DACL 1, 694-850 (741-746); 7, 635-637; 12, 1518-1519; EC 5, 435-436; Abbé Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, Paris 1889, 504-516; A. Harnack, *Missione e propagazione del cristianesimo nei primi tre secoli*, Turin 1906 (repr. Cosenza 1986), 314-319; F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato di epigrafia cristiana*, Rome 1920, 71-89; Ph. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels [2]1933; I. Kajanto, *On the Problem of "Names of Humility" in Early Christian Epigraphy*: Arctos 3 (1962) 45-53; Id., *Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage*, Helsinki 1963; A. Ferrua, *I nomi degli antichi cristiani*: Civiltà Cattolica 117/IV (1966) 492-498; Id., *Memorie dei SS. Pietro e Paolo nell'epigrafia*, in *Saecularia Petri et Pauli*, Vatican City 1969, 129-148; *L'onomastique latine*, Colloque international au Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris 13-15 octobre 1975, Paris 1977 (the articles of I. Kajanto, *The Emergence of the Late Single Name System*, 421-430; N. Duval, *Observations sur l'onomastique dans les inscriptions chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord*, 447-456; H.I. Marrou, *Problèmes généraux de l'onomastique chrétienne*, 431-435; C. Pietri, *Remarques sur l'onomastique chrétienne de Rome*, 437-445); Y.E. Meimaris, *Sacred Names, Saints, Martyrs and Church Officials in Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Pertaining to Christian Church of Palestine*, Athens 1986; O. de Bruyn, *Onomastique chrétienne et culte des martyrs dans la Rome des IIIe-VIe siècles*: RTL 20 (1989) 324-335; I. Kajanto, *Sopravvivenza dei nomi teoforici nell'età cristiana*: Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 41 (1989) 159-168; J. Gascou, *Notes d'onomastique ecclésiale ancienne (à propos de P. Lond. III 1303 descr.)*: ZPE 96 (1993) 135-140; D. Mazzoleni, *I nomi dei cristiani nelle iscrizioni romane*: Forma Urbis 1 (1996) 19-24; I. Kajanto, *Roman Nomenclature During the Late Empire*, in *Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano*, ed. I. Di Stefano Manzella, Vatican City 1997, 103-111.

A. Di Berardino

NAPLES

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. Origins of Christianity. The earliest history of the church of Naples remains somewhat obscure even today. The sources available, late and legendary in character, need to be assessed with care. According to the account found in the *Life* of St. Aspren (in ASS, *Augusti* I, 200-202) and the biography written by Alberic (in F. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra sive de episcopis Italiae*, VI, Venetiis [2]1720, cols. 18-25), the Christian community of Naples was founded by St. Peter. The apostle, traveling from Antioch, is said to have stopped at Naples, where he healed and converted the young Aspren, who, acc. to the account, was consecrated bishop of Naples in 44 and suffered martyrdom in 79.

These pieces of information, all from later than the 9th c., are not altogether different from those in the most authoritative sources, such as the *Chronicon episcoporum Neapolitanorum* preserved in the *Liber pontificalis* (*cod. Vat. Lat.* 5007), the Bianchini Catalog (cod. Laur. 604, compendium of cod. Vat. Lat. 5007), and the "Marble Calendar" of Naples, which limit themselves to giving the name of Aspren (also with the variant Asprenus) first in the list of Neapolitan bishops, but without giving any indication of date. The dating of Maximus, the tenth bishop, who died between 355 and 362, far from reducing the length of the episcopacy of Aspren, could indicate the incompleteness of the catalog. Other elements seem to confirm the presence of a Christian community at Naples already in the 1st c.: a fresco in the catacombs of St. Januarius, dating to the 2nd c., suggesting the presence of an already constituted community; the prevalence in the 1st c. of the name Asprenas; the probable cultural influences of Pozzuoli, where there was already an active Christian community already in the 2nd half of the 1st c.

DACL 12, 691-776; EC 8, 1631-1644; BHL I, 117, nn. 724-726; D. Mallardo, *Storia antica della Chiesa di Napoli. Le fonti*, Naples 1943; Id., *Le origini della Chiesa di Napoli*: Miscellanea P. Paschini, I, Rome 1948, 27-68; A. Bellucci, *Le origini della chiesa di Napoli e nuovi ritrovamenti nel cimitero paleocristiano di San Gennaro*, in *Actes du Ve Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Aix-en-Provence 13-19 septembre 1954), Paris 1957, 487-504; D. Ambrasi, *Il cristianesimo e la chiesa napoletana dei primi secoli*, in *Storia di Napoli*, I, Naples 1967, 625-759; P. Bertolini, *La serie episcopale napoletana nei sec. VIII e IX. Ricerche sulle fonti per la storia dell'Italia Meridionale nell'alto medio evo*: Rivista di Storia della Chiesa 24/2 (1970) 355-391; G. Otranto et al., *Identità cristiana e territorio. Il caso di Napoli e della Campania*: Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi 20/1 (2003) 139-164.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

II. Archaeology. Notwithstanding the greater antiquity of the evidence of cemeteries, the topographical plan of the city necessarily must have taken its shape around the episcopal complex. This complex, thanks partly to the results of archaeological investigations, can be described with clarity along with the buildings of which it was composed. According to the framework proposed by Farioli in 1978, we can identify (1) the Constantinian cathedral which ancient sources mention, dedicated variously to the Savior or the apostles, and the church of the Restituta, initially with five aisles (still visible in the modified

plan of the present basilica); (2) a basilica constructed by Bishop Stephen at the end of the 5th c., dedicated to the Savior and also named *Stephania* after its sponsor, which seems to have been oriented on an axis parallel to that of the Constantinian basilica, from which it was separated by an alley. A mosaic floor found in the 1970s has been attributed to the *Stephania*, but we know nothing of its architectural characteristics. From the 5th c. onward, then, the presence of two buildings for the Christian cult presented Naples with the liturgical and functional problems typical of "double cathedrals"; mosaic fragments underneath the *Stephania* may even show that the arrangement existed in the 4th c., with the presence of a hall for catechumens adjacent to the cathedral. Between the two churches is the baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte, attributed to Bishop Severus (362–408), square, its cupola with an octagonal drum, decorated with a rich mosaic. Apart from these three buildings, the *insula* of the bishops' residence must have contained a second baptistery ascribed to Bishop Vincent, and an *accubitorium*, i.e., an episcopal triclinium, of which an apse with mosaic floor, found in the above-mentioned archaeological digs, is said to be part.

In proximity to the *insula episcopalis*—in the area of the ancient Greek agora and Roman forum—in 1954 the basilica of St. Lornzo Maggiore was discovered, traced to the episcopacy of *John II (535–555); it had three aisles with a semicircular apse flanked by *pastophoria*, preceded by a narthex and with ample remains of mosaic flooring. The urban religious topography of Naples is completed by the church of S. Giorgio, in the present piazza of S. Giorgio ai Mannesi, not far from the cathedral complex, with three aisles and apsed transept, dating from the episcopate of Severus and restructured radically in the 17th c.; the church of S. Maria Maggiore (today S. Maria Maggiore alla Pietra Santa), placed in the episcopate of *Pomponius (514–532), completely rebuilt in the 17th c.; the basilica of the Holy Apostles, completely restored in the 1st half of the 17th c.; the basilica of St. John (today St. John Major) on the hill of the same name, ascribed to Bishop Vincent (555–578) and rebuilt in the 17th c.; and a group of deaconries, from that of St. Andrew, of which there is clear evidence at the beginning of the 8th c., to that of St. Januarius (today St. Gennaro all'Olmo), which we first learn of at the end of the 7th c., to that of Sts. John and Paul, completely destroyed, known of from the beginning of the 8th c., in the area now of the university, and finally S. Maria in Cosmedin (today S. Maria di Porta Nova) which also seems to go back to the 8th c. As for the monasteries—there are fourteen mentioned by the sources—there are only traces remaining of that of St. Severinus, which we hear of as early as the era of Bishop Victor (492–496), in the castle of St. Elmo, with remains from the church and also from below ground level, with cells of the monks cut out of the rock.

As for the suburbs, four underground cemetery complexes are known: St. Januarius, St. Gaudiosus, St. Euphebius and St. Severus. The catacomb of St. Januarius, created in the hill of Capodimonte, consists of two levels, one above the other, each having developed from ancient nuclei. The lower level, the older, was established around a family burial area, non-Christian, with a large trapezoidal hall—the so-called vestibule—with seating extending along the richly decorated walls, opening out into smaller rooms; its center is a common area where, in the mid-3rd c., the body of Bishop Agrippinus was placed. Around this tomb, perhaps at the start of the 4th c., a small oratory was constructed, and then later, but before 5th c., a more ample basilica. An extension of the catacomb, which can be dated to the mid-4th c., is centered on three principal (and notably wide) galleries, from which smaller ones branch off. Also notable is the variety of typology on the burial places, and the decorative themes. The upper level also developed around a family burial area, this one originally Christian, as the pictures which decorate it bear witness, identifiable in two adjoining and connecting rooms, subsequently expanded with galleries which meet and incorporate other small hypogea. The more obvious transformation, however, is of one niche in the catacomb, to which—it seems at the beginning of 5th c.—the relics of St. Januarius were transferred. This necessitated restructuring of the surrounding area, with the creation of a sort of sanctuary decorated with frescoes on different levels, datable earlier than the 9th c.: the oldest, from the beginning of the 6th c., depicts St. Januarius between Vesuvius and Mount Somma. Also connected with the adaptations made for the deposition of the martyr's relics is the so-called *basilica minor*, also known as the basilica of the bishops, because it contained the tombs of the bishops of Naples from *John I onward, and of which some mosaic images remain. Immediately to the W of the catacomb we find a large basilica above ground, also dedicated to St. Januarius, with three aisles, its apse interspersed with great arches. Of the later development of the complex we should note the so-called expanding residence of Paul II, made up of various buildings including a triclinium and a *marmoreus baptismatis fons*, identified in the lower vestibule; also a church dedicated to St. Stephen, constructed at the end of

the 5th c., of which only part of the foundations of the apse remain. It is proposed that in this church, along with that of St. Januarius, we see an example of twin basilicas erected in the domain of a Roman suburban villa.

As for the catacomb of St. Gaudiosus—which takes its name from the bishop of Abitina, exiled to Naples at the time of the *Vandal persecutions and buried there—it is difficult to reconstruct the original iconography given the radical transformation it underwent in the 17th c. From what remains, the hypogeum consisted essentially of a large ambulatory, from which opened small niches decorated with frescoes and mosaics.

Even less may be said with certainty of the small hypogea of St. Euphebius and St. Severus. The first, located in the Hill of Capodichino, consists of an ambulatory with niches on both sides, and an oratory at the end, which was the origin of the present church of S. Eframo Vecchio or of the Immaculate Conception. A fresco there, dated to the 5th c., is the earliest evidence, although the sources indicate its existence before this. Of the other hypogeum, which is in the Hill of Capodimente, the only remains are a niche with traces of fresco, datable to the 5th c., accessible through the present church of St. Severus della Sanità.

The sources mention the church of St. Euphemia (5th c.), also in the suburbs, located between the catacomb of St. Januarius and the walls of the city; Sts. Fortunatus and Maximus (ca. mid-4th c.) in front of the catacomb of St. Gaudiosus; St. Sossius (1st half of 8th c.), apparently situated on the Hill of Capodimonte, no trace of which remains. The oratory of St. Aspren, however, in the harbor area of the city, survives, albeit profoundly altered: it has two small rooms, one above the other; the lower reuses a bath structure, perhaps dating from the 6th c., dedicated to a community of fishermen; the upper one is laid out on a "T" plan, its marble remains indicating an early medieval origin.

The topographical structure of the city also included a set of monasteries mentioned by the sources, but the only remains we have are those already mentioned of St. Severus.

Research of recent decades has not brought to light anything new of importance with respect to the *insula episcopalis*, for which the reconstruction proposed at the end of the 1970s is still valid; in the church of S. Maria Maggiore alla Pietra Santa and of S. Giorgio Maggiore, on the other hand, some limited archaeological work has identified traces of basilicas going back to the 6th. c., in particular in the construction attributed to Vincent, bishop of Naples immediately after the Greek-Gothic war, part of an apse with *opus sectile* flooring, in which we see the cultural influence of the new Byzantine rulers.

Our knowledge of the late Roman and Byzantine periods of the city has improved in recent years thanks to the large number of archaeological excavations, which show a progressive contraction of the residential areas of the city, indicated by the shrinkage or even obliteration of certain axis roads, the metamorphosis of urban into agricultural areas, and the abandonment of some areas within the walls, which became dumping grounds or cemeteries. In this context, ecclesiastical building projects had a special importance, monumental constructions marking the rehabilitation and revitalization of some areas. The location of the basilicas gives us a good idea of the main centers of the city, which apart from the zone around the cathedral were to be found in the area of the forum (basilica of S. Lorenzo), in the SW suburb containing the flourishing harbor area (basilica of S. Giovanni Maggiore), and in the suburban area to the N, where the catacombs were created, frequented for reasons both funerary and cultic. The older pessimistic view of the state of the city in *Late Antiquity has been nuanced, giving way to a more complex and integrated understanding; the study of the abundant and varied ceramics found in the urban excavations bears witness to a high volume of imports, and to the relative vitality of the city, particularly in commercial terms, between the 5th and 6th c. In this light we understand better the evidence of *Cassiodorus, who extolled the large population and prosperity of the city, a true center in the *Gothic era of political and military power and of *peregrina commercia* (Cassiod., *Var.* VI, 23, 3). The importance of the harbor area is shown by the enlargement of the city wall to the SW, on the occasion of the substantial fortification work undertaken by *Valentinian III in 440; from this time onward, thanks to an effective new defensive arrangement, Naples assumed a role of some importance in the region, as a place of refuge for the surrounding rural population and of villages not protected by walls, and also for exiles, such as Africans, who had come from distant places.

New discoveries in the suburban areas have come from the catacomb of St. Januarius, where there have been excavations in the large underground basilica of the upper level: new frescoes, among which is a depiction of *traditio legis*; a large number of tombs have also been investigated. Of great importance was the finding of a graffito which records structural expansion around the tomb of the martyr Januarius by a certain John, probably to

be identified with the bishop of that name, founder of the basilica of St. Lawrence. In the catacomb of St. Gaudiosus, during restoration of parts of the crypt (*succorpo*) of the 17th-c. church of S. Maria della Sanità (from which at present the catacomb is accessed), an arcosolium has been found with traces of a mosaic depicting a bishop, which interestingly has been identified, albeit hypothetically, with the Nostrianus who, acc. to the *Chronicon episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, is buried in the *ecclesia beati Gaudiosi*, so pointing to a location in that crypt. Finally, some parts of a catacomb found at the end of the 19th c. in *vico Lammatari*, again in the Sanità district, have been reexamined; the catacomb, presently inaccessible, may owe its origin to the nearby presence of the tomb of Bishop Victor, buried acc. to the sources in the basilica of St. Euphemia, perhaps identifiable in the chapel dedicated to the saint also in *vico Lammatari*.

S. D'Aloe, *Catalogo di tutti gli edifici sacri della città di Napoli e suoi sobborghi*: Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane 8 (1883) 111ff., 287ff., 499ff. and 670ff.; B. Capasso, *Topografia della città di Napoli nell'XI secolo*, Naples 1895; A. Bellucci, *Ritrovamenti archeologici nelle catacombe di San Gaudioso e Sant'Eufebio a Napoli*: Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana XI (1934) 79-115; D. Mallardo, *Ricerche di storia e topografia degli antichi cimiteri cristiani di Napoli*, Naples 1936; A. Bellucci, *Il cimitero di S. Gaudioso*, Naples 1942; A. Venditti, *L'architettura dell'Alto Medioevo*, in *Storia di Napoli*, II, 2, Naples 1969, 774ff.; A. Venditti, *Problemi di lettura e interpretazione dell'architettura paleocristiana a Napoli*: Napoli Nobilissima 12/5 (1973) 177-188; R. Di Stefano, *La cattedrale di Napoli. Storia, restauro, scoperte, ritrovamenti*, Naples 1974; U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; R. Farioli, *Gli scavi nell' "insula episcopalis" di Napoli paleocristiana: tentativo di lettura*, in *Atti IX Congr. Int. di Archeol. Crist.*, Rome 1978, 275ff.; Id., *Aggiornamento a E. Bertaux, "L'art dans l'Italie méridionale,"* IV, Rome 1978, 153-162, 189-193; N. Ciavolino, *S. Maria alla Sanità. La chiesa e le catacombe*, Naples 1979; U.M. Fasola, *Le raffigurazioni di defunti e le scene bibliche negli affreschi delle catacombe di S. Gennaro*, in *Parola e spirito. Studi in onore di Settimio Cipriani*, Brescia 1982, 763-776; P. Arthur, *Rapporto preliminare sullo scavo a S. Patrizia, Napoli*: Archeologia Medievale 11 (1984) 315-320; Id., *Naples: Notes on the Economy of a Dark Age City*, in C. Malone - S. Stoddart, *Papers in Italian Archaeology IV: The Cambridge Conference, Part IV, Classical and Medieval Archaeology*, Oxford 1985, 247-258; G. Rassello, *S. Severo fuori le mura*, Naples 1985; Id., *Archeologia urbana a Napoli. Riflessioni sugli ultimi tre anni*: Archeologia Medievale 13 (1986) 515-525; J. Desmuilliez, *Note de topographie napolitaine*: Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome 98 (1986/2) 873-879; U.M. Fasola, *Le tombe privilegiate dei vescovi e dei duchi di Napoli nelle catacombe di San Gennaro*, in *L'inhumation privilégiée du IV^e^ au VIII^e^ siècle en Occident. Actes du colloque* (Créteil, les 16-18 mars 1984), Paris 1986, 205-210; N. Ciavolino, *Nuovi affreschi delle catacombe di San Gennaro*: Campania Sacra 20 (1989) 185-206; A. De Simone, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore in Napoli. Il monumento e l'area, in Neapolis. Atti del XXV convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto, 3-7 ottobre 1985), Taranto 1988, 233-253; A.M. Giuntella, *Napoli*, in P. Testini - G. Cantino Wataghin - L. Pani Ermini, *La cattedrale in Italia*, in *Actes du XI^e^ Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste, 21-28 septembre 1986), Vatican City 1989, I, 95-97; P. Arthur, *Naples: A Case of Urban Survival in the Early Middle Ages?*: Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome - Moyen Âge 103/2 (1991) 759-784; G. Liccardo, *Le presenze archeologiche: dai complessi ellenistici a quelli altomedievali*, in *Il borgo dei Vergini. Storia e struttura di un ambito urbano*, ed. A. Buccaro, Naples 1991, 93-102; L. Trapanese, *S. Severo a Capodimonte, un importante polo religioso nel cuore del borgo*, ibid., 275-279; G. Bertelli, *Affreschi altomedievali delle catacombe di S. Gennaro a Napoli. Note preliminari*: Bessarione 9 (1992) 119-139; F. Bologna, *Momenti della cultura figurativa nella Campania medievale*, in *Storia e civiltà della Campania. Il Medioevo*, Naples 1992, 171-275, esp. 178-192; G. Liccardo, *Lineamenti di epigrafia cristiana napoletana*: RivAC 68 (1992) 259-270; F. Luzzati Laganà, *Società e potere nella Napoli protobizantina attraverso l'epistolario di Gregorio Magno*: Bullettino della Badia di Grottaferrata n.s. 46 (1992) 101-136; P. Arthur, *Il complesso archeologico di Carminiello ai Mannesi, Napoli. Scavi 1983-1984*, Galatina 1994; G. La Posta, *Neapolis. Storia di Napoli e del meridione d'Italia. Periodo greco, romano e bizantino. Dalle origini al 1140*, Naples 1994; F. Bisconti, *Il restauro della cripta dei vescovi nelle catacombe napoletane di S. Gennaro*, in *Atti del II Colloquio dell'Associazione italiana per lo studio e la conservazione del mosaico* (Rome, 5-7 Dec 1994), Bordighera 1995, 311-320; M. Esposito, *Resti di un pavimento in opus sectile recentemente scoperti nella basilica di San Giovanni Maggiore in Napoli*, ibid., 31-38; C. Scarpati - F. Fratta - D. Giampaola, Neapolis. *Le mura e la città. Indagini a S. Domenico Maggiore e a S. Marcellino*: Annali. Sezione di archeologia e storia antica 3 (1996) 115-138; M. Schmauder, *Das sogenannte Cubiculum des hl. Nostrianus in der Gaudiosus-Katakombe. Zur spätantiken Malerei in Neapel*: JbAC 39 (1996) 225-262; F. Bisconti, *Imprese musive paleocristiane negli edifici di culto dell'Italia meridionale: documenti e monumenti dell'area campana*, in *Atti del IV Colloquio dell'Associazione italiana per lo studio e la conservazione del mosaico* (Palermo, 9-13 Dec 1996), Ravenna 1997, 637-643; L. De Maria, *Coperture musive delle tombe pavimentali al S. Gennaro di Napoli*, ibid., 637-644; F. Bisconti, *L'evoluzione delle strutture iconografiche alle soglie del VI secolo in Occidente. Il ruolo delle decorazioni pittoriche e musive nelle catacombe romane e napoletane*, in *Radovi XIII. Medunarodnog kongresa za starokrščansku arheologiju. Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae* (Split - Poreć 25.9.94–1.10.94), Split 1998, 2, 253-282; J. Desmulliez, *Le dossier du groupe épiscopal de Naples. État actuel des recherches*: Antiquité Tardive 6 (1998) 345-354; P. Novara, *Sectilia parietali dalle catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte (Napoli)*: RivAC 74 (1998) 149-162; A. Bellucci, *Le catacombe di Sant'Eufebio presso il convento cappuccino di Napoli*, ed. F. Mastroianni (Quaderni storici dei Cappuccini di Napoli, 4), Naples 2001; F. Bisconti, *Mosaici nel cimitero di S. Gaudioso: revisione iconografica ed approfondimenti iconologici*, in *Atti del VII Colloquio dell'Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico*, Ravenna 2001, 87-98; D. De Francesco, *Il battistero del vescovo Paolo II nella catacomba di S. Gennaro a Napoli: un caso di dualismo episcopale*, in *Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist.* (Genoa-Sarzana-Albenga-Finale Ligure-Ventimiglia, 21-26 Sep 1998), Bordighera 2001, 1057-1076; C. Martorelli, *L'architettura dei battisteri di Napoli, Capua e Marcellianum*, ibid., 1041-1046; P. Arthur, *Naples, from Roman Town to City-State: An Archaeological Perspective*, Rome 2002; K. Gandolfi, *Les mosaïques du baptistère de Naples: programme iconographique et liturgie*, in *Il Duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all'età angioina*. Atti della I giornata di studio su Napoli (Losanna, Nov 2000), ed. di S. Romano - N. Bock, Naples 2002, 21-34; D. Giampaola et al.,

Napoli. Indagini archeologiche nel centro storico di Napoli: Bollettino di Archeologia 39-40 (1996, May-Aug), 2002, 84-124; N. Ciavolino, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana dal 1983 al 1993 in Campania*, in *1983-1993*: *dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia*. Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeol. Crist. (Cassino, 20-24 Sep 1993), ed. E. Russo, Rome 2003, 615-666; M. Amodio, *Mosaici paleocristiani dalla basilica di San Lorenzo Maggiore a Napoli*: Napoli Nobilissima 5/5 (2004) 3-20; M. Amodio, *Storia degli studi di archeologia cristiana a Napoli dal '600 ad oggi*, in *Roma, la Campania e l'Oriente cristiano antico. Giubileo 2000*. Atti del Convegno di Studi (Napoli, 9-11 Oct 2000), ed. L. Cirillo - G. Rinaldi, Naples 2004, 229-253; F. Bisconti, *Testimonianze archeologiche delle origini cristiane nel napoletano. Le Catacombe di S. Gennaro*, ibid., 212-228; D. Giampaola, *Dagli studi di Bartolommeo Capasso agli scavi della Metropolitana: ricerche sulle mura di Napoli e sull'evoluzione del paesaggio costiero*: Napoli Nobilissima 5/5 (2004) 35-56.

L. Pani Ermini - M. Amodio - L. Spera

NARBONNE

I. Origins of Christianity - II. Visigoth (462–719) and Arab (719–759) eras.

Narbo Martius was the first Roman colony of *Gaul (118 BC), established by Domitius Ahenobarbus. In 46 BC veterans of the 10th legion Decumana (the favorite of Caesar) were brought here, under the direction of Tiberius Claudius Nero. Capital of the Narbonese province, which extended from the Alps to the Pyrenees, situated at the crossroads of the Aquitaine Road with the Via Domitia, which from the Rhone continued to *Spain, the city had an active port, from which commercial sea traffic left for the East, Sicily and *Rome; at Ostia the *navicularii* of Narbonne had their own free port. There is nothing preserved of the ancient monuments, other than a few inscriptions, but the city had a forum, a theater, a *horreum*, baths, an amphitheater and capitol, all mentioned by *Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carme* 23, vv. 39-44 and 145-146). In the 3rd c. the barbarian threat in the Rhone moved the political center of gravity, and in the 4th c. the administrative provincial center, toward the Rhone and the N, with the administrative reforms of the end of the century signaling the eclipse of Narbonne, reducing its provincial territory to Narbonese I, with Narbonne, Toulouse, Béziers, Nîmes and Lodève as its principal centers. Ecclesiastical organization was modeled on the civil administration.

I. Origins of Christianity. The hypothesis has been advanced that during his journey to Spain St. Paul stopped at Narbonne, but both this journey and stopover are suppositions and indeed equally without foundation.

The first known bishop was called Paul, and he seems actually to have been the first bishop. He was buried *ad Albolas*, on the Via Domitia, where a basilica was built in his name in the middle of the S necropolis. Prudentius (*Perist.* 4, 34), the *Mart. hier.* (22.3; Italian version) and *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 1, 30) all mention him. *Caesarius calls him a disciple of *Trophimus of Arles, and Gregory numbers him among the seven missionaries sent from Rome into Gaul in about 250. There is a *Life* (BHL 6589-90) which may date to the 8th c., the era in which the Franks reconquered Narbonne (759); from this work seems to derive the *Passio SS. Dionysii, Rustici et Ekutherii*. Ado of Vienna confuses the saint with Sergius Paulus of Acts (13:7-8).

We know nothing of the church of Narbonne in the 4th c. Its bishop was not present at the Council of *Arles in 314; we do not know for what reason. The history of the 5th c. is, however, well known, on account of the difficult relationship with Arles in the matter of metropolitan rights during the episcopate of Hilary (417–427). At the time of the *Visigoths, during the episcopate of *Rusticus (9 Oct 427–26 Oct 461), numerous church buildings were constructed, as inscriptions show: Rusticus was responsible, along with a priest called Othia, for the erection of the cathedral, the church of St. Felix, built at the N necropolis on the road which leads to Béziers, and the churches of the Minerva and that of nearby Ensérune. Rusticus, perhaps owing to his being from *Marseille, also played a role in the religious life of the province and of the West in general, in connection with the consecration of *Ravennius of Arles, the Council of *Chalcedon, ecclesiastical discipline, and the dispute between Fréjus and Lérins. His successor Hermes, who was first nominated bishop of Béziers but not accepted by the inhabitants of that diocese, was then elected bishop of Narbonne, contrary to the canons. Pope *Hilary (461–468) intervened, accepting his election to Narbonne, but removing for life his authority as metropolitan.

II. Visigoth (462–719) and Arab (719–759) eras. From the end of the 5th c. to the beginning of the 8th c., Narbonese I, with the name of Settimania, was a Visigoth province, under the religious influence of Spain, *Arian until 589, and Catholic subsequently. The archbishops of Narbonne took part (occasionally) in the Councils of *Toledo, used the Visigothic liturgy (the oldest *Liber commicus*, preserved in fragmentary form in the palimpsest *Paris. bat.* 2269, comes from St. Nazarius of Carcassonne, 8th–9th c.), and received from Spain the relics of martyrs (Vincent of Saragossa, Felix of Gerona, *Eulalia of Mérida, Justus and Pastor of Complutum); from Spain also, moreover, came patristic influence and

canonical legislation. During this period missions in the countryside were continued and completed, through the creation of rural parishes.

The archbishops we know of are few: Caprarius, present at the Council of *Agde (506); Migetius, at the Councils of Toledo and Narbonne (589) and of Toledo (597); Sergius, whom we hear of ca. 610; Selva, present at the Councils of Toledo (633, 638); Argebad, mentioned by Julian of Toledo in 673; Sunifred, who was represented at the Councils of Toledo (683, 684) and present at that of 688, addressee of a letter of *Idalius of Barcelona, ca. 689; Daniel (788–789). Nebridius was the first of the bishops of the Carolingian era (799–822): he was in communication with Benedict of Aniane, the duke William of Gellone (Toulouse), and the king, then emperor, Louis the Pius. With him closes the history of the church of ancient Narbonne: the cathedral of Rusticus was destroyed and reconstructed.

DACL 12, 791-878; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, I, Paris 1907, 302-309; E. Griffe, *Histoire religieuse des anciens pays de L'Aude*, vol. 1, Paris 1933; A. Mundó, *El commicus palimpsest Paris. Lat. 2269*, Montserrat 1956, 151-275; H.I. Marrou, *Le dossier épigraphique de l'évêque Rusticus de Narbonne*: RivAC 46 (1970) 331-349; *Province ecclésiastique de Narbonne* (*Narbonensis Prima*), ed. P.-A. Février, Paris 1989, 15-23.

V. Saxer

NARCISSUS of Jerusalem (d. after 212). He succeeded Dolichianus in the see of *Jerusalem between 180 and 192, in the reign of *Commodus (176–192). According to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* V, 12, 1-2) Narcissus was the fifteenth bishop of Jerusalem since *Hadrian (117–138) and the thirtieth since the apostolic age. In 195 he presided (with *Theophilus, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine) over a Palestinian synod, gathered together on order of Pope *Victor (189–199) to debate the age-old problem of the celebration of *Easter. Narcissus agreed with Theophilus and the Alexandrian church on the appropriateness of celebrating Easter only on a Sunday, to the exclusion of every other day: this opposed that of the *Quartodecimans, who claimed to draw on apostolic tradition (*HE* V, 23, 3 and 25). Eusebius records many miracles of Narcissus and his great virtue (*HE* VI, 9). Attacked and defamed, Narcissus abandoned the episcopate and retired to the desert. In Jerusalem he was succeeded by Dius, Germanios and Gordius, after which he returned to the see, sharing the pastoral governance with Alexander of Cappadocia, owing to his now advanced age (*HE* VI, 10). He died sometime after 212. *Epiphanius (*Pan.* II, 2, 66, n. 20: PG 42, 61) dates his death later, to the reign of *Alexander Severus (222–235). Baronius (*Roman Martyrology*, 29 Oct) says that he died at the age of 116. According to tradition he was martyred. The first writer to have introduced him into the Roman Martyrology was Ado, the Frankish bishop of Vienne and hagiographical author, in the 9th c. His contemporary Usuard, the Paris Benedictine, followed this in inserting Narcissus into his own analogous publication.

Tillemont 3, 177-180; AASS, *Oct.* XII, 782-790; *Synax. Constantinop.* 873-874, l. 60; *Comm. Martyr. Rom.* 484, n. 5; *Vies des Saints* 10, 971-973; Eus. *HE* V, 12, 1-2; 22; 23, 3 and 25; VI, 8, 7; 9, 1-8; 10 and 11, 1-3; J. Dubois, *Le martyrologe d'Usuard*: Subsidia Hagiographica 40 (1965) 330; BS 9, 719-721; LTK[3] 7, 638-639 (Th. Baumeister).

M. Spinelli

NARCISSUS of Neronias (d. after 360). Bishop of Neronias (Irenopolis) in Cilicia. Supporter of *Arius from the first, and as such condemned, along with *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Theodotus of Laodicea, at the council held at *Antioch shortly before the Council of *Nicaea (325). At Nicaea he yielded, signing the anti-Arian formula, but immediately afterward he was among the protagonists of the anti-Nicene reaction. He participated in the Councils of Antioch (327) and *Tyre (335) which condemned respectively *Eustathius and *Athanasius. He was part of a Eusebian delegation which met *Constans in *Milan in 342. He participated in the Council of *Serdica and was condemned by the Westerns as Arian. It is not clear if he was present at the Council of *Sirmium of 351 against *Photinus. In 358–359 he contended with *Constantius against the *homoiousion party, in favor of a more moderate pro-Arian theological approach.

DCB 4, 3-4; Fliche-Martin III, passim; Simonetti 593; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, see index; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 197; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996, see index.

M. Simonetti

NARRATIO. In its broad sense, the Latin term *narratio* indicates the *rei gestae expositio*, the *actus narrandi*; in a special, technical sense used in rhetoric, it is the part of a work which follows the *exordium* and prepares the argumentation. Characteristic of the *narratio* are brevity, clarity and verisimilitude (see, e.g., Cic., *Orat.* 124), in other words, functionality.

Quintilian esp. considers it to be of fundamental importance (see *Inst. Or.* IV, 21). Three types of *narratio* may be identified: the first consists in setting out the facts that relate directly to the subject under discussion; the second in an account in the mode of *digressio*, made within the context of the *oratio* and connected to it (in these cases the *narratio* is one of the six parts making up the classical *oratio* acc. to the rules of the *inventio*; see, e.g., *Rhetorica ad Herennium* I, 3, 4; Cic., *Part. orat.* 31-32; *De orat.* II, 326-330); the third type of *narratio*, which has nothing to do with the *causae civiles*, embraces the whole mastery of literary culture: it is the *pars in negotiis posita* which in its turn is divided into *fabula*, *historia*, *argumentum*: these are stages necessary for the pupil who progresses from the outset under the guidance of the *grammaticus* and then under the rhetorician (see *Rhetorica ad Herennium* I, 8, 12; Cic., *De invent.* I, 19, 27). Christian writers often use the term and concept of *narratio* with the literary genre of *historia* in mind, included in the *pars in negotiis posita*: for them the content of *narratio* is sacred history, the *historia salutis*, which—acc. to *Augustine—extends from creation until the present period of the church (cf. *De catechiz. rudibus* 3, 5; 6, 10).

For the rhetorical concept, see K. Barwick, *Die Gliederung der narratio in der rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des antiken Romans*: Hermes 63 (1928) 261-288; H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, I, Munich 1960, 147ff. and passim; R. Barthes, *L'ancienne rhétorique*, Paris 1970. Some remarks on the use of *narratio* by Christian authors in V. Grossi, *Regula veritatis e narratio battesimale in Sant'Ireneo*: Augustinianum 12 (1972) 437-463; P. Siniscalco, *Christum narrare et dilectionem monere. Osservazioni sulla narratio del "De catechizandis rudibus" di S. Agostino*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 605-623; *La narrativa cristiana antica. Codici narrativi, strutture formali e schemi retorici.* Atti del XXIII Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità cristiana (Rome 5-7 Maggio 1994), Rome 1995: the whole volume is useful, but esp. S. Pricoco, *La narrativa cristiana antica*, 7-24 and P. Siniscalco, *La "narratio historica" da Luca ad Eusebio*, 25-38; J. Knape, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. G. Ueding, VI, Darmstadt 2003, cols. 98-106, under *Narratio*.

P. Siniscalco

NARRATIO DE REBUS ARMENIAE (Διήγησις). History of the *Armenian church in its relations with the Byzantine, at the time of the Council of *Nicaea (325) up to the end of the 8th c., prepared in a pro-*Chalcedonian Armenian setting. The work, the original Armenian of which has been lost, exists only in a Greek version which dates from before the 13th c.

G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae. Édition critique et commentaire* (CSCO 132/subs. 4), Louvain 1952; S.P. Cowe, *The Significance of the Persian War (572–591) in the* Narratio de rebus Armeniae: Muséon 104 (1991) 265-276; N. Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne et le grand schism d'Orient*, CSCO 574/subs. 100, Louvain 1999.

S.J. Voicu

NARRATIO DE REBUS PERSICIS (Ἐξήγησις τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν Περσίδι). "A novel with a dogmatic and apologetic purpose" (Bardenhewer), in the form of a debate on the true religion held at the court of the *Sassanid king Arrinatus, to which Christians, pagans, Jews and even a Persian magician contribute. The central role in the debate is played by the official Aphroditianus, chief of the bodyguard, a pagan who is very well disposed toward Christianity. The author of the work presents himself as one of the Christians invited to the discussion. The principal part of the *Narratio* is the first, in which Christianity and Hellenism, or paganism, are discussed.

In this regard it is shown that the pagan gods have borne witness to Christ: among the arguments adduced to illustrate this thesis, Aphroditianus recounts the marvels which occurred at the temple of the goddess Hera, also called Source, in the Persian capital, at the moment of the birth of Christ, culminating in the appearance of a star and a shining diadem above the statue of the goddess. This would be the same star that guided the magi, sent by the king, to Jerusalem. When they found Mary and the child, they returned to Persia with a picture of both Virgin and child. Following this in the *Narratio* we read the accusations against Aphroditianus for his pro-Christian opinions, made by certain "archimandrites" of the king, who nevertheless vindicated Aphrotitianus. Then there is a proof of magic, in which the Persian Oricatus is beaten by the bishop Casteleus; then a dispute with the Jews, in which they are criticized for their incredulity.

The purpose of the whole work is not so much the triumph of Christianity over other religions, as much as proving the thesis that paganism has made a real contribution to the affirmation of Christianity, as shown by the centrality of the figure of Aphroditianus.

This composition, in origin Syrian or Asiatic, is later than the *Christian history* of *Philip of Side (434–439), frequently suggested as its source, and before the defeat of the Sassanids in the 1st half of the 7th c.: its editor, E. Bratke, places it in the 2nd half of the 5th c., but more commonly it is dated to the end of the 6th c. The attribution of the work to the patriarch *Anastasius I of Antioch or to *Anastasius the Sinaite, as attested in certain MSS, does

not seem reliable. One may even doubt if the author was Christian, as he himself does affirm, given his poor knowledge of ecclesiastical institutions and organization: he may be a pagan who wrote in an era when adherents of paganism risked persecution and suppression in the Roman Empire.

CPG 6968; BHG 802-805 g; PG 10, 97-108 (the account of Aphroditianus only); E. Bratke, *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden*, TU 19, n.s. 4, 3, 1899; Bardenhewer 5, 151; U. Monneret de Villard, *Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici*, ST 163, Vatican City 1952, 107-111; E. Honigmann, *Philippus of Side and His Christian History*, in *Patristic Studies* (ST 173), Vatican City 1953, 82-91; Beck 381; Erbetta I, 1, 224.

F. Scorza Barcellona

NARRATIONES DE CAEDE MONACHORUM IN MONTE SINAI. Account of a barbarian incursion in Sinai, drawn up by an anonymous hermit, previously an official at the court of *Theodosius II, with a particular interest in the sacrifice of animals as practiced by the Arabs. Notwithstanding the title of the MS, the author cannot be *Nilus of Ancyra; even if he is a Sinaite monk of the 5th c., what he recounts cannot be considered reliable history.

CPG 6044 (with bibl.); CPG/S BHG 1301-1307; PG 79, 589-693; K. Heussi, *Untersuchungen zu Nilus dem Asketen*, TU 42/2, Leipzig 1917, 123-159; V. Christides, *Once Again the "Narrationes" of Nilus Sinaiticus*: Byzantion 43 (1973) 39-59; F. Conca, *Per una edizione critica di [Nilo], "Narrationes" (PG 79, 589-694)*: Acme 31 (1978) 37-57; F. Conca, *Nilus Ancyranus. Narratio* (BT) Leipzig 1983.

J. Gribomont

NARRATIVES, CHRISTIAN. Christian narrative technique immediately assumed models deriving from ancient stories. There were various types of narrative Christian texts that acquired fictitious elements, esp. the apocryphal *Acts* and the martyrological literature. With respect to the *Life of *Adam and Eve*, only recently has it been discovered that this work is entirely Christian and that it was originally written in Greek at the beginning of the 2nd c. AD. It refashions the story of Genesis, embellishing it in a fictionalized sense and introducing the repentance of the progenitors after their death and their admission into *paradise (see J.R. Levison, *Adam and Eve, Life of*, in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, I, New York 1992, 64-66; subsequent studies are listed in the bibl.). Among the so-called Apostolic Fathers, a narrative structure that can be juxtaposed to the story can be seen in the *Shepherd* of *Hermas, which originated in a Roman context at the beginning of the 2nd c., written in a simple and popular style. Within its framework, it contains five visions, twelve mandates (or precepts) and ten similitudes (or allegories). At the center is the personification of the church as a lady in white garments who appears to Hermas to invite him to repentance with the promise of forgiveness. At first she is a sick elderly woman, but she becomes young again. Hermas is presented as a slave—perhaps also as a metaphor of his conversion—who had a dreary marriage and wicked and apostate children, who drew up charges against their parents; acc. to the Muratorian *Canon, he was the brother of *Pius, bishop of Rome around the year 150, but in his second vision he is a contemporary of *Clement of Rome, toward the end of the 1st c. The work may be a combination of several works, some have thought of several authors. It has an adoptionist or angelic Christology, so as to suggest Jewish Christian tendencies; at times, however, it seems to reveal the preexistence of the Son of God; the dates offered by scholars go back to as far as AD 90 (see, e.g., J.S. Jeffers, *Conflict at Rome*, Minneapolis 1991, 106-120; P. Henne, *L'unité du Pasteur d'Hermas*, Paris 1992; J.C. Wilson, *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas*, Lewiston 1995; C. Osiek's introduction to her English tr., The *Shepherd of Hermas*, 1999, 1-10; *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J. Henderson, II, Cambridge 2003, 161ff.).

But the larger and more homogeneous group of "Christian stories" is without a doubt that of the apocryphal *Acts* of the apostles, as well as some gospels, esp. those containing the stories about *Jesus' childhood. The *Acts of *Peter* and the *Acts of *Paul* seem to have originated, probably within the mid-2nd c., in close connection with each another, and both pay special attention to the preaching of the two *apostles at *Rome. The *Acts of Peter* begin with Peter's arrival to Rome after his departure for *Spain; an important part is made up of the combat with *Simon Magus—acc. to *Irenaeus the founder of the *gnostic heresy, and acc. to *Eusebius of Caesarea all heresies—that culminates in an amazing scene in which Simon flies and Peter, by calling upon *Jesus, causes him to crash to the ground, where he is stoned to death by those standing nearby. The original Greek has survived only in a fragment; the most complete version derives from a reworking of the text in *Latin (*Actus Vercellensis*). The *Acts of Peter* and the *Acts of Paul* end with the martyrdom of the two apostles. The story of *Thecla made up part of the *Acts of Paul* (*Acts of Paul and Thecla*). According to recent scholarship, the story of Thecla was detached from the *Acts of Paul* due to the positive

and important image attributed to the feminine figure and for its *encratite notions. The story is situated during Paul's day at Iconium, where the little girl Thecla is convinced by his preaching of monotheism and chastity and refuses to marry her fiancé, who causes the apostle to be imprisoned. Thecla follows Paul and confronts a series of tests, from which she is saved by providence: when she is about to be burned, it rains; when she is exposed to a lioness, it does not hurt her. Those standing nearby invite her to perform miracles, esp. healings for their sick and dying children; last, Thecla devotes herself to preaching, following the footsteps of the apostle Paul by cutting her hair and dressing as a man and assuming in its entirety the apostolic mission (see R.R. Stoops, *Peter, Acts of,* in Anchor Bible Dict., V, 267-268; P. Sellew, *Paul, Acts of*, ibid., 202-203; V. Burrus, *Chastity as Autonomy*, Lewiston 1987; A. v.d. Hoek - J. Herrmann, *Thecla the Beast Fighter*: StudiaPhilAn 13 [2001] 212-249).

Concerning the *Acts of Paul*, in addition to the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*—which was used by *Manicheans and *Priscillianists, and which falls within the closest stream to the story models—we also have the apocryphal letter of Paul to the Corinthians and the *Martyrdom of Paul*, all writings for which we possess the Greek text. The story of Peter inserted into the ps.-Clementine *Recognitiones* is an ancient part included in a later framework, perhaps of the 4th c., which gives the title to the work inasmuch as it recounts, in ten books, a series of discoveries of the members of *Clement of Rome's family, who had been separated for a long time. Clement narrates his journey into Judea upon receiving notice that the Son of God had manifested himself; his meeting with Peter; his conversion through the work of Barnabas; and his ordination by Peter. This work, therefore, expresses the truths he heard by being present at the preaching of Peter, which constitutes the part of the story called the *Homiliae*, twenty in all, generally considered to have been derived from the Greek *Kerygmata Petrou* of the 2nd c. The battle between Peter and Simon Magnus makes up part of the story (which here seems to represent Paul, in an anti-Pauline function) and, among other things, at least a homily with Jewish Christian theology, bearing the *ebionite stamp, in which Christ is seen more as the greatest prophet than as God (see F.S. Jones, *Clementines, Ps.*, in *Anchor Bible Dict.*, I, 1061-1062; B. Pouderon, *Flavius Clemens et le proto-Clément juif du roman ps.-clémentin*: Apocrypha 7 [1996] 63-79; *Dédoublement et création romanesque dans le roman ps.-clémentin*, in *Les personnages du roman grec*, ed. Id., Lyon 2001, 269-283; *L'énigme Flavius Clemens*: Ktèma 26 [2001] 307-319; Id., *Origène, le Ps.-Clément et la structure des Periodoi Petrou*: Apocrypha 12 (2001) 29-51; *Studi su Clemente Romano*, ed. Ph. Luisier, Rome 2003).

From the *Acts of John*, which were probably composed in *Asia Minor toward the mid-2nd c., the most ancient layers are marked by *docetist and ascetic ideas (chs. 87-105): e.g., this work mentions that Jesus did not cast shadows and seemed to be one age at one time, and another at another time; the Last Supper is replaced by a hymn with dances. With respect to John, the following are narrated: his exemplary life and numerous miracles, which included brining about the obedience of bedbugs (see J. Bremmer, *The Apocryphal Acts of John*, Kampen 1995).

One of the most extensive apostolic stories is the *Acts of Andrew*, the brother of Peter: this work narrates his adventures near the Black Sea, *Scythia and *Thrace. Some scholars have suggested that this work imitates some of the events contained in the *Odyssey*: e.g., *Andrew saves Matthew from imprisonment by the carnivorous giants, an event which recalls the Cyclops (D.R. MacDonald, *Christianizing Homer: "The Odyssey, " Plato, and the "Acts of Andrew,"* New York 1990). In the *Acts of Philip*, he is invited by Jesus to evangelize the lands of the Greeks, with his sister Miriam, who shares with him the apostolic commandment by Christ's wishes. Even here marvelous deeds occur, such as the conversion of a leopard and a kid, which acquire a human meekness and the ability to speak and become worthy of receiving the *Eucharist. The narrative texture is full of adventures; the important one is that in which Philip, incapable of responding to evil with good, curses the Greek idolaters and causes them to sink into an abyss, from which Jesus draws them out, giving them his cross as a ladder. The *Acts* conclude with the martyrdom of the apostle (see F. Amsler, *Les Actes de Philippe*, in *Le mystère apocryphe*, Geneva 1995, 125-140; *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, intr., notes, tr. F. Amsler - F. Bovon - B. Bouvier, Turnhout 1996; *Actes de Philippe*, Id., in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, 1, Paris 1997, 1179-1320; *Acta Philippi*, ed. Id., Turnhout 1999, CC Apocr. 11).

The *Acts of Thomas*, which were composed at *Edessa during the Severian age, perhaps first in *Syriac and then in Greek, probably reveal the marks of the school of *Bardesanes (for documentation on this matter, see I. Ramelli, *Bardesane e la sua scuola tra la cultura occidentale e quella orientale*, in *Pensiero e istituzioni del mondo classico nelle culture del Vicino Oriente*, ed. R.B. Finazzi - A. Valvo, Alessandria 2001, 237-255). The *Acts* narrate the mission of the apostle *Thomas in India, where he

was sent by Jesus, whose twin he was: hence his name "Didymus." There are many adventures narrated in the various areas of N and S India, where Thomas finally died as a martyr. Various authentically Indian elements and historical details such as that of King Gondopharre/Gundaphorus, have been detected in this certainly romanticized narration, which is also characterized by encratite echoes and very ancient liturgical forms; one section seems to be very close to the *Coptic version of the *Book of Thomas* contained in the *Nag Hammadi library. Some texts are striking on account of their antiquity and beauty such as *The Hymn of the Pearl* (crit. ed. with tr. and comm. by P.H. Poirier, Louvain-la-Neuve 1981). (For documentation, see I. Ramelli, *Note sulle origini del Cristianesimo in India*: SCO 47 [2000] 363-378 and *Gli Apostoli in India*, in collaboration with C. Dognini, Milan 2001; H.W. Attridge, *Thomas, Acts of*, in *Anchor Bible Dict.*, VI, 531-534; J.D. Turner, *Thomas the Contender, Book of*, ibid., 529-530). The *Gospel of the Childhood of Thomas*, which narrates the life of *Jesus at Nazareth until he was twelve years old, with accounts centered on his miraculous powers, also has a clear romantic stamp (see P. Mirecki, *Thomas, Infancy Gospel*, in *Anchor Bible Dict.*, 540-544).

The *Gospel of James* has also been fictionalized, a document written before the year 200 and ascribed to James the Less, the brother of Jesus and head of the Christian community of *Jerusalem until 62. It narrates the life of the Madonna and Jesus until the slaughter of the innocents and the death of King *Herod, with many marvelous deeds; it had an influence on the iconographic depictions and the representations of the legends pertaining to *Mary.

In the *Syriac area, we find the *Doctrina Addai*, from the 4th c. and its continuation, the *Acta Maris*, from the 5th–6th c. The *Doctrina* narrates the evangelization of Edessa through the work of Thaddeus-Addai, one of the 70, sent by Thomas, who was one of the Twelve, after the ascension of Jesus; the *Acta Maris* narrate the evangelization of Mesopotamia by *Mari the disciple of *Addai, who departed from Edessa (see the documentation in I. Ramelli, The *First Evangelization of the Mesopotamian Regions in the Syriac Tradition*: Antiguo Oriente 3 [2005] 11-54; Possible Historical Traces in the "*Doctrina Addai*"?: Hugoye 9, 1 [2006] §§ 1-24; *La "Doctrina Addai" e gli "Acta Maris,"* published in AION 65 [2005]; *Gli "Atti di Mari,"* intr., tr. and notes, Brescia 2007).

Even the martyrological literature, which makes up part of the hagiographical literature and began in the 2nd c., can be likened to the narrative-fictional genre, esp. in its most elaborate and late examples. There exist in fact the *Acts* of the martyrs and the ancient *Passiones* and established upon historical data in which the documentary component—even eyewitness accounts are copies of proceedings of the interrogations from the proconsular archives—is much stronger and the narrative development is less emphasized. The *Acta* are heavily focused on the interrogations although the *Passiones* narrate the tortures and the death of the martyrs. Even in this regard, there were not lacking pagan precedents, as in the *exitus virorum illustrium*, e.g., those who flourished through the deaths of the Roman *Stoics who were persecuted during the age of the emperor *Nero or *Domitian, or the *Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs*, discovered on Egyptian *papyri of the 1st–2nd c. AD. The passion of Christ remained an exemplary model for Christians, alongside the martyrdom of *Stephen and that of the Maccabean brothers.

From the mid-2nd c. come the *Martyrdom of St. *Polycarp*, who had been condemned under *Antoninus Pius, as well as the epistolary document the *Acts of the Martyrs of Lyons*, who were put to death under the emperor *Marcus Aurelius. The A*cts of the Martyrdom of St. *Justin* was composed after the year 165, and the *Acts of the *Scillitan Martyrs*, written in Latin unlike the two preceding works, which were written in Greek, dates to after 180. In the 3rd c., the *Acts of the Martyrdom of St. *Cyprian* was written. He was put on trial for the first time in 257, then sent into exile and then put back on trial a year later, then sentenced to death. The report consists of four parts: the *Acts* of the first interrogation, a concise narrative section on the exile and the calling for the second trial, the sentencing to death, and the report of the martyrdom, at which many Christians were present. In these sober documents there are not many fictitious elements, and they are generally considered to be primarily historical. A certain rhetorical elaboration and structuring into topics in the questions of the magistrate and the responses of a martyr seems to make inroads into the *Acts* of the martyrs, deriving from some early and historically valuable sources such as those of *Fructuosus of Tarragona, *Marcellus and *Maximilian.

Very interesting are the Greek and Latin versions of the *Acts of Carpus, Papilus and Agathonice*, who were martyred at Pergamum under Marcus Aurelius. In the original Greek *Acts*, Agathonice turns herself in and is put on trial and sentenced to death immediately. In the Latin text the act of turning herself in is not mentioned, but from the beginning she behaves as if she has already been arrested and then sentenced along with the other two: a modification evidently intended to eliminate the self-oblation, of

which the church had already disapproved in the letter that accompanied the *Martyrdom of *Polycarp*. Even the version that we possess of the *Acts of the Martyr of Apollonius*, a senator who was sentenced before the Senate presided over by the prefect of the Praetorian Tigidius Perennis, seems to have been reworked with respect to what was read by *Eusebius, and it is full of antipagan apologetic arguments.

The Greek text of the *Martyrdom of *Pionius*, a priest of *Smyrna who died under Marcus Aurelius or *Decius, is a broad reworking established upon a nucleus of an autobiographical document during his time in prison. The nucleus of the Latin *Passio *Perpetuae et Felicitatis* is analogous, which has as its basis the written accounts of the same *Vibia Perpetua* and by one of her companions in martyrdom, Saturus, who was in prison: they are full of "stories in the account" because they also recount the visions of both martyrs. An editor, perhaps *Tertullian, united the whole account of the martyrdom within a succinct framework. (See I. Ramelli, *La Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis come dossier storiografico*: RIL 139 [2005]; P. Habermehl, Perpetua und der Ägypter, Berlin ²2004, 238-252 for the narrative technique of the Passio: Perpetua's diary is authentic [267-275], although the narration of the martyr's death is sensationalized [197-237]; further studies are listed in the bibl.)

Although here the historical basis is still strong and the narrative reworking seems limited, in subsequent *Acts* of the martyrs, from the post-Constantinian age, the romanticizing aspects increased as well as the taste for the marvelous and special effects: the magistrates become ever more ferocious and inventors of cruel punishments, while the martyrs become ever more heroic, the miracles more frequent and the rhetoric more evident. Sensationalized texts of this type have transmitted to us the *Passiones* of Sts. *Sebastian, *Lawrence, *Cosmas and Damian, *Lucia, *Agatha, *Agnes and *Cecilia, texts that truly set forth again elements of the Hellenistic adventure story.

R. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*, Minneapolis 1987; Id., *Early Christian Fiction,* in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London-New York 1994, 239-254; Id., *The Ancient Novel Becomes Christian*, in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling, Leiden 1996, 685-711; B. Shaw, *The Passion of Perpetua: Past and Present* 139 (1993) 3-45; J. Perkins, *The Suffering Self: Paul and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*, London-New York 1995; D. Konstan, *Acts of Love: A Narrative Pattern in the Apocryphal Acts*: JECS 6 (1994) 15-36; *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, ed. R. Hock, J. Perkins et al., Atlanta 1998, with various important contributions; J. Bremmer, *The Novel and the Apocryphal Acts*, in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, IX, Groningen 1998; LACL 533-535; J. Pettorelli, *Vie latine d'Adam et d'Ève*: ALMA 57 (1999) 5-52; R. Hock, *Recent Literature on the Greek Novel and Early Christian Literature*: Petronian Society Newsletter 30, 1-2 (April 2000) 9-11; I. Ramelli, *Caritone e la storiografia greca. Il romanzo di Calliroe come romanzo storico antico*: ACME 53 (2000) 43-62; M. De Jonge, *The Christian Origin of the "Life of Adam and Eve, "* in *Pseudepigrapha of the OT as Part of Christian Literature*, Leiden 2003, 184-200; Id. - L.M. White, *The Washing of Adam in the Acherusian Lake*, in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture*, ed. J. Fitzgerald et al., Leiden 2003, 609-637; J. Bremmer, *Perpetua and Her Diary*, in *Märtyrer und Märtyrerakten*, ed. W. Ameling, Stuttgart 2002, 77-120; Id., *The Vision of Saturus in the "Passio Perpetuae, "* in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome*, ed. F. García Martínez - G. Luttikhuizen, Leiden 2003, 55-73; Id., *The Motivation of Martyrs: Perpetua and the Palestinians,* in *Religion im kulturellen Diskurs*, ed. B. Lucchesi - K. von Stuckrad, Berlin 2004, 535-554; F. Graf, *The Bridge and the Ladder: Narrow Passages in Late Antique Visions*, in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religion*, ed. R.S. Boustan - A.Y. Reed, Cambridge 2004, 19-33; K. Waldner, *Zur narrativen Technik der Körperdarstellung im "Martyrium Polycarpi" und der "Passio Ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis, "* in *Die Christen und der Körper*, ed. B. Fichtinger - H. Seng, Munich 2004, 29-74; F. Bovon, *Studies in Early Christianity*, Tübingen 2005, c. 1: *The Apostolic Memories in Ancient Christianity*; H. Rhee, *Early Christian Literature: Christ and Culture in the II and III Centuries*, London 2005; R.D. Butler, *The New Prophecy and "New Visions": Evidence of Montanism in the "Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas, "* Washington, D.C. 2006.

I. Ramelli

NARSAI (Narses) (399–502). Narsai, called the "Leper," is the theologian par excellence of the *Nestorian church and the founder of the *school of *Nisibis. Born in 399 in a village NE of Mosul, he showed a marked intellectual precocity. Constrained to flee a persecution of the Zoroastrians and orphaned, he was brought up in a monastery of which his uncle was the *abbot. He went after this to the school of *Edessa, where he studied for ten years. His uncle tried more than once to keep him in the monastery, in order to make him his successor, but Narsai's love for teaching spurred him to return to Edessa, in ca. 435. At the death of Qiyore (Cyrus), director of the school, Narsai was unanimously elected his successor (437). He held this position for twenty years, during which he undertook to spread the doctrine of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, and became friends with *Ibas, bishop of Edessa. At the death of Ibas in 457 his successor, Nonnus, banished Narsai on account of his adherence to Nestorianism; suspected of having had interactions with the enemy (the Persians), he was condemned, again by Nonnus, to be burned alive. Narsai fled Edessa, and acceding to the pressure of *Barsauma, metropolitan of Nisibis, he founded the school of Nisibis, which he directed from 471, and which took the place of the school of Edessa, which closed in 489. He died in 502, at the age of 103.

Narsai's literary work falls into three categories: *exegesis, *preaching and *liturgy. The authenticity of the exegetical works has been cast into doubt as a result, above all, of the silence about them in exegetes from the following period, and of the lacunae of the MS tradition, which is not earlier than the 13th c. The same problem exists for the liturgical works, which are also attributed to other authors, such as *Ephrem and *Balai.

On the other hand, there are 82 (or 84) homilies in verse (*mēmrē*), certainly authentic, of which only half have been published. These homilies, written in verses of twelve syllables, are on subjects liturgical, theological, exegetical and moral. Narsai's theology is not original: it is that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was his true master. There is also the influence, albeit to a lesser degree, of *Theophilus of Antioch, which without doubt came through *Aphrahat, and in a lesser measure, that of Ephrem. The originality of Narsai consists in having "fixed, as a true exegete and theologian . . . a whole tradition in all its parts, which continue right up to the rebirth of Nestorian exegesis of the 9th or 10th c." (P. Gignoux, PO 34, 515).

It is not without value, following in the line of P. Gignoux, to remember the influence that Narsai was able to have on "an authentic representative of Nestorian exegesis, the famous traveler *Cosmas Indicopleustes" (ibid., 510). It is certain that Cosmas depended in the first place on Theodore of Mopsuestia, and on Mar *Aba, catholicos of Persia, but, considering that certain of his ideas are simplified versions of the complex theology of Theodore, we may ask ourselves if in this work of simplification Cosmas did not rely on certain passages of the works of Narsai. This could apply, e.g., to the analogies used to clarify the doctrine of the *Trinity, the mystery of the generation of the Son, the cosmic functions of the angels, etc. (see ibid., 511-513).

A. Mingana, *Narsai Doctoris Syri Homiliae* et *Carmina*, 2 vols., Mosul 1905; P. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsai sur la création*, PO 34, 419-716 (with Fr. tr.); F.G. McLeod, *Narsai's Metrical Homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension*: PO 40, 1-193 (with Eng. tr.); Ortiz de Urbina 115-118; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*: CSCO 266, Subsidia, 26, 57-65; DSp 11, 40-41; F.G. McLeod, *Man as the Image of God: Its Meanings and Theological Significance in Narsai*: ThS 42 (1981) 458-467; J. Frishman, *The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy, An Edition, Translation and Study of 6 Homilies by Narsai*, Leiden 1992; C. Molenberg, *Narsai's* Memra *on the Reproof of Eve's Daughters and "Tricks and Devices" They Perform*: Muséon 106 (1993) 65-87 (Eng. tr.).

R. Lavenant

NARSES (490–574). Byzantine general. Of Armenian extraction, a eunuch, he became grand chamberlain and minister of the treasury at the court of *Justinian, thanks to the intercession of the empress *Theodora. He participated actively in the repression of the Revolt of Nika (532); he was responsible for its failure. Justinian sent Narses to join Belisarius during the war in *Italy against the *Goths. In 552 he assumed command of the troops in *Belisarius's place, and guided the Byzantines to victory, defeating first *Totila at Gauldo Tadino (552) and then, definitively, Teias at Mons Lactarius (553). With the title of *patricius* he was of importance in the administrative reorganization of Italy, convulsed by the Greek-Gothic war, and for the whole of the following period most civil and military powers were vested in his hands. His presence was also felt in the ecclesiastical sphere, in which he often adapted his policies acc. to the will of the pope. In disagreement with the emperor *Justin II (565–578), Narses was probably removed from office, and passed the last years of his life in *Rome.

LMA 6, 1029; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, Storia di Rome IX, Bologna 1941, 182-224; Z.V. Udalcova, *La campagne de Narsès et l'écrasement de Totila*: CCAB 18 (1971) 557-564; F. Trisoglio, *Procopio dinanzi a Belisario e a Narsete*: Rivista di Studi Classici 27 (1979) 96-136; T.C. Lounghis, *Narsetis memoria*: JOEByz 32/2 (1982) 347-353; T.S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers. Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554–800*, London 1984; A. Guillou - F. Burgarella, *L'Italia bizantina. Dall'esarcato di Ravenna al tema di Sicilia*, Turin 1988; M. Padoan - F. Borella, *Busta Gallorum: la battaglia tra Totila e Narsete del 552 d.C.: i cronisti, l'ambiente, la vicenda*, 2 vols., Mestre-Venezia 2002.

G. Pilara

NATALIUS (2nd–3rd c.). We know him only from *Eusebius of Caesarea, who includes extracts of an anonymous work of the 3rd c. against the *adoptionists (*HE* 5, 28, 8-12). Persuaded by *Asclepiodotus and *Theodotus the banker, disciples of the adoptionist *Theodotus the tanner (in *Rome at the end of 2nd c.), Natalius, who was a *confessor* under persecution (perhaps in 202–203) and therefore enjoyed some prestige, accepted ordination as bishop at *Rome for the adoptionist community and receive a monthly stipend (the first case known of a cleric receiving a salary, something which happened also among the *Montanists). Subsequently repentant, he presented himself to the bishop of Rome *Zephyrinus (d. 217), who reaccepted him to ecclesial communion, but as a layman. The episode is very important for the question of penitential discipline, in that it indicates that even the sin of heresy

was forgiven in the Roman church at the beginning of the 3rd c.

A. D'Alès, *L'édit de Calliste*, Paris 1914, 124-125; P. Galtier, *Aux origines du sacrement de la pénitence*, Rome 1951, 152-153; P. Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis 2003, 344-348; EPapi I, 234.

A. Di Berardino

NATIVITY (apocryphal accounts of). There are quite a large number of apocryphal works called "gospels of the Nativity." To this group belong those works regarding the birth and childhood of Mary, her marriage to Joseph, the birth of the Lord (journey to Bethlehem, birth, episode with the shepherds, meeting with the magi), the circumcision, Massacre of the Innocents, flight into Egypt, return to Nazareth and the infancy of the Lord.

The first group of apocryphal works refers to the parents of Mary, the miraculous conception of Anne, her sanctity, her visit to the temple, the wedding of Mary and Joseph, the annunciation, the perturbation of Joseph and the journey to Bethlehem. The first of these is the **Protevangelium of James* (2nd c.), composed in Greek, the most ancient and important; the other texts, generally, depend on it directly or indirectly; these are the Latin texts, the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* and *The Nativity of Mary*, the Arabic and *Georgian gospels and many other Eastern texts. Works which speak of the annunciation are, among others, the *Sibylline Oracles* (bk. VIII), the *Pistis Sophia* (63, 3), the *Epistula Apostolorum* (14, 25), the Qur'an (3, 42) and the Islamic *Gospel of Barnabas*. From these apocryphal works derive the feasts of Joachim and Anne, the Birth of Mary, the Presentation in the Temple (21 Nov) and the Conception of Anne in the Greek Church.

All the apocryphal gospels speak of the events regarding the birth of Christ, but with different emphases. Only a few speak of the journey to Bethlehem, and some develop the episode of the midwife—brief in the *Protevangelium*, longer in the *Latin* **Book on the Infancy* (*Book of the Birth of the Savior, and of Mary, and of the Midwife*). In the same work we find the episode of the shepherds; that of the magi is found in the *Syriac *Story of the Magi*, in the Georgian and *Armenian gospels, and also in the Eastern legend reported in the **Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, a fragment in the Uyghur language, in the text of Longinus and in the *Cave of Treasures* (preserved in Syriac and Arabic). Marco Polo gave expression to this legend, as did certain Eastern geographers and historians. The Massacre of the Innocents is generally only mentioned, while some texts speak of the death of Zechariah (mentioned for the first time in the *Protevangelium*, then in the *Pistis Sophia* [7], Georgian gospel, Armenian gospel). In the Arabic gospel of John an expanded account of the purification of Mary is given: the author recounts the story of Simeon and Anna. The flight into Egypt is briefly mentioned in the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, an apocryphal work of the early Middle Ages (6th c.), while a long description is to be found in the Armenian and Arabic gospels, the source in the *Coptic world of many legends on the visit of the Holy Family to Egypt, giving rise to numerous Marian shrines in Egypt.

The infancy of Jesus and his peculiar miracles are recounted in the *Infancy of the Lord* (*Paidika tou Kyriou*, improperly called the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*), probably of the 2nd–3rd c., very popular and translated into all the languages of Christian antiquity, inserted also into the Armenian gospel; various *gnostics made use of it; certain allusions to events in this gospel we find in *Justin Martyr and then in the Qur'an.

All these texts of infancy gospels have had a great influence on Christian culture, literature and particularly on Christian iconography.

For a list of the apocryphal texts on the Nativity see CANT 50-60; tr. of a selection of these texts may be found in all the series of tr. of the apocryphal works—Elliott, Santos Otero, Moraldi (vol. 1); Erbetta (vol. 1, 1-2); Craveri; Schneemelcher (vol. 1), Starowieyski (vol. 1, 1)—and in numerous separate publications, e.g., A. di Nola, *Vangeli apocrifi. Natività e infanzia*, Parma 1986.

M. Starowieyski

NATIVITY (iconography). In the earlierst depictions of the Nativity, the majesty of the newborn, rather than his poverty, is emphasized (Testini, *Giuseppe*, 313f.). In the 1st half of the 4th c., in the atmosphere of triumph created by the peace of the church, the oldest scenes illustrating OT prophecies in their relation to the Messiah's birth of the Virgin—scenes thus only indirectly alluding to the incarnation—gave way to realistic representations of the Nativity, glorifying the *incarnation of the Logos, underlining the reality of his earthly mission, and showing the announcement of his advent to the shepherds, i.e., to the Jewish people.

Developed very probably in the workshops of marble workers—the oldest example is found on a *sarcophagus of 343 (Ws II, 182-183, fig. 175-176)—the fixed elements of Nativity scenes, apart from the child in swaddling clothes in the manger, were the ox and the ass mentioned in the prophecy of Isaiah (1:3)

and Habakkuk (3:2), and then by the fathers of the church (Ambr., *In Lucam* 2, 7: PL 15, 2649; Prud., *Cathemerinon* XI, 78: PL 59, 896). While the ox and the ass are present in almost all the paleo-Christian depictions of the Nativity, Mary and above all Joseph in fact appear less frequently. Sometimes they are both missing, e.g., in a fresco of the hypogeum of S. Maria in Stelle of Verona, of the end of the 4th c. (Testini, *Giuseppe*, 314) and on the cover of the sarcophagus of St. *Ambrose in Milan, from the same period (Ws, pl. 189, 2). On the other hand, the presence only of the ox and the ass at the feet of the Virgin on the sarcophagus of St. *Trophimus of Arles, of the mid-4th c., indicates a condensed depiction of the Nativity scene and its fusion with that of the adoration of the *magi (Ws, pl. 242, 1). More commonly, and particularly in sarcophagi of the 4th c., along with Mary and Joseph one or more shepherds appear, poorly clothed and with a *baculus* in hand or otherwise a work tool (Ws, pl. 243, 6), in the act of venerating the child or of pointing to the star. In old representations, Mary is seen sitting next to the manger (see, e.g., Ws, pls. 198, 1; 201, 5; 226, 1; 249, 11); from the 6th c. she is more commonly extended on a coach, a position perhaps intending to underline the fact that Christ has truly taken on our humanity, and to make the suffering of the Virgin more evident (see, e.g., Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, n. 169, pl. 54). In older compositions—i.e., from the 10th c.—Mary appears bent over the crib (see illumination in the *Codex Egberti*, of ca. 980: Knaus, *Miniaturen*, pl. 12). Joseph, on the other hand, who appears in the Nativity scenes only from the 1st half of the 5th c., is generally shown sitting (e.g., Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, nn. 118, 119, pls. 36, 37: only example with a saw in his hand), more rarely standing next to the child (e.g., in a panel of the *cathedra* of Maximian in Ravenna): Cecchelli, *Cattedra*, 160, pl. 25; and in an illumination of f. 4b of the *Syriac Evangeliary of Rabbula: Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, 54ff.). For setting the scene, ancient Western depictions placed the crib under a shelter or canopy; in the Eastern, however, it usually appears in the open or in a grotto.

RBK 2, 637ff.; LCT 2, 86-120; F.X. Kraus, *Die Miniaturen des Codex Egberti*, Freiburg i.Br. 1884; M. Schmid, *Die Darstellung der Geburt Christi in der bildenden Kunst*, Stuttgart 1890; F. Noak, *Die Geburt Christi in der bildenden Kunst bis zur Renaissance*, Darmstadt 1894; E.B. Smith, *Early Christian Iconography and a School of Ivory Carvers in Provence*, Princeton, NJ 1918, 13ff.; H. Cornell, *The Iconography of the Nativity of Christ*, Uppsala 1924; C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avorii romano-orientali*, Rome 1936; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten des Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952; L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, II, 2, Paris 1958, 752ff.; C. Cecchelli - G. Forlani - M. Salmi, *The Rabbula Gospels*, Olten-Lausanne 1959; G.A. Wellen, *Theotokos. Eine ikonographische Abhandlung über das Gottesmutterbild in früchristlicher Zeit*, Utrecht-Antwerpen 1961, 20ff., 49ff.; G. Ristow, *Die Geburt Christi in der frühchristlichen und byzantinisch-ostkirchlichen Kunst*, Recklinghausen 1963; P. Testini, *Alle origini dell'iconografia di Giuseppe di Nazareth*: RivAC 48 (1972) esp. 273-74, 313ff.; B. Bagatti, *La "luce" nell'iconografia della Natività*: SBF 30 (1980) 233-250; C. Conidi, *L'arcosolio del presepe nel cimitero di San Sebastiano. A proposito di una pittura recentemente restaurata*: RivAC 73 (1997) 85-93; U. Utro, *Come fiore dal germoglio di Iesse. La prima iconografia del Natale*: Ecclesia 20 (1998) 8-14; Marienlexikon 2, 598-602; C. Conidi: TIP 225-228.

M. Marinone

NATIVITY, Feast of the. Similarly to other comparable feasts (6 or 10 Jan, 18 Nov, 28 March), in *Rome the tradition developed of keeping the feast of Christmas on 25 Dec; this dates to ca. 336, though it is mentioned for the first time in the *Chronography of 354. The Roman calendar indicates for 25 Dec, day of the rebirth of the sun after the winter solstice, the birth of Mithras and public games in honor of the *Sol Invictus*, the cult of which the emperor *Aurelian had introduced at Rome in 257. This apologetic context—Christ as the true *Sol iustitiae* (Mal 3:20)—was behind the introduction of the feast of Christmas in the ecclesiastical Roman calendar. Further, chronological reasons relating to the other dates of the life of Christ (e.g., the Annunciation, 25 March) may have played a certain role. In 380 the feast was introduced in *Constantinople, in 432 in *Alexandria, and in 439 to *Jerusalem, where it did not become established, however, until the *Justinian era. There are numerous Christmas homilies in Latin and Greek, beginning with that of ps.-*Optatus of Milevis (CPL 245). The oldest liturgical formulas may be found in the *Sacramentarium Veronese*. From the time of *Gregory the Great we find the characteristic triplicate Christmas Masses (*Hom. ev.* 8), then celebrated in S. Maria Maggiore, St. Anastasia and St. Peter's (J.P. Kirsch, *Die Stationskirchen des Missale Romanum*, Freiburg 1926, 236-239).

CPG 5, 157-158 (sermons); LTK[3] 10, 1017-1023; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* 2, Milan [3]1969, 48-120; H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 1, Regensburg 1983, 165-176; S.K. Roll, *Toward the Origins of Christmas*, Kampen 1995; H. Förster, *Die Feier der Geburt Christi in der Alten Kirche. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Anfänge des Epiphanie- und des Weihnachtsfests*, Tübingen 2000; M. Wallraff, *Christus Verus Sol*, Münster 2001, 174-195.

S. Heid

NATIVITY of MARY (apocryphal accounts of). There exist three apocryphal works under this title: (1) a *gnostic gospel under the name of *Genna Ma-*

rias (*De generatione M.*), of the 2nd c., cited by *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26, 12, 1-4); (2) the **Protevangelium of James*, the true title of which is *Genesis Marias*; (3) a medieval apocryphal work, *Liber de nativitate Mariae*, a brief Latin text in nine chapters, linked to the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*. The author speaks of the birth of Mary and of her life up to the birth of Jesus, reworking the material of the *Protevangelium of James*. The author is a theologian and a writer; his Latin is elegant. The book was composed in the 9th c. by Paschasius Radbertus, or in his circle, and was very popular in the Middle Ages, particularly amongst Dominicans; it figures in their lectionary. It influenced the *Legenda Aurea* and was translated in the 12th c. into Old French.

CANT 52; BHL 53-43; ed. R. Beyers, CCAp 10, 1997 (with Fr. tr.). Ital. tr. - Erbetta 1, 2, 71-77; Moraldi 1, 147-156; Craveri 215-226; Fr. EApC 143-161; Polish: Starowieyski 1, 331-341; L. Scheffczyk, *Das Mariengeheimnis in Frömmigkeit und Lehre der Karolingenzeit*, Leipzig 1959, 152-165; 250-251.

NAUCRATIUS (ca. 320–ca. 356). Eldest of *Basil of Caesarea's three younger brothers. Before Basil finished his studies in Athens, Naucratius retired to a family property, in Annisa, with his mother and sister, and sacrificed his worldly career to embrace the ascetic life (see *Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of St. Macrina*). We know that hunting and fishing played a notable role in this life, in the company of the domestic staff who had become his companions, from the fact that he died in an accident resulting from these activities.

M.M. Hauser - Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, Bonn 1960, 125-126.

J. Gribomont

NAVIGIUS (4th c.). Brother of *Augustine of Hippo and son of *Patricius and *Monica, native of *Thagaste in Africa. He was of delicate health (Aug., *De beata vita* 2, 14). Present at the house of Verecundus at Cassiciacum, he was one of the interlocutors of the dialogues *Contra Academicos* (I, 2, 5-6), *De beata vita* (1, 6; 1, 7; 2, 14) and *De ordine* (I, 2, 5). He was present at the death of Monica at Ostia in 387 (*Confess.* IX, 11, 17). It seems certain that he had sisters who were consecrated religious (Possid., *Vita Aug.* 26, 1). We do not know if Patricius, cleric of the church of Hippo, and his brother, cleric of Bishop *Severus of Milevis, were his sons (Aug., *Serm.* 356, 3: PL 39, 1575).

W.H.C. Frend, *The Family of Augustine: A Microcosm of Religious Change in North Africa*, in *Atti del Congresso Intern. su s. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione*, Rome 1987, 1, 135-151.

A. Di Berardino

NAZARENES (Nazoreans). A Jewish-Christian sect mentioned for the first time by Epiphanius (*Pan.* 29). *Epiphanius of Salamis and *Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 3) agree that its members lived in Beroea. The first held that they were descended from the Christians of Jerusalem who had fled, after the fall of the city (AD 70), to Pella (Eus., *HE* III, 5, 2-3). They spoke Aramaic and possessed a gospel written originally in Aramaic which was presumably known to Jerome (*Ep.* 112, 13 and other passages). According to Epiphanius, the Nazarenes could be called orthodox, although he did not know if they accepted the virgin birth of Christ. It is obviously this group that was cursed three times a day by Jews (*Pan.* 29, 9, 2; often cited in early Christian literature: see Justin, *Dialog with Trypho*, ch. 16). Jerome perhaps was in contact with several members of the sect, but he gives no precise information of it.

P. Vielhauer, *Judenchristliche Evangelien*, in E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, I, Tübingen 1959, 75-108; A.F.J. Klijn, *Jerome's Quotations from a Nazoraean Interpretation of Isaiah*: RecSR 60 (1972) 241-255; A.F.J. Klijn - G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*: NovTSup 36 (1973) 44-52; H. Räisäsen, *Nokolaiten*: ANRW II/26 (1995) 1602-1644; S.C. Mimouni, *Les nazoréens: recherche étymologique et historique*: RBi 105 (1998) 208-262; Id., *I nazorei a partire dalla notizia 29 del Panarion di Epifanio di Salamina*, in *Verus Israel: nuove prospettive sul giudeocristianesimo*, ed. G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto, Brescia 2001, 120-146; S.C. Mimouni, *Les chrétiens d'origine juive dans l'antiquité*, Paris 2004.

A.F.J. Klijn

NAZARENES (Nazoreans), Gospel of the. "Nazarene" is the appellation given to Jesus and his followers in Mk 1:24; Lk 4:34; Jn 19:19; Acts 3, 6-7; 4, 10. In Acts 24:5 Paul is called "chief of the *hairesis* of the Nazoreans, " and *Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* IV, 8, testifies that the Christians of his era were called Nazarenes by the Jews. According to some, the title comes from Nazareth, to others from the Hebrew *naṣar*, whereby the Jewish-Christian Nazoreans/Nazarenes would be the perfectly observant, or finally from *neṣer*, "shoot, " referring to the shoot of Jesse of Is 11:1; 14:19; 60:21. (This association is found in the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 43a, which mentions Christians in a derisory tone.) Schaeder considers Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος as Greek forms of the

Aramaic *nâṣrâyâ*, indicating Nazareth as a place of origin; Jossa agrees; Brown also admits the relationship with *nazîr*, "nazirite"; Nazoreans or Nazarenes were Jewish Christians in the first age of Christianity, of whom *Epiphanius attests that they recognize Jesus as Messiah but maintain the prescriptions of the law (*Pan.* 29), with *Jerome noting that *dum volunt et Iudaei esse et Christiani, nec Iudaei sunt nec Christiani* (*Ep.* 112)—see R.A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity*, Jerusalem 1988, 122ff.; A. Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphane*, Paris 1992.

Among the various Jewish-Christian groups which were called Nazoreans or Nazirites were the Dosithean disciples of Ado (see J.M. Fiey, *Naṣara*, in *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, VII, Leiden 1993, 970-974 and Mimouni, *Nazoréens*, on the term, also applied to the Mandeans: M. Lidzbarski, *Ginza*, Göttingen 1925, 327). The "heresy of the Dositheans, taught by the beggar Ado, " of *Adiabene, is mentioned at the beginning of the 7th or 8th c. by *Theodore Bar Koni in the *Liber scholiorum*, XI, on the basis of a list of heresies compiled in his times; since he was from Kashkar in Mesene, Theodore could have known them. The Dositheans were followers of one *Dositheus, a *Mandean leader of the same type as Ado. Dûṣtî, probably representing Dositheus and his followers, is in the *Syriac *Acts of Mari* healed, catechized and baptized in the name of Jesus of Nazareth (see C. and F. Jullien, *Les Actes de Mâr-Mâri*, Turnhout 2001, 43-46; Id., *Aux Origines de l'Église de Perse*, Louvain 2003, 31-33; it seems that the Dosteans of Theodore Bar Koni, Mandeans, should be distinguished from the Dositheans [from Dositheus] of the ps.-*Clementines, of *Origen, Epiphanius etc. who were Samaritans, even if both groups were Baptists). In the *Acts of Mari* Jesus is often called the Nazarene, and in the *Acts of the Persian Martyrs* the Zoroastrian persecutors call the Christians Nazarenes; the Christians of India, who are linked to the Jewish-Christian preaching of Bartholomew and Thomas, are called *Nazrani mahâpilla*, "great Nazarene sons": acc. to *Pantaenus, they were in possession of the gospel of *Matthew in the original Aramaic or Hebrew. We learn that *Papias, in the 1st or 2nd c., wrote that Matthew had compiled a summary of the λόγια of the Lord Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ (Eus. *HE* 3, 39, 16); he had also used the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (ibid.) that Eusebius says existed in his own day, which differs from the Greek Matthew (*Theoph.* 155 Mai). *Hegesippus also speaks of a Gospel καθ' Ἑβραίους and one Συριακόν (Eus. *HE* 4, 22, 7). According to Eusebius (*HE* 3, 24, 6), Matthew, having preached to his followers in Aramaic, before leaving Palestine wrote a summary for them of his preaching in his "native tongue." Jerome in his *De viris illustribus*, in the chapter dedicated to Levi-Matthew, and in the preface to his gospel (21), affirms that Matthew, *primus in Iudaea*, published for his followers his gospel *Hebraicis litteris*, subsequently translated into Greek. The Nazarenes considered themselves guardians of the genuine Semitic Matthew, which acc. to Epiphanius (*AH* 29) they preserved with great care, indeed "perfectly" and "as it was at the beginning."

The *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, as far as well can tell from the fragments remaining to us, and which hardly shows itself to contain a "heretical" theology, seems to scholars to be an amplified Aramaic translation of Matthew, probably prepared in *Syria or *Alexandria in ca. 100–160. It is Jerome who tells us most about it, and who knows it well, although he probably mistakenly identifies it with the *Gospel of the Hebrews*—used particularly by the *Ebionites and cited already by *Clement and Origen, and then by Epiphanius—and with the Semitic original of Matthew. With the permission of the Nazarenes of Beroea, who gave him the *describendi facultas* of it, Jerome consulted and transcribed this gospel, which is also to be found in a codex preserved in the library of Caesarea collected by Eusebius. Elsewhere he also says he has translated or consulted this gospel or the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, also quoting variant texts, e.g., in *Vir. ill.* 2 and in the commentary on Mt 22:13; 13:13: *in Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraei*, or in that on Ezek 18:7: *in Evangelio, quod iuxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt*, or again in *ad Ies.*, prol. 18: *iuxta Evangelium quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazaraei*. According to Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 16, *Ignatius of Antioch had drawn on this gospel in the early years of the 2nd c. in his letter to *Polycarp of Smyrna, which we still have. In his opinion, it had been written in Aramaic, but in the Hebrew alphabet, not in Syriac (*adv. Pelag.* III, 2).

A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien*, Leipzig 1911; B. Bagatti, *L'église de la circoncision*, Jerusalem 1964, ch. II; H. Schaeder, *Nazarenos*, in GLNT, VII, Brescia 1971, 843 (cf. TDNT 4, 874–879); L. Moraldi, *Gli apocrifi del NT*, I, Turin 1971, 355-361, 367-369; J. Daniélou, *La teologia del giudeo-cristianesimo*, intro. L. Cirillo, It. tr. Bologna 1974, 79; Erbetta I, 1, 111-116; F. Manns, *Essais sur le judéo-christianisme*, Jerusalem 1977; Id., *Bibliographie du judéo-christianisme*, ibid., 1979; R.E. Brown, *La nascita del Messia secondo Matteo e Luca*, Assisi 1981, 273-278, 286-295 (Eng. orig., *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, New Haven [2]1999); *The Other Gospels*, ed. R. Cameron, Philadelphia 1982, 97-102; A. Klijn, *Das Hebräer- und das Nazoräer-Evangelium*, in ANRW, II 25, 5, Berlin-New York 1988, 3997-4033; *New Testament Apocrypha: Gospels and Related Writings*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, tr. R. McL. Wilson, Louisville, KY 1992, 154-

165; S.C. Mimouni, *Pour une définition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme ancien*: NTS 38 (1992) 161-186; L. Cirillo, *I Vangeli giudeo-cristiani*, in *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana*, I, ed. E. Norelli, Bologna 1993, 275-318; C. Moreschini - E. Norelli, *Storia della letteratura cristiana antica*, I, Brescia 1995, 101-109; S.C. Mimouni, *Les nazoréens*: RBi 105/2 (1998) 208-262; Id., *Le judéo-christianisme ancien*, Paris 1998; Id., *I nazorei a partire dalla notizia 29 del "Panarion" di Epifanio*, in G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto (eds.), *Verus Israel*, Brescia 2001, 120-146; I. Ramelli, *Tommaso*, in *Gli Apostoli in India*, with C. Dognini, Milan 2001, 52ff.; *Il titolo della croce di Gesù*, Rome 2003, [2]2005, 51-97; C. & F. Jullien, *Aux frontières de l'iranité*: *nâṣrâyê et krîstyonê des inscriptions du* mobadi *Kirdîr*: Numen 49 (2002) 282-335; G. Jossa, *Giudei o Cristiani?*, Brescia 2004, 109 and 157-158; I. Ramelli, *Gli Atti di Mar Mari*, Brescia 2007; Id., *Fonti note e meno note sulle origini dei vangeli*: Aevum 81, 1 (2007) 171-185.

I. RAMELLI

NAZARETH. A small town of Galilee, mentioned in the NT as the place of residence of Mary the Mother of Jesus and of Jesus himself after the return from *Egypt. In the Byzantine period it was not a bishopric, because until the 7th c. Christians from Jewish stock were still living there. Excavations on the site of the Annunciation have revealed a first phase of construction, with devotional grottoes, a square baptistery and a martyrium; a second phase with a synagogue-style church oriented toward the venerated grottoes; finally, in the 5th c., an E-facing church with three aisles, the grottoes, still venerated, now on the N side at a lower level. In the Middle Ages a great basilica was erected, 70 meters in length. In the baptismal font, and also under the foundations of the Byzantine church, many graffiti were found, in different languages, which have recorded the visits of the faithful and, at the same time, Marian devotion with invocations to Mary before such devotion became popular after the Council of *Ephesus. Also in the traditional "house of Joseph" there is a similar history of construction.

V. Tzaferis, *Nazareth: Identification and History*, in E. Stern (ed.), *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, 3, 1103; B. Bagatti, *Nazareth: Excavations*: NEAEHL 3, 1103-1105; B. Bagatti, *Gli scavi di Nazaret I*, Jerusalem 1967; Id., *Scavo presso la chiesa di S. Giuseppe a Nazaret*: SBF 21 (1971) 5-32; E. Testa, *Nazaret Giudeo-cristiana*, Jerusalem 1969; G. Krofi, *Auf den Spuren Jesu*, Innsbruck 1973, 110-123; G. Cornfeld, *Archaeology of the Bible: Book by Book*, New York-London 1976.

B. BAGATTI - C. PAPPALARDO

NAZARIUS and CELSUS, martyrs. *Ambrose of Milan, acc. to his biographer *Paulinus, after the death of *Theodosius (395) rediscovered the bodies of the saints Nazarius (10 May) and Celsus (28 July) and transferred the first to the basilica of the Apostles by the Porta Romana (*Vita Ambr.* 32-34), which later took the name of St. Nazarius (Major). The archbishop Landolphus (979–997) also placed the remains of Celsus there. Toward the mid-5th c. a *Passio* was composed, without historical value: it says that Nazarius preached the gospel in *Italy, *Gaul and *Trier. Many Latin and Greek recensions were made of it, which connect the life of the two saints with *Gervasius and Protasius. From the time of Ambrose onward their relics were scattered across the whole empire. The *Synax. Eccl. CP* remembers them with Gervasius and Protasius on 14 Oct, the *Mart. hier.* on 19 June, 28 Jul and 30 Oct; Florus and Usuard also on 12 June. The translation of the relics to Lorsch occurred in 765.

BHL 6039-6050; BHG 1323-1324; BS 9, 780-785; BBKL 6, 517-518; LCI 8, 32; E. Dassmann, *Ambrosius und die Märtyrer*: JbAC 18 (1975) 49-68; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Milano Romana*, Milan 1984, 125-129.

V. SAXER - S. HEID

NEBRIDIUS (d. before 391). Born near *Carthage, *curialis* with the obligation of the *munera*; he had a brother called Victor. Intimate and valued friend of *Augustine of Hippo, but younger than he and perhaps his disciple; both became *Manicheans. From Carthage they left together for *Rome, where they rejoined *Alypius (Aug., *Conf.* 6, 10, 17; 6, 2, 3). They were then together in *Milan, but Nebridius was not attracted by public life (*Conf.* 8, 6, 13); he was assistant to the *grammaticus* Verecundus. He was not present at the discussions at Cassiciacum, when Augustine converted with his friends. However, he contributed in convincing Augustine to reject divination, "for no art existed by which to foretell the future" (*Conf.* 7, 6, 8), and to abandon the doctrine of the Manicheans (*Conf.* 7, 2, 3). Nebridius, having returned to *Africa, converted shortly after Augustine in 388, with his relatives (*Conf.* 9, 3, 6); he led an ascetic life, retiring to his rural properties, but always in a *Neoplatonic and not a monastic spirit. He died before 391. In Africa he continued a close friendship with Augustine, above all through the exchange of letters. Three letters of Nebridius to Augustine remain extant (in the letters of Augustine: 5, 6, 8), but there must have been many more, and nine letters of Augustine to him. In the *Confessions* and in the letters Augustine presents him as a true friend, intellectually gifted, full of goodness and compassion, and moved by great inquisitiveness (*Ep.* 98, 8: *diligentissimus et acerrimus inquisitor*; *Conf.* 9, 4, 6: *inquisitor ardentissimus veritatis*), prudent, but sometimes importunate in asking questions. The letters of Nebridius are brief

but full of questions, which required extensive answers, making Augustine exhort him not to raise fresh queries (*nova quaerere*; *Ep.* 11, 1).

DCB 4, 9-10; PLRE 1, 620 n. 4; PCBE 1, 774-776; J.J. Gavigan, *St. Augustine's Friend Nebridius*: CHR 32 (1946-47) 47-58; G. Folliet, *La correspondance entre Augustin et Nébridius*, in *L'opera letteraria di Agostino tra Cassiciacum e Milano*, Palermo 1987, 191-215; R. Piccolomini (ed.), *Sant'Agostino, Verso la verità. Corrispondenza tra Agostino e Nebridio*, Rome 1990; G. Catapano, *Il concetto di filosofia nei primi scritti di Agostino. Analisi dei passi metafilosofici dal Contra Academicos al De vera religione*, Rome 2001.

A. Di Berardino

NECTARIUS (d. 27 Sep 397). Saint, archbishop of *Constantinople (381–397). Originally from *Tarsus in Cilicia, senator and praetor, present in Constantinople in June 381, when unexpectedly the emperor *Theodosius I proposed him to the bishops gathered together in council (the second ecumenical council) as successor to the outgoing *Gregory of Nazianzus. Although he was still a catechumen, the imperial candidate obtained the support of the council. The formula of faith recited by the newly elected as a profession of baptismal faith became, it would seem, the symbol of Nicaea-Constantinople. The first *Acts* of Nectarius were linked to conciliar decrees (dogmatic definition, letter to the emperor [9 July 381] and synods of the years 382, 383, 384), and they modestly inaugurated, in virtue of can. 3 of the council, a new phase of the Constantinopolitan church toward the full development of the patriarchate. He died 27 Sep 397, the day on which the Byzantine Synaxarium keeps his memory, together with *Flavian of Antioch. In another liturgical commemoration (11 Oct), his name precedes that of four archbishops of Constantinople, among which is *Arsacius, his brother. Apart from some patriarchal acts of his which remain, there is an unpublished *Eulogy* of St. Stephen in an *Armenian version. The homily on the martyr St. *Theodore of Tyre (Amasea) transmitted under his name has been judged spurious.

CPG 4300-4301; PG 39, 1821-1840; Cath. 9, 93-94; BS 9, 831-832; J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom: Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*, London 1995, 104-129.

D. Stiernon

NEFALIUS. An Alexandrian monk of Nubian origin. He played a notable role in the religious life of the years between 482 and 507. He was initially a *monophysite of schismatic tendencies, as *Zacharias Rhetor (*Hist. Eccl.*; *Vit. Sev.*) and other sources testify. We should not regard as reliable the opinion of J. Lebon (*Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909, 33 n. 3; 43, n. 4), which on the basis of a poor interpretation of certain passages of *Evagrius and *Liberatus holds that he was always *Chalcedonian. Nefalius participated in 482 in the revolt of the thirty-thousand monks who, led by Theodore of Antinoe, claimed an explicitly anti-Chalcedonian interpretation of the **Henoticon* of *Zeno, Nefalius being among the most intransigent and obstreperous (Fliche-Martin IV, 362-367). He then moved to *Palestine, where he found support from the patriarch *Elias, and there he was active against the monophysites, who were in the *Gaza area. His intolerance was more based on ecclesiastical politics than doctrinal extremism; thus in 507 we find him the leader of an equally violent campaign against the Severian monophysite monks. In Palestine, for this occasion, he gave a discourse in defense of the two natures and of the Council of Chalcedon: this *apologia* (*Synēgoria*) has been lost. Fragments of it are preserved in the two *Orationes ad Nephalium* (of the first we possess only the end; the second has come to us in full in a *Syriac version) composed, in response, by *Severus of Antioch: Nefalius, who uses patristic arguments, seems to be the source of the original theology of John Grammaticus and a precursor of *Neochalcedonianism, a *Christology aimed at conciliating, with the help of Aristotelian categories, the thought of *Cyril of Alexandria with the Chalcedonian formulations.

CPG 6825; CSCO 119, 1-69 (text); CSCO 120, 1-50 (Fr. tr.); J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909, 118-175; W. Ensslin, *Nephalios*: PWK 16, 2489-2490; Ch. Moeller, *Un représentant de la Christologie néochalcédonienne au début du sixième siècle en Orient: Nephalius d'Alexandrie*: RHE 40 (1944-1945) 73-140; Beck 284-285; S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus*, Bonn 1962, 151-159; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 148-151, 234-240; Grillmeier, II/2, 49-54; Patrologia V, 356-357.

A. Labate

NEMESIANUS and COMPANIONS, martyrs. Nemesianus and his companions, bishops, priests, deacons and laity, were martyrs at the time of the *Valerian persecution. Among them we can distinguish a first group of Numidian martyrs (Cypr., *Ep.* 76-79), of which the marginal notes of the council of 256 identifies Iader of Midili and Litteus of Gemellae as confessors, and Lucius of Theveste (Tebessa, Algeria) a martyr and confessor. Mentioned also are Nemesianus of Thubunae (Tobnae, Tobna, Algeria), Felix of Bagai (Algeria), Felix of Bamacorra, Dativus of Badiae, Lucius of Castra Galbae, Polianus of Mile-

vis and Victor of Octavu. The *Mart. hier.* puts Dativus on 14 March, and Lucius of Theveste on 18 Jan; the *Calendarium Carthaginense* puts Nemesianus 18–23 Dec (not fully legible). The same marginal notes of the council of 256 also name Clarus of Mascula as a confessor and Salvianus of Gazaufala as a martyr. A second group of martyrs was of the Proconsular: Successus of Abbir Germaniciana (Cypr., *Ep.* 80; *Mart. hier.* 18 Jan; council of 256: marginal notes), Faustus of Thimida Regia, Lucius of Membresa, Quietus of Uruk, Saturninus of Thugga, Therapius of Bulla, Ventantius of Thinissa and Victor of Assuras, all named as confessors in the same notes; Peter of Hippo Diarrhytus, Verulus of Rusiccade and Libosus of Vaga are named as martyrs. Paulus of Obba was inserted into the *Mart. hier.* (18 Jan).

BS 9, 798-800; Monceaux 3, 533; V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 16-17, 104-116; Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae* 2, Rome 1982, 713.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

NEMESIUS of Emesa (4th–5th c.). Bishop of *Emesa in *Syria at the end of the 4th c., he composed (into 5th c.) the *De natura hominis*. (It now seems certain that the composition of this work dates to this period and not to the mid-5th c., as E. Zeller and E. Amann argued; see W. Vanhamel: DSp 11, 93.) Important more from a historical and cultural point of view than a theological or dogmatic one (even if the emphasis in ch. 3 on the complete absence of mingling between the divine and human natures in Christ, expressed in the term ἀσυγχύτως, anticipates the formulation of the Council of *Chalcedon; see A. Grillmeier, *Vorbereitung der Formel von Chalkedon*: CGG I, 158-159; S. Lilla: Augustinianum 22 [1982] 553-555; Id., *Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite, Porphyre et Damascius*, in *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Occident et en Orient*, ed. Y. De Andia, Paris 1997, 133-134; W. Vanhamel: DSp 11, 95), the work of Nemesius, as the German *Quellenforschung* above all has shown (see bibl.), uses the most disparate philosophical sources, from those belonging to the *Aristotelian-peripatetic tradition to the *Stoics and *Neoplatonists, from Galen to the *Commentary on Genesis* of *Origen; the *De natura hominis* is important for our knowledge of the *Symmikta Zetemata* of *Porphyry and also, as W. Jaeger has highlighted, of various Posidonian doctrines. The work, the first complete tractate of Christian *anthropology, considers the various questions regarding the nature of the human soul; an account of its content may be found in DSp 11, 94-98.

Editions: CPG 3550; of the Greek text: *Nemesius Emesenus De natura hominis*, ed. C.F. Matthaei, Halae 1802 (= PG 40, 504-817); *Nemesii Emeseni De natura hominis*, ed. M. Morani, Leipzig 1987; of the Latin version of Nicola Alfano, arcbishop of Salerno, d. 1085: C.J. Burkhard, Leipzig 1917; of the Latin version of 1165, dedicated to the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, of Burgundio of Pisa: *Nemésius d'Emèse*, ed. G. Verbeke - J.R. Moncho, Leiden 1975 (Corpus Comm. in Aristotelem Graecorum Supp. 1); *De natura hominis*, ed. M. Morani, Leipzig 1987; It. tr. *La natura dell'uomo*, tr. M. Morani, Salerno 1982.

Studies: Bardenhewer IV, 275-280; PWK Suppl. 7, 562-566; DSp 11, 92-99; A. Gercke, *Eine platonische Quelle des Neoplatonismus*: RhM 41 (1886) 266-291; D. Bender, *Untersuchungen zu Nemesios von Emesa*, Leipzig 1898; B. Domański, *Die Psychologie des Nemesius*, Münster 1900; W. Jaeger, *Nemesios von Emesa. Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios*, Berlin 1914; H.A. Koch, *Quellenforschungen zu Nemesios von Emesa*, Berlin 1921; H. Schöne, *Verschiedenes*: RhM 73 (1920-1924) 154-156; E. Skard, *Nemesiusstudien*, I: SO 15/16 (1936) 23-43; II: SO 17 (1937) 9-25; III: SO 18 (1938) 31-41; E. Dobler, *Nemesios von Emesa und die Psychologie des menschlichen Aktes bei Thomas von Aquin*, Werthenstein 1950; A. Grillmeier, *Vorbereitung der Formel von Chalkedon*: CGG I, 158-159; H. Dörrie, *Porphyrios' Symmikta Zetemata*, Munich 1959; M. Morani, *La versione armena del trattato* Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου *di Nemesio di Emesa*: Memorie Ist. Lombardo di Sc. e Lett. 31/2 (1970) 105-193; Id., *Il manoscritto Chigiano di Nemesio*: RIL 105 (1971) 621-635; Id., *Un commento armeno inedito al "De natura hominis" di Nemesio*: RIL 106 (1972) 407-410; Id., *Contributo per un'edizione critica della versione armena di Nemesio*: MIL 33/3 (1973) 195-235; A. Siclari, *L'antropologia di Nemesio di Emesa*, Padua 1974; M. Morani, *La tradizione manoscritta del "De natura hominis" di Nemesio*, Milan 1981; *Nemesius Emesenus*, in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum. Medieval and Renaissance*, VI, Washington 1986, 31-72; K. Samir, *Les versions arabes de Némésius de Homs*, in *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*, ed. M. Pavan - U. Cozzoli, Rome 1986, 99-151; M. Zonta, *Nemesiana Syriaca: New Fragments from the Missing Syriac Version of the "De natura hominis"*: Journal of Semitic Studies 36 (1991) 223-258; E. Dobler, *Zwei syrische Quellen der theologischen Summa des Thomas von Aquin: Nemesios von Emesa und Johannes von Damaskus: ihr Einfluss auf die anthropologischen Grundlagen der Moraltheologie (S. Th. I-II, qq. 6-17; 22-48)*, Freiburg (CH) 2000; B. Motta, *La mediazione estrema. L'antropologia di Nemesio di Emesa fra neoplatonismo e aristotelismo*, Padua 2004; M. Streck, *Das schönste Gut: der menschliche Wille bei Nemesius von Emesa und Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 2005.

S. Lilla

NEOCAESAREA (Pontus). The city of Neocaesarea (modern Niksar) is found on the W slopes of the *Paryadres Mons*, dominating the valley of the Lycus (Kelkit Çayi), tributary of the River Iris, ca. 50 km (31 mi) from Comana Pontica, and ca. 100 km (62 mi) from the coast of the Black Sea. The region, as a province, changed its borders during the Roman Empire. At first the district of the Pontus Polemoniacus, of which the metropolis was Neocaesarea, belonged to the province of *Galatia; in the time of *Trajan it became part of the province of *Cappado-

cia. With the reform of *Diocletian the Pontus Polemoniacus became a province and Neocaesarea became its capital. Its ancient name was Caberia, and under Pompey (d. 48 BC) it was called Diospolis. At the time of *Nero (AD 54–68) it took the name of Neocaesarea, to indicate a new foundation and beginning; it now boasted an emperor as its founder. In the 3rd c. it was a flourishing city, as coins show, bearing images of its buildings and symbols of games to honor the local divinities; in this period *Gregory Thaumaturgus became its bishop. The evangelization of the city and its territory is to be ascribed to him, even if there were Christians there before, as the first letter of Peter and *Lucian of Samosata (ca. 120–190) attest, the latter stating that "Pontus is full of atheists and Christians" (*Alexander* 25, 38). In the 3rd c. there were *Gothic invasions, and their deportations included Christians. In his *panegyric, *Gregory of Nyssa referred to the construction of the church begun by Gregory and concluded by his successor: it was still there in his time, well resistant to the earthquake. After 314 a council was held in the city at which 17 bishops participated. Other bishops of Neocaesarea are Longinus, Musonius and Dorotheus.

F. Cumont, *Studia Pontica*, II, 1906, 259-273; B. Rémy, *L'évolution administrative de l'Anatolie aux trois premiers siècles de notre ère*, Lyon 1986; S. Mitchel, *Anatolia*, *Land*, *Men*, *and Gods in Asia Minor*, II, *The Rise of the Church*, Oxford 1993 (see index); A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford 1971, 148ff.; R. Lane Fox, *Pagani e cristiani*, Bari-Rome 1991, 580-582; L. Padovese, *La Turchia*, *i luoghi delle origini cristiane*, Casale Monf. 1987, 225-226; ODB 2, 1453-1454; Fedalto I, 68.

A. Di Berardino

NEOCAESAREA, Council of. At Neocaesarea, city of Ponto Polemoniaco, between 314 and 319 a council was held, presided over by *Vitalis of Antioch in the presence of seventeen bishops, of which six came from *Galatia. The council was held, in any case, before the death of Vitalis (319), but, as it did not consider the question of the **lapsi*, the period of persecution must have been some years in the past. The Greek text comes to us through John Scholasticus (V. Benesevič, *Joannis Scholastici Synagoga L titulorum*, Munich 1937), that of the *Latin from *Dionysius Exiguus (A. Strewe, *Die Canonessammlung des Dionysius Exiguus*, Berlin 1931). The council prohibited priests from marrying, the penalty being deposition (can. 1); norms were given with respect to sexual morals; liturgical laws were promulgated. Other canons regarded marriage, in particular subjecting to penance those who contracted second marriages. The instruction of catechumens was regulated. It was clarified that the baptism of a pregnant woman does not convey grace to the fetus. The canons of the Council of Neocaesarea entered into the legal collections of the Eastern church.

Mansi II, col. 539; J.G. Herbst, *Die Synoden von Ancyra und Neucaesarea*: ThQ 3 (1821) 399-447; C. Busioc, *Sinodul local din Neacesarea*, Bucharest 1915; Joannou I, 2, 74-83; Palazzini 3, 175-176; *I canoni dei concili della Chiesa antica*, I, *I concili greci*, ed. A. Di Berardino, Rome 2006, 281-287.

C. Nardi

NEOCHALCEDONIANISM. With this term modern scholars define the form of *Christology which integrated the *Chalcedonian formula (two natures united in one hypostasis) with the **Unus de Trinitate passus est* of the Scythian monks and the twelve Cyrillian anathemas, so as to emphasize the unity of the two natures and thus dampen the hostility of the *monophysites. This theological tendency gained popularity through the effect of the new doctrinal orientation promoted by the politics of Zeno's **Henoticon*, in the 1st half of the 6th c., and was actively favored by *Justinian. Its principal representatives were *Nefalius, *John of Scythopolis, *John of Caesarea, *John Maxentius, *Ephrem of Antioch, Justinian himself and *Leontius of Jerusalem.

M. Richard, *Le Néo-chalcédonisme*: MSR 3 (1946) 156-161; Ch. Moeller, *Le chalcédonisme et le néochalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI[e] siècle*: CGG 1, 637-720; S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus*, Bonn 1962; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 224-285; K.-H. Uthemann, *Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monothelismus*, in J. Van Oort - J. Roldanus, *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität*, Leuven 1997, 373-413.

M. Simonetti

NEONA of Seleucia (of Isauria) (4th c.). An exponent of the *homoiousion party, he was deposed by the Council of *Constantinople of 360, which saw the victory of the moderate *Arians and the *Acacians. He was among the homoiousion bishops who in ca. 365 signed a letter to be sent to *Liberius of Rome to establish relations with him.

DCB 4, 175; Simonetti, 340, 395; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 197.

M. Simonetti

NEONICENISM. From the study of T. Zahn (*Marcellus von Ancyra*, published in 1867) onward, schol-

ars, esp. Protestants, have characterized the interpretation of the Nicene faith as maintained by the Cappadocians and their friends and sanctioned by the Council of *Constantinople (381) as Neonicenism, speaking of "Jungnizäner, " "neue Orthodoxie, " "kappadokische Neugläubigkeit" etc. The novelty of this Neonicene position is supposed to have consisted in the fact that its proponents understood the ὁμοούσιος of *Nicaea as ὁμοιούσιος, unity of substance (*unius substantiae*, imposed at Nicaea by the Latins) as likeness of substance. This theory, however, was based on unsubstantiated premises (unsustainable interpretations of Nicaea, *Athanasius, of the Cappadocians etc.) and therefore is not admissible. It is legitimate, however, to speak of a reinterpretation of the Nicene faith in the sense that the Cappadocians and those who depended on them replaced ὁμοούσιος with the more complete formula μία οὐσία-τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, opposing thereby not only *Arianism but also *Sabellianism, as their formula expressed. Scholars such as C. Markschies and others, who have investigated in depth the history of the Greek and Latin reception of the Nicene faith, have certainly sharpened and actually corrected the positions of the classical history of the dogmas. However, by using the rather ambiguous term of Neonicenism, they still risk giving too much importance to the ὁμοούσιος which is but a technical expression, secondary to the principal affirmation *natus*, *non factus*, and further give the impression of reducing the study of the baptismal faith, as presented in the patristic tradition, to those aspects discussed in the councils and synods of 4th and 5th c.

R. Arnou, *Unité numérique et unité de nature chez les Pères après le concile de Nicée*: Gregorianum 15 (1934) 242-254; A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*, Göttingen 1965, 270-293; C. Markschies, *Ambrosius von Mailand und die Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen 1995; B. Studer, *Una valutazione critica del neonicenismo*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 29-48 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Kritische Beobachtungen zum "Neunizänismus" der modernen deutschen Dogmengeschichte*: Adamantius 8 (2002) 152-159.

B. STUDER

NEOPHYTE. The Greek term indicating a newly grown shoot, and therefore still fragile. It is used in the LXX and then by St. *Paul in 1 Tim 3:6 to indicate a "new convert, " "just baptized" (there is similar symbolism in Rom 6:5, σύμφυτοι, taken up by *Gregory the Great, Ep. V, 53: *adhuc noviter plantatus*. Transliterated into Latin, *neophytus* is used by *Tertullian to mean a convert (*Praescr.* 41, 6; *Adv. Marc.* 1, 20, 3). We do not find it frequently in the first centuries of Christianity: the Greeks prefer the expression "newly illuminated." The term became common above all in *Augustine of Hippo and in epigraphs (see *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. VI) to designate the newly baptized.

After baptism, the neophytes participated for the first time in the prayer of the faithful (Hippolytus, *Tr. Ap.* 21), in the offering of the bread and wine (ibid., 21) and in eucharistic communion (see Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 65, 1). After baptism, through the catecheses they deepened their understanding of the sacraments, above all of baptism and the *Eucharist.

Particular ceremonies characterized the *dies neophytorum*, esp. from the 4th c. onward: the neophytes, who generally received baptism on the day of Easter, wore white garments, which they then took off the following Sunday, named *in albis*; in the East they girded their loins and put a crown on their heads, a sign of joy and dignity; their first entrance into the assembly took on a solemn and festal character (see Greg. Naz., *Oratio*, 40, 46 [*in sanctum baptisma*]); in the West, they covered their heads with a veil and washed their feet; in *Africa they were given milk and honey (as a sign of entrance into the Promised Land [see Ex 3:8, 17] and to symbolize that they were still babes in the faith [see 1 Pet 2:2]); in *Milan, they chanted psalms 42 and 22 as they approached the altar, to indicate their renewed youth (see Ambrose, *Myst.* 43 and *Sacr.* 4, 7); in 6th-c. Rome they were also given a mixture of milk and honey, placed in the chalice (see John the Deacon, *Ep. ad Senarium* 12).

The councils, following the norm of 1 Tim 3:6, prohibited neophytes from being elevated immediately to the priesthood or the episcopate (see Council of Nicaea, can. 2; Council of Serdica, can. 10 [13]; *Apostolic Canons 80 [79]). There were famous exceptions, such as Ambrose of Milan.

DACL 12, 1103-1110; J. Cantinat, *La Chiesa della pentecoste*, Turin 1972; Lampe 905; A.G. Martimort, *La Chiesa in preghiera*, Brescia 1984; A. Ferrua, see "Neofito, " in *Grande dizionario enciclopedico UTET*, vol. 14, Turin 1993, 403; E.J. Kilmartin, *The Baptismal Cups: Revisited*, in *EULOGHMA. Studies R. Taft, S.J.*, ed. E. Carr et al., Rome 1993, 249-267.

M. MARITANO

NEOPLATONISM

I. General characteristics - II. Plotinus - III. Porphyry - IV. Neoplatonism of the 4th c.: Iamblichus and Julian the Apostate - V. The school of Athens and the exegesis of the *Parmenides* - VI. Proclus and Damascius - VII. Neoplatonism in the Latin West.

I. General characteristics. Neoplatonism is the

philosophical current which dominates the thought of *Late Antiquity from 3rd c. AD onward, and which, in metaphysical and theological as well as in moral discourse, provided the framework for many of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin (*see* *Platonism and the Fathers). Commonly it is closely associated with the name of *Plotinus, its creator and most illustrious exponent. Without taking anything away from the greatness and originality of his thought, we should remember that Neoplatonism had many centuries of preparation behind it. Beginning with the ancient Academy immediately following Plato, including *Aristotle and his commentator Alexander of Aphrodisias, followed by *Stoicism (above all the Middle Stoicism of Posidonius), the Neo-Pythagoreanism of the first two centuries AD (esp. that of Moderatus, ps.-Brotinus and Numenius), the New Academy of Antiochus of Ascalon, *Middle Platonism, the Jewish-Hellenism represented by *Philo of Alexandria, we arrive at *Ammonius Saccas, the Alexandrian teacher of Plotinus. As two great modern scholars, W. Theiler (*Plotinus und die antike Philosophie*: MH [1944] 209-225 = *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 140-159) and E.R. Dodds (*Tradition and Personal Achievement in the Philosophy of Plotinus*: JRS 50 [1960] 2), have shown one of the most distinctive characteristics of Neoplatonism is a marked cultural syncretism, in which, to create a new and original philosophical system, not only Platonic doctrines are drawn upon, but also Academic, Aristotelian-peripatetic, Stoic, Neo-Pythagorean, and Middle Platonic doctrines, as well as those of Philo. (E.R. Dodds: CQ 22 [1928] 139-140 and 140 n. 1, justly excludes any direct influence of Philo on Plotinus; however, it is very probable that Plotinus was exposed to some of Philo's doctrines through Ammonius Saccas, who was of Christian origin and who, like all educated Alexandrian Christians, had certainly known Philo's writings; in this way we may explain certain surprising analogies between Philo and Plotinus, as, e.g., the doctrine of the double ethical phases *metriopatheia-apatheia* or that of the second hypostasis as the image of the first.) As do subsequent exponents of Neoplatonism, Plotinus sets out above all to be an exegete and systematizer of the philosophy of Plato: his principal intent is that of "explaining" and "ordering" into a coherent system the doctrines which the Athenian philosopher left scattered across his dialogues, doctrines also frequently covered by veils which need to be lifted (*Enn.* V, 1, 8; E.R. Dodds: JRS 50 [1960] 1). In order to reach this goal Plotinus does not disdain—rather he considers it necessary—to have recourse to almost the entire body of Greek thought which preceded him: *Porphyry (*Vita Plot.*, ch. 14) gives us an idea of the vast range of authors who were read and discussed in his school. His example was to be followed by his successors.

II. Plotinus. While Ammonius Saccas, faithful to the thought of Aristotle and to the tendency dominant in Philo and in Middle Platonism, had discussed the problem of the nature of the supreme principle, considered as mind (*nous*) or as "One"—the first solution was adopted by *Origen the Neoplatonist and later, in the 5th c., by Hierocles—Plotinus showed himself decisively in favor of the second solution, which remained fundamental in all subsequent "orthodox" Neoplatonism: at the apex of his construction was not the *nous*, but the "One," conceived absolutely negatively, of the first hypostasis of the Platonic *Parmenides*, identified by him with the absolute good of *Rep.* VI, 509b (*Enn.* V, 1, 8). The adoption of the negative "One" as the first principle, the clear formulation of the doctrine of its superiority over mind (*nous*) and over being, and its identification with the good, have precedents in the history of Greek thought. First, as E.R. Dodds has observed in his key article (*The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One*: CQ 22 [1928] 129-142), the points of contact between the absolutely negative "One" of the first hypostasis of *Parmenides* and the Plotinian doctrine of the "One" (see Dodds, op. cit., 132-133; H.R. Schwyzer: PWK 21, 1, 553-554), presuppose the interpretation in a theological and metaphysical sense of the "One" in the first three hypostases held above all by the Neo-Pythagorean Moderatus, who acc. to Simplicius (*In Phys.* 230, 34-231, 2 Diels) had identified the One of the first hypostasis with the metaphysical One superior to being, that of the second with the intelligible and the ideas, and that of the third with the soul (this same interpretation is also found in Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 1, 8). Second, Plato (*Rep.* VI, 509b) had himself affirmed that that the good "is not being, but exceeds it in dignity and power" (this passage, along with the first hypostasis of *Parmenides*, represents the best "Platonic" authority on which the doctrine of the first hypostasis in all "orthodox" Neoplatonism is based. Third, as both Dodds (op. cit., 140) and Ph. Merlan (*The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 30-32) have argued, already in the old Academy Speusippus had come to distinguish the One from mind and from being. Fourth, both Aristotle (*On prayer*, fr. 46 Rose) and two exponents of Neo-Pythagoreanism, ps.-Brotinus and ps.-Archytas, had affirmed the superi-

ority of the One over mind (on ps.-Brotinus and ps.-Archytas see esp. J. Whittaker: VChr 23 [1969] 95 e 102-103; *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, XIII). And fifth, the identification of the One and the good had been sustained in all probability by Plato himself in his lecture *On the Good* (see Aristoxenus, *Harm.* 30, 44, 11; Aristotle, *Met.* N 109lb 13-14; Numenius, fr. 19 Des Places 59, 12-13) and taken up by the Neo-Pythagorean ps.-Brotinus (see Syrianus, *In Met.* 183, 1-2; ps.-Alexander *In Met.* 821, 33-822, 1 and Whittaker, op. cit., 95).

The principal motifs that characterize the Plotinian doctrine of the first hypostasis (the One-Good) are the following: (1) the One is the first and supreme principle (V, 1, 1; V, 1, 7; V, 3, 11; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 10; VI, 9, 3); (2) it is absolutely simple (II, 9, 1;V, 1, 5; V, 1, 9; V, 3, 11; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 10); (3) it is absolutely pure, without quantity or quality (V, 1, 9; V, 5, 10; VI, 9, 3); (4) it is free from any mixture (V, 1, 9; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 10; V, 5, 13; VI, 7, 36); (5) it is anterior to everything and above everything (V, 3, 11; V, 3, 13; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 6; V, 5, 12; V, 5, 13); (6) it is different from everything else and cannot be identified with anything (V, 1, 7; V, 3, 11; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 6; V, 5, 13); (7) at the same time, however, it is everything, in that it contains everything in itself potentially, in an undifferentiated state (V, 2, 1; V, 3, 15); (8) it is entirely self-sufficient (II, 9, 1; V, 3, 12; V, 3, 13; V, 4, 1; VI, 9, 6); (9) it is superior to virtue inasmuch as it does not possess it (I 2, 3); (10) it is desired by all beings (I, 6, 7; V, 5, 12; V, 1, 6); (11) even generating the *nous* it remains immobile, in a state of absolute quiet, always identical with itself (V, 1, 6; V, 3, 12; V, 4, 2; V, 5, 5; V, 5, 12; on this idea is based the motif of the *monē*, which together with those of the *proodos* and the *epistrophē* underwent a further development in Proclus); (12) in the generation of the *nous* its power is not subjected to diminution, nor is it exhausted (VI, 7, 36; VI, 9, 5); (13) although remaining immobile in the generation of the *nous*, it may neither be said that it moves nor that it remains still, since it is above the states of quiet or of movement (V, 5, 10; VI, 9, 13); (14) it is not the *nous*, to which it is superior and anterior, generating it, being the cause of its existence and of the multiplicity which it includes (V, 1, 7; V, 3, 11; V, 3, 16; V, 1, 5; V, 1, 8; V, 3, 12; V, 3, 16; V, 4, 2); (15) it is superior to being (V, 1, 8; V, 1, 10; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 6; V, 3, 17; V, 4, 2); (16) it "towers above being" in that it is at the apex of the intelligible world, over which it reigns (I, 1, 8; V, 5, 3; V, 3, 12); (17) as it is not being, it is nonbeing (V, 2, 1; V, 5, 6; VI, 9, 3; VI, 9, 5); (18) on the one hand, it is identified with the absolute good; on the other, the good which it transmits remains below its own true nature (II, 9, 1; V, 1, 8; V, 5, 13; V, 3, 11; VI, 9, 6); (19) it is without form or figure (V, 1, 7; V, 5, 6; V, 5, 11; VI, 7, 32); (20) it is indivisible (V, 1, 7; VI, 9, 2); (21) from the point of view of physical size it is neither limited nor infinite (V, 5, 10); (22) it is, however, infinite in its inexhaustible, generative power (V, 5, 10; VI, 9, 6); (23) it radiates the light which constitutes the *nous* and which shines also in the mind of humanity, esp. if humans approach it (V, 1, 6; V, 3, 12; V, 3, 15; V, 3, 17; VI, 7, 36; VI, 9, 4; VI, 9, 7; VI, 9, 9); (24) it is to be found everywhere and at the same time is not in any place (V, 5, 9; VI, 8, 16; VI, 9, 3); (25) it is outside time (VI, 9, 3); (26) it is superior to the beautiful since it is its source (I, 6, 9; V, 5, 12); (27) it lacks any will or thought and does not even think of itself (V, 1, 6; V, 3, 11; V, 3, 13; VI, 7, 35; VI, 7, 40; VI, 9, 6); (28) however, its act is one with its will (VI, 8, 21); (29) it does not engage in any cognitive activity (V, 3, 12); (30) it is unknown, inasmuch as it is the object of thought or of knowledge (V, 3, 14; V, 4, 1; VI, 7, 35; VI, 9-4); (31) it is superior to words and therefore is without name and ineffable (V, 3, 13; V, 3, 14; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 6; V, 9, 4; V, 9, 5); (32) it eludes whoever seeks it (V, 5, 10); (33) the only means which the human mind possesses for approaching it is the *via negativa*, that process which consists in taking away all attributes and which reveals only what is not, not what is (V, 3, 14; V, 3, 17; V, 5, 4; V, 5, 6; V, 5, 13; VI, 8, 21).

The *nous*, the second hypostasis, is for its part distinguished by the following characteristics: (1) it is generated by the One *ab aeterno* following an overflowing of its superabundant power and an irradiation of its light (V, 1, 6; V, 2, 1; V, 3, 16; V, 4, 1; V, 5, 5; in connection with this last motif see no. 23 of the doctrine of the One); (2) it is *nous* inasmuch as, once generated by the One, it turns to it and contemplates it (V, 1, 6; V, 1, 7; V, 2, 1; V, 4, 2); (3) it is act, image and copy of the One, but remains inferior to it, even if it is superior to all other beings (V, 1, 6; V, 1, 7; V, 3, 15; V, 4, 2; V, 5, 5); (4) it is the multiple One that includes in itself an indistinct multiplicity, and in this sense corresponds to the One of the second hypostasis of *Parmenides* (V, 3, 15; V, 4, 1); (5) it includes in itself all intelligible beings or ideas which are the product of its noetic activity (III, 8, 11; V, 1, 4; V, 1, 7; V, 3, 5; V, 3, 11; V, 3, 15; V, 4, 2; V, 5, 2; V, 5, 3; V, 5, 6; V, 6, 6; V, 9, 5; V, 9, 6; V, 9, 8); (6) it is identical to intelligible beings or ideas (there exists a complete identity between being, the *nous*, the ideas or forms and the act of being) (III, 9, 1; V, 1, 4; V, 1, 8; V, 1, 10; V, 3, 5; V, 4, 2; V, 5, 6; V, 9, 3; V, 9, 5; V, 9, 6; V, 9, 8); (7) consequently, it is identical to the intelligible world, model of the sensible world, i.e., of the "living intelligible being" of Plato's *Timaeus* (III, 8, 11; V, 1, 4; V, 3, 16; V, 5, 4; V, 9, 9); (8) it is identical to ab-

solute beauty (I, 6, 9); (9) it is identical to the "cause" of the *Philebus* and of the *Timaeus* and to the demiurge of the *Timaeus* (V, 1, 8; V, 9, 3); (10) in the first moment of its existence—i.e., before it turns toward the One and contemplates it (see above no. 2)—it is identical to the *apeiria* and to the "indeterminate dyad" (II, 4, 15; V, 1, 5; V, 4, 2; VI, 5, 11; VI, 5, 12); (11) again with reference to this first moment, before the formation of ideas, it is identical to the intelligible material without form, which is the model of sensible material, as the intelligible universe is the model of the sensible One (II, 4, 3; II, 4, 15); (12) before turning toward the One and receiving from it the impression of limit and of unity (see *Enn.* II, 4, 5) it is an indeterminate being (II, 4, 5), prior to mind true and proper (V, 2, 1; V, 9, 8) (on points 10-12 see J.M. Rist, *The Indefinite Dyad and Intelligible Matter in Plotinus*: CQ New Series 12 [1962] 99-107; A.H. Armstrong, *Spiritual or Intelligible Matter in Plotinus and St. Augustine*, *Plotinian and Christian Studies*, London 1979, 277-283; Proclus, E.R. Dodds (tr.), *Stoicheiōsis theologikē: The Elements of Theology*, Oxford 1933, 246-247; the motif of the anteriority of being in respect to intelligence—which in Plotinus represents two moments of the same hypostasis, distinguishable only logically—undergoes a development in subsequent Neoplatonism); (13) it contains in itself life (V, 6, 6); (14) it thinks itself (V, 3, 13; V, 9, 5); (15) the ideas considered in the singular, present within the *nous*, are intelligent like the *nous* (V, 1, 4; V, 9, 8).

The third hypostasis is represented by the *anima mundi* of which Plato had spoken in the *Timaeus*, the *Philebus* and in book X of the *Laws*. Of it, we may note: (1) it is born of the *nous* following the overflowing of its power, as the *nous* is born of the One (see *nous*, no. 1) (V, 2, 1); (2) it contemplates the *nous* as the *nous* contemplates the One, and from this contemplation it draws its capacity to act (see *nous*, no. 2) (VI, 3, 6; V, 1, 3; V, 1, 6; V, 2, 1); (3) it is the manifestation, the act and the image of the *nous*, as the *nous* is of the One (see *nous*, no. 3) (V, 1, 3; V, 1, 6; V, 2, 1); (4) indeterminate in the moment in which it is generated by the *nous*, it receives the limit and the form from its generative principle, analogously to what happens in the *nous* (see *nous*, no. 12) (V, 17); (5) it participates both in the intelligible world and in the sensible (IV, 8, 7; V, 1, 7; V, 3, 7); (6) it generates the sensible world (V, 1, 2; V, 1, 7; V, 2, 1); (7) it receives from the *nous* the rational principles (*logoi*) and then transmits them to the sensible world (IV, 3, 10; V, 9, 3); (8) it contains in itself all the *logoi* and is itself the universal logos and a multiple unity (II, 3, 16; IV, 3, 8; V, 3, 8; V, 2, 5); (9) it vivifies the universe and is cause of its life (V, 1, 2); (10) it supports, holds together and governs the sensible universe, every part of which is spanned by it, and thanks to it is a god (IV, 3, 9; IV, 8, 2; V, 1, 2); (11) it governs and adorns the universe, acc. to the *logos* which is its law (II, 3, 16; IV, 3, 10; IV, 3, 39); (12) it is infused into the sensible universe *ab aeterno* (IV, 3, 9).

Almost all the points listed above may be traced to earlier Greek thought. Without proceeding to a detailed investigation into the various sources, we limit ourselves here to recalling that, as regards the One, points 13, 17, 19, 24, 25, 30 and 31 go back to Plato's *Parmenides*; points 2, 3, 4 and 5 are of Aristotelian-peripatetic provenance; point 16 has a precedent in *Numenius. As far as the *nous* is concerned points 4 and 5 are traceable respectively to the second hypostasis of the *Parmenides* and to the Middle Platonic doctrine (found also in the ancient Academy, in Antiochus of Ascalon and in Philo) of the ideas identical to the thought contained in the mind of God; points 6, 13 and 14 are of Aristotelian origin; point 15 goes back to Plato (*Sophist* 248e-249a) and to Alexander of Aphrodisias (*Mantissa* 108, 15-18). And as regards the *anima mundi* points 2 and 9 have precedents in Numenius and in Alcinous, and points 7, 8, 10 and 11 are of Stoic derivation (see R.E. Witt, *The Plotinian Logos and Its Stoic Basis*: CQ 25 [1931] 103-111).

The Plotinian positions on the matter which is at the base of sensible bodies depends in part on the preceding Platonic-peripatetic tradition, which had identified the receptacle of the Platonic *Timaeus* with the primordial material, absolutely without form, figure, and quality, and ready to receive into itself the impressions of the form, which produce quality: as for Aristotle, Antiochus of Ascalon, Middle Platonism and Numenius, as for Plotinus sensible matter is the absolute negation of form (I, 8, 9), and free of quality, figure, and size (I, 8, 10; II, 4, 8; VI, 9, 7), and receives into itself the forms and the qualities (I, 8, 8; I, 8, 10; II, 4, 8; VI, 9, 7). Plotinus, however, goes beyond the classical position of Middle Platonism, in which matter, along with God and ideas, was one of the "three principles, " and approaches instead the positions of certain Neo-Pythagoreans: agreeing in substance with Numenius (fr. 50 Des Places) he affirms that there exists an incompatibility between being and matter, which is incapable of combining with being (III, 6, 13); that which enters into the material is not a true being, but only an image (III, 6, 13): and, in the same way as Moderatus in Simplicius (*In Phys.* 231, 4-5), he sustains that matter, being in itself without forms, which are identical with being, may be considered a nonbeing, without this implying a

negation of its existence (I, 8, 5; II, 4, 10; II, 4, 16; II, 5, 4; III, 6, 7; III, 6, 13).

In respect of the origin of matter, Plotinus (IV, 8, 6) seems to take into consideration both hypotheses: either it exists *ab aeterno* (the classic thesis of Middle Platonism and of Numenius), or it derives from a superior principle, which has granted it existence as a grace: this is the thesis of Eudorus, Ammonius Saccas and certain Neo-Pythagoreans (see Calcidius, *In Tim.* 235; Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 25; and Simplicius, *In Phys.* 181, 18-19).

To the problem of the origin and the nature of evil, Plotinus, in the eighth tractate of the first *Ennead*, gives two answers. On the one hand, evil consists in the total absence, privation and want of good; it is not to be found in beings—which, as they are products of the good, participate in it—and it is a form of nonbeing (I, 8, 1; I, 8, 3; I, 8, 5): this thesis will be taken up by Proclus and, among the Fathers, by *Origen, St. *Basil the Great, *Gregory of Nyssa, St. *Augustine and ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite. On the other hand, its essence—supposing that one may talk of an "essence" of evil—should be identified with matter (I, 8, 3): this thesis would be rejected by Proclus, and, following him, by ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. In souls, evil consists above all in the lack of measure, a salient characteristic of matter (I, 8, 4). The two solutions are for Plotinus perfectly compatible with each other, in that they are derived from his theory about matter: evil, the total absence of good and nonbeing, is identical with matter insofar as this last, which of itself in no way participates in being, is completely lacking in it, and is a nonbeing (I, 8, 5). All intelligible beings and all sensible objects originally contained in the One in an undifferentiated state (see point 7 of the doctrine of the One) issue from it in virtue of a process of emanation (*proodos*) which is the result of the overflowing of its inexhaustible power. The One does not remain in this way only in itself; yet, notwithstanding the generation of beings, it remains always in the same state (see points 11 and 12 of the doctrine of the One). For their part, the beings generated by the One imitate their principle, generating in their turn the inferior beings. These are the ideas espoused in IV, 8, 6 (II, 242, 1–244, 18 Henry-Schwyzer). Although these themes were to undergo further accentuation in later Neoplatonism, and above all in Proclus and ps.-Dionysius, we find them already here clearly formulated (the term *proodos* appears in 242, 5, while that of *menontos* [243, 10] is the exact equivalent of Proclus's *monē*).

Notwithstanding the presence of matter, the sensible universe is most beautiful, for it imitates intelligible nature, of which excellence it is the revelation (IV, 8, 6 [244, 23-28]). Plotinus decisively rejects the *gnostic disdain for creation, of which he exalts the beauty, symmetry and order, thus conforming to all preceding Greek thought (II, 9, 16) (*see* also *cosmos). The sensible universe is characterized by the "sympathy" of the various beings among themselves (their great variety is governed by the One and multiform universal *logos*, and each part collaborates with the universal soul and with the other parts of the life of the whole, from which it cannot be separated [IV, 3, 8; IV, 4, 35; IV, 4, 40; IV, 7, 3]) and by the harmony which reigns there supreme (IV, 4, 35). We are here in the presence of Stoic, and in particular Posidonian, motifs, as has been demonstrated by R.E. Witt (*Plotinus and Posidonius*: CQ 24 [1930] 198-207; see esp. 202-203).

Plotinus dedicates two tractates to ethical problems, that *On the Virtues* and that *On Happiness*, respectively the second and the fourth of the first Ennead. If the evil of the soul consists in the lack of measure (see above), the function of the first class of virtues—the political virtues—is that of moderating and regulating the passions, imposing a measure on them (I, 2, 2): the preliminary ethical stadium is therefore represented by the *metriopatheia* which Plato had already mentioned in the *Republic* (IV, 423e, 431c, X, 619a) and which had become the ethical norm par excellence in the ancient Academy, in the peripatetic school, in Middle Stoicism and Middle Platonism (see the references in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 99-103). The highest end of humanity, which Plato in the famous passage of the *Theaetetus* 176b had made to consist in the "resemblance to God insofar as possible" and in the flight from this world toward the ideal world, cannot be realized for Plotinus by the simple moderation of the passions through the political virtues, but by their total destruction or *apatheia*, produced by the superior class of virtues, the cathartic virtues, and practically identical to that catharsis or detachment of the soul from the body on which Plato had so insisted in the *Phaedo* (I, 2, 3). When completely purified, the soul is ready to turn toward the mind, the second hypostasis, and to contemplate it, realizing thus in itself the third and highest class of virtues, those proper to contemplation (I, 2, 4; I, 2, 6). Whoever reaches this third stage is a true and proper god (I, 2, 6); his or her mind returns to humanity's state of perfection found at the moment of the descent from the ideal world (I, 2, 6). (This motif will be at the base of the doctrine of the "image" of Gregory of Nyssa; *see* *nous; *Platonism and the Fathers.) The perfect person is absolutely imperturbable; Plotinus

makes his own both the ideal of the *apatheia* characteristic of ancient Stoicism, and the attributes which the ancient Stoics had held to be typical of wise people, spelled out in the fourth tractate of the first Ennead. In adopting the double ethical phase of the *metriopatheia-apatheia*, Plotinus has a clear precursor in Philo of Alexandria; and since the identical scheme may be found also in Clement, this motif can be considered one of the most salient characteristics of the Alexandrian cultural milieu from which Neoplatonism emerged (for more detail see S. Lilla, op. cit., 103-105, 227-228). There exists, however, an even more advanced state of contemplation of the intelligible: that condition is reached when human intellect arrives at the vision of the source of the intelligible, the One-Good, and, transported by a loving impulse, aspires to "be mingled" with it (I, 6, 7). It is then that the union between human mind and the One is realized, which becomes one reality (VI, 7, 34). And since the One is above mind and does not think (see points 14, 27 and 29 of the doctrine of the One), human intellect too, which is identical with it, sees the end of its noetic activity (VI, 7, 35). This idea of union with the first principle as characterized by the extinguishing of every thought becomes a constant of Neoplatonism, receiving particular emphasis in ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (see S. Lilla, Augustinianum 22 [1982] 564-565; ch. *Dionigi* in *La mistica*, I, Rome 1984, 389-391).

III. Porphyry. A syncretistic line was continued by the greatest disciple of Plotinus: following the example of Ammonius, who had shown the points of agreement between Plato and Aristotle and united their approaches into a single system (see Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 214, 172a; cod. 251, 461a), Porphyry also wrote a work *On the Identity Between the School of Plato and That of Aristotle* (n. 20 in the list of Beutler: PWK 22/1, 285). The syncretism of Porphyry was, however, broader than that of Plotinus, since it also included the oracles, above all the Chaldean ones (the fragments of which have been edited by G. Kroll, *De oraculis chaldaicis*, Vratislaviae 1894, and more recently by E. Des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris 1971), and an interest in the practices of *magic and *theurgy: this is revealed by his youthful works *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* (n. 44 in the list of Beutler: PWK 22/1, 295) and by the *Commentary on the Chaldean Oracles*, composed probably after the death of Plotinus (nn. 48 and 48a in Beutler: PWK 22/1, 296-297; on these two works and questions surrounding them, see the article of P. Hadot, REAug 6 [1969] 205-247). In fact, it was contact with the *Chaldean Oracles* that brought about certain changes in the theological and metaphysical vision of Porphyry from his "Plotinian" phase, which was typified by a greater adherence to the thought of his master: these changes regard principally the nature of the first hypostasis and its relations with the following hypostases, and the "triadic" structure of Porphyrian metaphysics. Porphyry establishes the basis of a metaphysical system which may be found, in its principal features, and with certain corrections, in later Neoplatonism, and above all in *Iamblichus and in Proclus.

The *History of Philosophy* and the *Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes*, probably dating from the "Plotinian" phase, reproduce the general scheme of the three hypostases fixed by Plotinus, as they do certain Plotinian doctrines relating to each. The three hypostases are the good, the demiurge and the *anima mundi* (*Hist. philos.* fr. 16 Nauck, Sent. 31). The first hypostasis generates the second in virtue of a process of emanation which does not fall within time (*Hist. philos.* fr. 18) and which is due to the superabundance of the power of the first principle (Macrobius, *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* I, 14, 5; cf. Beutler: PWK 22/1, 303 and point 1 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*); analogously, the *nous* generates the *anima mundi* (Macrobius, ibid., see point 1 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *anima mundi*). The first hypostasis is the first and supreme principle of everything (Macrobius, ibid., see point 1 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); it is the One-Good, absolutely simple, self-sufficient, without parts; it is neither the object of names nor of knowledge, and may not be defined by any term, which always remain below it (*Hist. philos.* fr. 18, see points 18, 2, 8, 20, 30, 31, 33 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); it is above mind and being and is a nonbeing (*Sent.* 25 [15, 1-2 Lamberz], 26 [15, 9. 12], see points 14, 15, 17 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); it cannot be compared to any other being, and no being is found at its level (*Hist. philos.* fr. 18, see points 5 and 6 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); it is found everywhere but in no place (*Sent.* 31, see point 24 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); it can be contemplated only through reaching the absence of every noetic activity superior to thought itself (*Sent.* 25 [15, 1-2], see what has been said in respect of the motif of the "union" of the One in Plotinus). For its part, the second hypostasis is mind, in that it contemplates the first (Macrobius, ibid., see point 2 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*); it is similar to the first (Macrobius, ibid., see points 3 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*); it is identical to the totality of beings and to their essence (*Hist. philos.* fr. 18, see points 5, 6, 7 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*); it is also iden-

tical to absolute beauty (*Hist. philos.* fr. 18, see point 8 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*). Prior to becoming acquainted with the teaching of Plotinus, Porphyry, who still held to the positions of his previous master Longinus, had criticized the doctrine of the presence of intelligible ideas in the divine *nous*, a doctrine maintained by Plotinus in the fifth book of the fifth Ennead, and had written a tract on the subject; only after two refutations of his thesis on the part of Amelius did he change his mind, and he then embraced Plotinus's doctrine, to which he was then always faithful (see *Vita Plot.* 18, 8-22). In Porphyry too, therefore, we find the Middle Platonic and Plotinian doctrine of ideas contained in the divine mind (see Macrobius, *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* I, 2, 14).

Although in the "Plotinian" phase, the first hypostasis of Porphyry seems to be identical to the One of Plotinus, the influence of the theology of the *Chaldean Oracles* leads Porphyry to identify this principle with the "Father" named in these oracles (see, e.g., fr. 3, 7, 22, 79 Des Places) and with the first member (identical to the Father) of the intelligible triad which they praise (see, e.g., fr. 31 Des Places). Reference to this identification made by Porphyry, together with the adoption of positions contrary to it, is made by Proclus (*In Parm.* 1070, 15 Cousin) (see W. Theiler, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, in *Forschungen zum Neuplat.*, Berlin 1966, 260-261, and P. Hadot, *La métaphysique de Porphyre*, in EntAC XII [1966] 132) and Damascius (*Dub. et sol.* 43 [I, 86, 8-10 Ruelle], see Hadot, ibid.). From this evidence, we can see distinctly that the first principle of Porphyry does not clearly transcend the intelligible triad, but rather is part of it, even if it is its "Father"; it is thus substantially different both from the Plotinian One and from the first hypostasis, as is seen in the *History of Philosophy* and the *Sententiae*. As P. Hadot has shown (op. cit., in EntAC XII, 127-157), the way to a better understanding of the thought of Porphyry in this respect, which also shows an albeit partial connection with the *History of Philosophy* and the *Sententiae*, is an anonymous comment on *Parmenides* attributed by Hadot to Porphyry himself (REG 74 [1961] 410-438), and which he includes in the second volume of his *Porphyre et Victorinus* (64-112). In this comment, the first principle—identified with the One of the first hypothesis of *Parmenides*—is, like the One of Plotinus and of Porphyry's *History of Philosophy* and the *Sententiae*, the negative One, which is beyond plurality, act, thought, simplicity and the very same One itself (I, 31-35; II, 10, 12; on this last point, see Plato, *Parm.* 141e), beyond diversity, identity, resemblance, dissimilarity (III, 33-34), approachable only through a process of negatives, which best corresponds to its nature (II, 4-5; II, 15-16; IV, 17-18; VI, 23-28; IX, 27-28; X, 9-11; X, 23-25; XIII, 16-23), superior to all beings and not comparable with them (I, 4-5; I, 18-19; III, 7-8; III, 11; III, 35; IV, 1; IV, 11; IV, 28-30; VI, 20), simple (I, 8), without parts (VI, 17-18), different from the *nous* (II, 1-3), superior to word and thought and knowable only through ignorance (II, 15-17; IX, 24-26), ineffable and without names (I, 3-5; II, 20; II, 24), superessential (II, 11; XII, 23-24), anterior to essence (X, 25), without essence (XII, 5), outside time (VIII, 8-9), superior and anterior to knowledge and to ignorance (V, 10-11; V, 15; V, 28-30; VI, 10-11), and possessing infinite power, thanks to which it is the cause and principle of everything (I, 25-27; see also Macrobius, *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* I, 14, 6 about Porphyry, and point 22 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One). On the other hand, notwithstanding its radical difference to all beings, this One is not quite to be identified with the nonbeing One of *Sent.* 25 and 26 and of Plotinus (see point 17 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); neither is it without the attribute of existence, as is the One of the first hypothesis of *Parmenides* (see 141e). On the contrary, as J.M. Rist has rightly highlighted (Hermes 92 [1964] 220-225), Porphyry holds that the attribute par excellence of the first One is precisely existence: it is inseparable from the existence with which it is identified (IV, 7-8; XII, 26; XIV, 6-7; XIV, 22-23; XIV, 25-26) and is a real being compared with the beings which follow it (IV, 27-28; to be noted in XIV, 6-7, 22-23, 25-26 the application of the term *hyparxis* to the first principle; see also Rist, op. cit.). In virtue of its infinite and overflowing power, the first One possesses an activity proper to it, *energeia* (XIV, 6; XIV, 21-26), which leads it to emanate a second One (XI, 19-23): here we have the One of the second hypostasis of *Parmenides*, distinct from the first even though it derives from it (XI, 23-28; XI, 33-XII, 4), the One-Being (XI, 30-31; XII, 5-10), unity of all beings (XII, 4), the One which possesses being at a lower level in that it participates in the existence of the first One (XII, 27-29). (There exist, therefore, for Porphyry two planes of existence: that anterior to true and proper being, definable as "the idea of being, " that is of the first One, and then that of the second One, which participates in the first [XII, 29-35].)

The infinite power emanating from the first One and expression of the activity (*energeia*) of its existence, is life, which is therefore also infinite (XIV, 17-21; XIV, 25-26). The turning of this power—destined to become the second One—toward the original principle, the first One, and the act in which it contemplates that principle in the attempt to return to it

(it sees, in the first principle, itself and an intelligible being, *noēton*) (XIV, 16-21, 23-25) produce mind (see point 2 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*). Thus a clearly drawn profile of the three members of the highest triad emerges. The first member—the father of the *Chaldean Oracles*—on the one hand almost completely identical with the negative One of the first hypothesis of *Parmenides*, but on the other—and in this it diverges from the One of Plotinus and the later Neoplatonists—it is identified with absolute existence (*hyparxis*), and therefore is being par excellence. The second member—produced by the emanation of the infinite power of the original source—is represented by life. The third member—identical to the *patrikos nous* of the *Chaldean Oracles* (see fr. 37, 1; 39, 1 Des Places) and called such also by Porphyry (*De regr. an.* fr. 8 Bidez) (= Aug., *Civ. Dei* X, 23)—is mind destined to form, as in Plotinus, the composed unity or the One-Being of the second hypostasis of *Parmenides*. The characteristics of each member of the triad—the first characterized by simple existence (*hyparxis*) which remains in itself, the second by the *energeia* which bursts out from the *hyparxis*, the third by the turning of the emanation toward its source (XIV, 5-8, 21-26)—clearly suggest the three moments of the *monē*, the *proodos* and the *epistrophē*, which, as we saw, were already present in Plotinus (see point 11 of the doctrine of the One and points 1 and 2 of the doctrine of the *nous*) and which would become even more marked in later Neoplatonism. Even if conceptually they are distinguishable from each other, the three members of the triad form a superior unity (IV, 3-4; even the first member, in the moment in which it produces the emanation destined to turn toward its source, may be called *nous* and *vita* [XIV, 16-21]). We can see then how to this unity the opposing conclusions—negative or positive—of the first two hypotheses of *Parmenides* may be contemporaneously applied (XIV, 26-34). (Under this aspect Porphyry points forward to the theology of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite: see *Div. Names* V, 10: PG 3, 825B; VII, 3: PG 3, 872A.)

It should be remembered that the nature and function of the intermediate member of the triad, life, seem obscure to Augustine, who hesitates to identify it with the *anima mundi*, which in the Plotinian scheme and also in the *History of Philosophy* of Porphyry occupies not the second but the third place (*Civ. Dei* X, 23) (= *De regr. an.* fr. 8 Bidez); in effect, the Porphyrian "life" is to be identified not with the Plotinian *anima mundi* but rather with the *apeiria*, or infinite energy, which for Plotinus emanates from the One. According to John the Lydian (*De mens.* IV, 122 [159, 5-8 Wuensch]), the summit of Porphyry's metaphysical system has a henadic structure: in other words, acc. to Porphyry, basing himself on his own interpretation of the *Chaldean Oracles*, it is formed not by One but by three intelligible triads. This means that the inexhaustible power of the first principle does not limit itself to produce the first triad but, by an analogous process, makes a second triad to emerge from the first, and a third from the second. The reconstruction of Hadot (in EntAC XII, 138-140) is more than satisfactory, in which the second and third triads are thought to be composed by members analogous to those of the first, i.e., being, life or power, and intelligence; while in the first triad the dominant character is given by the first member—i.e., being or Father—in the second it is given by the second, life or power, and in the third by the third, intelligence. Being, life and intelligence do not enter only into each triad as constitutive members, but dominate respectively the first, second and third triads (see Hadot, 138). Already clearly delineated in the Porphyrian schema is the hierarchical system of later Neoplatonism, above all that of Iamblichus and Proclus (even if these clearly separate the first principle from the first member of the first triad).

Two other important aspects of Porphyrian metaphysics, which will be taken up above all in the *Elements of Theology* by Proclus, are expressed in the two following laws: (1) The production (or "generation") of inferior by superior beings (on this idea see Plotinus, *Enn.* IV, 8, 6) necessarily implies a subdivision or multiplication of the original unity, and also a diminution of its power descending down the scale of beings; the generated being is therefore inferior to that which produces it (see *Sent.* 11 and 13; W. Theiler, *Porph. u. Augustin*, in *Forschungen zum Neuplat.*, 174; R. Beutler: PWK 22/1, 305). (2) Each being occupies its place in the scale of beings acc. to its dignity (*axia*); the ordered disposition (*taxis*) of the beings depends on their relation of superiority to the inferior beings and of subordination to those superior, and produces a harmony (*syntaxis*) which is an image of the original unity (see Theiler, ibid., 172, 180-184: PWK 22/1, 305).

For Porphyry too, as for Plotinus, matter is without form, it is veritable nonbeing and an absence of being (*Sent.* 20, 3; 20, 10); but while, as we have seen, in *Enn.* IV, 8, 6 Plotinus had considered the origin of matter from the first principle as simply a hypothesis, Porphyry, making his own the positions of Ammonius Saccas and of the *Chaldean Oracles* (see fr. 34 Des Places and 129, nn. 1-2), makes the hypothesis of his master into certitude: acc. to *Aeneas of

Gaza (*Theophr.* 45, 4-9 [ed.] Colonna), in his *Commentary on the Chaldean Oracles* and in his exegesis of *Enn.* I, 8, Porphyry had sustained that matter could be considered "atemporal" (*achronos*) but not ingenerate, and rejected as impious the Middle Platonic doctrine that held matter to be one of the three principles; this passage of Aeneas of Gaza is echoed by John the Lydian (*De mens.* IV, 159 [175, 5-9]), where it is affirmed that matter, "atemporal" but not "without principle, " had received its existence by the will of the Father (see Theiler, op. cit., 179-180). Proclus (*In Tim.* I, 396, 5-7, 21-26; see Theiler, 177), who presents the thought of Porphyry, says that the demiurge "with one single thought" gave reality to the sensible world, without having need of matter and producing everything from itself (the passage of John the Lydian and these two passages of Proclus emphasizing the self-sufficiency of the will and thought of God in creation are close to two parallel passages of Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 214.172a, 251.461b which reflect the views of Hierocles and of Ammonius Saccas; see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 224). Porphyry shares the Plotinian theory of evil as nonbeing; from *Sent.* 26 it is clear that this nonbeing is to be contrasted absolutely with the nonbeing of the first principle. The estrangement of humanity from the first principle provokes their separation from real being, and generates in them this "false passion" which is nonbeing, an extreme degradation of being.

Porphyrian ethics does not diverge substantially from those of Plotinus: para. 32 of the *Sententiae* closely follows what Plotinus had said in the treatise *On the Virtues* (*Enn.* I, 2). LIke Plotinus, Porphyry distinguishes the preliminary ethical stage of the *metriopatheia*, realized through the political virtues, from *apatheia*, identified with the *homoiōsis theō* and realized altogether by the third class of human virtues, the theoretical virtues (*Sent.* 32: 25, 6-9; 28, 3-4). The only difference in comparison with Plotinus consists in the fact that while Plotinus (*Enn.* I, 2, 6 [57, 14-17]) had simply spoken of the presence in the divine *nous* of the "paradigms" of the highest human virtues—these are "paradigms" superior to any virtue and not in fact definable as "virtues"—Porphyry (*Sent.* 32 [28, 6–29, 7]) calls these models "paradigmatic virtues, " thus postulating the existence of a fourth and highest class of virtues, those present in the divine *nous*. For Porphyry too, the separation of the soul from the body, or "catharsis, " is the indispensable premise for the contemplation of the intelligible and for the return of human intellect to God; he insists on this point not only in *Sent.* 32, where, as with Plotinus, he considers the cathartic virtues the second class of virtues, but also in the lost work *De regressu animae* (see, e.g., fr. 11, 2; 11, 5 Bidez) and in the work *De abstinentia*. In *De regressu animae* (see esp. fr. 2 Bidez = Aug., *Civ. Dei* X, 9), along with a firm censure of the lower magical practices, one may observe a partial reevaluation of theurgy, for which Porphyry certainly does not show the admiration found in his youthful work *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* (see E. Des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris 1971, 18-19; 23-24): theurgy may be useful to the purification of the inferior (or "spiritual") part of the human soul, with which sensible objects are perceived, but has no effect on its intellectual part, the conversion of which to God is accomplished without it.

Finally, it should be noted that, for Porphyry too, the highest knowledge of the supreme principle presupposes the cessation—which is superior to thought—of every noetic activity (*anoēsia*) (*Sent.* 25 [15, 2]). To this *anoēsia* is combined absolute ignorance (*agnōsia*) of the first unknowable principle (*Comm. in Parm.* IX, 24-26). This complete identity between ignorance and knowledge of God foreshadows the analogous formulations of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (see S. Lilla, Augustinianum 22 [1982] 563-564; *Dionigi*, in *La mistica*, I, Rome 1984, 381-386). On the determinant influence of Porphyry on authors such as *Ambrose of Milan, *Marius Victorinus and Augustine, *see* *Platonism and the Fathers.

IV. Neoplatonism of the 4th c.: Iamblichus and Julian the Apostate. In Iamblichus—who may be considered the author of the final phase of Neoplatonism, since in his system that of Proclus is largely anticipated—the syncretistic tendency, which was notable already in Porphyry, undergoes a further development: from a philosophical point of view, it embraces Aristotelianism and the Neo-Pythagorean tradition of the 1st and 2nd c. AD (one of Iamblichus's more important works in ten volumes—of which five remain under various titles: *On the Pythagorean Life*, *Exhortation to Philosophy*, *On the General Science of Mathematics*, *The Nicomachean Arithmetic*, *Theological Principles of Arithmetic*—are called *Collection of Pythagorean Doctrines*; see W. Kroll: PWK 9/1, 646-647); from a religious point of view, in the *Chaldean Oracles* and theurgy, Iamblichus offers a reevaluation of Porphyry (see Dalsgaard Larsen, in EntAC XXI (1975) 1-4; E. Des Places, ibid., 69-94; J.M. Dillon, *Iamblichi Chalcidensis in Platonis dialogos commentariorum fragmenta*, Leiden 1973, 26-29). Iamblichus also inaugurates the systematic exegesis of Platonic dialogues, which became characteristic of later Neoplatonism: they were interpreted from ethical, physical, mathematical

and metaphysical standpoints (see esp. K. Praechter, in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos*, I, Berlin 1926, 615-616). J. Dillon (op. cit., 27) has observed in this respect: "Plato is made to agree not only with Aristotle and Pythagoras but also with *Homer, Hesiod, Orpheus and the Chaldean oracles. . . . Each dialogue, in its entirety, is imbued with a higher significance. . . . To each dialogue a purpose is assigned, to which even the introductory and apparently accessory parts must be conformed."

Although he inherited from Porphyry both the triadic scheme and the components of each triad (being, life, intelligence), Iamblichus does not hesitate to repeatedly take positions contrary to his predecessor, whom he accuses of not being sufficiently "Platonic" or "Plotinian" (see, e.g., *Comm. in Tim.* fr. 16, 34, 70 Dillon, and Dillon, *Iamblichi Chalcidensis*, 28). In fact, one great difference is instantly apparent: while Porphyry had identified the first principle with the first member of the intelligible triad and with the "Father" of the *Chaldean Oracles*, Iamblichus places above the first intelligible triad (1) the two principles destined to make up both the first and following triads, i.e., the *peras* and the *apeiria* (see Plato, *Philebus* 23c, 24a); (2) the One anterior to these two principles, which is simple, not coordinated with the first triad, identical to the monad, anterior to the essence (*proousios*), father of the essence (*ousiopatōr*), principle of the intelligible (*noētarchēs*), preexistent being (*proontōs ōn*), good, first god and first king: this One occupies an intermediate position between the *peras* and the *apeiria*, on the one hand, and the first absolute principle, on the other; (3) the first absolute principle (*prōtistos*), completely ineffable, anterior to the first god and the first king, immobile, solitary, free from any contact with the intelligible, model (*paradeigma*) of the first god, which is born from it thanks to a process of irradiation (see above all *De myst.* VIII, 2; Damascius, *Dub. et sol.* 43, 50, 51, and the schema in Dillon, op. cit., 32). Even if the second One of Iamblichus (see 2 above) is not coordinated with the first triad (see Damascius, *Dub. et sol.* 43), while the first principle of Porphyry is an integral part of the first intelligible triad, these two principles nevertheless show some close similarities: both, in fact, are "anterior to the essence, " "principle of the essence, " "father, " "preexistent being, " "principle of the intelligible" (see *De Myst.* VIII, 2; Porphyry, *Comm. in Parm.* IV, 27-28; X, 24-25; XII, 26-27; XII, 29-30; and Damascius, *Dub. et sol.* 43). Given Iamblichus's openness to the Neo-Pythagoreanism of the 2nd c. AD, we should not be surprised if his second One has a strong affinity with the first god of Numenius, defined as "good," anterior to the *ousia*, its cause, its principle and absolute being (see fr. 16 and 17 Des Places).

From the conjunction between the *peras* and the *apeiria* the One-Being originates (see Dillon, 32), the third member of the first intelligible triad, formed by the *peras*, the *apeiria*, and by the One-Being (*hen ōn*) which characterizes it. This One-Being or Absolute Being is identified by Iamblichus with the Eternal Being (*to ōn aei*) of Plato's *Tim.* 27d, with the One of the second hypostasis of *Parmenides* (142b), with the One-Being (*hen ōn*) mentioned several times in the *Sophist* 244d, 245 a-e (*In Tim.* fr. 29 Dillon, 132), with eternity (*aiōn*) (*In Tim.* fr. 64) and with the model (*paradeigma*) of *Tim.* 28a (*In Tim.* fr. 35; cf. Dillon, 33-36). Since Plato (*Sophist* 248e) strictly associates absolute being with life and intelligence (see also Dillon, 36), this absolute being is also identical to life and to intelligence in their highest form; intelligence in this context is the *katharos* or *patrikos nous* which contains in itself the "monads" of the forms at an undifferentiated stage and which is characterized by symmetry, truth and beauty, but above all symmetry (*In Phil.* fr. 4 and 7; Proclus, *Theol. plat.* III, 13; cf. Dillon, 37, 260, 262-263). The third member of the first intelligible triad of Iamblichus corresponds fully to the third member of the first intelligible triad of Porphyry, represented itself by the *patrikos nous* and by One-Being (see above), and also reflects the Plotinian doctrine of the presence of being, life and intelligence in the second hypostasis.

We learn from Proclus (*In Tim.* I, 308, 20-21 and *Theol. plat.* III, 13) that Iamblichus, as had Porphyry, supposed the existence of two further intelligible triads after the first: in the latter passage Proclus traces to Iamblichus the doctrine of the three mixed beings—the three intelligible triads—characterized respectively by symmetry, truth and beauty. As before in Porphyry, and as later for Proclus, for Iamblichus the second intelligible triad was characterized most of all by life (*noētē zōē*), identical to the *zōon* of *Tim.* 37d, 39e, the third by intelligence (*noētos nous*); this latter intelligence—which should not be confused with the *katharos* or *patrikos nous* of the first triad, identical to being (see *In Phil.* fr. 7)—produces the forms true and proper (*In Phil.* fr. 4; cf. Dillon, 37 and 260). But Iamblichus goes beyond Porphyry, anticipating the scheme of Proclus: from this last intelligible triad originate three triads of "intelligible and intelligent" beings (Proclus, *In Tim.* I, 380, 21 = fr. 230 Dalsgaard Larsen; Festugière in his translation rightly integrates *noēton tē kai* before *noeron*; cf. Dalsgaard Larsen, in EntAC XXI, 16, and also Dillon, 308, n. 1); from the last triad of "intelligible and in-

telligent" beings a series of seven intelligent beings originates (*noera hebdomas*), corresponding in all probability to those of the *Chaldean Oracles* (see Dillon, 308-309, and the list in Dalsgaard Larsen, in EntAC XXI, 17) and in which the demiurge of *Timaeus* occupies the third place (Proclus, *In Tim.* 1, 308, 22-23 = fr. 230 Dalsgaard Larsen). The affirmation of Proclus (*In Tim.* 1, 307, 17-18 = *In Tim.* fr. 34 Dillon), therefore, is not strictly correct, acc. to which Iamblichus had identified the demiurge with the entire intelligible universe, placed, as has been seen, above intelligent beings; in any case, the demiurge of Iamblichus, to make the sensible world, "welcomes into himself" and controls the intelligible models present in the *noēton* (Proclus *In Tim.* I, 307, 20-25 = *In Tim.* fr. 34 Dillon; see also Dillon, p. 38): thus Iamblichus must have interpreted the passage of *Tim.* 39e about the contemplation of ideas on the part of the demiurgic *nous*.

In the system of Iamblichus, then, the idea again emerges at various levels of the doctrine of the presence of the ideas or models in the divine mind, an idea formulated by the ancient Academy and taken up by Antiochus of Ascalon, Philo, Middle Platonism, Plotinus and Porphyry. Descending further down the scale, acc. to Iamblichus it is necessary to distinguish the nonparticipatory or separate intellect from the intellect that is the object for participation in the hypercosmic soul and the *anima mundi* and which is inseparable from them (*In Tim.* fr. 56; see Dillon, p. 39); and the hypercosmic soul, transcendent, absolute, nonparticipatory and monadic—with which the Porphyry of the post-Plotinian phase had identified the demiurge (see Proclus, *In Tim.* I, 306, 32-307, 2) and to which the soul mentioned in *Tim.* 34b refers (*In Tim.* fr. 50, 19-27)—from the *anima mundi* true and proper, object of participation within the sensible world (*In Tim.* fr. 54, 9-10). Both the *anima mundi* and individual souls are produced by the hypercosmic soul (ibid.; see Dillon, 39). In Iamblichus, as in Porphyry and Plotinus, the law of the three moments is to be found—i.e., the *monē*, the *proodos* and the *epistrophē*—as is clear from Proclus (*In Tim.* II, 215, 5-15 = text 252 Dalsgaard Larsen, *In Tim.* fr. 53 Dillon; see also Dalsgaard Larsen, in EntAC XXI, 19). In this passage, containing an allegorical interpretation of the first four numbers, the *monē* is related to the number one, the *proodos* to two, the *epistrophē* to three; moreover, we may observe here the close association between *henōsis* and *tautotēs*, on the one hand (identical to the *monē*), and between *proodos* and *diakrisis* (= multiplication), on the other, which will be characteristic of Proclus and of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite.

Like Plotinus, Iamblichus makes his own the Posidonian idea of "sympathy" and "communion" between the various parts and elements of the sensible universe, as shown by *De myst.* I, 5, 17. As in Porphyry before him and later in Proclus, he holds the origin of matter to be from the superior principle (see Proclus, *In Tim.* I, 386, 10-16). The principal characteristic of matter is otherness, traceable to the dyad (*apeiria*) which is found after the second One (*In Tim.* fr. 7; see Dillon, 47-48).

In Iamblichus too we find the Plotinian and Porphyrian scheme of the various classes of virtues (political, cathartic, theoretical, paradigmatic), as testified by Ammonius (*In Categ.* 135, 12-32). To these virtues Iamblichus adds the "hieratic virtues, " also called "unitary" in that they realize the union with the first principle (see Olympiodorus, *In Phaed.* II, 138 ff; Praechter, in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos.*, I, 617).

Strictly dependent on Iamblichus (see on this point R.E. Witt, *Iamblichus as a Forerunner of Julian*, in EntAC XXI, 35-63) is Julian the Apostate. In his *Oration upon the Sovereign Sun* (ed. Ch. Lacombrade, *L'empereur Julien*, II, 2, Paris 1964) in which he makes substantial use of a writing of Iamblichus now lost (see W. Kroll: PWK 9/1, 646), he adopts the distinction, characteristic of Iamblichus, between "intelligible" (*noēton*) and "intelligent" (*noeron*): above the sensible sun (the third sun), there is the sun of the intelligent beings (the second sun) and the sun of the intelligible world (the first sun). While the first sun is the principle and cause of everything, above and beyond mind, and practically identified with the One-Good of Plotinus (*In Reg. sol.* II, 2), the second sun (*noeros*) is born from the first, receives from it its knowledge and acts as an intermediary between the intelligible and sensible worlds. This work of Julian constitutes an attempt to reconcile Neoplatonism with solar religion, popular particularly in the 3rd and 4th c. AD.

V. The school of Athens and the exegesis of the *Parmenides*. We have already had cause to note (1) that the correspondence established by Plotinus in *Enn.* V, 1, 8 (26, 23-27) between his three hypostases and the first three hypostases of Plato's *Parmenides* presupposes the theological and metaphysical interpretation of *Parmenides* given in Neo-Pythagoreanism, esp. by the Neo-Pythagorean Moderatus; and (2) that the teaching of Porphyry must be traced back to a *Commentary on Parmenides* which explains the agreement between the post-Plotinian phase of Porphyrian metaphysics and the theology of the *Chaldean Oracles* (see above). In later Neoplatonism too,

the *Parmenides* continued to be an object of exegesis: in the eyes of the Neoplatonists, it was a dialogue in which what they regarded as the true Platonic philosophy was set out, based on the hierarchical system of different beings which, from the One superessential and absolutely transcendent One, arrived finally at matter. As H.D. Saffrey and L.G. Westerink have shown in the preface to the first volume of their edition of *Platonic Philosophy* (*Proclus. Théologie platonicienne*, I, Paris 1968; cf. esp. LXXV–LXXXIX), Proclus, in the sixth book of his *Commentary on Parmenides* (1051, 34–1064, 12 Cousin), gives a detailed review of the interpretations of *Parmenides* given in Neoplatonism after Plotinus: he expounds, criticizing them, the interpretations of Amelius and Porphyry (the mutilated text edited by Hadot represents only the beginning of the commentary on the latter), that of Iamblichus and that of the "philosopher of Rhodes, " not further identified; and arrives finally at his two immediate predecessors in the school of Athens, Plutarch of Athens and Syrianus. It is not possible to proceed here with a detailed examination of the interpretations of Amelius, Porphyry, Iamblichus and the "philosopher of Rhodes" and of Proclus's critique of them, which in any case has been done by Saffrey and Westerink; here we limit ourselves to observing that the interpretations of Plutarch of Athens (see Proclus, *In Parm.* 1058, 21–1061, 20) and of Syrianus in large measure coincide: acc. to Proclus, Plutarch of Athens had identified the first hypostasis of *Parmenides* with the first principle, the second with mind, the third with the soul, the fourth with the forms united to matter, and the fifth with matter; Syrianus, for his part, had made the first hypostasis to correspond with the absolutely transcendent One, the second with all the classes of the gods (intelligible, intelligible-intelligent, intelligent, hypercosmic, encosmic), the third with the souls deriving from the divine soul, the fourth with the forms united to matter, and the fifth with matter. Again acc. to Proclus, the interpretation of Syrianus, while not substantially different from that of Plutarch of Athens, shows progress in respect to it, in that it includes in the second hypostases all the hierarchies of the gods, introduces in the second hypostasis the concept of henads, and limits the third hypostasis to the souls which participate in the divine soul (see Saffrey-Westerink, op. cit., LXXXIV–LXXXVIII).

Syrianus's interpretation of *Parmenides* coincides with that of Proclus, and is thus fundamental in understanding the whole Proclean system.

VI. Proclus and Damascius. Proclus, as in the case of his master Syrianus, makes the first hypostasis of the *Parmenides* correspond to the absolutely transcendent One, the second to all the classes of beings (or gods) including the lower ones, the third to particular souls, the fourth to the forms united to matter and the fifth to matter (see *Theol. plat.* I, 12). In the Proclean system, the process of "hierarchization" of beings is pushed to the limit. The relationships between the varied classes of beings arranged acc. to this rigid hierarchical criterion appear regulated by laws which, derived in large part from earlier Neoplatonism, receive their systematic codification in the *Elements of Theology*. Another work of importance, the *Theology of Plato*, of which six books remain, represents the *summa* of the whole Proclean system, setting out to be a detailed study both of the first principle and of the successive classes of gods. In the commentaries on the Platonic dialogues (*On the Parmenides*, *On the Republic*, *On the Timaeus*, *On the Cratylus*), Proclus, acc. to the example of Iamblichus and of his masters in the school of Athens, interprets Plato acc. to his own philosophical scheme; he aims at demonstrating that already in Plato's philosophy his own system is prefigured (see, e.g., *Theol. plat.* I, 2, 9, 16-18 Saffrey-Westerink). Here we can consider briefly the following points: (1) the most important laws that regulate Proclus's hierarchical model; (2) the first principle; (3) the henads; (4) the various classes of beings or gods; (5) the origin of matter and the characteristics of the universe; (6) the nature of evil; (7) ethics and union with the supreme principle.

1. Of the laws which regulate the relations between the different classes of beings, arranged hierarchically, the most important are the following: (a) the three moments of the *monē*, *proodos* and *epistrophē* (*El. Theol.* 29-35): this is a law already present in Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus and Syrianus (*In met.* 127, 9-10); (b) the likeness of the being produced to the producing principle (*El. theol.* 28.29.32; cf. Syrianus, *In Met.* 106, 26-29); (c) the inferiority of the produced being in respect of the producing principle (*El. theol.* 28.36); (d) the unchangeableness of the producing principle notwithstanding the production of the inferior being (*El. theol.* 27: see points 11 and 12 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); (e) the production due to the superabundance and overflowing of the power of the producing principle (*El. theol.* 27: see point 1 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*); (f) the strict connection between the production of the inferior beings and the division (or multiplication) of the unity and the power of the superior being (*El. theol.* 27.35.64.95: see above, with respect to Porphyry); (g) the greater or lesser participation of the being in perfection and in the

original unity acc. to the higher or lower point which it occupies in the hierarchical scale (*El. theol.* 36.62.86: cf. Plotinus I, 2, 2); (h) the strict connection between the place occupied by a being in a hierarchical scale, its dignity (*axia*) and its aptitude to receive illumination from the superior being (*El. theol.* 122.142: see above, with respect to Porphyry); (i) the presence in the superior beings of all the properties of the inferior beings, and the absence in the inferior beings of some of the properties of the superior beings (*El. theol.* 18.97.150: cf. Plotinus I, 2, 7); (j) the relation of the superior to the inferior beings, constituted by "transmission" (*metadosis*) (El. theol. 18), and that of the inferior to the superior, constituted by "participation" (*methexis*, *metochē*, *metousia*) and "conversion" (*epistrophē*) (*El. theol.* 1.2.3.12.148); (k) the function of the central member of a series, which extends to both the superior and inferior members, joining them together (*El. theol.* 148). Some of these "laws" are adopted in the *Celestial Hierarchy* of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (see S. Lilla, Augustianum 22 [1982] 554-557).

2. Different from Iamblichus, who had put two "ones" above the absolute being or One-Being, Proclus, like Theodorus of Asine, Plutarch of Athens and Syrianus, returns to the Plotinian conception of the single "One, " superior to being, to the intelligible and intelligent, and identical to the negative One of the first hypostasis of the *Parmenides*. The points which characterize the Proclean conception of the first principle are the following: (a) The many participate *in some way* in the transcendent One (*Theol. plat.* II, 1; *El. theol.* 1); (b) the One transcends the many (*Theol. plat.* II, 1; *El. theol.* 5); (c) the One is cause of the many (*Theol. plat.* II, 2); (d) the One is unique (*Theol. plat.* II, 2); (e) the One is above being (*Theol. plat.* II, 2); (f) the One is a nonbeing (*Theol. plat.* II, 2; II, 5) (see point 17 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); (g) the One is the cause of everything that exists (*Theol. plat.* II, 3); (h) the One is above mind (*Theol. plat.* II, 4; *El. theol.* 20); (i) the One is identical to absolute good (*Theol. plat.* II, 6; *El. theol.* 20); (j) although identified with absolute good, the One is superior to the idea of the good (*Theol. plat.* II, 7); (k) the One is above knowledge and word, i.e., absolutely unknown and without names (*Theol. plat.* II, 7); (l) the One generates all the divine orders (*Theol. plat.* II, 7); (m) the One is the source of goodness which fills the whole universe with itself (*Theol. plat.* II, 7); (n) the unity of the One is fecund, but its generative activity implies neither division, nor movements, nor multiplications (*Theol. plat.* II, 7) (see point 11 of the Plotinian doctrine of the One); (o) the One is desired by all beings (*El. theol.* 12); (p) the *via negativa*, characteristic of the first hypostasis of *Parmenides*, is that which is most fitting for the One (*Theol. plat.* II, 10).

3. As Saffrey and Westerink have shown in the introduction to the first volume of their edition of the *Theology of Plato* (LXIII), the Proclean system, from the One to the lower divinities, is composed of nine classes of divinity, which are treated in the various books of the *Theology of Plato* in the following order: (a) the One (book II); (b) the henads (book III); (c) the intelligible gods (book III); (d) the intelligible-intelligent gods (book IV); (e) the intelligent gods (book V); (f) the hypercosmic gods (book VI); (g) the encosmic gods; (h) the universal souls; (i) the angels, demons and heroes (classes 7-9 of gods were treated in the books of the *Theology of Plato* subsequent to the sixth, which have been lost).

The absolutely transcendent One, most important, produces a multitude of henads, similar although not identical to it (*Theol. plat.* III, 2-3). Of these henads, we should note (a) their generation occurs in a way which is appropriate to the One, i.e., in a unitary way (*Theol. plat.* III, 3); (b) the henads, as in the case of the One, are superessential, i.e., superior to all other beings (*Theol. plat.* III, 3); (c) different from the One, the henads are objects of the participation of the inferior beings (*Theol. plat.* III, 4); (d) the henads function as intermediaries between the One and the beings, linking these latter to the One and making them turn to each other and toward the One (*Theol. plat.* III, 3; III, 4); (e) the henads are ordered hierarchically: those nearer to the One are participated in by the higher beings, those further from the One by those beings of lower rank (*Theol. plat.* III, 5).

4. Proclus inherits from Iamblichus the division of beings or gods into the three great classes of gods, the intelligible (*noētoi*), the intelligible-intelligent (*noētoi tē kai noeroi*) and the intelligent (*noeroi*); the triadic scheme which is found in the two classes of the intelligible and the intelligible-intelligent gods and which is characterized by the presence, at different levels, of being, life and intelligence; the modality of the generation of the various classes. (The highest class originates from the One, while each of the following classes is originated from the immediately superior class.) From this point of view Iamblichus may be considered the most important influence on Proclus, who in his writings frequently calls him "divine."

For Proclus, as for Porphyry and Iamblichus, being, life and intelligence form three descending grades (*El. theol.* 101; *Theol. plat.* III, 6; IV, 1); and while being characterizes the class of the intelligible

gods, life characterizes that of the intelligible-intelligent gods and intelligence that of the intelligent gods (*Theol. plat.* IV, 1; IV, 3). As before in Iamblichus, so too in Proclus the triad being-life-intelligence is not, however, limited to determining the difference between these three great classes of gods, but is found within the class of the intelligible gods and that of the intelligible-intelligent gods, in that it characterizes the three triads which make up each of these two classes.

Proclus, like Iamblichus, postulates the existence of two constitutive principles of the various triads, of which Plato had spoken in the *Philebus*, i.e., the *prōton peras* (or second One, derived directly from the first principle) and the *prōtē apeiria* which is its infinite generative power, which occupies an intermediate position between the *prōton peras* and the absolute being, and which propagates itself, producing the other beings in virtue of a process of multiplication (*Theol. plat.* III, 8; *El. theol.* 89.90). While the *prōton peras* corresponds to the *monē*, the *prōtē apeiria* expresses the moment of the divine *proodos* (*Theol. plat.* III, 8). The *peras* and the *apeiria*, combining themselves together, generate a product which, itself participating in both, is mixed, *mikton* (see *Philebus* 27b): this is the being absolute in excellence (*autoon*), which together with its two constitutive elements, the *peras* and the *apeiron*, forms the first and highest triad of the intelligible gods, thus distinct from being. As it participates in the *peras*, this absolute being is a unity (*hen ōn*); as it participates in the *apeiria*, it contains in itself, in a hidden and indistinct way, the multiplicity of beings destined to assume an even clearer and sharper profile in the following classes (*Theol. plat.* III, 9). The *peras* and the *apeiron* also produce the two following triads: the second triad of the intelligible gods is formed by the *peras*, the *apeiron* and the intelligible intelligence (*Theol. plat.* III, 12; III, 14); the second and the third triads, also deriving from the *peras-apeiron* combination, proceed respectively from the first and second triads (*Theol. plat.* III, 12; III, 13). With respect to the three intelligible triads it should be noted that (a) the first triad is distinguished by the *peras*, the second by the *apeiria* and the third by the mixture (*Theol. plat.* III, 13); (b) the first triad reflects the moment of the *monē*, the second that of the *proodos* and the third that of the *epistrophē* (*Theol. plat.* III, 14); (c) the third triad participates chiefly in symmetry, the second in truth and the third in beauty (*Theol. plat.* III, 13); (d) proceeding from the first to the third intelligible triad One witnesses a progressive process of unfolding and revelation of beings (*Theol. plat.* III, 13; III, 14).

From the class of intelligible gods originates the second great class, that of the intelligible-intelligent gods, which fall within the stratum of life (*Theol. plat.* IV, 1; IV, 3), as the class of intelligible gods fall within the stratum of intelligence. Their main characteristics are the following: (a) the intelligible-intelligent gods act as an intermediate link and as a point of union between the superior class (the intelligible gods) and the inferior class (the intelligent gods) (*Theol. plat.* IV, 1; IV, 2; IV, 3); (b) in them there is a progressive multiplication and revelation of the *dynameis* which in the superior class still appear united (*Theol. plat.* IV, 1; IV, 2; IV, 3); (c) as in the case of the intelligible gods, these are divided into three triads, each of which is formed by being, life and intelligence. In the superior triads the intelligible component dominates, in the intermediate there is an equilibrium between the intellible and intelligent elements, and in the third it is the intelligent element which dominates (*Theol. plat.* IV, 3).

Classes 5-7 of divinities (the intelligent gods, the hypercosmic gods and the encosmic gods) are based on allegorical interpretations of certain divinities of Greek mythology and of the *Chaldean Oracles* of which Proclus, like Iamblichus, was a great admirer: a detailed examination of them, which cannot be undertaken here, may be found in the introduction of Saffrey and Westerink (*Proclus. Théologie platonicienne*, I, LXVI–LXXV). In his treatment of these inferior classes, Iamblichus must have been the principal source for Proclus (for certain doctrines of Iamblichus taken over by Proclus, see J.M. Dillon, *Iamblichi Chalcidensis in Platonis dialogos commentariorum fragmenta*, Leiden 1973, 52-53).

5. Like Porphyry and Iamblichus, Proclus holds that matter originates from the divine principle: carrying to its extreme consequences the Plotinian identification between *apeiria* and intelligible material (see points 10 and 11 of the Plotinian doctrine of the *nous*), Proclus identifies sensible material with the *apeiria* of the sensible world deriving from the *prōtē apeiria* (*In Tim.* I, 385, 7-8). The supreme god, as it is the cause of the *apeiria*, also originates matter which is its extreme degradation (*In Tim.* I, 384, 30-385, 2); and as it generates all beings, so also it generates matter (*In Tim.* II, 102, 6-11). The demiurge, which occupies a rather low rank in the scale of the gods, since it belongs to the class of the intelligent gods (*In Tim.* I, 394, 8-9), does not himself produce matter, but finds it already formed by the superior principle and is limited to imposing order upon it (*In Tim.* I, 300, 6-8; I, 384, 16-24). The imposition of order on matter by the demiurge occurs, however, *ab aeterno*, since the demiurge is by nature good,

and there has never been a moment in which it has not manifested his goodness (*In Tim.* I, 394, 23-25); the "evil and disordered" movement of corporeal nature (see *In Tim.* 30a) is therefore not real or anterior to the intervention of the demiurge, and even less due to the existence of an evil *anima mundi*, as Plutarch of Chaeronea had supposed (*In Tim.* I, 394, 9-11), but solely hypothetical: this would have occurred only if the demiurge had not intervened (*In Tim.* I, 394, 27-31). Also in Proclus, as in Plotinus and in Iamblichus, the Posidonian doctrine recurs of the close communion of the beings among themselves (*El. theol.* 148 [130, 10-11]).

6. Proclus inherits from Plotinus the doctrine of evil as absence of good, which he considers at length in the writing *De malorum subsistentia*, found in the Latin translation of William of Mörbeka, archbishop of Corinth in 1280 (ed. H. Boese, *Procli Diadochi opuscula De providentia*, *libertate*, *malo*, Berlin 1960). There are four points which distinguish the Proclean theory of evil: (a) absolute evil cannot be numbered among the beings, since all beings, by their nature, aspire to the good (ch. 2, 24-7, 29-32); (b) while absolute evil cannot exist, relative evil must—in order to exist—participate in some way in the good, as with every being (ch. 9, 5-18); (c) evil can be considered only as a relative and not a total absence of good (ch. 10, 12-13); (d) evil is not found in matter (ch. 32, 1-4; 35, 12-14): on this last point Proclus differs markedly from Plotinus (see above). On the use of this work of Proclus by ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite in ch. IV of the *Divine Names*, see S. Lilla, Augustinianum 22 (1982) 557-558, and the bibl. to be found there.

7. In his *Life of Proclus*, Marinus paints an idealized portrait not only of Proclus the teacher but also of his way of life; in the description of him in chs. 21-26 we find a confluence of motifs: Platonic (above all from the *Phaedo* and the *Phaedrus*), Plotinian, Porphyrian and Iamblichan. In ch. 21 we find the idea of the total separation of the soul from the body and of its retirement into itself, already formulated in the *Phaedo*, then taken up by Plotinus in the treatise *On the Virtues* and by Porphyry, above all in the *De regressu animae*; in ch. 21, following Plotinus and Porphyry, the difference is highlighted between *metriopatheia* and *apatheia*, identified with the absolute independence of the soul from the body and with the "cathartic virtues." Ch. 22 celebrates the progress of the master beyond the cathartic virtues to the vision of the ideas—the description of which, through Plotinus and Porphyry, may be traced ultimately to the *Phaedrus*—and to the attainment of the "paradigmatic virtues" present in the divine *nous* (this last is a Porphyrian motif). Ch. 25, following Plotinus and Porphyry, underlines the differences between the inferior life of the "good man" realized through the political virtues and the superior One of the gods attained by Proclus, and the identity between *apatheia* and *homoiōsis theō*. Ch. 26 names Iamblichus explicitly in celebrating the ascent of Proclus to the highest class of virtues, those which Iamblichus had called "theurgic." Most probably it is the "hieratic" virtues that are in view (see above, with reference to Iamblichus).

Proclus, like Plotinus, holds to an idea of union with the supreme principle, a union characterized by the cessation and surmounting of every noetic activity (see, e.g., *Exc. chald.* IV; *Theol. plat.* I, 3; I, 25: this last passage is considered by ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite in *Div. Names* I, 1: PG 3, 585B-592A; see S. Lilla, Augustinianum 22 [1982] 565 n. 189).

Of *Damascius, pupil of Proclus and the final scholarch of the school of Athens when *Justinian decreed its closure (529), the following works have come down to us: *Dubitationes et solutiones de primis principiis*, *Dubitationes et solutiones in Platonis Parmenidem* (corrupted at the beginning and edited together with the former by C.E. Ruelle, Paris 1889; new edition of the two works: Damascius, *Traité des premiers principes*. Crit. text L.G. Westerink, tr. J. Combès, I. Paris 1986, II. Paris 1989, III. Paris 1991 [Les belles Lettres]; Damascius, *Commentaire du Parménide de Platon*. Crit. text, L.G. Westerink, intro. tr. and notes, J. Combès - A.Ph. Segonds, I. Paris 1997, II. Paris 1997, III. Paris 2002, IV. J. Combès - C. Luna, Paris 2002 [Les belles Lettres]), the *Lectures on the Philebus*, ed. L.G. Westerink, Amsterdam 1959; and the *Life of Isidore* (*Vitae Isidori reliquiae*, ed. C. Zinten, Hildesheim 1967).

The work of Damascius is characterized by a minute examination of the numerous questions which emerge from Neoplatonic thought and from the interpretation of the *Parmenides* and the *Philebus*; all the possible implications and conclusions are meticulously discussed. In general, Damascius tends to exclude every possible relationship between the beings and the highest apex of the metaphysical system, for whom strictly speaking the term *principle* is inappropriate, which in a series always presupposes a relationship between the first and the following terms. He therefore accepts the Iamblichan theory which postulates a "something" above the One: this "something" is that which can be called "ineffable, " expressing the most absolute negativity which excludes from it even those properties which earlier Neoplatonism had usually assigned to the One (for references see S. Lilla, Helikon 31-32 [1991-

1992] 3-33). Immediately below this "ineffable" there is the One, corresponding in substance to the One of Plotinus and of Proclus and to the second One of Iamblichus; compared to earlier Neoplatonism, Damascius accentuates its property of containing all within its own unity, albeit in a yet indistinct state (see Lilla, op. cit., 34, n. 975). Below this One (or One-All) there is the multiplicity (or All-One) represented by the infinite power emanating from the same One and corresponding to the "paternal power" of the *Chaldean Oracles* (see the references and the discussion in Lilla, op. cit., 46-47, n. 1055 and p. 53). While the One (or the One-All) has as its symbol the limit (*peras*), the multiplicity (or the All-One) has as its symbol the infinite (*apeiron*, *apeiria*, see Lilla, op. cit., 56). From the combination of the One-All and the All-One the One-Being takes its origin (*hen ōn*), otherwise called the "unified being" (*henomenon*, see Lilla, op. cit. 47, n. 1055). The One-All, the All-One and the One-Being (or "unified being") together form a triad characterized by a substantial unity; but in reality these three principles can be called neither monads nor triads, which are only concepts on which the weak mind rests (see Lilla, *Denys l'Aréopagite*, *Porphyre et Damascius*, cited *infra* in bibl.). There is a close correspondence between the theological and mystical doctrines of Damascius and those of ps.-Dionysius (see Lilla, *Denys l'Aréopagite* . . . , op. cit. in bibl.).

VII. Neoplatonism in the Latin West. Thorough research on the influence of Neoplatonism in Western Latin culture has been the work above all of P. Henry and P. Courcelle (see bibl.): while the first has shown the presence of Neoplatonic motifs in *Firmicus Maternus (25-43), Macrobius (146-192), Servius, Ammianus Marcellinus and *Sidonius Apollinaris (192-202), the second has focused on Macrobius (16-34), Martianus Capella (198-205), *Claudianus Mamertus (223-235) and Sidonius Apollinaris (235-246). On the question of the dependence on Neoplatonism of various patristic writers of the Latin language, such as *Hilary of Poitiers, *Marius Victorinus, St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Augustine of Hippo and *Boethius, *see* *Platonism and the Fathers, with its bibl. On Calcidius, the studies of J.C.M. Winden and J.H. Waszink are still important today (see bibl.).

Studies: I. Prehistory and history of Neoplatonism: E.R. Dodds, *The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One*: CQ 22 (1928) 129-142; W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1930; C.J. De Vogel, *À la recherche des étapes précises entre Platon et le Néoplatonisme*: Mnemosyne, ser. IV, 7 (1957) 111-122; Ph. Merlan, *From Platonism to Neoplatonism*, The Hague 1960; Id., *Greek Philosophy from Plato to Plotinus*, in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 14-132; H.J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Neuplatonismus zwischen Platon und Plotin*, Amsterdam 1964; J. Trouillard, *Le Néoplatonisme*, in *Histoire de la philosophie* I (various authors) [Encyclopédie de la Pléiade] Paris 1969; R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 16-36.

II. On Plotinus and his sources: H.R. Schwyzer: PWK 21/1, 471-592; W.R. Inge, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, London-New York 1918; R.E. Witt, *The Plotinian Logos and Its Stoic Basis*: CQ 25 (1931) 103-111; Id., *Plotinus and Posidonius*: CQ 24 (1930) 198-207; E. Bréhier, *Le Parménide de Platon et la Théologie négative de Plotin*: Sophia 6 (1938) 33-38; P. Henry, *Les états du texte de Plotin*, Paris 1938; Id., *Les manuscrits des Ennéades*, Paris 1941; A.H. Armstrong, *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus*, Cambridge 1940 (repr. Amsterdam 1967); Id., *Plotinus*, in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 195-268; Id., *Plotinian and Christian Studies*, London 1979 (repr. of various important previously published articles); W. Theiler, *Plotinus und die antike Philosophie*: MH (1944) 209-225 (repr. in *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 140-159); Id., *Plotin zwischen Platon und Stoa*, in *Les sources de Plotin*, EntAC V (1960) 65-86 (repr. in *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, 124-139); J. Trouillard, *La procession plotinienne*, Paris 1955; Id., *La purification plotinienne*, Paris 1955; L. Sweeney, *Infinity in Plotinus*: Gregorianum 38 (1957) 515-535, 713-732; W.N. Clarke, *Infinity in Plotinus: A Reply*: Gregorianum 40 (1959) 75-98; P. Hadot, *Être, vie, pensée chez Plotin et avant Plotin*, in EntAC V, 107-141; E.R. Dodds, *Tradition and Personal Achievement in the Philosophy of Plotinus*: JRS 50 (1960) 1-7; J.M. Rist, *The Indefinite Dyad and Intelligible Matter in Plotinus*: CQ n.s. 12 (1962) 99-107; Id., *The Neoplatonic One and Plato's Parmenides*: TPAPA 93 (1962) 389-401; Id., *Eros and Psyche*, in *Studies in Plato, Plotinus and Origen*, Toronto 1964 (It. tr. by E. Perolio, Milan 1995); Id., *Plotinus: The Road to Reality*, Cambridge 1967; Ph. Merlan, *Monopsychism, Mysticism, Metaconsciousness*, The Hague 1963; R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin*, Rome 1967 (It. tr. by A. Trotta, Milan 1997); W. Beierwaltes, *Plotin über Ewigkeit und Zeit*, Frankfurt a.M. 1967; A. Graeser, *Plotinus and the Stoics*, Leiden 1972; R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 37-93; V. Schubert, *Plotin*, Munich 1973; W. Beierwaltes, *Denken des Einen*, Frankfurt a.M. 1985 (It. tr. by M.L. Gatti, *Pensare l'uno. Studi sulla filosofia neoplatonica e sulla storia dei suoi influssi*, Milan 1991); Id., *Selbst-erkenntnis und Erfahrung der Einheit*, Frankfurt a.M. 1991. See also the numerous contributions in the following three volumes: *Les sources de Plotin*, in EntAC V (1960), *Le Néoplatonisme. Royaumont 9-13 juin 1969*, Paris 1971 and *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente*, Accademia Naz. dei Lincei, Rome 1974; Th. A. Szlezák, *Platon und Aristoteles in der Nuslehre Plotins*, Basel 1979 (It. tr. by A. Trotta, *Platone e Aristotele nella dottrina del Nous di Plotino*, Milan 1997); M. Isnardi Parente, *Introduzione a Plotino*, Rome-Bari 1984 (with full bibl., 191-206); S. Lilla, *La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino*: Helikon 28 (1988) 207-260; L.P. Gerson, *Plotinus*, London 1994 (with full bibl., 295-316); M.L. Gatti, *Plotino e la metafisica della contemplazione*, Milan ^{2}1996; M. Andolfo, *L'ipostasi della "Psyche" in Plotino. Struttura e fondamenti*, Milan 1996; A. Trotta, *Il problema del tempo in Plotino*, intr. by W. Beierwaltes, Milan 1997; M. Andolfo, *Plotino. Struttura e fondamenti dall'ipostasi del "Nous,"* Milan 2002.

IIIa. On Porphry: R. Beutler: PWK 22/1, 275-313; H. Dörrie,

Porphyrios' Symmikta Zetemata, Zetemata 20, Munich 1959; Id., *Das fünffach gestufte Mysterium: der Austieg der Seele bei Porphyrios und Ambrosius*, in *Mullus, Festschr. Th. Clauser*, Münster 1964, 79-92; Id., *Die Schultradition im Mittelplatonismus und Porphyrios*, in EntAC XII (1966) 3-32; Id., *Die Lehre von der Seele*, ibid., 165-187; P. Hadot, *La métaphysique de Porphyre*, in EntAC XII, 87-123; J.M. Rist, *Mysticism and Trascendence in Later Neoplatonism*: Hermes 92 (1964) 220-225; A.R. Sodano, *Porfirio commentatore di Platone*, in EntAC XII, 195-228; J.H. Waszink, *Porphyrios und Numerios*, ibid., 35-83; A.C. Lloyd, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 272-295; R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 94-137; J. Whittaker, *Neopythagoreanism and the Transcendent Absolute*: SO 48 (1973) 81-82 (= *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, XI); A. Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition: A Study in Postplotinian Neoplatonism*, The Hague 1974; W. Deuse, *Der Demiurg bei Porphyrios und Jamblich*, in *Die Philos. des Neuplatonismus*, ed. C. Zintzen, Darmstadt 1977, 238-278; F. Romano, *Porfirio di Tiro. Filosofia e cultura nel III secolo d.C.*, Catania 1979; H.D. Saffrey, *Connaissance et inconnaissance de Dieu: Porphyre et la Théosophie de Tübingen*, in *Gonimos. Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies Presented to Leendert G. Westerink at 75*, ed. J. Duffy - J. Peradotto, Buffalo, NY 1988, 3-20 (= *Recherches sur le Néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris 1990, 1-20); S. Lilla, *La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino*: Helikon 28 (1988) 260-279; M.J. Edwards, *Porphyry and the Intelligible Triad*: JHS 110 (1990) 14-24; P.F. Beatrice, *Le traité de Porphyre contre les chrétiens: l'état de la question*: Kernos 4 (1991) 119-138; G. Girgenti, *Porfirio negli ultimi cinquant'anni: bibliografia sistematica e ragionata della letteratura primaria e secondaria riguardante il pensiero porfiriano e i suoi influssi storici*, Milan 1994; Id., *Il pensiero forte di Porfirio*, Milan 1996; Id., *Introduzione a Porfirio*, Rome-Bari 1997 (with full bibl., 161-174).

IIIb. On the anonymous *Commentary on Parmenides* attributed to Porphyry: P. Hadot, *Fragments d'un commentaire de Porphyre sur le Parménide*: REG 74 (1961) 410-438; Id., *Porphyre et Victorinus*, II, Paris 1968 (It. tr. by G. Girgenti, with bibl., Milan 1993); J. Whittaker, *Neopythagoreanism and the Transcendent Absolute*: SO 48 (1973) 81-82 (= *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, XI); A. Linguiti, *Per una rilettura dell'anonimo commento al Parmenide di Torino*, in *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in età tardo antica. Atti del terzo convegno dell'Associazione di studi tardo antichi*, ed. C. Moreschini, Naples 1995, 229-236.

IV. On theurgy and Iamblichus: W. Kroll: PWK 9/1, 645-651; J. Bidez, *Le philosophe Jamblique et son école*: REG 32 (1919) 29-40; E. Eitrem, *La théurgie chez les Néoplatoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques*: SO 22 (1942) 49-79; E.R. Dodds, *Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism*: JRS 37 (1947) 55-69; H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*, Le Caire 1956, Paris [2]1978; B. Dalsgaard Larsen, *Jamblique de Chalcis exégète et philosophe*, Aarhus 1972; Id., *La place de Jamblique dans la philosophie antique tardive*, in EntAC XXI (1975) 1-26; R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 118-137; H. Dillon, *Iamblichi Chalcidensis in Platonis dialogos commentariorum fragmenta*, Leiden 1973; E. Des Places, *La religion de Jamblique*, in EntAC XXI, 69-94; R.E. Witt, *Iamblichus as a Forerunner of Julian*, ibid., 35-64; H.D. Saffrey, in Id., *Recherches sur le Néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris 1990, 33-123.

V. On the school of Athens: H.D. Saffrey - L.G. Westerink, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne*, I, Paris 1968, XXVI–XLVIII, LXXV–LXXXIX; H.D. Saffrey, *École platonicienne d'Athènes*, in *Encyclopedia Universalis*, II, Paris 1968, 723-724 (= *Recherches sur le Néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris 1990, 127-129); R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 138ff.

VI. On Proclus: R. Beutler: PWK 23/1, 186-247; E.R. Dodds, *Proclus: The Elements of Theology*, Oxford 1933; W. Beierwaites, *Proklos. Grundzüge seiner Metaphysik*, Frankfurt a.M. 1965 (It. tr. by N. Scotti, Milan 1988); A.C. Lloyd, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 302-314; H.D. Saffrey - L.G. Westerink, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne*, I-IV, Paris 1968-1981 (intros. to the individual volumes); P. Bastid, *Proclus et le crépuscule de la pensée greque*, Paris 1969; J. Trouillard, *L'un et l'âme selon Proclus*, Paris 1972; Id., *La mistagogie de Proclus*, Paris 1982; R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 138-158; S.E. Gersh, *Kínesis Akínetos*, Leiden 1973; G. Martano, *Proclo di Atene*, Naples 1974; H. Dumery, *Proclus et la puissance de produire*, in *Néoplatonisme Melanges offerts à Jean Trouillard*, Fontenay aux Roses 1981, 159-190; M. Di Pasquale Barbanti, *Proclo tra filosofia e teurgia*, Catania 1983; G. Reale, *Introduzione a Proclo*, Rome-Bari 1989 (with full bibl., 125-163); S. Lilla, *La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino*: Helikon 29-30 (1989-1990) 137-186; H.D. Saffrey, *Recherches sur le Néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris 1990, 141-248 (collection of previous studies); var. aus., *Proclus et la théologie platonicienne. Actes du Colloque international de Louvain (13-16 mai 1998) en l'honneur de H.D. Saffrey et L.G. Westerink*, ed. A.Ph. Segonds - C. Steel, Leuven-Paris 2000; *Marinus Vita Procli*, ed. H.D. Saffrey - A.-L. Segonds, Paris 2001.

VII. On Damascius: J. Combès (the eight studies cited in Linguiti, *L'ultimo platonismo Greco . . .* [see below], 108); M.J. Galpérine, *Damascius et la théologie négative*, in *Le Néoplatonisme*, Royaumont 9-13 juin 1969, Paris 1971, 261-262; L.G. Westerink, *Damascius, Commentateur de Platon*, in *Le Néoplatonisme*, op. cit., 253-260; R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, op. cit., 158-159; R. von Haeling, *Damascius und die heidnische Opposition im 5. Jahrhundert nach Christus*: JbAC 23 (1980) 82-95; A. Linguiti, *Giamblico, Proclo e Damascio sul principio anteriore all'uno*: Elenchos 9 (1988) 95-106; Id., *L'ultimo platonismo greco. Principi e conoscenze* [Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere "La Colombaria" Studi 112], Florence 1990; L.G. Westerink - J. Combès - A.-Ph. Segonds - C. Luna, intro. and notes to the crit. ed. of the *De primis principiis* and *In Platonis Parmenidem*, publ. in the series "Les belles Lettres" (see above in the section of Damascius); S. Lilla, *La teologia negative dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino*: Helikon 31-32 (1991-1992) 3-72; Id., *Denys l'Aréopagite, Porphyre et Damascius*, in *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident*, Actes du Colloque International, Paris 21-24 septembre 1994 [Coll. des Étud. August. Série antiquité 151], Paris 1997, 135-152; C.M. Mazzucchi, *Damascio, autore del Corpus Dionysiacum*: Aevum 80 (2006) 299-334.

VIII. On Neoplatonism in the Latin West: P. Henry, *Plotin et l'Occident. Firmicus Maternus, Marius Victorinus, Saint Augustin et Macrobe*, Louvain 1934; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident. De Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris 1948; J.C.M. van Winden, *Calcidius on Matter. His Doctrine and Sources*, Leiden 1959; J.H. Waszink, *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, London-Leiden [2]1975; C. Moreschini, *Boezio e la tradizione del neoplatonismo latino*, in Atti Congr. Int. di Studi boeziani, Rome 1981, 297-310.

S. Lilla

NEPOS. (First?) bishop of Arsinoe (Medinet el Fayyum), in about 240. Millenarian, fervent defender of the Apocalypse, wrote against *Origen in a *Refutation of the Allegorists* which has been lost; Eusebius (*HE* 7, 24, 1-3) seems to know it through *Dionysius of Alexandria, his adversary. It is nonetheless an important part of the Egyptian tradition which has not been sufficiently emphasized, and which influenced the story of *Origenism. Nepos also wrote liturgical poetry (in Greek?).

Quasten I, 371.

J. Gribomont

NEPOTIANUS (d. 96). Nephew of *Heliodorus, bishop of Altinum, and friend of *Jerome, who lived in the 2nd half of the 4th c. After having initially embraced the military life, he consecrated himself to God; at first he intended to take up the ascetic life in the East or on a Dalmatian island, but affection for Heliodorus made him stay in his home country. He became a priest and coadjutor of his uncle; he died in 396. Jerome dedicated to him *Ep.* 52, on the life of clerics and monks, and wrote a funeral oration for him in *Ep.* 60 to Heliodorus, in which the virtues and qualities of Neopotianus become a portrait of the ideal priest.

F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son oeuvre*, Louvain-Paris 1922, vol. I, 182-184; PCBE 2, 1535-1536.

S. Zincone

NEREUS and ACHILLEUS. Roman martyrs. The oldest evidence of their cult is from the 4th c.: the poem of Pope *Damasus (A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 101-104) and the pillar of the ciborium which covered the primitive altar of the cemeterial basilica. According to these sources, the martyrs were two soldiers who, having deserted for religious reasons, were condemned to death. The bodies were buried in the cemetery of *Domitilla, and Damasus (366–384) erected a chapel over their tomb. Then in 390 Pope *Siricius erected an underground basilica over it. In the *Mart. hier.* their feast is 12 May. The *Gelasian Sacramentary* contains a Mass in honor of the saints. The itineraries of the 7th c. mention the tomb of the saints in the catacomb of Domitilla (CCL 175, 299.308.316.327.331); on account of the proximity of the tomb of *Petronilla (daughter of Peter) the legend says that the saints were brothers baptized by Peter. The cathedra of stone, from which Pope *Gregory the Great gave the *Hom. in Ev.* 28 (CCL 141, 239-243), was transferred by Baronius from the cemeterial basilica into his *titulus* of Sts. Nereus and Achilles, near to the Baths of Caracalla. The cemeterial basilica was destroyed by an earthquake in 817. G.B. de Rossi unearthed it in 1873–1874.

BHL 6058-6067; BHG 1327; LCI 8, 34-35; BS 9, 813-820; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *I SS. Nereo ed Achilleo nell'epigramma damasiano*: Studi e Testi 22, Rome 1909, 43-55; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926 (repr. Rome 2000), 388-389; U. Fasola, *La basilica dei SS. Nereo e Achilleo e la catacomba di Domitilla*, Rome [2]1967; R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* 3, Vatican City 1971, 136-153; W. Buchowiecki, *Handbuch der Kirchen Roms* 3, Vienna 1974, 350-367; Ph. Pergola, *Nereus et Achilleus martyres. L'intervention de Damase à Domitille*, in Saecularia Damasiana, Vatican City 1986, 205-224; Ph. Pergola, *Sanctuaires locaux et sanctuaires internationaux à Rome. Les cas des basiliques de Domitille et de Generosa*: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Vatican City-Münster 1995, 1097-1100.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

NERO (37–68). Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, Roman emperor from 54–68 with the name of Nero, was placed in the succession by Claudius before Britannicus, under pressure from Aggripina and moderate circles. A complex and controversial personality, Nero reigned until 62 with moderation, and then was influenced by extreme monarchist elements (Tigellinus) who incited him to ferocious purges of the opponents of absolute power: in 65–66, Seneca, Lucan and Petronius, among others, were killed under the pretext of the Pisonian conspiracy. In 68, faced with the rebellion of the Senate and the soldiers of many W provinces, Nero committed suicide. Galba succeeded him, acclaimed by the praetorian guard.

With respect to the Christians, the ferocious persecution of 64, which included among its victims *Peter and *Paul, was acc. to *Tacitus (*Annal.* XV, 44) caused by the popular outcry over the burning of *Rome perhaps brought about intentionally by the emperor himself. It was not owing to a specific Neronian law, but, acc. to *Tertullian, to the application of a *senatus consultum* from the Tiberian era. According to Tertullian (*Apol.* V, 1ff.), Nero instigated the *institutum* of the persecutions. On the other hand, acc. to *Suetonius (*Nero* 16, 38, 39), the Christians were condemned for *superstitio illicita*, and not for responsibility for the fire. According to M. Sordi, the change of Nero's policy in an anti-Christian direction, even before 64, is attested to in 1 Peter, written in Rome before that date (Sordi, *Il cristianesimo*, 85). Scholars have long debated the existence of a *institutum Neronianum*, i.e., of a specifi-

cally persecutory law, in the context of research on the legal basis of persecutions against the Christians.

L. Dieu, *La persécution au IIe siècle. Une loi fantôme*: RHE 38 (1942) 5ff.; M.A. Levi, *Nerone e i suoi tempi*, Milan 1949; J. Zeiller, Institutum Neronianum: RHE 50 (1955) 393-399; V. Monachino, *Il fondamento giuridico delle persecuzioni nei primi due secoli*, Rome 1955; J. Beaujeu, *L'incendie de Rome en 64 et les chrétiens*: Latomus 19 (1960) 65-80; 291-311; E. Demongeot, *À propos de la persécution de 64 contre les chrétiens et de l'Institutum Neronianum*: Recueil de mémoires et travaux de la Soc. d'hist. du droit écrit de Montpellier 7 (1970) 145-155; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan 21990; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; M.A. Levi, *Nerone e i suoi tempi*, Milan 1995; J. Malitz, *Nero*, Munich 1999; A. Ziolkowski, *Storia di Roma*, It. tr., Milan 2000; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

NERSES (Narsetes or Narsai or Nersetes). Name of various Armenian *catholicoi.

Nerses I (catholicos 353/355–372): *Faustus of Byzantium speaks of him, giving many semilegendary details. He spent some years as chamberlain at the court of King Arshak. Consecrated bishop, he showed himself full of energy, concerned above all to reorganize the charitable work and canonical rules of the *Armenian church. As catholicos he would continue to pursue political missions for the king.

J. Markwart, *Die Entstehung der armenischen Bistümer*, Rom 1932, 223 [87]-233 [97]; BS 9, 742-746.

Nerses II Astarakec'i (catholicos 548–557): convened the Council of Dwin (554–555) against the *Nestorians (or the *Manicheans?). Some canonical responses have been attributed to him.

EC 8, 1768.

S.J. Voicu

NESTORIUS – NESTORIANISM. In April 428 Nestorius was consecrated bishop of *Constantinople. Born ca. 381 (although the date is uncertain) in Germanicia (*Syria), of Antiochene education, perhaps a pupil of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, he was a monk and then priest in the Syrian metropolis. His election as patriarch was supported by court circles who had learned of his virtues and eloquence. Within the context of a series of initiatives aimed at reestablishing purity of faith in Constantinople, Nestorius publically disapproved of the use, by then widespread, of naming Mary the mother of God (*Theotokos*): Antiochene *Christology distinguished between the divine and human properties in Christ with the greatest precision, so that Mary *stricto sensu* should be considered only mother of the man Jesus. Nestorius, however, preferred the more inclusive title *Christotokos*. Nestorius's position gave rise immediately to discontent and protests, inducing *Cyril of Alexandria to intervene. In his involvement we find political and doctrinal motives intermingled: in fact, with the traditional rivalry between *Alexandria and *Antioch, Cyril regarded the presence of a prestigious Antiochene as patriarch of the episcopal see of Constantinople—by this time the principal see of the East—unfavorably, evoking the specter of Chrysostom; and Cyril's typically Alexandrian Christology, which emphasized to the maximum the subordination of the humanity of Christ to his divinity, accommodating their unity better, made him suspicious of an overly sharp distinction between the human and divine properties. The second letter of Cyril to Nestorius (the first was only a generic request for information) and the response of Nestorius (430), both of a doctrinal character, clarified the divergences between the Alexandrian and Antiochene Christologies.

In the context of their respective propaganda, both Cyril and Nestorius had informed Pope *Celestine in *Rome of the disagreement: the pope, without looking deeply into the question, decided in favor of Cyril and, following a council held in Rome in August 430, invited Nestorius to recant of his errors, and commissioned Cyril to transmit to him the Roman decision. Only in November did Cyril convey this to Nestorius, along with a series of 12 anathemas, which presented Alexandrian Christology in the most radical form: they spoke, e.g., of the unity of nature (*henōsis physikē*) of the human and divine in Christ. No Antiochene would have been able to submit to them. The council which began in Ephesus on 22 June 431 took a very irregular form on the initiative of Cyril: his supporters condemned and deposed Nestorius, then some days afterward supporters of Nestorius condemned and deposed Cyril. Faced with this irregularity, *Theodosius approved both the censures and depositions; but that against Cyril, who had returned to Egypt, did not actually take effect, while Nestorius spontaneously chose not to defend himself and retired to a monastery in Antioch. In his place Maximian was elected in Constantinople. Negotiations which followed between Cyril and *John of Antioch led to reconciliation in April of 433: the Antiochenes renounced Nestorius, the censures of whom they approved; Cyril set aside his 12 anathemas. The formula of faith (act of union) approved by both parties affirmed that in the One

Christ Son and Lord there had occurred the union of the two natures, human and divine, without confusion, so that he is consubstantial with the Father in divinity and consubstantial with us in humanity, and Mary is called the mother of God. Nestorius was exiled from Antioch, first to Petra and then to the Great Oasis, in the Libyan desert. He long survived his misfortune, up to the Council of Chalcedon (451), and in his late apology, the *Book* (or *Bazaar*) *of Heraclides*, he affirms the congruence of his doctrine with that of the **Tomus ad Flavianum* of Pope *Leo I.

Nestorius was accused of dividing Christ, of affirming two Christs and two Sons—i.e., man and God—of renewing the adoptionism of *Paul of Samosata, conceiving only as exterior the union in Christ of God and man. Nestorius always denied the legitimacy of these accusations and accused Cyril of being an *Apollinarian. It is not easy to describe all the details of his doctrine on the basis of the evidence we have: a few letters and homilies, and fragments, particularly of homilies, quoted by his enemies, assembled at the beginning of the controversy, and then the late *Book of Heraclides*, which has come to us in *Syriac, the ideas of which cannot be said to correspond *in toto* with those expressed many years earlier. On this question modern scholars do not yet agree: some speak of the tragedy of Nestorius, accused of errors which he had not committed, while others affirm the validity of the accusations. We will synthesize here the principal points of his doctrine.

The preoccupation of Nestorius, as a good Antiochene, was to protect, against both the Apollinarians and the *Arians, the integrity of the human nature of Christ, understood as a complete personality, capable of free initiative, where the Alexandrians reduced it to a mere passive instrument of the Logos. He therefore with great care keeps the properties of the two natures distinct, as well as the appellations which refer to them: this is why he prefers to give Mary the appellation of *Christotokos* (= mother of Jesus in his union with the Logos) over that of *Theotokos*. But notwithstanding the distinction, he refuses the accusation of preaching two Christs, constantly repeating the indivisibility and the unity of Christ, the incarnate Logos. To indicate the union of the two natures, he speaks of ineffable unity (*henōsis*), but prefers *synapheia* ("conjunction"), so that the union does not become a mixture. He adopts the traditional terminology of Antioch, and speaks of the humanity assumed by the Logos, of the temple in which the Logos has taken up dwelling, i.e., a terminology which highlights the distinction in Christ between the human and the divine. Given this fundamental concern, Nestorius cannot accept the Cyrillian formula of union of nature, of union of *hypostasis in Christ: for him in fact a nature has no subsistence, concrete reality, if it is not a hypostasis, so that the union of natures and hypostases seems to him a confusion of the two natures and of the two hypostases in the manner of Apollinaris. He prefers to speak of union *kat' eudokian* (= of complaisance, condescension), which his opponents denounced as *adoptionism, but which should be understood as the voluntary union of the Logos with humanity. To render this concept more concrete Nestorius repeatedly spoke of a sole *prosōpon* in which the two natures unite, but it is not easy to understand the precise meaning of this concept, given the generic character of *prosōpon*, which corresponds to the Latin *person*, but which always has the connotation of appearance, the external aspect. The expression had already been used by Theodore of Mopsuestia, but Cyril rejected it as insufficient from the outset of the controversy: it was thought that it could mean the psychological or moral personality in which the clearly distinct properties of the two natures come together, each nature with its own hypostasis and its own *prosōpon* (the mode of being of each real entity). In the *Book of Heraclides*, Nestorius speaks even of an exchange of *prosōpa* in Christ, in the sense that One of the two natures makes use of the *prosōpon* of the other as if it were its own, making him open to a late acceptance of the *communicatio idiomatum* (= exchange of the predicates of humanity and divinity in Christ on account of the union), refused years before in the response to the second letter of Cyril.

We can conclude that Nestorius, as did Theodore, intuited the danger of compromising the unity of Christ, inherent in the divisionist Christology of the Antiochenes, and sought to obviate it, though without making this good intention concrete in a theologically impeccable system. This deficiency was magnified by the confluence of a series of adverse circumstances of disparate character (political, personal etc.) which, assisted also by Nestorius's lack of prudence and malleability, brought about a chain of events which crushed Nestorius without mercy, and made of a good monk the impious divider of Christ. In Antiochene circles, however, his condemnation was not accepted by all. His supporters won to the Nestorian faith (two natures, two hypostases, one *prosōpon* of Christ) the Christian church of Persia which, despite its difficulties and trials, was destined to survive into the modern era.

CPG III, 5665-5766; Quasten II, 518-523; F. Loofs, *Nestoriana*, Halle 1905; DTC 11, 76-187; L. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di*

Efeso, Milan 1974 (bibl.); W. de Vries, *Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalkedon*: CCG 1, 603-635; M. Redies, *Kyrill und Nestorius: eine Neuinterpretation des Theotokos-Streits*: Klio 80 (1998) 195-208; S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy*, New York 2000; D. Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*, Oxford 2003; S.J. Voicu, *Nestorio e la "Oratio de epiphania" (CPG 4882) attribuita a Giovanni Crisostomo*: Augustinianum 43 (2003) 495-499.

M. Simonetti

NESTORIUS of Bet Nuhadra (8th c.). Monk of the monastery of Mar Yozadaq, where *John of Dalyatha took the habit, and author of a biography of *Joseph Hazzaya which was included by *Isho'dnah of Basra in his *Liber castitatis*. Before being consecrated bishop of Bet Nuhadra in ca. 790/791 he had to defend himself against the accusation of being a *Messalian before *Timothy I, who had already had the above-mentioned Joseph and John condemned in a synod of 786/787.

Baumstark, 226; O. Braun, Zwei *Synoden des Katholikos Timotheos* I: OC 2 (1902) 283-311 (302-311: letter of Nestorius which contains his confession of faith); R. Beulay - R. Beulay, *La lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, Chevetogne 1987, 217-223 (on an unpublished letter); Išō'dnaḥ di Basrā, *Liber Castitatis*, ch. 126.

K. den Biesen

NICAEA
I. City - II. Council of 325.

I. City. City of *Bithynia (today Iznik) and, acc. to legend, founded by Dionysius. It came under Roman control in AD 72, at the conclusion of the Mithridatic War (App., *Bell. civ.* V, 139, 1). At the time of Claudius, Nicaea competed with *Nicomedia for the seat of the provincial governor. Ruined by an earthquake in AD 112, the city was restored under *Hadrian, who visited it in 123 and who also promoted the construction of the city wall, finished at the time of Claudius the Goth. Damaged by the Goths in 258, it was repaired several times: again in the 5th c. it was rebuilt. An ancient Christian city, a series of martyrs are recorded there (see E. Josi, *Nicea*: EC 8, 1827). Bishops: *Theognis (*Arian, exiled in 325, bishop again in 328, d. 344), Chrestus (325-328), Eugenius (Arian, d. 370), Hypatius (Arian, 379), Dorotheus (381), Anastasius (at *Chalcedon), Peter, Appius, Anstasius II, Stephen, Theophilus, Photios, George, Anastasius III.

PWK 17, 226-243; DACL 12, 1179-1211; EC 8, 1827-28; EAA 5, 452-453; J. Sölch, *Bitinische Städte im Altertum*: Klio 19 (1925) 140ff.; for the bishops cf. M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, I, Paris 1740, 640-662; P.B. Gams, *Series Episc.*, Graz 1957 (repr.), 443.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Council of 325. After his victory over *Licinius, emperor of the East, in Sept 324, *Constantine made every attempt to settle the disputes among the Eastern bishops, as he had tried to do in the West with respect to the *Donatist schism, initiating the synods of *Rome (311) and *Arles (314). From the autumn of 324, therefore, he called the bishops to a synod, similar to the *comitia* of the civil organization of the empire, first to *Ancyra and then, for reasons of convenience, to Nicaea, near to the imperial residence at *Nicomedia. The *cursus publicus* was placed at the disposition of the conciliar fathers. The essential purpose of the synod was twofold: to settle the *Arian question and the matter of *Easter. A first approach of *Ossius of Cordoba, the principal agent of the political-religious policy of Constantine, to *Alexander of Alexandria in order to reconcile him with Arius, completely failed. On the contrary, a synod, held in Antioch during the winter of 324/325, confirmed the Alexandrian bishop's censure of the initial group of Arians issued by the local synod, which had brought together about a hundred bishops of Egypt and Libya. Constantine inaugurated his council on 20 May 325, on the day after the celebrations for his victory over Licinius, held at Nicomedia. The synodal fathers had been present already for some days at Nicaea. After a welcoming discourse by the emperor, spoken in Latin, the sympathizers of Arius spoke first, proposing a formula of the faith read by *Eusebius of Nicomedia, which, however, was rejected. *Eusebius of Caesarea then presented a formula of faith, on his own account, to deliver himself from suspicion of heresy, which had been attached to him for some months owing to a censure by the Synod of Antioch, but also to help the conciliar fathers find a formula acceptable to all. As *Athanasius of Alexandria would recount 25 years later in the letter *De decretis*, the discussions of the Council of Nicaea were long and laborious. With successive additions the traditional formulas of the symbol were determined in an anti-Arian sense, up to inserting the attribute *homoousios*, "consubstantial, " to qualify the unity of essence of the Father and the Son. We do not know who took the initiative to propose this insertion, which became the touchstone of Nicene orthodoxy. At the conclusion of the debates, only Arius and two bishops, Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais, refused to subscribe. They were each excommunicated, the two bishops deposed, and all three exiled to Illyria.

Just three months after the council, Eusebius of Nicomedia was also exiled.

The controversial originality of the "faith of Nicaea" is to be found in these words: "from the substance of the Father" and "true God from true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father." This way of defining the divinity of Christ was particularly near to the position of *Alexander of Alexandria, without, however, reproducing to the letter the propositions of his theology. Neither Alexander, nor after him Athanasius, seem by themselves to have used the word *homoousios*, which for the great majority of the Eastern bishops had become a source of doctrinal difficulty, even though they condemned Arius. The political developments of the so-called Arian crisis brought about opposition to Nicaea among these bishops, which lasted publicly up to the beginning of reign of *Theodosius I and the first Council of *Constantinople (381).

Among the disciplinary decrees of Nicaea, the most important regarded the date of the celebration of Easter, acc. to the Roman use and the Alexandrian use, i.e., on the Sunday immediately following the first full moon after the spring equinox. The necessary work of astronomical calculation was entrusted to the see of Alexandria. The canons of Nicaea, twenty in number, speak of the structure of the church (can. 4-7, 15, 16); the clergy (can. 1-3, 9, 10, 17); public penitence (can. 11-14); readmission of *schismatics and *heretics (can. 19); and finally gave *liturgical norms (can. 18 and 20).

The emperor closed the council, the honorary presidency of which he had assumed during the principal sessions, with a banquet and gifts offered to the fathers; this without doubt occurred in the context of the celebrations organized from 25 Jul 325 on the occasion of his *vicennalia* (he became Caesar at the age of about 36, 25 Jul 306).

The full ecclesial significance of this first ecumenical council become progressively yet gradually clear in the minds of the principal leaders of the church in the course of the 4th c. The faith of Nicaea remained the dogmatic rule invoked by all other councils of the ancient church.

Sources: CPG IV, 8511-8527; G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*, critical ed., Rome 1967.

Recent studies: I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nicée et Constantinople*, *Hist. des Conciles oecum.*, 1, Paris 1963; M. Aubineau, *Les 318 serviteurs d'Abraham et le nombre des Pères au concile de Nicée (325)*: RHE 61 (1966) 5-43; H. Chadwick, *Les 318 Pères de Nicée*: ibid., 808-811; H.J. Sieben, *Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee*, I-II: TheolPhilos 45 (1970) 353-389; 46 (1971) 40-70; D.L. Holland, *Die Synode von Antiochien (324/25) und ihre Bedeutung für Eusebius von Cäsarea und das Konzil von Nizäa*: ZKG 81 (1970) 163-181; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975; R. Lorenz, *Das Problem der Nachsynode von Nizäa (327)*: ZKG 90 (1979) 22-40; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Nicene Creed: A Turning Point*: Scottish Journal Theol. 36 (1983) 29-39; TRE 24, 429-441; C. Luibhéid, *The Alleged Second Session of the Council of Nicaea*: Journal of Eccl. History 34 (1983) 165-174; D. Spada, *Le confessioni di fede da Nicea a Costantinopoli*, Rome 1988; L.D. Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787)*, Collegeville, MN 1990, 33-80 (It. tr. *Storia e cronaca dei sette concili che definirono la dottrina cristiana*, Casale Monf. 1998); L. Perrone, in *Storia dei concili ecumenici*, ed. G. Alberigo, Bologna 1990, 11-56; *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. G. Alberigo, Bologna 1991, 1-19; R. Staats, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel: historische und theologische Grundlagen*, Darmstadt 1996; P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils*, Crestwood, NY 1996, 17-100; L. Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, New York-Oxford 2004.

Ch. Kannengiesser

NICETA of Remesiana (4th–5th c.). After having been confused, up to the end of 19th c., with a bishop of the same name from *Aquileia and with *Nicetius of Trier we may now, after the studies of Morin and Burn, almost certainly identify him with the Niceta mentioned by *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 22), the guest of *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* 17; 27; *Ep.* 29, 14), the author of a book on the faith recommended by *Cassiodorus (*Inst.* 16), and the recipient of a letter of 414 of Pope *Innocent I (*Ep.* 17), who also names him in another of his letters (*Ep.* 16) of ca. 409. Niceta, therefore, was bishop of Remesiana, modern Bela Palanka, in Serbia, in the 2nd half of the 4th c. He came to *Italy at least twice in 398 and 402, and was guest of the bishop of Nola who, at his departure, dedicated to him the *Propempticon*: from this poem (17) it seems reasonable to conclude that Niceta also exercised his ministry in areas outside the boundaries of his episcopal territory, situated in the Dacia Mediterranea, politically united to the East by *Theodosius in 379, but ecclesiastically dependent on the patriarchate of *Rome. If the work of Paulinus helps to reconstruct the figure of Niceta (besides *Carm.* 17 also see *Carm.* 27, composed on the occasion of the visit of Niceta to Nola for the Feast of St. *Felix in 402), that of Gennadius constitutes the source for the knowledge of his writings. These are the *Instructio ad competentes*, which have come to us fragmentarily in six books, dedicated to the catechumens and written with a pastoral rather than a theoretical aim. We have fragments of the first and second books which consider, respectively, the conduct expected of the candidates for baptism, and the errors of the pagans. Two treatises in our possession must be part of the third book, which against the *Arians affirm the divinity and consubstantiality of the Son, and against the *Macedonians the divinity of the

*Holy Spirit. The fourth book, however, on the practice of horoscopes, has been completely lost. Book V, which we possess in full, is an *Explanatio symboli* which shows significant affinity with the catecheses of *Cyril of Jerusalem: in it is found, for the first time in the West, the formula "the communion of saints." It is not certain if book VI, on the paschal victim, may be identified with the *De *ratione Paschae* variously attributed to *Athanasius (PG 28, 1605) and to *Martin of Braga (PL 72, 49). Also mentioned by Gennadius is the *Libellus ad lapsam virginem*, recently identified by Gamer with the brief recension of the ps.-Ambrosian *De lapsu virginis* (PL 16, 383-400). Among the apocryphal letters of *Jerome but attributed to Niceta is the *De vigiliis servorum Dei* (PL 30, 240-246), while under the name of *Nicetius of Trier is found the *De psalmodiae bono* (PL 68, 371-376), a sermon which advocates the singing of hymns and psalms and attributes the Magnificat to Elizabeth (Lk 1:46) acc. some Latin MSS. Finally, the *De diversis appellationibus* (PL 52, 863-866), a writing perhaps from Niceta's youth, considers the various christological titles. Uncertain and disputed is the attribution of the *Te Deum* to Niceta.

PL 52, 837-876; PLS III, 189-202; CPL 646-652; A.E. Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana, His Life and Works*, Cambridge 1905; K. Gamber, *Textus patristici et liturgici*, 1, 2, 5, 7: Regensburg 1964, 1965, 1966, 1969; M.G. Mara, *Niceta di Remesiana*: Patrologia III, 180-183; C. Riggi, *La figura di Niceta di Remesiana secondo la biografia di Gennadio*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 189-200; Id. (ed.), *Niceta di Remesiana. Catechesi preparatorie al battesimo*, Rome 1985; PCBE II, 1539; BBKL 6, 827-829.

M.G. Mara

NICETIUS of Trier (d. 569?). The principal sources on his life are the biographical accounts of *Gregory of Tours (*De vita* 17; *Gl. conf.* 92). To these may be added two letters written by him, and five received (MGH, *Epp.* 3, 116-122, 126-127, 133-134, 137-138), as well as two poems by *Venantius Fortunatus (MGH, *Auct. ant.* 4/1, 63-65). Originally from Limousin, where he took up the monastic life, he was named bishop of Trier in 525–526 by *Theodoric I of Austrasia. He had great influence on his contemporaries (he urged Aredius to enter the monastic life), including kings. He brought Italian workers to his city to restore the cathedral of St. John, the church of St. Peter of Neumagen and the abbey of St. Maximinus. No one better than this Roman could bring this ancient capital of the Roman Empire back to life, establishing there the the Roman character of his native Aquitaine. One may call the 6th c. of Trier "the century of Nicetius." He died perhaps in 569 and was buried in the basilica of St. Maximinus. His local cult seems to have started immediately (Greg. Tours, *Gl. conf.* 92), but the liturgical books of the city give evidence of it only from the 10th c. (AB 69, 285). His feast was placed on 5 Dec by Ado of Vienne, on the same day or on 3 Oct by the calendars of Trier of the 13th c., and on 1 Oct by an addition to the *Corbeiensis* (11th c.) of the *Mart. hier.*

BHL 6090-6092; CPL 1063-1064; BS 9, 900-902; LCI 8, 37; BBKL 6, 656-657; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle*, Paris 1980, 169-207.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

NICHOLAS of Ancyra (5th/6th c.?). Priest of *Ancyra. Nothing certain is known of him or when he lived: perhaps in the 5th or 6th c. Useful clues to this may be drawn from the dating of the MSS of the **catenae* which preserve fragments of works attributed to him, calling him Nicholas, Nicholas the priest, Nicholas priest of Ancyra, or Nicholas monk and priest.

He may perhaps be identified with the ascetic of Ancyra to whom the hermit Mark wrote his *Pros Nikolaon* (CPG 6095; PG 65, 1027-1050) and from whom he received in response a letter of thanks (PG 65, 1051-1054). From some references in *scholia* of *catenae* on the Acts of the Apostles it seems that he was probably author of commentaries on biblical books: *In prophetam Ioel* and *In prophetam Amos*. Perhaps we may also attribute to him a commentary *In Psalmos* and one *In Ionam* of which we possess two fragments with interpretations of the literal type.

CPG 6104; J.A. Cramer, *Catenae graecorum patrum in N.T.*, vol. 3, Oxford 1838, 35, 37, 38, 124; G. Karo - I. Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus*, Göttingen 1902, 35; K. Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht*, Rome 1926, 16-17; Y.M. Duval, *Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine*, Paris 1973, 454-456, 663-665; Bardenhewer IV, 181; R. Devreesse, *Chaînes exégétiques grecques*: DBS 1, 1146-1147, 1209; W. Ensslin, *Nikolaos*: PWK 17, 361; Patrologia V, 164 and 631, 650.

A. Labate

NICHOLAS of Myra (d. 343). Among the signatories of the Council of Nicaea (325), as bishop of Myra in Lycia (*Asia Minor). We know almost nothing of his life. He was perhaps born in Patara. He died 6 Dec 343. He was buried outside the city, toward the sea, where his mortal remains stayed until their transferral to Bari, 9 May 1087, when the Saracens invaded. The mausoleum has the form of a 4th-c. chapel, with his *sarcophagus in marble, dec-

orated with pastoral scenes, under an arcosolium. It seems to have been inserted into a basilica of the *ad corpus* type on a square-cross plan, above which are vaults and cupolas (6th c.), the last restoration of which dates to the second quarter of the 11th c. His popular cult was vast and universal, and was given new impetus by the translation to Bari toward the end of 11th c. However, the legend about Nicholas (BHG 1347-1364; BHO 10; BHL 6104-6121, Suppl. 235-237) is of no historical value. His feast is kept 6 Dec and 9 May.

BS 9, 923-948; *Vies des SS.* 12, 200-213; G. Anrich, *Hagios Nikolaos*, 2 vols. (TU 2), Leipzig 1913-1917; F. Darsy, *Il sepolcro di S. Nicola di Mira*, in *Mél. Tisserant*, (ST 232), Vatican City 1964, 29-40; M. Ebon, *Saint Nicholas. Life and Legend*, New York 1975; *An Anonymous Greek Account of the Transfer of the Body of Saint Nicholas from Myra in Lycia to Bari in Italy*, tr. by J. McGinley - H. Mursurillo: Bollettino di S. Nicola 10 (October 1980) 3-17; Ch.W. Jones, S. Nicola. *Biografia di una leggenda*, Bari 1983; BBKL 6, 915-920 (bibl.); LTK[3] 7, 859-860.

V. Saxer

NICOLAITANS. The evidence of Rev 2:6, 14, 16, 20 does not allow us to identify the sect, nor to establish its origins even in approximate terms. Probably it was a movement of doctrinal and ethical character. If they are to be recognized in the "false apostles" (Rev 2:2) they would correspond to those itinerant preachers who passed themselves off as prophets and apostles without really being such (see 1 Th 5:20-21; 1 Jn 4:1), who left their mark also at the beginning of the 2nd c. (Ign., *Eph.* 9, 1; *Did.* 11, 8-10). Their doctrine may be traced through an examination of their conduct. The Nicolaitans did not scruple to participate in the sacred banquets of the pagans (Rev 2:14-15), which were often accompanied by immoral practices. Archetypes of this conduct were Balaam (Num 31:16ff.) (who, acc. to rabbinic exegesis, had advised King Balak of Moab to offer Moabite women to the Israelites to make them deviate from monotheism and convert them to idolatry, making them eat the meat of unclean animals) and Jezebel (a name which certainly answers symbolically to a real person, linked to the Phoenician queen of Israel of the same name, who induced her husband Ahab, followed by a good part of the people, to practice idolatrous cults [1 Kgs 16:31; 2 Kgs 9:22]). This woman, passing herself off as a prophet, gathered a large group of faithful around her whom she misled with prophecies and seductions (Rev 2:20-23). The references in the Apocalypse lead us to identify a sort of pregnosticism, which in the name of a "superior knowledge" (Rev 2:24) professed and practiced a certain theoretical and practical laxism, pushing the teachings of *Paul the Apostle on Christian liberty to the extreme (1 Cor 8; Rom 14). The consequences would thus have been participation in the sacred banquets of the pagans, on the grounds that the idol is nothing, and a certain complaisance toward the imperial cult, the cultic act deemed adoration not of the person of the emperor but of his protecting genius. The symbolic language of the Apocalypse (food sacrificed to idols, fornication) seems to conceal this doctrine. Apart from the identity of the name, there exists no proof to hold the founder of the movement to be the proselyte of Antioch, the deacon Nicolaus (Acts 6:5). The patristic tradition is divided: *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1, 26, 3; 3, 11, 1), *Hippolytus (*Refut.* 7, 36) and *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 25) repeat and amplify the evidence of the Apocalypse. Their reliability is doubtful in respect of the deacon Nicolaus. *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* II, 20; III, 4), followed by *Eusebius (*HE* 3, 29) and *Theodoret (*Haer. fab.* 3, 1), rejects the identification with the deacon of Acts 6:5 and explains that wicked men distorted the true meaning of his words "it is necessary to disregard the flesh," making it a principle of licentiousness.

In the Middle Ages the title of Nicolaitans was used to include all those who opposed ecclesiastical celibacy.

DB 4, 1616-1619; DTC 11, 499-506; EC 8, 1859; LTK[2] 7, 976; M. Goguel, *Les Nicolaïtes*: RHR 115 (1937) 5-36; EB 5, 129-131; A. Pourkier, *L'hérésie chez Épiphane de Salamine*, Paris 1992, 291-334; P.D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food. 1 Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*, Waterloo 1993; Anchor Bible Dictionary 4, 1106; P. Bordreuil, *Qui étaient les Nicolaïtes de l'"Apocalypse de Jean"?*: Semitica 47 (1997) 105-109.

E. Peretto

NICOMEDIA
I. City and Christianity - II. Martyrs of Nicomedia.

I. City and Christianity. Nicomedia, civil and religious capital of *Bithynia, today Izmit (Turkey), at the end of the gulf of the same name of the Sea of Marmara (ancient Propontis). The name derives from Nicomedes IV of Bithynia. The city was founded in 264 BC. Described along with *Rome, *Alexandria, *Antioch and *Athens as one of the largest cities of the Greco-Roman world, it was the residence of the prefect (perhaps it was from here that *Pliny the Younger wrote his letter on the Christians to *Trajan) and that of *Diocletian, who, in 303, unleashed a terrible persecutions of which the principal victim was the Christian community (flourishing already at the time of *Dionysius of Corinth in

ca. 175), which then constituted half the population. The martyrology of Nicomedia is thus one of the most abundant, with individual commemorations (above all of St. *Anthimus and *Lucian of Antioch) and collective *memoriae*: 18 March (ten thousand), 22 June, 23 Dec (twenty), 25 Dec, etc.

With his solemn entrance into Nicomedia in 324, *Constantine signaled the final victory over his rivals, and the establishment of the religious peace. Even after the foundation of *Constantinople (330), Nicomedia remained the preferred residence of the monarch, who in the suburban villa of Achyron received baptism *in articulo mortis* (May 337) from Bishop *Eusebius, linked to the cause of *Arius, as were also the successors at Constantinople, *Eudoxius and *Demophilus. In 358 *Constantius established a new diocese, with Nicomedia as its capital, called Pietas in honor of his wife Eusebia. Weakened, to the advantage of its rival *Nicaea, by the pro-Arian policy of Bishop Himerius at the Council of *Ephesus (in Sept 431 *Theodosius II called a synod at Nicaea to mediate an agreement between *Cyril of Alexandria and *John of Antioch), the precedence of Nicomedia in Bithynia was reestablished at the 4th council (451) within the limits allowed by can. 28 of *Chalcedon on the primacy of Constantinople. On the metropolises, *see* *Bithynia and Pontus.

Invaded by the *Goths, shaken by earthquakes (24 Aug 358, Oct 359, Nov–Dec 362, 368, 15 Aug 554, 26 Oct 740, the last date commemorated liturgically), the city was several times reconstructed, in particular the great martyrion of St. Anthimus which *Justinian chose to adorn in marble and gold, the ideal setting to receive Pope Constantine I, in 711, under Justinian II.

The passage of the Persians and other invaders eradicated the ancient beauty of the city, still borne witness to by the city walls.

PWK 17, 468-492; CE 9, 70-71; EC 8, 1864; EAA 5, 455-457; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, 1, Paris 1963, 268-281; Beck 164-165; R. Janin, *Les Églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins*, Paris 1975; J. Darrouzès, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae byzantinae*, Paris 1981, 208, nn. 171-179; 221, nn. 191-201; P. Boulhol, *L'apport de l'hagiographie à la connaissance de la Nicomédie paléochrétienne* (*Toponomie et monuments*): MEFRA 106 (1994) 921-992; D. Woods, *Where Did Constantine I Die?*: JTS 48 (1997) 531-535.

D. Stiernon

II. Martyrs of Nicomedia. During the persecution of *Diocletian, Nicomedia, as the imperial residence, counted a very high number of victims among its inhabitants, and numerous groups of the faithful were killed in that city and mentioned in the *Mart. Rom*. A Greek *passio* (BHG 1219) speaks of 1,003 martyrs—men, women and children, free and slaves—slaughtered on the same day, after having spontaneously given themselves up to the emperor, spurred on by the example of four bodyguards of Diocletian, to whom they were linked by bonds of family or patronage: the four *protectores* had confessed themselves Christians from the very first days of the persecution and had courageously met their martyrdom. There have been various but unconvincing attempts to identify the four guards with better-known martyrs of Nicomedia.

Neither *Eusebius of Caesarea, who gives much information about the great persecution, nor the *Mart. hier.* or the *Mart. Syr.* mention this group of martyrs, their story being known only through the already cited Greek *passio*, which has a legendary flavor, and the Byzantine synaxaria. The dating of their martyrdom is problematic: the *passio* places it on 13 *mechir* of the Egyptian calendar (7 Feb), while the synaxaria give it five days later, 12 Feb, perhaps owing to an error of transcription. In both cases, however, given that the start of the Diocletian persecution is fixed on 24 Feb, it would be necessary to place the *dies natalis* (*see* *birthday [dies natalis]) of 1,003 Christians to the second year of the same persecution (304).

Their cult is absolutely unknown in the Latin West, while it seems probable that it was kept in *Egypt, as one can deduce from the fact that the dating in the *passio* follows the Egyptian usage.

AASS, *Feb.* II, 18-19; BHG 1219-b; BS 9, 982-985; *Synax. Const.* 459, 1.

V. Novembri

NILUS of Ancyra (d. 430?). Ascetical writer, disciple of *John Chrysostom. As he does not make any mention of the christological disputes, he must be placed at the beginning of 5th c.; the evidence confirms this hypothesis. More than twenty people with the name of Nilus have been enumerated by J.A. Fabricius - G.C. Harles (*Bibliotheca Graeca*, X, Hamburg 1807, 1-40: see index, Leipzig 1838, 70), and the works transmitted under this name (CPG 6043-6084; PG 79) raise thorny problems of authenticity. The links of Nilus with the emperor *Theodosius II and with *Sinai are based only on the *Narrationes de caede monachorum in monte Sinai*, a legendary account which it seems must be attributed to a different author. No ancient *Latin translations exist, and few Eastern versions.

K. Heussi has begun the study of the corpus of letters; establishing the order of the MSS, roughly

dealt with by the editors, eliminates a certain number of false problems. Even if, as A. Cameron has demonstrated, the recipients may have been modified, and certain passages have been interpolated—e.g., the pleading with the emperor on behalf of John Chrysostom—these letters nonetheless remain a document of value about a monk of *Ancyra. To the letters are connected the *Logos askētikos* (= *De monastica exercitatione*), a vigorous appeal for the return of monks to poverty, which is the basis of their "philosophy, " with ample use of the OT interpreted *allegorically (though not at all in an *Origenist way). Nilus uses *Philo, the *Vita Antonii*, *Basil and not the apophthegms. There exists a *Syriac version of this work. The same themes are to be found in a work addressed to Magna, a deaconess of Ancyra at the beginning of 5th c., *On Voluntary Poverty*, which makes explicit allusion to the preceding work; however, it also opposes the contrary vice, refusal to work (chs. 21-27), naming in regard to this *Adelphios*, one of the *Messalians of Mesopotamia, and *Alexander the Acoemete, "recently arrived in Constantinople" (PG 79, 997A), an event which brings us to about 427.

The *De monachorum praestantia*, a defense of a life far from the cities passed in recollection, has points of contact with the previous treatises, even if the critique of monasticism is less striking, owing to new concerns. Perhaps it is necessary to add the *Panegyric of Albianus*, as this monk, who was at the school of Leontius of Ancyra (who became bishop in 400), then pilgrim in *Jerusalem and hermit in the desert of Nitria, is similar to our author; however, the literary genre is completely different.

The commentaries on Ecclesiastes and the *Song of Songs are only known through the *catenae*. H. Ringshausen thinks that the author is the same as that of the *Peristeria*, an Alexandrian work, the author of which is generally considered to be difficult to identify. Ringshausen identifies him with the author of the Sinaitic *Narrationes*; he also believes, and he is very likely right, that Nilus was the author of the tract *On Voluntary Poverty*; his argument, in my opinion, rightly leads us to identify him with the monk we have been describing above. Ringshausen has great (excessive!) confidence in the letters and does not refer in the least to the *Logos askētikos*. It is difficult to judge the reasons which lead him to choose a yet unpublished commentary as his point of departure, but he may, at least in part, be right. In that case one would have two different authors, both with the name of Nilus.

There exist, furthermore, collections of sentences under the same name (there is a Syriac version): they are antitheses (on the theme corruptible-incorruptible), lacking great profundity. Numerous works of *Evagrius were circulated under the name of Nilus, without doubt at the time of the Council of *Constantinople of 553 and the censures of Origenism: *De oratione*, *De octo spiritibus malitiae*, *Ad Eulogium*. The *De octo vitiosis cogitationibus* is a compilation made by Cassian the Greek. The *Enchiridion* adapts Epictetus. A search in the MSS and *florilegia would be necessary to untangle this complicated history.

CPG 6043-6084; CPG/S 6043-6072. P. Bettiolo, *Gli scritti siriaci di Nilo il Solitario*, intro., ed. and tr., Louvain-La-Neuve 1983; DIP 6, 296-298; DSp 11, 345-354; H. Ringshausen, *Zur Verfasserschaft und Chronologie der dem Nilus Ancyranus zugeschriebene Werke*, Frankfurt a.M. 1967; J. Gribomont, *La tradition manuscrite de s. Nil*: StudMon 11 (1969) 231-267; A. Cameron, *The Authenticity of the Letters of St. Nilus*: Greek, Roman and Byz. Studies 17 (1976) 181-196; P. Bettiolo, *Le Sententiae di Nilo*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 1 (1980) 155-184; M.-G. Guérard, *Nil d'Ancyre. Commentaire sur le Cantique der Cantiques.* Édition princeps. Tome 1, SC 403, Paris 1994; D. Folger Caner, *Nilus of Ancyra and the Promotion of a Monastic Élite*: Arethusa 33 (2000) 401-410; L. Bossina, *Per un'edizione della "Catena dei Tre Padri" sul "Cantico": Cirillo di Alessandria o Nilo "Ancirano"?*: MEG 1 (2001) 29-51; H.-U. Rosenbaum, *Nilus von Ancyra, Schriften* I, *Kommentar zum Hohenlied*, Göttingen 2004.

J. Gribomont

NIMBUS – HALO (iconography). A luminous disk set around the head of a divinity, divinized person or allegorical figure. Particularly common in a Greco-Roman and Eastern context as an attribute of the gods, emperors and of symbolic personifications (J. Strzygowski, *Calenderbilder*, pls. IXXIII-XIV), it was assumed by Christian art, indicating continuity in the translation of an idea into an image, in a symbolic and cultic evocation. In the vault of the mausoleum of the Julii, in the necropolis under St. Peter's in the Vatican, Christ-Helios is represented with a radiating nimbus (O. Perler, *Die Mosaiken der Juliergruft*). In the frescoes of the catacombs it was initially given to ornamental and symbolic figures, and to the sun (Wp 2, 1-2), acc. to classical tradition. The seasons in the catacomb of St. Marcellinus and Peter have the nimbus, as do the Phoenix in the Greek catacomb at Priscilla (P. Testini, *Catacombe e ant. cimiteri*, fig. 115) and the representation of *Tellus*, also thought to be Cleopatra, in the hypogeum of the Via Latina (A. Ferrua, *Via Latina*, pl. 102). From the middle of the 4th c. it is attributed to Christ, both to his real figure and the symbol of the *Agnus Dei* (Wp 252), as well as to the dove. However, it is not used uniformly: its absence

does not have the same value as a chronological indicator as does its presence.

In the frescoes of the catacomb of *Domitilla (Wp 115, 2; 225, 1; 181, 1), *Callistus (Wp 243, 1), Mark and Marcellinus (Wp 153, 1) and St. Cyriac (Wp 205; 206, 1), Christ among the *apostles and *saints is the only one with a nimbus. Only later do *Peter and *Paul (Commodilla, *Traditio Clavium*, WMM, 148-149; U. Fasola, *La cat. di S. Gennaro*, pl. VI, fig. 71) and the numerous figures of saints who fill the catacombs receive the nimbus (Wp 255, 1-2; 256; 259, 1; 260; 261; 264, 2; M. Marinone, *Cat. di Albano*, fig. 16). That of Christ from the 5th c. often has a cross marked by a monogram, with or without apocalyptic letters (e.g., Marcellinus and Peter, Wp 252, *sarcophagi of *Arles, *Tarragona, *Ravenna). It is more rarely found, but is nonetheless found, on sarcophagi, where often it had to be painted. The form does not vary much, and the color on the frescoes varies from brown to blue, to a dark green, to yellow. Very common from the 2nd half of the 4th c. on mosaics, which allowed better preservation of the colors and on which gilded, translucent and bejeweled nimbi soon became popular. At St. Vitale in Ravenna the classical tradition of the nimbus as an honorific emblem is still found: *Justinian and *Theodora, among their court, are haloed. From the 6th c. onward, the nimbus is always given to Mary, to the angels and saints, and to the symbols of the evangelists.

The *tabula circa verticem*, the square or rectangular nimbus or "pseudo-nimbus, " considered by Paul the Deacon, in the life of *Gregory the Great, as a *signum viventis*, is placed around the heads of living persons in frescoes, mosaics and illuminations. Certainly manifesting a special dignity, or, acc. to some, a particular role (e.g., that of founder), intended to give the impression of a portrait true and proper, they assumed considerable importance in medieval portraiture.

DACL 12, 1272-1312; EC 8, 1884-1887; EAA 5, 493-497; LCI 3, 324-332; G. Ladner, *The So-Called Square Nimbus*: Medieval Studies 3 (1941) 15-45; M. Collinet Guérin, *Histoire du nimbe des origines aux temps modernes*, Paris 1961 (with bibl.); J. Strzygowski, *Die Calenderbilder der Chronographen vom Jahre* 354: JDAI, Berlin 1888, Suppl. 1; O. Perler, *Die Mosaiken der Juliergruft in Vatikan*, Freiburg (CH) 1953; P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma*, Bologna 1966; M. Marinone, *La decorazione pittorica della catacomba di Albano*: RIA 19/20 (1972-1973) 103-138; U.M. Fasola, *La catacomba di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; B. Brenk, *Aureola*: EAM 2, 720-722; G.B. Ladner, *God, Cosmos, and Human Kind: The World of Early Christian Symbolism*, Berkeley, CA 1995; TIP 230-1.

A.M. Giuntella

NÎMES, Council of. In 394 or 396, about twenty bishops, all followers of *Felix of Trier, came together at Nîmes (*Gaul), to settle the doctrinal conflicts linked to *Priscillianism and the quarrels that had arisen between the bishops of Aix and *Arles and those of *Marseille and *Vienne. The absence of the opposing parties impeded the resolution of these problems, but, by way of compensation, the council issued many disciplinary canons, esp. against the ordination of women to the diaconal ministry (can. 2) and against itinerant clerics (can. 1).

CCL 148, 49-51; SC 241, 124-131; Hfl-Lecl II, 79-81; Palazzini 3, 198-199.

Ch. Munier

NINIAN, saint. The most ancient evidence of this Scottish saint is given to us by *Bede (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* 3, 4), in two poems from the end of the 8th c. (*Miracula and Hymnus Nynie ep.*), and by a *Life* of a later era, by Aelred of Rievaulx (12th c.). According to these traditions Ninian was a priest educated in *Rome (ordained by Pope *Siricius?), then missionary and bishop for the Picts of the region of Galloway in *Scotland; he had founded a church of stone ("Candida Casa") dedicated to St. Martin, which was the episcopal see and place of burial of Ninian, today to be located at Whithorn or Withern. Ninian died as a hermit; Whithorn passed through the cradle of rigid Celtic monasticism. The feast of Ninian is celebrated in Scotland on 16 Sept.

BHL 6239-6241; BS 9, 1012-1014; LCI 8, 66; BBKL 6, 946-948; P. Grosjean, *Les Pictes apostats dans l'épître de s. Patrice*: AB 76 (1958) 354-378; J. MacQueen, *St Nynia*, Edinburgh 1990.

S. Heid - V. Saxer

NINO. *Rufinus (*HE* 10, 11, based on the lost ecclesiastical history of *Gelasius of Caesarea), recounts the story of an anonymous slave of the kings of *Georgia (*Armenia), who had converted her masters to Christianity. In this same form the story is given by the Byzantine synaxaria (Synax. Eccl. CP, 27 Oct). In the 8th c., ps.-*Moses of Khorene (Story of Armenia, 8th–9th c.) gives to this anonymous person the name of Nounè; the slave of Rufinus becomes a virgin ("nonna" in the sense of nun!) (see R.W. Thomson, *Moses Khorenats'i. History of the Armenians*, Cambridge, MA-London 1978, 238-240). The Georgian collection *Conversion of Kartli* (10th c.) gives two independent recensions, which are hagiographical in character but not without historical

elements, on the life of Nino; they reflect the relations between *Jerusalem and Georgia as established by pilgrims (e.g., the cross of gold on the Mount of Olives and the mountain of the cross at Mtskheta; S. Heid, *Kreuz - Jerusalem - Kosmos*, Münster 2001, 156). Bodi, the place of burial of Nino, may be identified with the E Georgian town of Bodbe. The Georgian synaxaria keep the feast of Nino on 14 Jan, the Armenian on 29 Oct. In the West, Baronius inserted in the *Mart. Rom.* on 15 Dec the mention of the "Christian prisoner," "the holy Christian handmaid" who had converted Georgia.

BHO 811; BS 9, 1018-1021; RAC 17, 45-50; BBKL 14, 1322-1324; P. Peeters, *Les débuts du christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques*: AB 50 (1932) 5-58; G. Pätsch, *Das Leben Kartlis. Eine Chronik aus Georgien 300-1200*, Leipzig 1985; G. Shurgaia (ed.), *Santa Nino e la Georgia*, Atti del I Conv. Int. di Studi Georgiani, Rome 2000; J. Pahlitzsch, *Die Bedeutung Jerusalems für Königtum und Kirche in Georgen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge im Vergleich zu Armenien*, in W. Brandmüller (ed.), *L'idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del medioevo*, Vatican City 2003, 104-131.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

NISIBIS
I. The city and Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. The city and Christianity. Nisibis (today Nusaybin, in Turkey) was a point of transit for caravans between the East and the West; Nisibis therefore found itself on the path of numerous invaders who, at different times, took possession of it. Populated by Greek colonies by Seleucus I, at the beginning of the Christian era it became the object of a bitter dispute between the Persians and the Romans. It fell into the hands of the latter from 297. If we say that it enters into Christian history from that date, we should recognize that its evangelization was much earlier, in that the presence of Mari, disciple of *Addai, apostle of *Edessa, is attested further to the S, at Ctesiphon, between 79 and 116. The first historical evidence of Christianity at Nisibis remains the epitaph of *Abercius of Hierapolis. Additionally, the memorials of the martyrs of Nisibis in the old *Breviarium Syriacum* show the antiquity of the evangelization of Nisibis.

The first bishop of the city was *Jacob of Nisibis, celebrated by *Ephrem in his *Carmina Nisibena*. His episcopate lasted about thirty years (ca. 308/309–338). He participated in the Council of *Nicaea (325). Jacob is also said to have founded the *school of Nisibis, calling Ephrem "interpreter" or commentator on the Scriptures. However, it is only with *Narsai (399–502) that the true school of Nisibis begins, after the closure of the school of the Persians at Edessa in 489. During the life of Jacob, Nisibis saw a period of peace. Shortly before his death in 338, however, the Persians returned to lay siege to Nisibis, then again in 346 and 350. After the death of Vologases II, the successor of Jacob, the emperor *Jovian negotiated in 363 with *Shapur II the transfer of Nisibis to the Persians. After the exodus of the Hellenic population, Shapur II had 12,000 Persians moved there to replace the inhabitants who had left with the Roman troops. Thus, having been Greek for six centuries, Nisibis became Persian. This change would have a considerable influence on the direction of theological controversies in the following centuries. Along with Nisibis, the five provinces beyond the Tigris also came under Persian dominion, becoming the five dioceses dependent on Nisibis. Among the Syro-Eastern metropolises, Nisibis occupied the second place, after Elam or Beth Lapat-Gundeshapor, royal summer residence of the *Sassanids.

The most famous metropolitan of Nisibis in the 5th c. was *Barsauma, who secured the triumph of *Nestorianism in Persia. One of his decisive actions in this respect was to attract to Nisibis the great doctor Narsai, who had been compelled to flee Edessa in 457 or 471. After coming to Nisibis he founded, at the request of Barsauma, the school of Nisibis, a breeding ground of bishops and missionaries, the intellectual and spiritual center of Nestorianism. Barsauma also founded a hospital in which the doctors of Nisibis were trained, who subsequently had great influence at the court of the king of Persia, a tradition which continued up to the court of the caliphs of Baghdad (9th c.).

At the beginning of 6th c. the first *monophysites appeared in Nisibis. Nonetheless, the city remained the stronghold of Nestorianism, its influence making itself felt as far as Roman Syria. The contacts and exchange of ideas with the Byzantines were not interrupted, however. The metropolitan *Paul of Nisibis was one of the theologians sent by *Chosroes I to *Justinian for a disputation on theological matters. It was, however, at the school of Nisibis itself, in about 567, that a theological dispute broke out with *Henana of Adiabene, who, since he taught theses contrary to the doctrine of the Interpreter (*Theodore of Mopsuestia, d. 428), was expelled from the school.

From 565 onward, with the emperor *Justin II, a new period began in the relations between the Persians and the Byzantines. The latter laid claim to Nisibis, and hostilities started again in 572. The Persians, however, retained the city. At the death of the metropolitan Paul in 573, Henana returned as director of the school of Nisibis and resumed teaching his errors. The new metropolitan, Gregory, was im-

potent against the rebels, because Chosroes, manipulated by the doctors and Henana, in 601 sent Gregory into exile, where he died in 611/612.

The conflict between the Persians and the Byzantines resumed in 602. Nisibis rose up against Chosroes, and the king seized control and sacked the city. Neither was the church in peace, disturbed by doctrinal controversies. Cyriacus, metropolitan of Nisibis, reached an agreement with numerous other metropolitans to elect *Babai the Great as the general supervisor of the convents, to the end of combating the *Messalians, and the followers of Henana and *Joseph Hazzaya. For more than ten years Babai worked to consolidate the Nestorian faith, until his death a little after the year 628. In the meantime the battle between the Persians and the Byzantines continued, extending itself even more under *Heraclius, who repelled the Persians and advanced toward the cities of royal residence, which he conquered in 629. Nisibis was then in the hands of the Byzantines. In the same period (631) we read of a Syro-Western bishop in the city, Abraham by name. We do not know if he had successors. During the Byzantine occupation, Nisibis was hit by a terrible famine. In 639 Heraclius had to abandon the city, and it was surrendered to Arab Muslims, thereby beginning a new era for the city. At this time the Nestorian church was engaged mainly in the fight against the monophysites, who sought to establish themselves within the city: in 707 this project was brought to an end. In that very year a monk of Qartamin, Simon of Zayté, had a large church built for the orthodox, and a hospice for foreigners. The uninterrupted series of Syro-Western bishops of Nisibis, however, began only in the 9th c. The school of the city, even if the doctrinal innovations of Henana had brought it into discredit, continued to exist until 832, when it was replaced by the school of Baghdad.

DTC 11, 157-323; CE 10, 473-474; Labourt, passim; Ortiz de Urbina, 15-17; 120-122; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, CSCO 266, Subs. 26, Louvain 1965; J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, Subs. 36, Louvain 1970; Id., *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants, des origines à nos jours*, CSCO 388, Subs. 54, Louvain 1977; D. Bundy, *Jacob of Nisibis as a Model for the Episcopacy*: LM 104 (1991) 235-249; E. Kettenhofen, *Die Eroberung von Nisibis und Karrhai durch die Sasaniden in der Zeit Kaiser Maximins (235/236 n. Chr.)*: Iranica Antiqua 30 (1995) 159-177.

R. LAVENANT

II. Archaeology. The church of Mar Yaqub, constructed above the crypt, is believed to have been inhabited by the saint. It was built in 359 and transformed in the 8th and 9th c.: it is a building on a square plan, with an apse at the E and facing atrium.

J. Strzygowski, *L'ancien art chrétien de Syrie*, Paris 1936, 9 and 147; U. Monneret de Villard, *Le chiese della Mesopotamia*, Rome 1940.

B. BAGATTI

NISIBIS, School of. After the surrender of Nisibis to the *Sassanid Empire in 363, the exegetical-theological division of the school of Nisibis was transferred to *Edessa which thanks to the influence of *Ephrem continued to attract many students from Persian lands and was as a result called "the School of the Persians." *Narsai, who was first a student and then in 437–457 became the rector of the school, had to leave Edessa after 457 because of his *dyophysite *Christology. Ceding to the pressures of the metropolitan *Barsauma, who also was once a student at Edessa, Narsai in 471 at Nisibis established the true and proper school of Nisibis, which undoubtedly took on teachers and students from the school of Edessa when it was closed by the emperor *Zeno in 489. In 494, the first rules of the school were drafted, which immediately became the spiritual and intellectual center of the church of Persia and the primary architect of its adoption of dyophysite Christology.

After the death of Narsai in 502, the school was directed for a very long and uninterrupted period from 510 to 569–570 by *Abraham of Beth Rabban, who ordered the construction of a large complex of buildings to host the ever-increasing activity of the school. From 569 to 571, the future *catholicos* *Isho'yahb I was rector of the school. His successor *Henana of Adiabene, one of the great Syro-Western theologians and the enfant terrible of the church of Persia, led the school from 572–610. From 572 onward Henana was a protagonist of exegetical and theological debate, inciting bitter controversies because of his exegetical and christological innovations. For this reason, in 596–597, nearly 300 teachers and students—among whom was *Ishai, the future *catholicos* *Isho'yahb II and *Michael Badoqa—left the school of Nisibis, and many of them then went on to other schools. The most famous teacher of the school of Nisibis was without a doubt Mar *Aba, who toward the end of the years 530–540 established the school of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon.

In the literary field, the school of Nisibis was best known for a type of theological explanation of "reasons" for certain celebrations, liturgical or otherwise, which seems to have been developed by Narsai and became a widespread literary genre in the schools and in the monasteries of the church of the East. Among the authors from whom such Explanations have survived we find Ishai, *Thomas of Edessa,

*Cyrus of Edessa, Henana and *Barhadbeshabba ʿArbāyā. This last author wrote, between the years 558 and 596, the speech On the Formation of the Schools, which is one of the most important sources for our understanding of the history of the school of Nisibis.

Patrologia V, 473-476; A. Scher, *Mar Barhadbeshabba ʿArbaya, évêque de Halwan (VIe siècle), Cause de la fondation des écoles* (PO 4/4), Paris 1908; A. Vööbus, *The Statutes of the School of Nisibis*, Stockholm 1961; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 226), Louvain 1965; N. El-Khoury, *Auswirkungen der Schule von Nisibis:* OC 59 (1975) 121-129; R. Macina, *L'homme à l'école de Dieu. D'Antioche à Nisibe: profile herméneutique, théologique et kérygmatique du mouvement scoliaste nestorien. Monographie programmatique*: POC 32 (1982) 86-124, 263-301 and 33 (1983) 39-103; Mar Abraham Mattam, *The School of Nisibis-Edessa: First Theological University in Christendom*: Christian Orient 6 (1985) 30-39.

K. den Biesen

NITRIA. This monastic complex was found in the W part of the Nile Delta, at the boundary of the cultivated area, where in about 315 Amun (*Ammon, d. ca. 337), a contemporary of *Anthony, retired. The name comes from the Greek *nitron* (Lat. *nitrium*, owing to the existence of saltpeter caves); literary sources speak of the mountain of Nitria, as it is higher than the Nile Valley (Palladius, *Historia Laus.* 7, 1,). Having married, Amun decided to live in chastity with his wife who, after 18 years of marriage, suggested that he embrace the ascetic life. He then retired, as an anchorite, into the desert of Nitria (Palladius, ibid., ch. 8), perhaps to be located in the present-day village of el-Barnudj, 14 km (8.7 mi) to the S of the city of Damanhour (the ancient Hermopolis Parva). Other anchorites joined him. Rufinus, in the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (chs. 21-22), writes that he went to Nitria, where there were *monks under the guide of one sole father, some living alone, others in larger or smaller groups. Thus the eremetic and *cenobitic life were established in the same place. *Palladius also, author of the *Historia Lausiaca* (ch. 7), went to Nitria in 390, remaining there one year; he puts the number of people there at five thousand. There was a common church and next door a house for pilgrims, who could remain as long as they wished, although they had to contribute by working. The monks produced wine, bread and fabrics, which they sold for their maintenance. They came together for common prayer on Saturday and Sunday; there were eight priests, but the eldest celebrated and preached. Among the illustrious visitors, beyond the two already mentioned, were *Jerome and *Paula in about 385, and *Evagrius of Pontus, who remained there ten years. In the 7th c. the vast monastery faded away. Deriving from this monastic center was that of Kellia (the cells), some 10 km (6.2 mi) to the SW, founded in about 337, of which numerous ruins remain in an area of ca. 100 square km (ca. 40 square mi). Much farther to the S, some 60 km (37.3 mi), the monastic complex of Scete at Wadi-Natrum is to be found; it was founded at that same time, and is still in existence.

DIP 6, 303-306; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1794-1796; W. Harmless, *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism*, New York 2004, 279-281 (see index).

A. Di Berardino

NOAH.
I. In the Fathers - II. Ark of Noah (iconography).

I. In the Fathers. Noah, whose name etymologically means "consoled, " is the patriarch of the age of the flood of which both Genesis and some Babylonian texts speak. In the biblical text, Noah is a farmer, inventor of the cultivation of vines and makes Ham serve Shem (Gen 9:18-27); Noah, however, is principally connected with the flood (Gen 6:5-9 and 17), known as a the righteous man who is saved along with his family and cooperating in the salvation of humanity. After the sin of the first couple, it is with Noah that God makes a new covenant, with the promise that there will not be another flood, and with the symbol of the rainbow as sign of this promise. Noah is mentioned also in other books of the OT (Is 54:9; Ezek 14:12-23; Sir 44:17) and of the NT, from the gospels to the letters. In fact, in Mt 24:37 the unexpected second coming of the Son of Man is compared by Jesus to the arrival of the flood, which surprised people while they ate, drank and married, up to the moment that Noah entered the ark: "And they knew nothing until the flood came and swept them all away." In Hebrews, Noah—together with Abel, Enoch and obviously Abraham—is a symbol of that faith defined in 11:1—"the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen": "By faith Noah, warned by God about events as yet unseen, respected the warning and built an ark to save his household; by this he condemned the world and became an heir to the righteousness that is in accordance with faith" (Heb 11:7). A typological interpretation of the Noachic episode as a prefiguration of baptism is found already in 1 Pet 3:20, where the eight persons saved by Noah "by means of water" are a "figure of baptism, which saves you now." In 2 Pet 2:5 Noah is the righteous man who announces

justice: if God "did not spare the ancient world, he nonetheless saved Noah, a herald of righteousness, with seven others, when he brought a flood on a world of the ungodly." These typological meanings with which Noah is invested in the NT were taken up and developed in the Fathers, while side-by-side with this, in the rabbinic literature, Noah has the role of intercessor before God in favor of the just. In this way he remains a figure who contributes to the work of salvation.

In the Fathers in general, Noah, a subject of Christian iconography from ancient times, inspiring in poetry also a hymn of *Romanus Melodus, is seen as an example of morality and faith, as in *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 43, 70, and as a preacher of penitence already in *1 Clement* 7, 6, and then in *Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autol.* 3, 19. Above all, however, the person of Noah has frequently and from the earliest times been an object of typological *exegesis, principally as a type of Christ and antitype of Adam.

In fact, acc. to *Justin Martyr, who provides an extended typological reflection on the wood and the water as symbols respectively of the cross and of baptism which admit to salvation, frequently in *Dial.* 86 associating the wood and the water in order to connect the cross and baptism, the just man Noah prefigures Christ, and the eight persons who are saved with him in the ark represent the *Ogdoad which Christ accomplished, saving us through the wood of the cross, as Noah brings the righteous to salvation through the wood of the ark (*Dial.* 138, 1-2): "In the times of the flood the μυστήριον of human salvation appeared. For the just Noah, along with the others at the flood, i.e., with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, in which Christ appeared when he rose from the dead, the day which always has the prerogative of being the first, " i.e., Sunday, the day of the Lord. In patristic exegesis the episode of the ark is often considered a figure of baptism, following 1 Pet 3:20-21, which as we saw interprets the salvation of the ark precisely as a τύπος of baptism (see H. Rahner, *L'ecclesiologia dei Padri. Simboli della Chiesa*, It. tr. Rome 1971, 865-938; Id., *Miti greci nell'interpretazione cristiana*, It. tr. Bologna 1971, 63-86: *Il mistero della croce*; 87-106: *Il mistero del battesimo*). Justin also insists, alongside the way of the flood and of baptism, on the importance of the wood, that of the ark, which prefigures that of the cross of Christ, which "became the origin of another race regenerated by himself through water, and faith, and wood, possessing the mystery of the cross [μυστήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ]; even as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters with his household. Accordingly, when the prophet [Is 54:8-9] says, 'I saved you in the times of Noah,' he addresses at the same time the people who truly have faith in God, and possess these signs, " that is those of baptism and of the cross, "as was shown in advance by all the symbols [σύμβολα] of the flood; i.e., those who are prepared by water, faith, and wood and who repent of their sins shall escape from the impending judgment of God" (*Dial.* 138, 2-3). The typology of the sons of Noah and their descendants is traced by Justin to the presence of a great μυστήριον, accomplished in Christ ("There is another mystery prophesied at the times of Noah, and which has been accomplished, " *Dial.* 139, 1), linked to the universality of salvation of Christ. Justin's line was followed by *Clement and *Origen, who show continuity with him in their interpretation of Noah: in *Hom. in Gen.* 2 both a typological exegesis and an *allegorical exegesis of the Noah story are provided: in the first, Noah represents Christ, the flood the end of the world and the ark the church; in the second, the three and two floors of the ark are seen as a symbol of the three senses of Scripture, which are sometimes only two because, acc. to Origen, in certain biblical passages the literal sense is absent, and we are faced with the ἄλογα or the ἀδύνατα.

The ark also becomes a symbol of the church in the controversy between *Hippolytus and Pope *Callistus, on the question of whether the ark-church symbolizes a Christian community, including both the just and sinners, or refers only to the instrument of salvation of the first. *Cyril of Jerusalem also considers the typology of the dove which, sent by Noah out of the ark, returns with an olive branch: this prefigures the baptism of Christ in the Jordan, when the Holy Spirit descended on him in the form of a dove (*Cat.* 17, 7). According to *Asterius the Sophist, Noah, closed up in the ark during the flood, prefigures Christ buried in the tomb (*Hom. in Ps.* 6).

A type of Christ, Noah is also an antitype of Adam, in that, acc. to St. *Athanasius of Alexandria, Noah is he who renews the human race corrupted by sin (*Oratio c. Arian.* 2, 51), who has saved, in himself, the image of God and domination over the inferior creatures, as note *Basil of Seleucia, *Or.* 5, 2; *Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topogr. Chr.* 5; and *John Chrysostom *Hom. in Gen.* 25, 5. The name of Noah, acc. to Origen, means "justice, " δικαιοσύνη (*Hom. in Gen.* 2, 3): in effect, already for his master Clement, as earlier for Justin, Noah is a symbol of the just: thus Origen in *Princ. I praef.* 4 can include Noah among the just of God who, in an anti-*Marcionite sense, is called "God of all the just, from the foundation of the world: Adam, Abel, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, Noah,

Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob . . . Jesus Christ, the apostles." Even the episode of Noah's drunkenness is interpreted by Origen in an allegorical sense: the wine, produced by Noah undressed and drunk, is assimilated to the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, in that the wine too may become an occasion of sin; the sin of Noah, however, was due only to ignorance (*Hom. in Gen.* 9, 20). The figure of Noah therefore finds in the Fathers numerous typological and allegorical interpretations.

RGG^4, 1501-1502; DB 4, 1661-1667; BS 9, 1027-1028; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri*, Paris 1950, 60ff.; *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* II, 1613-1615; J.P. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in the Jewish and Christian Literature*, Leiden 1968; P. van Sichem, *L'hymne sur N. de Romanos le Mélode*: EHBS 36 (1968) 27-36; Origen, *I Principî*, ed. M. Simonetti, Turin 1968; E. Testa, *La figura di N. secondo i SS. Padri* (*Contributo alla storia della esegesi*): SBF 20 (1970) 138-165; H. Buschhausen, *Die Deutung des Archemosaiks in der justinianischen Kirche von Mopsuestia*: JOEByz 21 (1972) 57-71; R. Stichel, *Naturwissenschaftliche Kenntnis des Romanos im Noe-Hymnus*: Hermes 100 (1972) 249-251; P. Franke, *Bemerkungen zur frühchristlichen Noe-Ikonographie*: RivAC 49 (1973) 171-182; J. Schlosser, *Les jours de Noe et de Lot. À propos de Luc XVII, 26-30*: RBi 80 (1973) 13-36; E. Lucchesi, *Note sur un lieu de Cassiodore faisant allusion aux sept livres d'Ambroise sur les patriarches*: VChr 30 (1976) 307-309; J. Gutmann, *Noah's Raven in Early Christian and Byzantine Art*: CArch 26 (1977) 63-71; R. Pillinger, *Noe zwischen zwei Tauben*: RivAC 54 (1978) 97-102; A. Quacquarelli, *L'unità dei due Testamenti nell'iconografia del II e III secolo*: VetChr 18 (1981) 253-274; D. Ramos-Lissón, *Tipologías sacrificiales-eucarísticas del Antiguo Testamento en la epístola 63 de san Cipriano*: Augustinianum 63 (1982) 187-197; J.A. Maritz, *Noah's Ark and the Animals of Early Christian Art*: Akroterion 28 (1983) 102-108; M. Fédou, *La vision de la Croix dans l'oeuvre de saint Justin, "philosophe et martyr"*: RecAug 19 (1984) 29-210; M. Harl, *Le nom de l'arche de Noe dans la Septante. Les choix lexicaux des traducteurs alexandrins, indices d'interprétation théologique?*, in *Alexandrina. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges C. Mondésert*, Paris 1987; T. Kaczmarek, *Tipologia eucaristica di Noè nella Lettera 63 di S. Cipriano*: SP 21 (1989) 260-263; G. Gounaris, *The Early Christian Paintings of Tomb no. 18 at the University Campus of Thessaloniki*: Egnatia 2 (1990) 245-262; N.R.C. Cohn, *Noah's Flood*, New Haven, CT 1996; P. Gray, *Covering the Nakedness of Noah*: ByzF 24 (1997) 193-205; D. Diedrich, Noach: LThK^2 7, 886-887; R. Patai, *The Children of Noah*, Princeton, NJ 1998; M. Dulaey, *Noè*, in Id., *"Des forêts de symbols." L'initation chrétienne et la Bible* (*I^{er}-VI^e siècle*), Paris 2001, 191-212; C. Carletti, *L'arca di Noè: ovvero La Chiesa di Callisto e l'uniformità della "morte scritta"*: AntTard 9 (2001) 97-102; M. Edwards, *Origen on Christ, Tropology, and Exegesis*, in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G.R. Boys-Stones, Oxford 2003, 235-256; J.D. Pleins, *When the Great Abyss Opened: Classic and Contemporary Readings of Noah's Flood*, Oxford 2003; M.P. Ciccarese, *Origene e l'arca di Noè: l'expositio historica*, in *Ad contemplandam sapientiam*, Studi in memoria di S. Lenza, Soveria Mannelli 2004, 96-113; I. Ramelli, *San Giustino Martire: il multiforme uso di mustørion e il lessico dell'esegesi tipologica delle Scritture*, in *Il volto del Mistero*, II, ed. A.M. Mazzanti, Castel Bolognese 2006, 35-66; Id., *Origen and the Stoic Allegorical Tradition: Continuity and Innovation*, in Invigilata Lucernis 28 (2006) 195-226; Id., *Christian Soteriology and Christian Platonism. Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Biblical and Philosophical Basis of the Doctrine of Apokatastasis*, VChr 61 (2007) 313-356.

I. RAMELLI

II. Ark of Noah (iconography). The ark of Noah is at the center of a sphere of symbolism of great importance (Wp 316): in fact, the ark is an allegory of the church which saves the righteous and outside which no one can be saved. St. Peter views it in relation to baptism. According to the biblical text (Gen 6:3-22), God gives to Noah precise instructions for the construction of the ark which results in a rectangular structure with three floors: a sort of enormous chest. It is in this way that the ark appears in ancient Christian depictions. Probably this iconography derives from classical repertory, in particular from the mythical episode of Deucalion and Pyrrha, who were thrown into the sea inside a chest. It is thought that the oldest representation of the ark is the picture in the hypogeum of the Flavi in the catacomb of *Domitilla, dating from the first twenty years of the 3rd c. The Roman catacombs contain about fifty depictions of the subject. The scene is also common in sculpture. The oldest examples are the so-called Jonah sarcophagus (Ws 9, 3 = Rep. 35) and the ex-Lateran sarcophagus 236 (Ws 57 = Rep. 46), both from the end of 3rd c. In this last the deceased appears, praying in the ark in place of Noah because in sepulchral symbolism the figure of Noah was assimilated to the idea of the salvation of the soul, just as the dove, when it appears, normally refers to the saving intervention of the Lord. An arcosolium painted in the catacomb of Pamphilus in Rome, dating from the mid-4th c., shows the variant of the closed ark (normally it is open), without Noah; to the left the dove appears, in flight, while to the right it returns with the olive branch. In the 5th c., at el-Bagawat in Egypt, the ark is portrayed as a gondola (a unique case). In mosaic, there is a damaged portrayal of the ark of Noah in the cupola of the mausoleum of Centcelles in Spain, from the middle of the 4th c. In the floor mosaic of the basilica of Mopsuestia (1st half of the 5th c.) in Cilicia, the ark, set on feet, stands surrounded in a circle by the animals; it bears the inscription ΝΩΕ. Finally, in Palestine, there is a mosaic floor, dating to ca. 530, in the synagogue discovered under the church of Sts. *Cosmas and Damian at Gerasa, showing Noah leaving the ark after the flood.

In sculpture, Noah is shown in a fragment of an illustrated baptismal font in the Bardo Museum, originating from Sufetula (Sbeitla); he is turned toward the dove with the olive and the raven. In a

sarcophagus of the Museum of Velletri (Rep. 4, 3), of the end of the 4th c., the ark appears on feet. Noah is always alone in the ark, with the exception of the sarcophagus of Trier, the dating of which is much disputed (4th–5th c.), where he appears with his whole family.

We find the same variant in the Pentateuch of Tours, from the beginning of the 7th c., which also shows the ark during the flood. Other illuminations that should be mentioned are the Cotton Codex and the Genesis of Vienna (of the *Justinian era), where the ark is depicted with more floors. In the sumptuary arts, a series of scenes about Noah are attested to in gold-glass and on clay lamps. A window of the Constantinian era on display in Cologne shows Noah in the ark, together with other OT episodes. On the reverse side of some coins from Apamea, from the era of *Septimius Severus, Macrinus and Philip, the ark appears with two male figures. On the ark is written ΝΩΕ.

DACL 12, 1397-1400; EC 8, 1909-1910; LCI 3, 611-620; R. Garrucci, *Storia dell'arte cristiana*, III, Prato 1873-80, pls. 169-202; W. von Hartel - S. Wichkoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, Vienna 1895, pl. 4; W. De Bock, *Matériaux pour servir l'archéologie chrétienne de l'Égypte*, Pietroburgo 1901, 22, pl. 12; M.A. Merlin, *Catalogue des Musées et Collections Archéologiques de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie. Musée Aloui*, III, Paris 1921, col. 1444, 73; E. Josi, *Il cimitero di Panfilo*: RivAC 3 (1926) 191, fig. 76; F.M. Biebel, *Mosaics in Gerasa City of Decapolis*, New Haven, CT 1938, 297-351; J. Daniélou, *Les figures du Christ dans l'Ancien Testament*, Paris 1950, 55; R.P.J. Hooyman, *Die Noe Darstellungen in der frühchristliche Kunst*: VChr 12 (1958) 113-135; A. Grabar, *L'età d'oro di Giustiniano*, Milan 1966, 202; H. Laag, *Der Trierer Noe-Sarkophage*: Festschrift A. Thomas, Trier 1967, 233-238; J. Porcher, in J. Porcher - J. Hubert - W.F. Volbach, *L'Europa delle invasioni barbariche*, Milan 1968, 128; L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien*, Recklinghausen 1969, pls. 26-44; L. Pani Ermini, *L'ipogeo detto dei Flavi a Domitilla, osservazioni sulla sua origine e sul carattere della decorazione*: RivAC 45 (1969) 138, fig. 9, 173; J. Fink, *Bemerkungen zur frühchristlichen Noe-Ikonographie*: RivAC 49 (1973) 171; G. Gutmann, *Noah's Raven in Early Christian and Byzantine Art*: CArch 26 (1977) 63-75; H. Schlunk - Th. Hauschild, *Die Denkmäler der frühchristlichen und westgotischen Zeit*, Mainz a.R. 1978, 25-27, pls. 12-19; R. Pillinger, *Noe zwischen zwei Tauben*: RivAC 54 (1978) 97-102; TIP 231; C. Carletti, *L'arca di Noè: ovvero la Chiesa di Callisto e l'uniformità della "morte scritta"*: AntTard 9 (2001) 97-102

A.M. Di Nino

NOETUS of Smyrna (2nd half of the 2nd c.). He was the first to spread *patripassian doctrines, toward the end of the 2nd c., and for this was condemned by the presbyters of *Smyrna. *Hippolytus (*Noët.* 1) states that Noetus affirmed that he was *Moses and that his brother was *Aaron.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentum*, Leipzig 1884, 616-618; BBKL VI, 984-985; M. Simonetti, *Ippolito contro Noeto*, Bologna 2000.

M. Simonetti

NOLA-CIMITILE. The sanctuary of St. *Felix at Cimitile was one of the great places of pilgrimage of Late Antiquity, particularly between 4th–5th c. Its center was the burial place of the martyr Felix, perhaps dating from the end of the 3rd c., in a cemeterial area near the city of Nola, then an episcopal see. Between the end of the 2nd c. and the beginning of the 3rd c. a necropolis grew up in the N suburb of Nola, constituted by mausoleums, of which at least ten have been identified on a N-S alignment, and an overground funerary area: it was here that the tomb of the priest Felix was located, resulting, from the 1st half of the 4th c., in the birth of a magnificent martyrial sanctuary. From the original use of the area, the sanctuary itself, and then the built-up zone which over time grew up around it, assumed the name of Cimiterium, attested to with certainty toward the middle of the 9th c., a term which became corrupted over the centuries into *Cimitile*.

As the complex was only 1.5 km (ca. 1 mi) from the center of Nola, it was natural that the development of the shrine should have influenced the urban evolution of the city; in this respect the positioning of the cathedral should be noted, as it seems to have been moved, although many doubts remain over the question. The medieval cathedral built at Nola on the remains of the temple of Jupiter may have copied the siting of the ancient cathedral, or it may have replaced a paleo-Christian cathedral erected at Cimitile, and even the episcopal residence may have returned in the medieval period to its original location at Nola, having been moved for some centuries to the shrine. Unquestioned, however, are the close links between the two places: the center of civil authority at Nola and the religious one at Cimitile, around the tomb of the saint.

The establishment of the shrine began in the very first years of the 4th c., when a small mausoleum was constructed over the tombs of Felix and the first contemporary bishops, Quintus and Maximus: this was soon expanded with the addition of two other mausoleums, built as privileged places of burial near to the local martyr. Demolished shortly afterward (still in the Constantinian era), they were replaced by a great apsed church with a single aisle, the basilica *ad corpus*, from which the remains of mural decorations indicate NT scenes described by *Paulinus in his writings. To the E of this there already ex-

isted a basilica intended for liturgical use, with three aisles divided by pillars and terminating in an apse flanked by *pastophoria*, bounded outside by a rectilinear wall; at its S side, it was set against a chapel dedicated to St. Calionius. The whole monumental complex was completed by a large apsed building to the W, which archaeological remains have connected with the celebration of funeral rites, in particular the **refrigerium*.

The building with three aisles was called the *basilica vetus* by Paulinus, and he renovated it at the beginning of the 5th c., to distinguish it from the *basilica nova*, which he actually built. This celebrated figure, of noble origin, who had also held the post of governor of Campania, retired with his wife to live near the martyrial shrine at the end of 4th c., becoming bishop of Nola in 412; he played a very great part in the growth of Felix's cult and in the expansion of the shrine centered on his tomb, and Paulinus's testimony about this in his works is very important. Even if the development of the sanctuary around the tomb, constituted by a monumental shrine supported by columns and capitals and decorated with mosaics, long attributed to the work of Paulinus, would seem in fact to date to the 6th c. (Korol), without doubt it is to Paulinus that the triforium which allowed passage to the *basilica nova* should be ascribed, which was built after the removal—to make room for the new church—of the old *basilica ad corpus*. The triforium perhaps took the place of the apse of *basilica ad corpus* (Lehmann). The *basilica nova* had three aisles divided by columns and a presbytery with a trichoral frame; its interior, as Paulinus himself records, was richly decorated with marble, both floor and walls, its decorative scheme depicting OT and NT scenes and crowned with a sumptuous mosaic in the central apse that displayed a central jeweled cross in a starry sky, with twelve doves, and the *Agnus Dei* on the celestial mountain, to which were turned twelve lambs in two ranks; completing the embellishment of the new construction was a series of marble screens, bearing engraved phrases of biblical inspiration on their cornices.

To the two basilicas other structures were added, essential for a place of pilgrimage: Paulinus built an aqueduct, necessary to satisfy the needs of the complex, the expansion of a monastic zone, which probably existed before him, and the creation of a hospice for pilgrims. The written sources, however, unfortunately provide limited evidence of the existence of a baptistery, something certainly appropriate for the sanctuary of a martyr of this importance. Finally, a new fresco containing OT scenes was undertaken in one of the old remaining mausoleums (n. 14). From Paulinus's description, moreover, the complex must have been surrounded by a wall, of which only clues can be said to exist, rather than actual archaeological evidence.

At the beginning of the 6th c. the shrine suffered grave damage following a flood which struck the area and from which traces of a thick layer of silt have been discovered, the presence of which—as well as its relation to the various monuments of the complex—help to identify the successive historical building phases; already before that date, in fact, the construction of the basilica dedicated to St. Stephen had occurred, while the funerary basilica of St. Thomas was built only later, on the residue left from the catastrophe. The flood naturally must have damaged the *basilica nova*, which was later in part restored, with the building of the church dedicated to Sts. John the Baptist and John the Evangelist in the zone of the trichoral presbytery and of the first part of the central aisle, which was used for funerary purposes in the 6th and 7th c. The vitality of the center of pilgrimage, focused on the tomb of the martyr, did not in any case abate: in particular, at the end of 9th c. and the start of the 10th, there were important works commissioned by local bishops, esp. Lupinus, to whom we may attribute some of the marble in the liturgical fittings of the sanctuary, and *Leo III, thanks to whom the oratory of St. Calionius was reconstructed, set against the S side of the *basilica vetus*, while a small basilica, dedicated to the holy martyrs, was built in the area of one of the ancient mausoleums of the necropolis (n. 13). There was decorative work undertaken on this last building, and on the restored oratory of St. Calionius, in the mid-10th c., the 11th c. and the 12th c.

In the 14th c, after the reconstructions of the cathedral of Nola, the shrine of Cimitile underwent further adaptation, with restoration of the church of St. John and the construction of a new chapel of St. Mary of the Angels at a location of paleo-Christian origins.

H. Belting, *Cimitile. Le pitture medioevali e la pittura meridionale Alto Medievo*, in A. Prandi, *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale. Aggiornamento dell'opera di E. Bertaux* IV, Parigi-Rome 1978, 177-182; D. Korol, *Die frühchristlichen Wandmalereien aus den Grabbauten in Cimitile/Nola*, Münster 1987; L. Pani Ermini et al., *Recenti indagini nel complesso martiriale di S. Felice a Cimitile*: RivAC 69 (1993) 223-313; G. Luongo (ed.), *Anchora Vitae.* Atti del II convegno paoliniano nel XVI centenario del ritiro di Paolino a Nola (Nola-Cimitile 18-20 maggio 1995), Naples-Rome 1998; L. Pani Ermini, *Cimitile*: EAM IV, 790-794; C. Ebanista, *La Basilica Nova di Cimitile/Nola: gli scavi del 1931-1936*: RivAC 76 (2000) 477-539; H. Brandenburg - L. Pani Ermini, *Cimitile e Paolino di Nola. La tomba di S. Felice e il centro*

di pellegrinaggio—Trent'anni di ricerche, Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana, Vatican City 2003; C. Ebanista, *"Et manet in mediis quasi gemma intersita tectis." La basilica di S. Felice a Cimitile*, Naples 2003; M.K. Kiely, *The Interior Courtyard: The Heart of Cimitile-Nola*: JECS 12 (2004) 443-479; T. Lehmann, *Paulinus Nolanus und die Basilica Nova in Cimitile/Nola. Untersuchungen zu einem zentralen Denkmal der spätantik-frühchristlichen Architektur*, Wiesbaden 2004.

A. Milella

NOMINA SACRA. Ludwig Traube designated a certain number of terms in this way that were connected to the three persons of the *Trinity, to biblical figures, or relating to aspects of worship and reverence, as well as to ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which appear abbreviated by contraction in Latin and Greek biblical MSS from the 4th c. onward. Many of these abbreviations are found frequently, even in paleo-Christian inscriptions, but today the appellation *nomina sacra* is no longer used in critical epigraphy.

The hypothesis proposed was that the first *nomina sacra* were transcribed in an abbreviated form in order to accentuate their sacred character; it was equally thought that the overlining was also connected with this symbolism, but these theories have not proved convincing. Apart from any other consideration, abbreviated letters and numerals with overlining appear ordinarily in *epigraphy, with a purely distinguishing value.

Among the *nomina sacra* most commonly used in Greek *palaeography, we should note at least $\overline{\text{KC}}$ (Κύριος), $\overline{\text{IC}}$ $\overline{\text{XC}}$ (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός), $\overline{\text{YC}}$ (Υἱός), $\overline{\text{MP}}$ (Μήτηρ), $\overline{\text{CHP}}$ (Σωτήρ), $\overline{\Delta\text{A}\Delta}$ (Δαυίδ); in Latin, $\overline{\text{DS}}$ (Deus), $\overline{\text{IHS}}$ (Jesus), $\overline{\text{XPS}}$ (Christus), and later $\overline{\text{EPS}}$ (episcopus), $\overline{\text{PBR}}$ (presbyter), $\overline{\text{REVS}}$ (reverendissimus). Abbreviations by contraction were also widely used from the 6th c. in pagan texts.

DACL 12, 1478-1481; EC 8, 1926-1927; L. Traube, *Nomina sacra*: Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, 2, Munich 1907; C.H. Turner, *The Nomina Sacra in Early Latin Christian Manuscripts*: Miscellanea F. Ehrle, IV, Rome 1924, 62-74; C.H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, Oxford 1979; I. Kajanto, *Sopravvivenza dei nomi teoforici nell'età cristiana*: Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica 41 (1989) 159-168.

D. Mazzoleni

NONNA (d. ca. 374). Mother of *Gregory of Nazianzus, born of an old Christian family. *Discourse* 18 of Gregory describes her virtues and how she converted her husband.

F.J. Dölger, *Nonna. Ein Kapitel über christliche Volksfrömmigkeit des IV. Jhrh.*: AC 5 (1936) 44-75; M.M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, Bonn 1960, 134-135; BBKL 21, 1067-1068.

J. Gribomont

NONNUS of Panopolis (5th c.). Originally from Panopolis in Upper Egypt (today Akhmim), our knowledge of Nonnus is imprecise in regard both to biography and religious background. Livrea has proposed to identify him with a Pachomian monk who subsequently became a bishop of *Edessa, who lived between ca. AD 400 and 470. The arguments advanced are interesting, but in need of further investigation and corroboration to be convincing, in the context of a global reappraisal of the question.

Under the name of Nonnus we possess an epic poem, in 48 books, the longest of its type which has come to from Antiquity, titled *Dionysiaca*. In it are described the adventurous journeys and warlike and amorous deeds of Dionysius in India and in the cities of the Near East and Greece, until his final apotheosis. The poem is in character absolutely pagan, rich in mythological, topographical and antiquarian detail, and highly ornate in its language. It is an erudite work which, apart from its explicit reference to the Homeric model, represents the fruit of a long and complex tradition of the Greek epic in the imperial era. We should note that the hexameter of the text is characterized by the predominance of the dactyl, and the particular attention paid to the intensive nature of the accent.

Under the name of Nonnus, a hexametric paraphrase (*Metabolē*) of the gospel of John has come down to us, in 21 cantos, which reveals clear affinities, stylistic, linguistic and metrical, with the *Dionysiaca*. For this reason it is frequently attributed to the same author. There is no shortage of authoritative dissenting voices, however, such as that recently of Sherry.

It is fair to say that the question of authorship has not yet reached an adequate solution. On the one hand, the *Paraphrase* is clearly the work of an author who has had more than superficial contacts with the circle and theology of *Cyril of Alexandria (strongly suggestive in this sense, among other things, is the use of the Marian appellation **Theotokos* in 2, 9; 2, 66; 19, 135); but still remaining to be explained is the surprising and mysterious attribution of the *Paraphrase* to a not-better-identified Ammonius, philosopher and rhetorician, a name indicated by the important Marcianus MSS of Planudes Z 481 (ca. 1300). On the other hand, if, with the majority of

scholars, we wish to trace both poems to the same author, the purpose of their composition and the nature of their mutual relation are no easier to explain either from the point of view of content or from their relative dating.

It is not strictly necessary to suppose that the poem about Dionysius was composed by a Nonnus obstinately pagan and that therefore his *Paraphrase* should be dated after his conversion to Christianity. Neither should it be assumed that the mythological poem should be read as a great ironic demolition and parody of the pagan religion, humorous and elegant in character, written by a committed Christian, since the irony and humor may very well simply indicate the detachment of the writer from his material. Entirely misleading, moreover, is the theory that the writing of the Dionysian poem along with the *Paraphrase* is a theological attempt to demonstrate the typological presence of the savior God already in the pre-Christian world. Nor in this respect can we search for support in the *Theosophy* (as Livrea would have it), since its anonymous author is not open to pagan mythology as such, but values only those things evidenced by the oracles and the pagan sages deemed to be inspired by God, and only in the measure in which these are in harmony with the Scriptures (for an evaluation of the theological stance of the *theosophist, see P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia*, Leiden 2001, intro.).

The twofold composition of Nonnus seems rather to find a plausible explanation in a particular historical context, one of transition, in which Christian authors—sometimes even bishops—with a strong classical formation continued to take pleasure in the composition of literary works (poems, novels, prayers etc.) which were "secular" in character, without any properly "religious" implication, demonstrating in this way a complete ideological indifference to the material in view (Chuvin, Liebeschuetz). It would be simple to give more examples of this "neutral" use, i.e., not anti-Christian, of the classical cultural heritage: one may mention, e.g., the names of Ausonius, *Claudian, *Sidonius Apollinaris, Ennodius of Pavia, *Fulgentius of Ruspe, Dracontius, *Synesius of Cyrene, Heliodorus of Tricca, Coricius of Gaza, Agathias and Dioscurus of Aphrodito. From this point of view, nothing prevents us from thinking that the same Christian author of the *Paraphrase* also wrote the poem on Dionysius, in which he does not give expression to his own pagan ideas but rather to his extensive Hellenistic education, and that the *Dionysiaca* could have been composed contemporaneously with the *Metabolē* or even after it.

This interest in mythology on the part of a Christian author such as Nonnus of Panopolis, far from causing us surprise, finds a remarkable parallel in the famous four orations (4, 5, 39, 43) of *Gregory of Nazianzus, which also come to us also under the name of Nonnus. It is true that from the time of Bentley (end of the 17th c.), most scholars have argued for a distinction between the two figures, designating the second with the conventional distinction of ps.-*Nonnus (see, finally, the ed., tr. and comm. by J. Nimmo Smith). Yet if it is possible to demonstrate the identity of the two homonymous authors, a picture emerges of a remarkable ecclesiastical and literary figure, who both paraphrased the gospel of John and, at the same time, continued unaffectedly to pursue his erudite interests in the sphere of Hellenic mythology, composing both the Dionysian poem and the mythological *scholia* on the orations of Nazianzus. In any case, it is actually to the example of Nazianzus, the poetic work of whom Nonnus seems to have been an attentive reader, that the literary effort and cultural inspiration of Nonnus should be traced: he intended to demonstrate that Christians have the right to appropriate the instruments of the Hellenic literary tradition, emptying them of any pagan religious significance and, when necessary, adapting them to the requirements of Christian teaching.

Editions: PG 3, 5641-5642; PG 43, 665-1284; A. Scheindler, *Nonni Panopolitani Paraphrasis S. Evangelii Ioannei* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana), Leipzig 1881; R. Keydell, *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca*, 2 vols., Berlin 1959; ed. of the *Dionysiaca*, with Fr. tr. and comm., ed. F. Vian, *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques*, C.U.F., Paris 1976; E. Livrea, *Nonno di Panopoli. Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni. Canto XVIII*, Naples 1989; Nonno di Panopoli, *Parafrasi del Vangelo di San Giovanni. Canto V*, intro., critical ed., tr. and comm. ed. G. Agosti, Florence 2003.

Studies: R. Janssen, *Das Johannesevangelium nach der Paraphrase des Nonnos* (TU 8/4), Leipzig 1903; J. Golega, *Studien über die Evangeliendichtung des Nonnos von Panopolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bibeldichtung im Altertum* (Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie 15), Breslau 1930; G. D'Ippolito, *Studi nonniani. L'epillio nelle "Dionisiache,"* Palermo 1964; J. Golega, *Zum Text der Johannesmetabole des Nonnos*: ByzZ 59 (1966) 9-36; Quasten II, 116-118; W. Peek, *Kritische und erklärende Beiträge zu den Dionysiakà des Nonnos*, Berlin 1969; Id., *Lexikon zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos*, 4 Lief., Berlin-Hildesheim 1968-1975; P. Volpe Cacciatore, *Osservazioni sulla Parafrasi del Vangelo di Giovanni di Nonno di Panopoli*: Annali Fac. Lett. Napoli 32 (1979-1980) 41-50; W. Fauth, *Eidos poikilon. Zur Thematik der Metamorphose und zum Prinzip der Wandlung aus dem Gegensatz in den Dionysiakà des Nonnos von Panopolis* (Hypomnemata 66), Göttingen 1981; E. Livrea, *Il poeta ed il vescovo. La questione nonniana e la storia*: Prometheus 13 (1987) 97-123; P. Chuvin, *Mythologie et géographie dionysiaques. Recherches sur l'oeuvre de Nonnos de Panopolis*, Clermont-Ferrand 1991; A. Hilhorst, *The Cleansing of the Tem-*

ple (John 2, 13-25) in Juvencus and Nonnus, in J. Den Boeft - A. Hilhorst (eds.), *Early Christian Poetry: A Collection of Essays* (VChr Supplement 22), Leiden-New York-Cologne 1993, 61-76; N. Hopkinson (ed.), *Studies in the "Dionysiaca" of Nonnus*, Cambridge 1994 (bibl.); B. Coulie - L.F. Sherry et CETEDOC, *Thesaurus Pseudo-Nonni quondam Panopolitani. Paraphrasis Evangelii S. Ioannis* (Corpus Christianorum, Thesaurus Patrum Graecorum), Turnhout 1995; W. Liebeschuetz, *Pagan Mythology in the Christian Empire*: International Journal of the Classical Tradition 2 (1995/1996) 193-208; D. Accorinti, *Nonno di Panopoli. Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni. Canto XX*, Pisa 1996; W. Liebeschuetz, *The Use of Pagan Mythology in the Christian Empire with Particular Reference to the "Dionysiaca" of Nonnus*, in P. Allen - E. Jeffreys (eds.), *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?* (Byzantina Australiensia 10), Brisbane 1996, 75-91; L.F. Sherry, *The Paraphrase of St. John Attributed to Nonnus*: Byzantion 66 (1996) 409-430; F. Tissoni, *Nonno di Panopoli. I canti di Penteo (Dionisiache 44-46). Commento*, Florence 1998; E. Livrea, *Nonno di Panopoli. Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni. Canto B* (BP 36), Bologna 2000; A. Cameron, *The Poet, the Bishop, and the Harlot*: GRBS 41/2 (2000) 175-188; J. Nimmo Smith, *A Christian's Guide to Greek Culture: The Pseudo-Nonnus Commentaries on Sermons 4, 5, 39 and 43 by Gregory of Nazianzus*, Liverpool 2001; R. Shorrock, *The Challenge of Epic: Allusive Engagement in the "Dionysiaca" of Nonnus* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 210), Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2001; E.D. Floyd, *Homeric and Other Ancient Patterns in Nonnos, "Paraphrase of John,"* in Atti dell'XI Congr. Int. di Studi Classici, vol. 2, Atene 2002 (Praktika XI Diethnous Synedriou Klassikon Spoudon, Tomos B', Athenai 2002), 396-409; D.A. Welsby, *The Medieval Kingdoms of Nubia: Pagans, Christians and Muslims Along the Middle Nile*, London 2002; J. van der Vliet, *Gleanings from Christian Northern Nubia*: JJP 32 (2002) 175-192; F. Vian, *L'épopée posthomérique. Recueil d'études*, ed. D. Accorinti, Alessandria 2005, 379-608.

P.F. Beatrice

NONNUS of Panopolis (pseudo). The oldest (6th c.) of the scholiasts of *Gregory of Nazianzus, various of whose discourses he commented upon, his greatest interest being in the mythical allusions (*see* *Nonnus of Panopolis). The work was widely disseminated: 139 MSS have been counted. It was used by numerous other scholiasts and Byzantine philologists, and even translated into *Syriac (the version we have dates to 624), *Armenian and *Georgian. Under the title *Collectio et expositio historiarum* his comments on *Or.* 4 and 5 have been published in PG 36, 985-1072, along with extracts relating to *Or.* 39 and 43.

CPG 3011; CPG/S bibl.; K. Weitzmann, *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art, Princeton*, NJ 1951; F. Letherz, *Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz*, Bonn 1958; J. Declerck, *Les commentaires mythologiques du Ps. Nonnos sur l'hom. XLIII de Grégoire de Nazianze*: Byzantion 47 (1977) 92-112; J. Nimmo Smith, *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentarii*, collationibus versionum syriacarum a Sebastian Brock versionisque armeniacae a Bernard Coulie additis (CCSG 27, Corpus Nazianzenum 2), Turnhout 1992.

J. Gribomont

NORICUM
I. Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. Christianity. Noricum was a Roman province, corresponding, in our period, to a large part of modern Austria (Vienna and the left bank of the Danube excluded). To the S it bordered the Carnic Alps, to the W the River Inn, to the N the Danube and to the E Pannonia, conforming to an imaginary line which joined the Danube, Sava and Drava Rivers, and included the cities of Celeia (Celje in Slovenia) and Flavia Solva (near Leibnitz: see ANRW II, 6, 415). In the tetrarchic period Noricum was divided into two parts: Noricum Ripense (between the Danune and the Tauern mountains) and Noricum Mediterraneum (between the Tauerns and the Carnic Alps), under the government of a *praeses*.

Evidence of the initial evangelization of the area is both scarce and uncertain. A probable way in which Christianity was introduced, apart from colonists and military presence, may have been commercial relations with *Aquileia. There was also significant influence from important centers such as *Milan and *Sirmium. We may regard the *Passio* of Florianus of Lauriacum (Lorch) with his 40 companions, which has come to us in two recensions (ASS, *Mai* 1, 466-472), as an early record on the expansion of Christianity in Noricum at the time of *Diocletian; its historicity, at least with respect to its essential nucleus, is supported by the *Mart. hier.* (IV *Non. Mai*). Other evidence is provided by *Athanasius, who, without specifying names, origin or number, speaks of the presence of representatives of Noricum at the Synod of *Serdica (343), where they supported the cause of orthodoxy (*Apol. sec.* 1. 36: PG 25, 312A; *H. Ar.* 28: PG 25, 725B). At the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c., it is probable that the province saw a more extended growth of Christianity, if it is true that certain *castella* (fortified refuges built on high ground at the time of the barbarian incursions) almost always possessed, as archaeological investigations suggest, churches and baptisteries at the center or highest part of the complex.

The document of greatest importance for the life and organization of the church of Noricum, however, in a particularly difficult period (453–486) for this province placed as it was at the very boundary of *Romanitas*, is the *Vita sancti Severini* of *Eugippius. Among other things, we know for that period of two episcopal sees, Lauriacum and Tiburnia or Teurnia (St. Peter im Holz). Other important Christian centers mentioned by the *Vita* are Asturis (Klosterneuburg), Boiotrum (Innstadt), Comagenis (Tulln), Favianis (Mautern?), Ioviacum (Shlögen) and Iuvavum (Salzburg).

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918 (repr. Rome 1967); R. Noll, *Frühes Christentum im Österreich von den Anfängen bis zum 600 n. Chr.*, Vienna 1954; K. Gamber, *Die Severins-Vita als Quelle für das gottesdienstliche Leben in Norikum während des 5. Jh.*: RQA 65 (1970) 145-157; M. Pavan, *Stato romano e comunità cristiane nel Norico*: Clio 9 (1973) 453-496; V. Pavan, *Note sul monachesimo di s. Severino e sulla cura pastorale nel Norico*: VetChr 15 (1978) 347-360; G. Winkler, *Noricum und Rom*: ANRW II, 6 (1977) 183-262; H. Vetters, *Virunum*: ANRW II, 6, 349-354; Id., *Lauriacum*: ANRW II, 6, 355-379; H. Grassl, *Die ethnischen und sozialökonomischen Bedingungen für die Romanisierung des Ostalpenraumes in der Spätantike*: Grazer Beiträge 11 (1984) 251-267; H. Steinhauer, *Das christliche Leben in Noricum nach der "Vita sancti Severini"*: Hippolytus N.F. 7 (1984) 42-53; F. Glaser, *Frühes Christentum im Alpenraum. Eine archäologische Entdeckungsreise*, Regensburg-Graz 1997; V. Bierbrauer, *Arianische Kirchen in Noricum Mediterraneum und Raetia II?*: Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter 63 (1998) 205-226; *Mitteilungen zur Christlichen Archäologie*, XII, Vienna 2006.

V. Pavan

II. Archaeology. The old province of Noricum was divided in 293 into *Noricum Ripense* and *Noricum Mediterraneum*. Among the buildings dedicated to Christian worship so far found in Noricum, most numerous are basilicas of the type characteristic of the Upper Adriatic, consisting in a longitudinal church, in the E part of which, the elevated presbytery, semicircular seating is found for the clergy, accessible from either side. Churches of this type are found at Lauriacum, Aguntum, Lavant, Grazerkogel and church no. 1 at Hemmaberg. Of these, the most interesting is that of the Lavant, constructed on a hill and fortified at the beginning the 5th c.: it is composed of two similar large chambers, arranged E-W, both with seating for the clergy and cathedra. The presence, in the E chamber, of a baptismal *piscina*, indicates that this is an episcopal basilica. There are also other basilicas and in total about twenty church buildings.

The second type of church found in Noricum follows a plan which includes a semicircular apse and seating for the clergy in the same shape. Church no. 2 of Hemmaberg is of this type, with annexed chambers along the longitudinal walls (as in the case of Duel) but also *pastophoria* off the apse, as in Hoischügel. At Celeia the church was decorated with mosaic pavements of notable quality. At Ulrichsberg the church seems have had external pilasters, while the paved section, around the *subsellia* in semicircular form for the clergy, was decorated with mosaics. These churches sometimes have a narthex.

Elsewhere there are different and more developed designs. At Teurnia (St. Peter im Holz), the building follows a cruciform plan with more narrow transversing arms. The E arm contains semicircular seating for the clergy; the W is flanked with absidal chambers. The first has an apse with pilasters, the other a mosaic floor with depictions of animals amid decorative motifs. All these rooms are connected by a door onto the transversal arm and another to the E arm. The plan of the basilica of Teurnia probably derives from churches of a similar type in N *Italy. The church of Säben seems to be a simpler variant of that of the Teurnia. A complex of religious buildings constructed on a fortified hill at Vranje near Sevnica holds particular interest: one in basilica style situated on the upper terrace, and two others on the lower (one of the two has a square apse), without doubt for baptismal purposes. The presence of the cathedra between the seats for the clergy indicates that this is an episcopal complex. The complex of Rifnik in Slovenia was also built on a fortified hill. At Iuvavum (Salzburg), above the cemetery of St. Peter, ritual chambers have been cut out of the steep rock with arcosolia similar to those of the Roman catacombs. From the form of the arcosolia and acc. to the old tradition, the establishment of these chapels may probably be attributed to hermitic monks of the first centuries of Christianity.

Among small objects discovered we should mention a fragment of a sarcophagus bearing a portrayal of a shepherd with a lamb on his shoulders. Also to be noted are inscriptions, jewels, lamps and fragments of a pluteus at Teurnia, etc.

R. Egger, *Frühchristliche Kirchenbauten im südlichen Noricum*, Vienna 1916; R. Noll, Frühes *Christentum in Österreich von den Anfängen bis um 600 nach Chr.*, Vienna 1954; K. Gamber, *Domus Ecclesiae. Die ältesten Kirchenbauten Aquileias sowie im Alpen- und Donaugebiet bis zum Beginn des 5. Jh. liturgiegeschichtlich untersucht*, Regensburg 1968; G. Alföldi, *Noricum*, London 1974; P. Petru - Th. Ulbert, *Vranje bei Sevnica. Frühchristliche Kirchenanlagen auf dem Ajdovski Gradec*, Ljubljana 1975; *Probleme des Südostalpenraumes in der Spätantike—Arbeitsgemeinschaft Alpe - Adria*, Vienna-Graz-Cologne 1985; S. Ciglenecki, *Hohen-befestigungen aus der Zeit vom 3. bis 6. Jh. im Ostalpenraum*, Dela Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti 31, Ljubljana 1987; A. Poulter, *The Use and Abuse of Urbanism in the Danubian Provinces During the Later Roman Empire*, in *The City in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Rich, London-New York 1996 (¹1992), 103ff.; R. Bratoz, *Christianisierung des Nordadria- und Westbalkanraumes im 4. Jahrhundert*: Situla 34 (1996) 299ff.; R. Pillinger, *Das frühe Christentum im Limesbereich*, in *Der römische Limes in Österreich*, ed. H. Friesinger - F. Krinzinger, Vienna 1997, 128ff.; F. Glaser, *Frühes Christentum im Alpenraum. Eine Archäologische Entdeckungsreise*, Regensburg-Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1997; R. Pillinger, *Zur Genesis der Christlichen Archäologie in Österreich*: Mitteilungen zur Christlichen Archäologie 5 (1999) 74ff.; R. Bratoz, *Il cristianesimo aquileiese prima di Costantino fra Aquileia e Poetovio*, Udine 1999; *Mitteilungen zur Christlichen Archäologie*, XII, Vienna 2006.

N. Cambi

NOTAE DE TEXTU EVANGELIORUM. The MSS St. Gall 1935 (Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 984), a palimpsest of which numerous pages bear gospel texts acc. to the Vulgate, and so old that it could have been written while *Jerome was still alive. The margins contain firsthand glosses, which specify, e.g., the case of a noun or the tense of a verb which has an ambiguous form; often they transcribe the Greek term translated and its various equivalents. These glosses are found in certain later MSS, traceable to the school of *Reims of the 9th c. Jerome is their most likely author.

CPL 590a; B. Bischoff, *Zur Rekonstruktion der Sangallensis* (Σ) *und der Vorlage seiner Marginalien*: Biblica 29 (1941) 153-158.

J. Gribomont

NOTARIUS. The noun derives from *nota*, *notare*, and indicates one who makes notes with the help of marks of abbreviation, designating the tachygraph. The sign written is more a mark than a letter. There were schools of *notarii* (also called *exceptores*), where stenography was learned. The *notarii* were used for public affairs, lectures and legal processes. They took notes of speeches, and depositions in legal matters, as seen from the *Acts* of martyrs, esp. the Scillitan and of *Cyprian. *Notarii* worked at the conference of 411 in *Carthage. Their *Acts* were faithfully kept in the archives, as Cyprian (*Ep.* 68, 6) and *Augustine (*Contra Cresc.* III, 70) attest. Esp. from the 4th c. the church also had her own *notarii*, who compiled *Acts* carrying official importance: e.g., the release of a slave, a document of donation etc. The *notarii* also took down the improvised discourses of preachers, who then, even if not always, reread the transcribed text; or a text dictated by the author. Normally they were clerics. In Rome, the regional *notarii* were persons of importance.

DACL 12, 1623-1640; A. Mentz, *Antike Stenographie*, Berlin 1944; H. Hagendahl, *Die Bedeutung der Stenographie für die spätlatein. christ. Literatur*: JbAC 14 (1971) 24-38; H.C. Teitler, *Notarii and Exceptores. An Inquiry into Role and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire* (*from the Early Principate to c. 450 A.D.*), Amsterdam 1985; *Tironische Noten*, ed. P. Ganz, Wiesbaden 1990; *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 1996, 1468-69.

A. Hamman

NOTITIA DIGNITATUM. Official document of the imperial chancellery, to be dated not earlier than 395 and the entire title of which must have been *Notitia omnium dignitatum et administrationum tam civilium quam militarium*. In its present state, it takes the form of a sort of yearbook with fairly clear chronological "stratifications." The copy in our possession was that of the Western *primicerius*. The text is divided into two parts, relating to the two *partes* of the Roman Empire, of which it enumerates the officials and formal titles, territorial competence, staffs or dependent troops, and the composition of the *officium*. The discussion about the genesis of the work, i.e., if it derives directly from an official document or if, from a brief original nucleus, it reached its present form through interpolations and additions of private compilers, remains open. Various proposals have been made with respect to its date, from the end of the 4th c. (L.A. Constans and F.S. Salisbury) to the 4th decade of the 5th c. (O. Seeck, Th. Mommsen, J.B. Bury). Recently G. Clemente has demonstrated that the document was "the product of a tested bureaucratic tradition, with the purpose of providing information, maintained constantly up to date, and thus usable for a long period of time." The textual anomalies and the history of development of the document are linked to the discontinuity of the imperial chancelleries. C. Zuckerman dates the "Eastern" part to 401.

E. Böcking (ed.), *Notitia Dignitatum*, Bonn 1839–1853, still useful for its extended commentary; O. Seeck (ed.), *Notitia Dignitatum*, Berlin 1876 = Frankfurt a.M. 1962. *Studies*: E. Polaschek: PWK 17, 1, 1077ff.; A. Lippold: KIP 4, 166-167; P. Lot, *La "Notitia Dignitatum Utriusque Imperii." Ses tares, sa date de composition, sa valeur*: REA 38 (1936) 285-338; G. Clemente, *La "Notitia Dignitatum, "* Cagliari 1968; D. Hoffmann, *Das spätrömische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum*, 2 vols., Düsseldorf 1969-1970; J.H. Ward, *The British Section of the Notitia Dignitatum*: Britannia 4 (1973) 253-263; E. Demougeot, *La Notitia Dignitatum et l'histoire de l'Empire d'Occident au début du Ve siècle*: Latomus 34 (1975) 1079-1134; R. Goodburn - P. Bartholomew (eds.), *Aspects of the Notitia Dignitatum*, Oxford 1976, with the essays contained there; P.C. Berger, *The Insignia of the Notitia Dignitatum*, New York-London 1981; M. Zahariade, *Moesia Secunda, Scythia şi Notitia Dignitatum*, Bucureşti 1988; C. Zuckerman, *Comtes et ducs en Égypte autour de l'an 400 et la date de la "Notitia Dignitatum Orientis"*: AntTard 6 (1998) 137-147; P. Brennan, *The User's Guide to the Notitia Dignitatum*: Antichthon 32 (1998) 34-49; W.E. Kulikowski, *The Notitia Dignitatum as a Historical Source*: Historia 49 (2000) 358-377; J. Barlow - P. Brennan, *Tribuni Scholarum Palatinarum c. A.D. 353–364: Ammianus Marcellinus and the Notitia Dignitatum*: CQ 51 (2001) 237-254.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

NOTITIA GALLIARUM. In origin a document of the Roman administration, and then used by the Gallican Church, prepared between the end of the 4th c. and the 1st decades of the 5th. c. with additions in the Frankish era. Its full title is *Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Galliarum*. It offers the list of the

17 provinces—a list which corresponds to that of the *Notitia dignitatum*—and of the 115 *civitates* of *Gaul, of the *castra* and of the ports. It is very useful for our knowledge of the structure of ecclesiastical organization in Gaul in the 5th c., in that it practically gives a list of the ecclesiastical provinces and of the principal city sees of the metropolitans and other episcopal city sees.

CPL 2342; MGH, *Auct. ant.* IX, Chron. Minora I, 552-612 (text: 584-612); CCL 175, 381-406; DACL 11, 1716-1727; Schanz IV, 2, 128-130; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, II, Paris [2]1966, 111-125; P.-M. Duval, *La Gaule jusqu'au milieu du V[e] siècle*, Paris 1971, 681-682; A.L.F. Rivet, *The Notitia Galliarum: Some Questions*, in R. Goodburn - P. Bartholomew (eds.), *Aspects of the Notitia Dignitatum*, Oxford 1976, 119-142; J. Harries, *Church and State in the "Notitia Galliarum"*: JRS 68 (1978) 26-48; LMA 6, 1287; A.L.F. Rivet, *Gallia Narbonensis*, London 1988, 98-100; J.W. Ermatinger, *Three Late Roman Notitiae*: Manuscripta 39 (1995) 110-119.

A. Di Berardino

NOTITIA PROVINCIARUM ET CIVITATUM AFRICAE. The document enumerates, acc. to the provinces, the African bishops and their sees convoked in 484 at Carthage by the Vandal king *Huneric, who hoped to see from the gathering a settlement between *Arians and *Catholics. But the firmness of resolution of the Catholics, who drew up an orthodox profession of faith, caused the project to fail. In reprisal, Catholic churches were closed and their goods confiscated; 46 bishops were sent into exile in *Corsica, and 302 sent to internment in *Africa: there were a martyr, a confessor, apostates and many dead (the gloss *prbt* = *peribat*, better than apostasy). Beyond the information it contains on the persecution of Huneric, the *Notitia* reflects the situation of the African church at the end of the 5th c.: Proconsular, 54 bishops; Numidia, 125; Byzacena, 115; Mauretania Caesariensis, 120 and 3 vacant sees; Mauretania Sitifensis, 42; Tripolitana, 5; Insulae Sardiniae, 8; in total 469 bishops and 472 bishoprics. In the reckoning, Mauretania Tingitana, dependent on *Spain, does not figure.

MGH.AA 3, 1, 63-71; CSEL 7, 117-134; R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum*, Mainz 1997; S. Lancel, *Victor de Vita*, Paris 2002, 222-272.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

NOTITIA URBIS CONSTANTINOPOLITANAE. Anonymous description of the city of *Constantinople, written in Latin at the time of *Theodosius II (408–450). It provides an inventory of the principal buildings in each of the fourteen districts of the city, into which it was subdivided: the imperial *palatia* (5), including the *palatium magnum*, those of the empresses (6), the houses of the nobles; the names of the officials (*curatores*), the night guards (*vicomagistri*), fire fighters (*collegiati*), police (*vernaculi*, [public slaves]), the churches (14 churches), the public (8) and private (153) baths, the forums (4), theaters (2), a circus, 4, 388 *domus*, etc. It serves as an important source for the topography of the city in the 5th c. and its administration. Because it affirms that it refers to buildings both completed and decorated, and it mentions the double wall constructed by the prefect Cyrus under Theodosius (*Invicti principis*), its composition must date to after 440.

O. Seeck, *Notitia Dignitatum accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et Latercula prouinciarum*, Berlin 1876 (repr. Frankfurt a.M. 1962), 261-274; F. Unterkircher, *Notitiae regionum urbis Romae et urbis Constantinopolitanae*, Amsterdam 1960; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris 1950; H. Fuchs, *Die Vorrede zur Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae*: Museum Helveticum 26 (1969) 56-60; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974; A. Corsini, *La praefatio della Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae*, in *Prefazioni, prologhi, proemi di opere tecnico-scientifiche latine*, ed. N. Scivoletto, II, Rome 1992, 963-968; A. Berger, *Regionen und Strassen im frühen Konstantinopel*: MDAI(I) 47 (1997) 349-414.

A. Di Berardino

NOUS

I. In Greek philosophy - II. In patristics - III. In gnosticism.

I. In Greek philosophy. To Anaxagoras is owed the first elaboration of the doctrine of the metaphysical *nous*, which later Greek thought could not set aside: already for this pre-Socratic philosopher, the *nous* is the ordering principle and the cause of everything (texts 42, 47, fr. 12 Diels, *Die Fragm. der Vors.* II [6]1952; cf. Plato, *Cratylus* 400a 8-10); it is simple, devoid of mixture, pure (texts 55, 56 and 61, fr. 12 and 13), free of passions (text 56), identical to the One (text 61), infinite (fr. 12) and at the same time superior to infinity (see Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 66, 1: GCS I, 50, 15-17), principle of movement (texts 42, 55, 56, fr. 13), immobile (text 46) and at the same time given to run through everything (text 55). For *Plato the demiurge, maker of the **anima mundi* and of the sensible universe acc. to the model of the ideas, is himself a *nous* (*Tim.* 39e) and also infuses the *nous* into the soul of the universe (Tim. 30b); this latter, therefore, is a being endowed with soul and intelligence (Tim. 30b; also *see* *cos-

mos). In *Philebus* 28c-d, the *nous* is presented as the supreme governor of the universe; in 28e its ordering function is underlined (cf. also *Phaed.* 97d = Anax. text 47; *Cratylus* 413c = Anax. text 55e; *Cratylus* 400a 8-10, another passage in which Anaxagoras is named); and in 30c it is identified with the cause and the supreme wisdom, superior to the limit and to infinity. In the *Laws* X, 897b, the *nous* is the divine principle which, infusing itself into the soul of the world (see *Tim.* 30b, *Philebus* 30d), makes it ready to rule, resolutely and happily, the whole universe. Of different movements, the circular is that which gets closest to the movement of the *nous* (*Laws* X, 898a; on the Platonic conception of the *nous* as a transcendent metaphysical principle, see still today the important article of R. Hackforth, *Plato's Theism*: CQ 30 [1936] 4-9). Human intelligence, the divine element destined to govern humanity, is "sown" in him directly by the demiurge (*Tim.* 41c). Only it, the pilot of the soul, is able to contemplate the essence free of color, form and untouchable, represented by the ideas as a whole (*Phaed.* 247c); but only the thought of the philosopher is equipped with wings which carry him or her on high, beyond the heavenly vault, and initiate him or her into a superior vision and knowledge (249c, 250c).

In the ancient Academy, Xenocrates (fr. 15 Heinze) considers the first god a *nous* identical to the monad (it is very probable that Xenocrates had already formulated the doctrine—which would then become characteristic of *Middle Platonism, *Neoplatonism, *Philo and some of the Fathers—of the ideas identical to the thoughts contained in the divine mind: having identified the *nous* with the monad and the ideas with the numbers (fr. 15 and 34 Heinze; he cannot have found it difficult to make the ideas derive from the *nous*, as the numbers derive from the monad; on this question and studies on it, see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 202-203, n. 3 and 246). In another exponent of the ancient Academy, Speusippus (fr. 38 Lang, 89 Isnardi-Parente = Aetius in Stobaeus, *Ecl.* I, 29, vol. I, 35, 3-4 Wachsmuth), we find already formulated a doctrine which will become basic in orthodox Neoplatonism, that of the distinction of the intelligence from the One and from the good (see E.R. Dodds: CQ 22 [1928] 140 and Ph. Merlan, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 32). Both in relation to the metaphysical *nous* and to the human *nous* *Aristotle elaborates a theory which, taken in part from Anaxagoras, left a profound mark on subsequent thought.

In *On Prayer* fr. 46 Rose (Bekker V, 1483a 27-28), Aristotle, coming near to Speusippus and also himself anticipating orthodox Neoplatonism, seems to take into consideration the hypothesis of the transcendence of the supreme divinity also with respect to the intelligence; but in ch. 7 of book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics* (1072a-1073a) he does not abandon the identification of the first principle with the intelligence. The first principle (1072b 11, 13-14) is the *nous* which always thinks itself and which is therefore in constant activity, totally identical to the object of its thought (1072b 18-23); it is identical to life, since it is its activity and life (1072b 26-28); it has no size or parts and is indivisible (1073a 5-6); it is absolutely free of passions and unchangeable (1073a 11); it is eternal, completely separated from sensible things (1073a 4); it is immobile (1073a 4), and remaining immobile and unchanging it moves the first heaven (1072a 24-25, b7-8), and since it is absolute beauty, it is an object of desire, thought and love (1072a 26, 27-28, b3); it is a simple being par excellence (1072a 32); it is endowed with an infinite power, in that it moves for an infinite time (1073a 8-9; see W.D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, II, Oxford 1948, pp. 372-374).

The human *nous* is a divine principle infused from the outside (*De gen. an.* B 736b 28), and it is the most divine part of humanity, cause of perfect happiness (*Et. Nic.* X, 1177a 13-17), since this activity, the highest activity of humanity, is all one with the **theoria* (*Et. Nic.* X, 1177a 19-22); in the *soul, nothing is superior to it (*De an.* I, 410b 13-14). But it is above all in chs. 4-5 of the third book of *De anima* (429a-430a) that Aristotle develops his theory of the human *nous*: the *nous* in activity (see *De an.* III, 430a 17), distinct from that which is passive or in potentiality (*De an.* III, cap. 5, 430a 10-14), is free of passions (429a 15, b 23, 430a 18, a 34), devoid of any mixture (429a 18-19, b 23-24—in these two passages Anaxagoras is named—430a 18), simple (429b 23), not confused with the body, but rather separated from it (429a 24-25, b 5, 430a 17, to 22-23); it is the seat of the ideas (429a 27-28). Precisely because it performs its noetic activity, it is identical to the intelligible objects of which it thinks (429b 30-31; 430a 3-4) and is intelligible as they are (430a 2-3); it is immortal and eternal (430a 23).

The idea of the metaphysical *nous* which thinks itself and is identical to the object of its own thought is taken up by the Aristotelian commentator of the 2nd c. AD *Alexander of Aphrodisias (*Mantissa* 108, 7-8; 109, 4-7; *De an.* 87, 89-88, 2; 88, 5-6), to whom, as R. Walzer has shown (*Plotino ed il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente*, Rome 1974, 430), we owe the full elaboration of the doctrine of the *nous poiētikos*, which consists of the application to the

metaphysical *nous* described by Aristotle—ch. 7 of book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics*—of the various properties of the "active" human intelligence illustrated in ch. 5 of book III of the Aristotelian *De anima* (see esp. Alexander, *De an.* 88, 17-89, 12). The theory of the metaphysical *nous* elaborated by Aristotle and Alexander would be accepted in its entirety in the *Plotinan conception of the *nous*.

For the *Stoics, the metaphysical *nous* is identified with the rational principle immanent in the universe, which it spans, permeates with itself, governs and rules: it also takes the form of *logos*, spirit, soul, fire, Zeus, law, ether, nature, fate and providence (SVF I, 102, 154, 160, 162, 172, 176, 530, 534; II, 580, 634, 937, 1026-1027, 1151) and contains in itself all the rational and spermatic principles which, combining with the passive element, the primordial matter, originate the various elements and all the sensible beings (SVF I, 98, 1202; II, 1027). As regards the nature of humanity, unlike Plato, who had always underlined a clear distinction between the rational part of the soul and the two irrational parts, Stoicism affirmed the substantial unity of the human soul: the seven faculties of the soul, apparently different from the rational faculty or *hēgemonikon* (the five senses, the reproductive and vocal faculties), are in reality emanations of the *hēgemonikon*, which have their seat in the heart, more than the head (SVF II, 826, 827, 836-838, 839, 910); there exists, therefore, a strict interdependence between irrational and rational faculties, between sensations and thought: rather than faculties different by nature, it would be more correct to speak of a single power which, acc. to the occasion, fulfills different functions (SVF II, 849).

On the strict parallelism established by the Stoics between humanity governed by reason and the universe ruled by the logos, *see* *macrocosm and microcosm. The syncretistic but fundamentally Stoic character of the thought of Antiochus of Ascalon—who although professing to be "Academic" and follower of the *antiqui*, i.e., of the ancient Academy and of the peripatetic school, is in reality a Platonizing Stoic—is clearly shown in his conception of the metaphysical *nous* and the human *nous*. The passage of Cicero (*Academ. post.* I, 29): *quam vim animum esse dicunt mundi, eandemque esse mentem sapientiamque perfectam, quam deum appellant . . . quam interdum necessitatem appellant* denotes a mixture of Platonic and Stoic elements: the term *vim* is both Platonic and Stoic (see *Sophist* 265b; SVF I, 176; II, 1025, 1151); the *animum mundi* is found both in Plato (see, e.g., *Tim.* 30b; Laws X, 897b) and in the Stoics (see, e.g., SVF I, 495, 530; II, 1026); the words *mentem sapientiamque* go back to *Philebus* 28d-e, 30c and to the Stoics (cf. SVF I, 102, 112); and the identification of the intelligent divine principle with the *necessitas* is of Stoic origin (cf. e.g., SVF I, 160, 176; II, 580). As J. Dillon has justly noted (*The Middle Platonists*, London 1977, 83 and 95), this passage of Cicero, reproducing the point of view of Antiochus, presupposes an identification between the *nous*-demiurge, the *anima mundi* of the *Timaeus* and the Stoic *logos*. W. Theiler (*Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1930, 18-19 and 39-40) and J. Dillon (op. cit., 93-96), in examining the passages dependent on Antiochus in Cicero (*Orator* 8-10) and *Augustine (*Civ. Dei* VII, 28 with respect to the *allegorical interpretation, given by Varro, of Jupiter, Minerva and Juno: Jupiter would be the mind of God, Minerva his daughter would be his thoughts, and Juno matter), arrive at the conclusion that Antiochus too advocates the doctrine of the ideas, as thoughts, contained in the mind of God; however, as Dillon observes (op. cit., p. 96), we must recall that Antiochus, precisely because he identifies the Platonic *nous*-demiurge with the Stoic *logos*, is brought to identify the Platonic ideas contained in the *nous*-demiurge with the *logoi* or spermatic principles contained in the universal *logos* of the Stoics. The doctrine of Antiochus with respect to the human *nous* (Cicero, *Academ.* Pr. II, 30: *mens enim ipsa quae sensuum fons est atque ipse sensus est, naturalem vim habet quam intendit ad ea, quibus movetur*) is nothing other than a reproduction of the Stoic doctrine (see SVF II, 826, 827, 836).

In the conception of the metaphysical *nous*, proper to Philo, elements of the Platonic, peripatetic and Stoic traditions all come together. The relationship which he establishes between the *nous* and the first principle coincides with that found in Aristotle (*On Prayer* fr. 46 Rose): on the one hand, as J. Whittaker has noted (VChr 23 [1969] 102), in *Leg. Alleg.* II, 46 Aristotle places God above the *nous*; on the other—and this is the dominant tendency of his work—he is brought to identify God with the *nous* of the universe (*De migr. Abr.* 192 [II, 306, 3-4], *De gig.* 41 [II, 50, 5], *De opif. m.* 8 [I, 2, 19]). In *De opif. m.* 8, this *nous* is, on the one hand, identified with the second active principle acc. to the teaching of the Stoics (see SVF I, 85); on the other, it receives the attributes εἱλικρινέστατος and ἀκραιφνέστατος which bring it close to the Anaxagorean-Aristotelian conception (on εἱλικρινής, however, see also Plato, *Sympos.* 211e), and is presented, in conformity with the peripatetic tradition, as "superior to virtue" (see *Magna mor.* B 1200 b 14) and "superior to science" (see *Et. Eud.* H 1248a 28). It directs the universe as a pilot of a ship and a charioteer (*De ebr.* 86 [II, 186,

14], *De conf. ling.* 98 [II, 247, 22-23], *De aet. m.* 83 [VI, 98, 20]), an image found also in the ps.-Aristotelian *De mundo*, 400b 6-7 and which may be traced ultimately to Plato (*Phaedo* 246a-b, 247c, 253c, 253e), where, however, it is applied not to the metaphysical but to the human *nous*. As with the metaphysical *nous* of Aristotle, the God of Philo moves while remaining immobile (*De post.* C. 28 [II, 7, 14]). Of Platonic-Aristotelian derivation (*Philebus* 20d, *Et. Nic.*I, 1097b 7-8, *Et. Eud.* H 1244b 8, 1249b 16, *Met.* N 1091b 16-17) is the doctrine of his absolute self-sufficiency (*De Cher.* 44 [I, 181, 4], 46 [I, 181, 12], 123 [I, 199, 16], *De vita Mos.* 111 [IV, 145, 15], *De spec. leg.* II, 38 [V, 95, 1]).

Also in Philo we find the doctrine of the ideas identical to the thoughts contained in the mind of God. In *De opif. m.* 17-20 the comparison is made—similar to that present in Cicero (*Orator.* 8-10) and going back to Antiochus—between the architect who plans a city in his mind and God who, before giving origin to the sensible universe, thinks it in his mind; and in *De Cher.* 49 (I, 182, 3) God is called "incorporeal seat of the incorporeal ideas," a passage closely parallel to *De opif. m.* 20 (I, 6, 9-10). Both passages represent an application to the divine *nous* of what Aristotle (*De an.* III, 429a 27-28) had said about the thinking human *nous*. Another application of the divine *nous* of the Aristotelian doctrine of the human *nous* is the total absence of passions in God: the divine *nous* of Philo is entirely impassible (*Quod D. sit imm.* 52 [II, 68, 10-12]), just as the active human *nous* is in Aristotle (*De an.* III, 430a 18, but see also *Met. Lambda* 1073a 11). For Philo the human *nous* is a "divine fragment" "breathed" from on high (*De somm.* I, 34 [III, 212, 7], *Quis rer. div. her.* 64 [III, 15, 19-20]), since it is "an image of the image, " i.e., an image of the divine *logos* (thus Philo interprets the "second image" of Gen 1:26-27; see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 21). Philo also makes his own the Stoic doctrine (see SVF I, 826, 827, 836) of the *nous* as source of sensations (*Leg. alleg.* I, 28 [I, 68, 11-12], *De post.* C. 126 [II, 27, 24-26]). The term πηγή present in these two passages should be compared with the term *fons* of Cicero (*Academ pr.* II, 30; see above).

For Plutarch of Chaeronea the supreme god is identical to the intelligence and to the good *anima mundi* of book X of the *Laws* of Plato (*De Is. et Os.* 371A [II, 523, 12-13 Bernardakis], 370F [II, 522, 16-20]), to the good (*e Is. et Os.* 372F [II, 527, 20-21]), to the One and to true being (*De E apud Delphos* 392E [III, 22, 9-11], 393AB [III, 23, 6-13], 393B [III, 23, 15-19], *De def. or.* 428F [III, 117, 3]), to the intelligible (*De Is. et Os.* 373A [II, 528, 9-10], 382D [II, 552, 21-22]), to the beautiful (*De Is. et Os.* 383A [II, 554, 5-6]), to the ideas and the demiurge (*De Is. et Os.* 373F [II, 590, 9-10]). The identification of the first principle, the absolute being and the intelligible derive not only from the application to God of the Platonic doctrine of the immutability of the ideas but also from Aristotle (*Met. Lambda* 1072b 10, 1072a 26); the identification of the first principle with the intelligence is based on *Timaeus* 39e, *Philebus* 30c and on book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics*; the strict connection between the *nous* and the *anima mundi* goes back to the *Philebus*, *Laws* X, 897b; the identification of the idea-model (see *Tim.* 28a, 28c, 30c, 31a, 39e) with the *patēr* or demiurge-*nous* (see *Tim.* 28c, 39e) is explained by the fact that Plutarch interpreted in an Aristotelian-peripatetic sense the passage of *Tim.* 28c, 39e, in which the demiurge-*nous* contemplates the ideas present in the living intelligible being. (According to this interpretation of the passage the intelligence contemplates itself, i.e., its own thoughts.) This proves that Plutarch also, in the line of the ancient Academy and of Antiochus, considered the Platonic ideas-model as the thoughts contained in the mind of God; this hypothesis finds a clear confirmation in *De plac. philos.* 882D (V, 287, 5-7).

In the doctrine of the *nous* of Alcinous (that this, and not Albinus, is the actual orthography of the author of the *Didaskalikos* has been demonstrated by J. Whittaker: Phoenix 28 [1974] 450-456), the presence of Aristotelian motifs is even clearer. In the same way as Aristotle (*De an. III, cap.* 5, 430a 10-14), Alcinous (*Did.* 164, 16-20) distinguishes the *nous* in potentiality from the *nous* in act, applying to the heavenly *nous* (the second *nous* which governs the *anima mundi*) the distinction which Aristotle had reserved to the human *nous*. The new distinction, present in this passage, between the heavenly *nous* and the *nous* which is its cause, identified with the first god, is based on *Laws* X, 897b and on *Timaeus* 30b—where the demiurge-*nous* (see *Timaeus* 39e) infuses the *nous* into the *anima mundi* and this last into the sensible body of the universe. Of peripatetic derivation (see *Magna Mor.* B 1200a 14) is the idea—present, as we have seen, also in Philo—of the superiority of the first *nous* over virtue (*Did.* 181, 36-37). Similarly to the *nous* of Aristotle and Alexander of Aphrodisias, the *nous* of Alcinous thinks itself (*Did.* 164, 24-27), and remains immobile and at the same time is an object of desire and also active in that it moves the intelligence of the heavens (*Did.* 164, 20-24). For Alcinous, too, the ideas are an integral part of the mind of God, in that they are his thoughts and his activity (*Did.* 163, 12-13, 27-30; 164, 26-27). The identification of the ideas

with the thoughts of God is present also in Atticus (fr. 9 Des Places [69, 40-41]).

In Neo-Pythagoreanism we may observe two tendencies with respect to the *nous*, considered at times to be the supreme principle, at others subordinated to the One. (This latter tendency, which is related to Speusippus and Aristotle [*On Prayer*, fr. 46 Rose], is that which would be held to in orthodox Neoplatonism.) Parallel to Alcinous, *Numenius of Apamea affirms the existence of two intelligences, which are for him the first and the second gods: the "first god" is the supreme intelligence (fr. 16 Des Places), the good and absolute being (fr. 16 and 17), the living intelligent being of the *Timaeus* (fr. 22), superior and anterior to the *ousia* as its cause and principle (fr. 2 and 16) and at the same time connate to it; the "second god, " identical to the Platonic demiurge (fr. 16 and 21), is the second intelligence (fr. 17 and 22), directs the heavens (fr. 12) and is the cause of the harmony of matter (fr. 18). As H.J. Krämer (Theologie und Philosophie 44 [1969] 486) has illustrated, Numenius's fr. 22 Des Places (= text 25 Leemans), in which the first *nous* is identified with the intelligible living being of *Tim.* 39e, proves that Numenius too considers the ideas present in the mind of God. (In fr. 16 the first *nous* is considered the principle and the cause of the ideas because these are the result of his noetic activity, and "connate" to them because they, once produced, are contained in the *nous.*) On the other hand both ps.-Brotinus (*Syrianus*, *In Met.* 166, 5-6) and ps.-Archytas (Stobeus, *Anth.* I, 41, vol. I, 280, 15-17) place the *nous* below the One (see Anth. I, 41, vol. I, 280, 15-17).

In Neoplatonism, as in Neo-Pythagoreanism, there are two different directions taken with respect to the *nous*. On the one hand, *Ammonius Saccas, his faithful disciple *Origen the Neoplatonist and, later, in the 5th c., Hierocles continue to consider the *nous*-demiurge as the supreme principle (on Ammonius Saccas, see K.O. Weber, *Origenes der Neuplatoniker*, Zetemata 27, Munich 1962, 160; W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 10 and 41; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 223-224; on Origen the Neoplatonist see Proclus, *Theol. plat.* II, 4 = fr. 7 Weber 5-6; on Hierocles, see Photius, Bibl., cod. 214, 172a; cod. 251, 461b, where the will appears as one of the attributes of God and *In aureum Carmen* 125, 6-7 Mullach, with respect to the presence of the ideas in the mind of God). On the other hand, the so-called orthodox Neoplatonism, inaugurated by *Plotinus and concluded by Proclus and *Damascius, considers the *nous* not as the first principle but as a following *hypostasis, since the first principle is the absolutely transcendent and negative One of Plato's *Parmenides*. For a detailed examination of the doctrine of the *nous* proper to the "orthodox" Neoplatonists, *see* *Neoplatonism. Here it suffices to mention that also in the cases of Plotinus, *Porphyry, *Iamblichus, Proclus and Damascius the *nous*, independent of its hierarchical rank compared to the first principle (for Plotinus it is the second hypostasis, while for Porphyry, Iamblichus, Proclus and Damascius it is the third member of the triad formed by being, life and intelligence), is the seat of the ideas-models and is in general identified with the demiurge; and that the Plotinan doctrine of the *nous*, as with that of Philo, Plutarch and Alcinous, incorporates important Aristotelian motifs.

II. In patristics. Patristic thought inevitably felt the effects of the speculations on the relation between the *nous* and the first principle (oscillating, as we have seen, between total identity and subordination) characteristic of *Platonism and of contemporary Neo-Pythagoreanism. For *Athenagoras God is an eternal intelligence (*Legat.* 10) who can be understood only by the mind (*Legat.* 4). *Clement of Alexandria makes his own Philo's conception of God as *nous*, seat of the ideas: the passage of *Strom.* IV, 155, 2 (II, 317, 11) ("the intelligence is the seat of the ideas, the intelligence is God") refers back to Philo *De Cher.* 49 (I, 182, 9; "God . . . is the incorporeal seat of the incorporeal ideas"). That Clement considered God as a *nous* is clear from the emphasis he places on his will (fr. 48 Stählin [III, 224]), a conception he has in common with his master *Pantaenus and with Ammonius Saccas (see also S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 222-224). As for Philo, so also for Clement the human mind is a divine element (*Strom.* I, 94 [II, 60, 24-25]) and a most pure essence (breathed) into humanity at the moment of creation (*Strom.* V, 87, 4 [II, 383, 20-384, 3]), since it is "the image of the image," i.e., of the *logos* (Strom. V, 94, 4-5 [II, 388, 13-16]). *Origen, who one the one hand (*De princ.* I, 1, 6 [21, 13]) considers God an intelligence (*C. Cels.* VII, 38 [II, 188, 11]), on the other openly affirms that God can be conceived both as *nous* and as something superior to the *nous*, agreeing with Aristotle (*On Prayer* fr. 46 Rose) and showing himself fully aware of the debate occurring within contemporary Neoplatonism (see J. Whittaker: VChr 23 [1969] 92-93). Certain aspects of his conception of God (God thinks himself and is completely self-sufficient) reflect the Aristotelian-peripatetic doctrine of the metaphysical *nous* (*see* *Aristotelianism, subpoints 3-4 in the discussion of Origen). For the most part, his understanding of the *logos* as having its origin from God and of the relation between them co-

incides substantially with the Plotinan conception of the relationship between the *nous* and the one (*see* *Platonism and the Fathers with respect to the *logos* of Origen, nn. 1-9). We may observe motifs of Aristotelian provenance in the Origenian conception of the human *nous* (*see* *Aristotelianism, under Origen, nn. 6-10).

*Gregory of Nyssa, in full accord with Plotinus, affirms that God is superior to the *nous* (*In cant. cantic. hom.* V, 157, 15) and reserves to his wisdom or *logos*—the equivalent of the *nous* of Plotinus—the presence of the thoughts, anterior to the creation of the sensible universe (it is same idea found in Origen and Philo; *see* *Platonism and the Fathers, under Gregory of Nyssa). Gregory sees the human *nous* as it was created by God as the expression of the original purity, beauty and perfection of humanity (it is thus that he interprets the phrase "according to the image and likeness" of Gen 1:26); darkened and disfigured by a predilection for matter, this beauty can be restored by distancing the *nous* from the body to the highest possible degree (on the agreement, also on this point, between Gregory and Plotinus, which Merki emphasizes, *see* *Platonism and the Fathers, under Gregory of Nyssa). Very frequent in Gregory is the idea of the noble intelligence which, free from every tie with matter, flies toward the divine (see, e.g., *De virg.* 294, 8-10 and Plato, *Phaedo* 246 d). Gregory welcomes the *Stoic doctrine—present as we saw also in Antiochus of Ascalon and Philo—of the strict dependence of the sensations on the intelligence (*De an. et res*: PG 46, 29B 2-4, 32A 8-11, 60B 4-6; cf. also *De hom. opif.*: PG 46, 140A 1-9). For *Eusebius, *Cyril of Alexandria, St. *Augustine and *Theodoret the second person of the *Trinity (the Johannine *logos*) corresponds to the *nous* of Plotinus and of *Porphyry (*see* *Platonism and the Fathers). For ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, the *nous*, as in the case of the other "divine names, " does not designate the first principle considered in its *monē*, superior to the *nous* and to the *ousia*, but refers only to its *proodos*, and also in this sense it is superior to any *nous* (see *Div. Names* I, 5: PG 3, 583A 7-8, C 9; VII, 1: PG 3, 868A 5; VII, 2: PG 3, 868C 14; 869A 7); in the divine *nous* considered in this sense all the ideas-models are present in a superior unity (see *Div. Names* V, 8: PG 3, 824C 7-8). The angelic creatures are from the *nous* commonly called "intelligences" (*noes*).

III. In gnosticism. Also in the *Corpus *Hermeticum* we may note the oscillation between identifying the *nous* with God and the tendency to consider him subordinate to the first principle: in *Poimandres* 6 (I, 8, 16-18), the highest god is the *nous* generator of the *logos*; and also in *Corp. Herm.* V, 11 (I, 65, 4), the supreme god is presented as *nous*; but as J. Whittaker has noted (VChr 23 [1969] 95), in *Corp. Herm.* XII, 1 (I, 174, 3) the *nous* is presented as the product of the essence of God. In the system of *Basilides the *nous* is born from the Father (see Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 24, 3 [SC 264, 324, 40-326, 43]: *Basilides autem . . . ostendens Nun primo ab innato natum Patre* [see also J. Whittaker, op. cit., 103]). The *Valentinian school distinguishes the *Ennoia* (also called *Charis* or *Sigē*)—which together with the *Bythos* or *Propatōr* forms the first syzygy of aeons—from the *nous*, which is the *Monogenēs* born together with the *Alētheia* from the first syzygy: it is the principle of everything, and it alone is able to fully know the Father (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 1, 1: SC 264, 28, 74-30, 90). In the *Apocryphon of John* (ed. W. Till, TU 60, Berlin 1955), the *Ennoia* is identical to *Barbelo and to the *Pronoia*, the first image of God (27, 5-18 p. 95 Till), while the *nous* is produced subsequently to the *Monogenēs*, generated by Barbelo and identical to Christ (30-31, 9 101-103 Till).

DSp 11, 459-469; A.H. Armstrong, *The Background of the Doctrine "That the Intelligibles Are Not Outside the Intellect, " Les sources de Plotin*, in EntAC V (1960) 393-425; P. Hadot, *Être, vie, et pensée chez Plotin et avant Plotin*, ibid., 107-157; H.J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*, Amsterdam 1967; Id., *Grundfragen der aristotelischen Theologie*, II: Theologie und Philosophie 44 (1969) 486-496; J. Whittaker, Ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας: VChr 23 (1969) 91-104 (= *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, XIII); R. Walzer, *Aristotle's Active Intellect* νοῦς ποιητικός *in Greek and Early Islamic Philosophy*, in *Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente*, Acc. Naz. dei Lincei, Quaderno 198, Rome 1974, 423-446; A.H. Armstrong, *The Negative Theology of Nous in Later Platonism*: JbAC Erg. 10 (1983) 31-37; L. Rizzerio, *Le problème des parties de l'âme et de l'animation chez Clément d'Alexandrie*: NRTh 111 (1989) 389-416; T.A. Szlezák, *Platon und Aristoteles in der Nuslehre Plotins*, Basel 1979 (= *Platone e Aristotele nella dottrina del Nous di Plotino*, It. tr. by A. Trotta, Milan 1997); S.R.C. Lilla, *Neuplatonisches Gedankengut in den "Homilien über die Seligpreisungen" Gregors von Nyssa*, Leiden 2004.

S. Lilla

NOVATIAN (d. after 251). Probably Roman by birth, proud of his belonging to the community of *Rome (see Cypr, *Ep.* 30, 32), he did not receive all the degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (Cornelius to Fabius, in Eus., VI, 43, 13). His priestly ordination at the hands of Pope *Fabian of Rome met with the opposition of both the clergy and the community, perhaps because he had received baptism when he was gravely ill. Pope Fabian, predecessor of *Cornelius, had been very impressed by the very great intellectual gifts of Novatian. He was not mistaken, because Latin theology did not have, at least up to the 4th c.,

any work which could be compared to his *Trin.* The letters written by Novatian, found in the corpus of *Cyprian of Carthage (30 and 36), stand by no small distance above other Roman letters, and not only stylistically. For this, Cornelius himself, Cyprian (*Ep.* 55, 24) and the anonymous author of the *Ad Novatianum* show a certain esteem for Novatian. A passage in *Trin.* 29, 169 seems to reveal that he had been healed from a grave illness, and had begun, immediately after an emergency baptism, the preparation of the work. For this work, and for ascetical reasons, he seems to have lived as a hermit until the time of the *Decian persecution; only in the summer of 250 did he place himself completely at the disposition of the community, immediately occupying a leading role, and exercising his authority also in the pastoral application of *penance. While the first Roman letter envisages reconciliation, in the case of illness, for those who had fallen short in the persecution (the *lapsi*), letter 30, 8 permits "prudent assistance" only when there is no human hope of a cure. Further, Cyprian, whose flight was much criticized in letter 8, is now called *gloriosissimus* and placed therefore on the same level as the confessors; Novatian now clearly saw in Cyprian, whose rigid attitude in penitential practice had in the meantime become well known in Rome, a natural ally.

When in 251 at Rome Cornelius was elected pope and not the eminent Novatian, the latter had himself ordained by three Italian bishops and sought to attract to his side bishops of other cities, or to install alongside them other bishops favorable to him, so that a truly new church was constituted. Novatian can therefore be regarded as the first antipope for whom that appellation is fully appropriate. His community did not grant forgiveness at all for grave sins, and did not direct people to penance, as *Tertullian had done even when he had become a *Montanist. The *schism of Novatian arose out of a desire for a church which was holy and pure. This image of the church did not, however, derive from a genuinely primitive Christian heritage, but is rather the expression of the reception of a Stoic rigorism in the Christian life (Cypr., *Ep.* 55, 16 Hartel).

Late sources maintain that Novatian became a martyr under *Valerian. In 1932 an inscription was found in a small catacomb near St. Lawrence Outside the Walls: *Novatiano beatissimo martyri Gaudentius diaconus fecit*, but the identification of this martyr with the founder of the sect is not demonstrable.

The chief and classic work of Novatian, *Trin.*, was not conceived as a treatise on the *Trinity. The author does not use the word *trinitas*, even though it had been used forty years earlier by Tertullian (*De pud.* 21). Novatian does not call the *Holy Spirit either God or person, nor does he include him in the discussion on the unity of God. The Spirit is in fact for Novatian something divine and the third, next to the Father and the Son (not only the *fidei auctoritas*, i.e., the authority of the baptismal confession, but also the order of reason requires faith in the Spirit). In fact, Novatian's theology of the Holy Spirit is much behind that of Tertullian. Since the clearest assertions of the latter are connected in more than an accidental way with the defense of Montanism and the new prophecy of the Holy Spirit (*Adv. Praxeam* combats the opponents of Montanism), it may be that the reticence of Novatian has its basis in an ongoing rejection of Montanism.

Novatian introduced into Latin Christianity the expressions *incarnari* (*Trin.* 138) and *praedestinatio* (*Trin.* 94). This second term also appears in a *christological context. Christology is the basic question for Novatian, even if in the first place he clarifies the concept of God (accepting his immutability: *Trin.* 23) and assumes the defense of the God of the Bible against those who accused him of being envious (*Trin.* 7, 28). Christ came to earth in a true body (*Trin.* 56); he is not only man but also God (ibid.). This is shown by the fact that he is universally invoked (*Trin.* 74) and is the *concordia utriusque substantiae* (*Trin.* 140). As God, he is not to be identified with the Father, in that he is the second person next to him (*Trin.* 146). He is only able to save us because he has come in our flesh (*Trin.* 53). Actually, nowhere does his account concern the liberation from sin. Further, no expiatory efficacy is attributed to the death of Christ; this proves only the true human nature of Christ. The word of God (*deus*, *sermo*) takes on a body in the incarnation, which he lays down at death, as a tunic, and takes up again forever in the *resurrection (*Trin.* 124). With this, what was begun by means of the incarnation is made definitive. Truly because the Son of God has become Son of Man, and the Son of Man, the Son of God, the human race may be led to eternal salvation (*Trin.* 134). This Christ works as master, whose word confers on those who believe immortality and divinity (*Trin.* 84). Faith, however, seems to be identified with morals; the fault of the Jews consisted in the fact that they rejected the law, while the merit of Christians who have come from paganism lies in their having attained to the law of the gospel, becoming worthy of the help of the Holy Spirit (*Trin.* 164). The weight of humanity's sin consists for Novatian above all in mortality, in being subject to the passions and in the weakness of the flesh. Salvation

is obtained through faith and austerity of life. Morals and doctrine are given the first place; sacramentality and grace are placed second.

Novatian wrote a work, completely *allegorical in character, *De cibis iudaicis*, before the persecution of Decian; he did this for one of the partial communities which was being formed in the 3rd c. to which he had been assigned. He also composed treatises, lost to us, in which he had clarified the true significance of the *sabbath and of circumcision (*Cib.* 1, 6). In the *De cibis* he shows how unclean animals, prohibited in Scripture, signify evil human actions (*Cib.* 3, 12); e.g., to eat birds of prey would not be prohibited, but rather theft (*Cib.* 3, 20). His *De spectaculis* is against those who tried to justify the legitimacy of the theater and their participation in public *entertainments with arguments from Scripture, adducing the episode of David, who danced (*Spect.* 3, 2), or those who wished to reconcile Christianity and theatrical culture, the Roman state and the church. We can think of the period which preceded the Decian persecution under the emperor *Philip the Arab, who was quite favorable to the Christians. Novatian tried to call attention to the immoral content of the pagan spectacles. For the Christians only the texts of Scripture are proper (*Spect.* 10, 1).

The *De bono pudicitiae* is a composition of Novatian subsequent to his episcopal ordination; in it he intimates that he preached almost every day on the gospel (*Pud.* 1, 1). The fundamental reason for the practice of chastity is the church itself, which is both virgin and bride (*Pud.* 2, 2), beyond the desire to spare oneself from the shame of fault and *paenitentia*, which is nothing other than an "ashamed testimony of the sin committed" (*Pud.* 13, 4). The church of Novatian, virgin and mother, is not concerned with sins, and does not direct to penance, but is watchful that its members remain "the temple of the Lord, member of Christ, dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, chosen for hope, consecrated in the faith, destined for sanctity, sons of God, brothers of Christ, spouses of the Holy Spirit" (*Pud.* 2, 1).

CPL 68-76; PL 3, 911-1000 and part of PL 4, among the works of Cyprian; CCL 4; H. Koch, *Zum novatianischen Schrifttum*: ZKG 38 (1920) 86-95; M. Simonetti, *Alcune osservazioni sul* De Trinitate *di Novaziano*, Studi in onore di A. Monteverdi, Modena 1959; H. Weyer, *Novatianus. De Trinitate. Über den dreieinigen Gott.* Text, Übersetzung, Einleitung, Kommentar (Testimonia II), Düsseldorf 1962; M. Simonetti, *Ilario e Novaziano*: RCCM 7 (1965) 1034-1047; H.J. Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum. Der Kirchenbe-griff des Novatian und die Geschichte seiner Sonderkirche* (Theophaneia 20), Bonn 1968; G.F. Diercks, *Note sur le traité De Trinitate de Novaziano*: SE 19 (1969/70) 27-31; R.J. de Simone, *Christ the True God and True Man by Novatian "De Trinitate"*: Augustinianum 10 (1970) 42-117; Id., *The Treatise of Novatian the Roman Presbyter on the Trinity* (SEA 4), Rome 1970; G.F. Diercks, *Some Critical Notes on Novatian's* De bono pudicitiae *and the Anonymus* Ad Novatianum: VChr 25 (1971) 121-130; V. Loi, *La latinità cristiana nel De Trinitate di Novaziano*: RCCM 13 (1971) 136-177; Id., *Vetus Latina, "testo occidentale" dei Vangeli, Diatessaron nelle testimonianze di Novaziano*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 201-221; H. Gülzow, *Cyprian und Novatian. Der Briefwechsel zwischen den Gemeinden Rom und Kartago zur Zeit der Verfolgung des Kaisers Decius* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 48), Tübingen 1975; P. Petitmengin, *Une nouvelle édition et un ancien manuscrit de Novatien*: REA 21 (1975) 256-272; C. Curti, *Lo scisma di Novaziano nell'interpretazione dello storico Socrate*, in *La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità*, Atti del Convegno tenuto in Erice (3-8 dicembre 1978), ed. S. Calderone, Messina 1980, 313-333; R.-Th. Klein, *Novatian*: BBKL 6, 1047-1049; C. Granado, *Teología del Espiritu Santo en Novaciano*: Communio 14 (1981) 187-204; E. Lupieri, *Contributo per un'analisi delle citazioni veterotestamentarie nel* De Trinitate *di Novaziano*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 211-227; S. Prete, *L'Antico Testamento in Novaziano* De spectaculis 10: Augustinianum 24 (1982) 229-237; F. Bisconti, *Un nuovo coperchio di sarcofago dal cimitero di Novaziano*: RivAC 59 (1983) 61-85; P. Grattarola, *Gli scismi di Felicissimo e di Novaziano*: RSCI 38 (1984) 367-390; J. Polland, *Un passage difficile de Novatien sur I. Cor. 15, 27-28*: Gregorianum 66 (1985) 25-52; R. Giordani, *"Novatiano beatissimo marturi Gaudentius diaconus fecit": contributo all'identificazione del martire Novaziano della catacomba anonima sulla via Tiburtina*: RivAC 68 (1992) 233-258; E. Zaffagno, *Sul capitolo introduttivo del* De cibis iudaicis *di Novaziano*: GIF 44 (1992) 59-65; H.J. Vogt, *Novatian*: LTK 7, 938-939; P. Mattei, *Deux notes sur mariage (divorce) et virginité dans Novatien*: RSLR 29 (1993) 357-366; Id., *Recherches sur la Bible à Rome vers le milieu du III^e siècle*: RBen 105 (1995) 255-279; M. Wallraff, *Geschichte des Novatianismus seit dem vierten Jahrhunderten im Osten*: ZAC 1 (1997) 251-279; P. Mattei, *La figure de Novatien chez Pacien de Barcelone. Sources et valeur documentaire des Lettres à Simpronianus sur le sujet*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 355-370; Id., *Un tombeau pour Novatien? Retour sur une* quaestio vexata: elenchus *bibliographique, état des lieux, essai de mise au point*, in *Autour de Lactance* (Mélanges Monat), Besançon 2003, 123-137; Novaziano, *Gli spettacoli*, [critical text, tr. and comm.] ed. A. Saggioro, Bologna 2001.

H.J. Vogt

NOVATIANUM, Ad. This treatise on the readmission of the **lapsi*, composed in the wake of the African legislation prepared by the Council of *Carthage at which *Cyprian presided, after *Easter of 251, embraced its theses. The author criticizes Novatian for denying the *misericordiam patris*, *respuendo paenitentiam fratris* (ch. 1). Attempts to identify the author have not been successful. Pope *Cornelius has been suggested; Harnack proposed Pope *Sixtus II (Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altchrist.* Literatur, 13, XX), followed by numerous scholars, therefore of Roman origin; others, however, think that it should be attributed to an unknown African bishop. In the 4th c. *Pacian of Barcelona used the treatise. The text is in PL 3, 1205ff., CSEL 3, 56ff., CCL 4, 137ff.

CPL 76; CPPM IIA, 549; EC 8, 1980; A. d'Alès, *Novatien*, Paris 1925, 25-30; Bardenhewer, 2, 495-496; H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*, Bonn 1926, 358-420; Quasten, *Patrologia*, II, Turin 1967, 598; G.F. Diercks, *Some Critical Notes on Novation's* De bono pudicitiae *and the Anonymus* Ad Novatianum: VChr 25 (1971) 121-130.

V. Saxer

NOVATIANISTS

I. Preamble. Novatian - II. The Novatian church.

Novatianists (*Nouatian[o]i* or *Nauatianoi*, in the greater number of ancient sources, from the error in naming the founder: "Novatus/tos" or "Nauatos," more frequent than "Nouatianus/nos." *Novatianenses* we find in Cyprian, *Ep.* 73, 2, 1 Hartel). The history of the Novatian church begins with the schism of spring 251; it continued until the 7th c. The more important sources are *Cyprian, *Letters*; *Eusebius, *HE* 6-7 (passages from one of more letters of *Cornelius to Phabios [*Fabius] of Antioch; letters of *Dionysius of Alexandria); *Pacian of Barcelona, three letters to the Novatianist *Sympronianus; *Socrates (who demonstrates sympathy for the Novatianist movement, its moral rigor and dogmatic orthodoxy; he uses a Novatianist informer, the priest Auxanon; *Sozomen in general depends on him); *Eulogius, Chalcedonian patriarch of *Alexandria (580[581]-607 [608]); six books, lost but commented upon by *Photius (*Bibl.*, codd. 182.208.280), on the schismatic doctrine; and finally, against the *Acts of the Martyrs of Novatian*.

I. Preamble. Novatian. *1. The schism.* This is not the place to trace its birth, scandalously foolish, acc. to Cornelius (Eus., *HE* 6, 43, 5f.), nor the commotion which it aroused in Rome itself, owing above all to the actions of *Novatus, a dissolute Carthaginian deacon, and of some of the confessors, who had gathered themselves around Cornelius. The split should be attributed not so much to psychological questions as to theological ones, which, to justify a rigidity toward the **lapsi*, found their roots in the *anthropology, *soteriology and *ecclesiology of Novatian. He was not a rebaptizer (in conformity with the Roman tradition), he rejected absolution and any form of *penance, for adulterers no less than for the *lapsi*, and he administered "confirmation."

2. The fate of Novatian. His martyrdom is plausible, to judge from the account of Socrates (HE 4, 28, 15) and from the *Acts* read by Eulogius (cf. also Pacian *Ep.* 2, 7, 5-6), as long as we understand them properly: dead, without doubt, in exile where the bishop would have been sent in virtue of a previous edict of *Valerian (promulgated between Aug 257 and Aug 258). It is probable that the tomb of the dissident was recovered in 1932 in Rome, in the catacomb which, from that time, has borne his name.

II. The Novatian church. *1. Beginnings outside Rome.* After his election, Novatian sent to Carthage the priest Maximus, the deacon Augendo, and the laymen Machseus and Longinus, and via letters tried to win to his cause the African episcopate, which at first hesitated; later, Evaristus, an ex-Italian bishop, *auctor schismatis* acc. to Cornelius (*inter Ep. Cypr.*, 50, 1, 2: a hypothetical text, which in any case does not necessarily mean that Evaristus was one of the consecrators of Novatian), the deacon Nicostratus, Novatus (already cited), Dennis and Primus set up a Novatian church in Carthage, the bishop of which was Maximus (already cited; Cyprian, *Ep.* 44, 1, 1; 52; 59, 9, 2). In the rest of the West the schism attracted adherents: in 254–255, Cyprian, his attention recalled to the case of Marcianus of Arles by Faustinus of Lyons, asks Stephen of Rome to arrange his dismissal (*Ep. 66*). The episcopate was at first hesitant in the East as well: At Antioch Fabius supported Novatian, and at Alexandria, Dionysius, responding to a message in which the Roman sought to justify his works, attempted a call to return to unity. In the years that passed, the rebellion welled up again both in East (Dionysius to Stephen, in Eus., *HE* 7, 4-5, 1) and West—without disappearing.

2. 4th and 1st half of 5th c. The presence of Novatianists is attested in various parts of the empire, although in very different ways. In the West, these attestations are rare. There is relative silence in *Gaul, Illyria, and *Africa itself (*Augustine does not say much [cf. *Ep.* 265], and the links that certain modern writers profess to find between the Novatianists and the *Donatists are disputable). In N *Italy *Ambrose (*De paenitentia*) suggests the existence of dissidents, and in *Spain *Pacian contended with them, but without giving the impression that they are a clearly defined group. In Rome, toward the middle of the century, the deacon Gaudentius decorated the tomb of Novatian (see the inscription *in situ*); a bishop, Leontius, is mentioned under Theodosian, who esteemed him. (He interceded with success in favor of a pagan, Symmachus, compromised during the usurpation of Maximus: Socr., *HE* 5, 14, 3-9.) In *Egypt and in *Syria, the polemics of *Athanasius and of *Eusebius of Emesa would not have had any meaning if there had not existed groups of Novatianists. But it is at *Constantinople (and the nearby regions *Asia Minor, *Thrace) that information abounds, thanks to Socrates and Sozomen (see GCS 50 and NF 1, 1, "Name Index," s.v. "Ναυατιάνοι").

Thanks to them we know the succession of Novatian bishops in the imperial capital: (1) Acesius, under *Constantine and *Constantius (the Novatian church was destroyed by bishop Macedonius, but three churches were built or rebuilt under *Julian); (2) Agelius, until 384 (exiled by *Valens, who closed the churches, then granted an amnesty owing to the intervention of the schismatic priest Marcianus, tutor to his daughters; at the time of Agelius, but in his absence, the synod of Pazos, in Phyrgia, considered the difficulties created by Sabbatius and by his partisans, *quartodecimans; in 383, in a council convoked by *Theodosius I, of various trinitarian parties, Agelius, on the advice of the lector Sisinnius, a refined and educated man, proposed, along with a Catholic bishop Nettarius, an orthodox profession of faith); (3) Marcianus (already mentioned; a Bithynian synod of 391 left complete freedom on the question of *Easter); (4) Sissinius (already mentioned; after 395); (5) Chrysanthus (after 407 or 408), charitable and active; (6) Paul (419–438), worker of miracles; (7) another Marcianus. Epigraphy indicates the "churches of the pure" ("καθάροι": a title already common in Eus., *HE* 6, 43, 1, and in the fathers of *Nicaea) in certain cities of Phrygia; there, the Novatianists were united to other rigorist groups (*Montanists): whence their subsequent history—and some confusions among the *heresiologists and ancient historians.

Novatian discipline in the course of the 4th c. (and in following centuries) shows both novelty and local variation. Already from the 3rd c. the Mauretanian Novatians practiced rebaptism (see Cypr., *Ep.* 73, 2, 1). Certain communities saw their way to establish a penitential discipline, but without absolution (even on the deathbed). In *Asia at least, the list of grave sins included, under Montanist influence, second marriages, and confirmation had fallen into disuse (Theodoret, *Haer.* 3, 5). According to Eulogius, the Novatianists of *Alexandria rejected the cult of relics.

Despite the attacks from the Catholics (following stereotypical themes: rebukes addressed to "Novatian" for pride and rigidity), the church and the state in the 4th c. maintained rather sympathetic relations. This is shown by synodal legislation: the so-named canons of *Elvira demonstrate that the schism could have influence in an attitude of moral severity, and the Council of Nicaea (can. 8) accepts the baptism and ordination of the Novatianists, under the condition of an imposition of hands, with penitential meaning. (They impose also accepting the communion of the δίγαμοι—i.e., those divorced and remarried.) At Constantinople, the authorities showed themselves indulgent when Nicene adherents persecuted pro-*Arians: the Novatianists, who accepted Nicaea, were not touched by the anti-Nicene measures of *Constantine and *Theodosius (a contrary decision, attributed to Constantine by Eusebius [?], *Vit. Const.* 3, 64, and, after him, by Sozomen, *HE* 8, 24, 1-2, is apocryphal); as for the bishops, if Macedonius, supporter of the *homoiousios, accused them of Nicenism (as did Eleusius, he too homoiousion, at Cyzicus), the *homoousians (except *John Chrysostom) welcomed them—esp. since, faced with the "Arians, " the group which had remained Catholic received help on occasion from them.

A change occurred in the 1st half of the 5th c., in Rome, when Pope *Innocent I and—after a period of tranquility under Pope *Zozimus and *Boniface I—*Celestine I closed the churches of the Novatianists: they must have disappeared from the city, and "Rusiculas" (?) is the last bishop of which we know (Socr., HE 7, 9, 2.11, 1-5). The emperors, in 423, included them among the heretics (*CTh.* 16, 5, 59), but changed this in 428 (ibid., 16, 5, 65). In Alexandria *Cyril persecuted them, as also *Nestorius in Constantinople (*Socr.*, HE 7, 7, 5.29, 11-12); Cyril, however, did not succeed in eliminating them, and in the capital in fact, after Marcianus II, we have no more information about the Novatianists simply because the continuers of Socrates tell us nothing. In the 6th c. *Leontius of Constantinople mentions the Novatianists again (PG 62, 759-764), but perhaps this is an archaism, while a Constantinopolitan homily of ps.-Chrysostom shows debate with them at a date which remains unknown (*De poenitentia*: PG 59, 765-766; 6th c.).

Later evidence. One notices a disparity between West and East. In the West, almost nothing after the middle of the 5th c.: Pope *Leo I indicates in Mauretania the arrival in the *catholic* church of a bishop, Donatus, with his faithful (*Ep.* 12, 6). In the East, the evidence is hardly less scarce (up to *John of Damascus; we recall Eulogius, to whom we may add some later statements, somewhat bookish in character; the latest Asian Novatianists seem to have had relations with the *Paulicians). Novatian rigorism was maintained for a long time in the East, since its deeper roots esp. in Asia allowed it, in those countries, to embody a protest against the establishment of the state church.

E. Amann, DTC 11, 815-849; R. Janin, *Les Novatiens orientaux*: Échos d'Orient (1929) 385-397; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford 1952, passim; H.J. Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum. Der Kirchenbegriff des Novatian und die Geschichte seiner Sonderkirche*, Bonn 1968; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome

1976, passim; G. Cereti, *Divorzio, nuove nozze e penitenza nella chiesa primitiva*, Bologna 1977, 265-361; M. Wallraff, *Geschichte des Novatianismus seit dem vierten Jahrhunderten im Osten*: ZAC 1 (1997) 251-279; P. Mattei, *La figure de Novatien chez Pacien de Barcelone. Sources et valeur documentaire des Lettres à Simpronianus sur le sujet*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 355-370; Id., *Le témoignage d'Euloge, patriarche d'Alexandrie, sur Novatien* (*d'après Photius*, Bibl., *codd. 182, 208, 280*), in *Curiosité historique et intérêts philologiques* (Mélanges Lancel), Grenoble 1998, 151-166; Id., *Un tombeau pour Novatien? Retour sur une quaestio vexata: elenchus bibliographique, état des lieux, essai de mise au point*, in *Autour de Lactance* (Mélanges Monat), Besançon 2003, 123-137.

P. Mattei

NOVATUS (d. 440). Bishop of Sitifis (today Sétif, in Algeria) for 37 years, as his epitaph tells us (Diehl 1101; CIL 8, 8634). He was ordained in 403. He seems to be the same bishop Novatus to whom letter 84 of *Augustine was addressed, whose brother Lucillus was deacon with Augustine in *Hippo (*Ep.* 84, 1), and who then became bishop of Castellum Sinitense. In fact we find him not only to be a friend of Augustine but also someone who made his works known to Count Darius (Aug., *Ep.* 229,1 and 230,1-2); a letter of his addressed to Augustine is not extant (Aug., *Ep.* 229, 1). In 416 he was present at the Council of Milevis (Aug., Ep. 176, *intest.*), of which he was the twelfth signatory; in 418 at the Council of *Carthage (cf. CCL 149, 158, 54-56); and also at the council of 419, still more important as it had to consider the matter of *Apiarius, as one of the legates of the Mauretania Sitifensis (CCL 149, 92 and 151). In that year *Galla Placidia invited Novatus, perhaps then primate of Mauretania Sitifensis, to attend a council to be held in Spoleto—a council which never actually met—to deal with the dispute between *Boniface, bishop of Rome, and his rival *Eulalius (*Coll. Avel.*, *ep.* 28: CSEL 35, 93). The invitation of Galla Placidia is a sign that Novatus was also known and appreciated at the imperial court of *Ravenna. Before 422 he interceded for a widow who had taken a vow of continence and had been abducted by the catechumen Celticius in order to marry her (Aug., *De octo Dulcitii quaest.* 7, 3). In 437 Novatus was expelled from his see by the *Vandal *Genseric, who had confiscated his churches (Prosp. Aq., *Chron. ad an.* 437: MGH, *Auct. ant.* IX, 475). He died in 440 (CIL 8, 8634).

S.A. Morcelli, *Africa christiana*, I, Brescia 1816, 283-284; PWK 3 A, 393-394; J.-L. Maier, *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine, vandale et byzantine*, Rome 1973, 369; PCBE I, 783-784; S. Lancel, *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411*, SC 373, Paris 1991 (see index).

A. Di Berardino

NOVATUS of Carthage (mid-3rd c.). Priest of *Carthage of the mid-3rd c. Together with *Fortunatus and Gordius he opposed the election of *Cyprian (*Ep.* 24, 4). Novatus, a follower of *Felicissimus, avaricious, malicious and always searching out novelties (*Ep.* 50, 52, 2), separated from the church (*Ep.* 47, 52, 1) on account of this perversity. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VI, 43, 1-2.21; VI, 45.46, 1.3; VII, 4, 8) and, with him, all Greek writers who followed him, confuse Novatus with *Novatian.

F. Villegas, *Les sentences pour les moines de Novat le Catholique*: RBen 86 (1976) 49-74 (see 65); G.W. Clarke, *The Letters of Cyprian of Carthage*, New York 1984, I, 266-268.

E. Romero Pose

NOVATUS the Catholic (d. before 530). Italian author of the sermon *Sententia de humilitate et oboedentia et de calcando superbia*, whom the MS tradition calls *catholicus* to distinguish him from certain heterodox figures of the same name. Novatus, a priest or bishop, addressed a religious community in which there were strained relations with the abbot. He defended the importance, in the common life, of the three virtues of humility, obedience and fraternal charity. Since *Eugippius draws on it in his rule, written between 530 and 535, it must date from before then.

CPL 639 and 1154; PL 18, 67-70; PLS 1, 672 and 1751; DSp 11, 477-478; DIP 6, 441-442; F. Villegas, *Les sentences pour les moines de Novat le Catholique*: RBen 86 (1976) 49-74.

A. Di Berardino

NOVELLAE. Imperial constitutions enacted by the emperors after the promulgation of the codices of *Theodosius II and of *Justinian (534). They are of two types: (1) *Novellae Constitutiones posttheodosianae* (ed. Mommsen 1905) of the period from 438 to 468. They were valid in the part of the empire of the respective emperor, and in the other part only if accepted: only one case is known, that of Theodosius II, who in 447 sent a collection of 35 *novellae* to his son-in-law *Valentinian III. In about 460 the first collection was compiled, which contained 35 *novellae* of Theodosius II, 35 of Valentinian III and apparently 12 of Majorian (d. 461). To this collection others were added, among which were five Eastern *Novellae* of *Marcian (450–457). No other Eastern *novellae* have been preserved, because they were incorporated into the CI and also because Justinian prohibited recourse to laws anterior to his codification (CI, *Const. Summa* 3 of 529). (2) *Novellae Con-*

stitutiones, those issued by Justinian after the second edition of the CI (534), almost all drawn up in Greek. For those of Justinian there was no official collection, but only a series of different private collections. Important are the *Epitome Iuliani* of 556/557, i.e., the Latin summary of 124 *novellae* (there are two duplicates); the *Authenticam* of 557–558, then enlarged up to 563, containing 134, all translated into *Latin (in the West from the 12th c. it replaced the *Epitome*); *Collectio graeca* composed of 168, of which 158 of Justinian (two repetitions), up to Tiberius II (578–582) (ed. Schöll-Kroll). Many of these deal with ecclesiastical questions (see DDC 4, 657-661): persons (3, 5, 56, 57, 76, 81, 123), ordinations (6, 16), hierarchy (11 and 35), depositions (42), church property (7, 46, 55, 120), places of worship (67), worship (58), funerals (59), ecclesiastical jurisdiction (79, 83, 85), heretics (45, 131) etc. 131 is interesting because it refers to the sources of ecclesiastical law, the organization of the churches and contains the statement that "the pope of ancient *Rome is the first of all the *sacerdotes*, " while the bishop of *Constantinople is the second.

CPL 1795; 1799; Noailles, *Les collections des Novelles de l'empereur Justinien*, Paris 1912; Id., *La collection grecque de 168 Novelles*, Paris 1914; G.G. Archi, *Giustiniano legislatore*, Bologna 1970 (cf. Dovere: SDHI 47 [1981] 31-36); C. Capizzi, *Giustiniano I tra politica e religione*, Soveria Mannelli 1994; G. Lanata, *Società e diritto nel mondo tardo antico: sei saggi sulle Novelle giustinianee*, Turin 1994; N. van der Wal, *Manuale Novellarum Justiniani: aperçu systematique du contenu des Novelles de Justinien*, Groningue [2]1998; O. Mazal, *Iustininian I und seine Zeit*, Cologne 2001.

A. Di Berardino

NOVIODUNUM. The ruins are to be found 2 km (1.2 mi) to the E of Isaccea, in the area of Tulcea, Romania, on the right bank of the Danube, by the last ford before the river goes into the sea. Its name of Celtic origin, this Roman and later Byzantine port in N Dobruja was rebuilt at the beginning of the 4th c. and again under *Justinian (527–565). In the vicinity there were various necropolises. The Danube now marks the boundary between Romania and the Ukraine, but then it was the boundary between the Roman (and Byzantine) Empire and the barbarian world. It was a commercial and cosmopolitan city; a military base (*Legio I Iovia Scythica*) and a naval one (*Classis Flavia Moesica*). The archaeological work undertaken for reasons of preservation in 1955–1956 identified a part of the walls and buildings from the NE side of the city, destroyed for the most part by the waters of the Danube. Ruins of a Christian basilica were discovered, with a large apse facing NE, set against the city walls, with three aisles and a simple narthex. A cemeterial basilica was identified in the large necropolis in the S part of the city. Being a commercial city, Christianity arrived there by means of merchants. Hagiographical texts (*Breviarium Syriacum*, *Sinassario Costantinopolitano* and *Martirologio Gerominiano*) locate numerous martyrs at Noviodunum.

The most important paleo-Christian structure found in the area of the city is ca. 10 km (6.2 mi) to the SE, in the center of the village of Niculitel: a crypt with the tombs of martyrs (martyrium), found in 1971, over which a Christian church was built. The martyrium, integrally preserved, is square in design, with sides of ca. 3.5 m (11.5 ft), 2.25–2.3 m (7.5 ft) in height, with a brick cupola of 3 m (9.8 ft) diameter, and with a small entrance (0.7 x 0.69 m [2.26 x 2.30 ft]) on the W, which was discovered blocked in with a slab of limestone. On the upper part of the N and S walls, each under their respective monogrammatic cross, the following epigraphs are etched in raw plaster, and subsequently colored red: Μάρτυρες Χριστοῦ (on the N wall) and Μάρτυρες Ζώτικος, Ἄτταλος, Καμάσις, Φίλιππος (on the S wall). The names of four martyrs Zotikos, Attalos, Kamasi(o)s and Philippos, together with "another 25" are recorded by the *Mart. hier.* on the date of 4 June. The continuation of the excavations under this crypt in 1973 and 1975 brought to light two small rooms on the entrance of which this epigraph was found: Ὧδε καὶ ὧδε ἰχὼρ μαρτύρων ("Here and there [is found] the blood of martyrs"). Inside, two ceramic jars were found with a great quantity of calcined human bones belonging to the two martyrs. It is supposed that the six martyrs died during the great persecution of *Diocletian of 303–304. Placed at first, or otherwise subsequently, in a martyrium structure, traces of the foundations of which have been identified to the W of the preserved martyrium, the relics of the six martyrs were probably transferred to the latter location in the 5th or 6th c., when a basilica was erected over it, the foundations of which have been partly unearthed.

I. Barnea, *Dinogetia et Noviodunum, deux villes byzantines du Bas-Danube*: RESE 9 (1971) 343-362; V.H. Baumann, *La basilique découverte à Niculitel*: Dacia n.s. 16 (1972) 189-202; P.S. Nasturel, *Quatre martyrs de Noviodunum* (*Scythie Mineure*): AB 91 (1973) 5-8; Em. Popescu, *Inscriptiile grecesti si latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite in România*, Bucharest 1976; I. Barnea, *Les monuments paleochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; Id., *Christian Art in Romania*, I, Bucharest 1979; Id. - A.L. Barnea, *Sapaturile de salvare de la Noviodunum*: Pauce 9 (1984) 97-105, 503-518; A. Rădulescu - V. Lungu, *Le christianisme en Scythie mineure à la lumière des dernières découvertes archéologiques*, in *Actes du XI[e] Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, III, Rome 1989, 2561-2615, esp. 2614-2615; *Roman limes*

on the Middle and Lower Danube, Archaeological Institute, Belgrade 1996; A. Barnea, *Une province chrétienne sous Justinien: La Scythie mineure*, in Acta XIII Congressus Intern. Arch. christianae, II, Vatican City 1998, 807-822, esp. 816; V.H. Baumann, *La città romana e bizantina di Noviodunum. Reperti archeologici, in Italia e Romania*, ed. S. Santelia, Bari 2004, 113-132.

I. Barnea

NUBIA
I. Christianity - II. Old Nubian.

I. Christianity. Nubia is a region situated between N Sudan and S *Egypt along the course of the Nile, more or less from the confluence between the White Nile and the Blue Nile (Khartoum) N to the first cataract (Aswan). Christianity probably penetrated the area, in a sporadic form, as early as the 3rd c. The first archaeological evidence of Christianity dates to ca. 400. According to the *History* of *John of Ephesus, the evangelization of the country was due to rival missions, sent by *Justinian and by *Theodora in about 540, which succeeded in converting the three kingdoms of the region: Nodabia (capital: Faras/Pakhoras), Makuria (capital: Old Dongola) and Alodia (capital: Soba). Relations with *Byzantium were broken off in about 640, when Egypt was conquered by the Arabs, with whom a permanent state of war was established, which finished, in 1323, with the invasion of the kingdom of Dongola (already ca. 700 united to Nobadia). The kingdom of Alodia was destroyed at the end of the 15th c. by the Funj, a desert population.

Regardless of the presence or absence of missionaries of *Chalcedonian convictions during the 6th c., from an ecclesiastical point of view Nubia emerged as an anti-Chalcedonian region, organized around the episcopal sees of Faras (then transferred to Qasr Ibrim/Primis) and of Gebel Adda/Daw. Archaeological research has revealed a Christian culture with its own specific features, which flourished in 9th–11th c. both architecturally (churches following a distinctive design, sometimes frescoed) and in literary terms, with epigraphs and evidence of literary work in Greek, Sahidic, Nubian and Arabic.

U. Monneret de Villard, *Storia della Nubia cristiana*, OCA 118, Rome 1938; Id., *La Nubia medioevale. I-IV*, Le Caire 1935-57; E. Dinkler (ed.), *Kunst und Geschichte Nubiens in christlicher Zeit. Ergebnisse und Probleme auf Grund der jüngsten Ausgrabungen*, Recklinghausen 1970; C.J. Gardberg, *Late Nubian Sites: Churches and Settlements*, Scandinavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia 7, Stockholm 1970; S. Jakobielski, *A History of the Bishopric of Pachoras on the Basis of Coptic Inscriptions*, Faras 3, Warszawa 1972; K. Michalowski (ed.), Nubia. *Récentes recherches . . .* , Varsovie 1975; J.M. Plumley, *The Scrolls of Bishop Timotheus . . .* , London 1975; W.H.C. Frend - I.A. Muirhead, *The Greek Manuscripts from the Cathedral of Q'asr Ibrim*: Muséon 89 (1976) 43-49; *Nubia christiana. I*, Warsaw 1982; J. Cuoq, *Islamisation de la Nubie chrétienne, VII^e-XVI^e siècle*, Bibliothèque d'études islamiques 9, Paris 1986; *Faras: die Kathedrale aus dem Wüstensand . . .* , W. Seipel (ed.), Vienna 2002; S.G. Richter, *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens*, Wiesbaden 2002; D.A. Welsby, *The Medieval Kingdoms of Nubia: Pagans, Christians and Muslims Along the Middle Nile*, London 2002.

II. Old Nubian. Language of the Nile-Chadic family, in which, using an alphabet derived from that of Old *Coptic, some works were either written or translated in the Middle Ages which are of Christian importance: parts of the Bible have been preserved (above all a lectionary for the Christmas period), a collection of miracles of St. Menas, the canons of *Nicaea, a ps.-Chrysostomic homily on the cross, as well as numerous minor texts and fragments, some still unidentified.

B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament, Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations*, Oxford 1977, 268-274; E.A.W. Budge, *Texts Relating to Saint Mena of Egypt and Canons of Nicaea in a Nubian Dialect*, London 1909; J. Barns, *A Text of the Benedicite in Greek and Old Nubian from Kasr El-Wizz*: JEA 60 (1974) 206-211; G.M. Browne, *Chrysostomus Nubianus: An Old Nubian Version of Ps.-Chrysostom, In Venerabilem Crucem Sermo*, Papyrologica Castroctaviana 10, Rome-Barcelona 1984; J.M. Plumley - G.M. Browne, *Old Nubian Texts from Qaṣr Ibrīm*. I, Texts from Excavations. 9th Memoir, London 1988; G.M. Browne, *Ad Chrysostomum Nubianum* 18.5-7: Orientalia 57 (1988) 210-211; G.M. Browne, *Literary Texts in Old Nubian*, Beiträge zur Sudanforschung 5, Vienna-Mödling 1989; G.M. Browne, *Introduction to Old Nubian*, Meroitica 11, Berlin 1989; G.M. Browne, *Bibliorum sacrorum versio Palaeonubiana*, CSCO 547/Subs. 87, Lovanii 1994; S. Emmel, *Preliminary Reedition and Translation of the Gospel of the Savior: New Light on the Strasbourg Coptic Gospel and the Stauros-Text from Nubia*: Apocrypha 14 (2003) 9-53.

S.J. Voicu

NUDITY, BAPTISMAL. Ancient art contained many images of nude persons, expressive of a "heroic body" (a heroic nudity). In paleo-Christian art we find depictions of nude babies (*putti*), but also biblical persons (*Adam, Eve, *Daniel, *Jonah). Pagan statues were condemned by the Christians not because they were nude but because they portrayed divinities. Nudity was particularly practiced in athletic games to indicate complete control of both mind and body; the athlete had to be perfectly naked to be able to do the exercises; it was necessary to free oneself from things both external and internal (Porphyry, *De abstin.* 1, 31). Baths, in the imperial period, were large and complex structures. Vitruvius (*De archit.* 5, 10, 1) writes: "Care must be taken that the warm baths of the women and the

men [*caldaria muliebra et virilia*] adjoin" so that they could use the same heating. They became very popular and were frequented also by women. Everyone bathed nude; but it is not really known to what extent the sexes mixed. Baths were not only for bathing but also for physical exercises undertaken in the gymnasium, as well as for conversation, social activities and for pursuing economic and political contacts. From the 1st c. AD, because many women bathed with men and scandals occurred, the emperor *Hadrian was said to have prohibited mixed bathing (Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 69, 8, 2; *Hist. Augusta* 18, 10); in reality it seems that only from the 4th c. were there distinct sections in the baths. Attendance could be at different times; but everything depended on the particular sensibility of persons and on the region of the Roman Empire; also, the "atmosphere" of the individual bath complexes varied: some baths were more disreputable, or more open and reserved, others less.

Christians attended public baths (Eus., *HE* 5, 1, 5; 5, 4, 2; Iren., *Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 4; Tertull., *Apolog.* 42, 2; 42, 4; *De spect.* 8, 9; *De virg. vel.* 12, 4), as did Jews (L.M. Epstein, *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism*, New York 1967, 29-30). Some Christian authors warned women, out of modesty, against mixed baths and frequent use of them (Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 3, 5); *Cyprian of Carthage reproved the *virgines* who frequented the *promiscuae balneae*, in that they were contrary to modesty and exposed one to licentious glances (*De habitu* 19), but recommended bathing together with other women (*De habitu* 21). The *Didascalia* (3, 19), a work of the 3rd c., criticizes mixed bathing and recommends that women, in the absence of separate baths, attend them at a later hour. The **Apostolic Constitutions*, from the 4th c., which draw on the *Didascalia*, do not, however, allow any exceptions (1, 9). The Council of *Laodicea prescribes: "No consecrated ministers or clerics or ascetics, nor any Christian layman, shall wash in a bath with women; for this is the first reproach among the pagans" (can. 30). The use of baths and of common times is admitted by the monk Jovinian at *Rome at the end of the 4th c. (Jerome, *Adv. Iov.* 2, 36). *Jerome criticized the *virgines* who bathed, nude, with eunuchs and married women (*Ep.* 107, 11). Still in the 7th c. in the East we find cases of mixed bathings, condemned by the Council *in* **Trullo* (can. 77). It may be said that that in those centuries nudity, in shared baths, did not have ethical significance. Decency and modesty were linked to the social status of persons and to the social context, acc. to values which were both accepted and shared. To strip someone publicly was a great humiliation and considered a great crime, as *Ammianus recounts in the case of Flavian, accused of adultery; for this act the executioner was burned alive (*Hist.* 28, 1, 28). At *Carthage, "the crowd was horrified that the women were stripped naked in the arena" (*Passio Perpetuae* 20, 1). Slowly, however, in a Christian context, the exhortation to modesty, both for women and men, was intensified in all settings. Reserve became the norm.

How was the rite of the administration of solemn baptism conducted? There was a fast evolution in the first centuries, from the early ceremonies, brief and containing what was essential (see Acts 2:41; 8:36-40) to a progressive enrichment of forms and modalities. With respect to the 4th c. the development of the complexity of baptisteries is a witness to the rich and extended ceremony of the paschal vigil, during which baptism by triple immersion and emersion was administered in a bath of water. The ancient sources say that before the central act of the rite the catechumens took off their clothes, remaining nude, both men and women. This stripping, an essential element, and the reclothing were acts rich in profound theological and spiritual symbolism. Nudity—required also for unction—was ritual in character, rather than ascetical, and took its place within an absorbing and dramatic ceremony. Those to be baptized were in the 4th c. normally adults and not children. The term *nudus* (Greek: *gymnos*) did not always indicate complete nudity; its exact significance one determines from the context. Leclercq (DACL 12, 1804) affirms that those to be baptized were nude on the grounds not only of a sketch on stone at Aquileia—where the candidate seems to be a baby girl (DACL 26)—but also on the grounds of extensive and diverse literary evidence. It is not possible that this usage was introduced later; that would be unthinkable. This is the common opinion. In the Abbey of Pomposa a nude couple is depicted with babies in their arms, but only the upper part of the picture has been preserved. In the 3rd-c. **Apostolic Tradition* (ch. 21) there is evidence of it; the *De singularitate clericorum* writes that "one should not be ashamed on account of nudity in that same baptism where one renews the infancy of Adam and Eve and where, more than taking off, one receives the tunic" (PL 4, 847). *John of Jerusalem affirms: "You stripped yourselves of your tunics . . . you were nude, imitating also in this Christ nude on the cross. . . . You were nude in the sight of everyone, and you were not ashamed" (*Catech. myst.* 3, 2). Among others we may cite *John Chrysostom (*Catech.* 3, 8) and Proclus (in ST 247, 193). From the 5th c. there is evidence of various expedients employed on account of

a certain reservedness in the baptismal chamber, into which few persons were able to enter. In the East, for some rites, e.g., the unction of those to be baptized, deaconesses were used (see Martimort, *Les diaconesses*, 34ff.; 49ff.). *John Moschus mentions the curious incident of the priest Conon, who found difficulty in anointing women in baptism (*Prato spir.* 3: PG 87, 2852-2856). Some texts (the *De singularitate*, the *Didascalia*, the *Apostolic Constitutions* etc.) reflect embarrassment in the communities. Ritual nudity was not sexual promiscuity, because modesty was preserved in various ways: temporal separation of baptism, architectural techniques, veils (cf. V. Ferrua, 212; Saxer, 655); Augustine distinguishes in the baptistery "the part of the women" (*Civ. Dei* 22, 8, 4). Filoramo delicately contextualizes baptismal nudity in the "same ritual dynamic, more precisely in its capacity of practical control and of symbolic sublimation" (34). Spiritual formation generated a new vision of the body. After the long, arduous and tiring preparation, in the fast, in the atmosphere of collective prayer and spiritual rebirth, "the ritual process itself offered the means opportunely to articulate, control, and sublimate personal emotions and passions" (op. cit., 39) in a place "where all is innocence, all is piety, all is grace, all is sanctification" (Ambrose, *Sacram*. 1, 10).

Recently, Laurie Guy, contrary to the received opinion, has argued that, baptism being administered by a male clergy, the sense of modesty of both the Jewish tradition—which was contrary to feminine nudity in public—and the Christian would not have permitted female nudity to be exposed to the gaze of men, even if holy persons. Since the administration of baptism by women was prohibited—the prohibition indicates that this sometimes happened—without denying that in some cases during immersion the persons being baptized were nude, Guy argues that normally they wore some clothing. The few pictorial depictions which show nude women are only stylizations or of adolescents; more frequently we find the depiction of men, "of a small naked figure immersed in water, while a larger male figure lays hands on his head" (*baptism, p. 323). In fact, acc. to Chrysostom, shortly before the central act of the rite those to be baptized were "nude, " yet still wearing some garment; it is supposed that they had worn it still during the act of immersion (*Catech.* 1, 2); this interpretation is confirmed by *Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Catech.* 2, 4; 2, 2 and 3). A respectable person is "nude" when he or she does not wear the clothes which are socially appropriate, as Peter, in the boat, is called nude, while in reality he is wearing something (Jn 21:7). The language of nudity used by the Fathers expresses rather a total stripping off of the old person in order to be reborn in Christ, with the realization of a radical change in one's mode of being and living, expressed with the putting on of the white garment. In baptism, a new birth is realized, as in the nudity of natural birth.

DACL 2, 72-177 (bains); 12, 1801-1805; cf. also 12, 1782-1801 and 1806-1808; DPAC 2, 3411-3412; J. Heckenbach, *De nuditate sacra sacrisque vinculis*, Giessen 1911; S. Giet, *Un témoignage possible sur l'administration du baptême dans les premières années du II^e siècle et sur le rôle ministerial d'Hermas*, Atti VI Congr. Int. Archeol. Cristiana, Rome 1965, 191-197; M. Harl, *La prise de conscience de la nudité d'Adam. Une interprétation de Genèse 3, 7 chez les Pères grecs*: SP 7 (1966) 486-495; J.A. Arieti, *Nudity in Greek Athletics*: Classical World 67 (1975) 431-436; J.Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*, Leiden 1978; V. Messana, *La nudité d'Adam et d'Ève chez Diadoque*: SP 17, 1 (1982) 325-332; A.G. Martimort, *Les diaconesses: essai historique*, Rome 1982; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du II^e au VI^e siècle*, Spoleto 1988; P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York 1988; R.M. Miles, *Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West*, Boston 1989; L. Bonfante, *The Naked Greek*: Archaeology 43 (1990) 28-35; H.P. Duerr, *Nudità e vergogna. Il mito del processo di civilizzazione*, Venezia 1991; R. Bowen Ward, *Women in Roman Baths*: HTR 85 (1992) 125-147; G. Schöllgen, *Balnea mixta. Entwicklungen der spätantiken Bademoral im Spiegel der Textüberlieferung der Syrischen Didascalie*: JbAC, Ergb. 22 (1995) 182-194; V. Ferrua, *"Nudus nudum Christum sequi." Sulla nudità battesimale*, in *Super fundamentum Apostolorum, Studi in onore di J. Ortas*, ed. A. Amato - G. Maffei, Rome 1997, 205-216; *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, A.K. Ostrov - C.L. Lyons (eds.), London-New York 1997; M.L. Satlow, *Jewish Construction of Nakedness in Late Antiquity*: JBL 116 (1997) 429-454; G. Filoramo, *Il controllo dell'eros: la nudità rituale*, in *L'Eros difficile. Amore e sessualità nell'antico cristianesimo*, ed. S. Pricoco, Soveria Mannelli 1998, 67-88 (now in Id., *Veggenti profeti gnostici*, Brescia 2005, 29-45); G. Garrett Fagan, *The Bathing in Public in the Roman World*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999; L. Guy, *"Naked" Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and the Reality*: JRH 27 (2003) 133-142.

A. Di Berardino

NUMBERS, SYMBOLISM of. To understand the symbology of numbers in the ancient world and in the Fathers we must look to the *flexio digitorum* which was the manner of counting at the time, and then to *grammatria* and *gematria* or *psephy* and *isopsephy*. The term *finger* included the meaning of calculation and so entered into the domain of the *actio* which played such a great part in rhetoric. The first chapter *De loquela digitorum* of *Bede's work *De temporum ratione* gives us a clear account of all the numbers as expressed by the fingers. This bending of fingers produced symbolic images which then ascribed particular meanings to biblical numbers. Typical is the case of the 100 (for the martyrs), 60

(for the widows) and 30 (for married people) of the parable of the sowers. The representation on the fingers of 100, which took the form of a circle formed by the index finger and the thumb of the right hand, suggested the possession of the Spirit, e.g., the crown of martyrdom. The representation of 100 signifies perfection. To the 99 sheep one had to be added: that which was lost. To express 30 the index finger was set gently onto the thumb, almost as to indicate the conjugal embrace. Thus 30 was attributed to the married faithful. 60, owing to the uncomfortable position of holding the thumb toward the index finger, was for widows. In many texts we find the expression: he has got 100, or 60, or 30. If the value given to these numbers is not understood, we fail to grasp aspects of the text's meaning. This applies all the more to the kingdom of heaven expressed by the *Ogdoad, indicated by the sign of eight made with the thumb, the index finger, and the middle finger raised and the ring and little fingers folded onto the palm of the hand. This did not indicate three, as it does now, which was instead shown by the index finger and the thumb raised and the other fingers folded onto the palm of the hand. There have been many misunderstandings with respect to the gesture for eight, which in our times has not been well understood. It has been confused with the rhetorical gesture for the dead who, in fact, hoped in the Ogdoad: the kingdom of heaven. Arab numerals have universalized numerical signs, so we are obliged to enter into different methods and systems in order to understand the past. The symbology of numbers, inherited by the ancient Christians, may seem to us overingenious and artificial. It is therefore necessary to enter into the soul of their culture in order to read and understand them. The *actio* of numbers which lay outside a common method was regarded as forced and lacking in consistency. *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* I, 16, 2) disputed with the *Valentinians over this very point. According to St. *Augustine, without the knowledge of the language of numbers it is not possible to understand the metaphors and the mystical senses of Holy Scripture (*Doct. christ.* 2, 16, 25). The Lord has arranged all things acc. to measure, acc. to number and weight (Wisd 11, 20). Augustine wanted a dictionary to be compiled of the mystical sense of the numbers mentioned in the Bible (*Doct. christ.* 2, 39, 59). Further, he thought foolish those who believed that the numbers in Sacred Scripture were found there without reason (*Trin.* 4, 6). As well as St. Augustine and Bede, we have *Isidore of Seville, who wrote a tract: *Liber numerorum qui in Sanctis Scripturis occurrunt*. Under the title *Liber de computo* we have, in a jumbled form, a vast amount of material relating to the paschal cycle. The term **computus* in antonomasia was that which had to do with Easter.

There is no ancient Christian author who did not directly or indirectly speak of the symbology of numbers. *Methodius of Olympus in the *Symposium* (8, 11, 199-203 Bonwetsch) gives us meanings attributed to particular figures. 1,000, which is equal to 100 × 10, is a symbol of the Father; 200, as the sum of two perfect numbers, is a symbol of the *Holy Spirit; 60, which contains 6 times the number 10, is a symbol of Christ. But even earlier *Clement of Alexandria presents us with a numerology acc. to the culture of the period. For him, 6, 7 and 8 are the three numbers which link humanity most directly with the divinity (*Strom.* VI, 16, 138, 5-6; VI, 16, 140, 1-2; VI, 16, 141, 3 Stählin).

We come to *grammatria* and *gematria*, or, as others say, to *psephy* and *isopsephy*. The relationship between the letters which make up a word and the numbers that these letters signify could have a symbolic meaning. The ancient Christians thought that every letter of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin alphabets possessed a mysterious character. *Origen, referring to the 22 inspired books of the Bible, notices in the 22 letters which make up the Hebrew alphabet an introduction to the wisdom and to the divine teachings stamped upon men (*Select. in Ps.* 1: PG 12, 1084). Often, a signature was written using the number corresponding to one's name, as in the graffiti of Pompeii. But every number was able to correspond to different subjects and names. Of 666, Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 5, 30, 3 Rousseau) says that many names can have this number. The number 801 is the maximum that the letters can give A = 1, Ω = 800, and is attributed to Christ as fullness and perfection, the beginning and the end of the Apocalypse (21:6; 22:12). The symbology of numbers is a crucial part of patristics, one which needs careful consideration so as to approach the subject with a research method not alien to the culture of the period. The Fathers in their theology did not want to separate themselves from the popular mind.

A. Quacquarelli, *Il triplice frutto della vita cristiana 100, 60 e 30 (Mt. 13, 8 nelle diverse interpretazioni)*, Rome 1953; Id., *Ai margini dell'actio: La loquela digitorum (La rappresentazione dei numeri con la flessione delle dita in un prontuario trasmesso dal Beda)*: VetChr 7 (1970) 199-224; Id., *La fortuna di Archimede nei retori e negli autori cristiani antichi*, in *Saggi patristici. Retorica ed esegesi biblica* (Quaderni di VetChr 5), Bari 1971, 381-424; Id., *L'ogdoade patristica e i suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei monumenti* (Quaderni di VetChr 7), Bari 1973; A.Y. Collins, *Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature*: ANRW II, 21, 1 (1984) 1221-1287; A. Quacquarelli, *Il recupero della numerologia per la metodica dell'esegesi patristica*: AnSE 2 (1985) 235-249; Id., *La scienza e numerologia in S.*

Agostino: VetChr 25 (1988) 359-379; G. Friedlein, *Die Zahlzeichnen und das elementare Rechnen der Griechen und Römer und des christlichen Abelandes vom 7. bis 13. Jahrhundert*, 1984; *Lexikon der mittelalterichen Zahlendbedeutungen*, ed. H. Mayer - R. Suntry, Munich 1987; A. Michel, *Si la mémoire n'était comptée: symbolique des nombres et mémoires artificielle de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Lyon-Paris 1991; C. Horn, *Augustins Philosophie der Zahlen*: REAug 40 (1994) 389-415; J.-P. Brach, *La symbolique des nombres*, Paris 1994; S. Barbone, *El número en Agustín*: Augustinus 44 (1999) 35-49; EAM 8, 781-786; I. Bodrožic', *La numerologia in Sant'Agostino*, Zagreb 2002; M. Marin, *Note sul simbolismo aritmologico di Vittorino di Petovio*, in *Italia e Romania. Storia Cultura Civiltà a confronto*, ed. S. Satelia, Bari 2004, 195-203.

A. Quacquarelli

NUMENIUS of Apamea (2nd c.). *Platonizing Neo-Pythagorean philosopher of the 2nd c. AD, with vast interests in the religions and cultures of the Eastern peoples and in the history of philosophy, both Greek and that of other peoples. Numenius's theological and metaphysical system based on the "three gods"—the first god or absolute good, the second god or demiurge, the third god or world (fr. 21 Des Places, 60)—clearly anticipates the *Plotinian system of the three *hypostases, even if there are some differences. His works have not come down us intact—the most important of which was *On the Good*—but only fragments and testimonies about his doctrine, both of which come to us through later authors (such as the Christian *Origen, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Porphyry, *Iamblichus, *Nemesius of Emesa, *Olympiodorus, *Aeneas of Gaza, *Calcidius, Proclus, Macrobius), collected and edited first by E.A. Leemans and then by E. Des Places (see final bibl.). The "first god" (on this expression see fr. 11, 15 and 21 Des Places) is the Pythagorean monad (fr. 52, p. 95, 5-6 Des Places), the absolute good of *Plato, *Rep.* VI 509b (fr. 16, p. 57, 4, 14; fr. 20, p. 60), the supreme intelligence (fr. 16, p. 57), the completely unknown absolute being (fr. 17, p. 58); on the one hand, he "rises above the essence" (fr. 2, p. 44, 16), is anterior to it and is its principle (fr. 16, p. 57); on the other, he is "connatural to the essence" (fr. 16, p. 57), and possesses an essence, although a different one from that of the second god (fr. 16, p. 57, 15-16); he is absolutely inactive and immobile (fr. 12, p. 54; fr. 15, p. 56), but at the same time "sows" the seminal principles (fr. 13, p. 55). The "second god" is the "fabricator" and the "demiurge" of the Platonic *Timaeus* (fr. 21, p. 60; fr. 16, p. 57), the second intelligence (fr. 17, p. 58), concerned with both intelligible things and sensible things (fr. 15, p. 56), is "good" (cf. *Tim.* 29e) in that he participates in the absolute good of the first god (fr. 19, p. 59; fr. 20, p. 60); he looks on matter, takes care of it and is joined to it while remaining separate from it, elevating it to his own character (fr. 11, p. 53); he moves (fr. 15, p. 56), proceeds through the heavens and guides them (fr. 12, p. 54), is the cause of the harmony which reigns over matter, and guides it while contemplating the ideas (fr. 18, pp. 58-59). Material is ingenerate and in origin free of forms and qualities, an opinion that Numenius shares with contemporary *Middle Platonism (fr. 52, p. 95); once, however, it has received the forms, ornaments and harmony it becomes the sensible universe and in this sense can be considered generated (fr. 52, p. 95, 10-12).

The sensible universe, the "third god" (see fr. 21), is beautiful in that it is an imitation of the essence of the "second god" and receives its ornaments from its participation in the good (fr. 16); together with the "second god"—which, as has been shown, unites itself to matter—it forms one entity (fr. 11, p. 53, 14).

Like many other advocates of the *mirage oriental*, Numenius sees Platonic doctrine foreshadowed in other more ancient Eastern peoples among which the Hebrews should be included (fr. 1, p. 42) and sees in Plato "a Moses who speaks Attic" (fr. 8, p. 51). Plotinus in his courses read and commented upon the writings of Numenius, as well as those of other philosophers (Porphyry, *Vita Plot.*, ch. 14, vol. I, p. 15, 12 Bréhier), and was even accused of having taken his ideas from him (Porph., ibid., ch. 17, p. 17, 1-2). Indeed, similarities between Numenius and the great *Neoplatonic philosopher, including at the level of terminology, are not lacking, something that E.R. Dodds has highlighted (*Les sources de Plotin*, in EntAC V, 16-20): here we limit ourselves to noting that the expression ἐποχούμενον ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ attributed to the first god (fr. 2, p. 44, 16) is echoed by the words ἐποχούμενον τῇ νοητῇ φύσει καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ of Plotinus, *Enn.* I, 1, 8 (I, 44, 9-10). Another important point in which Numenius anticipates Neoplatonism, again highlighted by Dodds (op. cit., pp. 23-24), is the idea acc. to which the giving of goods by superior principles to inferior beings does not cause any impoverishment of the former, since the goods, while being given, continue to remain in their source (fr. 14, pp. 55-56). The three Plotinian hypostases, however, represent a more coherent system than that of Numenius, hinging on the "three gods": the first hypostases of Plotinus, the one-good, would be elevated above the intelligence and the **ousia* in an unequivocal way; the second hypostasis or intelligence, while remaining identical to the demiurge, would be clearly separated from matter and from the sensible world; the third hypostasis or **anima mundi*—and not the second—would have

the role of guiding and directing the sensible universe, as Plato had affirmed in the *Timaeus*, in the *Philebus* and in book X of the *Laws*. Numenius was valued also by various Greek Fathers: the phrase "What is Plato if not a Moses who speaks Attic?" is cited by *Clement, *Eusebius and *Theodoret (see the references in Des Places, p. 52, n. 4); numerous fragments are preserved by Eusebius; some aspects of the theology of Origen—who acc. to Porphyry (Eus., *HE* VI, 19, 8) was an assiduous reader of Numenius—show a clear dependence on his doctrines (*see* *Platonism and the Fathers, apropos Origen); and *Nemesius of Emesa (*De natura homimis* ch 2) invokes in support of the thesis of the incorporeity of the soul not only *Ammonius Saccas but also Numenius (fr. 4b, pp. 46-47).

PWK Suppl. 7, 664-678; KLP 4, 192-194; F. Thedinga, *De Numenio philosopho platonico*, (Diss.), Bonn 1875; H.Ch. Puech, *Numénius d'Apamée et les théologies orientales au IIe siècle*, in Mélanges Bidez, 2, Paris 1934, 745-778 (repr. in *En quête de la Gnose*, I, Paris 1978, 25-54); A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 3, Paris 1953, 42-47; 4, Paris 1954, 123-132; G. Martano, *Numenio d'Apamea*, Naples 1960; E.R. Dodds, *Numenius and Ammonius*, in EntAC V (1960) 3-24; J.H. Waszink, *Porphyrios und Numenios*, in EntAC XII (1966) 35-78; Ph. Merlan, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 96-106; E. Des Places, *Numénius, Fragments*, Paris 1973; *The Neoplatonic Writings of Numenius*, collected and tr. by K. Guthrie, Lawrence 1987; M. Frede, *Numenius*: ANRW 36/2 (1987) 1034-1075; S. Lilla, *Introduzione al Medio platonismo*, Rome 1992, 100-110 (with bibl., 188-189); *Oráculos caldeos: con una selección de testimonies de Proclo . . . Numenio de Apamea*, intro., tr. and notes by F. García Bazán, Madrid 1991; R. Somos, *Origen and Numenius*: Adamantius 6 (2000) 51-69.

S. Lilla

NUMIDIA. Annexed to Roman *Africa by *Augustus (25 BC); constituted as a military territory by *Claudius (AD 37) and into a province by *Septimius Severus (197–213), under the authority of the legate of the Third Augustan Legion stationed at Lambaesis; divided by *Diocletian into two, with *Cirta in the N and Lambaesis in the S as capitals, with four centers linked to constitute an autonomous confederation: Cirta-Costantina; Chullu-Collo; Rusicade-Skikda, Milevis-Mila; conquered by the *Vandals (429-456), then by *Justinian (535) and finally by the Arabs (ca. 700), Numidia was a turbulent province, which bore foreign domination with difficulty, with periodic revolts, starting from Aurès; an essential agricultural province (grain, oil) in which urbanization (ancient cities: *Hippo Regius, Cirta, Calama; cities of Roman foundation: Lambaesis, Thamugadi-*Timgad, Mascula-Khenchéla, Cuicul-Djémila etc.) favored the Roman occupation before the penetration of Christianity. Economic disorganization at the time of the Vandals compromised the Roman and Christian presence for a long time.

The presence of Christians in Numidia is proven in the first place by the existence of martyrs at the beginning of the 3rd c., mentioned by Maximus of Madaura: Miggin, Samae, Namphamo, Lucitas (Aug., *Ep.* 16, 2). At the time of *Cyprian, information about the councils leaves us to suppose that Numidia had about 30 bishoprics, among which 21 can be identified thanks to the *Sententiae episcoporum* of 256: Badia-Bades, 15; Bagai, 12; Bamaccora, 33; Castra Galbae, 6; Cedias-Hr Oum Kif, 11; Cirta, 8; Cuicul-Djémila, 71; Gadiaufala-Ksar Sbahi, 76; Gemellae-Sidi Aich, 82; Hippo Regius-Annaba, 14; Lamasba-Hr Merouane, 75; Lambaesis, 6; Madauro-Mdaourouch, 73; Mascula-Khenchela, 79; Midili-Hr Bou Rebia, 45; Milevis, 13; Nova-Hr Ben Khelifi or Hr el Ateuch, 60; Octavu, 78; Rusicade-Skikda, 70; Thamugadi-Timgad, 4; Thubunae-Tobna, 5.

The persecution of *Valerian (259) yielded martyrs, mentioned in the *Passio Mariani* (BHL 131): Agapius, a bishop otherwise unknown; Secundinus, bishop of Cedias; *Marianus and Jacobus, clerics of Cirta; Emilianus, Tertulla, Antonia. We find other martyrs of this persecution recorded in the *Sententiae episcoporum* of 256, such as *Nemesianus and his companions. From 303 the *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (record of the confiscation of the goods of the church of Cirta) gives a concrete idea of the economic status and liturgical apparatus of the community. *Donatism, which originated after the persecution of Diocletian, was deeply rooted in Numidia, where in effect it dictated the laws. At the Conference of *Carthage of 411, the province was represented by 55 + 9 Catholic bishops and 67 + 4 Donatists, that is 64 against 71. These figures give us a picture, albeit an imperfect one, of the prevalence of Donatists in the province. The development of the *schism seems to have been assisted by the missionary momentum in the countryside, after the peace of the church (313), and by the absence, among the Catholics (with the exception of *Optatus of Milevis), of strong personalities, which the Donatists possessed. We can think of the Donatist bishops (who were at the same time warrior chiefs) Donatus of Bagai or *Optatus of Timgad, or the great controversialists such as *Parmenian or *Petilian. The situation was reversed by the work of *Augustine. Further evidence comes from the **Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae*, which speaks of 125 Numidian bishoprics.

PWK 17, 1343-1357; Delehaye OC 376-399, passim; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III^e siècle*, passim, Vatican City 1969; Id., *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, passim, Vatican City 1979; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, Rome 1982; N. Davis, *Ruined Cities Within Numidian and Carthaginian Territories*, London 2001; S. Lancel, *L'Algérie antique*, Paris 2003.

V. Saxer

NUMISMATICS. *1. Pre-Constantinian period.* Two Aquileian bronzes of the Maxentian age bear a small cross engraved on the tympanum of the temple of the goddess Rome. In fact, the symbol, considered the first evidence of Christianity in Roman coinage (Laffranchi, *Il problematico*, 45ff.) even before the Constantinian era, has proved to be the decussate form of the numeral X, alluding to the decennials of the emperor (Picozzi, I *"folles,"* 75ff.).

2. Constantinian period. The edict of 313 did not result in an immediate reflection of Christian symbolism in Roman coinage (Pautasso, *I segni*, 501). The first symbol is the *monogram which *Constantine had engraved on the shields of his soldiers on the vigil of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge of 312, recorded by *Lactantius (*De mort. persec.* 45, 5) and *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Vita Const.* 28-29). The *coeleste signum*, constituted by weaving together a X and a P—the first letters of Χριστός—appears in a medal of 315 minted at Ticinum (Pavia), engraved on the helmet of Constantine, with the words: IMP. CONSTANTINVS P.F.AVG. (Alföldi, *The Helmet*, 9ff.). In 316 some *folles* of Ticinum bear a Greek cross next to the figure of Mars or the Sun (Bruun, *The Christian Signs*, 5ff.); in the two following years similar *folles* were struck at *Rome and Londinium (London) (Daniélou, *Les Symboles*, 143ff.). The Greek cross, in different positions, also appears in *folles* of Ticinum, *Trier and Lugdunum (*Lyons) in 318 and 319, while in the same years at Siscia some *folles* show Constantine with the christological monogram on his helmet, with the legend: VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINC. PERP., bearing out the testimony of Eusebius (*Vita Const.* I, 31), who also reports that the emperor bore the initial letters of the name of Christ on his helmet. In 320 *folles* were issued in Londinium, Ticinum, *Aquileia, Siscia and *Thessalonica with the cross or the monogram between two defeated barbarians, with the legend VIRTUS EXERCITVS or VIRTVS PRINCIPI. A golden medallion, minted at Siscia in 326, shows on the obverse the face of Constantine tautly directed toward the divinity, his arms in the posture *expansis manibus* to indicate the new relationship between the emperor and God and, together, the *pietas* of the sovereign (Breglia, *L'arte romana*, 218ff.). On the back we find the emperor again, holding the *labarum* with the Christogram, the scene bearing the legend: GLORIA SAECVLI. In 327–328 we find again the Christian *labarum* which crushes a serpent, alluding to the defeated *Licinius (Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Il labaro*, 61ff.), on a *follis* of Constantinople with the legend SPES PVBLICA, expressing the hope of the empire in the sons of Constantine, with whom the second Flavian dynasty began.

3. The age of the Constantinian dynasty. From 334 to 336 *folles* emanated from Aquileia, Trier, *Arles and Lyons with Christograms variously placed and bearing the legend VIRTVS EXERCITVS (Pautasso, *I segni*, 508). In *Antioch in 336 *solidi* were struck with the legend VICTORIA CONSTANTINI AVG. and the monogrammatic cross, of which Eusebius also speaks (*Vita Const.* 2, 9). On the *pecunia maiorina*—new money introduced between 346 and 348 to revalue the bronze, with the legend FEL. TEMP. REPARATIO—the emperor appears with the *labarum*, or between two banners, or, otherwise, on a boat guided by a winged spirit between Christograms and the legend CONCORDIA MILITVM. The conflicts which between 350 and 353 set Magnentius against Constantius II are represented in numismatic iconography (Kellner, *Libertas und Christogram*, passim) with the personifications of Liberty and Victory with the legends VICTORIA AVG. LIB. ROMANOR., RESTITVTOR LIBERTATIS, LIBERATOR REIPUBLICAE. The bronzes of Magnentius contain Christograms on their own and with the apocalyptic letters A and Ω, thus assuming an anti-*Arian position in order to have the support of the Catholics. *Constantius II, for his part, had inserted, as well as the *labarum* with the Christian emblem, the legend HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS, reusing thus the famous Constantinian portent from the vigil of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge.

4. From Theodosius to Justinian. With Theodosius I (379–395) some *solidi* show the emperor with the *labarum* and a processional cross, an enthroned Victory with a shield bearing a cross, and the statues of Rome and Constantinople with the *globus cruciger*. In the *solidi* and in the *maiorinae* of Aelia *Flaccilla, wife of Theodosius, the Victory inscribes a Christogram onto a shield. The *centenionales* of Arcadius (394–408) and *solidi* of Honorius (395–423) represent the emperor crowned by the *manus Dei*, and the gold coinage of *Galla Placidia has the legend SALUS REI PUBLICAE in explanation of a Christogram within a laurel wreath. In the following years the iconography of the emperor bearing a cross was embellished with the *volumen* (Panvini

Rosati, *Il rotolo*, 557-566) and in a *solidus* of Theodosius the emperor crushes a serpent with a human head, in reference to the usurper John (423–425), defeated in 425 by *Valentinian III, and recalling Ps 90:13: *super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis, leonem et draconem calpestabis*. Subsequently, legends and reliefs saw little change apart from marginal elements until Zeno (479–491) and Phocas (602–610), after which an unaccompanied Latin cross is found until the end of the 10th c., sometimes with the striking title LVX MVNDI. The Christogram, however, continued in the solidi of Eudoxia, Arcadius and Justinian with the text SALVS ORIENTIS FELICITAS OCCIDENTIS.

H. Cohen, *Description des monnaies frappées dans l'empire romain*, VII-VIII, Paris 1888–1892; J. Maurice, *Numismatique Constantinienne*, 3 vols., Paris 1908–1912; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Il labaro descritto da Eusebio*: Studi Romani 50 (1914) 161; L. Laffranchi, *Il problematico segno della croce nelle monete precostantiniane di Aquileia*: Aquileia Nostra 3 (1932) 45-52; A. Alföldi, *The Helmet of Constantine with the Christian Monogram*: JRS 21 (1932) 9-23; J. Daniélou, *Les symboles chrétiens primitifs*, Paris 1961, 143ff.; P. Bruun, *The Christian Signs on the Coins of Constantine*: Arctos 3 (1962) 5-35; V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'Empire byzantin*, V, Paris 1963-1972; F. Panvini Rosati, *Il rotolo come attributo dell'Imperatore sulle monete romane*, in *Atti del VI Congr. Int. di Arch. Cristiana*, Vatican City 1965, 557-566; P. Bruun, *The Roman Imperial Coins*, VII, London 1966; V. Gardthausen, *Das alte Monogramm*, Wiesbaden 1966; G. Pitt-Rivers, *The Riddle of the Labarum and the Origin of Christian Symbols*, London 1966; J.E. Hartmann, *Greek Numismatic Epigraphy*, Cambridge 1969; L. Breglia, *L'arte romana nelle monete di età imperiale*, Milan 1968; W. Kellner, *Libertas und Christogram*, Karlsruhe 1969; S. De Caro Balbi, *Comparsa di simboli cristiani sulle monete dell'impero in età costantiniana*: Annali 16-17 (1969–1970) 143-169; F. Panvini Rosati, *La zecca di Aquileia*, in *Aquileia e Ravenna*, Udine 1973, 289-298; V. Picozzi, *I "folles" con leggenda CONSERV VRB SVAE coniati nella zecca di Aquileia sotto Massenzio*: Rivista Italiana di Numismatica 71 (1969) 73-87; J.M. Whittaker, *Coins and Christian Symbolism*: Numismatic Circular 87 (1979) 3-4; A. Pautasso, *I segni del Cristianesimo nella monetazione romana*, in *Atti del V Congr. Naz. di Arch. Cristiana*, Rome 1982, 491-525; R. Oster, *Numismatic Windows into the Social World of Early Christianity: A Methodological Inquiry*: Journal of Bib. Lit. 101 (1982) 195-223; J. Green Miranda - J. Ferguson, *Constantine, Sun-Symbols and the Labarum*: Durham University Journal 59 (1987) 9-17; A. Lukaszewicz, *À propos du symbolisme impérial romain au IV*[e] *siècle: quelques remarques sur le christogramme*: Historia 39 (1990) 504-506; C. Brenot, *À propos des monnaies au chrisme de Magnence*, in *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV*[e] *siècle ap. J.-C.*, ed. M. Chistol - S. Demougin - Y. Duval et al., Rome 1992, 183-191; W. Hahn, *Die Zeichen des Menschensohnes am Himmel: zu den Anfängen der Kreuzdarstellung im römischen Münzbild des 4. Jahrhunderts, insbesondere auf dem Labarum*, in *XII. Inter. Numismatischer Kongress*, ed. v. B. Kluge - B. Weisser, Berlin 2000, II, 772-779; TIP 220-223; G. Paci, *Le prime testimonianze paleocristiane ad "Urbs Salvia"*: Picus 22 (2002) 282-288; M. Wallraff, *La croce negli storici ecclesiastici: simbolo cristiano e propaganda imperiale*: Mediterraneo Antico 5 (2002) 461-475.

F. Bisconti

NYSSA. City of Cappadocia, not to be confused with other cities of the name Nysa (e.g., in Caria), in the Strategia Morimene (see Ptol., V, 6, 23), the more W part, not far from the river Halys. The *Itinerarium Antonini* locates it to the NW of *Caesarea, on the road to *Ancyra and not far from the border with Galatia (see Greg. Nyss., *Ep.* 19, Pasquali, 65, 24), 24 miles from Parnassus and 32 from Osiana (cf. Greg. Nyss., *Ep.* 26). The site of the city cannot be identified with certainty (see Ramsay, *Historical Geography*, 287-288; Maraval). It was the episcopal see of *Gregory, younger brother of *Basil of Caesarea and consecrated by him in 372 with the intention of increasing the number of suffragan bishops of the metropolis linked to him, since in Cappadocia I, where Nyssa is found (Maraval 243), there were few cities which could have a titular bishop, but many **chorepiscopi* (rural bishops), while in Cappadocia II, a province created when *Valens divided Cappadocia in two in 371–372, the episcopal sees were more numerous, and this province depended on the bishop of *Tyana—which had become the capital—hostile to the *Nicene front. In this province on the other hand Basil placed *Gregory of Nazianzus at Sasima, to counter the new metropolitan. Bishops: Gregory (372–394); Heraclidus (431); Musonius (449–451), present at *Chalcedon (Mansi VI, 981ff.); John (at Constantinople in 553: Mansi IX, 175, 192 and 391); John II (680); Paul (692).

W.M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, London 1890; W. Ruge, *Nyssa*: PWK 17, 2, 1662. For the bishops: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, I, Paris 1740, 391ff., and Fedalto 1, 27; P. Maraval, *Nysse en Cappadoce*: RHPhR 55 (1975) 237-247; LTK[3] 7, 953-954.

M. Forlin Patrucco - A. Di Berardino

O

OAK, Synod of the. In "the Oak" (Drus, also called Rufinianae, today Djad-Bostan: SC 177, 13), a suburb S of *Chalcedon, a council gathered in 403, whose conciliar acts have been passed down by *Photius, to decide on the disagreement that had arisen between *John Chrysostom, patriarch of *Constantinople, and *Theophilus of *Alexandria. The disagreement was caused by a few monks, whom Theophilus had expelled (401) from *Egypt and had accused of being *Origenists and who had found refuge at *Constantinople. When the conflict between them and Theophilus flared up again at the capital, the emperor *Arcadius summoned Theophilus to Constantinople to vindicate himself before a tribunal presided by John Chrysostom. When he had arrived to the capital during 403, the very capable Theophilus took advantage of his support at the royal court and among the members of the local clergy who were hostile toward their bishop. In a short time, Theophilus was able to reverse the situation such that it was he who put John Chrysostom under accusation in the council that had gathered in the village of the Oak. In attendance at the council were some Egyptian bishops who had come with Theophilus and a few others from various regions who were hostile to Chrysostom, among whom were *Acacius of Beroea, *Severian of Gabala and *Antiochus of Ptolemais. John was accused of having given help to the Origenists and of various administrative irregularities. He refused to be judged by his enemies and protested by letter against the proceedings, which had various irregularities. He refused to present himself even when the emperor's rescript had been enjoined upon him, and this rejection was adopted by the participants at the council as a reason for John's condemnation and deposition. The emperor immediately took measures to transfer him to a place in *Bithynia, and thus began Chrysostom's first exile.

Hfl-Lecl 2, 137-150; C. *Baur, Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, II, Munich 1930, 202-220; P. Ubaldi, La sinodo ad Quercum dell'anno 403: AAT 52 (1903) 33-98; J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Bishop, Preacher*, London 1995, 218-227; *Storia del cristianesimo*, II, 463; S. Acerbi, "*Accusatore, testimone e giudice": il ruolo dei vescovi di Alessandria nella sinodo della Quercia e in altri concili posteriori, in Giovanni Crisostomo: Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo*, 2005, 713-720.

M. Simonetti

OBLATIONS of the FAITHFUL. The NT uses two terms: *eleēmosynē,* often associated with prayer and fasting, as a form of worship (see *Did.* 1,6; 15,4; 2 *Clem.* 16,4), and *prosphora,* dear to St. Paul, who emphasizes the liturgical character of the offering, whether of Christians offering themselves (Rom 15:16; *1 Clem.* 36, 1; *Mart. Pol.* 14, 1) or of offerings brought for worship.

The NT passages linked to oblation (Mt 6:1-4; 10:42; 19:16-26; 25:31-46; Mk 12:41-44; Lk 6:30; 11:41; 12:16-21, 33-34; 16:19-31; Acts 4:32; 10:4; 2 Cor 8:9-10, 13-14) are cited and commented upon repeatedly by the Fathers. An example of biblical citations offered as a basis of the obligation to give alms is in *Cyprian (*De op. et el.* 4-8).

Two intimately related attitudes are found in the patristic texts: first the theological, present in treatises (see Gutiérrez) or in preaching, either as clarification or as teaching to the people (a favorite argument was the identification of the poor or suffering person with Christ), or in the specific context of what we would today call social justice, with the clear intention of seeking solidarity within Christian communities (see Garrison; Sierra). Already appearing in the Apostolic Fathers, in relation with the Jewish tradition, is the expiatory and penitential value of alms (see Garrison). *John Chrysostom stands out in this area for his homilies, in which alms is identified with the virtue of charity, without forgetting their practical effect. *Augustine also reflects on the value of alms in relation to the forgiveness of sins or to salvation, in line with Mt 25:31-46.

Pope *Leo the Great frequently speaks of alms in his sermons, relating them to the liturgical seasons, esp. Lent (see Dolle). *Caesarius of Arles preaches on the importance of the offering; his teaching is found in the councils of *Gaul and in the *Decretum Gratiani*. Other notable authors such as *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Cyril of Jerusalem and *Ambrose make notable contributions to the study of the phenomenon of oblation.

A second, practical aspect offers a vision of the various guidelines and norms that disciplined this custom. In the Jewish context, the **Didache* requires the offering of the firstfruits and the tithe for the benefit of the ministers of the gospel. The same principle is in *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer*. IV, 18,1-2) and esp. in *Origen (*Hom. Num*. 11,2; *C. Celsum* VII, 34-35; Hamman 1968, 255-256). *Hermas knows of offerings for bishops and the poor (*Sim*. V, 2,9-11). *Justin mentions offerings twice: they are spontaneous and tied to the Sunday assembly, for the sake of the poor (*1 Apol*. 1,17 and 67,1-6). The *Sibylline Oracles* mention the custom of leaving on the altar, besides the bread and wine, clothes for the needy (VIII, 483-486; 496-500). Sometimes the bishop appeals to the generosity of the faithful (Tertull., *De ieiunio* 13; *Hom. Clem*. III, 71,5; for Africa, see Hamman 1968, 257-259). The canonical and liturgical collections also regulate offerings, and specify their administration and the distribution of the gifts (*Didasc*. VIII-IX; *Trad. Ap*. 5, 1-2; 28,1-8; *Const. Ap*. 11, 34,5; 36,3-8; VII, 29,1-3; VIII, 18,30; *Can. Ap*. 2-4; *Can. of Hipp*. 159-163; *Test. D*. 11,11; in the following councils: Gangra, cans. 7-8; IV Carthage, can. 95; Vaison, can. 4; II Arles, can. 4; Orléans, cans. 14-16; Mâcon, can. 4 [581]; and Mâcon [585], which restores the ancient prescription of the tithe on pain of excommunication, can. 5).

John Chrysostom mentions the offering of the faithful at every liturgical assembly (*Adv. Iud*. 3,4; *Hom. Hebr*. 11,3), which the clergy must distribute, without hoarding, for works of assistance and esp. for the poor. Benefactors' names are mentioned in the litany (*In Act. hom*. 18,5; on which see Hamman 1968, 198-200). In the West, Cyprian (*De op. et el*. 15) and later Ambrose protest against the faithful who forget their offering at the liturgical assembly (*In Ps*. 118, prol. 2).

E. Lio, *Le obbligazioni verso i poveri in un testo di S. Cesario riportato da Graziano* (*Can. 66, C. XVI, q. 1*) *con falsa attribuzione a S. Agostino*: Studia Patavina 2 (1955) 18-44; R. Dolle, *Un docteur de l'aumône, Saint Léon le Grand*: La vie spirituelle 96 (1957) 266-284; A. Sifoniou, *Les fondements juridiques de l'aumône et de la charité chez Jean Chrysostome*: RDC 14 (1964) 241-269; A. Gutiérrez, *La Teología de la limosna en San Cipriano*: RET 27 (1967) 19-32; A. Hamman, *L'offrande des fidèles*, in *Vie liturgique et vie sociale*, Paris 1968, 229-295 (It. tr. Milan 1969); R.M. Grant, *The Organization of Alms*, in *Early Christianity and Society*, London 1978, 124-145; R. Brändle, *Jean Chrysostome. L'importance de Matth. 25, 31-46 pour son éthique*: VChr 31 (1977) 47-52; B. Ramsey, *Almsgiving in the Latin Church: The Late Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries*: ThS 43 (1982) 226-259; J. Fasiori, *La dîme du début du deuxième siècle jusqu'à l'édit de Milan*: Lateranum 49 (1983) 5-24; L.J. Frahier, *L'interprétation du récit du jugement dernier* (*Mt 25,31-46*) *dans l'œuvre d'Augustin*: REAug 33 (1987) 70-84; R. Sierra Bravo, *El mensaje social de los Padres de la Iglesia*, Madrid 1989 (texts); R. Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, Sheffield 1993, 76-152; B. Leyerle, *John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money*: HTR 87 (1994) 29-47; S.L. Bridge, *To Give or Not to Give? Deciphering the Saying of Didache 1.6*: JECS 5 (1997) 555-568; *Comunicación de bienes*, in R. Sierra Bravo, *Diccionario social de los Padres de la Iglesia*, Madrid 1997, 68-103 (selection of texts); Cyprien - Augustin, *Partage avec les pauvres*, ed. A.-G. Hamman, Paris 1998; John Chrysostom, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, tr. G.G. Christo, Washington 1998; A. Fitzgerald, *Augustine Through the Ages*, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 557-561.

A. Hamman - M. Flores Colín

OCEANUS (4th–5th c.). An educated Christian of a noble Roman family, relative of *Fabiola and friend of *Jerome (*Ep*. 69 and 77), whom he met at *Rome ca. 384/385. He visited Jerome in *Palestine and returned to Rome in 395, where he was active against *Origenism. Oceanus was greatly appreciated for his conduct and his theological learning. Jerome writes: "Our holy brother Oceanus . . . is so worthy from every point of view and so erudite in the law of the Lord that he has no need for me to ask him before he can instruct you and illustrate my thought on all questions of Scripture" (*Ep*. 126,3). Though a layman, Oceanus was concerned with church discipline (see Jerome, *Ep*. 69) and orthodoxy. For this reason, alarmed by *Rufinus's translation of *Origen's *De principiis,* he and *Pammachius, another layman, asked Jerome for a complete translation of the work so as to condemn its errors (see Jerome, *Ep*. 83); Jerome made the translation (Jerome, *Ep*. 84,12). Oceanus also corresponded with *Augustine, to whom he wrote three letters, all lost (see Aug., *Ep*. 180,1).

DCB 4, 63; PLRE 1, 636; PCBE 2, 1547-1549.

A. Di Berardino

OCTATEUCH of Clement. To distinguish the *Syriac canonical Clementine tradition from the **Apostolic Constitutions* (ed. Funk) in eight books, P. de Lagarde introduced the apt expression "Octateuch of Clement." The Syriac form is very different from the Greek tradition. It contains, in books I and II, the *Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ*. These docu-

ments, cited by *Severus of Antioch in 512–518, were published by E. Rahmani at Mainz in 1899. They were then discovered at the head of canonical collections by A. Vööbus, who reedited them in 1979 on the basis of all the MSS. Book III is the *Doctrina XII apostolorum* (*see *Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles*), a combination of texts already published in Greek by Bickell in 1843, and later by Funk. This is the "Apostolische Kirchenordung" of the Germans. Book IV, titled *Ordinance of the Apostles,* was addressed by Clement to the nations, and concerned charisms, ordinations and ecclesiastical canons. The title actually corresponds to the contents of books IV-VII; it is the material of book VIII of the Greek *Apostolic Constitutions,* in a different order. Book VIII is titled: *Eighth Book Addressed by Clement to the Peoples;* it concerns ordinances of the holy apostles and canons. These are the 85 or 84 canons preserved in Greek and printed apart in all conciliar collections. The *Testament* itself parallels certain parts of book VIII of the Greek Constitutions. The whole of the Octateuch was recopied by *Jacob of Edessa in the 7th c. In the Arabic, *Coptic and Ethiopic translations, the Octateuch has taken a different form, containing other apocrypha. The Ethiopic *Clementine Octateuch,* in particular, is composed of four recensions of the **Apostolic Canons,* one in 56 canons, one in 80 and two in 81; the *Alexandrian Synod,* in 71 canons; the *Letter of Peter*; the *Canons After the Ascension* and the *Canons* of Simon the Zealot. The superimposition of four recensions of *Canons* and other indications led Bausi to hold that the text is a combination of two different canonical collections, one Coptic-Arabic and the other Arabic-Melkite. The Ethiopic texts were edited and translated by A. Bausi, *Il Sênodos etiopico*; *Canoni pseudoapostolici*, Louvain 1995 (CSCO 552-553, Aethiopici 101-102); the *Alexandrian Synod* was edited and translated by G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici,* edited with translation and collation from Ethiopic and Arabic MSS, London 1904, 1-87, 127-132 and 365-420.

F. Nau, *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clément*, Paris 1913; G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, V/1, Rome 1944, 283-292; R.W. Cowley, *The Identification of the Ethiopian Octateuch of Clement and Its Relationship to the Other Christian Literature*: Ostkirchliche Studien 27 (1978) 37-45; A. Vööbus, *The* Didascalia Apostolorum *in Syriac*, Louvain 1979, CSCO 401-402, 406-407, Syri 175-176, 179-180, bibl. in 402, 5*-22*; DDC 6, 1065-1066; F.S. Jones, *The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research*: SCent 2 (1982) 1-33, 63-96; E. Ferguson, *Studies in Early Christianity*, 2, New York-London 1993, 195-262; A. Bausi, *Presenze clementine nella letteratura etiopica*: SCO 40 (1990) 289-316: 289-293; Id., *Alcune considerazioni sul Sênodos etiopico*: Rassegna di Studi Etiopici 36 (1990) 5-73; 58-67; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Adam and the True Prophet in the Pseudo-Clementines*, in *Loyalitätskonflikte in der Religionsgeschichte*, Würzburg 1990, 314-323; A. Bausi, *Heritage and Originality in the Ethiopic Synodos*: Journal of Ethiopian Studies 25 (1992) 15 and 21-23; Id., *Il Qalêmentos etiopico*, Naples 1992; F.S. Jones, *Evaluating the Latin and Syriac Translations of the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions*: Apocrypha 3 (1992) 237-258; Id., *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Ps. Clem. Recogn. I 27-71*, Atlanta 1995, SBL Texts & Tr. 37; F. Fiaccadori, *Prototipi miniati dell'Ottateuco etiopico*: Boll. del Museo Bodoniano di Parma 8 (1994) 69-102; L. Cirillo - A. Schneider, *Les* Reconnaissances *du Ps. Clément*, Turnhout 1999; A. Bausi, *S. Clemente nella letteratura etiopica*, in *Studi su Clemente Romano*, ed. F. Luisier, Rome 2003, OCA 268, 13-55.

M. van Esbroeck - I. Ramelli

ODES of SOLOMON. A collection of 42 poetic compositions, well known in the early church. Lactantius (*Inst.* IV, 12,3) cites *Ode* 19,6 in *Latin. The *Pistis Sophia* (3ff.) cites *Odes* 1, 5, 6, 25 in Coptic. Ps.-Athanasius (*Synopsis of Holy Scripture*, 6ff.) and Nicephorus (*Stichometria*, 9ff.) mention it.

The *Odes* were discovered by J.R. Harris, in Syriac, in 1907: 56 leaves in fascicles of six, containing 40 *Odes* and 18 *Psalms of Solomon*: hence the title *Odes of Solomon*. They were published in English in 1909 ([2]1911). A facsimile edition, with translation and commentary, was published by J.R. Harris and A. Mingana at Cambridge in 1916–1920. A second *Syriac MS, incomplete, was discovered by F.C. Burkitt, in the British Museum, in 1912 (Add. 14538 = *Odes* 17,7-end). The 11th *Ode,* in Greek, is in *Papyrus Bodmer* XI (Cologne-Geneva 1959) in a 3rd-c. MS.

It seems certain that the 42 *Odes* were originally written in Greek, in the 2nd half of the 2nd c.; they comment on the liturgy, esp. that of *baptism and *Easter, of a Jewish-Christian community in *Syria.

The *Odes* show no trace of the dualism characteristic of the principal *gnostic systems. The OT is venerated and paraphrased to the same degree as the NT. Their theology is that of the *trinitarian God, Creator and Savior, exactly that of the great ecclesiastical tradition. Their mystical doctrine is based on the concrete accomplishment of salvation, acquired in Jesus Christ, through his death and resurrection. All the spiritual attitudes expressed in the *Odes* presuppose the historical reality of this accomplishment; they bring out its significance in praise, thanksgiving and profession of faith. There are still unresolved enigmas concerning the correct interpretation of the *Odes* in the history of 2nd-c. Christian doctrine, in particular regarding the gnosticizing form of their lyricism and the use of certain expressions which may be of Essene origin.

CPG 1350; Quasten I, 145-150; L. Tondelli, *Le odi di Salomone*, Rome 1914; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Odes of Salomon*, Oxford

1978 (with Syriac text, Eng. tr. and notes); M. Lattke, *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für N.T. und Gnosis*, 2 vols., Fribourg-Göttingen 1979 (cf. RecSR [1981] 455-6); A. Hamman, *Les Odes de Salomon*, Paris 1981; DSp 11, 602-608; Erbetta I,1, 608-658 (It. tr.); M. Lattke, *Die Oden Salomons in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*, III, Fribourg 1986; IV, 1998; *Les Odes de Salomon*, ed. and tr. by M.-J. Pierre, Turnhout 1994; M.-J. Pierre, *Les Odes de Salomon*, in F. Bovon - P. Geoltrain (éds.), *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, I, Paris ²1998, 671-743; M. Franzmann, *The Odes of Solomon: An Analysis of the Poetical Structure and Form*, Göttingen 1991; *Oden Salomos*, tr. and intro. by M. Lattke, Freiburg 1995; Id., *Oden Salomos*, text, tr. and comm., 3 vols., Freiburg 1999-2005; *Les Odes de Salomon*, ed. and tr. by E. Azar, Paris 1996; J.H. Charlesworth, *Critical Reflections on the Odes of Salomon*, Sheffield 1998; E. Engelbrech, *God's Milk: An Orthodox Confession of the Eucharist*: JECS 7 (1999) 509-526.

CH. KANNENGIESSER

ODILIA (Othilia). Abbess, saint. The earliest evidences of a cult of this saint are the invocations in the litanies: St. Emmeram of Ratisbon, 9th c.; Freising, Münstereifel, Utrecht, 10th c.; Tegernsee, 11th c. Then follow the calendars and martyrologies: Echternach, Eichstätt, 12th c.; Metz, Paris, St. Maur of Verdun, 13th c. In the same century the offices and Masses appear: Metz, St. Maur of Verdun. From the 13th c. the evidence multiplies. In the monastery of Hohenburg (from the 18th-c. "Odiliënberg") in Alsace, the saint's name appears in documents of the 10th c. In the same century a cleric of Hohenburg wrote, on the model of the *Vita Salabergae,* the unhistorical *Life* of Odilia. In the late 7th c., probably the duke Eticho (Adalrich) founded, in the family castrum, a monastery of monks, which under the influence of his daughter Odilia (d. before 723) was turned into a monastery of nuns, where she was later buried (feast 13 Dec). Odilia founded a second monastery at the foot of the mountain (Niedermünster). The first monastic *Life* shows Merovingian-Benedictine influence.

BHL 6271-6274; BS 9, 1110-1116; LCI 8, 76-79; LMA 6, 1350-1351; BBKL 6, 1109-1110; M. Barth, *Die heilige Odilia, Schutzherrin des Elsaß* 1-2, Straßburg 1938; J. Legros, *Le Mont Sainte-Odile*, Paris 1988; F. Petry - R. Will, *Le Mont Sainte-Odile* (*Bas-Rhin*), Paris 1988.

V. SAXER - S. HEID

ODOACER (Odovacar) (434–493). Scythian by origin, Odoacer was born in 434. He soon entered the Palatine Guard. In 476 the barbarian soldiers of which the Roman army was largely composed acclaimed him king, at the same time claiming a third of the lands of *Italy. After deposing Romulus Augustulus, Odoacer did not proclaim himself emperor, but, to legitimize his position and his government of the West with the court of *Constantinople, he sent the imperial standards (the *ornamenti Palatii*) to the Eastern emperor *Zeno and requested the title of Roman patrician (which he never assumed). In 481 he occupied *Dalmatia, and later defeated the Rugians and freed Sicily from the *Vandals (ca. 486). In 489 *Theodoric marched on Italy at the head of the *Ostrogoths; Odoacer, repeatedly defeated (Isonzo, Verona, Adda), shut himself up in *Ravenna and sustained a siege of two years which ended in his death and that of his people, the Heruli (15 March 493).

Odoacer's policy was essentially conservative of Roman prerogatives; distribution of lands to the barbarians did not diminish small landed properties, since it was limited to the *latifundia*. The Heruli held the military command, but the most important civil positions remained in Roman hands. Thus began a period of mutual adjustment between Romans and Germans. *Arian by faith, he was tolerant toward the Catholic Church, whose bishops he respected; the *schism between Rome and Constantinople, provoked by the "unitive" edict (**Henoticon*), favored the cohabitation of the two ethnic groups on Italian soil. He issued a decree, annulled in a Roman synod of 502, against the transference of church property, and intervened directly in the election of Pope *Felix III.

PWK 18, 1888-1896; EC 11, 74-75; L. Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, Munich 1934; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 19-41; A. Chastagnol, *Le sénat romain sous le règne d'Odoacre. Recherches sur l'épigraphie du Colisée au Vᵉ siècle*, Bonn 1966; M. McCormick, *Odoacer, Emperor Zeno and the Rugian Victory Legation*: Byzantion 47 (1977) 212-222; C. Pietri, *Aristocratie et société cléricale dans l'Italie chrétienne au temps d'Odoacre et de Théodoric*: MEFRA 93 (1981) 417-467; N. Geoffrey, *The Last Emperor: The Fate of Romulus Augustulus*: CM 43 (1992) 261-271.

M.L. ANGRISANI SANFILIPPO

OECUMENIUS (late 6th c.). Philosopher and rhetor, also called *scholasticus* by the tradition, he lived in the 6th c.: he was identified by Pétridès in 1903 with the *comes* of Isauria, correspondent of the *monophysite *Severus of Antioch (d. 538). Previously placed as late as the 11th c., three large catenistic commentaries from the late 8th c. were attributed to him, first by Donatus of Verona in the 16th c.: *In Acta Apostolorum, In epistulas catholicas, In Pauli epistulas* (PG 118-119). This false hypothesis, not confirmed by the MS tradition, probably derived from the presence of some other **scholia* reported under the name *Oikoumenion* (K. Staab, *Die Paulus-katenen*, Rome 1926, 93-99) and taken from his works that have not reached us (*Commentarii in*

Pauli epistulas, Scholia in Iohannem Chrysostomum). Solidly linked to Oecumenius is the *Commentarius in Apocalypsin,* already known in the 7th c. in a *Syriac edition and published by Hoskier (the most important codex used is the *Messan. gr. 99*): to be distinguished from that published under his name by J.A. Cramer (*Catenae graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum* VIII, Oxford 1840, 497-582), which in fact presents only *excerpta* of a similar commentary by *Andrew of Caesarea. In a small number of MSS which contain a *synopsis scholike* of the commentary on the Apocalypse, Oecumenius is named as the bishop of Trikka in Thessaly: but this is an error attributable, as Schmid has shown, to the 10th-c. compiler of the *synopsis,* a contemporary of a bishop Oecumenius of Trikka, perhaps the one celebrated as a thaumaturge on 3 May in the Greek Church. Monaci Castagno and De Groote have shown that the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* is from the late 6th c. The author, a man of broad culture, divides the work into twelve discourses in which, through *allegorical interpretation, he refers mainly to the past and only rarely to the present, with the purpose of recording the punishments for the correction of human conduct. It rejects the *Origenian doctrine of **apokatastasis*.

CPG III 7470-7475; H.C. Hoskier, *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius to the Apocalypse for the First Time from Manuscripts at Messina, Rome, Salonika, and Athos Edited*, Ann Arbor, MI 1928; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Münster i. W. 1933, 423-469; M. De Groote, *Oecumenü commentarius in Apocalypsin*, Turnhout 1998; Krumbacher, 131-133; S. Pétridès, *Oecumenius de Trikka, ses oeuvres, son culte*: Echos d'Orient 6 (1903) 307-310; W. Ensslin, *Oikumenios*: PWK 17, 2174; J. Schmid, *Ökumenios der Apokalypsen-Ausleger und Ökumenios der Bischof von Trikka*: Byz. neugr. Jahrb. 14 (1938) 322-330; Beck 417-418; J. Schmid, *Oikumenios*: LTK 7, 1122-1125; J.M. Sauget, *Ecumenio*: BS 4, 899; A. Monaci Castagno, *Il problema della datazione dei Commenti all'Apocalisse di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea*: Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 114 (1980) 223-246; Id., *I Commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: due letture divergenti dell'Apocalisse*: Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, series V, vol. 5 (1981), II. Classe di Scienze morali, Storiche and Filologiche, 305-426; M. De Groote, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Oecumenius-Kommentars zur Apokalypse*: SE 35 (1995) 5-29; Id., *Die Quaestio Oecumeniana*: SE 36 (1996) 67-105; J.C. Lamoreaux, *The Provenance of Ecumenius' Commentary on the Apocalypse*: VCh 52 (1998) 88-108 (the author of the *Commentary* is the Oecumenius, correspondent of Severus); Patrologia V, 222-224.

A. Labate

OGDOAS – OGDOAD (ὀγδοάς)

I. In gnosticism - II. Hermeticism - III. Clement of Alexandria.

I. In gnosticism. (1) In the *Valentinian system the Ogdoas is represented first of all by the first four pairs of aeons: Βυθός–Σιγή, Νοῦς–Ἀλήθεια, Λόγος–Ζωή, Ἄνθρωπος–Ἐκκλησία; these form the πρώτη ογδοάς: see Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 1,1 (ed. Rousseau-Doutreleau, SC 264, Paris 1979, 28, 74-32, 105), I, 11,1 (168, 1205). This Ogdoas is the first of the three parts into which the *pleroma of thirty *aeons is divided: the *Ogdoas*, the *Decad* and the *Dodecad*: Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 1,2 (34,123). The Ogdoas is also identified with Σοφία–Ἀχαμώθ (on the identity between Σοφία and Ἀχαμώθ see Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 4,1, p. 62, 354-355), the heavenly *Jerusalem and universal mother who, expelled from the pleroma, generates the demiurge of the sensible world, in turn related to the *Hebdomas*: see Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 5,2 (80, 502-504), I, 5,3 (82, 522-523); Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI, 31 (159, 16-18 Wendland), VI, 34 (165, 20-21). Finally, the Ogdoas is also the place where Σοφία–Ἀχαμώθ resides, i.e., the eighth heaven of the fixed stars: Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI, 32 (161, 14-15), VI, 33 (162, 4). Considered under this last perspective, the Ogdoas is the seat of life, the heavenly Jerusalem, the place of rest to which the elect are destined before entering the pleroma of the aeons, the day of the Lord (as the Lord's day is the eighth day that follows the *Sabbath, the Jewish seventh day, so on the cosmological plane the Ogdoas comes after the *Hebdomas,* the group of seven lower heavens or the seventh heaven where the biblical demiurge resides): see Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI, 32 (161, 16-18); Clement, *Exc. ex Theod.* 63,1 (III, 128,9-12), 80, 1 (III, 131, 25). (2) For the school of *Secundus, the original Ogdoas is formed of προαρχή, ἀνεννόητος, ἄρρητος and ἀόρατος, which respectively generate ἀρχή, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀνωνόμαστος and ἀγέννητος: see Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI, 38 (169, 2-9). (3) The gnostic *Mark identifies the Ogdoas with Jesus: Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI, 47 (179, 4). (4) *Basilides identifies the Ogdoas both with the μέγας ἄρχων who creates and rules the sensible world (see Hippolytus, *Ref.* VII, 25 [203, 9], VII, 27 [207, 14-15]), and with the heaven of the fixed stars in which he and his son reside: *Ref.* VII, 23 (201, 15-16), X, 14 (275, 22-23). (5) For the *Barbelo-gnostics, the Ogdoas is the eighth heaven in which Barbelo, the universal mother, corresponding to the Σοφία–Ἀχαμώθ of the Valentinians, resides: see Epiphanius, *Pan.* 6,10 (I, 287,9-10 Holl). (6) The same doctrine recurs in the **Arcontici,* for whom the "resplendent mother," corresponding to Barbelo and Σοφία–Ἀχαμώθ, resides in the eighth heaven: Epiphanius, *Pan.* 40,2 (II, 82, 16-20). (7) For the *Wisdom of Jesus Christ,* as for the Valentinians, the Ogdoas is the eighth heaven, seat of the elect (124, p. 289, 6-9 Till, TU 60, Berlin 1955).

II. Hermeticism. In *Poimandres,* the Ogdoas, called ὀγδοατικὴ φύσις, is the eighth heaven where the elect *soul arrives after having put off all of its vices in the lower heavens and where, before being deified and entering into divinity, it resides with the other powers singing hymns in praise of the Father (*Corp. Herm.* I, 26 vol. I, 16,4-13 Nock-Festugière): the correspondence with the Valentinian doctrine found in Clement (*Exc. ex Theod.* 63) is very close. The same motif of the hymn in praise of the divinity sung by the powers present in the Ogdoas also recurs in *Corp. Herm.* XIII, 15 (II, 206,16-18). In Leida papyrus W, Ogdoas is the sovereign name of the deity to which all the hierarchies of angels and demons and all created beings are subject (see R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig 1904, p. 54; A.D. Nock - A.J. Festugière, *Corpus Herm.* II, Paris 1945, p. 216 n. 66). In the ancient Egyptian religion, Ogdoas indicates the group of eight original deities, a doctrine closely approaching that of the schools of Valentinus and Secundus (see Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 54).

III. Clement of Alexandria. *Clement of Alexandria was profoundly influenced by gnostic speculation on the Ogdoas. For him the Ogdoas is (1) the eighth heaven of the fixed stars, the nearest to the intelligible universe: *Strom.* IV, 159,2 (II, 318,31–319,1), V, 36,3 (II, 350,18); (2) the place where "gnostic" souls reside in contemplation after having overcome the *Hebdomas* and, at the same time, the eighth day of the Lord: *Strom.* VI, 108,1 (II, 486,6-9), VII, 57,5 (III, 42,11-14); (3) Jesus Christ himself: *Strom.* VI, 140,3 (II, 503,15-16). While doctrines (1) and (2) show very close analogies with the Valentinian school, doctrine (3) displays a clear dependence on *Mark the Gnostic, as shown by A. Delatte, *Études sur la littérature néopythagoricienne*, Paris 1915, 231-245.

R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig 1904, 53-55; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen 1907, 12-19, 164, 340, 354; J. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*, Münster 1914, 304, 308, 363, 412; A. Delatte, *Études sur la littérature néopythagoricienne*, Paris 1915, 231-245; A.D. Nock - A.J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, I, Paris 1945, p. 25 n. 64; II, Paris 1945, 215-216 nn. 65-66 (contains additional bibl.); A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III, Paris 1953, 130-133; F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris 1947, 301-304; Id., *Clément d'Alexandrie: extraits de Théodote*, (SC 23), Paris 1948, p. 185 n. 2; P.A. Recheis, *Engel Tod und Seelenreise*, Rome 1958, 150-151; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 184-186; R. Staats, *Ogdoas als ein Symbol für die Auferstehung*: VChr 26 (1972) 29-52; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica e suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei monumenti*, Bari 1973; J.P. Mahé, *Le sens et la composition du traité hermétique. L'ogdoade et l'ennéade, conservé dans le codex VI de Nag Hammadi*: RSR 48 (1974) 54-65; *Scritti ermetici in copto*, ed. A. Camplani, Brescia 2000.

S. Lilla

OIKEIOSIS. The theory of οἰκείωσις ("appropriation," "affinity," "bonding," "closeness") was central to *Stoic ethics, up to Roman Stoicism and the imperial age. It was already present in the Old Stoa, and became more and more important; in neo-Stoicism it found its most mature formulation. The so-called social *oikeiosis* provided a basis for valuing interpersonal relationships, not only one's friends, who in the Old Stoa were wise men, but also one's family. This is esp. clear in Hierocles the Stoic (middle of the 2nd c. AD or somewhat earlier) the author of *Elements of Ethics* and *On Appropriate Acts,* which included precepts on marriage and household management. The *Elements* treat the Stoic theory of *oikeiosis,* from its beginning in the individual at birth to the more complex developments of social *oikeiosis,* which is proper to human beings: the social dimension of *oikeiosis* entails ethical values, among which *kathēkonta* ("appropriate acts") are prominent. In *On Appropriate Acts,* sections are devoted to appropriate behavior toward parents, the gods, one's country, one's siblings and one's spouse. In Hierocles's image of the concentric circles, the *oikeiosis* is applied to wider and wider groups of "others," beginning with the "appropriation" of one's self and passing through one's family and one's city, up to the whole of humanity. The width of the circles and their distance from the center is inversely proportional to the intensity of one's ties. In this way, the *oikeiosis* theory became closely connected with that of *kathēkonta*. Hierocles pointed out the need to perform a "contraction of the circles," reducing the distance from each circle to the next, so to create the closest possible *oikeiosis*. A similar purpose seems to motivate his recommendation to assimilate our feelings toward various categories of others to those due to one's father and mother. The (impossible) goal is to maintain toward the whole human race, or large groups of people, the same goodwill that one feels toward the dearest persons. The Stoics posited a bond of *oikeiosis* not only between each human being and the whole humanity but also between each one and the divinity, for the shared possession of the rational nature. Even the bond linking the whole of humanity was motivated by the common paternity of Zeus/Jupiter, the allegorical counterpart of the sharing of the *logos* by all humans.

In Hellenistic Judaism, *Philo developed a doctrine of *oikeiosis* of the human being to God through the Spirit by building upon the Genesis notion of the human as image of God. In the NT, too, there are clear traces of the influence of the doctrine of *oikeiosis,* in particular in an author steeped in Hellenistic moral philosophy such as the author of the Pastoral

Epistles, who displays notable affinities with ample portions of the conceptions and works of Hierocles, probably contemporary with him.

The idea of *oikeiosis* was so fruitful that it continued to influence patristic philosophy, for example, *Clement of Alexandria and *Origen, and above all, *Gregory of Nyssa. Gregory revisits the Stoic doctrine of all humans' *oikeiosis* with the divinity in the light of Christian theology and of the Genesis account of the creation. Gregory applies the *oikeiosis* theory to his doctrine called "the theology of the image," which is grounded in Gen 1:26. All humans are an image of God, and thus endowed with the divine beauty: this is the πρῶτον οἰκεῖον of every human creature. The soul's own beauty is *oikeion* (familiar and of the same nature) to God's own beauty. The closest and most familiar thing to each human being is the Godhead itself. If God's image has been blurred by sin, it will be fully recovered in the end, thanks to Christ's assumption of humanity. The πρῶτον οἰκεῖον of each human will be recovered in all its purity and beauty in the end, after the purification of each one, which will precede the **apokatastasis*. For all will recover "the beauty that is proper to them" (*Hom. in Cant.* 15 GNO 6,439,18). We shall "return to the Beauty that is proper and familiar [οἰκεῖον] to us, in which we were formed in the beginning, acc. to the image of our Archetype" (*De Mort.* GNO 9,42,20 = 11 Lozza). As a consequence, we should appropriate the Good; if we make sin our own, this is an alienation from our nature (*Antirrh. adv. Apoll.* GNO 3,1,199,4; 228,17). We must have an *oikeiosis* to the Good (*De benef.* GNO 9,100,20). As God is the Good, familiarity and affinity with God means for each soul alienation from evil (*De beat.* PG 44,1293,47). Conversely, alienation from the Good is tantamount to *oikeiosis* with evil (*C. fat.* 44,21). It is through virtue that one acquires an *oikeiosis* with God (*De or.* 238,14), and nobility consists in being familiar with God (*In Bas. fr.* 25). The main example of *oikeiosis* with the Good is offered by the *ascetics, who become familiar with the angels. In *Vita Macr.* Gregory describes the life of his sister and her nuns as angelic, and in *In inscr. Ps.* GNO 5,123,13 he outlines this *oikeiosis* with the angels. Ascetic life is an anticipation of the *apokatastasis*, and a return to (and even improvement of!) human life before the fall (*De opif. Hom.* 188,46). This original and *eschatological life, which is *oikeios* with God, cannot be *oikeios* with evil, as God has no familiarity to evil (*Antirrh. adv. Apoll.* GNO 3,1,180,24). Evil is totally extraneous to the nature of God, who is the Good itself (e.g., *De An.* 89CD); only God is good intrinsically and by nature, and thus stably and eternally; all other beings, i.e., the creatures, are good only by participation (*Adv. Ar. et Sab.* GNO 3,1,82,16), so that all that is familiar and *oikeion* with God is good (*De op. hom.* 164,9). God wants to reappropriate his creatures, after their alienation by evil: the process of purification of sins is described in *De An.* 97Dff. as a painful side effect of God's primary action of *oikeiosis,* i.e., of attracting each soul from evil back to himself, for the Godhead vindicates what is *his own.* The *apokatastasis* is the supreme action of *oikeiosis* performed by the Godhead in respect to all its creatures. This universal *oikeiosis* to God does not mean a confusion of substance or pantheism: Gregory distinguishes what is *oikeion* to the Godhead and what is *homoousion* to it, which is transcendent. This is why in *De inf.* 82,4 Gregory can state that the good expected for the telos is familiar, *oikeion,* to the human nature; for it is the Godhead itself, in whose image the human being was created at the beginning, and which in the end will be "all in all," i.e., God will be all good things for all beings. Since the Good is nothing but God, Gregory, like Origen and *Evagrius, can maintain the ontological priority of good over evil and virtue over vice. This priority entails both a chronological and an axiological precedence: virtue existed before vice, and good before evil, because they are coeternal with God, who is the Good; human nature was created familiar with virtue (*De vita Greg. Thaum.* PG 46, 893,42). It was created familiar with God, and sin was the falling down from *oikeiosis* and kinship with God, who is the Good (*De ben.* GNO 9,95,3). Gregory emphasizes that nothing is more familiar than God to our intellect, a theme that is particularly developed in *De anima*. Also in *De op. hom.* 161,25 Gregory insists that our intellect is familiar to that which is acc. to nature. But *Plato demonstrated that what is natural for the human being is virtue; and Gregory follows this conception, which was also shared by Origen and Evagrius. The *apokatastasis* will be characterized by the eviction of death, which is the consequence of evil: the vanishing of evil due to the *oikeiosis* of all to the Good will entail the disappearance of death, i.e., the victory of life, who is Christ. In *Or. Cat.* 24 Gregory explains that what is proper to life is to have death vanish. Christ will perform the actions that are *oikeia* to him as Light and as Life: the vanishing of darkness and death. Gregory describes the true life for the intellectual creature in terms of familiarity or *oikeiosis* with God, whereas death is falling away from God (*C. Eun.* 3,6,77).

Therefore, the *oikeiosis* between the human beings and God passes through Christ, just as the *apo-*

katastasis itself. Christ has made our *pathē* his own (the verb is οἰκειόω) even though he, as God, is *apathēs* (*Antirrh. adv. Apoll.* GNO 3,1,181,21; 160,16; 160,20). Christ has assumed our curse and thus has liberated us from it (*C. Eun.* 3,10,12). Indeed, Christ has made his own all that is human (*Tunc et ipse* 20,9 Downing). Christ's resurrection brings all humans to return to familiarity with God and thus the highest form of freedom (*In d. lum.* GNO 9,222,24). This is the fundamental premise for the *theosis* of the human being: if Christ, who is God and is pure and without sin, has "assumed" all that is human, the human being is sanctified, purified, liberated from sin and divinized.

The notion that God is the first *oikeion* of all humans also provides a basis for the evaluation and social promotion of all humans. Gregory's attack against slavery and every oppression, and also his concept of the equal dignity of women and men derive from the principle that all humans are an image of God. Human beings, as images of God, participate in God's perfections, the first of which is freedom. Humans were created by God for virtue, which has no master (*adespoton*), acc. to Plato's definition, and thus no human being can be subject to a master as a slave (*De op. hom.* PG 44,184B). Gregory puts forward a full demonstration of the intrinsic illegitimacy and impiety of slavery esp. in his fourth homily on Ecclesiastes. T.J. Dennis in *The Relationship Between Gregory of Nyssa's Attack on Slavery in His Fourth Homily on Ecclesiastes and His Treatise "De hominis opificio,"* in SP 17.3 (1982) 1065-72, has shown the link between Gregory's statements in this homily and *De hominis opificio*. I highlighted the close connection between Gregory's ideas in this homily and *De anima,* which is roughly contemporary, and in a number of other important texts, in *Slavery as a Necessary Evil or as an Evil That Must Be Abolished?* (Paper at the SBL Annual Meeting, Boston, Nov 21–25, 2008), pointing out the interrelation between Gregory's discourse on free will and human freedom in *De anima* and his thought concerning slavery in homily 4 on Ecclesiastes. In *De mort.* (GNO 9,54,1-5) Gregory illumines the glory of free will given to the human being by God in that it is in the image of the Godhead, *adespoton* in its beatitude. The saints are those who appropriate God's "being *adespoton*" for themselves (*C. Eun.* 1,1,572,3), making the assimilation to God a veritable *oikeiosis*. For all that is *adespoton* in us, like all that is beautiful and good, is by participation in divine *adespoton*, beauty and good. God's characteristics, including freedom, which are *oikeia* to us, were in the human being at the beginning, as image of God, and will be recovered in their perfection in the end. Freedom is the sovereign freedom of adhering to the Good and enjoying it, as the choice of evil always entails a limited freedom. Gregory ultimately bases his claim of the equality of nature within humanity on the equality of nature within the *Trinity, thus contrasting any *subordinationistic trend such as that of the "neo-*Arians," and likewise insists on the *oikeiosis* that obtains among the persons of the Trinity by nature; in *C. Eun.* 1,1,222 and 3,1,99 Gregory claims that the Son is *oikeios* to the Father by nature and essence, and not *allotrios* (see 3,1, 102 and 119; 3,6,48). Gregory's evaluation of women comes from the same source, the sharing of the same nature by all humans, men and women alike, and by their sharing a nature that is *oikeios* to God (Gen 1:26). Gregory, more than many other church fathers, insisted on the equality of both genders and on the secondary and functional nature of gender differences within humanity. This is why, as he stresses on the basis of Jesus' words, these differences will vanish in the next world.

The other Cappadocians held a similar view. They maintained that men and women have the same capacity for virtue, a point emphasized esp. by Basil (e.g., *Hom. Iul.* 241A), who also stressed the complete equality of both genders, deriving from the same "lump" (φύραμα), with the same honor and dignity (ὁμοτίμως) and in perfect equality (ἐξ ἴσου). Men even risk being inferior in piety (241B). Likewise, Basil emphasizes that man and woman have "one and the same virtue" and "one and the same nature" (*Hom. Ps.* 1, PG 29,216-217); their creation was of equal honor and dignity (ὁμότιμος); they have the same capacity and activity (ἐνέργεια) and will be given the same reward.

Basil shares with Gregory important features of his Christianized doctrine of *oikeiosis* as well. He notes that "knowledge is manifold: it comprises perception of our Creator, recognition of God's wonderful works, observance of God's commandments, and *oikeiosis with God*" (*Ep.* 235,3). Thus, *oikeiosis* with God is the highest form of the knowledge. Basil describes the intradivine relationships in terms of *oikeiosis,* between Father and Son (*Adv. Eun.* 2,23 and 28) and between the three divine *hypostases (*Ad Eun.* 3,3). In *Ad Eun.* (2,4 PG 29, 625) Basil remarks that the name "Father" indicates, not a passion, but a relationship of *oikeiosis,* which is granted either by nature (to the Son) or by grace (to humans). For humans, the attainment of *oikeiosis* with God passes through Christ, who has recalled the human being from disobedience to *oikeiosis* with God (*De Spir. Sanct.* 15,35). The convergences of thought with Gregory of Nyssa are clear, although the latter developed

a deeper and more philosophically modeled doctrine of *oikeiosis,* which Christianized the main features of the Stoic theory of the *proton oikeion* and of social *oikeiosis,* also under the influence of Plato, Philo and Origen. Remarkably, the latter had already performed a synthesis between the Platonic and the Stoic tradition, which was typical of *Middle Platonism.

It is remarkable that *Augustine, too, even without developing a coherent doctrine of *oikeiosis,* surely shared with Gregory of Nyssa the notion that the πρῶτον οἰκεῖον of each human being is God. He is adamant that the Godhead, in its manifestation of Beauty (God is famously described as *pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova*), is *intimior intimo meo* (*Conf.* 1,3,6,11) and that *in interiore homine habitat Veritas,* i.e., Christ (*De v. rel.* 39,72). The divinity is *oikeion* to each human being even more than each human is to him- or herself. This is because, as Augustine himself explains, God created human beings for himself, and they cannot have peace until they have returned to God (with a Platonic movement of ἐπιστροφή or return), who is their "home" and what is proper and familiar to them most of all.

G. Striker, *The Role of Oikeiosis in Stoic Ethics*, in *OSAPh* 1 (1983) 145-167; M. Whitlock Blundell, *Parental Nature and Stoic Oikeiosis, AncPhil* 10 (1990) 221-242; V.E.F. Harrison, *Male and Female in Cappadocian Theology*, in *JThS* 41 (1990) 441-471; T. Engberg-Pedersen, *The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis*, Aarhus 1990; R. Radice, *Oikeiosis*, Milan 2000; R. Bees, *Die Oikeiosislehre der Stoa*, I, Würzburg 2004; Chang-Uh Lee, *Oikeiosis: Stoische Ethik in naturphilosophischer Perspektive*, Freiburg 2002; G. Reydams-Schils, *Human Bonding and Oikeiosis in Roman Stoicism*, Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy 24 (2002) 221-251; B. Guckes, *Zur Ethik der älteren Stoa*, Göttingen 2004; I. Ramelli, *L'interpretazione allegorica filosofica di Zeus come Padre nello Stoicismo*, in *Figuras mítico-religiosas del padre en la antigüedad clásica*, ed. S. Perea Yébenes, Madrid 2004, 155-180; M.-A. Zagdoun, *Problèmes concernant l'o. stoïcienne*, in G. Romeyer-Dherbey, J.-B. Gourinat, eds., *Les Stoïciens*, Paris 2005, III; T. Brennan, *The Stoic Life: Emotions, Duties, and Fate*, Oxford 2005, 154-168; C. Spuntarelli, *Uomo a immagine in Filone*, in *Il Commento a Giovanni di Origene. Il testo e i suoi contesti*, ed. E. Prinzivalli, Verucchio 2005, 381-411; I. Ramelli, *Hierocles the Stoic*, Atlanta-Leiden 2009; eadem, *Gregory of Nyssa's Christianized Form of the Stoic Oikeiosis*, in *Homo Romanus Graeca Oratione*, ed. F. Mestre, forthcoming in Barcelona.

I. Ramelli

OIL. In the ancient Mediterranean, esp. in the sphere of Hellenistic Jewish culture, oil and the olive were of great importance. "With bread, cheese, salt and wine, olives and olive oil were the primary sources of sustenance" (PWK 17, 2012). "Like the palm and the laurel, the olive too had an important symbolic function in the field of the arts and religion" (PWK 17, 2020). The same is true in the OT world. We often read of anointing with oil; it was poured on religious objects, for the consecration of priests and kings. Metaphorically, anointing indicates the outpouring of the Spirit of God. So the *eschatological Savior would be called the "Anointed" (= *Christos*). All this was fulfilled in Jesus the Christ; the Spirit of God rested on him, and this act was properly an anointing (Lk 4:18-21; Acts 10:38; see also Rom 11:17.24; 2 Cor 1:21-22; 1 Jn 2:20; Heb 1:9; Rev 11:4; also Mt 25:3-8). But alongside these important *allegorical uses, the NT also knows the actual use of oil in the Lord's anointings (Mk 14:3-9; Lk 7:38) and for the healing of the sick (Mk 6:13 and, already in a "liturgical" way, Jas 5:14-16). All this is accepted by the Fathers in ever-growing measure.

*Ephrem the Syrian celebrates the significance of oil widely in his hymns (*De virginitate* IV-VII and XXXVII: CSCO 224, 12-29; 116). "Oil possesses a great efficacy . . . like Christ, who is all in all. . . . The name of oil is a symbol, and from it is derived the name 'Christ.' . . . And if they [the disciples] have been anointed and consecrated, mysteriously present in the oil was Christ, who has cast out all ills. . . . The name of oil, then, is a symbol and shadow of the name 'Christ'" (IV, 6-8). *Hymn* V exalts the oil of the candlestick and the lamp. *Hymn* VI celebrates the "oil, worthy of the Most High, giver of royal dignity"; it was used for the anointing of priests and kings; now "the multitudes are anointed and purified [in Christ]." In *Hymn* VII, 6 he says of baptism: "The Holy Spirit impresses his seal with oil on the sheep of his flock. . . . The invisible imprint of the Spirit is also impressed with oil in bodies . . . . (14) Oil is a real mirror. And from whatever angle I may observe oil, I see the gaze of Christ which shines in it."

In the postapostolic period, our earliest source is *Tertullian. He attests the use of oil for the healing of a sick man (*Ad Scap.* 4: PL 1, 703B) and explains its meaning in detail in the ceremony of initiation: *Exinde, egressi de lavacro, perungimur benedicta unctione de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant. Ex quo Aaron a Moyse unctus est, unde Christus dicitur, a chrismate quod est unctio, . . . facta spiritualis, quia spiritu unctus est a Deo Patre* (*Bapt.* 7: PL 1, 1206C-1207A). In more strictly liturgical contexts, early evidence of the use of a prebaptismal *oleum exorcismi* is found in *Serapion of Thmuis (*Prayer* 15), *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Mystagogical Catecheses* 2.3) and *John Chrysostom (*Baptismal Homilies* 3.27). In the Western tradition, with the exception of *Cyprian (*Ep.* 70,2), where mention is made of a consecration with baptismal oil during the Eucharist, we must wait until *Ambrose (*De sacr.* 1,5),

who attests a prebaptismal anointing of exorcism before the renunciation of Satan. The evidence of the *Apostolic Tradition 21, frequently invoked, must be used with a certain prudence, considering it to be a 6th-c. addition, and thus not allowing a prebaptismal anointing of this kind to be attributed to the West until the above-mentioned evidence of Ambrose.

The Eastern traditions are more recent, and the use of oil is thought of differently: with a more pneumatic and messianic character in E *Syria and with a nonexorcist tone in *Egypt, although there, from the 6th c., it would acquire an exorcistic character with the addition of another postbaptismal anointing of foreign provenance, still today not better identified. The use of oil eventually diversified into three different applications, as already attested in Serapion of Thmuis's *Euchologion*: consecration of oil for healing of the sick (chs. 17 and 29), for baptismal exorcism (ch. 22), for the anointing of the baptized (ch. 25) (Funk II, 178-192). Worth mentioning are Cyril of Jerusalem's *Mystagogical Catecheses* II and III, the latter wholly dedicated to *chrisma* (PG 33, 1088A-1091A).

In the church of *Rome, the consecration of these three types of oil has been fixed, from the earliest times, on feria V of Holy Week. The *Sacramentarium Gelasianum Vetus* gives us in the *Missa Chrismatis* the formularies of consecration, still valid today in the Roman rite (Mohlberg, nn. 378-390). We must at least mention the important passage on the consecration of the *chrisma*: . . . *Te igitur deprecamur . . . ut huius creaturae pinguedinem sanctificare . . . digneris . . . per potentiam Christi tui a cuius sancto nomine chrisma nomen accepit, unde unxisti sacerdotes reges prophetas et martyres tuos, ut sit his qui renati fuerint . . . chrisma salutis* (n. 388). But the use of holy oil was not limited to these strictly sacramental circumstances. Not only was oil taken to sick people at home, as medicine, but the custom became established of taking oil from lamps lit on the tombs of saints or in holy cities, in small containers (*ampullae*), as a sort of physically and spiritually miraculous ointment (e.g., John Chrys., *In mart. hom.*: PG 50, 664 at the end).

Texts: F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Const. Apostol.* I-II, Paderborn 1905; L.C. Mohlberg, *Liber Sacr. R. Aeccl.* (= Gelasianum vetus) (RED Fontes IV), Rome 1960; E. Beck, *Des hl. Ephraem d. Syrers Hymnen, De virginitate* (CSCO 224), Louvain 1962; B. Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique de S. Hippolyte* (LQF 39), Münster i.W. [5]1989.

Studies: *Dictionaries*: F.X. Kraus, *Realenc. d. class. Altertümer* 2 (1886), 522-525, 710-714; DACL 1, 1722-1747; 6, 2777-2791; TWNT 1, 230-232 (TDNT 1, 229-232); 2, 468-478 (TDNT 2, 470-473); 4, 807-809 (TDNT 4, 800-801); 9, 482-576 (TDNT 9, 493-580); PWK 17/2, 1998-2022; 2454-2474; LTK[2] 7, 1143-1145. Ph. Hofmeister, *Die Öle in der morgenländischen und abendländischen Kirche*, Würzburg 1948; DSp 11, 788-819; Cath 5, 1056-1063; DTC, Tables génér. 2135-2143; E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, London [3]2003; G. Winkler, *The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications*: Worship 52 (1978) 24-45; G. Winkler, *Das armenische Initiationsrituale*, Rome 1982; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du II[e] au VI[e] siècle*, Spoleto 1988; B. Varghese, *Les onctions baptismales dans la tradition syrienne*, CSCO 512/Subs. 82, Louvain 1989; S.J. Voicu, *Textes peu connus concernant l'onction prébaptismale*: Irénikon 64 (1991) 468-482; M. Dudley - G. Rowell (eds.), *The Oil of Gladness: Anointing in the Christian Tradition*, Collegeville, MN 1993; M.E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Serapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*, Rome 1995; E. Boone, *L'onction pré-baptismale: sens et origine. Un exemple dans les Actes de Thomas*: SP 30 (1997) 291-295; A.H.B. Logan, *Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Syria: The Evidence of Ignatius, the Didache and the Apostolic Constitutions*: JTS 49 (1998) 92-108; W. Kinzig - C. Markschies - M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis*, Berlin 1999; P.F. Bradshaw - M.E. Johnson - L.E. Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition*, Minneapolis 2002.

B. Neunheuser - P. de Navascués

OLD AGE. The recently discovered Sappho fragment (PKöln 21351 and 21376) is a reflection on old age and its sad physical effects. Indeed, before *Plato, there was a tendency to dwell on negative aspects of old age, such as the worsening of faculties, the vanishing of pleasures and the ill treatment that old people must endure. Socrates famously preferred to die than to bear the disabilities of old age. Plato, however, in his *Republic,* presented old age much more positively, esp. from the spiritual point of view (see in particular *Resp.* 1, 327A-331), noting in particular that old age is blessed because it is freed from the tyranny of passions (329BC). And Phocilides exhorted people to respect wise old men as their own fathers (*Sent.* 42). But *Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* offers a description of pessimistic old people, lacking energy and seeing only the bad aspects of things, because of sad experiences in life, or thinking and speaking only of the past (2,13,1389b; 1390a), and generally more concerned with what is useful than with virtue. He recognizes that old people are endowed with self-control (2,1389a13-14), but as a result, not of virtue, but of calculation. For old people are "self-controlled and cautious" (σώφρονες καὶ δειλοί, 2,1390b3). Several philosophers, however, not only Plato, but also Cicero, Seneca and Plutarch, refuted overly negative conceptions of old age and highlighted its advantages and its noblest aspects. A whole genre of treatises Περὶ γήρως/*De senectute* flourished. Cicero in his *De senectute* compliments his reader on his self-control or *moderatio animi,* thus conveying a general positive picture of an old

person (*Senect.* 1; cf. 7 and 33). He clearly depends, at least in part, on Plato's *Republic,* and offers a methodic refutation of four major charges leveled against old age, the so-called *crimina* or *vituperations senectutis*. The first two are that old age prevents people from undertaking active pursuits (15-20) and heavily weakens the body (27-38). Cicero admits that it weakens the body, but he affirms that an aged person, too, can retain some vigor through exercise and good nutrition. Philosophers, moreover, warned that what is more important for old people is not so much physical exercise as the exercise of their mind and soul (see, e.g., Plato, *Resp.* 498B; Seneca, *Ep*. 15,5; 80,2-3; Pliny, *Ep*. 3,1; Plutarch, *An seni* 788B). The other two charges against old age refuted by Cicero in *De senectute* are the following: old age eliminates physical pleasures (39-66) and makes people closer to death (66-83). But these are not at all misfortunes: pleasure is to be avoided rather than pursued, as Cicero insists with an anti-Epicurean polemic; as for death, it is not an evil, but it is a good thing, esp. for the virtuous. Moreover, along with Plato, Cicero claims that old age is a blessed gift in that it sets people free from passions (12,39-42).

The picture of the wise old man who can still serve his state with his counsel, which is drawn by Cicero as a reply to the first *vituperatio senectutis,* is also to be found in Plutarch, the author of a treatise titled *An seni respublica sit gerenda*: the ideal old man—for these ancient authors are much more concerned with men than with women, of course—will have counsel, foresight and wise (conservative) speech; ruling becomes old men rather than young people (*An seni* 789DE). Precisely to avoid idleness, cowardice and softness, Plutarch advises that aged men engage in public affairs (ibid.). (See Antonio Cacciari, "Plutarco," in Mattioli, ed., *Senectus*, I, 361-395.)

Parkin fixes the threshold of old age for the Roman period at sixty—Ovid had old age extend between sixty and eighty years—and estimates that between 6 and 8 percent of the population was sixty or older, amounting to about four million among the about sixty million in the empire. The Senate was prevalently composed of men in their forties and fifties, *seniores* more than *senes* proper. Medical writers, of course, acknowledged the problems caused by old age and tried to offered remedies such as wine, sleep, massages and plums. Within Galen's extant work, however, only 0.6 percent is devoted to the elderly. Seneca in a lengthy and heartfelt passage (*Ep*. 58,32-36) focuses on the drawbacks of old age (see Parkin, 70). Juvenal (*Sat.* 10,188-288) lists all the misfortunes that accompany old age, such as grief, illnesses, weakness, dementia and ugliness, sharply criticizing those who pray for a long life, unaware that this is not at all a true good (his satires, like those of Persius, are replete with motifs drawn from Stoicism). In this unfortunate condition, a big comfort comes from being revered by the young, as Cicero remarked: *Levior fit senectus, eorum qui a iuventute coluntur et diliguntur* (*De senectute*, 8,26). The traditional reverence for aged people is underscored by Ovid: *Magna fuit quondam capitis reverentia cani* (*Fasti* 5,57).

In the Bible, old age is often portrayed in a positive manner, although there are also reflections such as those in Eccl 11:10 on the ephemerality of youth, and in Ps 89[90]:10: "The days of our life are seventy years, eighty for the robust, but most of them are suffering and labor, because tameness [πραΰτης] came upon us and we shall be instructed [παιδευθησόμεθα]." This is the text acc. to the LXX, which slightly differs from the Hebrew, but it was the most widely used by patristic authors. Humans are tamed by suffering and labor during the present life, which is limited, and finally they die: this was decreed by God because of our sin, as a paideutic punishment. This is why the wise aging person places his or her hope in God: "You have taught me, O God, since my youth, and still now I announce your wonderful deeds. And till old age [ἕως γήρους καὶ πρεσβείου], please, do not abandon me, that I may announce your power to every future generation, your power and your justice" (Psalm 70[71]:17-18 LXX). Especially in the OT, longevity is deemed a sign of divine benevolence: famously, the first patriarchs are said to have lived for hundreds of years (Gen 11:10-32). Both Sarah and *Abraham in their advanced age experienced God's power, which overcame the limits of nature and gave them a son, Isaac. Again in the OT, *Moses was aged when he led Israel out of *Egypt and performed all the rest of his deeds for God and his people. *Tobit, pious and just, is also portrayed as an aged man, and it is in his old age that an angel of God, Raphael, appeared to him (Tob 3:16-17). Eleazarus was ninety when he was martyred; his refusal of apostasy is motivated in 2 Macc 6 precisely by his venerable age: his heroism is said to become his old age (γήρως, πολιᾶς).

In the OT one often encounters exhortations to revere the elderly, frequent them and pay attention to their advice (Lev 19:32; Sir 6:34; 8:9), since wisdom becomes old people (Sir 25:5). In Ps 91 (LXX) the just are said to flourish and to live long, so to have a fruitful old age: "The just will flourish like a palm. . . . In their old age they will still bear fruits; they will be vigorous and prosperous to announce how the Lord is righteous" (vv. 13 and 15-16). The

book of Wisdom spiritualizes and moralizes the idea of longevity and the related notion that it is a sign of the grace of God: "Venerable old age is not physical longevity; it is not calculated on the basis of the number of years: white hair for humans consists in wisdom; true longevity is a faultless life" (4, 8-9).

In the NT, too, there are old people who are presented in a prominent way. Apart from *Joseph, the "righteous," *Mary's spouse and adoptive father of Jesus, whom the tradition regards as an old man, Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrin, is portrayed as an old man (γέρων) in John 3, a chapter entirely devoted to his colloquium with Jesus, where the latter reveals to him many truths and, above all, his identity of Son of God who came into the world to save it. Nicodemus manifested himself as a disciple of Christ at Jesus' burial (Jn 19:38-40). *Peter was martyred as an old man, as foreshadowed in Jn 21: while when he was young he denied Jesus, in his old age he remedied this by being his witness. Lk 1:7 presents Zechariah and Elizabeth as old (προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν) when they were given a child, *John the Baptist, by God, notwithstanding their age and sterility, which Zechariah emphasized in 1:18: "I am old [πρεσβύτης] and my wife is advanced in age [προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῆς]." Soon after the birth of Jesus, at his presentation at the temple, the child was greeted by old Simeon, who recognized him as the Messiah whom he had been waiting for all his life long (Lk 2:29). A female complement to Simeon is offered by Anna the prophetess, a widow aged 84 who always lived in the temple: she also recognized in Jesus the Messiah (Luke 2:38). The letter to Titus ascribed to St. Paul offers a portrait of the ideal elderly: "Bid the older men be temperate, serious, sensible, sound in faith, in love and in steadfastness. Bid the older women likewise to be reverent in behavior. . . . They are to teach what is good" (2:2-3). And in another Pastoral Epistle, a presbyter is urged to treat old people with respect and affection: "Do not rebuke an older man but exhort him as you would a father; . . . treat . . . older women like mothers" (1 Tim 5:1-2).

The idea of the blessing of earthy longevity, already questioned in the book of Wisdom, in the NT tends to be replaced by the bliss of eternal life: it is a blessing, not so much to live long in this world, but to live forever with the Lord. But the basic conception remains the same: it is the Lord who is life and the giver of life, not only a long life, but life eternal.

*Philo of Alexandria, the Platonic exegete who is the main representative of Hellenistic Judaism, is well aware of the notion of the blessedness of old age in the OT, but is also aware that true life is moral and spiritual life. Thus, drawing on the Stoic distinction between the wise and the stupid and vicious person (φαῦλος), he states: "According to the Legislator [i.e., Moses], only the wise person enjoys a good old age and an extremely long life, whereas the unwise has an extremely short life and is always learning to die, or better is already dead to the life acc. to virtue" (*Quis heres* 293). The virtue of the sage is an allegorical or spiritual old age, indicating that the life of the wise is always long: indeed, for Philo, only the wise and virtuous are immortal in their soul; the others will vanish altogether, and, even if their earthly life is long, they are already dead.

The Fathers depended on both the Bible and their knowledge of classical literature and philosophy, including Philo himself in several cases, for their conception of old age. Those of them who were best acquainted with Philo were *Clement, *Origen, *Eusebius, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Jerome. Among them, esp. Gregory of Nyssa and Origen had a strong eschatological orientation. Like many other patristic authors as well, they thought that in the new world there will be no old age, no illness, no corruption and decay, no death. Gregory of Nyssa in his *De anima et resurrectione* depicts this glorious return to incorruptibility at the resurrection after *Macrina has refuted the objections raised by her brother in the dialogue (137). Gregory explained his perplexities in the following way, adducing first of all the example of old age and all its troubles, and maintaining that an aged resurrected body would be a tragedy rather than a grace: "If our bodies are to be reconstructed and restored to life in the same condition in which they were when they ceased to live, then humans, hoping for resurrection, hope for an unending disaster. For, what view could be more pitiful than when, at the end of time, the bodies, cramping and wrinkled by senescence, will be created again only to obtain horror and ugliness as a result, with their flesh devastated by time, and their skin wrinkled and hardened, adhering to their bones? Then, since their nerves will be contracted, in that they will be no more lubricated by their natural liquid, and for this reason the body will be all crooked, the result will be a pitiful and miserable sight, with one's head bent toward one's knees, and one's hands, on both sides, unable to do anything they should be used for by nature, always involuntarily shaken by a tremble."

But Macrina replies that resurrection, ἀνάστασις, will be the restoration of our nature, not to the state that we had at the moment of our death, but to its original condition (148A; 156C: ἡ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον

τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἀποκατάστασις, "the restoration of our nature to its original condition"). Thus, we shall not rise old, or babies, or ill, but perfect. For "in the original life, of which God himself was the creator, there existed neither old age nor infancy, as it seems probable, nor sufferings due to various illnesses, nor any other physical misery (since it seems unlikely that God created anything of this sort), but human nature was a divine thing, before the human being acquired an impulse to evil. . . . Our nature, when it became liable to passions, was joined to the consequences of passible life. But after returning to its state of impassible beatitude, it will have nothing to do anymore with the consequences of sin," among which are "old age, illness and death." Old age will disappear together with all aspects of corruptibility, to yield to incorruptibility and immortality, not a long life, but an eternal life. Subsequently, indeed, Macrina adds: "After abandoning, in dying, all the characteristics that it had acquired through the disposition of liability to passions, i.e., ignominy, corruption, weakness and different ages, human nature does not lose itself, but it is transformed into incorruptibility . . . and glory, honor, power and perfection in all respects. . . . Now, incorruptibility, glory, honor and power, which are commonly thought to be characteristics proper to the divine nature, originally belonged to the human being, made in the image of God and are hoped for again for the future." The closing section of *De anima* is a depiction of the recovery of incorruptibility after resurrection, when old age has disappeared: "After the purification and vanishing of passions due to the healing process of purgatorial fire, instead of those defects each corresponding positive reality will appear: incorruptibility, life, power, honor, grace, glory and every other similar prerogative that we conjecture it is possible to contemplate both in God and in God's image, i.e., human nature."

Another Cappadocian father, *Gregory of Nazianzus, shared Gregory of Nyssa's conception of the absence of old age in the other world: "He will not grow old in his spirit: he will accept dissolution as the moment established for the necessary freedom. He will gently pass on to the other world, where nobody is immature or old, but all are perfect in their spiritual age" (*In seipsum*, Oratio 26, 11 PG 35, 1241-42). Also the idea of physical *death as liberation from enslavement to corruption with a view to the future resurrection is common to both Gregorys.

*Ephrem the Syrian compared human life to our fingers, to indicate that it does not last longer than a span, and that each phase in life has its own characteristics, like each finger. "Fingers represent the five steps on which the human being proceeds" (*Commentary on "All Is Vanity"* 5-6). This is a variant in respect to the widespread classical parallel between the ages of human life and the seasons, expressed, e.g., in Ovid (*Met.* 15,199-236).

Jerome praises old age in that it approaches *apatheia* and thence *auget sapientiam, dat maturiora consilia* (*Comm. in Amos*, 2, *prol.*). To this idea of old age as the age of wisdom is also connected the classical topos of the *puer senex* (see, e.g., the legendary Etruscan Tages, looking like a child but wise as an old man), which had fortunate developments in early Christianity. As Gregory of Nyssa in his *De virginitate* observes, it is above all ascetics who incarnate this ideal: "Many ascetics, in spite of their young age, became old in the pureness of wisdom, reaching old age by means of their *logos* and overcoming time through their behavior." This notion was grounded in a differentiation between physical and spiritual age, which was particularly developed by Origen, who, in line with Philo, distinguished the inner and the outer ἄνθρωπος, physical and spiritual senses, the latter perfectly and mysteriously corresponding to the former. Origen notes that in Scripture two ages are mentioned or meant: the first is that of the body, which obeys nature's law and does not depend on our free will; the other is the age of the soul, which depends on us (*Hom. in Luc.* 20.6-7): *Duae in Scripturis feruntur aetates: altera corporis, quae non est in potestate nostra, sed in lege naturae; altera animae, quae proprie in nobis sita est, iuxta quam, si volumus, cotidie crescimus et ad summitatem eius venimus, ut non simus ultra parvuli et fluctuantes et qui circumferamur omni vento doctrinae, sed, esse parvuli desinentes, incipiamus esse viri atque dicamus, "quando factus sum vir, destruxi ea quae erant parvuli." Huius, ut dixi, aetatis profectus, qui incrementum habet animae, in nostra est potestate . . . Aliud de Paulo sumamus exemplum: "Donec perveniamus," inquit, "omnes in virum perfectum, in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis corporis Christi"* [Eph 4:13]. *In nobis ergo est ut ad mensuram perveniamus aetatis corporis Christi, et, si in nobis est, omni labore nitamur deponere parvulum et destruere illum et ad aetates reliquas pervenire, ut nos quoque audire possimus, "Tu autem ibis ad patres tuos cum pace, nutritus in senectute bona,"* [Gen 15:15] *utique spiritali, quae est vere senectus bona* [compare what I have pointed out above in the book of Wisdom and in Philo], *canescens et ad finem usque perveniens in Christo Iesu.* These considerations also have roots in the Bible, as all of Origen's thought. The book of Wisdom spiritualizes age and old age; in 4:8 it is stated that "age is not measured by the number of

years." In Tob 1:4, acc. to the Vulgate, Tobias is presented as a typical *puer senex*: "Although he was the youngest of all, his behavior was not that of a child." In the NT, Christ in Revelation appears both as a newborn lamb (ἀρνίον) and as a very old man, with hair as white as wool and snow (Rev 1:14).

Likewise, a spiritual understanding of youth and old age is in Clement of Alexandria, of course well known to Origen: in *Protr.* 10,108 he states that even those who have grown old in the error of paganism can return young thanks to Christian faith. I think that this is the same idea that underlies Ambrose's reply to *Symmachus: for *Rome it will certainly not be a shame, but a benefit, to convert to Christianity in its old age, *longaeva converti.*

Jerome, who at first was a fervent admirer of Origen, took up the *puer senex* theme in *Ep.* 60, a funeral encomium of the young presbyter Nepotianus, whose choice of the ascetical life is presented as an overcoming of physical age and gender in order to fulfill Paul's ideal (Gal 3:28) that "in Christ there is neither man nor woman." *Prudentius applied the *puer senex* topic to another Christian young person, *Eulalia of Mérida, who died as a martyr at twelve, and to whom he devotes one of his hymns. Even when she was much younger, she did not behave as a baby or small child, but as an aged person (vv. 21-25). But already *Athanasius in his biography of St. *Anthony presented the latter as a child who, like a mature man, did not play.

The Christians presented as *pueri senes* are mostly young martyrs and ascetics. Related to this is the notion that ascetics, and esp. virgins, are less exposed to the injury of time (Jerome, *Ep.* 38a). This idea is to be connected to Gregory of Nyssa's *De virginitate,* who describes virginity as an anticipation, already in this world, of the angelic and divine life that all human beings will lead in the telos, the life in which, acc. to him, as I have mentioned, there will be no more illness, no more infancy, no more old age, no more death.

Ph.S. Miller, *Old Age in the Greek Poets*, CW 48 (1955) 177-182; H.N. Couch, *Cicero on the Art of Growing Old, a Translation and Subjective Evaluation of the Essay Entitled Cato the Elder on Old Age*, Providence, R.I., 1959; M.S. Haynes, *The Supposedly Golden Age for the Aged in Ancient Greece and Rome*, The Gerontologist 2 (1962) 93-98; 3 (1963) 26-35; P. H. Niebyl, *Old Age, Fever and the Lamp Metaphor*, Journal for the History of Medicine 26 (1971) 351-368; G.S. Kirk, *Old Age and Maturity in Ancient Greece*, Eranos Jahrbuch 40 (1971) 123-158; Chr. Gnilka, *Aetas spiritalis. Die Überwindung der natürlichen Altersstufen als Ideal frühchristlichen Lebens*, Cologne-Bonn 1972; M.J. Smethurst, *The Authority of the Elders: The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, CPh 67 (1972) 89-93; E. Eyben, *Die Einteilung des menschlichen Lebens im römischen Altertum*, RhMus 116 (1973) 150-90; G. Koumakis, *Aristotle's Opinions on Old Age from a Social Point of View*, Philosophia 4 (1974) 274-285; G. Luck, *Ne lateat ratio finem quaerentibus aevi . . .*, AJPh 100 (1979) 531; Chr. Gnilka, *Kalogeros. Die Idee des guten Alters bei den Christen*, JAC 25 (1980) 5-21; R.D. Williams, *Virgil. Aen. VI,304*, CQ 31 (1981) 469-470; M.I. Finley, *The Elderly in Classical Antiquity*, G&R 28 (1981) 156-171; É. Lamirande, *Les ages de l'homme d'après Saint Ambroise de Milan (397)*, Cahiers des Études Anciennes 14 (1982) 227-233; Chr. Gnilka, *Greisenalter* in RAC, XII, Stuttgart 1983, 995-1094; A.J.L. van Hooff, *Old Age in Ancient Greece*, Tijdschr. voor Gerontol. & Geriatrie 14 (1983) 141-148; A.M.M. Talbot, *Old Age in Byzantium*, ByzZ 77 (1984) 267-278; T. Falkner, *Old Age in Euripides' Medea*, CB 61 (1985) 76-78; P. Desideri, *La vita politica cittadina nell'Impero. Lettura dei "Praecepta gerendae reipublicae" e dell'"An seni res publica gerenda sit,"* Athenaeum 64 (1986) 371-381; L.J.J. Houdijk - P.J.J. Vanderbroeck, *Old Age and Sex in the Ancient Greek World*, WZRostock 36 (1987) 57-61; J. Gordon Harris, *Biblical Perspectives on Aging: God and the Elderly*, Philadelphia 1987; G. Zerbi, *Gerontocomia* (*On the Care of the Aged*), and Maximianus, *Elegies on Old Age and Love*, ed. and trans. by L.R. Lind, Philadelphia 1988; *Old Age in Greek and Latin literature*, ed. Th.M. Falkner and J. de Luce, New York 1989; G. Minois, *History of Old Age: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, tr. S.H. Tenison, Chicago 1989; R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Life, from Conception to Old Age*, London 1990; Th.M. Falkner, *The Politics and the Poetic of Time in Solon's "Ten Ages,"* Classical Journal 86 (1990) 1-15; W. Suder, *Geras: Old Age in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Classified Bibliography*, Wróclaw 1991; H.C. Covey, *The Definitions of the Beginning of Old Age in History*, International Journal of Aging 34 (1992) 325-337; A. Chrichton, *The Old Are in a Second Childhood: Age Reversal and Jury Service in Aristophanes' Wasps*, BICS 38 (1991-1993) 59-80; Ulrich Förster, *Weisheit und Alter: Konzeptionen von Lebensklugheit in Antike und Gegenwart* Frankfurt 1993; E. Giannarelli, *Il puer senex nell'antichità*, in O. Niccoli (ed.), *Infanzie. Funzioni di un gruppo liminale dal mondo classico all'Età moderna,* Florence 1993, 73-112. Th.M. Falkner, *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy*, Norman 1995; R.F. Hock, *A Support for His Old Age: Paul's Plea on Behalf of Onesimus*, in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of W.A. Meeks*, ed. L.M. White, O.L. Yarbrough, Minneapolis 1995, 67-81; A.L. Motto, *Seneca on Old Age*, CFC(L) 19 (2000) 125-139; S. Panayotakis, *Insidiae Veneris: Lameness, Old Age and Deception in the Underworld* (*Apul.* Met. *6, 18-19*), in *Groningen colloquia on the novel* 8, ed. H. Hofmann - M. Zimmerman, Groningen 1997, 23-39; Giovanni Paolo II, *Lettera Agli Anziani*, Vatican City 1999; M.C.G. Razzano, *La vecchiaia di Solone: età e politica nella città greca*, Rome 2001; A.D. Nikolopoulos, *Tremuloque gradu venit aegra senectus: Old Age in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Mnemosyne 56 (2003) 48-60; K. Cokayne, *Experiencing Old Age in Ancient Rome*, London-New York 2003; T.G. Parkin, *Old Age in the Roman World: A Cultural and Social History*, Baltimore 2003; *Hoping for Continuity: Childhood, Education and Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. K. Mustakallio, Rome 2005; *A History of Old Age*, ed. P. Thane, Malibu, CA 2005; L. Edmunds, *The New Sappho: Ephanto (9)*, ZPE 156 (2006) 23-26; R. Rawles, *Notes on the Interpretation of the New Sappho*, ZPE 157 (2007) 1-7; *Senectus. La vecchiaia nel mondo classico*, ed. U. Mattioli, A. Cacciari, I-III, Bologna 1995-2007 (I on the Greek world; II, *Rome*: here esp. O. Fuà, *Da Cicerone a Seneca*, 183-238; III, *La vecchiaia nell'Antichità ebraica e cristiana*); I. Ramelli, *Stoicismo romano minore*, Milan 2008.

I. Ramelli

OLD and NEW. In its translation of various Hebrew words, the Septuagint expresses the idea of a diminution or even loss of some value due to the long use of a good thing (Dt 8:4; 29:4; Neh 9:21); metaphorically, these terms connote the fallenness of humanity and the world (Ps 32:3; 49:15; 72:7; Gen 18:12; Job 21:13; Is 65:22), without using the abstract term *antiquity.* The latter term appears in the NT only in Rom 7:6, where it emphasizes the irreconcilability of the old principle of the written norm ("antiquity") and the new worship given to God in the *Holy Spirit ("newness"). A relationship is established between the law that regulates the service of God from the outside without intimately moving the person, and the Holy Spirit given to the faithful that renews the person from within, generating a new type of service. The concept of antiquity, common in various NT contexts, adds to the classical connotation of something in existence for a long time, that of its supersession (see 1 Cor 5:17; Eph 4:22-24). Mk 2:21-22 is emblematic, where the past (i.e., Jewish practices) is compared to an old, torn garment that cannot be repaired with unshrunken cloth, and to old wineskins, worn out and rigid, that cannot handle the pressure of the new wine. Other concepts emphasize that the Word, though having recently appeared, is from of old (Hermas, *Par.* IX, 12,2; *To Diognetus*, 11,4; *Epitaph of Abercius* 16).

The distinction between the OT and NT is frequent, however. Newness is contrasted with antiquity; Paul uses the former in Rom 6:4 to describe the life of the Christian after baptism as a participation in the death and resurrection of Christ, and in Rom 7:6, as mentioned, to compare the worship given to God before and after Christ's coming. While in profane classical literature "novelty" referred to a new linguistic term (Thucydides, *Hist.*, III, 38,5), and more often something that excites or surprises (Plutarch, *Moralia* 16; Philo, *De vita contempl.* 63), its broad meaning in the NT refers to the full and complete reality of the salvation given by Christ, compared with which the old status has no value. Under this aspect Mk 2:21-22 places the accent on the power and dynamism of the new, which manifests the fallenness and obsolescence of the old and its inadequacy with respect to the in-breaking of the kingdom of God. The preference given to the adjective *new* can be explained by its ability to comprehensively indicate either the whole of the work of salvation or some of its aspects, such as new covenant (Mt 26:28 and par.; 1 Cor 11:25ff.), new commandment (Jn 13:34; 1 Jn 2:7-8), new creation (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15), new heavens and new earth (2 Pet 3:13; Rev 21:1), new person (Eph 2:15; 4:24), new name (Rev 2:17; 3:12), new Jerusalem (Rev 3:12; 21:2), new song (Rev 5:9; 14:3). Such conceptions were received and deepened in the patristic literature, becoming, esp. for the 2nd-c. apologists, an argument to be appealed to as an event that has already occurred and as still in the future: "a time will come when everything will be renewed in the Lord, because Christ is the new law and the new covenant" (*Barnabas*, XI,4; XIV,3; XV,7).

One of the accusations directed by pagans at the Christians was that of being "new," recent (*hesterni*), of not having a long history, since the criteria of the truth and morality of a doctrine, religion or practice was its antiquity. This accusation was also made during the persecutions, since the Christians with their *novitas* upset the social and religious life of the city. The Christians employed two apologetical strategies in response. On the one hand, they demonstrated their antiquity by showing their continuity with the Jewish people, making the history of the OT their own; on the other hand, they appealed to reason. Homer was older than the Greek philosophers, who drew on the OT. Isaiah was prior to the Pythagoreans. Not everything that is old is true and reasonable, but statements and practices themselves must be examined. The *auctoritas patrum* was also present in the law.

K. Prümm, *Il cristianesimo come novità di vita. Il cristiano di fronte al mondo pagano*, Brescia 1965; G. Bornkamm, *Taufe und neues Leben* (Röm 6): *Das Ende des Gesetzes. Paulusstudien*, I, Munich [5]1966, 34-50; J. Behm, καινός: TDNT 3, 447-454; H. Seesemann, πάλαι: TDNT 5, 717-720; T. Stramare, *La nuova umanità secondo Dio*: Div 19 (1972) 103-129; H. Haanbeck - H.G. Lunk, *Antico-vecchio*: Diz. conc. bibl. N.T., Bologna 1976, 121-123; Id., *Nuovo*: ibid., 1104-1109; H. Hagendahl, *Cristianesimo latino e cultura classica*, Rome 1988; A.J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretation of the History of Culture*, Tübingen 1989; P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron kreitton: der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*, Tübingen 1990; R. Moriarty, *The Claims of the Past: Attitudes to Antiquity in the Introduction to "Passio Perpetuae"*: SP 31 (1996) 306-313.

E. Peretto

OLYMPIA, deaconess (ca. 361/368–ca. 410). Various ancient documents mention her: *Palladius's *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom* and his *Lausiac History;* *Sozomen's *Ecclesiastical History;* 17 letters sent to her by *John Chrysostom; and an anonymous *Life* (2nd half of 5th c.).

Born between 361 and 368 at *Constantinople, of a family belonging to the circle of the imperial palace, she was brought up by Theodosia, sister of St. *Basil's friend *Amphilochius of Iconium. Sources attribute to her friendly and familiar relations with

*Gregory of Nazianzus and *Gregory of Nyssa. She married Nebridius, prefect of Constantinople, in 386, but was soon widowed. It is related in terms of sublime spirituality how she refused to obey the emperor *Theodosius and marry a high imperial official. Her refusal resulted in the sequestration of all her goods and the start of her life of poverty and *ascesis. She used her property—restored to her because of her edifying life—for great works of charity in the capital, for which *Nectarius, archbishop of Constantinople from 381–397, made her a deaconess when aged just 30. Olympia lived at Constantinople, sharing her life of service with numerous women who joined her. When Chrysostom arrived there as archbishop (398), he highly esteemed and supported Olympia's community; Olympia and her companions in turn collaborated with him; various of her companions were ordained deaconesses. After the emperor *Arcadius's decree of 404 had exiled Chrysostom to Cucusa in Armenia, Olympia also suffered various persecutions, finally being exiled to Nicomedia, where she died ca. 410. We possess 17 letters written to her by Chrysostom from his exile.

BHL II, p. 154, nn. 1374-1376; Palladius, *Dialogus X*, 16 (PG 47, 35-61); Id., *La Storia Lausiaca*, 56,1; 61,3, Milan 1975; Sozomen, *HE* VIII, 9,24.27 (PG 67, 1538); Jean Chrysostome, *Lettres à Olympias et à tous les fidèles*, SC 103, Paris 1964; EC 9, 96; BS 9, 1154-1158; It. tr. *Lettere a Olimpiade*, ed. M. Forlin Patrucco, Milan 1996. *Studies*: G. Battista, *Olimpiade e Giovanni Crisostomo*: Claretianum 30 (1990) 335-383; G. Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*, Oxford 1994; E.M. Synek, *Heilige Frauen der frühen Christenheit: zu den Frauenbildern in hagiographischen Texten des christlichen Ostens*: Das östliche Christentum, N.F. 43, Würzburg 1994, 173-189; R. Teja, *Olimpiade la diaconessa*, Milan 1997; N. McLynn, *The Other Olympias: Gregory Nazianzen and the Family of Vitalianus*: Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum 2 (1998) 227-246.

E. Cavalcanti

OLYMPIODORUS, deacon (6th c.). In a subscription of the codex *Vat. Barber. gr.* 549 of the commentary on Jeremiah we read that Olympiodorus was ordained deacon by Bishop John II Niciota of Alexandria (505–515/516). He was thus born between 470–490. He says that he wrote commentaries on Job and Ecclesiastes at the request of the otherwise unknown Julian and John. *Anastasius the Sinaite calls him a "great philosopher," adding that he is "a philosopher who with his books described Alexandria, of which he was deacon" (see PG 93, 10 and Hagedorn, *Olympiodor*, XLV). So, he was a learned exegete who commented on various biblical books; numerous ample fragments of his work remain in the **catenae*; the editions of his works were in fact put together from these *catena* citations. He commented on the book of Job (CPG 7453; PG 93, 13-469; now ed. by Hagedorn; Olympiodorus was much used in the *catena* on Job, from which *Niceta extracted the fragments for his edition reprinted in Migne), Ecclesiastes (CPG 7454; PG 93, 477-628), Jeremiah (CPG 7455; PG 93, 628-725); Lamentations; (CPG 7456; PG 93, 725-761) and the letter of Jeremiah (CPG 7458; PG 93, 773-780), Baruch (CPG 7457; PG 93, 761-773) and Psalms (CPG 7460). Anastasius the Sinaite also cites a passage of his work *Contra Severum Antiochenum* (CPG 7459; 7771; PG 89, 1189). Other fragments are considered spurious. His *exegesis has a moralizing character.

CPG 7453-7465; PG 93, 13-780; D. und U. Hagedorn, *Olympiodor Diakon von Alexandria, Kommentar zu Hiob*, PTS 24, Berlin 1984; Id., *Die älteren Katenen zum Buch Hiob*, PTS 40, Berlin 1994, 97-98; PTS 48, Berlin 1997. U. Bertini, *La catena su Giobbe*: Biblica 4 (1923) 129-142; C. Zedda, *Sulla paternità origeniana di alcuni frammenti esegetici*, in *Misc. A. Piolanti*, II, Rome 1964, 25-35; D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julians*, PTS 14, Berlin 1973; S. Leanza, *Le catene esegetiche sull'Ecclesiaste*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 542-552. On CPG 7454: S. Lucà, *Anonymus in Ecclesiasten*, CCG 11, Turnhout 1983, XV; A. Labate, *Catena Hauniensis in Ecclesiasten*, CCG 24, Turnhout 1992. On the fragment cited by Anastasius: K.-H. Uthemann, *Anastasii Sinaitae Sermones*, CCSG 12, Turnhout 1985; Grillmeier 2/4, 106-108 (It. tr. 2001, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della chiesa* 2/4, 145-147); LTK³ 7, 1050.

A. Di Berardino

OLYMPIODORUS of Thebes (ca. 370–ca. 430). Pagan historian and poet, a native of Thebes (*Egypt) who lived in the 1st half of the 5th c. at the court of *Constantinople, where he was employed in various missions because of his diplomatic abilities; ca. 412 he was sent to meet with the Hunnian prince Donatus. He made various voyages and was an attentive observer, and thus had knowledge of geography; he may have visited *Rome ca. 425. He wrote a Roman history, covering the years AD 407–425, in 22 books dedicated to *Theodosius II. The work (acc. to Gillett completed after 441) is lost except for some fragments preserved in *Photius (*Bibl. codex* 80), who criticizes his sloppy style. Olympiodorus does not consider it a history in the traditional sense but a collection of materials for a history, thus in annalistic form using the consular system for dating. It accurately transliterates the *Latin technical terminology. Nonetheless the work was heavily used by *Zosimus (from book 5,27 on), who wrote in the early 6th c., and by ecclesiastical authors such as *Philostorgius (ca. 380–after 439) and *Sozomen (d. after 450). Olympiodorus is well informed about Constantinopolitan political life and about events of

the Western *pars* of the empire, the main focus of his work, and even of events which occurred in distant *Britain, to which *Stilicho had not given adequate military attention. He knows well the sack of *Rome of 410 and the political and military errors that led to it, as well as the slow recovery of the Western empire with the help of the East. Today his work is being reevaluated to the disadvantage of Zosimus, who borrows much from him. Livrea considers him the probable author of the *Blemyomachia,* preserved in a Berlin MS. He in fact knew of the Blemmyes, who lived at Egypt's S border and once took ca. 20,000 prisoners in an incursion, and of the Nobadae, whom he perhaps visited as an ambassador. Olympiodorus was also an alchemist.

Frammenti storici, intr., tr. and notes with appendix containing the Gk text, ed. R. Maisano, Naples 1979; R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, Liverpool 1981, 151-220 (text and tr.; intr. pp. 27-47); C. Chaffin, *Olympiodorus of Thebes and the Sack of Rome: A Study of the Historikoi Logoi*, with tr. frags., comm. and additional material, Lewiston, NY 1993; *Anonymi fortasse Olympiodori Thebani Blemyomachia* (*P. Berol. 5003*), ed. E. Livrea, Meisenheim 1978; LTK[3] 7, 1051; PLRE 2, 798-799; J.F. Matthews *Olympiodorus of Thebes and the History of the West* (*A.D. 407-425*): JRS 60 (1970) 79-97; E. Livrea, *Chi è l'autore della Blemyomachia* (*P. Berol. 5003*)*?*: Prometheus 2 (1976) 97-123; B. Baldwin, *Olympiodorus of Thebes*: AC 49 (1980) 212-231; G. Zecchini, *Aezio. L'ultima difesa dell'Occidente romano*, Rome 1983; F. Paschoud, *Romains et barbares au début du V[e] siècle après J.C. Le témoignage d'Eunape, d'Olympiodore et de Zosime*, in *La nozione di "romano" tra cittadinanza e universalità*, Naples 1984, 357-367; C. Zuccali, *Problemi e caratteristiche dell'opera storica di Olimpiodoro di Tebe*: Rivista storica dell'Antichità 20 (1990) 131-149; A. Gillett, *The Date and Circumstances of Olympiodorus of Thebes*: Traditio 48 (1993) 1-29; C. Zuccali, *Sulla cronologia dei Materiali per una storia di Olimpiodoro di Tebe*: Historia 42 (1993) 252-256; C. Viano, *Olympiodore l'alchimiste et les présocratiques: une doxographie de l'unité:* (*De arte sacra, § 18-27*), in *Alchimie: art, histoire et mythes*, ed. D. Kahn – S. Matton, Milan 1995, 95-150; B. Mugelli, *Olimpiodoro di Tebe: i viaggi nelle "capitali" della cultura: Atene* (*frr. 28, 32*) *e Roma* (*frr. 43-44*): AFLS 21 (2000) 103-118; A. Baldini, *Considerazioni sulla cronologia di Olimpiodoro di Tebe*: Historia 49 (2000) 488-502; D. Rohrbacher, *The Historians of Late Antiquity*, London-New York 2002; A. Baldini, *Ricerche di tarda storiografia* (*da Olimpiodoro di Tebe*), Bologna 2004.

A. Di Berardino

OLYMPIUS. 4th-c. bishop, some say of *Toledo (H. Chadwick, 172), others of *Barcelona. According to *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 23), he wrote a (lost) *Librum Fidei adv. eos qui naturam et non arbitrium in culpam vocant* (on original *sin). *Augustine cites him together with *Irenaeus, *Cyprian, *Reticius, *Hilary, *Ambrose and *Gregory (*C. Iul.* I, 3,8; II, 10,33; III, 17,32), and in the same work (*C. Iul.* I, 2,8: PL 44, 644-645) alludes to a work—*in quodam sermone ecclesiastico*—which may be the same one cited by Gennadius.

CPL 558. E. Flórez: ES 29, 77-81; H. Chadwick, *Prisciliano de Ávila*, Madrid 1978, 284-289; Domínguez del Val 2, 24.

E. Romero Pose

OLYMPIUS (d. 412). Honorius's *magister officiorum,* a native of Euxine *Pontus. He succeeded *Stilicho, whom he ruined, obtaining his arrest (408) and persecuting his followers. Olympius may have inspired the law of 14 Nov 408 that excluded pagans from the palace administration. Upholder of a last-ditch antibarbarian policy, he prevented any agreement with the invader *Alaric. He was finally disgraced and put to death by *Constantius (Zosimus, *Historia nova* V, 32-46; Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 80; CT 16, 5, 42). *Augustine wrote two letters to Olympius, one asking help for a bishop in a question of property, the other requesting action against heretics (*Ep.* 96 and *Ep.* 97).

PLRE 2, 801-802; J. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425*, Oxford 1975, passim; S. Mazzarino, *Stilicone*, Milan [2]1990.

E. Prinzivalli

ONOMASTICS. In pagan *Latin inscriptions in the first two centuries of the imperial age, the onomastic system of the naming of persons was based on three elements (*praenomen*, *gentilicium*, *cognomen*). From the 3rd c. on, the *praenomen* and then the *gentilicium* progressively fell into disuse. Thus in the great majority of Christian titles only the *cognomen* appears, for both men and women, since this was presumably sufficient to identify people. However, esp. in some provincial, more conservative contexts, or in particular social classes, the use of the *tria nomina* persisted, though only sporadically, while the *duo nomina* continues to be attested fairly frequently in the 4th c., becoming rare only in the 5th–6th c. In Christian inscriptions one notes that sometimes the *cognomen* functions as a *praenomen* or *gentilicium*, or vice versa (see, e.g., CIL V, 1661, from Aquileia: *Furia Firmina Gaudentia* and Diehl, 286, from Rome: *Valerius Victor Paternus*). In Greek, the name usually has only a nominal element, often followed by the surname in the simple genitive, or preceded by υἱός, παῖς, something very rare in Latin Christian inscriptions. It is thought that the Greek examples of two or three names are imitations of the Roman usage, as the transliteration of *praenomina* and *gentilicia* shows (e.g., Μάρκος Αὐρέλιος, Κλ. 'Ακείλιος, Τίτος Φλάβιος).

The etymology of first names was given no particular importance by the Christians (as among the Jews): thus they usually bear names of pagan origin, or specifically mythological names, e.g., Aphrodite, Galatea, Herculius, Isidorus, Liber, Mercurius, Phoebe, Martialis, Saturus, Silvanus, Socrates, Ptolomaeus and many others. Similarly, at least until the 4th–5th c., biblical names were not very widespread (the most common being Maria, Susanna, Iohannes, Petrus), while it is thought that typically Christian or Christianized *cognomina,* like Agape, Anastasius, Benedictus, Martyrius, Redemptus, Spes or Renatus, spread esp. as the practice increasingly spread of baptism at a very young age. Also notable here are the so-called theophoric names, which spread in other forms also in the pre-Christian era, almost as if to put oneself under the special tutelage of the deity. Many of these were used by Africans: Quodvultdeus, Habetdeus, Deogratias, Deusdedit, Adeodatus, Theodulos. Also found quite frequently in inscriptions are names of humiliation (or disgrace), at first peculiar to Christians, but quickly adopted by pagans too, though simply as fashionable, no longer paying attention to their meaning: Asellus, Calumniosus, Contumeliosus, Importunus, Onager, Stercorius, Coprion, Projectus and Projecticius (these last two for abandoned babies).

Surnames, or *signa,* could be introduced from expressions of various kinds (*qui et, quae et,* ὅς καί, *signum*, *sive*, *id est* . . .), and follow the cognomen, or they could be used alone. Sometimes, despite the ending in *-ius,* they referred to women (Amantius, Simplicius, Toribius). A certain number of feminine *cognomina* are irregularly lengthened in the genitive and dative, with the prevalence of weak forms over strong and Greek endings: Agnes (-etis, -eti), Aproniane (-enis, -eni, or -etis, -eti), Cyriace (-etis, -eti), Iuliane (-enis, -eni, or -etis, -eti). These are certainly not diminutives, as was hypothesized in the past. As early as the 4th c. barbarian first names appear, notably more widespread in the following centuries.

In general it is not possible, from the type of name, to trace the origin of the person who bears it, given that normally Greek or Eastern first names are used by Westerners, and vice versa, for exoticism or fad. Not yet sufficiently emphasized are the function and importance of seemingly unusual *cognomina,* which had only a local diffusion (*see* *names, Christian).

DACL 12, 1481-1553; EC 5, 435-436; W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin 1904 (= Berlin-Zurich-Dublin 1966); M. Schoenfeld, *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen*, Heidelberg 1911 (= ibid. 1965); F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato di epigrafia cristiana latina e greca del mondo romano occidentale*, Rome 1920 (= ibid. 1968), 71-91; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1958 (= Bari 1980), 367-371; I. Kajanto, *On the Problem of Names of Humility in Early Christian Epigraphy*: Arctos 3 (1962) 45-53; Id., *Les noms*, in *SyllInscrLatVetMusVat* 2, Helsinki 1963, 40-72; Id., *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965; Id., *Supernomina: A Study in Latin Epigraphy*, Helsinki 1966; A. Ferrua, *I nomi degli antichi cristiani*: La Civiltà Cattolica 117 (1966) 92-98; D. Mazzoleni, *Nomi di barbari nelle iscrizioni paleocristiane della Venetia et Histria*: RomBarb 1 (1976) 159-180; I. Kajanto, *The Emergence of Late Single Name System*, in *L'onomastique latine* (Colloques internationaux du C.N.R.S. 564), Paris 1977, 421-430; H.I. Marrou, *Problèmes généraux de l'onomastique chrétienne*, ibid., 431-435; Ch. Pietri, *Remarques sur l'onomastique chrétienne de Rome*, ibid., 439-445; N. Duval, *Observations sur l'onomastique dans les inscriptions chrétiennes d'Afrique du nord*, ibid., 447-456; C. Carletti, *Appendice bibliografica*: *Epigrafia*, in P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 817-818; M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina*, Rome 1994; I. Kajanto, *Roman Nomenclature During the Late Empire*, in I. Di Stefano Manzella (ed.), *Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano* (= *Inscriptiones Sanctae Sedis,* 2), Vatican City 1997, 103-111; D. Mazzoleni, *La produzione epigrafica nelle catacombe romane*, in V. Fiocchi Nicolai - F. Bisconti - D. Mazzoleni, *Le catacombe cristiane di Roma*, Regensburg 1998, esp. 155-159.

D. Mazzoleni

ONUPHRIUS (4th c.). Egyptian *anchorite, probably mid-4th c. His life, and that of other monks, is described in a *Coptic text attributed to one Papnutis (*Paphnutius). The part referring to Onuphrius also exists in Greek and other languages—it is thus not clear whether the Coptic text is the original. He lived quite alone, naked, clothed only by his hair, which reached his knees. A palm tree gave him one fruit per month for food. For reasons that are not clear, his reputation became popular outside of *Egypt and gave rise to various legends. His iconography too is particularly rich, inside and outside Egypt. Feast 12 (or 10) June.

BS 9, 1187-1200; BHG 1378-1382; 2330; Auctarium p. 143; E.A.T. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1914, LIV-LXVII, 205-224, 455-473.

T. Orlandi

OPERA OMNIA. In the age of the MS, the idea of bringing together the works of a single author had to contend with two difficulties: one financial, the other critical. The first could be overcome, but the second required a critical sense which appeared only in the Renaissance, thanks to the efforts of the great editors, mainly Johann Froben (Frobenius) assisted by Erasmus. So, with regard to the Fathers, we know only one attempt to bring together St. Augustine's works, at Clairvaux (now *Troyes BM* 40). For him, apart from the *Retractationes,* there was

*Possidius's *Indiculus* (PL 46, 5-22) which simplified the collecting.

The publication of *opera omnia* began at Basel with the publisher J. Froben (1460–1527), who worked with Johann Petri (1441–1511) and Johann Amerbach (1441–1513). This brought improvements to the correctness of the texts; above all it required a critical examination of authenticity and the discarding of spurious works.

From 1505–1506 the *editio princeps* of St. Augustine's *opera omnia* appeared, but without critical apparatus. In 1513 Erasmus's collaboration brought a critical surge: *opera omnia* of *Jerome, in 10 vols., 1516; of *John Chrysostom (in Latin), 1517; of *Cyprian, 1520; of *Tertullian, 1521 (ed. by Rhenanus); of *Arnobius, 1522; of *Hilary, 1523; of *Irenaeus, 1526; of *Ambrose, 1527. A new 10-vol. edition of Augustine's works by Erasmus appeared in 1528–1529, a landmark for choice of MSS, correctness of texts and elimination of apocrypha. All *Origen's works, edited by Erasmus, were published after his death by Rhenanus.

Erasmus's activities were carried on by his disciple Beatus Bild, surnamed Rhenanus. The impetus had been given. In the following centuries the Maurists brought out exemplary editions of *opera omnia,* at first of the Latin fathers, then of the Greeks (published with the Greek text for the first time). They had the good sense not to discard the *spuria* completely, but to put them in appendixes.

J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et moyen âge*, II and III, Brussels 1947-1949; DHGE 15, 667-679; 19, 126-129; for Rhenanus, see A. Horawitz: SAW 70 (1872) 189-244, 323-378; *Auctoritas patrum I-II: Zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert / Contributions on the Reception of the Church Fathers in the 15th and 16th Century*, eds. L. Grane - A. Schindler - M. Wriedt, Mainz 1993, 1998; *Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. I. Backus, 2 vols., Leiden 1997; *"I Padri sotto il torchio." Le edizioni dell'antichità cristiana nei secoli 15-16*, ed. M.R. Cortesi, Florence 2002; I. Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation, 1378-1615*, Leiden 2003.

A. Hamman

OPHITES – NAASSENES. *Gnostic groups of the 2nd–3rd c., in whose religious doctrines and practices the serpent (Gk, ὄφις; Heb, *nāḥāš*) occupied a prominent place. The use of the serpent must be seen against the background of their polemical attitude, characteristic of various gnostic systems, toward the God of the OT: indeed, the corrupter of *Adam and Eve, presented in the account of Gen 3 as a symbol of evil and origin of sin, was venerated by the Ophites as a spreader of **gnōsis*, i.e., that knowledge of good and evil that the demiurge-God of the OT had forbidden to human beings. His power was further manifested by *Moses in the episode of the bronze serpent (Num 21) and recognized by Jesus himself (Jn 3:14) (see Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 30,7; ps.-Tertull., *Adv. omn. haer.* 2). Besides this polemical value, they concurred in explaining the prominence of the serpent in gnostic speculation, the great importance of and fundamental function of this animal in so many aspects of pagan religiosity as a symbol of the generative force of nature, of divination and prophecy, and as linked to the cult of the dead and to astrology (ref. in Leisegang).

Within gnostic speculation, the symbolism of the serpent assumed values and functions that varied considerably acc. to context. Most likely, the facts relating to the Ophites or to the Naassenes, documented by the *heresiologists, should be understood not as referring to a single or specific gnostic group, but to various schools which, though beginning from some common doctrinal elements, then developed diversified theological systems.

*Irenaeus, who identified the Ophites with the *Sethians, attributes to them a cosmogonic and anthropogonic mythical account which in many aspects anticipates, in a more simplified form, the *Valentinian myth (*Adv. haer.* I, 30). In the so-called Diagram of the Ophites (described in Orig., *C. Celsum* VI, 24ff.), a design schematically representing the universe as these sectarians imagined it, the serpent becomes a cosmic symbol: it is the monster (the biblical Leviathan) that surrounds the terrestrial world as its lord and master. According to *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 37), who describes some of their religious practices, the Ophites used a live serpent for the consecration of the *Eucharist. Particularly important is the evidence of ps.-*Hippolytus (*Ref.* V, 6,3-11,1; X, 9,1-3), who quotes, citing literally as well as paraphrasing and summarizing, a long passage taken from a Naassene work and an anapestic psalm also used among them. The former (also known as the "Preaching of the Naassenes") recounts the myth of humanity's origin, following a scheme that shows some analogies with the doctrine of *Saturnilus. According to the author of this work, the theme of the Primordial Man and his descent to the world, which makes up the nucleus of the gnostic myth, is present, though in confused and obscure forms, in the religious heritage of various peoples, as attested by the rich review of pagan myths (Greek, Phrygian, Assyrian, Egyptian etc.) that accompanies the anthropogonic account. The psalm develops the theme of the *soul which wanders in the labyrinths of the world until Jesus descends to free it by revealing

"gnosis" to it. A painting, found in the catacombs of Viale Manzoni, Rome, seems to refer to this Naassene doctrine of the soul. According to ps.-Hippolytus, the Naassene group was closely related to the Perati, the Sethians and the gnostic *Justin.

CPG 1155-1156; W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, 11-33; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici cristiani*, Bari 1970, 25-71; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums urkundlich dargestellt*, Leipzig 1884, repr. Hildesheim 1963, 249ff., 277ff.; A. Hönig, *Die Ophiten*, Berlin 1899; R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig 1904, 83-102; H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, Leipzig 1924, 111-185; EC 9, 80-81; LTK 7, 1178-1179; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, Milan 1993, 37-130; J.D. Kaestli, *L'interprétation du serpent de Genèse 3 dans quelques textes gnostiques et la question de la gnose "ophite,"* in J. Ries (ed.), *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique.* Actes Coll. de Louvain-La-Neuve (11-14 mars 1980), Louvain-La-Neuve 1982, 116-130; J. Frickel, *Hellenistische Erlösung in christlicher Deutung. Die gnostische Naassenerschrift*, Leiden 1984; M.J. Edwards, *The Naming of the Naassenes: Hippolytus, Refutatio V, 6-10 as Hieros Logos*: ZPE 112 (1996) 74-80; M.G. Lancellotti, *The Naassenes: A Gnostic Identity Among Judaism, Christianity, Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Traditions*, Münster 2000.

C. Gianotto

OPTATIANUS (260/270–before 335). Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius, born probably in *Africa (as perhaps attested to by the tradition of his poems, and by the importance given *Carthage in *Carm.* 16,18 or, even more so, 20); in 306 presumably attained the post of *proconsul Achaiae,* but was exiled ca. 315 or soon after, following an accusation to the emperor *Constantine (see *Carm.* 2,31ff.). Despite the impossibility in exile of having his poetry written out in a decorative style adequate to their literary form (see *Carm.* 1,1-12), he sent to the emperor his collection of 20 figured *panegyric poems on the occasion of Constantine's twentieth anniversary and succeeded in obtaining his recall from exile in 325 (certainly before the murder of Crispus in 326; Jer., *Chron.* 232 [Helm] erroneously dates the return in 328 = a. Abr. 2345). In 329 and 333 he was *praefectus urbi*. Since his works contain no echo of Constantine's *tricennalia*, the author presumably died before 335.

A poetical corpus is preserved, called panegyric in the MSS, which, besides the dedicatory work to Constantine (inauthentic) and a response letter (also spurious; Polara, vol. 1, 31ff.), contains the 20 pieces composed in exile, along with 7 that were in part composed later (certainly prior to the exile were 6, 10, 18). Besides this collection, in the *Codex Salmasianus* of the *Anthologia Latina* (81 Riese) are preserved some so-called *versus anacyclici* (distichs which, without a change in meaning and preserving the same meter, can also be read from back to front), while some fragments are found in the mythographer Fulgentius (*Mythol.* 2,1).

The poems are in general extremely artful **carmina figurata*: three pieces, in continuity with Hellenistic figured poetry, represent via the outline of the work themes presented in various places (20: a hydraulic organ; 26: an altar; 27: panpipes); others are crossword poems tracing geometric designs, objects, letters—a scheme invented by the author. Letters highlighted by color are introduced periodically within some poems that, while contributing to sense of the poem, at the same time create geometrical motifs (e.g., *Carm.* 6), an object (e.g., *Carm.* 9: palm of victory) or large letters with symbolic meaning (e.g., *Carm.* 5: *AVG XX CAES X*). Since, alongside pagan subjects, the last group contains poems which, by content and by the representation of the Greek letters X and P, are clearly Christian (e.g., *Carm.* 8), the author can be considered a Christian. His influence was substantial, mainly on early-medieval authors, who received the subgenre of "figured poetry" (Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus).

Editions: G. Polara, *Publilii Optatiani Porfyrii Carmina*, 2 vols., Turin 1973 (with comm.); Id., Quaderni di Koinonia 2 (1976; tr.).

Studies: E. Kluge, *Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius und sein Werk*, Diss., Munich 1920; E. Groag, *Der Dichter Porfyrius in einer stadtrömischen Inschrift*: WS 45 (1926) 102-109; G. Polara, *Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta di Publilio Optaziano Porfirio*, Salerno 1971; Id., *Cinquant'anni di studi su Optaziano (1922-1973)*: Vichiana 3 (1974) 110-124; T.D. Barnes, *Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius*: AJPh 96 (1975) 173-186; K. Smolak, *Art. Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius*: Herzog 5, 237-243; U. Ernst, Carmen Figuratum. *Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1991, 97-142; A. La Penna, *Poche note a Optaziano Porfirio*: Maia 48 (1996) 51-55; M.-O. Bruhat, *Les "Carmina Figurata" de Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius. La métamorphose d'un genre et l'invention d'une poésie liturgique impériale sous Constantin*, Diss., Paris, Univ. 4, 1998.

D. Weber

OPTATUS of Milevis (4th c.). Bishop of Milevis in *Numidia. From *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 110) we know that he wrote his six books against *Donatism, *Valentiniano et Valente principibus*, sometime between 364 and 367 (probably, acc. to some scholars, toward 366–367). The work's original title is not known, either from Jerome or from the MS tradition: those proposed by modern editors and scholars (the best known being *Adversus Parmenianum Donatistam, De schismate Donatistarum*) have a merely indicative value. Contrary to Jerome's indication and to the plan laid down by Opta-

tus himself (book I, ch. 6), the work as handed down consists of seven books: passages of book VII are interpolated into book III. It is now accepted that, around 385, Optatus had wanted to prepare a 2nd edition (witness the Catholic and Donatist episcopal lists of *Rome cited in II, 3-4, brought up to date in some codices with the names of Pope *Siricius, elected 384, and the Donatist bishops Lucian and Claudian), but was unable to complete it: someone in his circle was charged with completing the new edition, using the material collected by Optatus which appears in book VII, though not without making transpositions and interventions of his own.

The work is a reply to the anti-Catholic treatise written by the Donatist *Parmenian in ca. 362. In the first book Optatus, who addresses Parmenian as "brother," recalls the points treated by the Donatist in his work and explains the order he intends to follow in his own treatment: then he corrects some statements of Parmenian on Christ's flesh, and distinguishes the concept of *heresy from that of *schism, retorting to Donatus the accusation of schism that Parmenian had thrown at the Catholics. The main argument of book I is the history of the origins of the schism up to the Council of Rome held under Pope *Miltiades: here Optatus wants to show that some of the bishops who had accused *Caecilian's consecrator *Felix of Aptunga of *traditio* should themselves be considered **traditores*. The theme of book II is the unicity of the Catholic church, characterized by its universality. In *Africa, only the Catholic church is in communion with the universal church, and only the Catholic church is in possession of the qualities that, acc. to Scripture, are proper to it. In book III Optatus defends the imperial intervention in Africa, reminding the Donatists that they had been the first to appeal to the emperor's authority. The severe measures adopted against them were made necessary by their own violence, and their claim to style themselves martyrs in a persecution unleashed by the Catholic church was empty. In book IV Optatus rejects Parmenian's thesis that, in the sinners of Scripture, we should see the Catholics. It is rather the Donatists, responsible for so many crimes, who are sinners. Book V is dedicated to the theme of the validity of baptism. Against the Donatists who, following ancient African practice, considered the baptism conferred by heretics invalid and therefore rebaptized Catholics who (spontaneously or otherwise) came over to their church, Optatus defends the baptismal doctrine of the church of Rome accepted by the African Catholics at the Council of *Arles in 314, acc. to which the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend on the person of the minister, but on the action of God. Book VI describes Donatist violence, esp. at the time of *Julian the Apostate, but above all Optatus laments the spiritual harm done by the Donatists through their propaganda. Book VII, added to the second edition, attempts to reply to objections the treatise raised among the Donatists. After an invitation to unity in the Catholic church, it examines the interpretation of some biblical passages to which the Donatists appealed in their controversy, and gives a defense of Macarius, the architect of unity in 347.

Optatus's work was also to have provided a collection of documents on the origins of the schism (see I, 22.26). Only one of our MSS, *Parisinus* 1711, cites some documents (*Gesta apud Zenophilum, Purgatio Felicis*) which make up part of the original documentation collected by Optatus, as well as eight letters (six by *Constantine) added to the collection at a later date. Optatus's work has great value, both historical and theological. He collected a great number of documents to reconstruct the events of the schism and rebut the Donatists' charges, anticipating what *Augustine would do esp. on the occasion of the Council of *Carthage of 411. Theologically too, anticipating Augustine, Optatus thoroughly explores the ecclesiological and sacramental doctrine in the points contested by the Donatists (unity of the church, efficacy of the sacraments in relation to who administers them). Also characteristic of Optatus is the tendency to mitigate the reasons for disagreement between the parties, presenting his opponents as extremists with whom he can dialogue and whose positions he can disprove, rather than as enemies.

A sermon, *In natali sanctorum Innocentium* (PLS 1, 288-294: actually a Christmas sermon adapted to the Feast of the Holy *Innocents), features in a MS under the name of Optatus of Milevis and has been attributed to him since A. Wilmart's edition of it; the prevalent opinion now is that formulated earlier by A. Pincherle, who saw it as the work of a Donatist, perhaps of *Optatus of Thamugadi: precise points of contact have been noted between it and the work of *Tyconius (F. Scorza Barcellona, E. Romero Pose). We must certainly reject the attribution to Optatus, upheld by G. Morin, of three ps.-Augustinian sermons on *Epiphany: *Serm.* 131 and 132 of the Maurists' *Appendix* (PL 39, 2005-2007 and 2007-2008) and the *Sermo sancti Augustini de Epiphania* (PLS 1, 297-300). Optatus's name has been proposed, on the basis of stylistic arguments that are ultimately unconvincing, for two *Easter sermons (PLS 1, 295-296; PLS 4, 665-667).

CPL 244: PL 11, 883-1104 (this is Ellies du Pin's edition, Anversa 1702); CSEL 26 (ed. C. Ziwsa) 1893; It. tr.: Ottato di Milevi, *La*

vera Chiesa, ed. L. Dattrino, Rome 1988 (rec. RSLR 28 [1992] 646-655); SC 412-413 (ed. M. Labrousse, 1995-1996); CPL 245-249 and 940 (spurious sermons of dubious attribution); DTC 11, 1077-1084; EC 9, 449-451; BS 9, 1307-1311; PWK 18, 1, 765-772; TRE 25, 300-302; E. Michaud, *La théologie d'Optat de Milève d'après le "De schismate Donatistarum"*: Revue Intern. de Théol. 16 (1908) 208ff.: O.R. Vassall-Phillips, *The Work of St. Optatus Against the Donatists*, London 1917; P. Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin*, I, Paris 1920, 77-108; A. Wilmart, *Un sermon de saint Optat pour la fête de Noël*: RSR 2 (1922) 271-302; G. Morin, *Deux sermons africains du V^e-VI^e siècle avec un texte inédit du symbole*: RBen 35 (1923) 233-236; A. Pincherle, *Un sermone donatista attribuito a S. Ottato di Milevi*: Bilychnis 22 (1923) 134-148; Id., *L'ecclesiologia nella controversia donatista*: Ricerche Rel 1 (1925) 5-55; Id., *Noterelle ottazianee*: ibid. (1927) 440-445 (= *Cristianesimo antico e moderno*, Rome 1956, 70-76); U. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*, 2, Turin 1928, 698-722; A. Wilmart, *Un prétendu sermon pascal de S. Augustin*: RBen 1 (1929) 197-203; A. Pincherle, *Due postille sul donatismo*: Ricerche Rel 18 (1947) 160-164 (cf. *Cristianesimo antico e moderno*, 76-79); S. Blomgren, *Eine Echtheitsfrage bei Optatus von Mileve*, Stockholm 1959; Id., *Spicilegium Optatianum*: Eranos 58 (1960) 132-141; H.D. Altendorf, rev. of S. Blomgren, *Eine Echtheitsfrage . . .* : ThLZ 85 (1960) 598-600; A.C. de Veer, *À propos de l'authenticité du livre VII^e d'Optat de Milève*: REAug 7 (1961) 389-391; H. Silvestre, *Trois sermons à retirer définitivement de l'héritage d'Optat de Milève*: Proceed. of the African Cl. Assoc. 7 (1964) 61-62; V. Saxer, *Un sermon médiéval sur la Madeleine. Reprise d'une homélie antique pour Pâques attribuable à Optat de Milève (392)*: RBen 80 (1970) 17-50; R.B. Eno, *The Work of Optatus as a Turning Point in the African Ecclesiology*: Thomist 37 (1973) 668-685; F. Scorza Barcellona, *L'interpretazione dei doni dei Magi nel sermone natalizio di (Ps.) Ottato di Milevi*: SSR 2 (1978) 129-149; E. Romero Pose, *Ticonio y el sermón In natali sanctorum Innocentium (Exégesis de Mt 2)*: Gregorianum 60 (1979) 513-544; Patrologia III, 112-116; PCBE 1, 795-801; DSp 11, 824-829; G.A. Cecconi, *Elemosine e propaganda. Un'analisi della "Macariana persecutio" nel III libro di Ottato di Milevi*: RecAug 36 (1990) 42-66; L. Dattrino, *Il battesimo e l'iniziazione cristiana in Ottato di Milevi*: RivAC 66 (1990) 81-100; B. Kriegbaum, *Zwischen den Synoden von Rom und Arles: die donatistische Supplik bei Optatus*: Archivum Historiae Pont. 28 (1990) 219-244; C. Mazzucco, *Ottato di Milevi in un secolo di studi. Problemi e retrospettive*, Bologna 1993; R.B. Eno, *The Significance of the List of Roman Bishops in the Anti-Donatistic Polemic*: VChr 47 (1993) 158-169; B. Kriegbaum, *Ein neuer Lösungsvorschlag für ein altes Problem: die sogenannten preces der Donatisten (Opt. 1,22)*: SP 22 (1989) 277-282; J.E. Merdringer, *Optatus Reconsidered*, ibid. 294-299; R.B. Eno, *"Radix catholica"*: REAug 43 (1997) 1-13; J.R. Alexander, *Count Taurinus and the Persecutors of Donatism*: Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 2 (1998) 247-267; M.J. Edwards, *Optatus. Against the Donatists*, TTH 27, Liverpool 1997.

F. Scorza Barcellona

OPTATUS of Thamugadi. *Donatist bishop of Thamugadi (*Timgad), 388-398. A tyrannical personality who exercised enormous power in *Numidia during his ten-year episcopate (Aug., *C. Ep. Parmen.* II, 2,4: *Optatum Gildonianum decennalem totius Africae gemitum*). Revered by the Donatist population, who celebrated the anniversary of his consecration with enthusiastic displays (Aug., *C. litt. Petil.* II, 23,53), Optatus was accused by the Catholics of having abused his authority against minors and others, whose property had been entrusted to him, and against landed proprietors who got in his way (ibid. II, 35,82); he also sought to suppress by force the schism of the *Maximianists within the ranks of Donatism (Aug., *C. Cresc.* IV, 25,32; see also III, 54,65). In *Augustine's mind, Optatus was associated with the plundering, increasingly widespread (*C. litt. Petil.* I, 24,26; *Ep.* 43,8,24) and organized, of the *circumcellions (*C. Ep. Parmen.* I, 11,17: [*Circumcelliones*] *qui primo tantummodo fustibus, nunc etiam ferro se armare coeperunt*). In 397/398, Optatus threw in his lot with Count *Gildo in the last rebellion against the authority of the emperor *Honorius (Aug., *C. Cresc.* III, 12,15: *inter Gildonis satellites praecipuus haberetur teneretur moreretur* [*Optatus*]), and with him was defeated, captured and executed (Aug., *C. litt. Petil.* II, 92,209). Though perhaps not himself a revolutionary (see E. Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken*, 74-78), his violent actions and despotic ways (Aug., *C. Cresc.* IV, 25,32) gave an opening to the revolutionary social elements in the Donatist church. His power is symbolized by the large cathedral and dependent buildings built to glorify his name on a hill overlooking Timgad (see E. Albertini, CRAI [1939] 100-102; Ch. Courtois, *Timgad, l'antique Thamugadi*, Alger 1951, 72ff.).

In the mid-20th c. the hypothesis was advanced (Pincherle), and has not yet been disproven (Scorza Barcellona), that Optatus was the author of a Christmas sermon (*In natali sanctorum innocentium*, PLS I, 288-294) which the MS tradition attributes to *Optatus of Milevis.

Sources: Augustine, cited texts (ed. Petschenig, CSEL 51-52). *Studies*: A. Pincherle, *Due postille sul donatismo*: Ricerche Religiose 18 (1947) 161-164, now in Id., *Cristianesimo antico e moderno*, Rome 1956, 76-79; H.J. Diesner, *Die Periodisierung des Circumcellionentums*: Wiss. Zeitsch. Univ. Halle 10 (1962) 1329-1338; E. Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken*, Göteborg 1964, 74-78 and 84-90; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, ch. 15; F. Scorza Barcellona, *La celebrazione dei santi Innocenti nell'omiletica latina dei secoli IV-VI*: StudMed 15 (1974) 705-767 (707-712 on the sermon attributed to Optatus of Milevis); PCBE I, 797-801; P. Langa, *Optato Gildoniano*, in *Notas complementarias*, BAC 32, Madrid 1988, 898-899.

W.H.C. Frend - P. Marone

OPUS IMPERFECTUM IN MATTHAEUM. Name given to a lengthy anonymous Latin commentary on *Matthew's gospel, which ends at ch. 25 and shows lacunae here and there. Though handed down under the name of *John Chrysostom, its author was an

unknown early 5th-c. *Arian. The earlier hypothesis of a Latin translation of a lost Greek original has been disproved by the Latin sources. The *exegesis is mainly *allegorizing, with technical procedures that closely recall *Origen, touching on themes of a strongly existential character: humanity seen in the struggle between good and evil, between the devil, who has enslaved the flesh, and God, who succors the soul, which is free in its decisions, but insufficient to achieve salvation without divine help. The author's Arian faith is evident in various polemical and doctrinal passages and esp. in the recurrent theme of persecution: he is head of a small Arian community which sees its membership diminishing daily, due to the pressure of the dominant Catholics; so he insists on the theme of temptation, the sifting that awaits the best. In the *eschatological perspective of the last judgment, which will see the defeat of the persecutors, the army of the Antichrist is represented by the Catholic church, and the beginning of the end time is made to commence with *Constantine and *Theodosius, emperors who persecuted the Arians. So *Pelagian ideas in the author, recently suggested by one scholar, must be ruled out.

CPL 707; PG 56, 611-946; J. van Banning: CCL 87B, Turnhout 1988; Patrologia III, 95-97 (bibl.); M. Simonetti, *Note sull'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*: Studi Medievali 10 (1969) 1-84; P. Nautin, *L'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum et les Ariens de Constantinople*: RHE 67 (1972) 381-408; 745-766; R. Étaix, *Fragments inédits de l'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*: RBen 84 (1974) 271-300; J. van Banning, *The Critical Edition of the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum: An Arian Source*, SP 17, Oxford 1982, 382-387; F.W. Schlatter, *The Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum and the Fragmenta in Lucam*: VChr 39 (1985) 384-392; Id., *The Pelagianism of the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*: VChr 41 (1987) 267-284; Id., *The Author of the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*: VChr 42 (1988) 364-375 (cf. K. Cooper: SP 27 [1993] 249-255); J. van Banning, *Il Padre Nostro nell'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*: Gregorianum 71 (1990) 293-313; F. Mali, *Das Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum und sein Verhältnis zu den Matthäuskommentaren von Origenes und Hieronymus*, Innsbruck 1991; T. Sindona, *Aspetti sociali nell'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*: Koinonia 20 (1996) 77-105; J.H.A. van Banning, *Gregory the Great and the Surviving Arianism of His Time: Did He Know the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum?*: SP 38 (2001) 481-495; J.A. Kellerman - T.C. Oden, *Incomplete Commentary on Matthew*, 2 vols., ACT, Downers Grove, IL 2010.

M. Simonetti

ORACLES

I. In general - II. *Chaldean Oracles* - III. *Sibylline Oracles.*

I. In general. One form of divination consisted of a reply, expressed in various ways and means, by a deity, or at least by a suprahuman interlocutor, to a query put by the believer on personal or communal questions. In some cases the oracle could be a spontaneous manifestation of the deity through a human mediator or prophet, who expresses a divine pronouncement without having been interrogated, as in the case of the Greco-Roman (later Jewish-Christian) Sibyl. In this form the oracular phenomenon was more or less tangential to the prophetic function. In Greece, Dodona and Delphi were seats of famous oracles, dedicated respectively to Zeus and to Apollo. At Dodona, divination took place by observing the movement of the leaves of the sacred oak and the waters of a nearby spring, as well as through certain prophets, the Homeric Selloi, or the "Dove" prophetesses (*peleia*) mentioned by Herodotus. Archaeology has also brought to light numerous small tablets containing written requests to the oracle. At Delphi the Pythia, inspired by the god, uttered enigmatic replies which the priests then interpreted. Christian polemic against *astrology and its practices also applied to the oracular art, whose veracity was sometimes not wholly denied, but was attributed to the activity of demons. Thus, e.g., *Tertullian claims that these, knowing some truths and borrowing others from biblical prophecies, deceive people through oracles so as to subject them to their power (*Apol.* 22). *Tatian too recognizes in oracles a certain curative capacity inspired by evil spirits (*Orat.* 18). Meanwhile the pagans objected to the use of oracular writings by the Christians themselves to confirm their own doctrines. *Lactantius, in support of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, appeals—besides to the Bible—to the "prophecies of the Sibyl" and the replies of Milesian Apollo. One document attesting to Jewish and then Christian use of the pagan oracular genre is the *Sibylline Oracles* (see below). *Augustine's treatise *De divinatione daemonum,* while repeating the polemical arguments against oracular practices worked out in earlier patristic tradition, confirms the persistence and strength of such practices, which penetrated widely even into the Christian population, despite imperial decrees against haruspices and diviners.

A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, I-IV, Paris 1878-1881; DACL 2, 1198-1212; P. Amandry, *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes*, Paris 1950; H.W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus*, Oxford 1957; D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids, MI 1983, [2]1991; H.W. Parke, *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, London 1987; J.G. Heintz (ed.), *Oracles et prophèties dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1997; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Profeti Oracoli Sibille. Rivelazione e salvezza nel mondo antico*, Rome 2002; A. Busine, *Paroles d'Apollon: pratiques et traditions oraculaires dans l'Antiquité tardive (II^e-VI^e siècle)*, Leiden 2005.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

II. *Chaldean Oracles*. Attributed to an author named Julian, perhaps Julian the Theurge (2nd c. AD), and highly esteemed in *Neoplatonist circles, this collection of brief theosophical and cosmosophical hexametrical compositions survives only partly and indirectly through the citations of pagan and Christian authors. The first Christian to mention it is *Arnobius; later, *Marius Victorinus and *Augustine. Among pagans, besides *Porphyry, *Iamblichus was particularly inspired by the theology of the *Chaldean Oracles,* to which he dedicated a (lost) commentary in 28 books. Some extracts of a similar exegetical work by *Proclus are preserved by Michael Psellos (11th c.), who wrote a *Commentary on the Chaldean Oracles*. The doctrine expressed by the collection, Platonic in inspiration, contemplates the notion of a supreme transcendent God (the Father) from whom derive an Intellect with demiurgic function and a third principle (Hecate), intermediate between the two and identifiable with the **anima mundi*. Numerous angels and demons populate the higher world, exercising their action on humans positively or negatively. They play a fundamental role in the practice of *theurgy, which consists of establishing contact with the gods through ritual acts of initiation. The *Chaldean Oracles* affirm a dualistic *anthropology, with the notion of the *soul fallen from the divine world, imprisoned in the body and subject to cosmic destiny. Salvation is possible through theurgic rites and rigorous abstention, aimed at dominion over the bodily passions.

E. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques. Avec un choix de commentaires anciens*, Paris 1971; H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy: Mysticism Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*, Jerusalem 1960, Paris [2]1978 (ed. M. Tardieu); R. Majercik, *The Chaldaean Oracles: Text, Translation and Commentary*, Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 5, Leiden 1989; A. Tonelli, tr. and ed., *Oracoli caldaici*, Gk. text with It. tr., Milan [2]2002; S. Lanzi (ed.), *Michele Psello. Oracoli caldaici con appendici su Proclo e Michele Italo*, Milan 2001.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

III. *Sibylline Oracles*. 1. *The pagan Sibyl*. Among the ancients, the Sibyl was a woman who went into ecstasy and prophesied, very often announcing catastrophes. Her words were considered oracles. Her origin should perhaps be sought in Persia, whence she spread esp. to the Greek colonies of *Asia Minor. She was sometimes considered a demoniac, sometimes a deity (*Thea Sibylla*). Various places of worship were dedicated to her, so that her name ended up becoming a common name, the Sibyls, to whom a collection of oracles was attributed. The Greeks knew the Sibyl of Marpessos; more important was that of Erythrai, who settled at Delphi, where she was considered sometimes the bride, sometimes the daughter of Apollo. *Clement of Alexandria cites the beginnning of a *Carmen Sibyllinum* by Heraclius the Sophist (*Strom.* I, 108). Then the Sibyl came to Cumae, where she pronounced oracles in a grotto. Virgil evokes her in *Aeneid* VI, 98ff. The collection of her oracles, preserved in the Capitol, was burned in the fire at the temple of Jupiter. The most famous oracle of Cumae was the announcement of the savior of the world, immortalized in Virgil's 4th Eclogue, which *Constantine in his *Oratio ad sanctos* applies entirely to Christ (19-21). There we read the acrostic of Christ ΙΧΘΥΣ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ (*Or. Sib.* VIII, 217-250). *Augustine gives it in *Latin translation (*Civ. Dei* 18,23).

2. *The Sibylline Oracles*. The Jews of *Alexandria used the collection of *Sibylline Oracles* and their authority in the Greek world mostly for their own religious propaganda. To this end they adapted, transformed, interpolated and added new compositions. These oracles usually announced, in the spirit of the prophets, catastrophes and the end of the world, as does the medieval hymn *Dies irae*. The primitive Jewish nucleus is book III of the *Sibylline Oracles,* in the first version, written ca. AD 140. Books IV and V drip with hatred toward *Rome at the time of *Vespasian and *Titus, who destroyed the temple. The Christians acted similarly to the Jews, exploiting the Jewish source, interpolating, esp. in books I-III, and rewriting specifically Christian parts, like books VI-VIII, probably in the 2nd c. The *Shepherd* of *Hermas makes reference to them (*Vis.* II, 4). They rise in turn against Roman persecution in book VIII, announcing the fall of Rome and of the emperor *Nero. The collection in eight books goes back to the 6th c.; in 1817 A. Mai discovered another four books (11-14); the eighth, because of its length, was divided into three.

3. *Structure*. Books I-II form a whole, a Jewish redaction (I, 1-223) with Christian interpolations (224-400) and later editing. In book II it is hard to distinguish what is Jewish from what is Christian. Book III announces various catastrophes; it seems to be entirely Jewish with no Christian interpolation.

Books VI-VIII are entirely Christian. Book VI contains only 28 verses, including a hymn to Christ and to the cross. Book VII shows gnostic conceptions from the late 2nd c., such as baptism of fire (VII, 84). Book VIII, of 500 verses, is much more important, since it refers to Christian life and liturgy (VIII, 402-411). Lactantius takes 30 citations from it. The first part could have been written by a Jew. It announces God's chastisement and the fall of Rome. The second part is a triumphal hymn to Christ, as judge and Lord of the world. The third is a

hymn to God the Creator and to the Logos, his incarnate son. The book concludes with norms for Christian life. There seems to be no gap between this book VIII and the four books discovered by A. Mai (XI-XIV, a numbering that follows the MS tradition of the family of codices [*Ambrosianus* E 64 sup., Vaticani 1120 and 743, *Monacensis* 312], which divides book VIII into three).

4. *Survival of the collection*. Already known to Hermas, the oracles are cited by *Justin (1 *Apol.* 20,1; 44,12), *Athenagoras, *Theophilus (*Ad Aut.* 2,9), ps.-Melito, *Tertullian, frequently by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 6,5 cf. 1,21; 3,3; 6,5,43,453), *Commodian, *Lactantius, *Eusebius, the **Apostolic Constitutions*, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Sozomen and *Augustine. Augustine knew a Latin translation of VIII, 217-243 (see also Kurfess's edition, pp. 222-264). *Celsus knew an interpolated version and reproved Christians for using it to their own advantage (Origen, *C. Cel.* 7,53). Its influence continued to be felt over the centuries: in the *Dies irae,* Dante, Calderón, Giotto, Michelangelo, Raphael and in painting. A *Prophetia Sibillae magae* exists in Latin, published by B. Bischoff (*Mél. de Ghellinck*, Gembloux 1951, pp. 121-147).

Texts: CPG 1352; *Oracula Sibyllina*, ed. A. Rzach, Vienna 1891 (the best); ed. Geffcken, GCS 1902; ed. A. Kurfess, Munich 1951 (text with Ger. tr., bibl.; new ed. and tr., ed. by J.-D. Ganger, Düsseldorf); It. tr. Erbetta III, 497-529; P. Sacchi, *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento*, III, Brescia 1999, 385-535 (the Jewish Oracles).

Studies: A. Rzach, PWK 2A, 2073-2183 (bibl. up to 1924; after, see J. Quasten, *Patrologia*, I, Turin 1967, 151-152); H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom*, Berlin 1938; H. Jeanmaire, *La Sibylle et le retour de l'âge d'or*, Paris 1939; A. Peretti, *La Sibilla nella propaganda ellenistica*, Florence 1943; B. Altaner, *Augustinus und die nt. Apokryphen*: AB 67 (1949) 244-247; E. Demougeot, *St. Jérôme, les O.S. et Stilicon*: REA 54 (1952) 83-92; A. Kurfess, *Kaiser Konstantin u. die Erythr. Sibylle*: ZRGG 3 (1951) 353-357; Id., *Zur V. Buch der O.S.*: RhM 29 (1956) 225-241; Id., *Juvenal und die Sibylle*: HJ 76 (1957) 79-83; Id., *Dies irae*: ibid. 77 (1958) 328-338; J.B. Bauer, *Die Gottesmutter in den Or. Sib.*: Marianum 18 (1956) 118-224; M.-L. Thérel, *Une image de la Sibylle sur l'Arc thriomphal de Sainte-Marie Majeure à Rome?*: Cahiers Archéol. 12 (1962) 153-171; F. Paschoud, *Roma aeterna*, Rome 1967; V. Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, Paris 1970; L. Breglia Pulci Doria, *Oracoli sibillini tra rituali e propaganda: (studi su Flegonte di Tralles)*, Naples 1983; D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids, MI 1983, [2]1991; It. tr. Brescia 1996); *Oracles Sibyllins*, III, text with tr., ed. and annotated by V. Nikiprowetzky, in *La Bible*, III: *Écrits intertestamentaires*, ed. A. Dupont-Sommer - M. Philonenko, Paris 1987, 1035-1140; G. Panayiotou, *Addenda to the LSJ Greek-English Lexicon. Lexicographical Notes on the Vocabulary of the Oracula Sibyllina*: Hellenica 38 (1987) 46-66, 296-317; V. Nikiprowetzky, *La Sibylle juive et le "Troisième Livre" des "Pseudo-Oracles Sibyllins" depuis Charles Alexandre*: ANRW 20/1 (1987) 460-542; A. Momigliano, *Dalla Sibilla pagana alla Sibilla Cristiana*: ASNP 17 (1987) 407-428; H.W. Parke - B. McGing, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, London-New York 1988; D.S. Potter, *Prophecy and History in the Crisis of the Roman Empire: A Historical Commentary on the Thirteenth Sibylline Oracle*, Oxford-New York 1990; S.A. Redmond, *The Date of Fourth Sibylline Oracle*: Second Century 7 (1990) 129-149; B. Tessèdre, *Les représentations de la fin des temps dans le chant V des Oracles sibyllines*: Apocrypha 1 (1990) 147-165; J.-M. Nieto Ibáñez, *El hexámetro de los oráculos sibilinos*, Amsterdam 1992; H.W. Parke, *Sibille*, Genoa 1992; G.J.M. Bartelink, *Die Oracula Sibyllina in den frühchristlichen griechischen Schriften von Justin bis Origenes: 150-250 nach Chr.*, in *Early Christian Poetry: A Collection of Essays*, ed. J. Den Boeft - A. Hilhorst, Leiden 1993, 23-33; *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari: mito storia tradizione*, eds. I. Chirassi Colombo - T. Seppilli, Pisa 1998; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Oracoli Profeti Sibille. Rivelazione e salvezza nel mondo antico*, Rome 2002; LCL 639-640; R. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Leiden 2003; J.-M. Roessli, *Augustin, les sibylles et les Oracles sibyllins*, in *Augustinus afer*, ed. P.-Y. Fux et al., Fribourg 2003, 263-286; Id., *Catalogues de sibylles, recueil(s) de Libri Sibyllini et corpus des Oracula Sibyllina. Remarques sur la formation de quelques collections oraculaires dans les mondes gréco-romain, juif et chrétien*, in *Recueils normatifs et canons dans l'antiquité*, ed. E. Norelli, Lausanne 2004, 47-68.

A. Hamman

ORANGE, Council of. Met 8 Nov 441 at Orange (Lat. *Arausio*) in *Gaul; *Hilary of Arles presided, *Eucherius of Lyons took part. It issued 30 disciplinary canons, which show clearly the pastoral problems of the time and the customs of the *Gallican liturgy. For the council of 529, *see* *Merovingian Councils).

CCL 148, 77-93; Hefl-Lecl II, 430-454; Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, Paris [2]1966, II, 121-122; III, passim; Palazzini 3, 237.

Ch. Munier

ORANS (iconography). This term is used to indicate a male or female figure, usually in front view, in the gesture of *expansis manibus*. This attitude can be explained if we consider it proper to someone praying or calling for help; still it expressed a dialogue, following a custom repeatedly mentioned in the OT: "All day long I call upon thee, O Lord; I stretch out my hands to thee" (Ps 88:10; see also Ex 17:11; Ps 118:48 [LXX]; Lam 3:41). In the past this symbol was considered exclusively Christian, though with various interpretations (the soul, Mary, the *ecclesia*), but the studies of W. Neuss and Th. Klauser have stressed the existence of similar representations outside the Christian figurative context. Besides monumental evidence (the famous statue of Livia [1st c. AD] which substantially repeats the type of the Artemisia of Halicarnassus [4th c. BC], the stuccos of the Py-

thagorean basilica of Porta Maggiore, *Rome, to cite only the best known), literary sources document the familiarity of this gesture in the Hellenistic and Roman artistic cultures (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XXXIV, 73; 78; 90).

In a quite numerous series of coins, going from *Trajan to *Maximian Herculius, a female figure recurs in the indisputable gesture of the *orans*, indicated by the legends as *Pietas, Pietas publica, Pietas augusta, Pietas Augusti or Augustae, Augustorum* etc., i.e., a personification of *Pietas erga homines* and *adversus deos*. The *pietas* of the deceased *erga deos* appears in some 3rd-c. *sarcophagi next to the figure of the shepherd carrying a lamb, symbol of φιλανθρωπία, and generalized figures of philosophers (Ws 1,3; 2,3; 19,1). Certainly belonging to the same iconographical tradition are some clearly Christian-inspired monuments, in which the figure of the *orans* is combined, for its christological significance, with that of the Good *Shepherd. These two symbolic images are repeated on the oldest Christian sarcophagi (Ws 1,2; 3,1; 19,3-6; 178,2) and on the vaults of cubicles in the catacombs (Wp 25; 61), figuratively expressing the two poles of the work of salvation: the Savior and the saved. The introduction of biblical scenes and the evident allusion to the means of salvation help to clarify the precise sense of these symbolic figures, taken from the pre-Christian repertoire (Ws 127,1; 127,2). The iconographical type of *Pietas* or Εὐσέβεια was taken up by the Christians with no formal change. The isolated *orantes* are depicted among the trees which represent paradise (Wp 110; Ws 19,6), or with the *capsa* of the *volumina,* an allusion to doctrine as means of salvation, or between two apostles who introduce the deceased into paradise (Ws 111,4; 215,7), acc. to the indispensable formulas for expressing the state of being "saved."

When the artist endows the image with individual elements (name, facial characteristics, age etc.), he fixes in the portrait of the deceased the general characteristics of the type: e.g., in the cemetery of *Domitilla the deceased Veneranda, in the act of praying, is introduced by St. *Petronilla into *Paradise (Wp 213). Further evidence of the desire to represent the deceased in heavenly peace is provided by numerous funerary slabs, on which the text of the epigraph is accompanied by the image of the dead *orans* (e.g., ICUR 5, 14385; 15137). Finally, some well-known biblical characters are shown as *orantes*: *Noah, *Jonah, *Daniel, *Susanna, the three young men in the *fiery furnace. The presence of the dove alongside Noah (Ws 9,3) or of the angel alongside Daniel (Ws 96; 218,1-2) and the three young men (Wp 137,1; 23,1; Ws 161,1; 201,4) indicates the divine intervention that has taken place. *Mary, martyrs and saints also appear *expansis manibus,* again testifying to the state of eternal beatitude; e.g., St. *Agnes on a 5th-c. *pluteus* slab (U. Broccoli, *Corpus* VII, 5, pl. 106) and on gold-glass (C.R. Morey, *Gold Glass*, pl. XIV, 83-85), St. Cecilia in her crypt in the catacombs of St. Callistus (Wp 260,2), St. *Januarius (U.M. Fasola, *La cat. di s. Gennaro*, pl. VII), St. *Apollinaris in his basilica at *Ravenna (F.W. Deichmann, *Mosaiken von Ravenna*, pl. 38). This gesture, variously interpreted but certainly familiar to the first Christians in its most simple and spontaneous meaning, in harmony with the words of St. *Paul (1 Tim 2:8) and of the Fathers (Clem. Rom., *I Ad Cor.* 39,1; Tertull., *De orat.* 14,29: PL 1, 1272, 1286-1288; Orig., *De orat.* 21: PG 11, 479-482), has been exhaustively clarified in De Bruyne's proposed hermeneutic: the biblical characters do not invoke salvation, they are already saved. Thus the dead *orans* is a symbol of joy because she or he is in divine peace; the isolated images are nothing but a stereotyping of this symbol. Primitive Christian iconography knew no doubt or pessimism, but was permeated by the constant certainty of Christ's saving intervention.

DACL 12, 2298ff.; EC 9, 179-181; EAA 5, 704-708; LCI 3, 352-354; W. Neuss, *Die Oranten in der altchristlichen Kunst*: Festschrift P. Clemen, Bonn 1926, 130ff.; H. von Schoenebeck, *Die Christliche Sarkophagplastik unter Konstantin*: MDAI (R) 51 (1936) 275-320; A. Grabar, *Martyrium*, II, Paris 1946, 24, 292-295; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim. Die Vorstellungen vom Zwischenzustand und die frühchristliche Grabeskunst*, Bonn 1957; Th. Klauser, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der christlichen Kunst*: JbAC 2 (1959) 115-131; 3 (1960) 112-133; L. de Bruyne, *Les Lois de l'art paléochrétien comme instrument herméneutique*: RivAC 39 (1963) 12ff.; E. Sauser, *Frühchristliche Kunst*, Innsbruck-Vienna-Munich 1966, 368-377; P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri in Roma*, Bologna 1966, 266ff. (bibl.); F. Bisconti, *Contributo all'interpretazione dell'atteggiamento di orante*: VetChr 17 (1980) 17-27 (bibl.); V. Saxer, *"Il étendit les mains à l'heure de sa Passion": le thème de l'orant dans la littérature chrétienne des II^e et III^e siècles*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 335-365. For the examples cited in the text, see F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden Baden 1958; C.R. Morey, *The Gold Glass in the Vatican Library with Additional Catalogue of Other Gold Glass Collections*, Vatican City 1959; C. Carletti, *I tre giovani Ebrei di Babilonia nell'arte cristiana antica*, Brescia 1975; U.M. Fasola, *La catacomba di s. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; U. Broccoli, *La diocesi di Roma: Corpus della scultura altomedievale*, VII, 5, *Il Suburbio*, 1, Spoleto 1981; TIP 235-236; A. Donati - G. Gentili, *Deomene. L'immagine dell'orante fra Oriente e Occidente*, Milan 2001.

A.M. Giuntella

ORATIO CYPRIANI. Two prayers exist with this title, wrongly attributed to *Cyprian of Carthage and to the legendary *Cyprian of Antioch. They are two prayers, preserved in *Latin, to be freed from

*sin, from the devil and from sickness, i.e., for health of body and *soul. The Greek original was published by Th. Schermann (*Die griech. Kyprianosgebete*: OC 3 [1903] 303-323). The first bears the title *Oratio I Cypriani antiocheni pro martyribus,* and begins with the angelic trisagion *Hagios*: the whole is at once a profession of faith and an invocation. Biblical names appear in it (Tobias, Daniel etc.). It has recently been recognized as a source of inspiration for symbolic figures painted in the catacombs (H. Leclercq, DACL 12, 2230). The *Oratio II Cypriani quam dixit sub die passionis suae* is full of examples of answered prayer. It gives an impression of being a series of exorcisms invoking God against the infernal powers.

CPL 67 (p. 14); PL 4, 985-999; 101, 567-569; CSEL III, 3, 144-151; DACL 12, 2324-2345; A. Wilmart: RBen 48 (1936) 281, note 1; A. Di Berardino, *Patrologia* III, 298; K. Michel, *Gebet und Bild in früchristlicher Zeit*, I, Leipzig 1902, 53-63; G. Philippart, *Orationes Cypriani*: AB 91 (1973) 298. For the value of this type of prayer in hagiographical literature, see B. de Gaiffier, *Études critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie*, Subsidia Hagiographica 43, Brussels 1967, 58-60; R. Gryson - D. Szmatula, *Les commentaires patristiques sur Isaïe, d'Origène à Jérôme*: REAug 36 (1990) 3-41 (*orationes* pp. 22-24).

L. Dattrino

ORDER – ORDINATION. Basing themselves on the apostolic writings, the ecclesiastical writers consider Christ's priesthood to be the one priesthood, in which ordained *ministers and the faithful participate. Many authors speak in this way, including *Origen (*Hom. in Lev.* IX, 1: GCS VI, 417-419), *Clement of Alexandria (*Adumbratio in I Pt.*: PG 9, 730), *Ambrose of Milan (*Expos. in Lc.* V, 33; VIII, 52: PL 15, 1645, 1781), *Augustine of Hippo (*Civ. Dei* XX, 10: PL 41, 676; CCL 48, 717-718) and *Leo the Great (*Serm. IV*, 1: CCL 138, 14). At the same time they make a clear distinction between ordained ministers and the faithful, starting with *Justin who distinguishes ἀδελφοί from προεστός and διάκονοι (1 *Apol.* 65: PG 6, 428). *Tertullian makes the same distinction (*Bapt.* 27: CCL 1, 291-292; *De praescr.* 32,41: CCL 1, 212-213, 221-222; *De virginibus velandis*, 9: CSEL 2, 1218-1219). *Hippolytus of Rome, in his ritual for ordination, states it with the utmost clarity (*Trad. Apost.*, ed. B. Botte 1963, pp. 7-20), and ps.-*Dionysius repeats it in his *De eccles. Hier.* (V, 1-6: PG 3, 500-505; SC 58, 10-103).

The same distinction appears very early within the hierarchy itself; e.g., in *Hermas (*Vis.* III, 5,1: SC 53, 110-112) and still more in *Ignatius of Antioch (*Magn.* 3,7; Funk 2, 116; *Trall.* 2,3; Funk 2, 96; *Philad.* 3,7; Funk 2, 170, 174, 184), who also specifies that the faithful are subject to the bishop, the priest and the deacon (*Eph.* 2,4,20; Funk 2, 236, 240, 256; *Magn.* 2,3, 6,13; Funk 2, 114, 130; *Trall.* 2,13; Funk 2, 94, 112, etc.). This distinction became more and more firmly established.

On the other hand, we know that in the West one controversy tended to see the bishop as simply a priest to whom a power had been added. Thus *Ambrosiaster (*In ep. ad Tim. primam* 13,8-10: CSEL 81, 267; *In ep. ad Eph.* 14,11-12: CSEL 81, 98-101). *Jerome in particular defends this thesis (*Ep. ad Evangelum* 116: CSEL 56, 308-312; *Com. in ep. ad Titum* 1,5). *Tertullian, in various places, takes up the mentioned distinctions (*Bapt.* 17: CCL 1, 291-292; *De praescr.* 32: CCL 1, 1218-1219), and *Cyprian too mentions them in his letters (*Ep.* 5,1: CSEL 3, 478; *Ep.* 17: CSEL 3, 521; *Ep.* 18: CSEL 3, 523; *Ep.* 23: CSEL 3, 568). Though from the beginning the Fathers distinguish an ordained hierarchy from the faithful, they are not so clear when they distinguish between ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος. *Clement of Rome, e.g., calls those who hold power at Corinth πρεσβύτεροι (*1 Cor* 47,6; 44,2; 47,1: Funk 1, 160, 170-171). *Theodore of Mopsuestia seeks to explain the progressive distinction between ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος, esp. in his *Commentary on I Tim.* In small communities the πρεσβύτερος did a bit of everything and for this reason was called ἐπίσκοπος. Later, only those would be called bishops who had the power of *laying-on of hands (χειροτονεῖν), and they were indicated by this name. They were responsible for a province and bore the name of *apostle.

After the death of the apostles, their successors bore the name of ἐπίσκοποι (Theod. Mops., *In Tim.* III, 8: ed. Swete 2, 117-126). It is interesting to note that it was apparently *Irenaeus of Lyons who, for the first time in the West, called a local bishop ἐπίσκοπος (*Adv. haer.* 3,3,1: SC 211, 31). Hippolytus shows us above all the "great priest," the bishop: this name clearly indicates that he constitutes the first order, and the priest shares a part of these powers. The place Hippolytus assigns to the deacon—who was ordained to serve the bishop not just in performing the liturgy but for every concrete need of the life of the ecclesial community—offers us a theology of the diaconate whose richness would later, and quite quickly, be lost from sight; already by the 5th c. the deacon had only, and almost exclusively, a liturgical function. We have proof of this decline in the formularies for ordination contained in the *Verona sacramentary (*Sacr. Veronense*, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, pp. 120-121, nn. 948-951). If Hippolytus leaves the priest little to do, it is because it is the bishop who usually celebrates the *Eucharist and the other sacraments. The priest celebrates as a delegate of

the bishop, as is openly shown by the rite of *fermentum* in *Ordo romanus* I (M. Andrieu, *Les ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, II, Louvain [2]1960, 61-64). *Innocent I's well-known letter to *Decentius of Gubbio speaks very clearly and distinctly of the rite of *fermentum* (*Ad Decentium Eugubinum* 5: PL 56, 516-517; ed. R. Cabié, *La lettre d'Innocent I à Decentius de Gubbio*, Louvain 1973; *Ordo Romanus* II, ed. M. Andrieu, 6). Cyprian describes the custom in *Africa, where the priest celebrates in the bishop's absence (*Ep.* 13,2: CSEL 3/2, 510-511). The offering of the Eucharist is proper to the bishop or the priest, and is never entrusted to the deacon. *Athanasius refines this idea, mentioning a layman in a small village where there was no priest, who had been permitted to celebrate the Eucharist (*Apol. c. arian.*: PG 25, 269).

A certain theological exploration of the matter unfortunately issued in a form of legalism, to the extent that the Council of *Serdica (343) required anyone being consecrated bishop to be first, for a certain length of time, lector, deacon or presbyter (Mansi 3, 4). Luckily, as we know, these legal prescriptions were not really observed until later: St. Ambrose's consecration as bishop is a case in point. As for rites of ordination, from the **Apostolic Tradition* through the Roman sacramentaries to the 10th-c. Romano-German Pontifical, we find only laying-on of hands and a consecratory prayer (*Pontificale romano-germanico del X secolo*, ed. 1972, C. Vogel - R. Elze, ST 269, Vatican City, I, 1972, 20-36; 205-226). Laying-on of hands was considered the essential rite of ordination, and it was frequently indicated as conferring the grace of the *Holy Spirit and the power received from the bishop to communicate it to others (Basil., *Ep.* 188, 1: PG 32, 668). In the Antiochene-Constantinopolitan area, perhaps before the mid-4th c., episcopal consecration called for the laying of the open book of the gospels on the head of the ordinand. This rite, which accompanied the laying-on of hands and sometimes replaced it, is attested to ca. 380 by the *Const. apost.* VIII, 4,6 (Metzger III, 142), and in the early 5th c. by *Severian of Gabala (*Hom. de legislatore*: PG 56, 404, 10-13) and by *Palladius (*Dialogus de vita Chrysostomi* 16: Malingrey - Leclercq 1988, 302). Jerome, in expressing his thought on the episcopate, makes the ordination of a bishop consist only in the choice of a simple priest who is made to sit on a higher seat (*Ep. 146 ad Evangelum*: PL 22, 1194; CSEL 56, 316). The Latin fathers, therefore, give no indication of other rites than that of laying-on of hands; the other rites appear only in the 10th c. with the Romano-German Pontifical.

Though St. Augustine says much about the grades of the hierarchy, on the rites he repeats what his predecessors had written; more than once, however, esp. in his letters, he insists on the need for irreproachable moral conduct in those who have received orders (*Ep.* 21: PL 33, 38; CSEL 88, 112; *Ep.* 22: PL 33, 90; CSEL 88, 113-119). But he does not deny the validity of orders conferred by an unworthy, heretical or schismatic minister. His anti-*Donatist works try to explain the respective roles of the minister, the sacrament as such and the faith of the subject. What is said of baptism is applicable to the other sacraments, which must be considered valid even if conferred outside the church (*Bapt.* III, 17,22: PL 43, 149; CSEL 51, 213-214; ibid. III, 17,23: PL 43, 150; CSEL 51, 214-215). An expression in *Bapt.* sums up Augustine's theological opinion on the validity of the sacrament: *non cogitandum quis det, sed quid det* (*Bapt.* IV, 10,16: PL 43, 164; CSEL 51, 240). St. *Leo, and with him many other ecclesiastical writers, followed this Augustinian doctrine on ordinations conferred outside the church (Leo the Great, *Ep.* 12,6: PL 54, 653). Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus* and *De doctrina christiana* give the same doctrine.

We should not overlook the influence exercised by *Gregory the Great. His *Liber regulae pastoralis,* which had considerable success and was even translated into Greek, took up the Augustinian doctrine on ordination conferred on a subject whose moral conduct before ordination left something to be desired, invoking the theology of baptism: *Sicut baptizatus semel baptizari iterum non debet, ita qui consecratus est semel in eodem ordine iterum non valet consecrari* (*Ep.* 46: PL 77, 585). For the doctrine pertaining to the validity of the sacrament of orders conferred by a heretic, we cannot here go into the controversies of the 8th c. and later, but in general the Augustinian doctrine was adhered to. On the other hand, the Roman council of 769 invalidated all ordinations made by the usurping Pope Constantine (Mansi 12, 701). The same case was repeated with Hincmar of Reims, resolved through the intervention of Nicholas I, for the ordinations conferred by Ebo, bishop of the same city. The decisions of the Council of Soissons (853) on this matter followed the Augustinian line, as did the theological position adopted to resolve the problem of the ordinations conferred by Pope Formosus. On this occasion Auxilius, in ca. 911, provided a patristic document: *De ordinationibus papae Formosi,* and a dialogue titled *Infensor et defensor*: small works summing up the Augustinian doctrine for unworthy bishops or a usurping pope (*De ordinationibus* 19.20.25.26: PL 129, 1060-

1074; *Infensor et defensor* 5-6: PL 129, 1082). These problems returned to the fore in various minor episodes and were usually resolved by following the Augustinian doctrine on baptism and ordination.

A. Michel, *Ordre*: DTC 11, 1275-1286; var. aus., *Études sur le sacrement de l'Ordre*, Paris 1957; J. Lécuyer, *Épiscopat et presbytérat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte de Rome*: RecSR 41 (1953) 30-50; Id., *Le sacerdoce dans le mystère du Christ*, Paris 1967 (ch. 13, *Les successeurs des Apôtres et le sacrement de l'Ordre*, 339-392. *Évêque et prêtre*, 393-410); J. Colson, *Ministre de Jésus Christ ou Sacerdoce de l'évangile*, Paris 1966 (awareness in the subapostolic period 211-346; patristic index 367-374); A. Lemaire, *Les ministères aux origines de l'Église*, Paris 1971; R.D. Dupuy, *Mysterium salutis*, 8, Brescia 1975, 618-647; A. Santantoni, *L'ordinazione episcopale*, SA 69, Rome 1976; J. Lécuyer, *Le sacrement de l'Ordre*, Paris 1983; Y. Congar, *Ordinations* invitus, coactus, *de l'Église antique au canon 214*: RSPh 50 (1966) 169-197; P. van Beneden, *Aux origines d'une terminologie sacramentelle.* Ordo, ordinare, ordinatio *dans la littérature chrétienne avant 313*, Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense, Louvain 1974; C. Vogel, *Ordinations inconsistantes et caractère inamissible*, Études d'histoire du culte et des institutions chrétiennes 1, Turin 1978; E.J. Kilmartin, *Ministère et ordination dans l'Église chrétienne primitive*: La MaisonD 138 (1979) 49-92; P.F. Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches*, New York 1990; A. Faivre, *Ordonner la fraternité. Pouvoir d'innover et retour à l'ordre dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1992; A. Santantonini - S. Parenti, *Gli ordini sacri e i ministeri*, in A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Scientia liturgica*, IV, Casale Monf. 1998, 209-240; H. Brakmann, *Die altkirchlichen Ordinationsgebete*: JbAc 47 (2004) 108-127.

A. NOCENT

ORDINES ROMANI. While the sacramentary—the celebrant's text—contains the euchological formulary of the Christian rites, the *ordines,* which serve as a guide to the master of ceremonies, offer a detailed exposition of the rites, and are an indispensable supplement to the sacramentary. The *Ordines romani* also often indicate the *Incipit* and *Explicit* of the readings. Before being gathered in collections, the *ordines* existed as separate booklets, each one intended for a specific function. This was also true of the *Ordines romani*. They were preserved, and willingly called *Romani,* thanks to the religious policy of the Carolingian sovereigns Pepin the Short and Charlemagne, who introduced the Roman *liturgy into their domains. To attain this end, however, they had to seek a compromise with *Gallican customs. To this period (early 9th c.) go back the oldest MSS of the *ordines*: among them can be distinguished those in which the Roman rites have preserved their original purity, and those in which Frankish customs had been adapted, collections A (ca. 700–750) and B (early 9th c.) in Andrieu's edition. Besides the 50 *Ordines romani* (from the 8th to 11th c.) published by Andrieu, others have been found.

I-X: papal and episcopal mass.
XI: baptismal ritual.
XII-XIV: order of songs and readings.
XV-XIX: order of the monastic liturgy.
XX-XXXIII: various celebrations of the liturgical year.
XXXIV-XL: sacred ordinations.
XLI-XLIV: dedication-consecration of churches.
XLV-LXVIII: coronation of the emperor.
XLIX: funerals.
L: *Ordo romanus antiquus* (part of the 10th-c. Romano-German Pontifical of Mainz).

The most important of the *Ordines romani* is no. I, which describes the liturgy of the stational Mass celebrated by the pope in the 6th–7th c., and which is at the beginning of the history of the Roman Mass. The *Ordines romani* lost their function when the rubrics were included in the sacramentaries or, conversely, when the *ordines* also included the prayers. A central role was played by the Romano-German Pontifical written in St. Alban's at Mainz (ca. 950–963).

CPL 1998-2007; LMA 6, 1437-1439; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* 1, Milan [3]1964, 332-337; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, Washington, D.C. 1986, 135-224; A.-G. Martimort, *Les "Ordines," les Ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, Turnhout 1991; E. Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques. Le Moyen Âge. Des origines au XIII[e] siècle*, Paris 1993, 187-196; J. Nebel, *Die Entwicklung des römischen Messritus im ersten Jahrtausend anhand der Ordines Romani*, Thesis ad Lauream n. 264, Pont. Athenaeum S. Anselmi de Urbe, Pont. Inst. Liturgicum, Rome 2000.

V. SAXER - S. HEID

ORIENTATION. *See* *EAST – ORIENTATION

ORIENTIUS (early 5th c.). Author of a poetic composition subdivided into two books of 518 distichs (309 + 209), called *Commonitorium* by its first editor, Delrio, in the 17th c. The author's name, otherwise unknown, is given at the end (*Comm.* 2,417). The first to mention him was *Venantius Fortunatus in the 6th c. (*Vita s. Martini* 1,17: PL 88, 366), who places him between *Prudentius and *Sedulius. Orientius certainly lived in *Gaul (*Comm.* 2,184), which was devastated by the numerous barbarian incursions of the early 5th c., of which he speaks amply, without naming the invaders (*Comm.* 2,165-202). He wrote after 405/407; the invasions caused in him feelings of horror and desperation. We know three biographies of an Orientius, bishop of Augusta Ausciorum (= Auch in Gascony), and everything suggests an identification with the author of the *Commonitorium*. The work is a long exhortation to live a fully Christian life. To this end he also teaches the

fragility of human things, the importance of the worship of God and right conduct of life in view of the heavenly kingdom. He denounces the various vices that were widespread in his milieu. The moral aspect predominates in his work, which could also be defined as a long sermon in verse. The work abounds in descriptions. In the only MSS of the *Commonitorium* there are also various other poetical works, almost certainly not by Orientius. These are *De nativitate Domini, De epithetis Salvatoris, De Trinitate, Explanatio nominum Domini, Laudatio* (these last three are thought to form a single literary work) and two *Orationes*.

CPL 1465-1468; PL 61, 977-1006; R. Ellis: CSEL 16, 1 (1881) 191-261; L. Bellanger, Paris-Toulouse 1903 (with Fr. tr.); M.D. Tobin: PSt 74 (1945) (with Eng. tr.); C.A. Rapisarda, Catania 1958, [2]1970; Id., It. tr. in NDid 10 (1960) XII-36, and Catania 1970.

Studies: Bibl. in Patrologia III, 310; L. Bellanger, *Études sur le poème d'Orientus*, Toulouse 1902; Id., *Le poème d'Orientus*, Paris-Toulouse 1903 (revision and enlarging of the previous work); C.A. Rapisarda, *Introduzione critica ad Orienzio con bibliografia*: NDid 8 (1958) 1-78; DSp 11, 903-906; P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris [3]1964, 98-101, 145-146, 339-347; P.M. Duval, *Les sources de l'histoire de France*, I, Paris 1974, 701-702; K. Smolak, *Poetische Ausdrücke im sogenannten ersten Gebet des Orientus*: WS 87 (1974) 188-200; D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Emendations of the Commonitorium of Orientius*: Classical Philology 72 (1977) 130-133; V. Tandoi, *Noterelle orienziane*: Vichiana n.s. 13 (1984) 199-210; M.G. Bianco, *Il Commonitorium di Orienzio. Un protrettico alla conversione nella Gallia del V secolo*: AFLM 20 (1987) 33-68; N. Adkin, *Orientius and Jerome*: SE 34 (1994) 165-174; S. Blomgren, *In Commonitorium Orientii adnotatiunculae*: Eranos 94 (1996) 1-4; LACL3 527-528.

A. Di Berardino

ORIGEN (ca. 185–ca. 254)

I. Life - II. Works - III. Character of Origen's thought - IV. The exegete - V. The spiritual person - VI. The speculative theologian.

Origen is, with *Cyprian, the pre-Nicene author about whom we possess the greatest amount of biographical data, which is scarce in his works, but abundant in book VI of *Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History,* to which we can add the information provided by *Jerome and *Photius from lost works of Eusebius. His relations with his pupils and his teaching programs are described in *Gregory Thaumaturgus's *Panegyric to Origen*.

I. Life. Origen, surnamed Adamantius, man of steel, or of diamond, was born of a Christian family, probably at *Alexandria. His father, *Leonides, gave him a particularly thorough education, Greek and biblical. In 202 Leonides suffered martyrdom during *Septimius Severus's persecution, and the family's goods were confiscated. Some months later Origen opened a school of grammar (i.e., literature) so as to maintain his mother and six younger brothers; Bishop *Demetrius put him in charge of instructing *catechumens, while some Egyptian prefects continued the persecution. For some time he kept up this dual teaching role; then, probably when his family no longer needed his help, he gave up teaching secular culture to dedicate himself entirely to catechesis. Urged by the radicalism which characterized his youth, he sold all the MSS in his possession for a petty sum, a gesture which seems to indicate a renunciation of all but the knowledge of God; apostolic demands, however, made him return to what he had abandoned, and to deepen his philosophical knowledge, he followed the courses of *Ammonius Saccas, the father of *Neoplatonism. He lived a life of extreme austerity and, taking Mt 19:12 literally, castrated himself. Having obtained great success in his teaching, he put *Heraclas in charge of catechesis proper, reserving for himself the students most eager to make progress, also maintaining contacts with *heretics and pagans. At age 30 he began to write, urged by Ambrose, a wealthy Alexandrian whom he had brought back from *Valentinianism to *orthodoxy. Ambrose had been drawn to *gnosis, not finding in the great church the intellectual nourishment he craved. Converted by Origen, he persuaded his teacher to produce what he had lacked, putting considerable means at his disposal. During this first period living in Alexandria, Origen made many journeys: to *Rome, where he seems to have heard *Hippolytus preach; to Palestinian *Caesarea, where Bishop *Theoctistus, like *Alexander of Jerusalem, allowed him to preach although a layman, provoking a protest from Demetrius; to Roman Arabia (Jordan), called there by the governor; finally, to Antioch with a military escort, summoned by Julia Mammaea—mother of the emperor *Alexander Severus—who wished to be informed about Christianity.

The bishops of *Achaia ca. 231 invited Origen to *Athens to dispute with groups of heretics. On his way through *Caesarea in Palestine, Theoctistus and Alexander ordained him priest. On his return to Alexandria, Demetrius, annoyed by an ordination carried out without requesting his consent, called a council of bishops and priests who exiled Origen from *Egypt; then Demetrius, supported by some bishops, declared him deposed from the priesthood. Saddened, Origen withdrew to Caesarea, where he was welcomed by his Palestinian friends and where, as in many other provinces of the East, Demetrius's sentence was ignored. Origen resumed teaching,

and from Gregory's panegyric to him, we know something of his teaching in that city: a type of school that was more a "missionary" course of study for young pagan sympathizers, developed with the aim of presenting the Christian version of philosophical problems, without yet teaching Christian doctrine proper. Origen preached frequently, and we have many of his homilies. His literary activities remained considerable, since Ambrose joined him at Caesarea with stenographers and copyists. He traveled often: to Athens, where he began his *Commentary on the Song of Songs;* to *Arabia (Jordan) where, during a synod, he brought Bishop *Beryllus of Bostra back to orthodoxy and where he disputed with a group of Christians who asserted that the *soul died with the body and was raised with it; to *Nicomedia, where he dictated his letter to *Julius Africanus; to *Cappadocia, called there by Bishop *Firmilian. Perhaps it was in Arabia that a small council met around Bishop *Heraclides; its proceedings were discovered in 1941 at Tura in Egypt. In 250, this overflowing and multiform activity was abruptly ended by *Decius's persecution: imprisoned and tortured, Origen courageously proclaimed his faith. What they desired was not his death but his apostasy, which, as the most outstanding Christian figure of his time, would have had a considerable effect. The emperor's death restored him to freedom within a few months, but in broken health. He died soon after, aged 69, probably in 254. His tomb was still visible in the 13th c. at *Tyre, in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

II. Works. Origen was probably the most prolific author of Antiquity, pagan or Christian: the list of his works given by Jerome in letter 33 to Paula, though incomplete, is astonishing. His *Hexapla* set down the whole text of the OT in six columns: Hebrew, in Hebrew and Greek characters; the four Greek versions of Aquila, *Symmachus, the Septuagint and *Theodotion; for some books he had supplementary versions, called Fifth, Sixth, Seventh; the additions and lacunae of each text he represented with graphic signs borrowed from Alexandrian grammarians. He also commented, by different methods, on much of the Bible. Of his learned commentaries we possess, in Greek, nine books on John and eight on Matthew; in Rufinus's *Latin version, ten books on Romans and four on Song of Songs; an anonymous Latin translator gives us the whole second half of the commentary on Matthew. About 300 homilies are preserved: in Greek, on Jeremiah and on Saul and the Witch of Endor; in Rufinus's Latin version, on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, the birth of Samuel, Psalms 36, 37 and 38; in Jerome's Latin version, on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Song of Songs, Luke, as well as homilies on various psalms, until now attributed to Jerome himself, but which he only translated. Origen also wrote many **scholia* (brief exegetical notes on scriptural passages); such *scholia* were often made into collections. They are hard to identify today in the mass of innumerable short or long fragments from lost commentaries or homilies. These fragments have come down to us in one of three ways. We possess two collections of excerpts: the *Apologia for Origen* in six books (only book I remains, in Rufinus's Latin translation), composed by the martyr *Pamphilus of Caesarea with the help of the historian Eusebius, defends Origen from the accusations made against him in the 3rd and 4th c., and cites numerous other texts of his, many cited nowhere else; while the *Philocalia of Origen,* surviving in Greek, contains extracts collected by *Gregory of Nazianzus and *Basil of Caesarea for a veiled apologetic motive. We also find many fragments attributed to Origen in the exegetical **catenae*, compilations of patristic interpretations on a book of Scripture, which thus form a verse-by-verse commentary. Finally, Origen is very often cited by later authors accusing or defending him. In addition, Jerome tells us that his own commentaries on the Pauline Epistles Galatians, Ephesians, Titus and Philemon closely follow Origen's corresponding commentaries, now lost save for fragments.

A second group of works, though not declaredly exegetical, give plenty of room to Scripture. *De principiis,* or *Peri Archōn,* the source of posthumous accusations against Origen, is the first Christian attempt at theological reflection to start from the *regula fidei* and rely on Scripture and reason: it survives entirely only in Rufinus's Latin translation; one seventh of it is preserved in Greek in the *Philocalia,* and some fragments are cited by Jerome, *Justinian and other authors. The other works survive in Greek: *De oratione* (*Peri Euchēs*), with a commentary on the Lord's Prayer; *Exhortatio ad martyrium,* addressed to Ambrose when he was in danger of being arrested during the persecution of *Maximinus Thrax; the *Dispute with Heraclides,* rediscovered at Tura (see above); *Contra Celsum,* a refutation in eight books of the attack by the philosopher *Celsus in his anti-Christian *True Doctrine,* and the most important apologetic work of Christian Antiquity. Fragments survive, Greek and Latin, of other lost works such as *De resurrectione* and *Stromata*. Of Origen's abundant correspondence, two complete letters remain, to Julius Africanus and Gregory Thaumaturgus, and fragments of some others.

The greater part of Origen's immense work has not escaped the ravages of time and the persecuting violence of the emperor *Justinian. What remains still has considerable breadth, but the greater part consists only of Latin translations and fragments. This raises important critical problems, since his translators Rufinus and Jerome did not just translate, but paraphrased, aiming by their translations to fit the texts into the Latin thought-world; and the fragments in the *catenae* often consist of summaries made by the catenists, who sought to retain the main ideas. The result of this procedure was certainly not satisfactory, esp. in *De Principiis,* since Rufinus on one side and Jerome and Justinian on the other translated or chose passages acc. to the opposed positions they took up in the Origenist dispute; even the texts preserved in the *Philocalia* underwent cuts.

III. Character of Origen's thought. Later we will look at the accusations, mostly unfounded, made against Origen's thought after his death. His accusers, however, have some excuse. First, the historical mentality which tries to place a writer in his own time is a relatively recent acquirement—even today we cannot say it is all that widespread among theologians; the same with the idea of a development of dogma or, rather, of the church's awareness of revelation. Second, Origen himself never troubles to "define" his theological thought. He depends heavily on the biblical text he is commenting on and follows it step by step, not bothering to counterbalance it immediately with complementary statements, which will be found elsewhere, in the interpretation of another text. In the theorizing contained in *De Principiis,* he often examines two or even three different solutions, which he seeks to expound in all their clarity, often leaving the conclusion to the reader. For this reason, while studying him we must keep in mind the whole of his work, at least what remains of it: we can then see that the different passages balance each other, making up a theology full of tension and nuances which generally turns out to be orthodox. He must never be judged on an isolated text, since this expresses only a partial aspect which, taken alone, is unilateral and hence heterodox. But his detractors from the 4th c. had neither the time, nor the patience, nor the will to study him in this way. The need to "define," which appears in the many councils provoked by the *Arian crisis, from *Nicaea to *Constantinople, with their various formulas of faith, arose both from the influence of Roman law, which, from the time of Constantine, assimilated the rule of faith more and more to the civil law, and from the need, against heretics, to enunciate doctrine in the clearest and most complete terms possible, so as to leave the enemy no loophole. The resulting mentality created the most adverse conditions possible for understanding and judging Origen fairly. We must also bring out another essential point: in all his works, Origen is simultaneously an exegete, a spiritual man and a speculative theologian. We cannot understand his *exegesis and his speculation if we forget that they are the product of a spiritual man, since they are informed by the preeminence of the spiritual element, as is the cosmology of *De Principiis*. And vice versa: his spirituality and his theology are those of an exegete; he has made theology of his exegesis and his spirituality. Many distortions of his thought by modern criticism come from ignorance of this spiritual element. Also, Origen knew the philosophy and science of his time very well, and taught it, as we see in the program illustrated in the *Panegyric*. But he himself was not a philosopher: he used philosophy as a theologian. As for science, he used it to explain the literal meaning of Scripture; as he did with philology, which he knew from his Alexandrian education.

IV. The exegete. Origen is, together with Jerome, the greatest critical exegete (the *Hexapla*) and the greatest literal exegete of Antiquity. He possessed inexhaustible curiosity about the different readings found in MSS of both the OT and NT, and pointed them out in his commentaries and even in his homilies: but, for him as for all the Fathers before Jerome, the Greek text took precedence over the Hebrew, since it was the one the *apostles had given to the church. His explanations of the literal meaning are always accurate, helped by philology and by all the disciplines of his time, and using his knowledge of Hebrew customs and exegesis, which he gained by cultivating relationships with rabbis. Many have been scandalized by his statement in *De Principiis* IV, 2,5 that some texts have no valid literal sense. But for Origen, the literal sense means the material meaning of the letter, not, as for us, the meaning which the sacred author wished to express. Consequently, when the Bible speaks in figurative language, which it does frequently, it cannot be reduced to a literal meaning in Origen's sense. If we examine the cases of this sort which we find in the *Homilies on the Hexateuch,* we will see that they arise either from errors of interpretation of the Septuagint (which was, as we said, the text of the church for the Fathers before Jerome, and not the Hebrew text even when that was known) or from the fact that, in relatively rare cases, Origen has failed to properly situate himself in the literal, literary, psychological or historical context. But these in-

stances develop from details of little importance, and Origen believed much more in the historicity of scriptural passages than the most conservative of contemporary exegetes: see his defense of the historicity of *Noah's ark against the objections of the Marcionite *Apelles, who rightly said that the dimensions given would not allow room for so many animals (*Hom. Gen.* 11,2; *C. Cels.* IV, 31). In some NT events, such as the theophany of Jesus' baptism, Jesus' temptation etc., he rightly sees a sensible expression of a spiritual vision.

But if it was for us Christians that Scripture, including the OT, was composed (1 Cor 10:11), the *Holy Spirit did not do so just with regard to the literal meaning: otherwise the legal and ceremonial prescriptions of the old covenant abolished by Christ ought to be eliminated from the Bible, along with those narratives which, in the pastoral perspective in which Origen places them, are of interest only for the teaching which can be drawn from them. The meaning intended by the Spirit is the spiritual one, which Origen finds in the NT and in the earlier tradition, but of which he himself is the great theorist. The OT is only revelation in that it is, in its entirety, a prophecy of Christ, and exegesis must show that Christ is its key. NT exegesis applies what is said of Christ to every Christian and shows, in Christ's actions, the prophecy and anticipated possession of the eschatological blessings. Christ's first coming is both the fulfillment of the time which preceded it and the prophecy of his second coming; the difference between the "temporal gospel" as lived here on earth and the "eternal gospel" (Rev 14:16) of beatitude does not lie in ὑπόστασις, "substance," since there is only one gospel, but in ἐπίνοια, in the human manner of considering things, since we see only "through a glass darkly" what we will see "face-to-face": yet even now we possess the "true goods," and all the sacramentalism that characterizes the time of the church is found in germ in this distinction.

Despite the incomprehension it would meet from the 16th c. on, this type of exegesis is essential to Christian dogma, since, if revelation is Christ, the OT is not as a whole revelation if it does not, as a whole, speak of Christ. We can certainly criticize Origen's exegesis for not taking the human author sufficiently into account, in the persuasion that the Holy Spirit is the author of Scripture; and, since the exegesis of Scripture must be worthy of God, for seeking a meaning in every detail, often resulting in an arbitrary procedure, compensated by the beauty and spiritual wealth of many of his expositions. But into the pattern we have described are woven many influences, biblical, rabbinic, Philonian, Hellenic, *gnostic etc., which give Origenian exegesis an extremely complex character. There has been no lack of attempts at classification. Above all, the theory of triple meaning goes back to Origen himself (*De Principiis* IV, 2,4), in which the meanings correspond to the divisions of his trichotomic *anthropology: the corporeal or literal meaning, the psychical or moral meaning, and the spiritual or mystical meaning. H. de Lubac (*Exégèse médiévale* I/1, 198-211) traces the doctrine of the fourfold meaning, first enunciated by *John Cassian, back to Origen's practice: literal meaning, allegorical meaning (affirmation of Christ as the center of history), tropological meaning (concerning the Christian's behavior after Christ's coming), anagogical meaning (giving a presentiment of the eschatological blessings). Some modern authors distinguish "typology" from "allegory," understanding the latter in a different sense from that of the doctrine of the fourfold meaning: interpretation which conforms to the horizontal, progressive and linear conception of Christian time is "typological"; exegesis which supposes, above the actual world, a divine or angelic world which it reflects in some way is "allegorical." This distinction is legitimate if it refers to different literary forms: what is not acceptable is the value judgment on "allegory," which is accused of not being Christian. In fact, "allegorical" exegeses of this type are not rare in the NT, and if Christian time is sacramental it implies, in addition to the horizontal dimension, a vertical dimension which manifests the fact that the eschatological realities are already present in the actual world.

V. The spiritual person. The spiritual teaching is present throughout every exegetical work. Origen's ascetic and moral conceptions are still largely unstudied. Spiritual combat dominates his anthropology and his angelology. Humanity is at once spirit (πνεῦμα), soul and body: *pneuma* is the gift God gives to each one to guide him or her in knowledge, prayer and virtue. But the soul is dual: its higher part, mind (νοῦς) or heart, is educated by *pneuma* and is the faculty of the soul which receives grace; the lower part, "flesh" or "thought of the flesh" (*Rom* 8,6-7), corresponds in some measure to the concupiscence which attracts the person toward the body. Moreover, the soul is urged by angels and demons who are behind their army commanders, Christ and Satan. We find in Origen a fairly complete doctrine, scattered here and there in pages of exegesis, on martyrdom, on virginity or chastity, on virtue and the virtues, on sin and on all that Christian *ascesticism implies.

Origen was the originator of many mystical themes that would be taken up by his successors. To the traditional, collective exegesis of the bride of the Song of Songs as representing the church, he added an exegesis that applied to the individual Christian soul. He compared Is 49:2 to Song 2:5, thus creating the image of the arrow and wound of love. Because Christ's *incarnation produces its effects in everyone, he must also be born and grow in every soul. Spiritual ascent, through prayer and virtue, is represented by the apostles' ascent of the mountain, on whose summit Jesus appeared to them in his divinity, which appeared through his humanity: the transfiguration is the symbol of the highest knowledge that the human being can have, here below, of God and his Son. The spiritual senses which develop in those who progress allow them, in analogy with the five bodily senses, to know intuitively and innately the divine realities to which they had earlier adhered by faith. This innate character comes about with the development of their participation in God's image, the Word, which persons received at the moment of their creation and which they make grow in themselves by Christian life and by the practice of the virtues—since only like knows like—until they reach the "likeness" of beatitude which coincides with perfect vision.

Knowledge has for its object the mysteries, those of visible and invisible beings, those of the relations within the *Trinity, all unified in the person of the Son, mystery par excellence, image of the Father, intelligible World: in him are found the plans and germs of creation in that he is God's wisdom. The mystery is understood in the light communicated by the divine persons, where the Son, adapting himself in various ways acc. to each one's capacity, becomes food which nourishes the person with the divine nature, which the Son receives constantly from the Father; he is a wine which rejoices the soul, filling it with sweetness, delight, "enthusiasm," i.e., the feeling experienced through the divine presence. Knowledge is the meeting between the divine freedom that gives itself and the human freedom that receives: God does not take possession of the person against his will, in an ecstasy that would take away his fundamental conscience and freedom, since only the devil acts in such a way, in those possessed and in those in the grip of a passion. Knowledge has as its usual beginning point the exegesis of Scripture, meditated upon in renunciation of sin and of the world and in purity of heart: faith is its necessary beginning, but its object becomes ever more present to the five spiritual senses, and perfectly understood, knowledge is indistinguishable from love, in union: "Adam knew Eve, his wife" (Gen 4:1). The esotericism of which Origenian spirituality has been wrongly accused is really a matter of not giving a soul something which it could not support and which would damage it: a rule common to all spiritual directors. Similarly, to accuse him of an aristocratic vision would be to forget that he expounded all these arguments in homilies preached to all the Christians of Caesarea, exhorting his hearers to make progress in order to know. Remember too that Origen often manifests a profoundly affective devotion to Christ, and that in his works we find some evidence, few but clear, of a personal mystical experience.

VI. The speculative theologian. Origen's theology is inseparable from his exegesis and his spiritual teaching and is inspired by them. He remains faithful to the *regula fidei* of his time, which he sets out in the preface to *De Principiis,* and, starting from this, with the help of Scripture, reason, and his own spiritual and pastoral experience, he conducts his research with all modesty, without claiming to dogmatize: *De Principiis* is a theology ἐν γυμνασίᾳ, "in exercise," i.e., in research. In large measure, it is developed in reaction to the heresies of his time. Against the *Marcionites, Origen affirms the goodness of the Creator and his identity with Jesus' Father, as well as the agreement of the two Testaments and the value of the OT. Against the *Valentinians, he affirms free will, personal responsibility and the rejection of predestination seen as a law of nature. Against *docetism, he affirms the authentic humanity assumed by Christ as a condition of redemption. He also opposes two*trinitarian heresies: against the modalists, he proclaims the distinct personality of each person, and against the *adoptionists, the eternal generation of the Word. Finally, the tendencies toward *anthropomorphism, *millenarism and literalism present in the Great Church provide him with the occasion to profess the incorporeality of God, the *soul and the final beatitude, as well as the abolition, in Christ, of the Jewish law in its ceremonial and legal precepts. It would obviously be unjust to criticize him, as his detractors frequently do, for not having foreseen later heresies and for sometimes using in an orthodox sense (as comparison with other texts shows) expressions which later received a heterodox meaning. The philosophy behind his theology is *Middle Platonism, an eclectic *Platonism mixed with a lot of *Stoicism and a little *Aristotelianism. But Origen is not properly a philosopher, because he uses his philosophical knowledge as a theologian.

Regarding the Trinity, Origen seeks to express, in a way that is more dynamic than ontological, the

unity of the persons and the distinct personality of each one. The Father is the source of the divinity that he communicates to the Son in his eternal and continuous generation and to the Spirit, in such a way that the Son is and remains in the Father, as the Father in the Son: the Son remains in the Father even when, in the incarnation, he is on earth with his human soul. We find in Origen, for the first time, concerning the eternity of the Son's generation, the formula οὐκ ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ("There was no time when he was not" [*Peri Archōn* I, 2,9; IV, 4,1, confirmed by *Athanasius, *Com. Rom.* I, 5]). On the other hand, he opposes in the Valentinians their representation of the generation of the Son as *probolē* or *prolatio,* i.e., a representation implying, like human or animal generation, a division of substance. The Father is the first since he is the beginning and since it is he who sends the Son and the Spirit on their mission: this is the essence of Origen's supposed "*subordinationism" which, save for a few clumsy expressions, does not involve an inferiority of power for the other two persons. The Son possesses, in the unity of his person, a multiplicity of titles (ἐπίνοιαι): the different names attributed to him by Scripture, which express the different aspects of his relations with the Father and with humanity. As Wisdom, he is the intelligible World which contains the principles and seeds of beings and all knowledge of mysteries; as Logos, he reveals them, and it is he who carries out the work of creation. The union of the Word with human nature is, in accordance with the doctrine of the preexistence of souls, prior to the incarnation since the Word's human soul was created together with the other souls in preexistence: through its union with the Word it was "in the form of God," impeccable, and so Christ, in his humanity, is the bridegroom of the church, which, in preexistence, was formed of the totality of the other souls. To redeem his fallen bride, he became incarnate in *Mary's womb, and with him the Word. He revealed his divinity to humanity by translating it into a human person. This soul, in the passion, was abandoned as a ransom to Satan and descended into hell, where he freed the souls of the righteous dead and brought them back with him in his ascension. Origen teaches, in his own way, the *hypostatic union and, for the first time, the *communicatio idiomatum*. The Holy Spirit comes from the Father through the Son, who communicates his titles to it: it is the Sanctifier and constitutes the "matter" or "nature" of the charisms which correspond to the "actual graces" of scholastic theology.

Origen works out a doctrine of angels and demons: guardians of individuals or peoples, or overseers of various realms of nature. Humanity has been created, like the angels, in the image of God, the Word: they partake of the existence and divinity of the Father and the filiation and rationality of the Word, all these terms being understood in a sense that is more supernatural than natural. But sin covers God's image in humanity with diabolical or bestial images, which only the Redeemer can overcome. Origen's speculations on resurrected bodies tend to affirm simultaneously their identity with and their otherness from the earthly body, acc. to the Pauline image of the seed and the plant (1 Cor 15:35-44). If Origen does not see Mary as completely exempt from sin, he is the first to affirm clearly her perpetual virginity; he sees in her one of the great "types" of the spiritual person and, acc. to *Socrates (*HE* VII, 32), he called her **Theotokos*. He also works out a precise doctrine on *baptism, the *Eucharist, *penance, *orders and marriage.

What is called Origenism is taken, not from the whole of Origen's theology, which would become the nourishment of the 4th-c. Fathers, but from some speculations in *De Principiis,* deprived of their hypothetical and antithetical character, and systematized by successors. In the absence of a defined ecclesiastical doctrine on the soul, Origen maintains the preexistence of souls, including that of Christ. In the beginning, God created "minds," all equal and immersed in divine contemplation. Slackening of fervor constituted the primitive fault which divided them into angels, human beings and demons: at that time the "minds" cooled down into souls, since ψυχή is connected with ψῦχος, cold. This doctrine, inherited from Plato, provided Origen with a reply to the *Marcionite attacks on God the Creator, since it allowed him to trace the inequality of human beings at birth to a consequence of free will: it also allowed him to avoid the difficulties of the two other replies to the problem of the soul's origin, *traducianism and creationism. In the context of his time, he cannot be called a heretic, since the church had no doctrine on the origin of souls, apart from their creation by God.

In a way corresponding to the equal beginning of all creatures, Origen maintains an equality of their final condition, by their perfect reintegration into the good (= **apokatastasis*). Scripturally, this doctrine is based on 1 Cor 15:24-28, in which passage Origen reads the salvation even of the enemies of Christ, and interprets the annihilation of death as the destruction of the will of enmity which the devil (*De Principiis* III, 6,5) has toward God. *Apokatastasis*, thus understood, is the true hinge of Origen's thought in that it preserves for the one God, against

gnostics and Marcionites, the presence of goodness and justice, considering evil as transitory and punishment as medicinal. So as to not see *apokatastasis* as a necessary process, Origen insists on the fact that, through a long period of purification, every creature will freely choose the good, and for this reason he postulates an unlimited series of worlds, for which he was later reproved. The other errors he was accused of are often contradicted by reliable Greek texts and arose from the a misunderstanding on the part of his accusers or from a subsequent specialization of vocabulary: it was not understood that the world created from all eternity by God is the intelligible world of Platonic "ideas" or Stoic "reasons," designs or seeds of beings, the world contained in the Word, hence created from all eternity by the Father in the generation of the Son. Neither was it understood that the claim that the Son does not see the Father is directed against anthropomorphism and that *see* is used here in its ocular sense: because in fact Origen frequently speculated on the Son's knowledge of the Father. Furthermore, Methodius's accusations about resuscitated bodies arose from a misunderstanding, since he took Origen's use of the word εἶδος in its common meaning of external appearance, while in Origen it indicates a metaphysical principle. Origen cannot have claimed in *De Principiis* to believe in metempsychosis, which he judges absurd in his surviving Greek commentaries, considering it as incompatible with the church's teaching; nor can he have believed in the renewal of Christ's sacrifice in heaven, since in book I of *Com. Jo.* (35 [40], 255), contemporary with *De Principiis,* he clearly affirms its uniqueness. It was also not understood that to apply to Christ the term γενητός, not distinct from γεννητός and κτίσις, which does not have precisely the meaning of creature, does not make the Word a creature. Neither was it understood that his "subordinationism," motivated by his conception of origin and of "economy," remains orthodox, despite some clumsy expressions. Finally, it was not fully understood that by attributing to him the absurd theory of spherical glorious bodies, *Justinian interpreted what Origen said of stars (*De Oratione* XXXI, 3) as referring to risen bodies.

A virtually complete bibl. up to 1969 in H. Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique d'Origène*, La Haye-Steenbrugge 1971: a suppl. up to 1980: ibid. 1982; 1996; A. Monaci Castagno (ed.), *Origene. Dizionario*, Rome 2000.

Editions: In the GCS collection of various authors in 12 vols.; numerous works with text and Fr. tr. in SC; Ch. Delarue's ed. in J.P. Migne's re-edition (PG 11 to 17) with the *Hexapla* and some fragments, published by A. Galland and A. Mai. For the *Philocalia,* ed. Robinson, Cambridge 1893. Fragments on the Pauline Letters in JTS 3 (1902); 9-10 (1908-1909); 13-14 (1912-1913). *Homilies on Ps* in CCL 78 (see V. Peri, *Omelie Origeniane sui Salmi*, Vatican City 1980). See CPG 1410-1525; *Suppl.* 23-31.

General works: DTC 12, 1489-1565; R. Cadiou, *La jeunesse d'Origène*, Paris 1935; J. Daniélou, *Origène*, Paris 1948; P. Nautin, *Origène, sa vie et son œuvre*, Paris 1977; A. Monaci Castagno (ed.), *La biografia di Origene fra storia e agiografia*, Ravenna 2004.

Exegesis: H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit*, Paris 1950; R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, London 1959; R. Gögler, *Zur Theologie des biblischen Wortes bei Origenes*, Düsseldorf 1963; A. Zöllig, *Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes*, Freiburg i.Br. 1902; E. Molland, *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology*, Oslo 1938; G. Lomiento, *L'esegesi origeniana del Vangelo di Luca*, Bari 1966; N. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, Cambridge 1976; H. Crouzel, *Pourquoi Origène refuse-t-il parfois le sens littéral dans ses Homélies sur l'Hexateuque?*: BLE 70 (1969) 241-263; M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004.

Spirituality: W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen 1931; A. Lieske, *Die Theologie der Logosmystik bei Origenes*, Münster 1938; P. Bertrand, *Mystique de Jésus chez Origène*, Paris 1951; H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*, Paris 1956; H.U. von Balthasar, *Parole et Mystère chez Origène*, Paris 1957; F. Fässler, *Der Hagios-Begriff bei Origenes*, Fribourg 1958; G. Teichtweier, *Die Sündenlehre des Origenes*, Regensburg 1958; F. Hartmann, *Origène et la théologie du martyre*: EThL 34 (1958) 773-824; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique,"* Bruges-Paris 1961; G. Gruber, ΖΩΗ. *Wesen Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes*, Munich 1962; M. Martínez Pastor, *Teología de la Luz en Orígenes*, Comillas 1963; H. Crouzel, *Virginité et Mariage chez Origène*, Bruges-Paris 1963; J. Dupuis, *L'"esprit de l'homme,"* Bruges 1967; M. Eichinger, *Die Verklärung Christi bei Origenes*, Vienna 1969; W. Gessel, *Die Theologie des Gebetes nach "De Oratione" von Origenes*, Munich 1975.

Theology: C. Verfaillie, *La doctrine de la justification chez Origène*, Strasbourg 1926; C. Vagaggini, *Maria nelle opere di Origene*, Rome 1942; K. Rahner, *La doctrine d'Origène sur la pénitence*: RecSR 37 (1950) 47-97, 252-286, 422-456; M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe Incarné*, Paris 1958; P. Nemeshegyi, *La paternité de Dieu chez Origène*, Paris 1960; J. Chênevert, *L'Église dans le commentaire d'Origène sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, Brussels 1969; J. Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes*, Rome 1970; J.A. Alcain, *Cautiverio y redención del hombre en Orígenes*, Bilbao 1973; H.J. Vogt, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Origenes*, Cologne 1974; L. Lies, *Wort und Eucharistie bei Origenes*, Innsbruck 1978; H. Strutwolf, *Gnosis als System. Zur Rezeption der valentinianischen Gnosis bei Origenes*, Göttingen 1993. Gli Atti dei due Colloqui internazionali su Origene, Montserrat 1973 and Bari 1977: *Origeniana*, Bari 1975; *Origeniana Secunda*, Rome 1980 (the Origenian colloquia are in the eighth ed., ed. by L. Perrone, P. Bernardino and D. Marchini, Louvain 2003); F. Cocchini, *Origene*, Bologna 2006; for the bibl. see the journal "Adamantius."

H. Crouzel - E. Prinzivalli

ORIGENISM. Six successive stages can be distinguished in "Origenism." The first was that of related to Origen himself, i.e., the whole of the speculations

that, through the misunderstandings of his successors, constituted the basis of later Origenism.

The second was that of Origenism as understood by his 3rd- and 4th-c. detractors, who were answered by Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen*. Besides the preexistence of the soul and **apokatastasis*, they contested, through a series of misunderstandings, the doctrine of the resurrected body and of eternal creation.

The third was the Origenism of the Egyptian and Palestinian monks (2nd half of 4th c.): it was expounded mainly by *Evagrius of Pontus in the *Kephalaia Gnostica*—acc. to the unexpurgated *Syriac translation published by A. Guillaumont in PO 28/1 (1958)—and in the *Letter to Melania*, ed. in the Syriac translation and a Greek retroversion by W. Frankenberg (*Evagrius Ponticus*, Berlin 1912). Evagrius's thought is very complex and highly speculative. With respect to Origen, he seems to emphasize the initial and final unity of creatures with God, but nuances of his own emerge, as well as problematic wording.

The fourth and most important stage was Origenism as supposed by the 4th- and 5th-c. anti-Origenists—*Epiphanius, *Jerome, *Theophilus of Alexandria (while Origen was defended by *John of Jerusalem and *Rufinus of Aquileia). Their contentions must undergo the screening of criticism, however, since, as was quite normal for their time, they lacked a historical sense: they had no notion of the development of dogma—awareness of which has been attained only quite recently—and did not judge Origen based on the situation of his own time. Moreover, they excelled neither in philosophical nor in theological understanding. They completely failed to understand the change of mentality which separated the persecuted, minority church of Origen's time and the triumphant church of their own, esp. regarding the importance of a Christianization of philosophy for the guidance of the intellectual world, and the need for a theology "in exercise" (γυμνασία), i.e., of research. They accused Origen in view of the heresies of their own time, esp. *Arianism, without asking what the heresies were that he had to face, and which determined his particular problems. They had absolutely no awareness of the doctrinal progress brought about in the church by the reaction to Arianism, as compared with the succinct *regula fidei* of the 3rd c., which Origen had expounded in the preface to *De Principiis*; nor of the evolution of vocabulary, and they thus understood the terms used by Origen in the sense which such terms had assumed in the 4th c., which, in some theologically important cases, was much more precise than that of the 3rd c. In reading Origen they projected onto him the Origenism of their own time—that of the third stage—since it was that which they actually were targeting. They made no systematic studies of Origen's work, and based their accusations on isolated texts, taking no account of the explanations often found in other passages in the same book, sometimes only a few lines away. What Origen wrote in the form of exercise (γυμναστικῶς), they understood as put forth in the form of doctrine (δογματικῶς), with a conception of orthodoxy and *regula fidei* which was increasingly being modeled on that of civil law and expressed in "definitions" in the struggle against heresy.

The battle began with Epiphanius, metropolitan of Salamis or Constantia in *Cyprus: he classified Origen's "heresy" together with those that filled his *Ancoratus* and his *Panarion,* and insisted on obtaining a condemnation of Origen from Bishop John of Jerusalem. In 393 a certain *Atarbius, by what right we do not know, made a round of the convents of *Palestine, gathering signatures for Origen's condemnation. Ill received by Rufinus in his convent on the Mount of Olives, against all expectation he was welcomed by Jerome—until then an ardent defender of Origen—in his monastery at *Bethlehem. The battle grew bitter, with Rufinus and John against Jerome and Epiphanius. A reconciliation was reached between Rufinus and Jerome, but the dispute was revived when Rufinus, back in Rome, translated book I of Pamphilus's *Apologia,* followed by the *Peri Archōn* and a MS which, stolen by *Eusebius of Cremona, a monk and friend of Jerome, scandalized Jerome's Roman friends. They obliged Jerome to make a new translation of the *Peri Archōn* which, intent on being literal, highlighted Origen's heresies and Rufinus's inexactitudes, doing everything possible to embitter thoughts. Meanwhile the patriarch of Alexandria, Theophilus, was chosen to arbitrate between the two contending parties. At first favorable to Origen, for reasons of patriarchal politics he changed sides, expelled the auxiliary bishop Isidore and the "Long Brothers," and obtained the deposition of *John Chrysostom, who had given them asylum in *Constantinople. He condemned Origen at a regional synod in 400. These events had immediate repercussions in the West, thanks to Jerome, and are echoed in two letters of Pope *Anastasius. This first dispute terminated in 402 with Rufinus's silence.

The fifth stage was the Origenism, or rather the Evagrianism, of the Palestinian monks (1st half of 6th c.) of the Great Laura and the New Laura, convents under the obedience of St. *Sabas. The main expression of their doctrine is the *Book of St. Hierotheus,* the work of the Syrian monk *Stephen bar

Sudhaile, who aggravated Evagrius's Origenist thought into a radical *pantheism. In the interim between *Justinian's first and second interventions, these Origenists divided into two groups. The extremists were called **isochristi* (ἰσόχριστοι), since they held that both at the beginning and at the end, all "minds" are equal to Christ: his superiority over them is only provisional; he had no part in original *sin. The moderates, whose late alliance with the anti-Origenists led to the condemnation of the *isochristi,* were called **protoktisti* (πρωτόκτιστοι), since they attributed to Christ a superiority over other minds: their opponents labeled them *tetraditi,* accusing them of transforming the *Trinity into a tetrad by introducing Christ's humanity into it.

The sixth stage consisted of the presumed Origenism against which the emperor Justinian's condemnatory documents were directed: we must be careful not to confuse the documents of 543 with those of 553. The former, occasioned by an appeal by the anti-Origenist Palestinian monks and presented to the emperor by the papal *apocrisarius Pelagius, consist of the *Liber adversus Origenem* or *Letter to Menas,* followed by extracts from *De Principiis* and anathemata (DS 403-411): approved by the emperor's domestic synod, they were presented for signature to the pope and the patriarchs. They take aim at Origen himself, seen in the perspective of the Origenism of the time and with some gross misunderstandings, both in the *Letter* and in the anathemata. The other condemnatory documents come from the 5th ecumenical council, Constantinople II, compiled before and after the official opening. While Justinian sought to obtain the assent of Pope *Vigilius, whom he had brought to the capital by force, before declaring the council open, acc. to the hypothesis of Fr. Diekamp he addressed a letter to the assembled bishops, which is the rough draft of 15 anathemata which do not figure in the official acts of Constantinople II and which are not thus legally the product of an ecumenical council: they take aim explicitly at the *isochristi,* and Origen is cited only as the standard-bearer to whom they appeal. Moreover, some of these anathemata reproduce texts of Evagrius word for word. In the council's official *Acts*—the emperor, having given up on obtaining the pope's consent, had declared the council open on his own authority—the anathemata directed against the "*Three Chapters" contain Origen's name last in a list of heretics, in anathema no. 11. The same list, but without Origen's name, appears in the emperor's *Homonoia,* which is the rough draft of these anathemata. Very probably Origen's name was added, as the symbol of the *isochristi,* following the discussions on the Origenists which preceded the official opening. Pope Vigilius's documents, approving after its close a council that was held against his will, do not mention Origen. From a legal point of view, the presence of Origen's name in the list in question is not particularly important: it does not mean that he was formally a heretic (though the conciliar fathers were probably persuaded of it by certain rumors of an alleged apostasy, spread by Epiphanius) but probably means that in his writings there are some errors, taking into account the way in which they were read at that time; but it is more exact to say, perhaps, that it was really the *isochristi* who were condemned under his name. A consequence of this condemnation was the loss of the greater part of his works in the original language. This greatly hindered the propagation of Origen's thought in the Byzantine world, or rather its direct propagation, since, through the 4th-c. Fathers—nearly all of whom were his disciples—Origen's theology has invisibly marked the whole Christian tradition.

If Origen seems to have been generally rejected by the Byzantine Middle Ages, the Latin Middle Ages, up to the 13th c., read him passionately in the *Latin translations: Origen influenced Bernard of Clairvaux, William of Saint-Thierry and, through them, the Cistercian tradition. On the other hand, recent attempts to make him the source of Bulgarian Bogomilism and of Catharism do not seem worthy of consideration. Between the 13th and 14th c., his *Platonism was hard to reconcile with the ruling *Aristotelianism: in this period he was remembered only for his *exegesis. In the Renaissance he was defended by Pico della Mirandola and much admired by Erasmus. In the 16th c. the first editions appeared that would be perfected in the following centuries, as well as several studies. At the start of the 20th c., Origen, confused with later Origenism, judged almost exclusively on a rather one-sided reading of the *De Principiis,* was seen more as a Greek philosopher than as a Christian theologian: his spirituality went completely unnoticed, and his exegesis was considered arbitrary and absurd (A. von Harnack, E. de Faye, P. Koetschau, H. Koch). Origen's spirituality was rediscovered by W. Völker (1931), and our understanding of his exegesis is the work of H. de Lubac (1950): his personality has recovered its essential dimensions. At present Origen is, after *Augustine, the most widely read of the ecclesiastical writers of Antiquity.

F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil*, Münster 1899; F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, Louvain 1922; *Origénisme*: DTC 11, 1565-1588; A. Guillaumont, *Les "Kephalaia Gnostica" d'Évagre le*

Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens, Paris 1962; H. Crouzel, *Qu'a voulu faire Origène en composant le Traité des Principes?*: BLE 76 (1975) 161-186, 241-260. Origen's influence on the 4th-c. Fathers is frequently emphasized in studies of them. For the Latin Middle Ages: H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, I/1, Paris 1959, 198-304; J. Deroy, *Bernardus en Origenes*, Haarlem 1964; P. Verdeyen, *La théologie mystique de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry*: in various contributions, in *Ons geestelijk erf* (Anversa) from 1977 to 1979; H. Crouzel, *Origène est-il la source du catharisme?*: BLE 80 (1979) 3-28. For the Renaissance: H. Crouzel, *Une controverse sur Origène à la Renaissance: Jean Pic de la Mirandole et Pierre Garcia*, Paris 1977; M. Schär, *Das Nachleben des Origenes im Zeitalter des Humanismus*, Basel 1979; A. Godin, *Erasme lecteur d'Origène*, Geneva 1982; J.F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity*, Macon, GA 1988; E.A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, Princeton, NJ 1992; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth Century Origenism*, Rome 2001; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo*, SEA 82, Rome 2002.

H. Crouzel - E. Prinzivalli

ORIGEN the Neoplatonist (3rd c.). Nearly all modern scholars (Daniélou, *Origène*, Paris 1948, 89; Schwyzer, PWK 21, 1, 480; Dörrie, Hermes 83 [1955] 468-472; Dodds, *Numenius and Ammonius*, in *Les sources de Plotin*, Geneva 1960, 26 and 31, n. 1; Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 68-69; Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 3) agree that the Origen mentioned by *Porphyry in *Vita Plot.* chs. 3 (I, 4,24-32) and 14 (I, 20,20-23), and by *Longinus, cited by Porphyry, *Vita Plot.* ch. 20 (I, 22,37), and who, with *Plotinus and Herennius, was a disciple of *Ammonius Saccas (fr. 2,5 and 6 Weber, pp. 4-5), must be distinguished from the other much more famous Christian *Origen—also a disciple of Ammonius—whom Porphyry refers to in *Eusebius, *HE* VI, 19,6-7 (II, 558,26-560,7 Schwartz; but Dörrie, Hermes 83 [1955] 469-470, is wrong in holding that Porphyry, in this passage of Eusebius, confused the Christian Origen with Origen the Neoplatonist). The attempt to identify the two and deny the independent existence of Origen the Neoplatonist, made by R. Cadiou (*La jeunesse d'Origène*, Paris 1935, 231-262) and recently repeated, with no new arguments, by F.H. Kettler (*Origenes, Ammonius Sakkas und Porphyrius*, in *Kerygma und Logos*, Festschrift C. Andresen, Göttingen 1979, 325-327), does not seem tenable. A deeper examination of the facts that make this distinction necessary, together with a collection of the evidence related to Origen the Neoplatonist (preserved by Porphyry, *Eunapius, *Photius, *Proclus and *Nemesius of Emesa), and a reconstruction and interpretation of his philosophical system, can be found in K.O. Weber's monograph *Origenes der Neuplatoniker* (Zetemata 27, Munich 1962), which remains the classic work on which any study of him must be based. Here we will simply say that, as Porphyry relates, he was at *Alexandria, with Plotinus and Herennius, when Ammonius Saccas died ca. 242 (*Vita Plot.* ch. 3 = fr. 2 Weber); that he visited Plotinus when the latter held his lectures at *Rome after 244 (*Vita Plot.* ch. 4 = fr. 3 Weber; on the date, see Cadiou, p. 235 and Dörrie, p. 471); that he wrote two treatises, *On Demons* and *That Only the King Is Creator,* the latter during the reign of *Gallienus, which began in 253 (*Vita Plot.* ch. 3 = fr. 2 Weber); that he also left notes for a commentary on the *Timaeus,* mentioned by Proclus (fr. 8-16 Weber, pp. 6-11); and that, as Proclus relates (*Theol. plat.* II, 4 [= fr. 7 Weber]), his metaphysical system differed from that of Plotinus in that he did not put the One above mind and being, but considered mind (equivalent to absolute being) as the supreme principle, remaining more faithful to the teaching of his master Ammonius Saccas (cf. Schwyzer, PWK 21, 1, 480; Weber, p. 160).

R. Beutler, PWK 18, 1, 1033-1036; H.R. Schwyzer, PWK 21, 1, 479-480; K.O. Weber, *Origenes der Neoplatoniker*, Zetemata 27, Munich 1962; L. Brisson et al., *Porphyrius, La vie de Plotin*, I, Paris 1982, 259-261, 261 n. 1; II, Paris 1992, 213-216, 217-219, 265.

S. Lilla

OROSIUS (4th–5th c.). We first hear of the Spanish priest (Paul?) Orosius in 414 when, still a young man, he arrived at *Hippo and made contact with *Augustine. On the latter's advice, in 415 he went to *Palestine, where he met *Jerome, and by his imprudence became involved in the beginnings of the *Pelagian controversy. In 416 he returned to the West, bearing various messages and the claimed relics of *Stephen the protomartyr, which contributed to the conversion of numerous Jews at Minorca. He returned to Hippo, where he wrote his historical work in 416 and 417. Of his final destiny we know nothing (details, discussion of controversial points and *testimonia* in Schanz IV, 1, 483-485).

We have three of Orosius's works: (1) *Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*. In this very brief *memoria,* sent to Augustine by Orosius after his first stay at Hippo, he provides an orientation on these heretical doctrines which had spread on the Iberian Peninsula and invites the bishop to refute them. (2) *Liber apologeticus contra Pelagianos*. This is our only source on the conference of *Jerusalem of 415 where, under the presidency of Bishop *John, the ideas of Pelagius, who was present, were discussed. Orosius railed against

Pelagius's doctrine, but his *Latin was poorly translated into Greek by the interpreter, and he was subsequently accused by John of having maintained that, even with God's help, humanity could not remain sinless (*Apol.* 9,2). In this treatise Orosius gives a summary of the conference, denies having expressed the heretical opinion he was charged with and esp. refutes Pelagianism (for these two works see Patrologia III, 467-469). (3) *Historiarum adversus paganos libri VII*. This is Orosius's main work, and it is the oldest universal Christian history. The material is divided as follows: Book 1: Geographical introduction, history from the flood until the founding of *Rome. Book 2: Rome, from its foundation to the capture of the *Urbs* by the *Gauls (390 BC); history of *Persia and Greece up to the Battle of Cunassa (401 BC). Book 3: Roman history up to the eve of the war against Pyrrhus; Greek history until the collapse of Alexander's empire. Book 4: History of Rome up to the destruction of *Carthage (146 BC). Book 5: Rome from 146 to 70 BC. Book 6: Rome from 70 BC to the coming of Augustus. Book 7: History of the empire until AD 417.

The writing of this work was, like Augustine's *City of God,* a consequence of the taking of Rome by *Alaric in 410. The pagans claimed that this catastrophe was the consequence of the abandonment of the traditional religion, definitively prohibited by *Theodosius in 392, and many Christians were shaken: for almost a century, in fact, the doctors of the church had proclaimed that the Roman Empire had been established by divine providence for the spread and triumph of Christianity, whose fate thus seemed linked to Rome. Augustine, in the *City of God,* refutes this political theology. In the prologue to his *History,* Orosius says that Augustine, when he was writing Book 11 of the *City,* asked him to make a list of the innumerable evils that had afflicted humanity in the past (evidently to attenuate the gravity of the catastrophe of 410); Orosius concludes by stating that his research led him to discover that past evils were infinitely more terrible than those of the present, and that the kingdom of death had been crippled after Christianity's triumph (*Prol.* 10-14). Orosius's *History* is not a calm exposition of objective research, but an impassioned argument. Against the pagans—as the title specifies—with apologetic intent, he seeks to demonstrate the coherence of the action of providence in history: for him the designs of God are not inscrutable, but clear.

Like many ancient historians, he does not directly use the authors he cites (esp. *Plato, Polybius, Sallust, Trogus Pompeius), and does not cite his true sources, the identification of which is still discussed (see Goetz, 25-29). Among them, however, besides the Bible, are Justin the historian (for the events not pertaining to Roman history), a summary of Livy, Florus, Eutropius, the *Chronicle* of *Eusebius-*Jerome, Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* translated into Latin by *Rufinus and Augustine's *City of God*. Orosius is neither too erudite nor too accurate: he believes *Suetonius to have been the author of the *Gallic War* (VI, 7,2), and that Sallust had narrated the period of *Domitian (VII, 10,4). He draws from his sources what is useful to his argument, i.e., catastrophes, defeats, large numbers of deaths; if he has differing versions, he chooses the most dramatic. Thus his narrative, at least up to Augustus, is essentially a series of tragic upheavals.

Orosius follows the schema of the succession of the four worldly empires acc. to Dan 2 and 7, but with a geographical and chronological correction that is his own: Babylon, Macedonia, Carthage, Rome (II, 1-3 and VII, 2). He is fascinated by synchronisms and by the symbology of *numbers, to which he sacrifices exactness. By forcing some things, he is able to elaborate an extraordinary construction of chronological parallelisms between the four worldly empires. To underscore the Christ-Augustus synchronism, e.g., he falsifies the date of three episodes which mark the beginning of the monarchy at Rome so as to locate it on the day of *Epiphany, the manifestation of Christ's monarchy (VI, 20 and 22; VII, 1; on these various passages see Paschoud, 115-119 and 125-131). Orosius's *History* is divided into seven books, like the seven days of the week; the last book is dedicated to the imperial age, which thus appears as the Sunday of human history. In fact, acc. to Orosius, from the time of Augustus good begins to again triumph over evil, to then predominate almost exclusively during the Christian empire. In this way Orosius almost completely eliminates any eschatological dimension of history: he counts ten persecutions of the Christians, compared to the ten plagues of Egypt; after the tenth plague, the Egyptians were swallowed by the Red Sea, which the Hebrews crossed safe and sound; likewise, suggests Orosius, after the tenth persecution, the Christians will be safe from evil: they will escape the eleventh persecution, that of the *Antichrist (VII, 26-27; cf. Paschoud, 119-125).

Orosius thus ends by demonstrating the opposite of what Augustine expounds in the *City of God;* it is no surprise that Augustine never mentions Orosius after the publication of his *History*—indeed, he refutes him without naming him (e.g., *Civ. Dei* XVIII, 52). One might ask whether Orosius is telling the truth when he says that he wrote the work at Augustine's request (see Corsini, 35-51). In the Middle

Ages, Orosius's interpretation of history was better understood than Augustine's lofty speculations, and his work was very popular and had a considerable influence: only the "century of lights" forced Orosius off his pedestal. His importance today is not in his value as a source: he in fact does not give us much information that we do not find in older and more reliable historians. But he provides fundamental evidence of the history of ideas in his time, even if he fails to overcome his contradictory tendencies (Christian cosmopolitanism vs. loyalty to the empire, hatred toward the barbarian invaders vs. adhesion to the idea that the invasion makes possible the evangelization of the Germans), and he created the universal Christian history that would be at the basis of medieval historiography. Finally, Orosius, master of the resources of rhetoric, vigorous and impassioned, is not without literary talent.

CPL 571-574; PL 31, 663-1216; CSEL 5 (Zangemeister, 1882: *Liber apol.*, *Hist.*) and 18, 149-157 (Schepss, 1889: *Comm.*). Serie Mondadori-Fondazione L. Valla (text, It. tr. by A. Bartalucci, intr. and notes by A. Lippold), 2 vols., Milan 1976 (only *Hist.*); FC 50 (Eng. tr. by I.W. Raymond - R.J. Deferrari, 1964; only *Hist.*); *Pauli Orosii operum concordantiae*, ed. A. Encuentra, Hildesheim 1998; G. Fink, *Recherches Bibliographiques sur Paul Orose*: Revista de Archivos, BiblMus 58 (1952) 271-322 (bibl. to 1952); Schanz IV, 1, Munich 1920; J. Svennung, *Orosiana*, Uppsala 1922 (problems of language); B. Lacroix, *Orose et ses idées*, Montréal-Paris 1965; E. Corsini, *Introduzione alle "Storie" di Orosio*, Turin 1968; Patrologia III, 466-470; F. Fabbrini, *Paolo Orosio, uno storico*, Rome 1979; H.W. Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie des Orosius*, Darmstadt 1980; F. Paschoud, *La polemica provvidenzialistica di Orosio*, in *La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità*, Atti del Convegno di Erice, Messina 1980, 113-133; J.E. López Pereira, *Estado de la cuestión bibliográfica sobre Orosio*: Euphrosyne 18 (1990) 395-412; A. Polichetti, *Rassegna di studi orosiani*: Koinonia 18 (1994) 33-61; 19 (1995) 179-197; M.V. Escribano, *"Tyrannus" en las "Historiae" de Orosio: entre "breuitas" y "aduersum paganos"*: Augustinianum 36 (1996) 185-212; S. Bodelón, *Orosio: una filosofía de la historia*: Memorias de historia antigua 18 (1997) 59-80; V. Gauge, *Les routes d'Orose et les reliques d'Étienne*: Antiquité tardive 6 (1998) 265-286; E. Spät, *The "Commonitorium" of Orosius on the Teachings of the Priscillianists*: AAntHung 38 (1998) 357-379; J. Vilella, *Biografía crítica de Orosio*: JbAC 43 (2000) 94-121.

F. Paschoud

ORPHEUS

I. In general - II. Iconography.

I. In general. Mythical singer and poet; Greek tradition usually linked him with *Thrace, though different versions of his parentage and life circulated in Antiquity. Son of a Muse, sometimes Calliope, and of Apollo or of the river god Oiagros, Orpheus was connected with the voyage of the Argonauts and involved in an infernal *katabasis* in search of his wife Eurydice. A particular tradition tells of his violent death at the hands of the Maenads, followers of Dionysius, whose orgiastic cult Orpheus had neglected in his special veneration for Apollo. But beyond such traditions of his "life," the essential fact remains the quality of "theologian" attributed to him by virtue of the many religious writings which, from the 6th–5th c. BC, circulated in Greece in Orpheus's name and in that of people variously connected with him (Musaeus, Linus). This literature, usually called *ta orphika* ("the Orphic things"), was interested in a particular way in theocosmogonic and anthropogonic speculations and became very popular in the late Hellenistic period. In it was expressed a particular religious vision with dualistic leanings, based on the idea of the fragmentation of the original One, which, through a process of evolution, resulted in the present situation involving the presence, in the human body, of a divine substance (the *soul) which aspires to liberation. A life of abstention, sometimes accompanied by cathartic practices, ensures such liberation, freeing the soul from the cycle of rebirth.

To the first generations of Christians the figure of Orpheus, like that of other pagan "sages," appeared in an ambivalent light: rejected as a spokesman of the error of idolatry, he yet seemed, due to some aspects of the religious teaching connected with him, to be one who had prefigured some facts of revelation. The statement of *Augustine suffices, who, reflecting an opinion quite widespread among Christians, saw in Orpheus one who, with the Sibyls, "predicted" some truths about the Father and the Son (*Contra Faust.* XVII, 15). *Clement of Alexandria attests the use of the figure of the mythical Thracian singer who could tame wild beasts with the sweetness of his music, as a "symbol" of Christ who draws people to himself by the fascination of the divine Word, leading them to the truth (*Protr.* 1,1-10). This symbolism justifies Orpheus's presence in the Christian art of the first centuries, his image often being characterized by the attributes of the Good *Shepherd: the frescoes of some Roman catacombs (3rd and 4th c.) show Orpheus sometimes acc. to classical iconographical schemes, sometimes in the type of the Good Shepherd, as a figure of Christ.

O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, Dublin-Zurich [3]1972; W.K.C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and the Greek Religion*, 1935; DACL 12, 2735-2755; M.L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford 1983; Ph. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée: en l'honneur de Jean Rudhardt*, Geneva 1991; A. Masaracchia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'Orfismo.* Atti del Seminario Nazionale (Rome-Perugia 1985-1991), Rome 1993; L. Brisson, *Orphée et l'Orphisme dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine*, Paris 1995; *Inni orfici*, ed. by G. Ricciardelli, Milan 2000; L. Vieillefon, *La figure d'Orphée dans l'antiquité tardive*, Paris 2003.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

II. Iconography. In early Christian figurative art, the myth of Orpheus is reduced to his figure in Eastern dress, seated among wild beasts or other animals, which he soothes with the sound of the lyre. But there is no reason to consider this as evidence of the presence of an Orphic component in Christianity from the start. The figure of Orpheus thus rendered—in the intentional likeness of the Good Shepherd—recalls, in a unique transference of images and hence only for purposes of communication, the figure of Christ who fascinates and softens even the most restive hearts; but precisely because of the danger of confusion between the two, the scene had little popularity among Christians (Clem. Al., *Protr.* 1,3; Eus., *Praep. ev.* XII, 12; *Vita Const.* 14; ps.-Just., *Cohort. ad Graec.* 14; Cyr. Al., *Contra Jul.* 1,26: PG 76, 541; Aug., *Contra Faust.* XVII, 5). Orpheus appears, however, acc. to a well-defined scheme, in some Roman cemetery frescoes (1st half of 3rd–end of 4th c.): at *Callistus (Wp 37), *Domitilla (Wp 229), Sts. Marcellino and Pietro (Wp 98 and Nestori 1993, 74, n. 79), and Priscilla (ibid., 26, n. 29). The Christian character of some figures of Orpheus sculpted on two *sarcophagus fronts from Ostia (Rep. 70 and 1022) and one from Porto Torres (Pesce, *Sarcofagi*, n. 57) seems less probable.

According to the most recent findings of iconological research (Murray, *The Christian Orpheus*, 19ff.), the identification of Orpheus with Christ involves the other, already made in Jewish art, between Orpheus and David in his role as lyrist and psalmist. There is clear evidence of this in a painting in the synagogue of *Dura Europos, a mosaic in that of *Gaza, one in *Jerusalem and a painting—now lost—in the Roman cemetery of Vigna Randanini (Corby-Finney, *Orpheus-David*, 7ff.). A painted ceiling in the cemetery of Domitilla (Wp 55), which includes the figure of Orpheus in a central *clipeus* and that of David in a lateral scene, constitutes, for the declining 3rd c., an important proof and a salient phase of this process of assimilation.

A. Boulanger, *Orphée: rapports de l'orphisme et du christianisme*, Paris 1925; M. de Fraipont, *Orphée aux catacombes*, Paris-Tournai 1935; B. Bagatti, *Il mosaico dell'Orfeo a Gerusalemme*: RivAC 28 (1952) 145-160; G. Pesce, *Sarcofagi romani di Sardegna*, Rome 1957; J.B. Friedman, *Syncretism and Allegory in the Jerusalem Orpheus Mosaic*: Traditio 23 (1967) 1-13; A. Ferrua, *Una nuova regione della catacomba dei SS. Pietro e Marcellino*: RivAC 44 (1968) 29-68; F.M. Schoeller, *Darstellungen des Orpheus in der Antike*, Freiburg i.Br. 1969; H. Stern, *Orphée dans l'art paléochrétien*: CArch 23 (1974) 1-16; C. Murray, *The Christian Orpheus*: CArch 26 (1977) 19-27; P. Corby-Finney, *Orpheus-David: A Connection in Iconography Between Greco-Roman Judaism and Early Christianity?*: Journal of Jewish Art 5 (1978) 6-16; P. Testini, *Arte mitraica e arte cristiana*, in *Mysteria Mithrae*, Rome 1979, 435-437; C. Murray, *Rebirth and Afterlife*, Oxford 1981, 37ff.; F. Bisconti, *Un fenomeno di continuità iconografica: Orfeo citaredo, Davide salmista, Cristo pastore, Adamo e gli animali*: Cristianesimo e giudaismo: eredità e confronti. XVI Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità cristiana, 7-9 maggio 1987: Augustinianum 28 (1988) 429-436; Id., TIP, 236-237; L. Vieillefon, *La figure d'Orphée dans l'Antiquité tardive. Les mutations d'un mythe: du héros païen au chantre chrétien*, Paris 2003.

F. Bisconti

ORTHODOXY

I. Orthodoxy-heterodoxy - II. Orthodox Church.

I. Orthodoxy-heterodoxy. In ancient Christianity the term *orthodoxy,* which means "right or correct opinion" (*doxa orthē*), connotes Christian doctrine and life in conformity with the original truth about Jesus of Nazareth and his teachings. It is therefore opposed to heterodoxy, whose error it shows up, in the synonymous sense of *pseudodoxy* ("false opinion"). In this development there is a departure from the classical philosophical meaning of *heterodox* (having different opinions), as opposed to those who are of the same opinion (*homodoxoi*). The Pastoral Epistles speak of heterodox teaching (1 Tim 1:3 and 6:3), and 2nd-c. authors speak of heterodox doctrines (Ign., *Magn.* 8,1; *Smyrn.* 6,2) and heterodox teachers (Polyc., 3). Just as the term **heresy,* from its original meaning of "choice," acquired a pejorative sense, so too did heterodoxy, though this was perhaps a parallel phenomenon, and only later did the two terms come to be identified as synonyms of deviation from Christian doctrine and discipline. This fusion is clear in *Eusebius, where the *quartodeciman churches, excommunicated by Pope *Victor, are called "heterodox" (*HE* 5,24,9), and false teachers in the church *heterodidaskaloi* (*HE* 3,28,8; 7,7,4). These are opposed not to *homodoxia* but to *orthodoxia,* while orthodox teachers, like *Irenaeus and *Clement, are called "ambassadors of the church's orthodoxy" (*HE* 3,23,2), in whom there are no heresies (Athan., *C. Arian.* 2,42-43). The affirmation of orthodoxy involves the same set of problems as the dialectic orthodoxy-heresy.

J.F. McCue, *Orthodoxy and Heresy: Walter Bauer and the Valentinians*: VChr 33 (1979) 118-130; M. Simon, *From Greek Hairesis to Christian Heresy*, in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition*, Paris 1979, 101-116; A. Meredith, *Orthodoxy, Heresy and Philosophy in the Later Half of the Fourth Century*: The Heythrop Journal 16 (1973) 5-21; J.M. Leroux, *Le surgissement d'une orthodoxie au IVe siècle*: La Vie Spirit., Suppl. 118 (1976) 294-309; H. Chadwick, *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church*, Aldershot 1991.

II. Orthodox Church. In subsequent eras the term *orthodoxy* was used to indicate the Eastern churches

in communion with *Constantinople, which, taken as a whole, were called the "holy, orthodox, Catholic, apostolic Eastern church," distinguishing themselves from the other communities that were not in communion with them, e.g., the *Nestorian, *Jacobite and *Coptic churches—which in turn declared themselves to be Orthodox. The first Sunday in *Lent is celebrated as the feast of orthodoxy (going back to 824), commemorating the triumph over iconoclasm and heresy in general.

S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, London 1935; W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Würzburg 1951; P. Evdokimov, *L'orthodoxie*, Paris 1959; J.D. Zizioulas, *La continuité avec les origines apostoliques dans la conscience théologique des églises orthodoxes*: Istina 19 (1974) 65-94.

V. Grossi

ORTU ET OBITU PROPHETARUM ET APOSTOLORUM, De. In the first centuries of our era, the *Lives* of the prophets were widely spread among Jewish and Christian circles, which from the beginning used them for apologetic purposes (T. Schermann). Added to them, esp. in Late Antiquity, were many legends about the *apostles, in brief treatises whose purpose was to provide essential information on these scriptural personalities. Included in this long literary tradition must be the *De ortu et obitu prophetarum et apostolorum,* a Latin booklet of biblical prosopography which circulated from the 5th to the 6th c. in a vast NW area that included *Italy, *Gaul and *Spain. The anonymous author collects brief information on 39 persons from Scripture—prophets, apostles and disciples of the Lord Jesus—indicating for each their origin and place of birth (*ortus*), type of death and place of burial (*obitus*).

The existence of the *De ortu et obitu* had been hypothesized in the 1st half of the 20th c., but the first complete edition of the text was published only recently, thanks to the chance discovery of two MSS (F. Dolbeau, 1986). The author's anonymity had not worked in the text's favor, which was broken up over time and ultimately lost, making its way into other compilations such as the prologues to the prophets in some Latin Bibles and *Isidore of Seville's *De ortu et obitu patrum,* a very popular work due to the prestige of its author. The subsequent editing of other MSS besides the two on which the critical edition is based has allowed both a more precise dating of *De ortu et obitu* (between *Jerome, from whose works it takes the life of *Jonah and those of six NT personages, and Isidore of Seville), and the identification of a reliance on some compilations of *Epiphanius of Salamis, author of various short biographies of prophets and apostles, the Greek model drawn on by the anonymous Latin author.

Th. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden. Nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte*, TU, Leipzig 1907; F. Dolbeau, *Deux opuscules latins, relatifs aux personnages de la Bible et antérieurs à Isidore de Séville*: Revue d'Histoire des Textes 16 (1986) 83-139; Id., *Nouvelles recherches sur le "De ortu et obitu prophetarum et apostolorum"*: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 91-103.

V. Lombino

OSROENE (Osrohene, Osrhoene). The NW territory of Mesopotamia was conquered by *Trajan, who made it a Roman province in 114 (*prov. Mesopotamiae*), but it was almost immediately abandoned by *Hadrian (d. 138). With the military campaigns of Lucius Verus it became first a Roman protectorate, then in 195 with *Septimius Severus, a Roman province under the authority of a *procurator*; in 198 the province of Mesopotamia was also created with capital *Nisibis (today Nusaybin, Turkey), with military garrisons at Resaina and Singara, which became, with Nisibis, *coloniae*. In an early period the Roman province of Osroene excluded the kingdom of *Edessa, left to Abgar VIII (167–177) as a vassal king; his successor, *Abgar IX (177–213), was deposed by the emperor *Caracalla and his kingdom annexed to the province; the city of Edessa received the status of colony (213). Only in the 3rd c. did Abgar X obtain a certain functional independence in the wars with the *Sassanids. The capital of the region was Edessa (Urfa); the population was a mixture of Arameans, Greeks and Persians. Osroene was a strategic territory between the Roman Empire and, first the Parthians, and from the 3rd c. on, the Sassanids. The area was partially lost in the 2nd half of the 3rd c.; with *Diocletian and *Galerius the two provinces of *Osrohene* (capital Edessa) in the W and *Mesopotamiae* (capital Nisibis) in the East were re-created. As a consequence of the defeat of *Julian in 363, E Mesopotamia was partially ceded to the Sassanids. The province of Osroene was part of the diocese of the East and was led by a *dux* with the rank of *vir spectabilis,* with troops under him. Christianity arrived in Osroene, in particular Edessa, from the 2nd half of the 1st c. from *Jerusalem or from Adiabene (*see* *Edessa, *Bardesanes, *Abgar, *Mesopotamia, *Persia). A variety of Christian groups confronted each other there: *Marcionites, the followers of Bardesanes, *encratites, Catholics and, from the 3rd c., *Manichees. At the beginning of the 4th c. there were various episcopal sees, but only the bishop of Edessa was pres-

ent at the Council of *Nicaea (325). In the 4th c. the region contained strongly Christianized areas alongside substantially pagan cities (e.g., Harran, Charrhae). Monasticism, under various forms, spread rapidly. In the 6th c. the majority of Christians were *monophysites. The territory of upper Mesopotamia was conquered by the Arabs in the course of the 7th c.: they occupied *Syria with the Battle of Yarmuk (636), and Edessa in 639.

M.G. Angeli Bertinelli, *I Romani oltre l'Eufrate nel II sec. d.C.* (*le province di Assiria, di Mesopotamia e di Osroene*): ANRW II, 9, 1 (1976) 3-45; R.C. Blockley, *East Roman Foreign Policy: Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius*, Leeds 1992; F. Millar, *The Roman Near East, 31 B.C.-A.D. 337*, Cambridge, MA-London 1993; G. del Olmo Lete - J.L. Montero Fenollós (eds.), *Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates*, Barcelona 1999; *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Parthian and Sasanian Periods: Rejection and Revival, c. 238 BC-AD 642*, Proceedings of a Seminar in memory of Vladimir G. Lukonin, ed. J. Curtis, London 2000; T. Gnoli, *Roma, Edessa e Palmira nel III sec. dopo Cristo. Problemi istituzionali. Uno studio sui papiri dell'Eufrate*, Pisa-Rome 2000; S.K. Ross, *Roman Edessa*, London-New York 2001; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionnaires chrétiennes dans l'Empire perse*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002; *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars: A Narrative History*, Part 2, *AD 363-628*, compiled and edited by G. Greatrex and S.N.C. Lieu, London 2002; N. Lenski, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century*, Berkeley, CA 2002; *Procedings of the II Intern. Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*, ed. I. Thuesen, I-II, Winona Lake, IN 2004.

A. Di Berardino

OSSIUS (Hosius) (ca. 256–d. after 357). Born ca. 256, bishop of Cordoba ca. 300, a confessor during *Diocletian's persecution, and friend of *Constantine, who asked him to make peace during the *Arian controversy (ca. 324). In the role of peacemaker he presided over the Council of *Antioch early in 325 and played a significant role in the Council of *Nicaea. He also played a prominent role in that of *Serdica (343), where, with the local bishop *Protogenes, he headed the Western bishops. Later, when the West too passed under *Constantius's administration, he refused to subscribe to the condemnation of *Athanasius in 356. But in 357, aged over 100, he was forced to subscribe to the pro-Arian formula of *Sirmium. He died soon after. His yielding, due to old age, made a great impression and provoked violent reactions in the West, from *Hilary, *Phoebadius and the *Luciferians. Ossius's *De laude virginitatis* and *De interpretatione vestium sacerdotalium,* mentioned by *Isidore (*Vir. ill.* 5), are lost. But we have some canons approved at Serdica, a letter written with Protogenes to inform Julius of Rome of some decisions of the Council of Serdica, and one written in 356 to Constantius, who was pressuring Ossius to subscribe to Athanasius's condemnation: here, for the first time after the start of the Constantinian policy of collaboration between church and empire, a bishop points out how beneficial it would be for the emperor to abstain from meddling in the internal affairs of the church, such as the Arian controversy. On the basis of Mt 22:21, Ossius affirms the separation of the two powers.

CPL 537-539; PL 8, 1317-1332; 10, 557-564; 632-848; PLS 1, 184-196; V.C. De Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova*, Washington, D.C. 1954; Patrologia III, 58-59; BBKL II, 1074-1075.

M. Simonetti

OSTROGOTHS. Information on this population is closely linked to the events of the Gothic Germanic stock until ca. 376, the time at which, following the clash with the *Huns, the detachment (in fact already present) of the *Visigoths from the Ostrogoths became definitive. The former refused to submit to the victors and migrated S, continuing their raids in the territories of the Eastern Roman Empire until the conflict at Hadrianopolis in 378, after which they moved W. The Ostrogoths, on the other hand, chose to subject themselves to the Huns, remaining in the region between the Don and the Dniester Rivers along the Black Sea. With the breakup of the Hunnic kingdom around 453, the Ostrogoths moved N, occupying the territories of *Pannonia, where they stayed from 456/457 to 473, as *foederati* of the empire. From Pannonia the Ostrogoth people slowly moved toward the Balkans, affecting areas of Lower Moesia, Dacia Ripensis and *Thrace, from where they took the road to Byzantium. The emperor *Zeno, recognizing the danger to the city of *Constantinople, in 487 charged *Theodoric and his army with moving against *Odoacer and reconquering the Italian peninsula. In 489 Theodoric began his journey toward *Italy, where he defeated and killed the king of the Heruli (493); he then obtained formal recognition on the part of the Eastern emperor, who gave him the title *rex Romanorum et Gothorum* of Italy. Keeping intact the foundations of the Roman imperial administrative organization, Theodoric sought to use it to perfect the organizational system maintained until then by his people. Regarding the legal system, Theodoric, as a functionary of the Byzantine emperor, was careful to apply Roman law in Italian lands and for citizens of the old empire, whereas toward his people he wanted to respect the traditional norms still in force; sources in fact give us certain evidence of

the collection and written codification of Gothic laws, called *belagines,* from before the arrival in Italy (Iordanes, *Get.* XI, 69,3-6; M.F. Ennodius, *Panegyricus* XX, 87; *Anonymus Valesianus* 14 [60]; Cassiodorus, *Var.* VII, 3).

Religiously, the Ostrogoths remained faithful to their *Arian tradition. Nonetheless, relations with the church of *Rome and with the pope stayed always on a level of reciprocal acceptance and concord, and esp. the Goths, conscious of the importance that ecclesiastical good graces had for relations with the Byzantine Empire, always wanted to keep the religious side in good order. On more than one occasion Gothic kings intervened in church affairs; a primary concern for Theodoric was the *Laurentian schism (498–507), and he intervened directly in the resolution of the issue. Following the gradual reapproach of the Roman church to that of the E, divided because of the *Acacian schism (484–519), relations with Roman Christianity also changed radically; esp. with the issuing of *Justin's edict (523) against heretics, the king of the Goths launched a policy of intolerance against senators and illustrious persons favorable to the empire, such as *Boethius, *Symmachus and Albinus, all tried and put to death for treason. Theodoric's attitude to the pope was also one of suspicion; the pope's representative, Bishop John I (523–526), was sent to Constantinople to plead the Ostrogoth cause in Italy. At Theodoric's death (526), the kingdom passed to his grandson Athalaric and his daughter Amalasuntha.

Despite an auspicious start for the new Gothic government, other reasons for discord reemerged on the occasion of the election of Pope *Boniface II (530–532), opposed by the faction of the clergy which backed the deacon *Dioscorus (d. 530). Very strong throughout this period was the presence, in the Germanic government, of *Cassiodorus, who distinguished himself during the reign of Theodoric and esp., as *praefectus praetorio Italiae,* under Amalasuntha. Not even the Roman senator's political ability was able to prevent the queen, upon Athalaric's death (534), from being deposed, imprisoned and killed by her husband and successor as ruler, Theodatus. The woman's death moved the Byzantine emperor *Justinian to decide for war against the Goths. The Byzantine general *Belisarius, victor in the campaign against the *Vandals in *Africa, was charged with reconquering the peninsula and evicting the Germanic population. Thus began the Greco-Gothic conflict, which bloodied the Italian peninsula for eighteen years. Theodatus was soon killed by an assassin sent by Vitiges, general of the Gothic army, who took over command of the government (536). The two armies clashed, resulting in a victory by the Roman Belisarius, who also captured the Germanic king (540). A truce followed, until the Goths found a worthy military leader in Totila. The war then recommenced, even more intensely than before. The city of Rome in particular suffered gravely during a long period of sieges. The situation changed radically when Justinian decided to turn the war over to *Narses. Arriving in Italy in early 552 with a huge army, he went straight to *Ravenna, then turned to Rome: the two armies, Roman and Gothic, met at Tagina, where Totila died in battle. The Byzantine march continued to the walls of Rome, where the garrison left by the barbarian king was easily defeated and the city retaken. Meanwhile the Goths elected Teia as king, having moved their base of operations to Campania, near the Monti Lattari, where the decisive battle took place. Narses got the better of his foe, who was forced to retreat in March 553; Teia died in battle. At that point the war could be considered over, with the definitive defeat of the Gothic people, followed by their complete dispersion and the temporary reconquest of the Western territories by the Eastern emperor.

Sources: *Acta Synhodorum habitarum Romae*, MGH Auct. Ant. XII, 399-454; Boethius, *Philosophiae Consolationis Libri Quinque*, CSEL 67; Cassiodorus, *Variarum Libri XII*, CCL 96; Ennodius, *Panegyricus dictus regi Theoderico*, MGH Auct. Ant. VII, 203-214; *Excerpta Valesiana*, BT; Duchesne LP I; Iordanis, *De origine actibus Getharum*, MGH Auct. Ant. V/1, 53-138; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, MGH Auct. Ant. II, 216-224; Procopius of Caesarea, *De bello gothico*, BT.

Studies: O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Storia di Roma dell'Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, IX, Bologna 1941, 45-94; *I Goti in Occidente. Problemi*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, III, Spoleto 1956; T.S. Burns, *The Ostrogoths*, Wiesbaden 1980; Id., *A History of the Ostrogoths*, Bloomington, IN 1984; Ch. Pietri, *Aristocratie et Société dans l'Italie Chrétienne au temps d'Odoacre et de Théodèric*: MEFRA 93/1 (1981) 417-467; H. Wolfram, *Storia dei Goti*, Rome [2]1985 (1st ed. Munich 1979), 431-618; P. Heather, *Goths and Romans 332-489*, Oxford 1991; Id., *The Goths*, Oxford 1996; A. Schwarcz, *Die Goten in Pannonien und auf dem Balkan nach dem Ende des Hunnenreiches bis zum Italienzug Theoderichs des Großen*: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 100 (1992) 50-83; G. Vismara, *Il diritto nel Regno dei Goti in Italia*: Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris 58 (1992) 1-33; *Teoderico il grande e i Goti d'Italia*, Atti del XIII Congr. int. di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1993; B. Luiselli, *Teodorico e gli Ostrogoti tra romanizzazione e nazionalismo gotico*: Rom-Barb 13 (1994-95) 75-98; T. Sardella, *Società, chiesa e stato nell'età di Teoderico: papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996; P. Amory, *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy (489-534)*, Cambridge 1997; V. Epp, *Goten und Römer unter Theoderich dem Großen*, in *Migration und Integration. Aufnahme und Eingliederung in historischen Wandel*, M. Beer - M. Kintzinger - M. Krauss (eds.), Stuttgart 1997, 55-74; L. Gatto, *Figura e funzione del* Comes. *Momento di raccordo e di convivenza fra Goti e Romani*, in *Società multiculturali nei secoli*

V-IX: scontri, convivenza, integrazione nel Mediterraneo occidentale, Atti delle VII Giornate di Studio sull'Età Romanobarbarica (Benevento, 31 maggio - 2 giugno 1999), Naples 2001, 127-142; G. Tabacco, *Egemonie sociali e strutture del potere nel medioevo italiano*, Turin [3]2000, 76-92; S. Rota, *La Chiesa di Roma di fronte ai barbari* (*V-VIII secolo*), in *La Comunità Cristiana di Roma. La sua vita e la sua cultura dalle origini all'alto Medio Evo*, eds. L. Pani Ermini - P. Siniscalco, Vatican City 2000, 139-170; F. Giunta, *Gli Ostrogoti in Italia*, in G. Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), Magistra Barbaritas. *I barbari in Italia*, Turin [2]2001; K. Tabata, *I* comites gothorum *e l'amministrazione municipale in epoca ostrogota*, in Bibliothèque de l'antiquité tardive, 3, Études d'antiquité tardive offertes à Lellia Cracco Ruggini, J.M Carrié and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), Turnhout 2002, 67-78; B. Luiselli, *Dall'arianesimo dei Visigoti di Costantinopoli all'arianesimo degli Ostrogoti d'Italia*: Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 16/1 (2005) 5-30; G. Pilara, *Ancora un momento di riflessione sulla politica italiana di Teoderico, re dei Goti*: StudRom 53/3-4 (2005) 431-469; Id., *Il regno di Amalasunta e Atalarico: questioni politiche e sociali per un'analisi dei rapporti fra Stato e Chiesa*: Signum. Rivista di studi medievali e moderni I (2006) 93-115, Id., *La città di Roma fra Chiesa e Impero durante il conflitto gotico-bizantino*, Rome 2006.

G. Pilara

OUR FATHER. *See* *LORD'S PRAYER

OUSIA. The term *ousia* is derived from the Greek verb *einai,* "to be." It is usually translated "substance" or "essence" (Lat. *substantia, essentia*), but carries an ample series of meanings not completely expressed by these words. *Einai,* "to be," was normally opposed to *genesthai,* to "come to be" or "become," so that *ousia* represented a thing considered as persisting, or that which was permanent in something, beyond its changeable states. The problem remained of how this was to be explained or with what it should be identified; on this there was little agreement, and various theories were developed.

*Plato was the first great thinker to use the word in philosophical discussion. He showed Socrates asking the question: "what is"—e.g.—"justice?" as distinct from any specific just act. For Plato the *ousia* of a thing was its "Idea," its eternal and perfect archetype; *ousia* could also be used in a collective sense for "reality," i.e., the entirety of Ideas, as opposed to "appearance," changeable phenomena.

*Aristotle made limited use of this conception, holding that things were composed of their form (*eidos, idea*) and their matter: the form of things was permanent and characteristic of the species, but did not subsist outside its relation in matter: the Platonic conception of Ideas was thus rejected. Aristotle explained that the *ousia* could refer both to the form of things and to their matter, or to their union, i.e., to the thing itself. In the *Categories* he distinguished between the first *ousia,* the individual person or thing, and the second *ousia,* the species or genus to which it belonged. Considering its subsequent importance, this nomenclature was surprisingly not widespread until about AD 200: in any case it failed to clarify the distinction between the species understood collectively (e.g., the human race) and its specific form (e.g., human nature).

*Stoicism saw the world as a process in evolution, whose development was controlled not by a permanent system of Ideas or Forms, but by a single rational principle operating within it: formless matter and informing reason were thus two aspects of what was really a single and entire complex. Against this, however, Platonism considered the Stoics to be materialists for whom the permanent reality (*ousia*) of the world was its matter, rather than the intelligible and spiritual realities (*noētai ousiai*), as they themselves held.

In the Bible, *ousia* is not used as a philosophical term, but only in the sense of "property" or "possession." The Christian writers quickly became familiar with the Platonic distinction between material *ousia* and immaterial *ousia,* the latter including not just intelligible realities (e.g., moral ideas) but also rational beings, such as demons or angels (as in some old Platonizing writers, e.g., *Philo). The discussion soon turned to God's *ousia*: it was commonly held that we could be sure of God's existence (one possible sense of *ousia*), but that we could never comprehend his nature (which could also be called *ousia*). Thus God's *ousia* was declared incomprehensible, though in fact it was often discussed, having recourse to biblical texts such as "God is . . . fire . . . light . . . love." It was often asserted that God could be classified among "immaterial realities," though with the important proviso that God, for Christians, was the *sole* creator of all other reality.

Ousia played an important role in the theology of the *Trinity, in which a composite of the term—**homoousios* ("of the same *ousia,*" "consubstantial," "coessential")—was decisive. Discussion centered on the Logos, or Son of God, and it was soon admitted that God's Word could not be understood simply as an activity, like a pronounced word, but must be a totally independent reality: whence it seemed to follow that it must be a distinct *ousia.* Applying the same principle to the *Holy Spirit, it might seem that there were three *ousiai* in God, a formulation which can be found in some Greek writers before the Council of *Nicaea. The formulation was criticized as suggesting three different natures or degrees of divinity. But some Greek authors, from

*Origen on, had expressed God's triple reality with the alternative expression "three *hypostases," using a term that had come to be more clearly associated with individual beings. This formulation too was opposed by some Latin authors, for whom *hypostasis* corresponded to their term *substantia*, which was its etymological equivalent. Thus, acc. to the Latins, the Origenian Greeks believed in three *types* of divinity, whereas the Latin expression *una substantia* (and its equivalent "one hypostasis," used by some Greeks) risked being understood as "one single person."

The Council of Nicaea, opposing the teaching of *Arius, established that there was a single *ousia* in God, and that the Son came from the Father's *ousia*; but the doctrine of the three hypostases was not directly attacked, and the Eastern theologians continued to insist on the distinct reality of the Father, Son and Spirit. Modern discussions on Nicaea often hold that the conciliar bishops must have presupposed a definition of *ousia* which implied the Aristotelian distinction between first and second *ousia*: either "a thing," or "a nature." This is mistaken: the *Categories* had little influence on the Christian writers of that period, and in any case the Nicene formula was conceived in order to ensure wide agreement, while it condemned Arianism (see Kelly, *Doctrines*, 233-237; Stead, *Divine Substance*, 223-266). The solution was clarified in the course of the 4th c. as discussions proceeded between those who (like *Athanasius) spoke of "one hypostasis" in three persons, and those who continued to defend the "three hypostases." An important reference point was the Council of *Alexandria of 362, in which Athanasius decided for tolerance: the expression "one hypostasis" need not be understood as a fusion of the three persons, and the expression "three hypostases" was not to be condemned, as though a division were being made. Shortly later the Cappadocians opted for the formula "three hypostases, but one *ousia*," which became the normal orthodox expression. *Ousia* thus came to indicate the essential attributes common to all three persons: but even among the Cappadocians themselves we can find traces of their earlier and more flexible use. Both they and later orthodox theologians emphasized the incomprehensibility of God's *ousia*: all that we can understand are his activities or "energies."

G.C. Stead, *The Concept of Divine Substance*: VChr 29 (1975) 1-14; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London [3]1977; G.C. Stead, *Divine Substance*, Oxford 1977 (bibl.).

G.C. Stead

OXYRHYNCHUS. The city of Oxyrhynchus (*Oxyrhynchon Polis,* "city of the fish with the pointed nose") was the metropolis of the Roman province of Arcadia, 160 km (99.4 mi) SW of Cairo (ancient Memphis) in the W desert, 17 km (10.6 mi) from Beni Mazar on the Bahr Yusuf Canal, W affluent of the Nile terminating in Lake Moeris and the oasis of Fayum. In the Roman and Byzantine period it was a prosperous capital of the Oxyrhychus district. Oxyrhynchus (today the village of el-Bahnasa) had streets with columns, a theater for 11,000 spectators, a hippodrome, four thermal baths, temples for Egyptian (Serapis, Zeus Ammon, Isis, Osiris), Greek (Demeter, Apollo, Hermes, Dionysius) and Roman (Fortuna, Capitoline Jove, Mars) divinities. In 641 it came under Arab dominance and slowly declined, in part because its water system had been ruined. Few ruins remain of the ancient splendor, and few elements of the considerable Christian presence; there have been various finds of *Coptic art. There was also a Jewish community at Oxyrhynchus (see R. Mazza). From 1896, with the work of two English archaeologists, B. Grenfell and A. Hunt, and later of other archaeologists (including Italians), an impressive quantity of ostraca, papyri and fragments (in Greek, *Coptic, *Latin, Hebrew, *Syriac, Arabic) have been found, preserved thanks to the particular climatic conditions. The papyri date from the Ptolemaic period to the 8th c. Most of them regard the life of the city and relations among citizens (private and public acts, registers, inventories, letters, tax receipts etc.), by which it is possible to have a vivid outline of the way of life and the problems of an important Late Antique urban center. The papyri containing literary works are very numerous (Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Sappho, Alcaeus, Callimachus, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Menander, Apollonius of Rhodes, Demosthenes etc.), with further papyri containing scientific works (astronomy, mathematics) and an epitome of Livy's work. With new technology it is possible to read thousands of as yet unpublished papyrus fragments, since much of the content of the discovered material is otherwise unknown. The most substantial parts of the Oxyrhynchus papyri have been published in the series of the *Oxyrhynchus papyri;* more than 75 volumes have been published since 1898.

The legend that Joseph, Mary and Jesus, in the flight from Herod, took refuge at Oxyrhynchus has been passed down. The Christian community is attested from the 3rd c., since some Christians suffered persecution under *Diocletian (the eunuch Elias, Isaac of Tiphre and Epiusa). A papyrus (*POxy* 1,43) attests the existence of two churches at the be-

ginning of the 4th c., but its first known bishop is Pelagius, a Meletian (PG 25, 376); the first Catholic is Theodore (PG 24, 1430). To a visitor in the late 4th c., the city seemed totally Christian. In fact, the author of the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto,* attributed to *Rufinus by *Jerome (*Ep.* 133), presents the situation this way in 394: "It was then the turn of Oxyrhynchus, city of the Thebaid. . . . The city teems with monks; and around it—nearby—there are many others. Even the public buildings (which could at one time be dedicated to the gods), the temples of the ancient error, had by now become the dwellings of monks. In that city there were more monasteries than private houses. The city, as is known, is large, full of people; it numbers 12 beautiful churches" (ch. V). In the village of al-Sanquriya (Deir al-Sanquriya), 3 km (1.9 mi) outside of el-Bahnasa, are the remains of a Christian monastery.

Many papyri are Christian: numerous biblical texts from both the OT and NT; passages from the *Gospel of Thomas,* the *Didache* (*POxy* 15,1782), *Hermas (*POxy* 1,5; 3,404; 15,1828), the *Acts of Paul* (*POxy* 1,6), *Aristides (*POxy* 15,1778), *Irenaeus (*POxy* 3,405) and more. The papyrus fragment *Oxyrhynchus 840* describes a controversy in the temple between Jesus and a leader of the priests over purifications; papyrus *Egerton 2* from ca. 150 contains four gospel pericopes and is important for the dating of *John's gospel. One papyrus (*POxy* 42,3035) concerns the order for the arrest of a Christian by the local curia (perhaps during a persecution); another (*POxy* 31,2601; Naldini, 169-170 and 438) refers to the sacrifices to which all were obligated; another is the first attestation of the observance of Sunday in Egypt by the courts, acc. to *Constantine's law of 321 (*POxy* 54,3759). *POxy* 11,1357 presents a Christian calendar (year 535/536; see AB 42 [1924] 83-99). Many papyri preserve letters of Christians, e.g., *POxy* 8,1162, of a presbyter; *POxy* 8,1161, of a sick woman; *POxy* 6,839 speaks of a healing; *POxy* 1,198, *POxy* 14,1683, *POxy* 10,1299 of family and everyday problems, etc. An ostracon reports that Bishop Aphu of Oxyrhynchus required of candidates for the diaconate the memorization of 25 psalms, two letters of St. Paul and parts of the gospels (W.E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca*, London 1903, n. 29, n. 3); others relate prayers for healing of a fever (*POxy* 6,924; 8,1152; DACL 13, 1384).

Fedalto 2, 629; L.G. Modena, *Il cristianesimo a Ossirinco secondo i papiri*: Bulletin Société royale d'Archéologie. Alexandrie 31, n.s. IX, 2 (1937) 254-269; P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchite*, Florence 1981; O. Montevecchi, *La papirologia*, Milan 1988; S. Daris, *Scritti rari e scritti anonimi da Ossirinco*: Aevum Antiquum 2 (1989) 47-95; J. Krüger, *Oxyrhyncos in der Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption*, Frankfurt a.M. 1990; M. Lama, *Aspetti di tecnica ad Ossirinco: copie letterarie su rotoli documentari*: Aegyptus 71 (1991) 55-120; M.S. Funghi - G. Messeri Savorelli, *Lo "scriba di Pindaro" e le biblioteche di Ossirinco*: SCO 42 (1992) 43-62; S. Daris, *I papiri letterari di Ossirinco*: Papyrologica Lupiensia 5 (1996) 109-128; M. Naldini, *Il cristianesimo in Egitto*, Florence 1998; M. Capuani, *Egitto copto*, Milan 1999 (Eng. tr. *Christian Egypt: Coptic Art and Monuments Through Two Millennia*, Collegeville, MN 1999); R. Mazza, *Documenti dall'Egitto relativi agli Ebrei (sec. V-VII)*: AnSE 17 (2000) 383-394; W. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto (Ont.) 2004; F. Bovon, *"Fragment Oxyrhynchus840," Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity*: JBL 119 (2000) 705-728.

A. Di Berardino

P

PACATUS (d. after ca. 410). A difficult person to identify. Harnack once tried to identify him as Latinius Drepanius Pacatus, an orator from Aquitaine (4th/5th c.) (SPAW 1921, 266-284; 834-835). Harnack also suggested that he could be connected to another individual with the name Pacatus, an apologist and author of the treatise *Contra Porphyrium*, a few fragments of which remain (PL 68,359; PG 5,1025-1028). These hypotheses should be rejected (W. Bährens, "Pacatus," *Hermes* 56 [1921] 443-445); it seems better to associate him with a certain Pacatus, who was a close friend of *Paulinus of Nola. The presbyter *Uranius sent a letter to him concerning Paulinus's death (*Epistula de obitu Paulini ad Pacatum*). As one can gather from the letter itself, it seems certain that this Pacatus intended to commemorate Paulinus's life by writing a biography in poetic verses (ch. 1: *Nunc autem veniamus ad ea quae tibi, qui vitam eius versibus illustrare disponis, dicendi materiam subministrent* ["Now, because you are planning to describe his life in Latin verse, let us talk about the facts of his life that are going to provide you information for speaking about him"]).

CPL 1152a; *Pacatus* (*Ps. Polycarpi Smyrnensis*) *Contra Porphyrium*, ed. F.X. Funk - F.D. Diekamp, *Patres Apostolici*, II, Tübingen 1913, 397-400; *Epistula de obitu Paulini*: PL 53, 859-866; E. Galletier, *Panégyriques latins*, III, Paris 1955, 49 n.4; J.F. Matthews, *Gallic Supporters of Theodosius,* Latomus 30 (1971) 1073-1099; A. Pastorino, *Il* De obitu sancti Paulini *di Uranio,* Augustinianum 24 (1984) 115-141; Pacatus Drepanus, *Panegyric to the emperor Theodosius,* Liverpool 1987; A. Lovino, *Su alcune affinità tra il Panegirico per Teodosio di Pacato Drepanio e il De obitu Theodosii di sant'Ambrogio,* VetChr 26 (1989) 371-376.

L. Dattrino

PACHOMIUS (ca. 292–347). Founder of *cenobitism. Born into a *pagan family in the remotest S part of Egypt, he converted upon witnessing the love of Christians for the new recruits of the imperial army. From the moment of his baptism (313), he was attracted to the monastic life in order to serve his brothers; he followed the austere school of the solitary Palamon. After an unsuccessful attempt at communal life, he deemed it necessary to impose strict poverty and rigid discipline upon his brothers. He possessed the gift of understanding different individuals, maintaining their total allegiance and organizing their collective efforts. At times, he was too heavy handed, which pleased no one. Some even accused him of acting on the basis of visions and spiritual intuitions, because he was not one for abstract knowledge. In many *monasteries, esp. at Tabennesi and Pbou, he gathered thousands of monks and nuns, who were maintained by a thriving economy. Shortly before his death in 347, he was subject to the judgment of local bishops gathered at Latopolis, but his disciples' zeal rescued him. Even *Athanasius of *Alexandria remained his faithful supporter. Toward the end of his life, though, he rejected his disciple *Theodore, who appeared to be destined to succeed him.

For many years, Theodore preserved the most vivid, respectful, but also very human memories of Pachomius. It was precisely these memories of his humanness that provide the basis of the *Coptic *Lives* and the Greek *First Life*. (The Greek version was edited, perhaps, before the first Coptic *Life* was put to writing, because the brothers who translated it were more comfortable with Greek. But the Greek was written on the basis of the best preserved memories in Coptic. The Greek recension had a remote audience in mind; it omits his various idiosyncrasies and downplays the founder's visions and charismatic authority.) The other Greek *Lives* and the Latin *Life* that is dependent upon it already distance themselves from the sound authenticity of the ancient documents. With regard to the **Rules*, it is difficult to determine if they were written before the founder's death. In *Jerome's translation these *Rules* appear in four collections that do not line up. It was precisely this Latin text that exerted great influence in the West. Only fragments have been found in

Coptic (the same could be said of the *Lives*); in Greek, only excerpts have survived. Pachomius is also the author of *letters written in a cryptic language, later translated by Jerome, then discovered in Coptic and Greek. Some Coptic *catecheses, moreover, have been discovered.

The *Lives* turn Pachomius into an opponent of *Origen; this probably reflects the controversies at the beginning of the 4th c. The hypothesis that his community collected the "*gnostic" texts discovered at *Nag Hammadi remains subject to fierce debate.

CPG 2353-2355; DIP 6, 1067-1073; BBKL 6, 1413-1419; A. Boon, *Pachomiana latina,* Louvain 1932; F. Halkin, *S. Pachomii Vitae Grecae,* Brussels 1932; L.Th. Lefort, *Les vies coptes de s. Pachôme,* Louvain 1943, 1966; L.Th. Lefort, *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples* (CSCO 159-160) Louvain 1956; L.Th. Lefort, *S. Pachomii Vita Bohairice Scripta* (CSCO 107, S.Coptici 11, Traduction) Louvain 1964; L.Th. Lefort, *S. Pachomii Vitae Sahidice Scriptae* (CSCO 99, 100; S.Coptici 9,10) Louvain 1965; A.J. Festugière, *La première Vie grecque de S. Pachôme: Les moines d'Orient,* IV,2, Paris 1965; A. Veilleux, *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pachômien,* Rome 1968; F. Ruppert, *Das pachomianische Mönchtum,* Münsterschwarzach 1971; A. de Vogüé, *Saint Pachôme et son oeuvre d'après plusieurs études récentes*, RHE 69 (1974) 425-453; H. Quecke, *Die Briefe Pachoms,* Regensburg 1975; A. Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia,* I-III, Kalamazoo 1980–1981; F. Moscatelli, *Vita copta di S. Pacomio,* Padua 1981; H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs: Studien zum frühen Mönchtum II: Pachomius – Der Mann und sein Werk,* Würzburg 1983; P. Rousseau, *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt*, Berkeley 1985; T. Baumeister, *Der aktuelle Forschungsstand zu den Pachomiusregeln*, Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift 40 (1989) 313-321; A. de Vogüé, *De Saint Pachôme à Jean Cassien: Études littéraires et doctrinales sur le monachisme égyptien à ses débuts* (SA 120) Rome 1996; A. Camplani, *Sulle date del Sinodo di Latopolis e della morte di Pacomio*, StudMon 37 (1995) 7-18; A. Khosroyev, *Die Bibliothek von Nag Hammadi. Einige Probleme des Christentums in Ägypten während der ersten Jahrhunderte* (Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten 7), Altenberge 1995; E. Wipszycka, *The Nag Hammadi Library and the Monks: A Papyrologist's Point of View*, JJP 30 (2000) 179-191.

J. Gribomont

PACIAN (4th c.). Bishop of *Barcelona toward the end of the 4th c.; died during the reign of *Theodosius. He wrote various works (Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 106), among which was the *Cervus* (or *Cervulus*), to dissuade the faithful from celebrating the feasts in honor of the New Year. From his writings, three letters written to the *Novatianist *Sympronianus have survived to our day. In these letters, he combats the rigorist ecclesiology of these heretics by contrasting the unity of the Catholic Church with the plurality of *heresies and by recalling the fact that even Novatian himself approved the pardon of the **lapsi* (the lapsed) before becoming a *schismatic. Using a large number of passages from the NT, he demonstrates that even after *baptism the church allows for the repentance of the sinner; the church desires the conversion of sinners, not their death. Pacian discusses penance in his *Paraenesis ad paenitentiam* to exhort sinners to public penance, which, at that time, many Christians refused to do either out of dread for the sanctions imposed by the penance, or out of concern for what others would think of them. We even possess one of Pacian's baptismal sermons. Pacian, however, did not write the *Liber ad Iustinum Manichaeum* and the *De similitudine carnis peccati*, treatises G. Morin attributed to him. Scholars have properly attributed the second work to *Eutropius.

CPL 561-563; PL 13, 1051-1094; Ed. L. Rubio Fernández, Barcelona 1958; *Patrologia* III, 124-126 (bibl.); BBKL VI, 1423-1426; P. Mattei, *La figure de Novatien chez Pacien de Barcelone: Souces et valeur documentaire des 'Lettres' à Simpronianus sur le sujet*, Augustinianum 38 (1998) 355-370; Id., *Baptême hérétique, ecclésiologie et Siracide 34,25: Notes sur l'influence de Cyprien dans un texte de Pacien de Barcelone,* RTL 30 (1999) 180-194; *Pacien de Barcelone et l'Hispanie au IV^e^ siècle,* ed. D. Bertrand et al., Paris 2004.

M. Simonetti

PAGAN - PAGANISM. The Latin term *paganus, a, um* (from *pagus*, *-i*: village) referred to what was *rustic, of the countryside*, *of the village*; its secondary meaning was *civil, middle class*, as opposed to the *military class*. Scholars have discussed the historical process that introduced the religious meaning of the term *paganus*, which has remained in the corresponding adjective *pagan*, meaning: *the one who* (*or that which*) *belongs to ancient polytheism, *Gentile*. Some scholars have argued that the religious meaning came from the secondary meaning (T. Zahn and after him many other scholars), others from the original meaning (J. Zeiller). The question is extremely complex and has been long discussed, with scholars offering different hypotheses. It should be noted, however, that only in the 4th c. do certain documents attest that the term *paganus* acquired the modern meaning in the language of Christians: the first document, dated between 300 and 330, is an inscription (CIL X/2, 7112) pertaining to a baby girl, *Iulia Florentina*, who was born as a *pagana* and received *baptism, that is *fidelis facta.* In the second document, which is also presented in an inscription (*mutila*; CIL VI, 30463; Diehl *Inscript. Lat. Christ.*, vol. I, 1342), we read of a woman who *inter fidels fidelis fuit*, *inter [al]ienos pagana fuit*. This meaning of *paganus* became the norm during the 2nd half of the 4th c. *Orosius, at the beginning of the 5th, says that the *pagani* are *alieni a civitate Dei* (*Hist. adv. Paganos*, pro. 1,9).

This semantic evolution is difficult to explain; as a result, various suggestions have been forwarded. In the 2nd half of the 4th c. one finds the use of the term *paganismus,* even though it is rare, in, e.g., *Marius Victorinus's writings (see *Comm. in epist. Pauli ad Galatas* 2:9). If one wants to trace the notion of "paganism" as a religion and a way of life that does not mix with *Judaism or Christianity, it is necessary to keep in mind several other ideas. Already from the 2nd c., the apologists divided humanity into three group: Greeks (Ἕλληνες), *Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι) and Christians (Χριστιανοί); this came about because Christians did not identify themselves with either Hellenic or Jewish culture. On this basis, they defined themselves as the τρίτον γένος or the καινὸν γένος in order to defend the newness and originality of Christianity precisely with reference to paganism and Judaism; for this reason, they directed their apologetic treatises both πρὸς Ἰουδαίος and πρὸς Ἕλληνας.

When *Tertullian, the first, or one of the very first, Christian writers of the Latin language, wrote a work against the pagans, he titled it *Ad nationes*, making it thus known that in all likelihood he recognized that the concept *romanus* retained its ethnic or political meaning but did not deprive Christians of the title of Roman citizens nor did it intend to place them outside the *res publica*. That Christians applied to pagans the Latin term *nationes* or *gentes*, which translates the Greek term ἔθνη, as has been suggested (see A. Schneider, *Le premier livre*, pp. 13ff.), came about perhaps (1) through the influence of the OT—the LXX (Septuagint) designates the holy people of Israel as a λαός and the pagans as ἔθνη, the last term being taken up by the NT, along with its derivative ἐθνικοί—and (2) from the influence of Roman "nationalism" that set the *populus romanus* against the *gentes* or the *nationes*, inasmuch as they were peoples foreign, provincial and not too geographically distant from the barbarians.

At the end of the 3rd c., *Arnobius would still entitle his *apologetic work *Adversus nationes*. Later the term *paganus* would prevail; this brings to mind the work of Paulus *Orosius, *Historiarum adversus paganos libri VII*.

It is clear that the worst sense of the notions of "pagan" and "paganism" took hold among Christians: these terms stood for beliefs in false gods accompanied by negative and reprehensible rituals, practices, customs and practices. But at the same time, these terms reveal the historical situation of the relationship between paganism and Christianity, which constitutes another theme of great interest for understanding the historical dynamics of the first centuries of the common era, as the enormous bibl. on this topic demonstrates.

T. Zahn, *Paganus*: Neue Kirchl Zeitschr. 10 (1899) 18ff; J. Zeiller, *Paganus Étude de terminologie storique*, Paris-Fribourg 1917; B. Altaner, ZKG 58 (1939) 130ff; C. Mohrmann, *Encore une fois paganus*: VChr 6 (1952) 109-121 (= Id., *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens*, t. III, Rome 1979, 277-289); E. Demougeot, *Remarques sur l'emploi de Paganus*: Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni, I, Milan 1956, 337-350, H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'Empire Romain*, Brussels [2]1964, 188-220; I. Opelt, *Griechische und lateinische Bezeichnungen der Nichtchristen. Ein terminologischer Versuch*: VChr 19 (1965) 1-22; A. Schneider, *Le premier livre "Ad nationes" de Tertullien*, Geneva-Rome 1968, 10ff., 187ff. (Christians as a *tertium genus*) and passim. On the conflict/encounter between paganism and Christianity, see the classic work of P. de Labriolle, *La réaction payenne*, Paris 1934 ([2]1948). For a more recent treatement, see L. Padovese, *Lo scandalo della croce. La polemica anticristiana nei primi secoli*, Rome 1988; F. Ruggiero, *La follia dei cristiani. La reazione pagana al Cristianesimo nei secoli I-V*, Rome 2002 (there are extensive bibl. references on pp. 213-251, see P. Siniscalco, *Il cammino di Cristo nell'Impero romano*, Rome-Bari [5]2004 (with a short bibl. on pp. 335ff.).

P. Siniscalco

PAHLAVI. Dead language belonging to the W Iranian group into which numerous works of Christian interest seem to have been translated, generally from *Syriac. Of these works, only *Manichean texts and a Psalter have survived.

C.A. Friedrich, *Bruchstücke einer Pehlevi-Übersetzung der Psalmen. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Kaj Barr*, Berlin 1933; B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament . . .*, Oxford 1977, 276-277; W. Sundermann, *Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur*: MIOF 14 (1968) 388-415; Ph. Gignoux, *L'auteur de la version pehlevie du psautier serait il nestorien?*, in Mémorial Mgr G. Khouri-Sarkis, Louvain 1969, 233-244; D. Shapira, *Biblical Quotations in Pahlavi:* Henoch 23 (2001)187-195 [Old Testament questions]; C.G. Cereti, *La letteratura pahlavi*, Milan 2001; C.G. Cereti, *Le Croci di San Tommaso e la letteratura cristiana in lingue medioiraniche,* in *Studi in onore di Umberto Scerrato per il suo settantacinquesimo compleanno,* ed. M. V. Fontana and B. Genito, Naples 2003, 193-206.

S.J. Voicu

PAIDEIA. Christianity certainly produced a comprehensive conception of paideia, understood as an expression of a new vision of the world and the transcendent, and therefore as *education* on the basis of such principles. Nevertheless, this conception was not (like many other teachings) the object of theory and systematic inquiry during the first years of the new religion.

The School of *Alexandria, esp. its leaders *Clement and *Origen, achieved a theoretical advance by

reaching one of the first comprehensive examinations of the topic. In the *Pedagogue*, Clement maintains that Greek learning, *Hellenic paideia, provides a model for Christian learning; it serves as a preliminary state of Christian truth. In the *Pedagogue*, Clement assigns Christ the role of the divine educator. Clement thus places himself before the Greeks even with respect to the idea of learning/culture in its totality. To present Christ as a pedagogue implied a curriculum, and its full meaning can be understood only by considering the historical background of the entire tradition of Greek paideia. It does not mean, therefore, that one should limit oneself only to the comparison of teachings; instead, it means that one should retain the theoretical principles that underlie this comparison. The lofty meaning Clement assigns to the term "pedagogue" is close to the philosophic meaning that Plato had given to God, when he defined him in the *Laws* (X, 897b) as "the pedagogue of the entire world." By analogy, Christ should be seen on this very high level, as the universal pedagogue. Other philosophers and writers, Greeks and barbarians, were able to achieve a "pedagogy" only because of God's *providential plan. Greek philosophy, however imperfect it may have been, was therefore a type of preliminary education for the perfect *gnostic.

The true paideia, as a result, is identified as the Christian religion, i.e., Christianity in its intellectual form, which was formulated by Clement, because it is clear that only if it is understood as *gnosis does Christianity express the divine paideia. This being a given, Clement attributed an important part of gnosis to the disciplines of *enkyklios* paideia, i.e., the "humanistic" learning, which was dialectic, astronomy and geometry. The primary function of dialectic is to lead the gnostic to an understanding of the world of the forms (*Strom*. I 176,3; 177,1; VI 80,8). Astronomy helps the gnostic move from a contemplation of the physical world to the transcendent world. The gnostic does not reject the contemplation of the world and its beauties (*Strom*. IV, 163,1; 169,1) because he knows that by contemplating the harmony and order of the universe, his *soul will be liberated from every contact with the earth (*Strom*. VI, 80,3; 90,3, etc.). This positive assessment of the encyclopedic disciplines is likewise in agreement with the *Platonic *tradition. In the seventh book of the *Republic*, Plato had already indicated the role of each of these disciplines. Dialectic renders the human mind capable of knowing the first principle (533cd). Astronomy, in turn, must be the study of what one finds beyond the world (529d), because the contemplation of the order of the universe causes humans to have *faith in God (*Laws* 966de). Even geometry helps the intellect to elevate itself to contemplate reality because the objects of this science are not subject to change or corruption (*Republic* 527b).

The same conception of the encyclopedic disciplines can be found in the schools of thought upon which Clement depends such as *Philo's or those contemporaneous to him such as *Middle Platonism and *Hermetism. For example, acc. to Alcinous, dialectic leads to the knowledge of the first principles and the divine things (*Didask*. pp. 162, 8-10 and 17-18); astronomy allows humans to pass from the world of the senses to the world of the forms and to obtain some knowledge of the creator of the universe (162, 22-28 and 30-32). In sum, only after the study of all these propedeutic teachings can one begin the study of theology.

Origen made the discussion more complex precisely because of his less favorable attitude toward Greek philosophy, despite the fact he studied it no less than Clement. Even Origen maintains that paideia should characterize the Christian religion, and he attributes paideia to the Son of God, whom he analyzes not so much under the aspect of a pedagogue who teaches truth, but rather under the aspect of the Logos who has come to earth to fulfill the duty of the Teacher. The pedagogical aspect of Christ's teaching consists in teaching the human soul—which is clothed with flesh and materiality as a result of its *sin of being "satiated" in the vision of God, a sin committed before time began—to fulfill its mission of knowing the truth and returning to final union with its creator. As Courcelle notes in his well-known and extensive study, it was Origen, in a certain sense, who recovered and used the two values that the pagan tradition had expressed in the teaching of the Oracle at Delphi, "Know Thyself": (1) the original and essentially religious value; (2) the specifically philosophical value recognized and proposed by *Socrates. The need for inner knowledge thus becomes central in a certain type of Christian, or even a purely human, education, starting from the manifold experience of pagan learning; this idea runs through the awareness of Christianity and the *pagan world of Late Antiquity until the era of St. Bernard of Clairveaux.

*Basil of Caesarea used this theme of self-awareness, reworked in a Christian way, esp. in his homily *Attende tibi ipsi*, in which he interprets the analogous exhortation of Dt 15:9: "Take heed to yourself so that your thoughts do not become iniquitous in your heart." Basil's position in that homily is common to the other great Cappadocians: following the

teaching of Origen, Basil proposes a formulation of primarily philosophic ideas intended for Christian rulers—ideas that were originally developed by the Platonic tradition. *Plotinus's thought can be summarized in a concise expression found in the *Enneads*: "The one who knows one's self will also know one's origin" (VI, 5,7,13). *Porphyry of Tyre dedicated himself to further explaining the ideas of his teacher Plotinus on this point, esp. in the following works: *On the Statement "Know Thyself," The Sentences* and *Letter to Marcella*. Of utmost importance in Porphyry's thought is the affirmation that "the soul through true knowledge of our essence . . . reaches the Good, which is its happiness." The exhortation of Dt 15:9 should be interpreted in a way analogous to the Greek precept "Know thyself," in the sense that Basil exhorts one to know one's self, i.e., both one's weaknesses and the *virtues that one has received from God. Basil, therefore, always maintains the necessary distinction between the two propositions and the two spheres of thought, resolving the statement "know thyself" as the self-control required by Christian morality. As a result, one should not focus on the "Greek" aspect of the exhortation to "know thyself," as many have done, but one should preserve its specific Christian sense. Granted, within this homily there are some elements that undeniably come from pagan philosophy. In fact, in ch. 3, Basil uses the Alexandrian tradition, acc. to which humans have been made in the image and likeness of God not in entirety but solely in the intellect. One can find a hint of this conception in the *Homilies on the Hexameron* (VI, 1,6): "You will know yourself to be earthly by nature, but a work that has come from the hands of God: a creature much weaker than irrational beings with respect to physical strength, yet the chosen master of the animals and beings without a soul. With respect to natural qualities you are inferior, but through the superiority of reason you are capable of lifting yourself up to heaven" (tr. Naldini). If we pay attention to ourselves, the homily continues, we will have the opportunity to find God in ourselves: we are truly a microcosm, and the very God who reveals himself for our admiration in the creatures of the universe is present in us.

Accordingly, Basil rejected, probably from the very beginning of the period after his departure for *Athens, the pretentious claims of the traditional curriculum of studies. And the impression the *Exhortation to Youths* gives us is no different from his other statements from those years. According to Basil, the entire structure of the educational system had already collapsed and needed to be rebuilt within a Christian framework. Though not realizing it, only what he had absorbed from his Christian readings could remain intact in his texts. What for other Christian authors, esp. in the Latin-speaking world, constituted such a drastic disagreement, Basil resolved with peaceful determination in his balanced and also resolute and innovative awareness. His ascetical interests are certainly undeniable, but he knew how to display them in such a way as to avoid the extremes of individuals such as *Eustathius of Sebaste in the area of ethics-doctrine, just as (and this is what interests us here) his exasperation with the condemnation and rejection of non-Christian values. Even his pedagogical interests in the *Exhortation to Youths* reveal the influence of Origen's teaching insofar as the work follows a selection of writings and ideas within the pagan *paideia* to obtain only what is valid for the Christian, just as the Alexandrian had done. This also applies to the so-called scientific disciplines for "benefit," i.e., understood in a Christian sense, for non-Christian writings and philosophies that function as a propedeutic for understanding the sacred Scriptures and penetrating the mysteries of Revelation.

*Gregory of Nazianzus applies the same approach (*Oration* IV, 101ff.) to defend the same right to avail oneself of Greek paideia when *Julian the Apostate believed he could take it away from Christians on the pretext that it did not belong to them but only to pagans. In the same way, he defends Greek paideia against those shortsighted and insular faithful who considered it unsuitable for a Christian writer (*Oration* 36,4); so that as a result precisely in the *Eulogy for Basil* (*Oration* 43.11), he digresses at length to defend its usefulness for the Christian writer both on the literary level and the educational level for theological insight. "Paideia, therefore, should not be despised," he concludes.

During these same years, the Latin world addressed this theoretical issue, and two very well-known figures focused their attention not only on *sapientia* but also on *eloquentia*, which, in their eyes, was also present in Christian authors. If in the past Christians refuted the criticisms against the plain and improper style of the *Bible by making recourse to the concept of the "true" and the "useful" that those writings obtained for people, at the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th, Christian scholarship possessed a richness that could not be called into question. From this fact arises *Jerome's proud claim in the dedicatory statements of the *De viris illustribus*: pagans critical of the church because they do not think it has had philosophers or orators will have to recognize that they are mistaken when they read the catalog of Christian writers, Greeks and

Latins, from the religion's origins until Jerome himself (many of the judgments of the *De viris illustribus* return in *Letter* 70, To Magnus). *Augustine addresses the issue in the *De doctrina christiana*, which contains an explicit educational program centered on a serious and in-depth study of Scripture. In fact, if until that time Christian writers had adopted the schema of *prodesse*, acc. to Horace's formula, but held it distinct from the *delectare*, in the sense that one could find the first element in the Bible, but the second in pagan rhetorical education, Augustine maintains that now *auctores nostri*, i.e., those Christians mentioned by Jerome, are able to supply the constitutive elements for a Christian paideia. Such *auctores* (authors) are both the Bible, which possesses its own artistic merit that cannot be judged by the measure of pagan rhetoric, and Christian authors, by that time considered classical, who in their own way presented the rhetorical virtues of *delectare* and *prodesse*, which are tightly united.

H. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis*, Berlin-Leipzig 1932; H.I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris 1958; A. Quacquarelli, *Le fonti della paideia antenicena* (*Renovatio mundi*), Brescia 1967; Id., *Scuola e cultura nei primi secoli*, Brescia 1974; W. Jaeger, *Cristianesimo primitivo e paideia greca*, Florence 1974; P. Courcelle, *Connais toi toi-même. De Socrate à saint Bernard*, Paris 1974–1975; M. Naldini, *La posizione culturale di Basilio Magno*, in *Basilio di Cesarea, la sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia*. Atti del congr. int., Messina 1983, 199-216; M. Simonetti, in *Sant'Agostino*, *L'istruzione cristiana*, ed. M.S., Milan 1994; C. Moreschini, *Filosofia e letteratura in Gregorio di Nazianzo*, Milan 1997; M. Simonetti, *Auctores nostri* (*Agostino, doctr. Christ. 4,6,9*): Auctores nostri 1 (2004) 183-200.

C. Moreschini

PAINTING

I. Wall decoration: Style and content - II. Miniature painting - III. Icons.

I. Wall decoration: Style and content. Scholars have now definitively abandoned the thesis of earlier authors who dated early Christian painting to the 1st or 2nd c. AD. After comparative investigations with "pagan" products and after the affirmation of a line of research that, alongside the purely stylistic elements, examined the archaeological-topographical data that were decisive for the chronology, scholars now believe that the most ancient pictorial depictions of Christianity should not be dated before the early years of the 3rd c. From the formal point of view, it has also been accepted that early Christian painting, as in the case of early Christian art in general, was perfectly inserted into Late Antiquity's artistic sensibilities (an expression of the deep economic, political, social and spiritual crisis that shook the Roman world in the 3rd c.). The artistic sensibilities of that era tended toward a popularizing vein that primarily privileged the content and expressive value of the image at the expense of its correct and formal delivery. This tendency, moreover, was perfectly in line with the very essence of ancient Christian art, and at that, in addition to trying to reach formal perfection, aimed to recall the foundations of its own faith through the figurative "language" capable of "expressing" such concepts in a manner clear and easily intelligible to all.

Until the religious peace achieved in the early 4th c., early Christian painting was almost exclusively documented for us through the frescoes found in cemeteries (and, esp., the Roman catacombs). The use of paintings for decorating the tomb as a second home, a practice already widespread in the classical world, continued to recall to one's mind through images the means through which faith assures the believer of salvation. The documentation is therefore full of lacunae, leaving one to ask whether during this period, alongside funerary decoration, there also developed the decoration of Christian places of worship, as one would be led to believe by the example of the *domus ecclesiae* in *Dura Europos, a caravan city on the river Euphrates, destroyed by the Persians shortly after 256 (C.H. Kraeling - C. Bradford Welles, *The Christian Building: The Excavations at Dura Europos. Final Report VIII, Part II*, New Haven, CT 1967). Here, in an empty space of the house that was turned into a baptistery, are found painted images of the OT and the NT, recalling the neophyte's salvation obtained through the death and resurrection worked in baptism by Christ, the new *Adam, in an extremely schematic and well-depicted style (but also monumental, as in the case of the scene of the Holy Women at the Sepulcher). The chief structure of the figures in the baptistery, its coordinate composition and the loss of its natural proportions have caused some scholars to note the strong Iranian influences (Bisconti, *Arte e artigianato*, 53-56). The appearance of these paintings in the baptismal contexts and not in the meeting room of the *domus* has been considered by some to be evidence of the church authority's utmost aversion, in the first centuries, for decorating the church's walls (an aversion, moreover, attested by the 36th canon of the Council of *Elvira [306]: Mansi II, 11), where, however, the figures on the baptistery could have performed the simple task of illustrating to the neophyte the sacramental means of the *soul's regeneration (on this question, see Bisconti, *Arte e artigianato*, 23-30, 48).

At *Rome, the first manifestations of paintings—which, as noted above, can be found solely in a cemeterial context—are dated to the first decades of the 3rd c. During this period, the wall decoration of the recesses of the catacombs' galleries—obtained through the use of the fresco or, much more rarely, in tempera painting—was marked acc. to the typical pattern of an illusionist wall division of red-green lines on a white background. This scheme combines—on ceilings and walls—aedicules, panels, portraits, lunettes, etc. acc. to the various geometrical textures, connected by linear segments, and represents the soul's life using the extreme simplification of the ancient decorative architectural partitions of the Pompeian tradition (Bisconti, *Memorie*, 27-36; Id., *La pittura*, 36-40; Mielsch, *Römische Wandmalerei*, 112-123). Within this linear syntax (as one can see, e.g., in the crypts of Lucina in the cemetery of S. Callisto [Wp 24-25; 26,1; 27,1; 28; 29,1 = Nestori, p. 99, nos. 1-2], in the recess of the *coronatio* in the catacomb of Pretextatus [Wp 17-20 = Nestori, p. 87, no. 3] or in the recesses of the so-called sacraments likewise in S. Callisto [Wp 15,2; 26,2-3; 27,2-3; 29,2; 38-39; 40,3; 41; 46-48,1 = Nestori, pp. 102-103, nos. 21-25]) there are figures (those decorations often taken from the then-current cosmic, zoomorphic and Dionysian fashion repertoire of the classical tradition), formulated with a rapid and uninhibited impressionistic technique which, by means of vivid and essential chromatic components, forms a quick outline of the image, ignoring its volume and details.

Early depictions are marked by a heavy symbolism centered on the concept of salvation and the sacramental means that ensure it, means to which the symbolic images taken from the classical repertoire allude. Take, for example, the Good Shepherd and the **Orans*, repeated in alternation, as on the ceiling of the recess of the aforementioned crypts of Lucina, to signify the two ends of the work of salvation, the Savior and the saved soul—while the Good Shepherd in a synthetic way also alludes to the pastoral contacts and the prefiguration of the afterlife. Another example includes some of the first depictions of biblical events such as those of *Daniel in the lions' den, the story of *Jonah, the baptism of *Jesus, the sacrifice of Isaac, the Samaritan woman at the well, the miracle of the rock, the resurrection of *Lazarus, the healing of the *paralytic, etc. Other figures such as the *fisherman and the philosopher, likewise drawn from classical iconography, as in the case of the Good Shepherd and the *Orans*, could assume additional symbolic meanings alluding to baptism and the "new" doctrine held by believers, in addition to a generic reference to the afterlife and culture. At times, alongside scenes that are not repeated in a later age (one thinks, e.g., of the "fish of Lucina," which perhaps alludes to the *Eucharist [Wp 28 = Nestori, p. 99, no. 2] or to the so-called crowning with thorns in the aforementioned homonymous recess [Wp 18 = Nestori, p. 87, no. 3]), we find iconographic formulations during this period that, while not having specific representation in later paintings (e.g., the scene of the Samaritan woman or the resurrection of Lazarus in the recesses A 3 and A 6 of the sacraments [Wp 39,1; 46,2 = Nestori, pp. 102-103, nos. 22, 25]), still provide evidence of an earlier phase that can be defined by the formation of an iconographic Christian repertoire. This phase is characterized by the elaboration of figurative partitions that have not yet been codified into those fixed patterns that are typical of later periods which make their subjects easily recognizable and understandable to all. In the most ancient area of the catacomb of Priscilla, the occurrence of Christ's incarnation is represented by the image—which is also an original formulation no longer used—of Mary with baby Jesus in arms, alongside the prophet Balaam, who points to the star to signify the fulfillment of prophecy (F. Bisconti, *La Madonna di Priscilla: Interventi di restauro ed ipotesi sulla dinamica decorativa*: RivAC 72 [1996] 7-34).

Outside the Roman setting, but still in a funerary context and still during the first decades of the 3rd c., the paintings of a mausoleum of the necropolis of Cimitile, near *Nola, with scenes of Jonah and humanity's first parents (Korol, *Die frühchristlichen Wandmalereien*, 38ff.), thematically, stylistically and chronologically can be assigned to a period very close to that of the paintings of the vestibule found in the upper level of the catacomb of S. Januarius at Naples. In that catacomb, in the context of a decorated, elaborate, linear, red-green syntax, motifs drawn from the classical repertoire and thematically Christian scenes appear in alternation (*David and Goliath, the episode of the "mystical" tower inspired by the *Shepherd of* *Hermas; U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Roma 1975, 26-27). In *Egypt, at *Alexandria, an underground tomb reveals the same mixture of themes from the classical tradition (scenes of rural life, a portrayal of a bust of the god Pan) and from images probably or certainly Christian in origin (Good Shepherd, Jonah under the booth that he had made for himself), a mixture documented in contemporary Roman works (H. Riad, *Tomb Paintings from the Necropolis of Alexandria*: Archaeology 17/3 [1964] 169-171; J. Weitzmann-Fiedler, *Tomb Chamber*, in *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third*

to Seventh Century, New York 1979, 273-274).

Returning to Rome, shortly after the mid-3rd c., the lighter, linear, red-green style of the first decades of that century tends to become increasingly more illusory and loses its compositional coherence with the gradual insertion of suspended elements and clutter that tend to break up the linear syntax and destroy the illusion of open space (e.g., in the recesses of the Good Shepherd at Domitilla: Wp 6,2; 7,2; 9-12,1 = Nestori, p. 121, no. 23). One can perceive such features surely after the mid-3rd c. in the hypogeum of the Aurelii on Viale Manzoni (Nestori, pp. 44-47, nos. 1-4), thus affirming the current classification, noticeable esp. in the monumental figures of the individuals represented on the walls of one of the hypogeum recesses. Several scenes are marked by the typical bucolic-pastoral and philosophical themes; nevertheless, others produce a more controversial interpretation and probably reveal the patron's will to express his or her own distinct philosophical and religious ideas (F. Bisconti, *L'ipogeo degli Aureli in Viale Manzoni: Un esempio di sincreresi privata*: Augustinianum 25 [1985] 889-903). Frescoes depicting episodes from the OT and the NT (in addition to a banquet scene, held by some to allude secretly perhaps to the Eucharist), of the so-called Greek Chapel in the catacombs of St. Priscilla (Wp 13-15,1; 16 = Nestori, pp. 27-28, no. 39) have created chronological problems—as have other paintings of the most ancient regions of the catacombs: a dating was proposed (based on studies conducted more or less contemporaneously) between 170-180, rather than placing them in the first decades of the 4th c. (see Reekmans, *La cronologie*, 284-285). The megalographic dimensions of the cycle of Susanna (unique in its formulation), in addition to that undeniable classicism that pervades the "chapel," has caused some scholars to set a post-Gallienic dating (A. Recio, *La "Cappella Greca" vista y diseñada entre los años 1783 y 1786 por Seroux d'Agincourt*: RivAC 56 [1980] 49-94), in the context, i.e., of that classicist Renaissance, whose signs one can clearly identify in the same catacomb of Priscilla, and the so-called recess of the Velatio (Wp 66,1; 78-81; 82,2 = Nestori, p. 23, no. 7), where the figures of the arcosolium at the bottom, to be interpreted as representations of three moments of a young woman's life (C. Dagens, *À propos du cubiculum de la "Velatio"*: RivAC 47 [1971] 119-129), are painted with intense colors and plastic shaping (F. Bisconti, *Scavi e restauri nella regione della "Velata" in Priscilla*: RivAC 77 [2001] 49-95).

The period extending from the last decades of the 3rd c. to the Constantinian age (*Die Katakombe*, 190ff.). The most ancient group of frescoes likewise characterized by the linear wall pattern and an establishment of solid and well-constructed figures (one thinks, e.g., of the so-called recess of *Nicerus* with the sole scene of the crippled woman: *Die Katakombe*, 312-318, no. 65), are those in several recesses of the so-called staircase Y and the area of the *agapai* (ibid., 297-300, 309-312, nos. 58, 64), compositions marked by clear dramatic contrasts that, through the use of divisionist optic effects, achieve a revealing intensity. In these paintings one repeatedly finds a unique variety of floral and geometric decorations, alongside a progressive transformation (starting esp. from the tetrarchic age) of lines of the 3rd c. from the ornamental pattern into bands, whose frames of figured scenes almost became an essential element of the decoration (Bisconti, *La pittura*, 42-43). From a thematic point of view one should note the introduction of new OT and NT scenes and the frequent representation of gravediggers (**fossores*) at work, and banquets, at times, perhaps, alluding to the heavenly banquet and at other times realistically representing funerary banquets offered by the living for the dead.

As a result of the Constantinian peace, further new themes were introduced into the pictorial repertoire to celebrate the steps of Christ's earthly journey or to recall episodes from the OT esp. significant in relation to the history of redemption or in the perspective of the always latent salvific symbology. The theme of Christ the teacher appears, alone or surrounded by the apostolic college (complete or incomplete), a theme alluding to the doctrine preached by Christ, but also to the final judgment and the unity of the church; aside from the typical scenes ranging from philosophers teaching to the courtly scenes representing the emperor and his dignitaries, the dependency on the iconographic substantiates the idea that such images were meant to evoke a subtle anti-Caesar response. The images are set at one point more often within wide frames, bordered by large moldings, juxtaposed and interconnected in the walls of the recesses on horizontal vignettes, often above the interior wall lining, that imitate marble panels, or on the ceilings, within the compartments at times similarly separated by a red-green lining partition (Bisconti, *La pittura paleocristiana*, 42). At times, the images, as in the contemporaneous sarcophagi designed in a flowing vignette fashion, are set one next to the other, without dividing elements, against one sole decorative background, that can occupy, e.g., a wall of a gallery (Wp 62,1; 204; 212 = Nestori, pp. 18-19, nos. 5-6). From the formal point of view, the Constantinian age signals the recovery of plasticism and a reconsolidation of

the forms contained in the surrounding marked lines; the figures are often represented facing forward; the faces become rounded, characterized by dark and compact hair (see, e.g., the well-known depiction of the Madonna with Child in Maius: Wp 163,1; 207-209 = Nestori, p. 36, no. 22).

At Rome, the most significant artifact of the 4th c.—datable between the Constantinian age and the last decades of that century—is the catacomb on the Via Dino Compagni (A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960). This catacomb was a private cemetery, almost entirely decorated with frescoes, in which, alongside pieces of unusual artistic quality, we find themes formulated with a peculiar iconography and, in certain cases, totally new scenes (e.g., the now very famous "medical lesson": ibid., pl. 107 = Nestori, p. 77, no. 9); these are rare phenomena, all of which are to be properly connected to the private monuments in which evidently painters of the highest skill were able to work. These workers were not tied to those traditional iconographic patterns that were invariably repeated by modest artisans who worked in the community cemeteries. Some have placed the extraordinarily rich iconographic repertoire (esp. with OT scenes) in relation to the existence of miniatured Bibles, from which painters borrowed themes and iconographic images (L. Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe an der Via Latina in Rom. Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie der alttestamentlichen Wandmalereien*, Münster 1978). If, because of the pictorial quality, one can therefore reasonably conclude that it was wrought by a particularly wealthy commission, then the existence, among the various paintings, of mythological subjects is probable evidence in the hypogeum, in the 2nd half of the 4th c., of the presence of groups that had not yet been converted to the new faith interred alongside groups of Christian families. From the formal point of view, the characteristics of the Constantinian age, which can be found in the early recesses, follow representations marked by a more knowledgable classicism and the formal composition typical of the style from the decades immediately following the mid 4th c.

This classicist manner, however, characterized by a more emphasized linearism, can be found in the figure compositions of the closing decades of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th. During this period, added to the more customary themes of the funerary repertoire were others marked to exalt the glory of the martyrs and the royalty of the Teacher—scenes that often drew inspiration from the most prestigious models existing in places of worship. Images of Christ with the apostolic college or with *Peter and *Paul alone were enriched with individual iconographic details that were intended to emphasize the royalty of Jesus (A. Ferrua, *Un nuovo cubicolo dipinto della via Latina*: Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 45 [1972–1973] 176-179); the theme of the *Traditio Legis*, perhaps elaborated for the apse of the basilica of St. Peter in the Vatican, makes its appearance in painting in a fresco from the beginning of the 5th c. of the catacomb *ad Decimum* in Grottaferrata (Roma) (L. Recio Veganzones, *Las pinturas de la catacumba "ad Decimum" de Grottaferrata*: RivAC 59 [1983] 387-409). In the fresco of the ceiling of the recess of the catacomb of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter (Wp 252-254 = Nestori, p. 48, no. 3), the derivation from lost basilica models is evident in the characteristic superimposition of the two partitions in which the artist develops the exaltation of Christ's royal magisterium, between Peter and Paul, and the acclamation of the four eponymous martyrs on the mountain of Paradise. The stylistic characteristics of that historical period are revealed in the elongated figures, the hieratic faces, the almond eyes and the helmet-shaped hair, in the marked linearism of the forms, dematerialized in an abstract ambience. Similar characteristics can be also found in that painting representing Christ among seven individuals, from the catacomb of Albanus, near Rome, datable to the beginning of the 5th c., to which was added in the same catacomb at the end of the century a fresco with Christ among four saints, a fresco characterized by a greater linearity and abstraction (M. Marinone, *La decorazione pittorica della catacomba di Albano*: RIA 19-20 [1972-73] 103-138).

Outside the funerary context, in the 2nd half of the 4th c., we find at Rome a fresco of the small local cult under the church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo al Celio (M. Cecchelli, *Osservazioni sul complesso della "domus" celimontana dei SS. Giovanni e Paolo*: Atti IX Congr. Int. Arch. Crist., I, Vatican City 1978, 551-562; B. Brenk, *Microstoria sotto la chiesa dei SS. Giovanni e Paolo: La cristianizzazione di una casa privata*: RIA, sr. III, 18 [1995] 188-197) and one in a private oratory near the Lateran basilica (V. Santa Maria Scrinari, *Documenti paleocristiami nell'ambito dello storico ospedale di S. Giovanni al Laterano*: Rend. PARA 48 [1975/76] 377-391). The two monuments show the stylistic characteristics of the cemeterial painting of the period (esp., for the oratory of the Lateran, one can see affinities with the frescoes of the catacomb on the Via Dino Compagni), and both present scenes of considerable interpretive difficulty.

Many problems of interpretation—not so much concerning the paintings, as much as the function of

the monument—surround the hypogeum of S. Maria in Stelle, at Verona (W. Dorigo, *L'ipogeo di S. Maria in Stelle in Val Pantena*: Saggi e memorie di Storia dell'Arte 6 [1968] 9-31), believed by some to belong to a funerary context, by others pertaining to a local cult. The depictions drawn from the OT and NT that adorn the walls of one of the two underground areas, reshaped in monumental forms and characterized by elongated figures, contained in heavily marked, contoured lines, are dated to the end of the 4th-5th c. One must date to a later age, however, the depiction of Christ with the apostolic college, a depiction marked by a greater linearity. The catacombs and hypogea of Syracuse, Sicily, have restored a good number of paintings from the 4th-5th c; they adorn the arcosolia, cubicles and at times the same closings of burial cells with depictions of the deceased in gardens of paradise filled with flowers, wreaths, birds, shepherds. Also represented are themes drawn from the OT (scenes of Jonah and Daniel), as well as more complex images of the crowning or introduction of the deceased into paradise in the presence of Christ and of the apostolic band (Ahlquist, *Pitture*). The frescoes of the catacombs of St. Januarius at Naples, if already existing in the 4th c., seem to repeat decorative patterns and themes common to those of the Roman catacombs; in the 5th c. in the lunettes of arcosolia of the deceased's portraits, they are characterized by the depiction of heavily individualized faces, isolated, in groups, and at times associated with the images of the saints (St. Januarius, St. Peter and St. Paul) (Achelis, *Die Katakomben*, plates 16, 18-24, 27, 30-33, 38, 40-44). A tomb in an underground chamber found in the necropolis of Bonaria at Cagliari was likewise painted with frescoes during the early years of the 4th c., with a complex scene from the sea, displayed on the entire wall at the bottom of an arcosolium, that connects the episode of *Piscator hominum* a singular occurrence in early Christian art) to an episode from Jonah's life, represented with truly revealing iconographic idiosyncrasies (A.M. Nieddu, *La pittura paleocristiana*, 246-261).

Outside Italy pictorial evidence datable to the 4th c. has been found in the Balkans, at Niš (L. Mirkovic, *La nécropole paléochrétienne de Niš*: Archaeologica Iugosl. 2 [1956] 85-100), at Pécs in Hungary (F. Fülep, *Sopianae. Die Stadt Pécs zur Römerzeit*, Budapest 1975, 24 and 26) and in Greece, esp. at *Thessalonica (Salonica), where a continuous activity of painting is documented from the late 3rd c. (tomb of the Eastern necropolis, decorated acc. to the red-green linear model) through the entire 4th c. (tomb of the Good Shepherd, the so-called tomb of Eustorgius, on the Via of St. Demetrius, of the necropolis, with various biblical depictions) (D. Pallas, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1959 à 1973*, Vatican City 1977, 65-73). The frescoes from the 2nd half of the 4th c. that adorn a sepulcher room with a curved ceiling are particularly significant: the walls become entirely occupied by a vignette made of large edges where there appear images of the Good Shepherd, a philosopher, a deceased person, as well as numerous biblical scenes; all of this artwork was done in a quite simplified and well-designed style (E. Marki, *Early Christian Representations and Themes Imitating Secular Painting in a Grave Complex in the West Cemetery of Thessaloniki*: Deltion tes Chr. Arch. Etaireias 19 [1996-97] 125-149). Also worthy of note are the frescoes of Pécs, which came to light during 1975-76. They adorn an interior room of a large mausoleum with depictions of a person seated on a throne in paradise and the biblical episodes of Adam and Eve's fall into *sin and Daniel in the lion's den, compositions that present iconographic and stylistic characteristics comparable to Roman cemetery painting of the 2nd half of the 4th c. (F. Fülep, *Excavations of the Early Christian Mausoleum of Pécs*: Archaeológiai Értesitı 104 [1977] 246-257). In Thrace, in a village of Osenovo near Varna (Bulgaria), more or less during the same period, paintings were completed for a tomb-shaped room (depicting the deceased person, members of his family, birds and other animal and vegetable elements, all of which was under a ceiling painted with stars containing images of the Sun and Moon) of particular note for their characteristic styles, marked by a singularly early taste that establishes a revealing artifact of Late Antiquity's provincial artistic fashion (A. Minčev - P. Georgiev, *The Tomb at Osenovo: A Monument of the Late Antique Paintings on the Thracian Coast of Pontos*, in *Actes du IIe Congrès International de Thracologie* [Bucarest, 4-10 septembre 1976], II, "Histoire et Archéologie," Bucures ti 1980, 411-423). In Romania, in the ancient city of Constantia (today Tomis) in Scythia Minor, in addition to its famous tomb containing the frescoes of a banquet (C. Chera, *Wandmalerei aus dem 4. Jh. n. Chr. in einem Grab von Tomis [Constanța - Rumänien]*: Babesch., suppl. 3, Leiden 1993, 136-140), archaeologists have restored another important sepulcher, more or less contemporaneous (end of the 4th c.), entirely covered with frescoes on the walls: above a high façade that reproduces faux architectural structures, an ornament curls within large frames where one finds scenes of a banquet and the deceased in a prayerful disposition (A. Barbet - M. Bucovală, *L'hypogée paléochrétien des orants à Con-*

stanta (Roumanie), l'ancienne Tomis: MEFRA 108 [1996] 105-158). In the 1st half of the 5th c., at Constantinople, pictures with images of Christ, the apostles and perhaps *Moses receiving the law, all placed above a façade made with fake marble, adorn the walls of a sepulchral room, covered with a circular ceiling, subsequently enriched by figurative reliefs representing Christ with the apostolic college, deceased *orantes* praying at the sides of a *cross, Moses receiving the law and the sacrifice of Isaac (J.G. Deckers - Ü. Serdaroğlu, *Das Hypogäum beim Silivri-Kapi in Istanbul*: JbAC 36 [1993] 140-163). At *Ephesus, in the so-called Grotto of St. Paul, a noteworthy fresco, datable to the beginning of the 5th c., represents the rare image of the apostle *Paul in the act of teaching his disciple *Thecla in the presence of her mother Theoclía; the episode inspired by the account of the *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (R. Pillinger, *Neue Entdeckungen in der sogenannten Paulusgrotte von Ephesos*: Mitteilungen zur christlichen Archäologie 6 [2000] 23-29).

As to the decoration of the buildings of worship, one should note the paintings of a Christian chapel found in a village of Lullingston (England; 2nd half of the 4th c.): six individuals are portrayed, one alongside the other and placed above a fake marble vignette (the Christian faithful, patrons?); two panels with Constantinian *monograms set within crowns adorn another wall of the chapel and that of a foyer (N. Davey - R. Ling, *Wall-Painting in Roman Britain*, London 1982, 138-145).

In Egypt, paintings datable to the closing decades of the 4th c. and decorating the dome of a tomb in the necropolis of El-Bagawat have drawn great interest, esp. for the presence of a scene from the exodus of the Hebrews. Placed alongside the usual depictions inspired by Stoic models, it was formulated in an exceptionally schematic and summary manner. For this reason, scholars have thought that there was a strong Jewish influence (M.L. Thérel, *La composition et le symbolisme de l'iconographie du mausolée de l'Exode à El-Bagawat*: RivAC 45 [1969] 223-270; G. Crispino, *Il mausoleo dell'Esodo di El-Bagawat. La lettura iconografica del programma decorativo della cupola*: RivAC 79 [2003] 243-288). In the same necropolis, also of great interest is a slightly later fresco adorning the dome of the "mausoleum of peace," where the vignettes depict several biblical scenes, sacred persons and symbolic figures (M. Zibawi, *L'arte copta. L'Egitto cristiano dalle origini al XVIII secolo*, Milan 2003, 32-38). Likewise in Africa, and in the second quarter of the 4th c., an artist(s) painted frescoes on a noteworthy funerary hypogeum found at Gargaresh (Tripoli) with scenes of Adam and Eve, Jesus' entrance into *Jerusalem and torchbearers—paintings that show close connections to the frescoes from the Via Dino Compagni and the mosaics of the Piazza Armerina (A. Di Vita, *L'ipogeo di Adamo ed Eva a Gargaresh*: Atti IX Congr. Int. Arch. Crist., II, Vatican City 1978, 199-256).

With the 6th c., at Rome, alongside the persistence of the classical tradition, one begins to notice the nascent penetration of Byzantine taste that hardens the image into an abstract immobility, materializing its essential chromatic parallels. Such tendencies can clearly be found, in addition to what one finds in other cemeterial paintings, e.g., in the famous fresco of the catacomb of Commodilla, representing the Virgin with child among Sts. *Felix and Adauctus, the latter portrayed in the act of presenting the deceased Turtura (Nestori, p. 138, no. 3 = *Die Katakombe "Commodilla,"* 61-65, no. 3e; M. Minasi, *Le vicende conservative dell'affresco di Turtura nel cimitero di Commodilla*: RivAC 73 [1997] 65-94). Alongside the flat and schematic style that depicts figures with linear outlines and fixed, abstract faces, we find, in the image of Turtura, modes that are clearly Western in the exquisite realism of the face. The ancient frescoes (6th to the beginning of the 7th c.) of the *diakonia* of S. Maria Antiqua al Foro also drew inspiration from the characteristics of Byzantine fashion (J. Nordhagen, *S. Maria Antiqua: The Frescoes of the Seventh Century*: AAAH 8 [1978] 89-142), such as the "Maria Regina" and the Annunciation, with the "Pompeian Angel," the latter characterized by a formal classicist mark of the Hellenistic tradition, noticeable in the soft transitions of the layers and the use of thick and warm colors. In the catacombs of St. Januarius and St. Gaudiosus at Naples, portraits of bishops, images of saints, the deceased, a unique scene of Christ the "lawgiver" between Peter and Paul and an introduction of a deceased person were done during the course of the 6th and even the 7th c., following an exceptional linearism and a marked formal simplification (Achelis, *Die Katakomben*, pls. 26, 28, 39, 45; Fasola, ibid., 119-123, 143-144, 180-182, figs. 89, 93, pl. X; N. Ciavolino, *L'iconografia petrina nell'arte paleocristiana a Napoli*: Campania Sacra 21 [1990] 300-304; G. Liccardo, *Il catalogo figurato dei vescovi nelle catacombe di San Gennaro. Note intorno all'apostolicità della Chiesa di Napoli*: Campania Sacra 22 [1991] 5-14; N. Ciavolino, *Scavi e scoperte in Campania dal 1983 al 1993*, in Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Arch. Cristiana, Cassino, 20-24 settembre 1993, Cassino 2003, 646-647, 653-659).

A noteworthy bit of documentation of 6th- to 7th-c. painting comes to us from Egypt, thanks to the frescoes of Bawit and Saqqara that adorned the

walls of the numerous small chapels that the Coptic monks made in their monasteries. In the majority of the works at Bawit, an advanced process of geometrization of the forms can be seen, esp. in the frequent apsidal depictions of Christ in majesty and Mary on the throne between the apostles and saints, facing forward, in a hieratic way, with clear colors and strong contoured lines (J. Clédat, *Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouît*: Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire 12 [1904]). Even more schematic are the paintings of Saqqara: the images of Christ on the throne and the Madonna *lactans*, painted on the vaulted ceiling, are clearly two-dimensional and linear (J. Quibell, *Excavations at Saqqara (1906–1907)*, Le Caire 1908, pl. XLff.; J. Maspéro - E. Drioton, *Fouilles exécutées à Baouît: Mémoires*, Impr. de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1931, 59).

Returning to Rome, a vibrant approach, animated by a return to a more condensed style, characterizes the layers of frescoes of S. Maria Antiqua containing Solomon and the seven Maccabean sons, datable to the mid 7th c., i.e., earlier than the grandiose composition of Christ on Golgotha commissioned by Pope John VII (705–707) in the presbytery of the church (J. Nordhagen, *S. Maria Antiqua . . .* , 114-120; Id., *The Frescoes of John VII (A.D. 705–707) in S. Maria Antiqua in Rome*: AAAH 3 [1968]). The most ancient frescoes of the church of St. Saba with the row of saints can be dated to the mid 7th c., although the oldest frescoes of the same subject in the basilica of St. Chrysogonus must be dated later (Matthiae - Andaloro, *Pittura*, 271-272). Increasing decoration and more elaborate styles of calligraphy are to be found in the last depictions that adorned the historical nucleus of the catacombs, as in the coronation of Sts. Abdon and Sennen in the Pontian cemetery (Wp 258 = Nestori, p. 146, no. 6), the *Traditio Clavium* (*Handing Over of the Keys*) and the faded figure of St. Luke found in the basilica of Commodilla (Nestori, p. 138, no. 3 = *Die Katacombe "Commodilla,"* 50-57, 83-85, nos. 3a, 3i), datable to the late 7th c. acc. to the inscription lying underneath.

II. Miniature painting. In the wake of the Late Antique miniatures inspired by the Hellenistic-Roman tradition (*Vergilius Romanus, Vergilius Vaticanus, Iliade Ambrosiana, Dioscoride di Vienna*, etc.: Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 32-72), starting from the 5th c., the earliest Christian miniatures appear, adorning (usually at the bottom of the page, using the technique of tempera) biblical MSS on the *codices* of parchment that had by that point replaced the ancient scrolls. Scholars should probably attribute the *Itala of Quedlinburg* (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 40-41) to the beginning of the 5th c. and to a Roman scriptorium. The presentations of the figures and the still illusionist scenery (as one can see in the scenes that are preserved in the life of Samuel) have caused some scholars to compare the work to the *Virgilius Vaticanus*. One can detect a heavily classicist imprint in a few fragments of the "Cotton" Genesis, datable to an Alexandrian milieu of the 5th-6th c. (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 73-75), and esp. in the famous *Genesis of Vienna* (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 76-87), the most elegant MS of the early Christian era that has survived, and which, alongside the then typically Byzantine characteristics (denial of spatiality, abstract background, refusal to create a precise relationship between figure and background, and figurative stylizing of several elements), strong reminiscences of Hellenistic-Roman naturalistic art, esp. in the scene of the flood, likewise marked by large spatiality and full-view perspective (R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *La composizione del diluvio nella Genesi di Vienna*: MDAI(R) 62 [1955] 66-77).

The Vienna miniatures—copies of a more ancient and exquisite model and executed by more than one artist—were probably produced in the 6th c. somewhere in *Syria or *Palestine. Close in style and date to the *Genesis of Vienna* are the illustrations of the gospel of Matthew contained in the *Codex Sinopensis* of the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris, and those of the gospel of Matthew and Mark from the Rossano Cathedral (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 14, 89-90), all of which can be traced to a 6th-c. Syrian milieu. The miniatures of Rossano, in particular—grouped outside the text, at the beginning of the work—show a highly refined style, by then fully Byzantine in its flattening and its tendency toward abstraction of the figures and backgrounds. One moves even further from the naturalism of the classical tradition with the miniatures of the gospels of Rabbula (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 101-108), produced in Syria in 586 and preserved in Florence's Biblioteca Laurenziana. They consist of eight full-page miniatures and a series of canonical tables decorated with pictures and scenes of the NT. This style is rather schematic, but the miniatures are not lacking realistic tones in the living and expressive faces and their explorations of spacious scenic designs in certain compositions—such as the scene of the crucifixion—which, even as late as the 6th c., harks back to the classic tradition. The Bible of Paris and the Gospel of St. Augustine (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 109-115)—the latter containing two noteworthy miniatures, one representing scenes from Christ's passion, the other depicting Luke the evan-

gelist sitting on a throne—should be dated at the end of the 6th c. Lastly, we should attribute to the 7th c. and a N African milieu the miniatures of the Pentateuch "Ashburnham," at the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris (Weitzmann, *Manuscrits*, 118-125), with its stories from the OT, in which the absence of every trace of spatial composition, the dramatic sense, the abundance of incredible architectural structures and the sensibility for a richer coloring seem to announce the medieval aesthetic.

III. Icons. The most ancient sacred images painted on wood, using encaustic technique and having a devotional purpose, cannot be older than the 6th c. The majority of these works come from the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. To three very talented artisans who worked between the 2nd half of the 6th c. and the 1st half of the following century at Constantinople, where the classical tradition was preserved with utmost care, posterity owes three magnificent icons representing Christ, the Virgin on the throne between two saints, and St. Peter. In the first (Weitzmann, *The Monastery*, no. B1, pp. 13-15, pls. I-II, XXXIX-XLI), the great refinement in the artistic composition constructs a plasticity, in its gentle transition of planes, with the face of Christ, to whose rigidity the conspicuous asymmetry of his large eyes, mustache and beard provide a counterpoint; the same contrasting rhythms recur in the Madonna on the throne with the toddler Jesus (Weitzmann, *The Monastery*, no. B3, pp. 18-21, pls. IV-VI, XLIII-XLVI). To the relative mobility of Jesus are contrasted the two saints George and Theodore, rigidly facing forward and solemn; above them, the heads of the archangels that gaze on high upon the divine hand are rendered with an impressionist technique. Lastly, inspired by the compositions of the consular ivory diptychs, the icon of St. Peter (Weitzmann, *The Monastery*, no. B5, pp. 23-26, pls. VIIIX, XLVIII-LI) finds in its expressive and spiritual face the focal point of the entire composition. More abstract and calligraphic are the faces of Sts. Sergius and Bachus on an icon, likewise from Mount Sinai, today at the Museum of Kiev, which can be dated to the 7th c. (Weitzmann, *The Monastery*, no. B9, pp. 28-30, plates XII, LII-LIII).

In Rome, between the last quarter of the 6th c. and the beginning of the 8th, must be attributed two images of the Virgin, one at S. Maria and the other at the basilica of S. Maria in Trastevere. Both show marks of Byzantine inspiration, but with a typical linearistic intonation typical of the Western tradition (C. Bertelli, *La Madonna di Santa Maria in Trastevere*, Rome 1961; M. Andaloro, *La datazione della tavola di S. Maria in Trastevere*: RIA 19-20 [1992-1993] 139-215; Matthiae - Andaloro, *Pittura*, 255-256; Andaloro, *L'icona*, 416-424, 660-663).

I. *General research on early Christian painting*: G. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane*, Rome 1903; Id., *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV. bis XIII. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg i.Br. 1916; F. Wirth, *Römische Wandmalerei von Untergang Pompejis bis Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1934; H. Achelis, *Die Katakomben von Neapel*, Leipzig 1936; J. De Wit, *Spätromische Bildnismalerei*, Berlin 1938; G. Agnello, *La pittura paleocristiana della Sicilia*, Vatican City 1952; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Continuità ellenistica nella pittura dell'età medio e tardo romana*: RIA (1953) 1-85 (see Id., *Archeologia e cultura*, Rome [2]1979, 344-423); A. Grabar - C. Nordenfalk, *Early Medieval Painting from the Fourth to the Eleventh Century*, Lausanne 1957; M. Borda, *La pittura romana*, Milan 1958; R. Farioli, *Pitture di epoca tarda nelle catacombe romane*, Ravenna 1963; S. Pélékanidis, *Gli affreschi paleocristiani ed i più antichi mosaici parietali di Salonicco*, Ravenna 1963, 7-29; M. Chatzidakis - A. Grabar, *La pittura bizantina e dell'alto medioevo*, Milan 1965; J. Kollwitz, *Die Malerei der konstantinischen Zeit*: Akten VII. Intern. Kong. für christliche Archäologie. Trier 5-11 September 1965, Vatican City 1969, 29-158; L. de Bruyne, *La peinture cimétériale constantinienne*, ibid., 159-214; G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo*, Rome 1965 (new edition with scientific update and bibl. by M. Andaloro, Rome 1987); W. Dorigo, *Pittura tardo romana*, Milan 1966; A. Grabar, *Le premier art chrétien (200–395)*, Paris 1966; Id., *L'âge d'or de Justinien*, Paris 1966; P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma*, Bologna 1966, 255-309 (with extensive bibl. on pp. 357-368); T. Hubert - J. Farther Porcher - W.F. Volbach, *L'Europe des invasions*, Paris 1967; L. de Bruyne, *L'importanza degli scavi lateranensi per la cronologia delle prime pitture catacombali*: RivAC 44 (1968) 81-113; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Rome. La fin de l'art antique*, Paris 1970; L. Reekmans, *La chronologie de la peinture paléochrétienne. Notes et réflexions*: RivAC 49 (1973) 271-291; A. Nestori, *Repertorio topografico delle pitture delle catacombe romane*, Vatican City 1975; B. Brenk, *Spätantike und frühes Christentum* (= Propyläen Kunstgeschichte, Supplementband I), Berlin 1977; H. Mielsch, *Zur stadtrömischen Malerei des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*: MDAI(R) 85 (1978) 151-207; J. Fink, *Die römischen Katakomben* (= Antike Welt. Zeitschrift für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte 9), Munich 1978; E. Russo, *L'affresco di Turtura nel cimitero di Commodilla, l'icona di S. Maria in Trastevere e le più antiche feste della Madonna in Roma*: Bollettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano e Archivio Muratoriano 88 (1979) 35-85; J. Osborne, *The Roman Catacombs in the Middle Ages*: PBSR 53 (1985) 278-328; J-G. Deckers - H.R. Seeliger - G. Mietke, *Die Katakombe "Santi Pietro e Marcellino." Repertorium der Malereien*, Vatican City-Münster 1987; P-A. Février, *À propos de la date des peintures des catacombes romaines*: RivAC 65 (1989) 105-133; D. Korol, *Die frühchristlichen Wandmalereien aus den Grabbauten in Cimitile/Nola*, Münster-Westfalen 1987; J.-G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Anonima di Via Anapo." Repertorium der Malereien*, Vatican City 1991; M. Andaloro, *Pittura romana e pittura a Roma da Leone Magno a Giovanni VII*, in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 39), Spoleto 1992, 569-609; F.W. Deichmann, *Archeologia Cristiana*, Rome 1993, 105-203; J.-G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Commodilla." Repertorium der Malereien*, Vatican City 1994; F. Bisconti, *Memorie classiche nelle decorazioni pittoriche delle cata-*

combe romane. Continuità grafiche e variazioni semantiche, in *Historiam Pictura Refert. Miscellanea in onore di Padre Alejandro Recio Veganzones O.F.M.*, Vatican City 1994, 23-66; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Zum Stand der Katakombenforschung in Latium*: RQA 89 (1994) 216-218; A. Ahlquist, *Pitture e mosaici nei cimiteri paleocristiani di Siracusa. Corpus iconographicum*, Venice 1995; A.M. Nieddu, *La pittura paleocristiana in Sardegna: Nuove acquisizioni*: RivAC 72 (1996) 245-283; *Romana Pictura. La pittura romana dalle origini all'età bizantina*, Milan 1998, in part, the study of F. Bisconti, *La pittura paleocristiana*, pp. 33-53; F. Bisconti, *La decorazione delle catacombe romane*, in V. Fiocchi Nicolai - F. Bisconti - D. Mazzoleni, *Le catacombe cristiane di Roma. Origini, sviluppo, apparati decorativi, documentazione epigrafica*, Regensburg 1998, 71-144; F. Bisconti, *Arte e artigianato nella cultura figurativa paleocristiana. Altre equivalenze tra letteratura patristica e iconografia paleocristiana*, in *Res Christiana. Temi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, Rome 1999, 23-108; K.-D. Dorsch - H.R. Seeliger, *Römische Katakombenmalereien im Spiegel des Photoarchivs Parker. Dokumentation von Zustand und Erhaltung 1864-1994*, Münster 2000; C. Bordignon, *Caratteri e dinamica della tecnica pittorica nelle catacombe di Roma*, Rome 2000; *Dieci anni di restauro nelle catacombe romane. Bilancio, esperienze e interventi conservativi delle pitture catacombali, Roma, 3 marzo 2000*, Vatican City 2000; H. Mielsch, *Römische Wandmalerei*, Darmstadt 2001; N. Zimmermann, *Werkstattgruppen römischer Katakombenmalereien*, Münster 2002; *La conservazione delle pitture nelle catacombe romane. Acquisizioni e prospettive.* Atti della giornata di studio, Rome, 3 marzo 2000, Vatican City 2002; A.M. Nieddu, *L'arte paleocristiana in Sardegna: La pittura*, in *Insulae Christi. Il cristianesimo primitivo in Sardegna, Corsica e Baleari*, Oristano 2002, 365-381.

II. *On miniatures*: K. Weitzmann, *Ancient Book Illumination*, Cambridge, MA 1959; Id., *Illustrations in Roll and Codex. A Study of the Origin and Method of Text Illustration*, Princeton, NJ [2]1970; Id., *Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination*, Chicago-London 1971; Id., *Manuscrits gréco-romains et paléochrétiens*, New York 1977; Id., *Byzantine Book Illumination and Ivories*, London 1980; *L'illustrazione nel rotolo e nel codice*, ed. M. Bernabò, Florence 1991; *Miniature. Le splendide illustrazioni dei codici dal IV al XV secolo*, Rome 1996; M.G. Ciardi Duprè Dal Poggetto - J. Lowden, s.v. *Miniatura*: EAM 8, 413-414, 452-456.

III. *On icons*: K. Weitzmann - M. Chatzidakis - K. Miatev - S. Radojčić, *Frühe Ikonen. Sinai, Griechenland, Bulgarien, Jugoslawien*, Vienna-Munich 1966; D. and T. Talbot Rice, *Icons and Their Dating*, London 1974; K. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons. I: From the Sixth to the Tenth Century*, Princeton, NJ 1976; Id., *The Icons. Holy Images. Sixth to Fourteenth Century*, New York 1978; M. Andaloro, *L'icona cristiana e gli artisti*, in *Aurea Roma. Dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, Rome 2000, 416-424, 660-663.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

PALEOGRAPHY

I. Greek writing from the 1st to the 8th c. AD - II. Latin writing from the 1st to the 8th c.

Paleography aims to reconstruct the history of script in all its manifestations, situating it in its sociocultural framework. For a large portion of the period covered here (1st-8th c. AD), Greek and Latin script developed within the same cultural framework; a true Greek-Latin paleography, however, remains to be constructed. The major ideas are common to paleography for each language. For reasons of swiftness and economy, everyday script, i.e., what one finds in private notes and documents, tended to reduce the number of strokes and to connect them together: it was a cursive script. The script intended for books above all sought to attain legibility and elegance: the strokes were distinct, the execution slower and more accurate; the aesthetic effect was achieved by the writer's deliberate style. One can understand the forms and the transformations of the book script, which were autonomous until a certain point, only if one keeps in mind some changes that took place in the context of everyday script, the usual place where developments in writing occur.

I. Greek writing from the 1st to the 8th c. AD. Before the 1st c. a differentiation between the everyday script and the book script took place. Both forms of writing were still done in capital letters, enclosed, i.e., between two ruled lines. Although the everyday script emphasized the cursive character to the point of compromising its legibility, aside from the rather plain forms that were close to the then-current usage but used primarily in "literary texts," the book script also developed truly and properly speaking calligraphic styles. Two of these were very characteristic and signaled the Roman period of the history of Greek writing (30 BC–AD 324). The Bacchylides Papyrus (BM 733) provides a typical example of the "severe style" or "Bacchylidean majuscule." This work contains no ornate strokes; it shifts between wide and narrow strokes, a contrast that will return several times in the history of Greek writing. It flourished in the period between the beginning of the 2nd and the end of the 3rd c. The Hawara Papyrus of Homer's *Iliad* provides an example of "Roman uncial" or "round majuscule": the letters and the rotund stylization are extremely typical; the golden age of this writing coincides with the age of the Antonines (i.e., Roman emperors 138-180). The end of the Roman period saw the birth of scripts that would strengthen, establish and perpetuate themselves in a canonized form during the Byzantine age. With the triumph of the codex over the scroll and parchment over *papyrus, the latter form witnessed the success and spread of the "biblical majuscule."

Although originating in a *pagan environment, this script attained perfection in the biblical codices of the entire 4th c. (e.g., *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*) and, because of Christianity's triumph, it spread everywhere. Its appearance is extremely cal-

ligraphic; it tends toward neat geometric forms (almost every letter, including the round ones, can be written within squares); the layout is modest, the contrast is balanced between the upstrokes and down strokes; ornate strokes are absent, at least until the period when the script attained perfection. When "canonized," the biblical majuscule enjoyed a long usage from the 5th to 8th c.: more noticeable contrasts and the presence of ornate "peaks" that were becoming more and more artificial signaled its gradual decline. Alongside the biblical majuscule, another form of writing established itself esp. in the Alexandrian area: the "Alexandrian majuscule" (a name preferable to "*Coptic uncial"). A more fluid script (the strokes are joined by ligatures), it presented the already revealed contrast between wide and narrow letters in the most common type (see the famous *Codex Marchalianus* of the Prophets, *Vat. gr.* 2125). In use until the 8th c., it eventually exhausted its distinctive characteristics. In the ancient form, the origin of which is to be sought perhaps in the Bacchylidean majuscule, the "Ogival [Gothic] majuscule" was a writing that leaned to the right and that presented a contrast between the wide and narrow letters; its strokes were curved; with the passing of time, the characters tended to separate. This writing, which reached its perfection in the *Codex Freer* of the gospels (dated to the 5th c.), spread above all during the 6th and the 9th c., gradually supplanting the biblical and Alexandrian majuscule (it would also develop a vertical shape).

If the majuscule preserved its monopoly of higher-level book script until the 8th c., everyday script had been moving for some time toward the minuscule, a script contained between four lines. From the 6th c. onward, the script of documents and in growing measure the script of some "literary" documents was almost entirely minuscule. Its development was very distinct from the majuscule book script, which by that time had become entirely artificial; but its canonized forms tenaciously resisted. Although the script of the first Christian *books had a modest design, it was often similar to the current usage, the script of codices, above all biblical codices, became all the more solemn, a sign of a change in the book's function. Nevertheless, from the 8th c. onward, and probably already from the 7th c., various forms of cursive minuscule, more or less stylized, were used in the books not intended to impress others (e.g., personal copies on papyrus); one of these would become the origin of the book script minuscule that would triumph in the 9th c.

II. Latin writing from the 1st to the 8th c. After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, the development of Latin writing was somewhat parallel to the development of Greek writing. The first documents written on papyrus date back to the 1st c. BC, and the first literary papyri to the beginning of the Christian era. The book script from this period was a majuscule, the *capitalis rustica*; the use of quill pen with a broad and flexible tip created a clean contrast between the upstrokes and down strokes, and the layout was modest and precise. The characteristics of the *capitalis cursiva*, the writing used for documents, were different; here the hard and subtle quill pen produced equal strokes that tended to fuse and, at times, lengthen; in certain MSS this script, however, was substituted by a more majestic and solemn script that patterned itself on the squared majuscule of the monuments, the *capitalis elegans* (e.g., in the so-called Virgilius Augusteus fragment). Between the 2nd and 4th c., technical factors (the use of parchment, the change of the positioning of the quill on the page) and cultural factors over which scholars still debate (e.g., the spread of the Christian book) favored changes (from majuscule to minuscule) and innovations, which then led, in the 6th c., to the rise and establishment of new scripts: the uncial and the semi-uncial script was used in books; cursive minuscule was used in documents.

Uncial, the original meaning of which remains unclear, was characterized by a rounded stylization of the letters, some of which were formed on the basis of the cursive; the most typical examples are the letters *A*, *D*, *E* and *M*. The uncial achieved great precision in the 4th and 5th c., then degenerated into forms that were not as precise; it survived until the 9th c.; from the 4th c. to the beginning of the 8th c., it was the most widespread book script. The origin of the semi-uncial remains subject to debate; nevertheless, in this script majuscules were mixed with numerous minuscules that were cursive in origin: particularly characteristic were the letters *a*, *b*, *d*, *g*, *m*, *r* and *s*. In the 4th c. a new form of cursive also appears in the documents: the cursive minuscule that was characterized by the decisive adoption of the four-line system and by a series of graphic forms that, whatever their origins may have been, were freely adapted and transformed in the interplay of the many ligatures. More disciplined forms of minuscule and semi-minuscule cursive were also used in books, above all in 7th- and 8th-c. *Italy.

With the fall and the subsequent breakup of the Western Roman Empire, local cultures and particular scripts called "national scripts" arose and took hold. From the 5th to the 8th c., the *monasteries and the episcopal *schools replaced the workshop of

professional copyists, adapted the majuscule script and, on the basis of the cursive minuscule, developed individual book scripts. One can distinguish between the different types of pre-Carolingian minuscules in N and central Italy; in S Italy, which underwent a long cultural eclipse, the Beneventan minuscule acquired its characteristic strokes in the course of the 8th c. In *Spain, the Visigothic script, both book and cursive script, was differentiated by a large number of very particular forms (e.g., *a*, *e* and *g*). In *Gaul and *Germany, under the *Franks, the Merovingian script, Chancery, and then the book script witnessed a brief but considerable development from the 6th to the 8th c. One can identify more types connected to the centers of Luxeuil, Laon and Corbie and to those connected with Germany and Switzerland. But the most characteristic area was certainly *Ireland and *Britain, which exerted strong influence on the continent because the Irish missionary monks established monasteries such as Bobbio. Two scripts (called insular) were used in this area: one called the "majuscule" or "semi-uncial insular" was used in the most exquisite and calligraphic MSS such as the Lindisfarne gospels; the other, with its narrow and sharpened forms and characterized by the use of particular ligatures, was called "insular minuscule." The latter would spread in the continent's monasteries until the Carolingian minuscule—a script connected to the formation of the new Roman-Germanic Empire and Charlemagne's cultural renaissance—put an end to the age of script particularism. But by that time, the patristic era had ended.

Retrospective bibliography: J. and M.D. Mateu Ibars, *Bibliografía paleografica*, Barcelona 1974 (to be used with caution). *Current Bibliography*: Scriptorium. Revue internationale des études relatives aux manuscrits, since 1946 (published in conjunction with "Bulletin codicologique"); an excellent retrospective for the Greek portion: J. Irigoin, *Les manuscrits grecs 1931–1960*: Lustrum 7 (1962) 5-93, 332-335; for a select bibl. of recent publications: B. Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, tr. D. Ó Cróinín - D. Ganz, Cambridge 1990; J. Irigoin, *Bibliographie*, in A. Dain, *Les manuscrits*, Paris [3]1975, 191-205; D. Harlfinger, *Griechische Kodikologieund Textüberlieferung*, Darmstadt 1980, 657-678; P. Canart, *Paleografia e codicologia greca. Una rassegna bibliografica* (Littera antiqua 7), Vatican City 1991; L. Boyle, *Paleografia latina medievale*, ed. M.E. Bertoldi, Rome 1999. For general discussions on the history of Latin writing: B. Bischoff, above; A. Petrucci, *Breve storia della scrittura latina*, Rome 1992; C. Cencetti, *Compendio di paleografia latina,* Naples 1963; Id., *Lineamenti di storia della scrittura latina*, Bologna [2]1997; G. Battelli, *Lezioni di paleografia*, Vatican City [4]1999. Fundamental documentation for the patristic era: E.A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores*, 1-11 and suppl., Oxford 1972; A. Bruckner - A. Marichal, *Chartae latinae antiquiores,* ed. A. Bruckner - A. Marichal, Olten-Lausanne 1954; 2nd series, ed. G. Cavallo - G. Nicolaj, Dietikon etc. 1997-. The history of Greek writing, a fundamental work: V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie*, III, Leipzig 1911–1913 (repr. Leipzig 1978); for the majuscule period: E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford 1971 (a collection of facsimiles with an important introduction); G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*, Florence 1967; *La paléographie grecque et byzantine*, Paris 21-25 octobre 1974 (C.N.R.S. Colloque international n. 559), Paris 1977; G. Cavallo - H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period. A.D. 300-800* (Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement 47), London 1987; E. Crisci, *Scrivere greco fuori d'Egitto. Ricerche sui manoscritti greco-orientali di origine non egiziana dal IV secolo a.C. all'VIII d. C.* (Papyrologica Florentina 27), Florence 1996; *Paleografia e codicologia greca*. Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino - Wolfenbüttel, 17-21 ottobre 1983), ed. D. Harlfinger - G. Prato, I-II, Alexandria 1991; *Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio*. Atti del seminario di Erice (18-25 novembre 1988), I-II (Biblioteca del "Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici nell'Università di Perugia" 5), Spoleto 1991; *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito*. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia greca (Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998), ed. G. Prato, I-III (Papyrologica Florentina 31), Florence 2000.

P. Canart

PALEOSLAVONIC, Translations in. Methodius, one of the creators of the Slavonic alphabet and simultaneously one of the promoters of Paleoslavonic literature, worked primarily as a translator of Greek together with his brother Constantine the Philosopher (= Cyril), and by himself, particularly after the latter's death (February 869). His biographer—probably his disciple Clement of Ochrida—narrates in the *Vita Methodii*, ch. 15, how Methodius translated, among other things, the so-called *očskija knigy*, i.e., the "books of the fathers." The meaning of this claim has sparked much debate among specialists. The hypothesis that these books were the **Paterikon*, which narrates the life and actions of the *desert fathers, seems very unlikely because this type of document was not indispensable for the Slavs who had recently converted to Christianity. It seems much more likely that the statement refers to the "fathers of the church," i.e., patristic works in the strict sense of the term, inasmuch as such works were truly necessary for every group of people immediately after it had embraced the Christian faith. The *conversion of a new people to Christianity created a demand for translations into their respective language of the sacred *Scriptures and some fundamental liturgical *books, but also for patristic texts that could offer material for their subsequent formation. Knowledge of these writings truly was the best stimulus for consolidating and deepening the Christian instruction of the new converts: these texts were a common literary treasure no less precious than the books used in the *liturgy, and they became so much the more necessary because among the new converts heretical

teachings soon began to spread and threatened the purity of the true *faith. One finds an important testimony along these lines in the famous *Responsa Nicolai I Papae ad consulta Bulgarorum* of 866 (ch. 106): the pope instructs the newly converted Bulgarians: "Now, concerning these individuals whom you allowed to come into your homeland from different places, they are teaching various and different things" (*de his autem, quos in patriam vestram de diversis locis advenisse perhibetis varia et diversa docentes*). From other historical sources we learn that preachers of various heretical doctrines came into the newly converted country: *Paulicians, *Manicheans, dualists and even followers of Muhammad. Even tenets of *dualism that had been disseminated for a long time that then crystallized in the heresy of the Bogomiles reemerged.

Paleoslavonic literature, esp. Paleobulgarian, comprised primarily numerous original works of translations from the Greek and, more specifically, patristic works, and not the works of Byzantine writers, properly speaking. The first among the S and E countries to undergo conversion, Bulgaria became the true center of translation and, as a result, of the spread of patristic texts among the orthodox Slavs. Later, the Serbs and the Russians would take up and continue this project so that as a result, during the medieval era, almost all the works of the major Fathers were translated, and even, at times, the works of lesser-known authors. The translation of patristic works thus became an essential component of medieval literature. Nevertheless, it is difficult to determine the chronology of these translations, esp. for the centuries after the group's conversion, i.e., as soon as they established numerous centers of literary activity, even if, however, for some of these, it is relatively easy to establish the precise chronology of the translations made in Bulgaria during the 2nd half of the 9th c. and the one following. Some of these translations contain a specific date, but one can determine the date of the others through *paleographic, linguistic and historical evidence. It should be noted, however, that the choice of works for translation was not determined by accident but by the needs of the community's spiritual life, inasmuch as such a choice was motivated by the desire to answer questions or by the occurrence of these questions in the religious life.

The names of the great Fathers such as St. *Basil of Caesarea, St. *John Chrysostom and St. *Gregory of Nazianzus became widely known through the translations of their liturgies: they were venerated as saints, and their images were regularly depicted in places of honor on altars. Also translated were the writings of St. *John of Damascus, this illustrious representative of the Greek patristic tradition. Toward the years 893/894, his famous *De fide orthodoxa* was translated into Paleobulgarian; but only 48 of its 100 chapters were translated, and precisely those chapters that would be particularly relevant to the new converts and perhaps more useful for their contents: on the terrestrial and celestial world, on human nature, certain natural phenomena and other topics. At some later time, even his book on *Dialectica* was translated. Despite the various difficulties the translator had to overcome in rendering the complex theological and philosophic terminology, the translation was executed with laudable precision. Already in the Early Middle Ages the dualist currents of thought held among the S Slavs were identified in part with the teachings of *Arius of *Alexandria primarily because of their denial of the *Trinity. It was well known that during the High Middle Ages, the teaching of the Bogomiles, the Patarines and the Cathari was referred to as the *ariana haeresis*. The Bulgarians certainly did not intend to combat "authentic" Arianism, which by that time had disappeared for centuries, when, at the very beginning of the 10th c., Bishop Constantine of Preslav (then the capital of Bulgaria) at the request of Prince Simeon (893–927), undertook a translation of *Athanasius of Alexandria's *Sermons Against the Arians*; he completed his translation in the year 906. Overcoming numerous difficulties to render this text, which was esp. complicated because of its abstract terminology, into a language that still lacked a literary tradition of that sort, the bishop of Preslav offered his contemporaries a powerful weapon to combat the dualist heresy that was solidifying itself precisely during those times.

Gregory of Nazianzus was among those authors who were most well known to the Slavs from the earliest ancient times. It is worth mentioning that Constantine the Philosopher (= Cyril) was already acquainted with his writings during his youth and was thus particularly devoted to him, a devotion that served him well during his entire life. In the *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli* 3, his biographer narrates that as a son of a well-to-do family, after experiencing a certain disappointment, he enclosed himself within his home and dedicated himself to learning Gregory's works by heart. It was precisely under his influence that Constantine composed his first literary work: a poem of seven strophes in praise and honor of his first teacher. Constantine undoubtedly read and learned Gregory's great works by heart, i.e., his *sermons and his very beautiful poems, but also his epistolary correspondence: another passage from the *Vita* (ch. 5) attests to this fact, in which the

young scholar attributes to Gregory a citation taken from his *Letters*. Already the first Slavic authors reveal, among other things, that the Cappadocian Fathers had exerted an influence on them.

The Bulgarian writer John the Exarch (who lived between the beginning of the 2nd half of the 9th c. and the end of the third decade of the subsequent century) composed his voluminous *Hexameron* not much earlier than 918. This work was a vast compilation based primarily upon the work of the same name of Basil of Caesarea, *Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom and other, lesser-known sources. The *Hexameron* presents, as is well known, a vast commentary on the first chapter of Genesis, with numerous digressions on related issues. As a response to the dualistic heretics' arguments that generally denied the importance of the OT as a sacred book for the Christian church, in this work, the fundamental importance of the book of Genesis is revealed while insisting on the intrinsic connection between the two testaments. The *Hexameron* offered Slavic readers an authoritative exposition related to questions concerning the *creation acc. to the conceptual categories of *Moses. In its vast scope, the compilers inserted information on the celestial and terrestrial world and on the plants and animals of a given region, often in truly realistic form with details deriving from an attentive observation of nature. Though using all the writings of patristic provenance above, John also used other sources and, naturally, some personal reflections; he was thus able to create a true encyclopedia of dogmatic and naturalistic content. Inspired by the example of Basil and a few other Fathers (e.g., *Theodoret of Cyrrhus—from whose work *Graecarum affectionum curatio* he cites extensive passages), John the Exarch edited his compilation with a deep sense of praise for divine Wisdom and the amazing harmony of the creation of the universe and humankind. Even in that statement, he was subliminally and fervently responding to the pessimistic ideas of the dualistic heretics who maintained that as in the case of humanity, the visible and material world was a creation of the principle of *evil. Following the example of his sources, moreover, he always criticized the astrological beliefs of the Protobulgarians.

Toward the end of the 9th c. and the beginning of the following, the so-called *Dialogi quattuor* (CPG 7482) of ps.-*Caesarius, the alleged brother of Gregory of Nazianzus, who lived during the 4th c., were translated in Bulgaria. The document was actually written by an unknown author from the *Acoemetae; he lived during the mid-6th c. Even in this case, together with his very interesting observations on ethnography, one finds in his writings criticisms of *astrology. The anonymous author used the *Book of the Laws of the Countries* of *Bardesanes (d. 222), offering copious extracts which are extremely interesting for their contents. It should be noted that the Paleoslavonic translation is more complete and accurate than the Greek text that has come down to us and constitutes a source for supplementing and correcting this text, preserved in relatively late MSS.

In the panoply of writings used in the refutation of Arian tendencies, one must also mention the *Visio S. Petri Alexandri*, a work connected to the name of the bishop and *martyr of Alexandria, *Peter (d. 311), which was translated in an early period that cannot be dated with precision. The popularity of this hagiographic text was such that the scene of the vision was reproduced on murals and icons, in which the bishop is portrayed before the *image of Christ wearing a torn garment; also included is the inscription of the bishop's question, which asks who was responsible for this tear, and Christ's response: "The ungodly Arius." Because the dualistic tendencies lasted for a long time, artists continued to produce these depictions, which were inspired by a hagiographic source, until the Late Middle Ages.

As a response to the philosophic determinism of the dualistic heretics who denied individual responsibility for their own actions, the *resurrection and the retributions for *sin, during the first decades of the 10th c., *Methodius of Olympus's *De autexusio* (*De libero arbitrio*) was translated. Given that the full Greek text was lost, the Paleoslavonic translation acquired considerable value in patristic studies (it was edited in 1930 by A. Vaillant in the PO 22,5 pp. 631-889, with a wise retroversion into Greek and a French translation). During this same period, the *Christian Topography* of *Cosmas Indicopleustes (a merchant and then monk in Alexandria) was translated into Slavonic. In addition to refuting Ptolemy's cosmographic system, this work offered the Slavic reader a very rich picture of geographic, ethnographic and naturalistic information on *Ethiopia, India, the Island of Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and other countries, with helpful information on the plants and animals of a given region and with illustrations made by the author himself, which were faithfully reproduced in the copies of the Slavonic translation. The work constituted a specific answer to the widespread notions in Greater Moravia, already toward the middle of the 10th c., regarding the roundness of the earth and existence of antipodes. Constantine the Philosopher vigorously combated these widespread notions during his stay in the area, as did the official church.

Other numerous patristic works of prose and poetry were subsequently translated, a detailed list of which is impossible to offer here; it would thus be worthwhile to mention just a few of the most important works. We know, e.g., that when the largest monastic center in SW Bulgaria was established in the third decade of the 10th c., the *monastery of Rila, they translated there *Ephrem the Syrian's fundamental work, the *Paraineseis* (*Admonitiones*). Fragments of this document and allusions to it can be found in the *Spiritual Testament* of the founder (St. James of Rila), written ca. 940; fragments remain in Glagolithic script of the 10th c., and an entire Paleoslavonic translation in a Cyrillic MS of the 14th c. Slavic translators also translated *Hippolytus's *Commentary on Daniel*, the Greek text of which is incomplete, though in this translation it is preserved in its entirety. Thanks to translations, other devotional patristic texts for the edification of monks and *laypeople were also available to Slavic readers in the length of their original versions, such as *John Moschus's *Pratum spirituale* and *John Climacus's famous *Scala Paradisi*, which was very popular: it was copied, read and cited very often until the end of the medieval period as in recent times. A fragment from *Palladius of Helenopolis's *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*, composed on the model of Plato's *Phaedo*, and also containing fascinating information on the "peoples of India and the Brahmans," attracted much interest and was published as a separate narrative document. *Isidore of Pelusium (d. ca. 435) enjoyed much fame; various letters he wrote were translated and disseminated in the orthodox Slavic-speaking world. Already during the High Middle Ages, the *Catecheses* of *Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387) were translated into Slavonic, the second series of which were analyzed and published by the Slavicist A. Vaillant (1932). We also possess some works of *Epiphanius of Salamis of Cyprus (d. 403) in medieval Slavonic translation.

Selecting different writings of famous Fathers such as Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom, the translators were accustomed to gathering large collections of excerpts (*sborniki*) that would usually enjoy a wide dissemination. The collection from John Chrysostom's writings with the eloquent title *Zlatostruj* (*Chrysorrhemon*), composed around the beginning of the 10th c. under the inspiration of King Simeon, acquired much prestige. In the first decades of the same century, *Hesychius of Jerusalem's *Commentary on the Psalms* (5th c.) was translated into Paleobulgarian. Alongside this translation, later copyists added the actual text of the *Psalms: the two texts are found in the famous codex of the University Library of Bologna, known as the *Psalterium Bononiense*; it can be dated to the 1st half of the 13th c. In response to certain Renaissance tendencies to offer a naturalistic interpretation of the *Song of Songs, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Interpretatio* was translated probably toward the end of the 14th c. Slavic authors of that period cited and even alluded to this work. Ps.-*Dionysius was known to the Slavs already toward the 9th-10th c. and was cited by them more than once; but it seems that the entire translation of his writings was completed only during the 2nd half of the 14th c.; the translation was preserved, moreover, in a copy dated to 1371.

In sum, one can conclude that the translation of numerous writings of the Fathers established the most solid basis for the birth and development of literature of the orthodox Slavs. Such Slavic translations, furthermore, are also of considerable interest for knowing Greek patristic literature and should be used with gratitude and care.

CPG II-III (useful but incomplete); A.S. Archangelskij, *Tvorenija otcov Cerkvi v drevne russkoj pis'mennosti. Izvlečenija iz rukopisej i opyty istoriko- literaturnych izučenj*, I-IV, Kazan 1889-1890 (a foundational work, its place has still not be been supplanted); G.H. Bonwetsch, *Hippolyt's Kommentar zum Buche Daniel und die Fragmente des Kommentars zum Hohenliede*, Leipzig 1897 (See Dujčev: *Medioevo bizantino slavo*, II, Rome 1968, p. 10 n.2); Bishop Michail, *Agrafy v tvorenijach Sv. Metodija*: Žurnal Moskovskoj patriarchii 6 (1954) 43-50; M. Heppell, *Slavonic Translations of Early Byzantine Ascetical Literature. A Bibliographical Note*: JEH 5 (1954) 86-100; V.V. Daniov, *Pis'ma Isidora Pelusiota v "Izbornike Svjatoslava 1073 goda"*: Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury 11 (1955) 335-341; M. Heppell, *Some Slavonic Manuscripts of the "Scala Paradisi"* (*Lestvica*): ByzS18 (1957) 233-270; I.K. Bunina, *Sistema vremen staroslavjanskogo glagola*, [The system of tenses of the Old Church Slavonic verb], Akad. nauk SSSR, Moscow 1959; A. Vaillant, *Le saint Ephrem slave*: ByzS 19 (1958) 279-286; L. Scharbau, *Untersuchungen zum Tempusgebrauch im Gotischen und Altkirchenslavischen*. PhD dissertation, Università di Kiel 1958; G. Nandris, *Handbook of Old Church Slavonic*, London 1959; A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios apócrifos*, Madrid [2]1963; D. Bogdanovič, *Jovan Lestvičnik u vizantijskoj i staroj srbskoj književnosti*, Beograd 1968 (see also Dujčev: ByzZ 66 [1973] 102-103); I. Dujčev, *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, II, Rome 1968, 3-27, 589-594 (for the Slavic version of the *Dialogues* of ps.-Caesar: 191-205, 604-605); R. Riedinger, *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Verfassersfrage*, Munich 1969 (see also Dujčev: ByzZ 67 [1974] 403-406); G.M. Prochorov, *Korpus sočinenij s imenem Dionisija Areopagita*: Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury 31 (1976) 351-361; A. de Santos Otero, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen*, I-II, Berlin-New York 1978–1981; I. Dujčev, *La letteratura greca patristica nella Bulgaria medievale*: Παρνασσός 25 (1983) 173-178; R. Picchio - H. Goldblatt, eds., *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, vol. 1, New Haven, CT 1984; E.M. Vereshchagin, *Istoriia vozniknoveniia drevnego obshcheslavianskogo literaturnogo iazyka: Perevodcheskaia deiatelnost Kirilla i Mefodiia i ikh uchenikov*, Moscow 1997; W.R. Veder, *Utrum in Alterum Abiturum Erat?: A Study in the Beginnings of Text Transmission in Church Slavic*, Bloomington, IN 1999; J. Schaeken

- H. Birnbaum, *Die Altkirchenslavische Schriftkultur: Geschichte, Laute und Schriftzeichen, Sprachdenkmaler (mit Textproben, Glossar und Flexionsmustern)*, Munich 1999; H.G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, New York [7]2001; *Kirilo-Metodievska bibliografiya 1516-1934*. Pod obshchata redaktisiya na S. Nikolova, Sofiya 2003; D. Petkanova, s'stavitel, *Starob'lgarska literatura: entsiklopedichen rechnik*, 2. preraboteno i dop'lneno izdanie. Nauchni redaktori I. Dobrev i A. Miltenova, Veliko T'rnovo 2003.

I. Dujčev

PALERMO. People have inhabited Palermo for a long time. In the 7th c. BC, the Phoenicians invaded *Panormos,* a city so named in Greek because of the size of its port ("all port"). Perhaps the Phoenicians named it *ziz* (flower); then in 480 the Carthaginians arrived. When war broke out between *Rome and *Carthage, Sicily became a war theater, and Palermo served as the base for the Carthaginian fleet. Rome first attacked the military bases; then after Kamarina (258 BC) Rome conquered Palermo (in 254 BC). With a flourishing maritime traffic, Palermo functioned as an important base for the Romans as well. When Sicily became the first Roman province, some Sicilian cities preserved their autonomy. During Cicero's time, Palermo was among the cities "free and immune" from taxation. During the reign of Octavian, Palermo possessed the *status* of a Roman colony. Already since the time of Cato the Elder, Sicily was considered the breadbasket of Rome, being one of the major Mediterranean producers of grain along with Spain, Africa and Egypt. Even in the 4th c. BC there was an abundance of grain in Sicily, as *Prudentius mentions in his book *Contra Symmachum* (II 940-942). Even in the 5th c., because of its agricultural wealth and its strategic location, different groups of people were continually drawn toward Sicily; in AD 440 the island was occupied by *Genseric, king of the *Vandals; *Theodoric, king of the *Visigoths, was careful not to confiscate Sicily's lands lest the flourishing agriculture be damaged. *Belisarius took Palermo from the *Goths in 535, a date signaling the end of the Roman governance and the beginning of the Byzantine domination (535–831). The Arabs then conquered Palermo in 831 and made it the capital of Sicily, taking the primacy from *Syracuse, which had been the island's capital until that point. The Arabs made Palermo the capital of the Muslim emirate of Sicily.

Given the dearth of information that has come down to us, it is uncertain when Christianity began to spread in Sicily. The most ancient and certain historical evidence goes back to the 3rd c., when *Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (AD 250-258), referred to a message sent to Sicily concerning the **lapsi*; this event presupposes the existence of organized Christian communities on the island, local anti-Christian persecutions, and even the presence of *martyrs and the lapsed. The *heretical controversies that raged through the East and Africa between the 3rd and 5th c. never took place on the island. The first known *bishops from Palermo date to the 5th c., beginning with a certain Gratian (Gams 951).

The process of Christianization was more intense in Catania and less so in Palermo, perhaps because of the restraining presence of aristocratic pagans. A valuable Catanian inscription that can certainly be dated to the first decades of the 4th c. because of its mention of a certain *Zoilus corr*(*ector*) *pr*(*ovinciae*), attests to the existence of a *martyrium* (the place of a martyr's grave). The inscription is an epigraphic note describing a certain Iulia Florentina, the *dulcissima atque innocentissima*, who at eighteen months and twenty-one days of age died at Hybla and was baptized at the point of death. Her body, the inscription reads, was entombed *per presbiterum* in a *loculus pro foribus MartXPorum*. The provenance of the title indicates that at Catania one can find the *martyrium*, near which the baby girl was buried. The epigraph is preserved at the Louvre Museum in Paris (see G. Rizza, *Un* Martyrium *paleocristiano di Catania*).

At Palermo, in the 5th c., there exists only one testimony to the spread of *monasticism in Sicily: the sepulchral inscription of *Munatia Eul*(*alia*) *religiosa femina*, who died in 488 (CIL X, 7329). One should note that the inscription comes precisely from Palermo, a city that certainly has not provided much epigraphic material (see F.P. Rizzo, "Eremiti e itinerari commerciali nella Sicilia orientale tardoimperiale: il caso sintomatico di Ilarione," in *Storia della Sicilia*, ed. S. Pricoco, 81). Until the 7th c., Sicily's priests were primarily of Latin extraction; this was inevitable perhaps due to the presence of senators on the island, who, though officially residents of Rome, often stayed at their large Sicilian estates. The predominance of ecclesiastical officials of Latin extraction is proven, moreover, by the fact that *Paschasinus had to use a Greek translator at the Council of *Chalcedon AD 451 when he had been charged by *Leo the Great to present Rome's reasons for opposing the autonomous tendencies of the Eastern church (see Leo the Great, *ep*. 88, to Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum). Worthy of mention for the reconstruction of Christianity at Palermo is the fact that Leo entrusted his own *scripta* to Silanus, a *deacon of the Palerman church, so that he might transmit them to Paschasinus. L. Cracco Ruggini perceives in a series

of names of monks, abbots, nuns and abbesses mentioned in the letters of *Gregory the Great used in reference to the *cenobites of Sicily that most of the Sicilian clergy were primarily Latin (see L. Cracco Ruggini, "Il primo cristianesimo in Sicilia [III-VII secolo]," in *Il cristianesimo in Sicilia*, ed. V. Messana and S. Pricoco, 113-114).

Gregory the Great's letters offer us valuable testimonies on Sicilian monasteries, chapels and hospices of the 6th c.; some of these were already in existence for years, while others were founded and brought to material completion through the benefices of Gregory's family and his donations to the Sicilian church (*Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* X, 1). Gregory mentioned several monasteries at Palermo: St. *Theodore, St. Erma, Sts. Maximus and *Agatha (called Lucuscanus), Pretorian, St. Adrian, St. Martin. Gregory the Great certainly established two of these: the *monastery of St. Erma over which Urbicus was the superior (*Urbicus monasterii mei praepositus*; Greg. the Great, *Epist.* V, 4, September 594) and that of Sts. Maximus and Agatha, which the pontiff called *monasterium nostrum* (Greg. the Great, *Epist.* IX, 20, October 598, sent to Abbot Urbicus). Again at Palermo, there was the oratory of the Blessed *Mary that was recently (*nuper*) ordered to be built, as Gregory the Great writes, on the initiative of the same pontiff (*coepta nostra*) *in cella fratrum* in the monastery of which Marinianus was abbot (it seems that he is referring to the monastery of Pretorianus) (Greg. M., *Epist.* I, 54–July 591). There existed only one **xenodochium*; it was attached to the monastery of St. Theodore and was established by Peter, the director of which was Bacauda (Greg. the Great, *Epist.* I, 9, October 590). From the Gregorian letters we know that groups of *Jews were present at Palermo and in other important Sicilian cities: Catania, Syracuse and Agrigento.

D.G. Lancia di Brolo, *Storia della Chiesa in Sicilia nei primi dieci secoli del Cristianesimo*, 2 vols., Palermo 1880-1884; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII*, 2 vols., Faenza ²1927 (repr. Modena 1997); G. Rizza, *Un* Martyrium *paleocristiano di Catania e il sepolcro di Iulia Florentina*, in *Oikoumene, Studi paleocristiani pubblicati in onore del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II*, Catania 1964, 593-612; G. Rapisarda Lo Menzo, *L'Empatia di Gregorio Magno attraverso il suo epistolario*: Orpheus 24/1-2 (1977) 15-65; *Il Cristianesimo in Sicilia dalle origini a Gregorio Magno*, ed. V. Messana and S. Pricoco, Caltanissetta 1987; *Storia della Sicilia e tradizione agiografica nella tarda antichità*, ed. S. Pricoco, Soveria Mannelli 1988; R. Marino, *La Sicilia dal 241 al 210 a.C.*, supplement to Kókalos 7, Rome 1988; *Sicilia e Italia suburbicaria tra IV e VIII secolo*, ed. S. Pricoco, F. Rizzo Nervo and T. Sardella, Soveria Mannelli 1991; G. Rapisarda Lo Menzo, *Studi gregoriani. Gregorio Magno e la Sicilia*, Catania 1993; *La Sicilia nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo. Religione e società*, ed. R. Barcellona and S. Pricoco, Soveria Mannelli 1999; G. Mammino, *Gregorio Magno e la Riforma della Chiesa in Sicilia. Analisi del Registrum Epistularum*, Catania 2004; L. Giordano, *Itinerari di giustizia gregoriana: Testualità e recezione*, Bari 2005; F.P. Rizzo, *Gli albori della Sicilia cristiana. Secoli IV*, Bari 2005; F.P. Rizzo, *Sicilia cristiana dal I al V secolo*, 2 vols., Rome 2006.

G. Rapisarda

PALESTINE

I. Palestine I - II. Palestine II - III. Palestine III.

Pompey conquered *Syria in 64/63 BC, establishing it as a Roman province with poorly defined borders, inasmuch as it extended more or less from *Cappadocia to *Egypt, to the Arabian Desert and to the Euphrates. In these various territories, the Romans usually left puppet kings or they formed them into independent cities. After the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, Judea became an imperial Roman province in and of itself under the *legatus* and, after the war of 130/131, it assumed the name Syria-Palestine, which from 295 extended to certain territories of *Arabia. From 358, the province was subdivided into *Palaestina* and *Palaestina Salutaris*. Around 400, Palestine was subdivided into three parts: two included Palestine properly so-called (*Palaestina I* and *Palaestina II*), and the third (*Palaestina III*) included a few territories E of the Dead Sea. Moreover, the province of Arabia bordering Syria extended toward the N. The capital of *Palaestina I* was *Jerusalem; *Palaestina II*, *Scythopolis; *Palaestina III*, *Petra. For identifying the Roman dioceses, consult F.M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine II*, Paris 1938, 200-202; B. Bagatti, *The Church from the Gentiles in Palestine*, Jerusalem 1971, 92-95.

I. Palestine I. Along the coast, toward the N, one finds Dor (Dora), an episcopal see since the 5th c. Archaeological excavations have revealed remnants of the port, the walls, a temple, the theater and a few churches. An inscription on one of the church's mosaics commemorates Bishop *Acacius (EAEHL 1, 334-337; NEAEHL 1, 357-372). A rock bears within it a piece of rock from Calvary; it is displayed for the veneration of the faithful (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Galilea*, 111).

Ashkelon and *Maiuma of Ashkelon*. The archaeological excavations of Barnea, located to the N of the actual medieval enclosure of Ashkelon, now a public park, have shown that this area was primarily inhabited during the Roman-Byzantine period. Two churches have been discovered: one with three aisles; the second, which appears to be an annex to other sacred buildings, bears an inscriptioon of Ps 23:1 on the floor and the name of Bishop Anastasius with the date 493. This fact leads one to surmise that

the ancient city of Ashkelon could have been located there. Maiuma is none other than the port of Ashkelon (Bagatti, *Ascalon* SBF 24 [1974] 227-264; NEAEHL 1, 103-112). The bishop of Maiuma in Ashkelon is mentioned only in the 6th c. Arches taken from churches and other sacred objects are in the park (EAEHL, 125-130).

**Gaza* and *Maiuma of Gaza*. The city had many churches adorned with numerous mosaics (Abel, *Gaza*). Recently to the N of Gaza, at Jabalya, a church was discovered with surrounding sacred objects, among which was a baptistery, adorned with mosaic flooring from various eras. The mosaic of the *diaconicon* dates to the middle of the 5th c., and the one in the church comes from the beginning of the 8th (*Madaba Map*, 216-218). We also know of many sepulchral inscriptions primarily from the 6th c. that commemorate the *faithful, e.g., two deacons: Alexander and Patricius, and a phrase expressing goodwill toward the dead who "rest in Christ among the saints." A Latin inscription recalls the memory of *Juvenal, probably the first patriarch of *Jerusalem (Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches*, 397-429). Also found were buildings, not mentioned in literary texts, decorated with mosaic floors. A few of these possess an artistic interest: the mosaic of birds in the church at *Umm Gerar*; the mosaics of human figures, a horseman and some portraits in the church at *Kissufin* (these were among the most beautiful in Palestine); the mosaics of birds, grapes and paintings in the church dedicated to St. Cyriacus at *Magen*; the church at *Shellal* had mosaics of four-footed animals, birds, birds, fish and fruit dating to the year 561-562. At *Maiuma*, in the ruins of a synagogue, archaeologists found a mosaic of various animals and *David playing the harp (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Giudea e Neghev*, 150-189).

Eleutheropolis/Beit Gebrin. This city was recognized as an episcopal see beginning from the 4th c. Two religious buildings have been preserved from ancient Roman and paleo-Christian periods: the church at *Muhatt el-Urdi* had mosaics with animals and scenes from *Jonah's life; another church had mosaics with the seasons of the year as well as hunting scenes; it also had a chapel dedicated to Christ, the King of the Universe, originally on the hill of el-Muqarqal but now moved to *Jerusalem (Bagatti, *Cristianesimo ad Eleuteropoli*). Toward the S lie the remains of a large church called Sanhanna, studied in the 19th c. but deteriorating rapidly (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 135-137). Inside the church, archaeologists have found Christian tombs decorated with *crosses and painted birds.

**Diospolis-Lydda*. When the Arabs founded the city of Ramle, Lydda was almost abandoned even though it had been an important Jewish center and Roman colony during the time of Septimius Severus. In the 6th c., it was also called Georgiopolis, thanks to a tradition that asserted that the saint's martyrdom and tomb were located here. Nothing remains of the buildings from the Roman period and of the ancient church of St. George, with the exception, perhaps, of remains here or there that have been incorporated into a later crusader church. A half-erased inscription on a column that was later reused for the mosque and was formerly placed in the middle portion of the sanctuary of St. George said that "the most worthy pastors" took care to "adorn this most illustrious temple" (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Samaria*, 160-169). Because it was a *cemetery church, it probably had to be placed on the outskirts of the city.

Nicopolis/Emmaus, later *Amwas*. An important city between Jerusalem and Jaffa. It is the location in which the gospel of *Luke places the scene containing the appearance of the risen Christ to Cleopas (Lk 24:13-32). It was reestablished in the 3rd c. with the name Nicopolis and was recognized as an episcopal see from the 4th c. onward. After the complete destruction of the village, nothing remains here but three apses made of giant blocks without bases, built using Roman techniques, and a group of Christian buildings, all in ruins, including a church with three aisles, a baptistery with a pool consisting of four lobes and mosaics containing scenes of wild animals biting domesticated ones. Scholars have demonstrated that the original dating of the mosaic and the building to the 2nd c. is untenable. It seems more reasonable to suggest that the building is a church with three apses and that the style of the mosaics indicate a 5th-c. date. The building was constructed upon existing walls from the Roman period, although some additions were made in the 6th c. (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Samaria*, 148-52; EAEHL 2, 362-364).

Jericho. Remains of various churches are found here: at Wady-el-Kelt, the church of St. Andrew with 6th-c. inscriptions; in the current town the church of St. George, which is a small oratory constructed by the priest George (d. 566); at Tell Hassan, a church believed to have been the episcopal cathedral; and, to the N toward the fountain, a church belonging to the monk Anthimos, which has floors with birds, four-footed animals, fish and the inscription of the names of three deacons: Daniel, Macarius and John. The church built right on top of the fountain, which one could partially see in previous centuries, can no longer be seen today (Augustinovic, *Gerico*, 65-92; EAEHL 2, 550-575). Formerly known as *Flavia Neapolis* but today as *Nablus*, the city was established

by Titus Flavius Vespasian not far from the biblical city of Shechem; it does not preserve the remains of the ancient churches but probably has the *proseuchē* built as a forum for a group of *Messalians that bears their members' inscriptions on the stone seats (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Samaria*, 52). To the S, at the well in Samaria, the remains of a mosaic have allowed archaeologists to design a reconstruction of the cross-shaped church, built in the 4th c, when the well had been turned into a baptistery. A *sarcophagus with a shield containing an image of the Amazons and the cross reveals that Christian worship had taken place in that location before the erection of the church. The material that was taken from the well during the reconstruction shows that it had already been in use since the Iron Age.

Sebaste possessed the temple of Augustus, which had a large series of steps that were destroyed by the excavators in their efforts to search for the oldest ones (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Samaria*, 31-36). On the E side of the hill, as tradition maintains, is the tomb of John the Baptist, which was subsequently enclosed in a church of the 4th c. (partially rediscovered) and therefore placed in the crusader church. To the S of the city, near the fountain that supplied the water, almost at the mouth of the canal, there is an underground chapel dedicated to *Aaron that likewise has Christian graffiti (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 157-159; EAEHL 4, 1047-1050).

II. Palestine II. *Diocesarea*, today *Ziporis*, was one of the most important centers for *Judaism after the destruction of the temple at *Jerusalem and an episcopal see since the 6th c. A church made of rock near the top of the hill, where the city had been built, was in all likelihood transformed into a basilica in 518 by Bishop *Marcellinus (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 182ff.). In the lower part, to the N, there is a Hebrew inscription where the crusaders built the church of St. Anna (EAEHL 4, 1051-1055).

Capernaum. The excavations at the traditional "house of Peter" have revealed that under the floor of the octagonal church built in the 5th c. by Gentile Christians lies an ancient room supported by a giant arc where the *pilgrims wrote names and invocations for prayers in various languages: Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin, thus attesting that worship was practiced there. At a lower level, one finds small houses joined together near the courtyard dating back to the Hellenistic period. The synagogue built with some white seashells and adorned with decorations and symbols was not constructed earlier than the 4th c.

Et-Tabga is the traditional place where Jesus was also accustomed to speak to the crowd and to perform miracles. Ancient pilgrims commemorated the location with the name *Eptapegon* "seven fountains" because of its multiple water fountains in the local area. Remnants of 4th- and 5th-c. churches have been preserved, one containing a commemoration of the multiplication of the bread and fish performed by Christ and bearing Nilotic designs in the mosaic floor (S. Loffreda, *Scavi di et Tabgha*, Jerusalem 1970; EAEHL 2, 497-501).

Scythopolis-Beth-She'an was a city of the Decapolis established by the Ptolemies of Egypt in the 3rd c. BC; it was the metropolis of the province. On top of the hill there was a cathedral, the layout of which was formed by a circular apse with an atrium and cells set around it. Excavators destroyed the cathedral in their attempts to explore the most ancient buildings (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 38-40). Not all the details of the cathedral's construction are certain (one does not know, e.g., if the canals discovered by archaeologists functioned as the baptistery). The church dedicated to St. *Procopius had mosaics in geometric shapes. Mosaics with human figures, the zodiac, months and birds are found in the *monastery of Our Lady Mary on the rocky side to the N of the wadi, where there was also a funerary chapel with a mosaic representation of the months (EAEHL, 221-228) and a mosaic with an inscription commemorating a building used as a bathhouse for lepers, which is yet to be found. Ongoing excavations are still bringing to light many of the city's monuments.

Tiberias. A city established by Herod Antipas in AD 18 on the W shore of the Sea of Galilee; it was one of the most important centers for Judaism. Archaeologists discovered some *thermal baths, the ancient aqueduct, a portion of the wall, and a few synagogues and churches. During a break from their work on the aqueduct that redirected the salt water from the region of Et-Tabga, archaeologists discovered a structure containing a small church lower down and a 6th-c. church higher up. The first church, scholars conjectured, displayed a particular form of architecture that was the work of Count Joseph, a Jewish convert during the time of *Constantine (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 180). Nothing is now known of the residence of a Jewish-Christian bishop mentioned by St. *Epiphanius. Christian artifacts include a piece of architrave with crosses that were already reused for a small mosque—now a museum—and a now-lost Greek inscription (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Galilea*, 48-61).

Beth-Yerak/Philoteria. Farther S of Tiberias on the same shore of the lake are the ruins of Bet-Yerak, including a synagogue and a church with a thermal

bath and a baptistery that reveals architecture of various periods. One inscription dating to the years 528-529 commemorates the presbyters Elias and Basil (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 40ff.; EAEHL, 260-262).

Pella, a city of the Decapolis and a refuge for Christians during the year AD 70; archaeologists have found three churches there. The one to the W had three apses and an atrium resting on the most ancient remains where a *cross and an elaborate *sarcophagus decorated with clusters of grapes were found; in the E part there is a church with three apses. Both can be dated to the end of the 5th c. A third church with three aisles and one sole apse can be traced back, at its most ancient point, to the 1st half of the 5th c. The abandonment of this and, most likely, the other churches should be dated around the late 8th c. (Michel, *Les églises*, 120-128).

Helenopolis. One must identify this city with the modern-day village of Daburiyya, which is located at that foot of Mt. Tabor on the W side, the episcopal residence of which was moved to the mountain. Ancient Christian artifacts, however, cannot be found here. Instead, they have been rediscovered at Kfar Kama, a modern-day Circassian village at the foot of the mountain, on the E side. Here, in two chapels, connected and placed alongside each other, with upper levels, are mosaic inscriptions that mention a deacon, a presbyter and a bishop named "Eustathius." Mosaics on the floor depict birds, fish and geometric designs. There is even a reliquary. Thanks to this abundance of discoveries, one can reasonably conclude that there was an episcopal see in present-day Kfar Kama (Bagatti, *Villaggi di Galilea*, 274-280).

Kursi, on the E shore of Lake Tiberias and traditionally the place where the healing of the two demon-possessed Gadarenes occurred (Mt 8:28-34). There is one church and one chapel in which the miracle recorded in the gospel is commemorated.

Hippos/Sussita also lies on the shore of Lake Tiberias set on a hill, which has received its name because of its position. From this city of the Decapolis, aside from the remains of the walls, paved streets, theater and other buildings, scholars know of four churches, none of which, however, have been completely excavated to this day. One has a baptistery on the N side and flooring made acc. to *opus sectile*; from the inscriptions one gathers that the place was dedicated to Sts. *Cosmas and Damian. The baptismal tank is placed in the center of the apse (Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 174-178; EAEHL 2, 521-523).

Gadara, today *Umm Qeis*, once a diocese, preserves the urban Roman setup with classic buildings and a beautiful colonnade. The excavations have brought to light a thermal bath from the Byzantine period with mosaic flooring containing geometric shapes and Greek inscriptions. Archaeologists have discovered two churches: one built with a central layout, having a squared outside and an octagonal inside, with eight columns placed in the center and four apses at the corners of the square; it is preceded on the W side by a columned portico. The other church, only partially excavated, is built acc. to a basilica layout and is set against the S wall of the octagonal church (Michel, *Les églises*, 128-132).

Al-Salt is part of the diocesan territory of Gadara. A monastery with a church was found there and in it preserved mosaic flooring containing scenes from the Nile River and the image of a boy, which had already been ruined during the 8th c.

Capitolias, today called *Beit Ras*, preserves some classical monuments. Among the Christian artifacts (Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 222) are the ruins of a church of Weli El-Khader. A building with a central layout, an apse and flooring in *opus sectile* were excavated in 1976-78 near the small W theater. More recently, since 1983, two churches have been excavated. One is found in the N part of the city; the other, perhaps the cathedral, at the center of the same (Piccirillo, *Chiese e mosaici*, 31-32).

At *Abila*, today *Ain Quweilbeh*, the excavations have brought to light the thermal baths, a theater and six churches. Among the ruins are also the remains of a cemetery (see Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 221; Piccirillo, *Chiese e mosaici*, 5-34; Michel, *Les églises*, 111-120).

III. Palestine III. The capital of the *Negev* was the Nabatean city of *Elusa* or *Al-Khalasa*; it was plundered already in ancient times to obtain construction materials. Recent excavations, however, have brought to light again a portion of a large basilica, which first had only one apse then three (EAEHL, 359ff.). More fortuitous discoveries in other small towns of the Negev have also brought to light important ruins of churches, two or more in each center, with many inscriptions on mosaic and rock. One should also mention the city of *Eboda* (or Avdat), in which two churches have been found. At *Nitzana*, now *Haugia el Hafi*, were found, in addition to two churches, liturgical and secular MSS, among which was a small Greek-Virgilian dictionary. Also, at *Shivta* or *Sbaita*, three churches were found. *Mefis*, or *Kornub*, contains three churches. *Rehovot*, or *Betomolachon*, contains three churches. Study of the entire complex and comparison of various architectural elements of these sacred buildings has permitted scholars to forward a detailed chronology of the various stylistic-constructive phases of these churches that goes from

the 2nd half of the 4th c. to the first years of the 7th (Negev, *The Cathedral of Elusa*).

Charachmoba, now called *Kerak*, does not preserve any layout of its Byzantine church; however, it preserves 200 Greek inscriptions, for the most part sepulchral, often reused for the flooring. The inscriptions that have been dated range from the years 375 to 661. In the vicinity, various villages still preserve Christian artifacts, among which are a few hermitages, e.g., El-Habis and another on the Wadi ed-Defali with the remains of religious *paintings (Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 229ff.).

Areopolis, now *Rabba*. In addition to the Nabatean temple, the city preserves the remnants of a church, inscriptions bearing the name of Bishop John (597–598) and the Metropolitan Stephen (687) and on one small shell an invocation of the **Theotokos* (R. Canova, *Iscrizioni*, 198-208; Michel, *Les églises*, 139).

From *Zoara*, today called *Ghor es Safi*, the map of Madaba commemorates the church of *Lot (Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 230). The excavations have brought to light this church on the slopes of the towering mountains at the district of *Dayr ʻAyn ʻAbata*. The church contains three aisles and three apses set against to the wall of the mountain; it had access to the outside world by means of an opening on the N side, which had a grotto containing a tomb. The building must have been built in the 6th c. on a preexisting church and subsequently underwent restoration and remodeling as the two rediscovered inscriptions show: one in the N nave dates to the year 606, the other in front of the presbytery to the year 691 (Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 336; Michel, *Les églises*, 148-152; *Madaba Map*, 225-227).

At *Arindella*, today *Gharandal*, archaeologists have found the remains of a church containing three aisles that are preceded by a vestibule and paved with a mosaic (Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 131; Michel, *Les églises*, 420).

Feinan, a place well known to those condemned to forced labor during the last *persecutions of Christianity, contains the remains of three churches, inscriptions (one with a dedication to the church of Bishop Theodore, which dates to the years 587-588) and sepulchral titles.

Aila, today *Aqaba*, preserves Christian artifacts among which are two column capitals: one engraved with Sts. Longinus and Theodore and two *angels holding the globe; the other is engraved with Sts. George and Isidore. These individuals are all identified by the inscriptions (Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 233; Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 337).

Pharan is on *Sinai on Djebel Meharret (Gebel). In the past, capitals with crosses and a praying man, perhaps in commemoration of *Moses, were seen in the garden of the monks of St. Catherine, where a new chapel was erected.

In the basilica of the same monastery-fortress constructed by the emperor *Justinian, one can still admire the splendid mosaic on the wall and on a segment of apse where the scene of the Transfiguration was depicted (Piccirillo, *Mosaics*, 333-334).

Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land, 4 vols., Jerusalem 1970; *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, 5 vols., Jerusalem 1993, C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine II*, London 1896; F.M. Abel, *Gaza au VI siècle d'après le rhéteur Chorikios*: RBi 40 (1931) 5-31; Id., *Géographie de la Palestine II*, Paris 1938; S. Saller - B. Bagatti, *The Town of Nebo*, Jerusalem 1949; A. Augustinovic, *Gerico e dintorni*, Jerusalem 1951; G.H. Forsyth - K. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai: 2, The Church and fortress of Justinian*, Ann Arbor, MI 1965; A. Ovadiah, *Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holy Land*, Berlin 1970; B. Bagatti, *Antichi villaggi cristiani di Galilea*, Jerusalem 1971; Id., *The Church from the Gentiles in Palestine*, Jerusalem 1971; Id., *Il Cristianesimo ad Eleuteropoli* (*Beit Gebrin*): SBF 22 (1972) 109-129; Id., *Ascalon e Maiuma di Ascalon nel VI secolo*: SBF 24 (1974) 227-264; Id., *Antichi villaggi cristiani di Samaria*, Jerusalem 1979; V. Corbo - S. Loffreda - E. Testa - A. Spijkerman, *Cafarnao*, 4 vols., Jerusalem 1972–1975; R.H. Smith, *Pella of Decapolis*, Vooster 1973; K. Weitzmann - J. Galey, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai: The Icons*, Princeton, NJ 1976; D. Baldi - B. Bagatti, *Saint Jean-Baptiste dans les souvenirs de sa patrie*, Jerusalem 1980; M. Piccirillo, *Chiese e mosaici della Giordania settentrionale*, Jerusalem 1981; B. Bagatti, *Antichi villaggi di Giudea e Neghev*, Jerusalem 1983; A. Ovadiah - C.G. d. Silva, *Supplementum to the Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holy Land*, Jerusalem 1984; S. Loffreda, *Recovering Capharnaum*, Jerusalem 1985; C.A.M. Glucker, *The City of Gaza in the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Oxford 1987; A. Negev, *The Cathedral of Elusa and the New Typology and Chronology of the Byzantine Churches in the Negev*: SBF 39 (1989) 129-142; J. Shereshevski, *Byzantine Urban Settlements in the Negev Desert*, Beer-Sheva 1991; M. Piccirillo, *The Mosaics of Jordan*, Amman 1993; Y. Tsafrir - L. Di Segni - J. Green, eds., *Tabula Imperii Romani Judaea-Palaestina. Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods – Maps and Gazetteer*, Jerusalem 1994; C. Dauphin, *La Palestine byzantine. Peuplement et populations*, Oxford 1998; M. Piccirillo - E. Alliata, eds., *The Madaba Map Centenary 1897-1997*, Jerusalem 1999; A. Michel, *Les églises d'époque byzantine et umayyade de Jordanie* (*Provinces d'Arabie et de Palestine*) *V-VIII siècle*, Turnhout 2001; D. Bar, *Christianising of Rural Palestine During Late Antiquity*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History: 54 (2003) 401-421; Id., *Rural Monasticism: A Key Element in the Christianization of Byzantine Palestine*: HTR 98 (2005) 49-65 (copious bibl.); I. Greco, *La terra santa e le origini cristiane*, Naples 2005; R. Canova, *Iscrizioni e monumenti protocristiani del paese del Moab*. Rome 1954.

G. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

PALIMPSEST. The name for a MS usually made of parchment that preserves traces of writing that has

been washed away or erased (*scriptio inferior* or *antiquior*) to make room for a new document (*scriptio superior* or *recentior*) or for subsequent layers. Hence the definition of the term *codex rescriptus,* today preferred to the term *palimpsest*, from the Greek πλινοψάω = "I scrape afresh." The underlying writing was blotted out with milk and oats (a recipe from the 11th c., see W. Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, Graz [4]1958, 303), by means of a so-called *spongia deletilis* or even by an erasure, i.e., by rubbing it with the dust from pumice stone, after having moistened the parchment with milk and flour. With the first method, traces of the previous writing would resurface; in the second, however, it would be lost forever.

Not unknown to ancient book production even for *papyri, this practice became commonplace during the Middle Ages primarily because of the high costs for parchment and the scarcity of this material in face of the demand. The need for writing material forced people to reuse ancient codices (as in the 4th-6th c.) that had already become fragmentary or been intentionally dismantled, as canon 68 of the Council in **Trullo* implicitly attests (691 or 692), which explicitly prohibits under the pain of a one-year excommunication: "to destroy a volume of the Old or New Testament, as well as the works of our saints and authoritative preachers and doctors, and to dismantle into parts and distribute them, because they are damaged, to booksellers . . . as long as such a volume is not totally damaged by bookworms, water or in any other way" (tr. C. Noce). Initially, in the West the practice spread among the Irish monasteries, from which it then easily passed onto the continent, in *cenobiums that were in turn established by the Irish, such as Luxeuil, San Gaul and Bobbio; these were the authentic protagonists of the process of the reestablishment and recovery of knowledge of which the palimpsest is but one expression. Practical and economic reasons are certainly often intertwined with spiritual and cultural choices. All factors taken together are connected to the idea of erasure as *damnatio.* The pagan texts would be covered over with the Word of God (of the 241 biblical MSS written in majuscule, 55 are palimpsests); the Vulgate was often written over Old Latin versions, and the writings of heretics erased (an alternative to the bonfire). Writings deemed irrelevant such as out-of-date legal texts, or liturgical texts that became obsolete after a reform, were scrubbed down. Texts written in foreign languages with scripts that had become illegible (as occurred with works written in Greek, Gothic or Hebrew) were also scrubbed down in order to write treatises over them that were small, technical-practical or educational works, within the scope of what had been defined as "the instrumental use of the heritage of the past" (Cavallo). Being recycled material, moreover, an erased parchment was at most destined for the production of an unpretentious book. Starting with the Carolingian era, the use of palimpsests began to become rarer, and among them we find mainly liturgical texts. Liturgical texts were also preferred in Eastern Greek monasticism.

The number of palimpsests (also fragments) known today is significant, and these can be found in the main European libraries. Among the locations: Florence (Cod. Plut. 87.21 of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, the most ancient layer of which dates back to the 9th c. and contains *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Historia philothea*; the mid-layer dates to the 11th c. and contains Homer's *Iliad*; the most recent layer dates to the 13th c. and contains various texts among which are works of Aristotle); León, Spain (the palimpsest of the cathedral contains part of the 6th c. *Lex Romana-Wisigothorum*, along with *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia ecclesiastica* and part of a 7th-c. copy of the *Itala*); London (in a codex of the British Museum, one finds a work of *Severus of Antioch from the beginning of the 9th c. written over pages of a MS of the *Iliad* and a MS of the gospel of *Luke, both dating to the 6th c., and Euclid's *Elements* from the 7th or 8th c.; in another MS of the same collection, a *Syriac translation of John *Chrysostom of the 9th-10th c. covers a 5th-c. treatise of Latin grammar dating to the 6th c., which in its time replaced the *Annales* of the historian Granius Licinianus: this last one is called the *codex bis rescriptus*); Madrid (*Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica* from the 9th c. on the *Codex Theodosianus* for the 6th-7th c., in the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial); Milan (at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, a text of Plautus from the 4th or 5th c. is preserved, written over with biblical passages in the 9th c.); Paris (e.g., the so-called *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus*: parts of the Old and New Testament in Greek from the 5th c.); Vatican City (Vat. lat. 5757: a MS from Bobbio containing Cicero's *Republic*; it dates to the 4th/5th c. and is written over with *Augustine's *Ennarationes in Psalmos* in the 7th c.; this work of Cicero was restored by Cardinal Angelo Mai); Verona (Gaius's *Institutiones* and some of *Jerome's works). One could list many more examples though. For a complete listing of places in Europe that preserve the actual MSS containing palimpsests see this website: rinascimentovirtuale.eu.

To make faded writing reemerge, paleographers in the past used various methods and possible solutions, keeping in mind the variety of substances

used for creating medieval inks that patristic and medieval authors and copyists could have used: (1) a carbon-based ink, extracted from the mixture of a black pigment with glue; (2) gallic-metallic ink, obtained by the chemical reaction between tannin and iron or even copper sulfate. Although in the first case the recovery of the writing was arduous, if not impossible, in the case of the gallic-metallic ink, the base component allowed traces of the vanished writings to reemerge. These two techniques for traditional recovery were adopted by each one of the two greatest Italian palimpsest decipherers of the 19th c., Angelo Mai and Amedeo Peyron. Mai remained consistent in the use of tannin; Peyron, however, used a synthetic reactant made at the end of the 18th c. The use of chemical reactants in many instances had positive results: the increase of legibility and the degree of preservation for the parchment; the reactants, however, caused irreversible damage. Thereafter, in the 20th c. paleographers decided to make use of photography and the illumination provided by ultraviolet rays. Today, scholars use digital technology, multifaceted analysis and electronic reworkings of images; all this prevents damage to books.

Finally, regarding the so-called *Palimpsestforschung,* although the existence of palimpsests has been known for a long time, only in 1692 was an attempt made to read a rewritten parchment when Jean Boivin discovered the *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus*. At the beginning of the 18th c., Bernard de Montfaucon published the first facsimile of this codex. Shortly thereafter in 1762, however, Scipione Maffei studied and published the first exhaustive treatment of palimpsests (origin, history and methodology of research) for Franz Anton Knittel of Wolfenbüttel (1721–1702), in the *Commentarius* that opens his editions of Gothic-Latin fragments discovered in MS Weissemburgensis 64. Discoveries of and the paleographic signs in palimpsests followed for the entire 2nd half of the 18th c., above all in Italy, but transcriptions and editions of palimpsests were few and far between. Starting from the first decades of the 19th c., Cardinal Angelo Mai, a librarian of the Ambrosiana Library of Milan, made a name for himself. Mai is credited with having discovered Marcus Cornelius Fronto's epistolary correspondence and Cicero's *De republica*; he is also known for his intense editorial and publishing activity of ancient and patristic texts (Greek and Latin). Shortly before World War I, Kögel established the *Palimpsestinstitut* in the Benedictine Abbey of Beuron and published facsimile reproductions of numerous palimpsests. Finally, mention should be made of the European community's pilot project intended for research in the field of deciphering Greek palimpsests. The project is called "Rinascimento virtuale" and aims to unite more than 50 institutions of 26 European countries. To date, the project has resulted in the creation of a network open to new technological developments.

Fr. Mone, *De libris palimpsestis tam Latinis quam Graecis*, Carlsruhae 1855; R. Kögel, *Die Palimpsestphotographie (Photographie der radierten Schriften) in ihren wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen und praktischen Anwendungen*, Halle 1920; *Palimpsest-studien I-II*, ed. A. Dold, Beuron 1955 and 1957; E.A. Lowe, *Codices Rescripti. A List of the Oldest Latin Palimpsests with Stray Observations on Their Origin*, in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, V, Vatican City 1964, 67-112 (= Id., *Palaeographical Papers, 1907–1965*, Oxford 1972, II, 480-519: a list of Latin palimpsests until the year 800); R. Gryson, *Les palimpsestes ariens latins de Bobbio: Contribution à la méthodologie de l'étude des palimpsestes*, Turnhout 1983; B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des Abendländischen Mittelalters*, Berlin [2]1986, 26ff; L. Crisci, *I palinsesti di Grottaferrata: studio codicologico e paleografico*, Naples 1990; L. Fossier - J. Irigoin, eds., *Déchiffrer les écritures effacées: Actes de la Table ronde (Paris, 4-5 mai 1981)*, Paris 1990; LMA VI, 1993, cols. 1641-1642 (G. Karpp); G. Cavallo, *L'immagine ritrovata. In margine ai palinsesti*: Quinio 3 (2001) 5-16; G. Declercq, ed., *Early Palimpsests: Proceedings of the Workshop Early Medieval Palimpsests* (Brussel, 8 February 2002), Turnhout 2007.

V. Milazzo

PALLADIUS of Helenopolis (363/364–before 431). Born in *Galatia around the year 363/364, Palladius appears to have received a good education in the classics. He became a monk around 386 and lived for some time in *Palestine; he then decided to travel to *Egypt, where he was introduced to the lives of the Egyptian *ascetics. In 390 he went to the Egyptian area of Nitria, then traveled in the desert of Cellae, where he lived for nine years and met *Evagrius of *Pontus, who exerted a profound influence upon him (see *Hist. Laus.* 38). Around 400, he became the bishop of *Helenopolis in Bithynia; in 403 during the period of the Synod of the *Oak, he was involved in the *Origenist controversy.

When *John Chrysostom was sent into exile, Palladius championed his cause in *Rome before Pope *Innocent I. When he returned to *Constantinople in 406, he was arrested and banished to Egypt. When allowed to return from exile, Palladius went back to his homeland, Galatia, and, acc. to *Socrates (*HE* 7, 36), became the bishop of Aspuna. The date of his death remains unknown; nevertheless, he was no longer alive by 431 because from this point onward Eusebius appears to have been the bishop of Aspuna.

During his exile ca. 408, Palladius composed the *Dialogus de vita S. Iohannis Chrysostomi*, an impor-

tant biographical source esp. for the last years of John's life. Palladius was a friend and great admirer of Chrysostom. From a formal point of view, the work uses the model of Plato's *Phaedo*. He structured this work in the form of a dialogue held at Rome between an Eastern bishop and the Roman deacon Theodore. In the dialogue, Palladius defends Chrysostom from the accusations raised against him by *Theophilus of Alexandria in one of his defamatory booklets (see Facundus, *Defens*. VI, 5), now lost.

Around 419-420, Palladius wrote the *Historia Lausiaca*, dedicated to Lausus, chamberlain of the emperor *Theodosius II. This work is a collection of profiles of the lives of various male and female ascetics primarily from Egypt and, to a lesser degree, Palestine.

Palladius drew on personal memories of ascetics he knew directly and stories he had heard from others. He also left plenty of room for legendary elements. He aimed to write a work of edification and wanted to emphasize the spiritual value of life in the *desert, which he knew very well; this is a lifestyle that vigorously withdraws from the world and which, he observes, has strengths but also weaknesses such as pride. From the textual point of view, one should note that the *Historia Lausiaca* exists in three versions: one short (G), which appears to be the original; the long version (B), which, acc. to E. Honigmann, was written by *Heraclidas of Nyssa; and another (A), which turns out to be a contamination of the two preceding versions and is mixed with the **Historia monachorum in Aegypto*. The *Historia Lausiaca*, which remains an important source for the history of the beginnings of *monasticism, had great success: people immediately translated it into Latin and numerous eastern languages.

As to the treatise *De gentibus Indiae et Bragmanibus*, which is preserved under the name of Palladius, only the first part seems to be his work, which contains some stories about India. The author of the second part, however, attributes the work to Annanus; it is a mixture of different ideological tendencies and influences.

CPG III, 6036-6038; *Historia Lausiaca*: PG 34, 995-1260; C. Butler, TSt VI, 2, Cambridge 1904; G.J.M. Bartelink, Milan 1974. *Dialogus de vita S. Iohannis Chrysostomi*: PG 47, 5-82; P.R. Coleman Norton, Cambridge [2]1958. *De gentibus Indiae et Bragmanibus*: J.D.M. Derrett, CM 21 (1960) 100-135; W. Berghoff, Meisenheim am Glan 1967; *Dialogus*, SC 341-342. Among the numerous translation of *Historia Lausiaca* in modern languages, we should mention the Fr. tr. of A. Lucot, Paris 1912, and the recent *Histoire lausiaque*, by N. Molinier, Spiritualité orientale 75, Bégrolles-en-Mauges 1999; the Ger. tr. of St. Krottenthaler, BKV2 5, Kempten Munich 1912, 315-440; the Eng. tr. of R.T. Meyer, ACW 34, London 1965; the It. tr. of G. Gottardi, Siena 1961; and the tr. of M. Barchiesi, Milan 1974, with an introd. by C. Mohrmann and text and comm. by G.J.M. Bartelink. One should also mention the Eng. tr. of the *Dialogus* by H. Moore, New York-London 1921; the Sp. tr. of D. Ruiz Bueno, BAC 169, Madrid 1958, 125-296; the Ger. tr. of L. Schläpfer, Düsseldorf 1966; the It. tr.: *Dialogo sulla vita di Giovanni Crisostomo*, ed. L. Dattrino, CTP 125, Rome 1995. For the *De gentibus*, there is an It. tr. by G. Desantis: *Le genti dell'India e i Bramani*, CTP 99, Rome 1992.

For an extensive bibl. on Palladius, see Quasten, II, 178-182. Among the numerous studies, one should note: C. Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, TSt VI, 1, Cambridge 1898; P. Ubaldi, *Appunti sul "Dialogo storico" di Palladio*: Mem. Acc. Sc. Tor. 56 (1906) 217-296; C. Butler, *Palladiana*: JTS 22 (1921) 21-35, 138-155, 222-238; F. Halkin, *L'Histoire Lausiaque et les Vies grecques de S. Pachôme*: AB 48 (1930) 257-301; E. Schwartz, *Palladiana*: ZNTW 36 (1937) 161-204; S. Linner, *Syntaktische und lexikalische Studien zur Historia Lausiaca des Palladios*, Uppsala-Leipzig 1943; R. Draguet, *L'Histoire Lausiaque. Une oeuvre écrite dans l'esprit d'Évagre*: RHE 41 (1946) 321-364; 42 (1947) 5-49; J. Dumortier, *La valeur historique du Dialogue de Palladius et la chronologie de S. Jean Chrysostome*: MSR 8 (1951) 51-56; E. Honigmann, *Heraclidas of Nyssa (about 440 A.D.)*, in *Patristic Studies*, ST 173, Vatican City 1953, 104-122; J.D.M. Derrett, *The History of "Palladius on the Races of India and the Brahmams,"* CM 21 (1960) 64-99; B. Berg, *Dandamis: An Early Christian Portrait of Indian Ascetism*: CM 31 (1970) 269-305; F. van Ommeslaeghe, *Que vaut le témoignage de Pallade sur le procès de saint Jean Chrysostome?*: AB 95 (1977) 389-413; P. Devos, *Approches de Pallade à travers le Dialogue sur Chrysostome et l'Histoire Lausiaque*: AB 107 (1989) 243-266; N. Molinier, *Ascèse, contemplation et ministère d'après l'"Histoire Lausiaque" de Pallade d'Hélénopolis*, Bégrolles- en-Mauges 1995; A. Isola, *Alle fonti del monachesimo cristiano: l'"Historia Lausiaca" tra peccato ed estasi*: Siculorum gymnasium 49 (1996) 101-117.

S. ZINCONE

PALLADIUS of Ireland (1st half of the 5th c.). First bishop of *Ireland, little is known about his life. Palladius served as a deacon of the Roman church, but we do not know if he was from *Rome or *Gaul; in 429 he advised Pope *Celestine to confer authority upon *Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, so that he could combat the ideas of the *Pelagians in *Britain, esp. the Pelagian Bishop Agricola (*Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chronicon*, MGH AA 9,472). Later, *Muirchú, in the Life of St. *Patrick, describes him as an archdeacon (*Vita Patricii*). Palladius was thus in contact with Germanus and knew of the religious situation on the islands. In 431 he was ordained a bishop and sent on a mission to Ireland primarily to rebut the claims of the Pelagians (Prosper, *Chronicon*, MGH AA 9,473) and to maintain the Catholic faith of that area: *dum romanam insulam studet servare catholicam, fecit etiam barbaram christianam* (Prosper, *C. Coll.* 2: PL 51, 271). The sending of a bishop suggests that a Christian community was already in existence

there. Even though Prosper speaks of the *evangelization of the *pagans residing there, Palladius remained there on the island only for a very short time. On the way there, he passed through Auxerre to meet Germanus. Perhaps, after having completed his specific mission, he set out for Rome again and during the trip died in *Britain (was he killed instead in Ireland?); St. *Patrick received the news when he was in Gaul. Patrick was then immediately ordained a bishop by Germanus and sent to Ireland to continue and extend Palladius's mission (432). The advice given to Celestine and his travels among those populations suggests that Palladius had a connection with Germanus and could have been from Gaul because the name Palladius was very common there. His mission territory must have been in S Ireland, where he would have established three churches. His feast day used to be celebrated on 7 October; today it is 7 July.

L. Grosjean, *Notes chronologiques sur le séjour de S. Patrice en Gaule*: AB 63 (1945) 73-93; 70 (1952) 325; L. Bieler, *The Mission of Palladius: A Comparative Study*: Traditio 6 (1948) 1-32; Id., *Interpretationes Patricianae*: Irish Ecclesiastical Record 5th ser., 107 (1967) 1-13; *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae X*, *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh*, ed., intr., tr., comm. by L. Bieler, Dublin 1979, 165; J. Carney, *The Problem of Saint Patrick*, Dublin 1961, 49ff.; T.M. Charles-Edwards, *Early Christian Ireland*, Cambridge 2000, 202-214.

A. Di Berardino

PALLADIUS of Ratiaria (d. after 383). The leader of the *Arians of Illyricum. Around the year 380, he asked the emperor *Gratian to convoke a council that would also be open to the Eastern bishops. The Council of *Aquileia (381), however, which was limited to Italian bishops guided by *Ambrose, condemned and deposed him because of his adherence to Arianism, along with *Secundianus of Singidunum. In 383, he traveled with *Wulfila to *Constantinople to ask the emperor *Theodosius to lift the Council of Aquileia's sentence, but he did not succeed. The *Dissertatio Maximini contra Ambrosium* includes one of Palladius's long polemical passages on the council and Ambrose. The attribution of the *Sermo Arrianorum* and some of the *Fragmenta Arriana* to Palladius has no solid basis.

M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 85-92, 111-134; Patrologia III, 89.97-98; Y.-M. Duval, *La convocation du concile d'Aquilée de 381*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V. XXX Incontro di Studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma 3-5 maggio 2001*: SEA 78 (2002) 421-437.

M. Simonetti

PALLADIUS of Saintes (6th c.). Bishop of Saintes (*Santonae*) in the 1st half of the 6th c. Born into a wealthy family (Greg. Tours, *Glor. conf.* 60), he ordered the construction of basilicas and dedicated them to Sts. *Martin of Tours, *Eutropius (the first bishop of Saintes), *Stephen, *Peter, *Paul, *Lawrence and *Pancras. *Gregory the Great sent him the relics of these saints (*Ep.* VI, 48). He was a participant at the 4th Council of *Paris (573). On the order of the Metropolitan Bertram of *Bordeaux, in 584 he consecrated Faustianus bishop of Dax, the candidate favored by the usurper Gondovald (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* VII, 31; VIII, 2). He participated in the 2nd Council of Mâcon, convoked by King Guntram in 585; this conciliar body deposed Faustianus and ordered Palladius, Bertram and another prelate named Orestes to pay an annual salary to Faustianus (ibid. VIII, 20). Palladius was stripped of one of his properties because he had housed the messengers of a woman named Fredegund, an enemy of Guntram (ibid. VIII, 20). His feast day is celebrated locally on 7 October.

BS 10, 59-60; DCB 4, 177; DACL 15, 557-561 (Saintes); Cath 454 (Palais).

E. Malaspina

PALLADIUS of Suedri. Palladius was a *politeuomenos*, i.e., a citizen (*Bürger*, acc. to K. Holl) or, more precisely, a magistrate (curialis or senator, acc. to Petau) of this region of Pamphilia; after *Constantine's reign, it regained the right to have its own governor. He was certainly a model citizen acc. to *Epiphanius, having sold all his possessions in order to minister to the poor and the church. He "burned with zeal," Epiphanius writes, "and lived a holy life; he was admirable on account of his faith and adherence to perfect communion." He appealed to the bishop of *Cyprus with a *letter, referring to him as the "leader of his soul and the church," to request his intervention in the questions concerning the *Holy Spirit that were troubling the church in Suedri. Palladius summarized the faith by writing at length on the trinitarian creed acc. to the *orthodox faith. From time immemorial Pamphilia had been in communion with Cyprus, and its own dialect was related to the one spoken on that island. In July of the ninetieth year of the ascension of *Diocletian (374), Epiphanius provided a response with his book titled the *Ancoratus*, thereby fulfilling the requests of the Christian magistrate and the other individuals who had posed similar questions.

CPG 3744; PG 43, 13-17; GCS 25, 3-5; C. Riggi, *Epifanio. L'ancora della fede*, Rome 1977, 35-37.

C. Riggi

PALM. In the Old Testament, the use of the palm took on various meanings: first, simply as ornamentation (1 Kgs 6:32; Ezek 40:26, 31, 34). In Ps 92:12, the righteous are said to *flourish like the palm tree*; Jericho was the city of palms (Dt 34:3). During *Jesus' entry into *Jerusalem, the crowd received him with palms and shouts of joy (Jn 12:13). The book of Revelation describes the saved *before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, with palm branches in their hands* (7:9). In the Greco-Roman world, palms were the symbol of victory. *Tertullian considers the palm a symbol of *martyrdom: *haec palmata vestis* (*Apol.* 50,3); for Christians, the palm became a sign of victory: in the *Passio Perpetuae* the victress receives a palm branch (10,9 and 12). For *Augustine, palms signify the *martyrs (*Civ. Dei* 8,27,1), to whom the palm is granted for professing their faith through their death: *victoriae debita iustitiae palma reddatur* (*Civ. Dei* 13,7). *Ambrose also affirmed: *palma vincentis est* (*De obitu Valent.*; Damasus, *Epigrammata damasiana*, ed. Ferrua 47,6). In Christian iconography the palm at times had only an ornamental and decorative function (Rep. 34, pl. 11; 200, pl. 47; 638, pl. 96; 675, pl. 103; WK plates 11; 15; 17a-b; 82; 101). One also finds the palm alongside the *phoenix, which was a sign of regeneration, to indicate a setting beyond earth.

LCI 3, 364-365; EC 9, 650; TIP 238-240.

A. Di Berardino

PALMAS of Amastris (2nd c.). Bishop of *Amastris in *Pontus at the end of the 2nd c. *Eusebius of Caesarea informs us that during the same period (at the time of Pope *Victor, 189-199), in addition to the Roman, Palestinian and Gallic *councils, one was also called by the bishops of Pontus to discuss the dating of *Easter; Palmas was its president, "being the most elderly" (*HE* 5,23,2-3). The *Acts* of these councils were known during Eusebius's time so that as a result we know that all the bishops set the date for the celebration of Easter on the Sunday after the 14th of Nisan, i.e., they followed the Roman tradition. *Dionysius of Corinth, in a letter to the faithful of *Amastris, mentions Palmas as their bishop (*HE* 4,23,6).

DHGE 2, 971-274; DCB 4, 177.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PALMYRA

I. History - II. Archaeology.

I. History. Modern-day Tadmor, *Syria (a small village inhabited by sedentary Bedouins), it was a caravan city with ancient origins; it is remembered for its fame even in the Bible (Tadmor: 2 Chr 8:4). Being a large oasis in the Syro-Arabian desert, almost midway between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates (300 km [186 mi.] from the river), large waves of commercial traffic coming from the East passed through it; it was favored by the presence of abundant wellsprings. Embroiled in the long wars between Rome and the Parthians (in AD 41, it ran the risk of being plundered by Mark Antony, but the inhabitants withdrew by taking their possessions and finding refuge beyond the Euphrates), Palmyra owed its extraordinary fortune to its status as a semi-independent, neutral city, in which the two hostile superpowers, Rome and the kingdom of the Parthians, were able to exchange goods. The exchange brought wealth and the construction of an important and splendid city that combined diverse styles: Semitic, Greek, Roman and Parthian, Roman walls and temples, forums, a colonnade street, etc. The upper classes knew Greek, but Aramaic was also used very frequently as the lingua franca. Its religious pantheon, as demonstrated by the presence of numerous temples, united Arabian divinities and the Canaanite Bel (Baal).

The pantheon entered the orbit of Roman influence after *Trajan's victory over the Parthians when Mesopotamia became a province. *Hadrian visited Palmyra ca. 129. *Septimius Severus attempted to make the city a base for military action against the East, but the rise of the *Sassanid dynasty favored the autonomy of the city: after the disastrous defeat of the Romans by *Shapur in 258, the Palmyran Odenathus, who was from the mighty family of *Iulii Aurelii Septimii*, defeated the king of Persia in battle and received from the emperor *Gallienus the honorific title *imperator* (*restitutor*, *corrector*) *totius Orientis.* Odenathus then extended his authority to Syria and a large part of the East; he died in 267 as a result of a plot on his life, and his son Septimius Vaballatus succeeded him under the care of his mother *Zenobia (Bath Zabbai). After the death of Claudius in 270, she continued the politics of conquest to the point of rejecting the sovereignty of Rome—the great adventure of Palmyra finished in 272 with its defeat by Aurelian first at *Antioch then at *Emesa (Homs)—the Roman emperor besieged the city of Palmyra and captured Zenobia herself while she was fleeing; she was brought to Rome through the triumph of Aurelian. A few months later, because of an uprising against the Romans, Aurelian destroyed Palmyra, which from that moment would have less importance, even in commerce. Palmyra, at the time

of Odenathus and Zenobia, had also become a cultural center to which educated Syrians flocked. Zenobia had protected *Paul of Samosata, the heretical bishop of Antioch, against the Catholic majority of the East, who had condemned him in two councils; Paul was banished from his episcopal see only with the assistance of Aurelian (Eus., *HE* 7,30,19). There, *Diocletian constructed an encampment, baths and walls. *Justinian rebuilt the walls and the churches; the city came under Arab rule in 634. The ruins of Palmyra were rediscovered in the 17th c. We do not have information on the presence of Christians in Palmyra during the 3rd c.; the first known bishop is Marinus, who was present at the Council of *Nicaea.

M. Rostovtzeff, *Città carovaniere*, It. tr. Bari 1971; J. Teixidor, *Un port romain du désert. Palmyre*, Paris 1984; R. Stoneman, *Palmyra and Its Empire. Zenobia's Revolt Against Rome*, Ann Arbor, MI 1992, 1994; E. Equini Schneider, *Septimia Zenobia Sebaste*, Rome 1993; L. Dirwin, *The Palmyrenes of Dura-Europos. A Study of Religious Interaction in Roman Syria*, Leiden 1999; E. Savino, *Città di frontiera nell'Impero Romano. Forme della romanizzazione da Augusto ai Severi*, Bari 1999; T. Gnoli, *Roma, Edessae Palmira nel III sec. d. C. problemi istituzionali. Uno studio sui papiri dell'Eufrate*, Pisa-Rome 2000.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Archaeology. Inside the large enclosure of the walls constructed acc. to the Roman layout, to the W of the great temple, are preserved the remains of two churches with three aisles, one of which, however, has a fortified apse of radiating buttresses, as in the church of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives. The other two churches lie outside the walls of the city (Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 168-231). The most recent excavations have brought to light pagan monuments, with the exception of a depiction of *Jesus Christ. In the Polish excavations of 1960, archaeologists found, inside a small jar, jewels and pendant earrings, one of which was in the form of a *cross; during the excavations of 1962, a seal, a Maltese cross and a Greek inscription were found. Various sepulchral inscriptions mention Christians. For the Jewish and Christian influence, one should consult the study of L.D. Merino.

J. Lassos, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947; K. Michalowski, *Palmyre. Fouilles polonaises 1960*, Paris 1962; L.D. Merino, *Influencias judía y cristiana en los signos y inscripciones palmirenas*: SBF 21 (1971) 76-148.

B. Bagatti

PALUT (2nd–3rd c.). A Semitic name that means "the ransom." The disciple of the legendary *Addai, with whom he evangelized the city of *Edessa, which became an important Christian center in *Mesopotamia and an axis for the spread of Christianity to the E of the Tigris River. According to the *Teaching of Addai*, Palut went to *Antioch to receive episcopal orders from the hands of *Serapion (par. 102), around the year 200. This was after Addai had been killed before having had the opportunity to "lay hands" upon him, although Palut had already been ordained a presbyter by Addai (par. 77). The incident reveals the Edessene community's dependence on Antioch. The *Martyrium Barsamya* presents Palut as the first bishop of Edessa (Cureton - Wright, 63-72). After the death of Palut, acc. to *Ephrem, the orthodox Christians of Edessa came to be called "Palutiani" in opposition to the dissenters. ʿAbshelama then Barsamya succeeded Palut, who died a martyr between 249 and 260.

W. Cureton and W. Wright, *Ancient Syriac Documents: Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa and the Neighbouring Countries*, London 1864, repr. Amsterdam 1967. J.B. Segal, *Edessa "The Blessed City,"* Oxford 1970, 79-81; E. Peretto, *Il problema degli inizi del cristianesimo in Siria*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 197-214; Erbetta II, 574-578; A. Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, Paris 1983; J. Teixidor, *Bardesane d'Édesse, la première philosophie syriaque*, Paris 1992; J. González Núñez, *La leyenda del rey Abgar y Jesús*, Madrid 1993.

A. Di Berardino

PAMMACHIUS (d. 410). Senator from the family of the Furii, he was a schoolmate and companion of *Jerome. He married Paulina, the daughter of the Roman matron *Paula, and, when widowed (397), entered the *monastic life; he spent his wealth in aiding the *poor, ordered the construction of a hospice for *pilgrims at Porto and built the church of Sts. *John and *Paul on the Caelian Hill (*titulus Pammachii*) in Rome. He engaged in the controversies regarding *Jovinian and *Origen, by actively working in opposing *Rufinus. Jerome dedicated some books to him and sent him numerous letters (*Ep.* 48; 49; 57; 66; 83; 84; 97). He also received a letter from *Paulinus of *Nola (*Ep.* 13), as soon as the latter was informed of the death of Paula, and a laudatory letter from *Augustine (*Ep.* 58), for his anti-Donatist activity in *Numidia. He died in 410 during the occupation of Rome by *Alaric's *Goths.

Palladius, *Hist. laus.* 62; BS 10, 72-74 (bibl.); PLRE I, 663; LTK[3] 7, 1306-1307; PCBE 1576-1581.

A. Pollastri

PAMPHILUS of Caesarea (d. 16 February 310). Born of a noble family of Berytus (Beirut), he accu-

mulated public offices; then, at the *Didaskaleion* of *Alexandria he became the student of *Pierius (*Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 118-119), who was called "*Origen the Younger." He relocated to *Caesarea to reinvigorate the school founded by Origen; he was ordained a priest by Bishop Agapius of Caesarea. Eusebius retold his life in *De Mart. Pal.* His teaching, like Origen's, entailed a spiritual and scriptural approach. He restored and expanded the library attached to the school and organized a workshop of copyists. Arrested in November of 307, he spent two years in prison and was beheaded on 16 February 310 under *Maximinus Daia. Two now-lost biographies were written by his teacher Pierius and his student Eusebius, who asked to be called "Eusebius Pamphili" and spoke of him even in the *Historia ecclesiastica* and in the *De Mart. Pal.*

While in prison and with the help of Eusebius, he wrote the *Apology for Origen* in six books, the sixth of which was written after his death by Eusebius alone (Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 118). Only book 1 has survived in the Latin translation of *Rufinus. The introduction, which is addressed to the *martyrs of *Palestine condemned to the mines (**damnatio ad metalla*), illustrates the method to be followed for reading and justly assessing Origen's work; it emphasizes the hypothetical and antithetical approach of his speculations that are not intended to be understood as dogmatic affirmations but are often opposed to each other; it also emphasizes the teacher's adherence to *orthodoxy. Citing numerous texts from Origen's writings, some of which are not recognized as his, Pamphilus refutes the charges regarding Origen's thought on the *Trinity, the *incarnation and the historicity of *Scripture, the *resurrection, punishment, the *soul and *metempsychosis. To dissociate such a defense from the over-glorious patronage of a martyr, *Jerome wanted others to accept the idea that this document was the exclusive work of the semi-Arian Eusebius, but he is refuted by others' citations of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

Apology of Origen: PG 17, 521-616; SC 464-465; Palut van Nuffelen, *Two Fragments from the Apology for Origen in the Church History of Socrates Scholasticus*: JTS 56 (2005) 103-114.

H. Crouzel

PAMPHILUS of Jerusalem (6th–7th c.). Two documents have come down to us under Pamphilus's name: one dogmatic, the other *hagiographic. The work *Capitulorum diversorum seu dubitationum solutio* (A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, II, Rome1844, 597-693) treats questions of *Christology and refutes *Severus of Antioch, the *Acephali and the *tritheist *monophysites. One finds long citations of this work in the **Doctrina Patrum* (ed. F. Diekamp, Münster 1907; repr. [2]1982). The author at times used *Leontius of Byzantium verbatim (esp. the *Epilysis*) and the emperor *Justinian's *Confession rectae fidei*. The work was composed between 560 and 630. To commemorate the holy *virgin and Roman martyr *Soteris, who was venerated also at *Jerusalem in the 6th c., Pamphilus wrote the *Encomium s. Soteridis* (P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Hagiographica*, ST 19, Rome1908, 113-120). Pamphilus made this female saint out to be a companion of St. *Pancras.

CPG III, 6920ff.; Bardenhewer V, 18ff.; Beck 379 and 465; Altaner 549; M. Richard, *Léonce et Pamphile*: RSPh 27 (1938) 27-52 (= *Opera Minora* III, Turnhout 1977, n. 58); Id., *Pamphile de Jérusalem*: Muséon 90 (1977) 277-28

A. De Nicola

PANCRAS, martyr. Pancras is inscribed in the *Mart. hier.* after Sts. *Nereus and Achilleus, on 12 May. Pope *Symmachus (498–514) built or enlarged the basilica constructed over his tomb, outside the gate of the same name on the Via Aurelia (Duchesne, LP 1, 262). There, *Gregory the Great delivered *Hom. in Ev.* 27 (CCL 141, 229-238) and established a *monastery nearby (*Reg. epp.* 4,18: CCL 140, 236-237). *Honorius I (625–638) added a semicircular crypt and an altar *ad corpus* in the choir of the church (ICUR 2, 24 and 156). *Gregory of Tours (*Glor. mart.* 38) mentions the custom by which accused people, through an oath sworn in a church, could be exonerated from accusations. The Gelasian and Gregorian *Sacramentaries record a *Mass in honor of the *martyr on the day of his feast. Pancras's Latin *Passio* is categorized as an epic and dates back to the 6th-7th c.: Pancras was from a rich Phrygian family and resided at *Rome under *Diocletian and *Valerian; he was baptized and martyred. In the East, Pancras does not have a cult; BHG 1408 is a translation made in S Italy, of which BHG 1409 is a paraphrase, used by *Pamphilus of Jerusalem (BHG 1642).

BHL 6420-6428; BHG 1408-1409; BS 10, 82-89; LCI 8, 110-111; BBKL 6, 1483-1484; R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* 3, Vatican City 1971, 154-175; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 251-253; J. Declerck, *Les recensions grecques de la Passion de S. Pancrace, martyr à Rome*: AB 105 (1987) 65-85; M. Cecchelli, *Chiese di Roma illustrate. S. Pancrazio*, Rome1972; H.R. Drobner, *Der heilige Pankratius*, Paderborn 1988; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane*, Rome [2]1999, 234-237.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PANEGYRIC

I. Eulogy and epideictic speech: Theoretical premises, practical indications - II. Panegyrics of Late Antiquity.

The Latin term *panegyricus*, which then passed into European languages, is a transliteration of the Greek adjective πανηγυρικός, which derived from the substantive πανήγυρις, "a meeting, solemn assembly," such as the one held on the occasion of the Panathenaic or the Olympic games. As an attribute of the λογός, speech, the term is used—without specific technical rhetorical connotations—by Isocrates, who thus labels the oration he published in 380 BC on the occasion of the gathering of the Greeks at Olympia. For a long time the Greek πανηγυρικός would retain this generic meaning that one finds again in the *Ars rhetoricia* of ps.-*Dionysius, probably composed toward the end of the 3rd c. AD, where πανηγυρικός refers to speeches delivered in the public celebrations of solemn religious feasts. It is only in the Byzantine period that the meaning of πανηγυρίζειν becomes closer to ἐγκωμιάζειν, until finally becoming its synonym in modern Greek. In the Latin milieu, however, as early as the imperial age, the term *panegyricus* was used as a synonym of *laudatio*, in the ancient technical sense of "laudatory speech of a famous person." The first securely datable testimony of such a meaning is in *Lactantius, *Div. inst.* I, 15,13 (*sicut faciunt qui apud reges etiam malos panegyricis mendacibus adulantur*), although one finds the use of the term *panegyrista* to refer to the author of an encomiastic speech for the first time in *Sidonius Appollinaris (*Epist.* IV, 1,2).

I. Eulogy and epideictic speech: Theoretical premises, practical indications. The ancient corpus of treatises, which catalogs the panegyric among the speech of the epideictic genre, is devoted to the encomium both for theorizing the role and characteristics in the widest context of oratory and for indicating themes and practical rules of composition. Given the sparse and unoriginal contribution to epideictic composition by Latin oratorical treatises, we will limit ourselves here to the most important texts from the Greek milieu for the purposes of our discussion, referring the reader for more in-depth information to the studies cited in the bibl.

The most authoritative and influential voice for Greeks and Latins was Aristotle, whose theorization presupposes an acquaintance with the thought of the Sophist Gorgias (on the latter, see Buchheit, 27-38). In *Rhet.* I. 3 1358bff., Aristotle distinguishes three genres (εἴδη) of speech: deliberative (συμβουλευτικόν, Lat.: *deliberativum*), judicial (δικανικόν: Lat. *iudiciale*) and epideictic (ἐπιδεικτικόν: Lat. *demonstrativum*). The distinction is based on the role of the hearer, which in the first two cases is the judge, and he must decide on the future (deliberative oratory) or on the past (judicial oratory), although in the epideictic genre, which expresses praise or blame and pertains to the present, he is the spectator (θεωρός) and decides on the ability of the orator. Each one of the three genres has its specific end: the deliberative has as its end the useful and the harmful; the judiciary genre, the just and the unjust; the epideictic, the beautiful and the ugly. Unlike the other two genres that pursue concrete goals, the epideictic genre appears in Aristotle disconnected from immediate practical ends (on the other hand, in *Rhet.* III, 12,1414a, it is explicitly stated that the epideictic speech is intended for reading and therefore requires a style more suited to writing than to recitation).

Aristotle takes into consideration virtue and vice, the noble and the base, since these are respectively objects of praise or blame, whether one is dealing with a human being, a god, other animate beings or inanimate objects (*Rhet.* I, 9,1366a). The forms of virtue are *justice, courage, temperance, nobility, magnanimity, generosity, sensibleness and wisdom (*Rhet.* I, 9,1366a-b), all qualities that we will find again in Late Antiquity. In praising (as well as in blaming), the goal is to take those qualities that might be considered excessive and bring them nearer to what is more acceptable (e.g., the reckless individual who is called courageous), and thus the actions of the person will be interpreted as a manifestation of praised virtues. Aristotle then distinguishes between ἔπαινος (elegy, praise) and encomium. The concept of ἔπαινος emphasizes the greatness of virtue, which is manifested in actions: it will then be important to highlight both the action and the intention with which one acts; the encomium, instead, has as its object the works (ἔργα) that are signs of a moral disposition: circumstances such as nobility of birth and education can increase credibility (*Rhet.* I, 9, 1367b).

If later on not everyone made the distinction between ἔπαινος and encomium (or not in the same terms articulated by Aristotle), the attention to the virtues, gifts, actions, intentions and achievements of the person praised would establish a constant element in the speech of praise. In praising someone, it is good to repeat many forms of amplification (the one praised did something by himself, or was the first ever to do so, or with few people, etc.); in the event that the subject per se does not offer many cues in this respect, he is contrasted with others. Because it is good to appear better than admirable people,

comparisons with famous people are preferred; if this was not possible, the comparison is made with the majority of people (*Rhet.* I, 9,1368a). Important for the role of amplification (αὔξησις)—which must show how such actions are admirable and useful (*Rhet.* III, 17,1417b), both because they would be taught in the schools and because they provide a testimony of the current practice for explaining a person's actions (*Rhet.* III, 16,1416b)—are some practical suggestions offered by the third book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, pertinent to the introduction (*Rhet.* III, 14,1414b-1415a; see Buchheit, 169-188).

The final outcome of the Sophist tradition is more represented by the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* than by Aristotle (*Rhetores Graeci* I, II, ed. C. Hammer ex recognitione Leonardi Spengel, Leipzig 1894, 8-104; thereafter, M. Fuhrmann, *Anaximenis ars rhetorica quae vulgo fertur Aristotelis ad Alexandrum*, Leipzig 1966), an anonymous work (on the possible authorship of Anaximenes, see Buchheit, 189-207) that was chronologically close—we do not know if it was earlier or later—to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. From our point of view, this is important because in various ways it anticipates the developments of the epideictic speech of Late Antiquity. The encomiastic genre is here defined as αὔξησις of intentions, actions and glorious words, but also attribution of qualities that the praised subject does not possess (συνοικείωσις μὴ προσόντων). Worthy of praise are things just, legitimate, useful, beautiful, pleasant and those things that (if one supposes they are difficult) the person to be praised has easily accomplished (c. 3, p. 28 Hammer). The positive qualities (τὰ ἀγαθά) are distinguished into two categories: gifts such as nobility, strength, beauty and wealth, which give prestige without being virtues (τὰ ἔξω τῆς ἀρετῆς), and true and properly speaking virtues (ἀρεταί), which are identified with the cardinal virtues of wisdom, justice and courage (c. 35, p. 80 Hammer). For the first category—because they do not depend on the individual but on the circumstances—one must delight in the one who possesses them; the second category, however, one must praise. With respect to the disposition of the topics for discussion, one will begin with the family of the one to be praised, then pass on to what he has accomplished as a child and as an adolescent, and, finally, to his actions as an adult, which are grouped together acc. to the virtues of justice, wisdom and courage (see Buchheit, 208-231).

Since the Hellenistic age, specific books of exercises on the techniques of composition were in use (*progymnasmata*: see W. Kroll, RE suppl. VII, 1118ff.), which taught one to lay out the various types of speeches. The most ancient *progymnasmata* that have come down to us are owed to the Alexandrian rhetorician of the 1st-2nd c. AD Aelius Theon (ed. L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* II, Leipzig 1854, 57-130), who, among other things, emphasizes σύγκρισις (additional points in Russell - Wilson, 26ff. and above all RE V A, 2, cols. 2040-2047, *Theon* 5). After Theon, between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th c. a treatment of the art of the epideictic speech is found in four texts, the chronology—absolute and relative—of which is anything but certain: the *progymnasmata* of the so-called Hermogenes of Tarsus (ed. H. Rabe, *Rhetores Graeci* VI, Leipzig 1913, repr. Stuttgart 1985: the section on the encomium is at pp. 14-18, followed by a chapter on σύγκρισις), the *Ars Rhetorica* of ps.-Dionysius of Halicarnassus (in *Dionysii Alicarnassei opuscula*, ed. H. Usener - L. Radermacher, Leipzig 1904–1929, vol. II: the section on panegyrics, at pp. 255-260, is now translated in English in Russell - Wilson, 362-381), and the two treatises διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν and περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν attributed to the orator Menander of Laodicea. Thereafter, the following orators would allocate a chapter of their *progymnasmata* to the encomium: Aphthonius of Antioch (ed. H. Rabe, *Rhetores Graeci* X, Leipzig 1926: on the encomium, ch. VIII, pp. 21-27) and Nicholaus of Myra (ed. I. Felten, *Rhetores Graeci* XI, Leipzig 1913: the section on the encomium and blame at pp. 47-58), who were active between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c., who both devote a separate treatment to σύγκρισις.

Basing themselves on current practice in the Greek milieu at the end of the 3rd c. AD, all four treatises at the end of the 3rd to the beginning of the 4th c. try to systematize epideictic oratory. Rather distant from the practice witnessed by the panegyrics that have come down to us is the *Ars Rhetorica* of ps.-Dionysius, who claims that the ancient meaning for *panegyric* is a speech to be delivered on the occasion of solemn feasts: in this setting, one foresees that the culminating part of the oration is the praise of the emperor. The treatise attributed to Hermogenes offers a more vast comparison on the points and the *topoi* in which the orator articulates the encomium of a person (see Russell - Wilson, 27ff.). Hermogenes's treatise is perhaps the most ancient; however, it does not consider panegyric as an autonomous literary form, but as a genre of discourse that recurs in works pertaining to the most disparate literary genres.

Of great pertinence for the study and understanding of the Late Antique encomia are the two treatises, probably from the age of *Diocletian, passed down to us under the name of Menander, but most likely the work of two different authors (cf.

Pernot 1986). The first of the two (διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν, which is more theoretical and is organized on the basis of the objects of praise, provides a framework applicable to any eulogistic speech. The second (περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν)—which, precisely for this reason, is the most important for us—indicates in detail the points (κεφάλαια) in which the different varieties of epideictic speech must be articulated for recitation during public and private occasions. Of specific interest for our purposes are the precepts regarding the eulogy of the emperor (βασιλικὸς λόγος: ch. I), but encomiastic themes are fixed even for a funeral speech (ἐπιτάφιος λόγος: ch. XI)—which briefly develops the eulogy of the sovereign upon whom the crown is bestowed—and, finally, by the funerary lament (μονῳδία: ch. XVI). For the βασιλικὸς λόγος Menander lays down the rule that, after an introduction characterized by the *amplificatio*, the orator proceeds to the eulogy of the sovereign's city of birth and the province of which he is a native, if they happen to be famous; if such is not the case he should immediately move on to praising the family. If his family members are little known, he will say that there is no sense in praising them because the ruler has no need of being extolled by the glory of another, or he will instead attribute to him a divine origin. The orator will then recall the wonders tied to his birth, aspects of his nature (τὰ περὶ τῆς φύσεως) such as, e.g., his beauty, his maturity (ἀνατροφή), education (πράξεις)—divided into actions in a time of war and actions carried out in a time of peace—which would be grouped under the label of temperance, justice and wisdom. Lastly, he will mention destiny (τὰ τῆς τύχης) and will make a global comparison between his reign and that of another monarch (e.g., Alexander the Great). At the end, the epilogue will extol the happiness of the present-day state.

Because—as the author himself emphasizes from time to time—many of the directions given (among these, the frequent recourse, even on individual points, to the σύγκρισις) are not exclusive to the βασιλικὸς λόγος but are applied to any discourse of praise, the treatment of Menander on the imperial encomium presents the comparison more closely even for the laudatory speeches that do not have a sovereign as the recipient.

II. Panegyrics of Late Antiquity. Given that encomiastic themes can also be presented in other literary genres (a clear case of which is represented by the *epos* of Claudius *Claudian), and given that what has survived to our day is only a very small part of the panegyric actually delivered (we use the term *panegyric* for all laudatory speeches regardless of the title with which they have been handed down to us), we now go on to examine the production of panegyric in Late Antiquity.

1. Secular panegyrics: A. *In Greek*. In outlining the eulogy of a public person, the Greek-speaking orators were able to take as a model two famous encomiastic-type biographies: the *Evagoras* of Isocrates and the *Agesilaus* of Xenophon. In his book *Evagoras*, composed ca. 365 BC to praise the lord of Salamis, Cyprus, who was assassinated in 374/373 BC, Isocrates sets forward an ideal portrayal of this ruler (hence the various convergences with Menander's suggestions on the βασιλικὸς λόγος); the narration does not follow the chronological order of the events, but he organizes them under the qualities of Evagoras, who illustrates them: courage, wisdom and justice. The other eulogistic text that would serve as a powerful model for the Late Antique encomia was the *Agesilaus* of Xenophon (ca. 357 BC), which instead follows a chronological order and enumerates secondarily the virtues of the protagonist, providing them ideal exemplification.

Even though a Hellenistic tradition of orations connected to public events existed later, a formal speech in praise of a public personage has not come down to us for the period before Menander's treatise. The most ancient encomium is *Libanius's *Oration* 59 (on *Constans and *Constantius, delivered probably around AD 348: see Malosse, 7-11), which outlines an image of both political leaders acc. to a schema comparable to those theorized by the panegyric of ps.-Hermogenes and Menander's περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν. The panegyric of the emperor *Julian for Constantius II shows traces of Libanius's teaching (*Or.* I, probably delivered after January 357; see Tantillo, 36-40), in which the young caesar compares himself with the subject of Themistius's oration for and on Constantius (on the issue, see Tantillo, 33-36). Julian also follows a panegyric schema in the contemporary encomium of the empress Eusebia (*Or.* II), where, however, he introduces some more personal touches such as gratitude for having allowed him to dedicate himself to the study of philosophy (*Or.* II, 12ff.). After 1 January 362 (see Guida, 73ff.) there is a panegyric in honor of Julian: a few fragments have been added (ed. A. Guida).

The various orations of *Themistius are also encomia (ca. AD 317–388): in particular *Or.* 1 (Constantius or the humanness of the ruler); *Or.* 11—directed to *Valens for the tenth anniversary of his reign in 373—in which the orator dwells on the political leader and his actions on behalf of the army

and the civilians; *Or.* 18, dedicated to Theodosius in 384, is of great ideological weight because Themistius therein elaborates a theory about the collaboration between philosophy and royalty. Themistius's encomia—as do his extensively eulogistic speeches—go beyond praise to become an instrument for a political and philosophical proposition and establish an occasion for advising and disagreeing, as one sees, e.g., in his *Or.* 7, dedicated to Valens in the winter of 366/367, after the bloody suppression of the revolt led by *Procopius the Usurper: In this oration Themistius—in outlining the conduct of the perfect ruler—in fact counsels the sovereign to act with moderation and leniency. Finally, one should remember that *Procopius of Gaza's panegyric for *Anastasius has a secular quality about it despite the author's attested Christian faith.

B. *In Latin.* (1) In prose. *Latin *Panegyrics* is the name of a collection of eleven official speeches, scattered over the period between AD 289 and 389, which name was placed before the text—reworked and considerably expanded—of the panegyric (the most ancient attestation of this title is in Sidonius Appollinaris—*Epist.* VII, 10) for Trajan, delivered by *Pliny the Younger in AD 100. With the exception of the Ambrosiana *palimpsest (E 147 sup. of the 6th c., originating from Bobbio and discovered by Angelo Mai), which, however, only preserves fragments of Pliny's speech, the codices that have handed down to us the *Latin Panegyrics* all derive from the copy discovered at Mainz in 1433 by Giovanni Aurispa. The *editio princeps* was the work of Cuspinianus, Vienna 1513, and the first modern critical edition was edited by Emil Baehrens (Leipzig 1874).

After the panegyric of Pliny, there follows in the collection the most recent panegyric (II), which is the one recited in 389 in honor of Theodosius by Latinius Drepanius Pacatus, friend and colleague of *Ausonius. We then have Mamertinus's *gratiarum actio* to Julian in 362 (III), Nazarius's panegyric for Constantine (IV, delivered at Rome in 321), the *panegyrici diversorum septem* (V-XI) and, lastly, the panegyric of 313 in honor of Constantine (XII). Of the eleven speeches, the majority delivered at *Trier (V, VI, VII, VIII, X, XI, XII), five are anonymous (i.e., V, VI, VII, VIII, XII). The speech for the reconstruction of the school held in 298 at Autun by Eumenius before the prefect of *Lyons, *Gaul (IX), and the oration delivered in 362 at Constantinople by Claudius Mamertinus to thank Julian for the consulship (III) cannot be defined, properly speaking, as βασιλικοὶ λόγοι. (Readers are cautioned that the numbering of the *Latin Panegyrics* is inconsistent; here Roman numerals indicate the MS order of the panegyrics and not their chronological order. *See* *panegyrics, Latin.) The various authors—all orators active in the most important schools of Gaul (Autun, *Bordeaux, Trier)—were *pagan, but they spoke of the divinity in very generic terms that could also be adapted to the God of Christianity. The eleven speeches, which seem to have been chosen for their literary quality, in setting forth an idealized depiction of the political leader, have this famous example (evidently considered such even by the individual who placed it at the beginning of the collection): Pliny's *gratiarum actio* to the emperor who desired to confer upon him the consulship and for whom he delivers the encomium. Cicero's influence was also very strong, particularly in these following orations in which he defines the qualities required for the exercise of command: *De imperio Cn. Pompei*, *Pro lege Manilia*, *De provinciis consularibus* and *Pro Marcello*.

Aside from the *Latin Panegyrics*, we have information about four panegyrics composed by Quintus Aurelius *Symmachus: those for *Valentinian I (*Or.* I and II, delivered 368-369 and 370) and for *Gratian (369), which are partially preserved by a palimpsest of the Ambrosiana Library (all commented upon by A. Pabst, Darmstadt 1989; *Or.* I also by F. Del Chicca, Rome 1984), and one lost for the usurper Maximus (probably from January 388). Ausonius's *gratiarum actio* dates to the year 379 by his former student, the emperor Gratian, who appointed him consul. *Merobaudes I's panegyric is also a *gratiarum actio* for the conferral of a high office. After the fall of the W portion of the empire, the tradition of the imperial panegyric would be taken up again by *Ennodius in his panegyric for *Theodoric.

(2) In verse. Alongside those in prose, panegyrics in verse from late Latin Antiquity have also come down to us. Their composition was not an utter novelty because the practice of using an encomium in verse was already very likely in use at the Hellenistic courts (a confirmation in this regard could be the 17th Idyll of Theocritus), and its use was taken up again in the Latin-speaking world. From Servius (*Ecl.* IX, 36) we learn that the poet Anser wrote the *laudes* of Anthony, whereas the commentaries of Pomponius Porphyrion and ps.-Acron on Hor. *Ep.* I, 16,25 provide information on the *laudes* (Porphyrion uses the term *panegyricus*) composed in honor of Octavian Augustus. We have the *Laudes Messalae* or the *Panegyricus Messalae* (the coining of the term *panegyricus* must be after the 3rd c. AD), a poem of 211 hexameters passed down by the *Corpus Tibullianum* (III, 7 = IV, 1) which eulogizes the military and oratorical gifts of Messala and the *Laus Pisonis*, an anonymous short poem written in 261 hexameters,

the dedicatee of which is perhaps to be identified with Gaius Calpurnius Piso, who headed the plot against *Nero in AD 65. Lastly, we know that in AD 60 Marcus Annaeus Lucanus composed the *Laudes Neronis*, which have not survived. Encomiastic tones characterize even the various *Silvae* of Publius Painius Statius (we note in particular *Silv.* IV, 1, where Janus delivers a brief eulogy of *Domitian, who begins his seventeenth consulate) and, during the Constantinian age, Publilius *Optatianus Porfyrius composed many songs in praise of Constantine. The first panegyrics in the full sense of the term are nonetheless owed to Claudius Claudian, in whose line Merobaudes and Sidonius Apollinaris would later place themselves. Common features of these three poets are the use of the hexameter, the adoption of pretentious and epical language, the presence of mythological scenery and the absence of reference to Christianity.

C. *Credibility of the panegyric and the role of panegyrist.* In a famous passage from the *Confessiones*, *Augustine recalls the anguish that he experienced as a young orator at the court of Milan: *cum pararem recitare imperatori laudes, quibus plura mentirer et mentienti faveretur ab scientibus* (Conf. VI, 6,9). The falsehood, however, of the panegyric was a commonplace for Greek and Latin orators (see Giardina, 604-607) and came to be part of the definition that *Isidore of Seville would assign to it: *Panegyricum est licentiosum et lasciviosum genus dicendi in laudibus regum, in cuius compositione homines multis mendaciis adulantur* (*Orig.* VI, 8,7). Regardless of the veracity of their claims, it is nonetheless difficult to deny that the panegyric has value as a historical witness, if for no other reason than the presence of recurring themes that reveal the existence of burning issues (e.g., the repeated praises for exemption from taxes and the insistence on military success of the ruler derive justification and cogency from the existence of high taxation and ever more precarious borders.)

Certainly more problematic is the question of whether the panegyrists had actual political influence. In their speeches scholars have seen an expression of imperial politics (see esp. MacCormack) and have attributed to them a role of mediation between the ideology of the court and the demands of a public needing answers that had the support of an imperial guarantee (Sabbah, 371). It seems, however, hardly believable that simple professors of rhetoric could have had the prestige, the power and the competence for a such a demanding role, and it is very likely that in a great number of cases the recital of a panegyric was an occasion for the orator to climb the social ladder, which phenomenon, however, was witnessed in quite a few cases. It is absolutely certain that the success of a career—Augustine was aware of this—could depend upon a good oratorical "performance"; nevertheless, it would not be advisable to put all the panegyrists on the same plane, because it is clear that their ability for suggesting or offering a more or less manipulated interpretation of the facts must have been as great as the extent to which they were within the life of the court. In sum, one must distinguish a Themistius, who indulged himself in writing a program for the ruler, or even a Claudian, *tribunus et notarius*, who was at the source of the facts and who forced himself to present them in the most favorable light to Flavius *Stilicho, from the professors of rhetoric such as Augustine or the authors of the *Latin Panegyrics*, whose utmost aspiration would have been to make a good impression so as to guarantee themselves a prestigious career in the public administration.

2. Christian panegyrics: A. *In Greek*. We can consider the speech by which *Eusebius of Caesarea in 335/336 praises the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine's reign (*Triakontaeterikos* or the *Laudes Constantini*) as an encomium, even if it is *sui generis* centering on the relationship between the sovereign and God and not developing points pertinent to the emperor's family and his actions (see Drake, 36-38). The speech extols above all the sovereign's Christian virtues, giving his actions a preferential interpretation as manifestations of *pietas* (εὐσέβεια = godliness). For the most part, however, Christian panegyrics have as their objects *martyrs and *saints (see Payr, 338-342). A great contribution in this sense is supplied in a special way by the speeches of *Basil the Great, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa and *John Chrysostom. From the moment that the eulogized are already dead, their encomia appear acc. to the schema proposed by ps.-Hermogenes (see above), who had placed death and the glory that follows among the points on which the orator must insist (for saints and martyrs it is obviously a heavenly glory). In this genre of texts, moreover, the limits between panegyric ἐπιτάφιος λόγος and *hagiography are extremely uncertain.

B. *In Latin*. (1) in prose (see *Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 49 and Pricocus), an example of this must have also been the lost panegyric for Theodosius composed by *Paulinus of Nola, who lauded his victory over the usurpers, praising in him—as Paulinus himself says (*Ep.* 28.6)—*non tam imperatorem quam Christi servum, non dominandi superbia sed humilitate famulandi potentem, nec regno, sed fide principem* ("not so much the emperor as much as the servant of Christ;

not a powerful person with the pride of domineering but a powerful person with the lowliness of serving, and a ruler not with a kingdom, but with faith").

(2) In verse. The following panegyrics bear a Christian character: the imperial panegyric *De laude imperatoris Anastasii* (delivered at the end of 513–beginning of 514; see Chauvot, 98-107) of *Priscian in 312 hexameters with a preface of 22 trimetric iambs, the four books in hexameters with a preface in the same meter *In laudem Iustini Augustii minoris* of Flavius Cresconius Corripus recited in 567, and, lastly, of the same Corripus, the 51 hexameters of the *Panegyricus in laudem Anastasii quaestoris et magistri* (565–566). One could also classify as a Christian panegyric Ennodius's *dictio* composed in hexameters for celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of the consecration of Epiphanius as bishop (XLIII ed. Vogel = *Carm.* I, 9 ed. Hartel). The tradition of the late imperial poetic encomium would then be taken up again by *Venantius Fortunatus for the benefit of the Merovingian kings (partially in *Carm.* VI, 1; VI, 2; and IX, 1, respectively in praise of Sigebert III, Charibert I and Chilperic I: see Reydellet, 321-331; for a general treatment of Venantius as a panegyrist, see J. George in Whitby, 225-246).

On the epedeictic speech and the encomium: V. Buchheit, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des* Genos Epideiktikon *von Gorgias bis Aristoteles*, Munich 1960; H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* I, Munich [2]1973 (on the *genus demonstrativum* §§ 239-254, pp. 129-138) [Eng. tr. Leiden 1998, 102-111]; J. Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 1974 (on the epideictic speech pp. 177-210); M. Mause, *Panegyrik*: Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik, ed. G. Üding, VI, Tübingen 2003, 495-502; Th. Payr, *Enkomion*: RAC V, 332-343; L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*, I-II, Paris 1993; M. Whitby, ed., *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 183, Leiden 1998; K. Ziegler, *Panegyrikos*: RE 36, 559-581. *On Menander*: D. A. Russel - N.G. Wilson, eds., *Menander Rhetor*, edited with Translation and Commentary, Oxford 1981; L. Pernot, *Les* topoi *de l'éloge chez Ménandros le Rhéteur*: REG 99 (1986) 33-53.

On the Latin Panegyrics: C.E.V. Nixon - B.S. Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini, Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary*, with the Latin text of R.A.B. Mynors, Berkeley 1994; P. Fedeli, *Il 'Panegirico' di Plinio nella critica moderna*: ANRW II 33,1 (1989) 387-514; D. Lassandro - R. Divaccaro, *Rassegna generale di edizioni e studi sui XII* Panegirici latini: BStudLat 28/1 (1998) 132-204; S. MacCormack, *Latin Prose Panegyrics*, in *Empire and Aftermath. Silver Latin II*, ed. T.A. Dorey, London 1975, 143-205 (not limited to the *Latin Panegyrics*); G. Sabbah, *De la rhétorique à la communication politique: Les Panégyriques Latins*: BAGB 4 (1984) 363-388; P.L. Schmidt, *Die Panegyrik*: Herzog, 161-172.

General Studies: A. Chauvot, *Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée. Panegyriques de l'empereur Athanase I[er]*, textes traduits et commentés, Bonn 1986; H.A. Drake, *In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*, Berkeley 1976; A. Giardina - M. Silvestrini, *Il principe e il testo*, in *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*. II. *La circolazione del testo*, Rome [2]1993, 579-613; A. Guida, *Un anonimo panegirico per l'imperatore Giuliano* (*Anon. Paneg. Iul. Imp.*), Introduzione, testo critico, commento, Florence 1990; P.-L. Malosse, Libanios, *Discours*. Tome IV, *Discours LIX*, texte établi et traduit, Paris 2003; S. Pricoco, *Non regno sed fide princeps. L'imperatore Teodosio, Ambrogio e Paolino di Nola*, in R. Teja - C. Pérez (eds.), *La Hispania de Teodosio. Congreso Internacional* (*Segovia-Coca, Octubre 1995*), 1, Salamanca 1997, 207-215; S. Pricoco, *Ancora sul panegirico di Paolino di Nola per Teodosio e il nuovo concetto cristiano del potere imperiale*: Cassiodorus 4 (1998) 225-246; M. Reydellet, *La Royauté dans la littérature latine de Sidoine Apollinaire à Isidore de Séville*, Rome1987, 320-331; I. Tantillo, *La prima orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo*, Introduzione, traduzione e commento, Rome1997.

F.E. Consolino

PANEGYRICS, LATIN (4th c.). The *Latin Panegyrics* are found within a vast encomiastic literature, which, to cite only contemporaneous examples, included the orations of *Themistius to *Constantius II, *Valens and *Theodosius, or the speech of thanksgiving of *Ausonius to *Gratian; then followed the *panegyrics of *Merobaudes to Flavius *Aetius and the panegyrics of *Ennodius to *Theodoric. To the corpus of Latin panegyrics—to the panegyric of *Pliny the Younger that was dedicated to *Trajan in the year 100 and reworked for publication in 103, which first comes in the codices and which is, properly speaking, a *gratiarum actio*—can be added the so-called eleven minor Latin panegyrics, all much later, which can be dated from 289 to 389. These encomiastic speeches were given by well-noted Gauls, professors of *rhetoric or high officials of the imperial administration, in the presence of the emperors in command, with the intention of idealizing his image and creating and consolidating a political and social consensus about it.

They accomplished this by exalting the ethical, civil and military virtues of the emperor who often, both at the beginning of the panegyrics and in its middle, was called *sacratissimus imperator*. Also, he was often Christian, and his virtues were exalted by supplying even biographical and historical details such as Constantine's victory at the Milvian bridge, a victory invoked by the two panegyrics of 313 and 321, and the testimony of widespread public opinion in the cities of *Gaul in the 3rd-4th c. The sovereign who emerges from these speeches is merciful, just and generous, invincible in war, godly; the divinity sanctions his power; he is presented with manners at times clearly pagan, and at other times compatible with Christianity. The orators directed to the emperor both praises of thanksgiving and invocations for aid, which was sometimes military but

above all economic and fiscal. During the celebratory speeches of the emperor, acc. to the imperial ideological positions of the 4th c., the orator balanced his speech by demonizing enemies—political adversaries as well as barbarians and usurpers and also insurgents such as the Bagaudae (see F. Del Chicca, *Panegiristi e barbari*: RomBarb 11 [1991] 109-128; D. Lassandro, *L'integrazione romanobarbarica nei Panegirici Latini*: CISA 12 [1986] 153-159; Id., *Sacratissimus imperator*, Bari 2000, 33-81; 105-144). Rome, whose *aeternitas* is praised, is presented as the civilizer of the world in speeches whose prose is solemn and conforms to Cicero's, with other classical references such as Virgil and Horace, and in which emerges the pride of these prominent Gauls for having obtained for a long time the honorable name *fratres populi Romani*, a name already attested by Julius Caesar's *Gallic Wars* I, 33, and by *Tacitus, *Ann.* XI, 25.

The order in which the codices hand down the *Latin Panegyrics* is not chronological; therefore, they are numbered there in two ways: with a Roman numeral for the chronological order, often followed in the translations and commentaries (e.g., *Panegirici Latini*, It. tr. D. Lassandro and G. Micunco, Turin 2000), and with Arabic numbers for the order of the MSS, which is generally followed in the critical editions such as the *XII Panegyrici Latini*, ed. D. Lassandro, Turin 1992. (Readers are cautioned that the reverse system is used in some standard English-language sources such as Rees and Nixon - Rodgers; i.e., III/11 might need to be read as XI/3, as is the case in the preceding article in the subsection on the *Latin Panegyrics*.) Accepting the Plinian panegyrics to be the first, the others are as follows: II/10, the panegyrics of Mamertinus, Gallic orator, for Maximinian and Diocletian, delivered in 289 at *Trier, one of the new imperial residences; III/11, the speech of the same orator for the birthday of Maximian Augustus, delivered at Trier in 291; in these two orations he praises Maximian's victories over the Bagaudae, the Germans and pirates, and his peace with *Diocletian and his *felicitas*; IV/8, panegyric of an unknown author from the city of Augustodunum (i.e., *Autun), to Caesar *Constantius Chlorus, delivered at Trier in 297, on the occasion of Constantius's *Quinquennalia* (i.e., games celebrated every five years), along with a thanksgiving for the emperor's visit to Gaul, a commemoration of the emperor's military campaign against *Britain, and his victories over the usurper Carausius and Allectus, thanks to which *omnibus nationibus securitas restituta [est]* (18,4), and with a description of Trier, rich in porticos and markets, where the barbarians have been included in various humiliating activities (9,1-4); V/9, Eumenius's speech, a professor of Autun who had Greek origins, for the rebirth of the "Maenianae" schools after the destruction caused by the Bagaudae, delivered in the city of Augustodunum in 298: in ch. 5 the history of such schools is recounted, already noted by Tacitus, *Ann.* III, 43,1, where prominent professors taught, guaranteeing the formation of a youth that would then complete important functions in the imperial bureaucracy: for this reason the emperors supported these schools and appointed their directors. Eumenius in ch. 14 preserves the imperial letter that appointed him such, and in chs. 20-21 he explains the didactic importance of geographical maps painted on walls and urban porticos, which assisted in learning the history, geography and greatness of Rome. This is the only speech not directed to an emperor, in this case Constantius Chlorus, but to a *vir perfectissimus*, the governor of the province of Lyons.

We still have the following: VI/7, a panegyric of an unknown author, perhaps the disciple of Mamertinus, for Maximian and Constantine, delivered at Trier in 307: in it is celebrated Constantine's wedding, as soon as he was proclaimed Augustus, with Fausta, daughter of Maximian, and the peace between son-in-law and mother-in-law, both praised; VII/6, a panegyric of an unknown author, a native of Augustodunum to the emperor Constantine, at Trier in 310: in it Constantine is extolled at the beginning of his reign, while Maximian is vilified, who in the meanwhile died in disgrace, and in ch. 22 the bond of brotherhood between Augustodunum and Rome is recalled (tr. and comm. in B. Mueller-Rettig, *Der Panegyricus des Jahres 310 auf Konstantin den Grossen*, Stuttgart 1990); VIII/5, a speech of thanksgiving by an unknown author, a native of Augustodunum to the emperor Constantine, at Trier in 312: delivered during the *Quinquennalia* of Constantine, it commends the emperor's generosity, who has reduced the taxes on Augustodunum, the city of the Aedui, whose fidelity to Rome harks back all the way to the time of Julius Caesar, with reference to his *Gallic Wars* VI, 12,5, and their title *fratres populi Romani* expresses, acc. to the author, the *communitas amoris* and the *dignitatis aequalitas*; IX/12, a panegyric of an uncertain author of Augustodunum to Constantine, son of Constantius, to whom we shall return, delivered at Trier in 313; X/4, a panegyric of the famous orator Nazarius of Bordeaux, remembered also by Ausonius and by *Jerome, to the emperor Constantine, at Rome in 321: the last two panegyrics (IX and X) praise both Constantine's incursion into Italy and

his victory over Maxentius at the Milvian bridge, which, acc. to *Lactantius and Eusebius, was owed to a divine sign that caused Constantine's "conversion" to Christianity; XI/3, speech of thanksgiving of Claudius Mamertinus to the emperor *Julian, at *Constantinople in 362: the author is perhaps a descendant of the previously mentioned Mamertinus and a supporter of Julian, and for this reason, the minister of the treasury, prefect of Illyricum and then consul, who describes Julian's good governance both in Gaul and in the Danube regions, also praising his military and moral virtues; XII/2, a panegyric of Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, a native orator of Bordeaux, to the emperor Theodosius, at Rome in 389: delivered before the emperor and the senate, it praises Theodosius's civil and military virtues and his victory over the usurper Maximus, without hesitating to call the emperor "god."

In the first of the *Latin Panegyrics*, Pliny even set forward, as does Dio Chrysostom in his orations 1-4 *Peri basileias*, a stern warning to the emperor, that he does not consider him a god or divine but a being gifted with great virtues that are placed at the service of the empire: his role is not a *laboriosa statio* (86,3). The sovereign is *diis simillimus* (1,3), but he is not a god—as *Domitian demanded to be called—even if his ascent to the throne was willed by the *providentia deorum*; he is a fellow citizen and a father, not a master; he must respect the laws, guarantee senatorial *libertas* and refuse to govern with compulsion, otherwise he will be a tyrant, where principality and tyranny are opposites by nature. The good emperors were exemplified by *Augustus, *Titus and Nerva, the evil by *Tiberius, *Nero and *Domitian, and Pliny admonishes Trajan that to merit the love of the gods, it is first necessary to merit the love of men, otherwise there is the risk of meeting the same tragic end of the other evil emperors who were eliminated (see G. Zecchini, *Il pensiero politico romano*, Rome 1997, 101-102; my *Divus e Deus negli autori del I sec. d. C.: Seneca, Lucano e Plinio il Giovane di fronte al culto imperiale*: RIL 134 [2000] 125-149).

The panegyrics in this collection were dedicated to imperial propaganda, but not one of these is lacking certain parenetic and admonitory elements as well (C. Odahl, *Propaganda política y opinión pública en los Panegíricos latinos*, Salamanca 1991; M. Mause, *Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der l.P.*, Stuttgart 1994; my *Il concetto di* res publica *nei panegirici latini*: RIL 133 [1999] 177-197; K. Enenkel, *Panegyrische Geschichtsmythologisierung und Propaganda*: Hermes 128 [2000] 91-126). In general, scholarship has come to a greater appreciation of these documents, which in the past have felt the effect of a judgment such as that of E. Gibbon in *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*: theirs is a "language of adulation" (It. tr. Turin 1967, 320 n.3). The collection of these documents is perhaps owed to the last author of the *Latin Panegyrics*, *Pacatus, who chose the most significant ones of that time, including even his own panegyrics, in a collection that also had an educational purpose but then disappeared only to be found in 1433 at Mainz by the humanist Giovanni Aurispa.

Among these panegyrics, the one for Constantine of 313 has special prominence from the religious point of view: the author praises the victory over Maxentius, which is considered to be of and obtained by divine origin despite the official responses of the haruspices (diviners). The orator speaks of one divinity, of one *divina mens* (2,5; 16,2), of one *maiestas*, of the merciful *deus ille mundi creator et dominus* (13,2), of the *summus rerum sator*, who has willed to have as many names as there are languages of peoples and of whom we cannot know how he himself wishes to be called and can be both immanent to the world and transcendent (26). The gods of polytheism are never named; they are called *dii minores* whose responsibility is the care of common mortals, while the supreme God deigns to reveal himself only to Constantine (2,5). It seems that the way in which the pagan orator, by taking recourse to henotheistic formulas already present in Stoic and Platonic philosophy, takes part in the new religious approach shown by Constantine from that moment onward: see M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]2004, 174-176. In effect, one finds a difference in comparison to the preceding panegyrics dedicated to Constantine in 307 and 311, where, instead, the traditional gods were repeatedly named: Ceres, Liber, Mercury, Capitoline Jupiter, Apollo, Victory and Hercules. Constantine's devotion toward these gods and their temples was admired.

The application of the concept of divinity to the emperor himself in the *Latin Panegyrics* seems interesting: he is described as a *deus praesens* in the panegyric II, for pagan emperors, at 2,11; in III, even for a pagan, at 10,5; in VII, for Constantine before his conversion, at 22,1; as a *praesens numen* in panegyric IX, of a pagan for Constantine barely "converted" to Christianity, at 4,4. Similarly, the emperor is called *deus* or *magis quam deus* almost exclusively in the panegyrics of pagans for pagan emperors: *deus* in II, 2,1 and 5,1; III, 10,4-5; VII, 4,2; 17,4; 21,5; 22,1; IX, 2,4 and 25,4; XI, 22,1. But there is a considerable difference. In the panegyrics of Pacatus for Theodosius, who was truly Christian and who made Christianity the religion of the state, the emperor is assimilated to a divinity and called *deus* repeatedly and without any

difficulty. Pacatus recalls the imperial cult given to Theodosius, who, inasmuch as he was a Christian, would have had to reject it (2,1: *ad contuendum te adorandumque*; 6,4: *qui gentibus adoratur, cui toto orbe terrarum privata vel publica vota redduntur, a quo petit navigaturus serenum, peregrinaturus reditum, pugnaturus auspicium*); he calls him *deus* two times (4,5: *deum quem videmus*; 30,1: *in nos oculos deus rettulit*), and he likens him to the gods (10,1: *gaudent profecto perpetuo divina moto, et iugi agitatione se vegetat aeternitas, et quidquid homines vocamus laborem vestra natura est . . . si fas piumque mortalibus aestimare caelestia*, where *caelestia* refers to the sovereign), in addition to stating that Theodosius's beauty is derived from heaven (6,3), and to affirming that God helps the emperor (6,4) and that he participates in his majesty (18,4). Theodosius's kiss sanctifies (20,2: *ille osculo consecratus est*), and in 21,2 Theodosius is called a *numen*, the sight of whom makes the viewers blessed, just as in 47,2. It is common knowledge that Theodosius is called a "human sovereign and god," *theos*, even in an unpublished text of Themistius, *Pros basilea*, probably dedicated to the same Theodosius and to be considered one of the last works of the author, as I seek to demonstrate in *The Unpublished "Pros basilea" of Themistius*, ed., tr. and comm., in collaboration with E. Amato: ByzZ 99 (2006) 1-67, to which I also refer the reader for documentation on its influence on the political theology of *Eusebius of Caesarea, to which I here add B. Studer's, *Dio salvatore nei Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1986, 184-185, and J.M. Sansterre's, *Eusèbe de Césarée et la naissance de la théologie "Césaropapiste"*: Byzantion 42 (1972) 131-195; 532-594. The *Latin Panegyrics*, therefore, prove to be of great interest even for religious thought during their period and culture.

M.J. Rodríguez, *Las virtudes del emperador Constantino*: SHHA 2-3 (1984-5) 239-247; Id., *Aspectos ideológicos de las relaciones de dependencia*: SHHA 6 (1988) 189-195; D. Lassandro, *Terra mater frugum da Orazio ai Panegirici Latini*, in *Orazio in colloquio*, ed. P. Fedeli, Venosa 1988, 123-128; Id., *Bibliografia dei P.L.*: Invigilata lucernis 11 (1989) 219-259; I. Lana, *La storiografia latina del IV sec. d. C.*, Turin 1990; R. Ferorelli, *Un manoscritto dei P.L.: il cod. Oxoniensis Balliol College 315*: Invigilata lucernis 12 (1990) 161-180; A. Lovino, *Un manoscritto dei P.L.: il cod. Matritensis 8251 (V 210)*, ibid. 261-296; C. Odahl, *A Pagan's Reaction to Constantine's Conversion*: The Ancient World 21 (1990) 45-63; M.-C. L'Huillier, *L'empire des mots: Orateurs gaulois et empereurs romains, 3e et 4e siècles*, Paris 1992; C. Zink, *La vision de Constantin d'après le Panégyrique VII*: REL 12 (1992) 21; D. Lassandro, *Aedui, fratres populi Romani*: CISA 18 (1992), 261-265; C. Nixon, *Constantinus oriens imperator*: Historia 42 (1993), 229-246; K. Rosen, *Constantins Weg zum Christentum und die P.L.*, in *Costantino il Grande*, II, Macerata 1993, 853-863; A. Foulon, *Du nouveau sur la datation du Panégyrique de Messalla?* Kentron 8 (1992) 17-24; I. Hajdú, *Beiträge aus der Thésaurus-Arbeit, XXVI*: MH 50 (1993) 181-182; T. Kotula, *Autour de Claude II le Gothique*: REA 96 (1994) 499-509; M. Mause, *Der Kaiser als Fachmann in ökonomischen Fragen?* MBAH 13 (1994) 89-101; A. Taldone, *Repertorio delle cose notevoli nell'orazione di Latino Pacato Drepanio a Teodosio*: Invigilata lucernis 15-16 (1993-94) 291-311; D. Lassandro, *Storia e ideologia nei P.L.*, in *Sermione mansio*, ed. N. Criniti, Brescia 1995, 111-121; A. Manfredi, *Un'editio umanistica dei P.l. minores*, in *Studi G. Tarditi*, Milan 1995, 1313-1325; P. Kos, *Sub principe Gallieno . . . amissa Raetia?* Germania 73 (1995) 131-144; C.E.V. Nixon - B.S. Rodgers, eds., *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, Berkeley, CA 1994; R. Orihuela, *Consideraciones sobre el Panegírico XI(3) del Corpus P.L.*: Myrtia 11 (1996) 47-60; G. D'Alessandro, *Sulla contrapposizione tra Costantino e Massenzio nei P.L.*: Invigilata lucernis 18-19 (1996-97) 131-138; D. Lassandro, *Exhaustae provinciae . . . praesidentium rapinis*: VetChr 34 (1997) 251-261; M. Lolli, *Il lascito degli anelli*: MH 54 (1997) 226-229; Id., *La* celeritas principis *fra tattica militare e necessità politica nei P.L.*: Latomus 58 (1999) 620-625; D. Lassandro, *Rassegna generale di edizioni e studi sui XII P.l.*: BStudLat 28 (1998) 132-204; Id., *I P.L. del III-IV secolo*, in *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina*, III, Turin 1998, 476-483; M. Christol, *Le métier d'empereur et ses représentations à la fin du IIIe et au début du IVe siècle*: CCG 10 (1999) 355-368; N. Baglivi, *Su Paneg.* 4,5,1: BStudLat 30 (2000) 134-142; Id., *Su Paneg.* 4,33,4: ibid. 554-560; Id., *Su Paneg.* 4,30,3: BStudLat 31 (2001) 538-542; Id., *Su Paneg.* 4,33,6: Vichiana 4 (2002) 73-81; Id., *A proposito di impero, imperatori e P.L.*: ibid. 107-115; Id., *Su Paneg.* 6,2,5: BStudLat 32 (2002) 102-110; A. Bruzzone, *Due recenti studi sui P.l.*: RFIC 129 (2001) 110-120; J.J. Cienfuegos, *El carisma*: ExcPhilol 10-12 (2000-2) 199-213; R. Cicatello, *Il VII capitolo del* De mortibus persecutorum *di Lattanzio*: Seia 6-7 (2001-2) 211-234; F. Paschoud, *Les P.l. et l'Histoire Auguste*, in *Mélanges C. Deroux*, II, Brussels 2002, 347-356; A. Chauvot, *Défaites militaires et problèmes internes dans les p. d'époque tardive (289–313)*: Ktèma 27 (2002) 271-279; M. Lolli, *Un singolare caso di aduentus principis*: ibid. 256-263; Id., *Massenziobis in Pan. IV (X)*: Historia 51 (2002) 502-508; R. Rees, *Layers of Loyalty in L.p., AD 289-307*, Oxford 2002; D. Lassandro, *Il* concentus omnium laudum *in onore dell'imperatore nel Panegirico di Plinio e nei P.L.*, in *Plinius der Jüngere und seine Zeit*, Munich-Leipzig 2003, 243-255; C. Epplett, *Winter Warfare in Antiquity*: Mouseion 3 (2003) 269-283; D. Pérez - M.J. Rodríguez, *Panegírico y ciudad*: SHHA 21 (2003) 223-245; M. Sordi, *Fiducia nella propria forza e paura del nemico nella punizione dei vinti*: BStudLat 33 (2003) 100-103; A. Hostein, *Le corpus des P.L. dans deux ouvrages récents*: AntTard 12 (2004) 373-385; B. Leadbetter, *Best of Brothers*: CPh 99 (2004) 257-266; C. Macías, *Referencias a los astros en el panegírico latino*: Mene 4 (2004) 141-171.

I. Ramelli

PANNONIA PRIMA

I. History - II Archaeology.

I. History. Corresponding to modern-day Hungary in the stretches of land included between the Danube River, the Drava River, the Sava River and the border of *Noricum, Pannonia was divided during the Roman Empire into administrative dioceses of *Pannonia Prima*, which included, among others, the territories of Vindobona, Carnuntum, Scarbantia and Savaria—homeland of St. *Martin of Tours

(Sulp. Sev. *Mart.* 2,1)—and **Pannonia Secunda*, situated between the Danube and the lower course of the Drava and the Sava Rivers, which had its center in *Sirmium: it is remembered as a *civitas Valeria*, the homeland, acc. to *Ennodius, of Anthony of *Lérins (*Opusc.* 4,7).

The first certain testimony to the existence of Christianity in Pannonia can be gathered from the martyrdom of *Victorinus (304), bishop of Petovium (Ptuj/Petau); it is always maintained that this city did not belong to Noricum (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 74). The presence of this valiant Christian author—Jerome considers him such—can in a certain sense verify that Christianity had been in Pannonia for a long time and that it had already pushed itself to reach mature stages. This fact, moreover, later signified by some authentic elements present in the accounts of other various *passiones* such as that of *Quirinus of Siscia (AASS *Jun.* 1, 372ff.) and, for *Pannonia Secunda*, of Pollio, *primicerius lectorum* of the church of Cibali (AASS *Apr.* 3, 571-573), and of *Irenaeus of Sirmium (AASS *Mar.* 3, 553-555); for information on these *passiones*, see M. Simonetti, *Studi*, 55-79. Moreover, alongside these individuals, one recalls the martyrdom of the so-called *Four Crowned Martyrs and their companion Simplicius (AASS *Nov.* 3, 748ff.). A full and vivid depiction of the church of Pannonia becomes evident therefore already at the end of the 3rd c., which is confirmed for the subsequent period by the repeated convocation of councils and synods by various representatives of that church.

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918 (repr. Rome 1967); H. Leclercq, *Illyricum*: DACL 7,1, 99-104.114; Id., *Pannonie*: DACL 13,1, 1046-1063; M. Simonetti, *Studi Agiografici*, Rome1955; A. Lippold - E. Kirsten, *Donauprovinzen*: RAC 4, 166ff.; L. Várady, *Das letzte Jahrhundert Pannoniens (376–476)*, Amsterdam 1969; M. Pavan, *Romanesimo, cristianesimo e immigrazioni nei territori pannonici*: RomBarb 9 (1986–1987), 161-227; Z. Kádár, *A. Alföldi sul cristianesimo primitivo*: Acta class. Univ. Scient. Debr. 33 (1997) 15-218.

V. Pavan

II. Archaeology. *Pannonia Prima* was founded as a province in the former territory of *Pannonia Superior* in 293, when *Diocletian reformed the organization of the provinces, and it had the following borders: to the N, the Danube River; to the E, the ancient border with *Pannonia Inferior*; to the West, Noricum (i.e., a line between the Drava and the Sava Rivers slightly to the E of the cities of Noricum Celeia and Flavia Solva); to the S, the Sava River. The administrative center of the province was Savaria (Szombathely). The bishop of Siscia, Quirinus, was martyred at Savaria. The other dioceses remain unknown. Very few paleo-Christian buildings have been preserved in the province. The location of the basilica of Savaria is unknown. The building in the garden of Romkert, however, is not a basilica but an imperial palace, acc. to E. Tóth. Many small Christian artifacts were found at Savaria such as an altar pillar decorated with roses, ivy, the *monogram of Christ and a dolphin with a cuttlefish. At Kekkut, in the vicinity of Lake Balaton, two churches were discovered, one of which is of a common type, whereas the other has a layout containing three apses and a bench for the clergy. At Fénékpuszta, near Balaton, two churches were excavated, the second constructed upon an older building. Aside from the basilicas, many smaller buildings were preserved at Kisdiospuszta.

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918 (repr. Rome1967); T. Nagy, [The history of Christianity in Pannonia until the fall of the Roman border protection], Budapest 1939 (in Hungarian, with a German summary); Z. Kádár, *Lineamenti dell'arte romana della Pannonia nell'epoca dell'antichità tarda e paleocristiana*: CCAB 16 (1969) 177ff.; H. Buschhausen, *Die spätrömischen Metallscrinia und frühchristlichen Reliquiare*, Vienna 1971; E. Tóth, *Late Antique Imperial Palace in Savaria*: Acta Antiqua Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 25 (1973) 117ff.; A. Móczy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London 1974, 297ff.; F. Fülep - G. Török, *Ungarn*, in *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum, Propyläen Kunstgeschichte Supplementband I*, ed. B. Brenk, Berlin 1977, 310ff.; E. Thomas, *Das frühe Christentum in Pannonien im Lichte der archäologischen Funde*, in *Zwischen Römerzeit und Völkerwanderung. Ausstellung im Stadtmuseum Enns*, ed. H.G. Severin, Linz 1982, 255ff.; E. Thomas, *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Silbergegenstände im mittleren Donaugebiet, innerhalb und ausserhalb der Grenzen des Römmerreich*, in *Argenterie romaine et byzantine*, ed. N. Duval - Fr. Baratte, Paris 1986, 135ff.; D. Gaspar, *Römische Kästchen aus Pannonien*, Budapest 1986; L. Barkóczi, *Pannonische Glassfunde in Ungarn*, Budapest 1988; E. Tóth, *Das Christentum in Pannonien bis zum 7. Jahrhundert nach dem archäologischen Zeugnissen*: Christentum 1994, 242ff.; D. Gaspar, *Christianity in Roman Pannonia. An Evaluation of Early Christian Finds and Sites from Hungary*, Oxford 2002.

N. Cambi

PANNONIA SECUNDA. Established as a province in the former territory of *Pannonia Inferior* in 293, *Pannonia Secunda* stretched to the S up to the border of *Dalmatia, i.e., to the Dinaric Alps; to the E up to the Danube River; to the N it crossed slightly into the Drava River. The border to the W converged with *Savia, i.e., the ancient border with *Pannonia Superior*. The episcopal centers of *Pannonia Secunda* were large cities such as *Sirmium, capital of the province, Mursa (modern-day Osijek) and Cibalae (modern-day Vinkovci). Bishop *Valens of Mursa

was one of the strongest supporters of *Arianism in Pannonia. With the exception of Sirmium, buildings of worship have not been found in *Pannonia Secunda*. At Mursa, the basilica has still not been found, but it is possible to conjecture that one could be found in the heart of the ancient city and another outside the military walls of defense. At Cibalae a building in the necropolis called Kamenice has not yet been excavated, at 1.5 km (= .93 mi.) from the city, where the martyr Pollio was most likely buried; he was the *lector* of church of this city. Purportedly, another basilica was in the center of Cibalae. At Mursa the following were found: a *monogram of Christ, numerous inscriptions, oil lamps and many other small objects. At Certissia (modern-day Štrbinci, near Đadkovo) Christian tombs were found painted with frescoes. In this necropolis, archaeologists found two chests of gold with the depiction of familial images and with votive inscriptions. Also found at Cibalae was a *sarcophagus with a handle without an inscription but with the figures of fish and bread.

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918 (repr. Rome1967); T. Nagy, [The history of Christianity in Pannonia until the fall of the Roman border protection], Budapest 1939 (in Hungarian, with a German summary); A. Mocsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London 1974; R. Košcevic - R. Makjanic, *Siscia-Pannonia Superior*, Oxford 1995; B. Migotti, *Evidence for the Christianity in Roman Southern Pannonia (Northern Croatia). A Catalogue of Finds and Sites*, Oxford 1997; B. Migotti - M. Šlaus - Z. Dukat - Lj. Perinic, *Accede ad Certissiam. Anticki i ranokršcanski horizont arheološkog nalazišta Štrbinci kod Đakova*, Zagreb 1998; D. Gaspar, *Christianity in Roman Pannonia. An Evaluation of Early Christian Finds and Sites from Hungary*, Oxford 2002. B. Migotti, *Two Gold-sandwich Glasses from Štrbinci (Đakovo, Northern Croatia)*, Zagreb 2002.

N. Cambi

PANODORUS. Egyptian monk, flourished between 395 and 408, author of a *Chronography* now lost, continuator of the work of Sixtus *Julius Africanus and *Eusebius of Caesarea; he is known only for a few excerpts mentioned by Syncellus, of which he is the principal source. His work, which was completed by another Egyptian monk, *Annianus (CPG 5537), was written in 412; it began from the creation of the world, which he dated 5493 years before the birth of *Jesus Christ, and was framed within a chronological scheme established upon the biblical tradition and in which, from to time to time, he inserted secular history. He introduced into Christian *chronology Ptolemy's *Kanon basileion*, Manetho's canon, the book of Soti and the "list of the Theban Kings" of Erastosthenes and Apollodorus. His primary sources were Dexippus, Julius Africanus and Eusebius, whom Syncellus knew through his work. His influence on George Syncellus was decisive. H. Gelzen (*Sextus Iulius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 3 vols., Leipzig 1880-1898) denied any originality to this 9th-c. chronographer and attributed all credit to the Egyptian monk, who was tied to the official church but enmeshed in 4th- to 5th-c. *Neoplatonist culture, which made it easier to reconcile Christian and *pagan history: this thesis was partially reevaluated by R. Laqueur (*Synkellos*: PWK 11,4, 1388-1410).

CPG 5535; G. Dindorf, *Georgius Syncellus et Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus* (CSHB), I, Bonn 1829, 61[3-5] - 62[2-5] - 63[11] - 66[3]; J. Van der Hagen, *De cyclo magno paschali seu de periodo DXXXII annorum Panodori, monachi Aegyptii*, in *Dissertationes de cyclis paschalibus*, Amsterdam 1736, 93-106; Krumbacher 340-342; O. Seel, *Panodoros*: PWK 18, 632-635; Altaner 236; V. Grumel, *Chronologie*, Paris 1958, 86-92; W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, Washington DC 1989, 72-105.

A. Labate

PANTAENUS. All the pertinent testimonies (preserved by *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Jerome, *Clement of Alexandria, *Origen, *Alexander of Jerusalem, *Pamphilus of Caesarea, *Anastasius the Sinaite, *Maximus the Confessor) were collected and cited at full-length by A. Harnack in his *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I, Leipzig 1893, 291-296). Eusebius (*HE* 5, 11,1 [II, 452,10-12 Schwartz]) was correct in maintaining that Clement (*Strom.* I, 11,2 [II, 8,22-9,3]), when speaking of the teacher he found "hidden in Egypt," alluded specifically to Pantaenus; this same text of Clement informs us about the Sicilian origins of Pantaenus: Σικελικὴ τῷ ὄντι ἦν μέλιττα (see T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, III, Erlangen 1884, 161); and the words δυνάμει δὲ οὗτος πρῶτος (*Strom.* I, 11,2 [II, 8,23-24]) demonstrate that Clement held him in higher regard than all other teachers, the "*presbyters," guardians of the apostolic *tradition, whose oral teaching Clement himself claims to have heard (*Strom.* I, 11,1 and 11,3). Eusebius (*HE* 5, 10,1-4 [II, 450,12-452,5]) tells us that Pantaenus, after having been a *Stoic philosopher, led the catechetical *school of Alexandria (*see* *Didaskaleion) with great zeal during the reign of *Commodus and traveled to India to announce to those faraway peoples the Christian message. According to Zahn (p. 176), his death should be placed around the year 200. In his exegetical writings and above all in his work *Hypotyposeis*, Clement appealed to the rule of the teaching of the *presbyters*—

the most authoritative of which was without a doubt Pantaenus—or, simply, the presbyter par excellence, who should undoubtedly be identified with Pantaenus (see the various citations in Harnack, 292-293, and Zahn, 157-161). Pantaenus's name, nonetheless, is explicitly mentioned in only two passages, which are cited in full as the only two certain fragments by M.J. Routh (*Reliquiae sacrae*, 378-379: Clem. Alex., *Ecl. proph.* 56,2 [III, 152,28-153,4 = fr. I Routh p. 378], one that, with regard to Ps 18:6, said that the prophets generally used the present tense in place of the future [it is arbitrary, however, to attempt to attribute to Pantaenus a much broader intellectual context including that shown in a good part of the *Eclogae propheticae* and the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, as done by W. Bousset in his book *Jüdischchristlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Göttingen 1914, 156ff., 174ff., 263]; and the other in Maximus the Confessor, *De variis difficilibus locis Dionysii et Gregorii*: PG 91, 1085 A10-B12 [= fr. II Routh, 378-379; Clem. Alex., fr. 48 Stählin, III p. 224], where he emphasizes the will of God as the creative principle). This last passage, to which H. Langerbeck has rightly called attention (JHS 77 [1957] 71 and AAWG phil. hist. Kl. 69 [1967] 157), demonstrates a close affinity to the two texts of *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 214, 172a [III, 126,25-26 Henry] and 251, 461b [VII, 192,8-9]) pertaining to *Hierocles and mirroring in all likelihood the teaching of *Ammonius Saccas.

The title "*Stoic philosopher" attributed to Pantaenus by Eusebius (*HE* 5, 10,1 [II 450,18-19]) is understood too literally by Pohlenz (NAWG phil. hist. Kl. 1943, p. 166 n.3), given the syncretist character of Greek philosophy at the end of the 2nd c. AD. It is not rash to suppose that Clement inherited from Pantaenus the tendency to combine into one system, reflecting upon the truth, the best teachings of the various philosophies (see *Strom.* I, 37,6 and I, 57,6): the image of the bee used by Clement (*Strom.* I, 33,6 e IV, 9,2) in support of *polymathia* is always applied by Clement even to Pantaenus (*Strom.* I, 11,2); one finds the same "eclectic" tendency, moreover, in Ammonius Saccas, who taught at Alexandria during the same period and aimed to harmonize the thought of Plato and Aristotle. R.E. Witt formulated a very similar hypothesis (CQ 25 [1931] 195) on the existence of tight connections between Ammonius Saccas and the Christian community in Alexandria at the tail end of the 2nd c. AD: the existence of these ties seem to be confirmed not only by the aforementioned correspondence between Pantaenus and Ammonius in the doctrine of the will of God as the creative principle but also by the parallels between Clement and *Plotinus noted by Witt (CQ 25 [1931] 195-204); to these parallels one could add the parallel pertaining to God's infinity; compare *Strom.* V, 81,6 (II, 380,22-23) οὐ κατὰ τὸ ἀδιεξίτητον νοούμενον with *Enn.* VI, IX, 6 (III, 310,10 Henry-Schwyzer) οὐ τῷ ἀδιεξιτήτῳ (cf. S. Lilla, JTS 31 [1980] 100 n.2). Lastly, because Pantaenus is presented by Clement (*Strom.* I, 11,2-3) as one of the recipients of the esoteric tradition going back to the *apostles, it is legitimate to maintain that even Pantaenus, on par with Clement, was a supporter of the existence of a secret tradition, an idea characteristic of the Christian *gnosticism that flourished in 2nd-c. *Egypt (see Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 234).

M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, I, Oxonii 1846, 375-379; T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, III, *Supplementum Clementinum*, Erlangen 1884, 156-176; A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I, Leipzig 1893, 291-296; G. Bardy, *Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie*: RecSR 27 (1937) 65-90; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 233-234; A. Van Den Hoek, *How Alexandrian Was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and His Alexandrian Background*: Heythrop Journal 31 (1990) 179-194; G. D'Ippolito, *Una testimonianza di Panteno scrittore recuperata in Teodoro Metochite*, in *Scritti classici e cristiani offerti a F. Corsaro*, ed. C. Curti - C. Crimi, Catania 1994, I, 227-233; Cath 10, 510ff.; B. Pouderon, *Réflexions sur la formation d'une élite intellectuelle chrétienne au IIe s.: Les "écoles" d'Athènes, de Rome et d'Alexandrie*, in *Les Apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, sous la dir. de B. Pouderon et J. Doré, Paris 1998, 237-269.

S. Lilla

PANTALEON MEGALOMARTYR. Pantaleon Megalomartyr is the Latinized form of the Greek name *Panteleimon*, "all-merciful." Pantaleon Megalomartyr is inscribed in the *Mart. hier.* for 27 July. One does not find the same information in the *Mart. syr.* because it is incomplete at this point. The Eastern synaxaria record Pantaleon Megalomartyr's name for different dates. Perhaps *Theodoret in his work *Graecarum affectionum curatio* already knew of the feast (but not the most trustworthy MSS of his work; SC 57, 335). According to the 5th-6th-c. passion and the panegyrics about his life, Pantaleon Megalomartyr, born at *Nicomedia, was the personal physician of Maximinus; he was an "unmercenary" physician who had the ability to "cure all sicknesses" (the epithet comes from the etiological legend derived from his name). The numerous versions of the legend also attest to his popularity. The *martyrology of Florus of Lyons follows the Latin version of the legend. The following locations have a local cult for Pantaleon Megalomartyr: *Constantinople (a church built by *Justinian), *Jerusalem, the monas-

tery of Pantaleon Megalomartyr in the Jordan Desert (Procop. *De aed.* 1,9,11; 5,9,3), *Rome (four churches built in his honor) and Cologne (the Benedictine *monastery possesses the tomb of the empress Theophano). The oldest depiction of Pantaleon Megalomartyr is a N African relief of clay from the 5th-6th c.; there is a fresco of him dating to the year 708 together with *Cosmas and Damian in the church of S. Maria Antiqua in Rome.

BHG 1412-1418; BHO 835-837; BHL 6429-6448; BS 10, 108-118; LCI 8, 112-115; BBKL 6, 1485-1486; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926, repr. Rome 2000, 410-412; A. Pazzini, *I santi nella storia della medicina*, Rome 1937, 178-182; J. Zandee, *Some Coptic Fragments from the Martyrdom of St. Pantoleon*: VChr 16 (1962) 42-52; Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae* 2, Rome 1982, 665-666.

V. Saxer – S. Heid

PANTHEISM. Pantheistic conceptions of reality can be seen in *Heraclitus (the divinity is represented by the universal fire, which is transformed into all things, text 8 and fr. 90 Diels, *Die Fragm. der Vors.* I[6], 1951, 145 and 171), in Diogenes of Apollonia (God is identical with the air that reaches everywhere, fr. 5 Diels, II[6], 1952, 61), in Aeschylus (Zeus is identical with all things found in nature, fr. 70 Nauck, *Trag. graec. fragm.*, Leipzig 1889, 24) and in Euripides (Zeus is identified with the "chariot" of the world and fate, *Trojan Women* 884-886).

"Pantheistic" tendencies also appear in the writings of the young Aristotle, in the Peripatetic school and in the 10th book of Plato's *Laws* (where, however, still above the **anima mundi* is the **nous*, a principle distinct from it: see Plato, *Laws* X, 897b 1) and in his *Epinomides*; for the young Aristotle, see *On Philosophy*, fr. 26 Walzer (= Cicero, *De nat. deor.* I, 13,33): *Aristotelesque . . . modo mundum ipsum deum dicit esse* *Clement of Alex., *Protr.* 66,4 (I, 51,1-2) and Plutarch, *Plac. philos.* V, 20,908F (cited by R. Walzer, *Aristotelis dialogorum fragmenta*, Florence 1934, p. 92 n.2); for the peripatetic school, see Cicero, *De nat. deor.* I, 13,35: *nec audiendus eius* [Theophrastus] *auditor Strato . . . qui omnem vim divinam in natura sitam esse censet*, and Clement of Alex., *Protr.* 66,5 (I, 5 1,6-7); for the 10th book of Plato's *Laws* and the *Epinomides*, see the two passages offered above by R. Walzer, p. 92, nos. 2 and 3.

But a pantheistic outlook above all characterizes *Stoic philosophy in which Heraclitus's influence is esp. apparent. According to Heraclitus, the divine principle is none other than a spirit (*pneuma*) identical to the ether, fire, the logos, fate and *providence; this spirit is immanent in the universe, permeating it with itself, crossing it from part to part and proceeding from the center to the periphery and from the periphery to the center; it governs and serves it inasmuch as it is its supreme law: see SVF I, 153-177, II, 1021-1056 (*Stoicism affirms a strong affinity exists between the concepts of *physis*, *nomos*, *logos*, *kosmos*, *pneuma*, *aithēr*, *pyr*, *heimarmenē* and *pronoia*). Patristic authors, although generally accepting the understanding of the Stoics and *Philo on the divine *logos* immanent in the universe, certainly could not accept—on an equal par with Philo and contemporaneous Platonic philosophers—the Stoic identification between the material universe and the first creative principle, which in this sense comes to be material, corporeal and corruptible, and they constantly argue against it (in fact, for them, as for Philo, the *logos* is no longer the first principle but the Son of God generated by the Father, his power, the instrument in the creation of the material universe and the soul and law of the latter). One can see, e.g., the refutation of Stoic pantheism in *Justin Martyr's writings (1 *Apol.* 20 [I, 180, 7-11 Otto], 2 *Apol.* 7 [I, 300,6-7 and 9-12]), in Clement of Alex. (*Protr.* 66,3 [I, 50,24-27 = SVF II, 1039], *Strom.* I, 51,1 [II, 33,12-14 = SVF II, 1040], V, 89,2 [II, 384,18-19 = SVF II, 1035] and V, 89,3 [II, 384,22–385,1]) and in certain passages of *Origen's *Contra Celsum* and the *Commentary on John*, cited in SVF II, 1051, 1052, 1053 and 1054. Texts of *Theodoret, *Hippolytus, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Tertullian, *Lactantius and *Salvian of Marseille in which this Stoic doctrine is mentioned and often even rejected can be found in SVF II, 1029-1043.

A. Rodríguez Bachiller, *El problema de Dios en la filosofía de Séneca*, Madrid 1965; M. Simon, *Early Christianity and Pagan Thought. Confluences and Conflicts*: Religious Studies 9 (1973) 385-399; U. Pizzani, *Lucrezio, il panteismo, la zoogonia e . . . Pietro Gassendi*, in *Lingue tecniche del greco e del latino*, ed. S. Sconocchia - L. Toneatto, Bologna 1997, II, 105-126; Cath 10, 515ff.; TRE 25, 611-615.

S. Lilla

PANTOCRATOR. The title Pantocrator refers to the creative omnipotence and universal sovereignty of God. Pantocrator occurs 180 times in the LXX; for this reason, O. Montevecchi aptly stresses that it is not a wooden-literal translation of the concept of YHWH *Sebaoth*, as much as it is one of its theological interpretations from a universalistic view; it is the culminating point in the semantic evolution of the term already recognizable in the Hebrew Scriptures. In the NT one finds ten occurrences of the term, nine of which are found in the book of Revela-

tion, almost always in a doxological context and against the backdrop of citations or echoes of OT religious language. The novelty of Revelation is that some of these texts place this title traditionally reserved for God in a christological backdrop, which serves as a prelude to the direct attribution of Pantocrator to Jesus Christ himself: thus, esp., Rev 1:8 (often understood in this sense by later interpreters), but also Rev 19:6, 15. Patristic texts allow one to observe the gradual expansion of this concept: it begins with the initial exclusive reference to God the Father, distinct from *Jesus the Κύριος (thus again in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan *Creed) and is later applied to the *hypostasis of the Son-Logos, in whom all things subsist. In this respect, the insights of the Alexandrians seem to have been decisive: already *Clement of Alex. (e.g., *Paed.* 1,9, 84,1; 3,7,39,4), then, above all, *Origen, both in Latin translation (repeatedly in his *De princ.* 1,2,9-10, at the center of which one finds a fragment from *Justinian which preserves the term Pantocrator in the original) and in Greek (*Fr. Io.* 45 and 46) use the title Pantocrator in this christological sense and defend its relevance. Among the most ancient attestations of this usage, moreover, are *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* 1,4 et passim) and *Hippolytus (*Adv. Noetum* 6,18). Among the Latin Fathers, realizing that the current translation of Pantocrator with *omnipotens* was not completely satisfying, *Augustine (*Tr. in Io.* 106,5) proposes as an alternative *omnitenens*.

Inspired by the portrayals of the emperor, the iconographic model of the Pantocrator moreover combines those distinguishing and specific physiognomic characteristics (beard, thick hair, intense look, etc.) that, being acquired from the 4th c. onward, end up replacing the typical representations prevailing in the previous period such as the Apollonian Christ, the teacher, philosopher and thaumaturge. On the basis of the inclusion of this physiognomic characterization, Grabar distinguishes the *iconography of Pantocrator—as one can find completely affirmed in the Byzantine milieu between the 8th and 9th c.—by the portrayals of the Cosmocrator, likewise on the throne just as the Roman sovereigns, present on the *sarcophagi of the Late Roman Empire. Moreover, they characterize the iconography of Pantocrator with the following: Christ is facing the viewer and blessing with his right hand; there are also symbolic attributes such as the scroll embedded with precious gems on the left, sometimes completed by the inscription A – Ω (which refers to Rev 1:8) or analogous texts.

Having survived the two phases of the iconoclastic controversy of the 8th and 9th c., the icon on an encaustic board portraying the bust of Pantocrator preserved at St. Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai, made in *Constantinople and dated by Weitzmann to the 1st half of the 6th c., is considered by many to be the ancestor of every subsequent representation of Christ Pantocrator in Byzantine art, and also because this icon was in turn derived from the lost image of Christ hanging over the bronze door or Χαλκή; it was removed from the Eastern capital by decree of the emperor *Leo III the Isaurian to be replaced with a noniconic symbol of the *cross. At *Ravenna (the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo, S nave) there dates back to the *Arian commission of *Theodoric an analogous majestic image of Christ on the throne, having a beard and dressed in imperial clothes, holding in the original an open scroll containing the words *Ego sum rex gloriae*. Slightly later is the representation of the Pantocrator (the entire figure is on the throne but having the most ancient and harsh characteristics) on the ivory diptych, of Constantinopolitan origin, now preserved at Berlin. It is believed that the presence of this Pantocrator on the coinage of the emperor *Justinian II (565–578) had a decisive influence on the spread and the preponderance of this iconographic portrayal of Christ. Lastly, thereafter the bust of Pantocrator appears frequently on apses as on the triumphal arch of the basilica of S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna (7th c.), and subsequently (from the 9th c.) on the domes.

Cath 10, 522ff.; LCI 1, 392-394; ODB 3, 1374; O. Montevecchi, *Pantokrator*, in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, 2, Milan 1957, 401-432; C. Capizzi, Παντοκράτωρ. *Saggio d'esegesi letterario-iconografica*, Rome 1964; F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna. Hauptstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes*, Bd. 2.1, Wiesbaden 1974, 146-149; J. Matthews Timken, *The Pantocrator. Title and Image*, Diss. Univ. New York 1976; K. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons*, 1, Princeton, NJ 1976, 13-15; Id., ed., *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century*, Princeton, NJ 1979, 527-530; A. Grabar, *Le vie della creazione nell'iconografia cristiana. Antichità e Medioevo*, Milan 1983, 198ff. [It. tr. of *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins*, Princeton 1968]; S. Barbagallo, *Iconografia liturgica del Pantokrator*, SA 122, Rome 1996 (the extensive classification is important, pp. 179-213).

F. Pieri

PANTOLEON (7th–8th c.). *Presbyter of a *monastery "of the Byzantines" probably at *Jerusalem. He is the author of the *Homilia in exaltationem crucis* (BHG 430). Scholars used to date this homily between the 5th and 12th c. The latter date was refuted by the discovery of two Greek MSS (*Marc.* II, 17 and *Vat. Palat.* 205), dating back to the 9th c. and containing the *Homilia* and a codex (*Berolin. syr.* 28)

with the *Syriac translation of the work, datable to the 8th-9th c. Honigmann, after having solved the problem of the time of the institution of the feast of ὕψωσις (the "Exaltation" of the *Cross) and after he had established that the monastery "of the Byzantines" was probably the one founded by *Abraham of Ephesus in Jerusalem, recently indicated that the time of Pantoleon's composition of the *Homilia* was the period between 650 and 750. This dating excludes the identification of our author with Pantoleon (or Pantaleon) the *deacon and chartophylax of the Great Church of *Constantinople and author of several homilies (V. Grumel, *Pantaléon*: DTC 11, 1855; H.G. Beck, *Pantoleon*: LTK² 8, 31). Perhaps the presbyter Pantoleon is the same person to whom Pope *Martin I sent a letter (Jaffé 2068) the day after the Lateran *Council upbraiding him for opposing his decisions. A lack of evidence precludes us from attributing to him the unpublished *Homilia de exaltatione crucis* (BHG 427 p) found in Messan. gr. S. Salv. 4 (7th c.); and he is certainly not the author of the *Tractatus contra errores Graecorum* (PG 140, 487-574), written in 1252 by another author with the same name. Sachot has recently argued that Pantoleon the presbyter and *archimandrite of the Constantinopolitan monastery *ta Benantiou* was one of the signatories of the 518 petition against *Severus of Antioch (see ACO V, 7, 37) and, moreover, also the author of the homily on the Transfiguration BHG 1978 (PG 98, 1253-1260).

CPG 7915-7918; PG 98, 1265-1269; Krumbacher 167; Baumstark 264; E. Honigmann, *La date de l'homélie du prêtre Pantoléon sur la fête de l'Exaltation de la Croix* (*VII^e siècle*) *et l'origine des collections homiliaires*: Bull. de l'Acad. royale de Belgique 36 (1950) 547-559; Beck 457-458; Patrologia V, 299; M. Sachot, *L'homélie pseudochrysostomienne sur la Transfiguration CPG 4724, BHG 1975: Contextes liturgiques, restitution à Léonce, prêtre de Constantinople, édition critique et commentée, traduction et études connexes*, Frankfurt a.M.-Bern 1981, 451-463.

A. Labate

PAPA BAR AGGAI (d. 329). The first patriarch of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, ordained ca. 291, died in 329; the *Chronicon of Arbela*, 43, 46-47 and 52 (Kawerau), refers to him as "Papa the Aramean, a wise and prudent man," ordained by the bishop of Arbela Aha-d-Abuhi (273–291) and Hai-Bel, the bishop of Susa. Papa bar Aggai was backed by the prayers and support of the inhabitants of Ctesiphon and "the consent of all the people." But after 313, he wanted to impose the primacy of Seleucia-Ctesiphon on the other episcopates of the Near East and met opposition from the *presbyters and people of Seleucia, who wanted to depose him. He was even denounced by his archdeacon *Simeon bar Sabba, whose parents were close to the king. Papa bar Aggai then wrote to the bishops of *Edessa, Sa'da and the others of the "West," who sent a letter to *Constantine on his behalf, recalling the fact that in the Roman Empire there existed patriarchs of *Antioch, *Rome, *Alexandria and *Constantinople, so too in the kingdom of the East it was right for there to be at least one patriarch. Papa bar Aggai was regarded as "the universal prelate for all the bishops and Christians of the East: all the bishops acknowledged what had been defined by the West," and he succeeded in convincing his archdeacon Simon by promising him that he would be named as his successor. Many of the bishops with whom he clashed would become martyrs in the persecutions that followed. Papa bar Aggai worked to create a center for the Christian community in the *Sassanids' capital. A letter on ecclesiastical hierarchy was attributed to him, which, it argued, was a mirror of the heavenly hierarchy, acc. to ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite's line of thought, and was sent to his disciple Aggor. This text, however, is a later pseudepigraphal work.

EC 9, 777; Baumstark 29-30; DTC 11, 164-165; P. Kawerau, *Die Chronik von Arbela*, Louvain 1985, CSCO 468, Syri 200, p. 65 n.35; I. Ramelli, *Il Chronicon di Arbela: Presentazione, traduzione e note*, Madrid 2002, 'Ilū Anejos VIII, 50, 52-53, 55.

I. Ramelli

PAPACY

I. The Christian community of Rome in the first 3. c. - II. The emergence of the papacy in the 4th-5th c. - III. The transition to the medieval papacy (6th–8th c.) - IV. Elements of historical evaluation - V. Historiography of the papacy - VI. Letters of the popes.

I. The Christian community of Rome in the first 3 c. For the period before the Constantinian era, little precise information on the bishops of *Rome remains. The documentation collected esp. by *Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Ecclesiastical History* is sparse and unreliable. Thus, the various lists of *popes composed to defend apostolic succession are very problematic. *Irenaeus's list (*Haer.* III, 3,3) deserves some credit for the names he took from credible traditions. The list, however, does not permit one to establish the moment at which the collegial rule of the Roman community changed to the monarchical episcopate. Even more uncertain is the chronology that Eusebius (d. 339) and after him the so-called *Catalogus liberianus* (336 or 354) attempted to establish by synchronizing the individual pontificates with the dates of the reigns of specific emperors.

Despite the fragmentary character of the established historical information, one can argue that already from the beginning, Christianity spread rapidly to the capital of the empire (Acts 2:10). The most ancient historical data on the Christian presence at Rome is found in Suetonius's *Life of *Claudius* (41-54) in the 2nd c. (Mirbt n. 3; cf. Acts 18:2). But one cannot hold that either *Peter or *Paul were the founders of the Roman community, as the tradition mentioned for the first time by Irenaeus maintains (*Haer,* III, 1,1; III, 2,3). Instead, unknown Jewish-Christians established the community. Its importance, however, was clearly attested early on by the epistle Paul wrote to the Romans around the year 57 to 58. The testimony of the *1 Clement* (*Prima Clementis*, ca. 96) is much clearer. With this letter, the Roman community intervened during the discord that had emerged in the church in *Corinth. The way in which this document refers to the *martyrdom of Peter and Paul (ch. 5), and the way in which it insists on the beginning of the succession, the guarantee of order in the community (chs. 40-44), somewhat foreshadows the care that the Roman church would later show toward other churches. In addition to the testimony of the *Prima Petri* (written after 94), Ignatius's *Letter to the Romans* (around the year 110), with its very solemn address and its reference to Peter and Paul (ch. 4,2a), is striking because it already contains several elements of later papal theory: the importance of the capital, the presence of the two *apostles, the primacy in faith and in love (*praef.*). Toward the end of the 2nd c., Irenaeus offered the most famous testimony concerning Rome; he not only dates the Roman community back to Peter and Paul, but also believes that *communion with this community is a more certain way to determine if one is in the doctrinal *tradition deriving from the apostles (*Haer,* III, 3, 2). This witness was confirmed, even though less explicitly, by other authors such as *Tertullian (*Praescr.* 32.36), *Origen (Eus., *HE* 6, 14,10) and even the so-called inscription of *Abercius.

This witness proved to be true esp. by the fascination the community of Rome exerted upon early Christians. As Eusebius reports, not a few Christians went to the capital to find greater security in their faith or to belong to such a famous community: *Polycarp of *Smyrna, *Justin, the philosopher and martyr, *Hegessipus, *Marcion (139), *Montanus, Irenaeus and Origen. The epigraphic testimony of the trip made by Abercius during the reign of Marcus Aurelius is striking. This fascination is not due to the mere fact that the Roman community found itself at the center of the empire. Nevertheless, certain facts about the history of the so-called *Apostles' Creed, the formation of the New Testament canon, and the first outline of the liturgical traditions in the **Apostolic Tradition* (*Traditio Apostolica*) attributed to *Hippolytus all demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that around the year 200 the community of Rome, whatever the exact explanation may be, exerted an incomparable and *de facto* authority that no other community possessed.

One cannot understand the importance of the Roman community without keeping in mind the concrete initiatives taken by certain popes. Around the year 200, one finds more precise information on not only the monarchical organization, which until this time was ambiguous, but also on the individual bishops. *Cornelius (251–253) provides us the first description of the Roman *clergy, guided by one bishop alone (Eus., *HE* 6, 43,11-12; see the testimonies shortly thereafter provided by *Hippolytus of Rome). We do not know whether the bishop of Rome at that time had a fixed residence. We do know, however, that from *Callistus (217–222) onward, the popes were buried in a cemetery of the community. The first certain biographical date is *Pontianus's resignation (230–235), 28 September 235. Before this date we know of *Victor I's intervention around 190, in which he *excommunicated *Polycrates of Ephesus and other bishops of Asia Minor, because they did not want to permit the celebration of *Easter on the *Sunday after the 14th of Nisan, an intervention criticized, although accepted, by Irenaeus (Eus., *HE* 5, 23ff.). Likewise, Victor banned *Theodotus for trying to spread his views in favor of *adoptionism in Rome. According to the tendentious information provided in the *Philosophumena*, Zephyrinus (199–217?) and Callistus defended a trinitarian teaching that was too unitarian. The second, moreover, was accused of moral laxity.

After 250, Cornelius was involved, along with *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258), in the controversy on the readmission of those who during the *Decian persecution had denied the Christian faith in some way (i.e., the **lapsi*) and who, acc. to *Novatian and *Novatus, were therefore to be excluded forever from the community, which was seen as the church of the saints. During this situation, Cyprian wrote his most famous work, *De unitate catholicae ecclesiae*, in which he presents Peter's confession of faith, narrated in Mt 16, as a symbol of the church's unity. At another time, however, setting himself against the position of *Stephen I (254–257), concerning the validity of baptism administered by *heretics, Cyprian made it known that in his view the primacy of Peter did not extend to his successors. He even explicitly

rejected the Roman claims that Stephen seems to have established upon Mt 16, while emphasizing the responsibility of the entire episcopal college for the unity of the church (*Ep.* 68,3). The disagreement in which even *Firmilian of Caesarea was involved ended with the new persecution in which the two protagonists died as *martyrs. After *Gallienus revoked the anti-Christian edict of his father, the church enjoyed a period of peace for about 40 years. *Dionysius of Rome (260–268) took advantage of the opportunity to reorganize the communities, which had been heavily tested by *persecutions for nearly ten years. Having been called upon by the *presbyters of Alexandria concerning the trinitarian controversy that had broken out in *Egypt, he took a position against *Sabellian and *tritheist movements in a synod and communicated to *Dionysius of *Alexandria the accusations that had been brought against him. The latter defended himself, as Eusebius (*HE* 7, 26) and Athanasius report. Dionysius of Rome even helped the community of *Caesarea in Cappadocia, which was suffering due to the barbarian invasions (see Basil, *Ep.* 70). Precise information on subsequent pontificates is lacking. *Marcellus I (307/308) and Eusebius I (308-310?) died in exile.

From this sparse and at times unreliable information on the Roman community and its bishops, it appears that during the first centuries the church in Rome took the initiative, as soon as it had the opportunity, to maintain peace in other communities or to establish the unity of Christians. In particular, it defended the *apostolicity of the faith, recalling the succession of those who were responsible for it. Roman theology, however, was hardly original, and the same would be true later. Rome would always stand for the protection of the faith and discipline (*custodia fidei et disciplinae*), but almost never took new theological initiatives. On the other hand, one finds testimonies that the other churches accepted these interventions in favor of the harmonious communion in the one apostolic faith. Thus, the *Prima Clementis* continued to enjoy great authority as its virtually canonical transmission and a letter of *Dionysius of Corinth attest (Eus., *HE* 4, 23). Irenaeus, who admonished Victor I, recognized his authority nonetheless (*HE* 5, 24). Dionysius of Alexandria, lastly, though defending himself against the accusations raised against his supposed tritheism, did not call into question the intervention of the Roman synod under the leadership of Dionysius of Rome, whom, in an earlier letter, he regarded as a learned and admirable man (*HE* 7, 6). Finally, one should note how Ignatius and, later, Basil praised the charitable actions of the Roman church.

II. The emergence of the papacy in the 4th-5th c. *Galerius's edict (311) officially introduced a new political situation for Christianity. This period, which has been called the "time of the imperial church" or the "Constantinian age," was decisive for the history of the papacy. At the beginning of these *tempora christiana*, however, the papacy begins to emerge. *Constantine gave *Miltiades (310–314) the Lateran palace as a residence; he was commissioned by the same emperor to resolve the *Donatist problem, which had come about after the persecutions, when at *Carthage a minority had contested the episcopal election of Bishop *Caecilian, because he was accused of being a **traditor*. But Miltiades's arbitration failed. Constantine himself became involved in the matter, calling together a synod at *Arles (314), at which neither Miltiades nor *Sylvester was present (314–335). The latter had no role at the Council of *Nicaea (325), which was convoked by Constantine to put an end to the *Arian crisis. Though recognizing the privileges of the See of *Alexandria on the model of those enjoyed by *Rome, this synod established the basis of ecclesiastical hierarchy acc. to the civil division of the empire. This decision (cans. 6-7) was very important because Constantine transferred his residence to *Constantinople, the episcopal see of which would enter the lists not only with the major sees of the East, but also with the ancient See of Rome.

During the Arian controversy, which became worse after the death of Constantine (337), *Julius I (337–352) with his synod (341) defended *Athanasius and *Marcellus of Ancyra, asserting the priority of his decision in such matters (DS 132). The Western *Fathers of the Council of *Serdica (343) justified this decision and sanctioned the right of appeal to the Roman See; they did not, however, obtain the consensus of all Eastern bishops (DS 133ff.). Ten years later, *Liberius (352–366) obtained even less. Buckling under political pressure, he signed the so-called Third Formula of *Sirmium (DS 139-140), thus compromising his commitment to the Council of Nicaea, without however breaking ties with Athanasius, and thus causing a grave crisis in the community of Rome.

Only with *Damasus (366–384) did papal political strategy begin to achieve success. This "shift" (as Pietri calls it) is certainly owed to the ingenious figure of Damasus and his successors. Nevertheless, the shift was supported by the political and ecclesiastical situation and succeeded above all due to the *conversion of the Roman aristocracy, which by this time financially supported the Roman community and esp. contributed to the formation of the ideol-

ogy of *Roma aeterna*, without which the papacy would not have been able to establish itself in the 5th. c. After having overcome the difficulties that arose from the moment of his election, and that not without the help of the emperor *Gratian (375–383), who approved his jurisdiction with respect to all the metropolitan sees of the West (Mirbt n. 305), Damasus through his synods intervened in the doctrinal controversies of his time (see the *Tomus Damasi*, from 377: DS 152-161). Called upon at the same time by Eastern churchmen to address the Antiochene *schism, in 380 Damasus received a solemn confirmation of his political primacy by *Theodosius I in the so-called Edict of the Three Emperors (Mirbt n. 310). A year later, however, the Council of Constantinople (381), with its decision concerning its second place with respect to the New Rome (can. 2: Mirbt n. 312), showed that Theodosius no longer had need of Rome's support.

In his protest against this council's decision (Mirbt n. 310) and on several other occasions, Damasus revealed that behind his interventions were very clear ideas on the role of the *Sedes Apostolica*, which from the 5th c. onward became a distinct title for the Roman See. Appealing to Mt 16:18-19 in a context that by this time had become legal, a passage which had served the African tradition for emphasizing the church's unity, symbolized by the chair of Peter, the new *Moses, and basing himself above all upon the *authority of Peter and Paul, venerated at Rome as the princes of the apostles, he established a theory of the Roman primacy later developed by his successors. *Siricius (384–399) applied for the first time Paul's statement *sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* (2 Cor 11:28) to the apostolic ministry of the popes. *Anastasius I (399–402) and *Innocent I (402–417) used it in their "decretal" letters answering the disciplinary questions raised by bishops of missionary countries such as *Gaul and *Spain, or communicated the decisions of synods to bishops who could not be present (*see* below, VI. Letters of the popes).

Considering not only the recipients who were for the most part bishops of *Italy or other countries in which the metropolitan's governance was not yet sufficiently established, but also observing the relatively restricted fields known as the *causae maiores* i.e., interventions in contested elections of bishops, we note a striking contrast between the limited jurisdiction practically speaking of the sole W regions—of which N *Africa was still an exception—and the jurisdiction concerning disciplinary questions, and the theory with which it seemed to extend its *cura, onera* and *principatus* to the churches of the entire Roman Empire. No less remarkable is the fact that these popes, though calling upon the apostolic origin of their universal authority, sought to confirm it not only with *consuetudo*, but also with synodal right. In this regard, Siricius seems to have been the first to appeal to the so-called *corpus romanum*, i.e., to that MS tradition that had confused the canons of *Nicaea with those of Serdica (*Ep.* 5,2). Even if one can account for the pope's appeal to the canons by the urgent need to support his interventions even with a law that was still in force in the civic sphere (Speigl), it is striking, nonetheless, how much these popes were concerned about emphasizing the conformity of decretal to synodal law. Their attitude illustrates, however, the historical importance of the synods, which for a long time were the primary guarantors of ecclesial unity (Schwaiger, TRE 650).

The contrast between the relatively limited practice and the apparently universal theory is even more apparent if one considers that the interlocutors of the popes did not always attribute the same importance to their interventions; in fact, they even challenged them outright. This is esp. true in the case of *Zosimus (417–418), who favored *Pelagius and *Celestius (417), but also in the case of *Apiarius, presbyter of Sicca, who appealed to this same pope and later to *Celestine I (422–432). *Boniface I (418–422), who expressed with great vigor the necessity of *communion with the Roman Church, head of all the churches (*Ep.* 14,1), must have recognized the limits of Roman jurisdiction, which had been disregarded by an African synod (419) and contested by the claims of Constantinople, which were expressed in the edict of *Theodosius II (421) (*Ep.* 13ff.). His successor Celestine, who had been asked by the Sees of Constantinople and Alexandria, offered a decision together with his synod on the question of Christ, God born from the Virgin; he also commissioned *Cyril of Alexandria, as his representative, to take necessary measures against *Nestorius (*Ep.* 11-14). But he must have noticed not only that the Council of *Ephesus, convoked by Theodosius II (431), reopened discussion on a question he believed he had already resolved, but also that Cyril cared little about the legal style with which the Roman Church pursued its own interests. One should note that, like his predecessors, Celestine was not very interested in theological discussion. Instead, he was content with rejecting Nestorius's errors on the basis of authority, as he had already done when he confirmed the condemnation of the Pelagians (*Ep.* 21). When *Sixtus III (432–440) was informed of the reconciliation achieved in 433 between *John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexan-

dria, he rejoiced with the two reconciled bishops for the reestablished ecclesiastical peace, thereafter approving the creed of union and attributing the success to the presence of Peter, guarantor of the true faith (*Ep.* 5-6). He certainly collaborated from the very beginning for the reconciliation of the two chief sees of the East (*Ep.* 1-2). But it is obvious that that union was an Eastern matter.

All this history of the papacy, with its progress and regress, reached its apex in the pontificate of *Leo the Great (440–461). Well prepared for his position (though living during a difficult political and ecclesiastical situation), not only by his solid literary education, but also by his activity in service of the Roman Church, this pope earned the right to be called "the Great," esp. for his great contribution to the development of the papacy, bringing to completion the work Damasus and his successors had begun. Thanks to his numerous letters and, in part, also to his sermons, there is sufficient information about the ministry he exercised in the Roman community as well as his interventions in favor of the orthodox faith and discipline in the West, esp. in Italy and in Gaul, but also his relations with the Eastern churches, in particular his contributions to the definition and defense of the Chalcedonian faith. Committing himself with great care, but also with sophisticated moderation, to the *custodia fidei et canonum* (*Ep.* 115, 1) in favor of the unity of all the churches, he always recognized the political implications of his pastoral actions, as the situation of the "imperial church" demanded at that time. He collaborated for the communion of faith—the foundation of the political unity of the empire. He even put himself at the disposal of the people of Italy, who had been invaded by the *Huns and the *Vandals. Nor did he hesitate to accord a certain priestly dignity to the emperor, i.e., the duty to work for the *peace of the churches in the interest of the same empire. His very open attitude toward the *salus rei publicae*, emphasized by a certain amount of Roman patriotism, did not prevent him from rejecting canon 28 of the Council of *Chalcedon, in which the order of the great churches was entirely set acc. to political criteria. Accordingly, he did not fail to remind the emperor Marcian of the distinction between church and state, thus demanding freedom of action for the churches and vigorously affirming the primacy of the Apostolic See, but he did not find much reciprocity in this regard from the court of Constantinople.

In all his pastoral activity, with more or less universal scope, Leo adhered to very clear ideas about the primacy of Rome, which he expressed in his letters, esp. in their introductions and conclusions, as well as in the sermons he delivered on the anniversary of his episcopal ordination. One can summarize these ideas with this trilogy: Christ-Peter-Pope. Therefore, the role of the Apostolic See's primacy was founded upon two facts: the intimate union between Christ and Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the enduring apostolic inheritance in the bishops of Rome, the successors and vicars of Peter, who is always present in his church. Like his predecessors, Leo relies primarily upon Petrine succession, also established, he believed, by the order of the Lord himself (Mt 16:18; Lk 22:32; Jn 21:15-19). Moreover, he applies this principle even to the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch, which therefore must have precedence over the See of Constantinople (*Ep.* 106, 5).

His reinterpretation, however, of the apostolic authority that Christ granted to Peter and his heirs reflects a more keen political orientation than even that shown by his predecessors. When justifying his claims, Leo not only used, as did his predecessors, political-legal categories such as *principatus*, *dignitas*, *haeres*, *vices*, *ius potestatis*, *consortium potestatis*, but used more often the outlook of *Roma aeterna*, *caput orbis* and source of peace. In his sermon on Peter and Paul (*Serm.* 82), he not only takes up the traditional theme of the providential role of pagan Rome for the evangelization of the world, but he insists, with an emphasis not found before him, on the even more glorious action of pacification effected by Christian Rome, which has been renewed by now on the foundation of the apostles. It is true that one finds in Leo's writings the contrast between the theory of universal need and the obviously limited practice of the ecclesiastical-political milieu of that time, esp. if one compares the pyramid-like description of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in his letter to *Anastasius of Thessalonica (*Ep.* 14 or 11) with the concrete exercise of the *sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, esp. when dealing with the Eastern churches. It is also striking to see the delicacy with which Leo respected custom *consuetudo*, the canons of the synods and above all the rights of other bishops who along with him establish the college of charity *collegium caritatis*, (*Ep.* 5, 2; 6,1; 12,2). The fact remains that with a theological precision unknown until that time, he formulated the Roman doctrine on the primacy of Peter's successors with respect to the *custodia fidei et disciplinae*.

Although *Hilarus (461–468) limited his actions to a few interventions in the jurisdictional controversies in Gaul and *Spain, *Simplicius (468–483) and *Felix III (483–492) were faced with the reli-

gious politics of the court of Constantinople, which, in the post-Chalcedonian discussions, favored the *monophysite movement. This difference became more serious in the meantime because the W part of the empire came under the control of the Germanic peoples, who adhered to *Arianism. The protests of *Felix III against the so-called *Henotikon*, promulgated in 482 by the emperor *Basiliscus, led to a break between him and *Acacius, bishop of Constantinople. This first great *schism between East and West, called the "Acacian schism," lasted until 519, bringing it about that by 490, all the patriarchal sees of the East were occupied by monophysites. Meanwhile, *Gelasius I (492–496), also involved in the controversy with the New Rome, in his letter to the emperor *Anastasius, formulated the doctrine of the two powers, which would determine the political thought of the medieval West for a millennium (DS 347). Reusing Leo's distinction between the *auctoritas* of the bishops and imperial *potestas*, he affirmed the independence of the two sectors, civil and ecclesiastical, without, however, desiring to separate them. In his letters and treatises he later vigorously defended his position against all imperial interference into ecclesiastical matters. At the same time, he sought to impose the rights of his primacy onto the Latin churches.

III. The transition to the medieval papacy (6th–8th c.). During the pontificates of the 2nd half of the 5th c., the difficulties were already evident that would characterize the Byzantine era, the period in which the papacy still depended more or less on the imperial court of Constantinople, partially represented by the exarch of *Ravenna, up to the period when the popes closely collaborated with the kingdom of the *Franks: the rivalry between the Sees of Rome and Constantinople, the popes' fight for the church's freedom, the growing inclination of the Apostolic See toward the Germanic kingdoms. After the short pontificate of *Anastasius II (496–498), who was viewed as too favorable to Byzantine politics and even toward monophysitism, the majority, contrary to this pro-Byzantine attitude, chose *Symmachus (498–514); the minority, however, chose *Laurentius (498–506). Though supported by *Theodoric, king of the *Goths, and even thereafter by a synod held in 501, Symmachus ran into problems imposing his authority. This sad situation explains why Gelasius insisted on the distinction between the two powers and even explains the aspirations that were behind the so-called Symmachian forgeries, in which an assertion is made about papal prerogatives on the basis of forged documents, namely, the principle that would be repeatedly called upon during the Middle Ages: *prima sedes a nemine iudicatur* (Mirbt n. 468). Still tied to "Roman patriotism," Symmachus immediately became interested in the spread of Catholic Christianity in the kingdom of the Franks and the *Burgundians.

Only from *Hormisdas (514–523) onward was a reconciliation between East and West made possible, because the emperor *Justin I (518–527) and his nephew *Justinian I (527–565) became involved in pro-Chalcedonian politics in the interest of the empire's unity. In 519, the imperial court accepted the *Regula fidei Hormisdae*, which not only insists on the faith of *Chalcedon but even affirms that the Apostolic See is the only guarantee of true Christian faith. Although Justin and, after him, Justinian understood this affirmation of primacy established on Mt 16:18 in a different way, holding another view on the coexistence of the church and the state, Hormisdas's formula entered canon law as one of the bases for the development of papal primacy.

The rapprochement of the Apostolic See and the court of Constantinople, however, created difficulties in the East and the West. Theodoric, king of the Goths, looked at the situation with growing suspicion. *Boethius and *John I (523–526) became victims of the political differences between the Germans and the Byzantines: a sign of the future situation in which the papacy would suffer because of its political activities. Popes *Felix III (526–530) and *Boniface II (530–532) were favorable to the Goths, though challenged by *Dioscorus (530). Subsequent popes, such as *John II (533–535) and *Agapitus I (535–536), were more open to Byzantine politics. After *Silverius (536–537), supported by the Goths and therefore sentenced, by a court martial of the Byzantines, who in 536 captured Rome, *Vigilius was elected pope (537–555) and was completely overpowered by Byzantine ecclesiastical-political strategies. This occurred first in 548, and then, after a certain amount of resistance, a second time in 554; he accepted the so-called Condemnation of the *Three Chapters, which was imposed in 543/544 by Justinian in the interests of reconciliation with the monophysites, and even recognized the Council of *Constantinople II (553), in which he did not want to participate and in which he was excommunicated. It was a disaster. A large portion of the Western episcopate, in particular the Sees of *Milan and *Aquileia, separated from Rome. Though professing his fidelity to Chalcedon, his successor *Pelagius I (556–561) also relied upon Justinian and therefore was not in the position—not even by helping the Roman population which was suffering from an economic recession—

to overcome the schism in the West. *John III (561–574), who was finally approved by Justinian, reestablished peace for the most part. After his death (565), the invasions of the *pagan *Longobards (Lombards) created new difficulties in the face of which *Benedict I (575–579) and *Pelagius II (579–590) found themselves powerless.

There was need for new a political policy, an openness toward the German peoples, who for some time had been more open to Catholicism. This shift, which for the West included the transition from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages, occurred under Gregory the Great (590–604). Born around 540 from a senatorial family, he was profoundly Roman. But that did not stop him from recognizing the call of the Roman Church to convert the nations and to integrate them into the universal church. Thanks to his numerous *letters (854 preserved) scholars are well acquainted not only with his winsome personality, but also his political and pastoral ideals. Though accepting the imperial power of *Byzantium, he sought to reach an agreement with the Longobards and even began to approach the Franks. The new political approach and even the defense of the primacy of Rome were not the hallmark of his greatness, though. His greatness emerged more in his charitable action in the reorganization of the *patrimonium Petri*, the property of the Roman Church; in his pastoral ministry (formation of the clergy and tireless preaching); in his interest in monastic life, understood in an Augustinian sense as *actio* and *contemplatio*; and in his missionary efforts, stimulated by a certain eschatological mindset toward the Anglo-Saxons, i.e., beyond the frontiers of Roman civilization.

His successors, who for the most part governed for a short time, were unable to maintain the papacy at this level. Despite the gradual separation between East and West, these popes remained favorably disposed toward the Byzantine court such that one can say that the Western Middle Ages began at Rome only toward the middle of the 8th c. In the long series of those still "Byzantine" popes, there are a few noteworthy events to record. In 607 a Roman synod provided better regulations for the election of the bishop of Rome. The pontificate of *Honorius I (625–638) became famous for the Honorius question, which was much discussed in the modern controversies over papal infallibility. The ambiguous position Honorius took on the question of *monoenergism led the Council of *Constantinople III (680) to include even Honorius in its condemnation of *monothelitism. *Leo II (682–683) accepted the decision, rebuking his predecessor for having betrayed the apostolic tradition, which had always been preserved intact by the Roman See. Though he was certainly not up to the theological demands of that time, Honorius made a name for himself in his earnest administration of ecclesiastical *property. This action permitted him to exert a great influence on the political situation in *Italy, as well as in his missionary activity for the Anglo-Saxons and Longobards. His successors *Severinus (640), *John IV (640–642) and above all *Theodore I (642–649) clearly took a stance against monophysitism. During this difficult political situation for the empire, this question of faith became a political matter. With the help of *Maximus the Confessor, *Martin I (649–653) succeeded in having monothelitism condemned with his synod (649); nevertheless, in 653 he was deported to Constantinople, where he was condemned and exiled. He died in 655 as a martyr for the church's freedom. His successors *Eugenius I (654–657) and *Vitalian (657–672) succumbed to Byzantine influence. In 666, the emperor even established Ravenna as an autocephalous church, boorishly imposing on the rights of the Western patriarchate.

Because Byzantine power was seen as foreign in Italy and because at the same time relations between the Apostolic See with the West, esp. with England, became stronger, the definitive shift toward the Germanic kingdoms was only a matter of time. The shift was not blocked by the restoration of ecclesiastical communion between Rome and Byzantium on the occasion of the Council of Constantinople IV (680–681), under *Agatho (678–681), nor by the rather favorable attitude of the Sicilian, Greek and Syrian popes, who occupied the Apostolic See between 678 and 752. The growing separation between Rome and Byzantium and Rome's ever-increasing union with the West, which was coming under the Frankish domain, was instead increased by the following factors: (1) the imperial intervention against *Sergius (687–701), whom the Roman people protected against Byzantine soldiers (692: after the so-called Council *in Trullo* II); (2) the political and military difficulties of the Byzantine Empire itself, esp. in Italy, which was dominated by the *Longobards; (3) the iconoclastic controversy that was dividing the East (from 726 onward); (4) the Roman interest in missions undertaken above all by *Boniface, in Friesland Saxony (719–754); (5) the reconciliation of the papacy and the Longobards under Zacharias (741–752), who commissioned the Frankish metropolitan to consecrate Pepin the Short as king of the Franks. Under Stephen II (752–757), the union between the Apostolic See and the Frankish kingdom, which was con-

ditioned by the hostile attitude of both the Byzantines and the Longobards, definitively began a new era in papal history.

IV. Elements of historical evaluation. There is no doubt that the awareness of the bishop of Rome of responsibility for the *cura ecclesiae universalis*, as successors of Peter, grew slowly during the first Christian centuries. It is also no less certain that their increasing commitment to the *sollecitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, a decisive contribution to the defense of the church's freedom, constitutes a complex history of assertions on the one hand and rejections on the other, moments of advance or of stagnancy or even rapid progress (*Stephen I, *Damasus, *Leo I, *Gelasius, *Gregory I); at times the process was slow, but it foreshadowed what was to come (*Liberius, *Zosimus, *Julius). It is worth mentioning that, under many aspects, papal theory preceded the actual exercise of universal primacy (a distinction in the areas of influence). The fact that this tortuous history, characterized by many human vicissitudes, corresponds to an innate dynamic in the apostolic church cannot be discussed at this time. Such a discussion would require not only an introduction to systematic theology, but also to later papal historiography extending beyond the patristic era. While we think of the Petrine ministry as an integral part of the mission entrusted by Jesus to the apostles, we have here limited our horizon to the history of the ancient church. One should remember Leo's famous statement on this matter: *Si quid itaque a nobis recte agitur recteque decernitur, si quid a misericordia Dei cotidianis supplicationibus obtinetur, illius est operum atque meritorum cuius in sede sua vivit potestas, excellit auctoritas*. With these words Leo I, the greatest ancient theorist of the papacy, simultaneously indicated the ideal excellence and the concrete limits of the Petrine ministry (*Serm.* 3,3). Nonetheless, we cannot understand the history of the papacy except as a long and complex evolution.

In this historical development, favorable and unfavorable contrasting factors interacted. However, it is not easy to reach a judgment. In hindsight, actions that appeared to be obstacles became the cause of progress and vice versa. On the *civil* level, it was advantageous for the papacy to be tied to the historical destiny of the city of Rome, the governmental center of the empire until the end of the 3rd c. The privileged condition that this city owed to the political situation was put in question, however, when the imperial residence was moved to another city. Nevertheless, the political degradation of Rome and the rise of Constantinople during *tempora christiana* became a blessing, because the papacy took advantage of its greater independence from the emperors, who increasingly meddled in church matters, but by that time they resided far from the city of Rome.

On the level of *ecclesiastical politics*, the emergence of the great episcopal sees, later called patriarchates, certainly favored the development of the papacy. On the one hand, the jurisdiction of the papacy over the West was recognized without many difficulties by the Eastern sees, it was even favored at Nicaea as the model for Alexandria's jurisdiction over Egypt; on the other hand, the rivalries that the See of Egypt posed to that of the New Rome allowed the Apostolic See to acquire a new role as the mediator between the two rival sees and thus to enforce its own position. In the W part of the empire, Rome slowly overcame the resistance of other important sees. Milan, and above all Carthage, and later Ravenna, were forced to acknowledge, in addition to Rome's always-acknowledged status as *caput et origo*, a wider jurisdiction of the Apostolic See, because these cities had lost their political importance.

On the *theoretical* level, we also find a disagreement of political ideas and theological premises. The idea of the *Urbs aeterna*, after the conversion of the Roman aristocracy, taken up again with a Christian spirit by the popes of the 5th c., certainly provided an ideological foundation for papal claims. Similar aspirations, however, could also animate the attitude of the bishops of the New Rome, esp. after the *romanitas*, not to mention *graecitas*, was compromised in the West (note the title "imperial ecumenical patriarch"). The principle of *apostolicity was above all in favor of Rome, founded on Peter and Paul, the princes of the apostles. Nevertheless, even Alexandria and Antioch could boast of being Apostolic Sees, as the same popes emphasized in their arguments against the claims of Constantinople, which later did not hesitate to present itself as the See of the Apostle Andrew. Furthermore, as *Tertullian and *Cyprian showed, the principle of the apostolicity of all the bishops was more ancient. It took, therefore, a series of other factors for the Roman See to lay sole claim to the title *Sedes apostolica*. Among them was the development of the cult of Peter and Paul; special visits to their tombs also earned Rome a special place. One must not forget that the same phenomenon, i.e., the veneration of the relics and the pilgrimages to other sanctuaries contributed much to a kind of "Christian nationalism" that intensified centrifugal forces, diverse languages and mentalities.

Finally, a conflict of *ecclesiologies was also vastly significant. The Roman See had the advantage of representing the *Una sancta*. This role must

have been esp. felt from the moment Christianity was recognized as the official religion of the empire, and Christians became so identified with it that the idea of **extra ecclesiasiam nulla salus* meant, practically speaking, *extra ecclesiam imperii nulla salus*—consider Ambrose's attitude and many others toward the barbarians. Moreover, the *origo unitatis*, symbolized by the special calling of Peter, included a special regard for the Western churches, the privilege of *antiquitatis*, even in a chronological sense. In the face of the Eastern churches, this prerogative could also be understood at least in the sense that the church of Rome had always remained faithful to the apostolic tradition, esp. because it did not abandon the faith of Nicaea.

Nevertheless, the principle of the sole apostolic church was opposed to the principle of the *catholica* and the **koinonia* of all the apostolic churches, a principle no less felt in the historical context of the imperial church. This opposition was even more crucial because the idea of catholicity included the idea of *consensus*, no less cherished by the ancients than the idea of *antiquitas*. It was certainly easier to affirm one's agreement with all the churches, demonstrating that communion with that church which possessed the *principalitas* of all the apostolic churches (Irenaeus). Nonetheless, was communion with all the churches no longer convincing?

Finally, the *personal* level. There is no doubt that the Roman church largely owed its ascent to its strong leaders: Victor I, Stephen I, Dionysius, Damasus, Innocent I, Leo I, Gelasius and Gregory I. Nevertheless, other important figures in the early church challenged this ascent, such as Cyprian, Basil of Caesarea, Ambrose, *Patroclus of Arles and Cyril of Alexandria. On the other hand, certain losses, even utter obfuscations, of Roman primacy were owed primarily to weak popes who lacked circumspection or were too compliant: Liberius, Zosimus, Vigilius, Honorius and Eugenius I. However, it is also true that the necessities and difficulties of certain bishops, which were caused by the shortcomings of other people, whether in the government or in the church, provided the Apostolic See the opportunity to intervene on behalf of oppressed bishops and, thus, to increase its own prestige, as is demonstrated in the appeals of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Nestorius, *Flavian and in a certain sense even Basil. In view of all these different and, in large measure, even opposing factors, it is not easy, therefore, to arrive at a just and even-handed explanation of the ancient history of the papacy (*see* V. Historiography of the papacy). When considering all these human phenomena, which at times seem to be too human, it does not mean that a Catholic can maintain that the church no longer has need for the Petrine ministry. It simply means that one is taking history seriously, i.e., the incarnational structure of Christ's church.

Bibliographies: see the studies on individual popes contained in the manuals of church history, and above all the Gregorian University's annual journal: *Archivum historiae pontificiae*, Rome 1963ff.; P. Levillain, ed., *Dictionnaire historique de la Papauté*, Paris 1994, It. tr. Milan 1997; EPapi.

Sources: see the edition of the popes' writings and the letters sents to them, indicated by the CPL and the CPG; Ph. Jaffé - G. Wattenbach, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, I, Leipzig 1885, repr. 1956; C. Vogel (L. Duchesne), *Le Liber pontificalis*, Paris ²1955; H. Foerster, *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, Bern 1958; C. Mirbt - K. Aland, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, I: *Von den Anfängen bis zum Tridentinum*, Tübingen ⁶1967.

General Studies: see the manuals of the history of the church edited by A. Fliche - V. Martin, H. Jedin, L.J. Rogier, etc., C. Andresen, K.D. Schmidt - E. Wolf; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, Tübingen 1930–1933; P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri*, Paris 1938; J. Haller, *Das Papsttum*, I, Stuttgart ²1950; F.X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste*, I-II, Munich ²1954-1955; V. Monachino, *I papi nella storia* I, Rome 1961; G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste*, Munich 1964; C. Falconi, *Storia del papato e dei papi*, Rome 1967ff.; A. Franzen - R. Bäumer, *Papstgeschichte*, Freiburg ²1980; J.M.R. Tillard, *The Bishop of Rome*, London 1983; K. Schatz, *Der päpstliche Primat. Seine Geschichte von den Ursprüngen bis zur Gegenwart*, Würzburg 1990; H. Fuhrmann, *Storia dei papi da Pietro a Giovanni Paolo II*, Bari 1992; K. Schatz, *Papst, Papsttum*, I. Alte Kirche: LTK³ 7, 1328-1331; G. Schwaiger, *Papsttum* I,3. *Im römischen Reich*: TRE 25 (1998) 648-651.

Studies on individual periods or particular aspects: P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique*, Paris ²1924; G.B. Ladner, *Die Papstbildnisse des Altertums und des Mittelalters*, I, Vatican City 1941; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941; J. Ludwig, *Die Primatsworte Mt 16,18-19 in der altkirchlichen Exegese*, Münster 1952; M. Maccarrone, *Vicarius Christi. Storia del titolo papale*, Rome 1952; G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste im V. und VI. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1964; M. Maccarrone, *S. Pietro in rapporto a Cristo nelle più antiche testimonianze*: StudRom 15 (1967) 397-420; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, London ³1970; W. Marschall, *Karthago und Rom, Die Stellung der nordafrikanischen Kirche zum apostolischen Stuhl in Rom*, Stuttgart 1971; P.P. Joannou, *Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im 4. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1972; L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome 1972; J. Hennig, *Zur Stellung der Päpste in der martyrologischen Tradition*: AHP 12 (1974) 7-32; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975; J. Speigl, *Das entstehende Papsttum, die Kanones v. Nizäa und die Bischofseinsetzungen in Gallien*: Festschrift H. Tüchle, Paderborn 1975, 43-61; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana* (*311–440*), Rome 1976; P. Stockmeier, *Römische Kirche und Petrusamt im Licht frühchristlicher Zeugnisse*: AHC 14 (1976) 357-372; P. Conte, *Il significato del primato papale nei padri del VI concilio ecumenico*: AHC 15 (1977) 7-111; J. Roloff, *Apostolat*: TRE 3 (1978) 458-462; V. Monachino, *Il canone 28 di Calcedonia, Genesi storica*, L'Aquila 1979; M. Wojtowych, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I.*, Stuttgart 1981 (cf. AHC 17 [1985] 9-17); B. Schimmelpfennig,

Das Papsttum. Von der Antike bis zur Renaissance, Darmstadt [3]1988; J. Hofmann, *Die amtliche Stellung der in der ältesten römischen Bischofsliste überlieferten Männer in der Kirche von Rom*: HJ 109 (1989) 1-23; A. Garuti, *Il papa patriarca d'Occidente*, Bologna 1990; M. Maccarone, ed., *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio*, Vatican City 1991; M. Maccarone, *Romana Ecclesia – Cathedra Petri*, ed. P. Zerbi et al., Rome 1991; R. Minnerath, *De Jérusalem à Rome. Pierre et l'unité de l'église apostolique*, Paris 1994; H. Feichtinger, *Christus praesens in Ecclesia*, Tesi Augustinianum, Rome 2005.

V. Historiography of the papacy. Historical interest in the papacy appears for the first time in the catalogs of the bishops of Rome. To emphasize the apostolicity of authentic Christian tradition, *Hegessipus and *Irenaeus of Lyons, already in the 2nd c., and, following in their footsteps, Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339) composed, among other things, these chronological lists. Driven by the sole desire to compose a chronography, the author of the so-called **Chronography of 354* harmonized the *Liberian Catalog* with Roman consular *fasti*. Certain chronicles of the 5th c. as well as the histories of *Theodoret and *Socrates, both continuators of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*, completed the earlier extant catalogs that were available at their time. Furthermore, a series of early portraits depicting Roman pontiffs on the walls of the basilica of St. Paul (Rome) attests the concern certain people had at that time for the history of the papacy.

The chronographical attempts of the 4th to 7th c. were continued in the **Liber pontificalis*, the first two recensions of which (until the year 530 and until the end of the 7th c.) pertain to the patristic age. The *Liber* is a collection of *biographies on Roman bishops; the first set of biographies are brief and extend only to the year 400; the subsequent sets of biographical accounts are more extensive. All the biographies are written acc. to the same methodical layout (name, origin, duration of pontificate, decrees, liturgical institutions, ordinations, date of funeral and the vacancy of chair after the pope's death). The first redaction contains little reliable information. The second, however, includes precise facts. During the Middle Ages, historians inserted papal historiography within the ecclesiastical historiography of the time, which was marked by its rather edifying schema of the ages of the world; the same historiography of the 16th c., however, was too influenced by the polemical confessions of that era.

From the beginning of the 1700s, however, a more critical and objective historiography begins to emerge thanks to the efforts of Panvinio, Baronius, Tillemont and others. The new methods devised by the *Maurists (Coustant) and by the Bollandists and finally by the historical criticism of the 19th c., allowed scholars to make enormous progress in researching the papacy (see Schwaiger, 1337-38). The opening of the Vatican archives and the establishment of the national institutes of history in Rome, while causing medieval and modern historiography to make great progress, could not but also stimulate the study of the discipline's own beginnings (see Schwaiger, 1338). Thus, Duchesne, the editor of the *Liber pontificalis* (1886–1892), Caspar (1930–1937), Haller (1934–1945) and Seppelt (1931–1941), as well as several Italian scholars, esp. on the history of Rome, such as Brezzi, devoted many years to studying the origins of the papacy. As one can see from Pietri's recent work on the question at hand, which, unfortunately, is limited to the 4th and the 1st half of the 5th c., even pontifical historiography must examine a wider spectrum of data, i.e., not only papal documents and ancient writings, but also the development of the city of Rome, the various forms of pastoral ministry, the social conditions, as they continue to emerge even from archaeological discoveries. Nevertheless, it is obvious that such undertakings still suffer from the dearth of preparatory monographs, as is shown, e.g., by the case of the still-limited list of the popes.

Sources: in addition to the letters of the popes (CPL 1627-1744) and the historical works of the ancient authors already mentioned, see esp. the *Liber Pontificalis*: ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1886-92, repr. 1955.

Studies: C. Schmidt, *Studien zu den pseudo-Clementinen: nebst einem Anhange, Die älteste römische Bischofsliste und die pseudo-Clementinen* (TU 46, 1), Leipzig 1929; A. Mercati, *La serie dei papi nell'Annuario pontificio per l'anno 1947*: Oss. Rom. 19 gennaio 1947 (Eng. vers. Mediaeval Stud. 9 [1947] 71-80); A. Frutaz, *Papa: IV, La cronotassi papale*: EC 9, 756-765; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976; M. Wojtowytsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440–461)*, Stuttgart 1981; W. Ullmann, *Gelasius I* (492–496), Stuttgart 1981; G. Schwaiger, *Papstgeschichtsschreibung*: LTK[3] 7, 1336-1339; Id., *Papstliste*: LTK[3] 7, 1345ff.

VI. Letters of the popes. Ecclesiastical historians use the generic phrase "Letters of the popes" (*epistulae pontificiae*) to refer to all the documents attributed to the bishops of Rome without distinction of form, such as the decretals dating back to the end of the 4th c., the encyclicals, which were used for the first time by *Martin I (649–653), chirographs, apostolic letters, etc., with the exception of the so-called papal privileges. With regard to these documents, which are certainly early sources for the history of the papacy and, actually for the history of the entire church, it is fitting to distinguish those of the first three centuries from those that came after.

The scarcity of extant documents for the first pe-

riod is striking. Aside from the *1 Clement* (*Prima Clementis*), which presents itself as a letter from the community of Rome, we possess only a few letters from *Cornelius I (251–253), preserved in the collection of Cyprian's letters (CPL 5050). As is the case for many other writings of the first centuries, fragments from several other popes (Soter, Eleuterius, Victor I, Pontianus, Lucius I, Stephen I and Dionysius) have been transmitted by Eusebius of Caesarea. Among these, the most important are those written by the following pontiffs: Victor I on the question of Easter, Stephen I on baptism administered by heretics (DS 110-111) and Dionysius on trinitarian theology (DS 112-115). Other letters, however, were mentioned or have been partially preserved by other ecclesiastical authors such as the two letters of Julius I (337–352) in Athanasius's writings (CPL 1627) and Liberius's *Letters* (352–366) in the works of Hilary and Socrates (CPL 1628ff.).

Damasus I (366–384) marks the beginning of the second period, for which much more documentation has been preserved. Thanks to the pontifical registers (*regesta*, *registri*) in which, from the 4th c. onward, acc. to Roman usage, the copies of the documents that left the apostolic chancery were inserted, as well as transmitted only in a fragmentary state, and above all, thanks to the ecclesiastical-political collections, both canonical (decretal law), of which the *Avellana* is the most famous, we have a very good understanding of the pontifical correspondence for the second period, esp. for what pertains to *Innocent I (401–417; CPL 1641), Leo I (440–461; CPL 1656: more than 170 letters), Hilarus (461–468; CPL 1662-63), Gelasius I (492–496; CPL 1667-68), Symmachus (498–514; CPL 1678) and Gregory I (590–604; CPL 1714). Even if these writings should be attributed more to the anonymous activity of the apostolic chancery than to the literary initiative of individual authors, with the exception perhaps of several letters of Leo and Gregory, nonetheless, they deserve to be considered not merely as sources of the history of the Roman church, but also as testimonies to the history of ancient Christian literature. In fact, pontifical letters, esp. those composed during the heated moments of papal history, have a great deal of importance for the history of Christian doctrine, canon law and liturgy, and esp. for the Augustinian theology of *grace, several questions about *sacramentaries, *Christology, the ecclesiological positions of the Roman curia in comparison to those of the imperial court and other bishops. At the same time, these allow us to understand better the theological and ecclesiological situation of various fathers of the church: Ambrose, *John Chrysostom, Augustine, John Cassian, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret and, of course, the popes themselves, who like Leo and Gregory are numbered among the *fathers of the church.

Even with respect to the literary aspect, these letters are not devoid of interest because they allow us to trace the development of rhythmic prose, the transition, i.e., from quantitative rhythm to accentuated rhythm in the final clauses (*see clausula* and *cursus*). They demonstrate, moreover, the influences of the political-juridical Roman mentality on the *Latin language used by the Christians, as one sees esp. in Leo and in his immediate successors. They even establish a textbook case of Christian adaptation to a secular literary *genre, i.e., the reuse of the form of imperial legislation in the decretal legislation of the Apostolic See. Lastly, the later letters of Gregory and others also attest to the transition from the ancient to the medieval mentality.

Therefore, a study of all this documentation on the popes not only pertains to the history of the Roman church, *patrology, the history of later Latin literature and even the history of the end of the Roman Empire, the beginning of the Byzantine Empire and the Germanic kingdoms; it also requires a much broader familiarity with the editions, tools and studies than the training normally required for patristic research.

On the editions: CPL 1568-1774, and in particular. Ph. Jaffé - G. Wattenbach, *Regesta Romanorum Pontificum ab condita Ecclesia ad a. 1198*, Leipzig ²1885-1888; C. Silva-Tarouca, *Le antiche lettere dei Papi e le loro edizioni* (*sec. IV-VI*): CivCatt 72 (1921) 13-22, 323-336; Id., *Nuovi studi sulle antiche lettere dei Papi*: Gregorianum 12 (1931) 3-56, 349-425, 547-598.

Editions: in addition to the PL, MGH, CSEL, CCL, see A. Thiel, *Epistulae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt*, Braunsberg 1867/8 (repr. Hildesheim 1974); C. Mirbt - K. Aland, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, I, Tübingen ⁷1967.

Studies: in addition to the histories of the church, see in particular E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, I-II, Tübingen 1930, 1933; F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei Papi e nei documenti della cancelleria romana dal IV al XIV sec.*, Rome 1937-39; C. Andresen, *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit*, Stuttgart 1971, esp. pp. 579-601; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana* (*311–440*), Rome 1976; Patrologia III, 346ff. (bibl.); P.A. McShane, *La Romanitas et le Pape Léon le Grand*, Paris 1979 (bibl.); LTK³ 7, 1335ff.; Patrologia IV, 1-15, 123-189 (bibl.).

B. Studer

PAPHNUTIUS. The name of various Egyptian *ascetics and hermits. *Rufinus and *Sozomen noted that the first Paphnutius was a bishop, a *confessor

of the faith, a member of the Council of *Nicaea (325), where he sided against clerical *celibacy. The second Paphnutius (d. before 394) is known from the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*. A contemporary bearing the same name, nicknamed Bubalo (wild ox), appears in the *apophthegmata* in the writings of *Cassian and *Palladius. Last, the most famous and entirely legendary Paphnutius was the disciple and supposed biographer of St. *Onuphrius.

BS 10, 35-37 and 26-28; BBKL 21,1113-1114

J. Gribomont

PAPIAS of Hierapolis (2nd c.). Born at Hierapolis in *Phrygia, where he was also *bishop, Papias wrote *An Explanation of the Sayings* [λόγια] *of the Lord* around the year 130/140, which heavily influenced *Irenaeus of Lyons, *Hippolytus of Rome and *Victorinus of Petovium. The extant fragments have been preserved by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, V, 33, 4) and *Eusebius of Caesarea, *HE* II,15,2; III, 36, 2; 39, 13-17. Today we have various editions and even recent translations. The work is an interpretation of what the Lord said and did, as the title itself indicates.

According to Eusebius, *HE* 3, 39, 15ff., Papias was a follower of one of the seven disciples of *John, among whom were the *presbyters *Aristion and *John, though modern scholars often maintain that only the latter two are historical figures, on the supposition that the seven disciples represent a widespread literary device used during that period (e.g., for the discussion of the supposed John of Papias, see M.L. Rigato, *La testimonianza di Papia di Gerapoli sul "secondo" Giovanni e il contesto eusebiano*, in *Atti del VI Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni Apostolo*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 1996, 237-272). Papias was considered to have had close ties to the apostolic age: acc. to Irenaeus (*Haer.* V, 33,4), Papias was "very old," a follower of John and a contemporary of *Polycarp. With regard to the direct transmission of the apostolic message, Papias's insistence on παράδοσις/*traditio* is very important, because through it one finds the "living voice" (ζώση φονή, *viva vox*), as seen in A.D. Baum's study *Papias, der Vorzug der* Viva Vox *und die Evangelienschriften*: NTS 44 (1998) 144-151. Eusebius did not consider Papias a very rigorous thinker and thus inserted him within the Jewish Christian tradition (*HE* 3, 39, 13).

The most famous fragment, already discussed during antiquity (*HE* 3, 39, 15), reports a πρεσβύτερος, acc. to whom the gospel of Mark was written on the basis of *Peter's preaching at *Rome and indicates that *Mark was an "interpreter" of Peter. The question has been studied (e.g., by T.Y. Mullins, *Papias and Clement and Mark's Two Gospels*: VChr 30 [1976] 189-192; J. Kürzinger, *Die Aussage des Papias von Hierapolis zur literarischen Form des Markusevangeliums*: Biblische Zeitschrift 21 [1977] 245-264; A. Delaux, *Deux témoignages de Papias sur la composition de Marc*: NTS 26 [1981] 401-411; M. Sordi, *L'ambiente storico-culturale greco-romano e la missione cristiana nel I sec.*: Ricerche Storico-Bibliche 10 [1998] 217-229; A.D. Baum, *Der Presbyter des Papias über einen Hermeneuten des Petrus*: TZ 56 [2000] 21-35).

Matthew, acc. to Papias, wrote his gospel ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, i.e., in Hebrew or in Aramaic dialect; he collected the λόγια (sayings) of Jesus in this language and ἡρμήνευσε them, i.e., he "interpreted" them, or "translated" them, evidently in Greek, even if *Jerome (*Vir. ill.*, s.v. Matthaeus) claims that he does not know who translated the Greek of "the Hebrew version of Matthew." One such gospel was then used by a group of Jewish-Christians such as the *Nazareans and, acc. to *Pantaenus, the teacher of *Clement of Alexandria, was actually in the possession of certain Christian groups in India, who obtained it from *Bartholomew (documentation for this is found in ch. 3 of my work: *Gli Apostoli in India nella tradizione patristica e nella letteratura sanscrita*, in collaboration with C. Dognini, Milan 2001, 45-59). The question has been raised if what Matthew wrote in "the Hebrew language" acc. to Papias was a collection of the sayings of Jesus that Irenaeus and Origen speak of as the text of "Matthew in Hebrew." Scholars have debated this issue at length, and the literature on this question is voluminous. See, at least, C.B. Amphoux, *L'évangile selon les Hébreux*: Apocrypha 6 (1995) 67-77; A.D. Baum, *Ein aramäischer Urmatthäus im kleinasiatischen Gottesdienst*: ZNTW 12 (2001) 257-272; further information can be found in the bibl.

RGG[3] V, 47-48; J.F. Bligh, *The Prologue of Papias*: ThS 13 (1952) 234-240; J. Munck, *Presbyters and Disciples of the Lord in Papias*: HTR 52 (1959) 223-243; W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen ²1968, 187ff.; G.M. Lee, *Eusebius, HE 3,39,4*: Biblica 53 (1972) 412; C.M. Nielsen, *Papias. Polemicist Against Whom?*: ThS 35 (1974) 529-535; Altaner 54-55; E. Güttgemanns, *In welchem Sinne ist Lukas "Historiker"? Die Beziehung von Luk 1,1-4 und Papias zur antiken Rhetorik*: LingBibl 54 (1983) 9-26; U.H.J. Koertner, *Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, Göttingen 1983; J. Kürzinger, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des NT*, Regensburg 1983; L. Cirillo, *Un recente volume su Papia*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 7 (1986) 553-563; H.H. Schmidt, *Semitismen bei Papias*: TZ 44 (1988) 135-146; J.-D. Dubois, *Remarques sur le fragment de Papias cité par Irénée*: RHPhR 71 (1991) 3-10; G. Zuntz, *Papiana*: ZNTW 82 (1991) 242-263; R. Bauckham, *Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of*

the Fourth Gospel: JTS 44 (1993) 24-69; W.R. Schoedel, *Papias*, in ANRW II, 27, 1, Berlin-New York 1993, 235-270; W.A. Löhr, *Kanonsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition im zweiten Jahrhundert*: ZNTW 85 (1994) 234-258; A. Stewart-Sykes, *Taxei in Papias*: JECS 3 (1995) 487-492; P. Bruns, *Papias*: LTK³ 7, 1325-1326; C.E. Hill, *What Papias Said About John (and Luke)*: JTS 49 (1998) 582-629; C.P. Thiede, *Der Petrus Report*, Augsburg 2002, 153-170; I. Ramelli, *I romanzi antichi e il Cristianesimo. Contesto e contatti*, Madrid 2001, 163-192, part. 167; Id., *The Ancient Novels and Possible Contacts with the New Testament*, in *Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature*, Atlanta, GA, November 22-25, 2003, section *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative Group*; H. Clarke, *The Gospel of Matthew and Its Readers: A Historical Introduction to the First Gospel*, Bloomington, IN 2003; B. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Cambridge 2003; M.-L. Rigato, *Il titolo della Croce di Gesù*, Rome 2003, 134-144; I. Ramelli, *Indizi della conoscenza del Nuovo Testamento nei romanzieri antichi e in altri autori pagani del I sec. d. C.*, in Atti del Convegno *Il Contributo delle scienze storiche alla interpretazione del Nuovo Testamento* (Rome, 2-6 ottobre 2002), ed. Pontificio Comitato di Scienze Storiche, Vatican City 2005; Papia di Hierapolis, *Esposizione degli oracoli del Signore: i frammenti*, intr., text, tr. and notes by E. Norelli, Milan 2005.

I. Ramelli

PAPISCUS and PHILO, Dialogue of. In 1889 Arthur McGiffert published the *editio princeps* of an anonymous dialogue between a Christian monk and two Jews, Papiscus and Philo (*Papisci et Philonis Iudaeorum cum monacho colloquium*), placing the work's composition in 7th-c. Egypt. In the decades following, but esp. in recent years, numerous other MSS have been found, and it has been noted that the text in many codices differed from the edited text. The analysis of the MS tradition of the *Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo*—which is much more rich than once thought, but also much more complex and characterized by numerous processes of contamination and manipulation of the text—allows one to conclude that the work is actually a heap of textual units of different provenance; the precise parallels that one finds with other anti-Jewish works of the same period (*Trophies of Damascus, Question 137 to Antiochus*, but also Leontius of Neapolis's *Apology* containing one section on the veneration of images) depend in all likelihood on the use of the same repertoire of sources. The genesis of the *Dialogue* cannot be ascribed to an individual creative act, but should be viewed as a process that is developed over time as a result of work carried out by several authors at different times. One can situate the genesis of the most ancient and original nucleus of the *Dialogue* around the 2nd half of the 7th c., to which nucleus new textual units were gradually added. The use of the original title, *The Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo*, is open to discussion. Scholars have continued to use it for the sake of clarity and out of respect for a consolidated tradition. In essence, the work was open and flexible and was probably composed in an E region subjected to Arab domination: in *Palestine or *Syria.

The reconstruction of the work's original nucleus and its progressive development should be placed within the literary genre of polemical, anti-Jewish dialogue. The work primarily sets forth again the then-traditional themes of the longstanding debate between Jews and Christians, but also reflects the conflict on the veneration of images that deeply troubled the period between the 7th and 8th c., even though the textual units in which reference to such a question appears autonomous and strongly suspect of being written much later than the original nucleus of the work. The work does not contain exegetical insights of particular originality in comparison to the preexisting tradition, except for the question on the veneration of the images, which, however, the *Dialogue* shares with anti-Jewish writings of the same period: the Jew accuses the Christian of attributing to the *cross and the images of Christ and the saints, or rather to manmade objects, the veneration due to God alone; the Christian responds by asserting that he does not venerate images but instead venerates God through such images. The references to the conquests of the E areas of the Byzantine Empire by the Persian and Arabic-Islamic peoples contextualize the *Dialogue* with a certain precision and provide clues about the work's historical context. In the work, the Persians and Arabs appear as a third interlocutor, lacking a definite dialectical structure, and are more perceived as an impending and threatening presence, and therefore liable of being associated with the Hebrews as a subversive element in the empire. On the whole, the exegesis is also traditional: typological, christological, Christocentric and bent on interpreting every figure and event of the OT as a prefiguration of the NT in a line of historical continuity.

Precisely because the dialogue has known various traditional phases and its genesis cannot be reduced to a coherent and unifying project, we cannot delineate with precision the historical moment in which it was composed: but its wide dissemination and its gradual growth are in all likelihood the effect of the encounter and the clash between the Jewish and Christian communities, a factor always present in the first period of the elaboration of the work (7th c.) and for all phases of its transmission. Another very important point to note for understanding the history of the *Dialogue* is that it was translated many

times: not only into Latin, as has been known for some time, but also into Slavic (with different versions: Middle Bulgarian, Russian and Ruthenian) and into Middle High German.

CPG 7796. *Editions*: A.C. McGiffert, *Dialogue Between a Christian and a Jew, the Greek Text Edited with Introduction and Notes, Together with a Discussion of Christian Polemics Against the Jews*, Marburg 1889; I. Aulisa - C.Schiano, *Dialogo di Papisco e Filone giudei con un monaco*, Bari 2005, 177-210.

Studies: V. Déroche, *La polémique anti-judaïque au VI^e^ et au VII^e^ siècle. Un mémento inédit, les Képhalaia*: Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991) 275-311; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit vor dem Bilderstreit*, Berlin 1992; A. Cameron, *The Jews in Seventh-Century Palestine*: Scripta Classica Israelica 13 (1994) 75-93; D.M. Olster, *Roman Defeat, Christian Response and the Literary Construction of the Jew*, Philadelphia 1994; A. Külzer, *Disputationes Graecae contra Iudaeos. Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen antijüdischen Dialogliteratur und ihrem Judenbild*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999; P. Andrist, *Pour un répertoire des manuscrits de polémique antijudaïque*: Byzantion 70 (2000) 270-306; I. Aulisa, *"Papisci et Philonis Iudaeorum cum monacho colloquium": Note per una ricostruzione del confronto tra giudei e cristiani in epoca altomedievale*: VetChr 40 (2003) 17-41; C. Schiano, *Dal dialogo al trattato nella polemica antigiudaica. Il "Dialogo di Papisco e Filone" e la "Disputa contro i giudei" di Anastasio abate*: VetChr 41 (2004) 121-150; P. Andrist, *Trois témoins athonites mal connus des* Anastasiana Antiiudaica (*et du* Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae)*: Lavra K 113; Vatopedi 555; Karakallou 60. Essais sur la tradition des* Anastasiana Antiiudaica*, notamment du* Dialogus Papisci et Philonis cum monacho: Byzantion 76 (2006) 402-422.

I. Aulisa

PAPYRUS - PAPYROLOGY

I. Literary papyri - II. Documentary papyri.

Papyrus, as a writing material taken from the plant and bearing the same name (*cyperus papyrus*), produced by a meticulous treatment of the stem, began in *Egypt, where as early as in the 3rd millennium BC it was in current use. The technique adopted for the making of papyrus paper was described in detail by *Pliny the Elder, although with a few inaccuracies (*Nat. Hist.* XIII, 74-77; 81-82).

Papyrus paper was used throughout the entire ancient world. Remnants of papyrus have been preserved thanks to the favorable climate conditions above all in the valley of the Nile, on the outskirts of the area subject to flooding, as well as in other places with a dry climate, though to a lesser extent also in *Dura Europos and Phouraia on the Euphrates River, Nessana and the caves near the Dead Sea in *Palestine, *Petra in *Arabia, and Nbu-Ndjem in *Libya. Sporadically they are also found elsewhere, but in these rare instances they usually disintegrate completely at the moment they are removed from the earth. One particular example involves the numerous scrolls of carbonized papyrus that were found at Herculaneum in the 2nd half of the 17th c., some of which are still waiting to be unfolded and read. The majority of papyri that we possess come from ordinary excavations, but there are also many other papyri that have been found by private individuals and have entered museums or libraries by means of the antiquarian market; in these latter instances, it is difficult to be certain of a papyrus's provenance.

In addition to papyrus, writers in the ancient world used other materials to compose (in this entry we are not going to discuss the materials used for inscriptions, which were intended to be read by anyone); more specifically, they used different types of animal skin (the best of which was parchment) as well as materials that cost little or nothing: waxed-wooden tablets, limestone clay tablets (*ostraka*). Text written on such materials, esp. if they have been found in Egypt, are usually studied and published by the same specialists who are committed to investigating papyri; therefore, the term "papyrus" is often applied—improperly, but conveniently—also to these.

For many centuries, papyrus paper was the primary material for book production, documents, letters and the administrative acts of the state.

In Egypt, papyrus paper was still in use in the 8th-9th c. AD, even though the use of paper made from cloth had already begun to spread. The latter definitively supplanted the former during the course of the 11th-12th c. Scholars usually divide papyri into two large groups: literary papyri and documentary papyri. Even though superficial and imprecise, this division is convenient. Even paraliterary texts are assigned to the first group, e.g., scholastic exercises, horoscopes and formulas of written prayers for private use. The second group includes not only documents deriving from the state's chancery and documents relating to actions completed by individuals (e.g., loans, receipts, rent contracts and acts of commerce), but also private letters.

The term "papyrology" refers to a discipline that began between the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th c. It analyzes both literary and documentary papyri.

For the papyri pertaining to the period of interest to this *Encyclopedia*, the overwhelming majority were written in Greek; those written in Latin are rare, and those in the Egyptian language are rather numerous. They were written until the 2nd c. AD by means of the demotic script later used for the *Coptic alphabet. Rare at the beginning, the extant Cop-

tic papyri became increasingly numerous over time. We also possess a certain number of documentary papyri in *Arabic and Persian.

I. Literary papyri. The original form of the book in the ancient world was a scroll made from a certain number of pages of papyrus that were glued together so that they formed a unit of varying length, that wrapped around in such a way that the writing was on the inside, which was usually smoother. Beginning from the 2nd c. AD the use of the codex gradually increased. In the course of the 4th c., the codex supplanted the scroll. For a long time codices were made with folia of a papyrus folded together, even though this material easily ruined at the folds. Only gradually was the papyrus replaced in this area with parchment—material much more durable and convenient, but also more costly.

It did not take long for Christians to adopt the codex as their form of the book. Being less bound by a literary tradition than either pagans or Jews, they could more easily abandon the scroll form of the book. For Jews, however, the scroll remained the typical book form for the Bible.

Among the Christian Greek and Coptic literary papyri, the biblical texts of both the OT and NT constitute the majority of papyri. The quantity and the characteristics of the biblical Christian papyri discovered in Egypt confirm and enrich the witnesses to the daily use and diffusion of sacred *Scripture within all levels of the Christian communities of the first centuries. From these papyri, the most ancient are the P.Yale I, 1 (end of the 1st c.), a papyrus fragment of a codex of Genesis; the most notable is P.Ryl. III 457, a fragment of a papyrus codex perhaps originating from Faym or Oxyrhynchus, which is *paleographically datable to the first decades of the 2nd c. and contains John 18:31-32, 37-38; and the noteworthy complex of the P.Chester-Beatty, some of which are datable to the 2nd c. Following in age and importance is the P.Bodm. II (2nd-3rd c.) found in Upper Egypt (Panopolis), a papyrus codex with an accurate edition of the entire gospel of *John.

Among the New Testament *apocryphal texts, the most attested is the **Protevangelium of James*, of which the P.Bodm. V (3rd c.), originating from Upper Egypt with the title *The Nativity of Mary*, contains the most ancient redaction.

Even though inferior to the biblical papyri, the contributions of papyri in the area of patristics are noteworthy, for which the New Testament text already establishes the basis and a constant point of reference for patristic authors. Contemporary patristics, in addition to extending its interests beyond its traditional borders, has increasingly taken historical-philological aspects into its own theological field (K. Treu), and the same papyri, both for the peculiarity of the documentation and for this fruitful convergence, has indicated the connection between specifically philological data with the contents of theological thought, and thus remains influenced by it.

P.Oxy. XV 1782 (end of the 4th c.), which belonged to a small parchment codex, contains a fragment of the *Didache* 1,4, with two interesting readings that differ from the text that we know from other sources.

The *Shepherd* of *Hermas has the following primary papyrological witnesses: P.Mich. 130, a fragment of a papyrus scroll from the end of the 2nd c. (Faym), containing *Mand.* II, 6–III, 1; and P.Mich. 129 of the 2nd half of the 3rd c. (Theadelphia or Lycopolis?), long fragments of a papyrus codex that restore large portions of the *Mandates* and the *Similitudes* and confirm the hypotheses that the work was not published just once and that the original redaction began with the fifth Vision.

*Melito of Sardis's *De Pascha* has been transmitted in two series of folios of a papyrus codex: P. Chester-Beatty XII and P.Bodm. XIII, respectively datable to 3rd-4th c. The connections of this famous document to the *apocryphal texts known as the *Acta Ioannis* (2nd c.) has caused some to suspect a common theological tradition on the central theme concerning trinitarian and christological doctrine.

The most ancient and direct witness to *Irenaeus's *Adversus haereses* is the P.Oxy. III 405, which contains seven fragments of a papyrus scroll almost contemporaneous to the author. One of the fragments contains a citation of Mt 3:6-7 that conforms to MS D of the NT, thus leading one to conclude that Irenaeus must have known of the text today found in Codex Bezae.

Among the numerous papyrus finds that have enriched scholarly understanding of *Origen's texts is the codex of Tura (6th-7th c.), published by J. Scherer in 1949: the codex reports Origen's interesting christological discussion with Heraclides, in which it becomes evident that laypeople were actively involved in the debate. Also surviving from *Tura is a papyrus codex datable to the 6th-7th c. and containing Origen's *De Pascha* (published by O. Guéraud and P. Nautin), a text in which one finds helpful comparisons in the exegetical **catenae*.

The various commentaries of *Didymus the Blind, originating from the Monastery of St. Arsenius of Tura, believed to contain Origenist tendencies, possess much value for patristic research.

There are papyri for the texts of *Basil the Great, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, *John Chrysostom and *Cyril of Alexandria. Also of much interest in this respect is a group of patristic fragments unidentified or anonymous (more than a hundred in the catalog of van Haelst), which make a sizeable contribution to our collection of patristic texts.

Among the few Latin papyri, we should mention four parchment sheets from the 4th c. with sections of *Augustine's *Sermons* 34 and 38, and a *Psalmus responsorius* (P.Barc.Inv. 149-153), which an editor improperly titled *A Hymn to the Virgin Mary*, the primary source of which is the *Protevangelium of James*.

Among the literary papyri found in Egypt, a large collection of Coptic codices discovered in 1945 at *Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt deserves separate consideration. This is a collection of Coptic translations made in the 4th c. composed of religious-philosophical writings, the Greek text of which has not been preserved. For the most part, they are *gnostic and hermetic works, but a sapiential text is also present, *The Teachings of Silvanus*. The so-called library of Nag Hammadi has attracted and continues to attract the attention of many scholars. Catalogs of Christian literary papyri can be found in K. Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*, I: *Biblische Papyri*, Berlin 1976, and in J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Paris 1976, as well as in some electronic programs, among the most important and convenient of which is the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB), which is available online: www.trismegistos.org/ldab/.

II. Documentary papyri. Scholars who study various aspects of church history, and esp. the Egyptian church, can find interesting pieces of information within the enormous mass of Greek and Coptic documentary papyri—a mass that continually grows thanks to new publications.

The chance of finding useful information is all the more likely when one deals not only with an isolated text but also with collections (improperly called "archives"), i.e., with groups of documents written by or related to a single person or institution or deriving from a person or an institution's archive (e.g., of a church or of a monastic center). Particularly valuable are two collections of Coptic texts that are the remains of the archives of two bishops from Upper Egypt who lived during the 1st half of the 7th c., Abraham and *Pisenthios.

The "Christian" documentary papyri begin to appear at the outset of the 3rd c. Their number increases over the course of the century and then much more rapidly in the 4th c. These provide us plenty of information on the lives of the Christian communities of Egypt (unfortunately, not *Alexandria's: not one papyrus has been preserved at either Alexandria or the Delta). They make it possible for one to gain a more precise knowledge of some regions than others in the world of Late Antiquity, the network of churches and income, their expenses, those who made up the clergy, and the behavior of some bishops.

Documents originating in monastic centers are very important. They may allow scholars to correct and complete the information supplied by other literary sources (*The History of Monks in Egypt, The Lausiac History*, the documentation provided by *Pachomius, the *Apothegmata Patrum*, etc.). It was the documentary papyri, e.g., that convinced scholars of the coexistence of various types of *monasticism—eremitism, semi-anchorite *laurae*, cenobitism—this was the normal situation in Egypt down through the centuries until the Arab conquest. Analogously, the documentary papyri have shown us that the obligation of renouncing one's possessions the moment one entered monastic life was the exception, not the rule, for Egyptian monasticism.

The so-called private letters provide a case of their own. Note that papyrologists apply this term to any letter preserved by a papyrus with the exception of letters written by or sent to any office of the state. According to this terminological convention, a letter, for instance, sent by the head of a Christian community to the head of another Christian community vouching for one of his traveling lay faithful is classified as a "private letter." Private Christian letters supply an enormous amount of information not found in other sources. These are written in language very close to the spoken language of the day, more or less uninfluenced by literary customs. They allow us to see and observe in concrete detail ordinary Christians immersed in their daily activities and their daily interactions with pagans.

For the history of doctrinal conflicts, documentary papyri are less important (they hardly need to be taken into consideration).

A helpful list of papyrological editions, which pertains to Greek documents, is supplied by J.F. Oates - R.S. Bagnall - W.H. Willis - K.A. Worp, *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraka*, 4th ed., Atlanta 1992; and for Coptic documents by A.A. Schiller, *A Checklist of Coptic Documents and Letters*: Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrology 13 (1976) 99-123. Documentary papyri published in journals are systematically republished in two special collections: for Greek documentary papyri we have the *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, in many volumes since 1915 on, edited

by F. Bilabel, then by E. Kiessling, then by H.-A. Rupprecht; for Coptic documentary papyri *Koptisches Sammelbuch*, of which vol. I, edited by M.R.M. Hasitzka, was released in 1993. Another edition of all Coptic documents ordered acc. to category is underway at the *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*, since vol. 29 (1999), and is being edited by T.S. Richter. See too, K. Aland - H.-U. Rosenbaum, *Repertorium des griechischen christlichen Papyri*, vols. I-II, Berlin-New York 1976–95; K. Treu - J. Diethart, *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhalts*. II: *Textband*, Vienna 1993.

Two excellent introductions to papyrology are E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford [2]1980, [1]1968, It. tr. (with supplementary annotations by M. Manfredi) *Papiri greci*, Florence 1984; O. Montevecchi, *La papirologia*, repr. rev. and corrected with addenda, Milan 1988 ([1]1973).

Reviews of editions of papyri: E.A. Judge - S.R. Pickering, *Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community in Egypt to the Mid-Fourth Century*: JbAC 20 (1977) 47-71; O. Montevecchi, *La documentazione papiracea del III secolo d. C. Aspetti e problemi*: Aegyptus 73 (1993) 57-69; M. Naldini, *Egitto cristiano: testimonianze papirologiche*, in A. Camplani (ed.), *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, Rome 1997, 273-289; E. Wipszycka, *Les papyrus documentaires concernant l'Église d'avant le tournant constantinien. Un bilan des vingt dernières années*, in Atti del XXII Congr. Int. di Papirologia, Florence 2001, 1307-1330.

M. Naldini - E. Wipszycka

PARABALANI (Parabolani). According to the *Codex Theodosianus* (hereafter CTh), the parabalani were *qui ad curanda debilium aegra corpora deputantur* (CTh 16,2,43) at Alexandria: accordingly, they established the nursing personnel of the church at *Alexandria, but we do not know exactly the nature of their work. Likewise, we do not know when they began, but as early as the beginning of the 5th c. they constituted a powerful organization, which at times caused chaos in cities. Therefore, after the death of *Hypatia—we do not know if they were involved—*Theodosius released a law in 416 restricting their privileges and their activities that were not specifically intended to provide humanitarian aid. Moreover, he ordered that their members be of a poor background—the *honorati* and the *curiales* could not be parabalani—their number should not exceed 500 (CTh 16, 2, 42), a number that two years later was increased to 600 (CTh 16, 2, 43). They should not meddle in public affairs (shows, city governance and tribunals, for fear that they might interfere with the judicial decisions). The parabalani, acc. to this law of 418, were under the authority of the bishop of Alexandria (for a brief period they were under the *augustalis* prefect); on certain occasions they could be his right-hand man, as in the case of the *Latrocinium* *Ephesus in 449 (Mansi 6, 828). The parabalani enjoyed a certain amount of the clergy's privileges, but even though they were named in the CTh under the title *de clericis*, we are unsure if they belonged to the clergy. The legislation of the CTh partially passed into the CJ (CTh 16, 2, 42 = CJ 1, 3, 17; CTh 16, 2, 43 = CJ 1, 3, 18).

DACL 13, 1574-1578. F. Martroye, *Les parabalani d'Alexandrie*: Bulletin de la Société nationale des Ant. de France (1923) 275-281; H. Grégoire, *Sur le personnel hospitalier des Églises. "Parabalani et Privatarii"*: Byzantion 13 (1938) 283-285; A. Philipsborn, *La compagnie d'ambulanciers "parabalani" d'Alexandrie*: Byzantion 20 (1950) 185-190; W. Schubart, *Parabalani*: JEA 40 (1954) 97-101; J. Rougé, *La politique de Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le meurtre d'Hypatie*: Cristianesimo nella storia 11 (1990) 485-504 (esp. 500-501); Cyrille de Alexandrie, *Lettres festales*, SC 372, Paris 1991, 57ff., 69 n.1.

A. Di Berardino

PARABLE. In the technical language of ancient *rhetoric, the term παραβολή (Lat. *conlatio*, *similitudo*; see Cicero, *De invent.* 1, 30, 49) indicates a more or less broad and detailed comparison between two terms pertaining to different contexts. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 11, 20), though distinguishing parable from a story occurring outside reality, numbers the former among the examples that supply the orator generally accepted proofs. In the NT, in addition to Heb 9:9; 11:19, where it acquires the meaning of *symbol, the term παραβολή is found numerous times in the synoptic gospels and is used in the vast gamut of meanings contained in the Hebrew term *mashal* (Aramaic *mathla*): from time to time it can mean a solemn and enigmatic statement, a piece of advice for knowing how to live, a typical case, a metaphor, a brief image, a comparison, an analogy or a story. In other NT passages we find the term παροιμία, the sense of which fluctuates between similitude (Jn 10:6), proverb (2 Pet 2:22) and an enigmatic speech (Jn 16:25, 29). As C.H. Dodd observed (*The Parables of the Kingdom*, New York [2]1961, 5): "At its simplest the parable is a metaphor or simile drawn from nature or common life, arresting the hearer by its vividness or strangeness, and leaving the mind in sufficient doubt about its precise application to tease it into active thought." The simple metaphor can be enriched by particular details and can become a complete image and subsequently a story and a true and proper account. And in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, the term παραβολή is found in the so-called *Letter of *Barnabas* and in the *Shepherd* of *Hermas. In *Barnabas* 6,10, with respect to Ex 33:3, this term indicates an enigmatic affirmation that should be interpreted allegorically (see also *Barn.* 17, 2). The third part of the *Shepherd* of Hermas is designated as the παραβολαί, which,

with regard to the first five, are similar to the synoptic parables; a parable requires explanation (see *Sim.* V,3,1; 4,1), acc. to a conception analogous to that present in Mk 4:34 (one should note that the same term ἐπιλύω appears with the reference to the explanation of the parable).

According to *Clement of Alexandria, a parable is a speech that leads the hearer from what is similar to the proper sense—to what is true and proper—or it is an expression that in another way powerfully shows what is said in the proper sense (*Strom.* VI, 15,126). *Origen, who also had in mind this type of definition for parable, adds another: the parable is a speech relating to a fact presented as if it had already occurred, but it has not really occurred, but it could occur; such a discourse indicates, in a figurative sense, some transfer of meaning inasmuch as it is said in a parable (*In Ps.* 77,2: Analecta Sacra III, p. 111; see also *Fragm. in Pr.* 1,6: PG 13, 20C). He distinguishes the parable from the αἴνιγμα that consists in the exposition of events that have not been verified and cannot occur and that express an arcane meaning in a hidden way (*Fragm. in Pr.* 1,6: PG 13, 25B; see Jerome, *Tract. de Ps.* 77,2: CCL 78, 65); the fact recounted by the enigma is therefore unlikely in comparison to the parable. On the other hand, Origen also appears to distinguish the parable from the similitude, on the basis of Mk 4:30, emphasizing that the former is specific and the latter generic (*Comm. in Matt.* X, 4), but further along he seems to call into question such a distinction (ibid. 16 and also 11). In any case, for Origen the hidden teaching expressed by the parable is intended to stimulate the human spirit toward investigation, the condition of every discovery of the truth (see M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné*, Paris 1958, 245); the Logos, in order to exercise the understanding of the hearers, has indicated some truths under the form of enigmas, others in obscure speeches, others in parables and others in difficult questions (*C. Cels.* III, 45). *John Chrysostom, who seems to associate the term παραβολή with αἴνιγμα (*In Jo. hom.* 47, 1), observes with regard to Mt 13:15 that had not the Lord desired the salvation of his hearers, he would have remained silent and would not have spoken in parables, but precisely this parabolic language, with its manner of expressing itself in a veiled way, invites their attention (*In Matt. hom.* 45, 2). For *Cyril of Alexandria, the parables are images of things not visible, but rather intelligible and spiritual; what one cannot see with the eyes of the body, the parable makes visible with the eyes of the mind, bestowing a beautiful form to the subtlety of intelligible things through sensible and almost tangible things (*Comm. in Lc.* VIII: PG 72, 624 CD).

With regard to the Latin Christian authors, *Tertullian, in reference to the parables found in the gospels, uses the term *parabola* interchangeably with *similitudo* (see *De praescr. haer.* 26,3; *De paen.* 8,4); *Hilary usually considers the parables of the NT *similitudines* (*In Matt.* 13,7; 21,8) and *comparationes* (*In Matt.* 6,6; 20,5; 21,13). For the term *parabola* meaning *comparatio*, see also *Cassiodorus (*Exp. in Ps.* 56,2 with regard to Mt 23:37). The association of the concept of the parable to those of *similitudo* and *comparatio* is found in the writings of *Gaudentius of Brescia, who shows how it is the characteristic of the perfect teacher to make use of parabolic language for instructing his disciples and stimulating them to action (*Tract.* 18: CSEL 68, 153). *Jerome notes that it was the custom of the Syrians and esp. the Palestinians to insert parables in all their speeches because what the listeners could not understand by means of simple teaching becomes understandable through similitude and examples (*Comm. in Matt.* 18,23). He also considers the parable a similitude: *quae ab eo vocatur, quod alteri* παραβάλλεται, *hoc est adsimilatur, et quasi umbra proemiumve veritatis est* (*Ep.* 121,6: CSEL 56, 23. For the contrast *parabola-veritas*, see *Ep.* 49,13: CSEL 54, 370; see also *Theodoret, *In Ez.* 20,49: PG 81, 1008A). He emphasizes that the Lord spoke in many parables to the crowds so that his various teachings might be accepted acc. to the disposition of each individual's *soul, and united clear things with obscure things in order to stimulate his audience to an understanding of what they did not understand by means of things they did understand (*Comm. in Matt.* 13, 3). *Ambrose considered the parable a figure demanding a solution (*Expl. Ps.* 43, 56) and distinguished the *narratio from the *parabola*, as in the case of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, a parable that even uses the name of one of the figures (*Expos. ev. sec. Lc.* VIII, 13; see also Jerome, *Hom. de Lazaro et divite.* CCL 78, 507). In *Augustine's writings, one finds the concept of *parabola* associated with that of *similitudo* and *aenigma* (see *Enarr. in Ps.* 68, *Serm.* 1,15; *In Ps.* 48, *Serm.* 1,5, where he affirms: *Aenigma est obscura parabola quae difficile intelligitur*; *Serm.* 93,1); in the parables and in the figures that are not understood in the proper sense (*aliud ex alio est intellegendum*; *Contra mend.* 24). Augustine divides the parables found in the gospels into groups, the first of which conforms *secundum similitudinem aliquam*, such as Mt 18:23-35; Lk 7:41-43; 15:11-32, the second *ex ipsa dissimilitudine* (acc. to the dissimilarity itself), such as Mt 6:30; 7:7-11; Lk 16:1-13: in the first case the distinctive character of the two terms of

comparison in the parable is the similarity; in the other, the dissimilarity (*Quaest. evang. lib.* 11,45).

In the writings of ancient Christian authors, despite the variety of their attitudes and manners of expression, one can discern a common thread: the parabolic language expressed by *Jesus tends to invite reflection and understanding from the hearers so that whoever is guided by an upright intention can more easily understand the Lord's salvific message and thereby translate it into action.

TDNT 5, 744-761; DBS 6, 1149-1177; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, Eng. tr., London [3]1972; C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London-New York [2]1961; M. Marin, *Ricerche sull'esegesi agostiniana della parabola delle dieci vergini* (*Mt 25,1-13*), Bari 1981, 49-64; V. Fusco, *Oltre la parabola. Introduzione alle parabole di Gesù*, Rome 1983; A. Sáenz, *Las parábolas del evangelio según los Padres de la Iglesia*, Buenos Aires 1994 (*La misericordia de Dios*), 1995 (*La misericordia con el prójimo*), 1997 (*La figura señorial de Cristo*), 1999 (*El misterio de Israel y de las naciones*); S. Zincone, *Parlare in parabole. Osservazioni sull'esegesi crisostomiana di Mt. 13, 10 sgg.*, Omaggio a D. Sabbatucci, SMSR 62, XX (1996) 685-690.

S. Zincone

PARACLETE. The modern term *paraclete* comes from the Latin *paraclitus* (*paracletus*), which is a loan word from the Greek noun *paraklētos* (from *parakaleō*, "I call on, beseech, console, exhort"; composed of *para* [near] and *kaleō* [I call]). *Paraklētos* means advocate, intercessor and spokesperson. Its first meaning, therefore, strictly speaking, was not juridical; the one who has been called upon must defend and help the one accused (Demosthenes, *Oratio* 19, 1; Diogenes L. 4, 50), but it did not become a technical term like the Latin noun *advocatus*.

The term is absent from the Septuagint; *Philo of *Alexandria applied it to an intercessor before other men (*In Flacc.* 13, 151 and 181) and before God (GLNT 9, 682-683 [TWNT 5, 801]). In the NT, it is used only five times in *John's writings. Jesus Christ the righteous is the paraclete before the Father for sinners (1 Jn 2:1: "we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous"). Alongside Jesus, the Father will send another paraclete (Jn 14:16: "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another [paraclete] to be with you forever"). The *Holy Spirit, the other paraclete, is a teacher of truth for the disciples (Jn 14:26: "but the [paraclete], the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and will bring to remembrance all that I have said to you"); he will bear witness to Christ (Jn 15:26: "when the [paraclete] comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, he will bear witness to me"). Christ himself will send the paraclete to continue his mission in the world (Jn 16:7: "it is to your advatage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the [paraclete] will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you"). Jesus identifies the paraclete with the Holy Spirit. In many languages, the term *paraclete* is often translated as "comforter," which does not fully convey the meaning of the word as found in John's text, because "neither Jesus nor the Spirit is described as a 'comforter'" (TWNT 5, 802; TDNT 5, 804]).

The *Fathers interpreted the term *paraclete*, when applied to Jesus, as "intercessor" (Clement Alex., *Quis dives* 25,7); for *Origen, Christ is the intercessor (*Comm. in Ioh.* 1,33; *De princ.* 2,7,4). In addition to this meaning applied to the Holy Spirit, *paraclete* was often understood as "comforter" (Eus. Caes., *De ecc. theol.* 3,5,11-12.; John Chrys., *Hom. in Ioh.* 75: PG 59, 403). The Latin translations of the Bible at times rendered the term *paraklētos* with the simple transliteration *paraclitus*, while other translations used *advocatus* and *consolator*. This phenomenon was very important for the Fathers' use and explanations of the term. *Tertullian understood the term *paraclete* as *advocatus*, thus preserving the juridical aspect (*De ieiun.* 13: *Paraclitus id est advocatus*; *De monog.* 3), but other Latin Fathers also understood it as comforter (e.g., Hilary, *Tr. in Ps.* 125,7; Jerome, *Ep.* 120,9). *Hilary himself at times understood it as *advocatus* (*De trinitate* 8,19: *cum advenerit advocatus ille*); *Augustine affirmed *paracletus enim latine dicitur advocatus* (*Tr. in Ioh.* 74,4); he even specifies: *consolator ergo ille vel advocatus* (*utrumque interpretatur quod est graece paracletus*) (Aug., *Tr. in Ioh. Ev.* 94,2). The terminological question was only partially connected to the development of the doctrine of the *Holy Spirit.

GLNT 9, 675-715 (TWNT 5, 798-812; TDNT 5, 800-814); Lampe, 1018-19; A. Casurella, *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers*, Tübingen 1983; E. Franck, *Revelation Taught. The Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, Lund-Malmö 1985; S.J. Bulgakov, *Il Paraclito*, Bologna 1987; G. Ferraro, *Il Paraclito, Cristo, il Padre nel quarto Vangelo*, Vatican City 1997; Id., *Lo Spirito e Cristo nel commento al quarto Vangelo e nel trattato trinitario di sant'Agostino*, Vatican City 1997; L. Dattrino - G. Di Nola, *Lo Spirito Santo nella testimonianza dei Padri e degli scrittori cristiani* (*I-V sec.*), Rome 1999; D. I. Rankin, *Tertullian's Vocabulary of the Divine "Individuals" in "Adversus Praxean"*: SE 40 (2001) 5-46; R. Uglione, *Tertulliano. Teologo e scrittore*, Brescia 2002.

A. Di Berardino

PARADISE. From the Avestan word *pairi-daēza*, "enclosed park," from which come the Late-Babylonian

term *pardisu* and the Hebrew word *pardes*. The latter term appears in the OT in Neh 2:8 and Song 4:13 with the meaning of "orchard, forest." The Septuagint translated it with παράδεισος, a term Xenophon used to refer to the park of the Persian kings: Cyrus himself showed the paradise of Sardi to Lisander, which he himself measured and laid out acc. to aesthetical principles, and in which he also personally planted some trees (*Oecon.* IV, 20-21). The Septuagint gave this term a religious meaning, extending it also to the account of Gen 2:3, whence, at last, the term *paradisus* entered the Vulgate. In intertestamental *Judaism, the Garden of Eden became the repose of the *souls of the blessed, the patriarchs and the visionaries. It thus affirms the idea that the original paradise, today hidden, will return visibly at the end of time, a conception that finds its parallel in certain passages in the NT (Lk 23:43; 2 Cor 12:4 and Rev 2:7). St. Paul's writing reveals the tension between the eschatological goal and our heavenly dimension in the here and now, which we can summarize with his famous statement: "But our citizenship is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior" (Phil 3:20). For this tension in Paul's eschatology, see A.T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology*, Cambridge 1981.

In the writings of the Fathers, the term acquired a plurality of meanings to designate the definitive place where the eschatological destiny of the blessed would be fulfilled: the bosom of Abraham where they will rest; the heavenly *Jerusalem destined to receive them; the blessed life and its location, heaven, frequently identified with the paradise of Eden. Thus, *Cyprian (*Ad Fort.* XII) recalls during the time of persecution that if death takes us from this deceitful earth, it does so in order to transport us to paradise, the kingdom of heaven. *Basil used the two nouns *heaven* and *paradise* interchangeably. Moreover, using the cosmology of the time, he was the first to establish the origin and the particular nature of this paradisiacal heaven. Paradise, he maintained, is the highest heaven that defies every definition; it possesses a radiant brilliance and was created to receive angelic natures and make the friends of God blessed (*Hom. I in Hex.* V). *Cyril of Jerusalem, to the contrary, maintains that heaven is made up of water, the most beautiful element (*Cat.* III; *De bapt.* 5). Furthermore, one must recognize, he maintains, the multiplicity of heavens: only the third, to which St. Paul ascended, is to be identified with paradise (*Cat.* XIV; *De res.* 26). Even *Augustine places this location of the blessed in the apogee of the heavens (*illud summum coelum: De Gen. ad litt.* XII, 35), which coincides with Abraham's bosom or paradise (*In Jn.* 91; *Serm.* 280,5), even if it should not be confused with the angels' heaven (*Serm.* 26, 5; and *Enchir.* 73). Moreover, if paradise were indistinct from heaven, where else could it be located (*Enarr. in Ps.* XXX 3, 8)? Ultimately, the same reality is hidden behind all these various names, i.e., the place of the blessed (*De Gen. ad litt.* XII, 34, 65). In conclusion, facing the more pressing demands to locate it, Augustine concluded that after this life, God himself will be the place where our souls will rest (*Enarr. in Ps.* XXX, 3, 8).

Augustine's difficulties inevitably reflect the wavering of the *Fathers on determining the location of paradise. *Irenaeus of Lyons, e.g., distinguished heaven from paradise, the heaven of the holy city (*Adv. haeres.* V, 36, 1), because unequal merits produce an inequality of rewards. *Ephrem the Syrian sought to add some specificity: the admission of the saints into the kingdom of heaven will take place only after the *resurrection of the dead. The souls of the blessed, in the meantime, wait in heaven, not in the highest part of glory but in Eden, and that is in the heaven of paradise (*Carmina nisibena* LXXIII, ed. Bickell, Leipzig 1866, 222-223; Éphrem de Nisibe, *Hymnes sur le Paradis*, Fr. tr. R. Lavenant, intr. and comm. F. Graffin, Paris 1968 [SC 137]).

These differences, however, did not affect the images depicting the content of life in paradise during the afterlife, for which we find significant testimonies even in *epigraphy and *iconography. Already, the Apostolic Fathers recalled the reward that awaits the heirs of the kingdom: they will be allowed to seek Christ and live in communion with him (*Barn.* VII, 11); in the future, this reward will result in infinite happiness (Clem. Rome, *1 Cor.* XXXIV, 7-8). The writings of *Ignatius are replete with this idea: to be blessed with God (θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν: *ad Rom.* IV, 1; *ad Eph.* X, 1), the enjoyment of God that will be mediated through Jesus Christ. These themes are also at the heart of the passions and the martyrologies. The *martyrs of *Lyons yearned to be with Christ immediately to receive the crown of immortality (Eus., *HE* 5, 1). Saturus (*Passio Perp. et Fel.* XI) had a vision of the heights of heaven, toward the east, seeing an immense space resembling a blooming garden. Heaven thus appears to the martyrs as a promised paradise, a luminous place of rest and *peace.

Subsequent theologians elaborated upon these images. *Origen's description was significant. He mentions that the place of the blessed life, wherever it may be, is above the firmament and is a world of true light in which it will be possible to dwell thanks

to the glorious bodies the redeemed will possess at the resurrection (*C. Cels.* III, 42). When the redeemed reach this heaven, they will learn from God the true causes of events and will subsequently know invisible and ineffable things. At the end of this process, they will be pure intelligences capable of directly contemplating rational substances (*De princ.* II, 11, 7; on the question of the presence of a spiritual body for the blessed in paradise or of the total absence of the body, the possibility of which is left open by Origen, see the recent investigation by M.J. Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, Aldershot 2002). Origen's controversial theory of the **apokatastasis* maintains, moreover, that paradise will be understood at the end of time; all beings, even the enemy par excellence, called death, i.e., the devil, will no longer be an enemy and death inasmuch as he will be oriented toward the good, because, as St. Paul affirms in 1 Cor 15:28, "everything will be subject to Christ" and "God will be all in all" (*De princ.* I, 6,2 and 4; III, 5,6-8; 6,1-6; see M. Simonetti, *Origene. I Principi*, Turin 1968, 59, 71 and passim). In fact, "nothing is impossible for the Almighty, and nothing is incurable for the Creator" (*De princ.* I, 6,5; see also *Hom. in Ier.* I, 16; *C. Cels.* VIII, 72).

The issue of the deification of the blessed, the nature of the spiritual body and its relation to the earthly body, its duties and its functions was a privileged theme of reflection for the Fathers. *Lactantius, e.g., emphasizes the transformation that will take place in our faculties, which will be adapted to the new conditions of our heavenly residence (*Div. Inst.* VII, 26). *Ambrose favors the mystical theme of the elect's union with each other and with God (*De ob. Th.* XXIX). *Eusebius of Caesarea describes the soul of *Constantine as dressed in the splendor of light as it is being reunited to God, with his gaze fixed upon the heavenly vault (*De vita Const.* 1,2). The Cappadocians used vivid images to describe life in paradise. *Basil of Caesarea maintained that after the resurrection the elect will contemplate God directly (*Hom. in Ps.* XXXIII, 11). He compares the calm and infinite joy of this contemplation with the unforeseen rapturous moments of ecstasy that one can experience in this life (ibid. XXXII, 1). For *Gregory of Nazianzus, our joy will consist in contemplating the *Trinity; this will be possible because we will become children of God (*Or.* XXIV, 9). This theme returns in the thought of *Gregory of Nyssa: in addition to immortality, our nature will find itself clothed with other divine qualities such as glory, power and perfection (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 156ff.). The descriptions that some Eastern Fathers offered were full of detail. *Aphraates, e.g., maintained that the air of those sublime regions will be infinitely sweet, fitting for glorious bodies clothed with eternal light and nourished by the divinity. An eternal spring is destined to cause the marvelous trees planted by the Lord to flourish in a garden without limits and boundaries (*Dem.* VIII, *De res. mort.* 22: PS 1, 402).

For Augustine, lastly, our moral perfection and our final happiness will consist in knowing and loving the divine Trinity; this is the blessedness awaiting the angels and the redeemed (*De Trin.* VIII, 4-8). All this will be possible thanks to the eyes of the risen and transfigured body (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 29, 3-6). The greatest joy will consist in praising God. There will be degrees of honor based upon merit, but there will be no jealousy. The saints will continue to use their free will and will finally lack the ability to commit *sin. Eternal life for the redeemed will be a perpetual *sabbath in which they will be brimming with blessing and sanctification from God. Thus will the words of the psalmist be fulfilled: "be still and know that I am God" (*Civ. Dei* XXII, 30, 1-4).

DTC 2 2474-2511 (Ciel); RGG[3] 5, 96-98 (Paradies. II im AT); J. Goubert - L. Cristiani, *Les plus beaux textes sur l'au-delà*, Paris 1950; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt in Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, WUNT 2, Tübingen 1951; J.Ph. McClain, *The Doctrine of Heaven in the Writings of Saint Gregory the Great*, Studies in Sacred Theology. Second series 95, Washington, DC 1956; G.L. Rossi, *Teologia dell'oltretomba. Paradiso*, Turin 1957; G.M. Colombás, *Paraíso y Vida Angélica. Sentido escatológico de la vocación cristiana*, Barcelona 1958; I. Colosio, *Inchiesta teologica sul Paradiso e saggi storico-bibliografici sulla visione beatifica*, Florence 1964; MySal XI, Brescia 1978; J.L. Ruiz de la Peña, *La otra dimensión*, Madrid [2]1975 (ch. VII: *La vida eterna*) (It. tr. Assisi 1981); A. Orbe, *Cristología gnóstica. Introducción a la soteriología de los siglos II y III*, I-II, Biblioteca de autores cristianos 384-385, Madrid 1976; J. Magne, *From Christianity to Gnosis and from Gnosis to Christianity: An Itinerary Through the Texts to and from the Tree of Paradise*, Brown Judaic Studies 286, Atlanta 1993; J.B. Russell, *Storia del Paradiso*, Rome-Bari 1996; G.P. Luttikhuizen, ed., *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity, Proceedings of the Congress: Groningen 1999* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 2), Leiden 1999; J. Delumeau, *Quel che resta del Paradiso*, It. tr. Milan 2001.

On the Zoroastrian understanding of paradise: *The Book of the Mainyo-I-Khard*, Stuttgart-London 1871; *The Book of Arda Viraf*, Bombay-London 1872. On the iconography of paradise: Ph. Camby, *Le paradis et les naïfs*, Paris 1983; W.A. McClung, *Dimore celesti. L'architettura del Paradiso*, Intersezioni 33, Bologna 1987. On the relation between paradise and earthly paradise: A. Graf, *Miti, leggende e superstizioni del Medio Evo*, Turin 1925; R.R. Grimm, *Paradisus coelestis, Paradisus terrestris. Zur Auslegungsgeschichte des Paradieses im Abendland bis um 1200*, Medium Aevum: philologische Studien 33, Munich 1977; P. Giovetti, *Inchiesta sul paradiso*, Milan 1986; J. Delumeau, *Une Histoire du Paradis. Le jardin des délices*, Paris 1992, It. tr. *Storia del Paradiso: il giardino delle delizie*, Bologna 1994; P. Morris - D. Sawyer (eds.), *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical*

and Literary Images of Eden, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Suppl. 136, Sheffield 1992; T. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 25, Leuven 2000, with an extensive bibl. on pp. 493-560.

G. Filoramo -I Ramelli

PARALYTIC, Healing of the (iconography). The gospels narrate the healing of the paralytics performed by Christ in various places and conditions: the first occurred at Capernaum (Mt 9:1-8; Mk 2:3-12; Lk 5:18-26), the second, in the environs of the pool of Bethesda by the sheep gate (Jn 5:1-9). Very frequently already in the ancient repertoire and in the depictions found in the catacombs, the story from the gospels is generally synthesized into one sole image: the paralytic leaves with his pallet on his shoulders in obedience to Christ's command: "rise, take up your pallet, and walk" (see, e.g., fresco of the Chapel of the Sacraments A3 in the *cemetery of Callistus, which provides one of its most ancient testimonies: Wp 27, 3). Often the image of the paralytic is placed alongside a baptismal scene to emphasize the symbolic nexus between the healing of the paralytic and the remission of *sin. There are a few painted examples in which the healed paralytic is standing alongside Christ (and among these, the most important of these is the baptistery of *Dura Europos, from the second quarter of the 3rd c.: see C.H. Kraeling, *The Christian Building: The Excavations at Dura Europos. Final report VIII*. 2, New Haven 1967, pl. 18); this is very different from what one finds on funerary reliefs, where the figure of the Redeemer is in the act of speaking the word or laying on hands (*impositio manus*), and even frequently one or more of the disciples become an essential part of the depiction. Entirely lacking in the *paintings and the images on the sarcophagi is the slightest hint of the place or circumstance that would allow one to identify which of Christ's healings of a paralytic is being depicted. The focus centers on the figure of the paralytic as a paradigm of Christ's saving power and a symbol of the trust placed in such power.

One exception is offered by the depiction of the miracle on *sarcophagi that are often called the "Bethesda-type," esp. rich in details, of which many elements depend upon *John's text: the episode is represented through two images, one placed above the other, divided by a wavy stripe that is intended to represent the water of the pool near the sheep gate; at the bottom, the paralytic, surrounded by other sick people, is still laid out on his pallet as Christ is approaching him; toward the top, next to the Lord, who is in the act of issuing his command, the healed paralytic walks away with a pallet on his shoulders (see, for instance, among the more complete depictions, the example provided by sarcophagus 125 of the Museo Pio Cristiano, dating to the last quarter of the 4th c. = *Rep.* no. 63).

Among the *mosaics, one should note the splendid representation found in the basilica of S. Apollinare at *Ravenna from the 6th c. (Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken*, pl. 175-176). Though less frequent than in painting and funerary reliefs, the miracle of the paralytic is present even in the repertoire of the iconography of the so-called minor arts: golden glass (Morey - Ferrari, *Gold-Glass*, nos. 159, 347, 366, 448; Kötzsche, *Age of Spirituality*, p. 442 no. 401); ceramics (Salomonson, *Late Roman*, 72-73; Kötzsche, ibid., p. 443 no. 402 [see other examples]); ivories (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, nos. 113, 119, 125, 142, 152, 170, 179, 180, 181, 185, 221, 233, 234) and metalwork (Volbach, *Metallarbeiten*, p. 38, pl. 7).

DACL 13, 1615-1626; EC 9, 806-808; Wp, 201ff.; Ws II, 293ff.; E. Baldwin Smith, *Early Christian Iconography and School of Ivory Carvers in Provence*, Princeton, NJ 1918, 102ff.; W.F. Volbach, *Metallarbeiten des christlichen Kultus in der Spätantike and frühen Mittelalter*, Mainz 1921; M. Simun, *Sur l'origine des sarcophages chrétiens du type Béthesda*: MEFRA 55 (1938) 207ff.; F. Gerke, *Die christlichen Sarkophage der vorkonstantinischen Zeit*, Berlin 1940, 216ff.; L. de Bruyne, *L'imposition des mains dans l'art chrétien ancien*: RivAC 20 (1943) 113-266; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike and frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz [2]1952; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten and Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden-Baden 1958; C.R. Morey - G. Ferrari, *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections*, Vatican City 1959; J.W. Salomonson, *Late Roman Earthenware with Relief Decoration Found in Northern Africa and Egypt*: Oudheidkundige Mededelingen 43 (1962) 72-73.; R. Giordani, *Di un singolare rilievo funerario cristiano del Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Cagliari*: RivAC 52 (1976) 171-184; L. Kötzsche, in *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art: Third to Seventh Century*, New York 1979; A. Nicoletti, *I sarcofagi di Bethesda*, Milan 1981; F. Monfrin, *La guérison du serviteur (Jn. 4,43-54). Une nouvelle interprétation des sarcophages de Béthesda*: MEFRA 97 (1985) 979-1012; M. Minasi: TIP 241-243; B. Outtier, *Dialogue du paralytique avec le Christ*, in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*. II, Paris 2005, 61-74.

M. Marinone

PARAPETASMA. The Greek term παραπέτασμα, corresponding to the Latin *cortinae*, *vela* or *antependia*, is generally used to refer to the curtains that, as early as the 3rd c., are found with a certain frequency on *pagan and Christian *sarcophagi, on the back of the busts of the departed or praying figures (**orantes*), on the center of the front, the side panels or on the lid. At times, these drapes are supported at the

ends by two figures (*erotes*, *genii*, victories), as, e.g., on the lid of the so-called Albani sarcophagus from S. Sebastiano (Ws 40 = *Rep.* 241), but in the majority of cases these are just hanging with flamboyant nodes on the upper corners (see, e.g., Ws 98, 1 = Rep. 73 and Rep. 76). The purpose of the parapetasma is not entirely clear; nevertheless, scholars believe that it was a symbol that generically alluded to the afterlife. According to Bovini, this can probably be seen in relation to the curtains used in the funerary ceremonies, but its genuine function was probably lost over time. The parapetasma thus became a simple ornament for enlivening and enriching the background behind some figures (in the so-called sarcophagus of *Plotinus, the parapetasma occupies the entire front). Cumont's theory, however, did not find much acceptance. His theory saw in the parapetasma the presence of certain apocryphal Hebrew texts, acc. to which the good spirits would cover the deceased with a radiant garment (restored with the parapetasma) to carry it to heaven. The veils that appear on the *mosaics of public or private buildings (e.g., *Theodoric's *palatium* at S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna) and the so-called minor arts (see the scene of Christ in the act of teaching in the reliquary of Brescia) have an entirely different meaning connected to an actual use.

DAGR 9, 670-677; G. Rodenwaldt, *Cortinae. Ein Beitrag zur Datierung der antiken Vorlage der mittelalterlichen Terenzillustrationen*: NGWG (1925) 33-49; F. De Ruyt, *Études de symbolisme funéraire*: Bulletin de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome 17 (1936) 143-185; F. Cumont, *Lux perpetua. Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, Paris 1942, 476; G. Bovini, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani*, Vatican City 1949, 57-58; Volbach – Hirmer, figs. 85-86, p. 75; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden-Baden 1958, figs. 107-109; D. Mazzoleni, s.v. *Parapetasma*: TIP 243.

D. Mazzoleni

PARAPHRASES, BIBLICAL and HAGIOGRAPHICAL

I. Biblical - II. Hagiographical.

Scholars use the term *paraphrase* (biblical and hagiographical) to refer to the literary genre associated with, on the one hand, the broad production of biblical content, which spans Late Antique, medieval and modern European literary culture (from *Juvencus to Vida, Tasso, Milton, Klopstock and others) and, on the other hand, the less broad, but no less significant, poetic production of hagiographical content that spans above all, but not only, Byzantine literary culture. With respect to "biblical (or hagiographical) poetry," which is a rather generic term, if not completely ambiguous (Krüger, Kartschoke), and with respect to "biblical epos (or hagiographical)" (Wehrli, Hergoz, Kirsch), which is a label that does not suit all poetic compositions (the hexameter being insufficient to qualify them *tout court* as epics!, our use of "paraphrase (biblical and hagiographical)," established on the notion of a reworking of the biblical stories and the *Lives* of the saints, is more appropriate for identifying literary compositions that have for more than a millennium preserved the distinctive traits of the genre, even though changing some constituent techniques and altering their religious and edifying significance. *Paraphrase*, which as a term in modern literature has outlasted rival terms from ancient rhetoric such as *metaphrase, metabolē* or *periphrase*, designates every type of composition that involves the transcoding of one language into another, or rather, within the language itself, from one style to another, from one meter to another, from poetry to prose and vice versa.

Important texts on classical paraphrases are Aelius Theo (*Progymn.* 1, CUF 1997, 1-9) and Quintillian (1,9,2 and 10,5,4-5). Theo believed that reading, listening and paraphrase were three exercises for the initial classical program: reading prepares for oratorical action (*actio*); listening prepares for written composition, enriching vocabulary; paraphrasing teaches the art of formulating ideas through four principal means: the arrangement of elements, addition, subtraction and substitution. For Quintillian the paraphrase preceded the exercise of literary composition. In 1,9,2, he dwells at length on the phases of this exercise: "the first task (of the students) will be the transposition of verses (of Aesop's fables) in prose (*versus primo solvere*), then an explanation with different words (*mox mutatis verbis interpretari*) and lastly a rather free paraphrase (*tum paraphrasi audacius vertere*), which allows one to summarize the text and embellish it without offending the meaning." And in 10,5,4, after having emphasized the usefulness of translation from Greek into Latin, he claims that just as useful is the *conversio ex* Latinis, which is not a translation from Latin, as has been demonstrated, but the paraphrase of a Latin model, and he adds: *Neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum uolo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem* ("and I do not want the interpretation to be a mere paraphrase, but a struggle in emulation with respect to the meaning"; 10,5,5). In sum, the *paraphrasis* should not be reduced to a mere *interpretatio*: the latter, inasmuch as it is a translation, aims at faithfulness to the sense; the former, inasmuch as it is an *aemulatio*, belongs to the sphere of literary autonomy.

In the same way, *Jerome (in the prologue on

1 Kings) contrasts the *interpres*, who in the translation treats the text with respect, with the *paraphrastes*, who when interpreting takes many liberties with the text, and he specifies elsewhere (*In Is.* 17,64,4-5) that the paraphrase is not a literal transposition of a singular term, but an adaptation to the sense. The paraphrastic exercise—about whose utility in the sphere of eloquence Cicero expresses a certain amount of hesitancy (*De orator.* 1, 34, 154)—was practiced above all in prose. Mythological and historical themes (*progymnasmata*), often taken from poetry, were treated in prose during *Augustine's time (*Conf.* 1,17,27) and later on appear in *Ennodius's *dictiones*. The biblical and the hagiographical paraphrase reconnect to the ancient rhetorical paraphrase (in prose), the former of which were composed in the epic verse of Homer and Virgil, but also—a certain type in the Byzantine milieu—in iambics. To trace the lines of development and to demarcate the characteristics of the Christian paraphrase of paraphrastic poetry, which reached its apex in the 4th-5th c., would require reviewing the history of the biblical *epos*, which presupposes both the *interpretatio Christiana* of the classical epic and the *interpretatio epica* of the Bible (Thraede).

The paraphrase can be attributed to a metatextual relationship (Genette), originating and developing from other texts (biblical or hagiographical), which are necessary presuppositions for understanding it. The understanding of paraphrase as a metatextual phenomenon facilitates one's understanding of both the individual works and, more generally speaking, this originally Christian poetical genre, which arose not from the mere juxtaposition of two distinct cultural traditions—the tradition of the Greco-Roman paraphrase and the Jewish-Christian tradition with its scriptural interpretation—but from their free and fruitful interaction.

I. Biblical. *1. Greek biblical paraphrases.* The Hellenistic-Jewish milieu attests to the pre-Christian examples of OT hexametrical paraphrase. In this respect, *Eusebius of Caesarea preserved three fragments of *Philo the Elder's *De Jerusalem* (3rd c. BC), which imitates Lyocophron and Euphorion (*Praep. ev.* IX, 20, 24, 37), and one from Theodotus's *De Judaeis* (2nd c. BC), which Homerizes Gen 33 and 34 (ibid. IX, 22).

The first biblical paraphrase among Greek-speaking Christians was the *Ecclesiastes of Solomon* and *Gregory Thaumaturgus (PG 10, 987-1018), which puts the biblical books of the Septuagint translation into classical prose. According to *Socrates (*HE* 3, 16) and *Sozomen (*HE* 5, 18), the Christian poetical genre of paraphrase began in a Greek context, less than a century earlier, in 362, as a response to the edict of *Julian against Christian teachers. Immediately the Apollinarises (father and son, the latter to become the future heretic) went to work for Christian learning: the father put the five books of Moses to verse for didactic purposes (hexameters, but also tragic trimeters and Pindaric meters); the son rewrote the gospels in the form of Platonic dialogues. The *Metaphrases of the Psalter* of Apollinaris (who was neither the heretic nor one of the two from the crisis created by Julian), however, is to be dated around 460 or shortly thereafter. The author, probably an Egyptian religious who came to *Constantinople for political-doctrinal reasons, justifies recourse to epic verse by appealing to the need to recover the formal-metric dignity of the Hebrew Psalter, which was lost in the Greek translation of the Septuagint, for which reason Ptolemy preferred prose to poetry, and, to prepare an apologetic instrument for answering the *pagans (see *Protheoria* 15-23 Golega): the translatability of the Psalms can be achieved through Homeric language, which was also created by God as a language of song. The metaphrase that has come down to us slavishly follows the sacred text, replaces every stich of the Psalms with a hexameter and is orthodox in every respect. Also datable to the same time, the *Paraphrase* (*Metabolē*) *of the Gospel of St. John*, often claimed to be by *Nonnus of Panopolis, the author of the *Dionysiaca*. The *Metabolē*, a giant *summa* in 48 songs, expands John's text and rereads it acc. to *Cyril of Alexandria's exegesis.

2. Latin biblical paraphrases. Paraphrases of the Bible in the Latin world, which are mostly written in hexameters, took on a surprising variety of characteristics and forms: at one point a faithful transcription, respectful of the order of facts in their logical succession and averse to rhetorical amplification; at another point a free rehandling of the text (*retractatio*), enlivened by digressions or embellished by passages of doctrinal exegesis. By using a manner more or less emulative of Virgil, the paraphrase bestowed on the sacred text a colored epic and Romanized it. For the entry *Epos* in the RAC, Thraede delineated a morphological and typological map of the Christian *epos* and, therefore, also amorous biblical paraphrastic poetry in the Latin language, marking the various compositions. Even if at times these definitions emphasize only one—and not always the most important—of the aspects of these rather complex works, Thraede's work remains a laudable attempt at systematization.

The NT paraphrase in hexameters is represented

by the Spanish presbyter Juvencus, who, at the request of *Constantine's religious political program, composed the *Euangeliorum libri IV* between 329 and 330, a rather literal hexametric rewriting of the gospels. Another representative is Sedulius, an author living in the 2nd half of the 4th c. who wrote the *Paschale carmen* in five books, the first of which is devoted to the OT, and the *Paschale opus*, which is a paraphrase of the *Carmen* in a prose heavily subject to rhetoric and which began the *opus geminatum*, i.e., the composition of the same work in prose and in verses by the same author, who would enjoy much success in the Middle Ages (*Bede, Alcuin). Still other representatives include the subdeacon *Arator, who wrote the metric version of the Acts of the Apostles in 544 at St. Peter's in Rome, and *Severus of Malaga (end of the 6th c.), probably the author of the *Metrum in Evangelia* in 12 books, a fragment of 717 hexameters of which have survived from books VIII-X.

In the area of the OT paraphrase (and in particular Genesis) Thraede distinguishes the following: (a) the historical-grammatical paraphrase (*Paraphrase*): the anonymous works *De Sodoma* and *De Jona*, *Hilary's *De martyrio Maccabeorum*, *Victorinus's *De Maccabeis* and *Cyprian the poet's *Heptateuch*; (b) the rhetorical-didactic paraphrase (*Paraphrase*): ps.-Hilary's *Metrum in Genesin* and *Claudius Marius Victorius's *Alethia*; (c) the elegiac-hymnic reelaboration (*Umdichtung*): *Dracontius's *Laudes Dei*; (d) the lyrical-dramatic reelaboration (*Umdichtung*): *Avitus's work *De spiritalis historiae gestis*.

Through the terminological distinction between *Paraphrase* and *Umdichtung*, this survey also shows how the term "biblical epos," if its definition is confined only to the use of traditional heroic verse, cannot be applied to all the various works of biblical paraphrase: Proba's centos from Virgil, for instance, which sings of the creation of the world and the life of Christ, would remain inexplicable outside the category of epos. Neither could epos accommodate *Paulinus of Nola, who, after having experimented with abbreviating Suetonius's work *De regibus* (poem III is a fragment of it), paraphrased Luke 1:5-80 in poem VI, creatively sketching the person of *John the Baptist; and in poems VII (in iambic trimeters), VIII and IX, respectively, paraphrased Psalms 1, 2 and 136.

II. Hagiographical. *1. Greek hagiographical paraphrases.* The interrelationship between biblical paraphrase and hagiographical paraphrase is tied to the relationship of continuity that exists between their two hypotexts: Scripture and hagiographical literature. The latter appeared to be a practical exegesis of the former. The relationship between hagiography and Scripture is clearly affirmed by *Sulpicius, who at the end of his *Life* (2,468-472) claims for his writings the same faith the Christian owes to the Word of God, and in the *Dialogues* (1, 26, 5) he affirms that not believing in the miracles performed by *Martin is equivalent to denying the gospel. The saints are the successors of the people in the Bible, so that as a result their acts (*gesta*) are the natural extension of the acts (*gesta*) of the biblical heroes. *Venantius, in the prologue for the first book of his poem on Martin (vv. 10-25), presents himself as the heir of the biblical paraphrasers and makes known the desire to insert himself within that poetic tradition, bearing witness in this manner that even hagiography with its narration of the actions of the saints, who are similar to the people in the Bible, could and must be celebrated in a lofty form. In paraphrasing, they actualize their text and allow it to bear fruit in various contexts of space and time: their work extends the model of biblical paraphrase and contributes as much to spreading among their contemporaries the knowledge of the *virtutes* of the saint as to edifying the general public of the faithful. The demands for form and edification coexist in both the Greek and Latin hagiographical paraphrases. The use of the poetical paraphrase of nonbiblical texts must have been very widespread in Late Antiquity, between the 5th and 6th c., if Venantius proposed to *Gregory to put his collection of St. Martin's miracles into verse (*vita Mart. epist. ad Greg.* 2) and Gregory concluded the *Historia Francorum* (10, 31) with the recommendation that his successors not delete or rewrite his books, but that they leave them intact just as they have received them. For the most part, others could put a certain part into verse if they wished, while leaving the actual work unchanged.

The Greek hagiographical paraphrase is represented by two writers of the 5th c.: (1) the empress *Eudoxia, the author, among other things, of a short hexametrical poem, commonly referred to by the title *Martyrium sancti Cypriani*, a poetical version of this event enriched by fictitious and edifying details of three documents originating from various authors and relating to the legend of Cyprian the Magician, and (2) ps.-Basil of Seleucia, the author of a work in prose in two books *On the Life and Miracles of St. Thecla*. The first book is a reworking of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, dating to the 2nd c.; it has been embellished and expanded with long speeches; the second book contains 31 miracles connected to the sanctuary and is interesting for the history of the city of *Seleucia and Christian pilgrimages. The two

books are preceded by a preface, in which the author makes known the criteria used for composing his paraphrastic work.

2. *Latin hagiographical paraphrases.* Following the Old Testament paraphrases in the aforementioned classification of Thraede are the metrical paraphrases of the lives of the saints built on prose as found in *Paulinus of Périgueux (but missing from *Venantius Fortunatas) and the autobiographical paraphrase as represented by the *Eucharisticos* of *Paulinus of Pella, which replaces the panegyristic *gratiarum actio*.

The most significant instance in Late Antiquity of the hexametrical rewriting of hagiographic works is certainly the work relating to the hagiography for St. Martin, which begins with *Sulpicius Severus, the author of the *Vita Martini*, published in 397, a few months before the death of the bishop. Then in the three letters sent between 397 and 398 to Eusebius, Aurelius and his mother-in-law, Bassula, he describes the edifying death of the bishop and the triumphal transference of his bodily remains to Tours, where they were buried in a humble grave. Six years later, Sulpicius commissioned Gallus, a monk of Marmoutier, to extract a selection of miracles from the deeds of Martin's life. At random and without any concern for chronology or composition, he collected thirty-some accounts of his marvelous deeds and presented them to Sulpicius, who placed them under the form of dialogues, setting them into three periods.

Thirty years after his death, Martin had at the place of his burial a sanctuary—thanks to his successor Britius (398–442)—which became the point of departure for the cult that would grow under the joint action of the high clergy and the pilgrims, along with the art, literature and iconography that were both a catalyst for and a testimony to the popular devotion. The sixth bishop of the city, *Perpetuus (459–488/489), replaced the first sanctuary with a gorgeous basilica, erected in the *suburbium*, for the consecration of which (4 July 471 or 472) he requested that Paulinus of Périgueux and *Sidonius Apollinaris write epigrams for the decoration of the walls. He himself composed a collection of 11 miracles worked by Martin, made known by an oral witness after his death.

Between 463 and 470 (a few decades after the aforementioned Greek hagiographical paraphrases) the *Life* and *Dialogues* of Martin were paraphrased into the meter of the classical epic by Paulinus, son of an orator of Périgueux, within the framework of the religious propaganda undertaken by Perpetuus, probably encouraged by Paulinus of Nola's in honor of St. Felix, *Carmina Natalicia*, and, a century later, by Venantius Fortunatus, upon the request of *Gregory, the bishop of Tours, the dedicatee of the poem, or, more likely, upon the petition of Agnes and *Radegund, to whom he addressed the preface in elegiac distiches. Gregory of Tours, who begins the *Historia Francorum* with the creation of the world, and ends it, significantly, with the life of Martin, is credited with four books (in prose) *De virtutibus sancti Martini Episcopi*.

With his paraphrase in six books, at one point defined as a *translatio* (4, 1) and at another as *transcripta oratio* (5, 872-873), Paulinus of Périgueux completed an original and relevant literary work, transforming Sulpicius's account into an epic poem. Moreover, in a historical-religious context in which a defense of Martin was no longer necessary, he contributed to the development of the cult of St. Martin and the improvement of the Christian city of *Tours in harmony with the intentions and directions of *Perpetuus. If Paulinus's paraphrase pleased Perpetuus, as demonstrated by his thanks to the author and the invitation to compose a metrical inscription for the new church constructed at Tours in honor of the saint, that does not necessarily mean it satisfied the tastes of the readers. In contrast, Venantius, even before receiving a request from Gregory to put to verse the book *De virtutibus s. Martini*, composed the work *De vita s. Martini* in four books (2243 hexameters), to thank the saint for healing his eyes, a miracle he received through his intercession. In this work, Venantius devoted much attention to Martin's miracles because these would satisfy the needs of his contemporaries more than the widely known acts of the life of the saint. The work is preceded by Gregory's letter and a preface in elegiac distiches addressed to Radegund and Agnes and closes with the farewell at the end of the small book, which cites Horace (*Epist.* I, 20) and Ovid (*Trist.* 1,1). It also explains how the small book made it to *Ravenna, Italy: Venantius retraces the itinerary he completed years before his trip to *Gaul and invites his old *sodales* at Ravenna to recognize, through the compositions in Greek, the deeds of the saint in the East. A great personal success, Fortunatus naturally awaited the dissemination of the poem among the well-read people of Ravenna, where Martin was very popular.

General bibl.: G. Krüger, *Die Bibeldichtung zur Ausgang des Altertums*, Giessen 1919; M. Wehrli, *Sacra Poesis*: *Bibelepik als europäische Tradition*, in *Festschrift für Friedrich Maurer*, Stuttgart 1963, 262-283; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung. Studien zur Geschichte der epischen Bibelparaphrase von Juvencus bis Otfrid von Weissenburg*, Munich 1975; A. Pignani, *Parafrasi o metafrasi* (*a proposito della 'Statua Regia' di Niceforo Blemmida*): AAP 24 (1976) 219-225; Id., *La parafrasi come*

forma d'uso strumentale: Jahrb. der Öster. Byz. 32 (1982) 21-32; J. McClure, *The Biblical Epic and Its Audience in Late Antiquity*, in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3 (1981) 305-321; G. Malsbary, *Epic Exegesis and the Use of Vergil in the Early Biblical Poets*: Florilegium 7 (1985) 53-83; D. J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, Leeds 1993; A.V. Nazzaro, *Poesia biblica come espressione teologica: Fra tardoantico e altomedioevo*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, Florence 2001, 119-153; J.-F. Cottier, *La paraphrase latine, de Quintilien à Erasme*: REL 80 (2002) 237-252; F.E. Consolino, *Il senso del passato: Generi letterari e rapporti con la tradizione nella 'parafrasi biblica' latina*, in I. Gualandri et al. (ed.), *Nuovo e antico nella cultura greco-latina di IV-VI secolo*, Milan 2005, 447-526; A.V. Nazzaro, *Riscritture metriche di testi biblici e agiografici in cerca del genere negato*: Auctores Nostri 4 (2006) 397-439.

On biblical paraphrases: S. Gamber, *Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au V^e siècle*, Paris 1899 (repr. Geneva 1977); J. Golega, *Der homerische Psalter*, Ettal 1960; K. Thraede, *Epos*: RAC 5, 983-1042; A.V. Nazzaro, *La parafrasi salmica di Paolino di Nola*, in *Atti del Convegno. XXXI cinquantenario della morte di S. Paolino (431-1981)*, Rome 1983, 93-119; Id., *La figura di Paolo nella* Historia Apostolica *di Aratore*, in L. Padovese (ed.), *Atti del VII Simposio di Tarso su S. Paolo Apostolo*, Rome 2002, 227-251; Id., *La poesia cristiana latina*, in E. dal Covolo - M. Sodi (ed.), *Il Latino e i Cristiani. Un bilancio all'inizio del terzo millennio*, Vatican City 2002, 109-149 (by the same author, see the bibl. cited. under the entry *Juvencus*); R. Herzog, *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike. Formgeschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung*, I, Munich 1975; W. Kirsch, *Die lateinische Versepik des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1989.

On hagiographical paraphrases: A.V. Nazzaro, *L'agiografia martiniana di Sulpicio Severo e le parafrasi epiche di Paolino di Périgueux e Venanzio Fortunato*, in M.L. Silvestre - M. Squillante (ed.), Mutatio rerum. *Letteratura Filosofia Scienza tra tardo antico e altomedioevo*, Naples 1997, 301-346; Id., *La parafrasi agiografica nella tarda antichità*, in G. Luongo (ed.), *Scrivere di santi.* Atti del II Convegno di studio dell'AISCA, Napoli, 22-25 ottobre 1997, Rome 1998, 69-106 (with bibl.); *La* Vita Martini *di Sulpicio Severo e la parafrasi esametrica di Venanzio Fortunato*, in *Convegno Internazionale di Studio. Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo*, Treviso 2003, 171-210.

A. Navarro

PARENESIS in the FATHERS. From the Greek παραίνεσις, "exhortation, recommendation, encouragement," the parenesis was a specific type of discourse present in the Greek, Latin and biblical world, in *Judaism and Christianity. In Greek culture, it appears in Hesiod's writings, who interchanged expressive modes of parenesis with pedantic and mythical modes (J. Kakridis, *Hesiod*: SIFC 10 [1992] 827-832). It likewise appears in Tyrtaeus's works, whose elegy on virtue, e.g., was completely parenetic, as H. Shey demonstrates (*Tyrtaeus and the Art of Propaganda*: Arethusa 9 [1976] 5-28); we see it again in Theognis, 549-554, and in Alcaeus, 140 V, who, describing perhaps a room used for a symposium furnished with weapons, lays out a warlike parenesis. This use of parenesis was rejected by Anacreon, esp. in his programmatic fr. 56 G. In philosophy, philosophers typically used parenesis in protreptic speeches, which, following the trail of Aristotle, invite people to pursue philosophy. These works would later have a notable influence on the Christian apologetic treatises and protreptic speeches; Cicero's lost protreptic speech was very important for *Augustine. But naturally, all of Greek philosophy, esp. ethics, had a parenetic objective inasmuch as it encouraged the pursuit of virtue as a means to happiness, and this was the case from the very beginning. In his philosophical poem, Parmenides, describing his trip from not knowing to knowing, offers a parenesis for philosophy (M. Tulli, *L'esortazione di Parmenide al sapere*: MD 31 [1993] 35-50). The philosophical parenesis was expressed in many forms, from treatises to letters—such as the Epicurean parenesis to Meneceus, which is a protreptic speech directed at all people—to the philosophical poems such as Lucretius's magnum opus, or Perseus's satires: *discite, o miseri, et causas cognoscite rerum!* Many specific genres, such as the *consolationes*, normally included parenetic aspects. Alongside philosophical parenesis, we also possess Galen's *Protrettico alla medicina* (ed. A. Barigazzi, Berlin 1991, CMG V 1,1).

In the OT one finds an occurrence of the term παραίνεσις, in Wisd 8:9 (LXX), but not one instance of the corresponding adjective or verb, although the different modes of prophetic and, above all, sapiential speech that pervade the books of the OT that are chronologically closer to the NT and more closely related to Hellenistic culture employ parenesis a great deal (B. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, Sheffield 1996). Parenesis was also one of the forms to which *Philo (an exponent of Hellenistic Judaism and adherent of Middle Platonism) had recourse; his preoccupation with ethical teaching was a constant theme even in his exegetical works (E. Trisoglio, *Apostrofi, p. e preghiere in Filone*, Turin 1964). The Greek Sibylline oracles, which entered into the Hebrew world beginning with the Hellenistic age, assumed a more noticeable tone of moral parenesis in keeping with a more lively eschatological tension (J. Collins, *The Jewish Transformation of Sibylline Oracles*, in *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari*, ed. I. Chirassi - T. Seppilli, Pisa 1998, 369-387): this pair is found in the NT, e.g., in 1 Thessalonians, and a good portion of the writings of the Fathers. In the NT, the analysis of which is crucial because patristic reflection was rooted in it, only the verb παραινέω appears, and not by chance does it occur exclusively in the Acts of the Apostles and only with *Paul as the subject (27:9, 22), when the apostle exhorts his ship-

mates on the voyage to Rome to take courage: the Vulgate renders it as *consolabatur* and *suadeo*.

In effect, in the NT it is Paul who, in the letters and in the speeches of the Acts of the Apostles, makes use of parenesis, from exhortation to consolation. In recent decades, a vast amount of literature has been produced on the various rhetorical aspects that Paul borrowed from Hellenistic culture (a detailed summary is in my chapter *Philosophen und Prediger*, in *Dion von Prusa: Der Philosoph und seing Bild*, ed. H.-G. Nesselrath, Tübingen 2009, ch. 4). H. Cruz devoted an exhaustive study to Paul's use of parenesis, which, he argues, employs many aspects from Greek ethics but establishes them upon Christ (*Christological Motives and Motivated Actions in Pauline Parenesis*, Frankfurt a.M. 1990). Several Pauline letters are esp. marked by the parenetic canons such as 1 Thessalonians, Galatians and 1 Corinthians. A. Malherbe (*The Letters to the Thessalonians*, New York 2000, 86 and passim) insists on the parenetic aspects of 1 Thessalonians, as does M. Konradt (*Gericht und Gemeinde*, Berlin 2003, 38 and passim); esp. in chs. 4-5, Paul focuses upon the consolatory and exhortatory aspect (R. Collins, *The Function of Parenesis in 1 Thessalonians*: EThL 74 [1998] 398-414). In Galatians, the parenetic section is in chs. 5-6, after the introduction, the *exordium*, the *narratio*, the *propositio* and the *probatio*, as H. Betz demonstrated (*The Literary Composition and Function of Galatians*: NTS 21 [1975] 353-379). One particular aspect of the parenesis of Galatians also involves the idea of "having clothed yourselves with Christ" (3:27) in *baptism, which is to be connected to the ceremony of the *toga virilis*, an occasion for moral exhortation, which in the Pauline equivalent develops in the parenesis on the responsible use of freedom (see J. A. Harrill, *Coming of Age and Putting on Christ*: NovT 44 [2002] 252-277). A particular element of the Pauline parenesis is the effective recourse to speech in the first person and to one's own example (see B.J. Dodd, *Paul's Paradigmatic 'I'*, Sheffield 1999). Even Colossians and Ephesians, which have been commented upon by H. Hübner (Tübingen 1997), whose Pauline authorship has been contested by various critics, include clear parenetic sections, as argued for example by W. Wilson (*Education and Exhortation in Colossians*, Leiden 1997) and A. Bevere (*Identity and the Moral Life in Colossians*, Sheffield 2003).

In general, the pastoral letters do not lack hints of parenesis to the Christian communities, as R. Karris, e.g., observes (*The Paraenetic Elements in the Pastoral Epistles*: HTR 64 [1971] 572); this aspect also recurs in the epistolographic analysis of these letters (see W. Richards, *Difference and Distance in Post-Pauline Christianity*, New York 2002, in A. Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstauslegung des Paulus*, Göttingen 2004; R. Collins's commentary *1-2 Timothy and Titus*, Louisville 2002; and Y. Redalié, *Paul après Paul*, Geneva 1994), which analyzes the aforementioned three epistles for ethical and soteriological themes. Elements of parenesis also esp. characterize Hebrews 13, which was written to exhort Jewish-Christians to the correct faith, which did not include Christ being possessed by an angel (see M. Goulder, *Hebrews and the Ebionites*: NTS 49 [2003] 393-406; V. Rhee, *Faith in Hebrews*, New York 2001). In addition, 1 Peter, considered one of the foundations of Christian parenesis (L. Thurén, *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter*, Sheffield 1995), and a particular form of parenesis, was intended to encourage submission to political authorities; such parenesis appears both here in 2:13-17, and in Rom 13:1-7, as G. Jossa observes (*La sottomissione alle autorità*: RivBib 44 [1996] 205-211). Many other parenetic aspects are found in James; see L. Perdue, *Parenesis and James*: ZNTW 72 (1981) 241-256, which studies the context and the social functions of parenesis and its formal structures in James, as well as D. Edgar, *Has God Not Chosen the Poor?* Sheffield 2001. Not only in the letters, but also in the gospels, one recognizes a parenetic structure, primarily in the sayings, speeches and parables, where the objective is to exhort one to virtue in view of the kingdom and, esp. in John, in view of the ζωὴ αἰώνιος—(for Luke's parables in particular, see J. Kilgallen, *Luke 15.16*: Biblica 78 [1997] 369-376). One can detect a parenetic prophetic form also in the proclamation to the seven churches of Revelation 2–3, a form that reuses the eyewitness speech related to salvation and judgment, mixing it with what was originally the genre used for the imperial edict (see D. Aune, *The Proclamations to the Seven Churches*: NTS 36 [1990] 182-204).

The parenetic intimations, already notably present in the NT, esp. in Paul's writings, reached extensive developments in patristic texts. The parenetic speech of exhortation and advice extends to various literary genres, from letters to homilies, from protreptic speeches to exegesis, the final end of which is instruction that does not remain at the purely theoretical level, but is always directed toward spiritual growth and, in the eschatological perspective, salvation. One of the most ancient examples of Christian parenesis is found in Clement of Rome's *Letter to the Corinthians* (see B. Bowe, *A Church in Crisis*, Minneapolis 1988). Between the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd c., the exhortations to *peace and reciprocal love, and to not incite external hostility, are probably Christian in the letter of Ammonius to Apollonius,

two Egyptians (see my study *Una delle più antiche lettere cristiane extra-canoniche?*: Aegyptus 80 [2000] 169-188). In the Apostolic Fathers, the second part of the *Letter of *Barnabas* and the **Didache* contain the parenetic theme of the Two Ways (V. Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making*, Cambridge 1997); the *Shepherd* of *Hermas is heavily parenetical in substance, like many other types of literature, which, like the apocalypses, describe the rewards and punishments in the world to come, often not without Jewish influence (see the study on Jewish and Christian apocalyptic texts by R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead*, Leiden 1998). The heavy influence of the Jewish parenesis on the Christian parenesis of the 2nd c. AD seems to be attested in the **Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, composed in Greek and interpolated in the post-Nicene age (see J. Charlesworth, *Reflections on the SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Duke*: NTS 23 [1977] 296-304).

All of protreptic literature clearly has parenetic purposes, where the protreptic speech for philosophy becomes an invitation to adhere to Christianity, and it takes on forms such as protreptic speeches to martyrdom or chastity. *Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* (ed. O. Stählin, Berlin 1972^{3}, GCS 12bis; ed. M. Galloni, Rome 1991; F. Migliore, Rome 2004) and *Pedagogue,* and perhaps the *Stromata*, are part of a larger project and are an invitation to Christian philosophy, acc. to a concept already apparent in *Justin Martyr's writings, for whom Christianity is the "divine philosophy." Furthermore, the works of the *apologists in general can be considered as a parenesis to conversion to the true Christian philosophy (see B. Pouderon, *D'Athènes à Alexandrie . . . les origines de la philosophie chrétienne*, Louvain 1997; Id. - J. Doré, dir., *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, Paris 1998). Clement borrowed much from the apologists, from the criticism of paganism to the derivation of Greek philosophy from *Scripture, but with less polemics, better arguments and more parenesis: he praises Christ's new song, superior to those of the Greek poets, which also invites pagans to the revelation first reserved for the Jews. The conclusion is an appeal to the Logos who, after having inspired the philosophers, has been fully manifested in Jesus Christ. We also possess from Clement's writings the *Exhortation to Patience* (*Esortazione alla pazienza*, ed. A. Pieri, Rome 1965). But parenesis also pervades Clement's other major preserved works, the *Pedagogue* and the *Stromata* (G. Ferrarese, *Sapienzialità, p. e vera gnosi*: Koinonia 11 [1987] 7-26). Clement insists heavily upon human free will, also an antignostic polemic, as in *Origen's writings: what becomes so much more important, therefore, in his writings, as in Origen's, is the exhortation to free choice for the Good and the pursuit of the knowledge that allows one to identify it. The final end for Christians is, as always, salvation. In Origen's writings, a very strong element of parenesis emerges in the *Exhortatio admartyrium*, just as in *Tertullian's booklet *Ad martyras*, addressed to Christians who were awaiting martyrdom in prison, but also in another work of the same author, already leaning toward *Montanism, the *Exhortation to Chastity* (*Esortazione alla castità,* ed. R. Frigerio, Milan 1995). Another famous protreptic speech is attributed to Justin Martyr, even if today it is considered to be the work of a 3rd-c. author who was very familiar with Middle Platonism: the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (comm. C. Riedweg, Basel 1994), which demonstrates the superiority of the Scriptures over the contradictions of the poets and the Greek philosophers in theological investigation. Toward the year 375, then, *Pacian of Barcelona wrote a further protreptic speech, the *Parenesis to Penance*, classifying the various types of sins and inviting people to abandon them.

Parenesis can be found in many patristic works, and it primarily runs through the entire corpus of homilies in the early church. This corpus was able to enrich itself even with bitterly polemical intimations as in *Cyril of Alexandria's *Homiliae* (S. Wessel, *Nestorius . . . in Cyril's Hom. IV*: AHC 31 [1999] 1-49), but it remains primarily exhortatory, as it was from the very beginning, with *2 Clement*, which seems to be the most ancient Christian homily, in the 1st half of the 2nd c., and, from the 2nd half, the *Homily on Easter* by *Melito of Sardis. Parenesis is also present in many letters, and reaches, among other things, scriptural exegesis, the lifeblood of patristic thought.

Exegesis, even in schools with different tendencies—such as Origen's school of *Alexandria, bent toward allegorizing, and in that of *John Chrysostom's Antiochene *school, which prefered to remain at the historical level—was always aimed at spiritual and moral perfection, and was therefore soaked with parenetic emphases. In Chrysostom's writings this is immediately evident, inasmuch as his exegetical production tends to coincide with his homiletic production, as occurs in part even in St. Augustine's writings, where one should recall at least the homilies on St. *John's gospel. Nevertheless, even in Origen's works, part of his exegesis consists in homilies in addition to commentaries and scholia; the objective of the spiritual understanding of the Scriptures is always salvation. An excellent example of exegesis connected to parenesis is found in *Cyprian's interpretation of the passage on the rich

young ruler in Luke 18:29-30, where one sees another consistent element of Christian parenesis: the reference to the eschatological dimension, the end to which all Christians are invited to gaze (R. Cacitti, *Ad caelestes thesauros*: Aevum 65 [1991] 151-169; 67 [1993] 129-171). In the Syriac church, in *Ephrem's writings (4th c.), exegesis also developed in poetic works, and likewise is married to parenesis, as shown for example by E. Vergani (*La fucina di verità*: CSt 19 [1998] 597-630) with regard to the exegesis of Daniel 3 contained in the *Hymns on Fasting* and in the *Hymns Against *Julian*. Even *Basil's exegesis, which is influenced by Origen and *Eusebius of Caesarea, is always directed toward edification, or to moral ends by means of direct parenesis or reflections (J.R. Pouchet, *L'Église dans les homélies de S. Basile sur les Psaumes*: Augustinianum 33 [1993] 369-405). One can recognize parenesis, e.g., also in *Epistles* 5 and 6, in the consolation of Netarius and his wife for the death of their son, which Basil, being an excellent orator, articulates acc. to a threefold division of a funerary speech in lament, consolation and exhortation, the last two of which can both be considered parenesis (V. Novembri, *Due epistole, una* consolatio: VetChr 40 [2003] 319-337). Basil's brother *Gregory of Nyssa was heavily parenetic, even if very speculative: his dialogue *On the Soul and the Resurrection*, e.g., which was very influenced by Plato's *Phaedo*, is a powerful encouragement not to succumb to despair in the face of death, because he demonstrates the immortality of the *soul, the *resurrection of the body and the glorious final *apokatastasis.

In sum, the parenesis in the writings of the fathers, which is rooted both in the Bible, and above all in Paul's epistles, and in classical culture, can be found in letters as well as in speeches, protreptic orations and exegetical works. In fact, it is not a literary genre, but a pervasive way of speaking inherent to many of the genres used by the Fathers—a way of speaking every time they exhort people to virtue and spiritual elevation in every sense, as had already occurred in philosophical texts, the best models of which were wisely used by patristic philosophy.

S. Prete, *Escatologia e parenesi negli scrittori cristiani latini*, Bologna 1966; R. Freni, *Le concezioni pedagogiche nella* Paraenesis didascalica *di Magno Felice Ennodio*, in *Umanità e storia*, II, Naples 1971, 109-126; E. dal Covolo, *Il* kerygma *come critica alla prassi nella parenesi di Gal. 5,16-24*: RivBib 29 (1981) 379-391; G. Tarditi, *Parenesi e* areté *nel* corpus *tirtaico*: RFIC 110 (1982) 257-276; R. Collins, *This Is the Will of God: Your Sanctification*: Laval théologique et philosophique 39 (1983) 27-53 [parenesis in 1 Th 4:3]; L. Edmunds, *Theognis' Parainesis to Cavalry* (549-54), Lexis 1 (1988), 53-60; G. Tedeschi, *L'elegia parenetico-guerriera e il simposio*, in *Studi di poesia conviviale*, ed. K. Fabian et al., Turin 1991, 95-104; N. Adkin, *The Date of Pacian of Barcelona's* Paraenesis ad paenitentiam: Prometheus 20 (1994) 73-76; K. Erlemann, *Naherwartung und Parusieverzögerung im NT*, Tübingen 1995; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, Collegeville, MN 1995; G. Colesanti, *La disposizione delle armi in Alc. 140 V*: RFIC 123 (1995) 385-408; D. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, Harrisburg 1997; P. Tite, *Compositional Transitions in 1Pt*, San Francisco 1997; J. Montes, *Texto programático . . . en Anacreonte*: ExcPhilol 7/8 (1997/8) 49-67; A. Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source . . . Wisdom Redaction in Q*, Leiden 1998; J. Lambrecht, *Gal 5,17d*: Biblica 79 (1998) 515-524 [on parenesis in the passage]; C. Sleeper, *James*, Nashville 1998; A. Milazzo, *Un'epistola encomiastica di Cassiodoro*: Cassiodorus 5 (1999) 277-88 [on *Var.* 10,3, with a paranesis for the ruler]; J. Starr, *2Pt 1:4 in Its Hellenistic Context*, Stockholm 2000; T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics*, Louisville 2000; D. Ackerman, *Cross, Resurrection, and Parenesis in the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians*, Ph.D. Denver 2000; M. Jackson, *Logos and Law in James*, Leiden 2001; G. Burnett, *Paul and the Salvation of the Individual*, Leiden 2001; M. Theobald, *Studien zum Römerbrief*, Tübingen 2001; R. Maddox, *Parenesis and Exegesis*, Ph.D. Fort Worth, TX 2001 [on Hebrews 13]; C. Carpenter, *James 4.5*: NTS 47 (2001) 189-205; W. Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians*, New Haven, CT 2002; L. Thurén, *Derhetorizing Paul*, Harrisburg, PA 2002; P. Hartin, *A Spirituality of Perfection: Faith in Action in the Letter of James*, Collegeville, MN 1999; Id., *James*, Collegeville, MN 2003; D. Aune et al., eds., *Neotestamentica et Philonica*, Leiden 2003; M. Stirewalt, *Paul the Letter Writer*, Grand Rapids, MI 2003; S. Elliott, *Cutting Too Close for Comfort*, Sheffield 2004 [on Galatians]; C. Song, *Reading Romans as a Diatribe*, New York 2004; J. Starr, *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, Berlin 2004; B. Pouderon (ed., tr.), *Apologistes grecs du IIe siècle*, Paris 2005; I. Ramelli, *La coerenza della soteriologia origeniana: Dalla polemica contro il determinismo gnostico all'universale restaurazione escatologica*, in *Pagani e cristiani alla ricerca della salvezza* (*secoli I-III*), XXXIV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana (Rome, 5-7 maggio 2005), Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, SEA 96, Rome 2006, 661-688; Id., *Gregorio di Nissa. Sull'anima e la resurrezione*, Milan 2007.

I. Ramelli

PARENTIUM. We know very little or next to nothing about Parentium before the Romans wanted to use the strategic position of the Parentine peninsula halfway between the two colonies Tergeste and Pola and the natural meeting point of all the internal roads of the territory. At that time, in relation to the transfer of the E Italian border from Formio (Risano) to Arsa in 16 BC, the supposedly pre-Roman center must have obtained an exact boundary and an urban organization that is still recognizable in the layout of the two primary roads and the road network that divides the layout of the city into isolated rectangles and the forum (the archaeological stratum of the forum has been explored under the modern Piazza Marafor). Here, the Romans erected the largest Roman temple of Istria, which was reconstructed by T. Abudius Verus, then vice admiral of the *Ravenna unit established at Parentium.

This city is perhaps the only place that allows one to use archaeological data in testing the theory of the existence of an episcopate before the Edict of Tolerance. In fact, the protobishop *Maurus (notwithstanding some recent doubts raised on the matter) was venerated as a martyr from at least the 6th c., which is attested in famous epigraphs (4th c.) that recall the transfer of his remains from the cemetery outside the walls into a city basilica, *ubi episcopus et confessor est factus*. Furthermore, one should not forget that to the N of the splendid basilica built by Euphrasius around the mid-6th c., one finds the remains of what was most likely an *ecclesia domestica*, excavated from the lounge of a Roman house, which was subsequently enlarged into the first rooms used for worship. The mosaic inscriptions recorded there at the end of the 4th c. document the existence of what was already a diverse community composed of people from various social backgrounds. After Maurus, there is no known name of a bishop until Euphrasius, but in the apse vault of his basilica, his image is immortalized in the mosaic alongside that of Maurus, who is in the act of placing a crown on the Virgin *Mary with his hands veiled. This provides us a glimpse of the end result of the process of Christianization achieved in Istria during the span of nearly two and a half centuries.

G. Cuscito, *Parenzo dalle origini all'età di Giustiniano*, Padua 1976; Id., *Ancora su Mauro "episcopus et confessor" e sul "locus duplicatus" di Parenzo*, in *Domum tuam dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di A. Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 185-210.

G. Cuscito

PARIS. The Celtic tribe of the *Parisii* occupied the actual territory of Paris, once a swampy area; the Romans conquered it in 52 BC. The Celtic *oppidum Parisiorum*, "the town of the Parisians" (*Lutetia Parisiorum*: Caesar, *De bello gal.* 6,3; 7,57-58), was established on the Island of Seine. After the conquest, it was rebuilt by the Romans, but the new town extended to the S side of the Seine into the modern Latin Quarter, acc. to the Roman urban structure: la rue Saint-Jacques was the *cardo maximus*. From the 4th c. onward, the name *Parisii* was used in place of *Lutetia Parisiorum* (Ammianus Marcellinus used both terms: 20,1,1; 20,4,12; CTh; *Notitia Dignitatum*; *Notitia Galliarum*); from the 5th c. it was referred to as *Parisius*. The new city of the province *Lugdunensis Senona*, grew rapidly, being in a favorable place for river commerce and the convergence of various roads. During the time of Tiberius, the Romans erected a column in honor of Jupiter, which was found during the excavations carried out between 1965 and 1972 under the church of Nôtre Dame; after AD 50 the forum was constructed; the construction of the *thermal baths dates to the 2nd c. (today visible under the Hôtel de Cluny), fed by an aqueduct of approximately 10 miles (16 km); then an amphitheater with 17,000 seats and a theater with 3,000 extra seats were built. They also added two other buildings for the thermal baths. In the 4th c., Lutetia was a strategic spot for the defense of Gaul, and often troops were stationed there, but it never became the capital of the province. Caesar *Julian (the Apostate) spent the winter in Lutetia between 358 and 360 and was there proclaimed *augustus* (March 360); the emperor *Valentinian resided there in 365 and 366. In 2006 the pavement of a 1st-c. street along with the remains of other buildings were discovered. At the end of the 4th c., the city reduced its dimensions, and the island, which was smaller than it is today, was fortified. In 451, *Geneviève convinced *Attila, king of the *Huns, to spare the city of Paris, which in 508 became the capital of the Merovingian dynasty, through the work of *Clovis, and remained so during various intervals until the following century. In 577, King *Chilperic I ordered that repairs be made to the theater and also supplied provisions for the games.

We do not know when Christianity arrived in Lutetia. The first bishop we can speak of with historical certainty was Victorinus (6th on the episcopal list), who in 346 participated in the Council of *Cologne in favor of *Athanasius; Marcellus (9th on the list) is venerated as a saint. *Denis of Paris, the legendary bishop, was its first martyr; he was killed around 250 (*Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 1, 30) along with Rusticus and Eleutherius, on the hill of *Mons Mercurius* (thereafter *Mons Martyrum*, Montmartre). On the burial site of these martyrs, at St. Denis (*vicus catolacensis*), upon the initiative of St. Geneviève (d. 502) a church was built, in which certain Merovingian kings were then buried. King Dagobert, between 628 and 637, established the Abbey of St. Denis, in which in 754 Pope Stephen III consecrated Pepin the Short. In 540, the church of St. Stephen was constructed, whose remains are under the church of Nôtre Dame and in the adjacent streets; but the ancient sources simply referred to it as an *ecclesia*. Germanus, whose friend Fortunatus wrote a biography about Germanus's life, was bishop during the years 558-576. In the 6th c., various *councils were held at Paris, where church buildings still stand today: the *ecclesia senior*, *baptisterium*, *oratorium sancti Martini*, *basilica beati Vincentii* (where the following kings were buried: Childebert in 558; Chilperic I in 584; and in 576 Bishop Germanus, whose

name the church then took), *basilica sancti Marcelli*, *oratorium Criscentiae virginis*, *basilica beati Iuliani*, *basilica Apostolorum* (also simply called *Sancti Petri*). Clovis ordered that this church be constructed on the tomb of St. Geneviève, in which both the king and his wife Clotilde and the other members of the royal family were later buried. During the 6th c., councils were also held in the *basilica Apostolorum*.

P.-M. Duval, *Paris antique, des origines au troisième siècle*, Paris 1961; P. Perin, *Lutèce, Paris de César à Clovis. Catalogue de l'exposition du musée Carnavalet*, Paris 1984; var. aus., *Topographie chrétienne de la Gaule*, VIII, *Province ecclésiastique de Sens*, Paris 1992, 97-129; P. de Carbonnières, *Lutèce: Paris ville romaine*, Paris [2]2001; J.P. Adam - H. Delhumeau, *Les thermes antiques de Lutèce*, Paris [2]2001; D. Busson, *Paris, a Roman City*, Paris 2001.

A. Di Berardino

PARIS, Council of. Christianity must have reached the Roman city of *Lutetia Parisiorum* during the course of the 2nd c.; however, its first known bishop acc. to tradition was *Denis of Paris, from the 2nd half of the 3rd c. In this city, during the summer of 360, Gallic bishops convened a council to renounce their adherence to the acts of the pro-*Arian Council of *Rimini (359) and sign the definitions of *Nicaea. The bishops banned *Saturninus of Arles and Paternus of Périgueux from the episcopate because they supported that heresy.

CCL 148, 32-34; SC 241, 90-99; Palazzini 3, 295; Hilary of Poitiers, *Fragm. Hist.* XI.

Ch. Munier

PARISH. The term derives from the Greek word παροικία, which means "a temporary residence," esp. in a foreign land, a dwelling place. Early, from the 2nd c. onward, the term indicated a Christian community (*Mart. Polyc.* pref.; Eusebius, *HE* 5,18,9); to be even more precise: a stable, Christian community hierarchically organized (Council of *Ancyra, can. 18; Alexander of Alex.: PG 18, 548; Council of *Nicaea, can. 16). In the 4th c., its ordinary meaning was "diocese." Only from this period onward, and very slowly at that, did the term assume the modern meaning—the precise definition emerges only in the 13th c.—referring to the territorial structure as part of the diocese, when, with the conversions and the spread of Christianity into the countryside, it was impossible to unite around the bishop who resided in the city. In the first centuries, Christianity was primarily an urban phenomenon; nevertheless, in certain Roman provinces it also spread to the countryside, as *Pliny the Younger attests in the 2nd c., for the region of *Pontus: in the *vici* (towns) and in the *agri* (fields) (*Ep.* 10,96). The first African martyrs came from an unknown place, Scili, which must have been a small village, and, therefore, not an episcopal see.

In the early days, the *bishop was the center of the Christian *liturgy and ecclesial administration; he was helped by the deacons and *presbyters. Generally speaking, he was the only person to administer the *Eucharist and *baptism; in the event of an emergency, as during the persecution, presbyters administered the sacraments. When Christianity reached the villages and the *latifundia*, for liturgical services instead of multiplying *episcopal* churches, other places of worship were built. In some of those places the figure of the *periodeuta*, an itinerant presbyter, became a widespread phenomenon; in other areas, a **chorepiscopus*. In the West, a system of *plebes* was devised, communities where the liturgical service was performed by presbyters. In the large cities, with the growth of the Christian community, it was impossible to gather into just one place, both because of the distance and the limitations of the gathering place. When the parochial system began to emerge, the decentralization of the liturgy occurred. Trustworthy pieces of historical information concerning communities that were under the bishop, but not directly guided by him, are provided by the Council of *Antioch (341) for the East, and by the Council of *Serdica (343) for the West. The bishop not only led the urban community, but also that of the village (χώρα). If there were bishops in the villages (χωρεπίσκοποι), they were obliged to serve only the churches that depended upon them (Council of Antioch, can. 10). From this information, one can conclude that not all the countryside churches had their own bishop and that there existed several countryside parishes. At Serdica, bishops were prohibited from interfering in another bishop's parish (can. 18).

Pope *Innocent (402–417) said that all of his churches were located within the city walls; one can suppose, however, that the other bishops administered the more remote parishes. It seems Rome did not have any countryside parishes. Only those presbyters who served in the cemeteries outside the city walls would have been comparable to the countryside parish priests of other episcopal districts. Innocent called the churches in Rome **tituli* (*Ep. ad Decen.* 5). The Roman parishes must have been created long before Innocent's pontificate. However, the information on this matter in the **Liber pontifi-*

calis (*Book of Popes*) was compiled after Innocent's time, at the end of the 5th c. Already around the mid-3rd c., *Cornelius numbered the following groups within the Roman community: 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, 52 among the exorcists, electors and *ostiarii* (i.e., *doorkeepers), 1,500 widows and those in need that were fed by the community (Eus., *HE* 6, 43, 11). The Roman community must have been composed of tens of thousands of faithful, who would have been unable to gather at the same eucharistic celebration. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, *Cletus (ca. 80-90) had already ordained 25 presbyters, and *Evaristus (after 100) divided Rome into *tituli* for the presbyters (and ordained 7 deacons). *Urban (d. 230) acquired 25 golden patens (probably for 25 titular churches). *Fabian (236–250) divided the municipal regions among the deacons and installed seven subdeacons (the districts of the deaconry are not identical to those of the titular churches).

Pope *Dionysius's (260–268) entrusting of the churches to the presbyters should certainly be dated to an earlier age; he also constructed cemeteries (and the parishes) as dioceses, i.e., he erected the churches of the cemeteries outside the walls for the parishes. Pope *Marcellinus (ca. 300) created 25 titular churches for the diocese of Rome, for the numerous baptized (neophytes) and penitents.

Therefore, the term *diocese* is used to refer to autonomous presbyteral communities with the right to confer baptism. This linguistic use is attested for the first time by *Sulpicius Severus in his letter to *Martin of Tours (*Dial.* II, 9,6; *Ep.* 1,10; 3,6), who established nearly ten countryside parishes (*dioeceses*) in the vast region of his episcopal city. In the 5th and 6th c., the parochial organization of the countryside was completed everywhere. We see this esp. in *Gaul, where only around the year 600 the term *diocese* entered into common use for the episcopal communities, while the presbyteral communities referred to themselves as parishes. Already from the 3rd c., the bishop was able to develop the urban parishes in the large cities, as had been done in Rome. During *Augustine's time, we find in the small centers of *Numidia presbyters who performed liturgical functions (*Ep.* 83; *Ep.* 139,1); several presbyters were killed by the *Donatists (*Ep.* 133,1; 134,1).

Duchesne LP 4 (1923) 1212-1219; DACL 13 (1938) 2197-2199; LTK 8, 162-170; Cath 10, 671-674; *Dizionario Encicl. del medioevo*, ed. A. Vauchez, Rome 1999, I, 1409-1411; K. Müller, *Parochie und Diözese im Abendland in spätrömischer und merowingischer Zeit*: ZNTW (1933) 149-185; E. Griffe, *Les premières paroisses de la Gaule*: BLE 50 (1949) 229-239; Id., *À travers les paroisses rurales de la Gaule au VI*[e] *siècle*: BLE 75 (1975) 3-26; W. Geerlings, *Augustinus und sein Bistum*: ThQ 158 (1978) 27-35; A. Martin, *Topographie et liturgie: Le problème des 'paroisses' d'Alexandrie, in Actes du XI*[e] *Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne*, Rome 1989, 113-114; V. Bo, *Storia della parrocchia. I: secoli delle origini* (*sec. IV-V*), Rome [2]1992, II: *I secoli dell'infanzia* (*sec. VI-XI*), Rome 1990; M. Colardelle, *Les paroisses rurales*, in *Atlas archéologique de la France*, Paris 1992; *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, ed. J. Blair - R. Sharpe, Leicester, NY 1992; Ch. Pietri, *Régions ecclésiastiques et paroisses romaines*, in *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997, 173-200; Id., *Chiese e comunità locali nell'Occidente cristiano* (*IV-VI sec. d. C.*), ibid. 475-521; *Alle origini della parrocchia rurale, IV-VIII sec.*, ed. Ph. Pergola, Vatican City 1999; G. Gantino Wataghin, *Christianisation et organisation ecclésiastique de campagne, L'Italie du Nord aux IV*[e]*-VIII*[e] *siècles*, in *Towns and Their Territories Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. G.B. Brogiolo et al., Leiden 2000, 209-234.

H.J. Vogt - A. Di Berardino

PARMENIAN. *Donatist bishop of *Carthage from 362 to 391/392. He was either Gallic or Spanish, not N African (Optatus of Milevis, *De schismate* II, 7). He probably joined Donatus's cause during the latter's exile from N Africa and became the leader of the movement after his death around 355. He became the bishop of Carthage in 362 after the triumphal return of the Donatist leaders to N Africa, who had the support of the emperor *Julian (Optatus of Milevis, *De schismate* II, 16, and Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani* II, 97, 224). Julian's death on 26 June 363 did not pose an obstacle to the resurgence of *Donatism but, around 364, Parmenian wrote a treatise, *Adversus ecclesiam traditorum*, that justified the legitimacy of his own church and asserted the unredeemable unworthiness of *Catholics (Optatus, I, 4-6). The work was divided into five books that treated: *baptism, the unity of the church, the unworthiness of Catholics as *traditores* and instigators of the persecution initiated by Paul and Macarius (imperial commissioners in 347/348), and lastly, the reason for rejecting Catholic *sacraments, "the oil of the ungodly" (see Ps 141:5). Parmenian's writings reveal that he was heavily influenced by *Cyprian, even though his definition of the church by means of reference to the possession of those gifts (*dotes*), which are attributed to the bride in the *Song of Songs, offered an original contribution to Western *ecclesiology. He claimed for the Donatists the **cathedra*, the sign of the authority and unity of the episcopate; the *angelus*, the angel that floated upon the waters of baptism; the *fons*, namely the baptismal font; the *sigillum* (*seal) of baptism; and the altar. Once again he showed the great importance the Donatists attached to the liturgy and the symbolism of baptism. His energetic denial of the emperor's right to interfere in

ecclesiastical affairs (Optatus, I, 22) followed Donatus's ideas. A response was posed to his treatise around 365 when *Optatus of Milevis composed the *De schismate Donatistarum*.

During his 30 years in the episcopate, Parmenian maintained control over the Donatist church. In *Mauritania, he managed to control the schism of *Rogatus and the activity of the *circumcellions, even though Parmenian was unable to repress the Claudianist schism that struck the Donatists at *Rome around 385 (Augustine, *Serm. II in Ps.* 36,20). He even subjected Donatist superior imperial officials such as Flavian, *Vicarius Africae*, to ecclesiastical discipline (Augustine, *Ep.* 87, 8). Parmenian's *Psalms*, written in a simple, popular style, spread Donatist teaching throughout N Africa (*Predestinatus*, *De haer.* 43; Augustine, *Ep.* 55, 18, 34). His prestige almost rivaled his predecessor Donatus. Around 380, however, Parmenian found himself in conflict with the lay Donatist theologian *Tyconius, who seemed to oppose the justification that had been used for the schism and the Donatist insistence on rebaptizing their converts (Augustine, *Ep.* 93,10, 43-44, and *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani* I, 1,1). At first Parmenian tried to convince Tyconius that the universality of the church was acceptable only on the condition of its integrity (*Epistola ad Tyconium*), and, when he was unable to succeed, he had Tyconius condemned by a council: ca. 385 (Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* I, 1,1). His firmness, however, was successful, because it seems that Tyconius listened to his appeal not to leave the Donatist church (Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* III, 6, 29) and his excommunication created no schism among the ranks of the Donatists.

*Augustine respected Parmenian's ability as a theologian and administrator: "he strengthened the Donatist sect" (Augustine, *Serm.* 46,8,17). Augustine and *Optatus both regarded him as a talented speaker, wielding a sharp tongue (Optatus, II, 14). His acceptance of Donatism shows that other Western Christian communities shared similar points of view with the Donatists. Upon his death, he left a church that undoubtedly possessed the allegiance of the majority of N African Christians (Optatus, VII, 1 and Augustine, *Ep.* 22, 2).

Several extracts from the works of Parmenian are found in Optatus of Milevis's *De schismate Donatistarum* (ed. C. Ziwsa, CSEL 26) and Augustine, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani* (ed. Petschenig, CSEL 51). PCBE I, 816-821; P. Monceaux, *Parmenianus, primat donatiste de Carthage*: JS n.s. 7 (1909) 19-26, 157-169; Id., *Histoire litt. de l'Afrique chrét.*, V, 220ff.; A. Pincherle, *L'ecclesiologia nella controversia donatista*: Ricerche Religiose I (1925) 35-55; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, ch. 13; P. Langa, *Réplica a la carta de Parmeniano. Introducción, bibliografía y notas*, BAC 32, Madrid 1988, 195-377.

W.H.C. Frend

PAROUSIA. Greek term (= presence, coming) found in the NT where, beginning with *Paul's writings, it refers to the second coming of *Jesus Christ in glory, which he proclaimed more than once. Uncertainty of when this would occur produced in the mainstream church and among heterodox groups various speculations that aimed to establish a precise date: the doctrine of *millenarism emerged from among these speculations. For ecclesiastical writers, the parousia referred to the eschatological judgment (*Diogn.* VII, 6), the presence of God alongside the martyrs (*Diogn.* VII, 9) and, esp., the coming of Christ in the *incarnation (Ign., *Philad.* 9,2; Just., *Dial.* 88,2; *1 Apol.* 48,2; 54,7; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 18; II, 16; Orig., *Hom Ier.* 7,1). Standing in relation to the first coming of Christ in the flesh, but opposed to it in comparison to its outward manifestation, the eschatological parousia or the second parousia (Justin, *Dial.* 14,8; 31-32; Hippolytus, *Antichrist* 44,1; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 4,22,1.2) was an element discussed in *catechesis in connection to the themes of the judgment, the *resurrection of human beings and the restitution of all things, and a vigilant expectation that was void, however, of curious investigation (Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* XV, 1-4). It will be confirmed by two events: first the *cross will appear for the condemnation of the reprobate, then the angels for the glorification of the righteous (John Chrys., *In Matt. hom.* 76,3-4). The parousia of Christ at the end of time will ensure that every person will know, and thus will the righteous and wicked be separated (Orig., *Com. Mt.* 70).

A. Oepke, s.v. παρουσία in GLNT IX, 839-878 [TDNT V, 858-871]; N. Brox, *Zum literarischen Verhältnis zwischen Justin und Irenäus*: ZNW 58 (1967) 124-127; R. Trevijano Etcheverría, *Ἐπιδημία y παρουσία en Orígenes*: Scriptorium Vict. 16 (1969) 313-337; Lampe 1043-44; A. Brontesi, *La soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*, Rome 1972, see index pp. 725-726.

F. Cocchini

PARRHĒSIA. In the Greek *polis*, *parrhēsia* meant freedom of speech and the citizen's freedom. In patristic literature, the term was used in a pejorative sense to signify excessive casualness, excessive familiarity and the fruit of vanity (Dorot., *Doctrinae* IV, 5-6: SC 92, 252). In a positive sense, *parrhēsia* characterized the relationship between God and humanity before *sin. *Gregory of Nyssa identified "freedom" with the "familiarity" that God has

granted to his elect (J. Gaïth, *La conception*, 65-66). Various authors joined *parrhēsia* to some special virtues, very often with prayer (Nilus, *Peristeria* 4,2: PG 79, 828ab), with *sophia* and truth (the contemplatives), with humility and with *martyrdom. *Parrhēsia* was a prerogative of the **Theotokos* (ps.-Epiph., *Hom. 5 In laudes s. Mariae Deiparae*: PG 43, 501b). Lastly, *parrhēsia* with God is mirrored in the fraternal contact among people, in particular, the trusting relationship with one's spiritual father.

J. Gaïth, *La conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris 1953, 65-66.; H. Jaeger, Παρρησία *et fiducia*: SP 1 (1957), TU 63, 221-239; W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, ed. C. Moreschini, It. tr. Ch.O. Tommasi: *Gregorio di Nissa filosofo e mistico*, Milan 1993.

T. Špiklík

PARTHEMIUS. An unknown 5th- or 6th-c. *presbyter, perhaps African; in his reply to a letter from the *Vandal count Sigisteus, he wrote in a deliberately ornate style and concluded with twelve hexameters and an elegiac distich.

CPL 804-805; PLS 3, 448-449; PCBE I, 821.

F. Scorza Barcellona

PARTHENIUS of Constantinople (5th c.). *Presbyter and *archimandrite of *Constantinople, supporter of *Nestorius. One of his *Letters*, which was preserved in Latin (*Synodicum*, 153, see 152: PG 84, 767-67), and addressed to the Metropolitan *Alexander of Hierapolis, an intransigent follower of Nestorius and an adversary of *Cyril of Alexandria (*Synodicum* 152: PG 84, 767b), refers to Nestorius as *sanctissimo illo et deo honorabili archiepiscopo nostro et teste Christi domino Nestorio*. Therefore, his profession of faith should be interpreted in a Nestorian sense; it reads as follows: "It is indeed true to confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God, perfect God and perfect man; we certainly attribute his sufferings to the humanity of Christ, the miracles however to his divinity, preaching one Christ and one Lord" (*Veritas vero est confiteri Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum*, *Filium Dei vivi*, *Deum perfectum hominemque perfectum*; *et damus passiones quidem humanitati Christi*, *divinitati vero miracula*, *unum Christum*, *unum Dominum praedicantes*).

CPG III, 5780; ACO I, 4, 175-176.; Bardenhewer 4, 212; Patrologia V, 29.

A. De Nicola

PASCENTIUS the ARIAN (beginning of the 5th c.). *Arian count of the imperial court (4th-5th c.). In 406, he challenged *Augustine to a debate at *Carthage (Possid., *Vita Aug.* 17), which lasted from the morning to the afternoon. Pascentius, however, refused to have his words written down, fearing that they might be altered to his detriment (Aug., *Ep.* 238,1,7). Facing Augustine's insistence in this regard, he resorted to ad hominem attacks (*Ep.* 238,1,8). He later boasted that he won the debate. Augustine professed his own belief in the three divine persons (*Ep.* 238,2,10), explained the mystery of the *Trinity (*Ep.* 238,2,11; 238,4,25; 238,5,28), the word **homoousios* (*Ep.* 238,1,4; 238,5,27) and exhorted Pascentius to explain his own belief (*Ep.* 238,5,26) so that by believing without distorting the truth he might find happiness (*Ep.* 239,1; 238,5,29; 239,2-3). He vigorously opposed Augustine (*Ep.* 240), who responded to the Arian's misrepresentations in his *Ep.* 241.

CPL 703: *Ep. ad Augustinum*: PL 33, 1051; CSEL 42, 559-560; CPL 366: *Altercatio cum Pascentio Ariano*: PL 33, 1156-1162; PCBE 1, 827-830; A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Vita di Cipriano, . . . Vita di Agostino*, Milan 1975, 393-394.

L. Dattrino

PASCHAL, antipope. Roman archdeacon who, midway through the year 687 when the elderly *Conon became ill, did not hesitate to make a pact with the exarch of *Ravenna John Platyn to be elected bishop in exchange for a large sum of money. However, after Conon's death (21 September 687) the volatile Roman electorate divided into two factions, and Paschal, who was not yet consecrated, found himself opposed by the archpresbyter Theodore, then replaced by a third candidate, the presbyter *Sergius. In contradistinction to Theodore, Paschal never recognized Sergius as the legitimate pontiff and continued to scheme with his Byzantine supporters to get himself placed at the head of the Roman Church. His plot failed: he was apprehended, condemned without a trial, stripped of his ecclesiastical office and imprisioned in a monastery where he died in 692 impenitent (*impenitens*).

LP I, 368-382, 518; Mansi XI, 737-738, 1018, 1097-1098; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, Tübingen 1933, 622-625; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 399-401; M. Andrieu, *Riflessi politici delle controversie religiose con Bisanzio nelle vicende del secolo VII in Italia*, in *Caratteri del secolo VII in Occidente*, II, Spoleto 1958, 785-787; U. Longo, *Pasquale antipapa*, in EPapi I, 631-633.

P. Marone

PASCHAL CANDLE. Its origin is uncertain; it may go back to the Eastern custom of *lucernarium* on Saturday evening and the *Easter vigil. *Egeria describes the lighting of the lamps every evening from the perpetual lamp of the Holy Sepulchre (*Peregr.* 24: SC 21, 191-192). A 5th-c. *Ordo* describes the practice of the solemn lighting of the lamps at the Easter vigil in Jerusalem (Thibaut, *L'ordre des offices*). But its origin may also go back to the patristic theology of baptism as illumination (Justin, *1 Apol.* 65,1). *Eusebius tells how *Constantine had the whole city illuminated with lamps on the Easter vigil (*De vit. Const.* IV, 22: GCS I, 125,22). St. *Augustine's Easter homilies mention the lamps lit during the Easter vigil (*Addit. ad Wilmart* 15: PLS 2, 740; *Addit. ad Wilmart* 17: PLS 2, 741-742; *Guelferb.* V, PLS 2, 549-552).

Since the church did not use candles in the liturgy until the 4th c. because of their pagan overtones, the replacement of lamps by candles can be dated only from then. One reason Jerome severely criticized the practice of blessing the Paschal candle was because, acc. to him, neither the OT nor the NT knew the use of candles (*Ep. ad Praesid.*; PL 30, 182). The use of the Paschal candle in the Roman liturgy probably derives from the *Gallican liturgies, which were influenced by the East. Yet the **Liber pontificalis* (ed. Perovsky, II, 95) attributes its use at Rome back to a pope *Zosimus, who was Greek. Though the Paschal candle was used in Roman parishes from the 5th c., it did not enter the papal liturgy until the 11th c. (*Ordines Romani* 23 and 24).

J. Thibaut, *L'ordre des offices de la semaine sainte à Jérusalem*, Paris 1916; H. Schmidt, *Hebdomada sancta*, Rome 1962; A. Chupungco, *The Cosmic Elements of Christian Passover*, Rome 1977 (SA 72); U. Perovsky, *Liber Pontificalis* (Studia Gratiana 22), Rome 1978; S. Rosso, *Elementi naturali*, in Liturgia (Dizionari S. Paolo), Cinisello B. 2001, 650-651.

A. Chupungco

PASCHALE CAMPANUM. In 464, an anonymous scholar composed the *Epitoma temporum et indiculum paschae* of the *Paschale campanum*, under the consulship of Olybrius and Rusticus. On the basis of the accounts of Victor of Aquitaine (*see* computus, ecclesiastical), this same author set forth an *Easter table that follows a cycle of 84 years, recognizing the celebration of Easter beginning with the 15th day of the moon established acc. to the Alexandrian tradition, and thereby establishing as the endpoints 22 March and 25 April. The period of time goes from 464 to 599. To these dates, a later anonymous author added the years 600-613. The place of the Paschale's origin was certainly Campania, as one can gather from historical information regarding the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in the years 505 and 512 and the entry of *Belisarius into *Naples (536).

The calculation is preceded by a collection of several opinions on the calculation of the years that have passed since the beginning of the world: Flavius Josephus, with 5605 years until the death of *Domitian in AD 96 (*Epitome* 3, *ab exordio mundi*); *Julius Africanus, with 5500 years before the birth of the Lord (*Epitome* 4, *a primo homine*); therefore, three hypotheses that place the *incarnation 5200 years after the creation: *Prosper of Aquitaine, with 5228 years until the passion of *Jesus, in the 15th year of *Tiberius Caesar (*Epitome* 5); *Eusebius of Caesarea, with 5578 years until the death of the emperor *Valens, as one reads in his **Chronicon*, translated into Latin by *Jerome (*Epistome* 6, *a principio mundi*); *Orosius, with 5618 years until Honorius (*Epitome* 7, *ab initio mundi*); lastly, an anonymous text that calculates (*iuxta diligentissimam supputationem*) 5943 years until the consulate of Olybrius and Rusticus, in 464 (*Epitome* 8, *a principio mundi*): which means that the birth of Jesus would have occurred 5479 years after the creation, a number close to *Julius Africanus's calculation, but this is difficult to explain if it is not a mistake in the MS tradition.

CPL 2297; Th. Mommsen, *Chronica minora* I, Berlin 1982, 744-750 (MGH IX, *Auct. Ant.*); H. Inglebert, *Les romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome*: Études Augustiniennes (1996) 593-609; Repertorium 8, 488.

L. Longobardo

PASCHASINUS of Lilybaeum. Bishop of Lilybaeum in Sicily (today Marsala), Paschasinus enjoyed the trust of *Leo I (440–461) who, in 444, consulted him on the question of the date of *Easter. Paschasinus answered him (Leo, *Ep.* 3; 16,7), preferring the Alexandrian over the Roman solution. Seven years later Leo turned again to Paschasinus concerning the date on which of Easter would fall in 455. We do not have Paschasinus's response. Thus in 451, the pope sent Paschasinus as the head of the pontifical delegation to *Constantinople to represent him at the Council of *Chalcedon (see *Ep.* 88; 89; 91; 92). As one can gather from the *Acts* of the synod, Paschasinus was the Roman spokesperson in the conciliar debates.

CPL 1656; Leo, *Ep.* 3: PL 54, 606-610; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christl.-mittelalterl. Chronologie I*, Leipzig 1880, 247-278; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, London 1941, passim; see also the notes of the Ballerini in PL 54; *Pascasino di Lilibeo e il suo tempo*, ed. M. Crociato, Sciascia 2002.

B. Studer

PASCHASIUS of Dumium. Monk of the *monastery of *Dumium *Gallaecia and a disciple of the city's bishop, St. *Martin of Braga (ca. 515–580). The establishment of that monastery, called for by Martin already before his election to the episcopate, conformed to the rules professed by the ancient monks of the East. To this end, Martin commissioned the learned monk Paschasius to translate the statements (**apophthegmata patrum*) of the *desert Fathers acc. to its Greek version (*Prologus* [PL 73, 1024]: (*Vitas Patrum graecorum [ut caetera] facundia studiose conscriptas, iussus a te, sanctissime pater, in latinum transferre sermonem . . .*). The version attributed to Paschasius is contained in book VII of a large collection titled **Vitae Patrum*, first published by the Jesuit H. Rosweyde (Anversa, 1615), and is part of the well-known collection called the *Verba seniorum*. Thus, Paschasius of Dumium and Martin of Braga seem to be the first major humanists of the Early Medieval period in Portugal.

Díaz 315; PL 73, 1025-1066; 74, 381-394; C.W. Barlow, *Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia*, New Haven, CT 1950, 30-51; M. Martins, *Pascasio Dumiense traductor dos Padres do deserto*: Broteria 51 (1950) 295-304; J.H. Waszink: VChr 6 (1952) 60; A. Kurfess, *Weitere Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Martin ep. Bracarensis opera*: Athenaeum 33 (1955) 60-63; C.W. Barlow, *Martin of Braga. Paschasius of Dumium*, Washington 1969, 113-171; Quasten 2, 189-191; J.G. Freine, *A versão latina por Pascásio de Dume dos Apophthegmata Patrum*, 2 vols., Coimbra 1971; G. Folliet, *La tradition latine des Septem capitula abbatis Moysi*: VChr 50 (1996) 200-209; Domínguez del Val 2, 322-324.

L. Dattrino

PASCHASIUS of Rome (d. before 514). His name was connected to the events of the antipope *Laurentius (498–507). With obstinate persistence, Paschasius openly approved of this antipope during the schism that occurred at Rome after the election of Pope *Symmachus (498). The faithfulness of Deacon Paschasius to Laurentius can be explained by the fact that he was probably ordained by him. Removed by time and perhaps focusing on his penitential life, Pope *Gregory the Great rendered a positive judgment about him: *Mirae sanctitatis vir, eleemosinarum maxime operibus vacans, cultor pauperum et contemptor sui* (*Dial.* 4,42,1). Paschasius was venerated in Rome after his death. The same pontiff attributed his adherence to the schismatic party more to ignorance than malice. Paschasius wrote a book on the *Holy Spirit, now lost but owned by Pope Gregory (Greg. M., *Dial.* 4,42,1: SC 265, 152ff.). From his writings, a letter he wrote to the abbot *Eugippus in 513 has survived (CSEL 9, 2, pp. 2-4). The abbot lived in the vicinity of *Naples and supplied him with material for writing a biography on the life of St. *Severinus of Noricum, but Paschasius declined the request.

CPL 678 and 962; CPPM 2, 1315; *Commemoratorium de vita S. Severini cum epistulis amoeboeis Eugippii et Paschasi diaconi*: PL 62, 39ff.; CSEL 9, 2, 1ff.; R. Cessi, *Lo scisma laurenziano e le origini della dottrina politica della Chiesa di Roma*: Archiv. Soc. Romana di Storia patria 42 (1919) 5-229; BS 10, 347; T. Sardella, *Società, chiesa e stato nell'età di Teoderico: Papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996; PCBE 2, 1606.

L. Dattrino

PASSIO SEPTEM MONACHORUM. This text has come down to us in an appendix to the *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* by *Victor of Vita and can be placed in the context of the hagiographic African literature. The *Passio septem monachorum* documents the martyrdom of seven monks (the deacon Boniface, the subdeacons Servus and Rusticus, the abbot Liberatus and the simple monks Rogatus, Septimus and Maximus) from a monastery in Capsa (Tunisia) who were killed at *Carthage by order of *Huneric, during the *persecution of 484. Taking cues probably from Victor's work (*Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* III, 41: CSEL 7, 92) and using as somewhat of a template the biblical account of the suffering of the seven brothers found in 2 Macc 7, the *Passio* seems to have been composed some period after 484, when by that time the memory of Huneric's persecution began to wane.

CPL 800; BHL 4906; PL 58, 261-266; MHG AA 3, 1, 59-62; CSEL 7, 108-114; Moricca III, 763; BS 8, 16-17; PCBE I, 159 n.25 (Bonifacius), 638 n.4 (Liberatus), 740 n.21 (Maximus), 993 n.12 (Rogatus), 1015 n.11 (Rusticus), 1060 (Septimus), 1066 n.6 (Servus); V. Saxer, in *Hagiographies*, I, Turnhout 1994, 76-77; Patrologia IV, 41-42.

P. Marone

PASTOR. Anti-*Priscillianist bishop of the mid-5th. c., of Galician origin; it seems he was the bishop of Palencia. We know nothing of his life before his consecration to the episcopate (431). He is mentioned by *Hydatius (*Chron.* 102), as a friend of *Agrestius and *Syagrius, and by *Gennadius (De vir. Ill. 65. 76), who informs us that Pastor wrote a book titled *Libellum in modum symboli*, at Orléans in 457 as a prisoner of the *Goths. He was the first person to use the term **filioque*. He directed his creed against the Priscillianists. Morin—following the testimony of Gennadius—identified the creed of the first Council of *Toledo with Pastor's: an opinion generally accepted by scholars, but with certain provisos. Ac-

cording to J.A. de Aldama, the profession of faith of Toledo went through two redactions: one shorter (Toledo, 400), the other longer (Toledo, 447). Pastor was the author of the latter.

Libellus in modum symboli: CPL 559; G. Morin, *Pastor et Syagrius, deux écrivains perdus du cinquième siècle*: RBen 10 (1893) 385-390; A. Künstle, *Antipriscilliana*, Freiburg 1902, 40-45; J.A. de Aldama, *El símbolo Toledano I. Su texto, su origen, su posición en la historia de los símbolos*, AG 7, Rome 1934, 29-37; A. Tranoy, *Hydace. Chronique*: SC 219, 68-69; A.C. Vega, *Un poema inédito titulado "De fide" de Agrestio, obispo de Lago, siglo V*: Bol.R.Acad. Hist. CLIX (1966) 167-209; Domínguez del Val 2, 61-63; H. Chadwick, *Prisciliano de Avila*, Madrid 1978, 284-289.

E. Romero Pose

PATERIKON. Greek term (understood as *biblion* = the book of the *Fathers; pl. *paterika*) which, in monastic literature, refers to the collections of anecdotes and ideas of the *desert Fathers. For more information, *see *apophthegmata patrum*.

A. Di Berardino

PATERIUS. Disciple and *notarius secundicerius* of *Gregory the Great (6th–7th c.; *Ep.* 1,37; V, 26; VI, 2; IX, 97; XI, 15; John the Deacon, *Vita Greg.* II, 11). He undertook a project to write a commentary on all of *Scripture, using the interpretations of his teacher. He divided the work into three books: two for the OT (historical books, *Psalms, Proverbs, *Song of Songs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Prophets) and one for the NT. We do not know if he ever finished the work or edited only the part from *Genesis to the Song of Songs. Many medieval authors cited Gregory through Paterius's compilation.

CPL 1718: *Liber Testimoniorum veteris Testamenti quem Paterius ex opusculis S. Gregorii excerpi curavit*: PL 79, 683-916; A. Wilmart, *Le recueil grégorien de P. et les fragments wisigothiques de Paris*: RBen 39 (1927) 81-104; R. Etaix, *Le Liber Testimoniorum de P.*: RSR 32 (1958) 66-78; CCL 142, 401-432 (fragments); CPPM 2, 2820; PCBE 2, 1613.

E. Romero Pose

PATERNIANS. This was the name of the members of a heretical sect in antiquity who maintained that the lower parts of the body, i.e., from the loins to the feet, were the work of the devil, while the upper parts were the work of God. It was their view that one should only be vigilant over the *soul's purity, which resides within the stomach and the head, but one need not worry at all about the purity of one's private parts. Therefore, they taught and practiced moral laxity. It is probably the case that some propagandist coined the title "Paternians." They were also called "Venustians" for their connection to Venus, the goddess of love. Citing information from *Julian of Eclanum, *Augustine spoke of this group, likening them to the *Manicheans.

DTC 11, 2246-2247; Augustine, *Contra Julianum* 5,7,26; *De haeresibus* 85.

C. Dell'Osso

PATERNOSTER. *See* *LORD'S PRAYER

PATERNUS of Avranches (ca. 480–ca. 565). According to *Venantius Fortunatus, who wrote a trustworthy *Vita* about him, Paternus was born at *Poitiers around 480, and as a young man entered the monastic life at the *monastery of St. Jouin, near Thoars, where he held the office of cellarer (i.e., one in charge of provisions). Therafter, accompanied by the monk Scubilion, he decided to begin a life of travel and solitude for the Lord. After having settled at *Sesciacum* (Scissy), he established a monastery, where he remained for nearly three years leading a life full of rigor and mortification. Ordained a deacon, then a priest by the bishop of Coutances, Leontianus, he dedicated himself to intense pastoral activity and established many monasteries in the region of Coutances, Bayeux, Le Mans, Avranches and Rennes, earning himself the fame of a thaumaturge. At 70 years old, i.e., after 550, he was elected bishop through popular acclamation of the people and died after thirteen years of episcopal ministry.

BHL II, 936 n.6477; BS 10, 390-391; LTK 7, 1457. V. Fortunatus, *Vita Sancti Paterni*: PL 88, 487-498; P. Grosjean, *S. Paterne d'Avranches et S. Paterne de Vannes dans les Martyrologes*: AB 67 (1949) 384-400; R. Godding, *Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne*, Brussels 2001, 507.

C. Dell'Osso

PATIENCE. The Stoic idea of patience (καρτερία), conquered of itself, for itself and finalized in itself, is different from the Christian idea of patience (ὑπομονή), which rests on divine grace and help—although with respect to the concept of patience in Greek, contrary to what followed in Latin, it did not correspond to one specific term. Stoicism, however, influenced the Christian concept, and at times during the patristic era it was a factor in introducing the concept of impassibility (ἀπάθεια).

*Ignatius of *Antioch was one of the first *Fathers

of the church to speak of patience. For Ignatius (*Rom.* 10,3), the term means to be strong "until the very end in the patience of Jesus Christ," and this end should be understood as martyrdom. *Hermas referred to it almost exclusively as μακροθυμία and recognized it as one of the four virgins at the corners of the tower that is the church (*Sim.* IX, 15,2); he also dedicated the entire fifth precept to patience: "this is a witness to the presence of the Spirit, before the diabolical wrath (*Mand.* V, 1,2-3), overseeing all the commandments (*Mand.* 2,8), large, strong, serene and joyous" (*Mand.* 2,3 and *Sim.* VIII, 7,6).

In the classical Latin world, Cicero offers us a definition of patience: *patientia est honestatis aut utilitatis causa rerum arduarum ac difficilium voluntaria ac diuturna perpessio* (*De inventione* II, 54). The various positions held by Latin Fathers were not too far from this idea. *Tertullian methodically studied patience in his work *De patientia*, emphasizing its divine origin and explaining its nature, application and fruits. St. *Cyprian in his treatise *De bono patientiae* that this virtue should be accompanied by two others: humility and charity. For this reason, the philosophers were unable to know the true patience (*Pat.* 2). *Patientia est quae nos deo et commendat et seruat: ipsa est quae iram temperat, quae linguam frenat, quae mentem gubernat, pacem custodit, disciplinam regit, libidinis impetum frangit, tumoris uiolentiam comprimit, incendium simultatis extinguit, coercet potentiam diuitum, inopiam pauperum refouet, tuetur in uirginibus beatam integritatem, in uiduis laboriosam castitatem, in coniunctis et maritatis indiuiduam caritatem* ("Patience is both what commends us to and protects us in God: it is what moderates anger, restrains the tongue, governs the mind, keeps the peace, rules discipline, breaks the attack of excessive desire, suppresses the violence of a commotion, extinguishes the fire of hatred, restrains the power of the rich, supplies the necessities of the poor, protects blessed integrity in virgins, laborious chastity in widows and individual charity in couples and married people"; *Pat.* 20).

For *Lactantius, patience is the *malorum quae aut inferuntur aut accidunt cum aequanimitate perlatio* (*Div. Instit.* V, 22,3); it means to endure evils with equanimity. The importance of this virtue is such that all human virtues are joined to it. St. *Augustine proposed several explanations of patience: *interiorem motum frenare, et quod habes commune cum pecore non tamquam pecus in omnia relaxare* (*Sermo* 8); *tolerantia malorum pro iustitia* (the suffering of evil for righteousness; *Sermo* 15D,7); *honestatis aut utilitatis causa rerum arduarum ac difficilium uoluntaria ac diuturna perpessio* (*De div. quaest.* 31). The chief example of patience is God: *patiens est dominus; peccas, et parcit; adhuc peccas, adhuc parcit, et adhuc addis* (*Enarr. in Ps.* 63,19). And the reason for this patience is eternity: *Deus autem patiens est, quia aeternus est, et nouit diem iudicii sui, ubi omnia examinat* (*Enarr. in Ps.* 91,7).

Greek patristic authors left no treatise on patience. Only *Clement of Alexandria wrote a protreptic on patience, a brief fragment of which remains. In the *Stromata* (II, 18, 79, 5-80) he offers a definition: "next to courage is patience [ὑπομονή], which the Greeks call καρτερία, a knowledge of the things that one must endure or not endure." It is a virtue of the gnostic, the one perfected (IV, 21,130,1), and it is associated with ἀπάθεια (II, 20,103,1). In the Greek tradition, in numerous homilies and exegetical commentaries, Job was often presented as an example of ὑπομονή.

Cyprian, *À Donat et La vertu de patience*, Intr., tr. et notes de J. Molager, Paris 1982; Tertullianus, *De la patience*, Intr., texte critique, tr. et commentaire par J.-C. Fredouille, Paris 1984; Augustin, *De patientia*, tr. e comm. di A. Bussoni, Parma 1989; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme dans l'histoire de la patience chrétienne*: Mélanges de science religieuse 39 (1982) 101-130; M. Spanneut, *Patience*: DSp 12, 438-476.

J. Leal

PATIENS of Lyons (d. ca. 480). Mentioned many times by his friend *Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 2, 10; 4, 25; 6, 12; 9, 3), after his election as bishop in 469–470, Patiens was elevated to the episcopal see of *Lyons when the city fell under the rule of the *Burgundians. A guest at the king's court, esp. *Chilperic, he exercised a beneficial influence over them and the nobility, and he succeeded in converting them, and esp. their women, to Catholicism. Patiens was well known because of his activity as a builder; during his time he ordered several basilicas to be constructed, among them a cathedral. In 470 he participated at the Council of *Arles (CCL 148, 159); shortly thereafter he himself convoked another at Lyons (CCL 161) to examine the case of the priest *Lucidus, who had been accused of teaching predestinationism. Patiens made a name for himself through his works of charity: he ordered that grain be distributed during the invasion of the *Visigoths in 471. He died around 480; the date of his martyrdom is mentioned in the *Mart. hier.* as 11 September.

BS 10, 426-427; J.F. Reynaud, *Lugdunum christianum: Lyon du IVe au VIIIe s.: Topographie, nécropoles et édifices religieux*, Paris 1998.

V. Saxer - S. Held

PATRIARCHATE

I. Historical developments - II. Ecclesiological foundations - III. Canonical aspects.

The word *patriarchate* refers to an upper episcopal see and, from an institutional point of view, a superior ecclesial structure, possessing jurisdictional power and a privilege of honor over a vast geographical area.

I. Historical developments. Although the term *patriarch* appeared in ecclesiastical use and in official documents of the Byzantine Empire only from the 5th c. onward, as an institution of church government, the patriarchate began following the Constantinian turning point and more specifically with the Council of *Nicaea (can. 6), when the council fathers recognized the status and authority (*exousia*) of the episcopal sees of *Rome, *Alexandria and *Antioch, i.e., a true authority with responsibility and the capacity to serve as a doctrinal and disciplinary guide over other surrounding churches in large civil administrative areas. The arrangement (*taxis*) of importance attributed at that time to the three great sees, acc. to the order just listed, although following a civil custom (Flavius Josephus, *Jewish War* III, 23), was nonetheless established upon the awareness of the pre-Constantinian churches that the unity of Christ's church was expressed visibly in an ecclesiastical structure hierarchically ordered, with titular *bishops having particular responsibilities for the universal church. In fact, and only for practical reasons, the council simply gave legal form to the pastoral care, which for a long time the three great sees had exercised over communities and bishops residing beyond the boundaries of their own see. Together with the bishops of the three large cities, the council fathers at Nicaea also included the bishop of *Jerusalem, to whose see, however, they assigned "acc. to ancient tradition and custom," only a place of honor without the corresponding universal pastoral duties (can. 7).

At the Second Ecumenical Council of 381, to the four previously mentioned sees another was added, namely, *Constantinople, which was elevated to the second place of honor "because it is the new Rome" (can. 3). In 451, notwithstanding the protests of the papal legates, the decision was confirmed by the Council of *Chalcedon (can. 28), which greatly increased the pastoral faculties of the new Rome, assigning to it honors equal to the First See of Rome and the right of ordaining the metropolitan bishops of Asia, *Pontus and *Thrace (can. 9; 17; 28). On the grounds that Jerusalem was the city of Christ's *resurrection, the council also approved the agreements reached between *Juvenal and *Maximus of Antioch, so that the See of Jerusalem might become independent from the jurisdiction of *Antioch, also conferring upon it powers over the three Palestinian provinces (after the year 400, *Palestine had been subdivided into three administrative provinces: I, II and III, with their respective capitals in *Jerusalem, *Scythopolis and *Petra).

II. Ecclesiological foundations. With Chalcedon, the definitive structure of the patriarchal institution became consolidated, already having been formed by its Nicene origins, not to create a foil against the primacy of Rome, but to meet the demands of centralization for episcopal authority over large Eastern geographical areas in such a way that all the bishops around the patriarch, who depended upon him, might be able to exercise their pastoral authority for the universal church. In fact, although Chalcedon's subdivision was unanimously accepted by the E bishops, Rome did not accept its 28th can. because of the ecclesiological principle it had adopted for individuating the episcopal sees to be created by patriarchal sees. The Eastern bishops had a pragmatic understanding of the canons of Nicaea, Constantinople and Chalcedon in relation to the arrangement (*taxis*) of the future patriarchal sees, and they justified the elevation of Constantinople to "have the primacy of honor after the Bishop of Rome" (can. 3 of the Council of 381) because of its political importance. At Chalcedon, this interpretation was more explicit than at first, from the moment that they spoke of the ancient *privileges granted* to the See of Rome and the rights that therefore could not be attributed to Constantinople because "the city is honored by the presence of the emperor and the Senate" (can. 28). The weakness of the adoption of the sole "political" principle, in the event that it be taken up as the sole support of the patriarchal see, can be seen in its ecclesiological implications. According to this idea, any episcopal see could theoretically be elevated to a supra-metropolitan see on the condition that it corresponded to the will of God expressed by the "consensus" of all the bishops, with conciliar sanction.

At Rome, however, the popes opposed the "political" subdivision of the church universal's territory on the basis of another principle that had already been deeply rooted in the West as a result of earlier debates with *gnosticism: the "apostolic" Petrine foundation belonging only to the sees of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch. After having affirmed the Roman understanding of the *apostolicity of the three sees, *Leo the Great warned in May of 452 in a

letter to *Marcian: *Alia tamen ratio est rerum saecularium, alia divinarum, nec praeter illam petram, quam Dominus in fundamento posuit, stabilis erit ulla constructio* ("Nevertheless, there is one way of thinking acc. to things of the world, another acc. to things of the divine, and, aside from that rock which the Lord laid in the foundation, no other building will stand"; *Ep.* 104, PL 54, 995 AB). Leo's understanding could have derived from the **Decretum Gelasianum*, if one accepts that its original core dates back to Pope *Damasus, where the apostolic foundation of the Roman Church is defended and where one also finds an interpretation of can. 6 of Nicaea that understands the privileges granted to Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, on the basis of a "Petrine" foundation of the three churches (E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, Leipzig 1912, 7; PL 13, 374D-376A). Moreover, at Rome a "mystical" understanding of papal authority developed (Y. Congar), owed to the presence of Peter's tomb in the city, an understanding that in itself would not have led to a special authority of the pope over the other bishops and which at certain times the same Eastern bishops would recognize as a title of honor.

In all actuality, in the history preceding Chalcedon, the two principles of "political" and "apostolic" found an equal attestation of ecclesiological acceptance when one examines the awareness of the use in the traditions of the various patriarchal sees. Even in Constantinople, where the "political" principle prevailed and where the apostolic foundation of the church certainly could not be invoked, accepting the "apostolic" Petrine principle did not consign itself to a certain forced theological interpretation of the unity of the churches. On the basis of the apostolic principle, the council fathers at Chalcedon, and much later *Anatolius of Constantinople, appealed to the "apostolic" mediation of Rome, so that a ray of its apostolic light would most surely shine on the new Rome (ACO tom. II, vol. I, pars 118; PL 54, 958). Because it was *one* with Rome, Constantinople could *also* call itself "apostolic" (W. de Wries, in var. aus., *I Patriarcati orientali*, 32; 13-35).

On the other hand, aware of the apostolic foundation of its universal primacy, between the 4th and 11th c., the papacy never once appealed to its patriarchal power over the West even though the *Justinian idea of **pentarchy* was accepted and even though the Easterners turned to the pope as the patriarch of the West and his Lateran See was called a *patriarchium*. In the West, the jurisdiction of Rome originally extended to the territories that fell under the civil prefecture of Rome, and the bishops who had special relations and obligations to the pope were named *suburbicari*. Thereafter, moreover, Rome did not invoke any rights for ordaining Western metropolitans and forwarded to a lesser extent its patriarchal rights over important Western sees such as those of *Milan, *Aquileia, those of *Gaul or *England. Only in 742, because of the extension of Western Christianity with the conversion of new peoples—to promote doctrinal unity and Western discipline—Rome decreed that the metropolitans of the West needed to go to the pope to receive the *pallium* (Y. Congar, *L'ecclésiologie*, 204-205). Lastly, with the new millennium, the urgency to make effective the reception of the Roman primacy in episcopal unity led Gregory VII (1073–1085) to transfer the "mystical" understanding of the primacy into institutional power, "established by God and non-negotiable" (J. Meyendorff, 30). Even in the East, however, when the *pentarchia* ceased its activities due to the loss of imperial control over the Middle East and Egypt to the invading Islamic forces, it was inevitable that the patriarch of Constantinople, who for centuries was the point of reference for the Eastern episcopate, became the sole spokesman of the Eastern Church and his patriarchate became the only center for the missionary expansion of orthodox Christianity.

III. Canonical aspects. Even with Justinian the patriarchal institution found a legislative ratification under pentarchical form. The patriarchate was, more properly, the expression of Eastern ecclesiology—albeit with Rome included nonetheless—and was imposed on a eucharistic vision of the church along with the awareness that the church is made up of a multiplicity of local churches in *communion, placed on a level of perfect equality. In the West, after centuries of events with different outcomes (A. Garuti), the Second Vatican Council reevaluated the ancient patriarchal institution (*Lumen gentium* 23; *Unitatis redintegratio* 14; *Orientalium ecclesiarum* 9); nonetheless, in continuity with the preceding code of canon law, the 1983 Code (*Codex Iuris Canonici—CIC*) specified that in the Latin church the patriarch is not the one who possesses a power of governance but is solely the bearer of a title of honor, "unless the contrary is clear in some instances and in virtue of apostolic privileges or approved custom" (can. 438). On the other hand, the code of canon law for the Eastern Churches (*Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium*) states that the institution of the patriarchate is a recognized structure of government and it is extensively treated in cans. 55-150, always acc. to Catholic ecclesiology, in connection to the primacy of the Roman pontiff. The patriarch is recognized as

having "a personal, ordinary and proper power" over the faithful, clergy, bishops and metropolitans of his own patriarchal church (can. 78), for maintaining the unity of his own church in the faith, and hierarchical communion with the Apostolic See and other churches (D. Salachas).

To support ecumenism, after the Second Vatican Council theologians sought for theological entry points into the ecumenical dialogue of the Latin church with those of the East in assessing the pope's title as *Patriarch of the West*, a title that in reality does not appear in the conciliar documents and not even in Paul VI's Apostolic Constitution *Romano Pontifici eligendo* (1 October 1975) but only in the *Annuario Pontificio*, and which was a title of honor in compliance with can. 438 of *CIC*. Nevertheless, in 2006 such ecumenical entry points became unfeasible because among the pope's titles that the 2006 *Annuario* listed, that of Patriarch of the West no longer appeared. In a statement released by the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, which accompanied the notice of the suppression of the title (22 March 2006), an explanation is given for both the ambiguity of the title, which was used very sparingly in the tradition, and also for the inadequacy of the term "West" in today's cultural context. That notwithstanding, the statement justifies the suppression of the title for ecumenical reasons. In effect, the patriarchal ideal, contaminated down through history by the connection between the patriarchate and political power, does not render an authentic service to actual ecumenical dialogue (J.-G. Boeglin, 535), which is attuned to an ecclesiological and cultural context in which the respective autonomies of the church and other power structures should be effectively safeguarded.

E. Eid, *La figure juridique du Patriarche. Étude hist.-juridique*, Rom 1962; W. de Wries, *Die Entstehung der Patriarchate des Ostens und ihr Verhältnis zur päpstlichen Vollgewalt*: Scholastik 37 (1962) 341-366; W. de Wries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg-Munich 1963; O. Keramé, *Le Cattedre apostoliche e la funzione dei Patriarcati nella Chiesa*, in Y.M.J. Congar - B.D. Dupuy et al., *L'Episcopato e la Chiesa universale*, Rome 1965, 323-344; Y.M.J. Congar, *L'ecclésiologie du haut Moyen âge*, Paris 1968; var. aus., *I Patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio. Relazioni del Congresso tenutosi al Pontificio Orientale nei giorni 27-30 Dicembre 1967*, Rome 1968; V. Parlato, *L'ufficio patriarcale nelle Chiese orientali dal IV al X secolo*, Padua 1969; W. de Wries, *Orient et Occident. Les structures ecclésiales vues dans l'histoire des sept premiers conciles œcuméniques*, Paris 1974; Maxime de Sardes, *Le Patriarcat Œcuménique dans l'Église orthodoxe*, Paris 1975; L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980; W. de Wries, *Ortodossia e cattolicesimo*, Brescia 1983; A. Garuti, *Il papa patriarca d'Occidente? Riflessioni sull'origine del titolo*: Antonianum 60 (1985) 42-85; V. Grumel - V. Laurent - J. Darrouzès, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, Paris (1932) 1989; R. Schiefer, *Der Papst als Patriarch von Rom*, in M. Maccarrone (ed.), *Il primato del vescovo nel primo millennio*, Vatican City 1991, 433-451; G. Dagron, *Costantinopoli. Nascita di una capitale*, Turin 1991; D. Salachas, *Istituzioni di diritto canonico delle Chiese cattoliche orientali*, Bologna 1993; F.R. Gahbauer, *Patriarchat I*: TRE 26 (1996) 85-91; J.-G. Boeglin, *Pierre dans la communion des Églises*, Paris 2004; J. Meyendorff, *Lo scisma tra Roma e Costantinopoli*, Magnano 2005; M.K. Magee, *The Patriarchal Institution in the Church: Ecclesiological Pespectives in the Light of the Second Vatican Council*, Rome 2006; A. Garuti, *Patriarca d'Occidente? Storia e attualità*, Bologna 2007.

V. Lombino

PATRICIANI. According to *Filaster (*De haer.* 62: CSEL 38, 32) the Patriciani originated from a certain Patricius, who lived at *Rome and taught that the human body was not created by God, but by the devil. Therefore, the Patriciani despised the body even to the point of suicide (see Aug., *De haer.* 61). They thus seem to have been a *gnostic sect (see Aug., *C. adv. legis* II, 12,40: PL 42, 664). The **Praedestinatus* (61: PL 53, 608) adds that at times they asked others to put them to death and that the sect was widespread in *Mauretania and *Numidia, subsequently followed by the *Donatists (see also Ambrosiast., *In I Ep. Tim.* 4: PL 17, 499).

A. Di Berardino

PATRICIUS (d. 370/371). Husband of *Monica (Aug., *Conf.* 9,9,19) and *curialis* of the city of Thagaste in N *Africa (*Conf.* 2,3,5; Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 1,1). He was the father of three children: *Augustine, *Navigius and a daughter whose name is unknown (Possid., *Vita Aug.* 26,1). Though a *pagan, he respected *Monica's faith and the instruction she imparted to their children (*Conf.* I, 11,17). Although an average landowner, he, in agreement with his wife, greatly desired to help their son Augustine move up the social ladder by means of advanced study at *Carthage: at that time study was one of the primary means for social ascent (see *Conf.* II, 3,5 and II, 3,8). He succeeded with the help of a fellow citizen and relative, Romanianus, the father of Licentius (*C. Academ.* 2,2,3). Although at times given to anger and not very committed to marital fidelity, Patricius loved and respected his wife, even managing to win the devotion of his mother-in-law (*Conf.* IX, 9,20). Monica, in turn, with her sweetness and amiability, served Patricius and sought to convert him to Christianity (*Conf.* IX, 9,19). Patricius eventually converted (*Conf.* IX, 9,22) and died in 370/371, when Augustine was seventeen.

PCBE 1833-1834, W.H.C. Frend, *The Family of Augustine: A Microcosm of Religious Change in North Africa*, in *Congresso Internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione*, Rome, 15-20 settembre 1986, vol. 1, Rome 1987, 135-151; C. Lepelley, *Spes saeculi. Le milieu social d'Augustin et ses ambitions séculières avant sa conversion*, in ibid., 99-117; G. Madec, *Le neveu d'Augustin*: REAug 39 (1993) 149-153; R. Doni, *La madre di Agostino. "Donna virile,"* Milan 2002.

A. Di Berardino

PATRICK, saint (d. ca. 492), apostle of *Ireland. The chronology of his life has been subject to much debate. From his writings one discovers that he was born in *Britain to the deacon Calpornius, a decurion, the son of Potitus, a *presbyter and landowner of a modest holding at Bannaventa Berniae (?), an unidentified locale, situated perhaps in the environs of Carlisle, near the Valley of Hadrian. Kidnapped by pirates at 16 years old, he worked in Ireland as a shepherd. After six years, he was able to escape and return to his homeland, probably passing through N *Gaul, where for two months (*Conf.* 21) he was also probably a prisoner of the *Franks (see *Ep.* 14). Having returned to his family, he felt called to the apostolate and pursued it, all opposition notwithstanding. There he prepared himself, he says, for a period that lasted several years (*Conf.* 23). This occurred—acc. to the biography of *Muirchú and *Tirechán—in Gaul, with *Germanus of Auxerre, and at *Lérins (which is very unlikely); instead, his preparation could have taken place in N Gaul (in one of several monastic settings modeled after St. *Martin, whose members were from the countryside and mostly illiterate) and also in Britain itself. Consecrated bishop, Patrick set sail (in 432, acc. to the chronology of the Irish Annals) to N Ireland, where he preached Christianity, reliving the experience of St. *Paul, whose epistles he cited continually. Being an itinerant bishop, he knew how to maintain good relations with the tribal chiefs (*Conf.* 52) and the local administrators (*Conf.* 53), in order to obtain free and safe passage to the country's most remote areas (*Conf.* 51). He pushed westward, toward the Woods of Fochluth (*silva Vocluti*), where he was formerly a prisoner (*Ep.* 10) and from where he had heard the call to come to Ireland (*Conf.* 23). Here the population was mostly pagan (*Conf.* 41) among which, until that time, no one had arrived to preach the gospel (*Conf.* 51). When a community of his neophytes was attacked by the Scots and the Picts, who were connected to the British tribal leader Ceretic Guletic, Patrick intervened by issuing a letter of excommunication (written in Latin) still extant.

In the 7th c., the primatial See of Armagh regarded Patrick as its own founder; other traditions made Dún Lethglaisse (Down) the place of his burial. From Armagh his cult spread until the 8th c. even onto the continent, due to the work of Irish missionaries, and there circulated many legends about him. His feast is celebrated 17 March.

Two of his writings have survived: the *Epistola ad milites Corotici,* against the British king probably from SW Scotland (Strathclyde), and the *Confessions*, written late in life. Writing in a vulgar Latin mixed with biblical words (because Patrick spoke Gaelic in Ireland and knew Latin primarily as a language of the Bible), he "confesses" God's mercy which has called him to evangelize Ireland. Presenting himself as a *peccator rusticissimus*, Patrick compares himself to the learned men of Britain who were probably adherents to *Pelagianism. Though choosing to evangelize the "barbaric" land of Ireland (see *Ep.* 1), Patrick remained deeply attached to his Romanized Celtic roots and thus to Gallic-Roman Christians (*Ep.* 14; *Conf.* 43).

The authenticity of the following works is doubtful: *Epistola ad episcopos in Campo hAi* (frag.) and the *Dicta Patricii.* In some of the canons of the first *Synodus episcoporum, id est Patricii, Auxilii et Iserninі*, some scholars believe they can find traces of Patrick's thought. The account of the prologue to *Senchas Már* is apocryphal, in which the codification of the Irish juridical traditions is attributed to an agreement reached between civil authorities, Fili and the bishops from the time of Loígaire, son of Niall, "King of Ireland," and *Theodosius "great king of the world"; acc. to late recensions, one of the bishops would have been Patrick.

Sharpe 1154; Lapidge-Sharpe 25-26; J.F. Kenney, *The Sources of the Early History of Ireland*, New York 1929, I, 29 and 323-329; CPL 1099-1100; 1102-1104.

Editions and translations: PL 53, 801-826; SC 249, 1978 (R.P.C. Hanson); L. Bieler, *Libri epistolarum Sancti Patricii Episcopi*: CM 11 (1950) 1-150; 12 (1951) 81-214; D. R. Howlett, *The Book of Letters of Saint Patrick the Bishop*, Dublin 1994; L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials*: SLH 5, Dublin 1963, 54-59; M.J. Faris, *The Bishop's Synod*, Liverpool 1976; E. Malaspina, *Gli scritti di san Patrizio: Alle origini del cristianesimo irlandese*, Rome 1985; D. Conneely - P. Bastable [et al.], *The Letters of Saint Patrick: A Study of Their Theological Dimension*, Maynooth 1993.

Biographical Sources: L. Bieler, *Four Latin Lives of St. Patrick*: SLH 8, 1971; Id., *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh*: SLH 10, 1979; Id., *The Life and the Legend of St. Patrick*, Dublin 1949; F.J. Byrne - P. Francis, *Two Lives of Saint Patrck: Vita Secunda and Vita Quarta*: JRSAI 124 (1994) 5-117.

Studies: Chr. Mohrmann, *The Latin of Saint Patrick*, Dublin 1961; R.P.C. Hanson, *Saint Patrick: His Origins and Career*, Oxford 1968; D. A. Binchy, *The Pseudo-historical Prologue to the Senchas Már*: Studia Celtica 10/11 (1975/76) 15-28; P.A. Wilson,

St. Patrick and Irish Christian Origins: Studia Celtica 14/15 (1979/80) 344-379; C.E. Standcliffe, *Kings and Conversion: Some Comparisons Between the Roman Mission to England and Patrick's to Ireland*: FMS 14 (1980) 59-94; E.A. Thompson, *St. Patrick and Coroticus*: JTS 31 (1980) 12-27; Ch. Thomas, *Christianity in Roman Britain to AD 500*, London 1981, 295-346; R. Sharpe, *St Patrick and the See of Armagh*: CMCS 4 (1982) 33-59; E. Malaspina, *Patrizio e l'acculturazione latina dell'Irlanda*, Rome 1984; E.A. Thompson, *Who Was St. Patrick?* Woodbridge 1985; K. McCone, *Dubthach maccu Lugair and a Matter of Life and Death in the Pseudo-Historical Prologue to the Senchas Már*: Peritia 5 (1986) 1-35; K. Devine, *A Computer-Generated Concordance to the Libri Epistolarum of Saint Patrick*, Dublin 1989; D.N. Dunville, ed., *St Patrick, AD 493-1993*, Woodbridge 1993; C. Bourke, *Patrick: The Archaeology of a Saint*, Belfast 1993; L. De Paor, *Saint Patrick's World: The Christian Culture of Ireland's Apostolic Age*, Blackrock 1993; R.M. Keogh, *Does the Armorican Forest Hold the Key to Saint Patrick's Escape?*: SHib 28 (1994) 145-158; T. Ó Fiaich, *Saint Patrick and Armagh*: SAM 16 (1995) 107-119; G. Márkus, *What Were Patrick's Alphabets?*: CMCS 31 (1996), 1-15; Th. O'Loughlin, *Celtic Theology*, London 2000; B. Luiselli, *La formazione della cultura europea occidentale*, Rome 2003, 152-154.

E. Malaspina

PATRIMONY of ST. PETER. This expression came to refer to the sum total of possessions and properties that were acquired by the Roman See starting from the moment in which, with *Constantine's imperial law (*CTh* XVI, 2, 4), the church was recognized to have the right to possess, receive and inherit any type of good. Constantine himself was one of the first to donate various goods to the Apostolic See, primarily lands (in this article we are not going to discuss the so-called **Donation of Constantine* because of its apocryphal character). After Constantine's donations and those of many other emperors, the faithful also contributed many gifts, a phenomenon that slowly increased the belongings and landholdings of the Roman pontiff, which, with the progression of time, took up the name *Patrimonium Sancti Petri*. Thus, because of the multiple historical, economic, social and political factors, the bishop of Rome initially became one of the largest landholders of his time, and subsequently a civil authority of enormous social influence, eventually to become a true and proper sovereign. Such a process of patrimonial growth was similar to the *patrimonium principis* discussed by Roman law.

Starting in the 6th c. various colonies of the Italian peninsula constituted part of the Petrine patrimony: Sicily, *Corsica, *Sardinia, N *Africa, *Gaul, *Dalmatia and certain areas of the East. *Gregory the Great (590–640) led a bold political administration, creating an efficient system of organization for the various territories of the pontifical patrimony. The economic benefits that resulted from this structure not only served to maintain the pontifical administration, but were also used to accomplish many works of social justice. With the passage of time and because of the unstable political situation, a portion of the income was set aside for the military defense of the Roman See. Already in the 8th c., in order to face the serious threat posed by the *Longobards, *Stephen II personally asked for protection from Pepin the Short, king of the *Franks. Moved not only by political interest, but also by an authentic, sincere and devout veneration for the Prince of the Apostles, Pepin not only guaranteed protection for Stephen II, but signed a pact with him (*Donation of Pepin* [Quierzy]), by which he pledged to restore to the Roman See the imperial Italian territories that had been occupied by the *Longobards. These landholdings constituted the initial nucleus of the pontifical states and consolidated the temporal power of the popes. (*See also* *papacy.)

G. Arnaldi, *Le origini del Patrimonio di San Pietro*, in G. Arnaldi - P. Toubert - D. Waley - J.-C. Maire Vigueur - R. Manselli, *Comuni e signorie nell'Italia nordorientale e centrale. Lazio, Umbria e Marche, Lucca*, Turin 1987, 3-151; Id., *L'approvvigionamento di Roma e l'amministrazione del patrimonio di S. Pietro al tempo di Gregorio Magno*: Studi Romani 34 (1986) 25-39; Id., *Le origini dello Stato della Chiesa*, Turin 1987; L. Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical*, Paris 1904; B. Llorca - R. García Villoslada, *Historia de la Iglesia Católica*, II, *Edad Media (800-1303): La cristiandad en el mundo europeo y feudal*, Madrid 1963; R.A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World*, Cambridge 1997; V. Recchia, *Gregorio Magno e la società agricola*, Bari 1978 (bibl.).

J.A. Cabrera Montero

PATRIPASSIANS. The title the Latins used for referring to the *monarchians who were known in the East, starting from the mid-3rd c., such as the Sabellians and those whom modern scholars call "modalists," inasmuch as they made the Son a mode of being and manifestation of the *Father. The founder of this doctrine was *Noetus of Smyrna at the end of the 2nd c. He taught that, if God is only one, Christ, who is God, is to be identified with the Father, in the sense that he, presenting himself as the Son, was begotten as a man, suffered and rose again from the dead. In support of this doctrine he cited scriptural passages on the unicity of God (Ex 3:6; 20:3; Is 44:6 and others) from which he concluded that the Son is to be identified with the Father (Jn 10:30; 14:9-10), as well as Is 44:6; Bar 3:36-38; Rom 9:5. He offered an allegorical interpretation of Jn 1:1, on the basis of which the Logos theologians considered God the Son to be distinct from the Father.

Noetus was condemned by the presbyters of Smyrna, but *Epigonus introduced the doctrine at

*Rome, where *Cleomenes and *Sabellius spread his teaching, as *Praxeas spread it at *Carthage. The type of patripassianism espoused by these individuals who flourished at the beginning of the 3rd c. was that of Noetus, but there was also a different version of the teaching: in the incarnate Christ the divine component represents the Father; the human, the Son; this latter suffered on the *cross, therefore, the Father did not suffer but sympathized with the Son. In fact, Lk 1:35 refers to the Son of God, the one born of *Mary. Moreover, the *Philosoph.* (IX, 10, 11) describes the patripassian doctrine at Rome in the following terms: the one same God manifested himself at one point as the Father, invisible, immortal, etc., at another, as the Son, visible, mortal, etc.

*Tertullian fought against this teaching at Carthage, and the *Philosoph.* did the same at Rome. *Callistus, around 220, condemned Sabellius at Rome for holding a via media (middle position) between the two extremes; but he himself professed a monarchian doctrine: the Father and the Son are distinguished in name, but not by substance (*ousia*); they are just one indivisible Spirit; their **prosopon* (person) is also just one, distinct only in name. In the incarnation, the man is the Son, the divine Spirit that descended on him is the Father; thus the Father has also suffered with the Son. Callistus, like the patripassians, accused the Logos theologians of being ditheists.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884, 615-626; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958, 119-123; M. Slusser, *The Scope of Patripassianism*: SP 17, Oxford 1982, 169-175; LTK³ 7, 1470-71; M. Simonetti, *Ippolito, Contro Noeto*, Bologna 2000; A. Grillmeier, *Le Christ dans la tradition chrétienne. De l'âge apostolique au concile de Chalcédonie*, Paris ²2003.

M. Simonetti

PATROCLUS, hermit (6th c.). The earliest information about Patroclus comes from his contemporary *Gregory of Tours (538–594) (*Vitae Patrum* IX: PL 71, 1051-1054; *Hist. Franc.* 5,10: PL 71, 325). Born in the area of the *Bituriges* (Avaricum), in the territory of Bourges (*Avaricum*, *Bituriga*, etc.), he was appointed by his father to shepherd the family's flock, while his brother Anthony attended school. Thereafter, he also attended, having much success. His scholastic achievements won him a position in the court of King Childebert, son of *Clovis and *Clotilde, at *Paris. Upon the death of his father he returned to his homeland and, against the wishes of his mother, turned to Bishop Arcadius (536–549), who admitted him into the clergy of Bourges. Because of his ascetic lifestyle, he was forced to separate from the local clergy and establish an oratory dedicated to St. *Martin of Tours at Néris-les-Bains, a small, ancient town of Roman *Gaul, where he applied himself to the instruction of children; Néris-les-Bains already had a presbytery and a church, traces of which have been preserved. His fame attracted visitors; he created a community of monks and retired to a solitary place to live as a hermit (*Mediocantus*, today La Celle, situated 7 km [4.3 mi] from Colombier). Other people followed him, for which reason, though continuing to live as a recluse, he established for them a monastery at Colombier, several km N from his hermitage, around 560. He died around the year 576; his body was transferred to the monastery of Colombier, which attracted pilgrims. Miracles occurred in that place. Patroclus was not mentioned in the ancient martyrologies, but in the 12th c. he was venerated by the monks of Souvigny. His feast is celebrated 16 November in the diocese of Moulins and 28 November at Bourges.

BHL 6519; BS 10, 416-17; Cath 10, 828-829; M. de Laugardière, *L'Église de Bourges avant Charlemagne*, Paris 1951, 80-83, and passim; R. Godding, *Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne*, Brussels 2001, 508.

A. Di Berardino

PATROCLUS of Arles (d. 426). In 412, Patroclus replaced Heros as bishop, who had been caught up in the fall of the usurper *Constantine, who resided at *Arles from 409 to 411. Despite his atypical advancement in the hierarchy, he worked his way up during the time of Pope *Zosimus (417–418), at whose ordination he was present. He immediately obtained from the pope the parishes of Ceyeste and Garguier on the pretext that they had been wrongly taken by Proculus of *Marseille. Furthermore, he caused the metropolitan's rights to extend over Viennensis and Narbonensis I and II, to the detriment of *Vienne, *Narbonne and Aix. He manipulated the apostolate of St. *Trophimus, who had been supposedly sent by the apostle *Peter to occupy the See of Arles, to act as metropolitan and dominate and wield the episcopal sees as a means to his ends. *Boniface (418–422), however, the successor of Pope Zosimus, ceased to continue his predecessor's policy and did not renew Patroclus's exorbitant privileges. Patroclus was entangled in the political storm that followed the emperor *Honorius's death (423) and was assassinated (426).

G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1964; Storia del cristianesimo, vol. II (index).

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PATROLOGY - PATRISTICS

I. Meaning of terms - II. Origins and development (17th-19th c.) - III. Patristics in the 20th c.

The reception and use of the *Fathers during the Middle Ages and Renaissance is treated under the entry *Father, Fathers of the church; in this entry we will treat the most recent period.

The title "father" (Lat. *pater*) provided the source for the term "patrology," then "patristics"; two related terms that tend to be distinguished. The individual who coined the term *patrology* was the Lutheran scholar J. Gerhard (d. 1637) in his posthumous study *Patrologia sive de primitivae Ecclesiae Christianae Doctorum vita ac lucubrationibus*, which appeared at Jena in 1653; the book includes authors from *Hermas to Bellarmine.

I. Meaning of terms. The term *patrology* tends to refer primarily to historical and literary study (life and works) of ancient Christian writers. A certain number of historians prefer to speak of "the history of ancient Christian literature," a title shared by numerous works, with different origins and tendencies (Batiffol, Puech, Labriolle, Bardy, Moricca, Pellegrino, Moreschini-Norelli and Simonetti-Prinzivalli). At the beginning, *patristic* was an adjective, which was understood to refer to "theology." In the 17th c., it appeared in the writings of Lutheran and Catholic theologians who distinguished theology into the following categories: biblical, patristic, scholastic, symbolic and speculative. Today, those who prefer this term privilege the study of ideas and doctrines over the philological and literary aspects. The first patrologists did not outline rigid borders between ancient Christianity and the Middle Ages; they simply gave the name "Fathers" to earlier writers, as is the case in the ancient *Bibliothecae Patrum*, which go until the 15th and 16th c. Mabillon himself still considers St. Bernard of Clairvaux to be "the last of the Fathers." Migne followed this idea in his *Patrologia* (to the consternation of J.B. Pitra). Modern authors, however, have set more precise limits. They maintain that the age of the Fathers ended with *Gregory the Great or *Isidore of Seville for the Latins and *John of Damascus for the Greeks. Certain modern authors would like to include the Venerable *Bede and Byzantinism. *Eusebius of Caesarea can be considered the precursor of the *Patrologia*. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, he supplies us with an invaluable history of early Christian authors and their works, providing large quotes from their writings. In the *De. vir. ill.*, *Jerome wrote 135 short biographies, taken in loose, logical order, which go from Simon *Peter to *Sophronius, ending modestly with himself. Eusebius was a great source of inspiration for this work. The best pieces of information come from those on his contemporaries. The work of Jerome was continued by *Gennadius of Marseille, who added a hundred new biographies; this work is extremely valuable for the 5th c. The continuation of *Isidore of Seville and *Ildefonsus of Toledo extends primarily to Spanish writers.

II. Origins and development (17th-19th c.). The Renaissance and the invention of the printing press helped spread patristic writings. The first text was an *apocryphal work of *Augustine, *De vita christiana*, printed at Mainz in 1461. Then, in the 16th and 17th c., the printing of patristic texts reached a feverish pitch. In fact, there were more than 20 editions of *Tertullian's *Opera Omnia* between the publication of the *editio princeps* in 1521, released by B. Rhenano, and the last edition of the 17th c.

Erasmus's efforts were preceded by famous publishers who were assisted by philologists such as Robert Estienne (d. 1559) and his son Henry. We should also mention here the Franciscan Feuardent (d. 1610), the author of a series of patristic editions; the Jesuit Fronton du Duc (d. 1624), editor of *John Chrysostom, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Basil of Caesarea; J. Sirmond (d. 1651), historian and editor of the writings of the Fathers, *Fulgentius, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Eusebius of Caesarea and *Rufinus, and of the collection *Concilia antiqua Galliae;* the Dominican F. Combefis (d. 1678), who published *Maximus the Confessor's writings and a vast collection of patristic homilies; the historian Etienne Baluze (d. 1718), who, among other things, prepared the *Conciliorum nova collectio* (*New Collection of Councils*); J.B. Cotelier (d. 1686) who, at Paris, established a catalog of Greek MSS and published three volumes of the *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta* (*The Written Works of the Greek Church*).

In England, one should at least mention Henri Savile (d. 1622), cofounder of the Bodleian library, who made a noteworthy edition of John Chrysostom's works, using the best MSS available at the time; in Germany, J.A. Fabricius (d. 1736), philologist and editor of the writings of *Hippolytus and *Filaster (1721). To these one should add the work of the *équipe* of the Maurists and the Bollandists. In fact, in the course of the 16th c. scientific historiography began with the work of Cardinal Baronius (1538–1607), with his *Annales Ecclesiastici*, and the Jesuit Jean Bolland (1596–1665), founder of the *Acta Sanctorum*, and continued by the *Society of the Bollandists*, among whom one should note the name of P. Peeters (1887–1950) and H. Delehaye (1859–1941),

the latter considered to be the greatest modern scholar of hagiography. The work continues thanks to the work of the Congregation of the Maurist Fathers, in the Benedictine Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Près at Paris, a center for the promotion of learning and historical and philological renewal. Among the Maurists, one should mention Jean Mabillon (1632–1707) and Bernard de Montfaucon (1655–1741), founder of Greek *paleography.

In the 19th c. Jacques Paul Migne (1800–1875) collected the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers in two series under the same generic title *Patrologia*; the collection included all partial publications and the large editions of the Fathers, bringing together in one locus the *Bibliotechae*, *Spicilegia*, *Analecta*, *Anecdota*, *Miscellanea*, *Monumenta* and *Reliquiae*, published since the invention of the printing press. He also added the historical, critical and theological studies of earlier centuries—valuable resources that scholars can still consult to this day and that would be difficult to find elsewhere.

Starting from the mid-19th c., K. Lachmann formulated and applied more rigorous criteria for creating critical editions; patristic texts and the new "corpus" now benefit from his efforts, esp. the CSEL, GCS, SC and CCL. The East has its own place in the PO, PS and the CSCO.

III. Patristics in the 20th c. This rich area of research has been enormously enlarged; monographs and specialized journals have accumulated. Every year, the bibl. on *Origen and *Augustine requires numerous pages. Patristic study has been enriched thanks to the discovery of new Latin, Greek and Eastern texts that have increased the *dossier*. To create the *Supplementum* for just the *Patrologia Latina*, four volumes were required. The most surprising recent discoveries have been those of the following scholars: Dolbeau, who found 20 of Augustine's *Sermons*, all of which were published in 1996; Frede, in 1983–1984, who discovered a Latin MS of the Pauline Epistles along with a complete anonymous commentary; and Divjak, in 1981, who found 30 letters, 25 of which were Augustine's.

*Papyrology and *epigraphy have brought forth unpublished texts such as Origen's *Disputation with Heraclides*, *Didymus's commentaries on Genesis, Job and Zechariah, discovered at Tura in 1941. The *Nag Hammadi Library has opened a new phase in the study of *gnosticism. More modest papyri allow us to become better acquainted with the daily life of the early Christians. Moreover, archaeology enriches patristics, which explains the large amount of space devoted to this subject in this encyclopedia.

Papyri, translations, fragments, precise inventories of MSS favor the ever more rigorous editions of ancient texts, which benefit also a deeper understanding of Christian Greek and Latin.

The contribution of philology has allowed true progress with respect to the fascination with and study of ancient texts. It is not by chance that Adolf von Harnack's works have been reissued in anastic reprints, notwithstanding their unequal historical value. After the school of Uppsala, that of Nijmegen has taught us to discern better the originality of Christian Latin. The questions of authenticity and chronology have been studied with new rigor, the sources of authors accurately and patiently analyzed. The *Sitz im Leben*, the cultural, religious, political, social, literary and philosophical atmosphere have been minutely explored. The way opened by F.J. Dölger in his comparison between Antiquity and Christianity has brought forth abundant fruit. Studies in this area offer a new reading with greater consistency in interpretation and more objective analysis.

The 2nd half of the 20th c. has been esp. rich in various contributions to patristics studies; some series of texts have reached their 50th anniversary: the *International Conference on Patristics, Oxford; Sources Chrétiennes;* and the *Corpus Christianorum*. Scholars at the Oxford Patristics Conference in the first fifty years of its well-attended meetings (almost a thousand participants gather every four years) offered the most studies on the following authors: Augustine, followed immediately by Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great. The conference has also witnessed a geographical change in the provenance of scholars. In fact, in the two last patristic conferences of the century (1995 and 1999) the number of participants from the United States has surpassed those of Britain, which was historically the most numerous group, followed by the French, Germans and Italians, but Japanese, Indian and South African scholars have also attended. Every four years international patristic conferences are organized also in France and Australia, a bit more restricted but not inferior in quality. The centers for patristics studies have multiplied: to list just the most recent would be too long. We mention here the annual patristic conferences held at the Augustinianum (Rome) and the Centre for Early Christian Studies, created in 1997 in Australia. Moreover, during this time, with respect to the initial project of the CCL, the direction has had to forgo quantity in favor of quality, slowing down the rate of publication, but publishing a series of critical editions of the highest level, some entirely innovative (Simonetti). The effort has also been technological, because various

editions of CD-ROMs and online editions have been published containing the original texts in electronic format (as is the case also for the PL and TLG) and lexicographical instruments of the CCL. With respect to the SC, the quality of the volumes published has improved as much as it has with the CCL.

Furthermore, in these fifty years, various patristic associations have been created, including in 1965 the AIEP/IAPS (Association Internationale d'Études Patristiques/International Association of Patristic Studies), and associations at both the national and international levels are now beginning to form (e.g., Canada, United States [1970] and Hungary).

The topics most frequently studied by scholars range from the Bible of the Fathers and patristic exegesis to *Manicheism, *apocryphal texts, the relations between Christianity, Hellenism and *Judaism, the history of Christian spirituality, *monasticism, the Origenist controversy, ecclesiology, the liturgy etc. (Di Berardino).

To all these areas one could add the influence the Fathers exerted on the subsequent centuries; scholars have been able to determine to what extent Tertullian, Origen, *Lactantius and Augustine were able to shape the thought of all Europe.

Though once reserved to the domain of the clergy (like theology), patristics has entered the public domain, drawing the interests of religious and nonreligious scholars, Christians and non-Christians, who gather together to study the Fathers, bringing their own philological and philosophical learning to the discussions. The Fathers have now found their own place in general literature and can be found widely represented on the Internet with bibliographies, texts and translations.

E. Amann, *Pères de l'Église*: DTC 12, 1192-1215 (summary of the discussions on the term); see also the manuals of Altaner and Quasten; H.R. Drobner, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie*, Freiburg 1994, 3-4; *Les Pères de l'Église au XVII^e^ siècle: actes du colloque de Lyon, 2-5 octobre, 1991*, publiés par E. Bury et B. Meunier, Paris 1993 (with an extensive bibl. on the topic); H. Rosweyde, *Jean Bolland et la recherche des documents. Le "Memoriale pro R.P. Silvestro Pietrasancta"*: Analecta Bollandiana 120 (2002) 141-150. For the modern editions and translations: *De studio theologiae patristicae et historicae*: Seminarium 17 (1977) (fine tuned to the work of specialists). See the manuals: Quasten 1, 17-21; Altaner 33ff. For bibl., see *L'Année Philologique* (a large amount of space has been devoted to the Fathers) and *Bibliographia Patristica*. A.G. Hamman, *Pour un aggiornamento des manuels de patrologie et de patristique*: TU 107, 1970, 95-99; Id., *Jacques Paul Migne. Le retour aux Pères de l'Église*, Paris 1975; Id., *Pour une lecture concrete des textes*: TU 125 (1982) 285-292; Id., *L'épopée du livre. La transmission des textes anciens, du scribe à l'imprimerie*, Paris 1985; A. Di Berardino, *Tendenze attuali negli studi patristici*, in *Complementi interdisciplinari di patrologia*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1989, 25-70; Id., *Orientations actuelles des recherches patristiques*, in *Les Pères de l'Église au XX^e^ siècle: Histoire-Littérature-Théologie. "L'aventure des Sources chrétiennes,"* Paris 1997, 379-402; Id., *Lo sviluppo degli studi patristici*, in *La Teologia del XX secolo, un bilancio*, I, ed. G. Canobbio - P. Coda, Rome 2003, 327-357; M. Simonetti, *Novant'anni di filologia patristica*, in *La filologia medievale greca e latina nel secolo XX*, Atti del Congr. Int., Rome 1993, 17ff.; P. Maraval, *Le Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques. Histoire et bilan de trente ans d'existence*: Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 76 (1996) 211-221 (Biblia Patristica); P.H. Poirier et al., *Littérature et histoire du christianisme ancien*: Laval théologique et philosophique 57 (2001) 337-365; 563-604; and 58 (2002), 357-394; J. Leemans, *Fifty Years of* Corpus Christianorum *(1953–2003). From Limited Edition Project to Multi-located Scholarly Enterprise*, in *Corpus Christianorum 1953–2003, Xenium Natalicium*, ed. J. Leemans, Turnhout 2003, 9-55; M. Simonetti, *La teologia dei Padri*, in *Lo sviluppo degli studi patristici*, in *La Teologia del XX secolo, un bilancio*, I, ed. G. Canobbio - P. Coda, Rome 2003, 359-389; TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae), University of California, Irvine.

A. Hamman - J. Leal

PATRON. This investigation on the nature and the function of the patron begins with some observations on the etymological range and the functional capacities that the term had from its first appearance in the Latin West. The concept of *patronus*, in its full legal sense, represented primarily one of two sides of an unequal relationship in which the second party was the *cliens*, the *libertus* or the *discipulus*. The *cliens*, who did not enjoy the Roman *civitas* in the full sense of the term, found himself in an inferior state and obligated toward the patron, and for this reason, he soon also sought his protection. From this legal disparity would also necessarily derive the responsibility of the patron for the client (Dion. Hal., *Ant.* 2,9,3; Plut., *Rom.* 13). At the end of the age of the Republic, during Caesar's time, it seems that the *cliens* relationship ceased to be one of obligation—with the exception of freed slaves who remained bound by obligation to the those who had freed them—and instead became a voluntary relationship (Cic., *Orat.* 1,177). During the imperial period, the relationship of the patron remained voluntary. The patron was a respectable citizen who received praise and reverence from a large number of clients, to the extent that he merited having statues dedicated to him (Plin., *Nat. hist.* 34,4-5). It was not rare, however, that the use of the term *patronus* conveyed not only the idea of protection for people, but also of things, ideas and ways of being (Cicero speaks of *Caesaris actorum patroni*: Cic., *Philipp.* 10,16). There are, however a few passages that attribute the human title patron to a divinity: Plautus provides a case in point; he defined Venus as the *patrona* of a priestess consecrated to her service (Plautus, *Rudens* 258). Therefore, one

can maintain that gradually the category of *patronus* came to lose its legal basis; one witnesses the shift of the term toward metaphorical meanings.

The semantic meanings of the pre-Christian period do not lack testimonies of a patronage relationship between a private Roman citizen and a civil community. They speak in these instances of *patronus civitatis*, *patronus pagi*, *municipii*, *provinciae* and *coloniae*. During the imperial period, the position of the patron of a community lost its historical meaning: from an intermediary between the conquered peoples and the senate, the patron tended to be transformed into a generic protector, almost a doer of public works as it were toward the client community. During this period, however, the bond between the community and its patron tended to occur in a restricted context, and in fact the patron was usually a native of the *civitas* that chose him to be its protector.

When the imperial power began losing strength, the subsequent decline of the municipal bodies reduced the patron-city relationship to an honorific title on the one hand; on the other hand, the weight of the bureaucracy and the fiscal burdens brought about the need to have recourse—esp. on the part of the inhabitants of the peripheral settlements in the countryside—to the great landowners or army officials to obtain special help against the tax revenue authorities. Such help, however, always required a *quid pro quo*, i.e., the cessation of all one's own rights. This practice would be called *patrocinium* (*Cod. Theod.* 11,24,1). With the backdrop of the decline of the city's governmental bodies, one should analyze the figure of the **defensor civitatis*, who was responsible not only for juridical representation but also for providing protection against every abuse. In this regard, this person was the equivalent to the *patronus*, even though the latter originated from the official norms and the other from custom.

At the lexical level, Latin authors often used the term *patronus* as the equivalent of *defensor civitatis*, often creating great confusion. The term *defensor*, however, soon and with great success, entered into Christianity, although the same was not the case for the *defensor civitatis*.

From these extended meanings came the first reflections of Christian writers, who already from the beginning of the 2nd half of the 4th c. focused primarily on the veneration of the martyr *saints, whom they trusted to obtain intercession. If during the period of *persecution, in fact, the ideal of holiness was recognized in the *martyrs, then with the advance of the peace of the church and the recognition of Christianity as a *religio licita*, the figures of the monks and the *confessores* were venerated and took on the role of protectors of single individuals or groups. In the same way, the disintegration of the empire and the invasions of foreign peoples led the people to identify the sanctity of life with the commitment to survival and the support of the city, and with the defense of the communities from the invasions caused by natural disasters and barbaric invasions.

For the entire 4th c., Christian authors showed great familiarity with the classical meanings of the terms and the phenomenon of its change from the civil duty with the ensuing loss of the semantic meaning strictly connected to it (*Minucius Felix, *Cyprian, Arnobius, *Tertullian, *Lactantius, *Ausonius, *Augustine and *Jerome).

Though the pre-Christian use of the term continued, the vocabulary of patronage also entered Christian language, bringing with it the images and metaphors of the civil world. Though its meanings remained intact, it seems that there was a transferal of horizons, in the sense that the community of which they spoke began to refer to the heavenly community.

*Ambrose spoke of the martyrs as those who performed their ministry of patronage in favor of the living. In a manner similar to the civil authority, the martyr performed this protective function for the chief Authority, almost as if he were the highest magistrate of heaven (*Exp. Ev. sec. Luc.* 10,12: CSEL 32, 460). The martyr, the *patronus* par excellence during this period, held an almost juridical relationship among the faithful, inasmuch as he agreed to offer the faithful protection, offering them his own intercession before God. At the same time his remains became a pledge, a guarantee: his body and his *relics guaranteed the protection and defense of the church or city that protected them. In Ambrose's writings, two specific senses of the term emerge: *advocatus* of individuals who enjoy his protection and *defense* of the entire community. The bishop's contribution therefore was the fact that he inserted into the official Christian language a concept that was formulated however by other writers (e.g., *Victricius of Rouen and *Sulpicius Severus).

*Paulinus of Nola exerted decisive influence in forwarding the idea of a saint's predilection for a given community. He constantly attributed the term *patronus* to St. *Felix, who was the patron of the poet, the city of *Nola and the local Christian community. The passages that attest to personal patronage reveal that the traditional values of the bond of patronage that tied Paulinus to Felix have by that point been turned into a celestial dimension: the relationship is not restricted to a specific time, but is eternal, and Felix is a *patronus*, *susceptor* (the one

who patronizes and defends at the tribunal) and *dominus* (*dominaedius*, as Paulinus says). In relation to the saint, Paulinus refers to himself as an *alumnus* and a *mancipium*, i.e., the *libertus* of the saint (*Carm.* 18,1-5; 20,11-12; 21,85-190: CSEL 30, 97.143.164). The passages, however, that attest to a patronage over a city refer both to the heavenly protection of the saint over the city of Nola, and the attribution to Felix of the title *patronus caelis* over the city itself (*Carm.* 13,26-27; 19,153: CSEL 30,45.123).

From his writings, one discovers that the living who do not possess full rights in the heavenly city are placed under the protection of the one who does. They not only protect but also lead them to liberty, causing them to seize full heavenly citizenship. Paulinus himself, moreover, mentions the *patron saints of various regions or cities among whom, alongside the *apostles and martyrs, appear the great recently deceased bishops such as *Ambrose for Italy, *Martin for *Gaul, *Delphinus for Aquitaine (*Carm.* 19,153: CSEL 30, 123). In this perspective, Paulinus heavily emphasizes the similarity between *Rome, the guardian of the apostles, and *Nola, protected by the presence of Felix (*Carm.* 13,28; 14,85: CSEL 45.49). First in the writings of Ambrose, then in those of Paulinus—both of whom came from famous families and thus possessed the canonical *cursus honorum*—the term *patronus* evolved and took on the idea of patronage over individual cities.

In the mid-5th c., moreover, hagiographical texts were added to the literary corpus. The *Passio Genesii* provides an example because it speaks of *Genesius as the patron of *Arles (CSEL 29, 425-428). Similarly, in the *Passio Symfronianii*, Symphronianus is the *patronus et defensor patriae suae* of the city Autun (in AASS Aug. 4, 496-497). Likewise in the 5th c., the expressions tending to express the special bond between a saint and a community multiplied, including *peculiaris patronus* or *peculiare patrocinium*, which were intended to show that, in addition to the intercession of the *saints over every region, certain places enjoyed a special assistance (see *Maximus of Turin and the *Vita* of Amator of Auxerre). The title *peculiaris patronus* was attributed to the saints and native bishops of the city (Cesarius of Arles attributes a *patronus peculiaris* to St. Genesius in *Sermo* 225,1: CCL 104, 888) or to those who are connected to the city for having suffered martyrdom in it (Valerian of Cim., *Hom. de bono martyrii* 15,5: PL 52, 740C). *Avitus of *Vienne, moreover, attests that the presence of a patron also determines a social phenomenon, i.e., the modification and growth of the civil conglomeration following the presence of the local martyr whose cult, with the presence of pilgrims, determines the transformation of simple towns (*oppida*) into cities (*Hom.* 28-29: MGH AA 6, 2, 150).

The authors of the 6th c. do not offer any substantial novelties to the evolution of the term *patronus*, even if *Cassiodorus, writing in 533, for the first time in Latin Christian literature, attributed the title "*patroni* of Rome" to *Peter and *Paul (*Var.* 11,2,6-7: CCL 96, 427-428). From the literary sources of this period, and in a manner widespread in the hagiographical sources, it seems that the person of the *bishop assumed a new role, precisely that of a protector. This phenomenon was widespread esp. in those cities that lacked the presence of a martyr or his or her relics and had recourse to the bishop and his intercession. Starting from the time of the emperor *Constantine, the bishop was no longer a simple institution of juridical government within the church; rather, he entered into the juridical structure of the empire in the full sense of the term. He represented a point of reference for the defense of the citizens' freedom. From the end of the 4th c. to the mid-7th, in fact, the guardian role of the bishop and his juridical capacity, which do not seem to have undergone substantial modifications with respect to what had been established in the imperial laws, would take on such an importance that the survival of the bishop would also determine the survival of the civil community.

The bishop assumed a role of primary importance both for the dignity of his position and the exercise of various public functions. The responsibilities of the bishop can be thus synthesized: the capacity primarily *to watch and protect*. For this reason, he was a supporter of the needy, the one who received the orphans and pilgrims, the redeemer of prisoners (as in the case of Namatius of Vienne and Sergius of Tarragona). He was also the intercessor for the believers before every power, public or private, a strange phenomenon very scattered in the hagiographical literature of the 5th and 6th c. The liberation of those imprisoned always pertained to the bishop (Sulp. Sev., *Dial.* 3,4: CSEL 1, 201), a characteristic that, in addition to representing a literary *topos*, had a certain relevance with the Justinian legislation for the regions of the East and Italy. From the testimonies of the 6th-7th c., scholars have concluded that the bishop possessed additional responsibilities: intervening in aid of those purely human needs of civil society, in the case of a natural disaster such as a fire and in the defense of the community from external threats such as the barbarians.

When a person presents all these characteristics or even just one of them, grounds are established for

a community to choose its own bishop as a patron whose virtues have been recognized, because in the mind of the faithful the functions performed by the bishop in life do not end with his death, but continue even when he enters the afterlife (Greg. Tours, *Vit. patr.* 17,4: MGH Scr. mer. 1, 731; Gennad., *Script. eccl.* 1: PL 58, 1062; Dynam., *Vita Maximi* 7: PL 80, 36). As had occurred already for the martyrs and even for the bishops, from the 5th c. onward, the bond of preference and protection that began with his own city and community was maintained in a more efficacious manner if the citizens made sure to preserve his mortal remains (Gennad., *Script. eccl.* 1: PL 58, 1062; Dynam., *Vita Maximi* 7: PL 80, 36).

RAC 3, 649-656; A.M. Orselli, *L'idea e il culto del santo patrono cittadino nella letteratura latina cristinana*, Bologna 1965; A.M. Orselli, *Il santo patrono cittadino: genesi e sviluppo del patrocinio del vescovo nei secoli VI e VII*, in *Agiografia Altomedievale*, Bologna 1976, 85-104; A.M. Orselli, *Il santo patrono cittadino fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto medioevo*, Rome 1981, 771-784; W. Speyer, *Die Hilfe und Epiphanie einer Gottheit, eines Heroen und eines Heiligen in der Schlacht*, in E. Dassmann - K.S. Frank (eds.), *Pietas*, Münster 1980, 55-77; R. Wisskirchen, *Christus – Apostelfürsten – Heilige – Stifter. Zur Stellung und Beziehung von Einzelfiguren oder Gruppen in Mosaiken stadtrömischer Kirchen*, in E. Dassmann (ed.), *Chartulae*, Münster 1998, 295-310; F. Canali De Rossi, *Il ruolo dei patroni nelle relazioni politiche fra il mondo greco e Roma in età repubblicana ed augustea*, Munich-Leipzig 2001; M. Jost, *Die Patrozinien der Kirchen Roms während des ersten Jahrtausends*: Hagiographica 8 (2001) 1-34; A. Angenendt, *In honore Salvatoris. Vom Sinn und Unsinn der Patrozinienkunde*: RHE 97 (2002) 431-456, 791-823.

F. Lentino

PATRON SAINT. 1. In classical Roman antiquity, the term (which derived from the Latin *pater*, "father") generally referred to those who in some manner protected persons, or rather entire provinces. In more ancient times this type of relationship was probably not regulated by legal sanctions. With the passing of time, however, it was regulated both by certain norms pertaining to common law or, at least with respect to the relationships between the members of leading families and the poorest citizens, by some religious prescriptions. One very special type of patronage existed between *patrons and freedmen that was regulated in an ever-more-precise manner by the law. An indication of this type of bond can be gathered from a statement in one of Plautus's works: *Volo me placere Philolachi, meo ocello, meo patron* (*Most.* 167). With respect to legal assistance, the *patroni* had recourse to the assistance of the orators who, on the condition of payment, defended their legal cases: *Iudicis est semper in causis verum sequi, patroni non numquam veri simile etiamsi minus sit verum, defendere* (Cic., *Off.* 2,14,51). Another type of patronage was instituted at times among the commanders of the Roman army and the peoples subject to them. Pompey's patronage pertained to many regions of the empire and constituted, without a doubt, a significant element of the emperor's *auctoritas*: *Pompeianorum colonorumque dissensio delata ad patronos est, cum iam inveterasset ac multos annos esset agitata* (Cic., *Sull.* 60). Already during the time of the empire, certain Roman municipalities chose influential Roman citizens who, on the condition of payment, acted as mediator between the town councils and the emperors and defended in a generic way the interests of the citizens of those locales.

The transformed office of the patron of the communities, which was so widespread in Late Antiquity, was the rise and fall of the patronage of the bishops, esp. because of the disintegration of the imperial administration as a result of the barbaric invasions. The development of the episcopal *patrocinium* led to the creation of the figure of the civic patron saints.

2. The practice of placing a person, an association or a place of worship under the protection of a saint was born in the Christian context. From written testimonies it is evident that the patron saints lived before the founding of a given church. In fact, *Cyprian in some of his *Epistulae* attested that his brother bishops assumed the names Peter and Paul (*Ep.* 27-28; 31-32, etc.). *Eusebius of Caesarea's text is very significant in this regard. He cited the case of five martyrs who changed their pagan names to biblical ones (see *Mart. Pal.* 11,8). *Ambrose, for his part (*Exh. virg.* 3), exhorted Christian parents to name their children after virtuous people and martyrs, so as to place them under their protection and to set them forth as an example. *Prudentius wrote the work *Peri stephanon* in honor of Christian martyrs, primarily Spaniards and Romans, whom he calls *patroni martyres*; the crowns that were a reward for the soldiers and the athletes were conferred upon the martyrs, i.e., the victorious soldiers of Christ, who in turn became protectors in the common struggle against evil: *Sed per patronos martyras / potest medellam consequi*, "but through the patron martyrs, one can obtain a cure" (2,579-580); *exultare tribus libet patronis / quorum praesidio fovemur omnes*, "it is a joyful thing to cheer for three patrons / by whose protection we are all supported" (6,145-146). The case of Pope *John II (533–535) is relevant: before being elevated to the pontifical throne he had the name Mercury but then decided to change it to the

Christian name John. This name change is attested by numerous inscriptions of the church of St. *Clement at *Rome. It was during that period that it became popular to be called by a Christian name, while it was felt at the same time to be unfitting to bear a pagan name.

The practice of assigning the name of a saint to a church was unknown in the first three centuries of Christianity, or at least we do not possess any written testimonies in this regard. This custom probably began in *Constantinople at the beginning of the 4th c., while Constantine was building the "basilica of the *Apostles," called the *apostoleion*, in which he was buried and where his son *Constantius ordered the transfer of some of the apostles' relics. The use subsequently passed into the West, esp. at Rome and *Milan. It was heavily promoted by Ambrose with the discoveries of the relics of Sts. *Gervasius and Protasius. At *Rome the cemeterial churches often took the name of the martyr buried there: St. *Peter at the *Vatican, St. *Paul Outside the Walls, St. *Lawrence Outside the Walls and St. *Agnes Outside the Walls. From the cemeterial churches, where it made its first appearance, the use was extended to the city churches. The synods held at Rome between 499 and 595 attest to a significant change in this regard. In the Acts of the Synod of 499, Roman titular priests signed the documents as those charged with the pastoral care of the *tituli Pammachi, Iulii, Vestinae, tituli ss. Iohannis et Pauli, s. Mariae trans Tiberim, S. Eusebii* etc. Other churches during that period bore the name of a saint: St. Clement, St. *Matthew, Santa Maria Maggiore and Holy Apostles. The pilgrims and the translations of the relics multiplied the number of churches dedicated even to nonlocal saints: Roman saints were accepted as patrons of the churches outside *Italy; similarly, buildings of worship were constructed in honor of Eastern saints in the West and vice versa.

DACL 4, 374-405 (dedication of churches); EC 9, 983-990; ODC 462ff.; LTK 8, 187-192; F. Engesser, *Der Stadtpatron in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diokletian*, Diss., Friburgo 1957; L. Harmand, *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au bas empire*, Paris 1957; A.M. Orselli, *L'idea e il culto del santo patrono cittadino nella letteratura latina cristiana*, Bologna 1965; S. Boesch Gajano, *Agiografia altomedioevale*, Bologna 1976; F. Bajo, *El patronato de los obispos sobre la ciudades durante los siglos IV-V en Hispania*: Memoria de Historia Antigua 5 (1981) 203-212; A.M. Orselli, *Il santo patrono cittadino fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, II, Rome 1981, 771-784; M. Forlin Patrucco, *Social Patronage and Political Mediation in the Activity of Basil of Caesarea*: SP 17, 3 (1982) 1102-1107; P. Brown, *Il culto dei santi: l'origine e la diffusione di una nuova religiosità*, Turin 1983; R. Van Dam, *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Berkeley, CA 1985; J.-U. Krause, *Spätantike Patronatsformen im Westen des Römischen Reiches*, Munich 1987; C.D. Fonseca, *La dedicazione di chiese e altari tra paradigmi ideologici e strutture istituzionali*, in *Santi e demoni nell'Alto Medioevo occidentale* (*secoli V-XI*), XXXVI Settimana CISAM, Spoleto 1989, 925-946; *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental* (*III*e*-XIII*e *siècle*). Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome La Sapienza (Rome, 27-29 octobre 1988), Rome 1991; J.K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*, Sheffield 1992; J.M. David, *Le patronat judiciaire au dernier siècle de la république romaine*, Rome 1992; L.M. White, *Social Networks in the Early Christian Environment: Issues and Methods for Social History*, Atlanta 1992; R.E. Daly, *Position and Patronage in the Early Church*: JTS 41 (1993) 529-553; S. Giglio, *Patrocinio e diritto privato nel tardo impero romano*, Perugia 1995; B. Repsher, *The Rite of Church Dedication in the Early Medieval Era*, Lampeter 1998; G. Ferraro, *Cristo e l'altare: Liturgia di dedicazione della chiesa e dell'altare*, Rome 2004.

W. Turek

PATROPHILUS of Scythopolis. One of *Arius's first followers from the very beginning of the controversy, Patrophilus sought to support his cause at the Council of *Nicaea. He took part in the subsequent reaction to that council, and at *Tyre (335) he was among the bishops who condemned *Athanasius. *Eusebius of Vercelli, who was exiled to *Scythopolis following the Council of *Milan (355), suffered various forms of mistreatment from him. In 358-359, Patrophilus worked to oppose the anti-Arian program of the *homoiousians who condemned him at the Council of *Seleucia (359), but the condemnation had little effect. Around 360, when a debate arose about the divinity of the *Holy Spirit, he took a negative position along with *Acacius.

DCB 4, 216-217; Simonetti 595; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV*e *siècle* (*328–373*), Rome 1996, see index.

M. Simonetti

PAUL, apostle

I. The man and his evangelistic work - II. Paulinism - III. Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles - IV. Iconography.

I. The man and his evangelistic work. The primary sources for information on Paul's personality and evangelistic work the letters he wrote to the communities he founded, for which he lived and worked (see Gal 1:11–2:14; 1 Cor 15:9; 2 Cor 11:22-23; 12:1-10; Rom 11:1; Phil 3:4-6; Phlm 9). The autobiographical statements in the letters, though offering an incom-

plete depiction of his life, are supplemented by the data provided by the Acts of the Apostles, notwithstanding the problems that this text raises as a historical work composed by *Luke, his disciple, from the moment that three-quarters of the book has *Paulos* as its protagonist, as he himself affirms (see 1 Th 1:1; Rom 1:1), in the Greek form of the Roman surname *Paulus* ("small"), a typical name for the *Gens Aemilia*. In the book of Acts he is called "Saul" until his meeting with Sergius Paulus, the governor of *Cyprus (Acts 13:7), and from this moment onward he is called "Paul" (Gk *Paulos*, Acts 13:9,) as if to emphasize the placement of the apostle's missionary role in the Hellenistic-Roman world. Among groups of the Diaspora, moreover, having two names was commonplace, namely, a Semitic and a Hellenic one (see Acts 1:23; 12:25). He claims he was "circumcised on the eighth day, from the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews, acc. to the law a Pharisee" (Phil 3:5; see also Rom 11:1). Born at *Tarsus (Acts 22:3), the commercial center of Cilicia, not far from the mouth of the navigable river Cydnus, between AD 5 and 10, he traveled to *Jerusalem as a youth (Acts 22:3 and 26:5), where he was a disciple of Rabbi Gamaliel (Acts 22:3) and set himself apart in his zeal for the law and the Mosaic traditions (Gal 1:13-14), vigorously opposing the nascent church (Gal 1:13-16; 1 Cor 15:10-11; Phil 3:5).

Through a divine calling and election (Gal 1:13-16; 1 Cor 15,9-10; Phil 3,6.12), he suddenly became a follower and *apostle of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 15:8-9), who appeared to him in the radiance of his resurrection (1 Cor 15:8-9; 9:1) on the way to *Damascus (Acts 9:3; 22:6; 26:12; but this claim is not explicitly confirmed in the Pauline Epistles); he stayed in Arabia for nearly three years, then returned to Damascus (Gal 1:17). The only date that is relatively certain can be derived from the fact that he was able to flee from the governor of King Aretas (2 Cor 11:32-33), who died in AD 40. Having reached Jerusalem in an extraordinary way, he stayed there for just a short time but had the opportunity to meet *James and *Peter (Gal 1:18ff.) before returning to Cilicia (Gal 1:21). In all likelihood he stayed in Tarsus (Acts 11:25) for several years without engaging in any specific evangelistic activity. It was *Barnabas who invited him to Antioch (Acts 11:25) and who joined him on his mission (Acts 13:2). From the Pauline Epistles one can identify some significant points of his evangelical mission in Asia Minor and Greece, but it is impossible to reconstruct a complete picture of his missionary activity. Acts instead describes at length the three missionary *journeys across the regions of Anatolia, *Asia Minor, *Macedonia and Greece. At the end of the third journey, he traveled to Jerusalem to offer the Judean brothers a collection taken from the communities he had established (Acts 21:17ff.). He was arrested at Jerusalem by Roman soldiers because a riot broke out due to his presence in the temple area (Acts 21:27ff.). Facing the danger that Paul would meet a violent end at the hands of the *Jews, the Roman tribune had him led to Felix in *Caesarea, the Roman procurator from AD 52 to 58 (this date, however, has been disputed).

Felix was stalling and desired to send him back to the religious judgment of the Sanhedrin. At that point Paul appealed to the imperial tribunal, being a Roman citizen from birth (Acts 22:28). Felix's successor *Festus (AD 58-62) had him brought to *Rome. Acts narrates the vicissitudes of the sea voyage until their disembarkation at Puteoli and ends abruptly, informing the reader that he remained for two years under house arrest at Rome, while receiving guests and preaching the kingdom of God and the Lord Jesus Christ. It seems almost certain though that Paul recommenced his missionary activity after his Roman imprisonment, because his letters show that he founded the communities at Colossae and Laodicea in Asia Minor, and also at *Crete (Tit 1:5). An ancient tradition, established on Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Rom 15:24, 28) and implicitly confirmed by *Clement of Rome's *Epistle to the Corinthians* (chs. 5–7), describes Paul's missionary journey to *Spain before his death, which acc. to an ancient tradition of the Roman church was crowned with martyrdom together with Peter in Rome during the *persecution instigated by *Nero (between AD 64 and 68). *Ignatius of Antioch in his epistle from Smyrna seems to allude to this tradition (Ign. *Rom.* 4,3). At the end of the 2nd c., Gaius the presbyter was aware of the *tropaion* of Paul the martyr on the Ostian Way (see Eus. *HE* 2, 25, 7).

H.D. Saffrey, *San Paolo apostolo: Una biografia storica* (It. tr. P. Carozzi), Cinisello Balsamo 1995; M. Adinolfi, *Da Antiochia a Roma: Con Paolo nel mondo greco-romano*, Cinisello Balsamo 1996; G.F. Hawthorne - R.P. Martin - D. G. Reid, *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, Downers Grove, IL 1993; R. Penna, *Paolo di Tarso: Un cristianesimo possibile*, Cinisello Balsamo 2000; J.-M. Poffet, *Paolo di Tarso*, Cinisello Balsamo 2002.

V. Loi - B. Amata

II. Paulinism. From the very beginning, Paul's theology was a goad and a point of contention in the church's theological discussions. Already the book of Acts, which devotes one-half of its narrative to the apostle, defends him, praises his person and presents him as a great thaumaturge and powerful preacher, and at the same time passes over in silence

his desire to be called an *apostle in the same way as the Twelve. Other letters composed (edited), in the tightest circle of Pauline preaching, by collaborators and disciples of the apostle, touch upon individual aspects of his theology and deepen them (Eph: the church, *one holy*, even if composed of *Jews and Gentiles; Col: the cosmic and universal character of Christ and the *redemption). 1 Peter and, less conspicuously, Hebrews fall under the influence of Pauline thought. Even more problematic, however, remains the problem between Paul and *John. As much as both authors insist on certain underlying concepts (law and *grace, *faith, *love), which distinguish them with respect to the synoptic gospels, so too is Paul independent from the Johannine exposition. In certain late New Testament letters (Jas, 2 Pet), one already notes some critical tendencies toward Paul and some indications about a distortion of the Pauline doctrine of *justification; such tendencies and indications in the *canonical writings, as in the later writings of the *Orthodox Church, never lead to an open rejection and condemnation of the apostle. This hostile attitude toward Paul was limited to extremely small groups of heretical Jewish Christians (*see* *Clementines [pseudo]). The writings of the Apostolic Fathers (*1 Clem.*, Ignatius, *Polycarp) presuppose some knowledge of the Pauline Epistles, esp. 1 Cor, but they do not show what foundational concept provides the basis for their concern to preserve Paul's living theological inheritance. The same applies to the Pauline letters (1 and 2 Tim; Tit) which, at the end of the New Testament era, with their preoccupation for preserving the authentic teaching intact, appeal vigorously once again to the sole *authority of the apostle, but do not enter, moreover, into a discussion with their opponents on the meaning of Paul's sayings. The Apostolic Fathers and the Pastoral Epistles share great esteem for Paul, as a missionary and apostle who suffered much for Christ.

1. Controversies over Paul in the 2nd c. A large portion of ecclesiastical writings (the *Epistle of *Barnabas*, *2 Clement*, the majority of the *apologists, *Papias of Hierapolis) pass over Paul without giving a precise reason for their decision, nor do they allow one to posit a possible explanation. After the extremist manipulation of Paul's epistles by *Marcion, ecclesiastical writers were also compelled to take a position. One cannot know with certainty if the preference for Paul shown by the presbyter of Asia Minor and author of the *Acts of Paul* (Tertull. *De bapt.* 17) was caused by an anti-Marcionite stance. The poor condition of the primary sources of that period keep us from understanding *Justin Martyr and *Melito of Sardis's knowledge of Paul and their evaluation of the apostle's teaching. An exception to the rule is the author of the *Letter to *Diognetus*, who, though hardly a Marcionite, displays an open disregard for the OT and a clear predilection for Paul. For the *gnostics, Paul was not a particularly authoritative witness, even though Tertullian called him the "apostle of the *heretics" (*Adv. Marc.* 3,5,4). The *Valentinians above all sought to exploit his ideas in their system because of his allegorical *exegesis, although some central Pauline ideas (e.g., God as the *Father of Jesus Christ, the universality of the salvific plan of God, the *resurrection of the flesh as the inalienable moment of the *eschata*) were irreconcilable with their views. The documents in which one notices the real points of agreement, as for instance the *Letter to Reginus*, show doubts on the authenticity of their gnostic character. At the end of the century, *Irenaeus (*Haer*) and Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.*) not only affirmed the incorporation of the Pauline Epistles into the revealed writings of the New Testament, but also demonstrated it. From then on, the place of the *Corpus Paulinum* in the biblical canon, which was being formed at that time, was no longer subject to debate.

2. The Pauline tradition in the East and West. At no particular period have all of Paul's writings been used in their entirety for theological discussion; at various times, one aspect of his thought has always been privileged over another. In the 3rd c. it came about that the Pauline tradition followed divergent paths in the Eastern and Western churches. Eastern authors first challenged Paul's doctrine of *justification, to which the West attributed utmost importance. The East propagated the Paul of 1-2 Corinthians; the West, the Paul of the Epistle to the Romans (Benz, 291). *Clement of Alexandria certainly cited Romans but did not accept the doctrine of justification. *Origen even comments upon Romans, but the epistle's key underlying concept is absent from his theological system. *Athanasius and *Gregory of Nyssa comment only upon 1-2 Corinthians and remain silent about Romans. Only from the turn of the 5th c., *Didymus the Blind, *John Chrysostom, *Theodoret of Mopsuestia and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus begin to treat the entire Pauline corpus. According to Benz (297) those *commentaries give the impression that they were compiled more out of a literary scrupulosity for completeness than for a desire to elaborate their theological contents; scholarship, however, lacks a broad study on the reception of Paul's epistles in the 4th and 5th c. In any case, all the Greek theologians heavily emphasized the following aspects: the mystical-sacramental dimension of Paul's preaching with an emphasis on conformity to Christ, the new

*birth, the new creation and sanctification.

In Western theology, for a long time Paul did not exercise a role that one could call, on a large scale, "definitive." A serious investigation of the Pauline Epistles does begin before the end of the 4th c., first and foremost—at the margins of the theology of the official church. The commentaries on Paul of the so-called *Ambrosiaster and the Aquileia MS were written by unknown authors, although those of *Marius Victorinus were those of an orator recently converted to the faith from Neoplatonism. But even *Ambrose of Milan deals seriously with Paul's writings, esp. in some late letters addressed to his brother bishops (*Ep.* 73-76). *Priscillian is said to have had a special knowledge of Paul; he was condemned as a heretic. In Galatians and then more thoroughly in Romans, Paul articulated his theology of grace and justification, which was accepted above all in the West, inflaming the controversy between *Pelagius and *Augustine on the cooperation of grace and free will, which then developed into their extreme consequences (the doctrine of original *sin and *predestination). Luther and the Protestant Reformation, unilaterally emphasizing Romans and the doctrine of justification, further deepened the chasm between the theology of the East and the West. Paul, who wanted to become "all things to all men" (1 Cor 9:22), wrote to the Greeks and Romans, adapting himself to their various temperaments. This objective of the apostle is reversed when one forgets that he always wanted to adapt himself to particular recipients of his epistles and their life situations, and one pretends to adopt the Paul of certain epistles or theological positions as if it were Paul's teaching in its entirety.

General Studies: A. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford 1927; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Münster 1933 = ²1984; E. Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der Alten Kirche*, Berlin 1937; E. Benz, *Das Paulus-Verständnis in der morgenländischen und abendländischen Kirche*: ZRGG 3 (1951) 289-309; M.F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle*, Cambridge 1967; W. Schneemelcher, *Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des 2. Jh.*: ZKG 75 (1964) 1-20; A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen 1979; E. Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch. Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus*, Münster 1979; W. Geerlings, *Hiob und Paulus. Theodizee und Paulinismus in der lateinischen Theologie am Ausgang des 4. Jh.*: JbAC 24 (1981) 56-66; E. Dassmann, *Paulus in frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Opladen 1982; L.F. Ladaria, *Paul chez les Pères de l'Église*: DSp 12 (1984) 513-22; E. Dassmann, *Zum Paulusverständnis in der östlichen Kirche*: JbAC 29 (1986) 27-39; W.S. Babcock, ed., *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, Dallas, TX 1990; M. Simonetti, *Paolo nell'Asia cristiana del II secolo*: VetChr 27 (1990) 123-44.

Studies on individual authors: A. Merzagora, *Giovanni Crisostomo commentatore di S. Paolo*: Didaskal. 9 (1931) 1-73; U. Wickert, *Studien zu den Pauluskommentaren Theodors von Mopsuestia*, Berlin 1962; H. Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*, Berlin 1967; P.M. Parvis, *Theodoret's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford 1975; B. Lohse, *Beobachtungen zum Paulus-Kommentar des Marius Victorinus und zur Wiederentdeckung des Paulus in der lateinischen Theologie des 4. Jh.*: Kerygma und Logos (Festschrift C. Andresen), Göttingen 1979, 351-366; W. Erdt, *Marius Victorinus Afer, der erste lateinische Paulus-Kommentar*, Frankfurt a.M. 1980; A. Viciano, *Cristo el autor de nuestra salvación. Estudio sobre el comentario de Teodoreto de Ciro a las epístolas paulinas*, Pamplona 1990; F. Cocchini, *Il Paolo di Origene*, Rome 1992; R. Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret*, Tübingen 1994; J.-N. Guinot, *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, Paris 1995; U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos. Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, Berlin 1995; B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin lecteur et interprète de saint Paul*, Paris 1996; G. Raspanti, *Mario Vittorino esegeta di s. Paolo*, Palermo 1996; L. Wehr, *Petrus und Paulus – Kontrahenten und Partner. Die beiden Apostel im Spiegel des Neuen Testaments, der Apostolischen Väter und früher Zeugnisse ihrer Verehrung*, Münster 1996; J. Pichler, *Paulusrezeption in der Apostelgeschichte*, Innsbruck 1997; M.M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet. John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, Tübingen 2000.

E. Dassmann - H.R. Drobner

III. Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles. Various scholars have reiterated several times (Harnack, Lagrange, Wiles, Lyonnet, Godsey) that the Pauline corpus, and, in particular Romans, with the reflections and commentaries to which it has given place, has marked the most salient moments of the history of Christianity. One finds plenty of information on the commentaries of Greek Christian writers in Jerome's writings: in *Ep.* 33, he provides a catalog of Origen's commentaries on the Pauline corpus, lastly presented in *Vir. ill.* 54; in *Ep.* 49, he mentions various patristic commentaries on 1 Cor and, in *Ep.* 119 those on 1 Th. In all, Jerome provides us information on twenty-some Greek commentaries on various Pauline Epistles, and the list of *Fathers cited includes the following names: *Origen, *Dionysius, *Pierius, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Didymus, *Diodore of Tarsus, *Theodore of Heraclea and *Apollinaris of Laodicea. *Socrates provides information about *Eunomius's *Commentary on Romans* (*HE* 4, 7).

Such statements show that toward the end of the 4th c. Pauline commentaries from the 3rd and early 4th c. were still circulating, commentaries, which, for the most part, are no longer available to us today. One can gather information about other commentaries, even if fragmentary, from the scriptural commentaries known as *catenae* written during the Byzantine period. If we omit the uncertain information about one possible Marcionite commentary on the Pauline Epistles—and another commentary attributed at times to *Pantaenus (Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 36) or at

other times to *Heraclitus (Eus. *HE* 5, 27)—the most ancient and important commentator on Paul's writings appears to have been *Origen. From the Pauline commentaries attributed to him, aside from *Rufinus's Latin translation of the *Commentary on Romans* and chapters 3–5 of the same commentary preserved in a Greek text on a *papyrus from Tura, we have only fragments cited by *Pamphilus, Eusebius, *Epiphanius or contained in the **catenae* (for the fragments on the *Comm. on Eph.*, see J.A.F. Gregg, in JTS 3 [1901–1902] 233-244, 398-420, 554-576; for the fragments on the *Comm. on 1 Cor.*, see Cl. Jenkins, in JTS 6 [1903–1904] 113-116; 9 [1907–1908] 231-247, 353-372, 500-514; 10 [1908–1909] 29-51). Only fragments from the *catenae* from *Eusebius of Emesa's *Comm. on Rom.* and *Comm. on Gal.* and *Acacius's *Comm. on Rom.* and Didymus's commentary on *1 and 2 Cor.* have survived. Of the five commentaries on the Pauline Epistles that Jerome attributes to *Apollinaris, we only have important fragments from his *Comm. on Rom.* Even from Diodore's commentaries, only the fragments in the *catenae* have survived.

We know, however, of *John Chrysostom's 250 *homilies on the entire Pauline corpus and his systematic commentary on Galatians. In these homilies and in this commentary, the pastoral character typical of Chrysostom's work emerges continually where the text permits it; however, he does not fail to offer a literal explanation first. The *catenae* have preserved numerous fragments from *Severian of Gabala's commentaries, and *Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentaries on Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Hebrews. A 5th-c. Latin version of Theodore's commentaries on the 10 minor letters of Paul have survived. The greater part of his works have been lost because he was accused of *Nestorianism and condemned by a council a century after his death. From the Pauline commentaries of *Cyril of Alexandria we have fragments on Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Hebrews. However, we have all of Theodoret of Cyrrhus's systematic commentaries on the 14 letters of the Pauline corpus. These commentaries from the 1st half of the 5th c. are characterized, acc. to the author, by their brevity and unsought-for originality. Also belonging to the 5th c. are commentaries on Paul's letters from *Gennadius of Constantinople, of which we know only fragments from the commentary on Romans and brief passages from other letters which are extant in the *catenae*.

With regard to the Latin commentaries on the Pauline corpus, the fact that numerous commentaries have survived intact allows us to provide a more precise synthesis. The first commentator was *Marius Victorinus, from whose commentaries we have parts from Galatians, Ephesians and Philippians, in which he strives to apply a literal interpretation of the text; shortly after him was *Ambrosiaster, who wrote systematic commentaries on all of Paul's epistles, all of which have come down to us. Through this author's commentaries, dominated by literal-historical exegesis, even if not lacking typological interpretations, we can observe the transmission of the Latin text as it existed in the 2nd half of the 4th c. before the revision of the Vulgate. In 1973–1974, a discovery was made of an anonymous commentary contained in a codex from Budapest. Shortly after 386, during his stay at Bethlehem, Jerome wrote his commentaries on Philippians, Galatians and Titus, in which he reverts to the earlier commentaries of Origen, Didymus and Apollinaris, esp. for what he says about Galatians and Ephesians.

In 394 Augustine made his first attempt to comment upon Romans; he restricts himself to explain briefly only a few passages, using a literal interpretation (*Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epist. ad Rom*). His complete *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* dates to this same year. Shortly thereafter, Augustine returned to Romans with the intention of commenting upon it systematically, but the work did not get beyond Rom 1:1-7. In 397, he explained Romans 7–9 for *Simplicianus (*Quaest. ad Simplicianum*). He commented upon other chapters of Romans in his books *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* and in *De spiritu et littera*. *Pelagius had a deep interest in the Pauline corpus between the years 406 to 409, at which time he commented upon the apostle's thirteen epistles. Pelagius's exposition is literal, restrained and contains few digressions; his interlinear explanations make his work more akin to *scholia* than a commentary in the true and proper sense of the term. Souter has attributed a commentary on Romans to *Cassiodorus, which was published in the 16th c. under the name of *Primasius. In the mid 6th c., Cassiodorus and his school produced a set of Pauline commentaries that modified Pelagius's commentaries in an anti-Pelagian sense (*Expositio s. Pauli epistulae ad Romanos, una cum complexionibus in XII sequentes s. Pauli epistulas a quodam Cassiodori discipulo anonymo concinnatis*).

Scholars have explained the limited presence of the Pauline corpus in the 2nd c. and the dearth of commentaries in the 3rd c., now for the most part lost, as a consequence of the attitude taken by the mainstream church, on the one hand, toward the use made of Paul by Marcionites (see E. Norelli, *La funzione di Paolo nel pensiero di Marcione*: RivBib 34 [1986] 578-586) and gnostics (see E. Pagels, *The*

Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters, Philadelphia 1975), and on the other, toward a strong anti-Paulinism esp. among Jewish Christians (var. aus., *Antipaolinismo: Reazioni a Paolo tra I e II secolo*: Ricerche Storico Bibliche I/2 [1989]).

The proliferation of Pauline commentaries in the 4th and 5th c., however, does not seem to be accidental if one considers that authors like Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius—who were not interested in commenting on the whole Bible—devoted a large portion of their exegetical work almost exclusively to Paul's letters. It seems inadequate to account for the presence of these commentaries with the reduction of the threat posed in the 2nd c. by the Marcionites and the gnostics, by the *Ebionites and all *Judaizing groups. The following factors contributed to the phenomenon: (1) the Christian community's attainment of a higher level of maturity in its doctrinal formulation—this maturity was witnessed by the use commentators made of the Pauline corpus for arguments against heresies (see Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Rom.* praef.); (2) the increased interest of Jews and Christians for proselytism: a fresh reading of Paul's writings, esp. Romans, could have helped clarify questions that arose from this situation; (3) the change of the political situation, which saw the empire outlaw paganism and thus the conversion of many pagans to Christianity: Paul's letters became the point of reference for those who emphasized the sufficiency of faith and those who discussed at length humanity's sinfulness and, accordingly, each person's ethical responsibility; (4) monastic asceticism which institutionalized a nostalgia for the witness of the proper life to live in the new historical situation, with emphases that differed acc. to the intensity with which one preferred grace or free will, divine mercy or human merit—all themes extensively discussed in Paul's writings.

J.A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, Oxford 1844 (for the Pauline fragments, vols. IV-VII); C.H. Turner, *Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles*, in *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. Hastings, New York 1906, 485-531 (extra vol. 484-531, Edinburgh 1947); A. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries in the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford 1927; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche*, Münster 1933; K.H. Schelkle, *Paulus Lehrer der Väter*, Düsseldorf 1959; M.F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church*, Cambridge 1967; E. Peretto, *La lettera ai Romani cc. 1-8 nell'Adversus Haereses d'Ireneo*, Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Università di Bari 1971; H.J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulus Text und Kommentar*, I-II, Freiburg 1973–74; F. Gori (ed.) *Mario Vittorino. Commentari alle Epistole di Paolo agli Efesini, ai Galati, ai Filippesi*, Turin 1981; A. Piédagnel (ed.), *Jean Chrysostome. Panégyriques de S. Paul*, SC 300, Paris 1982; S. Zincone (ed.), *Giovanni Crisostomo. Commento alla lettera ai Galati*, Rome 1982; L.F. Ladaria, *Paul chez les Pères de l'Église*: DSp 12 (1983); A. Pollastri (ed.), *Ambrosiaster. Commento alla lettera ai Romani*, Rome 1984; M.G. Mara, *Il significato storico-esegetico dei commentari al corpus paolino dal IV al V secolo*: ASE 2 (1985) 71-87; F. Cocchini (ed.), *Origene. Commento alla lettera ai Romani. Libri I-VI*, I, Casale Monf. 1985; Id., *Libri VII-X*, II, Genoa 1986; L. Fatica (ed.), *Ambrosiaster. Commento alla lettera ai Galati*, Rome 1986; S. Zincone, *Problematiche relative alla resurrezione nell'esegesi antiochena di 1 Cor 15,20 ss.*: ASE 3 (1986) 99-108; S. Zincone (ed.), *Giovanni Crisostomo. Panegirici su San Paolo*, Rome 1988; L. Fatica (ed.), *Ambrosiaster. Commento alla Prima lettera ai Corinzi*, Rome 1989; M. Pesce, *Il commento dell'Ambrosiaster alla Prima lettera ai Corinzi. Alla ricerca della differenza tra esegesi antica ed esegesi storica*: ASE 7/2 (1990) 593-629; A. Viciano, *Cristo el autor de nuestra salvación. Estudio sobre el commentario de Teodoreto de Ciro a las epístolas paulinas*, Pamplona 1990; V. Ugenti (ed.), *Cirillo di Alessandria. Commento alla lettera ai Romani*, Rome 1991; F. Cocchini, *Il Paolo di Origene. Contributo alla storia della recezione delle epistole paoline nel III secolo*, Rome 1992; M.G. Mara, *Agostino interprete di Paolo*, Turin 1993; F. Cocchini, *L'esegesi paolina di Teodoreto di Cirro*: ASE 11/2 (1994) 511-532; G. Di Nola (ed.), *Giovanni Crisostomo. Commento alla Prima Lettera a Timoteo*, Rome 1995; F. Cocchini, *I Commentari di Origene e Teodoreto di Cirro alla lettera ai Romani: Continuità e novità nella storia della recezione di Paolo*: Augustinianum 36 (1996) 313-336; F. Cocchini (intr., notes, comm. and ed), *Teodoreto di Cirro. Commentario alla lettera ai Romani*, Rome 1998; J. Ries - F. Decret - W.H.C. Frend - M.G. Mara, *Le epistole paoline nei Manichei, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Rome 2000.

M.G. Mara

IV. Iconography. "Short in stature, bald head, bowed legs, joined eyebrows, jutting nose, magnanimous. Sometimes he looked like a man, but at other times he seemed to have the face of an angel." This is the description of Paul by the anonymous author of the *Acta Pauli et Theclae,* an apocryphal Pauline work dating before AD 200 (Erbetta II, 259). Likewise, acc. to *Nicephorus (*HE* I, 2,37), the apostle had the following physical characteristics: small body, curved shoulders, large forehead, beak-like nose and a long face.

With regard to paleo-Christian art, scholarship has not answered the problem of the origin of the iconography of Paul nor provided a reason for its relatively late start. As in the case of many biblical figures, Paul's portrait was a reconstruction. The first representations of the apostle date back to the end of the 3rd c.; in some paintings of the Roman catacombs from this time (e.g., at Domitilla: Wp 126; 148,2), the apostolic college was portrayed with Christ at the center, but Paul's features are not yet well defined, nor are Peter's, as they would be a few decades later. The same phenomenon reappears in some *sarcophagi of the same period or shortly thereafter, in which the deceased person appears standing alongside the two *apostles, whose bodily features still varied but should still be identified in all likelihood with *Peter and Paul, representatives

par excellence of the Twelve (see, e.g., Ws 81,4 = Rep. 855; Ws 269,3 = Rep. 565).

From the mid Constantinian era, however, the portrayals of the prince of the apostles took on new idiosyncrasies, which became more widespread in the figurative paleo-Christian repertoire: *painting, *sculpture, *mosaics and the so-called minor arts (ivories, gold glass and metalwork). This phenomenon can be explained by the wide diffusion of the cult of the martyrs and by their increasingly frequent depiction on the garments of the guides and supporters of the *souls of many of the deceased. Toward the middle of the 4th c., Pauline iconography (like Petrine iconography) was already established and was found in many examples from different periods and locations, with few variants of little significance: head mostly bald, beard long and pointy for the most part, usually with fine features. These physical features are different from Peter's, who, because of the law of contrast, bears different characteristics: short and curly hair, short and frizzy beard and stark features. Even if these representations, which are above all pictorial, appear simplified in some cases, the identification of the two apostles is certain and at times corroborated by captions with their names found alongside their figures.

Paul often appears to the side of Christ (opposite Peter) in the scene of the so-called **traditio legis*, or, in the group of sarcophagi (esp. Roman and Gallic) referred to as "of the Passion," displaying the following events: his arrest (tied between two soldiers or with a soldier who is placing a rope around his neck) and *martyrdom, in the moment he is about to be decapitated by a soldier who is drawing his sword. The most famous example in which the images appear together is found on the front of Junius Bassus's sarcophagus (Ws 13 = Rep. 680,1), dated to the year 359 and preserved in the Vatican Grottoes. Among the many examples, there is also a columned sarcophagus preserved in the Vatican basilica (Ws 154,4 – Rep. 675,3) and another sarcophagus front in the Museo Pio Cristiano (Ws 142,3 = Rep. 61), already from the end of the 4th c.

In painting, the Pauline facial features appear particularly clear in the burial recess of Diogenes the gravedigger (**fossor*) at Domitilla (Wp 182,2) and in room I of the catacomb on the Via Latina (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, plate CVIII and p. 69); also, they are very clear among the oldest paintings of the small basilica of the cemetery of Commodilla, certainly from the mid-6th c. (WMM 146). Among the mosaic scenes, one should note those from the mausoleum of St. Costanza in Rome (WMM 4) with the *traditio legis* (with considerable restorations) and the triumphal arch of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, where St. Peter appears beside the throne (see C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, pl. XLVII). Among the sculpted reliefs, one can recognize Peter and Paul's profile in a piece from the Museo Paleocristiano di Monastero at *Aquileia, datable to the end of the 4th c. or the beginning of the 5th (B. Forlati Tamano - L. Bertacchi, *Aquileia. Il Museo Paleocristiano*, Padua 1962, fig. on p. 37). The apostle is portrayed on objects of ivory, as in the *traditio legis* scene of the Samagher capsella, now at the Museo Archeologico di Venezia (see M. Guarducci, *La capsella eburnea di Samagher. Un cimelio d'arte paleocristiana del tardo Impero*: Atti e Memorie della Soc. Istriana di storia patria 26 [1978] 1-146). One can recognize the bust of Paul, alone or together with Peter, other saints and the deceased, in golden glassware. The representation of Paul stoned to death at Lystra (Acts 14:19) appears on an ivory box produced in the West, dating back to the third decade of the 5th c. and preserved in the British Museum in London (Testini, *L'iconografia degli Apostoli*, p. 293 n.16).

Lastly, one should note the scene of the symbolic embrace between Peter and Paul, which alludes to the unity of the two parts of the church and likewise to the more frequent *concordia apostolorum*, already found in the aforementioned relief from Aquileia and some golden glass. This image recurs on a piece of ivory from Castellammare di Stabia and on a fresco from the beginning of the 5th c., found in recent years in a Roman catacomb, already known as the Vigna Chiaraviglio, but certainly belonging to the complex of the *Memoria Apostolorum* (or St. *Sebastian). A fragmentary sarcophagus from the Roman cemetery of St. *Valentinus is also unique, in which Paul, well stocked with captions, appears in a helmsman's garments while steering a ship upon which is inscribed the allusive name of Thecla (Rep. 832 = ICUR X, 27284). A number of frescoes, however, from the period of Pope St. *Leo the Great (440–461), which must have adorned the walls of the basilica of S. Paolo Fuori le Mura, were destroyed after a disastrous fire in 1823. Nevertheless, the theme of these frescoes is known through a watercolor painting of them that Antonio Eclissi completed around 1635 and preserved in Ms. Barb. lat. 4406 located at the Vatican Library.

DACL 2, 2694-2699; EC 9, 720-722; LCI 8, 128-147; L. de Bruyne, *L'iconographie des Apôtres Pierre et Paul dans une lumière nouvelle*, in *Saecularia Petri et Pauli*, Vatican City 1969, 35-84; P. Testini, *L'iconografia degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo nelle cosiddette arti minori*, in ibid., 241-323; Id., *L'apostolo Paolo*

nell'iconografia cristiana fino al VI secolo, in *Studi Paolini*, Rome 1969, 61-93; Id., *La lapide di Anagni con la "Traditio legis"*: Archeologia Class. 25-26 (1973–1974) 718-740; Y. Christe, *Apocalypse et "Traditio legis"*: RQA 71 (1976) 42-55; E. Dassmann, *Paulus in frühchristlichen Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Opladen 1982; J.M. Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum. Christian Propaganda at Rome in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. A Study in Early Christian Iconography and Iconology*, London 1982; H.L. Kessler, *The Meeting of Peter and Paul in Rome. An Emblematic Narrative of Spiritual Brotherhood*: DOP 41 (1987) 265-275; F. Bisconti, *L'abbraccio tra Pietro e Paolo ed un affresco inedito del cimitero romano dell'ex Vigna Chiaraviglio*, in *Ricerche di Archeologia cristiana e bizantina. XLII Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina*, Ravenna 1995, 71-93; Id., *Pietro e Paolo. L'invenzione delle immagini, la rievocazione delle storie, la genesi delle teofanie*, in A. Donati (ed.), *Pietro e Paolo. La storia, il culto, la memoria nei primi secoli*, Milan 2000, 43-53; U. Utro, *Disegni relativi alla decorazione di San Paolo fuori le Mura*, in ibid., nos. 56, 211-212; F. Bisconti, *Paolo* (s.v.): TIP, 240-241.

D. Mazzoleni

PAUL, apostle (apocryphal). Apocryphal material on Paul is particularly rich. One can classify these apocryphal documents into three categories: (1) pseudepigrapha; (2) biographic writings on Paul's life and activity; (3) other apocryphal texts concerning Paul.

1. Several apocryphal letters exist among the letters attributed to Paul: the *Letter to the *Laodiceans*, the *Letter to the *Alexandrians*, St. Paul's *Correspondence with the Corinthians*, part of the *Acts of St. Paul* (ch. 10) and Paul's *Correspondence with *Seneca* (14 letters—from the 4th c.), which is mentioned by *Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 12) and St. *Augustine (*Ep.* 153,3), and was recognized as authentic until the 15th c.; the work was perhaps a rhetorical exercise used in schools and the product of his popularity among the first Christians but also the consequence of a legend about Seneca's possible conversion to Christianity (see *Tertullian, *De anima* 20,1). The objective of this apocryphal text is apologetic: how much this great *pagan philosopher admired St. Paul and how the two spoke to each other. The eleventh letter regarding the fire of *Rome and the persecution of Christians is interesting. There exists, moreover, a letter of the Jewish High Priest Annas to Seneca.

Editions: CANT 306; CPL 191; L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul et ses lettres*, Paris 1913; C.W. Barlow, Rome 1938; L. Bocciolini-Palagi, Florence 1978, 1985; M. Natali, Milan 1995. *Translations*: Eng.: Elliott 543-553; It.: L. Bocciolini-Palagi, Florence 1978, 1985; Erbetta 3, 85-92; Moraldi 3, 107-113; Fr.: R. Kappler, EApC 1, 1581-1594; Germ.: C. Römer, in Schneemelcher 2, 44-50; K. Obrycki, in Starowieyski 3, 55-66, 356ff. (bibl.). K. Pink, *Die pseudopaulinischen Briefe*: BbM 6 (1925) 179-200; A. Momigliano, *Note sulla leggenda del cristianesimo del Seneca*: RivStorItal 62 (1950) 325-344; L.D. Reynolds, *The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Letters*, Leiden 1965; A. Fürst, *Pseudoepigraphie und Apostolizität im apokryphen Briefwechsel zwischen Seneca und Paulus*: JbAC 41 (1998) 77-117.

2. The *Acts of Paul* was among the five major apocryphal *Acts* of the *apostles of the 2nd-3rd c., but the text was unknown until the 19th c. With the discovery of the *Coptic *papyri of Heidelberg (C. Schmidt 1904), Greek papyri of Hamburg (1936, C. Schmidt, W. Schubart), Bodmer (M. Testuz, 1959) and other papyri, it was observed that some parts of the *Acts of Paul* were already well known (*Acts of Paul and *Thecla*, and the *Correspondence with the Corinthians*). The reconstruction shows us that the *Acts of Paul* were divided into 14 scenes (the trip from Damascus to *Jerusalem; stays in Syrian *Antioch, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch [the famous *Acts of Paul and Thecla*], then to Myra, Sidon, Tyre; a trip to Jerusalem, Cicilia and *Smyrna; stays in *Ephesus and *Philippi, Corinth; a trip to Italy and his *martyrdom in *Rome). From some episodes only fragments exist on papyri, from which it is often difficult to understand the meaning; the other episodes are complete. From *Tertullian we know that these *Acts* were written by a *presybter of Asia Minor who was deposed from his office (*De bapt.* 17,5). The *Acts of Paul* were written in Greek probably between 150 and 200; the question remains concerning the relationship between the *Acts of Peter* and the *Acts of Paul* (which were written earlier, or which later). There exist, furthermore, other apocryphal texts on Paul: two martyrdoms of Paul, ps.-Linus and the 2nd book of ps.-Abdias dedicated to Paul. In addition, there are texts in which the apostles *Peter and Paul are connected (e.g., ps.-Marcellus's *Passion*, the *Letter of ps.-Dionysius the Aereopagite on the Passion of Peter and Paul*, in a Latin version and numerous Eastern versions); there exists, in addition, the *Acts of Andrew and Paul*.

CANT 211-214; *Editions*: *Acts*: Lipsius-Bonnet 1, 123-144; 104-117, 235-272; C. Schmidt, *Acta Pauli aus der Heidelberger koptischen Papyrushandschrift Nr 1*, Leipzig [2]1905 (Hildesheim 1965); L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul*, Paris 1913; C. Schmidt - W. Schubart, ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, *Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats – und Universitäts-Bibliothek*, Hamburg 1936. *Translations*: Fr.: W. Rodorf - R. Kasser, EApC 1, 1117-1177; Eng.: Elliott 350-388; It.: Erbetta 2, 243-301; Moraldi 2, 141-210, 536-542, 692ff.; Ger.: Schneemelcher 2, 193-242.

Studies: J.N. Bremmer, *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Kempen 1996 (bibl.); A.F.J. Klijn, *The Apocryphal Correspondence Between Paul and the Corinthians*: VChr 17 (1963) 2-23; J.P. Asmussen, *Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief in der armenischen Tradition*: Orientalia 35 (1972) 51-55; T.W. Mackay, *Observations on P. Bodmer X*, in Actes du XV[e] Congrès Int. de papyrologie, Brussels 1977, 119-128; Id., *Content and Style in Two Pseudo-Pauline Epistles* (*3 Corinth. and the Epistle to the La-*

odiceans), in *Apocryphal Writings and the Latter-day Saints*, ed. C.W. Griggs, Salt Lake City 1986, 215-240; G. Luttikhuizen, *The Apocryphal Correspondence with the Corinthians and the Acts of Paul*, in J.N. Bremmer, ibid., 75-91; W. Rordorf, *Hérésie et orthodoxie selon la correspondance apocryphe entre les Corinthiens et l'apôtre Paul*, in *Hérésie et orthodoxie dans l'Église ancienne*, Fribourg 1993, 21-63 = Id., *Lex orandi, lex credendi*, Freiburg 1993, 389-431; V. Hovhanessian, *Third Corinthians. Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy*, StudBiblLit 18, New York 2000.

3. Other texts connected to the figure of St. Paul exist, such as the *Apocalypse of Paul*; although the existence of a *Kerygma Paulou* (similar to the *Kerygma Petri*) remains subject to debate.

A famous apocryphal text connected to St. Paul alongside the *Correspondence of Paul with Seneca* (4th c.) is the *Apocalypse of Paul* (5th c.). Its source is the text from 2 Cor 12:2-4 in which Paul speaks of his rapture into heaven. An *Apocalypse of Paul* probably already existed in the 2nd c. (*Epiphanius, *Haer.* 38,2,5). The Latin version of the *Apocalypse of Paul* probably dates to the 5th c., but it is the product of a progressive and gradual evolution of the text. There he recounts the apostle's journey into the afterlife where he sees the glory of the saved and the punishments of the damned, for whom he intercedes. This *Apocalypse*, which existed in Greek, Latin, Arabic, *Armenian, Ethiopian, *Georgian, *Coptic, *Paleoslavonic and *Syriac, was extremely popular and had an influence upon Dante in his *Divina Commedia*; the *Apocalypse of Mary* is an elaboration of the *Apocalypse of Paul*. Alongside the *Apocalypse of Paul* exists another gnostic apocalypse from Nag Hammadi (cod. V). In the text of NH, moreover, one finds a prayer of Paul from the 2nd/3rd c. (cod. I).

Kerygma: C. Zamagni - A. D'Anna, *Accertamenti sul "Kerygma Paulou"*: SEA 74 (2001) 67-124; Erbetta 2, 302 n. Apocalissi: CANT 325; BHG 1460; BHL 6580-6582; BHO 899-901. T. Silverstein - A. Hilhorst, Geneva 1997, Cahiers d'Orientalisme 21 (bibl.); C. Carozzi, *Eschatologie et l'au-delà*, Aix-en-Provence 1994 (with Fr. tr.). *Translations*: Fr.: C.C. and R. Kapler, EApC 775-826; Eng.: Elliott 616-644; It.: Erbetta 3, 359-386; Moraldi 3, 369-425; Pol.: Starowieyski 3, 241-279, 369 (bibl.); Ger.: H. Duensing - A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 639-667. The *Apocalypse of Paul* of Nag Hammadi and the *Prayer of Paul* are found in the collections of texts of NH. G. Ricciotti, *Apocalisse di Paolo siriaca*, 1-2, Brescia 1932ff.; R. Kasser, *Oratio Pauli, Tractatus tripartitus II und III*, Berlin 1975; A. Koschorke, *Paulus in den Nag Hammadi Texten*: ZThK 78 (1981) 177-205; H.J. Klauck, *Die Himmelfahrt des Paulus*, in Id., *Gemeinde, Amt und Sakrament*, Würzburg 1989, 391-429; P. Dinzelbacher, *La 'Visio S. Pauli'. Circulation et influence d'un apocryphe eschatologique*: Apocrypha 2 (1991) 165-180; P. Piovanelli, *Les origines de l'apocalypse de Paul reconsiderées*: Apocrypha 4 (1993) 25-64. CANT 192-194, 197, 201, 203, 206, 211-214, 239, 305, 306, 323, 325; BHG 1451-1465; BHL 6644-6686; BHO 882-904; Lipsius-Bonnet 2, 1, 1-467; Suppl. 32-63; ANRW 2, 26, vol. 2 dedicated to St. Paul.

W. Schneemelcher, *Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts*: ZKG 75 (1964) 1-20; E. Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch. Paulus in der früchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus*, Münster 1979; A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der früchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, Tübingen 1979; J.N. Bremmer, *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Kempen 1996 (collection of articles).

M. Starowieyski

PAUL AURELIAN. *See* *PAUL of Léon

PAUL II. Patriarch of Constantinople (641–653). Serving previously as steward and treasurer of the Hagia Sofia, he was elected patriarch on 1 October 641, as the successor of the retiring *monophysite *Pyrrhus. Pope *Theodore rejected his very vague synodal letter and demanded from this newly elected leader a synodical condemnation of his predecessor. When the pope made new demands from him to ensure that he was orthodox, Paul II responded in 646–647 with a *monothelite profession of faith, though professing not to be in disagreement with the bishop of Rome. Theodore responded with a sentence of deposition, inciting Paul's retaliation against the altar of the palace chapel and the Roman apocrisiaries. Persuaded by Paul in 648, *Constans II promulgated a new edict of monothelite faith, the *Typos*, which was rejected by the Roman synod presided over by *Martin I, who in October 649 renewed the *anathema against Paul II, while around the year 650 the Byzantine patriarch sent a dogmatic document to the Armenians to restore union. Shortly before his death (27 December 653), he intervened in favor of Martin, who had been brought to trial at Constantinople in December of 653. The Sixth Ecumenical *Council (680) anathematized him along with Pyrrhus, after having read his three letters and other writings on the one will of Christ.

CPG 7620-21; Grumel, *Regestes*², 299-301; L. Maggi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini (VI-VII sec.)*, Rome-Louvain 1972, 212-223; J.L.D. van Dieten, *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI. (610–715)*, Amsterdam 1972, 76-103; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del sec. VII*, Rome 1971, passim (see index p. 582); Patrologia V, 109-110.

D. Stiernon

PAUL of Antioch (d. 582). Non-Chalcedonian patriarch of *Antioch, Paul (from Beth Ukkame or the Black) was born ca. AD 500 at *Alexandria. He was the syncellus (secretary) of the non-Chalcedonian

patriarch *Theodosius of Constantinople, who named him the successor of Sergius of Tella, founder of the dissenting non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical hierarchy at Antioch, who died in early 561. Paul showed himself to be very moderate toward the imperial church, willing to resign if it would simply condemn *Chalcedon, and even entered *communion with it for a time, fully convinced that it was on the verge of announcing a condemnation of that council. He took part in many dialogues held at the capital that aimed to restore peace. He was challenged by extreme factions, among which was *Jacob Baradeus, the great organizer of the non-Chalcedonian hierarchy in the East, who himself hoped to become patriarch. In *Egypt, in 575, Paul supported the moderate candidate for the See of Alexandria, *Theodore, who was defeated. Working among non-Chalcedonian theologians, Paul fought against what was being called "*tritheist tendencies," only to see himself accused of *Sabellianism. During moments of disagreement, when his authority was gradually lost, he always found support from the Ghassanid Bedouin tribes and stayed with their Sheikh Al-Haret bar Gabala for a long time. The letters he wrote in justification of his actions have been published in *Syriac by J.B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas* (CSCO 17, Louvain [2]1952).

CPG 7203-7214; E. Honigmann, *Evêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*, Louvain 1951, 195-205; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 291-293, 318-328; Patrologia V, 213-214.

J. Gribomont

PAUL of Apamea. Appointed bishop of *Apamea and metropolitan of **Syria Secunda*, after the emperor *Justin deposed Peter the *monophysite bishop in 513. A follower of Chalcedonian doctrine, he attended the Synod of Constantinople (536), and on behalf of the suffragan bishops he wrote a letter to *Justinian containing an *orthodox profession of faith and a condemnation of *Anthimus of Trebizond, *Severus and his predecessor Peter, all monophysites (Mansi 8, 980-984).

Fedalto 2, 775.

E. Prinzivalli

PAUL of Aphrodisia. Native of Asia Minor (Ephesus?), he was ordained the metropolitan of Aphrodisia in Caria in 558 by *Jacob Baradeus along with two other *monophysite bishops. In 566, at *Constantinople, he signed a letter to his Eastern colleagues. In 571, at the beginning of the persecution of the monophysites, he was arrested at the *monastery at Caria, where for a long time he had retired, and was led in chains to the Byzantine capital and held prisoner in the patriarchal palace. The patriarch *John Scholasticus forced him to renounce his adherence to monophysitism and sent him back to Aphrodisia to be deposed and reordained by the Chalcedonian metropolitan, thus creating a unique instance of episcopal reordination. He died in poverty before 576-577.

CPG 7234; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VI^e siècle*, Louvain 1951, 218-231.

D. Stiernon

PAUL of Callinicum (5th–6th c.). Only a few details are known about Paul, bishop of Callinicum (today Rakkah) in *Osroene. His professed *monophysite leanings were the cause of his elevation to the episcopate around 503, but they were also the cause of his deposition, along with about 50 anti-Chalcedonian bishops, shortly after the arrival of the emperor *Anastasius. Paul then fled to Edessa, where he devoted himself to the translation of Greek texts into *Syriac, mostly the works of the patriarch *Severus of Antioch. Despite the *damnatio memoriae* imposed on Severus's Greek writings, this translation preserved the polemical correspondence between Severus and *Julian of Halicarnassus on the incorruptibility of Christ's body before the *resurrection and a speech against Julian. One should also attribute to Paul the translation of the correspondence between Severus and *Sergius Grammaticus, some of the patriarch's treatises *Contra impium Grammaticum* (i.e., *John of Caesarea), and a treatise of the same author titled *Philalethes* (see CSCO 133; 134). Keeping in mind the affinity of the style of these translations to the ancient version of the *Cathedral Homilies*, likewise by Severus of Antioch, scholars since W. Wright have concluded that the latter version should also be attributed to Paul. Moreover, one should not confuse Paul with the bishop of Edessa who had the same name, who was exiled to Euchaita in 522 and was reestablished in his see in 526 (Duval 316 n.2) and died the following year. One must also distinguish him from the bishop Paul of Edessa (Chabot 79) who, one century later, fleeing from the invasion of the Persians (619), found refuge in the island of *Cyprus and there translated Severus of Antioch's *Octoechos* (a collection of approximately 300 hymns for the feast of the liturgical year).

This Paul of Edessa should in turn be distinguished (against F. Nau: ROC 7 [1902] 100 n.5) from another author bearing the same name, the abbot Paul, who around the same time (624), likewise at Cyprus, made a Syriac translation of *Gregory of Nazianzus's works. One should recall that in the 7th c. *Jacob of Edessa revised both the translation of the homilies and the *Octoechos*.

Duval 359; Baumstark 174; Chabot 70-71; Ortiz de Urbina 163, 245-246.

J.-M. Sauget

PAUL of Canopus. Patriarch of *Alexandria (538–540). Born at *Tarsus, he was a monk at Tabennesi and *abbot of the *monastery near Canopus. Upon the suggestion of Pelagius, apocrisary of Pope *Vigilius and future pope, the emperor *Justinian nominated him patriarch of Alexandria in place of *Theodosius, who was deposed because he did not accept the faith of the Council of *Chalcedon. Paul was consecrated by Patriarch *Mennas of *Constantinople. With the help of the military and special privileges of the imperial court he set out from Constantinople to suppress the *monophysite sect in *Egypt; his actions were so rough and imprudent that he was deposed by the Council of *Gaza (540), at which the patriarchs of *Antioch and *Jerusalem and the apocrisary Pelagius participated (Procop. Caes., *Hist. arc.* 27,11-9; Liberatus of Bizazena, *Brev.* 23,160-162). Later, Paul sought to reobtain his see by bribing the emperor, but his plan failed. His successor Zoilus was an insignificant figure.

DCB 4, 250-251

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PAUL of Concordia (d. after 381). From Jerome's letters (*Ep.* 5, 2), it seems that this Paul was a very old man, as well as a friend of *Rufinus of *Aquileia. Jerome sent him a letter (*ad Paul senem Concordiae – Letter* 10), asking to borrow some books. In exchange, Jerome sent him the *Life* of Paul the hermit, which he had just written (the letter is perhaps from 376). His friend's one-hundred-plus years led Jerome to rejoice in his robust old age, an age so uncommon that he believed it was a gift from God to Paul for his virtues, as was the case for the ancient patriarchs (*Tu semper Domini praecepta custodiens*). Jerome mentions Paul again in the *De vir. ill.* 53, when citing a testimony to Tertullian's fame.

J. Labourt, *Saint Jérôme*, *Lettres*, Paris 1949, I, 17 and 27; P. Zovatto, *Paolo di Concordia*: AAAd 5 (1974) 165-180; PCBE 2, 1670-71. (n. 1).

L. Dattrino

PAUL of Constantinople (d. after 350). Elected bishop of Constantinople in 332 (his election was contested by the nearby bishops: *Socrates, *HE* 2, 6; *Sozomen, *HE* 3,3), he participated in 335 at the Council of *Tyre and signed the condemnation of *Athanasius; but shortly thereafter he too was deposed and exiled to *Pontus. Later generations recognized him as the legitimate bishop of *Constantinople, honoring him as a martyr in the cause against *Arianism, but his anti-Arianism was anything but certain: he was deposed as the inciter of seditions and such would be the accusation always reported against him later. He reentered Constantinople upon the death of *Constantine (337) but was immediately ejected, and *Eusebius of Nicomedia was elected in his place. Paul fled to *Rome, but upon the death of Eusebius (ca. 342) he showed up again at Constantinople. These Eusebians placed *Macedonius against him, and the outcries degenerated into a true insurrection, after which Paul was again expelled from the city and first exiled to Sinagra, near the Persian border and then to *Emesa. Nevertheless, he did not desist but reappeared at Constantinople in 344, always winning the favor of the local population; he was secretly arrested, however, and was taken by ship and left at *Thessalonica, which was in the part of the empire administered by *Constans. Pressured by Constans, *Constantius allowed him to reenter Constantinople in 346, where Macedonius, who had been elected in his place, was forced to exercise his episcopal faculties only in one church. When Constans was killed by the usurper *Magnentius and Constantius in turn waged war against him (350), Paul was arrested once again. The fact that Paul had sent an embassy to him and that Athanasius was able to establish his accusation of treason, and the fact that some of his supporters, the so-called *Sancti Notarii*, were executed, show that the accusations leveled against them were not religious. Paul was transferred to Cucusa in *Cappadocia, where he died shortly thereafter. The ancient report that he was strangled to death does not seem very reliable.

W. Telfen, *Paul of Constantinople*: HTR 43 (1950) 31-92; Simonetti 395; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988, 265-66; 279-284; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, see index; R. Fusco, *La Vita*

premetafrastica di Paolo il Confessore (*BHG 1472a*). *Un vescovo di Costantinopoli tra storia e leggenda*, Rome 1996.

M. SIMONETTI

PAUL of Edessa (7th c.). Ordained bishop of Edessa around 602, in 619 Paul fled during the invasion of the Persians and established himself at *Cyprus. There he made a translation of a collection, perhaps at the monastery of Qennešrē, of around 300 poetical compositions for the liturgy written by *Severus of Antioch and other authors. *Jacob of Edessa then revised this translation, which was subsequently reordered in the *Octoechos* acc. to eight tones (CPG 7072; see Jacob's postscript for his translation, in PO 7, 801). Baumstark mentions that in this series in the W Syrian calendar, Paul is given the nickname "the translator of books" (see PO 10, 84 and 124) and suggests that he may be identified with the abbot Paul who published a translation of *Gregory of Nazianzus's *Orations*, on the island of Cyprus in 624. This work would later acquire great authority in the various *Syriac-speaking churches. This attribution, however, is not entirely certain.

Baumstark, 190; E.W. Brooks, *The Hymns of Severus and Others in the Syriac Version of Paul of Edessa as Revised by James of Edessa* (PO 6/1), Paris 1911; R.L. Bensly - W.E. Barnes, *The Fourth Book of Maccabees*, Cambridge 1895, 55-74 and 27-34 (text and tr. of a fragment of the tr. of the Gregory of Nazianzus's *Orations*); B. Coulie, *Corpus Nazianzenum 1. Versiones orientales*, Turnhout 1988; A. de Halleux, *Les commentaires syriaques des discours de Grégoire de Nazianze*: Muséon 98 (1985) 103-147; A. van Roey - H. Moors, *Discours de s. Grégoire*: OLP 4 (1973) 121-133 and 5 (1974) 79-126.

K. DEN BIESEN

PAUL of Elusa (d. 522). Native of Greece, and after having traveled to *Palestine, presumably on *pilgrimage, he entered the monastery established by *Theognius (d. 522). Thereafter Paul became a hermit at Elusa, a city near Beersheba. At times he was identified with Paul the Greek ("Helladikos") as well as with a Paul who subsequently became the *hegumen of the *cenobium of St. Theodosios, both mentioned by *John Moschus (*Pratus Spirituale* 163, 160). The following works remain from his writings: (1) *The Life of S. Theognius, Bishop of Betylios*: a biography of his teacher Theognius, which *Cyril of Scythopolis knew and used. (2) A letter written by Paul of Elusa has also survived.

CPG 7530-7531; BHG 1786; I. van den Gheyn, *Acta sancti Theognii episcopi Beteliae*: AB 10 (1891) 78-113 (emendations: AB 11 [1892] 472). Lettera: CPG 7531; V. Lundström, *Anecdota Byzantina e codicibus Upsaliensibus cum aliis collatis*, Uppsala-Leipzig 1902, 17-23.

A. LOUTH

PAUL of Emesa (1st half of the 5th c.). Bishop of *Emesa in Phoenicia Lebanon (today Homs, in *Syria), after 410. In 431, at *Ephesus, he was the member of a synod led by *John of Antioch and *Memnon of Ephesus. The following year, John chose him as his ambassador to *Alexandria to begin the attempts at restoring *communion with *Cyril of Alexandria, entrusting him with a document which would later become the Creed of Union. Cyril received him into *communion and invited him to preach several times in the cathedral of Alexandria because he was willing to excommunicate *Nestorius and recognize *Maximian as the bishop of *Constantinople. In 433, he traveled again to Egypt and returned to *Antioch with Cyril's letter *Laetentur coeli*, which brought his mission of peace to a happy ending. He died between 433 and 445, the year in which another bishop appears in the See of Emesa. From his writings, the following texts have survived: portions of the correspondence relating to the aforementioned attempts to restore union and fragments of the three homilies given at Alexandria.

CPG 6365-6369; PG 77, 165-168, 1433-1444; Hfl-Lecl II, 1, 393-402; Patrologia V, 179-180.

D. STIERNON

PAUL of Jerash (6th c.). A native probably of Chalcedon and the bishop of Jerash from 526 to 539, Paul, whom certain inscriptions remember as the "great benefactor" (Gatier, 299) and a "wise" and "just" man (Welles, 306 and 314), during the time of the emperors *Justin and *Justinian, played a role in the initial phase in the architectural evolution of the city that hosted his episcopal see and actively collaborated in the construction of various buildings, not just religious ones. In the years immediately following 526, Paul occupied the churches of *Procopius (Welles, 304), St. George (Welles, 309), St. *John the Baptist (Welles, 306), Sts. *Cosmas and Damian (Welles, 314), as well as the Cathedral of Bostra (Welles, 293), and in a certain way contributed to the transformation of a synagogue into a place of Christian worship (Welles, 323). In 539, moreover, by then at the end of his life, he ordered the construction of a prison for those accused of crimes and awaiting a verdict (Gatier, 299). This was the second prison of Jerash and was intended to serve as a "preventative

prison" for those had been detained but not yet condemned. Certainly such a prison, which was most likely reserved for the clergy (Gatier, 303), is the only one that has ever been established by the bishop for use by the town, but it remains to be determined if it was introduced to meet the demands of an increase in the prison population caused by the persecution of the *monophysites (Frend, 271-274).

C.B. Welles, *The Inscriptions*, in C.H. Kraeling, *Gerasa. City of the Decapolis*, New Haven, CT 1938; M. Piccirillo, *Chiese e mosaici della Giordania settentrionale*, Jerusalem 1981; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972; P.L. Gatier, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Gerasa*: Syria 62 (1985) 297-312; A. Hoffmann - S. Kerner, *Gadara - Gerasa und die Dekapolis*, Mainz 2002.

P. Marone

PAUL of Léon (d. 572/575). Paul Aurelian, a Gallic monk, is known through a biography written by Wrmonoc (884). In this work, among its many legendary elements, Wrmonoc provides us several pieces of information about Paul's life such as his birth in *Great Britain (ca. 480). Having crossed the English Channel with a few of his companions, he settled on the small island of Batz (Brittany), where he established a *monastery and a missionary center of priests in the fortress on the mainland (Kastel-Paul or St.-Pol-de-Léon). Childebert, king of the *Franks, persuaded him to accept the episcopal see of Kastel-Paul. He died at Batz in 572/575 but was buried at Kastel-Paul. A city developed around his tomb and took its name from him. His feast day is celebrated 12 March.

AASS *Mar.* 2, 107-119; *Vies des Saints* 3, 260-262; LTK[3] 7, 1514; BS 10, 296-299; Cath 10, 917-918; J.M.H. Smith, *Oral and Written. Saints, Miracles, and Relics in Brittany*: Speculum 65 (1990) 309-343.

E. Romero Pose

PAUL of Mérida (7th c.). Deacon of *Mérida (Spain); at the beginning of the 7th c. he wrote the *Vitae sanctorum patrum Emeritensium*, with the stated intention to imitate *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*. He wrote in a simple form to help the unlearned (*imperiti*) understand the text. The document aspires to be an account of the miracles of the ancient monks and *Fathers, but as the account gradually approaches the author's time it becomes enriched with important historical information relating above all to Bishops Fidelis and *Masona. He narrates at length the vicissitudes experienced by Masona, who was of Gothic origin, during *Leovigild's "persecutions."

CPL 2069; PL 8, 115-164; Diaz 214; A. Maya Sánchez, *Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium*: CCL 116 (1992); Patrologia IV, 102-103.

M. Simonetti

PAUL of Narbonne (3rd c). The first known bishop of *Narbonne was called Paul, and he seems to have been the city's first ever. He was buried at *Albolas* on the Via Domitia, where a basilica was later built in his name, at the center of the necropolis in the S part of the city. Already in the 4th c., people were venerating his tomb; this is one of the most ancient testimonies of a local cult for a nonmartyr bishop. His name is mentioned by *Prudentius (*Persist.* 4, 34), the *Mart. hier.* (22 March, Italian recension), *Caesarius of Arles (G. Morin, *Sancti Caesarii ep. Arel. Opera omnia* 1, 1942, 179) and *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 1, 30). Caesarius calls him a "disciple of the apostles"; Gregory would later number him among the seven missionaries sent from *Rome to *Gaul around the year 250. It seems that his *Vita* (BHL 6589-6590) dates to the 8th c., the period when the *Franks reconquered Narbonne (759). It seems that the information for the *Passio SS. Dionysii, Rustici et Eleutherii* was derived from this *Vita*. Ado of Vienne confused this saint with Sergius Paulus of Acts 18:7-8.

BHL 6589-6590; BS 10, 261-262; LCI 8, 149; P.-A. Fevrier - X. Barral, *Topographie Chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII[e] siècle 7*, Paris 1989, 21-22.

V. Saxer - S. Held

PAUL of Nisibis (or Paul the Persian). *Nestorian exegete and theologian, he was learned and gifted with great judgment. For 30 years, during the time of Mar *Aba I, he was the director of the school of Hadiab; from 551 he was the bishop of *Nisibis; he died in 571. Leading a strong delegation, he took part in a colloquium at *Constantinople with *Justinian's theologians (532–533), where he defended (for the first time?) the doctrine of the two *hypostases in Christ. Without a doubt, one can identify him with Paul the Persian, who was very active in Constantinople around 527 and served as the spokesman for Christians upon the request of Justinian during an official debate with Photinus the Manichean (see PG 88, 529-574). His introduction to the Bible was the basis for the *Instituta regularia divinae legis*, which was edited in Latin at Constantinople by *Junilius Africanus, the then quaestor of the sacred palace (*quaestor sacri palatii*), which he dedicated to *Primasius of Hadrumetum (PL 68, 15-54, ed. of

H. Kihn). This clear manual, written in an Aristotelian spirit, summarizes the teaching of the School of Nisibis, that is to say, *Theodore of Mopsuestia; one finds therein teaching on the *Trinity, the *incarnation and the law. He achieved great success in St. Gallen and S Germany in the 9th c.

CPG 7010-7015; BBKL 7, 37-38; H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*, Freiburg 1880; G. Mercati, *Per la vita e gli scritti di Paolo il Persiano*: ST 5, Vatican City 1901, 180-206; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 266), Louvain 1965, 170-172; A. Guillaumont, *Un colloque entre orthodoxes et théologiens nestoriens de Perse sous Justinien*: CRAI 1970, 201-207; Id., *Justinien et l'Église de Perse*: DOP 23-24 (1969-70) 39-66; M. Richard, *Iohannis Caesariensis Opera*: CCG 1 (Turnhout 1977) XXXIX-XLI; Patrologia V, 216-217.

J. Gribomont

PAUL of Samosata (3rd c.). Paul of Samosata, the successor of Demetrian and predecessor of Domnus, was one of the prestigious bishops of *Antioch, during the 2nd half of the 3rd c. (259/60–268/69). The end of his episcopate coincides with various synods in his own episcopal see that resulted in the condemnation of Paul's teaching and his subsequent deposition. The intervention of the Antiochene presbyter *Malchion, head of the city's rhetorical school, was the deciding factor for the defeat of Paul. For his part, the bishop, who was supported by his cohort, refused to abandon the church building and in the end brought the intervention of the emperor *Aurelian, who decided in favor of Paul's opponents, who were in epistolary communion with Rome and Italy. In modern historiography, there has been a long debate concerning the figure and the teaching of Paul, which was fueled by the fragmentation of the sources and the extant information. The sources can be reduced to the following: (a) a letter that *Hymenaeus of Jerusalem and other bishops of the area sent to Paul of Samosata, before his deposition; (b) four fragments of a letter from the synod of the bishops who condemned him, which are mentioned by *Eusebius of Caesarea, along with later information about him (*HE* 7, 27-30); (c) and a series of a little more than 40 fragments (in the original Greek, and in *Syriac, *Armenian and *Latin translations), where different authors, beginning with *Eusebius of *Dorylaeum, passed down semiaccurate statements about Paul, his enemies and both rival groups. Some of these fragments belong to the synodal *Acts*; the first fragments, as far as we know, pertain to the history of the church.

The questions surrounding Paul of Samosata have gone through various stages in the course of the 20th c. The monographs of F. Loofs and G. Bardy (1924), which mark the beginning, and the later monograph of H. de Riedmatten (1952) supply a dossier of primary texts concerning the bishop of Antioch. Later studies completed in Central Europe, such as those of M. Richard (1959) and T. Hübner (1979), raised doubts about this dossier, which it considered a *falsification by later Apollinarians, arguing that the followers of *Apollinaris intentionally pretended to connect their teaching to those of the opponents of Paul of Samosata, i.e., to Malchion, Hymenaeus and a large number of bishops and presbyters who were present at the synods of Antioch that condemned Paul. A few decades later, several scholars showed that these hypotheses were false because they lacked any factual support. M. Simonetti's two studies (1986, 1988) proved to be conclusive in this respect; his findings were then confirmed by various scholars: C. Stead (1993, 2000), U.M. Lang (2000) and P. de Navascués (2004).

With respect to the figure of Paul of Samosata, the key historical dates were set by F. Millar (1971). V. Burrus wisely brought attention to rhetoric as a way of analyzing the information provided by Eusebius (1989). Finally, recent studies have shown that the series of moral accusations against Paul are no different from the usual critiques devised in the pagan schools. They function on a hypothetical level and hide the real character of Bishop Paul. The accusations functioned as keys of communication between the different churches where the synod's letter was read so that there would be no doubt that Paul's teaching was heretical. On the other hand, with regard to the supposed relations between Paul and Queen *Zenobia, the only certain fact is the possibility of some contact between the two, but certainly after Paul's deposition, i.e., after the year 270. The intervention of the emperor Aurelian in favor of his allies in *Rome and Italy—at the moment he decided whom he should assign the building of the *domus ecclesiae*, the object of dispute between Paul and his enemies—must always be understood within the backdrop of the religious and imperial politics of that period, which always sought to find a middle position.

With the exception of the few differences in relation to the politics and ecclesial organization, the discussion around Paul was indeed focused on his doctrine. The opponents of Paul, led by the presbyter Malchion, responded acc. to an *Origenian schema based on *Neoplatonism. They sought to safeguard as much as possible the personality of the Logos, Son of God, who can be given various titles or *epinoiai* (Wisdom, Power etc.), eternal *hypostasis* together with the Father, incarnated through mercy

in view of salvation and personally united with the *human* (i.e., the body) proceeding from the Virgin. The teaching of Malchion and his disciples could not but collide head-on with the monarchian tendencies of the teachings Paul defended. Paul's teaching, contrary to Origen's understanding of the *hypostasis*, distinguished between the Son, on the one hand, and *Jesus Christ, on the other, the man born from *Mary who was made the Son of God through his exalted union with Wisdom (or the *Holy Spirit). The unique feature of this formulation renders it irreducible to an *adoptionist position (in consideration of the fact that it also defends the existence of a preexistent Logos Son). Rather, it should be understood as having derived from the preceding Antiochene tradition. Certain aspects of Paul's teaching permit one to attribute to it a certain inspiration from the peripatetic school, esp. in the line of the exegete of Aristotle, Alexander of Aphrodisia.

Malchion's schema, which was in a certain sense Apollinarian *ante litteram*, by clearly defending the personal identification between the Logos and the man *Jesus Christ, was imposed on that of Paul of Samosata. The bishop of Antioch for his part continuing under various aspects in the tradition of his predecessors Ignatius and Theophilus (such as the emphasis on the soteriological character of the complete humanity of *Jesus Christ—a point that remained noticeably weak in Malchion's theology)—nevertheless seemed to distance himself from this tradition by establishing a rift between the invisible Logos and the visible man Jesus Christ united to the Logos. *Eustathius of Antioch would not go much further than Paul, even if he corrected a distinction that the latter established between the Logos and the man Christ, proposing instead a distinction between the invisible Christ Logos and the visible Christ man. The debate between Paul of Samosata and Malchion sheds light on the subsequent debates of the 4th and 5th c., i.e., surrounding *Arius and *Nestorius. In a certain sense, the question of the greater or lesser dignity of the visible and passible Logos, with different results from those brought about in the Arian controversy, is revealed in the synodal discussions of the 3rd c. in Antioch.

Another interesting point in the question of Paul of Samosata is the supposed condemnation in the synods of the term **homoousios*. In reality, this term was already avoided by Malchion as much as by Paul, because both men saw within this term materialistic connotations, leading one to attribute to God a generation proper to material, corporeal substances. One should not forget that the term with its theological meaning originated in a *gnostic context to explain the generations within the *Pleroma. At one point in the debate, Paul probably seemed to have prevailed over Malchion's position, accusing him of defending a Christ *homoousios* with the Father. As *Athanasius reports, Malchion and his followers would have immediately opposed this argument *ad absurdum* forwarded by Paul. This condemnation, however, was delivered in a very different context from that of *Nicaea, where the term *homoousios*, if Eusebius of Caesarea's testimony is true, was only imposed by the emperor's intervention and with the clause that it should not be understood in a *corporeal* sense.

F. Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata* (TU 44, 5), Leipzig 1924; G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate*, Louvain [2]1929; H. de Riedmatten, *Les Actes du procès de Paul de Samosate*, Freibourg 1952; F. Millar, *Paul of Samosata, Zenobia, and Aurelian. The Church, Local Culture, and Political Allegiance in Third-Century Syria*: JTS 61 (1971) 1-17; M. Simonetti, *Per la rivalutazione di alcune testimonianze su Paolo di Samosata*: RSLR 24 (1988) 177-210; V. Burrus, *Rhetorical Stereotypes in the Portrait of Paul of Samosata*: VChr 43 (1989) 215-225; P. de Navascués, *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios*, Rome 2004 (with bibl.).

P. de Navascués

PAUL of Tamma. Egyptian *anchorite, born in the village of Tamma—in the neighborhood of Dahut, on the Nile River opposite to Sharunah—he lived during the time of *Anthony and *Pachomius. The large Greek-Latin literary tradition on *monasticism (*Palladius, *Cassian, *Historia monachorum*, **Apopthegmata Patrum*) has left no record of him; this lack of information makes it difficult to place him within the general context of the history and spirituality of Egyptian monasticism. Two fragmentary *Coptic codices contain a text on the life of Paul, or rather they narrate certain episodes (the most extensive fragments come from a codex of the White Monastery [sigla CMCL = MONB.FI], for the most part published by Amélineau 1888, 759-769 and 835-836 [= pp. 67-68 and 83-96 of the MS]; two folia from the University of Michigan Library, 158.44, are unpublished [pp. 59-62 of the MS]). Later a summary of the text available at the time of the compilation (12th c.) was included in the Copto-Arabic Synaxis. I argue that initially there existed two different and independent texts. Although the text attested by the Synaxis is hardly significant, the text preserved by the two Coptic MSS shows us a work from a milieu committed to collecting the lives of a certain number of monks, describing them in tight relationship one with another, perhaps somewhat forcing historical fact. These monks, however, were forgotten by the Greek-Latin tradition.

It is difficult to determine what historical information can be deduced from these documents. Broadly speaking, from this work emerges a middle-Egyptian tradition pertaining to the monastic communities of the territory between Memphis and Shmun, the chief individuals of which were, in addition to Paul, Apollo, Phib, Anup, (p)Amoun and Aphu. These individuals should be placed in the 1st half of the 4th c., and their activity seems to be viewed in contrast to the analogous initiatives of the Scetes (who came from Kellia and Nitria) to the N and the Pachomians (from which came from Shenoute) to the S. Later, Jeremiah, along with his companion and disciple Enoch (and perhaps an *ama Sibyl), revitalized the memory of these famous individuals (and perhaps above all that of Apollo) in order to establish a new community, faithful to the anti-Chalcedonian movement.

Paul of Tamma is one of the only aforementioned individuals whose works have come down to us and not merely accounts of his life. It is possible to consider him the driving force or the cultural leader of the group that we have identified. An edition of what has survived from his works can be found in T. Orlandi, *Paolo di Tamma, Opere,* Rome 1988. These works are as follows: (1) *Letter*. A brief text handed down in its entirety, containing advice for the anchorites. (2) *On the cell*. This long exhortatory text appears in two different redactions. The first, almost entirely complete (there are brief lacunae due to the poor preservation of the MS), is that of MU0166; the second is mutilated at the beginning (the text begins at par. 49 of the other redaction), continues parallel to the other redaction until par. 98 (which is almost the end of the other redaction), and then has a long passage that the other lacks (par. 99-125). (3) Other fragmentary passages treat poverty, *justice and humility.

The literary genre of all these works can be reduced to monastic rules and exhortations, attested above all by the *Letters* of *Anthony, *Ammonas, *Macarius of Egypt, and the writings of Pachomius, *Theodorus and *Horsiesi. What seems to distinguish the style of Paul is the foundational element of a literary text, i.e., the organization of the argument, which is completely lacking in Paul. His work consists of a number of individual *sententiae* thrown together apparently without any underlying theme. One finds certain emphases here and there and groups of *sententiae* joined around a concept, but one does not find a sustained set of arguments even within the author's stated objectives that do not amount to more than mere citations of Scripture. We see a certain Pachomius of the *Letters* (and of the *Rules*), those which we can presume were the primitive texts at the base of a collection of **apophthegmata patrum* and other authors. Mark Sheridan has recently examined the theological and spiritual character of Paul's works, emphasizing in addition to common elements to the first Egyptian monasticism (in particular, attention to oneself, *prosoché*, vigilance, *népsis*), certain specific characteristics: the quality and nature of thoughts, and above all the fight against vain thoughts; the fight against the passions to obtain purity of heart and tranquility; certain interpretations of scriptural passages. Sheridan finds analogies between the latter of these and *Origen's intellectual context. How much that differs from the context of which we have been speaking is too early to judge.

É. Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux IVe, Ve, VIe et VIIe siècles*, Paris 1988; T. Orlandi - A. Campagnano, *Vite di monaci copti*, Rome 1984; Paolo di Tamma: opere, intr., testo, tr. e concordanze ed. T. Orlandi, Rome 1988; M. Sheridan, *The Development of the Interior Life in Certain Early Monastic Writings in Egypt*, in *The Spirituality of Ancient Monasticism*. Acts of the International Colloquium held in Cracow-Tyniec 16-19th November 1994, ed. M. Starowieyski, Cracow, Benedictine Abbey of Tyniec, 1995, 79-89; E. Lucchesi, *À propos d'une édition récente des oeuvres de Paul de Tamma*: Studia Christiana Orientalia 18 (1995) 161-166; M. Pezin, *Nouveau fragment copte concernant Paul de Tamma* (*P. Sorbonne inv. 2632*), in *Christianisme d'Égypte*, Mél. R.-G. Coquin, Louvain 1995, 15-20; *L'Egitto cristiano*, ed. A. Camplani, Rome 1997 (see index); E. Lucchesi, *Une version copte du Sermo asceticus d'Étienne le Thébain*: AB 11 (1997) 252; T. Vivian, *Saint Paul of Tamma: Four Works Concerning Monastic Spirituality*: Coptic Church Review 18 (1997) 105-116; Id., *Saint Paul of Tamma: On the Monastic Cell* (*De Cella*) (with B.A. Pearson): Hallel 23 (1998) 86-107; E. Lucchesi, *Vers l'identification de Étienne de Thèbes*: AB 116 (1998) 106; L.S.B. Maccoull, *Paul of Tamma and the Monastic Priesthood*: VChr 53 (1999) 316-320; A. Wadi, *La recensione breve di Paolo di Tamma*, in *Aegyptus christiana, Mélanges P. P. Devos*, ed. U. Zanetti – E. Lucchesi, Geneva 2004, 195-210; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1923-1925.

T. Orlandi

PAUL of Tella (7th c.). Miaphysite bishop of Tella d-Mauzalat, who between 615 and 617, with the assistance of a few collaborators, made a *Syriac translation of the so-called *Septuagint Hexapla*, i.e., *Origen's edition of the Septuagint corrected acc. to the Hebrew. This Syriac translation, called the "Syro-Hexaplaris," did not supplant the *Peshitta, but it was used in the context of biblical exegesis, esp. in the W Syrian tradition, though there are also traces of it in the liturgy. Almost the entirety of the Syro-Hexaplaris has been preserved; certain portions of the Pentateuch and the historical books are missing. The MS tradition also attributes to

Paul some translations of liturgical texts.

Baumstark, 186ff.; Duval, 50-51; A. Baumstark, *Nichtevangelische syrische Perikopenordnungen des ersten Jahrtausends*, Münster 1921, 88-110; A.M. Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana VII. Codex syro-hexaplaris Ambrosyanus photolith.*, Milan 1874 (contains the 2nd half of the original codex, i.e., Psalms, Job, the Wisdom and Prophetic books); P. de Lagarde, *Bibliothecae Syriacae quae ad philologiam sacram pertinent*, Göttingen 1892 (what remains of the Pentateuch and historical books); W. Baars, *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts*, Leiden 1968; A. Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla. A Facsimile Edition of a Midyat Ms Discovered 1964*, CSCO 369, Louvain 1975.

K. den Biesen

PAUL of Thebes (4th c.). The hero of *Jerome's first literary work, the *Vita Pauli*, written during his first visit to Chalkis in *Syria (most likely around 375/376). Jerome claims that Paul of Thebes—and not *Anthony the hermit, as *Athanasius had asserted—was the first to practice *ascesis in the desert. The superiority (and not only anteriority) of Paul with respect to Anthony is a recurrent theme in the work.

At age 15, Paul took refuge in the desert to escape from the *persecutions of *Decius and *Valerian. Having found a cave, an opening of which provided him a protected forecourt furnished with a pure well and a *palm tree (a true *locus amoenus*), he decided to settle there. Every day a crow brought him half a loaf of bread. When Paul was 113 years old, Anthony, who by then was 88, had learned in a vision from God that there lived in the desert a more devout ascetic than he. With the help of a centaur and a faun, he found Paul's hermitage. After convincing the hermit to open the door to the cave, he spent half the day with him, praying together and sharing a meal (that day the crow brought him an entire loaf of *bread, and not just the usual half). Paul asked Anthony to bring him the cloak he had received as a gift from *Athanasius. When Anthony returned with the cloak, he found Paul dead. The pit of his grave had been dug by two lions.

Jerome claims more than once and with much insistence that his account about Paul is true. Nevertheless, even if we overlook the part about the centaur, the faun, the crow that brought the bread and the lions that dug the grave, one cannot accept this account because it does not conform to actual facts. The numerous Egyptian sources we possess never connect the beginnings of *monasticism to using the desert as a means for escaping persecution. Moreover, the description of the desert provided by the author has nothing to do with reality. Lastly, one should note that we have no other testimony about Paul of Thebes than what Jerome has provided: all later texts clearly draw upon the *Vita Pauli*.

It could be the case that Jerome obtained some vague information, utterly lacking concrete details on the existence of an Egyptian ascetic older than Anthony. In this case, he acted in a way perfectly acceptable for an ancient biographer: because it was impossible to know the actual facts concerning that ascetic, he had to imagine what life must have been like in order to conform to a monastic ideal envisioned by Jerome himself. The rules of the literary genre within which he wrote this small work authorized him to see his duty not so much as to recount factual truths as much as to supply the reader with a moral example.

Paul the hermit was a literary fiction. It is certain that another person from one of Jerome's works, *Vita Malchi monachi captivi*, was entirely imaginary.

Jerome's small work had an immense importance for the emerging literary genre of *hagiography. The figure of Paul of Thebes became a model for many authors and for many centuries remained an element within Christian culture.

Not far from the Dead Sea, in a deep rocky *wadi*, within the proximity of the Monastery of St. Anthony, an enormous monastery of St. Paul was founded in the Middle Ages and exists to this day (Dayr Anba Bula). The first testimony to its existence is dated to the 13th c. It was enlarged during the centuries and remains one of the primary places of pilgrimage for modern Coptic Orthodox.

Editions: PL, 23, 17-28; B. Degórski (ed.), *Edizione critica della "Vita sancti Pauli Eremitae" di Girolamo*, Rome 1987; SC 508, 144-183 (with Fr. tr.). *Translation*: It.: S. Girolamo, *Vite di Paolo, Ilarione e Malco*, Milan 1975. *Studies*: BS 10, 269-280; M. Fuhrmann, *Die Mönchsgeschichten des Hieronymus. Formexperimente in erzählender Literatur*, in *Christianisme et formes littéraires, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, 23, Fondation Hardt, Geneva 1977, 41-99; P. Leclerc, *Antoine et Paul: métamorphose d'un héros*, in Y.-M. Duval, ed., *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris 1988, 257-265; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, I, Paris 1991, 150-184.

E. Wipszycka

PAUL of Verdun (d. 648/49). Native of the region of Autun, after having stayed for a brief period at the court of *Chlothar II (584–629), he retired to a mountain near *Trier (Paulusberg or Bulisberg) but did not join an organized form of monastic life. Between 625/630 and 648/649, he was the bishop of Verdun. He was nominated by King Dagobert I (beginning of the 7th c.–639) and elected by the

clergy and the people. Though finding his church in a miserable condition, he worked very hard: he restored divine worship, revitalized canonical life and trained the clergy well. He distinguished himself for promoting *eucharistic adoration, devotion to the Madonna and charity toward the poor. He wrote two gracious letters to *Desiderius of Cahors around 641; also extant is an invitation from Desiderius to Paul requesting his presence at the inauguration of a basilica.

CPL 1303; PL 87, 260.261; CCL 117, 333.334; BS 8, 280-281; DCB 4, 271; LTK³ 7, 1529; N. Gauthier, *L'évangelisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de Première Belgique entre antiquité et moyen-âge (IIIᵉ-VIIIᵉ s.)*, Paris 1980, 407-412; F.G. Hirschmann, *Verdun im hohen Mittelalter: eine lotharingische Kathedralstadt und ihr Umland im Spiegel der geistlichen Institutionen*, Trier 1996; Th. Bauer, *Lotharingien als historischer Raum: Raumbildung und Raumbewußtsein im Mittelalter*, Cologne 1997, 254-257, 599-605.

M.G. Bianco

PAUL SILENTIARIUS (6th c.). Byzantine poet, he performed the task of **primicerius* of the *silentiarii* (chamberlains who were responsible for maintaining order in the imperial audiences and processions) at the court of *Justinian (527–565). He was a friend of the historian and poet Agathias (*Historiae* 5,9). Following the Alexandrian tradition, he composed epigrams and descriptions of artwork in verse. He is the author of the *Descriptio* (*ekphrasis*) *sanctae Sophiae* in 887 hexameters (in the manner of *Nonnus), preceded by two introductions, one addressed to the empress, the other to the patriarch *Eutychius. The second didactic composition is the *Descriptio ambonis*, written in 275 hexameters with an introduction in iambic trimeters. This pulpit of the cantors was located under the dome of the Hagia Sophia supported by eight marble columns. The earthquake of 558 greatly damaged the Hagia Sophia, which had been inaugurated by Justinian in 537. The church was restored in five years and, during the Christmas vigil of 562, the solemnities of the second "inauguration" began. Probably on 6 January 563, the first composition was read and a few days later, the second likewise in the presence of the emperor and the patriarch. The two short poems, which are important for their literary and historical aspects, are of great importance for the history of Byzantine art: the author describes at length the magnificence of this sacred building, rich in multicolored marble, possessing high columns, mosaics, precious materials and gold and silver glassware (candles, oil lamps of various types, etc.). The **Anthologia Palatina* contains 789 of his *Epigrams* pertaining primarily to love. He did not write the short poem of 190 choliambics *In thermas pythicas* (*On the Pythian Baths*) (in Bithynia).

CPG III, 7513-7516; PG 86, 2119-2268; P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius*, Leipzig-Berlin 1912; G. Viassino, *Paolo Silenziario, Epigrammi*, text, tr. e comm., Turin 1963; *Anthologia Palatina* (ed. P. Waltz, "Les belles lettres"); Bardenhewer V, 24-25: PWK 3, 2366-2377; Impellizzeri 247-248 and 434-35. (bibl.); Patrologia V, 46-48.

A. De Nicola

PAUL the SIMPLE, saint (4th c.). Mentioned by *Rufinus (*Hist. monach.* 31 [PL 21, 457-459]) and by *Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 28: PG 34, 1076-1084; see *Appendix ad Palladium*: PG 65, 381-385; *De vitis Patrum seu verba seniorum*, 167: PL 73, 795-796; Soz., *HE* 1,13: PG 67, 900 BC). An Egyptian peasant, he peacefully left his wife who had committed adultery and went to St. Anthony who was abbot in Thebaïd. Before accepting him as his disciple (at 60 years of age), Anthony put his vocation to the test. Humility, simplicity, obedience and great faith characterized his life; he exercised much power over the demons.

AASS *Maii* 1, 643-647; LTK² 8, 214; BS 10, 264-265.

A. De Nicola

PAULA (347–404). Mother of *Eustochium. A noble Roman matron about whose life we have information from Jerome's lengthy epitaph shortly after her death to console Eustochium (*Ep.* 108). She married the *pagan Toxotius from whom she bore five children, among whom were Blessilla, *Eustochium and Paulina, the wife of *Pammachius. Upon the death of her husband, which occurred before 381, she entered the *ascetic life and joined a group of noble Roman women who met in the house of *Marcella on the Aventine Hill under the spiritual direction of Jerome from the year 382 onward, when he was in *Rome with *Epiphanius of Salamis and *Paulinus of Antioch. Paul hosted Epiphanius from whom she heard stories about the lives of the Eastern ascetics; she was captivated. Under Jerome's direction, she applied herself to studying the *Scriptures and the Hebrew language, being already familiar with the Greek language. In 385, she set sail for the East to follow Jerome together with her daughter Eustochium and, after a stop at *Cyprus to meet with Epiphanius and at Antioch with Paulinus, she headed to *Jerusalem and then on to *Bethlehem. After having seen all the holy sites of *Palestine with Eustochium, she went with her and Jerome to *Egypt to visit the monks of the desert of Nitria. Finally, in

386 she settled once and for all at Bethlehem, where she established a hospice for *pilgrims and a male and female *monastery; she lived in the latter until her death (26 January 404).

Jerome, *Ep.* 30 (to Paula on Ps. 118); 39 (to Paula on the the death of Blesilla); 46 (letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, preserved in the collection of Jerome's letters); 108 (to Eustochium); Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 36; 41; LTK[3] 7, 1487 (bibl.); PCBE 1617-1626; N. Adkin, *The Letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella: Some Notes*: Maia 51 (1999) 97-110.

A. Pollastri

PAULICIANS. A heterodox medieval sect originally from *Asia Minor. If one disregards the Armenian sources, which are not clear, the first attestation to its existence was around 655 (the preaching of Constantine-Sylvan) in Byzantine Mesopotamia. After various misfortunes (imperial persecutions and migrations into Arabic territory), in the 1st half of the 9th c. the sect was already widespread in the E part of the empire and actually possessed its own "state" at Tefrik, which was suppressed by the Byzantines around 878. Until the end of the 12th c., the Paulicians are sporadically attested in the West and in the Near East and with a certain continuity in the Balkans (where they converged with the Bogomils) and at *Constantinople. The precise nature of their teaching is still subject to scholarly debate. In the Byzantine sources, they are wrongly referred to as "*Manicheans," but the Paulicians considered themselves to be Christians and willingly appealed to the NT, esp. the apostle *Paul's writings. Doctrinal developments aside, two traits seem to have characterized the sect: a certain type of *dualism and, with respect to the *incarnation, *Docetism. In their worship service, they made no place for the *saints and their *relics and not even the *cross or the *sacraments. Their affinity to the iconoclasts was only superficial. Lemerle contested Conybeare's theory (and Garsoian's), who maintained that the sect had *adoptionist origins and that its doctrines were contained in the Armenian treatise *The Key of Truth*.

F.C. Conybeare, *The Key of Truth: A Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia*, Oxford 1898; N. Garsoian, *The Paulician Heresy*, The Hague-Paris 1964; Id., *Byzantine Heresy: A Reinterpretation*: DOP 25 (1971) 85-113; Ch. Astruc et al., *Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure*: Travaux et Mémoires 4 (1970) 1-227; P. Lemerle, *L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques*: ibid. 5 (1973) 1-144; G. Huxley, *The Historical Geography of the Paulician and T'ondrakan Heresies*, in T.J. Samuelian - M.E. Stone (eds.), *Medieval Armenian Culture* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6), Chico, CA 1983, 81-95; V. Nersessian, *The Tondrakian Movement: Religious Movements in the Armenian Church from the Fourth to the Tenth Centuries*, London 1987.

S.J. Voicu

PAULINIANS. This was the name given to those who adhered to the teachings of *Paul of Samosata. *Augustine attributed their *Ebionite christological teaching to "a certain *Artemon," and said that it was confirmed by *Photinus of Sirmium (*De haer.* 44; see also Eus., *HE* 5, 28,1-2). Canon 19 of the Council of *Nicaea maintained that they should be rebaptized if they wanted to return to the Catholic Church (Rufinus, *HE* I, 6; Athan., *Or. c. Ar. sec.* 43) and attested the existence of clerics, deacons and deaconesses within this group.

F. Cocchini

PAULINIANUS (4th c.–beginning of 5th. c). Jerome's youngest brother who followed in his footsteps, along with his sister, into the monastic life. With *Vincent (Presbyter), Jerome's friend and benefactor, he left *Rome for *Palestine. Not yet thirty years old, in 394, despite his resistance, he was ordained a priest by *Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, which violated the rights of the local ordinary, Bishop *John of Jerusalem, with whom Jerome was debating concerning *Origen's teaching. Paulinianus, who only desired to help his brother in the *monastery, therein exercised his ministerial priesthood. He always remained in good standing with Jerome, despite *Palladius's insinuations (*Hist. laus.* 79), and perhaps outlived his brother, but we know nothing of what he did afterward.

DCB 4, 230ff.; Patrologia III, 203-207.

M.G. Bianco

PAULINUS of Antioch (d. after 382). Antiochene priest, around the year 350 he was the leader of a small community in *Antioch that supported the decisions of the Council of *Nicaea and was thereby separated from the majority church of that area. This occurred because after the deposition of *Eustathius of Antioch, the majority church was continually led by pro-*Arian bishops. The disagreement continued even when the local bishop *Meletius, between 360 and 363, began to lean toward Nicene theology. In 362, *Lucifer of Cagliari ordained Paulinus bishop, and in 363 *Athanasius recognized him as the bishop of Antioch in place of Meletius: this decision exacerbated the Antiochene

*schism inasmuch as *Egypt and the West aligned themselves with Paulinus and the entire anti-Arian East with Meletius. *Basil of Caesarea was particularly hostile toward Paulinus, even accusing him of being bent toward the ideas of *Sabellius and *Marcellus of Ancyra. The *Apollinarian controversy put a further strain on the small community, but around the year 380 Paulinus rejected Meletius's proposal for reconciliation (we do not know acc. to what terms). When Meletius died during the Council of *Constantinople (381), Paulinus, despite being supported by the West, was unable to get himself recognized as the sole bishop of Antioch, and *Flavian was elected in place of Meletius. The Council of *Rome (382) recognized Paulinus as the sole bishop of Antioch, but this recognition had no effect. Paulinus died shortly thereafter and was replaced by *Evagrius as the head of the schismatic community.

DCB 4, 232-233; F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, Paris 1905; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 177ff.; 196ff.; 230-232; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVᵉ siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim; L.L. Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius. Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX*, Toronto 2004.

M. Simonetti

PAULINUS of Bordeaux. Contemporary of *Faustus of Riez and, perhaps, the same Paulinus whom *Gennadius presents as the author of the works on *penance, the beginning of Lent, *Easter, obedience and *neophytes (*Vir. ill.* 68). From his writings a fragment of a document *De paenitentia* has survived; it was mistakenly attributed to Faustus of Riez. Perhaps *Ep.* 4 of the aforementioned Faustus is by the same Paulinus (CSEL 21, 181-183), although the attribution of the *Tractatus duo de initio quadragesimae* to him remains doubtful (A. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, IV, Rome 1840, 309-313).

CPL 981-982; PL 58, 875-876 (= PL 103, 699-702); B. Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbusse im Ausgang des christlichen Altertums*, Munich 1928, 128-129 n.4.

S. Zincone

PAULINUS of Milan. Biographer of *Ambrose of Milan. The few pieces of information on him upon which Bouvy, then Palanque, tried to reconstruct his life are based on the work he wrote (*Vita s. Ambrosii*) and on the information reported by *Marius Mercator (*Commonitorium*, ACO I,V, 1, 66.4), *Augustine and *Isidore of Seville (*De vir. ill.* 17). An eyewitness of the last period of Ambrose's life (the first explicit piece of information he provides is from the year 395), he came to know the bishop of Milan, whose **notarius* he later became at an unknown time.

After Ambrose's death (397), he stayed in Milan and found himself there when Mascezel arrived from Africa, victorious over his brother *Gildo. He still resided there when the bodies of the martyrs *Sissinius, Martyrius and Alexander were transferred to the city. We do not know when *Simplicianus sent him to *Africa to manage the property of the Milanese church. It is very likely, however, that during his stay in Africa, he wrote the *Vita s. Ambrosii* at the request of Augustine. With regard to the date of the work's composition, 422 seems more plausible than 412 (see M. Pellegrino, *Paolino di Milano*). Much discussion has been raised concerning the biography's historical value. Today, scholars have considered the core of Paulinus's account to be trustworthy (ibid., 23) because its encomiastic aims, its moral preaching, the presence of the miraculous and his interest in the ecclesial dimension of Ambrose's life take nothing away from the seriousness of the information Paulinus provides. Lacking in literary luster and void of *rhetoric, the work follows a chronological order in narrating the life of the bishop of Milan. Scholars have also attributed to Paulinus the authorship of the *Libellus adversus Caelestium Zosimo episcopo datus*. Baronius and Tillemont argued that Paulinus the biographer of Ambrose should be identified with Paulinus the opponent of *Celestius; Palanque confirmed their thesis. In this brief document, Paulinus, who in the assembly of the bishops gathered at *Carthage in 412, took a stance against Pelagian ideas (Aug., *De gratia Christi et de pecc. orig.* II, 3.8; *Contra duas epist. Pel.* II 6), refused to appear, as Pope *Zosimus had wanted, before a Roman council to renew his charges; he exposed Pelagius and Celestius's errors and asked that the condemnation be ratified. All information about Paulinus after this event has been lost.

CPL 169; *Vita s. Ambrosii*: PL 14, 28-50; *Libellus adversus Caelestium Zosimo episcopo datus*: PL 20, 711-716; L. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, Venise 1732, X, 81; E. Bouvy, *Paulin de Milan*: Revue Augustinienne 1 (1902) 497-514; J.R. Palanque, *La Vita Ambrosii de Paulin. Étude critique*: RSR 4 (1924) 26-42; 401-420; Id., *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1933, 400-416; M. Pellegrino, *Paolino di Milano. Vita di S. Ambrogio*, Rome 1961; E. Lamirande, *Paulin de Milan et la "Vita Ambrosii,"* Paris 1983; L. Canali - C. Carena (ed.), *Vita di Cipriano. Vita di Ambrogio. Vita di Agostino*, Milan 1975; M. Navoni (ed.), *Paolino di Milano. Vita di sant'Ambrogio: la prima biografia del patrono di Milano*, Cinisello Balsamo 1996; PCBE II, 1654-1658.

M.G. Mara

PAULINUS of Nola (355–431). Christian poet. A collection of his *Letters* and *Poems* has been passed down to us (ed. Hartel, CSEL 29-30). Born at Burdigala (Bordeaux) in Aquitaine in 355 (if not before) from a noble and rich senatorial family related to the most famous families of the empire, he was educated in the circles tied to the teaching of *Ausonius. This allowed him to attain the imperial laurel for poetry and numerous achievements in forensics. In 378 he was appointed Senator and, as a result, obtained the *curule magistrature*, probably the governorship of Campania, which he exercised with benevolence. In 383, after *Gratian's death and *Valentinian II's rise to power—as an *Arian Valentinian persecuted the magistrates of orthodox faith and esp. those who had supported the usurper *Maximus in *Gaul—he returned to Aquitaine and perhaps passed through *Milan, where he met Bishop *Ambrose. He seems to have had subsequent encounters with Ambrose, from whom he received his first series of lessons for *baptism. He was then baptized in his homeland in 389 by Bishop *Delphinus. During this year—perhaps even to avoid the persecution to which his family was then subject—he fled with his wife Terasia to *Spain, into the recesses of the Pyrenees Mountains, breaking ties with the groups with which he had associated until that time and even with his teacher and friend Ausonius. In Spain, having converted definitively to Christianity beyond mere externals, he gave away his immense fortune, causing a great scandal everywhere, but also drawing the approval and praises of Ambrose, *Augustine, *Jerome and *Sulpicius Severus. At *Barcelona, in 394, the people declared him a priest by a less-than-clear procedure. But he left Spain in 395 to flee to Nola, where he still had some assets. He felt compelled to go there by the calling to place himself at the service of St. *Felix, to whom he had dedicated himself since the years of his governorship in Campania. Here he lived until 409 or 410, leading an ascetic life together with his wife Terasia and some confreres. He resided adjacent to the sanctuary of St. Felix at Cimitile, in the environs of Nola, while maintaining contact by letter with the most respected bishops and Christian scholars and receiving friends and visitors who came from everywhere to talk with him. Toward 409-410 he ended his retirement at Cimitile to fill the episcopal chair of Nola, which was vacant after the death of Bishop Paul. Meanwhile around the year 409 his wife, Terasia, died. Paulinus died on 22 June 431.

During his stay at Cimitile, Paulinus wrote the bulk of the letters and poems that have come down to us. The letters (51 acc. to Hartel's edition), addressed to various people, among whom were Augustine, Jerome, *Rufinus, *Jovius, *Pammachius, *Desiderius, Sulpicius Severus, *Amandus, Delphinus, reveal the sentiments of a warm friendship renewed by Christian spirituality and by a geniality made purer through *ascesis and by the bonds of brotherhood in Jesus Christ. Even if he does not show himself to be a keen and original theologian nor a profound exegete when grappling with problems of theology or biblical *exegesis in these letters, Paulinus presents us an example of a *faith that is pure, intensely heartfelt, deep and rich in benevolence. Paulinus's poetic activity (33 poems acc. to Hartel's edition, but poems I, IV, V, XXXII and XXXIII have been mistakenly attributed to him) before 389 was focused on secular topics; from 389 onward however they turned entirely to singing the praises of Christ and St. Felix. From 389 to 394 while in Spain he wrote poems VI, VII, VIII and IX; in 393-394, poems X and XI to Ausonius; in 395 poem XII, the first *natalicium* in honor of St. Felix; at Nola, in 396, he wrote poem XIII, the second of the *natalicium* and, thereafter, every year, a poem for St. Felix's birthday: the others, 12 in all, from 397 to 408 or 409 (XIV in 397, XV in 398, XVI in 399, XVIII in 400, XXIII in 401, XXVI in 402, XXVII in 403, XXVIII in 404, XIX in 405, XX in 406, XXI in 407, XXIX in 408 or 409). He composed other poems for various occasions: poem XVII, *propempticon* for *Nicetas, and poem XXIV, a letter to Citherius, in 400; poem XXV, epithalamium for the wedding of *Julian of Eclanum and Titia, between 401 to 404; poem XXXI, a *consolatorium* for the death of Celsus, of an uncertain date, between 393 and 408, more likely between 393 and 401. In all these poems, with the exception of the VI in honor of St. *John the Baptist and poems VII, VIII and IX which are pareneses of Psalms 1, 2 and 136, Paulinus uses the same literary genres already consecrated by the classical tradition (*propempticon*, *epithalamium*, *consolatorium* and *natalicium*), profoundly renewing their contents, however, with a Christian meaning.

Like *Prudentius, whom he resembles in cultural formation, participation in public life and very similar religious experiences, Paulinus renewed—in accordance with the demands of a comprehensive conception of the Christian life—the poetic ideas not only of the *pagan poets but even of his Christian predecessors and by consecrating poetry to Christ, he appropriated it in the service of spiritual exercise and above all that which, on the basis of **lectio divina*, raises the creature to the Creator so that he obtains salvation. Judgment on Paulinus's poetry has been skewed by a comparison with Pru-

dentius's work, which is more diverse and rich in imagery and therefore more communicative. It is true, however, that Paulinus's poems are at times excessively prolix and too rhetorical, but even the digressions fulfill a specific poetic purpose. His poetry, even if it appears simple, is in fact difficult to read and, moreover, is not confined to its sympathy for one's neighbor (which manifests itself in many scenes realistically told, depicting at one point saints and learned visitors and then humble country folk and pilgrims at another, thus retaining in some ways his connection with secular poetry). He also provides vivid descriptions of feasts (still corresponding, however, to the ascetic's love for St. Felix and, through him, above all, for Christ); he reveals, however, a constant poetic tension that is always operative, even when it is weakened by certain mannerisms and excesses.

Meekness is generally considered the principal note of Paulinus's character. This assessment is derived from the friendly tone with which he speaks to his friends and by his sympathy toward the lowly. This meekness, however, should not be confused with weakness of the *soul: Paulinus also knew how to be stern and definitive as when he answered Ausonius's rebukes for having abandoned the secular topics of poetry and the criticisms of his detractors; such sternness was also evident when he had to reprimand the citizens of Nola for refusing to provide him water for his sanctuary. Rather than meekness, what is predominant in Paulinus's character is the fervor of his religious faith; it influenced all his actions and his literary activity, directing it in charity toward his neighbor for the love and honor of Christ.

Editions: PL 61; Paulinus Nolanus, *Epistulae*, ed. G. de Hartel - M. Kamptner, CSEL 29, Vienna 1899; Paulinus Nolanus, *Carmina*, ed. G. de Hartel - M. Kamptner, CSEL 30, Vienna 1899; M. Skeb (Hg.), *Paulini Nolani operum concordantiae*, 3 Bd., Hildesheim 2000. *Translations*: Eng.: P.G. Walsh, *Letters* and *Poems*, 3 vols., London-Westminster 1966, 1967, 1975 (ACW 35, 36, 40); It.: Paolino di Nola, *I Carmi*, A. Ruggiero, Rome 1990 (It. tr.); Paolino di Nola, *Le lettere*, G. Santaniello, Naples 1992 (Lat., It. tr.); Paolino di Nola, *I Carmi*, A. Ruggiero, 2 vols. Naples 1996 (Lat., It. tr.); German: Paulinus von Nola, *Briefe*, M. Skeb, [Fontes Christiani 25/1-3], Freiburg i.B. 1998.

For an exhaustive list of the studies on Paulinus (the fundamental studies of these are the two by P. Fabre, *Essai sur la chronologie de l'oeuvre de St. Paulin de Nole*, Paris 1948, and *St. Paulin de Nole et l'amitié chrétienne*, Paris 1949) S. Costanza, *Meropio Ponzio Paolino: Antologia di carmi*, Messina 1971, 17-36, and J.T. Lienhard, *Paulinus of Nola and Early Western Monasticism*, Bonn 1977, 11-16 and 192-204. To these works indicated, one should now add: W. Erdt, *Christentum und heidnisch-antike Bildung bei Paulinus von Nola, mit Kommentar und Übersetzung des 16. Briefes*, Heisenheim a.G. 1976; S. Costanza, *Cristianesimo e Romanità in Paolino di Nola*: Studi in onore di S. Pugliatti, Messina-Milan 1979, vol. V, 179-192; Kl. Kohlwes, *Christliche Dichtung und stilistische Form bei Paulinus von Nola*, Bonn 1979; A. Ruggiero, *Nola crocevia dello spirito* (with a tr. of poems XXI and XXVII); A. Ruggiero - H. Crouzel - G. Santaniello, *Paolino di Nola, momenti della sua vita e delle sue opere*, Nola 1983, with a tr. of the poems XV, XVI, XVIII (Ruggiero) and from the ep. XXIII (Santaniello); the studies collected in *Atti del Convegno su Paolino di Nola* (Nola 20-21 marzo 1982), Rome 1984; T.J. Brown - T.W. Mackay, *Codex Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 235: An Early Insular Manuscript of Paulinus of Nola Carmina*, Turnhout 1988; G. Santaniello, *San Paolino di Nola: una vita per Cristo*, Naples 1994; F.E. Consolino, *Cristianizzare l'epitalamio: il carme 25 di Paolino di Nola*: Cassiodorus 3 (1997) 199-213; M. Skeb, *Christo vivere: Studien zum literarischen Christusbild des Paulinus von Nola*, Bonn 1997; G. Luongo (ed.), *Anchora vitae*, Atti del II convegno paoliniano, Naples 1998; S. Pricoco, *Ancora sul Panegirico di Paolino di Nola per Teodosio e il nuovo concetto cristiano del potere imperiale*: Cassiodorus 4 (1998) 225-246; D. E. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters and Poems*, Berkeley, CA 1999; C. Conybeare, *Paulinus Noster: Self and Symbols in the Letters of Paulinus of Nola*, Oxford 2000; R. Kirstein, *Paulinus Nolanus: Carmen 17*, Basel 2000; S. Mratschek, *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola: Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*, Göttingen 2001.

S. Costanza - C. Ricci

PAULINUS of Pella (d. after 459). Information about his life is gathered from his short poem. Born at Pella (Macedonia), where his Father Thalassius was the *vicarius*, at the end of 376 or the beginning of 377, after having briefly stayed at *Carthage, where his father was proconsul, and having passed through *Rome, he then journeyed to *Gaul (Bordeaux), the land of his parents, where he lived from the age of three (vv. 22-49). Without a doubt his father received those appointments because of the influence of his brother-in-law *Ausonius, whom Paulinus met in 379. He received his education at Bordeaux, where he studied two languages, but at home he spoke Greek. He had a child through a relationship with a slave girl, but the child died soon after (vv. 169ff.). At twenty years old, his parents arranged a marriage for him with a girl from a prominent family who bore him three children. He then devoted himself to managing his estates. His father died around 407, when the invasions of the Alans, *Vandals and Suebi began; a few years after, the *Visigoths arrived, with whom he sought to collaborate. The usurper Priscus Attalus, first proclaimed emperor by *Alaric, then by Ataulf, conferred an important office upon him; he collaborated with the *Goths (vv. 291-317). In 414 he was able to save the city of Bazas (*Vasatis*), where he had fled with his parents (vv. 328-376). By his own choice he then had to suffer at the hands of the barbarians (vv. 317-327) and the Gallo-Romans (vv. 424-430), who put him through considerable suffering, stripping him of many of his properties. He dates his "conver-

sion" to the Easter of 421, i.e., a return to the faith of his childhood; he was made "an ascetic by force" (Marcone 21). He spent the last years of his life at *Marseille, where he had an estate (vv. 520-535). He died after 459.

Paulinus was the nephew of Ausonius, whose sister had married Thalassius. One should not rule out the possibility that he was born of a previous marriage of the latter, because Ausonius never mentions him. Paulinus composed a short autobiographical poem, *Eucharisticos*, published in the year 459, when he was 83 years old (v. 12ff.); it was composed as a hymn of thanksgiving for the divine mercy he experienced during his personal trials; but it is also a justification for his personal dealings against any possible charges. The author does not pretend, as he notes in the preface, to write his biography to satisfy the curiosity of others but to give thanks to God, who has always guided and protected him in the various ups and downs of life. The short poem of 616 verses is thus a reconsideration of his past life in the light of his faith and God's providence; the work does not contain a true spiritual and poetic dynamic. His poetry is thus deficient both in form and content. Scholars have attributed *Paulinus of Nola's *Carmen* IV to Paulinus (Hartel CSEL 30, 3), which is a prayer to God requesting a peaceful life with his family without having to harm others.

CPL 1472-1473; PLS 3, 1115-1128; CSEL 16 (1888) 291-318; H.G. Evelyn White, London 1921 (among the works of Ausonius and with Eng. tr.); C. Moussy, SC 209, Paris 1974 (with Fr. tr.); Paolino di Pella, *Discorso di ringraziamento*, [critical text, tr. and comm.] ed. A. Marcone, Florence 1995. G. Funaioli, *De Paulini Pellaei carminis "eucharisticos" fontibus*: Le Musée Belge 9 (1905) 159-179; P. Courcelle, *Un nouveau poème de Paulin de Pella*: VChr 1 (1947) 101-113 (also in *Hist. Litt. des grandes inv. germ.*, Paris [3]1964, 293-302); P. Tordeur, *Concordance de P.P.*, Brussels 1964; Patrologia III, 311-313; G. Sciascia, *Paolino di Pella*: AARC 4 (1981) 193-199; A. Fò, *Tentativo di introduzione a Paolino di Pella*, in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, ed. A. Garzya, Naples 1989, 361-382; N.B. McLynn, *Paulinus the Impenitent: A Study of the Eucharisticos*: JECS 3 (1995) 461-486; L. Zurli, *Paolino di Pella ed Enea*: BStudLat 26 (1996) 559-567; E. Colombi, *Rusticitas e vita in villa nella Gallia tardoantica: tra realtà e letteratura*: Athenaeum 84 (1996) 405-431; S.M. Perevalov, *Bazas 414: la rupture de l'alliance alano-gothique*: Dialogues d'histoire ancienne 26 (2000) 175-193.

A. Di Berardino

PAULINUS of Périgueux. We do not have much information about the life of this 5th.-c. poet, who has often been confused, even in antiquity, with the more famous *Paulinus, namely of Nola. His birth should be dated around the year 400, as one gathers from a line in the poem *De visitatione nepotuli sui*, written between the years 470 and 473, in which the poet makes reference to his *gravis senecta* (v. 20). The idea that he was the bishop of Périgueux (*Petricordia*) is rather doubtful. Paulinus's most famous work is his hagiographical poem *De vita S. Martini*, a six-book poetic parenesis of *Sulpicius Severus's work on *Martin of Tours, perhaps to be read in public upon the request of *Perpetuus of Tours, who also suggested that he put to verse one of his small books on the miracles performed by St. Martin. But Paulinus enlarged upon Sulpicius Severus's account with certain emphases that were at times overdone, thus lapsing into frequent and excessive moral and apologetic digressions, and minute descriptions, in which, however, he at times does not lack sensitivity in observation and liveliness in representation. For the exaltation of the miracles of St. Martin, Paulinus left two minor compositions of meager literary value, an inscription of 25 hexameters titled *De orantibus*, intended to adorn a new basilica dedicated to St. Martin, and a poem of 80 hexameters, *De visitatione nepotuli sui*.

CPL 1474-1477; PL 61; M. Petschenig, CSEL 16, 1, 1888. *Studies*: A. Huber, *Die poetische Bearbeitung der Vita S. Martini des Sulpicius Severus durch Paulinus von Périgueux*, Kempten 1901; J. Fontaine, *Hagiographie et politique de Sulpice Sévere à Venance Fortunat: La christianisation du pays entre Loire et Rhin* (Actes du Colloque de Nanterre): RHEF 62 (1975) 113-140; R. van Dam, *Paulinus of Périgueux and Perpetuus of Tours*: Francia 14 (1986) 567-573; G.H. Malsbary, *The Epic Hagiography of Paulinus of Périgueux*, Winnipeg 1988; E. Grünberg, *Studien zur Vita S. Martini des Paulinus von Petricordia*, Vienna 1991; A.V. Nazzaro, *L'agiografia martiniana di Sulpicio Severo e le parafrasi epiche di Paolino di Périgueux e Venanzio Fortunato*, in *Mutatio rerum*, ed. M.L. Silvestre - M. Squillante, Naples 1997, 301-346; S. Labarre, *Le manteau partagé: deux métamorphoses poétiques de la "Vie de saint Martin" chez Paulin de Périgueux* (V[e] *s.*) *et Venance Fortunat* (VI[e] *s.*), Turnhout 1998; Th. Gärtner, *Zur christlichen Imitationstechnik in der "Vita sancti Martini" des Paulinus von Petricordia*: VChr 55 (2001) 71-85.

S. Costanza

PAULINUS of Trier. At the Council of *Arles of 353 he was the sole participating bishop from *Gaul who refused to sign the condemnation of *Athanasius imposed by the emperor *Constantius. He was deposed and exiled to *Phrygia and died there soon after because he was *indignus ecclesiae episcopus, dignus exilio a rege est iudicatus* (Hilary: CSEL 65, 102).

DCB 4, 232; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 332ff., 460ff.; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV*[e] *siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, 455, 461, 466.

M. Simonetti

PAULINUS of Tyre. Supporter of *Arius from the very beginning (ca. 320), he shared his beliefs and was the recipient of an important doctrinal letter from *Eusebius of *Nicomedia. At the Council of *Nicaea, he buckled under *Constantine's pressure, signing the anti-Arian formula of faith; he later assisted, however, in measures taken against Nicaea. In 327 he was elected the bishop of *Antioch in place of the deposed *Eustathius but died after a few months.

CPG 2, 2065; DCB 4, 231-232; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 44ff., 277ff.

M. Simonetti

PAULINUS of York (d. 10 October 644). He was consecrated as bishop of *York on 21 July 625, before he arrived there. He came from Kent with the entourage of Ethelburga, King Eadbald of Kent's Catholic sister, who went to York to marry Edwin, a *pagan king of Northumbria (Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II, 9). The objective of Paulinus's transfer to York was to convert the king and his court to Christianity. He exerted himself with zeal to this end, baptizing not only the king but also numerous nobles (Bede, ibid. II, 12.14). In 601 *Gregory the Great had sent him to Kent (Bede, ibid. I, 29); he was compelled to return there (Bede, ibid. II, 20) when in 632 King Edwin was defeated by the Briton Cadwallon, who brought paganism back to Christianized areas. Thereafter named bishop of Rochester, Paulinus died 10 October 644.

F. Cocchini

PEACE. The term *peace* was an important word in ancient Christianity. It had many meanings; we focus here on the primary ones: (1) Peace in connection to Christ, the peace of every person (Eph 2:14). The concept of peace developed in reference to the person of Christ; then, esp. in *Augustine's writings, the application of the term developed in connection to the human person. This was, perhaps, Christianity's most specific contribution to the meaning of the term *peace*, which, previously, was usually understood in relation to war and its absence. (2) The peace of Christ and as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22; Rom 14:17), given to the one who believes in Christ ("Peace I leave with you. . . . My peace I give you," Jn 14:27). This is the believer's own peace; it is distinct from the peace that reigns among other groups. The Fathers heavily stress that Christians receive this peace, which is their own (see *Origen and Augustine's comments on Jn 14:27). Origen speaks of the son of peace (Lk 10:5-7), a term designating the new person in Christ; Christians, therefore, become messengers of peace by working within human history to obtain peace with God and concord while living among other people. (3) Peace in connection to civil and religious institutions and to the relations between peoples striving for dominance of economic goods and for cultural, utopian and political goals.

The first meaning of peace (i.e., Christ and the human being) was widely used in the *liturgy and in *anthropological discussions, esp. in Augustine's writings. The second—the peace "of believers," as a religious group—manifested itself in the internal debate on orthodoxy and heresy and relations between the various churches (*Cyprian and Augustine use the term in this sense in their writings, the latter using it thus in the *Donatist controversy). The third meaning was subject to the developing Christian understanding of its place in the world. Before *Constantine, Christians generally rejected war and, more generally, everything that threatened human life (e.g., the *Traditio Apostolica* 16, ed. B. Botte 1963, 36, forbids the *catechumen and faithful Christian believer from enlisting in the army and killing in war; it also forbids the judge from using the *ius gladii*; and Origen's *Contra Celsum*, in books 5, 7 and 8, provides the clearest testimonies). The *Vita Martini* (ch. 4), in his statement of faith, picks up this sort of disposition again: "It is not permissible for me to engage in combat" (*pugnare mihi non licet*). After Constantine and before the *Vandal invasions, Augustine responded along the same lines (*Ep.* 220, 229, 230, 231), during the years 426–427. Augustine's principle has remained famous: wars are destroyed at negotiating tables and peace is obtained through peaceful means, not through wars (*ipsa bella verbo occidere . . . et acquirere vel obtinere pacem pace, non bello: Ep.* 229,2).

By Augustine's time, the political situation for Christians had changed. This was not the era of the conscientious objector; instead, soldiers had to engage in battle. The insistent plea was made to leaders that, being in charge, they not go to war or that they postpone or mitigate its damaging effects. What was in the pre-Constantinian church a requirement for all believers (i.e., opposition to every attack on human life), after Constantine becomes a distinction between life as a citizen, which naturally requires one to defend the state, and life as a Christian, which advises one not to engage in war at all. Augustine summarized the new situation in this way: "If you ask me for advice that conforms to the principles of this world . . . I cannot offer a solid piece of

advice on unstable matters. But if . . . you ask me for advice that conforms to the law of God, I know exactly what I ought to say . . . Christ's soldiers fight not to kill men but to defeat *the principalities, powers and spirits of evil* (Eph 6:12) . . . marital obligations do not prevent you . . . from seeking peace even in war, if you ever have to engage in it again" (*Ep.* 220, 9 and 12). One should read Augustine's statement on wars justified by the wickedness of neighboring countries in this light (*Civ. Dei* 4,15), acc. to Titus Livy's model, which he applied to the expansion of the Roman Empire.

In sum, we again note that at one point the term *peace* was employed to indicate the cordial relations between churches and the state, at another point, the state of reconciliation with God, eternal rest and the Christian community established upon orthodoxy and concord (*Tertullian, *De or.* 18; Orig., *In Jer. Hom.* 9.2). Peace is, therefore, synonymous with *communio* (Ursacius, *Ep. ad Athanasium*). As in the case of war, peace, acc. to the gospels, is not tied to a political state but to the coming of Christ, who came to earth to reestablish human peace with God (never the other way around, because the tension between the two arises from *sin). Paul calls Christ "our peace" (Eph 2:14). Christ's disciple, therefore, must be a "peacemaker" (Mt 5:9).

*Clement of Rome attributes great importance to the idea of peace (the term occurs seven times in his letters). The peace of the creation, acc. to the Stoic model, provides a paradigm for exhorting the Corinthian community to live in peace. For *Ignatius, peace is an eschatological good that God grants to the assembly (*Phil.* 7,2). *Cyril of Jerusalem asks that believers pray for the authorities so that they may promote peace (*Cat.* 15,6). In the writings of the other Fathers, one can distinguish different tendencies in their uses of the term. All develop the soteriological and spiritual aspect of peace acc. to the gospels. Tertullian remains faithful to the evangelical line (*Adv. Marc.* 3,14; 4,28; 5,14.17). Reconciliation with God completes peace (*Pud.* 2, 12,15). During his Montanist period, he distinguishes between *pax humana*, *pax ecclesiastica* and *pax divina*; so does *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1,29,4). Though devoting much time to discussing the ravages of war (*De beat. hom.* 7,2-4), *Gregory of Nyssa offers a spiritual interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount's *beatitude concerning peacemakers. Christian writers use the term *peace* on the level of a political theology already in *Melito of Sardis. Especially from the 4th c. onward, one finds writers such as *Eusebius, *Ambrose, *Lactantius and *Orosius equating the concept of *pax Christi* with the *pax Constantini*. Augustine gradually dissociates himself from this political vision in order to come to an understanding of peace as an interior and eschatological good; Augustine's most important text is found in book XIX of the *City of God*. He takes another idea from Origenian terminology (*filius pacis*) and applies it to his understanding of divine foreknowledge and predestination (*De corr. et grat.* 15,46).

The term *peace* appears in the funeral responsory *in pace,* which was never used by pagans but is found very often in Christian *epigraphy. In *Africa one finds the inscription *fidelis in pacis*. The phenomenon of *schism gave rise to the epigraphic formula *pax et unitas*. Since *Justin Martyr's time the liturgy knows of the kiss of peace for fraternal reconciliation (*1 Apol.* 65,2). The term *peace* occurs in the liturgical greetings (*Apos. Con.* VIII, 13,1; 15,10). There we also find a prayer for peace (*Apos. Con.* VIII, 10,3; 15,4; Jn. Chrys., *In Ac. hom.* 37,3).

RAC 8,434-505; M. Viano, *Contributo alla storia semantica della famiglia latina di pax*: AAT 88 (1953), 168-183; C. Tibiletti, *Il senso escatologico di pax e di refrigerium in un passo di Tertulliano*: Maia 10 (1958) 209-219; J. Laufs, *Der Friedensgedanke bei Augustinus. Untersuchungen zum 19. Buch des Werkes "De civitate Dei,"* Wiesbaden 1973; W.R. Schoedel, *Christian "Atheism" and the Peace of the Roman Empire*: ChHist 42 (1973) 309-319; A. Portolano, *L'etica della pace nei primi secoli del cristianesimo*, Naples 1974; A.M. Papes, *Il concetto di pace in Tertulliano*: Salesianum 42 (1980) 341-350; M. Toschi, *Pace e vangelo, La tradizione cristiana di fronte alla guerra*, Brescia 1980; V. Grossi, *I nodi della pace nella storia del cristianesimo*, in *La pace del Regno*, Turin 1983, 73-95; S. Budzik, *Doctor pacis. Theologie des Fridens bei Augustinus*, Innsbruck 1988; E. Corsini, *La pace nella "Città di Dio" di S. Agostino*: Civiltà Classica e Cristianesimo 9 (1988) 205-215; R. Farina, *La pace in Eusebio di Cesarea*, in F. Biffi, ed., *La pace: Sfida all'università cattolica*, Rome 1988, 327-337; R. Pizzorini, *La pace frutto della giustizia e della carità secondo S. Agostino e S. Tommaso d'Aquino*, in ibid., 562-572; I. Lana, *L'idea della pace nell'antichità*, S. Domenico di Fiesole 1991; E. Gallicet, *Pax Babylonis, pax nostra, pax finalis: La pace in Agostino*, in R. Uglione, ed., *La pace nel mondo antico,* Turin 1991, 291-308; P. Siniscalco, *L'uomo e la pace in scritti cristiani del II e del III secolo*, in ibid., 257-275; E. Lanne, *Saint Irénée de Lyon, artisan de la paix entre les Églises*: Irénikon 69 (1996) 451-476; M. van Parys, *Paix et réconcilitiation dans la traditions patristique et monastique*: Irénikon 69 (1996) 163-188; R. Farina, *La concezione della pace nel IV secolo. A proposito di Costantino il Grande ed Eusebio di Cesarea*, in A. Amato-G. Maffei, ed., *Super fundamentum Apostolorum*, Rome 1997, 229-239; V. Grossi, *Testimoni. Origene. Agostino*, in L. Lorenzetti, ed., *Dizionario di Teologia della Pace*, Bologna 1997, 926-930; 932-936; F. Ruggiero, *I volti della pace. Testi dall'Episolario di Agostino di Ippona*, Rome 1999; S. Agostino, *La pace. Il libro XIX de La città di Dio*, ed. R. Piccolomini, Rome 2000; J. Fernández Ubiña, *Cristianos y militares. La Iglesia antigua ante el ejército y la guerra*, Granada 2000; D. X. Burt, *Peace*: in A. Fitzgerald. ed., *Augustine Through the Ages*, Grand Rapids 1999, 629-632; T.J. Weisenberg, *Die Friedenslehre des Augustinus*, Stuttgart 2005.

A. Hamman - M. Flores Colín

PEACOCK. Absent from biblical literature (if one excludes a mention of it in certain MSS of 1 Kgs 10:22 LXX, though not accepted by Rahlfs's edition), the peacock was sacred to Hera-Juno in the Greco-Roman religion, evoking the celestial dimensions to which the deceased ascended once it had been deified. In the Latin world it was often mentioned in poetry (Ovid, Propertius, Martial) as a symbol of vanity and its stunning beauty found in its fan-shaped tail. *Augustine reiterated this belief when he said: "what beauty lies in the wings of the peacock!" (*Com. Io.* 3,4), contrasting it to the superior dignity of humanity created in the image of God. As an iconographic motif, the peacock was already part of the repertoire in *Sassanid art and was continually changed by classical and Hellenistic art, and, as a result, by metaphorical paleo-Christian and Byzantine language.

It was primarily and symbolically connected to the motif of death and rebirth: Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* 10,22-23), following Aristotle's path (*Hist. Anim.* 6,9,564), described the shedding of their feathers in fall and their rebirth in spring. Reflecting a widespread belief originally held by *pagans and disputing with Platonic rationalism (*Civ. Dei* 21,4), Augustine affirmed that the peacock possessed an incorruptible flesh, to thus avoid through divine decree the fixedness of the laws of nature. This legend about its incorruptibility had a definitive influence, along with its own ornamental functionality, on the success of the symbol of the peacock in sepulchral art, first Roman, then Christian. Concerning this matter, Testini categorized the peacock (as, e.g., in the case of the *phoenix) in the "paradigm of continuity" that pertained to various zoomorphic symbols in their passage from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages. The peacock, he maintains, therefore constituted an intermediate case between two extremes: one the one hand, of their fading symbolic value (such is the case with those depictions containing animals already known from the preceding tradition that seem to fossilize in the repetition of ancient models without bearing a real trace of reappropriation: thus as in the *venationes* or the marine and pastoral scenes) and, on the other hand, the expansion of their use as a Christian ideogram due to their ethical and didactic value (think, e.g., of the eagle, the lion and the serpent).

The extraordinary dissemination of the peacock throughout paleo-Christian and Byzantine art—where it constituted the chief zoomorphic element, most represented until the High Middle Ages—marks a clear distinction esp. in comparison to the scarcity of information in the literary sources. When in the 13th c., this appears treated as a distinct topic for the first time in a homily of Anthony of Padua (Ant. Patav., *Serm. Dom. V post Pentecosten* 10), the peacock is, on the basis of the aforementioned ancient physiological conceptions, a symbol of the mortal body destined to resurrect with Christ and to be reclothed with immortality.

The primary areas of its depiction in paleo-Christian art are the following: primarily, as was said, in those of the funerary scene (catacombs, *sarcophagi and sepulchral slabs); therefore the wall and floor mosaics; likewise, not infrequently, the screens and the *plutei* (low walls). Many noteworthy examples, also because of their antiquity, are found in Italy. With no pretext of being exhaustive and not ignoring the spread of these motifs to other geographic contexts such as *Gaul, *Dalmatia, Tunisia, *Syria etc., this entry only treats those found in Italy. The catacombs both in *Rome (Callistus, Priscilla, viale Manzoni, etc.) and those in *Syracuse and N Africa are very rich with images of the peacock. Elements from scenes of the Garden of Eden—lush vegetation, fountains of refreshing water, etc.—among which the peacock is often placed, are rich in their value as a symbol of the *soul destined to the blessedness of the afterlife, making it the animal of paradise by antonomasia. Among the sarcophagi, the following are of great importance: Archbishop Theodore in S. Apollinare in Classe, and Theodota at Pavia (8th c.). For an example of a sepulchral slab with writing etched in it, one could also mention that slab from the cemetery Pretextatus (4th c.), today housed at the Lateran Museum. For the mosaics one should note those on the walls of the mausoleum of St. Costanza in Rome (4th c.), St. Vitalis at *Ravenna (6th c.) and those on the floor of the so-called Theodorian basilica at *Aquileia (4th c.). Similarly, at Ravenna there are screens in the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo and S. Vitale (6th c.). One particular case, then, is Maximinian's cathedra at Ravenna (4th c.), with depictions of the peacock on the mold of the chair.

The *iconography of the peacock is formulated in various typologies: it can be isolated, in pairs or groups of three, in relation to other elements (tree, the branch of the vine, cluster of grapes, flower, etc.) at times with a possible symbolic meaning added (as in the aforementioned slab in the cemetery of Pretextatus that also presents anchors and dolphins, or in the numerous cases where it is composed with a *cross). The motif of pairs of peacocks—or alternatively a pair of deer—enjoyed great success; they were often represented face-to-face in the act of drinking, on the rim of a chalice, goblet or a stream

of water. According to Bisconti and De Maria, the analogy between the iconographic motifs of the peacock and the deer (which is such also because of their high frequency) consisted in their both being figures of salvation, in which a regenerative and baptismal meaning could be immediately recognized.

Cath I, 577; DACL 13/1, 1075-1097 (large collection of images); EC 9, 1008-09; ODB 3, 1611-12; F. Bisconti - L. De Maria, *Temi paleocristiani nei rilievi altomedievali altoadriatici. Dagli animali simbolici all'immaginario zoomorfo*: AAAd 32 (1988) 441-463; M.P. Ciccarese, *Animali simbolici. Alle origini del bestiario cristiano*, 1, BiblPatr 39, Bologna 2002 (important for its bibl.); H. Lother, *Der Pfau in der altchristlichen Kunst*, Leipzig 1929; T.E. Reimbold, *Der Pfau. Mythologie und Symbolik*, Munich 1983; P. Testini, *Il simbolismo degli animali nell'arte figurativa paleocristiana*, in *L'uomo di fronte al mondo animale nell'Alto Medioevo*, 2 (Settimane di studio del CISAM 31), Spoleto 1985, 1107-1179 (and the bibl. contained therein); R. Tosi, *Dizionario delle sentenze greche e latine*, Milan 1991, n. 1739.

F. Pieri

PEKTORIOS (Pectorius) (inscription). This very well known epigraph was engraved on a marble tombstone discovered in 1839 at *Autun, *Gaul (the ancient *Augustodunum*), and is today preserved in a local museum. The epigraph, consisting of three elegiac distiches (vv. 1-6) and five hexameters (vv. 7-11), was engraved in the 4th c., but its first part (vv. 1-6) seems to have been taken from a much more ancient text datable to around the end of the 2nd c. On it a certain Pektorios remembers his parents, Aschanios and Lilaios. The family seems to have come from *Asia Minor. Although vv. 7-11 pertain directly to Pektorios, vv. 1-6 (those taken from the most ancient texts) have a didactic character and are connected to the acrostic: (ΙΧΘΥΣΕ). This last letter, the first from v. 6, had as its conclusion in the primitive text perhaps the word Ἐλπίς, "Hope." The first and most ancient part, that esp. interests us here, is replete with Christian ideas. Humanity is the divine offspring of the heavenly *Fish (Ἰχθύς), i.e., Jesus Christ (v. 1); once they have received *baptism, "the immortal source . . . of the divine waters," they must warm their *soul again "with the perennial waters . . . of salvation," i.e., by listening to and reading the Word of God (vv. 2-4); they must nourish themselves with the *sacrament of the *Eucharist (vv. 5-6). This last distich reads as follows: "Receive the sweet food of the Savior of the Saints; eat with delight while holding the Fish in your hands." One should note here the mention of Christ as the "Savior of the Saints," i.e., of the faithful (ἅγιοι). Moreover, the verb λάμβανε (take) in the present tense indicates a continual action, i.e., the frequency of the consumption of the Eucharist; there is also an allusion to the ancient practice of putting a fragment of the eucharistic bread on the open hand of the faithful. In the second part, at v. 8, worthy of note for the 4th c., is the definition of Christ as the φῶς τὸ θανόντων ("light of the dead").

IG 14, 2525; DACL 1, 3194-3198; 13, 2884-2901; RAC 7, 1031-32; F.J. Dölger, *Ichtys*, vol. 1, Münster 1910, 12-15, 177-183; vol. 2, Münster 1922, 507-515. G.M. Grabka, *Eucharistic Belief Manifest in the Epitaphs of Abercius and P.*: American Ecc. Review 131 (1954) 245-255; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, IV, Rome ²1995, 487-494; A. Hamman, *La preghiera nella chiesa antica*, Turin 1994, n. 103, p. 154; LACL 560; *La preghiera dei cristiani*, ed. M. Simonetti - S. Pricoco, Rome 2000, p. 100, n. 40 (notes pp. 552-53).

G. Guarducci

PELAGIA, martyr. The *Mart. syr.* and the *Mart. hier.* commemorate Pelagia of *Antioch on 8 October. *John Chrysostom preached a homily in her honor (CPG 4350). *Ambrose recognized her as a martyr (*De virginib.* 3,7,33; *Ep.* 27,38). It is quite possible that *Eusebius of Caesarea may have been the first author to mention this saint (*HE* 8,12,2). These authors were unanimous in presenting her as a voluntary martyr: she flung herself from the roof of her home to avoid being assaulted by a group of soldiers who had come to arrest her (for the moral question on the suicide of the saints, see Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 1,26). Ambrose wrongly believed that she was the sister of two other martyrs in Antioch, Berenice and Prosdoce. This mistake passed into Florus of *Lyons's martyrology and, through his work, into other such martyrologies as the *Mart. rom.* (9 June). Another Pelagia was connected to this saint—a famous actress of Antioch who converted and led a life of penance. At the very beginning, John Chrysostom's account was probably the only one available (*Hom. in Matt.* 67). In the 5th c., however, ps.-James the Deacon wrote the legendary *Vita*, in which he borrowed elements from the life of Pelagia of Antioch (BHG 1478). The *prostitute Pelagia (also known as Margarita or *Marina) converted, was baptized and led an ascetic life at *Jerusalem under the spiritual guidance of the monk Pelagius. In fact, the feast of the second Pelagia also falls on 8 October. Another Pelagia, of Tarsus, is confused in the traditions with the two aforementioned Pelagias; this last Pelagia, who was of noble birth, was killed during the *Diocletian persecution.

BHG 1477-1479; BHL 6605-6611; BHO 919; BS 10, 430-441; LCI 8, 152-153; BBKL 7, 161-166; P. Petitmengin, *Pélagie la Pénitente*, 1-2, Paris 1981–1984; C. Nardi, *Il martirio volontario nelle omelie di Giovanni Crisostomo sulle martiri antiochene*: Ho Theológos n.s.1 (1983) 207-278; A. Di Berardino, *Il modello del martire volontario*, in *Euplo e Lucia 304–2004. Agiografia e tra-*

dizioni cultuali in Sicilia, Atti del Convegno di studi (Catania-Siracusa, 1-2 ottobre 2005), ed. T. Sardella - G. Zito, Florence 2005, 63-105.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PELAGIUS (ca. 354–ca. 427) - PELAGIANS - PELAGIANISM

I. Historical outline - II. Polemical context - III. Writings and thought.

These three terms have had their own noteworthy historical significance in relation to their own time, from the person to the ideas that they embodied, and they to this day have established a symbolism in relation to what they represented in the history of Christianity. Using the findings and progress achieved by recent studies in this area, we shall try to shed light on the historical significance of such terms in order to redefine them more in conformity to textual sources than with the symbolism that has developed in a peculiar way since *Augustine's death (430). Down through the centuries the Pelagian controversy has been read mostly from the perspective of Augustine's writings, which presented it as a new "*heresy" within Christianity (*Retract.* II, 33). Such a perspective has negatively affected Pelagius, his movement and an understanding of Augustine's thought, because it has led people to attribute to Pelagius the anthropological positions of others, positions to which he often responded more to demonstrate their inconsistency than to offer a solution to the problem himself. Studies on Pelagianism from Plinval (1943) to this day have allowed scholars to go beyond the judgment of orthodoxy to obtain a synthetic and more complete understanding on an entire movement, which, for nearly 20 years (from 410 onward) caused great controversy in Christianity, esp. in the West.

Pelagius was born in *Britain ca. 354 and between 380 and 384 was baptized at Rome, where he lived for a long time as one of the most listened to voices of the time. The terms "Pelagian" and "Pelagianism" were derived from his first name. We shall discuss the historical outline, polemical context, the writings and thought of this ideological movement, which at Rome was tied to powerful Roman families and encountered and united itself to the *Origenist movement.

I. Historical outline. Scholars usually distinguish three well-defined periods in the Pelagian movement: before 411; from 411-418; and after 418.

I.1. Before 411. Historians of the movement have attributed to this period the anonymous document (perhaps a work of Pelagius) *De induratione cordis Pharaonis*. This document represents Pelagius's understanding of Christianity discussed at that time in Italy and in other Christian intellectual circles that were perhaps debating the theses of the impeccability of the baptized promoted by *Jovinian, along with *Ambrosiaster and Augustine's *83 Quaestiones*. In this work he rebuts every type of *Manichean and non-Manichean predestinationism and insists on the ability to merit eternal life by observing God's precepts through the freedom placed within human nature (*Indur.* 46 and 51).

We must conclude that the Pelagian period before 411 is rather difficult to understand completely, given the scarcity of explicit, concrete elements that one can categorize. It is certain that Pelagius made a name for himself at Rome after the controversy started by Jovinian. In the 2nd half of the 4th c., Jovinian created much debate both on the topic of the impeccability of the baptized (Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* 1,1: *eos qui plena fide in baptismate renati sunt, a diabolo posse non subverti* ["those who were reborn in baptism with full faith cannot be ruined by the devil"]) and the topic of virginity, because all Christians, he argues, have been made equal by the one baptism that we receive and therefore we are all meritorious of the same crown (*varia quidem luctae genera, sed una corona victorum est* ["there are certainly different types of battles, but there is one crown for the winners"]: Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* 1,20). The controversy was also stirred by *Bonosus and *Helvidius, who rejected the perpetual virginity of *Mary. Augustine believed that Jovinian's position was a blend of *Stoicism (for its belief in the indistinction of sins) and Epicureanism (for its defense of carnal desires—*Ep.* 167,4) and summarized it in the following terms: "not many years ago at Rome a certain Jovinian encouraged the *sanctimoniales* of even an advanced age to marry not enticing them with carnal pleasure (*non inliciendo*) . . . but by arguing (*disputando*) that before God there exists no difference in merit for *virgines sanctimoniales* in comparison to married people" (*De peccatorum meritis et remissione* 3,13).

I.2. 411–418. During this period the Pelagian controversy began and officially ended. In 411 a synod was held at *Carthage against *Celestius, followed by a condemnation that was always referenced in the years following; the Synod of *Diospolis (415) in the East, from which Pelagius left exonerated; the African reaction that led to the condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius by *Innocent I (27 January 417); the momentary rehabilitation of Pelagius and Celestius by Pope *Zosimus (September 417); the *coun-*

cilium plenarium of Carthage (May 418) that condemned Pelagianism in nine canons; the *Tractoria* epistle by Pope Zosimus confirming the condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius, sent for all the bishops to sign, and the condemnation issued by the emperor *Honorius (we do not have the precise dates to determine whether Zosimus or Honorius's condemnation was first). During this period Augustine refuted Pelagius's writings *De natura* and *Pro libero arbitrio*. During the same period Pelagius wrote his *Ep. ad Demetriadem*. In his three writings, Pelagius articulately elaborated his theology of creation and the possibilities of free choice in doing the good and meriting eternal life for oneself.

I.3. After 418. This last period was characterized by Augustine's controversy with *Julian of Eclanum, the last great Pelagian, on reconciling the transmission of original *sin both with the origin of the *soul and the goodness of marriage. It was also characterized by the transformation of the Pelagian controversy from a problem of the necessity of *grace into an *anthropological question (in the creation of *Adam, his freedom existed by grace and human freedom as such is therefore called to live by grace; after Adam's sin it is called to live by *gratia Christi*). In this last phase, Augustine composed his great theological works on human freedom and grace (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, *De correptione et gratia*, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, *De dono perseverantiae*). The issues discussed in the book *De induratione cordis Pharaonis* returned during this period (the similarity between many questions in this work and those that emerged during the years 426–428 have raised many questions concerning the author and the dating of that work). After 426 the Pelagian controversy found a home in the convents of N Africa (*Hadrumetum) and the provinces, but no longer along the lines of heresy, but rather in theological discussion. Once the promoters of the Pelagian movement had been considered harmless (Pelagius died, perhaps in Egypt, around 427; Celestius and Julian were sent into exile), there was a de facto general acceptance of the distinction made by Julian of Eclanum to Pope Zosimus, namely, between heresy and an open question. In the monasteries an argument arose concerning the questions regarding grace and free will formulated acc. to the *more pelagiano*, i.e., one before the other (for Augustine, however, grace is the help of the will/free choice/freedom, not its opponent) resulting in a question on the *initium fidei* (whether it begins with the human or with God, a problem erroneously indicated along the line of heresy by the author of the entry on *semi-Pelagianism of the DTC) and *predestinationism condemned at the Council of *Arles in 473. The reading of Pelagianism in relation to Augustine, which occurred after 431, took into consideration for the most part only this third period. The emperors produced the following documents on the controversy: the rescript of Honorius against those at fault (9 June 419) and *Valentinian III against Pelagianism in S *Gaul (9 July 425).

II. Polemical context. In the history of theology, the Pelagian controversy has continued to provide a means to understand Christian anthropology. In fact, this anthropological point was the synthesis in which it expanded in the years following the condemnation of the Pelagians, esp. from 426 onward. However, in actuality it was an entire movement of ideas that adapted itself to the local context (Italy, Gaul, Africa and the East) and thereby spread throughout Christianity in the 1st half of the 5th c. This movement presented a powerful case for itself by arguing for its adherence to the sacred *Scriptures in their totality (OT and NT). The movement read the Scriptures in the unifying optic of a revelative *lex* of God's will. Such a revelation required *ascesis and commitment in every state of life and therefore not only for those who chose to live in monasteries. One of the popular adages of the movement was "maybe the same law of Christianity has not been given to all those who call themselves 'Christians'?" (*Divitiis* 6). In the end, it was a movement committed to imitating Jesus Christ, who by his example awoke all humanity from the sleep of its sin and seriously committed his own will/freedom *ut vires suas virgo agnoscat* (*Divitiis* 2). Everything that could only signify a stimulus to doing better, however, was deepened on a theoretical level by involving a comprehensive interpretation of being Christian. The discussion in fact expanded to include the actual possibilities and the merit of human freedom, the nature and function of God's grace, and the value of the *sacraments inasmuch as they mediate grace. In Roman Christian circles, divided at that time between *Origenists and anti-Origenists, a very bitter controversy was underway that very soon spread, after the sack of Rome by *Alaric in 410, when the fugitives fled from Rome. The controversy was widespread and became radicalized esp. in Africa, a region of the church that was just finishing its century-long division between *Donatists and *Catholics by means of the *Collatio carthaginensis* (411).

Moreover, Christian Rome was trying to regain its balance after the challenging interpretation of Christianity proposed by Jovinian. Condemned at

Rome in 392 and in 393 at Milan, he emphasized the commonality of baptismal grace and denied special merits and therefore a special award to the ascetic choices of a lifestyle of virginity and continence, lifestyles that had been greatly promoted during that time by such authoritative voices as *Ambrose, *Jerome and others. The circle of Roman Origenists was tied to the powerful families of the time, and a circle headed by Pelagius, which had already produced Rufinus's *Liber de fide*, an antitraducianist work, now gathered many diverse voices thanks to the moral reputation of Pelagius and the dialectical ability of Celestius, in a new unitary interpretation of Christianity: every Christian is called to follow Christ in the choice of virginity and chastity, and the possibility of accomplishing this was made to reside only within each person's freedom of choice (*Ep. ad Demetriadem*). Such an ideal, radically opposed to Jovinian, found favorable ground in almost every land acc. to the local circumstances: in Africa against the use of infant baptism, deemed an act void of personal and voluntary choice; at *Syracuse in the social milieu; in the noble family of the Anicii when the family felt itself honored in the work of supporting monasteries; and in the very monasteries that found, in the Pelagian ascetical ideas, a stimulus to continue to live and to set forward the choice of that *propositum* (embracing *monasticism) so devalued by Jovinian. Augustine tells us that in the years 425–426 at the monastery of *Hadrumetum, Africa, the following Pelagian adage was in circulation: "it is in my power to do the good, I direct my freedom" (*Ep.* 216,5).

The ambiguities underlying the Pelagian synthesis pertained not so much to the affirmation of the possibility of human freedom, but the way of understanding such possibilities and the very understanding of human freedom and its implications. In fact, the Pelagians, placing the choices of freedom at the foundation of everything, denied that humanity was born into "original" sin and refused to acknowledge that each person stood in need of Christ's *redemption from the moment of birth. They therefore opposed the practice of infant baptism *in remissionem peccatorum*, explaining that the practice was only a consecration. Moreover, they understood the grace of God to be both a natural endowment (the gift of free will/the freedom granted through creation) and God's revelation of what one must do (the sacred Scriptures in the category of revealed law), i.e., grace serves both as an external aid to freedom and as a good example to be imitated—i.e., Christ's example in distinction from Adam's, which instead provided a bad example.

The Pelagian ambiguities carried into Africa came into contact with the ecclesiological-sacramental solutions of Augustine for the Donatist question, which by that time had almost come to an end (411), and with the question of *traducianism, tied to the problem of the soul's origin, and they were received as "a new scandal in the church" (*Ep.* 177,15), a "new heresy" (Aug., *Retr.* II, 33). The old question raised by Jovinian concerning the possibility that the baptized could not sin was extended to the possibility in general concerning human freedom (Augus., *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*). Pelagius and Celestius were identified as the leaders of the movement; these men were learned individuals who possessed a great ability to persuade (*Ep.* 175, 1), but were "pernicious founders of a new heresy" (*Ep.* 175,1 and 182,3), which was definitively condemned as such by the Council of Carthage (418), a circular letter (the *Tractoria*) written by Pope Zosimus (418) and the Council of *Ephesus (431), in which an association was made between Pelagius and the *Nestorian heresy.

The Pelagian movement should be seen as a new attempt to understand a Christianity that was vulnerable after the first decade of the 5th c. Jovinian, Pelagius and Augustine certainly reflect the deep-seated ideas on the various ways of thinking about God's grace and human freedom, namely, the relationship between God and human beings and the placing of the anthropological problem within the heart of Christianity, which at that time was framed acc. to the ascetical understanding of being a *sequela Christi*. For Jovinian, the grace of God has been given to all in the same measure; it cannot therefore be made one's own in the sense that one can increase it by one's personal merit owed to one's ascetical commitment (the choices of virginity and those exercising continence). For Pelagius, the grace of God is only an external help for freedom, a help in the sense of creation (free will), revelation (the sacred Scriptures), remission of sins (personal), a good example (that of Christ), and therefore not an intrinsic help so that this freedom itself constitutes God's grace and enables one to act on the level of a good that is meritorious of eternal life. In fact, in the Pelagian perspective, freedom, from the moment of creation, has its own radical autonomy in the decisions pertaining to its destiny. To its choices and only to these choices are owed the merit of both desiring them and putting them into action and the corresponding just reward from God.

For Augustine, the grace of God is itself a good of human freedom: in fact, through it freedom can be what it is and operate with the help of grace on the level of a good that can be meritorious of eternal life.

Left to itself, however, and not having its own resting point, which is God, it wanders adrift; alone, it can only alienate itself from God (*Ep.* 194,2,3).

The help that freedom receives from grace, however, does not mean that it has now been replaced in its own decisions; it is only placed in a position to express itself at the level of freedom and not by its circumstances. In fact, grace helps freedom as a friend helps another friend, adapting itself to its actual possibilities. From Augustine's point of view, freedom is not an absolute that can actualize itself upon one's first wish. Augustine recognizes that its growth is gradual: a state of infancy (*voluntas parva et invalida)*, when it knows what to desire but knows neither the way nor possesses the strength to bring about how much it desires; a state of adulthood (*voluntas magna et robusta*), when it is also able to complete what it wishes (*De gratia et libero arbitrio* 17,33).

III. Writings and thought. One should place the Pelagian writings in the historical-cultural context of the controversy over the understanding of Christianity that occurred in Western settings, esp. Milanese, Roman and African at the beginning of the 5th c. These texts were bent on exhorting one to fulfill what is set before us in the exhortations and examples of the sacred Scriptures. The Pelagian writings were seen in the past as a monolithic corpus attributed to Pelagius. Today with the progress of research, scholars have become aware of the differences of content and style in many of the works contained in this corpus, though possessing a homogenous outlook. The Pelagian controversy involved an anonymous diffusion of many ideas, slogans and writings that had already made it very difficult for their contemporaries to differentiate the actual thought of Pelagius from that of his followers. The *Liber Testimoniorum* (a collection of 160 titles), from which were extracted six propositions in the canonical trial raised against Pelagius at *Diospolis in 415, remains the most comprehensive treatise of Pelagian ideas that circulated without an explicit identification of its author. Actually, the *corpus pelagianum* was divided into three groups: Pelagius's works, doubtful works and works of other authors. The following studies have provided the greatest contributions in clarifying these points: C.P. Caspari (*Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten* . . . , Oslo 1890), who maintained that the works once attributed to Pelagius are the works of Bishop *Fastidius; G. Plinval (see esp., *Vue d'ensemble sur la littérature pélagienne*: REL 29 [1951] 284-294: a position seconded by Hamman in PLS I, 1101-1102); R.F.. Evans (*Pelagius Fastidius and the Pseudoaugustinian De vita christiana*: JTS 13 [1962] 72-98); P. Courcelle (*Histoire litt. des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris [3]1964, 303-317); J. Morris (*Pelagian Literature*: JTS 16 [1965] 25-60); the clarifications of the CPL 728-766; lastly, the contributions of the DSp (1984) XII/2, 2895-2942. Finally, one should note that the majority of Pelagius's works have come down to us through the writings of ps.-Jerome.

The nature of the exegetical, theological and ascetic-moral writings of Pelagius—which can be summarized acc. to Plinval, in the *De induratione cordis Pharaonis* (a work written before 411 and to be attributed to Pelagius)—with respect to his thought, is summarized in imitating Christ as the gospels propose and in fulfilling the Bible's exhortations. All Scripture therefore should be understood as the revelation of a *lex* to be observed and examples to be imitated, and particularly that of Jesus Christ (the position in his commentaries on Paul's *Epistles: Expositiones XIII ep. Pauli*, ed. A. Souter, Cambridge 1926).

The theological and ascetical writings can be grouped around the *De natura* (from 414?; 405-406? acc. to Y.-M. Duval), in which he made the case for the fundamental ability of and possibility for humanity, lying within its nature, to orient and fulfill its own choices acc. to God's commandments and to live without sin. Pelagius expanded upon such a key idea in his thought, founded upon the doctrine of creation and the four books *Pro libero arbitrio* (415). The free choice of the will has been set within the human being from the moment of creation like a root, which is determined by its choices in the fruits that it bears. The grace of God plays a role in helping this primary decision under the guise of an incitement of the will to follow Christ's example. Pelagius's other writings, esp. those on chastity and virginity, explained this idea in concrete terms.

In the end, we can say that Pelagius was the name from which the titles "Pelagianism" and "Pelagian" derived their origin; historically, however, already at the beginning of the open controversy, the group that made Celestius its leader was also prominent. Julian of Eclanum did not represent a group properly speaking, but many documents after him make reference to his thought, esp. his ideas on the nature of sexual concupiscence as a Pelagian doctrine (e.g., *Arnobius in his book **Praedestinatus* now attributed to him by F. Gori). From Augustine's death onward, "Pelagianism" was a comprehensive term used to refer to all those who, standing on the autonomy of human freedom, were suspect of being—as Augustine put it—"enemies of God's grace." Pelagius himself became a

symbol: either as the heretic who wanted to make himself independent of God's grace or as a defender of human freedom.

In a similar way, Augustine was considered to be a counterpart to Pelagius inasmuch as he was considered the defender of God's grace, but, for many people, he was suspected of having overthrown human freedom. From this insinuation was born the heresy of predestinationism after Augustine's death, but connected to him acc. to some people, namely, that God has determined human freedom to good or evil, thus predestining each individual to heaven or hell. A greater understanding of the Pelagian movement has also done historical justice to the actual content of Augustine's last writings. They freed his writings from later projections onto his thought; e.g., the discovery that he believed that predestination is only and always the gift of a good, without any equivocation about the existence of a predestination to evil.

PLS I, 1101-2; CPL 728-766; C. Martini, *Sei frammenti del "De fide Trinitatis" di Pelagio*: Ricerche Religiose 20 (1949) 35-64; G. Plinval, *Pélage. Ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme. Étude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse*, Lausanne 1943; Id., *Vue d'ensemble sur la littérature pélagienne*: REL 29 (1951) 284-294; R.F. Evans, *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals*, London 1968; G. Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism*, Villanova, PA 1972; G. Greshake, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit. Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*, Mainz 1972; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius . . .* , Stuttgart 1975; Id., *Das Pelagiusdossier in der Tractoria des Zosimus*: FZPhTh 26 (1979) 336-368; V. Grossi, Patrologia III, 437-453; Id., *La crisi antropologica nel monastero di Adrumeto*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 103-133; Id., *Pelagio*: DIP 6, Rome 1980, 1327-1330; J. Burns, *Augustine's Role in the Imperial Action Aganist Pelagius*: JTS 30 (1979) 67-83; J.F. Kelly, *Pelagius, Pelagianism and the Early Christian Irish*: Mediaevalia 4 (1978) 99-124; F. Nuvolone, *Problèmes d'une novelle édition du De induratione cordis Pharaonis attribué à Pélage*: REA 26 (1980) 105-117; J.B. Valero, *Las bases antropológicas de Pelagio en su tratado de las Expositiones*, Madrid 1980; Y.-M. Duval, *Pélage est-il le censeur inconnu de l'Adversus Jovinianum à Rome en 393? Ou: Du "portrait-robot" de l'hérétique chez s. Jérôme*: RHE 75 (1980) 525-557; Id., *L'affaire Jovinien. D'une crise de la société romaine à une crise de la pensée chrétienne à la fin du IVe et Ve siècle* (SEA 83), Rome 2003; M.-F. Berrouard, *Le Lettres 6* et 19* de saint Augustin. Leur date et les renseignements qu'elles apportent sur l'évolution de la crise pélagienne*: REA 27 (1981) 264-277 (to be seen in relation to Augustine's *Contra duas epp. Pelag.*); on *De gestis Pelagii* and Augustine's *Ep.* 19* Divjak: BA 46b, 286-291 with a long note by Y.-M. Duval, 507-516; on the *De gestis* and Augustine's *Ep.* 6* Divjak in relation to the Eastern bishops: BA 46A, 108-117 and the auxiliary note on pp. 430-442; O. Wermelinger - A. Solignac - F. Nuvolone, *Pélage et Pélagianisme*: DSp (1984) XII/2, 2895-2942; C. Hammond Bammel, *Rufinus' Translation of Origen's Commentary on Romans and the Pelagian Controversy*: Antichità Altoadriatiche 39 (1992) 131-149; F.E. Consolino, *Fra Pelagio e Claudiano: l'elogio degli Anicii nell'epistola di Girolamo a Demetriade*: Hestíasis (Studi . . . S. Calderone), Messina 65-83; J. Yates, *The Canonical Significance of the Citations of James in Pelagius*: EThL 78 (2002) 482-489; V. Grossi, *L'origenismo latino negli scritti agostiniani: dagli origenisti agli origeniani*: Augustinianum 46 (2006) 51-89.

V. Grossi

PELAGIUS I, pope (556–561). Coming from the Roman aristocracy, Pelagius I made a name for himself as a deacon and **apocrisarius* of Pope *Vigilius. Under his influence, *Justinian I condemned *Origenism (PG 86, 945-994). While still a deacon, he collaborated in the Latin translation of the **Apophthegmata patrum* (CPG 5570). Defending the Latin position, he took a stance against the condemnation of the *Three Chapters. While Vigilius was being detained at *Constantinople, Pelagius I played an important role at Rome. He actively helped the city's population during the conflict between *Totila and the Byzantines. Again at Constantinople, he supported Vigilius and his resistance against the condemnation of the Three Chapters, even writing a treatise on the topic (*Constitutum*). Though rebuking Vigilius for succumbing to imperial pressure (*Defensio*), he too eventually recognized the condemnation of the Three Chapters after the pope's death, as well as the Council of *Constantinople II (553). Against the resistance of the clergy and people, the emperor orchestrated his consecration as bishop of Rome. Working within the framework of imperial politics, Pelagius I restored the discipline and the finances of the Roman Church. Although he was able to obtain the people's approval through his works of charity, he continued to meet resistance in the Western churches. In N Italy, a very long *schism began. From Pelagius I onward the Roman bishops were constrained to seek approbation from the Byzantine emperor for their election.

CPL 1698-1703; PLS IV, 1277-1369; P.M. Gassó - C.M. Batlle, *Pelagii I Papae epistulae quae supersunt*, Montserrat 1956 (PLS IV, 1284-1312); O. Guenther, *Constitutum*: CSEL 25, 230-320; R. Devreesse, *Pelagii in defensionem trium capitulorum*, Rome 1932 (PLS IV, 1313-1369); *Vitae Patrum*: PL 73, 855-988; B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Justinians*, I, Berlin 1960; K. Baus et al., *Storia della Chiesa*, III, It. tr. Milan 1978, passim; Patrologia IV (1996), 144-146; A. Placanica, *L'epistolario di Papa Pelagio*, in A. Quacquarelli (ed.), *Res Christiana. Temi interdisciplinari*, Rome 1999, 239-246; LTK³ 8, 10-11; EPapi 1, 529-536; PCBE 2, 1710-1716.

B. Studer

PELAGIUS II, pope (579–590). Elected on 26 September 579, after an almost four-month vacancy in his see, at a time when the *Longobards (Lombards)—who were *Arians—were invading *Rome, Pelagius II could not obtain approval from the emperor Tiberius. He first sought assistance from the

*Franks (Jaffé 1048), then in 584 from the Byzantines by means of his *apocrisarius at *Constantinople, *Gregory, the future pope (Jaffé 1052). Because of the political situation in Italy, he was appointed Byzantine exarch of *Ravenna by the emperor (584). Once peace had been reestablished in 585 with the treaty between the exarch Smaragdus and King Authari, Pelagius II worked to bring an end to the schism that had been brought about by the bishops dependent on *Aquileia (Jaffé 1054-1056) that had arisen under *Pelagius I (556–561) because of the controversy over the *Three Chapters. Despite Gregory's collaboration—who in the meantime had returned to Rome (585/586)—and his position as exarch of Ravenna, Pelagius II's plan came to naught. In a long letter (ACO V/2, 112-132), where one can detect Gregory's influence, he addressed the entire theological difficulty raised by the documents sent by these bishops and distinguished the conciliar decisions pertaining to the *custodia illibatae fidei* from the decision of other councils, inasmuch as they had varying degrees of binding authority; moreover, he minutely examined each case of the three condemned theologians (*Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ibas of Edessa and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus). The bishop of Aquileia, Elia, along with the bishops of *Venetia et Histria*, did not agree with the Roman position. This failure to achieve reconciliation led Pelagius II to seek the intervention of the exarch Smaragdus, who was under obligation to abstain from any intervention acc. to the will of the emperor Tiberius; but after the death of Elia he intervened in 587. Pelagius objected when *John IV, patriarch of Constantinople, attributed to himself the title of "ecumenical patriarch" and refused to accept the **Acts* of the council he held in 587; he even forbade his apocrisary to communicate with John. His protests, however, were useless (Greg. Great, *Ep.* IV, 32, 34, 38; V, 44; VI, 41). The **Liber pontificalis* and several inscriptions mention that he undertook numerous building projects in Rome; a mosaic for the basilica of St. Lawrence outside the walls portrays him as a restorer of the church. He died of a plague on 7 February 590 and was buried at St. Peter's. The plague devastated Rome.

CPL 1705-1707; Verzeichnis 482; PL 72, 701-760; PLS 2, 1413-14; LP I, 309-311; Jaffé 1047-1065; ACO V/2, XXIII and 105-132; DTC 12, 669-675; EC 9, 1078-79; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 225-300; E. Pontieri, *Le invasioni barbariche e l'Italia del V e VI sec.*, Naples 1960; M.J. Higgins, *Two Notes*, in *Polychronion*, *Fest. Dölger*, Heidelberg 1966, 238-243; J. Orlandis, *Sobre el origen de la "lex in confirmatione Concilii"*: Anuario de Historia del Derecho Esp. 41 (1971) 113-126; L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini*, Rome-Louvain 1972, 162-165 (see index); A. Tuillier, *Grégoire le Grand et le titre de patriarche oecuménique*, in *Grégoire le Grand*, ed. J. Fontaine et al., Paris 1986, 69-70; P. Meyvaert, *A Letter of Pelagius II Composed by Gregory the Great*, in *Gregory the Great: A Symposium*, ed. J.C. Cavadini, Notre Dame, IN 1996, 84-116; Patrologia IV, 150-51; EPapi 1, 541-546.

A. Di Berardino

PELAGIUS of Laodicea. A Syrian bishop who was in communion with *Meletius of Antioch (ca. 360–ca. 382). His life before the episcopate is known to us thanks to *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. Pelagius married at a very young age, but from the first day of his marriage he lived in perfect chastity with his wife (*HE* 4,13). He was consecrated by *Acacius of Caesarea to strengthen the homoiousian party. At the councils of *Antioch (363) and *Tiana (367) he was a passionate defender of orthodoxy, and for this reason the emperor *Valens exiled him to Arabia (372). After the death of Valens, he reobtained possession of his cathedra. During the schism of Antioch he sided with Meletius, and at the Council of *Constantinople (381) he protected *Gregory of Nazianzus (Theodor., *HE* 6, 8). The date of his death remains unknown.

M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, see index; LTK³ 8, 10.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PELLA. Various cities had the name Pella: the capital of *Macedonia starting from the 4th c. AD, and the homeland of Alexander the Great (AD 356–323); the city of *Apamea (*Syria), Pella (Pellene) in *Achaia and Pella (Tabaqat Fahl) in the *Decapolis in Peraia. This latter city—whose name was thus taken from its previous name of Pehel (Pahel) or rather from the name of the city where Alexander the Great was born—is found in the valley of the River Jordan, 4 km (2.5 mi) E of the river, 45 km (28 mi) S of the Sea of Galilee, in present-day Jordan, to the NW of Gerasa and SE of *Scythopolis. It was an important and ancient city. Though it was destroyed by Alexander Jannaeus (Flavius Josephus, *De bello iud.* 1,4,8; *Ant. Iud.* 13.15,4), Pompey revitalized the city inside the confines of the province of Syria; he reconstructed it and placed it within a federation of ten cities (*De bello iud.* 1,7,7 and 14,5,3; *Ant. Iud.* 14,4,4). It remained a city of Greek learning and part of the Decapolis from its very beginnings; it flourished during the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods because it was located along a commercial road. The city passed under Arab rule after the Battle of Yarmuk in 636 and was utterly destroyed

by an earthquake in 749. Archaeological digs have brought to light artifacts from the Canaanites, esp. the Temple of Migdol. Many ruins of public buildings remain (an odeon, *thermal baths and a Byzantine fortress) and private structures from the Roman, Byzantine and Arab periods, among which was a large water reservoir and two churches, one from the 5th c. (called "the Church to the East") and another from the 6th (called "the Church to the West"). From the latter, numerous columns and remains of a mosaic on the floor have been uncovered.

According to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 3, 5, 3; see Epiphanius, *haer.* 29, 7; *De Mens. et Pond.* 15), during the Jewish war the Christians of Jerusalem took refuge in the Transjordan and the Decapolis, or communities were established, esp. in the city of Pella. The traditions reported by Eusebius and *Epiphanius have been studied in great detail in relation to Jesus' exhortation to flee during the destruction of *Jerusalem in order to better understand the development of the Christian communities in *Palestine and to understand Eusebius's sources. Scholars once considered these reports reliable, but today they pose numerous problems: when did the Christians flee (before or after the siege)? How were they able to cross between territories during the war? How were they received in a city that was primarily Hellenic? Had not Pella already been destroyed by the Jews (Josephus, *De bello Iud.* 2,18,1)? What happened to the communities of Jerusalem? How did they return after the year AD 70? For this reason many scholars tend to consider the information reported by Eusebius and Epiphanius as lacking historical substance; instead, they maintain that they were invented by the Jewish Christians of Pella to affirm their original connection with an apostle and the primitive communities of Jerusalem and to justify their particular form of *Jewish Christianity (Luedemann, Verheyden), or rather because Christians were unable to leave the city during the siege (Brandon). Koester, however, acknowledges the veracity of the escape from the Decapolis but denies their apologetic character for justifying the Jewish Christian community of Pella as a historical heir to the one in Jerusalem.

According to Epiphanius, the *Nazarenes were the descendants of those Christians who were Jewish and came from Jerusalem (*Haer.* 29,7; 30,18). Ariston was a native of Pella and a Christian writer from the 2nd c.; he wrote the *Dialogue Between Jason and Papiscus*, a discussion between a Christian (Jason) and an Alexandrian Jew (Papiscus), which was lost but had been translated into Latin during the 3rd c. by a certain individual named Celsus, whose dedication has been preserved. The other important cities of the Decapolis where Christian communities were born were the following: Hippos (Susieh), Gadara (Umm Qais), Philadelphia (Amman), Gerasa (Jerash), Dion (Adun), Kanatha (Kanawat), *Damascus and Raphana (Abila). From the 4th c., Pella was part of *Palestina secunda* (*see* *Palestine), the metropolis of which was Scythopolis, and the first known bishop was Zebenus (4th c.).

Fedalto 2, 1037; S.G.F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*, London [2]1957, 168-173; *La distruzione di Gerusalemme del 70 nei suoi riflessi storico-letterari*. Atti del Conv. biblico francescano, Rome 22-27 settembre 1969, Porziuncola, Assisi 1971; J.J. Gunther, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Church. The Flight to Pella*: TZ 29 (1973) 81-94; G. Luedemann, *The Successors of pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity. A Critical Evaluation of the Pella Tradition*, in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*, ed. E. Sanders, I, Philadelphia 1980, 161-173; B. Bagatti, *Le comunità giudeocristiane*, Vatican City 1981; A.G. Walmsley, *Pella/Fihl after the Islamic Conquest (AD 635–c. 900): A Convergence of Literary and Archaeological Evidence*: Mediterranean Archaeology 1 (1988) 142-159; J. Verheyden, *De vlucht van de Christenen naar Pella. Onderzoek von het getuigenis van Eusebius en Epiphanius*, Brussels 1988; Id., *The Flight of the Christians to Pella*: EThL 66 (1990) 368-384; C. Koester, *The Origin and Significance of the Flight to Pella Tradition*: CBQ 51 (1989) 90-106; J. Wehnert, *Die Auswanderung der Jerusalemer Christen nach Pella. Historisches Faktum oder theologische Konstruktion? Kritische Bemerkungen zu einem neuen Buch*: ZKG 102 (1991) 231-255 (Verheyden's vol.); T. Weber, *Pella Decapolitana. Studien zur Geschichte, Architektur und bildenden Kunst einer hellenisierten Stadt des nördlichen Ostjordanlandes*, Wiesbaden 1993; C. Vidal Manzanares, *Pella revisitada. Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*: Historia Antigua 6 (1993) 467-476; A.G. Walmsley, *The Social and Economic Regime at Fihl (Pella) Between the 7th and 9th Centuries*, in P. Canivet - J.-P. Rey-Coquais (éds.), *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam, VII[e]-VIII[e] siècles*, Actes du Colloque International, Institut Français de Damas, Brussels 1994, 249-261; A.G. Walmsley, *Christians and Christianity at Early Islamic Pella (Fihl)*, in S. Bourke - J.-P. Descoeudres (eds.), *Trade, Contact, and the Movement of Peoples in the Eastern Mediterranean. Studies in Honour of J. Basil Hennessy*, Mediterranean Archaeology Supplement 3, Sydney 1995, 321-324; R. Houston Smith, *Chancel Screens from the West Church at Pella of the Decapolis*, in *The Archaeology of Jordan and Beyond. Essays in Honor of J.A. Sauer*, Harvard 2000, 465-475; S. Borzì, *Sull'attribuzione della Disputa fra Giasone e Papisco di Aristone di Pella*: VetChr 41 (2004) 347-354.

A. Di Berardino

PELUSIUM. An ancient port city situated in the W part of the Nile, between the river's two branches, 32 km (20 mi.) SE of Port Said, in the Sinai peninsula (South Canal of Peace); today it corresponds to Tell Farama, Tell Makhazan (the Byzantine extension) and the necropolis of Kanais. In antiquity these locations were the farthest from the sea. The biblical

name was Sin (Ezek 30:15); the Egyptian name, Per-Amon (House of Amon). It was the city located at the border of Egypt and Syria—understood in the broadest sense of the term—and before the arrival of the Romans it was thus quite susceptible to invaders. Its linens were famous, abundant and of good quality (*lenun pelusinum*: Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 19,1); it exported salted fish and *garum* (a spicy condiment often used). Marc Antony conquered it in 55 BC; Augustus entered the city in 31 BC. Pelusium suffered under the hand of the Persians in AD 619; in 640 it came under Arabic rule (Alexandria was conquered in 641).

During the Roman Empire, acc. to the *Itinerarium Antonini*, six roads converged at Pelusium; *Egeria passed through Pelusium (*Itin.* 9), but did not provide us information on its Christian community. In Late Antiquity Pelusium was a metropolis of the Roman province of *Augustamnica prima*, under the governance of a *corrector*, who relied on the prefect to the praetorian. The ongoing excavations have uncovered an amphitheater, perhaps a hippodrome, a Byzantine church and an imposing fortress with three entrances and 36 towers. After the plague of 524, the city was better known by its name Peramun.

We do not know when Christianity arrived at Pelusium, but one may suppose that this occurred rather early because it was close to *Palestine and on the road to *Alexandria. The first two bishops we know of are from the year 325: one was Catholic and a participant at the Council of *Nicaea, the other a *Meletian bishop (acc. to *Dorotheus and *Callinicus). Pelusium had a metropolitan see, but its bishop did not enjoy the same powers possessed by other similar institutions outside Egypt because in this area the patriarch of Alexandria was the point of reference for everyone. In fact, during this time one finds no mention of provincial synods. The metropolitan only had a certain preeminence in comparison to the city's importance. The most famous son of Pelusium was *Isidore (ca. d. 435), a presbyter and monk whose numerous letters survive, which are important for understanding the civil and religious life of the city. From him we learn that Bishop Eusebius ordered the construction of an impressive church and was heavily criticized for doing so (*Ep.* 37; 113; 700; 746).

P. Figueras, *The North Sinai Road in the Graeco-Roman Period*: Scripta Classica Israelica 8/9 (1985–1988) 53-65; P. Évieux, *Isidore de Péluse*, Paris 1995; J.-Y. Carrez-Maratray, *Péluse et l'angle orientale du delta égyptien aux époques grecque, romaine et byzantine*, Le Caire 1999; D. Valbelle - J.-Y. Carrez-Maratray, *Le camp romain du Bas-Empire à Tell el-Herr*, Paris 2000.

A. Di Berardino

PENANCE

I. Penance and reconciliation - II. Iconography and epigraphy - III. Penitentials.

I. Penance and reconciliation. Reconciliation was first procured by *baptism, through which one obtained the remission of the sins committed during one's life before receiving the sacrament of Christian initiation. After baptism, a Christian was obligated not to *sin grievously against the faith, the community or the family: the question concerning penance was therefore a baptismal question with respect to its effects (penance = second baptism).

1. The Pre-Nicene Period. The first pieces of information pertaining to a reconciliation granted to faults committed after baptism can be found in the writings of *Hermas (Rome, ca. 140), *Origen, *Tertullian (d. after 220) and *Cyprian (d. 258). According to Hermas, the only reconciliation is the one received in baptism; an exceptional case, a second penance is possible but just once in one's life: "the one who has obtained the remission of sins (in baptism) should sin no more. . . . For those who have been called before the end times, the Lord has established a penance. . . . If someone . . . falls into sin, he can do penance, but only once" (Hermas, *Mand.* IV, 1, 8). Origen, however, spoke of the various ways to obtain the forgiveness of sins (*In Levit.* Hom. II, 4), thus indicating the variety of sins and the means to receive forgiveness. Tertullian (ca. 204), in his work *De paenitentia* (7,9,10), provided a very clear formulation for the fundamental principle of the nonrepeatability of the ancient penance: "(for the most grave sins, a second penance is possible), but only once because it is already the second time (the first penance being that of baptism) and never again." The author of the treatise *De paenitentia*, which addressed the readmission of adulterers and fornicators into communion (Tertullian himself argued against this practice when he became a *Montanist), describes for the first time the penitential process at *Carthage: a life of the harshest mortification, ragged clothes, extended fasts, prayers and lamentations, various prostrations before the presbyters and the servants of God, and a request for the intercession of the community, final pardon (by God alone? through the mediation of the community?). *Cyprian (d. 258), in agreement with Pope *Cornelius (253–255), allowed for the reconciliation of numerous apostates during the *Decian and *Valerian *persecutions, not without facing opposition from many rigorists. It seems, therefore, that the penitential discipline was developed case by case and was therefore subject to variation from community to community.

2. Early Christian Post-Nicene Period (*from 325 to early 7th c.*). Recourse to penance was prohibited to the offices of bishop, presbyter and deacon not because of some privilege enjoyed by the laity but because of the incompatibility of the penitential and the clerical state (in two senses). All the documents (*Augustine, *Caesarius of Arles, *councils, decretals, the correspondence of the bishops of S *Gaul in particular) agree in describing the organization of the official penance. There were three distinct moments: (1) entrance into penance (*petere*, *accipere paenitentiam*), with the bishop's consent and often elicited by the bishop's word (*correptio*); (2) remaining in the order of the penitents for a relatively long period of time (*ordo*, *status paenitentium*), acc. to the judgment of the bishop; (3) readmission into communion, solemnly on Holy Thursday, through the imposition of hands performed by the bishops before the gathered community (*reconciliatio*). This official process found a rich basis in the preaching of daily penance for the lightest of sins.

Because the official process was rigorous, unrepeatable and full of consequences, various types of sinners were excluded because of their possible relapse into sin and their need for abandoning a public office or for observing perfect continence. With the explicit permission of the bishop, some of the faithful even deferred reconciliation to the very end of their life. The deferment of penance occurred as in the case of baptism, which likewise witnessed a similar postponement during this period. Even after reconciliation, the sinner remained marked for his or her entire life: entrance into official penance seemed to be the equivalent of entrance into the religion. At the same time, *Ambrose and Augustine's praise of *Theodosius's penance indicates how much the process that once carried with it the mark of infamy, civil and familial death, remained open to interpretation and pastoral action. The process (aside from the confession of sins) was public: the penitents occupied a special place in the church, the community interceded for them and they were reconciled publicly; the penitents were set off to the side in view of their reconciliation but were not excommunicated.

One does not find, however, a "penitential void": explicit preaching since Origen's time made present the evangelical word of the pardon of sins for all time. The teaching of Ambrose and Augustine on penance indicates to what extent it was based on Jesus Christ's passion and oriented toward the *Eucharist. The efforts of the penitents as signs of repentance and the intercession of the community showed the role of mercy and the desire for the penitent's reconciliation.

3. Tariffed penance (*early 7th to 12th c.*). At the close of the early Christian era, there appeared on the continent a penitential system introduced by Anglo-Saxon and Celtic monks, which represented a break with the official penitential discipline. Its fundamental principle was as follows: to each sin there should be applied a specific penance, which consists of various mortifications but above all fasts (days, months and years). The practice of fasting was understood to be a synthesis of all types of Christian mortification existing at that time. The tariffs or taxes were contained in the *Penitential Books*. The sinner, then, could turn to a confessor each time a sin was committed. The minister of tariffed penance was the presbyter (and no longer just the bishop). The sinner made a detailed confession of his faults and underwent a time of fasting that varied acc. to the gravity of the acts. Once the fasting had been completed, the sinner was considered to be absolved; only starting from the 9th c. does one find an attestation to an explicit absolution by the confessor (the formula *Ego te absolvo* was late). Major clerics were not excluded from tariffed penance. Given a number of sins, the days, months and years of fasting could add up to exceed the duration of one's life. The "redemptions" or ransoms provided for possible commutations to avoid this situation:

- A long fast could be redeemed by a shorter but more rigorous fast, or with corporeal punishments administered by the confessor (at times flagellation) or with other bizarre mortifications (e.g., spending entire nights in graveyards).
- The fast owed by a sinner could be redeemed by fasts completed by third parties such as monks in exchange for economic compensation (money, legacies, gifts in kind, lands, rivers or ponds).
- A fast of several years could be redeemed by Masses celebrated on behalf of the sinner by monks (who, during the same period, became priests), in exchange for various donations, esp. in the form of money. This was the most customary form of penitential atonement (*indulgentia*), at least for rich sinners. Hence the equation: sin = fast = Masses = sum of money given to confessor or monastery.

The Carolingian reformers who tried to fight against the tariffed penance and the *Penitential Books* in order to restore the ancient discipline only achieved partial success, reaching a penitential dichotomy: a tariffed penance was requested for a grave hidden sin, a penance acc. to the ancient prac-

tice was requested for a grave public sin. By this point a sin was evaluated not in light of its intrinsic gravity but its public character; the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) established the norm for annual confession and insisted on the role of the priest: absolution of the penitent.

4. Penitential reorganization (*beginning of the 13th c.*). At the end of the 12th c., penitential discipline evolved: the penitential books disappeared, giving way to the *Confessors' Manuals*. A tripartite system was set in place:

- *Solemn public penance* was the ancient penance with all its rigor and implications, imposed on laypeople for particularly scandalous sins (patricide, infanticide, regicide, setting fire to the city, etc.). The major clerics were excluded from this form of penance.
- *Nonsolemn public penance* refers to the penitential pilgrimage. The confessor sent the sinner to some famous or not-so-famous sanctuaries in Christendom, conferring upon them a blessing, the pilgrim's staff, a money bag and a hat, and supplying them with a letter attesting that the individual was traveling to atone for his or her sins. This document for the most part assured the sinner-pilgrim of lodging and water. The penitential pilgrimage was imposed on laypeople for less scandalous public sins and on clerics for grave public sins of any type (wandering clerics).
- *The tariffed penance* was imposed for all grave hidden sins committed by clerics or laypeople. This type of penance quickly evolved toward the actual practice of sacramental confession: confession immediately followed by absolution (expiation was made void of every moral meaning by the game of commutations).

5. Penitential discipline in the East. In its organization and evolution, the penitential system of the East was much less known than the Western system. Sinners were divided into various groups acc. to the gravity of their sins. These groups were established by Eastern councils and the penitential letters of the church fathers, esp. those of St. *Basil of Caesarea.

- The implorers (*ploratio*) remained standing outside the church, beseeching the faithful who were on their way to receive the Eucharist.
- The listeners (*auditio*) participated in the liturgy of the Word and were sent away with the catechumens without receiving a special prayer; their place was in the narthex.
- The prostrate (*prostratio*) left the ceremony with the catechumens after having received the laying on of hands, *ante absidem* (in front of the apse, i.e., in front of the sanctuary).
- The participants (*assistentia*) took part in the eucharistic service but did not partake.

This process was public by necessity, even though the confession of sins was not public. Sinners went through various stages, being consigned to one or the other acc. to the gravity of their sins. At a time difficult to date precisely, but nevertheless in the 7th c., the penitential groups disappeared, giving way to a penitential system in which confession, as in the Western tariffed system, had an important place. The difference was that the punishments (ἐπιτίμια) imposed on sinners were not left to the confessor, but were determined in conformity to the penitential canons established by church councils, without the possibility of satisfaction in alternate form. For the evolution of individual sanctions, see the studies of Hausherr, Ligier and van de Paverd.

I. Hausherr, *Penthos. La Doctrine de la Componction dans l'Orient Chrétien*, Rome 1944; B. Poschmann, *Busse und Letzte Ölung*, Freiburg i.Br. 1951; L. Ligier, *Dimension personnelle et dimension communautaire de la pénitence en Orient*: La Maison Dieu 90 (1967) 155-188; F. van de Paverd, *La pénitence dans le rite byzantin*: Questions Liturgiques 54 (1973) 191-203; A. Fitzgerald, *Conversion Through Penance in the Italian Church of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, Lewiston, NY 1988; C. Vogel, *Le pécheur et la pénitence dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1966; Id., *Le pécheur et la pénitence au moyen âge*, Paris 1969; Id., *Les Libri paenitentiales* (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 27), Turnhout 1973; G. Picasso - G. Piana - G. Motta, *A pane ed acqua. Peccati e penitenza nel Medioevo*, Novara 1986; Ph. Rouillard, *Histoire de la pénitence des origines à nos jours*, Paris 1996; G. Moioli, *Il quarto sacramento. Note introduttive*, Milan 1996; R.N. Longenecker, *New Wine into Fresh Wineskins. Contextualizing the Early Christian Confession*, Peabody 1999; A.F. Carr, *Il perdono dei peccati delle eucaristie delle Chiese orientali con particolare riferimento alla liturgia siriaca*: Annali Scienze Religiose 5 (2000) 69-79; E. Mazza, *Un confronto tra alcuni elementi della liturgia penitenziale dell'Occidente e dell'Oriente: il caso delle liturgia visigotica*: Annali Scienze Religiose 5 (2000) 93-108; J. de Mayke, *Transformation of Penance*, in *Rituals of Power, from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. F. Theuws - J.L. Nelson, Leiden 2000, 185-224; *I Giubilei nella storia della Chiesa*. Atti del congr. int., Rome 2001; P. Saint-Roch, *La pénitence. Dans les conciles et le lettres des Papes des origines à la mort de Grégoire le Grand*, Vatican City 1991.

C. Vogel

II. Iconography and epigraphy. We do not have a firsthand account of penance during the early Christian era that describes the liturgical-sacramental act of confession or reconciliation.

Nevertheless, J. Wilpert interpreted two largely reconstructed sarcophagus fragments as a description of this sacramental event (*La fede*, 256–260).

Aside from doubts on the accuracy of the reconstruction, one should note, however, that the laying on of hands on *orantes* lends itself to multiple interpretations.

Achelis (7-11) tried to connect a fresco on the face of the catacomb of Praetextatus at Rome (WK 51,1) with the issue of penance during the early Christian period. The scene at the center of the ceiling represents, acc. to this scholar, a shepherd who stretches out his right hand to the sheep approaching him, although with the left he wards off a pig and a donkey. Achelis explained this representation by appealing to *Novatian rigorism, which denied to sinners (pigs) and heretics (donkeys) reintegration into the church. This fresco would therefore have been commissioned by someone who wanted to express their personal convictions on the issue of penance, which differed from those of the Roman community. If, however, the animals depicted to the right of the shepherd, and represented in a less naturalistic manner, were not a pig and a donkey, but were wolves, it would then be the biblical scene of the shepherd, which would allow one to interpret the fresco in this light.

In the context of *baptismal *iconography one should keep in mind a scene in the area of Lucina in the catacomb of St. Callistus (WK 29,1), which, in addition to other meanings, also lends itself to a penitential interpretation. To explain the fresco, Fink (106ff.) has called attention to a passage in the *Didascalia siriaca* (2,15,8) in which the author invites the bishop not to allow the sinner to sink into despair, but to extend to him the hand of reconciliation. One can accept for certain that the question of the possibility and feasibility of the postbaptismal remission of sins, in addition to the few examples at our disposal up until now, constituted a theme of early Christian iconography. It is no coincidence that the beginnings of Christian art are to be dated to those decades in which the problem of the **lapsi* and the reintegration of public sinners into the church had exploded in pastoral and theological discussions. Especially in the case of those who were at the point of death and in view of their passing away, the question of the verification, and also the recovery, of baptismal grace acquired utmost attention.

With reference to Ezek 14:13-20, in which God, in a punishment inflicted upon the earth, said he would save only the righteous men *Noah, *Daniel and *Job but not their sons and daughters, *Cyprian (*De lapsis* 19) also mentions these three persons to invite one to personal penance, which cannot be replaced by the intercession of the confessors. Fink (61-73) has therefore emphasized that these three individuals, whom he maintains must be understood to have been frequently depicted in a contextual nexus in the catacomb pictures, can be interpreted as a representation of penance. Even if the contextual connection of the scene with Noah, Daniel and Job is at times so uncertain that their insertion into other iconographic contexts appears possible, in each case it is indisputable that numerous Old and New Testament scenes, often recurring in early Christian sepulchral art, are connected to contemporary homilies and catecheses with the exhortation to penance and with hope for the remission of sins.

This holds true with respect to the figure of the shepherd, which the Christians of the Great Church, challenged by Tertullian, used as a decorative element on chalices for the eucharistic offering to thus express their hope in the remission of sins (*De pudicitia* 10,12). Many church fathers emphasized the love of the Shepherd-Savior for sinners (Dassmann, 322-340).

It should be noted that in patristic exegesis before *Constantine, even the image of Jonah possessed not a paschal but an exclusively penitential symbolism, as one could possibly argue on the basis of Mt 12:39ff. From the formal point of view, Jonah's repose under the booth he had made for himself—connected to the scene of his having been tossed into the sea—could be, esp. in the reliefs of sarcophagi, a survival of the secular myth of Endymion, and could symbolize at the same time the blessed repose of the dead. When, however, in certain sarcophagi (e.g., sarcophagi of Belgradus and Julian Julianete [Dassmann, 387]), the scene of repose (subject to a mythological interpretation) is completely lacking and, alongside Jonah cast into the sea or spewed forth from the mouth of the fish, the shepherd appears who saved the sheep or Noah who survived the flood, there is no doubt that the figurative agenda was transferred into the context of the Christian symbolism of salvation, and is therefore open to the theme of the remission of sins. In certain instances, in the paintings found in the catacombs, the normally tripartite cycle (Jonah tossed into the sea, Jonah spewed forth and Jonah at rest) appears expanded with the scene of the so-called *Ionas irritatus*, where the prophet sits saddened by the dried shrub (WK 61; 96; 100). Jonah must learn not to be angry at the mercy God has shown toward the repentant city of Nineveh. The depictions of the shepherd and those of Jonah are often connected in early Christian sepulchral art.

If New Testament motifs also appear, such as the healing of the *paralytic, the woman with an issue of

blood and similar miracles, the penitential meaning of the entire figurative program of one monument becomes even more evident (e.g., cubicle 5 of the catacombs of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus [WK 98]). The 3rd- to 4th-c. patristic exegesis of the original *sin of *Adam and Eve also emphasized hope in redemption.

A subject still in need of study is the existing relationship between the images of martyrs and intercessors of any type and hope in the remission of sins. It is known that the cult of the martyrs, which began in the 3rd c. and flourished in the 4th, had as its root hope in the intercession of the saints during the Last Judgment. One cannot conclude with certainty, however, whether one can apply this intercessory function to the Old Testament scenes of Daniel in the lions' den and the three young men in the fiery furnace, given that until the era of *Constantine, one does not find iconographic representations of martyrs or scenes of martyrs; whether those scenes, together with other motifs, do not allude only to a generic symbolism of salvation, which is known from the prayers of ps.-Cyprian, remains an open question.

More recently, it has also been noted that starting from the 3rd c. the scene of Peter's denial with the rooster (Mt 26:34, 75 and parallel texts) may reflect the development of the theology and the penitential practice of the church toward the *paenitentia secunda* after baptism and the daily awareness of the sinful human condition. This is primarily found on the sarcophagi (e.g., Ws 45,1; Ws 126,1 = Rep. 276; Ws 226,2 = Rep. 665), but also in the Roman catacombs, churches and on objects of ivory and silver (see catalog in Post, 24-53).

From the end of the early Christian period, a dozen funerary inscriptions have been preserved with reference to penance—four coming from *Gaul (Diehl nos. 1552, 1554, 1674, 1687), four from *Spain (Diehl nos. 1551A, 1554, 1555; Huebner no. 54), three from N *Italy (Diehl nos. 1664, 1693, 1733), one of unknown origin (Diehl no. 1553). Two of them date to the end of the 5th c., eight from the 6th and two from the 2nd half of the 7th c. Six speak *of paenitentia in extremis: post acceptam paenitentiam*, *accepta paenitentia*, *paenitentiam consecuta*, *Christo praestante paenitentiam*. Four characterize the dead as *paenitens* resp. *religiosa* in the same sense. Two use the formula *paenitentiam egit* and one *accepit paenitentiam* (see Vogel). One can explain the scarcity of epigraphic testimonies as either referring to penance *in extremis* or to the state of the penitent until death. This phenomenon is explained by the early Christian penitential practice, which hesitated to impose heavy penitential demands upon those of a rather young age since it would affect the entirety of one's life.

E. Huebner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae*, Berolini 1871; H. Achelis, *Altchristliche Kunst* 4: ZNTW 16 (1915) 1-23; G. Wilpert, *Un'antica rappresentazione della penitenza*: L'illustrazione vaticana 6 (1935) 15-16; Id., *La fede della chiesa nascente secondo i monumenti dell'arte funeraria antica*, Vatican City 1938; J. Fink, *Noe der Gerechte in der Frühchristlichen Kunst*, Münster-Cologne 1955; C. Vogel, *La discipline pénitentielle dans les inscriptions paléochrétiens*: RivAC 42 (1966 [pub. 1968]) 317-325; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973; Id., *Die Szene Christus-Petrus mit dem Hahn*, in Pietas. Festschrift B. Kötting, Münster 1980, 509-527; P.G.J. Post, *De haanscène in de vroegchristelijke kunst*, Utrecht 1984; A. Fitzgerald, *Christ, Peter and the Rooster*: Augustinianum 41 (2001) 409-423.

E. Dassmann - H.R. Drobner

III. Penitentials. Penitentials were books (or *opuscula*), originally from the British Isles, that spread to the continent thanks to the efforts of Irish and Scottish monks, who came to evangelize regions that remained *pagan or had reverted to paganism as a result of the great Germanic invasions. They presented a system of penance essentially characterized by the application of tariffs to punishments established in relation to the number and types of sins. Historians have assigned the name "tariffed penance" to this type of penance. It entered into competition with and finally supplanted the old canonical penance of earlier times, establishing the prelude to the private penance of the Late Middle Ages and the modern era. In contradistinction to the ancient and canonical penance, this form was no longer imposed only by the bishop, but by any priest; one could have access to it not just once after baptism, but whenever one felt the need. In each instance, it presupposed a confession of sins and an act of penance, but essentially it consisted in a fast, which was more or less severe and prolonged, so that as a result the two terms *paenitere* (to do penance) and *ieiunare* (to fast) became synonymous. If, at least in theory, the punishments imposed for sins confessed only once could not exceed the duration of one's life, in practice, and from the beginning, the punishments could be changed or replaced with compensations that made them shorter. An evaluation of the punishments was not left to the individual's initiative but was regulated carefully in writing.

Because a list of Penitentials is far from complete, one can only outline their history. Until the year 650, the books originated solely from the islands: the Penitential of Gilda, *Canones Wallici*, Irish and Celtic Penitentials and the Penitentials of *Columbanus. These documents flourished from the mid-

7th c. to the age of the Carolingian reform. Some books still came from the islands, whether of the ancient type (Penitential of *Cummian, *Iudiciae Theodori*, *Discipulus Umbrensium*) or of the new type (Penitentials of *Bede, *Egbert, Alberes, Bigot, Gwynn, etc.). Others came from the continent but defied every classification because of their complexity and incoherence. Nevertheless, an attempt was made to fix this disorder by distinguishing the Penitentials in which the influence of Columbanus, Cummian and *Theodore predominates, and separating them from the books of Spanish origin.

The Carolingian reform opened the third period, characterized by the claim to revive the ancient canonical penance, but the reformers only achieved a compromise on the basis of the following principle: if the sin is public, the penance must be public (i.e., the canonical penance); if private, the penance must be private (i.e., the "tariffed penance"). Other Penitentials dating to this period are those of Alitgarius of Cambrai (825–830) and the two of Rabanus Maurus, at Otgar (841–842) and at Heribald (852–854). Moreover, during the Carolingian period, the great canonical collections were compiled and propagated: the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, *Hispana*, *Dacheriana* and the *Quadripartita*, which portrayed themselves as *summae* of the ancient canonical penance, even though that form was unable to establish itself and that failure demonstrates the limits of the Carolingian reform. Among the Penitentials of the last period (until the 9th-11th c.), there are three groups with original characteristics: the post-Carolingian Penitentials, which pass themselves off as Roman, but are in fact Frankish; the Penitentials in which the Anglo-Saxon character dominates; the mixed extracts that contain ancient conciliar canons and snippets taken from Penitentials appearing side by side. The penitential collection of Burchardt of Worms, *Corrector sive Medicus*, if not chronologically last, is the most representative of the genre and the most utilized in the Late Middle Ages. One must wait for *Gratian's *Decretum* and the 4th canon of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) to bring the tariffed penance into disuse and to substitute for it the present-day system of private penance to the degree it survives after the Second Vatican Council.

CPL 1877-1896; LMA 2, 1118-1122; M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia liturgica* 4, Milan [2]1959, 253-258; A. Di Berardino, Patrologia IV, 514-523; R. Lasczcz, *Organisation de la pénitence "tarifée" d'après les "Ordines" des "Libri paenitentiales" jusqu'au "Corrector sive Medicus" de Burchard de Worms (1008–1072)*, Strasbourg 1972 (typed thesis); C. Vogel, *Les "libri paenitentiales,"* Turnhout 1978; R. Messner - R. Kaczynski, *Sakramentliche Feiern* 1,2, Regensburg 1992, 158-175.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PENTAPOLIS. This term, Greek in origin, indicated a collection of five cities (sometimes in the sense of city-state); during antiquity it was applied to various geographic entities in *Asia Minor, *Greece, *Syria and Cyrenaica, etc.

1. The term *Pentapolis* appeared in the biblical book of Wisdom (10:6) to refer to the region containing the five cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Segor (Zoar), Admah and Zeboim. These cities once united to fight off the invasion of other kings (Gen 14:1-11). During the first centuries of the common era, the existence of Segor was still known (Zoora: Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* IV, 8,4; Ptolemy, V, 17,5; *Eusebius, *Onom.* 232,236). It became an episcopal see, and its bishop was present at the Council of *Chalcedon (451). During the Roman Empire, the term "Decapolis" (ten cities) was more often used to indicate a territory in *Syria and *Palestine, an organized conglomerate of ten cities that enjoyed a certain level of autonomy and Greek culture: Gerasa (Jerash), *Scythopolis, Hippus, Gadara, *Pella, Philadelphia, Dion, Canatha, Raphana and *Damascus. Naturally, other cities were also included within the territory (e.g., Abila).

2. The territory of central Cyrenaica with the cities Apollonia (Marsa Susa), Taucheira (Arsinoe), Berenice, Cyrene and Ptolemais/Barca was called Pentapolis until the 7th c. AD (*see* *Libya). This territory retained its Greek cultural unity for centuries. Christianity arrived there rather early with bishops already known from the 3rd c., perhaps determined by the presence of important Jewish communities. In Late Antiquity, Cyrenaica constituted the province of *Libya superior*, which is distinct from *Libya inferior* (Marmarica).

3. In Byzantine Italy of the Late Middle Ages, Pentapolis referred to a military province S of *Ravenna with ill-defined borders; some later documents speak of two Pentapolises (maritime and governmental). The capital was *Rimini, along with Pesaro, Senigallia and Fano.

OCD ed. 1996, 1135-1136; CE 11, 97; EI 26, 698; ODB 3, 1624-1625; E. Honigmann, *L'évêché de Carphia ou Pentapolis en Grèce*: AB 67 (1949) 287-289; N. Alfieri, *La Pentapoli bizantina d'Italia*: Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate 20 (1973) 7-18; A.H.M. Jones, *Cities of Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford [2]1971; *Cirene e i Libyi*, ed. S. Stucchi - M. Luni Mario, Rome 1988; A. Chancey - A. Potter, *The Archaeology of Roman Palestine*: Near Eastern Archaeology 64 (2001) 164-198.

A. Di Berardino

PENTARCHY. For the patristic period the *patriarchate exercised its ecclesial function under the

form of pentarchy, a collegial organization for the governance of all the churches located within the confines of the Roman Empire; it was composed of patriarchs from *Rome, *Constantinople, *Alexandria, *Antioch and *Jerusalem. Even though the inception of the pentarchy was gradual and at times difficult, one must recognize that this system of governance was operating de facto between the 4th and 7th c., during the period in which the Roman imperial regime exercised its power over all the geographical areas affected by the government of the church. Its function depended on the *symphōnia* (also *synergeia*) between ecclesiastical and civil power, established on the common ideology of the time that considered the Christian emperor to be chosen directly by God with sovereignty over the entire civil world and with the duty to enact laws sanctioned by the five patriarchs (in 680, the Latin Fathers gathered in the Sixth Ecumenical Council formally asked Constantine IV to ratify their conciliar decisions with his signature and to send copies "to the five patriarchal thrones"; see Mansi XI, 682D-684A). Therefore, the decline of the pentarchy as an institution of the collegial government of the church was subsequent to the decline of the Byzantine imperial power and the loss of the administrative control over large geographical areas that was esp. due to the *Longobards (Lombards), Bulgarians and Arabs.

After the 7th c. and until the 16th, however, the pentarchy survived as a theological concept and an ideology transmitted in the theological and canonical schools of the East and West. Though it had fallen entirely into disuse as an ecclesial institution of the West and though maintained in Eastern Orthodoxy as an expression of the collegiality of the governance of the universal church, the pentarchy, following the Second Vatican Council, drew the interest of ecclesiologists who identified in its institution and exercise during the time in the church when it was still united a possible solution to the ecumenical problems raised in the East by papal primacy (i.e., by the relationship between the council and the pope's primacy) and also an opportunity for the exercise of episcopal collegiality. To overcome the questions raised by the apparent antithesis between pentarchy and the Roman primacy, one must distinguish the institution's historical path from its doctrinal content. The former is understood to be an objective given of the ancient church, the latter as a development of theological reflections heavily influenced by historical contingencies.

History of the pentarchical system. If with the Council of *Chalcedon the patriarchal institution already possessed its fivefold configuration, only with *Justinian did it receive its legal form. In a series of foundational laws, the Justinian *Novellae* (109; 123, c. 22; 126, c. 3; 131, c. 2; 137), the canons issued by the first four ecumenical councils, became equivalent to the laws of the empire and officially named as patriarchs the archbishops of the five sees recognized as supra-metropolitan (the term *pentarchy* is later), with the duty of preaching "unanimously" the faith in the "Catholic tradition" (*Nov.* 109). The pope of ancient Rome was recognized as the "first of all the bishops" (*Nov.* 131). In the ancient ecclesial awareness, as the ecumenical councils attest (can. 36 of Council of Constantinople of 681, completed by the Council of Quintisext [691]; Council of Constantinople [869-870], cans. 17 and 21; IV Lateran Council, can. 5; Council of Florence 1439) and certain Fathers (*Maximus the Confessor, *Disp. cum Pyrro*: PG 91, 532; Theodore the Studite, *Ep.* II, 63: PG 99, 1281B), the pentarchy was well received even though Rome had a few reservations.

Down through the centuries, the unwillingness of the Roman See to accept this system of pentarchy should not be seen as its rejection of all collegial forms of church government, but rather as its theological reservation toward an ecclesiology that could blend the duty of the Roman primacy with the guidance of the universal church, which the Roman See always believed itself to possess. In particular, Pope *Damasus, appealing to the need for a direct apostolic "Petrine" foundation of the patriarchal sees, was a promoter of the triarchic ecumenical government of the church (Rome, Alexandria and Antioch), later taken up in the following centuries by the popes who opposed Eastern appeals to establish a hierarchical order of the patriarchate on the grounds of an "expanded" understanding of the apostolic institution of the patriarchal sees and on political justification, or on the civil dignity of Constantinople. As the Late Medieval urban toponymy attests (the title *Patriarchium Lateranense* for the papal residence in Rome), the pope, nevertheless, acknowledged himself to be the first of the five patriarchs (V. Peri), only after, however, a quiet acceptance of the different foundation of the title possessed by Rome and Constantinople confirmed multiple times. Especially in the 6th and 7th c., following the Byzantine reconquest, the recognition of Rome as the patriarchate of the West is evident both from the official documents of the imperial and patriarchal chancery of the East and by a series of events during the period that witnessed the involvement of the popes in regard to the *symphōnia* between imperial and ecclesial power and in the re-

course to the principal pentarchy as the ultimate collegial instance in the government of the church universal. It was necessary to adhere to the pope's judgment if one desired to preserve ecclesial communion (in this manner, *Pelagius I attempted to prevent the schism caused by the controversy of the *Three Chapters). On the other hand, one should note that the popes were connected to the pentarchical system through the relationship of the Roman See with the *basileus*, who at times was responsible for approving the election of a new pope (W. de Vries, *Orient et Occident*, 206).

Despite the Byzantine Empire, rigid control of protocol and titles thrived; starting from the 6th c., many bishops assumed the title of patriarch with primacy over an entire ecclesiastical region (Hierapolis of *Phrygia, *Tyre, *Thessalonica, *Aquileia, *Milan, *Ravenna, *Lyons, Besançon and Bourges). To distinguish the five cities of the pentarchy, Justinian civil law had specified, however, that only these are patriarchs "of the entire *oikoumenē*" and that each one could be called *oikoumenikos* or *universalis*. As time progressed, the titles of those participating at the various councils of the 8th-9th c. indicate that the title of patriarch was slowly abandoned by the archbishops and only applied to the five, with the exception of the bishops of Aquileia (a title that was passed on to Grado and finally to Venice), who maintained it only with an honorary meaning.

History of the Doctrine. With the decline of the Western Empire, the system of the collegial governance of the five sees lost its authority over the churches falling outside Byzantine influence but gained theological and legal authority. For centuries in the East, arguments were sought from Scripture, tradition and reason to establish and maintain the ecclesial nature of the pentarchy. The ultimate driving force behind its theological effort resided not in the attempt to oppose papal primacy, which was safeguarded and upheld, but in the necessity of creating a check to the Caesaro-papist intrusions of the Byzantine emperors (Marella, 114ff.), esp. by some of its chief theologians who paid dearly for their reflection (*Maximus the Confessor, Tarasios of Constantinople, Nicephorus and Theodore the Studite deepened the theological discussion in the context of the iconoclastic controversy). At the close of the millennium, on the one hand, the theologians wanted to demonstrate the *apostolicity of the pentarchy, retracing at all costs the missionary activity of Peter at the origins of the various sees and, on the other hand, they justified the special quality of those five sees using a symbolic interpretation of the number five (the five senses of the body of the church; the five stars of the spiritual firmament; the five heads of a mysterious person; the five cities of the *Pentapolis).

At Byzantium, the theoretician of the pentarchy was Peter II, patriarch of Antioch (1054–1056), who explained the concept in a letter to Pope Leo IX (preamble). Then, in a letter to the patriarch of Grado, he denied his own alleged title of "patriarch," after having mentioned the five ancient patriarchal sees, saying: "Therefore, this pertains to what I am saying. The body is only directed by one head, although there are many members in it and all of these are guided by the five senses which are: sight, smell, hearing, taste and touch. This also applies to the body of Christ, i.e., the church of the faithful, which is brought about by the convergence of many peoples, similar to the members, and guided by the five senses, the aforementioned five great thrones (Episcopal), is led by one single head, namely Christ" (*Ep. ad archiepiscopum Gradensem sive Aquileiae*, 3-4: PG 120, 760AB). Nonetheless, following the *Schism of 1054, the legal positions of the East and the West attest to innovative interpretations of the pentarchy. The Byzantines of the 12th c. tried to transfer to Constantinople the secular primacy attributed to Rome or, at best, they tried to reduce the primacy of Rome to a simple title of honor, though the Westerners attempted to demonstrate the compatibility of papal primacy and the pentarchy to the systematic exclusion of Constantinople or any other Eastern see. In fact, in the West, aside from a few exceptions, the notion of pentarchy entirely disappeared, though in the East it remains to this very day. Its existence was not diminished even in 1593, when the episcopate of Moscow was elevated to fifth place in the patriarchate. On 12 February of that year, a "sacrosanct and large council" gathered at Constantinople, at the request of the Czar of Moscow, Fëdor I Ivanovič, approved that the archbishop of Moscow bear the title of "Patriarch of Moscow and all of Russia in the N regions" and that such notice in the sacred diptychs and the ecclesiastical gatherings be included immediately after the patriarch of Jerusalem. Nonetheless, the new see never sought access to the pentarchical college and always received its decisions (E. Melia, 354).

Final Problematic Developments. In the ancient church, it was not only the lack of political support that broke the collegial system of pentarchical government in the East, but also the schisms that occurred after the Council of Chalcedon produced a multiplication of the title of "patriarch" used by the heads of those churches that were not recognized to be in the faith of that Council or that fell outside the

borders of the empire. In the West, however, the exercise of "Petrine" primacy of the See of Rome, having a different understanding of the ecclesial function of the patriarchate, discouraged every claim to the title by the archbishops of important sees (in 866, Nicholas I refused to grant the title to Prince Boris of Bulgaria, who claimed it for the head of the nascent national church). Moreover, following the Fourth Crusade, the creation of Latin patriarchates in the East caused a serious ecclesiological problem because patriarchal privileges became concessions of the Roman *Sedes apostolica*. Today, the Catholic Church includes eleven patriarchal sees, seven of which belong to various Eastern rites.

DTC 11, 2269-2275; D. H. Marot, *Note sur la pentarchie*: Irénikon 32 (1959) 436-442; W. de Vries, *Orient et Occident. Les structures ecclésiales vues dans l'histoire des sept premiers conciles oecuméniques*, Paris 1974; M. Marella, *Roma e il sistema pentarchico. Problemi e prospettive*: Nicolaus 4 (1976) 99-138; E. Melia, *La Pentarchie*: Istina 32 (1987) 337-360; J. Meyendorff, s.v. *Pentarchy*: Dictionary of the Middle Ages 9 (1987) 495-96; V. Peri, *La Pentarchia. Situazione ecclesiale (IV-VII sec.) e teoria canonico-teologica*, in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto Medioevo*, Atti delle Settimane di Studio del CISAM, XXXIV, Spoleto 1988, 209-311; M. Maccarrone (ed.), *Il Primato del Vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio. Ricerche e Testimonianze*, Atti del Symposium storico-teologico, Rome, 9-13 ottobre 1989, Vatican City 1991; F.R. Gahbauer, *Die Pentarchietheorie. Untersuchung zu einem Modell der Kirchenleitung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Frankfurt a.M. 1993; E. Morini, *Roma e la pentarchia dei patriarchi nella percezione dell'oriente greco tardoantico e medievale*, in P. Prodi (ed.), *Forme storiche di governo della Chiesa universale. Giornata di studio in occasione dell'ultima lezione del prof. Giuseppe Alberigo, 31 ottobre 2001*, Bologna 2003, 27-42.

V. Lombino

PENTECOST. The origin of the Christian feast of Pentecost, the Jewish roots of which the Fathers never forgot, goes back to Acts 2:1-11. The church of the 2nd-3rd c. recognized the "seven weeks" of joy after *Easter: the *laetissimum spatium*, namely, the *sacrament of *baptism, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the gift of the *Holy Spirit and the expectation of the *Parousia (Tertull., *De bapt.* 19,2). The *alleluia* was sung in churches; Christians did not pray on their knees nor did they fast, and they continually read from the Acts of the Apostles. On the 50th day, this period ended without a separate feast. Through a complex series of events, the historicizing tendency of the liturgical feasts during the 4th c. caused the development of a proper feast for Pentecost and the Ascension of the Lord. At *Rome, the insertion of penitential days (*litania maior* April 25, *litaniae minores/rogationes* before the Ascension) disrupted the connection between Easter and Pentecost, which received its own octave because it was a separate feast. The fact that the rabbis connected the Pentecost with the Ascension of Moses and the fact that Roman theology brought to mind the gift of the New Law together with the descent of the Holy Spirit provides a way to understand better the iconographic motif of the *traditio legis*, where *Jesus, standing on the Mount of Paradise, entrusts the law to St. *Peter. The *Sacramentarium Veronense* already offered formularies for the vigil of Pentecost celebrated at Rome.

CPG V (sermons); M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* 2, Milan [3]1969, 309-323; H. auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit* 1, Regensburg 1983, 122-124.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PEPUZA. A small town of *Phrygia, along with Tymion, it was a center of the charismatic movement of the *Montanists (also called the heresy of the Phrygians or Cataphrygians), which arose around the year AD 165 and was established by Montanus and two women, Priscilla and *Maximilla (Eusebius, *HE* 5,18,2; Hierokles, *Synecdemos* 667,6). Pepuza, the holy city, also became a place of pilgrimage. The Montanist movement soon spread into Asia Minor, almost immediately reaching even *Carthage, where one of its great supporters was *Tertullian. The level tract of land between Pepuza (to the S) and Tymion (to the N) was the place where the new Jerusalem would descend from heaven, acc. to the statement in the *Apocalypse* (ch. 21), at the end of time; Pepuza, in particular, was the new city. *Epiphanius wrote that during a dream Priscilla received an important revelation: "taking the form of a woman, Christ came to me clothed in a white tunic and placed wisdom within me and revealed to me that this is a holy place and that the new Jerusalem would descend on it from heaven" (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 49,1: PG 41, 880). For this reason, the Montanists were called the "Pepuzians" (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48,14: PG 41, 872; *Praedest.* 27). Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla were born in the region and resided there. Pepuza was their strategic center, a place where they had gathered many people (Cyril Jer., *Catech.* 16: PG 33, 928-29).

Though sought after for more than a century, the precise location had not been found; nonetheless, archaeologists tended to place it roughly in the area of the city of Uflak. In the year 2000, near the village of Susuzören, the discovery of a bilingual Greek and Latin inscription—in which the inhabitants of Tymion complained to *Septimius Severus, arguing that their taxes were too high—allowed scholars to iden-

tify first the location of Tymion and as result also the "holy city" of Pepuza. Tymion (today Susuzören) is found ca. 18 km (11 mi.) SW of Uflak. Pepuza was ca. 12 km (7.4 mi.) S of Tymion and 16 km (9.94 mi.) N of Karahalli, in the district of Ulas, where one still finds the remains of ancient buildings and, esp., the remains of a large monastery in the vicinity (its abbot Euthymius was present at the Council of *Nicaea in 787). In 550, Byzantine soldiers, following the lead of *John of Ephesus, destroyed the sanctuary that contained the bones of the movement's founders and confiscated the other buildings. The bishop of Pepuza, Theophylact, participated at the Council of Nicaea of 787. According to a Latin inscription of 205 or 208—it is said that the original was located in the *thermal baths of Trajan at Rome—Tymion was to be found near the imperial estates, which at the end of the 2nd c. were tilled by the *coloni Caesaris*. A procurator was responsible for the administration of the imperial landholdings in the region.

J.C. Poirier, *Montanist Pepuza-Jerusalem and the Dwelling Place of Wisdom*: JECS 7 (1999) 491-507; C. Markschies, *Nochmals: Wo lag Pepuza? Wo lag Tymion? Nebst einigen Bemerkunger zur Frühgeschichte des Montanismus*: JbAC 37 (1994) 7-28; W. Tabbernee, *Portals of the Montanist New Jerusalem: The Discovery of Pepouza and Tymion*: JECS 11 (2003) 87-93; T. Hauken, *A New Inscription from Phrygia: A Rescript of Septimius Severus and Caracalla to the Coloni of the Imperial Estate at Tymion*: Epigraphica Anatolica 36 (2003) 33-44; P. Lampe, *Die montanistischen Tymion und Pepouza im Lichte der neuen Tymioninschrift*: Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum 8 (2005) 498-512; W. Tabbernee - P. Lampe, *Pepouza and Tymion: The Discovery and Archaeological Exploration of a Lost Ancient City and an Imperial Estate*, Berlin-New York 2006.

A. Di Berardino

PEREGRINUS. A *civis*, i.e., a free individual, of one city was also considered a *peregrinus* (stranger, foreigner) in another, and therefore a non-Roman citizen. Just as citizenship granted a strong personal identity with rights and obligations, among which were the religious practices owed to the city's divinities, a *peregrinus* was seen as the other, the stranger, the one who did not have civil protection and therefore his situation was insecure. During the age of the Republic, the majority of the Roman population was made up of *peregrini* from conquered countries. They generally did not enjoy political rights (they did not participate at the popular assemblies; they could not refer matters to the courts; they were not conscripted for military service). Within the sphere of private law, they could not offer testimony in a court, nor draw up a will in the form of Roman law, nor the property of citizens. Their marriages were considered legal (*iustae nuptiae*) only if they enjoyed the *ius connubii* granted on a personal basis or, as was more often the case, to their *civitates* of origin, which obtained it from *Rome. With the concession of Roman *citizenship to all the free inhabitants of the empire, all people were thereby *cives romani*, but also *cives* of their respective cities.

E. Volterra, *L'acquisto della cittadinanza e il matrimonio del peregrino*, in Id., *Scritti Giuridici*, Naples 1991, II, 257-58; Id., *Sulla condizione dei figli dei peregrini cui veniva concessa la cittadinanza romana*, in ibid., 229-30; E. Cizek, *L'image de l'autre et les mentalités romaines du Ier au IVe siècle de notre ère*: Latomus 48 (1989) 360-371.

M. Forlin Patrucco - A. Di Berardino

PEREGRINUS of Auxerre. His Latin name was *Peregrinus*. The *Mart. hier.* mentions 16 May at Bouhy (today in the Nievre department), identifying him as the city's first bishop. The *Passio* (BHL 6623) of the 7th c. makes him out to be a martyr, an account influenced by the *Passio SS. Andochii et Thyrsi*, a Roman priest whom *Sixtus II (257–258) consecrated as bishop and sent to evangelize the Puisaye. There he preached on a pagan feast day; as a result, he was imprisoned at Bouhy and beheaded. Between the 7th and 9th c., his relics were transferred to Saint-Denis. At Rome, the church of St. Peregrinus in the Vatican was near the hospital of St. Peregrinus, which was founded by Leo III (795–816) (Duchesne LP 2, 47.57).

BHL 6623-6625; BS 10, 460-462; LCI 8, 154; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926 (repr. Rome 2000), 416; R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* 3, Vatican City 1971, 176-178; J.-Ch. Picard, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIIIe siècle*, Paris 1992, 53.

V. Saxer - S. Held

PEREGRINUS, exegete. An individual who was very involved in biblical studies. Using Jerome's work, he made a new edition of the Wisdom books and, perhaps, even for other books. With regard to the Pauline Epistles, he revised and adjusted the *Priscillian canons (*Prooemium Peregrini episcopi in epistulas Pauli apostoli*) and the canons of the bishop of Avila (*Canones in Pauli Apostoli epistulas a Peregrino episcopo emendati*). It seems certain that he was a bishop and very likely that he was from *Baetica. Recently, scholars have tried to show that he was responsible for a complete recension of the *Bible, but the question has remained open until this day. It is unclear when he lived. Usually scholars date his activity to the 5th c., but it could also be the case that he worked in the 1st half of the 6th.

CSEL 18, 109-147; T. Ayuso Marazuela, *La Vetus Latina Hispana*, I, Madrid 1953, 520-522; B. Fischer, *Algunas observaciones sobre al "Codex Gothicus" de la R.c. de S. Isidoro en León*: Archivos leoneses 15 (1961) 5-47; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 76-78.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

PERFUME. Perfume is solar energy and a sign of the divine life. According to the ancients, the gods breathed aromas to preserve immortality. For mortals, perfume grants the joy of living and the ability to forget misfortune. It was the spirit's ambassador: it foretold the arrival of the beloved person and invoked the person's presence when absent. It is perceived by the sense of smell, releasing hidden, affective fascinations within the receiver. In ancient *Egypt, incense and aromas filled the temples to lift the faithful into the heavenly kingdom, while the ointments of embalming seem to give life back to the dead. Greeks and Romans sought in perfume a sign of the divine presence (a theophany), and in the ointment, the medicine that brings one back to life. For the Persians, perfume was the symbol of the "good," and stench, the symbol of "evil." In Israel and in all religions, perfume expressed "the life and nearness of God" (E. Lohmeyer, 3). The Jews saw in the "tree of life," planted by God on earth, the source of "the perfume of the law," which guided humanity to the "perfume of wisdom" so that it could make the world the "garden of justice" (Gen 2:9-12; Sir 24:15; 1 Enoch 24:4–32:6). The "sacrifice of a sweet odor" is a human life offered to God and to others (Gen 8:21): one's life can become a "theophany" if in irradiating the perfume of holiness, one collaborates in the manifestation of God in the world (*Ap. Baruch* 67,6; *Jubil.* 2,22). God's love for the community, his spouse, is described in the *Song of Songs with the triumph of aromas that are spread about in the fields and in the nuptial chamber. According to Flavius Josephus, "the altar of incense with thirteen perfumes . . . signified that all things are from God and for God" (*Bell. Iud.* V, 5,5). At his birth, Jesus received the gifts of "incense and myrrh," the perfume that announced "sweetness and bitterness" for the Messiah and all humanity (Mt 2:11). "Anointed" with the *Holy Spirit at the Jordan and with ointment at Bethany, Jesus foretold the perfume of his death and resurrection, which begot the church (Jn 1:32-34 and 12:1-8). *Paul perceived in *sin a "stench of death" and in righteousness a "perfume of life" (2 Cor 2:16). *Philo the Jew defined the breath of life given by God to *Adam "a light breath," "a breeze" and "a mild and sweet perfumed exhalation": Adam, by receiving it, opened his eyes to life (*Leg. All.* 1,42). The *Mandeans also affirmed this, acc. to whom "when the baby is in the womb of its mother, it breathes the odor of life" (*Joh.* I, in G. Furlani, *Il buon odore e il cattivo odore nella religione dei Mandei*: RAL VIII/7 [1952] 321).

Christians affirm that God is the "perfect perfume" (Athenag., *Suppl.* 13). God possesses "every sweet odor and every aroma" (Iren., *Haer,* IV, 14,3). *Hippolytus asked, "What is the perfumed anointing of Christ, if not the Word?" (*Co. Ct.* 2,4). The Father gives to the Son his immortal perfume through the anointing in the Holy Spirit; the incarnate Word brings to the world the breath of trinitarian life, by inaugurating the diffusion of love onto all humanity (Hipp., *Co. Ct.* 2,1-30; Orig., *Co. Ct.* I, 101,8–102,8 and 107,17–108,8). For *gnostics, perfume is the knowledge of God: Sophia possesses "an aroma of immortality left to her by Christ and the Holy Spirit" (*Iren., *Haer,* 4,1), and her children on earth "struggle to maintain in themselves the ray and the spark of light with the perfume of the Spirit" (Hipp., *Ref.* V, 19,6 and X, 11,4). The *fathers of the church recognized in Jesus the suffering, the sacrificial offering pleasing to God for its "sweet fragrance" (Eph 5:2): the *cross of Christ is the perfumed tree that conquers the wicked odor of death and floods humanity with new and moral life (Hipp., *Com. Cant.* 12,1–13,4; Orig., *Com. Cant.* I, 102,10-20; Greg. Nyss., *Hom. Cant.* III; Ambr., *In Ps.* 40,15).

By giving his life, Christ renewed creation and granted life to humankind, to whom God had communicated from the first day "the perfumed breath of his divinity" (ps.-Clem., *Rec.* IV, 9,1). The memory in perfume of the earthly *paradise, brought to life by the expectation of the perfume of the eternal paradise, grants depth to Christians' commitment in history. The heralds of God's justice "everywhere breathe incorruptibility and give life to humankind" (Iren., *Haer,* III, 11,8), hiding from all the fact that the "sweet odor for the Lord is the heart that praises its creator" (Barn. 2,10; cf. Greg. Nyss., *Hom. Cant.* XI). *Ambrose stated: "the perfume of the faith smells pleasant to the *soul that opens its heart to Christ, by receiving the odor of the burial of the Lord to believe that his flesh did not undergo corruption and did not exalt the wicked odor of death, but is arisen by spreading the perfume of that flower of life, which is always flourishing" (*De virginitate* 62, et passim). He also exhorted every believer: *et tu, si desideras gratiam, caritatem auge: mitte in corpus Iesu fidem resurrectionis, odorem Ecclesiae, communis caritatis unguentum* ("and you, if you desire grace, increase charity: place in the body of Jesus,

the faith of the resurrection, the odor of the church and the ointment of mutual charity"; *In Lc.* 6,29, et passim). *Augustine echoed Ambrose's exhortations by offering a wonderful commentary on the anointing at Bethany (Aug., *In Jo.* 50,1-10).

*Martyrdom is the supreme Christian witness, in which the outpouring of the "perfume of Christ" reaches its apex: *Polycarp, when lifted upon funeral pile, "stood in between, not as flesh that burned, but as *bread that cooked . . . and we smelled an intense perfume, as if a cloud of incense or another precious aroma had been lifted up" (*Mart. Polyc.* 15,2). The Christian who dies for the name of the Lord spreads in the world the aroma of his resurrection and draws to God with the outpouring of his sacrifice a flood of believers: "we, i.e., where one finds the relics of the martyrs, run with urgency toward the perfume of Christ's anointed" (Phil. Carpas., *In Ct.*: PG 40, 41 C). A daily martyrdom is the ascent of life. The fragrance of the Spirit makes believers a sweet-smelling community of aromas that in contemplation ascend to the heights of the perfume of paradise. *Gregory the Great said that the "lives of the saints" are "a perfume of aromas" that allows one to have a foretaste on earth of the vision of God: *illa bona, quae per contemplationem tu praeparas, ista omnia virtutum munera, quae in hac vita tribuisti, transcendunt* (Greg. Gt, *Com. Cant.* 20 and 12-30).

E. Lohmeyer, *Vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch*: SHAW 1919, 9, 1-52; A. Stumpff, εὐωδία: TWNT [TDNT] 2, 808-810; M. Löhr, *Das Räucheropfer im A.T. Eine archäologische Untersuchung*, Halle 1927; W. Deonna, *Euodia. Croyances antiques et modernes. L'odeur suave des dieux et des élus*: Genava 17 (1939) 167-262; H.Ch. Puech, *Parfums sacrés, odeur de sainteté, effluves paradisiaques*: L'Amour de l'Art (1950) 36-40; G. Delling, ὀσμή: TWNT 5, 492-495 [TDNT 5, 493-495]; E. Cothenet, *Parfums*: DBS 4, 1653-1660; A. Orbe, *La teología del Espíritu Santo*, Rome 1966, 377-390; M. Détienne, *Les jardins d'Adonis*, Paris 1972; Id., *Aromi e seduzione. Religione e Civiltà* 1 (1972) 529-537; G. Piccaluga, *Adonis e i profumi di un certo strutturalismo*: Maia 26 (1974) 33-51; P. Meloni, *Il profumo dell'immortalità. L'interpretazione patristica di Cantico 1,3*, Rome 1975 (including an extensive bibl.); M. Détienne, *Dionysos mis à mort*, Paris 1977; P. Rovesti, *Alla ricerca dei profumi perduti*, Venice 1980; J.P. Albert, *Odeurs de sainteté. La mythologie chrétienne des aromates*, Paris 1990.

P. Meloni

PERICHORESIS (Gk. περιχώρησις). A term in *Neoplatonic anthropology that was used to explain how the *soul was intimately united to the body without being confused with it; by means of analogy, *Gregory of Nazianzus applied it to the union of the two natures in Jesus Christ (*Ep.* 101; *Or.* 38,13). In this sense, it was reused by Byzantine authors who saw in the human composite an analogy of the *incarnation (Lampe 1077ff.). *Maximus the Confessor developed the concept to explain the unity of the person against the *monothelites (Bausenhart 173), using the example of a piece of iron placed in a fire, an example *Origen had used to illustrate the union of the soul with the Logos. Following the thought of ps.-*Cyril (PG 77, 1144B, 1163B), *John of Damascus adopted the term *perichoresis* in an analogous sense for the inseparable, but not confused, union of the three divine *persons (*Expos.* 8; 14; 49). Thanks to the Latin translation of John of Damascus's *Expositio* made by Burgundio of Pisa, scholastic theology also received the idea under the Latin term *circumincessio*.

B. Studer, *Die theologische Arbeitsweise des Johannes von Damaskus*, Ettal 1956, 112-113; G.L. Prestige, *Dio nel pensiero dei Padri*, It. tr. Bologna 1969, 297-305; H.A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, Cambridge, MA 1964 (It. tr. Brescia 1978), 418-428; P. Stemmer, *Perichorese*: HWP 7 (1989) 255-259; G. Bausenhart, *"In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde." Studien zum Beitrag des Maximus des Bekenners zur altkirchlichen Christologie*, Mainz 1992; G. Greshake, *Perichorese*: LTK[3] 8, 31-32. (bibl.); E. Durand, *La périchorèse des personnes divines*, Paris 2005 (see also Lateranum 72 [2006] 553-575).

B. Studer

PERIGENES. Bishop of *Corinth (ca. 419–after 435). He was born in Corinth, where he was ordained a priest. He was consecrated bishop of Patras (Gk. *Patrai*, Lat. *Patrae*) in 419, but the Christians of that city did not approve of him for unknown reasons (Socr., *HE* 7,36,9). The Corinthians selected him as their bishop in 419 and sought the approbation of Pope *Boniface (419–422) because the election had been carried out in a manner contrary to the canons (Council of *Nicaea, can. 13). After having received information from his legate *Rufus of Thessalonica, the pope approved Perigenes's election (*Ep. Bonif.* 5). Some bishops, however, were not in agreement with the pope's decision so that as a result the pope was obliged to confirm the appointment (*Ep. Bonif.* 16). Perigenes recognized the supremacy of the papal legate, but after Rufus's death he refused to submit himself to his successor *Anastasius, who was elevated to the same position by *Sixtus III (432–440). When Anastasius convoked a synod at *Thessalonica, the pope wrote a letter to the Eastern bishops and another (435) to Perigenes so that he might recognize the authority of Anastasius (*Ep. Sixt.* 7; 8; 10). We do not know Perigenes's response, nor do we know the date of his death. Perigenes participated at the Council of *Ephesus (431) among the orthodox fathers; at various times at that council, his name was reported as "Peregrinus."

E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums, von den Anfängen bis zur*

Höhe der Weltherrschaft 1, Tübingen 1930 = Münster 1985, 373-382; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana*, Rome 1976-78, 1069-1147; Id., *La géographie de l'Illyricum ecclésiastique et ses relations avec l'Église de Rome. Villes et peuplement dans l'Illyricum protobyzantin*, Rome 1984, 21-62.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PERIODEUTA. A priest dependent on the city's bishop who was responsible for visiting and caring for Christians in villages and the countryside. Dating back to the 3rd c., this institution was found in the E provinces: *Asia Minor, *Syria and esp. *Egypt, where one could not easily reach the bishop because he resided in the major cities of the districts, or because he was far away for other reasons, as in the case of *persecution (see Philea, *Ep.*: PG 10, 1566B). The Council of *Laodicea at the end of the 4th c. (can. 57) made a law stating that one should not consecrate bishops for villages and the countryside, but only that a *periodeuta* should be placed there who did not have a fixed residence and was responsible for ministering to the Christians of many villages (see Athan., *Apol.* 85: PG 25, 400), esp. in a diocese with a vast territory and Christian villages. The figure of the *periodeuta* was tightly connected to *chorbishop, the number of whom gradually decreased during the 4th c., though it increased for the periodeuta; among the nomadic peoples, however, the presence of a bishop was more fitting.

DACL 14, 369-379; Lampe, s.v.; P. Hindo, *Disciplina antiochena antiqua. Syri. II: Les personnes*, Vatican City 1951, 268-271; G. Dagron, *Entre village et cité. La bourgade rurale des VIe-VIIe siècles en Orient*: Koinonia 3 (1979) 29-52 (esp. 44-47); D. Feissel, *L'évêque, titres et fonctions d'après les inscriptions grecques jusqu'au VIIe siècle*, in Actes du XIe Congrès int. d'archéologie chrétienne, Rome 1989, I, 801-828; O. Bucci, *Il Corepiscopato nella storia della Chiesa*, Rome 1993.

A. Di Berardino

PERPETUA and FELICITAS
I. The *Passio* - II. Iconography.

I. The *Passio*. The archetype of the *Acts* of Christian martyrs. This *Passio* refers to the arrest of Vibia Perpetua, along with other catechumens (Revocatus, Felicitas, Saturninus and Secundinus), the events that occurred in prison, the sentencing, the execution (chs. 3-10) and the visions of Saturus, who had freely hid himself among the detainees (chs. 11-13). On the basis of the first chapters (1-2), the end (chs. 14-21) and other pieces of information, scholars have sought to attribute the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis* to *Tertullian or to a member of his circle. Written by an anonymous member of the community, it contains historically authentic elements mentioned by the martyrs themselves (the three visions of Perpetua and that of Saturus) and reflects events that occurred during the first *persecution at *Carthage following an edict (202). It is dated to the year 203, and Tertullian (*De anima* 55) and Augustine (*Sermo* 280: PL 38, 1281) mentioned it. Preserved in Latin and Greek redactions, the text is a witness to the Christianity lived by the people and, more than being just an apologetic document, it was a means of edification during the *liturgy. It contains typical Jewish-Christian apocalyptic elements.

CPL 32; PL 3, 13-18 (Ruinart); P. Franchi de' Cavalieri: RQA 5 (1896) 104-148 (= ST 221, 1962, 41-155); H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, 107-131; Quasten I, 163-164; E. Corsini, *Proposte per una lettura della "Passio Perpetuae,"* in *Forma Futuri* (Misc. M. Pellegrino), Turin 1975, 481-541; C. Mazzucco, *Il significato cristiano della "libertas" proclamata dai martiri della "Passio Perpetuae,"* in ibid., 556-586; S. Prete, *Il motivo onirico della "scala." Note su alcuni Atti di martiri africani*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 521-526; *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen, Milan 1987, 111-147 (text and tr.); 412-452 (comm.); C.M. Robeck, *Prophecy in Carthage. Perpetua, Tertullian, and Cyprian*, Cleveland 1992; P. Habermehl, *Perpetua und der Ägypter oder Bilder des Bösen im frühen afrikanischen Christentum. Ein Versuch zur Passio sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, Berlin 1992; B.D. Shaw, *The Passion of Perpetua*: Past and Present 139 (1993) 3-45; J.E. Salisbury, *Perpetua's Passion. The Death and Memory of a Young Roman Woman*, New York-London 1997; H.B. Vierow, *Feminine and Masculine Voices in the "Passion of Saints Perpetua and Felicitas"*: Latomus 58 (1999) 601-619; K.B. Steinhauser, *Lectura agustiniana de la "Pasión de las santas Perpetua y Felicidad"*: Augustinus 44 (1999) 172-175, 263-269.

E. Romero Pose

II. Iconography. Martyrs in 202 at Carthage, Perpetua and Felicitas and their companions were greatly venerated in this city. According to *Victor of Vita (*De persecut. Vand.* 1, 3), African Christians built the *basilica maiorum* upon their place of burial. Archaeologists identified this building in 1907 thanks to an inscription naming the *martyrs along with the *confessio* of the same basilica, which was uncovered in 1929. The most ancient iconographic testimonies of the two martyrs are at *Ravenna in the chapel of S. Andrea (ca. 519), which is today the archbishop's chapel, and in the procession of the martyrs in the church of St. Martin *in Caelo aureo*, then S. Apollinare Nuovo (6th c.). Moreover, one finds these testimonies on the underside of the apsidal arch in the Euphrasian basilica of *Parentium (543–554). Lastly, one should note that the sarcophagus of the Archaeological Museum of Burgos, variously dated between the 5th and 8th c., contains an intriguing image. Scholars have sought to identify

one of the visions of the *Passio Perpetuae* in the scenes on the back of the sarcophagus because of the presence, among other things, of a ladder (= heavenly ladder).

E. Josi: EC 9, 1191ff.; L. Schütz: LCI 8, 155-156; Wp 445ff.; A.L. Delattre, *Les martyrs de Carthage*: Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres 1907, 176-177 and 193-195; Id., *Nuove scoperte di monumenti cristiani antichi a Cartagine. La "confessio" della Basilica Maiorum*: RivAC 7 (1930) 303; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, Rome 1982, 682-683; L.C. Seelbach, *Perpetua und Tertullian. Die Martyrerin und der Kirchenvater*, Jena 2000.

G. Santagata

PERPETUUS of Tours (d. 491). The sixth bishop of the city, from ca. 461 until his death in 491. He received two letters from *Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 4,18; 7,5,8-9) and one from *Paulinus of Périgueux (CPL 1475). He presided over two councils, at *Tours (18 November 461) and *Vannes (between 461 and 491) (CCL 148, 147.150). *Gregory of Tours dedicated a biographical sketch to him and passed down the *Calendarium Turonense*, a work written by Perpetuus and still in force during Gregory's time (*Hist. Franc.* 10,31; *Virt. S. Mart.* 1,6): the fasts were set for Wednesday and Friday from *Pentecost to the feast of St. John (24 June), from 1 September to 1 October, from St. *Martin (11 November) to Christmas, from St. *Hilary (13 January) to 15 February; the vigils, to Christmas, *Epiphany, St. *John the Baptist (24 June), *Cathedra of St. *Peter, Resurrection of Christ (27 March), *Easter, *Ascension, Pentecost, *Passio* of St. John the Baptist (29 August), Sts. Peter and *Paul (29 June), anniversaries of St. Martin (4 July and 11 November), St. Symphorian (22 August), St. Lictorius (13 September), St. Brize (13 November, St. Hilary (13 January). As a result, we have the liturgical calendar of Tours at the end of the 5th c. Perpetuus built a basilica at Tours in honor of St. Martin, St. Peter and another at Mont-Louis in honor of St. *Lawrence and the parish churches of Esvres, Mougon, Barron, Ballau, Vernon (Indre-et-Loire) (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2,14; 10,31). As part of his last will and testament, he left all his property to the various churches of his diocese. He was buried in the church of St. Martin 30 December; his epitaph and testament from 475 are 17th-c. forgeries (AASS *Apr.* 1, 747-748).

CPL 1475, 2029; BS 10, 502-503; L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IV^e au VI^e siècle*, Rome 1983.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PERSECUTIONS. Persecutions can be understood as violent actions directed against the Christian church and its members by its adversaries.

Jesus' message of salvation led to a confrontation with the Jewish authorities and his crucifixion by order of Pontius *Pilate, the Roman procurator in Judea. The gospels warned the disciples that their future could involve suffering and persecution; they could be "delivered up to councils and flogged in the synagogues" (Mt 10:17). Jesus himself affirmed that the blood of his covenant was shed for many (Mk 14:24; Mt 26:28, cf. Is 53:12) and that for his name the blood of Christians would also be shed (Mk 10:39).

The primitive community of *Jerusalem immediately experienced the truth of these words. Around AD 35, *Stephen became the first martyr (Acts 7:60). In 44, the zeal of Herod *Agrippa for the precise observance of the law, during the brief period of his service in government (41–44), culminated in the martyrdom of *James the brother of *John and in *Peter's arrest (Acts 12:2-3). Although this persecution was not taken too far, Paul preferred to preach in the synagogues of the Diaspora (AD 47–57), in the face of bitter opposition from many Jews. Paul was persecuted from city to city (see Acts 17:10-13). His opponents depicted him as "an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world" (Acts 24:5) and sought to obtain his condemnation and execution from the Roman authorities first at *Corinth (Acts 18:12-17) then at Jerusalem (Acts 24:1-6 and 25:2). *Luke showed that the Roman authorities looked at Christianity as an internal affair within *Judaism (Acts 18:14-17) and were not hostile to Paul and his preaching (Acts 13:7-12). What then was the cause of the Neronian persecution of AD 64?

Little is known about the Christian community of *Rome during this period (see, however, Acts 18:10; 28:22; Rom 1:8 and Suetonius, *Claudius* 25,4; see Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution*, 160-161). Three factors seem relevant: (a) the desperate attempt of *Nero to find a scapegoat for the fire of 19 July 64, which he was thought to have caused; (b) the official and popular opinion in Rome, which detested every threat to the majesty of the Roman gods by foreign cults, Judaism included, and the ease with which the Jews were suspected of misanthropy (Tac, *Hist.* V, 5, 1) and arson (Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* VII, 3, 3); (c) the hostility of the Jews toward the Christians.

*Tacitus's account (*Annales* XV, 44) of the persecution, written nearly 60 years later, could have had as a model the description of the plot of the Bachanali and its suppression in 186 BC (Liv., XXXIX, 14,10). Christians, moreover, were seen as sectarians like the Jews and, as such, guilty of "hos-

tility toward humankind" (*odium generis humani*) which manifested itself in the adoption of a perverse religion (*prava religio*) and in the conspiracy to spread the fire at Rome. And thus, those who "confessed" (Christianity) were killed in a cruel and theatrical manner in order to appease the wrath of the gods. A generation later, the author of *1 Clement* (5) seems to blame the catastrophe on the "envy and jealousy" of the church's enemies; namely, the Jews.

Although not extending to *Italy and the provinces, the persecution put Christians in a legal predicament. Tacitus leaves no doubt that for him the execution of Jesus by Pontius Pilate was justified, that Christianity was a "mortal *superstition," the adherents of which deserved punishment. His contemporary *Suetonius describes the suppression of Christians through Nero's policing actions (*coercitio*), whose deeds in this regard he approved (*Nero* 16,2). According to Suetonius, Christians are guilty of magical practices and of having introduced "a new and dangerous religion," but he did not connect the persecution to the fire of Rome.

*Melito of Sardis (Eus., *HE* 4, 26,8) and *Tertullian (*Apol.* 5,4) mention *Domitian as the second "persecuting emperor." It seems, however, that Domitian's suppressing measures were intended to discourage the members of the Roman nobility from adopting Jewish customs (Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* LXVII, 14; cf. Suet., *Domit.* 18). It is possible that *Domitilla, the emperor's niece (*neptis*), who was exiled to Pandataria (Pantelleria), was a Christian (see Eus., *HE* 3, 18,4 and *Chron. ad ann. Abraham* 2111).

From the end of the 1st c., however, the Roman authorities distinguished between Jews and Christians (Seut., *Domit.* 12), and Christianity was considered illegal (see 1 Pet 4:15-16). In the province of Asia, the book of *Revelation referred to the merciless persecution carried out by Jews, the local populace and the civil authorities (Rev 2:9, 13; 17:6 and 13:16-17: a definite commercial boycott). The correspondence between *Trajan and *Pliny, his special legate (*legatus pro praetore*) in Bithynia (112–113), demonstrates that once denounced to the civil authorities, Christians were subject to quick execution (*ad me tamquam christiani deferebantur*: Plin., *Ep.* X, 96,2). Pliny asked the emperor if the simple profession of the name Christian deserved of punishment or if they should only be punished for the crimes attributed to them. In response, Trajan explained that although the Christians should not be sought out (as common criminals)—*conquirendi non sunt*—they should be punished if they refused to retract and to "worship our gods." If they recanted, however, they should be set free. In another rescript, *Hadrian, the successor of Trajan, instructed the proconsul of Asia, C. Minucius Fundanus, in 124–125, to condemn Christians only if the court found them guilty of breaking the law. They should not be victims of popular uprisings and denunciations, and they had the right to respond with an accusation of defamation against their accusers (the procedure of *calumnia*).

These two decisions of the emperors established the line of conduct pursued by the authorities with respect to the Christians until the end of the 2nd c. These decisions discouraged the accusations (see A.N. Sherwin White, *The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again*: JTS 3 [1952] 199-213), and the Christians enjoyed a period of relative peace until the reign of *Marcus Aurelius (161–180). From that period, however, the official reluctance to take action against the Christians was overcome by the growing discontent of the populace. In addition to personal resentment, which cost *Justin Martyr his life at Rome in 165 (see Just., *2 Apol.* 3 and 11), certain *pagans vociferously accused Christians of incest ("Oedipal relations"), cannibalism ("Thyestean banquets") and atheism (rejection of the Greek gods). The Christians were held responsible for the natural disasters, which pointed to the wrath of the gods (see Tertull., *Apol.* 40,2 and Aug., *Civ. Dei* II, 3, who provides the popular statement: *Pluvia desit causa Christiani sunt*). Also during this period they remained sufficiently close to Judaism (see Orig., *C. Celsum* II, 1 and 4: III, 1) so as to inherit the unpopularity of the Jews. The result was a series of sporadic but savage persecutions inspired by popular resentment: the most noteworthy was that which led to the martyrdom of *Polycarp of Smyrna, probably around 165 (or, perhaps, between 156 and 160; see *Mart. Polyc.*, ed. H. Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 5-20 and cf. Eus., *HE* 4,15) and the *pogrom* of *Lyons in 177, mentioned in a letter sent by the survivors to the churches of Asia and *Phrygia (Eus., *HE* 5,1 and 2,1-8). At *Smyrna, the Jews joined the pagans to request the death of Polycarp (*Mart. Polyc.* 13 and 18; Eus., *HE* 4,15,26 and 29). The authorities agreed.

New light on the reasons for the unpopularity of Christians during this period is given by the Platonist *Celsus, whose book *Alethēs Logos*, written around the year 178, provided a complete attack to every aspect of Christian *theology, *anthropology and behavior. Celsus argued that Christians formed an "illegal association," whose members were bound by secret oaths (Orig., *C. Celsum* I, 1; see Caecilius, in *Minucius Felix's *Octavius* 8,4: "*profanae coniurationis*"), and not only were they not suited for taking

on normal public offices, but with their proselytism (*C. Celsum* III, 52 and 55) they were threatening the traditional social and religious structure of the empire. The persecutions, including the hunting down of Christians, were justified (*C. Celsum* VIII, 69).

Christians overcame the crisis during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In the last quarter of the 2nd c., Christians at Rome began to gain more respect and began to be considered, thanks to their behavior, as individuals comparable to "genuine philosophers" (*Galen's commentary on Plato's *Republic,* cited by R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians*, Oxford 1949, 15; see also Eus., *HE* 5,21). Sporadic persecutions nevertheless continued, leading to the martyrdom of the Senator (?) *Apollonius at Rome, around the year 183 (*Acta Apollonii*; cf. Musurillo, *Acts*, XXV and 90-104; G. Lanata, *Gli Atti dei martiri*, 145-157, with an extensive bibl.).

The beginning of the Severan dynasty in 193 opened a new era in the relations between Christians and the empire. Fewer accusations of black magic and promiscuous relations were raised, but there was an increase of charges of atheism and opposition to the gods that protected the Roman Empire. Christianity, moreover, then recovered its ancient missionary ideal. At *Alexandria, *Clement preached the need for spreading the gospel (*Strom.* I,1,3; 3,1ff.). Around 197 at *Carthage, Tertullian boasted of the ever-increasing number of Christians (*Adv. Nat.* 1,14) and other conversions to Christianity (*fiunt non nascuntur christiani*: *Apol.* 18,4). These advances provoked a strong popular reaction supported this time by the civil authorities. The persecutions, in the form of lynchings (at Alexandria, see Clem., *Strom.* II,20,125 and II,283,18) or mob attacks (see Hipp., *In Dan.* 1,23) or legal executions (at Carthage, *Passio Perpetuae*), took place over a wide area between 197 and 212, with great violence in 202–203. *Eusebius (*HE* 6,1,1) associated the persecutions with the emperor *Septimius Severus, but it seems more likely that the rescript attributed by Spartianus (*Historia Augusta, Vita Severi* 17,1) to the emperor in 202 that prohibited conversions to Judaism or Christianity was a response to a governor of a certain province that had requested instructions with regard to popular movements against Christians and esp. converts (see Frend, *Open Questions*, 349, against K.H. Schwarte, *Das angebliche Christengesetz des Septimius Severus*: Historia 12 [1963] 185-208). And it is to be noted that in contrast to all the other periods of persecution, the Christian converts were more often the target of pagan attacks than Christian leaders (thus the *Passio Perpetuae* and, for Alexandria, Eus., *HE* 6,3).

The wave of hatred once again diminished. Between 212 and 235 the church enjoyed another period of semitolerance. Whether one accepts Lampridius's statements that *Alexander Severus (222–235) "allowed the Christians to exist" (*Historia Augusta*: Lampridius, *Vita Alex. Severi* 22,6: *christianos esse passus est*), the church could now own property (the most ancient Roman catacombs) and erect buildings for prayer in certain cities (*Dura Europos).

The revolution (22 March 235) put an end to the Severan dynasty. The successor of Alexander Severus, *Maximinus Thrax (235–238), dismissed the Christian slaves and workers from the court of his predecessor (Eus., *HE* 6,36; cf. Orig., *C. Celsum* I,43). Pope *Pontianus and the martyr *Hippolytus were among the exiles (they died in *Sardinia near the end of 235), and Origen revealed that in 236 there were affluent Christians at *Caesarea, Palestine, who feared for their lives (*Exhortation to Martyrdom*, addressed to *Ambrose). Maximinus also died in the revolution inspired by the N African landholders (the Gordani), who were supported by the Roman senate. During the reigns of Gordian III (238–244) and *Philip the Arab (244–249) the church enjoyed a long period of prosperity (Eus., *HE* 6, 36; see Orig., *C. Celsum* I, 43). It was too good to last for long. Writing his *Commentary on Matthew* around 238, Origen foresaw that the persecutions against Christians would take on worldwide dimensions (*In Matt.* 24,9; *Serm.* 39).

Origen was not mistaken; a new turn of political fortunes brought with it a new emperor and a new political policy for Christians. C. Messius Quintus *Decius, who adopted the surname "Trajan" (249–251), was a good general and was a passionate believer in the traditional virtues of Rome. As in the case of Maximinus before him, he thought he could blame the Christians for the catastrophes that had struck the empire under his predecessor. Eusebius (*HE* 6,39,1) wrote that "because of his hatred for Philip, he launched a persecution against the churches." In January 250, Decius issued an edict stating that the annual *sacrifice performed on the Capitoline Hill to the Roman gods should be repeated in the provincial cities, and at the same time he ordered the arrests of many prominent Christians. On 21 January Pope *Fabian was brought to trial before him and condemned. The same was done to *Babylas, bishop of *Antioch (Eus., *HE* 6,39,4). At Carthage, *Cyprian was forced to go into hiding and, at Alexandria, *Dionysius was fortunate enough to escape arrest (Eus., *HE* 6,40,2ff.). This initial phase followed the establishment of commissions in the provinces to monitor the sacrifices to

the empire's gods and the emperor's plan (see Cypr., *Ep.* 43,3; 67,4; also Eus., *HE* 6,42,1). The trials were held from February to March at Carthage and Smyrna, and until June-July in certain parts of *Egypt. Egyptian *papyri have preserved for us 43 *libelli* (certificates) given to all those who had sacrificed (see esp. J.R. Knipfing: HTR 16 [1923] 345-390). It is presumed that all people sacrificed because to refuse to do so would have resulted in one's death (*Acta Pionii* 7,4). Decius's measures were initially successful. His intention was more to obligate Christians to conform themselves to the worship of the Roman gods and not to ban the practice of Christianity (thus, in the *Acts of Conon* 4,4 [Musurillo, *Acts*, 189], the judge told *Conon: "if you have recognized Christ, recognize our gods too"). Some Christians resisted; several important bishops such as Euthemon of Smyrna openly apostatized (*Acta Pionii* 15,2), while *confessors such as *Pionius of Smyrna were the objects of derision and pity (*Acta Pionii* 10,16 and 20). Paganism was still at its height, while Christianity remained an urban religion spread about in minority communities in the chief cities of the empire.

Decius, however, died in battle against the *Goths (June 251). An attempt to restart the persecution by his successors Gallus and *Volusianus (Cyp. *Ep.* 59,8) resulted in the exile and death of Pope *Cornelius at Centumcellae in June 253, but little else. The church soon recovered its lost ground. The 87 bishops gathered at Carthage on 1 September 256 to support Cyprian's position against Pope *Stephen in the controversy over the *baptism of *heretics bore witness to the church's resilience and flexibility. In the summer of 257, the emperor Valerian (253–260), after having been put to the test by the Persians on the E border of the empire, made a fresh attempt to force the Christians to recognize the gods of the Romans. The text of his edict has been lost, but a paraphrase remains, it seems, in a statement preserved by the *Acta Proconsularia* regarding the exile of Cyprian (*Sacratissimi imperatores Valerianus et Gallienus litteras ad me dari dignati sunt, quibus praeceperunt eos, qui Romanam religionem non colunt, debere Romanas caerimonias recognoscere: Acta Proc.* 1, ed. W. Hartel, CSEL 3,3, p. CX). The authorities, therefore, accepted the fact that the Christians did not worship the gods; they asked, nonetheless, that they formally recognize in some way their salvific power for the peoples of the empire. This is what Aemilianus, vice-prefect of Egypt, said in his conversation (which was hardly a "trial") with Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria in 257 (see Eus., *HE* 7,11,9-11, which records the account of Dionysius, contained in a letter to Bishop Erammon). Cyprian and Dionysius refused to accept the compromise and were thus exiled, Cyprian to a comfortable villa on his property at Curubis on the Gulf of Hammamet; Dionysius, however, was less fortunate—he was sent to the oasis of Kufra.

The following year Valerian gave much more severe instructions to the senate so that they might in turn forward them to the provincial governors. According to Cyprian (*Ep.* 80), the bishops, presbyters and deacons had to be punished immediately (with death). The Roman senators (*viri egregii*) and the knights (*equites*) were forced to give up their high positions and properties, and even the *matronae* were forced to relinquish their property and go into exile. Civil servants (*caesariani*) were reduced to slavery and were sent in chains to work in the imperial landholdings. This was the most severe and detailed list of punishments ever decreed for Christians and, in the West, the persecutions lasted for a long time and were probably more costly in terms of human life, esp. among its leaders, than even the "Great Persecution." On 13 September, Cyprian was taken from Curubis to Carthage and on the following day brought before the proconsul Galerius Maximus. After a brief hearing, he was condemned to death and executed on the evening of 14 September. Galerius's motives for putting him to death are intriguing: the Christians were "irreligious" (*sacrilegia mente*), "they gathered together as an illegal association" (*nefariae conspirationis*), and Cyprian, as their "standardbearer," was "an openly professed enemy of the gods and the religion of Rome" (*Acta Proconsularia* 4, pp. CXII-CXIII). The accusations seem to be those that Celsus formulated 80 years earlier, but now the "conspiracy" directly challenged the primacy of the Roman gods.

Outside events helped the Christians yet again. Valerian was imprisoned by the Persians at *Edessa (June 260), and his son and successor, *Gallienus (253–268), ordered the reconstruction of the church's places of worship and granted them the freedom of existence (and therefore of worship). A paraphrase of the text, sent ca. 262 to Dionysius and his suffragan bishops in Egypt, after the civil war, was preserved by Eusebius (see *HE* 7,13: "I have ordered that the benefit of my generosity expand into the whole world so that they (the authorities) withdraw from places of worship, and thus even you can benefit from the provisions contained in my rescript, so that no one bother you there").

In the 40 years after, a *modus vivendi* between the church and the empire was established. The church obtained something akin to an intermediary

situation, that of an autonomous body governed by its own officials acc. to its own laws, but subject to the commanding authorities of the imperial governing power. Although during this period, curiously enough, great leaders did not emerge from the Christian church, the church entered into every facet of the society and, more significantly, among the indigenous populations of important territories of Egypt, *Syria and N Africa and even beyond the frontiers of the empire, to the kingdom of *Armenia. It was no longer exclusively based in the cities, a relatively easy target for the authorities. The Great Persecution of 303–305, in the West, and of 303–312, in the East, can be seen today as the culmination of the measures taken by *Diocletian and his colleagues in the tetrarchy bent on imposing a tightly uniform administration in the empire, inspired by the worship of the Roman gods and the practice of the so-called traditional virtues of Rome. One after the other, the army, the administration of the provinces, the taxes and the coins were reshaped in view of providing an administrative and economic system that was simple and uniform, but resilient, across the entire empire.

The saying *genio populi Romani* on the back of the silvered bronze coins, minted in the tens of thousands of pieces for use in the empire, summed up the imperial message as in the emperor's edict on prices (301); it reflected his paternal search for uniformity. Uniformity was inevitably extended to religion. In March of 297 (302 acc. to some), Diocletian ordered the prefect of Carthage to put the *Manicheans to death and to burn their books (*Coll. legum mosaicarum et romanarum, in Iurisprud. anteiustin.*, ed. Seckel-Kübler, II, 2, p. 381; and the discussion in F. Décret, *L'Afrique manichéenne, IV^{e} et V^{e} siècles*, I, Paris 1978, 162-165). The Manicheans were seen as "enemy agents" paid by Rome's adversary, *Persia, but as soon as the latter was definitively crushed in 298, the government directed its attention toward Christians.

The persecution gradually developed—as it seemed to Eusebius, who was alive during this time (*Chron. ad ann. 301: Veturius magister militae Christianos milites persequitur, paulatim ex illo iam tempore persecutione adversum nos incipiente*). Christians were purged from the army and the civil administration, but during the last part of 302 Diocletian hesitated. His wife and his daughter may have been favorable to Christianity. At the end, the arguments of his caesar, *Galerius, and a visit to the oracle of the Milesian Apollo at Didyma persuaded him otherwise. The fact that Christianianity was a challenge to the empire had to be accepted, but the shedding of blood was not necessary (Lact., *De mortibus persecutorum*: SC 39, 11,8). The civil authorities chose 23 February 303, the day of the feast of the *terminalia*, as the day in which the Christian threat was to be put to an end.

The text of the first edict has not come down to us, but it seems to have followed the measures taken by Valerian, without the death penalty. The Christian churches had to be destroyed, religious functions prohibited and the Scriptures handed over to the authorities to be burned (see Lact. *De mort.* 13). Christians belonging to the upper classes were to lose their privileges. Those with civil offices (οἰκετίαι, in Eus., *HE* 8,2,4) were to be reduced to slavery, and Christians were prohibited from laying claim to or defending their own rights in a court of law. The edict was put into effect without difficulties from the provincial and local authorities. A second edict, after the revolts in Melitene and Syria reportedly inspired by Christians, condemned the *clergy to imprisonment (Eus., *HE* 8,6,9), but the prisons were inadequate to receive such a large number of people; therefore, in the summer of 303 a third edict decreed that Christians were to be forced to sacrifice on the spot and then freed. Every attempt was made, at times with grotesque results, to obtain the Christian's assent (Eus., *Mart. Pal.* 1,3-5). Diocletian then departed for Rome to celebrate his *Vicennalia* (20 November 303).

Until this point, the persecutions achieved a certain amount of success (Eus., *HE* 8,2,1). The churches were destroyed, many bishops succumbed to pressure (such as Paul, bishop of *Cirta in *Numidia), others stalled or fled (such as *Peter of Alexandria), and the communities were scattered. Only a small number of unwavering men and women were put to death (Eus., *Mart. Pal.* 1,5). During his visit to the West, however, Diocletian fell ill and Galerius took advantage of the situation. In the spring of 304, a fourth edict was issued that intimated to all men, women and children that they were under obligation to sacrifice and pour out a libation or suffer the death penalty. At that point, there began to be so many martyrs that in N Africa the *dies thurificationis* was remembered a century later (CIL VIII, 6700), alongside the *dies traditionis*.

Aside from N Africa (Eus., *HE* 8,6,10), the Great Persecution in the West was more violent in its historical transmission than its reality; it ended practically speaking at the time of Diocletian and *Maximian's resignation (1 May 305) and was not renewed. In the East, however, things turned out differently. Galerius was now the *Senior Augustus* and, after a pause that lasted until Easter 306, the persecution

began again. *Maximinus Daia, the caesar of Galerius, issued an edict commanding all the governors of the provinces to impose on everyone the obligation to sacrifice to the gods. At Caesarea, the public officials called forth each individual by name acc. to a census (*Mart. Pal.* 4, 8). Eusebius mentions many deaths in Palestine in the two following years (*Mart. Pal.* 5-7). Between July 308 and November 309, another interval of persecution occurred during the meeting between Diocletian, Maximian and Galerius at Carnutum (November 308). From this period onward, however, pagan zeal began to wane. When, in November 309, the persecution restarted in Palestine, every item purchased or sold at the market had to be contaminated with libations and sprinklings of blood from the sacrifices (*Mart. Pal.* 9,2). The pagans themselves were skeptical about the effectiveness of this measure; Eusebius comments that they "considered it to be off the mark" (*Mart. Pal.* 9,3); nonetheless, during this time a famous victim suffered martyrdom (*Mart. Pal.* 11) in March 310, the presbyter *Pamphilus.

The same lack of pagan zeal awaited the attempts of Maximinian to restore the cult and the pagan temples. Even before Galerius fell ill in the spring of 311, it was clear that Christianity had become too strong to oppress with violent means.

Galerius's retraction (30 April 311) has rightly been considered the turning point in the fight between paganism and Christianity in the Roman Empire. Although written up in the conviction that everything "must be reordered acc. to the ancient laws and public order (*disciplinam*) of the Romans," it admitted that many Christians had refused to obey. Now the Christian God, deprived of worship, was angry; therefore, "let Christians exist once again (*denuo Christiani sint*) and reconstruct their churches" and let them "pray to their God for our well-being, for that of the state and themselves, so that in every place the state might be safe and that they themselves might live safely in their own homes" (text in Eus., *HE* 8,17,3-10). But all this was in vain because Galerius died a painful death six days later (5 May 311).

This edict put Christianity back into the same situation it had enjoyed before the beginning of the persecution: but this was not the end of the fight. There were now two divine entities responsible for the safety of the empire: the "immortal gods" and the "Christian God." For the first time in Roman history, a power different from that of the ancient ones was accepted as exerting influence, even if in a negative manner, over the empire's destiny.

Maximian, however, did not acknowledge the spirit of Galerius's edict. The Christians "could exist," but what would happen if their pagan neighbors objected? Petitions against the "atheists" were organized, thanks to the city *curiae* of *Nicomedia, *Tyre and Antioch (Eus., *HE* 9,9,4-5) and the senates of the provinces of Lycia and Caria (Diehl 1a and b). In 311, a last atrocious wave of persecution shook Egypt and cost the life of Peter of Alexandria (d. 25 November 311) and the lives of innumerable Coptic Christians in *Thebaid (Eus., *HE* 9,9,4-5). This time, the Christians knew that death signified victory; they never forgot this lesson. Diocletian's rise to power began the "age of the martyrs," which marked the starting point for the **computus* of the Coptic Christians.

The last victim of the persecutions was *Lucian of Antioch, who was martyred at Nicomedia on 7 January 312. On 28 October of that year, *Constantine defeated *Maxentius at the Milvian bridge, and in 313 he met *Licinius at *Milan: this marked the solemn end for the age of the persecutions (*Edict of Milan).

Why, for two and a half centuries, were Christians the objects of suspicion, attack and official suppression? It is impossible to provide just one answer. Much ink has been spilled, esp. at the beginning of the 20th c., in attempts to define the nature of the charges leveled against the Christians. It is more likely the case that the persecutions were the result of numerous political, social and legal factors, with different emphases over time. In the first place, there was the conviction, deeply rooted in the governing class of Rome, that the salvation of the empire depended on one's recognition of the gods. In no way could one tolerate an attack on their primacy. In AD 64, the Christians were accused, wrongly or with reason, of having insulted this belief and, as Tacitus showed, they were not forgiven for this; as a result, their religion could never become a *religio licita*. Second, to the 2nd-c. inhabitants of the provinces, the ties between Jews and Christians could appear stronger than they really were, and the Christians gradually began to inherit the unpopularity already experienced by the Jews in the Greek cities of the E Mediterranean world. Third, their apparent secrecy and closed organization made them the objects of fear and common resentment. Celsus's twofold rebuke of "illegal organization" and "apostate Judaism" summarizes this attitude. They deserve suppression as a *latebrosa et lucifuga natio* (Caecilius's opinion is recorded in Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 8,4). The authorities agreed. In the 3rd c., to these various accusations was added that of directly fighting against the gods and therefore the political stability of the empire. This was the background of the persecu-

tions from those of Decius to those of Diocletian. It took the genius of Constantine to understand that one could accept the victory of the Christian God without causing a political disaster. The organization of the church and the conviction of a personal salvation suggested that the pagan world had fallen and that its defeat could be placed at the service of a new Christian empire.

Acta martyrum: R. Knopf - G. Kruger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten*, 4. Auf., with an appendix by G. Ruhbach, Tübingen 1965; H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, texts with Eng. tr. (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford 1972; G. Lanata, *Gli Atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973.

Studies: until 1963, see bibl. in W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, Oxford 1965, 572-604; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965; G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, *Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted*: Past and Present 26 (1963) 6-38; C. Delvoye, *Les Persécutions contre les chrétiens dans l'Empire romain*, Brussels 1967; R. Freudenberger, *Christenreskript. Ein umstrittenes Reskript des Antoninus Pius*: ZKG 78 (1967) 1-14; Id., *Das Verhalten der römischen Behörden gegen die Christen in 2. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1967; T.D. Barnes, *Legislation Against the Christians*: JRS 58 (1968) 32-50; Id., *Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum*: JTS 19 (1968) 509-531; E. Bickermann, *Trajan, Hadrian and the Christians*: RFIC 96 (1968) 290-315; P. Keresztes, *Marcus Aurelius a Persecutor?*: HTR 61 (1968) 321-341; G. Clarke, *Some Observations on the Persecution of Decius*: Antichton 3 (1969) 63-76; J. Molthagen, *Der römische Staat and und die Christen im zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert*, Göttingen 1970; A. Wlosok, *Rom und die Christen*, Stuttgart 1970; Id., *Die Rechtsgrundlagen der Christenverfolgungen der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte*, in R. Klein (ed.), *Das frühe Christentum im römischen Staat*, Darmstadt 1971, 275-301; G. Clarke, *Two Measures in the Persecution of Decius*: BICS 20 (1973) 118-124; W.H.C. Frend, *Open Questions Concerning the Christians and the Roman Empire in the Age of the Severi*: JTS 25 (1974) 333-351; P. Keresztes, *The Peace of Gallienus*: WS 9 (1975) 174-185; L.F. Jannsen, *"Superstitio" and the Persecution of the Christians*: VChr 33 (1979) 131-159; B.W. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*, Oxford [2]1980; W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Political Oppression*, in *The Early Christian World*, II, ed. P.F. Esler, London 2000, 815-839.

W.H.C. Frend

PERSIA

I. Origins - II. 2nd-4th c. - III. 5th-7th c. - IV. After the 7th c..

The Persian territory, which extended from *Mesopotamia to the borders of India and from *Armenia to *Arabia, was a fief of the Arsacid (Parthian) and *Sassanid (224–632) empires and then of the caliphates of *Damascus (637–750) and Baghdad. Persia was the birthplace of an Aramean Christian church. The territory was very active from its origins. Because it developed on the margins of the Roman Empire, in an area that was subject to religious syncretism in every period, following the Byzantine Empire it preserved important aspects of the Eastern ecclesiastical tradition.

I. Origins. With regard to origins our understanding of Persia has greatly advanced in recent years. Thanks to the discoveries and research done in the field of *gnosticism (*Nag Hammadi, *Manicheism), heterodox *Judaism (Qumran) and in particular *Jewish Christianity (*Elkesaites), one can say that Persia, even before *Osroene, was the first bulwark of Aramean-Syriac Christianity. The important Jewish communities, which resided in Mesopotamia for a long time, and above all those of "Palestinian obedience"—beginning with the small realm of *Adiabene, in which Judaism was the religion of the state from AD 36—account for the immediate success in the evangelization that reached the periphery of Ctesiphon already between 76 and 116 (Ancient tradition pertaining to Mari is preserved in Arabic in the *Book of the Tower.* The apocryphal literature relating to Judas *Thomas, *Addai, Mari and Aggai is rather late in its attempts to make everything depend on *Edessa, from which it comes). The characteristics of early Persian Christianity (which can be reconstructed with the help of *Aphraates, the Persian sage, and *Ephrem of *Nisibis)—asceticism, *encratism, Targumic and Midrashic traditions, *liturgy (eucharistic blessings, music and architecture), a theological school—point to a Jewish Christianity that was often tainted by an underlying sectarian Judaism, as in the case of the **Odes of Solomon*, the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Acts of Thomas*, the *pseudo-*Clementines* and the *Manichean Psalter*, etc. (The question of the evangelization of India since apostolic times, although not guaranteed by any scientific proof, is historically admissible because of its commercial relations with the Roman Empire: see ANRW 9,2 [1978] (s.v. Mesopotamia.)

II. 2nd-4th c. Evidence for the period immediately following the beginnings of the evangelization is still rare. The stele of *Abercius (see RAC I, 12-17) speaks of the Christianity lying beyond the Euphrates around 150, and the *Book of the Laws of the Countries*, attributed to a disciple of *Bardesanes, briefly describes the life of the communities of "Parthia, Media and Hatra" around 200–220. Nevertheless, it is clear that Christianity had developed in the 3rd and 4th c. in the Persian Empire, as one can conclude from the following phenomena: (a) the disappearance of *heresies like *Marcionism and esp. Manicheism; (b) the reception of Christian exiles and prisoners deported during the successful campaigns in the West (as far as *Cilicia) by the first

*Sassanids; (c) the existence of the first *martyrs; (d) reverberations of quarrels over the See of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon starting from 310 (*see* *Papa bar Aggai); (e) establishment of a theological school at Nisibis. The Sassanid court led by a policy of tolerance, in contrast to their enemies the Romans, who were expelled during the reign of *Gallienus (260–268). It was during the "small peace" that the party of the Magi, at the urging of its powerful leader Kartîr, put heavy pressure so that the shahanshah Bahram II (276–293) launched the first persecution against foreign religions (during which time, among other things, *Mani was put to death), and it was precisely after peace was established that, under *Constantius II, *Shapur II (309–379) carried out the "Great Massacre" (344–345) against those who by that time must have been considered "allies of the Caesars." On the other hand, in their internal policy, the kings of Persia always had to make treaties with the very influential national religion, Zoroastrianism, but also with the Jewish and Manichean communities and at times with those "Greek" Christians, who were useful for developing their economy.

III. 5th-7th c. Starting from *Yazdegerd I (399–420) until the advent of Islam, Persian Christianity benefited from the protection afforded by the shahs. According to their political policy, they knew how to make use of Christians at times, even as ambassadors to *Byzantium, and to favor them over the party of the Magi, and at other times to take advantage of their internal disagreements or to exert much pressure on them. Nonetheless, this period was characterized by a reorganization of martyr Christianity and its consolidation with the help of the West. The following events provide specific evidence for this: the exponential growth of *monasticism, the polemical disputes with *Messalianism and *Origenism (*see* Henana of Adiabene, d. 610), the theological work (translation of the Greek Fathers, establishment of the school at Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 541 by Mar *Aba), but also the divisions, and all this under the direction of the chief leaders, a good number of which were doctors at the Sassanid court. The first among them, *Maruta of Maiferqat, brought about the recognition of the faith and the ecclesiastical discipline of the Council of *Nicaea in the Synod of 410. This synod, moreover, attested the expansion of the Persian church over this period (from the islands of the Persian Gulf to the borders of Armenia and from Persis [Fars] to the region of Nisibis). The expulsion of the Persians from Edessa, the establishment of a new school at Nisibis by *Narsai (d. around 502), and the strong personality of *Barsauma (d. 491–496) were the primary causes for the adoption of *Nestorianism by the Persian church (486). The young Nestorian church, however, was not organized early enough and in a manner capable of opposing the infiltration of the *monophysites. The latter group, taking advantage of the Byzantine conquest over the N part of the country, was able to install its own hierarchy at Takrit until the year 629.

IV. After the 7th c. The tolerance of the Umayyads (637–750) and above all of the Abbasids (750–1258) (the patriarchal see was transferred to Baghdad, which had become the new capital) favored the *Jacobite and Nestorian Christian churches. Although they began to separate themselves from the imperial church, the Nestorian churches dedicated themselves in a peculiar way to new missions, esp. in China, and to transmit their own Aramean and Greek heritage to the new Muslim culture.

Sources: In addition to the secular Roman, Byzantine, Persian and Arabic sources, to reconstruct the history of the Persian church it is necessary, first and foremost, to consult the ecclesiastical, and more specifically Syriac, sources (a list of which is found in the work of Ortiz de Urbina 206-212 and esp. in J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310/subs. 36, Louvain 1970, 8-31) and, preferably, the *Chronicle of Seert* (in Arabic), *Synodicon orientale* (ed. Chabot), as well as Bedjan and various authors, beginning from Aphraates and Ephrem (see Ortiz de Urbina 115-153).

Studies: J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224–632)*, Paris 1904; E. Tisserant, *Nestorienne (Église)*: DTC 11, 157ff.; S.P. Brock, *A Classified Bibliography*: ad loc.; ANRW II, 8 and 9; J. Neusner, *History of the Jews in Babylonia*, Leiden 1965–1970; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition*, Cambridge 1975, esp. 1-38; J. Ries, *Mani et le Manichéisme*: DSp 10, 198-216; F. Decret, *Les conséquences sur le christianisme en Perse de l'affrontement des empires romain et sassanide de Shâpûr Ier à Yazdgard Ier*: RecAug 14 (1979) 91-152; G. Wiessner, *Zur Märtyrerüberlieferung aus der Christenverfolgung Schapurs II*, AKW Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3, Folge 67, Göttingen 1967; J.-M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, 3 vols., Beyrouth 1965–1968; Id., *Nisibe*, CSCO 388 (sub. 54) Louvain 1977; Id., *Chrétiens syriaques sous les abassides*, CSCO 420/subs. 59, Louvain 1980; M.-L. Chaumont, *La christianisation de l'empire iranien des origines aux grandes persécutions du IVe siècle*, CSCO 449, Louvain 1988; R. Gyselen, *La géographie administrative de l'empire sassanide. Les témoignages sigillographiques*, Paris 1989; *La tradition syriaque*, Colloque Pro Oriente, Vienne, juin 1994: Istina 40 (1995) 1-160; J. Rist, *Die Verfolgung der Christen im spätantiken Sasanidenreich. Ursachen, Verlauf und Folgen*: Oriens Christianus 80 (1996) 17-42; G. Greatrex, *Rome and Persia at War (502–532)*, Leeds 1998; B. Isaac, *The Eastern Frontier*, in *The Cambridge Ancient History, XIII. The Late Empire*, ed. A. Cameron - P. Garnsey, Cambridge 1998, 437-460. Bettiolo (esp. in Patrologia V, 427-430) reopens the discussion on origins and Drijwers's theses, in opposition to a position that regards the early Syriac-speaking church as Jewish Christian.

F. Rilliet

PERSONA - PERSON. In addition to the classical meanings of the term *persona* (role, person and individuality), Latin theology from the very beginning knew of a technical meaning. The refutation of the *monarchians provided *Tertullian the opportunity to develop the trinitarian use of the term and even to suggest a christological meaning (*Prax.*). Borrowing from secular exegesis that distinguished *persona* grammatically and aesthetically (dignity or personal character), and under the influence of the legal tradition, he applied a realist meaning to the term (*persona* = *res*). In the 4th c., the anti-*Arian authors clarified the trinitarian meaning of the term, excluding the purely functional meaning that the Greek equivalent πρόσωπον (*prosopon*) seemed to suggest (*see* *Hilary). *Augustine, although having some reservations about the trinitarian use of the term *persona* (*Trin.* VII, 4, 7-6, 11), introduced it with a positive sense into *Christology (from 400: *unitas personae*]; from 411: *una persona*). As its parallel use in ecclesiology demonstrates (*ecclesia quasi una persona*), the exegetical associations remained strong even in Augustine's writings. But applying the expression *una persona* to the person composed of *body and *soul, Augustine also shows to what extent for him *persona* not only signified the logical subject of attribution, but also the ontological principle of the one Christ (not yet, however, explicitly in the sense of a *hypostatic union). Under the influence of the philosophical and christological discussions of the 6th c., *Boethius finally offered the definition of *persona* as a *naturae rationalis individua substantia* (*De duab. naturis* 3), a foundational definition for scholastic theology and the beginning of modern personalism.

M. Nédoncelle, *Prosopon et persona dans l'antiquité classique*: RSR 22 (1948) 277-299; T. van Bavel, *Recherches sur la christologie de s. Augustin*, Fribourg 1954; C. Andresen, *Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffs*: ZNTW 52 (1961) 1-39; J. Moingt, *Théologie trinitaire de Tertullien*, II, Paris 1966; S. Otto, *Person und Subsistenz*, Munich 1968; A. Milan, *Persona in Teologia*, Naples 1984; B. Studer, *Una persona in Christo*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 453-487; H. Drobner, *Person-Exegese und Christologie bei Augustinus*, Leiden 1986; B.J. Hilberath, *Der Personbegriff der Trinitätstheologie in Rückfrage von Karl Rahner zu Tertullians "Adversus Praxean,"* Innsbruck 1986; M. Fuhrmann, *Person*, 4: HWP 7 (1989) 274-282 (bibl.); G. Greshake, *Person*, II: LTK³ 8, 46-50, esp. 46.

B. Studer

PERSONIFICATIONS *1. Personifications of concepts.* The most ancient personifications of figurative Christian art may be the figures of the so-called *orans and the Good *Shepherd*, esp. if viewed alone, inasmuch as their symbolic expressions convey *pietas* and *philanthropia* (Klauser, *Sudien*, II, 397 and III, 112) . It is thought that a woman holding a palm branch on a *mosaic carpet of the S hall of the Theodorian estate in *Aquileia (4th c.) alludes to the *victoria eucharistica* (Mian, *La "vittoria,"* 131ff.).

2. Personifications of the church. Personifications of the church appear on the front of a *sarcophagus preserved at Perugia (late 4th c.)—facing St. *Peter and standing in place of St. *Paul, a matron is depicted alongside Christ (Ws, pl. 28,3)—and in the mosaics that adorn the basilicas of St. Pudentiana (WMM III, 42-44) and of St. *Sabina (5th. c.), where two female figures are defined by the subtitles *ecclesia ex gentibus* and *ecclesia ex circumcisione* (ibid. III, 47, 1 and 2). Also at St. Sabina, one of the panels on the wooden doors, dated approximately to the aforementioned mosaic, the church—if it is not *Mary, as has also been suggested—is represented in the form of a woman who is standing between the two princes of the apostles and in a scene of triumph (Jeremias, *Die Holztür*, pl. 68).

3. Personifications of physical elements. Similarly, in ancient Christian art, personifications of the common repertoire persist such as those of the seasons, months, sky—motifs constantly repeated in pictures and sarcophagi, without, however, acquiring new or renewed significant meanings. In the floor mosaic of the martyrial basilica of Gasr Elbia (ancient Olbia), in Cyrenaica (6th c.), a series of panels likewise includes personifications, among which are that of the lighthouse of Alexandria (Guarducci, *Epigrafia,* IV, fig. 148) and the four rivers of *paradise (ibid., figs. 144, 145). In this respect, it does not seem that a figure painted in the *cemetery of the Jordani personifies the Tigris River (Wp 212), although more certain is the identification of the Jordan in the figures represented in the context of the scenes of Christ's *baptism, as occurs in the mosaic decorations of the baptistery of the orthodox (Bovini, *Mosaici*, pl. 2) and in those of the *Arians (ibid., pl. 19) at *Ravenna. Likewise, mountains, rivers, cities and geographic locations are personified in the miniaturist codices and in the *itineraria picta*, as on the *Joshua Scroll*, the **Chronography of 354* and in the *Tabula peutingeriana*.

4. Personifications of the moon and the sun. The personifications of the moon and the sun, in bust or in entire figure, already on the front of the so-called sarcophagus of *Jonah (late 3rd c.: Ws 9, 3), on the covers of sarcophagi from the Constantinian age (Ws II, p. 300) and the scenes of the two dreams of *Joseph depicted on the hypogeum of the Via D. Compagni (4th c.: Ferrua, fig. 51), are intended to

indicate the heavenly ceiling vault, alluding perhaps to the afterlife or, more simply, to the course of human life. The symbolic component appears more explicit in the ivories of the 5th and 6th c., where the sun and the moon are personified, in the context of the scene of Christ's crucifixion to signify the end of his earthly life and to foretell the *resurrection, and of his baptism, to indicate the beginning of his human journey (Testini, *Arte mitraica,* 443-452). Added to this phenomenon of personification is that of the symbolic assimilation in the representation of Christ-Helios, as in the mosaic that adorns the vault of the mausoleum of the Julii in the *Vatican Acropolis (Sear, *Roman Wall,* pl. 53, 2-3).

5. *Zoomorphic substitutions.* The last manifestation of the process of personification is signaled by a secondary phenomenon to personification itself: the substitution of animals for human figures. On the front of the so-called Celerina arcosolium at Pretestato, the episode of *Susanna harassed by the elders is portrayed with a lamb threatened by two wolves, which are identifiable by the captions: *Susanna* and *senioris* (Dagens, *Autour du pape Libère,* 327ff.). In the cubicle of the lion (4th c.) at Commodilla, in place of Christ is depicted a lamb multiplying bread (Ferrua, *Scoperta,* 35), the *Agnus Dei* between two lambs (Peter and Paul: ibid., 37), a dove with a monogrammatic *cross accompanied by the Greek letters *alpha* and *omega* (ibid., 36), a haloed dove on a mountain (ibid., 10), with twelve other doves facing it (the apostles—ibid., 11). Likewise alluding to the apostles are the twelve doves that appear around a threefold *monogram decorating the ceiling of the baptistery of Albenga (Sciaretta, *Il battistero*, fig. 10).

LCI 3, 394-407; H. Stern, *Le calendrier de 354*, Paris 1953; G. Bovini, *Mosaici di Ravenna*, Milan 1957; A. Ferrua, *Scoperta di una nuova regione della catacomba di Commodilla*: RivAC 34 (1958) 10ff.; Id., *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960; Th. Klauser, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der christlichen Kunst*: JbAC 2 (1959) 115-145 and 3 (1960) 112-133; F. Darsy, *Santa Sabina*, Rome 1961, 81; M.C. Dagens, *Autour du pape Libère. L'iconographie de Suzanne et des martyrs romains sur l'arcosolium de Celerina*: MEFR 78 (1966) 327–381; F. Mian, *La "vittoria" di Aquileia*: AAAd 8 (1975) 131-153; R. Farioli, *Ravenna romana e bizantina*, Ravenna 1977; V. Sciarretta, *Il battistero di Albenga*, Ravenna 1977; F.B. Sear, *Roman Wall and Vault Mosaics*, Heidelberg 1977, 127-128; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, IV, Rome 1978, 476-481; P. Testini, *Arte mitraica ed arte cristiana. Mysteria Mithrae*, Rome 1979, 443-452; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom*, Tübingen 1980; C. Murray, *Rebirth and Afterlife*, Oxford 1981, 77-84; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute: una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la Via Latina*, Florence 1990 (Eng. tr.: *The Unknown Catacomb: A Unique Discovery of Early Christian Art*, New Lanark 1991).

F. Bisconti

PESHITTA. Probably between the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 3rd c., the first Syriac translation from the Hebrew OT was made, which from the 9th c. onward was called *pšiṭṭā,* i.e., "simple" and "common," to distinguish it from the version called "Greek," i.e., the translation from the *Hexapla of the LXX, made by *Paul of Tella and completed around the year 615–617. The Peshitta was not a monolithic translation, because some of its parts (such as the Pentateuch, Chronicles and the book of Proverbs) seem to have had close contact with the Targumic traditions. The text of the Peshitta already appears to have been stable in the NT citations of the OT as found in the **Diatessaron* and the *Vetus Syra*, the first "separate" translation of the gospels, which both date back to the 2nd half of the 2nd c. The Peshitta seems to have come from *Edessa, because it uses the writing and language proper to the territory of Edessa. There are many views with respect to the environments that produced the Peshitta of the OT. Recent study of the *Diatessaron* has strengthened the hypothesis of a pre-Christian formation, esp. for the most ancient books such as the Pentateuch, although the more recently translated books such as the book of Proverbs or the Psalms testify instead to a greater proximity to Christian thought.

The Peshitta of the gospels is more recent; not until the beginning of the 5th c. was the gospel text used in the Syriac-speaking churches added to that of the *Diatessaron*. A first Syriac version of what came to be called "the separate gospels" (*evangelion damepharreše*) is attested by two ancient MSS (the Syro-Sinaiticus and the Curetonian, respectively, from the 4th and 5th c.) and was called the *Vetus Syra*. This ancient version served as the basis for establishing the Peshitta's text, although it in turn was based at least in part on the *Diatessaron*. The gospel text of the Peshitta, having become the sole authorized text in Syro-Western settings starting from the first decades of the 5th c. was then subjected to radical modifications before the beginning of the 6th c. by the *chorbishop Polycarp, who, commissioned by *Philoxenus of Mabbug, made a new Syriac translation of the Greek text of the gospels (the *Philoxenia*), and then, in 616, by Thomas of Ḥarquel, who undertook a translation from the Greek text of the entire NT (the *Harqulensis*).

Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, Leiden, since 1972; W. Cureton, *Remains of a Very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syrian, Hitherto Unknown in Europe*, London 1858; A.S. Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion Damepharreshe; Being the Text of the Sinai or Syro-Antiochene Palimpsest*, London 1910; E. Pusey -

G.H. Gwilliam, *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum versionem*, Oxford 1901 (text used in the current editions of the Syriac NT); University of Munich, *Das neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, 1986 (critical ed. of the Syriac NT); G.M. Lamsa, *Holy Bible from the Ancient Eastern Text*, San Francisco 1985 (Eng. tr.). *Studies*: S. Brock, *Syriac Studies. A Classified Bibliography (1960–1990)*, Kaslik 1996, 43-52 and 54-61; J.P. Lyon, *Syriac Gospel Translations. A Comparison of the Language and Translation Method Used in the Old Syriac, the Diatessaron and the Peshitta*, Louvain 1994; G. Lenzi, *L'antica versione siriaca dei Vangeli dopo centocinquant'anni di ricerca*: Annali di scienze religiose 3 (1998) 263-278; M. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament. An Introduction*, Cambridge 1999.

K. Den Biesen

PETER, apostle

I. The ancient evidence - II. Legends of Peter - III. The veneration of Peter at Rome - IV. The veneration of Peter in the ancient world - V. Iconography.

The cult of the *apostle Peter rests on presuppositions whose veracity must first be verified: his trip to *Rome, his death and burial at the *Vatican. A critical examination of such presuppositions prepares the way for a discussion of the various forms the cult of the apostle acquired over time.

I. The ancient evidence. From the chronological point of view, it is necessary to identify the first witnesses who referred to Peter: *Clement of Rome, *1 Cor.* 5-6: ca. 95–96; *Tacitus, *Ann.* 15,44: between 98 and 117; Jn 21:18: before 100; *The Ascension of Isaiah* 4,25,8: between 100 and 125; *Ignatius of Antioch, *Rom.* 4,3: dated to 24 August 107; Suetonius, *Life of Claudius*, 25,4: ca. 120; *Dionysius of Corinth (*Eus., *HE* 2,25,8): ca. 166–174; the Roman priest Gaius (*Eus., *HE* 2,25,6-7): between 199 and 217. I have deliberately left out *Papias of Hierapolis because his testimony is ambiguous and thus subject to debate. All the other sources, however, permit one to reach the following conclusions: (1) In his epistle to the Romans, *Paul makes no mention of Peter's stay at Rome, which means that at that time Peter was not yet there. None of the other texts oblige us to deny or to affirm that this trip occurred. (2) With regard to Peter's *martyrdom, there exists an entire tradition dating to the end of the 1st c., attested by *John the Evangelist, Clement of Rome, the *Ascension of Isaiah* and Dionysius of Corinth. (3) One must make several distinctions on the circumstances of the martyrdom. The establishment of Rome as the place in which the martyrdom occurred becomes evident from the statements of Clement of Rome and *The Ascension of Isaiah*; as to the period, the age of *Nero. Moreover, Clement of Rome and Tacitus agree that there were a large number of Christian victims, and at first they seem to refer to the same event. John the evangelist indicated the mode of the martyrdom, namely, crucifixion. (4) Only one text—the testimony of Gaius—the last on our list of authors—specified the burial place. The interesting thing about this last text lies in its correspondence to a monument from that period. This monument was found in the *Vatican necropolis placed on a red wall. The monument commemorated the place in which the body of Peter was laid. From time to time, the faithful gathered here to perform the traditional commemorative rights in his honor. These rites explain how people outside Rome were able to preserve the memory of Peter's burial place.

II. Legends of Peter. Starting from about the year 100 there appeared some texts, anonymous or with suspect names, that attempted to complete the *canonical writings through an account of the teaching, actions and deeds of the apostle. (1) The *Doctrine of Peter* (early 2nd c.) and (2) The *Kerygma of Peter* (2nd c.) are two texts limited to the preaching of the apostle in the *East and mention no tie to Rome. (3) The *Acts of Peter* is a primitive form known only through fragments and uncertain citations that lead one to think that the text dates back to ca. 200. The first part refers to the *Acts of Peter* at *Jerusalem and contains two episodes with the apostle's daughter and the gardener. In the second, one finds Peter's fight with *Simon Magus, and the crucifixion of Peter upside down. This early recension was used in the writings of ps.-Clement from the beginning of the 3rd c.; the definitive form is contained in the Latin *Acts* of Vercelli (4th c). This last redaction originated in Rome and offers several points of comparison with the city's topography and iconography. It contains the **Quo vadis?*, but neither the place of martyrdom nor burial is specified. (4) The so-called *Passion* of ps.-Linus (BHL 6655) is a 4th-c. document that borrows from the preceding text, namely the *Quo vadis*? but adds the imprisonment of Peter at the Mamertine prison, the episode of the *titulus Fasciolae* and situates the apostle's death "in the naumachia near Nero's obelisk on the hill." It is also based on a 2nd-3rd-c. Vatican tradition, but with a very unrealistic perception of things and does not speak at all of Peter's tomb. (5) The *Acts of Peter and Paul* by ps.-Marcellus (BHL 6657, chs. 22-88), dated ca. 400, establish a further development of the legend likewise on the basis of preceding traditions. New elements were established by Pontius *Pilate's letter to *Claudius: the identification of the place where Simon Magus flew, the imprint left by the

knees of the apostles in prayer alongside the Via Sacra (*iuxta templum Romae*), the burial place of Peter "under the terebinth near the Vatican naumachia." (6) *The Passion of Peter and Paul* by ps.-Hegesippus and ps.-Ambrose (BHL 6648) compiled around the year 580 provides no new elements. On the basis of the *Latin Chronology* of 553 his martyrdom was dated to 29 June 57. (7) *The Martyrdom of Peter* by ps.-Abdias (BHL 6663) is another compilation made by using numerous preexisting elements such as ps.-Hegesippus. In conclusion, the legendary texts, through their ever more frequent and less trustworthy claims (from no. 3 on) concerning the topography of Rome and the Vatican, on the one hand reveal the continuity of a local tradition that connects to the monument mentioned by Gaius and the burial of Peter, and on the other, the ever more fanciful and inacurate rumors identify the circumstances of the apostle Peter's stay and martyrdom at Rome.

III. The veneration of Peter at Rome. In the **Depositio martyrum* for 29 June, one reads: *III kal. iul. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense Tusco et Basso cons*. From this piece of information one concludes that starting from 258 the Roman cult of Peter was celebrated in the catacomb of St. Sebastian and that of Paul on the Via Ostia on 29 June. The graffiti on the walls of the *triclia* (*see *memoria apostolorum*) from the catacomb dating to the 2nd half of the 3rd c. associate Paul with the cult of Peter, and specify the nature of the cult: it was a celebration of the *refrigeria* in honor of the two apostles (*see *cathedra Petri*). Neither from the graffiti nor the *Depositio* can one conclude or find a basis for this cult offered to them at St. Sebastian. Two opposing theses on this matter have been offered that, with time, have been transformed into theories. Duchesne proposed that the bodies were transferred into the catacomb during the time of the *Valerian persecution. This hypothesis is in vogue again and has apparently found confirmation in the archaeological digs of the Vatican necropolis, although the ensuing scholarly discussion has shown that the transference of the relics of Peter to St. Sebastian remains only a hypothesis. The second hypothesis was put forward by H. Delehaye, who explained the creation of this location of the cult with the impossibility of celebrating the memory of Peter at the Vatican during the Valerian persecution (257–259). According to Delehaye, it was a transference of the cult, not of the relics. Because it became impossible to perform the *refrigeria* near the tomb, the rites were transferred to St. Sebastian near a cenotaph. This hypothesis has recently been reaffirmed by M. Guarducci.

Whatever the case may be, *Constantine built the great basilica of St. Peter not at St. Sebastian but at the Vatican, it seems, in 324; the reasons for his decision are obvious. Nonetheless, around 350, the *basilica apostolorum* was erected at St. Sebastian dedicated to the joint cult of the two apostles. The basilica on the Esquiline was specifically dedicated to the apostle Peter, where his chains had already been venerated since 431, the time in which *Sixtus III tried to unite Paul to the patronage of Peter, but with little success. The second family of MSS of the *Mart. hier.* specifically identified that basilica as the first church established and consecrated by Peter, but this novelty cannot date back to the Italian recension of the martyrology. Another one of Peter's churches from the ancient period is the chapel that indicated the place in which Peter and Paul prayed when Simon Magus came crashing down on the Via Sacra. Paul I (757–767) restored it.

In addition to these constructions, works of the emperors and popes, one can add the testimonies of private individuals preserved in the iconography of the catacombs, the sarcophagi, and the golden windows, medals and other objects of the so-called minor arts. Popular testimonies come primarily from Rome. The themes follow two fundamental testimonies: either Peter and Paul appear together with Christ (personified or symbolized), or without him, with or without the apostolic college, and with a similar attitude (both either seated or standing) or differentiated by their attributes or their relation to Christ (Peter alone receives from him the law or the keys). Or rather, Peter is represented alone in various moments of his life and those invented by popular legend (e.g., the scene with the rooster, the water gushing forth from the rock, in the act of reading or being led to execution).

Christians thus expressed a faith to which the liturgical formularies provided a more theological and, in a certain way, official expression. Even the formularies invoked Peter and Paul simultaneously so that when speaking of the "apostles" without further qualification, they always intend to refer to the two sole apostles of Rome: together they founded the church of Rome with their blood and continue to teach and rule it in the person of their successor, the pope; their united authority and their care extend to the universal church, for which they serve as the foundation, the leaders and the capstone. According to liturgical formularies, Paul was the apostle of the nations (in keeping with his advance of Christianity, the primitive meaning of *gentes* [*pagans] disappeared in favor of its universal meaning),

Peter, as the shepherd of the flock. But the two titles also expressed each individual's different relationship to Christ: Paul remains "the last of the apostles," because he was last among them to be called to the faith; Peter "the first," because he was the first to confess it and because he received from Christ, along with the primacy, the responsibility of the universal pastor, which the popes inherited. Therefore, in the religious topography of the city and in *iconography, under the most varied forms, in the same liturgical *prayer there appears in every area this twofold fundamental tendency of Rome's veneration toward Peter: on the one hand he was Paul's inseparable companion, together with this symbology of the internal unity of the Roman church born *ex circumcisione et gentibus*, and on the other hand, he was the head of the apostolic college and, as a result, of the Roman Church and the church universal.

IV. The veneration of Peter in the ancient world. Among the Roman feasts, only that of 29 June achieved universal diffusion. In the *Mart. syr.*, however, it was set for 28 December; in the Coptic *calendar of *Alexandria for 5 Epaphis (= 11 July). In these two cases, one should note that Peter was considered the *coryphaeus* or the leader of the apostles. The feast of 22 February (**cathedra Petri*), however, was unknown in Africa (*Cal. Carth.*), and in *Gaul, it competed with 18 January. From this situation of competing feasts arose the compromise achieved through the Hieronymian and Gallican martyrology: 18 January, cathedra of St. Peter at Rome; 22 February, cathedra of St. Peter at *Antioch. One should also note that the calendar of *Perpetuus of Tours (d. 490) presents some ambiguities on the dating of this feast, and like the Hispanic calendars they always received that of 22 February.

The pilgrim movement solidified around these feasts: 29 January drew them from every region to Rome to venerate the tomb of the apostle; the Fathers testified to this: *Ambrose (*Apostolorum passio*), *Prudentius (*Perist.* 11,1-2, the entire 12th par.), *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 17-18, 29, 35), *Gregory the Great (*Hom. in Ev.* 37,9). The circulation of ideas accompanied all this traveling of peoples. The Roman portrayal of Peter was reiterated by *Asterius of Amasea (PG 40, 264), *John Chrysostom (PG 60, 678-679; 62, 57) and *Maximus of Turin (CCL 23, 1-8, 30-33, 426-428). *Augustine was among those preachers who wrote most on St. Peter (*Serm.* 295-299, 381; PLS 2, 462ff., 598-608, 756-758); among the most significant was *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who reiterated the pro-Petrine ideas of *Leo the Great (PG 83, 1311-1313).

It should not be surprising to find that the same pilgrims and others spread the apostle's relics and created churches after his name in their home countries. Usually they were representative relics or the links from his chains, as found in Africa from 359 at Kherbet-Oum-el-Ahdam, near *Sétif (Alg., CIL 8, 20600), in *Spain from the 4th to the 7th c. (J. Vives, *Inscr. crist.* 199, 316, 335, 374, 389, 513). Churches of the apostle existed in Gaul, *Tours, at the time of Perpetuus (d. 490), at *Vienne in the 5th c., at *Arles, during the time of *Caesarius (d. 543), S.-Pierre-de-Mouleyrès and S.-Pierre-de-Gallègue. At *Paris, the basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul received the remains of *Clovis (d. 511), *Clotilde (d. 545), St. *Geneviève (d. ca. 502), the last of which the church itself was eventually named after (the Abbey of St. Geneviève); at the end of the Merovingian era, there existed at Paris three other churches dedicated to the apostle: S.-Pierre d'Arcis, S.-Pierre-des-Boeufs and S.-Pierre-des-Bois. Even at Corbie a basilica of St. Peter arose, thanks to Clotilde, then *Chlothar I (d. 561). At Nantes a church of Sts. Peter and Paul existed in 567; at Rouen, the church of St. Peter took on the name of St. Ouen upon the death of this saint (d. 684). The missionaries sent by Gregory the Great to England spread the apostle's cult: the church of Sts. Peter and Paul in London was established by *Augustine of Canterbury (end of the 6th c.). After 653 St. Peter's of Bradwell on Sea was constructed, St. Peter of Wearmouth in 674. *Boniface, in turn, laid the roots of the apostle's cult in *Germany, but with him we come to the chronological limits set for our investigation.

BHG 1482-1501; BHL 6644-6688; BHO 933-954; W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* 2, Tübingen [5]1989, 243-289; BBKL 7, 305-320; EPapi 1, 175-194; H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, Berlin-Leipzig [2]1927; Th. Klauser, *Die römische Petrustradition im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche*, Köln-Opladen 1956; A. Rimoldi, *L'apostolo san Pietro*, Rome 1958; O. Cullmann, *Petrus*, Zürich-Stuttgart [2]1960; F. Susman, *Il culto di S. Pietro a Roma dalla morte di Leone Magno a Vitaliano (461–672)*: Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria 84 (1961) 1-193; *Saecularia Petri et Pauli*, Vatican City 1969; P.L. Vannicelli - B. Mariani (ed.), *Pietro e Paolo nel XIX centenario del martirio*, Naples 1969; D. O'Connor, *Peter in Rome. The Literary, Liturgical and Archaeological Evidence*, New York 1969; E. Kirschbaum, *Die Gräber der Apostelfürsten*, Frankfurt 31974; U. Fasola, *Pietro e Paolo a Roma*, Rome 1980; Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae* 2, Rome 1982, 633-645; M. Guarducci, *Pietro in Vaticano*, Rome 1983; J.E. Walsh, *The Bones of St. Peter*, New York 1987; C.P. Thiede (ed.), *Das Petrusbild in der neueren Forschung*, Wuppertal 1987; W. Jordan, *Das Apostelgrab, der sakrale Grundstein der Vatikanischen Basilika*, Trier 1990; J. Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter*, New York 1992; R.J. Bauckham, *The Martyrdom of Peter in Early Christian Literature*: ANRW 2, 26, 1, Berlin-New York 1992, 539-595; L. Wehr, *Petrus und Paulus – Kontrahenten und Partner*, Münster 1996; L. Hertling - E. Kirschbaum, *Le catacombe romane e i loro martiri*, Rome [5]1996, 83-111; E. Schurr, *Die Ikonographie der Heiligen*, Dettelbach 1997, 99-135; V. Saxer, *Le culte des apôtres*

Pierre et Paul à Rome: Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuixà 29 (1998) 15-27; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Memorien für Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, Berlin-New York 1999; *Pietro e Paolo. Il loro rapporto con Roma nelle testimonianze antiche*, XXIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome, 4-6 maggio 2000, Rome 2001; A. Donati (ed.), *Pietro e Paolo. La storia, il culto, la memoria nei primi secoli*, Milan 2000; J. Gnilka, *Petrus und Rom. Das Petrusbild in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*, Freiburg 2002; P. Fortini, *Nuovi documenti sul Carcere Mamertino* (*Carcer-Tullianum*) *quale luogo di culto cristiano*: Ecclesiae Urbis 1, Vatican City 2002, 503-532; S.J. Voicu, *Feste di apostoli alla fine di dicembre*: Studi sull'oriente cristiano 8 (2004) 47-77.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

V. Iconography. Peter was certainly the most represented individual in early Christian iconography, a fact that perfectly corresponds to the numerous times the apostle is mentioned in the gospels. Beyond the pertinent statistics, though useful, documenting the number of times the apostle Peter appears displayed on monuments (figures thoroughly tallied by E. Josi), thanks to recent studies one can say that a fixing of the physical features of the apostle in the figurative arts did not appear before the mid-4th c.

Previously, Peter was only depicted in a few scenes. Among the most ancient examples in which one can certainly identify the apostle, one must mention the baptistery of *Dura Europos (256): here, in the episode of Peter's being rescued from drowning, a symbolic value connected to the hope of salvation clearly appears. With a gradual spread of the scenes portraying Christ among the apostles, Peter certainly had to possess a role of primary importance, not yet clearly delineated by precise physical traits: at the end of the 3rd c. the composition developed almost in antithesis to the image of the emperor surrounded by the *apparitores*, a theme that would be largely taken up later.

The physical characteristics that would come to distinguish his person (curly hair, short beard, wide forehead) took shape in the period immediately following, between the religious peace (313) and the entire 1st half of the 4th c., alongside the birth and development of numerous other new scenes that entered into the definitive repertoire of Christian compositions.

This repertoire created the so-called Petrine cycle with episodes relating to the life and works of the apostle: a portrayal is thus given of the moment of his denial (the scene that occurs at least 70 times on decorated monuments), where Peter generally occupies a central place in the scene alongside the rooster, the interpretive key of the episode; likewise, one can often observe Peter tied between the two soldiers who arrested him; the miracle of the fountain also reappears, an episode derived from apocryphal texts, where the apostle is likened to *Moses, confirming what Augustine wrote more or less during the same period in which the scene developed (*Serm.* 351, 4: [Moses] *figura fuit Petri*). It is precisely these three moments from Peter's life that are often represented together as if they constituted part of one trilogy. A fourth episode developed over the course of the 4th c.: Peter in the act of catechizing his two prison guards Processus and Martinianus (see Bisconti). Once his facial characteristics had been defined, he was often associated with Paul. Both are represented alongside Christ in *sculpture, *painting and *mosaic (*see* also **Traditio legis et clavium*): Christ, in addition to being a *magister,* is now also an *imperator* and is joined together with his court, both symbolically opposed to the *imperatores* and earthly courts.

Scenes of this type signal the stages of the evolution in Christian representations of the 4th c., the period in which they became the vehicle of ideological opposition to the power established by determined social categories. From the representation of the apostle without a precise iconography in scenes without the message of hope in salvation, one then arrives at an iconographic definition of Peter inserted into a heavily symbolic context where, alongside the early gospel message, ideas are present that are taken from the ideologies of that historical period.

Though not lacking many examples of pictorial or mosaic representations, a good number of the monuments through which it is possible to identify the Petrine cycle are established by the sarcophagus figures (an element that per se reveals a certain client). Peter, his acts, miracles or, more simply, his figure associated to Paul's, is fully attested on the monuments of the so-called minor arts: one merely has to think about the enormous production of engraved or golden glass, upon which the heroes of classical *mythology formerly appeared, now clearly replaced by new heroes of an ideology of the ruling class that creates fashion. Peter and the miracle of the fountain are on a glass cup from Podgoritza: Peter and Paul together wish health to the users of the golden glasses or cups.

DACL 14, 822-891 (esp. 935ff.); EC 9, 1417-1420; EAA 6, 162-167; LCI 8, 158-174; C. Cecchelli, *Iconografia dei Papi*, I, *S. Pietro*, Rome 1937; G. Ladner, *I ritratti dei Papi nell'antichità e nel medioevo*, Vatican City 1941; A. Grabar, *Le portrait en iconographie paléochrétienne*: RSR 36 (1962) 87-109; M. Sotomayor, *S. Pedro en la iconografía paleocristiana*, Granada 1962; P. Testini, *Gli apostoli Pietro e Paolo nella più antica iconografia cristiana*, in *Studi Petriani*, Rome 1968, 105-130. *On the sarcophagi*: G. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*, Rome 1929–1936; F.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg, *Repertorium der*

christlich-antiken Sarkophage, I, *Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967. For images in the Roman catacombs: A. Nestori, *Repertorio topografico delle pitture delle catacombe romane* (*Roma Sotterranea Cristiana*, V), Vatican City 1975; J.M. Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum. Christian Propaganda at Rome in Fourth and Fifth Centuries. A Study in Early Christian Iconography and Iconology*, London 1982; R. Giordani, *Spigolature su un frammento di rilievo funerario a carattere cristiano di Roma*: RivAC 62 (1985) 279-297; F. Bisconti, *Altre note di iconografia paradisiaca*: Bessarione 9 (1992) 89-117; TIP 258-259.

U. Broccoli

PETER APSELAMOS or BALSAMOS (d. 309). Native of the village of Anea on the borders of Eleutheropolis (Beit-Guvrin/Bet Gubrin) in Judea acc. to *Eusebius (*Mart. Pal.* 10,2). Despite his youth, he refused to sacrifice to the gods, and thus was burned alongside the *Marcionite Bishop Asclepius. A Latin *Passio*, which reproduces the now-lost original Greek text, attributes to him the nickname "Balsamos" and affirms that he died in likeness to Christ, crucified at Aulona (Samaria). In reality, he died at *Caesarea in *Palestine on 11 January 309, a date recorded by the *Armenian Lectionary*. The *Mart. hier.* records his feast day for the same day but with much confusion over the details.

BHL 6702; BS 10, 791-792; M. Simonetti, *Nuovi studi agiografici*: RivAC 31 (1955) 244-252.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PETER CHRYSOLOGUS (ca. 380–450). The life of Peter Chrysologus, archbishop of *Ravenna, remains very obscure. From the 9th c. onward, he acquired the name "Chrysologus." The testimonies of the **Liber pontificalis*, a 9th-c. biography and certain writings attributed to him indicate that he was born at Imola around 380. Between 425 and 429, or at least before 431, he became the metropolitan of Ravenna. In 445 he was present at the death of St. *Germanus of Auxerre. Three or four years later, he wrote to *Eutychius, presbyter of *Constantinople, who appealed to him after his condemnation by *Flavian. He warned him to submit to the decisions of *Leo, bishop of *Rome and successor of *Peter. He died between 449 and 458 (the date of one of Leo's letter to his successor, Neones), probably 3 December 450, perhaps at Imola. The following are now considered to be Chrysologus's authentic works: a letter, 168 sermons of the *Collectio Feliciana* (8th c.) and another 15 sermons. Other writings, such as the famous Scroll of Ravenna and a collection of prayers (7th c.), cannot be considered authentic. The sermons for which Peter Chrysologus became famous are well known for the careful preparation of a well-prepared orator, their human sentiment and the divine fervor of a holy man. Through their examples, they also reflect the situation during that time at Ravenna, the imperial residence, an important port and agricultural center. As to the content, they are mostly homilies on passages from the gospels, but also on the Pauline letters, *Psalms, the baptismal *creed, *Lord's Prayer or on the saints. He also delivered sermons that exhorted the people to repentance. Commenting upon the *Bible and taking cues from the themes of liturgical celebrations, Chrysologus became an authoritative witness to the theological concerns of his time: the Latin teaching on the *incarnation, Catholic theological positions concerning *grace and the Christian life, and even the recognition of the primacy of the bishop of Rome. Above all, his vast work as a preacher has left us an invaluable amount of documentation on the *liturgy of Ravenna and the culture of that city, situated between Rome and N *Italy. No other bishop from this period allows us to create a more complete picture for the course of the liturgical year. Opposing the resistance of a dying *paganism and arguing against the Jews of his city, Peter Chrysologus also represents the pastoral attitude of the episcopate of the imperial church from that time. It remains a mystery why many of his sermons have been transmitted under the name of Bishop Severian/Severinus.

Editions: CPL 227-237; PL 52, 183-666: *Coll. Feliciana*; PLS III, 153-183; V, 399; A. Olivar, critical ed.: CCL 24; 24A; 24B; Text and Italian translation of sermons, ed. G. Banterle, R. Benericetti et al., 3 vols., Rome 1996/97; *Ep. ad Eutychen*: PL 54, 739-744 (see CPL 229).

Studies: BS 10, 685-691; A. Olivar, *Los sermones de san Pedro Crisólogo*, Montserrat 1962; R. Ladino, *La iniciación cristiana en san Pedro Crisólogo de Ravena*, Diss. Greg., Rome 1969; G. Lucchesi, *Stato attuale degli studi sui santi della antica provincia ravennate*: Atti dei conv. di Cesena e di Ravenna I, Cesena 1969, 51-80; F. Sottocornola, *L'anno liturgico nei sermoni di Pietro Crisologo*, Cesena 1973; A. Olivar, *Die Textüberlieferung der Predigten des Petrus Chrysologus*, in *Texte u. Textkritik*, J. Dummer (ed.), Berlin 1987, 469-487; R. Benericetti, *Il Cristo nei sermoni di C.*, Cesena 1995; L.H. Westra, *The Authorship of an Anonymus Expositio symboli*: AugR 36 (1996) 525-542; TRE 25 (1996) 290-91; LTK[3] 8, 117-118; E. Lodi, *L'esegesi biblica*: SEA 68 (2000) 617-653; LACL (2002) 570-571; PCBE 2, 1728-1730; V. Zangara, *Una predicazione alla presenza dei principi. La Chiesa di Ravenna nella prima metà del sec. V*: Antiquité Tardive 8 (2000) 265-304.

B. Studer

PETER MONGUS (d. 490). Patriarch of *Alexandria between 477 and 490. Elected by the anti-

Chalcedonian party upon the death of *Timothy Aelurus, at first he was not recognized by the patriarchs of *Constantinople (*Acacius) and *Rome (*Gelasius), who were both favorable to *Timothy Salofaciolus. But upon the latter's death, from the moment that his successor *John Talaias provided no guarantee from the political point of view, Acacius convinced the emperor *Zeno to send a letter of reconciliation to Alexandria (commonly known as the **Henotikon*). The result was a rapprochement between Acacius and Peter Mongus, even though they had different theological interpretations of the *Henoticon*'s text. This rapprochement, moreover, displeased many of the Egyptian anti-Chalcedonian *clergy and Rome. In response, Rome broke communion with Acacius (Acacian *Schism). But Peter Mongus's work enabled his anti-Chalcedonian successors to rule the Alexandrian See without rivals until the period of *Justinian and the patriarch *Theodosius.

CPG 5495-5499; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972 (esp. 174-183); Patrologia V, 356; Ph. Blaudeau, *Le cas Pierre Monge au regard des sources monophysites d'origine palestinienne (fin 5e-début 6e s.)*, SP 38 (2001), 353-360.

T. Orlandi

PETER I of Alexandria (d. ca. 311). Elected bishop of Alexandria around 300, after having directed the catechetical school (**Didaskaleion*). He was imprisoned during the last persecution, then freed around 306; arrested again and beheaded ca. 311. During the years of the persecution, he had to deal with *Meletius of Lycopolis. Meletius did not agree with Peter I's moderation toward the **lapsi* who wanted to reenter the church; he thus replaced the bishops held in prison with those who agreed with his ideas. Peter I condemned and opposed Meletius by a council held during the interval between his two imprisonments, and this measure caused the Meletian *schism. One of Peter I's brief letters concerning the schism has survived. Writing from prison, Peter warned his faithful against the false doctrines of Meletius. We know the titles of his various literary works and possess a few fragments: *On the Divinity*, which treated the divinity of Christ; *On the Advent of Our Savior*, which perhaps should be identified with the preceding work; *On the Soul*, in which he refuted the *Platonist position adopted by *Origen on the preexistence of the *soul with respect to the *body; *On the *Resurrection*, perhaps also in response to Origen, whose doctrine on the spiritual condition of the resurrected human body he refuted; a letter, probably festal, *On Penance*, whose 14 disciplinary canons have survived. These canons pertain to the sanctions imposed on the *lapsi* who were requesting readmission into the church. Perhaps the treatise *On the Passover* dedicated to Tricenius was also a festal letter.

Peter I's attack on several of Origen's teachings has led several modern scholars to suggest the idea that there was a widespread anti-Origenian reaction at *Alexandria during his time. This reaction would have also involved the exegetical principles of the great Alexandrian. In reality it was only Peter's stance against the most frequently discussed teachings of Origen, because Origen's exegesis and theology continued to exert influence at Alexandria even after Peter I's life.

PG 18, 449-522; Quasten I, 378-382 (bibl.); DCB 4, 331-334; L.B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria. Theognostus, Pierius and Peter*, Cambridge 1908; M. Simonetti, *Le origini dell'arianesimo*: RSLR 7 (1971) 317-330; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle*, Rome 1996, 219-298; E. Prinzivalli, *Magister ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo*, Rome 2002, 33-64; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1943-1947; A. Camplani, *Atanasio di Alessandria, Lettere festali; Anonimo, Indice delle lettere festali*, intr., tr. and notes, Milan 2003, 26 and 28 (festal letters for 309) and 53-54 (the discipline of the ordination of bishops and the patriarch); V. Conticello, *Un florilège sur le Grand Carême attribué à Jean Damascène. Authenticité, sources, nouveaux fragments de Sévère d'Antioche*, in *Philomathestatos. Studies . . . J. Noret*, ed. B. Jansenns et al., Leuven . . . 2004, 77-104.

M. Simonetti

PETER II of Alexandria (d. 381). Priest of *Alexandria; as *Athanasius was dying (373), he appointed him as his successor, but the emperor *Valens imprisoned him and installed the Arian *Lucius. Peter II was able to escape and find refuge with *Damasus at *Rome. Here Peter worked in favor of *Paulinus in the *schism of *Antioch, all to the detriment of *Basil of Caesarea's efforts in uniting the anti-Arians of the East. He reentered Alexandria shortly before the death of Valens (379), and in the following year he attempted to install *Maximus in place of *Gregory of Nazianzus as the bishop of the anti-Arian community of *Constantinople. His plans failed. Peter died before the beginning of the Council of *Constantinople (381).

CPG II, 2515-2517; DCB 4, 334-336; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, passim (see index).

M. Simonetti

PETER IV of Alexandria (d. 577). Upon the death of the *monophysite patriarch *Theodosius I (566),

who died in exile, there ensued a few years of confusion, after which in 575 the elderly Deacon Peter was elected patriarch by the Alexandrian clergy who were still faithful to Theodosius in opposition to the Syrian *archimandrite *Theodore. Theodore had already been consecrated by *Longinus, bishop of Nobatia. At Alexandria, moreover, there were two irregular elections and consecrations. Peter, a monk of the monastery of Enaton, situated nine miles W of Alexandria, was consecrated by *John of Cellae. To strengthen his authority in favor of the monophysites (*Jacobites), Peter immediately ordained 70 bishops (*John of Ephesus, *Hist. Eccl.* IV, 12). He was not recognized in Nobatia, which was controlled by Longinus. Peter IV was supported by *Jacob Baradeus but not by John of Ephesus (*Hist. Eccl.* IV, 15-17). Peter deposed Theodore and immediately clashed with *Paul "the Black" (of Beit Ukkame), exiled in *Egypt at that time; though resisting, he accepted the deposition of Theodore on the condition that Paul "the Black" not be excommunicated. Peter died on 19 June 577, and after a year of uncertainty, the learned *Damian succeeded him. He was also a monk from the *monastery of Enaton. From Peter's writings, only a Syriac fragment of his original conciliar letter written against Paul has survived.

CPG 7238; J.B. Chabot, *Documenta*: CSCO 17, 230 (text); CSCO 103, 161 (tr.); J. Maspéro, 223-245; Fliche-Martin IV, 619-620; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites*, CSCO 127, Sub. 2, Louvain 1951, 224-234; E.R. Hardy, *The Christian Egypt*, New York 1952, 142-152; P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus. The Church Historian*, Leuven 1981, 33-34.; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1948-1949; Patrologia V, 213-214; 391.

A. Di Berardino

PETER of Altinum (5th–6th c). Bishop of Altinum; he was ordered in 501 by *Theodoric to serve as an administrator over the church of *Rome, which was awaiting clarification on the controversy between *Symmachus and *Laurentius. Peter performed his duty in a manner unfavorable to Symmachus; instead of being neutral, he acted as Laurentius's representative; he celebrated *Easter at the Lateran while Symmachus was celebrating Mass at St. Peter's. His attitude provoked a reaction from Symmachus, who condemned Peter in a synod of 115 bishops, held at the Roman basilica of S. Maria in Trastevere (Mansi 8, 245-248; 273-290; Anast. Bibliot., *Hist. de vitis rom. pont.* 53: PL 128, 451).

PCBE 2, 1747-48.; T. Sardella, *Società, Chiesa e Stato nell'età di Teodorico. Papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996.

E. Prinzivalli

PETER of Apamea (d. after 536). A follower of the *monophysite *Severus, patriarch of *Antioch (512–518, d. 537/538), around the year 510 (during the time of the emperor *Anastasius), he became bishop of *Apamea (metropolitan of *Syria Secunda*) contrary to the *canonical norms. He erased the name of his orthodox predecessors from the *diptychs and led a very violent and scandalous life (*turpem ac omni abominatione plenam*: *Libellus monachorum*, Mansi 8,1129). Upon the restoration of orthodoxy promoted by *Justin (518–527), Peter was excommunicated by the Council of *Tyre (16 September 518; Mansi 8, 577 and 1093ff.; Hfl-Lecl 2, 1049-1050) and was forced to distance himself from his see. *Justinian, at the beginning of his reign, sought to bring the monophysites who were under the protection of *Theodora into the unity of the church. Meanwhile, she was able to place *Anthimus, who was leaning toward monophysitism, into the See of *Constantinople. Only through Pope *Agapitus's intervention in 536 was Anthimus removed and replaced by the patriarch *Menas. A council was immediately convoked to which Severus, Peter and Zoara were summoned. During their stay at Constantinople, they undertook an intense propaganda effort in favor of the heresy, even causing scandal. The council then condemned and deposed them (Mansi 8, 975-1156; a second condemnation followed at the Council of *Jerusalem in 536: Mansi 8, 1163-1176: Hfl-Lecl 2, 1142-1155). Justinian, with *Novella* 42, ratified the council's decisions.

DBC 4, 340-41 (n. 12); Bardenhewer 5, 22; DHGE 3, 920; Fliche-Martin IV, [3]1972, 339, 368-371; Beck 54 and 379.

A. De Nicola

PETER of Callinicum. *Jacobite bishop of *Antioch from 581 to 591, he was esp. important for his dogmatic writings and his controversy against *Damian of *Alexandria (578–606/7), who was also an anti-Chalcedonian bishop.

Peter's fundamental work was the *Treatise Against Damian of Alexandria*, structured in three sections or speeches (*mêmrē*), and originally written in Greek. The second section of the work has been preserved, and almost the entirety of the third exists in an ancient *Syriac translation, although the first does not seem to have left a trace, not even in the dogmatic *florilegia in the Syriac language. This treatise represents an important stage in a theological debate at the end of the 6th c. that occurred within the anti-Chalcedonian camp. Already from the year of the work's redaction, the trinitarian controversy dividing

the two patriarchs led to a *schism between the Egyptian and Antiochene churches, which, only in 616, Athanasius of Antioch and Anastasius of Alexandria were able to heal, albeit with some dissent and difficulty. This schism occurred after Damian's antitritheist treatise written around 585. Peter considered the work to be defective, but Damian responded with an apologetic treatise responding to Peter's criticisms. After a burning crisis in which ecclesiastical factors, such as the two patriarchs' testing of each other's power, had their effect, and after the *Easter of 588, Peter composed a long refutation.

To understand the terms of the new trinitarian question, one should recall that, even though the *tritheist controversy was brought to an end with the official condemnation by the Eastern episcopate (569), the questions raised by it had been inadequately resolved. If the tritheist theologians emphasized the distinction between the three *hypostases, maintaining that in the *Trinity there are as many natures or substances or divinities as there are hypostases, while the divinity common to the persons ended up being considered an abstraction (Aristotle's secondary *ousia*) rather than a reality, the majority of their adversaries lacked adequate theological reflection on the nature of the divine substance common to the three hypostases. Damian, following the example of *Theodosius of Alexandria, sought to explain this theory. Noting that the earlier "*Fathers" had used the term "property" to refer to the hypostases considered in the one divine substance, he sought to enrich it with the qualifier "characteristic," thus producing the technical expression "characteristic properties" and indicating its content: ingenerate (= *Father), generated (= Son), *proceeding (= *Holy Spirit), subsisting and unchangeable among each other inasmuch as they are ingenerate/generated/proceeding, but participating in the one substance inasmuch as they are divine hypostases. The reality of the common divine substance was thus safeguarded on the one hand, and the distinction between the hypostases, on the other.

Peter, in a long treatise against Damian, accuses the Egyptian bishop of failing to distinguish between the two senses of the term "property," i.e., property as "hypostasis," and property as "modality of being." The modality of the hypostases' being cannot, for Peter, coincide with the hypostases themselves; if in fact the hypostases were lined up with their "characteristic properties," they would lose the reality of the linguistic referent of these same hypostases. Ingeneration, generation and procession, confessed necessarily as consubstantial, could also be taken as being appearances, mere modalities of being, of the one same substance, with the great risk of falling into *Sabellianism. In the course of Peter's refutation, as in the case of Damian's, but perhaps with a superior competence, he made use of patristic authorities (*Basil of Caesarea, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Gregory of Nazianzus) with a mastery of the subject that cannot but strike the modern scholar. Nevertheless, one must point out the limits of a theological preparation and elaboration, which by that time was based solely on "ecclesiastical" learning and hardly open to the contributions of the philosophical and rhetorical heritage of the past and present.

These are Peter's other works: (a) the antitritheist *dossier*, whose character as an autonomous work, however, remains doubtful; it seems rather to have been a portion from the first section lost from the *Treatise Against Damian*; (c) a letter preserved by Michael the Syrian; (d) an anaphora attributed to him by the liturgical MSS.

Duval 365-366; Baumstark 177; Chabot 78-79; Ortiz de Urbina 165; R.Y. Ebied - L.R. Wickham, *The Discourse of Mar Peter of Callinicus on the Crucifixion*: JTS 26 (1975) 23-37; R.Y. Ebied, *Peter of Antioch and Damian of Alexandria. The End of a Friendship*, in *A Tribute to A. Vööbus*, Chicago 1977, 277-282; A. van Roey, *Une controverse christologique sous le patriarcat de Pierre de Callinique*: Symp. Syriacum 1976 (OCA 205), Rome 1978, 349-357; Peter of Callinicum, *Anti-Tritheist Dossier*, Leuven 1981; *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni Tractatus contra Damianum*, ed. R.Y. Ebied - A. van Roey - L.R. Wickham (CCG 29, 32, 35, 54), Turnhout 1994–1998.

A. Camplani

PETER of Jerusalem (d. 552). Patriarch of *Jerusalem from 524 to 552, he succeeded *John II. He was a great devotee of the ascetic St. *Saba, whom he sent to *Constantinople to intercede before *Justinian for the suspension of taxes for Christians in *Palestine, who had been reduced to poverty by the insurrection of the Samaritans. When Pope *Agapitus deposed *Anthimus, the *monophysite patriarch of Constantinople, replacing him with *Menas (536), Peter signed the condemnation. Because of the disorder caused by the *Origenist monks of Palestine supported at Constantinople by *Domitian of *Ancyra and Theodosius of Askida of *Caesarea in *Cappadocia, Peter appealed to Justinian, who through an edict ordered the bishops and abbots to sign the condemnation of *Origen (543). Later, however, Peter, along with Gelasius, abbot of Mar Saba, refused to sign the edict by which Justinian condemned the *Three Chapters: only after being called to Constantinople did he agree to sign, and he was forced to accept the two Origenist syncelli. He died in 552. One of Peter's homilies on Christmas sur-

vives in a Georgian translation, as well as a fragment on fasts. One of the primary sources for his life is *Cyril of Scythopolis's *Vita Sabae*.

CPG 7017 (homily on Christmas): I. Abuladze, *Mravalthavi*, Bulletin de l'Institut Marr de langue, d'histoire et de culture matérielle 14, Tiflis 1944, 307-316; CPG 7018 (fragment on fasts): PG 95, 76B (in ps.-John of Damascus, *De sacris ieiuniis*); DCB 4, 343-344; Hfl-Lecl 3, 1, 17; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VI^e siècle*, Paris 1925, 207-208; P. Batiffol, *Justinien et le Siège apostolique*: RecSR 16 (1926) 236-237; Fliche-Martin IV, 514, 584, 603; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, passim; Patrologia V, 314-315.

F. Scorza Barcellona

PETER of Mira. The bishop of Mira, in the 3rd quarter of the 5th c. He was one of the bishops to whom the emperor Leo (457–474) sent an encyclical letter in 458 to reestablish peace and orthodoxy in *Egypt after the Council of *Chalcedon. Only two of his letters survive: a fragmentary treatise *Contra Apollinarem* and a letter *Ad Leonem imperatorem*.

CPG 6157-6158; F. Diekamp, *Analecta patristica*: OCA 117 (1938) 50-53.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PETER of Perembolae (d. before 441). The first bishop of Perembolae, a military station in *Palestine. In his work on the life of St. *Euthymius, *Cyril of Scythopolis narrated the legendary story of Peter until his episcopate (*Vita s. Eut.* 18-21). Peter, a Greek by birth, had the name *Aspebetus* when residing in the Persian Empire and was a very high ranking official. During the period of the last *persecution (at the end of the 4th c.), instigated by the party of Magan, Aspebetus received the order to occupy the mountain passes in order to capture Christians who were escaping toward the Roman Empire. He did not follow the order; in fact, he helped the refugees escape and as a result even he was bound to flee along with his son Terebus and many relatives. Anatolius, the Eastern prefect, received them and named Aspebetus governor of the Bedouin tribes of his vassals. Terebus, who was a paralytic, received a suggestion in a dream that St. Euthymius could heal. After the miraculous healing of Terebus, Aspebetus and all his family were baptized; he took the name "Petrus" and entered the religious life. To fulfill the request of the Bedouin converts, *Juvenal, patriarch of *Jerusalem, ordained him their bishop contrary to the demands of the cathedral metropolitan of *Caesarea. Although the precise date of his ordination remains unknown, it must have occurred at least before 428. Peter participated at the Council of *Ephesus (431) where, following the advice of Euthymius, he sided with *Cyril of Alexandria. He was one of the four bishops who advised *Nestorius to travel to the council to justify himself and also one of the three who informed the council of the decisions taken by *John of Antioch, who arrived late. Peter condemned Nestorius. On his way home, Peter went to visit St. Euthymius to inform him of the decisions reached by the council. We know nothing of his life after this event.

DCB 4, 837-839; E. Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*: DOP 5 (1950) 209-279; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 75.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PETER II of Sebaste (ca. 344–ca. 394). Brother of *Basil the Great, he was born while his father was dying. He received an education in asceticism from his sister *Macrina (Greg. Nyss., *Vita Macr.*, 12-13). A priest, he probably resided at Annesi, near *Neocaesarea (Basil., *Ep.* 216) and acted as a mediator with the bishops of *Pontus (*Ep.* 203, end). He was elected to the See of *Sebaste before May 381, in opposition to the recently deceased *Eustathius. *Gregory of Nyssa dedicated to him his very openly Origenist work *De opificio hominis* and sent *Letter* 29 to him. Peter responded in what is now *Letter* 30 in Gregory's corpus of letters (PG 45, 241-244; ed. G. Pasquali, Leiden [2]1952, 89-91). He appears, moreover, in the legendary letter on the miracles of Basil (ps.-Amphilochius, CPG 3253).

BS 10, 771-772; P. Devos, *S. Pierre l'évêque de Sébastée dans une lettre de Grégoire de Nazianze*: AB 79 (1961) 346-390; R. Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003.

J. Gribomont

PETER of Trajanopolis (5th c.). Bishop of Trajanopolis (*Thrace). In 431 he participated at the Council of *Ephesus and supported *John of Antioch's Nestorian position. The council condemned him along with John and his supporters (ACO I, 1, 3, pp. 13, 25, 26). Later, however, he wrote and dedicated a short treatise (*libellus*) to the council in which, rejecting his previous position, he professed the orthodox faith and rejected *Nestorius.

CPG 3, 5799; ACO I, 1, 7, p. 139 (text of the *libellus*); PWK 19, 1327.

J. Irmscher

PETER the DEACON (d. after 604). A deacon of *Rome and a disciple of St. *Gregory the Great. After he gave his possessions to the poor, he led a monastic life under Gregory's spiritual direction. Immediately upon his election to the papacy, Gregory commissioned him first to administer the properties of the Sicilian church, and then starting from 592, while still a subdeacon, the church's landholdings in Campania. The exchange of letters between the pontiff and his administrator became frequent, as one can see from Gregory's corpus of letters (*Registr. Epist.*: PL 77, 442-1327 passim). In it, one sees the pontiff's concern for the distribution of the church's revenues for the benefit of the poor, esp. at Rome. After having returned to the city of Rome, Peter was ordained a deacon in 593 and, after the pope's death, he became the most vocal defender of the work of the pontiff, who had been accused by some people of having squandered the possessions of the church of Rome, even by way of charity. He seems to be one of the main characters in Gregory's *Dialogues* (PL 77, 150-430). A letter exists in his name bearing the title *Liber Petri diaconi et aliorum qui in causa fidei a Graecis ex Oriente Romam missi fuerunt*. Therein he affirms the doctrine of the two natures and the one *person of Christ acc. to the faith of the Council of *Chalcedon (451) and *Cyril of Alexandria.

CPL 663 and 817; PL 45, 1772-1776; 62, 83-92; 65, 442-451 (among the *Letters* of St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, no. 16); John the Deacon, *Vita S. Gregorii*, II, 11: PL 75, 92; PCBE 2, 1762-1771.

L. Dattrino

PETER the FULLER (d. 488). First *monophysite patriarch of *Antioch, and intermittently on several occasions between 471 and 488. The primary sources do not permit us to make a thoroughly reliable reconstruction of his life. It seems, however, that Peter, though initially a member of the *monastery of the *Acoemete monk at *Constantinople, distanced himself from it, perhaps because of his theological disagreements with his zealous Chalcedonian brothers. On good terms with Zeno the Isaurian, the son-in-law of the emperor *Leo, he followed him to Antioch when he was nominated *magister militum per Orientem*. Here he strengthened the opposition to the patriarch *Martyrius and succeeded him for a brief period, so that as a result the latter was forced to retire (471). Deposed and exiled by order of Leo, Peter returned a second time to the episcopal throne of Antioch during the revolt of *Basiliscus (475–477). Again expelled from his episcopal see, he finally reentered thanks to the political policy of reconciliation with the monophysites achieved by the emperor Zeno through the **Henoticon* (485–488).

A controversial and difficult person to evaluate precisely, Peter left significant vestiges of himself in certain liturgical innovations. The most important and discussed was the addition of the **Trisagion* of the *theopaschite formula ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι᾽ ἡμᾶς during his first service in the episcopate. This was the object of intense controversies in the 6th c., as the apocryphal letters sent to Peter bear witness, which are preserved in the *Collectio Sabbaitica*. In 476 he began to recite the *Creed at *Mass and also introduced the rite of the consecration of oil (μύρον) and the blessing of water on the night of *Epiphany. It was primarily these liturgical facets of his work that led some scholars to suggest that Peter be identified with the author of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, in which writings, among other things, the consecration of the μύρον is elevated to the level of a *sacrament (*Ecc. hier.* IV: PG 3, 472D-485B). The thesis, which has been reproposed by Riedinger, has not been accepted, but scholars acknowledge that the writings of ps.-*Dionysius reflect a liturgical context close to the one described in Peter's writings.

CPG 6522-6525; Zacharias Rhetor, *HE* V, 10; CSCO 83 (tr.) 233-235, CSCO 87 (tr.) 161-162; ACO III, 6-25, 217-231; E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma* (ABAW NF 10), Munich 1934, 182-183, 192-193, 210, 287-300; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et Évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VIe siècle* (CSCO 127), Louvain 1951; U. Riedinger, *Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagites. Pseudo-Kaisarios und die Akoimeten*: ByzZ 52 (1959) 276-296; Id., *Akoimeten*: TRE 2, 148-153; W. Strothmann, *Das Sakrament der Myron-Weihe inder Schrift de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia des Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagita in syrischen Übersetzungen und Kommentaren*, Wiesbaden 1978; G. O'Daly, *Dionysios Areopagita*: TRE 8, 772-780; E. Klum-Böhmer, *Das Trishagionals Versöhnungsform der Christenheit. Kontroverstheologieim V. und VI. Jahrhundert*, Munich-Vienna 1979; A. Solignac, DSp 12 (1986) 1588-1590; Grillmeier, II, 2,265-277; Patrologia V, 194-195.

L. Perrone

PETER the IBERIAN (d. 491). He received this name because he was a native of *Georgia (= *Iberia). He was one of the prominent leaders of first-generation *monophysitism. The son of King Bosmyrios, his actual name was Nabarnugi. At 12 years of age he was sent as a hostage to *Constantinople. Moved by ascetic zeal, in 437–438 he fled to Jerusalem and was received by *Melania the Younger and *Gerontius, who clothed him with the monastic habit and gave him the Christian name Peter. In 445 he settled at Maiuma near *Gaza, where he was ordained a priest. As the bishop of the city during the Palestinian rebellion against the Council of *Chalce-

don, he went as an exile in *Egypt in 453 and later consecrated Timothy Aelurus as patriarch of *Alexandria. When he returned to *Palestine, he consolidated the monophysite presence. He escaped with *Isaiah of Gaza when both men were requested to accept the **Henoticon*. Despite his intransigent rejection of Chalcedon, Peter was not a proponent of radical monophysitism, as witnessed to by his condemnation of John the Orator's Eutychian theses. He exerted great influence on the intellectual circles from which *Severus of Antioch would emerge. His quality as a visionary, esp. attested by John of Beth Rufina's *Pleroforiae*, has led some to identify him with ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite. The *Life*, another work by John and the primary source for the biography, presents Peter as the "new Moses," set apart by his itinerant existence always aspiring to the monastic ideal of *xeniteia*.

R. Raabe, *Petrus der Iberer, ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des 5. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1895; F. Nau, *Jean Rufus, évêque de Maiouma. Plérophofories*: PO VIII, 1, Paris 1912; E. Schwartz, *Johannes Rufus, ein monophysitischer Schriftsteller*: SHAW 16, Heidelberg 1912; E. Honigmann, *Pierre l'Iberien et les écrits du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*: Mém. de l'Ac. Roy. de Belg., Cl. des lettr. 47, 3, Brussels 1952; P. Devos, *Quand Pierre l'Ibère vint-il à Jérusalem?*: AB 86 (1968) 337-351; L. Perrone, *Dissenso dottrinale e propaganda visionaria. Le* Pleroforie *di Giovanni di Maiuma*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 451-495; M. van Esbroeck, *Pierre l'Ibère et Denys l'Aréopagite*, in *Proceedings of the Second Int. Symposium in Kartvelian Studies*, ed. E. Khintibidze, Tbilissi 1993, 167-177; A. Kofsky, *Peter the Iberian. Pilgrimage, Monasticism and Ecclesiastical Politics in Byzantine Palestine*: SBF 47 (1997) 209-222; J.-E. Steppa, *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway, NJ 2002; B. Bitton-Ashkelony, "*Imitatio Mosis" and Pilgrimage in the "Life of Peter the Iberian*," in B. Bitton-Ashkelony - A. Kofsky, *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, Leiden 2004, 107-129.

L. PERRONE

PETER the PATRICIAN (6th c.), also called "Peter the Orator," Byzantine historian. Born at *Thessalonica around 500, he was a lawyer at *Constantinople and the *curator* at the court of the empress *Theodora. In 539/540 he became the *magister officiorum*, and before 550 he was appointed patrician. Already in 535, Peter had carried out negotiations in *Italy with Theodahad, king of the *Goths; during that period, he was imprisoned for three years. In 552 he was sent to Pope *Vigilius, who during the course of the debate over the *Three Chapters had fled from Constantinople to *Chalcedon. In 561/562, he reached a peace treaty with the Persians. His diplomatic ability, vast learning and rhetorical talent won for him the admiration of his contemporaries. Peter died after his return from *Persia. Fragments from his *Histories* (Ἱστορίαι) are preserved in the collections of *Excerpta de legationibus* and *De sententiis*, compiled by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (1st half of 10th c.). The work was probably divided acc. to imperial reigns, beginning with the second triumvirate (43 BC); his history reached at least to the age of *Julian. Peter's primary source, cited in a few passages, was Dio Cassius. A second work was titled *On the Organization of the State* (Περὶ πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως). Belonging to it were chapters 84-85 of the first book, and also perhaps chapters 86-95 of Constantine Porphyrogenitus's book on the ceremonies. The attribution of the *palimpsest fragment Περὶ πολιτικῆς ἐπιστήμης, a work discovered by A. Mai (*Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 2, Rome 1827, 571-609), remains subject to vigorous debate. Through his reflections, Peter clearly wanted to offer practical direction for the development of a model for a constitutional monarchy established on philosophical principles. A third work, which has been completely lost and was written in common language (an event of considerable interest), discussed the peace negotiations between the Byzantines and Persians in 560/562.

Potthast 2, 921; PG 113, 663-676 (very incomplete); C. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, 4, Paris 1868, 181-199 (without the Constantinian *excerpta*); A. Mai, loc. cit., 197-246; L. Dindorf's edition of Dio Cassius, 5, Leipzig 1865, 181-232; PWK 19, 1296-1304; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 1, Munich 1978, 300-303; R. Dostálová, *Soziale Spannungen des 5./6. Jh. in Byzanz im Spiegel des anonymen Dialogs* Περὶ πολιτικῆς ἐπιστήμης. *Eine Quellenanalyse*, in *Volk und Herrschaft im frühen Byzanz*, Berlin 1991, 33-48; F. Paschoud, *Nicomaque Flavien et la connexion byzantine*: AntTard 2 (1994) 71-82; PLRE 3, 994-998; P. Antonopoulos, *Petrus Patricius. Some Aspects of His Life and Career*, in V. Vavrínek (ed.), *From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium*, Praha 1985, 49-53.

J. IRMSCHER

PETILIAN. Donatist bishop of *Constantine (ca. 395–412) and opponent of *Augustine. Originally a jurist and *Catholic, he converted to *Donatism, initially against his will (Aug., *Sermo ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem* 8). He became the chief representative of the Donatist church during Augustine's time. In 400–401 he wrote an encyclical letter to his clergy, *Epistola ad presbyteros*, to prove that *Donatus's church was the true Catholic church in N *Africa. In 401 Augustine responded with the first two books *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, to which Petilian responded with a work personally directed to Augustine (*Ad Augustinum*), in which he asserted that his opponent had never fundamentally ceased to be a *Manichean. Augustine responded again with the last book of the

Contra Litteras Petiliani. Later, around 410, Petilian wrote the book *De unico baptismo* in defense of the Donatist practice of rebaptizing their converts; Augustine responded with the work *De unico baptismo contra Petilianum*. At the Conference of *Carthage of 411, Petilian immediately emerged as the chief protagonist of Donatism: he tirelessly defended the movement's cause with subtle rhetoric and, even more effectively, succinct and caustic remarks on the arguments raised by Catholics. He spoke almost 150 times; toward the end, when it became obvious that the Donatist cause was weakening, he sought to obtain an adjournment, asserting that throat pain was preventing him from speaking (*Gesta Collationis* III, 541-542: CCL 159, 50). Once deposed from his episcopal see after the proscription of Donatism (CTh XVI, 5,52), he still tried, where possible, to gather the remaining Donatists, and he even gathered a council of bishops in *Numidia (Aug., *C. Gaud.* I, 37,47-48). He disappeared after 415.

Sources: For a reconstruction of the *Epistola ad presbyteros*, see Monceaux V, 311-318. Augustine's works against Petilian were edited by Petschenig, CSEL 52-53. *Studies*: Monceaux VI, Paris 1922, 1ff.; S. Lancel, *Actes de la conférence de Carthage en 411*, I, Paris 1972 (SC 194), 231-238; PCBE I, 855-868; P. Langa, *Réplica a las cartas de Petiliano e El unico bautismo* (*réplica a Petiliano*). *Introducción, bibliografía y notas*, BAC 33, Madrid 1990, 5-400.

W.H.C. Frend

PETITIONES ARIANORUM. In 363, after having reentered *Alexandria following the death of the emperor *Julian, *Athanasius traveled to *Antioch to meet the emperor *Jovian; several *Arians presented repeated requests to the emperor not to allow Athanasius to take possession of his episcopal see and to put in place another person instead. These requests were of no effect, but they have come down to us in the form of a dialogue between the emperor, the Arians and the crowd, in an appendix to the letter Athanasius sent to Jovian (PG 26, 820ff.). *Lucius of Alexandria was also among the Arians petitioning before the emperor. The Arians sought to set him against Athanasius as the bishop of Alexandria.

PG 26, 819-824; Simonetti 376.

M. Simonetti

PETRA. The city situated on the mountains of Idumea, 300 km (186.4 mi.) S of Amman. Petra (OT Sela?) was the capital of the Nabataeans and an important caravan city. The Romans annexed it in 105, and during the Byzantine period it was the metropolitan see of the province of *Palestine III. The earthquake of 551 signaled the decline of the city. Its beauty was achieved by cutting and embellishing rock, which was rich in stunning colors. One of the major temples, called the "Temple of the Urns" because of its decorations, in 447 was transformed into a church by Bishop Jason—as one gathers from the inscription therein (Saller - Bagatti, *Nebo*, 233; Brúnnow - Domaszewski, *Provincia Arabia*, I, 393). Another church was found SE of Qasr el-Biut. Some graffiti and several inscriptions bear *crosses, as does a lamp and various steles (Dalman, *Petra Forschungen*, 26). As a result of the Arabic occupation, the rocky city lost its strategic value.

The location has been the object of recent excavations that have led to important discoveries. Most significant is the ecclesiastical building structure known as "the Petra Church," which is found in the central N area of the city's valley, not far from a colonnade street, and which includes, in addition to the monumental basilica decorated with pavement mosaics, the baptistery and other areas that have not yet been excavated. In an area connected to the church, archaeologists have found an archive containing many papyri dating to the 6th c. AD, the reading of which is now allowing scholars the chance to shed new light on the history of the Nabatean city during the Byzantine period. Five km (3.1 mi.) W of Petra on the slopes of Jabal Harun, a small *monastery was found on the mountain. Tradition maintains that *Aaron was buried on this mountain, and on its peak one can still visit to this day a small Muslim sanctuary containing his cenotaph.

R.E. Brúnnow - A.V. Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia*, I, Strassburg 1904; G.H. Dalman, *Neue Petra Forschungen und der heilige Felsen von Jerusalem*, Leipzig 1912; S. Saller - B. Bagatti, *The Town of Nebo*, Jerusalem 1949; A. Negev, *The Nabateans and Provincia Arabia*: ANRW II, 8, 520-686; A. Negev, *Petra*: NEAEHL 4, 1181-1193; Z.T. Fiema - Ch. Kanellopoulos - T. Waliszewski - R. Schick, *The Petra Church*, Amman 2001; J. Frösén - Z.T. Fiema (eds.), *Petra. A City Forgotten and Rediscovered*, Helsinki 2002; J. Frösén - A. Arjava - M. Lehtinen (eds.), *The Petra Papyri I*, Amman 2002.

B. Bagatti - C. Pappalardo

PETRONILLA, martyr. The most ancient documentation on the saint is found on an arcosolium of the *retro sanctos* of the basilica of the catacomb of *Domitilla, the 4th-c. fresco of Veneranda: this deceased saint is portrayed at the moment of her introduction into heaven by *Petronella mart.* Petronilla then appears in the papyri of Monza as a daughter of St. *Peter and in the Roman **Itineraries* of the 7th c.

(CCL 175, 294, 299, 316, 327, 332, 341). These latter texts attest the saint's popularity, whose name replaced those of Sts. *Nereus and Achilleus as the titular of the cemetery basilica. The saint was inserted into the legendary *Passio* of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus (BHL 6061): not only did these men, former soldiers, become eunuchs and guardians of the palace of Domitilla, but Petronilla was the daughter of the apostle Peter and was miraculously healed by her father, as maintained in the *Acts of Peter*. The identification does not seem to derive from the fresco but rather from the *sarcophagus upon which the inscription reads: *Aur. Petronillae filiae dulcissimae*. The sarcophagus was considered to be that of Peter's daughter and the inscription written by the very hand of the apostle. The sarcophagus was transported by Paul I (757–767) into the chapel of "St. Petronilla" S of the *Vatican basilica (the former mausoleum of the imperial family of *Theodosius). The transfer was made in order to reunite father and daughter in burial, and to please Pepin the Short, king of the *Franks. Petronilla was considered the firstborn daughter of the church. For this reason, the *Mass of St. Petronilla continued to be celebrated down through the years in France, on the day of her feast (31 May), in the *Capella regum Francorum*.

BHL 6640m/n; BS 10, 514-521; LCI 8, 157; BBKL 7, 303-304; Ph. Pergola, *Petronella martyr. Une évergète de la fin du IVe siècle?* in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes*, Miscellanea V. Saxer, Vatican City 1992, 627-636; M. Jost, *Die Patrozinien der Kirchen Roms während desersten Jahrtausends*: Hagiographica 8 (2001) 28-31.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PETRONIUS of Bologna. According to the testimony of *Eucherius of *Lyons (PL 50, 719) and *Gennadius (PL 58, 1082-83), Petronius, after having occupied high civil offices, must have been the bishop of Bologna from 431/432 until 450. His name was connected to the construction of the church of St. *Stephen, which was designed on the model of the Constantinian basilicas in *Jerusalem. For a variety of reasons, he could not have been the author of the *Vita patrum monachorum Aegypti*, attributed to him by Gennadius, but is perhaps the author of two sermons in honor of St. *Zeno of Verona and for the anniversary of his episcopal consecration. Nevertheless, from the Middle Ages onward he was frequently venerated at Bologna.

CPL 210-211; G. Morin, RBen 14 (1897) 3-8; F. Filippini, *Petronio di Bologna*, Bologna 1948; BS 10, 521-530; E. Lodi, *Due omelie*: FS G. Lercaro, Rome 1967, 263-301 (coll. ed.); LTK³ ad. loc., 89-90; LACL (2002) 565; PCBE 2, 1723-24.

B. Studer

PHILASTER, PHILASTRIUS. *See* *FILASTER

PHILEAS of Thmuis (d. 306). Bishop of Thmuis, a city of the Nile delta, and archon of *Alexandria at the beginning of the 4th c. We possess firsthand documents on the circumstances of his martyrdom: (1) the letter sent by him to his diocese at his arrest, on his imprisonment and the tortures inflicted on the *martyrs of Alexandria (Eus. *HE* 8,10, 2-10); (2) his defense, i.e., the minutes of the verbal trial of the fifth and final audience during which the prefect of Egypt Culcianus condemned him to death 4 February 306 (Bodmer Papyrus XX); (3) the *Acta* composed in Latin of his martyrdom and of the martyrdom of Philoromus (BHL 6799). The first two documents are very close to the events; the last goes back to the end of the 4th c.

F. Halkin, *L'Apologie du martyr Philéas de Thmuis et les Actes latins de Philéas et Philorome*: AB 81 (1963) 5-30; V. Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer XX. Apologie de Philéas, évêque de Thmuis*, Geneva 1964; BS 5, 686-687; *Acta Phileae*: BHL 6799; BHG 1513k, m; *Atti e passioni dei martiri,* critical text and comm., ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen et al., Milan, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1987, 247-337; G.A.A. Kortekaas, *De Acta van Phileas*, in *De heiligenverering in de eerste eeuwen van het christendom*, ed. H. Hilhorst, Nijmegen 1988, 138-150; V. Saxer, *Atti dei martiri dei primi tre secoli*, Padua ²1989, 209-223; J. Fontaine, *Littérature narrative sur le martyre et l'ascèse, de 280 à 370 après J.C.*, in *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, V: *Restauration et renouveau. La littérature latine de 284 à 347 après J.C.*, ed. R. Herzog, avant propos de J. Fontaine, Turnhout 1993, 588-589; Th. Baumeister, *Fortschritte in der ägyptischen Hagiographie*, in *Divitiae Aegypti. Koptologische und verwandte Studien zum Ehre von Martin Krause*, Wiesbaden 1995, 9-14; Id., *Der ägyptische Bischof und Märtyrer Phileas*, in *Garten des Lebens. Festschrift für W. Cramer*, ed. M.B. von Stritzky - Ch. Uhrig (Münsteraner theologische Abhandlungen 60), Altenberge 1999, 33-41; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Agli inizi dell'agiografia occidentale*, in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, sous la direction de G. Philippart (CC. Hagiographies III), Turnhout 2001, 75-77.

V. Saxer

PHILIP, apostle. He is named between John and Bartholomew in Mt 10:3 and Lk 6:14; after Andrew in Mk 3:18/Acts 1:13; together with Andrew in Jn 12:22. The two names (Philip and Andrew) are Greek. According to Jn 1:44, Philip was born in Bethsaida as were Andrew and Peter. In Jn 6:5-7, Philip is called by Jesus before the multiplication of the loaves. In Jn 12:20-23, the Gentiles who want to be introduced to Jesus turn to him. According to *Clement (*Strom*. III, 25,3) he was the anonymous person to whom Jesus said the phrase in Mt 8:22/Lk

9:60. *Papias, *Polycrates of Ephesus, and the apocryphal *Acts Andr.* and *Acts Phil.* confuse the apostle Philip with *Philip "the deacon" (Acts 6:8 and 21:8). Clement (*Strom.* III, 52,5; cf. Eus., *HE* 3, 30,1) also talks about the daughters of the apostle Philip, but only to refer to the fact that the father married them. He is one of the eleven apostles presented as authors of the *Ep. Apostolorum* (2,13).

He is one of those who question Jesus during the gnostic disputes (*Sophia J. C., Pistis Sophia, Books of Jeu*). *Pistis Sophia* 42-44 presents Philip as an author of the deeds and acts of Jesus, as were Thomas and Matthew. Therefore he is the presumed author of one of the three principal apocryphal gospels, so highly prized in certain gnostic circles. The *Ev. Phil.* was known only through a brief citation of *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 26,13,2-3). It was known that it had been used by the *Manicheans (Tim. of Constantinople: PG 86, 21C; ps.-Leontius of Byzantium: PG 86, 1213 C). The document in *Coptic discovered in *Nag Hammadi (NHC II, 51,29–86,19) is a collection of the sayings of Jesus which offers an important contribution to our very limited knowledge of gnostic theology and sacramental practice. It is a collection that seems to combine elements of the tradition of "Thomas," a few extracts of elements linked to the *Apocryphon of John* and *Hypostasis of the Archons*, and longer passages with a style and theology similar to those of the fragments of *Valentinus and the *Gospel of Truth*. From Nag Hammadi (NHC VIII, 132,10–140,27) comes also a *Letter of Peter to Philip* (a gnostic dialogue of the risen Savior with his disciples) in which Philip is mentioned only at the beginning. Rather than a letter, it is of the same literary genre as the *questiones* and *responsiones* illustrated by the *Epistula apostolorum*. The *Letter* presents a chronological distinction between a period in which the apostles do not believe in the supposed gnostic teaching of Jesus and a period of full understanding. According to the most ancient tradition (Heracleon, in Clem., *Strom.* IV, 71,3), Philip did not die a martyr.

R. Trevijano

PHILIP, apostle (apocryphal). Philip the apostle is mentioned in the synoptic gospels only in the lists of apostles, while he appears several times in the gospel of John (6:5-7; 12:21-22). According to *Clement of Alexandria, the words of Mt 8:22 were addressed by Jesus to Philip (*Strom.* 3,25,3). Philip must have had four daughters (cf. Eusebius, *HE* 3,39,9). Philip preached probably in Greece and Asia Minor (*Phrygia) and died in Hierapolis; acc. to the apocrypha he suffered martyrdom. Philip became in the following centuries an emblematic figure in Phrygia (*Papias, *Polycrates, *Eusebius); already in antiquity he had been confused with *Philip the Deacon (Acts 6:5; 8:5-13, 26-40; 21:8). We find the same error in the most important apocryphal narrative on Philip, the *Acts of Philip* in Greek: one part is dedicated to the apostle (1,8-15, *Mart.*), the other to the deacon (3-7). The *Acts* constitute a series of texts on Philip: an orthodox section (2) is inserted in a body of a radically *Encratite character. The text of the *Acts of Philip*, published in volumes 12-13 of the CCAp, is the fruit of long research: today we have most of the text available. Independent of the Greek *Acts* are the Latin text (ps.-Abdias X), the text in *Syriac and in Arabic of the *Acts of Philip at Carthage*, the *Acts of Philip and Peter* in *Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopian and an Irish legend. The gnostics were interested in Philip: acc. to the *Pistis Sophia*, Philip wrote the sayings of the Lord (42-44); an existing gnostic text, the *Gospel of Philip*, extremely important for knowledge of the sacramentology of the Valentinians, is preserved in Coptic among the texts of *Nag Hammadi (cod. II), along with a *Letter of Peter to Philip* of the same group of texts of Nag Hammadi (cod. VIII). Italian archaeologists have made important excavations in the (octagonal) basilica of S. Philip at Hierapolis (Pamukkale).

CANT 20; 26; 250-255; BHG 1516-1530; BHL 6813-6818; BHO 974-984; BS 5, 1964, 706-711; LCI 8, 1976, 198-205. *Editions*: F. Bovon - B. Bouvier - F. Amsler, CCAp 11-12, 1999 (text, commentary, bibl.—a fundamental work); Id., *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*, Apocryphes 8, Turnhout 1996; Id., EApC 1, 1997, 1181-1320—previous translations were based on an imperfect form of the text; P. Verzone, *Hierapolis di Frigia nei lavori della missione archeologica italiana*: Quaderni di La Ricerca Scientifica 100 (1978) 391-475 (or Martyrium 448-457); T. Ritti, *Fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche* (Hierapolis, Scavi e ricerche), Rome 1985; *Hierapolis di Frigia, 1957–1987*, ed. A. Peres, Milan 1987; A. Frey, *L'éloge de Philippe, saint apôtre et évangéliste du Christ* (*BHG 1530b*): Apocrypha 3 (1992) 165-209 (édition du texte); M. van Esbroeck, *Les actes syriaques de Philippe à Carthagène en version arabe*: OrChr 79 (1995) 121-146. The *Gospel of Philip* and the *Letter to Philip* have been published in the collection of Nag Hammadi texts; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Il "Vangelo secondo Filippo." Rassegna degli studi e proposte di interpretazione*: ANRW II, 25,5, 1988, 4107-4166; J. Jacobsen Bucley, *Conceptual Models and Political Issues in the Gospel of Philipp*: ibid., 4167-4194; Lipsius-Bonnet 2, 2, 1-53; Supp., 64-73; F. Bovon, *Les Actes de Philippe*, ANRW II, 25,6, 4431-4527; A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 424-432; F. Amsler, *The Apostle Philip, the Viper, the Leopard and the Kid. The Masked Actors of the Religious Conflict in Hierapolis of Phrygia* (*Acts of Philip VII-XV*), in 1996 Seminar Papers (SBLSP), Atlanta 1996, 432-437; Id., *Remarques sur la réception liturgique et folklorique des Actes de Philippe* (*APh VIII-XV et Martyre*): Apocrypha 8 (1997) 251-264.

M. Starowieyski

PHILIP, deacon. Acts (6:5; 8:5, 12-13, 26-40) speaks of "one of the Seven," of an "evangelist" (Acts 21:8), Philip by name. The identification of the ministry of the "Seven" in the church in Jerusalem (Acts 6) with that of the deacon is very questionable and does not appear before *Irenaeus (*Haer,* I, 26,3; III, 12,10; IV, 15,1) and, after, in *Cyprian (*Ep.* 3,3). Some writers confused this "evangelist" with the apostle *Philip, one of the Twelve. They speak of the apostle Philip, father of daughters (*Papias, in Eus., *HE* 3,39,9), of virgins (*Polycrates of Ephesus, in Eus., *HE* 3,31,3), of prophetesses (the Montanist Proclus, in Eus., *HE* 3,31,4), buried at Hierapolis. These are the daughters of Philip in Acts 21:8-9. On the other hand, *Jerome was shown, in *Caesarea in 385, the house of Philip and the residences of his daughters. The same confusion appears in the *Martyrdom of Andrew* (Lipsius - Bonnet II, 1,47), where the apostle Philip ends up a missionary in Samaria. The principal personages of the *A. Phil.* (ibid. 1-98), the apostle and the "deacon," are the same person. This work is a compilation of fifteen different *Acts*. The combination of two Philips into a single person is obvious particularly in the first 7 *Acts*, those most marked by *encratism. The compilation seems to be the product of Encratite circles of Asia Minor of the middle of the 4th c. The *Acts* 8-15, the oldest and most important section, with various ancient translations, constitutes, as a unitary account, the *Acta Philippi in Hierapolis*, which finishes with the *Martyrium*; the work, which depends on older legends, was probably composed in the 5th c.

Lipsius-Bonnet, I, 1-2; Erbetta I, 213-243 (gospel), II, 451-490 (*Acts*); R.M. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip*, London 1962; J.-E. Ménard, *L'Evangile de Philippe*, Strasbourg 1967; A.H.C. van Eijk, *The Gospel of Philip and Clement of Alexandria*: VChr25 (1971) 94-120; BS 5, 719-721; A. de Santos Otero, *Jüngere Apostelakten*, in W. Schneemelcher, II, Tübingen [5]1989, 380-438; G.P. Luttikhuizen, *The Evaluation of the Teaching of Jesus in Christian Gnostic Revelation Dialogues*, in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, Leuven 1989, 363-372; M.L. Turner, *The Gospel According to Philip. The Sources and Coherence of an Early Christian Collection*, Leiden 1996; R. Trevijano, *La Biblia en el cristianismo antiguo. Prenicenos. Gnósticos. Apócrifos*, Estella 2001.

R. Trevijano

PHILIP, presbyter (d. after 431). As Roman legate he took part, along with the bishop *Faustinus of *Potentia* and the Roman priest Asellus, in the delegation sent before December 418 by Pope *Zosimus to *Carthage to handle the case of *Apiarius, priest of *Sicca Veneria*, who, having been excommunicated by his bishop *Urbanus, had appealed to *Rome. They took a *scriptura emandata* with them, where their role was defined, and a *commonitorium* in four points, given to them to treat with the African episcopate the question of the appeals to Rome and of episcopal visits to the court, as well as that of priests and deacons excommunicated by their bishop, and finally the question of Urban, whom the pope threatened to excommunicate or judge at Rome if he did not change his behavior. The African episcopate contested some canons (presented as being from *Nicaea, while in reality they were from *Serdica), while declaring to Zosimus, through a letter prior to 26 December 418, that they agreed provisionally—until further results of the inquiry—to observe the contested canons. Meanwhile, a letter from the new pope *Boniface I and a new delegation arrived. Philip was present at the Council of Carthage of 25 May 419 and of 30 May, where the canons were contested again and the *canones in causa Apiarii* were ratified. Philip signed the *Acts* and carried back to Rome the *Acts* of the council and a letter of the African bishops.

Philip also took part, along with the bishops Arcadius and Projectus, in the Roman delegation charged to represent Pope *Celestine at the Council of *Ephesus (431) with the intention of ending the conflicts between *Cyril of Alexandria and *Nestorius of Constantinople. He was also instructed to defend the authority of the Apostolic See and to model his attitude in everything on that of Cyril. Because of delays through the difficulties of the sea voyage, Philip and the other legates arrived with the work already begun. In the session of 10 July, Philip spoke in Latin (the first of the legates) to request the reading of the original letter sent by Pope Celestine to the council, then to solicit the reading of the Greek translation; he also intervened with Arcadius to protest the communication of the conciliar *gesta* prior to the arrival of the delegation. He recognized the canonical character of the deposition of Nestorius; he profited from the occasion to defend the Roman primacy and the accord between the church of the West and that of the East in condemning Nestorius. He signed immediately after Cyril the letter sent to the clerics of *Constantinople to confirm the deposition of Nestorius, and is associated with the sentence of excommunication brought against Nestorius, in a *relatio* sent from the council to *Theodosius II. He was also present in other sessions, signing the minutes and the various letters.

Furthermore, along with the legate Arcadius, Philip was one of the eight delegates chosen from the Cyrillian party to participate in the contrary re-

union called at Constantinople by Theodosius II. Having arrived at *Chalcedon, Philip, like the other Cyrillian delegates, had to confront the representatives of the Antiochene party multiple times between 11 September and 25 October 431; and, like his colleagues, he defended, but without success, the cause of the council before the senate and before the emperor. Later he was present in Constantinople at the designation of *Maximian, new bishop of the imperial capital, of whose election he also informed Pope Celestine and the other churches. Incardinated in the *ecclesia Apostolorum* (at least from 431), Philip was already old when he was charged with supervising the construction of a new church, also with imperial donations, completed under Pope Sixtus (432–440), in the last two years of his pontificate.

L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976; PCBE II, 1786-1792.

M. Palmieri

PHILIP, priest (d. 455/456). A disciple of *Jerome (Gennadius, *De viris ill.* 63) from whom there has reached us a commentary on the book of Job, an important witness of the Vulgate. There are two recensions of it, a long and a short (CPL 643 and 757; PL 26, 619-802 and 23, 1407-1470). The introductory letter and several fragments are in A. Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, Vatican City 1933, 316-322.

CPL 643; J. Bauer, *Corpora orbiculata. Eine verschollene Origenesexegese bei Pseudo-Hieronymus*: ZKTh 82 (1960) 333-341; Patrologia III, sp. ed. (ed. A. Di Berardino), Madrid 1981, 290; RAC 15, 405-406.

J. Gribomont

PHILIP of Gortyna (2nd c.). Bishop of Gortyna (*Crete) around 170. *Dionysius of Corinth, writing to the church of Gortyna, praised Philip for the faith and courage of his church and exhorted it to preserve itself from heretics, perhaps Marcionites (Eus., *HE* 4, 23,5). Philip wrote a work against *Marcion (Eus., *HE* 4, 25).

E. Prinzivalli

PHILIP of Side (5th c.). Disciple in Side (Pamphilia) of Rhodo, he was ordained deacon and priest by *John Chrysostom, with whom he was linked by close friendship (*Ep.* 213; PG 52, 729). He competed three times for the *patriarchate of *Constantinople (426 *Sisinnius; 428 *Nestorius; 431 *Maximian). He refuted the writing of *Julian the Apostate *Against the Galileans*. His voluminous *Christian History* in 36 volumes, in around a thousand chapters, began with the creation of the world and reached to 426. It was published between 434 and 439; it often departed from the chronological order and had continual digressions of every kind (geometrical, astronomical, musical, geographical, botanical, etc.); the style also was verbose (Asian) and lacking refinement. Some fragments and extracts remain; important are those which complete the *HE* of *Eusebius (e.g., on *Papias of Hierapolis, on the catechetical school of *Alexandria).

CPG III, 6026; Socrates, *HE* 7,26-27.29.35; Photius, *Bibl.* 35; Bardenhewer 4, 135-137; Quasten II, 533-535; Altaner 228; BBKL 7, 510-512.

A. De Nicola

PHILIP the Arab. Emperor from 244 to 249. According to *Eusebius (*HE* 6, 34), who probably bases his account on the letters of *Origen to Philip and to his wife (mentioned in V6I,36,3)—the information is confirmed by two independent authors, of Antiochene tradition, *John Chrysostom in one of his sermons on *Babylas of Antioch (PG 50, 539-544) and the **Chronicon Paschale* (Dindorf I, 503)—the emperor Philip and the empress Otacilia Severa were submitted to public penitence by Babylas, bishop of Antioch, during a paschal vigil, for the assassination of the young son of Gordian III, entrusted to them by his father. Philip might then have been the first Christian emperor, and if Eusebius does not mention him in his *Life of Constantine,* it could be because Constantine included the memory of Philip in the *damnatio memoriae* of his supposed descendant Licinius. The objections constantly raised by historians to the Christian faith of Philip could thus find a partial response. A further objection, however, sees the supposed Christianity of Philip as the result of an identification between the empire and the new religion practiced by *Orosius on the occasion of the millennial celebrations of the city (*ludi saeculares*) organized by Philip, an identification supported by his policy of tolerant syncretism even toward Christians. A sign of that toleration appears in his relations with Origen, as well as the speech *Eis basileia* of the ps.-Aristides, probably addressed to him, where themes dear to Origen and to *Cyprian are found, such as divine providence or universal peace. One can also think that the attribution of “Christian” sentiments to Philip might be an indirect consequence of his hostility to *Decius, the great persecutor of Christians.

J.M. York, *The Image of Philip the Arab*: Historia 21 (1972) 320-

332; H. Crouzel, *Le Christianisme de l'empereur Philippe l'Arabe*: Gregorianum 56 (1975) 545-550; F. Elia, *Ancora sul cristianesimo di Filippo l'Arabo*: QC 1 (1979) 267-283; M. Pavan, *Filippo l'Arabo e il millenario dell'Urbe*: PP 45 (1990) 401-419.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

PHILIP the Gnostic (3rd c.). A disciple of *Bardesanes, he belongs to the E branch of Valentinianism. According to some scholars (e.g., Nau, Quasten, Drijvers), he would be the author of the *Book of the Laws of the Nations*, a writing composed in dialogue form, but in reality a monologue interrupted by some questions, traditionally attributed to *Bardesanes, in which the master responds to the questions of the disciples on the characters of men and the influence of the planets. This text, mentioned by *Eusebius (*HE* 4, 30,1-3) and preserved in the original language, represents one of the most ancient documents of *Syriac literature (if one excludes the translations of the Bible).

The Syriac text of the *Liber legum regionum* with Fr. tr.: F. Nau, PS, p. I, t. 2, Paris 1907, 490-658; It. tr. and ed. by G. Levi della Vida: *Il dialogo delle leggi dei paesi*, Rome 1921 (rev. ed. by R. Contini, Rome 1989); W. Drijvers, *Bardesanes of Edessa*, Assen 1966; G. Widengren, *Bardesanes von Edessa und der syrisch-mesopotamische Gnostizismus*, in *The Many and the One. Essays on Religion in the Graeco-Roman World presented to H. Ludin Jansen*, Trondheim 1985, 153-181; A. Camplani, *Rivisitando Bardesane. Note sulle fonti siriache del bardesanismo e sulla sua collocazione storico-religiosa*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 19 (1998) 519-596; I. Ramelli, *Linee generali per una presentazione e per un commento del "Liber legum regionum" con traduzione italiana del testo siriaco e dei frammenti greci*: RIL 133 (1999) 311-355; Id., *Bardesane e la sua scuola tra la cultura occidentale e quella orientale. Il lessico della libertà nel "Liber legum regionum."* (*testo siriaco e versione greca*), in *Pensiero e istituzioni del mondo classico nelle culture del Vicino Oriente*, ed. R. Bianca Finazzi - A. Valvo, Alessandria 2001, 237-255.

C. Gianotto

PHILIPPI. "The city of Philippi was once called Datos and, even before, Krēnides, because of the numerous springs of water (*krēnai*) which emerge from its hills. Philip II of Macedon furnished it with fortifications, because it was the most flourishing city of *Thrace, and named it for himself as Philippi" (Appian, *Bell. civ.* 105, 439). A city of *Macedonia, it is on the Via Egnatia; after the battle of Philippi in 42 BC it became a Roman colony with Roman organization. The apostle *Paul reached it with his followers at the end of 49–50, from Troas, following the vision that disclosed new paths and opened new horizons to him in his apostolic mission (Acts 16:8-10). From the first years of Christianity nothing is preserved at Philippi that might shed light on the organization, worship and activity of the first community. The small and poor environments which probably were transformed into domestic churches have been destroyed. The church discovered several years ago belongs to the 2nd half of the 2nd c.

Late Antiquity is the period of maximum splendor of Christianity at Philippi. It is not logical, however, to expect grand Christian religious edifices immediately after the *persecutions. In the center of the city, to the E of the agora, is an important "Macedonian" tomb of the 2nd c. BC with a rich assortment of golden objects (a crown of oak leaves, a finely worked diadem, etc.). Above the funeral chamber there was a construction in the form of a *naos,* of which the foundations remain. It is a monument dedicated to the deceased hero *Euephenes Exekestou,* as the epigraph of the sarcophagus says, and who, as is deduced from some discoveries, being a priest of the Cabeiri, was also considered, acc. to a later legend, the founder of the city and was venerated with a particular cult. Next to this late Hellenistic tomb the first house of prayer of the Christian community of Philippi was founded: a single-aisled hall with an apse with rectilinear termination, whose form appears to be conditioned by the presence of a street linking the Via Egnatia with the market street, which bounded the Roman forum to the S. The construction up to the limit of the altar, 10.5 m (34.5 ft) high, following successive enlargement reached 18 m (59 ft). The restructuring allowed the late Hellenistic tomb to be included in the construction. A transversal wall, more or less at the center of the oratory, in which arcades or passages must have been opened, divided the hall into two areas: probably this fulfilled the function of supporting the roof. The *mosaic decoration of the floor corresponded to this internal articulation of the edifice. The E part includes six sectors, placed side by side in pairs and surrounded by panels, with intervals enlivened with trees, peacocks and small birds that pick at fruit or else *peacocks next to vases, stems that sprout from the vases, etc. On the E side of this composition, at the center of the *tabula ansata,* an inscription on three lines, composed of golden, red, blue and white tesserae, reads: ΠΟΡΦΥΡΙΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΚΕΝΤΗΣΙΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ ΕΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ. The Bishop *Porphyry to whom the inscription refers is the noted bishop of Philippi who was a signatory at the synod of *Serdica (342–343). In the years of his episcopal ministry, Porphyry substituted the present mosaic for an older and coarser one, less valuable, which covered the floor. The construction of the church can therefore be dated back several decades, but still after the *Edict of Milan (313). The other mosaic composition that

covers the floor of the S part of the church is divided into four grand sectors in which animal and floral themes are enclosed in a geometric decoration. At the center of these sectors an inscription with black letters on a white field has been discovered: ΧΡΙΣΤΕ ΒΟΗΘΙ ΤΟΥ ΔΟΥΛΟΥ ΠΡΙΣΚΟΥ ΣΥΝ ΠΑΝΤΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ. Around the end of the 4th c. Philippi began to lose the urban outline that the Romans had given it with sumptuous public edifices and streets on a regular plan. With the peace of the church, the ecclesiastical Christian architecture began to develop, of which we will record the principal monuments.

The octagonal basilica. Born from a small church dedicated to St. Paul, it became the cathedral of the city. It is an octagonal construction with an internal *peribolos* of columns that make a deambulatory within the central nucleus: to the E is the shallow apse with the *subsellia*; to the W a narthex slightly larger than the *naos*. To the W of the narthex, and of the same size, is placed the triporticoed atrium with the font, which occupies the space of the W portico. To the S a semicircular vestibule (*propylaeum*) opens that, with a monumental entrance with three flights of stairs, links the temple with the market street. The floor is in marble slabs; the perimeter walls of the hall and the atrium had rich decorations in marble and in *opus sectile* with various themes (plants, fish, etc.). Around the middle of the 5th c., the octagonal structure was transformed by the insertion of an inscribed square, the enlargement of the apse, new *subsellia* and the addition of galleries. In the 1st half of the 6th c., in the first inscribed octagon very few structural modifications were done, limited to reinforcing with plinths the corner pilasters of the temple, forming four angular apses, which therefore underwent alterations. The angular pilasters, having become thicker, altered the original proportions of the building; the atrium, which linked the octagon A and B, together with the font and the splendid vestibule that opened to the market street, was eliminated and replaced with a modest courtyard open to the sky. Centered on the octagon were the constructions indispensable for liturgical life: to the NW the font, to the NE the baptistery, perhaps the best preserved of its kind in all its parts (vestibule, changing room, cathecumeneum, hall of the baptistery, in the middle of which was found the cruciform pool, and chrismarium linked with the E sector of the *naos*). More to the N, separated from the complex of the baptistery by a dividing wall, the structure of a bath has been discovered, used from the late Hellenistic era until the destruction of the city. To the NE of the octagon an imposing episcopal palace on two levels has come to light, whose architectonic phases mirror those of the octagonal basilica. The complex of the octagon constitutes a scheme of paleo-Christian ecclesiastical architecture rare if not unique in the area of the E basin of the Mediterranean, including *Syria.

The basilica outside the walls. To the E, 500 m (.3 mi) from the walls of Philippi are the ruins of a paleo-Christian basilica brought to light in the years 1956–1957, 33 m x 15.5 m (108 ft x 50.9 ft): it has three aisles, galleries and a semicircular apse to the E with presbyterial bench. Nothing remains in the space of the altar except the altar of consecration and the *thalassidion*. The *naos* proper reveals two architectonic periods; it was preceded by a narthex and by a quadriporticos, of which it has been possible to excavate only the E portion. Along the N perimeter wall five areas were attached; the functions of three of them have been identified. The smallest zone, to the NW, functioned as a landing for the entrance stairway to the galleries; the other two, as could be certified from the discoveries, were the place of the offerings (*prothesis*) and the room of the deacons (*diaconicon*). In the 4th c. the basilica had a transept with stylobate columns and a floor mosaic with geometrical, animal or vegetable figures framed in multicolored cornices of various kinds. Below the pavement of the basilica, in correspondence with the naves and the narthex, many vaulted or chest tombs have been discovered, for the most part of clerics, and also inscriptions now preserved in the local museum. The foundation of the basilica dates back to the middle of the 4th c., i.e., to the reign of *Constantius II (337–361). The coins of a later date found in more recent levels of the construction belong to the era of *Theodosius II (408–450). In 473 the *Goths reached Philippi without succeeding, however, in taking the city: "they made only raids outside the walls of the city and did not perform any other cruelty" (Malchus, ed. Bonn 1829, 234ff.). It is nevertheless obvious that in the course of this incursion the basilica that was outside the walls, "in front of the city," was partially destroyed. It is not possible to tell if restorations were carried out: perhaps the church remained abandoned for several decades or perhaps it was used in a haphazard way until the epoch of Justinian, when in the works of rebuilding it underwent the above-mentioned modifications. The second period of the basilica was finished a little before the era of Leo VI (886–912). In the 5th c. in particular, but also in the 6th, other splendid churches were built at Philippi, without the Octagon losing its ancient prerogative as the cathedral of the city. Another basilica has been discovered 400 m

(437.5 yd) to the S of this basilica, datable between the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th c., with three aisles and a narthex with mosaic floor; next to the basilica is a sepulchral complex made up of two chambers and a common vestibule.

Basilica A. Built around the end of the 5th c. at the foot of the acropolis, above a natural terrace situated to the N of the Roman forum, it is notable for its dimensions of 130 m x 50 m (426.5 ft x 164 ft). The basilica was connected to the Via Egnatia through a monumental staircase that reached into the atrium or quadriporticos, whose S side was occupied by a fountain for ablutions, which presented itself as a structure on two floors. In the thick wall of the pool five niches open: the central, larger than the others, served as a sacristy and for other liturgical necessities; the others, alternatively square and semicircular, were closed with parapets that made little basins. From the atrium, three entrances led to the narthex and from here as many doors admitted into the basilical interior of three aisles with transept. In the altar the hollow of the consecration stone and the series of *subsellia* on the N and S sides have been discovered. On the N side of the basilica is the staircase, which leads to the galleries and two other areas whose function is unknown.

Basilica C. More to the W and a short distance from Basilica A, a three-aisled basilica has been discovered, with transept, rich furnishing of *sculpture and splendid marble decoration in the lateral sectors of the transept, with tribunes, a narthex, an atrium to the N and annexes in a more elevated position, which were accessed via a stair, and a hall that served as *diaconicon*, i.e., a deposit of the offerings that did not serve for the eucharistic service (cf. **Apostolic Canons* 3). In the 6th c. it underwent modifications for liturgical adaptation with the creation of an inscribed transept and with various other interventions; the date has been confirmed by the discovery of a coin of Justinian.

Basilica B is a domed basilica, built around 550 in the center of the Roman city, to the S of the forum, on the market street. It has three aisles separated by colonnades of six columns, a large altar and semicircular apse extending to the E, narthex to the W, and rooms laid out along the perimeter, among which is the fountain for the ablutions and an extension to the N. The sculptures that decorated capitals, bases, abacuses and gates are of exceptional quality, comparable to those of Hagia Sophia of Constantinople. This basilica has been placed in relationship with Bishop Demetrius, who had a close relationship with Justinian, and was active in 531–534. From the 7th c., Philippi lost the importance that it had enjoyed for so many centuries. Slowly the monuments fell into ruin, and the city was reduced finally to insignificance. Despite this, the tradition of the veneration of Paul the apostle was kept alive even after the radical destruction of the city at the time of Turkish rule.

P. Lemerle, *Les inscriptions latines et grecques de Philippes*: BCH 59 (1935) 126-164; P. Collart, *Philippes, Ville de Macédoine*, Paris 1937; P. Lemerle, *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale*, Paris 1945; S. Pelekanidis, Ἡ ἔξω τῶν τειχῶν παλαιοχριστιανικὴ βασιλικὴ τῶν Φιλίππων: AE (1955) 114-179; PAAH 1958-1965, 1967-1979 (for a general reconsideration of the excavations of the complex of the Octagon at Philippi); R.F. Hoddinot, *Early Byzantine Churches in Macedonia and Southern Serbia*, London 1963, 99-116, 169-173, 188-193; S. Pelekanidis, *Kultprobleme in Apostel Paulus-Oktagon von Philippi im Zusammenhang mit einem älteren Heroenkult*, in Atti del IX congr. int. di Archeologia cristiana, Vatican City 1978, 303-397; A. Mentzos, *The Bishop of Philippi Demetrius and the Early Christian Monuments of the City of Philippi*: Egnatia 1 (1989) 195-205; V. Abrahamsen, *Bishop Porphyrios and the City of Philippi in the Early Fourth Century*: VChr 43 (1989) 80-85; E.D. Maguire, *A Revolution in Northern Justinianic Capital Design*: *The Axial Void in Constantinople and Philippi*: ByzF 14 (1989) 159-175; G. Gounaris, *L'archéologie chrétienne en Grèce de 1974 à 1985*, in *Actes du XI[e] Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne*, III, Rome 1989, 2687-2711, esp. 2707; *Tabula Imperii Romani*, K-35.1, Philippi, ed. A. Avraméa, Atene 1993; EAA II Suppl. 3, 666-667; L. Bormann, *Philippi. Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus*, Leiden 1995; E. Kourkoutidou-Nikodou - E. Marki, *Des innovations liturgiques et architecturales dans la basilique du Musée de Philippes*, in *Akten des XII. Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, I, Münster 1995, 950-956; C. Pennas, *Early Christian Burials at Philippi*: ByzF 21 (1995) 215-227; P. Pilhofer, *Philippi, I*: *Die erste christliche Gemeinde; II*: *Katalog der Inschriften von Philippi*, Tübingen 1995–2000; G. Gounaris - G. Velenis, *Casa paleocristiana di Filippi*, in *XIII Acta Congressus intern. Archaeologiae Christianae*, ed. N. Cambi - E. Marin, Vatican City 1998, 355ff.

E. Pelekanidou

PHILO, historiographer (between the 4th and 7th c.). He composed an ecclesiastical history (Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία), as we learn from two citations of *Anastasius the Sinaite (8th c.). He should not be identified with the bishop *Philo of Carpasia (4th c.; cf. PWK 15, 362ff.).

CPG III, 7512; G. Mercati, *Un preteso scritto di san Pietro vescovo d'Alessandria e martire sulla bestemmia e Filone l'istoriografo*, in *Opere minori*, 2, Vatican City 1937, 426-439 (for the fragments: 429-431 and 437-438).

J. Irmscher

PHILO of Alexandria (1st c.). The principal representative of Hellenistic *Judaism. His influence on the *exegesis, theology and spirituality of the *Fathers has been great, through the mediation of *Clement, *Origen, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Am-

brose, all of whom knew him directly. He was treated by *Eusebius and *Jerome almost as a Christian, and the preservation of his works seems to be due to Christians. He was several years older than Jesus and still alive in 41. He led an ascetic and contemplative life, and he seems to have carried out the activity of a rabbi. He belonged to an extremely rich Alexandrian business family: his brother Gaius Julius Alexander, called the Alabarch, administered the goods of numerous members of the imperial family and of the Herodian dynasty; his nephew Tiberius would apostatize from Judaism, become procurator of Judea, prefect of *Egypt, finally lieutenant of Titus at the siege of *Jerusalem; his nephew Marcus would be the first husband of the celebrated Berenice. Philo received a fairly profound Greek education, but remained sincerely attached to the Jewish faith. His work is the first, to our knowledge, where the encounter of two cultures takes place on a large scale. He is, however, also the defender of the Jewish community of Alexandria against the pogroms stirred up in 38 by the Prefect Flaccus (cf. *In Flaccum*) and led the delegation sent to the emperor Caligula (cf. *Legatio ad Caium*): only the assassination of the mad emperor prevented a disaster.

His work is above all exegetical. Part of his treatises correspond to a literal and moral exegesis: *De opificio Mundi*, *De Abrahamo*, *De Iosepho*, *De vita Mosii*, *De Decalogo*, *De Specialibus Legibus*, *De Virtutibus*, *De Praemiis et Poenis*, *De Exsecrationibus*.

Another part consists in the allegorical explanation of certain passages of Genesis: *Legum Allegoriae, De Cherubim, De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini, Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari soleat, De posteritate Caini, De Gigantibus, Quod Deus sit immutabilis, De Agricultura, De Plantatione, De Ebrietate, De Sobrietate, De Confusione linguarum, De Migratione Abrahami, Quis Rerum Divinarum Haeres sit, De Congressu Eruditionis et gratiae, De Fuga et Inventione, De Mutatione nominum, De Somniis*. The two exegetical styles meet in the *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim et in Exodum* preserved in Armenian. Along with these there are philosophical works: *Quod Omnis Probus Liber sit*, *De Vita contemplativa* (which describes the life of Hellenistic Jewish monastic communities, the *Therapeutae*), *De Aeternitate Mundi*, *De Providentia*, *De Animalibus*. Above we have cited two occasional works, *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Caium*. His interpretation of the *Scripture is multiform. The literal sense is the base of the spiritual one, and he explains it with all the science of his time. At the source of his **paideia* is found, on the one hand, the Jewish law, esp. the Pentateuch, on the other, Hellenistic culture with the encyclopedic training (grammar, *rhetoric, dialectic, music, geometry, astronomy, physics, etc.), handmaid of *philosophy, this itself subordinated to Wisdom, which is spiritual understanding. He explains the text and its anomalies, he makes a broad use of symbolic arithmetic inspired by the Pythagoreans, and he knows law and jurisprudence, both Jewish and Greek. The spiritual interpretation takes place on various registers. It is finally cosmological: the temple is symbol of the world, and its diverse parts, of regions of the world; the same is true for the vestments of the high priest. From the macrocosm he passes then to the microcosm, from the world to the human: psychological exegesis which reveals intelligence and feeling in the couples *Adam/Eve or Abraham/Sarah. Thus the step to moral allegory is easy, such as that of the animals representing the passions. The essential interpretation, however, is the mystical: reading the text becomes the awareness of a spiritual experience that awakens and expresses itself. For example, take the exegesis of the three patriarchs, developed in *De Congressu* and repeated everywhere, as three types of acquiring Wisdom: Abraham by study, Jacob by practice (asceticism), and Isaac, the greatest, who possesses it by nature. We cannot dwell on his theology: *God, the Logos, the Powers, the *angels, humanity, the *world.

Philo uses philosophy with regard to theology in an eclectic manner: his inspiration is above all *Stoic and *Platonic acc. to the amalgam inaugurated by Posidonius of Apamea and Middle Stoicism, but *Aristotelianism of other schools is not absent from his works. His biblical exegesis can be found elsewhere in the diverse genres of rabbinical interpretation. It is not, however, without links to that of the Stoics Cornutus and Chaeremon, applied to Greek mythology or to Egyptian traditions. He influenced patristic exegesis despite the fact that he differed on an essential point, the central role occupied by Christ. Despite being fully Greek, Philo remained a Jew in his fundamental convictions, a Jew who often was close to being a Christian in his theology and spirituality: to be mentioned are the affirmation that God alone works virtuous action in the *soul and that humans should give him thanks; the distinction between the Creator and the creature that replaces the more Greek one of the incorporeal and the corporeal; finally, the importance given to charity.

L. Cohn - P. Wendland - J. Reiter, 8 vols., Berlin 1896–1930; F.H. Colson, 12 vols. (with Eng. tr.), London 1928–1952; R. Arnaldez - J. Poilloux - Cl. Mondésert, 36 vols. (with Fr. tr.), Paris from 1961. For a general introduction, see J. Daniélou, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1958, and the extensive intr. of R. Arnaldez in vol. 1 of the Fr. ed. *Bibliography*: D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexan-*

dria: An Annotated Bibliography, 1987–1996; with addenda for 1937–1986*, with the assistance of H.M. Keizer, Leiden 2000. It. tr., ed. by R. Radice - C. Kraus Reggiani, Milan 1986ff.; G. Bolognesi, *Studi e ricerche sulle antiche traduzioni armene di testi greci*, Alessandria 2000; P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria, an Exegete for His Time*, Leiden-New York 1997; J. Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*, Tübingen 2001; "Studia Philonica Annual" (specialized periodical).

H. Crouzel

PHILO of Carpasia (d. beginning of 5th c.). Bishop of Carpasia (*Cyprus). A deacon and an expert in the interpretation of the *Scripture, contemporaneous with *Epiphanius of Salamis, he seems to have been ordained by him a bishop (*Vita S. Epiph.* II, 49). He wrote a *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. Of this work there remains a summary of the Greek text, published by Giacomelli in 1772, and a Latin translation, important because it is closer to the original, prepared by *Epiphanius Scholasticus, friend of *Cassiodorus. The latter, however, attributed the work of Philo to the more famous Epiphanius of Salamis (*Inst.* I, 5,4). Passages of the *Commentary* were used in the *catenae of *Procopius and of ps.-*Eusebius on the *Song of Songs, and in the *Christian Topography* of *Cosmas Indicopleustes. Philonian exegesis, based on the traditional identification of Christ as the bridegroom and the church as his bride, is modest and is a compilation. In Ethiopian there is a paschal homily that is inspired in large measure by the *In sanctum pascha* of ps.-*Hippolytus.

PG 40, 27-154 (M. Giacomelli); A. Ceresa Gastaldo, *Commento al "Cantico dei Cantici" di Filone di Carpasia*, Turin 1979 (CP 6) (the ed. of the Latin version and tr.); BBKL 7, 539; DSp 12, 1374-1377; S.J. Voicu, *Filone di Carpasia e Pseudo Ippolito: di un'omelia pasquale tramandata in etiopico*: Augustinianum 44 (2004) 5-24.

E. Prinzivalli

PHILOCALIA. *Gregory of Nazianzus sent to his metropolitan *Theodore of Tyana an *Origenian anthology, in memory of *Basil, recently deceased. There is reason to think that the work was composed by Gregory himself and his friend likely around 360, at the beginning of their theological studies; the fact need not surprise us, if we recall that the two already possessed an exceptional maturity. The work, which in the original has preserved some remarkable pages of Origen, concerns itself mainly with exegetical method and the doctrine of liberty, passing over in silence controversial theological themes.

CPG/S 1502; J. Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen*, Cambridge 1893; E. Junod, *Origène. Philocalie 21-27* (SC 226), Paris 1976 (the other chapters have been published in SC with the works of Origen to which they belong); M. Harl - N. de Lange, *Origène, Philocalie* (SC 302), Paris 1983; DSp 12, 1336-1352; LACL 576.

J. Gribomont

PHILOCALUS (or Filocalus), Furius Dionysius (d. ca. 382). Author of the calendar called the **Chronography of 354*, whose frontispiece is signed *Furius Dionysius Filocalus titulavit*. The name of Philocalus remains linked to the work of Pope *Damasus, for whom he carved the famous epigrams, by which the deeds of the martyrs were celebrated. For these epigraphs, Philocalus elaborated characters new in their proportions and their heights: these, defined later as *philocalian* characters, represent an important stage in the history of *paleography and *epigraphy.

PCBE 2, 820-822; DNP 4, 518; M.R. Salzmann, *On Roman Time. The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA 1990, 3, 26, 202-205; A. Cameron, *Filocalus and Melania*: Classical Philology 87 (199) 140-144; G. Binder, *Der Kalender des Filocalus. Eine illustrierte Ausgabe des römischen Festkalenders aus dem 4. Jahr. n. Chr.*, in *Der Kalender*, ed. W. Geerlings, Paderborn 2002, 61-83.

G. Pilara

PHILOGONIUS of Antioch (d. 324). Bishop of Antioch when the Arian controversy began, he was among the adversaries of *Arius, and the Arius mentions him in the letter to *Eusebius of Nicomedia as one of those who conceived of the generation of the Son from the Father in a way unacceptable for him. He died between 324 and 325, a few months before the Council of *Nicaea.

DCB 4, 389-390; Fedalto 2, 682.

M. Simonetti

PHILOMENA, martyr. There never existed a martyr venerated in antiquity with this name; the BHL and BHG do not offer a hagiographic dossier. The inscription *Pax tecum, Filumena* (ICUR 23234), found above a sepulcher in the catacombs of Priscilla and the bones found there 25 May 1802 were considered to belong to a martyr, because there was a vase that contained a liquid held to be blood (G.B. de Rossi, *Sulla questione del vaso di sangue*, Vatican City 1944). Hagiographic and biographical romances were written, based on the *Revelations* of the third-order Dominican sister Maria Luisa di Gesù and on the *Historic Relation* of the translation of the priest of Nola, Francesco De Lucia. When the body

of Philomena had been transferred to Mugnano (diocese of Nola), miracles immediately took place, so that the spot become a pilgrimage destination and the celebrity of Philomena became universal. The Curé d'Ars attributed his own miracles to her mediation. Philomena became "the saint of the 19th century"; the Sacred Congregation of Rites permitted the possibility of veneration in 1837 (feast day 11 August), but suspended it in 1961 (AAS 53, 1961, 174).

BS 5, 796-800; BBKL 7, 521-523; E. Trapp, *Philomena. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts*: RQA 86 (1991) 252-260.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PHILOSOPHY and ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY. In relation to ancient Christianity, the term *philosophy* (love of wisdom) refers to the various ways Greek thought, starting from the 6th c. BC, seeks to understand and explain the realities (truths) and the meaning of the cosmos: the "Presocratic" philosophers (e.g., Heraclitus ca. 544–ca. 483 BC and Pythagoras 540–ca. 500 BC), the two greatest thinkers *Plato (427–347 BC) and *Aristotle (384–322 BC), the schools of *Stoicism (e.g., Zeno ca. 335–ca. 262 BC, Seneca ca. 4 BC–AD 65, Epictetus ca. AD 50–ca. 130 and the emperor *Marcus Aurelius 121–180 AD), of Neo-Pythagoreanism (e.g., *Apollonius of Tyana, 1st c. AD), of *Middle Platonism and of *Neoplatonism (e.g., *Ammonius Saccas ca. 175–ca. 242, *Plotinus 204/205–269/270, *Porphyry of Tyre 234–302/305, *Iamblicus ca. 240/50–ca. 325, *Proclus 412–485). With the integration of Greece into the Roman Empire in the 2nd c. BC, Hellenism began to permeate the entire Mediterranean culture in a syncretistic form of thought and way of life. In the Latin area Cicero (106–43 BC) tried to translate Greek philosophy for the West into a unitary and homogenous system. These ancient philosophies, furthermore, also embraced theology (investigations on God) and *ethics, assuming thus an aspect more attractive for the Christian milieu.

Until the era of the Reformation (Erasmus of Rotterdam, Melanchthon) the idea was transmitted acc. to which only the Greek *apologists, starting from the middle of the 2nd c., had introduced philosophical categories into Christian theology in order to defend the faith from *persecutions, whether concrete or intellectual. In reality, *Fronto of Cirta, teacher of the emperor *Marcus Aurelius (121–180), considered one of the great philosophers of his time, pronounced a public discourse on the absurdity of the Christian faith. The sophist *Lucian of Samosata mocked the ideas of love of neighbor and martyrdom in his satire *De morte Peregrini* (ca. 170). In this work the author supposes that Peregrinus has killed himself driven by the ardent desire for God, and suggests that all the Christians should follow his example. The Alexandrian Platonist *Celsus composed a book titled Ἀληθὴς Λόγος (ca. 178), in which he appreciates the Christian doctrine of a Logos and also the very high ethic of the Christians. The *incarnation of the Logos in the person of Christ and his resurrection, on the other hand, seemed to the Greek philosopher to be totally unacceptable ideas. Furthermore, the idea was created that Christian theology had begun only at this point: Before Celsus, Christianity was based on the "simple" message of the gospel born in the Semitic-Judaic environment. While the Catholic Church has always accepted philosophy as a suitable progress in the expression of the faith, in the 1700s Protestant thinkers began to consider it rather as an abandonment of the original truth of the gospel (e.g., A. Gottfried, *Unparteische Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*, Frankfurt a.M. 1699–1700, repr. 1967–1999). The resulting thesis of the "Hellenization of Christianity" of Adolf von Harnack (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg i.Br. 1886–1889) then had a strong following for almost a century. Only from 1958 did Jean Daniélou open the route toward a Jewish Christian theology, and the later hermeneutic development in the context of the research on "Antike und Christentum" clarified that the shape of this theology was much more a matter of a complex of ambivalent influences of acceptance and refusal, which transformed all the interested parties.

First of all, one must understand that an exclusively Semitic Christianity had never existed, because, from the 3rd c. BC, *Judaism also was subject to the direct and indirect influence of Hellenism, both in *Palestine and even more in the Diaspora (esp. in *Alexandria), as the translation of the *Bible into Greek (*Septuaginta*) and Jewish authors such as *Philo of Alexandria (20 BC–AD 42) prove. The writings of the NT also confirm this fact. The first converts to Christianity during the feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem were "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, inhabitants of Mesopotamia, of Judea and *Cappadocia, of *Pontus and *Asia, of *Phrygia and of Pamphilia, of *Egypt and the regions of *Libya near Cyrene, Romans who live here, Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs" (Acts 2), that is to say, Hellenized Jews from the entire Mediterranean Diaspora and the Near East. In the Areopagus of *Athens *Paul presented his "new doctrine" to Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, and only when he began to speak about the *resurrection of the dead, "Some scoffed

at it, and others said, 'On this we will hear you another time'" (Acts 17:17-33). Philosophy and the faith, therefore, never have reconciled without problems: "For Jews demand signs and Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men. . . . God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise" (1 Cor 1:22-27). "See to it that no one make a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elemental spirits of the universe and not according to Christ" (Col 2:8). Despite the numerous enticing resemblances with philosophy—such as the idea of the transcendence of the One, of the three hypotheses or *hypostases, of the supreme good, of the demiurge, of the divine Logos and the *logoi* of the world, of νοῦς, of the *soul, of the virtues and of *divinization—the Christian doctrines of the *creatio ex nihilo*, of an incarnate God, dead and risen for the salvation of human beings because of his love, and the disposition of the Christians to follow him as far as martyrdom with the hope of the resurrection of the flesh, remained an irreconcilable scandal.

Therefore, certain theologians absolutely opposed the entire Hellenistic culture. The *Oratio ad Graecos* of *Tatian (155–170) considered all the conquests of which the Greeks were proud, their *rhetoric, poetry, philosophy and ethics as barbarian and void of any value. They knew nothing of the truth, because this is found only in the OT, which is older than all the Greek philosophy. In his *Apologeticum* 47-48 (197), *Tertullian rejected the use of the term *philosophy* for the Christian faith, and in *De praescriptione haereticorum* 7 (a few years before 207/208) began from Col 2:8 to identify philosophy as the root of the *heresies: "The same questions are brooded over by heretics and by philosophers. . . . From whom do those myths derive, and those sterile genealogies and those discourses which go sideways like a crab: from these the Apostle keeps us far away. . . . What do they have in common, then, Athens and Jerusalem? The academy and the church? The heretics and the Christians?" The majority of Christian theologians, on the other hand, accepted philosophy as a propaedeutic instrument for reflecting on and proclaiming the Christian faith: *Justin Martyr "the philosopher" (d. 165), *Clement of Alexandria (140/150–before 215/216), *Origen (ca. 185–254), *Marius Victorinus (282/291–a little after 362), *Gregory of Nyssa (335/340–after 394), *John Chrysostom (ca. 350–407), *Augustine (354–430), *Maximus the Confessor (ca. 580–662), ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite (end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th c.), *Boethius (475/480–ca. 525) and many others. Certainly, they too knew to distinguish between divine wisdom (the Logos) and human wisdom: "It is one thing to become wise only through the Wisdom of God and another to carry the Person himself of the Wisdom of God" (Augustine, *De agone Christiano* 20,22; cf. *Gal. exp.* 27). *Intellege ut credas, crede ut intellegas* (Augustine, *Sermo* 43,9). Therefore Christianity is the *verissima filosofia* (Augustine, *Contra Academicos* 3,20-22.42; *De civitate Dei* 10,32), because it was revealed by God himself.

At the same time one should not forget that the conception cannot be maintained acc. to which the ancient church was permeated by philosophy to the exclusion of any reservations. Certainly the great theologians, those who produced the great ancient Christian literature and who had a decisive influence on the councils regarding the development of theology, imported their classical education which culminated in the study of philosophy. On the other hand, every little center of the empire had its bishop, who took part in synods. From the 3rd c. many bishops had received in the monasteries an exclusively biblical education, others had little or no education, and some were not able to sign their own name. But beyond the names we know little or nothing about them, and with the exception of *Epiphanius of Salamis (310/320–403), almost none of them published anything. Despite all this, during the centuries of the great controversies, esp. under the influence of the monks, the opposition to philosophy grew—a field perhaps as yet too little studied.

The various philosophical schools exercised influences of various intensity. Epicureanism seems not to have had any influence on Christianity and *Aristotelianism little, mostly in syncretic contexts. In the NT a certain presence of Neo-Pythagoreanism is felt in the literary dimension of Jesus as θεῖος ἀνήρ, and of Cynicism in the Pauline letters. In the first two Christian centuries *Stoicism predominated, which had also assimilated Platonic and Aristotelian elements. This was the system that permeated the literary and philosophical interests of the apologists. Among the monks the figure of the Stoic sage Epictetus was esp. popular. In first place, however, is without doubt Plato and his successors in Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, above all Plotinus, *Porphyry and Iamblicus. The Fathers admired Plato as the author of the most inspired philosophy, a true theology, and read his books frequently, which were also translated into Latin: *Parmenides*, *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Theaetetus*, *Timaeus*, *De republica*. For several decades the

relationship between *Platonism and Christianity has been discussed: perhaps they only used the same terminology, which however in the two contexts expressed totally different realities? Or was the Platonic doctrine "baptized" by Christians, creating misunderstandings? Or rather, did the Christian message change under the influence of philosophy? Given the fact that Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism developed contemporaneously (Plotinus and Origen were school companions of the same *Ammonius Saccas) and in consideration of modern hermeneutics, maybe one should rather look for the reciprocal influence of philosophy and Christianity.

Christian philosophy continued to handle the traditional questions of humanity from its new point of view centered on salvation in Christ: (1) The origin and end of the universe, including the stars and all the creatures; the one God as creator along with the Logos and Holy Spirit; the *creatio ex nihilo*; the divinization of human beings through the virtues and the struggle with the passions; and sometimes also the restoration of everything, also of the fallen angels, to the primordial state (**apokatastasis*). (2) The person of God, *providence and the *free will of humankind (*theodicy*). (3) Human persons as beings composed of *body and *soul, intelligence (γνῶσις, *mens*) and personality. (4) Time and history as integral parts of the divine *creation, which has as its goal the salvation of all people "of good will" (cf. Lk 2:14). The history of salvation has its beginning in the creation on the part of God and develops acc. to the divine plan up to the last judgment. Its culmination is the incarnation of the Son of God. (5) *Ethics: virtues and duties private and public (political), the origin of evil, passions, based on the fundamental idea of God as the source and end of every good, of following Christ, and of the double commandment of love toward God and toward neighbor (cf. Mt 22:37-40).

The use of philosophical terms and concepts was particularly important for the development of trinitarian theology and of *Christology from the 4th to 7th c. It was toward the year 318 when the Alexandrian priest *Arius made use of a (Neo-)Platonic vocabulary in order to develop and clarify the trinitarian doctrine of Origen, which he had formulated in the context of Middle Platonism. Starting from 362, *Apollinarius of Laodicea added a term close to Stoicism to better explain the unity of God and man in Christ. From then the debates of theologians and of the great councils of this period (*Nicaea 325, *Constantinople 381, *Ephesus 431, *Chalcedon 451, Constantinople II 553, Constantinople III 680/681) turned on words and formulas such as ἀγέν(ν)ητος, ἀληθινὸς θεός, ἀρχή , ἐνέργεια, ἡγεμονικόν, θέλος, ἰδιότης, ἰδιώματα, ὁμοούσιος, ὁμοιουσιος, ὅμοιος, οὐσία, πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις, φύσις, μία οὐσία—τρεὶς ὑποστάσεις, μία φύσις τοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκομένη, ἕν πρόσωπον καὶ μία ὑπόστασις ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, *communicatio idiomatum*, *consubstantialis*, *essentia*, *natura*, *persona*, *una persona in utraque natura*, *subsistentia*, *substantia* and many others. On this foundation the hypothesis of the "Hellenization of Christianity" was inspired.

The modern study of the ancient Christian philosophy, however, as stated above, should rather investigate the relationships between philosophy and Christianity as a phenomenon of mutual influence in the context of multiple interactions with the entire ancient world.

Numerous specific entries in this encyclopedia handle in more detail the complex relationship between Christian thought and Greek thought; in particular, *see* *Aristotelianism, *Hellenism and Christianity, *Hellenistic Judaism, *pantheism, *Platonism and the Fathers, *Stoicism and the Fathers.

L. Bieler, θεῖος ἀνήρ. *Das Bild des "Göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*, 2 vols., Vienna 1935–1936 (repr. Darmstadt 1967); P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris 1948; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des pères de l'Église de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Aléxandrie*, Paris ²1957; A.H. Armstrong - R.A. Markus, *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy*, London 1960; J. Daniélou, *Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée*, Tome I: *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, 2e Édition, Texte établi sur l'édition italienne de 1974, revu et corrigé, Tournai 1991; Tome II: *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles*, Tournai 1961; C. Tresmontant, *La métaphysique du christianisme et la naissance de la philosophie chrétienne*, Paris 1961; E. v. Ivánka, *Plato Christianus. Übernahme und Umgestaltung des Platonismus durch die Väter*, Einsiedeln 1964; H.A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. I: *Faith*, *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, Cambridge, MA ²1964; A.H. Armstrong, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967; C.R. Holladay, θεῖος ἀνήρ *in Hellenistic Judaism. A Critique of the Use of this Category in New Testament Christology*, Missoula, MT 1977; C. Andresen, *Antike und Christentum*: TRE 3 (1978) 50-99; Ch. Gnilka, CRHSIS. *Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur*. I: *Der Begriff des "rechten Gebrauchs,"* Basel-Stuttgart 1984; M.L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, 2 vols., Leiden 1985; E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, Grand Rapids, MI 1987; ANRW II, 36.1-3 (1987–1989); B. Blackburn, θεῖος ἀνήρ *and the Markan Miracle Traditions. A Critique of the* θεῖος ἀνήρ *Concept as an Interpretative Background of the Miracle Traditions Used by Mark*, Tübingen 1991; C. Colpe et al., eds., *Spätantike und Christentum. Beiträge zur Religions- und Geistesgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Kultur und Zivilisation der Kaiserzeit*, Berlin 1992; F.G. Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins*, Edinburgh 1992; D. Ramos-Lissón et al., eds., *El diálogo fe-cultura en la antigüedad cristiana*, Pamplona 1996; F.G. Downing, *Cynics, Paul and the Pauline Churches*, London 1998; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004.

H. DROBNER

PHILOSTORGIUS (d. ca. 430). A writer of ecclesiastical history, born around 368 in the village of Borissus in *Cappadocia, he died after 425 (in his works he refers to events of that year). He was a *layman, but we have no information as to his profession. He arrived in *Constantinople as a 20-year-old and lived there, leaving occasionally for travels (among others in *Palestine and to *Antioch) which increased his exposure to culture: in fact he demonstrates that he knows geography, astronomy and natural sciences. The change of his life was determined by the encounter with Eunomius, his compatriot, a disciple of *Aetius and head of the intransigent *Arians: from then on he shared the destinies of the *Anomoians and his work was extraordinarily influenced as a result.

Two writings (ἐγκώμιον of Eunomius; ἀγῶνες against *Porphyry) mentioned by him in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* are lost. The complete text of this work did not reach us either, but we have ample extracts edited by Bidez and known beforehand through the editions of J. Gothofredus (Geneva 1643) and H. Valesius (Paris 1673). The work, conceived as a continuation of that of Eusebius, included the events between 320 (beginning of the Arian controversy) and 425; it was divided into two tomes, each one introduced by an epigram (*Anth. Pal.* IX, 193-194), of twelve books total, of which the initial letters, reunited, made an acrostic with the name of the author. Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 40) knew the entire work. He made a summary of it, preserved for us by the MS tradition (cod. *Barocc.* 142 and its descendants), not always exact and somewhat tendentious, because he omitted whatever was in contrast with orthodoxy. Numerous other fragments of the *HE* have also been found in the *Artemii Passio* (PG 96, 1251-1320), drawn up before the 10th c. by John of Rhodes, and in the Suda (acc. to the character of the lexicon, it is a story of famous persons such as the martyr Babylas, Agapetus of Synada, Auxentius of Mopsuestia, *Leontius of Tripoli). *Excerpta* are also in the *Thesaurus orthodoxae fidei* of Nicetas Acominatus and above all in the *Vita Constantini* of the cod. Angel. 22, edited by H.G. Opitz (Byzantion 9 [1934] 535-593): here the author summarized a compilation of the *HE* done by others and in which every heretical excess had been eliminated. The sources used by Philostorgius are unknown. He certainly used letters of emperors, *Acts* of councils and martyrs and perhaps also the work of *Eunapius. *Paganism and Catholic orthodoxy are his enemies, and the persecution of heretics, as Battifol has revealed (*Quaestiones*, 12), led him to apocalyptic views: thus in the misfortunes of the Roman Empire he recognized the realization of divine anger and of the prophecies of Daniel and the gospels. The apologetic intent toward the Arianism of Aetius and Eunomius led him above all to cite documents of Arian origin: precisely this factionalism makes the *HE* valuable to round out knowledge of a historic period for which the majority of the sources are orthodox. *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 40) acknowledged a certain elegance of style in Philostorgius.

CPG 3, 6032; PG 65, 460-637; GCS 21, Berlin 1972; E. Walford, *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen . . . also the Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius as Epitomized by Photius*, London 1855; P. Batiffol, *Quaestiones Philostorgianae*, Paris 1891; L. Jeep, *Zur Ueberlieferung des Philostorgius*, TU 17, 3b, 2; Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*: HAW VII, 2, 2, 1433-1434; P. Heseler, *Neues zur Vita Constantini des codex Angelicus 22*: Byzantion 10 (1935) 399-402; J. Bidez, *Fragments nouveaux de Philostorge sur la vie de Constantin*: Byzantion 10 (1935) 403-442; G. Fritz, *Philostorge*: DTC 12, 1495-1498; G. Geutz, *Philostorgios*: PWK 20, 119-122; G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica I*, Berlin 1958, 473-474; Quasten II, 535-537; G. Fernández Hernández, *La elección episcopal de Atanasio de Alejandría según Filostorgio*: Gerión 3 (1985) 211-229; G. Zecchini, *Filostorgio*, in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, ed. A. Garzya, Naples 1989, 579-598; D. Woods, *Three Notes on Aspects of the Arian Controversy c. 354–367 CE*: JTS 44 (1993) 604-619; R.J. Penella, *Julian the Persecutor in Fifth-Century Church Historians*: Ancient World 24 (1993) 31-43; I. Tantillo, *Filostorgio e la tradizione sul testamento di Costantino*: Athenaeum 88 (2000) 559-563; W.I. Argov, *Giving the Heretic a Voice. Philostorgius of Borissus and Greek Ecclesiastical Historiography*: Athenaeum 89 (2001) 497-524.

A. Labate

PHILOTHEUS. A monk of Our Lady of the Burning Bush, in *Sinai, of uncertain date, he wrote, in the *hesychast line of *John Climacus and of Hesychius, several spiritual works (CPG 7864-7866) published in part in the *Philocalia* of Nicodemus the Agiorite (Athens 1958, II, 274-286), in part in PG 98, 1369-1372, with a further fragment under the name of Philotheos Kokkinos, PG 154, 729-745 (see the indications in col. 717, nn. 21 and 22). See the MSS, hesychastic collections written in Mount Athos in the 14th c.: *Vat. gr.* 658, 703, 730; *Marc.* II 73; *Vindob. theol. gr.* 156, 224, 228. Another collection, not recorded in CPG, is in the Italian Greek MS *Paris. Suppl. gr. 1277.* According to Beck (453-454) these writings would be later than Simeon the New Theologian; certainly, they do not belong to antiquity.

Patrologia V, 286.

J. Gribomont

PHILOTHEUS, catenist (5th–6th c.). Author of a biblical *catena, which was constituted perhaps be-

tween the 2nd half of the 5th c. and the 1st half of the 6th c. The *terminus ad quem* is reconstructed on the base of the lemmas of authors and the prologue, which confer on *Theodoret the attribute "blessed" and the title "saint" respectively, honors which were revoked after the condemnation of the Council of *Constantinople in 553. The Philotheus named in the prologue, "Philotheus, nourished with the study of the (sacred) Scriptures," is probably the compiler of the catena and not a late copyist of the same. We know nothing else about him. Among writers who have the name Philotheus, he could be the monk of Our Lady of the Burning Bush, in Sinai, who lived before Simeon the New Theologian. Our catena transmits two authors, of whom the commentary on the Minor Prophets has reached us: Theodoret, a continuous commentary; *Hesychius of Jerusalem, a scholiastic one.

Patrologia V, 640-646.

M.A. Barbàra

PHILOXENUS of Mabbug (d. 523). By his ferocious battles whether political or doctrinal, by his assiduous action with the monks of *Syria, Philoxenus was the principal craftsman of the installation of the Severian regime at *Antioch and deserves the title of pioneer of Syrian monophysitism. Even though his memory has been eclipsed by that of *Severus, what remains of his works reveals an original theological synthesis, expressed in very beautiful language, which is located at the point of encounter between the Syriac (*Ephrem and *John of Apamaea) and the Alexandrian (*Athanasius, *Cyril and *Evagrius) traditions.

He was a native of the province of Beit Garmai, where he was born around 440, and had the name *Xenaias* (perhaps Joseph). Probably he was sent very early to the theological school of the Persians at *Edessa. At the end of a solid education he embraced the Cyrillian ideology, abandoning the Nestorian theology in order to be able to sojourn in the *monasteries of Syria-Mesopotamia and of W Syria. Toward 470 he proceeded to Antioch (at this time he must have taken the Hellenized form of his name) and managed to make himself appreciated by the patriarch *Peter the Fuller. When the latter was removed from his seat (476–484), Philoxenus was expelled as well by the patriarch Calendion (482–484). Sent to Constantinople by the monks of his faction, he obtained from the emperor Zeno the deposition of Calendion and the return of Peter, who ordained him 16 August 485 for the metropolitan see of Mabbug (*Hierapolis*). Philoxenus dedicated his episcopate, at least until the arrival of Severus to the patriarchal see of Antioch (512), to the fight against the Council of *Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Pope *Leo, to the point of accepting the **Henotikon* of *Zeno. He employed all his strength, his zeal, his eloquence and his pen to convince the clergy and the monks of his province, rather hostile to his ideas, to support the *monophysites of *Persia and to neutralize his adversaries, the principal of whom was the patriarch of Antioch *Flavian, whom, after ten years of fierce fighting, he caused to be deposed. During the too-few years of the patriarchate of Severus, Philoxenus tried to calm the extremist spirits of the faction. The arrival of the emperor *Justin I (518) put an end to monophysitism at Antioch; Philoxenus, refusing to recant, was deported. He died, tired and at a very advanced age, at *Philippopolis* in *Thrace.

The works of Philoxenus are divided into two literary groups: those of monastic and those of dogmatic character. For the first, Philoxenus depends on the *Messalian and Evagrian terminology, from which he distances himself by opposing the Syriac tradition. An evolution has also been observed in his attitude toward the "learned spirituality" of Evagrius: this permits the establishment of a relative chronology of his works, otherwise datable with difficulty. Thus the *Epistle to Abraham and Orestes* follows that to *Patricius*, which in turn comes after the 13 parenetic *mēmrē*. To the second group of works, on the other hand, belong tracts, commentaries and letters, which, having a polemical character, are more easily datable. To a first pre-episcopal period belong the *Ten mēmrē against Ḥabīb* (*De uno e sancta trinitate incorporato et passo*). The beginnings of his episcopate saw the birth of the great *Evangelical Commentaries*, which seek to be a *pendant* of the similar works of *Diodore of Tarsus and of *Theodore of Mopsuestia. To finish this work, Philoxenus had carried out by his suffragan, the Bishop Polycarp, a new translation of the NT more faithful to the Greek; this version, today lost, is known by the name of *Philoxeniana*. In a third period we see a Philoxenus who hardens his positions, and is anti-Chalcedonian even in words, but then a little more conciliatory from the moment of the arrival of Severus, as the *Book of Sentences* shows. The last letters finally are an echo of the antimonophysite persecution of Justin. (For a complete list of his works, of the spurious, and of references, see the bibl. and esp. the fundamental work of A. de Halleux).

The "verbal" and archaizing monophysitism of Philoxenus sinks its roots at the same time in the theocentric Alexandrian tradition and in the apophatic Syriac tradition, for which his theology is not

a simple reaction against the Council of Chalcedon; it is characterized rather by a double divine becoming: without change, God is born, suffers and dies (*Theopaschism); with the destruction of *sin the Son makes humanity into a new creature (filiation: the state of the simple believer) and unites them to God (restoration to the primordial state: the monk). Strictly connected with the trinitarian doctrine (the Savior does not assume another nature nor another *hypostasis than that of the God-Word), Philoxenus's *Christology is founded above all on soteriological bases: "the monophysitism of our author conceives the union less as a principle of singularity and of personal unity than as a principle of mediation of the individual humanity of the Word between the divine person and the whole human race" (de Halleux, 514). This soteriology is not intellectualist (e.g., Evagrius), but sacramental: it sinks its roots in the mysteries of the salvific economy of Christ. His feast is celebrated by the Syro-orthodox on several occasions: 18 August (ordination), 10 December (death) and 18 February (translation).

M. Brière - F. Graffin, *De uno e sancta trinitate incorporato et passo, diss.* 3, 4, 5: PO 38 (1977); *diss.* 6, 7, 8: PO 39 (1979); *diss.* 9-10: PO 40 (1980); A. de Halleux, *Commentaire du prologue johannique*, CSCO 380-381, Syr. 165-166 (1977); J.W. Watt, *Fragments of the Commentary on Matthew and Luke*, CSCO 292-293, Syr. 172 and 174 (1978); cf. A. de Halleux: Muséon 93 (1980) 5-35; S. Brock, *A Classified Bibliography*: PdO 4 (1973) 343-465; Id., for the years 1970–1980: PdO 10 (1981/82) 291-412; Id., *A Classified Bibliography*: PdO 17 (1992) 211-301; Baumstark, 141-144; Ortiz de Urbina, par. 107; A de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog, sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Louvain 1963 (with bibl.); P. Harb, *Les origines de la doctrine de "lā-hāšūāta" (apatheia) chez Ph. de M.*: PdO 5 (1974) 227-241; F. Graffin, *Le Florilège patristique de Ph. de M.*: OCA 197 (1974) 267-290; A. Vööbus, *La biographie de Ph. de M., tradition de manuscrits*: AB 93 (1975) 111-114; A. de Halleux, *La Philoxénienne du Symbole*: OCA 205 (1976) 295-315; A. Grillmeier, *Die Taufe Christi und die Taufe der Christen. Zur Tauftheologie des Ph. von M. und ihrer Bedeutung für die christliche Spiritualität*: Fides sacramenti, sacramentum fidei, studies in honor of P. Smulders, Assen 1981, 137-175 (with bibl.); J. Martikainen, *Gerechtigkeit und Güte Gottes. Studien zur Theologie von Ephraem dem Syrer und Philoxenos von Mabbug* (Göttinger Orientforschungen I, 20), Wiesbaden 1981; Patrologia V, 462-465.

F. Rilliet

PHILUMENE the Marcionite (2nd c.). According to the sources from antiquity (*Rhodo, *Tertullian, *Hippolytus, ps.-Tertullian, *Adv. Omnes haereses* 6), *Apelles, follower of *Marcion, encountered at Rome the clairvoyant virgin *Philumene*, whose dreams and visions he collected in a work titled *Revelations*, now lost. Her fame has been obscured by the fact of being a heretic and a woman, but certainly she influenced the thought of Apelles; among other doctrines she maintained that Christ had flesh in reality, but not received through normal birth, rather taken from the elements of the stars (cf. Tertullian, *De carne* 6,1; 8,2; *De praescr.*, 6,6; *Adv. Marc.* III, 11,2); perhaps the doctrine that the *soul knows a sexual differentiation prior to birth belongs to her (cf. Tertullian, *De anima* 36,6).

R. Hanig, *Der Beitrag der Philumene zur Theologie der Apelleianer*, ZAC 3 (1999) 241-277.

A. Di Berardino

PHINEHAS (iconography). Up to now paleo-Christian art has transmitted to us a single representation of the biblical episode of the killing, by the Israelite Phinehas, of the Hebrew Zamri, guilty of having united himself with the Midianite idolater Kozbi (Num 25). This appears in Rome in a picture of the catacomb of Via Dino Compagni (Nestori, 72, no. 2), datable to around the middle of the 4th c.: Phinehas appears here dressed as a Roman official, while he holds with the left hand a lance on which the bodies of Zamri and Kozbi are impaled; below, to the left, is represented perhaps the bed where Phinehas killed the couple. The identification of the scene should be held as certain, on the basis of the close iconographic parallels with medieval Bible miniatures and with a Serbian psaltery of the 15th c. (Kötzsche Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe*, 85-87, pl. 21), in which the episode is formulated in an entirely analogous manner. The scene, as it is represented in the picture and in these later miniatures, seems however to have drawn on, more than the biblical story, old rabbinical traditions, which had amplified it and which were evidently widespread in the Christian environment. Furthermore, a Jewish archetype has been proposed from a formal point of view as well; in contrast, the illustrated versions of the *Octateuch and of the Psalteries from the 9th c. on (Kötzsche Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe*, 86f.; Ferrua, *Una scena nuova*, 110) seem more adherent to the letter of the Bible.

A. Ferrua, *Una scena nuova nella pittura catacombale*: RPAA 30-31 (1957–58, 1958–59) 107-116; Id., *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di via Latina*, Vatican City 1960, 48, pl. 92; L. Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe an der via Latina in Rom. Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie der alttestamentlichen Wandmalereien*: JbAC Erg. 4 (1976) 85-87, pl. 21.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

PHOCAS of Sinope (d. 305?). The only historically documented saint who bore this name was a gar-

dener, presumably martyred under *Diocletian at Sinope, of whom *Asterius of Amasea wrote a *panegyric around 400 (*Hom.* 9; CPG 3260). At that time his veneration was already widespread in *Pontus, in the Cyclades (AB 120 [2002] 203), at *Constantinople (John Chrys.: PG 50, 699-706; AB 66 [1948] 85-86), in Sicily, at *Rome (Asterius), Sidon (SC 90, 242), *Antioch (Severus, *Hom. cath.* 72 [PO 12, 71-89]) and *Tyre. His feast day was celebrated 22 September (*Synax. Eccl. CP*), and he was the patron of sailors in danger (Aster., *Hom.* 9; John Chrys., *Hom. in Phoc.* 1-2). Starting from the real existence of this person and using his name, the following were fabricated: a bishop Phocas of Sinope (executed under Trajan and recorded as 22 September: *Synax. Eccl. CP*; 14 July: historical martyrologies), another martyr executed under *Trajan (22 July: *Synax. Eccl. CP*) and a martyr of Antioch (5 March; *Mart. hier.*) invoked against snake bites (Greg. Tours, *Glor. conf.* 99).

BHG 1535-1540; BHL 6837-6838b; BHO 990-991; BS 5, 948-950; LCI 8, 209-210; A. Ehrhard: ByzZ 21 (1912) 309-311; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938, 82-85; P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'orient*, Paris 1985; N. Koutrakou, *Nautical Information from the Life of St. Phocas, a Byzantine Maritime Saint*, in Ch. Makrypoulias (ed.), *Sailing Ships of the Mediterranean Sea and the Arabian Gulf*, Athens 1998, 41-44; W. Mayer, *The Sea Made Holy. The Liturgical Function of the Waters Surrounding Constantinople*: EphLit 112 (1998) 459-468.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PHOEBADIUS (d. after 392). Already bishop of Agen (Aquitania, Gallia) prior to 357, he played a primary role as an anti-*Arian in the Council of *Rimini of 359, was the last to bend to signing the pro-Arian formula and was allowed to add some clarifications. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 108) says he was very old in 392. He also identifies him as author of certain *opuscula* but names only the *Contra arianos,* the only one extant. It is a brief writing in refutation of the Sirmian formula (pro-Arian) of 357 and composed immediately after that date. Phoebadius employs, through the absence of appropriate literature, the *Adversus Praxean* of *Tertullian, adapting its antimonarchian arguments to the requirements of the anti-Arian polemic. Although never naming the term **homoousios,* characteristic of the Nicene theology, Phoebadius defends this theological position and considers the formula of 357—pro-Arian but presented as a compromise—as a pure and simple affirmation of Arianism. He participated in the Council of *Valence in 374 (Mansi 3,491ff.), apparently as president of the assembly. He was a friend of *Delphinus of Bordeaux, with whom he participated in the Council of Saragossa in 380, where again it seems that he was the president of the assembly. His feast day is celebrated 25 April.

CPL 473; PL 20, 11-30; CCL 64; Patrologia III, 77-78; A. Durengues, *Le livre de S. Fébade contre les Ariens*, Agen 1927; P.P. Glaeser, *Phoebadius von Agen*, Univ. Ausburg 1978; Phoebadius, *Contra Arianos, Streitschrift gegen die Arianer*, tr. and ed. by J. Ulrich, Freiburg im Breisgau 1999; DHGE 16, 785-790.

M. Simonetti

PHOENIX (iconography). Born in the ancient East and in *Egypt as a symbolic expression of the exceptional or everyday events of the cosmos, the myth of the phoenix, as it was introduced into the West by Herodotus (*Hist.* II, 73), has it that a sacred bird, similar to an eagle and a *peacock, dies every five hundred years to rise immediately from its ashes. The Latin authors referred to it to illustrate the concept of eternity understood as palingenesis, a cyclical and continuous return; the *fathers of the church used it to communicate the mystery of the resurrection of the flesh (*1 Clem.* 1,25; Tert., *De res. carn.* XIII; Commod., *Carmen apolog.* vv. 139-142; Zen. Ver., *Tract.* I, 2,9; Ambr., *Hexaem.* V, 23,79; *Apos. Con.* V, 7, 15; Aug., *De natura et orig. anim.* IV, 20,33; ps.-Epiph., *Phys.* XI) and the concepts of *virginity-chastity (Ruf., *Expos. symb.* IX, 10) and of filial piety (Orig. *C. Cels.* IV, 98,25). The most extensive and definite literary expression consists of the *De ave phoenice* of ps.-Lactantius. In paleo-Christian art the myth is reduced to a symbol, and the bird is usually shown furnished with halo and rays—typical solar attributes—in the proud and majestic aspect of the already accomplished regeneration. Thus, it appears in a carving on a slab in S. Callistus (ICUR IV, 10785) and, perhaps, in a *painting on a wall block in the catacomb of Praetextatus (Nestori 1993, 92, no. 11). The mythic bird appears also associated with *palms, with which it shares name and meaning in Greek, on some leaden seals, in a carved slab of *Priscilla (Bisconti, *Lastra incisa,* 45) and on a bronze lamp of *Aquileia (Bertacchi, *Il grande lampadario,* 341).

In areas connected with the scene of the **Traditio legis,* the phoenix is represented with palms, in correspondence with St. Paul, the most important proponent of the fundamental aspect of the resurrection (1 Cor 15:14). The fronts of a group of *sarcophagi referable to the final period of the 4th c. follow this format (Ws 150,2; 154,5; 151,1; 12,4; 39,2), as do a painting in the catacomb of Grottaferrata (WMM I, 132), a carved slab preserved at Anagni (Testini, 718) and several gilded glasses. To designate the paradisiacal spot, the phoenix also appears in

later paintings and in *mosaics that employ the format and ambience of the *traditio.* Recall, e.g., the painting that decorates the little basilica of the cemetery of Felicitas (8th c.) (de Rossi, *Scoperta di una cripta,* 149) and the apsidal mosaic of the basilica of SS. Cosmas and Damian (WMM III, 102). Pictorial documents that present the bird in the moment of death among the flames are more rare. An example in painting is known in the so-called Greek chapel of Priscilla (Ferrua, *Tre note di iconografia,* 273) and another in mosaic in an environment attached to the post-Theodorian basilica of Aquileia (Menis, *I mosaici*, 33). Mosaics and monetary coinings, esp. of the Constantinian dynasty, also attest the representation of the phoenix on the mountain and on the globe (Van den Broek, *The Myth,* pl. II, III, VIII, XX, XXX).

G.B. de Rossi, *Scoperta d'una cripta storica nel cimitero di Massimo "ad sanctam Felicitatem" sulla via Salaria Nuova*: BACr 3 (1885) 149-184; L. Charbonneau-Lassay, *Le bestiaire du Christ*, Bruges 1940, 402-422; A. Ferrua, *Tre note di iconografia paleocristiana. La fenice sul rogo*: Misc. G. Belvederi, Vatican City 1954–1955, 237-277; G.C. Menis, *I mosaici cristiani di Aquileia*, Udine 1965, 33-35; R. Van den Broek, *The Myth of Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Tradition*, Leiden 1972; P. Testini, *La lapide di Anagni con la "Traditio legis." Nota sull'origine del tema*: Archeologia Classica 25-26 (1973–1974) 718-740; L. Bertacchi, *Il grande lampadario di Aquileia*: Aquileia Nostra 50 (1979) 341-350; F. Bisconti, *Aspetti e significati del simbolo della fenice nella letteratura e nell'arte del cristianesimo primitivo*: VetChr 16 (1979) 21-40; Id., *Lastra incisa inedita dalla catacomba di Priscilla*: RivAC 57 (1981) 43-67; Id., *La fenice nell'arte aquileiese del IV secolo*: AAAd 22 (1982) 529-547; Id., TIP, 180; F. Zambon - A. Grossato, *Il mito della fenice in Oriente e in Occidente*, Venice 2004.

F. Bisconti

PHOS HILARON. The hymn *Phos hilaron*, acc. to *Basil the Great (*De sp. sancto* 29, 33), is very ancient. It was an evening song sung when the lamps were lit (Greg. Nyss., *De vit. Macr.* 25). In the song, the light is portrayed as a symbol of Jesus Christ who was sent from the *Father. Perhaps it represents a Christian reaction to the cult of the Sun, which was very dear to the *pagans. The hymn is addressed to Christ and closes with the trinitarian *doxology, in which the three divine persons are associated. We find an analogous structure to it in the liturgical hymn *Gloria* and a papyrus from the 3rd c. (PO 18, 506). On the basis of Basil's argument, one can conclude that the hymn was written before the *Arian controversy. Dölger thinks that it dates to the 2nd c.

C. Pelargus, *Enchiridion Graeco-Latinum Hymnorum*, Frankfurt 1594 (editio princeps); M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, 3, Oxford 1815, 299, = ed. Usher; E.R. Smothers, *Phos hilaron*: RecSR 19 (1929) 266-283 (text and analysis). F.J. Dölger, *Der christ. Abendhymnus, Phos hilaron*: AC V, 11-26; A. Hamman, *La prière*, II, Paris-Tournai 1962, 251; E. Lodi, *Enchiridion euchologicum fontium liturgicorum*, Rome 1979, no. 300, 168; M.E. Mcbann, *Hymn and Anaphora in Early Christian Liturgy*: Ecclesia Orans 17 (2000) 407-443; P. Plank, *Phos hilaron. Christushymnus und Lichtdanksagung der frühen Christenheit*, Bonn 2001.

A. Hamman

PHOTINUS of Constantinople (d. after 610). *Presbyter and defender of the church of *Constantinople, he is the author of a *Life of *John (IV) the Faster*, the patriarch of Constantinople (589–595) to whom the popes *Pelagius II (579–590) and *Gregory the Great (590–604) made their remonstrances in vain, because he had attributed to himself the title of *ecumenical patriarch* (i.e., of the Byzantine Empire). Of the *Vita* a fragment is preserved, reported in the *Acts of the Nicene Council II* (787), *Actio* IV (Mansi 13, 79-80): it narrates a miracle obtained with the image of the Madonna. Photinus, as it seems from the story, knew the patriarch personally and wrote his life after the death of the emperor Mauritius (602), who is called *martyr.* He almost certainly wrote after the death of the emperor Phocas (610) as well, since he refers to him as a *serpent from the abyss and a tyrant.*

CPG III, 7971; Bardenhewer 5, 75 and 131; Beck 459; Patrologia V, 100.

A. De Nicola

PHOTINUS of Sirmium (d. after 362). A Galatian by origin and a deacon and disciple of *Marcellus of *Ancyra, he was bishop of *Sirmium (*Pannonia) when for the first time those in the East associated him with his teacher, condemning him in the **Ekthesis makrostichos*; those in the West signed the condemnation at *Milan (345). After an action against him in 347, about which we are poorly informed (Milan? Sirmium?), a council of Eastern bishops, reunited at Sirmium in 351, condemned and deposed him. He reentered Sirmium at the arrival of *Julian (362) but was later chased out again. His followers had a certain influence in the West, even to *Africa, but never represented a real peril for orthodoxy. *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 107) says that Photinus wrote extensively and refers to a *Contra gentes* and *Ad Valentinianum.* Not only have all of his works been lost, but likewise those written by his adversaries to refute him. Among the few surviving testimonies, the *anathemas of the Council of Sirmium of 351 and the mention of *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 71) are

important. Photinus, whom the ancients associated with *Paul of Samosata as a representative of *adoptionism but who shows close contacts above all with Marcellus, affirms a rigid *monarchianism in which the Logos is conceived as a mere impersonal *dynamis* of the *Father, which at one time was contained within him in repose, and now is expressed and is externalized in the divine action inherent in the world (*Logopator)*. In this sense Photinus assigned to the Father, operating by means of the Logos, the theophanies of the OT, which a unanimous ancient tradition assigned to the Logos conceived personally, because he considered this tradition to be ditheist. Photinus, like Marcellus, considered the Son of God to have been born from *Mary, in the sense that the Logos became Son only by incarnating in the man Jesus and taking residence in him. Compared to his teacher, Photinus was clearer in affirming that the humanity assumed by the Logos was complete, including a soul, against the Logos/Sarx *Christology typical of the Alexandrians. As *Adam had sinned with *soul and with *body, so the Logos, to redeem man, became incarnate in a complete humanity of body and soul.

M. Simonetti, *Studi sull'arianesimo*, Rome 1965, 135-159; Simonetti 590; M. Clauss, *Photin* BBKL 7, 554-555; *Photinus*: ODC (1997), 1283; K.-H. Uthemann, *Photeinos*: LTK 3, 267; L.A. Speller, *New Light on the Photinians. The Evidence of Ambrosiaster*: JTS 34 (1983) 99-113; R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apollinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin* (*Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos*) *und Basilius von Caesarea*, Berlin-New York 1989, 163-196; G. Feige, *Die lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner*, Leipzig 1991, esp. 144-155, see index s.v.; G. Emery, *Le photinisme et ses précurseurs chez saint Thomas. Cérinthe, les ébionites, Paul de Samosate et Photin*: Revue Thomiste 95 (1995) 369-398; Ch. Markschies, *Ambrosius von Mailand und die Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen 1995, 144-165, 180; M. Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius*, *Contra Arianos IV. Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien*, *Eusebius von Cäsarea*, *Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium*, Leiden-New York 1996; J.T. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum. Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*, Washington DC 1999, passim.

M. Simonetti

PHOTIUS (ca. 820–891). Born in *Constantinople around 820 in a noble iconodule family, he received an excellent education. Under the regency of *Theodora (843–858), he was professor of philosophy at the university and later head of the imperial chancellery and member of the senate. He was called by Bardas to be patriarch (858), replacing Ignatius; he was deposed (867) by Basil I, who recalled Ignatius, but was restored at the death of the latter (878) and remained in office until 886, when he was definitively removed by Leo VI. He died in 891. Photius is important in the history of the church as a theologian and as a humanist. This latter aspect (the only one which is of interest here) is evident above all from his work usually called *Bibliotheca* or *Myriobiblon*, whose authentic title seems however to be *Description and List of the Volumes We Have Read.* As is said in the prefaced *Letter*, addressed to his brother Tarasius, and repeated at the end of the work, this was put together and published immediately before Photius left for the embassy to the Caliph Mutawakkil (855), and was intended to be a testimony of affection for his brother during the separation. The work, therefore, was compiled when the author was about to turn 40 and was still a layman with duties at court. It gathers the readings completed and summarized in the preceding years, from the moment in which the desire to become educated awoke in him. Within it 279 writings are reviewed, without any established order, which testify to the variety and immensity of the interests of the author: writings of philologists, grammarians, lexicographers, metricians, orators, sacred and profane historians, doctors, philosophers, novelists, theologians. Each work forms a chapter, commonly called a *Codex*; the size is extremely variable: from simple annotations of a few lines (Cod. 2, 4, 5, etc.) to genuine summaries of works with anthologies of extracts (Cod. 220, 223, 230, 242, 245, etc.). Some authors are treated more than once; very often Photius gives an opinion on the utility and literary value of the work in question. Many more than half of the works cited in the *Bibliotheca* have been lost: from this the importance of Photius's work is obvious.

The large space devoted to ecclesiastical literature is surprising in Photius, as yet a *layman, both for the number (20 historians, 55 theologians), and for the size (more than half the work). The authors or texts cataloged include: (a) *historians*: Basilius Cilix, Charinus, *Chrysippus presb., *Evagrius, *Eusebius, Eustratius, Georgius Alex. episc., Hermias *Sozomenus, *Hesychius ill., Ioannes presb. Aegates, Ioannes (*John) Moschus, Fl. Iosephus iud., *Metrodorus, Nicephorus, Philippus Sid. (*Philip of Side), Philo Iud. (*Philo, historiographer), *Philostorgius, Sergius, *Theodoretus, Theophanes Byz.; (b) *theologians*: Adriani Alex. Andronici Isagoge, Andronicianus, Apollinarius (*Apollinaris), *Athanasius, *Asterius Amasiae ep., Basilius M. (*Basil of Caesarea), *Basilius Seleuc., *Cassianus, *Caesarius, Iohannes (*John) Chrys., *Clemens Alex, *Clemens Rom., *Conon, *Cyrillus Alex., *Diadochus Phot., *Diodorus Tars., Ephraem Theop., *Ephraim Syrus, *Epiphanius, *Eugenius, *Eulogius, *Eusebius ep. Thess., *Gelasius, *Germanus patr., *Gregorius

Nyss., Heracleanus, *Hesychii duo, *Hippolytus ep., Hippolytus Irenaei discip., Iobius (*Jobius) mon., Ioannes (*John) Carpathius, Ioannes (*John) Scytop., *Irenaeus ep., Iustinus (*Justin) martyr, *Leontius ep., Marcus mon., *Maximus Conf., *Methodius ep., *Modestus ep. Hier., Nicias mon., *Nilus mon., *Origenes, *Pamphilus Martyr, *Pierius presb., *Polycarpus Martyr, *Procopius, *Sophronius patr. Hier., Stephanus Gobarus (*Stephen Gobar), *Synesius Cyn., Synodi variae, *Theodorus Antioch., *Theodorus mon., *Theodorus presb., *Theodosius mon., *Theognostus.

E. Bekker, Berlin 1824 (in PG 103-4); R. Henry, Paris 1959–1977; PWK 20,1 (1941) 667-737; S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina*, Florence 1975, 340-365; LTK 8, 484-488; J. Schamp, *Photius, Bibliothèque*. IX: *Index*, Paris 1991; N. Wilson, *Fozio, Biblioteca*, Milan 1992 (partial); *Thesaurus Photii Constantinopolitani, Bibliotheca*, ed. J. Schamp - B. Kindt et CENTAL (Thesaurus Patrum Graecorum), Turnhout 2004.

A. De Nicola

PHRYGIA. Included from the beginning in the province of *Asia (the list of the cities, which later all became episcopal sees, is given by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* V, 95 and 145), after the *Diocletian reorganization it was divided into two smaller provinces, *Phrygia I* (cap. Laodicea) and *Phrygia II* (cap. Eukarpia). A distinction, from a doctrinal point of view, can be made in the region on the basis of the vast *epigraphic material preserved: on the one hand there are *Montanist inscriptions from the valley of the Tembris, in NW Phyria, on the other hand, there are *orthodox ones found in the central and S urban areas. The latter testify to the Christianization effected through the Pauline churches of Laodicea, Colossae and Hierapolis; those of the valley of the Tembris to the spread of the Montanist heresy in the 3rd c.—chased out of the Hellenized cities of S Phyria—in the N countryside, among rustic classes not touched by Hellenism, where, moreover, there are indications of the presence of a heretical Christianity into the 4th c. (cf., e.g., Socr., *HE* 4, 28, on the *Novatianist bishop of Cotiaion, metropolis of the upper valley of the Tembris). Hierapolis gloried in *Philip and his daughters. Its bishop *Papias (around 130/140) was known for his *Explanations of the Words of the Lord.* The inscription, toward the end of the 2nd c., of its bishop *Abercius is famous; he had traveled widely, arriving as far as Rome.

In the Christianization of the region, the city of Laodicea Combusta occupies a special place, at the crossing of the roads from *Cappadocia to *Cilicia, a vivacious center of commercial traffic. Always absent from the urban representatives at the councils of the 4th c. (the first mention is at *Chalcedon in 451), acc. to *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 47), it owed its nickname of κεκαυμένης (Combusta) to the burning of the *Encratite heresy in its territory (cf. also Basil, *Ep.* 188), a response to the question of *Amphilochius, bishop of *Iconium, concerning the admission of members of heretical sects to his church. This was not an academic question, but founded undoubtedly on the concrete problem represented by the presence of a heretical city like Laodicea in the district, as also demonstrated by the epigraphs of Laodicea, which mention the same sects that were the subject of the letter of Basil (Cathari, Saccophori, Apotactites, *Encratites). A famous epitaph of the Bishop Eugenius survives, a provincial noble, imperial functionary, victim of the *persecution of *Maximinus, who died around 340, after a 25-year episcopate in his home city of Laodicea Combusta. He provides an exceptional example of the role played by Christians of the dominant social classes before the Constantinian period. The little town of Orcistus was already Christian at the time of *Constantine, as was Eumeneia even earlier, of which *Polycarp named the bishop toward the middle of the 2nd c. (Eus., *HE* 5,24,4).

W.M. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Oxford 1895–1896; W.M. Calder, *The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies*, in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir W.M. Ramsay*, Manchester 1923, 59-91; J. Schmidt, *Phrygia*: PWK XX, 1, 781-891; C.H.E. Haspels, *The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments*, Princeton, NJ 1971 (fundamental); E. Gibson, *The "Christians for Christians." Inscriptions of Phrygia*, Greek texts, tr. and comm., Missoula, MT 1978; A.R.R. Sheppard, *Christians, and Heretics in Acmonia and Eumeneia*: AS 29 (1979) 169-180; A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten. Eine religionsgeographische Untersuchung*, Berlin 1980; W. Wischmeyer, *M. Iulius Eugenius. Eine Fallstudie zum Thema "Christen und Gesellschaft im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert"*: ZNTW 81 (1990) 225-246; G.J. Johnson, *A Christian Business and Christian Self-Identity in Third/Fourth Century Phrygia*: VChr 48 (1994) 341-366; W. Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia. Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, Macon, GA 1997; D. Feissel, *L'"adnotatio" de Constantin sur le droit de cité d'Orcistus en Phrygie*: AntTard 7 (1999) 255-267; S. Dmitriev, *The End of "provincia Asia"*: Historia 50 (2001) 468-489.

M. Forlin Patrucco

PHYSICIAN, CHRIST the. For the ancient peoples of the Mediterranean, sickness and healing were at the center of personal religious experience and had repercussions on the general cosmic equilibrium (P. Gerlitz). In the imperial period, despite the fact that the *art* of medicine had already developed techniques and rationales that provided cures for sicknesses of various sorts with tested remedies, never-

theless, recourse to the gods and to superstitious practices to obtain a restoration of health lost due to some evil remained the primary solution. Christianity entered into this religious context with the preaching of Jesus, a worker of miracles and exorcisms. It did so not because of the need for pastoral adaptation to Hellenistic culture, but rather because such an image is fundamental to the Christian perception of Jesus. His miraculous and healing actions manifest the presence of the kingdom of God and his messianic mission (Mt 12:28), and, acc. to patristic theology, they manifestly confirm these things and are the expression of the divine power present in him (*Origen, *C. Celsum* II, 48.51). In a period in which popular anxiety for health was at extreme levels and means were not spared, including the magic of charlatans, to obtain the healing of sickness, the preaching of and faith in Jesus the Healer allowed Christianity to penetrate rapidly in *Palestine, *Syria and areas where Greek was spoken (H.C. Kee, 205).

This image of Jesus was not forgotten in the following centuries. In the 2nd and 3rd c., Christ was defined as a physician by the *apologists who responded to the comparison made between him and Asclepius, the god of health, and the rational objections of the Greek philosophers, who accused Christians of having recourse to magic (Orig., *C. Celsum* I, 6; II, 50-51). The image of Christ the physician acquired strength from comparison with the philosophical schools as well, esp. the Cynic-Stoic school, whose philosophers presented themselves as physicians capable of healing the passions of the soul. The earliest apologetics transferred the notion of Christ the physician to a metaphorical, soteriological level of meaning, beside the number of other images of the redemption. Deeply rooted in the NT tradition (A. Oepke), this meaning refers essentially to human liberation from sin, understood as incurable sickness. It is described in the language and with the knowledge of medicine which belong to the time: passages from the writings of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* or from other famous medical treatises are often cited in writings (see, e.g., Orig., *C. Celsum* IV, 15; *Eus., *HE* 10,4,11; *Greg. Naz., *Disc.* 7,20,4).

Yet the notion of Christ the physician is not limited to the symbolic representation of the redemption. Indeed, Christ is the "only physician of bodies and souls" (Orig., *Hom. in Lev.* VII, 1), who heals those who have recourse to him in the church and invoke him in their physical and spiritual sicknesses. Thus, liturgy and spirituality are presented from a *medicinal* point of view, esp. in the *Alexandrian tradition and in Eastern monasticism, where they constitute the healing remedies for humanity, who is sick in nature due to the passions. Finally, the image of Christ the physician in the gospel shaped the disposition of the church toward the sick, not so much with regard to offering specific medicines, as to the merciful care reserved for them. These themes—apologetic, dogmatic, anthropological-spiritual and ecclesial—tied to the notion of Christ the physician cannot easily be gathered together in one concise exposition. Moreover, this image belongs to the same problematic triangle of health in antiquity, the three sides of which were the sickness, the sick person and the physician (*Corpus Hipp., Epid.* I, 2,5). Therefore, the exposition of this topic, which cannot be exhaustive for obvious reasons, will turn upon the following three fundamental points: (1) Christ the physician—(a) in the apostolic preaching, (b) in ante-Nicene apologetics, (c) in catechesis of the 4th–5th c.—(2) Christ the physician and sick humanity; (3) sicknesses healed by Christ the physician—(a) healing remedies of Christ, (b) ecclesial care of sickness.

1. *Christ the physician*. In the OT, sickness and healing depend on God, who assumes the task of healing Israel (Ex 15:26). But in general, Yahweh is a healer in a figurative sense: he can heal from sin and restore the sinner to communion with him (Is 6:10; 2:4; Ps 6:10; etc.). This salvific monopoly is exercised in the NT by Jesus, whose very name means "*Yahweh* saves" (Mt 1:21; Acts 4:12); and *save* in the language of the NT means "liberate," "take out of danger," but also "heal." In the gospels, Jesus never presents himself directly and personally as "physician" (*iatros*). Nevertheless, the NT tradition is undoubtedly oriented toward such an image. In fact, Jesus not only heals all the sick that he encounters, but also *saves* them, healing their sins and restoring them to the life of a relationship with God and the community. Because of his activity, the gospels attribute to Jesus the title of physician either because he was defined as such by his fellow citizens (Lk 4:23), or else because it may be understood from the way Jesus justified his redemptive activity by comparing himself to a physician who cares for the sick, since he came not for the just but for sinners (Mt 9:12; Mk 2:17; Lk 5:31). The Fathers drew the medical image of Christ from this passage of the gospel (see Harnack, 125).

a. *In the apostolic preaching*. The apostolic tradition received this image as essential, as it appears in the first sermon of Peter (Acts 10:30), and, when the cripple is healed at the Beautiful Gate (Acts 3:2), the apostle calls upon the "salvific" power of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 3:11). In noncanonical writings, the title "physician, fleshly and spiritual" for Jesus Christ appears for the first time at the beginning of the 2nd

c. in an antidocetic profession of faith by *Ignatius of Antioch (*Eph.* 7,1-2). Yet the image was equally popular with marginal groups which denied the reality of the body of Christ, who was invoked by them as the "physician who heals for free" (*Acts of John* 108; *Acts of Thomas* 156).

b. *In ante-Nicene apologetics*. The 2nd c. was a golden period for Roman medicine, which had masters such as Soranus and *Galen, who raised a wave of enthusiasm unheard of before for medicine. This was also the century of *Asclepius, who had the title of *sōtēr*, because of the miraculous healings attributed to him by those devoted to him, and by the votive offerings (*ex voto*) placed in the famous Greek places of worship in Epidaurus, Kos, Pergamon, but also in Rome itself, on the Tiber Island, and in some 400 other temples or shrines scattered throughout the Mediterranean. These places of worship were also centers for health, with corresponding structures, where *incubation* was practiced, and where priest-physicians carried out specific forms of treatment for the sick, who went there either because they were poor—although the poor also were required to contribute financial remuneration for the services offered—or else when professional physicians had failed. But such an order was not always observed. While keeping their distance from magic, professional physicians, from Hippocrates to Galen, upheld both medicine and the cult of Asclepius. In fact, in antiquity medicine always remained *religious*, and physicians carried out their practice as earthly substitutes and helpers of the divine healers (Gerlitz).

For their part, Christians greeted with favor Soranus and Galen and rejected Asclepius. Galen was almost made into an idol by some Christians, guided by *Theodotus, an *adoptionist from *Byzantium. But Galen was able to provide some medical ideas by which Christianity could be presented to pagans (Eus., *HE* 5,28-13-14). In the 4th c., thanks to the popularization of his ideas by Oribasius, a physician in the circle of *Julian the Apostate, it became the foundation of the medical and anthropological knowledge of the Cappadocians, and later, of Byzantine medicine. In the West, *Tertullian, in addition to knowing and citing Hippocrates, Galen, Herophilus and Asclepiades, shared with Soranus, esp. for his concept of nature, the ideas of the medical school of the "methodists," whose positions are between those of the "dogmatists" and those of the "empiricists" (*De An.* 6,6; 27,4). On the other hand, criticism of the cult of Asclepius began early on and is perhaps already present in the gospel of John (Sauser, 106). Still, thanks to the almost universal positive attitude toward medicine, the apologists of the 2nd c. use the image of Christ the physician to present Christian salvation in comprehensible terms while they criticize the supposed healings worked by Asclepius (*Quadratus, *HE* IV, 3,2; *Aristides, *Ap.* X, 5; *Tatian, *Orat.* 21; *Athenagoras, *Suppl.* XXIX; *Diognetus IX).

For *Justin, the cult of Asclepius and the healings occurring in his shrines are works of demons seeking to create obstacles to the work of Christ (*1 Ap.* XXII, 6). Unlike Asclepius, a man who became a god (1 Ap. XXV, 1), the Logos of God became human for us, "so that, having become a partaker in our infirmities, he might be able to heal them" (*2 Ap.* XIII, 4). In this way, the medical image of the redemption pertains to the divine *oikonomia* itself, since, because of his wounds, healed humanity can now approach the Father (*Dial.* XVII, 1).

Unlike the other Greek apologists, *Theophilus places the activity of physician in the Father, who unfolds his work of salvation in healing by means of the Logos and Wisdom (Theophilus, *Ad Aut.* I, 7). The unclear theology of this bishop of Antioch nevertheless cleared a path for the theologians who descended into the arena of antignostic polemic. *Irenaeus presents both the image of Christ the physician as well as of God who, just as a good physician, gives proof of his skill by healing sick humanity (*Adv. Haer.* III, V, 2; IV, XX, 7). On the other side of the Mediterranean, in Africa, in polemics with the *Marcionites, who may have used Christ the physician as a point in favor of the predilection of Christ the *foreigner* for the pagans, Tertullian took up the image of God the physician in *Against Marcion* (1,22; 3,17) and introduced it firmly into the African theological tradition (*De Paen.* 10; 15). In defense of the value of martyrdom and, again, against the *gnostics, who did not approve of it, Tertullian was disposed to accept the aspect, at times cruel, of God the physician (also in *Marc.* 2,16), who nevertheless works so as to save the sick from death. Tertullian combines the idea of God as *medicator* (*hapax*), with that of God as *predicator* (*Marc.* 3,17). With his word he cuts out from human hearts the word of death placed there by Adam. If, then, he commands the martyr to die, he actually delivers him from death (*Scorp.* 5).

In the 3rd c., due to their openness to Greek culture, the Alexandrians were able to give the metaphor of Christ the physician its fullest formulation. Already *Clement, a man of many cultural interests, was fascinated by medicine in his time, and understood the work of Christ to be like that of a good physician who prepares the faithful for the divine pedagogue (*Paed.* I, 83,2-3). The activity of the di-

vine physician is focused on the spirit of the believer who has received the call of the Logos, because for Clement, good spiritual health is necessary in order to progress in divine knowledge (*Exc. ex Theod.* 45,1). The Logos thus exercises a double function: first, as physician, he heals human passions; next, as pedagogue, he can introduce the mysteries of God (*Paed.* I, 3,1-3). In polemics with the gnostics, who depreciated the human body, Clement remarked that the Logos heals the entire person: spirit and body. As the only physician of humankind, he healed the paralytic, saved Lazarus from death (*Paed.* I, 6,1-4; *Strom.* III, XVII,104,4), and as the Good Samaritan, heals from the passions of the soul which dominate the world and lead to death (*Quis Dives* 29). In the doctrine of Origen, medicine and the knowledge of the word of God are considered equivalent, because both are necessary for human life (*Com. in Luc.* I, 5) and thus the figure of Christ the physician has an important position in his doctrine for catechetical, spiritual and apologetic reasons. But the title *physician* applied to Christ is firmly rooted in his doctrine of the Logos. According to Origen, Scripture attributes to the Logos various titles through which it adapts to various human necessities (*Com. in Jo.* I, 20). These are subdivided into eternal and essential titles, those that pertain to the mystery of God in itself, and in temporal and contingent things, those that pertain to the economy of salvation. Among the latter, the title of physician is among the most important, as it refers to the action of the Son of God with respect to sick humanity (*Comm. in Jo.* I, 23). Because of the descent of the Word to mortal prostration, the medicinal mission of Christ, the "Great Physician" (*archiatros*)—a common title for physicians in imperial times—is inscribed in the very plan of God, who comes to cure the horrible wound of sick humanity (*Hom. in Jer.* II, 6). The angels had failed in the case of humanity, and likewise the patriarchs and prophets, "physicians superior to all other physicians," sent to heal Israel, and finally, the disciples themselves. Thus, it was necessary that the only great specialist, Christ, present himself as the "physician of bodies and souls" (*Hom. in Luc.* XIII, 2-3; *Hom. in Jer.* XVIII, 5; *Com. in Mt.* XIII, 5).

To *Celsus, who considered the descent of Christ to the sick dishonorable for the divinity, which would thus be subject to change, Origen stated that, unlike earthly physicians, the Logos of God is immune from the contagion of evils. In fact, Christ heals souls through the immutable divine Logos present in him (*C. Celsum* IV, 15). Further, Celsus's manner of making comparisons leads Origen to evaluate the healings attributed to Asclepius, "a demon physician." For Origen, it is possible that true healings occurred in his shrines, but no one acquired health from such a god. On the contrary, Christ's absolute superiority and divinity are proved through the gift of health, which no earthly physician or demon can offer (*C. Celsum* III, 3.25.42; V, 2).

c. *In catechesis of the 4th–5th c.* At the end of the 3rd c., the Latin apologists sharpened their criticism against the cult of Asclepius (*Arnobius, *Adv. Nat.* 7,44; *Lactantius, *DI* 2,16,12), but ante-Nicene artistic production, which portrays Christ with the characteristic features of the pagan divinity (Dinkler), shows that the image of Asclepius as savior and healer had strongly influenced Christians as well. Yet in the following century, the popularity of the healer god among pagans declined in favor of the cult of Isis, Serapis and *Mithra. In the mid-4th c., *Firmicus Maternus names him only in passing (*De err.* 12,8), whereas he elaborates upon the Eastern mystery cults which promised salvation, asking the emperors for the suppression of all such cults. And indeed, a few decades earlier, *Constantine had taken measures in order to demolish the *Asklepion* of Aegae in *Cilicia (Eus., *Vit. Const.* 3,56). As the cult of Asclepius disappeared in the post-Nicene period, the theologians' criticism of the god of medicine diffuses into a general criticism of polytheism (Ambrose, *Virg.* 3.2.7; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 3,12.17; 4,21 etc.) and of magic, which was supposed to have been taught in the shrines of the divinity (*Jerome, *In Is. Comm.* 18,65; *Life of Hilarion* 21). Yet, although the image of Christ the physician lost its apologetic interest, it gained in theological depth. In the West, the reading of the apologists and of Origen was not forgotten by their eminent Latin readers, who deepened the theological meaning of the titles *medicus* and *salvator* applied to Christ (Jer., *Tract. In Psalm.* LXXXIII 8; Aug., *Sermo* 155,10; 299,6) and preached to the faithful the urgency of conversion and the confidence that they could find in him, their savior and physician, pardon for their sins and spiritual health (Ambrose, *De Helia* 20.75; *Cain* 2.3.11; *Exp. Ev. Lucae* 4.57; 67; 5.19; 46; *Exp. Ps. CXVIII* III, 22-26). In his preaching, Jerome accumulates medical terms for Christ: *verus medicus, ipse et medicus et medicamentum, verus archiater, quasi spiritualis Hippocrates* (Jer., *Tract. in Marci Ev.* I, 13-31 CCL 78,468; SC 494, 16; other *loci*: Sauser, 109). In the East, the metaphor of Christ the physician is essential in the soteriology of *Athanasius (*CG* 1; *De Inc.* 18; 44) and recurs in the images of redemption in the baptismal catecheses of *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 2,6; 10,13; 12,7), in the soteriology of the Cappadocians and in

the preaching of *John Chrysostom (various *loci* in Larcet, *Terapia* 288-289).

With *Augustine, the title *medicus* for Christ received a new lease on life, as he placed it within the economy of salvation understood as *dispensatio medicinalis*. The metaphor of Christ the physician is present above all in the discourses preached to the people and in the polemics with the *Manicheans, the *Montanists and the *Pelagians. It helped Augustine explain to the people how the redemption is a *mystery of the humility of Christ, who descended in order to heal humanity from the tumor of pride. For pride brought about the fall of the first parents and is the cause of all human vices (*Pecc. merit.* 2.17.27). In redemption, therefore, Christ carries out the role of *medicus humilis* (*loci*: Abersmann 7 ff.), who came to heal the sick with his humility. He suffered in order to teach "them humility, so that, instructed in humility, they would be healed of pride" (*En. in Ps.* 35,17). However serious the sickness of the one who approaches Christ, he should never despair, since, as in the case of Paul of Tarsus, Christ gives proof of his talent in desperate cases (*Sermo* 175,9). In order to remain in the condition of health, the Christian, healed by the divine physician, must become a disciple of the *magister humilitatis* (*Sermo* 77.7.11). The image of Christ the physician appears again in Augustine's defense of Christianity, which had been accused in his time of being the cause of the many disasters which had occurred in the empire. In this case, Augustine changes the image, and Christ becomes the all-powerful physician, the only one capable of diagnosing true human sickness in sin, which causes every catastrophe, and for this reason descended to heal humanity from sin (*Serm.* 87, 10.13–11.14 and again, Abersmann, 23-28).

2. *Christ the physician and sick humanity*. The healings worked by Christ are considered by the evangelists from a theological point of view. Jesus fulfills the prophetic promise of Yahweh as healer to save his people and heal the nations. He heals in order for human spiritual transformation to be realized and for the salvific economy of God to be actualized (Kee, 205-207). The Fathers continued such a theological reading of the activity of Jesus (Iren., *A.H.* III, 5,2; Clem. Alex., *Paed.* I, 2,6; Ambrose, *Exp. in Luc.* 7,73-75). They had learned from medicine and from philosophy that sickness is weakness, lack, deformation of all that pertains to nature (*modus deficiens*). The natural human condition is health in agreement with cosmic harmony. Sickness, on the other hand, is not a natural event, but rather a corruption of health, *res contra naturam* (Aug., *Fund.* 53). Considered theologically, esp. in the tradition of the Cappadocians, the state of human health is a dynamic condition and consists in the healthy orientation of spiritual powers such that they cooperate with divine grace, so that the image of God within is completed by *likeness* to God as well, in the perfection of divinization. "Man is a creature which has received the commandment to become God" (Basil in Greg. Naz., *Disc.* 48, PG 36, 560A). Human health depends on an ordered will, capable of dominating *passions*. But the fall brought about a loss of rational control over the passions, which are unchained and impose themselves as "a brand upon bodies" (Greg. Naz., *Disc.* 32,27). For the Cappadocians, the spiritual has predominance over the bodily, and the various sicknesses are not all caused by physical causes which specific medicines can be used for. Briefly, sickness appears as a disturbance and negation of human nature acc. to the divine project. Gregory of Nyssa states that "once the human race . . . enjoyed health," but after the fall "this mortal sickness which sin is, fixed itself in human nature" (*Hom. on the Lord's Prayer* IV, 2). Thus, the truly sick one is the whole human race, the Adam for whom the heavenly physician came "casting away evil by its contraries, acc. to the rule of medicine," healing the human will and orienting it toward God (ibid.). In the West, this doctrine of incurably sick humanity received its most famous theological formulation in Augustine: "The human race is sick, not with a bodily sickness, but with its sins. There he is, the great sick one, who lies upon the whole earth from E to W" (*Serm.* 87,11; 155,10).

3. *Sicknesses healed by Christ the physician*. According to our sources, we must distinguish two types of sickness: physical and spiritual. To cure their physical sicknesses, Christians turned to the physicians of their time, but when these failed, they sought miraculous healing. But the custom of asking for the intervention of the divine physician in order to heal sicknesses increased as they lost awareness of the causes of diseases (Ferngren, 2965f.). With the development of demonology in all ranges of society in the 1st and 2nd c., both Jewish and Hellenistic, many sicknesses were attributed to the activity of demons, and such sicknesses thus rendered necessary a supernatural intervention. Among Christians, at first only marginal groups, such as the Montanists, the gnostics, then the *Donatists, requested miraculous healing, but later, beginning in the 3rd c., the orthodox sought such healing as well, through exorcisms, sacramental anointings and the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ. At *Timgad in Africa, an inscription that was most likely Donatist, discovered in 1919, reads: "*Rogo te, Domine, sub-*

veni, Criste, tu solus medicus sanctis et penitentibus." Another Greek inscription found in a house in Frikya (Syria) expresses nearly the same invocation of Christ the divine physician (Leclerq, 160). But more than for physical sicknesses, Jesus the physician is invoked so that he might heal personal spiritual sicknesses. Sickness of body opens the way to spiritual purification (Ambrose, *Hex*. 1,31; Basil, *Hom. in Ps*. 45: PG 29, 417; Gregory Naz., *Ep*. 31: PG 37, 68B). The numerous pathologies of the spirit listed by theologians are clearly connected with their pastoral preoccupations (poisonous bites of the *Docetists: Ign,, *Eph*. 7,2; the passions: Clem. Alex., *Quis Dives* 29,3; paralysis, blindness, deafness, tumors of the soul due to sin: Origen, *Comm. in Math*. 13,4; concupiscence: Greg. Nyss., *Hom. on the Lord's Prayer* IV, 2). The blind, the deaf and the lame healed by Christ represent the spiritually sick of their time, in need of meeting the divine physician (Orig., *Mat. Com*. XI, 18, other *loci* in Fernández 89 ff.; Cyril Jer., *Cat*. 10,13; *Hom. in Paralyt*. 4). In the case of physical sicknesses, before having recourse to a physician, a spiritual discernment is necessary. According to *Basil, medicine is a divine help for humanity. But Christians believe that at times sicknesses are disorders provoked by sins. In this case, one should not seek a physician, but remain patient under the hand of God, thus showing the fruits of true conversion (Basil, *Reg. fus*. 55).

a. *The healing remedies of Christ*. In the medical soteriology of the Fathers, Christ is physician and also pharmacist, acc. to the pharmaceutical terms which express salvation. This is reflected in the liturgy of the church, which has abundantly used this rich medical-pharmaceutical vocabulary (*Apostolic Constitutions* 5; *Sacramentary of Serapion* 13; 17; 29). In the first centuries, however, such terminology must be considered as an alternative to the healing remedies offered in the shrines of Asclepius (incubation, bath therapy, physical exercises, music therapy, special diets). According to Ignatius of Antioch, the eucharistic bread is the "medicine of immortality, an antidote that allows us not to die" (*Eph* 20,2). In Justin, Jesus is the source of living water (Jn 4:10, 14) who healed the blind, deaf and lame, unlike Asclepius (*Dial*. 69,3-6). In Clement, the Logos is again the "medicine of immortality," which grants to humankind that they not slither about like serpents (*Protr*. 106,2). But the most efficacious medicine which Christ provides for all evils is his word (Theophilus, *Ad Aut*. I, 7; Origen, *In Lev*. 8,1; Lactantius, *Inst*. 4,15). Almost all the Fathers show its healing power, esp. in order to keep all suspicion of magic far from the church. Christ, in fact, heals at a distance, by his word, "without medicines or herbs" (apocryphal letter of *Abgar in Eus. *HE* 1,13,6). In Origen, Christ does not use extracts of herbs and of mineral oils, but "mysteries of words," contained in the Sacred Scriptures proclaimed in the church, which is at the same time his pharmacy and his hospital (*In Lev*. 8,1). In the 4th c., Christ assumes the identity of the Good Samaritan as well, who reserves for the sinner = "sick man" *many medicines*, such as the word, oil, wine (Ambrose, *In Luc*. 7,75; *Exp. Ps*. CXVIII 21,5). Yet this pharmaceutical theology reaches its culmination in proposing Christ himself as the medicine of the sick. As in modern medicine, which has found the role of the physician to be important, in his very person, just so Ambrose, Jerome and then Augustine present Christ as *et medicus et medicamentum* (Jer., *Tract. in Marc. Ev*. I, 13-31 CCL 78, 468).

In Augustine's *theologia medicinalis* (Schipperges, 15), the descriptions of the mortal condition in which fallen humanity finds itself must be read as corresponding to his "Christology-soteriology." Humanity, having been cast deep into death by the fall, can be raised up again only by God. God carries this out through a man, because a human must save humankind, but one who possesses the fullness of life. The Word of God became flesh, assuming humanity in Jesus. He is therefore the Mediator, God and man. He is Wisdom that has shown its capacity to cure by healing; *ipsa* [Sapientia] *medicus, ipsa medicina* (*De Doctr. Chr*. I, 14.13).

b. *Ecclesial care of sickness*. The image of Christ the physician is also reflected in the life of the church. Until Origen's time there were present in the church charisms of healing (*C. Celsum* I, 46), which tended to disappear in the following centuries (John Chrys., *In Inscriptionem Actorum Ap*. 2,3, PG 51, 81; Aug., *De Vera Relig*. 25,47; but also *Retract*. 1,13,7). On the other hand, the therapeutic activity of the community tended toward a progressive ritualization and spiritualization. If sickness is the expression of sin, sin also bears the marks of sickness. Thus, prayer and penance, which heal sin, are the chief physicians for Christians (*Cyprian, *De Lapsis* 14). Therefore, the whole community exercises this healing role, esp. in the sacramental liturgy (Sauser, 112 ff.). With time, the medical metaphor was also transferred to bishops, priests and laity, who carry out their role of "spiritual physicians." Nevertheless, in concrete situations of physical sickness, esp. in health emergencies due to epidemic diseases, Christians of every hierarchical order, without fear for their health, took care of the infected sick with an attitude contrary to the norm in pagan practice

(Cyprian, *De mort.*; Letter of *Dionysius of Alex. regarding the plague of 252-267, in Eus., *HE* 7,22,7).

From the 4th c. on, bishops were required to organize centers which would offer care for the sick and would receive the poor and foreigners (Council of *Nicaea, *Coll. Araba Can.* 75, Mansi 2,1006; *see* *xenodochium). Arian bishops opened various centers which offered food and medical assistance to the poor. Among the orthodox, because of the marginalization of the poor in Cappadocia, Basil the Great had constructed at Caesarea the "new city" (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 43.35; 43.63), a complex of buildings that arose around 372, where care was taken of the seriously ill and the poor were provided for. In this center, later named Basileiad in his honor (*Firmus of Caes., *Ep.* 43), the nurses and physicians were, for the most part, ascetics themselves, following the bishop (Basil, *Ep.* 94). In this small city of health and Christian mercy, Basil taught the monks to consider the service of their brothers as rendered to God (*Reg. Brev.* 160), while he taught the sick to trust the physicians, so that through their sickness they might learn to entrust themselves to the Lord and ask healing from him. Basil is quite demanding with the sick, since sickness is not a reason for spiritual laziness, but becomes the propitious occasion for a true personal conversion (*Reg. Brev.* 301; 26; 155; esp. 314).

Between the 3rd and 4th c., in the East, thanks to St. *John Chrysostom and to imperial assistance, and in the West, due to the generosity of many converts from the higher social classes, many hospitals and *xenodochia* were founded which offered free medical assistance (Mattioli, 262-263). On the other hand, in the East, the title of spiritual physician, attributed initially to bishops ("spiritual surgeons," *Const. Apost.* 3,41), thanks to *Athanasius and to the *Life of Anthony* (ch.87: "physician of Egypt"), began to designate the spiritual monk as well, who was capable of healing sicknesses of the spirit. Through his works, *John Cassian spread throughout Western monasticism confidence in Christ the physician, who uses methods and medicines to heal the passions of the soul (*Conf.* VII, 30; XIX, 12; *Ist.* XII, 8). In the *Rule of St. Benedict,* where it recommends the reading of Cassian (42; 73), the abbot, as *vicarius Christi*, is the *sapiens medicus* who must know how to use all the medicines necessary for those who have been entrusted to him as sick to care for (27,1-3,5). Thanks to its foundation in the notion of Christ the physician, the Eastern ascetical tradition can say that it was established as and remains a "method of diagnosis and therapy for spiritual sicknesses" (Larcet, *Therapy*). In the West, however, no one goes further than *Benedict in creative theological development of the metaphor of Christ the physician. In the following centuries, this concept gradually lost theological importance, though it remained quite present to some theologians. At the beginning of the Middle Ages, instead of *Christus Medicus* and *Mediator*, we find *sancti medici mediatores* (*Gregory of Tours, in Lutterbach).

A. Harnack, *Medizinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte,* TU 8 (4), Leipzig 1892, 37-152; H. Leclercq, *Le Christ médicin*: DACL 11 (1933) 157-160; R. Herzog, s.v. *Asklepios*: RAC 1 (1950) 795-799; G. Bardy, *Saint Augustin et les médecins*: L'année théologique augustinienne 13 (1953) 327-346; R. Schneider, *Was hat uns Augustins* theologia medicinalis *heute zu sagen?* Kerygma und Dogma 3 (1957) 397-415; R. Arbesmann, *The Concept of "Christus Medicus" in S. Augustine*: Traditio 10 (1954) 1-28; H. Schipperges, *Zur Tradition des "Christus Medicus" im frühen Christentum und in der älteren Heilkunde*: Arzt und Christ 11 (1965) 12-20; C. Andresen, *Erlösung*: RAC 6 (1966) 54-219; E. Nowak, *Le chrétien devant la souffrance. Étude sur la pensée de Jean Chrysostome*, Paris 1973; A. Oepke, ἰάομαι: GLNT IV (1968) 667-724 [TDNT 3, 194-215]; A. Brontesi, *La soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*, Rome 1972; E. Dinkler, *Christus und Asklepios*, Heidelberg 1980; G. Dumeige, *Médicin* (*Le Christ*): DSp 10 (1980) 891-901; Id., *Le Christ médicin dans la littérature chrétienne des premiers siècles*: RivAC 48 (1972) 115-141; D. Gourevitch, *Le triangle hippocratique dans le monde gréco-romain. Le malade, sa maladie et son médicin*, Rome 1981; J. Pigeaud, *La maladie, l'étude de la relation de l'âme et du corps dans la tradition médico-philosophique antique*, Paris 1981; G. Fichtner, *Christus als Arzt. Ursprünge und Wirkungen eines Motivs*: Frühmittelalterliche Studien 16 (1982) 1-18; B. Studer, *Redenzione:* DPAC II (1983) 2974-2977; P. Gerlitz, *Heilkunde/ Medizin I*: TRE 14 (1985) 738-743; G. Giurisato, *L'abate come "Medico esperto"* (*RB 27,2–28,3*), in *Comunione e Comunità,* Rome 1987, 291-335; E. Sauser, *Christus Medicus—Christus als Arzt und seine Nachfolger im frühen Christentum*: Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift 101 (1992) 101-123; G.B. Ferngren - D.W. Amundsen, *Medicine and Christianity in the Roman Empire: Compatibilities and Tensions*: ANRW II (1996) 37,3, 2957-2980; H.C., Kee, *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times,* SNTSMS 55, Cambridge 1988; M. Herzog, *Christus medicus, apothecarius, samaritanus, balneator. Motive einer "medizinisch-pharmazeutischen Soteriologie"*: Geist und Leben 67 (1994) 414-434; A.N. Terrin (ed.), *Liturgia e terapia*, Padua 1994; H. Lutterbach, *Der Christus medicus und die Sancti medici: das wechselvolle Verhältnis zweier Grundmotive christlicher Frömmigkeit zwischen Spätantike und Früher Neuzeit*: Saeculum 47 (1996) 239-281; U. Mattioli, *Assistenza e cura dei malati nell'antichità cristiana*, in E. dal Covolo - I. Giannetto, *Cultura e promozione umana. La cura del corpo e dello spirito nell'antichità classica e nei primi secoli cristiani. Un magistero ancora attuale?*, Troina 1998, 245-278; D. Knipp, *"Christus Medicus" in der frühchristlichen Sarkophagskulptur: ikonographische Studien zur Sepulkralkunst des späten vierten Jahrhunderts*, Leiden 1998; S. Fernández, *Cristo médico según Orígenes. La actividad médica como metáfora de la acción divina*, Rome 1999; Th.F. Martin, *Paul the Patient. "Christus Medicus" and the "Stimulus carnis"* (*2 Cor. 12:7*). *A Consideration of Augustine's Medicinal Christology*: Augustinian Studies 32 (2001) 219-256; J.-Cl. Larcet, *Terapia delle malattie spirituali*, Cinisello Balsamo 2003; G. Hammann, *Die Geschichte der christlichen Diakonie: Praktizierte Nächstenliebe von der Antike bis zur Reformation-*

szeit, Göttingen 2003; M. Dörnemann, *Krankheit und Heilung in der Theologie der frühen Kirchenväter*, Tübingen 2003; I. Andorlini - A. Marcone, *Medicina, medico e società nel mondo antico*, Florence 2004; V. Boudon-Millot - B. Pouderon, *Les Pères de l'Église face à la science médicale de leur temps*, Paris 2005.

V. Lombino

PHYSIOLOGUS. The name of diverse Christian collections of questions and answers on "mirabilia" of natural science, circulated in Greek, in Latin and in Eastern languages. The answers were given by a personage called Physiologus, i.e., Aristotle, but the work is anonymous, even if certain adaptations go under the names of famous fathers of the church (*Epiphanius, *Basil, *Chrysostom, *Jerome, etc.). The Physiologus was composed in Greek in the 4th c., but displays many archaizing traits. It contains 48 "natures," for the most part of animals, but also of plants and minerals, taken from very diverse sources (biblical material, classical and Hellenistic influences, and also traditional Egyptian beliefs), the whole revisited in a Christian sense acc. to the rules of *allegorical *exegesis, which drew from them *christological applications (sometimes with accents of an *adoptionist type) and moral ones (often of an *Encratite mold). The popular character of the work favored its dissemination in the East and in medieval Europe, in numerous languages and diverse editions, variously interpolated from MS to MS, which renders difficult the research on the literary history of Physiologus. The work had a notable influence on Christian *symbolism and *iconography.

CPG 3766; W. Lüdtke, *Zum armenischen und lateinischen Physiologus*, Vienna 1911, 212-222; PWK 20, 1 (1941) 1074-1129; F. Sbordone, *Physiologus*, Mediolani . . . , 1936; F.J. Carmody, *Physiologus latinus. Études préliminaires, versio B*, Paris 1939; G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, I (ST 118), Vatican City 1944, 548-549; A. van Lantschoot, *À propos du Physiologus*: Coptic Studies in Honor of W.E. Crum, Boston 1950, 339-363; C. Conti Rossini, *Il Fisiologo etiopico*: Rassegna di studi etiopici 10 (1951) 5-51; A. van Lantschoot, *Fragments syriaques du Physiologus*: Muséon 72 (1952) 37-51; E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Studien und Untersuchungen*, Rome 1959, 236-253 (cf. ByzZ 47 [1954] 60-72); D. Offermanns, *Der Physiologus nach den Handschriften G und M*, Meisenheim am Glan 1966; D. Kaimakis, *Der Physiologus nach der ersten Redaktion*, Meisenheim am Glan 1974 (irrelevant); F. Sbordone, *Rassegna di studi sul Physiologus (1936–1976)*: RFIC 105 (1976) 496-500; J.H. Declerck, *Remarques sur la tradition du Physiologus grec*: Byzantion 51 (1981) 148-158; Ch. Koch, *Eine Notiz zum armenischen Physiologos*: REArm 16 (1982) 87-88; A. Stojkova, *Vizantijskata redakcija na Fiziologa v južnoslavjanskata srednovekovna knižina*: Palaeobulgarica/Starobŭlgaristika 16 (1992) 68-76; A. Scott, *The Date of the Physiologus*: VChr 52 (1998) 430-441.

Sources: E. Brunner-Traut, *Spitzmaus und Ichneumon als Tiere des Sonnengottes*: NGWG 7 (1965) 123-163; Id., *Ägyptische Mythen im Physiologus (zu Kapitel 26, 25 und 11)*: Festschrift für S. Schott, Wiesbaden 1968, 13-44; Id., *Altägyptische Mythen im Physiologus*: Antaios 10 (1969) 184-198 (repr.: Id., *Gelebte Mythen. Beiträge zum altägyptischen Mythus*, Darmstadt 1981, 99-113); U. Treu, *Otterngezücht. Ein patristischer Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des Physiologus*: ZNTW 50 (1969) 113-122; R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*, Leiden 1971; E. Otto, *Das Pelikan Motiv in der altaegyptischen Literatur*: Studies presented to D. M. Robinson, I, Washington DC 1971, 215-222; L.S.B. MacCoull, *The Coptic* Triadon *and the Ethiopic* Physiologus: OC 75 (1991) 141-146. *Simbolismo*: LCI 3 (1971) 432-436 et passim; K. Grubmüller, *Überlegungen zum Wahrheits-anspruch des Physiologus im Mittelalter*: FMS 12 (1978) 160-177; M.J. Curley, *"Physiologus," Φυσιολονία (!) and the Rise of Christian Symbolism*: Viator 11 (1980) 1-10; G. Orlandi, *La tradizione del "Physiologus" e i prodromi del bestiario latino*, in *L'uomo di fronte al mondo animale nell'Alto Medio Evo*. Atti della XXXI settimana di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 7-13 aprile 1983. II, Spoleto 1985, 1057-1106; G. Lusini, *Osservazioni sulla versione copta del Fisiologo*: Egitto e Vicino Oriente 16 (1993) 67-72; L.K. Gibbs - M. Bettini, *Per una semiotica del Physiologus. Allegoria e racconti*, in *Il tardoantico alle soglie del Duemila. Diritto, religione, storia.* Atti del V conv. naz. dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi, ed. G. Lanata (Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi. Atti dei Convegni 5), Pisa 2000, 205-221; G. Peers, *Iconoclasm and the Use of Nature in the Smyrna Physiologus (Evangelical School, B. 8)*: Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 50 (2000) 267-292.

S.J. Voicu

PIERIUS of Alexandria (d. after 309). Priest of *Alexandria, preacher and ascetic during the episcopate of *Theonas, around 281–300 (Eus., *HE* 7,32, 26-30; Jer., *Ep.* 70,4). Head of the *Didaskaleion*, acc. to *Philip of Side and *Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 119), he was nicknamed "Origen junior" (Jer., *De Vir. ill.* 76). The *Acts of Philea*, published in 1964, say that Pierius faltered during the *Diocletian *persecution. His writings were very well known. *Ammonius, an *anchorite of the Desert of Nitria, could recite many of his texts by heart: Silvia, a Roman noblewoman, read some of his homilies on the *Bible during a *pilgrimage in *Palestine (Pall., *Hist. laus.* 12 and 14; Jer., *De Vir. ill.* 76). Though far removed from this period, Photius personally knew ten of these biblical homilies: he praises their easy, clear style, free of artificial devices, the style of argument and the originality of their ideas. Unfortunately, only two fragments from these homilies remain: one on the gospel of *Luke, where he affirms that the honor or dishonor done to the *image (*eikōn*) is in turn done to the "prototype," thus establishing an argument in favor of *trinitarian theology; the other, from a Passover homily on Hosea, concerns the cherubim placed by Moses on the ark of the covenant and Jacob's pillar. Two other fragments can be found in what remains of Philip of Side's *HE* (ed. de Boor, TU 5, 2). The following writ-

ings, however, have been lost: the *Life of St. Pamphilus* and a treatise on the Mother of God, also mentioned by Philip of Side. Either the Diocletian persecution, or rather the anti-*Origenism of Theonas's successor, *Peter I of Alexandria, made life nearly impossible for him. Pierius found refuge in *Rome, where he lived out his last years. Speaking of several NT MSS, *Jerome refers to them as *exemplaria Pierii* (*Com. Mt.* 24,36). It is possible that *Pamphilus, a disciple of Pierius, took these copies to *Caesarea, where Jerome could have been able to consult them. There was a church at Alexandria dedicated to his name, perhaps one he established.

CPG 1630; M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, Oxford 1846, III, 423-435; PG 20, 733ff.; A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchr. Literatur bis Eusebius*, Leipzig 1893, I, 439ff.; L.B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria: Theognostus, Pierius and Peter. A Study in the Early History of Origenism and Anti-Origenism*, Cambridge 1908; DTC 12, 1744-1746; BS 10, 574-577; L.W. Barnard, *The Antecedents of Arius*: VChr 24 (1970) 172-188 (see esp. 182-183); H. Chadwick, *A Letter Ascribed to Peter of Alexandria*: JTS 24 (1973) 443-455 (see 445 n. 2); A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, Freiburg [3]1990, 294-302; T. Vivian, *St. Peter of Alexandria*, Philadelphia 1988, 12, 111 and 114-116; C. Moreschini - E. Norelli, *Storia della letteratura cristiana antica greca e latina*, I, Brescia 1995, 437; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Aléxandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Paris 1996, 145 (see index).

C. Kannengiesser

PIETY. Piety (εὐσέβεια) refers to the application of one's entire being to the service of God. Its opposite is *impiety. Since classical antiquity the term referred to the deep sense of religious respect and love toward the divinity (see Isocr. 258; Plat., *Symp.* 193) and one's parents (Plat., *Repub.* 615). The OT presupposes the fear of God, which is not fright, but utmost respect for the divine majesty and transcendence, and taken in a wide sense, suggests the idea of religion or piety toward God. For human beings, piety takes on concrete forms in the heroic obedience of Abraham (Gen 22:12), the faith of Jacob (Gen 48:15), and Joseph's flight instead of offending God (Gen 39:9), in Josiah (Sir 49:3) and Onias III's faithfulness to God (2 Mac 3:1), and in the theological-messianic definition of Jerusalem as the "glory of piety" (Bar 5:4). In the NT, the term only appears in the Pastoral Letters and in 2 Peter. The primeval meaning was enriched by the NT's emphasis on filial love toward God, which in the *incarnation of the Word has manifested itself in a unique and sublime way. The truth, which is in conformity to piety, is another way of saying "the religion of Christ" (1 Tim 6:3). The universality of piety, which has the promises of eternal *life (1 Tim 4:7; see also 1 Cor 9:24-26; Eph 6:12; Phil 3:12-14) presupposes a close connection to Christ and religious knowledge. Because it is a means to acquire imperishable goods (1 Tim 6:6-7), piety makes up part of the *virtues for the person of God (1 Tim 6:11). The evidence of piety's authenticity is in a genuine *love for one's neighbor.

Early Christian literature received and appropriated the biblical and secular meaning of love and respect for the gods (religion), making the term *piety* carry a sense of obligation (Just., *1 Apol.* 3,2), piety-devotion in its various manifestations (Eus., *Praep. Evang.* I, 1). To this meaning, which seems to have been the most prominent, other meanings were added and explained in various ways: religion (or worship?) of the *pagans, Jews and Christians acc. to their own particular characteristics (Just., *Dial.* 14,2; Athenag., *Leg.* 13,1; Eus., *Praep. Evang.* XI, 15), the *orthodox faith in opposition to *heresy (Athan., *Contra Arianos* [*Against the Arians*] 2,45; Epiph., *Haer.* 34,21), correct moral behavior (Just., *Dial.* 4,7), the religious observance of the pagans (Athenag., *Leg.* 30,3) and the Christians (Eus., *HE* 4,24), and the worship of the divinity (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 24).

In Late Antiquity it became a title of honor for monks, bishops and emperors (Athan., *Ad Monacos Epist.* I; *Epist. ad Rufinianum*; *Apol.* 2,44). The concept of piety is also found, as a derivation and secondary meaning, under the Greek term εὐλάβεια. In the Septuagint, the meaning of fear-reverence opens the door to a privileged meaning of piety-devotion (Ex 3:6; 1 Sam 18:15-29; Jer 5:22; Mal 3:16). In the NT, only Heb 12:28 is relevant to our discussion, and here the term pertains to worship that is offered with piety and fear by the church-community to God, a consuming fire (= theological title: Dt 9:3). In the religious vocabulary of Christian writers, the meaning of reverence and piety is prevalent (Polyc., *Phil.* 6,3; Evagr. Pont., *De orat.* 42; Cyril Alex., *Ps.* 5,8; Eus., *HE* 4,15,8; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6,17; Hipp., *In Dan.* 3,22,1; etc.). The term *pious* had more success as an honorific title of monks, bishops, priests and emperors (Alex. of Alex., *Epist. ad Alex.* I; Greg. Naz., *Epist.* 102; Athan., *Epist. ad Jovianum* 1).

EC 9, 1388-1389; GLNT 9, 1458-1486; Enc. Bib. 5, 728-729; P. Veyne, *Une évolution du paganisme gréco-romain. Injustice et piété des dieux, leurs ordres ou "oracles"*: Latomus 45 (1986) 259-283; J.D. Garrison, *Pietas from Vergil to Dryden*, University Park, PA 1992; Philodemus, *On Piety, Part I, Critical Text with Commentary*, ed. D. Obbink, New York-Oxford 1996; B. Colot, *Pietas, argument et expression d'un nouveau lien socio-religieux dans le christianisme romain de Lactance*: SP 34 (2001) 23-32.

E. Peretto

PILATE
I. Pilate in tradition - II. Iconography - III. Apocryphal texts.

I. Pilate in tradition. The canonical gospels agree that Pilate, even though recognizing Jesus' innocence, committed a judicial crime in order to placate the people. This seems to contradict what we know from other sources about Pilate, the Roman procurator of Judea from 26 to 37. Much can be said about his administration, which was full of provocation, violence, fraud and executions without trials. The letter of Herod Agrippa I, which narrates the governance of Pilate and offers a detailed description of his character, has been preserved by *Philo (*Leg. Gai.* 301-302), which presents him as a haughty, irascible, cowardly, hardheaded and cruel man. Even though this description contains much of Philo's political rhetoric (as in the case of his portrayal of Caligula, Flaccus, the Alexandrian populace and other enemies of *Judaism), his description of the facts are certainly worthy of credence: bribes, violent acts, fraudulent dealings, executions without trial, abusive and savage conduct. In contrast to this image, Flavius Josephus (*De bello iud.* II, 169-177; *Antiq. Iud.* XVIII, 55-59.62) presents him as a relatively capable governor and open to collaboration with the Jewish priestly authorities, though lacking common sense in dealing with the Jewish people and their law. His description of Pilate's disposition corresponds to that of a military prefect: a rugged, steadfast and harsh man in his decisions. He matches the incident mentioned by Luke (13:1) on the massacre of the Galilean pilgrims. His execution of Jesus was probably the typical crucifixion administered to messianic troublemakers; but he executed only the leader and not his followers.

What we know of his character and behavior differs from the weakness and the uncertainty he shows in the gospel accounts in the trial of Jesus. Nonetheless, these accounts do not appear to be entirely identical. According to *Mark, Pilate was far from being weak and uncertain; he was a fully capable politician, a strong representative of the imperial interests and one who manipulated the multitudes to overcome a difficult situation. According to *Matthew, Pilate was indifferent toward Jesus and very favorably inclined to placate the Jewish leaders without, however, accepting any responsibility for the act. Luke presents his weakness as his primary characteristic, which led him, under the pressure of the Jewish nation, to condemn an innocent man. *John's Pilate is a manipulator, a man certain of his authority, who supports the Jews' desires to condemn Jesus, but on the condition that they accept Caesar as their only king; he is an ally of the hostile "world" that rejects Jesus. The current situation of each community was a factor in determining the portrait that each evangelist drew of the prefect. The Christian description of Pilate's conduct can be said to be due in part to the apologetic interest of presenting a Jesus (and an early Christianity) who was innocent before the Roman authorities, attributing all hostility against him to the malice and intrigues of the Jewish leaders; but this explanation is inadequate. The fall and execution of Sejanus put Pilate's political career in danger. If the trial of Jesus is to be placed in the period following the fall of Sejanus, the year 32 or 33, one understands why Pilate appeared to be weak, yielding to the pressure against Jesus. Later, when Pilate realized that he was secure in his position, he returned to his old foibles (Fl. Josephus, *Antiq. Iud.* XVIII, 85-87). In the year 36, he was deposed and sent back to Rome to render an account for his work before the emperor.

The apologetic tendencies of the *Gospel of Peter* also pertain to the person of Pilate; it seeks to exonerate him from all responsibility in the condemnation of Jesus and place the blame on Herod and the Jews. *Justin (*1 Apol.* 35.48) mentions the *Acts* of the trial of Jesus before Pilate, but Justin is probably merely conjecturing about their existence. *Tertullian (*Apol.* 5, 21) speaks of a letter of Pilate to *Tiberius, where Pilate narrates the miracles of Jesus in great detail; he indicates that its author was a Christian. *Eusebius also speaks of this apocryphal letter (*HE* 2, 2). He does not mention the Christian *Acts of Pilate*; nonetheless, he was well acquainted with the anti-Christian *Acts* that the persecuting Emperor *Maximus ordered to be memorized by heart in the schools (*HE* 1, 9,3-4; 9, 5,1; 9, 7,1-2). It is possible that the Christian *Acts of Pilate* originated as a response to these latter texts. Christian literature began to discuss Pilate in the 2nd c. and knew many continuations of this genre until the Middle Ages and even into modern times. Because the origin of this literature varied in time, place and language, it thus revealed its various objectives. The apologetic and edifying interests of later Christians accompanied the desire to fill the gaps in the tradition and satisfy their historical and pious curiosity. Thanks to such letters, Pilate served as a *pagan witness to the divinity of Jesus. The various letters that were circulated and studied with the objective of influencing the magistrates and Roman public opinion were a relatively late development within the internal process of persuading some of the pagan authorities of the harmlessness of Christian beliefs and practices. There ex-

ists an apocryphal correspondence between Pilate and Tiberius; another between Pilate and Herod, and the letter of Pilate to the emperor *Claudius.

The account of the *Paradosis Pilati* is relatively ancient, in which Pilate, when brought to trial before the senate, declares his innocence of Jesus' death and blames the Jews. Condemned to beheading, he praised the Lord and asked for forgiveness. A voice from heaven declares him blessed and announces that he will be the Lord's witness during his *second coming. This allows one to understand and justify how the holy Pilate came to be venerated in the Coptic Church. A *Martyrium Pilati* has survived in Arabic and Ethiopian. On the opposite side of the spectrum, Greek Christian legend asserts that he committed suicide (Eus., *HE* 2, 7). We have three Western accounts (*Mors Pil.*, *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* and the *Vindicta Salvatoris*). The documents of *Orosius (*Hist.* VII, 4) in the 5th c. and *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* I, 21-24) in the 6th c. confirm the hypothesis of a further rearrangement of the early *Acts of Pilate* that have come down to us as the *Evangelium Nicodemi*, which heavily influenced Christian *iconography starting from the 5th c.; they claim the testimony of Pilate and that of the Jews themselves in favor of the innocence and divinity of Jesus.

EC 9, 1472-1476; K. von Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, Leipzig ²1876; Erbetta 3, 119-135; A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios apócrifos*, Madrid ⁶1988, index, p. 759; E. Bammel, φίλος τοῦ καίσαρος: ThLZ 77 (1952) 206-210; J. Blinzler, *Die Niedermetzelung von Galiläern durch Pilatus*: NovT 2 (1957) 24-49; P. Winter, *A Letter from Pontius Pilate*: NovT 7 (1964-65) 37-47; O.V. Volkoff, *Un saint oublié. Ponce Pilate*: Bulletin Arch. Copte 20 (1969/70) 165-175; E. Cerulli, *Tiberius and Pontius Pilate in Ethiopian Tradition and Poetry*: Proceedings British Ac. 59 (1973) 141-158; W. Speyer, *Neue Pilatus-Apokryphen*: VChr 32 (1978) 53-59; J.-P. Lémonon, *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée, Textes et monuments*, Paris 1981; Schneemelcher 1, *Neutestamentliche Apocryphen* I (Tübingen ⁵1987) 395-424; H.K. Bond, *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation*, SNTSMS 100, Cambridge 1998.

R. Trevijano

II. Iconography. The interpretation of Pilate's judgment appears in Christian iconography throughout the course of the 4th c. Completely absent from the figurative repertoire of catacomb *paintings, this scene enjoyed a noteworthy dissemination and success in the figurative repertoire of the *sarcophagi, in the so-called contexts of the "passion" developed after the advent of religious peace and in the celebrative atmosphere of victory.

This scene is easily identifiable for the numerous characteristic elements that characterize it: the *suggestus* (platform), the *sella curulis* (magistrate's chair) upon which Pilate sat surrounded by a variable number of counselors; the hourglass used to determine the time in which the legal proceeding occurred; the *cammillus* who carried the basin in which Pilate washed his hands; finally, Christ, who is alone or placed next to the soldiers and is brought to or led away from Pilate by them.

Well-known sarcophagi, chronologically datable to around the mid-4th c., reproduce the scene: e.g., Lat. 55, called the sarcophagus of the two brothers (Rep. 45), Lat. 174 (Rep. 677,1) and that of Junius Bassus (Rep. 680,1) dating to the year 359. Scholars know around 30 instances of the scene of Pilate washing his hands. The case of the Constantinian sarcophagus of Berja (Spain) is unique (but Wilpert's intuition has been unanimously received by all recent scholars), where Pilate appears to be replaced by *Nero under the form of the persecuting ruler Nebuchadnezzar, and Jesus by the two apostles *Peter and *Paul in a symbolic context that clearly alludes to ecclesiology.

This scene from 4th c. onward develops the expression in various ways and in the various dispositions of the main characters and on the different types of monuments; one should note here, e.g., the ivory diptych of Milan's Cathedral Treasury and the British Museum ivory, both dated to the 5th c., while in the 6th c. the scene appears on the famous ciborium of the basilica of S. Marco, Venice.

If testimonies are lacking in 4th-5th-c. painting, in the period immediately following and in continuity with the examples of courtly art examined at this point, the scene returns on the *mosaics of S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna in which Christ is led by the Jewish priests. In closing, the *Codex Purpureus Rossanensis*, which was studied by Maffei, is worthy of special mention.

See the exhaustive bibl. collected by C. Carletti, s.v. *Pilato*: EC 9, 1476-1477; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952; F. Zuliani, *I marmi di S. Marco, Alto Medioevo*, II, Venice [1969]; A. Saggiorato, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani con scene di passione*, Bologna 1968, 83-89; M. Sotomayor, *Sarcófagos romano-cristianos de España. Estudio iconográfico*, Granada 1975, 105-106; F. de' Maffei, *Il codice purpureo di Rossano Calabro. La sua problematica e alcuni risultati di ricerca*, Rossano 1978; TIP 259-263.

U. Broccoli

III. Apocryphal texts. Pontius Pilate was a historic person mentioned many times in the NT. He was also mentioned by non-Christian (Tacitus and Flavius Josephus) and Christian (*Eusebius and *Orosius) historians, and the *Creed. A group of apocryphal texts exists in which Pilate plays an important role: *The Gospel of Nicodemus* (5th/6th c., the first

part contains a description of the judgment of Pilate); various rulings of Pilate who condemned Jesus (medieval texts); the *Anaphora* and its continuation, the *Paradosis of Pilate* (5th c., Pilate's report on the death of Jesus, Pilate's delivery to justice, ending with his conviction); the *Death of Pilate*; the *Letter of Pilate to Tiberius* (16th c.?); *The Healing of Tiberius* and *The Revenge of the Savior* (two chronologically close accounts); the Ethiopian *Martyrdom of Pilate* attributed to *Cyriacus of al-Bahnasa; *The Letter of James to Quadratus* (ca. 400, in Syriac). Close to these works are *The History of Joseph of Arimathea* and the *Testimony* of Ursinius, where Pilate is mentioned.

Different problems and motifs intersect in all these works: the guilt or innocence of Pilate and the various people tied in some way to the passion of Christ; the problem of divine justice on *Jerusalem; the relationship of Pilate to the emperor; the legend of the healing of Tiberius and Titus (that mirrors the healing of *Abgar). These works have different literary forms: letters, official reports and narrations. The point of departure for some of these works is the report Pilate sent to Tiberius, which was already mentioned by *Justin and *Tertullian. Another important point was the death of Pilate, already mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea, and the problem of his guilt or innocence. Here there are two solutions: was Pilate innocent or guilty? The first, following the line of the gospel of John, and generally accepted by Eastern texts, considers Pilate innocent or less guilty; the condemnation of Jesus was an act of weakness that became a *felix culpa*; acc. to this body of literature, the Jews became the first guilty party and therefore had to be punished; and in certain texts, Pilate and his wife Procula become saints (in the Coptic and Ethiopian churches). The other solution, following the line of the synoptic gospels, was generally accepted in Western apocryphal texts: Pilate was guilty and deserving of a terrible death. Alongside Pilate, the main character, other biblical persons played a more or less important role: Nicodemus, *Joseph of Arimathea, Gamaliel, the two thieves and *Mary Magdalene; historical figures: the emperors *Tiberius, *Claudius, *Nero, *Titus and *Vespasian; and fictitious persons: Nathan, Volusianus and Veronica (identified as the woman with the hemorrhage). *Judas the traitor appears only marginally alongside these individuals. These legends on Pilate enjoyed great popularity in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Pilate and the other individuals from this circle (such as Veronica) met with favor in popular devotion and literature.

CANT 62, 64-78. Bibliography on the *Acts of Pilate*: R. Gounelle - Z. Izydorczyk, in *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus*, ed. Z. Izydorczyk, Tempe 1997, 419-519; Id.: Apocrypha 11 (2000) 259-292. The majority of these texts are found in the edition of Tischendorf and in Santos Otero. One can find translations of the apocryphal gospels in all the important series such as those by Elliott, Erbetta, Moraldi, Craveri and Starowieyski. W. Creizenach, *Legenden und Sagen von Pilatus*, Beitrage z. Geschichte d. deutsch. Sprache und Literatur, 1874, 89-107; E. Fascher, RE 40, 1950, 1322-1323; W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschungen im heidnischen und christlichen Literatur*, Munich 1971 (see index: Pilatusliteratur); E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, Edinburgh 1973, 357-387 [esp. 383-387]; E. Cerulli, *Tiberius and Pontius Pilatus in the Ethiopian Tradition and Poetry*: Proceedings British Acad. 5 (1975) 141-158; J.P. Lémonon, *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée. Textes et monuments*, Paris 1981; Id., *Ponce Pilate. Documents profanes, Nouveau Testament et traditions ecclésiastiques*: ANRW 26/1 (1992) 741-778; R. Staats, *Pontius Pilatus im Bekenntnis der frühen Kirche*: ZThK 84 (1987) 493-513; J.D. Dubois, *Les Actes de Pilate au quatrième siècle*: Apocrypha 2 (1991) 85-98; *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, II, ed. P. Geoltrian - J.D. Kaestli, Paris 2005, 243-413.

M. Starowieyski

PILGRIMAGES (Peregrinatio). The first known Christian pilgrim was a Cappadocian bishop named *Alexander, who shortly after 200 traveled to *Jerusalem "to pray and visit the sites there" (Eus., *HE* 6,11,2). *Clement of Alexandria went there as well a few years later (Jerome: PL 33, 687). Around a hundred years later, *Eusebius (*Dem. ev.* 6, 18, 23) states concerning Zech 14:4 that "all those who believe in Christ come together here [at Jerusalem] from every part of the world not, as in the past, to admire the splendor of the city or to pray at the ancient temple, but stop here to see the effects of the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem . . . and to pray on the Mount of Olives in front of the city . . . where the feet of the Savior stood." Elsewhere, Eusebius also alludes to the influx of pilgrims into Jerusalem (*Vita Const.* 3,28; *Dem. ev.* 7,2). Of course, not all Christians traveled there, and the Mount of Olives was not, at least at the beginning of the 4th c., the sole place where Christians prayed; Golgotha and Christ's sepulcher were inaccessible because of Hadrian's towering temple (Jer. *Ep.* 58,3), but on the hill to the SW of the city, on Christian Zion, before the building of *Constantine's basilica, a church had already existed.

Constantine's numerous building projects in Jerusalem and the Holy Land already bear witness to the burning interest in the holy places; such projects conferred a new impetus on the pilgrimages. Not only *Helena, Constantine's mother, traveled through the Holy Land as a pilgrim (Eus., *Vita Const.* 3,42), but also Eutropia, the mother of Fausta, the wife of the emperor (Soz., *HE* 2, 4). Both women made the trip

probably because of the bloodshed that had occurred in their family, so that as a result the idea of expiation was added to the two classical motives (prayer and visits to sites), an idea that later definitively marked pilgrimages.

The most ancient extant piece of Christian information on pilgrimages pertains to a Christian pilgrim from *Bordeaux (333) and informs us that Christians in the Holy Land not only visited the sites from the life of Jesus but also those of the OT. This source makes only nine references to the NT but 22 to the OT, and it not only refers to the sites of salvific events, but also refers, e.g., to the tomb of the patriarchs in Hebron. On a theoretical level, the Christian pilgrimages were in continuity with those of the Jews, even if Eusebius heavily emphasizes the differences. In the 4th and 5th c., the fact that certain Roman women had moved to *Palestine had a particularly favorable effect on pilgrimages: after 372 *Melania the Elder (Pall., *Hist. Laus.* 46), *Paula in 385 with her daughter *Eustochium (Jer., *Ep.* 108), and in 417, *Melania the Younger (Gerontius's *Vita*) with *Paula. *Jerome settled at Bethlehem with Paula, who also created a hospice for pilgrims. As a result, in the East there arose Latin centers that continually strengthened an awareness of the church's unity through *peregrinatio*.

To the aforementioned pilgrims one should also add the Spanish sister *Egeria, whose records, which have come down to us in part, reveal a new stage. Pilgrims not only visited the sites of the memorials and tombs—among which visits were undertaken again to the tombs of Christian *martyrs—but also the dwellings of the *ascetics. Above all, Egeria visited the monks in *Egypt. In addition to visiting the memorials of the patriarchs, Egeria was greatly interested in *Mesopotamia and the numerous monks and sisters whom she regarded as holy people (*Peregr.* 20 and 21). The *stylites (monks living on a column), such as *Simeon the Elder in Qal'at Semān in *Syria (d. 459), *Simeon the Younger near *Antioch (d. 592), and *Daniel near *Constantinople (d. 493), attracted many pilgrims. Even after their deaths, their landmarks remained destination points for pilgrimages, as is the case of the famous tombs of the martyrs in Resafa, Syria (Bacchus and *Sergius), in *Seleucia, Isauria (*Thecla), and Chalcedon (*Euphemia), in the city of *Mennas (Abu Mina) near *Alexandria, etc.

The *Bible was and remained the travel guide even after the 5th c. when special guides for the Holy Land had been compiled (e.g., that of *Eucherius of Lyons). From it they not only gathered the routes, but also read pertinent passages on the site, they prayed and chose a song to match the occasion (*Pereg.* 3,6; 4,3; 14,1). Where a church was constructed, the holy sacrifice was celebrated (*Pereg.* 3,6; 4,3ff.), so that in certain instances the sacrifice was celebrated two times in the same day, even if those who were not priests received the sacrament only once (*Pereg.* 4,4). The pilgrims took part in the local religious functions and feasts, and when they returned to their homeland they recounted these events (e.g., *Pereg.* 24-29, on the lavish *liturgies in Jerusalem).

They also sought to carry *relics with them, e.g., a few fragments from the *cross of Christ, which was venerated at Jerusalem from ca. 350 onward. At *Rome, however, in the most important Western center of pilgrimages because of the presence of the tombs of the apostles *Peter and *Paul, which conferred upon it the prestige that exceeded that of *Carthage, Valencia or *Saragossa, the pilgrims were only given contact relics, i.e., pieces of material that had been lowered into Peter's tomb. Elsewhere, Rome offered a sufficient number of relics of the martyrs and there thus arose a new form of pilgrimage with the goal of obtaining relics (Avitus, *Ep.* 27; Greg. Tours, *In glor. mart.* 28).

Nevertheless, pilgrimages were also criticized by the great doctors: *Gregory of Nyssa exhorted the faithful to leave the body alone and to make pilgrimage toward the Lord, and not from Cappadocia to Palestine (*Ep.* 2,18); Jerome, though he had served as a guide for Paula's pilgrimage, insisted on saying: "*Anthony and all the ranks of monks . . . did not visit Jerusalem, and nevertheless the doors of *paradise were opened to them" (*Ep.* 58,2).

With the monks, however, we find another form of pilgrimage that developed alongside that of *peregrinatio*, namely, the ascetical detachment from one's homeland (*xeniteia*) in imitation of *Abraham, who left his home. It is thus better, acc. to the abbot Jacob, to live as a foreigner than to give lodging to them (*Apophth. Patr. Jacob* 1). This does not mean that the monk undertook a pilgrimage with a specific goal in mind, but that he had to detach himself from his house and family. For the abbot Titoe, the one who holds his tongue truly lives in a foreign land (ibid., *Titoe* 2; see also the response of Lucius and Longinus).

DACL 14, 45-65 (pilgimage at Rome), 65-175 (pilgimage in Palestine); B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa. Wallfahrten in den Antike and das Pilgerwesen der alten Kirche*, Münster 1950; J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels*, London 1971; H. Donnen, *Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land. Die ältesten Berichte christlichen Palästinapilger (IV.-VII. Jh.)*, Stuttgart 1979; E.D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312–460*, Oxford 1982; P. Maraval, *Lieux Saints et Pélerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1985; var. aus.

Akten des XII Internationales Kongress für christliche Archäologie, Bonn 1995; R. Lavarini, *Il pellegrinaggio cristiano*, Genoa 1997; D. Frankfurter (ed.), *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*, Leiden 1998; G. Otranto, *Il pellegrinaggio nel cristianesimo antico*: VetChr 36 (1999) 239-257; *Pellegrini e luoghi santi dall'antichità al Medioevo*, ed. M. Mengozzi, Cesena 1999; M. Coccopalmerio, *Il ritorno del Pellegrino. Eulogie di Terra Santa*, Genoa 2001; var. aus., *L'idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del Medioevo*, Vatican City 2003; *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity. Seeing the Gods*, ed. J. Elsner - I. Rutherford, Oxford 2005; G. Otranto, *Caratteri identitari del pellegrinaggio dei cristiani nel rapporto con i "santuari"*: AnSE 22 (2005) 99-117.

H.J. Voigt

PIMENIUS, martyr. The *Mart. hier.* mentions his name various times, but the actual date seems to be 18 February, in keeping with what one finds from various legends and the marble *calendar of Naples. Another date, 2 December, is explained with that of *Bibiana, in whose legendary cycle Pimenius was inserted. According to the itineraries of the 7th c. (CCL 175, 309, 316, 327), his body lay in the cemetery of Pontianus on the Via Portensis. In this cemetery, one can see his image along with that of two other martyrs, accompanied by the inscription *SCS Milix. SCS Pimenius. SCS Pollion*. His name appears at times in the *Passio* of Bibiana (BHL 1322), the legend of Crescentius (BHL 1986) and that of Donatus (BHL 2289), where he is called a "priest." These documents arbitrarily claim that their main characters were martyred under *Julian the Apostate. Pimenius's relics were transferred to the basilica of S. Silvestro in Capite.

BHL 6849; BS 10, 871-873; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 230-231.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PINIANUS (d. 432). We know about his life thanks to *Augustine (*Ep.* 124; 125; 126), *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* 21), *Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 61) and *Gerontius's bibliography on the life of Melania. Valerius Severus Pinianus was a Roman from the aristocratic and wealthy family of the Valerii; he was a *consularis* at 17 years of age; he married *Melania the Younger—who at the time was 13/14 years old and the granddaughter of *Melania the Elder—who suggested to him that they live in continence. He accepted the proposal, but only after having begotten two children. They first had a daughter, whom they consecrated to God, then a baby boy, who died immediately. Because of his wife's poor health and the death of their little girl, they decided to live in continence after seven years of marriage (*Vita Melaniae* 6: SC 90, 136). In 404/405, Pinianus received Palladius, who had come to *Rome to defend *John Chrysostom. Around 406, he withdrew with his wife to an area near Rome to live an ascetic life and, esp., to give away their many riches dispersed throughout the entire Roman West. As a result, they met opposition from their relatives. In 407 he was residing in *Nola. Following the urging of his brother Severus, the slaves who did not want to be freed or sold raised an objection to him. Through an imperial concession, however, the governors of the provinces were placed in charge of selling their goods and giving away their assets for works of charity and the construction of monasteries. In 408/409 he was at Sicily, where he must have had contact with *Rufinus of *Aquileia; when *Alaric was approaching in 410 he fled to *Thagaste, Africa, where the bishop was *Alypius. He and his wife made large contributions to the church of Thagaste and at the same time established and supplied various monasteries. In 411, Pinianus was at *Hippo with Melania; in the presence of Augustine, the congregation asked Pinianus to enter into the clergy of Hippo. He was obliged to sign a promise to remain in Hippo if he ever decided to become a priest (Augustine, *Ep.* 126,3). In 417 he left Africa and settled in *Jerusalem, where he resided near Anastasis; in 418 Pinianus, Melania and *Albina informed Augustine that *Pelagius was intending to reenter the church (see Augustine, *De gratia Christi* 1,2). Perhaps still in 418, Pinianus and Melania traveled to *Egypt to meet the holy monks. After his return to Jerusalem, he lived an ascetic life until 432, the year of his death.

PCBE 2, 1798-1802; L.J. Swift, *Augustine on the Oath of Pinianus*, in *Congresso Int. su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione*, Rome, 15-20 settembre 1986, Atti 1, Rome 1987, 371-379; V. Sirago, *Incontro di Agostino con Melania e Piniano*, in *L'umanesimo di S. Agostino*. Atti del Congr. Int. 1986, ed. M. Fabris, Bari 1988, 629-648; G.A. Cecconi, *Un evergete mancato. Piniano a Ippona*: Athenaeum 66 (1988) 371-389; L.J. Swift, *Augustine on Fama. The Case of Pinianus*, in *Nova & Vetera. Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton*, ed. J. Petruccione, Washington 1998, 196-205; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999, 440-442.

A. Di Berardino

PINYTUS. Bishop of Knossos. *Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Ecclesiastical History* (IV, 21 and 23,7-8) is the sole source that has preserved the name of Pinytus bishop of Knossos (*Crete), who lived during the time of the emperor *Marcus Aurelius (161–180). He mentions Pinytus with regard to an epistolary correspondence he had with Bishop *Dionysius of Corinth.

Dionysius warned his colleague against certain openly *Encratite movements. Pinytus responded by insisting on the obligation of giving the faithful spiritual nourishment that would lead them to a state of mature manhood. Eusebius of Caesarea could not contain his admiration of Pinytus: "with this letter, as in a complete portrait, are evident Pinytus's orthodoxy in the faith, his concern for everything that is advantageous for his faithful, his learning and his understanding of divine matters" (ed. Bardy, 204). On the basis of this statement of Eusebius, *Jerome introduced Pinytus into his work *On Illustrious Men* (*De viris illustribus*, 27 [PL 23, 679-680]).

Eusebius, *HE* (SC 31, 199 and 204); BS 10, 876-877.

J.-M. Sauget

PIONIUS. The martyrdom of Pionius, who is presented as a *presbyter of the church of *Smyrna, is mentioned in an ecclesiastical treatise found in *Paleoslavonic, *Armenian and *Greek; a reference to this text, moreover, is found in *Eusebius's work (*HE* 4,15,46-47). Eusebius places his martyrdom during the reign of *Marcus Aurelius, even if that seems very unlikely; the fact that the document associated Pionius with *Polycarp certainly misled this ancient Christian historian. Scholars generally place his dates closer to the time of the *Decian persecution.

Nevertheless, the process of editing the text within the scholastic context of Christianity in Smyrna created some confusion in the details regarding the legal *Acts* and has made it virtually impossible to obtain absolute certainty. The long account of Pionius's martyrdom underwent many editorial changes and interpolations, and became an example of religious propaganda from the moment that Pionius's martyrdom was connected to Polycarp's. The latter was also used to demonstrate the superiority of Christianity over *paganism and *Judaism, esp. through long speeches delivered in a sophistic style and placed in Pionius's mouth at key points in the narrative. Nevertheless, there is a historical nucleus within the account of the martyrdom. The document is also of special interest for its references to the Christian *sabbath, Pionius's use of water in the *Eucharist and the constant liveliness of the prophetic visions.

Delehaye 26-33; BS 10, 919-921; RAC 2, 1175; M. Srapian, *Das Martyrium des hl. Pionios. Aus dem Altarmenischen übersetzt*: Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 28 (1914) 376-405; M. Simonetti, *Studi agiografici*, Rome 1955, 9-51; Sist. Cyrilla, *Pionius of Smyrna*: SP 10 (1970) 281-284; G. Lanata, *Gli Atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 162-177; R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, Harmondsworth 1986, 450-492; A. Hilhorst, *Heidenen, joden en christenen in Smyrna. De verdedigingsrede van de martelaar Pionius in de vervolging van Decius*: Hermeneus 66 (1994) 160-166; L. Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios prêtre de Smyrne*, Washington DC 1994 (bibl.); E.L. Gibson, *Jewish Antagonism or Christian Polemic. The Case of the Martyrdom of Pionius*: JECS 9 (2001) 339-358.

A. Stewart-Sykes

PIONIUS (pseudo). This is the name assigned to the author of an anonymous life of *Polycarp. The postscript to the *Martyrium Polycarpi* states that "Pionius" discovered the *Martyrium*, and this is the source for the attribution of the *Life*, from the moment in which the same hand seems to have united the *Life* to the *Martyrium*, thus forming a *corpus Polycarpianum*. Nevertheless, this ps.-Pionus is *not* the author of the *Life*, but was simply an editor who created the corpus, probably in the second quarter of the 4th c. The *Life* itself, even though anonymous, should be dated to the 3rd c.

L. Duchesne, *Vita Sancti Polycarpi Smyrnaeorum Episcopi auctore Pionio*, Paris 1881; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Life of Polycarp. An Anonymous Vita from Third-century Smyrna*, Early Christian Studies 4, Sydney 2002.

A. Stewart-Sykes

PIRMINIUS (8th c.). Perhaps originally from *Spain, he engaged in intense missionary activity in S *Germany during the 1st half of the 8th c. He founded the *monastery of Reichenau on an island in Lake Constance. In 727 he went to Alsace, where he created Murbach and other monasteries. He wrote a treatise titled *De singulis libris canonicis scarapsus* (= *excerptus*), a *florilegium of scriptural passages designed in such a way as to illustrate the catechetical theme of world history seen as a work of divine providence for the salvation of humankind. The text must have served to help train the missionaries working in *pagan lands; it therefore develops anti-idolatrous themes derived from *Martin of Braga's *De correctione rusticorum*.

PL 89, 1029-1050; G. Jecker, *Die Heimat des heiligen Pirmin, des Apostels der Alamannen*, Münster 1927 (with the ed. of the *Scarapsus*); H. Löwe, *Pirmin, Willibrord und Bonifatius. Ihre Bedeutung für die Missionsgebiete ihrer Zeit*, in K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche des früheren Mittelalters* (= Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte II/1), Munich 1978, 192-226; BS 10, 927-932; DSp 12, 1788-89; LTK^3 8, 312; BBKL VII, 634-637.

M. Simonetti

PISENTHIUS of Kepht (d. 632). A person of great importance in the Coptic church, he lived between

the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th c. Initially, he was a monk in the *monastery of Apa Febammon at Geme near Thebes. He was then consecrated bishop of Keft (Koptos) by the patriarch Damian. Two different biographies written in *Coptic tell us about his life, albeit in a very romanticized way. But one can learn most about him from the original archive of his correspondence, which was found near the monastery of Epiphanius, likewise near Thebes, where he resided for a long time. His only extant work is an *Encomium for St. Onuphrius*, a good literary work, but lacking any special properties.

E.A.T. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha*, London 1913, 75-127, 258-334; E. De Lacy O'Leary, *The Arabic Life of S. Pisentius*: PO 22 (1930) 313-488; M. Krause, *Ein Fall friedensrichtlichter Tätigkeit in Oberägypten,* Revue d'Égyptologie 24 (1972) 101-107; W.E. Crum, *Discours de Pisenthios sur saint Onophrius*, ROC 20 (1915-17) 38-67; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1978-1980; BBKL 20, 1185-1189.

T. Orlandi

PIUS I, pope (ca. 140–ca. 155). His pontificate may have been from 140 to 155, but the chronology is uncertain. Nevertheless, Pius was the ninth bishop of Rome after *Peter (Iren., *Haer.* III, 3,3; Eus., *HE* 4, 22,3). Some doubtful and fragmentary bits of information on his life have survived. He was probably born in *Aquileia; acc. to the *Muratorian Fragment*, he was the brother of *Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd.* During his pontificate, the apologist *Justin led his school of philosophy in Rome. At that time, the heretics were also active in the city of Rome: *Valentinus (*Adv. Haer.* III, 4,3) and *Marcion (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I, 19), who came to the capital of the Roman Empire to spread their *gnostic teachings. The construction of a baptistery in the home of Praxedes and Pudentiana was attributed to Pius, as well as the establishment of Sunday alone for the *Easter celebration. He was sentenced to death along with fellow believers during the *persecution of *Antoninus. For the numerous writings attributed to him, see Jaffé 43-56.

Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni . . . , Leipzig 1863; LP I, 58-59, 132-133; *Catholicisme* 11, 251; *Frammento Muratoriano*: Erbetta 1, 25-26; LTK[2] 8, 528; BS 10, 881-883; BBKL 7, 658-659; EPapi I, 220-222.

M. Spinelli

PLATONISM and the FATHERS

I. Two different interpretive dispositions - II. The attitude of the Fathers toward Plato and their relation to contemporary Platonism - III. The 2nd c. - IV. Clement of Alexandria and Origen - V. The Greek Fathers - VI. The Latin Fathers.

I. Two different interpretive dispositions. The modern question of the relationship between Platonism and patristic thought—still heavily debated by theologians, scholars of Late Antiquity and Medieval thought, and some classical philologists—ultimately dates back to Luther's utter condemnation of the quasi cult-like devotion of this period toward *Aristotelian philosophy. He opposed it to such an extent that he banned the study of it from the universities: in this perspective Aristotle was only a charlatan, the symbol of the "arrogance of reason," which is unable to exercise a salvific role, a prerogative that is exclusive to the faith, which is entirely irreconcilable with philosophy. During the following centuries, Luther's severe judgment on Aristotelian philosophy did not fail to influence what some patristic scholars thought and wrote about Platonic philosophy, the Platonism of the imperial age and the possibility of its influence on the Fathers (see G. Reale, in C. de Vogel, *Platonismo e Cristianesimo*, Milan 1993, 11-12).

In effect, at the beginning of the 18th c., N. Souverain (*Le platonisme dévoilé ou essai touchant le Verbe platonicien*, Cologne 1700) and P. Baltus (*Défense des SS. Pères, accusés de Platonisme*, Paris 1711) saw Platonism as a fall, a heretical distancing from Christianity and the total destruction of the Christian tradition. This was already, in substance, the point of view held by *Tertullian, *Hippolytus and *Epiphanius (*see* *Hellenism and Christianity); in the 20th c., H. Dörrie appropriated this theory: "in every historical period, Platonism has signified a failure in comparison to Plato" (*Die andere Theologie*: TP 56 [1981] 2, cf. *Gregors Theologie auf dem Hintergrunde der neuplatonischen Metaphysik*, in *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*, Leiden 1976, 27). "The one who looks for Christian Platonism can only find it in the heretics" (with regard to Dörrie's last statement, who takes as his point of departure *Gregory of Nyssa's attitude in dealing with the *Arians, see G. Reale in C. de Vogel, pp. 12 and 14 with n.16). While Souverain—who thus anticipated Harnack's position (see below)—maintained that the Fathers from the period of the Council of *Nicaea substituted the Platonic *logos* for the Christian *logos*, obscuring the dogma of the preexisting Christ, Baltus wanted to defend the *Fathers from this accusation (on this topic, see Dörrie in *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 510-511), yet he still saw Platonism as heretical.

The diametrically opposed thesis found its con-

vinced patron in G.W.F. Hegel, who in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* theorized the necessity of an engagement between Christianity and philosophy: the data of faith, if left in its original condition, and allowing at most a strictly literal interpretation, is destined to remain sterile and dead; it can only acquire a significant meaning if one interprets it philosophically. To be able to propose something valid, the Fathers therefore had to strive for an engagement between their faith and the philosophy of their time, thus determining Christianity's reception of Greek thought (esp. in its *Neoplatonic form). What they achieved through this objective should not be considered their mistake but, on the contrary, a perfectly legitimate decision (see E. Peroli in C. de Vogel, 107-108).

A sort of synthesis between Luther and Hegel's position can be found in the work of Adolf von Harnack. The historical reality of Christianity's Hellenization was for Harnack, as was already the case for Hegel, an undeniable fact: the dogmas of the church are the product of theology, depending in turn on the spiritual climate of the time (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* I⁴, Darmstadt 1964, p. 12); their ideas in this structure, these dogmas, were the work of the Hellenic spirit, transplanted into the terrain of the gospel (ibid., I⁴, p. 20). Definitive theological doctrines were received into the deposit of faith, and full citizenship in the general faith of the church was granted to theological conclusions and formulas (ibid., II⁴, p. 27). The *apologists were the first to present the Christian religion as a philosophy and therefore to begin a connection between Christianity and philosophy that was recognized and continued in the following centuries, in comparison to what had occurred in *gnosticism, and gave rise to a gradual Hellenization of Christianity itself (ibid., I⁴, pp. 497-498). Theological science was primarily *Origen's creation, which could still operate in full freedom without being conditioned by preestablished dogmas (ibid., I⁴, p. 650, II⁴, p. 27). Nevertheless, the process of "Hellenization" and the relative philosophical speculation that permeated the church's entire dogmatic system (ibid., I⁴, pp. 791-794) covered and obscured the original purity of the Christian message: only with *Augustine and esp. with Luther did Christianity gain its authenticity, recovering its original character and drawing near to St. *Paul (ibid., I⁴, p. 14, see also p. 637). Harnack's thesis was adopted by F. Loofs and M. Werner (see Peroli in C. de Vogel, p. 108 with n. 8).

The Lutheran idea—adopted by Souverain and Baltus (see above)—on the absolute incompatibility between Christian faith and Greek philosophy can be clearly seen in the studies of J. Meifort and W. Völker. On the basis of a comparison between an abstract Platonic philosophy and equally abstract Christian doctrine, Meifort came to the conclusion that the two currents of thought were incompatible and, therefore, denied a substantial influence of Platonism on *Clement of Alexandria (*Der Platonismus bei Clemens Alexandrinus*, Tübingen 1928). Völker, in contradistinction to Harnack, denied that there was a substantial Hellenization of Christianity in the writings of the Fathers (*Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus* [TU 57], Berlin 1952, p. 352 n. 3) and affirmed that Clement, despite the philosophical borrowings to which he continually had recourse, never crossed the line between Christianity and philosophy (ibid., p. 9). Clement adopted the language of the philosophers to attract his opponents (ibid., p. 8); his use of *Stoic and Platonic philosophy could be reduced to a simple assumption of terms that covered the core of a genuine Christian perspective like a shell and would be used for the purpose of converting *pagan philosophers (ibid., pp. 8, 9, 14 n. 1). What Völker affirmed with regard to Clement represents the chief argument of all his books (*Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen 1930; repr. Nedeln 1966; *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*, Wiesbaden 1955, It. tr. Ch.O. Tommasi, Milan 1993; *Kontemplation und Extase bei Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita*, Wiesbaden 1958; *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1965): the relationship between the Platonic tradition and the Christian tradition would only be formal, superficial and instrumental, and thus the latter, despite the appeals to Platonic terminology, would preserve unadulterated its genuine Christian character.

The interpretation of Christian Platonism offered by E. von Ivánka and Daniélou is no different. With regard to Clement, Ivánka affirmed that the "Platonic motifs possessed only a metaphorical value"; Clement carried out a transformation in a Christian sense and a mediation of Platonic teachings that would nonetheless exclude a Hellenization of Christianity (*Plato Christianus*, Einsiedeln 1964, 98). This position lies at the basis of all Ivánka's studies, collected in a volume titled *Plato Christianus*, as one can easily conclude from its subtitle (*Übernahme und Umgestaltung des Platonismus durch die*). As in the case of Ivánka, Daniélou, in his study on *Gregory of Nyssa, tended to reduce the relationship between this Cappadocian Father and *Plotinus to a simple assumption of "images" that nonetheless would not compromise the transformation and the supersession of Platonism and the creation of a

completely Christian mystical doctrine on Gregory's part (*Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris 1953, 211, 212, 214-217; for more detailed information on the agreement between Ivánka and Daniélou with regard to Gregory of Nyssa, see S. Lilla, *Neuplatonisches Gedankengut in den Homilien über die Seligpreisungen Gregors von Nissa* [Suppl. to VChr 68] Leiden 2004, 20-24). As in the case of Völker, Daniélou likewise rejected the thesis of the "Hellenization of Christianity" (*Méssage évangélique et culture hellénistique*, Tournai 1961, 279).

Scholars of the 1950s and 1960s followed a very different interpretation: one merely has to recall the work of J.H. Waszink, A. Grillmeier, W. Pannenberg, W. Jaeger, H. Chadwick and I.P. Sheldon-Williams. For Waszink, "the influence of Platonism in ancient Christian thought is an historical fact"; whoever immerses oneself in the study of the writings of *Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, *Origen and Gregory of Nyssa inevitably encounters Platonic motifs that acquire a remarkable importance in the new context in which they are found; the dependence of Christian thought on "the most important and vital idealistic system of ancient culture" can be accepted a priori; "Platonism was used in the construction and development of this thought" (*Der Platonismus und die altchristliche Gedankenwelt*, in *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne* [*Entret. sur l'ant. class.* III] Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1957, 139). "As soon as Christianity met ancient culture, the influence of Platonism on Christian thought was inevitable, so that in the spiritual life of the period Platonism represented the most vital element" (ibid., p. 174). In the writings of Justin Martyr and *Athenagoras, "one finds for the first time the use of ideas whose provenance from Platonism was well known to those who used them" (*Bemerkungen zum Einfluß des Platonismus in frühen Christentum*: VChr 19 [1965] 135); "Often an idea proper to Platonism that Christians found useful in some way and placed as a pillar in the edifice of thoughts cast as entirely Christian remained in its essence as a foreign body, exactly like the Ionic and Corinthian columns coming from the pagan temples and existing within early Christian buildings" (ibid., p. 136). "With regard to the prevailing theological system of Platonism, well-defined in its essential lines, one could not deny that it revealed a strong harmony with certain key teachings of Christianity" (ibid., p. 138; two decades later C. de Vogel would hold the same view; see below).

Grillmeier did not deny the historical reality of the Hellenization of Christianity; in his view, however, this process should not be taken as global, generic and uniform given its complexity and difficulty (*Hellenisierung-Judaisierung des Christentums als Deuteprinzipien der Geschichte des Kirchlichen Dogmas*: Scholastik 33 [1958] 354-538 [= *Mit ihm und in ihm*, Freiburg i.B. 1975, 457-467])—worthy of note, in his entire study, is his very erudite critical review of 19th- and 20th-c. studies on the phenomenon of "Hellenization."

Unlike Harnack and not unlike Hegel, Pannenberg offered a positive judgment of the reception of the philosophical elements in the Christian message beginning with the apologists (*Die Aufnahme des philosophischen Gottesbegriffes als dogmatisches Problem der frühchristlichen Theologie*: ZKTh 70 [1959] 1 [= *Grundfragen systematischer Theologie*, Göttingen [2]1971, 296]). Beginning with the idea of Greek **paideia* (in which Platonism played a primary role), Jaeger recognized that "classical Greek culture and the Christian church undergo a process of mutual adaptation," and he emphasized the fusion between Christian religion and Greek cultural inheritance (*Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, Cambridge, MA 1965, 62); Gregory of Nyssa was steeped in the great Greek philosophical tradition and its cultural ideals (ibid., p. 86).

Though Chadwick considered Justin Martyr, Clement and Origen Christian thinkers who worked in a Christian context in order to respond to the problems raised by the Christian religion that were not always in harmony with the views of the Platonists, he did not minimize the impact of Greek philosophy—and in particular Platonism—on their reflection. Platonism provided Justin's theology with its fundamental presuppositions (*Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 16); this apologist extended his hand esp. to the Platonists (ibid., p. 22). For Clement, Plato was by far the best of all the Greek philosophers (ibid., p. 39); Clement's reception of Platonism was more thorough than Justin's (ibid., p. 45); for this Alexandrian Father, the account of creation present in the *Timaeus* is parallel with the one in Genesis (ibid., p. 46; cf. Waszink in VChr 19 [1965] 143). In the *Stromata*, one of his earlier works that has been lost, Origen had intended to demonstrate the agreement between Jesus and Plato (Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought*, pp. 71-72). Chadwick's position in substance concurs with that of Sheldon-Williams, for whom "Christian Platonism" is characterized by a "controlled acceptance" of certain Platonic teachings that does not therefore exclude the rejection of incompatible propositions with Christian revelation. A "Christian Platonist may be either a Platonist who requires to substantiate his speculations by a faith that transcends them, or a Christian who thinks of

his faith, and desires to expound it, in terms intelligible to Platonists" (*The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, 425).

As G. Reale did not fail to note (in C. de Vogel, pp. 11-12, 16), Luther's inheritance, already well seen in the works of Meifort and Völker (see above), flourished again with particular vehemence in two important studies written by a famous scholar of the entire Platonic movement, H. Dörrie: in these works the thesis of the impossibility of Platonic philosophy's deep impact on Christian thought is generalized to the fullest and officially codified (*Was ist spätantiker Platonismus? Überlegungen zur Grenzziehung zwischen Platonismus und Christentum*: ThRu 36 [1971] 285-302 [= *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 508-523]; *Die andare Theologie*: TP 56 [1981] 1-46).

According to Dörrie, "Platonism was not received by the Fathers in its substance" (*Platonica minora*, pp. 516, 522, cf. *Die andere Theologie*, p. 443): "the following decisive dogmas were rejected without exception by the church: the graduated *Trinity, the existence of a world lacking a beginning, the changeable revelation of the *logos*, the transmigration of *souls and the return of the soul which recognizes its home" (*Platonica minora*, p. 522). "Christian theology can, actually it must, be conceived as antithetical to Platonism" (ibid.): they are two diametrically opposed forces (*Platonica minora*, p. 519). One cannot speak of a "Christian Platonism," but on the contrary of a "de-Platonization," an "anti-Platonism," a "Christian contra-Platonism" (*Platonica minora*, pp. 518, 520, 523). The expression "Christian Platonism" is only fitting, strictly speaking, for heretics (see below, with respect to Souverain and Baltus); in the area of orthodoxy, it is admissible only if understood as a cunning maneuver adopted by the Fathers to face their opponents who could not be fought with other weapons (*Die andere Theologie*, p. 46). The relationship between Platonism in Christianity could have only consisted in the "passing on" from Platonism to Christianity "of formulas, metaphors, examples and citations. This subtle web of borrowings cannot lead to confusion about the actual existence of an arduous fight, a strict confrontation between two religious confessions with clear-cut boundaries" (*Platonica minora*, p. 521). "From time to time, the teachers of the church borrowed weapons from the arsenal of Platonism; in all the bitter confrontations there is present the attempt to combat the adversary with his own weapons" (*Platonica minora*, p. 522; cf. *Die andere Theologie*, p. 46). "The few and entirely formal common points," which are opposed "to the profound diversities and lines of demarcation," in reality lead to a "transformation of Platonism by Christianity" (*Platonica minora*, pp. 515, 516, 520, 523). The Christian apologists, when they accepted formulas, expressions and images proper to Platonism, pursued a purely exhortatory objective aiming for their conversion of educated pagans, as Philo had already done toward the Hellenized Jews of *Alexandria (*Die andere Theologie*, pp. 6-13, 24, 28). With the goal of converting those pagan readers who were inclined to Christianity but were not yet disposed to receive baptism, they wanted to convince them of their spiritual proximity to the new religion and of the fact that for them it would have been sufficient to take just a small step to enter the faith (*Die andere Theologie*, pp. 21, 24). It was therefore natural for these apologists to have recourse to the "caricature" of the presence of the contents of the Christian faith in Greek philosophy so that they might dispel the fear that entrance into Christianity would require a new mode of thinking and a new spiritual life (*Die andere Theologie*, pp. 24, 30, 40).

The adoption of language and aspects of metaphysical teachings and categories of thought proper to *Neoplatonism aimed to present a Christian substance under Platonic clothing (*Die andere Theologie*, p. 45). All this, however, cannot obscure the substantial irreconcilability between the two theologies (*Platonica minora*, pp. 523): the Platonists would never have been able to accept the concepts of *redemption, *grace, original *sin, bodily *resurrection of the dead and God's salvific action in history (*Die andere Theologie*, pp. 18, 20, 23). One's eyes immediately jump to the utter opposition between the point of view held by Dörrie and that of Waszink and Jaeger and the strong similarity between the theses of Dörrie and those of Völker, Ivánka and Daniélou, esp. with regard to the purely formal value and apologetic objective of the adoption of Platonic terms and images by the Fathers and their transformation of Platonism.

A clear dissociation from the theses of Dörrie and a long and penetrating critique of them characterized an article written by E.P. Meijering, *Wie platonisierten Christen? Zur Grenzziehung zwischen Platonismus, Kirchlichem Credo und patristischer Theologie*: VChr 28 (1974) 15-28. For Meijering, the simple and abstract opposition theorized by Dörrie between the fundamental truths of the Christian faith and that of Platonic philosophy hinders one from understanding the history of Christian theology: such an understanding presupposes that one can ascertain the way in which the Fathers interpreted and justified their faith and the influence ex-

erted by Platonism on their theological reflection (ibid., pp. 16-17). In the idea of God's immutability, Meijering saw a clear inheritance of Platonism in the thought of the Fathers, who had to reconcile this philosophy with their faith (ibid., pp. 17-18, 27). After having recalled that the doctrine of the hierarchical gradation of the divinity—a view characteristic of the Platonic tradition and adopted by *Arius—is also present in the theological reflection of certain Fathers (e.g., the apologists and Origen) and cannot therefore be adopted as a proof of the irreconcilable opposition between Platonism and Christianity (ibid., pp. 25-26), Meijering reached conclusions opposite those of Dörrie, but analogous to those of Waszink: "Platonism resided as a spiritual force in the hearts and minds of many Christian theologians"; "the Alexandrian Fathers interpreted the faith and biblical texts using the culture of their time as a point of departure"; "to limit the influence of Platonism on Christian theology to the purely linguistic and formal aspects would be to obscure a very important factor" (ibid., pp. 27-28).

In the synthetic but clear and linear presentation of the encounter between the Christian message and Greek thought, which led to the Hellenization of the former, M. Simonetti recognized without reservation the historical reality and the inevitability of this phenomenon, as Waszink had already done in *Entret. sur l'ant. class.* III, pp. 139-174 and in VChr 19 (1965) 135: "Here I merely point out how abstract the idea is of a primitive Christian message formulated in a pure state, which then became contaminated in contact with Greek culture: in fact, the Christian message took shape initially in Semitic categories because it was entirely formulated in a Semitic area, so that of necessity then when aspiring to universal propagation and to spread itself in areas of Greek culture, it had to be formulated anew acc. to the categories of thought typical of Hellenism. This leads me to believe that it is more correct to see in the Hellenization of the Christian message, not its deformation owed to the influence of Greek culture, but rather the result of a process of adaptation, a process inevitable and natural, even if very laborious and difficult . . . with the goal of finding on the one hand the indispensable contacts with the surrounding world and on the other to emphasize the newness of the subject and therefore the identity itself of the new community" (*Cristianesimo antico e cultura greca*, Rome 1983, 7-8). In these statements one finds both an acceptance and rejection of Harnack's position, to which, as was seen, one can attribute both the idea of the formulation of a Christian message "acc. to the categories of thought typical of Hellenism," fully shared by Simonetti, and its "deformation owed to the influence of Greek culture," which was instead rejected by him. Although the first idea was, in substance, also Waszink's (see above) and Meijering's (ibid., pp. 16-17), the rejection of the second has a clear precedent in the writings of R. Cantalamessa, who considered negative judgments on the process of Christianity's "Hellenization" to be erroneous (see *Cristianesimo primitivo e filosofia greca*, in *Il Cristianesimo e le filosofie*, Milan 1971, 51-52 [cited by C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004, 8-9]). Simonetti's agreement with Jaeger is also clear (with regard to the "process of adaptation") and Chadwick (with regard to the "newness of the subject" and "identity").

A.M. Ritter was also critical of Dörrie's ideas, though fully acknowledging the other merits of this scholar's studies on the Platonic tradition (*Platonismus und Christentum in der Spätantike*: ThRu 49 [1984] 31-56). Like Grillmeier and Meijering, Ritter maintained that Dörrie presented an image that lacked critical distinctions of Christian theology, and that it is necessary to apply a distinction between the faith and its theological interpretation if one wants to outline the history of Christian thought (ibid., p. 37). He cannot accept the thesis acc. to which "the ancient theologians were aware of the irreconcilability between Greek and Christian thought, that would have excluded a priori any sort of compromise" (ibid., p. 38): Christian theology was met with the necessity of "testing its own assimilative and critical strength" (ibid., p. 54). Ritter's contribution remains significant also because of his invaluable review of previous research (ibid., passim, in particular pp. 46-53). This was not unlike the contribution of I. Opelt, who at the end of his work on Socrates spoke of an "interaction between Christianity and Platonism" (*Das Bild des Sokrates in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur*, in *Platonismus und Christentum, Festschrift für H. Dörrie* [Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband 10], Münster 1983, 207). C. Andresen, after having presented the two opposing solutions given to the problem of the relationship between Neoplatonism and Christianity (namely, the "diacritic" relationship of which Dörrie is a spokesman and the "dialogical and synthetic" relationship supported by Meijering) focuses his attention on the *Corpus Aeropagiticum* and thus concludes that in this corpus of writings one finds the presence "of a synthesis between Christian theology and Greek ontology" (*The Integration of Platonism into Early Christian Theology*: SP XV [TU 128], Berlin 1984, 405).

In his lengthy study *Platonism and Christianity: A Mere Antagonism or a Profound Common Ground?*: VChr 39 (1985) 1-62, C. de Vogel developed Meijering's criticisms of Dörrie's positions. Mindful esp. of F. Ricken's studies on *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Athanasius (*Die Logoslehre des Eusebios von Caesarea und der Mittelplatonismus*: Theologie und Philosophie 42 [1967] 341-358; *Zur Rezeption der platonischen Ontologie bei Eusebios von Kaisareia, Arieos und Athanasios*: Theologie und Philosophie 53 [1978] 321-352), de Vogel presented a picture of the relationship between Platonism and patristic thought that disagreed specifically with the picture presented by Dörrie (his point of view therefore agreed not only with Meijering but also with those of Jaeger and Ritter).

De Vogel's criticism distinguished five different attitudes of Christian authors toward Greek philosophy (and therefore also Platonism): (a) complete rejection and open hostility; (b) broadmindedness characterized by the assimilation of philosophical categories; (c) an extremely critical evaluation that did not exclude, however, the reception of certain doctrines; (d) an extensive reception of philosophical categories that at times was also syncretistic; (e) an extensive reception combined with a transformation. The following figures of early Christianity conform to these categories: (a) *Tatian; (b) Clement of Alexandria, who had Philo as his forerunner; (c) Justin Martyr, *Aristides, *Athenagoras and Origen, the Cappadocian Fathers and Augustine; (d) *Minucius Felix, *Boethius and *Synesius; (e) the *Corpus Aeropagiticum* (de Vogel, *Platonism and Christianity*, pp. 19-27).

The use of philosophy by Clement is not reduced to a mere tactical maneuver to convert pagans but is part of his spirit (ibid., p. 22). Minucius Felix provided a rational and philosophical exposition of his faith without even naming the person who gave this title to Christians (ibid., pp. 22-23). In the writings of Boethius, one observes at times an excessive syncretism associated with Neoplatonic categories; he did not speak at all about Christ (ibid., pp. 23-24). Synesius became a Christian while still being a Platonist and remained a Platonist even after having become a Christian; he had a very strong relationship to the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria (ibid., pp. 24-26). Eusebius's doctrine of the *logos* was characterized by motifs already present in the writings of Philo, in the treatise titled *De mundo* and in the works of Middle Platonic authors such as *Maximus of Tyre and *Numenius (ibid., p. 33). Presenting God as a "real being," perfect, eternal and immutable, in a manner similar to *Philo of Alexandria, Plutarch and Justin Martyr, *Anastasius implemented a Hellenization of the Christian message (ibid., pp. 32, 50-54). In the *Corpus Aeropagiticum*, one notes a Christianized form of Proclean Neoplatonism (ibid., p. 27).

Aside from judgments on these individual authors, de Vogel's contribution also presented more generic observations: "Christian theologians who learned to think acc. to the forms of Platonic metaphysics inserted this philosophy in their own life" (ibid., p. 30); "Platonism . . . in time became an integral part of the intellectual life of prominent Christians" (ibid., pp. 30-31); "Platonic ontology was at the foundation of the thought of Christian theologians and established part of their understanding of God" (ibid., pp. 34-35). Although rejecting the thesis of Dörrie on the utter incompatibility between Christianity and Platonism, de Vogel's thesis emphasizes that these two currents of thought have some common foundational points that can be summarized into a clear distinction between sensible realities—which are not primary—and a reality that is absolute, perfect and primary, regulatory of human life. The rational expression that Platonic philosophy supplied to Christians was considered by them to be in harmony with *Scripture and capable of deepening and confirming their faith. Platonism, therefore, contributed in giving expression to the dogmas of the Christian faith. On this key point, de Vogel's thesis agreed with Harnack, even if he rejected his negative evaluation of the phenomenon (ibid., pp. 54-55). A few years earlier Cantalamessa and Simonetti expressed an analogous rejection on this matter (see above). E. Peroli's Italian translation of de Vogel's study accompanied by G. Reale's introduction has made a noteworthy contribution to spreading an awareness of Dörrie and de Vogel's opposite theses esp. in Italy (C. de Vogel, *Platonismo e Cristianesimo. Antagonismo o comuni fondamenti?* ed. G. Reale and E. Peroli, Milan 1993). While G. Reale presented the two positions of Dörrie and de Vogel acc. to their main themes, calling attention to the "Lutheran presuppositions" of the former and thoroughly criticizing his thesis (ibid., pp. 9-23), E. Peroli focused his study on a wide and analytic exposition of Dörrie's views, with extensive references to his own studies (ibid., pp. 110-134); he placed before this exposition a brief but dense introductory note on the debate relating to the problem of the "Hellenization of Christianity," of which Hegel was already well aware (ibid., pp. 107-110, see also above). His final conclusions criticized Dörrie's chief arguments and established the full validity of the expression "Christian Platonist," which was rejected, however, by Dörrie (ibid., pp. 134-138).

In his essay "Les débuts de la Théologie comme science (IIIe-IVe siècle)," which appeared in RSPh 80 (1996) 201-220, H.D. Saffrey outlined the development of theology as a science in a Christian and pagan context (namely, a theological context that used a rigorous scientific method changed by philosophy in view of the construction of a fully rational system). In a Christian context, such a theology saw its first manifestation at Alexandria with Clement, who, when confronted with Hellenism, "inaugurated a more rational form of Christian doctrine" (ibid., p. 204). This rational form later developed over the course of the 4th c. and esp. in the 2nd half of that century when it found its best champions in the Cappadocian Fathers, who introduced a certain measure of philosophical rationality into biblical categories in order to refute the *Eunomian heresy (ibid., pp. 210-212). In a pagan context Neoplatonism's primary objective was to form a scientific theology characterized by the metamorphosis of philosophy into theology, as soon as the doctrinal baggage of the former came to bestow a rational structure on the latter (ibid., p. 213). Such a process reached its full development in the Neoplatonism of the school of Athens with Plutarch of Athens, Syrian and *Proclus (ibid., p. 215). In the Proclean system, philosophy assumed a theological character, and theology, in turn, found its full expression and scientific rigor, becoming a "scientific theology." Specifically keeping in mind the Proclean theology of the author of the *Corpus Aeropagiticum* (ibid., pp. 218-219), he was able to set forward a theological system that in a Christian context functioned as a foil to that of Proclus, from which it adopted its character and laws. Reaching its acme between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th c., "scientific theology" was not an exclusively medieval phenomenon, but was already present in Late Antiquity; the *opinio communis* which has dated it to scholastic theology of the 13th c. should be corrected (ibid., p. 201).

In his recent work *Storia della filosofia patristica* (Brescia 2004), C. Moreschini has adopted R. Cantalamessa's rejection of scholars' earlier condemnation of the process of "Hellenization" and of the attitude of the Fathers toward Greek philosophy (ibid., pp. 8-9). He cited Cantalamessa's words that emphasized the "sovereign liberty with which the Fathers used fundamental concepts and categories of Greek thought for the demands of the Christian message" and that, with Hellenization taken as a given, placed the emphasis "on the mode and measure with which it is verified" (ibid., p. 9). Proceeding in this direction, Moreschini on the one hand admits that the Fathers depended on Platonism; on the other, he intends to safeguard their critical sense and identity: "Patristic philosophy was, along the entire arc of its existence, . . . heavily influenced by Platonism. Clement, Origen, the Cappadocian Fathers and Augustine were experts in it and, in effect, their openness toward what was already considered the most famous philosophy of the day—both Plato's and his followers, who were contemporaries of the Christians—was very great. But such an openness was truly a conscious adoption of Greek teachings . . . and only and exclusively inasmuch as these were considered functional and adaptable to the Christian message. The same Christian philosophers which we have just mentioned openly professed their substantial differences from pagan philosophy and always stressed their specific Christian character" (ibid., p. 10). In its most essential part, Moreschini's assessment concurs with those of Chadwick, Jaeger, Sheldon-Williams and Simonetti ("patristic philosophy . . . was heavily influenced by Platonism," "Greek teachings . . . adaptable to the Christian message," "specific Christian character"); but it does not seem entirely immune from Dörrie's influence ("their substantial differences from pagan philosophy").

A detailed and analytical study of the Platonism of the Fathers has demonstrated how substantially sterile Dörrie's position was, not budging on the utter incompatibility between Platonists and Christians on certain nonsecondary points (such as *metempsychosis, the resurrection of the body, the redemption and the revelation transmitted by the incarnate God). His position therefore cannot proceed in the direction indicated by Waszink, Jaeger, Meijering, Ritter, de Vogel, Reale and Peroli, even if it must broaden, examining other points of contact between Platonist philosophers and the Fathers beyond those indicated by Meijering (the immutability of God) and by de Vogel (the clear distinction between lower sensible reality and absolute and primary reality): **theologia negativa* (of which the immutability of God is only one aspect); ideas as God's thoughts; the relationship between God, intelligence and being; the doctrine of absolute beauty; the doctrine of the *logos* as the sum of ideas/powers, as the seat of the highest concepts that the Christian must imitate, as the head of the angelic world, as the forming principle and law of the cosmos; the trinitarian doctrine itself; the theme of the control of the passions; the idea of **apatheia* and similarity to God; the reduction to unity; the theme of the soul's retreat into itself and self-contemplation and mystical union. S. Lilla has sought to shed light on these

points (see the bibl. and *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971).

II. The attitude of the Fathers toward Plato and their relation to contemporary Platonism. Of all the Greek philosophers Plato was without a doubt the one most venerated by the Fathers (see H. Dörrie, *Die andere Theologie*: TP 56 [1981] 27, 46). Aside from figures such as *Tatian, the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, *Hermias, *Hippolytus, *Epiphanius and *Tertullian, who were inclined to a radical condemnation of *all* Greek philosophy, and therefore Plato as well, what strikes one the most when examining the attitude of the Fathers who were open to Greek thought is that the often violent polemical attacks against Aristotle and the *Stoics (*see* *Aristotelianism, *pantheism)—not to mention Epicurus, who was considered an atheist *tout court*—did not touch Plato, considered to be the founder of the highest and most inspired philosophy. This philosophy was a true and proper "theology" capable of supplying the Christian who did not content himself with "simple faith" with an adequate conception of the divinity and the means necessary to reach it, and therefore worthy of being set next to Christianity or even of being used in the investigation of its highest truths. The rejection by certain Fathers of specific Platonic teachings or the Platonic school—such as the doctrine of metempsychosis, the coeternity of matter with God or its demonology—did not overshadow their admiration toward one who remained for them the greatest philosopher of all time (on the positive or negative attitude of various patristic authors toward Plato, see J. Geffken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Hamburg 1907, passim; R. Arnou, *Platonisme des Pères*, DTC XII, 2 Paris 1935, 2300-2302; C. Fabricius, *Zu den Aussagen der griechischen Kirchenväter über Platon*: VChr 42 [1988] 179-187).

The cult-like tribute offered to Plato by the Fathers, however, was not an isolated phenomenon: Platonic philosophy was the object of veneration and study even by supporters of the Academy and, in a much larger context, of the *pagan *intelligentsia*, and thus became a current of thought in the pagan world that continued until the beginning of the 6th c. AD. In its initial phase, represented by the ancient Academy of Xenocrates, Crantor and Speusippus (4th-3rd c. BC), this current remained limited to the context of the Academy and was only one of many philosophical schools; during the imperial age it became the dominant "philosophy" par excellence of the Hellenistic period, which was influenced by many of its teachings (see H. Dörrie, *Platonica minora*, p. 515). The *Hellenistic Judaism of *Philo of Alexandria was also indebted to Platonic philosophy, even as it ran parallel to the development of patristic thought.

During the arc of time between the 2nd and 6th c. AD, there began between these two currents of thought an uninterrupted series of very close relationships that gave rise to a continuous osmosis. As in the study of Justin Martyr, one cannot disregard *Middle Platonism of the 2nd c.; as in the case of Clement and Origen, it is necessary to keep in mind both Middle Platonism and the initial phase of *Neoplatonism of the 3rd and 4th centuries; and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite cannot be separated from the Neoplatonism of *Proclus and *Damascius (*see* *syncretism). It is already well known that Marius Victorinus and St. Augustine felt the need to consult the works of *Plotinus and *Porphyry. The study of the "Platonism of the Fathers" must also keep in mind their direct knowledge of the writings of Plato, and, therefore, esp. the study of their relationships to the current of Platonic thought reigning from the 1st to 6th c. AD. This type of study must examine both the mode in which the Fathers' own interpretation of Platonic thought was influenced by contemporary Platonism, and the doctrines coming from this Platonism, appropriated by the Fathers and used by them to interpret their religious faith.

III. The 2nd c. While Tatian does not seem to treat Plato better than the other Greek philosophers (he rebuked him for γαστριμαργία, *Ad Graecos* 2, p. 2, 22-23 Schwartz, 25, p. 26, 23-24, and for having imitated Pythagoras and Pherecydes, 3, p. 4, 7-8), *Athenagoras showed a great respect for him, accompanied with a precise awareness of contemporary Platonism, which left a deep mark on his thought. In his work *Pro Christ.* 6 (7, 5-7 and 9-11 Schwartz), in order to demonstrate that even Plato believed in one God who was not subject to becoming and is eternal, he cites with approval two passages from the *Timaeus*, 28c—foundational in the theology of *Middle Platonism—and 41a (the latter is also considered in ch. 23, pp. 29, 19-21); and in ch. 23 (pp. 30, 23-31, 2). He also cited a passage from the *Phaedrus* 246 (see also Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19,8, pp. 20, 17-18) affirming that Plato called the chief divinity μέγας Ζεύς due to a need for clarity, εἰς σαφήνειαν, and adding (p. 31, 6-7) ὅτι μὴ δυνατὸν εἰς πάντας φέρειν τὸν θεόν: these last words are an echo of *Timaeus* 28c. Likewise from the *Timaeus* 28c, he derived the expression ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ποιητής in *Pro Christ.* 8 (8,23).

In the following points the influence of Middle Platonism on Athenagoras appears evident: **(1)** God is above all beings (*Pro Christ.* 8 [9,5-6]: cf. Plutarch, *De def. or.* 426b; *De Is. et Os.* 382f.; Alcinous, *Did.*

164,15-16). **(2)** God is immortal, immobile, eternal, not subject to change and becoming (*Pro Christ.* 22 [27,24–25,28-29], 4 [5,10], 6 [7,7]: cf. Diogenes Laërtius, III, 77; Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19,6 [20,12]; Alcinous, *Did.* 164,21 and 28; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* XI, 59 a; *Philo, *De Cher.* 90). **(3)** God is self-sufficient and above human desires (*Pro Christ.* 29 [39-20]: cf. Alcinous, *Did.* 164,28; Philo, *De virt.* 9). **(4)** God is an eternal intelligence (*Pro Christ.* 10 [11, 9-10]: cf. Plato, *Tim.* 39e, *Philebus* 28c-e, 30c; Alcinous, *Did.* 164,24; Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* III, 29). **(5)** God can be understood only with the mind (*Pro Christ.* 4 [5,10-11]: cf. Alcinous, *Did.* 165,4-5). **(6)** The doctrine of the three principles (God, matter and the ideas) formulated in *Pro Christ.* 7 [8,14-15] is a typically Middle Platonic notion (see Alcinous, *Did.* 163,10-12; Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19,1; Diogenes Laërtius III, 76). **(7)** The association between λόγος and idea in *Pro Christ.* 10 (11,2-3) is from Philo (cf., e.g., *De opif. m.* 20; *De sacr. Ab. et C.* 83) and would be taken up again by Clement (*Strom.* V, 16,3 [II, 336,8-9]), who would date it back to the "barbarians," namely, Philo; at the root of Athenagoras's statement is the Middle Platonic teaching of the ideas as thoughts contained in the mind of God (see below with regard to Clement); **(8)** εἶδος is the idea close to matter, which because of its presence acquires the form and becomes a fixed sensible object (*Pro Christ.* 22 [28,7 and 21], 24 [32,7 and 20]): this originally Aristotelian teaching was common in Middle Platonism, as seen from the passages E. Schwartz collected from the writings of Plutarch, Alcinous and Philo (index p. 105 TU IV, 2, Leipzig 1888). **(9)** God began the world by stamping forms and order upon matter that was originally unformed and disordered (*Pro Christ.* 15 [16,11-15]; *De res. mort.* 3 [51,16-17]): this is the classical Middle Platonist perspective on the origin of the world found, e.g., in Plutarch's *De animae procr. in Timaeo*, in Alcinous (*Did.* VIII, pp. 162-163), in Philo's *De opificio mundi*, in Hippolytus (*Ref.* I, 19,1-3 [19,7; 19,4–20,1]) and in Diogenes Laërtius (III, 76-77). **(10)** Primordial matter is πανδεχές (*Pro Christ.* 15 [16,14]): this epithet, which dates back to Plato, *Tim.* 51 a 7 (he thus describes the receptacle as void of form, which subsequent philosophy would identify with primordial matter) is found, e.g., in Alcinous, *Did.* 162,26 (see also Hippolytus's δεξαμενή, *Ref. I*, 19, p. 19, 6-7). **(11)** Athenagoras adopted the contrast—originating with Plato and present in all subsequent Platonism—between the *intelligible* world, which is the world of being, not subject to becoming and eternal, and the *sensible* world, which is subject to becoming, having a beginning and end: see *Pro Christ.* 15 [16,2-4] and 19 [21,15-19] and Plato, *Tim.* 27d-28a. **(12)** The motif of the wonder caused by the vision of the beauty of the universe, which leads one to go back to one's designer, can be found in *Pro Christ.* 16 [17,13-14]: already present in Plato's writings (*Philebus* 28e; *Laws* XII, 966d-e), this motif repeatedly returns in subsequent Platonism and in the writings of various patristic authors (*see* *cosmos).

Justin Martyr spoke of Plato and Pythagoras as two "wise men who were the walls and support of our philosophy" (*Dial.* 5, p. 28, 16-17 Otto) thus conforming to the tendency of contemporary philosophy (cf. C. Andresen, *Justin und der mittlere Platonismus*: ZNTW 44 [1952–1953] 162; Id., *Logos und Nomos*, Berlin 1955, 124 and 239-240; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 44). Referring to the period before his conversion, he left the following statements about scholastic Platonism of the 2nd c. AD, which attracted him more than all the other philosophical schools: "The thought of the incorporeal essences seized me, and the contemplation of the ideas gave my mind wings; in a short time I believed that I had become wise, and in my ingenuity I soon hoped to see God: because this is the goal of Platonic philosophy" (*Dial.* 2, p. 10, 23-12, 2). At the beginning of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin spoke as a Platonist of his time (see also C. Andresen, 163). Almost every single phrase echoes with reminiscences of Plato's dialogues and scholastic Platonism which lies at the base of his formation. The term ἀνεπτέρου (*Dial.* 2 [10,24]) connects back to the *Phaedrus* (246c 1, 249c 4, 249d 6, 251b 7) and foreshadows the idea—that would enjoy great success in the writings of subsequent Fathers, esp. *Gregory of Nyssa—of the *winged mind that flies upward. The statement "what tears the soul away from sensible things and makes it apt to those intelligible, so that it can see beauty and the absolute good" (*Dial.* 2 [10,11-13]) refers to the motif of the souls distancing themselves from the body and the present sensations (e.g., in the *Phaedo* 65e, 67c) and to the idea of the contemplation of beauty (*Sympos.* 211d-212a). The motif of philosophy as the sole source of happiness (*Dial.* 3 [14,13-15]) follows the Stoic and Platonist point of view of the self-sufficiency of virtue which was appropriated by Middle Platonism (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 68-72). The definition of philosophy as "the science of being and the knowledge of the truth" (*Dial.* 3 [14,18-19]), aside from basing itself on very common terminology in Plato's writings, recalls Alcinous's definition of the contemplative life: "that consists in the knowledge of the truth" (*Did.* 152, 28-29).

The definition given for God (*Dial.* 3 [16,1-2]) recalls the two Platonic doctrines of the immutability

of ideas (*Tim.* 28a) and the absolute good upon which the existence of all beings depends (*Rep.* VI 509b; see also *Timeaus* 29a and Alcinous, *Did.* 164, 35-36). The definition of science as the knowledge of things human and divine (*Dial.* 3 [16,8-10]) takes up the definition that *Stoicism formulated for wisdom, a definition that became commonplace in Middle Platonism (see C. Andresen, ZNTW 44, 162 n. 20). The motif of the knowability of God only through the mind (*Dial.* 3 [18,1-2]) is the same as what one finds in the writings of Athenagoras and Alcinous (see above Athenagoras no. **(5)** and C. Andresen, ZNTW 44, 166) and certainly goes back to the Platonic conception of the knowability of the ideas through the intelligence (*Phaedo* 66a 1; *Phaedrus* 247c; *Tim.* 28a 1). Justin Martyr says, "The eye of intelligence has been given to us for this reason: to be able to see with this pure instrument the being that is the cause of all intelligible beings, and which has neither color, form, nor size concerning those things that the eye is able to see, but which is something which is found above every essence, which is unspeakable and inexpressible, which alone is beauty and the good that is suddenly found in the well gifted souls because of their affinity to it and for their desire to see it" (*Dial.* 4, p. 18, 7-13). He has in mind Plato's various dialogues: the expression εἰλικρινεῖ αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ has its precise correspondence in the *Phaedo* 66a; "being which is the cause of all intelligible beings" is the absolute good of the *Rep.* VI 509b; the idea of the absence of color, form and size in God goes back to the *Phaedrus* 247c, *Parm.* 137d, *Sympos.* 211e. C. Andresen demonstrated (ZNTW 44, 166) that it also occurs in the writings of *Celsus (frag. VI, 64 Bader) (it is the famous "via negativa," a commonplace in Middle Platonism and in Neoplatonism, which was also adopted by later Fathers: for its presence in Middle Platonism and in Neoplatonism, see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 221 and 222 n.5). The superiority of the supreme being with respect to every essence is based upon the famous passage in the *Rep.* VI, 509b, a text that would become foundational for Neoplatonist theology; its ineffability goes back to the *Sympos.* 211a, *Parm.* 142a, *Tim.* 28c, and was a commonplace also in Middle Platonism (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 220-221); the identification between Beauty and the absolute Good (namely, between the Beauty of the *Sympos.* 210e-212a and the Good of the *Rep.* VI, 509b) is found in the Platonism of the 2nd c. AD (see, e.g., Alcinous, *Did.* 164, 30-33; 165, 27), but not in Neoplatonism (where the Good would be identified with the first *hypostasis, and Beauty with the second); the words "that are suddenly manifested in the soul" recall *Epist.* VII, 341c 6-d 1; and the motif of the desire (ἔρως) for contemplation is already found in the *Phaedo* 66e, *Sympos.* 210e. The statement "esp. when it detaches itself from the body and stands alone by itself, it obtains what it loves" (*Dial.* 4 [22,2-3]) refers to the *Phaedo* (66a 3-5, 66e 2-3, 67c 6-d2, 68a 6-7).

The doctrine of the unbegotten and immortal soul, which Justin explicitly attributed to "some Platonists" (*Dial.* 5 [24,9-10]), finds a precise confirmation in Middle Platonism (see Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19, 10, p. 21, 5). The theory of the unbegotten universe, which was defeated by Justin (*Dial.* 5, p. 24, 11-12), was held not only by the Peripatetic school, but also by supporters of Middle Platonism—such as Alcinous, Apuleius, Celsus and Taurus, who did not interpret the *Timaeus* literally (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 197-198). The idea of considering the universe's materiality and being subject to becoming as a proof of the universe's generation by a superior cause—a thesis accepted both by Justin and Trypho (*Dial.* 5, p. 24, 13-16)—goes back directly to the *Timaeus* 28b (in Middle Platonism Plutarch and Atticus supported the teaching of the universe's generation; see also Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19,4, p. 20, 4-6; C. Andresen, ZNTW 44, 163-164; Id., *Logos u. Nomos*, 280-283; and S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 197). When Justin spoke about the universe, which, although being subject to corruption per se, is made immortal by God's will (*Dial.* 5 [26,8-10]), he explicitly referred to the *Timaeus* (on the agreement between Justin and Middle Platonism in the interpretation of this passage from the *Timaeus*, see C. Andresen, ZNTW 44, 163). The attributes "unbegotten and incorrupt" which are properly said of God (*Dial.* 5 [28,3-4]) were already observed in the writings of Athenagoras and are commonplace in Middle Platonism (one can find a precise correspondence in one of Hippolytus's works [*Ref.* I, 19,6, p. 20, 12]). The motif of the dialectical process that finishes in the absolute beginning *Dial.* 5 (p. 28, 14-15) is the same as that found at the end of the sixth book of the *Republic* (511 b) and in Alcinous's work (*Did.* 162,8-10).

Even after his conversion, Justin continued to express himself in a language specific to the Platonism of his time. His conception of the chief divinity remained characteristic of this Platonism, as was proven by the citation and famous passage from the *Timaeus* 28c in his 2 *Apol.* 10 (1304,22-24). This passage is based, as Andresen demonstrated (ZNTW 44, 167-168), not on the original text of Plato's dialogue, but on a scholastic tradition of Middle Platonism. Justin's views on the primordial unformed

material and the origin of the world, which he believed took place thanks to God's ordered intervention upon matter (1 *Apol.* 10 [I, 156,6-7] and 50 [I, 252,26-254,1]), likewise depended on Middle Platonism, in a way equal to that of Athenagoras (see C. Andresen, ZNTW 44, 164-165). Also in the criticisms directed toward the Peripatetics, the Stoics and the Epicureans, one can detect the influence of 2nd-c. scholastic Platonism (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 45-51). A resonance of the Pythagorean maxim ἕπου θεῷ, also widespread in Middle Platonism, is found in the 1 *Apol.* 14 (I, 164,18-19): C. Andresen (ZNTW 44, 163 n. 20) demonstrated that this passage corresponds exactly to Plutarch's *De recta rat. aud.* 1,37 d.

The author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* rebuked Plato and Aristotle for contradicting each other and esp. themselves (cc. 6-7, p. 28-32 Otto). Though recognizing that Plato was right about the true God (c. 20, p. 62, 2-3), he did not hesitate to claim that in this regard the Athenian philosopher was indebted to Moses: like *Orpheus, *Homer, Solon and Pythagoras, Plato too was able to come to know the books of Moses during his stay in *Egypt, and thereby reach a higher understanding of God's inability to be named (c. 14, p. 48, 25-29; c. 20, p. 60, 6-8; p. 62, 3-6). This thesis allowed ps.-Justin the opportunity of accusing Plato of cowardice: though having learned from Moses the "true theology," Plato did not have the courage of professing it openly at Athens for fear of meeting Socrates's fate. By introducing in the *Timaeus* (41a) the speech directed by the demiurge to the gods of the stars, he desired to protect himself from every possible accusation of impiety toward the traditional religion and to give the impression of professing polytheism (c. 20, p. 60-62; c. 22, p. 64, 27-30). Beyond these criticisms, the knowledge that ps.-Justin showed of Platonic philosophy betrayed the unmistakable stamp of Middle Platonism: the doctrine of the three principles (God, the ideas and matter) (c. 6 [28,10-14]) was the one in vogue in the Platonism of the first two centuries AD (see above Athenagoras no. **6**). The juxtaposition of the ideas to God (c. 6 [28,17-18]) foreshadowed the Middle Platonic doctrine of the ideas as thoughts of God, explicitly mentioned in the subsequent chapter (7 [30,14-15]; see below with regard to Clement). Numerous other expressions of ideas go back to Plato and other Platonist authors. Here we will only mention that in c. 22 (66,5-9) the words of the *Timaeus* 27d on immutability are placed in relation to ὁ ὢν of Ex 3:14: this tendency to refer to God the words that in *Tim.* 27d-28a pertain to being is from Middle Platonism (see Alcinous, *Did.* 165, 4-5).

*Hermias's few words reserved for Plato derive from a Middle Platonic source (*Irrisio gent. philos.* 11 [Diels, *Dox. gr.* 653, 27-301]). A chapter *Hippolytus devoted to the exposition of Plato's system is also Middle Platonist in origin (Hippolytus considered Plato's system to be *heresy—*Ref.* I, 19 [19-23 Wendland: cf. Diels, *Dox. gr.* 567-570]). This represents one of the most important sources for our understanding not only of scholastic Platonism of the first two centuries AD in general, but also of its various currents (see also K. Praechter, in F. Überweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos.* I, Berlin 1926, 556).

IV. Clement of Alexandria and Origen. In the writings of *Clement of Alexandria the veneration for Plato and the influence of contemporary Platonism acquired a broader dimension and richer development than in Justin Martyr's work. In the *Protr.* 68, 1 (I, 51,25-27), Clement asked Plato to accompany him in his search for God; immediately after, he cited two famous passages from the *Timaeus* 28c and the *Epist.* VII, 341c, relating to God's ineffability, and he turned again to Plato, approving his words and renewing the invitation made a few lines earlier (*Protr.* 68, 2 [I, 52,1-2]). In *Strom.* I, 42,1 (II, 28,2-4), Plato is represented as "a friend of truth . . . moved by God as it were"; in the *Strom.* II, 100,3 (II, 167,23-168-4), he was praised for his definition of the end of man as ὁμοίωσις θεῷ (cf. *Theaetetus* 176b); and in the *Strom.* V, 29,4 (II, 345,3) he was commemorated along with Pythagoras as the one who "was able to seize some reflections on the correct sense of the truth." The thesis about the use of the OT by the Greeks, which for *Tatian and the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* only caused an attitude of contempt and self-sufficiency toward Greek philosophy, for Clement, even more than Justin Martyr, increased his admiration for the Athenian philosopher. Though affirming Plato's dependence on Scripture as Justin Martyr did (see the passages gathered in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 42 n. 4), Clement, similar to and yet more than Justin, saw in it not a reason for condemning his philosophy, but a further occasion to praise its divine origins and to invite Christians to follow it.

The most obvious proofs that Clement believed Plato was influenced by Moses are presented by ch. 25 of the first book of the *Stromata* and two passages of the *Strom.* II, 100,3 and V, 29,3-4. In these three cases the agreement between Plato and Moses provided Clement the opportunity to emphasize the loftiness of Plato's understanding of the contemplative life, the formula ὁμοίωσις θεῷ, and, in general, Platonic-Pythagorean theology. Therefore, one should not be surprised by the large number of cita-

tions and the Platonic echoes present in the writings of Clement, who in all likelihood had direct knowledge of Plato's dialogues (in addition to the *Register* of the critical edition done by Stählin, see also F.L. Clark, *Citations of Plato in Clement of Alexandria*: Trans. Proc. Am. Phil. Ass. 33 [1902] XII-XX). Among the numerous passages of Clement, it will be sufficient here to call attention to the *Strom.* V, 83,1-4: the terms πτεροῦται and βρῖθον used to recall the soul's inclination toward higher things (see above regarding Justin Martyr) hearken back to the *Phaedrus* 246c, 255cd, 247b. Moreover, to indicate the divine origin of virtue, he cited two passages from the *Meno* (100b and 99e), in which the expression θείᾳ μοίρᾳ appears, an expression used also by Philo and contemporary Platonism (cf. S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 66 n. 1). An important "Platonic" motif appropriated by Clement—brought to light esp. by J. Wytzes (VChr 9 [1955] 148-158; 11 [1957] 226-245; 14 [1960] 129-153)—was that of the educational and providential function of the wounds inflicted by God on humankind. This idea is also found in the writings of *Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa.

*Middle Platonism of the 2nd c., Philo and incipient *Neoplatonism are the source for a large number of Clement's teachings, and, therefore, they placed an unmistakable mark upon his Christianity (Clement and *Ammonius Saccas lived in the same city, *Alexandria, between the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd c. AD). Clement's attitude with regard to the various Greek philosophical schools (the cult of Plato and Pythagoras and the condemnation of *Stoic materialism, Epicurus and the *Aristotelian doctrine of providence) faithfully conform to the canons of Middle Platonism, and he derives his understanding of philosophy as a "cultivation of wisdom" from Philo and Middle Platonism—wisdom defined in Stoic terms as "a knowledge of things divine and human and their causes" and the subordination of philosophy to theology (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 41-59).

An examination of Clement's ethical system demonstrates the triple influence of Middle Platonism, Philo and Neoplatonism. The following doctrines derived from Middle Platonism and Philo—even if in the final analysis they derive from the Stoics, Plato and Aristotle: virtue as the soul's coherent and compliant disposition toward the *logos*, as the very harmony of the soul and as its just means; its self-sufficiency; its derivation from the natural disposition, from exercise and learning; the definitions of the four cardinal *virtues and their application to the three parts of the human *soul; the tight connection between the various virtues; the origin and the nature of the passions, irrational movements produced not by flawed judgments of reason but to lower parts of the soul (the irascible and the concupiscible) and from the same bodily conditions; the regulation of the passions by the *logos*—which is the charioteer described in the *Phaedrus* 246b—and the obedience to the law of nature established by the universal *logos*, which is also present in the human reason (the ethics of the μεριοπάθεια). The adoption of ἀπάθεια and the identification between the latter and the ὁμοίωσις connect Clement very closely to the Alexandrian tradition represented by Philo and Neoplatonism (cf. S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 60-117).

Almost all the foundational elements of Clement's understanding of **gnosis* go back to the Platonic tradition and Philo: the use of cryptic language, the heavy esoteric sense attributed to higher understanding, the ideal of the contemplative life and the union with intelligible realities that has its presupposition in *catharsis* or detachment from the body and the sensible world in general, and the role of the auxiliary disciplines are all motifs present in the writings of Plato, Philo, Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 144-173). One can say the same thing with regard to cosmology and *theology. One can also trace back to the *Timaeus* the distinction—appropriated by Philo and the Platonic tradition—between the intelligible world (or the model) and the sensible world (or the image), present in the *Strom.* V, 93,4. The doctrine of matter ἄχρονος, which, acc. to *Photius, Clement adopted in the *Hypotyposes* (ed. Stählin, III, p. 202, 10-11), is found in Middle Platonism; similarly, in Middle Platonism is the understanding of matter deprived of quality and form (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 191-194; its presence was already noted in the writings of Athenagoras and Justin Martyr). At one particular point, however, Clement distanced himself from scholastic Platonism, drawing nearer to Neoplatonism. In the *Strom.* V, 89,5-6 (II, 385,5-9), he somewhat anticipated *Gregory of Nyssa's approach, rejecting the Middle Platonic teaching on matter as a principle, and countering that this was defined by Plato not only as devoid of quality and form, but also as nonbeing (μὴ ὄν). This last expression in reference to matter is found in Plotinus's writings (*Enn.* II, 4,10 [II, 64,34-35]). Plotinus inherited it from the Neo-Pythagorean Moderatus (see Simplicius, *In phys.* 231,4-5; see also S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 197-199).

Clement's doctrine of the ideas as thoughts contained in the mind of God clearly comes from Mid-

dle Platonism and Philo (see *Strom.* IV, 155,2 [II, 317,11]; V, 16,3 [II, 336,8-9]; V, 73,3 [II, 375,18-19]). One particular teaching in which Clement foreshadowed Neoplatonism is his definition of the *logos* as the unity that encompasses all things (πάντα ἕν; *Strom.* IV, 156,2): the same idea is found in the Plotinian conception of the *nous* (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 205-206) and in the writings of St. *Augustine (see below). The various motifs that characterize Clement's understanding of God's transcendence (remoteness with respect to beings; superiority with respect to space, time and virtue; and ineffability and "via negativa") are those of Philo, Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 212-224). On the close parallelism between *Strom.* V, 81,6 (II, 380,22-23) and *Enn.* VI, 9,6 (V12, 170,10-11) with regard to God's infinity, see S. Lilla, JTS 31 (1980) 100 n. 2, and also the entry *Pantaenus.

With regard to Plato, Origen did not show the enthusiasm and admiration that was characteristic of Clement. The lack of a true, genuine and open cult-like devotion toward Plato in Origen's writings constitutes one aspect of his more reserved and detached attitude with respect to Greek philosophy, a lack brought to light by H. Koch (*Pronoia und Paideusis*, Berlin-Leipzig 1932, 176-180, 307), J. Quasten (*Patrologia*, Turin 1967, I, 318) and by H. Chadwick (*Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 101-103). In Origen's work *Contra Celsum*, however, there is no lack of a positive assessment of the Athenian philosopher: in III, 63 (I, 257,4-5) he rebuked Celsus for not having followed the Platonic teaching on humility and composure (cf. *Laws* IV, 716a). In III, 80 (I, 270,16-22), he affirmed the substantial identity between the Christian conception of the blessed life in communion with the divine and the Platonic doctrine of the soul's ascent to the heavenly vault and contemplation of the hyperuranian world (see *Phaedrus* 247a-c, 250bc). In IV, 39 (I, 312,26-29), he reused Clement's argument (cf. *Strom.* II, 100,3; II, 167,24-168,4): Plato found himself in agreement with the Mosaic law either by chance or because he was able to become directly acquainted with its texts during his stay in *Egypt (this last point reiterates the same argument raised by the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*). In VI, 3 (II, 72,20), he fully approved the passage in *Epist.* VII, 341 c-d; in VI, 5 (II, 74-75); he relates the light of which this passage speaks with the light of Jn 1:9 and Mt 5:14 and renewed his approval (p. 75, 16-17); in VII, 43 (II, 194,6), repeating the words of the *Timaeus* 28c, he showed that he fully agreed with them (on Origen's attitude toward Plato's philosophy, see esp. H. Crouzel, *Origène et la philosophie*, Paris 1962, 49-65).

As H. Chadwick observed (*Early Christian Thought*, 102), despite his restraint with regard to Greek philosophy, Origen achieved a more profound synthesis between Christianity and philosophy than did Clement. *Porphyry tells us that he was a student of *Ammonius Saccas, the founder of Neoplatonism (see Eus., *HE* 6, 19,6) and that he always lived together with Plato and the most important Neo-Pythagorean and Platonist philosophers (Eus., *HE* 6, 19,8). In effect, his entire system of thought reveals the deep imprint of Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism. H. Koch (*Pronoia und Paideusis*, 17, 206-207, 237-238, 268-274, 286-291) demonstrated that Origen's judgments on the various Greek philosophical schools (substantially analogous to those of Clement and Justin Martyr, see, e.g., *C. Celsum* I, 21 and III, 75: I, 266,20–267,6) agree with those of the supporters of Middle Platonism. Its role in cultural formation at his time was therefore no less important than it had been for the cultural formation of his two predecessors. He certainly depended on Middle Platonism, in addition to the *Phaedrus* 247c, the passage of *De princ.* IV, 3,15 (347,9-12) on incorporeal creatures bears this out: *si sit aliqua substantia in qua neque color neque habitus neque tactus neque magnitudo intellegenda sit, mente sola conspicabilis* ("if there is any substance in which neither color nor habit not touch nor greatness should be understood, it can be seen by the mind alone"). This passage has two exact parallels in the writings of *Maximus of Tyre (*Or.* XI, 60a [139,20-140,5]) and Alcinous (*Did.* 164,14); esp. the words *mente sola conspicabilis* that refer not to God but to his spiritual creatures; these words should be compared with the *Phaedrus* 247c 7-8 and the *Timaeus* 28a 1, Maximus of Tyre (*Or.* XI, 60a [140,4-5]), Alcinous (*Did.* 165,4-5), ps.-*Justin (*Coh. ad Gr.* 66,19-20), Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 3 [18,1-2]), *Athenagoras (*Legat.* 4 [5,10-11]).

It has already been noted, however, that the Middle Platonist authors and the apologists refer directly to God. Origen's conception of God connects on the one hand to scholastic Platonism of the 2nd c. and on the other hand to Neoplatonism. Equal to the chief divinity of the Middle Platonists, Origen's God is unbegotten, incorruptible and superior to all beings (*C. Celsum* VI, 66: II, 136,26; IV, 14: I, 284,27; cf., e.g., Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19,6; Alcinous, *Did.* 164,15-16, 18-19, 166,12), immutable and unchangeable (*De or.* 24,2, p. 354, 8-9; cf., e.g., Philo, *De Cher.* 90; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* XI, 59a; Alcinous, *Did.* 166,12), self-sufficient (*C. Celsum* VII, 65: II, 215,6; *Comm. on Ioh.* XIII, 34, p. 259, 20; cf. Celsus in *C. Celsum* VIII, 21: II,

238,16; Alcinous, *Did.* 164,28; Philo, *De spec. leg.* II, 38), void of form, size and color (*C. Celsum* VI, 64: II, 134,15; *De princ.* I, 1,6, p. 21, 16; cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 247c; *Parm.* 137d; Hippolytus, *Ref.* I, 19,3; Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 382b: II, 552,2-4; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* XI 60a), beyond any spatial locality (*De or.* 23,1, p. 349, 25-27; 23,3, p. 351, 2-4; *De princ.* I, 1, p. 21, 15, p. 22, 4; cf. Plato, *Parm.* 138a; *Sympos.* 211a; Philo, *De post.* C. 14; *De conf. ling.* 136; Apuleius, *Apol.* 64,7), ineffable and void of names (*C. Celsum* VI, 65; VII, 43; cf. Plato, *Parm.* 142a; *Sympos.* 211a; *Tim.* 28c; *Epist.* VII, 341c; Alcinous, *Did.* 164,7; 164,28; 165,4; Celsus in *C. Celsum* VI, 65, p. 135, 18 and 26; VII, 42, p. 192, 30; 193, 1; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* XI, 60a; Apuleius, *De Plat.* I, 190; *Apol.* 64,7), absolutely void of passions (*C. Celsum* VI, 65, p. 136, 6-7: where Celsus's thesis is accepted; *De princ.* II, 4,4, p. 131, 27; cf. Philo, *De Abr.* 202: IV, 45,8-9; Celsus in *C. Celsum* VI, 65, p. 136, 6-7). Origen, moreover, applied respectively to the Father and the *logos* the expressions πρῶτος θεός δεύτερος θεός characteristic of *Numenius and Alcinous (*De martyr.* 46 [42,18 e 23]; *C. Celsum* VI, 47 [II, 119,2]; V, 39 [II, 43,22-26]; cf. Numenius, frag. 11 and 21 Des Places [p. 53, 3-4; 60, 4-5] and Alcinous, *Did.* 164,19). Almost all of these teachings can be also found in the writings of *Plotinus.

With regard to the proximity of Neoplatonism, one should esp. recall the following points: (1) God is simple, not a mixture and indivisible (*C. Celsum* IV, 14 [I, 284,27-28]): cf. Plato, *Rep.* II, 380 d., *Parm.* 137 d; Plotinus, *Enn.* IV, 2,1 (IV, 7,17-8,30; 30,41-42); V, 2,1 (V, 33,3) and also Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* II, 2 (I, 90,10); Alcinous, *Did.* 166,6; Clement, *Strom.* V, 81,6 (II, 380,21-22): this entire passage from Clement (380,20-25) is based on a Neo-Pythagorean interpretation of the first hypothesis of Plato's *Parmenides* (cf. S. Lilla, JTS 31 [1980] 97 n. 4). (2) In addition to the **nous*, God can be defined as something that is superior to the *nous* and *ousia* (*C. Celsum* VI, 64 [II, 134,24–135,5]; VII, 38 [II, 188,11]; *Comm. in Ioh.* 19,6 [305,16-17]). This teaching was debated in the Platonic and Neo-Pythagorean schools and was a commonplace in Neoplatonism (cf., e.g., Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 1,8 [V, 26,7-8]; V, 5,6 [V, 98,11]; V, 6,6 [V, 118,30-31]), which on the one hand goes back to Plato, *Rep.* VI 509b, and on the other to Aristotle, Περὶ εὐχῆς, frag. 46 Rose (as J. Whittaker noted, VChr 23 [1969] 92). Nevertheless, this is present also in the writings of Celsus (cf. *C. Celsum* VII, 45 [II, 197,2-3]). (3) God remains absolutely unknown to human reason (*C. Celsum* VI, 65 [II, 135,18-20]; *De princ.* I, 1,5 [20,7; 20,22-23]): this is the same teaching present in the writings of Plato (*Parm.* 142a; *Sympos.* 211a), Clement, Numenius and Plotinus (cf. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 217-219, 222) and also in Celsus (*C. Celsum* VI, 65 [II, 135,17-18,24-25]). (4) God created various beings, causing them to emanate from his own unity, and in this sense he can be considered their source (cf. *De princ.* II, 1,1 [107,3-5]; I, 1,6 [21,13]; I, 3,8 [61,14]). This is a typically Neoplatonic idea, which in later patristic writings would be adopted and developed by ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite: for Plotinus the One generates the *nous* (in which is contained the totality of beings) inasmuch as it "overflows" and emits from itself its overflowing energy (*Enn.* V, 2,1 [V, 33,7-8]; V, 3,12 [V, 66,40-41]).

The Platonic tradition also left evident traces in *Origen's understanding of the *logos*: (1) in the fragment preserved in the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (PG 14, 1308C), Origen, in describing the generation of the *logos* by the Father, appropriated the teaching of the Wisdom of Solomon (7:25), acc. to which σοφία (wisdom) is an ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτος δόξης εἰλικρινής ("pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty"). Plotinus returns to the same idea of the emanation from the original beginning to describe the generation of the *nous* from the One (*Enn.* V, 2,1 [V, 33,7-8]; V, 3,12 [V, 66,40-41]). (2) For Origen, the *logos* is the splendor that proceeds from the light represented by the Father (*De princ.* I, 2,4 [33,1-2]; I, 2,7 [37,7-8]; IV, 4,1 [349,17-19]; *Comm. in Ioh.* XIII, 25 [249,29-30]; *In Ier. hom.* IX [70,19]). Even this teaching, though appealing to Wisd 7:26, presented an analogue to Plotinus (*Enn.* V, 1,6 [V, 22,28-29]; V, 2,12 [V, 66,40-42]), where the *nous* generated from the One is presented as the light that emanates from the sun (see also W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 24). (3) Just as Origen's *logos* was generated by the Father *ab aeterno* (*De princ.* I, 2,4 [33,1]; *In Ier. hom.* IX [70,16-22]), so too the *nous* of Plotinus was generated *ab aeterno* from the One (*Enn.* V, 1,6 [V, 22,29-30]) (cf. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, 24). (4) Just as Origen's *logos* received its existence and divinity from contemplating the Father (*Comm. in Ioh.* II, 2 [55,5-8]; cf. H. Crouzel, *Origène et la connaissance mystique*, Bruges 1961, 497), so too Plotinus's *nous* exists as a *nous* inasmuch as it contemplates the One (*Enn.* V, 2,1 [V, 33,9-11]; V, 4,2 [V, 81,24-26]). (5) Appealing to Ps 35:10 and Jn 8:12, Origen (*Comm. in Ioh.* II, 23 [80,16]) called both the Father and the Son "lights"; Plotinus spoke in the same way, speaking of the One and the *nous* (*Enn.* V, 3,12 [V, 66,44]). (6) The *logos*, the second god generated from the first god (cf. above), was also called by Origen "the demiurge" (*C. Celsum* VI, 47 [II, 119,2]), just as Numenius had called his second god "the demiurge" (cf. 20-21 Des Places, p. 60), and Plotinus called the "demiurge"

the *nous*, the second hypostasis (*Enn.* II, 3,18 [II, 45,15]; V, 9,3 [V, 163,26]). (7) While the Father is the absolute Good, the *logos* is the image of his "goodness," but not the absolute good (*In Matt.* XV, 10 [375,12-376,13]; *De princ.* I, 2,13 [46,13-47,9]; *Comm. in Ioh.* XIII, 34 [261,27-28]). Numenius spoke in entirely analogous terms (frag. 20 Des Places [p. 60]); when referring to Plato (*Rep.* VI 509b), he called the first god αὐτοαγαθόν (cf. Origen's αὐτοαγαθόν in *De princ.* I, 2,13, p. 47,4) and the model (ἰδέα) of the second god, who is "good" inasmuch as he participates in the Good represented by the first god (see also Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, 24). (8) To emphasize the superiority of the *logos* with respect to all other beings, Origen (*Comm. in Ioh.* XIII, 25 [249,27]) used the words ὑπερέχων οὐσιᾳ καὶ πρεσβεία καὶ δυνάμει, deriving these words from Plato (*Rep.* VI, 509b). (9) In his divine wisdom, identical to the *logos*, are present all the forms (τύποι), which, if on the one hand they are models of sensible things, on the other they are the "thoughts" or the "rational principles" conceived beforehand by God (*Comm. in Ioh.* I, 19 [I, 24,1-2; 7-8]; cf. *Comm. in Ioh.* I, 34 [I, 43,20-22]; see also Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, 21-22). (10) Origen's doctrine of the presence of various *logoi* or rational principles in *sophia* or *logos* has an exact correspondence in Plotinus's conception of the **anima mundi*, that contains in itself the totality of *logoi* (cf. on the one hand, *Comm. in Ioh.* I, 19 [I, 24,7-8]; I, 34 [I, 43,20-22]; *De princ.* I, 2,2 [30,7-8]; *C. Celsum* V, 39 [II, 43,22-27] and on the other, Plotinus, *Enn.* VI, 2,5 [VI1, 104,12-14]): it is a Stoic doctrine (cf., e.g., SVF I, 98; I, 102; II, 1027) that would be adopted by *Gregory of Nyssa (*De anima et res.*: PG 46, 28,38-29,2) and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (*Nom. div.* V, 8: PG 3, 824C). (11) For Origen, the *logos* is also the power of God that embraces and holds together the entire universe (*De or.* 23,1 [349,28–350,1]), also found in the writings of Philo and Clement (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 210-211). On the one hand, Origen reverts to the Stoic understanding of the *logos* (cf., e.g., SVF I, 530; III, 439), on the other, to that of the *anima mundi* specific to Plato's *Timaeus*, which also encompasses and embraces the sensible universe (*Tim.* 34b 3-4; 36 e 2-3), and is also found in Middle Platonism (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 211-212, and JTS 31 [1980] 98 n. 2). As Theiler demonstrated (*Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, p. 23 n. 37), in Origen's writings one finds Plotinus's doctrine of "intelligible matter," the fundamental elements of the ideas (or forms) that constitute the *nous* (cf. *Calcidius, par. 278). Plotinus dedicated the fourth treatise of the second *Ennead* to this problem.

Though decisively rejecting the Platonist and Orphic-Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of the soul from the human body into that of an animal (cf. Chadwick, pp. 115-116; Theiler. pp. 18-19; M. Simonetti, *I principi di Origene*, Turin 1968, p. 68 no. 35, 228-229 nos. 29-30 with regard to *De princ.* I, 8,4 and also *C. Celsum* VIII, 30 [II, 245,24-25]; see Plato, *Phaedo* 81e-82a; *Phaedrus* 249b 2-3; *Tim.* 41d-42d), Origen considered the presence of the soul in the human body as the result of its fall from heaven caused by its inclination toward the corporeal and the material and the "cooling" of its love for God; the difference between various people mirrors the differences between the souls' original conditions (*De princ.* II, 8,3, p. 157,14–158,2; 158,17–159,1; 159,4-14; 160,1-7, 19-20; 161,2-3; IV, 2,7, p. 319,10-14). This is the same understanding explained in Plato's *Phaedrus* (246c-248e) and also adopted by Plotinus (*Enn.* VI, 9,9 [VI², 184,22-24]). Aside from his rejection of transmigration into the bodies of animals, the cyclical rhythm described by the *Phaedrus* and what one finds in Origen's *De princ.* IV, 3,11 corresponds exactly: in the *Phaedrus*, the souls fall from heaven into human bodies and, if they remain attached to corporeal things, they transmigrate from these into irrational animals, to then recover the opposite path; Origen established a parallel between the soul's descent from heaven to this earth and its subsequent descent from this earth to hell (*De princ.* IV, 3,11, p. 339,7-9) and between the soul's reascent from hell to earthly life and its ascent from earth to the firmament (*De princ.* IV, 3,11, p. 339,10-15). Theiler (p. 29) noted that the same motif of the soul's fall into the human body as a result of a punishment and its subsequent reascent after a period of time more or less reappears in the writings of Hierocles.

Another Platonist motif in Origen's writings, to which H. Koch called attention (pp. 13-144), is the idea of the value of punishments: they are not inflicted by God on the sinner as a form of retaliation, but are a true and proper cure and a medicine (*De princ.* II, 5,3, p. 135,30–136,2); they cause purification (*De orat.* 29,15, p. 390,12-15) and represent therefore an important element of the divine *paideia* (*C. Celsum* V, 31 [II, 33,9-10]). Clement expressed his position in analogous terms, and so would Gregory of Nyssa. Passages such as the *Phaedo* 113de and the *Gorgias* 525b prove that the idea that punishment has an educational and cathartic function goes back to Plato. This idea is also present in Middle Platonism: for Plutarch, divine punishment is a medicine and a cure of the soul (*De sera num. vind.* 549f-550a [III, 421,22–422,8]); the terms *iatreia* and *pharmakon* used by Plutarch (p. 421,24; 422,2) should be com-

pared with the words *curari . . . medicamentis* from Rufinus's Latin translation (*De princ.* II, 5,3 [135,32]). The punitive function, acc. to Origen, is often carried out by angels; analogously, for Hierocles they are the rational beings who punish humankind (on this last correspondence, see Theiler p. 29).

Even in the doctrine of the *apokatastasis, the points of correspondence between Origen and Hierocles brought to light by Theiler (pp. 27-28) are very close: for both men, the apokatastasis consists in the return to the original condition; it results in deification and union with the divinity (on this harmony, see also Koch, p. 297) and presupposes the person's spontaneous submission to God.

In ethics, Origen was connected to the Alexandrian tradition represented by Philo, Clement and Plotinus. Even for Origen, as was the case for Plato (*Rep.* IV, 439d 1-2; 444d 13-e 2; *Tim.* 86b 5-7) and *Chrysippus (cited in *C. Celsum* VIII, 51 [II, 266,18-30]), Posidonius, *Galen, Philo and Clement (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 96, 98), the passions are a true and proper sickness of the soul (*Comm. in Matt.* XIII, 16 [I, 220,12-14]). At first, even he leaned toward arguing for their control and moderation in such a way that they conformed to nature (*Hom.* XXII *in lib. Jesu Nave*, 4 [436,17-20]), but he also saw in their total destruction the highest ethical ideal (*Comm. in Matt.* XIII, 16 [I, 219,28-29]; XV, 4 [II, 358,22-23, 32-33)]; XV, 17 [II, 398,27]; fr. 64 [III, 41]; *Hom.* I *in lib. Jesu Nave* [294,18-20]; *Comm. in Ioh.* XX, 36 [376,27]). H. Koch's affirmation (p. 267), acc. to which Origen rejected *apatheia* in a manner equal to Alcinous, does not correspond to the truth of the matter. Origen also saw in the "likeness to God" (Plato, *Theaetetus* 176 b) humanity's ultimate end: *De princ.* III, 6,1 (280,2–281,5), *Comm. in Ioh.* XX, 17 (349,26-27).

With regard to superior knowledge or **gnosis*, H. Crouzel (*Origène et la connaissance mystique*, Bruges 1961) has emphasized and carefully examined Origen's use of terms coming from mystery language or technical language such as μυστήριον, μυστικός, ἀπόρρητος, ἄρρητος, κρυπτός, ἀόρατος (pp. 25-46), θέα, θεωρία, θεᾶσθαι, θεωρεῖν, θέαμα (pp. 375-379), ὁρᾶν, διορατικός (pp. 380-381), νοεῖν, ἐννοεῖν (pp. 383-389), χωρεῖν, χωρητικός (pp. 392-395), γνῶσις, γνωστικός (pp. 395-398). These are terms already present for the most part in the writings of Plato, adopted by the entire subsequent Platonist tradition and profusely used also by Philo and Clement (see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 146-150). Even subsequent patristic authors such as Gregory of Nyssa and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite would make regular use of these terms.

Finally, an indelible mark was left by the Platonic tradition on Origen's understanding of the *resurrection of the body: Origen vociferously argued against those who, interpreting Scripture literally, believed in the resurrection of the material body, subject to the same physical needs of the body that lives on earth (*De princ.* II, 11,2 [184-186]). He emphasized the fact that the resurrected body comes to an end by taking up a completely spiritual nature (*De princ.* III, 6,6 [288,6-7; 289,7-8]): *iam tum corpus quasi spiritui ministrans in statum qualitatemque proficiat spiritalem* ("by that point, then, the body, ministering to the spirit as it were proceeds toward a spiritual state and quality"). *Methodius criticized Origen's perspective on this matter (*De res.* III, 16,9 [413,5-8]).

*Gregory Thaumaturgus's *Panagyric to Origen* is replete with statements that echo Plato's ideas both directly and filtered through later authors: A. Brinkmann brought these to light (*Gregors des Thaumaturgen Panegyricus auf Origenes*: RhM 56 [1901] 56-58); he esp. emphasized the definitions of the four cardinal virtues.

V. The Greek Fathers. *Epiphanius considered Platonic philosophy a heresy deriving, on a par with the other Greek philosophical schools, from the mystery religions in vogue among the Egyptians, Phrygians, Phoenicians and Babylonians (*Pan.* 4,6-9 [182,13–183,10 Holl]). His brief outline of Platonism (*Pan.* 6,1-3 [185, 13-25]) depended both on 1st- and 3rd-c.-AD *Middle Platonism and Neo-Pythagoreanism: although the doctrine of the three causes and the coeternity of matter to God (p. 185, 19-20, 24-25) reveals a clear Middle Platonist stamp and should be compared to the information provided by *Hippolytus (see also ed. Holl, *ap. font.*, p. 185). The mention of the opposite thesis, acc. to which matter that is generated by God is not coeternal with him (pp. 185, 21-22), goes back to the speculations of certain Neo-Pythagoreans on matter, as one can see from the writings of *Calcidius (*In Tim.* 295 [297,16-19 Waszink]).

*Eusebius of Caesarea dedicated the entirety of books XI-XIII and part of book XIV of his *Praeparatio evangelica* to Plato. Book XI aimed to demonstrate, exhaustively, the thesis—already present in the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, *Justin Martyr and *Clement—of the dependency of Plato's theological-metaphysical system on the wisdom of *Moses (see esp. the title for ch. 2, vol. II, p. 6). Eusebius's attitude toward such a suggestion is not polemical as in the case of *Tatian and the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, but is closer to that of Clement: marked by a

deep respect. Eusebius presented Plato as the "greatest of the Greek philosophers" (XI, 1,3, vol. II, 5,17) and as "the one who, though not expressing himself always in the most felicitous way, for the most part said things in conformity to the truth (XI, 1,5, vol. II, 6,6-8) (for Eusebius's judgments on Plato, see E. Des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée juge de Platon dans la Préparation évangélique*, in *Mélanges A. Diès*, Paris 1966, 69-77). A careful reading of book XI of the *Praeparatio* demonstrates that for Eusebius, more than proving Plato's dependence on Moses, it forces one to discover Platonic philosophy in the books of the OT, interpreted acc. to the canons of Middle Platonism and *Neoplatonism. Eusebius cited extensive extracts not only from Plato's dialogues, but also from subsequent authors such as Atticus, *Aristotle, *Numenius, Plutarch, *Philo, Amelius and Clement. The interpretation of Plato's writings, which Eusebius followed, was, in effect, heavily conditioned by the Platonic tradition and by earlier patristic authors. In ch. 10 (II, pp. 24-25), he adopted the Platonic distinction appropriated by all subsequent Platonism, between the mutable sensible world and the immutable intelligible world, placing the famous passage from *Tim.* 27d-28a not only in relation to Eccl 1:9 but also to Ex 3:14 (see the foregoing discussion on the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* and, below, with regard to St. Augustine); in chs. 15-19, on a par with Middle Platonist and Neoplatonist philosophers, whose authority he invokes, he affirmed the existence of the "second cause" in the Platonic system; in ch. 21 (II, p. 46) he saw in the famous passage from *Epist.* II, 312d-e the proof of the existence of the three *hypostases and Platonic theology. Plotinus used the same passage—cited by Eusebius in ch. 18 (II, 39,22–40,8)—to provide a "Platonic" foundation for his three hypostases (*Enn.* V, 1,8); the title of ch. 21, Περὶ τῶν ἀρχικῶν ὑποστάσεων, is that of the first treatise of the fifth *Ennead;* Book XII (II, 83-162) is entirely devoted to demonstrating the agreement between Platonic philosophy and Mosaic wisdom.

Book XIII (II, 163-256), on the one hand, praises Plato's rejection of Greek religion and presents Aristobulus and Clement as the primary authorities capable of confirming the thesis of the Greeks' dependence on the OT and their agreement with it. On the other hand, it criticizes several points of Platonic philosophy, inasmuch as it is incoherent with the teaching of Moses. The fourth chapter of Book XIV (II, 263-268) recalls with approval Plato's criticism of earlier materialist theories. Following the example of *Numenius, chapters 5-9 outline the history of the Platonic Academy up to Carneades. Book XV contains a brief criticism of *Aristotelian philosophy, acc. to the point of view expressed by the Middle Platonist philosopher Atticus. These books from the *Praeparatio* reveal Eusebius's great interest not only in Plato, but also in the entirety of subsequent Platonism: they represent the primary source for our understanding of Numenius and Atticus's ideas. The *excerptum* on the *soul selected by the seventh treatise of the fourth *Ennead* and preserved in ch. 22 of book XV of the *Praeparatio* (II, pp. 387-399) is considered by P. Henry an authoritative witness to the history of Plotinus's text (*Les états du texte de Plotin*, *Études plotiniennes* I, Paris 1938, ch. IV, pp. 68-71, 77-124).

The Platonist echoes present in the works of *Basil the Great were brought to light by K. Gronau in his still very important study *De Basilio Gregorio Nazianzeno Nyssenoque Platonis imitatoribus* (Göttingen 1908). Basil's use of Platonism, esp. in the *Timaeus*, is evident in his nine *Homilies on the Hexameron* (see S. Giet, SC 26 bis, Paris 1968, 57-60, the commentary in the footnote to the edition and the index of authors cited, p. 537), even if this use, as Gronau demonstrated (*Posidonius, Eine Quelle für Basilius' Hexaemeros*, Braunschweig 1912, and *Posidonius und die jüdisch-Christliche Genesisexegese*, Leipzig-Berlin 1914, 7-112), was not based only on a direct reading but also and esp. on an intermediary source represented by the commentary on the *Timaeus* of the Stoic philosopher Posidonius, who had a great influence on the entirety of Late Antique and patristic thought.

Among the many echoes of the *Timaeus* we will only mention here the expression *aphthonos agathotēs* in reference to God (*Hom.* 1,2 [96,12 Giet]): this connects to *Tim.* 29e 1-2. The motif of contemplation of what is found beyond heaven, an idea present in the *De fide*, ch. 1 (PG 31.465B 7-10), goes back to the *Phaedrus* 247b-d; likewise from the *Phaedrus* (246b, 247b) derives the image of the charioteer who allows himself to be pulled violently by two horses, a symbol of reason overcome by the passions (*Ad iuv.* IX [57,74-76 Boulenger]). The motif of the body, however, as an obstacle and prison of the soul that finds its deliverance in philosophy (*Ad iuv.* IX [54,4-55,6; 57,87]), goes back to the *Phaedo* 65a, 67b, 83a.

Even more relevant is *Basil's dependence on *Neoplatonism—and, in particular, on *Plotinus—which while rather underestimated by Giet with respect to the *Homilies on the Hexameron* (SC 26 bis, Paris 1968, 60-61), was given its proper weight by other scholars. A. Jahn, in his work *Basilius Magnus plotinizans* (Bern 1838), demonstrated the heavy dependence of the *De spiritu* (PG 29, 768-774) on the

Enn. V, 1,1-5 and of the ninth chapter of the *De Spiritu sancto* (PG 32, 108-109) on various treatises of the *Enneads*. P. Henry (*Les états du texte de Plotin, Études plotiniennes* I, Paris 1938, ch. 5, pp. 159-196), through numerous and precise synoptic comparisons, called attention to several points of correspondence, even terminological, between the *Enneads* and Basil's various writings (*Epist.* II; *In hexaem.*; *De fide*; *De Spir. sancto*; *De spir.*) and maintained with valid arguments the authenticity of the *De spiritu*, which was rejected by Garnier. H. Dörries too (*De Spiritu sancto, Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogma*, Göttingen 1956, 53) has admitted, although with several reservations and qualifications, the presence of Plotinian motifs in ch. IX of *De Spiritu sancto*; J.M. Rist is of the same perspective (*Basil's Neoplatonism*, in *Basil of Caesarea, Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, ed. P.J. Fedwick, I, Toronto 1981, 207). H. Dehnhard, for his part (*Das Problem der Abbängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin* [PTS 3], Berlin 1964), readdressed the question of Basil's use of Plotinus's writings, esp. in *De spiritu*, emphasizing the numerous points of contact between the two authors (see esp. pp. 6-13, 57).

Similarly, with respect to *Gregory of Nyssa, K. Gronau (*Posidonius*) listed the numerous Platonic echoes. Even if Gregory clearly refuted certain Platonic ideas or those of subsequent scholastic Platonism (esp. the doctrine of *metempsychosis: *De an. et res.*: PG 46, 108B-121A; the doctrine of the fall of souls from heaven, characteristic of the *Phaedrus* and appropriated by Origen: *De an. et res.*: PG 46, 112B, 116B–117C; the doctrine of matter as the unbegotten and coeternal principle with God, adopted, as was seen, by the apologists: *De an. et res.*: PG 46, 121C 8-124A 5), one can say that every phrase of his writings represents a reworking of motifs taken from both Plato and the subsequent Platonic tradition and expresses them in their characteristic terms. Among Gregory's numerous themes present already in the writings of Plato, it will be sufficient to mention here just a few: the passage concerning the absolute good (*De virg.* ch. 11 [296,15-20 Cavarnos]) that goes back to the *Sympos.* 211a; the rejection of attributing to the divinity feelings of envy (*Adv. Maced.* 99,23-24 Müller; cf. Plato, *Tim.* 29e; *Phaedrus* 247a; *Epin.* 988b; and W. Jaeger, *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom heiligen Geist*, Leiden 1966, 38); the motif—very frequent in Gregory's writings and deriving from the *Phaedrus* 246d 6-7—of the *winged understanding that, delivered from every material bond, flies toward the divine (cf., e.g., *De virg.* ch. 11, 294,8-10); the views on the *soul's nature deriving from the *Phaedo*: the soul is an intelligible and invisible essence (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 36A; cf. *Phaedo* 80b); it is imprisoned and impeded by the body (PG 46.88A; cf. *Phaedo* 66b-67b, 67d); it must meditate on itself and separate itself from the body and is to contemplate the intelligible (PG 46, 88A, 89C; cf. *Phaedo* 65c, 65d, 67a, 79d, 80e, 83b); and if it has shown an excessive attachment to the body, it is condemned to wander like a phantasm around the tombs (PG 46, 88B-C; cf. *Phaedo* 81c-d). (On these points of similarity, see also M. Pellegrino, *Il platonismo di Gregorio Nisseno nel Dialogo intorno all'anima ed alla risurrezione*: Riv. fil. neosc. 30 [1938] 437-474.) The perception of the cathartic and educational value of punishment was also adopted, as was seen, by Clement and Origen (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 88A, 89B, 97C-100A, 100C, 157B-C, C-D, 160C; cf. *Phaedo* 113d; *Gorgias* 525b).

In Gregory's theology, the Platonic tradition, and in particular Neoplatonism, left obvious marks: the supreme divinity is superior to color, form, size and all bodily properties (*De virg.* 10, 290,23–291,2; *In cant. cantic. hom.* V, 157,17-18 Langerbeck; cf., e.g., Plato, *Sympos.* 211e; *Phaedrus* 247b; *Parm.* 137b; Alcinous, *Did.* 164, 14; Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 5,6 [V, 97,4-5]), the good itself (*In eccl. hom.* VII, p. 425, 8-13 Alexander; cf. Philo, *De opif. m.* 9 [I, 3,21]; Iamblicus, *De myst.* VIII, 2 [196,12-14 Des Places]), intelligence (*In cant. cantic. hom.* V, 157,15; for references to Neoplatonism and Aristotle, see above on Origen, and Langerbeck, op. cit., *ap. font.*, p. 157), all beings (*De perf.* 188,15-16 Jaeger; cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 5,6, [V, 97,9-10]; V, 1,6 [V, 22,13]). Gregory only admits that the "via negativa" (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 40C; *In cant. cantic. hom.* V, 157,16-19; for the presence of this motif in Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, see above with regard to Justin Martyr) is infinite (*C. Eunom.* II [I, 246,16-17 Jaeger]; *In cant. cantic. hom.* V, 157,20-21; *De an. et res.*: PG 46, 97A; cf. E. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 1966; Plato, *Parm.* l37d; Plotinus, *Enn.* IV, 3,8 [74,38]), absolutely simple (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 93C; for references to the entire Platonic tradition, see above on Origen), undefinable and therefore incomprehensible and ineffable (*De virg.* 10,288, 21-22, 25-26; 290, 21-23; *De profess. Christ.* 134,7-8 Jaeger; *De perf.* 194,14-26; *C. Eunom.* II [II, 58,26-28]; *Quod non sint tres dei* 52,15-20 Müller; for the parallels in the Platonic tradition, see above with regard to Clement and Origen), flees from the one who searches (*C. Eunom.* II [I, 246,16-22]; *De perf.* 194,12-14; cf. Philo, *De post. C.* 13 and 18; Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 5,10 [V, 102,9]), is self-sufficient, loves itself and desires nothing outside itself (*De an. et res.*: PG 46,

92C, 93A-B; cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* III, 8,11 [III, 167,9-10-168,42-43]; VI, 8,15 [VI², 153,11; 152,1–153,6]), and is the absolute beauty that renders all things beautiful that participate in it (*De virg.* 11, p. 292, 14-15; cf. Plato, *Sympos.* 211b; Plotinus, *Enn.* I, 6-7 [I, 103,25-30]; I, 6,8 [I, 104,6-8]; for Plotinus, however, beauty is to be identified not with the first principle, but with the second hypostasis).

Two other important characteristic motifs of the Platonic tradition also appropriated by Gregory are those of God's noetic activity, or more precisely, the presence of thoughts in divine wisdom (before creating the sensible universe, divine wisdom thought it [*De perf.* 182,14-15; 183,3-4]; cf. Philo, *De opif. m.* 19; and above, with respect to Origen's *logos*, no. 9), and that of God's power that embraces, holds together and permeates the entire universe (*De profess. Christ.* 138,27-139,4; *De an. et res.*: PG 46, 24C, 28A; cf. above, with regard to Origen's *logos*, no. 11). Gregory too, on par with his predecessors, adopted the Platonic ideal of ὁμοίωσις θεῷ (cf. *Theaetetus* 176b) that unites with the expression from κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν from Gen 1:26; while Clement and Origen, following Philo, saw in the term εἰκών of Gen 1:26 a reflection of the divine *logos* in human reason and in the ὁμοίωσις, a reflection of the perfection understood as the crowning of humanity's ethical duty, and therefore attainable only at a later time. Gregory considered the two expressions of Gen 1:26 synonyms and therefore was led to consider the εἰκών-ὁμοίωσις as the expression of the original perfection of humanity, which was lost by following sin—which is dark in the image of the primordial beauty—and which humanity must strain to restore by cutting off as much as possible ties to the body. It was to the credit of H. Merki (*Homoiosis Theo. Von den der platonischen Angleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Freiburg in der Schweiz 1952, 92-164) to have analyzed in depth the meaning of the term *homoiosis* in Gregory's writings and have brought to light the analogues that it presented to Neoplatonism: Plotinus also put in strict relation the ὁμοίωσις with ἀπάθεια, the καθαρότης (purity) and the soul's return to its original beauty, darkened by its ties to the body (cf. the parallels in Merki, pp. 98-99, 115-117). Gregory is also connected to Platonism with respect to the motif of the superior understanding of the divine realities (θεωρία): even in his writings, as was already the case in those of Clement and Origen, it acquired a heavily esoteric stamp; it was expressed in terms taken from the mystery language and found its scriptural symbols in the images of the cloud and darkness (for all these points, see J. Lemaître, R. Roques, M. Viller, a portion of the entry *Contemplation* dedicated to Gregory, DSp 3, 1772-1775; and esp. J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris 1944, and the subsection *Mystique de la ténèbre chez Grégoire de Nysse*: DSp 3, 1872-1885).

With regard to the motif of the soul's union with God, examined above by Daniélou (see the studies cited above), here we will only mention several points of the *De anima et resurrectione* and analogous Plotinian motifs: both for Gregory and Plotinus the pure and beautiful soul is connected to and mixes with the divine beauty to which it is similar (*De an. et res.*: PG 46, 89B, 93C; cf. *Enn.* I, 6,7 [I, 103,13]; I, 6,9 [I, 105,12; 106,29-30]); it sees in its own beauty the image and the reflection of the original beauty that serves as a model (PG 46, 89C; cf. *Enn.* I, 6,7 [I, 103,25-30]); it actualizes a likeness to God by seeking to imitate the transcendent beauty (PG 46, 89D-92A; cf. *Enn.* I, 6,7 [I, 103,27-28], I, 6,9 [I, 106,29-30, 32-33]); it already possesses what it hopes to possess (PG 46, 93B; cf. *Enn.* VI, 9,9 [VI², 185,46]). On the relationship between Gregory of Nyssa and the Platonic tradition, see also H.F. Cherniss, *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa*, New York 1971 (reprint of the 1930 ed.); and also E. Peroli, *Il platonismo e l'antropologia filosofica di Gregorio di Nissa*, Milan 1993; S. Lilla, *Neoplatonisches Gedankengut* (cited below in the bibl.).

Also in the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus, K. Gronau (*Posidonius*) found numerous Platonic echoes (see also R. Gottwald, *De Gregorio Nazianzeno platonico*, Diss. Breslau 1906; H. Pinault, *Le platonisme de saint Grégoire de Nazianze*, La Roche-sur-Yon 1925; E. Fleury, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et son temps*, Paris 1930, 79-80; C. Moreschini, *Luce e purificazione nella dottrina di Gregorio Nazianzeno*: Augustinianum 13 [1973] 535-549; Id., *Il platonismo cristiano di Gregorio Nazianzeno*: ASNP serie III, 4 [1974] 1347-1392; Id., *Filosofia e letteratura in Gregorio di Nazianzo*, Milan 1997). Among the various Platonic statements, we will mention only the one present in his second *Theological Oration* (*Orat.* 28): the allusion to the famous passage of the *Timaeus* 28c (PG 36, 29C), to which other authors also appealed (such as Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr and Origen); there is also the denial of God's presence in the feeling of hatred, also found in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa (PG 36, 40B); the motif of a *winged thought that flies toward heaven, going back to *Phaedrus* 246e (PG 36, 65B); and the parallel between God and the sun of the sensible world, which connects with *Rep.* VI, 508b 12-c2 (PG 36, 69A); other passages from other homilies have been cited by C. Moreschini (Augustinianum 13 [1973] 538). Also in Gregory of Nazian-

zus's theology, one finds the characteristic motifs of the entire Platonic tradition, already observed in the writings of earlier Fathers (see esp. the writings of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa): God is unbegotten, unchangeable and incorruptible (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 36C), infinite, void of form and untouchable (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 33B), simple (*Orat. 30 theol.* 4: PG 36, 105B), not composite (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 44A; *Orat. 31 theol.* 5: PG 36, 169B). God cannot be found in any place (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 37C), is very far (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 29B), incomprehensible and unreachable (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 29C, 32B, 40B, 53B-C), ineffable and void of names (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 29C; *Orat. 30 theol.* 4: PG 36, 125B), is desired by all rational beings (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 44A; cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* I, 6,7 [I, 103,1-5], and also Aristotle, *Met.* L 1072a26b 3), but is only recognized through the via negativa (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 44A 4-6; *Orat. 29 theol.* 3: PG 36, 76B 15); he permeates everything (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 33D) and holds it together (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 32C). Two other Neoplatonic motifs adopted by Gregory of Nazianzus are those of the communion of beings among each other (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 48A; cf., e.g., Iamblichus, *De myst.* I, 5,17 [47,12-13 Des Places]) and the use of the term παράγειν to refer to the creation of beings by the divinity (*Orat. 28 theol.* 2: PG 36, 48A 15-16; cf., e.g., Plotinus, *Enn.* VI, 8,20 [VI2, 159,21]). On one particular point, however, Gregory of Nazianzus took a stand against Neoplatonism: in *Orat. 29 theol.* 3 (PG 36, 76C), he openly criticized the Plotinian understanding of the production of the second hypostasis following the automatic and involuntary overflow of the power present in the One (see *Enn.* V, 2,1 [V, 33,8-9]).

Neither was *Nemesius of Emesa able to shield himself from the influence of Neoplatonism, as demonstrated by chs. 2 and 3 of the *De natura hominis*. In ch. 2 (p. 59,12-70,2 Matthaei), to refute the thesis of the corporeality of the human soul, he appealed to the authority of Ammonius Saccas and the Neo-Pythagorean Numenius, one of the most read and admired philosophers by Plotinus. In ch. 3, Nemesius solved the problem of the relationship between the divine and human nature in the person of Christ (cf. p. 140,6-141,1), having recourse to what Ammonius Saccas and Porphyry, in his *Symmikta Zetemata*, had maintained with regard to the soul's union with the body (see esp. pp. 129,9-14; 139,4; 140,5 and S. Lilla, *Ps.-Denys l'Aréopagite, Porphyre et Damascius*, in *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident*, Paris 1997, 133-134). As one can see from the *Adversus Iulianum*, *Cyril of Alexandria's trinitarian theology is established on the Neoplatonist doctrine of the three hypostases. And in the 10 remaining books of this document, which aim to be a refutation of the three books *Against the Galileans* composed by the emperor *Julian, Cyril wanted to demonstrate that the Christian doctrine of the *Trinity is essentially shared by various Greek philosophers, and to this end he refers to the writings of Plato, Numenius, Hermes, Trismegistus, Plotinus and *Porphyry of Tyre, citing more or less extensive passages from these authors. As in the case of Eusebius, the document that mostly served for Cyril's undertaking was a Plotinian treatise Περὶ τῶν ἀρχικῶν ὑποστάσεων (the first treatise of the fifth *Ennead*), from which the Alexandrian Father approvingly cited various sections esp. Book VIII and also Books IV and II (see esp. PG 76, 921B-C, 921D–924A, 924B, 929C, 917D–920A, 920C for Book VIII; PG 76, 724A-B for Book IV; PG 76, 604B for Book II; all of these citations were noted by P. Henry, *Les états du texte de Plotin, Études plotiniennes*, I, Paris 1938, 123-140).

In his work *Graecarum affectionum curatio* (PG 83, 784-1152; P. Canivet, SC 57,1-2, Paris 1958), *Theodoret named on several occasions both Plato and the supporters of the subsequent Neo-Pythagorean, Middle Platonist and Neoplatonist tradition (see the very detailed indices by Canivet, under the entries for Amelius, *Ammonius Saccas, Atticus, Neoplatonists, Numenius, Plato, Platonists, Plotinus, Plutarch of Cheronea and Porphyry, SC 57,2, pp. 473, 475, 482, 483-486). He also made numerous citations of the writings of all these authors (see the index of authors cited, pp. 451-466). Plato had a magnificent style (I, 9, p. 105,25); he overshadowed all the philosophers with the beauty of his diction (I, 12, p. 106,21-23) and was the best of the philosophers (II, 6, p. 138,15-16). In a manner similar to Pythagoras and Anaxagoras, Plato went to *Egypt to learn the true wisdom from the Jews (II, 23-26, p. 144,19–145,9); he agreed with Pythagoras esp. on the doctrine of the soul, an essence divine in origin that falls into a body as a result of its punishment (V, 13, p. 229,18-20; V, 28, p. 234,9-15); he saw in the purity of the soul the precondition for the reception of divine teachings (I, 85, p. 126,4-7, with a citation of the *Phaedo* 67b). He spoke of a multiplicity of gods only for fear of the Athenians (II, 38, p. 149,11-13; II, 42, p. 150,10-11; III, 74, p. 192,4-6); he believed in one God (II, 38, p. 149,9-11; II, 42, p. 150,6-9, with a citation from the famous passage of the *Tim.* 28c); he distinguished in a marvelous way the supersensible and immutable being from becoming sensible and mutable (II, 33-36, p. 147,14–148,19, with a citation from the *Tim.* 27c-28a, 37e-38a). He identified the supreme ethical ideal

with detachment from things of this world (XII, 22, p. 424,19-21) and with the likeness to God as much as possible (XI, 9, p. 394,3-7; XII, 22-23, p. 424,21–425,6, with a citation from the *Theaetetus* 176 a-b). He also studied Scripture (VI, 61, p. 276,5-6), followed the teachings of Moses and the prophets and adopted them (II, 26, p. 145,8-9; II, 43, p. 150,13-18; VI, 31, p. 265,14-15; VI, 33, p. 266,10-11; XI, 27, p. 40,13-22), and was, as Numenius affirmed, "a Moses that spoke Attic Greek" (II, 114, p. 169,17-18). His philosophy was far more elevated than that of *Aristotle, who did not know how to pay him respect and opposed him esp. in the two doctrines of the soul's mortality and divine providence (V, 46-47, p. 242,13-15).

Especially worthy of admiration and praise are Plato's metaphysical-theological conceptions: the universe was born from a cause represented by the demiurge, good by nature and free from any feeling of envy; everything owes its existence to the Good which is superior to essence in dignity and power; the best proof of the universe's derivation from a cause is in its sensible and corporeal nature, subject to birth and becoming. It is difficult to find its artisan and demiurge; it is even more difficult to express it. The sensible universe is the most beautiful of beings that have been born, just as the demiurge is the most beautiful of the causes. Furthermore, immutability is proper to the most divine realities, while change is proper to those who are corporeal (IV, 32-45, p. 212,16–217,5, with a citation from the *Timaeus*, the *Republic* and the *Statesman*). The universe was formed acc. to an idea-model, but that should be identified with the thought of God and the intelligible heaven (IV, 49, p. 218,13-19).

One should not approve, however, of several aspects of Plato's teaching and his conduct, such as the doctrine of matter understood as a coeternal principle with God, a doctrine shared by Pythagoras, the Stoics and Aristotle (IV, 46, p. 217,10-11, cf. IV, 37, p. 214,7-8); the doctrine acc. to which evil should be sought out in the body (IV, 46-48, p. 217,12-218,12); the doctrine of metempsychosis, adopted by Pythagoras (XI, 34, p. 403,11-13); and his predilection for the sumptuous table of the tyrant of Syracuse (XII, 70, p. 439,1-6, with a citation from Xenophon's apocryphal letter to Aeschines). These judgments on Plato and his philosophy are connected to both the Platonic tradition of the first centuries AD and earlier patristic authors.

In the final analysis, the following derive from Middle Platonism: the veneration for Plato, the juxtaposition of his philosophy to that of Pythagoras, the distinction between the intelligible world and the sensible world—see also above with regard to Athenagoras no. **(11)**—the exaltation of likeness to God as the supreme ethical ideal, the opposition between the Platonic and Aristotelian doctrines pertaining to the soul and providence (one merely has to think of the Middle Platonist philosopher Atticus), the well-known citation of the passage from the *Rep.* VI, 509b on the superiority of the Good (cf. discussion above with respect to Justin Martyr), the citation of two famous passages from the *Tim.* 28b-c and 28c on the derivation of the corporeal universe from a superior cause and the demiurge which is difficult to find and impossible to express (cf. discussion above with regard to Justin Martyr). Also from Middle Platonism is the doctrine of matter as a coeternal principle with God and that of the ideas, a model of the sensible world and the thoughts of God. One finds the emphasis placed on the beauty of Plato's language and style already in the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (*see also* *Aristotelianism). The two theses acc. to which Plato went to Egypt to study Hebrew wisdom and expressed polytheistic ideas only for fear of the Athenians are also present in the *Cohortatio*; the theory of his dependence on *Moses and the Prophets and the theft perpetrated by him from their texts is a classical theory proposed by Justin Martyr, the author of the *Cohortatio*, Clement and *Eusebius of Caesarea. One finds the thesis of his love for the sumptuous table already in the writings of *Tatian.

In the writings of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, the metaphysical-theological system characteristic of the final phase of Neoplatonism—namely, that of *Proclus and *Damascius, of whom he was in all likelihood a "listener" at Athens—became both the foundation of theology and the interpretive canon of Scripture and the liturgy, as a rich series of studies has demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt (see S. Lilla, *Introduzione allo studio dello Ps. Dionigi l'Areopagita*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 533-577, revised and republished in *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il Platonismo cristiano*, Brescia 2005, 159-185; for the list of related studies, see esp. pp. 541-542, 571-573). It will suffice to mention the most important of the Proclean motifs appropriated by ps.-Dionysius: the law of the *monē*, the *proodos* and the *epistrophē*; the emphasis on the transcendence of the first principle, defined as nonbeing; the application to the *monē* of negative concepts of the first hypothesis of Plato's *Parmenides* and to the *proodos* some positive concepts of the second hypothesis; the definition of the Son and the Holy Spirit as "flowers" and "superessential lights" of the Father; the perspective acc. to which everything is found potentially included in the unity of the first principle and emanates from it

into the *proodos* as a result of the overflow of its superabundant power, without, however, exhausting its original source, which remains unchangeable. These motifs also include the simultaneous adoption of positive theology, which alongside *proodos* arises from the first principle to beings, and the adoption of negative theology, which from beings searches to reascend to the first principle; the preference accorded to negative theology; certain fundamental laws of the angelic hierarchy (the superior beings transmit to the inferior the divine illuminations and possess all the properties of the inferior, while the inferior beings do not possess all the properties of the superior; the angels are revealers of the mystery of the divinity); the idea of "mystical tradition"; the union of the human mind with the chief principle, which acts without intermediaries and presupposes the silence and overcoming of every knowledge and noetic activity. (These and other motifs have been examined in detail, alongside their dependency on the Platonic tradition and in particular on Proclus, in S. Lilla, *Introduzione allo studio dello Ps. Dionigi*, where attention is also called to the most relevant contributions of earlier scholars; see also *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il Platonismo cristiano*). One should not forget that ps.-Dionysius's dependence on Proclus is not limited to the adoption of teachings, but extends even to the use of technical terminology, which is not lacking in the *Corpus Dionysiacum*; at points certain passages from Plato's dialogues reappear: here we will only mention that of the *Div. Names* I, 5 (PG 3, 593A 10-B2), which draws on the *Parm.* 142a, and that of the *Div. Names* IV, 7 (PG 3, 701 D3-704A 2), relying on the *Sympos.* 210 a-b.

Not a few Neoplatonic motifs and terms—esp. those of late Neoplatonism—entered the work of *Maximus the Confessor through the writings of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite. Maximus thoroughly read and studied the *Corpus Dionysiacum*: he was the author of the *Ambiguorum liber* or *De variis difficilibus locis S. Dionysii et Gregorii* (PG 91, 1032-1417) and at least one part of the scholia to the *Corpus*, passed down under his name; in his writings he refers more or less openly to ps.-Dionysius (cf. the list of relevant passages in P. Sherwood, DSp 3, 296-297). In addition to the study by Sherwood (DSp 3, 295-300), Maximus's dependence on ps.-Dionysius has also been studied by W. Völker, in three of his works (*Festschrift für Bischof Dr. A. Stohr*, Mainz 1960, 243-254; *Der Einfluss des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita auf Maximus Confessor*, in *Studien zum neuen Testament und Patristik E. Klostermann zum 90 Geburtstag dargebracht*, TU 77, Berlin 1961, 331-350; and *Maximus Confessor als Meister geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1964; see also C. Moreschini's recent book, *Ambigua: Problemi metafisici e teologici su testi di Gregorio di Nazianzo e Dionigi Areopagita*, Milan 2003).

The same dependence can be seen in the *De Trinitate*, a document falsely attributed to *Cyril of Alexandria, but in actuality composed in the 7th c. (see B. Fraigneau-Julien, RecSR 49 [1961] 188), and the *Expositio fidei* by *John of Damascus. The use of ps.-Dionysius (and in particular his *De divinis nominibus*) by John of Damascus was not always direct, as shown by B. Kotter (*Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* II); various chapters of the *Expositio fidei* reproduce sections of the *De Trinitate*, which in turn depend on ps.-Dionysius's *De divinis nominibus*. Two detailed lists of parallels between the *De divinis nominibus* and the *Expositio fidei* can be found in S. Lilla, *Studi in memoria di C. Ascheri*: Differenze 9 (Urbino 1970) 176-177, and Augustinianum 13 (1973) 611-623; this latter study also contains references to the *De Trinitate*.

VI. The Latin Fathers. Of the Latin Christian authors in which Platonism left evident marks, one should esp. remember *Minucius Felix, *Lactantius, *Hilary of Poitiers, *Marius Victorinus, St. *Ambrose, St. *Augustine and *Boethius. Minucius Felix in the *Octavius* XIX, 14 (29,31–30,4 Waltzing) approvingly cited the famous passage from the *Timaeus* 28c, which became a classic not only in Middle Platonism but also in the writings of the Greek Fathers: *Platoni itaque in Timaeo deus et ipso suo nomine mundi parens, artifex animae, caelestium terrenorumque fabricator, quem et invenire difficile prae nimia et incredibili potestate et cum inveneris in publicum dicere impossibile praefatur* ("Therefore, in the *Timaeus*, for Plato, God by his very name is the parent of the world, the artisan of the soul, the maker of things heavenly and earthly, whom, he declares, is both difficult to find because of his exceeding and incredible power and when you have found him, it is impossible to speak of in public"). See also XXVI, 12 (45,13-14): *Plato, qui invenire deum negotium credidit* ("Plato, who believed it difficult to find God"). In XXVI, 12 (45,15–46,3), making explicit reference to the *Symposium*, he called attention to the Platonic opinion concerning demons (see in particular *Sympos.* 202d-e). The direct dependence of *Octavius* XIV, 6 on the absolute need for not hating true reason, from the *Phaedo* 88c-91a was discovered by J.P. Waltzing (*Minucius Félix et Platon*, in *Mélanges Boissier*, Paris 1903, 445-460; see esp. p. 459). P. Shorey (*Plato and Minucius Felix*: Classical Review 18 [1904] 302-303) emphasized the dependency of *Octavius*

XVI, 1 (19,30-32) on the *Phaedrus* 243d: *ut conviciorum amarissimam labem verborum veracium flumine diluamus.*

A. Kurfess (*Lactantius und Plato*: Philologus 78 [1923] 381-392) listed the various points of Lactantius's *Divinae institutiones, Epitome and De ira dei*, in which Lactantius either explicitly refers to Plato or clearly depends on him. From all these passages one must not conclude, however, acc. to Kurfess, a direct knowledge of Plato's writings by Lactantius, whose direct source would have been Cicero—and in particular the *Tusculan Disputations*—anthologies used by the apologists, compendia of philosophy *ad usum christianorum* and *Arnobius. Here we will restrict ourselves to mentioning the echo of the famous passage from the *Tim.* 28c which is present in the *Div. inst.* I, 8,1, the definition of death as the soul's separation from the body taken from the *Phaedo* 64c, 67d and present in the *Div. inst.* II, 12,9, and the reference in the *Div. inst.* II, 14,9 to the doctrine of demons expounded by Plato in the *Sympos.* 202e (cf. Kurfess pp. 383-384; the echoes of the *Tim.* 28c and the *Sympos.* 202e can be found, as was seen, also in the writings of Minucius Felix). A. Wlosok has rightly insisted on the determinative importance exerted by *Hermetism and *Middle Platonism in Lactantius's interpretation of the passage of *Tim.* 28c (*Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis*, Heidelberg 1960, 252-253); this last study also has to its credit the fact of emphasizing the close relationship that bound Lactantius's theology and his idea of revelation, knowledge of God and contemplation with the Hermetic-Platonic tradition of the 2nd c. AD (see esp. the section *Das Verhältnis des Laktanz zur philosophischen Gnosis*, pp. 222-231).

Hilary of Poitiers's work was the first major example of an affirmation in the Latin Christian world of that marked negative theology that was so in vogue, as was seen, in the writings of the Greek Fathers. L. Longobardo (*Il linguaggio negativo della trascendenza di Dio in Ilario di Poitiers*, Naples 1982) dedicated a meticulous analysis to the concepts of ingeneracy, infinity, incomprehensibility, ineffability, incorporeity, immutability, incorruptibility and impassability that characterized Hilary's theology, showing their connections to the Platonic and patristic tradition: practically speaking they are the same concepts already noted in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Origen and the Cappadocian Fathers and were clearly derived from Platonism, Middle Platonism, Neoplatonism and Philo. Here we will only mention that the idea acc. to which the Son's generation by the Father has led to no change in the nature of the latter, an idea articulated by Hilary in the *De trin.* V, 37 (PL 10, 155B; cf. Longobardo p. 55), imitates the Neoplatonist idea of the absolute inalterability of the first principle, not compromised by the emanation of intelligence and beings from this first principle (cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 3,12 [V, 66,34-36]; VI, 7,36 [VI2, 111,24-25]; VI, 9,5 [VI2, 178,36-37]).

In his still-important study *Plotin et l'Occident* (Louvain 1934, 1-24), P. Henry, taking his point of departure from Porphyry's *Vita Plotini*, investigated the diffusion of Plotinian philosophy in the Latin West. Those who contributed to this diffusion were not only Porphyry and the Latin-speaking disciples of Plotinus (such as Amelius, who was of Etruscan origin), but also, in the mid-4th c., the African orator *Marius Victorinus, who converted to Christianity only at an advanced age (cf. Henry, *Plotin et l'Occident*, p. 44): as Augustine mentioned in the *Confess.* VIII, 2,3 (cf. P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres*, Paris 1971, 201), he was the author of a Latin translation—read with great interest by Augustine (see the passages of the *Contra Academicos* and the *De beata vita* cited by Hadot, p. 202)—of certain *libri platonicorum* which, in all likelihood, included several treatises of Plotinus collected and commented on by Porphyry (this was the conclusion Hadot reached, pp. 202 and 207, sharing the thesis of W. Theiler, *Porphyrios und Augustin, Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 163. Henry [*Plotin et l'Occident*, p. 46], on the other hand, saw in the *libri platonicorum* only Plotinus's *Enneads*). Marius Victorinus's interest in Neoplatonic philosophy, however, was not limited to the simple activity of a translator: P. Henry and esp. P. Hadot's investigations demonstrated the breath of the dependence of Victorinus's theological-dogmatic writings on Neoplatonism. Although P. Henry (*Plotin et l'Occident*, pp. 47-62) has called attention to the presence of Plotinian motifs in the *Liber de generatione divini verbi ad Candidum arianum* and esp. in his *Adversus Arium*. In this last document (IV, 22) one can actually perceive a textual citation of *Enn.* V, 2,l (V, 34,1-2 Bréhier) referring to the one that is simultaneously all things and nothing in particular (cf. Henry, *Plotin et l'Occident*, pp. 49-54).

P. Hadot, in his foundational work (*Porphyre et Victorinus*, I-II, Paris 1968), dedicated a comprehensive and detailed investigation to the presence of "Porphyrian" motifs in the theological works of Victorinus (in the first volume, all the parallels between Porphyry and Victorinus's theology are analyzed; see esp. pp. 102-461): among the "Porphyrian" motifs present in Victorinus's writings, one should mention above all the motif of the first principle

conceived as nonbeing and the motif of the intelligible triad formed from being, life and thought. In the second volume, he cited texts from the *Adversus Arium* and the *Ad Candidum* deriving from Porphyry, the text of Porphyry's commentary on the *Parmenides*, and a section of Proclus's commentary on the Parmenides containing "important elements for understanding some of Victorinus's Porphyrian themes (cf. Hadot, vol. II, preface). The foundational "Porphyrian" character of Victorinus's theology was reinforced by Hadot in his subsequent work titled *Marius Victorinus* (p. 203). The various studies by A. Solignac, J.H. Waszink and P. Courcelle (see the pertinent references in P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, p. 204 n.10) have called attention to the existence of a circle of learned Latin Neoplatonists at *Milan around 386, both Christian and *pagan. St. *Ambrose and his teacher *Simplicianus, the old friend of Marius Victorinus, were part of this group (see P. Courcelle, RevPhilol 76 [1950] 56, and Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, p. 204).

In effect, St. *Ambrose deeply assimilated certain Platonic teachings and the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and Porphyry, as the studies of P. Courcelle, L. Taormina, P. Hadot and A. Solignac have demonstrated, following the guidance of specific textual comparisons. P. Courcelle (*Plotin et Saint Ambroise*: Rev. Philol. 76 [1950] 29-56; see also his book *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1950, 106-132) has brought to light numerous echoes of Plotinus present in Ambrose's *De Isaac vel anima* and in the *De bono mortis*, and has emphasized the dependence of his sermon *In Isaiam* on Porphyry's *De regressu animae* (on this last point, see esp. *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1950, 133-137). L. Taormina (*Sant'Ambrogio e Plotino*: MSLC 4 [1954] 41-85) has focused on the numerous similarities between the bishop of Milan and Plotinus, esp. with regard to the doctrine of God's transcendence and certain ideas about the soul. P. Hadot (*Platon et Plotin dans trois sermons de Saint Ambroise*: REL 34 [1956] 202-220), following the direction indicated by Courcelle, discovered further parallels between Plato and Plotinus on the one hand and the *De Isaac vel anima* and Ambrose's *De bono mortis* on the other. Although in the *De Isaac* VIII, 64-65 there appear echoes of the *Phaedrus* 246a, 247b (cf. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, p. 208), Plato's most used dialogue in the *De bono mortis* is the *Phaedo*, even if in the *De bono mortis* V, 17 the famous passage from *Theaetetus* 176b concerning the flight from the world understood as the likeness to God resurfaced (cf. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, p. 213).

The direct source for Ambrose could be, acc. to Hadot, Porphyry's *De regressu animae* (*Platon et Plotin*, p. 220) or some document of the Cappadocian Fathers, the only ones in whom one finds the fusion of elements from the writings of Philo, Origen and Plotinus, which is characteristic of the *De Isaac* (on this last hypothesis, see *Marius Victorinus*, p. 206). Courcelle's example was also followed by A. Solignac, *Nouveaux parallèles entre Saint Ambroise et Plotin. Le "De Jacob et vita beata" et le Perì eudaimonías* (*Enn. I, 4*): Archives de Phil. 20 (1956) 148-156. Lastly, P. Courcelle, in one of his studies (*Nouveaux aspects du platonisme chez Saint Ambroise*: REL 34 [1956] 220-239), returned to the question of Ambrose's dependence on Neoplatonism: in the first section (*Ambroise lecteur de Plotin et Porphyre*, pp. 221-226) he emphasized further parallels between the *Enneads* on the one hand and Ambrose's *De Iacob* and the *De officiis* on the other, and accepted Hadot's hypothesis (*Nouveaux aspects*, p. 220), acc. to which Porphyry's *De regressu animae* was the direct source for Ambrose's *De bono mortis* (the various echoes of Plato's *Phaedo* thus reached Ambrose through Porphyry's treatise). In the second section (*Ambroise lecteur du Phèdre de Platon*, pp. 226-232), using and in part modifying W. Wilbrand's hypothesis (*Ambrosius und Plato*: RQA 25 [1911] 42-49), acc. to which the direct source for the echoes of the *Phaedrus* present in Ambrose's *De Abraham*, *De Isaac* and *De virginitate* were presented by Origen, he brought to light further parallels between the *Phaedrus* 246d-247e, 248b, 254a and *De virg.* XV, 96 and XVII, 109. Though not excluding that the direct source for Ambrose could have been Origen's *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, he is disposed to think that Ambrose directly read the section of the *Phaedrus* 246-254 (Wilbrand, *Ambrosius und Plato*, pp. 231-232). In the third section (*Ambroise lecteur de Macrobe*, pp. 232-239), he demonstrated several parallels between Macrobius's commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* and several of Ambrose's writings (*Exaemeron, De Cain et Abel, De bono mortis, De Noe, De Isaac et anima, De Nabuthae historia*).

Even St. Augustine, on par with *Justin Martyr, *Clement, *Eusebius and *Theodoret, showed a great admiration for Plato: the praise he gives him in ch. 4 of book VIII of the *De civitate Dei*, where he presented him as the chief theologian among the Greek philosophers (CCL 47, p. 219, 1-3: *non quidem immerito excellentissima gloria claruit, qua omnino ceteros obscuraret, Plato*), reiterates the praise attributed to the Athenian philosopher by Middle Platonism (Augustine was also a reader and admirer of one of Plato's most famous supporters, Apuleius, the author of the *De Platone et eius dogmate*: *Apu-*

leius Afer extitit Platonicus nobilis [*Civ. Dei* VIII, 12: CCL 47, 229, 23-28]). In *Civ. Dei* XXII, 22 (CCL 48, 845, 123-124), he cited with approval Cicero's paraphrase of the passage from the *Tim.* 47b on the divine origin of philosophy, *nec hominibus, inquit, ab his aut datum est donum maius aut potuit ullum dari*, and in the *Civ. Dei* VIII, 11 (CCL 47, 227-228) he does not hesitate to closely associate the Platonist teachings with the books of Moses in order to emphasize the substantial identity between Platonic philosophy and Mosaic wisdom, as had already been done by Justin Martyr, Clement and Eusebius, and as Theodoret would do a little later. The beginning of the book of Genesis was interpreted along the lines of the *Timaeus*, and the famous passage from Ex 3:14, *ego sum qui sum*, is connected to the Platonist doctrine, or more correctly the Middle Platonist doctrine of the immutability of the first principle: *qui vere est quia incommutabilis est . . . vehementer hoc Plato tenuit et diligentissime commendavit*—as was already observed that the same relationship between Ex 3:14 and *Tim.* 27d and immutable ideas was established by the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (ch. 22), which, influenced by Middle Platonism, refers (as it does also in Augustine) to *Tim.* 27d in reference not to the realm of ideas but to the first principle (and by Eusebius *Praep. ev.* XI, 10; cf. above).

It was precisely this correspondence between Plato and Moses that led Augustine to adopt the thesis of the Athenian philosopher's knowledge of the OT, *ut paene assentiar Platonem illorum librorum expertem non fuisse* (*Civ. Dei* VIII, 11 [CCL 47, 228, 41-42]), even with a caution that the Greek Fathers did not show: if Plato was truly able to learn Mosaic wisdom during his stay in Egypt, this could have only occurred thanks to an oral teaching and not through a Greek translation of the Hebrew books, which at that time still did not exist: *qua propter in illa peregrinatione sua Plato nec Hieremiam videre potuit tanto ante defunctum nec easdem scripturas legere, quae nondum fuerant in Graecam linguam translatae, qua ille pollebat; nisi forte, quia fuit acerrimi studii, sicut Aegyptias, ita et istas per interpretem didicit, non ut scribendo transferret . . . sed ut conloquendo quid continerent, quantum capere posset, addisceret*, "for this reason during his stay Plato could neither see Jeremiah, who had died much earlier, or read the same scriptures, which had not yet been translated into the Greek language, in which he was very eloquent; unless perhaps, because he was very tenacious in study, as with the Egyptian language, he also learned those scriptures through an interpreter, so that he translated not by writing . . . but by discussing in conversation what it contained, he would learn more, as much as he could grasp" (*Civ. Dei* VIII, 11 [CCL 47, 228, 15-23]).

Plato's dependence on the OT, however, did not exclude God's direct inspiration of or revelation to him. Augustine actually seems to have preferred this last hypothesis: *sed undecumque ille ista didicerit, sive praecedentibus eum veterum libris sive potius, quo modo ait apostolus, quia quod notum est Dei manifestum est in illis; Deus enim illis manifestavit* (*Rom 1,19*) (*Civ. Dei* VIII, 12 [CCL 47, 229, 1-4]). Augustine's presentation of the hypothesis of the divine inspiration of Platonic philosophy along with the other hypothesis of Plato's dependence on the books of Moses reveals a surprising similarity with Clement's statements regarding Plato and Pythagoras in the *Strom.* II, 100,3 (II, 167,23-168,4) and in *Strom.* V, 29,3-4 (II, 344,23-345,3).

Not only Plato, but also the supporters of subsequent Platonism, in particular those of Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, received high praise from Augustine, who believed that their teachings in large part agreed with the Christian faith: *elegimus enim Platonicos omnium philosophorum merito nobilissimos, propterea quia sapere potuerunt licet immortalem ac rationalem vel intellectualem hominis animam nisi participato lumine illius Dei, a quo et ipsa et mundus factus est, beatam esse non posse; ita illud, quod omnes homines appetunt, id est vitam beatam, quemquam isti assecuturum negant, qui non illi uni optimo, quod est incommutabilis Deus, puritate casti amoris adhaeserit* (*Civ. Dei* X, 1 [CCL 47, 271,13-272,21]); *recentiores tamen philosophi nobilissimi, quibus Plato sectandus placuit, noluerint se dici Peripateticos aut Academicos, sed Platonicos ex quibus valde sunt nobilitati Graeci Plotinus, Iamblichus, Porphyrius; in utraque autem lingua, id est Graeca et Latina, Apuleius Afer extitit Platonicus nobilis* (*Civ. Dei* VIII, 12 [CCL 47, 229, 23 to 28]). But the light of Platonic philosophy shined again esp. in Plotinus, who is to be considered Plato reborn: *os illud Platonis, quod in philosophia purgatissimum est et lucidissimum, dimotis nubibus erroris emicuit maxime in Plotino, qui Platonicus philosophus ita eius similis diiudicatus est, ut simul vixisse, tantum autem interest temporis, ut in hoc ille revixisse putandus sit* (*C. Acad.* III, 18,41 [CCL 29, 59,41-60,46]). It was the reading of Marius Victorinus's translation of some books of Plotinus—most likely accompanied by Porphyry's commentary; see above—that incited at Milan in 386 a burning fire in Augustine's soul: . . . *libri quidam pleni . . . etiam mihi ipsi de me ipso incredibile incendium concitarunt* (*C. Acad.* II, 2,5 [CCL 29, 20, 51-57]); *lectis autem Plotini paucissimis libris . . . conlataque cum eis, quantum potui, etiam illorum*

auctoritate, qui divina mysteria tradiderunt, sic exarsi, ut omnes illas vellem ancoras rumpere (*De beata vita* I, 4 [CCL 29, 67, 98-102]).

This reading convinced the 30-year-old Augustine of a substantial identity between the metaphysics of Plotinus and the theology of John, present acc. to him in the *Enneads: procurasti mihi . . . quosdam platonicorum libros ex graeca lingua in latinam versos et ibi legi non quidem his verbis, sed hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus quod in principio erat verbum et verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat verbum: hoc erat in principio apud Deum . . . et quia hominis anima, quamvis testimonium perhibeat de lumine, non est tamen ipsa lumen, sed verbum, Deus, est lumen verum . . . et quia in hoc mundo erat, et mundus per eum factus est* (*Confess.* VII, 9,13 [CCL 27, 101, 4-16]); *quod enim ante omnia tempora et supra omnia tempora incommutabiliter manet unigenitus filius tuus coaeternus tibi et quia de plenitudine eius accipiunt animae, ut beatae sint, et quia participatione manentis in se sapientiae renovantur, ut sapientes sint, est ibi* (*Confess.* VII, 9,14 [CCL 27, 102, 32-36]); *gratulatus est mihi* (*Simpliciano*) *quod. . . in istis autem omnibus modis insinuari deum et eius verbum* (*Confess.* VIII, 2,3 [CCL 27, 114, 6-9]). The identification of God and the *logos* in the prologue of John's gospel, respectively, with Plotinus's first and second *hypostasis is none other than the adoption of Plotinian metaphysics, as was seen (see above), but Eusebius of Caesarea, *Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine honored it. In fact, Neoplatonist philosophy can rightly be considered, acc. to Augustine, the truest philosophy and the pinnacle of all human thought (see W. Theiler, *Porphyrios und Augustin. Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 160).

His enthusiasm for Plotinian philosophy accompanied Augustine throughout the entirety of his life: as his biographer Possidius noted (*Vita Aug.* ch. 28), at the point of death he repeated the words of a wise man (*sapiens*): *non erit magnus magnum putans quod cadunt ligna et lapides et moriuntur mortales.* P. Henry (*Plotin et l'Occident*, 137-138) had the credit of noting that the *sapiens* in question was Plotinus, because the quote was a translation from *Enn.* I, 4,7 (I, 77,23-24 Bréhier). One should not be amazed, therefore, that the relationship between Augustine and Neoplatonism has been the object of numerous studies: here we should stop to recall the work of L. Grandgeorge (*Saint Augustin et le Néoplatonisme*, Paris 1896; see esp. the lists of the various treatises by Plotinus and Porphyry cited and alluded to by Augustine, pp. 39-41); P. Henry (*Plotin et l'Occident*, Louvain 1934; see the two chapters *Saint Augustin le converti*, pp. 63-119, and *Saint Augustin l'évêque*, pp. 120-145, containing numerous synoptic comparisons between Augustine and Plotinus; likewise important is a collection of passages from the works of Augustine in which he spoke of the Neoplatonists, pp. 79-82; on the use of Porphyry's writings, see esp. p. 121); P. Courcelle (*Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1950, 153-174); W. Theiler (*Porphyrios und Augustin. Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 160-251), who not only examined in depth the multiple analogies between the Bishop of Hippo and the student of Plotinus, but also supplied (pp. 250-251) an exhaustive list of all the passages from Augustine's writings that provide doctrines that trace back to Porphyry; A.H. Armstrong (*St. Augustine and Christian Platonism*, in *Plotinian and Christian Studies*, London 1979, XI, 1-66, and *Spiritual or Intelligible Matter in Plotinus and St. Augustine*, ibid., VII, 277-283); R. Russell (*The Role of Neoplatonism in St. Augustine's De civitate Dei*, in *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought. Essays in Honour of A.H. Armstrong*, London 1981); and J.J. O'Meara (*The Neoplatonism of Saint Augustine. Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, New York 1981).

In this entry, it is not possible to cite even a few of the multiple analogies between Augustine, Plotinus and Porphyry discovered by these and other scholars. One can only note the parallels between Augustine's understanding of God and Plotinus's conception of the One, brought to light by Grandgeorge (*Augustin et le Néoplatonisme*, pp. 57-84), even if on this topic a more precise and in-depth investigation would be necessary. For the common attitude of the two authors toward the "sensible universe," see Grandgeorge, *Augustin et le Néoplatonisme*, pp. 123-125; the teaching on "intelligent matter" was present, as was seen (see above) also in the writings of Origen (A.H. Armstrong has called attention to its presence in Augustine's writings in his *Plotinian and Christian Studies*, London 1979, VII, 277-283). There is also the motif of human self-contemplation, a precondition for union with the first principle, brought to light by Henry (*Plotin et l'Occident*, 112); we also see the Platonic ideal of the likeness to God (see *Theaetetus* 176b) accomplished by flight from this world, which Augustine appropriated, reiterating the words of Plotinus (see Henry, p. 107).

Augustine's understanding of the "Word" or divine wisdom that contains in itself the rational principles of all things merits special attention: *veritatem fixam, stabilem, indeclinabilem, ubi sunt omnes rationes rerum omnium creaturarum*, "established, stable and unchangeable truth, where all the reasons of

all created things exist" (*Sermo* 141: PL 38, 776); *spiritus sapientiae multiplex, eo quod multa in sese habeat; sed quae habeat, hoc et est, et ea omnia unus est, neque enim multae sed una sapientia est . . . in quibus sunt omnes invisibiles atque incommutabiles rationes rerum etiam visibilium et mutabilium, quae per ipsam factae sunt*, "the manifold spirit of wisdom has many things in itself; but it *is* also these very things that it has, and all those things are one, for wisdom is not many but one . . . in which are all the invisible and unchangeable reasons of things even visible and changeable, which were made through it" (*Civ. Dei* XI, 10 [CCL 48, 331,72-332,78]). In this regard, the similarity is surprising not only in comparison to Origen's understanding of the *logos* (see above, with respect to Origen's *logos*, no. 9), but also Plotinus's doctrine of the **nous* that contains in itself all the ideas and that is a composed unity, identical to this multiplicity or totality of ideas. Augustine's words *eo quod multa in sese habeat; sed quae habeat, haec et est, et ea omnia unus est* ("[wisdom] has many things in itself, but it *is* also these very things that it has, and all those things are one, for wisdom is not many but one") are explained by keeping in mind ἓν ἄρα πολλά from *Enn.* V, 3,15 (V, 69,11), ἓν πάντα from *Enn.* V, 3,15 (V, 69,23) and the ἔχει οὖν ἐν ἑαυτῷ πάντα *Enn.* V, 1,4 (V, 20,2l); see also the expression πάντα ἕν with which Clement described the *logos* (*Strom.* IV, 156,2 [II, 318,1]). Even Plotinus's **anima mundi*, the third hypostasis, contains within itself the rational principles received from the *nous* (see e.g., *Enn.* II, 3,16 [II, 42,19-20] and VI, 2,5 [VI1, 104,12-13]). On the points of correspondence between Plotinus's second hypostasis and Augustine's "Word"/wisdom see also the dissertation by O. Perler, *Der Nus bei Plotin und das Verbum bei Augustinus als vorbildliche Ursache der Welt*, Freiburg Schweiz 1931. Lastly, one should remember that Augustine's famous doctrine of evil as a deprivation of the Good (see, e.g., *Civ. Dei* XI, 22 [CCL 48, 341, 22-23]; XII, 3 [CCL 48, 357, 26], and the references in Courcelle, *Recherches*, p. 124 n. 4) are found already formulated by Plotinus in the eighth treatise of the first *Ennead* (see *Enn.* I, 8,1 [I, 115,11-12; I, 115,19]). According to Courcelle (ibid., p. 124), Augustine was most likely led to embrace this Plotinian doctrine from St. Ambrose's sermon *De Isaac*, which likewise depended on Plotinus (see Courcelle, ibid., p. 106-107).

The role played by Plato and Neoplatonism—esp. that of Proclus—in certain aspects of *Boethius's thought has been highlighted by P. Courcelle (*La consolation de la philosophie dans la tradition littéraire*, Paris 1967, passim; with regard to Proclus, see pp. 203-231), and H. Chadwick, in his book *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology and Philosophy*, Oxford 1981 (see esp. pp. 16-22 and the entirety of chs. 4-5, pp. 174-253).

In addition to the studies cited throughout the course of this entry, R. Arnou's *Platonisme des Pères:* DTC 12, 2294-2392 remains foundational. A useful anthology of texts is found in another of R. Arnou's works, *De Platonismo Patrum*, Rome 1935. See also G. Madec, *"Platonisme" des Pères*: Catholicisme 11, Paris 1988, 491-507. Among the numerous recent publications, we shall only mention D. Wyrwa, *Die christliche Platonaneigung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, Berlin-New York 1983; H. Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltsecle. Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Tübingen 1994; J. Whittaker, *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984; S. Lilla, *The Neoplatonic Hypostases and the Christian Trinity*, in *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition*, Essays presented to J. Whittaker, Aldershot 1997, 127-189; Id., *Neuplatonisches Gedankengut in den Homilien über Seligpreisungen Gregors von Nyssa* (Suppl. VChr 68) Leiden 2004; Id., *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il Platonismo cristiano*, Brescia 2005 (republication of earlier studies); J. Rist, *Platonism and Its Christian Heritage*, London 1985; Id., *Eros and Psyche. Studies in Plato, Plotinus and Origen*, Toronto 1964; Id., *Augustine. Ancient Thought Baptized*, Cambridge 1997; D. Carabine, *The Unknown God. Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition. Plato to Eriugena* (Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 19), Louvain 1995; Y. de Andia, *Henosis. L'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite* (Philosophia antiqua 71), Leiden 1996; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004.

Bibliographic review: DTC 12/2 (1934) 2390-2391; E.P. Meijering, *Zehn Jahre Forschung zum Thema Platonismus und Kirchenväter*: Theologische Rundschau 36 (1971) 303-320; H. Dörrie, *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 538-542; Catholicisme 11 (1998) 505-507; E. Peroli, in C. de Vogel, *Platonismo e Cristianesimo. Antagonismo o comuni fondamenti?* Milan 1993, 147-153.

S. Lilla

PLEROMA (πλήρωμα). This word means "fullness," perfection and totality. In classical texts, the term *pleroma* referred to something full, the complete content of something; the large quantity, the complete sum, the totality; the completion, crowning or, more rarely, that which is filled, and the very action of filling, in competition with πλήρωσις. The word is already found in the Greek translation of the OT (or LXX) primarily to indicate complete and contented fullness and abundance (Song 5:12), and was extensively used by Christian authors, esp. the gnostics, but also by the mainstream church. In the writings of *Philo, one finds the substantive used in various contexts, usually in the sense of "fullness" or "crowning." For example, in *Abr.* 268, faith in God is called πλήρωμα χρηστῶν ἐλπίδων, "fullness of good hopes," probably in the positive sense, namely, the faith that fills one with good hope; in *Praem.* 65, the *soul, in virtue of its natural gifts, apprehension and

exercise, becomes a πλήρωμα ἀρετῶν, "fullness of virtue," such that the Feast of Tabernacles becomes the *pleroma* of the sacred Jewish feasts, i.e., their crowning and their apex (*Spec. leg.* II, 213). In most cases in Philo's writings, the idea of *pleroma* has a theological connotation and seems to bear *Stoic echoes; in a more secular sense, in *Leg. Gai.* 11, πλήρωμα εὐτυχίας is the "fullness of a happy condition."

In the NT, St. *Paul esp. repeatedly used the term *pleroma* with quite different meanings, e.g., in Eph 1:10 and 23; 2:17; 3:19; 4:10 and 13, and in Col 1:19 and 2:19, etc. If in Rom 11:25 *pleroma* is a numeric totality, in Rom 15:29 it indicates fullness and richness (the Vulgate renders it *abundantia*) of blessing with which Christ accompanied his apostle. In a similar manner, in Eph 3:19 *pleroma* is a richness of gifts that God grants to the community. In Eph 1:23 the church is the "body" and the "fullness" of Christ who "fills," i.e., governs, the world (see R.R. Jeal, *A Strange Style of Expression*: Filologia Neotestamentaria 10 [1997] 129-138). In Jn 1:16 *pleroma* refers to the fullness of divine grace that was made present and operative in the incarnate Word. For this reason, the believer receives the fullness and superabundance of *grace. Similarly, in Col 1:19 it is said that the entire πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, i.e., the fullness of the divine nature, resided in Jesus Christ (on the use of the term *pleroma* in Col 1:15-20, see F. Capponi, *Filologia e dogmatica*: Invigilata lucernis 15-16 [1993-94] 77-97); and in Eph 1:23 *pleroma* indicates the body completely filled by the action of Christ, acc. to an idea also present in 1 Cor 12, Eph 4:16, etc. It is most likely used in an active sense in Rom 13:10, where the *pleroma* is the full and absolute fulfillment of what God asks, while in Rom 11:12 *pleroma* is in contrast to ἥττημα, and indicates the attainment of numeric completeness of the redeemed from Israel. In Gal 4:4 *pleroma* designates the fullness of time reached with the advent of the Son.

When it refers to the divinity, we can say that in St. Paul's epistles, the term *pleroma* designates the fullness and perfection of divinity in Christ, and Christ himself as the totality of the divinity, visible in his body, which is the church, and which, acc. to *Origen, is also *Scripture, the other and perpetual incarnation of Christ. In fact, acc. to the Alexandrian exegete, Christ is the fullness of divine revelation (*In Io.* VI, 3).

*Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* II, 10) translated the word *pleroma* with the Latin term *universitas* to indicate both the fullness and the overabundance of Christ's spiritual gifts, and the complete and perfect belonging of all creatures to God, who leaves no space for another divinity. Moreover, very frequent in the writings of nongnostic Christian authors, the term *pleroma* connotes in a temporal sense "the fullness of times," "the totality of ages" (πλήρωμα τῶν αἰώνων), referring in particular to the perfect condition of the world in the Son of God and with him, as one finds in the **Odes of Solomon* 17,7; 19,5; 26,7; 36,6 and 41,13, or perhaps in the writings of *Ignatius of Antioch, in the prefaces of the letters to the Christian inhabitants of *Ephesus—where the term *pleroma* is used to designate the generous fullness with which God has blessed the recipients—and of Tralles, where the expression ἐν τῷ πληρώματι, "in the fullness," seems to refer to ἀσπάζομαι, "greetings, embrace," that immediately precedes, or again in *Philosoph.* VIII, 10,3, or in the apocryphal and *Encratite *Acts of Thomas*, 148. Likewise, *The Odes of Solomon* (7,13; 35,6 and 36) transmit the idea that *pleroma* allows for perfect knowledge: what one finds at the end of the process of investigation, where there is rest.

In the writings of *Gregory of Nyssa, the idea of *pleroma*, referring to God and the attitude that is found in him, appears tightly connected to his theory of ἐπέκτασις, of humanity's continual inclination toward God, outside himself (see L. Karfíková, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes und der unendliche Weg des Menschen nach Gregor von Nyssa*: SE 40 [2001] 47-81). In Gregory's thought, *pleroma* is also the collection of humanity that will enter into the perfect unity of the *apokatastasis. *Clement of Alexandria, however, used the term *pleroma* both when speaking of nourishment in *Paed.* I, 96,3; II, 103,2, and in a series of the facts he relates about the gnostics, who considered the *pleroma* a foundational concept.

In fact, among the *gnostics, the *pleroma* is a fullness and totality of the divine, multiple and simultaneously one, and contains therefore the transcendent beings, which have their origin in the *pleroma* and to which they return as the place where they attain their perfect condition. In the writings of the Valentinians, the *pleroma* is the conglomerate of thirty eons, τὸ πᾶν πλήρωμα τῶν αἰώνων, acc. to *Epiphanius's testimony (*Haer.* XXXI, 13,6). The eons themselves, which complete the perfect number of the *pleroma* (τὸ πλήρωμα ἀριθμῷ τελείῳ συνηθροισμένον, "the *pleroma* gathered together in a perfect number"), are referred to as the πληρώματα (Clem. Al., *Strom.* IV, 90,2; *Exc. ex Theod.* 32,1; 33,1; Iren., *Haer.* I, 14,2.5). If the *pleroma* is the fullness, its opposite is the κένωμα, a place of emptiness, imperfection, nothingness, which in gnostic language refers to the material world: in this realm, being external to the *pleroma*, the souls are like exiles and fallen humans. In effect, in their dualistic tendencies, the

gnostics generally distinguished between two primary creators, one of the material world, frequently identified with the God of the OT, and another of the spiritual world: only the latter was considered the true God, unknowable and ineffable, on the basis of the principles of apophatic theology. *Basilides (e.g., acc. to *Philosoph.* VII, 21,1) laid down the principle of a God "who does not exist," οὐκ ὤν, "void of thought, sensibility and will etc.," totally transcendent, but from whom, through a series of operations, the *pleroma* composed of eons would be manifested.

In fact, for the gnostics, generally speaking, the known God, distinct from the unknowable Father, appears androgynous, endowed with a feminine component at times called Σιωπή, Πρόνοια, Ἔννοια (Silence, Providence, Thought), such that this God's reflection on himself is generative and manifests toward itself the true reality, through more subsequent developments: first the production of a son, Barbelo or *Νοῦς, that reveals the face of the original couple, therefore, this series of emanations that establishes the *pleroma* of the eons, generally is understood as circular. God "Father of all things" does not belong, properly speaking, to the *pleroma*, but remains outside it, producing outside himself the first eons, as the *Philosoph.* VI, 29,6 and Irenaeus (*Haer.* I, 1,1) attest: although the *pleroma* is by nature the closest in proximity to God, God remains above it, μόνος ἀγέννητος, οὐ τόπον ἔχων, οὐ χρόνον, ἀναπαυόμενος αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ μόνος, "the only unbegotten, that has neither place nor time, which, being alone, rests in itself by itself" (*Philosoph.* VI, 29,5).

The last of the eons of the *pleroma* is Σοφία, Wisdom, to which is attributed a *sin, variously described, that, in any case, explains the rise of evil and, in the final analysis, also explains the material world, with the fall of Sophia from the world of the *pleroma*. The material world is therefore outside the *pleroma*; actually it is the contrary to it: it is κένωμα, "emptiness," the absence of every divine element. The exit of Sophia from the *pleroma*, in fact, establishes the premise for the work of a demiurge that creates the world from preexistent matter, which contains shadows; it is an illusion and lacks real existence; it is inspired by models, τύποι, transmitted to it by Sophia, acc. to the Valentinians (Iren., *Haer.* I, 5, 3). Sophia reigns over the cosmos together with the seven *archons* that are to be identified with the seven planetary spheres and which are also created by her. This myth, found in certain gnostic texts, is probably inspired by the episode contained in the gospels of Jesus' *baptism in the Jordan and the epiphany of God, acc. to G. Lettieri (*Il fondamento cristologico del mito gnostico*, Cassiodorus 1 [1995] 151-165). In effect, alongside a total opposition between the *pleroma* and the κένωμα-world, we also find attestations of a mimetic relationship between the invisible and the spiritual *pleroma* (τὸ ἀόρατον καὶ πνευματικὸν, Epiphanius, *Haer.* XXXI, 10,13) and the cosmos that is created "according to the image of the invisible *pleroma*" (Clem. Alex., *Exc. ex Theod.* 22,4; 42,1; Iren., *Haer.* II, *praef.* 1: *secundum imaginem invisibilis . . . Pleromatis factam*). The gnostics at times returned to the image of the matrix to indicate the *pleroma* from which everything draws its origin, although the same image was employed—esp. in the *Paraphrase of Shem*—also for the visible world, seen negatively, whose continuation is only assured by the union of the races; the death of the body is therefore construed as an exit from this matrix, just as birth was a fall into it (see T. Onuki, *Le monde comme matrice*: Apocrypha 11 [2000] 123-145).

A student of *Valentinus the Gnostic, *Ptolemy, who lived during the 2nd half of the 2nd c. and authored a commentary on the Prologue of the gospel of *John, the contents of which are known thanks to *Irenaeus and *Epiphanius, allegorically interprets the Prologue itself as referring to the *pleroma*. From his point of view, in fact, it symbolically alludes to the origin of the first *Ogdoad, i.e., the first eight eons of the Valentinian *pleroma*, composed in all of 30 eons formed by the deployment of the first principle, Bythos or the abyss. The eons of the *pleroma* subsequent to the first eight were produced by the Logos emitted from the only Begotten Son; then, Sophia produced the reality existing outside the *pleroma*. According to *Tertullian (*Adv. Val.* 4), one must differentiate between Valentinus's and Ptolemy's understandings of the *pleroma*: the pleromatic eons acc. to Valentinus were feelings and affections of the divinity, while Ptolemy conceived of them as personal substances and external to the divinity itself. The divine *pleroma*, acc. to the gnostic perspective, is also the true homeland of pneumatic human beings, i.e., spiritual persons (*see* **pneuma*)—which as such are opposed to the *illici* and **psychici*—that are called by different names, such as, in the writings of Basilides, the "Third Filiation" and "the church of the spirituals," and by the *Ophites and the *Sethians, the "sons of the light" or the "race that does not falter." The entire *pleroma* is also conceived as the nuptial chamber (νυμφών) into which spiritual people enter who—once divested of their souls, their psychic element—reach the angels-spouses and become pure spirits, intellectual eons, αἰῶνες νεοροί (*Exc. ex Theod.* 64). Likewise *Heracleon—another student of Valentinus whose commentary on John

remains, thanks to the citations of it that Origen inserted in his own, and has thereby come down to us in a fragmentary form—interpreted the husband of the Samaritan woman in Jn 4:17 allegorically as her *pleroma* (πλήρωμα αὐτῆς), her spiritual counterpart, her σύζυγος ἀπὸ πληρώματος, with which she, as an allegory of the pneumatic human being, must unite herself to reach salvation (*ap.* Orig., *Comm. in Ioh.* XIII, 11).

In *Hermetic literature, the *pleroma* acquired an ambivalence of meaning that reflected the fundamental ambivalence toward the cosmos one finds in gnostic writings. On the one hand, the cosmos, (*ap.* Lact. *Inst.* IV, 6,4) is presented as a second god and defined as πληρέστατος πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, and in the *Corp. Herm.* XII, 15 it "is the fullness of life," πλήρωμα ἐστι τῆς ζωῆς. On the other hand (ibid. VI, 4), ὁ κόσμος πλήρωμα ἐστι τῆς κακίας, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, "the cosmos is the fullness of evil, God, however, is the fullness of good." Again, the *pleroma* is associated with God (ibid., XVI, 3), where it is said that God, the creator of the totality of the universe, is all in one, because the *pleroma* of everything—i.e., the totality and the fullness of the universe—is one and in one.

LTK[2] 8, 560-561; TWNT 6, 283-309; Lampe, 1094-1095; G. Delling, πλήρωμα: GLNT 10, 674-696 [πλήρης, κτλ, TDNT 6, 283-311]; A. Feuillet, *L'Église, plérôme du Christ, d'après Ephés. 1,22*: NRTh 78 (1956) 449-472, 593-610; J. Ernst, *Pleroma und Pleroma Christi. Geschichte und Deutung eines Begriffs der paulinischen Antilegomena*, Regensburg 1970; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica*, Bari 1973; D. J. Good, *Sophia in Valentinianism*: The Second Century 4 (1984) 193-220; C. Scholten, *Martyrium und Sophiamythos im Gnostizismus nach den Texten des N.H.*, Münster 1987; K.L. King, *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism*, Philadelphia 1988; *Pléroma*, ed. E. Romero-Pose - J. Rius-Camps - J. Montserrat-Torrents, Santiago de Compostela 1990; G. Zuntz, Αἰών *in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Vienna 1992; G. Iacopino, *Il Vangelo di Giovanni nei testi gnostici copti*, Rome 1995; G. Filoramo, *Antropologie in conflitto. Il caso di Ireneo e degli gnostici*: Humanitas 1 (1996) 52-67; R.T. Wallis - J. Bregman (eds.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, Albany 1992; G. Filoramo, *Il tema della caduta nello gnosticismo*: Annuario Filosofico 9 (1999) 95-110; G. Casadio, *From Hellenistic* Αἰών *to Gnostic* Αἰῶνες, in *Religion im Wandel der Kosmologien*, ed. D. Zeller, Bern et al. 1999, 175-190, 383-392; *Gnosticism and Later Platonism*, ed. J.D. Turner - R. Majercik, Atlanta 2000; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, Québec-Louvain-Paris 2001; K.L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* Cambridge-London 2003; M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004.

I. Ramelli

PLEROPHORIAE. From the Greek term πληροφορεῖν (to give full assurance). This was the name assigned to the collection of anecdotes attributed to various individuals who lived around the time of the Council of *Chalcedon (451), who, primarily through miraculous events, demonstrated the validity of the anti-Chalcedonian theses. The most famous of these collections, in which many episodes remain nonetheless the same, was redacted by *John of Maiuma, a monk from the monastery of Rufinus (Beit-Rufin) and therefore known as John Rufus, who was also the bishop of Maiuma (Palestine). John's name was therefore commonly used to refer by antonomasia to this work, but it has come down to us in a *Syriac translation from the Greek original. But fragments of analogous works have come down in *Coptic, and works that today bear a different title (e.g., the Life of *Peter the Iberian or the Memories of Dioscorus) should be considered as belonging to the same literary genre.

F. Nau, *Jean Rufus évêque de Maiouma, Plérophories*, PO 8, 1; T. Orlandi, *Un frammento delle Pleroforie in copto*: Studi e Ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano 2 (1979) 3-12; Patrologia V, 565-569.

T. Orlandi

PLINY the Younger (61/62–after 113). Nephew and adopted son of Pliny the Elder, Gaius Pliny Caecilius Secundus was born at Como around AD 61/62. He had a thorough education, first in the province, then at *Rome in the rhetorical schools of Quintilian and Nicetes Sacerdos. The practice of civil and criminal law prepared him for a swift and successful political career, favored by his moderate nature and by his wealth, that allowed him to be a munificent benefactor. He was therefore a judge in 81 and a military tribune in *Syria in 82, then a *quaestor* in 88, a *praetor* in 93, prefect of the military treasury in 95–97, prefect of the Treasury of Saturn from 98 to 100, and consul in 100, augur in 103 and lastly *legatus Augusti* in *Bithynia from 110/111 to 112/113. He died shortly thereafter.

He composed the *Panegyric for *Trajan* (a speech of thanksgiving and a model of courtly elegy for the *optimus princeps*) and the *Epistolary*, a collection of letters in 10 books written precisely for publication: they inform us not only about private and public life, but also on the social and political customs of the time. The style of his letters is formal and vaguely eclectic; reading the letters is pleasurable and interesting. Pliny shows himself to be fundamentally honest and open, a scrupulous official in respecting the laws (he often asked for advice from the emperor on their application).

Pliny sent a famous and important letter to Trajan on the Christians (*Ep.* X, 96) and provided a document of incontestable authenticity and of primary interest for 2nd-c. Christianity in *Asia Minor.

Pliny sought advice from the emperor on the course of action to take with Christians, who were becoming more numerous, and against whom he had received anonymous accusations. The point requiring explanation was the following: should the Christians be persecuted for the specific crimes implicit in the profession of their religion or for the simple name of "Christian," i.e., for the "religious crime" in itself, even in the absence of proven crimes of the common law? In any case, it was evident to him that the practice of Christianity was prohibited and demanded the death penalty. He described the procedure he carried out: he would interrogate them, threaten them if they continued, condemn them to death if they did not recant. He affirmed that there were numerous Christians not only in the cities, but also in the villages and the countryside; he offered details on their liturgical and social life. They gathered "on the day established [almost certainly *Sunday] before the rising of the sun"; they sang "a hymn to Christ as God"; they bound themselves with an oath not to commit crimes and to live honestly (an allusion to the obligations deriving from *baptism). Then they would gather again during the evening "to take part in a meal, but entirely ordinary and innocent" (*agape). Investigating further, Pliny also subjected two *ancillae*, perhaps *deaconesses, to torture but did not learn anything except that the religion was a *superstitio prava immodica*. He was then exasperated by their refusal to offer sacrifice before the image of the emperor and the statues of the gods: in Pliny's eyes this refusal implied a lack of loyalty and therefore a subversive attitude.

From the text, therefore, it appears that Christ was at the center of the worship service, the synaxis was characteristic of the faithful and the obligation for a morally irreprehensible life was foundational. On the other hand, it is also the first document that provides legal arguments for *persecution (a punishment religious in character, a crime of opinion), but at the same time it also had an apologetic value for Christians: the *pagan Pliny recognized that crimes were not necessarily connected to the *nomen christianum* and that the Christians were not "citizens dangerous" to the empire.

In response (*Ep.* X, 97), Trajan praised the flexible line taken by Pliny; he strongly disapproved of anonymous denunciations, but he was ambiguous in his solution: Christians should not be sought out by juridical order, but if accused and convicted as such they must be punished; if they denounce their faith they should be released. *Tertullian would expose the contradiction of "this judgment confused by necessity" (*Apol.* 2,8).

J. Beaujeu: Lustrum 6 (1961) 272-303; B.V. Cova: BStudLat 4 (1974) 274-291; E. Aubrion, *La Correspondence de Pline le Jeune. Problèmes et orientations actuelles de la recherche*, in ANRW II, 33, 1, Berlin-New York 1989, 304-374.

Editions: A.M. Guillemin - M. Durry, Paris 1947–1955; M. Schuster - R. Hanslik, Leipzig 1958; R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1963; H. Kasten, Munich 1968, [5]1984 (with German tr.); B. Radice, 2 Bände, London-Cambridge, MA 1969 (with Eng. tr.); F. Trisoglio, 2 vols. Turin 1973 (with It. tr.); W. Williams, *Pliny, Correspondence with Trajan from Bithynia* (*Epistles X*) (Classical Texts), Warminster 1990 (with commentary).

Studies (concerning the problems with the Christians): J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme dans l'empire romain*, Paris 1956; L. Rusca, *Saggio sulle persecuzioni, Plinio il Giovane, Carteggio con Traiano*, Milan 1963; R. Scarcia (ed.), *Plinio il Giovane, Lettere scelte*, Rome 1967 (extensive bibl., 29-35); A. Hamman, *Chrétien et christianisme vus et jugés par Suétone, Tacite e Pline le Jeune*, in Forma futuri, Turin 1975, 91-109; P.V. Cova, *Plinio il Giovane e il problema delle persecuzioni*: BStudLat 5 (1975) 293-314; P. Carrara, *I pagani di fronte al Cristianesimo*, Florence 1984, 49-61; BBKL 7 (1994) 745-749 (bibl.); M. Testard, "*. . . Carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere . . .*": REL 72 (1994) 138-158; J. Siat, *La persécution des chrétiens au début du II^e s. d'après la lettre de Pline le Jeune et la réponse de Trajan en 112*: Les Études Classiques 63 (1995) 161-170, A. Mitescu, *La liturgia orale dei cristiani sotto Traiano secondo l'interrogatorio di Plinio il Giovane*: Ricerche Teologiche 11 (2000) 9-53; A.A. Nascimento, "*Nomen Ipsum." Os primeiros cristãos face ao poder ou a coragem de uma identidade incómoda*: Igreja e Missão 54 (2001) 139-191; A. Reichert, *Durchdachte Konfusion. Plinius, Trajan und das Christentum*: ZNTW 93 (2002) 227-250.

M. Maritano

PLOTINUS (ca. 204–270). His biographical information has come down to us from *Porphyry, who composed his *Life of Plotinus* between 301 and 305. It provides the only primary source (as R. Schwyzer noted [PWK 21/1, 476]; *Firmicus Maternus, *Eunapius, the *Lexicon Suidae* and ps.-Eudoxia cannot be considered sources independent from Porphyry; the only piece of information that does not appear in Porphyry's work and that is instead supplied by Eunapius is the identification of Lykon as his city of birth (either Lycopolis in Upper *Egypt or Lykon on the Nile Delta).

Born during the 13th year of the reign of *Septimius Severus, namely 204–205 (the date calculated by Porphyry [*Vita Plot.* 2, vol. I, p. 2,34-3,37 Bréhier] on the basis of the information provided by the doctor Eustochius, acc. to which Plotinus was 66 years old at the age of his death, which occurred in the second year of the reign of Claudius II [see *Vita Plot.* 2, p. 2,29-31]). At 28 years old, therefore in 232–233, in *Alexandria he heard various teachers of philosophy. He remained profoundly disillusioned by these teachers until he met *Ammonius Saccas, who was

for him a revelation and at whose side he remained for 11 years. At the beginning of 243—Ammonius in all likelihood had died shortly before—desirous of knowing more about the Persian religion, Plotinus joined the emperor Gordian III's military expedition against *Persia. In the first months of 244, following the failure of the campaign and the death of the emperor, he went to *Antioch; that same year he reached Rome, where he settled definitively and began his teaching activity. For 10 years, following the example of Ammonius, he restricted himself to oral teaching; only during the first year of the reign of Gallienus (253) did he begin to write a certain treatise. When during the summer of 263—during the ten-year anniversary of the reign of Gallienus—*Porphyry came to Rome and met him, he had already written 21 treatises. Between 263 and 268, during the period in which Porphyry remained near him before leaving Rome, he wrote another 24. The last five treatises were composed during the first year of the reign of *Claudius II (268–269). Likewise in 269, after a stay in Rome that lasted 26 years and by then beset by a persistent illness that worsened, Plotinus retired to Campania near Manturnus under the care of his friend Zeto, where he died in 270 at the age of 66. His project of establishing a Platonopolis, the ideal city governed acc. to the model established by Plato in the *Laws*, was originally approved by the emperor *Gallienus, but then left by the wayside and never implemented.

For his teachings, *see* *eon, *apatheia, *cosmos, *nous and esp. *Neoplatonism; for his influence on the Greek and Latin Fathers, *see* *Platonism and the Fathers and *Neoplatonism.

H. Oppermann, *Plotinos' Leben*, Heidelberg 1929; H.R. Schwyzer, PWK 21/1, 472-477; BBKL 7, 753-756; *Porphyre, La vie de Plotin*, par L. Brisson . . . [et al.], 2 vols. Paris 1982–1992; O. Montevecchi, *Ritorniamo a Licopoli e a Plotino*: Aegyptus 80 (2000) 139-143 (on his homeland).

S. Lilla

PNEUMA - SPIRIT (πνεῦμα)

I. Greek meanings - II. Old Testament Hebrew and Greek meanings - III. Postbiblical Jewish meanings - IV. New Testament meanings - V. Patristic and gnostic meanings.

I. Greek meanings. In Greek, πνεῦμα is found in place of the Homeric term πνο(ι)ή beginning with Aeschylus and Herodotus. Originally, it meant "breath," "wind," "blowing," therefore "vital breath" (πνεῦμα βίου —Aesch., *Pers.* 507) and "living being," and lastly "spirit" and "inspiration": in this sense he speaks of the pneuma of love, folly, the poetic and prophetic πνεῦμα, often indicated as "divine" (πνεῦμα θεῖον, θεῶν, θεοῦ). In poetry, already in the writings of Hesiod, *Theo.* 31-32, using the corresponding verb, he proclaimed: ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν θείην, "they inspired me with a divine song"; in the context of manticism, for example, Piatia was inspired by a πνεῦμα ἐνθουσιαστικόν (Plut., *Def. or.* 50). In medical theory, the pneuma was understood both as air and as a life-giving fluid of natural material such as respiration or blood circulation (e.g., V. Langholf, *L'air (pneuma) et les maladies*, in *La maladie et les maladies dans la Collection hippocratique*, ed. P. Potter - G. Maloney - J. Desautels, Québec 1990, 339-359). Generally, it was understood as the link to the living body, but such that it separated from it upon death: for Aristotle, esp., pneuma is a fundamental concept, and his characterization of it was developed in particular by *Chrysippus (P. Hager, *Chrysippus' Theory of Pneuma*: Prudentia 14 [1982] 97-108; N. Aujoulat, *De la phantasia et du pneuma stoïciens, d'après Sextus Empiricus, au corps lumineux néo-platonicien*: Pallas 34 [1988] 123-146, who in *SVF* II 1009 defines the substance of God as πνεῦμα νεορὸν καὶ πυρῶδες, and in II 1027 as πνεῦμα that pervades the entire cosmos). This is in fact identified with the soul of the cosmos, a fiery and ethereal breath, material but very thin and fine, which, endowed with its own motion, pervades the cosmos, and the τόνος (i.e., the cohesive tension) maintains it. This energy is to be identified chiefly with divinity itself, Zeus, a symbol of the ethereal fire, very thin and pure acc. to the theological-allegorical system of the Stoics (see my *Allegoria*, I, *L'età classica*, in collaboration with G. Lucchetta, Milan 2004; ch. 2 provides documentation). This hot and fiery breath (ἔνθερμον καὶ διάπυρον, *SVF* II, 897) is also present in human beings, whom it pervades, bestowing on them not only vital functions but also psychic and spiritual; it is rendered in Latin with the term *spiritus* (e.g., in Seneca, *Ep.* 66,12), the divine part present in human beings.

In Neostoicism, until the time of Epictetus and *Marcus Aurelius, the materialistic understanding of *pneuma* developed and acquired *Platonic overtones; with respect to Seneca in particular and his understanding of *pneuma*, see T.G. Rosenmeyer, *Seneca and Nature*: Arethusa 33 (2000) 99-119; with respect to *Neoplatonism, I will restrict myself to recommending M. Morford's synthesis, *The Roman Philosophers: From the Time of Cato the Censor to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*, London-New York 2002, 161-239. Although the *Stoics tended to join πνεῦμα to νοῦς, and to ἡγεμονικόν, in the writings of Marcus Aurelius, πνεῦμα, used in the diminutive form

(πνευμάτικον), is distinguished from νοῦς, which is divine and inferior to it (12, 3. 26). *Pneuma* is also an important element in *Neoplatonic thought, as M. Di Pasquale Barbanti brought to light (*Ochema-pneuma e phantasia nel neoplatonismo*, Catania 1998), although in the writings of *Plotinus, *pneuma* was seen negatively. The doctrine of the ethereal and luminous *pneuma* is of great significance in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, a *pneuma* which enwraps the world and the human soul, of which it is a vehicle, inasmuch as it is a bridge between the *body and *soul. Even if in *Hellenism it was not conceived as entirely immaterial, this would take place in Christianity, where *pneuma* in the highest sense would become the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the *Holy Spirit of charity, and where God himself, who is entirely immaterial, is defined as πνεῦμα (Jn 4:24).

II. Old Testament Hebrew and Greek meanings. In the OT, the concept of πνεῦμα is expressed primarily by the term *rûaḥ*, which means "breath," "wind," often sent by God, or "vanity"; in the human being, *rûaḥ* is the living spirit and life itself, such as *nefeš*; it is the seat of perception, affect, intelligence and the will. *Rûaḥ* is often connected to God: He produces it, or is the *rûaḥ* of God, the operating force of God that creates (the *rûaḥ* that broods over the primordial waters in Gen 1:2), or inspires the leaders and prophets with visions and descends on the elect of God such as *David (1 Sam 16:13). It is that with which God executes judgment, and it is also God's innermost essence, the *rûaḥ qodšô*, spirit of holiness or Holy Spirit.

In the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible known as the LXX, from which the term passed into the lexicon of the *Fathers, πνεῦμα usually translates the term *rûaḥ* and acquires the meanings of "wind," "air," "vital breath," which comes from God and creates and sustains the world, the life-giving "spirit," which at the end of time will bring about the resurrection (Ezek 37:6, 14). The πνεῦμα in human beings is the seat of all the *soul's functions. In the *Wisdom of Solomon*, the πνεῦμα is both the vital principle of human beings and is to be identified with Σοφία itself. If understood as an immaterial and invisible power, the πνεῦμα represents the spiritual nature of God (Ps 139:7) that existed before the beginning of creation (Gen 1:2) in which God blows into *adam*, made of dust, to render him a living being in Gen 2:7 (P.H. Poirier, *Pour une histoire de la lecture pneumatologique de Gn 2,7*: REAug 40 [1994] 1-22). It inspires the prophets (Num 11:25-29) and, inasmuch as it is the spirit of wisdom, also endows with special artistic abilities (Ex 28:3; 31:3). It is therefore not surprising that πνεῦμα was found frequently in prophetic language, where it appears closely connected to the divine Logos (Dan 5:11; Wis 7:12). This conception, in ancient Christianity, undoubtedly influenced Logos-*Christology, e.g., in the writings of *Justin Martyr and *Clement of Alexandria. In Is 11:2, the divine πνεῦμα is attributed to the Messiah and is also promised to all the righteous.

The Old Testament's use of the term πνεῦμα in the plural (πνεύματα) is more ambiguous, which, as one sees, e.g., from Num 5:14; Hos 4:12; 5:4; Zech 13:2, can refer to both good and bad spirits, *angels or *demons. The first were often seen as people's guardians, paracletes or intercessors, who carried the prayers of the righteous to God, acc. to an understanding that had remained in a prayer from the Roman Canon: *Supplices te rogamus: iube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectum divinae maiestatis tuae*. The angels, moreover, perform a permanent *liturgy, acc. to a Jewish idea that then transferred into Christianity.

III. Postbiblical Jewish meanings. In the writings of *Philo of Alexandria, πνεῦμα referred both, on the physical level, to the higher and more pure part of the air (*Ebr.* 106), the wind, or the human or animal breath (*Spec. leg.* I, 338), and to that which confers structure and compactness to wood, stones and other substances, which it completely permeates, providing a more natural bond (συμφυέστατος δεσμός; *Rer. div. her.* 242): acc. to this decisively Stoic conception, the πνεῦμα depends on the νοῦς, which is the soul's ἡγεμονικόν (*Fug.* 182). Philo also recovered the Stoic idea of the soul as the πνεῦμα ἔνθερμον, which is the stamp and mark of divine power (τύπον τινὰ καὶ χαρακτῆρα θείας δυνάμεως; *Det. pot. ins.* 83). This πνεῦμα is analogous to that of God the Creator, inasmuch as, being λογικὸν πνεῦμα, rational, it generates thoughts. In the *Op. mund.* 135, Philo also spoke of a πνεῦμα θεῖον, a divine spirit that is breathed within humanity and is added to the earthly nature and, in *Gig.* 27, is "wise, undefinable, undivided and excellent, that fills all things with itself," and in *Plant.* 24 it is an omnipotent force. Philo himself, inasmuch as he was an exegete of allegory, believed himself to be inspired by the divine πνεῦμα (*Somn.* II, 252), which had already inspired *Moses (*Vit. Mos.*, passim). The most excellent expression of divine pneumatic inspiration was that experienced by the prophets (see B. Besnier, *Migration et telos d'après le "De migratione Abrahami"*: StudPhilon 11 [1999] 74-103). Even Flavius Josephus's linguistic use is similar to that of the LXX

and Philo; πνεῦμα often indicates a part of human beings or a demonic spirit, and the expression πνεῦμα θεῖον was also used many times.

In Palestinian Judaism, then, one finds the OT meanings of *rûaḥ* reused and developed: wind, spirits (in the plural), that is angels or demons, or the dead who dwell in the tombs; likewise, the vital force present in the human being, the seat of psychic functions, Spirit of life (*rûaḥ ḥayyîm*) placed by God in the person, whose body is of an earthly origin, while the soul is celestial and pure (*Ber. b.* 60b.) and the person must return it to God pure (*Sheb. b.* 152B). From the eschatological point of view, in the *Book of Jubilees* we find the survival of the spirit without the resurrection of the body; in the Ethiopic version of *Enoch* it is theorized as both the survival of the soul immediately after death and the *resurrection of the body at the final judgment (see also *4 Esdras* and *Baruch syr.*)

With respect to the *pneuma* of God, among the rabbis there is found the common and almost formulaic syntagma *rûaḥ haqqōdeš*, "Spirit of holiness," therefore "Holy Spirit," which is above all the Spirit of prophecy (*rûaḥ nebû'â*), through which divine revelation passes, but can also be a spirit of power (*rûaḥ gebûrâ*), with which God clothes the elect, and a spirit of righteousness that has inspired all the righteous and godly people of the OT. In the end, on the basis of Is 11:2, the Messiah will be the one to possess the Spirit of God, and the redeemed righteous will receive such a spirit, and all the Israelites will be prophets (in rabbinic literature there is no one answer to the question of whether the Spirit of God withdrew from Israel after the last of the biblical prophets). During the time of Jesus, the members of the *Qumran sect of the New Covenant believed themselves to be in possession of the Holy Spirit, whose *Rule of the Community* (1QS) is characterized by the presence of two spirits, namely, that of light and that of darkness, who struggle for dominion over humanity, but were created by God. "Spirit" in the texts from Qumran also refers to the spirit of the human being.

IV. New Testament meanings. The use of the term in the NT and the patristic period is set against this conceptual background. In the NT, πνεῦμα in the plural indicates different spirits, although in the singular it generally refers to the *Holy Spirit, who in the trinitarian theology of the Fathers became the third person of the *Trinity. In *Mark and *Matthew, the term πνεῦμα refers both to the demonic and the human spirit, as well as the Spirit as the power of God. In Mark, the term appears in 23 passages, 14 of which contain the expression πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, which is the equivalent of "demon." In Mk 2:8, e.g., πνεῦμα instead refers to the seat of the human perceptions and affective reactions, and in Mt 27:50 it designates the life force. The famous passage from Mk 14:38 is important, in which πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, "willing spirit," is set against the flesh inasmuch as it is "weak" (σὰρξ ἀσθενής). In the pronouncement of blessing of Mt 5:3 it is the human spirit to which the dative of relation refers in the expression πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, referring to "the poor in spirit."

In Mk 3:28-30 the Spirit of God is the one against whom one can blaspheme, a practice which is there condemned; the Spirit is also described as a universal gift in Mk 1:8, while in 1:9ff., it is said to have been the gift given to Jesus in his *baptism: that this pertains to the Holy Spirit becomes clear from the command to baptize in Mt 28:19, where the Spirit appears alongside the other two persons in the formula "in the *name of . . .". The Holy Spirit in Mt 1:18-20 also has a special role in the virginal conception of Jesus. In the gospel of *Luke, πνεῦμα refers to the Spirit of God three times more than in Mark: analogously in the first 12 chapters of Acts, another work written by Luke, πνεῦμα is used in this sense 37 times. And, in relation to Mark, Luke seems to want to eliminate every impression of Jesus' submission to the Spirit, as one can see from the comparison between Mk 1:12 and Lk 4:1. According to Lk 12:10, the πνεῦμα, blasphemy against whom one does not find forgiveness, is the πνεῦμα of God that is manifested in the inspired words of the witnesses to Jesus. In Luke 11:13 the πνεῦμα ἅγιον is promised to those who ask for it from God, while in Mt 7:11 the objects of the promise are simply some "good things." Likewise in Luke, one also finds some occurrences of the term πνεῦμα with an anthropological meaning, e.g., in Lk 1:47 and 80, referring to that part of humanity that survives death: Lk 8:55.

In *John πνεῦμα is used precisely for the definition for God: πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (4:24). Moreover σάρξ is opposed to πνεῦμα (3:6; 6:63), and only the spirit grants life (6:63 = 2 Cor 3:6); the flesh profits nothing. The Spirit is the water of life for those who believe (7:38-39), it is bestowed on the Eleven, who also represent all believers (20:22), and is identified with the *Paraclete who was called the πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (14:17; 15:26; 16:13), which shares many characteristics with Jesus Christ: both were sent from the *Father (14:24-26) and proceed from him (16:27-15:26), they teach (7:14; 14:26), they bear witness (8:14; 15:26), they convict the world of *sin (3:18-20; 16:8-11) and do not speak of themselves (14:10; 16:13). On the idea of πνεῦμα in the gospel of *John, see C.K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel*: JTS 1 (1950) 1-15; F. Porsch, *Pneuma und*

Wort. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums, Frankfurt 1974.

In St. Paul, 1 Th 5:23, the πνεῦμα is depicted as the constituent part alongside the ψυχή and the σῶμα; in 1 Tim 3:16, we find a strict opposition between πνεῦμα and σάρξ, that returns in Gal 4:23, 29, where the one who is begotten acc. to the flesh is compared to the one who is begotten acc. to the πνεῦμα. In Rom 8:13, by virtue of the πνεῦμα, believers put to death the deeds of the σῶμα, and in Rom 1:3-4, where Jesus is called the Son of *David "according to the flesh," he is Son of God from the spiritual point of view (on the flesh/spirit polarity in St. Paul's epistles, see J. Frey, *Die paulinische Antithese von Fleisch und Geist und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition*: ZNTW 90 [1999] 45-77). In 2 Cor 3:17, πνεῦμα and Κύριος are identified as the same entity. In effect, in 1 Cor 15:45, Paul announces the identity between the risen Christ and the ζωοποιοῦν πνεῦμα. Paul connects the future resurrection of believers to the resurrection of Jesus, thanks to the πνεῦμα (Rom 8:11). For this reason, the πνεῦμα is the first fruits, ἀπαρχή, of the redemption of the body (Rom 8:23), and the promise of the new dwelling that awaits us (2 Cor 5:5; 1:22).

The πνεῦμα is also a force that manifests itself in extraordinary ways in 1 Th 5:19; in 1 Cor 14:14-16 it confers the ability to speak in tongues; in Rom 15:19, the "power of the πνεῦμα" is placed parallel with that of the "signs and wonders," and in Gal 3:5 with the "wonders" (δυνάμεις). In 1 Cor 2:6ff., the πνεῦμα is a power that grants the highest understanding, σοφία enshrouded in mystery, which in 1:23-24 is to be identified in turn with Christ crucified. The πνεῦμα is therefore the "spirit of faith" in 2 Cor 4:13, and possesses its equivalent obligation of "walking in faith" (2 Cor 5:5, 7). In fact, this allows one to know Jesus as Lord, leading one to profess this faith (1 Cor 12:3), closely connected to the πνεῦμα also in Gal 3:14. According to Rom 8:15, 25-26 and Gal 4:6, the specific duty of the πνεῦμα is prayer, and the first of its gifts, acc. to Gal 5:22, is love (ἀγάπη) that embraces in itself all the others (on πνεῦμα in Gal, see P.-G. Klumbies, *Zwischen Pneuma und Nomos. Neuorientierung in den galatischen Gemeinden*: WD 19 [1987] 109-135). In Rom 8, the indwelling of the πνεῦμα in the believer and of the believer in the πνεῦμα seems to be parallel to the indwelling of Christ and being in Christ. (For this inhabitation of the Spirit within the believer, see H.D. Wendland, *Das Wirken des Hl. Geistes in den Gläubigen nach Paulus*: ThLZ 77 [1952] 457-470, and for the action of the Spirit in the believer, see G. Haufe, *Das Geistmotiv in der paulinischen Ethik*: ZNTW 85 [1994] 183-191; on the relation between πνεῦμα and Christ in Paul's epistles, see *Paulinische Christologie*, ed. U. Schnelle - T. Söding - M. Labah, Göttingen 2000.)

In Ephesians, πνεῦμα is the power of revelation (1:17; 3:15), that which builds the community (3:16), and the power of prayer (6:18). In the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, πνεῦμα appears rarely; in Hebrews the πνεύματα are the dead, or the angels; in 10:29, πνεῦμα is the Spirit of grace. In Rev 16:13-14 and 18:2, we find πνεύματα in the sense of demons and spirits and πνεῦμα in the sense of a vital force given by God or also by a demon (11:11; 13:15). The seven spirits are the archangels, situated between God and Christ, from whom proceeds *grace and *peace, sent on earth as messengers of God and Christ (1:4; 4:5), and they correspond to the seven churches. In effect, the two designations for spirits and angels alternate frequently, not only in the book of Revelation (e.g., 27:3; 21:10), but also in other early Christian texts such as the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (*Mand.* 11:9). Likewise, in certain Jewish apocryphal texts one finds angelic figures with almost divine-like dignity such as in *4 Esdr* 5:43, or on a par with the Messiah such as in the Ethiopic version of *Enoch* 39:5-7. Moreover, in the book of Revelation, the πνεῦμα is that which inspires prophecy (19:10) and grants extraordinary visions (17:3; 21:10). The most theologically relevant point is that such a πνεῦμα is the glorious Christ (2:1; 7:8, etc.).

V. Patristic and gnostic meanings. Following the foundational NT meanings, the Fathers used πνεῦμα in the singular form, generally only for the Holy Spirit, although in the plural they used it to refer to the angels, souls, wind, virtue, sins and demons, as one sees, e.g., in the writings of *Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 16,13).

Among the Apostolic Fathers, in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, we find a "spirit of truth" or an "angel of righteousness," which is identified with the Spirit of God, opposed by the "angel of wickedness," which enters into many spirits: both fight for control over humanity. This use finds a parallel in the **Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which, acc. to some, originated in Jewish Christianity and presents affinities to texts from *Qumran: there appear two spirits or angels, one good, identified with the Holy Spirit of God, and one wicked, named also in the plural, between which humans must choose due to their "spirit of intellectual acumen." In *Past. vis.* 1,1,3 and 2,1,1, the πνεῦμα is characterized by extraordinary physical phenomena. Moreover, in *Past. sim.* 9,1,1, as in *2 Clem.* 9,15 and 14,2, it expresses the idea that the Christ is constituted of a spiritual substance from the moment of his preexistence. For *Ignatius of Antioch, Christ's resurrection makes possible the resurrection of the believer because of the union, in

Christ, of the substance of the πνεῦμα and the flesh (*Eph.* 7,2; *Magn.* 1,2; *Smyrn.* 3,2-3; 12,2). At the ecclesial level, the Spirit immediately became the requirement and, at the same time, the gift with which a minister is clothed, as the following Fathers seems to suggest: Ignatius (*Phld.* 7,1-2; *Magn.* 13,1), *Clement of Rome, *Ep.* 41ff., and St. *Irenaeus, who in *Haer.* IV, 26,2 attributes the specific charism of truth to the members of the episcopal succession.

In the anthropological context, *pneuma* no longer designated only breath or circulation, as it did in medicine, but soon also the νοῦς in the human, the intellect, the rational and spiritual element, e.g., in *Ignatius of Antioch's epistles, *Ep. Polyc.* 5,1 (see T. Rüsch, *Die Entstehung der Lehre vom Hl. Geist bei Ignatius, Theophilus und Irenäus*, Zürich 1952; R.G. Tanner, *Pneuma in Saint Ignatius*, Berlin 1975), or in *Justin Martyr's, *Dial.* 135,6. This intellect-Spirit is clearly distinct from the soul, the principle of lower animal life, as one can see, e.g., in *Tatian's *Or.* 12. At the foundation of this understanding is the tripartite Pauline and Late Antique division of human nature into body, soul and spirit (M.C. Simon, *Entstehung und Inhalt der spätantiken trichotomischen Anthropologie*: Kairos 23 [1981] 43-50; I. Ramelli, *Tricotomia*, in *Encicl. Filosofica*, Milan 2006, 11772-11776). Or rather, the *pneuma* was understood as a spiritual being superior to the soul of the world, e.g., in the writings of Tatian (*Or.* 4), *Athenagoras (*Leg.* 22,3) or *Theophilus (*Ad Autol.* 2,4ff.) (see P. Nautin, *Ciel, pneuma et lumière chez Théophile d'Antioche [Notes critiques sur Ad Autol. 2,13]*: VChr 27 [1973] 165-171).

The term πνεῦμα in the writings of the Fathers can also refer to the inspiration of human moral and intellectual disposition, as occurs in the writings of *Origen (*In Io.* X, 39), or the spirit of a certain person, as in *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 49,7), or also a supernatural power of the Christian soul that, inasmuch as it is saved, is capable of resisting idols, as one finds in the ps.-Clementine *Homilies* (9,15). Elsewhere, as in *Basil of Caesarea's *De Sp. sancto* 38, πνεῦμα refers to the immaterial substance of the angels (on pneumatology in Basil's writings, see J. Verhees, *Die Bedeutung der Transzendenz des Pneuma bei Basilius*: OS 25 [1976] 285-302; Id., *Pneuma, Erfahrung und Erleuchtung in der Theologie des Basilius des Grossen*, ibid. 43-59; Id., *Mitteilbarkeit Gottes in der Dynamik von Sein und Wirken nach der Trinitätstheologie des Basilius des Grossen*: OS 27 [1978] 3-24). Or πνεῦμα refers to God's nature, as in Athenagoras (*Legatio* 16,8), or even to the Logos, which is the preexistent Son of God, e.g., in Origen's *Dial. Her.* SC 67, p. 60, and therefore to God himself, who is πνεῦμα (see J. Boada, *El pneuma en Orígenes*: Estudios Eclesiásticos 46 [1971] 475-510; C. Blanc, *Dieu est pneuma. Le sens de cette expression d'après Origène*: SP 16, Berlin 1985, 224-241; and H. Saake, *Der Tractatus pneumatico-philosophicus des Origenes in* Περὶ ἀρχῶν *I,3*: Hermes 101 [1973] 91-114). In *Irenaeus (*Haer.* V, 1,2 and *Epid.* 42), it refers to the Spirit of God as a force that resurrects the body and the soul, acc. to an understanding also present in the *Martyrium Polycarpi* (4,2); this spirit makes the human being perfect when it is joined to the body and the soul (Iren., *Haer.* V, 6,1). One finds a similar idea presented in the writings of other Christian authors such as Clement (*Strom.* V, 87,4-88,4) and Tatian (*Or. Graec.* 15,2). *Gregory of Nyssa also devotes his attention to discussing the πνεῦμα in its various ἐνέργειαι (J.J. Verhees, *Die energeiai des Pneuma als Beweis für seine Transzendenz in der Argumentation des Gregor von Nyssa*: OCP 45 [1979] 5-31). In Crete patristic reflection on the soul, ψυχή acquired feminine connotations, while in Syriac Christian theology the feminine gender of "Spirit" (*rûaḥ*) also established the association of feminine images with the Spirit.

According to the *gnostics, God has a spiritual nature, as defined in the statements of Heracleon (frag. 24, *ap.* Orig. *Comm. in Ioh.* 13,25) and in a manner conforming to what one also finds in the *Corp. Herm.* (XVIII, 3). The spiritual substance of the divine nature is generally distinguished from the earthly ψυχή (Iren., *Haer.* I, 21,4; *Philosoph.* V, 26,8.25; VI, 34,1; VII, 27,6); it is like a foreigner in relation to matter and must strive to free itself (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 26,3-4; Heracl. fr. 23 *ap.* Orig. *Comm. in Ioh.* 13,20; *Philosoph.* V, 10,2). The *pneuma* has the same nature of God and Christ (e.g., Heracl. frag. 24 *ap.* Orig. *Comm. in Ioh.* 13,24; *Od. Salom.* 26.6ff.). In Irenaeus (*Haer.* I, 18,2) πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος was identified by the gnostics with Philo's first human being, the one created in the image of God, of both genders, in Gen 1:27, and distinct from that material human of Gen 2:7 (*Opif.* 46,134; *Leg. all.* I, 12,31), acc. to a dichotomy that is also found in Origen's writings (see M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004, 111-122). For *Valentinus, in particular, the sowing of a superior nature (σπέρμα τῆς ἄνωθεν οὐσίας), which is spiritual (πνευματικόν), is mixed by the Redeemer with the ψυχή, unbeknownst to the demiurge (see, e.g., Iren., *Haer.* I, 4,5; 5,6; II, 19,1-3; Clem. Alex., *Exc. ex Theod.* 2; 53,2-5). Such a sowing, however, is killed as a result of the existence of the material world; this is why only the second eon survives, i.e., the angel, its spiritual counterpart, which is to be identified with Christ, who enters the individual (*Exc. ex Theod.* 22,2

and 36,1ff.; Heracl. frag. 35 *ap.* Orig. *Comm. in Ioh.* 13,49). These angels are defined as πνεύματα νεόρα (intellectual spirits) (e.g., *Exc. ex Theod.* 42,2). From this perspective, redemption is the reunification of all the particles of the πνεῦμα, which is only accomplished when the Redeemer, who is also a pneumatic (Iren., *Haer.* I, 26,1; Epiph., *Haer.* 30,34), comes down to matter, collects the remaining pneumatics dispersed in it and ascends with these through all the spheres in the **pleroma* (e.g., *Exc. ex Theod.* 42,2). At the end, he restores his somatic and psychic part to chaos, and the pneumatic part to God (*Philosoph.* V, 26,31-32; VII, 27,10-12); but the πνεῦμα that Jesus gives to the Father ends up being identified with the entire number of the elect (*Exc. ex Theod.* 64), which become pure πνεύματα like the Redeemer, as one gathers from Iren., *Haer.* I, 7,1 and *Exc. ex Theod.* 64, and reenter that pneumatic body which is the mystical body of Christ (*Act. Io.* 100).

One should also recall that, from the anthropological point of view, in the tripartate division of σῶμα, ψυχή and πνεῦμα, the πνεῦμα in gnostic texts is often replaced by νοῦς, as occurs in the *Corpus Hermiticum*, where the concept of νοῦς is interchangeable with that of πνευματικὸς λόγος. Nevertheless, there also exists for the gnostics a πνεῦμα σαρκικόν inferior to the rational part, λογιστικὸν καὶ ἡγεμονικόν (see Clem., *Strom.* VI, 135,3-5). Moreover, in the Ethiopian *Enoch* 16,1, we find the expression "soul of flesh." This πνεῦμα, at least in certain gnostic sects such as the *Ophites and the *Sethians, seems to refer to a type of intermediary kingdom between the light and the darkness (*Philosoph.* V, 19,4), to which, acc. to the Ophites, the bodies of the risen belong (Iren., *Haer.* I, 30,13).

The gnostics usually subdivided human beings into the following categories: *hylics* (ὑλικοί, in which matter prevailed), **psychics* (ψυχικοι, in which the vital soul, inferior to the spirit dominated) and *pneumatics* (πνευματικοί), who belonged to the Spirit and whose true homeland is the divine πλήρωμα (see, e.g., G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed. Studies in Gnostic Mythology*, Leiden 1984; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Creazione e antropologia nello Gnosticismo*: Dizionario di Spiritualità Biblico-Patristico 11, 2, Rome 1995, 61-81). This terminology in part goes back to St. Paul himself, who in 1 Cor 2:13-15 distinguished the πνευματικός who, due to the Spirit, recognizes God's action, and the ψυχικός, who does not recognize it. In addition, 1 Cor 15:44-46 directly attests to the distinction between σῶμα πνευματικόν and the σῶμα ψυχικόν (see B. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, Missoula, MT 1976). The so-called Valentinian sacrament of the nuptial room symbolizes the union of the "pneumatic" human being with its own angel and the restoration of the original unity; in a similar sense, one can speak of a spiritual wedding (see A. Orbe, *Los Valentinianos y el matrimonio espiritual*: Gregorianum 58 [1977] 5-53).

Spiritual human beings are variously defined by the Ophites and Sethians as the "Sons of the Light" or the "race that does not falter," by *Basilides as "the Third Filiation," and by Valentinus as the "church of the spiritual." The light, opposed to the darkness, which is connected to matter, is in effect tied to the pneumatics, and its symbology is particularly important in gnosticism and is obviously tied to the illumination of the conscience. G. Filoramo's study in particular showed this: *Luce e gnosi. Saggio sull'illuminazione nello Gnosticismo*, Rome 1980; *Pneuma e luce in alcuni testi gnostici*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 595-613; *Pneuma e conoscenza in alcuni testi gnostici*, in *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique*, ed. J. Ries, Y. Janssens and J.M. Sevrin, Louvain 1982, 236-244. One should keep in mind the fact that already Clement of Alexandria, in his teaching on the true γνῶσις, connected the πνεῦμα to illumination, φωτισμός, which not by chance also refers to Christian *baptism in its sacramental meaning (G. Filoramo, *Pneuma e photismos in Clemente Alessandrino*: Augustinianum 21 [1981] 329-337). The ontological dualism between the material and spiritual world is a frequent characteristic in the writings of the gnostics, who tended to distinguish the two chief creators, one for the material world, often identified with the God of the OT, and another for that of the spiritual, considered to be the true God, unknowable and ineffable, acc. to the principles of apophatic theology. Similarly, the creation of human beings, acc. to the gnostics, though often derived from the biblical account, nevertheless, distinguished between the formation of the material part, worked by the demiurge in its own image, and the breathing in of the pneumatic principle that likened *Adam to God and had a salvific function.

The πνεῦμα also appeared in other gnostic currents of thought, such as that of the Sethians, who, acc. to the account of the *Philosoph.* VI, 19,2, rather than considering evil a result of the progressive fragmentation and extenuation of the divine world, originally postulated a principle of good and a principle of evil that was accompanied by an intermediary divine principle, Πνεῦμα or the Λόγος. This principle was used in the creation of the world, ac-

complishing a mixing between the two principles. The world's salvation, however, was attributable to the pneumatic principle alone. In gnostic literature, one often finds the plural form πνεύματα in reference to the dualism of the world of spirits.

F. Mussner, LTK² 8, 568-576; H. Kleinknecht - F. Baumgärtel - W. Bieder - E. Sjöberg - E. Schweizer, πνεῦμα: GLNT 10, 767-1099 [TDNT 6, 332-455]; S. Mowinckel, *Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums vom Hl. Geist*: ZNTW 32 (1933) 97-130; P. van Imschoot, *L'action de l'esprit de Jahwé dans l'A.T.*: RSPh 23 (1934) 553-587; Id., *L'esprit de Jahvé, source de vie, dans l'A.T.*: RB 44 (1935) 481-501; Id., *L'esprit de Jahvé et l'alliance nouvelle dans l'A.T.*: EThL 22 (1936) 201-226; F.B. Allo, *Sagesse et Pneuma dans la première épître aux Corinthiens*: RBi 43 (1934) 321-346; J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, Bonn 1941; M. Goguel, *Pneumatisme et eschatologie dans le Christianisme primitif*: RHR 132 (1946) 124-169; 133 (1947–48) 103-161; E. Schweizer, *The Spirit of Power*: Interpretation 6 (1952) 259-278; A. Recheis, *Engel, Tod und Seelenreise. Das Wirken der Geister beim Heimgang des Menschen in der Lehre der alexandrinischen und kappadokischen Väter*, Rome 1958; H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, Göttingen 1956; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, Göttingen 1960, part. 127ff.; H. Opitz, *Der heilige Geist nach den Auffassungen der römischen Gemeinde bis ca. 150*, Berlin 1960; O. Benz, *Der Paraklet*, Leiden-Köln 1963; A. Miklósházy, *East-Syrian Eucharistic Pneumatology*, Rome 1968; G. Dautzenberg, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der* διάκρισις πνευμάτων (*1 Kor 12, 10*): ByZ 15 (1971) 93-104; M. Putscher, *Pneuma, Spiritus, Geist. Vorstellungen vom Lebensantrieb in ihren geschichtlichen Wandlungen*, Wiesbaden 1973; H. Saake, *Pneuma*: RE Suppl. 14 (1974) 387-412; C.K. Barett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, London 1975; H.J. Jaschke, *Der Heilige Geist im Bekenntnis der Kirche*, Münster 1976; *Aristotle on Mind and the Senses. Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium Aristotelicum*, ed. G.E.R. Lloyd - G.E.L. Owen, Cambridge 1978; J.P. Martín, *Il rapporto tra Pneuma ed Ecclesia nella letteratura dei primi secoli cristiani*: Augustinianum 20 (1980) 471-483; *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II, *Sethian Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, Leiden 1981; J.T. Lienhard, *Discernment of Spirits in the Early Church*: SP 17,2 (1982) 519-522; C. Tibiletti, *Azione cosmica dei Cristiani in A Diogneto 6,7*: Orpheus 4 (1983) 32-41; J.P. Couliano, *Les gnoses dualistes d'Occident*, Paris 1989², It. tran. Milan 1989; C. Moreschini, *Divinazione e demonologia in Plutarco e Apuleio*: Augustinianum 29 (1989) 269-280; *Atoms, Pneuma, and Tranquillity: Epicurean and Stoic Themes in European Thought*, ed. M.J. Osler, Cambridge 1991; M.D. Boeri, *El valor de Alejandro de Afrodisia como fuente de la Stoa antigua* (*a propósito de pneûma, tónos y krâsis*): Méthexis 4 (1991) 129-136; M.F. Frompton, *Aristotle's Cardiocentric Model of Animal Locomotion*: Journal of the History of Biology 24 (1991) 291-330; *Monotheismus und Christologie. Zur Gottesfrage im hellenistischen Judentum und im Urchristentum*, ed. H.-J. Klauck, Freiburg 1992; R.T. Wallis - J. Bregman, eds., *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, Albany 1992; H.S. Schibli, *Hierocles of Alexandria and the Vehicle of the Soul*: Hermes 121 (1993) 109-117; W. Wink, *Cracking the Gnostic Code: The Powers in Gnosticism*, Atlanta 1993; E. Domingo García, *La complejidad del hombre*: Helmantica 45 (1994) 65-79; B. Macías, *1Cor 12,13*: Filologia Neotestamentaria 7 (1994) 209-214; G. Freudenthal, *Aristotle's Theory of Material Substance*, Oxford-New York 1995; A. Stimpfle, *Buchstabe und Geist*: BZ 39 (1995) 181-202; G. Filoramo, *Antropologie in conflitto. Il caso di Ireneo e degli gnostici*: Humanitas 1 (1996) 52-67; K. Rudolph, *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte*, Leiden 1996; M. Tardieu - P. Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*, Leuven 1996; G. Casadio, *Vie gnostiche all'immortalità*, Brescia 1997; N. Aujoulat, *Le pneuma et le corps lumineux de l'âme d'après le Prologue du Commentaire sur le* De Anima *d'Aristote de Jean Philopon*: Byzantinoslavica 59 (1998) 1-23; G. Lekkas, *La féminité de l'âme chez Origène*: Revue de philosophie ancienne 16 (1998) 23-36; A. Setaioli, *La vicenda dell'anima nella* Consolatio *di Cicerone*: Paideia 54 (1999) 145-174; F. Dünzl, *Pneuma*, Münster 2000; *Pneuma und Gemeinde*, ed. J. Eckert et al., Düsseldorf 2001; I. Ramelli, Μυστήριον *negli* Στρώματα *di Clemente Alessandrino*, in *Il mistero nella carne*, II, ed. A.M. Mazzanti, Castel Bolognese 2006, 83-120.

I. RAMELLI

PNEUMATOMACHOI. *Athanasius and others initially used this term (πνευματομαχοῦντες, πνευματομάχοι) to refer to those who, though not *Arians, did not accept the divinity of the *Holy Spirit. They were subsequently called "Macedonians."

P. Meinhold, *Pneumatomachoi*: PWK 41, 1066-1101; W.-D. Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, Hamburg 1967; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 760-772; M.A.G. Haykin, *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatochian Controversy of the Fourth Century*, Leiden 1994.

M. SIMONETTI

POEMA ULTIMUM. A poetic composition of 255 hexameters discovered by Muratori in the last document contained in the Codex *Ambrosianus* C74; hence its name (*carmen ultimum*), which is found in the *editio princeps* of 1697. Some falsely attributed it to *Paulinus of Nola and others to a certain Antony, who appears in the first verse, who could be the recipient or even the author. It is an antipagan work and is to be set against the background of polemics and the interactions between pagans and Christians from the 2nd half of the 4th c., just like the other composition *Carmen ad senatorem* (CSEL 23 Peiper). The criticism directed toward paganism is not political, but philosophical and doctrinal. It is aimed at those currents of thought such as Pythagoreanism and *Platonism, which were very popular in the 2nd half of the 4th c. The first verses could very likely indicate that the author became a Christian after having undergone many tests and having undertaken numerous investigations. For this reason, the *Poema* is considered important for the information it provides on pagan cults. The attribution to Paulinus should be ruled out because, in comparison to the poetic style of his works, the *Poema* appears to be inferior. Scholars have suggested that it be dated to the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th c.

CPL 206; CPPM 2, 100; PL 5, 261-282; 61, 689-710; CSEL 30, 329-338; Paolino di Nola, *I Carmi*, ed. A. Ruggiero, Marigliano

1996, 376-399 (text and It. tr.); P. Fabre, *Essai sur la chronologie de l'oeuvre de S. Paulin de Nola*, Paris 1948; Id., *S. Paulin de Nola et l'amitié chrétienne*, Paris 1949; A. Chastagnol, *Le sénateur Volusien et la conversion d'une famille de l'aristocratie romaine au Bas Empire*: REA 58 (1956) 241-253; F.G. Sirna, *Sul c.d. Poema ultimum Ps. Paoliniano*: Aevum 35 (1961) 87-107; Patrologia III, 290; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien. Esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du IIIe au VIe siècle*, Paris 1981, 217-219; J.M. Poinsotte, *La présence des poèmes antipaïens anonymes dans l'oeuvre de Prudence*: REAug 28 (1982) 33-58; A. Bartalucci, *Alcune considerazioni sul Poema ultimum del pseudo-Paolino e sui motivi polemici contro orfici, gnostici e filosofi*: Koinonia 17 (1993) 125-142; M. Corsano, *Un incontro problematico. Cristiani e pagani in tre carmi adespoti*: Orpheus 21 (2000) 26-43; M. Cutino, *Sui rapporti fra il cosiddetto "Poema ultimum" (CSEL 30 Hartel) e il "Carmen ad senatorem" (CSEL 23 Peiper)*: Emerita 67 (1999) 49-64; Id., *Per una interpretazione del "Poema ultimum" (CSEL 30 Hartel)*: BStudLat 31 (2001) 73-101; R. Palla - M. Corsano, *Ps.-Paolino Nolano, "Poema ultimum,"* Pisa 2002 (text, tr. and commentary).

L. Dattrino - A. Di Berardino

POEMENIA (4th c.). Knowledge about this female pilgrim is owed to the research of P. Devos. This scholar gathered disparate pieces of information and reconstructed her biography. She was a Spanish woman from the imperial family of *Theodosius. Using her own ships, Poemenia traveled with various groups: bishops and priests, her eunuchs and servants. She went to spend time with the hermit John of Lycopolis, in Thebes, to be healed from an illness. *Palladius narrates that the hermit did not want to receive Poemenia—for 40 years he had never seen a woman—but instead he warned her not to pass through *Alexandria again. Poemenia, going down the Nile on her boats, stopped at Nycopolis, where one of her eunuchs was killed and Bishop Dionysius was thrown into the river; the others were treated badly (Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca* 35, 14-15). At *Jerusalem, she paid for the construction of the church of the Anastasis (ca. 394) and ordered that an idol be destroyed on Mount Gerizim (Samaria). *Jerome criticized her because she traveled to the East with great pomp and *apparatus regius*.

P. Devos, *La "Servante de Dieu" Poemenia*: AB 87 (1969) 189-212; Id., *Saint Jérôme contre Poemenia?*: AB 91 (1973) 117-120; R. Teja, *Poemenia. Una peregrina hispana de la familia de Teodosio I*, in *Homenaje a Josè María Blázquez, Hispania Romana II*, ed. J. Alvar, Madrid 2000, 279-290.

A. Di Berardino

POETRY, CHRISTIAN

I. Preface - II. Greeks - III. Latins.

I. Preface. Poetic compositions connected to certain literary genres and respective metric forms—poetry in the sense of the concept beginning at least from Hellenism—are not found in the canonical texts of the OT nor in early Christian writings, including *apocryphal texts. In fact, textual units such as the prologue of the gospel of *John (Jn 1:1-14), the hymn to Christ in the letter to the Philippians (2:6-11), the songs in the *Acts of *Thomas* (6ff.; 108-113: the so-called *Hymn of the Pearl*) and the song of dance in the *Acts of John* (95) are outside the horizon of Greek literary theory. This certainly holds also with respect to the song—undoubtedly Greek—acc. to the testimony of *Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 10,96,7), sung by Christians in *Bithynia in honor of Christ.

In fact, we find the very earliest examples of Christian poetry in the strict sense of the term in the literary production of the gnostics, who accepted ancient philosophies and aesthetics. For example, we can cite the Greek hymn of the Valentinians in rhythmic prose preserved for us in the *Philosoph.* 6,37,7 (E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen ²1963, 155) and the song of the Naassenes, likewise passed down in 5,10,2 (Ibid. 155ff.). Also for the heretics of subsequent ages such as (perhaps) *Melitius of Lycopolis (W. Riedel - W.E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria*, London 1904), *Arius (Athan., *Ar.* 1,5ff.; *Syn.* 25) and the *Apollinarians serve as a testimony to the production of poems (propagandist-didactic).

According to these testimonies one must suppose that orthodox-Christian poetry arose during conflicts with the *heresies. For example, in the 4th c., *Gregory of Nazianzus wrote against Apollinarianism (*Carm.* 1,10), and St. *Augustine composed his rhythmic psalm *Contra Partem Donati*; both had a predecessor in the political propaganda of *Parmenian (*Liber praedest.* 43). In this context, one must remember that in the *Hellenistic Jewish community there already existed a wide gamut of poetic collaborations on the OT such as the works of the tragedian Ezekiel (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 1,23; 155; Eus., *Praep. ev.* 9,28). Works such as these would have contributed to the opinion, already widespread in the Jewish community of the Hellenized Diaspora, that certain parts of the Jewish Bible were composed in Greek meter, an opinion still held by St. *Jerome centuries later (e.g., *Prol. in Iob*), who in turn referred to *Philo and Flavius Josephus. The most salient testimonies for the continuation of Hellenistic Jewish poetry through the Christians of the first three centuries are found in the oracles written in hexameters of the Sibylline books: books 5-8 of the collection contain exclusively Christian material.

II. Greeks. The Christian production of poetry deriving from *pagan precedents in the Greek world began with lyric poems, whose short verses resembled pagan texts in the manner of Mesomedes of Crete from the Hadrian period such as the anonymous hymn to the light **Phos hilaron* (ed. W. Christ - M. Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca carminum Christianorum*, Leipzig 1871 [repr. Darmstadt 1963], 40). We find one particular feature of Christian poetry in the heteronymous function of lyric poems such as the summary of vast works of prose that were philosophical-theological-didactic in character; testimonies of this method are rarely found in antiquity. This conferred an unmistakable character on *Clement of Alexandria's *Paidagogos* (3,12,101,1-3), with his anapestic poetry of thanksgiving, as well as on *Methodius of Olympus's *Symposion* (285–292). In both works, one finds a reflection of the scholastic practice: the "sons" of the ideal educator, i.e., Christ, and the versions of the *Symposion* are found at the end of these respective works and at the end of their teaching. Bestowing on his *Parthenion*, written in iambics with a refrain, the abecedarian form, Methodius employed a principal technique that was Semitic in origin, i.e., the alphabetic structure, uniting it to the classical form. His verses would not be considered to be at the highest point of traditional quantitative meter; still, one observes his intention initially was not specifically to write Christian Greek poetry. His intention, rather, emphasized more the didactic character of the work and is presumably in contrast to the lyric compositions such as those that have come down to us from the Egyptian ascetic *Hieracas (Eus., *HE* 7,24,4). Of Egyptian origin, it could possibly be an abecedarian song which is perhaps to be placed in the context of baptismal *catechesis (ed. Heitsch, ibid. 161-164).

Gregory of Nazianzus (ca. 329–390) is also one of the most important representatives of Greek Christian poetry of the 4th c. All of his literary work should be understood as a Christian response to the new pagan Hellenism of that period. But aside from his non-Christian epigrams, Gregory's rich poetic works in the edition of the *Maurists (PG 37) is divided into two groups, i.e., theological poems (which in turn include a dogmatic and an ethical subclass) and historiographical poems (that pertain to the author himself or other persons and events). The individual works are very different both in formal and quantitative meaning; they encompass biblical-paraphrastic and polemical *epigrams, various hints of scholastic poetry (such as the Σύγκρισις βίων, the model of the various forms of life), didactic poems of popular philosophical influence on ethical conduct and a long autobiographical poem "on his life" (Περὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου). Following the tendency partly existent in Hellenism, Gregory used iambic trimeter, alongside dactyl meters and lyrics such as the hexameter, the elegiac and the Anacreontic distychs. The rhythmic texts (*Carm.* 1,32: "evening hymn"; *Carm.* 2,3: "counsels for virgins"), a hymn, in hexameters, *Neoplatonic in character, dedicated to the transcendent God (1,29), as well as the drama *Christos paschon*, primarily a cento of Euripidean verses—none of these are his work. The didactic aspect, also dominant in the theological poems of Gregory, is also present in the *Iambi ad Seleucum* of his cousin *Amphiliocus of Iconium.

It is also true, however, that the use of epic forms began in the 4th c. with the poems of *Apollinaris of Laodicea (the younger?) who—in addition to the Christian comedies and tragedies—composed a *paraphrase of the books of the OT to match Homer's poems (*Socrates, *HE* 3,16, speaks of Apollinaris the Elder), but all that work—if it ever existed—has been lost. Instead, there exists an epic paraphrase of a lyric theme, the "Homeric Psalter" (the author of which indisputably used the name Apollinaris). Some things considered epic—acc. to the concept of epic—do not appear before the 5th c., i.e., in the form of biblical paraphrastic columns or centos. At the beginning there were—it seems—the *Homeric centos of a certain Bishop Patricius, whose work was continued by the empress *Eudoxia (d. 460). A philosopher by the name of Optimus and the ecclesiastical poet Cosmas of Jerusalem (8th c.) collaborated on the *corpus* of the *Homerokentra*. Eudoxia herself also paraphrased some books of the OT and the NT (Fozio, *Bib.*, cod. 183; 184), and a biography of *Cyprian of Antioch. One should not exclude the possibility that Eudoxia was motivated by the biblical Latin cento of *Proba, a copy of which was found in the imperial library at *Constantinople (*Cento Probae*, *Praef.*). But the most important epic work of the century was the *Metabolē* of the gospel according to John by *Nonnus of Panopolis (perhaps one of the bishops who participated at the Council of *Chalcedon) in hexameters composed acc. to the rules of the art. It remains an open question whether the person who wrote the longest epic poem in antiquity, i.e., the *Dionysiaka* (in 48 books), also composed the *Metabolē* after a supposed conversion. In fact, it could also be two different expressions of the same mystical theology, as in the case of the lyric hymns of Bishop *Synesius Cyrene at the beginning of the 5th c, where part of it is explicitly Christian, and part of it is decisively *Neoplatonist. But while Synesius enriched his rigorously metrical poems

with references to the ancient Doric tradition of choral lyric, the first signs of new rhythmic forms of liturgical song foreshadowed the future. These songs developed under the influence of Syriac ecclesiastical song, esp. through the Greek translations of *Ephrem the Syrian's syllabic verses (ca. 306–373). It is also true that the few fragments of liturgical pieces written by *Auxentius do not provide a clear image of the way things were. According to the most recent research, the rhythmic song more known in that form, later called *Kontakion*, i.e., the *Akathist Hymn* to the Madonna, belongs to the period of the Council of *Ephesus (431).

The culmination of liturgical rhythmic poetry was reached during the *Justinian period with a production achieved by the monk *Romanus, nicknamed "Melodus," a poet, composer, singer and propagator of Greek-Syriac culture. His nearly 60 poems considered authentic are a type of rhythmic sermon and for this reason should be attributed to the genre of biblical poetry in the broadest sense of the term. They consist of a primary part (at most 18 strophes with a final prayer), before which is placed one or more proems of varying versification. These proems and the strophes have a common refrain. Biblical events (e.g., Elijah and the widow of Zarephath) are depicted also in several small rhythmic poems of the 6th c. A classicist piece characterized esp. by description and epigrams (as in the case of the church of the Hagia Sophia) is opposed to more recent poetry, represented by Romanus. The most important representative of the style was *Paul Silentiarius. Both trends had a relationship with the cultural and concrete politics of the emperor Justinian, who was the central point of reference for that period.

Apart from the Christian lyric style of *Sophronius of Jerusalem and *Maximus the Confessor—imitative of the ancient tradition, having composed an Anacreontic hymn in imitation of Gregory of Nazianzus—the 7th c., or more specifically the era of the emperor *Heraclius, saw an excellent poet in *George of Pisidia, whose works—profane, *panegyric and spiritual, all in classical meter—were composed for the most part in iambic trimeter. In his *Hexameron*, a didactic poem, in lyric tone, on beauty and the usefulness of creation, he appealed to concepts that were fundamentally *Stoic, which he introduced into a Christian framework. The antiheretical poem, even if under the form of poetic invective, is also didactic Κατὰ Σευήρου (against *Severus of Antioch). The secondary genres in the work of George of Pisidia are represented by a hymn on the resurrection of Christ, a corpus of epigrams in large part Christian and a brief autobiographical poem. George's work in its totality represents a brief classicist pause at the cusp of the middle-Byzantine era.

III. Latins. Christian poetry in the Latin world was incomparably richer and more diversified. Regardless of the end of the era in question, it presented itself primarily in the classicist form, which was brought about by the social-cultural circumstances of the Western empire. The most frequently used verse was the quantitative hexameter. The great exceptions, the works of *Commodian (*Carmen Apologeticum, Instructiones*), written in heavily popularized syllabic hexameters, probably to express some distance from traditional culture, are hard to date. Attempts to date this author's work fluctuate between the 3rd and 5th c. because of, on the one hand, the ancient poet's theology and, on the other, his language. An abecedarian hymn on *papyrus and rhythmic verses with end rhyme and refrain, therefore comparable to the Greek *Kontakia*, belongs to the end of the 3rd c. One can detect here a popular tradition, probably liturgical, that reappeared in the late 4th c. in Augustine's previously mentioned invective codified in the abecedarian hymn and refrain against *Donatists, i.e., the *Psalmus contra partem Donati*. The first product of Latin Christian poetry of certain chronology is therefore the anonymous *Laudes Domini*, written in hexameters, from the 2nd decade of the 4th c., in which the miracle pertaining to a deceased person who died in the country of the Aedui should be interpreted as a sign of the approaching *parousia.

In contradistinction to its Greek counterpart, Latin Christian literature, moreover, produced—contemporaneously to the most ancient known classical texts—the genre of the biblical epic poem, which survived until the Baroque period even in the national languages. The first representative author of this genre is the Spanish presbyter *Juvencus with his Virgilizing paraphrase of the gospels (*Evangeliorum libri*), esp. of the gospel acc. to *Matthew, from the late Constantinian period. He provided the motif of the epic poem in his preface to the liturgical prayer *Munda cor* that was said before the reading of the gospel. Juvencus held closely to his original text, but his literary successors increasingly transformed the biblical text, e.g., through personal meditation on the Bible or with exegetical insertions, as in the case of *Sedulius (5th c.), a poet perhaps of Italian origin. In his *Carmen paschale*, he put together—presumably by means of criticisms of poetic presentation—even a prose version, the *Opus paschale*; the Greek *Basil of Seleucia did the same for his *Life of *Thecla*

(Photius, *Bib.*, cod. 168, which speaks of a spurious text), obviously following scholastic practice. Almost contemporaneous in S *Gaul, *Claudius Marius Victorius, on the basis of his interpretation of Genesis, composed the didactic poem *Alethia* in open controversy against the didactic work of the Epicurean materialist Lucretius. Possibly following this path, ps.-Hilary also described the creation (*In Genesin*) and the new creation (*De Evangelio*) in brief interdependent poems with a clear, but not polemical, reference to Lucretius in the first poem. He also affirmed in his preface, metrically separated and dedicated to Pope *Leo, that his poetry must be understood as a liturgical praise to God in its function as a high *eucharistic prayer. At the end of the 5th c., the African poet *Dracontius, in order to demonstrate the goodness of God, chose several biblical scenes in his epic-didactic poem *De Laudibus Dei*, beginning with creation, which he presented almost as a commentator. Alcimus *Avitus of *Vienne in France gave up paraphrasing the entire biblical text; in his biblical epic *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, he limited himself to some typologically relevant passages in the OT, e.g., the crossing of the Red Sea. Lastly, the Roman deacon Arator, in a public reading in the church of S. Pietro in Vincoli in 544 presented the Acts of the Apostles, composed in hexameters, which gave an ecclesiological interpretation of the text under discussion. He concentrated on the patronage of the princes of the apostles for a Rome threatened by the Byzantine-Ostrogothic war.

A fragmentary paraphrase in hexameters of parts of the Heptateuch of the so-called *Poet of the Heptateuch* (first called Cyprian the Gaul—a text datable to the 4th or 5th c.) represents an entirely different current of the biblical poem. In it, the author does not present himself as a director or even serving in a fictitious liturgical function; instead he contents himself with transforming the original prose into traditional epic hexameters. Only in the paraphrases of the lyric portions of the original text, as in the case of *Moses's song of thanksgiving (Ex 15:1-19), did he use ancient lyrical forms, perhaps influenced by the aforementioned biblical aesthetic of St. *Jerome. Because of its equally fragmentary state, it is not possible to date the biblical poetry of *Severus of Malaga written in the high late 6th-c. style.

Like hagiography, Latin Christian poetry defined itself at times as a continuation of the gospels so that already in the 5th c. with *Paulinus of Périgueux's *Vita Sancti Martini,* *Sulpicius Severus's paraphrase written in the ambitious style of the *Vita*, appears as a hagiographic epic. Hagiography and paraphrase united in the poems on the martyrdom of the Maccabean brothers. One should also attribute to the classical biblical epic poems the Virgilian centos of the Roman woman Faltonia Betitia *Proba from the mid-4th c., who treated both testaments. We have already spoken of its possible influence on Eudoxia. Proba explicitly maintained that ultimately Virgil sang the deeds of Christ (23). Although the poetess believed that she was explaining the Christian core of the *Aeneid*, *Pomponius, in his cento, puts the same Virgil, the bucolic Christian, next to that poem. A third work of Virgil, the *Georgics*, and more precisely the famous description of the plague of the cattle, is formally separated by a lyrical meter, and is Christianized in connection to the bucolic in *Endelechius's poem titled *De mortibus boum*.

The final decades of the 4th c., esp. during the *Theodosian era, and the first decades of the 5th c. led the classicist current to its apex. The most important representative and the Christian poet of greatest fame (not only of Late Latin Antiquity) was the Spaniard *Prudentius (348–after 405). His work includes all poetic genres with the exception of drama. Ethical poetry is represented by the allegorical-historical poem *Psychomachia* (*The Soul's Combat*), the didactic epic from the *Liber Apotheosis* (i.e., the apotheosis of the human being through the correct faith) and the *Hamartigenia* (*The Origin of Sin*), antiheretical poems that appealed to, among other writings, the works of *Tertullian. Lyric poetry is represented by two cycles composed in various meters, i.e., the *Liber Cathemerinon* (*Book of Daily Songs*) and the *Peristephanon* or *De coronis* (the crowns of the martyrs), the apologetic-satirical invective (as opposed to the political invectives of his contemporary Claudian) and by the two books *Contra Symmachum*, a reelaboration of the two letters of St. *Ambrose against the reconstruction of the altar for the statue of victory in the Roman curia written in 384 (*Epist.* 10,72; 73). This reelaboration is similar to that of the anonymous work *Carmen contra paganos* and the not-as-aggressive *Carmen ad quendam senatorem*, likewise anonymous (perhaps against *Praetextatus). Lastly, his lyric poetry includes the epigram, until that time represented by *Damasus's metric titles written for the sepulchers of Roman martyrs, from the cycle of the *Dittochaeon* (double staff) or the *Tituli historiarum,* a collection of biblical titles for wall paintings, most likely fictitious, with scenes of the two testaments, as we also find in the less artificial form in the *Tituli* of *Elpidius Rusticus. Despite its classical character, every work of Prudentius is a creation sui generis both formally and linguistically, a peculiar feature of both the constant intrusive application of the Roman poetic tra-

dition and the frequent references to contemporaneous *pagan works.

In comparison to Prudentius's formal richness, the voluminous work of his younger contemporary *Paulinus of Nola from Aquitaine seems monotonous. And yet the lengthy *Carmina Natalicia* written in hexameters on the occasion of the anniversary of the death of the local Saint *Felix of Nola evidences great skill, esp. with respect to the Christianization of the poetic subject—a Christianization of the secular poetic *panegyric of the Claudian type, both for poems and other meters, such as the ones that are found inserted primarily in the prosaic letters, in which the future bishop of Nola treats the pagan poems of his teacher *Auxonius. This also holds for the sole nuptial Christian poem (for *Julian of Eclanum and Titia): if Paulinus composed it in Sapphic strophes in contrast to the Late Antique tradition, he does so because Sappho was considered the archetype of this lyric subgenre.

In the Roman-Gallic world of the 5th c., in the context of the question of theodicy that had become a pressing question because of the barbarian invasions, the didactic poem in hexameters *De divina providentia* was born. It was probably a work written by *Prosper of Aquitaine, the author of the thematically similar poem *Carmen ad uxorem*. The same historical-theological background shows in a satirical eclogue, set between the monastic and the outside world, titled *Sancti Paulini Epigramma*. Its author, however, remains unknown. In view of moral faults identified in these two poems as the cause of the devastation, *Orientius, bishop of the city of Auch, composed his didactic poem with vivid satire, the *Commonitorium*, in elegiac distychs. The difficult circumstances of that era were also the reason why *Paulinus of Pella, grandson of Auxonius, already advanced in age, composed a personal poem of thanksgiving (*Eucharistikos*) to God in somewhat crude hexameters (otherwise damaged in the textual tradition) that included references to Virgil's *Aeneid* and St. Augustine's *Confessions*.

Prosper dedicated his didactic poem bearing the ambiguous title *Carmen de ingratis* (which means either "the ungrateful" or "those who reject grace") and his didactic epigrams to the then-current controversy with the *Semi-Pelagian heretics in Gaul. A few decades after Prosper, but still in the context of that era, an anonymous author in Vandal *Africa (probably also before *Verecundus of Iunca's poem *De satisfactione paenitentiae*) wrote the didactic poem *De resurrectione mortuorum*. It was erroneously attributed to Tertullian, making reference to the approaching end of the world, partially written in hexameters ending in rhyme. Tertullian was also considered the author of a didactic poem titled *Carmen adversus Marcionitas*, because of his treatise against *Marcion. But the explanation for the false attribution of patristic poems to Tertullian, *Hilary and Marius Victorinus probably lies in the fact that such works, initially rejected by the church, after a period of anonymity were attributed to famous writers of prose by St. Jerome to make them more acceptable.

*Venantius Fortunatus lived between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. He was born near Treviso and worked in Merovingian Gaul (ca. 530–591). His various poems reflect a high level of quality; linguistically, they already showed traces of an advanced historical development, even if Venantius is located within the poetic tradition of Late Antiquity. The historical development can be traced through figurative poems in the style of *Optatianus Porfyrius as well as through references to Late Antique patristic poetry such as in the *Vita Sancti Martini* in relation to Paulinus of Périgueux, through a secular poem *Mosella* with references to the poem of the same name by Auxonius, and lastly in relation to Prudentius (*Cath.* 9,82) in his trochaic hymn to the *cross, which would later become the liturgical text *Pange lingua* (*Carm.* 2,2).

With this composition dedicated to the cross for a specific occasion, i.e., the solemn transfer of a relic of the cross to *Poitiers (ca. 570), we have touched upon the vast field of liturgical poetry, the nonclassical origins of which we have already spoken. To combat the heretics, presumably the origin of Christian poetry (here in the concrete sense against Arianism), *Hilary of Poitiers (4th c.) used community singing in order to confirm the community in the faith, inspired by his experience during exile in the East. What has come down to us of his hymns reveals a mixture of lyric-classical forms and pure theology; that mixture renders those poems poorly suited to accomplish their desired objective. The three anti-Arian prosaic hymns, originally written, however, without any reference to community singing, exhibit an extremely anticlassical form, but are written nonetheless with a mastery of the art, partially with refrain, which Marius Victorinus joined to his theological treatises on the same issue. Only Ambrose's hymns were widely received because of their outward simplicity, written in strophes of four iambic dimeters as small works of art to combat the Arians. In fact, Ambrosian-style hymns became the dominant liturgical form even in the Early Middle Ages, as in the case of Flavius de Chalon-sur-Saône. Already toward the end of the 5th c., one finds some

iambic dimeters in rhythmic verses.

Such a circumstance facilitated the victory of the exclusively rhythmic syllabic hymnody among the Irish, who had just entered the Latin world at the end of this century. The most famous collection of spiritual poetry of the Early Middle Ages, the antiphon of Bangor (today at Milan, Bibl. Ambros. C V inf., ed. E. Franceschini, Padua 1941), contains insular and continental texts, demonstrating the cultural interchange between the two historically diverse settings. One of the most successful Irish hymns, the *Altus Prosator* by Columba of Hy (i.e., Columba of Iona, d. 597), is an abecedarian in pairs, consisting of Ambrosian syllabic strophes. The *Loricae* (weaponry songs) warranted a special position in the spiritual lyric, such as that of the Irish Laidcenn (Lathcen), in which God is invoked for the protection of the individual parts of the body through researched glossary terms, in part Greek and Hebrew (a sign of the so-called Latin Hisperic). The Irish hymn notably influenced the first Anglo-Saxon poem; Aldelmo of Malmesbury (639–709) and various brief poems of his circle would be unthinkable without it. But rhythmic poetry also prevailed at the center of the declining Western Roman Empire. In *Spain it appeared at the end of the 7th c.—despite the criticism of the Archbishop *Julian of Toledo concerning rhythmic poetry—with the Abbot *Valerius of Bierzo and his *Epitameron* of long rhythmic verses (probably a composite of "hexameron" and "epigram") with moralistic content. In Gaul—acc. to the account given by *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 6,46)—the Merovingian King *Chilperic composed two metrical books imitating the style of Sedulius. A hymn on St. Medardus in rhythmic verses (from 15 to 17 syllables) has survived. Lastly, in Italy the so-called Lombardic rhythms of the 7th c. (among which we mention the poetry of a certain Stephen on the Synod of Pavia [698] in a heavily popularized Latin) present some salient examples of the radical change in language and versification; a development that would be modified only with the so-called Carolingian renewal.

J. Kroll, *Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria*: Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen der Akademie zu Braunsberg (1921/22) 86-88; F.J.E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1927; K. Thraede, *Untersuchungen zum Ursprung und zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, I: JbAC 4 (1961) 108-127; II: ibid. 5 (1962) 125-157; III: ibid. 6 (1963) 101-111; O. Reverdin (ed.), *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en Occident*, Geneva 1976; H.G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Munich [2]1977, 262-266; 425-430; 472ff.; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Bd. 2, Munich 1978, 98-107; 109-111; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien*, Paris 1981; J. Fontaine, *Étude sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence*, Paris 1987; S. Costanza (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica. Tra retorica, teologia e politica*, Messina 1984; Herzog 5, 219-224; P. Karavites, *Gregory Nazianzinos and Byzantine Hymnography*: Journal of Hellenic Studies 113 (1993) 81-98; K. Smolak, *La poesia cristiana latina tra il quarto e il quinto secolo*: Salesianum 62 (2000) 19-39; F. Stella, *Poesia e teologia. L'occidente latino tra il IV e l'VIII secolo*, Milan 2001; M. Salvatore (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale* 1, Alessandria 2001; A. Taranga (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale* 2, Alessandria 2004. See the critical editions with commentary and translation of the Greek and Latin poetry in the collection *Poeti cristiani* (ed. R. Palla, Pisa 1995).

Literary genres and authors (editions and commentaries excluded): W. Schmid, *Tityrus Christianus*: Rheinisches Museum 96 (1953) 101-165; A. Salvatore, *Studi Prudenziani*, Naples 1958; K. Thraede, *Studien zu Sprache und Stil des Prudentius*, Göttingen 1965; R. Herzog, *Die allegorische Dichtkunst des Prudentius*, Munich 1966; Id., *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike*, Munich 1975; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975; J.-L. Charlet, *Création poétique dans le Cathemerinon de Prudence*, Paris 1982; K. Smolak, *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Metabole des Nonnos*: JÖByz 34 (1984) 1-14; M. Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase*, London 1985; M. Herren, *The Hisperica Famina II. Related Poems*, Toronto 1987; P. Angelucci, *La tecnica poetica di Aratore*, Rome 1990; W. George, *Venantius Fortunatus, A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, Oxford 1992; J. Koder, *Mit der Seele Augen sah ich deines Lichtes Zeichen, Herr. Romanos Melodos*, Vienna 1996; M. Roberts, *Poetry and the Cult of the Martyrs*, Ann Arbor, MI 1996; A. Arweiler, *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung De spiritalis historiae gestis des Alcimus Avitus*, Berlin 1999; F. Stella, *Poesia dell'alto medioevo europeo. Manoscritti, lingua e musica dei ritmi latini*, Florence 2000; Ch. Gnilka, *Prudentiana* I-III, Munich-Leipzig 2001–2003; F. Stella (ed.), *La scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, Florence 2001; K. Smolak, *Maro mutatus in melius?* in O. Panagl - R. Wodak (eds.), *Text und Kontext*, Würzburg 2004, 51-66.

K. Smolak

POETRY, SYRIAC. In *Syriac literature, poetry occupies a preeminent place. It did not assume lyric or epic forms, but rather used literary genres suitable for religious instruction or sacred worship. As a result, Syriac poetry was primarily ecclesiastical. Syriac meter followed the isometric principle (an equal number of syllables for every verse) and not the accentuation or the quality of the vowels as in Greek and Latin poetry. The parallelism in the metric phrases is frequent as in Hebrew biblical poetry. One also finds the use of the acrostic alphabet as in the Psalms and Lamentations of Jeremiah and acrostics based on the name of the author, e.g., APRM (Ephrem).

The first known Syriac poet was *Bardesanes of *Edessa. According to *Ephrem the Syrian, he wrote the *madrashe* filled with melodies and also psalms (150) in metric form (*Contra haereses* 53,5) to spread his religious ideas. Ephrem himself at times cited his own verses. Two ancient isosyllabics (distychs of six syllables) are included in the *Acts of *Thomas* (3rd

c.). The composition of the *madrashe* is also associated with the name of *Mani. Fragments of ancient distychs of seven syllables have been preserved in the letter of Mara bar Serapione (3rd c.) to his son and in the writings of *Isaac of Antioch. Whether to consider the **Odes of Solomon* Syriac poetry is still a heavily debated question. If the text's original language was Syriac, then the poetic form of the *Odes* is very unique.

The great teacher of Syriac poetry was Ephrem. The most noteworthy collections of Syriac poetry are the works of this 4th-c. Syrian deacon. The variety of poetic forms—more than 60—used by Ephrem with great ease presupposed a long antecedent tradition. Ephrem took to the pen to compose didactic poems and exhortations against heresies. He wrote poems on the sound, orthodox faith and for the church feasts. The popularity of his writings gave rise to many imitators in the following centuries. Ephrem's influence on the origins and development of Byzantine hymnography, e.g., on *Romanus Melodus, is still subject to debate. Other poets of the first period of Syriac literature are *Cyrillona, *Balai, Isaac of Antioch, *Narsai and *Jacob of Sarug.

There are two chief literary genres of Syriac poetry: *memre* and *madrashe*. *Memre* were poetic "speech," didactic or narrative. The verses were isosyllabic without divisions in the stanzas. *Memre* often took the character of the homily and verses or a poetic exposition of the sacred *Scriptures. Other *memre* looked more like a treatise. The *memre* were used esp. for church feasts and commemorations of martyrs and saints. They are found in books for the celebration of the divine office or in collections intended for the edification of the faithful—*laypeople, monks and clerics. The *madrasha* or "instruction," however, is a poetic song of a determined number of stanzas in isosyllabic verses with a set response (ʿ*onyata*) after each stanza. The structure of the strophes can be very simple or quite complex. The *madrashe* were certainly sung and accompanied with the title of the melody (*qala*, i.e., the first words of the song that functioned as the model). According to a Syriac biography, Ephrem established choirs of the so-called daughters of the covenant who, after having learned his hymns by heart, sung them in choir in alternation in the liturgical offices. Another reason for the song of the "instructions" was to enable the spreading of the true faith in a popular way. Only a dozen or so cycles of hymns are preserved from Ephrem, constituting from 4 to 87 songs each with a rich variety of structures. The "hymns" in the strict sense of the term are a subgroup of *madrashe*. Another variety of the genre is the *soghitha* or "song." The *soghyatha* often had brief stanzas of four verses in the form of a dialogue or disputation. Many *soghyatha* display the characteristics of a drama and were popular among the ancient Syrians. Ephrem preferred heptasyllabic meter (7 [3+4] + 7). Balai, however, developed the pentasyllabic meter (5 [2+3] + 5). Jacob of Sarug used dodecasyllabic meter (12 [4+4+4]). Narsai composed poems with 7 or 12 syllables.

Liturgical poetry in Syriac included some particular forms: a *turgama* is an expository hymn before the reading of the epistle or the gospel; a *ba*ʿ*awatha* is a brief song of supplication; a *teshbohta* is a song of praise; and *qale*, which are "melody," i.e., responsories.

Rhymed verses appear in Syriac poetry during the Islamic period in imitation of Arabic poetry and came into general use from the 9th c. onward, e.g., with Anthony the Orator (fl. 825).

Anonymous, *Syriac Metrical Literature*: Journal of Sacred Literature 4/8 (1853) 389-397; H. Grimme, *Der Strophenbau in den Gedichten Ephraems des Syrers*, Fribourg (Suisse) 1893; A. Baumstark, *Syrische und hellenistische Dichtung*: Gottesminne 3 (1906) 570-593; R. Duval, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes* 2: *La littérature syriaque*, Paris [3]1907; A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922; G. Hölscher, *Syrische Verskunst*, Leipzig 1932; J.-B. Chabot, *Littérature syriaque*, Paris 1934; S.P. Brock, *Dialogue Hymns of the Syriac Churches*: Sobornost 5/2 (1983) 35-45; Id., *Syriac and Greek Hymnography: Problems of Origin*, SP 16/2, Berlin 1985, 77-87; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Solomon as Teacher: Early Syriac Didactic Poetry*, in *IV Symposium syriacum 1984* (OCA 229), Rome 1987, 123-134; M. Breydy, *Une nouvelle méthode pour constater l'originalité des hymnes syriaques*, in *Studia semitica nec non iranica*, Wiesbaden 1989, 33-51; M. Lattke, *Sind Ephraems Madrashe Hymnen?*: Oriens christianus 73 (1989) 38-43; S.P. Brock, *Syriac Dispute Poems: The Various Types*, in *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Medieval Near East* (Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 42), Leuven 1991, 109-119; R. Murray, *Aramaic and Syriac Dispute-poems and Their Connection*, Studia Aramaica, Oxford-New York 1995, 157-187; K. McVey, *Were the Earliest Madrashe Songs or Recitations?* in *After Bardaisan*, Leuven 1999, 185-199; S.P. Brock, *The Dialogue Poem: From Sumer to Syriac*: Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies 1 (2001) 1-10.

E. Carr

POITIERS. The ancient *Limonum* (*Lemonum*) *Pictonum*, then *Pictavis*, during the time of Augustus, the city belonged to the province of Aquitaine and, after *Diocletian, to *Aquitania Secunda*. It was one of the major cities of Roman *Gaul, having an amphitheater, from the Julio-Claudian period, that contained 40,000 seats, which was the largest. It was destroyed at the end of the 3rd c., as archaeologists have ascertained from a specific layer containing signs of fire (caused by the Bagaudi? Germans?). It was reconstructed on a smaller scale, but with more

pomp in a short time, and girded with the strongest system of fortification in Gaul. Even all the temples were rebuilt, which proves that the city was entirely *pagan. Its territory corresponded to the three districts of *Vienne, Vandée and Deux-Sèvres.

In the 4th c., Christianity laid deep roots and developed at Poitiers. Its first known bishop was *Hilary, the great opponent of *Arianism. The first episcopal church dates to this period (under the modern cathedral), the baptistery and the *domus ecclesiae* (i.e., home of the bishop); the churches of St. Martin, St. Hilaire-entre-deux-Églises, St. Hilaire-de-la-Celle (above the house of Hilary), St. Savin (above the home of Savin?) and perhaps St. *Paul (the future priory) date back to the 4th or 5th c. Outside the city, on the ruins of the temple, was constructed Notre-Dame-la-Grande, while St. Hilaire-le-Grand was built on the funerary *cella* of the wife of the daughter of Hilary. The 5th-c. history for Poitiers, however, remains unknown; nevertheless, one can conclude that by that time *paganism had disappeared. The following names of bishops have survived from this period: *Hilary (356–13 January 367/68), Adelphus and Elaphus.

The Battle of Vouillé (507) forced Poitiers to surrender to *Clovis. Under his successors, the leadership of the city changed 20 times in the 6th c., though in the 7th c. there was a period of peace, preserving its municipal institutions. The 8th c. was marked by fighting between the dukes of Aquitaine Hunaud and Gaiffier against the *Franks' Charles Martel and Pepin the Short, with the Arabic interlude in 732. This period was marked primarily by the construction of the Abbey of the Holy Cross through the work of Queen *Radegund, who there housed 200 monks, while, on the side, the Abbey of St. Mary was also built for the monks. The new churches of St. Luke (hospital and oratory) and St. *Leodegarius were constructed at Poitiers.

Outside the city, where the bishop had been buried in 368, St. Hilary's developed and became the episcopal necropolis (tomb of *Venantius Fortunatus, Theomastus bishop of Mainz [!]), and St. Salvatore (tomb of St. *Porcarius), and the oratories of Elidius and Leonius, Martin and Gelasius were also built . To the E of the city, the following churches were built: St. Hilaire-de-la-Celle, St. Pierre-le-Puellier, Notre-Dame-l'Ancienne; to the W, Notre-Dame-la-Grande, St. Michele, St. Radegund (enlarged in the 8th c.).

From this period we know of Bishop Pientius, who helped St. Radegund with the construction of the abbey in ca. 544; Pascentius, to whom Venantius Fortunatus dedicated the *Life* of St. *Hilary (BHL 3885-3887), Maroveus, a contemporary of Gregory of *Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 7,24; 9,33,39-41,43; 10,15-16; *Virt. S. Mart.* 2,44; *Gl. Conf.* 104); Plato, the archdeacon of Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 5,49; *Virt. S. Mart.* 4,32); Venantius Fortunatus (Baudonivia, *Vit. S. Radeg.* 2, prol.; Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* 2,13); Caregisilus; Ennoald (614); John (627); Diddus, uncle of St. *Leodegar of Autun (628/629–669/670); Ansoald (676–696/697); Eparchius (794); Maximinus.

Duchesne, Fastes 2, 75-87; DACL 14, 1252-1340; M. Vieillard Troiekouroff, *Les monuments religieux de Poitiers d'après Grégoire de Tours*, in *Études mérovingiennes*, Poitiers 1952, 285-292; Id., *Les monuments religieux de la Gaule d'après les oeuvres de Grégoire de Tours*, Paris 1976, 218-230; D. Claude, *Topographie und Verfassung der Städte Bourges und Poitiers bis in das 11. Jh.*, Lübeck-Hamburg 1960; *Province ecclésiastique de Bordeaux*, ed. L. Martin et al., Paris 1998, 65-92; B. Beaujard, *Le culte des saints en Gaule. Les premiers temps: d'Hilaire de Poitiers à la fin du VI*e *siècle*, Paris 2000.

V. Saxer

POLEMIUS SILVIUS. Historian of *Gaul from the mid-5th c., whose writings have all been lost with the exception of a work titled *Laterculus*, compiled in the year 448–449. This was a monthly calendar in which were inserted the names of emperors and consuls (*Nomina omnium principum Romanorum*); provinces (*Nomina provinciarum*); animals (*Nomina cunctorum spirantium atque quadrupedum*, *Voces variae animantium*); an *Easter *computus and, in the appendix, the monuments of *Rome (*Quae sint Romae*), where he mentions the *thermal baths of Caracalla as one of the seven wonders of Rome, famous for the abundant decoration and works of art that adorn them; a universal history (*Breviarium temporum*); and weights and measures (*Nomina ponderum vel mensurarum*). The calendar has information pertaining primarily to Christianity, joined to supplementary information on topics of popular culture, gathered under the appropriate titles. The compilation has an explicit date: *Postumio et Zenone viris clarissimis consulibus*, i.e., 448; this work was dedicated to *Domino beatissimo Eucherio episcopo*, i.e., *Eucherius of Lyons. The author is to be identified with Silvius, a friend of *Hilary of Arles, during whose life (ch. 11) he is listed among the eminent figures—*eiusdem temporis qui suis scriptis meriti summi claruere*. A brief bit of information on him, registered for the year 438, is also in the *Chronica Gallica a. 452*, concerning the circumstances in which he composed his book: *Silvius turbatae admodum mentis post militiae in palatio exacta munera aliqua de religione conscribit*.

CPL 2256; PL 13, 676; T. Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, I, 518-551; ed. of the treatise *Quae sint Romae*, in R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, I, Rome 1940, 294-301, 308-310; information in Schanz IV/2, 130; PWK 21, 1960–1963.

V. Loi - B. Amata

POLEMON the Apollinarist. Leader of the most extreme group of the disciples of *Apollinaris. *Theodoret (*Haer. fab. comp.* IV, 8) informs us about the divisions among Apollinaris's disciples, and in ch. 9 he speaks of the "Polemonians." It is not clear when this occurred; Polemon, however, emerged as the head of the opposition against the "great church": one of his famous fragments cited many times by later sources (see Lietzmann, frag. 174, pp. 274-275) contains many harsh expressions against the "novelties" of the Cappadocians and the "smoke" of the Italians (see also a fragment from his treatise *Antirrheticus*: Lietzmann, frag. 173, p. 274). Polemon vociferously guarded against the danger of "divisions" in Christ, which would have led one to think of two wills in the incarnate Logos (see Lietzmann, frag. 175, p. 275). His position was shared by *Eunomius of Berea in *Thrace and by *Julian the Apollinarian to whom Apollinaris himself dedicated a treatise (Lietzmann, frags. 150-152), responding specifically to the problem of the two wills in Christ. Two fragments remain from Polemon's letter to Julian the Apollinarian (i.e., Lietzmann, frags. 176-177, p. 276). *Timothy (Apollinarist), bishop of Berytus and the disciple of Polemon, separated himself from this group. In 381, he signed the canons of the Council of *Constantinople, which condemned Apollinarianism among other heresies (can. I). At that time, Polemon probably crafted a document against Timothy; the most famous fragment of this text has survived (Lietzmann, frag. 174).

CPG 3710-3713 *Suppl.* 205; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea and seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 40-42, 153; frags., pp. 273-276; DCB 4, 422.

E. Cavalcanti

POLITICS. The following observations do not intend to be anything more than a very brief introduction to the relationship between the various Christian communities and the political establishment and the reflection that thereby followed. Reference, therefore, will not be made to the history of doctrine but rather to the history of Christian political thought in the sense assigned to these terms by J. Touchard (see *Histoire des idées politiques*). Ancient Christian literature, in fact, did not contain treatises on political theory similar to those that the Greek world had known, but rather presented experiences and new problems that caused Christians to take temporary and contingent positions. The first and primary concern was religious (this was generally revealed by the biblical text, esp. by the NT and its interpretation): it is within this context that one must understand the political statements the bishops directed toward the leaders of the city (*civitas*) or toward the faithful, just as one should understand the testimony offered by the *martyrs in the first centuries. That understanding, however, does not diminish but rather establishes and explains the political relevance of the early Christian communities who lived and worked in different social situations.

For a long time, *Rome overcame the idea and reality of the city-states born in the Greek world and united peoples and nations of various languages and traditions under the same political structure. To maintain unity, Rome had elaborated a series of rules for common life and had attributed a legal status to the inhabitants of the Roman *oikoumenē*. Christians generally recognized all this as a positive situation that allowed the gospel to be proclaimed with greater ease to the nations (not all, however, shared the same view: alongside the "providential" line, there was in fact a perspective that tended to perceive the empire negatively, which it considered the personification of evil).

But beyond this attitude toward the Roman Empire, Christians took various stances with respect to the political establishment. It was said that their attention was essentially focused on the religious factor that was manifested in the revelation that they believed God had delivered to humanity: they found points of unity, on the one hand, by recognizing God as the Lord of history and Jesus Christ both human and divine, and, on the other, by considering humanity as creatures of God, in his image and a manifestation of his love. This was a God who respects human freedom, who calls human beings to love every other person and with that establishes a specific scale of values for the things of this world, including duties to be performed as well as rights to be exercised.

If this christological and anthropological basis was common to almost all Christians, the positions they took toward the established political powers were much more diverse. *Paul (cf. Rom 13:1ff.) justifies the obligation of obeying them because such powers were willed by God inasmuch as they do good; the Pauline position was reiterated until the end of apostolic times and then in the most difficult

of times, even when the church was persecuted. The words of 1 Peter (2:13ff.) are not far from this line of thought, finding their validity, however, on the level of love toward God and others. *John's position, which rejects the tacit agreement between the political establishment and the wicked "world," is different; even more clear and negative is the position found in the book of Revelation. Historically, the first option prevailed in the early Christian communities. There emerged an attitude of complete loyalty of Christians toward the Roman Empire, which was more and more stated and proven with specific arguments: in fact, because God was considered the foundation and source of every good, some Christians concluded that imperial power descended from him, whose exercise is necessary after *Adam's *sin or, as certain writers say (see, e.g., Iren., *Haer.* 5,24,1ff.), after Cain killed his brother, as soon as the fear of God vanished from the hearts of men.

Christianity, therefore, pointed people toward the simultaneous path of obedience to God and to their public leaders, provided that the latter did not attribute to themselves or the institutions they represented absolute prerogatives or did not make idolatrous claims, not recognizing that the justification for their existence came from above. One finds herein the originality of Christian political thought. From the time of Jesus' teaching (cf. Mt 22:15), one traces a distinction between "politics" and "religion," a distinction of great importance when viewed in a context in which history, tradition and common outlook took for granted the tight inextricable bond between the one element and the other and that precisely on this type of bond they constructed the city (*civitas*). In this manner, there was born a conception of the republic (*res publica*) in line with what we in modern terms call the "state"—considered legitimate in its order, but lacking religious value properly speaking, an idea that is different not only from the sacred character of the ancient city, but also from the theocratic ideal of that brand of *Judaism that identified the messianic kingdom with earthly political systems.

Further reflection on the problem of the nature of politics was made possible—actually, in a certain sense required—by recognizing God, one and three, as the Lord of everyone and everything and by believing that he has revealed to humanity a message of salvation containing certain imperative norms that each person must observe whatever social position that person may hold: whence arises the understanding of personal autonomy, claimed even in facing the empire. Freedom of *conscience was discovered, and the idea of individual freedom was gradually transformed. During the earliest centuries, these ideas became incarnate esp. in the behavior and the words of the martyrs.

Thus, Christian thought clarified the question of the relationship between politics and ethics and, at the same time, it seemed to be well aware that as difficult as it was to maintain the right balance between the two spheres, so too was it hard to preserve, in concrete historical situations, the reciprocal autonomy between church and state: "Their mutual relationship has its roots in the personal unity of the Creator and Redeemer, but it should not become confused resulting in the dominance of the state over the Church (*caesaropapism) or the Church over the state (papal theocracy)" (H. Rahner, *Church and State in Early Christianity*, San Francisco 1992, xiii).

R.W.-A.J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, I, Edinburgh-London [2]1927 (It. tr. Bari 1967); G. Combès, *La doctrine politique de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1927; J. Touchard, *Histoire des idées politiques*, Paris 1959 (It. tr. Milan 1961); H. Rahner, *Kirche und Staat im frühen Christentum. Dokumente aus acht Jahrhunderten und ihre Deutung*, Munich [2]1961 (Eng. tr. San Francisco 1992); *Il pensiero politico cristiano*, ed. G. Barbero, 2 vols., Turin 1962–1965; J. Speigl, *Der römische Staat und die Christen. Kirche und Staat von Domitian bis Commodus*, Amsterdam 1970; A. Wlosok, *Rom und die Christen. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christentum und römische Staat*, Stuttgart 1970; L. Schottroff, *Mein Reich ist nicht von dieser Welt. Der johannische Messianismus*, in *Religionstheorie und politische Theologie*, ed. J. Taubes, Munich 1984, 97-107; F. Bolgiani, *Cristianesimo e potere. Spunti di riflessione per i secoli II-IV*, in *Cristianesimo e potere*, ed. P. Prodi e L. Sartori, Bologna 1986, 83-100; *L'Impero romano-cristiano. Problemi politici, religiosi, culturali*, ed. M. Sordi, Milan 1991; E. dal Covolo, *Chiesa società politica. Aree di laicità nel cristianesimo delle origini*, Rome 1994, 85-127; L. Padovese, *Il problema della politica nelle prime comunità cristiane*, Casale Monf. 1998; P. Siniscalco, *Gli imperatori romani e il cristianesimo nel IV secolo*, in J. Gaudemet - P. Siniscalco - G.L. Falchi, *Legislazione imperiale e religione nel V secolo*, Rome 2000, 67-120; Id., *Il cammino di Cristo nell'Impero romano*, Rome-Bari [7]2007.

P. Siniscalco

POLLENTIUS (beginning of the 5th c.). Friend of *Augustine, who introduces us to him through his work *De coniugiis adulterinis* (PL 40, 451-486). Augustine's first treatise in this work covers the first five centuries and is exclusively dedicated to *divorce and remarriage. Augustine called Pollentius a "brother," and Pollentius in turn addressed Augustine as "father." We do not know whether he was a deacon, priest or bishop; nevertheless, he was not a *layperson, whom Augustine would have called "son." Pollentius sent Augustine a letter in which he spoke of his marital problems, asking him for his advice.

There arose, therefore, a discussion between the two and, as a result, Augustine wrote this treatise titled *De coniugiis adulterinis*, between 419 and 420, and referred Pollentius to the explanation he had given in the work *De Serm. in Monte* I, 14,39, with respect to the exegesis of 1 Cor 7 (the Pauline privilege, *adultery and *matrimony) and Mt 5:31-32; 19:9 (marriage in the OT and the NT). Augustine later recognized the difficulties of this controversial discussion (see *Retract.* II, 57).

NBA 7/1, 223-227; H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce*, Paris 1970, 337-353; PCBE 1, 878-880.

E. Romero Pose

POLYCARP (d. 167). Bishop of *Smyrna, Polycarp died a *martyr's death on 23 February 167. *Irenaeus, who was a native of Smyrna, states that he met him as a child and heard him speak of his acquaintance with "John," whom he identified as the *apostle. In all likelihood, he was probably referring to "*John the presbyter" whom *Papias explicitly distinguished from the apostle John (cf. Eus., *HE* 3,39,4). We have a *letter by *Ignatius of *Antioch to Polycarp and, a little bit later, a letter of Polycarp to the Christians of Philippi. Around the year 160, Polycarp went to *Rome to talk with Pope *Anicetus (155–166) "on the issue concerning *Easter" (Eus., *HE* 4,14,1). The church of Rome always celebrated the feast on *Sunday, although the churches of *Asia Minor celebrated it "according to an ancient custom," i.e., the 14th of Nisan, acc. to the Jewish calendar, on whatever day of the *week it fell. The bishop of Smyrna and the bishop of Rome remained firm in their respective positions but did so "in *peace." In 167 (a date supplied by Eus., *Chron.*, ed. Helm, GCS 47, p. 205, and *HE* 4,14,10), there was a *persecution at Smyrna. Polycarp, who had gone into hiding outside the city, was betrayed by a young slave and arrested. He died at the stake 23 February, which was, acc. to the account of his martyrdom, "the day of the great *Sabbath," i.e., Sunday (for the meaning of this expression, see Epiph., *Pan. Expos. fidei* 24). He was 86 years old.

The *Letter to the Philippians* has been partially preserved in Greek and completely preserved in a Latin translation. The hypothesis suggesting that the actual text was the result of a fusion of two early letters does not seem to be well founded. We see from this letter that certain members of the Philippian church had written to Polycarp to complain about a certain Valens who "was ordained a presbyter" (probably bishop) for their community and whom they accused of having perpetrated injustices for love of money. They also asked Polycarp to send them a copy of the letters of Ignatius in his possession. In response, Polycarp insisted on the need of keeping oneself free from every type of covetousness, but also asked them not to treat Valens and his wife as enemies. Along with his letter, he added some of the extant authentic letters of Ignatius.

The Martyrdom of Polycarp. Composed shortly after the death of the bishop of Smyrna in the form of a letter sent to the church of Philomelium, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* was the first work entirely dedicated to describing the suffering of a martyr and, moreover, the first to use the title "martyr" to refer to a Christian who had died for the faith. It underwent the influence of similar Jewish texts (II and IV Macc) and in turn influenced the development of this literary genre among Christians. There also exists a biography on Polycarp written around the mid 3rd c., which sheds light on the liturgical life of the Christian community of Smyrna in the religious context of the 3rd c.

Altaner 52-54; Quasten 1, 202-208; BBKL 8, 809-815 (bibl.). *Editions*: SC 10, Paris 1969, ^{4}1969; F.X. Funk - K. Bihlmeyer - W. Schneemelcher, Tübingen 1970, 114-120; J.A. Fischer, Darmstadt ^{8}1981, 227-265, with Germ. trans; J.B. Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, Göttingen 1995; Eng. tr.: W.R. Schoedel, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Camden, NJ 1967; It. tr.: A. Quacquarelli, *I Padri Apostolici*, Rome 1976, 151-172; C. Burini, *Lettera ai Filippesi, Martirio*, Bologna 1999. *Studies*: Th. Baumeister, *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums*, Münster 1980, 289-306; P. Brind'Amour, *La date du martyre de Polycarpe* (*le 23 fév. 167*): AB 98 (1980) 456-62; V. Saxer, *L'authenticité du Martyre de Polycarpe. Bilan de 25 ans de critique*: MEFRA 94 (1982) 979-1001; B. Dehandschutter, *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians. An Early Example of "Reception,"* in *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, ed. J.-M. Sevrin, Leuven 1989, 275-291; S. Cacitti, *Grande Sabato. Il contesto pasquale quartodecimano nella formazione della teologia del martirio*, Milan 1994; G. Buschmann, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*, Göttingen 1998; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Life of Polycarp. An Anonymous Vita from Third-Century Smyrna*, Sydney 2002; P. Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament. The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and Its Allusions to New Testament Literature*, Tübingen 2002; R. Burnet, *Épîtres et lettres I^{er}-II^{e} siècle, De Paul de Tarse à Polycarpe de Smyrne*, Paris 2003.

P. Nautin

POLYCHRONIUS of Apamea. Bishop of the famous Syrian city and brother of *Theodore of Mopsuestia, an important exegete in the Antiochene school. He wrote *commentaries on *Job, *Daniel, *Ezekiel and also perhaps on Jeremiah, which were inserted, in a form altered in various ways, as fragments in the **catenae*.

His exegesis focuses primarily on the historical

and chronological points of the text, as was the case for other Antiochene exegetes.

CPG 2, 3878-3880; A. Mai, *Scriptorurn veterum nova collectio*, 12, Rome 1825, 105-160 (commentary on Daniel); A. Mai, *Nova Patrum bibliotheca*, VII 2, Rome 1854, 92-127 (commentary on Ezekiel); PG 64, 739-1038 (the controversial commentary on Jeremiah); RE[3] 15, 528; PWK 21, 1598; O. Bardenhewer, *Polychronius, Bruder Theodors von Mopsuestia und Bischof von Apamea*, Freiburg i. Br. 1879; M. Faulhaber, *Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften*, Freiburg i. Br. 1899 (with mention of unpublished material); L. Dieu, *Le commentaire sur Jérémie*: RHE 14 (1913) 685-701; A. Vaccari, *Un commento da Giobbe*, Rome 1915; U. Bertini, *La Catena greca in Giobbe*: Biblica 4 (1923) 129-142.

J. Irmscher

POLYCRATES of Ephesus. Bishop of the city around the end of the 2nd c. Of his literary works, there remains a letter he wrote to Pope *Victor during the dispute on *Easter (Eus., *HE* 5, 25). During that period, in fact, synods were held in which many bishops professed themselves to be contrary to the quartodeciman practice and supporters of the *Sunday observance of Easter. Polycrates, although admonished by Victor, participated in a synod in Asia Minor, where all of the participants claimed to be followers of the quartodeciman tradition. In a letter, he also provides us some personal information: "I too, the most humble of all of you, observe the tradition of my relatives, some of whom were also my predecessors: seven of my relatives, in fact, were bishops; I am the eighth. They have always celebrated Easter when the Jewish people abstain from leavened bread. I, my brothers, have lived 65 years in the Lord; I have been in contact with brothers from the whole world; I have read the entirety of the *Scriptures, and I did not allow myself to be intimidated by bullies, because men greater than I have said that one must 'obey God rather than men' (Acts 5:29)" (Eus., *HE* 5, 24,6-7).

J.A. Fischer, *Die Synoden im Osterfeststreit des 2. Jh.*: AHC 8 (1976) 15-39; A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Berlin 1977; K. Gerlach, *The Antenicene Pascha*, Leuven 1998.

A. Di Berardino

POLYEUCTUS, martyr (3rd c.). A soldier stationed at Melitene (today Malatya), in *Armenia Minor, belonging to the same legion (*Legio XII Fulminata*) of the *forty martyrs of Sebaste from the time of Licinius, who was beheaded under the emperor *Decius (249–251) or the emperor *Valerian (254–260). The mention of two emperors in the account of the *martyrdom (*passio*) makes it difficult to assign a precise date. According to the *passio* (BHG 1566-68), which seems to be a reworking of the homily delivered on the anniversary of his death, two military friends—Nearcus, a Christian, and Polyeuctus, a *pagan—when informed of the obligation of sacrificing to the gods, reacted in different ways. Nearcus becomes perplexed, while his pagan friend converts after receiving a vision in the night, and rejects the imperial edict on the obligation to sacrifice. Arrested, Polyeuctus reacts by destroying pagan statues; he is led to decapitation, and resists the pleas of his wife Paulina and his father-in-law Felix. The martyrologies place his commemoration on various dates: 7 January (*Mart. di Nicomedia*); 9 January (Byzantine church); 13 February (Roman Mart.); 14 February. A church was constructed on his tomb (AASS Feb. 2, 650). His cult spread into *Egypt, *Syria, Greece and also the West. In *Constantinople, Anicia Juliana, a descendant of Emperor *Theodosius, ordered the construction of a towering basilica between 524 and 527, near the aqueduct of the emperor *Valens. This new church had to replace another constructed by the empress *Eudoxia. The remains were rediscovered in 1960, to the W of Fatih park. A long epigram that praises the work of Anicia Juliana and describes the building has allowed scholars to identify it; two pillars have been preserved, which were taken to Venice and placed near the basilica of S. Marco. Likewise, at *Ravenna, a church was built dedicated to the martyr. Pierre Corneille made him out to be a hero in one of his tragedies, titled *Polieucte*, consisting of five acts, which was adopted in the work by Charles Gounod.

BHG 2, 215; BHL 2, 1002; AASS Feb. 2, 650-655; BS 10, 96-99; BBKL 14, 1372; LTK[3] 8, 399; Cath 11, 599; B. Aubé, *Polieucte dans l'histoire*, Paris 1982; R.M. Harrison, *Scavi della chiesa di S. Polieucto a Istanbul*: Corsi cultura ravennate 26 (1979) 157-162; Id., *La scultura marmorea della chiesa di S. Polieucto a Istanbul*, ibid., 163-170; C. Strube, *Polyeuktoskirche und Hagia Sophia. Umbildung und Auflösung antiker Formen, Entstehung des Kämpferkapitells*, Munich 1984; G. Fawden, *Constantine, Silvester and the Church of St. Polyeuctus in Constantinople*: Journal of Roman Arch 7 (1994) 274-284; C.I. Condor, *The Epigram in the Church of Hagios Polyeuktos in Constantinople and Its Byzantine Response*: Byzantion 69 (1999) 479-527; S. Patitucci d'Alifera Patitario, *Architettura e potere a Costantinopoli nel VI secolo da San Polieucto a Santa Sofia. Le origini di un nuovo linguaggio*, in *Atti del IX Simposio di Efeso 2002*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 2003, 247-292; A.M.V. Pizzone, *Da Melitene a Costantinopoli. S. Polieucto nella politica dinastica di Giuliana Anicia; Alcune osservazioni in margine ad A.P. I 10*: Maia 55 (2003) 107-132.

A. Di Berardino

POMPA DIABOLI. The pomp (Gr. πομπή—solemn procession parade), with which the cult for the dead was primarily expressed in the *pagan world, was understood early on by Christians as a diabolic manifestation, a *pompa diaboli* to be precise, which in the baptismal rite the *catechumen was invited to renounce with formulas of this sort: *renuntio diabolo et pompae et angelis eius* ("I renounce the devil, his pomp and his angels"—Tertull., *Coron.* 3,2; *Spect.* 4,1.2.3; *Anim.* 35,3). In fact, such a renunciation referred primarily to the circus in which the pomp preceded and inaugurated the *ludi circenses* (circus games) with the procession of carts grouped acc. to types that conducted the magistrates, divine images and pictures of the ancestors. But in this regard, they naturally tended to condemn an entire culture that stretched its roots back to a remote period, and in the first centuries after Christ when it must have been well rooted, such condemnation could not have been otherwise because during the Roman Empire, the circus represented one of the privileged places for acquiring popular consent and within that space the leader already presented himself as an exhibition to the populace's transfixed gaze.

Nonetheless, to understand fully the reasons behind the renunciation of the *pompa diaboli* contained in the same baptismal rite it is helpful to examine *Tertullian's *De spectaculis*, which presented itself as a long prayer and provided the longest Late Antique treatment of the question. Working within that context, Tertullian adopted various forms of argument against the pagan shows, which raised great interest even among Christians. In particular, moreover, the ostentation was considered deplorable both from a religious and an ethical point of view, because it was a form of idolatry that led the passions to gain the upper hand. According to Tertullian, in fact, that *apparatus*, from the moment that it continued to maintain a connection to the *superstitiones* from which it derived its origin (*Spect.* 7), was designated as *pompa diaboli* and allowed the *furor* to possess everything and everyone (*Spect.* 16). Therefore, the *De spectaculis*, which then enjoyed enormous success in Christian literature of the 4th and 5th c., encouraged one to avoid all the ceremonies of the circus as the devil's true and proper deviations from God's creation, and to progressively conform oneself acc. to the divine model (*Spect.* 28-30).

Tertullian, *De spectaculis*, ed. M. Turcan, SC 332, Paris 1986; Id., *De corona e De anima*, ed. A. Gerlo, CCL 2, Turnhout 1954; H. Rahner, *Pompa diaboli*: ZKTh 55 (1931) 256-279; J.H. Waszink, *Pompa diaboli*: VChr 1 (1947) 13-41; H. Jürgens, *Pompa diaboli*, in *Die lateinische Kirchenväter und das antike Theater*, Stuttgart 1972 (Tübingen Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1); J.-R. Annot, *Les danseurs de la pompa du cirque. Témoignages textuels et iconographiques*: REL 70 (1992) 56-68; S. Rebenich, *Insania circi. Eine Tertullianreminiscenz bei Hieronymus und Augustin*: Latomus 53 (1994) 155-158; J. Köhler, *Pompai. Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Festkultur*, Bern 1996; A. Saggioro, *Dalla* pompa diaboli *allo* spiritale theatrum. *Cultura classica e cristianesimo nella polemica dei Padri della Chiesa contro gli spettacoli. Il terzo secolo*, Palermo, Università di Palermo 1999 (= Mythos. Rivista di Storia delle Religioni 8 [1996]).

P. Marone

POMPONIA GRAECINA (1st c.). A Roman noblewoman, wife of Aulus Plautius, who lived during the reign of *Nero (54-68). According to the testimony of *Tacitus, charges were brought against her: *et Pomponia Graecina insignis femina, A. Plautio nupta ac superstitionis externae rea, mariti iudicio permissa* (Ann. 13,32). Her husband examined her conduct and the rumors that circulated about her in the presence of her relatives; he declared her innocent. Tacitus adds that Pomponia lived for forty years in continual sadness, not wearing luxurious garments on account of the death of her relative Julia, the daughter of Drusus, at the instigation of Messalina. A Roman tradition regards her as having been a Christian, but Tacitus's words cannot serve as a proof of Pomponia's adherence to Christianity. Many scholars think that the "foreign superstition" at one point referred to *Judaism and at another to Christianity. It could also be the case that the Roman woman was a follower of one of the many Eastern religions heavily criticized at that time, or that she suffered from mental illness that could manifest itself in bizarre behavior. Interest in this woman reemerged with de Rossi's discoveries in the catacombs of St. Callistus, identifying her with Lucina.

G.B. de Rossi, *Roma sotterranea cristiana*, Rome 1864–1865, I 306-351; II 360-364; DACL 2, 2847-48; M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1964, 68-74; cf. G. Pascoli, *Pomponia Graecina*, intr., tr., exegetical notes and appendix by A. Traina, Bologna 1967, [4]1993.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

POMPONIUS. *Isidore of Seville informs us (*Etymol.* 1,39,26: PL 82, 121) that a certain Pomponius, concerning whom no other information exists, using Virgil's writings, composed a small poem in honor of Christ. Preserved from his writings is a poetic dialogue between the Christian Tityrus and the *pagan Melibeus (*Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*), to which the title is given *Versus ad gratiam Domini*). Isidore read a codex similar to Cod. Pal. 1753, where one finds a small poem and the cen-

tos of *Proba. Melibeus asks Tityrus the reason for his joy; he answers that by singing these things, he unites himself to the creation that sings to God; he then teaches him about Christianity.

CPL 1481; Schaller n. 16294; Schenkel, CSEL 16, 1 (1888) 609-615; PLS 1, 773-779; F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia latina*, 1,2, Leipzig 1906 (repr. Amsterdam 1972), n. 719, 189-193; M.L. Ricci, *Note al centone "Versus ad gratiam Domini" attribuito a Pomponio (719a Riese)*: Ann. Fac. Mag. Bari anni acc.1974–1976 = 14 (1977) 105-121; J.-L. Vidal, *La technique de composition du Centon virgilien "Versus ad gratiam Domini siue Tityrus" (Anth. Lat. 791a Riese)*: REA 29 (1983) 233-256; R. Lamacchia, *Centoni*, in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, I, Rome 1984, 733-737, esp. p. 736.

A. Di Berardino

PONTIANUS, bishop (6th c.). African bishop of an unknown see (perhaps to be identified with the *Pontianus* or *Potentianus*, bishop of Thenae in *Byzacena, to whom *Fulgentius of Ruspe appeared in a dream to notify him of his decision for his own successor; see *Ferrandus, *Vita S. Fulgentii* 29), author of a *letter that can be dated to around 544–545, addressed to *Justinian, in favor of the authors included in the condemnation of the *Three Chapters, because, inasmuch as they had already passed away, they were not subject to condemnation. One should not exclude the possibility that Pontianus was the same person as Ponticanus, the Catholic bishop of a particular see in Byzacena, who took part at the Synod of Iunca in 523 (*Concilia Africae*: CCL 149, 277-278). The theory that the first 12 chapters of *Isidore of Seville's *De viris illustribus* were taken from a similar work of Pontianus seems to lack foundation. Isidore's work was written to continue *Gennadius's work titled *De viris illustribus*.

CPL 864; PL 67, 995-998; F. Schütte, *Studien über den Schriftstellerkatalog (de viris ill.) des hl. Isidor von Sevilla* (Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, 1), Breslau 1902, 102; Schanz IV, 2, 583-584; Moricca 3, 2, 1479-1480; PCBE 1, 883-884; A. Placanica, *Teologia polemica e storiografia ecclesiastica nella controversia dei Tre Capitoli*, in A. Quacquarelli (ed.), *Res Christiana. Temi interdisciplinari di patristica*, Rome 1999, 129-254.

F. Scorza Barcellona

PONTIANUS (Pontian), pope (ca. 230–235). A Roman who succeeded Pope *Urban I ca. 230. During the *persecution of *Maximinus Thrax in 235, he was deported along with his presbyter (?) *Hippolytus to *Sardinia and condemned to forced labor; this led him to resign from his office on 28 September (*Cron. del 354*: MGH *Chron. min.* I,75) during exile. *Anterus succeeded him and reigned for only a month. Pontianus died on the island. His body was brought back to *Rome by Pope *Fabian, who buried him in the cemetery of *Callistus. His epitaph, written in Greek, was found in 1909 (Diehl 953).

LP I, XCIV-XCV; 145-146; III, 74; DTC 12, 2553-2554; BS 10, 1013-1015; EPapi 1, 261-263.

A. Di Berardino

PONTICIANUS (4th c.). An African, a member of the imperial administration first at *Trier, then at *Milan, and a devout Christian. In 386, he visited *Augustine and *Alypius. Being aware that the two were reading the apostle *Paul's epistles, he told them about the story of *Anthony the hermit, some of the Egyptian monks and two imperial functionaries at *Trier who had abandoned everything to become monks. The visit and Ponticianus's story provided the decisive push for Alypius's and Augustine's conversions (Aug., *Confess.* 8,6-7).

DCB 4, 439; PLRE 1, 715; PCBE 1, 884; A. Caprioli, *La conversione. Un ritorno ad Agostino*, Milan 1987.

A. Di Berardino

PONTIFEX MAXIMUS. The origin of the term *pontifex maximus* has been lost in the sands of time, although the most ancient election of a *pontifex maximus*, for which we have information (Livy, 25,5,2), goes back to the 3rd c. BC. The *pontifex maximus* was the head of the *collegium pontificum* (15 members, also called *flamines*) and the Roman religion; he set the calendar, protected the sacred books and appointed the other *flamines* and the sacred vestal virgins (7). Each *flamen* was designated to serve for the cult of a particular god, the three major priests for the three major divinities (Jupiter [*flamen dialis*], Mars and Quirinus). From Augustus onward the title *pontifex maximus* belonged to the emperor, who also regulated the official cult (the *sacra publica*). From Nerva onward, the dignity of the *pontifex maximus* was included among the attributes of the *princeps*, without the electoral procedure. Even *Constantine and his sons preserved the title. In 379, *Theodosius was the first emperor not to assume the title (19 January); the emperor *Gratian renounced it and its functions (during the years 376–383); the date is still subject to much debate. Because *Ausonius in 379 still referred to Gratian with the title *pontifex* (*Gratiarum actio* 32 and 45), Paschoud believes that this had a Christian meaning and no longer a *pagan one (*Cinq études sur Zosime*, Paris 1975, 71ff.).

Although the pagan title with its functions would no longer be appropriated by the emperors, some Christian emperors still bore the title *pontifex* (DACL 1424-1426).

From Christian antiquity until today the title *pontifex* or rather *pontifex maximus* has been applied primarily to *Jesus Christ. The title *pontifex* remained, however, as an attribute of religious authority, and starting from the end of the 4th c. it was used to refer to a bishop. From that period, the term *pontifex* and its synonym became common among Christians, as *Jerome notes: *pontifex et episcopus, quem oportet esse sine crimine*, "the pontifex and bishop, whom it befits to be without fault" (PL 22, 611). Jerome made ample use of the title (PL 22, 553; 594; 663; 665, etc.), but it was used esp. by the popes (*see* Leo I). The title *summus Pontifex*, starting with Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), began to be restricted to the pope: *summus pontifex, in sede Romana vicem beati Petri gerens, totius Ecclesiae apice sublimatur* (PL 114, 963) and esp. with Pope Leo IV (844–855). The application of the title *pontifex maximus*, however, after *Tertullian, was used only for *Athanasius by *Rufinus of Aquileia (PL 21, 536D); it was carefully avoided during Christian antiquity, perhaps because of the heavy pagan connotations; such a title was given to the popes only from the mid-15th c., esp. in epigraphy after the rediscovery of the classical world.

RAC 16, 6-58; G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich [2]1912, 501-523; A. Bernareggi, *Costantino imperatore e pontefice massimo*: Scuola Cattolica 41 (1913) 237-253; K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich 1960, 195-200, 400-407; K. Ziegler, KLP 4, 1046-1048; P. Stockmeier, *Die Übernahme des Pontifex-Titels im spätantiken Christentum*, in *Konzil und Papst*, Fest. für H. Tuechle, Munich 1975, 75-84; A. Cameron, *Gratian's Repudiation of the Pontifical Robe*: JRS 58 (1968) 96-102; L. Schumacher, *Die vier hohen römischen Priesterkollegien unter den Flaviern, den Antoninen und den Severern (69–235 n. Chr.)*: ANRW 16,1 (1978) 737-768; I. Kajanto, *Pontifex Maximus as Title of the Pope*: Arctos 15 (1981) 37-52; R. Seguin, *Remarques sur les origines des pontifes romains. Pontifex maximus et Rex sacrorum*, in *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec. Res sacrae*, publ. par D. Porte et J.-P. Néraudau, Brussels 1988, 405-418; R.M. Errington, *Church and State in the First Years of Theodosius I*: Chiron 27 (1997) 21-72; R. Stepper, *Untersuchungen zum römischen Kaiser als Priester*, Stuttgart 2003.

B. Aland - A. Di Berardino

PONTIUS, deacon. Deacon of *Carthage. Later centuries only knew him as the biographer of *Cyprian (Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 68), whom he accompanied into exile in 257 at Curubis (Korfa, Tunisia); he was an eyewitness to his execution on 14 Sept. 258. With firsthand knowledge of the *acta proconsularia*, he composed Cyprian's *Vita* in a *panegyric style, shortly after the death of his teacher. Nevertheless, the work contains some valuable information on Cyprian's *conversion, literary work and his attitude during the plague (252–254). The *martyrdom of Cyprian imitated the passion of Christ. Pontius witnessed the initial cult of Cyprian's relics *ex contactu* (*Vita Cypr.* 16,6). Ado later inserted Pontius into his *martyrology for 8 March.

LTK[2] 8, 616; Monceaux 2, 179-197; A. Harnack, *Das Leben Cyprians von Pontius*, TU 39/3; *Vita di Cipriano, Vita di Ambrogio, Vita di Agostino*, intr. Ch. Mohrmann, critical text and comm., ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen, trans. L. Canali and C. Carena, Fond. L. Valla, Milan [3]1989; S. Deleani, *Le récit de la mort de Cyprien dans la Vita Cypriani. Structure et signification*, in *La narrativa cristiana antica. Codici narrativi, strutture formali, schemi retorici*, XXIII incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 5-7 maggio 1994 (SEA 50), Rome 1995, 465-477; H. Montgomery, *Pontius' Vita Cypriani and the Making of a Saint*: Symbolae Osloenses 71 (1996) 195-215; V. Saxer, *La Vita Cypriani du diacre Pontius*, "Première biographie chrétienne," in *Orbis Romanus Christianusque ab Diocletiani aetate usque ad Heraclium. Travaux sur l'Antiquité tardive rassemblés autour des recherches de N. Duval*, Paris 1995, 237-251.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PONTUS. Pontus was the area of *Asia Minor on the coast of the Black Sea, bordering on the E with Colchis and *Armenia, to the W with Paphlagonia and SW with *Galatia, and to the SE with *Cappadocia. It is dominated by mountains and valleys with the rivers Halys, Iris (Yeşil) and Lycus (Kelkit Çayi). This is a general geographic indication, because from the political and administrative point of view its borders varied acc. to the decisions of political leaders and the times. In fact, the Roman province called **Bithynia et Pontus*, organized by Pompey and over which *Pliny the Younger was governor (111–113), included Paphlagonia and a small part of Pontus, the most Hellenized part on the coast, the cities of Sinope, homeland of *Marcion, and Amisus. During the course of the 1st c., upon the request of Corbulon, during the years 63/64, the kingdom of Polemon II of Pontus (*Pontus Polemoniacus*) was annexed to the Roman province of Galatia, but subdivided into two districts: *Pontus Galaticus* (*metropolis* *Amasea, 2nd c. AD) and the *Pontus Polemoniacus* (*metropolis* *Neocaesarea) (Rémy, 101ff.). The latter included the mountainous region of Pontus, the Lycus Valley, the coast to the E of the free city of Amisus up to Colchis. The two territories, although subjected to the legate of Cappadocia, formed distinct districts and, for strategic and military reasons, they came to be part of the province of Cappadocia (AD 110) during the time of *Trajan. The recent dis-

covery of two inscriptions demonstrates that under *Alexander Severus the province of Pontus was established, but scholars do not know its precise borders (Rémy, 101ff.). Consequently, *Gregory Thaumaturgus worked in the district of *Pontus Polemoniacus* in the province of Cappadocia. Subsequently, with *Diocletian's reorganization, it would acquire another provincial structure.

Even a well-known city like *Neocaesarea (today Niksar) immediately underwent changes of name acc. to the times. Its ancient name was "Cabeira," which was probably the city that through Pompey's influence became Diospolis, which was also called *Sebaste. During the time of *Nero, the city was annexed to the Roman province of Galatia and acquired the name Neocaesarea, to indicate a new establishment; during the time of the emperor *Hadrian, the city was also called Hadriana (see Barrington, *Atlas*). It became a *metropolis*, the first of the district of *Pontus Polemoniacus*, previously called *Pontus Mediterraneus.* During the time of *Trajan, the district was detached from Galatia and united to Cappadocia. With Diocletian's reform, it became a province with the name *Pontus Polemoniacus,* and Neocaesarea, its capital. The city was located to the W slopes of the Paryadres Mountains, towering over the Lycus Valley, a tributary to the Iris River, ca. 50 km (= 31 mi) from Comana Pontica and ca. 100 km (= 62 mi) from the coast. Neocaesarea, which boasted that it had an emperor as its founder, was a fully flourishing city during the 3rd c., as attested by the coins that portray its buildings and its symbols used for the games in honor of the local divinities.

So the title "Pontus" does not have a univocal meaning, but it gradually acquired various meanings acc. to the political and administrative context and ordinary use. In these Roman provinces, urbanization increased, inasmuch as the population lived primarily in the villages, even with the foundation of new cities and the creation of Roman colonies. Moreover, the Romans favored the spread of Greek language and culture, esp. in the cities and among the learned classes, because local Anatolian dialects spoken there would last a long time in certain areas.

Christianity, at least in the coastal cities, was already widespread in the beginning of the 2nd c., as evidenced by 1 Peter, *Pliny the Younger, who mentioned that Christianity was widespread even in the villages, the hatred expressed by Alexander Abonuteichus (2nd c.) toward Christians, who must have been numerous in that area, and *Marcion, son of the bishop of Sinope. The *Canonical Epistle* of *Gregory Thaumaturgus provides a lengthy treatment, suggesting that the Christians were numerous; even the legend acc. to which upon the death of Gregory the *pagans had practically disappeared from the area must have had some historical foundation. Even his brother *Athenodorus, *Eusebius of Caesarea noted, became bishop. The presence of large landholdings in Pontus is significant, keeping in mind the psychology and practice that, if the master of the house converted, his "entire house" became Christian. In *evangelization, the local dialects posed the greatest challenge, one that could be overcome only if the Christian clergy could speak the language. The ecclesiastical organization was urban, but the bishop had to send emissaries into the countryside to examine offending Christians (see Greg. Thaum., *Canonical Epistle*). Gregory greatly contributed to the Christianization of the region.

The *Sassanids of *Shapur I in 256 plundered Cappadocia and Armenia, conquering Satala and its territory, perhaps because the Roman forces were preoccupied by the ineffective defense of Trapezus (modern-day Trabzon). They again occupied Cappadocia and Caesarea in 259/260.

The *Goths and the unknown Boradi (or Voradi, Boranoi) tried to carry out raids many times in Pontus; one such raid covered the entire N area of Asia Minor, from E to W. The Goths devastated certain provinces (Zosimus 1, 31-36); they were not innovators who had come with the idea of staying, but came with the intention of looting and carrying off prisoners, many of whom were the Christians of Cappadocia and *Phrygia. The ancestors of *Wulfila, the evangelist of the Goths, were among those deported from Cappadocia, from a village near the city of Parnassus, just as those Christians under the jurisdiction of Bishop Selenas of Phrygia. The churches of Cappadocia and, we suppose, even the other communities of Asia Minor, devoted themselves to the captives' redemption, but many remained among the Goths and established some Christian communities. *Philostorgius wrote that the Goths (Scythians), upon invading Asia, Galatia and Cappadocia, in addition to spoils, carried with themselves many prisoners, among whom were members of the clergy. Good Christians converted many barbarians. For a few decades, the entire region had to undergo the deportations caused by the invaders and the armies. Manzoni in his novel *I Promessi Sposi* reminds us of the damage they caused to the local population. *Basil of Caesarea in 371 mentioned in a letter to Pope *Damasus that his predecessor *Dionysius (259–268) had sent monetary assistance for the redemption of the prisoners taken by the Goths, and there existed a written and oral

record of that assistance (see Basil, *Ep.* 70). For the bishops of Pontus, see Fedalto 1, 20ff.

M. Salamon, *The Chronology of Gothic Incursions into Asia Minor in the IIIrd Century AD*: Eos 49 (1971) 109-139; E. Olshausen, *Pontus und Rom (63 v. Chr.–64 n. Chr.)*: ANRW, Principat 7, 2, 903-912; R.D. Sullivan, *Dynasts in Pontus*: ibid., 913-930; B. Rémy, *L'évolution administrative de l'Anatolie aux trois premiers siècles de notre ère*, Lyon 1986; S. Mitchel, *Anatolia, Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, II, *The Rise of the Church*, Oxford 1993; D. D. Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity. A History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia*, Oxford 1994.

A. Di Berardino

POOR – POVERTY. The subject of the poor/poverty in the writings of the *Fathers has its roots in the *Bible, where it occupies a considerable amount of space: one merely has to think of the rich vocabulary used in the OT to speak about the subject. Facing the fundamental demands of existence, the biblical point of view is the most realistic possible: there is no praise for poverty per se; biblical legislation does not make allowance for pauperism, namely, the kind of absolute poverty that would lead to a state of dependence, thus reflecting the life of slavery in Egypt from which Israel was delivered. When considered in this light, the model of the Exodus is significant: during their pilgrimage in the desert, it was impossible to divide the people into social classes because virtually everyone was poor and equal. The Mosaic legislation pertaining to the subject of poverty is composed of various layers and perhaps in some points is an ideal rather than an effective norm (e.g., the redemption of slaves at the end of seven years and the institution of the jubilee year: Ex 21:1-11; Lev 25:3-9; Dt 15:1-18). Some texts introduced the original initiatives of Israel: Lev 19:9; 25:3-6, 35; Ex 22:24-26; Ruth 2:1-3. On the basis of such norms, there is an idea of true equality and not simply an affirmation of a principle. If the temporal blessings are a concrete sign of Israel's faithfulness to God, poverty is seen as a curse that strikes the unfaithful or the lazy. Experience, however, shows that poverty was not always a punishment, but it was often accompanied by virtue: esp. in the *Psalms, the poor were likened to the righteous. On the one hand, one finds many texts that show how wisdom should bring about a "happy medium" (Pr 30:8-9), and on the other hand, texts that tell a different story: many of the poor are such because they are victims of human injustice.

There is certainly a change of perspective with the passage from nomadic life to the invasion of Canaan, with the consequent division of land and the beginning of those social inequalities that became more emphasized during the period of the monarchy. It was in this period that the activity of the prophets in defense of the poor became intense (Amos 4:1; 5:11-12; Is 3:14-15; 10:1-2; Jer 21:11-12), a defense God begins to identify as his own (Is 11:4; 14:30-32; Amos 2:6-7; Bar 2:18). Such an identification changes the concept of poverty so that it is no longer merely economic and sociological, but spiritual (Zeph 2:3): the mediator of salvation is no longer the sovereign but the Servant of Yahweh, one of the "poor of Yahweh" who stands as a messianic figure.

The theme of the "poor of Yahweh"—a technical expression found only after the exile in the Wisdom literature (the identification of these "poor" with a socially organized group has been much discussed)—touches upon a collection of concepts and entities: poverty, political power, the land, ungodliness, righteousness, all of which belong to the specific history of Israel, and this history would become a model for the Christian communities of the first centuries.

In the NT and the Christian tradition, we discover in the figure of the "servant of Yahweh" the announcement of the Redeemer and the suffering Christ. With regard to the theme of poverty, the NT texts present a twofold evaluation: not only is it not a simple evil (cf. the theology of the Beatitudes), but it can become a sign of eschatological fullness. A page from Matthew's gospel (25:31-46) on the final judgment supplies the reason for the privileged position that the poor person acquires in the kingdom: the poor person is a universal sign of Christ's presence among people. The *Jewish Christian community of *Jerusalem (Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-37) demands an equality that excludes misery, recalling the equality that Jewish legislation had already set forth as the ideal; but the commonality of goods, in contradistinction to what occurred among the Essenes, was a free choice for poverty (see P. Brezzi and M. Del Verme) that, being essentially a lack of guarantees, recalled that liberty from the law proclaimed by the apostle *Paul. The commonality of goods is not merely a sign of a reciprocal acceptance between the faithful, but expresses, inasmuch as it is a manifestation of poverty, that every Christian is, like Christ, a "servant of Yahweh." In the NT, therefore, the discussion of poverty begins from the poverty of Christ (Mt 8:20; Lk 2:7, 12, 16, 24; 2 Cor 8:9), from his support for the poor (Lk 4:16; 7:22), to the point of requesting poverty of those who wish to follow (Mt 19:16ff.; Mk 1:16-20; Lk 9:3; 10:4), not imposing on all, however, the same renunciation of goods even if he taught all to be free with respect to money, to give mutual assistance in time of need and the necessity

of working to make a living for oneself (2 Th 3:10).

In the Christianity of the first centuries, the theme of the poor/poverty developed different emphases acc. to geographic and cultural contexts. Against the *Encratite and dualistic tendencies of *Platonism and *Manicheism, which perceived an irresolvable rift between the material and spiritual world and concluded by condemning any contact with earthly goods to the point of prohibiting work (see the heresy of the *apotactites* or the **apostolici*: Epiph., *Haer.* 61), the Christians proposed a fundamental continuity between the two worlds on the basis of faith in the one Creator-God. The *Didache* (IV, 8) emphasized the obligation to share one's goods, the fruit of labor; *Aristides (*Apol.* 15,7) and *Tertullian (*Apol.* 39,10) maintained that such a division was a specific obligation of Christians. For *Clement of Alexandria, the commonality of goods between people is commanded (*Quis dives salv.* 13). He indicated that poverty, acc. to the gospel, for the one who is renouncing his goods, is not an end in itself, but is ordered to the kingdom. With this perspective in mind, it is not permissible to judge the authenticity of someone's state of poverty; rather, it is necessary to give to each one who asks, giving without discrimination, inasmuch as each person has dignity (*Quis div. salv.* 33). For *Minucius Felix, poverty is not a disgrace (*Oct.* 36); Christ is present in the poor and the needy (Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* IV, 14,9; Cypr. *De op. et elem.* 15; Greg. Naz., *De paup. amand.* 36; Aug., *Serm.* 86). Pastorally concerned about the presence of the poor in the Christian community, *Cyprian emphasized the need for almsgiving (*De op. et elem.* 5) to reestablish a situation of equality between the rich and the poor.

For *Basil of Caesarea, the social condition of the poor was not desired by God, but is the product of human sin (*Hom.* VI, 7; Greg. Naz. *Or.* 14,25) from which, in the assistance for the poor, one wipes away original sin (Basil, *Hom.* VIII, 7). The extra resources of the rich belong to the poor (Id., *Hom.* VI, 7), but even among the poor themselves it is possible to establish some amount of generosity (ibid., *Hom.* VIII, 6). Not all the poor are blessed because poverty is not, per se, a positive reality: poverty without freedom does not give life (Clem. Alex., *Quis div. salv.* 11). Those poor are blessed who have become such through the imitation of Christ (Ambr., *Exp. Ev. sec. Luc.* V, 53; John Chrys., *In Matt. hom.* 90,4); they are poor because they do not have sins, they do not have vices, they have nothing that has to do with the prince of this world (Ambr., *Exp. Ev. sec. Luc.* V, 53). In contradistinction to understanding poverty only in a spiritual sense, *Gregory of Nyssa presented another view. He did not believe that there had to be a distinction between actual poverty and spiritual poverty because, for the Christian, there is only one true poverty, which is the fruit of the Holy Spirit, and it does not permit one to retain earthly riches (PG 44, 1208).

The poor are seen as teachers of life in enduring pain: for this reason they find entrance into the churches in order to be examples and to remind everyone of the need for mercy (John Chrys., *In 1 Thess. hom.* 11,4). They are free to speak: for this reason the disciples sent by Jesus Christ were poor (ibid., *In Hebr. hom.* 18,2); they are true patrons before God (*Hermas, *Sim.* 2; *Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 13,11; *Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Serm.* 1,7-8). Augustine warned the poor to be careful not to fall into greed (*Serm.* 85), because the true poor person is the one who not only does not possess, but does not want to possess (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 103, *ser.* 3,16; John Chrys., *In Hebr. hom.* 11,3). Poverty is the mother of all the virtues (*Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Prov. Div.* 6), but not the kind that is the product of squandering and laziness (John Chrys., *In 1 Cor hom.* 34,6). The complementarity between the rich and the poor was characterized by Hermas in his allegory of the vines and the elm tree (*Sim.* 2). A certain complementarity is demonstrated also by *John Chrysostom in the image of the two cities, namely, that of the rich and the poor (*In 1 Cor. hom.* 34,5), where the term *poor* makes reference to the one who lives to work tirelessly.

In patristic writings the following motifs are constant: a negative evaluation of poverty not freely chosen for the *sequela Christi*; the exhortation to the Christian communities to share, to give generously to create concrete structures (gathering centers, storehouses for those in need and centers of voluntary work) able to remedy situations of need. In the ancient church, the social problem was not the primary object of teaching; everything was oriented to evangelizing the poor, i.e., inasmuch as it is precisely the reception of the message that, acc. to the Fathers, involves the recognition of the common origins of all people and the goodness of material things, from this recognition emerges the obligation of the rich person to share even to the point of changing the conditions of the poor.

A. Causse, *Les pauvres d'Israël*, Paris 1922; DBS 7, 387-406; G. Barbieri, *Le dottrine economiche nel pensiero cristiano. Grande Antologia Filos.*, Milan 1954, V, 1089-1174; P. Christophe, *Les dévoirs moraux des riches. L'usage du droit de propriété dans l'Écriture et la Tradition patristique*, Paris 1964; L. Orabona, *Cristianesimo e proprietà. Saggio sulle fonti antiche*, Rome 1964; P. Brezzi, *Fonti e studi di storia della Chiesa*, Milan 1972; S. Zincone, *Ricchezza e povertà nelle omelie di Giovanni Crisostomo*, L'Aquila 1973; P. Vismara Chiappa, *Il tema della*

povertà nella predicazione di sant'Agostino, Milan 1975; various articles in Augustinianum 17 (1977); M. Del Verme, *Comunione e condivisione dei beni*, Brescia 1977; V. Grossi, *La chiesa precostantiniana di fronte alla povertà*, in *L'annuncio del regno ai poveri*, Turin 1978, 69-101; L.Wm. Countryman, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire. Contradictions and Accommodations*, New York-Toronto 1980; G. Visonà, *Povertà, sequela, carità. Orientamenti dei primi due secoli*, in var. aus., *Per forumen acus. Il cristianesimo antico di fronte alla pericope del giovane ricco*, Milan 1986; E. Patlagean, *Povertà ed emarginazione a Bisanzio* (*IV-VII secolo*), Bari 1986; J. Roug, *Aspects de pauvreté et de ses remèdes aux IV^e-V^e siècles*: AARC 8 (1990) 227-248; M.G. Mara, *Proposte relative alla giustizia sociale. Ricchezza e povertà nel cristianesimo antico*: Seminarium 30/3 (1990) 547-566; Id., *Ricchezza e povertà nel cristianesimo primitivo*, Rome [2]1991; G. Filoramo - S. Roda, *Cristianesimo e società antica*, Bari 1992; E.W. Stegemann - W. Stegemann, *Storia sociale del cristianesimo primitivo*, Bologna 1998, 383-392; B. Sesboüé, *Riches et pauvres. Présentation de textes de Basile de Césarée et de Jean Chrysostome*: Médiasèvres. Patristique 122 (2002).

M.G. Mara

POPE. The name "papa," from the Greek word πάππα(ς) (= father), almost up to the 9th c., but esp. in the 3rd-5th c. was given to abbots and bishops as an expression of loving respect. *Pope* was at times given to simple priests (as is still done today in the East). In Egypt, the πάππας par excellence was the bishop of *Alexandria. As a title for the bishop of *Rome, *pope* is found for the first time in an inscription from the end of the 3rd c. During the 4th c., the title was applied to the bishop of Rome above all in letters sent from the East to Rome, but also in Western documents such as the letter of the bishops gathered at *Arles who greeted *Sylvester as the most glorious pope (*gloriossimus papa*; Pietri 1609). Toward the end of the century it tended to become a proper title (see Ambrose, *Ep.* 42; Synod of *Toledo [400]: Mansi III, 1006-7; Vincent of Lérins, *Comm.* 32-33). Nevertheless, during the 4th c., the title was still often accompanied by certain qualifying terms such as *papa Urbis aeterna*, *papa Urbis Romae*. In official documents of the 6th c., with very rare exceptions, this term became the distinct title for the bishop of Rome (see the *Lib. pontif.*, from the life of *Agapitus I [535–536] onward).

EC 9, 752-753; B. Labanca, *Del nome di "papa" nelle Chiese cristiane di Oriente e Occidente*, in Actes du XII^e Congrès des Orientalistes, III/2, Rome 1899, 47-101 (repr. Rome 1978); Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, 1609-1612 (bibl.); M. Guerra Gómez, *Los nombres del Papa*, Burgos 1982; G. Schwaiger, TRE 25 (1995) 647; K. Schatz, LTK[3] 7, 1327-28.

B. Studer

PORCARIUS of Lérins, martyr. The *Vita* of Porcarius (not to be confused with the Porcarius of *Lérins from the 5th c.) belongs to the hagiographic cycle of Lérins (11th/12th c.). During the time of Charles Martel (ca. 732), *Saracens destroyed Provence: after being warned by a dream, Porcarius, *abbot of Lérins, took measures to secure the church's treasure, relics of the saints and all the children. Ten days later, the Saracens arrived and slaughtered the Abbot Porcarius and 500 monks. Eleutherus alone was able to escape. He buried the dead and 20 years later reconstructed the *monastery. At Lérins, a chapel supposedly from the 10th c. marks the spot commonly believed to be the site of the massacre. The feast day falls on August 12th.

BHL 6899-6902; BS 10, 1035-1036; LCI 8, 221.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PORPHYRY of Antioch (d. 413). Upon the death of *Flavian (404), Porphyry was elected patriarch (Socrates, *HE* 7,9), an event that was presented in different ways by the two primary sources: *Palladius's *Dialogue on the Life of St. *John Chrysostom* and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Ecclesiastical History*. According to Palladius (*Dial.* 16,31-63), Porphyry was the enemy of *John Chrysostom; he described Porphyry as a ruthless and dissolute man, a political opportunist and a persecutor of *Constantius, a friend of Chrysostom, and the deacon of Flavian. Porphyry was the people's preferred candidate for the See of *Antioch. He was consecrated with a hasty rite of ordination while the games were being held at Daphne on the outskirts of the city, which had been emptied due to the event. *Severian of Gabala was his supporter on this occasion. A revolt took place, which was suppressed by the military commander Valentinus. The Emperor *Arcadius intervened to support Porphyry and forced all the opposition to enter into communion with him (CTh 16,4,6 for 8 November 404). Nevertheless, Pope *Innocent and *Theophilus of *Alexandria did not recognize him. Theodoret presented him, however, as a man who "left many signs of his gentleness and prudence" (*HE* 5, 37); for this reason "his memory is holy" (*Ep.* 83). A fragment of Theophilus's letter sent to Porphyry has survived, informing him about the convocation of a council against the new followers of *Paul of Samosata.

DCB 4, 453-454.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PORPHYRY of Gaza, bishop (ca. 347–420). His life (CPG 6722) was written by the deacon *Mark, his faithful disciple. The publication of this document (ed. H. Grégoire and M.A. Kugener) gave rise to conflicting positions on its historical value. Nevertheless, it seems that it won acceptance for its statements concerning the succession and chronology of the events it narrated. Porphyry was born into a rich family around 347 at *Thessalonica. When 30 years old, he abandoned the world to devote himself to God. He first traveled to *Egypt, where he lived the life of a monk for five years in the Desert of *Scetis, then he went to *Palestine and spent five years in a grotto located on the bank of the Jordan River. His excessive austerity greatly deteriorated his health. Nevertheless, he wanted to visit the holy sites of *Jerusalem, and it was there that Mark, a professional scribe, became acquainted with him and gradually bonded with him: he did not leave Porphyry until the latter died. Porphyry, who in the meantime had given away all his possessions to the poor, settled in the holy city as a shoemaker to provide for himself and his basic needs. The fame of his holiness even reached the notice of Bishop *John II of Jerusalem, who ordained him a priest and commissioned him to guard the relics of the Holy Cross. It was the year 392 and Porphyry was now 45 years old. Just three years later (i.e., 395), upon the death of *Aeneas bishop of *Gaza, *John the archbishop of Caesarea, exercising his function as metropolitan, nominated Porphyry as Aeneas's successor. His governance as bishop was difficult at first, esp. because of the *pagans' hostile resistance. Porphyry had to ask for the emperor's support on at least two occasions: the first time he requested the intervention of *John Chrysostom; the second, he went to the imperial city (402). Porphyry's episcopate lasted 25 years; he died on 26 February 420. The Byzantine synaxaria dated his *memoria* on this date, and Caesar Baronius introduced it into the Roman martyrology.

BS 10, 1039-1043; H. Grégoire - M.-A. Kugener, *Marc le diacre. Vie de Porphyre évêque de Gaza*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté, Paris 1930. P. Peeters, *La Vie géorgienne de saint Porphyre de Gaza*: AB 59 (1941) 65-216; J.W. Childers, *The Georgian Life of Porphyry of Gaza*, SP 35, Leuven 2001, 374-384.

J.-M. Sauget

PORPHYRY of Philippi. Bishop who participated at the Council of *Serdica of 343 (CSEL 65, 133) on the side of the Western bishops who were against the Arianizing Eusebians and in favor of *Athanasius. In 1975, at the Roman colony *Philippi, a discovery was made of a floor mosaic with an inscription stating: "Bishop Porphyry made the mosaic of the basilica of Paul, in Christ." Nothing else is known of him.

P. Lemerle, *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale à l'époque chrétienne et byzantine*, Paris 1945, 270; V. Abrahamsen, *Bishop Porphyrios and the City of Philippi in the Early Fourth Century*: VChr 43 (1989) 80-85.

A. Di Berardino

PORPHYRY of Tyre (232/233–305?), philosopher. From Phoenicia, Malchus (= *Basileus*), called Porphyry, was one of the most prestigious representatives of the *Neoplatonist tradition. During his youth, he was accustomed to visit *Origen, probably at the school of *Caesarea (cf. Eus., *HE* 6, 19,1-8), but it seems that he cut all ties with Christians following some altercation (cf. Socrates, *HE* 3, 23,38; *Teosofia* II, 25, ed. Beatrice, 35-36). A disciple of *Longinus at *Athens and *Plotinus at *Rome (263–268), he went to Sicily to overcome a severe case of depression that led him to the point of suicide. During his trip to Sicily he was able to reach *Carthage and there composed, among other things, his long treatise against the Christians. After Plotinus died in Campania in 270, Porphyry returned to Rome—we do not know when—to lead the school. Married shortly thereafter to a rich Jewish widow named "Marcella," the recipient of one of his famous letters, Porphyry moved to *Nicomedia to the court of *Diocletian to work as an advisor shortly before the great *persecution of Christianity in 303. After this date, no trace of Porphyry appears in the historical record. For more than two centuries, his influence, which does not exclude critical reactions, was enormous on Neoplatonist philosophers, esp. Latin (one thinks, e.g., of *Iamblichus, Cornelius Labeon, *Firmicus Maternus, *Julian the Apostate, *Marius Victorinus, *Macrobius, *Martianus Capella and *Boethius). Very clear traces of his work can be found in the works of Christian authors who addressed his claims in a more or less extensive and direct manner to defend Christianity and the *Bible from his attacks (a long series that includes *Arnobius of Sicca, *Lactantius, *Methodius of Olympus, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Didymus the Blind, *Macarius Magnes, *Jerome, *Philostorgius, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and *Cyril of Alexandria). But there were also any number of Christian authors who, though aware of the danger of his writings, did not hesitate to reuse his work and his thoughts with a Christian interpretation within permissible parameters (another long series of names including *Calcidius, *Ambrose, *Synesius, *Augustine, *Aeneas of Gaza, the anonymous Syrian author of the *Theosophy*,

*John Philoponus and *Nemesius of Emesa).

A brillian polymath, author of numerous historical, philological, philosophical and religious works, Porphyry is quite interesting, therefore, in addition to the history of ancient and medieval philosophy, even for the history of ancient Christianity from various points of view. From here onward, I shall note the most important conclusions reached by scholars thus far and several points of discussion still subject to debate—in the awareness that the patristic sources can offer a greater understanding of his person and work than has been thought possible until now; vice versa, the study of his writings can help in resolving various enigmas of patristic literature.

1. In recent decades, it has become ever more clear that the *viri novi* against whom Arnobius argued in the *Adv. nationes* II, 15 are none other than Porphyry himself and his Neoplatonist followers. Overcoming earlier weak and confused hypotheses (Carcopino, Festugière), the following scholars have moved in this direction, esp. Courcelle, Fortin, Beatrice and recently Simmons.

2. The self-definition of *antistes philosophiae* used by the mysterious anti-Christian philosopher described by Lactantius in *Div. Instit.* V, 2,2-11 seems to have referred to Porphyry. Chadwick's keen intuition concerning Porphyry's activity at the court of Nicomedia was accepted and later developed by Wilken, Beatrice and Digeser.

3. Of particular importance is a testimony that Porphyry had Origen of Alexandria and his intellectual portrait in mind in a controversial fragment of the third book of his anti-Christian treatise cited by Eusebius, *HE* 6,19,1-8. This text had been used for a long time by Valesius (17th c.), to maintain that one must distinguish this Origen, undoubtedly Christian, from another person bearing the same name to whom some Neoplatonist sources refer (Porphyry, *Hierocles and Proclus), commonly referred to as "Origen the pagan" or "*Origen the Neoplatonist." One must note that the theory of two Origens is a prime, but disquieting, example of academic conformism and bibliographic laziness that transformed a hypothesis initially poorly concocted into a veritable historiographical dogma. From the systematic analysis of the entire documentation available, one finds, however, that the existence of a second pagan Origen seems rather shallow. Such a hypothesis derives in substance from the unjustifiable prejudice of the impossibility of a double career for a single person who, however, as a matter of common knowledge, was able to attend with the same self-confidence and authoritativeness episcopal councils, imperial courts and the most prestigious philosophical schools of his period (see my contributions to the following volumes: *Origeniana Quinta*, *Sexta* and *Septima*. One finds nothing new or useful on this matter in the pages of the following works: R. Goulet, *Études sur les Vies de philosophes de l'Antiquité Tardive*, Paris 2001, 391-393, and M.J. Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, Aldershot 2002, 53-55, although the contributions of the following scholars seem to promise interesting developments: W. Bienert, R. Somos, W. Kinzig and Th. Böhm).

4. Another field of research particularly rich with *litiges* (an expression of P. Courcelle) pertains to the identification of the *libri platonicorum* read by Augustine at *Milan (*Conf.* VII, 9). These works certainly contain some (not many) passages from Plotinus which, acc. to Augustine, were the sole, true source of his intellectual conversion (*De beata vita* I, 4), but the fact that they also included Porphyry's works was gradually recognized thanks only to the pioneering studies of W. Theiler, J.J. O'Meara and P. Courcelle.

In my opinion, the *libri platonicorum* should be identified with Porphyry's work titled *Philosophy from Oracles*, a work well known to Augustine in *Marius Victorinus's Latin translation (see the clear allusion already at the beginning of the *C. Acad.* I, 1,1; and *Civ. Dei* XIX, 23). This must have contained, among others things, various extracts of comments on some of *Plotinus's *Enneads* (see my study on this topic in VChr 43 [1989] 248-281), and could offer Augustine plenty of material on philosophical and religious meditation on various topics such as the oracles and theurgy, nature and the purification of the *soul, the liberal arts, trinitarian theology and providence. Augustine's silence about the author of these works can be easily explained if one concedes that the *Philosophy from Oracles*, in turn, was none other than Porphyry's anti-Christian treatise (see under no. 7).

5. A still more complicated problem, if that were possible, arises from a treatise that goes under the current title *Kata Christianōn* (*Contra Christianos*). In the past few decades, scholars have begun to rethink the underpinnings of the idea that this is a second work written by Porphyry against the Christians, thereby leading them to different conclusions. The edition of fragments published by Harnack (Berlin 1916; integrated with other fragments in 1921) has been subjected many times, and rightly so, to severe criticisms, but despite some new discoveries, it has not been truly rejected and, in the absence of something better, it still remains a valuable instrument for study. Unfortunately, even recent studies such as those by Hoffmann (1994) and Linguiti

(CPF I, 1***, Florence 1999, 623-633) not only do not offer any innovative contributions, but persist in setting forth, without adequate justification, interpretations that have already been rejected. The situation has already been made more complicated by the fact that in various English works (among others, e.g., Wilken, Droge, Simmons, Digeser, Cook and Kofsky), scholars have gone forward affirming the idea—in my opinion, void of any foundation in the primary sources—that Porphyry wrote not one, but two works against the Christians, i.e., first the *Philosophy from Oracles* (in three books, acc. to Wolff's reconstruction) and then the *Kata Christianōn* in 15 books (in realty, this is an old hypothesis already suggested in the 19th c. by various scholars such as Kellner, Seitz and Kleffner). The undeniable fact remains that no primary source attests to the existence of a work titled *Against the Christians*; however, the anti-Christian character of the *Philosophy from Oracles* always emerges more clearly with the progress of studies. In addition to the structure of the work, its dating remains uncertain and vacillates, acc. to some scholars (Croke), between 270/271 and the beginning of the 4th c., acc. to others (Barnes).

6. What are the prospects for future work in Porphyryian studies? It must be admitted that Porphyrian philology is not flourishing. Despite the notable efforts of various philologists (e.g., Nauck, Bidez, Westerink, Sodano, Hadot, Lamberz and Bouffartigue), we are certainly far from possessing safe and trustworthy critical editions of Porphyry's works. For the *Philosophy from Oracles*, one must still consult the incomplete and arbitrary edition of G. Wolff (1856). The attribution of the anonymous *Commentary on the Parmenides* of the Turin *palimpsest is still debated by scholars (see my review of Baltes, 2002 in IJCT 11 [2004/5] 473-478), and the same holds for the so-called *Theology of Aristotle*. The *Philosophy from Oracles* and the *De abstinentia* were differentiated into two treatises by Eusebius, but Theodoret of Cyrrhus believed them to be the same work. One could go on and on. In the end, even the Teubner edition by A. Smith (1993), despite its breadth and its definite usefulness, is nothing more than a collection of fragments structured acc. to entirely arbitrary and artificial criteria (and at times incomplete: where does one find, for instance, reference to Macarius Magnes's *Apokritikos* III, 42, in which the anonymous pagan interlocutor explicitly referred to the *Philosophy from Oracles*? For other proposals on integrating all these sources, see O. Ballériaux).

The situation certainly depends in large measure on the shipwreck in which Porphyry's literary production has been submerged and the insurmountable, objective confusion of the information supplied by Stobaeus and *Sudas. But one should also not underestimate the fact, disturbing in itself, that scholars of Porphyry—with appropriate exceptions made—demonstrate all too often a shallow familiarity, when it is not an outright ignorance, of the complex problems equally posed by the literary tradition (nature and dating of the Byzantine MSS, interventions of copyists, titles of works, developments of the text and selection of materials) and by the indirect tradition (techniques of citation, interpretation of the allusions, evaluation and comparison of patristic and philosophical sources, the anthologies and the Late Antique and Byzantine lexica, etc.) of the philosopher's works. Most recently, following the example of many others, Goulet offers an example of this approach (see Goulet, *Études*, 395-397); although A.J. Carriker has recently provided a positive sign at least with regard to the evaluation of the Eusebian sources.

In a rather negative backdrop as this one, there has not been lacking, however, several foundational contributions that one will have to keep in mind for every future development in this field. J.J. O'Meara (1959) forwarded important arguments to maintain that Augustine's expression *de regressu animae* does not translate the title of one of Porphyry's lost works, but rather indicates the contents of the *Philosophy from Oracles* or one of its sections. H. Dörrie (1959) and J. Pépin (1964) have identified Porphyry's *Symmikta zetemata* as the source of Augustine's *De immortalitate animae*. T.D. Barnes (1973) has called attention to the fact that Macarius Magnes's *Apokritikos* are not citations properly speaking of Porphyry's anti-Christian treatise, thus threatening the very basis of Harnack's edition. Lastly, B. Croke (1983) demonstrated that the so-called *Chronology* attributed to Porphyry in actuality never existed, and that the materials previously referring to it (see Jacoby's FHG) must, however, be reduced in all likelihood to the *History of Philosophy* and the 12th book of the anti-Christian treatise. On the basis of these advances, at present few and partial, but nonetheless important, it will be possible to begin the journey again on the right path.

7. For my part, in recent years I have repeatedly advanced several arguments identifying the anti-Christian treatise with the *Philosophy from Oracles* (see esp. my essays in the following works: Mélanges J. Pépin, Paris 1992, Miscellanea B. Studer, Rome 1993, and the Miscellanea U. Bianchi, Rome 1994: see esp. the discussion and bibl. contained therein). Such an identification implies the recognition that

Porphyry's anti-Christian polemic did not develop into a specific treatise, but constituted an integral part of a large esoteric work whose sole objective, primarily philosophical-religious, consisted in the exhortation to "theosophy," namely, that form of wisdom capable of leading those initiated to the salvation of the soul. This proposal demands that it be concretely demonstrated in a new and truly critical edition of the *Philosophy from Oracles* that redefines *ex novo* its structure, contents and viewpoint in light of a global rethinking of the transmission of the text in relation to the philosopher's other works known to us so far: indeed a difficult and long undertaking, but not impossible.

The most recent edition to which scholars make reference is A. Smith, *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1993. Various contributions to the study of Porphyry are found in ANRW II, 36, 2 (1987). Updates: T.D. Barnes, *Scholarship or Propaganda? Porphyry "Against the Christians" and Its Historical Setting*: BICS 39 (1994) 53-65; R.J. Hoffmann, *Porphyry's Against the Christians. The Literary Remains*, Amherst, NY 1994; M.B. Simmons, *Arnobius of Sicca. Religious Conflict and Competition in the Age of Diocletian*, Oxford 1995; O. Ballériaux, *Porphyre et Aristote. Quelques fragments à ajouter aux 'Porphyrii philosophi Fragmenta' d'Andrew Smith*, in A. Motte - J. Denooz (eds.), *Aristotelica Secunda. Mélanges offerts à Christian Rutten*, Liège 1996, 221-231; M. Tardieu, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*, in P. Hadot, '*Porphyre et Victorinus'. Questions et hypothèses* (Res Orientales 9), Bures-sur-Yvette 1996; S. Ackermann, *Christliche Apologetik und heidnische Philosophie im Streit um das Alte Testament* (SBB 36), Stuttgart 1997; P.F. Beatrice, *Porphyrius*: TRE 27 (1997) 54-59 (bibl.); M.B. Simmons, *The Function of Oracles in the Pagan-Christian Conflict during the Age of Diocletian. The Case of Arnobius and Porphyry*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), SP 31, 1997, 349-356; A. Smith, *Porphyry and Pagan Religious Practice*, in J.J. Cleary (ed.), *The Perennial Tradition of Neoplatonism*, Leuven 1997, 29-35; J. Carlier, *L'après-mort selon Porphyre*, in A. Charles-Saget (ed.), *Retour, repentir et constitution de soi*, Paris 1998, 133-160; W. Kinzig, *War der Neuplatoniker Porphyrios ursprünglich Christ?* in M. Baumbach - H. Köhler - A.M. Ritter (ed.), *Mousopolos Stephanos. Festschrift für H. Görgemanns*, Heidelberg 1998, 320-332; P.F. Beatrice, *Ein Origeneszitat im Timaioskommentar des Calcidius*, in W.A. Bienert - U. Kühneweg (ed.), *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts* (BETL 137), Leuven 1999, 75-90; F. Van Fleteren, *Porphyry*, in A.D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge 1999, 661-663; R. Lamberton, *Sweet Honey in the Rock. Pleasure, Embodiment and Metaphor in Late Antique Platonism*, in J.A. Porter (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body*, Michigan 1999, 314-326; C. Van Liefferinge, *La Théurgie. Des 'Oracles Chaldaïques' à Proclus* (Kernos-Supplément 9), Liège 1999; J.G. Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (STAC 3), Tübingen 2000; E. DePalma Digeser, *The Making of a Christian Empire. Lactantius and Rome*, Ithaca-London 2000; K. Corrigan, *Platonism and Gnosticism. The Anonymous Commentary on the Parmenides: Middle or Neoplatonic?* in J.D. Turner - R. Majercik (eds.), *Gnosticism and Later Platonism. Themes, Figures, and Texts* (SBL Symposium series 12), Atlanta 2000, 141-177; P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia. An Attempt at Reconstruction* (VChrS 56), Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001; G. Clark, *Fattening the Soul. Christian Asceticism and Porphyry on Abstinence*, in M.F. Wiles - E.J. Yarnold (eds.), SP 35, 2001, 41-51; M.B. Simmons, *Eusebius' Panegyric at the Dedication of the Church at Tyre A.D. 315. Anti-Porphyrian Themes in Christian Rhetoric of the Later Roman Empire*, in M.F. Wiles - E.J. Yarnold (eds.), SP 37, 2001, 597-607; S. Toulouse, *Que le vrai sacrifice est celui d'un coeur pur. À propos d'un oracle 'porphyrien'* (?) *dans le 'Liber XXI sententiarum' édité parmi les oeuvres d'Augustin*: RecAug 32 (2001) 169-223; P. Adamson, *The Arabic Plotinus. A Philosophical Study of the 'Theology of Aristotle,'* London 2002; M. Baltes, *Marius Victorinus. Zur Philosophie in seinen theologischen Schriften* (BzA 174), Munich-Leipzig 2002; Th. Böhm, *Origenes – Theologe und* (*Neu*-) *Platoniker? Oder: Wem soll man mißtrauen – Eusebius oder Porphyrius?*: Adamantius 8 (2002) 7-23; E. DePalma Digeser, *Porphyry, Julian, or Hierokles? The Anonymous Hellene in Makarios Magnês' Apokritikos*: JTS 53 (2002) 466-502; A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism*, Boston-Leiden 2002; M. Zambon, *Porphyre et le Moyen-Platonisme*, Paris 2002; A.J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea* (VChrS 67), Leiden-Boston-Köln 2003; var. aus., *Porfirio de Tiro contra los cristianos*, Cádiz 2006. For further updates to the bibl., see P.F. Beatrice, *The Oriental Religions and Porphyry's Universal Way for the Soul's Deliverance*, in *Les religions orientales dans le monde grec et romain*, Brussels-Rome 2009.

P.F. BEATRICE

PORTER. *See* *DOORKEEPER

PORTRAIT. In this entry, the term *portrait* refers to the reproduction of the image of an individual taken from the actual person, an individual who is seen in contingent reality. The true portrait occurs when one adds the search for the psychological characteristics to the imitation of the physical resemblance; in this manner, from the facial portrait, which alone is realistic, one passes to that more complete physiognomical portrait. When it is not possible to take a living person as a model, the reconstructed portrait seeks to conform itself to one's imagination of the subject's characteristics, on the basis of elements taken from literary sources or the tradition. It follows, however, that one can thus create images that are different from the actual individual. In ancient Christian art, the portraits of Christ displayed in different ways are of this type; the iconography of Sts. *Peter and *Paul were established only from the 4th c. Moreover, the portraits of many martyrs, saints and biblical persons as well as that of the apostolic college, whose components often show similar or stereotypical characteristics among them, are reconstructed. The phenomenon is certainly connected to the perdurance, in the early centuries, of the iconoclast tradition of the Jewish heritage, which did not allow that given physical peculiarities of persons be

captured in art. When such a demand was perceived, after a long interval of time, these elements had by then been lost and, therefore, they had to take recourse to reconstructed portraits.

The Egyptian portraits, in large part coming from El-Fayum (dated from the 1st-4th c. AD), which were painted on small wooden tablets that covered the faces of mummies, though important in the history of Roman portraits, did not in a single instance leave traces of Christianity, and one can only keep these in mind, therefore, due to their general stylistic comparisons with some portraits of deceased people from cemeterial *paintings, esp. Roman. Such paintings, characterized by a certain generality, but with noteworthy essentials of the features, one can identify esp. in the figures of the *orantes*, often by marked contours and large eyes, as in the examples contained in the complex of S. Callistus (Wp 88), Domitilla (Wp 138,2) or the cemetery of the Jordani (Wp 120,2). It is likely the case that the portraits painted onto the sepulchral walls of *Rome and, in large number, the Museo Paleocristiano of *Aquileia are of the poor, depicted in the posture of *orantes*. Portraits presumably of deceased people, moreover, can be detected in scenes pertaining to life or business professions (as in the hypogeum of Trebius Justus at Rome), as well as in those of the symbolic type (e.g., St. Petronilla's introduction of Veneranda into *paradise, in the catacomb of Domitilla: Wp 213).

Among the later paintings, dating to the 6th c., is that of the *Turtura* from the Roman catacomb of Commodilla which, due to its expressive intensity and the essential simplifications of its features, recalls the empress *Theodora from the mosaic of S. Vitale at *Ravenna.

On the *mosaics, in addition to those African funerary mosaics esp. from *Taburka (at the Bardo Museum), one should recall the 14 busts of benefactors (male and female) on the floor from the S Theodorian hall at Aquileia, which dates to the second decade of the 4th c. In these busts, esp. in the faces characterized by pronounced lines, in women's hairstyling and in the clothing, it is possible to recognize characteristics from the period when the expressionism of the tetrarchy transitioned to that of the Constantinian age. One can also identify other portraits in the figures of commissioners and proponents of the clergy (esp. with a square halo, which distinguishes them as saints from those who are still living), which generally appear on mosaic apse compositions: thus in certain Roman basilicas, in the basilica of Euphrasia of *Parentium, in St. Demetrius's at *Thessalonica or in S. Vitale at Ravenna, in which the imperial *iconography, which had a long *tradition, was reused but in ways that could be considered in many respects new, and on the mosaic panels of *Justinian and Theodora, numerous portraits can be identified even on the gold-glass, following a widespread practice esp. in the 4th c. Imperial portraits (or of other dignitaries) are then found, in the late imperial age, on the ivory *diptychs.

The tradition of Roman portraiture is connected to the *imagines clipeatae* of the *sarcophagi, which at times, however, only have outlined faces. This phenomenon probably owes to the lack of time for finishing touches; some scholars have thought, however, that this owed to the heirs' neglectfulness, possibly to the lack of application of a stucco mask with the features of the deceased person, or rather to the superstitious fear of the portrait's commissioners. There is the intriguing case, e.g., of the so-called sarcophagus of the two brothers found in the Museo Pio Cristiano (Ws 91 = Rep. 45), in which two male figures, who are similar, have taken the place of two spouses for whom the busts were prepared. At other times, the deceased are portrayed as standing, with a scroll in hand, with **parapetasma* in the background.

With regard to the portraits of the *popes, there is much dispute whether one can already recognize some of them on 4th-c. gold-glass. In painting, the most ancient examples are the portraits of a series of pontiffs on the walls of the basilica of St. Paul at Rome, which are not entirely preserved. Originally they would have been circular portraits with the popes from *Innocent I to *Leo the Great, which, however, underwent notable modifications and touchups during the Medieval and Baroque periods. Recent studies have established the importance of a series of papal portraits of the basilica of S. Paolo fuori le mura, which, before the fire of 1823, was composed of 78 busts represented on a shield-formed surface (all copied in 1634). Today this series of portraits is the only one at least partially preserved, although similar pictorial sequences have been completely lost, which were originally housed also at the Vatican and the Lateran Basilica.

DACL 14, 1, 1543-1573; EC 10, 1008-1009; EAA 6, 695-738; LCI 3, 446-455; H.P. L'Orange, *Studien zur Geschichte des spätantiken Porträts*, Oslo 1933; J. Bolten, *Die "imago clipeata." Ein Beitrag zur Portrait- und Typengeschichte*, Paderborn 1937; G.B. Ladner, *I ritratti dei papi nell'antichità e nel Medioevo*, I, Vatican City 1941; G. Bovini, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani*, Vatican City 1949; C. Casalone, *Note sulle pitture dell'ipogeo di Trebio Giusto a Roma*: CArch 11 (1962) 53-64; A. Grabar, *Le portrait en iconographie paléochrétienne*: RSR 36 (1962) 87-109; P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma*, Bologna 1966; K. Parlasca, *Mumienportraits und verwandte Denkmäler*, Wiesbaden 1966; F. Zanchi Roppo, *Vetri paleocristiani a figure d'oro conservati in Italia*, Bologna 1969; B. Forlati Tamaro, *Epigrafi cristiane sepol-*

crali con graffiti di Aquileia: Archeologia Classica 25-26 (1973–1974) 280-296; G.C. Menis, *I ritratti nei mosaici pavimentali di Aquileia*: AAAd 8 (1975) 73-92; M. Andaloro, *Pittura romana e pittura a Roma da Leone Magno a Giovanni VII*, in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, II, Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo 39, Spoleto 1992, 569-579; A.M. Ramieri, *Ritratti femminili nella catacomba di Priscilla*: RivAC 69 (1993) 47-61; F. Bisconti, *La pittura paleocristiana*, in A. Donati (ed.), *"Romana Pictura."* La pittura romana dalle origini all'età bizantina, Milan 1998, 33-56; M. Andaloro, *Effigi di Pietro e Siricio, in Pietro e Paolo. La storia, il culto, la memoria nei primi secoli*, Milan 2000, 230-231, nn. 104-105; M. Giannitrapani, s.v. *Ritratto*: TIP, 270-274.

D. Mazzoleni

PORTUGAL. *See* *SPAIN and PORTUGAL

POSIDONIUS (d. after 430). A deacon of *Alexandria, who on behalf of *Cyril of Alexandria bore news to Pope *Celestine (ACO 1, 1, 5, p. 10) concerning the case of *Nestorius of Constantinople. He took with him a piece of paper containing instructions (ACO 1, 1, 7, p. 171-172), i.e., an outline containing a more detailed oral explanation of Nestorius's case to give to the pope and influential individuals at *Rome. When he was to return to Alexandria, Pope Celestine gave him a letter (dated 10 August 430) for Cyril, accompanied with a verdict against Nestorius, and a letter for Nestorius as well, whom Cyril was asked to bring into agreement with the verdict. In addition, the pope gave Posidonius letters for various Eastern recipients, thereby informing them of the decisions of the Holy Roman See: a letter to the presbyters, deacons, clerics and the people of *Constantinople, accompanied by a copy of the judgment and the same letter as well as more copies to be delivered to *John of Antioch, *Juvenal of Jerusalem, *Rufus of Thessalonica and *Flavian of Philippi.

E. Amann, *L'affaire de Nestorius vue de*: RSR 24 (1950) 28-52, 235-265; L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il Concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, 156-157, 168-171; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana*, Rome 1976, 1347-1397.

M. Palmieri

POSSESSOR. Catholic African bishop of *Mauritania in 484 (*Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae* 40: CSEL 7, 133). He went to *Constantinople, where he promoted the doctrinal visions of the Council of *Chalcedon (451), he contributed to the healing of the *Acacian schism (Hormisdas, *Ep.* 131, in *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35/2, 552-553) and, as one sees from the letter that he sent to Pope *Hormisdas in 520 (*Relatio Possessoris episcopi afri*, ibid., 697-700), he was called upon by the Scythian monks with regard to the orthodoxy of the doctrine of *free will and *grace that *Faustus of Riez had proposed in his treatise *De gratia* (CSEL 21, 3-98).

CPL 1620, 1622, 1683; CPG 9192; *Relatio Possessoris episcopi afri*, in *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35/2, 697-700; F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei Papi e nei documenti della Cancelleria Romana dal IV al XIV secolo*, III, Rome 1946, 191-204; PCBE I, 889; M. Simonetti, *Il "De gratia" di Fausto di Riez*: SSR 1 (1977) 125-145; A. Quacquarelli, *Papa Ormisda al vescovo Possessore*, VetChr 30 (1993) 5-15.

P. Marone

POSSIDIUS (d. after 437). The *Vita Augustini*, *Augustine's corpus of letters and *Prosper's *Chronicon* are among the primary sources for knowledge of Possidius's life. From 391 onward, he lived in the monastic community directed by Augustine at *Hippo; shortly after 397, Possidius became bishop of Calama in *Numidia. In such a role, he participated in the anti-*Donatist councils of *Carthage of 403 and 407; he exerted a noteworthy role in the Conference of Carthage (411) and took part in the anti-*Pelagian councils of Milevis (416) and Carthage (419). He completed two official missions in *Italy (in 409 and 410) to the emperor's court to request the reintroduction of laws against *pagans and *heretics. Once Calama had been abandoned, having been invaded by the *Vandals in 428, Possidius fled to Hippo with other bishops, where he remained alongside Augustine until the city was taken. He aided Augustine during his last illness. Upon returning to Calama, he was expelled by the *Arian leader *Genseric. After this date, we no longer have information on him.

Between 432 (the death of *Boniface) and 437 (the exile of *Catholic bishops), Possidius composed the *Vita Augustini*, to which he adjoined a complete list of his writings (*Indiculum*: CPL 359), for fear that during the violence of the invasions the bishop and his works would spin into oblivion. The *Vita* is inserted into the template of the ancient Suetonius-style biographical tradition. The material after the prologue is not divided into four parts (Weiskotten, Diesner), but three (Pellegrino): (1) the *Vita*, i.e., the chronological account of the events and actions accomplished by Augustine beginning from his conversion (2–18). In fact, to not compete with the *Confessions*, he devotes only one chapter to his life before his conversion; (2) the *mores* (customs, behavior and habits), understood as an exposition of the hero's conduct in daily, public and private life (19–27,5); (3) the final events, sickness and death (27,6–31). In

this final section (30), Possidius published Augustine's letter to Bishop Honoratus on the clergy's behavior during an enemy's invasion. Augustine's biography is, within the limits of this literary genre, substantially authentic and objective: the biographer used his knowledge of Augustine's deeds and works, from which he often drew images and expressions. It was, as previously stated, a Suetonius-style biography, but with typical features of Christian hagiography. In the prologue, in fact, Possidius emphasized his personal experience with Augustine as the guarantee of his biography's authenticity. In contrast to *Paulinus of Milan, Possidius faithfully followed the chronological succession of events (the inaccuracies are few); he also knew how to appreciate even the literary activity of his subject; he provided little space for the spectacular and demonic elements (he recalls only two miraculous events) and in the presentation of the *vita* and the *mores* he reduces the apologetic objective to a minimum. The *Indiculum*, an integral part of the *Vita Augustini*, which is an appendix to the work (*Vita Aug.* 18,9), was considered by some scholars to be a work compiled in haste by Possidius on account of the suppression of certain details and the preservation of these works into such divisions as *libri*, *epistulae* and *tractatus* within ten sections. Others, however, have considered it to be a catalog of works that once existed in the library of Hippo (see *Retract.* 2,41), copied and reproduced, or rather it could be Possidius's personal list of Augustine's works.

CPL 358-359; PL 32, 33-66; H.T. Weiskotten, *Sancti Augustini Vita scripta a Possidio episcopo*. Edited with Revised Text, Introduction, Notes and an English Version, Princeton, NJ 1919; M. Pellegrino, *Possidio. Vita di S. Agostino*, intr., testo critico, versione e note, Alba 1955; *Vita di Cipriano. Vita di Ambrogio. Vita di Agostino* (Intr. Ch. Mohrmann. Testo critico e commento ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen. Trans. L. Canali e C. Carena, Milan 1975. It. tr. M. Simonetti, Rome 1977).

Studies: A. Harnack, *Das Leben Augustins von Possidius*, Berlin 1930 (intr. and tr.; Sp. tr.: Revista de Occidente 9 [1931] 52-100); H.J. Diesner, *Possidius und Augustinus*, SP VI, Berlin 1962, 350-365; PCBE 1, 890-896; A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *The Inaccuracies in the Vita Augustini of Possidius*: SP 16 (1985) 480-486; R. Grégoire, *Sulla tipologia agiografica della "Vita Augustini" di Possidio*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 21-26; DSp 12 (1986) 1997-2008; T.G. Kardong, *Monastic Issues in Possidius' "Life of Augustine"*: The American Benedictine Review 38 (1987) 159-177; A. Mutzenbecher, *Bemerkungen zum "Indiculum" de Possidius. Eine Rezension*: REAug 33 (1987) 128-131; E. Zocca, *La figura del santo vescovo in Africa da Ponzio a Possidio*, in *Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana*, Rome 1997, 487-491; G. Madec, *Possidius de Calama et les listes des oeuvres d'Augustin*, in *Titres et articulations du texte dans les oeuvres antiques*, Paris 1997, 427-445; F. Dolbeau, *La survie des oeuvres d'Augustin. Remarques sur l'Indiculum attribué à Possidius et sur la bibliothèque d'Anségise*, in *Du copiste au collectionneur. Mélanges en l'honneur d'André Vernet*, ed. D. Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda - J.-F. Genest, Tournhout 1998, 3-22; S. Dagemark, *Prayer as a Hagiographic Motif in Vita Martini and Vita Augustini*, in *La preghiera nel tardo antico, dalle origini ad Agostino*, Rome 1999, 361-388; S. Dagemark, *Conversion in Augustine's Confessions and Monastic Separation from the World in Possidius' Biography*, in *Le Confessioni di Agostino (402–2002). Bilancio e prospettive*, Rome 2003, 289-328; E. Elm, *Die Macht der Weisheit. Das Bild des Bischofs in der Vita Augustini des Possidius und anderen spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Bischofsviten*, Leiden 2003.

A.V. Nazzaro

POTAMIANA and BASILIDES, martyrs. *Eusebius (*HE* 6, 5,1-6) summarizes, in a form already contaminated by legend, the story of Potamiana, a young *martyr of *Alexandria: while on her way to be tortured, she was able to convert a soldier named Basilides, who escorted her and who was already a listener at *Origen's lectures. The persecutors placed boiling pitch on her and her mother and burned them both. A few days later, Basilides professed himself a Christian. He in turn was arrested. He saw Potamiana in a dream placing the crown of martyrdom on his head; he was baptized in prison and the following day beheaded. In the *Mart. hier.*, the three martyrs are commemorated on 28 June, and in the *Mart. rom.* 30 June.

Vies des SS. 6, 517; LTK[2] 8, 645; DHGE 6, 1175-1176; BS 2, 902-906.

V. Saxer

POTAMION (Potamon) of Heraclea (4th c.). Bishop of Heracleopolis Parva in the E delta of the Nile on the road that leads to Pelusium. Potamion was imprisoned during the *persecution of *Maximinus Daia; the persecutors gouged out one of his eyes. He was one of the participants at the Council of *Nicaea (325). Potamion took a clear stance in favor of *Athanasius ten years later at the Synod of *Tyre (335), presided over by *Flaccillus of Antioch: Potamion defended the orthodox positions and called into question *Eusebius of Caesarea's conduct during the persecution of Maximinus. Eusebius had escaped under suspicious circumstances, without incurring any wounds. Potamion was persecuted by *Gregory the Cappadocian, the intruder bishop of *Alexandria (339/340), meeting his death from his injuries. The *Mart. rom.* remembers him as a bishop on 18 May, killed during the *Arian controversy during the time of the emperor *Constantius II. The information found in the *Mart. hier.* on Potamion's martyrdom is unreliable; while it holds that the *martyrdom occurred 18 May, it places it during the persecutions against the Christians, and Potamion is identified only as a presbyter.

EC 9, 1848; BS 10, 1060; Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* 73; Id., *Ap. ad Const.* 28; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 68; ASS, *Mai* IV, Paris 1866, 165ff.; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996 (see index).

M. Perraymond

POTAMIUS of Lisbon (d. before 383/384). Potamius was the first bishop of Lisbon for whom we have historical information. According to the claims of the *Libellus Precum* he supported the orthodox faith in the first phase of his career, but later he went over to the *Arians in order to obtain a landholding from the pro-Arian emperor *Constantius II (see Faust. and Marc., *Lib. Precum* IX, 32: CCL 69, 368). His apostasy was denounced by Hosius of Cordoba before the Iberian church, but this gesture did not please Constantius. The emperor punished Hosius by exiling him early in the year 356. On the basis of this information we can infer that Potamius went over to Arianism around 356 and had been appointed bishop of Lisbon before this date, i.e., before the moment that Hosius, in his denunciation, addressed him as "bishop."

In 357, Potamius, already effectively a member of the Arian party, intervened in the case of Pope *Liberius, seeking to push this pope, who had begun a tepid pro-Arian political approach, to openly embrace Arianism (see Hil. Poit., *Coll. Ant. Par.*, B, III, 2: CSEL 65, 155-156). In August of 357, as attested by *Hilary of Poitiers (see Hil. Poit., *De Syn.* 3,11: PL 10, 482-487; *Lib. contra Const.* 23,26: PL 10, 599-601), Potamius took part in a group of bishops present at the Council of *Sirmium and probably contributed to the elaboration of the Formula of Sirmium, if one cannot rule out with certainty the possibility that he participated in its actual composition. *Phoebadius of Agen also attests to the presence of Potamius (see Phoeb., *C. Arr.* 3,5: CCL 64, 25-27), and explicitly cites a very brief fragment of one of his letters, which is all that remains of this author's literary production during his Arian phase. For the period after the Council of Sirmium, historical information on Potamius becomes very sparse. We know that *Athanasius wrote him a letter, which was cited by Alcuin (see Alcuin, *C. Her. Fel.* 61: PL 101, 113), in which he sought to oppose the pro-Arian positions. After the Council of *Rimini of 359, Potamius returned to orthodoxy, as was unmistakably demonstrated by his two anti-Arian doctrinal works on the total and absolute unity of the *Trinity, which were both written during this period: *Epistula ad Athanasium* and the *De Substantia*. The date of his death is unknown. We can only establish 383-384 as the *terminus ante quem*, which is supported by the date of the publication of his *Libellus Precum*, which describes the death of the bishop of Lisbon in a legendary and historically untenable manner.

In the *Epistula ad Athanasium* and the *De Substantia*, which constitutes an expansion and further exploration of the positions expressed in the *Epistula*, Potamius strained to describe in a clear and concrete way the nature and essence of the Trinity, in order to refute all the absurdities and ambiguities expressed by the Arians in their formulas. Although his trinitarian conception tends to be restricted to the *Father and the Son, Potamius often tries to provide an organic position to the *Holy Spirit, and presents the Trinity not only as a total union of substance, but also as a sort of divine organism that functions in absolute harmony of intent, will and action. In order to give concreteness to his ideas and his descriptions of the Trinity, in the *De Substantia*, Potamius made continual comparisons to the machines used in weaving and the various organs of the human body. He wanted to affirm that a concrete representation of the functioning of the trinitarian unity is clearly visible in textile machines, which function with parts and complementary movements, and also in the organs of the human body, which function on the basis of the same principles. These rather original ideas are expressed with an absolutely unique style in the panorama of 4th-c. Latin. Alongside the countless technical terms drawn from the language of textile production and human anatomy, Potamius made extensive use of the words and poetic constructions and philosophical language of the imperial period (esp. Senecan), creating an abrupt linguistic blend that is tight, baroque and expressionist.

Alongside the doctrinal works, two homilies of Potamius have been handed down: the *De Lazaro* and the *De Martyrio Esaiae*, whose dating cannot be established with certainty. In my opinion, however, it is possible that both of these works date to the period of Potamius's return to orthodoxy, from the moment that their argument can be interpreted symbolically: In the *De Lazaro*, the corrupt body can represent the corruption of Arianism that has invaded the body of the church, while the *resurrection of the body becomes the liberation from the death and the corruption of Arianism. In the *De Martyrio Esaiae*, in which carnivores search to cut the prophet's body in half, one can detect a symbolic representation of the Arians' attempt to divide the body of the orthodox church. Even in these two works, Potamius's style constantly seeks the most clashing baroque facts and indulges in the most ghastly and disturbing details with a very original and puzzling linguistic blend that unites elements of

Augustan and Neronian poetry (esp. Virgil, Seneca and Lucan), cues taken from Latin romance (esp. Apuleius), and typical terms of technical, scientific and philosophical language.

Editions and translations: A. Wilmart, *La lettre de Potamius à Saint Athnase*: RB 30 (1913) 280-283; Id., *Le "De Lazaro" de Potamius*: JTS 19 (1918) 298-304; A.C. Vega, *Opuscula Omnia Potamii episcopi Olisiponensis*, Escorial 1934; M. Conti, *Potamii Episcopi Olisponensis Opera Omnia*, Corpus Christianorum 69A, 55-274, Turnhout 1999 (critical ed. with Eng. tr.). *Studies*: A. Montes Moreira, *Potamius de Lisbonne et la controverse arienne*, Louvain 1969; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana e l'inizio della riflessione teologica in Spagna*, in *Hispania Romana*, Colloquio Italo-Spagnolo, anno 371 (Quaderno 200, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), Rome 1974; A. Montes Moreira, *Le retour de Potamius de Lisbonne à l'orthodoxie nicéenne*: Didaskalia 5 (1975) 303-354; M. Conti, *The Life and Works of Potamius of Lisbon*, Instr.Patr. 32, Turnhout 1998; V.Y. Urkiola, *Potamio de Lisboa*, Vitoria 1999; P.G. Alves de Sousa, *Patrologia Galaico-Lusitana*, Lisboa 2001, 15-21.

M. Conti

POTHINUS of Lyons. One of the *martyrs of *Lyons of 177, he was the bishop of the city and was more than 90 years old. His advanced age did not prevent him, however, from being handed over to the tribunal and thrown into prison, and perhaps mistreated by the enthralled crowd: "If his body deteriorated because of his age and sickness, his *soul was preserved intact because Christ triumphed through him." He died in prison two days later (Eus., *HE* 5,1,29-31). He and his companions who suffered martyrdom were inserted into the *Mart. hier.* for 2 June.

DACL 10, 72-121; *Vies des SS.* 6, 26-40; LTK² 8, 648; BS 8, 61-65.

V. Saxer

PRAEDESTINATUS. Using this title, P.J. Sirmond published in 1643 an anonymous work in the MSS that scholars have attributed to various authors from *Arnobius the Younger to *Primasius of Hadrumetum or to someone from the circle of *Julian of Eclanum. The work contains three books. In the first, the author presents a catalog of *heresies, following *Augustine's *De Haer.*, but adding interesting bits of information on the Tertullianists at *Rome, *Nestorians and predestinationists, to assure its orthodoxy against the potential attacks of the latter. The second, however, is made up of a sermon attributed to Augustine, but composed by the same author with very radical formulas on *predestination, so that it might be easily demolished. The third and last book refutes, phrase-by-phrase, such a theory of predestination, not without condemning by means of Julian's *anathemas the *Pelagian doctrine itself. The work, which dates to the years 432/440, must be definitively attributed to Arnobius, who sought a via media between radical *Pelagianism and Augustine's predestinationism (Gori).

Editions: CPL 243; PL 53, 587-672. *Studies*: H. von Schubert, *Der sogenannte "Praedestinatus,"* TU 24, 4, Leipzig 1903; M. Abel, *Le "Praedestinatus" et le pélagianisme*: RTAM 35 (1968) 5-25; C. Kannengiesser, LTK³ 8, 482-483; F. Gori, *Il Praedestinatus di Arnobio il Giovane. L'eresiologia contro l'agostinismo*, SEA 65, Rome 1999.

B. Studer

PRAETEXTATUS, Vettius Agorius, consul (d. 385). He was born probably at *Rome (Symm., *Rel.* 11); the precise date, however, still needs to be determined: 310, if he is to be identified with the *hierophant* who participated at the inaugural ceremonies at *Constantinople in 330, on which event we have information from John of Lydia (*De mens.* IV, 2); otherwise around 320. A complete picture of his distinguished *cursus honorum* is supplied by an inscription (CIL VI, 1779 = ILS 1259), although other information, even though incomplete, can be derived from two other inscriptions (CIL VI, 1777 = ILS 1258 and CIL VI, 1778): after having served respectively as a quaestor, praetor, governor of Tuscany and Umbria and *consularis* of Lusitania, his career came to a halt following a bold move during the time of *Constantius, namely, his decision not to join the Christian religion. With the rise of *Julian to the throne, the situation turned to his favor, and he thus obtained, from 362 to 364, the coveted position of proconsul of *Achaia. During his service as proconsul, he persuaded *Valentinian I not to enact his law against nocturnal *pagan sacrifices, an act attributed to him by the historian *Zosimus (IV, 3.3); approval for his political actions in Greece, moreover, was expressed by the orator Imerius, who addressed a *panegyric to him, which unfortunately has been lost (we have information on this work by *Photius, *Bibl.* 165,108B4). In 367, he became *praefectus urbi* until 368: during his term he had to intervene to resolve the conflict between the two candidates aspiring to the office of bishop of *Rome—*Damasus and *Ursinus (Amm., XXVII, 9,9). During his prefecture, he undertook a policy regarding building projects that was aimed at restoring many pagan buildings to their ancient splendor: he ordered the demolition of the *Maeniana*, a type of external gallery that had arisen in the piazzas around the forum, as well as the private homes that had been constructed upon temples; he

thus restored the temple of the *Dei consentes* in the forum (CIL VI, 102 = ILS 4003). When in 384 the pagan party experienced a moment of good fortune with the Roman prefecture of *Symmachus, Praetextatus also received the important duty of prefect to the praetorium and the appointment to the consulate for the year 385, the year in which he died.

His funeral service, acc. to *Jerome's testimony (*Ep.* 23), was an event in which the population of the city of Rome flocked en masse: after his death, his wife, Aconia Fabia Paulina, whom he married in 344 (Jer., *Ep.* 39,3 and epigraphs), dedicated all her energies to keeping the memory of her husband alive, and she was able to obtain official recognition for him through the erection of a statue in his honor. Although his son was able to bring about the construction of the statue on the Aventine Hill, the process of erecting a statue in his honor through the initiative of the state was much more difficult (CIL VI, 1777): the prefect of the city, Symmachus, a great friend of Praetextatus during his life, sent a statement (no. 12) to *Theodosius, *Valentinian II and *Arcadius in the name of the senate in order to obtain this recognition, but the Milanese court sought further documentation, accompanied by an action that appeared to be particularly offensive to the memory of Praetextatus and the pride of Symmachus. The latter responded with a subsequent statement (no. 21), recalling that the requested documentation was already at the court and attached several of Praetextatus's speeches, which demonstrated his complete loyalty to the emperors. Finally, Praetextatus obtained a statue in his memory; a fragment of its base has survived in the forum (CIL VI, 1779[a]). Before this recognition by the state, this illustrious person had nonetheless obtained another, perhaps even superior, recognition from the vestal virgins who, upon the request of Paulina, dedicated a statue to Praetextatus with the approval of the pontiffs, an exception made for very few people, among whom was Symmachus, who witnessed a similar procedure that was unheard of in the pagan tradition. It was an act of recognition by the pagan religion toward a man who had shown himself a passionate defender of paganism and was famous for his various priestly offices (CIL VI, 1779 = ILS 1259): augur, pontiff of Vesta and the Sun, consecrated to the cult of Liber and the Eleusinian mysteries, and *tauroboliatus*.

An open question remains concerning Ruggini's suggestion that Praetextatus should be identified with the senator who was the recipient of the poem *Carmen contra paganos*, whom Mazzarino (*Antico, tardoantico ed èra costantiniana*, Bari 1974, 398ff.) identified as the father of Symmachus, Aviarius, who died in 376, although the more traditional opinion identifies him with Nicomachus Flavian, who served as consul in 394, the year of his death in the war under the rule of the usurper Eugenius. If Ruggini's identification is correct, we would have information about Paulina, the *ipsa coniunx* who appears at the end of the piece to honor the memory of her husband with great devotion. The most important document for our understanding of Praetextatus and Paulina is contained in the corpus of the inscriptions etched in a funerary memorial found at Rome and today preserved at the Capitoline Museums (CIL VI, 1779). Here the inscription is certainly speaking about Praetextatus and Paulina, but we have difficulty regarding the authorship of the three poems written in iambic trimeters (with the anomaly that leads one to think of some iambic senari) that adorn the back side and the two sides of the memorial. According to Polara, the three poems are all the work of the same author and were all written after the death of Paulina and Praetextatus. Polara, in contradistinction to Ruggini, does not accept Lambrecht's thesis (*Op de grens van heidendom en christendom. Het grafscrift van Vettius Agorius Praetextatus en Fabia Aconia Paulina*, Brussel, 1955), acc. to which the inscriptions were composed between Praetextatus's death and Paulina's and that these poems or a eulogy as the source for these poems were familiar to Jerome when he wrote his letter on the death of Lea (*Ep.* 23). Two of the poems are presented as Praetextatus's writings to his wife, the other as written by Paulina to her husband. In the two compositions in which Paulina is remembered (not in the second person) the woman is presented acc. to the typical formula of the good matron but also one who is a woman of faith. Even the third composition, in the second person, addressed by Paulina to her husband, ends, as Polara notes, in praise of a woman. With regard to the relationship to other texts, one should note that the third poem has echoes of Symmachus's statement (no. 12), which establishes its source. It is more difficult, however, to establish a relationship to Jerome's text: certainly *Epistula* 23 was written before the memorial, the inscription and the three poetic compositions and the compositions seem to be a polemical response to Jerome's representation of an *infelix* Paulina.

Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, moreover, distinguished himself for his intense activity as a philosopher and a man of letters, as a translator of Greek verse and prose works, as attested by CIL VI, 1779, vv. 8ff.: among the translations, one should probably mention Praetextatus's translation of *Themistius's *Commentary* on Aristotle's *Analytics*, acc. to the tes-

timony of *Boethius (*De interpret. ed. sec.* I, 289). Vettius Agorius Praetextatus was, moreover, the primary interlocutor in *Macrobius's *Saturnalia* (see *Sat.* I, 17.1,21.1). We know that he owned a home in Rome on the Esquiline and Aventine Hills (CIL XV, 7563 and CIL VI, 1777), and his figure as the most upright pagan was esp. praised by Ammonius Marcellinus (XXVII, 9.8 and XXII, 7.6).

PWK 22 (1954) 1575-1579; ibid., s.v. *Praefectus praetorio*, 2391-2502; PLRE I, [2]1975, s.v. *Praetextatus* 1, 722-724; ibid. s.v. *Paulina* 4, 675; 7, 1298-1309; G. Polara, *Le iscrizioni sul cippo tombale di Vezio Agorio Pretestato*: Vichiana 4 (1967) 264-289; J.F. Merriman, *Aristocratic and Imperial Patronage of the Decorative Arts in Rome and Constantinople, A.D. 337–395*, Diss., University of Illinois, 1975; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Il paganesimo romano tra religione e politica (384–394 d. C.). Per una reinterpretazione del Carmen contra paganos*: MAL VIII, 23,1 (1979) 3-141; Id., *Vettio Agorio Pretestato e la fondazione di Costantinopoli*, in *Miscellanea E. Manni,* Rome 1979, 575-610; D. Vera, *Commento storico alle relationes di Q. Aurelio Simmaco*, Pisa 1981; M. Kahlos, *Fabia Aconia Paulina and the Death of Praetextatus. Rethoric and Ideals in Late Antiquity* (CIL VI, 1779): Arctos 28 (1994) 13-25; Id., *The Restoration Policy of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus*: Arctos 29 (1995) 39-47; G. Nieddu, *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, vol. II, Rome 1995, s.v. *Dei Consentes, Aedes*, 9ff.; F. Guidobaldi, ibid., s.v. *Domus: Vettius Agorius Praetextatus*, 164; M. Kahlos, *Saeculum Praetextati*, Helsinki 1998; P. Liverani, *Vaticano pagano, Vaticano cristiano*, in *Aurea Roma*, ed. S. Ensoli - E. La Rocca, Rome 2000, 295-297; G. Polara, *Iscrizioni e propaganda. Il cippo tombale di Pretestato*, in *Letteratura e propaganda nell'Occidente latino da Augusto ai regni barbarici*, ed. F.E. Consolino, Rome 2000, 107-126.

C. Noce

PRAGMATICA SANCTIO. In general, this Latin expression referred to the imperial disposition that allowed a rapid application of the law. The *novella of *Justinian published on 13 August 554 titled the *Pragmatica sanctio sub petitione Vigilii* was important. It was composed of 27 chapters and was released after the reconquest of *Rome by *Narses, upon the request of Pope *Vigilius. The objective was to regulate the Italian situation after the disastrous and terrible Gothic war. "People were forced to sell their children in order to pay their taxes": without using any exaggeration for rhetoric, Pope *Gregory the Great thus defined the conditions to which the Italian population had been subjected by Byzantine rule. In fact, after the massacres and the devastations caused by the Gothic war, in which the lives of 15-16 million Italians were taken, the emperor of the East, *Justinian, had published the *Pragmatic Sanction*, a document by which, in addition to defining the relationships of private law that had been subverted by war (validity or invalidity of acts; restoration of usurped properties; acquisitions obtained through violence made invalid; a time of probation after prison; male and female slaves married to free persons required to return to their legitimate slave masters; nuns married during the tyranny restored to their convents [even with force if need be]) and establishing weights, coins and measures, and transforming bishops (the de facto holders of power in the cities) into imperial officers, new taxes and new arbitrary fees were imposed on *Italy. Adhering to the imperial directives, during his ten years of governance in Italy (555–567), Narses systematically intervened in religious questions (not excluding the election of the pope), enacted a very extensive network of tariffs and shackled the peninsula's suffering economy to the minute control of Byzantium's authority.

P. Pescani, *Nuovissimo Digesto Italiano*, Turin 1976, vol. 13, 353-354; G. Archi, *Pragmatica sanctio pro petitione Vigilii*, in *Scritti di Diritto Romano*, Milan 1981, 1971-2110; F. Brandileone, *Il diritto bizantino nell'Italia meridionale*, Rome 1987; A. Ducellier (ed.), *Bisanzio*, It. tr. Turin 1988; G. Ostrogorsky, *Storia dell'impero bizantino*, Turin 1993; A. Carile, *Materiali di storia bizantina*, Bologna 1994; C. Capizzi, *Giustiniano I tra politica e religione*, Soveria Mannelli 1994, 236 s.v. *Vigilio*; O. Mazal, *Iustininian I und seine Zeit*, Cologne 2001.

A. Di Berardino

PRAILIUS of Jerusalem. Bishop of *Jerusalem from 417 to 422; successor of *John II. Perhaps he was the author of the part of the homily *Laudatio s. dei genitricis Mariae* (PG 65, 721-733) that discusses *virginity, transmitted under the name of *Proclus of *Constantinople. His life is otherwise unknown.

CPG 5805; R. Laurentin, *Bulletin sur la Vierge Marie*: RSPh 52 (1968) 545; R. Caro, *La homilética Mariana Griega en el Siglo V*, 3 vols., Dayton 1971–1973, 308-344.

S. Samulowitz

PRAXEAS (3rd c.). We know this *patripassian *monarchian only from *Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean*. Tertullian tells us that Praxeas introduced the monarchian *heresy at *Rome, then at *Carthage. At Carthage he was accused and was forced to retract and sign a document (**libellus*) in favor of orthodoxy; he then began, however, to spread the heresy so that Tertullian had to refute him with one of his own works written in 213. Because the *Philosoph.* and other primary sources do not mention this figure, although they name many other monarchians, and Praxeas can also be taken as a nickname (= lobbyist, crook), scholars have posited that with this

nickname Tertullian had targeted one of the monarchians who is otherwise known to us. Some have thought that he may have been *Epigonus, who introduced the monarchian heresy of *Noetus, and even *Callistus, to Rome from Asia Minor. Today, scholars tend to consider Praxeas the proper name of a heretic who is otherwise unknown and distinct from the other monarchians known through other primary sources.

R. Cantalamessa, *Prassea e l'eresia monarchiana*: Scuola Cattolica 90 (1962) 28-50; BBKL VII, 914-915.

M. Simonetti

PRAXEDIS. Perhaps the foundress of the titular church by the same name in the 5th c. at *Rome. According to 6th-c. legend, she was the sister of St. Pudentiana, who were both virgin daughters of the Senator *Pudens who provided lodging for St. *Paul (2 Tim 4:21), and both were erroneously identified with the women on the apse mosaic of St. Pudentiana. 7th-c. pilgrims visited the tomb of Praxedis on the Via Salaria in the catacombs of *Priscilla (CCL 175, 306). The titular church was remodeled by Pope Pascal I (817–824), a splendid example of the so-called Carolingian Renaissance at Rome. At the tombs of the martyrs transferred by Pascal from the catacombs to the circular crypt of St. Praxedis, G.B. de Rossi received his inspiration to dedicate himself entirely to the study of what would subsequently be called Christian archaeology (commemorative stones).

BHL 6920, 6988-6991; BS 10, 1062-1072; BBKL 7, 915-916; LCI 8, 224; J.P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum*, Paderborn 1918, 52-54; R. Wisskirchen, *Das Mosaikprogramm von S. Prassede in Rom*, Münster 1990; V. Tiberia, *Il mosaico di Santa Pudenziana a Roma*, Todi 2003.

S. Heid

PRAYER

I. The first three c. - II. The East: 4th and 5th c. - III. The Latin West and the 4th and 5th c.

I. The first three c. Prayer is an integral part of every religion. It is its heart and soul. Christianity rejected neither the terminology nor the gestures of *pagan prayer, but expressed systematic reservation with regard to everything that it knew about *idolatry. Instead of εὐχή, the common term for prayer in antiquity, Christians, and esp. St. *Paul, preferred the term προσευχή. The Latin gospels usually translated the latter term with the verb *orare*, to dissociate themselves from the classical meanings.

The *apostle Paul imported into his own experience the same reality that the synoptic gospels taught and that *John the Evangelist mentions when he speaks of worship "in spirit and in truth." Prayer immerses the Christian into the full trinitarian mystery, as the *Lord's Prayer demonstrates. This establishes its roots in the Lord who came, comes and will come, and ends with the contemplation of God's gift, received from Christ in the *Holy Spirit. It therefore has a triple dimension: ecclesial, existential and eschatological (Hamman, *Prière*, I, 423-434).

The first two centuries of spiritual experience prepared for the golden age of the *Fathers and developed Christian prayer, moving from the gospel, esp. from the *Lord's Prayer. *Jewish Christianity changed the forms and uses of prayer from what was found in *Judaism. Prayer was held three times a day; the form used, however, was the *Oratio dominica* (*Did.* 8), which ended with a doxology cherished by contemporary Judaism. The sparse bits of information on prayer in the *Epistle of *Barnabas* permit one to compose a small moral treatise on prayer, which must be humble, joyous, safe and vigilant. The importance given to eschatology served to orient prayer toward the expectation of the goods promised (*Did.* 16; *Barn.* 21,3; *Sim.* II, 9) and toward the Lord's **parousia*, namely, recompense and punishment.

The church born of the mission into the pagan world showed a greater autonomy from the Jewish heritage. *Clement's prayer, which is the first explicit formulation outside the NT, expresses the community's faith. Directed toward the Father, Creator and Father of ages, it praises and gives thanks for the Son, and it gathers the entire church's prayer intentions through the mediation of Christ, our older brother (*1 Clem.* 59,3-61,3). If *Ignatius did not supply any prayer texts, his letters are still full of allusions to it. He describes the bishop as having a soul continually directed toward God the Father and Jesus Christ, from whom it awaits all good things. Father and Son are united in the same worship and in the same faith. There we find some invocations to Christ that are sighings, the cry of the heart, in which it pours forth its most inner aspiration, without losing sight of the community (Hamman, *Prière*, II, 97). *Irenaeus, in turn, spontaneously returns to the prayer that flourished during the OT (*Haer.* III, 6,4; 25,2). Prayer is an existential attitude of the Christian, "every day he worships God, in the temple of God, which is his body, by practicing justice at all times" (*Dem.* 96). In this temple, the spirit cries *Abba*, *Father* and fashions the person in God's likeness (*Dem.* 6). The painful *kenōsis* elicits from us a cry of expectation and the awareness of incompleteness.

The *Acts* of the *Martyrs serve to provide us with the witness of sober and committed prayer. The *confessor of the faith, such as Christ on the *cross and the protomartyr *Stephen, expressed in his prayer the sense of his final liturgy and his entire and complete offering. *Martyrological literature describes with pleasure the long prayers during the martyr's time in prison, in dialogue with Christ even during torture. Christ accompanied and strengthened the martyr, who was visibly transformed by his presence. This allowed him to better understand the ecclesial dimension of his prayer and confession (*Martyrdom of Polycarp* 8; *Martyrdom of Fructuosus* 3). The soul of the martyrs' prayer, simultaneously individual and ecclesial, was the Holy Spirit: the Spirit prayed in each one of the martyrs as in all Christians, esp. at the hour in which they confessed the faith before the world. The Spirit guided the martyr, as does the *Eucharist, to his τελείωσις, acc. to an expression of *Clement of Alexandria, i.e., to his completion and perfection.

Even the *apocryphal texts in turn present a little studied aspect of ancient prayer. They are full of prayers and hymns, even if they appear interpolated. They are prayers at times somewhat disordered, in which their lyricism inspires a religious fervor that corresponds to popular tastes, full of poignancy and poetry, from which they arose (Hamman, *Prière*, II, 176). The prayers of the apocryphal texts present a rather uncertain theology, if not altogether *gnostic. Usually directed toward Christ, they are continually addressed to the *Kyrios* (Lord) in glory, which manifests his presence and power, and allows one to discover the cosmic dimension of salvation. They allow one to become aware of the cosmic significance of faith. It is a Christocentric, Easter, cosmic and eschatological prayer.

In the 3rd c., the first treatises on prayer arose that focused on the Lord's Prayer. These treatises thus placed the "Our Father" at the center of daily liturgical prayer. It was solemnly entrusted (*traditio*) to the *catechumen as the expression of new birth. It was by then the norm of Christian prayer. All the early treatises on prayer comment on the "Our Father" (*Tertullian, *Cyprian and *Origen), as if every teaching necessarily had its point of support therein.

Tertullian emphasized above all the absolute novelty of Christian prayer. Christ is the "spirit who overcomes, the Word who teaches, the reason that gives life" (*De or.* 1). Understood well, the "Our Father" is "the compendium of the entire gospel" (ibid.). Tertullian united to prayer the acts that accompanied it (genuflection, prostration), but also *fasts and *hospitality (*De or.* 25). Prayer is the offering of the new covenant that makes us "perfect worshipers and true priests" (*De or.* 28). His *commentary emphasizes the eschatological aspect: prayer must hasten the kingdom of God (*De or.* 5; 29).

Cyprian's small treatise possesses neither the ascetical character nor the expressive radiance of Tertullian's; instead, it is more pastoral because he was more concerned about seeing the faithful pray with a positive effect. For this reason, he was interested esp. in the ecclesial dimension of prayer suggested by the plural form used in the "Our Father." We also find a missionary preoccupation in Cyprian's text, which was rather rare in the first centuries. Daily prayer stimulates perseverance and prepares one for martyrdom (*De or. dom.* 18).

If Clement of Alexandria did not supply us a commentary on the "Our Father," the seventh book of the *Stromata* made up for it by offering us "the first Christian theological exposition on prayer" (E. von der Goltz). Two prayers are found in the *Pedagogue* (III, 12,101; cf. I, 6,42,1-2): they are directed toward Jesus Christ, but associated with the Father and the Holy Spirit. The seventh book of the *Stromata* describes prayer as "the soul's intimate and silent communication with *God" (Pourrat, *Spiritualité*, 113). Spiritual progress is above all progress in prayer because it completes the perfect gnostic and leads him to the mystical summit (*Strom.* VII, 49,6), a doctrine that would exert a long influence on Origen, *Cassian and *Diadocus.

Origen's treatise *On Prayer,* rightly called by Quasten "a true gem," in addition to being a substantial and profound textual commentary on the "Our Father," provides a *theology of prayer. This type of prayer must be biblical, ascetical and eschatological. Prayer marks the journey of God's people and its steps: a return to the divine likeness, the elimination of the sensible through *purification, the reawakening of the spiritual senses until one reaches perfect union. The Father is the destination of all prayer, the Holy Spirit is its soul (*De or.* 2). One notes the pedagogical character with which Origen described preparation, the inception and the conditions for every prayer (*De or.* 31-32; 9).

We find, moreover, numerous pieces of information on the practices of prayer in various treatises. The **Didache* had already mentioned the ternary system of daily prayer. Prayers in the morning and evening have a more solemn character and are often connected to an *assembly (Tertull., *De or.* 9; *Trad. Ap.* 41). Christians maintained the disposition of prayer before meals. Prayers should be offered at the right time, but this should not make one forget that "the entire life of Christianity is a long celebration"

(Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VII, 7,35,6).

*Polycarp prayed while standing, facing the *East (*Martyrdom of Poly.* 5,1), as John did, in the apocryphal acts, both in the expectation of the *Kyrios* and in the direction of *paradise (Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen attest to the same custom). The *Acts of Hipparchus* added that John painted a *cross on the E wall of his home, where he prayed seven times a day.

Christians pray standing in memory of the one who rose again, on their knees or even prostrate in order to worship God or to confess their *sins. Christians pray with arms stretched out like Christ on the cross, and with open hands just as the *orantes* (V. Saxer, Augustinianum 20 [1980] 335-365).

Christian prayer is never detached from everyday existence, but is extended in concrete situations "of charity without limits": *agape, hospitality, redistribution of goods are the manifestations of a brotherhood discovered in Christ and lived in the church. Origen repeated Clement's maxim drawn from sacred *Scripture: "the prayer accepted by God is a good work" (*Ped.* III, 69,3).

Rooted in the biblical *revelation and in Christ, Christian prayer is at the same time a giving of thanks and awaiting, *recapitulation and *eschatology.

E.F. von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit*, Leipzig 1901; G. Békés, *De continua oratione Clementis Alexandrini doctrina*, Rome 1942; P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne*, 4 vols., Paris 1947–1951; A.G. Hamman, *La prière*, I: *Le Nouveau Testament*, Tournai 1959; II: *Les trois premiers siècles*, Tournai 1963; in It.: *La preghiera*, Rome 1967 = vol. II; F.J. Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens*: JbAC 1 (1958) 5-19; 2 (1959) 15-29; 4 (1961) 5-17; Id., *Gebet*: RAC 8, 1134-1258; var. aus., *La preghiera*, Rome-Milan 1966, 3 vols.; C.H. Bernard, *La preghiera cristiana*, Rome 1976; V. Saxer (ed.), *Ecclesia Orans, Mèlanges . . . A.G. Hamman*: Augustinianum 20/1-2 (1980); A.G. Hamman, *La prière chrétienne et la prière païenne, forme et différences*: ANRW 23/2, 1190-1247; C. Cristiano, *La preghiera nei Padri*, Rome 1981; V. Grossi, *Tertulliano-Cipriano-Agostino, il Padre Nostro*, Rome 1983; A.G. Hamman, *La prière dans l'église ancienne*, Berne 1989 (It. tr. Turin 1994); A. Méhat, *Sur deux définitions de la prière*, in *Origeniana sexta*. Actes du Colloquium origenianum sextum, Louvain 1995, 115-120; K. Ruh, *Geschichte der abendländischen Mystik*, Munich 1993 (It. tr. *Storia della mistica occidentale*, Milan 1995 [vol. I patristica]; B. McGinn, *Storia della mistica cristiana in Occidente*, 1: *Le origini* (IV secolo), GenoA 1997; F. Cocchini (ed.), *Il dono e la sua ombra. Ricerche sul "Peri euches" di Origene*, I Convegno del gruppo italiano di ricerca su "Origene e la tradizione alessandrina," Rome 1997; var. aus., *La preghiera nel tardo antico. Dalle origini ad Agostino*, XXVII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, SEA 66, Rome 1999; S. Pricoco - M. Simonetti, *La preghiera dei cristiani*, Milan 2000; L.F. Pizzolato - M. Rizzi (ed.), *Origene maestro di vita spirituale*, Studia patristica Mediolanensia 22, Milan 2001.

A. Hamman

II. The East: 4th and 5th c. Starting from the 4th-5th c., spiritual writing in the East became increasingly monastic. It was in the monastic context that works of teaching and nearly exhaustive treatises on the topic of prayer flourished (see T. Špidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien*, 409ff.).

1. Definitions and divisions. For the monks, prayer was knowledge par excellence, knowledge that was acquired in the very act of praying itself: knowledge of *faith, *life acc. to faith and salvation. Therefore, the various definitions of prayer proposed by the Fathers certainly do not pretend to be such in the strict sense of the term, but hinge on one aspect or another of that vital act that is prayer. As a human conversation with God, prayer is above all "a request from God for appropriate things" (Basil, *Hom. in mart. Julittam* 3: PG 31, 244 A). Already the ancients spoke of the "the spirit's elevation toward God" (the definition adopted by *Evagrius [*De orat.* 35: PG 79, 1173]). Inasmuch as it is an elevation to God the *Father, this assent is not a simple "vision" in the Platonic sense, but instead becomes "the spirit's dialogue with God" (*De orat.* 3: PG 79, 1168). *John of Damascus (*De fide orth.* 3,24: PG 94, 1089 C) unites the two aspects of the formula then adopted by many others: "prayer is the spirit's elevation toward God and also a request from God for appropriate things." To avoid the danger of Platonic intellectualism, it was necessary to provide new meanings, to adapt the term *nous*, an instrument of this sense, or to substitute it with "heart," to refer to the totality of the person brought to life by the Spirit.

To refer to the progress of prayer a list was made of steps that were explained by classical authors who spoke of *contemplation and *mysticism. The traditional order of these steps generally repeats the trichotomous structure of the human composite: thus prayer of the *body or oral prayer becomes distinct from prayer of the mind or interior prayer and likewise from spiritual prayer that takes place in the depth of the human spirit.

When commenting on the four types of prayer present in the writings of St. *Paul (1 Tim 2:1): δέησις, προσευχή, ἔντευξις and εὐχαριστία, the Fathers followed the explanation offered by *Origen (*De orat.* 14: PG 11, 460; Cassian, *Collat.* 9,9: PL 49, 780).

2. Petitionary Prayer. In opposition to the aristocraticism of some people, the Fathers defended petitionary prayer for "all the needs" of the faithful, even if it was a more certain sign of a higher level of perfection to ask for heavenly needs instead of earthly and temporal ones (Evagr., *De orat.* 37-38: PG 79, 1176).

In response to the question why our prayers are not always heard, the Fathers often answered that

this occurs because we are sinners and we often pray too little (John Chrys., *In dimissionem Chananaeae* 10: PG 52, 457). For this reason, in the penitential tradition of the Eastern monks, a request was often repeated with insistence for the remission of sins: *Kyrie eleison*.

3. Continual Prayer. In full harmony with all the spiritual teachers of the East, *Maximus the Confessor wrote that "holy Scripture does not command anything impossible" when it orders: *Pray without ceasing* (1 Th 5:17) (*Liber asc.* 25: PG 90, 929 D, 932 A). The *Messalians took the commandment literally: to pray is the same as saying prayers, rejecting every secular work and above all manual *labor. In opposition to similar utopias, Augustine wrote the work *De opere monachorum* (PL 40, 547-582).

The *acoemetes believed it was possible to implement continual prayer by working together, obliging the community in turn, through the succession of offices of various groups of monks. The classical solution is in the writings of Origen: "the saint's entire life is like one long prayer; what we call prayer is nothing more than a part of that lifelong prayer" (*De orat.* 12: PG 11, 452). This would become Augustine's teaching (*De haeres.* 57: PL 42, 40) and that of *Aphraates (*Demonstr.* IV, 14-17). Although the monks always tried to increase their practice of prayer, their objective can be summarized in *Cassian's expression: *orationis status* (*Collat.* 10,14: SC 54, p. 95), a habitual disposition of the heart, a *katastasis,* a state of life.

4. The victory over iconoclasm. The fight for *images unleashed in the Byzantine Empire was a grave crisis that, with many vicissitudes, occupied part of the 8th and 9th c. The importance of the anti-iconoclastic reaction can only be understood by relating it to a long series of christological controversies. An idea dear to the Greek Fathers was that in Christ and through him the sanctification of the *world reached its apex and that the unity of the entire universe was achieved. The Byzantine East placed the image of the *Pantocrator at the center of the dome, where it appears as the central motif of all *iconography and simultaneously the axis of the cosmos. The objective of the iconography is therefore to witness to God's presence in the visible world. "At one time, God, the Incorporeal and the Invisible, was never depicted. But now that he has been manifested in the *flesh and has dwelt among men, I represent the 'visibility' of God: I do not worship matter, but the Creator of matter" (John Dam., *Imag.* I, 16: PG 94, 1245 A).

5. Liturgical prayer. In the writings of the Greek Fathers, one finds beautiful statements on the ecclesial character of public prayer. The victory over iconoclasm was also the victory of the monks. The "Studite reform" had its qualifying points in the development of the *liturgy and in the stabilizing of the rites. From the beginning of the 4th c., more precisely from the time when the church was accepted and favored by the imperial power, the freedom to improvise was reduced. Texts and rites were slowly fixed, parallel to the passing of the oral liturgy of the numerous communities to the written liturgy. In the writings of the Fathers, there are five groups of writings on the theme of liturgical prayer: mystagogical *catecheses; explanatory treatises (directed to the faithful, clerics or monks—these increased esp. after the decrease of the institution of the catechumenate); the *homilies delivered during liturgical feasts; the "Easter letters"; works of a more general theological character. The Fathers saw in the liturgy an authoritative argument, a *"locus theologicus" ante litteram*. The most famous example is found in the writings of *Prosper of Aquitaine, who, between 435 and 442, in his *Indiculus de gratia Dei* (8: PL 51, 209 F) set forth the classic formula: *legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi.* Later, among the monks, liturgical contemplation came to the patristic notion of theology as wisdom and gnosis of life.

*6. *Hesychasm.* In modern parlance, when one speaks of hesychasm one usually thinks of a certain method of prayer codified in the monastic context of Mount Athos. In reality, hesychasm, in its early meaning, was a system of *spirituality so old that it coincided with the origins of Eastern *monasticism.

Tranquility, ἡσυχία, being free of worries, ἀμεριμνία, the guardian of the heart, the spirit, vigilance, προσοχή, constitute the apex of prayer and derive from it. "The attentive practice of the *hesychia* of the heart will veil a frenetic abyss, and the ear of *hesychia* will hear marvelous things about God" (Hesychius of Batos, *Cent.* II, 30: PG 93, 1521 A). In the history of this movement, we can distinguish five phases: (1) the hesychasm of the desert Fathers: the insistence on solitude; (2) Sinaites (*John Climachus, *Hesychius and Philotheus the Sinaite): the spiritual combat recalls the *nepsis*, the sobriety, which helps one to drive out demonic suggestions; (3) Simeon the New Theologian (949-1022): the direct experience of the Spirit; (4) the Hesychasm of Mount Athos in the 2nd half of the 13th c. and during the 14th: the "method" of prayer and the Palamite controversies; (5) the era of the *Philokalia*, at the end of the 18th c.: the return to patristic sources.

The Philokalia (first published in Greek in Venice 1782) is a collection of the most significant texts on the subject of prayer in the tradition of the Fathers

of the Christian East (Eng. tr., 4 of 5 vols., K. Ware - G.E.H. Palmer - P. Sherrard, London 1982–).

DSp 1, 169-175; 7, 381-399; 1224-1239 (bibl.); DIP 3, 1306-1313; I. Hausherr, *Penthos. La doctrine de la componction dans l'Orient chrétien*, OCA 132, Rome 1944; Id., *Comment priaient les Pères*: Revue d'ascétique et de mystique 32 (1956) 38-58, 284-296; Id., *Les leçons d'un contemplatif. Le Traité de l'Oraison d'Évagre le Pontique*, Paris 1960; Id., *Noms du Christ et voies d'oraison*, OCA 157, Rome 1960; Id., *La prière perpétuelle du chrétien. Laïcat et Sainteté*, II, Rome 1965, 111-166, repr. in *Hésychasme et prière*, OCA 176, Rome 1966, 255-306; J.-M. Sauget, *Bibliographie des Liturgies orientales (1900–1960)*, Rome 1962; F. Vandenbroucke, *Théologie de la Liturgie*: Cath 7, 882-889; W. Gessel, *Die Theologie des Gebetes nach "De oratione" von Origenes*, Munich-Paderborn-Vienna 1975; C. von Schönborn, *L'icône du Christ. Fondements théologiques élaborés entre le I[er] et le II[e] Concile de Nicée (325–787)*, Fribourg 1976; T. Špidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient Chrétien. Manuel systématique*, OCA 206, Rome 1978, 293ff., 382ff. (bibl.) (It. tr. *Manuale fondamentale di spiritualità*, Casale Monf. 1993); A.G. Hamman, *La prière dans l'église ancienne*, Berne 1989 (It. tr. Turin 1994); K. Ruh, *Geschichte der abendländischen Mystik*, Munich 1993 (It. tr. *Storia della mistica occidentale*, Milan 1995 [I: patristica]); *La preghiera nel tardo antico. Dalle origini ad Agostino*, XXVII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, SEA 66, Rome 1999; B. McGinn, *Storia della mistica cristiana in Occidente*, vol. 1: *Le origini* (I-V secolo), Genoa1997; S. Pricoco - M. Simonetti, *La preghiera dei cristiani*, Milan 2000.

T. Špidlík

III. The Latin West and the 4th and 5th c. The Latin Fathers of the golden age all commented on the book of *Psalms: "vox Christi ad Patrem" (Ambr., *Ps.* 61). So too *Hilary, *Ambrose, *Jerome and *Augustine. It is from these *enarrationes* that we must analyze their teaching on Christian prayer. In all of these, prayer is rooted in *Scripture. *Origen heavily influenced the majority of these Western authors. One can detect it esp. in the writings of Hilary, Ambrose and Jerome. In Hilary's *Tractatus in Psalmos*, which are not just a commentary on the Psalter but are tracings of a spiritual journey to God, Christian prayer is not just a formula, but a stimulus for life; not so much *oratio verborum* as much as *affectus cordis* (*In Ps.* 60,2). It is in the first place an attitude of faith (ibid.) and a movement of the heart (*Op. Hist. fr.* VIII). It demands the interior assent of Christian action (*In Ps.* 63,5-6). The treatise *On the Trinity* begins and finishes with a prayer (I, 38; VI, 19,21; XII, 52-57). This facet of the work demonstrates, better than long explanations, that prayer leads to faith (I, 37-38). God is a mystery whom one must receive in prayer and with prayer. For finding God, silent adoration is better than speculation (*De Trin.* I, 6; II, 7; X, 50,54,55; XI, 9,23,47).

Ambrose is perhaps the Latin author who was most influenced by Origen. He was particularly sensitive in his devotion to Christ. A preacher of Scripture, Ambrose naturally drew on Origen's works, esp. in his long *commentary on Psalm 118, and esp. in 22:27-34. As in the case of his teacher, he willingly directed his *preaching to explicit prayer (*De fide* I, 20; V, 19; *Spir. s.* II, prol. 8; I, 14; *De paen.* II, 67 and 73; *Or. in Valent.* 80; *Or. in Theodos.* 36). He preferred worshiping and praising God, like the seraphim, rather than discussing his nature (*De fide* II, 106; *Spir. s.* III, 21). In his works, he continually directed spontaneous prayers toward Christ (*De fide* I, 137; *Spir. s.* prol. 13; cf. Baus, *Das Gebet beim hl. Ambrosius*, Trier 1952). The dogmatic expositions conclude with a profession of faith, a profession in *oratio* and *adoratio* (Dassman, 91). As in the case of Origen, he expressed his devotion to Christ in affective prayer (Baus, RQA 44-46).

Jerome equally depended on Origen in his prayer to Christ. He invoked Christ as well as the *Holy Spirit primarily when he commented upon Scripture (*Vita Hilar.* 1)—see, e.g., *In Os. comm.* prol.; *In Hierem. comm.* 4.6, praef.; *De Vir. ill.* praef. It is not possible to receive God's Word without the *Domino revelante* (*Ep.* 65,22,4), *nunc adiuvante, imo inspirante nobis Christo* (*In Is. comm. 8, in fine*). In this prayer to Christ, Jerome depended not only on Origen, but also on the piety and hagiographical literature on the martyrs (Baus, *Das Gebet zu Christus beim hl. Hieronymus* [1951] 187-188).

Augustine, in his *catechesis, preaching and literary correspondence left a special place for prayer, esp. the "Our Father," which he calls a *sacramentum* (*Serm.* 228,3) and which he ceaselessly explained (cf. A. Hamman, *Le Pater expliqué par les Pères*, Paris 1952, 154-169). In his *Enarrationes on the Psalms*, he views the Psalter as tracing the Christian's path toward God. One also sees this path in his commentary on 1 John. This aspect is esp. obvious in the *Enarr. in Ps.* 41, in the psalms that recall the heavenly *Jerusalem (*Enarr. in Ps.* 61; 85; 86; 98), and in the gradual Psalms (*Enarr. in Ps.* 124; 125; 136; 147; 149). In the Psalms, Augustine perceived prayer and the mystery of Christ and the church, the head and the body. Christ's prayer is ours; ours becomes that of Christ: "Our prayers are therefore directed toward him, through him and in him" (*In Ps.* 85,1). And he concludes: "there is therefore just one man who lasts until the end of time and it is always his members that cry forth" (ibid., 4). The *Enarrationes* prolong the prayer of the *Confessions* and show us Augustine's spiritual and mystical experience, a man of prayer, which he had already explained in the treatise *De quant. an.* 33,73-76. Augustine summarized his thought on this matter in his *Letter* 130 to *Proba. In the *Sermon on the Mount, he places the peti-

tions of the "Our Father" in relation to the *Beatitudes and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which unfold the path to God.

With regard to those who came after Augustine, prayer can be found in their preaching, esp. in explanations of the "Our Father," primarily in the sermons of *Peter Chrysologus (*Serm.* 67-72, c. 39; 43), in *John Cassian (*Coll.* IX and X) and in *Martin of Tours, for whom prayer is rooted in **lectio divina* (*Vita Mart.* 26,2-4). The monastic *rules, notably *The Rule of St. *Benedict*, insist on continual prayer (Aug., *Ep.* 211,7; Cass., *Coll.* IX, 3,6,7; X, 14).

Ch. Morel, *La vie de prière de st. Augustin d'après sa correspondance*: Revue d'ascétique et de mystique 23 (1947) 222-258; A. de Bovis, *Le Christ et la prière*: Revue d'ascétique et de mystique 25 (1949) 180-193; K. Baus, *Das Gebet zu Christus, beim hl. Hieronymus*: TZ 60 (1951) 178-188; J. Delamare, *La Prière à l'école de saint Augustin*: Vie spirituelle 86 (1952) 477-493; K. Baus, *Die Stellung Christi im Gebet des hl. Augustinus*: TZ 63 (1954) 321-339; Id., *Das Nachwirken des Origenes in der Christusfrömmigkeit des hl. Ambrosius*: RQA 49 (1954) 21-55; A.M. Besnard, *Les grandes lois de la prière. Saint Augustin, maître de prière*: Vie spirituelle 101 (1959) 237-280; T.A. Hand, *St. Augustine on Prayer*, Dublin 1964; M. Abad, *La oración misionera y sus fuentes según San Augustín*, Madrid 1964; E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosius von Mailand. Quellen und Entfaltung*, Münster 1965; G. García Montana, *La eficacia de la oración según la doctrina de San Augustín*, Madrid 1966; E. von Severus, *Gebet*: RAC 8, 1242-1247; A.G. Hamman, *Saint Augustin prie les Psaumes*, Paris 1981; V. Grossi, *Tertulliano-Cipriano-Agostino, il Padre Nostro*, Rome 1983; N. Cipriani, *La pedagogia della preghiera in S. Agostino*, Palermo 1984; M. Pellegrino, *La preghiera dei Salmi in S. Agostino*, Magnano 1984; C. Vagaggini - G. Penco, *La preghiera nella Bibbia e nella tradizione patristica e monastica*, Cinisello Balsamo 1988 ([1]1964); D. Gorce, *La "lectio divina" nell'ambiente ascetico di S. Girolamo*, Bologna 1990 (orig. ed. 1925); M.G. Jackson, *The Lord's Prayer in St. Augustine*: SP 27 (1993) 311-321; A. Trapè, *Sant'Agostino uomo e maestro di preghiera*, Rome 1995; K. Ruh, *Geschichte der abendländischen Mystik*, Munich 1993 (It. tr. *Storia della mistica occidentale*, Milan 1995 [I: patristica]); M. Belda, *La preghiera continua secondo S. Agostino*: Annales theologici 10/2 (1996) 349-379; B. McGinn, *Storia della mistica cristiana in Occidente*, 1: *Le origini* (*I-V secolo*), Genoa1997; var. aus., *La preghiera nel tardo antico. Dalle origini ad Agostino*, XXVII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, SEA 66, Rome 1999; M.M. Campelo, *San Augustín y el Padrenuestro*: Augustinus 45 (2000) 35-89; S. Pricoco - M. Simonetti, *La preghiera dei cristiani*, Milan 2000.

A. Hamman

PREACHING

I. Definition - II. The lexicon: Preaching as proclamation, explanation, exhortation - III. Object - IV. History - V. Forms - VI. Dynamics - VII. Trends in recent studies.

I. Definition. By the term *preaching*, we mean the oral transmission of the gospel message (*kerygma*), performed within certain parameters of space (the context of worship in a building) and time (the liturgical celebration) by an authorized representative. Formulated thus, this definition holds starting from the mid-2nd c., when *Justin Martyr discussed a sufficiently uniform phenomenon that he could describe it as such to observers who were unfamiliar with the customs of Christians (see below IV.1).

II. The lexicon: Preaching as proclamation, explanation, exhortation. In the Vulgate, the Latin term *praedico* usually translates the Greek New Testament's word κηρύσσω, which specifically means to "notify, publicly announce in advance," as does a herald (κῆρυξ). Although the announcement contains in itself *the invitation to believe, the content of the proclamation, and the exhortation to change one's behavior as a result*, it is a passive act, which does not involve any intervention by the one who fulfills it, inasmuch as that person is simply a speaker in the name of a higher authority whose orders must be obeyed (Friedrich TDNT 3, 687-688). But the herald of the NT has a direct responsibility in the spreading of the message of which he is the relator, and the measure in which he undertakes to demonstrate its truth. Such a demonstration is completed through the *explanation* of the message: its spokesperson thus becomes its interpreter who teaches the audience how to understand the message in such a way as to be able to adjust to it. Jesus was first mindful of the legacy he wanted to leave behind (Mt 4:23; 9:35: *docens* [διδάσκων] *et praedicans* [=κηρύσσων] *evangelium regni*), inviting the public to believe (Mt 4:17; Jeremias 1972). His apostles did the same following his commandment (Mk 16:15, 20; Acts 8:4-5; Dodd 1936; Wrege, in Klimkeit et al. 1997; Ghidelli, in Sodi-Triacca 2002) as did *Paul (Acts 9:20; Mounce 1999; Heriban, in Sodi-Triacca 2002). Since the NT, preaching was therefore at the same time the (oral) message of an event, an explanation of the proclaimed event and the exhortation to live accordingly.

This triple meaning is reflected in the lexicon used in ancient times to describe the act of preaching (Bardy 1946; Mohrmann, in Id. 1961, II; Olivar 1991, 487-514). In addition to the term κήρυγμα (verb κηρύσσω), which continued to mark the aspect of public proclamation, the Greek terms διδασκαλία and διδαχή (from the verb διδάσκω; the verb μανθάνω from Mt 28:19-20 had no continuation) and the Latin terms *tractatus* (verb *tractare*) and—more rarely—*expositio* and *enarratio* emphasize the aspect of teaching, i.e., explanation, which is more appropriately κατήχησις (Lat. **cathechesis*) when it corresponds to the preliminary instruction held in

preparation for *baptism. The terms ἐπιτίμησις, παραίνεσις, πρό(σ)κλησις, παράκλησις, (Lat. *admonitio*, *commonitio*, *exhortatio*, *consolatio*, *increpatio*, *castigatio*) constitute, however, other similar inflections of the exhortatory meaning of preaching. There then exists a series of generic terms that allude to the rhetorical form in which preaching was manifested (e.g., λόγος, διάλεξις, ὁμιλία; Lat. *declamatio*, *disputatio, homilia*, *sermo*), some of which tended to acquire a technical character (esp. ὁμιλία, soon supplanted by λόγος; *homilia* and *sermo* recall the original colloquial rather than formal nature of preaching). The Latin term *praedico*, from which the verbs and corresponding substantives of the chief modern Western languages derived, gained the upper hand over the others only in the Early Middle Ages. In scientific literature, the term *homily* was often used in reference to sermons in which exegetical interest prevailed, while the term *sermon* was used in reference to sermons on a theme. Here we shall use both terms as synonyms for preaching.

III. Object. In the NT the objective event of the message is substantiated by the messianic promises in Jesus, a sign of the approaching end of times and the kingdom of God (Mt 10:7). That Jesus was the Messiah expected by Israel is what Jesus himself preached, applying to his person the passage from Is 61:1-4, read in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-21). The *apostles and *Paul did the same (Acts 9:20; 10:42-43). The difference is naturally in perspective: Jesus read the Hebrew *Scriptures in relation to himself, the *apostles read in relation to Jesus. With their work, preaching became, therefore, a discourse on Jesus—on Jesus the Messiah, but also on his life and teachings, that which makes apostolic preaching simultaneously a theological discourse (christological) and an exhortation to a precise code of conduct: what befits the members of the community of the faithful who had become such through the right of passage in baptism (Mt 28:19-20). During the time of the apostles, this speech was based on the oral testimony of the one who delivered it (Acts 4:20), then put in writing (Jn 20:30; 21:24-25), and eventually transmitted to and reproduced by third-party recipients (Lk 1:1-4). After the apostolic and postapostolic age (when the disciples of the apostles were working and still able to report firsthand information on Jesus, as, e.g., *Polycarp did in Eus., *HE* 5,20,6), this slowly tended to become, more properly speaking, a discourse on Jesus revealed from documents that collected the memories considered most reliable concerning the Teacher, and which progressively and unharmoniously—and in competition with alternative traditions—came together in the course of the 2nd c. in the NT canon. From that point onward, preaching consisted of exegesis of these documents, in the light of which, from that point on, the Hebrew Scriptures were also understood.

We do not know exactly when sermons began to treat contemporary issues, however, but it seems to have happened rather early. Already, Jesus made known his judgment on various issues of this sort (e.g., Mt 22:17-18, on the theme of political Messianism), although it is difficult to believe that burning questions such as the coexistence of Jewish and Gentile Christians were not dealt with in the context of preaching (e.g., 1 Cor 8–11). In any case, the issues tied to the public and private life of Christians (which a text such as 1 Corinthians treats extensively) in time became increasingly present in homilies—*Origen's homilies show this well, even though they are primarily exegetical in character—and acquired an important role after the Constantinian conversion.

IV. History. *1. The first three c.* From the beginning, Christian preaching looked very much like that practiced in the *synagogue during Jesus' time, which provided for the public reading and explanation of a passage from the Torah and the prophets (e.g., in Klimkeit et al. 1997; Old 1998, I, 94-105; 113-180; Carucci, in Sodi-Triacca 2002) on specific days of the week (certainly the *sabbath, perhaps also Monday and Thursday) and on the occasion of the feasts. Jesus himself read and explained the passage of Is 61:1-4, in the synagogue of Nazareth (on the sabbath) (see above III). The apostles and Paul intended to maintain the same practice (Acts 15:21), even if, from the formal point of view, their preaching openly reflected the influence of argumentative techniques of the rhetorical and philosophical schools, and in particular diatribe (Bultmann 1984; Marrou 1957; Stewart-Sykes 2001, 39-79). At this level, preaching in certain places and set times was not strictly binding—Jesus taught in the *temple and in the synagogues (Jn 18:20), but not exclusively, nor preferably, nor did he only do it at preset times; the apostles also worked in this way (Acts 5:20 vs. Acts 10:1ff.), as did Paul (Acts 17:17 vs. Acts 17:19). Nevertheless, the synagogue's practice seems to have conditioned the spatial and temporal coordinates of Christian preaching that eventually developed in specific times and places. This happened as early as the mid-2nd c.: "And on the day called Sunday [Day of the Sun], all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memories of

the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray" (Justin, 1 *Apol.* 67,3-5).

On the basis of this passage from the *Prima Apologia* of Justin, written at Rome around AD 150, preaching was held in the *ekklēsia*—a term indicating the assembly of the faithful as well as the place in which they gathered. The gatherings (συνέλευσις) were periodic (they took place weekly: on the "Day of the Sun" = *Sunday) and scheduled the reading of the "New Testament" passage ("the memories of the apostles") and/or a prophetic passage ("the writings of the prophets," an expression, however, that could refer to the entire OT). A speech (λόγος) followed this reading, delivered by the one who presided over the assembly (προεστώς), and consisting of an explanation of the text just read (νουθεσία) and an *exhortatio* (πρόκλησις), which was held after the community prayer (Cattaneo 1997, 314-318; Old 1998, I, 265-269). The analogies with the worship service in the synagogue are obvious, but on the other hand, the differences are also obvious. The most important difference is that Christian preaching took place in the context of worship: a celebration of the eucharistic *liturgy, which is the very reason why the *ekklēsia* was gathered (1 *Apol.*, 65,2-5; 67,5). Despite the lack of sources, it is very likely that such a differentiation dates back to the apostolic age. In Acts 20:7-12, in fact, we see Paul meeting on Sunday ("the first day of the week"), along with the faithful of Troas, in a private home "to break bread," and to deliver a speech that lasted till sunrise—even if this speech did not also make room for a preliminary reading of the sacred text.

We are unable to determine if and to what extent Justin's description reflects a widespread and common practice. The fact that it is found in an apologetic document, crafted in order to give Christianity a homogenous image for the benefit of skeptic observers, can lead one to suspect that it is a simplification. Nevertheless, one such text is the so-called *Second Letter* of ps.-*Clement of Rome (see Eus., *HE* 3,38,4) which should be placed in the context of *Syria or *Egypt (less likely is *Rome or *Corinth) sometime before or after AD 150, if, as it appears, it was originally a homily. It provides a specific comparison to Justin's description because the author addresses an audience of "brothers and sisters" using an exhortation (ἔντευξις) that takes as its cue the exegesis of a scriptural passage read shortly before, which in this case seems to be Is 54–66 (Baasland 1993; Stewart-Sykes 2001, 174-186; Bergamelli, in Sodi-Triacca 2002). Moreover, nearly 40 years after Justin, *Tertullian provided a similar picture of *Carthage (Old 1998, I, 269-273): in 197 (*Apol.* 39,3-4) and then again in 210—in reference, here, to the procedure in use in the *Montanist church (*Anim.* 9,4). Starting from this point, preaching assumed a specific meaning in the worship service: it consisted in the oral transmission of the *kerygma* through preaching, namely through the homily.

Justin and Tertullian's testimony are of utmost importance for us not only because they illuminate the nature and dynamics of the preaching cultivated in a very ancient period, but also because they allow us to understand the cultural meaning of that preaching. In fact, their testimony represents a truly defining moment in which the followers of the new faith reaffirmed their own adherence to it (Tertull., *Apol.* 39,1.3). The regularity of the gatherings, moreover, assures us of a continuity of relation between the preacher and the audience of the faithful, which is very exceptional when compared to other events of the spoken word in the ancient world—with the exception of the preaching in the synagogue—a continuity that with time would become a formidable instrument of cohesion for the community conquered for Christianity. The Emperor *Julian (361–363) would show that he was quite aware of this fact, when, in his attempt to build a "*pagan church" to oppose the Christian one, acc. to his detractors, he specifically wanted to make sure that his "clergy"—hierarchically sitting on raised "platforms" (see below VI.5.b)—regularly held "readings and explanations of Hellenic teachings" (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4,111; Soz., *HE* 5,16,2-4).

Julian's plan used as a model a reality that, over the course of two centuries, had evolved enormously to the point of becoming widespread. In effect, already from the time of Justin's *Apologia* to 50 years after Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, preaching decisively intensified its rhythms over a two-century time span. During *Cyprian's time, e.g., the church lector read "the precepts and the gospel of the Lord" on a daily (*cotidie*) basis, i.e., "everyday" (*Ep.* 39,4,1). We do not know if there was a sermon after this daily reading: Cyprian himself, when a *presbyter, did not preach on a daily basis but "often" (Pont., V. *Cypr.* 3,5: *sermo usitatus*), although Origen, when a presbyter in *Caesarea Palestine (ca. 231–251) during the decade 238–248, preached "almost every day" (Pamph., *Apol. pro Orig.* 9,6-7: *paene cotidie*). That notwithstanding, it is evident that, at least in certain churches, preaching was no longer limited to the Sunday sermon, as was the case during Justin's time. Origen's material has allowed scholars to determine that during this period sermons were delivered not

only with the celebration of the *Eucharist (Friday and Sunday), but also without the eucharistic celebration (on other days of the week in the morning, before work activities) (Grappone 2001b).

The quantitative effects of this acceleration were impressive as early as the 3rd c. Unfortunately, none of Cyprian's sermons have survived—even if, as in the case of Ambrose later, it seems that many of the bishop of Carthage's treatises were originally homilies. From Origen, however, there remain at least 262 homilies (considering the 59 *Homilies on the Psalms*, whose authorship is contested by scholars), 21 of which are in the original Greek text and the rest in Latin translation. With these sermons, the Alexandrian nearly monopolized the homiletical scene of the first three centuries: but Origen's extant sermons are just a little more than the 500 sermons known to Jerome (*Ep.* 33,4), which in turn only reflect in part the prodigious effort of this preacher in his almost 20 years of activity (Monaci Castagno 1988; Old 1998, I, 306-352; Monaci Castagno, in Sodi-Triacca 2002). In the following century, such figures were destined to grow even more, in proportion to the subsequent intensification of the frequency in preaching (see below VI. 3).

Among the results of such zeal, one in particular deserves to be mentioned: the fact that the preacher became the voice most heard in the public arena, much more so than any other of the public figures obliged to speak in the city. Not soon after the new faith obtained the recognition of *religio licita*, preaching transformed into an extraordinary means for influencing public opinion and, with that, became an exceptional political weapon which no one—as Julian understood so well—could afford to ignore (see, e.g., Bas., *Hex.* 7,6,65-68: Basil's audience was encouraged to discuss at dinner the topics treated by the bishop in two [!] homilies delivered during the course of the day: and also Caes. Arles., *Serm.* 74,4; 198,5). Preaching had even greater influence when—directly or through translators—it took place in local dialects, rather than only in the learned languages of the empire, thus reaching an even wider audience, as occurred in *Egypt, *Syria and Palestine from the early years of the 4th c. (see *Passio S. Procopii Lectoris*, 2, in *AASS* 8 Julii, II, 556 D; Egeria, *Itin.* 47,3-4; Theodoret, *HE* 5,30; Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 123*, 8,12-13; Olivar 1991, 890-901).

Origen's abundant homiletic production provides us a photograph of Christian preaching more than that given by Justin's brief description for the preceding century. The succession of liturgical acts in which the preacher's discourse was placed is the same that was observed in the church of Rome in 150: following the reading of a biblical passage (probably just one) by a reader (so too in Cyprian's Carthage: see above) an explanation of the reading itself was given by a preacher surrounded by other members of the clergy, in turn followed by a community prayer (with hands lifted) of the standing faithful. There existed, however, an order of biblical readings—even if scholars still discuss which exactly—that consisted of a complete reading or extensive excerpts of scriptural books toward which the preaching was directed (Grappone 2001a; see later Bas., *Hom.* 3,1; 6,1: PG 31, 200 B; 261 B; *Const. App.* 2,57,5-8).

The homilies of Origen were primarily exegetical. Therefore they fully reflect the original meaning of preaching. The same was the case for his contemporary *Hippolytus (Old 1998, I, 273-277; Stewart-Sykes 2001, 249-257). This characteristic is probably explained in light of the fact that the efforts of the church of the first three centuries were directed precisely toward reaching a satisfactory formulation of the message of which it considered itself the guardian, esp. in the face of the objections by Jews and pagans, and in an atmosphere of strong competition *ad intra* for the primacy of this formulation. Origen also began, however, to discuss questions of social and institutional interest (Fatti 2004a), conferring on his own preaching a public function that would find its fullest expression beginning with the Constantinian century.

2. The 4th-c. turn. *Constantine signifies the transformation of Christianity into a religion of the emperor, an event destined to radically change Western history and with it the fate of preaching. Above all, quantitatively speaking, the Constantinian turn in fact led to the increasing spread of Christianity into society, both horizontally and vertically. There was also a proportional increase in the number of churches where the liturgy was celebrated and sermons were delivered. More churches or, better yet, more places of worship—alongside the traditional ones—led to an increase at least of the sanctuaries of the *martyrs, the *martyria*. These were more suited for the liturgical office and, therefore, required more preachers. The quantitative increase of preaching, however, was owed also to the increased social visibility of those who were in charge of it, and were, in the first place, *bishops. After Constantine, the Christian bishop—definitively recognized as the chief authority of the church and, with that, the official interlocutor of the state—became a public figure, held as having the prerogative to speak up not only in homilies but every time his new responsibilities required it. The multiplication of instances in which he

was called upon to speak made him a more sought after and sophisticated preacher: rather than only the head of a religious community, he was now the spokesperson of the city, deeply immersed in the life of the empire.

Such a change inevitably weighed upon the contents and the quality of preaching. Although it continued to preserve its specificity in the measure to which it remained tied to the liturgy, the evolution of the preacher's role diversified his interests, forcing him to focus not only on the Word read in the church, but also on current events. Preaching now increasingly discussed social or political problems more or less urgent. What comes to mind, in the first case, are the homilies devoted to the great questions of collective interest such as the good use of riches (Mara 1980) or particular events such as natural disasters (famines, earthquakes, epidemics etc.: e.g., Severus of Antioch, *Hom.* 19). Second, there were the sermons held on the occasion of the events tied to public life such as the very famous series *Homilies on the Statues* delivered by *John Chrysostom at *Antioch after the famous incident of 387 (CPG Suppl. 4330). Moreover, thematic sermons increased, which, together with traditional exegetical homilies, ended up in the first homilies crafted for supplying the preacher a range of arguments to address (see below IV. 3). The same traditional exegetical sermon, moreover, changed in significance. From the moment in which the one who was responsible to preach was no longer simply the guide of a "sect" (Acts 24:14), but a representative of the emperor's religion, his words always had political weight, even when they pertained to topics restricted to doctrine. The doctrinal controversies were certainly not novelties of the 4th c. They were born from disagreements on the interpretation of Jesus' message that dated back to the apostolic age. But after Constantine, they were no longer in-house debates (*ad intra*). Constantine wanted to have at his service a united church, capable of satisfying the religious and ideological needs of an empire with one leader (*see* *church and empire). In fact, these debates transformed the doctrinal conflict into a political conflict. The fact that the *Arian crisis, which marked the entire 4th c., began from the preaching of a dissident presbyter, is a sign that the new meaning acquired by this activity was no longer merely speculative.

The preachers, who had by that time become public figures, moreover, were immersed in a web of social and political relationships that now conditioned them more deeply than in the past. Preaching became an excellent instrument for solidifying bonds between churches and also for breaking them. There was also the custom of inviting speakers of proven ability—usually on special occasions: liturgical feasts or events governed by a specific ritual, such as the feasts of the martyrs—preachers different from those who served the local community that provided the invitation. In reality, it was an ancient practice, because Origen had already been called outside Caesarea to preach (e.g., Eus., *HE* 6,27); by the 4th c. it ceased to be exceptional and became customary. Such a custom represented an opportunity for voices different from that of the local bishop, or one of his trusted preachers, to make their own point of view known. We must imagine that, as in the case of Origen, such an opportunity was usually taken advantage of by all the parties involved. Invited in 361 to Constantinople by Eudoxius of *Antioch, on the occasion of the *Epiphany, the *Anomoian leader *Eunomius of Cyzicus, in fact, launched into an audacious, *subordinationist interpretation of the account of the birth of Jesus, capitalizing on the political-doctrinal front in which he battled, even against Eudoxius, the bishop of the capital (Philost., *HE* 6,2). Nearly a century and a half later, *Severus of Antioch, a guest at Cyrrhus during his second year as bishop (Nov. 513–514), took the opportunity to thank the Bishop *Sergius, thus enforcing the perfect cooperation between the two *cathedra (*Hom.* 58: PO 8, 214-215 [100-101]). At times, however, giving the floor to a guest preacher could turn out to be counterproductive, exposing oneself to unforeseen attacks damaging the hosting see: one thinks of the case of *Epiphanius of Salamis, imprudently invited for the *Easter of 393 by *John of Jerusalem, who was awarded the accusation of *Origenism by Epiphanius (Jerome, *C. Io. Hier.* 11,1-5).

The new, complex gamut of meanings acquired by preaching explains the qualitative transformation that now went against it. Precisely because they were public figures, preachers were now exposed to a much wider audience that was more attentive and demanding than in the past. By this point, it was not enough that the sermon explain and exhort, it also had to be pleasing and at times displeasing. And this was a time in which the public "did not look for priests, but orators" (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 42,24,24-25), namely, teachers who knew how to speak to win public opinion and obtain its support. Having arrived in Milan—in time to deliver in the presence of the emperor *Valentinian II, the *panegyric for the consulate of the *magister militum* Bautus, 1 January 385—the young African orator *Augustine understood what his path would be by listening to Bishop *Ambrose preach; the *suavitas* of his *sermo* prevailed

over the funny and captivating tones of *Faustus the *Manichean (*Conf.* 5,13,23).

Once he became the bishop of the city of *Hippo, he remained deeply convinced of the importance of knowing how to preach well—even if afterward, for reasons of clarity, he decided to preach in a colloquial style, aware of the need for adjusting to the level of the very diverse audience that attended his sermons (*Enarr. in Ps. 119*, 2,29 [CCSL 40, 1778]: *Sic loquimur, ut capere possitis* ["we speak in such a way so that you can understand"]): when the audience objected that Scripture discouraged the use of many words (misunderstanding the sense of *multiloquim* in Prov 10:19), he responded that the need for the audience to understand did not prevent one from expressing oneself *ex multa eloquentia* (*C. Cresc.* 1,1,2: PL 43, 447), and gave concrete demonstration of that by ably handling the *ornamenta* of the arts and willingly having recourse to the rhythmic *clausulae* (Aug., *De doctr. christ.* 4,20,41; Brennan 1947; Mohrmann 1961, I; Oberhelman 1991; Mühlenberg, in Mühlenberg - van Oort 1994; and moreover Memoli 1969; Massa 1991; Romano 2005). To act otherwise would have left a bad impression on the increasingly competent listeners present in the audience, risking compromising the success of the sermon. When using everyday language (*pedestri sermone*), *Cesarius of Arles therefore felt the need to excuse himself before an audience he knew full well was not lacking *eruditae aures* (Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 86,1: CCSL 103, 353; Bona 2000). *Avitus of Vienne, on one occasion during a sermon misspoke; he had to explain himself to an orator (*rhetor*) who did not appreciate the *défaillance* (Av. Vienn., *Ep.* 57 [51], MGH AA 6,2, 85-87). Naturally, it was not merely a purely formal question. Together with the pleasure of exposition, the interests of socially elevated and intellectually refined urban classes came into play; only the circumspect sermon was able to placate their cultural demands, thus guaranteeing for the church their attention and consent. It is, therefore, not without reason that a man of Ambrose's caliber did not tire in reiterating the importance for good exercise of pastoral activity in the exercise of quality preaching (Lizzi 1989, 42-53; Savon 1999).

From the moment that people could hear examples of rhetorical skill, the church became a place of entertainment, in competition with the other equally attractive locations such as the hippodrome, the circus, the civic festivals or the theater (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 80, 23 [CCSL 39, 1135]; Pasquato 1976). The circumstances for which such attractions were heavily criticized by particularly learned preachers such as *John Chrysostom established the fact that there were those who were aware of being able to offer an equally pleasing spectacle (see, e.g., Chrys., *Pan. Juln.* 4: PG 50, 673, 43-45: "What is more pleasing than the spiritual theater?" This was a point well understood by ps.-Mart. Ant., *Pan.* 4,20-24; 31,12-13 Wallraff). The same awareness lies at the heart of the controversy against the customs of the "outside" rhetoricians, whom the Christian preachers willingly humored, esp. when they challenged them with the kinds of speeches that were similar to those in use in the pagan city—e.g., the encomia (this was the case with, to give just a few famous names, the Cappadocians, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Severus of Antioch, but also *Quodvultdeus and *Zeno of Verona). Without considering that such a controversy was explained at times more in light of specific concerns than general convictions (Fatti 2004b), it does not at all exclude the idea of the pleasure gained from hearing Christian preaching, which was delivered in such a way as to never lose sight of public tastes (the preacher's predilection for applause provides an eloquent demonstration: see below VI.6.c).

To be able to satisfy similar tastes, the right tools were needed. The new preachers therefore went to the schools of *rhetoric. From the mid-3rd c., the increase of professions to the new faith and the attention paid to its heralds (see, e.g., Orig., *Hom. Num.* 13,7; *Hom. Jer.* 4,3) yielded significant results. Before entering the church, Cyprian obtained an excellent formation in the *studia* and the *bonae artes* that guaranteed him that *eloquentiae larga fecunditas* ("broad fecundity of eloquence") for which he was forever famous (Pont., *V. Cypr.* 1,1; 2,2). For his part, the bishop of Antioch *Paul of Samosata preferred to consider himself a sophist more than a bishop: the success he won in the "ecclesiastical assemblies" was enormous, and it took a presbyter, an orator by profession named *Malchion, who was eventually able to expel him from the church at an episcopal synod (Eus., *HE* 7,29,2; 32,9; Navascués 2004).

Starting from the 4th c., men such as Paul of Samosata or his opposition were no longer an exception to the rule. The new preachers—at the very least, those who were able (see Rapp 2005, 173-183)—went to study in the prestigious universities of the Mediterranean world such as *Athens, *Alexandria, Beirut, Rome and *Bordeaux. Before speaking from the church's cathedra, many had already done so from the one in the school, having previously worked as university teachers (one thinks of *Gregory of Nazianzus and Augustine), without the passage from the old to the new activity involving very deep rifts. Sometimes the very young students who attended

the *didaskaleia* of *Caesarea would go to the homilies of Basil, and free from the weight of the teachers, would take advantage of the opportunity to make noise, but also to listen to a quality performance (Bas., *Hom.* 8,3: PG 31, 309 C). In congratulating one of his promising students—*Amphilochius appointed bishop of Iconium in 373/374—the demanding professor of rhetoric *Libanius was convinced that the election would allow the young man to unleash all his oratorical ability with which he had been gifted (Lib., *Ep.* 1543 Foerster); however, with regard to his best student, *John Chrysostom, Libanius admitted, on his deathbed, that he would have been his most worthy successor had not the Christians stolen him (Soz., *HE* 8,2,2.5). After Constantine, a quality education guaranteed success in a career that was becoming more coveted and pursued in an atmosphere of growing competition. The great doctrinal controversies, beginning with the *Arian crisis, always wounded the church deeply; there was also an increasing number of struggles for power in the church. Winning and maintaining an episcopal cathedra certainly continued to depend on one's competence in using *Scripture which was the basis on which, as in the past, debates were held; but it also depended on how much one was able to please public opinion both at the local and international level. Rival preachers, skilled in speaking, gave the apostle Paul a hard time when they reproached him for his simplicity of language and his meager ability in persuasion (1 Cor 2:1-5; 2 Cor 11:5-6; Litfin 1994). Later on, Paul of Samosata came to the point of making jokes about the pure and simple "interpreters of the word," vaunting his own ability to excite the crowd over their own which he considered a disgrace (Eus., *HE* 7,30,9). A century later, the danger of being caught up by the success of competitors—who hurried into church "to flatter the audience, thinking not about the cure of the *soul, but only the beauty of words" (ps.-Athan., *Sem.* 4: PG 28, 149 A 8-10), and to thus appear to procure the public's approval—had by then become frequent enough that preachers who wanted to avert such danger were counseled to find time for adequate preparation.

The suspicion with which certain people still looked upon eloquence revealed that there was increasing risk in this area. In the years of his debut as presbyter at *Caesarea Cappadocia, *Basil knew that among his listeners envious detractors from those "exegetes of the sacred words" were hiding who, like Basil, drew admiration "because of the wisdom and power of their speeches" (*Hom.* 11,1.5: PG 31, 373 A; 384 A). Such detractors were not just anyone; they were competing sacred orators. Gregory of Nazianzus's irritation with the rhetorical skill (*Orr.* 27,2,14: τεχνύδριον; 29,21,18; 31,18,18: τεχνολογία) of *Eunomius—who, in order to shock, did not hesitate to call into question the perpetual virginity of *Mary (Philost., *HE* 6,2)—well expresses the never assuaged fears of a successful preacher threatened by a formidable rival, who, also after having been declared outside the law by the emperor *Theodosius (CTh 16,5,6, of January 381), still knew how to draw the leader's curiosity (Soz., *HE* 7,6,3; Philost., *HE* 9,8). The same can be said for the concerns harbored 50 years earlier by the deacon *Ephrem with regard to the presbyter Paulinus, a teacher who taught off-the-cuff and therefore one who had a great hold on the attention of his audience (Genn., *Vir.* 3). This context of competition also explains the elaboration of a deontology of the preacher, which took into consideration the need for preaching without troubling oneself too much, but also without ignoring entirely the need for pleasing one's hearers (thus already in one of the first "treatises on preaching" listed by Olivar, in Sodi-Triacca 2002, 1221: Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, V, of 426).

3. 5th-6th c. In the 5th and 6th c., the quality of preaching did not seriously reflect the political and social changes that, esp. in the West, were of interest to the empire. To the contrary, one perceives a refinement of aesthetic sensibility that was manifested, among other things, with the spreading of a taste for the dramatization of biblical scenes. This occurred in the East where, however, one must keep in mind the predilection, esp. in *Syriac, for rhetoric as a song, for which already during the time of Ephrem the *memre* and the *madrashe* were often structured in the same way as true and proper musical pieces, accompanied by instruments such as the harp, and willingly contained the orator's apostrophes to God and scriptural charactes, as well as true and genuine prosopopeias (see Old 1998, II, 249-268); this also occurred in the West (e.g., *Peter Chrysologus; see ibid., 416-424). Far from being an indicator of a lack of originality of thought and therefore a corruption, it is obvious that such an aestheticizing tendency reflected the ever-increasing sophisticated cultural demands on both the preachers and their audience (Kecskeméti 1994; Allen, in Allen - Cunningham 1998). The cases of poor preaching that were recorded at that time, esp. in the West (*Martin of Braga; see Naldini 1991), should not be generalized, but treated rather as local phenomena in space and time. Very talented homilists such as *Sidonius Apollinaris or *Avitus of Vienne remind one of this fact.

On the other hand, it is true that one notices the

clear awareness of the existence of a high profile tradition that one is advised to take into account. The example of *Abraham of Ephesus clearly provides a demonstration of this when, in his *Homily on the Annunciation* 1 (PO 16, 442 [18]) by his own admission, he made use of ancient preachers who, as far as he knew, had treated the same idea before he had: Athanasius, Basil, Gregory (of Nazianzus?), John (Chrysostom), Cyril (of Alexandria) and *Proclus (of Constantinople). The collections of sermons from these homilists, who for the West date back to the beginning of the 5th c. and for the East at least to the 7th c. (Barré - Grégoire 1969), reflect the definitive acquisition of this awareness. Created to supply a range of topics to be treated for various times of the liturgical year, they included the feasts of the saints and the usual celebrations such as episcopal consecrations, funerals, commemorations of the founders of monastic communities, etc. A particularly illuminating example is supplied by the so-called Eusebius Gallicanus collection (Triacca, in Sodi-Triacca 2002)—these sermons make up for the lack of adequate preparation by the preachers, providing them with ideas and arguments—where these were texts that were not just meant to be read or repeated (these are the sermons that *Caesarius of Arles distributed to bishops and presbyters "in France, *Gaul, *Italy and *Spain" [V. Caes., I, 55 Bona] to be used esp. by the *parrochiae*, namely the countryside churches [Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 2]. The practice of reciting speeches given by others was already approved by *Augustine [*De doctr. christ.* 4,29,62]). In the meantime, however, they attest the crystallizing of a tradition in which there was an expectation of preparation, and to do anything less was unacceptable (see Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 1,15; V. *Caes.* I, 54).

V. Forms. As shown above, starting from the mid-2nd c., when Justin spoke of it, preaching occurred during the *liturgy: it was therefore a liturgical act (Leclercq 1946; Thümmel, in Mühlenberg 1994). Proceeding from this observation, we distinguish sermons either on the basis of the circumstance in which they were delivered or on the basis of their content.

On the basis of circumstance, there exist Sunday, weekly, festal and *panegyric sermons. The Sunday sermons (at least from mid-2nd c.) and weekly sermons (at least in the mid-3rd c.) were sermons delivered during the liturgies held on these days and, in general, they consisted of an explanation of scriptural passages read during the course of these events (see above IV.1). The festal sermons were delivered on the occasion of major feasts of the liturgical year, first and foremost Easter, which is the first and most important Christian feast (the most ancient Paschal homilies are the *Peri Pascha* by *Melito of Sardis and the *In Sanctum Pascha* by ps.-*Hippolytus, to be dated—at least the first—in a *quartodeciman context of Asia Minor from the 2nd half of the 2nd c.: Schröter 1997; Stewart-Sykes 1998; 2001, 221-232; Visonà, in Sodi-Triacca 2002). The panegyric sermons, however, were delivered during the minor feasts of the liturgical year, in which, following a specific calendar that could vary from church to church (van de Paverd 1970; Saxer 1980; Old 1998, II, 95-105) there was a commemoration of a saint, martyr or a significant deceased person—usually a bishop—or the consecration of a priest or bishop, or the anniversary of such an event. In these cases, the sermon tended to privilege the topic that provided the reason for the festive occasion and often assumed formal traits of the *panegyric speech from the non-Christian tradition.

On the basis of content, there were gospel, *catechetical, *mystagogical, *exegetical, thematic and event-based sermons. The gospel sermons were precisely those that transmitted the gospel message, with the specific objective of winning over non-believers (Moreno 1986, 2058 [par. 3]). In effect, almost all the sermons were gospel-oriented, inasmuch as every sermon tended to reinforce the chief contents of the faith, irrespective of whether the recipient belonged or did not belong to the Christian community. When such content was presented within the framework of the preparatory instruction delivered to *catechumens aspiring to *baptism—in the 4th c., baptism was usually conferred during the Easter vigil—scholars generally speak of them as catechetical sermons, normally given during Lent; they became mystagogical sermons if they were directed toward neophytes as their objective was to deepen the understanding of the mysteries that were to be received usually during the week following Easter. The opportunity finally presents itself to mention the most well-known sermons, which are also the most ancient (but *Tertullian's *De baptismo* echoes the catechetical preaching of the church of Carthage of the 2nd-3rd c.): the 19 catechetical homilies (18 preceded by a general instruction) of *Cyril of Jerusalem, held in 348, and the 8 *Mystagogical Homilies* of the same Cyril or his successor *John of Jerusalem (Old 1998, II, 3-32). The others are by John Chrysostom, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ambrose, Augustine, although Cyril's collection of homilies finds its Western counterpart in *Gaudentius of Brescia's *Tractatus*, originally composed for catechumens and

then gathered into a *corpus* (*Tract.*, *praef.*). Because the proclamation of the *kerygma* (gospel) was based on the reading and the explanation of sacred texts, all sermons naturally tended to acquire an exegetical character. We, however, shall define exegetical sermons, properly speaking, as those in which such a characteristic dominates over every other interest. In the same way, we will call thematic sermons those in which the exegesis of the text read in the church became a pretext to discuss ethical or contemporary topics. One particular case of thematic preaching treats recent events that had immediate repercussions on the life of the community (a political event, natural disaster and the like). In this case, we shall speak of event-based sermons.

VI. Dynamics. *1. The locations of preaching.* It has been said that in the *Judaism of the NT period, preaching usually took place in the synagogue (see above IV.1). Jesus, the apostles and Paul held to this custom. Nevertheless, they did not lose an opportunity to preach elsewhere: in private homes (Acts 10:6, 22ff.; Rom 16: 3, 5)—or in specific places within homes (Acts 20:7-9)—and even in public. Little by little, private homes seem to have become the privileged place for apostolic preaching as a result of the mother religion's becoming rigid toward the new "sect" that had emerged from within it: these were the first Christian homes, namely, the first locales of the communities won over to the gospel message which, from the apostles onward, Christians used for their preaching (Stewart-Sykes 2001, 91-140). It was possibly the case that a home of this type was the gathering place for the Christian assembly described by *Justin Martyr (see above IV.1; and also Stewart-Sykes 2001, 241-244). It was still a mobile location because Justin himself (*Acta Iustini* 3), though indicating his own home as the place of gathering for the Christians of Rome, affirmed that they met "wherever any person was able or desired to meet." In any case, we must imagine locations already suitable for the needs of the ritual that was already on the way to definition, because the location reserved for the assembly described in 1 *Apol.*—in which the sermon was held—is clearly distinct from that one intended for baptism, acc. to a layout one finds, e.g., in the house-church of *Dura Europos, from the beginning of the 3rd c. (Serra 2006). The *domus ecclesiae* at Dura demonstrates, on the other hand, that at this time that there already existed established locations for worship (for a similar situation at Alexandria, see Martin 2006, 51-52).

Alongside the house-church, from the 3rd c. onward, however, independent architectural spaces begin to emerge. Spaces of this type were either "large buildings" devoted to Christian worship, that the philosopher *Porphyry noticed with disappointment, emerging from the heart of the city (*Adv. chr.* fr. 76), or the "large and full" churches of which *Eusebius speaks (*HE* 8,1,1-5), referring to the 50-year period preceding the *Diocletian *persecution (Krautheimer 1986, 9ff.). Similar large spaces are perhaps indicated where Origen preached, who, in order to address a large and restless crowd (*Hom.* Ex. 13,2), had to deliver his sermon in a location sufficiently large to host it. Although the custom of preaching in private homes did not completely vanish (see C. Gangr. *can.* 6; Possid., *V. Aug.* 7,1), from this point onward, the sermon was delivered primarily in church buildings—beginning with Constantine, certainly autonomous and monumental—in the context of the liturgy.

Particular sectors of the church building—if not, properly speaking, architectural structures independent from one another—were reserved for sermons held on special occasions. In the 4th c., the catechumens received instruction in the vestibule of the baptistery (Cyr. Jer., Catech. 19,2: τὸν προαύλιον τοῦ βαπτιστηρίου οἴκον), e.g., which was perceived to be a separate place (Testini 1980, 619-638).

After Constantine, a *martyrion* dedicated to the memory of the martyr was added to the church and baptistery. The fruit of a cult that dates back at least to the 2nd half of the 2nd c., and whose origin from the mid-3rd c. included a eucharistic liturgy (Cypr., *Ep.* 12,2,1), in the 4th c. it was the usual place for the homily which, under the form of a panegyric, was held on the occasion of the feast commemorating the martyr (Testini 1980, 129-139; 607-612). At times insufficient to hold the audience (Greg. Nyss., *Mart.* Ia [Gregorii Nysseni opera 10,1,137] and *Mart.* Ib [ibid. 145-146]), it could not be its own autonomous structure but was part of a more developed architectural complex such as the *martyrion* that was included in the *Basileiad, the hospital city established by *Basil at Caesarea around the year 370 (Bas., *Ep.* 176,20-21; Greg. Nyss., *Laus Bas.* (21) [ibid. 127]).

Sermons housed outside the ordinary places of worship, e.g., in the open, were contested as inefficacious. In the 4th c., they were the result of emerging situations, e.g., *schisms that divided individual churches (as in the case of Basil, *Ep.* 240,18-21). Conversely, the titles and at times the content of many sermons of John Chrysostom, Augustine, Severus of Antioch, *Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Leo the Great and others supply us with extremely useful pieces of information in determining the Christian topography of some of the chief cities of the empire by spec-

ifying the church or the *martyrion* where they were delivered (Allen - Mayer 1997; Mayer 2005, 315-473).

2. The occasions. 2.a. The time of preaching. Because the sermon is a liturgical act, there was preaching every time there was a liturgy (see above V; and moreover Olivar 1991, 641-645). The chief liturgy was held on Sunday. This was the proper occasion of preaching from the time of Justin and Tertullian (see above IV. 1). Origen preached on Sunday. The sermons attended by *Egeria, at Jerusalem, took place on Sunday. John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, but also *Maximus of Turin, Leo the Great and Caesarius of Arles would preach on Sunday.

Similarly, the great feasts of the liturgical year were also important events; the greater part of them at the end of the 4th c. found a definite place on the calendar (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 80, 23, notes that they must meet at a specific time; while the *Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem* [Renoux 1969–1971], that reflected the customs of the local church for the years 417–439, reports the object of each feast, precisely indicating the place, date and, at times, the hours of the liturgical station: the homilies of the contemporary Hesychius are easily inserted onto this calendar [Aubineau 1978–1980; Old 1998, II, 125-166]). It even actually seems that these times progressively acquired such a relevance as to be reserved for the bishop: Leo the Great, e.g.—the first pope whose sermons have survived—preached on the solemnities but not on the ordinary Sundays; this is why his contemporary *Sozomen (*HE* 7,19,5) was able to believe that the Roman pope did not preach at all. The bishops to whom Caesarius sent that encyclical letter on preaching, which is *Sermon* 1, did the same, preaching *solum in maioribus festivitatibus* (Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 1,10,3 [SC 175]). We know that the most well known of these feast days was already Easter, around which other heavily liturgical moments clustered: *Lent was filled with the instruction of the *catechumens, culminating in the Sunday of the Octave (cf. Cyr. H., *Procatech.* 11: "Do not think that these homilies are like the usual ones"); the week of Easter was filled with instruction for *neophytes, culminating in the Sunday of the Octave; *Pentecost (concerning which, see Schröter 1996) was observed in defined areas (Syria, Asia Minor, Constantinople, Cyprus, N *Italy), and within a circumscribed period (5th-7th c.) (Drobner 1993). The importance connected to such movements is proved by the fact that during these times preachers came to preach every day, even two times a day (see below VI.3), and the one who usually preached was the bishop. Gregory *senior*, father of Gregory of Nazianzus, on one occasion wanted to celebrate the Paschal mystery in person at all costs, though being gravely ill; and the Sunday of the Octave, "the first Sunday after that of the resurrection," having recovered, he presided again at the solemn liturgy with the entire clergy (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 18,29: PG 35, 1020-1021).

In addition to Sunday and the feasts, starting around the mid-3rd c., homilies were also delivered during the course of the week (see above IV.1). Origen, who acc. to *Pamphilus preached almost daily (*paene cotidie*), acc. to *Socrates (*HE* 5,22,45-46) preached specifically every Wednesday and Friday. Jerome and Leo the Great likewise preached Wednesday and Friday—unless they were preaching for the annual collection of 10 November (which could equally fall on Friday, Tuesday or Saturday: see Montanari 1999), and they also preached on important occasions. *John Chrysostom also preached on Monday; Severus of Antioch preached on Saturday (but also on other days, "if there is the commemoration of some saint": Bas., *Ep.* 93, on which see Voicu 1995; see *Const. App.* 8,33,2); Augustine preached on Saturday and also Thursday. *Gregory the Great's *Homilies on Ezekiel* were preached on weekdays.

With regard to the panegyrics, see the discussion above in section V.

2.b. The hour of preaching. The homily was usually given in the morning, but also in the evening—in this case, without the eucharistic celebration—on weekdays, before and after work. During Lent, Basil preached two times a day: morning and evening (*Hom. 14* 13,1: PG 31, 444 D-445 A; and also *Hex.* 2,1,1; 8,76; 3,1,17-21; 10,22-25; 7,6,62-63.67-68; 8,2,31-33; 8,30; 9,1,1). "Morning" can also refer to the first sign of the dawn (Chrys., *Hom. in Jo.* 31,5: PG 59, 182, 21); "evening," shortly before dinnertime (Bas., *Hex.* 7,6,65-68; 9,6,101-103; Chrys., *Hom. in Gen.* 8,2: PG 54, 619, 21) or nightfall (Chrys., *El. et vid.* 1: PG 51, 337, 26). It could also happen, however, that sermons were held even well into the night: usually, during solemnities, as occurred with Hesychius of Jerusalem for an Easter vigil for the early years of the 5th c. (Hesych. H., *Serm.* 3,1,3; Aubineau 1978–1980, 83-86). At times, there were exceptional circumstances, as was the case for Chrysostom, called upon to preach at midnight upon receiving news of the unexpected visit of the empress *Eudoxia (Chrys., *Hom. div.* 2, tit. [PG 63, 467, 35-36]).

3. Frequency. Sunday sermons, on a weekly pattern, date back at least to the mid-2nd c. (see above IV.1). One hundred years later, with Origen, sermons were delivered during the week (see above IV.1; VI.2.a). In the 4th c., daily preaching was affirmed in an almost definitive manner—at least dur-

ing Lent, often during Easter time and around the great feasts such as Christmas and *Epiphany (Olivar 1991, 651-662).

The following church fathers preached on a daily basis: *Eusebius of Emesa, *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Maximus of Turin and Caesarius of Arles (who would preach even while he slept [*V. Caes.* II, 5-6], and whose *incessabilis* voice was silenced only by death [ibid. II, 32, with Bona 1999]): one gathers this was the case esp. from the internal chronological data within the homilies, where one frequently finds rather eloquent adverbs such as "daily," or rather "yesterday," "today" and "tomorrow" (or similar expressions), indicating the relationship that bound the present sermon to the one proceeding or following. One already finds mention of daily sermons in Origen (*Hom. Num.* 13,1: *Hesterno die dixeramus*). They come back in the sermons of Basil of Caesarea (*Hom.* 7,1: PG 31, 277 C 12: πρώην; *Hex.* 3,1,5.14.16: χθές . . . σήμερον). Augustine esp. used them quite frequently (*Serm.* 58,5: *quotidie*; 73,1: *hesterno die et hodie*; *Enarr. in Ps. 32*, 2,29: *hodie . . . crastino die*.

It is, however, true that such expressions are not always completely accurate. Especially when they referred to the past ("yesterday"), it happens that they could refer in a vague way to a recent time, near without necessarily being the previous day. In one particular instance, e.g., *John Chrysostom intended to use the term (*Hom. in Matt.* 52,3: PG 58, 522, 33-34.36: λόγον . . . ὃν πρὸ τριῶν ἡμερῶν) in the sense of "three days ago." At other times, it is possible that they were emphatic expressions: "daily" does not necessarily have to mean "everyday" but "frequently," "with regularity," as in the sermons of Augustine, *Serm.* 58,5: *quotidie . . . in dominica oratione*. Nevertheless, we have certain examples of sermons held on successive days: such is the case with Augustine's *Sermons* 111, 23, 53 and 277, delivered at Carthage on January 19, 20, 21 and 22, the year of which we are uncertain (De Bruyne 1931); or some of the *Homilies on the Hexameron* by Basil of Caesarea, preached, as it seems, from 12-16 February 377 or 378 (Naldini 1990, xvi-xvii); *Gregory of Nyssa's *Homilies*, one on Christmas, one on St. *Stephen and one on St. *Peter, were delivered on December 25, 26 and 27 of 386 (Bernardi 1968, 290-293). If one adds to these examples precise markers with respect to sermons delivered on consecutive days (Bas., *Hom. in Ps. 14/2*, 1: PG 29, 264 C-265 A; Chrys., *David* I, 1: PG 54, 676-677, 4), we can conclude that from the beginning of the 4th c., the use of the daily homily, even though not necessarily universal, was extremely widespread.

The frequency of preaching, in any case, was much more elevated than in the past. On particular liturgical solemnities, sermons were delivered at least one or more times a day. According to the testimony of Egeria, at Jerusalem, during Lent, sermons were held every day (*Itin.* 46,2). But Basil of Caesarea, for the same feast, preached twice a day, morning and evening (see above VI.2.b). Augustine also preached two times a day (*Enarr. in Ps. 88*, 2,1); for Easter he even pushed himself to speak three or four times (Lambot 1956). Minor liturgical settings such as funerals (Greg. Nyss., *Melet.* [Gregorii Nysseni opera 9, 449]) or commemorations of martyrs (Chrys., *Pan. Bab.* 2: SC 362, 296, 5-7), but likewise ordinary liturgies (see below VI.5.a.), could moreover give place to a series of sermons held by various speakers who spoke in succession. Not one of these examples, however, can be generalized: during holy week, Theodore of Mopsuestia, in fact, preached only on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday (Janeras 1969); although *Proclus of Constantinople preached on Thursday and Holy Friday, the vigil and the Sunday of Easter, and the Sunday of the Octave (Janeras 1980; see Barkhuizen, in Allen - Cunningham 1998).

4. Duration. Very often preachers advised others and themselves to be brief, not to bore the audience, to make the sermon more concise so that it would stick in the memory of the one who heard it (Or., *Hom. Gen.* 2,6; *Hom. Num.* 11,8,4; Bas., *Hom. in Ps. 1*, 6: PG 29, 228 A-B). At times, they were diligent in putting these principles into practice for the reasons adopted or because restricted by factors beyond their control such as other institutional obligations (Bas., *Hom. in Ps. 114*, 1: PG 29, 481 A-C), or rather—e.g., on the solemnities of the solemn feasts—the length of the ceremony. In general, however, sermons lasted a long time (Olivar 1966; Olivar 1991, 686-721). Evidence of this are the frequent allusions, in authors such as Chrysostom or Augustine, to the preacher's exhaustion (Aug., *In Io. tract.* 19,20,7-8 [CCSL 36, 202]: *iam fatigatus loqui non possum* ["now tired, I cannot speak"]; and also Bas., *Hex.* 7,6,10-12), but esp. to the audience's exhaustion (Chrys., *Hom. in Gal. 2:11*, 10: PG 51, 380, 3), who had come to expect the preacher's brevity (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 60*, 1), and who the needed, therefore, the assurance of the homily's imminent end (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 76*, 22,4 [CCSL 39, 1065]: *post ipsos duos versus finis erit* ["after these two verses, it will be over"]).

Preachers, however, did not stick to one specific rule, but acted acc. to circumstance. They perceived that time limits needed to be respected, evidenced

by the fact that they would stop their sermon (Bas., *Hom. in Ps. 14/2*, 1: PG 29, 264C-265A; *Hex.* 7,6,10-12). They needed something, however, to remind them. Thus, because Ambrose realized that it was late, he wanted small night birds to come into the church (Ambr., *Hex.* 5,24,84). At times, it was enough that the audience became restless, perhaps because they had to go do work (Bas., *Hex.* 3,1,17-21; 10,22-25), or rather because their mealtime was soon approaching (Sev. Ant., *Hom.* 48. PO 35, 333, 28-337, 5). If, however, that time was still afar off (Aug., *Serm.* 128,4.6), or perhaps they were preaching during days of fasting (Bas., *Hex.* 8,8,29-33), the preacher reasserted his boldness and reserved the right to go on longer. The calculations on the sermon's duration, based on the texts that have survived and the allusions of their authors, confirm that the general tendency of most preachers was going in the direction of longer sermons. Eusebius of Emesa (*Serm.* 21,20 ed. Buytaert) spoke of the brief space of an hour (*brevi spatio horae*); but when it was time for a speaker of Ambrose's or Augustine's caliber to preach, this could mean that the audience would have to sit for a homily that could last for up to two or more hours.

5. The preacher. 5.a. Identity. In the ancient church, the preacher was a person authorized to preach from the institution that considered itself a dispenser of Jesus' task of preaching. Jesus himself satisfied such a condition (see above IV.1), although his preaching ended soon by the decision of the synagogue. Similarly, the apostles acted in the same way, who, though acting on the basis of their mission from Jesus (Mk 3:14), at the beginning were perfectly integrated into the institutional mechanisms of the Jewish world (Acts 13:14-15). It was precisely the apostles, after all, who arrogated the duty of preaching to themselves and to those to whom they transmitted the mandate that they had received, implicitly establishing that preaching must be a controlled activity, which requires the consent of those who represent the constituted authority to exercise it.

Naturally, that did not stop the fact that there continued to be individuals who asserted that same privilege *without* apostolic authority. Paul was also necessarily of this type of authorization (Acts 9,26-28); it seems that at least the prophets could preach, still very present in the Christianity of the first two centuries (Cattaneo 1997, 69-78). These individuals, nevertheless, were increasingly marginalized, and the role of the preacher became an exclusive prerogative of the church. It is very indicative that even in the Montanist context described by Tertullian, prophecy was rigorously held as distinct from preaching (*Anim.* 9,4-5; see Stewart-Sykes 2001, 260-265). Already 50 years before Tertullian, moreover, during the time of Justin Martyr, the preacher was "the one who is in charge of the community" (see above IV.1). Whoever this statement is speaking of, whether a president charged with directing the assembly or already the bishop who was the head of the *ekklēsia* (Cattaneo 1997, 315-315), it is obvious that the preacher was an institutionally integrated orator. One century later, his role was definitively established in this manner. Now, preaching was a duty, binding by law, of the bishop—as in the time of Cyprian, when the *episcopi tractantes* were a common reality (*Ep.* 58,4,1; see Iren., *Haer.* 3,3,1)—or rather a presbyter authorized by the bishop, as had occurred with Cyprian himself before he sat on the episcopal *cathedra* or with Origen at Caesarea Palestine and elsewhere. During this period, when a stranger to the institution exercised the preaching ministry, it would cause heated reactions and demanded an explanation. The letter written in this respect by *Alexander of Jerusalem and *Theoctistus of Caesarea to *Demetrius of Alexandria, who accused him of having made Origen preach in their church although he had not yet received priestly orders, demonstrates that the custom of allowing *laypeople to preach (λαικοὺς ὁμιλεῖν) had become an exception, despite the fact that some bishops continued to consider it a permissible practice (Eus., *HE* 6,19,16-18).

In the 4th c., the practice of allowing presbyters to preach as substitutes for and (usually) in the presence of the bishop was typical, esp. in the East—while in the West it took time to gain approval. There in the East, through the initiative of the presider himself, Basil preached at Caesarea, Cappadocia; John Chrysostom, at Antioch; *Atticus, at Constantinople; Hesychius, at Jerusalem. Augustine also did it at Hippo, but on the personal initiative of Bishop Valerius, who, to silence the criticisms of his African colleagues, had to explain what was perceived to be an innovation by saying that *in orientalibus ecclesiis id ex more fieri* (Possid., *V. Aug.* 5,3-4). It was not necessarily the case that such a practice implied that the titulary bishop of the cathedra relinquished his duty altogether (Mayer 2001a). Often, in fact, the bishop preached in the same circumstance in which his commissioned presbyters did. Even during the normal liturgies, the bishop and his presbyters could work together, preaching in succession: usually the bishop preached after they did, as occurred in Jerusalem when Egeria visited (*Itin.* 25,1) or in the Antioch of John Chrysostom (Chrys., *Philogon.* 3 [PG 48, 752, 47-50]; see also *Const. ap.*

2,57,9); at times, however, the bishop preached first, as was the case for Augustine (*Serm.* 20, at the end [CCSL 41, 261]). At other times, he reserved for himself the most important occasions: Cyprian, who preached already as a presbyter, when bishop, was said to have instructed people only on Sunday (Pont., *V. Cypr.* 14,5: *exhortationibus dominicis*), although we have seen how Leo the Great saved himself for the liturgical solemnities (see above VI.2.a).

The opportunity given to presbyters to preach represented, in any case, an opportunity for them to acquire public notoriety and constituted, therefore, a serious risk for a bishop when that occurred at his expense. Therefore, after the serious controversy with Arius, *Alexander of Alexandria took away that opportunity from his priests for good, reserving for himself the ministry in which until that time they had participated (Socr., *HE* 5,22,58; Soz., *HE* 7,19,5; see Soz., *HE* 1,15,12). It seems, however, that Basil, in 363–364, was removed from Caesarea because the success of his preaching displaced Bishop *Eusebius (Bernardi 1968, 58-59; 188 n.5, on the basis of *Hom.* 11,1.5, cited above IV.2). In the light of such events it is not surprising that a heavily centralized church such as that of Rome—in which even Origen had heard Hippolytus preach (Hier., *Vir.* 61,2)—was very reluctant, esp. after *Constantine, to delegate the ministry of preaching to others except the pope. Between the 380s and 90s, Pope *Siricius perhaps alluded to presbyter preachers (if letter *Ep.* 10,5 [PL 13, 1184 B-1185 A] is the pope's: *ausus est episcopus vel presbyter . . . praedicare*). The presbyter preachers, perhaps during the time of Leo the Great, exercised their prerogative (see Monachino 1947, 349-350; 372-374). In 431 *Celestine I, however, rebuked the bishop of *Arles for having allowed some priests to preach who took the opportunity to propose some embarrassing doctrinal positions (*Ep.* 21,2: PL 50, 528 D; but Caesarius of Arles would legitimize the initiative of his predecessor at the Council of *Vaison (529): see Hfl-Lecl II/2, 1112); although Gregory the Great records that the monk Equitius was at first denounced by a nobleman of Norcia because he preached without having received priestly orders or *licentia* from the Roman pontiff, and then was directly questioned by the clergy of Rome and the pontiff himself for abusing the papal office (Greg. Gt., *Dial.* I, 4,8.11). This tendency was not in opposition to the popes' custom, in the 4th c., of preferring to preach on feast days (see above VI.2.a). It is in fact possible that, as occurred elsewhere, while giving Sunday or weekly sermons himself, at Rome he also restricted presbyters to reciting a written text, on the basis of which he showed that the presbyter had no authority on his own (it is precisely on these conditions that Caesarius himself allowed the presbyters to preach a sermon [and some deacons]—*Serm.* 1,15; *V. Caes.* I, 54). This sight of priests being forced to remain silent when bishops were present (*praesentibus episcopis*) deeply wounded Jerome's volatile character, but in the eyes of a Westerner, Jerome's (*Ep.* 52,7) was an isolated voice.

As mentioned, in Augustine of Hippo, the practice of allowing presbyters to preach was recent, and was only permitted within precise conditions: Bishop Valerius had introduced it because, being of Greek origin and therefore less able to communicate *minus Latina lingua et litteris instructus* (Possid., *V. Aug.* 5,2), he needed someone who knew how to speak to the faithful with the necessary linguistic competence. Having succeeded Valerius, Augustine decided, in any case, to adopt and use this practice in turn (*Ep.* 52,7), certainly after careful consideration of the risks and advantages. Even he, as had already occurred long ago to his Eastern colleagues, evidently had to realize that giving space to a loyal preacher befitted the prestige of the cathedra much more than not doing so. Already *Paul of Samosata, famous for his oratorical verve, trusted his presbyters to preach, counting on the fact that they would praise him in their homilies (Eus., *HE* 7,30,10). This was more or less what the priest *Heraclius of Hippo had done, who when preaching before Augustine (*quod ante facere non solebat*) did not find a better way to fulfill the delicate commission than to transform the sermon into a praise of his bishop (Verbraken 1961; see Chrys., *Ordin.* 150-295).

It was rarer, however, for deacons to preach. The case of the martyr *Vincent (d. 304), who preached upon the request of Valerius of Saragossa (Moral 1969, 1149), seemed to recur 40 years later at Antioch, where, upon the order of Bishop Leontius (344–357), the teacher of *Eunomius, *Aetius (Philost., *HE* 3,17), exercised this office for a brief time. *Philostorgius asserted that Aetius was entrusted with "teaching in church the doctrines of the church" (διδάσκειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . . δόγματα), an expression that seems to allude to official preaching (Vaggione 2000, 26-27). It is not a given, however, that one can often find a similar practice in other parts of the church. Much later, as the century progressed, even the deacon Gregory the Great preached, but he did so only in the private sector, for the Latin community of Constantinople, where he lived for seven years as an *apocrisarius of Pope *Pelagius II. Having in turn become pope, when he had to entrust to others the duty of reading in his place some of his homilies, it is significant to note that he

did not entrust the duty to a deacon, but to a *notarius* (Greg. Gt., *In LX Evang. hom., praef.*). The practice of having deacons read the *sanctorum patrum homiliae* was permitted by the Council of Vaison (can. 2), but only in exceptional circumstances (e.g., sickness of the commissioned presbyter; see *V. Caes.* I, 54). The example of Deogratias, to whom Augustine dedicated in 399 the treatise *De catechizandis rudibus*, seems to confirm that the preaching of deacons was reserved, preferably, to set occasions—in this case, the catechetical instruction for those aspiring to baptism. The sermons of Ephrem (whose writings, acc. to Jerome, *Vir.* 115, were recited, in certain churches, in the manner of sermons) probably must be considered as a unique phenomenon, to be understood within a particular geographical setting.

Whether bishop, commissioned presbyter, deacon or layman, the preacher, nonetheless, perceived himself to serve in the role of a mediator, i.e., one who does not speak on his own authority but in the name of God (Iren., *Haer.* 1,10,2; Aug., *In Ioh. tract.* 12,5), and for the express purpose of moral and spiritual edification of the listeners. During the sermon, the faith in the presence of the angels, who suggest the word to bring forth to the one who preaches (Paul. Mil., *V. Ambr.* 17; Berrouard 1963), was scrupulously supported by the church, which was a solemn confirmation of the correctness of such a perception (Brottier, in Klimkeit et al. 1997, 246-247); although to Basil, *Hom. in ps. 28*, 7: PG 29, 301 B-C, the certainty of that angelic presence primarily served to scare a rather undisciplined audience, to whom he stated that the "holy angels take note of all the words" that are uttered during the synaxis, including vain words uttered therein.

5.b. The place and posture of preaching. The preacher—certainly from the beginning of the mid-3rd c.—spoke from the episcopal seat (καθέδρα; θρόνος; *cathedra*, *thronus*; see Stommel 1958), which, established in the presbytery, was encircled by seats of presbyters (*subsellia*) and was separated from a space reserved for the public through steps (*gradus*). Origen already had preached from the cathedra (*Hom. Ezech.* 5,4; Nautin 1976, 109-110), as had, later, Augustine (*Serm.* 146,1: *sublimi sede*) and Severus of Antioch—whose homilies not by chance bear the name *Cathedral* (ἐπιθρόνιοι).

The cathedra, which was mobile and could be moved from church to church acc. to the needs of the sermon (Aeth., *Itin.* 46,1), rested on a platform (βῆμα; *tribunal*), and was placed on a raised structure situated in the *exedra* or the apse (ἀψίς; *absida*)—in the elevated semicircular space situated usually in the back of the basilica. When he was a presbyter at Antioch (*Stat.* 19,1: PG 49, 189, 11) and then bishop of Constantinople (*Hom. in Rom. 12: 20*: PG 51, 173, 3), John Chrysostom usually preached on the *bēma*, which was also the place from which the reader read the Scriptures (Soz., *HE* 8,5,2). *Cyprian called it a *pulpitum* (*Ep.* 39,4,1), and said that it was a *locus alterior* from which the *praecepta et evangelium domini* were read. It is *superior locus* that Augustine opposes to the *inferior locus* where the listeners gather (*Serm.* 101,4): from up there Gregory of Nyssa could see the people as though from a lookout post (*Bapt. Chr.*: PG 46, 577 A 12-13), and the one who wanted to meet the listeners must "come down from the exedra" (Paul. Med., *V. Ambr.* 23,2: *Cui descendenti de exhedra*).

The structure of the exedra assured the voice a certain resonance, not always sufficient, however, to permit it to be heard by the entire assembly (Aug., *Serm.* 47,30). For this reason, it seems that in certain churches—rather late—the use of the ambo was also widespread (ἄμβω; *ambo*), the most famous example of which was that of the church of the Hagia Sophia at Constantinople, described in 563 by *Paul Silentiarius (Fobelli 2005), but whose distinction with respect to the *bēma* (a term used to refer to it at that time) is not always clear. As it seems, it was positioned closer to the public than usual. It is not certain, however, that a position of this type corresponded to the "platform" (βῆμα) and the "exalted throne" (θρόνος ὑψηλός) that Paul of Samosata had constructed (Eus., *HE* 7,30,9): interpreting Eusebius, *Rufinus was in fact thinking of the traditional *tribunal* and *thronus* only much higher than normal.

Likewise, we do not know with certainty whether by the term *cathedra* one must always understand the episcopal see: when, e.g., it was not the bishop who spoke, but his presbyter or a guest preacher, it is not clear if he was allowed to sit on the seat temporarily (as Origen seems to have done [*Comm. in Matt.* 10-17, 15,26] and *Diodorus of Tarsus [Chrys., *Diod.* 1]) or rather—something that certain people considered more likely—if he preached from a distinct position, from a different *thronus* (Mayer 2005, 328-331).

On this *thronos*, however, preaching was usually done while seated. Already the ancient *Polycarp gave his sermons to the faithful while seated (Eus., *HE* 5,20,6); *Gregory of Nyssa at a much later time observed the crowd that gathered in church while seated (*Bapt. Chr.*: PG 46, 577 A 12-13). At Jerusalem, the bishop *sedet et praedicat* (Egeria, *Itin.* 46,4), and Ambrose did the same in Milan, where he sat *in cathedra in tribunali* (Paul. Med., *V. Ambr.* 48,1). This was, moreover, the posture of the school teacher

didaskalos—who when sitting affirmed his authority over his students (see the legendary, but exemplary, episode of Arensius the Great, the teacher of *Arcadius and *Honorius, in Georg. Mon., *Chron.* 4,198,6-7 [de Boor, pp. 571,6–572,10] = BHG 167z; Mazzarino 1974)—and the preachers were teachers (e.g., Bas., *Ep.* 243,2,32-33; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 5,35,25-26). There was, however, no obligation to do so. Augustine (*Serm.* 95,2) and John Chrysostom (Socr., *HE* 6,5,5: καθεσθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄμβωνος) mostly preached seated; at times, however, they preferred to do so standing (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 96*, 10; Chrys., *Hom. in Matt.* 32,6).

5. The techniques. The preacher used different techniques (Olivar 1973; 1991, 589-633). They might improvise, as did Origen (*Engastr.* 1,1,3)—who, on the other hand, certainly had the Scriptures at hand (*Hom. in Num.* 12,2; Nautin 1976, 112-123; Olivar 1991, 634-640)—not unlike Basil (*Hom. in Ps. 61*, 1; 115,2: PG 29, 469 B; PG 30, 105 B) and later Sidonius (Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2,22). Or they might use a prepared piece that they would repeat by memory (cf. Genn., *Vir.* 58) or that would be read after having been put in writing through dictation (this was the practice of Leo the Great acc. to the judgment of P. Batifol 1926, 279; *Fulgentius of Ruspe in Ferrand., *V. Fulg.* 16,83: *dictabat*; Sev. Ant., *Hom.* 37: PO 36, 485, 32; *Philoxenus of Mabbug, acc. to Lemoire 1956, 12-13).

When they were not already written by the author, often the sermons were recorded by stenographers (Olivar 1991, 902-922; cf. Wilkenhauser 1907; Teitler 1985), something that happened at least in Origen's time when some of his extant homilies were authorized by him to be recorded by stenographers (Eus., *HE* 6,36,1). Stenographers helped *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, *Gaudentius of Brescia, Zeno of Verona, *Peter Chrysologus and Gregory the Great. At times, as in the case of Gregory's *Homilies on Ezekiel* and some of the *Homilies on the Gospels*, the sermons were in part dictated before their delivery. Both methods allowed the preacher to use a written text to which he made reference as a source for inspiration. He could also return to the same text when he was in a similar circumstance (this is what, e.g., Severus of Antioch did, who often reread the very same sermons before different communities: e.g., *Hom.* 41 [PO 36, 15]). Or he could also decide to reelaborate the text in view of publication—a method that stands at the origins of true and proper collections of an author (such as those of the same Severus, Gaudentius of Brescia, Leo the Great, Avitus of Vienne or Caesarius of Arles), or other collections produced by third parties (such as those of Peter Chrysologus).

The stenographic recording of the homilies, however, also served to make the sermon an evidentiary document, something to bring forward in the case of doctrinal or political disputes, either in favor of or against the preacher. At times, unauthorized stenographers were present during the presentation of sermons; they were there with the objective of establishing an evidentiary written record that was made available for those who had commissioned them ("visible and hidden hands" [γραφίδες φανεραί τεκαὶ λανθάνουσαι], took note of *Gregory of Nazianzus's homilies at *Constantinople: *Or.* 42,26,29; cf. Possid. *v. Aug.* 7,3; 18,9). To use official stenographers, however, could then allow the preacher to protect himself from improper uses of his own homiletic activity, allowing him to put an official stamp on authentic editions (Dagemark 2004, 701-708). Such a practice, in any case, has become extremely important for us today. It is in fact thanks to these that we possess a large number of transcribed homilies as they were delivered; they clearly reveal such aspects as idiomatic expressions which were often attested in the great homiletic collections (particularly instructive in this regard are the collections of Chrysostom and Augustine). They are extremely significant because they place us in contact with the actual event, revealing a number of exceptional historical details.

5.d. The exhaustion of preaching. Preaching was a psychological and physical commitment. When Ambrose would speak in public he would blush; this is why, when he had the choice, he preferred to allow his voice to be heard by writing (Ambr., *Virgin.* II, 1,1). The bishop of Constantinople John Chrysostom admitted that he was constantly experimenting with emotion at the moment of preaching, even when he preached before friends: he had that same mindset even when he faced a hostile crowd (Chrys., *Hom. in Ac.* 4,3: PG 60, 46, 18-20)! To maintain one's composure when confronting an audience, one therefore needed a good dose of self-esteem such as that shown by Severus of Antioch (*Hom.* 63: PO 8, 286). Otherwise, one could try the method of *captatio benevolentiae*, admitting with a certain self-deprecation one's own insufficiency and appealing to the audience's understanding and affection, as Severus did again (*Hom.* 121 [PO 29, 95]; see Olivar 1999). Even so, preaching was still tiresome; it required certain physical requirements and a particular type of training.

A capable voice, of course, was the first indispensable requirement. Aware of its importance in a society in which communication was preeminently

oral, the schools taught the necessary techniques of actuating and moderating the voice along the lines of a song in such a way as to transmit specific types of emotions (Rousselle 1983). Any lack of performance in this regard was noted. A passionate listener of Ambrose's speeches such as Augustine never forgot that the voice of the bishop of Milan "easily became weak" (*Conf.* 6,3,3: *facillime obtrundebatur*; cf. Ambr., *Sacram.* 1,24 [CSEL 73, 25]: *fragilitas nostrae vocis*). The same thing happened to Basil of Caesarea (*Hom. in Ps. 1*, 6: PG 29, 228 A 14-B 1), who was never a great speaker (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 43,17). Large and noisy crowds seriously worsened matters, even discouraging willing orators (Bas., *Hom.* 3,1: PG 31, 197 D-200 A; Adkin 1985). When the preacher did not improvise or read, there was also need for a good memory in addition to a good voice. An ability vigorously encouraged by the Greco-Roman educational system, the memory was considered a prerequisite, if not indispensable; it was certainly very important for a man of the church (Harris 1991, 36-39; 337-338). Augustine found that reciting sermons by memory was terribly boring (*De doctr. christ.* 4,10,25). The true problem, however, was that to commit to memory entire sermons was a great burden for many bishops. Rather than burdening themselves, many bishops therefore preferred to admit their flaws and save their energy (see Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 1,20,1-2 [SC 175]: *Memoria mihi deest*, cf. ibid. 15,2: *laboriosum est praedicare*).

But to preach did not mean merely to speak and remember. Every oratorical exhibition certainly also involved an adequate use of the body, whose movements accompanied words; these movements likewise transmitted emotions and increased the drama, to the audience's great pleasure. Paul of Samosata was already aware of this. When standing before his detractors, he won enormous approval among his own faithful by smacking his hand on his thigh and stomping his feet on the platform (Eus., *HE* 7,29,9, to be compared with Quint., *Inst.* 11,3,123; Philostr., *VS* 1,21,5). And he did all that despite the polemics of his opponents, who pointed fingers against such theatrical and affected poses connected to the exercise of rhetorical songs. *Effemminate sunt eorum magistrorum et animae et voluntates, qui semper sonantia, semper canora componunt* ("both the souls and the wills of those teachers who always compose sounds and melodies are effeminate"), observed the irritated Origen (*Hom. in Ezech.* 3,3). One hundred and fifty years later, an orator of the caliber of Gregory of Nazianzus had to face the same criticisms (*Or.* 42,12,4-6).

The use of the voice, the mind and body carried with it an enormous physical effort. John Chrysostom openly admitted that he got tired when preaching (*Eleem.*: PG 52, 271), and Basil did the same (*Hex.* 7,6,10-12), as well as Quodvultdeus (*Adv. Haer.* 8,3: CCSL 60, 301: *Quid adhuc dicam fatigatus fatigatis?*) and Augustine (*Serm.* 348,3.4). Augustine even perspired—and not just metaphorically speaking—from the work of expounding difficult scriptural passages (*Serm.* 183,13: PL 38, 993: *sudor hic meus*). Therefore, when the preacher was not in shape—because he was sick, as in the case of John Chrysostom (*Stat.* 19,1: PG 49, 187, 49-50), or weakened, as Peter Chrysologus (*Serm.* 74,1)—it was much better to stop preaching and not preach or to end sooner rather than later. To take on the task without the requisite energy exposed the preacher's image to serious risks. The pulpit, in which he spoke, "in order to help himself feel better," gave him a visibility that could backfire on him: *Quamquam enim propter commoditatem depromendae vocis altiore loco stare videamur, tamen ipso altiore loco vos iudicatis, et nos iudicamur* (Aug., *Serm.* 23,1: CCL 41, 309).

6. The public. 6.a. Identity. The ancient Christian preacher's audience was mixed, as evidenced from the official records: adults, children and even very noisy individuals would attend (Bas., *Hom.* 8,3: PG 31, 309 C-312 A; *Hex.* 4,7,29-30); the audience was also mixed acc. to the following categories: social (see above IV.1 vs. Bas., *Hex.* 3,1,17-19: present at the sermon were "workers of the mechanical arts who had just earned their food with a day's work"; Mayer, in Allen - Cunningham 1998), cultural (see above 4.IV.1 vs. Aug., *Serm.* 51,9,14: some people did not know how to read) and, esp., gender. Both men and women were present at the sermon in the assemblies during the time of Justin and, a century later, in those which acclaimed Paul of Samosata (Eus., *HE* 7,30,9). If at times one has the impression that the audience in which the homilist is interested was primarily male (e.g., John Chrys., *Stat.* 6,7; Sev. Ant., *Hom.* 37: PO 36, 479, 24-481, 13), one should not think that this was the norm (Mayer 1999 vs. MacMullen 1989). Precisely the presence of women among the audience—even more, high-ranking women—helps explain the importance that was given, esp. in the 4th c., to the themes of *virginity and the behavior and treatment of the body; all of this was within the context of the larger question of renouncing one's conjugal rights and of devoting oneself to the church—which in turn was connected with familial and patrimonial issues (Brown 1992; Elm 1996). It was precisely the proximity in the church of the two sexes that permitted men to take liberties that in other public places, e.g., such as the

piazza, they did not dare to exercise. Thus, to prevent them from unwanted contact with women, there arose the custom in certain churches of installing dividing "tables" (σανίδες), whose purpose was to keep men and women apart. These types of tables were used in Antioch at the time of John Chrysostom—but acc. to the elders of the city, it was a recent innovation (Chrys., *Hom. in Matt.* 73,3).

6.b. Where and in what position the audience listened. The audience gathered in the space of the basilica below the exedra and, like a class of students in view of the master (see above VI. 5. B.), usually listened to the preacher while standing. Basil's audience stood (*Hom. in Ps. 28*, 3: PG 29, 288 B: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἑστᾶσιν; *Hom in Ps. 29*, 3: PG 29, 312 C), so too Chrysostom's (*De futuris deliciis* 1: PG 51, 347), Augustine's (*Serm.* 355,2) and Caesarius of Arles's (*Serm.* 73,4). Nevertheless, even in this case it was not an obligation. At times, the public sat and even lay on the floor. Christians at the assemblies during the time of Justin Martyr stood at the moment of reciting the prayer that followed the sermon (1 *Apol.* 67,5). So too, later, did the hearers of Origen (*Hom. in Num.* 11,9,3; *Hom. in Lc.* 36,2), of Paul of Samosata (Eus., *HE* 7,29,9), and a century later—despite the contradiction—those of Basil (*Hex.* 7,6,64). In Jerusalem, during the instruction of the catechumens that lasted three hours, the relatives of those to be baptized were allowed to remain sitting (Egeria, *Itin.* 46,1), a custom encouraged by Augustine to avoid the possibility that one who "first listened willingly, exhausted either by hearing or standing, no longer praises, but yawns and appears unwilling, wanting to leave" (*qui primo libenter audiebat, vel audiendo vel stando fatigatus, non iam laudans, sed oscitans labia diducat, et se abire velle etiam invitus ostendat* (*Cathech. rud.* 13,19: CCSL 46, 142, 28-30). Even Caesarius of Arles, who preferred that his faithful remain standing during the sermon, permitted them at times to sit when their feet hurt or when they were sick and suffering from some illness (*Serm.* 78,1); but he in no way allowed anyone to lie on the floor—as it seems, Jesus' audience already did, if need be (Mk 8:6). The author of the **Apostolic Constitutions* (2,57,10-13) actually knew a specific church in which the seats were assigned (a practice overseen by a deacon) on the basis of age, sex and civil (or ecclesiastical) status of the faithful, and they remained standing only if they could not do otherwise. It is likely that important figures of the political world such as the emperor, members of the court, imperial administrators or noteworthy local figures were able to sit when they attended the sermon, occupying the seats of honor placed in a suitable spot (Dölger 1929, 61-63). The same can be said for the visiting ecclesiastical authorities, who, probably, found some spot in the presbytery.

6.c. Participation: Frequency and manner. It seems that to participate for the entirety of the liturgical office, or at all the services that took place during the course of the year, evidenced a deeper engagement of the faithful since the early days, in which the new faith was taking its first steps. Already the epistle to the Hebrews (10:25) in fact combats the habit of forsaking the assembling before its conclusion. During the time of Origen, there were those who left even before the end of the biblical readings (*Hom. in Ex.* 12,2); others, however, came only for feast days (*Hom. in Gen.* 11,1). But even a century later, Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus were obliged to acknowledge that at times there were very few people in attendance at their sermons (Bas., *Hom.* 8,3: PG 31, 309 C; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 3,1), although again Basil and John Chrysostom would rebuke those who were eager to leave the church, "as if it were a prison" (Bas., ibid.; cf. Chrys., *Coemet.*: PG 49, 397, 33-398), or those who left immediately after the homily (Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 3,480-482). Exasperated by his flock's behavior, Chrysostom came to the point of dedicating an entire sermon "to those who have not come to the synaxis" (*Hom. in Rom.* 12: 20). Again during the time of Augustine (*Serm.* 302,22), Leo the Great (*Serm.* 84,1), Severus of Antioch (*Hom.* 76: PO 12, 135-136) and Gregory the Great (*Hom. in Ev.* 14,6), the problem of many who left the liturgy continued to be an extremely relevant issue.

There were various reasons for this absence: personal factors such as boredom or exhaustion (see below) or daily tasks (Or., *Hom. in Gen.* 10,1); or other external factors such as heat (Aug., *Serm.* 303,1), cold (Aug., *In Ioh. tract.* 6,1), rain (Chrys., *Hom. div.* 1,1 [PG 63, 461]) or distance from the service (Ps. Chrys., *Petr. et El.* 1). In light of the other distractions, moreover, the church had to continually compete for the audience's attention (see above IV.2).

No less numerous, however, are the testimonies concerning crowded services, although, given the small average size of the churches in antiquity, it is difficult to determine what exactly is meant by a large assembly. Many of these testimonies, in effect, referred to liturgies held on the *martyria* for the panegyrics of the martyr, which were usually modest buildings (e.g., Greg. Nyss., *Xl mart.* Ia [Gregorii Nysseni opera 10, 1, 137]). Other testimonies, however, seemed to allude simply to the density of the crowd of the faithful who were surrounding the preacher to hear better (Greg. Nyss., *Bapt. Chr.*: PG 46, 577 A 5-8). Nevertheless, when Gregory of Na-

zianzus (*Or.* 42,26,29-30) or John Chrysostom described full assemblies crowding the churches of the caliber such as those of Constantinople, it is not fitting, perhaps, to relativize too much the significance of their claims, although certainly not devoid of rhetorical exaggeration. Special occasions could effectively call a rather significant crowd. In addition to the great feasts of the liturgical year (Chrys., *Hom. in Gen.* I, 1: Lent; Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 30*, 2,2: Easter; *Serm.* 196,4: Christmas; Greg. the Great., *Hom. in Ev.* 19,5: the Sunday of 70) and the Sundays—free from the duty of work (Chrys., *Poenit.* 3,1)—even special events of great curiosity (one thinks, e.g., of the events of the mighty Eutropius who fled into the large church of Constantinople [Chrys., *Eutrop.* 3], or the contested election of Severus of Antioch [*Hom.* 1,1: PO 38, 254]). At times, then, the popularity of an exceptional preacher alone was enough to arouse the interests of people: people from the countryside who only spoke Syriac also came to hear Chrysostom (Chrys., *Huit catéchèses baptismales* 8,1-6: SC 50bis). In these types of circumstances, the large crowd could cause much discomfort, which certainly did not help one to concentrate. It could also happen, e.g., that someone stepped on the foot of their neighbor (Aug., *Serm.* 24,2 Guelferb.). If it was hot and everyone was crammed in, some people would perspire heavily (Chrys., *Hom. in Rom. 12: 20*, 2). And at times it would even happen that a baby suffocated to death (Haidacher 1907, 143-145).

From the 3rd c., the audience attended the sermon with either utmost liveliness and involvement, or annoyance and disinterest (Olivar 1983; Olivar 1991, 761-814; Brottier, in Klimkeit et al. 1997, 246). Sometimes people came late (Caes. Arles, *Serm.* 76,3); greeted each other, exchanged smiles and even shook hands (Bas., *Hom. in Ps. 28*, 7: PG 29, 304 A); some people chattered in church and were distracted (Or., *Hom. in Gen.* 10,1); some people laughed and made hand gestures (*Const. App.* 2,57,13); others made noise, which annoyed the preacher (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 50*, 1); some church members rocked back-and-forth as if seized with giddiness; some yawned, others continually paced back and forth (Bas., *Hom.* 8,2: PG 31, 309 C). Some were impatient for the entirety of the sermon (Chrys., *Hom. in Gen.* 6,2) and became tired for having to stand (Aug., *Serm.* 355,2: PL 39, 1569: *ego sedens loquor, vos stando laboratis*); certain members fell asleep, esp. after having eaten (Chrys., *Stat.* 10,1; cf. Acts 20:9). At times the crowd became tumultuous, forcing the preacher to stop the sermon (Sev. Ant., *Hom.* 1,1: PO 38, 254); some people left the church grumbling (Eus. Em., *Hom.* 20,38); although some only came to look at beautiful women—as did Augustine when a young man (*Conf.* 3,3,5)—and beautiful boys, or even to prostitute themselves or to steal (Bas., *Hom. in Ps. 29*, 4: PG 29, 312 C; Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 4,6).

At other times, however, the audience took part in the sermon (and the readings that preceded it) with great enthusiasm. The audience interrupted the speaker to ask some questions; it read along with him scriptural passages that he mentioned in his sermon; the audience reminded him with cues things that he had forgotten to mention (Bas., *Hex.* 4,2,6-12; 8,2,24-26); they let him understand by the nod of their head that they had understood his point (Aug., *De doctr. christ.* 4,10,25); they came away with personal considerations, outbursts (of pain, sorrow and commotion: e.g., when they heard about the sufferings of Jesus [Egeria, *Itin.* 24,10], the story of Job [Chrys., *Laz.* 5,4]), or others with cries, laments and gasps (esp. on the occasion of someone's death) or even with gestures more or less warding off evil (spitting and snubbing their nose when they heard the story of Lazarus and the rich man: Aug., *Serm.* 102,3,4). Some brought accusations against the preacher or appealed to third parties. In sophisticated cities such as Constantinople, it even happened that the crowd would mock the preacher, e.g., if it heard him mispronounce the Greek language. John Chrysostom, whom Libanius greatly admired, did not have this defect; the Cappadocian Father Gregory of Nazianzus, however, did (Bernardi 1968, 193), as did *Severian of Gabala (Socr., *HE* 6,11,3; Soz., *HE* 8,10,1) and the Armenian Atticus of Constantinople.

When the audience did not like the preacher, they did not hesitate to let him know (Chrys., *Hom. in Matt.* 32,6). But when they were happy with him, they held him dear (Chrys., *Hom. in Gen.* 2,1), asking for homilies he promised and requesting that he would repeat homilies delivered elsewhere (Sev. Ant., *Hom.* 108: PO 25, 193), or protesting when he had himself replaced by someone else (Chrys., *Hom. div.* 9,1). The noisiest sign of their approval of his oratorical performance was their applause that usually resounded in the ancient church as a stamp of the preacher's skill (Norden 1986, 559-563; Olivar 1991, 834-867). At times, they even used *claques* specifically charged with applauding him: this happened in the case of Paul of Samosata, whose fans were accustomed to jump up and down to cheer for him, "as occurred in the theater" (Eus., *HE* 7,30,9).

Eusebius's institutional comparison with the practice of the theater is not without reason. As happened there, also in the church, applause was often

the voice of special interest groups, cunningly maneuvered, who aimed to condition political developments (Browning 1952), relying on a means of expression that willingly attributed to itself a spiritual meaning—analogous to that of a group's ovations that accompanied an ecclesiastical nominee. Jerome bitterly criticized this type of manifestation (*Comm. in Eccles.* 9,17), representing the interpretation of intelligent people. But Gregory of Nazianzus, whom Jerome prided himself on having often heard at Constantinople (Hier., *Vir.* 117), devoted himself to willingly inciting such ovations (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 36,4; Hier., *Ep.* 52,8), and Gregory's rival Eunomius portrayed himself no differently (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 27,1). The ovations pleased Basil of Caesarea (*Hom.* 11,5: PG 31, 384 B), and even Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* 141,8) and Fulgentius of Ruspe (Ferrand., *V. Fulgent.* 27). John Chrysostom knew well that, in certain cases, the ovations only expressed enthusiasm for the conclusion of a particularly well thought out sermon (*Bapt.* 4), but he himself did nothing to stop them. Even when criticizing such a custom, on one occasion, he did it in such a way as to earn himself thundering applause (*Hom. in Ac.* 30,3-4).

VII. Trends in recent studies. Regardless of how much of this corresponds to only a small part of the growing number of sermons actually preached, the homiletic heritage left to us from Christian antiquity is a historical source of utmost importance for a number of fields of research. Its contribution to the history of exegesis and doctrine should never be undervalued (one merely has to think of Origen or Augustine); scholars devoted to the spiritual life and ascetical practices derive no less an advantage (Eusebius of Emesa). Likewise these sermons benefit those concerned with the liturgical and sacramental practices of the early church—since proper homiletical material provides key information for understanding the dynamics of the sermon (Mayer 1997). Nevertheless, the most recent studies interest us for other reasons.

We, in fact, should affirm that there has been a growing success in a socio-historical approach to the homilies. Sermons constitute, in effect, alternate windows into the world in which they were delivered and to which they were addressed; they depict the most disparate aspects of life: from the larger political issues down to the most anonymous customs of private life (Leemans et al. 2003). Although this approach rarely produces results from the first three centuries because of the relative dearth of material, such an approach was readily imposed on the great preachers of the 4th-5th c., who offer some of the best evidence for justifying this approach (Drobner 1996; Meredith, in Allen - Cunningham 1998; Mayer 2001b). The homilies of this period, in fact, happily inform us about a very wide gambit of topics: demography and economy, natural catastrophes and disasters, food and the care of individuals; details of dress and popular beliefs; language, instruction and precise sciences, and much more (plenty of material in Madec 1998). They also permit one to analyze politically related events and to reconstruct the webs of social relationships. From these homilies we garner decisive pieces of information pertaining to the circumstances in which they were delivered, information that illuminates otherwise obscure aspects of the ecclesiastical topography of specific cities or regions and clarifies the quality of relationships existing between the various churches. The richness of such data is almost unmanageable: one notes, therefore, the need to use research tools to manage it with greatest possible benefit (Allen - Mayer 1993).

There is no doubt that this is a challenge posed to modern study—a difficult challenge, if one merely considers the amount of material (hidden among the numerous pseudonymous texts, or those that have survived only in Eastern languages) that lies still unexplored. With the exception of several important initiatives (e.g., Cattaneo 1981; Voicu 2004), much of this homiletic material is still awaiting studies that will open them up for a historically conscious use of its contents.

A. Wilkenhauser, *Der hl. Johannes Chrysostomus und die Tachigraphie*: Archiv für Stenographie 58, 3 (1907) 268-272; S. Haidacher, *Drei unedierte Chrsysostomus-Texte einer Baseler Handschrift*: ZKTh 31 (1907) 141-171; 349-360; P. Batiffol, *Léon I[er]*: DTC 9,1 (1926) 218-301; F.J. Dölger, *Kaiser Theodosius der Grosse und Bischof Ambrosius von Mailand in einer Auseinandersetzung zwischen Predigt und Messliturgie*: AC 1 (1929) 54-65; D. de Bruyne, *La chronologie de quelques sermons de saint Augustin*: RBen 43 (1931) 185-193; C.H. Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*, London 1936; G. Bardy, *Tractare, tractatus*: RSR 33 (1946) 211-245; J. Leclercq, *Le sermon, acte liturgique*: La MaisonD 8 (1946) 27-37; M.J. Brennan, *A Study of the* Clausulae *in the Sermons of St. Augustine*, Washington 1947; V. Monachino, *La cura pastorale a Milano, Cartagine e Roma nel secolo IV*, Rome 1947; R. Browning, *The Riot of A.D. 387 in Antioch: The Role of the Theatrical Claques in the Later Roman Empire*: JTS 42 (1952) 13-20; C. Lambot, *Les sermons de saint Augustin pour les fêtes de Pâques. Liturgie et archéologie*: RSR 30 (1956) 230-240; E. Lemoire, *Philoxène de Mabboug, Homélies* (SC 44), Paris 1956; H.-I. Marrou, *Diatribe*: RAC 3 (1957) 997-1009 (= Id., *Patristique et humanisme. Mélanges*, Paris 1976, 267-277); E. Stommel, *Bischofsstuhl und hoher Thron*: JbAC 1 (1958) 52-78; Ch. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, III, Rome 1961; Id., *St. Augustine and the Eloquentia*, in Id., *Études*, I, 351-370; Id., *Praedicare-Tractare-Sermo*, in Id., *Études*, II, 63-72; P. Verbraken, *Les deux sermons du prêtre Eraclius d'Hyppone*: RBen 71 (1961) 3-21; M.-F. Ber-

rouard, *S. Augustin et le ministère de la prédication. Les anges qui montent et descendent*: RecAug 2 (1963) 447-501; A. Olivar, *La duración de la predicación antigua*: Liturgica 3 (1966) 143-184; J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères Cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire*, Montpellier 1968; H. Barré - R. Grégoire, *Homéliares* (H.B.: I *Caractères généraux*; II *Homéliares latins*; R.G.: III *Homéliares orientaux*): DSp 7 (1969) 597-617; G. Friedrich, κῆρυξ κτλ.: GLNT 5 (1969) 424-482 (orig. ed. 1933; Eng. tr.: TDNT 3:683-718); S. Janeras, *En quels jours furent prononcées les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste?* in *Mémorial Mgr. Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis (1898–1968)*, Louvain 1969, 121-133; F.A. Memoli, *Periodare ritmico nell'*Oratio XLIII *di Gregorio Nazianzeno*, Naples 1969; T. Moral, *Vincenzo, diacono di Saragozza*: BS 12 (1969) 1149-1155; A. (= Ch.) Renoux, *Le codex arménien de Jérusalem 121*, I: *Introduction aux origines de la liturgie hiérosolymitaine. Lumières nouvelles*, Turnhout 1969 (PO 35, 1-215); II: *Édition comparée du texte et de deux autres manuscrits. Introduction, textes, traduction et notes*, Turnhout 1971 (PO 36, 139-388); F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jh. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos* (OCA 87), Rome 1970; J. Jeremias, *Teologia del Nuovo Testamento.* I: *La predicazione di Gesù*, Brescia 1972; A. Olivar, *Preparación e improvisación en la predicación patrística: Kyriakon. Festschr. J. Quasten*, Münster i.W. 1973, II, 736-767; S. Mazzarino, Prima cathedra. *Docenza universitaria e "trono" episcopale nel II/III secolo*, in Id., *Antico, tardoantico ed era costantiniana*, Bari 1974, I, 151-170; P. Nautin, *Origène, Homélies sur Jérémie* (SC 232), Paris 1976; O. Pasquato, *Gli spettacoli in S. Giovanni Crisostomo. Paganesimo e Cristianesimo ad Antiochia e Costantinopoli nel IV secolo* (OCA 201), Rome 1976; M. Aubineau, *Les Homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem* (Subsidia Hagiographica 59), I-II, Brussels 1978–1980; V. Recchia, *Il "praedicator" nel pensiero e nell'azione di Gregorio Magno*: Salesianum 41 (1979) 333-374; S. Janeras, *La predicació pasqual i baptismal de Procle de Constantinople*: RCT 5 (1980) 131-151; M.G. Mara (ed.), *Ricchezza e povertà nel cristianesimo primitivo*, Rome 1980; V. Saxer, *S. Augustin. L'année liturgique*, Paris 1980; P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Bari ^{2}1980; E. Cattaneo, *Trois homélies pseudo-chrysostomiennes sur la Pâque comme oeuvre d'Apollinaire de Laodicée. Attribution et étude théologique* (Théologie historique 58), Paris 1981; G.A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, Princeton, NJ 1983; A. Rousselle, *Parole et inspiration. Le travail de la voix dans le monde romain*: History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 5 (1983) 129-157; A. Olivar, *Les réactions émotionelles des fidèles pendant la lecture solennelle de l'Écriture dans l'Église des Pères*, in *"Mens concordet voci." Pour A.G. Martimort*, Paris 1983, 452-455; R. Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, Göttingen 1984 (orig. ed. 1910); N. Adkin, *A Problem in the Early Church. Noise During Sermon and Lesson*: Mnemosyne, ser. 4, 38 (1985) 161-163; H.C. Teitler, Notarii *and* Exceptores. *An Inquiry into the Role and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire (from the Early Principate to c. 450 A.D.)*, Amsterdam 1985; G. Groppo, *Storia della predicazione e della catechesi antica e medievale*, Rome 1986; R. Krautheimer, *Architettura paleocristiana e bizantina*, Turin 1986; M.A. Moreno, *Prédication*: DSp 12, 2 (1986) 2052-2064; H.M. Müller, *Homiletik*: TRE 15 (1986) 526-532 (565); E. Norden, *La prosa d'arte antica. Dal VI secolo a.C. all'età della Rinascenza*, 2 vols., Rome 1986 (orig. ed. 1898); A. Monaci Castagno, *Origene predicatore e il suo pubblico*, Milan 1988; R. Lizzi, *Vescovi e strutture ecclesiastiche nella città tardoantica. L'Italia annonaria nel IV-V secolo d. C.*, Como 1989; R. MacMullen, *The Preacher's Audience (AD 350–400)*: JTS 40 (1989) 503-511; M. Naldini (ed.), *Basilio di Cesarea, Sulla Genesi (Omelie sull'Esamerone)*, Milan 1990; A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. The Development of Christian Discourse*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford 1991; W.H. Harris, *Lettura e istruzione nel mondo antico*, Rome-Bari 1991 (orig. ed. 1989); E. Massa, *Gregorio Magno e l'arte del linguaggio. Alcune osservazioni*, in *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo*. XIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana in collaborazione con l'École Française de Rome, Rome, 9-12 maggio 1990 (SEA 33), Rome 1991, II, 59-104; M. Naldini (ed.), *Martino di Braga, Contro le superstizioni: catechesi al popolo* (De correctione rusticorum), Florence 1991; S.M. Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homilies in Fourth-Century Christian Literature. Prose Rhythm, Oratorical Style, and Preaching in the Works of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine*, Atlanta 1991; A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua* (Biblioteca Herder, Sección de teología y filosofía, 189), Barcelona 1991; M. Peinado, *La predicación del evangelio en los Padres de la Iglesia*, Barcelona 1991; M. Sachot, *Homilie*: RAC 16 (1991–1992) 121-175; M. Banniard, *Viva voce. Communication écrite et orale du IV^{e} au IX^{e} siècle en Occident latin*, Paris 1992; P. Brown, *Il corpo e la società. Uomini, donne e astinenza sessuale nel primo cristianesimo*, Turin 1992 (orig. ed. 1988); P. Allen, *Homilies as a Source for Social History*: SP 24 (1993) 1-5; P. Allen - W. Mayer, *Computer and Homily. Accessing the Everyday Life of Early Christians*: VChr 47 (1993) 260-280; E. Baasland, *Der 2. Klemensbrief und frühchristliche Rhetorik. "Die erste christliche Predigt" im Lichte der neueren Forschung*: ANRW II, 27, 1 (1993) 78-157; H. Drobner, *Die Festenpredigten der* Mesopentecoste *in der Alten Kirche*, in V. Grossi (ed.), *Ricerche patristiche in onore di Dom Basil Studer OSB* = Augustinianum 33 (1993) 137-170; J. Kecskeméti, *Personnages tragiques et personnages comiques dans les homélies dramatisées des prédicateurs grecs*: Euphrosyne 22 (1994) 45-61; A.D. Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation. 1 Cor 1–4 and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric*, Cambridge 1994; E. Mühlenberg - J. van Oort (ed.), *Predigt in der Alten Kirche*, Kampen 1994; E. Mühlenberg, *Augustins Predigen*, in ibid., 9-24; W. Stoellger, *Johannes Chrysostomus bei der Predigtarbeit. Bemerkungen zu Hom. 2 in Matt.*, in ibid., 82-114; H.G. Thümmel, *Materialien zum liturgischen Ort der Predigt in der Alten Kirche*, in ibid., 115-122; F.J. Tovar Paz, *Tractatus, Sermones atque Homiliae. El cultivo del genero literario del discurso homilético en la Hispania tardoantigua y visigoda*, Cáceres 1994; S. Elm, *'Virgins of God.' The Making of Ascetism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford ^{2}1996; H. Drobner, *Archaeologia Patristica. Die Schriften der Kirchenväter als Quellen der Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte. Gregor von Nyssa, Homiliae in Ecclesiasten* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 10), Vatican City 1996; F. Dünzl, *Homilie. I. Alte Kirche*: LTK^{3} 5, 248-249; H. Schröter, *Pfingstpredigt*: TRE 26 (1996) 391-394; S. Voicu, *Cesaria, Basilio (Ep. 93/94) e Severo*, in M. Simonetti - P. Siniscalco (ed.), *Studi sul cristianesimo antico e moderno in onore di Maria Grazia Mara* = Augustinianum 35 (1996), II, 697-703; P. Allen - W. Mayer, *Traditions of Constantinopolitan Preaching. Towards a New Assessment of Where Chrysostom Preached What*: ByzF 24 (1997) 93-114; E. Cattaneo, *I ministeri nella chiesa antica. Testi patristici dei primi tre secoli* (Letture Cristiane del Primo Millennio 25), Milan 1997; B. Judic, *Grégoire le Grand, un maître de la parole*, in R.M. Dessì - M. Lauwers (eds.), *La parole du prédicateur. V^{e}-XV^{e} siècle* (Collection du Centre d'Études Médiévales de Nice 1), Nice 1997, 49-107; H.-J. Klimkeit - E.S. Gerstenberger - B. Ego - H.-Th. Wrege - L. Brottier, *Predigt*: TRE 27 (1997) 225-248; W. Mayer, *The Dynamics of Liturgical Space. Aspects of the Interaction Between John Chrysostom and His Audiences*: EphLit 111 (1997) 104-115; H. Schröter, *Osterpredigt*: TRE 27 (1997) 530-533; P. Allen - M. Cunningham (eds.), *Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (A New History of the Sermon 1), Leiden-

Boston-Köln 1998; P. Allen, *The Sixth-Century Greek Homily. A Re-Assessment*, in ibid., 201-225; J.H. Barkhuizen, *Proclus of Constantinople. A Popular Preacher in Fifth-Century Constantinople*, in ibid., 179-200; W. Mayer, *John Chrysostom. Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience*, in ibid., 105-137; A. Meredith, *The Three Cappadocians on Beneficence. A Key to Their Audience*, in ibid., 89-104; G. Madec (ed.), *Augustin prédicateur (395–411)*. Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly (5-7 septembre 1996) (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 159), Paris 1998; J.-P. Bouhot, *Augustin prédicateur d'après le* De doctrina christiana, in ibid., 49-61; H.O. Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, 2 vols., Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge 1998; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, Milan [3]1998, III, 268-277; Ph. Rousseau, *The Preacher's Audience. A More Optimistic View*, in T. Hillard - R.A. Kearsley - C.E.V. Nixon - A. Nobbs (eds.), *Ancient History in a Modern University*, Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge 1998, 391-400; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast. Melito, Peri Pascha and the Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy at Sardis*, Leiden 1998; B. Studer, *Schola Christiana*, Paderborn 1998; E. Bona, Et tamen cessavit illa incessabilis vox. *L'ininterrotta predicazione di Cesario nei due libri della* Vita Caesarii Arelatensis: QDipFLTCl (1999) 465-490; W. Mayer, *Female Participation and the Late Fourth-Century Preacher's Audience*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 139-147; E. Montanari, *Introduzione*, in E. Montanari - M. Pratesi - S. Puccini (ed.), *Leone Magno. I sermoni quaresimali e sulle collette*, Florence 1999, 9-42; R.H. Mounce, *Preaching, Kerygma*, in G.F. Hawthorne - R.P. Martin - D. G. Reid (ed.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, Downers Grove, IL 1993, 735-737; A. Olivar, *Sévère d'Antioche prédicateur*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 74 (1999) 54-60; H. Savon, *Ambroise prédicateur*: ibid. 33-45; R. Zerfass - A. Weiser - A. Merkt, *Predigt*, in LTK[3] 8, 525-528; E. Bona, *Cesario d'Arles. Predicare la parola*, Magnano (BI) 2000; R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford 2000; A. Grappone, *Annotazioni sulla cronologia delle omelie di Origene*: Augustinianum 41, 1 (2001a) 27-58; Id., *Annotazioni sul contesto liturgico delle omelie di Origene*: Augustinianum 41, 2 (2001b) 329-362; W. Mayer, *At Constantinople, How Often Did John Chrysostom Preach? Addressing Assumptions About the Workload of a Bishop*: SE 40 (2001a) 83-105; Id., *The Homily as Historical Document. Some Problems in Relation to John Chrysostom*: Lutheran Theological Journal 35 (2001b) 17-22; S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC–AD 400*, Boston-Leiden 2001; W. Kinzig, *The Greek Christian Writers*, in ibid., 633-670; Ph.E. Satterthwaite, *The Latin Church Fathers*, in ibid., 671-694; A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching. A Search for Origins of Christian Homily*, Leiden 2001; M. Sodi - A.M. Triacca (ed.), *Dizionario di Omiletica*, Leumann (TO)-Gorle (BG) 2002 (rist. dell'ed. 1998); F. Bergamelli, *Pseudo-Clemente. Seconda lettera*, in ibid., 1275-1277; B. Carucci, *Liturgia sinagogale*, in ibid., 859-862; C. Ghidelli, *Predicazione. Nella Chiesa apostolica*, in ibid., 1211-1216; J. Heriban, *Paolo di Tarso*, in ibid., 1064-1069; A. Monaci Castagno, *Origene*, in ibid., 1050-1053; A. Olivar, *Predicazione. Nella Chiesa antica*, in ibid., 1216-1222; A.M. Triacca, *Eusebio Gallicano*, in ibid., 519-523; G. Visonà, *Omelie pasquali patristiche*, in ibid., 1023-1030; J. Leemans - W. Mayer - P. Allen - B. Dehandschutter, '*Let us die that we may live'. Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria* (*c. AD 350–AD 450*), London-New York 2003; R. Stuhlman, *Weinachtspredigt*: TRE 35 (2003) 468-471; P. De Navascués, *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios. Estudio histórico-teológico del cristianismo antioqueno en el s. III* (SEA 87), Rome 2004; F. Fatti, *Omelia XI: Le primizie. Questioni di deontologia sacerdotale*, in M. Maritano - E. dal Covolo (ed.), *Omelie sui Numeri. Lettura origeniana* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 186), Rome 2004, 35-81; Id., *"In ossequio alle leggi dell'encomio." Retorica e ideologia in Gregorio Nazianzeno*, in *Comunicazione e ricezione del documento cristiano in epoca tardoantica*. Atti del XXXII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome, 8-10 maggio 2003 (SEA 90), Rome 2004, 613-658; S. Dagemark, *Augustine's* Sermons. *Circulation and Authenticity Evidenced by Examples of Preaching and Response*, in ibid., 693-743; S.J. Voicu, *"Furono chiamati giovanniti . . ." Un'ipotesi sulla nascita del corpus pseudocrisostomico*, in B. Janssens - B. Roosen - P. Van Deun (eds.), *Philomathestatos. Studies in Greek Patristic and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2004, 701-712; M.L. Fobelli, *Un tempio per Giustiniano. Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli e la* Descrizione *di Paolo Silenziario*, Rome 2005; W. Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom—Provenance. Reshaping the Foundations* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 273), Rome 2005; C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity. The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2005; R. Romano, *Il ritmo prosastico nelle Omelie per Eutropio di Giovanni Crisostomo*, in *Giovanni Crisostomo. Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo*. XXXIII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome, 6-8 maggio 2004 (SEA 93), Rome 2005, 305-314; A. Martin, *Alexandrie. L'investissement chrétien de la ville*, in J.-O. Boudon - F. Thélamon (éds.), *Les chrétiens dans la ville*. Actes du Colloque: "Les chrétiens dans la ville," Rouen, 5-6 janvier 2000, Mont-Saint-Aignan 2006, 47-63; D. E. Serra, *The Baptistery at Dura-Europos. The Wall Painting in the Context of Syrian Baptismal Theology*: Ephemerides Liturgicae 120 (2006) 67-78.

F. Fatti

PREDESTINATION. In the opinion of many, the doctrine of predestination is inextricably tied to the name of St. *Augustine. It is, therefore, helpful to recall that the Augustine was not the first or the only among the ancient *fathers of the church to discuss this theological teaching. He only developed—even though in an entirely original way—a discussion that had already begun before him. St. *Jerome provided information on the origin of the issue of predestination when he explained the words of the apostle *Paul: *qui me segregavit ex utero matris meae* (Gal 1:15-16). Jerome placed this alongside the statement in Mal 1:1-2, originally cited in Rom 9:10-13, on the twins Jacob and Esau, observing that precisely on these and similar scriptural texts, the *gnostics had established their doctrine of the various types of people predestined to good or evil (*In Ep. ad Gal.* I, 1: PL 26, 350). Jerome simply referred to ideas taken directly from *Origen. In fact, even the Alexandrian teacher in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, after having cited the words of the apostle Paul: *segregatus in Evangelium* (Rom 1:1), and those very similar passages such as Gal 1:15-16, observed that the gnostics had appealed to these texts to support the idea that "there are men saved on account of their natural constitution and some, using these

words, have tried to deny the freedom of the will" (*Philocalia* 25,1: SC 226, 212).

The most complete treatment of the topic was given by Origen in his explanation of Rom 8:28-29, where he observed that "the principle of calling and justification is not predestination. If it were this principle, those who maintain the absurd doctrine of nature would be in possession of the most persuasive arguments. But before predestination there was foreknowledge: *those whom he foreknew*, he says, *he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his son*. Therefore, God having set his gaze beforehand on the chain of future events and having known the inclination (*hormē*) of the freedom of certain men toward godliness—as well as the momentum toward godliness that follows the inclination because he also knew that these men would give themselves totally to a virtuous life—he knew them beforehand, he, the one who knows the present and the future. And those whom he thus knew in this way beforehand, he predestined to be conformed to the image of his son" (ibid. 25,2: SC 226, 216). At this point, Origen noticed: "One must not therefore think that the foreknowledge of God is the cause of future events." To the contrary, it is because future events must come about in conformity to the will of man who acts, which God foreknew, the one who *knows all things before they occur* (Dan 13:42). With respect to the other verse: *now we know that for those who love God all things work together for good, to those who were called according to his purpose* (*Scimus autem quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum, iis qui secundum propositum vocati sunt sancti*), Origen observed that the same words "clearly show that the cause of the design and the divine foreknowledge depends on our freedom" (ibid. 25,3: SC 226, 224). The apostle, prechosen and predestined by God, does not therefore immediately have a necessity to be righteous because God saw beforehand that he would be righteous: "he was chosen to the gospel not because his nature presented something exceptional or superior—because of his constitution—to the natures of those who were not made thus, but thanks to their actions (*praxeis*) which were first known and then realized, each one according to the Apostle's preparation and free choice" (ibid. 25,4: SC 226, 230). In Book VII of the same commentary, Origen distinguished foreknowledge acc. to basic human understanding which is simple intellectual foresight, and foreknowledge acc. to *Scripture, which implies love, but reaffirms that the "cause of our salvation or perdition is not found in God's foreknowledge," but in the decision and the free choices of the person, which, foreseen by God, determine one's election. Foreknowledge and predestination, therefore, have the same object and the same scope (*In Ep. ad Rom.* VII, 8: PG 14, 1126B-C), and in no case does foreknowledge annul freedom and human responsibility.

As one can see, Origen was concerned with defending against the gnostics, on the one hand, the goodness and righteousness of God, and on the other, the freedom and moral responsibility of the person. To reconcile the two different demands, he leaned toward the principle that God chooses, predestines and calls only those whom he foresaw would have a well-disposed will to be conformed to the image of his Son. With respect to glorification and every other grace, such as the apostle Paul's apostolate, God predestined and calls the one whom he foresaw would merit with good works a superior grace.

Origen's doctrine was received in the East and also in the West, where one can perceive the same personal emphasis in the writings of an anonymous author named *Ambrosiaster and in the writings of *Hilary. Ambrosiaster explained Rom 8:28-29 in such a way as to make God's call depend upon faith acc. to the foreknowledge of a good disposition to believe: those called *secundum propositum* are those *quos credentes praesciit deus futuros sibi idoneos, ut, antequam crederent, scirentur*, while those chosen and predestined *ad praemia capessenda* are those whom God *praescivit futuros sibi devotos*, not with a temporal righteousness, as occurred in the case of *Judas, but with a persevering righteousness (*In Rom.* 8,28-29: CSEL 81/1, 290-291). It was precisely for this reason that he heavily emphasized that *faith was a meritorious human work: *credere autem et non credere voluntatis est . . . et ideo ad meritum proficit* (ibid. 129-130).

For his part, Hilary excluded above all that divine election could be the product of an indiscriminate judgment, *sed ex meriti electu facta discretio est* (*In Ps.* 64,5: CSEL 22, 236). While considering perseverance in faith as the gift of God, he was convinced that to begin a good work depended on the human will because human will *hoc proprium ex se debet, ut velit . . . meritum . . . adipiscendae consummationis est ex initio voluntatis* (*In Ps.* 118, *Nun*, 20: CSEL 22, 486). The priority of the human will with respect to God's grace is again clearly affirmed elsewhere: *imbecilla enim est per se aliquid obtinendi humana infirmitas, et hoc tantum naturae suae officium est, ut adgregare se in familia dei et velit et coeperit. Divinae vero misericordiae est, ut volentes adiuvet, incipientes confirmet, adeuntes recipiat: ex nobis autem initium est, ut ille perficiat* ["human weakness is very weak

for obtaining something on its own, and this alone is the duty of its nature, namely, that it both desire and begin to betake itself into the family of God. Now, it is a characteristic of divine mercy to help those who are willing, confirm those beginning and receive those along the way: for the beginning is from us so that he may bring it to completion"] (*In Ps.* 118, *Ain*, 10: CSEL 22, 501). The two authors, therefore, echo Origen in making divine election depend on justification and the glory of the foreknowledge of man's good disposition, embodied in faith and good will; but they emphasize the autonomy of the act of faith or good will because they think that divine election cannot be an indiscriminate act but must be based on individual merit.

Now, it was therefore precisely to these authors that Augustine drew near during the period of his service as a presbyter. Invited to explain Romans 8:28: *Quoniam quos ante praescivit, et praedestinavit conformes imaginis Filii sui* ("because those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his son"), he wrote: "not all those who have been called have in fact been called according to the design: this design, in fact, belongs to foreknowledge and predestination and God has not predestined anyone unless he knew that they would believe and follow his call, i.e., those whom he also calls the 'elect'" (*Exp. quar. prop. ex Ep. Rom.* 47 [55]: CSEL 84,30). Then explaining Romans 9:11-13 on the outcome of Jacob and Esau to those who had been disturbed by this Pauline text because it appeared to them to deny free will, he responds by appealing to the foreknowledge with which God knew, before they had been born, what type each one of the two was bound to be. But because this response can seem contrary to the apostle, who excludes that election is acc. to works (*ex operibus*), he specifies that the object of election in foreknowledge was not works of faith, because "if one does not believe in him and does not persist in the will of receiving, he does not receive God's gift, i.e., the Holy Spirit." Just like Hilary, the presbyter Augustine emphasized that *electio* presupposed merits, "because in things that are absolutely equal, one cannot speak of election" and, as did Ambrosiaster, repeated that believing is an autonomous work of the person: *quod ergo credimus, nostrum est* ("the fact that we believe is our doing") (Augustine, ibid. 52 (60): CSEL 84, 35). Faith and a good will are both considered the direct object of election in foreknowledge: *Non ergo elegit Deus bene operantes, sed credentes potius, ut ipse illos faciat bene operari. Nostrum enim est credere et velle, illius autem dare credentibus et volentibus facultatem bene operandi per Spiritum Sanctum* ("God, therefore, did not choose the ones who do good works, but rather those who believe so that he may cause them to do good works. For it is our duty to believe and to will, but it is his duty to give believers and those who desire it the ability to do good works through the Holy Spirit") (Augustine, ibid. 53 [61]: CSEL 84, 36). As one can tell, with regard to the theme of predestination, Augustine simply reused a reflection already employed by others and in their own terms. Therefore, one cannot impute to Augustine alone the accusation of being detached from St. Paul's understanding of this theological question, as many theologians and recent exegetes are accustomed to reiterate, because he accepted an individualistic perspective of predestination. Augustine's reflection on grace and predestination, as in the case of the other doctrinal points, must be read and evaluated keeping in mind the historical and cultural context in which it was developed.

In light of this basic methodological principle, the theological change found in his *Ad Simpl.* I, 2 seems to be less scandalous than one may think. In the famous *quaestio*, in fact, the Bishop of Hippo without a doubt completed a great step forward in theology, starting from Scripture's teachings, and in particular that of the apostle, that had been overlooked by earlier theologians, i.e., the absolute gratuity and freedom of God's action with regard to human salvation. Though confirming the necessity of voluntary human cooperation, beginning with the *Ad Simpl.* I, 2, St. Augustine recognized the necessity of grace already from the *initium fidei*, which he had earlier assigned to human will, in such a way that truly, as the apostle says, "let him who glories, glory in the Lord" (2 Cor 10:17—*Ad Simpl.* I, 2,21). Earlier, like *Hilary, he had maintained that *electio*, in order to be just, demands a certain difference of merit between the one who is elected and the one who is not (ibid. I, 2,4). Now, however, he came to see *electio* to justification as a mysterious act of God's mercy: facing St. Paul's conversion, who, "unforeseeably from an amazing persecutor of the gospel, was made its more amazing preacher," he confessed that he could not find an explanation at the human level (ibid. I, 2,22).

The recognition of the full gratuity of election and call to justification, however, raised the problem of the nonelect. He operated under the presupposition that all people are sinners because of original *sin (ibid. I, 2,16), because from the one mass of those condemned, God "requires the debt from whom he wants and remits from whom he wants? . . . Why to this one yes and to the other no?" The answer given at the beginning of his episcopal ministry

would remain the same for the remainder of his life: "if you do not pay the debt owed, you have someone to thank; if you pay the debt, you have no reason to complain" (ibid. I, 2,22). God certainly does nothing so that the sinner becomes more evil, but neither does he give something to make the sinner better (ibid. I, 2,15); God "does not force anyone to sin, he only refrains from granting his mercy and justification to some sinners" (ibid. I, 2,16). Therefore, the idea of a predestination to evil is entirely excluded. Nevertheless, the conclusion that God's mercy is only extended to some and not to all sinners was too harsh and, in fact, the magisterium of the Catholic Church has never appropriated it, in contrast to Augustine's doctrine of the gratuity of election and the necessity of *grace.

Why did Augustine reach such a harsh affirmation? Without a doubt, as he himself says, he defended the gratuity of grace with an insurmountable bulwark (*munitione*) (*Dono pers.* 21,54). The deepest reason, however, must be identified in the common conviction of earlier theologians that election or predestination does not extend to all persons, but only to some. The framing of the discussion in this manner among the Fathers was caused first by the gnostic teaching of various categories of people naturally destined to salvation or perdition, and subsequently the doctrine of the necessity of baptism and the church for salvation (**extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*). Such a disposition in Augustine can already be seen at the beginning of his famous change (cf. *Ad Simpl.* I, 2,2.17.22) and increasingly appears more clearly every time he explicitly mentions the fate of infants who die without *baptism (*Ep.* 149,2,17 and 22; *C. Iul.* 4,8,43; *Opus imp.* 4,125; *Praed. sanct.* 12,23ff.). In fact, with regard to the hypothesis that the children who die without baptism are excluded from eternal salvation, it becomes clear that some children are elect and others not. At that time in the West, this idea was held by all, with the exception of the *Pelagians; for this reason even the provincial monks were obliged to have recourse to the theory of future contingents.

In the last years of his life, however, accused of fatalism by the Pelagians and the monks of *Hadrumetum and heavily criticized by those from *Marseille, Augustine composed various works (*De gratia et libero arbitrio, De correptione et gratia, De praedestinatione sanctorum, De dono perseverantiae*) in which one reads important qualifications on predestination. Defining predestination as the "foreknowledge and preparation of God's gifts, with which all those who are delivered are truly delivered," he emphasized that the object of predestination is the works of God and no longer the sins of men. God knows and desires from eternity all that he himself will do in time in order to deliver all individual human beings from evil or to punish them because of their sin. Sins, however, are not the object of predestination, but rather are only the object of divine foreknowledge. One concludes that predestination "is such that it cannot exist without foreknowledge, although foreknowledge can exist without predestination. Through predestination, in fact, God knew beforehand the things that he would do. But he has the power to know beforehand even those things that he himself does not do such as every type of sin" (*Praed. sanct.* 10,19).

These are clear explanations that are unfortunately ignored by those who continue to attribute to Augustine the idea of a double predestination to good and evil in the manner of John Calvin. This idea does not at all coincide with that likewise equally unacceptable idea of abandonment to perdition or the denial of mercy to the nonelect, that Calvin continued to repeat to the very end. The idea that the predestination of the individual faithful should be seen in light of the results of Jesus Christ's own predestination was an authentically Pauline idea: "there is in fact no more glorious example of predestination than the mediator himself. If any believer wants to understand it, the believer should look at Christ and find oneself in him" (*Dono pers.* 24,67); "as that One alone was therefore predestined to be our head, we too have been predestined to be his members" (*Praed. sanct.* 15,31). Lastly, one should recall that *Prosper of Aquitaine, who, defending the Augustinian doctrine against the accusation of the provincial monks in his work *De vocatione omnium gentium*, knew how to proclaim the universality of God's salvific will with greater clarity than his teacher Augustine.

H.-D. Simonin, *Prédestination*: DTC 12, 2815-2896; O. Rottmanner, *Der Augustinismus. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Studie*, Munich 1892; J. Chéné, *La théologie de saint Augustin, Grâce et prédestination*, Le Puy-Lyon 1961; V. Boublík, *La predestinazione; S. Paolo e S. Agostino*, Rome 1961; A. Trapè, *A proposito di predestinazione. S. Agostino e i suoi critici moderni*: Divinitas 7 (1963) 243-284; R. Bernard, *La prédestination du Christ total selon saint Augustin*: RecAug 3 (1965) 1-58; MySal IV/2, 776-800 (It. tr. IX, 229-272); D. Marafioti, *Il problema dell'"initium fidei" in sant'Agostino fino al 397*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 541-565; Id., *Alle origini del teorema della predestinazione* (*Simpl I,2,13-22*), in SEA 25, Rome 1987, II, 257-277; G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino, Ermeneutica e retorica della grazia dalla crisi alla metamorfosi del* De doctrina christiana, Rome 2001; P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, London 1967, 398-407; J.M. Rist, *Augustine on Free Will and Predestination*: JTS 20 (1969), 420-447; J.P. Burns, *The Development of Augustine's Doctrine of Operative Grace*, Paris, 1980.

S. Folgado Flórez - N. Cipriani

PRESANCTIFIED. *Presanctified* refers to the consecrated species in a eucharistic celebration that is then used in another liturgical act, whether private or public. Initially, both species were preserved, later only the bread (*Procedunt* [*diaconi*] *cum corpore et sanguine Domini quod ante diem remansit—Sacram. Gelas*. 418). This practice originated as a service only for the sick who did not participate in the Sunday celebration, then it was used for other individual faithful, and finally, for everyone in a particular liturgical celebration, expressed differently in the various liturgical traditions. The spread of the practice of the so-called *missa praesanctificatorum* celebration is still practiced in the Latin liturgy on Good Friday, while in the *Byzantine churches it is common throughout *Lent, except on Saturday and Sunday. In the *Syriac liturgy, in order to designate the liturgy of the presanctified, the name *ordo uel anaphora consignationis* is used, derived from the blessing of the chalice by the celebrant with a previously consecrated particle of the host. The liturgy of the presanctified, believed by ancient authors to be of apostolic origins, and by others attributed without basis to *Gregory the Great, is confirmed only from the 7th c., but it could reasonably be older. For Andrieu it is a Byzantine creation; for Thibaut it is of Jerusalem or Syrian origin, based on a testimony of the *Nomocanon* of Bar Hebraeus attributed to *Severus of Antioch. Certain references to the Mass of the presanctified are found in the **Chronicon paschale* (the notice for the year 617), while the established normative text is canon 52 of the Council *in *Trullo* II. The common use of the ancient church was, in general, decidedly aliturgicial for the Lenten weekdays and esp. Good Friday, days of a penitential and fasting character. The renewal of the celebration after *None* (the 9th hour, mid-afternoon prayer) or at the daily time of Vespers, in fact, declines due to the difficulty the elderly had in breaking their fast, even if only to receive Communion. In the West, such a use continued until the 8th c., in the Mozarabic and *Ambrosian liturgies until modern times. The *Ordo* of Einsiedeln affirms that at Rome from the 8th c. it was possible to communicate in the *tituli* (M. Andrieu, III, 272), and at the end of the century the Mass of the presanctified was even introduced into the papal liturgy. In the East, at the same time, the liturgy of the presanctified was affirmed and described by Theodore the Studite (see *Epist. Lib.* II, 219,4; *Explicatio divinae liturgiae praesanctificatorum*, PG 99, 1687-1690).

H. Leclercq, *Messe des présanctifiés*, DACL, 11, 770-771; I. Ziadé, *Présanctifiés* (*messe des*) DTC, 13, 77-111; H.W. Codrington, *The Syrian Liturgies of the Presanctified*: JTS 4 (1903) 69-82; JTS 5 (1904) 369-377; 537-545; Id., *Liturgia praesanctificatorum syriaca sancti Joannis Chrysostomi*: *Studi e ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Cristostomo*, ed. by the Committee for the 15th Centenary of His Death, Rome 1908, 719-729; Id., *Studies of the Syrian Liturgies*, London 1952; J.B Thibaut, *Monuments de la notion ecphonétique et hagiopolite de l'Église grecque*, St. Petersburg 1917; M. Andrieu, *Immixtio et consecratio. La consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du moyen âge*, Paris 1924; Id., *Les ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, III, Louvain 1961; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, Paris 1925, 74.262-263; M. Righetti, *Storia della Liturgia*, Milan 1950, I, 109; Id., *Storia della Liturgia*, Milan 1955, II, 162.166; S. Janeras, *La partie vespérale de la Liturgie Byzantine des Présanctifiés*, OCP 30 (1964) 193-222; *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, ed. L.C. Mohlberg - L. Einzenhöfer, Rome 1981; M. Arranz, *La liturgie des Présanctifiés de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin*, OCP 47 (1981) 332-388; S. Alexopoulos, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite*, Louvain 2009.

R. Ronzani

PRESBYTERS. The term *presbyter*—a comparative adjective from the noun *presbys*, which refers to the oldest person; a mature person, who over time has shown wisdom in dealing with persons and things—occurs 12 times in the NT. It originally meant "elder," but immediately in the first Christian community, it became a technical term referring not to one's age but to an individual who was responsible for leading and therefore one who possessed wisdom and authority. In the Jewish tradition, the elders were those who had an authority at the local level; in the period of the Maccabees, it referred to those who ruled in the cities and villages, esp. *Jerusalem. They were men of the law (1 Macc 7:33; 11:23; 12:6 and 35; 14:20; 2 Macc 1:10; 4:44; 11:27; 13:13). During the Second Temple period, the Jewish communities had a college of presbyters, a *gerousia* (in Jerusalem it was called the Sanhedrin, made up of 70 individuals and the High Priest), in service to the communities. In the Diaspora, the number of members of the college of elders varied acc. to the size of the community: 70 at *Alexandria, 35 in Cyrenaica, etc.

In the first Christian community, those who had authority were the "apostles and elders [presbyters]"; in Jerusalem the presbyters participated actively in the administration of the community (Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4) and were connected to *James (Acts 21:18). *Paul and *Barnabas during their first trip appointed some presbyters: "And when they had appointed elders [presbyters] for them in every church, with prayer and fasting they committed them to the Lord in whom they believed" (Acts 14:23). At Miletus, Paul "sent to *Ephesus to call the presbyters of the church" (Acts 20:17), who were subsequently called "bishops" (20:28). The presbyters were important and specific figures in the Pas-

toral Epistles: "the laying on of hands by the college of presbyters [elders]" (1 Tim 4:14). They held the presidency (1 Tim 5:17; cf. 1 Pet 5:5); presbyters were established in every city (Tit 1:5). The Pastoral Epistles specify the qualities that the primary leaders, the bishops and the deacons, must have (1 Tim 3:2-12); those same qualities were required of the presbyters (Tit 1:5-9). In this letter, two terms are used: *episkopos* and *presbyteros*; in Latin they were only transliterated and were interchangeable. The epistle of *James exhorts that during every illness one should call the presbyters of the church *presbyteri ecclesiae* (5:14).

*Clement of Rome wrote that the *apostles had appointed presbyters in every city where they had preached: "after having tested them in the spirit" (*1 Clem.* 42,4-5), they received the *episkopē* (44,1; 44,3 and 5). From the apostolic nomination of the presbyters, presbyters were elected by the communities: the apostles "established those whom we mentioned earlier and then gave them the order that upon their death other men would succeed them in the ministry. Those who were appointed by them or other famous men with the agreement of the whole community . . . should not be replaced" (*1 Clem* 44,2-3). The **Didache* names bishops and deacons as those the community must choose who are "worthy of the Lord and who are kind and not given to money" (15,1). Presenting himself as the leader, *Polycarp wrote to the Philippians along with the presbyters (1,1) and also mentioned the deacons (5,2) and the presbyters (6,1); he criticized the Presbyter valens of Philippi who abused his position (11,1).

With *Ignatius of Antioch there appears a clear distinction of the triad: bishops, presbyters, deacons, always listed in this order or vice versa (deacons, presbyters and bishops). The bishop is surrounded by his presbytery: in Christian texts there is no mention of a *gerousia* (council), perhaps to emphasize individual rather than collective responsibilities. Nevertheless, even in the later language of the Fathers, the term *presbyter* continued to have a nontechnical meaning, i.e., it was used to refer to an elderly and wise person. Moreover, at times, other terms were also used: pastor, those who rule. Consequently, in the most ancient Christian texts the term *presbyter* had a plurality of meanings: an elderly man, a wise and venerable man; it could be applied to an apostle, be a synonym for "bishop," a member of the bishop's council, the witness of the Christian tradition, etc. It is not easy to determine the precise meaning in a given text because the nontechnical use persisted. *Irenaeus spoke of *successio presbyterorum* (*Adv. Haer.* 3,2,2) and a *successio episcoporum* for the Roman church, and it seems clear that the two terms were interchangeable for him; later authors were aware that "elder" was one of the term's older meanings (John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1,1 in Phil*). In the 3rd c., the Latin translation of *Firmilian's letter to *Cyprian also used nontechnical terminology: *maiores natu* for presbyter (PL 3, 1209A) and *seniores et praepositi* for presbyters and bishops (PL 3, 1206; cf. *Tertullian, *De pudic.* 14,16: *praesidens*). With the passing of time, the technical meaning was imposed more frequently to refer to a precise office in the Christian community, distinct from that of the bishop and deacons. Their obligations and rights were specified both in relation to bishops and deacons. For these aspects, *see* *bishop, *celibacy of the clergy, *clergy, *laying-on of hands, *ministries, *preaching and *presbyters, apostolic.

GLNT 11, 81-172 (= TDNT 6, 651-683); LTK³ 8, 558-568; var. aus., *Il ministero e i ministeri secondo il Nuovo Testamento*, ed. J. Delorme, Rome 1977; J.T. Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church. Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities*, Cambridge 1992; A. Faivre, *Ordonner la fraternité. Pouvoir d'innover et retour à l'ordre dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1992; S. Felici (ed.), *Sacerdozio battesimale e formazione teologica*, Rome 1992; E. Dassmann, *Ämter und Dienste in den frühchristlichen Gemeinden*, Bonn 1994; R.A. Campbell, *The Elders. Seniority Within Earliest Christianity*, Edinburgh 1994; J. Ysebaert, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der Alten Kirche*, Breda 1994; U. Falesiedi, *Le diaconie. Servizi assistenziali nella chiesa antica*, Rome 1995; E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive*, Rome 1996; E. Cattaneo, *I ministeri nella Chiesa antica. Testi patristici dei primi secoli*, Milan 1997; A. Hoffmann, *Kirchliche Strukturen und Römisches Recht bei Cyprian von Karthago*, Paderborn 2000; R. Godding, *Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne*, Brussels 2001; L. Padovese, *I sacerdoti dei primi secoli. Testimonianze dei Padri sui ministeri ordinati*, Casale Monf. ²2002.

A. Di Berardino

PRESBYTERS, APOSTOLIC. The presence of *presbyters, i.e., elders, is well attested already from the beginning in the early *Jerusalem community, alongside the college of apostles (cf. Acts 11:30; 15:2-23; 16:4; 21:18). In the area of *Paul's mission, presbyters appeared, however, as successors appointed as the collaborators of the apostles with subordinate functions to the "overseers" of the communities (Acts 14:23). At Miletus, Paul called together the presbyters of the church of *Ephesus (Acts 20:17). In 1 Tim (4:14; 5:17, 19) and Tit (1:5), he ordered that presbyters be appointed in every city. At least two times, the elders also received the title "bishops" (Acts 20:28 and Tit 1:7). Likewise at *Corinth, at the end of the 1st c., the community was led by presbyter-bishops (*1 Clem.* 1,3; 42,4; 44,1-5; 47,6; 54,2; 57,1). The presbyters preached and exhorted, acc. to the anony-

mous homilist of 2 *Clem.* 15,2; 17,3; 19,1; they prayed over the sick and anointed them with oil in the name of the Lord acc. to Jas 5:14. The author of 1 Peter referred to himself as a *sympresbyteros* in relation to the recipients of his letter in *Asia Minor (5:1) and exhorted the young men to be subject to the presbyters (5:5). An anonymous figure who referred to himself as the "presbyter," without any other qualification, is the author of 1 Jn and 3 Jn.

*Ignatius of Antioch introduced the novelty of a clear distinction between the figure of the monarchical bishop, leader of the community, and the presbyters along with the deacons subordinate to him (e.g., *Magn.* 6,1; *Smyrn.* 8,1). But in the terminology of his contemporary *Papias of Hierapolis, the presbyters are still of the "disciples of the Lord"; they belong, i.e., to the apostolic generation of the immediate followers of Jesus. In distinction to *Luke, who differentiated the group of the Twelve *Apostles from the 70/72 disciples and the presbyters of the early community of Jerusalem, for Papias all of them indistinctly constitute the group of the presbyters-disciples. In the famous and controversial introduction to his work titled *Explanation of the Sayings of the Lord*, Papias states that he personally saw and heard the presbyters, whom he identified simply as "the disciples of Lord," and that he, moreover, also confirmed his teachings by the words of other witnesses, who were likewise followers of the presbyters-disciples (see the citation of the fragment in Eus., *HE* 3,39,3-4). In particular, we know that Papias was a follower of the presbyter *John. Papias mentioned this individual twice: the first within a group of disciples, *Andrew, *Peter, *Philip, Thomas, *James and *Matthew; the second along with a certain *Aristion, who was likewise a disciple of the Lord. *Irenaeus maintained that, at the school of *John (the apostle and the author of the gospel, the letters and the *Apocalypse), Papias was the companion of *Polycarp of Smyrna (*Haer.* V, 33,4).

The heavy criticism that *Eusebius (*HE* 3, 39,2-7; 11-13) leveled against Irenaeus's testimony emanates above all from his complete misunderstanding of the arcane language used by Papias when he identified the presbyters and disciples. For Eusebius, Papias's text would indicate the existence of two distinct Johns, the apostle-evangelist and the presbyter. The explicit antichiliastic debate led Eusebius, following the path of *Dionysius of Alexandria, to attribute to the Presbyter the composition of the Apocalypse (on the distinction of the two Johns and the history of the two tombs at Ephesus, see Dionysius, cited in *HE* 7, 25,16). Affirming that Papias had never seen or personally heard the apostles, but that he was only a follower of the presbyters Aristion and John, Eusebius primarily intended to discredit his *millennialism. Unfortunately, Eusebius's tendentious interpretation has engendered a large amount of confusion (and it is not the first nor the last time) among scholars, as one can easily verify by reading the dense bibl. on the subject.

The distinction between apostles and presbyters that Eusebius took for granted and that prevented him from fully understanding Papias's testimony was clearly developed for the first time by Irenaeus of Lyons. He defined the "presbyters" as those who have seen and heard the apostles, who were, i.e., "disciples of the apostles," who in turn saw and heard the Lord Jesus, i.e., they were his disciples. This special relationship of discipleship implied that, as apostles, they were "eyewitnesses" of the life and teaching of Jesus; in the same way the presbyters in turn were "eyewitnesses" of the life and teaching of the apostles. Therefore there exists a chain of succession that, starting from Jesus, saw the apostles placed on the second rung and the presbyters on the third. In the course of his work, Irenaeus made frequent reference to the authority and teaching received by one or more presbyters. By thus placing himself at the fourth, and last, place in the chain of transmission of the truth, Irenaeus offered his readers the guarantee of the apostolic authenticity of his teaching in contrast to the wild dreams and lies of the *gnostic heretics.

Irenaeus almost never names these presbyters, and this silence has inevitably given rise to various speculations on their number and identity. In any case, it seems that they were representatives of the ecclesiastical and theological tradition of Asia Minor who seem to have been in close contact with the apostle John, who lived until the end of the *Trajan era, and that they did not combat the disciples of *Valentinus, whose doctrine they still did not know (IV, *praef.* 2). These precious bits of chronological information cannot but lead us to the end of the 1st c.–1st half of the 2nd c. The presbyters were guardians and guarantors of the correct faith and interpretation of the *Scriptures, the apostolic tradition and the legitimate episcopal succession (IV, 26,2-5; V, 20,1-2). The arguments by which Irenaeus appealed to the tradition of the presbyters are the most diverse. They contain, e.g., a tight argument on the chronology of the life of Jesus (*Haer.* II, 22,5); they confirm that Enoch and *Elijah were transported into *paradise (V, 5,1); and they explain various other complex questions esp. regarding eschatology (V, 30,1; 33,3; 36,1-3). The presbyters, disciples of the apostles, are also present in the *Epid.* 3 and 61 inas-

much as they are the sole and authentic guarantors of the demonstration of the apostolic preaching.

But to one of these presbyters Irenaeus felt himself esp. tied: he referred to him as "the best among us" (I, *praef.* 2; I, 13,3; III, 17,4), "divine" and "saintly" (I, 15,6). It is most likely the case that it is the same earlier theologian to whom Irenaeus appealed in III, 23,3; IV, 4,2; IV, 41,2 and V, 17,4. Above all, a long section of book IV, 27,1–32,1 reports the teachings of an anonymous "presbyter," a disciple of the apostles, whom Irenaeus maintains he personally heard (Latin translation of IV, 27,1 presents the presbyter as a disciple of the disciples of the apostles, but is clearly imprecise: cf. IV, 32,1 and Beatrice [1990] 181). Already Eusebius had noted the special importance that this "apostolic presbyter" had for Irenaeus, despite the silence on his name (*HE* 5,8,8). There is no reason to think it refers to Papias of Hierapolis, because it is not a given that Irenaeus was ever a direct "hearer" of this figure.

The identification of this anonymous teacher of Irenaeus with Polycarp of Smyrna, likewise a disciple of John along with Papias, is rendered highly probable by the comparison with the information reported in *Adv. Haer.* III, 3 and likewise in the *Letter to Florinus* (cited by Eusebius, *HE* 5, 20,4-8). In this document, Polycarp, who was accustomed to mention his dealings with John and the other apostles, eyewitnesses of the life of the Lord (V, 20,6), is referred to by Irenaeus as "the blessed and apostolic presbyter" (V, 20,7), an expression very similar to that of "apostolic teacher" used to refer to Polycarp in *Mart. Pol.* 16,2 (surprisingly Neymeyr [1989] never provides the reference to Polycarp). One must esp. call attention to a parallel that was certainly not by chance, namely, the fact that both the anonymous presbyter-teacher of Irenaeus (*Haer.* IV, 30,1) and Polycarp (Irenaeus, *Ep. Flor.* in Eusebius, *HE* 5, 20,5) preached in the *basilikē aulē* (Lat. *in regali aula*). This expression, badly misunderstood by the entirety of the commentators on this passage as "imperial palace" or "royal court" (see, e.g., A. Rousseau, SC 100/2, 773; Maier, 4; Ayán Calvo, 194; Grant, 159; Hartog, 37; Orbe, 415, who think specifically of the "House of Caesar" at Rome mentioned in Phil 4:22), cannot but refer to the "basilica," i.e., the architectural administrative and commercial structure of *Smyrna, where the Christians also used coins bearing the images of Caesar (not the "goods of Caesar," as the Latin expression *ex eis quae Caesaris sunt* is currently being translated) to conduct their transactions (cf. Beatrice [1990] 183 and 188).

One should mention that for Irenaeus, only the *quartodeciman *Easter observance practiced by the presbyter *Polycarp was of apostolic origin (John the disciple of the Lord and the other apostles with whom he lived). The *Sunday Easter defended by *Anicetus, however, was only a tradition of their predecessor presbyters, i.e., the bishops of the See of Rome: *Sixtus, *Telesphorus, *Hyginus and *Pius. Evidently, from the Asian and Irenaeus's quartodeciman point of view, one could not call them "apostolic" in the proper sense of the term (see Irenaeus, *Letter to *Victor*, in Eus., *HE* 5,24,14-17, and on the tendentious confusion of the information provided by Eusebius, see Beatrice [1983] 45-56).

The oral teaching of Irenaeus's presbyter, whether Polycarp or someone else, is rather important because it is the most ancient testimony we possess. It is dated to just a few years after Papias's fragments and the letters of Ignatius on the theological doctrines and the biblical exegesis as they were taking form in the 1st half of the 2nd c. in Asia Minor in the anti-*Marcionite controversy. Among the most interesting things, one should note the archaic doctrine of the *descensus ad inferos* (*Haer.* IV, 27,2), the most ancient orthodox interpretation of the Hebrews' plundering of the treasures of the Egyptians acc. to the book of Exodus (*Haer.* IV, 30,2-3), the political loyalty that is expressed in appreciation for the positive effects of the *pax romana* (*Haer.* IV, 30,3), the coexistence of Pauline (*Haer.* IV, 27,2 and 4) and Johannine terms (the most ancient mention of the book of Revelation known to us is in *Haer.* IV, 30,4), the bitter polemics against *Judaism (*Haer.* IV, 28,3 and 29,2), a monarchical Christology that identifies the Word with the *Father (*Haer.* IV, 31,2). One should not fail to mention that even other chapters of Irenaeus's work, e.g., *Haer.* III, 18-23 and IV, 37-39, reflect both partially and indirectly the teachings of this presbyter. One could add, lastly, that some textual variants of the NT present in Irenaeus's writings echo precisely this presbyteral teaching (e.g., *lectio brevissima* of Jn 13:10 in *Haer.* IV, 22,1 and the "Western" text of Rom 13:1-7 in *Haer.* IV, 36,6 and V, 24,1: cf. Beatrice [2003]).

The treatment of various theological themes in these sections of Irenaeus's work reveals the striking, not haphazard, affinities existing between the Asian presbyteral tradition of the 1st half of the 2nd c., represented in its highest form by *Polycarp of Smyrna, and the so-called *Letter to *Diognetus*. The anonymous author describes himself in 11,1 (which in my opinion is not to be attributed to a later addition but constitutes an integral part of the original text): "disciple of the apostles," i.e., "presbyter" in the sense in which the term was used by Irenaeus (e.g., IV, 32,1: *senior apostolorum discipulus*; V, 33,3: *presbyteri . . . qui Ioannem . . . viderunt*; V, 36,2: *presbyteri apostolo-*

rum discipuli), and "teacher of the pagans" (see the title "apostolic teacher" referring to Polycarp in *Mart. Pol.* 16,2, which synthesizes well the double aspect of his personality as a disciple of the apostles and teacher of the pagans). If H.E. Lona's recent commentary *An Diognet* (KfA 8, Freiburg 2001) had not completely overlooked such substantial affinities, he would have certainly reached very different and better-grounded results concerning the date and spiritual context of the *Letter to Diognetus*. The undeniable similarities to *Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus*, upon which the author essentially based his argument, unfortunately, do not at all favor the Alexandrian origin of the *Letter to Diognetus* ca. AD 200, but, to the contrary, can be interpreted most likely in the sense that even the *Letter to Diognetus* should be considered an expression, esp. qualified, of that Asiatic presbyteral literature from the 2nd c. that Clement knew very well.

In the *Strom.* I, 1,11,1-3, Clement says that he was very close to the succession of the apostles. In his book *On Easter*, he gathered the traditions that he had heard from the voice of the ancient presbyters and mentioned, in this context, the names of the two "Asiatic" luminaries such as *Melito and Irenaeus. In the *Hypotyposes* he commented upon the *Epistle of *Barnabas*, concerning the Syrian-Asiatic origin of this document (see my article in J.-M. Sevrin [ed.], *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, Leuven 1989, 231-245). In the same work, Clement, moreover, mentioned the teaching of an anonymous "blessed presbyter" on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and cited a tradition of the ancient presbyters on the order of the gospels (on this matter, see the extensive and developed account offered by Eusebius of Caesarea, *HE* 6, 13,2.8-9 and 14,1-7). The presbyters were also mentioned in other texts of Clement (*Protr.* 113,1; *Ecl. proph.* 11,1; 27,1.4; 50,1; 56,2; *Adumbr. I Jo.* 1,1). It is difficult to decipher the placement and specific relationship of *Pantaenus within this group of presbyters. In any case, it seems groundless to think (Daniélou) that in all these texts Clement made reference to a tradition of Alexandrian presbyters—given that this tradition, if it ever existed, is enshrouded in complete darkness—and not to the better known tradition of presbyters in Asia Minor. If, on the contrary, one admits that anonymous writings such as the letter of ps.-*Barnabas and the *Letter to Diognetus* are not documents of Alexandrian Christianity, as is commonly thought, but must be credited to the tradition of apostolic presbyters in Asia Minor, it provides us the opportunity to acquire elements for an evaluation that undoubtedly will shed new light on the sources of Clement of Alexandria's theological formation.

In conclusion, it is helpful to remember that *Origen mentioned the special interpretation that "one of the presbyters" gave to the parable of the Good Samaritan found in *Luke (*Hom. Luc.* 34,3 on Lk 10:30-35): the man is *Adam; Jerusalem, paradise; Jericho, the world; the thieves, the hostile forces; the priest, the law; the Levite, the prophets; the Samaritan, Christ, etc. Because Irenaeus makes an offhand allusion to this peculiar interpretation (*Haer.* III, 17,3), it seems plausible to suggest that, once again, we find ourselves before the vestiges of the teaching of an apostolic presbyter from Asia Minor.

J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournai 1958; J. Munck, *Presbyters and Disciples of the Lord in Papias. Exegetic Comments on Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, III,39*: HTR 52 (1959) 223-243; W.C. Van Unnik, *Irenaeus en de Pax Romana*: Kerk en Vrede. Feestbundel voor Prof. J. De Graaf, Baarn 1976, 207-222; Id., *The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus' Works*, in *God's Christ and His People*. Studies in Honour of N.A. Dahl, Oslo 1977, 248-260; Ph. Bacq, *De l'Ancienne à la Nouvelle Alliance selon S. Irénée. Unité du Livre IV de l' 'Adversus haereses,'* Paris-Namur 1978; E.G. Jay, *From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters. Christian Ministry in the Second Century: A Survey*: Second Century 1 (1981) 125-162; G. Maier, *Die Johannesoffenbarung und die Kirche* (WUNT 25), Tübingen 1981; U.H.J. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (FRLANT 133), Göttingen 1983; P.F. Beatrice, *La lavanda dei piedi. Contributo alla storia delle antiche liturgie cristiane* (BEL-Subs. 28), Rome 1983, 33-58; U. Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte* (VChrS 4), Leiden 1989; P.F. Beatrice, *Der Presbyter des Irenäus, Polykarp von Smyrna und der Brief an Diognet*, in E. Romero Pose (ed.), *Pléroma. Salus Carnis*. Homenaje a A. Orbe, Santiago de Compostela 1990, 179-202; J.J. Ayán Calvo, *Ignacio de Antioquía. Cartas. Policarpo de Esmirna. Carta. Carta de la Iglesia de Esmirna a la Iglesia de Filomelio* (Fuentes Patrísticas 1), Madrid 1991; J. Ysebaert, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche. Eine lexikographische Untersuchung*, Breda 1994; A. Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo*, IV: *Traducción y Comentario del Libro IV del 'Adversus haereses'* (BAC maior 53), Madrid 1996; R.M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, London-New York 1997; U. Neymeyr, *Presbyteroi bei Clemens von Alexandrien*: SP 31 (1997) 493-496; F.W. Weidmann, *Polycarp and John. The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Traditions* (CJA 12), Notre Dame, IN 1999; P. Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament* (WUNT II/134), Tübingen 2002; P.F. Beatrice, *John 13,1-10 and Romans 13,1-7 in Irenaeus of Lyons. Two Test Cases for New Testament Textual Criticism*, in J.K. Elliott - C.B. Amphoux (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (Histoire du Texte Biblique 6), Lausanne 2003, 369-386.

P.F. Beatrice

PRESENTATION in the TEMPLE

I. Liturgy - II. Iconography.

I. Liturgy. The first mention of a liturgical commemoration of the Presentation in the temple was

given in *Jerusalem by *Egeria's *Peregrinatio*, where she referred to it with the title of *Quadragesima de Epiphania*, because it was set not for 2 February, in dependence on Epiphany, the day in which Christmas was celebrated among the Eastern Christians, but for the 14th of the same month. The feast was celebrated *cum summa laetitia ac si per Pascha* (SC 21, 36, p. 206). Egeria did not mention the candles carried during the procession. It was the Roman matron Ikalia, during the time of the emperor *Marcian (450–457), who received credit of suggesting this type of practice. This solemnity reached *Antioch from Jerusalem before the end of the 5th c. as a Marian feast for 2 February, as attested by *Severus of Antioch (*Hom.* 14 and 67: PO 38, 2; 8, 2). Subsequently, it received the name *hypapantē = occursus* (*Domini*), although an edict of *Justinian prescribed that it be celebrated as a feast even at *Constantinople (Theophanes, *Cronographia*: PG 108, 487-488). Following the example of the Eastern churches, even Rome accepted a Feast of the Presentation, placing it, however, of course on February 2nd. It was Pope *Sergius I (687–701) who introduced it along with the other three Marian feasts of the Annunciation, Assumption and Nativity (LP 1, p. 376). At Rome, as in the East, the feast of the Presentation was celebrated with great solemnity, even if marked by *penance, with a procession from the church of St. Adriano to the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, as attested by the 7th-c. *Ordo* XX (M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Âge*, III, Louvain 1951, 235), in which one does not find mention of the rite of the *blessing of the candles, which is only attested toward the end of the 9th or beginning of the 10th c. by some formulas added to the Padua Sacramentary (A. Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter*, Freiburg i. Br. 1896, 130). In the other churches of the West, the Feast of the Presentation in the Temple was introduced rather late. In *Spain, e.g., one does not find it before the 9th c.

II. *Iconography. The only depiction of the Presentation of the Temple that has come down to us is that of the *mosaic on the righthand side of the triumphal arch of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore at *Rome, completed during the pontificate of Pope *Sixtus III (432–440) (C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, 219, pls. 53-58). The scene occurred solemnly before a portico and concludes at the temple. Escorted by two *angels, *Mary, dressed in royal clothes and holding a statuary pose, comes forward holding the child in her arms. Alongside is *Joseph in the act of pointing them out to the prophetess Anna and the elderly Simeon, who draw near with utmost reverence with hands veiled by the pallium to receive the Child *in pallio suo*, as specified by ps.-Matthew (XV), who for the remainder adheres to Luke's *canonical narrative. Behind Simeon stands a puzzled group of Jewish priests and, at the bottom, four birds (two white and two dark), whose number recalls the offering made by Mary acc. to ps.-Matthew, who changed this detail of the canonical source.

One Presentation at the Temple was also among the themes depicted in the mosaics of the Toulouse La Daurade (5th-6th c.) of which we have only vague bits of information (H. Woodruff, *The Iconography and Date of the Mosaics of La Daurade*: The Art Bulletin 13 [1931] 80ff.). The same subject then appeared in the decoration of the church of St. Sergius at *Gaza (1st half of the 6th c.) (Coricio, *Laud. Marc.* 1,48: ed. Foerster p. 14).

P. Batiffol, *Études de liturgie et d'archéologie chrétienne*, Paris 1919, 193-21; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien. Étude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne*, Paris [5]1925, 287-288; G. Löw, *Purificazione*: EC 10, 341-345; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, II, Milan 1955, 90-95; Marienlexikon 2, 142-147; 3, 275-276. *On the iconography*: C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, 219-220; G.A. Wellen, *Theotokos. Eine ikonographische Abhandlung über das Gottesmutterbild in frühchristlicher Zeit*, Utrecht-Antwerpen 1961, 60-61; K. Wessel, *Darstellung Christi im Tempel*: RBK 1, 1134-1135; E. Lucchesi Palli, *Darbringung Jesu im Tempel*: LCI 1, 473-477; P. Testini, *Alle origini dell'iconografia di Giuseppe di Nazaret*: RivAC 48 (1972) 334; Marienlexikon 2, 142-147; 3, 275-276.

M. Marinone

PRIESTHOOD of BELIEVERS. The discussion on the priesthood of believers emerged and became a particularly debated question from the Reformation onward. In the context of an unequal church society (the thesis of Robert Bellarmine against the Protestants), the priesthood of believers should be understood, when it is taken into consideration, in clear distinction from the ministerial priesthood of the clergy, and therefore in a restricted sense to the laity. The development of the theology of the laity, which occurred from the end of World War II (1945), to indicate the difference between the priesthood of believers and the ministerial priesthood, led to the formulation of the priesthood *essentia et non gradu tantum*, offered by Pope Pius XII (*Acta Apost. Sedis* 46, 1954, 669). The formula, which has been subjected today to linguistic and contextual development (see Rassegna di teologia 1980, 409-412; 1981, 471-473), was adopted in the Second Vatican Council's document *Lumen gentium* (n. 11) and then ex-

plained in the document *Ratio fundamentalis institutionis sacerdotalis* (n. 3) from 1970. The theological framework of the expression "priesthood of believers" from the Reformation to today has generally reflected a concern, at least in hierarchical churches, of affirming not so much a superiority as a distinction with regard to the ministerial priesthood and that of the faithful; semantically, as soon as one speaks of the ordained ministry, the "priesthood of believers" is distinguished by speaking in terms and categories of "priesthood" and therefore not primarily of official ministry in the church.

Given this premise, which is useful for grasping the different conceptual framework relating to the Christian priesthood today and in Antiquity, we should indicate some hermeneutical keys in this regard. The scriptural texts used in the patristic age for the priesthood of Christians can be grouped into two classes: (1) those tied to human life, lived in the religious line of Jesus, in particular Jn 4:23 ("the true worshipers of the Father"); Rom 15:16 and Phil 2:17 (the apostolic life and the conversion to Jesus Christ as a *liturgy or worship offered to God); Rom 12:1 (the spiritual worship of offering oneself to God as a living sacrifice); (2) the passages of 1 Pet (2:4-10) and Rev (1:6; 5:10 and 20:6) on the Christian people bestowed with a royal priesthood (*regale sacerdotium*). The first series of texts is generally found in more apologetic contexts, in the discussions with the *Jews and *pagans, on the nature of religious life (in the Christian evaluation, Jewish worship was no longer accepted by God; pagan worship was limited to offerings of things and not of one's holy life). Christian worship is different; it is a new way of understanding religion. It is expressed in the holiness related to God and not mere ritual gestures or cultic offerings bereft of it. Explaining their worship as a new way of understanding the "religious" bond, Christians were referred to as "priests," even as the only true priests in all of humanity. This response also established the watermark of Christian apologetic literature before the attainment of religious freedom (*Galerius 311; *Licinius and *Constantine 313). One of *Tertullian's texts can be taken as the hermeneutical key for similar passages in his writings and those of other authors. "This," he writes in the *De oratione* (28,1-2), "is the spiritual offering that has abolished all the ancient sacrifices . . . it is written: 'the time will come when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth and such worshipers he seeks.' We are the true worshipers and the true priests because, by praying in the spirit, we offer our prayer to God in the spirit, as a sacrifice owed and acceptable to him. He has asked for this offering and directs his good pleasure toward this offering" (see also Min. Fel., *Octav.* 32; Cypr., *Or. dom.* 2; *Ep.* 77,3). In this regard, i.e., in the bond that exists between living and worship, Christians are considered "priests of peace" because they were opposed to the violence of the circus (Tertull., *Spect.* 16) and war (Orig., *C. Celsum* 5,33); they spoke of the "priesthood of widowhood" (Tertull., *Ad uxorem* 1,7) and the *virgin (Ambr., *De virginibus* 1,2,5-8), and the priesthood of martyrdom as a testimony to Christ (Cypr., *Ep.* 77,3).

The second series of texts pertaining to the *regale sacerdotium* presents a double context: a sacramental context, esp. baptismal; and sometimes that of protest against the hierarchical ministry, which seemed to reserve exclusively for itself the title of "priesthood."

The NT expression derives from the Septuagint version of Ex 19:6, *regale sacerdotium*, which in the original Hebrew has the phrase *regnum sacerdotum* applied to the entire Jewish nation in the sense that one day it would be "a kingdom of priests." In the NT, those baptized in the name of Christ are referred to as the fulfillment of the ancient promise: Christians are all kings and priests. The sacred, in Antiquity, constituted the place of access for a meeting mediated by a priest, who was precisely the man of separation and mediation with the divine. Christians are identified as the ones who directly approach God without need of further mediation. In this sense, they are priests marked by a *regale sacerdotium*. The baptismal context esp. emphasized this aspect. This was in fact seen as a "consecration to God" (Just., 1 *Apol.* 61) that carried within itself the anointing of the Spirit, which anointing, in the line of the anointing of Christ, permitted one to draw near to God as a priest (Tertull., *Bapt.* 7; Iren., *Haer.* 4,8,3; 4,18,2; *Ephrem, *In festum Epiphaniae*, hym. 3; Ambr., *Myst.* 6,30; *In ps. 118*, 6,34; Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 26,11; *Leo I, *Ser.* 4,1). In the semantic context of this meaning, the Alexandrian School developed the concept of the priesthood of the righteous which will reach its perfection after the resurrection. Because the priesthood signifies being close to God, it is tied to the holiness of the subject and will be perfected in the kingdom of heaven (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6,8,107; Orig., *In ps.* 38; *Hom.* 1,1; *Exhort. ad mart.* 30 and 39; *In Num. hom.* 10,2; Ruf., *De ben. patriarch.* 2-3; Cyril Alex., *De ador. in spir. et verit.* 9, etc.). In the same context, *Augustine defined the term "*sacrifice" as "the work that puts us in holy communion with God" (*Civ. Dei* 10,5).

Naturally, all this emphasized the connection of the priesthood with Christ's priesthood, which in

the eucharistic offering, in addition to the holiness of his own life, attained one of its chief actualizations (Iren., *Haer.* 4,18,1ff.; Cyril Alex., *De ador. in spir. et verit.* 12 and 16; Ambr., *Sacr.* 4,1; *In ps.* 118, prol. 2; *In Lc. ev.* 8,52; Aug., *Serm.* 82,5). The application of the concept of sacerdotal dignity to all Christians, in the light of Christ (the anointed one), was also an apologetic response to the pagan mediations with the divinity proposed at the beginning of the mystery religions (although only in Christ is such a mediation possible) and Greek *philosophy, which considered God completely inaccessible (in Christ, however, every person is offered the opportunity to draw near to God). In the context of the priesthood, understood as the possibility of relating to God through the mediation of Jesus Christ, Christian antiquity knew a diversity of ministries that, on the concrete level, reflected the hierarchical structure of the church, esp. the triadic structure of deacon-presbyter-bishop. At the time of Augustine, all Christians were already well structured into three groups: the clergy, the virgins and *continentes*, and the faithful—a precursor to the later *ordo clericalis et laicalis*, "clerical and *lay order" from *Gratian's legislation (*Decr.* IV, q. 1, c. 2).

Although the first Christian generation did not know the distinction between the heads of the communities and the others on account of a different priesthood, the movement was in this direction esp. in the West. With *Clement of Rome (1st c.), in his intervention at the church of *Corinth, which sought to defrock its presbyters, one finds in the juxtaposition between *episkopē* and the priesthood, a juxtaposition that was foreign to the classic and biblical use of the term. Clement was the first to interpret the ministry of those at the head of the Christian community along the Jewish-sacerdotal lines of the OT (the priesthood of Aaron) (*1 Clem.* 43-44), even introducing for the first time the distinction between clergy and laity. *Tertullian the *Montanist objected to this position because, for him, the heads of the community are not to be identified with the "spiritual men" (the only ones endowed with true authority) and moreover because, with respect to them, one must start from the general notion of church and not from general sacral distinctions (*De exhort. cast.* 7; *De pudic.* 21). Nevertheless, in the *De praescriptione* (41), a work from his Catholic period, he had stigmatized as heretical the practice of the primacy of spiritual men, a solution that he later proposed as a Montanist.

Various factors contributed to the ever more emphasized distinction between the common and ministerial priesthood and the interpreting of the latter in sacerdotal categories: the application of the Old Testament title of "shepherd" (Ez 34) from Yahweh to Christ and from him to the heads of the community, in the pattern of the Aaronic priesthood (*1 Clem.* 43-44); the "sacral" character enjoyed by community leaders in ancient society, in particular in the Roman community which was heavily institutionalized (which explains sociologically—after the attainment of the Constantinian peace—the many transformations and identifications with the one who remained at the "head" in Latin Christianity); and even more the equation of the ecclesial ministers with civil dignities, that occurred with *Constantine, which also led to the assimilation of the insignia of court dress into public assemblies, esp. into liturgical ones.

In conclusion, in an investigation on the priesthood of believers and the testimonies of the patristic period (1st-6th c.), the point of departure of a priesthood common to all Christians remains in the line of the religious relationship with Jesus Christ, who, by reaching the goal of the orders (drawing near to God), transcends any order of concrete ministers. However transforming these ministries may be, they do not exceed their functional ministerial character.

B. Botte, *Secundi meriti munus*: QLP 21 (1936) 84-88; L. Cerfaux, *Regale Sacerdotium*: RSPh 28 (1939) 5-39; P. Dabin, *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne*, Paris 1950 (Western authors 71-168; Eastern authors 509-577); J. Lécuyer, *Le sacerdoce royal des chrétiens selon saint Hilaire de Poitiers*: AnTh (1949) 302-325; Id., *Essai sur le sacerdoce des fidèles chez les Pères*: La MaisonD 27 (1951) 7-50; G. Folliet, *Les trois catègories des chrétiens*: AugM II, Paris 1955, 631-644; J. Pintard, *Le sacerdoce selon s. Augustin. Le prêtre dans la Cité de Dieu*, Paris 1960; L. Ryan, *Patristic Teaching on the Priesthood of the Faithful*: The Irish Theol. Quarterly 29 (1962) 25-51; R. Jacob, *Le martyr, épanouissement du sacerdoce chrétien dans la littérature patristique jusqu'en 238*: MSR 24 (1967) 57-83, 153-172; A. Quacquarelli, *L'epiteto sacerdote (iereus) ai cristiani in Giustino martire (Dial. 116,3)*: VetChr 7 (1970) 5-19; G. Otranto, *Nonne et laici sumus? (Exh. cast. 7,3)*: VetChr 8 (1971) 27-47; M. Jourjon, *Remarques sur le vocabulaire sacerdotal de la 1 Clementis. Epektasis (Mél. J. Daniélou)*, Paris 1972, 107-110; M. Bévenot, *Tertullian's Thoughts About tbe Christian "Priesthood." Corona Gratiarum (Mél. E. Dekkers)*, I, Brugge 1975, 125-137.

V. Grossi

PRIMASIUS of Hadrumetum (6th c.). The bishop of *Hadrumetum (*Africa) between 550 and 560, he was one of the few Africans who favored the condemnation of the *Three Chapters. He left us a *Commentary on the *Apocalypse*; in it he says that he used the writings of *Augustine and *Tyconius. He purged, however, the latter's commentary of its anti-*Catholic aspects. Tyconius's influence is very heavy in the allegorizing interpretation that tends to find

in the prophetic text reference to the history of the church not only of the last days, but also from the very beginning, in such a way as to remove the book's eschatological tension. The anti-Roman aspects of John's work are completely removed.

Moricca III, 2, 1485-1487; CPL 873; PL 68, 793-936; A.W. Adams, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*: CCL 92 (1985); K.B. Steinhauser, *The Apocalypse Commentary of Tyconius. A History of Its Reception and Influence*, Frankfurt 1987, 69-88; Patrologia IV, 44-46.

M. Simonetti

PRIMIAN of Carthage. *Donatist bishop of Carthage (ca. 392–412). He was a violent and intransigent man; he represented the perspective of the people of *Carthage and *Numidia. Primian was only recently ordained (*recens ordinatus*) when he became the primate of the Donatist church (Aug., *Serm. 2 in Ps. 36*, 20). He was opposed by the Donatist clergy of Carthage under the deacon *Maximian (a descendant of *Donatus of Carthage). The *schism erupted in the Donatist church toward the end of 392, and Primian was condemned for his tyrannical actions, first by a council of 43 bishops gathered at Carthage, then on 24 June 393, by a council of 100 bishops at Cebarsussa, presided over by the Donatist primate of Byzacena, Victorinus of Munatiana (Aug., ibid.; and *C. Cresconium* II, 6,7). Primian retaliated: on 24 April 394, he was absolved by a council of 310 bishops primarily from Numidia and *Mauritania, gathered at Bagai, in S Numidia. The Maximianists were in turn condemned (*C. Cresconium* III, 15,18; 16,19; 19,22; 56,62; IV, 4,5; 10,12; 28,35; 31,38; 38,45; 39,46). Between 395 and 397, Primian began a series of legal trials before the proconsul of Africa and the city magistrates of Carthage to obtain possession of the landholdings then held by the Maximianist bishops (*C. Cresconium* III, 59,65; IV, 47,57). A tenacious supporter of *Optatus of Thamugadi, he participated at the yearly celebrations in commemoration of this individual (Aug., *Ep.* 108,2,5). In September 403, he disdainfully rejected an invitation from the representatives of the Catholic Church to discuss matters and bring the schism to an end (Aug., *Ad Donatistas post Collationem* I, 31,53). He then sought to discredit *Augustine by accusing him of crypto-*Manicheism on the basis of his shady past (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps. 36*, *Serm.* 3). At the conference of Carthage (411), Primian led the Donatist delegation but spoke infrequently. Although he must have been deposed immediately following the proscription of the Donatist church in 412 (CTh 16, 5, 52), nothing more is known about his later life.

Monceaux VI, 157ff. (severe judgment); W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford [2]1971, ch. 15; PCBE, 1, 905-913; P. Langa, *Primiano y el concilio de Bagai* and *El argumento del número en la Conferencia de Cartago*, in *Notas complementarias*, BAC 32, Madrid 1988, 887-888, 924-925.

W.H.C. Frend

PRIMICERIUS. Title (*primus in cera*, that is to say, on the *tabula cerata*) given in the Late Roman Empire to individuals who held a wide range of very different obligations and offices such as the *primicerius sacri cubiculi*, the *primicerius notariorum* or by other *officia* in the imperial chancery. In particular, the *comites sacrarum largitionum* (ministers of imperial finances: the titles in the primary sources present many variants) had a general *primicerius* for their orders and some particular *primicerii* for each one of the various *scrinia* (offices). A similar organization also existed in other *officia*, for some of which a *secundocerius* and a *tertiocerius* are also mentioned (cf. CTh VI, 24,7ff.; CJ I, 27; XII, 7.28; CIL 13, 2385; Cassiod., *Var.* XI, 25 and 30-32: MGH, *Auct. ant.* 12,346ff.). The title is also used in the ecclesiastical milieu to refer to various offices: *primicerius scholae*, *primicerius defensorum*, etc. *Isidore of Seville described the office of the primicerius of lower ecclesiastical ministers (*Ep.* 1,3: PL 83, 896). The *primicerius notariorum*, head of the secretariat, was particularly important in the large churches (cf. Diehl 1287; 3768; Council of *Ephesus: ACO I, I, 2 p. 7; Mansi 7, 377; Nilus, *Ep.* 2,238: PG 79, 321B; Evagr., *HE* 11,18: PG 86, 2560A; Anast. Apocr., *Acta S. Max.* 3: PG 90, 113D; Eugippius, *Vita Sev.* 46: CSEL 9, 2, p. 66; Greg. Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2,37). The primicerius of the *notarii* of the Roman Church fulfilled an important role in the life of the community (cf. PL 68, 55; Roman Council of 649: Mansi 10, 891; *Ordo Rom.* I, ed. Andrieu II, p. 70; *Liber diurnus*, passim).

DACL 14, 1171-1181; DAGR 4, 647; EC 10, 20-22; Lampe, s.v.; Niermeyer, 2002, vol. 2, 1105-1106.

M. Forlin Patrucco

PRINCIPIA DIALECTICAE. Placed by the *Maurists among his spurious works, scholars today attribute the *Principia dialecticae* to *Augustine (H.I. Marrou, 466; J. Pépin, 9). To justify the reattribution of the work to Augustine, they appeal to various internal and external factors of this text. First and foremost, if it is true that in Antiquity *grammatici* were accustomed to signing their works by inserting their own name within such books, Augustine himself—in whose scholastic *curriculum grammatica*

occupied a large place, remaining among other things a *grammaticus* in his exegetical method for his whole life (*De doctr. Christ.* III, 29,40; and passim I-III)—placed his signature on the *Principia*, in a chapter dedicated to the *power of words*: "the word incites the meaning not according to itself, but according to what it signifies, . . . as in the case when, the name Augustine is uttered, I alone am the one who is thought by the one to whom I am known" (ch. 7, tr. Bettetini, 199). Moreover, within the document, one finds some illustrations that, with surprising precision, one finds in his subsequent writings (*Temetum*, as an example of an *obscurum*, at ch. 8 and in the *De Trin.* X, 1,2; *pone*, verb and adverb, as an example of an *aequivocum*, at ch. 10 and in *De mus.* I, 1,1), there are also frequent references to the works written before the *Principia* (M. Bettetini). On the other hand, Augustine himself stated that, during his stay at Cassiciacum, he wrote, with the objective of attaining and helping his companions attain *per corporalia ad incorporalia*, some "principia" on all five of the *artes liberales*, i.e., dialectic, *rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic and philosophy—"principia" which then disappeared from his library, but which he was certain were in the good care of someone (*Retr.* I, 5,6). As a last confirmation, *Possidius listed among the works of the first period of Augustine's literary works five books, understood as *liberarum principia*, "*id est de dialectica, de retorica, de geometria, de aritmetica, de philosophia*" (*Indicul.* 10,5).

From Augustine and Possidius's allusions, which insert the *Principia dialecticae* (or it would be better to call this treatise the *De dialectica*, as maintained by the *Retr.* I, 5,6) within a group with four other treatises all bearing a similar type of name, one could theorize that the term *Principia* should be understood in the sense of "the first elements of dialectic," rather than "beginnings" of dialectic, because it would hardly be the case that he would write five different "beginnings," left then as such (contra: Bettetini, 14; 175). The five *Principia* would have then been the notes of Augustine's Milanese lectures on the liberal arts, which were then preserved by one of his student-followers (L.F. Pizzolato, 22).

A work exclusively technical in nature, but of great interest, Augustine therefore treated dialectic, by defining it, acc. to the *Stoic understanding, as the "science of arguing correctly," by means of simple and complex words, or combined among each other, subject to truth or falsehood and therefore affirmed or denied, then developed into propositions (*sententiae*), from the connection of which one arrives to the conclusion (*Principia dialecticae* chs. I-II). In the following chapters of the work, Augustine limited himself, however, to explaining only simple words, and nevertheless within the structure emerges a brief treatise on the science of the word, which finds its center in ch. 5, where the word is studied as "a sign of anything that, brought forth from the one who speaks, can be understood by the one who hears." The word then is presented acc. to the arguments of dialectic at various levels: *verbum*, i.e., the word itself subject to discussion; *dicibile* ("that which by the word is understood and contained in the mind"); *dictio* ("the word itself and that which comes into the mind by means of the word"); and *res* ("the thing itself" signified by the word). Distancing himself from the position of the Stoics, Augustine introduced a change to the term *dictio*, because, in distinction to what those philosophers thought, *dictio* is the bearer of meaning, although *dictio* itself still remains incomplete. In particular, Augustine rejected the theory of a relationship of equivalence between linguistic expression and content, maintained on the analogy between reality and language. Unifying the theory of language with that of signs, in essence, Augustine denied both the relationship of implication between the word and the reality signified by the word (acc. to the Stoics, by the sign, by the sole fact of existing, one could get back to the *res*) and the relationship of equivalence. Indeed, *dictio* is given to the union of signifier and signified in the individual word, which thus becomes a sign of something else. In this manner, he diverges from the Stoics even on the necessity of investigating the origin of words, a question that, in ch. VI, proves itself to be entirely useless. What counts, however, is the analysis of the *power of the word*, which is treated in ch. VII, where Augustine presents the word as a sign, therefore subjected to the very limits that, as a sign, it bears in relation to truth, namely, obscurity (ch. VIII), ambiguity and equivocity (IX-X).

Thanks to the linguistic innovation on *dictio*, Augustine rediscovered the Platonic opposition between words and things and therefore the mode of understanding the noun as hiding something not immediately perceptible, i.e., the essence of the thing, thanks to the correspondence between language and the structure of reality (*Cratilo* 424A-425B; 391B-396D; 427D-435D), with the difference that, while for Plato the noun reveals the thing through the iconic relationship that it initiated among these, for Augustine the noun is instead a sign of the thing. By the word's becoming a sign, however, the understanding of words in turn implies the understanding and the existence of the *res*, of which the words are signs. The *Principia dialecti-*

cae thus constitutes a valid and sufficient introduction to the *De Magistro*, in which Augustine would treat in more detail the question of the relationship between *res* and *verbum* and in general the informative value of language.

At the time of the composition of the *Principia dialecticae*, Augustine nourished a great trust in dialectic as *disciplina disciplinarum* (*De ord.* II, 13,38), capable of leading *ratio* to truth, because he was convinced that the Word delivered the human intellect to the point that it could by itself arrive at the enjoyment of God, with the help of a good educative plan built on the *disciplinae liberarum*. Later, in the *Confessiones*, with a certain detachment, he would speak, however, of these as the "so-called liberal" arts (IV, 1,1). Lastly, in the *Civ. Dei* , he would decide to simply call them *saeculares* (VI, 2), inasmuch as only *Dei gratia* liberates one (*Ep.* 101,2).

Nevertheless, during his entire theological activity, he never renounced the use of *dialectica*, considering it, however, a simple instrument for logically deducing the consequences from the given premises, because, among other things, even the *apostles and Jesus himself used it (*C. Cresc.* I, 12,15-20,25; J. Pépin, 141-148). In 397, moreover, he had fully incorporated it into the plan of studies listed in the *De doctrina Christiana* (I-III), "a technical manual" of Christian exegesis and education, but also a *summa theologica* (G. Lettieri, 24-83), then completed between 426–427, by treating it as a human instrument necessary for a correct hermeneutic of the sacred *Scriptures and intrinsically and theologically connecting it to rhetoric (IV) for better persuading others of the truth found in them (L.F. Pizzolato, 29-55).

PL 32, 1409-1420; W. Crecelius, *S. Aurelii Augustini de dialectica liber*, Eberfeldae 1857; M. Baldassarri, *Aurelio Agostino, I principi della dialettica*, Como 1985; B. Darrel Jackson, *De Dialectica*, Dordrecht-Boston 1975; M. Bettetini, *Aurelio Agostino. Il maestro e la parola*, Milan 1993; H. Ruef, *Augustin über Semiotik und Sprache. Sprachtheoretische Analysen zu Augustins Schrift "De Dialectica," mit deutschen Übersetzung*, Bern 1981; F. Castañeda (Intr. y estudio complementario), *Agustín de Hipona. Principios de Dialéctica. Edición bilingüe*, Bogotá 2003. *Dialéctica. Edición bilingüe*, Bogotá 2003.

Studies: J. Pinborg, *Das Sprachdenken der Stoa und Augustin Dialectik*: Classica Mediaevalia 23 (1962) 148-177; J. Pépin, *Saint Augustin et la dialectique*, Villanova 1976; H.I. Marrou, *S. Agostino e la fine della cultura antica*, Milan 1987 (It. ed.); L.F. Pizzolato, *Capitoli di retorica agostiniana*, Rome 1994; N. Cipriani, *Sulla fonte varroniana delle discipline liberali del* De Ordine *di s. Agostino*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 203-224; G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino*, Brescia 2001.

V. Lombino

PRISCA, saint. The Gregorian *Sacramentary (and the *martyrologies that depended on it) commemorate the *beatae Priscae martyris tuae natalicia* (ed. Lietzmann, Münster [3]1967, 19). The itineraries of the 8th c. transmitted the claim that in the cemetery of Priscilla, on the Via Salaria, lay the tomb of *Prisca martyr*. Even the Roman martyrology records that 18 January was the *dies natalis* (*birthday) of the martyr Prisca.

Certainly starting from the 5th c., there existed a church of the *titulus Priscae*. Two inscriptions attest to it (ICUR 2, 5153; 5160); one, preserved in the museum of the basilica of St. *Paul, from the 5th c., commemorates an *Adeodatus presb. tit. Priscae*; a second, *Aurelius tit. Priscae* by a cemetery on the Via Appia (Krautheimer, p. 264). The presbyter *Dominicus* was present at the Roman Council of 499 (MGH, *AA* 12, 413). A certain *Maurus presbyter tituli Sanctae Priscae* (MGH, *Epist.* 1, 367) was present at the synod of 595. Moreover, the title of *sancta* was given to the foundress Prisca, as had occurred in similar situations. The early Christian church was built on more ancient edifices and on a Mithraeum from ca. 135 and also reused earlier walls, as in the case of the end of the aisle on the righthand side. Pope Hadrian (773–795) reconstructed the roof of the church of *beatae Priscae* (LP 1, p. 501, cf. 517); in the account for Pope *Leo (795–816) given by the **Liber pontificalis*, mention is made of the basilica *beatae Priscae* (LP 2, 4), *titulus sanctae Priscae* (LP 2,24, cf. pp. 42-43) and also of blessed *Aquile et Priscae* (LP 2,20; so too on an inscription of the 11th-12th c.). Here one sees a process of identification between the foundress of the homonymous church and the wife of Aquila, mentioned by St. Paul: "Greet Prisca and Aquila, my fellow workers in Jesus Christ, who risked their lives for my life, to whom not only I but also all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks" (Rom 16:3; cf. 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Tim 4:19; Acts 18:2, 18). In 1776, the remains of an oratory were found, dating back to the 4th c., near the modern-day church of St. Prisca (Krautheimer, p. 264). The early Christian church was restored from top to bottom by Pope Callistus III (1455).

Lastly, a *Passio Sanctae Priscae* (from the 7th c.?) has survived. Fanciful and untrustworthy, this account speaks of the martyr (BHL II, 6926) and the place of burial (*in ecclesia sanctorum Aquilae et Priscae*). This *Passio*, acc. to Franchi de' Cavalieri, contains traces of heavy dependence on the records of the deeds of Martina (1 January; BHL 5587), and this in turn bears traces of dependence on those of Tatiana (12 January; BHG 1699). Prisca, daughter of a consul, during the time of the emperor *Claudius

(41-54), was beheaded on the hundredth mile of the Via Ostiense and was buried by the pope reigning at that time, whose name is left unstated, who had hid himself for fear of *persecution. A church was built on the place of burial, and the faithful prayed there night and day. Pope *Eleutherus (ca. 174–189) (in other versions one finds the name "Eutychian" [278-282]) along with the people brought the relics into the titular church of Aquila and Prisca on the Aventine Hill. The evolution of the legend of Prisca first led to the identification of the foundress of the church with the martyr Prisca, which in turn was confused with the Prisca (*Priscilla) mentioned by St. Paul, and lastly, someone wrote an imaginary *passio* based on another equally untrustworthy account.

BHL II, 6926; *AASS Ianuarii*, II, Venice 1734, 183-188; G.B. de Rossi - L. Duchesne, *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (*AASS* Novembris 2, 1), 1894, 47; *Martyrologium Romanum, Acta SS, Prop. Dec.*, ed. H. Delehaye, Brussels 1940, 26; LTK^3 8, 598; EC 10, 36; BS 10, 1112-1113; BBKL 7, 956; G.B. de Rossi, *Della casa d'Aquila e Prisca sull'Aventino*: Bull. Arch. Cristiana 5 (1887) 44ff.; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *S. Martina*: RQA 17 (1903) 222-236, esp. 232-235 (= *Scritti agiografici*, Vatican City 1962, II, [58-62]); J.P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum*, Paderborn 1918, 101-104; F. Lanzoni, *I titoli presbiterali di Roma antica nella storia e nella leggenda*: RivAC 2 (1925) 247-250; M.J. Vermaseren - C.C. van Essen, *The Excavations in the Mithraeum of the Church of Santa Prisca in Rome*, Leiden 1965; R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, III, Vatican City 1971; E.M. Steinby, *Lexikon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, IV, Rome 1999, 162-163; A. Lombardi, *La Chiesa di Santa Prisca e il suo mitreo*, Rome 2000.

A. Di Berardino

PRISCIAN. A (Christian) Latin grammarian. From what little is known of his life, scholars believe that he was born at *Caesarea in Mauritania, but that he lived most of his life at *Byzantium during the reign of the emperor *Anastasius (491–518). In the manner of *Pliny, the author of the *Panegyric to *Trajan*, Priscian desired to praise the emperor Anastasius's deeds in a *panegyric of a little more than 300 verses, a work lacking any true originality. His translation in verses of the Greek author Dionysius Periegete's geographical poem (*Periegesis of the Earth*) was also mediocre. But Priscian was primarily tied to his work as a grammarian: he was the author of the *Institutio de arte grammatica*, a work known and studied throughout the entire Middle Ages. Of its 18 books, the first 16 (*Priscianus maior*) articulate the principles and rules of Latin grammar; the last two (*Priscianus minor*), its syntax. Unfortunately, this work came to an abrupt conclusion; it is not known if this was intentional or perhaps caused by the loss of some subsequent book(s). Though recognizing the superiority of the Greeks, Priscian succeeded in offering a rather organic and comprehensive work of the entire traditional art of the Latin language. Moreover, he knew how to adorn the theoretical rules with an abundance of citations from now-lost Latin authors. In particular, in the work *De metris fabularum Terentii*, he knew how to organize the natural characteristics of the ancient comedians, who had by then been almost forgotten.

CPL 1546-1554. For the *Institutiones* and other minor works, M. Hertz, in H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vols. II and III, Leipzig, 1855-1923. For the *Carmen in laudem Anastasii imp.*, see E. Baehrens, *Poetae latini minores*, V, Leipzig 1883, 264-274. For the *Periegesis*, P. van de Woestijne, Bruges 1953. *Studies*: Schanz IV/2, 221-238; PWK 44 (1054) 2328-2346; KLP 4, 1141-1142; G. Mazzini, *Il codice vat. 3313 di Prisciano*: ALMA 1 (1924) 213-222; 2 (1925) 5-14; M. Passalacqua, *I codici di Prisciano*, Rome 1978; G. Ballaira, *Per il catalogo dei concili di Prisciano*, Turin 1982; G. da Cingoli, *Quaestiones supra Prisciano Minori*, ed. R. Martorelli Vico, Pisa 1985; G. Ballaira, *Prisciano e i suoi amici*, Turin 1989; Id., *Osservazioni sulla Praefatio del De laude Anastasii imperatoris di Prisciano di Cesarea*, Turin 1994; Id., *Concordantiae in Prisciani Panegyricum*, Turin 2000.

L. Dattrino

PRISCILLA. Countless legends arose around Priscilla in ancient and modern times. Hagiographers have made her out to be the mother of the Senator *Pudens, the grandmother of *Praxedis and Pudentiana, and the guest of the apostle *Peter in a villa located on the Via Salaria, under which a homonymous catacomb was later excavated. Then, under the leadership of G.B. de Rossi, archaeologists intervened and placed all these different historical figures, as well as even Aquila and *Prisca or Priscilla (Acts 18:2-4; Rom 16:3; 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Tim 4:19), into the family of the *Acilii Glabriones*; Orazio Marucchi went so far as to identify the pool of the catacomb in which Peter performed baptisms. All of this is nothing more than another novel that has no more historical value than a hagiographical tale. The only certain information is that the name "Priscilla" appears many times on inscriptions (DACL 6, 1264-1266), and that one must distinguish at least three women who had this name: Vera Priscilla, M. *Acilius Glabrio; Plaria Vera Priscilla, her daughter-in-law; Priscilla, the wife of a certain M. Acilius V; and so on. One can safely conclude that one of the nuclei of the homonymous catacomb undoubtedly owes its existence to them. Priscilla has nothing to do with the titular church of St. *Prisca.

BS 10, 1113-1114; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 66-67; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane*, Rome ^{2}1999, 130-137.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PRISCILLIAN – PRISCILLIANISM. Priscillian, a high-ranking and talented *layman, around 370–375 began to preach in *Spain a very rigid ascetical teaching, which enjoyed great success, but drew opposition from bishops *Hydatius of *Mérida and *Ithacius of Ossonuba. In 380, a council gathered at *Saragossa and condemned Priscillian's ideas, but without taking any action against individuals. At that time, bishops *Instantius and Salvian, to increase the authority of Priscillian's preaching, consecrated him bishop of Avila. In the meantime, Hydatius and Ithacius obtained a decree from the emperor *Gratian against the *Manicheans, using terms that would also include the Priscillianists. By that point, Priscillian had extended his preaching activity to S *Gaul, where he was able to win to his group a wealthy woman named Eucrotia. He then crossed over to *Italy to seek *Ambrose and *Damasus's support, all to no success; but he was able to obtain the abrogation of Gratian's decree. After the latter had been killed, Ithacius accused Priscillian, at *Trier, before the usurper *Maximus, who then deferred the case of Priscillian and Instantius to a church council gathered at *Bordeaux (384). Instantius was deposed; Priscillian did not show up but appealed directly to Maximus. Hydatius and Ithacius also went to Trier and were so persuasive before Maximus that they were able to obtain Priscillian's condemnation, despite the opposing efforts of *Martin of Tours. Priscillian and Eucrotia were beheaded on charges of black *magic; Instantius and others were exiled. This was the first time that a *heretic had been condemned to death as such. This execution engendered much displeasure: even *Ambrose, who refused to support Priscillian, vociferously protested his execution. In reaction, Ithacius was deposed; Hydatius resigned by his own choice. After Priscillian had been crowned with the wreath of martyrdom, his movement was active primarily in N Spain for most of the 5th c.

Because *multa opuscula* written by Priscillian were lost (Jer., *Vir. ill.* 121), until the end of the 19th century Priscillian's teaching was reconstructed on the basis of the writing of his opponents and the decrees of Spanish councils, who presented it as *gnostic and *Encratite: a distinction between the God of the OT and the NT, the divine nature of the *soul, the unreal humanity of Christ, the condemnation of *marriage, the use of magical and *astrological practices. In 1889, the publication of a corpus of Priscillianist writings contained in a MS from Würzburg misled those who were awaiting a decisive answer on the matter because these documents, with the exception of a few treatises, were entirely orthodox. In effect, it was a dossier of texts collected for apologetic purposes, and it therefore avoided treating the most characteristic themes of the movement. Although for a long time the possibility that such texts were a direct work of Priscillian was rejected, this thesis has now obtained a noteworthy consensus among scholars. The *Liber apologeticus* and the *Liber ad Damasum* condemn various *heresies and astrological teachings. The *Liber de fide et apocryphis* maintains that not all inspired books are contained within the *canon of Scripture, so that one should not indiscriminately reject all the *apocryphal texts only because the heretics have interpolated them with their errors. These books should be read, although with due caution. The divine spirit is not confined only to the canonical books, because where Christ is there is freedom. Eight other treatises are homiletical and liturgical: the *homilies treat episodes of the OT, acc. to the traditional, typological reference to Christ and the church. They were joined to the dossier to refute the accusation of rejecting this part of Holy *Scripture, as did the *gnostics and *Manicheans. Apart from this, Priscillian's *Canones epistularum Pauli apostoli* have survived to our day, a florelegium of 90 propositions extracted from the Pauline Epistles.

Nothing has remained of the Priscillianist writers mentioned by Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 122; 123) or others: *Latronianus, *Tiberianus and *Asarbus. G. Morin published, in 1913, an anonymous treatise titled *De Trinitate fidei catholicae*, perhaps to be attributed to Priscillian himself, almost certainly from a Priscillianist milieu: the document presents an archaizing trinitarian doctrine, leaning toward *monarchianism, confirming an accusation leveled already by *Orosius against the Priscillianists. With respect to the fundamental themes of their preaching, we cannot say more than that it was a rigorous Encratism that used a negative understanding of the material world, with, perhaps, astrological influences.

CPL 785-796; CSEL 18; PLS 2, 1389-1542; Patrologia III, 126-131 (bibl.); BBKL 7, 952-955; A. Orbe, *Doctrina trinitaria del anónimo priscilianista De Trinitate fidei catholicae*: Gregorianum 49 (1968) 510-562; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, Oxford 1976; J. Fontaine, *Panorama espiritual del Occidente peninsular en los siglos IV y V*, in *Primera Reunión gallega de estudios clásicos* (Pontevedra 2-4 julio 1979), Santiago de Compostela 1981, 185-209; J.M. Blázquez Martínez, *Prisciliano introductor del ascetismo en Gallaecia*: ibid., 210-236; A.B.J.M. Goosen, *Algunas observaciones sobre la pneumatología de Prisciliano*: ibid., 237-242; Domínguez del Val, I, 440-581; M. Veronese, *Le citazioni del* De Trinitate *di Ilario nella raccolta attribuita a Prisciliano*: VetChr 40 (2003) 133-157.

M. Simonetti

PRISCUS, historian (5th c.). Born at Panium (*Thrace); orator, historian and imperial officer. In 449 he accompanied Count Maximus before *Attila at *Rome in 450 and in 451/452 in *Arabia and *Egypt. According to *Sudas, Priscus published letters and speeches—all lost—and books on history in Greek, many fragments of which have been preserved in later works, primarily in Constantine Porphyrogennetos's *De legationibus* and in many other authors (*John of Antioch, *Jordanes, *Eustathius of Epiphania, etc.). His writing style is classical, following the example of Thucydides and Herodotus, and it avoids technical Latin terminology. It is not clear whether he was Christian or *pagan. His narratives began perhaps at 425 continuing the work of Olympiodorus (Girotti), or alternatively from 433/434 (Blockey) and extended until 472, with some extensive treatments on the preceding period. Priscus wrote his work during the time of the emperor Zeno (474–491). In many fragments, he speaks primarily of overseas politics—little of internal affairs and military strategy—and the emperors' political actions toward many peoples who invaded the empire, concerning whom he provides precious bits of information, esp. the *Huns. He was very critical toward the political actions taken by the emperor *Theodosius II, whom he presented as weak and a victim of court eunuchs, esp. the detestable Chrisaphius. Reluctant to go to war, Theodosius II bought peace from the Huns by paying increasingly burdensome tributes in attempts to avoid war. The emperor's cowardice was dangerous for the fate of the empire; the political action taken by his successor *Marcian was better. Priscus did not pay much attention to the events that occurred in the West. When he did, he only focused partially on those that occurred in *Italy and *Africa. He praised the general Aetius and heavily criticized his murder by *Valentinian III.

FHG 4, 69-110; 5, 24-26; PLRE II, 906; NP 10, 343; F. Bornmann, *Osservazioni sul testo dei frammenti di Prisco*: Maia 26 (1974) 111-120; E.V. Maltese, *A proposito dell'opera storica di Prisco di Panion*: Quaderni di Storia 5 (1979) 297-320; B. Baldwin, *Priscus of Panium*: Byzantion 50 (1980) 18-61 (= *Studies on Late Roman and Byzantine History, Literature and Language*, Amsterdam 1984, 255-298); R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicizing Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, Liverpool 1981, I, 48-70; III, 221-400 (with original text and Eng. tr.); G. Zecchini, *Aezio. L'ultima difesa dell'Occidente romano*, Milan 1983; C. Zuckerman, *L'Empire d'Orient et les Huns. Notes sur Priscus*: Travaux et Mémoires 12 (1994) 159-182; U. Roberto, *Prisco e una fonte romana del V secolo*: Romanobarbarica 17 (2000–2002) 117-159; B. Girotti, *Per una descrizione dell'opera di Prisco di Panion*: Rivista Storica dell'antichità 33 (2003) 243-246.

A. Di Berardino

PRIVATUS. Bishop of Mende (Gabali), martyr. *Gregory of Tours stated that, because he refused to sacrifice to the gods, Privatus was martyred by the Alamanni, led by their King Crocus (4th c.-beginning of the 5th?). A church was built on the site of his tomb. The *Mart. hier.* places Privatus on August 21. The cult of Privatus was already alive during Gregory's period (*Hist. Franc.* 1,34; 6,37; 10,29). The relics were transferred to the Abbey of St. Denis in 632, and from there in 777 to the priory of Salonnes (diocese of Metz) at *Cologne (A. Legner, *Kölner Heilige und Heiligtümer*, Cologne 2003, 24).

BHL 6932-6942; BS 10, 1126-1127; LCI 8, 226; P. Cubizolles, *Saint Privat de Mende*: Bulletin du Centre d'Études et de Recherches littéraires et scientifiques de Mende 16 (1996) 1-22; 17 (1998) 56-64.

S. Heid

PRIVATUS of Lambaesis (3rd c.). One finds reference to this individual in *Cyprian's epistles (*Ep.* 36,4; 59,10). From the first letter, published by the clergy of *Rome during the most crucial moment of the *Decian *persecution, one finds that Cyprian had warned the church of Rome of a situation that we know thanks to the second letter: Privatus, bishop of Lambaesis, was deposed "for numerous and serious mistakes, many years ago, by a decision reached by 90 bishops." He returned to plead his case at a council held in spring 251, but his request was rejected. He then went over to a small group in *Carthage that had separated from the official church by ordaining a certain *Fortunatus as bishop, contrary to the rules, in opposition to Cyprian. This letter is from the summer of 252: after this, all trace of Privatus is lost.

Monceaux 2, 5.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PROBA (4th c.). Faltonia Betitia Proba, wife of Clodius Celsinus Adelphius, *praefectus urbi* in 351 (confused in some MSS with Anicia Faltonia Proba, Olybrius, consul in 370, and wife of Sextus Petronius Probus, consul in 371), she was the author of a historical *epos*, now lost, on the fight between Magnentius and *Constantius II, which she conceived as a *bellum civile* in a manner similar to Lucan. She was also the author of *Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi*, composed between 360 and 370. The *Cento* of 694 hexameters is preceded by a proemium (vv. 1-9)—in which Proba (as she herself is called in v. 12) recalls with regret her earlier poetic works devoted

to wars of conquest and bloody conflicts—and by a lengthy invitation to God (vv. 10-55), which marks its similarities to the *praefationes* of *Juvencus and of *Paulinus of Nola in his *Laus sancti Iohannis*. After having asked Almighty God and his eternal Sevenfold Spirit for inspiration, Proba states that she has renounced traditional *pagan themes of *inuocatio*. After having drawn (with *baptism?) the waters of the Castalia fountain and after having had a foretaste (through the participation at the *Eucharist?) of the sweetness of the divine light, she will begin her poem, by declaring that Virgil sang of the most godly gifts of Christ (v. 23 *Vergilium cecinisse loquar pia munera Christi*). There follows a new request to the Father and the Son to favor the difficult request, guidance for the chief theme of this poem, which creates a seamless inversion with respect to the uselessness of her earlier poetry, and the invitation to the recipients of the poem to pay attention. A few years after Proba's death, an anonymous *librarius* inserted a dedication of 15 verses before a copy of the *Cento* commissioned to him by *Arcadius, a dedication that precedes the work in many of the codices. The *librarius* has no doubts on the fact that the emperor will know how to recognize in Proba's work a Virgil transformed for the better and placed at the service of Jesus Christ: *dignare Maronem / mutatum in melius diuino agnoscere sensu* ("to deem [Virgilius] Maro worthy, to recognize the one that has been changed for the better through a religious interpretation" vv. 3-4).

Using verses, hemistiches and Virgilian terms (taken primarily from the *Aeneid*, the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics*) the Christian poetess—applying the centonical canons—composed a *sacrum carmen* (v. 9), in which she sang of the Christian revelation in a series of brief biographical accounts (vv. 1-332) and in paraphrases of the New Testament (vv. 333-694), from the creation to the *Ascension of Jesus Christ; in the epilogue she recommends that Christians and her husband (v. 693: *o dulcis coniunx*) celebrate this feast, and she hopes that her descendants remain pure in the faith (v. 694).

One should note the erudition with which the centonical poetess was able to describe in Virgil's words the chief events of biblical history: the creation of sea animals acc. to the model of Aeneas's shield; the creation of plants acc. to style of the *Bucolics*; the serpent of the earthly *paradise acc. to that which killed Lacoön; the ejection from paradise using the words of the Cumaean Sibyl; the flood, the crossing of the Red Sea, the birth and baptism of Christ, during which *John received Jesus, in the words of Anchises; the *Sermon on the Mount that threatened using the punishments from Virgil's hell; the storm on the lake with sea themes from the third and fifth book of the *Aeneid*, and so forth. Despite *Jerome's severe criticisms on centonical poetry (*Epist.* 53,7: *puerilia sunt haec et circulatorum ludo similia*) and those issued by the **Decretum Gelasianum* (PL 59, 162) for some heterodox elements present in the poem, esp. on the christological level, Proba's *Cento*, certainly the most successful and representative poem of its genre, has witnessed an enormous dissemination even to the thresholds of the modern age.

CPL 1480. *Editions*: PL 19, 805-818; Schenkl, CSEL 16, 1, 511-609; E.A. Clark - D. F. Hatch, *The Golden Bough, The Oaken Cross. The Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba*, Ann Arbor 1981 (text of Schenkl and Eng. tr., with an interesting treatment of the life and work of Proba and containing a bibl.). *Studies*: Schanz 4,1, 219-221; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1891, 124-128; F. Ermini, *Il Centone di Proba e la poesia centonaria latina*, Rome 1909; P. Courcelle, *Les exégèses chrétiennes de la quatrième Églogue*: REA 59 (1957) 294-319; I. Opelt, *Der zürnende Christus im Cento der Proba*: JbAC 7 (1964) 106-111; M.R. Cacioli, *Adattamenti semantici e sintattici nel centone virgiliano di Proba*: SIFC 41 (1969) 188-246; Ch. Witke, *Numen Litterarum. The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great*, Leiden-Köln 1971, 195-198; M. Bonaria, *Appunti per la tradizione virgiliana nel IV secolo*, in *Vergiliana*, Leiden 1971, 35-40; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975, 35-36; 60-63; Patrologia III, 257-258; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 95-110; M. Spinelli, *Proba Petronia*, in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, IV, Rome 1988, 283-284; A.D.J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, Leeds 1993, 22-25; 78-82; D. Shanzer, *The Date and Identity of the Centonist Proba*: RecAug 27 (1994) 75-96; S. Kyriakidis, *Proba, Faltonia Betitia*: Keos 1 (1994) 185-200; P. Mastandrea, *L'epigramma dedicatorio del "Cento Vergilianus" di Proba (AL 719d Riese2). Analisi del testo, ipotesi di datazione e identificazione dell'autore*: Boll. Studi Latini 31 (2001) 565-578.

A.V. Nazzaro

PROCESSION. In religious history, the existence of processions (from the Latin term *procedere*, "to go forward") with a communal and ritual character, accompanied by appropriate songs and *prayers, seems to derive from human psychological and soteriological needs. They are a communal religious rite that, with the articulation into a slow and rhythmic journey in prayers, enacts the joyous or penitential path toward a significant goal. One finds processions in the OT (see La MaisonD 43 [1955] 5-22) and the NT (ibid., 22-28), which supply the theological and normative model for those that followed. The Christian meaning of procession is that of the people on pilgrimage accompanied by God (in the OT sense of the term) or that walk with Christ (toward death and *resurrection).

The primary examples of liturgical processions are those connected to the *eucharistic celebration, i.e., the entrance of the celebrant who advances with the book of the gospels and the offerings (see *Euchologium Serapionis* 19: A. Hänggi - I. Pahl, *Prex eucharistica*, Fribourg 1968, 133; Aug., *Retractationes* 2,11: PL 32, 634; *Confess.* 5,9,17: PL 59, 55). Holy Week, with the procession of the *palms, provides another prime example, one that flourished at the end of the 4th c. in the church of *Jerusalem (*Peregr. Egeriae* 31,1-4) before spreading into *Spain (6th c.) and *Gaul (9th c.) (see Férotin, 178-183): the entire crowd accompanied the bishop with palm or olive branches, making the "journey entirely on foot, even if there were women or famous people. In this manner, they accompanied the bishop while responding to the Psalms" (*Peregr. Egeriae* 31,4). Egeria also mentioned the morning procession of *Epiphany from *Bethlehem to Jerusalem after the night vigil (25,6 and 11).

At *Constantinople, *John Chrysostom opposed the *Arians by instituting large processions. The *translationes* of the bodies of martyrs was carried out with great solemnity and formidable processions. The stational churches developed from the feasts of the martyrs from the 5th c. onward. The Marian devotions such as those of Christmas, the *Annunciation, the *Purification and the Dormition flourished at *Rome toward the end of the 8th c. and seem to have begun in the Byzantine East. Further examples include the penitential practices, e.g., the major litanies, which began at Rome in the 6th c. and replaced for the *pagan *Robigalia*, and the minor litanies (Rogations), which began at *Vienna (*Gaul) and in the 5th c. were introduced at Rome at the end of the 8th c., none of which had been entirely penitential in character, as well as the translations of the relics of the saints and the funerary processions.

Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica 5, ed M. Férotin, Paris 1904; *Les Ordines Romani*, II, ed. M. Andrieu, Louvain 1960; DACL 14, 1895-1896; LTK³ 8, 678-681; CE 11, 819-821; RAC 2, 422-429; W. Rötzger, *Des Heiligen Augustinus Schriften als liturgiegeschichtliche Quelle*, Munich 1930; La MaisonD 43 (1955); M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, I, Milan 1955; F. Van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop*, London 1961; A.G. Martimort (ed.), *L'église en prière*, new ed., Paris 1984, II, 259-269; *Processioni, pellegrinaggi, giubilei*, in *La Chiesa in preghiera* (ed. A.G. Martimort), Rome 1966, 680-690; J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship in Jerusalem, Rome, and Constantinople from the Fourth to the Tenth Centuries. The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Rome 1987; P.F. Beatrice, *Modelli di processioni nel cristianesimo antico*: Rivista Liturgica 79 (1992) 496-504; D. Sartore, A.M. Triacca, C. Cibien, eds. *Liturgia*, Milan 2001, 1532-1539 (with bibl.).

P. Fahey

PROCHORUS. One of the seven deacons (Acts 6:5), acc. to the Greek tradition, bishop of Nicomedia and *Bithynia (ps.-Dorotheus, ps.-Epiphanius). According to the Latin tradition, he was a martyr in *Antioch. Traditionally held to be the author of the *Acts of John*, but the author of these *Acts* does not know these traditions: he is considered to be one of the 70, a servant of *John and his travel companion. The author of the *Acts of John* is instead a layman from *Syria or rather *Palestine, probably employed in the administration; the work was composed between the 5th and 6th c. (it is cited by the *Chronicon Paschale* of 630). The author recounts John's departure from *Jerusalem and arrival at *Ephesus, his miracles and deeds accomplished there, his trip to *Rome (event that occurred at Porta Latina), his exile at Patmos, where he wrote the gospel (against the tradition that placed it at Ephesus; he does not mention the *Apocalypse), and his death. These *Acts of John* have nothing to do with the primitive *Acts* and are the author's pure speculation, which demonstrates that he does not know the geography of *Asia Minor. The *Acts* do not reflect any pragmatic or ascetical tradition. Using incorrect language, the author employs stereotypes and has no understanding of style or *rhetoric. Nevertheless, the work enjoyed great popularity thanks to its sensational content and vivid narration: there exist Latin, Armenian (CCAp 3, 289-407), Arabic, Ethiopian, Georgian and *Paleoslavonic versions.

CANT 218; BHG 916-917b; BHO 458-473; A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 285-291; Lipsius-Bonnet I, 355-408. *Edition*: T. Zahn, Erlangen 1880 (Hildesheim 1975). *Translations*: French: M. van Esbroek: Bedi Kertlisa 33 (1975) 73-109 (from the Georgian version); L. Leloir: CCAp 3, 289-408 (from the Armenian version); It.: Erbetta II, 68-110; cf. Moraldi 2, 292-303 (summary); Polish: Starowieyski, Studia Paradyskie 4 (1994) 131-202. E. Junod - J.D. Kaestli: CCAp 2 (1983) 718-749. H.W. Hollander, *The Influence of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the Early Church. Joseph as Model in Prochorus' Acts of John*: OLP 9 (1978) 75-81; C. Nardi, *Il racconto del giovane Capo dei Briganti di Clemente Alessandrino negli Atti di Giovanni dallo Pseudo-Procoro*: Prometheus 15 (1989) 80-90; A. Stramaglia, *Una storia di fantasmi a la "Periegesi" di Pausania (6,6,7-11) e gli "Atti di Giovanni" dello Ps. Procoro (pp. 117-122, Zahn)*: Orpheus 12 (1991) 549-554.

M. Starowieyski

PROCLUS, Montanist. Proclus (*Proculus*), a second-generation Montanist, was a literary proponent of *Montanism at *Rome immediately after 200, as was *Tertullian, more or less during the same period, at *Carthage. His works have been lost. The information that we have of these documents derives from a dialogue against Proclus mentioned by *Eusebius

(*HE* 3,31,4), attributed to Gaius, a learned ecclesiastical writer (not the presbyter), an opponent of the *Apocalypse of John and an author of anti-Montanist writings (Eus., *HE* 2,25,6; 6,20,3) during the pontificate of the Roman Bishop *Zephyrinus (198–217). Proclus was the head of the Montanist group that took its name from him, distinct from another individual named after Aeschines, a *monarchian modalist (ps.-Tertullian, *Adv. omn. Haer.* 7,2). From that fact, one can conclude that Proclus, with respect to the Montanism of his time and the common views of the movement (the recognition of Montanus as the *Paraclete), did not profess a *Christology that could be accused of heresy. Proclus wrote against *gnosticism. Tertullian therefore mentioned him (and his writings from the Montanist period) among the most famous ecclesiastical antiheretical writers (*Justin, *Miltiades and *Irenaeus), and attributed great honors to him for the style of his ascetic life and his ability as an author. The identity of Proclus as the "christianus Proclus" mentioned by Tertullian (*Ad Scap.* 4,5) is taken for granted by scholars today.

P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste*, Paris 1913, 277-280; A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Leipzig [2]1958 (1904), 2,2, 206; Ch. Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*, Cambridge 1996, passim.

B. Aland

PROCLUS LYCIUS DIADOCHUS (d. 484/485). A biography on him was left by a scholar of his writings, Marinus (ed. F. Boissonade, Leipzig 1814). Written in the form of an encomium, this biography takes as its models the *Life of *Apollonius of Tiana* and *Porphyry's *Life of *Plotinus* (see R. Beutler, PWK 23/1, 186). Proclus was born in *Byzantium between 409 and 412 to wealthy parents, natives of *Lycia; shortly after his birth they took him back to Lycia. The young boy then began his studies at *Alexandria under the direction of the orator Leo of Isauria. He stayed in the city for several years, studying grammar, Latin, *rhetoric and philosophy (esp. Aristotle's). Not even 20 years old, he transferred to the school of the *Neoplatonists in *Athens, directed at that time by Plutarch of Athens and Syrianus, who had a decisive influence on him. It was these people—and esp. Syrianus—who initiated him into Neoplatonism through the study and exegesis of *Plato and Aristotle's writings. After the brief scholarchate of Domninus of Larissa, who succeeded Syrianus after his death—the precise year is unknown—Proclus, already famous and highly regarded, assumed the leadership of the school, which he maintained until his death (484–485). As a result of political troubles, from which his determined commitment to the restoration of the cult of the *pagan divinities was not exempt, his stay at Athens was interrupted for one year, during which time he had to take shelter in Lydia. For more information on his teachings, see the articles on **nous* and *Neoplatonism; on his influence on ps.-Dionysius, see the articles on *Platonism and the Fathers and ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite.

R. Beutler, PWK 23/1, 186-190; J. Pépin - H.-D. Saffrey (ed.), *Proclus, lecteur et interprète des anciens*, Paris 1987; M. Lebiez, *Éloge d'un philosophe resté païen. Textes présentés, traduits et commentés*, Paris 1998.

S. Lilla

PROCLUS of Constantinople (before 390–446). Born probably at *Constantinople before 390, he was a deacon and priest there during the episcopate of *Atticus. He was a passionate claimant to this episcopal see. He became disillusioned in 426 (the election of *Sisinnius), 428 (the election of *Nestorius) and 431 (the election of *Maximian). Upon the death of Maximian (434), he was able to fulfill his lifelong dream by becoming bishop. Previously, Sisinnius had appointed him bishop of Cyzicus, but the people did not accept the appointment. Proclus remained in the capital city, where on 23 December 428, in a homily delivered in the presence of Nestorius, to the consternation of the patriarch, he defended *Mary's divine maternity and the title **Theotokos*.

During his episcopate, which lasted until 446, Proclus worked in various ways to extend the scope of Constantinople's patriarchal authority, from *Cappadocia to Illyricum, and in January 437 he ordered that the relics of *John Chrysostom, who had died in exile, be transferred to the capital. The most important episode of Proclus's episcopate occurred in the aftermath of the Nestorian controversy. Around 435, once the objective of Nestorius's opponents had moved on to the literary works of *Diodore of Tarsus and *Theodore of Mopsuestia, who were considered to be his teachers, the bishops of *Armenia asked for Proclus's opinion on the matter. In his response, *Tomus ad Armenios*, refuting the most divisive aspects of Theodore's Christology, Proclus emphasized, following the example of *Cyril of Alexandria, the unity of Jesus Christ as human and divine with the formula "God the Word, one of the *Trinity, became incarnate." (This form subsequently developed into another, **Unus ex Trinitate passus est*, which was defended by the Scythian monks in the beginning of the 6th c. and was recognized to be Proclus's.) Proclus claimed that *John of Antioch and other bishops

of the Antiochene faction signed the *Tomus* and condemned the attached series of extracts from the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose name, however, was not mentioned. The refusal of the Antiochenes to condemn passages from Theodore's works, who had already been dead for several decades and had died in *peace with the church, provoked a controversy in which even Cyril took part; but facing the firm resistance of the Antiochenes, Proclus, Cyril and the emperor *Theodosius II refrained from trying to obtain the condemnation of the extracts taken from Theodore's works (ca. 437).

Proclus was a talented preacher, and various authentic speeches of his have survived, some of which exist only in *Syriac translation. They are almost all devoted to anti-Nestorian doctrinal concerns of the christological controversy. The same topic dominates in the extant letters, which have come down to us only in Latin translation, with the exception of the second, the *Tomus ad Armenios*, the Greek original of which we also possess. Spurious texts transmitted under his name are not lacking, and the fragment of a letter in which Proclus purportedly defined Christ as "one of the Trinity crucified according to the *flesh," in agreement with the *theopaschite formula, should in all likelihood be considered a forgery.

CPG III, 5800-5915; PG 65, 680-850; DTC 13, 662-670; M. Richard, *Proclus de Constantinople et le théopaschisme*: RHE 38 (1942) 303-331; F.J. Leroy, *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople*, ST 247, Vatican City 1967; M. Aubineau, *Bilan d'une enquête sur les homélies de Proclus de Constantinople*: REG 85 (1972) 572-596; BBKL VII, 985-988; N. Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity. Homilies 1-5*, Leiden 2003.

M. Simonetti

PROCOPIUS. Historian of *Palestine (ca. 500–after 562). Born in *Caesarea around the year 500, Procopius received a legal education and became the *consiliarius* of *Belisarius in 527. From 540 onward, he lived primarily at *Constantinople, where he wrote several historical books in which he demonstrated his great sympathy for Belisarius's great desire to restore the ancient boundaries of the empire. His most important work, *The Wars*, taken precisely from the military campaigns (until 553) by which the Byzantine Empire sought to regain its hegemony in N *Africa, *Italy and the E area of the Mediterranean. *The Wars* is one of the primary sources for *Evagrius Scholasticus's *Ecclesiastical History* (6th c.). The *Anecdotes*, a work composed around 550, contain the scandalous history of the emperor *Justinian and his wife *Theodora and reveal Procopius's hatred for Justinian and his profligate lifestyle. His last work, the *Aedificia*, however, is a *panegyric on the great architectural works built by the emperor. It contains, among other things, a famous description of the Theodosian church of the Hagia Sophia at Constantinople.

J. Haury - G. Wirth, *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, Leipzig, 1905–1913 (²1962–1964); O. Veh, *Prokopius. Werke: griechisch-deutsch*, Munich 1961–1970; O. Veh, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung und Weltauffassung des Prokopius*, Bayreuth 1951–1953; B. Rubin, *Prokopius von Cäsarea*, Stuttgart 1954; R. Browning, *Justinian and Theodora*, London 1971; L.A. Evan, *Procopius*, New York 1972; A. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, London 1985; H.G. Beck, *Lo storico e la sua vittima. Teodora e Procopio*, Bari 1988; A. de Vogüé, *Le témoinage de Procope*: Collectanea Cisterciensia 55 (1993) 271-286; A. Kaldellis, *Procopius of Caesarea*, Philadelphia 2004; *Procopio di Cesarea, La guerra gotica*, ed. D. Comparetti, Milan 2005.

K. den Biesen

PROCOPIUS of Gaza (465–ca. 530). Christian Sophist who lived between the 5th and 6th c. Born in 465 at Gaza, *Palestine, he completed his education in his city of birth and at *Alexandria. He was soon called home to fill the teaching chair, which he held for the remainder of his entire life. As testified by his disciple and successor Choricius in his commemorative speech, Procopius enjoyed great respect on account of his teaching and works, but also for his works' accessibility and simplicity. He possessed such a strong theological training that he was considered and honored as a bishop. Procopius died shortly after 530.

His teaching demonstrated a linguistic training founded on classical writers and a remarkable persona as an orator. The *panegyric for *Anastasius I, delivered during the inauguration of a monument, is a significant example of this. From the numerous rhetorical exercises (*ekphraseis*), only two have been edited: the description of the artistic clock of the Gaza market (ed. H. Diels, *Über die von Prokop beschriebene Kunstuhr von Gaza*, Berlin 1917) and that of a series of Late Antique *paintings in Gaza (ed. P. Friedländer, Vatican City 1939). The epistolary correspondence of Procopius, already published during the author's lifetime as an exemplary collection of masterpieces of stylistic, Athenian purity, consists of 163 *letters; even if they are tainted by abstraction, these letters highlight the spiritual bonds between Gaza and the cultural centers of the Mediterranean world.

Procopius, moreover, left a large number of theological writings, which for the most part still await an editor. Undoubtedly, scholars have incorrectly

wanted to distinguish Procopius the Sophist from Procopius the theologian. Procopius was the first of a series of authors of biblical **catenae*. A follower of Alexandrian *theology, Procopius made extensive use of *Origen's writings and rejected the Antiochene *Theodoret. To his large *catena* on the Heptateuch and the other historical books of the OT, which *Photius knew in their entirety, he assigned the title Ἐκλογαὶ ἐξηγητικαί; the salient aspects of extracts prepared by Procopius himself survive with the title Ἐπιτομὴ ἐκλογῶν. Two commentaries on the *Song of Songs go under Procopius's name, one of which is authentic, although the other is a fragment of the *catena* of three Fathers, based on *Nilus, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Maximus the Confessor. There remain, with numerous lacunae, the *catena* on the *prophet Isaiah and Ecclesiastes. The *catena* on Proverbs that has come down to us under Procopius's name is spurious. The fragments (edited by A. Mai, *Nova Patrum bibliotheca*, IV/2, Rome 1847, 155-201 and VII/2, Rome 1854, 1-81) of a genuine work of Procopius lead one to think of a double recension, as in the case of the commentary on the Heptateuch. A controversy with the *Neoplatonist *Proclus, fragments of which remain (A. Mai, *Classici auctores e Vaticanis codicibus editi*, 4, Rome 1831, 274ff.), and a text of Christian *apologetics developed using the dialectical method have been shown to be genuine by more recent studies that have dispelled earlier doubts. A description of the Hagia Sophia belongs, however, most likely, to *Procopius of Caesarea; a monody on the collapse of the same church caused by an earthquake is probably the work of Michael Psellos. Both documents, in the most ancient editions, are attributed to Procopius.

CPG III, 7430-7448; PG 87, 21-2842 (the spurious works are included); A. Garzya - R.-L. Loenertz, *Procopii Gazaei epistolae et declamationes*, Ettal 1963; S. Leanza, *Procopii Gazaei catena in Ecclesiasten*, CCG 4, Turnhout 1978, 1-50; PWK 23, 259-272; EC 10,85; Beck 414-416; M. Minniti Colonna, *Prolegomena a una nuova edizione del panegirico per l'imperatore Anastasio di Procopio di Gaza*: Byzantion 54 (1984) 89-99; A. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, Berkeley, CA 1985; A. Chauvot, *Procope de Gaze, Priscien de Césarée, Panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase Ier*, Bonn 1986; A. Garzya, *Per la storia della tradizione delle Epistole di Procopio di Gaza*, TU 133, Berlino 1987; F. Petit, *Eusèbe d'Emèse et Théodore de Mopsueste. L'apport de Procope de Gaza*: Museon 104 (1991) 349-354; A. Labate, *Il recupero del commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Dionigi Alessandrino attraverso le catene bizantine*: Koinonia 16 (1992) 53-74; C. Pasini, *Resti della "Catena sui Proverbi" di Procopio di Gaza in un frammento pergamenaceo nel codice Ambrosiano B 85 sup.*: Aevum 74 (2000) 421-29; *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, ed. B. Bitton-Ashkelony - A. Kofsky, Leiden 2004.

J. Irmscher

PROCOPIUS the Usurper (ca. 326–366). Information about this individual comes to us from *Ammianus Marcellinus, *Zosimus and *Photius. Born in ca. 326 to an important family, Artemisia may have been his wife. The Emperor Anthemius was his descendant. A *notarius* and *tribunus*, then a *comes* (Ammianus 26,6,1), he participated in *Julian's expedition of 363 against the *Sassanids. According to Ammianus, it was said that Julian told him to assume command after his death. However, upon the rise of *Jovian and after taking the emperor's dead body to *Tarsus (Ammianus 25,9,12), he retired to *Caesarea in *Cappadocia (Zosimus 4,4,3). After he was arrested, he was able to escape into Chersonese; then he returned to *Constantinople, where he proclaimed himself emperor in September 365, spreading the news that *Valentinian, who was in *Gaul, was dead. He sought to obtain the support of the legions of Illyricum through money. *Valens set out to combat Procopius, who during the winter of 365/366 consolidated his power. He was defeated in *Phrygia; Procopius was decapitated on 26 May 366 (*Consularia Constantinopolitana sub annum* 366, ed. Burgess p. 239). One recent scholar has detected a religious motive in Procopius's rebellion, i.e., the continuation of Julian's *pagan program. This hypothesis, however, finds no support in the primary sources.

N.J.E. Austin, *A Usurper's Claim to Legitimacy. Procopius in A.D. 365/6*: Rivista Storica dell'Antichità 2 (1972) 187-194; PLRE 1, 742-743; R. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*, Oxford 1993; N. Lenski, *Failure of Empire. Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Berkeley 2002.

A. Di Berardino

PROCULLIANUS (4th–5th c.). Donatist bishop of *Hippo during the time of the Catholic bishops Valerius and *Augustine. Augustine recognized Procullianus's peaceful demeanor (*Ep.* 33,1) and willingly and without conditions accepted his invitation to discuss ways to resolve the differences between *Catholics and *Donatists (*Ep.* 33,4), i.e., as of the year 396. Nonetheless, it does not seem that the two were able to meet. In the meantime, moreover, a Catholic, in dispute with his mother, had joined Procullianus's group, an act that even had civil consequences (*Ep.* 34). The relationship between the two groups became increasingly tense because other Catholics went over to the Donatist party (*Ep.* 35,1-2) or Donatists passed over to the Catholic Church (*Ep.* 78,8) and because of violence carried out on the latter (*Ep.* 105,2,3). We do not know the year of Procul-

lianus's death; however, in 410, we discover that *Macrobius was his successor at Hippo.

DCB 4, 489; PCBE 1, 924-926.

A. Di Berardino

PROCULUS of Marseille, bishop (5th c.). Although not mentioned by name, the last paragraph of Pope *Celestine's letter (PL 50, 435) dated 26 July 428 makes reference to him—a letter that was addressed to the bishops of the provinces of *Vienne and *Narbonne, in which the pope entrusted to the college of bishops of these provinces the duty of listening to the "so-called bishop of the church of Marseille," who had welcomed the killing of Patroclus, bishop of *Arles, who was put to death in 426 by order of the military commander Felix, who had a residence at *Ravenna. Proculus had in fact persecuted Patroclus, who had obtained from Pope *Zosimus the parishes of Ceyreste and Garguier, on the pretext that they had been usurped from Proculus of Marseille; Proculus, upon the death of his old enemy, had received the murderer by showing him his friendship. The bishops of Marseille and Arles were in fact in conflict because they both sought to lay claim to their right of primacy over Provence.

We know of him as well from *Augustine's *Ep.* 219, which was sent to Proculus and a certain Cillenius, who had condemned Leporius, a monk who had intruded into the African church. From the first years of his trip to Marseille, even *Cassian was confronted by the explosion of the controversy provoked by Leporius in Provence. Leporius, once he had become a monk, began to spread heretical opinions so that the guardians of orthodoxy in *Gaul were quick to offer their assessment against this accused individual who was preaching a heavily suspect theology of creation. They accused him, a bit superficially, of *Pelagianism. Because he was in error, he was expelled by the local bishops and esp. Proculus, bishop of Marseille. In the attempts to bring him to the right path, church authorities called upon Cassian.

Caelestinus, *Ep.* 4,3,5; 6,9-10 (PL 50, 429-436); Augstine, *Ep.* 219 (ed. Goldbacher, p. 428); Duchesne, *Fastes* I, 95-112; Tillemont, 14, 62; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, 2, Paris 1957, 219-226; B. Morel, *De invloed van Leporius op Cassianus' weerlegging van het Nestorianisme*: Bijdragen 21 (1960) 31-51; J.L. Maier, *La date de la rétractation de Leporius et celle du "sermon 396" de saint Augustin*: REAug 11 (1965) 39-42; O. Perler, *Les voyages de saint Augustin*, Paris 1969, 343; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana*, École Française de Rome 1976, 1026-1043.

M. Palmieri

PROFUTURUS. In the *lay community of *Hippo, there was a certain Profuturus (Aug., *Ep.* 158,9: from *Evodius), who must have been the same person described by *Augustine as a *frater* (brother), and who was commissioned by him to go to *Jerome at *Bethlehem to deliver a letter and some books (Aug., *Ep.* 28,1,1; 71,1). But at the moment of his departure, Profuturus was appointed bishop (*Ep.* 71,2; cf. *Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 7,1). His episcopal see could have been *Cirta (= Constantine), because we find a bishop there with his name (cf. Aug., *De unico bapt.* 16,29), the recipient of a letter from Augustine, who considered him a close friend (*Ep.* 38).

PCBE 1, 928-929.

A. Di Berardino

PROFUTURUS of Braga. Metropolitan of *Gallaecia in 538, he vigorously opposed *Priscillianists and *Arians. Interested in theological and disciplinary topics, in a letter that has not survived, he asked *Rome questions to obtain guidance on the following: the practice of baptizing with triple immersion, the celebration of *Easter, the *eucharistic celebration and other similar matters. In 538, Pope *Vigilius responded to this letter with a decretal (then included in the *Hispana* *Canonical Collection) that led to the Suevian *liturgy—from the celebration of the 1st Council of *Braga (561) and before the unification of the liturgy of the Visigothic period (beginning of the 7th c.)—becoming very similar to the Roman tradition.

PL 69, 18ff.; DHEE 5, 2030, Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España*, 11/2, Madrid 1933; J.O. Bragança, *A carta do Papa Vigílio ao Arcebispo Profuturo de Braga*: Bracara Augusta 21 (1967) 65-91; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispanolusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 356-358.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

PROGRESS

I. The history of salvation - II. "Urgeschichte" and the history of civilization - III. The stability of the state - IV. Eusebius of Caesarea and Constantine - V. Subsequent developments.

According to the scope of this entry, *progress* is defined as the idea of humanity's constant advancement toward its improvement, without seeking to identify the causes for this progress. With respect to moral progress and the perfection of the human being, see the pertinent entries in this encyclopedia.

I. The history of salvation. At the beginning of the 2nd c., the primary schools of thought within the

ancient church interpreted the OT and the NT as two stations along God's journey with his people. This concept finally led to the formation of the Christian idea of a progressive history of salvation, which is not found either in *pagan or Jewish thought. The first author who fully developed this idea was *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Haer.* IV). In contrast to *Marcion, he insisted on the absolute unity of God. At the same time, however, he also affirmed that this one God had also established a new covenant, that had supplanted the earlier one and that he interpreted as a sign of God's will to gradually lead humankind to final perfection. Irenaeus then used the term "man" (*anthrōpos*) in the individual and generic sense. Progress, however, could be the progress in the faith of the individual believer or all believers (understood as the chief end of all individual believers). When he used the term "man" as a generic term, Irenaeus applied the metaphor of growth (individual) to history in order to combine together God's unity and his plan of salvation on the one hand and the gradual unveiling of his plan on the other. Subsequent authors (*Clement of Alexandria, *Tertullian and *Origen) elaborated this idea. Tertullian, in the writings from his *Montanist period, also extended the idea of progress to include the history of the church. Although the ultimate act of faith could not be changed, under the guidance of the *Holy Spirit, the church's discipline was gradually changing for the better. Lastly, at the beginning of the 4th c., *Arnobius offered a constant defense of the idea of innovation in the *Adversus Nationes* (*Against the Nations* 1,57; 2,66-77). Although many aspects in this concept of the history of salvation were not clear, not only was the end of historical development a restitution of humankind to its original state before the fall (*restitutio in integrum*) but the final state would be established by a qualitative improvement.

When the idea of progress in the history of salvation was more fully reworked, it included not only the development of religion, but also the emergence of civilization and the concept of the state's stability.

II. "Urgeschichte" and the history of civilization. The biblical account of human origins, as reported in the book of Genesis, was not favorable to a positive interpretation of culture and history from the moment that it included the account of *sin and failure. *Theophilus of Antioch was the first Christian author to change the message of Genesis with the Hellenistic theories on the emergence of culture. Nevertheless, his concept was used only as a proof that has come down to us from the ancient world and therefore still lacked any progressive dynamism. From other documents, e.g., the ps.-Clementine literature, one can see that the progressive vision of culture and history is found only where, for apologetic reasons, the narrative of Genesis is placed in the background, while *pagan traditions come to the fore (Irenaeus; Tertullian, *De Pallio*; Origen; Arnobius).

III. The stability of the state. Another question that required attention was the relation of the history of salvation to secular history, in particular the problem of the position of the state in God's design. For apologetic reasons, Christians affirmed that there was a providential connection between the reign of *Augustus, who not only considerably enlarged the empire but had brought a legendary state of peace on earth, and the birth of Jesus Christ (*Melito of Sardis, Origen). In his *Contra Celsum*, *Origen emphasized the fact that Christians did not at all threaten the state but, to the contrary, had contributed to strengthening its stability. The level of morality in the state had grown in proportion to the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire. Therefore, the idea of progress in salvation was now extended to include the entire world. Origen, however, did not know with certainty whether progressive salvation found its conclusion in this world or whether it transcended it. Arnobius showed a similar optimism with respect to the benefits that the state and society, once converted, would garner from Christianity. According to this vision, the new faith had already promised universal peace, and the Christian empire would, once and for all, abandon weapons.

IV. Eusebius of Caesarea and Constantine. During the first decades of the 4th c., the political situation completely changed following the Constantinian Revolution. Many Christian theologians assigned a new role to the Roman Empire in the history of salvation. In *Eusebius of Caesarea's perspective, the Constantinian monarchy reflected and imitated the divine monarchy. The present era under *Constantine was seen as the result of a development that guided God's forgetful world toward the veneration of the one God of the Christians, who, in turn, guaranteed stability and prosperity. The emperor was seen as God's agent in promoting and ensuring its stability, by uniting the *oikoumenē* and thus allowing Christianity to spread. Eusebius's theology was not only heavily antiapocalyptic, but his eschatology almost disappeared behind the emphasis on humanity's progress in this world, a progress that will undoubtedly continue in the future, and must perhaps be understood as the gradual realization of the heav-

enly kingdom. Thus, Eusebius joined together all the propositions that had been formulated in 2nd-c. theology (history of salvation, cultural history and Christianity as political progress), in a complex theology of history. The Christian idea of progress was fully expressed for the first time by Eusebius.

The Eusebian concept of progress, i.e., the alliance of Christianity with the Roman Empire, corresponds to the ancient Roman ideology of *pietas* not in theoretical reflection but in actual results: the proper veneration of God guaranteed the empire's political stability and social prosperity. And for this reason, without a doubt, the Roman emperors, in general, and Constantine in particular, finally recognized the contribution that Christianity had given to the empire's stability, as soon as it had spread among the majority of the population or at least among the dominant classes. After his victory over Licinius, the Christian element in the writings of Constantine became increasingly predominant. Thus, he began to perceive his ability to unify and bring peace to the empire as a sign of divine *providence, and his military successes paralleled the spread of Christianity. Constantine began to understand the ancient Roman concept of *pietas* in terms of the Christian history of salvation, which resulted in an absolute monotheism. The applicability of the principle *do ut des*, which was the basis of *pietas*, was now made to derive from the progressive development of the Christian history of salvation, and therefore Constantine's kingdom was supported by the new foundation. This concept of the relation between religion and state could no longer tolerate any discord in religious matters or any religious pluralism without immediately endangering the state's stability. Therefore it was not by chance that this parallel between Christian monotheism and the monarchy also, in time, led to more severe suppression of *heresy and *paganism.

The Christian idea of progress, therefore, was vital in understanding the change that had occurred under Constantine. During the 3rd c., the church had developed some theological criteria that were now able to be used as a means for affirming a close connection between *church and state.

V. Subsequent developments. The question of the extent to which the concept of alliance between church and state, as formulated by Eusebius, influenced the relationship between spiritual and secular power in the East is still subject to debate and demands further clarification. In the West, the idea of progress appeared primarily in *Ambrose's controversies (*Ep.* 18) and *Prudentius's work against *Symmachus (*C. Symm.*). After the fall of *Rome in 410, *Augustine not only rejected all apocalyptic speculations on the end of the world, but he also warned against the identification of God's *peace (*civitas Dei*) with earthly peace (*civitas terrena*, see *De civitate Dei*). Nevertheless, other authors such as *Orosius continued to spread an optimistic vision of the development of world history.

With the Christian concept of progress, a new parameter in reflection on history was introduced, a parameter that was unknown in this form to Classical Antiquity, and that in various ways influenced the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.

K. Thraede, RAC 8, 141-182; R. Koselleck - Ch. Meier, GGB 2, 351-423; W. Kinzig, *Novitas Christiana. Die Idee des Fortschritts in der Alten Kirche bis Eusebius*, Göttingen 1994 (FKDG 58).

W. Kinzig

PROHAERESIUS (4th c.). According to *Eunapius of Sardis (*V. Soph.* X, 1,8 = p. 65; X, 8,1-2 = p. 79 Giangrande), he was, "it seems," an Armenian Christian, who studied at *Antioch and *Athens, a disciple of Ulpian of Antioch and the Cappadocian Julian; from 340 he went to Athens to fill the latter's chair. *Constans sent him to *Gaul, where he stayed and received honors, from 342 to 347. During this trip, he went to *Rome, where the senate dedicated a statue to him bearing an inscription for his great gifts in oratory. Among those who heard him were *Basil and *Gregory of Nazianzus; even *Julian the Apostate, during his trip to Athens, greatly admired his eloquence. Following Julian's decree prohibiting Christians from teaching, Prohaeresius, along with the African *Marius Victorinus, was forced to leave the school, despite his good relations with the emperor, who would have wanted to protect him from the effects of this law, as *Jerome says in the *Chron. a. 363* (GCS Eusebius Werke VII, 242).

The tenor of this relationship, however, has been reevaluated by recent study on the basis of a reinterpretation of Julian's *Ep.* 31 to Prohaeresius, in which the emperor seems to invite the reluctant orator to compose a historiographical work intended to illustrate his own ascent to power to the detriment of the Christian Emperor *Constantius. To better understand such an epistolary exchange, it would be necessary to contextualize it within the heated argument between Prohaeresius and his former student *Himerius, who was then in vogue at Julian's court at *Constantinople. If it is true that the majority of modern scholars, following Jerome, are in agreement in considering Prohaeresius a Christian, it is necessary to note, however, that Prohaeresius's

Christian faith has been recently called into question on the basis of a new analysis of the ancient testimonies about him (see R. Goulet, *Prohérésius le païen et quelques remarques sur la chronologie d'Eunape de Sardes*: AntTard 8 [2000] 209-222): on the basis of this reconstruction, Eunapius seems to adhere to the paganism of his teacher. In this case, his stature should be reconsidered within the political-religious context surrounding the emperor Julian's regime.

PWK 23, 1, 30-32; J. Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien*, Paris 1930, 55ff. And 113ff.; Fliche-Martin III, 234; PLRE 1, 731; Julian, *Briefe*, ed. B.K. Weis, Munich 1973–; Th.M. Banchich, JHS 107 (1987) 164-167; A.D. Booth, AHB, 1 (1987), 14ff., Ch.W. Fornara: CQ 39 (1989) 517-523; R.J. Penella, *Greek Philosophers and Sophists in the Fourth Century A.D. Studies in Eunapius of Sardis*, Liverpool 1990, 94-99; E. Pack, *Libanio, Temistio e la reazione giulianea*, in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* I, 3, Rome 1994, 679-681; U. Criscuolo, *Sull'"epitafio" di Gregorio di Nazianzo per il retore Proeresio*, in *Scritti offerti a F. Corsaro*, II, Catania 1994, 189-195; R. Goulet, *Prohérésius le païen et quelques remarques sur la chronologie d'Eunape de Sardes*: AntTard 8 (2000) 209-222.

C. Noce - M. Perraymond

PROJECTUS, bishop (d. after 431). An Italian bishop of an unknown see and a Roman legate. Nothing permits scholars to identify him with the homonymous bishop of the *Forum Cornelii*. The Projectus discussed here took part, with Bishop Arcadius and the Roman priest Philip, in the delegation commissioned to represent Pope *Celestine at the Council of *Ephesus, called by *Theodosius II for 7 June 431, to bring an end to the conflicts between *Cyril and *Nestorius. The papal instructions were to bring about the condemnation of Nestorius and to follow Cyril's lead.

The Roman delegation, due to the difficulties of traveling by sea, arrived after the work had started; the three legates were united in the doctrinal and disciplinary positions (*see* *Philip, presbyter) and also signed the conciliar acts and various documents.

In contrast to the legates Philip and Arcadius, Projectus did not participate in the opposing gathering convoked by Theodosius II in *Constantinople (and gathered at Chalcedon) starting from September 431; after 31 October 431, Projectus, however, was, just as were the envoys of Cyril's party, the recipient of a letter of introduction and greeting sent by Cyril to Constantinople, concerning the election of the new patriarch of the imperial capital, *Maximian. The extant data, however, does not permit us to say whether he at that time had reached Constantinople, as did the other two Roman legates.

There are no reasons for identifying Projectus with the homonymous bishop of an unmentioned see, whose name appears, at the 11th position, in the number of recipients of the *Libellus fidei*, which recognized the condemnation of Nestorius, who had been sent by Julian of *Serdica to *Rufus of Thessalonica and his synod, before 436.

L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976; PCBE II, 1855-1857.

M. Palmieri

PROLOGUES to the BIBLICAL BOOKS. The *Bible has been transmitted through a continuous release of editions (and translations), at times popular, at times scholarly, but which have left traces of their presence not only in the constitution of the text, but also in the prologues, glosses and more or less extensive marginalia, that offer what seems to be necessary to introduce the text, and at times to refute certain types of interpretations. Prior to the books, lists of numbered *Capitula* (chapters) can supply an analysis and help to outline the desired passage. In DBS 8 (1969) 688-692, B. Botte offered an excellent summary with a bibl.; in the *Bulletin de la Bible latine* attached to the *Revue Bénédictine*, P.M. Bogaert analyzed recent studies (see the indexes for the entry *Préfaces et prologues*). In effect, the Latin tradition was much richer in this regard. For the Greek MSS, however, see R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs*, Paris 1954, 102-121 (Origen), 139-141, 159-171, which slipped Botte's notice. It has often been the trend in scholarship to attribute these anonymous texts to famous heretics (or to the controversial literature against them): *Marcion, *monarchianism, *Priscillian and *Pelagius. A more prudent approach is to be reserved in the face these assumption and suggests a somewhat earlier date for the most significant texts.

M.E. Schild, *Abendländische Bibelvorreden*, Gütersloh 1970; J. Regul, *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe*, Freiburg 1969; and the introductions to the volumes of Beuron's *Vetus Latina*. The majority of Latin texts have now been published with critical editions of the *Vulgate*. E. Norelli, *La tradizione ecclesiastica negli antichi prologhi alle epistole paoline*, in *La tradizione. Forme e modi*, Rome 1990 (SEA 31), 301-324; A. Whealey, *Prologues on the Psalms. Origen, Hippolytus, Eusebius*: RBen 106 (1996) 234-245; V. Verheyden, *The Canon Muratori. A Matter of Dispute*, in *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers - H.J. De Jonge, Leuven 2003, 422ff.; Verzeichnis, 695-719; LACL 593-596.

J. Gribomont

PROLOGUS PASCHAE AD VITALEM. A short work (the incipit is as follows: *Cum magnanime impulsarer*) compiled in 395 almost certainly at *Rome,

because it devoted much attention to the Roman church and its martyrs. It is composed of two parts: the first is a brief chronology of biblical and post-biblical events starting from *Adam; it dates the birth of Jesus Christ to the year 4887 (752/753 years after the founding of Rome) and his death to the year 29. It lists seven persecutions: the first under the emperor *Nero (56/57) with the deaths of *Peter and *Paul. The few martyrs named from the various persecutions are from Rome, Capua (*Augustine and *Felicitas), *Carthage (*Cyprian), Solon (*Domnus and Felix). The second part discusses at length the paschal cycle of 84 years: the cycle begun in 299 ends in 382; in 383, a new one begins.

CPL 2292; *Chronica Minora*, ed. Mommsen, I, 737-738; PLS 3, 427-437 (from Krush's ed.); H. Inglebert, *Les romaines chrétiennes face à l'histoire de Rome*, Paris 1996, 595-596.

A. Di Berardino

PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL

I. Origins - II. Legal status - III. Administration.

I. Origins. According to the testimonies of the Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, the first communities did not possess buildings reserved exclusively for their gatherings. Christians gathered in private homes (Acts 1:14; 12:12; 20:7-12; 1 Cor 16:19; Rom 16:5; etc.). It seems that the construction of individual locales reserved for liturgical gatherings began to be taken into consideration only in the 3rd c. (Dura Europos [ca. 232]; cf. Tertull., *Adv. Valentin.* 3,1; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VII, 29,2), when Christian leaders began to think of Christian cemeteries. In fact, before organizing *areae* properly speaking, Christians buried their dead, as best they could, in Jewish or *pagan places of burial, remaining within the milieu of their family ties, their social relationships and their immediate vicinity. Starting from the 3rd c., however, *Rome had cemeteries administered by the local communities and integrated into their estates. The fact that the first places for gathering and burial belonged to private individuals had considerable advantages: the communities were free from material problems inherent in the possession and management of properties. With the progress of evangelization, however, the usefulness of an ecclesial estate in the proper sense of the term became more evident; on the other hand, the inconveniences attached to private property led the leaders of the churches to find a more secure system with regard to the possession of assets. In fact, precisely at the beginning of the 3rd c., in various places, and in a particular way at Rome, there began to exist a corporate-type property that was ecclesiastical properly speaking (*Elenchos* IX, 7; Tertull., *Scap.* 3,1; *Historia Augusta*, *Alex. Sev.* 49). The evidence from the 2nd half of the 3rd c. multiplies (the Rescript of *Gallienus: Eus., *HE* 7, 13; 30,19). In 311, the Edict of *Galerius authorized Christians to reconstruct their gathering places.

II. Legal status. The legal existence of an ecclesiastical estate is therefore attested even before the Constantinian *peace. The Edict of *Milan of 313 spoke openly of titular ecclesiastical property: it was held by the body of Christians, i.e., the various local communities over which their respective leaders presided. Contrary to the theories elaborated in the 19th c. to justify these facts (G.B. de Rossi: *collegia tenuiorum*; Duchesne: tolerance *de facto*), modern scholarship has recognized that, from then on, every community could acquire and administer a corporate estate acc. to private law, within the framework of common law (Munier, 274). It is clear that this situation was confirmed after the peace of the church. The legislative texts from Late Antiquity, although they recognized the ecclesiastical property, did not define its nature. It turns out, however, that the estate was that of the local community, under the direction of its bishop; one cannot say that at that time there existed an estate of the church understood in its totality (in the sense of can. 1495, par. 1, of the 1917 code of Canon Law). The idea of a foundation, in the modern sense of the term (an institution, i.e., itself the titular of the estate that causes it to exist), only corresponds to the system that began in the East at the end of the 5th c. It seems that, at that time, the West, where the bishop remained the administrator of the totality of assets (Gelasius, frag. 24: Thiel, 498), was unaware of this system. The tendency toward fragmentation, which was fostered further by various factors—strong growth of the estate; an increasing autonomy of the churches, hospices and monasteries; donations tied to specific conditions of allocation; the laity's claims to preserve some rights over assets that they had given (cf. Gaudemet, 302-306)—eventually prevailed.

III. Administration. Belonging to a local community, the assets were administered by the bishop, its head. The most ancient documents describe this type of management as entirely discretionary: the bishop was responsible only before God. The *Didascalia* considered it out of place for clerics and *laypeople to seek accountability from their own bishop.

As long as the distribution of resources was limited to the immediate distribution of the daily offerings, this manner of doing things did not run a serious risk of abuse: the bishop could not afford blatant injustice. There was, however, nothing in common between direct, public, patriarchal management described by the apostolic apocryphal texts and what one senses occurred at Rome under Pope *Cornelius (Eus., *HE* 6, 43), or at *Carthage under *Cyprian. The managerial ability of the Roman church appeared esp. in the organization of funeral services and the management of the catacombs; one can imagine that this management knew how to face the needs of the the poor, the sick and those in distress. Numerous testimonies of the administration of ecclesiastical property can be illustrated during the late Roman Empire: (a) In principle, the bishop continued to enjoy total freedom in this regard. Then suddenly there appeared and was imposed an ever-increasing tendency to associate the local clergy with the bishop's administration (Council of *Antioch, can. 25; **Apostolic Canons*, can. 40; Gelasius, *Ep.* 17,1). In the East, the institution of treasurers was made obligatory by the Council of *Chalcedon (451); in the West, the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* praised this institution. Pope Gelasius established his direct control over the temporal management of the Italian bishops under his jurisdiction (Gaudemet, 309). (b) On the other hand, the bishop had to respect the allocation of assets desired by the benefactor. If the donation did not include specific conditions, the bishop would have to use the surplus for godly or charity-based ends (the poor, the imprisoned and wayfarers, etc.). From the end of the 5th c., the bishop enjoyed complete freedom in the distribution of the surplus among these various allocations. In *Italy, however, an ever more rigid regulation took hold with popes *Simplicius (*Ep.* 1: Thiel 176) and Gelasius. The latter actually imposed a fourfold division (bishop, poor, clerics and buildings). *Gaul and *Spain adopted other types of distribution. (c) If ecclesiastical assets were inalienable for the most part, some exceptions were allowed, esp. in aid to the poor, ransom of prisoners and the assistance for all the needy under great distress.

G. Bovini, *La proprietà ecclesiastica e la condizione giuridica della Chiesa in età precostantiniana*, Milan 1949; G. Martínez Díez, *El patrimonio eclesiástico en la España visigoda estudio histórico jurídico*: Miscelánea Comillas 32 (1959) 1-281; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IV^e^-V^e^ s.)*, Paris 1958, 288-311; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana*, I, Rome 1976, 1-96; A. Faivre, *Clergé et propriété dans l'église ancienne: statut des biens, hiérarchie, célibat*: Lumière et vie 25 (1976) 51-64; V. Recchia, *Gregorio Magno e la società agricola*, Rome 1978; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (II^e^-III^e^ s.)*, Paris 1979, 264-274; I. Fasiori, *Storia della decima dall'editto di Milano (313) al secondo concilio di Mâcon (585)*: VetChr 23 (1986) 39-61; G. Arnaldi, *Le origini dello Stato della Chiesa*, Turin 1987; G. Barone-Adesi, *Il sistema giustinianeo delle proprietà ecclesiastiche*, in *La proprietà e le proprietà* (Pontignano, 30 settembre - 3 ottobre 1985), Società Italiana di Storia del Diritto, ed. E. Cortese, Milan 1988, 75-120; G. Tabacco, *L'origine della dominazione territoriale del papato*: Rivista Storica Italiana 101/1 (1989) 222-236; A. Barzanò, *La questione dell'arricchimento dei vescovi e del clero da Cipriano a Damaso tra polemica anticristiana, autocritica ecclesiale e legislazione imperiale*: RSCI 47 (1993) 359-367; F. Marazzi, *Le proprietà urbane della Chiesa Romana tra IV e VIII secolo: reddito, struttura e gestione*, in *Le sol et l'immeuble. Les formes dissociées de propriété immobilière dans les villes de France et d'Italie (XII^e^-XIX^e^ siècles)*, ed. O. Faron - É. Hubert, Lyon-Rome 1995, 151-168; A. Perlasca, *Il concetto di bene ecclesiastico*, Rome 1997; F. Marazzi, *I "patrimonia Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae" nel Lazio (amministrazione e gestione)*, Rome 1998; G. Nedungatt, *The Canons of the Ecumenical Councils on Church Property*, in *Laity and Church Temporalities: Appraisal of a Tradition*, ed. G. Nedungatt, Bangalore 2000 (Dharmaram canonical studies 1), 159-180; C. Buenacasa Pérez, *La legislación conciliar concerniente a la administración del patrimonio eclesiástico. El bajo imperio (siglos IV-V)*: SEA 78 (2002) 49-72.

CH. MUNIER - G. PILARA

PROPHET

1. Prophet in the early church - II. Iconography - III. Commentaries on the prophetic books.

1. Prophet in the early church. The prophet was above all "a man of the word": he spoke under the inspiration of the *Holy Spirit (Acts 21:11), fulfilling an important role in the community to edify, encourage and proclaim the future, thereby witnessing to the abiding action of the Risen One. His messages were received as authoritative expressions of the divine will. He was, however, subject to examination by the same community (1 Th 5:19-21). The division apostle-prophet-teacher, already present in 1 Cor 12:28 (see also Acts 13:1) and mentioned by the **Didache* (11–13), seems to have been of Hebrew origin and corresponds to the law-prophecy-wisdom pattern. In Acts 11:27, some prophets of *Jerusalem went to *Antioch. In Acts 13:1, five men from Antioch were called "prophets" and "teachers." In *Didache* 11,3, prophets are mentioned along with the *apostles (i.e., itinerant evangelists); in 15,2 prophets and teachers. The *Shepherd* of *Hermas likewise connects prophets to teachers.

The *Didache* reveals the organization and structure of the early Christian communities, which had a "diversity of ministries" (1 Cor 12:4): one finds the charismatic ministries of prophets (also some itinerant preachers) and teachers together with institutional ministries of bishops and deacons, chosen by the community, who also exercised the ministry of

the prophets and teachers (*Didache* 15,1). "The flourishing of prophecy in early Christianity occurred fundamentally in the period that preceded the full institutionalization of the church" (Aune, 380).

The prophet, when he speaks under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, should not be subjected to test or criticism by the community; the communities, however, will be able to judge him by his conduct and unselfish attitude, by the coherence between life and teaching (*Didache* 11,7-12): in other words, the true prophet has "the style of the life of the Lord" (8,12). The prophets can at will give thanks after meals (10,7) and can make requests that the poor be fed (11,9).

Hermas (*Mand.* 11) supplied criteria acc. to which one can distinguish true from false prophets. The latter, by their dissolute behavior, teaching and method in prophesying, are illegitimate, they act like *pagan fortune tellers, who are known for their *quid pro quo*, mercenary approach. *Justin recognized some false prophets, who proffered teachings that came from the spirit of error (*Dial.* 35,5; 51,2; 69,1; 82,1-2; cf. moreover, *Eusebius *HE* 4, 26; 5, 17-19). The *Montanists claimed to prolong the era of the prophets, and they let themselves fall into violent states of "trance" (Tertullian, *De An.* 9,4; Cyprian, *Ep.* 75,10; Eusebius, *HE* 5,16,3; 5,17,2-4).

The decline of prophecy after the 2nd c. is also owed to sociological motives; the ancient role of the prophets was assumed by the heads of the Christian communities, and the charismatic spontaneity receded before the gradual process of the church's institutionalization and the justification given for the church's structures. The gifts of the Spirit were contained under other forms, and the prophetic function came to be manifested in other ways (as in the martyrs and saints).

A. Lemaire, *Les ministères aux origines de l'Église*, Paris 1971; É. Cothenet, *Prophétisme dans le Nouveau Testament*: DBS VIII (1972) 1222-1337; T.M. Crone, *Early Christian Prophecy. A Study of Its Origin and Function*, Baltimore, MD 1973; J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, Leiden 1973; W. Rordorf - A. Tuiler, *La Doctrine des Douze Apôtres*, SC 248bis, Paris 1998; D. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids, MI 1983 (extensive bibl.); C. Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment*, Tübingen, 1995; R. Polanco Fernandois, *El concepto de profecía en la teología de san Ireneo*, Madrid 1999, 350-385.

II. Iconography. Images of the OT prophets already appeared in the most ancient repertoire of Christian arts as generic evocations of messianic prophecy or as historical depictions tied to the narratives of the biblical text or representations of the group.

1. Evocations of messianic prophecy. A generic allusion to the prophecy of the Messiah's birth from a Virgin rather than the historical identification with a prophet, Balaam, Isaiah or Micah, is recognizable in those isolated depictions of male individuals clothed with a pallium in the act of pointing to a sign in the heavens: a star in some frescoes of the catacomb of Saints *Marcellinus and *Peter, from the 1st half of the 4th c. (Wp 158,2, Nestori p. 55 n. 42; Wp 159,2, Nestori p. 55 n. 45; Wp 165, Nestori p. 57 n. 53), and in that of the cemetery of the Via D. Compagni (Ferrua, pl. 138, Nestori p. 83 n. 13); a christogram on a *painting from the cemetery of Cyriaca, from the 2nd half of the 4th c. (Wp 241, Nestori p. 45 n. 4). The fusion of an intense historical narrative and the symbolic expression of the evocation of messianic prophecy was recently believed to have been captured in a disputed pictorial figuration preserved in a cemetery of St. *Thecla, from the mid 4th c. (Santagata, *S. Tecla*, fig. 2), in which there are two male figures in the act of pointing to a star. Alongside these isolated figures, one should understand the images clothed with a pallium in the act of pointing to a star that appears alongside the Virgin with Child (*see* *Mary) also as a generic allusion to messianic prophecy, as in the case of a gallery's fresco from a sandstone of the cemetery of Priscilla, from the early years of the 3rd c. (Wp 21-22) and, at times, in scenes of the adoration of the *Magi, as, e.g., in the inscription of one Severa in the Museo Pio Cristiano (Kirschbaum, *Balaam*, pl. 3).

2. Historical representations. The prevalence of a historical narrative objective, however, is found in those representations more or less directly dependent on the biblical text, which are tied to the events of individual prophets, for many of which a discussion has already been provided in the pertinent entries. Concerning *Elijah, e.g., we find depictions of the encounter with the widow of Zarephath, the *resurrection of the widow's son, and the burnt offering on Mount Carmel in the frescoes of the synagogue of *Dura Europos, from the mid-3rd c. (Kraeling, *Synagogue*, pls. 31, 62-63), and that of his ascension to heaven in a chariot of fire, designed on the classical model of Elisha's ascent to heaven in a *quadriga* (Wp 230,2) in the paintings of the catacomb of *Domitilla and on the Via D. Compagni (Ferrua) and in some sarcophagi (Ws 189,2 and 190,3). For Jeremiah, in the biblical mosaic cycle of the basilica of St. *Ambrose at *Milan, acc. to the description of the illustrative distych (Forcella, *Iscrizioni*, no. 227), artists made a depiction of the vision of the angel under the form of a lamb. For *Ezekiel, there frequently appears on the *sarcophagi the

vision of the field covered with bones that is repopulated with living people (Ws 112,2; 123,3; 151; 184,1; 206,7; 215,7; 219,1); the most ancient representation of an Ezekiel cycle is offered, however, by the frescoes of the synagogue of Dura Europos (Kraeling, *Synagogue*, pls. 69-72). Perhaps, to Micah and his proclamation of the birth of the Messiah at *Bethlehem, one can connect the fresco of the catacomb of Domitilla, from the 2nd half of the 4th c., with a bearded person in the act of pointing to two towered buildings (an allusion to Bethlehem?), before which is depicted the Madonna with Child (Wp 229).

3. Group images. Among the first monumental representations of the series of prophets one should mention that representation, in stucco, of the baptistery of the Orthodox at *Ravenna, from the mid-5th c. (Deichmann, *Ravenna*, pls. 72-79,81). In the same city, about 50 years later, a series of 16 prophets, depicted as majestic old men holding a scroll between their hands—a motif that would be a persistent feature in later iconography—appears in the mosaics of the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo (ibid., pls. 136-153). Likewise at Ravenna, from the mid-6th c., images of prophets appear in the mosaic decoration of S. Vitale (ibid., pls. 312-321).

EC 10, 101-103; LCI 3, 461-462; see the pertinent entries for the individual prophets in DACL, LCI, RAC, RBK. G.B. de Rossi, *Altri monumenti di sacre vergini nell'Agro Verano*: Bollettino Arch. cristiana 1 (1863) 76ff.; Garrucci, *Storia*, II, p. 63ff.; Wp 174ff., 183ff.; G. Wilpert, *La divina maternità di Maria Vergine e il profeta Isaia*: RivAC 11 (1934) 151ff.; E. Kirschbaum, *Der Prophet Balaam und die Anbetung der Weisen*: RQA 49 (1954) 129ff.; L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*. II/1, Paris 1956, 343-419; L. de Bruyne, *L'Initiation chrétienne et ses reflets dans l'art paléochrétien*: RSR 36 (1962) 27-85; Id., *Les lois de l'art paléochrétien comme instrument herméneutique*: RivAC 39 (1963) 7-91; P. Testini, *Alle origini dell'iconografia di Giuseppe di Nazareth*: RivAC 48 (1972), esp., 281ff. For the monuments mentioned in the text, see V. Forcella, *Iscrizioni di Milano anteriori al sec. IX*, Codogno 1897; C.H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report VIII. Part I: The Synagogue*, New Haven, CT 1956; F.W. Deichmann, *Frühcristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden Baden 1958; G. Santagata, *Su due discusse figurazioni conservate nel cimitero di S. Tecla*: Esercizi. Arte, Musica, Spettacolo 3 (1980) 7-14; D. Calcagnini, *Nota iconografica. La stella e il vaticinio del Vecchio Testamento nell'iconografia funeraria del III e IV secolo*: RivAC 64 (1988) 65-87; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la Via Latina*, Florence 1990; M. Minasi: TIP 264-266.

M. Marinone

III. Commentaries on the prophetic books. Fundamental esp. for knowing the exegetical method used by the *Fathers in the interpretation of the OT, the patristic *commentaries on the prophetic books mark, with their presence, the history of Christianity from the earliest centuries. Before the systematic commentaries, the prophetic texts were certainly the object of homilies as evidenced by the fact that prophetic passages were read and commented upon during the liturgical assembly (Just., 1 *Apol.* 67). The reading, alongside a passage of the Torah and commentary on a prophetic text (*haftarah*), was already in use in the Hebrew language (cf. Lk 4:16-21). It is likely the case that it was precisely the liturgical and catechetical context that helped emphasize the messianic character of the prophetic preaching (see Iren., *Dem.* 30). Undoubtedly, it was in the works of the *apologists that the presence of prophetic passages began to become very important: the prophets were presented to the *pagan world as a testimony to God's truth and his revelation (Just., 1 *Apol.*53; *Dial.* 1-9; Tat., *Orat.* 29; Theoph. Ant., *Autol.* 1,14), although in the Jewish world they were put forward again following the messianic interpretation already sanctioned in the NT (Just., *Dial.* 43; Ign., *Philad.* 5,2; 9,2; Tertull., *Adv. Jud.* 8; cf. Eus., *Dem. Ev.*; Athan., *De inc.* 11; Cyr. Jer., *Catech.* 12,19). With *Irenaeus, the prophets became the irrefutable proof for simultaneously demonstrating the dynamism and the unity of the divine economy, which was based on the centrality of Christ, who was seen both as the one foretold and the fulfiller of every prophecy: the prophets spoke of him, he was the one who had filled what they revealed (Iren., *Haer.* IV, 33-34; see also Just., 1 *Apol.* 30).

Among the works explicitly dedicated to commenting on the prophetic books, but which have come down to us only through fragments or about which we have information solely because they were mentioned by other authors, we should mention here the following literary works: the systematic commentaries of *Origen, who had written 30 books on Isaiah (Eus., *HE* 6,32,2); *Victorinus of Petovium's commentaries on Isaiah, Ezekiel, Habakkuk; and the homily, or rather the treatise, on Hosea by *Peter of Alexandria (Jer., *Vir. ill.* 74 and 76). The more or less extensive glosses on various passages of Jeremiah are what remain of the commentary, certainly complete, of all the prophetic books composed by *Ephrem, acc. to a Christocentric and ecclesiological interpretation, which was also, however, always faithful to the historic meaning and philological analysis. We mention, moreover, the commentaries on Isaiah, Hosea and Malachi by *Apollinaris of Laodicea (cited by Jerome in the prologues on his commentaries on the same books); the commentaries on Ezekiel and Daniel by *Cyril of Alexandria; those on Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah and Daniel by *Theodore of

Mopsuestia, heavily anti-Origenist in the condemnation of every christological interpretation of the text; those of ps.-Chrysostom on Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, marked by a heavy moralizing interest; the fragments on Jeremiah by *Victor of Antioch and *Olympiodorus of Alexandria, under the form of glosses that have come down to us through the *catenae*, and those on Isaiah by *Procopius of Gaza. The fragments on Hosea, Joel and Amos by *Julian of Eclanum reveal a historical and rational interpretation.

The patristic works that have survived containing commentaries on all the prophetic books or part of them are usually in the form of the homily or treatise. The first homilies that have come down to us are those on Isaiah which Origen composed, but which we only have in the Latin translation by *Jerome (the 9th homily, however, is considered inauthentic by Baehrens: GCS VIII). Likewise from Origen are 14 homilies on Jeremiah translated by Jerome: of these, 12 (on Jer 1:1–20:12) have also been preserved in the Greek text and are a model of balance between respect for the historical meaning and the spiritual implementation, which is frequent, perhaps because of the homily's catechetical character. These focused primarily on problems pertaining to God's *providence, *evil and suffering. Likewise by Origen, but translated by Jerome, we should mention the 14 homilies on Ezekiel that offer an interpretation that is primarily moral and typological. From *John Chrysostom there remain six homilies on Isaiah with a heavily moralizing tendency and 2 homilies titled *De prophetarum obscuritate*. these provide a general treatment of some of the prophetic books. From *Gregory the Great, we have 22 homilies on Ezekiel where the text, however, is often used only as a point of departure for developing a larger spiritual discussion.

With regard to the commentaries, the first that has come down to us—which is also the first exegetical treatise that has been passed down by the Fathers—is the *Commentary on Daniel* by *Hippolytus, datable to the beginning of the 3rd c. It consists of four books on the prophetic text of Daniel, as contained in the Greek version of *Theodotion, including the Deuterocanonical portions. The author proposed an interpretation geared toward calming the hearts of all those who were expecting an imminent end of the world. His exegesis was historical: he read at face value all the information that Daniel provided concerning himself and the visions that he had received, but he also made use of allegory, esp. in a christological sense. Jerome mentioned (*Vir. ill.* 81) *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Commentary on Isaiah*, written in 10 books (or in 15 acc. to the information provided in the prologue of his *Comm. Is.*). This work (recently reconstructed and edited in 1975 in the GCS 9, *Eusebius Werke*, IX), which, acc. to the author's promise, should have given a historical interpretation of the prophecies, depends, however, primarily on Origen's spiritual and allegorical reading. The text of Isaiah was taken from the LXX acc. to the *Hexapla. Also, one can consider as true and proper commentaries on prophetic passages books 2–9 and 15 of his work the *Demonstratio Evangelica*. A long commentary on Is 1–16 seems to have been falsely attributed to *Basil of Caesarea. We have much of *Ambrose's *Expositio Isaiae prophetae*, thanks to a weaving of fragments found in other works of the bishop of Milan or in Augustine's references to the bishop's work (P.A. Ballerini: CCL 14 [1957] 403-408). A systematic commentary on all the prophetic books was offered by Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 135), who, after having cited all the texts in their double translation from the Hebrew and the LXX, commented upon them first literally then spiritually. With regard to the spiritual interpretation, Jerome's dependence on Origen and, for the *Comm. Zach.*, *Didymus is obvious. Perhaps a commentary by Chrysostom on Is 1:1–8:10 is authentic, but not the following part joined to the Armenian version. Eighteen books on Is 40–60 (the only part that he considered the original work of the prophet) and the entire *Comm. Zach.*, which has been restored to us by the papyri of Tura, belong to Didymus. In this work, composed at Jerome's request (*Vir. ill.* 109), Didymus used the literal interpretation for a first approach to the text, but then passed immediately to a spiritual reading acc. to anagogy, allegory, tropology and conjecture, even if he often used these terms without numerous distinctions. Of his *Comm. Hos.*, there remain only fragments in the biblical **catenae*. From Ephrem, the *Comm. Zach.* has come down to us in *Syriac and in a Latin translation of the 18th c., which is heavily Christocentric and composed in a sober and concise manner to such an extent as to appear almost under the form of *scholia*. The books of the so-called twelve minor prophets were systematically commented upon by Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Mopsuestia: although the first made extensive use of tropology and interpreted the majority of the prophecies in a christological sense, the second referred to the history of the Jewish people—thanks to a careful historical and philological investigation—even those prophecies considered messianic by the dominant Christian tradition. Glosses on the twelve minor prophets, still almost entirely unedited, were written by *Hesychius of Jerusalem, whose *Comm. Is.* has also survived under

the form of very brief glosses on individual verses. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's commentaries on all the prophetic books have survived to this day: the first, on Daniel, with a strong anti-Jewish tone; then one on Jeremiah composed in 10 books, the most extensive of those that have survived on this prophet, and which also includes Baruch and Lamentations; on Ezekiel (often reduced to a simple paraphrase of the text even if at the beginning he seems to echo aspects of the interpretation offered by Didymus); and the twelve minor prophets. The commentary on Isaiah, written in 20 books, clearly demonstrates how much Theodoret was able to be independent from the rigid literalism of his predecessor Theodore of Mopsuestia. In fact, alongside the literal sense, he made extensive use of the allegorical and typological method, by defending the messianic interpretation of numerous prophecies. In this sense, his commentary on Isaiah draws near to that of Cyril of Alexandria, who, in five books (pertaining respectively to Is 1–10; 10–24; 25–42; 42–66), first interpreted the prophetic text in a literal sense, then spiritual. A list, though not exhaustive, of patristic commentaries on the prophets can be found in *Cassiodorus's *Inst. div.* 3.

J. Harvey, *Ézéchiel*: DSp 4, 2217-2220; L. Doutreleau (ed.), *Didyme l'Aveugle. Sur Zacharie*, SC 83.84.85, Paris 1962; C. Kannengiesser, *Jérémie* (*chez les Pères de l'Église*): DSp 8 (1974) 889-901; A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Biblia Augustiniana. AT. Livre de Jérémie*, Paris 1972; V. Peri, *Geremia secondo Origene. Esegesi e psicologia nella testimonianza profetica*: Aevum 48 (1974) 1-57; V. Recchia, *Le Omelie di Gregorio Magno su Ezechiele (1–5)*, Bari 1974; A. Benoit - P. Prigent, *L'interprétation de Jérémie dans la tradition alexandrine*: SP 12 (1975) 317-320; J.N. Guinot (ed.), *Théodoret de Cyr. Commentaire sur Isaïe*, SC 276.295.315, Paris 1980–1982; E. Gandolfo (ed.), *Omelie su Ezechiele 1 e 2*, Rome 1979–1980; P. Nautin (ed.), *Origène. Homélies sur Jérémie*, SC 232.238, Paris 1976–1977; M. Simonetti, *Note sull'esegesi veterotestamentaria di Teodoro di Mopsuestia*: VetChr 14 (1977) 69-102; Id., *Note sul commento di Cirillo d'Alessandria ai Profeti minori*: ibid., 301-330; J. Dumortier - A. Liefooghe (ed.), *Jean Chrysostome. Commentaire sur Isaïe*, SC 304, Paris 1983; M. Simonetti, *Uno sguardo d'insieme sull'esegesi patristica di 'Isaia' fra IV e V secolo*: ASE 1 (1984) 9-44; Id., *Lettera e/o allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985; A. Cataldo (ed.), *Cirillo di Alessandria. Commento ai Profeti minori. Zaccaria e Malachia*, Rome 1986; M. Borret (ed.), *Origène. Homélies sur Ézéchiel*, SC 352, Paris 1989; Ch. Morel (ed.), *Grégoire le Grand. Homélies sur Ézéchiel*, SC 327, 360, Paris 1986–1990; M.P. Ciccarese, *Perdix diabolus. L'esegesi patristica di Ger 17,11*, in *Paideia Cristiana. Studi in onore di M. Naldini*, Rome 1994, 275-296; S.Ch. Kessler, *Gregor der Grosse als Exeget. Eine theologische Interpretation der Ezechielhomilien*, Innsbruck-Vienna 1995; D. Ciarlo (ed.), *Giovanni Crisostomo. Commento a Isaia. Omelie su Ozia*, Rome 2001; G.B. Bazzana, *Autorità e successione. Fugure profetiche nei testi del giudeo-cristianesimo antico*, Milan 2004; Jerome, *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Eng. tr., M. Graves, ed. C.A. Hall, ACT, Downers Grove, IL 2011; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentary on Isaiah*, Eng. tr., J.J. Armstrong, ed. J.C. Elowsky, ACT, Downers Grove, IL 2013.

M.G. Mara

PROPHETIAE EX OMNIBUS LIBRIS COLLECTAE. Anonymous book (CPL 84, PLS I, 177-180, 1738-1741), probably of *Donatist origin, from the end of the 4th c. A list of prophets from *Adam to Zechariah, father of *John the Baptist, and some passages of the NT concerning prophecy follows a very brief debate (*disputatio*) on the seven modes of prophecy. After a response mentioned by *Cyprian, the work closes with a condemnation of *Montanist prophecy.

For the MSS, see Fr. Dolbeau - É. Poirot: SE 32 (1994) 135ff.

J. Gribomont

PROPHETS, List of. The *Vitae Prophetarum* constitute a series of 23 biographies of *prophets in Greek: the four major prophets (the longer of the *Lives*), the twelve minor prophets in Greek and seven other biblical figures. The author probably came from *Palestine. The book was written in Greek (at times it has been suggested that there was a Hebrew original) and structured acc. to the model of the Hellenistic lives of famous men, emphasizing their tombs, which has given rise to the hypothesis forwarded by D. Satran that the work originated in Christian Palestine (1st-5th c.) for the use of pilgrims traveling *ad loca sancta*. There exist seven versions of the *Vitae Prophetarum*: two attributed to *Epiphanius of Salamis, one to *Dorotheus of *Antioch (or Tyre); there exist, moreover, many Eastern versions: *Syriac, Armenian, *Ethiopian, Arabic, Georgian, Slavic and *Celtic. The book is an example of a late Jewish-Christian hagiography. The work's objective is unclear. The *Lives* were composed from biblical and legendary material. Its work was interpolated by Christians and was perhaps known to *Origen.

CAVT 213 (bibl.); BHG 1585-1590; BHO 1004-1010, see the entry *Apostoles*. T. Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices Apostolorum discipulorumque Domini*, Leipzig 1907, 1-106 (ed.); C.C. Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets*, Philadelphia 1946 (text, Eng. tr.); N. Fernández Marcos, in A. Díez Macho, *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, Madrid 1983, 507-525 (Sp. tr., bibl.); C. Lusini, in Sacchi 4, 529-570 (It. tr.); D.R.A. Hare, in Charlesworth, 2, 385-399; T. Schermann, *Propheten und Apostellegenden*, Leipzig 1907; Denis 1, 577-607; F. Dolbeau: RBen 100 (1990) 507-531; Id.: Augustinianum 34 (1994) 91-107. *Concordance grecque des pseudepigraphes d'Ancien testament*, ed. A.M. Denis, Louvain-la-Neuve 1987. J. Jeremias, *Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt* (*Mt 23,29*; *Lk 11,47*), Göttingen 1958; A.M. Schwemer, *Studien zu dem frühjüdischen 'Vitae Prophetarum,'* 1-2, Tübingen 1995–1996; D. Satran, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine*, Leiden 1995; M. Petit, *Génération et transformations de thèmes appartenant aux 'Vitae Prophetarum'*: Apocrypha 8 (1997) 273-286.

M. Starowieyski

PROSELYTE. From the Greek term προσήλυτος, which meant "foreigner," "stranger" (*peregrinus*), the term was used to refer to a convert to *Judaism. This term translates the Hebrew word *ger* (foreigner). The term appears several times in the NT. Jesus said of the Pharisees: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you travel land and sea to win one proselyte" (Mt 23:15 RSV). On the day of *Pentecost there were pilgrims at *Jerusalem (Acts 2:11); a certain Nicholas was a proselyte from *Antioch, *Syria (Acts 6:5); likewise at Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:43). At *Rome were found seven inscriptions concerning proselytes. Jesus' statement and the witness of Flavius Josephus, in the milieu of the Roman Empire, attest the missionary zeal of the Jews (*C. Ap.* 2,39). Nonetheless, scholars do not know of Jewish missionaries and the ways in which they spread Judaism; for this reason, several scholars, Will and Orrieux, e.g., have called into question Jewish missionary zeal. During the early centuries of the Christian era, Jewish authorities also elaborated the rules for accepting converts into Judaism: there was a need for instruction, indicating the precepts to observe, circumcision, immersion into water ("baptism") and a sacrificial offering. With the destruction of the *temple at Jerusalem, this latter condition was rescinded, although circumcision and immersion to be performed before three witnesses continued. Moreover, conversion also involved the change of one's name and full acceptance into the Jewish community, although there remained a few differences with the natives (e.g., the ability to assume public offices in the community). The *Talmud and the Mishnah conveyed a positive attitude toward proselytes, even if several rabbis were opposed to their conversion to Judaism for fear of infiltration and conversions of convenience (e.g., to marry a Jewish woman).

On numerous occasions, imperial legislation of the 4th and 5th c. intervened to regulate the conversion of Jews and of *pagans to Christianity and Christians to *Judaism. The emperors were favorable to the conversion of Jews to Christianity (CTh 16,8,1 from 315; *Const. Sirm.* 4), by protecting converts from Jewish retaliations (CTh 16,8,28 from 426), although they opposed conversions for the sake of convenience (CTh 9,45,2 from 397; 16,8,23 from 416). On the other hand, the legislation sought to restrict conversion to Judaism with the prohibition of circumcision of non-Jews (CTh 16,9,1 from 335; 16,9,2 from 339; 16,8,26 from 423) or with the explicit condemnation of those who had religious relationships with Jews (CTh 16,7,3 from 383) and the prohibition of participation in Jewish worship (CTh 16,8,1 from 329). The conversion of Christians to Judaism was explicitly prohibited (CTh 16,8,7).

Lampe 1171; M. Simon, *Verus Israel*, Paris 1958; GLNT 11 (1979) 297-336 (TDNT 6, 727-744); Encyclopedia Judaica 13, 1182-1191; J.M. Reynolds - R.F. Tannenbaum, *Jews and God-Fearers at Aphrodisias*, Cambridge 1987; E. Will - C. Orrieux, "*Prosélitisme Juif"? Histoire d'une erreur*, Paris 1992; L.H. Feldman, *Jewish Proselytism*, in H.W. Attridge - H. Gohei (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, Leiden 1992, 372-407; Id., *Proselytism by Jews in the Third, Fourth and Fifth Centuries*: Journ. for the Study of Judaism 24 (1993) 1-58; M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion. Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1994; J.M. Lieu, *The Race of God-Fearers*: JTS 46 (1995) 483-501; *The Mission of the Early Church to the Jews and Gentiles*, ed. J. Adna - H. Kvalbein, Tübingen 2000; M. Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch*, London 2003.

A. Di Berardino

PROSOPON. Though retaining the various meanings of non-Christian Greek, the term *prosōpon* at first became a technical term in *trinitarian theology, then in *Christology. The specific trinitarian use, witnessed to for the first time by the treatise *C. Noetum* (7; 14) and indirectly by *Tertullian (*Prax.*), was explained primarily by three factors: by the scriptural use of *prosōpon*, esp. 2 Cor 4:6: "the glory of God in the face of Christ," a meaning that remained important in all patristic literature (Lampe, 1186); by the "prosopic" exegesis prepared by *Philo, in which, against the Jews and *monarchians, a distinction was made between the divine persons and their names (see *Justin, *1 Apol.* 36,1-2); by the method of the *Stoics in opposing *prosōpon*, as individuality, to the generic (see Iren., *Haer.* III, 11,9). The term *prosōpon*, which was very rare in Eastern Christian authors writing before the 4th c., was initially found, as a trinitarian term, primarily in texts that rebuked *Sabellians for speaking of a *prosōpon*, i.e., one sole divine reality, or to speak of three *prosōpa*, but in a transitory sense (Lampe, 1187). Subsequently, even the anti-Sabellians used the word *prosōpon*, by identifying it more or less with **hypostasis* (Lampe, 1187-1188)—as done by the synodic Epistle of the Council of *Constantinople of 381 (CoeD, 24). *Gregory of Nazianzus had already defended this synonymous use of the terms *hypostasis* and *prosōpon* (*Or.* 21,35: SC 270, 186; see Hammerstaedt, 1022).

In the 2nd half of the 4th c., *prosōpon* was used also as a key term in Christology, initially under the form of a denial of the two persons in Christ, then as an affirmation of one sole *person (Lampe, 1188ff.). Two particular details should be emphasized: the expression "one person" was often characterized by an exegetical nuance, referring to the sole subject of the

biblical and divine and human attributes in Jesus Christ; also relevant is *Nestorius's quite complicated theory, which distinguished two natural *prosōpa* from the *prosōpon* of the union (Grillmeier, *Jesus*, 707-726; Lampe, 1188-1189).

M. Nédoncelle, *Prosopon et persona dans l'antiquité classique*: RSR 22 (1948) 277-299; G.-L. Prestige, *Dieu dans la pensée patristique*, Paris 1955, 141-146; C. Andresen, *Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffs*: ZNTW 52 (1961) 1-39; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum*, Paris 1962, 207-242; C.J. de Vogel, *The Concept of Personality in Greek and Christian Thought*, in *Studies in Philosophy and History of Philosophy*, Washington 1963, 20-60; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Freiburg 1979; A. Milan, *Persona in teologia*, Naples 1984 (bibl.); M. Fuhrmann, *Person*, 4: HWP 7 (1989) 274-282 (bibl.); J. Hammerstaedt, *Hypostasis*, RAC 16 (1994) 986-1035; L. Turcescu, *"Prosopon" and "hypostasis" in Basil of Caesarea's "Against Eunomius" and the "Epistles"*: VChr 51 (1997) 374-395.

B. Studer

PROSPER of Aquitaine (d. after 455). According to *Gennadius (*De Vir. ill.* 84), Prosper of Aquitaine was born in Aquitaine at the end of the 4th c. The primary sources indicate that he was at *Marseille around 426, because he was attracted to the monastic and theological milieu of St. *Victor and *Lérins. There he had numerous contacts with *monasteries, though he always remained a *layman, and became involved in the *semi-Pelagian controversy. In 428, he wrote to *Augustine to send him the treatises *De predestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae*, which originally formed one work. After Augustine's death, he went to *Rome, along with his friend *Hilary, to obtain the condemnation of the ideas that circulated in the monastic communities of Provence, which caused *Celestine I to send a letter to the bishops of *Gaul (PL 50, 528-530). Prosper reentered Marseille, where between 432 and 436, he composed his most important writings. Then, in 440, he returned to Rome, where he was at the service of Pope *Leo I in the composition of some homilies. There he died shortly after 455. His feast day occurs on June 25th.

A man of letters and able to read *Greek, Prosper put his classical learning at the service of theology. One of his letters to *Rufinus is an excellent exposition of the Augustinian doctrine of *grace. Two works written in verse, *De ingratis carmen* and the *Epigrammata*, inspired by the *Pelagian controversy, defend the theological thought of Augustine. The theological works composed in Provence maintain the Augustinian theses in the semi-Pelagian controversy: *Pro Augustino responsiones*, *De gratia Dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio contra collatorem* (the collator is Cassian) and the *Capitula* added to Celestine I's letter. At Rome, he wrote *Expositio psalmorum*, which was inspired by Augustine, the *Liber sententiarum ex operibus S. Augustini*, *Epitaphium Nestorianae et Pelagianae haereseon* and the *De vocatione omnium gentium* that modern scholarship has reattributed to him (the first work in Christian literature on the salvation of nonbelievers). One should add the *Epitome Chronicae*, the history of humanity from the beginning of the world until 433, working from the earlier chronicles written by *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Jerome, then continued until 444 (*Chronicon vulgatum*) and to 446-455 (*Chronicon integrum*), which he called the *Additamenta*. This latter part helps us to know the activity of Pope *Leo. He probably wrote the *Epistula ad Demetriadem de humilitate* (PLS III, 149). Other works were attributed to him, among which was a *Confessio* (PL 51, 607-610), *Poema coniugis ad uxorem* (PL 51, 611-616).

An uncompromising Augustinian, Prosper vociferously defended his teacher's theology of grace. His stay in Rome, however, mitigated his strict positions, teaching him to not be more Augustinian than the pope. As a result, the *Capitula* have a more moderate tone. Along the same lines, the *De vocatione* maintains God's salvific will for individuals and all of humanity, by teaching human responsibility in history and revealing missionary concerns.

The *Liber sententiarum* is the first Augustinian *florelegium. This began a widespread literary genre in the Middle Ages. Its influence would be felt at the Council of *Orange in 529. Prosper was the "first representative of medieval *Augustinianism" (Cappuyns).

Editions: CPL 516-535; PL 51 and PLS 3, 147-149; MGH, *Auct. ant.* 9, 341-499 (*Epitome*); CCL 68A (*Liber sententiarum* and *Expositio psalmorum*); PL 45, 1756-1760 and 1833-1850 (*Pro Augustino responsiones* and *Capitula*); PL 55, 161-180 (*Epist. ad Demetriadem*). Eng. tr. (partial): ACW 14 and 32; *De providentia Dei*, text, tr. and comm. by M. Marcovich, Leiden 1989. It. tr.: *La poesia davidica profezia di Cristo. Commento ai Salmi 100–150*, intr., tr. and notes ed. A. Ruggiero, Rome 1996; *La vocazione dei popoli*, intr., tr. and notes ed. M.A. Barbàra, Rome 1998. Fr. tr.: *L'appel de tous les peuples*, ed. F. Frémont-Verggobi - B. Throo, Paris 1993.

Studies: E. Valentin, *S. Prosper d'Aquitaine*, Toulouse-Paris 1900 (still useful for its literary questions, antiquated for its critical and theological topics); G. Bardy: DTC 13, 846-850; J. Gaidioz, *La christologie de S. Prosper d'A.*, Lyon 1947; G. de Plinval, *P. interprète de s. Augustin*: REAug 1 (1958) 339-355; C. Bartnik, *L'universalisme de l'histoire du salut dans le De voc.*: RHE 68 (1973) 731-758; Patrologia III, 522-528; M. Marcovich, *Prosper, De ingratis. Textual Criticism*: Illinois Classical Studies 14 (1989) 417-424; S. Muhlberger, *The Fifth Century Chroniclers. Prosper, Hydatius and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, Leeds 1990; N.W. James, *Leo the Great and Prosper of Aquitaine. A Fifth Century Pope and His Adviser*: JTS 44 (1993) 554-584; M.A. Bar-

bàra, *Il "De vocatione gentium" di Prospero d'Aquitania*: Messana 16 (1993) 107-139; A. Elberti, *Prospero d'Aquitania. Teologo e discepolo*, Rome 1999.

A. Hamman

PROSTITUTION. The term can have various social meanings. Historically, prostitution has been documented in the majority of societies since ancient times. In certain cases the practice was connected to religious and ritual practices. During the modern age, it refers to the giving of sexual relations, both male and female, as well as homosexual, for money, without any emotional involvement. In antiquity, the relationship between prostitution and the monetizing of one's own body was not so binding. Moreover, the definitions for the terms "prostitute" and "prostitution" were not so clear.

During the classical period, the chauvinism by which the Athenians interpreted *sexuality led to a belief that intercourse with a female was inferior. From this belief, moreover, there was a legal organization of prostitutes. This was established by the statutes of Solon, the first of the Western world, which was then continuously repeated, and saw prostitutes subdivided into the categories of private and public. They were also subject to taxation. The prostitute—*pornē*—was at the lowest level; she was a concubine (courtesan) if she was more educated and refined. Foreign women or freed slaves worked in the brothels (*porneion*) and solicited their services at the doors of homes and in streets. These women were required to pay a tax to the city (*polis*). Courtesans were more expensive because they were instructed in every art form, exercised by an entrepreneur (*pornoboskos*) and rented at varying prices acc. to the services performed. At the same time, prostitutes constituted a helpful source of income for the city (*polis*): for males they were pleasure for hire and a safeguard for women from their husbands. A certain social and economic discrimination, however, put the poorest women at the risk of prostitution (Artemidorus Daldianus, *Oneirocritica* 1,56, It. tr., *Il libro dei sogni*, Milan 1975, 57). A particular magistrate (*astynomos*) handled any possible dispute that arose from the practice.

In *pagan *Rome, there existed the *postribula* (brothel) and the *meretrix* (prostitute). The brothels were alongside the Tiber River, piazzas, markets and the tents where foreigners resided (*castra pellegrina*). Prostitution was also allowed in residential neighborhoods and public baths. Caligula ordered that the tax correspond to an eighth of one's income. Prostitution was regulated by the building's management and required a license (*licentia stupri*). In contradistinction to Greece, prostitutes at Rome also had to be inscribed onto a list and wear a certain type of clothing. They were prohibited from wearing a scarf and a palla (i.e., an outer garment or wrap usually worn outside by women). Female prostitution was not penalized, with the exception of cases in which the daughters of senators, consuls and *equites* were involved. Women of high social standing, however, frequently placed themselves on the list of prostitutes in order to be free from the bonds of marriage and society.

Prostitution had a social function: it allowed Roman males sexual freedom outside marriage, given the relatively advanced age of their first marriage. To marry a prostitute, however—aside from what took place between slaves and actors—was prohibited to the Roman citizen (*civis romanus*). A Roman citizen, however, could have casual sex with the same types of women without incurring the penalties tied to sexual defilement and adultery.

As proof of how difficult it was at times to clearly establish who could be defined as a "prostitute," *turpitudo* connected to the exercise of prostitution did not always end with the cessation of the activity (Ulp. 1 *ad legem Iulia et Papia*, D. 23.2.43.4); it ended, however, in the case in which the profession was practiced by a woman in the state of slavery. Furthermore, later among medieval theologians, the number of sexual partners was the key to determining when a woman could be properly defined as a "prostitute."

In the OT, despite the general condemnation, there was a certain tolerance toward prostitutes. The Jews admitted that single people, in a large city, had difficulty being chaste (1 Th 4:7). For *Paul (1 Cor 6:16), however, to have intercourse with a prostitute meant becoming "one sole flesh" with her: an image that before him had only been applied to the marital union.

From the very beginning, Christianity strongly condemned prostitution, but it did not exclude prostitutes from salvation, and at different points in history it considered the act tolerable in order to avoid worse evils. Generally speaking, Christians did not immediately and entirely change their perspective concerning prostitution with respect to pagan classicism: already in the writings of Ulpianus, the justification because of poverty was at the basis for understanding the prostitute. During this period, however, there appeared a clear rift between *Augustus, who transformed adulterers into prostitutes, and *Justinian, who sought to make them become nuns. The dress to which such women were obliged was an element of difference and a key factor in the

politics of these two emperors. Moreover, the Christian age had to wait until 389, with Theodosius, to abolish the practice that obliged adulterers to work as prostitutes in brothels (Socr., *HE* 5, 18). The economic factor was decisive in the impact of this phenomenon. Already Suetonius and Cassius Dio emphasized the fact that the taxes came to the treasury almost exclusively from female prostitutes and their pimps. Moreover, *Justin Martyr (1 *Apol*, 27), our first source on this question, mentioned this obligation of taxes even for male prostitutes. He also confirmed once again that the revenues that came from prostitution were a large source of wealth for the investors in the Roman world. The Christian attitude toward the tax on prostitution, which was very different from the pagan attitude already in this first testimony, finally led to the abolition of this tax (see also *Zosimus, *HE* II, 38).

The condemnation was also expressed in the fact that in the writings of the Fathers the term is used to refer to an unclean moral condition, not necessarily tied to the selling of one's own body. Thus, the term *porneia* could refer to, among other *sins, having multiple marriages (e.g., Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 3) but also idolatry (e.g., *Greg. of Naz., *Or.* 31). The following authors wrote against prostitution, adultery and pederasty: *Clement of Alexandria (esp. *The Pedagogue*), *Origen, *John Chrysostom, the Cappadocian Fathers, *Eusebius of Caesarea and *Tertullian (esp. his *De cultu feminarum*), although *Salvian (*De gub. dei* 7,15) stated that the prostitutes were less criminal than adulterers and that *Vandals were better than the Romans (*De gub. dei* 7,99-100) because although the Romans transformed adulterers into prostitutes, the Vandals prohibited prostitution and adultery.

*Augustine laid the ethical foundations of his tolerance for prostitution for the Middle Ages. In fact, he maintained that if prostitution were abolished, there would be greater evils: unchecked excessive sexual desire, sexual violence, adultery and homosexuality (*De ordine* 2,4: *Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinis*). Thomas Aquinas perfected Augustine's theory by affirming, among other things, that "even the palace must have its drains."

During the mid-5th c., some laws permitted authorities to divide the legislative discipline that regulated prostitution. In 291, *Diocletian and *Maximian had already punished the ransom of a freeborn female (*ingenua*) if she was then forced into a life of prostitution (CI 8.50.7). In 343, *Constantius prohibited pimps from reselling Christian women who had already been forced into prostitution. The selling of slaves, however, was permitted to church officials and Christians of proven trustworthiness (CTh 15.8.1). It was *Theodosius II, however, who began the crusade against prostitution. CTh 15.8.2, from 21 April 428, represented a decisive turn: for the first time the official authorities legislated clearly against prostitution with heavy sanctions. This ban was based on the *ius potestatis* of the *patres* and *domini* with respect to the daughters and female slaves, who could turn to bishops and advocates if they were at risk of being prostituted. Legislation on 6 December 439, *Nov.* 18, from *Constantinople, recorded the progress of Theodosius's decree on prostitution and pimps: In the name of *pudicitia* and chastity, the condemnation of prostitution rejected the monetary gains of pimps and the state from this practice. Moreover, it granted freedom to slaves and freemen who had been forced into prostitution.

In an edict that can be dated between 457 and 467 (recorded in CI in two versions: more extensive in CI 11.41.7 and more brief in CI 1.4.14), the emperor Leo tightened the condemnation and the repression of prostitution, in the most direct, articulate way, without exceptions, without mitigations or compromises, with respect to CTh 15.8.2 and Theodosius II; moreover, he completely abolished the tax (Sicari has it right, p. 41; contra McGynn, *The Taxation*, p. 94, who attributes the abolition of the tax to *Anastasius, in 498, but the proof offered is not convincing). Justinian, perhaps under the influence of his wife *Theodora, a former prostitute, took measures to defend female prostitutes from pimps and to redeem them from that lifestyle.

As to persons, examples of repentant prostitutes are Pelagia and Mary the Egyptian, who ended their lives in isolation. The first, who was an actress/comedian, in Leontius's *Life of John of Cyprus*, led a monastery of women who were all repentant prostitutes. The *Life* of the second, which is legendary in its various editions, may be connected to the oral tradition of a real person. Called a "sinner" by Usuard, Mary was introduced into the martyrology for the first time (2 April), with the same brief elegy used for *Pelagia (8 October).

K. Kunze, *Die Legende der heilig. Maria Aegyptiaca*, Berlin 1978; R. Villa, *La prostituzione come problema storiografico*: Studi Storici 22 (1981) 305-314; P. Petitmengin (ed.), *Pélagie la pénitente. Métamorphoses d'une légende*, 2 vols. Paris 1981 and 1984; F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society*, London-Sydney 1986; I. Mereu, s.v. *Prostituzione (storia)*, in *Enciclopedia del diritto*, vol. 37, Milan 1988, 440-451; T.A.J. McGynn, *The Taxation of Roman Prostitutes*: Helios 16/1 (1989) 79-110; J. Beaucamp, *Le statut de la femme à Byzance (IV^e-VII^e siècle)* 1. *Le droit impérial*, Paris 1990, 2. *Les pratiques sociales*, Paris 1992; A. Sicari, *Prostituzione e tutela giuridica della schiava. Un prob-*

lema di politica legislativa nell'Impero romano, Bari 1991; W. Formigoni Candini, *Ne lenones sint in ullo loco reipublicae Romanae*: Annali dell'Univ. di Ferrara, Sez. V, Scienze giuridiche 4 (1991) 97-127; J.A. Brundage, *Sex, Law and Marriage in the Middle Ages*, Aldershot 1993; A. Leone, *Un'adultera* meretrix *a Bulla Regia. Alcuni aspetti della città tardoantica*, in *Africa Romana*, ed. M. Khanoussi - P. Ruggeri - C. Vismara, Ozieri 1996, 1371-1383; A.S. Scarcella, *La legislazione di Leone I*, Milan 1997; T.A.J. McGynn, *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, New York-Oxford 1998; B.E. Stumpp, *Prostitution in der römischen Antike*, Berlin 1998; R. Flemming, Quae corpore quaestum facit: *The Sexual Economy of Female Prostitution in the Roman Empire*: JRS 89 (1999) 38-61; T.A.J. McGynn, *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World. A Study of Social History and the Brothel*, Ann Arbor, MI 2004.

T. Sardella

PROTERIUS the Alexandrian (4th c.). After the deposition of Patriarch *Dioscorus by the Council of *Chalcedon (451), the *dyophysite Proterius was elected by the See of *Alexandria, with the approval of the local aristocracy and the support of the emperor *Marcian, and was forced to undergo the violence of the miaphysite reaction at the council. In fact, he came against much hostility among the populace, the clergy and the monastic milieu, where he was considered a betrayer of the theological tradition of the church of *Alexandria. It did not help him that he accepted *Leo the Great's **Tomus ad Flavianum* and that he regained approval from *Rome. After the death of the pro-Chalcedonian emperor Marcian in January 457, Timothy Aelurus ("the weasel"), immediately after having been consecrated as the rival monophysite bishop, provoked the murder of Proterius at the hands of the crazed mob while he was celebrating the liturgy of Holy Thursday, and instead made himself Patriarch *Timothy II of Alexandria. The only document that has survived is the letter that Proterius wrote to Leo the Great (*Ep.* 133 in Leo's epistolary, and the Latin translation of *Dionysius Exiguus) around 454, in which he defended the Alexandrian calculation for the celebration of *Easter.

CPG 5473; PL 54, 1084-1094 = PL 67, 507-514 (*Epistula ad Leonem papam*); Patrologia V, 352-353.

K. den Biesen

PROTEVANGELIUM of JAMES. The proper title of the apocryphal work is the *Birth of Mary*; the title *Protevangelium of James* goes back to its first editor, G. Postel (1552). It is one of the most important apocryphal works in the group of the so-called infancy gospels. Written in Greek in the 2nd half of the 2nd c., it is preserved in the P. Bodmer V of the 3rd c. It was written outside Palestine but exactly where cannot be determined; the author is a *Jewish Christian, but it is not known why *James, brother of the Lord, is considered the author. The *Protevangelium* contains a *midrash* on Mary: it speaks of the parents of Mary, Joachim and Anna, of the birth of Mary, of her childhood, engagement and the annunciation and of the birth of Jesus; the last three chapters are dedicated to Zechariah, Elizabeth and *John the Baptist. There are numerous versions or paraphrases of the *Protevangelium*: in Arabic, Armenian, *Coptic, Ethiopian, Georgian, Old Church Slavonic and *Syriac, independent or inserted into other apocryphal texts that speak of the infancy of Jesus (e.g., the *Gospel of ps.-Matthew*). The *Protevangelium* is particularly important from the dogmatic point of view (Mariology), defending the virginity and purity of Mary against the affirmations of Jewish and *pagan polemicists (e.g., Celsus). It is important from the liturgical point of view: some feasts come from it (Joachim and Anna, the Presentation in the Temple). The *Protevangelium*, furthermore, gives an interesting example of the exegesis of certain texts of the OT. From the stylistic point of view it is a very beautiful and expressive book, with some poetic passages. The *Protevangelium* had a profound influence on Christian art, particularly in the Christian East, and on the Marian homiletic tradition of Christian Antiquity.

CANT 50; BHG 1046; BHO 611, 613-14. *Editions*: E. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*, Subs. Hag. 33, Brussels 1961; E. Amman, *Le Protévangile de Jacques et ses remaniements latins*, Paris 1910. *Concordance*: A. Fuchs - E. Eckmair, Linz 1978. Lat. vers.: J. Gijsel, *Het Protevangelium Iacobi in het Latijn*, Antiquité classique 50 (1981) 351-366; J.D. Kaestli, *Le Protévangile de Jacques en Latin*: Revue de l'histoire des textes 26 (1996) 305-324; Id., *Un témoin latin du Protévangile de Jacques. L'homélie "Postulatis filiae Ierusalem" en honneur de S. Anne* (*BHL 483-485*): Apocrypha 9 (1998) 179-223; Id., *Le Protévangile de Jacques latin et l'homélie "Inquirendum est" pour la fête de la Nativité de Marie*: Apocrypha 12 (2001) 99-154; R. Beyers, CCAp 14 (2001) 884-957.

Translations: Eng.: O. Cullmann, in Schneemelcher ET 1, 421-439; Elliott 48-67; R.F. Hock, *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas*, Santa Rosa 1995; Fr.: Amman, *Le Protévangile de Jacques*; A. Frey, EApC 1, 73-104; Sp.: Santos Otero 120-171; J. González Núñez - C. Isaer Hernández - P. González Casado, Madrid 1997 (Apócrifos cristianos 3); Ger.: O. Cullmann, in Schneemelcher 1, 334-349; G. Schneider, *Apokryphe Kindsheitsevangelien*, Fontes Christiani 18, Freiburg 1995, 95-145; It.: A.M. di Nola, Parma 1986; Erbetta, 1, 7-43; Moraldi, 1, 60-87; Craveri 5-28; Fr.: E. Amman, *Le Protévangile de Jacques*; E. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*; Starowieyski, 1, 267-290.

Studies: L.M. Peretto, *La Mariologia del Protovangelo di Giacomo*, Rome 1955; Id., *Influsso del Protovangelo di Giacomo nei secoli II-IV*: Mar 19 (1957) 59-78; J.A. de Aldama, *El Protevange-*

lio de Santiago y sus problemas: EphemMar 12 (1962) 107-130; E. de Strycker, *Le Protévangile de Jacques. Problèmes critiques et exégétiques*, in *Studia evangelica*, TU 88 (1964), 339-359; P.A. van Stempvorort, *The "Protevangelium Jacobi," the Sources of Its Themes and Style, and Their Bearing on Its Date*, ibid., 410-426; H.R. Smid, *"Protevangelium Jacobi." The Commentary*, Assen 1965; F. Manns, *Essais sur le judéochristianisme*, Jerusalem 1977, 106-114; E. Cothenet, *Le Protévangile de Jacques comme premier témoin de la piété mariale populaire*, in *Liturgie, spiritualité, culture*, Conf. St. Serge XIX[e], Rome 1983, 63-80; Id., *Le Protévangile de Jacques. Origine, genre littéraire et signification d'un premier midrash chrétien sur la nativité de Marie*, in ANRW, 2, 25, 6, Berlin 1988, 4252-4269; W.S. Vorster, *The Protevangelium of James and Intertextuality*, in *Text and Testimony, Essays in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, ed. T. Baarda, Kempen 1988, 262-275; F. Bovon, *La suspension du temps dans Protévangile de Jacques*, in Id., *Révélations et écritures*, Geneva 1993, 253-270; I. Backus, *G. Postel, T. Bibliander et le Protévangile de Jacques*: Apocrypha 6 (1995) 7-65; E. Peretto, *Criteri d'impiego di alcune citazioni bibliche nel "Protovangelo di Giacomo,"* in *Saggi di patristica e di teologia biblica*, Rome 1997, 25-52; S.J. Voicu, *Verso il testo primitivo dei* Παιδικὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *"Racconti dell'Infanzia del Signore Gesù"*: Apocrypha 9 (1998) 7-95.

M. Starowieyski

PROTOGENES of Serdica (d. after 343). Bishop of the city of *Serdica (today Sophia) in Dacia, to whom a rescript from *Constantine was addressed (CI 1,13,1 from 316, or from 323). Constantine reinforced the concession of manumission of the slaves in church during an assembly, in the presence of the bishop—a practice already allowed by the law. Constantine often resided at Serdica: this leads one to think that Protogenes was an old friend of the emperor and followed his directions. He was present at the Council of *Nicaea and at the Council of *Constantinople of 336 to discuss the case of *Athanasius. The latter council was considered a continuation of the councils of *Tyre and *Jerusalem of 335. The Council that was celebrated in his city in 343 was presided over by Hosius of Cordoba and not by him. Protogenes signed fourth, i.e., after Hosius and the two Roman legates.

DCB 4, 500; L.W. Barnard, *The Council of Serdica 343 A.D.*, Sofia 1983; S. Stoytcheva, *Bishop Protogenes of Serdica. His Life and Theological View (335–351)*: ByzS 60 (1999) 308-314; H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford 2002.

A. Di Berardino

PROTOKTISTI (Protoktistoi). The Greek term meant "first creation," as, e.g., the angelic powers (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 5,6: PG 9, 61, a; Greg. Naz., *Carm.* 2,1,13 and 182), light (*Epiphanius, *Haer.* 76,26), wisdom (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 5,14: PG 9, 132A), etc. In the 6th c., in the context of the Origenist controversy in *Palestine, after the death of *Nonnus (d. 547), there occurred a division into two factions, the *Origenists of the New *Laura called the *protoktistoi* monks of Firminus's laura, although these referred to the others as *isocristi*, among whom one should mention *Theodore of Scythopolis. The former maintained Christ's superiority in relation to other rational beings in the context of preexistence, inasmuch as Christ was the first creation of all other creatures and joined to the *Trinity as a fourth person, hence the name *tetraditi*: they were moderate Origenists. The isocristi, however, maintained that in the final restoration (**apokatastasis*) all rational beings would be equal to Christ: they were radical Origenists. Among the isocristi, we should mention *Theodore Ascidas (d. 558) who, before becoming bishop of *Caesarea, Cappadocia, was the abbot of the New Laura. The attitude of Theodore Ascidas led the *protoktistoi* to come close to the position of the orthodox; in fact, Isidore, the superior of Firminus's laura, renounced the doctrine of the preexistence of *souls and went to *Constantinople with the orthodox Conon, the superior of the Great Laura, in 552. The *Christology of the isocristi had connections to *monophysite Christology. (*See also* *creation [double], *protology.)

F. Diekamp, *Die Origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil*, Münster 1899; E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skytopolis*, Leipzig 1939; DAFC 3, 1228-1258; A. Guillaumont, *Les 'Kephalaia gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, Paris 1962; J. Binns, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis*, Kalamazoo, MI 1991; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ. The Monasteries of Palestine, 314–631*, Oxford 1994; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy. A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, Rome 2001; Grillmeier II/3.

A. Di Berardino

PROTOLOGY - STUDY of ORIGINS
I. General notions: Religious-historical typology - II. History of Christianity.

I. General notions: Religious-historical typology. Scholars speak of "protology" and "protological theory" in analogy and at times in connection to "*eschatology" and "eschatological theory." The "beginnings," the *prōta*, the *archē* are thus seen in relation to the "last things," the *eschata*, the *telos*. If one looks at the religions and philosophies of the ancient world, this relationship appears to have been seen differently. At times, the beginning has only an inchoate character, implicit with respect to the ful-

fillment; at other times, however, the last things are presented as the restoration of the beginning; in other cases, the two views are combined in different measures and ways. Extreme cases of this phenomenology—foreign, however, to the writings of the patristic age—are positions familiar to Greek pre-Socratic thought of an evolutionary hylozoism from which variety in the world derived from a simple and basic *archē* or the idea of a repetitive cycle, which is based on the contrast or even dialectic of the One and the Many, as, e.g., in the dualistic monism of Empedocles and certain Orphic formulations. Another aspect of protological themes that directly interests scholars of Christian thought concerns widespread motifs in world religions: the foundational character at the beginning, with respect to the present state of the universe and humankind. The figures and events of the beginnings establish or rather condition the present, under the substantial and existential point of view. Herein lies the importance of the study of "protological theory." One also easily understands, outside and within Christian thought, how the characterization of entities and agents acquire importance, agents to whom a creative and an active or demiurgic power is attributed; at the same time the theme of a fault or a fall (or accident) that occurred in the beginning acquires importance, which imprinted on the world and humankind a mark that conditions them and renders urgent the need for salvation and *soteriology. This, in turn, has an eschatological function, but also with different modalities, in view of the reintegration of the beginning, i.e., the condition of the primordial integrity.

In this context, still remaining on the phenomenological level, but a phenomenology constructed with an eye to historical concrete research, there emerge alternative historical-religious categories: (a) that of a single creative act, even if developed in phases or moments, however, not motivated by faults or accidents situated at the level of the first creatures, or (b) that of a "double *creation," which in turn is expressed in different ways: (1) A creator God makes use of the collaboration of other creative "agents" of an inferior level, who render God "innocent" at every possible contact with the *evil that could emerge from the creatures' ontological imperfection (Plat., *Timeaus* 41A-43A: the Demiurge and the "young" gods, his collaborators in the creation of man; Philo of Alexandria, *Op. mundi* 72-75; *Fug.* 69-70, etc., for the most part follows the pattern given by the *Timaeus*; late Jewish conceptions of a *deuteros theos* or demiurgic *angels that are not hostile to God). (2) A single creator who, however, "adds" to the first creation a second creative intervention (second not necessarily in a chronological sense, but in an ontological sense), likewise justified by a fall of the first creatures (*Origen, *Gregory of Nyssa, etc.). (3) Also there is the *gnostic theory of an ignorant and proud Demiurge who transmits to beings formed by him these deformed characteristics of his, which, however, are not such that they abolish that pneumatic "self" that comes to the gnostic from an original outpouring of the divine substance, albeit unconsciously conveyed by the Demiurge itself. (4) Lastly, in the *pagan world, an alternative to the gnostic position was that of *Plotinus, who maintained a radical monism (the One, whence the **Nous*, whence the *Soul), which, however, through a sort of rationality-necessity intrinsic to the system, implies the self-manifestation at the emanative levels below the One (the souls, but already in its own way the *Nous*), of a *tolma* ("boldness"), that is not only ethical but also ontological, demonstrating in itself the entire "devolutionary" process, down to the embodiment of the souls and the final shore of pure matter; a devolutionary idea that is also implicit in such gnostic systems as that of *Valentinus, who believed that in the last, peripheral, and feminine *aeon, Sophia, her qualities bore—almost inscribed as such—the ontological premise of a crisis that specifically would give rise to the Demiurge and the psychic and hylic substance in the world and man.

On the basis of the foregoing, one understands how the notions—diverse but specific—of the "double creation" implied dualistic positions that vary from an ontological *dualism of the monistic type (Plotinus and, in their own way, the gnostics) to a dualism in a broad theological sense (God and the Demiurge for the gnostics, but also, even in the other sense, well or poorly suited to biblical monotheism, the aforementioned teachings of Plato's *Timaeus* and *Philo of Alexandria, who obviously did not speak of "gods," but of powers or angels with a demiurgic duty). Further variations extend to an anthropological dualism (even this, however, in its own way is ontological as is any dualism, properly speaking) such as that implicit dualism (through the inheritance, esp. Platonist, of a different mediation) in Origen's doctrines concerning the "heavy" embodiment of souls (the *noes*) or the primordial *Adam "the *image of God" and therefore—acc. to this line of interpretation—not destined in the first intention of the Creator (i.e., in the "first creation") for the physiological function of *sexuality (an analogous position is found in the radical *Encratism of *Tatian or *Julius Cassian, with the essential difference that these men used it to justify the absolute

incompatibility of such a function with God's intention for humankind, or at least with the regime of the new covenant). We find intermediary positions in the **Liber graduum* and in the writings of several *Fathers, never, however, in the sense of a condemnation of *marriage and neither, with respect to these Fathers, in the context of an overall position on the topic, but rather in the context of the ascetic ends that (although making reference to protological theories such as these or the aforementioned ones) tend to express the novelty of evangelical *spirituality.

Returning to the aforementioned distinction between a single creative act (even if divided, but not as a consequence of a fault committed) and "double creation" (in its various specifications), we note how the protological theory of evil appears differently in two cases, just as the protological theory of the actual constitution of the *world and humankind. Facing a single creative act, the *sin of those who were first formed remains foundational in a certain (or explanatory) sense with respect to humankind at the present moment in its qualifying conditions of existence (death, fatigue, work, need for salvation, hereditary sin as expressed in the conception of "original sin"), but does not, however, involve anthropological dualism. Such dualism is involved, however, in the conception of "double creation," in a way that fits its various theorizations (Platonic, gnostic, *Origenist and perhaps already in certain positions of apocalyptic *Judaism: interpretations of the biblical account of the "sons of God" in Enoch, etc.). In all these cases, instead of "original sin," the sources speak of a "previous fault."

Lastly, we should note how the protological theme (and the theory) functions as a type, albeit in various ways, with respect to the eschatological theme (and its theory). In every form of Christian thought, an original integrity, lost by those who were first formed, was conceived as requiring a final reintegration or *apokatastasis. But when the notion of "double creation" is involved, the position that develops in its various aforementioned meanings is quite specific. In this instance, the reintegration leads to the elimination of the significance of the "second creation" itself, i.e., of the psychic-hylic components acc. to gnosticism, or of "heavy" corporeality, implying a sexual structure of human beings, acc. to Origen's perspective. Thus in the writings of Origen, on the basis of the correspondence (even if not complete in every aspect) between *archē* and *telos*, the *archē* is outlined acc. to the *telos*: i.e., the original situation of Adam is conceived—on the model of the eschatological situation—as "angelic," not sexual or at least not destined to the exercise of a sexual function and to procreation by means of sexual intercourse. Placing this projection at the inception of the Origenist line connects it, phenomenologically if not historically, to the line of *Encratism in its various and nuanced meanings (from Tatian and Julius Cassian, to the **Odes of Solomon*, ps.-*Macarius, and the *Gospel of *Thomas* [in its Encratite component inasmuch as it can be distinguished from the gnostic component]). An Origenist-Encratite connection comes with the essential difference of the admission, quite clear in the Origenist line, of the lawfulness and advisability of the institution of marriage in the present *economy. To this one should add that it would be mistaken to miss the observation (at times undervalued or reduced in terms of generic Platonizing "language") of the effective ontological and anthropological depth of the protological theory because it is expressed with notions of "double creation" and "earlier fault"; this mistake neglects the fact that for the Fathers who adhered to the Origenist line and for nongnostic Encratism, the other dimensions and promptings of their spirituality and their biblical sources which they intended to refashion also often have a protological nature (the primordial innocence of Adam, the original splendor of the angelic creatures then fallen, the "new creation" introduced by Christ and the evangelical spirituality). Likewise, it would also be mistaken to underestimate the constant preoccupation of the Fathers with the safeguarding of *orthodoxy, not only with respect to *God the Creator, the ontological goodness of creatures and the doctrine of the *resurrection of the *body, but also with respect to the lawfulness and divine origin of the institution of *marriage, which was contested, albeit with certain nuances, by radical Encratism.

Thus, with respect to *virginity, theories of great protological depth (the original nature of Adam was not made for procreation through sexual intercourse) were aligned with other theories, also "protological" but not implying "double creation" (innocence and nonconcupiscence in the primordial couple and also of its eventual *synousia*), also eschatological (on the basis of Mt 22:30; Mk 12:15; Lk 20:34-36), and *ascetical, concerning the coming of the kingdom (Mt 19:12), etc. One must also consider the various distributions of these theories, keeping in mind chronology, literary genre, etc., as well as the concrete, reciprocal interchange that occurs between them. Under this last aspect, one should not forget the frequent connection, in being paired together (in *pendant),* that is made between protological and eschatological theories. Neither should one forget the possibility that, in the writings of the Fa-

thers themselves, protological theories of the "double creation" type, though remaining significant for the reconstruction of their thought and its underlying foundations, may have been utilized by them as a conventional way of expressing a meaning that was more broadly ascetical and spiritual, or more specifically tied to personal spiritual experiences.

Finally, we should provide an entirely typical conception of protological theory, even if it can be essentially framed within gnosticism: the *Manichean explanation that implies the original separation and the coeternity of the two substances, *light and darkness. This original situation is distinct from the state of mixture that characterizes the time in between, the end of which will follow with a restored separation of the two substances. Such a separation characterizes both Manichean eschatology-soteriology and the sexual and dietary Encratism theorized by this religion. The historic-religious presupposition of the Manichean protological theory, i.e., the formula of radical dualism (implying the coeternity of two principles, in comparison to the "mitigated" dualism of other gnostics and the dualistic monism of the *Neoplatonists) is found even in the radical dualism of Zoroastrianism that also acknowledged a darkness coeternal with light (it is not, however, identical to matter, as it was for gnostics). In fact, Zoroastrianism even combined protology and eschatology on the basis of the notion of the original and final separation between light and darkness. The process of the cyclical, but not repetitive, aspect of this separation, however, both in Manicheism and Zoroastrianism, remained foreign to the Greek idea of an eternal return or, at least, of a pure and simple final restoration of the primordial condition. In fact, at the end, darkness will be emptied of that aggressive potentiality that characterized it at its origin.

U. Bianchi

II. History of Christianity. In the Christian tradition, the basis of every anthropological formulation is offered by Gen 1–3, which, after the double account of creation of the first couple, described the situation of the those who were first formed in *paradise. After the accounts of creation follow the narratives of the transgression of the commandment, the expulsion from the Garden of Eden and the definition of the state of humanity as subject to death, fatigue from work and, for the woman, submission to her husband and birth pains connected to procreation.

In the other books of the OT, references to this protological framework are scarce and allusive; the only significant uses of these occur in Deuterocanonical texts. In addition to the brief mention in Tob 8:5-6 to the union of Adam and Eve, the book of Sirach mentions the transgression by attributing it to the woman's responsibility (Sir 25:24), although Adam is exalted as the one who was "above every living being" (Sir 49:16). The Wisdom of Solomon defined the one who was formed first as the "father of the world," endowed with "strength to rule all things," being ransomed, through wisdom, from his "transgression" (Wis 10:1-2). Ps.-Solomon recognized, moreover, another individual responsible for the entrance of death into the world, when in 2:23-24 he stated that "God has created man for immortality, an image of his own nature he made him; it was through the envy of the devil that death entered the world." The motif of φθόνος (envy) toward man, evidently connected to man's special dignity; the implicit identification of the serpent from Genesis with the "adversary," Satan, of other biblical texts; the contrast between the original ἀφθαρσία (immortality) and the death that took over after the transgression—all these elements enrich the lines of the protological framework emerging from Gen 1–3.

These became further expanded and complex in the rich apocryphal literature that flourished within *Judaism in the centuries near the start of the Christian era. This literature is in fact characterized not only by having apocalyptic and eschatological interests, but also by its focus on the beginnings of human history, which were considered decisive in many ways for determining the present-day state of affairs. The literary cycle gravitating toward the figure of Adam, which finds its most ancient expression in the *Life of Adam* in its two versions, the Latin (*Vita Adae*) and the Greek (*Apocalypse of Moses*), presented the original state of those who were first formed in terms of their commonality of life with the angels, coexisting with them in paradise and consuming "angelic food," to which is compared the "animal" food that the two found on Earth once they had been expelled from their primitive dwelling (*Vita Adae* IV, 1-2). Of special interest for the purpose of characterizing the protological framework present in this work is the theme of the "venom of wickedness," injected from the serpent-Satan into the forbidden fruit, which is identified with "concupiscence" (*epithymia*), the beginning and root of all evil (*Apoc. Mos.* 19,3). Another tradition, rather solid and widely diffused, attributed a decisive weight in determining human destiny to the equally primordial activity of a group of angels, the Vigilant ones identified with the "sons of God" from Gen 6:1-4, who had come on earth to unite with women and

teach them forbidden knowledge and skills. This theme, which finds its most ancient and elaborated example in the Ethiopian version of the book of *Enoch*, runs through a large portion of Jewish apocryphal literature from the book of the *Jubilees* to the **Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, to *2 Baruch* and was known to the Essenes at *Qumran, *Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus. This theme entered the patristic tradition from *Justin Martyr to *Ambrose, *Jerome and beyond, revealing the interests incited by such a topic even within primitive Christianity as an explanation for the origin of evil in the world, which is attributed to sinning angelic beings.

In the ancient Christian tradition, however, a decisive importance was attributed rather to Adamic protology, asserted, moreover, in the Pauline scheme of the first and second Adam as a paradigmatic sign of the history of salvation. Without pretending to exhaust the depth of such a scheme, suffice it to say that *Paul's focus on the redeeming universality of Christ's work led to an equally exclusive focus on the efficacy of the contrary sign of humanity's ancestor who, as the antitype of the Heavenly ancestor, "the first from the earth" (1 Cor 15:45-49), was depicted as the one "in whom all die, as in Christ all will be brought to life" (1 Cor 15:22), in the context of the invitation to put away the earthly image of him and to reclothe oneself with that of the *epouranios*. The theme of Adam *typos tou mellontos* in Rom 5:12-21 is based on the distinction between the *paraptōma* of the first pair and the salvific *charisma* (*charis/dōrea*) of Jesus Christ; the former, the forerunner of death and condemnation; the latter, of *life and *justification, respectively under the signs of complete disobedience and complete obedience.

It is not possible to trace here the various lines of development of the theme of protology in the patristic tradition. However, we should distinguish, alongside the Pauline line that heavily emphasized the negativity of the role of the first pair and discussed at length their status before sin, at least two primary tendencies respectively characterized: one by the idea of the inchoate character of the privileges of the original condition and the other by a notable insistence on the perfection and completeness of Adam, at times presented even as the goal of eschatological expectations. The first of such dispositions found its most organic and articulate expression in the writings of *Irenaeus, who, though exalting the very special prerogatives of prelapsarian Adam, privileged the notion of his "childhood" so that, if in one passage it implies "simplicity" and absence of malice (cf. Iren., *Dem.* 14), in another it also expresses that fundamental incompleteness and immaturity through which his fault was made possible. The divine work of redemption unfolding along the course of history was considered to be an education and guide toward humanity's complete maturity, within the framework of the "*recapitulation" in Christ of all creation. *Clement of Alexandria participated in the tradition that attributed to the first pair the quality of innocence, but also that of incompleteness, which is characteristic of childhood, when, in the *Protrepticus* (XI, 111,1), he depicted them as "free from everything," playing in paradise. Sin was thereby understood as a submission to pleasure, once Clement, following the example of Philo of Alexandria, identified in the serpent the figure of "pleasure that slithers on its belly, a carnal vice that turns toward matter." One encounters here the notion, elaborated in different ways, that would characterize the protological framework of the interpretive line that was interested in the exaltation of the exceptional privileges of prelapsarian Adam. The original state of the first pair is in fact defined as free from any worry of the material order, completely turned toward the *contemplation of *God, while sin consists in turning toward the sensible level, primarily described as ἡδονή. On the other hand, Clement, the only writer among the Fathers, with the exception of *Zeno of Verona, explicitly identified the first sin as the practice of marriage. With that, he conceded the chief point to his Encratite adversaries against whom he bitterly fought in the Third Book of the *Stromata*, except in the fundamental premise of the identification of Adam's fault with the physical union. Nevertheless, Clement substantially opposed the Encratite beliefs by affirming the intrinsic goodness and permissibility of marriage, oriented from the beginning by God for humanity and only unduly "anticipated" by the latter, because—the first pair were still "young" (*neoi*)—they should have waited for a better time (*Strom.* III, XIV, 93,3 p. 239, 16-21 Stählin; cf. XVII, 103, 1 p. 243, 23-25). Despite the fact that the first sin was seen in light of marriage, for Clement marriage appears to have been a reality pertaining to the divine plan for human beings, which did not therefore undergo substantial changes or "additions" because of the first transgression.

The Encratite perspective, to the contrary, implies the idea that physical union and subsequent generation are not only the matter of the first sin, but an activity that is substantially foreign to human nature, completed at the devil's instigation and in imitation of the beasts. The object of Clement's attack was the teaching of Tatian, Julius Cassian, the anonymous Encratites, already denounced by *Irenaeus for their radical abstaining, who continued in

the biblical line with the admission of the one sole divine Demiurge, but defined marriage and physical procreation as "animal" activities, an object and sign of the fall introduced by Adam. With that, it attributed to the first sin a specific foundational efficacy, which introduced in human life, against the divine will of the Creator, a constituent element of its present dimension. These particular protological motifs of radical *enkrateia* that condemned marriage as "fornication and corruption," in the Encratite circles, were accompanied, moreover, by a series of other motifs that were only partially shared by the orthodox, among which, along with the motif of the *imitatio Christi*, was the essential eschatological tension, in the double sense that complete continence procured the final resurrection and, at the same time, anticipated it and made it present already in this life. Clement upbraided his interlocutors for already considering themselves resurrected (perhaps on the basis of an identification of *baptism with *anastasis*) and for this reason rejecting marriage and procreation.

Also evident among Encratite circles of this period was a particular type of *exegesis on the passage from Luke's gospel's about the condition of resurrected beings (Lk 20:34-36), acc. to which all those who do not marry show themselves to be "the sons of that aeon" because already at the present moment, they live "like angels," who do not take husband or wife. Within the entirety of themes that crept into the Encratite perspective for establishing their radical rejection of marriage, the special protological scheme underlying that supplied one of the essential explanations; in fact, given the notion of a state of original perfection (*symphonia* of soul and spirit for Tatian; the completeness of the soul as *epithymia* in Julius Cassian's writings; the unity preceding the sexual differentiations in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*) and construing the salvific action of Christ as the restoration of the prelapsarian condition, the specific connection between Adam's transgression and the use of marriage led the Encratites to consider abandonment of the practice of marriage, a practice that was identified by antonomasia as sin, an inevitable necessity for salvation itself.

In the patristic tradition, with the principle of the legitimacy of marriage and procreation safeguarded, one can identify a different, but substantially homogeneous interpretive line which, insisting at one moment on the very special prerogatives of Adam and on the other exalting the values of continence and Christian virginity, in the wide framework of ethical-ascetic, eschatological and ecclesiological explanations on which those values rest, also left space for the typical protological explanation. This occurred when, presenting the perfect Adam of paradise as a virgin and by identifying in marriage and physical generation "a remedy" made necessary by the state of the fall and postlapsarian weakness, configured the *enkrateia* and virginity not as a "sign" of the resurrected, but as the anticipated realization of it and, contextually, a restoration of the original perfection. In this interpretive line, one places authors from various doctrinal presuppositions, from Tertullian and Origen to *Athanasius, *Didymus the Blind, *Basil of Ancrya, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *John Chrysostom and, in the West, Ambrose, Jerome and, for the first phase of his position on the topic, *Augustine.

Given the heavy eschatological tension in Tertullian's thought, this entry has no need of specific examples; if the structure of Christian *virtues, and in the first place, continence, are aimed at the attainment of that blessed *telos* in which the saints, acc. to the text from the gospel of Luke, will be *translati . . . in angelicam qualitatem et sanctitatem* (*Ad uxor.* I, I,5), for the African author, virgins enact in advance that eschatological condition, those who *iam in terris non nubendo de familia angelica deputantur* (ibid., I, IV,4). Such a *status* is at the same time a return to Adam's prelapsarian condition, being characterized by the complete extirpation of concupiscence, which is foreign to *paradise. In fact, this makes room for perfect completeness (cf. *De anima* 38,2; *De monog.* 17,5), such that those "who want to be received into paradise must finally cease from that activity (i.e., marriage) by which Paradise was contaminated" (*De exhor. cast.* 13,4). One can see then how the preeminent eschatological explanation of Tertullian's ethics and its heavy ascetical components cannot be divorced from a particular protological vision: one established on the notion of Adam's virginity in paradise and the identification of marriage and procreation as the chief signs of the postlapsarian condition, characterized by such activities—although legitimate inasmuch as they have been granted by God as "added" elements in characterizing a fallen human condition, which are neither useful nor necessary in the state of original integrity.

In the writings of Origen, protology was divided into two stages, the first creation, pertaining to equal and free intelligences united to God and to each other in perfect charity, and the "second" creation (in the double sense of chronological posteriority and ontological inferiority), relating to the material substance that supplies a support—along with an opportunity for the fall and the means for redemption—for intelligent creatures that have distanced

themselves in various ways, through "satiety" and incompetence, from the initial good and perfection. Human history is thus characterized by two beginnings: the one is metahistorical and immersed in the level of preexistence of the *noes* ("intelligences"), and the other, specifically connected with the story of Adam, where Origen maintained the biblical presupposition of a first human being created by God and a protagonist of the events in Eden. In a fragment from Origen's *Commentary on the Letter to the Corinthians*, this "historical" Adam is contrasted with the original state of perfect completeness, in the soul's total dedication to the contemplation of God. The contrast is made between the "historical" Adam and the postlapsarian condition in which marriage is practiced, for which his body was not ordered in the original divine plan. Thus it is clear that Origen's ideas about virginity and continence, which are so central to the spirituality of this Alexandrian master and his entire *anthropological vision, within the larger cosmological and eschatological framework, were deeply conditioned by the protology articulated acc. to the scheme of the double creation.

A further, typical example of the inevitable reciprocal connection between anthropological, ethical-ascetic and eschatological themes was offered by *Gregory of Nyssa. In his treatise *De virginitate*, Gregory passionately defended the postlapsarian condition of the institution of marriage, which, because it was a remedy and a "consolation" for the death begun by sin, is nevertheless prolonged with the continuation of birth and death, i.e., the present regime of *genesis-phthora*, while *parthenia*, which destroys this relentless cycle, poses a barrier to death itself; it restores the integrity of paradise and anticipates the blessed *eschaton*. His work titled *De opificio hominis* set forth a more complex and ontologically modified protological framework. The perfect creation of "complete" humankind, acc. to the image and likeness of God, contemplates the absence of sexual distinctions, because the multiplication of historic humanity has been entrusted to a mysterious form of generation in an "angelic" manner. The anticipation of Adam's future sin, because of which humanity would incline toward matter and sensible pleasure, led the Creator to add to the image the "animal" element of sexuality which, through physical union, would equally permit the multiplication of humankind that had by that time fallen, in order to reach that "fullness" to which it had been destined in the primordial divine project. A very peculiar scheme of "double creation" that, having put aside Origen's notion of preexistence and its implication for the chronological contextuality of the "first" (the element for the "image") and the second creation ("added" consisting in the distinction of sexes), equally configures one graded protology to two levels, which conditions the anthropological, ethical and eschatological vision of Gregory of Nyssa. Historic humanity is in fact the product of a single creative action of God that, nonetheless, in the foresight of Adam's transgression, confers to the human body that "animal"-type distinction of sexes, which is foreign by "nature" to the creature, which God would have wanted to be entirely in his own image corporeal but not sexual. Gregory reconfirms that sexuality, a constituent element of historical humanity, is a product of a secondary addition, caused by the historic Adam, and constitutes, moreover, a "second" anthropological level.

Augustine, after an early period of accepting the protological scheme that had been solidified by that time, acc. to which marriage appeared incompatible with Adam's complete state, rejected such a scheme in order to affirm, with an ever-more clear resolution during the *Pelagian controversy, that marriage and physical procreation belonged to God's original plan for humankind. He thus affirmed a different protology that was already widespread in the patristic tradition, including such representatives as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and, later, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and others from the Eastern and Western churches. In Augustine's writings, protology acquired a specific awareness and articulation in relation to his doctrine of "original sin," which, while emphasizing the multiple and dramatic devastating effects of Adam's transgression on all of humanity, attributes to these effects an exclusively ethical-religious significance. In this manner, Augustine consciously rejected the explicit or implicit anthropological implications of a protology that identified in Adam's sin the "foundational" event of a typical human activity and existential dimension, the sexual, expressed in marriage and procreation.

J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*, I-II, Paris 1934; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*: Annali Fac. Lett. Filos. Università di Macerata II (1969) 1-227; U. Bianchi (ed.), *La "doppia creazione" dell'uomo negli Alessandrini, nei Cappadoci e nella gnosi*, Rome 1978; Id. (ed.), *Arché e Telos. L'antropologia di Origene e di Gregorio di Nissa. Analisi storico-religiosa*, Atti del Coll. di Milano 17-19 maggio 1979, Milan 1981; P. Pisi, *Genesis e phthorà. Le motivazioni protologiche della verginità in Gregorio di Nissa e nella tradizione dell'enkrateia*, Rome 1981; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Protologia ed encratismo. Esempi di esegesi encratita di Gen. 1–3*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 75-81; Id., *Enkrateia e antropologia. Le motivazioni protologiche della "continenza" nel cristianesimo dei primi secoli e nello gnosticismo*, Rome 1984; U. Bianchi (ed.), *Atti del Colloquio internazionale su "La tradizione dell'enkrateia.*

Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche," Milan 20-23 aprile 1982, Rome 1985; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *L'*Epistula Titi discipuli Pauli de dispositione sanctimonii *e la tradizione dell'*enkrateia: ANRW II, 25, 6 (1988) 4551-4664, repr. with modifications in Id., *Agostino. Tra etica e religione*, Brescia 1999, 191-304; Id., *Image of God and Sexual Differentiation in Tradition of Enkrateia. Protological Motivations*, in K.E. Børresen (ed.), *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, Oslo 1991, 138-171; Minneapolis [2]1995, 134-169.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

PROTOPASCHITES. Numerous methods for observing *Easter and calculating the date on which it had to be celebrated were already known in ancient Christianity; nonetheless, the Council of *Nicaea imposed the Alexandrian calculation on all the churches of the empire: this date was similar to the practice in *Rome. As part of this calculation, authorities kept in mind the spring equinox; therefore, permission to celebrate *Easter before this time was not granted. Some Christians in *Syria, however, whose method of calculating Easter did not take into account the equinox, were not aware of this rule. For this reason, their Easter was occasionally celebrated on a different date from that of *Alexandria and *Rome: this question was resolved in a condemnation in 387. These Antiochene Christians, who were condemned by *Athanasius (*Chronicon Paschale*: PG 92, 76CD; *Pasch. Ep.* 39) and *John Chrysostom (*Adv. Jud.* 3,3), became known as Protopaschites.

V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines*, I, *La Chronologie*, Paris 1958, 42; R. Cantalamessa, *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza*, Casale Monf. 1984 (repr.), 134.; P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils. The Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils*, Crestwood, NY 1996, 19-26; K. Gerlach, *The Antenicene Pascha. A Rhetorical History*, Leuven 1998, 257-317.

A. Stewart-Sykes

PROTREPTIC. The term refers to a type of discourse directed esp. to young people (προτρεπτικὸς λόγος), primarily for encouraging them to dedicate themselves to philosophy as true wisdom. Common Latin renderings for the concept of protreptic were as follows: *adhortatio*, *cohortatio* and *exhortatio*, but also the simple term *hortatio*. It was introduced as a genre by the Sophists, in the form of *logoi* of exhortation to the practice of *rhetoric; they intended to draw from the protreptic speeches of the Socratic philosophers Antisthenes and Aristippus. The most famous protreptic of Antiquity was written by Aristotle, only rare fragments of which remain. Works bearing the same title are connected to, among others, the names of Epicurus, Cleanthes and Chrysippus. In Late Antiquity, the genre of protreptic saw its use extend to the sciences and arts, with the works—lost like the earlier works—of Galen, *An Exhortation to the Art of Medicine*, and *Themistius, *An Exhortation to Rhetoric*. However, the protreptic of the *Neoplatonist philosopher *Iamblichus, which constituted part of his *Summary of the Pythagorean Teachings*, is extant. In Latin, among the works that were based on an Aristotelian model, we should esp. mention Cicero's lost dialogue *Hortensius*, the reading of which made a great impression on the young *Augustine, setting him ablaze in search for truth (*Conf.* 3,4,7-8): in this document, Cicero maintained that he silenced the detractors of philosophy (*Tusc.* 2,4). To the academic Philo of Larissa, whom Cicero had among his students at *Rome, scholars have in fact traced the canonical bipartition of the protreptic speech: in one part disputatious (at times called "aprotreptic"), from its apologetic character, and the second part a *parenesis (or protreptic in the strict sense of the term) intended to demonstrate the values of philosophy, or rather to push one to adopt a "philosophical" style of life, close therefore to an epidictic or deliberative speech.

Against the background of the traditional philosophical theme, we should read the intention of Christians to revert to the protreptic genre, in a manner more or less explicit, and reverting in particular to the Aristotelian paradigm. This occurred both inasmuch as the new faith came to be considered globally and inasmuch as it was proposed as the true philosophy, the only road to truth and a corresponding practice of life (Hadot), and because essential dimensions of the Christian existence can require a deeper explanation and defense because of their intrinsic difficulty and loftiness. In the *Protrepticus*, *Clement of Alexandria exhorted *pagans to convert to the Christian faith, demonstrating negatively the deceitful character of traditional and mystic Hellenic religiosity, which were founded on myth; he proposed in their place the superiority of Christianity, which consisted in following the teaching of the divine Logos itself. Among *Origen's writings, the following documents can be traced back to the protreptic genre: not only the *Exh. ad mart.*, which makes explicit mention of this genre in its title, but also the treatise *Peri euchēs*, inasmuch as it is completely bent on defending the possibility of prayer against the pertinent metaphysical objections and the numerous practical obstacles that such an act encounters (Perrone). *Basil of Caesarea's *Speech to Young Men* is directed toward an audience receiving a school education that was still permeated by pagan culture in order to exhort them to value the

secular *paideia* as an ethical and religious propedeutic for divine revelation, also with the objective of gaining cultural credit for the ascetic ideal in a society that looked upon it with much reservation (Gribomont, Naldini). In a broader perspective, one observes (Cook) that the protreptic genre of the works that can be ascribed to it in their totality borders the protreptic character diffusely interwoven in the language of early Christian literature, where the authors intended to lead the interlocutor or the recipient to conversion by using on the demonstrative level arguments that, despite their often topical framework, tended to become characteristic of a Christian rhetoric of persuasion, such as miraculous signs, the wisdom contained in the Scriptures, the great example of the lives of the faithful, prophecy and fear of punishment in the afterlife.

LACL 598 with bibl.; M. Naldini, *Sulla "Oratio ad adolescentes" di Basilio Magno*: Prometheus 4 (1978) 36-44; E.R. Curtius, *Letteratura europea e Medio Evo latino*, Florence 1992, 614.622 n. 38 [orig. ed. Bern 1948]; J.G. Cook, *The Protreptic Power of Early Christian Language. From John to Augustine*: VChr 48 (1994) 105-134; L. Perrone, *Il discorso protrettico di Origene sulla preghiera. Introduzione al* ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΧΗΣ, in *Il dono e la sua ombra. Ricerche sul* ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΧΗΣ *di Origene*, SEA 57, Rome 1997, 7-32; P. Hadot, *Esercizi spirituali e filosofia antica*, Turin 2005 [orig. ed. Paris 2002].

F. Pieri

PROVERBIA GRAECORUM. A collection of 74 apothegms, translated from Greek, that we know through the Irish scholar *Sedulius and also through references in other sources, such as Cathwulf's letter to Charlemagne (MGH, *Epist.* IV, 503). This collection is generally considered to be an adaptation, made in 6th-c. *Ireland, from the Greek.

CPL 1130; S. Helimann, *Sedulius Scottus*, Munich 1906, 121-135; J.F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, I, New York 1929, 566.

S. Zincone

PROVIDENCE. The patristic teaching on providence as an active (as opposed to passive) divine attribute is the product of two traditions that as they flow together achieve development and theological depth: (1) the tradition of classical theodicy for which πρόνοια (= *providentia*) is the divine rationality that harmoniously organizes and guides the course of the *cosmos, and (2) the biblical tradition, acc. to which providence is the active and loving will of a personal and creator God in relation to beings created by him, esp. in view of the realization of the salvific plan for humanity.

The doctrine of divine providence that directs the life of the cosmos was already articulated by Plato (*Tim.* 30 and 44) and became the common heritage of the leading classical philosophical schools of the Hellenistic-Roman era, with the sole exception of the Epicurean school. It had, however, special relevance in the philosophical-religious tradition that drew upon *Stoicism: Panaetius wrote the περὶ προνοίας, used by Cicero in the second book of the treatise *De natura deorum*; Seneca wrote the *De providentia* (see also Diog. Laërtius, VII, 147; Cic., *Nat. Deor.* II, 22,58; Sen., *Nat. Quaest.*, II, 45,2). Christian authors, esp. the *apologists, often referred to the classical teaching on providence esp. in contexts aimed at vindicating Christian monotheism (Just., *Dial.* 1; Athenag., *Leg.* 19,3; Theoph. Ant., *Ad Autol.* II, 8; Tatian, *Orat.* 2; Iren., *Haer.* III, 25; *Elenchos* I, 21,1; Orig., *C. Cels.* IV, 74; Tertull., *An.* 20,5; Min. Fel., *Oct.* 19,10; Lact., *Div. inst.* I, 2,2-3; VII, 3,6; *Ira Dei* 9). In the praise of divine providence in creation, the teaching of Christian authors moved in the direction of classical theodicy and did not substantially detach itself from it; providence is the divine reason that devises, disposes and governs the universe (Athenag., *Leg.* 8; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 148,2; VII, 9,1-4; Novat., *Trin.* VIII, 43: Lact., *Ira Dei*, cc. 9-10; Aug., *Civ. Dei* XXII, 24). Providence is extended to the entirety and to the particulars of the cosmos (Athenag., *Res.* 18,5; *Leg.* 24,3; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 153,4; Orig., *Princ.* IV, 1,7; *C. Cels.* V, 71; Min. Fel., *Oct.* 18,3; Novat., *Trin.* VIII, 43). In a particularly evident way, providence is manifested in the functionality, beauty and harmony of the members of the human body (Min. Fel., *Oct.* 18,1ff.; Lact., *De opif. Dei* 1,16; 2,10; 3,4; 4,23-24; 6,6; 8,15; Aug., *Civ. Dei* XXII, 24; Greg. Nyss., *Hom. opif.*, cc. 8-9). Providence guides and governs all of humanity and individuals (Just., *1 Apol.* 44,11; Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 91,3; *Strom.* VII, 9,1-4; Novat., *Trin.* VIII, 43; Lact., *Ira Dei* 19,6). But in this respect, Christian authors mentioned the substantial difference between the Christian understanding and the classical notion of εἱμαρμένη or *fatum*, that denies human freedom (Just., *2 Apol.* 7,4; Theoph. Ant., *Ad Autol.* III, 7; *Elenchos* I, 21,2; Clem. Alex., *Exc. Theod.* 74; Orig., *C. Cels.* I, 10; Eus., *Praep. ev.* VI, 6; Aug., *Civ. Dei* V, c. 1ff.).

Providence governs and directs the destinies of peoples and human kingdoms. Already *Origen (*C. Cels.* II, 30) presented as providential the concurrence of the *pax augusta* in the universal Empire of Rome and the birth of Christianity; an analogous idea would return and be developed by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Praep. ev.* I, 4,2-5; *Dem. ev.* VII, 30-33.35).

*Lactantius commemorated the intervention of divine providence in the fall of the persecutors of the church (*De mortibus persecutorum*, c. 1) and in the ascent of *Constantine to the position of emperor (*Div. inst.* VII, 26,12). The commemoration of providence in the development of human history is one of the driving motifs of *Augustine's treatise *De civitate Dei*; providence has directed the destinies of human empires (*Civ. Dei* V, 12; V, 13; V, 15); it wished to repay the moral virtues of the ancient Romans with the power of an empire (*Civ. Dei* V, 12; V, 13; V, 15). Not entirely foreign to the classical philosophical-religious tradition (cf. *Asclepius* 39) was the idea of a divine providence that exercises its cosmological functions through intermediary "powers"; in the Christian understanding, God exerts providence through angels (Athenag., *Leg.* 24,3; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 148,2; Novat., *Trin.* VIII, 45; Method., *Res.* I, 37).

One can also connect back to the classical philosophical-religious tradition the idea of the divine Logos as the rational power that organizes and directs the cosmos, so that one can immediately attribute to the Logos the divine providence that pervades the cosmos; this doctrine can be found in the *Letter to Diognetus* (7,2), and it occurs in *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VII, c. 2) and Irenaeus's writings (*Haer.* I, 22,1-2). But this idea was esp. dear to Eusebius of Caesarea, for whom the Logos was the divine πρόνοια itself that creates and guides the universe (see Eus., *Laud. Const.* XII, 7); the Logos takes care of humankind with paternal love (*Theoph. syr.* I, 79); the Logos is responsible for the governance of kings and their legislation (*Dem. ev.* V, 1,6); the Logos educates humanity by guiding it to the summit of Christian civilization (*Theoph. syr.* II, 93).

Undoubtedly in the patristic tradition, esp. among the Greek Fathers, the influence of classical theodicy dominated with respect to the cosmological function of providence. But because Christian thinkers explicitly referred to the notion of providence as an active attribute of God, the Creator and Father of the biblical revelation, there were not lacking patristic statements specifically inspired by the biblical teaching through which providence is esp. manifested in the history of salvation. Moreover, in the writings of certain Christian thinkers, the idea of providence coincides with the divine will unfolding itself in the salvific "economy," so that the entire framework of the salvific "plan" and its individual traces are a manifestation of divine providence.

Divine providence is manifested in human history with a pedagogical action that leads to a progressive and ever deeper understanding of God and his work in the world (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI, 17,153,1; Aug., *Civ. Dei* X, 14). Providence awoke the *prophets of the OT to foretell the coming of Jesus Christ (Just., *Dial.* 118,3; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* V, 6,2; VI, 128,3; Eus., *Theoph. syr.* II, 93); it illumined humanity through Holy *Scripture (Orig., *Princ.* IV, 7; *Sel. in Ps.* 1). The progressive education of humanity and its development in *grace until the contemplation of God was actualized by divine providence (or the divine "*economy") through the incarnation of the Word, the dispenser of paternal glory for the good of humanity (Iren., Haer. III, 20,2; IV, 20,6-7; Novat., *Trin.* XVIII, 100). According to Eusebius of Caesarea, the Word is the dispenser of divine providence, which is esp. actualized by it with deliverance from the cult of demons, from there onward with the call to the understanding and worship of the true God; by means of his laws and his precepts, by means of the prophets and other just men, the Word teaches the fear of God.

Lastly, by suggesting love through truth and for the good, it elevates humanity to civilization and an encounter with Christian truth (cf. *Theoph. syr.* II, 93). Divine providence arranged for the call of the Gentiles to be God's people instead of the Jews (Just., *Dial.* 118,3); it still predisposes humanity to receive the divine call to salvation (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 2,3); it creates the church (*Hermas, *Vis.* I, 3,4) and edifies it with the sacred Scriptures (Orig., *Princ.* IV, 7). Inspired by biblical revelation is the understanding of divine providence that allows evil in the world, but it is not indifferent to it; it actually makes use of it as an occasion for merit for those who are good (Iren., *Haer.* IV, 38,4; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I, 17,86, 1ff.; Aug., *Gen. c. Man.* II, 28; *Civ. Dei* XIV, 11; *Enchir.* 11).

Especially drawn from biblical revelation was the eschatological perspective on the doctrine of providence, namely, that it prepares one for reward or punishment acc. to one's merits. This was the thesis developed by Lactantius in his treatise *De ira Dei*, but it also occurs in his *De mortibus persecutorum*. Lactantius categorically rejected the Stoic idea of an exclusively benevolent providence; precisely because God is provident, he cannot become indifferent to the transgressors of his law: *Si est providens, ut oportet Deum, consulit utique generi humani, quo sit vita nostra et copiosior et melior et tutior. Si est pater ac domimus universorum, certe et virtutibus hominum delectatur et vitiis commovetur. Ergo et iustos diligit et impios odit* (*De ira Dei* 19,6). Precisely because he cannot be indifferent toward moral evil, God judges and condemns sinners (*De ira Dei* 22,3; 24,9). To be the final judge of the good and the evil worked by all people is in keeping with divine provi-

dence: this teaching occurs frequently in the writings of the Fathers (Athenag., *Res.* 18; Iren., *Adv. Haer.* IV, 36,6; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 12,87,2; Orig., *Princ.* II, 9,8); in the variety and proportionality of the divine punishments against sinners, providence is clearly revealed (Aug., *Civ. Dei* XXI, 13; John Chrysost., *Hom. in Matt.* XIII; *In Ps.* IV, 10).

H.-D. Simonin, *La providence selon les Pères grecs*: DTC 13/1 (1936) 941-960; A. Rascol, *La providence selon S. Augustin*: ibid. 961-984; J. Behm, προνοέω, πρόνοια: TDNT 4 (1967) 1009-1017; Lampe, πρόνοια, 1157-1158; H. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis. Studien zu Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus*, Berlin 1932; G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, London 1936, 55-75; M. Spanneut, *Le Stoïcisme des Pères de l'Église*, Paris 1957, 325-331; V. Loi, *Lattanzio nella storia del linguaggio e del pensiero teologico pre-niceno*, Zürich 1970, 66-69; Ch. Parma, *Pronoia und Providentia. Der Vorsehungsbegriff Plotins und Augustins*, Leiden 1971; B. Brons, *Pronoia und das Verhältnis von Metaphysik und Geschichte bei Dionysius Areopagita*: FZPhTh 24 (1977) 165-186; H.S. Benjamins, *Eingeordnete Freiheit. Freiheit und Vorsehung bei Origenes*, Leiden 1994; R.J. Kees, *Die Lehre von der* Oikonomia *Gottes in der Oratio Catechetica Gregors von Nyssa*, Leiden 1995; G. Madec, *Thématique augustinienne de la Providence*: REAug 41 (1995) 291-308; P. Frick, *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*, Tübingen 1999; S.-P. Bergjan, *Der fürsorgende Gott. Der Begriff der* PRONOIA *Gottes in der apologetischen Literatur der Alten Kirche*, Berlin 2002.

V. Loi - H.R. Drobner

PRUDENTIUS (348?–after 405). Born probably at *Calagurris* (Calahorra on the Upper Ebro), Aurelius Prudentius Clemens belonged to that provincial Hispanic-Roman aristocracy that made a career on the success of the Spanish Emperor *Theodosius (379–395) of Cauca—without a doubt present-day Coca in Old Castile. A melancholy that was still similar to the Roman poet Horace characterizes his work, the introduction to which is written in verses that he placed before the collection of his poems published in 404/405, under the form of *Confessions* in miniature, a biography that precedes the exposition of his poetic project. There one perceives the passionate scholar of *rhetoric, the ambitious lawyer, the governor of the province who ended his career in the high office of private counselor to the emperor (*proximus*), perhaps until the emperor's death in 395. Retirement was the occasion for a second "new life" for this well-read Christian: his *conversion to the perfect life then led him on the path of asceticism and great poetry. The second expressed and maintained the hopes of the first; or rather, it became a spiritual exercise in asceticism, praise of God, service to the church for a singular testimony to faith and poetic culture, an extremely diversified literary production.

Prudentius planned in advance the course of his entire work, like that of an enormous basilica, a sort of Christian *archipoem*, perhaps aiming to emulate in every genre the traditions of ancient poetry (W. Ludwig). Or, more likely, he slowly organized, in four works that had already been completed, a production scattered over the course of many years and perhaps begun before his retirement from his high post to his lands and the province of *Tarraconensis (at Calahorra? or at *Saragossa or at *Tarragona?—three cities whose martyrs he esp. praises). The fact is that the *praefatio*, in a summary that provides the outline, does not exactly correspond to the works preserved under Prudentius's name: "That my sinful soul may compose hymns all my days and not pass a night without praising the Lord, that it may fight heresies and display the Catholic faith"; this strophe specifically alluded to the lyric collection of the *Cathemerinon* and its title and appears to invoke in what follows, with less precision, the didactic and theological poems, in hexameters, of the *Apotheosis* and the *Hamartigenia*. "This poem, by trampling upon the *pagan rites brings about the destruction of your idols, O *Rome": this verse well announces the antipagan polemic of his epic books *Contra Symmachum*. The celebration, through hymns on the passion and the cult of the martyrs (esp. Roman and Spanish), shines through in the following verse: "It consecrates a cult for the martyrs; it celebrates the *Apostles" (see *Peristeph.* 12, on martyrdom and the Roman sanctuaries of *Peter and *Paul). But at this point the presentation comes to a halt; nothing allows one to suppose the existence of the allegorical epic poem of the *Psychomachia* ("the soul's combat"—for the soul and within the *soul—between vices and *virtues personified), nor the *epigrams that serve as captions to figurative representations of biblical scenes: the *Dittochaeon* ("double nourishment"—of the two testaments?). Perhaps these two poetic compositions were completed after the publication of the edition of 404-405.

Collections of poems in various lyric meters and long poems written in hexameter contrast with each other, in their form, as the two sides of Prudentius's poetry: on the one hand there is that lyrical side, on the other that epic and didactic side. But, in effect, the entire project draws its unity from a properly hymnodic design, even if it only appeared later to Prudentius as the unifying principle of his poetry: "being unable on its own merits, this poem praises *God at least with its voice": all this poetic production is, therefore, heard, thought and desired as a "lyrical oblation," as a literary form of a "spiritual sacrifice." This is the font whence flows a specifically

religious poem, which, by means of hymnody, is directly connected to the *liturgy: this is the celebration (*concelebret*). As such, and even if it is progressively distinct in a very personal way (one observes that in the course of the *Cathemerinon*; see J.L. Charlet), it is found in the rich experience of its predecessors, the poet-bishops *Hilary of Poitiers and *Ambrose of Milan.

This learned poetry, the work of a layman of very broad and refined culture, produced a difficult synthesis of various currents of the Latin poetic tradition, as renewed and continued over the course of the 4th c. This is reflected in Prudentius's poetry like a sort of vast panorama. As a backdrop, we find the formation and the classical tastes of a "man of the Muses" who not only knew the writings of Virgil and Horace, but also Lucretius and Catullus as well as Ovid, Lucan and the poets of the Flavian Age. One can also perceive, in the background, the Renaissance of an innovative poetry in Latin letters of the 4th c.: *Optatianus Porfyrius's figured poetry, the scintillating overrefinement of Ausonius (J.L. Charlet recently demonstrated that their influence was considerable), the use in literate society of epigrams, wordplays and *centos. But most of all, Prudentius received the inheritance of three-quarters of a century of Latin Christian poetry. After an epic and meditative "re-presentation" of the Scriptures (*Juvencus—already during the time of *Constantine, a Hispano-Roman), during Prudentius's generation the following were released: the epigrams of Pope *Damasus, the hymns of *Hilary and *Ambrose, *Paulinus of Nola's search for a great Christian poetry (but the chronology with respect to Paulinus and Prudentius and their works, and therefore their reciprocal influence, remains difficult to establish).

Prudentius's genius consisted in taking on, in service of the project that we have tried to describe above, the three different styles and conceptions of poetry, by attempting at the same time to unite them, but also to follow their inflections in poetry of very diverse tones and genres. One cannot reduce him to a "neoclassicist," conscious of his means, demanding in his technique, a passionate *retractator* of the great ancestors of the Augustan Age and the Late Empire. Indeed, he was a poet imbued with the poetic aesthetics of Late Antiquity: consequently, his exaggerations and his baroque animation, the violence of his passion and imagination, his alternating taste for the pitiable and the gracious, the overly Hellenistic spark (*poikilia*!) of tones, levels of vocabulary and style—in short, a mixture of genres characteristic of the new "late" Alexandrianism. All this was established on the religious inspiration of the Christian poet, who was led to express in his verses this symbolic perception of the world and existence, which is common to the *homo religiosus* and the poet. In order not to misjudge Prudentius's talent, we should not reduce him to one of his three personages and neither should we eliminate any of them, but we should understand well that the first two were at the service of the third.

The lyrical collections are the most transparent witnesses of his spiritual project. With a concentric composition (or "mandala"), evidently from a Hellenistic source, each poetic work gravitates toward a center that is always the meditative paraphrase of one or many episodes of sacred history. Those works thus actualize, in their time, a lived and "ruminated" **lectio divina*—as stated by Ambrose and medieval monks. Thus, each poem is like the *libretto* of a small liturgy for the Christian imagination.

The pious ballads of the *Peristephanon* end by exalting this literary cult of the martyrs, which had already been expanded, in prose, through literature of the *Acts,* which was increasingly more fictitious, and, esp., the *Passions*. Prudentius therein unfolds the art of the lyrical and dramatic narration that is at times colored with a popular zing, acc. to the oral legends, the keys of which we have often lost (but the 6th composition is dedicated to the martyrs of *Tarragona whose *Acts* have been preserved, and one can, in this privileged case, compare his poetic work against the outline of a prose source).

The iconography of the frescoes or mosaics located in the sanctuaries of the martyrs has also played a role that makes us certain of the poet's precise allusions: thus, at Imola for *John Cassian, or at Rome for Peter and Paul. The geography of the *martyria* he commemorated maps for us the itinerary followed by the poet during a mysterious trip to Rome, the causes for which trip he offered only oblique statements. The poetic works in hexameters are more austere, but less original. Here, the poet has great difficulty working as a theologian in verse: but this layman did not possess the solid theological genius of Hilary or Ambrose. He attempted to be a Lucretius of Christian doctrine, in the structure of his demonstrations as well as in the forms and vocabulary that they express. The rhetorical and polemical epic poem (one thinks of Lucan and Juvenal; one can demonstrate that he attempted to imitate them) of the two songs *Contra Symmachum* juxtaposes a violently satirical rhetoric of the pagan religions and the celebration of the ideology of the Christian empire, and the black and white antithesis between barbarians, rustics, pagans and Romans,

citizens and Christians. The poem that would be most read and most represented by medieval iconography still merits greater attention. The discovery of the *Psycomachia* disturbs us because of its allegory. It is a Homeric series of duels between virtues and vices personified, dressed up as heroes and heroines of an Aeneid that would lead one to think of the "work," or the *auto sacramental*, every time. The *ekphrasis* (a poetic description of works of art acc. to Alexandrian poetry) reappears in this temple of the soul as the heiress of the allegorical temples of ancient poetry (cf. *Georgics*), and the prophetic visions of the heavenly *Jerusalem are concretized here in a splendor of precious materials and colors.

In the writings of Prudentius, Latin Christian poetry reaches its highest expression in the great generation of Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome. This work would immediately become a model that the poets of the 5th-c. West would not fail to reread, and more than anyone else, be read by medieval schoolboys. This "sweet Prudentius, with unrivaled mouth, so great and famous for his various poetic compositions"—as *Isidore of Seville would write at the beginning of the 7th c. on the walls of his library, where a picture of Prudentius may have well been—could be considered the prince of Christian poets.

Editions: CPL 1437-1446; PL 59, 767-1078; 60, 11-594; CSEL 61; CCL 126. *Text and Translation*: ed. M. Lavarenne, in 4 vols., Paris [2]1955–1963; LCL 2 vols., London 1949–1963; BAC 58, Madrid 1950. *Studies*: I. Rodríguez Herrera, *Poeta Christianus, Prudentius' Auffassung von der Aufgabe des christlichen Dichters*, Diss. Munich 1936 (Sp. tr. Salamanca 1981); B.M. Peebles, *The Poet Prudentius*, New York 1951; I. Lana, *Due capitoli prudenziani*, Rome 1962; Chr. Gnilka, *Studien zur Psychomachie des Prudentius*, Wiesbaden 1963; K. Thraede, *Studien zur Sprache und Stil des Prudentius*, Göttingen 1965; R. Herzog, *Die allegorische Dichtkunst des Prudentius*, Munich 1966; W. Ludwig, *Die christliche Dichtkunst des Prudentius und die Transformation der klassischen Gattungen*: Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 23 (1977) 303-372; Patrologia III, 267-281 (with bibl.); W. Evenepoel, *Studies in the Liber cathemerinon of Aurelius Prudentius Clemens* (in Dutch, summary in Eng.), Brussels 1979; M. Sotomayor, *La Iglesia en la España romana*: Historia de la Iglesia en España, I, Madrid 1979, 312ff. and 318-333; J.L. Charlet, *L'influence d'Ausone sur la poésie de Prudence*, Aix-Paris 1980; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien*, Paris 1981 (a fourth of the work is dedicated to Prudentius); J.L. Charlet, *La création poétique dans le Cathemerinon de Prudence*, Paris 1982; L. Gosserez, *Poésie de lumière. Une lecture de Prudence*, Louvain 2001; K. Smolak, *Die Psychomachie des Prudentius als historisches Epos*, in *La poesia cristiana tardoantica e medievale*. Atti del Conv. int., Macerata 4-6 maggio 1998, Turin 2000, 121-144; Id., *Der Hymnus für jede Gebetsstunde* (*Prudentius, Cathemerinon 9*). *Eine interpretierende Analyse*: Wiener Studien 113 (2000) 215-236.

J. Fontaine

PSALMODY. Throughout the Psalter one finds allusions to acts of worship: sacrifices, oracles, blessings, processions and feasts; some assistance was needed for the singing of the *Psalms; the psalmist sang and also mentioned the musical instruments. Titles and rubrics ("selah," "alleluia") show that the collection was made for the liturgy of that period. In the worship of the synagogue, the Psalter was not part of the readings (i.e., the Law and the Prophets) and does not seem to have had a fixed place, but it was nonetheless used. It is difficult to say how much of these adaptable and variegated worship traditions the first Christian assemblies preserved; one must undoubtedly insist on the inspired and charismatic character of the hymns and the Psalms joined to the readings, the *Eucharist and the exhortations. One can perceive a great interest for biblical songs analogous to the Psalms; the Psalms were certainly connected to the collection of the canonical *Scriptures at a very early date (one could possibly weigh the comparable influence of groups of biblical writings by counting the references to these biblical songs, i.e., the references to the Psalms, in the writings of the various *Fathers). One could certainly trace back to *Judaism the practice of having a soloist chant a Psalm aloud, with a slightly adorned melody, to which the community joined itself with shouts of praise under the form of a refrain ("responsory").

In the church, the well-prepared "choir," which knew the Psalter by heart and which for a long time was made up of consecrated *virgins, pious persons and the clergy, grew after the advent of *monasticism. In *Egypt, however, a community of monks tended to listen in silence to the song of the reader, accompanying it from time to time with a silent prostration and a concluding prayer. Traces have been preserved of the introduction of more active psalmodic practices at *Antioch or at *Milan in the 2nd half of the 4th c. in order to strengthen the communities of the Nicene opposition against the conservative and less popular customs of the *Arians. The spread of this antiphonal chant was rapid and placed an abundant amount of psalmody into the divine office. One can therefore recognize that one of the temptations of the richest and most artistic *liturgy was to immediately limit the monastic use of the Psalter to give more time to the melodies or free liturgical poetry (which was much more bland and less rich with profound *spirituality). Every local church experienced its own evolution, sometimes exceptional, at other times mediocre. This does not exclude the fact that psalmody remained the foundational structure of the liturgical prayer of the canonical hours.

H. Schneider, *Die altlat. bibl. Cantica*, Beuron 1938; J. Gelineau, *Les formes de la psalmodie chrétienne*: La MaisonD. 33 (1953) 134-172; P. Salmon, in A.G. Martimort, *L'Église en prière*, Paris 1961, 789-824; E.T. Moneta Caglio, *Lo jubilus e le origini della salmodia responsoriale*, Venice 1976-77; P. Jeffery, *The Introduction of Psalmody into the Roman Mass by Pope Celestine I (422–432). Reinterpreting a Passage in the "Liber Pontificalis*: ALW 26 (1984) 147-165; Ph. Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien (IV^e-XIII^e siècle)*, Paris 1996; Id., *A-t-on connu la salmodie alterne à deux choeurs en Gaule avant l'époque carolingienne?*: RBen 114 (2004) 291-325; 115 (2005) 33-60; C.A. Blaising – C.S. Hardin, eds., *Psalms 1–50,* ACCS OT 7, Downers Grove, IL 2008; Q.F. Wesslschmidt, ed. *Psalms 51–150,* ACCS OT 8, Downers Grove, IL 2007.

J. Gribomont

PSALMS, BOOK of. The New Testament multiplies allusions to the Psalms, as does the book of Isaiah (see Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart [26]1979, 752-757); christological interpretation abounds in songs of messianic triumph, the prayers of the righteous sufferer, the interpretation of the history of salvation, the kingdom, the holy city. Perhaps the little-known historical context of these prayers, which were always applicable and relevant, esp. facilitated their evangelical interpretation (see, e.g., J. Dupont, *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1967, 245-390). During the first three centuries, the Psalms remained (with Isaiah) the most-used prophetic book for *apologetics or pastoral ministry (see *Biblia Patristica* I-VII, Paris 1975–2000). The task was primarily to understand Christ's prayer and to participate in it as a church. The Septuagint translation was often obscure, and yet as an expression of a more universal and more prophetic prayer of the Hebrew Psalter, it presented itself esp. well for this adaptation (see B. Fischer, *Le Christ dans les Psaumes. La dévotion aux Psaumes dans l'Église des martyrs*: La MaisonD 27 [1957] 86-108; A. Rose, *Psaumes et prière chrétienne*, Bruges 1965).

The *commentaries on the Psalter were so numerous and abundant that it was impossible to preserve them all in their original form; they were primarily transmitted through complicated exegetical **catenae*, which are only beginning to be studied in their entirety. The fragments, which numerous scholars have discovered from isolated MSS, were so full of lacunae and so unreliable that scholars still do not have any idea about the history and the development of this literary genre. The richness of *Origen's works was such that a very large number of later commentators (*Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hilary of Poitiers, *Ambrose of Milan, *Jerome and many others) ransacked them, a fact that, if harmful to their survival, favored their influence. At the present moment, M. Harl, who is at the head of a group of Hellenists, and E. Mühlberg are systematically working on an edition of the *catenae*; R. Devreese, who opened the way for them, as an older scholar has provided a global analysis of what is valid in what has been edited up to this point. One can therefore attempt to offer a systematic presentation of the primary commentaries. We must first of all mention Origen. Practically speaking, his first exegetical attempt, at *Alexandria, around the year 222, was a commentary on Psalm 15 (or 25), and for which P. Nautin (*Origène*, I, Paris 1977, 262-275) has identified around a dozen important fragments. A second commentary was begun at Caesarea around 247, after the homilies and the volumes on the *Prophets and the *Song of Songs; he reached Psalm 72 and also treated Psalm 118. Lastly, unable to finish this Herculean task, Origen drafted brief notes, *Excerpta*, on the entire Psalter. According to V. Peri's wonderful discovery (*Omelie origeniane sui Salmi*, Vatican City 1980), these *Excerpta* are to be identified with the *Tractatus* translated by Jerome (CCL 76), and perhaps with the document that Jerome had already used in his *Epistles* 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 34 and 37. Origen's fragments published in various works have been cataloged by Devreese (pp. 1-88).

Nautin suggested that Origen's second commentary is owed to the discovery of *Quinta* and *Sexta* *Hexaplar versions, likewise recognized in the Alexandrian commentary, and also to the publication of *Hippolytus's homily (printed by Nautin in his *Dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton*, Paris 1953, 161-183) which attributed the composition of the entire Psalter to David.

In the 4th c., around the year 330, the first commentator of the entire Psalter was *Eusebius of Caesarea (CPG 3467). He made use of Origen's *library at Caesarea and followed his footsteps. The commentaries on Psalm 37 (PG 30, 81-104) and 51-95 (PG 23, 441-1221) have been well preserved; for the remainder, see Devreese (pp. 89-146). Eusebius inherited Origen's erudition, not his religious genius.

Jerome attributed a commentary on the entire Psalter to *Asterius the Sophist, who died after 341. Asterius's work was a compilation of *homilies; more specifically, these were rhetorical sermons that performed the function of exhortation and were far from a historical-philological commentary, but they sought to insert the texts into the life of *David acc. to the traditional titles. Thirty-one homilies have been preserved (all authentic? CPG 2815; PG 40, 389-477; M. Richard, *Asterii Sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*, Oslo 1956). The *catenae* allow one to reestablish the *scholia for the

Psalter of *Athanasius of Alexandria (CPG 2140), which have also been preserved in *Coptic and *Syriac. Scholars are uncertain when to date them in the life of the saint; it is not even certain whether they are authentic. Being very basic, they do not bear any traces of the themes that were dear to Athanasius; instead, they bear witness to their dependence upon Eusebius of Caesarea. Keeping in mind PG 27 and G.M. Vian's work (*Testi inediti dal commento ai Salmi di Atanasio*, Rome 1978), one can definitely detect such themes therein. The letter to *Marcellinus, however, is certainly authentic (CPG 2097; PG 27, 12-45).

Chronologically speaking, it is necessary to mention here *Hilary of Poitier's *Tractates on the Psalms* (CPL 428; PL 9), which drew heavily upon Origen's work. The fragments of *Didymus and *Apollinaris of Laodicea's comments on the Psalms (CPG 2551 and 3681) supplied by the *catenae* have been wonderfully edited by E. Mühlenberg. Didymus's long commentary transmitted by the *papyri of Tura (CPG 2550) was published at Bonn by M. Gronewald (with L. Doutreleau and A. Gesché) from 1968 to 1970. *Basil of Caesarea left a series of homilies on chosen Psalms, which were heavily influenced by Origen (CPG 2836; PG 29, 209-494; CPG 2910; PG 30, 104-116). The commentaries attributed to *Diodore of Tarsus, certainly very Antiochene, must still be studied when they are published in their entirety (CPG 3818; CCG 6). The commentaries of *Theodore of Mopsuestia (CPG 3833) were published by R. Devreese (*Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes*, Vatican City 1939). For the Latin version of *Julian of Eclanum, see CCL 88A, Turnhout 1977.

Moreover, the West produced the *Explanationes* by *Ambrose of Milan on the Twelve Psalms, then on Psalm 118 (CPL 140-141; PL 14 and 15), which was heavily influenced by Origen, as was the *Small Commentaries on the Psalms* by Jerome (*Commentarioli in psalmos*; CPL 582; CCL 72,163-245), whose *Tractatus* (CPL 592-593) can be considered, as was said, inspired by a translation of Origen's *Selecta*.

Likewise in the Origenian line—but at this stage having a more refined *spirituality—one could mention the work of *Gregory of Nyssa (*In inscriptiones psalmorum*: CPG 3155, PG 44, 432-608) and esp. *Evagrius of Pontus (CPG 2455; we are awaiting an edition by M.J. Rondeau, who has already published excellent studies).

From the Antiochene side, the homilies of *John Chrysostom (CPG 4413, PG 55) and the commentary of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (CPG 6202, PG 80) have enjoyed great success, and the published text still awaits improvements. From *Cyril of Alexandria only fragments remain in the *catenae* (CPG 5202; Devreesse, 24-233). From *Hesychius of Jerusalem, in contrast, we know of three distinct commentaries (CPG 6552-6554), which are also awaiting careful studies.

In the West, the most majestic and profound work is certainly represented by *Augustine of Hippo's very personal *Ennarationes* (CPL 283, PL 36, CCL 38-40). Late Antiquity would add to the commentary tradition *Cassiodorus's *Expositions* (CPL 900, PL 70, CCL 97-98).

This quick look at ancient exegesis must be restricted to these famous authors. The best part of this exegesis on the Psalms was put together verse-by-verse in the two anonymous volumes *La tradition médite le Psautier chrétien* joined together by E. de Solms (Paris 1973). This work happily complements the historical commentaries on the Psalter and enters more deeply into *prayer and the liturgical understanding.

CPG 5, 122-125; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs des Psaumes*, Vatican City 1970; M. Harl, *La chaîne palestinienne sur le Ps. 118*, I-II, SC 189-190, Paris 1972; E. Mühlenberg, *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, I-III, Berlin 1975–1978; M.J. Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier*, OCA 219-220, Rome 1982–1985; E. Zenger, *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum*, Freiburg-Basel 1998; C. Curti, *La catena palestinese sui salmi graduali*, Catania 200

J. Gribomont

PSALMUS RESPONSORIUS. A document published in 1965 from a *papyrus dating to the 4th c., bearing the library shelf mark 149[1]-153, the first 12 strophes of which have survived. The document recounts the story of Jesus by beginning with *David and coming to a halt at the wedding of Cana (Jn 2:1-11). It is not known, moreover, which other episodes from the gospels were poetically reread, because the last two folios do not permit any hypothesis. The composition conforms to the poetic norms of the *responsio* with its *cursus*, the harmony of sounds and the use of similar terms. Having a structure that is not rigid, the free combination of verses and stophes is guided by the author's poetic talent and mastery of Latin. One can identify its sources as the **Protevangelium of James*, upon which scheme it constructs the scenes up until the coming of the *Magi and the gospel of *Matthew for the episode with the Magi and along with the gospel of John for the wedding at Cana. There are few debatable traces of the gospel of *Luke. Discriminant points of doctrine are the virginity, divine maternity and the intercession of

*Mary. Belonging to the category of the most ancient Latin liturgical texts, the presence of certain Greek consonants shows that the Latin alphabet had not yet fully replaced the Greek alphabet in the rhythmic compositions for liturgical use.

R. Roca Puig, *Himne a la Virge Maria. "Psalmus Responsorius,"* in *Papir llatí del sigle IV*, Barcelona [2]1965; E. Peretto, "*Psalmus Responsorius." Un inno alla Vergine Maria di un papiro del IV secolo*: Marianum 29 (1967) 255-265; Patrologia III, 320-321; W. Speyer, *Der bisher älteste lat. Psalmus abecedarius*, in Id., *Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld*, 1, Tübingen 1989, 64-69; *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, ed. H. Herzog, Paris 1993, 275-276.

E. Peretto

PSEUDEPIGRAPHY. Pseudepigraphy in the strict sense of the term is a literary falsification concerning the author of a work. One must therefore distinguish it from the *falsification of the text. Moreover, the term is used for apocryphal books of the OT and the NT, but it also extends to all other secular and Christian works. One must distinguish two cases: the actual author intentionally hides himself under a fictitious or a well-known name. The deception is, therefore, one the author creates himself. The situation is different for texts that circulated under a name which was not the author's, without him being responsible. The error arose from a confusion of name, a false attribution or a copyist mistake. It is therefore important for textual criticism to correct the mistake, which remains its primary duty.

First, we should mention the anonymous gospels, Acts and Apocalypses or works falsely attributed to biblical characters, discussed under *Apocrypha. Moreover: the *Epistola apostolorum*, which in the *Ethiopian version bore the title: *The *Testament of Our Lord and Savior *Jesus Christ*; *Paul's letter to the to Laodiceans; the third letter to the Corinthians; the letters of *Barnabas and Titus and, if one accepts it, the writings of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite as well. The author of these documents is unknown. *Tertullian noted that the *Acts of Paul* were the work of some priest who composed them out of devotion for the apostle (*De bapt.* 4). The taste for the spectacular is obvious, as is the case for most *hagiography.

A legislative collection that goes from the 2nd to the 5th c. and whose author is neither named nor known is attributed to the *apostles and even Jesus Christ. The primary witnesses are the **Didache*, the **Didascalia Apostolorum*, the **Apostolic Tradition* (*Traditio Apostolica*), the **Apostolic Constitutions*, the**Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles* (the title is often modified: see A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique*, 114, n. 1) and *The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

The difficulty for all these collections lies in discovering their successive strata, the value and provenance of elements, and their influences, with the scope of establishing the place, date and, at times, motives for composition. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, e.g., undeniably present a Jewish foundation in the "Clementine liturgy." On the other hand, their objective was often polemical: the *Didascalia* railed against the *Judaizers, and the *Apostolic Constitutions* defended the hierarchy against monasticism.

Apart from New Testament figures, some authors hid themselves under a pseudonym. The most notable cases were ps.-Dionysius and *Macarius. Regarding the author who hid himself under the pseudonym of Dionysius the Areopagite, if he tried to confirm his own teaching through an apostolic figure, he esp. sought to act as a peacemaker during a period of violent christological controversy. A moderate *monophysite, he avoided, in this light, statements of the Council of *Chalcedon and the monophysites, as well as the **Henoticon*. A certain Macarius appears to have been the author of a hundred sermons or spiritual homilies: the pseudonym was unintentional and cannot be charged against the writer. It seems that the work was anonymous and attributed to a blessed one (Gk. *makarios*), just as the **Liber graduum*. Similarly, the author of the *Commonitorium* is called the **Peregrinus*. With the progress of time, the adjective was understood as a proper name. It is therefore easy to confuse this author with "Macarius" the Great, also called the "Egyptian." It is also possible that because the author professed *Messalian ideas condemned by *councils, the editors considered it prudent to have recourse to a subterfuge by placing the homilies under the patronage of the Egyptian *ascetic or *Simeon Stylites.

Moreover, there is no writer of certain prominence who was not pulled away under a trail of spurious works. Those of the most famous authors (*John Chrysostom, *Ephrem and *Augustine) make up a considerable mass (CPG, 4500-5079, against 4305-4495 authentic for John Chrysostom; for Augustine, see Verzeichnis, 158-190). The reasons are many. They were not caused by the author's literary production but by his personal success and the transmission of his text(s). The point of departure could have been the imitation of famous writers. At one point in time, the entire West "Augustinized" its writings. And that continued to occur throughout the Middle Ages. The famous letter or homily *Cogitis me*, which circulated under the name of *Jerome, was likewise a fraud, perpetrated by Paschasius Radber-

tus, and uncovered by modern textual criticism.

A large number of mistakes were owed to the scribes, for whom all the *Johns* tended to become John Chrysostom (Latin texts in CPL 916-945). An entire collection of homilies attributed to John Chrysostom, however, seems to have come from *Africa. A Latin text that went under the name of Gregory was assigned to *Gregory of Nazianzus, although it was written by *Gregory of Elvira. Augustine was subjected to this same mistake. Coming across the abbreviation CHR, a scribe read Chrysostom, although the siglum meant **Chromatius*. It also occurred that all the writings of a codex were assigned to the author of the first text or the one immediately preceding. Old catalogs have not always examined the contents of each MS with the needed thoroughness. Because of lack of control, the errors were transmitted based on the faith of others.

The ancients themselves already posed the problem of authenticity. To resolve it, *Clement of Alexandria and *Origen had recourse to the examination of language and style. We find some principles of hermeneutics in the correspondence between Sextus *Julius Africanus and Origen, in the writings of *Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* IV), *Rufinus (*De adult. libr. Origenis*), Jerome (*Adv. Rufinum*), *Amphilochius of Iconium (*Pseudepigrapha haereticorum*: PG 39, 115-117), the anonymous author of the *Adv. Fraud. Apollin.* (PG 86, 1947-76) and Nicephorus (*Contra Eus. et Epiphanium* 2).

For the printed editions edited by the humanists, two fundamental questions were raised: is the work authentic? If the answer was in the negative, then, who is its author? At an earlier time, the attempt was made to separate genuine from spurious works. To respond to these two questions and esp. to find the true author, today we make use of improved instruments: repertoires, *Claves*, PLS, that allow one to trek through this immense forest. A more precise and complete inventory of MSS, a better understanding of problems of chronology, vocabulary, teachings of Christian writers and currents of thought permit one to better identify the authors of anonymous documents and pseudepigraphy.

Th. Birt, *Kritik und Hermeneutik*, Munich 1913; J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Âge*, Brussels 1947, II, 80-92, 200-214; W. Speyer, *Fälschung*: RAC 7, 236-277 (bibl.); Id., *Religiöse Pseudoepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im Altertum*: JbAC 8/9 (1965/1966) 88-125; Id., *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, Munich 1971; N. Brox (ed.), *Pseudoepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike*, Darmstadt 1977; J.A. Sint, *Pseudonymität im Altertum*, Innsbruck 1960; D. G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon*, Tübingen 1986; TRE 27 (1997) 645-655; *La Letteratura pseudoepigrafica nella cultura greca e romana*, ed. G. Cerri, Naples 1998; R. Burnet, *Épîtres et lettres Ier-IIe siècle, De Paul de Tarse à Polycarpe de Smyrne*, Paris 2003.

A. Hamman

PSOTES of Psoi (d. 305). Egyptian bishop who became a *martyr under the emperor *Diocletian. His *Passio* (the type that seems genuine, but not "epic") has been passed down in *Coptic, Latin and Ethiopian, and because of some traits is related to the account of the martyrdom of *Peter of Alexandria. In Coptic, numerous other texts speak of him, and there has also survived a speech he gave before his execution. This speech, which for the most part contains exhortations to the faithful, should, however, be considered a later forgery. Nothing is known for certain about the life of Psotes and his activity, but it is certain that he was greatly venerated.

H. Delehaye, *Les martyrs d'Égypte*: AB 40 (1922) 5-154 and 299-364; esp. 316-319 and 343-352; T. Orlandi, *Il dossier copto del martire Psote*, Milan 1978; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 2041-2042.

T. Orlandi

PSYCHICI (ψυχικοί). The term ψυχικός appears in the writings of Aristotle (*Hist. anim.* II 3, 737a 8 and passim) in a philosophical context, explaining the concept of the *soul (ψυχή). It therefore passed over to the philosophical and religious lexicon alongside νοερός (intellectual) and πνευματικός (spiritual), and in constrast with σωματικός (corporeal), ὑλικός (material) and χοϊκός (terrestrial). The adjective also entered into common parlance with the meaning "psychic, pertaining to the soul."

In the biblical translation known as the LXX, the term rarely appears, although in the NT, it appears clearly differentiated and supplies the lexical basis for the patristic and *gnostic use of the term. In the NT, the adjective *psychikos* often acquired a negative meaning, closer to the spectrum of the "material" than that of the "spiritual." In particular, in 1 Cor 15:46-49, ψυχικός is assimilated to χοϊκός and is opposed to οὐράνιος, and in Jas 3:15, it is juxtaposed to ἐπίγειος (earthly), and against ἄνωθεν κατερχόμενος (coming down from above). In 1 Cor 2:13ff., ψυχικός is interchangeable with σαρκικός—although the latter contains a negative connotation per se, inasmuch as it refers to the one who knowingly orients oneself acc. to the σάρξ—and is used to refer to the simple ἄνθρωπος, the natural man, who is devoid of the divine gift of the Spirit, inasmuch as ψυχή refers to mere physical life. For this reason, in 1 Cor 2:13-14 and 15:44, 46, the adjective is found in

antithesis to πνευματικός (spiritual), because the psychic elements, although not sinful per se, remain deprived of the life-giving Spirit, the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν of the risen Christ (see R. Morisette, *L'antithèse entre le psychique et le pneumatique en 1 Cor 15,44-46*: RSR 46 [1972] 97-143). This is an idea also present in Jas 3:15, where ψυχικός also refers to what is earthly and closed off to the world of God, and esp. in Jude 19, which seems to make a direct equation between ψυχικός and πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχων (not possessing the Spirit). In this global perspective, one should read the theory of the double *creation of humanity—the spiritual human being, without body and without distinction of gender, Gen 1:27, and the psychic or carnal person in Gen 2:7—which, already present in the writings of *Philo of Alexandria, was then developed by *Origen (see the analysis in M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004, 111-122).

In *gnosticism, the pneumatic beings, who belong to the Spirit and whose true homeland is the divine πλήρωμα (*see *pleroma*), are in fact opposed to the hylic and psychic beings and are truly identified by the *Ophites and the *Sethians as the "Sons of light" or the "race that does not falter," by *Basilides as the "Third Sonship" and by *Valentinus the Gnostic as the "church of the spirituals." The Valentinians, in fact, by distinguishing between simple faith in God and knowledge of God, attributed the first to the *psychici*, i.e., to common Christians, but reserved the second, however, for themselves. The Valentinians considered themselves to be pneumatic or spiritual beings, as attested by *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Haer.* I, 6,2): "psychic men are educated in the psychic way, those who are confirmed by works rather than mere faith [πίστις ψιλή] and do not have perfect knowledge [γνῶσις]: they maintain that we will be those types of men, members of the church." As one can gather from *Heracleon, in fact (frags. 27 and 32), the Valentinians distinguished the rudimentary faith of the *psychici* from that conscious faith of the spirituals. Even Origen (esp. in *Comm. in Ioh.* 19) attributed mere faith to simple Christians and knowledge to those progressing and perfected, but he believed that these categories depended on the personal commitment of each individual to the study of the *Scriptures, and not on an inscrutable *predestination (see M. Simonetti *Psyche e Psychikos nella gnosi valentiniana*: RSLR 2 [1966] 1-47; Id., *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004, 166-168). In this case, acc. to the gnostics, the *temple of *Jerusalem symbolized various πλήρωματα: the sanctuary was the *pleroma* that was accessible only to the pontiff, who was in turn a symbol of the pneumatic man; the *pronaos* (the vestibule) was the *pleroma* accessible to the Levites, i.e., the *psychici*, etc., as Origen attests (see *Comm. in Io.* X, 19).

*Ptolemy the Gnostic, a student of Valentinus along with Heracleon and *Mark, who lived in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD, wrote, among other things, a commentary on the prologue of the gospel of *John, contents of which were cited by *Epiphanius and Irenaeus. Ptolemy's line, which seems to attenuate Valentinian *dualism and views the OT in a positive light, calling the Demiurge "just," more highly esteems the psychic element, which is recognized as present in Christ and which returns to the Hebdomad with the Demiurge after the crucifixion, although the pneumatic element returned to the higher *Ogdoad, so that salvation could also be extended to the *psychici* as well as to the few *pneumatici*.

The other student of Valentinus, Heracleon (whose commentary on the gospel of John has many extant fragments), divided human beings into the categories of hylic, psychic and pneumatic, and also made a distinction between the God of the OT and that of the NT. The threefold division of human beings was precisely the object of allegorical interpretation in his commentary, in which the exegesis of the gospel of John was preeminently allegorical and also attentive to the details, although concise, at least judging from the fragments that have survived, thanks to the citations and refutations included by Origen in his own *Commentary on John*. The words and works of Christ were interpreted by Heracleon as a symbol of the spiritual realities; the three classes of hylic, psychic and pneumatic; and the relations between *pneumatici* and their angelic counterparts. For example, *John the Baptist, inasmuch as he was a *prophet, was considered to be the symbol of the psychic man, tied to the economy of the OT; nonetheless, inasmuch as he was more than a prophet, acc. to the definition of Mt 11:9, he represented the pneumatic man, symbolized also by the Samaritan woman: although the material shell in which he was enclosed led him to evil, he gradually became aware of his true nature and the Savior purified him and brought him to gnosis.

In sum, in the complex school of the Valentinians, the ramifications of its teachings seem to match, all things considered, a certain evaluation of the psychic element, whose most direct representative—i.e., the Demiurge, the created divinity of the world—was guided in a rather positive way and appeared destined to attain a good outcome (Iren., *Haer.* I, 7,1), which was extended, with a certain soteriological optimism, even to the other members of the class of the *psychici*. A similar tendency seems to have been

consolidated in certain gnostic systems of the 3rd c.: e.g., in the four books of the *Pistis Sophia*, the Savior, who is Jesus and who grants revelations to his disciples after his resurrection, makes all the souls who desire him participants of gnosis and the mysteries: "all men who will receive the mysteries of the Ineffable one will become a king with me and will sit on my right and left in my kingdom" (ch. 96). It seems that in this manner, i.e., through gnosis, the door to salvation was opened even to the *psychici*.

A. Dihle - E. Schweizer: GLNT 15, 1303-1312 (cf. TDNT 6, 389-452); B.A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians*, Cambridge, MA 1973; Missoula, MT 1976; G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed. Studies in Gnostic Mythology*, Leiden 1984; J.P. Couliano, *Les gnoses dualistes d'Occident*, Paris [2]1989, It. tr. Milan 1989; J. Van Der Loof, *The Plebs of the Psychici*, in *Eulogia. Mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire*, ed. G.J.M. Bartelink - A. Hilhorst - C.H. Kneepkens, Steenbrugge 1991, 353-363; G. Filoramo, *Antropologie in conflitto. Il caso di Ireneo e degli gnostici*: Humanitas 1 (1996) 52-67; R.T. Wallis - J. Bregman (eds.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, Albany 1992; J. Magne, *From Christianity to Gnosis and from Gnosis to Christianity*, Atlanta 1993; *Gnosticism and Later Platonism*, ed. J.D. Turner - R. Majercik, Atlanta 2000; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, Québec-Louvain-Paris 2001.

I. Ramelli

PTOLEMY and LUCIUS. These Roman martyrs are known to us thanks to the philosopher *Justin (2 *Apol.* 2). Ptolemy led a woman to the faith who, with her husband, had led a dissolute lifestyle; this woman obtained a divorce by order of the emperor *Antoninus Pius (138-161). As an act of retaliation, her ex-husband accused Ptolemy of being a Christian, and Ptolemy was found guilty by the prefect Urbicus and sentenced to death. Lucius, who was present at the trial, protested against the unjust sentence, and was likewise condemned and sentenced to death. The two martyrs did not have a cult at *Rome until the historian Baronius inserted them into the *Mart. rom.* He did so following the example of Florus of Lyons, who had placed them on 23 August: Ado and Uswared preferred 19 October. The latter is the date retained by Baronius.

BS 12, 526-527; P. Lampe, From *Paulus to Valentinus. Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis 2003, 237-240.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PTOLEMY the Gnostic. Lived in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD; along with *Heracleon and *Mark (whose sources were collected and studied by N. Förster, *Marcus Magus,* Tübingen 1999, with bibl. 421-454) he was a disciple of *Valentinus and a member of the Italic or Western branch of his school. He was probably alive around 180; Ptolemy's biography, however, is unknown to us and A. Harnack's hypothesis remains unproven (TU 13), namely, that one can perhaps identify him with the Ptolemy concerning whom *Justin Martyr speaks *2 Apol.* 9-20, who provided instruction in Christianity to a Roman matron and was imprisoned and put to death under Urbicus, prefect of the city of *Rome from 150 to 160. Recent studies on the intellectual characteristics of Ptolemy have been supplied by C. Markschies, *New Research on Ptolemaeus Gnosticus:* ZAC 4/2 (2000) 225-254. His Letter to Flora, written in an elegant prose, was preserved in its entirety by *Epiphanius of Salamis, *Pan.* I, 33,3-8 (PG 41, 558-568: *Ptolémée, Lettre à Flora,* ed. tr. G. Quispel, Paris 1949, SC 24 [[2]1966]; see G. Quispel, *La Lettre de Ptolémée à Flora:* VetChr 2 [1948] 17-54; F.T. Fallon, *The Law in Philo and Ptolemy. A Note on the Letter to Flora:* VetChr 30 [1976] 45-51; W.A. Löhr, *La doctrine de Dieu dans la Lettre à Flora de Ptolémée:* RHPhR 75/2 [1995] 177-191). For this reason he was able to escape the subsequent destruction of the heretical works by the Great Church. Before the discovery of the gnostic library of *Nag Hammadi, it was probably the most important gnostic document that we possessed. In it Ptolemy explains to a noble Christian woman, Flora, the gnostic doctrine, reducing to the bare minimum the mythological explanation with the formation of the **pleroma* and dwelling a bit on the beginning on the law of the OT. With respect to these, only the Ten Commandments are of divine origin, since the meticulous precepts come neither from the Supreme God, because he is still imperfect, nor from the Devil, because he is just, but from the "intermediary" Demiurge, the creator of the universe. The rest comes partly from *Moses through his personal initiative, who kept in mind the weakness of the recipients of such a law, and partly from the elders of the Jewish people. The pure legislation of the *Decalogue, not mixed with evil, was not abolished by the Savior but rather perfected; the laws of the second type, however, which are mixed with evil, such as the law of vengeance for the admission of divorce, were abolished by him because "they are incompatible with his nature." The law of the third type, namely, the ritual law, with such precepts as circumcision, Sabbath, offerings and fasting, should be read in an "allegorical and symbolic" perspective of the "spiritual and transcendent world," inasmuch as the Savior has elevated the ritual law to the pneumatological level: circumcision is that of the heart, the

offerings are spiritual, and fasting is the extension of evil. Ptolemy's statements about the apostolicity of his own teachings and on their scriptural foundation at the end of the excerpt provided by *Epiphanius is interesting: "If God will allow it, you will learn the origin and the generation [of the essences that proceed from the Supreme God], when you will be considered worthy of the *apostolic tradition which even we have received through succession. We are also able to prove all our teachings on the basis of the teachings of the Savior*." From this document, moreover, it also turns out to be clear that for Ptolemy, as in the case of Valentinus and in contradistinction to other gnostics, the Savior is to be identified with *Jesus Christ: in addition to the foundational study by A. Orbe, *Cristología gnóstica,* I-II, Madrid 1976, see also P. Perkins, *Logos Christologies in the Nag Hammadi Codices:* VetChr 35 (1981) 379-396; P. Perkins, *Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament:* Catholic Biblical Quarterly 43 (1981) 590-606; D. Voorgang, *Die Passion Jesu und Christi in der Gnosis,* Frankfurt a.M. 1991 and G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Gesù il Cristo nello Gnosticismo,* in *Gesù Cristo nei Padri della Chiesa (I-III sec.)*: *Dizionario di Spiritualità Biblico-Patristica* 24, Rome 2000, 128-199 (in the Parafrasi di Sem, NHC VII, 1, Soldas: M. Roberge, *La crucifixion du Sauveur dans la Paraphrase de Sem*, in *Actes du VI*[e] *Congrès Copte*, II, Louvain-la-Neuve 1992, 381-387).

Ptolemy the Gnostic also wrote a commentary on the Prologue to the gospel of *John, which was mentioned around 180 by *Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 8,5-6, stating at the beginning his desire to lay out and refute "the opinions of those who are going about spreading their heresies; I am referring esp. to the disciples of Ptolemy, whose school can be considered an offshoot of that of Valentinus." (With respect to the modern research on the antignostic polemic in the writings of Irenaeus, see G. Filoramo, *Antropologie in conflitto: il caso di Ireneo e degli gnostici*: Humanitas 1 [1996] 52-67; J. Holzhausen, *Irenäus und die valentinianische Gnosis*: VetChr 55/4 [2001] 341-355; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Eretici e maghi in Ireneo: l'accusa di magia come strumento di polemica anti-gnostica*, in *Munera amicitiae. Scritti di storia e cultura sulla Tarda Antichità offerti a S. Pricoco*, ed. R. Barcellona - T. Sardella, Soveria Mannelli 2003, 471ff.).

In the commentary, Ptolemy is more decisive in setting forth the salient points of the gnostic teaching and provides an allegorical exegesis of the prologue, maintaining that "John intentionally spoke there of the origin of the *pleroma* through which the Father emitted all things," locating in Jn 1:1-14 the mention of the first *Ogdoad, i.e., the first eight fundamental *aeons of the Valentinian *pleroma* (composed of 30 aeons formed by the outward deployment of the first principle, Bythos; then Sophia, the Mother, produces the hylic, psychic and pneumatic reality outside the *pleroma*), which, divided into couples, are so listed by Ptolemy: Begetter or Father // Grace (*Charis*); Only Begotten (*Monogenes*) // Truth (*Aletheia*); World (*Kosmos*) // Life (*Zoe*); Humanity (*Anthropos*) // Church (*Ekklesia*) see G. Iacopino, *Il Vangelo di Giovanni nei testi gnostici copti*, Rome 1995 (SEA 49).

Ptolemy was also the author of the system upon which Irenaeus based his "Great Notice" of the Valentinians (*Adv. haer.* I, 1,1–8,5: see F.M. Sagnard, *La gnose valéntinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*, Paris 1947), which was of fundamental importance for the study and understanding of Valentinian gnosticism and esp. its "Italic" side of which the Great Notice seems to be a reflection (G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Tempo della storia e tempo della salvezza nello Gnosticismo*, in *Theoretical Frameworks for the Study of Graeco-Roman Religions*, Thessaloniki 2003, 171-207: 171). While interspersing some criticisms, Irenaeus turns to relating the teachings of the "followers of Ptolemy" in *Adv. haer.* I, 12: Bythos, the Abyss, has two spouses, the dispositions (*diatheseis*), *Ennoia* (or thought) and *Thelēsis* (or will), which generate *Alētheia* and *Monogenēs* as their respective images. Others, however, maintain that the first Ogdoad was not gradually produced, as one aeon from another, but once and for all by the Pre-Father and his *Ennoia*: when he wished to create, the Pre-Father took the name "Father." Because whatever he produced was true, it was said to be *Alētheia*; when he wished to reveal himself, he was called *Anthrōpos*; when he produced the creatures that he had thought of, he was called *Ekklēsia*. Inasmuch as he was the *Anthrōpos*, when speaking, he formed the Logos, the Only Begotten, who was followed by *Zōē*, and this completes the first Ogdoad. Other variants are also reported.

It seems that Ptolemy reworked the Valentinian system by attenuating its heavily dualistic bent and bestowing a greater value to the psychic element and, in part, the OT, perhaps to promote the acceptance of gnostic ideas by the Catholic Church—though one must keep in mind the difficulty of reconstructing the "original teaching" of Valentinus, due to the paucity of sources. One should also at least recall the attempts of the following scholars to achieve this difficult task: G. Quispel, *The Original Gospel of Valentine*: VetChr 1 (1947) 43-73; *The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic*: VetChr 50

(1996) 327-352; *Valentinus and the Gnostikoi*, ibid. 1-4, and G.C. Stead, *In Search of Valentinus*, in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, I, Leiden 1980, 75-95. C. Markschies (*Valentinus gnosticus?*, Tübingen 1992 [WUNT 65]; Nochmals: *Valentinus und die Gnostikoi*: VetChr 51 [1997], 179-187; *Valentinian Gnosticism*, in *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years*, ed. D. Turner - A. McGuire, Leiden 1997, 401-438) denies Valentinus's gnosticism, leading to a redefinition even of his followers. But one should examine the observations offered by M. Simonetti, *Valentinus Gnosticus: Cassiodorus* 1 (1995) 197-205, and the earlier contribution by U. Bianchi, *À propos de quelques discussions récentes sur la terminologie, la définition et la méthode de l'étude du gnosticisme*, in *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism*, Stockholm 1973, Leiden 1977, 16-26. In fact, M.A. Williams, *Rethinking Gnosticism*, Princeton, NJ 1996, precisely sought to destroy the very category of gnosticism, a category which he regarded as an invention of the ancient heresiologists (N. Brox, *Gnostikoi als häresiologischer Terminus*: ZNW 57 [1966] 105-114; M. Smith, *The History of the Term "Gnosticism,"* in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II, ed. B. Layton, Leiden 1981, 796-807; M. Tardieu, *Histoire du mot "gnostique,"* in M. Tardieu - J.D. Dubois, *Introduction à la littérature gnostique*, I, Paris 1986, 21-37; M.J. Edwards, *Gnostics and the Valentinians in the Church Fathers*: JTS n.s. 40 [1989] 26-47) and an invention of modern scholars: contra Sfameni, *Tempo*, n. 3; Sfameni, *Temi apocalittici nello Gnosticismo*, in *Millennium*, ed. R. Uglione, Turin 2002, 101-141: 103-104. Logan also regarded the gnostic movement as unitary and believed that it arose during the 1st c. of Christianity. He also offers the hypothesis that the hypogeum of the Aurelii at *Rome, from the beginning of the 3rd c., represents a gnostic cultural center.

In the writings of Ptolemy, the Demiurge is not seen too negatively: he is neither perfect nor the author of evil, but must be called "righteous" (although, e.g., in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, NHC III 2, IV 2, the Demiurge, called "Saklas," is not righteous, but rather arrogant, and proclaims himself to be the only God: see B. Barc, *Samaèl - Saklas - Yaldabaôth*, in *Colloque International sur les textes de Nag Hammadi*, ed. B. Barc, Québec-Louvain 1981, 125-150; M.A. Williams, *The Demonizing of the Demiurge: The Innovation of Gnostic Myth*, in *Innovations in Religious Traditions*, eds. M.A. Williams - C. Cox - M.S. Jaffee, Berlin-New York 1992, 73-107). Christ, moreover, had a *pneuma* and a psychic body, which allowed him to extend salvation even to "psychic" human beings, and not only to the few "pneumatic" humans, acc. to a generally well-known gnostic division of humanity already attested in the NT (e.g., B.A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, Missoula, MT 1976, SBL Dissertation series 12). After the crucifixion, Christ apparently abandoned his material body on the cross (*see* *docetism and U. Bianchi, *Docetism*, in *Myths and symbols. Studies M. Éliade*, Chicago-London 1969, 265-273 = U. Bianchi, *Selected Essays*, London 1978, 303-311), although the spiritual Christ, "pneumatic," turned into the Ogdoad and that "psychic" man sat at the right hand of the Demiurge in the Hebdomad, groups of eight and seven aeons acc. to the teaching of *Valentinus, which was adopted by Ptolemy with some interesting variations. In fact, *Tertullian, who declared that he had committed himself to fighting more the Valentinians like Ptolemy than Valentinus himself, in the *Valentinianos* 4,2, effectively summarizes Ptolemy's innovations with respect to the teacher in the doctrine of the aeons: "having turned to combat the truth, Valentinus made his own the seed of a certain ancient teaching and paved the road with his serpent. On that road, Ptolemy then entered, inasmuch as he distinguished the names and the numbers of the aeons making of them substantial persons, determining, however, to make them outside the divinity, although Valentinus had enclosed them in the complex of the divinity itself, as if they were the very feelings and affections and movements of this same divinity" (see Tertullian, *Contre les valentiniens*, ed. tr. comm. J.-C. Fredouille, Paris 1980-81, SC 280-281).

TRE 27, 699-702; A. Orbe, *Los primeros herejes ante la persecución*, Rome 1956 (Est. *Valentinianos* 5); Id., *La unción del Verbo*, Rome 1961 (Est. *Valentinianos* 3); Id., *La teología del Espíritu Santo* (Est. *Valentinianos* 4), Rome 1966; *The Origins of Gnosticism*, Leiden 1967 (Studies in the History of Religions. Numen Suppl. 12); B.A. van Groningen, *First Century Gnosticism: Its Origin and Motifs*, Leiden 1967; H. Jonas, *Lo gnosticismo*, pres. M. Simonetti, Turin 1973; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica*, Bari 1973; *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism*, Stockholm, August 20-25 1973, Stockholm-Leiden 1977; G. Lüdemann, *Zur Geschichte des ältestens Christentums in Rom*: ZNTW 70 (1979) 86-114; B. Layton, *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I, *The School of Valentinus*, Leiden 1980; J.D. Kaestli, *Valentinisme italien et valentinisme oriental*, in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I, *The School of Valentinus*, Leiden 1980, 391-403; G. Filoramo, *Luce e gnosi*, Rome 1980 (SEA 15); S. Pétrement, *Le Dieu séparé: les origines du gnosticisme*, Paris 1984; *L'exposé valentinien: les fragments sur le baptême et sur l'eucharistie*: NH XI, 2, par J.É. Ménard, Québec 1985 (BCNH, Textes 14); M. Tardieu - J.D. Dubois, *Introduction à la littérature gnostique*, Paris 1986; G. Filoramo, *L'Attesa della fine: storia della gnosi*, Rome-Bari 1987, with bibl. 291-304; M.

Marcovich, *Studies in Graeco-Roman religions and Gnosticism*, Leiden 1988 (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 4); I. Grünwald, *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism*, Frankfurt a.M. 1988; J.P. Couliano, *Les gnoses dualistes d'Occident*, Paris ²1989, It. tr. I miti dei dualisti occidentali, Milan 1989; *Gnostica, mandaica, liturgica. Festschrift E. Segelberg*, ed. J. Bergman et al., Uppsala 1990; *Gnostikerne og bibelen*, intr. tr. M. Müller, København 1991; M. Scopello, *Les Gnostiques*, Paris 1991; *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, II (1992) 724, s.v. *Ptolemy the Gnostic*; G. Zuntz, *Aiôn in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Vienna 1992; R. McQueen Grant, *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature*, Louisville-Westminster 1993; G. Filoramo, *Sulle origini dello Gnosticismo*: RSLR (1993) 493-510; G. Filoramo, *Il problema del tempo nello Gnosticismo*, in G. Filoramo, *Figure del sacro*, Brescia 1993, 29-45; P. Perkins, *Gnosticism and the New Testament*, Minneapolis 1993; H. Strutwolf, *Gnosis als System: zur Rezeption der valentinianischen Gnosis bei Origenes*, Göttingen 1993; M. Tardieu, *Cahiers contre rouleaux*: GH 27 (1993) 135-141; A. Böhlig - C. Markschies, *Gnosis und Manichäismus: Forschungen und Studien zu Texten von Valentin und Mani . . .* , Berlin-New York 1994 (Beihefte zur ZNTW 72); J. Iwersen, *Gnosis und Geschichte . . . von Alexander d.G. bis ins zweite nachchristliche Jahrhundert*, Hamburg 1994; A. Orbe, *En torno al mito teológico de la sombra*, in *Scritti classici e cristiani offerti a F. Corsaro*, ed. C. Curti - C. Crimi, Catania 1994, II, 513-535; *Apocalittica e gnosticismo, Atti del Colloquio int.*, Rome, 18-19 June 1993, ed. M.V. Cerutti, Rome 1995; W.A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1996, with bibl. 338-382; A.H.B. Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism*, Edinburgh 1996, with bibl. 321-340; G. Hanratty, *Studies in Gnosticism and in the Philosophy of Religion*, Dublin 1997; A. Magris, *La logica del pensiero gnostico*, Brescia 1997; A. Magris, *L'escatologia valentiniana*: AnSE 16 (1999) 133-139; F. Bermejo Rubio, *La escisión imposible: lectura del gnosticismo valentiniano*, Salamanca 1998; Th. Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien*, Leiden 1999 (VChr Suppl. 47); Dizionario di eresie [http://www.eresie.it/index.htm], s.v. Tolomeo; *La gnose, une question philosophique*. Actes du colloque 16-17 octobre 1997 Univ. Paris IV-Sorbonne, ed. N. Depraz - J.F. Marquet, Paris 2000; H.W. Attridge, *Valentinian and Sethian Apocalyptic Tradition*: JECS 8 (2000) 173-211; K. Rudolph, *Die Gnosis: Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantike Religion*, Göttingen ²1980, It. tr. *La gnosi: natura e storia di una religione tardoantica*, Brescia 2000; M. Waldstein, *Hans Jonas' Construct "Gnosticism." Analysis and Critique*: JECS 8 (2000) 341-372; *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, ed. M. Simonetti, Rome-Milan ³2001; G. Casadio, *From Hellenistic Aiôn to Gnostic Aiônes,* in *Religion im Wandel der Kosmologien*, ed. D. Zeller, Bern . . . 1999, 175-190; K.L. King - C. Markschies, *Gnosis*, Poole, Dorset 2003; A.H.B. Logan, *The Gnostics: Identifying an Early Christian Cult*, New York 2006; I. Ramelli, *Tricotomia*, in *Enciclopedia Filosofica* 12, Milan 2006, 11772-11776.

G. Filoramo - I. Ramelli

PUBLISHING. The term *edere* or διδόναι, which in a general etymological sense means "to cause to go out," acquires specific meanings acc. to its object. An author's intention to write for the public and the desire that his literary work be successful are subjective elements that recur in every age, but to understand what it meant in practical terms to publish a text in Antique and Late Antique periods, one must avoid imagining parallels with the editorial practice established in the modern period after the invention of the printing press. Manual writing and the impossibility of producing multiple identical copies simultaneously drastically conditioned the publishing process in Antiquity. For a letter, publication coincided with its being sent to the recipient, in that the author accepted, or hoped, that the work would enter the public domain and be reproduced (e.g., the apostolic and subapostolic *letters). The intent to publish was even more evident when the author kept copies of the letters to publish them in a collection (e.g., the epistolaries of *Cyprian, *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Augustine). The sermons of prestigious orators were often transcribed by stenographers, and from that moment they were considered published; indeed often not even a preliminary revision was requested by the author, unless perhaps they were sermons in a series, which the author could then reuse and reelaborate to compose monothematic treatises (e.g., *Ambrose's works on *virginity and widowhood). For written works, the editorial process was more schematic. After dictation to a stenographer, a first draft of the text was made in longhand, which the author reviewed, and then a definitive copy was made, which the author kept in his possession; from this copy, a *librarius* made the copy for publication, or the copies to be sent to customers or recipients. In some cases it was the recipient who, having received the publication copy from the author, looked after its successive dissemination, as occurred with Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, which he had sent to *Firmus.

In the modern period, after the invention of the printing press, the editing, effective publication and dissemination of a book are phases so closely connected as to constitute a single, well-defined event, even chronologically. In the Ancient and Medieval eras the period of editing, which is the preparation of the author's copy destined for the public, did not always coincide with the actual publication: not only was Origen's famous *Hexapla edition of the OT never reproduced, but it remained unconsulted and almost unknown in the library at Caesarea for several decades until *Pamphilus's arrival. A work's dissemination then consisted in making copies from one copy to another: more or less slowly and without a deadline, during which the text underwent a gradual evolution or degradation, since no MS copy could ever be identical to its model, and as new copies were produced, the older copies easily disappeared. There could also be different recensions of a

single work due to later modifications introduced by the author, as was the case with *Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* and his *Apologeticum*. Or there could be spurious reworkings, as with *Eucherius's *Instructiones*. It could also happen, as with the first 12 books of Augustine's *De Trinitate*, that a nondefinitive draft could be circulated without the author's consent.

F.W. Beare, *Books and Publications in the Ancient World*: Un. Toronto Quart. 14 (1945) 150-167; J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et moyen âge*, II, Brussels 1947; H.-I. Marrou, *La technique de l'édition à l'époque patristique*: VChr 3 (1949) 208-224; RAC 2, 664-668; var. aus., *Le biblioteche nel mondo antico e medievale*, ed. G. Cavallo, Bari 1988; A.G. Hamman, *L'épopée du livre. La transmission des textes anciens, du scribe à l'imprimerie*, Paris 1985; H.Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church. A History of Early Christian Texts*, New Haven-London 1995.

F. Gori

PUBLIUS of Athens (2nd c.). Bishop of *Athens, who was martyred at the beginning of the reign of *Marcus Aurelius (161–180). *Eusebius of Caesarea mentioned him with regard to the letter of *Dionysius of Corinth (ca. 160–170) to the Athenians. In this letter, Dionysius criticized the Athenian faithful for being lukewarm in their faith "after their leader Publius was martyred during the persecutions of that time"; Eusebius added: "*Quadratus became their bishop after the martyrdom of Publius" (*HE* 4,23,2).

DCB 4, 519; BS 10, 1237.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

PUDENS and PUDENTIANA. The church of S. Pudenziana appears in the Roman councils of 399 and 595 as the *titulus* (*s.*) *Pudentis*, and in the inscription of the apse mosaic as the *ecclesia Pudentiana*. The excavations that ended in 1962 demonstrated that it was a worship building dating back to the years 390–398, inserted within a preexisting thermal building, to which was then added an apse with the mosaic and the aforementioned inscription (before the year 417). The founder, concerning whom we do not possess any historic information, was transformed into a saint over the course of the 6th c. At around the same time, in the context of the legend on St. *Peter, he appeared as the host of the apostle, the father of Pudentiana and *Praxedis. Moreover, even the daughter Pudentiana emerged from an erroneous interpretation of the mosaic and the inscription contained therein. The identification of Pudens with the person named in 2 Tim 4:21 has the feeling of a novel. With respect to Pudentiana, who in the *itineraries, *martyrologies and the liturgy was also called "Potentiana," appears in texts beginning from the 7th c., contemporary with her sister. In the Middle Ages, Pudens and Pudentiana were celebrated 19 May; Praxedis, however, 21 July.

BHL 6988-6991; BS 10, 1062-1072; LCI 8, 224; J.P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum*, Paderborn 1918, 61-67; R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* 3, Vatican City 1971, 280-305; W. Buchowiecki, *Handbuch der Kirchen Roms* 3, Vienna 1974, 650-677; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 68-69; Chr. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei vom 4. Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1992, 130-132; S. Heid, *Kreuz – Jerusalem – Kosmos*, Münster 2001, 176-188.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

PULCHERIA (AELIA PULCHERIA AUGUSTA) (399–453). Eastern empress, born on 19 January 399 at *Constantinople, daughter of the emperor *Arcadius and *Eudoxia; she died in July 453. She became Augusta on 4 July 414. Pulcheria was consecrated a *virgin, along with her young sisters Arcadia and Marina. She exerted a notable influence on their education and formation, but also on the political and ecclesiastical activity of her brother, the emperor *Theodosius II (408–450). This influence was reduced after 439 through the work of the eunuch Chrysaphius, whom Pulcheria put to death in 450. After the death of her brother, she ascended to the throne, contracting a mystical *marriage with the older *Marcian.

The Council of *Chalcedon had the task of settling the christological disputes; instead, it created new conflicts with the debated terminology of its definition (Gk. *horos*). The council was entirely prepared and organized by Pulcheria; moreover, its 28th canon established the position of the patriarch of the new Rome and incited opposition from Pope *Leo I. *Bishops and clerics from every part of the empire had recourse to Pulcheria on any given question: during his controversy with *Nestorius, *Cyril of Alexandria in fact sent her two letters dated to 430; moreover, we have a vast correspondence with Pope Leo and his archdeacon Hilary on *Eutyches and the *monophysite *heresy. In defense of the Council of Chalcedon she wrote two letters: one to the monks of *Palestine and another to an abbess of a convent in *Jerusalem. Pulcheria, who left her inheritance to the poor and promised humanitarian institutions and the construction of churches, was proclaimed a saint (10/11 September).

PWK 23, 1954-1963; BS 10, 1245-1256; M. Abineau, *Ps.-Chrysostome, In S. Stephanum. Proclus de Constantinople, l'impératrice*

Pulchérie et saint Etienne: Instrumenta patristica 19 (1989) 1-16; N.P. Constas, *Weaving the Body of God. Proclus of Costantinople, the Theotokos and the Loom of the Flesh*: JECS 3/2 (1995) 169-194; J.A. McGuckin, *Nestorius and the Political Factions of the Fifth Century Byzantium. Factors in His Downfall*: BJRL 78/3 (1996) 7-21.

J. Irmscher

l'Antiquité tardive: De pulchritudine mundi. Remarques sur le Liber XXI sententiarum (*CPL 373*): REAug 42 (1996) 21-43. Cf. *Liber XXI sent.* PL 40, 725-732; PLS II, 1364; CPL 373; J. Divjak, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus* IV, Vienna 1974, 67; D. Weber, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus* VI, 1, Vienna 1993, 158; J. Machielsen, CPPM, IIA, 150.

M. Mendoza

PULCHRITUDINE MUNDI, De. A brief philosophical poem of 83 verses, transmitted under the authorship of *Augustine in ch. XVI of the *Liber viginti unius sententiarum*, which was probably contemporary to his *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*. With respect to meter, it is very irregular, a variant of the so-called Sotadic, used in didactic poems, even though rarely attested in Antiquity and the Middle Ages; the varying meters are explained by the fact that the poem possibly used an original Greek text as a model, without, however, being a translation. On account of internal literary criticism, the doctrinal content that is typically against the *Manichean thesis that nature was created by an insane principle (vv. 2-4), and the position coinciding with that of Augustine on the nature of the good (*Mor. ecc. Cath. et mor. Man.* II, 4,6; *C. adv. leg. et proph.* I, 1,1; *S. Mai* 126,5; *Ep.* 138,5), modern scholarship maintains that the *De pulchritudine mundi* was written by an anonymous author of the *Thagaste circle between 388 and 391 (Dolbeau, 41).

The philosophical controversy takes into consideration the positive opinion of the four elements of the world (vv. 5-18), which are considered good because they were created by God; therefore, it is the number four that brings the cosmic order into harmony and perfection (vv. 19-25). In this order, harmoniously created (vv. 26-29), even the four contrary elements participate in explaining the success of the order of the seasons (vv. 39-57), as in the relationship between these in the interpretation of the succession of daily time (vv. 59-73), which seizes human existence and creation, and where the events of human life meet in contrasts (vv. 74-79). But even in this respect, these correspond to the laws of the Creator (v. 80), calling upon it as a principle of all things. The author finishes with a sort of profession of faith and praise in v. 81 (*Unum carmen modulantur concinuntque in unum*), celebrating the harmony established in the world and inviting readers to think differently and to listen to this teaching and be instructed (vv. 82-83), because the harmonious mode speaks by itself and for its creator (cf. Aug., *Nat. boni*, 13-23; *Ep.* 138,1,5).

PL 40, 729-730; F. Dolbeau, *Un poème philosophique de*

PUNIC. *Augustine often made reference to the existence of the Punic language that was still spoken among the *rustici*, and he also mentioned Punic words. In many areas, interpreters were necessary to communicate between Latin speakers and others. Augustine ordained a lector named Anthony of Fussala because he spoke Punic (*Ep.* 209,2-3; 20,21 Divjak). What did Augustine mean when he said *lingua punica, id est afra* (*Tract. in Ep. Ioh.* 2,3)? N *Africa was inhabited by peoples who spoke Libyan, a Hamitic language; the dominance of the Phoenicians spread the Punic language (a Phoenician dialect) throughout the Phoenician colonies of the West, such as *Carthage and the markets of *Malta, *Sardinia and elsewhere. The Roman conquest did not destroy earlier elements, esp. in the most internal areas. Ulpian, in the 3rd c., affirmed that the legates could write in Punic (*Dig.* 32,11 pr.). The second son of Apuleius, Pudens, could only speak well in Punic (*Apol.* 98). Furthermore, acc. to some scholars, Augustine understood Punic (the new Punic of the 4th c. AD); others, however, maintained that it was Libyan, a language spoken in his time, which was an indigenous language, not an imported one (most recently G. Camps). The reasons for this position are the permanence of Libyan in the subsequent Berber dialect and the existence of numerous Libyan inscriptions in *Numidia, which are difficult to date, but nonetheless date back before the 4th c. It is actually impossible to reconcile Augustine's claims with the epigraphic evidence.

Nevertheless, Augustine bore witness that Punic was spoken in the countryside around *Hippo and of its importance for *evangelization and contacts with the *Donatists and the inhabitants of the villages. He asked Crispin, the Donatist bishop of Calama, that their discussions be translated into Punic for the inhabitants of the village of Mappalia (*Ep.* 66,2). *Macrobius, the Donatist bishop of *Hippo, needed a Punic interpreter in order to speak to the *Circumcellions (*Ep.* 108,14). Augustine himself mentioned various Punic words when he found Hebrew terms that had not been translated in the Latin text of Scripture: *Messiah* (*C. litt. Petil.* 2,104,239; *In Ioh. Tract.* 15,17), *mammona* (*Serm.* 113,2; 359A,1; *De*

serm. Domini in monte 2,47). On various occasions, he noted that Punic belonged to the same linguistic family as Hebrew, a language similar to Punic. "In reality, these two languages were united by a certain relationship of meaning" (*Serm.* 113,2); "*mammona* is a Hebrew term meaning 'rich,' and also here, in Punic, *mamon* is profit" (359A,1). Augustine refused to send the deacon Lucillus to his brother Novatus, bishop of Sitifis (*Mauretania, today Sétif), because "the preaching of the gospel in our area continues to encounter difficulties because of the lack of people who speak the Punic language, but over there the same language is actually used on a daily basis" (*Ep.* 84,2). Therefore, in many areas of Numidia, Punic was widespread: in addition to people who were bilingual, there were others who only spoke Punic.

W.M. Green, *Augustine's Use of Punic*: Semitic Philology 9 (1951) 179-190; M. Simon, *Punique ou Berbère? Note sur la situation linguistique dans l'Afrique Romaine*, in *Recherches d'histoire Judéo-Chrétienne*, Paris 1962, 88-101; F.X. Millar, *Local Culture in the Roman Empire. Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa*: JRS 58 (1968) 126-134; C. Courtois, *Saint Augustin et le problème de la survivance du punique*: Cahiers de Tunisie 23 (1975) (no. 89-90) 273-294; *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*, ed. G. Neumann - J. Untermann, Cologne 1980, 267-299; S. Lancel, *La fin et la survie de la latinité en Afrique du Nord. État des questions*: REL 59 (1981) 269-297; A. Penna, *Vocaboli punici in S. Girolamo e in S. Agostino, in Atti del I Convegno internazionale di studi fenici e punici*, Rome 1983, III, 885-895; I. Opelt, *Augustins Epistula 20* (Divjak). Ein Zeugnis für lebendiges Punisch im 5. Jh nach Christus*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 121-132; M.G. Cox, *Augustine, Jerome, Tyconius and the Lingua Punica*: Studia Orientalia 64 (1988) 83-105; G. Camps, *"Punica Lingua" et épigraphie libyque dans la Numidie d'Hippone*: Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques 23 (1990–1992) 33-49; F. Vattioni, *Note di onomastica punica nell'epistolario agostiniano (ep. 17,2; 29,12)*: Augustinianum 32 (1992) 177-182; M.-F. Berrouard, *Le punique*: BA 71 (1993) 950-951; C. Lepelley, *Quelques témoignages sur l'histoire de l'Afrique romaine épars dans les sermons de Saint Augustin découverts par F. Dolbeau*, in *Aspects de l'Afrique romaine*, Bari 2001, 391-396; K. Jongeling - R. Kerr, *Late Punic Epigraphy*, Tübingen 2005.

A. Di Berardino

PURGATORY. Purgatory is the intermediary state for *souls that must be purified from *sin. Although the technical term appeared as a noun only in the 12th c. (cf., PL 171, 741), the doctrine of purgatory was gradually prepared by the doctrinal elaboration of scriptural texts (esp. 1 Cor 3:11-15 and 2 Macc 12:43-46); faith in divine mercy that grants the remission of nonmortal sins even after death and the strong solidarity between the deceased and the living, which can, with intercessory petitions, obtain the remission of punishment for the dead. The efficacy of *prayer for the dead is present in *Acta Pauli* 28-29 and in the *Passio Perp.* 7-8.

In the first two centuries of Christianity, it was believed that the martyrs went directly into *paradise; all others had to expiate their own shortcomings in a certain type of *sheol* (*Tertullian, *De an.* 58). Purgatory had more of a medicinal character than a punitive one. For *Clement of *Alexandria, a "spiritual" fire purified souls (*Strom.* V, 14,91,2; VII, 6,34,4); for *Origen, the stains of human imperfection were eliminated through the fire (*Num. Hom.* 15; *Lc. Hom.* 24,13; cf. Edsman, 1-14).

Especially in the West, the "technical" vocabulary was applied to refer to the idea of purification and expiation of less grave sins: *Cyprian used the verb *purgare* (*Ep.* 55,20), and in the 4th-5th c. the adjective *purgatorius* characterized the fire and the punishments to which sinners in the intermediary time were subjected. The existence of purifying punishments was affirmed by *Ambrose (*In Ps.* 36,26), *Gregory of Nyssa (*Or. de mort.*) and *Caesarius of *Arles (*Serm.* 167 and 179). *Augustine provided a solid theoretical foundation for the doctrine of purgatory by emphasizing the distinction between punishment and purification with fire (*Gen. c. manich.* II, 20.30; *Civ. Dei* 21,26), the duration of the punishment in relation to the gravity of sins (*Ench.* 69) and esp. the efficacy of intercessory prayers for the dead (*Conf.* 9,13; *Nat. orig. Anim.* 1,13; *De cura mort.* 3; *Ench.* 110). *Gregory the Great also made a great contribution: he was persuaded that "for some light sins, there would be a *purgatorius ignis* before judgment day" (*Dial.* 4,41,3) and supplied some examples in the form of anecdotes and visions (cf. *Dial.* 4,42.57) and insisted on the helps that the living provide for the dead esp. through alms, *prayer and the *Eucharist (*Dial.* 4,55). Moreover, the threat of purgatory would also gradually become an instrument for influencing the behavior of the living.

Western and Eastern epigraphy attests that the Christians prayed for their dead. Tertullian already mentioned the eucharistic celebration for the dead esp. on the anniversary of their death (see *De Corona* 3,2-3). A *momento* for the dead was incorporated into the Eastern liturgy, and the Latin *sacramentaries contained some Masses *pro defunctis*.

DTC 13 (1936) 1163-1326; DACL 4 (1920) 427-456; 14 (1948) 1978-1981; H. Rondet, *Le Purgatoire*, Paris 1948; C.M. Edsman, *Le baptême de feu*, Upsala 1940; P. Jay, *Le purgatoire dans la prédication de Césaire d'Arles*: RecSR 24 (1957) 5-14; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim*, Bonn 1957; J. Ntedika, *L'évolution de la doctrine du purgatoire chez saint Augustin*, Paris 1966; J. Le Goff, *La naissance du purgatoire*, Paris 1981 (It. tr. Turin 1982); TRE 11 (1983) 69-78; M.P. Ciccarese, *La nascita del Purgatorio*: ASE 17 (2000) 133-150.

M. Maritano

PURIFICATION. Purity is a common concept in all religions: it is the disposition required to draw near to sacred realities. According to the primitive conception, purity was obtained through rites; conversely, it is lost through contact with certain material things. In the Bible, the notion of purity became interior and moral.

The Mother of God was "very pure" or "purified" by the coming of the *Holy Spirit and divinized (cf. M. Gordillo, *Mariologia orientalis*, [OCA 141], Rome 1954, 111ff.). But in the language of the ascetics, the term *purification* was reserved for the first level of the spiritual life, the *praxis* (in opposition to *theoria*, contemplation) which is, acc. to the definition of *Evagrius (*Praktikos* 78: SC 171, 666), "the spiritual method that purifies the passionate part of the *soul."

Greek philosophy insisted on purification in view of *theoria*: only the pure individual can reach the Pure One, says Plato, with a widely accepted aphorism (*Phaed.* 66d, 67bc, 70a). The theme is taken up by the *Fathers but in a larger context. They presented perfection as an **apokatastasis*, i.e., a restitution of the primitive state. In this context, perfection and *katharsis* coincide (cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.* 2,20).

To determine the various elements of purification, one must determine what is considered evil and an obstacle to perfection. For Christians, the first and essential purification is that from sin in repentance. The second purification pertains to the consequences and occasions of sin, primarily, the passions. The result of this ascetic purification is, therefore, **apatheia*. Purification requires, for the writers of the Alexandrian school and the Cappadocians, who were influenced by the former, that they be freed from *pathos*. The doctrine of the *pathos*—i.e., passion—in the writings of *Clement of Alexandria derives from *Stoicism (cf. *Strom.* II, 59,6 and *SVF* I, 205; III, 479.130), as in the individuation and characterization of the four primary passions (fear, joy, desire and anger). But the entire doctrine of *pathos* was already widely developed by *Philo of Alexandria. Stoicism had set forth a rigorous and total removal of passion (the *apatheia*), although the peripatetic school had maintained that passion could exist, but on the condition that it was controlled and directed toward the good (the so-called *metriopatheia*). This last doctrine found its place also in *Middle Platonism: it was maintained primarily by Plutarch and was found after *Clement in the writings of *Porphyry of Tyre, who put it in relation to the first class of virtues, that of the so-called "political virtues" (*Sententiae* 22,2-3), and in *Plotinus (I, 2,2 and 2,7).

Clement reused the doctrine of "moderation of the affections" but did not consider it the highest level of ethics, which is represented by "correct action" (κατόρθωμα, a Stoic word and concept). This means that to reach perfection, simple moderation of the affections is not enough, but the absolute lack of passion is necessary. But this distinction between the two levels of ethics, established by moderation and lack of passions, was reached by Clement through the mediation of Philo of Alexandria. As a result, Clement had recourse to Stoicism's commonplaces to describe the virtue of the perfect Christian. For the Christian, *gnosis is sufficient for happiness, and he does not allow himself to be attracted by external goods. By eliminating all the passions, the Christian can put "assimilation to God" as the ideal, the ideal that was articulated by a Platonist passage (*Theaetetus* 176b), which later became famous, and the characteristic of being "assimilated to God" was considered a typical characteristic of the philosopher. Clement borrowed from contemporary Middle Platonism, as well as its preceding teachings. Just as living acc. to the moderation of the affections means a lower level of Christian perfection that must be replaced by their complete domination, so too living acc. to nature must be exchanged for a higher ethical level—that of assimilation to God.

*Gregory of Nazianzus also set forth the ideal of the beatific vision of God, but it is only obtained through the purification of the body and mind (*Oration* 2,7). This conception, and the language with which it is expressed, clearly derived from Plato's *Phaedo* (cf. 65c; 66a; 66c; 67a). Gregory of Nazianzus maintained that one must shut off one's sense of individual self in the face of sensations and, therefore, the external world; one must receive an interiorizing force, to be able to contemplate the true reality which is God. This contemplation is exclusively reserved to the one who is prepared through a proper purification (*Oration* 39,8). The "end of our religion" was, yes, prophesied by books and souls who spoke with God (*Oration* 7,17), but it is also "the talk of wise men," namely, Plato (7,21). In conclusion, Gregory considered the knowledge of God to be conditioned by purification, and purification in turn can be none other than Christian virtue. There is also evidence here of the Christian transformation of the Platonist teaching: "and prudence itself, perhaps, is none other than purification" (*Phaedo* 69c), if we replace the virtues that properly belong to the Christian with the "prudence" of which Plato spoke.

The most radical purifications were described by classical authors on contemplation: the soul must renounce everything that can, in any way, cast a shadow over the vision of God. *Isaac of Nineveh

established three levels of this purification: (1) the bodily stage (*dûborô pagronô*): combating the passions of the body; (2) the psychic stage (*napšonô*): the fight against ephemeral thoughts; (3) the spiritual stage (*ruhonûtô*): to allow oneself to be totally governed by the Spirit (see DSp 7, 2043ff.). Moreover, Isaac returned to Evagrius's idea, which held that perfect purification demands the "nudity" of the intellect, divested not only of passions, fanciful images, but also of the multiplicity of rational concepts—because they are incomplete—in order to arrive at the intuitive vision of the "pure *light" (I. Hausherr, *Ignorance infinie*: OCP 2 [1936] 351-362; repr. in *Hésychasme et prière*, OCA 176, Rome 1966, 38-49). Many of Evagrius's ideas were then adopted by *Maximus the Confessor.

TWNT 3, 416-434 (TDNT 3, 413-431); DSp 8, 1664-1883; W. Völker, *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*, Wiesbaden 1965; R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin*, Paris 1967, 153ff.; M. Simon, *Souillure morale et souillure rituelle dans le christianisme primitif*: SMSR 38 (1967) 498-511; T. Špidlík, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Introduction à l'étude de sa spiritualité* (OCA 189), Rome 1971, 26ff.; Id., *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique* (OCA 206), Rome 1978, 180ff.; C. Desalvo, *L'"Oltre" nel presente. La filosofia dell'uomo in Gregorio di Nissa*, Milan 1996; G. Urso, *Purificazione e perdono. Una polemica fra pagani e cristiani*, in *Responsabilità perdono e vendetta nel mondo antico*, ed. M. Sordi, Milan 1998, 249-266; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004.

C. Moreschini

PURPLE. For all ancient peoples of the Mediterranean world, purple, extracted through a very expensive process from various types of shellfish (*Murex brandaris*, *M. trunculus* and others) off the Mediterranean coasts, was a color of deep symbolic value, the use of which in religious, political-institutional and social contexts could be attributed to a radically anthropological justification (purple-blood-life). In the ancient church, the suggestion of the symbolism of purple was immense, determined by its presence in the OT and in a few but significant passages of the NT (the rich man who dressed in purple and fine linen [Lk 16:19]; a garment of purple was placed on *Jesus during his passion [Mk 15:17; Mt 27:28]; the prostitute and Babylon identified as the one dressed in purple [Rev 17:4; 18:16]). On the other hand, receiving the cultural Hellenistic inheritance, Christianity reserved purple for the most elevated levels of the church's hierarchy and developed its symbolism in various contexts of theology (liturgical-sacramental, christological and spiritual). But at last the color became an omnipresent expression of imperial power in the theocratic Byzantine regime.

In contradistinction to the pre-Nicene period, which was characterized by the simplicity of the colors used for the clergy's attire (white was the common garment for all, without respect to the high levels of the hierarchy), after the Constantinian turn, there began a gradual ceremonial and liturgical use of colors and purple in the church, to the point of reaching a certain regulation of the color of the garments during the Roman-barbarian period. The **Liber pontificalis*, in addition to indicating a *chlamys rubea* for the exclusive use of the pope, mentioned other purple garments. Moreover, by permission of *Justin I, the pope had the right to wear a purple garment as a title of honor, a use that then passed to those who held certain important clerical roles within the city of *Rome and lastly to the cardinals (1245, Council of Lyons). Nevertheless, only with Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) did purple and other colors achieve a precise codification for liturgical uses, a codification finally accepted by the definitive systematization of Pope Pius V.

The gradual introduction of purple into the papal ceremony and the ritual attire is also reflected in the theological symbolism. Thus we find a "criticism of purple" by the 2nd-c.*apologists (Clem. Alex., *Ped.* 2,114,3-115,1; Tertullian, *De cultu fem.* 1,8,2): purple was a color for seduction and was thereby unsuitable for Christian women. Another criticism is found in the *Apologeticum* 15,7, in reference to *pagan priests, clothed with purple; or rather the contempt for purple in the writings of *Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 8,4; 37,10). A positive evaluation of its symbolism already emerges in the 4th c. in the reflections of the Fathers on the sacraments of initiation. The esteemed color represents well, in fact, the high dignity of the human condition, having passed through the laver of *baptism (see the homilies on baptism by *Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46, 420 and *Chromatius of Aquileia, *Hom.* 19,2).

Thanks to the typological reading of Scripture, already from the first centuries and in contrast to the criticisms of its equivocal use, purple also entered into the church's christological and soteriological symbolism. Through a complex of successive rereadings, the "blood of the covenant " (Ex 24:6-8), with which *Moses, after the reading of the law, sprinkled the people through the "scarlet wool and hyssop" (Heb 9:19-10), became a figure and prophecy of the redeeming blood of Jesus Christ. The "scarlet wool," which acc. to the *Epistle of *Barnabas* (VII, 6-11), crowned the head of the expiatory goat in the OT, thus acquired the figurative meaning of "Jesus who had to leave." This ingenious interpretation of the piece of scarlet wool (that is a light shade

of purple), from *Justin Martyr onward, became a sort of commonplace in the texts of the *Fathers (see *Dialogue* 111; Tertullian, *Marc.* 4,9; in Irenaeus, *AH* 2,4, for Rahab's "scarlet wool" in Josh 2:1ff.) and established the preceding exegetical substratum for the symbolic use of purple in the christological debates of the 5th c. *John of Damascus would conclude that the incarnation was the assumption of purple, i.e., the human body suitable for the most precious attire, by the Lord of glory (*Hom.* 6,4: PG 96, 668 A).

In *monasticism and *ascetic literature, which did not remain immune from the symbolism of the royal color, purple now touched the garment of the tribulations that the monk put on in this world, a garment thanks to which he would overcome, with *faith and *hope, the attacks of the devil (*Evag. Pont., *Treatise for Eulogius* 2). Now, in the hierarchy of the heavenly court of the blessed, represented by the image of an earthly king, it clothes those "eunuchs" who overcome the seduction of sin on earth and therefore occupy a privileged place, higher in dignity to the very *milites Christi* (ps.-Macarius, *Hom.* 4,1,1-3). The calling to the dignity of purple is therefore universal, because the final end of Jesus Christ's coming is that of rectifying the intelligence of human beings that has been corrupted by the devil, to reclothe them with the purple of the *Holy Spirit (ps.-Macarius, *Hom.* 22,2,3).

In the society of ancient *Rome, because of the cost, purple distinguished the most elevated senatorial and equestrian classes (the *laticlavium*, a large flounce of purple for the first group, and the *angusticlavium* for the second). But in Byzantine society, where the culture of purple acquired a new boost by the color's association with Christ, the most esteemed use of purple was an obsessive prerogative of the *basileus*. Everything around the emperor was red. The room in which his child was born was purple (*porfirogenito*), just as the entire palace was made of porphyry (*porphyra*) that hosted the empress who had recently given birth; the emperor's ceremonial and triumphal garments were made of purple, likewise the walled-tents, the *omphalium*, a round room in the stadium that lifted him above everyone else, physically and symbolically, and even the imperial ribbons with which the officials set apart confiscated assets, the books from which the royalty learned to read and the documents issued from their court. At *Constantinople, purple was the indication of God's choice in favor of the man who had the difficult task of representing him for the governance of the earth. There was no lack of criticisms to such a flamboyant display that forced the emperors into a voluntary prison, to live "the life of a marine shellfish" (so said *Synesius of Cyrene in his speech addressed to the emperor *Arcadius). The sacred ideology, however, was widespread. This ideology was also favored by a legislation (already starting from the CTh, with laws received by the Justinian Code) that severely regulated the production and commerce of this precious color, restricting certain gradations of it to the use of the emperor alone.

M. Cagiano di Azevedo, s.v. *Farbe*, in RAC 7, 417-447; O. Longo (ed.), *La porpora. Realtà e immaginario di un colore simbolico*. Atti del Convegno di studio, Venezia, 24 e 25 ottobre 1996, Venice 1998; H. Blum, *Purpur als Statussymbol in der griechischen Welt*, Bonn 1998; B. Virgilio, *Lancia, diadema e porpora. Il re e la regalità ellenistica*, Pisa-Rome 1999.

V. Lombino

PYRRHUS. Patriarch of *Constantinople (638–641; d. 654). Presbyter of the Hagia Sophia and the *hegumen of the *monastery of the *Theotokos* of Chrysopolis on the Bosporus, he was elected patriarch on 20 December 638. At the end of that year or the beginning of the following, he promulgated a dogmatic conciliar decree approving the **Ekthesis*, excommunicating whoever refused to sign, a signature which he requested twice (639 and 641), even from Pope *John IV. The arrival of the emperor *Constans II ruined his standing and forced him to withdraw from the patriarchate (night of 28-29 October 641). After he had withdrawn to the monastic life in *Africa, he became convinced of his own errors in a public debate held at *Carthage with St. *Maximus the Confessor (July 645). At *Rome, he rejected the *monothelite heresy, but then, shortly thereafter, he renounced the *orthodox position, provoking the *anathema of a council and a deposition pronounced by Pope *Theodore. After the death of Patriarch *Paul II, 8 or 9 January 654, he reoccupied the Byzantine See for a period of six months, during which time he approved the *Typos*. He died on *Pentecost (10? July) of 654. The Third Council of *Constantinople (680) condemned him as a heretic.

CPG 7615-7618; Grumel, Regestes[2] 294-298; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII*, Rome 1971, passim (index p. 583); L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1982, 205-215; J.L. van Dieten, *Geschichte der patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI.* (*610–715*), Amsterdam 1972, 57-78, 104-105; Patrologia V, 108-109; BBKL 7, 1076-1078.

D. Stiernon

Q

QALAT SEMAN. The famous remains of this religious structure (Qalat Seman, Qal'at Semān; Qalat Semân) are found on the peak of a hill nearly 60 km (= 37.2 mi.) northwest of *Aleppo and northeast of *Antioch: near the border with Turkey, where *Simeon Stylites (d. 459), called "the Elder," to distinguish him from the one who lived near Antioch, was born around 390. After he had spent a few years in the monastery in *Syria, first at Telada, then at Telanissos (Deir Seman, or rather Deir Samaan, under the hill where a sanctuary was constructed), at first he adopted the life of a recluse, then he started a new way of ascetic life and set himself upon a column that increasingly grew, on top of the mountain. According to legend, the last column was nearly 16 m (= 52.5 ft) high, or even more, and 2 m in diameter (= 6.6 ft), set upon a square platform of 4 m (= 13.1 ft). He did it perhaps to remove himself from the faithful who wanted to touch him. He lived on a column from which he also preached to the faithful for 30 years until his death. His column became a center for *pilgrimages; among its pilgrims were the historian *Evagrius Scholasticus (*HE* 1,4) and the emperor Maurice. Several people were at Simeon's service.

After the death of Simeon, which occurred between 476 and 490, an octagonal church was built around the column, with a chapel, which in earlier times was not closed; the foundation still remains. Four arcs of the octagon opened to four basilicas with three aisles, separated by columns, arranged in the form of a cross. The other four corners of the octagon tapered off in the exedra. The church had an area of 3840 m^2 (= 41333 ft^2). The E basilica, which ends with three apses, was slightly larger and covered with marble, and the floor was made of mosaics; it was the most important of the three because the primary liturgical activities took place there. The other three were designed for pilgrims waiting for some miracle. The S basilica was preceded by a narthex and a triple portal, which was the primary entrance. Women were not allowed to approach the column. The entire structure formed an immense sanctuary and a place for pilgrimages, with a monastery and lodgings for the pilgrims; it also included a baptistery and a martyrium, but the martyr's body was first taken to Antioch, perhaps before 467 (Malalas 369,10-16), and then to *Constantinople. The baptistery, which was built upon another small church, had an octagonal tank to the E with small steps to descend into the water. To the N of the sanctuary there was a funeral chapel hewn into the rock. A processional road began from the foot of the mountain, from the village of Deir Seman (the same name of the monastery on the mountain). Here lay the remains of a monumental rock at the beginning of the processional road toward the mountain that was lined with lodgings for pilgrims. Upon arriving at the baptistery, these people still needed to go another 200 m (= 656 ft) on the holy road to arrive at the church.

For the protection of the structure, girded walls were built, hence the name Qalat Seman (= Simeon's Fortress), which was coined by the *Melkite patriarch of Antioch. This Christian center underwent an earthquake in the 6th c. and a subsequent fire, then the Arab occupation. A bilingual inscription on the mosaic, before the ambo in the central nave of the E church, bears witness to the remodeling that occurred in the year 979. A few years later, in 985, it was occupied and sacked by the Arabs from the Emirate of Aleppo, Sa'ad ed-Dula; the final strike occurred in 1017. Impressive ruins remain alongside the foundation of the column, as shown at the center of the octagonal basilica of St. Simeon—remains that attest to the harmony in the constructions of a masterpiece of Syrian Christian art. Several sculptures were taken to the Museum of *Damascus.

I. Peña - P. Castellana - R. Fernández, *Les stylites syriens*, Jerusalem 1975; F.W. Deichmann, *Qalb Loze und Qal'at Sem'an. Die besondere Entwicklung der nordsyrisch-spätantiken Architektur*, Munich 1982; J.L. Biscop - J.-P. Sodini, *Qal'at Sem'an et les chevets à colonnes de Syrie du nord*: Syria 61 (1984) 267-330; J.-L.

Biscop - J.-P. Sodini, *Églises syriennes apparentées à Qal'at Sem'an. Les exemples de Turin et de Fasuq dans le Gebel Wastani*: Syria 64 (1987) 107-129; J.-L. Biscop - J.-P. Sodini, *Travaux à Qal'at Sem'an*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès Int. d'archéologie chrétienne*, II, Rome 1989, 1675-1695; P. Donceel-Voûte, *Les pavements des églises byzantines de Syrie et du Liban*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1988, 225-240; RBK 3, 854-891; ODB 3, 1763; John Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf, CSHB, Bonn 1831.

A. Di Berardino

QIIORE (d. 436/437). Director of the school of *Edessa during the first decades of the 5th c., he was the first to promote the *Syriac translation of *Theodore of Mopsuestia's writings. In so doing, he opposed the vociferously anti-*Nestorian agenda of *Rabbula, bishop of Edessa. *Ibas, a colleague of Qiiore, continued and extended his work, even the editorial aspect, primarily from the year 435 onward, when he was asked to succeed Rabbula on the episcopal chair.

P. Bettiolo, *Lineamenti di Patrologia Siriaca*, Rome 1989, 518, 543.

C. Dell'Osso

QUADRATUS, apologist. *Eusebius (*HE* IV, 3,1) identified him as the author of an apology in defense of the Christian religion, addressed and offered to the emperor *Hadrian. It was, therefore, the most ancient apology for which we possess information. Eusebius also bore witness, moreover, that this work was still widely available during his time and that he owned a copy (ibid.). By reading this document, he was convinced of the author's intelligence and the clear apostolic character of his teaching. Lastly, in demonstration of its antiquity, he cited a passage of the apology in which Quadratus made the connection between the truth of the miracles worked by the Savior with their lasting verifiability. In this regard, he maintained that several people who had been healed by Jesus had survived to his own time (*HE* IV, 3,2). With regard to this fragment, scholars have discussed whether it was in fact inserted into the tradition of the information that attributes to *Papias of Hierapolis the attestation of the existence of people whom Jesus had raised from the dead, even during Hadrian's period (see frag. 16 of Papias, ed. J. Kürzinger, pp. 116-117). Eusebius also mentioned Quadratus in his work *Chron., ad ann.* 125–126, ed. R. Helm, p. 199, calling him a "disciple of the apostles," and in this context, he seems to identify *Athens as the place in which he presented this document, during the trip that *Hadrian took to Greece in the years 124–125 in order to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. It is possible, furthermore, that the apologist should be identified with the similarly named prophet of the apostolic age, who was perhaps active in *Asia Minor, an individual whom Eusebius mentioned (*HE* III, 37,1), in all likelihood on the basis of the testimony of the anonymous anti-*Montanist (Eus., *HE* 5, 17,2-4). It appears, however, that the identification of Quadratus with the similarly named bishop of Athens, who lived during the time of *Marcus Aurelius (Eus., *HE* 4, 23,3), an idea already proposed by *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 19; *Ep.* 70,4 *ad Magnum*), is unwarranted. With the exception of the fragment preserved by Eusebius, Quadratus's apology has been entirely lost. The attempts undertaken by J.R. Harris and P. Andriessen to reconstruct the work, in its entirety or in part, as contained in other patristic texts, has not garnered consensus among scholars.

CPG 1060; the bibliography contained therein should be combined with the extensive literary documentation collected by H.R. Drobner, s.v. *Quadratus*: BBKL 7, 1081-1084. On frag. 16 of Papias, see J. Chapman, *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford 1911, 95-99 (esp. 97-99); M. Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage. Ein Lösungsversuch* (WUNT, 67), Tübingen 1993, 77 n.234; Papia di Hierapolis, *Esposizione degli oracoli del Signore*, ed. E. Norelli, Milan 2005, note 6 on frag. 10.

V. Zangara

QUADRATUS of Athens (pseudo). An apocryphal letter of *James bishop of *Jerusalem to Quadratus (probably the bishop of *Athens), written in *Syriac, that circulated in Syriac *Jewish-Christian circles. There exist versions in Syriac and *Armenian (the latter being the better of the two). The letter discusses the passion of *Jesus Christ and the situation in Jerusalem after his death.

CANT 308. Armenian version: *Die Lehre der Apostel, das apokryphe Buch der Kanones, der Brief des Jakobus an Quadratus und die Kanones des Thaddäus. Untersuchungen und Texte*, J. Daschean, Vienna 1896. German trans.: R. Van den Broek, *Der Brief des Jakobus an Quadratus und das Problem der judenchristlichen Bischöfe von Jerusalem (Eusebius, HE IV,5,1-3)*, in *Text and Testimony. Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, ed. T. Baarda et al., Kampen 1988, 56-65. Syriac version: Ignatius Ephraem II Rahmani, *Studia Syriaca* [1], Scharfe (Libano) 1904, text, Latin trans. 1-2. Italian trans.: Erbetta 3; 134-135. Polish trans.: Starowieyski 1, 747-749.

M. Starowieyski

QUAESTIONES ET RESPONSIONES on Holy Scripture. Among the exegetical genres of the *Bible, that is, the scholia, *homilies and *commentaries, the *Quaestiones et responsiones* (in Greek *erōtapokriseis*) are connected to the scholia. These,

like the scholia, do not offer a systematic and complete interpretation of an entire sacred book (which is characteristic of commentaries), but consist in explanatory notes, which are brief for the most part, on specific passages or verses or even biblical terms. However, in contradistinction to scholia, they use the generally artificial and fictitious method of questions and answers that had been introduced (especially the questions) by typical formulas that were repeated with tired monotony. Before being applied to *Scripture, the genre was widespread in pagan literature. Aristotle wrote a work entitled Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις and even earlier the sophists and orators had made use of it in the schools to prod students to solve numerous questions that various texts posed, especially the poems of Homer.

*Philo of Alexandria seems to have been the first to compose *quaestiones* on the Bible, whose work, *Problems and Solutions on the Book of Genesis and Exodus* (Eus., *HE* 2,18,1), commented on certain chapters of the two texts. It is not known, however, who among the Christian authors first had the idea to use this exegetical genre. It does not seem to have appeared specifically in the writings of *Origen, even if at times, both in the homilies and the commentaries, he introduced an imaginary interlocutor to propose a difficulty that then received a solution. *Eusebius left one specific work in this genre, *Questions and Solutions on the Gospels*; some fragments in *Greek and *Syriac of this work have survived and, fortunately, a compendium, later edited, that allows us to have a sufficiently precise idea of the original work and its contents. The work is divided into two parts: the first in two books treated problems relating to Jesus's childhood; the other, in just one book, the accounts of the resurrection. From the *Various Questions* of *Acacius, who was a disciple and successor of Eusebius in the episcopal see of *Caesarea, a long fragment relating to 1 Cor 15:51 has been preserved thanks to *Jerome (*Ep.* 119,6); from this fragment we conclude that Acacius's work treated biblical questions.

Under *Augustine's name, some manuscripts have passed down the *Questions on the Old and New Testament*; we possess three recensions: the first, 151 questions; the second, 127; and the third, 115. On the basis of linguistic, stylistic and conceptual arguments, the work has been reattributed to the author of the commentary on the epistles of St. *Paul, who is also known by the name of *Ambrosiaster. The *Questions* presented various characteristics: some are from true and proper treatises intended to develop all the aspects of a problem; others are focused on quickly clearing up a specific difficulty. Others, however, aim at the church's enemies and Christian believers who assert dangerous opinions. Lastly, other questions have a homiletical character dedicated to the interpretation of a psalm or biblical figure. The author reveals a good knowledge of both classical and Christian authors: among these, according to Alexander Souder, the foremost scholar on the *Questions*, are the following: Cicero, Sallustius, Titus Livius, *Tertullian, *Cyprian, *Victorinus of Petovium (Petau), *Hilary of Poitiers and others.

Various letters of Jerome made use of the literary genre of the *quaestiones*. These letters were dedicated to solving scriptural difficulties that were posed to this learned father of the church. Some examples of these are *Ep.* 35, in which five questions on Genesis are analyzed for Pope *Damasus; *Ep.* 36, sent to the same pontiff, and *Ep.* 120 and 121. But Jerome, at the beginning of his exegetical activity, also composed a specific document titled *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*: in this work, he places the Septuagint version alongside the Hebrew throughout 220 questions, which constitute a true and proper commentary on the entire book under the form of scholia.

Various works of Augustine are connected to this exegetical genre: *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri 7*; *De octo quaestionibus ex Veteri Testamento*; *Quaestionum evangeliorum libri 2*; *Quaestiones 17 in Ev. secundum Matthaeum* (a few doubts on the authenticity of this last work have been raised); *Expositio 84 propositionum ex epist. ad Romanos*; *De diversis quaestionibus 83 liber unus*; *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicium libri duo*; *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus liber unus*. The placement of these documents in the genre of *quaestiones* has been disputed by several scholars for specious reasons, namely because in these texts one does not find solutions for imaginary difficulties but actual problems that were presented to Augustine and his correspondents. With respect to the character and content, some of these documents are rather brief, others are extensive; some are a type of systematic repertoire of the difficulties that the study of the sacred book presents, others are restricted to solving a certain number of problems.

The first book of *Eucherius of Lyons's *Instructiones* is devoted to the interpretation of selected passages from the Bible, from *Genesis to *Revelation, under the form of a dialogue (Eucherius's work contains two books). The *Instructiones* are dedicated to his son *Salonius, bishop of Geneva, to whom were attributed—but the attribution is not satisfactory—four short treatises, in which, through a fictitious chain of questions and answers, answers are given to

questions pertaining to selected passages from the book of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the gospels of Matthew and *John. Both the *Instructiones* and Salonius's short treatises offer very little personal information, but they use previous works, at times even to the point of plagiarism. The following works are also characterized by a lack of originality: *Isidore of Seville's *Expositiones mysticorum sacramentorum seu Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*; these, however, belong more to the literature of the scholia than to the *quaestiones* properly speaking. Another work is the *De Veteri et Novo Testamento quaestiones*, whose authorship by Isidore has been maintained with convincing arguments. Likewise showing the same lack of marked originality are the Venerable *Bede's *Quaestiones in librum Regum*.

Three documents that appear among the writings of *Justin Martyr should be placed in the genre of the *quaestiones*: *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*, *Quaestiones christianorum ad gentiles*, *Quaestiones gentilium ad christianos*. Justin's authorship of these works has been rejected—with good reason—and some scholars have maintained that the authors of these works and the *Confutatio quorumdam Aristotelis dogmatum* were *Diodore of Tarsus and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, without either of these two attributions finding significant support. For the actual truth of the matter, one can only say that the four writings all come from the same hand and probably date back to the middle of the 5th c. We possess two recensions of the *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*, one that includes 146 questions, the other—which probably represents the original recension—161. The questions proposed are among the most diverse and only partially concern sacred Scripture; in fact, among the themes treated are discussions on apologetics, dogma, morality, exegesis, the liturgy and the natural sciences. There are also various interlocutors who range from the catechumen to the learned pagan to the disciple. The other two short treatises of ps.-Justin, *Quaestiones christianorum ad gentiles* and *Quaestiones gentilium ad christianos*, lie outside our scope of interest because they treat philosophical problems.

For the genre under examination, Theodoret of Cyrrhus also dedicated part of his literary activity to composing *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* and *In libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*. The two works were addressed to Hypatius, who had insistently asked the author to explain difficult passages from the Bible. In effect, the *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* is the only work that truly belongs to the genre, because the other document—that constitutes a continuation of the preceding work—especially the questions on the book of Chronicles, is presented under the form of scholia.

To *Hesychius of Jerusalem probably belongs the *Collection of Objections and Solutions*, which seems to be an abridgment of his *Harmony of the Gospels* that has now been lost. The *Collection* is a type of harmonizing intended to illustrate, through questions and answers, 61 problems on the gospels pertaining to the public life, passion and death of Jesus.

At least two collections of scriptural questions are owed to the work of *Maximus the Confessor: *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (PG 90, 243-786) and *Quaestiones et dubia* (PG 90, 785-856). In the first work, the author explains 65 questions for Thalassius, who had made a specific request. In this second collection, some of the problems proposed have no relation to Scripture. Altogether, this second work is simpler than the other and corresponds better to the classical type of scriptural questions. In contrast, the questions for Thalassius are characterized by long considerations, undoubtedly more important, but less in conformity to the genre. Much later were the *Erotapokriseis* of ps.-*Caesarius (6th c.?). Even *Macarius of Magnesia's *Apocriticus* was written under the form of questions and answers.

From the works of *Anastasius the Sinaite the only treatise that interests us here is the *Quaestiones et responsiones* (PG 89, 312-824). In the current editions, the work includes 154 questions; not all the manuscripts, however, attest the same number. Moreover, it is certain that some of the 154 published questions were not written by Anastasius. In addition to scriptural problems, dogmatic, moral and liturgical themes are treated.

G. Bardy, *La littérature patristique des "Quaestiones et Responsiones" sur l'Écriture Sainte*: RBi 41 (1932) 210-236, 341-369, 515-537; 42 (1933) 14-30, 211-229, 328-352; J.H. Declerck, *Maximi Confessoris Questiones et dubia*, Turnhout-Leuven 1982; G. Geraci, *L'utilizzazione dell'Antico testamento nelle Quaestiones et responsiones di Eusebio di Cesarea*: AnSE 2 (1985) 251-255; A. Pollastri, *Le Quaestiones di Agostino su Genesi. Struttura dell'opera e motivazioni storico-culturali*: AnSE 5 (1988) 57-76; F. Scorza Barcellona, *La parabola della zizzania in Agostino. A proposito di Quaestiones in Matthaeum 11*: AnSE 5 (1988) 215-223; M. Simonetti, *Le Quaestiones di Teodoreto su Genesi e Esodo*: AnSE 5 (1988) 39-56; G. Rinaldi, *Tracce di controversie tra pagani e cristiani nella letteratura patristica delle quaestiones et responsiones*: AnSE 6 (1989) 99-124; L. Perrone, *Le Quaestiones evangelicae di Eusebio di Cesarea. Alle origini di un genere letterario*: AnSE 7 (1990) 417-435; Id., *Sulla preistoria delle "quaestiones" nella letteratura patristica*: AnSE 8 (1991) 485-505; C. Mandolfo, *Le regole di Ticonio e le "Quaestiones et responsiones" di Eucherio di Lione*: AnSE 8 (1991) 535-546; G.M. Vian, *Le Quaestiones di Filone*: AnSE 9 (1992) 365-386; A. Garzya, *Appunti sulle "Erotapokriseis"*: VetChr 39 (1992) 305-314; L. Perrone, *Echi della polemica pagana sulla Bibbia negli scritti esegetici fra IV e V secolo. Le Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti dell'Ambrosiaster*: AnSE 11 (1994) 161-185; G. Girardi, *"Erota-*

pokriseis" neotestamentarie negli "Ascetica" di Basilio di Cesarea. Evangelismo e paolinismo nel monachesimo delle origini: AnSE 11 (1994) 461-490; L. Perrone, *"Quaestiones et responsiones" in Origene. Prospettive di un'analisi formale dell'argomentazione esegetico-teologica*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 15 (1994) 1-51; Id., *Perspectives sur Origène et la littérature patristique des "Quaestiones et Responsiones,"* in *Origeniana Sexta*, ed. J. Dorival et al., Leuven 1995, 151-164; *De diuersis quaestionibus octoginta tribus, De diuersis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum di Agostino d'Ippona*, comm. L. Perrone - J. Pépin - F. Cocchini [et al.], Rome 1996; G. Folliet, *La "Quaestio 12" des "83 Quaestiones" d'Augustin et un recueil de dix-sept "Apophtegmes" de Poemen dans le manuscrit de Nonantola* (*Vat. Lat. 5051*): Augustinianum 37 (1997) 165-182; M. Maas, *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean. Junilius Africanus and the Instituta Regularia Diviane Legis*, Tübingen 2003; *Erotapokriseis. Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*, ed. A. Volgers - C. Zamagni, Leuven 2004; M. Richard - J.A. Munitiz, *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones . . .*, Turnhout 2006.

C. Curti

QUAILS, MIRACLE of the (iconography). The biblical event of the gathering of the quail (Ex 16:13, repeated in Num 11:13-14) to feed the Israelites during their journey in the desert was intended to show the work of divine *providence. Given the remaining monuments, the artistic representation of this episode does not seem to have found extensive use in the repertory of ancient Christian art. The most well-known example is the *sarcophagus front of Camposanto Monumentale at Pisa, in which the event is portrayed by a group of people, men, women and children, with their arms raised to snatch the birds, and others with knees bent toward the large birds on the floor in the foreground. This scene is essentially represented with the same *iconography on other sculpted monuments: on the front of the sarcophagus lid preserved in the Museo Lapidario of Avignon, on the side of a sarcophagus now at the Musée des Beaux Arts in Aix-en-Provence; from *Arles, a fragment of the sarcophagus lid discovered at Trinquetaille with people divided into groups of three surrounded by trees; and perhaps the sarcophagus front of the Museo Civico di Carcassonne. In these, as at Pisa, it is presented in association with the artistic representation of the crossing of the Red Sea. The event is also present in the *mosaic decoration of the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore at *Rome. And recently, some scholars have maintained that they have identified it on a fresco of the Roman cemetery of the Jordani, where a figure, who seems to be nude, holds in his left hand a sack in which to place a bird he is approaching. The monuments cover a chronological arc that ranges from the Age of *Constantine (sarcophagus of Pisa) to the era of Pope *Sixtus III (the mosaic of S. Maria Maggiore).

For the Pisa sarcophagus, see P. Arias, in *Camposanto Monumentale di Pisa. Le antichità*, Pisa 1977, 168, figs. 244-245 (the list is not exhaustive and contains errors of interpretation). For the sculptures: F. Benoit, *Fragments de sarcophages inédits*: RivAC 17 (1940) 266ff. For the mosaic, in particular, C. Cecchelli, *I mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin 1956, 157-158, pl. 33; G. Matthiae, *Mosaici medievali delle chiese di Roma*, Rome 1967, 106; J. Wilpert - W.N. Schumacher, *Die römischen Mosaiken der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV-XIII Jahrhundert*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1976, pl. 40; U. Fasola, *Le recenti scoperte nelle catacombe sotto Villa Savoia. Il "coemeterium Iordanorum ad S. Alexandrum"*: Actas VIII Congr. Int. Arqueol. Crist., Vatican City-Barcelona 1972, 283, pl. CXII, fig. 11; F. Bisconti, *Il cubicolo dell'Esodo nel cimitero dei Giordani*, in *Domum tuam dilexi*, Misc. A. Nestori, Vatican City 1998, 81-108; TIP 267-268.

L. Pani Ermini

QUARTODECIMANS. Both in *Asia and *Syria, Christians continued to observe the Jewish Passover even after their separation, but they associated their practice not only with the *Exodus from Egypt, but also with the events of the death and *resurrection of Jesus, which was understood as the true Passover from the moment that Jesus had acquired the role of the true Paschal Lamb. Because this feast was celebrated on the 14th of Nisan, they became known, once the practice was publicly presented alongside different practices, as *tessareskaidekatites*, which was translated as "Quartodecimans" or "Quartadecimans."

Although this was the practice of certain Christian groups, it was not universal; it was possible that other Christians did not observe an annual commemoration of Passover, although in certain areas Sunday could be understood as a weekly celebration of the resurrection. With the gradual unification of the Roman Church at the end of the 2nd c., the quartodeciman practice of certain Roman Christians became a question that threatened the nascent unity of the Roman communities, from the moment that a different *Easter practice brought it about that some Roman quartodecimans, perhaps of Asian origin, fasted on Sunday in preparation for the Easter celebration that could have taken place without accounting for the day of the week. This situation led Pope *Victor to start an epistolary correspondence with other churches concerning this problem, and *Eusebius preserved a letter that Victor sent to *Polycrates of *Ephesus, who defended the Asiatic practice on the basis of its antiquity (*HE* 5,24). In Polycrates's letter seven famous quartodeciman leaders were mentioned, namely the apostles *Philip and *John, *Traseas, *Polycarp, *Melito of Sardis, Sagaris and Papyrius. In addition to these famous leaders mentioned by Polycrates, we should note the quar-

todeciman provenance of the following authors and literary sources: *Apollinaris of Hierapolis (*Chron. pasch.*: PG 92, 80-81), the **Epistula apostolorum*, the first 21 chapters of the **Didascalia apostolorum*, the author of the ps.-*Hippolytan homily *In sanctum Pascha*, *Blastus (ps.-Tertullian, *Adv. omnes Haer.* 8), and "*Hippolytus" the author of the *Refutation*, whose antiquartodeciman statements are cited (*Chron. pasch.*: PG 92, 80-81; *Ref.* 8.18) and which could also be the product of tensions between quartodeciman communities. Actually, in addition to the fact that the quartodeciman practice was clearly distinct from that of other Christian groups beyond Asia and Syria, a variety of practices existed then among the quartodecimans themselves. There were some who observed Easter on the same day as Jews observed Passover and appealed to one chronology offered by the synoptic gospels to justify their choice, despite the quartodeciman origin of the practice that had arisen in the context of the Johannine circles; the others celebrated Easter the whole night and fasted during the Jewish celebration and began their liturgy at midnight.

The general tendency to celebrate Easter in one way, and the subsequent discussion of the paschal question after the Council of *Nicaea, effectively isolated the quartodeciman practice from the wider church, and this practice began to disappear entirely, with the exception of isolated groups such as the *Montanists of Asia Minor who, in their isolation, developed a quartodeciman solar year.

C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, TU 43, Leipzig 1919; B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner*, Gütersloh 1953; R. Cantalamessa, *L'omelia "In S. Pascha" dello pseudo-Ippolito di Roma*, Milan 1967; Id., *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza*, Turin 1971; S.G. Hall, *Melito in The Light of the Passover Haggadah*: JTS 22 (1971) 29-46; S.G. Hall (ed.), *Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and Fragments*, Oxford 1979; G.A.M. Rouwhorst, *The Quartodeciman Passover and the Jewish Pesach*: Questions liturgiques 77 (1996) 152-173; A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast*, Leiden 1998 (bibl.); G. Visonà, *Pseudo Ippolito, In Sanctum Pascha Studio, edizione, commento*, Milan 1988 (bibl.); TRE 25, 93-97.

A. Stewart-Sykes

QUICUMQUE VULT. Also known as the *Athanasian Creed* (*Symbolum Athanasianum*) and the *Exposition of the Catholic Faith* (*Expositio fidei catholicae*), this *creed was composed in the 2nd half of the 5th c., probably in southern *Gaul, in Latin (PL 88, 585-586). There exists a Greek translation (PG 28, 1581A-1584C), which was certainly after the original version. From the 7th c. onward, it was erroneously attributed to *Athanasius, perhaps because the creed explained very clearly the trinitarian theology and the doctrine of the two natures in Christ. The author emphasized numerous times that all those who do not believe in its doctrines cannot be saved. The style of the work permits one to recite the creed in its entirety; it is easy to see why the Synod of *Autun (670) enjoined all clerics to memorize it by heart. All attempts to identify the author (*Ambrose, *Eusebius of Vercelli, *Vincent of Lérins, *Fulgentius of Ruspe and others) have been wrong. During the Middle Ages, it was revered at the same level of the Apostles' and *Nicene Creeds and was even used in the *liturgy.

CPL 167; CPG 2295; CPPM II A 36; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Athanasian Creed*, London 1964; V. Laurent, *Le symbole "Quicumque" et l'Église byzantine*, EO 35 (1936) 385-404; C.H. Turner, *Symbolum "Quicumque"*: JTS 11 (1910) 407-411; ODC[3] 119.

S. Samulowitz

QUINISEXT. *See* *TRULLO (Quinisext), Council in

QUINTASIUS of Carales (d. after 314). He was the first known bishop of Cagliari: along with his presbyter Ammonius, he appears among the signers of the canons of the Council of *Arles of 314, convoked by *Constantine to settle the controversy between *Caecilian and the *Donatists (Mansi II, 477; *Concilia Galliae*, CCL 148, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22) and those who sent a letter to Pope *Sylvester on the same occasion (CCL 148, 4).

PCBE 1870.

A. Pollastri

QUIRICUS. Saint and *martyr who probably died during the *Diocletian *persecution (303–305). Quiricus was a child of only three years, who was capable, however, of giving speeches and working miracles, when he was killed, by order of the judge, in the sight of his mother Julietta. The hagiographical sources, however, do not agree about his tragic end. One can easily see the variations among the *Hieronymian Martyrology*, the *Roman Martyrology* and *The Synaxarion of Constantinople* and a *Passio* (BHL I, 272, nos. 193-194), perhaps an *apocryphal text (see **Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis*, PL 59, 164), which was dedicated to him; he may have been killed on June 16th or July 15th, at *Antioch or *Tarsus in Cilicia, and with 404 companions, or some number between 54 and 11,504! Nevertheless, despite these discrepancies, which even in antiquity must have been well noted (see above *Decretum*

Gelasianum de libris recipiendis), the cult of Quiricus stopped suddenly in the East, and beginning from the 5th c., when the bishop of Auxerre Amator (or Amantius) ordered that the relics of the saint be placed at *Marseille, it began to spread in the West.

AASS *Iunii* III, Venice 1743, 15-37; *Mart. hier.*, 321; *Mart. rom.*, 240; *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. Delehaye, in *Propylaeum ad AASS Novembris*, Brussels 1902, 821-822; H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels [2]1933, 167ff.; LTK[2] V, 1203; EC X, 430; BS X, 1324-1328; L.P. Jessop, *The Cycle of Saints Quiricus and Julitta in the Church of Santa Maria Antiqua, at Rome*, Diss. University of London (Courtauld Institute of Art), 1985 (with bibl.).

P. Marone

QUIRICUS of Barcelona. The bishop of *Barcelona approximately 654–666, he participated at the 10th Council of *Toledo (656), but already as abbot he had probably participated at the 7th Council of Toledo (653). He maintained his friendship with *Taio of Saragossa, to whom he had sent a letter encouraging him to publish his book of *Sentences*. He also wrote two letters to *Ildefonsus of Toledo: the first to thank him for the copy of the treatise on the *Virginity of *Mary,* which he considered a book rich with spiritual edification and consolation, and the second to encourage him to write commentaries on some books of *Scripture. A *hymn in honor of St. *Eulalia of Barcelona was attributed to him.

CPL 1271-1273; Díaz 211-213; PL 80, 729-730; 96, 193-196; J. Tarré, *Santa Eulalia de Barcelona*: Vida cristiana 2 (1915) 122; A. Fábrega, *Santa Eulalia de Barcelona*, Rome 1958, 45-53; J.F. Rivera Recio, *Los arzobispos de Toledo en el siglo VII*: Anales Toledanos, III. Estudio sobre la España Visigoda, Toledo 1971, 203-205; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 479-481.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

QUIRINUS, martyr. Various martyrs had this name. (1) Quirinus of Novesia in Germany (feast day 30 March, translation of relics 30 April): according to the *Passio* of the 6th-7th c., he was a Roman tribune under the emperor *Hadrian (117–138), and after his martyrdom he was buried in the catacomb of *Praetextatus on the Via Appia, where a few years ago L. Spera was able to identify the possible place for his tomb, which was already venerated during the time of Pope *Damasus (Tauch 46-56). Tradition states that during a visit to the Mamertine Prison, Quirinus found the chains of St. *Peter, which were subsequently preserved in the Roman church known as S. Pietro in Vincoli (St. Peter in Chains). The local 15th- to 16th-c. legend of Novesia maintained that Gepa, the abbess from a monastery of Novesia, the sister of the German Pope Leo IX, had translated the relics from Rome to her country in 1050. (2) The bishop of Siscia (Sissek in Croatia) (feast day June 4th): according to the *Passio*, he was martyred ca. 308 in Savaria (Szombathely/Steinamanger in Hungary), perhaps translated to Rome and the so-called Platonia of St. *Sebastian under the Appia, where he was at least venerated. (3) Quirinus from Tegernsee (feast day March 25th): according to the *Passio*, he was martyred under the emperor Claudius II (268–270) and buried in the catacomb of *Pontianus; in ca. 765 his remains were translated to Bavaria.

BHL 7026-7039; BS 10, 1329-1332; BBKL 7, 1130-1133; LCI 8, 240-244; M. Simonetti, *Su S. Quirino di Siscia*: RivAC 31 (1955) 234-243; M. Tauch (ed.), *Quirinus von Neuss*, Köln 2000; C. Zangs - G. Holländer (eds.), *Quirinus. Tribun, Märtyrer und Stadtpatron*, Köln 2000; P. Hommers (ed.), *Verehrungsstätten des heiligen Quirinus von Neuss in Europa*, Neuss 2000.

S. Heid

QUMRAN

I. Archaeology - II. History - III. Literature from Qumran - IV. Scripture and spirituality - V. Connections to Christianity.

In present-day scholarship, the term *Qumran* refers to an archaeological site at Khirbet Qumran, a hill at the NW corner of the Dead Sea (2 km [= 1.24 mi.], S of *Jericho and 32 km [= 19.88 mi.] N of Engedi [Ein Gedi]), which once had a settlement of a Jewish community between the 2nd c. BC and AD 68. The term *Qumran* also refers to the ancient manuscripts discovered in caves that are more or less near each other. Both the archaeological remains and the nearly 900 discovered scrolls, intact or in fragments, have opened a myriad of archaeological, historical, biblical-linguistic and socioreligious questions, some of which are very far from a definitive solution.

I. Archaeology. Launched following the discovery of scrolls in a cave by a Bedouin (1947), explorations and excavations have shed light upon the following: There are more than forty caves on the cliff to the N and S of the settlement with remains showing the presence of people from different periods. The caves were adapted for emergency stockpiles but never used as living quarters (with the exception of one). There is a central structure that was used by the residents of Qumran for community activities, enclosed by a wall with three openings without doors for protection, with a tower alongside the chief entrance. Also there are tanks (*miqwôt*) for ritual baths of purification; a dining room for the community meal,

with a pantry and a kitchen a short distance away; a scriptorium (place for writing); and various workshops, including one used for ceramics. There is also a large adjacent central cemetery (1200 tombs) with human skeletons belonging only to males, flanked by two other much smaller burial sites, where skeletons of women and children were also found, probably those of Bedouins. The residents, whose number could have varied between a minimum of 55 and a maximum of 150, would have lived in all likelihood in caves on the marly terrace of the settlement.

II. History. The only archaeological evidence tends to associate the site of Qumran with a place inhabited by the Essenes described in the *Natural History* (V, 15,73) by Pliny the Elder (d. AD 79). Nonetheless, almost immediately after the discovery of the scrolls and the sites, an enormous debate began in identifying the inhabitants of Qumran on the basis of the discoveries. Placed alongside some of the texts, some of the positions became entirely untenable because of the archaeological evidence and the publication of all the discovered manuscripts. The positions have today polarized: they are represented by N. Golb's thesis and the (University of) Groningen hypothesis, the latter of which is passionately advanced by F. García Martínez. The former denies that there were any residential inhabitants with a communal life at Qumran, asserting it would have been only a military outpost for defending the territorial annexations during the Hasmonean dynasty. The scrolls, this thesis maintains, would have been taken to the caves for precautionary purposes by the wealthy families of Jerusalem before its fall in AD 70. Golb's thesis, which, in short, denies that the Essenes ever lived at Qumran, is based on the heterogeneity of the manuscripts found in the caves and especially the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15), which, with the notes taken of enormous treasuries and goods, leads one to doubt that they could have belonged to the Essene community, whose members, according to Flavius Josephus, numbered 4,000 adherents (*Ant.* XVIII, 20).

Today, Golb's thesis has been undermined by recent archaeological research and by textual analyses, evidence that, however, does not contradict the hypothesis of Groningen, which identifies the people of Qumran with those of the Essene community concerning whom the sources spoke, both ancient Jewish (*Philo of Alexandria, *Prob.* 75; Josephus, *Ant.* XII, 171, 172, 298, 311, 372, 373; XVIII, 11, 18; *Wars* II, 119, 158, 160; V, 145) and non-Jewish (Pliny, *Natural History* V, 15,73; Dio Cassius, in *Synesius of Cyrene, *Dio or the Life and His Example* 2,3). For the most part, the descriptions of these ancient sources agree with the characteristics attributed to the community of Qumran after the discoveries: sharing of goods, communal meals, ritual baths, the sacerdotal character of the community, a long and severe regimen for the admission of new adherents, celibacy of some sort, and the solar calendar of 364 days.

The common position of scholars who have adhered to the Groningen hypothesis, nevertheless, breaks down into various hypotheses regarding the origin of the Essenes and the Qumran community. These can be summarized in three categories: (1) the origin of the Essene *hasidim* (H. Stegemann); (2) the origins of the movement at Babylon (J. Murphy-O'Connor); (3) Qumran as a schismatic sect of the Essenes. This last hypothesis (A.S. van der Woude; F. García Martínez), which seems to have the best arguments, distinguishes two historical moments that are difficult to date with precision: one pertains to the origin of the Essene movement during the time of the apocalyptic traditions before the edict of Antiochus Epiphanes; the second, to the origin of the Essenes of Qumran during the time of John Hyrcanus (134–104 BC). Following the Teacher of Righteousness (CD-A I, 5-12), whose identity has not been determined but is certainly a person who belonged to the priestly class of the *temple and the high priest, a schismatic group separated from the movement and went into self-exile in the desert at Qumran looking for a heightened eschatological spirituality based on dualism; they adopted a never-changing solar calendar, upon which they based their sacrifices and rules for ritual purification. The solar calendar they used was based on 364 days, thus divisible by 7, which allowed every year to start on the same day, Wednesday (the day the sun was created). In AD 68, the community was destroyed by the Romans, and Qumran became a military garrison for the occupants. Nothing more is known of the community; only the scrolls of its library have survived, which were well hidden in the caves before the community's demise.

III. Literature from Qumran. Without a doubt, the greatest amount of interest in Qumran comes from the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek manuscripts—all religious in character—discovered in 11 caves and cataloged with the siglum 1Q to 11Q, according to the order of the discovery of the caves, with the addition of the abbreviation of the contents (e.g., 1QIs stands for the Isaiah scroll found in the first cave discovered; 1QS stands for the *serek* [=*Rule of the Community*] scroll found in the first cave) or the number of the inventory (1Q28). Because of the dif-

ferent teachings of the various texts and because some date from before the establishment of Qumran, the manuscripts cannot be traced back to the Qumranic matrix. According to some of the criteria adopted (linguistic, literary genre, thematic, etc.), the texts, however, admit various classifications. By taking into account their origins and their purpose, these can be divided into the following categories: (a) *biblical manuscripts* that contain the text or part of a book in the Hebrew Bible (all the books of the present-day *canon are represented, with the exception of Esther); (b) *apocryphal manuscripts* that are Jewish works written between the 3rd c. BC and the 2nd c. AD, already known even before Qumran; (c) *parabiblical manuscripts* that have a more or less definitive relationship to biblical texts (*commentaries, *florelegia, etc.); (d) *nonbiblical manuscripts* that specifically pertain to the community of Qumran. Nearly a fourth of the texts (around 220 of some 900) were biblical writings and were an expression of the life of the community, which centered its life, alongside liturgical celebrations, on the study of the *Tôrāh*, which was interpreted authoritatively by its founder, the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom, as clarified by the *Pesher of Habakkuk*, were revealed the mysteries of the *Scriptures (1QpHab VII, 1-8). Because the biblical books were not controlled by a canon and did not have a stabilized order, they were ordered around a central nucleus established by the *Tôrāh* and the Major *Prophets.

The importance of these biblical texts in Hebrew derives from their antiquity (last quarter of the 3rd c. BC), existing in a version that therefore preceded the Hebrew text that would later be transmitted by the Masoretes. The texts of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint have no less importance. Far from being finished, the study of the manuscripts has opened almost unlimited new horizons for research previously unknown. Certainly, this study has enriched the knowledge of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages; it has allowed scholars to better develop the history of the biblical text before the advent of Christianity and the rabbinic era; it has clarified numerous questions on the Greek translation of the Septuagint; it has supplied materials for the textual criticism of the OT; it has exerted influence on literary criticism that seeks to reconstruct the formation of individual biblical books.

IV. Scripture and spirituality. Various manuscripts pertain to the interpretation of biblical texts. Seen within the larger picture, biblical hermeneutics at Qumran presented the twofold objective of explaining the text (pure exegesis) and its application (applied exegesis) to the concrete situations that emerged (G. Vermes). Nevertheless, all the exegetical methods used (literal explanations, “rewriting” or halakhic paraphrase, *pēšer*, *testimonia*, typology and allegory, *midrash*)—methods shared, moreover, with contemporary *Judaism and the NT itself—tended more toward a practical application of reading the biblical text, with an eschatological orientation, corroborated when possible by the authoritative and revealed interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab VII, 1-8).

From the various manuscripts that pertain to the community and especially the *Damascus Document*, it appears that the community understood biblical history as its own history of salvation (CD-A III, 1-2). The members of Qumran were in fact convinced that they had established the ideal community of the end times, that they had remained faithful to God’s covenant, and that the God of the Jews spoke directly in the Scriptures and in the first person to the adherents of the sect (J.V. Allegue). At Qumran, there was no fear of modifying the biblical text by conveying it in the first-person voice of God, even though the text was in the third person, as had occurred, for example, in the *Temple Scroll* with regard to Num 30:3-4 (11Q19 LIII, 14-17). Because they believed themselves to be the recipients of the tradition preserved in the Hebrew Bible, the members of Qumran conferred on the texts both an authority and a sacredness that had never before been given to this extent. Scripture was truly at the center of the community’s life. They studied the Scriptures, discovering in them the community’s own saved condition and the hope for what it would become.

In a document foundational for the sect, the *Rule of the Community* (or the *Manual of Discipline*), the perception of the members of Qumran of already being saved is observed in the question of *justification, a topic in which Qumran differed from the rest of contemporary Judaism. Belonging to the sect meant one was already justified, because by belonging to the community one entered “through pure grace” into the “lot” (*goral*) of Light, which from the divine foundation of the world was opposed to the *goral* of Darkness, i.e., the adversary. Both *goralim* were understood as historical realities. For the theology of Qumran, in fact, sin, both ontological and voluntary, could be expiated only by God, and the community of Qumran was the only place where the *Holy Spirit of God was present, because it was the only true temple (1QS 3,6-7). Accompanying the community’s dogmatic “predeterminism,” however, was also a spiritual journey that the individual adherent in the tension of his incessant search for God

had to undertake, leading along two parallel paths: one was practical, with the sequential acquisition of three virtues, the spirit of humility, patience and "great love" for the other members of the community; the other was dianoetic (i.e., intellectual), with the passage from empirical knowledge to supreme *wisdom. Lastly, the "great love" and the "highest wisdom" confer on the adherent the highest good with which he esteems God's works with trust (P. Sacchi). The search for God by the members of Qumran had various ends: fidelity to the law (4QMMT) and "to obtain eternal life" (4Q521, *On the Resurrection*), and yet, the ultimate goal of the path undertaken when they became a part of the desert community, the place of authentic contact with God, was the very vision of God (1QS XI, 3-13).

Seeking God in Scripture day and night (1QS VI, 6-8), this lifetime project that expressed an all-encompassing choice translated concretely into the full observance of the precepts established by God in the law of Moses and therefore also the full observance of the feasts and set times established there (1QS I, 11-15). The observance of the calendar (not the lunar one of 354 days and 12 months of 30 or 31 days, which was introduced at Jerusalem by the Hellenization of Jason and Menelaus, but that solar one of the tradition consisting in 364 days and 12 months of 30 and 31 days) and the liturgy, understood as service to God with prayer—both communal and at regular set times (B. Nitzan, 64)—served to establish two unavoidable expressions of the path toward God. In the solar calendar of Qumran, which was presented in the texts as the solar calendar revealed by God, every feast and every *sabbath falls on the same day of the year. It thus possessed the great advantage of regularity and precision that created the ideal instrument for liturgical use (F. García Martínez, in J.V. Allegue, 259-292). By means of the liturgy, the member of Qumran meditated on the cosmic order that is revealed in the regular and repetitive succession of times and that is definitively inserted into the very history of creation, which from the eternal present of God is revealed in nature with its unchangeable cycles (P. Sacchi, 88). At Qumran, prayer underwent an exceptional development, and even though we only have a few concrete descriptions of the liturgy (1QS VI, 6-8), because of the constant presence of Scripture in it, one can conclude that at its core the life of Qumran was marked by continual and full service to the written word of God.

V. Connections to Christianity. Beyond the ancient Christian references to discoveries of biblical scrolls in the environs of Jericho (*Origen, cited in Eus., *HE* 6,16,3; *Epiphanius of Salamis, *On the Weights and Measures*: PG 43, 265-268; at the beginning of the 9th c., *Timothy I, the historian bishop of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon; see O. Braun), which would also pertain to the history of texts, the scientific debate on Qumran, alive and belabored because of ideological distortions of the sources, has also concentrated on its relationship to early Christianity (Berger; Betz - Riesner; Stegemann; Fitzmyer; Yécora, in J.V. Allegue). Although the influences of the Qumranic tradition are also found in the early rabbinism of the Mishnah and the Tosefta, for Christianity it was important not to find direct dependencies and to justify the analogies of some of its notions with the ideas of the community (J. Coppens, in M. Delcor, 373-383). Thanks to such a comparison, studies on Qumran allow us to know a Judaism that was richer with respect to the rabbinic Judaism known before 1947, and such studies contribute to better reconstructing that *humus* (ground) in which the message of Jesus and the Christian community was born.

In particular, however, the rigorous comparisons have ascertained that the original presupposition of *John the Baptist's membership in the sect, endorsed by some popular publications, is shown to be false by the peculiarity of his *baptism with respect to the repeated ritual baths of Qumran (H. Stegemann). Both because of the profound doctrinal differences and the geographical distance, it is therefore certain that "Jesus did not have any personal acquaintance with the Essenes" (H. Stegemann) and that he was never at Qumran (J.A. Fitzmyer). If it is possible to observe several points of contact between his teaching and that of the schismatic Essene community, one must also note the radical discrepancies of fundamental aspects of his life with respect to the sect of the desert: his openness toward the world; the commandment of love; purity-impurity understood as interior; his attitude toward women, sinners and lepers; the simplicity of his teaching in parables. The case of second- and third-generation Christianity is different; here one can find similarities and even influences of Qumran on nonessential themes (for Paul: the similarity between the literary production of Qumran and the biblical texts of Eph 5:6-20 and 2 Cor 6:14-18). For the synoptic gospels, common literary elements can be noted in the *Beatitudes, because Qumran possessed a small collection in 4Q525 frag. 2, II, 1-3, and between the messianic passage of Mt 11:3-5 and 4Q521 frag. 1, II. The enigmatic figure of Melchizedek from the epistle to the Hebrews, which applies the title to Jesus, is also better explained thanks to the literature of Qumran, because this figure is presented as the executor of di-

vine judgment on the day of expiation Heb 7:1, 3 / 1 QGenAp; 11QMelch II, 6-8). The hypothesis advocated by J. O'Callaghan that the fragments 7Q4 and 7Q5 contained texts of the NT seems to be false by their belonging to the Greek book of Enoch. Lastly, also false is the thought that it is certain that early Christianity was directly influenced both by the sophisticated use of Scripture at Qumran ("thus it is written"; "as it is written") and by the apocryphal texts of the OT rejected by Pharisaic Judaism and known by Christians in Greek and in other languages, texts that Qumran restored to scholars in their Semitic version. From this apocryphal literature, which reflects the ideas of a diverse Second Temple Judaism, only those texts were received by early Christianity that presented a broader, universal openness (J. Trebolle Barrera).

The study of the biblical texts of Qumran has contributed to a better understanding of the controversy between Christians and Jews that arose already at the beginning of the 2nd c. (see *Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*) on the reciprocal accusation of falsifying the Scriptures. Neither party was responsible for distorting texts, but rather, in that period the Greek version of the Septuagint as well as the Hebrew pre-Masoretic text and the Masoretic text had equal authority in the faith of Israel. The further insight of the textual themes of the Dead Sea Scrolls could have positive effects in future interreligious dialogue between Jews and Christians (J. Sanders, in P.W. Flint).

F. García Martínez - E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols., Leiden 1997; E. Tov - S.J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, vol. 1 (CD-Rom), Leiden 1997; vol. 2, 1999. Translated texts: F. García Martínez, *Testi di Qumràn*, ed. C. Martone, Brescia 1996; L. Moraldi, *I manoscritti di Qumràn*, Turin ²1986.

Studies: J. Murphy-O'Connor, *The Essenes and Their History*: RB 81 (1974) 215-244; M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, Paris-Gembloux-Leuven 1978; J.A. Soggin, *I manoscritti del Mar Morto*, Rome 1978, ²1994; N. Golb, *L'origine des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*: Annales 40 (1985) 1133-1149; Id., *Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?*: Biblical Archaeologist 48 (1985) 68-82; Id., *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secrets of Qumran*, New York 1995; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools for Study. Revised Edition*, Atlanta 1990; F. García Martínez - A.S. van der Woude, *A Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History*: Revue de Qumran 14 (1990) 52-541; N. Golb, *Hypothesis of Jerusalem Origin of Dead Sea Scrolls*: Qumran Chronicle 1 (1990) 36-40; K. Berger, *Qumran und Jesus*, Stuttgart 1993; J.A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran. Le domande e le risposte essenziali sui manoscritti del Mar Morto*, Brescia 1994; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994; O. Betz - R. Riesner, *Gesù, Qumràn e il Vaticano. Chiarimenti*, Rome 1995; H. Stegemann, *Gli esseni, Qumran, Giovanni Battista e Gesù*, Bologna 1995; J.C. Vanderkam, *Manoscritti del Mar Morto. Il dibattito recente oltre le polemiche*, Rome 1995; F. García Martínez - J. Trebolle Barrera, *Gli uomini di Qumràn*, Brescia 1996; A. Lange - H. Lichtenberger, s.v. *Qumran*: TRE 28 (1997) 45-79; C. Martone, *I LXX e le attestazioni ebraiche di Qumran*: Annali di Scienze Religiose 2 (1997) 159-174; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, Grand Rapids, MI 1999; Th.J. Kraus, *7Q5 Status quaestionis und grundlegende Anmerkungen zur Relativierung der Diskussion um das Papyrusfragment*: Revue de Qumran 19 (1999-2000) 239-258; P.W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape and Interpretation*, Grand Rapids, MI 2000; Th.H. Lim et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, Edinburgh 2000; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, Grand Rapids, MI 2000; L.H. Schiffman - J.C. Vanderkam (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 vols., Oxford-New York 2000; J.V. Allegue (ed.), *I manoscritti del Mar Morto*, Rome 2005; P. Sacchi, *Regola della Comunità*, Brescia 2006.

V. Lombino

QUO VADIS? An apocryphal event mentioned in various versions of the *Acts of Peter* by St. *Ambrose, ps.-*Hegesippus and in the *Passion of Processus and Martinianus*, probably belonging to the most ancient version of the *Acts* (2nd-3rd c.). Upon the requests of the faithful, *Peter, threatened with death, fled from *Rome. At the city gate, he met Christ, who was traveling to Rome to be crucified again. Peter then returned to Rome and underwent death. In this event, which established a theological introduction to Peter's death, expression is given to the theology of martyrdom (Christ suffers in the *martyr); it emphasizes the legitimacy of fleeing during *persecution (a problem discussed over the course of the 2nd-3rd c.) and Rome's special role, where upon Christ's order, Peter returned to die. The event is famous thanks to H. Sienkiewicz's novel and the Roman legend (the church of *Domine, Quo vadis?* on the Via Appia and the footprints of Christ in the church of St. *Sebastian).

A.A. Bell, *Early Latin Versions of the Quo Vadis Story and the Ambrosian Authorship of the "De Excidio Hierosolymitano"*: The Patristic and Byzantine Review 9 (1990) 171-180; C. Cecchelli, *Gli Apostoli a Roma*: Archivio della R. Deputazione Romana di storia patria 60 (1937) 1-106 [esp. 26-32]; D.R. MacDonald, *The Acts of Paul and Acts of Peter. Which Came First?*: Society of Biblical Literature, Seminar Paper Series, 31 (1992) 214-224; M. Starowieyski, *Scena "Quo vadis?"* (*Acta Petri, Martyrium 6*): Vox Patrum 32-33 (1997) 281-290; Id., *L'épisode Quo vadis?* (*Acta Petri, Martyrium 6*): Humanitas 50 (1998) 257-262; Id., *L'épisode Quo Vadis?* in *Philomathestatos Studies . . . Presented to J. Noret*, ed. B. Janssens et al., Leuven . . . 2004, 591-601.

M. Starowieyski

QUOD IDOLA DII NON SINT (*That Idols Are Not Gods*)—hereafter, *QId*. A short apologetic treatise transmitted under the name of *Cyprian. It was

composed of three parts: (1) a criticism of mythology from a euhemerist point of view (i.e., views that regard myths as traditional accounts of real events that occurred in history), a refutation of the idea that *Rome owed its greatness to its religion and a rejection of the role of the demons who used paganism to turn men from the true God (I-VII), (2) an examination of the divine attributes, especially the divine unity (VIII-IX), (3) an outline of *Christology, with the subsequent appeal to follow Jesus in *martyrdom in the form of a *peroratio* (X-XV). For its ideas and expressions, *QId* primarily borrows from the work of *Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 20–22, 25–27, 18, 32 (chs. I-IX) and *Tertullian, *Apol.* 21.23 (chs. X-XV). The treatise is not mentioned either by *Pontius or the List of Cheltenham; it was attributed to Cyprian by *Jerome (*Ep.* 70,5) and *Augustine (*Bapt.* 6,44,87; *Unic. Bapt.* 4,6). This attribution led some to see in the *QId* the work of a neophyte (or at least Cyprian before his episcopate, and it was therefore dated to 246–249). The work synthesized the ideas drawn from the most famous apologies of the day: the "centonical" method analogous to that of Cyprian's *Ad Quirinum* or *Ad Fortunatum.* After the end of the 19th c., this position and Cyprian's authorship of the work were called into question. Against this objection, one scholar pointed to this work's numerous verbal affinities to Cyprian's known treatises (Koch). This defense was in turn attacked by the thesis according to which, identifying in the *QId* some points of relation with the works of *Lactantius (*Inst.* I and IV; *Epitome*), some maintained that the *QId* drew upon the work of Lactantius, and therefore that it could be dated between the time of Lactantius and Jerome, that is, in the 2nd or 3rd quarter of the 4th c. (Diller, Axelson, Heck and Wlosok). Some scholars, however, argued that the original thesis was demonstrated poorly (Simonetti). Others, nevertheless, argued that the refutation of the original defense did not necessarily mean that one must therefore accept Cyprian's authorship of the text (Deléani, Heck). As a result, the question of this text's authorship remains subject to debate.

CPL 57; PL 4, 564-582; W. Hartel, CSEL 3,1 (1868) 17-31; A. Wlosok, Herzog, § 481.3, with exhaustive bibl.; S. Deléani, *Chronica Tertullianea et Cyprianea*: REAug 42 (1996) n. 43.

P. Mattei

QUODVULTDEUS (d. 454). According to one hypothesis, Quodvultdeus, the bishop of *Carthage, who was exiled to Campania by *Genseric following the occupation of the city (19 October 439), should be identified with the deacon of the same name who was an epistolary correspondent of *Augustine of *Hippo and the one to whom Augustine dedicated *De haeresibus*. On the other hand, the identification with the author of the *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei* and a group of ps.-Augustinian homilies is today considered more likely the case. Quodvultdeus was perhaps born at Carthage, where he was at the time of the consecration of the temple of *Caelestis* as a church, during *Easter of 399 (according to the traditional chronology) or 408 (according to Braun 1986, 2882). Because he was an *adulescens* (adolescent) at that time (as he himself states in the *Prom.* 3,38,44), the date of his birth ought to be placed around 380 or 390. During the years 417–421, he was deacon of the church of Carthage; in 428–429 he sent two letters to Augustine (*Ep.* 221 and 223 from Augustine's collection of letters), to ask him to compile a brief compendium on the heresies. Ceding to his insistence, Augustine in 429 composed and dedicated the *De haeresibus* to Quodvultdeus. Around 437, the deacon (or more likely the archdeacon) Quodvultdeus succeeded *Capreolus on the episcopal cathedra of Carthage. From this cathedra, he courageously lifted up his voice not only against the *Vandal invaders, who were carrying out massacres and devastating North Africa, but also, and especially, against the Vandal *Arians, who reviled the body of the holy church. The day after the capture of Carthage by Genseric, Quodvultdeus and a crowd of ecclesiastical officials embarked—as *Victor of Vita informs us (1,5,15)—on half-broken ships, naked and robbed of everything, then docked at Naples, a city of Campania, thanks to a fortuitous journey. It was here that he probably died on 8 January 454 (according to the 6th-c. calendar of Carthage) or 19 February (according to the marble calendar of Naples, 8th c.).

During the course of the 20th c., textual criticism has attributed to Quodvultdeus a group of ps.-Augustinian sermons, delivered in *Africa, perhaps at Carthage, during the years immediately before the Vandal occupation of the city (434–439), mostly during the period near the *baptism of *catechumens or during the baptismal liturgy. These documents provide precious information for reconstructing the religious and civic life of a *Catholic community of Africa on the eve (and at the very beginning) of the Vandal occupation. With respect to Quodvultdeus's authorship of the sermons—a view held between 1914 and 1919 by Morin and defended and supported with new and compelling arguments by Braun—there has been no lack of disagreements and reservations by such scholars as

Kappelmacher and Simonetti.

The sermons of Quodvultdeus are (in the order of Braun's 1976 edition) the *Contra Iudaeos paganos et arrianos*, which was preached during the Vandal occupation, probably during the Easter vigil of 439, and comments upon the baptismal *abrenuntiatio* and the articles of the *creed in an anti-Jewish, anti-*pagan and anti-Arian perspective; the treatise *Aduersus quinque haereses*, which attacks pagans (against whom he uses the *testimonia* of hermetic and Sibylline literature) as well as Jews, *Manicheans, *Sabellians and the Arians; the three sermons *De symbolo*, tied to the liturgy of the *traditio symboli* and preached to the catechumens during the Easter vigil; the sermon *De quattuor uirtutibus caritatis*, which is a spiritual commentary on 1 Cor 13:7-8 (charity *omnia tolerat, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet*); the sermon *De cantico novo*, which develops the symbolic theme of the journey toward the heavenly homeland; the sermon *De ultima quarta feria*, preached on Holy Wednesday of 439, in which the preacher explains the parable of the sower of seed and invites the catechumens to allow themselves to work from the cross-plow; the sermon *De cataclysmo*, which was preached near Easter, in which he develops the baptismal typology of the *exodus from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea and the Passover; *De tempore barbarico I*; and the two sermons *De accedentibus ad gratiam* and *De tempore barbarico II*, in which one can perceive in all its gravity the dramatic situation of Africa at the time of the Vandal invasion and persecution.

Braun has reattributed to Quodvultdeus (1964, 88-113) the *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei*, which had been previously assigned to *Prosper of Aquitaine until 1711, when J.B. Lebrun des Marettes and L.U. Mangeant placed it in their edition among Prosper's spurious writings (the text was then reprinted in PL 51). Composed between 445 and 451, the *Liber* presents itself as a collection of scriptural *testimonia* concerning God's "promises" and the "prophecies" from the beginning of the world. From the creation of humanity, which is mentioned in the first chapter, to the eternal blessedness of the saints, which occupies the last 13 chapters, the history of salvation unfolds, which has as its guiding motif the idea that it is the *progressive realization of an uninterrupted series of God's "promises" and "predictions," and that the promises and predictions that have been fulfilled justify the Christian's faith in those that still need to be fulfilled. The work is divided into three parts: *Ante legem*, *Sub lege* and *Sub gratia*, which encompass the three major epochs into which the tradition divides human history: that of the patriarchs until the giving of the law of *Moses; that of the Jewish people; that of the manifestation of the Son of God in Jesus Christ. The third epoch is extended by two additions dedicated to eschatology: the first, entitled *Dimidium temporis*, is dominated by the figure of the *antichrist and discusses the demonic attacks against the saints before the *parousia; the second has as its object the eternal glory of the saints and the final return of saved humanity to God's bosom (*Gloria regnumque sanctorum*). The number of 153 chapters, which make up the *Liber*, corresponding to the number of *fish from the second miraculous catch (Jn 21:11), symbolizes the infinite multitude of the saints. Each of the three parts is framed within a prologue and epilogue. In the three epilogues, which are indistinct from the final chapters, the same comparison with the same symbolism returns: each of the three times is paralleled to a day that shines on the world, and this symbol is developed by a double parallelism: that of the four points of the compass that respectively symbolize the four major patriarchs, the four major *prophets and the four evangelists, and that of the twelve hours, that respectively symbolize the twelve *patriarchs—the sons of Jacob, the twelve minor prophets and the twelve *apostles. The day, of course, is Christ.

The first two parts establish a sort of compendium of "biblical typology," although the third assumes the aspect of a collection of "verbal" promises and processes on the coming of the Savior (his earthly life, passion, *ascension and the birth of the church). Each chapter is conceived according to the following scheme, which makes use of substantially similar formulas: (1) prophetic testimonies; (2) testimonies from the gospels that are a confirmation (*firmat*, *confirmat*); (3) apostolic testimonies, which are an attestation to it (*testatur*); (4) secular testimonies taken from Hermes Trismegistus, the Sibyl and Virgil, which are introduced by the word *fatetur*. The two excurses of the third part (which draw upon books 20 and 22 of Augustine's *De civitate Dei*) are presented as a collection of *testimonia*. The *Dimidium temporis*, although respecting the scheme of the preceding portion, accords special attention to *Daniel and the book of *Revelation. The *Gloria sanctorum*, almost exclusively made up of NT citations, assumes the tone of a litany or refrain of Augustine's formula: *impii non videbunt*.

CPL 401-413a. *Editions:* PL 51, 753-838; R. Braun, SC 101-102 (Paris 1964); Id., CCL 60 (Turnholti 1976); text, English translation and commentary of the *Sermones De tempore barbarico*: R.G. Kalkman, Washington, The Catholic University of America, 1963 (Diss.); trans. of *Symb.* I-II-III: Th.M. Finn, ACW 60,

2004; Ital. trans. of the *Liber*: A.V. Nazzaro, CTP 82, Rome 1989 (with intro. and notes); L. Dattrino, Vatican City 2002.

Studies: G. Morin, *Pour une future édition des opuscules de saint Quodvultdeus, évêque de Carthage au V*[e] *siècle*: RBen 31 (1914-1919) 156-162; A. Kappelmacher, *Echte und unechte Predigten Augustins*: WS 49 (1931) 89-102; M. Simonetti, *Studi sulla letteratura cristiana d'Africa in età vandalica*: RIL 83 (1950) 407-427; Id., *Qualche riflessione su Quodvultdeus di Cartagine*: RSLR 14 (1978) 201-207; Id., *Note sul testo di alcuni passi di opere attribuite a Quodvultdeus*: RFIC 106 (1978) 291-299; Id., *La produzione letteraria latina fra Romani e barbari* (*sec. V-VIII*), Rome 1986, 35-39; P. Courcelle, *Quodvultdeus redivivus*: REA 67 (1965) 165-170; V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 184-186; A. Isola, *La tipologia dell'agnello Pasquale in [Quodvultdeus]*, in F. Vattioni, *Sangue e Antropologia. Riti e culto*, Rome 1984, 1203-1211; Id., *I Cristiani dell'Africa Vandalica nei* Sermones *del tempo* (*429–534*), Milan 1990; R.J. De Simone, *The Baptismal and Christological Catechesis of Quodvultdeus*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 272-282; R. Braun, *Quodvultdeus*: DSp 12 (1986) 2882-2889; A.V. Nazzaro, *Quodvultdeus*, in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* IV, Rome 1988, 383-384; Id., *Quodvultdeus*, in M. Sodi - A.M. Triacca, *Dizionario di Omiletica*, Turin 1998, 1310-1313; Id., *Quodvultdeus. Un vescovo dell'Africa vandalica a Napoli*, in M. Rotili (ed.), *Società multiculturali nei secoli V-IX. Scontri, convivenza, integrazione nel Mediterraneo occidentale*, Naples 2001, 33-51; W. Strobl, *Notitiolae Quodvultdeanae*: VChr 52 (1998) 193-203; BBKL 7, 1137-1142; R. González Salinero, *The Anti-Judaism of Quodvultdeus in the Vandal and Catholic Context of the 5th Century in North Africa*: Revue des études juives 155 (1996) 446-459; Id., *La invasión vándala en los "Sermones" de Quodvultdeus de Cartago*: Florentia Iliberritana 12 (2001) 221-237; Id., *Poder y conflicto religioso en el norte de Africa Quodvultdeus de Carthago y los vándalos*, Madrid 2002; D. Van Slyke, *Quodvultdeus of Carthage. The Apocalyptic Theology of a Roman African in Exile*, Sydney 2003.

A.V. Nazzaro

R

RABBAN SHABUR. Born in a village in the mountains of Bet Huzaye (Susania or Khuzestan, in the S of modern-day Iran), between the cities of al-Ahwaz and Shushtar, he established, probably in the second quarter of the 7th c., a monastery next to the latter city that subsequently became very famous and even came to be called "the monastery of Rabban Shabur." Venerated for his holiness, Shabur attracted many disciples and was visited by *Catholicos *Isho'yahb III during the years 650–660. At his monastery, at least for a certain amount of time, lived such famous authors as his disciple *Simon of Taybutheh, *Isaac of Nineveh (who died and was buried there) and *Dadisho of Beth Qatraya. The latter, in his commentary on the speeches of Abba Isaiah, recounts various episodes from the life of Rabban Shabur.

R. Draguet, *Commentaire du livre d'Abba Isaïe par Dadisho' Qatraya* (CSCO 326-327), Louvain 1972.

K. den Biesen

RABBULA of Edessa (d. 435). The anonymous *Syriac *Life* allows us to reconstruct the biographical profile of Rabbula bishop of *Edessa during the time of the Council of *Ephesus. Having converted to Christianity as an adult, thanks to the influence of *Acacius of Beroea, he left his family and career in order to embrace the monastic life. Elected bishop of Edessa (ca. 415), he directed his pastoral zeal into reforming the clergy and *monasticism and the fight against *heretics, *pagans and Jews. During the *Nestorian crisis, he first sided with the Easterners, signing at Ephesus the decisions taken against *Cyril of Alexandria and his adherents. Subsequently, however, he drew near to Cyril's position, to the point of condemning the writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia. The study of Theodore's writings had been promoted until that time by *Ibas in the *school of Edessa. These positions incited tensions in the relations with the Antiochene episcopate. In 432, *Andrew of Samosata, rejected by Rabbula for his refutation of the *Kephalaia*, noted the behavior of the metropolitan of Edessa to the Patriarch John, who had asked the bishops of *Osroene to break *communion with him. Rabbula turned to Cyril and received his support, but later he also adhered to the union of 433. Nevertheless, along with *Acacius of Mitilene, he put the churches of nearby *Armenia on guard against Theodore's errors. Despite his deep commitment to charity that animated his actions as bishop, with his ascetic rigor and doctrinal intransigence Rabbula made many enemies for himself. It was precisely one of these enemies, Ibas, whom he had exiled from the city, who was chosen to be his successor upon his death (8 August 435).

The governance of his diocese did not leave much space for the development of his literary activity. We have a few traces in the homily delivered at *Constantinople against Nestorius (CPG 6496), the Syriac letter to *Andrew of Samosata (CPG 6495), and the fragments of a letter to Gemellinus of Perrhae, which has also come down to us in Syriac (CPG 6493). Furthermore, only fragments from a letter to Cyril of Alexandria have survived (CPG 6494), but Rabbula helped to spread Cyril's teachings by translating into Syriac the treatise *De fide orthodoxa*. As the citations from the gospels contained in this document show (which are also adopted by the **Diatessaron*), the thesis that saw Rabbula as the promoter of a separate translation of the gospels no longer seems tenable.

His most significant legacy, however, was the canons for the secular clergy and the monks (CPG 6490-6491). These are marked by a special care as much as by the form of their relations *ad extra* and convey to us the image of a still rather ancient state of Syriac monasticism of the *cenobitic style. The *Epistula ad Gemellinum episcopum Perrhae*, in which Rabbula criticized the use of the *Eucharist as a substitute for daily food by certain monks, was directed at these monastic groups. With respect to the

christological teachings of the bishop of Edessa, alongside the *Life*, the most significant text is that of the *Epistula ad Andream Samosatenum*, in which Rabbula rejected the division of Jesus Christ into two natures after the union. An analogous emphasis on the unity of the *hypostasis is found in the *Epistula ad Cyrillum* in the context of the criticisms directed at the *dyophysitism of Theodore of Mopsuestia. In reality, Rabbula seems to have reconnected primarily with the legacy of *Ephrem the Syrian's Christology, without, therefore, noticing the issues regarding the soul of Christ, which were primarily developed by the Antiochenes.

Duval 339-341 (and passim); Baumstark 71-73; Chabot 45-47; Ortiz de Urbina 89-91. *Editions:* J. Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabbulae episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta*, Oxford 1865; F. Pericoli-Ridolfini, *Lettera di Andrea di Samosata a Rabbula di Edessa*: RSO 28 (1953) 154-169 (on which matter, see L. Abramowski, *Zum Brief des Andreas von Samosata an Rabbula von Edessa*: OrChr 41 [1957] 51-64); A. Vööbus, *Syriac and Arabic Documents regarding Legislation Relative to Syriac Asceticism*, Stockholm 1960.

Studies: G.G. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa, der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe* (CSCO 300, subs. 34), Louvain 1969; H.J.W. Drijvers, *The Man of God of Edessa, Bishop Rabbula, and the Urban Poor Church and Society in the Fifth Century*: JECS 4 (1996) 235-248; P. Bruns, *Die Kanones des Rabbula* (*d. 435*) *und ihr Beitrag zur Reform des kirchlichen Lebens in Edessa*, in *Theologia et Jus Canonicum* (= FS H. Heinemann), ed. J.F. Reinhardt, Essen 1995, 471-480; Id., *Bischof Rabbula von Edessa. Dichter und Theologe*: Symposium Syriacum VII (1996), Orientalia Christiana Analecta 256, Rome 1998, 195-202; Id., *The Protonike Legend, the Doctrina Addai and the Bishop Rabbula of Edessa*: VChr 51 (1997) 298-315; Id., *Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa. Spiritual Authority and Secular Power*, in *Portraits of Spiritual Authority. Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, Leiden 1999, 139-154; G. Bowersock, *The Syriac Life of Rabbula and Syrian Hellenism*, in *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, ed. T. Hägg - P. Rousseau, Berkeley, CA 2000, 255-271.

L. Perrone

RADEGUND (520–587). Born in 520 at Erfurt (?), the daughter of Berthar, king of Thuringia, she was taken as hostage in France after the defeat of the Thuringians in 531. It is uncertain if she was already a Christian, but she certainly was when she married Chlothar I (before 540). When her husband put her brother to death about 555, she first fled to St. Medard, bishop of Noyon, who consecrated her a nun (*diacona*), then to the royal palace of Saix (in the area of Touraine and Poitou), where she performed works of charity and, lastly, to *Poitiers, where Chlothar had built a monastery for her within the city. This monastery took the name of "Holy Cross" when Radegund obtained from *Justin II, in 569, a relic of the holy *cross. On this occasion, *Venantius Fortunatus composed the hymn *Pange lingua* (*Repertorium Hymn.* 14, 475) and the *Vexilla Regis* (*Repertorium Hymn.* 21, 481). The monastery followed the *Rule of *Caesarius of Arles. A letter from the Abbess Caesaria to Richild and Radegund survives (CPL 1054). Radegund died on 13 August 587 in her monastery of the Holy Cross (*Mart. hier.*) and was buried in Notre Dame outside the city, which subsequently took the name "St. Radegund." Venantius Fortunatus (d. 601) wrote the first biography on her life (CPL 1042); the nun Baudonivia of Poitiers (6th-7th c.) wrote the second (CPL 1053), and Hildebert of Lavardin wrote the third in the 12th c.

BHL 7048-7054; BS 10, 1347-1352; LCI 8, 245-247; R. Aigrain, *Sainte Radegonde*, Paris 1987; C. Papa, *Radegonda e Baltilde*: Benedictina 36 (1989) 13-33; F.E. Consolino, *Due agiografi per una regina. Radegonda di Turingia tra Fortunato e Baudonivia*: Studi Storici 1 (1988) 143-159; S. Gäbe, *Radegundis sancta, regina, ancilla. Zum Heiligkeitsideal der Radegundisviten von Fortunat und Baudonivia*: Francia 16 (1989) 1-30; I. Moreira, *Provisatrix optima. St. Radegund of Poitiers' Relic Petitions to the East*: Journal of Medieval History 19 (1993) 285-305; E.G. Whatley, *An Early Literary Quotation from the Inventio s. Crucis. A Note on Baudonivia's Vita s. Radegundis* (BHL 7049): AB 111 (1993) 81-91; P. Santorelli, *La Vita Radegundis di Baudonivia*, Naples 1999.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

RANSOM of PRISONERS. This was one of the forms of Christian charity and assistance (*see* *Works of Aid and Charity), according to *Tertullian: "the care that we take for the needy and our commitment to works of charity have become a sign that distinguishes us among our opponents" (*Apol.* 39,7). And he added that the monthly voluntary collection that was taken in the community served, among other things, to help those who were in prison: "if some of our people are in the mines, the islands or prisoners in some way, condemned solely for their adherence to the church of God, they earn the right to be assisted by their companions in the faith" (*Apol.* 39,6). *Justin Martyr similarly affirmed that the collections served the needs of the prisoners (*1 Apol.* 67). As early as the gospel of *Matthew mention is made of how it is a work of charity to visit those in prison (Mt 25:36, 39, 43). The first form, therefore, of care for prisoners pertained to those who were imprisoned for the faith, a form that was attested to by the most ancient Christian texts. The author of the letter to the Hebrews writes: "For you took part in the prisoners' suffering" (10:34; cf., 13:3; cf. Clement of Rome, *Ep. Cor.* 59,4 and 55,2; Ign., *Smyrn.* 6,2). The ransoming of prisoners was one of

the Christian virtues (Hermas, *Mand.* 8,10). *Aristides wrote the following: "when they know that one of their own is in prison or is being persecuted for the name of their Christ, all take to heart his pains, and if possible to free him; money is no object to attain this goal" (*Apol.* 15).

To visit those in prison was a normal practice for consoling them and alleviating their pains, an obligation even for married Christian women (Tertullian, *Ad ux.* 2,4). Even the *pagan *Lucian of Samosata, in his satirical work, attests to how much care Christians took to serve Peregrinus who was in prison (*De morte Per.* 1-16). At times, the Christians had to pay to visit those in prison: *Thecla had to bribe the guards to visit Paul (*Acta Pauli* 18: ed. Erbetta 2, 261), something that must have been rather common (see Lucian, *De morte Per.* 12; Eus., *HE* 5,1,61; *Passio Perp.* 3,7). The care of Christian prisoners was consistent; at times it was even criticized for the excessive attention given to them (Tertullian, *De ieun.* 12), not only for those locked up in prison, but also for those condemned to the mines and exile (see Cyprian, *Ep.* 66-70). In the 2nd c., *Dionysius of Corinth praised Pope *Soter and the Roman church for their commendable tradition of helping others and even Christians condemned to the mines (Eus., *HE* 4,23,10). The **Didascalia Apostolorum*, from the 3rd c., exhorted Christians not to overlook any means necessary to aid prisoners (19; see *Apos. Con.* V, 1-2). The bishop of Rome possessed a list of those to assist who had been condemned to the mines in *Sardinia and in certain cases even obtained their freedom (*Philosoph.* 4,7). Eusebius wrote that *Licinius prohibited Christians from caring for those who were in prison (*HE* 10,8).

Another expression of Christian charity was the ransom of prisoners of war, pirates or barbarian invasions, because when civilians were captured, it represented an opportunity for their captors to acquire great wealth by selling them as slaves. The *captivus* could volunteer to loan himself for money, which he then had to pay back in some way, or rather had to obtain help from his family and friends. Roman law conflicted with the *redemptio* (buying back) of prisoners practiced by Christians. The Christians also highly regarded this work of charity and solidarity. At *Rome, as early as the 2nd c., *Hermas considered ransom "of the servants of God" a work of mercy (*Mand.* 8,10). *Cyprian sent a hundred thousand sesterces collected in the communities to help the Christians of *Numidia for the ransom of prisoners and said that he was ready to give more through the generosity of the Christians of *Carthage: "if this were to occur again, until now you have counted on their voluntary and large contribution" (*Ep.* 62,4). *Lactantius considered the ransom of prisoners an action of great kindness (*Div. Inst.* 6,12,39; *Epitome* 65). We see how this work of charity was put in practice after the disaster of Hadrianopolis, for example, at *Milan: *Ambrose took the initiative to sell the church's sacred vessels; and not just this, he also offered an extensive justification for his work of charity (*De off.* 2,15,70: PL 16, 129; esp. 2,28,136-143; see 2,15,50ff.: PL 16, 129). The criticisms must have been very strong against this use of sacred vessels. Nevertheless, his action was a model for future generations. Ambrose was able to throw it in the face of the pagan *Symmachus that the pagan temples had no concern for works of charity: "let them tell us how many prisoners the temples have ransomed, how many times they have come to the aid of the poor, how many exiles they have helped with financial support" (*Ep.* 18: PL 16, 977). *Augustine did the same in *Africa (see *Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 24,15). In the 4th c., the church of Cappadocia also recalled the assistance sent by the church of Rome for the ransom of prisoners during the Gothic invasion of the mid-3rd c. (*Basil, *Ep.* 70 to Pope *Damasus). *Pinianus and *Melania even sold their own property for the redemption of prisoners (*Gerontius, *Vita Melaniae* 20: SC 90, pp. 168-169). It is interesting and significant that the imperial authorities required Christian priests, as an obligation, to focus on the ransom of prisoners, with a law of 408 (CTh 6,7,2). In Late Antiquity, the commitment to the ransom of prisoners of war was considered one of the obligations of a good bishop (*Julian Pomerius, *De vita* 1,25: PL 59, 440; *Vita Honorati* 20; *Vita Paulini* 6: PL 53, 862-863; *Avitus of Vienne, *Ep.* 35; *Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 4,8,23-24; etc.). *Patricius wrote that it was a typical custom for Christians to spend their money for ransoming baptized prisoners (*Ep. ad Corot.* 14: SC 249, 144-166). Klingshirn studied the works of charity performed by *Caesarius of *Arles for the ransom of prisoners after the wars between the *Franks and the *Burgundians on the one hand, and the *Ostrogoths and the *Visigoths on the other during the years 506–507. Likewise at the end of the 6th c., *Gregory the Great made reference to the need for the ransom of prisoners during the invasion of the *Longobards (*Ep.* 7,23 and 23; 9,17; *Dialogues* 2,1).

DACL 2, 2112-2127; C. Osiek, *The Ransom of Captives. Evolution of a Tradition*: HTR 74 (1981) 365-386; W.E. Klingshirn, *Charity and Power: Caesarius of Arles and the Ransoming of Captives in Sub-Roman Gaul*: JRS 75 (1985) 183-193; P. van Minnem, *Prisoners of War and Hostages in Graeco-Roman Egypt*: JJP 30 (2000) 155-163 (the Christian part 158ff.); L. Amirante,

Appunti per la storia della "redemptio ab hostibus": Labeo 3 (1957) 7-59; 171-220; G. De Gregorio, *Cesario di Arles e la* redemptio *dei* captivi infideles. *Vita Caesarii I, 3-33*: Cristianesimo nella storia 26 (2005) 671-682.

A. Di Berardino

RAPE. The modern-day meaning refers to sexual union violently imposed on the victim without respect to gender or age, and is not limited to only the legal sense. The distinction that included violence, however, was not binding in antiquity as a way of describing rape. Under the emperor Augustus, the term rape was used to refer to one of two forms of sexual relationships outside of marriage. These could be inflicted upon any citizen, through public *accusatio*, and they consisted in two types of crime: *adulterium* if the woman was united in *iustae nuptiae*; *stuprum*, in the opposite case, if engaged in relations with an unmarried woman, virgin or widow. The *lex Iulia de adulteriis* established that adultery consisted in a sexual union with a free and upright, but unmarried, woman and existed independent from the fact that the woman was or was not consenting and that the rape was carried out with violence. The same *lex*, however, also used the terms *adulterium* and *stuprum* indistinctly. And Ulpian equated rape with adultery even in relation to the loss of *conubium* and the ensuing prohibition of remarriage (Dig. 48,5,30,1).

A man who had sexual relations with a young boy, young girl or a widow who still maintained the status of *mater familias* was guilty of rape (Dig. 48,5,35, Modestino). The man, moreover, who had a sexual relationship with any free woman, with whom sexual relations were only permitted in marriage or in concubinage, also committed the crime of rape. For the rape of a young boy, in ancient times, a man ran the risk of incurring the death penalty, but, during the imperial age, he suffered the punishments prescribed for adultery (Dig. 48,5,9 and 11). The law did not mention lesbianism.

The woman who had a heterosexual relationship outside marriage or concubinage was guilty of rape. In the case of sexual relations with a virgin, the man and the woman were both punished with the confiscation of their goods, if it could not be demonstrated that the man used violence. This crime was under the jurisdiction of the public tribunals.

Difficulties of application in the suppression of *stuprum* derived from the very fact of defining what was elicit with respect to the well-known lack of constitutive formalities proper to Roman marriage. When jurisprudence regarded that *consuetudo* with a woman was to be seen as a marriage (Dig. 23,2,24), *stuprum* occurred only in the case of a nonmarital *consuetudo* (*Ed. Theod.* 52 and *Institutiones* 4,18,4). It could be punished only through popular accusation, in contrast to the trials of adultery brought about by the *iure mariti vel patris*. With *Trajan and *Marcus Aurelius, the accusation could also be brought by the *iure extranei*. In any case, the difficulty remains of tracing the sources on nonviolent or consensual *stuprum*: this leads one to think that there was a broad social tolerance with respect to these types of unions.

The law, moreover, established various categories of women *in quas stuprum non committitur* and whom one could not marry, although casual sex and concubinage were allowed: the actress; the procuress; *publico iudicio damnata*; *adulterio deprehensa*; the prostitute; also, of course, slave women in case of a cessation of activities (Dig. 23,2,43,4, 6 and 12; Dig. 25,7,1,2; Dig. 48,5,6 and Dig. 48,5,11,2; Tit. Ulp. 13,2). This circle of women *in quas stuprum non committitur* tended to broaden. The entrance into such categories, chosen by some of the more unrestrained women in order to enjoy a freedom not allowed to their *status,* led the Senate to impose restrictions in this regard (Dig. 48,5,11,2: cf., Suet., *Tib.* 35 and Tac., *Ann.* 2, 85). *Constantine affirmed the impunity of the sexual unions of some categories of women, including waitresses of inns and freedwomen, as well as *alienae*.

Postclassical legislation was more oriented toward the suppression of violent *stuprum* and abduction, which was regarded as a *crimen*, inasmuch as a woman was deprived of her divorce settlement rights because of her supposed economic share. *Constantine foresaw the case of the violation of an orphan's *castitas* by her guardian (CTh 9,8,1, from the year 326: cf., CI 9,10,1) to vindicate the deceived woman who had married a man who was still married (CI 9,9,18,1, from the year 258) or who had undergone violence (CI 9,9,20, from the year 290; Dig. 3,1,1,6; Dig. 48,5,14,7), or even other cases. Constantine himself restricted the right of raising an accusation of adultery only to near kinsmen (CTh 9,7: *ad leg. Iul. de ad.* 2), establishing a path later followed by the emperor *Justinian. The only crime punishable by victims of violence tended to merge with the *crimen vis* and the abduction.

In the writings of the fathers of the church, the meaning of the term *rape* leaned toward referring to generally immoral sexual relationships, even before referring to unlawful ones, and was often used as a synonym for adultery and thus not necessarily violent (Jerome, *Epist.* 70,2; 77,3; 123,6; 147,4); in the writings of the same author it can also mean sexual

violence (Ambr., *De off.* 2,20), or, from the religious point of view, it can be meant metaphorically referring to idolatrous action (Ambr., *De virginib.* 1,16). This last meaning was frequently used, as was the more specifically immoral meaning (for which see, e.g., Cypr., *Epist.* 13,5). Both of these meanings can be found in the writings of Tertullian (*De praescrip. haeretic.* 3).

*Augustine, facing the emotional situation of women who had been raped, developed a significant solution from the moral point of view, using prevalent theories of virginity. On this basis, rape leaves chastity intact even if one's physical integrity has been compromised (*Civ. Dei* 1,16; 1,28; 1,18,1; 1,25; 1,27, in NBA, vols. 1-3, Rome 1991). *Basil of Ancyra, an important figure within *Arianism, had already promoted the thesis, however, that the body is not corrupted if the *soul is pure. He did so in a text, however, whose authorship has been called into question by some scholars (*De vera virginitatis integritate* 1-2). In canon law, the term *rape* is used to refer to a forced sexual relationship with a woman who is a virgin (CIC, can. 2357).

H. Herter, *Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums*: JbAC 3 (1960) 70-111; M. Molè, *Stuprum*, in *Novissimo Digesto Italiano*, vol. 18, 1971, 582-587; G. Rizzelli, *"Lex Iulia de adulteriis." Studi sulla disciplina di "adulterium," "lenocinium," "stuprum,"* Lecce 1997; F. Lucrezi, *La violenza sessuale nel diritto ebraico e romano. Studi sulla "Collatio,"* II, Turin 2004; C. Venturini, *Legislazione tardoantica romana dopo Costantino in materia di* stuprum, adulterium *e* divortium, in *Comportamenti e immaginario della sessualità nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 31 marzo-5 aprile 2005), CISAM 53, Spoleto 2006, 177-214.

T. Sardella

RATIO PASCHAE (or Cyclus paschalis annorum LXXXIV). The Vatican Codex 2077 (incipit: *Dicente Domino ad Moysen Mensis hic*), written at the end of the 6th c., preserves an *Easter register that begins in 354, the year in which the **Chronography of 354* ends, and finishes in 437. For several years (i.e., 414, 424, 428 and 433), it names only the Western consuls and omits those of the East. After having demonstrated that Easter can be celebrated only starting from 22 March until 20 April, it presents a cycle of 84 years: a table reports the day of the week for 1 January, the age of the moon, the date of Easter and the consuls of the year. For example, for the year 354: 1 January is Saturday, the 21st day of the moon; Easter, 27 March; the consuls, *Constantius emp. for the seventh time and *Constantine the Gaul, for the fourth time.

CPL 2293; Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, I, 740-743; G.B. De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, Rome 1861, I, LVIII-LIX; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*: I. *Der 84 jährige Ostercyklus und seine Quellen*, Leipzig 1880, 43ff., 73ff.; R.S. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987, 51.

A. Di Berardino

RATIONE EMBOLISMORUM, De. This short work was written in England at the beginning of the 8th c., probably around the year 720. As a result of the history of certain manuscripts, C.W. Jones has inserted it into the volume dedicated to the works of the Venerable *Bede (CCL 123), and specifically in the part titled *Alia opuscula coaeva*. In reality, one should not exclude a connection to the prolific Bede or with some author of this milieu. The term *embolismus* was used by the ancient Greeks to refer to the months to which intercalary days were added in order to make the lunar cycle coincide with the solar one. The ancient Romans, taking into consideration the Greek usage, used the noun *embolismus* to refer to the intercalary day (leap day) for the month of February. The work was divided into seven short chapters that corresponded to seven years; the individual intercalary passages begin with the formula: *in primo anno embolismi* (*in secundo* . . .etc.), or with similar expressions. The work can be considered a type of calendar, that indicates through a chronological procedure the dating of the celebration of *Easter. The entire text aims at the concluding sentence: *Illa enim luna quae secundo non. Aprilibus initiatur prima, et extenditur usque in sexto non. Maiis vigesima nona, Aprilis est; et ipsa est paschalis, et evenit decima quarta in decimo sexto kal. Maiis. Et nisi ita fecisse, evenisset tibi in termino paschali luna decima quinta, et fuisset error in pascha et in aetatibus lunae.*

CPL 2315; PL 129, 1335 (exc.); CCL 123, 685-689; C.W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de temporibus*, Mediaeval Academy of America 41, Cambridge, MA 1943, 3-122: *Development of the Latin Ecclesiastical Calendar*; see also p. 380.

W. Turek

RATIONE PASCHAE, De (or Computus Carthaginensis AD 455). Migne's *Patrologia Latina* mentions the text *Anonymi libellus de computo Paschali* (59, 545-560), divided into two short books. The first begins with the word *Dum mens curiosa in re tam graviori. . . .* The work is framed in the context of the controversy between the Africans and Romans on the date of the celebration of *Easter. In the text,

many terms are used that refer to the calendar, and therefore, the months, the days and the hours. The anonymous author mentions and comments on certain passages of sacred *Scripture that in a special way describe the creative work of God, which was completed in six days and described in the book of Genesis. He emphasizes the importance of fasting by mentioning some passages of the *Bible and, in particular, the words that God addressed to Moses. The codex containing the document is in very bad condition, and it is therefore difficult, at least in some passages, to understand the individual phrases, which are at times composed without observing the rules of Latin grammar. The *Liber secundus* has as a subtitle *qui in se omnia ornamenta continet circulorum* (col. 549) and is dedicated to the explanation of the time passed since the *sacratissimo Paschae die in Aegypto immolato.* The text mentions, among others, Julius Caesar and the emperor Augustus, with the pertinent chronological dates surrounding their governance (col. 552). After providing various chronological, biblical and theological pieces of information, the author concludes with the following words: *Haec omnia sollicitius observabis, et dies paschae in integro invenies* (col. 560).

CPL 2296; PL 59, 545-560. B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig 1880, 279-297.

W. Turek

RATIONE PASCHAE, Prologus de (or Ratione Paschae, Praefatio de). The so-called *Anonimi liber de computo* (PL 129, 1275-1372) begins with the *Prologus sancti Cyrilli Alexandrini episcopi de ratione Paschae* (ibid., 1275-1278; see also PG 77, 383-390). The Latin term *compotus* or *computus* should be taken as referring to the lunar phases as well as the science on the course of the sun and the moon. The noun itself derives from the Latin verb *computare* (i.e., to calculate, reckon, sum up). It was necessary to count the years, months and days, to refer to the various events of human history, and in particular, the precise day on which *Easter should be celebrated. The characters on this codex (*Bibliotheca Ambrosiana*) that transmit the text have not permitted scholars to identify with precision the period in which this short treatise was composed (beginning of the 9th c.?). Scholars have noted some elements that occur in the writings of the Venerable *Bede, suggesting that this text must be later than Bede's. The *prologus* begins with the phrase: *Sanctum Paschae mysterium, eiusque sacra solemnitas. . . .* The author faces the famous question on the dating of Easter, in opposition to some who are not "illumined by divine *revelation, but who were puffed up by the human presumption of knowledge"—*divina revelatione inluminati, sed humana scientiae praesumptione elati sunt* (col. 1275). The author maintains that "by apostolic authority, the universal church throughout the whole world knew the specific day of Easter without any discussion"—*apostolica auctoritate universalis Ecclesia per totum orbem definitam Paschae diem sine ulla disceptatione cognosceret* (ibid.). Then he recalls the emperor *Theodosius (who was referred to as *religiosissimus*) who, considering the great confusion on this topic, asked St. *Theophilus bishop of Alexandria in order to be informed with accuracy on the dating of Easter. The author of the short treatise, because 428 years had been indicated by the bishop, saw now the necessity of taking up the question again: "I sought a revelation from the Lord, and because I knew that none of those men had understood, among whom I saw the orbit itself, I undertook to insert in this booklet this thing which I merited to derive from the source itself," *Revelationem Domini postulavi. Et hoc, quod de ipso fonte haurire promerui, in ipso libello praesumens, quia nec illos, apud quos ipsum circulum vidi, intellexisse cognovi* (col. 1276). There follows the *Liber de computo*, a true and proper calendar with many technical chronological terms, that ends with a *Versus* in poetry, that summarizes the preceding text (cols. 1369-1372).

CPG 5242-5243; CPL 2290-2291; PG 77, 383-390; PL 129, 1275-1278. B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig 1880, 337-343; C.W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de temporibus* , Mediaeval Academy of America 41, Cambridge, MA 1943, 38-39; A. Cordiolani, *Textos de Cómputo español del siglo VI*: Hispania Sacra 9 (1956) 127-139.

W. Turek

RATIONE PASCHAE, Tractatus de. Incipit: *Pleriqui [qui] mysterium Paschae*. This work has come down to us under various names and in two recensions: the Ambrosian recension attributes it to *Athanasius (CPG 2297: PG 28, 1605-1610); it is also ascribed to other such authors as *Niceta of Remesiana (CPPM 3, 821), *Jerome (CPPM 3, 800/2), but especially *Martin of Braga (d. 572; CPPM 3, 810). Jones and Barlow thought that the text was the work of the latter, although other scholars generally considered it anonymous (from *Spain, *Gaul or even *Ireland). It was dated after the mid-6th c. The author cited *Scripture according to the Itala (an early Latin version of the Bible) and drew upon the *Acta concilii Caesareae*, also known as the *Epistula Syn-*

odica, which is attributed to *Theophilus of Caesarea. The anonymous author affirmed that until recent times in Gaul, Easter was celebrated on 25 March, the day of Christ's resurrection, although he wanted to follow the *tradition of the ancestors, for whom the creation occurred on 22 March. Therefore, Easter should not be celebrated before 22 March or after 21 April.

CPL 2302; CPPM 3, 810; PL 72, 49-52; M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, IV, Munich 1904, 407-408; A.E. Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana*, Cambridge 1905, 92-111; C.W. Jones, *The "Lost" Sirmond Manuscript of Bede's Computus*: English Historical Review 52 (1937) 204-219, esp. 212ff.; C.W. Barlow, *Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia*, New Haven, CT 1950, 270-275; V. Loi, *Il 25 marzo data pasquale e la cronologia giovannea della Passione in età patristica*: EphLit 85 (1971) 48-69; Patrologia IV, 73-74, esp. 65-68; A. Strobel, *Texte zur Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Munich 1984, 107-115.

A. Di Berardino

RATIONE PASCHALI, Disputatio de. The somewhat obscure text, which presents itself as a letter of *Morianus* (*Moranus*, *Maurinus*, etc.) bishop of *Alexandria (incipit: [*Eo quod senserunt alii discere*] *de eo quod scriptum est*), is cited by *Cummineus. The anonymous author—who followed the lunar cycle of 19 years—maintained that in the equinox of spring, 25 March, the following events came to their completion: the creation of the world, the Jewish Passover, the crucifixion of Jesus Christ: it was the *feria sexta* and the 14th moon; the resurrection occurred on the 16th moon, that is, Sunday, 27 March. The *terminus post quem* of the composition is the era of *Dionysius Exiguus, who is mentioned by the author. Jones thought that the present document was a coupling of two different texts and placed it in Ireland at the beginning of the 8th c.

CPL 2306; CPPM III/A 815; PL 129, 1357-1358; A. Cordoliani, *Les traités de comput du haut moyen âge (526–1003)*: ALMA 17 (1943) 51-72; Id., *Les computistes insulaires et les écrits pseudo-alexandrins*: Bibl. École des Chartes 106 (1945–1946) 23ff. (text: 30-34); M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400–1200*, Dublin 1985, 326; J.-B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesm.*, I, Paris 1852, 14-15; C.W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de temporibus*, Cambridge, MA 1943, 97-98; A. Strobel, *Texte zur Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Münster 1984, 116-118 (Ger. trans. of the first part).

A. Di Berardino

RATIONES SEMINALES. The concept of *rationes seminales* (λόγοι σπερματικοί) is first found in the writings of the *Stoics, who used it to explain the origin and development of the world. Broken up into many particles, the Logos is therefore present, organizing the cosmos and creating harmony between all things. The Stoics thus better understood prophecy, *providence and life in conformity to human nature. In patristic writings (Lampe 1248-1249), the theme was adopted in various forms: *Justin Martyr used it to emphasize that all humans, by participating in the Logos, at least know a part of the truth (2 *Apol.* 10); *Origen, to help understand the fight of opposing forces in the human being (*Com. Jo.* 20,2-5); *Methodius, to demonstrate the *resurrection (*Res.* 1,24); *Eusebius of Caesarea, to define the notion of Logos (*Eccl. theol.* 2,13); *Augustine, to emphasize the connection between natural causality and the divine will that in an instant created all things (*Gen. Litt.*).

M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, Göttingen [3]1964; G. Faggin, *Rationes seminales*: Enc. Filosof. 2, 1967, 549-550; BA 48 (1972) 653-668, 685-690; HWP 5 (1980) 484-489; M.L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, Leiden 1985 (passim).

B. Studer

RAVENNA
I. City and archaeology - II. Councils.

I. City and archaeology. Rising on a group of outlying sandy mounds that made up the ancient shoreline, Ravenna was in immediate contact with the open ocean and defended by marshes that isolated it from the mainland. Due to its unique geographical location that made it almost impregnable, the city, having long flourished as a commercial center after the Roman conquest of the Po Valley, became a strategic stronghold of great importance. To better ensure the defense of the Adriatic Sea and the E Mediterranean, *Augustus built the base for a praetorian fleet of 250 ships to the southwest of the city's famous military port of Classis. Augustus also desired that the port be united by means of a canal that would cross Ravenna and join a S branch of the Po River: the *fossa Augusta* (Augustus's trench) thus assured that the city functioned as a nexus between the Adriatic routes and the internal navigation of the lagoons and the Po. From that point onward, the industrious life of the shipyards developed, according to the testimony of the sepulchral stele of *Publius Longidienus*, a carpenter for the fleet (*faber navalis*), who was depicted as holding an ax near a ship in the process of construction.

At the beginning of the 2nd c., *Trajan built an aqueduct that carried the waters from the nearby Apennine Mountains to Ravenna because it was lacking water resources. The city continued to grow slowly in importance and population, and extended

itself outside the ancient municipal *oppidum* in that area later called *Regio Caesarum*. But a noteworthy expansion of the urban center and the surrounding walls, in addition to a vast building activity, were begun in 402, when, before the danger of *Alaric's invasion, *Honorius strategically transferred the capital of the Western empire there from *Milan for reasons of safety: from that point on the city took on the look of a lavish imperial residence with astounding buildings for worship, which were covered on the inside with splendid *mosaics, such as the baptistery to the N of the cathedral that Bishop Neon (451–475) decorated with stucco and mosaics, the so-called Mausoleum of *Galla Placidia attached to the church of the Holy Cross, the Placidian basilica of St. *John the Evangelist, which was erected by Augusta for a vow she made during a sea storm while she was returning to Ravenna from the East (424), and the basilica dedicated to the apostles by Bishop Neon, today called the basilica of St. Francis, near which Dante's tomb lies.

The first cathedral, replaced by the current one in the 18th c., is identified in the five-aisled basilica consecrated by Bishop Ursus perhaps in 386 (Deichmann) under the shelter of the wall during the period of the Republic, which was, at least at that time, already partially knocked down by the superimposition of the residential buildings (Bermond Montanari); these are also attested, in addition to archaeological discoveries, by a much later piece of information by Andrea Agnello (9th c.), according to whom the Ursus basilica came to flank the already existing bishop's palace. From the text of the protohistoric "*Ravennate* letter" it appears that this basilica was the first worship building for the Christian community of Ravenna, which, moreover, already organized for a long time, must have been gifted with a meeting place that is unknown to us, but which should be placed in Ravenna itself, perhaps in the vicinity of the Basilica Ursiana (Cantino Wataghin).

In effect, contrary to the historiographical tendency represented by Testi Rasponi and Lanzoni and commonly received until a few decades ago, the tradition that placed the origins of the local Christian community near the port of Classis, from which the first episcopal see moved to Ravenna, which by that time had become an imperial see (Deichmann), now seems to be void of any historical foundation. This scholarly conclusion seems to find confirmation in the relatively late chronology of the worship buildings that have been identified in the Classis area (Farioli), although some cemeterial areas also used by Christians, according to the testimonies of the few but significant epigraphs that have come to light here, along with many reused ships belonging to the fleet, seem to refer to the first Christian settlement in the fleet area and the entire Emilia region until the end of the 2nd c. or in the first decades of the 3rd c. The reference is primarily directed at the sepulchral titles of *Flavius Anastasius*, *Valeria Maria* and *Antifon*, which came from the "Probian" area and are now at the Museo Arcivescovile; the last two especially, if in fact one recognizes their Christian character—as it seems reasonable to conclude—constitute a bit of evidence that could not be ignored in this respect.

Nonetheless, we do not know much about St. *Apollinaris, the protobishop and only martyr of the church of Ravenna, who was immediately surrounded by a halo of legend, beyond the scarce bits of information that have come down to us from sermon 128 by *Peter Chrysologus, the most ancient ecclesiastical writer from Ravenna and the first bishop of Ravenna who was invested with the authority of a metropolitan around the year 430. For the remainder, we are informed by the ancient *episcopal lists, which have come down to us authentic and intact: between Apollinaris and *Severus, who was present at the Council of *Serdica (343), another ten bishops succeeded who, the received and accepted tradition by Andrea Agnello maintained, were buried in those sepulchral areas of Classis, outside the walls of the *castrum* (fortress) where Probus I or, according to others, Probus II had supposedly constructed the first cathedral (*basilica Probi*) and much later *Maximian consecrated the majestic basilica of S. Apollinare (549).

Once the Roman Empire of the West had fallen in 476 and the experiment of *Odoacer, the first of the Roman-barbarian kings in *Italy, had come to a tragic end, Ravenna recorded its second moment of political greatness and building activity during the Gothic kingdom of *Theodoric (493–526). A wise and illuminated sovereign, in the first decades of his kingdom he tried to follow a political agenda of peaceful coexistence between conquerors and those conquered. He restored Trajan's aqueduct; he heightened his residence, that is, the *Palatium* portrayed on the mosaic on the right wall of the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo, the palatine basilica that was originally dedicated to the Savior and requested by Theodoric alongside his royal palace; he constructed churches for his own people who adhered to the *Arian faith such as the *Anastasis Gothorum* (today the church of the *Holy Spirit) to function as a cathedral with an adjoining baptistery.

Following the conquest of Italy by *Justinian, the city, which had become the seat of the exarch who

retained civil and military powers in the name of the Eastern emperor, came alive with its third period of political power and civic splendor. The Byzantines vigorously reaffirmed the dogmas of orthodoxy; they reconciled the Arian churches to *Catholic worship and brought into the city the magnificent resourcesce of the East, adorning buildings with marble from the Proconnesus and with mosaics executed by a workforce that was perhaps trained in *Byzantium. Linked to the most important monuments of this period—among which one should mention the basilica of S. Vitale and the imposing basilica of S. Apollinare in Classe—are the names of Julian Argentarius, who was probably Justinian's emissary at Ravenna seeking to obtain public approval for the emperor, and *Maximian of Pola who, when appointed to tenaciously lead the fight against the inchoate *schism caused by the *Three Chapters, was the first to assume the title of archbishop. A tireless builder and reorganizer of his church, he should be considered along with Chrysologus among the most prestigious successors of Apollinaris and the architect of the influence of the church of Ravenna which, in its vying for power with the Roman see, foreshadowed its later claim to autocephaly. It was Bishop *Maurus, in 666, who was able to obtain recognition from the Eastern emperor for Ravenna's hierarchical independence from *Rome on the basis of a supposed *apostolicity of his episcopal see, which derived from a legendary *passio* that made St. Apollinaris a disciple of St. *Peter.

G.B. De Rossi, *Il primitivo cimitero cristiano di Ravenna presso S. Apollinare in Classe*: Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana s. III, 3 (1879) 98-117; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII*, II, Faenza 1927, 723-767; R. Farioli, *Chiarificazione sulla topografia delle necropoli pagane e delle aree cimiteriali cristiane nella zona di Classe* (*Ravenna*), Atti del I Congr. Int. di Archeologia dell'Italia settentrionale, Turin 1963, 79-92; G. Bovini, *I principali monumenti paleocristiani del Museo Arcivescovile di Ravenna*: Corsi di Cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 11 (1964) 43-99 and esp. 43-48; Id., *Memorie cristiane scomparse dall'antica città di Classe*: Corsi di Cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 12 (1965) 45-169; Id., *Saggio di bibliografia su Ravenna*, Bologna 1968; Id., *Edifici di culto d'età paleocristiana nel territorio ravennate di Classe*, Bologna 1969; Id., *Principale bibliografia su Ravenna preromana, romana, paleocristiana, bizantina ed altomedioevale apparsa tra la fine del 1972 e la fine del 1974*: Felix Ravenna 107-108 (1974) 253-257; F.W. Deichmann, *Zur ältesten Geschichte des Christentums in Ravenna*: RivAC 42 (1966) 167-175; G. Cortesi, *Classe e Ravenna Origini cristiane e antichi edifici cultuali*, Ravenna 1966; Id., *Il porto e la città di Classe*, Alfonsine 1967; P. Bruun, *I primordi di Classe cristiana secondo le testimonianze epigrafiche*, Atti del Conv. Int. di Studi sulle antichità di Classe, Ravenna 1967, 427-439; G.A. Mansuelli, *Le stele romane del territorio ravennate e del Basso Po*, Ravenna 1967; Id., *Geografia e storia di Ravenna antica*: Corsi di Cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 14 (1967) 157-190; M. Mazzotti, *Problemi sul primitivo cristianesimo nella regione di Classe*, Atti del Conv. Int. di Studi sulle antichità di Classe, Ravenna 1967, 463-479; *Corpus della scultura paleocristiana, bizantina ed altomedioevale di Ravenna*, diretto da G. Bovini, Rome 1968–1969; R. Budriesi, *Le origini del cristianesimo a Ravenna*, Ravenna 1970; G. Zattoni, *Il valore storico della "Passio" di S. Apollinare e la fondazione dell'episcopato a Ravenna e in Romagna Scritti storici ravennati*, Ravenna [2]1975; R. Farioli, *Edifici paleocristiani di Classe. Stato attuale delle ricerche e problemi*, in *Ravenna e il porto di Classe*, Bologna 1983, 23-51; Id., *La topografia imperiale di Ravenna dal V al VI secolo*: Corsi di Cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 36 (1989) 139-147; G. Bermond Montanari, *Topografia di Ravenna e Classe*, in *Ravenna e il porto di Classe*, Bologna 1983, 18-22; P. Testini - G. Cantino Wataghin - L. Pani Ermini, *La cattedrale in Italia*, Actes du XI[e] Congrès Int. d'Archéologie Chrétienne, Rome 1989, 140-142; V. Zangara, *Una predicazione alla presenza dei principi. La Chiesa di Ravenna nella prima metà del sec. V*: AntTard 8 (2000) 265-304; *Ravenna da capitale imperiale a capitale esarcale*, Ravenna 6-12 giugno 2004 (XVII Congresso Internazionale di Studio del CISAM), 2 vols., Spoleto 2005; G. Cuscito, *Riflessi della cristianizzazione dell'Italia settentrionale attraverso l'epigrafia*, Atti del IX Congr. Naz. di Arch. Cristiana, Agrigento 20-25 novembre 2004, Palermo 2007, 651-670; C. Carletti, *L'origine della prassi epigrafica dei cristiani nell'area ravennate: mitografia e realtà storica*, in G. Cuscito (ed.), *La cristianizzazione dell'adriatico*, Trieste 2008, 127-150.

G. Cuscito

II. Councils. *419*. After the death of Pope *Zosimus (27 December 418), a small group of deacons and presbyters at Rome elected the archdeacon *Eulalius while the majority of presbyters chose *Boniface (418–422) as the new pope. The Emperor *Honorius, who at that time was residing at Ravenna, convoked a council at the beginning of February 419 to resolve the question, at which the two contenders were present. This council, however, was unable to come to a solution because of the disagreement that existed between the participating bishops. The emperor then commissioned *Achilleus of Spoleto to celebrate the *Eastern rites at Rome and, shortly after, due to the insubordination shown by Eulalius, the emperor recognized Boniface as the pope.

Mansi 4, 399; Hfl-Lecl 2, 211; Palazzini 4, 42-43; DTC 2, 988-989; EC 2, 1863-1864; Fliche-Martin IV, 315-317; A. Simoncini, *La Chiesa Ravennate*, Ravenna 1964, 165-169; EPapi 1, 398-399; 1, 404ff.

499. In 498, upon the death of Pope *Anastasius II (18 November 498), *Symmachus was elected as his successor (498–514). Symmachus was opposed by *Laurentius (22 November 498), who was supported by the senate and a minority of the faithful. Both claimants were then called by *Theodoric to Ravenna, where a council was called by Archbishop Peter. At this council, Symmachus was recognized as the pope. Laurentius agreed to the ruling, and Pope Symmachus appointed him as bishop of Nocera.

EC 11, 629-630; Fliche-Martin IV, 424-425; A. Simoncini, *La Chiesa Ravennate*, Ravenna 1964, 170-174; T. Sardella, *Società Chiesa e Stato nell'età di Teodorico. Papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996; EPapi 1, 473-475; *Il papato di san Simmaco (498–514)*, ed. G. Mele - N. Spaccapelo, Cagliari 2000.

A. Di Berardino

RAVENNIUS of Arles (d. 460/461). Successor of *Hilary on the cathedra of *Arles in 449, the cause of which, even while a *presbyter, he had defended at Rome before Pope *Leo I in 446, but without, it seems, great success. During his election and consecration, twelve bishops of S *Gaul, among whom was *Rusticus of Narbonne, gathered at Arles and wrote a letter to Pope Leo about the event (see Leo, *Ep.* 40). He responded and expressed his satisfaction that they had chosen a person with everyone's agreement, namely, that of the bishops, the people and the nobility. During the same occasion, Leo wrote a letter to Ravennius and asked that he inform him more frequently about his most recent activity. Against Pope Leo's orders to the hierarchy of Gaul, he ordained the bishop of Vaison in 449 and incited a reaction from the bishop of *Vienne. This bishop wrote to the pope and obtained the support of 19 bishops, who asked Leo to recognize all the preceding rights of Arles. In 450, to resolve the dispute the pope was forced to organize the ecclesiastical provinces in a different way in order to impose other decisions on the bishops of the S, and practically speaking, Leo adhered to decisions of the Council of *Turin in 398. The pope sent Ravennius the *Tome to hand on to the bishops of Gaul (*Ep.* 67); a letter of support was received only in January of 452. Ravennius, with his claims, did not please the central-northern bishops of Gaul. He presided over the Council of Arles of 453.

E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, II, Paris [2]1966, 145ff. and passim; P.-M. Duval, *La Gaule jusqu'au milieu du V^{e} siècle*, Paris 1971, 775; R.W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth Century Gaul*, Washington, DC 1988, passim, esp. 173-205.

A. Hamman

REBAPTISMATE, De. This small treatise discusses "heretical *baptism": is it necessary to rebaptize those who, baptized by heretics, request to enter the *Catholic Church? Written by a bishop who was hostile to this practice, this treatise attacks another bishop who favored rebaptism. The work has been preserved under *Cyprian's name: an attribution that must be rejected because Cyprian favored rebaptism. The reconstruction of the text has been difficult to achieve because of the state of the manuscript tradition: the *De rebaptismate* has been passed down by only four late and corrupted sources, manuscripts and printed editions (17th-18th c.). The *heresies to which it alludes (*Marcionism) and its mention of martyrdom has led scholars to date it during the period of the 3rd-c. baptismal controversy and the time of Cyprian (255–256; against Baluze and Rauschen, who situated it in the 4th c.); it is less likely that the accusations that the treatise directs at and, in a certain way, attributes back to Cyprian could have been leveled after the martyrdom (14 September 258), or even after his exile (August 257). A further consideration: the *De rebaptismate* demonstrates that it not only knew Cypr., *Ep.* 69-72 (Ernst), but also *Ep.* 73 and 74 (*non liquet* with reference to *Ep.* 75 and *Sent. LXXXVII episcop.*); it was therefore written after *Ep.* 74 (Summer 256) and could have been before the dissemination of the *Sent.* and *Ep.* 75 (during the autumn of 256?).

In favor of the work's Italian, and not African, origin, some scholars have appealed to the probable use of Cyprian's *Ep.* 72, a synodal letter that supported rebaptism, that was sent to *Rome—which an African who was not aware of its wording, and which even *Augustine, during the *Donatist controversy, did not mention—must not have, as they maintain, been aware (Campeau). But it is incorrect to say that *Ep.* 72 was not circulated in *Africa: it was in fact read together with other letters at the council held on 1 September 256. The African origin of the *De rebaptismate* can be deduced from its biblical text (von Soden) and its silence on the primacy of Rome; that is, it does not presuppose that the anonymous author was from *Mauritania (Ernst). There were bishops, however, in Proconsular North Africa and *Numidia who did not perform rebaptism (Cypr., *Ep.* 70).

The *De rebaptismate* distinguished between the baptismal water (the baptismal washing) and the baptism of the *Spirit (*the laying-on of hands by the bishop); heretics and Catholics confer the first, but the second has no value except in the Catholic Church; the heretical washing does not confer any *grace, and the penitent heretic who receives nothing more than the *impositio manus* (the laying-on of hands), at least with this gesture obtains the entire efficacy of the *sacraments of initiation; neither does the Catholic washing produce any grace, unless it is followed by the baptism of the Spirit (or by the desire for this baptism, as in the case of an orthodox person who dies before the intervention of the bishop). It is a "certain initiation into the Lord's mys-

tery," *initium quoddam mysterii dominici* (ch. 7), which by itself is insufficient (Ernst); the "baptism of blood" (according to the true *faith) makes up for all the other forms of baptism (the case of the *martyr *catechumen). The *De rebaptismate*'s notion of the church allows one to measure Cyprian's paradoxical influence on it: because it was focused on its adversary, the anonymous author poorly defended the renewed sacramental theology, the intuition of which he was able to perceive; if he anticipated the idea of the *opus operatum*, Cyprian's formula **extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, which he accepted, echoes the author's mere ambition for originality without the actually providing any (Mattei). The work's obscurity is owed to the author's inability to present a unified doctrine. Moreover, the anonymous author's literary culture situates him between Cyprian and the rest of the African episcopate.

CPL 59; PL 3, 1183-1204; W. Hartel, CSEL 3,3 (1871) 69-92; G. Rauschen, FP 11 (1916); J. Doignon, Herzog 4, § 480.3, with an exhaustive bibl.; F. Bovon, *De Vocatione Gentium. Histoire et interprétation d'Act. 10,1-11,18 dans les six premiers siècles*, Tübingen 1967, 271-280; L. Campeau, *L'origine de la querelle baptismale* (2): Science et Esprit 22 (1970) 34-41; P. Mattei, *Remarques sur la tradition textuelle (manuscrite et imprimée) du* De rebaptismate: SP 26 (2001) 35-45.

P. Mattei

REBEKAH (iconography). The only scene relating to Rebekah, the wife of Isaac (Gen 24ff.), is considered to be that of the Mausoleum of the Exodus located in El-Bagawat, *Egypt (beginning of the 5th c.). Depicted therein are Rebekah and Eliezer at Nahor's well (Gen 24:11ff.). Rebekah (with the subtitle PENBEKA) is facing a well, giving Eliezer something to drink, alongside whom are two camels and a servant, who is leading a saddled donkey. Often, however, Rebekah appears in the miniatures. Among the most ancient is the Genesis of Vienna (6th c.), in which she is found on three pages. On the first (VII, 13), Rebekah comes to Nahor with the jug on her shoulders, and, in the lower portion, she gives something to drink to *Abraham's servant, who has ten camels with him. In the second (VII, 14), Rebekah receives a golden necklace as a gift from the servant; in the lower register, to the left, he asks her a question, and to the right, in the inset, he is speaking with Laban. Lastly (VIII, 16), in a scene containing Isaac and Abimelech, Rebekah stands alongside Isaac, who has the two Gerarenes behind him; in the lower quadrant she embraces Isaac, under Abimelech's palace. In the Latin Pentateuch of Tours (now known as Ashburnham), from the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Paris) (8th c.), inspired by a 6th c. model, on f. 22v, one finds the event of Rebekah's giving birth; alongside her stand three individuals.

EC 10, 601; LCI 3, 503-504; Garrucci, *Storia* 3, pl. 115, 1, 2, 4; G. von Gerhardt, *The Miniatures of the Ashburnham Pentateuch*, London 1883; W. von Hartel - F. Wickhoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, Vienna 1895, 150-151: pls. XIII, XIV, XVI; H. Stern, *Les peintures du Mausolée de l'Éxode à El-Bagawat*: CArch 11 (1960) 93-119; A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, Princeton, NJ 1968, fig. 308; M.L. Thérel, *La composition et le symbolisme de l'iconographie de l'Éxode à El-Bagawat*: RivAC 45 (1969) 228-270.

M. Perraymond

RECAPITULATION. According to the classical and biblical use of the term ἀνακεφαλαίωσις (Rom 13:10; Eph 1:10) and especially by adhering to the Pauline theme of the two *Adams, *Irenaeus elaborated his famous doctrine of recapitulation within the framework of his presentation of the history of salvation, which was characterized, moreover, by concepts of οἰκονομία, the mutual adaptation of God and man, and *progress and education. By ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, he understood the *incarnation as it summarizes and completes earlier human history, the institution of Christ as head of the entire universe, the fact that Christ and *Mary, through their obedience, have repaired Adam and Eve's disobedience. Even if later authors did not adopt this soteriological theory in its entirety, they did draw on it, esp. for the idea of the ineffable exchange between sinful humanity and God the Savior.

RAC 1 (1950) 411-414; J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique*, Paris 1961, 156-169; R. Schwager, *Der wunderbare Tausch*, Munich 1986; L. Scheffczyk, *Anakephalaiosis*: LTK³ 1, 572-573 (bibl.).

B. Studer

RECARED (mid 6th c.–601). King of the *Visigoths of *Spain. He succeeded his father, *Leovigild, who, when dying, entrusted him to Bishop *Leander of *Seville so that he might be instructed in the Catholic faith. Already shaken by the violent death of his brother *Hermenegild, who had rebelled against his *Arian father, he rejected *heresy and thereby led his subjects to embrace *orthodoxy. He convoked the 3rd Council of *Toledo (589). Leander probably edited the speeches Recared delivered during that gathering. His *conversion marked a definitive turn in the political and religious history of Spain. He died at Toledo in 601.

Historia de la Iglesia en España, ed. R. García Villoslada, I, Madrid 1979, 401-413; S. Teillet, *Des Goths à la nation Gothique*,

Paris 1984, 448ff.; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Los discursos del rey Recaredo. El Tomus*, in var. aus., *Concilio III de Toledo. XIV Centenario 589–1989*, Toledo 1991, 223-236; Domínguez del Val, II, 478-481.

L. Navarra

RECTA IN DEUM FIDE, De. After the translation of *Origen's *De principiis*, *Rufinus, probably with the objective of distancing himself from every possible accusation of *heresy, translated the dialogue *De recta in Deum fide*, and attributed it to Origen under the pseudonym *Adamantius. *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nazianzus (**Philocalia* 24) and earlier *Eusebius (*HE* 6,23,2) had already made the identification of Origen under the name Adamantius. In reality, this Adamantius, the primary interlocutor, if not the very author of the dialogue, can hardly be considered a contemporary of Origen, but could, however, be placed in the 4th c., and thus a contemporary to *Methodius of Olympus. Like Methodius, Adamantius was hostile toward Origen's teachings.

The work was directed against the followers of *Marcion, *Bardesanes and *Valentinus, and consisted of two parts: the first mentions Marcion's ideas and is defended by his two students (Megantius and Mark); the other takes the opinions of Bardesanes, which were defended by his student Marinus. Adamantius vociferously defended the orthodox doctrine and at the end obtained the agreement of a certain Eutropius, who, though pagan, was chosen as an arbiter in the controversy. There still remains the original Greek text written probably in *Syria from which the Latin translation was made.

CPL 198*i*; PG 11, 1755-1762; W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, GCS 4, Leipzig 1901; V. Buchheit, *Tyranii Rufini librorum Adamantii Origeniis adversus haereticos interpretatio*, Studia et Testimonia antiqua I, Munich 1966; Pamphilus Caesariensis - Eusebius: Caesariensis - Rufinus Tyrannius, *Apologie pour Origène*. Texte critique, tr. et notes par R. Amacker et E. Junod, Paris 2002; EC 4, 1449-50; V. Buchheit, *Rufinus von Aquileja als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialog*: ByzZ 51 (1958) 314-428; Altaner 217; G. Sanders, *Un écrit oublié, le Dialogue d'Adamantius*: Antiquité Cl. 37 (1968) 644-651; J. Quasten, Patrologia I, 406-407; Patrologia III, 236-237; EP 541-544; V. Volpi, *Dizionario delle opere classiche*, Milan 1994, I, 13.

L. Dattrino

REDEMPTION. In the modern languages, under the terms that derive from the Latin noun *redemptio*, or that are translated literally (Ger. *Erlösung*), one commonly understands the totality of the salvific work of Jesus Christ, accomplished especially in his death (DTC 13/2, 1912). In the strict sense, however, redemption is equivalent to the ransom paid by Christ to deliver humankind from the forces of evil (the devil, demons and cosmic powers). Because, however, behind the metaphor of ransom, taken from military language (prisoners of war) rather than legal-mercantile language (slavery) (Elert), there is the idea of liberation, it is also necessary to take into consideration the categories and images that evoke the same idea of liberation such as the victory over demons, the deception of the devil, the devil's abuse of power, human revenge on an equal footing, etc. That is much more legitimate because in the same patristic literature all these motifs are continually intertwined not only among each other but also with other soteriological themes (*see* *soteriology, *expiation, *divinization, *illumination). Moreover, it is significant that in Latin the term *redemptio* and the verb "to redeem" do not include the idea of the price of the ransom in texts before the 4th c. (Braun, *Deus*, 506-511).

As in the NT itself, both in the gospels (Lk 10:18; Jn 12:31; 14:30) and in the Pauline corpus (1 Cor 2:8; Eph 2:2; Col 2:15), the victorious supremacy of Christ is so frequently mentioned that it is not surprising that this theme appears early in patristic texts. In the 2nd c., in fact, which was heavily dominated by dualistic tendencies and heavily influenced by Greek-Jewish demonology, *Justin Martyr often emphasized the victory Christ obtained over the demons both in his earthly existence, first in the temptation and passion, and in the persecuted church (Studer, *Soteriologie*, 69-70). After him, in part even before, Christian authors, as in the case of Christian *iconography, continually turned to the mysteries of Jesus' life that were understood as a manifestation of his superiority in comparison to the demons (Turner, *Jesus*, 55-59). This primarily held with respect to his death, which put *death to death (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III, 18,6.8; Aug., *Tract. Joh.* 12,11; Leo, *Serm.* 22,4); with respect to his *descent into hell in which the last forces of the devil were conquered (Grillmeier); and with respect to his ascension as a triumphal return through the celestial spheres (Daniélou).

In the 2nd c., in the controversy against *Marcion, who opposed the good and merciful God of the NT to the vengeful God of the OT (Mk 10:45; 2 Pet 2:1), this concept and the precious blood (1 Pet 1:19) (Braun, *Deus*, 506-507) was used to elaborate a theory of redemption, according to which God or especially Christ paid the just price to the devil to redeem men, who had become his prisoners or who had actually sold themselves to him as the price for sin. This theory that concedes a certain right ac-

quired by the devil—that is, it attributes a certain "fair play" to God who is always just, even if good—is already announced in the writings of *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* V, 1,1). Moreover, united to the motif of the devil's ignorance (1 Cor 2:8; Ign., *Eph.* 19,1-3) and especially to that of the deception (fishhook, venom), it reached its full development in the writings of *Origen of Alexandria (*Hom. Ex.* 6,9; *Com. Mt.* 16,8) and *Gregory of Nyssa (*Cat.* 22-23; Barbel, *Gregor*, 146-149; Studer, *Soteriologie*, 71-72). Nevertheless, the idea that God, though conceding to the devil a certain right over humanity, deceived the devil by inducing him to take revenge on an innocent person, Christ, who was without sin, and thereby caused the devil to lose dominion over humankind, was criticized as early as the 4th c. by an anonymous author (*Adam. dial.*: PG 11, 1756-1757) and by *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 45,22). Both in the East (DTC 13/2, 1939-1940), and especially in the West, a similar theory, namely that of the *abusus potestatis* (abuse of authority), is found in patristic literature especially in homiletic texts (Kessler, *Bedeutung*, 76-77). By arguing that the devil's ignorance primarily pertained to the mystery of Jesus's virginal conception, it emphasized even more heavily the devil's abuse of power with respect to Christ, who was void of original sin, although fully human and therefore in solidarity with all humankind (*Hilary, *Psalm.* 68,8; Aug., *Trin.* 13,12, 16-15,19; Leo, *Serm.* 22,3-4, etc.).

Moreover, it is significant how *Augustine, who was followed by Pope *Leo and others, played word games with the term *redemptio* and other terms such as *pretium*, *mercator*, etc., making clear that for him, redemption was a metaphor that, in the end, does not signify anything beyond the gospel's idea of "the stronger man" (Mt 12:29) (*Serm.* 130,2; *En. ps.* 147,16). In the controversial perspective of the 2nd c. (anti-*gnostic and anti-*Marcionite) in which it was necessary to defend the unity of the two testaments, the Pauline antithesis of the first and second *Adam (Rom 5:12-19) was already taken in the sense of revenge (*see* *recapitulation). The one who had been overcome in *paradise in turn had to overcome, in Christ, his overcomer. The following authors were influenced by this view: Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* III, 18,7) and much later adherents to Augustinian theology (Aug., *Ench.* 108; *Trin.* 13,17,22-23; Leo, *Serm.* 22,3; 42,3; 63,1) and even the *liturgy that was inspired by it (see *Miss. Rom.*, *praef. De cruce*, in Rivière, *Dogme* 98 n.1).

When finally in the 4th c. Christianity showed itself to be victorious over ancient *paganism, Christian authors, especially in their *Easter *preaching, expressed Christ's supremacy with respect to all adversarial forces; they even used the triumphal language of a Roman conquest. Already outlined in the NT (Col 2:15; 2 Cor 2:14; Rev 19:11-16) and always present in the writings of the first three centuries, especially in the acts of the martyrs, the manner of comparing the death and *resurrection of Jesus to a military victory was now used even in the very details of the Roman *triumphus*. Thus, in the writings of *Ambrose (*Fid.* IV, 1-2; *Luc.* 10,107-112) and Pope *Leo (*Serm.* 69,4; 74,1), the way of the cross (*via crucis*) and the ascension are presented as the triumph of the King of Glory (*rex gloriae*—see also *John Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Cor.* 5,1 and another texts in Lampe 654-655 and Blaise 830-831). From ancient criticisms concerning the theology of redemption, but also from certain reservations passed on by the authors themselves who had used it (Aug., *Trin.*, 13,13,17), it is evident that already in a certain way the categories and images used should often be judged as excessive concessions both to the anti-Marcionite controversy and popular taste. One should understand, therefore, that to a large extent later theology eliminated it and substituted it with the idea of vicarious substitution (*substitutio vicaria*—e.g., St. Anselm of Canterbury). Nevertheless, although the early theory of redemption was a bit one-sided, one cannot deny that it, especially for its essential idea of Christ's victory over the forces of evil, includes a fundamental gospel truth, that is, that God alone in Christ leads humanity—who has been freed by and created by him, and who is exposed to many external pernicious influences—to an open dialogue with him.

J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption après s. Augustin*, Paris 1930; DTC 13, 1912-2004; W. Elert, *Redemptio ab hostibus*: ThLZ 72 (1947) 265-270; J. Daniélou, *Bible et Liturgie*, Paris 1951, 409-428; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum*, Paris 1962; H.E.W. Turner, *Jésus le Sauveur*, Paris 1965; C. Andresen, *Erlösung*: RAC 6 (1966) 54-219, esp. 55-61: terminology; J. Barbel, *Gregor v. N., Die grosse katechetische Rede*, Stuttgart 1971; H. Kessler, *Die theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, Paderborn 1970; A. Grillmeier, *Der Gottessohn im Totenreich. Mit ihm und in ihm*, Freiburg 1975, 76-174; B. Studer, *Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*, in HDG 3/2a, Freiburg 1978; S. Poque, *Le langage symbolique dans la prédication d'Augustin d'Hippone*, Paris 1984; H. Wagner, *Erlösung*, III: LTK³ 3, 805-808; F.G. Clancy, *Redemption*: Augustine (1999) 702-704 (bibl.).

B. Studer

REFRIGERIUM. From the Latin *refrigerare*, *refrigerium*, "to cool, refresh" and "comfort" (it corresponds to the Greek terms: ἀναψύχω, ἀνάπαυσις, "relax, rest," "refreshment" and "relief"). The term was used in

classical literature both in its physical sense (Cicero, *De Sen.* 16.67, "cool, refresh"; thus even Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 21,46) and in a moral sense ("to appease," "to cool the flames of passion"). In the ancient Christian tradition, especially in the Latin West, it was intended to refer to two very precise and very broad concepts: On the one hand, *refrigerium*, which was used widely in the writings of the *Fathers, designated that eschatological reality which was intended to refer either to the deceased souls' blessed lingering in an intermediate state before the judgment, or to the eternal repose in *paradise, eternal happiness (Tert., *Apol.* 49,2; *De Monog.* 10). On the other hand, it also referred to the funerary cult that the Christians offered to their own dead and to the martyrs who were near their tombs with the hope of bringing their memory back to life in their minds. With that cult—which was developed on the framework of the sacred meal, as in the case of the pagan *parentalia* (from 13-21 February, a feast intended to placate the souls of the ancestors: Ovid, *Fast.* II, 533)—in addition to recalling the dead to memory, they prayed for their condition and eternal comfort. In this manner, they also appeared to be very connected concepts in the Christian tradition. Initially, only the relatives of the deceased participated at this banquet, but having been established as an ecclesiastical practice supported by communal money (Tert., *Apol.* 39,12), even the poor took part. Nonetheless, one should not confuse this practice with the **agape*, which was also present until the 4th c.

The semantic origins of the term among the Christian communities, in the sense of "eternal rest" or rather of the "blessed condition" of the righteous after death, was garnered not only from classical literature but also and especially from *Scripture itself (OT: Ps 65:11; Wis 4:7; Jer 6:16; in the new *vulgata*, NT: Lk 16:24; 2 Tim 1:16). From the 2nd c. onward we find a use in its eschatological sense (*Passio SS. Felicitas et Perpetua*, 3). Various graffiti attest to its use and constitute definite sources for the Christian meanings applied to the term (IG 638, CIL 14.3323). These graffiti have been found primarily in the catacombs, which speak of this awaited rest by the parents for their dearly beloved and righteous relatives: *in pace et in refrigerium*, *spiritus in refrigerium*.

There are also clear testimonies of the dissemination of this concept, tightly connected to funerary practice used among Christians, especially in the rooms in the underground cemeteries (Catacomb of Domitilla). There one perceives a semantic transition from refreshment in the physical sense to that eschatological sense of eternal comfort. Patristic documentation of its use is sizable both in official ecclesiastical documents (the letter to Pope *Damasus, Council of *Constantinople 381) and in literary texts: e.g., *Tertullian (*De orat.* 25.26; *Adv. Marc.* 3), *Cyprian (*De mort.* 15), *Ambrose (*De bon. mort.* 2,5), *Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 34.35.36), *Zeno of Verona (*Tract.* 1,2.62), *Augustine (*Conf.* 13,25; *En. ps.* 38.65) and *Jerome (*Comm. Is.* 9,28).

Refrigerium as a funerary ritual practice is closely connected to the Hellenistic Euergetism, both to the banquets found therein among *pagans and Jews—banquets the attendees used to establish a relationship with the world of the dead and to "refresh" their present condition and their memory. In Roman rituals, funerary meals had the function of establishing the role of the deceased person in the familial group; in Christian communities, its practice was enriched both by *eucharistic elements (in relation to the heavenly banquet) and by the fraternal component that made charity explicit. This banquet recalled the anniversary of the deceased person's birth to the heavenly life, and it was celebrated near their tomb. Soon this banquet also became a pious way of rendering veneration to the martyrs, and it spread quickly in the 3rd and 4th c., in a special way in the African church, where it became a special and popular devotion (Aug., *Conf.* VI, 2). Toward the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c., the practice of this cult fell into various vices and assimilated pagan practices. As a result, it was condemned and prohibited by many bishops, even though they themselves had encouraged this practice as a cult of devotion to the dead and the martyrs as due expressions of faith and works of charity, which expressed solidarity with those most in need. Initially, it was prohibited in the church of *Milan and subsequently in the African church (Aug., *Ep.* 29.22; *Serm.* 361,6).

A.M. Schneider, *Refrigerium*, I, Freiburg 1928; G. Van der Leeuw, *Refrigerium*: Mnemosyne 3 (1935) 125-148; J. Quasten, *Vetus superstitio et nova religio. The Problem of Refrigerium in the Ancient Church of North Africa*: HTR 33 (1940) 253-266; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim. Die Vorstellungen vom Zwischenzustand und die frühchristliche Grabkunst*, Bonn 1957; A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique et vie sociale*, Paris 1968, 202-218; P.-A. Février, *Le culte des morts dans les communautés chrétiennes durant le III^e siècle*, in Atti del IX Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana, Roma 21-27 settembre 1975, I, Vatican City 1978, 211-264; Ch. Pietri: RAC 12 (1983) 561; E. Dassman, RAC 17 (1996) 395-400; A. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists, Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*, Oxford 1999; B. Mazzei, s.v. *banchetti*: TIP 2000.

J.F. Rubio Navarro

REGINUS. (5th c.). Bishop of Constantia (Salamis), *Cyprus. He participated at the 3rd ecumenical

council (*Ephesus 431). Along with his colleagues Zeno of Kurion and Evagrius of Soli, he presented to the council a booklet that accused the patriarch of *Antioch of having violated the autocephaly of the church of Cyprus. In a homily delivered during the same occasion, a homily which has also been passed down in an Ethiopian version, he took a stance in favor of the dismissal of *Nestorius from the patriarchate of *Constantinople.

CPG 3, 6485-6486; the *Libellus* in Greek: ACO I, 1,7, pp. 118-119; in Latin: ACO I, 5, p. 357-358; the *Sermo* in Greek: ACO I, 1,2, pp. 70-71; in Latin: ACO I, 3, pp. 168-169.

J. Irmscher

REGULA FIDEI. This expression in antiquity indicated, among other similar expressions such as *professio fidei* (a brief formula of a confession of faith) and the *symbola fidei* (the creeds tied to *baptism), a norm for the Christian search for truth. We have explicit testimony concerning the *regula fidei* in the writings of *Tertullian and *Irenaeus of Lyons. Tertullian spoke of it in the *De virginibus velandis* 1 (*regula fidei credendi scilicet*), in *Adv. Prax.* 3 and especially in the *De praescriptione*, where in ch. 13 he also provided the enumeration of the articles of faith (there are 13). Irenaeus called it the *regula veritatis* in *Adv. haer.* (I, 1,20) and the *regula fidei* in the *Demonstr. apost.* (ch. 3). There are three difficulties inherent in understanding the phrase *regula fidei*: (1) the specific pinpointing of its content, recognizing, in general, a substratum that borders on the baptismal creeds, because it encompasses not only a confession of faith but also the observance of customs practiced in the church (ecclesiastical canon or rule of tradition, as *Clement of Alexandria calls it, *Strom.* I, 1,15; VI, 18,165; "the preaching of the church": *Origen, *In Joh. com.* V, 81). (2) A second problem pertains to its origin (how it came to be formed and under what directive norm) and to its function (did this norm of faith—one may ask—at the same time also establish its synthesis?). It had an adequate evaluation at the beginning of theological reflection, that is, in the controversy with *gnosticism and at the time of the translation of the Christian message into the categories of Greek thought. An appeal was made to the *regula fidei* as a methodological norm for study: in reading the *Scriptures (ps.-Athan., *De trin.* VII, 5); in the language to be used (Aug., *Civ. Dei* X, 23); in the traditions to respect, for example, the date established in the celebration of *Easter by the church leaders of *Asia Minor (Eus., *HE* 5, 24,6); and also in the trinitarian formulation to be used in the administration of baptism (ps.-Athan., *De trin.* VII, 10). In general, this rule was identified as a guiding norm for the investigation of the faith as opposed to and distancing itself from *philosophies (Ambr., *Exam.* 11, 1,3) and Christian views judged as heterodox. (3) In reality, the *regula fidei*, although difficult to clarify, performed the function of a regulating norm of faith in the dialectic of *orthodoxy-*heresy that sharpened with every contact of Christian acculturation. A recovery of this meaning of *regula fidei* would give evidence to its positive function over against its negative function of elimination (although this is inherent within it), and it would help create a more appropriate dialectic in the relationship between magisterium and theological research, proposing more meaningful formulations for all the faithful and therefore not only for theologians. The various *regulae fidei* of ancient Christianity were therefore not retrospective records for safeguarding the Christian faith, but by inserting themselves in the journey of Christian history, they constituted a guiding method for transmitting the essential nucleus of Christian truths, providing an orientation for research amid the continual process of acculturation and inculturation of faith. This concept slowly began to be identified with that of the Christian tradition, that stream of the Christian communities' journey through ever-changing cultures but ultimately arriving at its own unique Christian culture.

D. Van den Eynde, *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles*, Gembloux 1933; B. Hägglund, *Die Bedeutung der "regula fidei" als Grundlage theologischer Aussagen*, Lund 1958; A. Brekelmans, *Professione di fede nella Chiesa antica. Origine e funzione*: Concilium 1970, 49-58; V. Grossi, *"Regula veritatis" e narratio battesimale in s. Ireneo*: Augustinianum 12 (1972) 437-463.

V. Grossi

REIMS. *Durocorturum*, then in Late Antiquity the *Urbs Remensis* (the city of Reims), became the metropolis of Belgica II under *Diocletian and an economic and vibrant military center. The first bishop who is identified with certainty, Imbetausius, who was preceded in the *episcopal list by three unknown titulars (Sixtus, Sinicius and Amausius), appears in 314 (Council of *Arles). The testimony of *Gregory of Tours on the two local martyrs Timothy and Apollinaris (*Glor. Martyr.* 55) does not guarantee the historicity of the two saints; their historicity is as hypothetical as that of the purported founder Sixtus, who is first on the list of bishops (Flodoard, *Hist. Rem. Eccles.* I, 2; Duchesne, *Fastes* III, p. 77).

Imbetausius is followed on this list by Aper, Maternianus, Donatianus, Viventius, Severus and Nicasius (it is not known whether he fell victim to the *Vandals in 407, or the Huns in 451), Baruc (*Barucius*), Barnabas, Bennasius, who were all of little importance before the work of Remigius (an Alemanni bishop 457–518). In 482, he greeted the advent of *Clovis, whom he baptized between 496 and 508 at Reims, which became a metropolis of Catholic *Gaul for the S churches that were already under the rule of the *Arian kings. But his successors Romanus, Flavius (. . . 535 . . .), Mappinius (. . . 549) seem to have been erased from the record; Egidius placed himself, at the end of the 6th c., at the service of the political interests of King Sigebert and Fredegund, but was deposed by Childebert in 590. This indicates that by that time the bishops in some way performed the role of palace prelates.

Regarding the bishops of the 8th c., our knowledge is reduced almost entirely to Flodoard's testimony, who makes reference to their *donations; Romulf, Sonnatius (. . . 614–627), Laudigesilus, Angelbert, Landon, Nivon and Reolus (former count of Champagne); for the 8th c., Rigobertus (who was deposed in 717 by Charles Martel, who imposed the bishop of Trèves, Milo, on Reims), then an Irish monk, Abel, in 743, who preceded another monk (from Saint-Denis) Tilpinus (748–794).

From the buildings of the Christian community there remain only the testimonies supplied by the texts: *intra muros* (within the walls), a cathedral (initially dedicated to the *apostles), doubled by a second building (attested to since the 6th c. and dedicated to St. Maria), a baptistery and a church of St. *Peter (7th c. according to Flodoard); outside the walls, the Mausoleum of Jovinus, a military commander (*magister militum*), which would then bear the title of St. Nicasius, three basilicas dedicated to Timothy and Apollinaris, at St. Julian and at St. Remigius, attested by Gregory of Tours and, from the 7th c., the *ecclesia Sancti Sixti et Sinicii*: these buildings were grouped together to the south of the *castrum* in a cemeterial area that would become the village of St.-Rémy.

J. Leflon, *Histoire de l'Église de Reims du Ier au Ve s.*: Travaux de l'Académie de Reims 152, 1941; DACL 14, 2213-2290; H. Reinhardt, *La cathédrale du VIe s. à Genève et l'Église du baptême de Clovis à Reims*: Geneva 11 (1963) 127-139; L. Pietri, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule* (*IV-VIII s.*), I, Paris 1974, 73-83; J.-P. Martin, *Une grande alliée des Romains*, in P. Desportes (éd.), *Histoire de Reims*, Toulouse 1983, 13-54; P. Desportes, *La capitale cléricale du haut Moyen Âge* (*Ve-XIe siècles*), in ibid., 55-91; *Reims. Ville du sacre*: Les dossiers d'archéologie 186 (1993).

Ch. Pietri - M. Ghilardi

RELICS. The term *reliquiae*, λείψανα, only acquired a technical sense starting from the mid-4th c. (can. 8 of the Council of Carthage of 397 and Greg. Naz., *Or.* 5,29); the term appears gradually later (452) in the inscriptions IN HOC LOCO DEPOSITAE SUNT RELIQUIAE SANCTI LAURENTI MARTYRIS (CIL, VIII, 8630). The practice of collecting remains of the *martyrs is ancient: as early as the 2nd c., churches sought to obtain the restitution of the martyrs' bodies, an authorization that the magistrate could refuse if the martyrs were accused of lese majesty, indeed, the only crime for which the magistrate could refuse their request. The *Martyrium Policarpi* 18,1-3 is the most ancient testimony in this regard: despite the requests, *Polycarp's body was burned and not returned; the faithful, however, were able to collect the bones and bury them in a place where they had gathered to celebrate his birthday "in memory and for the exercise and preparation" of future martyrs. The martyrs of *Lyons and *Vienne did not have their remains buried, because the faithful were unable to put into effect the necessary means—money offerings, the carrying away of the bodies overnight—by which they sought to circumvent the magistrates' prohibition (Eus., *HE* 5,1,49-61). The extraordinary success of the cult of the martyrs and the saints starting in the 4th c. brought to the fore numerous legal, political and liturgical problems tied to the presence of the relics in the places of worship.

Humatum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat, nemo martyrem distrahat, nemo mercetur: thus reads one of *Theodosius's constitutions (386) that extended to the bodies of saints the traditional legislation that regarded the violation of tombs as a serious crime; this constitution was reiterated in 439 by the *Theodosian Code* (IX, 17,7). Despite these laws, the practices—even of the imperial court itself—were very different, even if with time the differences tended to decrease. In the West, at least until the 7th c., the official position of the church was to exclude the possibility of touching the bodies of the saints and a fortiori to divide them for distributing their relics: *Gregory the Great, when responding to Constantina, the wife of the emperor Maurice who had asked him for the head of St. *Paul or some other part of his body, affirmed that "among the Romans and all the West" it was intolerable and sacrilegious to touch the bodies of the saints (*Ep.* IV, 30) and, in effect, it seems that the church of the West remained faithful to these guidelines by continuing to construct churches and oratories on places where the bodies of the saints were found.

There is no lack, however, of even famous excep-

tions both with respect to the translation and the fragmentation of the bodies of the saints: one thinks, for example, of *Ambrose, bishop of Milan, to whom was owed the translation of the bodies of Saints *Gervasius and Protasius, *Nazarius and Celsus to *Milan, *Vitalis and Agricola to Bologna (*Ep.* 22; *De exhort. Virg.* 1.2; *Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii* 29), and *Gregory the Great himself seems to have sent to *Recared, king of the Goths, the hair of *John the Baptist (*Ep.* IX, 122). The movement and fragmentation of the body of the saints, however, remained events surrounded by precautions and special fears because in hagiographical literature stories abounded concerning the direct intervention of the saints (in a vision, dream or with other miraculous signs) to legitimate or prevent their removal: St. *Fructuosus, a martyr of *Tarragona, appeared in a dream to the faithful who had divided his bodily remains in order to enjoin their proper restitution to one sole place (*Passio S. Fruct.* BHL n. 3196, § 1); a presbyter attempted to remove part of the relics of Timothy and Apollinaris, but was unable to get away from them and was thereby forced to return them to their place (Gregory of Tours, *Libri mirac.* I, 55).

In the East, however, we see important proponents of the churches publicly making statements in favor of the practice of distributing the relics of the saints: *Basil of Caesarea approved that the relics of the *Forty Martyrs of Sebaste be present in more churches and that they protect such relics (*Hom. In sanctos XL martyr.* 8); *Theodoret (*Graec. Affect. Cur.* 8) and *Gregory of Nazianzus (*C. Iulian.* I, 69) affirmed that even though they were dismembered and divided into various tombs, the bodies of the saints continue to possess their indivisible *virtus*.

The use of relics in the dedication of churches and even secondary altars between the 4th and 7th c. was the most significant catalyst toward an increasingly self-confident practice regarding the bodies of the saints. This ceremony included precisely the deposition of relics under the altar: this was done, for example, at Milan by Ambrose with the relics of Gervasius and Protasius during the inauguration of the church of Porta Romana. In the East, the possession of famous relics capable of competing with those possessed by the most important cities such as *Rome, *Antioch and *Alexandria was considered by the emperors an essential aspect both of their own prestige and *Constantinople's. For this reason, they sought to obtain elsewhere those relics that the recent history of the city did not make available: when in 360 *Constantius inaugurated the Hagia Sophia, he ordered that the bodies of *Pamphilus and his companions who were put to death under *Diocletian at Caesarea, *Palestine, be brought from Antioch. To obtain for their own city the bodies of the saints or part of them was considered even by bishops an essential element for legitimizing their power. The translation of relics grew into collective rites that were celebrated at every feast; political motivations were inextricably intertwined with religious faith in the effective protection offered by the saint toward that city in which the relics lay: the *De laude sanctorum* by *Victricius of Rouen (d. 410) precisely described a ceremony of this type.

A source of new relics was the *inventiones*, the discovery and identification of the bodies of the saints for which there did not yet exist a cult tradition. A dream revealed to Pope *Damasus (366–386) the place where the remains of Eutychus lay; and for *Ambrose, the remains of Sts. Gervasius and Protasius. The *inventio* (discovery) of St. *Stephen's relics (415) and their fragmentation among many churches of the empire were events of such resonance so as to change Augustine's attitude with respect to the cult of the relics, who went from initially being indifferent to becoming an active supporter (Saxer).

Other ways of obtaining the relics were easier: we have already seen how Christians did not have any scruples about using any means necessary to obtain the remains of martyrs from the pagan authorities who often denied such relics to them. Soon relics were stolen from other Christians; the most ancient testimony seems to be that recorded by the *Chronography of 354, *Depositio Martyrum*, 10 July: *Hunc Silanum martyrem Nouati furati sunt* (other examples can be found in Leclerq, col. 2312). Disputes often arose between churches in different locations over which had the right to receive the mortal remains of the saint. The way to resolve this disagreement was often to simply steal the body by using various ploys. This was the case with the remains of *Martin, which were fought over by *Poitiers and *Tours: the first was the city see of the monastery established by Martin, and the second, the episcopal see of the saint himself. With deception and some violence, the inhabitants of the second city got the upper hand because—as Gregory notes, who was the successor of Martin in the same episcopal see—"Almighty God did not want the city of Tours to lose its patron" (*Hist. Franc.* I, 48).

In any case, the requests—even by private individuals—for relics were such that they could not be satisfied by either translations or even the fragmentation of the bodies of the saints: from the end of the 4th c., the church considered those objects that came into actual contact with the body of saints worthy of devotion; these were objects that either had be-

longed to the saints when they were alive or had come into contact with their relics at a later point. To the first type belonged such objects as the saint's clothes: Simplicius Severus recounts that the threads taken from Martin's clothes healed the sick (*Vita Martini* 18). After the death of St. *Honoratus a crowd of faithful who were eager to possess a relic of the saint removed the clothes from the corpse (Ven. Fort., *Sermo de vita s. Onorati* 7,35). They were even satisfied by less "intimate" objects: for example, the instruments used for his torture were the objects of great devotion: although he refused to send Constantina the head of St. Paul, *Gregory the Great sent her the links of the chains that held Paul prisoner (*Ep.* IV, 30). The second type of relics pertain to all those objects, which had various names—*brandea*, *pignora*, *sanctuaria*, *beneficia*—that entered into contact with the bones of the martyr or were sanctified by a continued presence near their sepulcher (as, e.g., the oil of the votive lamps). From the point of view of the saint's "presence" they were considered equivalent to the bodies themselves (Greg. the Great, *Dial.* 2,38). In this category of relics, one should especially mention the *palliola*, that is, pieces of material sanctified by contact with the saint's body and then distributed among the faithful.

A special devotion surrounded those *contact* relics that recalled *Jesus's life and passion: from the cross—according to a tradition known by *Ambrose and *Paulinus of Nola—discovered by *Helena, the mother of *Constantine, on Golgotha, to the lance that pierced his side, the sponge that was placed near his lips, the rocks of the well near which Jesus stopped to talk with the Samaritan woman, etc. (a list concerning especially *Constantinople is found in H. Leclerq).

A very delicate problem that faced the bishops early on was that of the control of the cult of the relics: the African church was the most active in pushing for the need to clamp down on the cults of the *Donatist martyrs; at Tours, Martin ordered the demolition of an oratory dedicated to a martyr who turned out to be a brigand who had been killed for his crimes: his inquiry among the clergy was unsuccessful, and only through divine revelation obtained through prayer was he able to attain clarification on the matter (*V. Mart.* 11); in addition to the edifying result, the means used by Martin to unmask the false martyr was rather indicative of the practical impossibility of the episcopate to check by every ordinary means at their disposal the proliferation of the cults of relics of dubious authenticity. In effect, the episode with Martin remains a rather isolated event in the documentation pertaining to the Late Antique and Early Medieval church (see Hermann-Mascard, 81ff.).

Altogether, the cult of the relics in the ancient church obtained the support of all its members: the bishops, monks, simple faithful and, among these, first and foremost, the representatives of the highest social strata; it is enough to simply cite for all these the case of *Paulinus of Nola and his activity in promoting the cult of St. *Felix. The use of burial (*de*-*positio*) *ad sanctos*, that is, near to the relics of the saints in the conviction that this practice would help the *soul of the deceased person's journey into the afterlife became widespread starting from the 2nd half of the 4th c., especially with regard to the privileged social classes who were able to take initiative in constructing chapels, establishing another mighty spring for the cult of relics. It would be erroneous, therefore, to consider it an expression only of the popular contingent of society. This success found one of its most significant expressions in the hagiographic work of Gregory of Tours: his eight *Libri miraculorum* consist of a vast repertory of miracles that occurred near the relics of saints. On the other hand, before the iconoclast crisis that also involved relics, there were few dissenting voices: the only voice of a certain importance that caused Jerome's response was that of *Vigilantius (*C. Vigilan.*). The lack of consistent and repeated criticisms explains the absence of deep theological reflection on the theme of the relics, even if with a few exceptions: *Victricius of Rouen affirmed that "the one who heals also lives, and lives in the relics. The *apostles and the martyrs heal and purify and therefore resided in the relics locked with the bond of all eternity" (*De laude sanct.* 11). The reflections offered by *John of Damascus were more theologically profound: through the intellect of the saints God has taken up his habitation in their bodies, and "therefore, would it not be necessary to honor the temples and the tabernacles animated by God?" (*De fide orthod.* 4,15).

H. Leclercq, *Reliques*: DACL 14, 2294-2359; N. Hermann-Mascard, *Les reliques des saints, Formation coutumière d'un droit*, Paris 1975; M. Heinzelmann, *Translationsberichte und andere Quellen des Reliquienkultes*, Turnhout 1979; V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, réliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980; Y. Duval, *Auprès des saints corps et âme. L'inhumation ad sanctos dans la chrétienté d'Orient et d'Occident du III^e^ au VII^e^ siècle*, Paris 1988; J. Dubois - J.L. Lemaitre, *Sources et méthodes de l'hagiographie médiévale*, Paris 1993, 247-319; A. Angenendt, *Heiligen und Reliquien. Die Geschichte ihres Kults vom Frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart*, Münich 1994; E. Bozóky - A.M. Helvétius (eds.), *Les Reliques. Objects, cultes, symboles*, Turnhout 1999.

A. Monaci Castagnos

REMIGIUS of Reims. Remigius (459–533) was one of the most famous bishops of *Reims, but whether the fact of having baptized *Clovis gained for him a certain notoriety remains uncertain. We are still very poorly informed about his life. *Sidonius Apollinaris delighted in his ability as a writer (*Ep.* 9,7); Remigius wrote to Clovis to congratulate him upon his accession to the throne as the king of Tournai in 481 (CCL 117, 407-408). He catechized and baptized him on 25 December between the years 496 and 506, presumably at Reims. Remigius reorganized his ecclesiastical province and wrote to numerous bishops (CCL 117, 407-413). His homilies have been lost. According to *Gregory of Tours (*Glor. conf.* 78), Remigius was a bishop for seven years. In the *Mart. hier.*, he appears on 15 January, the date of the end of his service as bishop, and on 1 October, the date of his translation. At Reims, his *natale* (episcopal ordination) was celebrated on 13 January. Two *Lives* were written about him, one wrongly attributed to *Venantius Fortunatus, but accurate (BHL 7150), the other written by Hincmar, which lacks any historical value (BHL 7152-7159). His testament has been preserved in two recensions: the longer recension contains *interpolations; the shorter, alterations, but is substantially trustworthy.

BHL 7150-7173; CPL 1070-1073; BS 11, 104-113; LCI 8, 261-263; BBKL 8, 19-21; K. Schäferdiek, *Remigius – Kirchenmann einer Umbruchszeit*: ZKG 94 (1983) 256-278; E. Panella, *Nuova cronologia remigiana*: Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 60 (1990) 145-311.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

RESTITUTUS (Restutus) (4th c.). Catholic bishop of *Carthage, successor of *Gratus before 359, the year in which he participated at the Council of *Rimini, over which he had perhaps presided. An adversary of *Sirmium's formula of 22 May 359 (known as the *credo datato*), he was appointed head of the delegation of the Nicene majority that was asked to travel to *Constantinople to summarize the council's documents and present a letter to the emperor *Constantius. This delegation, which was preceded by the pro-*Arian delegation, was not even received and was forced to stop at Nike (in *Thrace), where on 10 October 359, it was forced to cede and sign a new formula of *faith (the formula of Nike).

At that time Restitutus dictated a letter to justify his rejection—and that of the delegation he presided over—of the formula of faith of the Nicaeans at Rimini and the acceptance of *communion with the pro-Arian party, which had previously been condemned (see Hilary of Poitiers, *Frag. hist.* 8,5-6: PL 10, 702). Restitutus's attitude was criticized in *Africa (see PLS 1, 303-304), but the event must have been forgotten soon after. We do not know anything else about the life of Restitutus, except that in 390 Geneclius was bishop of Carthage.

Simonetti 314-321; PCBE 1, 968-969.

A. Di Berardino

RESURRECTION of CHRIST (iconography). The gospels are silent on the central moment of their narration, the *resurrection of *Jesus. The four Evangelists, in fact, although in different versions, appeal to a common tradition that clearly distinguished the account of the crucifixion from that of *Easter morning. This silence is highlighted by expectation of the Sabbath interval, in which the women delayed their visit to the Teacher's tomb to observe the "rest according to the commandment" (Lk 23:56). The various accounts then vacillate on the number and identity of the women and the motive that led them to Christ's tomb, but all transmit the record of the tomb that was found to be empty and the appearance of an angel (or even of Jesus himself), who proclaimed to them the resurrection and in turn made them proclaimers of this event to the *apostles.

1. Paschal iconography in early Christian art. Early Christian *iconography respected the gospels' silence on the moment in which Jesus rose again, and the image familiar to us of Christ emerging from the tomb is actually unknown to the figurative repertoire of the early centuries. It is undeniable, however, that images closely connected to the theme of Christ's resurrection were widespread from the beginning of Christian iconography, thus giving expression in images of the chief event of the Christian faith. In addition to symbolic images taken from the pagan cultural context (such as the image of the *Sol triumphans*, which in a Christian context seems to allude specifically to the resurrection), this expression used primarily some OT biblical personages and episodes to suggest a typological reading in reference to the events of Easter. This is undoubtedly the case for the cycle of the *prophet *Jonah, whom Jesus himself identified, in the gospel of *Matthew, as a sign of his burial and resurrection from the dead (Mt 12:38-41; parallel passages in Lk 11:29-32; Mk 8:11-12; the *Fathers, from *Irenaeus and *Tertullian onward, deepened this meaning). Even the figure of *patiens* (suffering) *Job, in his reference to the faith in the resurrection of the dead, thanks to the Latin translation of Job 19:26 (*et rursum cir-*

cumdabor pelle mea et in carne mea videbo Deum), was full of paschal christological meanings, which made Job known to the Fathers as the "great athlete" in the contest and a model of martyrdom (*Origen, *Basil of Caesarea): the *sarcophagus decorated with trees from the Museo Pio Cristiano in the Vatican would seem to demonstrate this fact (*Rep* I, 61). The sarcophagus places Job in parallel with *Abel and connects their test to the central element of the *Anastasis* (resurrection), a symbol, which we will encounter shortly below, of the death and resurrection of Christ. The Pauline idea of the resurrection of Christ as a presupposition of Christian salvation (see Rom 6:5) makes the scenes used by the first Christians to represent God's salvific power in death, such as the image of *Daniel in the lions' den, refer to the resurrection of Christ (Dan 6:1-25; 14:23-42). Moreover, Christ himself is the source of resurrection (the daughter of Jairus; Mt 9:18-19, 23-26 and parallel texts; the son of the widow: Lk 7:11-17; Lazarus: Jn 11:38-44), which shows him to be a participant of the creative power of God and anticipates and depicts his own resurrection, as *John reveals specifically with regard to the "sign" of *Lazarus (see Jn 11:25). Lastly, in the late 4th c., the words of the **Apostolic Constitutions* (V, 7) clarify the sense of the Eastern iconographies in early Christian art: "the reasons for believing in the resurrection from the dead we find specifically in the resurrection of the Lord. He in fact raised Lazarus, who was dead for four days, and the daughter of Jairus and the son of the widow, he also reawakened himself on the third day, upon command of the *Father; he is the pledge of our resurrection. Therefore, the one who caused Jonah to come out on the third day alive and intact from the belly of the large fish, and the three young men from the Babylonian furnace, and Daniel from the lions' den will not lack the power to also raise us from the dead!"

2. The iconographies of the resurrection of Christ. 2.1 *The empty tomb.* If to the silence of the gospels on the moment of the resurrection there corresponded for centuries a lack of iconography, Christian art, on the other hand, was able to draw direct inspiration from the gospel narration of the proclamation of the Risen One, which an angel directed to the godly women who had come to the tomb with oils for embalming the body of the Teacher (as clearly expressed in Mk 16:1; for this reason, these have also been called *mirophore*, from the Greek term, μύρον, i.e., ointment). These accounts' individual details differed in the synoptic gospels, but it seems noteworthy that in Matthew 28 the appearance and proclamation of the angel was followed by the appearance of Jesus himself (vv. 9-10). It was specifically Matthew who seems to have given inspiration to the representations of the proclamation near the tomb, which proclamation, after the unique (but uncertain) precedent offered by the fresco in the baptistery of *Dura Europos in ancient Mesopotamia (before 256), reappeared on reliefs of Christian sarcophagi throughout the 4th c. and distinguished the women standing before the seated angel (Mt 28:2) from those women who prostrated themselves in adoration before the Risen Christ who was standing before them (ibid. v. 9). At the beginning of the 5th c., the two scenes appeared on the wooden panels of the doors of the church of Santa Sabina in *Rome, placed next to the most ancient image of the crucifixion. The episode also appears on the ivory diptychs intended for private devotion, at times with the original details owed to a learned and distinguished patron.

This is the case for the so-called Trivulzio diptych, today at *Milan, in the 1st half of the 5th c. Here, it is possible to faithfully follow Matthew's text: on the top (under the symbols of Matthew and *Luke) are the guards who were "struck with terror" (Mt 28:4) upon the appearance of the angel. The guards were standing on top of the tomb, which is somewhat different from the gospel's account, which stated that it was "an empty tomb . . . hewn out in the rock . . . with a large rolling rock" (Mt 27:60). The circular building represented, however, recalls the one constructed by *Constantine upon the tomb of Christ at the beginning of the 4th c., which was then ruined in 614 and destroyed, finally, in 1099. At the bottom, the scene moves to the slightly open door of the tomb, the panels of which depict scenes of the resurrection of Lazarus, the call of Zacchaeus and the healing of the woman with the flow of blood. To the right is the "angel of the Lord who descended from heaven," seated on the rock that he has rolled away (Mt 28:2). The splendid garment of the philosopher, wearing ornate shoes, recalls that "his appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow" (v. 3). He wears a halo and is without wings as maintained by the Western tradition of the first centuries, and he gestures with his left hand side of the spoken word ("he said to them . . .": v. 5), as is fitting for a messenger *angelos*. What is surprising in this image, however, is the attitude of the two women "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary" (v. 1). The canonical iconography would have them standing, incapacitated and shocked before the angel, who in the text, in fact, exhorts them, saying: "have no fear . . ." (v. 5). Here instead these women prostrate themselves before him in adoration; they extend to

him their hand, they grab his feet. Matthew's account, after the angels' appearance, proceeds with the two "Marys" who, "having left the tomb in a hurry . . . ran to report it to the disciples" (v. 8). But shortly after, "Jesus" himself "encountered them saying: 'Hail!' And they came up and took hold of his feet and worshiped him." The women were represented in this pose only before the Teacher, but never thus before the angel (v. 9). The Trivulzio diptych, moreover, completed a refined and unique synthesis of the two moments of the account in Matthew and transformed the seated angel before the tomb into Jesus himself, by recovering in this manner a very ancient christological attribute according to which Christ is the "Angel of the Lord, glorious and very tall" (Hermas, *Sim.* 8,1). *Tertullian left an illuminating definition: "he was also called 'Angel of Great Counsel,' that is 'Messenger,' which is a term that denotes an office, not the nature. In effect, he had to proclaim to the world the Father's great design for the restoration of man" (*De carne Christi* 14).

The patron of the diptych wanted to place on the lips of Jesus himself the Easter proclamation by attributing to him the "office" of the *angel*, for proclaimer of the Father's design of love worked in the resurrection. Matthew's text, however, favors the identification: one can really say of Jesus that he is "the angel of the Lord, who has come down from heaven" (28:2), the Son of God sent from the Father to reveal himself to men and save them (see Jn 1:18; 3:16-17). The white garments of the angel then recall the transfiguration, when "he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as light" (Mt 17:2). Even the scenes on the door of the tomb recall the "restoration" of the project of God the Creator proclaimed by the "glorious angel," and the image of Jesus is, in these, the same as the image of the angel, although the prostrated woman from the lower scene is none other than the image reflected of the two Marys, and in one a puzzling repetition, on a lower scale, of the larger scene that unfolds before the door.

If the Trivulzio diptych reasons upon the *proclamation* of the Risen One, the *Syriac evangelistary of *Rabbula (586) closely ties the scene of the empty tomb to that of the crucifixion with the *Christus triumphans* clothed with the liturgical garment and eyes open as a sign of his victory over death: "I see the crucified one and I call him King" (*John Chrysostom, *De cruce, hom. II*). Under the large scene of the cross, a brief register below shows the women at the tomb who go to the sellers of the aromas mentioned by *Mark and Luke. They first meet the angel and then, to the right, Jesus, whom they adore. At the center, from the closed tomb, the rays of light strike the guards, a figure of the sons of darkness. Among the women at the tomb—one observes—is *Mary, the Mother of God (who was present at the crucifixion with John), whom 5th-c. Christians believed was present among "the women who had come with him from Galilee" (Lk 23:55), making her a witness to the resurrection of the Son. Even the cover of the reliquary of the Vatican Library (Musei Vaticani, inv. 61883), slightly behind, places the crucifixion at the center of the mystery of Christ, now glorious, in whom is revealed God's love for humankind. Around it and from it the other scenes find their meaning. In addition, the Constantinian dome of the basilica of the Holy Sepulcher, near which occurred the scene of Easter (with Mary), recalls at the bottom of the grotto, the Nativity, with the manger in the form of a sarcophagus for the Son of God who, "taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness . . . humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross" (Phil 2:7-8).

2.1.1 *A paschal cycle on the sarcophagus of Servanes at Arles.* Before the miniature of *Rabbula, who set forth the essential cycle of the passion and the resurrection of Christ, a Roman sarcophagus from the mid-4th c. placed the scene of the empty tomb as the fulcrum of a truly proper iconographic paschal cycle, in which were collected as many scenes as possible referring to the various moments of the passion and glorification of the Lord: it was a sarcophagus of St. Honorat or Servanes, today in the Museum of *Arles (*Rep* III, 42), a product of Roman craftsmanship from the mid-4th c., filled with many lacunae, but very legible on the basis of 17th-c. sketches. The "paschal cycle" in its entirety occupies the lower section of the sarcophagus (on the upper section four episodes from the OT and the NT, with young Jewish men who refused to worship Nebuchadnezzar's idol are placed next to and compared to the *Magi who recognized and worshiped the Son of God). Represented there are the following scenes: the prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mt 26:36-46 and parallel texts); Judas's kiss (Mt 26:47-50; the embrace between Jesus and the apostle-betrayer recalls the embrace between *Peter and *Paul of the Vigna Chiaraviglio at Rome); Christ led to Pontius *Pilate, who washes his hands (Mt 27:1-26 and parallel texts); the godly women who worshiped the Risen One near the empty tomb (only in Mt 28:9-10); the appearance of the Risen One to the disciples (see below); Judas's hanging (Mt 27:3-10); the *ascension of Christ (Lk 24:50-53 and parallel texts in Mk and Acts). The episodes are all common to the

fourfold tradition, though with certain variants. The first two (Gethsemane and the arrest) always follow one after the other in the four accounts, all of which, before the scene with Pilate, add the scene of Jesus being led to the high priest and Peter's simultaneous denial (the two scenes, here absent, are presented together as a contemporary front of a Vatican sarcophagus: *Rep* I, 13). The narration of the *passio Christi* continues precisely with the interrogation by Pilate, including the detail about the washing of the hands, which is only found in Matthew's gospel (27:24-26). From this scene we are transported before the empty tomb: the break corresponds exactly to the middle of the relief. The empty tomb appears flanked by two alarmed soldiers (which recalls Mt 28:4), exactly as they appear in the iconography of the *Anastasis*, which reveals that it was therefore already known; there are three women who prostrate themselves before Christ as in Mk 16:1 instead of the two, as it is more properly in Mt 28. Christ subsequently appears to the disciples, who are four in all, symmetrically lined up next to the Risen One and praising him: this number, which has no correspondence to the gospel accounts of Jesus's appearances after his resurrection, had the value of a generic reference and, at the same time, in the iconographic disposition, a decorative effect. At this point, one observes the improper insertion of the hanging of Judas, which Matthew, the only witness to this event (the mention of this event is different in Acts 1:18-19), however, ties to the very moment of Jesus's presentation to Pilate, who is also represented here. The ascension of the Lord—only found in the accounts of Mark and Luke (Mk 16:19; Lk 24:51; cf., Acts 1:6-11)—completes the decoration of the section in an iconographically effective manner. This is the most ancient attestation to this scene.

2.1.2. *The appearances of the Risen One.* The appearances of the godly women near the empty tomb and the generic appearance to the apostles on the sarcophagus of Servanes established the first and most ancient examples of scenes taken from the gospel narratives pertaining to the risen Jesus. Among these we can mention at least the appearance to *Mary Magdalene narrated in Jn 20:11-18 and the episode of the gospel of Luke of the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Lk 24:13-35; also mentioned in Mk 16:12-13), which appears on the wooden door of the church of Santa Sabina at Rome (datable between the pontificates of Pope *Celestine and *Sixtus III: 422–432, 432–440) and also among the *mosaic insets in the christological scenes in the church of S. Apollinare Nuovo at *Ravenna (beginning of the 6th c.) and which is perhaps even recalled on one of the sides of the Pignatta sarcophagus in the same city (*Rep* II, 376).

With respect to the iconographic effects, the most fortunate, however, of such episodes is that of the apostle *Thomas's unbelief, which John narrates in 20:19-29. Its most ancient attestation is on two sarcophagi produced in N Italy shortly after the mid-4th c. Among these, the sarcophagus housed in S. Celso at *Milan is truly pertinent (*Rep* II, 250); it shows, on the continuous front, two brief Christmas and Easter cycles, flanked by the central majestic scene with Christ between Peter and Paul. To the right of it is the scene of the Magi who follow the star, but give their backs to the Child and turn toward the central Christ; to the left are the two Marys in the gospel of Matthew at the empty tomb (with the angel who appears between the clouds) and the scene of unbelief, with Thomas, accompanied by only one other apostle, who places his hand in the Lord's side, who in turn raises his arm and uncovers his chest with the other hand. The contemporary fragmentary representation of another sarcophagus now kept at Brescia is analogous (Museo Cristiano; *Rep* II, 249), as well as a fragment from the Museo Nazionale di Ravenna, which dates to the beginning of the 5th c. (*Rep* II, 377).

One should also attribute to the first decades of the 5th c. the representations contained on one of the four small ivory plates from a lost small box (Lat. *capsella*), today housed in the British Museum of London (inv. 56.6-23.6). The scene imitates, more than half a century later, the iconographic layout of the Risen One on the sarcophagus of Servanes, with only four apostles (instead of 11) and adding only the detail of Thomas's left forefinger, which touches the side of Christ. The London plates, all decorated with scenes from the passion, can be considered—along with the sarcophagus of Servanes—an updated attempt to formulate a complete iconographic cycle of the passion and resurrection of the Lord. One sees upon these plates the presence of the scene of the crucifixion, which appears there for the first time during the same years of the wooden door of the church of Santa Sabina, on the latter of which is, moreover, also carved the scene of Thomas. The eleven apostles appear for the first time on one of the mosaic insets of the basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo, a century later: Christ's pose is that of the Lombardian sarcophagi, at the center of the two most numerous and matched groups of the apostles (in the first to the right one can identify Thomas), although a large barred door dominates in the background, according to Jn 20:26. The same image reappears then on a Palestinian leaden ampule of

the 6th-7th c., in the same British Museum, with the addition of a Greek inscription that overshadows the circular iconographic field, citing in full the confession of faith finally proclaimed by Thomas, "ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου" (Jn 20:28). Lastly, during the time of Pope *John VII (705–707), the scene appears again in the frescoes of S. Maria Antiqua in the Roman Forum, where it was inserted between the broadest iconographic repertory of appearances of the Risen One known at that time (the disciples on the road to Emmaus, the appearance to the Eleven, the appearance near the Sea of Tiberias, and the dialogue with Mary Magdalene). Among the appearances of the Risen One, one should also include that exceptional appearance to the apostle Paul narrated in Acts 9:1-9. This is attested in *paintings in the iconographic group cycle of the cubiculum of Leo in the Roman cemetery of Commodilla (*Rep* 142,5), at the time of Pope *Damasus (366–384), where Christ appears only from the waist up looking down from heaven, and in a sculpture on an important sarcophagus constructed in the shape of columns at *Marseille (*Rep* III, 291), from the end of the 4th c., where Christ and Paul appear standing side-by-side in the act of speaking alongside the very frequent scene, even though apocryphal, of the beheading of the apostle.

2.1.3. *The ascension of the Lord.* The establishment of the iconography of the ascension is late with respect to the other scenes from the life of Christ, tied to the late origin of the corresponding liturgical festival, attested not earlier than the end of the 4th c.—and specifically in 388 in the East (*John Chrysostom)—and only from the beginning of the 5th c. for the West. Thus, after the episodic appearance on the "Easter" sarcophagus of Servanes and on another fragment at Clermont-Ferrand (*Rep* III, 219; 2nd half of the 4th c.), the first known representation of this scene is that of the famous ivory from the Bavarian Museum of Munich (from ca. 400), that ties the iconography of the ascension to that of the resurrection of Christ, faithful to its theological interpretation as the accomplishment of the exit from hell. In that, at the bottom, is a representation of the episode of the godly women at the tomb, with a marvelous reproduction of the rotunda of the Jerusalem *Anastasis*; the right part, toward the top, is filled with the image of the ascension, with two astonished apostles who witness Jesus ascending on high, drawn by the hand of God. It is interesting that Jesus, who climbs a rocky mountain as on the sarcophagi from the city of Arles, seems to come from the already emptied tomb, in a surprising idea of temporal connection between the two scenes. The intervention of the divine hand, which draws Christ to itself, nears the messianic interpretation of Ps 18:16 [17] ("he stretched out his hand from on high and took me") and 73:24 ("you have taken me by your right hand"), reread by Acts 2:33 ("exalted at the right hand of God"), although the attitude of Christ during his ascent on the mountain (which is common to the event of *Moses who ascends Mt. Sinai to receive the law there) reproduces an ancient gestural character. In addition to this attestation it appears on a formula of the wooden door of Santa Sabina at Rome (beginning of the 5th c.), which moreover presents details that were then abandoned that have led some to doubt its very identification. In it, Christ, who is in the act of ascending a rocky mountain, is pulled up by three angels, one of which, in the upper right corner, takes him by the hand. In the lower portion, four apostles make gestures of astonishment or sadness. The presence of the angels and the place of the divine hand, however, is to be interpreted as a manifestation of the intervention of God himself, who "has exalted him" (Phil 2:9) and is taken most directly from the passive verbal forms from the attestations of the event recorded in the gospel of Mark and Luke (*anelēmphthē* [Mk 16:19] or *anephereto* [Lk 24:51] *eis ton ouranon* [to heaven]; and again *epērthē* from Acts 1:9).

These iconographies of the ascension, which we could call "Western," were soon placed alongside the original contributions of the Eastern part of the *Orbis christianus antiquus*. We can already see this scene on a column of a ciborium in Venice (from the 6th c., according to the most early dating), which includes the inscription *ascensio Cristi ad celos apostolis cu(m) miratione aspicentibus,* and we see Christ inserted in a circular mandorla, flanked to the right and the left by two winged angels. Surrounding him are six individuals, two of whom could be, following the description of the apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus*, *Elijah and Enoch, the good *thief from the crucifixion, who had just arrived and is represented with his cross. Even the various cruets from Monza, Italy (6th-7th c.), offer a similar representation to that of the Venice ciborium, but here Mary is at the center among the twelve apostles.

On the Syriac codex of Rabbula, from 586, Christ is within a mandorla, raised on high by two angels, although the two others are beside him in adoration. The mandorla has at the bottom the Tetraform angel with wings with eyes, endowed with four flaming wheels, according to the vision of Ezek 10. Mary is at the feet of Christ, and alongside her are two angels facing the outside toward the group of apostles who are gazing toward heaven and to whom they say:

"Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up toward heaven? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven" (Acts 1:11). In this short verse, in my opinion, is the hermeneutical key of the insertion of the image of the Tetraform, which derived from the book of Revelation, in the context of the *parousia of the Son of Man: it seems that, through an iconographic procedure that we could call "inductive," the image of the second coming of Christ was used, which was fully described in the last book of the *Bible and already experimented with in the arts, for representing the particular details of his departure from the world, which is not described by the gospels, but occurred, the Acts of the Apostles tell us, "in the same way." The same iconography, likewise in the Syro-Palestinian context, is already taken up in the aforementioned cover of the reliquary of the *Sancta Sanctorum*, in the Vatican Museum, or in the apse of the chapels of Bawît, some of which, under the representation of Christ in a mandorla with the Tetraform of the basin, repeat the image of Mary Magdalene alongside the group of apostles, reusing the iconographic integration between the ascension and the parousia on the aforementioned codex *Rabulensis*. A further iconographic mixing, this time with a scene of *Pentecost, was done on a cruet from Monza, in which from the mandorla of Christ there emerges the divine hand from which descend the dove and the rays of the *Holy Spirit, whom precisely and only after the ascension of Christ "the Father will send in my name" (Jn 14:26).

2.2. *The iconography of the* Anastasis. Since the institution of the Feast of *inventio Crucis* in 325—with the memory of the dedication of the *Jerusalem basilica of the Holy Sepulcher, or the *Anastasis* (resurrection), and Calvary—the celebration of the *Crux invicta* of the Lord favored the ascent of a new paschal iconography, in which the cross appears as a trophy of Christ's victory over death, at whose feet are "conquered" soldiers from Matthew's account. This scene—that finds conceptual and excellent graphic parallels in the Constantinian *labarum* and precedents in the triumphal vessels that had been carried in the procession to Rome after the conquests—appears on numerous Christian sarcophagi starting from the crucial years of the 4th c. The scenes on these sarcophagi are said to be precisely of the *Anastasis*, and are always placed so they occupy the central space. The image merges the cross from the passion (which appears for the first time in Christian iconography) with the monogram and the laureate of Christ—placed on the upper portion of his vertical arm, while the two doves perched on his horizontal arm nibble on the fruit of the crown wreath, alluding to the faithful who are nourished by the fruits of the resurrection. Initially they were sarcophagi in the form of columns with scenes from the passion of Christ (such as a very famous example from the Vatican *Rep* I, 49) or rather of trees with episodes of the OT and the NT (just as the other famous sarcophagus likewise in the Vatican, *Rep* I, 61). These make way for, in the 2nd half of the century, two depictions of the apostles, who pray or offer crowns to the Risen Lord, who is personified by this elaborate iconographic emblem (famous examples at Arles: *Rep* III, 49; or at Palermo: *Rep* II, 143; in the Vatican: *Rep* I, 59).

The Easter-oriented interpretation of the *Anastasis* group is further confirmed by the appearance of this typology from the scene of the empty tomb on some sarcophagi, inserted at the foot of the cross in the place of the soldiers. The two clearest examples are those of a lost sarcophagus from the Vatican Basilica, attested by Bosius and datable to the *Theodosian age (*Rep* I, 933), on which two miniature women prostrate themselves in adoration of Christ, who is standing there; and of an earlier fragment, today in Aix-en-Provence (*Rep* III, 20), where the angel is instead seated near the tomb.

2.3. *The Risen One who emerges from the tomb.* Using the eulogies of the Holy Land from the 6th-7th c., there were developed for the first time, with the push of serial production, images increasingly directed toward expressing the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord, beginning from the most established in the existing iconographies of the crucifixion and the women at the tomb. The most significant of these images was that of the cruet from Monza, which merges these two scenes showing the Christ of the crucifixion without the cross and in ornate garments as a living and Risen One, standing over the empty tomb and towering over it. The same scene is on another cruet from Bobbio, where Christ, however, is on a mandorla, lifted up by the angels (as in the ascension) above a cross with wooden arms, which is adored by two other angels. The Eastern development of the scene of Christ who emerges from the tomb is already mature: the first certain proof that has come down to us in the West, by work of the Greek Pope John VII (705–707), is in his Marian oratory up against the front of the old St. Peter's Basilica built by the emperor *Constantine. This scene—which is known through the reproductions before the basilica's destruction—is placed at the end of the inset motifs with a life of Christ, next to the scene of the crucifixion and before that of the

*descent to hell and the godly women. The Lord emerges from the cave, whose closing stone is rolled away, although near there are the terrified guards: this scene evidently reformulates the appearance of the Lord near the empty tomb, with the guards who were "struck with terror," already encountered on the Trivulzio diptych or on the scene of the *Anastasis*. The fortunes of this representation are well known, especially in the Western part of the Christian world, which preferred it to that of Jesus's descent into hell, forgetting the scene of the women at the tomb.

2.4. *The descent into hell.* A last representation of Easter, inspired by the apocryphal gospels—but established also by the words of Peter at Pentecost (Acts 2:24-31) and in his first letter (1 Pet 3:18-20) and Paul's various letters (Rom 10:7 and Eph 4:9)—appears only starting from the 7th c., and became established especially in Byzantine art. It was Jesus's descent into hell, attested in addition to the ancient formularies of faith by the imaginative account of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* from the 4th-5th c. Following an ancient Christian tradition, it there narrates that Jesus, who died on the cross, descended into hell to free the first parents (*Adam and Eve) and the patriarchs and to defeat Satan's kingdom. Perhaps its most ancient iconographic attestation is on the cruet from Monza mentioned previously with respect to the image of the Risen One; at the very least it is possible to identify Adam and Eve in the two kneeling figures on his sides. More certain is the identification of the scene of the so-called Fieschi-Morgan cross-shaped reliquary housed at the Metropolitan Museum of New York (ca. 700, according to the earliest dating), where Christ holds Adam by the hand while Eve gives him her left hand. In the other images that derive from this scene, as in the oratory of John VII and at St. Praxedes and St. *Clement, at Rome, or in the churches of the Christian East, Jesus descends into hell as the king of divine light, with the dazzling garments of Tabor, the true angel of the resurrection into the heart of the creation: "you have come down on earth to save Adam and, not finding him on the earth, he went to look for him even in hell" (*Byzantine Liturgy, morning of Holy Saturday). Under his feet are the unhinged doors of hell, and the Evil One is already imprisoned. Jesus, the New Adam, seizes with a decisive gesture the hand of the Old Adam. The two look each other in the eye; in Adam's face one can see the resemblance of Christ; there occurs a dialogue: "'I hear the steps of someone coming toward us!' 'Remove yourself from the dead. I am your God, and because of you I have become your son . . . get up, and let's depart from here, because you are in me and I am in you . . . let us escape from pain to joy: the kingdom of heaven that existed before all ages awaits you'" (ps.-Epiphanius, *Hom. II in Sabbato Sancto*). Adam and Eve have halos on their heads: redeemed by Christ, the church venerates them as the progenitor saints of humankind. *Solomon and *David or *John the Baptist are often together with them, along with a crowd of righteous people from the old covenant. Jesus is in the pose of ascending along with the saved, and the Greek name, in fact, no longer describes the scene as descent, but rather as *Anastasis*, *escape from below*—the resurrection. "For earth it is the day of pain, the duty of the tomb and the tears of the Mother of God; but for hell, holy Friday is already Easter, its power shatters the darkness in the heart of the kingdom of the dead (Evdokimov, *Teologia della bellezza*).

See the individual entries of this encyclopedia dedicated to the representations of the scenes from Easter and, especially, for the scene of the empty tomb, *see* *Women, pious. More general and useful, although dated, is the work of J. Villette, *La résurrection du Christ dans l'art chrétien du II^e au VII^e siècle*, Paris 1957. On the scene of Emmaus, see LCI 1, 622-626; TIP 171; P. Testini, *Su una discussa figurazione del sarcofago detto del profeta Eliseo o Pignatta*: Felix Ravenna 113-114 (1977) 319-337; F. Bisconti, *Verso Emmaus (Lc 24,13-35): alle origini di un tema minore*: Bessarione 8 (1991) 83-98; R. Giordani, *Di un controverso rilievo funerario cristiano con presunta rappresentazione della "cena in Emmaus,"* in *XLII Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina*, Ravenna 1995, 383-405. On the appearance to Mary Magdalene, see A. Recio Veganzones, *Maria Magdalena, protagonista de la escena "Mulieres ad Sepulcrum Domini," en la iconografía sepulcral de Occidente (siglos IV-V)*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes. Miscellanea in onore di Mons. Victor Saxer*, Vatican City 1992, 667-688. On the unbelief of the apostle Thomas, see DACL 15, 2273-2275; LCI 4, 301-303. On the conversion of the apostle Paul, A. Recio Veganzones, *El "carmen" paulino de Dámaso y la interpretación de tres escenas pictóricas de la catacumba de Comodila*, in *Saecularia Damasiana*, Atti del Conv. Int. per il XVI centenario della morte di papa Damaso I (11/12/384 – 10-12/12/1984), Vatican City 1986, 323-358. On the ascension of the Lord, see DACL I/2, 2926-2934; LCI 2, 268-276; TIP 127-129; E.T. Dewald, *The Iconography of the Ascension*: American Journal of Archaeology, II s., 19/3 (1915) 3-39; H. Schrade, *Zur Ikonographie der Himmelfahrt Christi*, in *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, 1928-29, 66-190; H. Gutberlet, *Die Himmelfahrt Christi in der bildenden Kunst von den Anfängen bis ins hohe Mittelalter*, Strassburg 1935. On the iconography of the *Anastasis*: DACL XIV/2, 2400-2401; LCI 1, 201-218; A.R. Saggiorato, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani con scene di Passione*, Bologna 1968. On the Risen One who emerges from the tomb, LCI 1, 201-218, in addition to the aforementioned work by Villette. On the descent into hell, see LCI 2, 322-331; B. Bagatti, *L'iconografia dell'Anastasis o Discesa agli Inferi*: Liber Annuus 32 (1982) 217-230. On the paintings and mosaics containing Easter scenes from the time of Pope John VII, see G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo. Secoli IV-X*, scholarly update by M. Andaloro, Rome 1987, 104-116; 251-252.

U. Utro

RESURRECTION of the DEAD. The affirmation of the resurrection of the dead or of the flesh, contained in the most ancient creeds, for example, in the *Apostolic Tradition* (beginning of the 3rd c.), in the *papyrus *Dêr Balyzeh* (mid-4th c., but from an ancient tradition) and in the professions of faith; it becomes evident that this was a consistent belief of the ancient church, and in general it was specified by three components: it is an eschatological event that will take place "on the last day" at the second coming of Christ; it is universal, in the sense that everyone will rise again; it includes the idea of a simultaneous identity and newness of the body (*Resurget non aliud corpus, quamvis in aliud*: *Hilary of Poitiers, *In ps.* 2,41). This faith established ancient Christianity's litmus test especially working within Greek thought, which, anchored in spiritualism, would not allow the corporeal or the sensible to reenter as a good for humanity. After the phase of defending the resurrection had been overcome, the question reemerged in specifying the modality of the risen body and how it might be imagined. But let us take a look at its developments.

In the writings of the Apostolic *Fathers, the resurrection of the body was often referred to as the true life, of which the resurrection of Christ is the beginning, the pledge and the model. *Clement of *Rome sought to find analogies by appealing to the rhythms of nature and the history of the *phoenix and by basing it on quotations from the OT. *2 Clement* derives an exhortation to chastity from it. Through passing allusions to it, we find the traditional primary affirmations.

The same approach occurs in the writings of the *Apologists, with further developments to be found in the writings of *Tatian (*Or. ad Graecos* 6 and 13), *Justin Martyr's *Apologies* and his dialogue that contains a *millenarist development (80-83), in the fragments of a treatise titled *De resurrectione*, falsely attributed to Justin, in the writings of *Theophilus of Antioch and in *Melito of Sardis.

The first important treatise on the resurrection of the dead was the *De resurrectione* by *Athenagoras: its authenticity, which has been rejected by R. Grant, who sees in it—wrongly we believe—a response to *Origen, has been defended by L. Barnard, E. Bellini and J. Vermander for good reasons. The work was a *lectio publica*, a lecture probably delivered before a *pagan crowd to demonstrate that faith in the resurrection is not absurd according to reason: therefore, the treatise is not based on revelation and does not contain any scriptural citations, with the exception of some allusions. Constructed according to all the rules of rhetoric, it first eliminates all the counterarguments—God does not want or is not able—and then moves on to the positive arguments. The first part shows a rather crass understanding of the resurrection because the major problem is this: if an animal eats a human being and then another human being eats the same animal, in the resurrection then, to whom will the elements of the first body which then passed into that of the second human belong? The arguments contained in the second part are more convincing because they are essentially based on the fact that human beings are simultaneously body and spirit.

*Irenaeus specifically treats the resurrection in book 5 of the *Adversus haereses*. It contains a traditional and rather complete doctrine supported by apologetic arguments, permeated by a millenarism expressed especially with a surprising citation from a work of *Papias (V, 33,3-4), of which he fully approves. *Clement of Alexandria did not discuss this topic. *Tertullian, however, dedicated an important treatise to it, *De resurrectione*, which was written while he was under the influence of *Montanism but still had not yet broken ties with the mainstream church. He reacts against the allegorical interpretations of the resurrection that were specific to the *gnostics, especially *Marcion and his disciple *Apelles, *Basilides and *Valentinus. After an introduction, in which he focuses on the opponents of the resurrection and praises the dignity of the body (1-17), in the first part he offers a magisterial explanation of the scriptural arguments (18-55), and in the second (56-62) he explains how, through the working of God, this same body that has suffered here is no longer subject to death and suffering, and examines the problems that arise from this argument.

Origen's teaching on the resurrection is present in almost all his works: his treatise *De resurrectione*, which was written during his younger years, has been lost with the exception of a few fragments. His teaching contains many important and traditional elements, but it was primarily his understanding of the resurrected body, an understanding that was misrepresented by later scholars, that created a scandal. This teaching attempted to demonstrate the existence of both an identity and an otherness between the earthly body and the glorious body, according to the example of the seed and the plant mentioned in 1 Cor 15:34-44. This teaching, moreover, is attentive to information that seems to have escaped his predecessors, that is, the fluid character of the earthly body, which cannot be defined by its ever-changing material elements. The glorious body that will be endowed with an ethereal quality is the same earthly body with its rigid

quality: the same, with respect to its substance, although different in quality. The permanence of the earthly body in the different moments of its existence and the permanence between the earthly body and the glorious body are expressed both with the *Stoic notion of seminal reason (*rationes seminales*)—that expresses in philosophical language the Pauline notion—and the Platonic term of *eidos* (form), the metaphysical principle of the unity and identity of the body. This term, which is understood by *Methodius in his treatise *De resurrectione* according to the common meaning of outward appearance, became the cause of a profound interpretive error that would have repercussions in later centuries. The millenarism and anthropomorphism of Methodius, even if near to those of his predecessors, certainly could not accept a teaching constructed precisely in relation to millenarism and anthropocentrism.

In the writings of the Valentinian gnostics, the cosmos and history are the moments of recovery of the "divine dispersed seeds," the moments of their deliverance by means of gnosis by the cosmos (= the visible, the material), through a salvation that will consist of reintegration of all that is divine that has fallen into matter; the moments of the *apocatastasis are the restoration of everything to its original condition: the reconstitution of the scattered members of God (*Ev. veritatis* 41,28-29). In a Letter to *Reginus, the resurrection is gnosis, that is, the reawakening of the spiritual ego in the gnostic: the moment of the rising from the dead to return to the kingdom of light, that original kingdom of one's existence in the *pleroma (in Erbetta, ed., I/1, 244-248). The anonymous author rejects the psychic resurrection, that is, the resurrection of the soul and the resurrection of the body as a biological continuity. The only reality is the spiritual resurrection of the living members, that is, of thought, mind and pneuma (spirit). The gnostic vision is to be placed on the level of the interior man, the spiritual man; even Origen's understanding is similar but with the exception of the resurrection of the body. Irenaeus's vision and that of Justin and the Apologists, however, falls within the Jewish apocalyptic vision: a belief in the millennium, the end of the world as a cosmic tragedy, the end of the empire and the appearance of the *antichrist. Origen overcame this tradition and tended to interiorize the end of the millennium (*Princ.* 2,11,2) and the end of the world as the unleashing of cosmic events. Apocalyptic themes, he believed, were not that important. He even spoke of the heavenly *Jerusalem as the provisional place until the number of the righteous be completed, but it is not the place of the millennial beliefs where the just people risen with Christ will live for a thousand years before passing into eternity definitively, although there is the opportunity for the righteous to progress in their understanding of God.

The book of Revelation, according to the different interpretation that Christian authors from *Asia Minor gave to it (e.g., Irenaeus) on the one hand, and the Origenists on the other, marked the major schools of thought with regard to the understanding of the resurrection of the dead or the body in ancient Christianity. In the East, the book was read without the preoccupation of seeing it as a unitary text, focusing the reader's attention instead toward an allegorical reading of the images and the individual passages; in the West, however, it was read as a succession of real events (*Victorinus of Petovium and *Tyconius) in light of the theory of the *recapitulation. After Origen, the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the body were passed down as categories of truth without creating much of a problem. With the Constantinian peace, interest in the afterlife waned and historical time acquired space in reflection on the faith (*Eusebius of Caesarea). In the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers, the future has special value for its ethical interests given the moment of judgment that awaits all. In the West, there was also the emphasis on the eschatological problem as a moral problem, which was especially tied to the book of *Daniel, which spoke of the fourth kingdom (2:40).

From all this, *Augustine's contribution stands out in particular because he created a synthesis between Asiatic and Alexandrian Christianity. Because he considered the *eschaton* to be that which is perfect, he conceived of the human being's ultimate destiny as the destiny of the body-soul, a unity that, to be happy, must be saved in its entirety. He rejected the Platonist thesis on human blessedness being tied to liberation from the body—and which therefore saw a possible resurrection of the body as an evil (*Ep.* 166,9,27)—and the sarcasm of *Porphyry and his followers regarding the Christians' faith in the resurrection (*Civ. Dei* 13,16,1). Augustine's thesis rested on two arguments: (1) the body, as such, is not an obstacle to happiness, but only that body that has fallen into mortality and corruptibility following the sin of the first parents (*Civ. Dei* 13,16,1 and 24; *En. in ps.* 141,17-19); (2) the soul, the vital principle of the body, does not fall into the body because of a previous fault (*Gen. ad litt.* 7,27,38; *De imm. animae* 15,24), but naturally tends toward it. In fact, even after death there remains in it "the natural appetite to govern the body that slows it down, in a certain sense, and hinders it from proceeding with all its might toward

the highest heaven" (*Gen. ad litt.* 12,36,68). Augustine overcame the stumbling block of the Platonic understanding of the body as the prison of the soul by introducing the category of the hierarchy of body-soul-God. The soul can actualize itself only by contact with the body, which, on the scale of being, has its own dignity. It is, therefore, not actualized by rejecting the body but by restoring the order destroyed, in other words, what will take place with the resurrection of the body (*De musica* 6,5,13). The risen body will recover its sanctity, but its real state will only be known when it is experienced. Augustine, therefore, was not slow in theorizing about the modalities of the risen body; the *eschaton* represented for him a given of the faith. What constituted the drama for Augustine was historical time, the state of human existence before the *eschaton*.

DTC 13, 2504-2572; A. Fierro, *Las controversias sobre la resurrección en los siglos II-V*: RET 28 (1968) 3-21; T. van Eijk, *La Résurrection des morts chez les Pères Apostoliques*, Paris 1974; P. Siniscalco, *Ricerche sul* De resurrectione *di Tertulliano*, Rome 1966; H. Crouzel, *La doctrine origénienne du corps ressuscité*: BLE 81 (1980) 175-200, 241-266; M. Alfeche, *The Basis of Hope in the Resurrection of the Body According to Augustine*: Augustiniana 36 (1986) 240-296; G. af Hällström, *Carnis resurrectio. The Interpretation of a Credal Formula*, Helsinki 1988; B. Pouderon, *Athénagore d'Athènes, philosophe chrétien*, Paris 1989; Id., *Athénagore et Tertullien sur la résurrection*: REAug 35 (1989) 209-230; *Athénagore, Supplique au sujet des chrétiens; et sur la résurrection des morts*, introd., texte et tr. par B. Pouderon, Paris 1992 (SC 379); H.E. Lona, *Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches. Studien zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie*, Berlin-New York 1993; S. Sabugal, *Anástasis. Resucitó y resucitaremos*, Madrid 1993; E. Puech, *La Croyence des Esséniens en la vie future. Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* 2 vols., Paris 1993; A. Wartelle, *Saint Justin, philosophe et martyr, De resurrectione.* Intr. et tr.: BAGB 1993, 66-82; C. Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*, New York 1995; M.J. Edwards, *Origen's Two Resurrections*: JTS 46 (1995) 502-518; B. Pouderon, *Le "De resurrectione" d'Athénagore face à la gnose valentinienne*: RecAug 28 (1996) 145-183; K. Schneider, *Studien zur Entfaltung der altkirchlichen Theologie der Auferstehung*, Bonn 1999; *Augustine Through the Ages*, ed. A. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 722-723; *Origene, Dizionario*, ed. A. Monaci Castagno, Rome 2000, 401-405; *Pseudo-Giustino, Sulla resurrezione. Discorso cristiano del II secolo*, ed. A. D'Anna, Brescia 2001 (cf., B. Pouderon, Apocrypha 13 [2002] 245-256); *Pseudojustin über die Auferstehung, Text und Studie*, ed. M. Heimgartner, Berlin 2001; *Tertulliano, La resurrezione della carne*, ed. P. Podolak, Brescia 2004; C.J. Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity. Doctrine, Community, and Self-definition*, Boston 2004; A.F. Segal, *Life After Death. A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West*, New York 2004.

H. Crouzel - V. Grossi

RETICIUS of Autun (d. ca. 334). Reticius was certainly not the first bishop of *Autun, but he appears as such in the medieval lists of the city's earlier bishops. He authored one of the first Latin *commentaries on the *Scriptures and the *Song of Songs, and a document against *Novatian. *Jerome mentioned his commentary on the Song of Songs (*Ep.* 5,2; 37,1-4; *Vir. ill.* 82) but maintained that its style was its only redeeming feature. Its content seemed to him to be "ridiculous and absurd." The commentary on the Song of Songs, however, was still known in the 12th c. to Berengarius of Poitiers, who preserved a fragment of it (*Liber apologeticus pro Petro Abaelardo*: PL 178, 1864B). In the writings of St. *Augustine, a citation taken from Reticius's treatise against Novatian has been preserved. Augustine praised Reticius because he openly acknowledged the idea of original *sin (*C. Iulian.* 1,3,7 = *C. Iulian. op. imperf.* 1,55). The two treatises seem to have been lost. Reticius also enjoyed the esteem of *Constantine, who sent him along with a couple of other bishops of *Gaul to the Council of *Rome (313), then to the Council of *Arles (314). *Gregory of Tours delivered an enthusiastic elegy about his life (*Glor. conf.* 74). It seems that he died around 334. He was buried in the same sarcophagus as his wife in the cemetery of Autun. The *Mart. hier.* set his feast day on 15 July, although at Autun it was celebrated on 20 July, and the Bollandists placed it on the 19th.

CPL 77-78; Verzeichnis [4]1995, 730; Ch. Sapin, *Les tombeaux des premiers évêques et l'occupation chrétienne du cimetière d'Autun, archéologie du site*, in *La Bourgogne. Actes du 109e Congrès national des Sociétés savantes* (*Dijon 1984*), Archéologie I, Paris 1985, 113-129; R. Herzog - P.L. Schmidt (hrsg.), *Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, V, Munich 1989, 419 (§ 576); BBKL 8, 57-58; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, Paris [2]1964, 188-190.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

REUSE. The term *reuse* (with its synonym *reemployment*) entered into the archaeological and historical-artistic lexicon in reference to the practice by which ancient architectural, sculptural, epigraphic materials, and also buildings, spaces and forms of the artistic lexicon become the subject of a total or partial recovery that places them in the context of a destination functionally different from their original ones, conferring on them new meanings. As such, it is a distinct phenomenon from their most elementary use as construction material, or for the calcination of whole or fragmentary architectural elements originating from demolitions and the different ways of occupying a site present in every context for the continuity of life. Reuse was not uncommon in the prevailing speculative perspective of the Roman age, and it was well known in the Middle Ages, when the

reuse of Roman* sarcophagi for tombs of high ranking persons or for the burial of relics (and consequently as the bases of the altar), or in the walls, the visible presence of ancient elements (the Dome of Pisa, the cathedrals of Modena and Genoa; the collegiate church of St. Feliu at Gerona; the cathedral of *Tarragona) acquired precise ideological as well as aesthetic values (Esch 1969 and 1998; Greenhalgh 1989; Settis 1986; De Lachenal 1995). This was no less the case in Late Antiquity (3rd-6th c.), a period of the most significant examples of materials acquiring new uses and meanings that were from time to time practical, economic, ideological, cultural and bundled up into the term "spoils," from the Latin term *spolia*, that is, lot, plunder, etc., by which people would refer to reused materials.

The best known and most discussed example of reuse is the arch of *Constantine at *Rome (315), where sculptures and reliefs from the time of *Trajan, *Hadrian and the Antonian age were reused. However, recovered reliefs and architectonic elements were likewise used at Rome in the *arcus novus* and in the baths of *Diocletian (end of the 3rd–beginning of the 4th c.) and subsequently, between the 4th and 5th c., for the restoration of public buildings after the sack completed by the *Visigoths in 410, as well as a support for commemorative, celebrative or even imperial epigraphs. Nevertheless, it was in Christian artistic production that the practice of reuse became most apparent.

The attention of scholars was initially focused on the transformation of the temples into churches (Deichmann 1939) and the reuse of architectural materials in the buildings of the first and middle imperial age (Deichmann 1940), which was documented especially at Rome because of the conspicuous extent of the early Christian foundations and their state of conservation. Columns, foundations, capitals, lintels and decorative architectural elements from the 2nd-3rd c. were used in Constantine's chief constructions known today for their high standards (the *basilica Lateranensis*, S. Giovanni in Laterano, with the ancient baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte; St. *Peter's Basilica); in the mausoleum of S. Costanza, who was the emperor's daughter (today the church of S. Costanza); in the subsequent churches of S. Sabina (422–432), S. Maria Maggiore (432–440), S. Pietro in Vincoli, (432–440), S. Stefano Rotondo (3rd quarter of the 5th c.), in the remodeling, shortly after 441, of the basilica of St. *Paul's Outside the Walls. The presence of conspicuous reused materials in the church of S. Lorenzo of *Milan (during the middle decades of the 5th c.: the marble portal applied to the entryway of the chapel of St. Aquilino, from the 2nd half of the 1st c. AD, columns and capitals of the 1st-2nd c. in the church of St. *Hippolytus and in the colonnade facing the street) attests that the practice was not limited to Rome, given the fact that elsewhere it was confirmed by fragments of Roman architectural materials that were found in association with the remains of early Christian churches.

For a long time reuse was considered to be a sign of the decline of the Roman world that was no longer capable of assuring the preservation of its own monumental patrimony or of producing something *ex novo*, apart from exceptional cases. This understanding is no longer considered correct; rather, reuse is understood as the outcome of complex motives generated by the dynamics of transformation of the political, social, economic, religious and cultural order that marked Late Antiquity. Marble architectural materials (though not forgetting the reuse of bricks), moreover, were widely available because of the deterioration of Roman monuments that were no longer maintained following the loss of their functions; forums, basilicas, porticos and other public buildings no longer represented the centers for the gathering of communities whose lifestyle had changed. In addition, with respect to Rome, materials were available from the stocks of the storerooms, supplied until the 2nd-3rd c., with regularity and in a measure greater than what was needed, from the chief quarry zones (Alpi Apuane, the Aegean Islands and *Asia Minor). It is not always easy to specify whether it was from these deposits or the systematic stripping of the interiors of random public buildings that the homogenous conglomerates of columns and capitals (such as those reused at S. Sabina and part of that reused at S. Stefano Rotondo) emerged. The true and proper remains were generally characterized by putting together materials that were different in form, manufacturing and chronology; generally speaking, the layout was not haphazard, but followed criteria of symmetry, rhythmic correspondence—however conceived—frequently "hierarchical," in the sense that the materials of greatest value were placed in the most significant positions from the architectural and liturgical point of view (the colonnade within the mausoleum of Costanza, the area of the triumphal arch in St. Peter's Basilica, the presbytery of the basilica of St. Lawrence Outside the Walls). In a conception entirely different from the classical period, the multiplicity of forms and orders of the capitals (*varietas*) should be understood as a sign of ostentation and fastidious refinement. Although without undervaluing the economic aspect of reuse (though the disassembly, transference

and reassembly of architectural materials demanded expenditures that cannot be ignored), it is evident that the reuse accompanied the prevailing of a new aesthetic dimension and that the appropriation of monumental signs of the past acquired a precise cultural and symbolic meaning: it is not by chance that the *spolia* were highlighted with respect to the materials manufactured *ex novo*.

The transformation of *pagan temples into churches should be situated in the prevailing ideological perspective, even if it is more nuanced than may appear at first sight. The imperial legislation, which in 391 imposed the closure of the temples (CTh 16,10,11), did not include provisions for their demolition, with the exception of the rural sanctuaries, where demolition was intended to prevent the celebration of pagan rites; rather, it required their safekeeping as a public good in the aesthetic sense as the contribution to the urban furnishing as well as the patrimonial furnishing, as the jurisdiction of the taxing authority (*ius patrimonii* or the *ius publicum)*, which alone could make use of it, eventually even to the advantage of the church; this, obviously, did not exclude some abuses. In hagiographical texts, the construction of churches in the places of destroyed temples was a recurring motif, starting from the *Life of St. Martin of Tours*, which was written shortly after his death (397) by *Simplicius Severus. In fact, the destruction of pagan sanctuaries is attested starting from the official recognition of the church and with its gradual consolidation into the empire until the point that it became the official religion of the Roman state (380). However, for a rather long time it remained a transient fact, more frequent in the Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire and connected to specific situations (*Syria, *Egypt) and moments (as in the case of the dramatic end of the 4th c., when the pagan reaction was the strongest), and it was not always followed by the construction of a place for Christian worship. When this did occur, it involved a total substitution, as in *Jerusalem, where the structure of the Holy Sepulcher built by *Constantine (between 326 and 336) took the place of a temple attributed to the Greek goddess Aphrodite (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3,26), the ruins of which had been removed, or at Gaza, for the church constructed by the Empress *Eudoxia on the site of the *Marneion* (which was destroyed in 402 by order of the emperor), which was purified with fire; the materials from the temple of Baal and Baalbek, however, were reused for the construction of the church; the significance of the substitution was emphasized at Gaza by the use of the temple's marble elements to pave the atrium facing the church, and at Baalbek by the placement of the nave over the pagan altar.

Despite the evidence of these and other similar occurrences, the very deep-rooted and traditional opinion, which has even been reaffirmed (Vaes 1984–1986 and 1989), that would maintain that the spread of Christianity brought with it a strong, and even violent, opposition to all signs of paganism and therefore in particular to the temples, with a precocious and generalized desecration of the pagan sanctuaries, is not confirmed by either the textual sources or by archaeological discoveries. In many cases referenced in the bibliography, the temple-church sequence is affirmed on the basis of the premise that considers this succession obvious; even the Constitution of 435 (CTh 16,10,25), which theoretically obligated the destruction of the temples, made provisions for their purification with the affixing of the text *venerandae Christianae religionis signum*, with a form of exorcism therefore and not a recasting of their use, as is usually affirmed. It was only between the 5th and the 6th c. that the practice of recovering sacred pagan buildings by consecrating them with fitting adaptations for Christian worship became more frequent, especially in Greece and in the West, often undertaken after a period of abandonment for a shorter or longer period (e.g., the transformation of the following buildings into churches: the Capitolium of Trieste; the temple of Athena at Syracuse; the temple of Concordia at Agrigento, Sicily, in the year 597; the temples of the Acropolis, the Erechtheum and the Parthenon, and the Hephaisteion of Athens, between the end of the 6th and the 7th c.; the temple of Apollo at Delphi; the Pantheon in 608 by Pope *Boniface IV, upon receiving authorization from the emperor Phocas). In the same chronological horizon, one should situate *Benedict's construction of the oratory of St. *Martin on the acropolis of Monte Cassino upon the temple of Apollo and the church of St. *John the Baptist on its peak near the altar of the pagan god, and *Gregory the Great's exhortation to Augustine of Canterbury, a missionary among the Angles, to convert the local pagan temples to places of Christian worship.

In fact, the archaeological documentation clearly attests that especially in the 4th-5th c., churches were preferably built on the sites of structures that were previously profane, public or private, from which they very often reused mortar elements in a varying amounts according to the type of building and its conformity to Christian liturgical demands: the basilicas were adapted (*Tipasa; *Sabratha; *Leptis Magna; *Bostra), public buildings of a certain function (Rome, Sts. Cosmas and Damian), thermal rooms (Rome, St. Pudentiana; Madauros; Cimiez;

Albenga; but this was also the case even in the 16th c. of the Roman church of S. Maria degli Angeli, which was produced by Michelangelo in the cooling room of the baths of *Diocletian), storerooms (Aquileia), esp. residential buildings that were often homes (*domi*) of the aristocracy (Florence; Parentium; Luni; Martigny; *Narbonne; the Roman churches of St. *Chrysogonus; St. *Clement, Holy Cross in *Jerusalem, St. *Andrew in Catabarbara, which no longer exists) at times belonging to public officials (Aosta; Geneva), with rooms wide enough to supply a framework adequate for the construction of a church. Usually, the church's reuse of earlier buildings or the areas occupied by them had to occur within the framework of the current legislation on property, both public and private, which appears to have been especially attentive to safeguarding the monuments of each city, of which the temples were an integral part. The legistlation also aimed at preventing the abusive acquisition by private citizens of public lands and buildings, while retaining the ability to grant to private citizens public buildings lying in ruins or useless, or to transfer them—all to the advantage of the municipal coffers (Janvier 1969; Cantino Wataghin 1999, with an analysis especially of the *Codex Theodosianus* XV and XVI). The frequency with which the restrictive provisions were repeated is a likely indication of substantial abuses; this is no reason to think, however, that the church was responsible for them. Constantine's granting of the areas of the *castra nova equitum singularium*, the emperor's cavalry guard, for the construction of the Lateran basilica, and his turning over of the necropolis to the same military body to be used as the cemetery for the basilica of Sts. *Marcellinus and *Peter on the Via Labicana, opened the way for further concessions both by the emperor and the local administrations (e.g., for the conversion of the civil basilicas into places for Christian worship).

The building of early Christian churches over private homes—numerically very relevant, even apart from the reuse of their walls—testifies to the important role of private donations in the organization of the "material structure" and in the establishment of the church's real estate holdings, which is widely confirmed, moreover, by the textual sources. It is not by chance that the best known ancient building for Christian worship originated from an adaptation of a private home, that is, the *domus ecclesiae* of *Dura Europos (*Syria, around 240). The disbursement of public property and the generosity of the faithful can be assessed by the number of public and private buildings in high-density urban centers that were made available for reuse or despoiling, though regulated at least formally by legal norms. Multiple factors were in play, including the loss of functionality for the public buildings; various private demographic crises; multiple residences in the hands of an individual owner; and ascetic lifestyle choices with the ensuing renunciation of one's own goods.

The reuse of private or public buildings fits in the broadest context of reuse (or Christianization) of spaces, which occurred any time a building for Christian worship took the place of another structure with a different functional purpose, thus changing the connotation of the pertinent area (urban or rural, where, often upon the initiative of the landowners, sectors of large villas were transformed into places of worship for private use, but also open to neighboring groups of people) and its role in the life of the community. Even in this aspect, pragmatism and ideology intertwined in a nexus in which the position of *Gregory the Great appears very telling. Gregory justified the consecration of pagan temples by proposing to *Augustine of Canterbury that this practice would present an opportunity for some to convert because the custom of visiting places traditionally identified as sacred would bring pagans to the church.

A further and different aspect of reuse pertains to the subjects of Roman *iconography, taken into Christian iconography with a reassignment of their meanings (Grabar 1969; Prigent 1995): subjects such as the shepherd bearing a wounded lamb or the fisherman, which occur frequently in bucolic settings of the Hellenistic tradition. The figure of the *orans* is a sign of *pietas* (godliness), which from time to time becomes a representation of the afterlife and symbol of the deceased and Christ, although the mythological images are taken as models of Christian figures such as Endymion for Jonah at rest under the arbor tree, the Muses for the Virtues, Deucalion for *Moses in the ark. This process inserted itself with little disruption into the maturing of Christian language from the ancient figurative tradition and culture.

In the transition from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages, the practice of reuse continued, but modified at least in part its own objects and their meanings. Monastic communities often took over rural Roman structures, which presumably had been abandoned and as such were not incompatible with the image of the "desert" in which the monastic spirituality recognized its own privileged place. Roman gems and precious stones present in the treasuries of cathedrals and abbeys were reused in the reliquaries (the Cross of "Desiderius": Brescia, S. Giulia-Museo della città) and book bindings; ivories were reused

for liturgical ends, such as the Barberini ivory (Paris, Louvre Museum), depicting the triumph of the emperor, perhaps *Justinian (527–565), carved in the 7th c. on a leaf that has a list of names, among whom were those such as the king of Austrasia, to be remembered in prayers during the course of the liturgical celebrations. The use of ancient columns conferred a special prestige on the buildings: to the intrinsic value of the material was then added to their value as a sign of a past that was perceived, as such, to carry recognized *auctoritas*.

F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern*: JDAI 54 (1939) 105-136; Id., *Säule und Ordnung in der frühchristlichen Architektur*: Römische Mitteilungen 55 (1940) 114-130; Id., *Chistianisierung* (*der Monumente*): RAC II, 1128-1230; Y. Janvier, *La législation du Bas-Empire romain sur les édifices publics*, Aix-en-Provence 1969; A. Esch, *Spolien. Zur Wiederverwendung antiker Baustücke und Skulpturen im mittelalterlichen Italien*: Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 51 (1969) 1-64; F.W. Deichmann, *Die Spolien in der spätantiken Architektur*, Munich 1975; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Transformation of Pagan Temples into Churches in the Early Christian Centuries*: Journal of Semitic Studies 23 (1978) 257-267; A. Grabar, *Les voies de la création en iconographie chrétienne. Antiquité et Moyen Âge*, Paris 1979; L. De Giovanni, *Chiesa e stato nel codice teodosiano. Saggio sul libro XVI*, Naples 1980; *Colloquio sul reimpiego dei sarcofagi romani nel medioevo* (*Pisa 5-12 settembre 1982*), ed. B. Andreae - S. Settis, Marburger Winckelmann-Programm 1983, Marburg 1984; B. Ward Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages. Urban Public Building in Northern and Central Italy AD 300–850*, Oxford 1984; J. Vaes, *Christliche Wiederverwendung antiker Bauten. Ein Forschungsbericht*: Ancient Society 15-17 (1984–1986) 305-443; S. Settis, *Continuità, distanza, conoscenza. Tre usi dell'antico*, in *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, III, *Dalla tradizione all'archeologia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 1986, 375-486; J. Vaes, *"Nova construere sed amplius vetusta servare." La réutilisation chrétienne d'édifices antiques* (*en Italie*), in *Actes du XI[e] Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (*Lyon-Vienne-Grenoble-Genève-Aoste 1986*), Vatican City 1989, 299-319; M. Greenhalgh, *The Survival of Roman Antiquities in the Middle Ages*, London 1989; L. Caballero Zoreda - J.C. Sánchez Santos, *Reutilizaciones de material romano en edificios de culto cristiano*, in *Cristianismo y aculturación en tiempos del Imperio Romano*: Antigüedad y Cristianismo (Murcia) 7 (1990) 431-485; Th. Mathews, *The Clash of Gods. A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*, Princeton, NJ 1993; P. Pensabene - C. Panella, *Reimpiego e progettazione architettonica nei monumenti tardo-antichi di Roma*: Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 66 (1993–1994) 111-283; P. Prigent, *L'art des premiers chrétiens. L'héritage culturel et la foi nouvelle*, Paris 1995; L. De Lachenal, *Spolia. Uso e reimpiego dell'antico dal III al XIV secolo*, Milan 1995; J.-P. Caillet, *La transformation en église d'édifices publics et de temples à la fin de l'Antiquité*, in *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale, de la fin du III[e] siècle à l'avènement de Charlemagne* (Actes du colloque tenu à l'Université de Paris X – Nanterre les 1, 2, et 3 avril 1993), ed. Cl. Lepelley, Bari 1996, 191-211; G. Cantino Wataghin, *La conversion de l'espace. Quelques remarques sur l'établissement matériel chrétien aux IV[e]-V[e] siècles, d'après l'exemple de l'Italie du Nord*, in *Clovis, Histoire et mémoire*, ed. M. Rouche, Paris 1997, 127-139; EAM 9 (1998) s.v. *Reimpiego*, 876-883; G. Cantino Wataghin, " . . . *ut haec aedes Christo Domino in ecclesiam consecretur." Il riuso cristiano di edifici antichi*, in *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego nell'alto medioevo*, XLVI settimana CISAM, Spoleto 1999, 673-749; P. Barresi - P. Pensabene -D. Truccini, *Materiali di reimpiego e progettazione nell'architettura delle chiese paleocristiane di Roma*, in *Ecclesiae urbis*, ed. F. Guidobaldi - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Rome 2002, 799-842; P. Fancelli, *Gli* spolia *tra architettura e restauro nelle chiese di Roma*, ibid., 843-858; S. Ciranna, *La lettura architettonica degli* spolia *nelle chiese di Roma*, ibid., 859-874; *Senso delle rovine e riuso dell'antico*, ed. W. Cupperi (Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia, S. IV, Quaderni, 14, 2002), Pisa 2004; H. Brandenburg, *Le prime chiese di Roma IV-VII secolo*, Milan 2004.

G. Cantino Wataghin

REVELATION. It is rather difficult to present the various patristic ideas on God's revelation. Conditioned perhaps too much by the discussions in the last two centuries, provoked by the critical and rationalist outlooks, and which on the Catholic side has even brought a dogmatic solution in the First Vatican Council (DS 3004-3007), we run the risk of easily introducing into the writings of the *Fathers a set of problems that were foreign to them. They in fact did not summarize either the totality of God's salvific action nor the content of the *Bible with the global concept of revelation. In particular, they did not discuss the possibility of a gratuitous manifestation of the divine mystery that is accessible only to supernatural faith. Neither did they set a limit on public revelation upon the death of the last apostle (DS 2421), admitting instead that the fullness of times that occurred in Jesus Christ would be recognized by faith only in virtue of a continual revelation by Christ himself, who is always present in his church. Actually, because the milieu in which they lived was very open to celestial interventions, even they tended to trace every form of knowledge about God (θεολογία, θεογνωσία) to some divine manifestation. They were of the view, therefore, partly under the influence of *Stoicism, that all creation was a revelation of God (see Stockmeier 28-29, and especially Herms).

In addition, the investigation on this topic reveals itself to be difficult because of the complexity of the biblical premises. The horizon between which the writings of the OT and those of the NT spoke of a dialogue with which the living God communicates to humankind, first to the people of Israel, then to all those who believe in Jesus, was differently understood by various authors. It can be nomist (covenant or law of the people delivered from Egypt), prophetic (a word that recalls God's fidelity), sapiential (a search on the meaning of human existence), rabbinic (interpretation of the Torah, the unique manifestation of the divine will), apocalyptic (an explana-

tion of the present in view of the future).

Lastly, patristic theology itself showed itself to be very complex. The vocabulary was far from uniform. It is therefore not enough to mention the terms ἀποκάλυψις, φανέρωσις, *revelatio* and similar terms. One must also consider εὐαγγέλιον, οἰκονομία, μυστήριον, γνῶσις, παιδεία, παράδοσις and other common images such as word, divine voice, vision, inspiration and others. The theological positions of the individual authors also diverge from one another because they correspond to the different conditions of their communities, the multifaceted objections of the Jews, *pagans and *heretics, and their various personal situations (the experience of conversion, culture, etc.). Moreover, the comprehensive monographs on this topic are rather sparse (Stockmeier, *Offenbarung*, 29-30; see now Herms).

As in other fields, in this one as well, the apostolic fathers did not abandon the early perspectives (Stockmeier, 30-37). Expectation of an imminent parousia did not cease to dominate their interests. They were therefore anticipating the final revelation of Christ. They also faced the question of the *secundum scripturas* of Jesus's destiny, by supposing that the events narrated by the biblical writings as well as these very writings themselves constituted a revelation from God. They also insisted that the Christian life be conformed to the commandments of Jesus, as well as to his example as a true teacher. Therefore they did not develop many of the teachings of the apostolic tradition, although we do find them inserted within various contexts of their religious context. *1 Clement*, in fact, goes so far as to compare the oracles and divine manifestations in paganism to the biblical testimonies (25–26; 53), recalling the eternal origin of the divine actions that lead to peace (19,2) and seeing in the cosmic order the model of communal life (60–61). By harmonizing therefore the divine manifestations in the creation with those of salvation history, God makes himself known in the end solely through the work of Christ, which was begun at the beginning of creation and continued in the history of Israel (59,3). *Ignatius, for his part, was innovative. Opposing the adversaries who supported their claims unilaterally on the Hebrew Bible, he presented the mysteries of the life of Jesus, who was foretold by the prophets, as the true document of faith (*Philad.* 8,2; 9,2). The sacred Scriptures, therefore, belonged to Christians inasmuch as they proclaim the fullness of times and therefore obtain the true meaning of the gospel (*Magnes.* 8,2; *Philad.* 9,2). Along with other apostolic fathers (*1 Clem.* 7,2), he moreover understood the gospel as tradition. Lastly, the *Shepherd* of *Hermas delivered heavenly revelations to the church, which is symbolized by an old woman (*Vis.* 1–3). It thus expressed the conviction of the early Christians that God continued to manifest himself especially when they were gathered in prayer.

The 2nd c. was characterized by the intensified Christian confrontation with the Jewish and pagan worlds (Stockmeier, 37-45). The Jews contested the Christian use of the Bible and therefore the messiahship of Jesus (Just., *Dial.* 48-108). The Greco-Roman world, though being open to oracles and every form of heavenly manifestation, rejected the exclusivity of the Christian religion, which was based on the actual incarnation of a son of God (Just., *2 Apol.* 13; 54-55; Orig., *C. Cels.* 5,2). Pagans especially called into question the late arrival of Christ, who Christians maintained was the savior of all people (Just., *1 Apol.* 46; *Diogn.* 9). In this context, Christian authors were led to offer the first thematization of divine revelation. The question of the Bible, the primary source of revelation, found a radical response in the *Letter of *Barnabas*. As Christ reveals himself in the Christian community (6,14ff.; 16,9), the Holy Scriptures lose their value. These Scriptures were none other than the prophecy of the coming of Christ (7,1). *Marcion's response (d. ca. 160) was even more exclusive. Resorting to the Pauline antithesis of law and gospel, he not only rejected the Bible of the Jews but also, opposing creation and redemption, spoke only of a revelation of the Savior-God (*Adv. M.* I, 19,1). The reaction against him did not appear fully until the end of the 2nd c.

The pagan opposition, on the other hand, obligated the *Apologists to demonstrate the convergence of the Christian message with the learned thought of that time. The purpose of this was obviously to emphasize through philosophical categories the uniqueness of the subsequent revelation in Jesus Christ. But as the *Jewish-Hellenistic tradition had already done earlier, the defenders of the Christian religion were also busy with the completely spiritual knowledge of God, thus reinforcing the intellectual aspect of the divine revelation. The most effective response to the pagan objections and even those of the Jews was *Justin Martyr's theology of the Logos. He maintained more strongly than the other Apologists that Christians possessed the entirety of the truth in Jesus Christ. After having appeared to the ancient fathers and having spoken to them through the *prophets (Just., *1 Ap.* 63,15-16; *Dial.* 127,4; Theoph., *Autol.* II, 22), as well as after having established every type of learning and just legislation in the pagan world (Just., *2 Apol.* 10), the Logos of God, by becoming incarnate, made himself

the definitive and complete word of God to the Christians (Just., *2 Apol.* 7[8],3). The cosmic aspect, included in this theology of the Logos, was reinforced by other Apologists who insisted on the sense of Rom 1:19-20 regarding the revelation through creation (Theoph., *Autol.* I, 5; Aristides, *Apol.* 15,3).

The idea of the incarnation of the Logos, the supreme manifestation of God, was subsequently elaborated by antignostic authors (Stockmeier, 45-57). When confronting pretensions to a perfect *gnosis reserved only for the spiritual, who, thanks to the coming of the heavenly Savior, recognize their affinity to God without however seeing the transcendent God, as well as facing the rejection of the goodness of the visible creation and therefore the history of Israel as well, Irenaeus aimed to establish the unity of the salvific economy. Indeed, he located the *dispositio libera* of God, the creator of all things, in the incarnation of the Son of God (*Adv. haer.* III, 16,6). The *christological economy, in which the Son reveals the *Father and the Father reveals the Son (*Adv. haer.* IV, 6,1-7: on Mt 11:27), along with the other entirely gracious divine manifestations, would lead humankind in the second resurrection, through a wonderful pedagogy (*Adv. haer.* V, 1,1), to the vision of the immortal God (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20,5). He also demonstrated that Holy Scriptures—the four gospels and the apostolic letters, interpreted, however, only in accord with to the *regula fidei* maintained in the churches of apostolic origin (*Adv. haer.* III, 1,1; III, 24,1)—established the authentic testimony of revelation, which began in the kingdom of the Spirit and extended in the kingdom of the Son, but will be definitively completed in the kingdom of the Father (*Adv. haer.* IV, 20,1-2).

In similar conditions, but also in part new ones, *Tertullian adopted the theology of Irenaeus. He transplanted it, however, into the Latin world. He introduced the term *revelare*, which would enjoy great success. He adopted the Latin category of truth and with it the idea of its ancient origin, that is, the divine authority present in the Bible, Christ, the *apostles and in the church's **regula fidei* (*Praescr.* 6; 32; 37; 44). Reacting against Marcion, he insisted more on the possibility of knowing God starting from creation, without however overlooking the rule of faith (*Adv. Marc.* I, 18,2: *natura ex operibus—doctrina ex praedicationibus*). Confronting paganism, he emphasized—and this was rather new—the testimony of the soul (*Apol.* 17,6; *Test.* 2). By defending his adherence to *Montanism, Tertullian, though compromising his principles of tradition, maintained in some way the ancient conviction that God never ceases to reveal himself, and most important expressed his own idea of the supremacy of faith (*Monog.* II, 4).

Shortly after, the Alexandrians *Clement and *Origen followed the same antignostic line (Stockmeier, 57-65). Nevertheless, they focused much more on the legitimate aspirations of the gnostics, without betraying the demands of ecclesiastical teaching. They therefore elaborated a Christian gnosis. By adapting not only the *Platonic vision of the world but also the mysterious language taken from Greek *philosophy to biblical teaching, Clement developed a theology of divine pedagogy. The Logos is the believers' mystagogue, illuminating them esp. in *baptism (*Protr.* X, 94,2) and leading them in a continuous education in the knowledge of God and of himself (*Paed.* I, 6; I, 55,2; *Strom.* I, 52,3; III, 44,3; VII, 6,1). Moreover, Clement expressed the educational function of the Logos by presenting him as a true and unique revealer of the all-transcendent God (*Protr.* I, 10,3, with Mt 11:27). He saw in the Logos the key of the biblical revelation (*Paed.* I, 57,2; *Strom.* V, 32; V, 34,1) and likewise the criteria of true philosophy (*Paed.* I, 20,2; *Strom.* VI, 44,1), established on various orders in the creation (*Paed.* III, 100,1) and on human natural openness to the knowledge of God (*Protr.* X, 100,3; *Strom.* V, 87,2ff.). Thus Clement makes it known that the true gnosis comes from God's initiative (*Strom.* V, 82,4 and 9) and in the final analysis consists in a salutary dialogue with the incarnate Logos (*Protr.* I, 8,4).

Origen, for his part, following Clement's philosophical path, but depending more on the Bible and more faithful to the *regula fidei* delineated in a grandiose summary the gnoseological mediation of the Logos (Studer, *Rivelazione*). Wisdom, inasmuch as it is directed toward the Father, that is, knowledge that God has of himself, and the Word, in relation to the world, that is, the manifestation of God, the Logos, being present in all created things through him and acting even in all history, everywhere reflects the glory of God (*Princ.* I, 2,2-3). By adapting himself to human capacities, both as creature and as sinner, he placed in the incarnation in which he announced himself (*Comm. Ioh.* XIII, 28,165-171) the bases of the faith without which one can not return to the perfect vision of God (*C. Cels.* 6,68). Identifying the written word with the Logos, Origen saw in the Bible an ever-present coming of the Logos that foretold the eternal gospel, without reducing, however, the entirety of revelation to Scripture (*Philoc.* XV, 19). Though thereby stamping a very intellectual character onto his theology of divine revelation, he did not entirely overlook its historical dimensions. Christ, in fact, manifests himself as the great witness

that guarantees the credibility of those who recount the salvific economy of God (*C. Cels.* I, 45). Actually, Origen understood revelation as a dialogue between God and humankind. As in the case of the disciples, every believer converses with Christ, the Truth. He adopted this position on the basis of the words of Christ himself which were committed to the sacred Scriptures and preserved in the church (Studer, *Geschichte und Glaube*, and PA I, praef. 1-3).

This teaching of Origen on the mystery of the Logos survived in particular in the theology of *Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339). He conferred upon it, however, a political orientation by emphasizing the triumph of divine revelation, achieved by *Constantine, the earthly vicar of the eternal Word in the victory over paganism (Farina, *L'impero*). Before elaborating this political theology, Eusebius had already tried on the apologetic level to demonstrate the superiority of the Jewish religion with respect to the "theologies" of the nations (*Praep. ev.*) and the superiority of Christianity over Judaism (*Dem. ev.*) and to thus introduce the gospel (*Praep. ev.* I, 1,2-8). In this regard, he developed the idea that the οἰκονομία, which culminated in the incarnation of the Logos (*HE* I, 2,6-13), reveals the θεολογία, the doctrine of the Trinity (*HE* I, 1,7-8; *Dem. ev.* III, pr.; IV, 1; *C. Marc.* II, 2ff.). In the later writings against *Marcellus he would even insist on the fact that neither Plato, nor even Moses nor any angel nor any other power, but only Jesus Christ has revealed that the Father, the Son and the *Holy Spirit is the only God (*Eccl. theol.* III, 5; *Praep. ev.* XI, 14,1-6).

During the 4th c., the dogmatic controversies, which were sparked above all by the misunderstanding of Origen's teaching on the mediation of the Logos, led to a further philosophical elaboration of the biblical premises in question (Stockmeier, 66-75). Although *Arius placed the Logos-Christ on the level of creatures, and even denied him full knowledge of the Father (Athan., *Ar.* II, 22), the Nicene theologians recognized in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the shining image of the Father. They therefore established in his true divinity the possibility of an authentic revelation of the Father. Thus, *Athanasius considered the incarnation of Christ, the true God, as a guarantee of the divinizing gnosis, which had been definitively reestablished in humankind. The incarnation of the Logos made much more possible the perfect knowledge of God, a knowledge in which the corruption of death had been conquered, and thus the root of every previously insurmountable obstacle to access to God (*De incarn.* 9-14.54). This revelation of Christ was confirmed in baptism in which the Holy Spirit, gift and true God, illuminates the believer (*Ep. Serap.* I, 20).

*Apollinaris of Laodicea in his doctrine on the λόγος ἔνσαρκος proposed in an even more stringent way this same theory of *divinization (Mühlenberg, *Unendlichkeit*). *Hilary of Poitiers, however, reinterpreting Origen's idea of the Logos, *gloria Patris*, in light of the faith of Nicaea concisely states: *Summa dispensationis est Filio, ut noveris Patrem* (*Trin.* III, 22). In this approach to the mystery of the Logos, two things appear clearer than before: the vivid interest concerning the internal relationship between the Father and the Son (and the Holy Spirit) and the preference for the historic revelation over the cosmic. In the second phase of the Arian controversy, Athanasius (*Ep. Serap.* I, 17.20), and even more so *Basil and the other Cappadocian Fathers, emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit, who is likewise sent by God for the illumination of humankind (Basil, *De Spir. S.* 24,55ff.; *Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 31,26; *Greg. Nyss., *Vita Mos.* 2,158-159 and already Eusebius, *C. Marc.* I, 1). Basil, who was very well studied in the doctrine of the knowledge of God from creation (*Hexaem.* 1,6), moreover, did not cease to affirm that the knowledge of the existence of the divinity preceded faith in God (*Ep.* 235,1; see Eus. *Praep. ev.* I, 1,11). He presented a very broad concept of *paideia* that included the entire universe, with its institutions, as its environment. Lastly, the discussion on the true humanity of Christ, which had been compromised in the *Origenist tradition, helped to clarify the way in which the intimate union between the full divinity and humanity in Christ constitutes the supreme revelation of the divine mystery. *Cyril of Alexandria in particular attested to it. Constrained by the Antiochene tradition, he recognized without doubt the integrity of the assumed humanity of Christ but nonetheless vehemently maintained that the incarnation is the manifestation in the flesh (1 Tim 3:16) of Christ himself, who according to his nature is invisible (*Chr. un.*: SCh 97, 324), and that therefore the illumination of the knowledge of God the Father shines in the very person of Christ (*De recta fide* 32: PG 76, 1181B).

In the West, at the same time, *Marius Victorinus, with his *Neoplatonic approach to the mediation of the Logos (*Cand.* 14; *Ar.* I, 19), *Ambrose, with his *lex-evangelium* antithesis (*Psal.* 61,33; *Off.* I, 48,238), *Jerome, with his philological analyses of the *revelatio*, considered as a Christian word (Gal 1:12), and *Augustine, with his wide use of the patristic heritage and esp. his linguistic finesse (De Veer, *Revelare*), were not slow to place new emphases on the theology of revelation. They especially praised the absolute value of God's manifestation in Christ.

Augustine, in particular, heavily involved in a broad debate with African *Manicheans and confronted with Milanese *Neoplatonism, noticeably developed the principal teachings of the Christian tradition. On the one hand, he emphasized even more that Christ revealed the true meaning hidden in the books of the OT (Wieland, *Offenbarung*, 263ff.). On the other hand, he bases all knowledge of truth on Christ, the *magister interior* (*Mag.* 37-38; *Trin.* IV, 2,4), without denying Christ divine *auctoritas*, which, present in the Bible, the incarnation and the church, leads to faith without which the illumination of the heart is not possible (*Conf.* XI, 8; *Trin.* VII, 4; *Ciu.* X, 32). Even if Augustine, in the framework of his *Platonist vision of the world, does not seem to attribute much importance to the historic revelation of God (Studer, *Geschichte und Glaube*), nonetheless, in part under the influence of Latin rhetoric, in part even more under the impression of the *regula fidei* was able to overcome the risks of his philosophical position. He insisted, in fact, on the faith that was based on the *narratio rerum gestarum* (*Trin.* XII, 14,22; XIV, 15,21) and united *scientia* and *sapientia* in Christ. Thanks to Christ, God and humanity, historic knowledge is able to lead to the contemplation of eternal things (*Trin.* XIII, 19,24). Indeed, in the wake of the 4th-c. tradition, Augustine elaborated the theme of the economy (*dispensatio*) that reveals the eternal reality of the *Trinity.

Although in the West the Augustinian doctrine on divine revelation dominated until the Scholastic age, in the East, two theologians introduced new emphases. Under the influence of Neoplatonism, ps.-*Dionysius, by closely uniting creation and revelation, presented the universe as a gradual communication of the intimate secret of God (*Cael. hier.* IV, 1-2). Confirmation, however, through the Scriptures is the norm of all knowledge of the truth (*Eccl. hier.* V, 3,7). He sees truth guaranteed especially by the theandric life of Jesus Christ (*Ep.* 4). Correcting this heavily unitarian perspective, thanks to his fidelity to the *invidise-inconfuse* of the faith of *Chalcedon, *Maximus the Confessor for his part distinguished clearly not only between the Creator and creation but also between the creations's symbolic function and the divine reality symbolized by it (*Quaest. Thal.* 59), as appears especially in the incarnation that reveals in the world more strikingly the love of God and at the same time attests the full freedom of the human response.

Observing all the patristic developments of the complex biblical teaching on revelation, one primarily observes the great openness of the ancient theologians toward different phenomena of the divine manifestation and the entirely natural presupposition that God communicates to human beings (see Herms, 146ff.). In their own way, the gnostics were an exception because they denied the possibility of seeing the transcendent divinity, as well as *Arius, who extended his negative theology even to Christ. The difficulties that the Fathers had to combat, with the exception of the two aforementioned cases, did not pertain to the possibility of the gracious revelation of the interior life of God but rather to its concrete form, that is, the manifestation of God through the incarnation of the true Son of God, which was rejected by both the Jews and the gnostics and the non-Christian philosophers. Justin, Irenaeus, Athanasius and Maximus the Confessor, therefore, defended the incarnation as the supreme theophany. But neither Origen, Augustine nor ps.-Dionysius failed to emphasize that the Word, by becoming incarnate through *Mary, revealed himself and therefore even God the Father. Augustine especially emphasized that by believing in and loving the incarnate Son, who died and rose again, the Christian will come to see his divinity and in it the divinity of the Father (*Div. Quaes.* 69; *Trin.* II, 16,27–17,29).

This Christo- or Logos-centrism, however, took different forms. Some, if not all, emphasized the revealing presence of Christ in the church. Justin especially emphasized the conquering force of the Logos. Augustine considered the Logos to be the *magister interior*. Some of the church's teachers, such as Origen, emphasized the twofold action of the Logos: first, by becoming incarnate he revealed God in the past, and second, he has spoken through the Scriptures to the believers of every age. All the authors, however, also look at the incarnation in a future perspective, whether by considering it to be the basis of the spiritual ascent toward the eternal vision of God, or by recalling the central affirmation of the angel that the Son of Man would appear as judge of the living and the dead to definitively reveal the glory of God.

M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné*, Paris 1958; R. Latourelle, *L'idée de révélation chez les Pères de l'Église*: ScEc 11 (1959) 297-344; R. Braun, *Deus christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, Paris 1962; A.C. De Veer, *"Revelare – Revelatio"*: RecAug 2 (1962) 331-357; W. Pannenberg (ed.), *Offenbarung als Geschichte*, Göttingen [3]1965; R. Farina, *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea*, Zürich 1966; E. Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa*, Göttingen 1966; V. Hahn, *Das wahre Gesetz. Eine Untersuchung der Auffassung des Ambrosius von Mailand vom Verhältnis der beiden Testamente*, Münster 1969; P. Stockmeier, *Offenbarung in der frühchristlichen Kirche*, in HDG I/1a, Freiburg 1971, 27-87 (basic bibl.); M. Seybold, *Die Offenbarungsthematik in der Spätpatristik und Frühscholastik*, in ibid., 88-115; B. Studer, *Soteriologie der Kirchenväter*, in HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978, 55-225; R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et*

la vision de Dieu selon s. Irénée de Lyon, Münster 1978; W. Wieland, *Offenbarung bei Augustinus*, Mainz 1978 (bibl.); H. Ziebritzki, *Hl. Geist und Weltseele. Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Tübingen 1994; H. Herms, *Offenbarung*: TRE 25 (1995) 146-210 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Theologia – Oikonomia*: StudAns 124 (1997) 575-600; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *La terminologia misterica nel linguaggio della rivelazione in Origene*, in Id., *Origene e la tradizione origeniana in Occidente*, Rome 1998, 195-236; C. Reemts, *Vernunftgemässer Glaube. Die Begründung des Christentums in der Schrift des Origenes gegen Celsus*, Bonn 1998; B. Studer, *History and Faith in Augustine's* De Trinitate: StudAns 127 (1999) 329-373; A. Monaci Castagno, *Esoterico/essoterico*, in Origene. Dizionario, Rome 2000, 144-150; B. Studer, *Rivelazione*, in ibid., 409-414; B. Studer, *Geschichte und Glaube bei Origenes und Augustinus*, CSt 25 (2004) 1-24.

B. Studer

REVELATION, Book of. *See* *APOCALYPSE

REVERENTIUS. Lived in *Gaul between the 5th and 6th c. and can be placed in the context of Merovingian *hagiography for having written around 475 the *Life of *Hilary of Arles* (*Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis*), an encomiastic work attributed in the past to *Honoratus of *Marseille (*Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 99: PL 58, 1118-1120), which, among its various historical and antiquarian references, emphasizes the efficacy of the preaching and depth of the saint's teaching who was the head of the monastery of *Lérins.

CPL 506; BHL 3882; PL 50, 1219-1246; S. Cavallin, *Vitae SS. Honorati et Hilarii*, Lund 1952, 79-109; M. Corti, *Studi sulla latinità merovingia in testi agiografici minori*, Messina 1939, 11-14, 157-174; B. Axelson, *In vitas Honorati et Hilarii marginalia critica*: VChr 10 (1956) 157-159.

P. Marone

RHAETIA (Raetia). A Roman province between the Tridentine Alps and the Danube, lying in parts of modern-day Switzerland and the Bavarian highlands. As a result of *Diocletian's reorganization of the empire, Rhaetia was included among the *regiones* of *Italy and divided into *Rhaetia prima* and *Rhaetia secunda*. Few pieces of information remain on the spread of Christianity in this region, which had come from nearby *Noricum. One must conclude, however, that it was difficult for the religion to spread, since archaeological discoveries in the region have revealed the widespread attachment to the indigenous cults as well as cults from the East, esp. in *Rhaetia prima* (on this topic, see R. Degen, *Liechtenstein*, 202-222).

To date, we have definite information on three ancient episcopates: (a) *Augusta Vindelicorum* (Augsburg), where the martyrdom of St. Aphra occurred under Diocletian (MGH, *Scr. rer. mer.* 3,41-64; 7,192-204; and see the testimony of *Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita Martini*, vv. 640-644); (b) *Curia* (Chur), if at the Synod of *Milan (451) **Abundius*, bishop of Como, signed in the name of the absent *Asinius* or *Asimus*, *episcopus ecclesiae Curiensis* (Mansi 6,144); (c) *Sabiona* (Säben), whose bishop, *Ingenuus* or *Ingenuinus*, took part at the synod of Marianus (590) (MGH, *Scr. rer. lang. et it. saec. VI-IX*, p. 393; and see Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* III, 26). Moreover, one can garner a general idea on the conditions of *Rhaetia secunda* during the mid-5th c. from *Eugippius's *Vita s. Severini*, esp. chs. 15, 19-20, 22 and 27, where we learn of the existence of some Christian communities at *Quintanis* (Künzing) and at *Batavis* (Passau), whose *basilica*, however, was near *Boiotrus* (Innstadt), beyond the river Inn and therefore in Noricum. A few doubts have been expressed concerning another testimony from the *Vita* (ch. 41,1), namely on the figure of a bishop of Rhaetia named Valentinus (M. Heuwieser, *Geschichte des Bistums Passau*, 37ff.).

Soon after, under the continual invasions of the Germanic populations, *Rhaetia prima* ceased to exist. Even *Rhaetia secunda*, after having been incorporated into the Italian kingdom of *Odoacer, came under the rule of the Alamanni and the Bavarii. During the Merovingian and Carolingian eras, the entire region maintained its adherence to Christianity.

R. Heuberger, *Rätien im Altertum und Frühmittelalter*, Innsbruck 1932; A. Bigelmair, *Bavière*: DHGE 6, 1524-1528; M. Heuwieser, *Geschichte des Bistums Passau*, I, Passau 1939; EC 10, 842-843; H.-J. Kellner, *Augsburg, Provinzhauptstadt Raetiens*: ANRW II, 5.2 (1976) 708-717 esp.; R. Degen, *Liechtenstein zwischen Spätantike und Mittelalter*: HA 9 (1978) 202-222; K. Gamber, *Sarmannina. Studien zum Christentum in Bayern und Österreich während der Römerzeit*, Regensburg 1982, 7-57; F. Lotter, *Passau im Zeitalter Severins*: Ostbairische Grenzmarken 24 (1982) 1-23; V. Bierbrauer, *Arianische Kirchen in Noricum mediterraneum und Raetia II?*: Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter 63 (1998) 205-226.

V. Pavan

RHETORIC. Rhetoric involves the same conception of life in the classical and the Christian world. In Greece, the people whom the Latins called "orators" they called "rhetoricians" or "rhetors." In common, everyday speech, the term *rhetoric* is often used in a pejorative sense, to refer to at most an ornate form of discourse apart from its content. In recent years, however, rhetoric has overcome the negative phase

of identification with its vices and has been recovered as the nexus of content and determining form for evaluating the phenomena of artistic, literary and figurative expression. Well-known German scholars, starting from E.R. Curtius to L. Arbusow (*Colores rhetorici*, Göttingen 1963) and H. Lausberg, have uncovered the importance of theological and liturgical texts for literature and the importance of linguistic phenomena in the public life of antiquity. V. Florescu emphasized the dilemma that appeared during the early patristic era, "when the Word of God was considered to be so rich with intrinsic penetration as to be able to despise the subtle and complicated utterances of the verbal debate" (*La retorica*, p. 7).

For the ancients, besides the schooling immediately following grammar school that took its name from rhetoric, rhetoric was a constant relationship between form and content. Common to the classical-pagan and ancient Christian rhetoric was the condemnation of formal values without moral values. There was a universal rhetoric which human beings cannot escape, a rhetoric that does not obey the rigid norms of the textbooks. It was then generally the tendency to see in the figurative arts the norms of universal rhetoric suffused in various modes of artistic expression. This is particularly the case in *iconography which like a literary page cannot be seen in isolation from the natural patterns of semantics—that is, of signs that reveal the spontaneity of certain states of the mind. This was the line of the fathers of the church, well described by St. *Paulinus of Nola and *John of Damascus, to explain how there came to be such a wide-ranging appropriation of the *Bible, the so-called Bible of the poor.

The relationship between word and action was very close, indissoluble for the Christian. Gospel principles (Mt 12:36) affirm that human beings will render an account for every vain word on *Judgment Day. The fathers of the church seemed to say that if the truth of things depended on the ability of the speaker, the world would end in the triumph of lies. By insisting on the truthful word of the humble and simple spirit, the OT and the NT continually affirm that the perverse word expresses perverse customs. The central pivot of all patristic Christianity was the Holy *Scriptures, which from the spiritual point of view replaced the writings of Homer and Virgil. The ancient Christian authors thought and wrote biblically, a dimension that must not escape the scholars of ancient rhetoric. The church fathers are representative not of a decadent form of Christian *Greek and *Latin, but of a rich culture that generated new forms and new content.

Through biblical *exegesis, the Fathers followed more the idea of *sapientia* than *eloquentia*. They also used beautiful metaphors to refer to the immense *sapientia* found in the Bible. With Jesus Christ, a new world opened; the *studia liberalia* were not to be excluded, but they were not to be required. One could reach Christ from every walk of life, from manual labor to study. The humble slave, the farmer, the fisherman, the artisan, young and old, men and women, those from any social condition could live as did Christ, which is to understand Holy Scripture. The penetration into the biblical text by the fathers of the church and the community exerted great influence on the language that was undergoing gradual transformation to express another civilization. New forms and elements that the classical world had never known began to enter common speech. In rhetorical terms, one could say that there was an *elocutio* performing the function of the biblical *inventio*. It was the language of the biblical translations, the *liturgy and the *catechesis, in other words, the language of the community. The forms themselves also developed with the language. Christian sermons had to speak in everyday language. The proper characteristics of the various *genera dicendi*, which have their roots in gospel preaching, prevailed.

The biblical *commentaries, philologically speaking, were richer than the pagan commentaries on the classical works. In comparison to *Jerome, Servius was impoverished in elements of comparison and vocabulary and did not have a historical sense of language, nor Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew. In the writings of every Christian author, one can identify the skill learned at the school of rhetoric that was now moving in the direction of Scripture, finding further elements to develop there. Declamations in the form of *controversia*—speeches about legal cases—and *suasoria*—debates over historical topics, mythology and various aspects of culture—were presented as propaedeutic exercises for the moral life. Many aspects of declamations became themes for Christian authors. Even Christian readers went back to the use of declamations and reading aloud so that the sacred texts might be understood in order to be practiced. In the transformation of the Greek and Latin languages many new elements of meter quietly entered in that pertained to quantity and accent. *Augustine examined the phenomenon explaining many things on the modification of the accents in relation to the quantity, which was waning, and on *melos*. He would have written six books on *melos* if the circumstances had permitted. Instead, "the burden of church care on his shoulders," which as a bishop he had to bear, prevented him from so doing (*Ep.* 101,3).

The *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and philosophy) began to undergo profound changes. Reading the Fourth Book of Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* makes this clear. The Fathers were the first to catch a glimpse of the elements that were common to all people *naturaliter rhetorici*—patterns such as antithesis, parallelism, *gradatio*, *auxesis*, etc., but these elements also became a means of scriptural exegesis. Even the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy) enlarged and developed within the writings of ancient Christian authors.

The encyclopedism of *Isidore of Seville is certainly a separate case altogether. From the 3rd c., *Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, reached the height of mathematical knowledge (Eus., *HE* 7,32,6; ed. Schwartz). A few fragments have come down to us from his writings. He was in contact with Pappus, to whom we owe much if we know anything today about Euclid and Apollonius's works on higher geometry. Pappus was a convert, as one can deduce from the oath in which he affirmed that he believed in God the author of the OT and the NT. Anticipating the direction of analytic geometry, Augustine considered numbers to be the foundation of mathematics and the natural sciences. The theologian *John Philoponus was the author of well-known books on mathematics. The mathematics of the 5th and 6th c. follow the path of ancient Christianity. As an orator, *Boethius was induced to write on arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, which completes the quadrivium, the preparation for philosophy; his last book was the *Consolatio Philosophiae.* Ancient Christian rhetoric still needs to be explored for a deeper understanding of the evolution of the hard sciences, which also had their practical applications.

H. Lausberg, *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik*, Munich ²1967 (Ital. trans. Bologna 1969); Id., *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 2 vols., Munich ²1973; V. Florescu, *La Retorica nel suo sviluppo storico*, Bologna 1971; J.J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*, London 1974; G.A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, London 1980 (extensive bibl.); A. Quacquarelli, *Retorica e iconologia*, Bari 1982; *Retorica della Comunicazione nelle letterature classiche*, ed. A. Pennacini, Bologna 1990; R.A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, Berkeley, CA ²1991; S.M. Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homilies in Fourth-Century Christian Literature*, Atlanta 1991; A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. The Development of Christian Discourse*, Berkeley, CA 1991; *Historische Wörterburch der Rhetorik*, ed. G. Ueding, Darmstadt 1992–; *Medieval Rhetoric. A Select Bibliography*, Toronto ²1992; *Dimostrazione, argomentazione dialettica e argomentazione retorica nel pensiero antico*, ed. A.M. Battegazzore, Genoa 1993; A. Quacquarelli, *Retorica patristica e sue istituzioni interdisciplinari*, Rome 1995; L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*, 2 vols., Paris 1993; M.L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome. A Historical Survey*, New York ³1996; K. Demoen, *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen. A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics*, Lingua Patrum 2, Turnhout 1996; O. Reboul, *Introduzione alla retorica*, Bologna 1996; V.K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christians. Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*, London-New York 1996; *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S.E. Porter, Leiden 1997; M. Meyer, *La retorica*, Bologna 1997; G.A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, Chapel Hill ²1999; L. Pernot, *La rhétorique dans l'antiquité*, Paris 2000; C.W. Wooten, *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome*, Leiden 2001.

A. Quacquarelli

RHODANIUS of Toulouse. The sources that speak of Rhodanius, bishop of Toulouse, are unanimous in affirming that Rhodanius opposed the pro-Arian objectives of the emperor *Constantius II, who, upon becoming the sole emperor after 350, sought to obtain the signatures of the Western bishops to condemn *Athanasius, putting pressure on them, with the exception of six bishops: *Paulinus of Trier, *Eusebius of Vercelli, *Lucifer of Cagliari, *Dionysius of *Milan, Rhodanius of Toulouse and *Hilary of *Poitiers, who were exiled for this reason. Later, the sources provide us conflicting information about the council at which Rhodanius was exiled: *Jerome seems to identify it as the Council of *Arles (353), although *Rufinus (*Eccl. Hist. Continuatio* 10,20) and *Sozomen (*HE* 4,9), speak of just one synod (Milan) preceding that of *Rimini, where five bishops were exiled (among them Rhodanius), and add Hilary, as if he had been exiled on another occasion; the first five, however, were all at Milan (355). *Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* 2,39), when mentioning three synods (at Arles, *Béziers and Milan, in that order), did not specify when Rhodanius opposed the emperor (it seems after Milan), but spoke of him along with Hilary, affirming that Rhodanius, who was of a weaker nature, owed to Hilary's example the strength he showed in opposition and said that, following the advice of Arbitio and Lollianus, they were exiled even though they were forced to sign the condemnation of Athanasius on the condition, however, that only the bishops had the right to examine the accusations. We also know from Sulpicius that Rhodanius died in exile in *Phrygia (*Chron.* 2,45,9).

Perhaps the information supplied by Hilary himself (*Fragm. hist.* 6,1-2; *Contra Const.* 2) is the most precise (Crouzel, Pietri); he identified the Council of Béziers (356) as Rhodanius's opportunity for opposition. Hilary, during the description of these events, called Rhodanius *Christus*: not in the sense that Rhodanius reproduced the passion of Christ, but

that, just as those anointed by the Lord in the OT, he too was the victim of an ungodly king's aggression (Doignon). It was Hilary himself who described the sufferings that the church of Toulouse underwent, the echo of which is found in the Mass of the translation of the *martyr *Saturninus of Toulouse (1 Nov), which was preserved by the Mozarabic Sacramentary. Despite his death in exile, which was equivalent to martyrdom, Rhodanius did not appear as a saint on the list of the bishops of Toulouse: the church of this city, which 50 years later became the capital of the *Visigothic *Arian kings, was unable to commemorate him as a saint and an opponent of Arianism; as a result, Rhodanius was thus forgotten by his countrymen.

H. Crouzel, *Un "résistant" toulousain à la politique de l'empereur Constance II. L'évêque Rhodanius*: BLE 77 (1976) 173-190; J. Doignon, *Christ ou oint? Un vocable biblique appliqué par Hilaire de Poitiers à l'évêque Rhodanius de Toulouse*: RHE 72 (1977) 317-326; Ch. Pietri, *De la* partitio *de l'empire chrétien à l'unité sous Constance*, in *Histoire du christianisme des origines à nos jours. Tome II. Naissance d'une chrétienté (250–430)*, ed. Ch. and L. Pietri, Paris 1995, ch. IV.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

RHODON. The only source we have on Rhodon and his work is *Eusebius (*HE* V, 13,1-8). Active during the time of the emperor *Commodus (180–192) and a native of *Asia Minor, Rhodon was a disciple of *Tatian at *Rome, as Tatian himself attests. *Eusebius says that he was the author of various works; he discusses at length, however, one of his works against *Marcion, providing extensive fragments from it. Rhodon there outlines the Macionite heresy of his day, illustrating how it had split into several differnt sects, each of which is individually analyzed and refuted by him (*HE* V, 13,2-4). It seems, in particular, that he had directed his polemic at *Apelles, whom he visited in person. Rhodon expounded his doctrine on the one principle regarding God and reported a disputation that he had with a heretic, which ended with an open derision of the deficiencies in his opponent's arguments (*HE* V, 13,5-7). Rhodon treated his discipleship under Tatian in this same anti-Marcionite work when he addressed Callistio, an otherwise unknown person. Rhodon, in particular, had promised to supply him from his own writings the solutions to Tatian's *Problems*, which concerned obscure passages in *Scripture that Tatian had exposed (*HE* V, 13,8). We do not know if he completed this project. Eusebius of Caesarea also mentioned Rhodon's commentary on the *Hexameron (*HE* V, 13,8), from which he was able to gather information on Apelles's lavish and impious exegetical work on the Mosaic law (*HE* V, 13,9). *Jerome's claim (*Vir. ill.* 37; 39) that Rhodon was active in the anti-Montanist controversy has no basis in fact.

CPG 1300; P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme*, Fribourg-Paris 1913, XX-XXI; A. Harnack, *Rhodon und Apelles*, in *Geschichtliche Studien Albert Hauck zum 70. Geburtstage dargebracht*, Leipzig 1916, 39-51; P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten. Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte*, 2 Auf., Tübingen 1989, 250-251; U. Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte* (Suppl. VChr 4), Leiden 1989, 35-36, 186; K. Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes. Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Suppl. VChr 48), Leiden 2000, 17-20; Id., "*Woher hast du den Beweis für deine Lehre?" Der altkirchliche Lehrer Rhodon und seine Auseinandersetzung mit den römischen Marcioniten*, SP 34, ed. M.F. Wiles - E.J. Yarnold, Leuven 2001, 82-87.

V. Zangara

RICH – RICHES – PROPERTY. In the *Bible, riches are good per se and they are praised; like everything else, riches also belong to God and the availability of riches or goods to a person can be interpreted as a sign of divine protection and blessing (Gen 13:2; 26:12ff.; Deut 6:7-10; 28:1-11). If people are blessed by God for their faithfulness and this blessing-reward consists in having descendants and riches, health and prestige, the understanding of a link between reward and faithfulness has a long development in the history of Israel until it reaches the observation that this is not always the case; actually, the contrary is true: the one who is continually well is the ungodly person (Jer 16:1-4). The sapiential books reflect on wealth to show how, though it is a good, it is never the best good (Prov 15:15; 16:8; 22:1; Sir 30:14ff.; Job 28:15,19; Wis 7:8-11). The difficult existential equilibrium between *poverty and riches and the advantages of one and the other are summarized in Prov 30:7. The *prophets perceived a close connection that arose between riches and idolatry as the monarchy developed (Hos 10:1; Is 2:7-8; 7:20; Ezek 7:19-20). The king became the country's primary landowner, and society's weakest members were forced to sell their own landholdings, an inheritance that visibly expressed one's belonging to the people of God. In these circumstances, land ownership was not merely a social injustice, it led directly to the desacralization of Israel; it separated the people from the land, the place where the people and land were the two inseparable terms of the promise to Abraham (Mic 2:1-5; Hos 5:10; Is 5:8; 1 Kgs 21:2).

In the NT, we find all the reservations present in

the OT concerning riches, although the connection between righteousness and earthly reward is absent. Even if goods are not considered evil in themselves, the idea of injustice is associated with the acquisition of riches (Lk 16:9-11), and the discourse is moved from goods to the one who possesses them, from riches to the rich (Lk 6:24-25; Jas 5:1-5; 1 Tim 6:17); it is difficult for rich people to enter the kingdom (Mt 19:23). The gospels also speak of the friendship between Jesus Christ and some rich people (Mt 27:57; Mk 2:3-17; 14:3; Lk 19:1-10; 14:1-12), but it is always considered in the light of salvation, and this is brought about through the divesting of riches in favor of the poor (Mt 19:21; Lk 12-33). *Luke especially insisted on the dangers deriving from riches (1:52-53; 6:20, 24, 25; 8:14; 12:13-21, 32-34; 14:12-14,15-24; 16,12-13, 19-31; 18:18-30; 19:1-10; 21:1-4).

The patristic reflection on the theme of the rich and riches took Scripture as its starting point. The first text that directly and fully treated the relationship between riches and the Christian life was *Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur?* Keeping in mind the text of Mk 10:17-31, which interpreted literally appears to be a categorical condemnation of the rich, Clement, through an allegorical-spiritual exegesis, asked with respect to the rich who have become Christian, what is the deepest meaning of the passage from the gospel of *Mark: the invitation to purge the heart from riches without depriving oneself of everything (*Quis div.* 11; 14; 18)? The discussion thus moved from possession to use (*Quis div.* 11; 26) because Clement's preoccupation with antidualism led him to reaffirm the goodness of created things, which are praised because they allow one to come to the aid of those in need (*Quis div.* 13). But wealth retained for oneself is sinful (*Quis div.* 7). Riches are compared to a serpent: the person who does not know how to handle them properly is easily bitten and remains poisoned (Clem. of Alex., *Paedag.* III, 6,37). The remedy for cupidity is thriftiness (ibid.); to have true riches is to possess the immortal Logos (ibid. II, 3,35). Several currents of thought came together in Clement's thought: the tradition of Jewish wisdom (material goods are good and a sign of blessing), *Stoic ethics (riches are a danger) and the proclamation of the gospel (the distribution of goods is a sign of fraternal love). Material riches should be abandoned by those who desire to become followers of Christ (*Orig., *In Mt* XV, 25). The attachment of Christians to riches is identified as one of the primary causes for the denial of the faith during the Decian *persecution (*Cypr., *De lapsis* 11), and the danger of riches (Id., *De op. et elem.* 13), the more they are accumulated, is demonstrated through an explanation of Lk 12:16-21 (Cypr., *De dom. orat.* 20; *Ambr., *Exp. Evang. sec. Luc.* VII). But riches have a positive aspect: they can be distributed (*Hermas, *Sim.* 1,6,8), donated in alms (Cypr., *De op. et elem.* 8-11), given and shared (*Lact., *Div. Instit.* 5,15; *Greg. Naz., *De pauper. amand.* 22). *Basil's Homily VI (*De avaritia*) is an extensive commentary on the parable in Luke of the foolish rich man. In all of Basil's works, the reference to the just position of the rich man is constant: he is the administrator of divine goods (*De avar.* VI, 1-2; see also Ambr., *De Nabut.* VI-VIII). In Homily VII (*In divites*), Basil comments on a large portion of Mt 19:16-26, demonstrating how the possession of goods by the rich man must result in sharing, which changes the social condition of the poor person and reestablishes the justice desired by God in giving to all people.

The relationship between the *right of possessing* and the *right of private property* in the thought of *Ambrose of *Milan has drawn the attention of scholars, leading them to offer different interpretations (see Mara, *Ricchezza e povertà*, 70 n.121). It does not seem that Ambrose denied the right to private property, as long as this right is actualized for each person (*De Nabut.* 2; 11; 29). At the basis of Ambrose's thought are many motifs common to patristic literature: the goods of the earth were destined by God for people to enjoy; the rich person is only the administrator, not the lord, of them; the monopoly of goods by the few is not permissible—the refusal to give and share them is the refusal of eternal life; not only does death refute the enduring possession of earthly goods, but above all the eschatological vision of life unmasks their temporary state. In homily 63 on *Matthew, *John Chrysostom shows the rich the necessity of leaving riches to follow Christ; in homily 85, he invites the leaders of the church to give to the poor the church's own riches; in homily 34, he shows how the rich man who is such by God's gift should be useful to his neighbor. *Augustine continually shifted the discussion from goods to their use: for this reason, the rich man is in contradiction with himself if, by desiring to possess good things (goods possess this quality), he himself does not desire to be good by sharing (*Serm.* 85).

Patristic thought on the rich and riches (goods) is consistent on the following topics: the goodness of things, the equality of humankind, the duty of the rich to share to the point of changing the condition of the poor, the role of the rich as administrators and not lords of goods, the transference of every moral judgment from the possession of riches to the use that is made of it, the condemnation of the accumu-

lation of riches, the demand for ordering everything that makes reference to the economic order (riches, goods, purchases, use, etc.) to the service of people. Patristic authors present different nuances due to historical circumstances (persecutions, breaches of political power toward social problems, moral decadence and therefore the faith of the Christian community, epidemics and famines), local circumstances (different economic situations of various cities or regions) and personal factors (the different economic situation of individual Fathers), when establishing whether riches, the product of inheritance, is permissible (Clem. of Alex., *Quis div.*) or whether there is always an injustice at the origin (Jn. Chrys., *In 1 Tim. hom.* 12) or usury. They also differ on whether selling everything and donating it in alms is a perfect virtue not required of all (Cyril of Alex., *De adorat. et cult. in spirt. et ver.* XIII, 462), not commanded (Jn Chrys.) or a necessary condition for possessing eternal life (Cypr., Greg. Naz.), the perfect duty of charity (Ambr.).

DB 5, 1093-1094; P. Christophe, *Les devoirs moraux des riches. L'usage du droit de propriété dans l'Écriture et la Tradition patristique*, Paris 1964; G. Barberi, *I nuovi principi economico-sociali nella elaborazione dei Padri greci e latini*: Grande Ant. Filos., Milan 1954, V, 1129-1174; Augustinianum 17 (1977); E. Marotta (ed.), *Salviano di Marsiglia. Contro l'avarizia*, Rome 1977; L.W. Countryman, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire. Contradictions and Accomodations*, New York-Toronto 1980; G. Barbaglio, *Rassegna di studi di storia sociale e di ricerche di sociologia delle origini cristiane*, I/II: RivBib 36 (1988) 377-410, 495-520; M.G. Mara, *Ricchezza e povertà nel cristianesimo primitivo*, Rome 1991; C. Nardi, *Clemente d'Alessandria. Quale ricco si salva? Il cristiano e l'economia*, Rome 1991; L. Padovese, *La dimensione sociale del pensiero patristico. Considerazioni generali*: Studia Moralia 37 (1999) 273-293.

M.G. Mara

RIEZ, Council of. In this Alpine city (*Reii*) of Upper Provence in *Gaul, a council met on 29 November 439, under the presidency of *Hilary of *Arles, and resolved problems that had arisen following the irregular ordination of the layman Armentarius to the episcopal see of Embrun (*Ebrodunum*).

CCL 148, 61-75; Hfl-Lecl II, 423-430; Palazzini 4, 109-110.

Ch. Munier

RIGHTEOUSNESS (Justice). A very common word in the OT and rich in meaning. The privileged sense is that of moral rectitude, of imitation of God in his multiple manifestations and in adherence to the law. Since this adherence is modeled on the relationship between two people, it varies with the changes in the relationship, but presupposes equity as indispensable (Lev 19:15; Dt 16:18, 20). This understanding continues in the very ancient texts of the Proverbs (10; 22; 25–29), where the antithetical parallelism emphasizes contradictory terms: righteousness-perversity, truth-deception and where the word *righteousness* is applied to sincere speech and exact measures (Pr 12:17; 16:13; 25:5). These archaic concepts, received into the code of the covenant (Ex 23:6-8), gave rise to the identification of the righteous as innocent (cf. Ex 23:7; Dt 25:1-2; 1 Kgs 8:32; Susanna (Dan 13:53) and had a prolonged presence in the Wisdom literature (Ps 52:6-7; 58:10-11). In some prophetic passages the persecuted righteous person is the pious believer, the religious person. Prophecy tends to create the pair righteousness-judgment and assigns the meaning of the correct administration of judicial power (Amos 5:7; 6:12) in particular in disputes between two private individuals, where the condition of the one who suffered injustice is privileged. The typical formula "act according to righteousness and justice" (Jer 22:3-4; Ez 45:9-10; Hos 10:12) denounces a situation in which justice does not follow its normal course and proposes an ideal of equity valid for all (Is 9:6; 11:4-5; 16:5; 22:1; Jer 23:5; 33:15). In the prophets, the transcendent righteousness of the Messiah finds expression.

Gen 15:6 introduces a new concept detached from legal prescriptions. Considering the character of the account and its probable original autonomy, despite alluding to Abraham's conduct which pleased God, the righteousness credited to Abraham sounds like compensation, as if merited, for having believed in God in that particular moment, and it is made to depend on an act of confidence in the disconcerting divine promise. The faith that grounds the righteousness of Abraham is not an isolated act, but an attitude. *Paul discovered here not only a consistent moral behavior but also a new ontological condition. With Gen 15:6 righteousness in the OT reaches its acme, but it did not have later influence like that of Jer 31:23, which identifies the temple hill with the domicile of righteousness and free access to those who practice righteousness (cf. Ps 15:1-2; 24:3-4; 118:19).

In the OT righteousness is imbued with religious meaning when it designates God and the divine attributes of goodness and fidelity understood concretely as active in relation to humanity; when it is said of humanity, despite the nuances, it covers conduct toward God (acts of worship), toward oneself (distributive aspect), toward the neighbor (juridical-legal aspect). The Messiah takes on the most troubling of unfulfilled expectations (eschatological aspect).

In the NT, in Matthew righteousness indicates

human conduct: correct, righteous and conformed to the will of God. It has this fundamental meaning in Mt 3:15, where Jesus presents the faithful observance and the fulfillment of the entire ancient legal righteousness as the essential object of his mission. In the Sermon on the Mount, the fourth and eighth beatitudes (Mt 5:6, 10) refer to the righteous of humanity which results from the observance of the law in the present world; in Mt 5:20 the righteousness to which the disciple is called is along the lines of that of the Pharisees, but surpasses it, because the law is represented in its original purity and in conformity to the divine exigencies of perfection; in Mt 6:1 it includes all duties, represented by almsgiving, prayer and fasting. The search for the kingdom of God and his righteousness (Mt 6:33) is an imperative for acquiring Christian perfection thanks to which the new community is already configured as a real anticipation of the eschatological kingdom. From Mt the link between the idea of perfection and that of Christian righteousness emerges clearly, which, despite being along Jewish lines, surpasses it through its more profound and radical demands. As is clear from Lk 1:75, Luke follows analogous paths: sanctity and righteousness are not extrinsic to humanity, but concretely reveal humanity's fulfillment of the divine will. The liturgical emphasis does not attenuate religious duty.

The religion of Paul before his conversion consisted in pursuing the righteousness of the law, according to which a person is righteous in proportion to his or her works (Rom 10:3; Phil 3:6). This righteousness, which comes from the law (Rom 10:5; Phil 3:9) or from the works of the law (Rom 3:20; Gal 2:16) or simply from works (Rom 4:2), gives humanity a sensation of rectitude and allows persons to advance certain pretences (Lk 18:9-14). After conversion, Paul denies that this is the condition of an authentically righteous person. In the realm of the law no one is just before God (Gal 3:11) and Christian righteousness is not conditioned by the law (Rom 3:21), nor by the works which it prescribes (Rom 4:6), but comes from *faith and is based on faith (Rom 3:26, 30; 5:1; 9:30; 10:6; Gal 2:16). Paul, who underlines the evolution between Christian righteousness and Jewish righteousness, passes over the aspects common to both, in particular that the role of faith, of pardon, of repentance and the great mercy of God were not unknown to rabbinical Judaism. In controversies he tries to show that the realm of the law was a transitory and propaedeutic regime to that of righteousness through faith. Examples of this are the choice of Abraham (Gen 15:6) which yielded righteousness for him and the antithetic parallelism of Christ with Adam (Rom 5:12-21): humankind, who at their origin received in Adam the state of sin, receives in Christ the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness which will lead them to the kingdom of God, where they will reign in life (Rom 5:16-17). Righteousness, which is communicated in baptism (Rom 6:1-4), creates a stable condition (Rom 5:2), grounds the hope of possessing the glory of God (Rom 5:2) and of being saved from his wrath (Rom 5:9-10). In this condition the law has no influence, as the experience of Abraham attests, who received the promise of inheriting the world, thanks to the righteousness of faith. This vast movement of ideas is the framework for the message of the "righteousness of God" which opens the letter to the Romans (1:16-17). The strong expression that "in the gospel the righteousness of God is revealed" allows a parallel with the phrase "kingdom of God." The righteousness of God, like the kingdom, is revealed and established on earth through the word of God. Just as the kingdom of God already exists in heaven and is realized on earth, so it is with the righteousness of God. The one and the other represent the celestial goods (L. Cerfaux, DBS IV, 1479). The expression "righteousness of God" accentuates the idea that the gift of God is given to us as an anticipation of eschatological salvation. This righteousness belongs originally to God since it is his salvation, his richness, his kingdom which are communicated to humanity because of his saving will which has shined in past centuries (Abraham, Christ-Adam). This interpretative line has a verification in 1 Cor 1:30, where the philosophy of the Greeks, which is human wisdom, just as the Jewish righteousness is a human righteousness opposed to Christian wisdom, which is the wisdom of God: "Through him you are in Christ Jesus, who became for us through God wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption." The message presents the wisdom of God to the Greeks and the righteousness of God to the Jews. Outside these lines but no less important are those notions which can be translated in terms of righteousness, a divine attribute operating in mercy (Rom 3:25-26), in the general judgment as a manifestation of the transcendence of the fundamental divine norm and of the fear of God (Rom 2:1-16; 1 Th 4:13–5:11; 1 Cor 15:12-34), as a grandiose vision of the celestial process when God will pronounce a favorable sentence and will proclaim the righteousness of the Christians, founded on the work of Christ, on his intercession and on the love which united them (Rom 8:31-39).

In patristic literature the word is subject to two interpretations: one, juridical, strictly linked to the

judicial act carried out according to the reigning norms; the other, ethical, which designates the conduct of persons faced with the law in its different articulations. *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VII, 3) says that the *gnostic takes time to reflect on courage, prudence, temperance and righteousness, which is the perfect, tetragonal, virtue (*Strom.* VI, 12). The task demanded of it is to coordinate all the potentials of the soul in the moment when a sentence is issued (*Strom.* IV, 26). Its borders coincide with those of rectitude and integrity (*Strom.* IV, 25). The sources of the Christian's righteousness are as follows: God, who grants it in exchange for the sacrifice made to him of our human righteousness (Orig., *Hom. 24,2 in Num.*), the love of God (Clem. Al., *Paed.* I, 9) and Christ, who is the substance of righteousness itself, from which the righteousness was formed which is in each believer, so that there are many forms of righteousness in those who are saved (Orig., *Com. Mt.* 12,11; *Com. Joh.* 6,6). One enters into its possession with grace through faith, like Abraham (John Chrys., *Hom.* 17,2 *in Rom.*, *Hom. 11,2 in Phil.*; Theodoret, *Com. Rom.* 5,21,10,3), through baptism (Orig., *Hom. 13,4 in Gen.*; Basil., *De Bapt.* 1,2,17), through the fear of God (Clem. Al., *Strom.* VII, 12). Righteousness, as a Christian virtue, begins with conversion (*Barn.*, 1,4; Just., *Dial.* 93,3); its multiple paths all lead to the path of God (Clem. Al., *Strom.* I, 7). Fidelity and righteousness are not identified because righteousness is a road which leads to perfection (Clem. Al., *Strom.* VI, 12). This tension has eschatological implications: only he who has lived cleanly and is adorned with righteousness and the other virtues will see God (Just., *Dial.* 4,3), and become immortal (*2 Clement* 19,20).

The frequent references to the righteousness of God are reducible fundamentally to two: the emendatory and the remunerative (Basil., *Hom.* 12.8), both oriented toward distributive righteousness. The *Marcionite conception of the righteousness of God as negative, as punitive, is opposed to the positive one, obvious to all, which nourishes every living creature. (Orig., *De Princ.* II, 5,1; *Hom.* 9,4 *in Num.*; Clem. Al., *Strom.* II, 18; VI, 14).

DBS 4, 1417-1510; GLNT 2, 1202-1328 (TDNT 2, 174-210); Cath 6, 1289-1299; H. Cazelles, *Études sur le code de l'alliance*, Paris 1946; A. Descamps, *Les justes et la justice dans les Évangiles et le christianisme primitif hormis la doctrine proprement paulinienne*, Louvain-Gembloux 1950; A.H. van der Weijden, *Die Gerechtigkeit in den Psalmen*, Nijmegen 1952; B. Vawter, *"Social Justice" in the Prophet Isaiah*, Denver 1952; E. Peretto, *La Giustizia. Ricerca sugli autori cristiani del secondo secolo*, Rome 1977; Lampe 368-370 (*Dikaios* e *dikaiosyne*); S. Agostino, *La giustizia*, ed. by G. Catapano, Rome 2004.

E. Peretto

RIMINI, Council of. Convoked by the emperor *Constantius, in parallel with the Eastern Council of *Seleucia, to bring peace to the church, which had been deeply shaken by the events pertaining to the *Arian controversy of 357–358, the Council of Rimini began around the beginning of June 359 with ca. 400 bishops present. *Restitutus of *Carthage presided over the council, although *Liberius of *Rome, who was absent, does not seem to have been represented. The pro-Arians *Valens, Ursacius and *Germinius, who were leading ca. 80 bishops, insisted on the ratification of the preparatory formula of faith published at *Sirmium on 22 May 359 and reiterated the condemnation of the Council of *Nicaea's term **homoousios*. But the greater majority at the council was decidedly opposed and, after prolonged discussions, reaffirmed the validity of Nicaea's formula of faith of 325 and included therein the term *homoousios*. Valens and his supporters abandoned the council's work and were condemned on 21 July 359; during that occasion the council Fathers reiterated the condemnation of the primary *Arian tenets, along with other *Sabellian and *Photinian beliefs.

At this point, following Constantius's order, a delegation of the council presided over by *Restitutus traveled to report to the emperor at *Constantinople, where he was preceded by Valens. By Constantius's order, who did not want to accept the term *homoousios* and demanded a theological formula characterized by a generic compromise, the council's delegation was stopped near Constantinople and transferred to Nike, a postal station in *Thrace. Here, Valens and his collaborators subjected the Westerners to a long series of trials and used threats and flattery so that they might weaken their resistance and convince them to sign a formula of faith in which the Son was only called "similar to the *Father according to the *Scriptures." Valens and the delegation returned to Rome, where the Western bishops were forced to remain by command of the emperor. Invoking the emperor's name, the Prefect Taurus announced that no one could leave the city without first signing, as the delegates had done. There was an initial resistance, but slowly their despair and discouragement overcame them and each one of the delegates signed the so-called *Formula of Rimini*, a brief text in which the Son was called "similar to the *Father according to the Scriptures," while the term **ousia* (and consequently the two composite terms *homoousios* and *homoiousios*) was banned. The last bishop to sign, in late November, was *Phoebadius of Agen, who was given permission to add to the formula, in his

own name, some anathemas that condemned the chief tenets of Arianism.

The *Formula of Rimini* was entirely generic and could thus also be interpreted in harmony with Arian teaching. For this reason, in all of Christianity this council was considered to have been a large victory for Arianism, and the Arians subsequently appealed to this body as a solemn conciliar decision.

Hfl-Lecl 1, 929-955; Simonetti 313-325; Y.M. Duval, *La "manoeuvre frauduleuse" de Rimini*, in *Hilaire et son temps*, Paris 1969, 51-103; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy (318–381)*, Edinburgh 1988, 371-380; A. Miranda, *Chiesa "orientale" ed "occidentale" nel sinodo di Seleucia-Rimini*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V*, Rome 2002, 461-470.

M. Simonetti

RING. After coming to Rome from ancient Greece, rings were used for state recognition of military success. Initially iron, then gold, a ring was first given to ambassadorial senators, then to all senators, and finally to the equestrian rank of the military. Through the centuries various laws regulated the use of rings, which was always reserved to freemen. The emperor could also grant the use of a gold ring to freed slaves, until the Novella 78, ch. 1 (539) declared that with his freedom the slave acquired the right to wear a gold ring. As luxury increased, so did the use of rings, so much so that Tertullian (*De cultu fem.*, 9) reproaches women who wear a ring on each finger. Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 3,11) encourages the engraving of Christian symbols on signet rings. It cannot be determined when the church began to use the ring not only as a seal, but also to indicate authority; its use was thus reserved to bishops, practically continuing the custom by which the *flamines Dialis*, dedicated to the cult of Jupiter in ancient Rome and considered equal to senators, like them had the right to wear a gold ring as a sign of honor. In the 7th c. the ring is included in episcopal insignia. We can deduce from Ambrose that there was the practice at his time, both at Milan and Rome, of giving a ring to Christian virgins on the day of their consecration, but only with the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum* (10th c.) is there a definite reference to the ring for virgins, blessed with a formula similar to that used for the blessing of the wedding ring. The practice of giving an iron ring as a sign of marital commitment also goes back to the Romans and is attested by Plautus.

DACL 1, 2174-2223; LTK 8, 1192-1194; J. Braun, *I paramenti sacri, loro uso, storia e simbolismo*, Ital. tr. Turin 1914; P. Salmon, *Étude sur les insignes du pontife dans le rite romain*, Rome 1955; P. Jounel, *La liturgie romaine du mariage*: La MaisonD. 50 (1957) 30-57; I.H. Dalmais, *La liturgie du mariage dans les Églises orientales*: La MaisonD. 50 (1957) 58-69; A. Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien*, Tournai 1958, 5-27; V. Noè, *Il matrimonio nella liturgia*: Enciclopedia del matrimonio, Brescia 1959, 684-732; A.A. Fourlas, *Der Ring in der Antike und im Christentum*, Münster 1971; R. Metz, *Le nouveau rituel de consécration des vierges, sa place dans l'histoire*: La MaisonD. 110 (1972) 88-115; M. Sordi, *Da Ambrogio al Boccaccio. L'anello simbolo della fede*: Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo Accademia di scienze e lettere 114 (1980) 116-122; P.C. Finney, *Images on Finger Rings and Early Christian Art*: DOP 41 (1987) 181-186; A.M. Piredda, *Il simbolismo dell'anello episcopale da Ambrogio a Isidoro di Siviglia*, Annals of the Archive of "Ferran Valls i Taberner's Library" 9-10 (1991) 39-54; G.-M. Oury, *Anello*: Dizionario Enciclopedico del Medioevo 1, Rome 1998, 80.

M.G. Bianco

ROGATION DAYS. At Rome, the feast of *Robigalia* was celebrated 25 April in honor of *Robigus* (other sources speak of *Robigo*) so that the mildew/mold (*robigo*) might not destroy the wheat. Led by the Flamen Quirinalis, a procession was held with people dressed in white. The Christian celebration with similar purposes was initiated as its substitute, using the celebration of the Mass, a procession and the singing of the Major Litany (*Gregory the Great, *Reg.* 9,167). Similarly, elsewhere in the West, there also appeared propitiatory rites for protecting the fields. In Gaul (470), Mamertus, bishop of *Vienne, formalized the rite (*Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 2,34). The Council of Orléans (511) extended it to all of *Gaul, ordering that three days of fasting and abstinence be held and that the slaves not work (cans. 27-28: SC 353, 86-87) for the three days that preceded the Feast of the *Ascension. *Caesarius of *Arles wrote that the three days were celebrated everywhere (*Sermo* 173). Through the Middle Ages, the rogation days in the West interrupted the *Easter season with their penitential character. Today they have been abandoned in urban areas, but in certain cases they remain in the countryside.

D. de Bruyne, *L'origine de la Chandeleur et des Rogations*: RBen 34 (1922) 14-26; DACL 14, 2459-2461; EC 10, 1084-1086; Cath 12, 348-349; A. Nocent, *Le rogazioni. Anamnesis* VI, Genoa 1988, 267-269; D. Sabatucci, *La religione di Roma antica*, Milan 1988, 138-140; S. Rossi, *Il segno del tempo nella liturgia*, Turin 2002, 220-223.

A. Di Berardino

ROGATUS (d. before 408). *Donatist bishop of Cartenna (Ténès) from the 4th c. (Aug., *Ep.* 93,1,1). Around 370, he broke ties with his former coreligionists, that is, during the time of *Parmenian, and established an independent sect called the "Rogatists"

(*Ep.* 93,3,11; 93,8,24). This separation was due to the fact that the Donatists had turned to an apostate emperor, *Julian, and had recourse to violence (Optatus 2,17-19; Aug., *Ep.* 93,3,11). Rogatus considered his community Catholic because it observed the commandments (Aug., *Ep.* 93,7,23). The followers of Parmenian then turned to the imperial courts to reclaim their rights over their churches. Supported by Firmus, who would then rebel against the imperial power, they persecuted the Rogatists (*pars Rogati*), who had concentrated in the area of Cartenna, in *Mauretania (*C. ep. Parmeniani* 1,10,16-11,17; *C. ep. Petiliani* 2,83,184; *Ep.* 87,10). Rogatus died before 408, when the head of the Rogatists was Vincentius, one of *Augustine's schoolmates at *Carthage (*Ep.* 93,1,1), who died around 420/422. The Rogatists and various supporting groups were centered in Mauretania (*In Ioh. ev.* 10,6). Augustine judged them harshly (*Ep.* 93,6,20-21; 7,23; 8,24-25; 10,36; 11,49).

BA 31, 827-828; Monceaux 4, 253-254; 6, 316-317; E. Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken*, Göteborg 1964, 79-82Z; PCBE 1, 990-991; J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier donatiste*, Berlin 1987, 44-45.

E. Romero Pose

ROMAN LAW and CHRISTIANITY

I. Christian doctrines and Roman law - II. Roman law and Christian institutions.

The problems that emerged from the encounter of Christianity with Roman law are numerous and complex, and were responded to in very different ways, some tending to increase the influence of Christian doctrines on Roman law during the late empire (I), others tending to reduce that influence to truer proposition. In effect, we are dealing with an evaluation of the influence of Roman law on the evolution of Christianity in general and on ecclesiastical institutions in particular (II).

I. Christian doctrines and Roman law. Christian influence on Roman law derived above all from the will of the ruler, the most direct expression of which was clearly imperial legislation: (a) The emperors accepted and imposed the new religion; they multiplied institutions favoring the church; they insured the triumph of the Christian faith, as defined by the church's authorities themselves, threatening a wide variety of sanctions where the religion was not accepted (exclusion from civil office, loss of the ability for succession, etc.). An abundant legislation suppressed heresy, paganism and the Jewish religion (CTh XVI). Emperors also concerned themselves with regulating the status of clergy and bishops, as well as the conditions required for accession to *orders; privileges and exemptions were lavished on the clergy. *Valentinian III formally recognized Roman primacy (*Novella* 18 of 19 June 448).

(b) A Christian influence should also be noted in legislation on the family and society. The church fought against abortion, abandonment of newborns, trafficking in children, abuses of the *patria potestas*, and would have also desired official restriction of the freedom to divorce (Counc. of Carthage, 13 June 407). It elicited sanctions against those who broke an engagement without a just reason (CTh 3,5,2; cf. Counc. of Elvira, can. 54) and obtained the interdiction of *marriage among relatives (CTh 3,12,2-4; cf. Counc. of Elvira, can. 61). The church supported slavery, but demanded abolition of the practice of branding slaves on the forehead and of keeping servants separate from their families; it promoted the liberation of slaves and obtained civil recognition for those who were freed *in ecclesia*. It opposed the gladiator games and succeeded in ending them. It was even able to have the civil calendar modified to accommodate its festivals and to replace the *dies solis* with the Christian Sunday. It attempted to preserve intact the sacred character of days reserved to God, having the games of theater and circus prohibited on those days.

(c) Christian doctrines had less impact in the area of economics. Some have seen this influence in legislation on damages or in the limitation of interest rates; in the expansion of the notion of fraud; in the reduction of formalism in favor of the obligatory character of a simple promise; in sanctions against unjust enrichment. However, Christian influence in each of these cases is difficult to evaluate, though it cannot be entirely rejected. (d) Criminal legislation in the late empire was marked by an increased severity, almost cruelty. Christianity had little influence on this, only sporadically, and completely at random. The church obtained an end to crucifixion and gained the possibility of participating in the supervision of prisons, so as to comfort the prisoners. (e) Historians have also discovered other traces of Christian influence on Roman legal technique, but these findings have been insignificant (Gaudemet, 512).

II. Roman law and Christian institutions. The influence of Roman law on ecclesiastical society occurred mainly in terminology, legal technique and institutions: essentially, in the transposition or adaptation of Roman rules to the church's own needs. (a) Of assumed terminology, that of *ordo* designating the members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is among the most important, since this term from the begin-

ning indicated the ruling structures of the *civitas*, including the municipal senate. It should also be recalled that the powers of the supreme pontiff were from the start defined with the technical terms *auctoritas* and *potestas*. The terminology of decretals depended heavily on that of imperial constitutions.

(b) Particularly notable was the influence of Roman law on legal procedure. The pope's legislative power was not a simple adaptation of Roman institutions (it remained founded on Scripture and derived from his primacy); but it was nonetheless quite dependent on them with respect to the elaboration of decretals, which imitated contemporary models. Moreover, the methods for appealing to the pope were clearly inspired by imperial law (*relatio, provocatio*); likewise for councils. This latter institution was not a simple adaptation from Roman public law and drew significantly on contemporary models for its organization (organization of sessions, voting procedures, redaction of the acts, etc.). Canon law drew widely on Roman models with respect to procedures: it took up the procedures of *praescriptiones* (*de persona, de mandato, de tempore*) and the *contestatio litis*; it also adopted details regarding means of proof and conditions concerning witnesses (e.g., exclusion of *infames personae*). It goes without saying that canon law owes to Roman law its entire understanding of the appeal process.

(c) The influence of Roman law on Christian institutions was varied, and especially clear in matters regarding marriage. The church in essence took up the Roman notion of *matrimonium* and the conditions for realizing it (*dos, tabulae nuptiales*); it adopted Roman doctrine on consensual marriage, but immediately improved it (Munier, 17); it maintained engagement according to the Roman laws, but soon made a clear distinction between engagement and marriage properly speaking. It was steadfast in its principles regarding fidelity and indissolubility. Many of the norms regarding the status of clergy were inspired by those regulating civil careers (prohibition of changing positions, promotion by degrees and at intervals). Also, the external signs of power (clothing and insignia) of Roman officials were used to indicate the various ranks of ecclesiastical dignitaries (*pontificalia*, dalmatic, pallium). Finally, the clear parallelism between administrative and ecclesiastical divisions should be noted.

B. Biondi, *Il diritto romano cristiano*, 3 vols., Milan 1952–1954; J. Gaudemet, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'Église aux IVe et Ve siècles*, Paris 1957; Id., *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IVe-Ve siècles)*, Paris 1958; Ch. Munier, *L'église dans l'Empire romain (IIe-IIIe siècles)*, Paris 1979; G. Crifò, *Romanizzazione e cristianizzazione. Certezze e dubbi in tema di rapporto tra cristiani e istituzioni*, in *I Cristiani e l'Impero nel IV sec. Colloquio sul Cristianesimo nel mondo antico*, ed. G. Bonamente - A. Nestori, Macerata 1988, 75-106; F. Amarelli, *I problemi di metodo per lo studio delle fonti relative ai rapporti fra cristianesimo e diritto romano*, in *Metodologia della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, Naples 1989, 111-123; var. aus., *Il diritto romano canonico quale diritto proprio delle comunità cristiane dell'Oriente Mediterraneo*, Vatican City 1994; G.L. Falchi, *Introduzione allo studio della ricezione del diritto romano nelle fonti del diritto canonico*, Rome 1997.

CH. MUNIER

ROMANIANUS. A wealthy benefactor and fellow citizen of *Augustine, native of Thagaste, who helped him when his father passed away (371), assuring him the means necessary to move to *Carthage so that he might study (*C. Acad.* 2,2,3-4; a work dedicated to Romanianus, ibid. 1,1). When they found each other at Milan (385), "it was he [Romanianus], who insisted more than anyone on carrying out the project" (*Conf.* 6,14,24) of a common life lived among friends (386). Romanianus had a son named *Licentius (see *De ord.* 1,2,5), who defended the teaching of the Academics in the book *De ord.* (1,4,10); he was a relative of *Alypius (*Ep.* 27,5). Augustine wrote the treatise *Contra Academicos* to lead Romanianus to the study of philosophy (*C. Acad.* 2,8; *Conf.* 6,24). A few years later (390), he sent him the book *De vera religione* to convince him to embrace the Christian faith as the true religion (*C. Acad.* 2,8; *De ver. rel.* 12; *Ep.* 15,1; 27,4). Romanianus became a Christian (396) and remained Augustine's disciple (*Ep.* 27,4; *Ep.* 32: *Paulinus of Nola at Rome and Licentius). The name Romanianus appears on an inscription at Thagaste (CIL 8 *suppl.* 17226), which also bears the name Cornelius.

DCB 4, 550-551; PCBE 1, 994-997; A. Gabillons, *Alias Cornelius. Du nouveau sur le bienfaiteur et l'ami de saint Augustin*: REAug 24 (1978) 58-70; F. della Corte, *Il mecenatismo di Romaniano*: Maia 38 (1986) 3-12; J. Doignon, *La baroque invitation au ciel d'Augustin à Romanianus (C. Acad. II 1, 2). Thèmes de Sénèque et ornements virgiliens*: Maia 43 (1991) 221-224; G. Catapano, *Il concetto di filosofia nei primi scritti di Agostino. Analisi dei passi metafilosofici dal Contra Academicos al De uera religione*, Rome 2001.

R. DE SIMONE

ROMANUS, martyr. An exorcist and deacon of the clergy of *Caesarea Maritime (Palestine), passing through *Antioch during the time of the *persecution of *Galerius or *Diocletian. He was put under arrest because of his zeal in exhorting Christians brought before the judge. He was sentenced to having his tongue cut out, and after a long time, on the

occasion of the emperor's *vicennalia* in 303, he was strangled to death in prison (*Eusebius of Caesarea, *Mart. Pal.* 2). Among the later panegyrics, *John Chrysostom's remains faithful to Eusebius on the essential points: he only adds the detail about the doctor's intervention (CPG 4353). The following sources, however, indulge in legends: *Eusebius of Emesa's eulogy (É.M. Buytaert, *Eusèbe d'Émèse: Discours conservés en Latin* 2, Louvain 1957, 52-57, where it is erroneously attributed to *Eusebius of Caesarea), the poem of *Prudentius (*Perist.* 10), the homilies of Severus, delivered in a church dedicated to Romanus at Antioch (*Hom.* 1, 35 and 80: PO 38, 254-269; 36, 438-457; 20, 324-343). Starting from the Middle Ages, the *Passiones* of the saint multiplied. Romanus was commemorated on 17 November in Caesarea (Eusebius; *Mart. hier.*), the 18th in Antioch by the *Mart. hier.*, and only on the 18th in the Byzantine synaxaria (*Synax. Eccl. CP*). The *Passiones* and martyrologies make him out to be the companion of Barule, a name that is a distortion of Barlaam.

BHG 1193, 1600-1602; BHL 7297-7304; BHO 45-46, 1028; BS 11, 338-342; LCI 8, 281; M. Simonetti, *Nuovi studi agiografici*: RivAC 31 (1955) 223-233; R. Henke, *Studien zum Romanushymnus des Prudentius*, Frankfurt a.M. 1983; F. Halkin, *Hagiographica inedita decem*, Turnhout 1989, 33-54.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

ROMANUS MELODUS (d. after 555). For some time, there was a dispute over whether Romanus, the most famous Byzantine hymnographer, lived during the time of the emperor *Anastasius I (491–518) or Anastasius II (713–716); the issue was definitively resolved in 1905 when the original Greek text of the miracles of St. Artemius was discovered, in which he spoke of a miracle that occurred during the time of the emperor *Heraclius (610–641) to the benefit of a young man who sang Romanus's hymns: therefore, if at that time Melodus's poems were known and sung, he could not have lived during the time of Anastasius II. There are bits of biographical information on the life of Romanus: Born at *Emesa in *Syria toward the end of the 5th c. to a Jewish family, he became a deacon when he moved to *Constantinople at the end of the reign of Anastasius I. It seems that Romanus's death should be dated before *Justinian's (565) and after 555.

Romanus composed a large number of sacred hymns, the *kontakia*; we have about 100 of them, but not all are authentic. The *kontakion*, whose origin has been much debated, can be considered a metric *homily; introduced by a *proemium*, it consists of several strophes, called *troparia*, the first of which, the *irmo*, is the model for the subsequent strophes. Each *troparion* has a refrain at the end called the *ephymnion*; the various strophes of the *kontakion* follow the laws of isosyllabism and homotony and are connected through an acrostic that generally provides the name of the author, at times even the subject, and more rarely the subject without the name of the author. The meter of the *kontakion* has no relation to that of classical poetry inasmuch as it is purely tonal and syllabic. The melodic recitation of the *kontakion* is indicated in the superscription with the specification for the tone. The contents of Romanus's hymns are connected to various themes of the liturgical celebration; they have as their subject the major feasts of the church, persons and events from the OT and NT, martyrs and saints, as well as various other topics. In addition to Scripture, the sources of Romanus's poems are to be found in the ancient passions of the martyrs, Greek homiletical literature and, in particular, the poems of *Ephrem. The poetry of Romanus, who was, without exaggeration, called the "Christian Pindar," often reached moments of high lyricism and intense participation as, for example, in the hymns on Christmas and *Mary's lament at the foot of the cross, in which the dialogue between the Virgin and the suffering Son is elevated with tones of sharp and vibrant dramaticism and reveals the depth of Melodus's inspiration.

CPG III,7570. The most complete critical edition of Romanus's hymns is that of P. Maas - C.A. Trypanis, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica. Cantica genuina*, Oxford 1963; *Cantica dubia*, Berlin 1970. Partial editions: J.B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra*, I, Paris 1876, 1-241 (29 hymns); G. Cammelli, *Romano il Melode. Inni*, Florence 1930 (8 hymns, with Ital. trans.); N.B. Tomadakis, Ῥωμανοῦ τοῦ Μελῳδοῦ Ὕμνοι, Athens, I, 1952 (14 hymns); II, 1954 (14 hymns); III, 1957 (8 hymns); IV, 1959–1961 (13 hymns); J. Grosdidier de Matons, SC 99 (Hymns I-VIII), 110 (Hymns IX-XX), 114 (Hymns XXI-XXXI), 128 (Hymns XXXII-XLV), 283 (Hymns XLVI-LVI) (with Fr. trans.). In addition to the aforementioned translations, we should also mention the following works in French: R.R. Khawam, *Romanos le Mélode. Le Christ Rédempteur. Célébrations liturgiques*, Paris 1956; Id., *Hymne sur la résurrection*, in *Le grec chrétien*, Paris 1965, 175-185; in German: G.H. Bultmann, *Romanus der Melode. Festgesänge*, Zürich-Munich-Paderborn-Vienna 1960; translation of 19 hymns ed. J. Koder, *Romanos der Melode, Hymnen des orthodoxen Kirchenjahres, Mit der Seele Augen sah er deines Lichtes Zeichen Herr*, Vienna 1996; in English: M. Carpenter, *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist I. On the Person of Christ*, Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press 1970; *II. On Christian Life*, ibid. 1973; Ital. trans. by G. Gharib, Rome 1981 (63 hymns).

Among various studies, one should note the following: E. Mioni, *Romano il Melode. Saggio critico e dieci inni inediti*, Turin 1937; C. Chevalier, *Mariologie de Romanos (490–550 environ), le roi des Mélodes*: RecSR 28 (1938) 48-71; G. Zuntz, *Probleme des Romanos-Textes*: Byzantion 34 (1964) 469-534; C.A. Trypanis, *The Metres of Romanos*: Byzantion 36 (1966) 560-623; K. Mitsakis, *The Language of Romanos the Melodist*, Munich

1967; E. Salvaneschi, *Adattamento interlinguistico come mezzo espressivo in Romano Melodo*: AATC 39 (1974) 21-68; J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, Paris 1977; E. Follieri, *La catechesi ecclesiologica di Romano il Melode*, Ecclesiologia e catechesi patristica, Biblioteca di Scienze religiose 46, Rome 1982; H. Hunger, *Romano il Melode – poeta, predicatore, retore – e il suo pubblico*: Römische Historische Mitteilungen 25 (1983) 305-332; R.J. Schork, *Sacred Song from the Byzantine Pulpit. Romanos the Melodist*, Gainesville 1995; J. Koder, *Romanos Melodos und sein Publikum. Überlegungen zur Beeinflussung des kirchlichen Auditoriums durch das Kontakion*: AAWW 134 (1997-99) 63-94; *Romano il Melodo*, ed. R. Maisano, Turin 2002; R. Maisano, *Le fonti patristiche greche di Romano il Melodo*: Nea Rome 3 (2006) 89-113; L. Mari Peltomaa, *Herodias in the Poetry of Romanos the Melodist*: JOEByz 56 (2006) 79-99.

S. Zincone

ROMANUS of Roso (6th c.). Bishop of Roso (or *Rosi* on the Gulf of Issus, N of *Antioch and Seleucia Pieria, in *Syria Secunda*), contemporary of the Antiochene Patriarch *Severus (512–518), of whom he was an opponent. He is only known by references and citations to his works. In 516, Severus, in a *Letter to Antiochus*, abbot of the monastery of Beth Mar, rebuked the abbot for having defended Romanus's *orthodoxy. From the *Letter*, it appears that Romanus was already dead. In the *Letter* and in the *Cathedral Homilies* 119 and 124, Severus cited numerous passages from one of Romanus's writings titled *Scala* (*seblatha*, that is, κλῖμαξ) harshly refuting his absurd exegesis. Romanus indeed interpreted *Mary at the wedding of Cana as a symbol of concupiscence and in this context affirmed the distinction of *sins into the following categories: natural sins, voluntary sins and sins against nature (*Hom.* 119,390ff.); he saw in the variety of the synoptic accounts of *Peter's confession an image of future heresies (*Hom.* 124, 222-223). Severus had come to know the contents of the *Scala* at *Constantinople (503–511) and wrote a refutation in a book. From the *Letter*, we discover another one of Romanus's writings against the *Theopaschites, from which he cited a sentence. Lastly, he mentions that Romanus was condemned by a council of bishops, first at Antioch then (shortly after 518) at Alexandria: Romanus was likened to *Nestorius, the *Manicheans and the *Borboriani.

CPG III, 7117-7121; PO 26, 375-379; 29, 222-223; Cod. Harvard (Houghton Library) Syr. 22, f. 68a. 75a. 76a.; R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilté du corps du Christ*, Louvain 1924, 80-81; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*: CSCO 127, Subsidia 12, Louvain 1951, 82-83; S.P. Brock, *Some New Letters of the Patriarch Severus*: (TU 115 = SP 12) Berlin 1975, 22ff.

A. De Nicola

ROME

I. History and archaeology - II. Councils - III. Liturgy.

I. History and archaeology.

1. The first three centuries. 1.1. The existence of a small community at Rome before the arrival of the apostle *Paul (and without a doubt, *Peter) is attested by the epistle to the Romans (ca. 57–58), which the apostle sent to those who had preceded him in the city: the small group came from a Jewish background, as the letter explicitly attests (2; 4:1) and as the list of the names of the faithful suggests (Rom 16, whose manuscript tradition is less certain). These early converts, who gathered in private homes (Prisca: Rom 16:5), received from Paul a deacon who carried the apostolic letter, but it is not known how this early community was organized, gathered together as it was by missionaries, whose identity remains unknown to us. Some evidence suggests a state of tension between these *Jewish Christians and the powerful urban synagogues: Paul in fact met Aquila at *Corinth, a Jew originally from *Pontus, who had come from *Italy with his wife Priscilla (Acts 18:3). Without a doubt, we must connect this exile to Suetonius's statement (*Vita Claudii* 18,2) that the emperor in the year 49 expelled some Jews from Rome who had been incited "by a certain *Chrestus*"; the historian perhaps alludes to some Christians who were poorly identified by the police. In any case, Paul, who also knew of another Jewish Christian, Epaenetus, who had come to Rome from *Asia Minor, certainly some years after his appeal to Caesar, was detained there in prison for two years, which did not quell his missionary zeal, because he had contact with Jewish Christians (Mark, Aristarchus) or with converts from *paganism (as perhaps Timothy: Acts 28:30). One cannot date with certainty the period of Paul's martyrdom, which certainly took place under the reign of the emperor *Nero; nevertheless, no one has ever contested his Roman mission.

In the case of Peter, an entire series of controversies has worked to keep the apostle far from Rome in order to weaken papal primacy and jurisdiction. In fact, as has been demonstrated by Lietzmann, this debate has been settled: the testimonies of patristic literature (1 Pet 5:13; *Clement of Rome, *Ep. Cor.*; *Irenaeus of Lyons; etc.), the evidence brought to light by archaeology (Fasola) and the local cult of the two apostles are sufficient to establish that Peter came to Rome and underwent martyrdom there. A tradition insists—for symbolic and ecclesiological reasons—to date the martyrdom of Peter and Paul to the same day (29 June) and the same year (often

AD 67). It is difficult to concretely define the scope of this twofold mission even though later traditions at times attributed to the community evangelized by the two apostles a special importance for the transformation of the good news into written gospels (*Mark, *Luke). In any case, certain pieces of information suggest that one can perceive the influence, in Clement of Rome's *Epistle*, of Jewish Christian themes for the elaboration at Rome of an entire theology of apostolic tradition.

1.2. This church in fact was almost unknown for the first two centuries: *Tacitus barely includes it in the history of Rome (*Annali* 15,44), when he mentions the slaughter of Christians who were martyred after the fire of Rome AD 64 upon the order of the emperor Nero, who sought scapegoats to placate the public's indignation after the disaster that had devastated the center of the city (from that moment onward, Christians were singled out by the police and Roman public opinion). But one must wait for the testimony of Clement of Rome at the end of the 1st c. (*Ep. Cor.*) to catch a glimpse of this community's organization: it was already aware of belonging to a postapostolic age; they had established some permanent ministries that Clement mentioned using the entire vocabulary of the Jewish sacerdotal traditions as well as the image of the military of Christ (*militia Christi*). At the head of the church, guided by a college of ministers who guaranteed the episcopate and the **diakonia* (as a still imprecise vocabulary indicates), was Clement, the leading member of the college, spokesman and leader of the mission. In the mid-2nd c., a small apocalypse written by *Hermas, a former slave, brother of Bishop *Pius, leads one to suppose the persistence at Rome of charismatic ministries, but he also mentioned priests and their college, attributing duties of assistance to the deacons and the bishops. This testimony must be supplemented with that of *Irenaeus of Lyons, who demonstrated the existence of a unitary organization entrusted to a leader, even if he did not bear, in the first local use, the title "bishop." In effect, Irenaeus provided the list of those men who transmitted the apostolic tradition after Peter and Paul: Linus, Cletus, Clement to the end of the 1st c., *Evaristus, *Alexander, *Sixtus, *Telesphorus, *Hyginus, *Pius, *Anicetus, *Soter, *Eleutherus and *Victor (189–199). He describes an *episcopal list *ante litteram*, that is, the succession of those who have in turn secured the cohesion of the local church's ministry.

Moreover, during the 2nd c. we see more clearly than during Clement's time the personal intervention of the Roman bishops in the name of their church: that of Soter, for example, who had been called upon in the mid-2nd c. by Bishop *Dionysius of Corinth, and later that of Anicetus, who received *Polycarp of Smyrna at Rome, Eleutherus, and finally Victor—all on the *Easter question. This question on the celebration of Easter divided the Christians living within the heart of the city, pitting the churches of Asia Minor against those of Rome and *Alexandria on a question concerning not only the calculation of Easter, but especially the choice of the date of the feast, that of the passion or the Sunday of the *resurrection. These interventions (and especially that of Victor, who broke *communion with the Asiatic episcopate) already reflect the authority "in the Latin sense of the term" of this church, which was doubly apostolic, to which Irenaeus assigned the concrete function of being, in the West, the privileged center of reference for ecclesial unity (*Adv. haer.* 3,3,2). The spread of Rome's role as the political and economic capital of the Roman world assisted this special mission; but the Roman Church claimed this responsibility because of its two apostolic titles. It was probably at the same time the missionary metropolis for *Gaul and perhaps *Africa, and certainly for *Italy. Moreover, the Roman Church offered numerous examples (see *Justin Martyr's testimony concerning the organization of the *liturgy; the celebration of Easter); it witnessed the debates on apologetics and a theology that, with Justin, began to use *philosophy as a conceptual instrument. In this manner, one explains the attraction exercised by Rome on many itinerant preachers and theologians who sought to establish themselves there or, at least, to make disciples there: *Marcion as well as the *gnostic *Valentinus, but also *Theodotus of Byzantium, an adoptionist who was expelled in 198; *Praxeas, who, however, defended a *Monarchian theology and was condemned by Eleutherus; and the disciples of *Montanus, who experienced the same lack of success around 177.

1.3. The 3rd c. was a period of great organization dominated by some prestigious bishops: after *Zephyrinus (199–217), one must mention *Callistus, a former slave (217–222), who was succeeded by *Urban (221–230), *Pontianus (230–235), *Anterus (235–236). These last two were victims of the *persecution. *Fabian (236–250), according to *Eusebius (*HE* VI, 29), enjoyed much spiritual prestige; *Cornelius, who died in exile (251–253), took action when *Novatian's schism threatened the Roman Church; after *Lucius (253–254), *Stephen (254–257) displayed with an authoritarian decisiveness the rights of his primacy. *Sixtus II (257–258) was overcome by the *Valerian persecution, but *Dionysius occupied

the see from 259 to 268 and, after him, *Felix (269–274), *Eutychianus (275–283) and *Caius (283–296), for whom we do not have much information. Until *Miltiades (311–314), the chronology is uncertain because of the massive *Diocletian persecution and the gap that it caused: *Marcellinus until 304, then *Marcellus and *Eusebius (309 or rather 310).

For this entire period, the testimony of the **Apostolic Tradition*, a small treatise on missionary organization, illustrates the organization of its synaxis; it testifies that the priests during the course of the century were able to preside in the absence of the bishop and his delegate. The precautions taken for the acceptance of candidates for *baptism and the institution of the *catechumenate attest the progress made in attempts to convert the city. At the same time, the work describes the system of assistance for the needy, the *agape meals and the special forms of collective charity for burial (the deacon Callistus was commissioned to administer the church's cemetery, a catacomb near the Appian Way). This was also the period in which the seven deacons received the charge for the collection and the multiple actions of charity, for each one to oversee one of the seven zones approximately limited to the urban area. This community did not use churches (in the sense that we now assign to this term, as a specialized place for gathering and permanently intended for the liturgy)—in any case, we do not know of any—but for these numerous services, Rome made better use of a specialized clergy than anywhere else in the empire: in 251, the clergy numbered at least 46 priests and 7 subdeacons with the same number of deacons, 42 acolytes, 56 electors, exorcists and doorkeepers and, according to the same testimony, the church nourished 1,500 widows and poor people (Eus., *HE* 6, 43,11). This last figure indicates the important following of converts, who were a notable minority in the large city (2-5% of the entire population?).

Pope Callistus demonstrated pastoral insight in this new situation by organizing with greater benevolence the penitential system for the faithful who had fallen into sin after baptism and by striving to facilitate the union of aristocratic Christians with spouses who shared their faith, even if they were not of the same social class. This last bit of legislation reflects the sociology of this early church: the aristocracy, notwithstanding some notable examples (*Domitilla at the end of the 1st c.; *Apollonius in the 2nd c), was still less penetrated by Christianity, but conversion touched different areas: members of the Palatine service (Prosenes, for example, whose epitaph is one of the most ancient Latin Christian inscriptions, in 217) and the entire Greek-speaking population of soldiers and artisans.

With respect to this early Christian community during the 3rd c., we know primarily of the *cemeteries and the epitaphs that attest the appearance of a Christian formulary, expressing, as in Jewish epigraphy, the hope of victory over death with a conviction entirely unknown to pagan texts. In the decorations of the catacombs the first images of figurative Christian art appear. Certainly, many trials shook this community: localized persecution struck from the reign of the emperor *Maximinus Thrax in 235 (the deportation of the Roman bishops Pontianus and *Hippolytus); but it became more widespread with the edict of *Decius in 250 (martyrdom of Bishop Fabian), the laws of Valerian (257 and 258) that led Pope Sixtus and his deacon *Lawrence to martyrdom, and, finally, with the edicts of Diocletian (303–304), who acted cruelly (see, e.g., *Agnes).

The church after these trials was divided on how to judge the numerous cases of apostasy; in 251, the priest Novatian gathered around himself a rigorous faction that he led until he and his group were in open schism against Bishop Cornelius, who had been elected by a more moderate majority. This latter figure gathered against his rival, who had become an antipope, a council of Italian bishops, which numbered around sixty. This assembly attests the expansion of the Roman primacy in the peninsula. In 254, Bishop Stephen received an appeal from two Spanish bishops; he was also invited by *Cyprian of Carthage to depose the bishop of *Arles. The bishop of Rome made known to Christian Africa the rules of his discipline that prohibited the practice of rebaptizing converted heretics: even if this discipline was in contrast to Cyprian's uncompromising resistance, this event was significant, exactly like that of Bishop Dionysius who took a stance, at the request of the Alexandrian clergy, against the overly subordinationist preaching of the Alexandrian bishop. These interventions made explicit the primacy of a church that intended to protect and maintain the apostolic tradition, the church of the *cathedra Petri*.

2. The 4th and the 5th c. After the victory won by *Constantine in October 312, N of Rome, near the Milvian Bridge, the attitude of the authorities toward the church radically changed, and it transitioned from privileged support during the period of the first "Christian" emperor (312–337) to the point of exclusive backing under *Theodosius (379–395). The evolution of the political union, but also of the social and economic conditions, certainly exercised a notable role in the development of the Roman

Church during the time of the Christian Empire (4th and 5th c.).

2.1. Especially in the great movement of conversion that esp. affected urban populations during this period Rome provided an example of an exceedingly fruitful missionary activity, to which the imperial favor gave only indirect and secondary assistance. As concrete proof of this, we have the numerous churches (to be understood, by this point, as specialized buildings) constructed for the Christian assemblies within the walls of the city as well as in the suburban areas. In the 1st half of the 4th c., Rome owed to Constantine the establishment of the bishop's church with its baptistery (*basilica constantiniana*, then basilica of St. John Lateran): a grandiose basilica in which, for the first time, the bishop was able to gather his people. Also to the imperial benevolence of Constantine and his successors it owed the construction of the basilica near the tombs of the Roman *martyrs: St. Peter in the Vatican, St. Lawrence near the Via Tiburtina, an early construction near the tomb of St. Paul, and at the end of the century, a large basilica near the Via Labicana, where Constantine at first thought of building his own tomb, as well as other *martyria* near the Appian Way (S. *Sebastian) or near the Via Nomentana (S. Agnes).

In all this activity, a few urban foundations were financed by the emperor (with the exception of the Palatine church near the residence of the Empress *Helena: Holy Cross in Jerusalem); esp. during this period the construction of the urban churches was indeed the duty of the bishops (*Sylvester, *Mark, *Julius and *Liberius), although private patronage was already evident (Lucina), a practice that dominated from the mid-4th to the mid-5th c. In some decades Christian construction erected more than 20 buildings (*see* *Titulus), constructed according to the intention of the donors, which resulted in a dense network in the urban space. In the 5th c., the bishops always participated with munificence in the building initiatives, as the foundation from the large basilica on the Esquiline (S. Maria Maggiore) indicates on the part of *Sixtus III. Nonetheless, after Sixtus (d. 440), the rhythm of the new constructions noticeably slowed down (just note the intervention of Pope Simplicius in reagrd to S. Stefano on the Caelian); still the embellishment of buildings and restorations continued, which became necessary after the two sacks of Rome, which had been devastated for three days in 410 by the *Visigoths and for three weeks in 455 by the *Vandals. Moreover, bishops, clergy and even the faithful took care of the catacombs for the cult of their martyrs and the visitation of pilgrims. Dating to the beginning of the 4th c., this activity developed esp. during the time of Pope *Damasus, *Siricius and, again in the 5th c., under *Innocent and *Boniface. Under Pope *Leo, an aristocracy financed the construction of a basilica in honor of St. *Stephen near the Via Latina.

In the meantime, the church was enriched with donations that, added to the imperial and private donations, allowed it to maintain the buildings and their clergy. If in the mid-4th c., this patrimony represented moderate sums of assets, such that the bishop appeared to be tied to the foundation charters (that constituted the *tituli*), in the 5th c., the economic power of the church was affirmed when the pope assumed, despite the resistance of the donors, the power of capitalizing on the revenue and organizing a common property. This material institution permitted a more efficient organization of the mission: the episcopal liturgy was enriched with large communal assemblies at the large basilicas (the bishop's palace, S. Maria Maggiore's and also St. Peter's, etc.), used by the bishop, over the course of the year, from station to station. Thus, the period of *Lent, ranging from three to six weeks, united catechumens and penitents in gatherings of instruction or reconciliation held in the presence of all the people until Easter. One must also take into account the celebration of Christmas, the institution of periods for fasting and monetary offerings (see section III below, **Liturgy*). A local pastoral staff was organized in the titular churches that began at the end of the 5th c. to be furnished with baptisteries. Entrusted to priests (numbering near a hundred in the 5th c.), who celebrated the *Eucharist in unity with the bishop thanks to the rite of *fermentum*, these churches possessed a fixed clergy (acolytes, lectors).

In the 5th c., these churches became centers of local life, which could accommodate gatherings for the collections (since the period of Pope Leo), as well as accommodate the now public ceremonies of Christian marriages. The system of assistance, always entrusted to the deacons who had been divided into seven sectors, received the support of the "titulars" and also of charitable foundations helped by the generous faithful (*xenodochia*), while the gravediggers (*fossores*) assured, in the catacombs, the service of the burials. Moreover, the organization of the sanctorale (the *Depositio martyrum* from 336, then the Hieronymian martyrology for a later testimony) permitted a true conquest of time and established, in competition with the pagan feast days, the celebration of the martyrs who were buried in suburban areas and likewise the celebration of the relics present in the city (the chains of Peter in the church of S. Pietro in Vin-

coli). Monastic communities were established near the large *martyria* (*Ad catacumbas*; the basilica of St. Peter; the basilica of St. Lawrence, etc.).

The organization of the clergy by then had a rigorously established discipline (see the decretals of Siricius, Innocent, etc.) and controlled recruitment. The practice outlined two types of careers: that which led from the office of exorcist or lector to that of acolyte and eventually to the priesthood; and that which led to the *diaconate, from which bishops were usually chosen. In this organization, clergy stand out as a small learned élite (of priests and deacons) often recruited from a Christian family tied to the service of the church: this was the case, for example, with Pope Damasus. It was precisely from this élite that there emerged bishops, among whom were some with very strong personalities: after Miltiades (311–314), there were Sylvester (314–335), Mark (336), Julius (337–352), Liberius (352–366) and Damasus (366–384). Siricius (384–399) seems to have had a dull personality in comparison to his predecessor, who was a poet and diplomat, but he was also an inflexible administrator. After *Anastasius (399–401), the political situation disturbed the episcopate of a great pope, Innocent (401–417), who was succeeded by the heavy-handed and blundering *Zosimus (417–418), then Boniface (418–422), *Celestine (422–432), a distinguished spirit, and finally *Sixtus III (432–440). *Leo the Great's pontificate marked a decisive moment, all the more that the bishop of Rome ascended toward the height of the great Eastern theologians (440–461). Subsequently, *Hilary (461–468) and, even more so, *Simplicius (468–483) seem less colorful. *Felix II (III) was the first bishop produced by the Roman aristocracy (483–492).

At the end of the century, *Gelasius, inflexible on account of his natural disposition and the then current situation, already belonged to another age, that is, one in which the emperor of the West had definitively disappeared. He measured the effectiveness of this pastoral ministry by the number of conversions. If, at the beginning of the 4th c., only some aristocratic families were Christian (the Anici and the Probi) and if, at the end of the same century, they organized a pagan resistance around *Symmachus and Nicomachus *Flavianus, at the end of the 5th c. they were no longer open defenders of the old idols, but simply faithful inclined to maintain, either through tradition or precaution, some ancient rituals such as those of the *Lupercalia*. The crises that separated the Roman community always created some Christian factions: thus the conflicts caused by *Ursinus against the election of Damasus (366–370) or by *Eulalius against Boniface (418).

2.2. During this new time for the church, in response to numerous requests, the Roman see exercised more fully the influence of its primacy: (a) In the traditional dependence on Rome, limited to suburbicarian Italy after the mid-4th c., the pope exercised a metropolitan authority, which is cited as an example at the Council of *Nicaea (can. 6, in 325). He controlled the elections of bishops, judged ecclesiastical affairs and rigorously imposed the canons of Roman discipline. In the northern provinces of the peninsula, this intervention was curtailed through the influence of the bishop of imperial residence, *Milan, especially during the time of *Ambrose (374–397) and then, in the 5th c., with that of *Ravenna, although with less importance.

(b) In the western provinces of the mission, *Spain and, even more, *Gaul, where the ecclesiastical organization was still rudimentary at the beginning of the 4th c., Rome exercised a sort of patriarchate. From these regions came the appeals of some bishops: that of *Himerius of *Tarragona to Siricius, *Exuperius of Toulouse or *Victricius of Rouen to Innocent. Most of the time, they sought counsel for the organization of their clergy and their liturgy; they received decretals, that is, small treatises on discipline that subsequently circulated in the form of collections and thus constituted a code of religious law. These requests less frequently required the pope in theological conflicts: Damasus refused to accept *Priscillian's appeal, but Innocent responded to the Council of *Toledo, which consulted him on the resistance of the heresiarch's partisans (404), and Leo, on the same problem of Priscillianism, gave some indications to *Turibius of Astorga bishop of *Gallaecia*. In sum, the Roman see treated the *causae maiores* and intervened in the affairs of bishops; when communication risked being interrupted by the barbarian invasions, *Zosimus entrusted the functions of vicar to the bishop of *Arles (418). But this system functioned poorly; Boniface restricted the scope, and Leo finally reduced the rights of *Hilary the bishop of Arles to that of a simple metropolitan.

(c) The same system was adopted with the bishops of the Illyricum Prefecture, passed in the 5th c. under the authority of the Eastern emperor. Preoccupied with escaping the influence of a nascent patriarch and the "second Rome," that is, *Constantinople, the episcopate accepted Innocent's establishment of a vicariate at *Thessalonica; the latter disappeared in the 2nd half of the 5th c.

(d) Africa, which had a Christian metropolis, *Carthage, as a support and an organized episcopal college, did not tolerate this type of practice: *Con-

stantine in 323 had charged the Roman Bishop Miltiades with adjudicating the controversy between *Caecilian of Carthage and his rigorist adversary. The failure of this intervention, at the beginning of the *Donatist schism, deterred Rome's intervention for some time. But, in the 5th c., Aurelius of Carthage and *Augustine of *Hippo sought the authority of communion with Rome to overcome the Pelagian danger (417): with much more force they praised Innocent's sentence, which his successor Zosimus seemed, for a certain time, bent on reopening for discussion. Thanks to imperial support, they were able to make Zosimus relent, who decided (summer 418) to condemn in no uncertain terms *Pelagius and his disciple *Celestius. Thus, Christian Africa recognized the prestige of the Roman primacy and ceded more and more to the authority of its communion, esp. when the invasion of the *Arian *Vandals created the threat of a persecution.

(e) For the Christian East, the Roman primacy more and more represented an authority for guaranteeing a certain ecclesiastical freedom so that the pope was no longer directly involved in the conflicts of the Eastern parties: at the great councils convoked by the emperor at *Nicaea (325), *Serdica (343), *Ephesus (431 and 447) and *Chalcedon (451), the pope sent some of his delegates. Analogously, the bishops persecuted by the imperial politics sought support from the apostolic see: this was the case with *Athanasius, who had been removed from *Alexandria through the work of the Arians in 339 and vindicated in 340 by a Roman council. When the emperor *Valens again favored Arianism, *Basil of Caesarea sought to obtain Roman support (372–379), despite the misunderstandings of theological vocabulary and the differences of ecclesiastical politics that separated him from Damasus. These requests led the bishop of Rome to intervene both in disciplinary questions and in problems of faith. In a council held at Rome in 377, Damasus formulated a strong condemnation of the *pneumatomachi, which was adopted in 381 by the Council of Constantinople. To fight against *Nestorius, bishop of *Constantinople, *Cyril of Alexandria sought the alliance of the Roman see, which, in the person of Celestine, embraced the decisions of the Council of Ephesus, and Celestine was greeted "as a new Paul" (431). With Leo the Great, the Roman intervention in theological debates became truly decisive, because the pope's legates at Chalcedon were able to bring about the conciliar definition that assumed the *Christology expounded by the pope in his **Tomus ad Flavianum* (451). The letters of the popes illustrate the ecclesiology that explains this exercise of the primacy: Damasus was the first to justify the powers of Peter's successors by making reference to Mt 16:18. Leo and Gelasius put together a definitive theological synthesis for explaining the role of the apostolic see, where the successor and vicar of the apostle, who is invested with a special responsibility and an eminent authority regarding discipline and faith, exercises his ministry in a city renewed by the intervention of the two new founders, Peter and Paul.

3. The 6th and the 7th c. The political climate changed when Rome came under *Gothic rule for half a century, even though the *Byzantine reconquest, which was completed in 554, decreed that there be a *vicarius in urbe* to represent the emperor.

3.1. The architectural heritage was enriched not only with churches restricted to the ancient network of titular churches: SS. Apostoli (mid-6th c.), S. Agata recovered by *Gregory the Great from the *Arian *Goths and, on the periphery of the city, S. Pancrazio, which was built under Pope Symmachus, S. Giovanni near the Porta Latina; yet another quarter was occupied, the Roman Forum, where Christians established themselves in some public buildings (in the 7th c., the curia, under *Honorius I?) and buildings adjoined to the imperial palace (S. Maria Antiqua). In the 6th c., *Felix III (IV) established a church in honor of *Cosmas and Damian within what was once a library of Vespasian's Forum of Peace. Two new types of buildings were repeatedly built: the *monasteries (some 15 foundations for the 6th c., among which was Gregory's monastery on the Caelian; some 10 odd monasteries in the 7th c., among which was S. Saba) and also the *diaconiae*, which served as liturgical annexes for charitable institutions created in the 7th c.

The ties of the clergy with the aristocracy appeared to strengthen after the Gothic period, even if the popes' relationship with the senators often degenerated into conflicts (over the administration of the patrimony, over the regulation of the succession of bishops: in particular, during the period of Pope Symmachus [498–514]). In any case, there were now more prelates who had come from powerful families: after the humble Symmachus, the rich *Hormisdas (514–523), perhaps *John I (523–526); then, after *Felix IV (526–530), *Boniface II (530–532) and *John II (533–535), *Agapetus, who belonged to a clerical family (535–536) and, especially, after *Silverius (536–537), *Vigilius, who was the son of a prefect (537–555). We do not know anything about the provenance of Pope *Pelagius (556–561), *John III (561–574), *Benedict (575–579) and *Pelagius II (579–590), but it is well known that Gregory the Great (590–604) came from a noble family. Some

great bishops appear on the 7th-c. list of popes: after *Sabinian (604–606) and the two *Bonifaces (III [607] and IV [608-615]), *Adeodatus, who was the son of the subdeacon (615–618), *Boniface V (619–625), *Honorius (625–638); *Severinus and *John IV, *Theodore (642–649), an Easterner, and *Martin (649–655) and, after *Eugenius and *Vitalian, *Adeodatus II and *Donus, *Agatho (678–681), *Leo II, *Benedict II, *John V, an Antiochene (685–686), who preceded the Thracian *Conon and another Antiochene, *Sergius (687–701).

3.2. When facing the barbarians, the bishop was the city's defender, the protector who sought to remove the threat, as did Pope Leo during the time of Attila the Hun. Gregory illustrated this role in a special way when the *Longobards made good on their threats, and he received on his epitaph the nickname "God's consul."

(a) The bishop of Rome always exerted a jurisdiction of direct administration over suburbicarian Italy: Gregory governed the succession of bishops (e.g., that of *Naples); he organized provincial councils (for Sicily), and he conferred real authority on Roman clerics who administrated the patrimony of St. Peter. The N provinces were for a long time disturbed by the schism organized by an episcopate that made the see of *Aquileia its head, an episcopate that was hostile to the condemnation of the *Three Chapters, a condemnation that was then ratified by Pope Vigilius (553). But in 649, the Lateran council gathered a considerable number of Italian bishops to condemn *monothelitism, which was declared by a *typos* of Constantinople and rejected by Pope Martin.

(b) The relationship with Africa, renewed during the time of the Byzantine reconquest, slackened after the Muslim conquest: in the 5th c., Rome received the bishops who had been persecuted by the Vandals; in the 6th c., Gregory intervened in *Numidia against a Donatist revival and the last manifestations of an organized African episcopate supported Rome against monothelitism.

(c) The political unification with Spain, in contrast, became more favorable thanks to the conversion of the Gothic kings, so much so that the ties between Gregory the Great and *Leander of Seville became stronger. However, to establish the rules of its pastoral ministry and its mission, the Iberian Peninsula used a conciliar organization that afforded less justification for Roman intervention: *Braulio of *Saragossa noted this after an intervention of Pope Hormisdas (638), considered inopportune, on the question of Judaism.

(d) Gaul had an increasingly important role, esp. after the establishment of the Catholic monarchy of the Franks; the episcopate generally maintained the Roman positions during the theological conflicts that pitted the pope against the emperor (such as the Three Chapters, monothelitism). Certainly the proxy granted to the bishop of Arles during the time of *Caesarius (503–543) lost all force over the course of the 6th c.; but despite the organization of provincial councils, the apostolic see remained a model that was often imitated.

(e) After Celestine, who supported *Patrick's mission among the Scotti (431), Gregory organized a mission for *Britain, which was headed by a monk from the Caelian monastery, *Augustine of Canterbury (597); in 668, moreover, Vitalian appointed a bishop for Canterbury.

(f) With respect to the East, the politics of Emperors *Zeno and *Anastasius (476–518) had caused a definitive break between East and West with the excommunication of *Acacius of Constantinople due to the work of Felix III in 487. However, in 518, the emperor *Justinian imposed submission on John who was forced in the "Second Rome" to accept communion with Rome; the primacy of Rome seems to have been better established when Pope Agapetus, who had come with a delegation, deposed the patriarch and set up *Menas in his place. Nevertheless, since the age of Justinian, the popes battled against the system of the imperial church: Vigilius, after a botched attempt at resistance, was forced to accept the condemnation of the Three Chapters, a condemnation that was desired by the sovereign (553); with Gregory the Great, who contested the bishop of Constantinople having the title of "ecumenical patriarch," Rome reacquired its authority. Despite the capitulation of Pope Honorius, Rome combated monothelist theology through Popes John IV, Theodore and Martin (Lateran Council 649), a theology that the Byzantine sovereign wished to impose on Rome. Despite the acts of retaliation by the emperor (execution and martyrdom of Pope Martin in 655), the Roman position was imposed at the Council of Constantinople (681).

Situated on the margins of an empire that was crumbling in Italy, Rome dealt with ever increasing difficulty the bothersome interference of the Byzantine authorities in the elections of the popes. Rome was concerned with finding a close and effective means to protect itself against the direct threats of the Longobards. The iconoclastic politics of the emperor *Leo the Isaurian exacerbated the alienation between Rome and the East and increasingly pushed the bishop of Rome toward France.

H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus*, Berlin 1927; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I and II, Tübingen 1930; H. Grisar, *Roma alla fine del mondo antico* (Ital. trans. by A. Mercati and revision by A. Bartoli, 2 vols.), Rome 1930; R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, 5 vols., Rome 1937-80 (Eng. and Ital. trans.); P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri*, Paris 1938; B.M. Apollonj Ghetti - A. Ferrua - E. Josi - E. Kirschbaum, *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di S. Pietro in Vaticano*, 2 vols., Rome 1951; L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, text, intr. and comm., I and II (III additions and appendix by C. Vogel), Paris ²1957 (bibl.); G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries*, Rome 1957; Y.M. Congar, *L'ecclésiologie du Haut Moyen Âge*, Paris 1968; D.W.M. O'Connor, *Peter in Rome, The Literary, Liturgical, and Archaeological Evidence*, New York 1969; W. Marshall, *Kartago und Rom* (Päpste und Papsttum 1), Stuttgart 1971; P. Joannou, *Die Ostkirche und die Kathedra Petri* (Päpste und Papsttum 3), Stuttgart 1972; L. Duchesne, *Scripta minora. Études de topographie romaine et de géographie ecclésiastique*, Rome 1973; H.I. Marrou, *Patristique et Humanisme* ("L'origine orientale des diaconies," pp. 81ff.), Paris 1975; C. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius . . .* (Päpste und Papsttum 7), Stuttgart 1975; M. Maccarrone, *Apostolicità, episcopato e primato di Pietro*, Lateranum 42, Rome 1976; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana, Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–340)*, 2 vols., (bibl.), Rome 1976; H.I. Marrou, *Christiana tempora*, Rome 1977; U.M. Fasola, *Pietro e Paolo a Roma*, Rome 1980; Ch. Pietri, *Aristocratie et société cléricale en Italie au temps d'Odoacre et de Théodoric*: MEFRA 93 (1981) 418-473; H. Geertman, *L'illuminazione della basilica paleocristiana secondo il Liber Pontificalis*: RivAC 64 (1988) 135-160; P.G. Caron, *La proprietà ecclesiastica nel diritto del tardo impero*, in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana.* IX Congr. Int., Perugia 1989, 217-230; E. dal Covolo, *I Severi e il cristianesimo. Ricerche sull'ambiente storico-istituzionale delle origini cristiane tra il secondo e il terzo secolo*, Rome 1989; F. Guidobaldi, *L'inserimento delle chiese titolari di Roma nel tessuto urbano preesistente. Osservazioni ed implicazioni*, in *Quaeritur Inventus Colitur. Miscellanea in onore di padre Umberto Maria Fasola, B.*, Vatican City 1989, 381-396; M. Mazza, *Deposita Pietatis. Problemi dell'organizzazione economica in comunità cristiane tra II e III secolo*, in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana.* IX Congr. Int., Perugia 1989, 187-216; Ch. Pietri, *Régions ecclésiastiques et paroisses romaines*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès Int. d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, Lyon-Vienne-Grenoble-Genève-Aoste, 21-28 Septembre 1986, Vatican City 1989, 1035-1062; L. Reekmans, *L'implantation monumentale chrétienne dans le paysage urbain de Rome de 300 à 850*, in ibid., 861-915; V. Saxer, *L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain. L'exemple de Rome dans l'Antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge*, in ibid., 917-1033; *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo*, XIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma 9-12 maggio 1990, Rome 1991; L. Pani Ermini, *Roma tra la fine del IV e gli inizi del V secolo*, in *Felix Temporis Reparatio.* Atti del Conv. archeologico int. "Milano Capitale dell'Impero Romano," Milano 8-11 marzo 1990, Milan 1992, 193-202; L. Gatto, *Ancora sull'edilizia e l'urbanistica nella Roma di Teodorico*: RomBarb 12 (1992–1993) 311-380; L. Paroli - P. Delogu (ed.), *La storia economica di Roma nell'alto Medioevo alla luce dei recenti scavi archeologici*, Atti del Seminario, Roma, 2-3 aprile 1992, Florence 1993; Ch. Pietri, *La Roma cristiana*, in A. Carandini - L. Cracco Ruggini - A. Giardina (ed.), *Storia di Roma. III. L'età tardoantica. I. Crisi e trasformazioni*, Turin 1993, 697-721; S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor. Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale. Basilica Salvatoris, Sanctae Mariae, Sancti Petri*, III, Vatican City 1994; L. Pani Ermini, Forma urbis *e* renovatio murorum *in età teodericiana*, in A. Carile (ed.), *Teoderico e i Goti tra Oriente e Occidente*, Ravenna 1995, 171-225; R. Coates- Stephens, *Dark Age Architecture in Rome*: PBSR 65 (1997) 177-232; F. Guidobaldi, *Transformations urbaines, sociales et religieuses à Rome au IV^e siècle*, in H.W. Pleket - A.M.F.W. Verhoogt (eds.), *Aspects of the Fourth Century A.D.*, Leiden 1997, 53-65; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane. Storia e topografia*, catalogo ed. P.M. Barbini, Rome 1997; É. Rebillard, *L'Église de Rome et le développement des catacombes. À propos de l'origine des cimetières chrétiens*: MEFRA 109 (1997) 741-763; V. Fiocchi Nicolai - F. Bisconti - D. Mazzoleni, *Le catacombe cristiane di Roma. Origini, sviluppo, apparati decorativi, documentazione epigrafica*, Regensburg 1998; F. Guidobaldi, *Spazio urbano e organizzazione ecclesiastica a Roma nel VI e VII secolo*, in N. Cambi - E. Marin (ed.), *Acta XIII Congressus Int. Archaeologiae Christianae*, I-III, Split-Poreč, 25 settembre-1 ottobre 1994, Vatican City 1998, II, 29-54; A. Fraschetti, *La conversione. Da Roma pagana a Roma cristiana*, Rome-Bari 1999; F. Guidobaldi, s.v. *Roma. Storia, architettura, urbanistica* (*sec. VI-XI*): EAM 10 (1999) 63-77; W.V. Harris (ed.), *The Transformations of* Urbs Roma *in Late Antiquity* (Journal of Roman Archaeology supplementary series 33), Portsmouth, RI 1999; *Riscoperta di Roma antica*, Rome 1999 (collections of entries devoted to Rome in 13 volumes of the Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica Classica Orientale; P. Delogu, *Solium imperii – urbs ecclesiae. Roma fra la tarda antichità e l'alto medioevo*, in G. Ripoll - J.M. Gurt (ed.), *Sedes regiae* (*ann. 400–800*), Barcelona 2000, 83-108; S. Ensoli - E. La Rocca (ed.), *Aurea Roma. Dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, Rome 2000; A. Giardina (ed.), *Roma antica*, Rome-Bari 2000; E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Roma imperiale*, Rome 2000; F. Marazzi, *Rome in Transition. Economic and Political Change in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, in J.M.H. Smith - T.S. Brown (eds.), *Early Rome and the Christian West*, Leiden 2000, 21-42; L. Pani Ermini (ed.), *Christiana Loca. Lo spazio cristiano nella Roma del primo millennio*, Rome 2000; L. Pani Ermini - P. Siniscalco (ed.), *La comunità cristiana di Roma. La sua vita e la sua cultura dalle origini all'alto medioevo*, Atti del I Congresso di studio, Roma, 12-14 novembre 1998, Vatican City 2000; M. Cecchelli (ed.), *Materiali e tecniche dell'edilizia paleocristiana a Roma*, Rome 2001; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Strutture funerarie ed edifici di culto paleocristiani di Roma dal IV al VI secolo*, Vatican City 2001; F. Marazzi, *Roma in transizione o Roma tardoantica? Spunti di riflessione su un problema di "quasi longue-durée,"* in G. Barone - L. Capo - S. Gaspari (ed.), *Studi sul Medioevo per Girolamo Arnaldi*, Rome 2001, 317-354; *Pietro e Paolo. Il loro rapporto con Roma nelle testimonianze antiche*, XXIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 4-6 maggio 2000, Rome 2001; M.S. Arena, et al. (ed.), *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo Nazionale Romano Crypta Balbi*, Milan 2001; A. Vauchez (ed.), *Roma medievale*, Rome-Bari 2001; F. Guidobaldi - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi (ed.), *Ecclesiae Urbis.* Congr. Int. di Studi sulle Chiese di Roma (IV-X secolo), Roma, 4-10 settembre 2000, Vatican City 2002.

Ch. Pietri – M. Ghilardi

II. Councils.

193. Apart from some councils mentioned by the *Libellus Synodicus*, a source that cannot be entirely trusted, the first Roman council concerning which scholars have any certain knowledge was the one held under Pope *Victor I, which condemned the *quartodeciman practice concerning the day of the celebration of *Easter. The bishops of *Asia Minor, led by *Polycrates of Ephesus, stated that they did

not want to follow the Roman practice. Victor intended to exclude them from *communion with Rome but was dissuaded from doing so by the intervention of some bishops, among whom was *Irenaeus of Lyons.

231. A council held during the pontificate of Pope *Pontianus to ratify the measures taken by Bishop *Alexander of *Alexandria against *Origen because of his irregular ordination and teachings. Origin subsequently sent a profession of faith to Pope *Fabian (Eus., *HE* 6, 36,4).

251. Following the Novatian schism, Pope *Cornelius called a council in which 60 bishops and a large number of priests and deacons participated (Eus., *HE* 6, 43,2). At this council, *Novatian and his followers were condemned; they accepted the decisions reached at the Council of *Carthage (251) concerning the *lapsed (*lapsi*), further specifying the course of action to be taken; they examined the case of Bishop *Trophimus.

260. Some members of the churches of the Libyan Pentapolis brought to Rome's attention the case of *Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria, accusing him of subordinationist *trinitarian teachings and of affirming that the Son was a creature (ποίημα). At Rome, a council was held in which *Dionysius of Rome condemned both *Sabellianism and *tritheism (see Athanasius, *Ep. de decr. Nic. Syn.* 26). Dionysius of Alexandria retracted and subsequently clarified some extreme positions of his theology.

313. The council pertaining to the rise of the Donatist controversy. The Donatists, in fact, persisting in the division of the African church in two parts—the part that made *Donatus its leader and the other that made *Caecilian its leader—turned to the emperor *Constantine and asked him for arbitration from the bishops of *Gaul. The emperor agreed and a council was held at Rome, presided over by Pope *Miltiades, at which three bishops of Gaul participated, 15 Italian bishops and representatives from the two conflicting parties, among whom were Donatus and Caecilian. The council confirmed the legitimacy of Caecilian's election.

341. *Athanasius, who had been deposed for the second time from the see of Alexandria (338), went to Rome to plead his case. Here, Pope Julius I had the idea of calling a council to attempt to resolve the problems caused by the Council of Nicaea. He also summoned the *Arians, who were led by *Eusebius of Nicomedia. Eusebius then delayed because he did not want to acknowledge that the bishop of Rome had the right to interfere in Eastern matters. Finally, Julius I held a council in the spring of 341: he reexamined Athanasius's case and declared him the legitimate bishop of Alexandria; he reexamined the case of *Marcellus of Ancyra, who had been accused of Sabellianism, and after having heard his profession of faith, which was considered adequate, this pope nullified his deposition and *excommunication.

370. A council held under Pope *Damasus concerning which we have information thanks to the conciliar letter *Confidimus quidem*, which was sent to the bishops of Illyricum, in which he reaffirmed the validity of the Nicene Creed and signed the formula according to which the three persons of the *Trinity were *unius substantiae*. *Auxentius, the Arian bishop of *Milan, was condemned.

374. This council condemned *Eustathius of Sebaste for his doctrine on the *Holy Spirit and *Apollinaris of Laodicea for his *christological teaching.

378. A council held at Rome following the case brought against Damasus by *Isaac, a Jewish convert who, when instigated by *Ursinus, the schismatic pope of 366, had accused the pontiff of serious crimes; to avoid the repetition of such cases, the conciliar bishops sent the council's decisions to the emperor *Gratian with the letter *Et hoc gloriae*, which asked that he intervene in this regard. Gratian responded with the rescript *Ordinariorum*, in which he specified the bishop of Rome's powers and spheres of intervention and in fact increased the scope of his jurisdiction.

380. The council examined the case of Bishop *Maximus the Cynic. He was irregularly elected to the see of Constantinople; he was therefore deposed and *Gregory of Nazianzus succeeded him. Maximus came to Rome to plead his case and the conciliar Fathers, who were poorly informed on the matter, sided with him.

382. This council was caused by the need to affirm once and for all the primacy of the see of the apostle Peter over all the Eastern churches. The Council of Constantinople (381) had seriously questioned the position of the Roman church and had overturned the hierarchical order of the apostolic sees, by placing the church of Constantinople ahead of the churches of *Alexandria and *Antioch. The Roman Bishop Damasus affirmed the prestige and the authority of the apostolic see (*apostolica sedes*) and confirmed the prestige and authority of that tradition; in an unmistakable way the order of the preeminence of the various apostolic sees and the position of the *prima sedes* (*Decretum Gelasianum* III). Among those who participated at this council were *Ambrose of Milan, *Jerome, *Epiphanius of Salamis, *Acholius of Thessalonica, *Paulinus of Antioch and three representatives of Constantinople. Jerome drafted a profession of faith for those *Apollinarians

who desired to reenter into communion with the church. *Flavian of Antioch, *Acacius of Beroea and *Diodore of Tarsus were excommunicated (see G. Pilara, *Problemi ancora aperti nel pontificato damasiano. Lo scisma ursiniano e i concili romani nel pontificato di Damaso*: Clio 28/1 [2002] 115-133).

390. Pope *Siricius condemned the monk *Jovinian and his supporters concerning the inability to sin after baptism, the denial of *Mary's virginity and the rejection of penitential practices (Jer., *Ad Iovinianum*).

417. Pope *Innocent gathered a council to receive the requests formulated by the African clergy to condemn *Pelagius and *Celestius. The decisions against the two heretics reached at the councils of *Carthage and Milevis (416) had been overturned by the Council of *Diospolis, where *John of Jerusalem had received Pelagius and Celestius into the church's communion. The African episcopate turned to the bishop of Rome as the one to whom alone belonged the right, as a last resort, to resolve the question. Innocent confirmed the condemnation of the two heretics and left an opening for the two heretics' repentance and reconciliation with the church.

417. *Zosimus, Pope Innocent's successor, reexamined Celestius's teaching, present at Rome, and that of Pelagius, who had sent a *libellus fidei*, and was convinced of their *orthodoxy and reinstated them into communion. A year later (418), when he had become aware of the hastiness with which he had absolved the heretics, in light of the clear position taken by the emperor *Honorius and the African clergy, Zosimus issued the *Epistola Tractoria* in which he condemned Pelagianism.

430. Following the christological controversy that had broken out between *Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and *Cyril of Alexandria, esp. regarding the conferring of the title **Theotokos* on the Virgin Mary, Pope *Celestine I intervened with a council. Previously in 429, Nestorius had written to the pope and made known his position. Cyril also wrote to Rome, and added to his letter a true and proper *dossier* on the event: some of Nestorius's sermons, the letters that Cyril had sent him, a list of Nestorius's errors compiled by Cyril and the collection of patristic testimonies on the incarnation, all of which had been translated already into Latin—a very important service for Latin speakers that Nestorius had failed to provide. On the basis of all these documents, the pope condemned Nestorius and gave him ten days to retract his position and entrusted to Cyril the execution of his judgment. The bishop of Rome sent letters to *John of Antioch, *Juvenal of Jerusalem, *Rufus of Thessalonica, *Flavian of Philippi and the clergy and the faithful of Constantinople (L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, 166-176).

443 or *444*. Council led by *Leo I in which the *Manicheans and their doctrines were condemned.

445. This council examined the situation in Gaul, where *Hilary, bishop of *Arles, had given displayed excessive zeal and excessive concentration of authority in his hands. Two controversial cases were reexamined, and Leo revoked the measures taken by Hilary, who, even in person, had vociferously defended his reasons. No specific measures were taken against him, with the exception of the limiting of his authority to the diocese of Arles alone. In the letter *Divinae cultum religionis* (*Ep.* 10), sent to the bishops of the province of *Vienne, Leo affirmed the primacy of Rome over all the churches.

449. Condemnation of the decisions taken at the Council of *Ephesus (August 449). Leo I sent letters to the emperor *Theodosius II, to his sister *Pulcheria and to the clergy and the faithful of Constantinople. He asked the emperor to nullify the decisions of the synod and to convoke an ecumenical council to be held in Italy.

484. In 482, the emperor Zeno had promulgated the **Henoticon* or the Edict of Union, in which he attempted to settle the *monophysite crisis. However, in the attempt at reconciliation, the edict had a clear monophysite tendency. To clarify the situation, Pope Felix III sent two legates to Constantinople, Bishops Vitalis and Misenus, bearers of letters for the emperor and *Acacius, bishop of Constantinople. The legates disregarded the pope's instructions and ended up restoring communion with Acacius and *Peter Mongus. As a result, in July 484, Felix called a council in which he deposed Acacius, excommunicating him from communion with Rome. Following the reaction of the bishop of Constantinople, the so-called Acacian schism had begun, which lasted until the year 519.

499. Following the Laurentian schism, which had paralyzed the activity of the Roman see, Pope *Symmachus convoked a council to take measures to prevent the repetition of similar events. For this council, he established a series of canons, among which one stated that the pope could appoint his successor. Even *Laurentius, his antagonist, signed the council's decisions and was appointed bishop of Nocera in Campania.

501. Despite legitimization of Symmachus's election, the party favorable to Laurentius appointed as their head the Roman Senator Festus and continued to scheme against the pope by accusing him of serious moral crimes, namely, changing the date of Easter and squandering ecclesiastical property. Symma-

chus convoked a council at Rome to answer the charges raised against him and to condemn those responsible for the disorder caused during the papal election.

502. The bishops of the opposing factions, to resolve the grave situation that occurred at Rome, had recourse to the Gothic King *Theodoric; he convoked a Roman council and sent a *visitator*, Peter, bishop of Altinus. The synod, called with the purpose of judging the conduct of the Roman pontiff, was long and tempestuous, and added more sessions because of the pope's reluctance to present himself before a judgment and because of the continual unrest that put his life at risk. The fourth session of the synod (23 October 502) introduced for the first time the legal principle of the pope's unjudgeable status. The conciliar bishops decided in favor of Pope Symmachus's reinstatement to the pontifical throne and for the excommunication of Peter and Laurentius from Rome. The schism continued, however, until 506, even if in fact it only ended with the death of Symmachus in 514 (see T. Sardella, *Società, Chiesa e Stato nell'età di Teoderico. Papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Messina 1996).

531. This council examined the appeal made by *Stephen, bishop of Larissa, to Rome. Stephen had been deposed by *Epiphanius of Constantinople. Stephen made his appeal on the basis that he was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of *Thessalonica, vicar of the apostolic see, and that only the pope, and not the bishop of Constantinople, had the right to judge him. Pope *Boniface II, having listened to Stephen's suffragans and having examined the evidence in his possession, reconfirmed Rome's jurisdiction over Illyricum, and affirmed, moreover, the legitimacy of the Thessalonican metropolitan's position toward the apostolic Roman see. The acts of the council have not survived.

600. A council held under the pontificate of Pope *Gregory the Great, in the presence of 23 other bishops, 23 presbyters of the Roman titular churches, deacons and the clergy; by popular acclamation, approval was obtained for the pontiff's proposals, which were sanctioned in six different disciplinary canons pertaining to the *liturgy, the administration of ecclesiastical goods and common norms of religious life.

600. Gregory the Great convoked a second Roman council to decide the condemnation of the monk Andrew, who had been accused of professing monophysite teachings, and to decide the case of Probus, the abbot of St. Andrew.

601. A council celebrated at the basilica of St. John Lateran. This council was also closely tied to the reforming work of Gregory I. In this particular conciliar forum, the pontiff made sure to address the questions pertaining to monasticism and, in all likelihood, along with 24 bishops and various deacons of the Roman Church signed the *constitutum* in favor of monasticism, by which the bishop of Rome intervened in favor of the autonomy of the monasteries and prohibited any interference from the clergy or the local bishops in the internal affairs of the individual communities, both with respect to the administration of property and with respect to the election of the abbots.

P. Coustant, *Pontificum Romanorum Epistulae*, Paris 1721 (letters before the year 440); A. Thiel, *Epistulae Pontificum Romanorum genuinae*, Braunsbergae 1868 (repr. 1974); *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum a condita Ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum 1198*, 2ª ed. (augmented), Berlin 1885–1888, repr. Graz 1956 (catalog of pontifical letters from Popes Julius I to Symmachus, 337-498), ed. Ph. Jaffé - G. Wattenbach - S. Löwenfeld - F. Kaltenbrunnen - P. Ewald; MGH AA 12, ed. Th. Mommsen - L. Traube, Berolini 1894, 395-455; *Collectio Avellana* (*Epistolae imperatorum pontificum et aliorum*), ed. O. Günther, CSEL 35, 2 vols., Vienna 1895–1896; C.H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima*, 2 vols., Oxford 1899–1939; E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, 431-879, Strasbourg-Berlin 1914–1974; Mansi 1-9; Palazzini 4, 119-180; Fliche-Martin I-IV; Hfl-Lecl 1-3; DACL, s.v. *Rome*, 3099. F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, I, Graz 1870 (repr. Graz 1956); L. Duchesne, *La première collection romaine de décrétales*, in Atti del II Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana, Rome 1902, 159-163; R. Massigli, *La plus ancienne collection de décrétales*: RHL 5 (1914) 402-424; C. Silva Tarouca, *Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Papstbriefe der 4. 5. und 6. Jahrh.*: ZKTh 43 (1919) 467-481, 657-692; E. Schwartz, *Die Kanonensammlungen der alten Reichskirche*: ZRG KA 25 (1936) 1-114; G. Röthe, *Geschichte der römischen Synoden im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1937; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IV^e-V^e siècles)*, Paris 1958; Id., *La Formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'Église aux IV^e et V^e siècles*, Paris ²1979, 159-166; Id., *Les sources du droit de l'Église en Occident du II^e au VII^e siècle*, Paris 1985; A.M. Stickler, *Historia iuris canonici*, I, *Historia Fontium*, Turin 1950; P. Paschini - V. Monachino, *I Papi nella storia*, I, Rome 1961; P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church*, 3 vols., London 1966; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana. Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, 2 vols., Rome 1976; A. Faivre, *La Documentation canonico-liturgique de l'église ancienne*: RSR 54 (1980) 204-215, 279-295; M. Wojtewytsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I. (440–461)*, Stuttgart 1981; EPapi I, Rome 2000; D. Jasper - H. Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, Ann Arbor, MI 2001.

G. Pilara

III. Liturgy. At Rome, as elsewhere, one should distinguish two periods in the history of the *liturgy: before and after the recognition of the church by the empire (314).

1. For the first three centuries, we know about the

liturgy celebrated at Rome through two primary documents: *Justin Martyr's *Apology* (written around 150) and the **Apostolic Tradition* (written around 215). Every Sunday, Christians gathered for *Mass, during which "the memories of the *apostles (the gospels) and the writings of the *prophets were publicly read, as much as time would permit." After the homily of the presider and a prayer offered on behalf of all the faithful, "some bread and wine with water was brought forward. The one who presided lifted up prayers and thanksgiving to heaven, as much as he could, and all the people responded with the acclamation *Amen*" (*1 Apol.* 67). Afterward, the distribution and division of these Eucharistic elements took place, which were also taken by the deacons to those who were absent (*1 Apol.* 67). One should note that it was the presider's prerogative specifically to improvise the Eucharistic prayer, "as much as he could," holding to a schema supplied by the tradition. Sixty years later, the *Apostolic Tradition* attests the same freedom; after having presented an example of a Eucharistic prayer, it added this observation: "that the bishop give thanks, as we said above. It is not necessary, therefore, that he say the same words which we have mentioned, as if forcing them to say them by memory . . . but each one should pray according to his ability" (*Apost. Trad.* 10).

Besides this Sunday *Eucharist, every year the Christians celebrated the feast of Easter: the memory of the passion and the *resurrection of the Lord, but also the birth of a new generation of believers, who received *baptism at the dawn of the Sunday morning of Easter. Baptism was usually conferred on adults, after a long *catechumenate, but it could also happen that adolescents or even babies were baptized along with their parents (ibid. 20-21). For the entire community, the feast of Easter was preceded by two days of *fasting and followed by 50 days of celebration (ibid. 33). The liturgical year did not include other feasts. Every year, however, the community celebrated the anniversary of its martyrs: thereafter would arise the sanctorale. According to the testimony of the *Apost. Trad.*, Christians gathered during the week to pray together, to listen to "instruction from the word" set forth by the deacons, priests or by some itinerant teacher (ibid. 39,41). This liturgical practice corresponded to a situation in which the Christians of Rome consisted of a few communities: they gathered by neighborhood, in one of their homes (*domus ecclesiae*), and the teaching, as in their worship service, was handled by qualified ministers.

2. Starting from the 4th c., the transformation of the relationship between the empire and the church had numerous repercussions on the liturgy. From the time of *Constantine, large basilicas were built (the Lateran, St. Peter's at the Vatican, St. Paul Outside the Walls) and other churches, which received an ever-increasing number of Christians. The Eucharist was, therefore, no longer celebrated in the domestic context of a home but inside the sacred context of the church; Christians no longer gathered around a table, but around an altar, which emphasized the sacrificial character of the Mass; the importance of the assembly necessitated greater organization; the increased number of ministers hastily trained made necessary the publication of booklets for preaching and worship. They thus passed from an oral liturgy to a written one, from a flexible to an established liturgy.

The collections of *prayers (*sacramentari*) and *homilies (*homiliaries) were written in Latin, because between 360 and 380 the church of Rome ceased to celebrate the liturgy in Greek, a language that many of the faithful no longer understood. This was done in order to adapt to the popular language of the day: Latin.

The Roman Canon of the Mass, which has been used even to our own time, dates back to the pontificate of St. *Damasus (366–384); it insisted heavily on the sacrificial character of the Mass, the presentation of the offerings by the priest and the assembly and God's acceptance of these sacrificial offerings.

From the 4th to the 6th c., numerous formularies were composed at Rome for the Mass and the *sacraments, which had first been gathered into anonymous *libelli* and then into *sacramentaries attributed to the popes, who were not their actual authors, but these literary works had an important role in the development of the Roman liturgy. One should mention the *Leonine Sacramentary*, which was compiled in the 6th c. (generally called the "Sacramentary of Verona," because it was transmitted by a manuscript from that city), the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, which was compiled at the end of the 7th c., which gathered formularies used in the titular churches (*tituli*) or the parishes of Rome; the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, which had as its basis the personal sacramentary used by Pope Gregory the Great (590–604), but was later enlarged and imposed by Charlemagne on the entire Western empire.

The 6th and the 7th c. likewise witnessed the composition of lectionaries for the Mass, epistolaries, evangelaries and *comes* (*books with specified references for reading), books of *chants for the Mass and Office: antiphonals, and lastly, directions for the celebration of the Mass, baptism and *ordination, the reconciliation of penitents, funerals: *ordines romani*.

With respect to the sacraments, the ecclesial and social evolution likewise caused some of the more or less rapid transformations. Candidates for baptism in the 4th and 5th c. were still primarily adults coming from *paganism: they prepared themselves at the beginning through a catechumenate of three years, which was completed by a period of more intense doctrinal and liturgical preparation during Lent that preceded their baptism. At the end of the 5th c., the situation changed because of the virtually complete Christianization of Roman society: by then the catechumens came from every walk of life, so that the preparation for their baptism was reduced to the scrutinies and rites of Lent. The baptism of adults became uncommon, and the baptism of babies became the norm; they were the children of Christian parents: the catechumenate had no reason to exist and the rites of initiation and baptism were simplified and adapted, for better or for worse, to the condition of the candidates, who were incapable of professing their faith. Nevertheless, Rome resisted this transformation of the baptismal rite more than other churches: only in 726, at the time of Pope *Gregory II, does one find a substitution of the traditional threefold question "*Credis in Deum . . .*" with the formula "*Ego te baptizo . . .*" that was pronounced by the priest (*Ep. 15 ad Bonifacium* 8: PL 89, 929).

The sacrament of *penance or reconciliation was closely connected to baptism, which antiquity considered a second baptism. At Rome, as elsewhere, penance was given only once in a lifetime. From the 4th to the 6th c., the Roman Church lived with a penitential legislation whose severity was justified at the time of the *persecutions, but no longer corresponded to the situation of a large and moderately fervent community. Christians guilty of grievous sins tended to delay to the last moment their request for reconciliation. To obtain it, they had to confess their faults to the bishop, then enter the *ordo poenitentium*; on Sunday, they attended Mass, but did not partake of the Eucharist; they were reintegrated during the public rite of reconciliation, which, from the 4th c., was celebrated on Holy Saturday to admit them to Easter communion (see *Sacram. Gelas.* 352-363).

Rites for the death and burial of Christians were precisely presecribed in the *Ordo romanus* 49 (ed. Andrieu IV, 523-530), which dates to the end of the 7th c. The Christian *transitus* is presented as a Paschal exodus, an entrance into the promised land with the welcome of angels and saints.

The Roman liturgy was therefore formed roughly between 350 and 680: Popes Leo I, Gelasius I and Gregory I were its inspirers and chief organizers. In its totality, this liturgy left great space for the word, biblical readings, *psalms, prayers and prefaces. The language of prayer united Roman sobriety with a controlled, but rich, lyricism. Chant occupied an important place in the Eucharistic celebrations, but musical instruments were not permitted. The gestural and symbolic language was also very discreet: the attitudes of prayer, the gestures of offering or the *laying on of hands, the processions were characterized by a sobriety, which could not have been preserved when, in Charlemagne's time, the Roman liturgy was widespread and imposed on the entire Western world: there then emerged a Romano-Frankish liturgy, which we have inherited.

Sources: Justin, *Apol.* I, II: PG 6, 327-470; *Apost. Trad.* (ed. and Fr. trans.): SC 11 bis, Paris 1968; *Sacram. Veronense*, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, Rome 1966; *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae – Sacram. Gelas.*, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, Rome ²1968; *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien*, ed. J. Deshusses, Fribourg 1971–1982; *Les ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vols., ed. M. Andrieu, Louvain 1931–1961.

Studies: T. Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare evangeliorum*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 28, Münster 1935; E. Bourque, *Études sur les sacramentaires romains*, I, Rome 1949; A. Chavasse, *Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l'antiphonaire romains de la messe*: RBen 62 (1952) 3-94; E. Dekkers, *Autour de l'oeuvre liturgique de S. Léon le Grand*: SE 10 (1958) 363-398; A. Chavasse, *Le Sacramentaire gélasien*, Tournai 1958; J.M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte*, OCA 155, Rome 1959; G. Pomarès, *Gélase Ier. Lettre contre les Lupercales et dix-huit messes du Sacramentaire léonien*, SC 65, Paris 1959 (intro.); H. Ashworth, *The Liturgical Prayer of Gregory the Great*: Traditio 15 (1959) 107-161; J.A. Jungmann, *La liturgie des premiers siècles*, Paris 1962; K. Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores*. I-II, Fribourg 1968; E. Cattaneo, *Introduzione alla storia della liturgia occidentale*, Rome ²1969; Quasten I, 177-180, 190-194 (studies and bibl. on the *Apologies* of St. Justin); 437-448 (studies and bibl. on the *Trad. Apost.*); A. Nocent, *Storia dei libri liturgici romani*: Anamnesis II, Turin 1978, 147-165; A. Chavasse, *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du Ve au VIIIe siècle* (SA 112), Rome 1993.

Ph. Rouillard

ROTHARI. King of the *Longobards (636–652). He distinguished himself by restoring his people, who were being torn to pieces by the internal wars of the dukes, and by continuing the war against the Greeks. Under the governance of Rothari, the Longobards extended their conquest to the demise of *Byzantine territories. Rothari's most significant feat was a promulgation of the edict (643) that bore his name, the foundation of subsequent Longobard legislation. The legal material, which was transmitted until that time in oral form, was substantially Germanic. In an ungrammatical Latin construction, the edict is sub-

divided into 388 chapters not always arranged according to a recognizable order; it has similar characteristics to those of other barbarian *leges*, as a written redaction of the ancient laws of the people drawn through various inquiries posed to the elders. They treat primarily the suppression of crimes against the state, the safety of persons and things, hereditary law, family law, existing rights, obligatory rights, responsibilities toward servants, damages and obligations.

CPL 1808; N. Tamassia, *Le fonti dell'Editto di Rotari*, Pisa 1889, now in *Scritti di storia giuridica*, II, Padova 1967, 181-260; Fr. Beyerle, *Die Gesetze der Langobarden*, Witzenhausen 1962; A. Cavanna, *Nuovi problemi intorno alle fonti dell'Editto di Rotari*: SDHI 34 (1968) 269-361; B. Paradisi, *Il prologo e l'epilogo dell'Editto di Rotari*, ibid., 1-31; C.G. Mor, *Il diritto romano nel sistema giuridico longobardo del secolo VIII*: RAL 27 (1973) 1-16; P. Delogu - A. Giullou - G. Ortalli, *Longobardi e Bizantini*, in *Storia d'Italia*, ed. P. Delogu, Turin 1980; *Langobardia*, ed. S Gasparri, Testi di P. Cammarosano, Udine 1990; N. Christie, *The Lombards: The Ancient Longobards*, Oxford 1995; B. Luiselli, *La formazione della cultura europea occidentale*, Rome 2002.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

RUFINUS (Friend of Prosper of Aquitaine) (d. after 429). Information about Rufinus exists only in a *letter by Prosper of Aquitaine *Ad Rufinum de gratia et libero arbitrio* (PL 51, 77-79; 45, 1793-1802). From this document one learns that, having come to the knowledge that some people, enemies of the Augustinian doctrine of *grace, also accused his friend Prosper of having fallen into heresy, Rufinus sent him a letter. Prosper responded by explaining and defending Augustinian thought and refuting the *Pelagian theses: this response seems to have been written around 429, because it considers *Augustine as still alive, but in the last phase of his life.

CPL 516; DCB 4, 562; F. Vinel, *Une étape vers l'affirmation du salut universel. Prosper d'Aquitaine. Lettre à Rufin sur la grâce et le libre arbitre. Introduction et traduction*: RHE 90 (1995) 367-395.

A. Pollastri

RUFINUS FLAVIUS (ca. 335–395). The information on Rufinus Flavius contained in the writings of *Ambrose (*Ep.* 52,1), *Symmachus (*Ep.* III, 81-91), *Jerome (*Ep.* 60,16), *Zosimus (*Hist. nova* IV, 57,4; V, 1,1.3) and *Theodoret (*HE* V, 18,6-12) makes him out to be a famous person of great learning. According to Jerome and Theodoret, Rufinus Flavius was astute, cruel, politically capable and especially a persecutor of heretics. A native of southern *Gaul, where he was born around 335, he was able to utilize his abilities with trickery and politics first under *Theodosius then *Arcadius. At first, with Theodosius, he was head of the imperial house; he became consul in 392, and he was shortly thereafter prefect of the praetorian for the East, a post he held also under Arcadius until 395. According to Theodoret, whose narration, however, leaves a few quandaries, Rufinus Flavius was responsible for the massacre at *Thessalonica. Rufinus was then commissioned to try to persuade Ambrose to rescind the condemnation leveled against Theodosius. After the death of Theodosius, the rivalry between *Stilicho and Rufinus Flavius resulted in the latter's death at *Constantinople in 395.

A. de Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire romain au IV^e siècle*, 3^e p.: *Valentinien et Théodose*, 2 vols., Paris 1869; G. Rauschen, *Jährbucher der christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem Grossen*, Freiburg i. Br. 1897, 439ff.; J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire romain*, Paris 1933; PLRE 1, 778-781; E. Potz, *Claudians in Rufinum. Invektive und Laudatio*: Philologus 134 (1990) 66-81; K. Fitschen, *Der Praefectus Praetorio Flavius Rufinus. Ein hoher Reichsbeamter als Gestalt der Kirchengeschichte zur Zeit der "Theodosianischen Wende"*: ZAC 5 (2001) 86-103.

M.G. Mara

RUFINUS of Aquileia (345–410). Tyrannius Rufinus, student of letters at *Rome around 368, friend of *Jerome, he took part with him in an *ascetic group, which in the years around 370, tried to recreate in his home town of Concordia the monastic and intellectual life of the East. After a long stay in *Egypt (373–380), where he also visited *Didymus, he saw *Melania at the monastery of the Mount of Olives, at *Jerusalem, which was closely tied to Bishop *John II and *Origenist circles (*Palladius, *Evagrius). After the painful controversies with Jerome on the translation of *Origen's writings (and on that of the *Bible from the Hebrew or the Septuagint), he reentered the West in 397, and was persecuted, at Rome, then at *Aquileia, due to the animosity of his old friend. He escaped from the *Goths during the invasion of *Italy and went to die in *Sicily. He was the friend and confidant of leading individuals in Christian Italy. His work, though modest, consisted primarily of translation into Latin, and he preserved for us the chief part of what remains of Origen's works. His goal was not to preserve Eastern texts that were unfortunately lost but to enlighten the Latin world that was suffering from an immense cultural lag with respect to the East; his translations were not designed to preserve the detail of the original, but rather to be useful to 4th-c. readers. He had more piety than critical sense. His original work (esp. the prefaces to his translations) were published in CCL 20.

His first translation was that of *Basil's *Asceticon* (397). In 398, he published Origen's *On First Principles*, which started a controversy. Rufinus then translated or summarized the *Apology for Origen* by the martyr *Pamphilus and *Eusebius of Caesarea; he defended himself before Pope *Anastasius with a personal *Apology* consisting of four pages. Then he was supposed to publish two books against Jerome, but he refused to pursue this controversy. He devoted himself to translating Origen's wonderful homilies on *Genesis, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, the *Song of Songs and the Epistle to the Romans; various homilies by Basil and *Gregory of Nazianzus; the ascetic sentences of *Evagrius and *Sextus (the Pythagorean, whom he mixed up with Pope *Sixtus); the *Dialogue* of *Adamantius, confused with Origen; Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia ecclesiastica*, which was extended to the death of Emperor *Theodosius the Great; the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*; the ps.-*Clementine *Recognitiones*. Two short and more personal compositions, a *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed* and the *Blessings of the Patriarchs*, were also inspired by Eastern models.

His work made a decisive contribution to the biblical and nonbiblical culture of the Latin Middle Ages.

CPL 195-198; PL 21; CCL 20 (1961); Patrologia III, 234-240; F.X. Murphy. *Rufinus of Aquileia*, Washington, DC 1945; C.P. Hammond, *The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life*: JTS 28 (1977) 372-429; For an extensive bibliography, see H.R. Drobner, *Rufinus, Tyrannius*: BBKL 8, 959-972; G. Fedalto, *Rufino di Concordia (345 c.–410/411). Tra Oriente e Occidente*, Rome 1990; Rufino di Concordia, *Storia di monaci*, ed. G. Trettel, Rome 1991; Rufino di Concordia, *Storia della chiesa*, ed. L. Dattrino, Rome 1986; Rufino di Concordia, *Le benedizioni dei patriarchi*, ed. M. Veronese, Rome 1995; G. Fedalto, *Rufino di Concordia tra Oriente e Occidente*, Rome 2005.

J. Gribomont

RUFINUS the Syrian (d. after 415). We know of a Rufinus, disciple of *Jerome, priest of his monastery at *Bethlehem, who was sent to *Rome in 399 to carry letters 81 and 84 and Jerome's translation of *Origen's *On First Principles* (*Ep.* 81,2; *Contra Ruf.* 3,24). According to B. Fischer (in K. Aland, *Die alten Übersetzungen des NT*, Berlin 1972, 73) and the editors of the Vetus Latina Institute Beuron, Rufinus corrected the Latin translation of *Paul's epistles and the remainder of the NT in the text that became the Vulgate. This Rufinus is identified by many scholars as Rufinus the Syrian, who, according to *Marius Mercator (ACO I, V, 5), introduced *Pelagian ideas at Rome during the time of Pope *Anastasius I (399–402) and whose teaching was promulgated by *Celestius and *Pelagius. At *Carthage, in 411, Celestius mentioned a Rufinus, whom he had heard at Rome in the home of *Pammachius (d. ca. 410), as the source of his teaching (*Augustine, *De gratia Chr.* 2,3,3). The *Liber de fide* (so named by the the first editor Sirmond on the basis of its *explicit* in the MSS attributed to Rufinus of *Palestine) in which one finds a defense of Pelagian ideas should be considered his work. The *Liber* reveals a familiarity with Greek theological texts (esp. those of the Cappadocians) and, with respect to *anthropology, the school of *Antioch. Moreover, a *Libellus de fide* containing twelve *anathemas is also at times attributed to the same Rufinus.

CPL 199-200; PL 21, 1123-1154; PL 48, 451-491; DSp 12, 2890-2891; M.W. Miller, *Rufini presbyteri Liber de Fide*, Washington, DC 1964; The *Libellus*: PL 21, 1123-1124; PL 48, 239-254; ACO I, V, 4-5; B. Altaner, *Der Liber de fide, ein Werk des Pelagianers Rufinus des "Syrers"*: ThQ 130 (1950) 432-449 (= TU 83, 467-482); F. Refoulé, *Datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagiens et du libellus fidei de Rufin*: REAug 10 (1963) 41-49; H.I. Marrou, *Les attaches orientales du Pélagianisme*: CRAI (1968) 459-472; G. Bonner, *Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism*: August. Studies 1 (1970) 31-47; E. TeSelle, *Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius . . .* : ibid. 3 (1972) 61-95; W. Dunphy, *Rufinus the Syrian's "Books"*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 523-529; L.J. van der Lof, *The Man in the Shadow Behind Pelagius*: SP 15, 247-254; W. Dunphy, *Marius Mercator on Rufinus the Syrian. Was Schwartz Mistaken?* Augustinianum 32 (1992) 279-288; Id., *The Lost Manuscript of Pseudo-Rufinus "De fide"*: Augustinianum 40 (2000) 89-103; Id., *An Unlisted Profession of Faith.* (*Pseudo-Rufinus, "De Fide"*): SE 39 (2000) 37-53.

J. Gribomont

RUFUS of Octodurum. Bishop of Octodurum (today Martigny, in Switzerland), who died probably before 565. At Orléans, he took part at the council of 541 and at the one called by Childebert I in 549, which saw the reunion of more than 50 bishops and delegates from various cities, among whom was *Nicetius of Trier. A certain *Rufus* wrote him a letter, included in the Austrian collection (Ep. 21), which Gundlach dates to the time of Chlothar I (ca. 550).

In this letter, the writer confirms that he sent Italian *artifices* requested by Nicetius (whom Rufus addressed by referring to him as *dominus semper meus* and *meus peculiaris dominus*), probably for the reconstruction of the churches of Trier and the building of a castle on the Moselle River (see Ven. Fort., *Carm.* 3,11 and 3,12). Rufus, who refers to himself as an *episcopus* in the *superscriptio* of the letter, addresses Nicetius with a tone altogether affectionate and humble, an implicit recognition of a devoted friendship, witnessed to, in the same epistolary context, by the memory of peaceful moments of mutual sharing. In the letter, other individuals are also

named: the priest Amabilis, *frater meus*, and the deacons Sunnoveus and Catellion, *conservi mei*.

Duchesne and Gundlach identified the sender of the letter with Rufus, bishop of Turin, who was mentioned by *Gregory of Tours (*Glor. mart.* 13), although Lanzoni and Kentenich—followed by Malaspina—proposed that he should be identified with the bishop of Octodurum.

CPL 1065; CCL 117 (1957) 439-440 [Rufus Octodurensis] = MGH, *Epistolae*, III, ed. W. Gundlach, Berlin 1892, 133-134 [Rufus Taurinensis]; *Concilia Galliae. A. 511 – A. 695*, ed. C. de Clercq, CCL 148 A (1963), 143 and 158; *Il* Liber epistolarum *della cancelleria austrasica* (sec. V-VI), ed. E. Malaspina, Rome 2001, 139-141 (text and trans.) and 266-267 (notes). F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, II, Faenza 1927, 1048; G. Kentenich, *Der Kult der Thebäer am Niederrhein. Ein Beitrag zur Heiligengeographie*: Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 8 (1931) 339-350; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de Première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen-Âge (III^e^-VIII^e^ siècles)*, Paris 1980, 172-207; E. Ewig, *The Merowinger und das Imperium*, Opladen 1990; Patrologia IV, 301-302 (Y. Hen); I.W. Wood, *Administration, Law and Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge 1990, 63-81.

B. Clausi

RUFUS of Shotep (6th–7th c.). An author of various *commentaries on the NT in *Coptic, who lived between the end of the 6th c. and the beginning of the 7th c. From the few sources on his life, one concludes that after a period of living as a monk and after having undertaken a *pilgrimage to the Holy Land, he was consecrated as bishop of Shotep (Hypsele, city of Upper Egypt, 7 km [4.3 mi] SE of Lycopolis-Siout) by the Patriarch *Damian (578–604). He was the driving force of a significant literary renaissance in the Coptic Church, in which he was also one of the most eminent figures. Fragments from four codices containing a commentary on the gospel of *Matthew and one on the gospel of *Luke have survived. The texts were published by M. Sheridan, and even in their rather fragmentary state, they bear witness to us of his vast theological learning for his time and made their author a worthy example in the Alexandrian exegetical tradition. The exegesis is of course allegorical, although that does not rule out the author's philological attention to the text. Rufus insisted on the harmony of the OT and the NT in the context of the *economy of salvation; here and there he inserted controversies with heretical teachings (there are a significant number of references to *Marcion and *Manicheism); but his interest was focused primarily on the moral teaching of *Scripture, which was directed to a diverse public, but esp. to a monastic audience.

G. Garitte, *Rufus évêque de Shotep et ses commentaires des Évangiles*: Muséon 69 (1956) 11-33; J.M. Sheridan, *Rufus of Shotep, Homilies on the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary*, Rome 1998.

T. Orlandi

RUFUS of Thessalonica. Bishop of Thessalonica, who in 412 was appointed the vicar of Pope *Innocent in the provinces of Illyricum (*Achaia, *Thessaly, Old *Epirus, New Epirus, *Crete, Mediterranean *Dacia, Dacia Ripensis, *Moesia and Dardania Prevalitana). Always maintaining a close connection to the church of *Rome, during his episcopate Rufus first turned to Innocent concerning a series of disciplinary questions (Innocent, *Ep.* 17: PL 20, 526-537) and with regard to the case of the two bishops Bubalius and Taurianus, who had recourse to Rome after being pronounced guilty by the Macedonian bishops of Illyricum (Innocent, *Ep.* 18: PL 20, 538-539). Rufus then cited Pope *Boniface concerning the election of *Perigenes at Corinth (Boniface, *Ep.* 4: PL 20, 760-761).

Having become involved in the doctrinal controversies of the 5th c. (*Cyril of Alexandria, *Ep.* 42 and 43: PG 77, 221-224) after the Council of *Ephesus (431), Rufus received from Pope *Celestine (*Ep.* 12: PL 50, 465-470) information about the condemnation of *Nestorius, and during the time of the Council of *Chalcedon (451) the Eastern Fathers wrote to him to make known their adherence to the faith of the Council of *Nicaea (*Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Ep.* 170: PG 83, 1476-1481).

CPG 5342-5343, 6319, 8641; DCB IV, 562; *Storia della Chiesa*, ed. P. De Labriolle - G. Bardy - L. Bréhier - G. De Plinval, IV, Turin 1972, 216, 232-233, 236, 306-307, 319-320.

P. Marone

RULES, MONASTIC. The *rule*, that is, the constitutional document of a given religious order, is an idea that was born in the West, among jurists and the curia of the 12th c. as a result of a long evolution. In the first centuries, the virgins that were inscribed on the lists (*canon*) of the local church—and who received subsidies and collaborated in its *liturgy and works of charity—were naturally subject to a certain unwritten discipline. Even male ascetics, who were more free because they were not dependent upon subsidies, had to render an account to the bishops for their activity. When the documents of the period sought to justify the *traditions of the church, they generally referred to the authority of the *apostles; this ps.-*apostolicity expressed an immemorial custom.

When *monasticism appeared, during the era in which the Constantinian church was secularizing and lowering its moral standards, contrasts and the distortions were not rare. The best monks served as models; when *Athanasius wrote the *Life of Anthony* (d. 356) he understood well on which points it was necessary to insist and proposed a rule of life for all, without naturally obligating anyone to reproduce *Anthony's miracles nor even the feats of the saint's austerity. It was the *cenobitic communities who imposed on themselves a certain number of conditions so that *prayer, *asceticism and work would be carried out in harmony, taking certain measures in the meantime against the possible abuses of power by the strongest: episcopal authority did not intervene here except for a tacit *nihil obstat*. *Pachomius's *Precepts*, perhaps written after his death (347) to maintain the customs that he began, based upon experience and not at all upon a theoretical system, tended to preserve the *canon* of the early church; these were so well conceived that, through *Jerome's translation, they exercised a great influence on the West. They willingly used the standard of right measure, but even more, that of the common good. In the Cappadocian context, where a revolutionary and social movement came up against a court episcopate, *Basil was able to impose mediation thanks to his *Moral Rules* (ὅροι), taken literally from the NT, that define God's will over all his disciples of the gospel. The commentary on these rules, the *Asceticon*, responded to the brothers' questions and came down to the concrete particular; it is that which, in a more evolved perspective, the Latins called the *Instituta* (*Rufinus) or *Regula* (*Benedict). All of these documents were translated into Latin (and other languages) and were foundational for the insertion of monasticism into the episcopal church.

In the East, councils and emperors slowly established some canons and laws to remedy abuses as well as for disciplining the monastic movement's relationships to the world. With respect to the internal life of the monasteries, the *Typica*, written by the founders, specified their demands toward the beneficiaries of their donations. But the essential thing remained the living tradition, the example the saints, especially in the case of the solitaries, who were often the most characteristic phenomenon. In the West, in addition to Basil's *Rule* (translated in 397) and that of Pachomius (translated in 404), and *John Cassian's *Institutions* (416–424)—a long text that refers to the (pseudo-)Egyptian traditions, not to mention the *Life of Martin* to bring about the reform of the monks of *Gaul—one must note, around the year 397, the *libellus* (the title "Rule" is late) that St. *Augustine gave to the (lay) African monks and which is founded on a brief earlier document known as the *ordo monasterii*, written perhaps by *Alypius. This would subsequently become the basis of the canonical life, organically integrated into the worship of the basilicas and the pastoral ministry, according to a typical tendency of the West, which is also found, *mutatis mutandis*, in its monastic communities.

The Rule of the Four Fathers belongs to a second generation, which one should situate probably at *Lérins, around the years 400–410; a second *Rule of the Fathers*, at Lérins, around 427 (?), brings completion to the first, and both left traces in subsequent texts. Likewise in S Gaul, before the year 500, the Eastern rule and that of *Macarius appeared; in 534 that of *Caesarius of *Arles for virgins and, along the same lines, another of the same author for monks; around 550 the two Aurelians' Rules. The tradition that arose from the Rule written by Caesarius of Arles bore a heavy Augustinian stamp. In the meantime, in Italy the *Regula magistri* (written before 530) claimed its charismatic authority. The cento rule written by *Eugippius, at Lucullanum (near *Naples) around the year 530, reused Augustine, the *Regula magistri*, Basil, etc. Around the year 550, at Montecassino, the *Rule of St. Benedict* preserved the doctrinal part of the *Regula magistri* (summarized and adapted to the needs of the Church of *Rome), but it adjusted the practices for some of the most important and hard-working monasteries.

The third *Rule of the Fathers*, which was written by Tarnant and St. Ferreolus, dates back to the second half of the 6th c.; in Italy we have that of Paul and Stephen. From *Ireland, the *Regula monachorum* and the *Regola coenobialis* of St. *Colombanus's (d. 615;) came to Gaul; in *Spain, in addition to the (lost) rule of John of Biclaro, we know of Leander of Seville's *De institutione virginum*, the Rules of *Isidore and *Fructuosus, the *Regula communis*, *The Pact of St. Fructuosus* and the *Consensoria monachorum*. But the *Rule of St. Benedict*, due to the strength inherent in its understanding of moderation and St. *Gregory the Great's recommendations of it, was adopted in Gaul and England, at first under a mixed form (with St. Columbanus's *Rule*), then by itself. All these texts, which have much in common, demonstrate that each leader patterned his own rule according to his own circumstances (even if he adopted, without modification, a document that was composed elsewhere). Only during the Carolingian period would the imperial authority (or that of the synods of abbots that depended upon it) see in the Rule (Benedict's or, for the canons, that of Chrode-

gang) a precise law, the monitoring of which the appropriate visitors enforced.

CPL 1838-1876; PL 103; DIP 7, 1410-1617; A. de Vogüé, *La Règle du Maître*, 3 vols., Paris 1964-65; Id., *La Règle de s. Benoît*, 7 vols., Paris 1972-77; G. Turbessi, *Regole monastiche antiche*, Rome 1974; V. Desprez, *Règles monastiques d'Occident*, Bellefontaine 1980; Id., *Les Règles des saints Pères*, 2 vols., Paris 1982; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1991–2006; Id., *Le regole monastiche antiche*, Salerno 1995; M. Bozzi - A. Grilli, *La Regola del Maestro*, 2 vols., Brescia 1995; J. Thomas - A.C. Hero, *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, 5 vols., Washington, DC 2001; *Regole monastiche d'Occidente*, ed. E. Bianchi, Turin 2004.

J. Gribomont

RUNIC. From the ancient Nordic term *runar*, "writing (secret)," the plural of *run*, Gothic *runa*, "mystery, secret." Special graphic characters from the Germanic world that made their appearance among the Scythian Goths on the Black Sea around AD 300, reaching their maximum circulation in the Scandinavian countries between the end of antiquity and the beginning of the Middle Ages (400–1100). Finally, the use of Runic remained in vogue in an isolated region of the Swedish countryside until at the end of the 19th c. the letters of this language were transformed, supplanted by the progressive establishment of the Latin alphabet. The word *runic*, which was closely connected to the ideas of "secret" and "mystery," alluded both to the silent characteristic of communication (writing in itself), and the magic use that was made of it (as *Tacitus observed in *Germania*; priests, tribal heads or the *paterfamilias* practiced divination by reading the pattern on pieces of wood, upon which were inscribed runes, randomly scattered on a white sheet).

The runic alphabet also called "futhark," from the sequence of the first six letters that constitute it (Fehu, Ur, Thurs, Ansuz, Raido and Ken), was the alphabet used by the ancient Germanic peoples such as the Angli and the Juti. The runic alphabet "futhark" was initially formed by 24 individual characters called "runes." We know of the subsequent developments of futhark, which were differentiated by the number and form of the runes. The straight-oline composition of the individual runes is due to the fact that the marks were often made upon stone, wood and hard surfaces.

The Germanic runes probably derived from a script belonging to the group of the five primary varieties of the Northern Italian alphabet, which derived from the Etruscan alphabet. This alphabet is known only through some inscriptions that were discovered in the Alpine and Prealpine area. Similar scripts were used for Lepontic, Rhaetic and Venetic.

The most ancient runic documents had their origin from the areas to the S of the Scandinavian territory, the fruit of a civilization that was pushed from more S regions toward N Europe around the beginning of the Christian era. Runic inscriptions discovered in Romania, Volhynia and Brandenburg testify to the presence that this civilization left in history. It seems that the Goths were the ones to bring the runic script into Scandinavia around the 3rd c. After 380, the runes appeared in Denmark and in S Norway. Historians documented numerous examples of this script from the entire 4th c., and then, after 500, from Denmark it went to the W Germanic lands and England, at least according to the archaeological attestations as well as the forms of the runes themselves. There are about 20 German inscriptions spread out in a territory from Westphalia in the N to Switzerland in the S, from Burgundy in the W to Hungary in the E. At the beginning of the 20th c., an isolated graffito was found in Bosnia. They are usually very brief and generally contain the names of individuals; for the most part they are inscribed on belt buckles. Among the Germanic peoples, however, it seems that the runes fell into disuse as early as the 7th c. The continental runes corresponded to the Danish runes of the 6th c. with respect to number, form and phonetic value, and they also presupposed the slight transformation into external forms of certain signs that previously took place in Denmark. One can say the same thing with respect to the English runes from the quantity of the inscriptions that we know of; they had a much wider use than the German runes. In England, in fact, runic inscriptions not only characterized ornaments, arms and other mobile objects, but they were also inscribed on stone, and inscriptions of noteworthy dimensions have even survived to our day. Moreover, the Anglo-Saxon runic alphabet was adapted to the local language with a subsequent increase in the number of characters to the point that in order to find something similar we have to return to N Scandinavia, at a much later historical period. The result of this adaptation was the transference of the runic alphabet from 28 signs to 33, which indicates the phonetic richness of the Anglo-Saxon language. Such English runes were used until AD 1000.

From the script which Ulfilas used to write his translation of the *Bible, some have concluded that he knew the runes, and from these, in addition to the Greek alphabet, he derived his new signs. If, however, one examines the sole three possible sources of the runic script, it seems that one must

conclude that for historical reasons the Greek alphabet must be eliminated, although it is impossible not to put some runes in relation to the Latin alphabet, but this alphabet is insufficient to explain everything. A heavily Latinized sub-Alpine alphabet would probably appear as the ideal prototype, but unfortunately it has not yet been found: one can only say that some scholars, comparing the runes with the form of the N Italian inscriptions from the Alpine territory (4th and 1st c. BC), have noted that around twenty characters have a perfect correspondence in that graphic system; nevertheless, for the remaining four runes it is not possible to find the source in any other graphic system of S Europe. The bivalence of each sign is characteristic of the runic script. This sign can be used with a phonetic or rather ideographic value, at times for the same inscription. Therefore, documented since the 9th c., each rune has its own name, whose initial letter (for the rune that equals *z*, the last letter) indicates the phonetic value although the meaning is the ideographic value. For example, the rune that carries a semantic value of *o* has the ideographic value of "possession, patrimony," which is precisely the meaning of its name *odal*.

Like the prerunic symbols, the runes were at first used not as a means of communication but as an instrument of worship and, as Tacitus says, of prophecy. And certainly the so-called *magia runica* (runic magic) constitutes the most characteristic and highest aspect of the magical practices of the N Germans. An Eddic poem recounts that the god Freir fell in love with a young giant girl, Gerdhr, and sent her the messenger Skirnir who, when faced with Gerdhr's resistance, threatened to use runic magic; this shows that the runes were believed to possess magical powers. Once erased, their effect instantaneously ceased. One day Egil Skallagrimsson visited a sick girl; in order to heal her he inscribed runes. They were poorly applied and thus aggravated the illness. Egil erased them, tossed them into the fire and etched them in again, but this time placing them under the sick girl's pillow. This time the runes brought about her healing. (See the Eddic *Poem of Sigurd*.) Each sign of the runic alphabet had a special value and thus generated the various combinations of runes.

Nordisk Kultur, VI, *Rune*, ed. O. v. Friesen, Stoccolma, Oslo, Copenaghen 1933; M. Meli, *Alemannia runica. Rune e cultura nell'Alto Medioevo*, Verona 1988; M. Polia, *Le Rune e gli dèi del nord*, Rimini 1999.

L. Montecchio

RUPERT of Salzburg (d. after 716). Born near Worms, he belonged to the family of the Robertini, who were Franko-Rhenish counts, and was related to the Carolingians. Rupert was perhaps the bishop of Worms. After being trained in the missionary methods of the Irish, he set out to evangelize, according to legend, Ratisbon and Lorsch, and with certainty, Salzburg. He arrived in the area of Salzach not after 696 and founded the Abbey of St. *Peter (the oldest in Austria) in the ancient Roman city *Iuvavum*, and another abbey, for women, at Nonnberg, where his niece Erentrude was the abbess. Theodbertus, son of and coregent with Theodo, the Bavarian Duke of the Agilolfings, gave him the city as a gift, and this assured him a stable basis from which he could depart for his missions. Rupert was a reformer of the Christian church that existed on the border with the Slavs and the Avars. The establishment of Seekirchen (Wallersee) and Maximilianszelle (Bischofshofen of Pongau) remain as a testimony to his missionary activity. He died around 27 March after 716 at Worms. His cult began with the translation of his relics to the new cathedral of Salzburg by his successor Virgil (24 September 774), who ordered that the first *Life of Rupert* be written, which has been substantially preserved in the 9th-c. *Gesta Hrodberti* (BHL 7390).

BHL 7390-7403; BS 11, 506-508; LCI 8, 293-294; J. Jahn, *Ducatus Baiuvariorum*, Stuttgart 1991, 48-97; H. Wolfram, *Österreichische Geschichte 378–907*, Vienna 1995, 105-110; P. Eder (ed.), *Hl. Rupert von Salzburg 696–1996*, Salzburg 1996.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

RURICIUS of Limoges (5th–6th c.). Of a high family position and the friend of *Sidonius and *Faustus of Riez but a bit younger than they, he was active in the 2nd half of the 5th c. and the beginning of the 6th c. Like Sidonius, he spent his adult life in the church. In 485, he was elected bishop of Limoges. From his writings, there remains an important epistolary collection of 80 letters. These writings from his time as a layman treat the usual, generally trivial, topics typical of this literary genre. Nor are such themes lacking in his writings after his entrance into the religious life, but the topics are primarily more engaged with moral and ecclesiological issues and scriptural citations occur more frequently. The form is very elaborate in each set of writings.

CPL 985; PL 58, 57-123; CSEL 21, 351-450; DTC 14, 205-206; H. Hagendahl, *La correspondance de Ruricius*, Göteborg 1952; R. Demeulenaere, CCL 64 (1985) 311-394; R.W. Mathisen, *Epistolography, Literary Circles and Family Ties in Late Roman Gaul*, Transactions of the American Philological Association 111 (1981) 95-109; Patrologia IV, 263-264.

M. Simonetti

RUSTICUS, deacon (6th c.). Roman deacon, son of the brother of Pope *Vigilius (ACO VI, 1, 188), whom he accompanied to *Constantinople in 547. Rusticus first accepted then rejected Vigilius's *Iudicatum*, published at Constantinople 11 April 548, with which the pope condemned the *Three Chapters, although he defended the authority of the four ecumenical councils and especially that of *Chalcedon. Rusticus was excommunicated by his uncle in 550 (PL 69, 51-53; *Epistle to Rusticus* 41-51; ACO IV, 1, 193-194); for his criticisms of the condemnation of the Three Chapters by the Council of Chalcedon (553), along with others, he was exiled to Thebaid (Victor of Thebaid, *Chron.* ad annum 553). Here he wrote the *Disputatio contra Acephalos* and a work in defense of the Three Chapters and against *monophysitism (PL 67, 1167-1254), a work which has come down to us incomplete and corrupted (PL 77, 1167-1170). The work is presented in the form of a dialogue between Rusticus himself (*Orthodoxus*) and a monophysite (*Haereticus*), and treats the complex *christological problems on the duality of the nature and the unity of the person. Moreover, the discussion also turned on the divine maternity of *Mary, and why she is the **Theotokos*. He was also acquainted with the teachings of *Severus of Antioch. No less important was the terminological discussion. He translated the term **hypostasis* (which, as he observed, could mean both **persona* and *substantia*) with *subsistentia* with the meaning of *persona*, although *substantia* meant *natura* (PL 77, 1191). In this regard, he explicitly corrected the definition for the term "person" offered by *Boethius (PL 77, 1196).

After the death of *Justinian (565), Rusticus reentered Constantinople and devoted himself to the revision of the preceding and poor translation of the Councils of *Ephesus and *Chalcedon on the basis of the Greek text; he also added other documents that he translated into Latin, among which was a large portion of *Irenaeus of Tyre's *Tragedia* (PG 84, 548-814; DCT 7, 2533-2536), written in defense of his friend *Nestorius and himself. These works contained an abundance of details concerning the Council of Ephesus. Rusticus called this group of works the *Synodicon* (also called the *Synodicon casinense*; the last word was owed to the location of the manuscript). The work intends to be a defense of the two councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon and the Three Chapters, and it especially intends to demonstrate the orthodoxy of *Theodoret.

CPL 946-947; CPPM 2A, 1540; PL 67, 1167-1254; Mansi 5, 731-1022, cf. 6, 938; 7, 79.118.183; *Synodicon*: CPG 8611 B 3-4; 8937; ACO I, 3; I, 4; II, 3; *Scholia, distinctiones et collationes in Acta Concilii Chalcedonesis*: E. Schwartz ACO II, 3, 1-3, in the apparatus (PLS 4, 546-596); ACO I, 4, VIII-XX (on the translations); DTC 14, 371-372; Moricca, III, 2, 1556-1558; CGG 2, 816-822; M. Simonetti, *La Disputatio contra acephalos del diacono Rustico*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 259-289; A. Milano, *Persona in teologia*, Naples 1984, 327-328; 373-374; EPapi 1, 522ff.; LTK³ 8, 1390; U.M. Lamg, *Christological Themes in Rusticus Diaconus's Contra Acephalos disputatio*: SP 38 (2001) 429-234; R. Spataro, *Il contributo del diacono Rustico al dibattito teologico postcalcedonese*, Rome 2006; Id., *Il diacono Rustico*, Rome 2007.

A. Di Berardino

RUSTICUS, poet (5th c.). A. Wilmart (Miscellanea Agostiniani 2, 271-272) has transmitted to us four distichs, with the title *Versus Rustici defensoris sancti Augustini*. The first of these distichs goes as follows: *Ter quinos animo suadente per ardua libros / Augustine trahens nobile condis opus*. The allusion to Augustine's treatise *De Trinitate* is evident. The name of the author, which is almost unknown, has often been confused because other authors had his name such as the poet *Rusticus Helpidius*, author of the *Carmen de Iesu Christi beneficiis* and the *Tristicha historiarum Testamenti Veteris et Novi* (CPL 1506-1507; see W. Baeherens, RhM 31 [1876] 94 n.1). We should not fail to note that a letter of thanks is also attributed to him, sent to *Eucherius of Lyons, and sent along with two of his works; although with respect to the CPPM, it belongs to a Roman deacon who lived after the year 565.

CPL 1506; CPPM 2, 1540; PLS 3, 1163; ICL 16246; 12358; *Anthologia latina* (ed. Riese) I, 2, p. 264, #785 (a defective edition corrected by Wilmart); (for the *Epistola Rustici ad Eucherium*: PLS 11, 46-47); S. Cavallin, *Le poète Domnulus. Étude prosopographique*: SE 7 (1955) 49-66, esp. p. 50 n.2; Patrologia III, 499.

L. Dattrino

RUSTICUS, presbyter. With respect to this little-known person, we possess a letter written to *Eucherius of Lyons to thank him for having sent him a copy of his two books (perhaps *Instructionum ad Salonium libri duo* or the *Formulae*). He should probably be identified with the Rusticus to whom *Sidonius Apollinaris wrote (*Ep.* II, 11). It has also been thought that he was Rusticus of Bordeaux (see Sidon., *Ep.* VIII, 11,3, vers. 36) or Rusticus the bishop of Narbonne from 427, but this last hypothesis has some problems.

CPL 496; CPL³ 177; PL 58, 489-490; CSEL 31, 198-199; PLS 3, 46-47; C. Wotke, CSEL 31, XXIII-XXIV; Bardenhewer IV, 570-571; Patrologia III, 499; LTK³ 8, 1390.

A. Pollastri

RUSTICUS of Narbonne (d. 26 October 461). Perhaps to be identified with the monk of *Marseille of the same name, an epistolary correspondent of *Jerome (*Ep.* 125: PL 22, 1072-1085). Although Rusticus lost his father at a young age, he obtained an excellent education from his mother. He then completed his studies at *Rome, where he earned a reputation as a good orator. Wishing to dedicate himself to the contemplative life, he went to *Lérins; in 427 he was consecrated bishop of *Narbonne. He was present at the Council of *Ephesus (431). From 441 to 445, he reconstructed the Cathedral of Narbonne, which had been destroyed by fire; he then built the church of Santa Maria and a basilica in honor of the martyr Felix of Gerona. Against the Gothic *Arians, he fortified the *Catholic faith in his diocese. In 451, he approved Pope *Leo's letter to *Flavian concerning *Nestorianism. One of *Ravennius of Arles's letters ranks him among "the most skilled physicians" to be consulted in a time of crisis (*inter Leonis ep.* 99). In 458/459, he sent his archdeacon Hermes (then his successor) to pose a series of disciplinary questions to Pope Leo (see PL 54, 1199-1209). The pope encouraged him to remain at his post and to not isolate himself "in silence." He died 26 October 461, the day on which his feast is celebrated. Three of his letters remain: one to Jerome and two others to Pope Leo I.

The Catholic Encyclopedia 13 (1912) 275-276; Vies des SS. 10 (1952) 890-893; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine* II, Paris [2]1966, 265-266, H.I. Marrou, *Le dossier épigraphique de l'évêque Rusticus de Narbonne*: RivAC 3-4 (1970) 331-349; BS 11 (1968) 513-514; J. Michaud - A. Cabanis (eds.), *Histoire de Narbonne*, Toulouse 1981, 84-86; *Martyrologium Romanum* (2001 edition), 559; BBKL 23 (2004) 1262.

M. Maritano

S

SABAS (439–532)
I. Abbot, founder of the Great Laura - II. Archaeology.

I. Abbot, founder of the Great Laura. The life of Sabas, written by *Cyril of Scythopolis, allows us to know with some precision this monk who remained famous in the monastic history of *Palestine, although one must keep in mind that Cyril, a Sabaite monk, wrote around the year 550, projecting the convictions of his era upon the history of the movement's origins. Sabas was born in *Cappadocia, in the village of Mutalaska (439), in the diocese of Caesarea. After an initial experience in the nearby *monastery (*Flavianae*), led by the desire to visit the holy places, he set out for *Palestine. At that time he was 17 years old. At *Jerusalem, Sabas decided to live in the nearby desert the monastic ideal that he had already experienced in his own country. After an attempt in the monastery of Passarion, directed by *Elpidius, he stayed with *Euthymius, the only monk of the area (acc. to the hagiographer), whom he had chosen because of his adherence to the faith of *Chalcedon. From him, acc. to Cyril, Sabas learned the distinction between the celibate life adapted to the novices, directed by *Theoctistus, and the eremitic life adapted to those who are more advanced, a community presided by Euthymius himself. After the death of Euthymius (473), he went to the desert and settled there in a grotto (478), on the left bank of the River Cedron. This was, in fact, the beginning of a foundation called to perform an important role in the development of *monasticism in this region, both on account of the quality of the ascetic life that was led there and the number of monks: it was, moreover, immediately called "the Great Laura."

The severity of the teacher provoked dissatisfaction and protests. Despite the support of the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Sabas encountered numerous difficulties and even exile. Far from his monastery, he established another at Gardara, E of the Lake of Tiberias. Shortly thereafter, however, the patriarch *Elias ordered Sabas to return to direct the Great Laura, around which their continued to emerge other monasteries and lauras. For the governance of his own monastery, Sabas united all the hermits of Palestine. One should also note the activity of the Great Laura in favor of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, during the time of the *Origenist and *monophysite controversies. In 530, following a bloody revolt of the *Samaritans, Sabas, despite his advanced age, did not hesitate—and it was the second time—to go to *Constantinople to petition before the emperor *Justinian the cause of the Christians. Sabas died on Sunday 5 Dec 532. The Byzantine synaxaria commemorate him on that day from an early date, although his memory was introduced in the West in modern times.

Without entering into the history of the Great Laura after the life of Sabas, one should at least mention that in the 8th and 9th c. there came from the monastery a series of monks who remained famous in the Byzantine church for their literary activity (theology, liturgical and ascetic poetry, and the Greek language): *John of Damascus, *Cosmas of Maiuma, Stephen Melodus, Stephen the Thaumaturge, Michael Syncellus, the two *Graptos* brothers (Theodore and Theophanes), as well as Theodore of Edessa. One should also emphasize that shortly after the Arab invasion, Sabas's Laura very soon became an active center for the translation of Greek texts into Arabic, whose influence extended beyond Palestine to Mount Sinai.

B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'oeuvre de Cyrille de Scytopolis*, Paris 1983; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Washington, DC 1995; Id. (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present. Monastic Life, Liturgy, Theology, Literature, Art, Archaeology*, Leuven 2001; L. Perrone, *Il deserto e l'orizzonte della città. Le "Storie monastiche" di Cirillo di Scitopoli*, introduction to: Cirillo di Scitopoli, *Storie monastiche del deserto di Gerusalemme*, ed. R. Balzelli - L. Mortari - L. Perrone (Scritti monastici, 15), Abbazia di Praglia 1990, 9-90; B. Flusin, *Saint Sabas: un leader monastique à l'autorité contestée*, in

Foundations of Power and Conflis of Authoriry in Late-Antique Monasticism, ed. A. Camplani - G. Filoramo, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2007, 195-216.

J.-M. Sauget - A. Camplani

II. Archaeology. The great reputation that St. Sabas reached even in the West earned it the recognition as an important monastic center at *Rome situated on the lower Aventine Hill. The dedication to the founder of the Great Laura began in the 2nd half of the 8th c. in an already-existing monastery, which was called in the sources *Cella Nova* and should be similarly traced back to the monastic experience of *Sylvia, the mother of *Gregory the Great. As *John of Damascus in the 9th c. and the *Vita Gregorii* (I, 9) attest, already during his time there indeed existed a place called the *Cella Nova*, an oratory dedicated to Sylvia, where she had resided, occupying herself by the daily support of her son, who lived in the nearby monastery of St. Andrew on the ancient Roman street called the Clivus Scauri. The Latin origins of what would become the most famous Eastern *cenobium in Rome are confirmed by the Syriac version of the *Life of St. Maximus the Confessor*, written in the 2nd half of the 7th c., where it is said that some students from *Nisibis came to Rome, who were probably put to flight by the Arab invasions, and they were entrusted with the monastery of the Cella Nova by Pope *Martin I, who was ignorant of their heretical positions. Initially this did not lead to any change, at least with respect to the naming of the site: a certain Leontius from the monastery of Cella Nova, in fact, participated at the Council of *Constantinople in 680 (Mansi XI,213), although in 768 at the monastery called *Cellanovas*, he was imprisoned by order of Pope Stephen III, the antipope Constantine (LP I,471). The new dedication supplanted the old at an undetermined date, but it occurred between this last event and 785, when Peter, who was the *abbot of the "monastery of St. Sabas, which had been called *Cella Nova*," was sent by Pope Hadrian I as a legate to *Constantinople (LP I,511). From this moment onward, the official dedication would remain tied to the name of the famous monk, as attested to by the subsequent documents, among which the life of *Gregory of Agrigento stands out (PG 98,615), edited by *Leontius, hegumen at St. Sabas, which in the past had generated confusion, but whose dating, which had been fixed by that point between the end of the 8th c. and the beginning of the subsequent century, is perfectly compatible with the reconstruction of the phases of the cenobium's life.

The archaeological evidence below the present church, which can be dated to the 2nd half of the 10th or the 12th c., documents the presence of an apse likely belonging to a Late Antique *domus*; it was this environment that was subsequently adapted for Christian worship, becoming an oratory through the implementation of a few modifications between the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th c. Below the floor, then, was a cemetery, progressively modified and expanded over the course of time to meet the demands of the monastic community. The funerary inscriptions preserved there, which can be dated to the 7th c., constitute a further element of confirmation for the reconstruction of the history of the monastery: the most ancient inscriptions, outlined with red lead in Latin, in fact, correspond to the first monastic establishment, followed by Greek epigraphs in charcoal, to be considered in conjunction with the arrival of a Greek-speaking community.

In addition to the succession of the phases of occupation, moreover, it also records the superimposition of frescoes on the walls of the oratory: at the moment of the monastery's institution one can surmise that saints were initially painted on the walls, replaced in the second phase by a christological cycle whose scenes, significantly, bear Greek subtitles; a last layer, finally, marked the return of a Latin monastic Benedictine community. From this phase are preserved, along the curve of the oratory's apse, lower portions of the figures of saints, and near the façade, some clypeate images, although particularly expressive are the fragments detached and exposed in the modern monastery depicting the head of an angel and a group of hooded monks.

R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* IV, Vatican City 1976, 51-68; M. Delle Rose, *"Crudis leguminibus pascebatur." Cellae Novae e S. Saba, fonti e riscontri archeologici*: RomBarb 9 (1986-87) 65-113; C. La Bella, *S. Saba* (Le chiese di Rome illustrate, n.s. 35), Rome 2003.

A. Milella

SABBATH. Throughout history the question has continually been posed to the Christian churches (by the Jews, as early as Trypho in his dialogue with *Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 10,3; and by the Seventh-day Adventists: S. Bacchiocchi, *Divine Rest for Human Restlessness*, Rome 1980) why they no longer celebrate the sabbath, the sanctification of which is required in the Decalogue and which has played, and still plays, a central role in Jewish tradition. Historically speaking, how did the churches come to abandon the observance of the sabbath?

By healing those with chronic illnesses on the sabbath (Mk 3:1-6 and parallel texts; Lk 13:10-17; Jn

5:2-9) and by his provocative transgressions of the sabbath (Mk 2:23-28 and parallel texts; Jn 5:10-11), Jesus so enraged the Pharisees to convince them that he, by behaving in this manner, was worthy of the death penalty (Mk 3:6 and parallel texts; Jn 5:16-18). Jesus' attitude, therefore, was not only an expression of his philanthropy, but even an indirect indication of his messiahship (Mk 2:28 and parallel texts): with his coming, the definitive sabbath had arrived (Lk 4:16-21), inasmuch as he offered people not only physical healing but also the "sabbath of the heart," the forgiveness of *sins (Mt 11:28-30). Initially the first Christians hesitated to also claim for themselves the liberties Jesus took with regard to the commandment concerning the sabbath (Mt 24:20-21; Lk 6:5, *cod. Bezae*). Our sources on the Jewish Christians testify in perfect agreement that they still observed the sabbath (*Just., *Dial.* 47,1-4; *Iren., *Adv. haer.* I, 26,2; Eus., *HE* III, 27,2-5). It was probably the "Hellenists" around *Stephen who were the first, among other things, not to observe the sabbath, and they thus brought upon themselves violent persecution (Acts 6:13-14).

The Gentile Christian communities established by *Paul certainly no longer observed the sabbath (Gal 4:8-11; Col 2:8, 16-17), which became a general tradition for the mainstream church starting from the 2nd c. (Ign., *Magn.* 9,1; *Barn.* 15,1-9; Just., *Dial.* 12,3; 18,2; 19,5-6; 27,5; 29,3; Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 8,1-3; 16,1). Naturally, here and there, even within the mainstream church, leaders had to put the faithful on guard against a renewed "Judaizing" (*Tertull., *Orat.* 23,1-2; *Cyril Jer., *Cat.* 4,37; Council of *Laodicea, can. 29; *John Chrys., *Adv. Iudaeos*; ps.-Ign., *Magn.* 9 [PG 5, 768]; ps.-Athan., *De semente hom.*).

What was the *theological motivation* of the mainstream church's attitude? There are three frequent motifs: (1) The sabbath was unknown to the patriarchs of the OT; Moses—with other ceremonial laws—gave it to the Jewish people as a punishment for their disobedience or as a preparation (see the shadow symbol of Col 2:17) for the fulfillment that would be accomplished in Christ (see the aforementioned texts of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus: in addition, *Ptolemy the Gnostic, *Epist. ad Floram* 5,8-9.12; *Ambrosiaster, *Com. Col.* 2,16-17; *Ambr., *Exp. Ev. Lc.* V, 31-33; 39-40; VII, 173-175; etc.). (2) With the coming of Christ, the fact of remaining outwardly idle for 24 hours became secondary; what mattered was to cease from serving sin, and this for the entirety of one's life; the true sabbath is observed by following Christ, honoring God with priestly service, and loving our neighbors (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV, 16,1 and *Dem.* 96; Tertull., *Adv. Iud.* 4,1-5 and *Adv. Marc.* IV, 12,9-11; *Orig., *In Num. hom.* 23,4 and *In Ev. Mt. comm.* XII, 36; Eus., *In Ps.* 91 [92]; *Epiph., *Pan.* 30,32,6-9; Aug., *Ep.* 55,18-19, 22). (3) Christians await the definitive sabbath, in which they will become participants of the perfect peace in God (Heb 3–4; *Barn.* 15,1-9; Just., *Dial.* 80,1-2.5; Iren., *Adv. haer.* V, 28,3; 30,4; Hipp., *In Dan. comm.* IV, 23,1–24,6; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* III, 24,3-6; *Victorinus Pet., *Fabr. mundi* 5; Lact., *Div. inst. epit.* 67 [72], 3 [13]–5 [15]; Aug., *Civ. Dei* XX, 7,9). Often—as these citations show—before *Augustine, this hope of the definitive sabbath was connected to the representation of a millennium. Sunday, in this context, was then understood as an "eighth day."

From the 3rd c. onward a difference with respect to the sabbath fast came to be established between the churches of the East and the West: because all Christians fasted on Holy Saturday, the Latin churches began, here and there, in analogy to the fast for Holy Saturday, to also fast *every sabbath* (Tertull., *Ieiun.* 14,3; *Hipp., *In Dan. comm.* IV,20,3; LP 17,2; Council of *Elvira, can. 26; Aug., *Ep.* 36,31). The Eastern Churches always rejected this custom (*Const. Apost.* VIII, 47,67; ps.-Ign., *Phil.* 13 [PG 5, 938]), even during *Lent (Athan., *Ep. fest.* 6,13; Eger., *Peregr.* 27). This diversity later became one of the reasons for the schism between East and West. The sabbath fast, as well as a eucharistic celebration in memory of the completion of the creation, was introduced in individual Eastern churches—at first, it seems, in *gnostic circles (*Vita Pachomii* 28; Pall., *Hist. Laus.* 32,3; *Greg. Nyss., *Adv. eos qui castigationes aegre ferunt*; Epiph., *De fide* 24,7; *Const. Apost.* II, 59,3; VII, 23,3-4; VIII, 33,1-2; *Timothy of Alex., *Responsa can.* 13). A direct relationship between these celebrations on the sabbath and the Jewish Christian practice cannot, in my opinion, be proven (contra C.S. Mosna and R.A. Kraft). Sunday, after *Constantine, became an ever-increasing "replacement" for the sabbath (*see* *Sunday).

C.W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagoga upon the Divine Office*, London 1944, 26-37; H. Huber, *Geist und Buchstabe der Sonntagsruhe. Eine historischtheologische Untersuchung über das Verbot der knechtlichen Arbeit von der Urkirche bis auf Thomas von Aquin*, Studia Theologiae moralis et pastoralis, 5, Salzburg 1958; K. Hruby, *La célébration du sabbat d'après les sources juives*: OrSyr 7 (1962) 435-463; 8 (1963) 55-86; Y.B. Tremel, *Du sabbat au jour du Seigneur*: Lumière et Vie 11 (1962) 29-49; C. Floristán, *El sábado judío. Del sábado al domingo. El domingo, día del Señor*: Salmanticensis 10 (1964) 429-444; E. Lohse, *Sabbaton*: TWNT 7, 1-30; R.A. Kraft, *Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity*: Andrews University Seminary Studies 3 (1965) 18-33; Ph. Delhaye - J.L. Leclat, *Dimanche et Sabbat*: MSR 23, 2 (1966) 3-14, 73-93; C.S. Mosna, *Storia della domenica dalle origini fino agli inizi del V secolo. Problema delle origini e sviluppo. Culto e riposo. Aspetti pastorali e liturgici*, AG 170, Rome 1969; A. Verheul, *Du sabbat au*

jour du Seigneur: Quest. Lit. et Par. 51 (1970) 3-27; F. Mathys, *Sabbatruhe und Sabbatfest*: ThZ 28 (1972) 242-262; W. Rordorf, *Sabbat und Sonntag in der Alten Kirche*, Traditio Christiana 2, Zürich 1972 (It. tr. Turin 1979); K.H. Strand, *Essays on the Sabbath in Early Christianity*, Ann Arbor, MI 1972; P. Grelot, *Du sabbat juif au dimanche chrétien*: La MaisonD. 123 (1975) 79-104; J. Kaiser, *Sabbat*: TRE 29, 518-533 (bibl.); DBS 10, 1132-1170; D.A. Carson (ed.), *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*, Eugene, OR 1999; H. Weiss, *A Day of Gladness: The Sabbath Among the Jews and Christians in Antiquity*, Columbia, SC 2003.

W. Rordorf

SABELLIUS – SABELLIANISM. We know that Sabellius was condemned at *Rome by Pope *Callistus as a proponent of patripassian *monarchianism. His Libyan origins remain uncertain. After the condemnation either he himself or his disciples spread the monarchian teaching in *Libya and *Egypt and developed it in opposition to the theology of the Logos of *Origen and his school. With respect to original *patripassianism, the Sabellians expanded the teaching by including within it the *Holy Spirit: only one God is manifested as *Father in the OT, as Son in the *incarnation, as Holy Spirit when he poured himself upon the *apostles at *Pentecost. In this manner, they avoided, at least formally, *Noetus's position, which had met much opposition and acc. to which the Father himself had become incarnate and suffered and died. Moreover, against Origen's teaching, which affirmed the three distinct hypostases in the Trinity, they maintained that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit make up one sole **prosōpon* and one sole hypostasis. The few testimonies acc. to which the Sabellians affirmed three *prosōpa* of the Trinity should be traced back to the more moderate monarchians. In fact, over the course of the 4th c., the Logos theologians set forth every form of monarchianism as Sabellianism: even *Marcellus of Ancyra was called a "Sabellian"; his monarchianism was radical, but different from that of Sabellius. Due to the lack of documentation, we cannot specify the spread and duration of Sabellianism: it is certain, however, that it represented a noteworthy obstacle for the Logos theologians in the 2nd half of the 3rd c. and the beginning of the 4th c. *Epiphanius (*Pan.* 62,1) stated that the Sabellians were still active around 375 in *Rome and *Mesopotamia.

M. Simonetti, *Sabellio e il sabellianismo*: SSR 4 (1980) 7-28; BBKL VIII, 1145-1146; A. Soler Merenciano, *El Sabelianismo en el concilio romano del año 263: la acusación contra Dionisio Alejandrino*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V.* XXX Incontro di Studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma 3-5 maggio 2001: SEA 78 (2002) 411-420.

M. Simonetti

SABINA
I. Saint - II. Archaeology.

I. Saint. Sabina can serve as an example, over the course of the 6th c., of how a founder or foundress of the churches at *Rome became saints. In the Roman Synod of 499, the church on the Aventine Hill that bears her name was called the *titulus Sabinae*; in the council of 595, one finds the title *titulus sanctae Sabinae*. Sabina does not appear either in the *Mart. hier.* (with the exception of a few additions by a second hand in MS S) or in the *Sacramentarium Leonianum*. Her feast day, which was set for 29 August, appears only in the *Capitulare evangeliorum* of Würzburg) around 740, in the Gelasian Sacramentaries of the 8th c., in the Gregorian Sacramentary and in the historical *martyrologies starting from *Bede's second redaction. It seems that these mentions of Sabina depend on a *Passio* (BHL 7407 and 7586) created in the 6th c. on the basis of pure fantasy.

BHL 7407, 7586; BS 11, 540-543; LCI 8, 301-302; BBKL 8, 1146-1148; R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae* 4, Vatican City 1976, 69-94; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom*, Tübingen 1980.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

II. Archaeology. The construction of the Aventine basilica of S. Sabina should certainly be assigned to a chronological arc between 422 and 440, i.e., between the pontificates of *Celestine I and *Sixtus III, as the dedicatory inscription on the building in fact records in the golden-lettered mosaic with a blue background, placed on the back wall of the building. The work was undertaken by the presbyter Peter of Illyria while Celestine was pope, although the *Liber pontificalis* (I, 235) inserts information about the dedication of this church in the biography of his successor Sixtus III, remembering Peter, who was owed the honor of the episcopal office.

The basilica, which was constructed on a place previously occupied by a sanctuary, perhaps to be identified with the sanctuary of the Roman goddess *Libertas*, by an *insula* and by a *domus*, whose remains were incorporated into the new construction. It was laid out with three aisles and an apse: a portico furnished with five entry marks was placed in front of the façade. Archaeological excavations carried out in the garden of the convent, moreover, have demonstrated that the church was also originally preceded by a quadriporticus. No archaeological element, however, has been preserved with respect to a baptistery, the construction of which, however, has been attested to by the *Liber pontificalis* at the time of the birth of the early Christian titu-

lar church. Still visible from the original building, in addition to the aforementioned mosaic inscription, are decorative remains in marble *crustae* preserved above the columns of the center aisle and a wooden door decorated with panels displaying OT and NT scenes.

One can attribute the construction of the decorated marble *plutei* to Pope Eugenius II's intervention in the 9th c. These were done to fence off the area for the basilica's priests. Today this area is repositioned in the central aisle acc. to a layout conceived by A. Muñoz on the occasion of the full restoration of the building completed at the beginning of the 20th c.

F. Darsy, *Santa Sabina* (Le chiese di Rome illustrate, 63-64), Rome 1961; L. Pani Ermini, *Recenti scoperte nel complesso di Santa Sabina sull'Aventino*, in *Archeologia Laziale*, VI (Quaderni del centro di studio per l'archeologia etrusco-italica, 8), Rome 1984, 294-299.

A. Milella

SABINIAN (Sabinianus), pope (604–606). Native of Blera, a small village of S Tuscia, he was a deacon at *Rome already in 593, when he was sent by *Gregory the Great as his *apocrisarius (legate) at the imperial court of *Constantinople. He returned to Rome in 597. On 13 November 604 he was consecrated as the successor of Gregory the Great. Little information remains on Sabinian. During his pontificate, *Italy was ruled by the *Longobards (Lombards) and left to its own fate by the *Byzantines. The situation became worse by the famine, which the pope sought to face by selling a part of the church's goods, amid the protests of the high-ranking conservative circles within the Roman Church. Despite the difficulties, Sabinian entered into peaceful relations with the Byzantines and the Longobards. He died on 23 February 606 and was buried in St. *Peter's Basilica.

Jaffé I, 220; LP I, 315; Paul the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii*, PL 75, 29 and 58; ICUR II, 1, 6, 127; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* II, Tübingen 1933, 404 n. 5, 405, 433, 450 n. 9, 451, 452 n. 7, 453, 456 n. 1, 493, 503 n. 1 and 515-518; O. Bertolini, *Roma e i Longobardi*, Rome 1972, 23-24, 26 and 32; T.S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers: Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554-800*, Rome 1984, 12 and 42; *Dizionario storico del Papato* (Ph. Levillain) II, Milan 1996, 1293-1294; LTK³ 8, 1410; EPapi 1, 574-577.

M. Spinelli

SABINUS of Canosa (d. ca. 566). Bishop of Canosa in Apulia, probably from 514 to 566. The certain dates about his life are as follows: his presence at the Roman Synod of 531, in the acts of which he appears alongside *Boniface II as one who assisted in the investigation for the case of *Stephen of Larissa, who had been deposed and detained in *Constantinople; he participated, as the leader, for the delegation sent by Pope *Agapitus (22 April 536) at the court of the emperor *Justinian to remove *Anthimus, the *monophysite patriarch of Constantinople in 536; at a council at Constantinople, after the death of Pope Agapitus (22 April 536), he participated as the second bishop and the first of the Italians; *Gregory the Great relates in the *Dialogues* (II,15; III,5) his familiarity with *Benedict at Monte Cassino and his meeting with *Totila at Canosa. It does not seem that one can identify him with the Sabinus who accompanied the unfortunate Pope *John I and the delegation sent to *Byzantium by *Theodoric (525–526) to plead, without success, the cause of the *Arians. The anonymous acts of Sabinus of Canosa (AASS *febr.* II, 323-328; 3ª ed. 324-329) speak of his holiness and refer to him as the *restaurator ecclesiarum*. This detail was confirmed by the excavations of the baptistery of St. John at Canosa, where his monogram was inscribed (*Puglia paleocristiana*, I, Bari 1970, 137-138); it is also likely that he constructed the basilica dedicated to *Cosmas and Damian.

BHL 7443-7445; A.A. Tortora, *Relatio status sanctae primatialis ecclesiae Canusinae*, Rome 1758 (It. tr. A. Paulicelli, Andria 1982); R. Cessi, *Un vescovo pugliese del sec. VI* (*S. Sabino di Canosa*): Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 73 (1912–1913) 1141-1157; V. Recchia, *Reminiscenze bibliche e "topoi" agiografici negli "Atti" anonimi di S. Sabino Vescovo di Canosa*: VetChr 4 (1967) 151-184; R. Moreno Cassano, *Il Battistero di S. Giovanni a Canosa*: VetChr 5 (1968) 163-204; G. Bertelli - M. Falla Castelfranchi, *Canosa di Puglia fra tardo-antico e medioevo*, Rome 1981; J.M. Martin, *Note sur la Vie de saint Sabin de Canosa et le prince de Bénévent Grimoald IV*: VetChr 24 (1987) 399-405; A. Campione, *Note sulla Vita di Sabino di Canosa*, *inventio e translatio*: VetChr 25 (1988) 617-639; *Principi, imperatori, vescovi: duemila anni di storia a Canosa*, ed. R. Cassano, Venezia 1992; C. Flick, *Die Kathedrale San Sabino in Canosa di Puglia: Versuch einer neuen zeitlichen Einordnung*: JbAC 41 (1998) 193-205; *Germano di Capua*, ed. F. Carcione, Venafro 1999; PCBE 2, 1975-1977.

V. Recchia

SABINUS of Heraclea. A bishop of the sect of *Macedonius; around 375, he put together a collection of the acts of the various councils that were held during the *Arian controversy, with anti-Nicene aims. The work has been lost. It was heavily used by *Socrates and even more so by *Sozomen, who took from it very important pieces of information.

W.D. Hauschild, *Die antinizänische Synodalaktensammlung des Sabinus von Heraklea*: VChr 24 (1970) 105-126; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988, see the *Index*; P. Van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Leuven 2004, 448-454.

M. Simonetti

SABINUS of Piacenza (4th c.). Saint. Feast day 11 Dec. We know of a Sabinus, a Milanese deacon (Mansi 3, 460), an envoy of Pope *Damasus, before the year 373, in the East, through the schism of *Antioch, who was greatly esteemed even by *Basil of Caesarea (*Ep.* 89 and 92). During this trip, he brought with him a synodal letter of the Roman council on the case of the Arian *Auxentius of Milan and on the condemnation of the Council of *Rimini, and also other letters of Western bishops. The first important step of the mission was *Cappadocia with Basil of Caesarea. Sabinus could have been the bishop of Piacenza, who was elected ca. 376 and who took part in the Councils of *Aquileia (381), *Rome (390) and *Milan (392). He was a greatly esteemed friend of *Ambrose, who sent six letters to him (45-49 and 58) that are still preserved. Ambrose even submitted his literary works to Sabinus for his judgment (Ambr., *Ep.* 48,1 and 3). None of Sabinus's letters to Ambrose, however, have survived. Sabinus also ordered the construction of the basilica *Duodecim apostolorum* at Piacenza.

EC 10, 1521; BS 11, 701-704; G.F. Rossi, *S. Savino vescovo di Piacenza*, Rome 1955; Id., *S. Savino diacono milanese, poi vescovo di Piacenza*: Divus Thomas (Piacenza) 59 (1956) 125-142; PCBE 2, 1969-1973.

A. Di Berardino

SABRATHA. In Tripolitania, 70 km (43.5 mi) W of Tripoli, established by the Phoenicians, an important commercial center due to its caravan roads and port. Under the influence of *Carthage during the Numidian kingdom, from 46 BC it was incorporated into the province of *Africa. It esp. flourished under the Antonine and the Severan dynasty. Sabratha fully adhered to the traditions of early Christianity in opposition to the widespread heretical tendencies in *Africa. From the 3rd c. onward, however, the city diminished in importance. It was first sacked by the Austurians (4th c.), then the *Vandals (in the 5th c.); it flourished again under the *Byzantines (6th c.). The city was conquered by the Arabs (643), then destroyed again by new Arab incursions; it was thereafter abandoned and disappeared as an inhabited center. Important archaeological discoveries from Sabratha have been preserved (pagan temples, a theater, an amphitheater, baths, private dwellings and buildings, Roman and Byzantine walls, necropolises and Christian cemeteries, in addition to sculptures, mosaics, grave-goods, and coins from the *Punic, Roman and Christian era).

E.M. Ruprechtsberger, *Sabratha: eine antike Stadt in Tripolitanien*: Antike Welt 32 (2001) 35-46; R.M. Carra Bonacasa, *Il cristianesimo a Sabratha alla luce delle più recenti indagini*: Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia 76 (2003–2004) 3-77.

T. Sardella

SACERDOTIO CHRISTI, De (apocryphal text). *De sacerdotio Christi* (*Conversio Theodosii Judaei*) is a Greek work preserved in two Greek versions (*Dictionary* of Suidas [ca. 950], s.v. *Iesous ho Christos*; ed. Adler, 1, 2, 620-625) and in Arabic, *Georgian, *Latin and *Paleoslavonic versions. According to this apocryphal text, Jesus is set forth as a priest, and the Jews, doing genealogical research by asking *Mary of the divine conception as a virgin, discover the truth of what was narrated and finally arrive at the conclusion that Jesus did not have an earthly father. All of this was put in writing by the priests, and the book was saved from the destruction of *Jerusalem and found at Tiberias. The work was a response to the attacks of the Jews and, if need be, the Muslims.

CANT 53; BHG 810-812; longer version: G. Ziffer, in *Studi per Ricardo Ribuoli*, Rome 1986, 141-173. French tr. J.P. Migne, *Dictionnaire des apocryphes*, 2, 382-387; R. Eisler, IHSOUS BASILEUS OU BASILEUSAS, 2, Heidelberg 1930, 478-479; G. Gerö: ANRW II, 25, 5 (1988) 3979-3980.

M. Starowieyski

SACRAMENT (Sacramentum). The important term *sacramentum* made its appearance in the Christian Latin of the most ancient versions of the *Bible as the equivalent of the Greek term μυστήριον and in the writings of *Tertullian, with a broad spectrum of meanings; modern scholars have not entirely agreed on the origin and the reasons behind the choice of this term. According to the authoritative judgment of Christine Mohrmann, who was followed by René Braun and esp. Vincenzo Loi, the introduction of the term *sacramentum* over *mysterium*, which is also attested in Classical Latin, is explained by the common tendencies of Christian Latin in its formative phase, which on the one hand privileged native terms to express abstract concepts (μυστήριον in *Scripture basically indicates a divine truth hid-

den that is knowable through revelation) and on the other hand tended to avoid words that had been compromised by their connection to *pagan religion, as indeed in the case of *mysterium*, esp. in its plural form.

The affirmation of the term *sacramentum* would be owed not to the translators of the Bible and nor even to Tertullian but to the use of the Latin communities over the course of the 2nd c., which was favored by the fact that the Greek term tended to acquire an ever-increasing liturgical-ritual meaning, as attested, e.g., in the writings of *Justin Martyr: by that point, it had been taken over by the Latin translations of the Bible as an equivalent term for μυστήριον, acc. to the customary technique of those first translators. For Mohrmann, the term *sacramentum* in the secular use primarily indicated initiation confirmed by an oath and, as derivative meanings, the military oath, the military service itself, a sacred bond and at the same time legal and lastly "sacred things"; this latter meaning is connoted by the term *sacrum* with the generic nominal suffix *-mentum*.

The affinity of the term with μυστήριον, as it was evolving, even consisted in the idea of the bond between the faithful and Jesus Christ, in the destination for those initiated into the doctrine of the kingdom, and esp. of the necessity of expressing a liturgical action rather than the concept of hidden truth. The fact that Christians in the 2nd c. began to attribute a ritual value to the term μυστήριον has a possible explanation in its competition with a legal use brought to light by Melchior Verheijen and attested in the biblical versions of *Symmachus and *Theodotion, in which the Greek word translates the Hebrew term *sôd*, which properly means "assembly" and by metonymy "the decision of the assembly," therefore "a secret teaching" and "secrecy, seal"; it was used by the rabbis in the sense of "seal" to refer to circumcision, to which the Christians opposed the baptismal *signaculum*, which was interpreted as spiritual circumcision. Christianity preferred, however, to use the term *sacramentum* because it was expressive of the resultant "sacred bond." Other authors have formulated different hypotheses by making reference esp. to the secular meaning of *sacramentum* as an oath in the technical sense: J. de Ghellinck - E. de Backer, following the path of Adolf von Harnack, suggested that there was a relationship to the military oath, which by analogy could be connected to baptism, because that commitment began the Christian life, which was understood as *militia Christi*. Vincenzo Loi suggested an early reference to the baptismal rites as *sacramentum* because of the affinity to the military pledge and Jewish *circumcision and the subsequent expansion of the semantic field to the doctrinal meanings of μυστήριον, given that baptism implied initiation and the biblical mysteries. Dimitri Michaélidès, who attributed to Tertullian all responsibility for the affirmation of the term in Christian Latin to the exclusion of any direct relationship to μυστήριον, took into consideration above all the legal action of the remote sacramental origin (and consecratory) called *sacramentum* by Roman law, which Tertullian introduced as a legal argument with antiheretical objectives, as he had done, moreover, in the case of the *praescriptio*. The legal action included an oath and a deposit: upon this basis Michaélidès systematically organized all the various meanings of the term *sacramentum* that one can find in the writings of Tertullian. Enrico Mazza hypothesized the existence of a true and proper oath within the rite of baptism that was delivered between the renunciation of Satan and the profession of faith, and this took place already at the beginning of the 2nd c., given that the first Latin source in which the term *sacramentum* appeared to refer to Christians is *Pliny the Younger's *Ep.* X,96 to *Trajan. With that term the governor of Bithynia indicated the Christians' commitment to leading a very upright life. Mazza found some indication of this hypothetical rite in the testimonies from the Syro-Antiochene area from the end of the 4th c. Marta Sordi, who assigned greater importance to the context in which the term was found, saw in Pliny's use of the term *sacramentum* an allusion not to baptism but to the Eucharist, esp. because for her, the *sacramentum*/oath in the Roman mind was connected to a sacrifice in view of a sacred *foedus*.

The multiplicity of the theories formulated certainly bears witness not only to the scarcity of the available documentation but also to the difficulty of specifying the semantic value of the term *sacramentum* already in use in secular speech, in which evidently the word was evocative of multiple shades of meaning. Its own ambiguity must have already favored the encounter with the term μυστήριον, which belonged to Christian parlance and was in the process of quick development and therefore was also characterized by rather nuanced features. The common element in all the attempts to explain the relationship between the two terms is the individuation of a common conceptual context embracing the doctrinal and ritual aspects, in which by the term *doctrine* one should understand both the revealed dogmatic aspect as well as the moral consequence, and by the term *rite* a series of symbolic actions expressive of the divine and human will to enter into

an obligatory relationship, each in its own context.

The history of the term *sacramentum* in the subsequent centuries is a history of the slow specification of the semantic content of the term. In the writings of Tertullian, one finds more than 130 occurrences of the term, which can be reduced to 14 categories of meaning acc. to the Latin dictionary edited by Albert Blaise. From the meanings connected to revealed truth, it became more specific acc. to the context as revelation of the OT and the NT, typological interpretation, the entirety of revealed truths, the divine disposition, or rather the doctrine of the *Trinity or the *resurrection, although in the plural it tends to signify the truths of the faith concerning *eschatology. By the term *sacramentum* *Tertullian also referred to the reception of doctrine; i.e., to the Christian's profession of faith, to the ecclesial bond that this profession involves and to the rites of initiation in which it is made concrete, namely *baptism and the *Eucharist. In this context the Christian's moral obligation is likened to the military oath.

The meanings of this term in *Cyprian's writings can in part be reduced to those identified in Tertullian's works, but one should add the characteristic expression *unitatis sacramentum* (*De Eccl. Cath. Un*. 7) to refer to the ecclesial bonds which Christians are obligated to preserve. The literary appearance of the competing term *mysterium*, attested to significantly by Lactantius and the "European" biblical versions, although not initially marked by a difference of content, seems to have contributed with time to the restricting of the semantic field of these two terms as least in part in different contexts. Although *mysterium* could evidently better cover the semantic field of abstract concepts, *sacramentum* was rather adapted to refer to the concrete reality of the liturgical rites and the feasts.

The differentiation, however, remained common until the time of St. *Augustine, in whose writings one finds their simultaneous use, and it is not clear what the difference was for him between *mysterium* and *sacramentum*, the latter containing a semantic breadth comparable to Tertullian's use of the term; nevertheless, his theological elaboration of *sacramentum* in the sense of the sacred sign (*sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum*, *id est sacrum signum est*: *De Civ. Dei* X,5) directly connected to the action of grace (*sacramentum* as opposed to *exemplum*) contributed in a decisive way to narrow the meaning of the term into the present-day use. Augustine, however, also used it with respect to marriage and holy orders. From the reception of Augustine's theology by *Leo the Great came the designation of the term *sacramentum* even in a technical sense in the liturgical language of the great Roman *sacramentaries; the medieval elaboration of this Augustinian line would lead to the definitions given by the Councils of Florence (1439–1445) and Trent (1545–1563), in which the term acquired the meaning used in the present day.

A. Harnack, *Militia Christi*, Tübingen 1905; H.F. von Soden, Μυστήριον *und Sacramentum in den ersten zwei Jahrunderten der Kirche*: ZNTW 12 (1911) 188-227: J. de Gellinck - E. de Backer - J. Poukens - G. Lebacqz, *Pour l'histoire du mot "Sacramentum," I, Les Anténicéens*, Louvain 1924; O. Casel, *Zum Worte sacramentum*: Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 8 (1928) 225-232; M.A. Sainio, *Semasiologische Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der christlichen Latinität*, Helsinki 1940, 75-86; A. Kolping, *Sacramentum Tertullianeum*, Münster 1948; C. Couturier, *"Sacramentum" et "Mysterium" dans l'oeuvre de S. Augustin*: REAug (Coll. Théol. 28), Paris 1953, 161-332; Ch. Mohrmann, *Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens*: HTR 47 (1954) 141-152; reprinted in *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens*, I, Rome 1958, 233-244; J. Doignon, *Le Sacramentum dans les anciennes versions latines de la Bible*: REL 32 (1954) 51-52; J. Doignon, *Sacrum, Sacramentum, Sacrificium dans le texte latin du Livre de la Sagesse*: REL 34 (1956) 240-253; T. Camelot, *"Sacramentum." Notes de théologie sacramentaire augustinienne*: REThom 57 (1957) 429-449; M. Verheijen, Μυστήριον, *Sacramentum et la Synagogue*: RSR 45 (1957) 321-337; A. Mandouze, *À propos de "Sacramentum" chez S. Augustin. Polyvalence lexicologique et foisonnement théologique*, in *Mélanges offertes à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann*, Utrecht-Anvers 1963, 222-232; V. Loi, *Per la storia del vocabolo "Sacramentum": "Sacramentum" in Lattanzio*: VChr 18 (1964) 85-107; V. Loi, *Il termine "Mysterium" nella letteratura cristiana prenicena*: VChr 19 (1965) 210-232; 20 (1966) 25-44; V. Loi, *"Scripturae Sacramentum"*: RivBib 14 (1966) 261-278; J. Morán, *"Mysterium" y "Sacramentum" hasta San Augustín*: Estudio Augustiniano 4 (1969) 79-107; D. Michaélidès, *Sacramentum chez Tertullien*, Paris 1970; Ch. Mohrmann, *Quelques observations sur "Sacramentum" chez Tertullien*, in *Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia I.H. Waszink . . . oblata*, Amsterdam 1973, 233-242; B. Studer, *"Sacramentum" et "Exemplum" chez S. Augustin*: RecAug 10 (1975) 87-141; M. Garrido Bonaño, *Uso y significación del término "Sacramentum" en la liturgia romana*: Burgense 18 (1977) 9-71; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, Paris [2]1977; M. Sordi, *Sacramentum in Plin. Ep. X, 96, 7*: VetChr 19 (1982) 97-103; E. Ruffini - E. Lodi, *"Mysterion" e "Sacramentum." La Sacramentalità negli scritti dei Padri e nei testi liturgici primitivi*, Bologna 1987; E. Mazza, *L'uso di "Sacramentum" nella lettera 10, 96 di Plinio il Giovane. Un confronto con la liturgia battesimale*: EphLit 113 (1999) 466-480; M. Sordi, *Da* mysterion *a* sacramentum, in *Il mistero della carne. Contributi su* mysterion *e* sacramentum *nei primi secoli cristiani*, Castel Bolognese 2003, 65-74.

A. Grappone

SACRAMENTAL SECRECY. The development of the sacrament of penance in the early church soon led to an understanding of the necessity of secrecy in the confession of secret sins. *Origen (beginning of the 3rd c.) spoke of the confession of secret faults

which does not automatically require a subsequent public confession (*Hom. 2 in Psalmum 37*: PG 12,1386). At the beginning of the 4th c., *Aphraates, in his seventh treatise, prohibited priests from making known the sins revealed to them by penitents (*Dem.* 7,3: PS I,318). *Paulinus of Milan in the *Vita s. Ambrosii* 39 (PL 14,43) reveals that the bishop of *Milan spoke only with God of the sins confessed to him, thus leaving to his successors a good example. It is also clear from the same *Ambrose (*De poen.* 2,10: CSEL 73, 199) that not all sins need to be publicly revealed, which implied a confession that remained secret. *Augustine of Hippo bore witness to the practice of the N African church at the beginning of the 5th c. (*Serm.* 82,11: PL 38,511) stating that if he does not publicly chastise some sinners then he does so because he desires to take care of them rather than accuse them. In the *Historia Ecclesiae* (7,16: PG 67,1458-1463) *Sozomen (beginning of the 5th c.) affirmed that the office of penitentiary priest at *Constantinople was established in such a way as to allow the sinner to make a secret confession as well as a public one and that the penitentiary was chosen precisely because of his reservedness and discretion. Pope *Leo the Great (440–461) took the occasion to rebuke the bishops of Campania, because contrary to the rule received from apostolic times, they made public the sins of their penitents (*Ep.* 168: PL 54, 1211). The legislation of the Council of Tovina (Armenia, ca. 527) against the priests who violated the sacramental seal (Hfl-Lecl II, 1079, 20) seems to be the first legislation in this respect, which indicates that at the beginning of 6th c. the fact that the sacramental seal had by that time acquired the force of law. The subsequent development of the practice of private confession in the church confirmed what had already become law.

DTC 3, 960-974; EC 11, 256-257; E. Vacandard, *La confession sacramentelle dans l'église primitive*, Paris 1903; L. Honoré, *Le secret de la confession. Étude historique-canonique*, Brussells 1924; C.F. Savio, *Ad sigillum sacramentale animadversiones*, Turin 1936; Dictionnaire Apologétique de la foi catholique 3, 1861-1865.

P. Fahey

SACRAMENTARY. During the first centuries of the church the celebrant improvised the important liturgical prayers under the guidance of an outline (see *Justin, 1 *Apol.* 65,3; 67,5). Slowly the celebrants used written texts as a guide and therefore fixed texts for euchological prayers that were approved by the bishop. Over the course of the 4th c., for the celebration of the *Mass, the *libellus Missae* was born, a small work that contained a formulary for the celebrant's part of the Mass or rather for different Masses; it could range from just one page to many pages; the text of only one celebration or many. In the 6th-7th c., the sacramentaries appeared as a book reserved for the celebrant (called *sacramentarium*, *sacramentorum liber*, *volumen* or similar expressions); the other participants prepared books (e.g., lectionaries, the *ordines*, from the 8th c. the antiphonaries). The collection of texts in the sacramentaries was not closed, but subject to additions and influences from other sacramentaries. Each collection (each *codex*) had a local character in the sense that it was adapted to the demands of a specific ecclesial community.

A. Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula*, Washington, DC 1981; E. Bourque, *Étude sur les sacramentaires romains*, 3 vols., Rome 1948-1958; J. Deshusses, *Les sacramentaires*: Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 24 (1982) 19-46; J. Deshusses - B. Darragon, *Concordances et tableaux pour l'étude des grands sacramentaires*, 6 vols., Fribourg 1982–1983; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, Washington, DC 1986, 61-134; A. Chavasse, *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du V^{e} au VIII^{e} siècle*, Rome 1993; E. Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques: le moyen âge des origines au XIII^{e} siècle*, Paris 1993; M. Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*, Turnhout 1994; E. Palazzo, *Liturgie et société au Moyen Âge*, Paris 2000; see the entry *Liturgy*, V: *Improvvisazione eucologica*; IX: *Libri liturgici*; LACL 617-619.

1. The first great collection was the so-called *Sacramentarium Veronense*, a mutilated MS of the Biblioteca Capitolare of Verona (85 [80]), a collection of authentic books that were preserved in the Lateran archives. The MS dates to the years 600–625. Because it was attributed to Pope *Leo the Great at the moment of its discovery, it was also called "Leonine." It actually did contain some of that pope's formularies and was composed during the time of Pope *John III (561–574) with texts from the Roman archives and therefore more ancient than the time of its final redaction. It reflects the Roman milieu and is organized by months.

CPL 1897-1898; PL 55,21-156; L.C. Mohberg, *Sacramentarium Veronense*, Rome 1956, [3]1978; A. Chavasse, *Le Sacramentaire dit "Léonien" conservé par le Veronensis LXXXV (80)*: SE 27 (1984) 151-190.

2. The ancient Gelasian Sacramentary (*Vat. Reg. lat. 316*), likewise of Roman origin but not by Pope *Gelasius (492-496). It was composed before the time of Pope *Gregory II (715–731). A presbyteral type of sacramentary, it is subdivided into three sections (or books): (1) the feasts from *Christmas to *Pentecost, (2) the *sanctorale*, (3) ordinary *Sundays. This sacramentary contains clear Gallican elements; moreover, it was a combination of papal and presby-

teral elements. Some Frankish monks during the time of Pepin the Short sought to unite the ancient Gelasian Sacramentary with a Gregorian model; the Gelasian Sacramentary of the 8th c. was thus born (*Frankish Gelasian* or Pepin the Short) and enjoyed immediate diffusion in Gaul, but was then replaced by the Gregorian-type sacramentary.

CPL 1899; PL 74, 1055-1905; A. Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien*, Paris-Tournai 1958; W. Ullmann, *Gelasius I (492-496). Das Papsttum an der Wende des Spätantike zum Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1981 (the last part of the work is also dedicated to the Gelasian Sacramentary); A. Chavasse, *Textes liturgiques de l'église de Rome. Le cycle liturgique romain annuel selon le sacramentaire du Vat. Reg. 316*, Paris 1997; *Sacramentario gelasiano dell'VIII sec.*: CPL 1905 (for the editions, see R. Cabié, DHGE 20 [1984] 305-306); A. Dumas - J. Deshusses (eds.), *Liber sacramentorum Gellonesis*, CCL 159-159A, Turnhout 1981; P. Saint-Roch (ed.), *Liber sacramentorum Engolismensis (ms. B.N. Lat 816). Le Sacramentaire gélasien d'Angoulême*, Turnhout 1987 (= CCL 159C).

3. *Egbert of York (PL 89,441-442) considered Gregory the Great (590–604) the author of a sacramentary; upon the request of Charlemagne, Pope Hadrian (784–791) sent a copy of a sacramentary, the author of which, he said, was Pope Gregory. It has come down to us through three types: *Hadrianum* (from the model sent to Charlemagne, composed on a text from 731/735, but revised and adapted in France with a full supplement); *Paduense* (*Paduensis D. 47*), a revision in the presbyteral sense of the Gregorian Sacramentary made between 659 and 681; on the basis of the ancient Gregorian Sacramentary, it seems that another sacramentary was written at Trent. The Gregorian Sacramentary was imposed and as a result obtained much respect; it established the basis for later missals.

CPL 1902ff.; J. Deshusses, *Le sacramentaire grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, 3 vols., Fribourg 1971–1979. Bibl. in R. Godding, *Bibliografia di Gregorio Magno* (1890–1989), Rome 1990, 179-182, nn.1657-1698; A. Heinz, *Gregorio Magno e la liturgia romana*, in *Gregorio Magno nel XIV centenario della morte*, Rome 2004, 281-290 (285-286).

A. Di Berardino

SACRAMENTS

I. A liturgical-typological approach - II. A symbolic-liturgical approach - III. Elaboration in the writings of the Fathers.

We should not expect to find in Greek or Latin patristic texts, esp. before St. *Augustine, a theology of the sacraments constructed acc. to our criteria. We cannot reconstruct their teaching by beginning from our categories. This would be to gravely misrepresent their thought. The brevity of this entry will explain some of the choices made for handling a vast amount of material on this subject.

I. A liturgical-typological approach. Until St. Augustine, who attempted to develop an already rather conceptual theology, the Fathers did not for a moment think of a logical demonstration of what the sacraments were. In their assessment, they placed them within the history of salvation—indeed, today they are "a stage" of the journey toward the eschaton. Thus the Fathers avoided what could lead one to a kind of sacramental "magic" and signified what the institution of the sacraments by Christ meant: a new content in forms, which preexisted and were prepared for centuries. Starting from the tangible and visible of the sacramental celebration (*water, *oil, *bread, *wine and rites), they go back to their announcement in the OT and the NT (ἀντίτυπος), to then arrive at the sacrament itself, which thus found its true root (τύπος). The Fathers then drew conclusions for the concrete life of the Christian.

1. In so doing, they followed the same method as the NT. In 1 Pet 3:19-21 the flood is understood as a *type* of *baptism, as is the rock at Horeb in 1 Cor 10:1-5 (see Col 2:17). St. *Paul wrote that the Jewish worship was a shadow of the true worship which was still to come, Christ being the reality. The vocabulary used in the NT, which included celestial reality (Jn 3:12; 1 Cor 15:40-48), shadow, image (e.g., Rom 1:23; 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:49), provided them frequently used examples.

2. The Fathers also continually used the NT because it offered important *types*, like the pool of Bethesda (Jn 5), in which they saw one of the specific *types* of baptism. *Tertullian (*Bapt.* 5: CCL 1, 281) made the same connection by insisting on the action of the angel. In this regard he was followed by *Ambrose of Milan (*De sacramentis* II, 3,7: SC 25bis, 115). The Fathers also used the NT with respect to the *Eucharist, as in Mt 22:3: e.g., the parable of the banquet and the guests, which *Cyril of Jerusalem commented on in his *Procatechesis* (PG 33,336-341). In the same way, the parable of the virgins (Mt 25:1), with its eschatological meaning, applied to the sacraments of Christian initiation: *Gregory of Nazianzus saw therein the point of departure and the road toward the eschatological banquet (*Oratio XL in sanctum baptismum* 46: PG 36,426). Tertullian (*Bapt.* 9: CCL 1, 284), *Cyprian (*Ep.* 63,12: CSEL 3/2, 711), and Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. Myst.* IV, 2: SC 76, 136) all used the account of the wedding at Cana (Jn 2) as a *type* of the Eucharist.

3. The OT esp. supplied the Fathers the *types* they needed for their catechesis. Tertullian offers us a list

of OT *types* which, along with those of the NT, would be used in later ages. (a) In particular, the *type* of water was used to much advantage in many biblical commentaries; from a liturgical point of view, this *type* was developed at the blessing of the baptismal water in the Gelasian Sacramentary, which was attributed to *Peter Chrysologus (*Sacram. Gel.* 445-446). Tertullian used the water of the creation as a *type* (*Bapt.* 3: CCL 1, 278). Ambrose of Milan drew attention to many of the creational aspects, like that of the ἰχθύς and *pisciculi* ("little fish"), i.e., Christians (*De sacramentis* 3,3: SC 25bis, 72). (b) The Fathers understood the flood in Genesis as a *type*, established, as noted above, on 1 Pet 3:3-10. In the eight persons who were saved, Justin saw the *Ogdoad, the eighth day, the day of *Easter and the *resurrection (*Dial.* 138: PG 6, 793). Tertullian developed the symbolism of the dove and that of the ark-church (*Bapt.* 8: CCL 1,283; *De idol.* 24: CCL 2,1924), followed in this regard by Cyprian (*De unit.* 6: CCL 3, 253). (c) Even the Red Sea, as a *type*, drew the attention of the Fathers, who were confirmed in this regard by 1 Cor 10:2-6. So Tertullian (*Bapt.* 9: CCL 1,283-284), Cyprian (*Ep.* 68,15: CSEL 3/2,764), *Basil (*De Spir. Sancto* 14: SC 17bis,163), *Gregory of Nyssa (*Vita Moysis* 50,2: PG 44,361), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. Myst.* I,2-3: SC 126,83-84) and Ambrose all referred to this *type* often (*De sacr.* I,12: SC 25bis,57-58; 61; *De myst.* 12: PL 16,409; 13: PL 16,410). (d) The water of the Jordan River offered the Fathers another *type*, esp. the crossing of the Red Sea as a *type* of baptism: in this regard, see Gregory of Nyssa (*De iis qui baptismum differunt*: PG 46,420-421; *In bapt. Christi*: PG 46,592-593), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. Myst.* 3,3: SC 126,121.123.129). Even the *type* of the healing of Naaman in the Jordan River drew their interest: Gregory of Nyssa (*In bapt. Christi*: PG 46, 593), Ambrose (*Exp. in Lc.* IV,50-51: CSEL 32/4,165-179; *De sacr.* I, 13-14; SC 25bis, 164). (e) The following Fathers likewise used the *types* of bread and *Melchizedek: *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV,25: SC 30,62), Cyprian (*Ep.* 63,4: CSEL 3/2,703), Ambrose (*De sacr.* V,1: SC 25bis,88; IV,10: SC 25bis,80). Of course, they could not forget the manna in the desert; one must simply look at, e.g., Ambrose (*De myst.* 46: SC 25bis, 182) and *Augustine (*Tr. in Jo.* 26,12: CCL 36, 265). (f) The Fathers also sought a typology of the meal and found it in the OT (Is 55:1-3) and the NT (Lk 22:29): thus *Origen (*Com. in Cant. hom.* 2,3: PG 13, 155), Gregory of Nyssa (*In Cant. Cant. hom.* 5: PG 44,873), Ambrose (*De Cain et Abel* I, 5: CSEL 32/1, 356). (g) Likewise establishing their claims on 1 Cor 10:4, as noted above, the Fathers saw in the rock at Horeb a *type* of baptismal water or even a *type* of the *blood of Christ: Cyprian (*Ep.* 63,8: CSEL 3/2,705ff.), Ambrose (*De sacr.* V,3-4: SC 25bis,89; *De myst.* 48: SC 25bis,123).

We have heavily insisted, but not yet exhaustively, on this patristic method, the most characteristic method of the Fathers, who did not intend to offer a true concept of sacrament but to "show it." Beginning from sign, they explained its origin and insertion within the history of salvation, of which the sacraments are today "a stage" and, at the same time, a prefiguration of eschatology.

II. A symbolic-liturgical approach. Not all the Fathers, however, followed this line in their catechesis. *Theodore of Mopsuestia, e.g., was never very fond of *types*; instead, he tried to outline a parallel between the visible and the invisible liturgy. In his homily 12,2 (Tonneau, ST 145,325), e.g., he worked from the epistle to the Hebrews (8:5; 10:1) and saw in the sacraments a ritual imitation of the historical actions of Christ. Neither did he stop at the general level, but he attempted to connect the sacramental rites to the gospel stories (*Hom.* 15, 25-27: ST 145, 503-509). Ps.-*Dionysius, who clearly had a bent toward symbolism, also placed himself within the same line: the sensible realities are the images of the intelligible realities (*De divinis nominibus*: PG 3,525-1120). The Eastern liturgy supplied a vast amount of symbolic material, upon which he drew heavily. This method was not without its dangers and prepared the way for the dubious symbolism of Amalarius of Metz. As one can see, the Fathers were esp. concerned with two fundamental sacraments: baptism and Eucharist; they were not ignorant, however, of the other sacraments, and they did discuss them: one merely has to think of Ambrose and his treatise on *penance.

III. Elaboration in the writings of the Fathers. With all this, the Fathers, even before St. Augustine, were not content with a presentation of the sacraments that was restricted to typology or symbolism. They also sought to express, in their own way, what we might call a certain sacramental "mechanism."

1. They were drawn to pre-Christian terminology. The use of the word μυστήριον in the writings of St. *Paul certainly does not imply a connection to the pagan mysteries; the term provided him the means for referring to the plan of salvation eternally hidden in God and revealed in and by Christ. Nevertheless, the pagan term μυστήριον increasingly became St. *Justin's key term (1 *Apol.* 66: PG 4, 429), who, however, did not use the expression; and *Tertullian (*De praescr.* 40: CCL 1, 221; *Bapt.* 2: CCL 1,

227), who in these cases and to refer to some of the Christian celebrations did not privilege the word *sacramentum*, saw in the pagan mysteries an imitation of the Christian sacraments: the mysteries attempted to incite an active presence of the divinity. The Fathers, however, combated the pagan mysteries, by opposing them with the true mysteries, namely those of Christianity. Thus, in opposition to the solar cults, they saw Christianity as the true possessor of the true sun. In this regard, *Clement of Alexandria offered us a very precise text of great importance, in which he asked the adherents of the cults of the pagan gods to come and celebrate the true mysteries. He used the then-current vocabulary of the pagan cults, which he intended to reject, by imitating it (*Protrepticus* XII: PG 9,778). At the time of the decline of the mystery religions, starting from the 4th c., the Fathers were not afraid of the possible misunderstandings and heavily used vocabulary that was specific to contemporary cults; thus Basil used this method in his treatise *De Spiritu Sancto* (27: SC 17,155). So, in this regard, the title Cyril of Jerusalem assigned to his work *Mystagogical Catecheses* was typical for his time. In the writings of ps.-*Dionysius, one finds many examples of these borrowings, esp. with respect to Christian initiation. This is not at all a theological "borrowing." In the ancient church, some thought that the mystery cults were a providential preparation for Christian worship, and esp. the theology of the implementation of the salvific acts of Christ. But it is not necessary to think of the ἀνάμνησις of *Hellenism, neither of the *memoria* of Latin civilization but rather of the Palestinian *zikkaron:* an implementation of the past in the present before the eyes of God (and not primarily before humans), because he remembers, acts and causes his people to walk in the covenant toward the end of time.

In the Latin-African text of the *Bible, the word was continually translated as *sacramentum;* the *Itala* offered many similar examples. The Vulgate, however, always preferred the word *mysterium*; nevertheless, in the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians, it uses both words interchangeably, without it being possible to determine the reason.

The military meaning of *sacramentum*—the promise of the soldier's fidelity—did not translate the term *mysterium* per se. Nevertheless Tertullian, who was followed by many others, by using it in a military sense influenced the use of the term among Christians to refer to the *credo*, i.e., the **regula fidei* professed at baptism. With Tertullian, therefore, this term ended up having a specific meaning that designated a precise content: the faith. This also allowed him to better compare the pagan and Christian cults: the pagan mysteries only have the "apparent matter" of the sacrament (*Ad nationes* I,16: CCL 1,36), and the pagan cult is called *non sacramenta.*

In the writings of Ambrose, one finds a definition for the sacrament of baptism, which applies to all the sacraments: the neophyte has seen everything he can see with human eyes, but he has been unable to see everything that has been made. Now, what is not seen is far greater than what is seen and what is temporal, because what is not seen is eternal (*De sacr.* I,4: SC 25bis,66). When Ambrose discussed the *Eucharist, he used both the terms *mysterium* and *sacramentum* (*Exp. in ps.* 118,13,20: CSEL 62, 294). And, nevertheless, to further clarify his thought, Ambrose used the term *mysteria* for the Eucharist, which was tied to the term *sacramenta: sacramenta mysteriorum* or *mysteria sacramentorum* (*Apologia David* 12,58: CSEL 32/2,339). Despite all that, however, the difficulty remains in specifying the meaning of the two terms. At times, *mysterium* indicated a sacramental rite (*De myst.* I,1: SC 25bis,156), but also *prayer itself was called *mysterium* (*De fide* IV,10,24: CSEL 73,90; *De sacr.* V,3,12: SC 25bis,124). The Fathers did, however, provide some clarification: *sacramentum* refers to what one sees, i.e., the exterior; *mysterium*, however, refers to the content, what is interior. The *sacramenta* introduce us to the *mysteria*, and in turn, the *mysteria* make us understand the exterior sign, the *sacramenta* (*De myst.* 2: PL 16, 406).

We cannot, however, ignore that the use of the word *sacramentum* in the writings of *Leo the Great is at times precise and extensive. In his literary corpus, we find the word *sacramentum* 128 times in the *Sermons* and 93 times in the *Letters*. Of all the meanings of this term in Leo's writings, we consider the two chief ones here: (1) a reality, a sign of another, a figure or symbol (e.g., *Serm.* 55,3: CCL 138A,325); (2) an efficacious sacred sign (the examples are very numerous; we only cite a few: *Serm.* 3,1: CCL 138,10-11; *Serm.* 21,3: CCL 138,88; *Serm.* 70,4: CCL 138A,429). St. Leo, however, also used the word *mysterium* or *mysteria* with the same meaning. We also provide here some texts where he primarily discusses the figure, a reality, the sign of another reality (*Serm.* 23,4: CCL 138,106; *Serm.* 51,7: CCL 138A,302); in the other texts, however, he discusses an efficacious sign (*Serm.* 16,1: CCL 138,61).

2. The Fathers also studied how the sacraments "work." Tertullian heavily emphasized the rite and its effect (*De resur.* 8: CCL 2,931; *De praescr.* 40: CCL 1,220; *Bapt.* 1; 4; 9: CCL 1,277.279.283). He applied the same treatment of baptism to the other sacraments (see the entries on the individual sacraments).

Tertullian did not recognize any efficacy of the sacramental signs practiced outside the church (*Bapt.* 15: CCL 1,290). Cyprian the bishop of *Carthage not only applied this thesis to *baptism but to all the sacraments, as e.g. to ordination (*Ep.* 69,1: CSEL 3,760). Ambrose was also interested in this "action" of the sacraments and, in an entirely special way, the sacrament of initiation. In this regard, he was in close connection to Paul's doctrine of baptism in the *similitudo* of the death and resurrection of Christ (Rom 6:5), and he sought to explain how the rite of baptism was a *similitudo* that encloses the reality (*De sacr.* II,23: SC 25bis,88). He did the same for the Eucharist; in this respect, he used the word *figura*, sign, a symbol that contains the reality (*De sacr.* IV,5,21: SC 25bis,114). We should mention here a very close connection with the way in which *Serapion of Thmuis explained this concept in the *Euchologion*, a work attributed to him (*Euchol.* 3: F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Const. Apost.* II, *Sacramentarium Serapionis* 174). Ambrose also explained that there was a rite whose symbolism corresponded to human nature (*In Lc.* I,2,79: PL 15,1663). He also attributed a considerable importance to the word; word and symbolic rite are for him two indispensable elements (*De sacr.* IV,19: SC 25bis,112). With respect to the Eucharist, Ambrose attributed to the word the expression: *sermones Christi*, *verba caelestia* etc. (*De sacr.* IV,5,21: SC 25bis,114); and elsewhere he calls it *sermo operatorius Christi* (*De sacr.* IV,4,1: SC 25bis,110). The intervention of the *Holy Spirit is part of Ambrose's theology (*De sacr.* I,5,15.17: PL 16,440; SC 25bis,68; *De myst.* 4; 19; 20; 24; 59: SC 25bis,164, 166, 168, 190-191; *De Spir. sancto* 3,16: CSEL 79,167). Neither did Ambrose forget the intervention of the church in the sacrament: it is precisely the church that is fertile in the Spirit (*De virginibus* I,6,31: PL 16,197; *Exp. in ps. 118*, 19,23: CSEL 62,433-434). We have primarily cited from the writings of Ambrose because his teaching is very representative of Latin patristic thought.

In the writings of the Eastern fathers, the teaching is just as strong. *Clement of Alexandria placed the efficacy of the rite at the base of his sacramental theology, and the texts that must be cited are numerous. We cite one of them that pertains to *confirmation, which he calls a *sigillum* (*Quis dives* 42: PG 9,48). The notion of an efficacious symbol was used by all, esp. for baptism and the Eucharist. *Origen drew on *Neoplatonist philosophy for both for his sacramental doctrine and the symbolism that he preferred, sometimes risking the typology with exaggeration. In the baptismal rite, Origen saw a symbol that confers the gifts (*In Jo.* VI, 17: PG 14, 257). Nevertheless, despite what has sometimes been written, his theological symbolism applied to the Eucharist does not overshadow the real presence (*C. Celsum* VIII,33: PG 11,1565).

The baptismal ritual of the **Didascalia*, just as that of the **Apostolic Constitutions*, incorporates the Pauline symbolism. Present here is the theology of the symbol stamped on the one baptized (*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* III,12,3; 16,4: Funk 210, 211). *Sins are forgiven and the person enters a new life (e.g., *Didasc.* II,39,4: Funk 216; V,9,1: Funk 262; VI,12,2: Funk 326). If Origen saw the effect of baptism in the invocation of the *Trinity, the Greek fathers saw therein primarily the active presence of the Holy Spirit (see Jn 3:5). For *John Chrysostom it is God who baptizes and not the minister (*In Mt. hom.* 50,3: PG 57,507: *In Act. apost. hom.* 14,3: PG 60,116). *Basil recalls that the *water per se does not produce anything: the presence of the Holy Spirit is necessary (*De Spir. sancto* 15,35: SC 17, 171). For *Cyril of Jerusalem, the invocation of the Trinity consecrates the oil and confers on it its efficacious power (*Cat. myst.* III,3-4: SC 126,124-126).

St. *Augustine occupies a special place because of his exposition on the sacraments: his theology was far more developed. Through the use of symbols, he prepared what would become the widely accepted theology of the 12th c. and the Council of Trent. Augustine did not ignore typology but transcended it and studied the sign in itself, independent of its relations with this or that sacrament. Just as some Fathers who had preceded him, he distinguished in the sacrament the visible (*sacramentum*) from the invisible (*virtus sacramenti;* see *In Io. tract.* 26,11: CCL 36,263). Without being evidently conditioned by our number seven in his understanding of the sacraments, Augustine affirmed that everything that speaks order onto sacred things is a sacrament. Therefore, in the rites of the catechumenate he called the blessed salt given to the catechumen *sacramentum salis* (*De cat. rud.* 26,50: CCL 46,173-174; the possible textual variants *sane* or *salis* is irrelevant here because Augustine later treated salt as a "sacrament"). Even the Gelasian Sacramentary applied the word "sacrament" to blessed salt (ed. Mohlberg, 288, p. 43, 26), and this is found in later rituals until the reform of the Vatican II, which suppressed this rite. In the two treatises *De doctrina christiana* (PL 34,15,122) and the *De magistro* (PL 32,1021-1034), Augustine explained a kind of philosophy of signs in which one can easily perceive his dependence on the Alexandrian theologians. On the one hand, the sacraments are material subjects that fall under the senses but which indicate a spiritual content. For

example, in baptism, the water is the visible element: it washes the body, but this signifies what is being produced in the soul (*In I Ep. Jo*. VI,11: SC 75,300-304). The signs are not simply conventional, but there is a relationship between the signifier and the thing signified (*Ep.* 98,9: CSEL 34, 530-531). There is within the sacraments a force that produces the effect signified. On the other hand, it would be to betray Augustine's thought to wish to reduce the *virtus sacramenti* to its effects alone, but the *virtus* also signifies the grace received (*In Io. tract.* 26,11-13: CCL 36,264-267). Christ acts through his church and his minister, and the word is this *virtus*, which brings the gift of grace, and that occurs independent of the minister's personal integrity (*Ep.* 98,2: CSEL 34,521-523). Augustine's statement *accedit verbum et fit sacramentum* (*In Jo. tract.* 53,3: CCL 36,529) thus echoes what we have already heard in the writings of the other Fathers, esp. Ambrose of Milan's. But there would be no need to limit the *verbum* to what we now call, acc. to the tradition of scholasticism, the *forma*. The *verbum* in the baptismal questioning is also the response given by the catechumen (*In Jo. tract.* 53,3: CCL 36,529). Augustine applied all this to different sacraments. After him, some Fathers such as *Maximus of Turin (*Serm.* 13: CCL 23,44) adopted the same thought and opened the possibilities for the theologians of the 11th and 12th c.

DTC 14, 498-527; LTK 9, 218-225; J. de Ghellinck et al., *Pour l'histoire du mot "sacramentum,"* Louvain-Paris 1924; O. Casel, *Zum Wort Sacramentum*: JLW 8 (1928) 225-232; E. Neveut, *La théologie sacramentelle de saint Augustin*: Divus Thomas (Piacenza) 34 (1931) 3-27; J. Daniélou, *Bible et Liturgie*, Paris 1951; B. de Soos, *Le mystère liturgique d'après saint Léon le Grand*, LQF 34, Münster 1958; W. van Roo, *De sacramentis in genere*, Rome 1966; K. Johanny, *L'eucharistie, centre de l'histoire du salut chez saint Ambroise de Milan*, Paris 1968; G. Francesconi, *Storia e simbolo. "Mysterium in figura": la simbolica storico-sacramentale nel linguaggio e nella teologia di Ambrogio di Milano*, Brescia 1981; E. Ruffini - E. Lodi, *"Mysterion" e "sacramentum." La sacramentalità negli scritti dei Padri e nei testi liturgici primitivi*, Bologna 1987; C. Rocchetta, *Sacramentaria fondamentale*, Bologna 1989, 246-277: *"Mysterion" e "sacramentum" nella patristica*; V. Grossi, *Cristo autore dei sacramenti nella patristica*: Riv. lit. 81 (1994) 21-59; B. Sesboüé, *Le témoignage de l'Église ancienne: des institutions sacramentelles*, in H. Bourgeois - B. Sesboüé, *Les signes du salut*, Paris 1995, 56-107; B. Studer, *La teologia sacramentaria nell'età patristica*, in var. aus., *Corso di teologia sacramentaria*, I, Brescia 2000, 62-84.

A. NOCENT

SACRIFICE. *Augustine of Hippo offered an explicit treatment on the characteristics and the function of sacrifice. He maintained that in every sacrifice one must consider four aspects: (1) the one to whom sacrifice is offered (God), (2) the one who performs the offering (a holy and righteous priest), (3) what is offered (the material used) and (4) for whom it is offered (for imperfect beings who have need of *purification; for this reason the matter of the offering must be without defect). Augustine also noted how these aspects find full expression in the sacrifice of Christ, the one true mediator (*De Trin.* IV,14,19). Augustine emphasized, moreover, that the visible sacrifice is the *sacrament, i.e., a sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice: for him, in fact, the true sacrifice is "every work with which we undertake to unite ourselves in holy Communion with God, in such a way that it is attributed to the ultimate good through which we can be truly happy" (*Civ. Dei* X,5-6; see de Broglie, 135-165).

Ancient Christian authors took various positions toward pre-Christian sacrifices. Augustine observed how since antiquity worship toward God was expressed in the form of sacrifice (*Civ. Dei* X,4). The sacrifices of the *pagans were in error because they were directed to the *demons; they emphasized the powers of created beings rather than the power of the Creator (Aug., *Ep.* 102,16-21). Jewish sacrifices, however, were seen by Christian authors as a remedy for idolatry (Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 19,6; Greg. Naz. *Or.* 31,25; Epiph., *Pan.* 66,71). God was pleased with these sacrifices not because they benefited him personally but rather because of the intention with which they were completed, i.e., the desire for honoring God, who expressed himself in them; he rejected the sacrifices, however, when they were carried out for personal gain and not to render him worship (Tertull., *Marc.* II, 22). Jewish sacrifices had a typological value (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VII,6,32,7; Orig., *C. Cels.* IV,31; John Chrysostom, *Hom. 17,3 in Hebr.*; Aug., *In ps.* 39,12; 74,12; *C. Faust.* VI,5; *C. adv. leg.* I,18,37)—esp. that of the sacrifice of Isaac (see J. Gribomont, *Isaac le patriarche*: DSp 7, 1922-2005) and that of *Melchizedek (see Ska, 967-972)—and gave way to the sacrifice of Christ (John Chrysostom, *Hom. 18,1 in Hebr.*; Aug., *Civ. Dei* X,20).

Ancient Christian authors used sacrificial terminology to interpret the death of Christ. They emphasized the voluntary character of his offering, which had an expiatory value by effecting reconciliation with God. In this offering, Christ is a victim and a priest. (For the interpretation of Christ in terms of the sacrifice offered to the Father, which was esp. present in the 4th-c. West, *see* *expiation.)

The sacrifice was called the "*Eucharist" since the early days of the church (*Did.* 14; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 41 and 117; Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV,17,5; Tertull., *De orat.* 19,4; *Trad. Apost.* 4 and 21), often in connection with the prophecy of Malachi (1:10ff.) with respect to the

"pure sacrifice." *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ep.* 63,17) held that we should remember the passion of Christ because "it is in the passion of the Lord that our sacrifice consists." If in fact the Eucharist is a sacrifice (Ambr., *In psalm.* 38,25; John Chrysostom, *In prod. Jud.* I, 6), true (Aug., *De spir. et litt.* 11,18; *Civ. Dei* X,20), spiritual and unbloody (Cyril Jer., *Cat.* 23,8), and an immolation (Ambr., *Exp. in Lc.* I,28), it is also, however, a sacramental or "relational" sacrifice, which is, namely, in relation to the sacrifice of the cross (Cyp., *Ep.* 63,14; Ambr., *De fid.* IV,10,124; *Sacr.* V,4,25; Chrom., *Serm.* 17A,2; Greg. the Great, *Dial.* 4,58). The identity between the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice offered on the altar, which is its memorial, is known by the fact that, in the first and in the latter case, the priest is unique and the victim is unique (John Chrysostom, *Hom. 17,3 in Hebr.*), who today as then is the only eternal priest (Ambr., *In psalm.* 38,25; Aug., *De div. quaest.* 61,2). The eucharistic sacrifice is an antitype (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 2,95) or the *homoiōma* ("a likeness, something similar, similarity, a copy") of the death of Christ (Serap., *Euchol.* XIII,13); a memorial of the true oblation (Aug., *C. Faust.* VI,5; XX,18; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *In Hebr.* 8,4-5), an image of the eternal *liturgy, which Christ now celebrates in heaven (Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. catech.* 15,15-16). This is the sacrifice acc. to the order of Melchizedek, which has replaced the sacrifice of Aaron (Aug., *In ps. 33, serm.* 1,5-6). The eucharistic sacrifice is a sacrifice of thanksgiving (Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 41,1; Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV,17,5) and praise (Aug., *C. adv. leg.* I,20,39), intercession (Cyril Jer. 23,8) and expiation (Ambr., *Sacr.* IV,6,28; Aug., *De anim.* II,15,21; *Quaest. Hept.* III,57); the sacrifice is also offered for the deceased (Tertull., *Coron.* 3,3; Cyril Jer., *Cat.* 23,9,10).

With the term *sacrifice*, in addition to the sacrifice of the cross and the Eucharist, the Fathers also made reference to the offering of Christians, who participate at the eucharistic sacrifice: their offering and their sacrifice must correspond to the sacrifice of the Lord (Cyprian, *Ep.* 63,9); the church, the body of Christ, every day offers itself through him (Aug., *Civ. Dei* X,6; XIX,23,5), who is the head of those who offer, and through the church, he exercises his priesthood as man, while as God he receives what is offered (Aug., *Civ. Dei* X,20; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *In ps.* 109,4).

DTC 10, 795-993, 1317-1332; 14, 662-692; EC 8, 757-778; 10, 1585-1597; R.J. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen*, Washington, DC 1978; Id., *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*, London 1978; TRE 25, 233-278 (esp. 273-278) (bibl.); G. de Broglie, *La notion augustinienne du sacrifice "invisible" et "vrai"*: RecSR 48 (1960); J.L. Ska, *Melchisédech*: DSp 10, 967-972. For the sacrifice of the Mass, see M. Lepin, *L'idée du sacrifice de la Messe d'après les théologiens depuis l'origine jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris 1926; J. Solano, *Textos eucarísticos primitivos*: BAC 88 and 118, Madrid 1962 and 1964 (esp. the index of vol. II, 880-908); J. Betz, *Sacrifice et action de graces*: La MaisonD. 87 (1966) 78-96; J. de Watteville, *Le sacrifice dans les textes eucharistiques des premiers siècles*, Neuchâtel 1966; F.M. Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*, Macon, GA 1990; J. Betz, *Eucharistie in der Schrift und Patristik*: HDG IV/4a; var. aus., *L'Eucaristia nei Padri della Chiesa*: Dizionario di spiritualità biblico patristica, Rome 1998. For the presence of the term "sacrifice" (and some related terms) in the writings of ancient Christian authors, see A. Blaise - H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Strasbourg 1954, 395, 409, 564, 731-732; Lampe 658-660; 671; 1184-1185.

A. Pollastri

SACRILEGIUM (Gk. ἱεροσυλεῖν = *sacra legere*, *rapere*, *auferre*, *clepere*). The term *sacrilege*, acc. to the dictionary of Zingarelli (Lo Zingarelli, 2004, 1585), is defined as "desecration, with acts or words, of people, things or sacred or consecrated places." According to the Roman understanding, sacrilege was primarily "an undue subtraction or theft" (*furtum*) of movable objects, *res*, which were *sacrae* or came from a sacred place (*aedes*, *templum*; see Quintilian, *Inst.* 7,3,10: the robbing of a temple came to be seen as an act of high treason because the well-being of the state depended on the goodwill of the gods). Moreover, the occupation of the temple's private property (see Cicero, *Leg.* 2.21.41) or the property of a third person considered sacred came to be considered a sacrilege (see Cicero, *Inv.* 1,11). In this case it was a desecration of things that entered into the divine sphere so that the gods were indirectly offended by it. An exception was made for the objects that were preserved in the temple for security reasons. Such objects were not considered the true property of the temple so that their removal was often legally prosecuted as a grave crime of robbery but not as a crime of sacrilege. Nevertheless, the profit obtained by this exemption was a sacrilege, inasmuch as it was done with the intent of monetary gain. As much as this term initially referred to *res sacrae* it was also subsequently extended, over the course of the broadening of Roman law, to individuals consecrated to God (see Seneca, *De benef.* 7,7: the violation of a religious vow, whether it occurred through one's own faults or another person's, as could have occurred, e.g., in the case of the vestal virgins, was punished with the death penalty), and to the Roman gods, the local titular deities, the Roman emperors and, last, the heroes of the state. Here we are now dealing with a true and proper "act of impiety" (see

Daremberg - Saglio, 980-987). Not sacrificing to the gods was, within this framework, a grave crime (*crimen laesae romanae religionis*), for which the first Christians were considered guilty (*sacrilegii*). Moreover, the following were considered to be sacrilegious: adultery, the falsification of coins and fiscal fraud (CTh XI, 36,4; IX, 38,6; XIII, 11,1).

1. The legal position among the Greeks and Romans. In order for sacrilege to be committed, the object first had to be dedicated to the gods in a ritual act (*dedicatio*). For this reason a sacrilege came to be seen in strict connection to the temple. Objects of value were contained in it that were consecrated to the temple. The desecration of funerary decorations at that time was not considered to be a sacrilege, as long as it did not pertain to such individual figures as heroes, emperors, etc. A key factor in determining if something was sacrilegious was the attitude of the one who stole (*animus furandi*), i.e., the personal disposition with which the objects consecrated to the gods were profaned, whether the theft, i.e., was committed to obtain a benefit from the subsequent selling of the objects or whether it was committed through simple carelessness toward such objects. The punitive measures for this reason could vary each time acc. to the interpretation of the existing laws. When it pertained to the emperor, even the refusal, however, to recognize the emperor's genius was considered sacrilegious—genius being a characteristic trait of the deities as was the subsequent disregard for his laws (CTh 1,6,9; CI 9,29,2). Only in exceptional cases was it licit for temple priests to sell objects dedicated to the temple, if by such earnings there was an intent to bring about a decoration or an improvement of the temple. The price paid for the acquisition was itself considered an act of *dedicatio*.

2. Legislation and punitive measures. As already mentioned, the punitive measures for sacrilege could vary considerably acc. to different interpretations and modes of action. For this reason, sacrilege, if it fell under the category of ungodliness (*impium*), was punished with the death penalty (*exsecratio capitis*), exile (*aqua et igni interdictio*), deportation, branding or confiscation of property. In the lighter cases, desecration could be purified through a sacrifice to the gods. Plato, however, made no such distinction in this case. For him, there can only be just one punishment for sacrilege: the distancing from the city of the ungodly person who, stripped of his or her clothes, had to be sent away, or the cadaver had to be buried outside the city. To the contrary, Cleinias of Tarentum maintained a differentiation of the punitive measures acc. to the action committed. It was important that the execution of the punishment (*hierosylias graphē*) be public, during the course of which the priests indicated the time of the crime and requested the punishment prescribed for it. There was also at times the idea that the gods punished the ungodly person with death, in the event in which the religious authorities did not notice the sacrilege committed.

3. The Bible and sacrilege. Sacrilege was committed, acc. to the Bible, when the sacredness of God was offended. The ancient covenant between God and humans was its foundation. Thus, acc. to Dt 7:25ff., on the basis of this covenant, the exclusion of all idols was required, and likewise indicated the holiness of God was not to be contaminated through the gold with which the idols were made. The mere possession of this gold would have led to the annihilation of the actual building and would have damaged the covenant. In the book of Leviticus (10:1-2) the author spoke of the offering of an "unauthorized fire" which the Lord had not commanded. As a result of this sacrilege, the Lord punished with death the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu. Their corpses were then taken away from the camp (see also 1 Sam 2:17). In the NT the authors focused on the manifestation of faith in Christ as a decisive sign of God's faithfulness and the salvation that is effected by it. This can be seen, e.g., in the gospel of *Matthew and esp. in *Paul's epistles. In connection to the scene of the purification of the temple recorded in Mt 21:12-13 there followed the curse of the fig tree, a symbol of the disobedient people of *Israel. In this way, lack of faith was seen as a sacrilege. In Rom 2:2, Paul spoke of the condemnation of those who had exalted themselves to the role of judge. Such individuals, acc. to Paul's statements, were proud and obstinate and not ready to convert and with their own behavior condemned themselves. Justification, in fact, acc. to Paul came only from faith.

The Acts of the Apostles (19:21-40) supplies us with important information on the development of the process until the time of the apostle to the Gentiles. As it seems, the popular assembly (*ekklēsia*) was not present here for the ἱερόσυλοι, who were equivalent to the βλασφημοῦντες τὸν θεόν, but the advocates (ἀγοραῖοι), an expert or proconsul (ἀνθύπατοι) were present.

4. Ancient Christian authors and sacrilege. With the acceptance of Christianity by the Roman Empire, the Christians of the first generations after this event witnessed a broadening of the meaning applied to the term *sacrilege*. This was related to the fact that the emperors now saw in the Christian God the foundation for the well-being of the state. For this

reason, Christianity enjoyed special protection. Crimes against the cult were now considered sacrilegious and condemned with the punishment pertaining to the crimes against the cult (desecration or improper use of a building of worship, of the rites, the *sacraments, disturbance of the religious function, etc.; see *Cypr., *De eccl. cath. unitate* 17; *De lapsis* 2) and against the ecclesiastical patrimony (an illicit possession of an ecclesiastical property through an illicit contract; see Cypr., *Ep.* 52,1), to which were added violations to the privileges of clerics (e.g., the immunity of priests and bishops [CTh X,1,31], the desecration of Sunday, the neglect of episcopal duties, therefore apostasy and, last but not least, schism or heresy (*haeresis sacrilega*, *decreta sacrilega*, *sacrilegae animae*, *mentes pectores*, *Arrius sacrilegus*, *voces sacrilegae*). The false interpretation of sacred *Scripture also fell under the crime of heresy (*Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* 4: *sacrilegium Marcionis*). Subsequent mention was made how even an unauthorized second baptism was the crime of sacrilege, which rendered the priest who administered it *sacrilegus* and *peccator* (Cyprian, *Ep.* 70,2; Conc. Carth. LXXXVII [*de haereticis baptizandis*]: *sic enim scriptum est: una fides*, *una spes*, *unum baptismum*, *non apud haereticos*, *ubi spes nulla est et fides falsa*, *ubi omnia per mendacium geruntur*, *ubi exorcizat daemoniacus*, *sacramentum interrogat*, *cuius os et verba cancerem mittunt*, *fidem dat infidelis*, *veniam delictorum tribuit sceleratus et in nomine Christi tingit antichristus*, *benedicit a deo maledictus*, *vitam pollicetur mortuus*, *pacem dat inpacificus*, *deum invocat blasphemus*, *sacerdotium administrat profanus*, *ponit altare sacrilegus*). Even the desecration of the consecrated life was considered a sacrilege (Tertull., *De virg. vel.* 3; *De pud.* 20). The desecration of Christian tombs was then subjected to punishment because of the Christian belief in the *resurrection, a crime that was also called *homicidium*. Moreover, even the immoral behavior of the one who took part in a religious celebration was considered a sacrilege.

DAGR 4, 980-987; PWK 20/2, 1678-1682; Lexikon der christlichen Antike, 325 (Sakrileg); Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament 3, 254-256 (ἱεροσυλέω); F. Gnoli, see *Sacrilegio* (*dir. romano*): Enciclopedia del diritto 39, 212-215; R.A. Bauman, *Tertullian and the Crime of* Sacrilegium: JRH 4 (1967) 175-183; O. Robinson, *Blasphemy and Sacrilege in Roman Law*: Irish Jurist 8(1973) 356-371; J. Barlow, *Cicero's Sacrilege in 63 B.C.*, in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, ed. Carl Deroux, VII, Brussels 1994, 180-189; R. Maceratini, *Ricerche sullo stato giuridico dell'eretico nel diritto romano-cristiano e nel diritto canonico classico: da Graziano ad Uguccione*, Padua 1994; H. Petersmann, *L'homélie pseudo-augustinienne "sur le sacrilege." Un document gallo-romain concernant la lutte des chrétiens contre le paganisme*, in *Culture antique et fanatisme*, ed. J. Dion, Nancy-Paris 1996, 141-149; N. Zeddies, *"Religio et sacrilegium." Studien zur Inkriminierung von Magie, Häresie und Heidentum* (*4.-7. Jahrhundert*), Frankfurt a.M. 2003.

J. Lam Cong Quy

SAECULUM (world/age). The most ancient translators of the sacred books generally adopted term *saeculum* to translate Greek term αἰών, which in turn was the equivalent of the Hebrew term *ʿôlām* in its various meanings: "the duration of world," "world," "human world" fallen and ephemeral with respect to the divine world. But in the *Afra* tradition of the *Vetus Latina*, esp. in the gospel of John, the term *saeculum* also appears as the normal equivalent of the Greek term κόσμος, likewise adopted by the Hellenistic Jewish linguistic tradition as the equivalent of *ʿôlām*. Perhaps the Latin mentality resisted assigning a negative semantic meaning to the term *mundus* (which until that time etymologically recalled the idea of the order and the beauty of the world); but the preference accorded to the term *saeculum* is likely explained by the fact that this term, already existing in secular Latin, could be used with a negative ethical meaning in reference to the fall of the human generations (see Virg., *Georg.* I,468; Horace, *Carm.* III,6,17; Cic., *Parad.* 50; Quintil., *Inst.* II, 5; Tac., *Germ.* 19,9). One can thus explain the clear preference given to the term *saeculum* with respect to *mundus* by writers who had a classical education, such as Tertullian, Cyprian and Lactantius. In patristic language, the term *saeculum*, continuing the classical meanings of *saeculum* (the space of one hundred years), "the temporal world," "humanity living in time," can therefore refer to "the present time," "the present life," without any specific negative meaning (see Tertull., *Spect.* 2,9, acc. to which God is the author of the world *auctor saeculi*; *Val.* 15,5; Cypr., *Dom. orat.* 13); analogously, it can refer to the temporal duration of the world (see Cypr., *Ep.* 58,7; Hilar., *Myst.* 1,1; August., *Serm.* 239,6). But more often, behind the suggestion of the linguistic biblical condition, it can have a negative semantic meaning of an ethic-religious force so that the term *saeculum* can refer to the human world in its vanity and fallenness (see Tertull., *Res.* 19,7; *Apol.* 21,6; *An.* 1,6; *Mart.* 2,5; Cypr., *Mort.* 21; Lact., *Div. inst.* V,1,19). At times it even emphasizes the sinful aspect of human life (see Tertull., *Spect.* 8,10; 15,8; Cypr., *Hab. virg.* 7; Commod., *Instr.* II,18,1; II,25,2). In the context of the persecutory disposition of the pagan world toward Christianity, the term *saeculum* can specifically refer to the pagan persecutor (see Tertull., *Pud.* 1,1; 1,4; Cypr., *Laps.* 2; Lact., *Div. inst.* V,1,26; VI,17,25; *Epit.* 61,6; *Mort. pers.* 16,5). In the

connection of the two terms *saecula saeculorum* or rather *saeculum saeculi*, which is of biblical origin and which was affirmed in the Christian doxologies, the term *saeculum* serves to refer to an indefinite duration, eternity.

H. von Soden, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*, Leipzig 1909, 63-71, 147; DB 5, 1707-1708; GLNT 1, 535-565; H. Helbling, *Saeculum humanum: Ansätze zu einem Versuch über Spätmittelalterliches Geschichtsdenken*, Naples 1953; G. Lettieri, *A proposito del concetto di* saeculum *nel* De civitate Dei: Augustinianum 26 (1986) 481-498; Id., *Il senso della storia in Agostino d'Ippona: il "saeculum" e la gloria nel "De civitate dei,"* Rome 1988; R.A. Markus, Saeculum*: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, Cambridge 1988; P. Bellini, Saeculum christianum*: sui modi di presenza della Chiesa nella vicenda politica degli uomini*, Turin 1995.

V. Loi - B. Amata

SAHAK the Great (Isaac; Armenian catholicos, 387–438). Born around 350, he was the last descendant from the line of St. *Gregory the Illuminator. When he became *catholicos, he actively intervened in the political life of *Armenia, which at that time was divided between the *Byzantine Empire and the Persian Empire. Among other things, thanks to his intercession, the Persian king *Yazdegerd ended the persecution against Christians. Deposed around the year 425 for political reasons, Sahak preserved a strong moral authority over the Armenian church. He had a very important role in the creation of the Armenian alphabet with his full support for the work of *Mesrob, and he himself undertook the translation of parts of *Scripture into *Armenian (the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the *Wisdom books), as well as "explanations of Scripture" (probably homiletic *commentaries). His literary production, if it ever existed, has been lost with the exception of a few letters he sent to the emperor *Theodosius II, to *Atticus of Constantinople and to the prefect *Anatolius of Constantinople. Of special interest was his correspondence with *Proclus of Constantinople, who at this time returned his *Tomus ad armenos.* The Armenian tradition attributes to Sahak a spurious *liturgy and some doubtful canons.

BS 7, 916-918; EC 10, 1616; Bardenhewer 5, 195-197; V. Hakobyan (ed.), *Kanonagirk' Hayoc'* [Armenian law]. I, Erevan 1964, 363-421 (Canons).

S.J. Voicu

SAHDONA. *See* *MARTYRIUS

SAINT and HOLINESS

I. Saint and holiness in the OT and in Second Temple Judaism - II. Saint and holiness in the NT - III. Evolution of two concepts in the patristic age - IV. The criticisms of the cult of the saints.

The concepts of saint and holiness seem closely connected, but at first sight these terms are not so easy to define. This is the case because the human perception of holiness changes with the vicissitudes of time and culture, being heavily determined by historical-geographical contingencies. Therefore, to understand in which manner these concepts were understood in the patristic age, it is necessary above all to focus one's attention on the historical context in which Christianity was born and developed.

I. Saint and holiness in the OT and in Second Temple Judaism. In the ancient religion of Israel, as is described to us from the OT, the terminology of sanctity was drawn from the Semitic root *qdš*. With this term and the other various words derived from it Israelites in the first place referred to God and, therefore, to everything that is in one way or another connected to him: places, temples, objects, priests and people. Now, given that acc. to an uncertain but widely held etymology, this root would suggest in the first place an idea of "separation" or even "rift"; if it referred to God, it would indicate his inaccessibility and transcendence (from which would follow religious fear), although, if it referred to men and things, it would essentially designate everything that remains separate from everything else, which is reserved for a special place, distinct from everyday use (Procksch), thus conveying the notion of "purity," esp. in a ritual sense.

Some scholars, however, have expressed some reservations and perplexity with respect to such an interpretation (Kornfeld, Costecalde and Cazelles), esp. in light of some new linguistic and cultural data. These scholars have indeed observed on the one hand that when the biblical authors used the derivatives from the root *qdš* to qualify the divine name YHWH, they demonstrate continuity with its usage in other Semitic languages to refer to Ba'al, El or any other divinity; on the other hand, they indicate that in the *Bible, as in other Semitic texts, the derivatives of the root *qdš* seem to express not so much the idea of interdiction or separation as much as they express the idea of belonging and relation. The formula "God *qâdosh*," which is very ancient and frequently used in the Bible, seems in fact generally to refer to God who is above all deserving that the thing or person who draws near to him be consecrated objects, places and individuals; in return God

consecrates them (Ringgren: *qâdosh ist ein Relationsbegriff*). In conclusion, keeping in mind also that the equivalent Greek and Latin terms of *qâdosh*, i.e., ἅγιος and *sanctus*, appear in corresponding cultural contexts, one can conclude that the term "holy," if used in reference to God, acquires the value of "divine," "God's being" (also in relation to the idea of *mysterium tremendum*), and, if used in reference to the human being or to things, it acquires the meaning of "belonging to God," "in relationship with God." But if this is the case, what is the relationship between these meanings and ideas with the aforementioned concepts of separation and exclusion marked by the theoretical etymology of *qdš*?

To understand this relationship, it is necessary to reconstruct the context of the calling to holiness, which many times, with slight variations, finds expression in the book of Leviticus: "Be holy because I the Lord your God am holy" (see Lev 11:44-45; 19:1-4; 20:6-8; 25-26; 22:31-33). Here, and esp. in the section referred to as *Heiligkeitsgesetz* (Lev 17–26), the emergence of this calling clearly established an ineliminable divine-human bond of reciprocity. The horizon upon which the relationship is designed is not put off to an ethereal mysticism but is found in human action on the level of history. It is God himself, in fact, who enters into human time and takes the initiative: in the first place, by choosing the people and thereby making the first step by delivering them from the slavery of *Egypt (see esp. Lev 11:45 and 22:33), and in the second place by setting down norms that govern the covenant. If the determination of the past, on the one hand, had established the terms of belonging, then, on the other, it will lead to the people's separateness and exclusion. If in fact it is the reciprocal belonging between God and the people that brings about the people's holiness (Lev 20:7-8 and esp. Lev 20:26) and that makes God the God of this particular people (see esp. Lev 22:33), then the same binding force of their relationship implies separation from everything that remains outside this union. Israel, in fact, is not only the elect people—i.e., the only group that God has chosen for themselves—but also the people "set apart" (see Lev 20:25-26). Having come to share with its God such an essential characteristic like holiness, Israel can no longer keep the idolatrous practices of former times nor maintain a coexistence with those people whom God has rejected. "Separation" or "rift," therefore, do not seem to present themselves as the constituent element of holiness but more simply as its corollary, a necessary consequence, but not a necessitating consequence.

In the same way the question must be asked with respect to the other two elements that played an important role in the OT definition of "holiness": the fulfillment of the precepts and the norms pertaining to ritual purity. Both are certainly explicitly requested by Leviticus and even seemed to present themselves as instruments of holiness through which it can and must be expressed; nevertheless, they are not the constituent element, nor did they assert themselves in such an unmistakable way that they have in and of themselves the ability to acquire or lose holiness (Lev 26:44-45).

The holiness proposed by the book of Leviticus is therefore portrayed as an ineliminable bond established once and for all between God and his people, a bond that leads one into a special condition, which in turn leads to the obligation of adapting oneself to specific norms that have a heavy ritual connotation and do not necessarily imply ethical components (Ringgren). Nevertheless, the prophetic movement, by recovering the awareness of so extraordinary and intense a relationship between God and humanity as that described in Leviticus, initiated a process that would gradually lead, at least as proposed, to the unshackling of holiness from the rigidities of ritualism in order to introduce an emphasis on an ever more intense spiritualization with a heavy emphasis on ethical behavior (Bardy). Already in the text of First Isaiah, in considering the prohibitions, there emerges in fact an obvious transition from the physical to the moral plane (Is 6:7), although, esp. during the postexilic period, the cult itself seems to be perceived as the crowning of faith, sacrifice as an act of reconciliation with God, and the Holy Spirit (*rûah haqqōdeš*) as the interior author of such a reconciliation (Ps 51:13; see Ezek 36:26-27).

Finally, to complete the picture on the Jewish "roots" of Christian holiness, it would perhaps be opportune to mention that in the later books of the OT, as well as in such authors as Flavius Josephus or *Philo of *Alexandria, the heavy influence of Hellenistic culture and the ethical demands imposed by Greek philosophy made its presence felt. Such an influence would have evidently conditioned both their perception of the human being and that of God, leading them to reconsider the ways and the ends of this reciprocal way of relating to each other.

II. Saint and holiness in the NT. The writings that converge together into the NT corpus demonstrate a very strong dependence on the OT conception of holiness, but they also present significant variants and original aspects on this topic. Even here the "holy one" par excellence is still God (although the attribution of the title, even though generally pre-

supposed, appears relatively infrequently: Jn 17:12; 1 Pet 2:9; Rev 4:8; 6:10). Alongside God the following figures enjoyed this name: Christ, who at times is referred to in the line of the prophetic tradition as "the holy one of God" (see Mk 1:24; Lk 4:34; Jn 6:69; Rev 3:7), and esp. the Spirit. In both cases the title would seem to be an indication of divinity, but this is not the only attested meaning. In relation to the Son, e.g., the expression ὁ ἅγιος παῖς (see Acts 3:14; 4:27, 30) would seem rather to refer to the sacrificial mission to which he was called; although, with respect to the Spirit, one must keep in mind that the Spirit is mentioned in its role of sanctifying power, a power that was initially expressed at *Pentecost (see Acts 20:22), and therefore in the sacraments Christ has left to his church.

*Baptism and *Eucharist certainly establish the distinctive sign of the new worshiping community; through them Christians enters into mystical communion with the death of Christ, and they do that "in the Spirit." It will therefore be the (Holy) Spirit who will effect regeneration, the new creation, which transforms the old person into a totally renewed person (see 1 Cor 12:13; 2 Cor 5:17; Rom 6:3-8; Col 2:12; Tit 3), and the Christian community will thus be able to obtain the status of ἁγιασμός, πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (see 1 Th 4:8; 2 Tim 1:14). Precisely in relation to the work of the Spirit and the consequences that this has for the ends of human sanctification, one notices with particular vividness the long road already traveled by that process of interiorization and spiritualization that began with the prophetic movement.

If in fact the NT inherited from the OT the connection between belonging to God and holiness, and therefore between holiness and worship, this connection is already on a different level. 1 *Peter, e.g., seems to allow the emergence of the same injunctions from the book of Leviticus both in renewing the call to holiness (1 Pet 1:15-16, with a citation of Lev 19:2), and in defining Christians as "a chosen race" and a "holy nation" (1 Pet 2:9, Is 43:20-21; Ex 19:6). But with respect to the first case, in the gospel saying, the ancient legalistic establishment seems to be definitively replaced by a more intimate call to perfection and mercy as the heavenly Father is perfect and merciful (see Mt 5:48; and for the abandonment of every type of formalism Mt 15:11-20); while, with respect to the second, it works a true and proper "transformation of belonging," which must now identify the "holy people" no longer with the old Israel but with the church of Christ, which has been unshackled from national limitations and gathered from different peoples but all sanctified from the root from which Christ drew his origin and from the vital lymph that flows from there (the Spirit of sanctification; see Rom 11:16ff, but also Eph 2:12; 5:26; 1 Cor 1:2; Rom 15:16).

With that in mind, it is not surprising that Paul frequently used the term ἅγιοι to refer to Christians (see, e.g., Rom 1:7; 15:25-26; 1 Cor 1:2; 16:1.15; 2 Cor 8:4; Eph 5:27); Christians, acc. to his view, are not "saints" by nature but receive this privilege, or to be more exact enter into this condition, by virtue of the call of divine grace. As ἅγιοι, they belong to a worshiping community which is established upon the sacrifice of Christ (Col 3:12), and for this reason they themselves are called to become a living sacrifice: θυσία ζῶσα ἁγία εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ (Rom 12:1; see 15:16, but also Phil 2:17). The sacrifice thus accomplishes a complete identification between victim and offerer, and the sacrificial dimension comes to consume the Christian's entire life (and not only its own possible, violent conclusion). This involves, despite the process of spiritualization mentioned many times and the undeniable changing of perspective, the preservation of a cultic element even within the new community: "purity." It is necessary, however, to specify that the type of purity to which Jesus referred—take the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:8)—is quite different from the ritual purity prescribed for priests, offerers and victims in the book of Leviticus because it possesses a clear and unmistakable ethical connotation, which is consistently echoed, moreover, in other NT writings (see 1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 2:22; Tit 1:15; Jas 1:27).

Nevertheless, the injunction certainly remains. At least in the first case, this does not pertain to a new way of acting as much as it pertains to a new way of being; a specific moral "action" is certainly not requested (which could be defined as δικαιοσύνη), even though a special "condition," the condition precisely of the person who finds himself in a state of perfect innocence (ἁγιασμός). The "perfect innocence" must in any case find confirmation in a coherent form of behavior, and here once again we are brought back to a level of practice at a higher and different level; in fact, whatever human action is taken, it must be controlled and directed by love (see Eph 1:15; Philem 5; 1 Cor 16:1ff.). The Christian communities, esp. in the texts that can be attributed to Paul or his influence, are precisely characterized by being established on the close unity of those who have been reconciled in Christ and who, regarding themselves as siblings on account of this (it is not by chance that it was precisely the term "siblings" that was Paul's favorite expression to refer to the members of the first communities; see Destro - Pesce), they love one another with a reciprocal love. The

"holy kiss" that the Christians exchanged is therefore not a banal form of greeting but is the very seal of the community to which they belong (see 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Th 5:26), a seal that, nonetheless, once again, has a ritual and liturgical character.

In conclusion we have to say that, for as much as the progress toward a spiritualized and interiorized dimension has been emphasized, the NT's concept of holiness cannot be reduced to a mere ethical connotation without always insisting on a religious interpretation, not to mention the place of worship.

III. Evolution of two concepts in the patristic age. The followers of the new faith, as has been seen, received the title of "saints" only inasmuch as they were members of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ. It follows that Christian holiness in the first centuries had, and could not but have, an essentially collective dimension. Nonetheless, with the passing of time, what seemed to be a shared possession seems to have been reduced to a few, select individuals who began to be considered saints par excellence, those who alone were "saints" in the full sense of the term. The phenomenon at times was presented as unforeseen, determined by the indiscriminate admission of a mass of faithful who were religiously inferior and hardly motivated, the poisoned fruit of the peace of the church. In reality, this was a very gradual process that witnessed different developments in various geographical regions, the details of which we do not know with precision to this day. To obtain an adequate understanding of this we would need to have access to much more precise information on the evolution of the individual figures who became the object of veneration (the mechanical replacement of martyr with monk, which was brought about only through the cessation of the persecutions, today appears to be historiographically naive and unfeasible), on the various levels of the formation of the cult and, esp., on the evolution of what one could call the perception of holiness.

Of the three areas just mentioned what appears to be the most known is certainly the second. Already studies done by Delehaye at the beginning of the 20th c. had in fact brought to light how the cult of the saints had a direct connection to the cult of the martyrs, which in turn derived, *recta via*, from that of the dead. But cult and veneration, as Van Uytfanghe, among others, noted are not the same thing; veneration "begins" much earlier than the cult, which is in turn preceded by admiration, from the attention directed toward persons (who were not yet noted personages!) who are set forth as ideal models of behavior in difficult, if not dramatic, situations. Cyprian's *Letters* (as well as Lucian's *De morte Peregrini*) attest with a certain precision to the first state of the process: the communities surrounded the martyrs (*designati*) with minute care while they were still alive and then adorned their memory after death (the *Dies natalis*, with a significant semantic inversion) during the eucharistic celebration. As Cyprian clarifies, however, the sacrifice is still held for the martyrs, i.e., in their favor (*Ep.* 12,2; 39,3; so too in the liturgy of *John Chrysostom it appears as an ancient survival). Not until almost two centuries later, at least in *Africa, was the cult fully attested and consciously assumed by the Catholic hierarchy; it was then Augustine who explicitly affirmed that no longer did the faithful pray *for* the martyrs but rather that the latter, having been established in God's glory, intercede for them (*Serm.* 285 and *Civ. Dei* VIII,27).

The portraits of these recipients of liturgical practices are now stabilized, delineated, however, by the bishop with different features than the most ancient martyrial images, and seem to embody a new model or ideal of holiness. One in fact does not notice substantial differences of approach between their celebrations and those of other figures who with ever-increasing frequency emerge in Augustine's work. Augustine in his homilies and treatises in fact began to mention, alongside those more established glorious Africans such as Perpetua, Felicity and others, an entire series of noted individuals, primarily illustrious bishops of proven faith and doctrine, to whom he assigned the same virtues that were praised in the martyrs (esp. charity, humility and love for peace), and to whom he referred with the honorable title of *sancti*, which by that time was used in a technical sense (Zocca). If we then turn our gaze from this famous African father to other contemporary authors, we realize that more or less during the same period (shortly before or shortly after) other famous bishops adopted this approach.

And it is not by chance that likewise between the 4th and 5th c. a rich hagiographical production dedicated to monks, ascetics and bishops (thus *Athanasius, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Jerome, *Sulpicius Severus, *Paulinus of Milan, *Possidius etc.) was joined to the martyrial literature. This extraordinary literary production led Peter Brown to speak of "the entrepreneurs of sanctity." This expression has raised numerous debates (Pietri: *le villain mot*), but one certainly cannot ignore what Brown so vividly emphasized. Whether it was a shrewd political-ecclesiastical promotion or sincere devotion or both, the fact of the matter is that from that time onward the cult of the saints seems to have received an extraordinary push, spreading itself almost everywhere.

Having considered the portrait just reconstructed, to speak of the simple passage of witness from "martyr" to "saint," of the succession of one "model" to another, certainly seems to be improper. It was not a replacement but was something else that perhaps calls to mind more closely the phenomenon of pseudomorphosis (Pietri); a new perception of holiness in fact seems, at one given moment, to become external both in the elaboration of new figures and in the "revisitation" of types already known, giving life to original forms that become bearers of values and changed demands. It has been said that "the *proclaimed* saint defines himself, but also the social and ecclesial group that produces the saint and, in a certain way, desires him" (Grégoire). This means that between the "saint" and the community that venerates him or her as such an exchange takes place, in virtue of which the former is made out to be an ideal example for his devotees, although the latter, for their part, "model" his or her image, attributing to it worries, desires and needs that were not otherwise expressed by that saint. In other words, society—to use a classic formula—produces the saints it needs: it produces the images in which it recognizes itself and by which it allows itself to be conditioned (Delooz).

It is evident then that the key point of the discourse remains the idea of holiness, or better yet the changes that this idea underwent over the course of time. It was a long and complex journey that cannot be outlined here in detail, because of notable variations both geographically and chronologically. There exist, however, some macroscopic factors at work in almost the entirety of the empire that could have certainly played a role in determining the passage from a widespread holiness to more individualized and codified forms.

We can quickly lay out a brief outline of the historical process: the progressive increase of the Christian communities, which led to the admission of an ever-growing number of new adherents to the faith coming from different social and cultural levels (even the highest levels of society and therefore philosophically trained); the advent of the religious peace which, with the end of the persecutions, provoked a sort of identity crisis (Markus) among those who had found a gravitational center in the ancient martyrial saying *christianus sum* (think of the marvelous text in *Passio Perpetuae* 3,1-2); the beginning of an ever more clear-cut distinction between clergy and laity, which led the latter to view themselves almost at the margins of an all-encompassing Christian commitment (= holiness?), which by then had been perceived as irreconcilable with normal daily activities and therefore delegated to "specialists" who were dedicated to it full-time (Singles, Brown); the progress and deepening of the theological debate which, emphasizing above all the divinity of Christ against *Arianism, perhaps invited the faithful to seek more humble and closer mediators (although the philosophical religious culture of the time set forth with ever-increasing conviction the necessity of an intermediation between heaven and earth). Last, even the evolution of *eschatology could have had a further effect so that Christians turned to the "saints" as the ideal intercessors before God (Van Uytfanghe). One certainly cannot ignore some psychological and social components of the time mentioned by Brown: in a world that had become uncertain and insecure, it must have seemed natural to seek an invisible patron who in virtue of his status as an *amicus dei* knew how to accompany and protect the existence of individuals whose life had become gradually more difficult. All these factors certainly contributed to the emergence of the "saint," as in the establishment and differentiation of ever-renewed typologies. Nevertheless, as was said, for a proper and exhaustive explanation of the phenomenon, it would be necessary to examine case by case the different geographical-cultural contexts and to reconstruct, due to the ordered composition of endless details, a single history made of many individual stories.

IV. The criticisms of the cult of the saints. When one speaks of the cult of the saints, one immediately thinks of the Protestant Reformation and, as a result, the Catholic response. In reality, accusations and complaints were raised almost from the very beginning and came from outside and inside Christianity. With respect to the outside, the existence of problems in this regard are recorded for us by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VIII, 6,7) and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*Graecorum affectionum cur.* VIII), but above all in the person of the emperor *Julian, who rebuked Christians for having abandoned OT monotheism for the cult of their martyrs (*C. Galileos* 201E). Other critiques came, however, as was said, from closer regions. Due to Augustine's testimony (*C. Faust.* 20,21), we have come to know that the Manichean *Faustus stigmatized the Christian practice in terms very similar to those of the emperor Julian, while *Jerome (*C. Vigil. Ep.* 61 and 109) mentioned the concerned reservations expressed by *Vigilantius, a Christian priest who discerned idolatrous practice in the cult of the relics and esp. in the belief in their thaumaturgic power. The Catholic clergy always responded by vociferously defending

the cult of the saints, but not without introducing cautions and needed corrections. Bishops and presbyters indeed strained to emphasize how the one true mediator between God and man was still Christ Jesus (1 Tim 2:5), and how even the miracles obtained through the intercession of the saints, or which occurred near their bodies, or from their relics, were nothing other than a manifestation of divine power.

E. Lucius - G. Anrich, *Die Anfängen des Heiligenkultus in der christilichen Kirche*, Tübingen 1904; E. Vacandard, *Les origines du culte des saints*, in *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse*, Paris ²1912, 59-211; H. Delehaye, *Sanctus. Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité* (Subsidia hagiographica 17), Brussels 1927; Id., *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Subsidia hagiographica 20), Brussels ²1933; A. Michel, *La sainteté*: DTC 14, 2 (1939) 841-870; P. Séjourné, *Saints* (*cult de*): ibid., 870-900; A.J. Festugière, *La sainteté*, Paris 1949; B. Kötting, *Heiligkeit u. Heiligentypen in der ersten Christlichen Jahrhunderts*: Diözesanpriester 1 (1949) 12-27 (= *Ecclesia peregrinans. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 54,2, Münster 1988, 43-60); H. Leclercq, *Saints*: DACL 15 (1950) 373-462; E. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr: The Monk as the Successor of the Martyr*, Washington, DC 1950; *Heilig, das Heilige*, ed. var. aus.: LTK² 5, 84-92; T. Klauser, *Christlicher Märtyrerkult, haidnischer Heroenkult und spätjüdischen Heiligenverehrung. Neue Einsischten und neue Probleme*, Cologne-Opladen 1960; P. Delooz, *Pour une étude sociologique de la sainteté canonisée dans l'Église catholique*: Archives de sociologie des religions 13 (1962) 17-43; Ph. Rouillard, *Le culte des saints au temps des Pères*: Assemblée du Seigneur 89 (1963) 62-85; A.M. Orselli, *L'idea e il culto del santo patrono cittadino nella letteratura latina cristiana*, Bologna 1965; O. Procksch, ἅγιος, ἁγιάζω, ἁγιασμός, ἁγιότης, ἁγιωσύνη: GLNT I (1965) 234-310; P. Van Bergen, *La vie quotidienne vécue comme culte et sacrifice spirituel*, in *Sainteté et vie dans le siècle* (Laïcat et Sainteté 2), Rome 1965, 83-107; A. Di Nola, *Santi e santità*: Enciclopedia delle Religioni (Vallecchi) 5 (1973) 816-825; A. Goldberg, *Der Heilige u. die Heiligen*, in F.V. Lilienfeld (ed.), *Aspekte frühchristlicher Heiligkeit*, Lehrstühl für Gesch. & Theol. des christl. Ostens an der Univ. Erlangen 1977 (Oikonomia 6), 16-34; 142-149; N. Hermann-Mascard, *Les reliques des saints. Formation coutumière d'un droit* (Societé d'histoire du droit. Collection d'histoire institutionelle et sociale 6), Paris 1975; C. Duquoc, *Modelli di santità*: Concilium 15,9 (1979) 13-23; C. Leonardi, *Dalla santità monastica alla santità politica*: Concilium 9 (1979) 85-97; Id., *I modelli dell'agiografia latina dall'epoca antica al Medioevo*, in *Passaggio dal mondo antico al Medio Evo da Teodosio a San Gregorio Magno. Roma, 25-28 maggio 1977* (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 45), Rome 1980, 435-476; G. Bardy, *La conversione al cristianesimo nei primi secoli*, Milan ²1981; A.M. Orselli, *Il santo patrono cittadino fra tardoantico e altomedioevo.* Atti del Convegno tenuto a Roma dal 12 al 16 novembre 1979, II, Rome 1981, 771-784; M. Van Uytfanghe, *La controverse biblique et patristique autour du miracle, et ses répercussions sur l'hagiographie dans l'Antiquité tardive et le haut Moyen Âge latin*, in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés, IVᵉ-XIIᵉ siècles*. Actes du Colloque organisée à Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 mai 1979), Paris, Études Augustiniennes, 1981, 205-231; A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du moyen âge d'après les procés de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques*, École Française de Rome, Rome 1981; Id., *Santità*: Enciclopedia Einaudi 12 (1981) 441-453; J. Fontaine, *Le cult des saints et ses implications sociologiques*: AB 100 (1982) 17-41; H.P. Müller, *qdš*, *Santo*, in E. Jenni - C. Westermann, *Dizionario teologico dell'Antico Testamento*, It. tr., Casale Monf. 1982, 530-549; S. Boesch Gajano, *Il culto dei santi: filologia, antropologia e storia*: Studi storici 1 (1982) 119-136; P. Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, Chicago 1981; *Saints and Their Cults*, ed. S. Wilson, Cambridge 1983; R. Kirschner, *The Vocation of Holiness in Late Antiquity*: VChr 38 (1984) 105-124; Ch. Pietri, *Les origines du culte de martyr* (*d'après un ouvrage récent*): RivAC 60 (1984) 293-319; H. Cazelles, *Le développement des notions de "sacré" et de "sainteté" dans l'Ancien Testament*: DBS 10 (1985) 1415-1432; K. Hausberger, *Heilige/Heiligeverehrung* III-IV: TRE 14 (1985) 646-655; D. Kellermann, *Heiligkeit* II: ibid., 700-701; C.B. Costecalde, *Sacré* (*et sainteté*): DBS 10 (1985) 1346-1415; Id., *Aux origines du sacré biblique*, Paris 1986; G.L. Müller, *Gemeinschaft und Verehrung der Heiligen. Geschichtlich-systematische Grundlegung der Hagiologie*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1986; R. Grégoire, *Manuale di agiologia. Introduzione alla letteratura agiografica*, Fabriano 1987; J. Guillet, *Sainteté de Dieu*: DSp 14, Paris 1988, 184-192; A. Dihle, *Heilig*: RAC 14 (1988) 1-63; T. Baumeister, *Heiligenverehrung I*: ibid., 96-150; M. Van Uytfanghe, *Heiligenverehrung II* (*Hagiographie*): ibid., 150-184; Id., *La typologie de la sainteté en Occident vers la fin de l'Antiquité*, in *Scrivere di Santi.* Atti del II Conv. di Studio dell'Ass. It. per lo Studio della Santità, dei culti e dell'Agiografia. Naples 22-25 ottobre 1997, ed. G. Luongo, Rome 1998, 17-47; *Histoire des saints et de la sainteté chrétienne*, ed. F. Chiovaro et al., 11 vols., Paris 1986-88 (It. tr. Milan 1991); W. Kornfeld - H. Ringgren, *qdš*, in *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, VI, Stuttgart-Berlin-Cologne 1989, 1179-1204; C. Leonardi, *Modelli di santità tra secolo V e VII*, in *Santi e demoni nell'alto medioevo occidentale* (*secoli V-XI*), Atti della XXXVI Settimana di studio sull'alto medioevo, Spoleto 7-13 aprile 1988, Spoleto 1989, 261-283; Ch. Pietri, *Saints et démons. L'héritage de l'hagiographie antique*, ibid., 15-90; P. Dinzelbacher - E.R. Bauer (eds.), *Heiligenverehrung in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Ostfildern 1990; Ch. Pietri, *L'évolution du culte des saints aux premiers siècles chrétiens: du témoin à l'intercesseur*, in *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental* (*IIIᵉ-XIIIᵉ siècle*), Rome 1991, 15-36; M. Van Uytfanghe, *L'essor du culte des saints et la question de l'eschatologie*, ibid., 91-107; P. Brown, *The Body and Society*, New York 1988; M. Forlin Patrucco, *Modelli di santità e santità episcopale nel IV secolo: l'elaborazione de Padri cappadoci*, in *Modelli di santità e modelli di comportamento*, Turin 1994, 65-77; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Dal Modello ai modelli*, ibid., 9-17; A. Destro - M. Pesce, *Identità nella comunità paolina: santi e fratelli*, in *Atti del IV simposio di Tarso su S. Paolo Apostolo*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 1996, 107-124; R.A. Markus, *La fine della cristianità antica*, It. tr., Rome 1996; M. Van Uytfanghe, *L'origine, l'essor et les fonctions du culte des saints. Quelques repères pour un débat rouvert*: Cassiodorus 2 (1966) 143-196; A. Angenendt, *Heilige und Reliquien. Die Geschichte ihres Kultes von frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich ²1997; *Santità, culti, agiografia. Temi e prospettive*, ed. S. Boesch Gajano, Rome 1997; E. Zocca, *La figura del santo vescovo in Africa: da Ponzio a Possidio*, in *Vescovi e Pastori in epoca teodosiana*. XXV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana. Roma 8-11 maggio 1996 (SEA 58), Rome 1997, I, 469-492; *Il grande libro dei santi. Dizionario Enciclopedico*, ed. C. Leonardi - A. Ricciardi - G. Zarri, 3 vols., Cinisello Balsamo 1998; S. Boesch Gajano, *La santità*, Bari 1999; A.M. Orselli, *Modelli di santità e modelli agiografici nell'Occidente latino*: Augustinianum 39 (1999) 168-185; *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, ed. J. Howard-Johnston - P.A. Hayward, Oxford 1999; D. Singles, *Un "peuple saint" sous le poids du sacré*, in *Anthropos laikos. Mélanges Alexandre Faivre à l'occasion de ses 30 ans*

d'enseignement, (eds.) M.-A. Vannier - O. Wermelinger - G. Wurst (Paradosis 44), Fribourg 2000, 304-314; P. Delooz, *Sainteté et martyre*, in *Deux mille ans d'histoire de l'Église. Bilan et perspectives historiographiques*, (eds.) J. Pirotte - E. Louchez, (= RHE 95/3, 2000), Leuven 2000, 34-47; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Le origini*, in *Storia della santità nel cristianesimo occidentale*, Rome 2005, 19-89; P. Siniscalco, *Modèles de sainteté dans le christianisme ancien (Ier-IVe siècle): le baptisé, le martyr, l'empereur*, in *Séminaires internationaux d'études historiques "De Rome à la troisième Rome."* Rome-Mosca, settembre 2000; E. Zocca, *Dai "santi" al "Santo": un percorso storico linguistico intorno all'idea di santità* (*Africa Romana secc. II-V*) (Verba seniorum 13), Rome 2003.

E. Zocca

SAINTS, FOOLISH (Holy Fools)

I. History and literature - II. Spirituality - III. Social-political context.

In an ideal history of ancient sanctity for individuals, the foolish saint succeeded the monk just as the monk had succeeded the *martyr. Starting from the 3rd c., historians and hagiographers wrote of a very rare form of asceticism practiced by monks who, with a bizarre and chosen form of behavior, outside every form of rationality in social and ecclesiastical relations, unmasked hypocritical behaviors and led many to conversion, often only moral, sometimes to Christianity, and occasionally to *Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Their holiness was recognized only after their death, when through the divine will it appeared evident to all that their folly was actually a fiction lived for (love of) Jesus Christ.

I. History and literature. In the Eastern church, the foolish saints (σαλοί) are found esp. in three periods of the history of its spirituality: (1) in Late Antiquity, (2) during the Macedonian dynasty of the Byzantine Empire (9th-11th c.) and (3) in Russia, where this expression of holiness was very widespread and highly regarded in a broad historical stretch that began from the 9th c., culminated in the 16th, then continuing until the last decade of the 20th, when even some diocesan canonizations were blocked (A. Sivak, 35). In the West there were no recorded cases of *saloi* (T. Baconsky, 267), but there existed an analogous type of christocentric holy madness, which is expressed in the perfect joy drawn from the disregard for oneself and for the disregard received from the world (F. Vandenbroucke, 767). After heterogeneous expressions of extreme asceticism present in early Irish *monasticism and cases of uncommon humiliation in the tradition of Benedictine and Camaldolese monasticism, there followed the "golden age" of the Western *perfect fools* for Christ, which began in the 13th c. by Francis of Assisi and continued then with other famous historical figures of sanctity such as Raymond Lull, Thomas More and Philip Neri. Mistaken at times for a fool, Ignatius of Loyola codified the Pauline theme of folly for Christ in the *Constitutions* for his society and in the *Spiritual Exercises* (J. Saward, 82-103). With regard to the literary genre of the sources that narrate the asceticism of the *saloi*, it is impossible to reconstruct a "real" history of the foolish saints of Late Antiquity nor a precise geographical map of the places in which the first ascetics practiced holy folly. Although on the one hand the first three stories of foolish saints, situated in Egypt, lead one to think of this region as a native country for this type of sanctity (J. Grosdidier de Matons, 279), on the other hand, the authors who told them collected stories that circulated widely in the entire E basin of the Byzantine Empire.

It is also possible that this extraordinary form of Christian spirituality was derived from *Syria, a traditional melting pot of extreme forms of asceticism which were then exported elsewhere (D. Krueger, 62). Conversely, we can review with a certain precision the Late Antique hagiographical literary tradition of the foolish saints, which reaches its highest stylistically elevated expression in the 7th c. Before that time, stories of foolish ascetics were incorporated into *Palladius's *Lausiac History* (34; 37); in an anonymous account, from the beginning of the 5th c., about a monk who "pretended to be mad" with the objective of inappropriate laughter (published by F. Nau in PO 8, 178-179); in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (8; 9); in the cycle of 5th-c. stories that pertain to the *Life of Daniel of Scetis* (*Vie [et récits]*) *de l'abbé Daniel le Scétiote*, ed. L. Clugnet, Paris 1901); in the *History of Theophilus and Mary*, preserved as the 52nd history in the *Lives of the Eastern Saints* (PO 19,164-179) of the *monophysite bishop *John of Ephesus (507–586); in the *Pleroforiae* by John Rufus (redacted in the years 512–518); in *The Spiritual Meadow* by *John Moschus (6th–7th c.). Finally, during the time immediately before the devastating Islamic invasion of the island (649), in a Cyprus still firmly tied to the Late Antique Greco-Roman tradition and populated by various types of exiles from Egypt and Syria, *Leontius of Neapolis (ca. 590–650), drawing on previous historical sources, among which was the *Ecclesiastical History* of *Evagrius Scholasticus (PG 86, 2, 2415-2886), codified this genre of sanctity with the *Life of Saint Simeon the Fool* (A.J. Festugière), which was destined to become a successful hagiographic model in the Slavic-Orthodox tradition.

After centuries of literary silence, at the turn to

the 2nd millennium, borrowing the language and a few examples from the work of Leontius, an anonymous Byzantine hagiographer who presented himself as a priest of *Constantinople's Hagia Sophia and who used the name Nicephorus, wrote the *Life of Andrew the Fool* (PG 111, 621-888), a fictitious story situated in an improbable 5th-c. Constantinople. Subsequently, at Byzantium, a great devotion and public cult of the saints even to the point of the dedication of monasteries became equally widespread (G.P. Majeska, 314-316), although the hagiography of St. Andrew gave decisive impulse to the fortunes of the *saloi* in Russian spirituality and culture. Between Nicephorus and Leontius there is not only a separation of centuries: even the typology of holy folly, a theme developed in their *Lives*, noticeably distances Andrew, who is centered on moralizing themes, from Simeon, who is moved by ecclesiastical motives. Moreover, the hagiographical differences derived from the history of holy Byzantine folly, because *The Life of Andrew* leads one to suppose that during the time of the priest of the Hagia Sophia, the authentic *saloi* only lived in the collective memory of a past of glorious asceticism (L. Rydén, 16-31). In the Byzantine Empire, in fact, the medieval promotion of the cult of the holy fools is related, perhaps through a growing cultural influence of Hellenistic humanism, to a certain suspicion toward those who liked to practice it. In the *Life of Saint Gregory the Decapolite* (9th c.), the *saloi* are indirectly associated with the devil, although in the 11th c. the notable Byzantine of Armenian origin Kekaumenos counsels people to keep themselves at a distance from charlatans who pass themselves off as *saloi* (*Strategikon*, p. 63, 18-30, in J. Grosdidier de Matons, 300), and in the 12th c., the canonist Theodore Balsamon applied to them the 60th canon of the Quinisext Council *in *Trullo* (692), which condemned those who faked demonic possession. In the Greek East, however, cases of *saloi* were also noted through the centuries, even until the 20th c. (T. Baconsky, 321-325).

II. Spirituality. To justify this style of life, the hagiographical texts that describe the deeds of these saints often appealed to *Paul (1 Cor 3:18), who was the theologian and the apostolic preacher of folly (μωρία) of the cross of Christ (1 Cor 1:18ff.), which was the heart of the act of faith (A. Derville, 639). Even if it is true, however, that only in one passage of his letters Paul seems to allude to a foolish behavior (μωροί) of the *apostles, it was antithetical to the conventional behavior of 1st-c. society (1 Cor 4:10); nevertheless, in all these cases in which the apostle spoke of the "folly" of the faithful, this theme was contrasted to worldly wisdom, the term commonly used was μωρός, an insult acc. to OT writings, and was usually used in classical antiquity to refer to deplorable cases of psychic-intellectual incapacity (G. Bertram). In the Late Antique accounts of foolish saints, the concept of holy folly, which was rather fluid, is not mediated by a uniform vocabulary; and the term *salos*, which is derived from the Syriac word *sakla* (agitation) which passed into the Orthodox Church as a technical term for the "foolish saint" (T. Špidlík, 753), was not used univocally, indicating even cases of folly that were not associated with holiness. Recalling Paul's language (1 Cor 4:10), Leontius of Neapolis referred to Simeon, the protagonist of his story, as a *salos dia Christon* ("a fool for Christ"), an expression whose particular novelty resides not in the first term (which alternates in the *Life* of the saint with *mōros*) but in the second, because folly was received and embraced as a charism for love of Christ (*dia Christon*). The hagiographic account is precisely constructed in such a way as to show the saint who pretends foolishness for Christ and identifies himself with him through a paradoxical imitation of the life of Jesus. The christocentricity off the *salos*, which is moreover the most important theological element of this type of holiness, funnels into self-abasement almost to the point of embodying the extreme humiliation of Christ in the various instances of contempt to which he subjects himself (Phil 2:7).

In the hagiographies of the *saloi*, the identification with Christ is expressed esp. with the term of "hidden holiness," a typology of holiness widespread in Late Antiquity. No one, with the exception of a cleric here or there, through great spiritual prominence or through divine revelation, knew the true identity of the foolish saint, who willingly hid his sanctity behind foolishness and by disrupting the canons of a sanctity founded upon the Aristotelian doctrine of the *just mean*. In the *Life of Saint Simeon the Fool*, the hagiographer develops this theme because the hiding of Christ acc. to the gospel of *Mark emerges as the literary thread (D. Krueger, 66-71). To characterize the spirituality of the *saloi*, however, other elements of holiness converged such as the *xenia* of the *salos* to the world; the eschatological tension in which their life is fulfilled; the gift of the discernment of spirits; spiritual childlikeness (J. Saward, 25-30). Last, wherever he was to be found, the foolish saint lived his relationships with utmost freedom above the social and ecclesial structures, shaking them from the norm with prophetic gestures that were full of humor, to show their injus-

tices and immoral behaviors. In the 6th c., the historian *Evagrius of Epiphania (Scholasticus) described the conduct of some of them by focusing his attention on their *apatheia* (absence of injury, immunity and freedom from emotion), because of their indifference toward food and because of their spiritual *androgyny*, which allowed them to undergo every discouragement of social-cultural discrimination. Devoid of every human intimidation, they bathed with the women at the baths; they touched and embraced them without risking any sexual involvement; "they are men with men and women with women, because they want to share life with both genders without belonging to just one" (*HE* I, 21: Bidez-Parmentier, p. 31).

The freedom from the soul's passions, esp. toward food and sex, should be regarded not only as a charism but also as the fruit of a preceding asceticism. In the first hagiographical accounts, the calling to "divine folly" is in fact presented as a "second vocation," which the ascetic achieves who has already been proven in the *cenobium or in the desert, which he leaves "for the salvation of souls." The first case of holy folly that was described was that of the nun Tabennisi, who has come down through history with the name Isidora. She lived in her convent as a mentally disturbed woman (σαλή) and as such was despised by all the other nuns, until through divine revelation a priest uncovered her true identity and sanctity. But Isidora withdrew from the honors of her monastery and ended her days in the anonymity of a hermitage (Palladius, *Lausiac History* 34). When he became aware of the divine calling to holy folly, St. Simeon of Emesa had already lived for 39 years as a hermit in the Transjordan. He became "perfect" at the divine impulse and, after having been moved by love for the "souls" of sinners, he left his companion who assisted him in the desert "to play games in the world" and to enter the city, at *Emesa, where he made his triumphal entry, dragging behind him a dead dog, which he had found in the dung heap, and was followed by a train of aggressive and vociferous children who cried out: *Abbas, mōros!* He spoke in parables, but he was also a thaumaturge, a diviner and a prophet. He converted the city from its sins. St. Simeon accompanied his deeds of folly with an unconditioned love toward the lowliest in society, to the point of not defending himself from accusations of stupidity and immorality, even to the point of assuming responsibility for a sexual act he did not commit, which he did to save a pregnant servant girl from punishment. He died in a papyrus hut among beggars, who carried him "without songs, nor ashes nor incense" to the cemetery of the vagabonds. When the city became aware that the saint was buried ignominiously, the people wanted to exhume the body for a more worthy burial. But they did not find it because the Lord had taken it away (Leontius of Neapolis, *The Life of Saint Simeon the Fool*).

Similar to Christ, the *apatheia* of the *saloi* far surpassed that of the philosophers. In the hagiography of Leontius, the saint was frequently placed alongside Diogenes of Sinope, the famous cynic on whom a worldly Christian approval was assigned; Leontius, however, demonstrated the limit of his spiritual "liberty." As in the case of the cynic, the *salos dia Christon* gorged himself on lupines, ate raw meat and defecated in public, not only to subvert the hypocritical conventions of the city, but also because through these gestures he revealed the superior perfection of an ascetic who had reached "angelic" impassability. Simeon, living in accord with God (*kata Theon*), infinitely transcended the cynic virtue derived from a life *kata physin* (see D. Krueger, 29; 36-56; 107).

III. Social-political context. In structured societies, the foolish saints willingly chose to be marginalized. They always aligned themselves with those who lived in poverty, whatever gender they might be, and they denounced the abuses and the injustices of those in power with bold and clean humor. The hagiographers did not overlook the development of this theme that won over the masses. Leontius described St. Simeon as a chastiser of the merchants, but not with the objective of destroying the ancient social structures in which the hagiographer believed, but to teach the value of the poor for the salvation of the world and to teach rich Christians the duty of giving alms as they await the day of judgment (D. Krueger, 120-122). The eschatological value of the life of the *saloi* reiterates the necessity for continual conversion of the ancient social order. It is not by mere chance that in the ancient Eastern tradition there occurred cases of vocations to become a *salos dia Christon* during periods of economic prosperity or the exaltation of the "autocratic" ideology, as in the Justinian empire and that of *Heraclius and in the 16th-c. Russia of Ivan the Terrible (O. Clément, 165-166).

The vocation to holy folly, with all its social implications, was not restricted to Christianity. In the Jewish tradition, one should recall similar phenomenon in Hasidic *Judaism (M. Buber). The cult of Muslim saints in North Africa included cases of folly analogous to those in Christianity (E. Dermenghem).

E. Benz, *Heilige Narrheit:* Kyrios 3 (1938) 1-55; P. Hauptmann, *Die "Narren um Christi Willen" in der Ostkirche:* Kirche im

Osten 2 (1959) 27-49; E. Dermenghem, *Le culte des saints dans l'Islam maghrébin*, Paris 1954; A. Derville, *Folie de la croix*: DSp 5 (1964) 635-650; T. Špidlík - F. Vandenbroucke, *Fous pour le Christ*: DSp 5 (1964) 752-770; J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Les thèmes d'édification dans la Vie d'André Salos*: Travaux et Mémoires 4 (1970) 277-328; G. Bertram, μωρός κτλ: TDNT 4 (1967) 832-847; A.J. Festugière (tr. and ed.), *Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre*, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 95, Paris 1974, 257-637; N. Challis - H.W. Dewey, *Byzantine Models for Russia's Literature of Divine Folly* (*Jurodstvo*), in *Papers in Slavic Philology in Honor of James Ferrel*, I, ed. B. Stolz, Ann Arbor, MI 1977, 36-48; J. Saward, *Perfect Fools: Folly for Christ's Sake in Catholic and Orthodox Spirituality*, Oxford 1980; M. Molé, *Les mystiques musulmans*, Paris 1982; G. Guidorizzi, *Motivi fiabeschi nell'agiografia bizantina: Studi bizantini e neogreci.* Atti del IV congr. naz. di studi bizantini, ed. P.L. Leone, Galatina 1983, 457-467; G.P. Majeska, *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, Washington, DC 1984; L. Rydén, *I santi folli di Bisanzio*, ed. P. Cesaretti, Milan 1990, 5-32; I. Goraïnoff, *Les fols en Christ dans la tradition orthodoxe*, Paris 1983; M. Buber, *I racconti dei chassidim*, Parma 1992; T. Baconsky, *Le rire des Pères. Essai sur le rire dans la patristique grecque*, Paris 1996; D. Krueger, *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's Life and the Late Antique City*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1996; F. Maspero (ed.), *Santi Folli della Chiesa d'Oriente*, Casale Monf. 1999; G. Fedotov, *I santi dell'antica Russia*, ed. M.P. Pagani, Milan 2000; O. Clément, *Follia e santità. Qualche nota sui "folli in Cristo" nella Chiesa d'Oriente*, in M.P. Pagani (ed.), *Starec Afanasij. Un folle in Cristo dei nostri giorni*, Milan 2005, 155-168; L. Coco - A. Sivak, *Le sante stolte della Chiesa russa*, Rome 2006.

V. Lombino

SAINTS, INTERCESSION of. Scholars have not sufficiently examined the possible dependence of the idea of the intercession of the saints on Jewish and pagan thought, e.g., the intercession of the *patriarchs (see Donahue) and the intercession of a *patron (see Orselli), i.e., before the presence of the Roman emperor (see Ernesti, 273-278).

Belief in the intercession of the saints is a corollary to belief in the *communion of saints. Since antiquity it was presented in various forms, acc. to who practiced it and whether it was in relation to the living or the dead.

1. The intercession of the martyrs. The early church recognized that because of their profession of faith, the *martyrs had the power to intervene in favor of sinners to obtain the lightening, if not the remission, of the punishments sanctioned by the church, which they had incurred as a result of their *sins. The first example of this practice is testified to by the martyrs of *Lyons of 177 (Eus., *HE* 5,2,3). *Tertullian also mentioned the sinners who were at the knees of the "friends of God," who intervened before the bishops (*Ad mart.* 1; *De pud.* 1). *Cyprian regulated the intervention of the martyrs by subordinating it to the *penance of those who were guilty, without leaving the chance that the first act of the martyrs could replace the latter (*De lap.* 36; *Ep.* 15-16; 18). Because "only God can forgive, even if we can see that before his tribunal the merits of the martyrs are of great weight" (*De lap.* 17).

2. The intercession of the saints with prayer. The power of the intercession of saints through the confession of faith presupposes that the *confessors (*confessores*) were alive. This power disappeared with the end of the *persecutions, but the martyrs continued to exercise it through prayer after their death. Therefore, by that time the intercession of the saints worked directly before the presence of God to lighten the eternal punishments and obtain their remission. Even though since the beginning the martyrs were considered participants in the eternal beatitude after their death, there survived ancient attitudes and forms of prayer toward them that were typical for the dead. The *Eucharist was offered "for" (*pro*, ὑπέρ) the martyrs as "for" the dead (Cypr., *Ep.* 1,2; 12,2; 39,3; *Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, ed. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, p. 131, 12ff.). Moreover, it was the general conviction that the martyrs and the saints prayed for their living and deceased brethren. In the year 203, *Perpetua of Carthage prayed for her deceased brother Dinocrates (*Pass. Perp.* 7-8). Around the same period at *Alexandria, *Potamiaena promised the soldier Basilides to pray for him when he was in God's presence (Eus., *HE* 6,5,3 and 6). At *Tarragona, on 21 January 259, the faithful asked Bishop *Fructuosus "to keep them in mind" (*ut illos in mente haberet*), and he answered that he must pray "for the Catholic Church, spread from East to West" (BHL 319f, nn. 1.7). At *Carthage, a few months later, the faithful committed themselves to the prayers of the martyr Lucius (BHL 6009, n. 13). At Tyre, in 310, Theodosia besought the confessors who were awaiting condemnation to remember her when they received their heavenly reward (Eus., *De mart. Pal.* 7,1). Similarly, the same role of intercessor was also attributed to nonmartyr saints: *Sulpicius Severus saw *Martin of Tours "among the *apostles and *prophets" and near the faithful to pray to bless them on God's behalf (*Ep.* 2,4 and 16: SC 135, 1196, 1251).

3. Prayers addressed to the martyrs and saints. The invocation of the martyrs was a current practice in ancient Christianity, as attested primarily by the inscriptions, starting from the 3rd c. The characteristic expressions of supplicatory prayer insistently returned to the concept: *in mente habete*, *orate*, *petite pro*, *subvenite*, *in orationes vestras nos in mente habete*. Analogous forms can be read in literary texts (Hippolytus, *In Dan.* 2,30; *Origen, *Orat.* 14,6; *Exh.*

mart. 37). One could multiply examples by drawing on the Cappadocian fathers, *John Chrysostom, *Augustine, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and others. The intercession of the saints is all the more efficacious if prayer is done near their tomb: the one who touches their tomb directly or through some other means obtains grace; the dead were buried near the saints to benefit in the afterlife through their salvific intercession; some miracles were accomplished over their tombs as a sensible sign that the prayer was heard. In this way, the saint, though in a subordinate position, was associated to Jesus Christ, who intercedes, inasmuch as he is a mediator before God.

LCI 2, 346-352; DTC 14, 886-939; RAC 9, 1-36; Delehaye OC 100-140; Id., *Sanctus. Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité*, Brussels 1927, 122-161; J. Camarero Cuñado, *La figura del santo en la liturgia hispánica*, Salamanca-Madrid 1982, 295-327; A. Angenendt, *Heilige und Reliquien*, Munich [2]1997; *Les miracles de saint Étienne*, ed. J. Meyers, Turnhout 2006; P.J. Donahue, *Jewish-Christian Controversy in the Second Century: A Study in the "Dialogue" of Justin Martyr*, Yale Univ. diss. 1973; A.M. Orselli, *L'idea e il culto del santo patrono cittadino nella letteratura latina cristiana*, Bologna 1965; J. Ernesti, *Princeps christianus und Kaiser aller Römer*, Paderborn 1998.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

SALLUSTIUS the Neoplatonist (d. 378/379?). Sallustius (or Salustius), the author of the treatise *On the Gods and the World*, was for a long time a difficult person to identify. Only in the 18th c. was Tillemont (see *Histoire des empereurs*, IV,696) able to narrow him down to two possible figures: Flavius Sallustius and Secundus Sallustius, who were both imperial administrators in service of the emperor *Julian. Today, in gratitude as well to G. Rochefort's critical study (see below), scholars have agreed in identifying the author of the treatise on the gods and the world with Secundus Sallustius (Saturninus). With respect to this person we know with certainty that he was born in *Gaul toward the beginning of the 4th c. In Gaul he followed a course of studies marked by the traditional principles of *paganism, obtaining a deep knowledge of classical literature and Roman law. In 355 he was appointed by the Emperor *Constantius as the quaestor of Gaul, and he entered into close contact with the future emperor Julian; he heavily influenced Julian in his choice to return to the values of paganism. After falling into disfavor with Constantius, in 361 he was appointed prefect of the East by the emperor Julian, who had just ascended to the imperial throne. Although he was inevitably involved in the disorder that followed Julian's death, he was able to maintain his irreprehensible conduct and to preserve his career as prefect even under the emperor *Valens. The exact date of his death remains unknown; it probably dates between the years 378/379.

The only work that has come down to us from Sallustius's writings is the treatise *On the Gods and the World*, which was most likely composed at the request of the emperor Julian immediately after 362. In this work, the author was able to focus and present in a harmonious way all the instances of that neopagan religiosity that Julian sought to import or introduce during his brief reign. Sallustius adopted the traditional themes and the figures of pagan religion and established and harmonized them with Eastern mysticism and all philosophical teachings, even if his attention was then directed in a special way to *Neoplatonist teachings. Most noteworthy was his effort at synthesis and syncretism, which certainly made his work attractive. Even ethics were fundamental in Sallustius's writings, and it is clear how his religious interests were directed to a search and knowledge of the gods that led men to a natural goodness and wisdom.

J.C. Orelli, *Sallustii philosophi libellus de Diis et Mundo*, Zürich 1821; A.D. Nock, *Sallustius – Concerning the Gods and the Universe*, Cambridge 1926; G. Rochefort, *Saloustious: Des Dieux et du Monde*, Paris 1960; Salustio, *Gli dei e il mondo*, ed. V. Vacanti, Turin 1998; Salustio, *Sugli dei e il mondo*, ed. R. Di Giuseppe, Milan 2000; R. Di Giuseppe, *Male nell'entourage di Giuliano e nel monoteismo*, in *Il Tardoantico alle soglie del duemila: diritto, religione, società*. Atti del V conv. naz. dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi, ed. G. Lanata, Pisa 2000, 43-58; A. Saggioro, *Il sacrificio pagano nella reazione al Cristianesimo: Giuliano e Macrobio*: AnSE 19 (2002) 237-254.

M. Conti

SALONA. According to Strabo, Salona was the port of the Illyrian *Delmatae*, a people who lived in the Dalmatian hinterland, and in the 3rd c. BC they conquered an area limited to the coast. At the time of Julius Caesar, Salona became the capital of the province of Illyricum and remained so even for the province of Dalmatia. As early as the 1st c. BC it was a developed and rather large city. Christianity began to spread perhaps as early as the 1st c. AD, but it did not take much root before the 3rd c. At that time, acc. to tradition, Salona had its organized church (*see* *Dalmatia). Toward the end of the 3rd c., Bishop Domnius organized the Christian community and the ecclesiastical province; but the church must have already been constructed. In the 1st half of the 5th c., Salona became the metropolis of Dalmatia under the archbishop *Hesychius. A century later, the see of the vicariate of W Illyricum was established at Salona. At the beginning of the 7th c., the city was

sacked and destroyed by the Avars and the Slavs.

Numerous remains and monuments in the early Christian period have been discovered at Salona. The oldest buildings of this sort emerged from the NW corner of the so-called *urbs nova*, where the episcopal center was constructed much later. It was considered a *domus ecclesiasiae*, organized into a private home, but the building was not completely excavated. In recent years the excavations have continued, but they have not yet been finished, and the results have not yet been published. The main room was located to the S and had an elevated presbytery with a step above the nave. No trace of the gate has been found because it was most likely made of wood. In the presbytery there was a semicircular bench for the clergy that was detached from the W wall that had a rather large door. Just S was another building fortified with a raised square apse with many steps. Its Christian character is likely but not certain. The two pillars adorned with an inscribed cross are from a later age. Shortly after the mid-4th c., next to these two oratories the first Christian basilica of Salona was constructed. The shape of the basilica is hard to determine, but it was certainly laid out on a longitudinal axis. At the beginning of the 5th c., to the N of this building another basilica was built containing a square baptistery and a hexagonal pool. The mosaic on the apse recalls the construction of the church. There thus arose a large Christian center consisting of two basilicas with additional rooms and the episcopal palace. The cathedral underwent remodeling on the occasion of the first and second Councils of Salona (530 and 533). During this era the S basilica was transformed into a cross-like layout with equilateral arms, and the baptistery was remodeled in the form of an octagon and with a cross-shaped basin. Both basilicas were connected with a long narthex, which came to the N by means of steps to the space for the catechumens. In front of the narthex, an atrium, which was not accessible from the basilicas and the narthex, finished on the N side with an oratory.

Other Christian buildings existed within the walls of Salona. Of special importance was the three-aisled basilica with an octoganal baptistery and a cross-shaped basin, considered by E. Dyggve to be the cathedral of the *Arian *Goths and therefore connected to the Arian cathedral of *Ravenna (but this relationship has not been confirmed). One should note that the paintings of the basilica published by E. Dyggve (*History of Salonitan Christianity*) are imprecise because he did not completely excavate them but only performed short explorations.

For the *cemeteries, the most important area is that of Manastirine, 100 meters N of the wall, which developed within the small *pagan sepulcher in which, at the beginning of the 4th c., the body of the martyr Domnius was interred. Around his tomb there arose memorial buildings built with apses. The cemetery was destroyed around the end of the 4th c., but at the beginning of the 5th c. or perhaps shortly thereafter the basilica with three aisles was erected, which enclosed the *memoria* of Domnius in his presbytery. The martyr Septimus was certainly buried here and many other illustrious persons from the Salonitan church (bishops, priests, nuns etc.). At Manastirine the (false?) relics of the apostle Peter were also buried. In the 6th c., a narthex was added to the church. In the first decade of the 7th c., the basilica was destroyed and the Salonitans were unable to reconstruct it entirely. The research that has been performed in recent decades has brought to light some important elements from which scholars will be able to better date the constructive phases of the necropolises.

A second important cemetery, that of Marusinac, is found approximately 1 km (.62 mi) NW of the city and developed around the tomb of the martyr Anastasius, who had been buried in the mausoleum of a certain matron Asclapia. The mausoleum is composed of a crypt with a dome-shaped ceiling and an upper floor. The two floors contained an inscribed apse. The walls were very strong and were fortified by solid buttresses. To the E, a basilica was built acc. to a longitudinal schema with sumptuous mosaics on the floors, in which, under the altar, there was a tomb with a *fenestella confessionis*. According to Dyggve, the relics of the martyr Anastasius were transferred here, but this could be the tomb of another saint because the mausoleum was certainly located on that site even during the period preceding the destruction of Salona. To the N of the aforementioned basilica, one finds a courtyard enclosed within porticoes, which ends to the E with a group of three mausoleums. Dyggve called this part of the structure "the discovered basilica"; but his very contested thesis lacks substance. At the beginning of this century, the entire structure including the mausoleum was closed within an atrium with porticoes. An inscription that mentions St. Menas perhaps indicates that his relics were deposited at Marusinac.

The third cemetery, at Kapljuc, near the amphitheater, developed around the tombs of the martyrs Asterius (presbyter) and the four soldiers from *Diocletian's court (acc. to tradition): Paulinianus, Antiochianus, Gaianus and Telius. The martyrs were buried in a mausoleum, which was then expanded toward the W and was thus transformed into a ba-

silica with three aisles, around which a vast cemetery formed. All the martyrs of Salona (Venantius, Domnius, Anastasius, Septimus, Asterius, Paulinianus, Antiochianus, Gaianus and Telius), including Maurus of Parentium, were depicted on a mosaic in the oratory near the baptistery, near St. John Lateran Basilica.

Numerous Christian monuments have been discovered at Salona: figured and nonfigured *sarcophagi, numerous inscriptions, decorations of churches, **mensae*, paintings, mosaics, pottery, glass, lamps etc.

F. Carrara, *Topografia e scavi di Salona*, Trieste 1850; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans la province Dalmatie*, Paris 1906; W. Gerber, *Altchristliche Kultbauten Istriens und Dalmatiens*, Dresden 1912; W. Gerber, *Forschungen in Salona*, I, Vienna 1917; R. Egger, *Forschungen in Salona*, II, Vienna 1926; R. Egger - E. Dyggve, *Forschungen in Salona*, III, Vienna 1939; J. Brondsted - Fr. Weilbach - E. Dyggve, *Recherches à Salone*, Copenhagen 1928; E. Dyggve, *History of Salonitan Christianity*, Oslo 1951; *Disputationes Salonitanae* I, 1970, Split 1975; N. Cambi, *Krist i njegova simbolika u likovnoj umjetnosti starokršćanskog perioda u Dalmaciji*, Vjesnik za arh i hist. Dalm. 70-71, 1968-69, Split 1977, 56ff.; N. Cambi, *Starokršćanska crkvena arhitektura na podrucju salonitanske metropolije*: Arheološki vestnik 29 (1978) 606ff.; H. Kähler, *Die Frühe Kirche. Kult und Kultraum*, Frankfurt-Berlin-Vienna [2]1982; *Disputationes Salonitanae*, Vjesnik za arh. i hist. Dalm. 77, Split 1984; N. Cambi, *Salona und seine Nekropole. Colloquium in München vom 28. bis 30. Oktober 1985 in München*, Munich 1987, 25ff.; V. Saxer, *Les saints de Salone. Examen critique de leur dossier*, in *Uslužbi covjeka. Zbornik nadbiskupa metropolite Dr. Frane Franica*, Split 1987, 293ff.; *Anticka Salona*, Split 1991 (ed. N. Cambi); N. Cambi, *Sarkofag Dobrog pastira i njegova grupa - The Good Shepherd and Its Group*, Split 1994; *Salona I. Recherches archéologiques franco-croates à Salona. Catalogue de la sculpture architecturale paléochrétienne de Salone*, ed. N. Duval - E. Marin - C. Metzger, Rome-Split 1994; *Salona Christiana*, ed. E. Marin, Split 1994; E. Marin, *Nova istraživanja na Marusincu u Saloni*: Diadora 15 (1994) 259ff.; Acta Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae Split-Poreč 1994, ed. N. Cambi - E. Marin, II, Vatican City-Split 1998; J. Dresken Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*, II, Mainz 1998; *Salona III. Recherches archéologiques franco-croates à Salona. Manastirine. Etablissement préromain, nécropole et basilique paléochrétienne à Salona*, ed. D. Duval - E. Marin; N. Cambi, *Povijest umjetnosti u Hrvatskoj. Antika*, Zagreb 2002; N. Cambi, *Sarcofagi con la croce nel centro della cassa*, Akten des Symposiums "Frühchristliche Sarkophage," Marburg 1999, *Sarkophag Studien II*, Mainz 2002, 47ff.; N. Cambi, *O "bazilici bez krova" u episkopalnom kompleksu u Saloni*, in *Zbornik Tomislava Marasovića*, Split 2003, 249ff.

N. Cambi

SALONIUS of Geneva (ca. 400–after 500). The son of *Eucherius bishop of *Lyons, he was born around the year AD 400. He and his brother *Veranus received a solid spiritual and doctrinal formation in the monastery of *Lérins, where their father, following the custom that had arisen in *Gaul between the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th, went with his wife Galla and their children to flee from the world. In addition to his own father, the following men were his teachers: *Honoratus, the founder of the *monastery, *Hilary, *Salvian and *Vincentius. *Gennadius, although not devoting a specific entry to Salonius in his *De viris illustribus*, mentioned him on two separate occasions: first, in the chapter in which he referred to Eucherius (*disseruit* [sc. Eucherius] *etiam ad personam filiorum Salonii et Verani postea episcoporum obscura quaeque sanctarum capitula scripturarum*: PL 58,1097), openly alluding to the two exegetical works, the *Instructiones* and the *Formulae spiritalis intellegentiae*, which the bishop of Lyons dedicated respectively to his sons Salonius and Veranus; the second mention is found in the chapter pertaining to Salvian, where Salonius appears as the dedicatee of the book of Salvian's *Epistles* (*ad Salonium episcopum liber unus*: PL 58,1099). Salvian also dedicated to him the *De gubernatione Dei* and sent him the last letter of the aforementioned *Liber epistolarum*, the ninth, being a response in which he explained to his *decus atque subsidium* (this is how he referred to Salonius) the reasons for which he published the treatise *Ad ecclesiam* under the pseudonym Timothy.

In 441, Salonius was already bishop—he was raised to the episcopal see of Geneva most likely at a date very close to 441—because his name appears among those bishops who signed the *acts of the Council of *Orange, which was held that year. In 442, he took part in the Council of *Vaison and, in 450, along with his brother Veranus, who was also by that time a bishop, and with Ceretius (Cérat), the bishop of Grenoble, wrote a letter to *Leo the Great (PL 54,887-890) to thank the pontiff for the copy of the **Tomus ad Flavianum*, which had been sent to them.

J.A. Brassicanus published in 1532 under the name of Salonius the *Interpretatio in Parabolas Salomonis* and *In Ecclesiasten*. Scholars are uncertain why the humanist attributed these two short exegetical works to Eucherius's son. In Codex 1278 from the National Library of Vienna, from which he created his edition, these have been transmitted anonymously, marked only by the "inscriptiones" *Glose Parabolarum* and the *De nominibus Salomonis*. (The inscription which identifies Salonius as the author is of another hand, most likely of Brassicanus himself.) The first critical edition was owed to the work of C. Curti, who in 1964 republished the two texts preserving their traditional attribution and using, in addition to the MS from Vienna, another twelve MSS; even in these MSS, the two short treatises are attested to without the name of the author, with the

exception of Codex 2689 from the Munich National Library, where, however, the marginal annotation that assigns the authorship to Salonius dates back to more recent times. In 1968 Curti also provided the *editio princeps* of other exegetical writings, *De evangelio Iohannis* and *De evangelio Matthaei*, which, even these two documents without the identification of the author, are attested to by 5 of the 13 MSS that have preserved the commentaries on the two books of the OT. The editor has demonstrated that the two short treatises on the gospels belong to the same author of those treatises on the OT.

On several occasions J.P. Weiss showed interest in the author of these four writings. He concentrated primarily on the commentary on the *Parabole* (Proverbs), for which Curti had not identified any literary source and explained the similarities between this work and *Bede's *Expositio in Parabolas Salomonis* by considering Salonius the source for Bede. Curti, however, did not exclude the possibility that the bishop of Geneva heavily used a work that is now lost, and in a similar way maintained that, to interpret the other three texts, he plagiarized *Jerome's commentaries on Ecclesiastes and *Matthew and *Augustine's commentary on *John. Weiss has the undeniable credit of having discovered *Gregory the Great's and Bede's dependence on this work, for which reason the short treatise on the *Parabole*, as a result, and the other three texts cannot be attributed to Salonius but must have been the work of an unknown author who lived between AD 800 and 1000; Bede, in fact, died in 735, and the most ancient MS that contains the author's four short treatises seems to date back to 10th c. Valerie I.J. Flint has returned to the question of the author's identity and has reached the conclusion that our author repeatedly plagiarized Bede's work (for the *Parabole*), Alcuin (for *Ecclesiastes* and the *Gospel of John*) and Hrbanus Maurus (for the *Gospel of Matthew*). For this reason, Flint suggested Honorius of Autun as a probable author, to whom through a mechanical mistake M. Denis had already assigned the short treatises when describing, in a catalog of the Vienna Palatine Library, the Codex Vienna 807, one of the five codices that transmits all four.

The documents under discussion belonged to the exegetical genre of **quaestiones et responsiones*, and none of these, as such, constitute a continuous commentary, in which the entire biblical text is explained, but from these only verses or specific lemma are chosen. His discussion develops into a fictitious chain of questions and answers. The INT. asks for clarifications; the RESP. answers by interpreting the verse or the lines in question and almost always adduces other passages from *Scripture. The question is very brief: it is introduced by a limited number of formulas, recurrent with tiresome monotony as is usual for this exegetical genre but even less diversified. The response is framed with the same uniformity: either it begins with a causal conjunction (*quod*, *quia* etc.) in immediate connection with the interrogative adverb (*cur*, *quare*, etc.) of the question, or it axiomatically elucidates the passage or the biblical term, which is the object of exegesis (INT. *Qui sunt isti pennati?* RESP. *Sancti et electi viri* . . .). But what is most surprising about these short works is their uniform structure and language. From these two facets, one draws the clear conclusion that they cannot be other than the work of the same writer: a writer who was always the same, void of creativity with respect to formulaic variations, who does not know how to elevate himself to the level of basic exegetical discourse, which is presented moreover in a slipshod and unadorned style, and is, at times, downright sloppy. The exegetical criterion followed is that of allegorical interpretation, but this is well-researched and constructed with much diligence and a truly exceptional effort, and this method of interpretation is even applied to passages in which the literal sense seems to be more obvious and in which it seems difficult to impose *allegory upon the texts.

CPL 499. *Parabole and Ecclesiastes*: J.A. Brassicanus, Haganoae 1532 (*editio princeps*) (= PL 53, 993-1012); C. Curti, Catania 1964; *Vangeli di Giovanni e di Matteo*: C. Curti, Turin 1968 (*editio princeps*); M. Besson, *Un évêque exégète de Genève au milieu du Ve siècle: Saint Salone*: Anzeiger für schweizerische Geschichte 9 (1902-1905) 252-265; J.A. Endres, *Honorius Augustodunensis*, Kempten 1906, 73-75; G. Bardy, *La littérature patristique des "Quaestiones et Responsiones" sur l'Écriture sainte*: RBi 42 (1933) 20-22; C. Curti, *Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Latino 807, ff. 66v-110r è di Salonio, non di Onorio d'Autun*: Orpheus 11 (1964) 167-184; Id., *Osservazioni sul testo di Salonio*, in Studi in memoria di Carmelo Sgroi, Turin 1965, 549-559; Id., *Due Commentarii inediti di Salonio ai Vangeli di Giovanni e di Matteo. Tradizione manoscritta, fonti, autore*, Turin 1968; J.P. Weiss, *L'authenticité de l'oeuvre de Salonius de Genève*: SP 10 (1970) 161-167; Id., *Essai de datation du Commentaire sur les Proverbes attribué abusivement à Salonius*: SE 19 (1969-1970) 77-114; Valerie I.J. Flint, *The True Author of the Salonii Commentarii in Parabolas Salomonis et in Ecclesiasten*: RTAM 37 (1970) 174-186; J.P. Weiss, *Les sources du Commentaire sur l'Ecclésiaste du Pseudo-Salonius*: SP 12 (1975) 178-183; *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae*, cura et studio C. Mandolfo, Turnhout 2004 (CCL 66).

C. Curti

SALSA of Tipasa (4th c.). This female *martyr had an extraordinary cult only at *Tipasa, in Mauretania Caesariensis (*see* *Caesarea in Mauretania), a colony around AD 145 on the coast, 70 km (43.5 mi) W of

Icosium (Algeria) and to the E of *Caesarea (Cherchell), which was replete with Roman and Christian ruins. The discovery at *Paris of two MSS of her passion account (BHL 7467) and that of her basilica, at the end of the 17th c., allow us to better understand this martyr. The passion, written at the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th c., mentions that when there were few Christians in the city (*rara fides*), a girl of 14 years committed the sacrilege of tossing into the sea the head, then the body of the serpent idol that was considered the protector of the city; she was then seized and tossed into the sea. Her body, which was discovered by seaman from Gaul three days later, was buried along the ocean shore; a chapel was built upon the tomb (a *brevum tabernaculum*), already existing at the time of Firmus's rebellion (in the year 372), who saw it and thereafter desecrated it. The events narrated in the passion are after the year 312, when by that time Christians enjoyed religious freedom. Two MSS do not coincide on this martyr's *dies natalis* ("*birthday): one dates it to 26 August, the other to the beginning of summer; the *Hieronymian Martyrology* to 20 May and 10 October. Salsa's feast was not recorded in the Carthaginian calendar. Close to the funerary chapel, to the E of the city, a large basilica was built, around which a Christian necropolis developed, "the most numerous concentration of Christian tombs *ad sanctos* known throughout Africa" (Duval, 698).

The discovery of the inscription in a *pagan memorial of a certain Fabia Salsa, a matron who died at the age of 63, around the Christian basilica has given rise to recent doubts on the historical identity of this Christian martyr. Thus the proposed solution, acc. to the archaeological finds and epigraphic evidence, is that the memorial of the pagan Fabia is from the 3rd c. and was later taken into the basilica and placed alongside the martyr's supposed sarcophagus as a cenotaph due to the similarity in name. In the mid-5th c., a certain Potentius enlarged and redecorated the basilica *ad sanctam*; an inscription commemorates this martyr's *deposition: *martyr hic est Salsa* (DACL 15, 2382-2383; Y. Duval, 361).

DACL 15, 2338-2406; BS 11, 596-597; LTK[3] 8, 1496f.; H. Leclercq, *Les martyrs*, III, Paris 1904, 59-70 (Fr. tr. of the *Passio*); P. Monceaux, *La vraie légende dorée*, Paris 1928, 299-326 (Fr. tr. of the *Passio*); H. Grégoire, *Sainte Salsa, roman épigraphique*: Byzantion 12 (1937) 213-224; J. Christern, *Basilika und Memoria der hl. Salsa in Tipasa*: Bulletin d'Archéologie Algérienne 3 (1968) 193-258; Chr. Courtois, *Victorinus et Salsa. Note d'hagiographie tipasienne*: Recueil des notices et mémoires de la Société Arc. de Constantine 68 (1954) 109-119; J. Christern, *Basilika und Memorie der Heiligen Salsa in Tipasa*: Bulletin d'arch. algérienne 3 (1968) 193-258; M. Bouchenaki, *Fouilles de la nécropole occidentale de Tipasa, 1968-72*, Alger 1975; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae*, Rome 1982, I, 358-365; II, 697-700; S. Lancel - M. Bouchenaki, *Tipasa de Maurétanie*, Alger [3]1991; S. Ferdi, *Augustin: de retour en Afrique 388-430; repères archéologiques dans le patrimoine algérien*, Fribourg 2000.

A. Di Berardino

SALT. In ancient cultures salt (Lat. *sal* from which the term *salarium* was derived) was very valuable both as a condiment and as a preservative because they did not possess more sophisticated systems of preservation; it was used in sacrifices and often with incense. For this reason salt also had a religious meaning of purification because it was the preservative par excellence of corruptible foods. As a result, salt became a symbol of protection. Salt was consumed by two or more persons as a covenantal sign. God made a pact with his people with "a covenant of salt" (2 Chr 13:5), i.e., a permanent covenant. In the Middle East, salt also signified the destruction of a city through the casting of salt on its ground, which was a sign of aridity and infertility (Dt 29:2; Jgs 9:45). The newborn was massaged with salt (Ezek 16:4). In the gospels, mention is made of salt on various occasions: "Because each one will be salted with fire. Salt is good, but if salt loses its flavor, with what will it be seasoned? Have salt in yourselves and be at peace with one another" (Mk 9:49-50). "You are the salt of the world; but if salt loses it flavor, with what will you be able to season with? It has no other purpose but to be tossed and stomped upon by men" (Mt 5:13).

Salt became a symbol of a spiritual seasoning, and it was believed that it could put the demons to flight. In Christian antiquity, one became a *catechumen through this ritual: a sign of the cross on the forehead, the imposition of the hands, the conferral of a bit of salt and "the bread of exorcism" (*Aug., *Confessions* 1,11; *De catech. rud.* 26,50). The rite caused one to taste the "salt of *wisdom." This type of rite (*sacramentum salis*), which originated in *Africa, was widespread in *Italy and elsewhere. The *porrectio salis* occurred more frequently during the catechumenal period (Stenzel, 201). The use of a grain of salt in the baptism of babies was suppressed in the Vatican II liturgical reforms; the use of salt in the baptism of adults is optional.

The use of salt in the rite of the blessing by means of sprinkling with water (holy water) was used in the Roman *liturgy; now it is optional. Early on the ancient Romans used water and salt in religious rites; even the prophet Elisha united water and salt in a pot and poured it in unhealthy waters, uttering the phrase, "Thus says the Lord: I make these waters clean; no more will death and sterility spread from

these waters" (2 Kgs 2:21). The Christian rite of blessing water and salt dates back to the 5th/6th c. at Rome (Duchesne, LP 1,127). Blessed water became a strong instrument against the demons and was used for every type of blessing.

R.J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Leiden 1955, III, 157-174; NCE 12, 989-990; LTK³ 8, 1501-1502; Cath 13, 1045-1046; A. Stenzel, *Il battesimo*, Alba 1962, 199-204, 235; J.E. Latham, *The Religious Symbolism of Salt*, Paris 1982; V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle*, Spoleto 1988, 383-384; 539-540.

A. Di Berardino

SALVIAN of Marseille (5th c.). Salvian was a significant author because of the attention he devoted to the historical events of his time, which was thrown into chaos by the barbarian invasions and which foreshadowed the destruction of the Roman Empire and ancient civilization, in addition to the fact that these events proved to be precursory signs of a new social order.

The biographical data on his life are scarce and vague. Besides *Gennadius of Marseille (*De vir. illust.* 68), *Hilary mentions him, the bishop of *Arles from 428/429 to 449, in the *Sermo de vita S. Honorati* (ed. Cavallin, Lund 1952, col. 19, p. 63) and *Eucherius bishop of Lyons (d. ca. 450), in the preface to the *Instructiones* (CSEL 31,1,66). Other pieces of information are gathered from his works, which contain ambiguities and lacunae. Because Gennadius says that when he was writing (he began between 467 and 469), Salvian was old and in good health (*in senectute bona*), one is led to think that Salvius's birth should not be dated beyond the first decades of the 5th c. (On the basis of other elements, it should probably be placed around the year 390.) It is held, on account of some mention which we find in a letter (I, 5) and in the primary work *De gubernatione Dei* (VI,68-81), that Salvian's homeland was *Trier, or Cologne or a nearby region. His writings reveal extensive cultural formation, with special attention to legal studies. He married Palladia, the daughter of Hypatius, a *pagan man who later converted to Christianity, and of Quieta. After the birth of a daughter, Auspiciola, he agreed with his wife to live a life of sexual continence, a decision that was definitely rejected by his wife's parents (*Ep.* IV). We do not know when Salvin moved to S *Gaul. From his *Letter* VIII to Eucherius, and Letter IX to *Salonius, and the letter from Eucherius (*Instructiones*, mentioned above) and Hilary of Arles (see above), which document for us some of his relationships with the most famous men who emerged from the *cenobium of the island of *Lérins, it was argued that Salvian belonged to the community, at least from the year 426. In 429 he was already a presbyter; we do not know if he was still at Lérins or at *Marseille, where the monastic life received a noticeable boost in religious fervor. We do not know anything about his exercise of the presbyteral ministry.

Hilary of Arles mentions an idea expressed by Salvian "in his writings," which was taken from a work that has not survived. Even some works mentioned by Gennadius have been lost: three books, *On Virginity*, the *Commentary on the Last Part of Ecclesiastes* and the **Hexameron* in verses, the *homilies "for the bishops" (preached to bishops or composed in service of bishops, as seems more likely to be the case), and the homilies on the sacraments (on *prayer and liturgical rites). The following works have survived: a collection of new *Letters*, the *Ad ecclesiam*, the *De gubernatione Dei.* The letters were sent to the monks of Lérins, to Eucherius bishop of Lyons (II and VIII), to *Agraecius bishop of Sens (III), to his wife's parents (IV), to his sister Captura (V), to a friend named Limenius (VI), to Aprus and Verus (VII), and to Bishop Salonius (IX). This collection of letters, probably a collection compiled by the author himself and which has come down to us incomplete, has little to offer in terms of historical and autobiographical data, although it seems to have been suggested by the literary intent, acc. to the customs of the time. In the treatise *Ad ecclesiam* (*Adversus avaritiam*, acc. to Gennadius), in four books, Salvian lamented the avarice that reigns in all people and maintained that every believer, layman or religious, has the duty—but with a few exceptions—of making available his goods, either now in this life, or at least in death, for the benefit of the church. The uniqueness of this thesis (although keeping in mind that the recipients of the church's goods were the poor), upon which the author insisted with such great emphasis, leads one to see in this text not so much a document of clerical fanaticism as much as the expression of a conviction of a social reality marked by intolerable injustices, presented with an overabundant style learned at the orators' school, which easily goes beyond the measure of the one who develops his arguments with calmness.

Salvian's primary work was the *De gubernatione Dei* (in Gennadius, *De praesenti iudicio*), contained in eight books, the last of which has survived (or has come down to us) in an incomplete form. Writing after the *Ad ecclesiam*, the author develops therein the theme of divine *providence, which includes the "governance" and the "judgment" of the world, by re-

ferring to the situation of the empire, which was caught up in the social calamities caused by the barbarian invasion. He addressed the Christians of little faith, who were asking how they could reconcile divine providence with the very sad state in which the Catholic Romans, who had been conquered and found themselves oppressed by the barbarians, who were either heretics or *pagans. At first the providence of God is demonstrated with arguments from reason and with recourse to the Bible; then he faces the problem posed by current events. By examining the various forms of behavior from such different countries as *Gaul, *Spain and *Africa, Salvian sought to make people understand that the answer to this question was found in the reprehensible conduct of "Roman" Christians, who in their wantonness were much worse than the barbarians, pagan and heretic alike (whose previous vices he does not pass over). Along with the apologetic objective, the work also follows the clear intent of chastising the moral disorder and exhorting the people to conversion. The *De gubernatione Dei* is a historical source of considerable value both for the individual events it records and for increasing our understanding of the West at that time in various respects: economic-social, religious and moral, and at least for the political and cultural conditions, although keeping in mind the apologist's objective, the moralist's worries and the author's emphasis led by his love to generalize and to use the darkest hues for his painting. His work reflects the mentality of at least a substantial part of Christians and church officials from that period who sought to understand, in light of their faith, the tragic events in which they were involved and derived from them the consequences for a coherent form of behavior with the profession of the Christian faith. His style, which is not lacking in cogency, reflects the tastes of the age and the habits of his school in his emphasis, his search for effect, and his use of *rhetorical devices and redudant verbiage.

Editions: CPL 485-498; PL 53, 9-238; MGH, *Auct. Ant.* I, 1 (1877); F. Pauly, CSEL 8 (1883); G. Lagarrigue, SC 176 (1971); 220 (1975) (French tr.: op. cit.; It. tr.: E. Marotta, *Contro l'avarizia*, Rome 1978).

Studies: A. Hamman: Patrologia III, 500-509 (with bibl.); L. Rochus, *La latinité de Salvien*, Acad. Roy. de Belgique, Cl. lett. Mém., vol. 30/2, Brussels 1934; O. Janssen, *L'expressivité chez Salvien de Marseille*, I: *Les adverbes*, Nijmegen 1937; M. Pellegrino, *Salviano di Marsiglia*: Lateranum n.s. VI, 1-2, Rome 1940; M. Jannelli, *La caduta di un impero nel capolavoro di Salviano*, Naples 1948; Ph. Badot, *La notice de Gennade relative à Salvien*: RBen 84 (1974) 352-366; S. Pricoco, *Una nota biografica su Salviano di M.*: Syculorum Gymn. 39 (1976) 351-368; Id., *L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978; H. Fischer, *Die Schrift des Salvian von M. "An die Kirche,"* Bern-Frankfurt a.M. 1976; C. Leonardi, *Alle origini della cristianità medievale: Giov. Cassiano e Salviano di M.*: Stud Med 18/2 (1977) 491-608; A. Hamman, *L'actualité de Salvien de M.*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 378-393; J. Badewien, *Geschichtstheologie und Sozialkritik in Werk Salvians von Marseille*, Göttingen 1980; RAC 8, 1258-1266; M. Maas, *Ethnicity, Orthodoxy and Community in Salvian of Marseilles*, in *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?*, eds. J. Drinkwater - H. Elton, Cambridge 1992, 275-284; D. De Decker, *Salvien de Marseille: note critique*: Augustinianum 38 (1998) 223-277; BBKL 8, 1258-1266.

M. Pellegrino

SALVIUS (5th c.). Bishop of an unspecified episcopal see, perhaps Octodurus (Martigny), to whom *Eucherius, who is commonly identified as the 5th-c. bishop of Lyons, wrote a letter (*Ep. ad Salv.*: PL 50, 827-828; CSEL 31,173; MGH, *scr. rer. mer.* III,39-41), and also sent him the *Passio Acaunensium martyrum, S. Mauricii et sociorum eius.* Eucherius maintained that the information on the martyrdom that he narrated ultimately went back to the account offered by Theodorus, the first bishop of Octodurus, in whose diocese Agaunum was located. With respect to the identification of Salvius with Silvius, who dedicated his *Laterculus* to Bishop Eucherius, see DCB 4, 581-582. Moreover, we find a letter addressed to a Salvius among the spurious writings of *Sulpicius Severus (PL 20, 243-244; CSEL 1, 254-56).

CPL 479 and 491; BBKL 8, 1255-1256; LTK[3] 8, 1500.

A. Pollastri

SAMARITANS. In a geographic sense, the term *Samaritan* refers to the inhabitants of Samaria in the historical region of *Palestine who occupied a central part of the highland to the W of the Jordan River; in the ethnic sense, it refers to the descendants of the Israelite inhabitants who remained in the territory after the destruction of the city of Samaria in 721 BC and the deportation of more than 27,000 people by Sargon II, and who mixed and merged with the settlers coming from E Syria, in particular from *Kūtah* (Tell Ibrahim, 20 km [12.4 mi] to the N of Babylonia). Tension already existed between the Samaritans and the *Jews from the time of the reconstruction of the *temple.

Numerous Samaritans, who were persecuted by John Hyrcanus and who were left in peace by Pompey the Great and by King *Herod, were slaughtered under Pontius *Pilate, who had prohibited them from gathering on Mount Gerizim under the leadership of an imposter at the beginning of the year AD 36 (Flavius Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* XVIII, 4,1-2). During

the war with the Romans (AD 66–70), 11,000 Samaritans were killed on Mount Gerizim, where they had organized a resistance (Flavius Josephus, *De bell. Iud.* III 7, 32). Soon after, they regrouped and spread around everywhere in Palestine and the Transjordan, building their own synagogues and respectfully rejecting the claims of both Jews and Christians. The attitude of the Evangelists toward the Samaritans was not uniform: *Luke attempted to understand them (10:30-37; 17:16), John had an attitude of reconciliation (4:4-42), *Mark was silent and *Matthew had reservations (10:5). *Philip was their apostle (Acts 8:5-25). Today, large numbers of them live together at Nablus, at the foot of Mount Gerizim and around their synagogues. They preserve the ancient traditions: they only accept the *Pentateuch; in light of Dt 18:15-19 they are awaiting a non-Davidic messiah who will restore the cult; they faithfully observe the *sabbath and practice circumcision.

At first, they were not different from Jews, who later provided a different explanation for their faith. Properly speaking they are not a sect or a branch of *Judaism. They are religious conservatives and model their rites, religious practices and ceremonies acc. to the Pentateuch. Tied to the Mosaic laws, they worship the God who revealed himself to Moses. The center of their religious life is the synagogue. On Mount Gerizim they celebrate the *Passover and perform other sacrifices. Accepting only the Pentateuch as *Scripture, they do not recognize the remaining portions of the OT, and they oppose rabbinic Judaism. Because of this self-understanding, they consider themselves to be the true Israel.

G. Ricciotti, *Storia d'Israele*, II, Turin 1934, 175-184; R.T. Anderson, *Le Pentateuque Samaritain CW 2473*: RBi 77 (1970) 68-75, 550-560; R.J. Goggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Growing Points in Theology), Oxford 1975; F. Dexinger, *Samaritaner*: TRE 29, 750-756; A. Loevenstamm, *Samaritans*: Enc. Jud. 14, 725-758; DBS 11, 773-1047.

E. Peretto

SAMSON (iconography). The *Fathers of the church likened the figure of Samson (*Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 23: CSEL 28, 168ff.) to Jesus Christ, and in early Christian writings, the triumph of the Philistines was seen as a symbol of divine *redemption and victory over death. Despite this important symbolism, the most ancient and unique scenes, in the context of the cemeterial arts, pertaining to the cycle of Samson come from the catacomb of the Via Dino Compagni at Rome. The cycle includes (1) Samson who slaughters the Philistines with a donkey's jawbone (Jgs 15:9-17) in recess F (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, pl. CV); (2) Samson who releases the foxes into the fields (Jgs 15:5) in recess B (ibid., XXX,1); (3) Samson who strangles the lion (Jgs 14:6). This last scene is found in two recesses: on the ceiling of recess B (ibid., pl. XVII) one only sees the portion under Samson's feet and the hind legs of the lion; in room L, however (ibid., pl. CIX), Samson is clothed in a tunic and a pallium; below there is a dead lion with the bees making honey in its mouth. The hypogeum is dated between 320 and 360. In the *mosaics there is only one example pertaining to Samson: on the floor of the basilica of *Mopsuestia of *Cilicia, from the 1st half of the 5th c. To this era are also dated the fragmentary reliefs in the *martyrion* of Seleucia, near *Antioch. With respect to the sumptuary arts, a silk cloth can be found in the Vatican Museum containing the event of the fight with the lion. The 8th-c. cloth is of Syrian origin. Another scene pertaining to Samson can be found among the Christian *symbols on a bronze Roman medallion.

DACL 15, 740; EC 10, 1819-1820; LCI 4, 30-38; F. Buonarroti, *Osservazioni sopra alcuni frammenti di vasi antichi di vetri ornati di figure trovati nei cimiteri di Roma*, Florence 1716, p. 2, pl. II; P. Lauer, *Le trésor du Sancta Sanctorum*: Fondation E. Piot, Monuments et mémoires 15 (1906) pl. XVIII; K. Weitzmann, in *Antioch on the Orontes*, ed. R. Stilwell, Princeton-London 1941, 137 a., I v. XVII; L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien*, Recklinghausen 1969, 187, figs. 143-157; TIP 276.

A.M. Di Nino

SAMUEL of Qalamun (Kalamun) (d. 695). One of the primary figures of *Coptic *monasticism at the cusp of the Arabic invasion (7th c.). A native of the Nile Delta and the son of a priest, he became a monk at *Scete and led an *anchoretic life. He underwent the persecution led by the *Melkite patriarch Cyrus Moqauqas around the year 630 because he did not want to deny the anti-Chalcedonian confession. He was then captured by the Mazici and was held prisoner. After he had been freed, he went to Fayum and established a new monastery at Qalamun. As the head of that community he earned great fame and also remained in good relations with the Arabic conquerors. (It was still the period in which Copts and Arabs enjoyed a substantially peaceful coexistence.) The *Life of Samuel* was written in Coptic and has come down to us intact in the original language and in an abbreviated Ethiopian translation, probably through *Arabic. This hagiographical work contains a large quantity of miraculous events but also many historical pieces of information of great interest, and taken as a whole it is a trustworthy historical source. Samuel's type of ascetic life in the monastery

was considered normal for those times; monastic life was one of the components of Egyptian civil and religious life, with constant relations to the various authorities and the local population and the concomitant spiritual and economic problems that resulted from it. As a general rule, asceticism did not have to be very rigorous.

P. van Cauwenbergh, *Étude sur les moines d'Égypte*, Paris 1914 (repr. Milan 1973); A. Alcock, *The Life of Samuel of Kalamun*, Warminster 1983; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 2092-2209.

T. Orlandi

SANCTE DEUS, LUCIS LUMEN, CONCORDIA RERUM (ps.-Paulinus of Nola). In the Codex *Urbinas lat*. 533 of the 15th c. from the Vatican Library, at folios 62r-67r, one finds a poem written in distichs without an indication of its author and title (the *incipit* reads *Sancte Deus, lucis lumen, concordia rerum*), which Angelo Mai regarded as previously unpublished (*ineditum*) and published the *editio princeps* of this work in 1827, attributing it to *Paulinus of Nola. The verses underwent a second edition with modifications of little importance and still with the attribution to Paulinus of Nola, likewise edited by Angelo Mai in 1833, and were then edited by W. von Hartel, who published them in an appendix to the poems of Paulinus of Nola in the Viennese corpus (CSEL 30, 1894, 350-256). Mai's attribution to Paulinus of Nola, which he based on unpersuasive arguments (the presence of the poem in a codex containing Paulinus of Nola's works, in which also appears, however, the spurious poem *Verba tui famuli, rex summe, attende serenus* to be attributed to Paul the Deacon, the congruity between scenes of the poem and the themes in the writings of Paulinus of Nola, the author's humility in weeping for his sins, the sacrament of baptism received in his adult years), was not received in the Vienna corpus, in which the verses are presented as those of ps.-Paulinus of Nola, and their nonascribability to Paulinus has now become widely accepted. The poem is the work of an unknown author who in 120 elegiac distichs, a type of versification widely used between the 4th and 5th centuries, expressed his heartfelt Christian faith, giving special emphasis to the theme of conversion, which results in baptism. Conversion is then perceived and presented not as a retreat from the evil committed but is presented in the first place as a moral and religious fact that overflows and leads to the praise of the triune God, a God who loves humankind, and proclaims and offers to all salvation and communion of life with him. The author of the distichs is an expert in the preceding rhetorical and literary language, and this became an efficacious, expressive foundation even for the biblical and liturgical themes which connote the anonymous author's interiority and culture, a man of letters and a sincere believer who expressed his faith. The poem should be examined in the cultural, spiritual and literary context established by some authors from Aquitania of the 4th to 5th c.: Horentius's *Commonitorium*, the *De Providentia* attributed to *Prosper of Aquitaine, the verses *Ad coniugem*, which are likewise ps.-Paulinian, the *Epigramma Paulini*, the *Eucharisticos* and the *Oratio* by *Paulinus of Pella. Perhaps one could speak of the "Aquitaine circle," reusing the phrase coined by A. Feder (*aquitanischer Kreis*). One is facing a literature that is not so much an examination of conscience and a listing of all the moral precepts (as it is easily defined therein), but of the worship and praise of God, which has existential consequences.

In the 4th-5th c., Aquitaine was characterized by much political instability and substantial economic and social difficulties, from barbarian invasions, which esp. passed through this region from the moment when, on 31 December 406, *Vandals, Alans and Suebi broke through the Rhine barrier and invaded the provinces of *Gaul, passing from Aquitaine into *Spain in the autumn of 409. The period between the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th witnessed disorder, loss, disturbance and even corruption within the church, but also witnessed a significant phenomenon of multiple and documented conversions by simple anonymous individuals as well as by young professionals and intellectuals (one thinks of Augustine and his circle of friends, *Marius Victorinus, Paulinus of Nola and his friends: *Vitricius of Rouen, Aper and his wife Amanda; one also thinks of Prudentius, *Sedulius, *Paulinus of Pella and the conversions connected to the monastery of *Lérins). It also knew the enthusiasm of the ascetic life (one thinks of *Martin of Tours, *Honoratus of Lérins, *Sulpicius Severus and Paulinus of Nola). In this context, the literary and poetic production of the authors of the "Aquitaine circle" between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c. counseled people to pass from the *sapientia terrena* to the *sapientia Dei*, following the teaching and language of the apostle *Paul (1 Cor 1:20ff). This is the *sapientia* that overcomes *stultitia*, i.e., serious error with respect to the true value of things. The fool thinks that the things that will last are going to perish and vice versa; for this reason he thinks that the rich, the powerful and those who assert themselves are happy; the goods of the earth, however, can be lost in one day. The wise servant of

Christ has the right perception of the true value of things; therefore, he is free of them.

Conversion was therefore lived and presented as the dynamic reality of an encounter with the triune God, to be completed through the passage to a life in wisdom acc. to God. Underlying the entire anonymous poem is the hope: *sim mundo stultus ut Tibi sim sapiens* (v. 144).

A. Mai, *Ss. Episcoporum Nicetae et Paulini scripta ex Vaticanis codicibus edita*, Rome 1827, 63-71; Id., *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus V*, Rome 1933, 369-379; G. de Hartel, CSEL 30, 1894, 350-356; M.G. Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza. Il Carme anonimo* Sancte Deus, lucis lumen, concordia rerum. *Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Università degli studi di Macerata, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia 54, Rome 1990.

M.G. Bianco

SANCTUARY

I. Sanctuaries *ad corpus* - II. Reliquary sanctuaries - III. "Locative" sanctuaries - IV. Hierophantic sanctuaries - V. Therapeutic sanctuaries.

On the basis of the generally received meaning, any place characterized by the presence of a sacred element, for which one can verify a visitation for devotional purposes, which therefore has an implicitly substantial devotional role, can be termed a *sanctuary*. The list of such places turns out to be extraordinarily rich, both with respect to the innumerable and diverse character of such settlements within the broad time span from the origins of Christianity to the Middle Ages. Within the context of the exceptional documentary panorama available, one can attempt a typological classification of sanctuaries on the basis of the forms in which they impose the presence of something sacred, which justifies the birth and the development of a center for worship; the sequence of clusters provides significant information for the elaboration of a chronological framework within which the comprehensive history of such centers should be reconstructed.

I. Sanctuaries *ad corpus*. The sanctuaries to be attributed to this group (*ad corpus*), which is arguably the most consistent and the earliest in formation, are those that arose esp. in direct relation to the burial places which were objects of devotion not only of the martyrs but also of well-known persons, esp. bishops, or at times, important figures of power, as in the exemplary case of the sepulcher of the emperor *Constantine at *Constantinople, "glorified together with a greeting directed toward the apostles" (Euseb., *Vita Constantini* IV,71). *Rome was the center at which this phenomenon took root, esp. during the period of the persecutions. The city developed an unmatched network of tombs, which progressively, through declared and general venerational attention, for the most part with early and significant monuments, brought the identity of the sanctuaries to maturity by transforming the image of the entire city into a vast sanctuarial entity. Of the 170 cultic regions included as goals for pilgrim visits in one of the *itineraria* from the 1st half of the 7th c., the *Notitia Ecclesiarum Urbis Romae*, a series of sanctuaries established in the hypogea of the cemeteries were archaeologically identified, although the sepulchers located in the city often posed significant problems in the areas *sub divo*, which were brought to light in an extremely fragmented state. In general, then, even in the well-known layouts it seems rather difficult to identify the original configuration of the burial place, which was systematically compromised by an often complex sequence of subsequent interventions designed to improve cultic apparatuses and the progressive refinement of the forms of reception and accessibility of the *limina sancta*.

One must recall, in general, that in the primary phase of deposition, the remains of the martyrs were mostly placed within simple funerary entities, absolutely indistinct from those of the other faithful, as demonstrated by a fortuitous discovery, during work in 1845 in the catacomb of Bassilla on the Via *Salaria vetus*, of the intact sepulcher of Hyacinth, who was most likely a victim of the *Diocletian persecution. The martyr's burial cell, which was hidden by the rising of the floor in the original cubicle, had receded backward due to the systematic extraction of venerated relics for transfer into the churches *intra muros* during the centuries of the Late Middle Ages. The burial cell had been further ravaged by "those seeking the bodies of the saints" during the modern age. It was discovered by the Jesuit Father Giuseppe Marchi with the original slab still affixed and bearing a reference to his name *Iacinthus martyr*, accompanied by the date of deposition *III idus septe*(*m*)*br*(*es*) (ICUR X 26662). The date 11 September aligns with his *dies natalis* mentioned by the **depositio martyrum* (Valentini - Zucchetti, 26). In actual fact, the tomb was configured as a niche large "enough to collect . . . a small group of ashes and burned bones wrapped in gold cloth and spices" (Marchi). As simple sepulchers they were taking shape, at the time of burial, near the same *loci* which received the remains of Peter and Paul in the necropolises on the Vatican Hill along the Via Ostia. However, already within a few decades a significant and parallel program of promoting monuments was taking place, as attested

to by the well-known fragment cited in *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia ecclesiastica* taken from the presbyter *Gaius, who lived during the time of *Zephyrinus. In this passage he pointed *Proclus, the head of the *Montanists, to the τρόπαια, i.e., "the trophies of the founders of this church" (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2,25,7), one in honor of Peter rightfully recognized in a stand leaning against the "red wall," an artifact which was unearthed during the excavation of the 1940s under the presbytery of the basilica dedicated to the apostle.

But it was esp. during the period following the peace of the church that the most significant development of sanctuaries occurred, a development aided by the direct intervention of the popes in the organization of the sepulchers of the martyrs. For some of the tombs that had by that point fallen into oblivion, true and proper works of *inventio* were undertaken, and preliminary strategies were developed for visiting the venerated tombs. If the literary sources, which fortunately at times can be integrated with the information on the monuments, allow scholars to connect (1) Pope *Sylvester (314–335), who was helped by Emperor *Constantine himself, with the basilicas *ad corpus* of St. Peter and St. Paul and the first work on the sepulcher of St. *Lawrence; (2) Pope *Julius (337–352) with the most ancient building in honor of *Valentinus; and (3) Pope *Liberius (352–366) with early decoration of the tomb of St. *Agnes (*Liber pontificalis* I,176, 178, 181, 208), then it was only with Pope *Damasus (366–384) that the project grew and acquired globalizing characteristics, making the church the only true "entrepreneur" of the cult of the saints. The strengthening of the sanctuaries is without a doubt bound to Pope Damasus, who has no parallel throughout the centuries of Late Antiquity. According to his biographer, simply *hic multa corpora sanctorum requisivit et invenit, quorum etiam versibus declaravit* (*Liber pontificalis* I,212). This information is to be set against an extensive series of incised epigraphic discoveries by the secretary and calligrapher Furius Dionysius Philocalus that confirm systematic interventions, which, it is believed, were rather standard in terms of the monumental profile in all the martyria of Roman suburbs.

One can reasonably infer that after 384, the year of Pope Damasus's death, each venerated tomb was withdrawn from undistinguished membership in the homogeneous sepulchral areas and entrusted to the devotion of the faithful with clear signs of official church recognition, signs which were summarized in the epigraphic furnishings of the display, in architectural and decorative enhancement, often with the use of splendid marble, and in appropriate inclusion within a circuit tour with well-defined stops. One can hypothesize that the earliest interventions were undertaken by the pontiff in the cemetery of *Callistus, which, until the recent decades of its development, preserved the characteristics of a strictly elitist context for the ecclesiastical hierarchy both in the cubicle of Pope *Cornelius, the successor of Peter from 251 to 253, and in the crypt where the nine popes of the 3rd c., from *Fabian to *Eutychian, were laid to rest. Here, in relation to the remote tomb in which lay the remains of *Sixtus II, a martyr of the bloody persecution of the emperor *Valerian, Damasus had two inscriptions written: one dedicated to his predecessor on the high part and, on the low part, an epigram in honor of all the saints venerated in the cemetery (ICUR IV 9514 and ICUR IV 9513). He also prepared a rather simple organization with the construction of a wall placed upon the original sepulcher acc. to the dining table design, which was constructed in such a way that allowed the people to peek through a *fenestella*. He also prepared the organization of an altar in the opposite sector, illuminated by an adequately positioned skylight, and the marble covering of the façade. In certain areas, Damasus's intervention over a venerated tomb made provisions for the application of a more developed schema, which can also be ascribable to an empowering in a certain symbolic way of the decorating, which is suggestive, it has been hypothesized, of a ciborium with the function of emphasizing the full presence of the sacred. The best-preserved examples are in the catacomb of *Praetextatus, over the tomb of the martyr *Januarius and in the crypt recently attributed to Pope Urban, where the monumental epigraphs appear flanked by columns supporting a marble architrave with perforated screens for filling the central spaces. Another scheme is also in the sanctuary of St. *Marcellinus and Peter on the Via Labicana, with columns furrowed in replacement for some of the columns close to the wall with the two venerated loculi.

After the 4th c. and until the Early Middle Ages, the venerated centers in suburban Rome acquired characteristics of extraordinary variety in the monumental solutions, which certainly recalled some contributing factors: (1) primarily the peculiarities of the contexts of belonging to the open sky or the underground regions, at times modified at the cost of radical tamperings with preexisting structures; (2) the ability of certain cults to be more attractive than others; and (3) the considerable assistance of devoted benefactors, who often sponsored important structural and decorative transformations to

the holy places. In a general and abridged consideration, this material evolution of the sanctuaries can be reduced to a phenomenon of progressive conquering of one's own space, increasingly more suited to the liturgical and cultic demands, to the reception of numerous visitors and to the program of creating new, very sought-after sepulchers, privileged by their vicinity to the *limina sanctorum*. Numerous basilicas answered these demands, some of considerable size, built, esp. between the 6th and 7th c., on the same tombs of the martyrs such as those of *Nereus and Achilleus, in the structure of *Domitilla on the Via Ardeatina, San Lorenzo on the Via Tiburtina, *Agnes on the Via Nomentana, the martyr Hermes on the Via Salaria Vetus. With this process the object place of devotion developed its own architectonic and functional identity in respect to the original cemeteries, which gradually fell into disuse after the 1st decades of the 5th c., whose survival, no longer guaranteed by the sepulchral activity, was also reduced to the same life of the martyrial center.

But the sanctuaries *ad corpus* of suburban Rome also played the role of definite protagonists in some substantial phenomena that marked the transformation of the topographical layout of the city and in particular the transformation of the functional relationships between urban spaces properly speaking and extramural territory in the centuries of transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, esp. through the well-reconstructed process of gradual improvement and multipurpose growth of the structures, a growth documented in relation to the most important martyria. The first extremely significant tendency in the multifunctional development of the martyrial structures should be seen in the annexing of the baptisteries. The archaeological evidence certainly attests to the presence of a baptismal font, in the final decades of the 4th c. and perhaps by the work of Pope *Damasus as well, in the basilica of St. Peter, where it occupied, presumably, the N arm of the transept, and, at the beginning of the 5th c., at St. Agnes. Later the construction of a baptistery was ordered by Pope *Hilary (461–468) at the basilica of St. Lawrence and by his successor *Simplicius (468–483) at the basilica of St. Paul. But above all, some sanctuaries at early stages attracted occasional vistors, alongside the masses of devotees, for whom were set up specifically host organizations (*xenodochia*) and facilities (*balnea*, which are attested to by the sources at the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Pancras and St. Lawrence), and certain forms of fixed residency. In addition to the *habitacula pauperibus*, which was built by Pope *Symmachus (498–514), near the sanctuaries of Peter, Paul and Lawrence (*Liber pontificalis* I,263), in the same area as the Vatican, and esp. around the Circus of *Nero, stood, on the basis of the testimony given by *Procopius, “many and various homes, which resulted in crammed streets everywhere” (*Bellum gothicum* II,1).

In relation to the large sanctuaries there gradually arose monastic centers, which must have contributed to the care of the cult and to the assistance of pilgrims: the first cenobitic establishment attested to by the sources in the area outside the walls is the one that arose in service of the structure *ad Catacumbas* during the pontificate of Pope *Sixtus III (432–440), which was reorganized under the direction of an abbot by Pope Nicholas I (858–867; LP I,234; II,161). Other monasteries were instituted near the sanctuaries of Hermes, Agnes and *Pancras. Various settlements of this sort were widespread, esp., however, in the area of the large sanctuaries, namely that of Sts. Stephen and Cassian *ad balneum* and St. Lawrence, those of Aristus, Cesarius, the two dedicated to the same Stephen, one of which was for women, at St. *Paul and those of *John and Paul, of Martin, St. Stephen Major and Minor and that of the so-called *Hierusalem* at St. *Peter. With regard to the stay of foreigners at Rome are linked finally the *scholae peregrinonum*, which were permanent establishments equiped for reception and shelter, but also with cultural and military functions, and furnished with their own hospital, a church and a cemetery for the community. The four *scholae* from which information is provided by the Early Medieval sources with respect to the Petrine sanctuary are mentioned by the biographer of Pope Leo III (795–816), who, upon returning to Rome in 799 from the court of Charlemagne, where he had fled following an attack, was received by all classes of Roman society, to which they had allied *cunctae scholae peregrinorum*, *videlicet Francorum*, *Frisonum*, *Saxonum atque Langobardorum* (LP II,6). It can be seen from the functional point of view that the centralizing of these manifold structures around the chief martyria was at the basis of the “urbanization” of extramural areas linked to the tombs of the martyrs, a phenomenon that annulled the rigid traditional boundaries between city and suburb and had its most significant examples in the final definition of the complex urban structural centers that have formed around the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Lawrence and St. Sebastian. The creation of systems of fortification and wall incorporation around these basilicas from the 9th c. onward marks the birth of true and proper *civitates* around Rome (and as such were known to the sources as *civitas leoniana* of the Petrine sanctu-

ary and Johannipolis for that of Paul, from the names of the pontiffs who completed the layout of the *castra*, and the Laurentiopolis), with its own topographic configuration and a quasi-satellite physiognomy with respect to the city enclosed within the Aurelian walls. The presence of walls made such settlements similar to impenetrable citadels, as, among other things, at the time of the Greek-Gothic War Procopius had already attested to for the planning of St. Paul, which as "a portico (that) goes from the city to the temple and many other buildings nearby" made it "difficult to attack" (*Bellum gothicum* II,1).

Although a substantially uninterrupted visitational trajectory can be laid out in relation to these important centers, during the Early Middle Ages the history of the other numerous sanctuaries *ad corpus* scattered around the Aurelian walls can be summarized as a progressive abandonment following the transfer of the remains of the martyrs into the worship buildings *intra muros.* Important precedents are traced in the biographies of the popes between the 7th and 8th c., directed at structures rather distant from Rome (Pope Theodore [642–649] ordered that the remains of Primus and Felicianus be transferred from a cemetery on the Via Nomentana in the area of Mentana, and Pope Leo II [682–683] transferred the remains of the martyrs Simplicius, Faustina and Viatrice from the estate of Generosa, at the sixth mile of the Via Portuensis, to the urban church of St. Balbina: LP I,332, 360). The phenomenon continued to emerge with more consistent characteristics after the siege of the *Longobard (Lombard) King Aistulf (756), after which Pope Stephen II (752–757) *multa corpora sanctorum*, *effodiens eorum sacra cymiteria*, *ad magnum anime suo detrimentum abstulit* (LP I,451-452), and Paul I (757–767), *cernens plurima eorundem sanctorum cymiteriorum loca neglectu ac desidia antiquitatis maxima demolitione atque iam vicina ruine posita*, *protinus eadem sanctorum corpora de ipsis dirutis abstulit coemeteriis* (LP I,464). This trend continued to the point of involving the entire web of sanctuaries in the 9th c., esp. with Pope Paschal I (817–824; LP II,52, 53, 54, 56), despite the attempts of one of his predecessors, Hadrian I (772–795), to reinstate the suburban martyria with substantial and general works of restoration.

Rome played a guiding role in terms of managing an important resource, which the sanctuaries constituted for the churches and provided a comprehensive model for sanctuaries, summarizing the chief steps of the evolutionary trajectory of the martyrial centers from the beginning to the Early Middle Ages, even for numerous other urban and rural centers of the *Orbis Christianus*, which was marked by the presence of venerated tombs. The general characteristics of the layout and the development of these sites, therefore, appear to be systematically traceable to the times of radicalization of Christianity among the people and the establishment of its institutional structures and with diversified perspectives and responses to local situations.

In general, the devotion to the martyrs and the development of the sanctuaries assumed characteristics of broader importance and diffusion, esp. during the post-Constantinian age. Every center tended to justify its own cults, the foundation of a local church. This development came about, in the greater part of the measurable cases, in direct connection with strategically farsighted programs formulated precisely by the bishops, who were the unquestionable managers of the cultic phenomenon and who were often, as in the Roman case of Damasus, responsible for providential acts of discovery (*inventio*) of the sacred tombs, which the extensive period of time after burial and, of course, the lack of early venerational interests had reduced to oblivion. Thus at Milan *Ambrose directed the first significant monumental interventions at the cemetery *ad martyres*, outside the Porta Vercellina, and on the street headed toward the Piedmontese area were the sepulchers of Victor, the Mauritanian soldier who was martyred at Lodi during the Diocletian persecution, and of Sts. Felix and Nabor. There a felicitous intervention of the bishop himself had led to the discovery of the remains of *Gervasius and Protasius, *ante cancellos sanctorum Felicis atque Naboris* (*Ep.*XXII, 1 = PL 16, 1019). Likewise at Nola the significant introduction of the rearrangement of the structure completed by Paulinus of Bordeaux, the consul *suffectus* and the governor of Campania, who became bishop of the city, had the credit of discovering (*inventio*) the tomb of St. *Felix, the rediscovery of which the *Carmina* (esp. XXI, vv. 557-565) clearly allude to.

Three main developments summarize the fundamental features of the evolution of the martyrial structures: (1) the Cimitile complex with the important Paulinian feature (i.e., the construction of the *basilica nova* to the N of the building *ad corpus*, which was connected through the replacment of the apse with a monumental triforium); (2) the progressive predisposition of spaces for sepulchers *ad sanctum*, which is also of exceptional importance (for Paulinus himself, his wife Tharasia and some bishops of Nola tombs were created in proximity to that of the martyr; even the later basilica of St. *Thomas, attributed to a period between the end of the 6th c. and the next, was conceived as a covered cemetery);

and (3) the significant, gradual, multifunctional strengthening of structures retrieved from the hub of worship—a baptistery, monastic buildings, spaces for reception and services. These characteristics can be identified with features generally marked by their systematic nature in the sanctuarial realities better known archaeologically. A constant attraction of privileged tombs has been uncovered, esp. episcopal tombs, a phenomenon well known both in the East and the West. This was a polygenetic development even within the perspective of the structures for the *cura animarum*, which became concrete in the sufficiently attested annexing of baptisteries, which was a dominant, peculiar feature esp. in the Eastern provinces, where it seems to have established itself as the model (in the West, in addition to the Roman examples and the case of Cimitile, significant situations have been documented, e.g., in *Sardinia, at St. Saturnus and at St. Antiochus of Sulcis, in *Gaul at *Tours and in *Spain at Calagurris). At Tours, the "urban" increase in relation to the tomb of St. *Martin and the small church *super corpus beati Martini*, which was described by *Sulpicius Severus and *Gregory of Tours (part. *Historia francorum* X,31,4), substantially covers nearly two centuries, from the 4th to the 6th, and the result is established by the complete and exhaustive articulation of structures—the baptistery, a colonnaded structure around the basilica, and oratory and other adjoining sanctuaries, a *domus*, monasteries and centers of reception—which defines the transition from the *civitas Turonorum* to the new Christian *vicus*.

II. Reliquary sanctuaries. This section will cover sanctuaries that arose in relation to the presence of relics. On the basis of the differentiated nature of these relics, these sanctuaries require a further and more precise subclassification, whether in relation to bodily relics, objects of different functions or materials generally sanctified *e contactu*, relics from the Holy Land or Marian relics. In a few cases, however, one can document the simultaneous presence of categorically dissimilar cultic objects.

The circulation and the cult of corporeal relics had their raison d'être in the idea, formulated esp. by Greek authors such as *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*Sermo* I, 8 = PG 83, 818), of an intact preservation of the *virtus* in the passage from one whole, which could be theoretically broken up *ad infinitum*, to one part. While it was generally considered a widespread custom in the East and despite its being rather circumscribed in the West—due to a more direct adherence to the legislative norms that prohibited the tampering with sepulchers and on the basis of the professed dislike of this practice by the Roman Church, in particular with certain popes such as *Hormisdas and *Gregory I, who refused the granting of bodily remains even to the representatives of the Byzantine court—this practice found rather significant manifestations in the beginning stages of the development of the sanctuaries. For many local churches the importing of the relics of "foreign" martyrs corresponded to well-studied strategies of cultic politics promoted by the bishops, but it esp. compensated for the lack of a personal historical-hagiographical heritage, which was established by the tombs of the martyrs of the persecutions.

In N *Italy, if one disregards the early circulation of apostolic relics (which, e.g., arrived into the community of Concordia perhaps even before the institution of the episcopate) and certain isolated cases (such as the arrival in Vercelli through the intervention of Bishop *Eusebius, around 360, of the remains of the St. Theonestus, who was probably of Eastern origin), the Ambrosian period seems to have inaugurated a generalization of the phenomenon in Milan. *Ambrose brought to the *Longobard (Lombard) center the relics of the apostles *John, *Andrew and *Thomas; and with these, which were placed under the major altar, he consecrated the sanctuary with a significant cross-shaped floor plan, which was strategically placed on the road toward Rome. Along with such corporeal remains the relics of the martyr *Euphemia of *Chalcedon were brought for a building located at the S of the city, although, only after the bishop's death and during the episcopate of his successor Simplicius. Due to a successful program of promotion of the relics of the saints by *Vigilius, the bishop of Trent, *Milan was enriched with the remains of the Cappadocian priests *Sissinius, Martyrius and Alexander, who were killed while preaching the gospel in the Alpine valleys of Anaunia (Val di Non). The circulation of these holy remains was guaranteed in a noteworthy measure by the friendly relations between the most representative figures of Christianity of that era. From one of *Vitricius of Rouen's writings we learn that in 296 a celebration was held in various cities commemorating the *adventus* of precious relics such as those of *Nazarius (Milan), Procolus (Bologna) and Antoninus (Piacenza), which were also donated, among other things, by Ambrose and Eustasius the bishop of Aosta. For the consecration of a sanctuary in Brescia in the year 402, *Gaudentius was able to gather, with exceptional adorning of the structure built on a circular layout, the remains of the apostles John, Thomas, Andrew and *Luke, but

also the remains of the aforementioned martyrs of Anaunia (Val di Non).

Even at Rome, despite the previously mentioned traditional aversion toward tampering with corpses—a position that made rather improbable the movement, even though temporary after the *Valerian persecution of 258, of the remains of *Peter and *Paul in the *memoria apostolorum* on the Via Appia, which has been considered by some people the origin of the sanctuary (the genesis of which should be considered, therefore, rather of a commemorative nature; one cannot exclude the presence of relics *e contactu*)—cultic centers born in relation to the importation of relics or to the deposition of secondary relics are attested to. These relics presumably came to the city through the intervention of ethnic groups residing there permanently. We see this, first, in the catacomb of Pamphilus, where a massive altar seemed to be the ideal entity for the repositioning of the relics of the eponymous African; second, in that of the catacomb *ad duas lauros*, where the *Four Crowned Martyrs were venerated, who were probably from Pannonia; and third, within the structure of St. Sebastian, in which a monumental mausoleum adjoined to the secular basilica dedicated to Peter and Paul had received, between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c., the remains of the bishop of Siscia *Quirinus, after his death in his homeland. The presence of the Greek community in the monastery that arose in the place traditionally connected to the martyrdom of St. Paul on the Via Ostia justified the importation to Rome of the head of the Persian martyr *Anastasius Magundat, an object of great veneration *ad Aquas Salvias*, sometime after the year 628, the year of the slaying, and after 641, the end of the kingdom of *Heraclius. Likewise, the Greek community explains, despite the nebulous information concerning the means by which it might have arrived in the city of Rome, the presence of the head of St. *George, which was rediscovered by Pope *Zachariah (741–752), acc. to his biographer, in a repository box (*capsa*) in the patriarch's palace of the Lateran and which was transferred into the church of St. George in Velabro (LP I,434). It is difficult to determine, however, if in Rome itself relics were used, whether bodily or of another type, as the basis for the dedication of certain consecrated buildings by pontiffs to nonlocal martyrs, as in the cases of the basilica of S. Apollinare near St. Peter's, the sepulchral areas of the Sicilian *Euplus of Catania, or the Egyptian Menas in the vicinity of the basilica of St. Paul. It seems certain, however, that the majority of the sanctuaries erected with the presence of bodily remains, and in particular the earliest ones, underwent a process of extreme "naturalization" in the sepulchral area that received them and enjoyed a cult entirely indistinguishable from the one directed toward the primary tombs of the martyrs, even starting common processes, such as that of the **depositio ad sanctos*. For the aforementioned Roman cases of Pamphilus, the *Four Crowned Martyrs and *Quirinus of Siscia, e.g., the type of devotional use that was shown by the early medieval *itineraria* became entirely indistinct, even through a likely distancing of the historical memory of the genetic element of the cult from those of the original sepulchers.

Different evaluations were imposed by some particularly succesful cults, the spread of which was connected to a true and proper diaspora of bodily relics, a diaspora documented in emblematic terms through the remains of the protomartyr *Stephen, after the miraculous discovery (*inventio*) of the place of his burial, which was followed by a vision received in a dream by the priest *Lucian of Caphargamala (PL 41,807-818), at Kĕfar Gamlā, N of the city walls of *Jerusalem, in 415. The remains, which had been distributed throughout the world (*Orbis*), gave rise to the birth of various sanctuaries in the West, as far as Mahon, a city located on the island of Minorca, and in the East, esp. at *Constantinople, where the martyr's hand and relics were transferred on several occasions, in honor of which a new church was built, a project that was accomplished by *Pulcheria, the sister of the emperor *Theodosius II in 428. *Eudoxia transferred new relics in the year 439, and again in the 6th c. Julia Anicia broadened the repertory; a legendary tradition then established their subsequent transfer from Constantinople to Rome at the time of Pope *Pelagius II, who placed them in the extramural basilica of St. *Lawrence (BHL II,1139, nn. 7878-7885).

A significant turn in the growth of the sanctuaries that were established in relation to bodily relics should be traced in some substantial changes during the centuries of the Early Middle Ages, a period in which the continuity of visitations to the original martyria was often shown to be radically compromised by political changes; demographic, urban and territorial transformations; and esp. the places of cult *ad corpus* of suburban Rome, which underwent a gradual but irreversible abandonment due to the systematic movement of the saints' bodies into the urban churches. The phenomenon of the translation of relics, it is obvious, contributed to the definitive changes of mindset and to the change from the traditional reluctance shown by the Church of Rome toward tampering with the venerated sepulchers, a

reluctance which had without a doubt impeded the sanctuary-city from transforming itself into an "inexhaustible mine of relics" (Cardini, *Reliquie*, 1024). A certain generosity of the papacy in the granting of the martyrs' remains was, at one time, deeply motivated by the political repercussions of the establishment of spiritual filiations such as those with the Franks or the Burgundians and could move in parallel with the processes of evangelization of peoples, a phenomenon which justified the "material" property at least of the bodily parts of their own protectors. In this way, well-rooted cults at Rome crossed the Alpine arc and found a home in N Europe, even following the traditional practice *furta sacra*, such as those of Marcellinus and Peter, which had been transferred into the German town Seligenstadt through Einhard's translation effort and that of Sebastian at Soissons, thanks to Hilduin, the abbot of St. Medardus. The sanctity of certain inescapable centers of Christianity beyond the Alps such as Fleury, e.g., was established upon imported relics, where the relics of St. *Benedict and *Scholastica had come from Monte Cassino. The same was true of Fulda, the most representative holy city of the Saxon area, which in the Middle Ages boasted the presence of the bodily remains of prestigious saints.

Another set of relics in which one should recognize a potential sacred element at the basis of the founding of a sanctuary is represented by the "contact" relics, which were promoted esp. by the Church of Rome as an alternative to the fragmentation and circulation of bodily remains. The efficacy of such *sanctuaria* resulted in the miraculous passage of the saint's *virtus* to handmade materials, whether objects that the saints had touched before death such as the chains of the apostles Peter and Paul, the grill of St. Lawrence, or the stones used for the stoning of the protomartyr Stephen, one of which, after being placed *super altare*, was venerated at Rome in an oratory near the Pauline sanctuary on the Via Ostia (*De locis sanctis*: Valentini - Zucchetti, 109); the same occurred with elements, esp. fabric, which were sanctified through contact with a tomb. Writing in the year 594 to the empress Constantina and desiring to obtain Paul's remains for the new church dedicated to the apostle at Constantinople, Pope *Gregory I explained that, by placing a *brandeum* in a small box (*in buxide*) *ad sacratissima corpora sanctorum . . . quod levatum in ecclesia quae est dedicanda debita cum veneratione reconditur*; in this way, one would receive the same miraculous effect (*tantae per hoc ibidem virtutes fiunt*), *acsi illic specialiter eorum corpora deferantur* (*Ep.* IV,30,35).

The propagation of relics from the Holy Land, on the other hand, determined the exceptionally early origin of numerous venerated centers related to them, either independently or in strengthening and empowering other forms of devotion. The discovery of the true cross had esp. triggered, from the Constantinian age, an extraordinary diffusion of the staurolite cult, due to the direct intervention of *Helena, who had reached Jerusalem at the invitation of the bishop *Macarius after the Council of *Nicaea (325) and was personally responsible for the first translation of relics from the Holy Land to Rome, where, in the Sessorium Palace, an oratory had been consecrated. The city of Rome (*Urbs*) itself was also able to fulfill the function of a sorting center, if indeed Rome was the origin of the relics venerated in the church of St. Peter at Spoleto, a station for pilgrims coming to Rome from the North, perhaps among those requested in the 1st half of the 5th c. by Bishop Achilles. Analogously, remnants of wood from the cross of Christ's passion, a symbol of the real body of Christ, had come to Nola through *Melania the Younger, and to Vienna, where remnants had been requested between the year 518 and 523 by Bishop *Avitus from the patriarch of Jerusalem, and to *Poitiers, where a precious relic of the cross, which was also mentioned in the hymns of *Venantius Fortunatus, had arrived, thanks to the emperor *Justin II, for the consecration of a monastery dedicated to the cross. Within the 1st half of the 7th c., Rome was enriched perhaps with new relics from Bethlehem if one can logically tie the title *ad Praesepe*, which was used to refer, for the first time under Pope *Theodore (642–649), to the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore (LP I,331).

From the 5th c. onward there exists documentation even for the definition of cultic objects tied to the initial spread of Marian relics. The first attestation was the consecration of a chapel at *Constantinople within the building of St. Mary at Blachernae in order to receive the fragment of the *Thetokos*'s cloak, which was brought to *Palestine in 473 upon the order of the emperor *Leo I (457–474; Theod., *Epitome* 508,24-25). In the same city the church of Chalkoprateia housed, in the 6th c., the girdle of the Blessed Virgin *Mary (ibid., 363).

III. "Locative" sanctuaries. One could define as "locative" sanctuaries the centers of devotional attraction which had been established in relation to the memory of events in reference to special places, in the context of which the desire of repeating the memory was oftentimes materialized with the construction of the building. Alongside the earliest and most emblematic monuments of the Holy Land—

the sites of the Passion and the Nativity, the value of which was increased through the direct intervention of *Constantine—a broad and variegated repertory of reminiscent locations should be noted as locative sanctuaries, on the basis of traditions that were more or less trustworthy, of episodes relating to the life or the martyrdom of the saints. At Rome, between *Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, these repertories progressively enriched the already very broad web of sanctuaries *ad corpus*, creating allusions to the experience of Peter and Paul, to whom, between 676 and 678 Pope Donus had dedicated an *ecclesia sita via Ostense* (LP I,348), which was later considered the transmission of the memory of the last encounter between the two apostles before undergoing martyrdom, which was narrated in a letter of ps.-*Dionysius (Mombritius, *Sanctuarius seu vitae sanctorum*, Paris 1910, II,355). Analogously, on the site *ad Aquas Salvias* of the supposed decapitation of the apostle Paul, acc. to a very ancient tradition mentioned as early as the apocryphal *Acts* of ps.-Marcellus, the memory of the martyrdom must have materialized very early with the erection of a commemorative building, which in the 7th c. was restored by Pope *Sergius (688–689), presumably in the place today occupied by S. Pauli ad Aquas Salvias, a work of Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini in the last decades of the 16th c. In relation to Peter, in the area N of the city, between the Via Salaria and the Via Nomentana, a tradition had already been reestablished from the 5th c. and was recorded by the *Passio* of Papia and Maurus (*Act. Sanct.*, *Ian.* II,371) and by the *Gesta Liberii*, which tied the apostle's baptismal activity to the *coemeterium Maius*, in the area in which one can suppose some material entity was established with the function of a memorial evocation, from which the presbyter John, during the pontificate of Gregory the Great, was able to withdraw *olea sancta* (Valentini - Zucchetti, 44-45).

Pilgrims attracted by the prospect of visiting the tombs of the saints were directed to turn their own devotional attention also to places consecrated by the acclamation of hagiographic accounts such as the *carcer in quo fuit Laurentius*, which was included in *De locis sanctis* (Valentini - Zucchetti, 114-115), or the small oratory near the suburban temple of Mars, on the Via Appia, where the hagiographic account centered the martyrdom of Pope *Sixtus II.

"Locative cultic center" can also be used to describe the series of eremitic sanctuaries, which spread around in the Eastern region, examples of which include the buildings of Qal'at Sim'ān, which developed in the 5th c. around the column of *Simeon the Stylite, and the basilica of Simeon the Younger at *Antioch. Such sanctuaries progressively arose in other geographical areas, esp. with the configuration of the cave sanctuaries, often associated with large pilgrimage roads in Late Antiquity and in the Early Middle Ages.

IV. Hierophantic sanctuaries. The installation of some sanctuaries should also be traced back to the events surrounding the birth of Christ and was well represented in the centuries of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages from the group connected to the cult of St. Michael, the model of which was generally traced to the Gargano sanctuary dedicated to the archangel in the 2nd half of the 5th c. This would introduce the typical characteristics that almost systematically marked the geomorphological habitat of St. Michael sanctuaries, which can be summarized in the hillside settlements within a natural grotto, often in proximity to rivers or springs, on the backdrop of natural craggy and rocky sceneries. The Gargano grotto was established by two separate cavities from a rocky partition placed at different coordinates, in the smallest of which the archangel, acc. to legend, had left marks, in the point consecrated by an altar. The building was gradually emphasized, first through simple adjustments in the area immediately before the grotto, and then with the progressive juxtaposition of adjoined structures and access to the monuments.

The Gargano sanctuary, however, which was a cultic center in the suburb of Rome, and which was located at the seventh mile of the Via Salaria, seems to have come earlier by a few decades. The first mention of this place is taken from the *Hieronymian Martyrology*, which mentions its *dedicatio* for 29 September (*Act. Sanct.*, *Nov.* II,2, 532), and the remains in a building with three aisles paved with a mosaic and with liturgical fencing in the area of the presbytery.

V. Therapeutic sanctuaries. The name "therapeutic sanctuaries" pertains to those sanctuaries that arose in relation to the charitable characteristics connected to natural elements, esp. water-based, which are generally distinguished by a tendency to be reinstated on sites already highly valued for their thaumaturgic and sacred characteristics in previous eras. Along these lines, one should understand the building of a basilica, between the 5th and 6th c., at the source of the Timavo River, already marked by the cult of the flame in the Roman age, or the devotional visitation to the Temple of Clitumnus, which is linked to an interesting repertory of extemporaneous writings of pilgrims during the *Longobard

(Lombard) era, or even the consecration of the place of martyrdom of St. *Saturninus of Cagliari in the area of the more ancient *fons Apollinis*. Within such a phenomenon of sacralization of the water element one can also frame cases of the increased valuing of water in connection to its baptismal function, both in the context of true and proper baptisteries (Barcino), and through the monumentalization of well-springs or natural aquifers, like a sanctuary-well of the catacomb of St. *Priscilla at Rome, which was characterized by a massive devotional visitation.

General Studies: V. Saxer, *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles. Les témoignages de Tertullien, Cyprien et Augustin à la lumière de l'archéologie africaine*, Paris 1980; P. Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, London 1981; Y. Duval, *Loca sanctorum Africae: Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVe au VIIe siècle*, Rome 1982; L. Pani Ermini, *Santuario e città fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo*, in *Santi e demoni nell'alto medioevo occidentale, secoli V-XI*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 36 (Spoleto, 7-13 aprile 1988), Spoleto 1989, 837-877; *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie* (Bonn 22.-28. September 1991), Münster 1995; *Lieux sacrés, lieux de culte, sanctuaires. Approches terminologiques, méthodologiques, historiques et monographiques*, Rome 2002; *Lieux de culte, lieux saints dans le judaïsme, le christianisme et l'islam*: RHR 222 (2005) 387-574.

Sanctuaries ad corpus: (Rome) R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, II, Rome 1942; L. Reekmans, *L'implantation monumentale chrétienne dans la zone suburbaine de Rome du IVe au IXe siècle*: RivAC 44 (1968) 173-207; S. Carletti, *Santuari di martiri romani negli itinerari del VII secolo*: StudRom 18 (1970) 51-67; Id., *Le antiche chiese dei martiri romani*, Rome 1972; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975; J. Guyon, *Le pélerinage à Rome dans la Basse-Antiquité et le Haut-Moyen-Âge* (*VIe-IXe s.*), in *Pélerins de Rome* (*Visages de Rome, II*), Paris 1976, 41-69; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III* (*311–440*), Rome 1976; *Saecularia Damasiana. Atti del convegno internazionale per il XVI centenario della morte di Papa Damaso I* (Città del Vaticano 10-12 dicembre 1984), Vatican City 1986, 291-303; F. Tolotti, *Il problema dell'altare e della tomba del martire in alcune opere di papa Damaso*, in *Studien zur Spatantiken und Byzantinischen Kunst, F.W. Deichman Gewidmet*, Mainz 1986, 51-71; V. Saxer, *L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain: l'example de Rome dans l'antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge*, in *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genéve et Aoste, 21-28 septembre 1986), Vatican City 1989, 917-1032; L. Spera, *Cantieri edilizi a Roma in età carolingia: gli interventi di papa Adriano I nei santuari delle catacombe romane*: RivAC 73 (1997) 185-254; L. Spera, *Ad limina apostolorum. Santuari e pellegrini a Roma nella tarda antichità e nell'altomedioevo*, in *La geografia della città di Roma e lo spazio del sacro. L'esempio delle trasformazioni territoriali lungo il percorso della Visita alle Sette Chiese Privilegiate*, Rome 1998, 1-104; F. Bisconti - D. Mazzoleni, *Alle origini del culto dei martiri. Testimonianze dell'archeologia cristiana*, Rome 2004; B.M. Apollonj Ghetti - A. Ferrua - E. Josi - E. Kirschbaum, *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano*, Rome 1951; J. Toynbee - J. Ward-Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations*, London 1956; E. Kirschbaum, *Die Gräber der Apostelfürsten*, Frankfurt a.M. 1957; M. Guarducci, *Le reliquie di Pietro sotto la confessione della basilica vaticana*, Vatican City 1965; L. Reekmans, *Le développement topographique de la région du Vatican à la fin de l'antiquité et au début du moyen âge* (*300–850*), in *Mélanges d'archéologie et histoire de l'art offerts au prof. Jacques Lavalleye*, Louvain 1970, 197-233; Ch. Pietri, *Observations sur le martyrium constantinien du Vatican*, in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston*, Paris 1974, 409-418; F. Tolotti, *Le confessioni succedutesi sul sepolcro di s. Paolo*: RivAC 59 (1983) 87-149; A.M. Giuntella, *"Spazio cristiano" e città altomedievale. L'esempio della* civitas leoniana, in *Atti del VI Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana* (Pesaro-Ancona 19-23 settembre 1983), Ancona 1985, 309-325; G. Filippi, *Die Ergebnisse der neuen Ausgrabungen am Grab des Apostels Paulus. Reliquienkult und Eucharistie im Presbyterium der Paulsbasilika*: Römische Mitteilungen 112 (2005-06) 277-292.

(Milan) M. Cagiano de Azevedo, *Appunti sulla relazione di S. Ambrogio circa lo scavo del sepolcro dei SS. Gervasio e Protasio*: Notizie dal chiostro del Monastero Maggiore. Rassegna di studi del Civico Museo archeologico e del Civico gabinetto numismatico di Milan 1-2 (1968) 1-9; M. Sannazaro, *Considerazioni sulla topografia e le origini del cimitero milanese* Ad martyres: Aevum 70 (1996) 81-111; *La città e la sua memoria. Milano e la tradizione di Sant'Ambrogio*, Milan 1997; J.M. Spieser, *Les fondations d'Ambroise à Milan et la question des* martyria: Deltion tès Christianikès Archaologikès Etaireias 20 (1998) 29-34.

(Cimitile) P. Testini, *Note per servire allo studio del complesso paleocristiano di S. Felice a Cimitile* (*Nola*): MEFRA 97 (1985) 329-371; *Cimitile e Paolino di Nola. La tomba di S. Felice e il centro di pellegrinaggio. Trent'anni di ricerche*. Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di archeologia cristiana (École française de Rome, 9 marzo 2000), Vatican City 2003; C. Ebanista, "Et manet in mediis quasi gemma intersita tectis." *La basilica di S. Felice a Cimitile. Storia degli scavi, fasi edilizie, reperti*, Naples 2003; Th. Lehmann, *Paulinus Nolanus und die Basilica Nova in Cimitile-Nola. Studien zu einem zentralen Denkmal der spätantik-frühchristlichen Architektur*, Wiesbaden 2004; C. Ebanista, *La tomba di S. Felice nel santuario di Cimitile a cinquant'anni dalla scoperta*, Marigliano 2006.

(Tours) L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du 4e au 6e siècle. Naissance d'une cité chrétienne*, Rome 1983; L. Pietri - Ch. Pietri, *L'image du Vicus Christianorum chez Grégoire de Tours*: Caesarodunum 18 bis (1983) 107-115; J. Biarne - L. Pietri, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIIIe siècle, 5. Province ecclésiastique de Tours* (*Lugdunensis Tertia*), Paris 1987; P. Saint-Roch, *L'utilisation liturgique de l'espace urbain et suburbain. L'exemple de quatre villes de France*, in *Actes du XIe Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste, 21-28 septembre 1986), Vatican City 1989, 1103-1115

(Other locations) E. Rodríguez Almeida, *La primitiva memoria martirial de los santos Vicente, Sabina y Cristeta* (*Avila, España*), in *Atti del VI Congr. int. di archeologia cristiana* (Ravenna 23-30 settembre 1962), Rome 1965, 781-797; L. Pani Ermini, *Ricerche nel complesso di S. Saturno a Cagliari*: Rend. PARA 55-56 (1982-84) 111-128; Ph. Pergola, *Spazio funerario e culto del martire. Soluzioni originali nel santuario di S. Calocero ad Albenga* (*SV*), in *Le sepolture in Sardegna dal IV al VII secolo. IV Conv. sull'archeologia tardoromana e medievale* (Cuglieri 27-28 giugno 1987), Oristano 1990, 383-390; B. Aleksova, *Loca*

sanctorum Macedoniae. The Cult of Martyrs in Macedonia from the 4th to the 9th Century, Skopje 1995; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Riflessi topografici e monumentali del culto dei martiri nei santuari paleocristiani del territorio laziale*, in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective: Memorial Louis Reekmans*, Leuven 1995, 197-232; P.G. Spanu, *Martyria Sardiniae, I santuari dei martiri sardi*, Oristano 2000; S. Cisci, *Il culto dei martiri sardi*, in *Sardegna in età tardoantica e altomedioevale attraverso le testimonianze storiche e archeologiche*: RivAC 77 (2001) 371-406; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Tipologie monumentali dei santuari martiriali paleocristiani dell'Umbria*, in *Umbria cristiana. Dalla diffusione del culto al culto dei santi. Secoli IV-X.* Atti del XV Congr. int. di studi sull'alto medioevo (Spoleto 23-28 ottobre 2000), Spoleto 2001, 305-338; A.M. Giuntella, *Brevi note in margine al santuario di San Vittorino di Amiterno (AQ)*, in Τερψις. *In ricordo di Maria Laetitia Coletti*, Alessandria 2002, 313-341; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Santuario martiriale e territorio nella diocesi di Nomentum. L'esempio di S. Alessandro*: RivAC 78 (2002) 157-189; J. López Vilar, *Les basíliques paleocristianes del suburbí occidental de Tarraco. El temple septentrional i el complex martirial de Sant Fructuós*, Tarragona 2006.

Reliquary Sanctuaries: P. Testini, *Le presunte reliquie dell'apostolo Pietro e la traslazione ad Catacumbas*, in *Actes du V^{e} Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Aix-en-Provence 13-19 septembre 1954), Paris 1957, 529-538; E. Vogt, *Die Textilreste aus dem Reliquienbehälter des Altars in der Kirche St. Lorenz bei Paspels*: Revue suisse d'art et d'archéologie 23 (1963-64) 83-90; J.M. Sauget, *Saint Grégoire le Grand et les reliques de Saint Pierre dans la tradition arabe chrétienne*: RivAC 49 (1973) 301-309; E.D. Hunt, *The Traffic in Relics: Some Late Roman Evidence*, in *The Byzantine Saint. University of Birmingham Fourteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, London 1981, 171-180; P. Brown, *Relics and Social Status in the Age of Gregory of Tours*, in *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, London 1982, 222-250; P.A. Février, *Baptistères, martyrs et reliques*: RivAC 62 (1986) 109-138; A. Paredi, *La dedicazione della basilica di Sant'Ambrogio a Milano nel giugno del 386*: RIL 120 (1986) 69-74; F. Cardini, *Reliquie e pellegrinaggi*, in *Santi e demoni nell'alto medioevo occidentale, secoli V-XI.* Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 36 (Spoleto, 7-13 aprile 1988), Spoleto 1989, 981-1035; C. Mango, *Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics*: ByzZ 83 (1990) 51-61; F. Heim, *Virtus. Idéologie politique et croyances religieuses au IV^{e} siècle*, Frankfurt a.M. 1991; D. Woods, *The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople*: VChr 45 (1991) 286-292; H. Brandenburg, *Altar und Grab. Zu einem Problem des Märtyrerkultes im 4. und 5. Jh.*, in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans*, Leuven 1995, 71-98; A. Angenendt, *Heilige und Reliquien. Die Geschichte ihres Kultes vom frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich 1997; F. Glaser, *Reliquiengräber. Sonderbestattungen der Spätantike*: *Arheološki* vestnik 48 (1997) 231-246; D.G. Hunter, *Vigilantius of Calagurris and Victricius of Rouen: Ascetics, Relics, and Clerics in Late Roman Gaul*: JECS 7 (1999) 401-430. A. Frolow, *La relique de la Vraie Croix. Recherches sur le développement d'un culte*, Paris 1961; J. Vogt, *Helena Augusta, das Kreuz und die Juden. Fragen um die Mutter Constantins des Grossen*: Saeculum 27 (1976) 211-222; S. de Blaauw, *Jerusalem in Rome and the Cult of the Cross*, in *Pratum Romanum. Richard Krautheimer zum 100. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1997, 55-73; P. Speck - O. Kresten, *Zum Datum der Translation der Kreuzreliquien nach Konstantinopel*, in Varia, 7, Bonn 2000, 167-179; M. Meier, *Die Translatio des Christusbildes von Kamulianai und der Kreuzreliquie von Apameia nach Konstantinopel unter Justin II. Ein übersehenes Datierungsproblem*: Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 7 (2003) 237-250. J. Wortley, *Some Notes on the Early Marian Relics of Constantinople*, in *Tenth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference* (Cincinnati, November 1-4, 1984); E. Testa, *Maria Terra Vergine*, 2. *Il culto mariano palestinese, sec. I-IX*, Jerusalem 1984.

"Locative" Sanctuaries: B. Bagatti, *Le origini delle tradizioni dei luoghi santi in Palestina*: Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 14 (1963-64) 32-64; D. Chen, *The Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem: The Design of Justinian's Plan*: Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 29 (1979) 270-275; V.C. Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme. Aspetti archeologici dalle origini al periodo crociato*, Jerusalem 1982; F. Heim, *L'expérience mystique des pèlerins occidentaux en Terre Sainte aux alentours de 400*: Ktema 10 (1985) 193-208; F. Tolotti, *Il S. Sepolcro di Gerusalemme e le coeve basiliche di Roma*: Römische Mitteilungen 93 (1986) 471-512; V.C. Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme. Nova et vetera*: Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 38 (1988) 391-422; A.J. Wharton, *The Baptistery of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem and the Politics of Sacred Landscape*: Dumbarton Oaks Papers 46 (1992) 313-325; J. Engemann, *Das Jerusalem der Pilger. Kreuzauffindung und Wallfahrt*, in *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie* (Bonn 22.-28. September 1991), Münster 1995, 24-35; G. Lavas - T. Mitropoulos, *Golgotha, Jerusalem. Die Aufdeckung der Kreuzigungsstelle Christi*, in *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie* (Bonn 22.-28. September 1991), Münster 1995, 964-968; M. Biddle, *The Tomb of Christ*, Stroud 1999; W. Pullan, *Ascent and Descent in the Constantinian Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem*, in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity. Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson*, Waterloo 2000, 308-321; G. Avni - J. Seligman, J., *New Excavations at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher Compound*, in *One Land—Many Cultures: Archaeological Studies in Honor of Stanislao Loffreda OFM*, Jerusalem 2003, 153-162; L. Spera, *Luoghi del martirio di papa Sisto II sulla via Appia*: Rend. PARA 73 (2000-01) 101-128; L. Spera, *Luoghi di culto di carattere rievocativo nel suburbio*, in *Ecclesiae urbis. Atti del congr. int. di studi sulle chiese di Roma, IV-X secolo* (Roma 4-10 settembre 2000), Vatican City 2002, 691-712; P. Verzone, *Il santuario di S. Simeone il Giovane sul Monte delle Meraviglie*, in *Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina*, Ravenna 1974, 273-286; P. Verzone, *Il santuario di S. Simeone Protostilita*, ibid., 259-272; J. Christern, *Die Pilgerheiligtümer von Abu Mina und Qalàt Simàn*, in *Spätantike und frühes Christentum*. Ausstellung im Liebieghaus (Museum alter Plastik, Frankfurt am Main. 16. Dezember bis 11. März 1984), Frankfurt a.M. 1983, 211-222; J.L. Biscop - J.P. Sodini, *Travaux à Qal'at Sem'an*, in *Actes du XI^{e} Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste 21-28 septembre 1986), Vatican City 1989, 1675-1695; H.C. Brennecke, *Wie man einen Heiligen politisch instrumentalisiert. Der Heilige Simeon Stylites und die Synode von Chalkedon*, in *Theologie und Kultur. Geschichten einer Wechselbeziehung. Festschrift zum einhundertfünfzigjährigen Bestehen des Lehrstuhls für Christliche Archäologie und Kirchliche Kunst an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Halle 1999, 237-261; M.L. Mancinelli, *Santuari rupestri nell'Italia meridionale e dinamica dei pellegrinaggi fra tarda antichità e alto medieovo: alcune riflessioni*: VetChr 30 (1993) 85-92.

Hierophantic Sanctuaries: G. Otranto, *Il* Liber de apparitione, *il santuario di San Michele sul Gargano e i Longobardi del Ducato di Benevento*, in *Santuari e politica nel mondo antico*, Milan 1983, 210-245; G. Otranto, *Il* regnum *longobardo e il santuario micaelico del Gargano. Note di epigrafia e storia*: VetChr 22 (1985) 165-180; G. Otranto, *Per una metodologia della ricerca*

storico-agiografica. Il santuario micaelico del Gargano tra Bizantini e Longobardi, in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*. Atti del Primo conv. dell'Ass. di studi tardoantichi (Napoli 16-18 ottobre 1987), Naples 1990, 121-141; G. Otranto - C. Carletti, *Il santuario di S. Michele Arcangelo sul Gargano dalle origini al X secolo*, Bari 1990; *Culto e insediamenti micaelici nell'Italia meridionale fra tarda antichità e medioevo*. Atti del convegno internazionale (Monte Sant'Angelo 18-21 novembre 1992), Bari 1994, 125-166; P. De Santis - D. Nuzzo, *Sepolture ad limina nel santuario di San Michele a Monte Sant'Angelo. Ultime indagini, 1999*: VetChr 38 (2001) 131-162; S. Franz, *L'architettura del santuario sul Monte S. Angelo a Terracina*, in *Religio. Santuari ed ex voto nel Lazio meridionale*. Atti della giornata di studio, Terracina 2004, 182-187; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *I monumenti paleocristiani della via Flaminia* (*territorio laziale*) *nelle più recenti ricerche archeologiche. Con un'appendice su S. Michele al VII miglio della via Salaria*, in *Domum tuam dilexi. Miscellanea in onore di Aldo Nestori*, Vatican City 1998, 338-349; M. Bianchini - F. Di Gennaro - M. Vitti, *Via Salaria. Basilica beati arcangeli in Septimo*, in *Ecclesiae urbis. Atti del congr. int. di studi sulle chiese di Roma, IV-X secolo* (Roma 4-10 settembre 2000), Vatican City 2002, 625-643.

Therapeutic Sanctuaries: C. D'Angela, *Cristianesimo e fruizione delle acque salutari nella tarda antichità. Alcune osservazioni sui centri termali in Italia*: VetChr 35 (1998) 69-77; G. Pross Gabrielli, *Il tempietto ipogeo del dio Mitra al Timavo*: Archeografo Triestino 35 (1975) 5-34; M. Mirabella Roberti, *La basilica paleocristiana di San Giovanni del Timavo*, in *Studi monfalconesi e duinati*. Atti della giornata di studio di Monfalcone (3 aprile 1976), Udine 1976, 63-75; E. Russo, *Su S. Salvatore di Spoleto e sul tempietto del Clitumno*: Acta ad Archeologiam et Artium Historiam Pertinentia 8 (1992) 87-143; A. Maldini, *Culto e popolamento antico alle sorgenti del Clitunno*, in *Città romane, 3. Città dell'Umbria*, Rome 2002, 121-165; C. Godoy Fernández - J.M. Gurt Esparraguera, *Un itinerario de peregrinaje para el culto martirial y veneración del agua bautismal en el complejo episcopal de Barcino*: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Abteilung Madrider 39 (1998) 323-335; L. Spera - E. Smiraglia, *Il cosiddetto battistero della catacomba di Priscilla a Roma: sistemazione monumentale e segni cultuali*, in *Atti dell'VIII Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana* (Genova - Sarzana - Albenga - Finale Ligure - Ventimiglia, 21-26 settembre 1998), Bordighera 2001, 975-1002.

L. Spera

SARACENS. The Greek term Σαρακηνοί was already used by the geographer Ptolemy; it seems to refer to peoples settled in the S of the Sinai Peninsula on the side of the Gulf of Aqaba. The term *Saracens*, generally speaking, corresponds to *Arabs*: they appear in classical literature as inhabitants both of the Arabian Peninsula and other areas in the Near East and are already mentioned in Syrian-Babylonian and *Persian texts.

In the OT the term *Arab* refers to "desert," "people of the desert" or a "nomad," which then acquired a more precise geographic connotation in later texts. In the most ancient books the Saracen peoples were called Ishmael (the son of *Hagar, who was considered the chief of many Saracen tribes) or Midian. The names of the sons of Cush, the son of Ham, in Genesis 10 corresponds to the Arab regions, among which was Sheba, whose queen visited *Solomon. The Midianites or Ishmaelites were also the merchants who acquired Joseph, who had been sold into slavery by his brothers. Nehemiah underwent the opposition of an Arab sheik, Geshem (Neh 2:19; 6:1); the Arabs became tributaries of King Jehoshaphat in 2 Chr 17:11; and in 2 Chr 21:16, the Arabs, perhaps the Nabataeans, are described as bordering on the Ethiopians. It is possible that other place names of the OT refer to Arab regions rather than Egyptian or Assyrian regions. During the time of the NT, the most important Saracen states in the S were those of Hadramut, the Sabaeans and the *Himyarites, who were defeated in the 6th c., shortly before the Arabs in the 7th c. were absorbed by the Islamic conquest. In the N were the kingdom of the Nabataeans, who were Saracens by race but who spoke Aramaic, not Arabic, and the kingdom of Hira, on the borders with Babylon, a vassal kingdom of the Persian *Sassanids, which was established in the 2nd c. AD and lasted until the Islamic conquest. Both in this kingdom and then even in the Arabic kingdom of Hassan, in lower *Syria, Christianity seems to have spread rapidly, with episcopal sees, churches and monasteries. Even the Arab Mesopotamian kingdom of Kindah, which originated in the 5th c., ended shortly after with the Islamic invasion. Many independent Saracen tribes were added to these kingdoms.

The Greek and Roman authors subdivided Arabia into the following categories: *Deserta*, *Felix* and *Petraea;* Tacitus referred to the subjects of *Abgar as *Arabes*, who in the 1st c. AD reigned over Osroene with its capital, *Edessa. According to the Syriac text the *Doctrine of Addai*, these Arabs converted to Christianity as early as the time of King Abgar due to the preaching of Thaddaeus/*Addai. If this piece of information is more than likely legendary, the presence of Christians, however, among the Arabs at the time of Abgar the Great, around the year 200, is attested by the historical records. It is likely, even though debated, that this ruler also converted to Christianity. Christianity seems to have arrived among the Arabs rather early, acc. to such ecclesiastical historians as *Eusebius, *Rufinus and *Socrates, but also *Origen and *Jerome. Their accounts, however, should be taken with a grain of salt because at times they confuse *Arabia with India and *Ethiopia. Nonetheless, Syriac authors and even the Arabs themselves confirm the arrival of Christianity among the Saracens, esp. in the N and in the SW of

Arabia. Paul himself, in Gal 1:17, attests to having gone to Arabia immediately after his conversion, and in Acts 2:11 we find some Arabs who practiced Judaism present at the *Pentecost sermon of *Peter at *Jerusalem. One should not rule out that the persecutions in the Roman Empire determined the flight of Christians toward the nearby Arab regions. Especially during the Syrian-Arabic kingdoms, Christianity seems to have arrived early. The Saracens of Hassan in NW Arabia were Syro-Arabs often subject to the control of the Romans, who defended them from the Sassanids. In the year 531, the Arab-Roman kingdom was established, which controlled all the Arabs of *Palestine, *Phoenicia, Syria and NW Arabia. The kingdom of *Palmyra was also Syro-Arabic, which became a Roman province after having been defeated by Lucius Domitius Aurelianus in 272. At times, even subsequent to the biblical and patristic age, the term *Saracen* acquired a more restricted meaning: in particular, in the Middle Ages it referred to the Arabs stationed on the coasts of North *Africa, esp. those opposite *Sicily, from which they completed numerous invasions. Both in antiquity and the Middle Ages, the predatory activities of some of the Saracen groups were well-known.

According to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VI,20), already during Origen's time, the bishop of Bostra, *Beryllus, was converted by him to orthodoxy from antitrinitarianism, and Origen was absolved from charges by an Arabian provincial synod. In 215, Origen went to Arabia upon the request of the Roman governor to explain his teachings; he returned there in the year 250 to refute the heresy acc. to which the soul dies with the body only to resurrect on the day of judgment (ibid., VI,19 and 39). In the beginning of the 4th c., Eusebius's *Onomasticon* and the *Acts* of the Council of *Nicaea (325) attest the presence of Christians among the Arabs. At Nicaea there were six bishops from the province of Arabia; others are attested by the Council of *Ephesus in 431, and at the Council of *Chalcedon "Eustathius, bishop of the Saracens" attended, who in 458 was still the bishop of *Damascus. Even at the Second Council of Ephesus in 449 a "bishop of the Arabs," Aussilaus, was present, and Anastasius bishop of Tiran Island was present at the Council of *Jerusalem in 536. The metropolitan of Bostra governed over twenty suffragan Arab bishops. Many of these Arab bishops in Late Antiquity, as in the case of the Syro-Westerners, embraced miaphysite teachings.

According to Rufinus (*HE* II,6), in the 4th c. the Arab queen Mavia made peace with the Romans through a pact that required the Egyptian monk *Moses (the Saracen) to be ordained bishop of his tribe. Because Moses refused to receive his ordination from the bishop of *Alexandria, who had been accused of *Arianism, the emperor *Valens accordingly recalled an orthodox monk from exile. The monks and the hermits of the Syro-Arabic desert certainly promoted the conversion of the Arab tribes to Christianity. *Jerome and *Theodoret attest the impression that the life and miracles of St. *Hilarion and *Simeon the Stylite made among the Bedouin Arabs, who converted various Arab tribes. Similarly, acc. to *Cyril of Scythopolis, the monk St. Euthymius converted an entire Arab tribe which, at the beginning of the 5th c., had passed over to *Palestine from the Euphrates. Therefore, in the 4th-6th c., many Saracens converted to Christianity, as also confirmed by epigraphy, and the Saracen Christian tribes seem to have been present in the area of Syria, Phoenicia and N Arabia; their local bishops generally depended on the *metropolitans of Jerusalem, Damascus and Tyre, and on the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch.

More to the E, the Mesopotamian area was also densely inhabited by Arab tribes, whose heads, from the 3rd c. AD onward, were generally subject to the Persians. The **Acts of Mar Mari* narrate the evangelization of these peoples by Mari, the disciple of Addai. The acts can also reflect later events at the end of the 1st c. to the beginning of the 2nd, but they seem to rest on historical evidence that has been carefully evaluated. Under the Sassanids, the deportations of Christians favored the planting of Christianity in Persia and even in the Mesopotamian areas subject to it, where many Saracens also lived; e.g., around AD 270, hundreds of Christians were deported from Syria and other Roman provinces into Mesopotamia (Babylon and Iraq). The *Acts* of the Persian martyrs, various Syriac documents, and the history of the church of *Persia and *Seleucia-Ctesiphon attest the spread of Christianity in these areas. This phenomenon also had an influence on the local Arab populations. The Arab king of Hira Nu'mân I, whose kingdom extended over the Arabs of Mesopotamia and into the Persian Gulf, around the year 400, protected his Christian subjects, while Sassanid rulers often persecuted them. Many of his subjects went to the Syro-Arab desert near Simeon the Stylite and converted to the Christian faith; the king himself ended his days engaged in a religious and ascetic life, even if his conversion to Christianity is not entirely certain. Other sovereigns of Hira, however, persecuted Christians, even through the influence of the Sassanids; the wife of one of these leaders, Hind, in the 6th c. established a monastery at Hira in which many Syro-Eastern patriarchs re-

sided and were buried, and her children were Christians. One of these children gave to numerous Arabs the example of his conversion to Christianity (Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* VI, 22). Even in the subsequent generations of these sovereigns one finds the presence of various Christian men and women, until the Islamic invasion. The *Acts* of the councils of 410, 430, 485, 499 and 588 attest the presence of the bishops "of Hira of the Arabs," the most noteworthy of whom were "George, bishop of the Arabs" (ca. 686–724).

In N Arabia, acc. to Eusebius, Rufinus and Theodoret, *Arabia Felix*, or Yemen, was evangelized by the apostle *Bartholomew, who, as tradition maintained, was also the evangelist of India, where he brought the gospel of *Matthew written in Semitic, which was found at that time by *Pantaenus, the teacher of *Clement of Alexandria, who also went to India in the 2nd c. (According to some, this reference to India should actually be understood as Ethiopia, but it is not certain.) Even the Indian mission of a Meropius, *Frumentius and Edesius, which was mentioned by Eusebius, Rufinus and Theodoret, acc. to some, should be taken to refer to *Arabia Felix*, even if it is not certain that it was India, or that one could understand that they went to India and during the return passed through N Arabia or through Ethiopia, where Frumentius remained and was subsequently ordained by *Athanasius of Alexandria. Around the year 356, Bishop *Theophilus was sent by the Roman emperor *Constantius as an ambassador among the *Himyarites, where he requested and obtained freedom of religion for his subjects, esp. the Christians. The Himyarite sovereign ordered the building of three large churches, and perhaps Theophilus exerted *Arian influence over local Christians, who lived among a large Jewish and *pagan population. The Arab historians themselves and the first biographers of *Muhammad attest the spread of Christianity at Hira, among the Himyarites and among other N and S Arab tribes between the 4th and 5th c., even if many stories contain legendary elements. According to the Arab historian Ibn Khaldun, as early as the 2nd half of the 3rd c. Abd-Kelal, the son of a Himyarite king, was converted to Christianity by a Syrian monk, but upon being discovered he was killed by his people. According to the church historian *John Diacrinomenos (PG 86,212), at the time of the emperor *Anastasius (491–518), the Himyarites, who had adhered to *Judaism since the time of the queen of Sheba, converted to Christianity and had Silvanus as their bishop, the uncle of John himself. The first biographer of Muhammad, Ibn Ishaq, attests that the first preacher of Christianity in Yemen was a Syrian named Phemion, who along with a certain Saliah—perhaps Silvanus himself—and Mark—was captured by an Arab caravan and sold to a local leader. One of his converts then evangelized the city of *Najran. In the 6th c., Christianity thrived among the Himyarites, who were subject to Abyssinian rule, at the time of Dhu Nuwas, a leader of the Jewish religion who persecuted Christians but was then defeated by the Abyssinian king, a Christian, who promoted the reconstruction of the churches and the reestablishment of Christianity in those lands. *Judaism was very widespread among the Saracens of S Arabia. A Christian successor of Dhu Nuwas, in the 1st half of the 6th c., Abram, under whom Christianity flourished in S Arabia, paid tribute to an Abyssinian king and lived in peace with the Arab tribes and was a friend of Bishop *Gregentius. He came into conflict, however, with some Arab tribes who controlled the pagan pilgrimages to the Kaaba, whose guardian at the time seems to have been the grandfather of Muhammad. Abram was defeated by these Arabs and died shortly thereafter. Under the kingdom of his two sons, in 568, a Persian invasion brought an end to the Christian dynasty of Abyssinia, namely the kingdom of Abram, in whose place a prince was established, who, with the help of the Persian king *Chosroes, defeated and put to flight the Abyssinians from Himyar, many of whom were Christians.

Various Persian governors came after him. Even Muhammad visited the church of Sana'a, the construction of which was ordered by the aforementioned Abram, and listened to the sermons of its bishop, even if under Omar, in the 7th c., the Christians of Najran were forced to convert to Islam or face exile. Many migrated to Hira, on the Euphrates River, where in the 8th c. the Syro-Eastern patriarch *Timothy I endowed them with a bishop, churches and ecclesiastical schools. Traces of Christian thought are still visible even in the Qur'an; the adopted son of Muhammad himself had Christian relatives; Arabic poetry before the Islamic conquest and immediately after is full of allusions to Christian ideas and customs. At Medina, acc. to the tradition, Muhammad received numerous delegations from Christian tribes, and in general he treated the Arab Christians better than he seems to have done with the Jews and, even more, with the pagans (who had the option of either embracing Islam or facing death). If the Christians paid tribute, it guaranteed peace and respect for their clergy, monks and sacred places. It was under the second successor of Muhammad, Omar, that the Christians were treated

with such greater harshness that many abandoned their religion for Islam and the number of Christians in Arabia dwindled, even though Christians who paid the tribute continued to reside there and maintained their faith, and Syro-Eastern and Syro-Western "bishops of the Arabs" continue to be attested there; among them there was a bishop of Sana'a, Yemen and Bahrein, acc. to Bar Hebraeus (*Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* I,303; III,123, 193) and Thomas of Marga (*Book of the Governors* II,448ff., ed. Budge). According to these historians, under the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs Christianity was partly respected in the Islamic empire, and many patriarchs of the Syro-Western and Syro-Eastern churches—i.e., of the so-called *monophysites and *Nestorian churches—received certificates and statements of recognition from Muhammad and his successors.

Christianity among the Saracens, which seems to have presented various "heresies," esp. the *Arian and the so-called monophysites and Nestorian heresies, disappeared rather early after the Islamic conquest and without having left many literary traces; it seems, esp., that translations of the *Bible or parts of it in Arabic dating back to the pre-Islamic era have not survived, as is also the case with their prayer books or other works produced by their religious leaders or their monks. At the time, the ecclesiastical language of the areas inhabited by the Christianized Arabs was Syrian, Western or Eastern, and it is probable that even their sacred books were in *Syriac. After the Islamic conquest, the acquisition of the Arabic language by the Christians who remained in the East—who retained Greek or Syriac as the liturgical language—led to the flourishing of the so-called Christian Arabic literature, a category whose legitimacy has been called into question but which is worthy of further study.

B. Luppi, *I Saraceni in Provenza, in Liguria e nelle Alpi occidentali*, Bordighera 1983; R. Panetta, *I Saraceni in Italia*, Milan 1973, [2]1998; D.F. Graf, *Rome and the Arabian Frontiers: From the Nabataeans to the Saracens*, Aldershot 1997; I. Ramelli, *Edessa e i Romani tra Augusto e i Severi*: Aevum 73 (1999) 107-143; Id., *Note sulle origini del Cristianesimo in India: la missione di Panteno*: SCO 47 (2000) 363-378; Id. - I. Dognini, *Gli Apostoli in India*, Milan 2001; D.H. Strickland, *Saracens, Demons and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art*, Princeton-Oxford 2003; I. Ramelli, *Abgar Ukkama e Abgar il Grande alla luce di recenti apporti storiografici*: Aevum 78 (2004) 103-108; Id., *The First Evangelization of the Mesopotamian Regions in the Syriac Tradition*: Antiguo Oriente 3 (2005) 11-54; Id., *Possible Historical Traces in the Doctrina Addai?*: Hugoye 9 (2006) §§ 1-24; *Literatura árabe cristiana*, ed. M. Abumalham, Madrid 2001: ibid. esp. K. Samir, SJ, *La littérature arabe médiévale des chrétiens*, 21-49; I. Ramelli, *Atti di Mar Mari*, Brescia 2007.

I. Ramelli

SARAGOSSA. The ancient city Salduba of the Cantabri was destroyed by the Romans in 45 BC and reconstructed with the name Caesaraugusta. In 24 BC, it became an important center as a *conventus iuridicus* for the Roman province of *Tarraconensis. Felix, its first known bishop, dates back to the time of *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ep.* 67, 6). According to *Prudentius (*Persist.* IV,81-84), the Christian community of the city suffered heavily from the *Diocletian persecution. At the Council of *Elvira (300–302), the city was represented by its bishop Valerius, at that of *Arles (314) by the presbyter Clement, and at that of *Serdica (ca. 343) by Castus; in 458 it intervened against the uncanonical judicial proceedings of Silvanus, bishop of Calahorra. Among its great bishops, one should note the following: *Braulio (631–651) and *Taio, the successors of *Maximus (592–619) and *John II (619–631). The city was the site for three councils.

380. Twelve bishops of various Spanish provinces and some from Aquitania were present. Along with other matters its eight canons were concerned with punishing *Priscillianist practices, but without condemning the leaders who refused to attend because Pope *Damasus had decided not to condemn anyone who was absent. That notwithstanding, *Sulpicius Severus and the First Council of *Toledo allude to the condemnation of some of the absent bishops.

592. A provincial council which was presided over by the metropolitan Artemius of *Tarragona. Eleven bishops and two delegates were present. Its objective was to resolve some problems pertaining to the lower clergy that had arisen with the *conversion of the *Visigoths to *Catholicism. The authenticity of relics and the possibility for the *Arian *clergy to become part of the Catholic clergy after a new *ordination was also taken into consideration.

691. Provincial council. As a result of the lack of the signatures on the *Acts*, the number of participants is not known. It promulgated five canons on church discipline.

Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 101-104; 145-146; S. Aznar Tello, *Los obispos de la sede cesaraugustana en la España visigoda del s. VII*, Centro Regional de Estudios Teológicos, Zaragoza 1984; Vives, *Concilios*, 16-18; 159-160; 475-481; Martínez Díez, *Hispana*, 296 (I); Orlandís, *Concilios*, 68-80 (I); 235-241 (II); 467-474 (III); B. Vollmann, *Priscillianus*: PW, suppl. XIV, Munich 1974, 498-502; 546-551; *I Concilio Caesaraugustano*, MDC anniversario, Zaragoza 1981 (Actas del Congreso conmemorativo); M.V. Escribano, *El Concilio I de Caesaraugusta*: Rev. Aragonesa de Teología 5 (1997) 37-52.

P. de Luis

SARCOPHAGI, Early Christian. This entry regards as early Christian the sarcophagi that were decorated

with motifs or themes pertaining to Christianity. Many sarcophagi from the 3rd and 4th c. preserve such themes and motifs, which come from the Roman shops: the most ancient were built in shops that primarily produced pagan sarcophagi. Among the frequent pagan themes in the 3rd c. were those of philosophers and bucolic scenes, as well as figures of the *orantes* and shepherds. The first Christian sarcophagi appeared toward the mid-3rd c. and present, alongside some biblical scenes, the aforementioned pagan themes which, however, were acceptable for Christians and amenable to a new interpretation that was specifically Christian. On the sarcophagus of S. Maria Antiqua (Rep 747), joined to the *orans*, the shepherd and the philosopher, are the scenes of *Jonah and the *baptism of Jesus Christ; on that of Baebia Hertofile (Rep 778), a scene of Jonah and a banquet is found on the lid, as well as a pastoral scene on the strigilated front; and on that of the Via della Lungara (Rep 777) are found the *orans*, the fishermen and the shepherd on the strigilated front, and the baptism of Jesus Christ on one side.

Christian motifs gradually acquired greater importance toward the end of the 3rd c. as attested by the decorated slab of the Capitoline Museum (Rep 811) with the reader-philosopher and the resurrection of Lazarus; the Velletri sarcophagus (Ws IV, 3), the front of which, dominated by the large figures of an *orans* and two shepherds, also contains small biblical scenes. With the passing of the 3rd-4th c., this tendency was stabilized and attention was gradually fixed on symbols and scenes that served to express the Christian hope in the afterlife, focusing esp. on the hero who makes possible such hope, i.e., Jesus Christ, and his beneficent actions. Starting esp. from the edicts of tolerance of Christianity, the number of sarcophagi noticeably increased.

The production of sarcophagi in relief with Christian themes and subjects is a typical phenomenon of Roman society and, as such, was inextricably tied to the rich production of pagan sarcophagi, which, starting from the age of Trajan, characterized Roman sculptural art. It was precisely on the basis of such models that early Christian production developed, which acquired and developed typologies, structures and decorations of the preceding production to continue to respond to a particular demand of Roman funerary culture.

Even in Christian culture, the funerary use of sarcophagi represented was significant, both with respect to the social aspect and with respect to economics. Funerary typology, however, in early Christian culture assumed a lightly diversified role, whether it was at a purely functional level or within a highly decorative repertory. The sarcophagi, in fact, were not always used in the early Christian necropolis in a canonical way. For example, they were sometimes buried either in a first burial or in cases of reuse, but in either instance hiding the figured reliefs, which seem to be, for this reason, an exclusive provision for the deceased rather than directed toward the observers.

The practice of the burial should not be considered an exceptional phenomenon, since monuments of some historical-artistic significance, such as the sarcophagus of Adelphia at St. John of Syracuse (Rep II,20) and the sarcophagus of Lot (Rep I,188), found in the complex of St. *Sebastian, were discovered completely buried. The sarcophagus of Lot, among other things, represents one of the most significant examples from the point of view of the techniques used for production inasmuch as some scenes appear at the state of an "outline" while others are perfectly polished and other are still entirely covered with colors.

Sepulchral Seats. As to what holds for the tectonics, of the two chief typologies in use in the pagan tradition, i.e., that of the basin (ληνός) and that of the box, the latter was preferably adopted, although the role of the decorative apparatus appears rather diversified. As early as the last decades of the 2nd c. one can identify an accentuated diminution of mythological themes and the advent of the new themes that better express the diverse imagination of the society of the new century. Starting from the 3rd c. onward, then, increasingly personalized themes are attested that refer to the life, to the actual or presumed public career, and to the aspirations, ideals and imagination of the deceased person's subsequent existence. Battle scenes, hunting scenes, marriages, social clients or figures of philosophers, literate people, images of country life, personifications of the seasons, or entire bucolic and marine scenes represent the deceased's virtues.

If these images, already on account of their themes, referred to the deceased, their ideals and their aspirations both for earthly life and for a possible existence after death, numerous portraits generously distributed on the figures of philosophers, musicians, *orantes* and the shepherds on the sarcophagi of this period emphasize the personalized meaning of these representations and reveal a growing preoccupation of individuals for their way of life, happiness, the fulfillment of their existence and personal destiny.

In such cultural conditions, around the mid-3rd c. AD, are placed the first group of Christian sarcophagi, which fit naturally within the philosophi-

cal, maritime and bucolic-shepherd vein to which the pagan production had arrived, but the themes of which were now diminishing and becoming completely Christian. There are a few examples of sarcophagi that previous scholarship referred to as "crypto-Christian," thereby moving the date of the birth of Christian sculpture back to the end of the 3rd c., which are now preferably referred to as "paradisiacal," emphasizing rather the heavenly context in which they convey the figurative matter.

On the basis of the location of discovery of one of the most significant exemplars of this class of sarcophagi, the sarcophagus of the Via Salaria (Lat. 181), it has been hypothesized that in this area there existed a shop, which was active between the years AD 240–268, and served the needs of the local and wealthy Christian clientele. To the same manufacturer, moreover, have been attributed the sarcophagi of Lungara (Ws 19,6), La Gayolle (Ws 1,3) and Basilea, in which the ancient association is maintained between the four allegorical figures (the *orans*, the good shepherd, the fisherman and the philosopher), respectively alluding to the concepts of *pietas*, philanthropy, *navigatio vitae* and wisdom, among which was instituted an entirely new conceptual nexus, which suggests the evolution of an iconographic language that has evolved into a Christian meaning.

Thus the first images of the OT and the NT, which were initially limited to a few representations such as the story of *Jonah and the baptism of Christ, were significantly inserted into the bucolic context and into the representations of a life devoted to philosophy and reading, symbols of a happy existence, serene and full of peace. Toward the end of the 3rd c., this gradual abandonment of neutral themes in favor of Christian scenes, which were likewise new and inserted into a more complex syntax, appears to be complete, as demonstrated by a series of sarcophagi "in large pastoral scenes," upon which the bucolic material unfolds to embody the ideal of *felicitas*, climaxing in the Vatican Jonah sarcophagus (*Rep* I, 7), which organizes the front of the sarcophagus into two registers, inserting alongside the predominant salvific cycle two scenes from the apocryphal *Acts of Peter*: the episode of the miracle of the fountain and the scene of the arrest.

The tetrachic period (284–313) recorded important innovations both in iconography, preferring scenes of new pregnancy to bucolic themes, and in composition: the front space is organized in two registers in which the succession of scenes occurs seamlessly as in the continuous frieze. Evidence of this trend comes in two polychrome plates from the National Museum of Rome (*Rep.* I, 773), belonging to a single face of a sarcophagus which, in two registers, displays a decoration inspired exclusively from the NT and dominated by the central scene of the *Sermon on the Mount, with Christ dressed like a cynic philosopher and no longer presented under the appearance of the Good *Shepherd.

An intense production of Christian sarcophagi, which continued the production and the use of Roman sarcophagi from the imperial era and which were decorated in an entirely new and revolutionary way with reliefs entirely filled with Christian themes, begins, therefore, only under the reign of *Constantine and after the *edict of Milan (313). As in the case of the others already mentioned, even this phenomenon of the production of sarcophagi from the imperial era, which denotes a marked change of sepulchral uses, was closely tied and favored by the social situation of that time. The mass conversions and the new role the Christian community assumed in society were without a doubt at the origins of this massive production of sarcophagi, some being important exemplars and richly decorated with figured reliefs, which could even satisfy the desires and the necessities of social representations of prestige.

The figure of Christ plays a central role that characterizes the era of Constantine, jointly with other important new elements. Stylistically, the human figure tended to reacquire a plastic quality, the themes multiplying within increasingly dense and developed spaces. With the advent of religious peace, christological subjects prevailed, modeling the iconography of the heavenly sovereign and the apostolic college on the basis and in contrast to that of the emperor and his court, although the different physiognomy used of the princes of the apostles continued to solidify, and the primacy of Peter was codified in the scenes of the handing down (*traditio*) of the law or the keys.

Within the prolific Constantinian production, which was by that point destined to overcome the boundaries of urban clients, the sarcophagus of the Museo Pio Cristiano called the "dogmatic sarcophagus" draws attention to this facet (340; *Rep* I,43) for the uniqueness of the concepts of faith illustrated and interpreted in an exclusively symbolic key. Among the scenes expressed on a double register, one should note the creation of Eve through the work of the *Trinity (which is recognized in a ternary group that all look the same), which addresses the need to reinforce this dogma of faith in an era marked by schisms and heresies.

Around the mid-4th c., the sculptural production of the city of Rome witnessed its most signifi-

cant flourishing. Among the most significant examples, one could mention the sarcophagus of the Museo Pio Cristiano called "the sarcophagus of the two brothers" (*Rep* I,45), on which the multiplicity of the scenes taken from the OT and the NT are organized on two registers, at the center of which the male images contained on the wing of the shell show clear signs of an intervention, correcting the original married couple. The apex of Christian sculpture of the period is represented, however, by the well-known sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, which was intended for the prefect of the city of Rome, who had passed away in the year 359, and was preserved in the Museum of the Sacristy of St. Peter in the Vatican (*Rep* I,680). The exemplar, which is representative of the so-called beautiful style, presents a façade with a double register articulated on two orders of columns, which were initially conceived on analogous models from basilicas and intended to frame the different scenes of a clear interpretation, among which one notes the centrality of those christological scenes. The exceptional tectonics of the sarcophagus is explained by typological research, which during the 2nd half of the 4th c. was defined by systematic recourse to trees, columns and shelled niches through the articulation of the front and the subdivision of scenes. Thematically, the inclusion of episodes illustrating the passion of Jesus or the martyrdom of Peter and Paul characterizes the group of sarcophagi "of the passion" or "of the *anastasis*." The latter are so named by the symbolic representation of the resurrection, which are epitomized by the two soldiers sleeping at the feet of a crown enclosing the Christogram and supported by a cross.

Although during the Constantinian era, until midway through the century, the reliefs on the sarcophagi were arranged, as we have seen, by individual scenes, primarily those of the miracles of Christ, with a clear soteriological meaning; in the 2nd half of the century, however, new compositions dominate which represent apocalyptic themes, acc. to different variants and which are made acc. to an individual theme and are of a broad inspiration. These new representations, such as the scenes of the passion of Christ and the apostles *Peter and *Paul, the apostolic college, the *traditio legis* in the presence of the apostles, and the acclamation of the twelve apostles at the apocalyptic cross, show an evident mark of monumental art. If the monumental sarcophagi, dating to the end of the century, like the sarcophagus of Tolentinus of *Flavius Iulius Catervius* (*Rep* II,148), former *praefectus praetorio*, and the large sarcophagus in the basilica of St. Ambrose at *Milan (*Rep* II,150), probably commissioned by a dignitary of the Milanese court, are monumental sepulchers of great prestige and noteworthy formal quality, the smaller sarcophagi display, on the contrary, a far inferior design of markedly poor style. The sarcophagus containing columns with the apostles, now preserved in three fragments at the Vatican Museum, the Museum of St. Sebastian and the Museum of Krakow, and another with apostles acclaiming in the cloister of St. Paul Outside the Walls are characteristic examples of this Roman production at the turn of the 4th and 5th c. (*Rep* I,208).

The last great productive phase of the Roman shops, which can be restricted to the era of *Theodosius and *Honorius (380–420), was inspired by a fervid climate of iconographic and stylistic innovations, which can be seen in the progressive abstraction of the material and in the evident reduction and the choice of the themes to be portrayed, which is resolved in the adoption of a repertory dominated by *theophany-based images. They were sarcophagi intended for a clientele of noteworthy Romans and Italians and are ascribable to refined and even diversified groups. Thus, while the theophany-based theme is emphasized by the tectonics of the sarcophagi "at the doors of the city," symbolically alluding to the *civitas Dei*, "those of Bethesda" exclusively select NT events, while the event of the crossing of the Red Sea connotes the imposing megalography of a group of sarcophagi. Other examples referred to as "with stars and crowns" recover the symbolic hinge of the sarcophagus of the *anastasis* and introduce theories of crowned saints converging on the cross under the starry firmament. The hieratic character of personages and the courtly character of the composition proclaim its close dependency on contemporary imperial ceremonies of the court and, at the same time, manifest the implementation of that process of osmosis between the funerary model and the worship buildings that anticipated the great era of Ravenna mosaics. An eloquent example of this new tendency can be perceived in the decoration of the sarcophagus in the Capitoline Museums, which shows a type of sarcophagus in the form of a chest of drawers with a decoration of crosses and stars on the front and on the shorts sides (*Rep* I,813). This ornamentation lent itself to a comparison with the mosaics of the dome of the mausoleum of Galla Placida and with the lids from the Ravenna sarcophagi with a symbolic decoration. The accurate and precise form of the crosses and stars, as well as the profile of the crown, suggest a dating to the second quarter or the mid-5th c. A comparison of the decoration of the monuments in Ravenna with those of the sarcophagi in Rome, which were in overt formal dependence on Constan-

tinopolitan models, as well as the type characteristic of Eastern sarcophagi, bear witness during this period to the prevailing influence of Eastern production with respect to structural and formal aspects.

Finally, it should be noted that the production of sarcophagi at Rome noticeably diminished after the year 400 and finished toward the first third of the 5th c. After this date we find the use of sarcophagi decorated primarily at Ravenna and only rarely in other regions of *Italy. The typology, structure and form of the decoration of the sarcophagi outside the Roman context show, however, the typical characteristics of the production of Anatolian and Constantinopolitan sarcophagi.

In the new capital Constantinople, the use and the manufacturing of decorated sarcophagi with figured reliefs extended to the 6th c. with exemplars of even higher quality such as the so-called Sarcophagus of the Prince; an analogous situation can be found at *Ravenna. After the transfer of the capital from the Western part of the empire in the year 402 to the Adriatic city, the use of sarcophagi with figured reliefs is recorded at least for a large part of the 5th c., showing a symbolic decoration until the 6th c. and onward. The Ravenna sarcophagi with reliefs—in all likelihood the majority from local shops but heavily influenced in structure, iconography and style by Constantinopolitan models—are datable, even if they lack external indications, not much beyond the mid-5th c. The use and the production at Ravenna of prestigious sarcophagi with figured reliefs, therefore, seem closely connected to the presence of the imperial court.

Finally, one must take into consideration the important group of Christian sarcophagi of S *Gaul. Places of privileged production turn out to be *Marseille and *Arles, an imperial residence in the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c. and from the year 396, in place of *Trier, the seat of the *praefectura galliarum*. A large number of Christian sarcophagi with reliefs is therefore to be traced back to the presence of influential persons in the history and culture of this region. The majority of these sarcophagi were in all likelihood imported from Rome, as shown by the structure, iconography and style of the figured relief; others, however, were certainly produced in local shops acc. to Roman models and perhaps by Roman workmen. This heavy dependence of the Gallic market on Roman production made it such that with the end of the production in the capital in the first decades of this century, even in Gaul one finds a heavy shrinkage of the presence of sarcophagi with reliefs generally and primarily of those of the Roman type. A new center, however, developed at Marseille in the first decades of the 5th c. through a new, even though very limited, local production. The pillared sarcophagi of Marseille, with an *orans* at the center, the apostles and the family of the deceased person, is considered one of the first of this type in the mannerist style of the figures comparable to the Roman sarcophagi of the late Theodosian period. To the same era we can assign a fragmentary sarcophagus of Marseille with a dominant symbolic decoration on the cover at the center of the box and two scenes of the miracles of Christ on the sides of the front. Probably sarcophagi imported from *Constantinople to Marseille and now lost inspired the characteristic details of some of the boxes of local production which were so different from the last Roman products. One front of a sarcophagus of Proconnesian marble in the church of St. Trophyme at *Arles (*Rep* III,120), in fact, attests the importance of the sarcophagus from Marseille, as one can see in the exceptionally large slab with Christ in the arched center and the apostles Peter and Paul in those on the sides of the front, where one can perceive clear structural traces and esp. the particulars of the style and the manufacturing that was characteristic of Constantinopolitan production.

Even a very limited number of local sarcophagi in *Spain, inferior in quality and difficult to date but nevertheless assignable to the Theodosian period of the 5th c., reflect the structure of the boxes, the composition of the relief figures and iconography characteristic of Constantinopolitan sarcophagi, which were probably imported for a chosen clientele of officials and members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. On such models, a local production developed esp. at *Tarragona, where we find the only shop of early Christian sarcophagi known in Spain. The first sarcophagi were imported from Carthage, as seen, e.g., in the strigilated front of the two *orantes* (Schlunk, *Tarragona*, 29-32). Subsequently, some artisans from *Carthage must have transferred to Tarragona. Frequently, the façade is decorated with fields of lines (Schlunk, *Tarragona*, 34-36). There are some sarcophagi that also present figures of the apostles or scenes, such as that of Abraham and Moses receiving the law (Schlunk, *Tarragona*, 1-2). The center of local production with Greek influence, perhaps through Africa, was documented at Bureba (Burgos), as well as a school tradition, likewise of Greek origin, in a broad Andalusian area, which encompasses Cordoba, Écija, Alcaudete and Antequere (Schlunk, *Sarcófagos*).

J. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*, I-III, Vatican City 1929-1936; F. Gerke, *Die christlichen Sarkophage der vorkonstantinischen Zeit*, Berlin 1940; J. Kollwitz, *Oströmische Plastik der*

theodosianischen Zeit, Berlin 1941; F. Gerke, *Christus in der spätantiken Plastik*, Mainz ²1948; F. Benoit, *Sarcophages paléochrétiens d'Arles et de Marseille*, Paris 1954; G. de Francovich, *Studi sulla scultura Ravennate I. I sarcofagi*: FR 26/27 (1958); D. Talbot Rice - M. Hirmer, *Kunst aus Byzanz*, Munich 1959; H. Fournet-Pilipenko, *Sarcophages romains de Tunisie*: Karthago 11 (1961) 77-166; G. Bovini, *Sarcofagi costantinopolitani dei secoli IV, V e VI d.C.*: CCAB 9 (1962) 179-192; B. Briesenick, *Typologie und Chronologie der südwest-gallischen Sarkophage*: JRGZ Mainz 9 (1962) 76-182; Th. Klauser, *Frühchristliche Sarkophage in Bild und Wort*, Olten 1966; F.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage.* I. *Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967; F.W. Deichmann, *Konstantinopler und ravennatische Sarkophag-Probleme*: ByzZ 62 (1969) 291-307; H. Schlunk, *Sarcófagos paleo-cristianos labrados en Hispania*, Act. VIII CongIntArq-Crist, Barcelona 1972, 187-218; J. Dresken Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarcophage.* II. *Italien mit einem Nachtrag Rom und Ostia, Dalmatien, Museen der Welt*, Mainz a.R. 1998; G. Koch, *Frühchristliche Sarkophage*, Munich 2000; *Akten des Symposiums "Frühchristliche Sarkophage" - Marburg, 1999*, ed. G. Koch, Mainz 2002; B. Christen-Briesenick, *Repertorium der christlichantiken Sarkophage III. Frankreich, Algerien, Tunesien*, Mainz 2003; *Sarcofagi tardoantichi, paleocristiani e altomedievali*, Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana, École Française de Rome, 8 maggio 2002, ed. F. Bisconti - H. Brandenburg (Monumenti di Antichità Cristiana 18), Vatican City 2004.

M. SOTOMAYOR - B. MAZZEI

SARDICA. *See* SERDICA

SARDINIA. Sardinia and Corsica made up a single Roman province, it seems, until the time of the emperor *Diocletian, when they were divided into two provinces and joined to the Italian diocese. Throughout the entire imperial Roman period, Sardinia enjoyed peace; it was one of the granaries of *Rome until the *Vandal occupation, when the Sardinian supplies were seized, creating great difficulties for the city of Rome, as noted by *Salvian of Marseille: *abscissis velut vitalibus venis* (*De guber*. 12: PL 53,121). It was a province of large private and imperial estates.

According to the *Liber pontificalis* the emperor *Constantine at the time of Pope *Sylvester donated some of the properties of Sardinia to the church of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus of Rome (LP 1, 183). The Roman church maintained these properties for a long time. It was a place of deportation (see Tacitus, *Annal.* II,85). Even some Christians were deported there: e.g., Pope *Callistus at the time of the emperor *Commodus (d. 192), Pope *Pontian and the priest *Hippolytus of Rome. *Passiones* and *legendae* speak of the deportations that occurred at the time of the *Diocletian persecution (303–305). The following martyrs from Sardinia drew much attention: Gavinus, Luxorius, Simplicius, Saturnus, Antiochus and Ephisius.

In 455 Sardinia came under the rule of the Vandals headed by *Genseric and in 533 under that of the Byzantine emperor *Justinian. The literary sources only provide us a little information on Christianity in Sardinia for the entire ancient and early medieval period; archaeological remains are much more numerous (*see* *Italy). The first historically verified bishop was *Quintasius of Carales (Cagliari), who was present at the Council of *Arles (314). There were perhaps only two episcopal sees at the time of the Council of *Serdica (343). Because there was an intense amount of commercial traffic between Sardinia and Rome and Sardinia and *Carthage, Christianity arrived there from one of these major cities. The most illustrious bishop was *Lucifer of Cagliari, whom *Athanasius of Alexandria referred to as the *Sardiniae metropolis episcopus* (PG 25, 650 and 731) with *Eusebius of Vercelli, a native of Sardinia. A few popes were natives of Sardinia: *Hilary (461–468) and *Symmachus (498–514). To obtain information about other episcopal sees we have to come to the year 484, when some Sardinian bishops participated at the Council of Carthage, which was called by the Vandal king *Huneric: Lucifer of Cagliari, Martinian of Forum Traiani (Fordongianus), Vitalis of Sulci (St. Antiochus), Felix of Turris Libisonis (Porto Torres) and Boniface of Senafer (Cornus?) (*Victor of Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr. prov.*: MGH, *Auct. ant.* 3,71). Only five of nearly 360 bishops were present. With the Vandal king Genseric, Huneric (484) and Thrasamund we have numerous pieces of information concerning the deportations of Christians from *Africa into Sardinia; among those we find *Fulgentius of Ruspe (467–533), who brought with him the remains of St. *Augustine and also established there a monastery in the environs of Cagliari. One of his letters to the bishop of Tarros survives to this day. Carales was the metropolitan see from the period of Vandal rule; first it relied on Rome. At the time of *Gregory the Great, the metropolitan was Quintasius. Byzantine Sulci was an important commercial center; in the 7th c., its bishop Euthalius participated at the christological debate between *monothelites and diathelites. At the time of Gregory the Great there were seven dioceses (not all have yet been identified), but the island was still full of *paganism. For this reason the pope sent two missionaries there, Felix and Cyriacus. He wrote the following on this matter: "From the information provided from Bishop Felix, my brother, and my son Cyriacus, a monk, I learned that the farmers among you all spread around in your lands are given over to idolatry" (*Ep.* IV,23). The same was also the case for the workers on the church's estates (*Ep.* IV,26).

Widespread paganism on the island, he believed, was caused by the clergy's indifference (*Ep.* V,38; IX,204). For this reason, Gregory did not tire of prodding Gennaro, the bishop of Cagliari, to whom he sent more than twenty letters. Pope Gregory's efforts did not take long to come to fruition (*Ep.* V,38). Moreover, the Roman Church possessed many estates in Sardinia, which were entrusted to the care of a **defensor ecclesiae* (*Ep.* IX,203; XIV,2). During this period the Sardinian church was closely connected with the Roman Church, but when the island passed to Byzantine rule, this led to definite influences from the Greek Church in the customs, forms and content of Christian worship, and therefore to a certain autonomy with respect to Rome, at least after Gregory the Great (with respect to the archaeology—*see* Italy). Bishop Boethius of Cornus was present at the Lateran Council (649).

DACL 15, 888-899; CE 12, 1087-1088; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII* (*an. 604*), Faenza 1927, 656-679; F. Cherchi Papa, *La repubblica teocratica sarda nell'Alto Medioevo*, Cagliari 1971; C. Bellieni, *La Sardegna e i sardi nella civiltà dell'Alto Medioevo*, I-II, Cagliari 1973; P. Meloni, *La Sardegna romana*, Sassari 1975, [2]1990; *Sardegna centro orientale dal neolitico alla fine del mondo antico*, ed. F. Lo Schiavo, Sassari 1978; A. Boscolo, *La Sardegna bizantina e alto giudicale*, Sassari 1978; Id., *La Sardegna dei giudicati*, Sassari 1979; E. Cau, *Fulgenzio e la cultura scritta in Sardegna agli inizi del VI secolo*: Sandalion 2 (1979) 221-229; T. Pinna, *Gregorio Magno e la Sardegna*, Sassari 1989; L. Porru et al., *Sant'Antioco: le catacombe, la chiesa martyrium, i frammenti scultorei*, Cagliari 1989; A.F. Spada, *Storia della Sardegna cristiana e dei suoi Santi*, 1, *Il primo millennio*, Oristano 1994; R. Turtas, *La diocesi di Sulci tra il V e il XIII secolo*: Sandalion 18 (1995) 147-170; A.M. Corda, *Le iscrizioni cristiane della Sardegna anteriori al VII sec.*, Vatican City 1999; R. Turtas, *Storia della chiesa in Sardegna: dalle origini al Duemila*, Rome 1999; *La Sardegna paleocristiana tra Eusebio e Gregorio Magno*, ed. A. Mastino *et al.*, Cagliari 1999; *Il papato di san Simmaco* (*498-514*), ed. G. Mele - N. Spaccapelo, Cagliari 2000; S. Cisci, *Il culto dei martiri sardi in Sardegna in età tardoantica e altomedioevale attraverso le testimonianze storiche e archeologiche*: RivAC 77 (2001) 371-406; R. Zucca, *Insulae Sardiniae et Corsicae: le isole minori della Sardegna e della Corsica nell'antichità*, Rome 2003.

A. Di Berardino

SASSANIDS. The Iranian dynasty which reigned in *Persia from the 3rd c. AD to ca. 640, when it fell into the hands of the Arabs. The Sassanids were always a thorn in the side of the Roman Empire, esp. when in 260, *Shapur I defeated and imprisoned the emperor *Valerian. The subsequent deportation of Christians from *Syria favored the spread of Christianity within the Iranian Empire. Christians were always looked on with mistrust because of their attachment to the Roman Empire, which became stronger esp. after the peace of *Constantine. Their sympathy drew a violent reaction from Shapur II, who began a persecution (339–340), which primarily aimed to strike the ecclesiastical hierarchy: three bishops of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon were subsequently martyred, and the episcopal see remained vacant for 40 years (348–388). Yazdegerd (399–420), the son of Shapur II, proved, however, to be more tolerant toward Christians, so much so that *Maruta of Maiferqat was able to gather in 410 a *council of around 40 bishops at Seleucia, in which they approved the decisions of the Council of *Nicaea and reestablished the Persian church.

DNP 11, 89-98; J.M. Fley, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, Subs. 36, Louvain 1970; G. Pugliese Carratelli, *La Persia dei Sassanidi nella storiografia romana da Ammiano a Procopio*, in *Scritti sul mondo antico*, Naples 1976, 35-46; O. Bucci, *La posizione del cristianesimo occidentale e quella del cristianesimo orientale di fronte alla guerra tra Roma e l'impero dei Sassanidi*, Atti Accad. Roman. Costant., Perugia 1979, 99-139; C.G. Cereti, *Primary Sources for the History of Inner and Outer Iran in the Sasanian Period*: Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 9 (1997) 17-71; R.N. Frye, *The History of Ancient Iran*, Munich 1984; G. Greatrex, *Rome and Persia at War*, *502-532*, Leeds 1998; J. Rist, *Die Verfolgung der Christen im spätantiken Sasanidenreich. Ursachen*, *Verlauf und Folgen*: Oriens Christianus 80 (1996) 17-42; Z. Rubin, *The Sasanid Monarchy*, in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 14, eds. Av. Cameron - B. Ward-Perkins, Cambridge 2000, 638-661.

G. Pilara

SATISFACTIO. The theological use of the term *satisfactio*, which was so characteristic of the Western church fathers, is only understood within the framework of Latin *rhetoric and jurisprudence. This held for both *Tertullian, who used it for the first time, and for subsequent Fathers. Tertullian spoke of *satisfactio* or of *satisfacere Deo* ("pleasing God") primarily in penitential contexts, both in texts that pertained to *baptism, first *paenientia* (*Bapt.* 20,1) and postbaptismal penance, and in those treatises on the *asceticism of all the faithful (*Orat.* 23,4). In his uses of this term one can distinguish two foundational aspects. The first pertains to the offering of *satisfactio*, the *confessio*, in which one admits to having done wrong and promises to make reparation for it (*Paen.* 9,2: *satisfactio confessione disponitur*; 8,9; 10,2; *Pud.* 9,16). The second aspect considers the effecting of *satisfactio*: one then completes the promised reparation of the sin in order to avoid the punishment and to obtain *venia* ("forgiveness") and to be restored to the state of righteousness (*Paen.* 5,2; 5,9ff.). In this second sense, *satisfactio* generically refers to *paenitentia* as interior conversion (*Paen.* 5,9: *per delictorum paenitentiam domino satisfacere*), and prayer (*deprecatio*) and the ascetic acts through

which the penitent expresses the seriousness of his repentance (*Bapt.* 20,1; *Pud.* 13,14). In all this, Tertullian makes the following assumptions: the relationship between God and human beings is established on law. If human beings do not observe the law, they become debtors to God. Human sin, being a *violatio legis*, constitutes a fault that demands punishment. God could simply grant forgiveness (*venia*). He does not do so, however, without requiring the *satisfactio paenitentiae* as the *compensatio poenae* (*Paen.* 6,4). But he is always disposed to accepting this *satisfactio* (*Paen.* 7,14). This teaching on *satisfactio* also found penitential contexts in the writings of *Cyprian, but with the new undertones. As in the case of the term *paenitentia*, the term *satisfactio* more often pertains to prayer and the penitential act that the penitent must complete before being admitted to the church's communion (*pax ecclesiae*: *Ep.* 59,13; 16,2; *On Almsgiving* 5). This *satisfactio* must have the right measure in order to be full (*Ep.* 64,1; 43,2; *Laps.* 16). Judgment on the legitimate measure is the responsibility of competent authorities (*Laps.* 29; *Ep.* 43,3). Only in this way can *satisfactio* be *grata* to the Lord (*Laps.* 29), who *satisfactione placandus est* (*Laps.* 17). After Cyprian's time, Latin Christian authors substantially adopted the same penitential terminology. Specific testimonies can be found in the writings of *Lactantius (*Ira* 21,9: *gratia-satisfactio*), *Ambrose (*Luc.* 7,156-157; 10,88), *Sulpicius Severus (*Dial.* 2,10: *poena-satisfactio*), *Augustine (*Serm.* 19,2-3; *Ench.* 65,70-71), Pope *Innocent I (*Ep.* 25,7) and *Leo the Great (*Ep.* 108).

In the 4th c., penitential language entered *Christology. Explaining Jesus' voluntary acceptance of suffering, *Hilary of Poitiers maintained that this satisfied the penal obligation, although it did not, properly speaking, apply to the suffering Christ as a punishment (Ps 53:12). *Ambrose for his part affirmed, along the same lines, that Christ accepted death so that the sentence might be carried out, the condemnation (of the sinful flesh) might be satisfied (*Fug.* 7,44). Although this pertains to two rather isolated texts, these are of great importance. They express not only in legal terminology a foundational patristic theme, namely that of expiation, but they also paved the way for Anselm of Canterbury's theology, which would wholly focus on the idea of vicarious satisfaction. Around the same time there appeared a new theological definition of *satisfactio*, which, however, remained in part very close to that of the first penitential use. In the conciliar acts and the papal epistolary correspondence, but also in preaching, the term *satisfactio* was used when speaking about the readmittance of heretics into the church's communion or about the recognition of the orthodoxy of bishops who were to be to be reallowed into the episcopal college. At that point the term *satisfactio* primarily meant confession, as one can gather esp. from the Greek translations that rendered it with the term ἀπολογία (see 1 Pet 3:15 [Vg]; Leo the Great, *Ep.* 28 28,6: PL 54, 778B. 780A; see also Orig., *Hom. Iud.* 3,2; *Princ.* III, 1,16; Jerome, *Ep.* 52,7). Within this framework of the confession of the true faith, *satisfactio* at times included justification, a satisfactory expression of faith, but also repentance from error; in certain cases it was also a question of written confessions (*satisfactio libellaris;* Leo, *Ep.* 31,4) or a document to be signed (*Ep.* 30,2). In addition to Leo's documents, which are the most interesting (*Serm.* 35,5: *satisfactio legitima*, a request from the *Manicheans; *Ep.* 89,1: *satisfactio correctis*, requested from the supporters of the Alexandrian patriarch *Dioscorus; *Ep.* 164,5: *correctis paenitentiae remedium non negetur*; also *Ep.* 127,1: *talia scripta*, without the term *satisfaction*), are also major works of *Priscillian (?) (*Tract.* 1,40: CSEL 18, 33), *Augustine (*Gest. Pelag.* 11,24; 20,44) and *Sixtus III (*Ep.* 2,3).

A. Deneffe, *Das Wort "satisfactio"*: ZKTh 34 (1919) 158-175; J. Rivière, *Sur les premières applications du terme satisfaction à l'oeuvre du Christ*: BLE 25 (1924) 285-297; DTC 14/1, 1129-1210; A. Beck, *Römisches Recht bei Tertullian und Cyprian*, Aalen [2]1967; J. Roussier, *Satisfacere*, in *Studi in onore di P. Francisci*, II, Milan 1956, 113-157; M. Brueck, *"Genugtuung" bei Tertullian:* VChr 29 (1975) 276-290; G. Hallonsten, *Satisfactio bei Tertullian*, Malmö 1984 (bibl.); C.H. Menke, *Genugtuung*: LTK[3] 3, 473ff.

B. Studer

SATOR / AREPO. The so-called magic square of five words of five letters each (25 letters) that can be read horizontally and vertically, with other possible layouts, has given rise to much research and controversy, which at times has been rather fanciful. Writing the words as set out here, they can even be read backward (i.e., as a palindrome, which is a word or phrase that can be read either way, from left to right or right to left). The square can be read in four directions and in all the lines. It was found at Pompeii in an area not far from the amphitheater, but also in many other places (Budapest, *Dura Europos, Cirencester, *Mesopotamia), and it was used in the Middle Ages and subsequently in many churches.

S A T O R
A R E P O
T E N E T
O P E R A
R O T A S

Different translations have been proposed; e.g.: (1) God (SATOR, the creator) rules and governs (TENET) the works of creation

(ROTAS OPERA) and as much as the earth produces (AREPO, plough); (2) the sower (SATOR) on his wagon (AREPO is a word of Celtic origins whose meaning is similar to wagon) directs (TENET) with skill (OPERA) the tires (ROTAS, here the wheels signify the orbits of the heavenly bodies). Moreover, when set in a different way the letters that compose the phrase *SATOR AREPO TENET OPERA ROTAS* can be set in two vertical and horizontal lines with the *N* at the center (with *A* and *O* at the edges in the sense of *Alpha* and *Omega*) one obtains the word PATERNOSTER ("Our *Father") twice. This type of reading has led to a Christian interpretation, an interpretation that must be ruled out, because the two examples found at Pompeii are too ancient (dating before the year AD 79), suggesting rather that the square was inspired by *Stoicism (see Cicero, *De natura deor.* 2,86). The spreading of the letters could have an apotropaic character; but initially it was only a word game. Naturally, the square lent itself to numerous, imaginative and even numeric anagrams. The five words of the magic square are widespread in the Ethiopian region, where they symbolize the five nails of the cross of Christ.

PW Suppl. 15, 1978, 477-565; M. Guarducci, *Il misterioso quadrato magico. L'interpretazione di J. Carcopino e documenti nuovi*: Archeologia Classica 17 (1965) 219-270; A. Frugoni, *Sator arepo tenet opera rotas*: RSLR 1 (1965) 433-439; P. Veyne, *Le carré Sator ou beaucoup de bruit pour rien:* BAGB 1968, 427-460; W.O. Moeller, *The Mithraic Origins and Meaning of the Rotas-Sator Square*, Leiden 1973; K. Aland, *Der Rotas-Sator-Rebus*, in *Corona gratiarum. Misc. . . . Dekkers*, II, Bruges 1975, 285-343; M. Marcovich, *SATOR AREPO*: ZPE 50 (1983) 155-171; K. Aland, *Noch einmal: der Rotas/Sator-Rebus*, in *Supplementa zu den neutestamentlichen und den kirchengeschichtlichen Entwürfen*, ed. B. Koester, Berlin 1990, 177-191 (also in *Text and Testimony, Essays on NT and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, ed. T. Baarda, Kampen 1988); W. Baines, *The Rotas-Sator Square: A New Investigation*: NTS 33 (1987) 469-476; U. Ernst, *Carmen figuratum*, Cologne 1991, 429-459; C. Cartigny, *Le carré magique, testament de saint Paul*, Paris 1984; M. Marcovich, in *Studies in Graeco-Roman Religion*, Leiden 1988, 28-46; O. Raineri, *Catalogo dei rotoli protettori etiopici della collezione Sandro Angelini*, Rome 1990 (see the index of this work: p. 315); M.C. Sacchi Zaffarana, *Sator Arepo: palindrome criptografica cristiana*, Alpignano 1998 (repr. 2000); R. Cammilleri, *Il quadrato magico: un mistero che dura da duemila anni*, Milan 1999; M. Chicoteau, *Un trésor suisse: le carré magique de "Primum Subinum" (Tessin)*: RBPh 80 (2002) 97-100; M.G. Lopardi, *Il quadrato magico del Sator*, Rome 2006.

A. Di Berardino

SATORNILUS (Saturninus). The *gnostic Satornilus, a contemporary of *Basilides, was a disciple of *Menander and carried out his activity in *Syria. According to *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 24, 1)—upon whose description many of the other sources on Satornilus heavily depend—Satornilus affirmed that the *world was created by seven *angels. These angels created humans, who, because of their inability, were unable to stand up straight and crawled on the earth like worms. The Higher Power (ἡ ἄνω δύναμις) sent a spark of life that animated man and allowed him to stand up straight. This represents the spiritual and eternal element of man, which, after his death, is destined to return to the place of its origin. The God of the OT is recognized in one of the seven angels, whose turn toward the unknown God caused the coming of Jesus Christ in order esp. to destroy the God of the Jews. Irenaeus's last piece of information on this matter is hard to reconcile with what he said earlier. He in fact stated that the angels have created two categories of human beings: one good, the other evil; in aid of the first the Savior came to destroy the wicked and the demons who help them. According to Satornilus, procreation and matrimony is the work of Satan, who, moreover, inspired, along with the Creator Angels of the world, the prophecies of the OT.

Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 24; *Refut.* VII, 28; Tertullian, *De anima* 23; Philastrius, *Liber de haer.* 31; Epiphanius of Salamis, *Pan.* 23; EC 10, 1964-1965; G. Lüdemann, *Untersuchungen zur simonianischen Gnosis*, Göttingen 1975; S. Pétrement, *Le Dieu separé. Les origines du gnosticisme*, Paris 1984, 449-458; M. Simonetti (ed.), *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, Milan 1993, 6-19.

A. Monaci Castagno

SATURNINUS and DATIVUS, martyrs. Saturninus and Dativus were two martyrs of the *Donatist community of *Abitina. They underwent martyrdom along with their companions under Anulinus in Proconsular *Africa at the beginning of the 4th c. The interrogations took place at *Carthage on 12 February 304. *Augustine specified that the persecutions took place at the time of the emperors *Diocletian and *Maximian (*Nam gesta martyrum quibus ostendebatur tempus persecutionis, consulibus facta sunt Diocletiano novies et Maximiano octies, pridie idus februaris*, *Brev. Coll. Donatist.* III,17,32). As is well known, Saturninus was the only presbyter at the head of this community. G.D. Gordini noted concerning this matter: "Fundanus, bishop of the Abitina community in Proconsular Africa, had handed over [**traditor*] the sacred books to the local authorities in order to obey the imperial orders of Diocletian, perhaps for this reason the faithful preferred to follow the priest Saturninus in the *eucharistic celebration despite the fact that the imperial decrees prohibited Christians from partaking in gatherings" (BS IX,683). In actuality, the emper-

ors not only prohibited meetings and the rites of the new religion, but they had also ordered Christians to hand over the sacred books to the civil authorities (*ut sacrosancta Domini testamenta scripturasque divinas ad exurendum peteret, basilicas dominicas subverteret et ritus sacros coetus sanctissimos celebrari Domino prohiberet*).

The Christians of Abitina preferred to shed their blood for their faith rather than to become *traditores*, as had Bishop Fundanus. They thus continued to gather until the day of their arrest in the house of Octavius Felix. On one Sunday, while they were celebrating the sacrifice of the Lord, they were taken by surprise and led as prisoners before the city magistrates, who then sent them to Carthage to be heard by the Proconsul Anulinus because it did not lie within their jurisdiction to rule over a normal criminal case. Nearly 50 people were arrested and led to *Carthage to be questioned about their religion. The senator Dativus was certainly the first to be judged. After him, Saturninus was sentenced to death; he was a presbyter and the father of four children. Last, all the members of the group likewise professed their faith and underwent martyrdom in the name of Jesus Christ. During the trial the name of Jesus Christ was invoked as the hope of Christians (*Domine Iesu*, *christiani sumus*, *tibi servimus. Tu es spes christianorum*). All professed their faith with constancy and as a result refused to sacrifice to the gods of the pagans and professed their innocence inasmuch as they were not murderers, nor had they committed any fraud.

The *Acta martyrum* brings to light the struggle of Christ's faithful against the devil, who acted through the will of the emperors. The Donatist compiler, after the Catholic revision, admired in them their faith in devotion, their holiness of life, the constancy in their profession of faith and their victory in suffering. Therefore, the substance of the accusations directed by Anulinus to the prisoners was that of being Christians and of gathering in assemblies that were prohibited by imperial decree. To urge Christians to abjure their faith, the proconsul Analinus subjected them to fierce tortures, without obtaining any results. In the *Acts* no mention is made of the outcome of the prisoners. It seems that they died in prison sometime after, either through hunger or torture. The account of the martyrdom is owed to the initiative of the Catholic editor who, without a doubt, integrated information into the text from the official documents from the interrogation with a brief comment on the facts. Later the text would undergo the influence of a Donatists compiler.

Augustinus, *Brev. collationis cum Donatistis*, III, 17,32: PL 43, 643; Id., *De civitate Dei* XXII, 8: CSEL 40, 608; *Ep.* 22,2: CSEL, 61-62; PCBE 1, 1038; P. Monceaux, *Histoire de la littérature de l'Afrique chrétienne*, III, Paris 1905, 140-147; P. Allard, *Storia critica delle persecuzioni*, IV, Florence 1928, 235-247; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Passio ss. Dativi Saturnini. Note agiografiche*: ST 65, Vatican City 1935, 47-71; A. More, *Saturninus*: LTK[2] 9, 354; G.D. Gordini, *Saturnino*, *Dativo*: BS 11 (1968) 682-684.

M.W. Libambu

SATURNINUS of Arles (4th c.). An *Arian bishop who was characterized by *Sulpicius Severus as a "powerless and divisive man; a truly awful man, both wicked and depraved in thought" (*homo impotens et factiosus; vir sane pessimus et ingenio malo pravoque—Chron.* 2,40; 45). *Hilary of Poitiers also left some information about him (*De syn.* 2,2; *Fragm. hist.* 2,8; 11,4). He was the bishop of *Arles under the emperor *Constantius (337–361); we do not know if he already held this office at the time of the Council of Arles (353), but he participated in the Council of *Milan (355) and that of *Béziers (356), which he convoked and over which he presided. At that council the decision was made to exile Hilary of Poitiers and *Paulinus of Trier as well as to condemn *Athanasius. He was present at the Councils of *Rimini (359) and *Constantinople (360). He lead the Arian group in *Gaul and was deposed from his episcopal office by the Council of *Paris (361) through Hilary's initiative. He was not inscribed into the episcopal diptychs because he was a heretic and was deposed acc. to the rules.

E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine* 1, Paris [2]1964, 224-226; 243-246; 262-264; *Hilaire et son temps. Actes du colloque de Paris 29 septembre - 3 octobre 1968 à l'occasion du XVI[e] centenaire de la mort de S. H.*, Paris 1968; H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337-361)*, Berlin-New York 1984; BBKL 8, 1408-1409.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

SATURNINUS of Cagliari. In the 6th c., there was a church dedicated to Saturninus not far from Cagliari. We do not know anything for certain about this saint. He was often confused with the bishop and martyr *Saturninus of Toulouse, even if his martyrdom, from a literary point of view, has nothing to do with that of Saturninus of Toulouse (BHL 7495-7496). The *Passion* (BHL 7491) dates to the 7th-8th c., the legend (BHL 7490) to the 11th-12th c.; the latter was probably written in the monastery of Saturninus at Cagliari. After *Diocletian's retreat, Saturninus was martyred on 30 October at

Cagliari by Barbarus, the ruler of Corsica and *Sardinia, because he refused to sacrifice to Jupiter on the Campidoglio.

BHL 7490-7491; BS 11, 671; L. Pani Ermini, *Ricerche nel complesso di S. Saturno a Cagliari*: Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Rendiconti 55-56 (1982-1984), 111-128; P.G. Spanu, *Martyria Sardiniae*, Oristano 2000, 51-60, 155-156; A. Piras, *Passio Sancti Saturnini* (*BHL 7491*), Rome 2002.

S. Heid

SATURNINUS of Rome. A Roman martyr. In his letters, *Cyprian mentions Saturninus, who was born at *Carthage and was arrested during the Decian persecution and then exiled to Rome, where he was perhaps martyred during the *Valerian persecution. The **Depositio martyrum* by the *Chronographer of 354 mentions around the year 336 the tomb of Saturninus in the catacomb of Trasone on the Via Salaria (feast day, 29 November). Pope *Damasus dedicated an epigram to the martyr with unique information. Even the *Mart. hier.* knew of him, and the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries provide a formulary in his honor. The basilica over his tomb was redone in the 6th c. by Pope *Felix III [IV]. The pilgrims of the 7th c. visited his tomb (CCL 175, 288, 299, 306, 320, 325 and 341), and the historical martyrologies recorded his memoria. The *Passio Marcelli* (BHL 5234-5235) connected Saturninus with the deacon *Sissinius. Both were forced to work for the construction of *Diocletian's baths before being decapitated on the second mile of the Via Nomentana. Trasone gathered their bodies and buried them in his field on the Via Salaria.

BHL 7493-7494; BS 11, 688-695; BBKL 8, 1409-1410; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 188-190; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 52-54; D. De Francesco, *La basilica di S. Saturnino sulla Via Salaria Nova*: Ecclesiae Urbis 1, Vatican City 2002, 611-624.

S. Heid

SATURNINUS of Toulouse, martyr (3rd c.). Saturninus (Fr. *Saturnin*, *Sernin*) was, around the middle of the 3rd c., the first bishop of *Toulouse. According to the *Passio* from the 5th c. (BHL 7495-7496), Saturninus refused to sacrifice during the *Decian *persecution (250), and a rioting mob had him bound, without the regular trial, to a bull that was to be sacrificed and that dragged him to his death. The same account of his martyrdom also informs us about the first events at the tomb of Saturninus. Bishop *Hilary (from the 2nd half of the 4th c.) had built there a wooden funerary chapel, which was then replaced by his successor (?) Silvius with a stone building. *Exuperius (405–411) transferred the relics there on a 30 November, at some distance from the early tomb and there commissioned the building of the basilica of St. Sernin which, after it had been destroyed by the Arabs in 721, left no traces. Another basilica built in the same place during the Carolingian era and reconstructed in the 11th-12th c. remains to this day. The *Passio* does not mention the day of the saint's death; in the *Mart. hier.* (acc. to the Gallican recension), it is recorded for 29 November and 30 October: the second date is that of the translation of the relics through the work of Exuperius, a transfer which in the Mozarabic calendars was connected to 1 November. The first date was chosen to match that of the feast day of the Roman Saturninus. In the 6th c., the legend of the saint also developed. Although *Caesarius of Arles (G. Morin, *Sancti Caesarii Ep. Arel. Opera omnia* 2, 1942, 179) made him a disciple of the apostles, *Venantius Fortunatus (PL 88,99-101) and *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 1,30) only state that he came from *Rome. Gregory added that it occurred in 250, in reference to the *Passio*. The cult spread into *Spain from the 5th c. onward, in the *Visigoth milieu (two Masses in honor of the saint) and in *Gaul, starting from the 6th c., in the region of Toulouse, along the Mediterranean coast and along the itinerary of St. James of Compostella (Santiago de Compostela), and finally in the region of *Paris.

BHL 7495-7508; BS 11, 673-681; LCI 8, 310-311; BBKL 8, 1410-1411.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

SATYRUS (ca. 330–375/378). The older brother of *Ambrose, who was born, perhaps at *Rome, around the year 330. He spent his childhood at *Trier and after studying in Rome and having undertaken an administrative career, he was appointed *consularis*. He then retired at *Milan to live with Ambrose and devoted himself to a strict Christian life. Upon returning from *Africa, where he had gone to administer some of his family's poperty, he became gravely ill. He died at Milan around 375 (acc. to Palanque; between 377–378, acc. to other scholars). He was buried in the basilica of St. Victor Ciel d'Oro near the grave of the martyr Victor. Ambrose delivered two funerary speeches in his honor (*De excessu fratris sui Satyri*): the first was delivered on the day of the funerary rites; the second, seven days later. These two speeches constitute the primary source of information on him.

BS 11, 664-666; J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1933, 488-493; A. Palestra, *S. Satiro, fratello di s.*

Ambrogio e s. Marcellina, Milan 1980; C. Perogalli, *San Satiro, fratello di sant'Ambrogio e santa Marcellina. La vita, il culto, l'iconografia*, Milan 1980; G. Banterle (ed.), *Sant'Ambrogio. Le orazioni funebri.* De excessu fratris, Milan 1985, 25-159; PCBE II, 1995-1996.

M.G. Mara

SAVIA. Savia was one of the provinces organized on the territory of *Pannonia Superior after the year 293. The border to the N was the Danube-Drava; to the E it reached the line that crossed the plain of Pannonia, which acted as a border with Valeria. To the W, Savia shared a common border with *Noricum, while to the S it bordered *Dalmatia, i.e., up to the Dinaric Alps. The administrative center was Siscia (today Sisak). The only known episcopal sees were Emona, Siscia and Iovia (today Ludbreg). Emona was then included in the Italic regions. The border city, Petovium, at the time of *Constantine was left to Noricum. In the 6th c., Siscia had to be included in the territory of Dalmatia because Bishops Johannes and Constantius signed the decisions of the Councils of *Salona from the years 530 and 533.

Christianity began to develop in Savia in the 2nd half of the 3rd c. Information about early Christianity in this area is sparse: the only concrete piece of information is the fact that in June 308 (during *persecutions under *Galerius) Bishop Quirinius from Siscia drowned in a stream that ran through Savaria. It seems, however, that the persecutions in Savia and Pannonia Prima were not as arduous or as fierce as they were in Pannonia Secunda. At a later age there is an inscription at *Aquileia, in which mention is made of Bishop Amantius, who was in the episcopal see of Jovia in the late 4th c. and died in 413.

The Christian archaeological remains are few. In Emona the remains of a baptismal vase with sumptuous mosaics were recently discovered. Unfortunately the basilica lies under modern homes. At Siscia there were some offices for the coinage of money (2nd half of the 3rd c. until the 2nd half of the 4th c.). From Siscia came numerous early Christian discoveries (inscriptions, *sarcophagi, *scrinia*, *terra sigillata*, lanterns etc.), but up to now the churches and the early Christian buildings have not been excavated. A fragment of terra sigillata portrays a woman (martyr) tied to a tree trunk and undergoing an attack from an animal. At least three churches were within the walls and one outside. It is very difficult to excavate here because the new city lies atop the Roman ruins. In Aquae Iassae (*Varaždinske* Toplice) a thermal hall in the sumptuous complex built by Constantine was transformed into a church; alongside the hall were added, for other liturgical services, ornate rooms of paintings from which only a few remains have been preserved. On one of the fragments was painted a head with a beard and a halo. Even at Jovia the thermal building was transformed into a church. Both transformations were completed in the late 4th c. In Savia small Christian objects such as *sarcophagi, *lamps, *amulets, *fibulae etc. were found.

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1918; T. Nagy, *La storia del Cristianesimo in Pannonia sino alla caduta della copertura romana di confine*, Budapest 1939 (in Hungarian with a summary in German); PWK, Suppl. 14, 739ff.; A. Mocsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London 1954; B. Vikic, *Elementi ranog kršcanstva u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj*: *Arheološki* vestnik 29 (1978) 588ff.; Lj. Plesnicar Gec, *Old Christian Center in Emona*, Katalogi in monografije 21, Ljubljana 1983; B. Migotti, *Evidence for the Christianity in Roman Southern Pannonia* (*Northern Croatia*), Oxford 1997; D. Gaspar, *Christianity in Roman Pannonia: An Evaluation of Early Christian Finds and Sites from Hungary*, Oxford 2002.

N. Cambi

SAYINGS of JESUS, apocryphal. A group of brief texts coming from the Middle Ages and modern times which completes the description of the passion of Jesus in the gospels and in the apocryphal texts where the sentencing of Jesus is missing (e.g., *Gospel of Nicodemus* 9). They were texts that were very well known within popular culture.

Santos Otero, 566-569; Starowieyski 1/2, 671-674, 890-891 (bibl.); Erbetta I/2, 405-406; Craveri 380-381.

M. Starowieyski

SCAPULA. The proconsul of *Africa (211–213), he was the source of a fierce persecution against the Christians. *Tertullian wrote him an open letter, *Ad Scapulam*, in which he emphasized the proconsul's personal responsibility for the persecution, although his other predecessors had known how to reconcile a sense of compassion with their duties as magistrates (4,1 and 3). Tertullian emphasized, moreover, that Scapula went against the very instructions he had received for punishing guilty people who had confessed and for torturing those who had denied their own crimes, inasmuch as through torture he sought to force those who had already declared themselves to be Christian to deny their confession (4,2). This Scapula should probably be identified with a Scapula Tertullus, the ordinary consul in 195.

J. Schmidt, *Ein Beitrag zur Chronologie der Schriften Tertullians und der Proconsuln von Afrika*: RhM 46 (1891) 77-98; *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I.II.III*, pars III, eds. P. De Rohden - H. Dessau, n. 193; Monceaux I, 244-246.

S. Zincone

SCETE, Desert of. A location noted for its salt lakes, situated on the W side of the Nile Delta, about halfway between *Alexandria and Cairo almost within the Libyan desert. The modern name is Wadi al-Natrun (Wadi 'n-Natrun, Wadi El-Natrun); the Greek (and Latin) name derives from the Coptic term "Shiet." This place was known during the classical era for its mineral resources. Around 330, *Macarius the Egyptian settled there, around whom a monastic community was formed. From that time onward it was a monastic center of enormous importance, although this monastery had its highs and lows (destructions by the barbarians, the persecution of the *Origenists etc.). Today these four *monasteries are still fully active (the monasteries of St. Macarius, St. Pshoi [Bishoy, Bishoi], the Syrians and the Romans [al-Baramus]). From these ancient libraries many important codices in *Coptic and *Syriac have survived. It was the custom that the patriarch of Alexandria be chosen from the monastery of St. Macarius in the 9th-11th centuries. In the modern era the location of Scete has been confused with that of Nitria, which is more to the E, within the Delta (the modern name *el-Barnugi*, from the Coptic *Pernug*).

D.J. Chitty, *The Desert a City*, London-Oxford [2]1977; H.G. Evelyn White, *History of the Monasteries of Nitria and Scetis*, New York 1932, 3 vols.; LTK[3] 7, 881; Coptic Encyclopedia 6, 1794-1796 (Nitria); 7, 2102-2106; *Les Kellia, ermitages coptes en Basse-Égypte: Musée d'art et d'histoire*, Genève 1989; O.F.A. Meinardus, *2000 Years of Coptic Christianity*, Cairo 1999; M. Capuani, *Christian Egypt: Coptic Art and Monuments Through Two Millennia*, Collegeville, MN 1999.

T. Orlandi

SCHISM – SCHISMATIC. The term *schism* entered Christian *Latin usage in the 3rd c. with the meaning: a dissent that led to disunity in the community. Along these lines the term *schismatic* initially did not refer to a Christian separated from the community but rather a dissident. The concept of schism was immediately put in relation to *heresy by addressing the question of their mutual difference and their relationship. For this reason, in ancient Christian sources we find schismatics almost always likened to the heretics, who, already in the collection of *Cyprian's letters, are often not easy to distinguish (*Ep.* 33; 66,5). *Jerome identified in heresy a distorted teaching of the Christian religion, although in schism a disagreement from one's own bishop that separates one from the community (*Inter haeresim et schisma hoc esse arbitrantur, quod haeresis perversum dogma habeat, schisma propter episcopalem dissensionem ab ecclesia separetur. Ceterum nullum schisma non sibi aliquam coniungit haeresim, ut recte ab ecclesia recessisse videatur*: *In Ep. Tit.* 3,10-11). In the writings of *Augustine the distinction between the heretic and the schismatic is clear (*De haeresibus* 50); nevertheless, there is in Augustine's writings the awareness that schism sooner or later leads to heresy, esp. when it becomes *schisma inveteratum* (*C. Cresconium* II, 4), as was the case with *Donatism, which he, after the *Collatio Chartaginensis* of 411, no longer mentioned among the schisms but rather among the heresies (*Ep.* 93,11,46; *De haeresibus* 69). The Donatists in fact—in his evaluation—had transformed a schism, a form of ungodliness that implies the absence of charity (Ep. 23,7; 108,3,11), into heresy (*Ep.* 87,4). Donatists who converted, however, were left in their ecclesial offices (*Ep.* 185,10,47). In the Greek East, in the writings of the Cappadocian fathers, esp. *Basil's, if heresy was to be placed in the line of separation of the faith of the community, schism was placed in that of dissent with the official community for ecclesiastical reasons and for questions that could in principle be resolved (Basil, *Ep.* 188, can. 1). In the line of schism, Basil places the *parasynagōgē*, i.e., the liturgical synaxes celebrated by the bishops, presbyters or the faithful who are not properly or not sufficiently taught (*Ep.* 188, can. 1). Schism is, therefore, a disagreement with the hierarchy of their time and the manner, e.g., in which penance was granted to the *lapsed. The Greek fathers found the primary cause of schism in the *libido dominandi* (Gk. *philarchia*, i.e., the lust for power) (Basil, *C. Eun.* 1,13; John Chrysostom, *In Eph 4 hom.* 11,4-5; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *In 1 Cor* 11,18).

The ecclesial legislation with respect to schism, which was primarily determined at the Council of *Nicaea (325), *Laodicea (345 or later), *Constantinople (381 and 382) and *Carthage (418), usually led to the removal of a presbyter or bishop from his office; *excommunication, however, if it pertained to a monk or layperson, extended even to the point of deferring to the civil authorities in case of factiousness (Synod of *Antioch [341], can. 5). Augustine spoke much of the civil laws against the schismatics in his numerous letters (*Ep.* 51,1; 76,4; 129,4; 185,2 and 7), esp. those to the emperor *Theodosius I, who issued laws concerning the Donatists (*Ep.* 105,2,9) and also promulgated a law against all heretics (*Ep.*

185,7, 25). Evodius along with the bishop Theasius was sent to *Italy to ask the emperor *Honorius to apply some of the imperial laws against the schismatics (*Ep.* 80, 1), although Augustine did not want the law of retaliation to be applied to the Donatists (*Ep.* 133,1-2; 134, 2). *Theodosius II also sent Augustine a letter concerning the enforcement of the laws against the Donatists (*Ep.* 201).

E. Buonaiuti, *Scisma ed eresia nella primitiva letteratura cristiana. Saggi sul cristianesimo primitivo*, Città di Castello 1923, 274-285; H. Pétré, *Haeresis, schisma et leurs synonymes latins*: REL 15 (1937) 316-319; N.I. Pontet, *La notion de schisme d'après s. Augustin*, in *L'Église et les Églises* I, Chevetogne 1955, 163-180; M. Meinertz, *Schisma und Hairesis im NT*: Biblische Zeitschr. n.s. 1 (1957) 114-118; S.L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church*, London 1953, [2]1964; E. Ferguson, *Attitudes to Schism at the Council of Nicaea*, in D. Baker, *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Cambridge 1972, 57-63; A. Schindler, *Die Unterscheidung von Schisma und Häresie in Gesetzgebung und Polemik gegen den Donatismus*: in *Pietas. Fest. B. Kötting*, Münster 1980, 228-236; W. Gerlings, *Haeresis und Schisma in den Canones der nordafrikanischen Konzilien von 345 bis 525*, in A. Gabriels - H.J.F. Reinhardt (ed.), *Ministerium Iustitiae* (*Fest. H. Heinemann*), Essen 1985, 161-167.

V. Grossi

SCHOLASTICA. The only piece of information on St. Scholastica, whose actual historical existence has recently been called into question, comes from the second book of *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*. The sister of St. *Benedict, Scholastica was consecrated to God from childhood; once a year she was accustomed to meet with her brother near the monastery of Monte Cassino and to have a conversation with him. Gregory the Great recorded in moving terms the account of the last encounter between these two siblings, who were very close to death by that time (*Dial.* II,33).

BS 11, 742-749; A. Pantoni, *Sulla località del convegno annuale di S. Benedetto e S. Scolastica, e sul monastero di Piumarola*: Benedictina 15 (1908) 206-228; A. de Vogüé, *La rencontre de Benoît et de Scholastique. Essai d'interprétation*: RAM 48 (1972) 257-273; P.A. Cusack, *St. Scholastica: Myth or Real Person?*: DR 92 (1974) 145-159; G. Barone, s.v. *Scolastica*, in *Il grande libro dei Santi*, ed. C. Leonardi - A. Riccardi - G. Zarri, III, Cinisello Balsamo 1998, 1767-1768.

S. Zincone

SCHOLASTICUS. In Christian antiquity, the adjective *scholastic* (obviously from *schola*) used as a noun preserved at first its original meaning—and therefore indicated the same social-cultural role—that it had in classical Latin culture: a man of the school, a teacher, an educator, a rhetorician, a grammarian, a teacher of declamation and, more generally speaking, an educated person, a learned person, refined, erudite, well read and intellectual (see ps.-Macarius of Egypt, *Hom.* 15,42: PG 34,604D; *Hom.* 26,17: PG 34, 685B). Later the term *scholastic* began to refer to the orator who cultivated the art of forensic eloquence in the context of the school and taught its rules to the students, only treating *lites fictae* and making the students perform traditional exercises on the basis of didactic texts such as the *Controversiae* and the *Suasoriae* of Seneca the Elder (see *Salvian of Marseille, *De gubernatione Dei*, Praef 2: CSEL 8,2: "[. . .] *ut scholastici ac diserti haberentur*; *Jer., *De vir. ill.* 99: PL 23,738: *Serapion ob elegantiam ingenii cognomen Scholastici meruit*; Aug., *De catech. rud.* 13: CCL 46,135). In a third semantic phase from the school, emphasis was placed on the legal aspect. For this reason the term came to be applied to the legal professional properly speaking, i.e., the jurisconsult, the **patronus*, who discussed—not on the condition that he was such (it should be stated) but that he did so with skill and eloquence—legal cases in the forum, or effectively defended the rights and interests of the citizens before the public authorities (see the Council of *Serdica, can. 10; Soc., *HE* VI,6,36: PG 67, 681A; Cyr. Scyth., *Vita Sabae* 61; John Moschus, *Prat. Spirit.* 131: PG 87, 2996B; *Cron. Pasch.*: PG 92,980A; Aug., *In Joh.* 7,11: NBA 50,166: *Qui habent causam, aut qui volunt supplicare, quaerunt aliquem scholasticum, a quo sibi preces componantur*). Moreover, this should be understood in relation to obligations or disputes of a legal nature that involved in some way the ecclesial community (see *Cod. Eccl. Afr.* 97). In Late Antiquity and then increasingly so in the Middle Ages, the term *scholastic* wound up having a full ecclesiastical meaning, to the point of indicating the cleric of the highest level (even called the *magister scholarum*, *cancellarius* or similar terms), originally a member of the cathedral chapter, who was responsible for monitoring the progress of the schools within the jurisdiction of the chapter (*regimen scholarum, ius scholarum*, *ius in regendis scholis*).

Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* VI, 351-352; PWK 21/1, 624-625; Lampe 121-123; E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France*, 5, *Les Écoles* . . . , Lille 1910-43, 453-512; H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Oxford [2]1936, I: 279-282; II: 84-88, 144-146, 155-158; H. Jedin, *Domschule und Kolleg:* Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift 67 (1958) 210-223; New Catholic Encyclopedia 12 (1966) 1170-1171; LTK[3] 3, 330.

M. Spinelli

SCHOLION. Derived from the Greek term σχολή ("occupation, study"), a scholion was a marginal (or interlinear) annotation of a MS of a classical text performing the function of a brief explanation, a grammatical and linguistic note or an analysis of a lemma (word or expression) obscure or little-known of the text itself, mentioned in connection to the line in discussion by an asterisk or a mere repetition of the phrase discussed. The most extensive scholia are for the most part extrapolations of larger commentaries that have been lost. They can also supply mythological, historical and geographical information; identify parallels and interpolations; mention citations from other works; and are useful for modern criticism for the exegesis of the text and the reconstruction of works and lost ancient theories. As a result, it is not easy to make a clear distinction between a scholion and a *gloss (Isidore, *Etymol.* 1,30; 6,8,1). Mentioned for the first time by Cicero (*Ad Atticum* XVI,7,3) with the meaning of *promemoria*, the term *scholion* was used with the current meaning of "commentary" from the 2nd c. AD onward (Epictetus, *Dissert.* 3,21,6; Galen 18,2,847). *Jerome subdivided *Origen's writings of scriptural exegesis into volumes (or commentaries), homilies and scholia (σχόλια, σημειώσεις, *excerpta*, *commaticum interpretationis genus*: "In the scholia he presented a summary of chapters and succinctly mentioned those questions that seemed to him obscure or that contained difficult points of interpretation": *in Ez. praef.*; cf., *in Is* 1,1; *in Math. praef.*; *in Gal. praef.*; *Ep.* 33,4). *Clement of Alexandria's *Hypotyposeis* on the Scriptures, which have been in large part lost, are considered scholia as are the textual explanations of ps.-Athanasius and *Evagrius of Pontus on the *Psalms, *Polychronius of Apamea on Ezekiel, *Julian of Eclanum on Job, *Arnobius the Younger on the gospels and *Hesychius of Jerusalem on the OT.

A. Gudeman, *Scholion*: PWK IIA/1, 625-705; T. Fuhrer, *Scholion*, in *Dizionario di Letteratura cristiana antica*, Rome 2006, 753; A. Le Boulluec, *Generi letterari*, in *Origene. Dizionario: la cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, ed. A. Monaci Castagno, Rome 2000, 185 ("Le opere esegetiche").

M. Girardi

SCHOOL

I. The Christian school - II. The Christian theological schools - III. Evolution of the concept of school - IV. Ancient Christian "exegetical" schools.

By the term *school* here we intend to speak, on the one hand, of a part of the system and the method, shared or at least not openly rejected even by Christians, in use during the patristic era to teach, and on the other hand, the orientation of the notably "Christian" school of a higher level in biblical exegesis and in catechetical tradition.

I. The Christian school. The religious situation of *Judaism at the time of Jesus was characterized by a multiplicity of religious sects with their cultural centers and training for the sacred, among which emerged the Pharisees (see Mt 15; Mk 7), the Sadducees (see Mt 22; Lk 20; Acts 23), the *Samaritans (see Jn 4), the zealots (see Lk 6:15), the Herodians (see Mk 8:15), the Essenes (Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Wars* §120, 122, 124), the Zadokites and some others of even less importance (Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Wars* II,8; *Jewish Antiquities* 18,4-5). But all these religious movements can scarcely be recognized as a historical and theological development of Judaism or as a manifestation of all the written and oral tradition transmitted by the pertinent structures, which go under the name of the rabbinic school, in which Jesus of Nazareth also participated, by learning to read and write the OT, as did every observant Jew of the tradition of the Fathers, thus becoming an authoritative teacher of doctrine and discipline ("but I say to you") and the head of an apolitical school by its nature (see Jn 6:15), but heavily oriented to the discovery of the self-identity of the people of God and growth in the fidelity to his Word of life. The disciples of Christ had two models to continue the teaching of the teacher: the rabbinic-Hellenistic model, which was attentive to philology and history, and the Roman model, which was primarily disposed toward politics and practical living.

Christian authors knew how to navigate between the two models, bringing to fulfillment the work of the cultural transition from Judaism to the Greek world and from Hellenism to the Roman world, developing school structures not inferior to those that proceeded them in enthusiasm for research and philological investigation, to the point of setting themselves forward as the victorious culture in the face of pagan or Jewish resurgences or any form of competition that was considered defective in comparison to "sound" doctrine and charged with heresy. Faithfulness to NT teaching, which was made to go back to Jesus and the apostles and which was contained in the books of the NT (see 1 Cor 11:2-23; Jude 3), constituted the basis of every sermon or exposition of individual authors or institutions, which arose rather early, upon the basis of existing models, designed to transmit the cultural Christian heritage. As in the case of every school, Christian schools also immediately underwent a process of heavy identification and research or investigation of particular

connotations that inspired its existence out of necessity of distinguishing itself from similar schools. One can, therefore, hypothesize for Christianity of the first five centuries a synchronic and at times a diachronic development in at least four phases, which were heavily influenced by contemporary Hellenistic and Roman schools: (1) pre-Constantinian schools of further instruction and exposition of the Christian message, generally catechetical, in the East; (2) pre-Constantinian schools of apologetics, further instruction and exposition of the Christian message in the West; (3) post-Constantinian Christian schools, generally theological and antiheretical, in the East; and (4) post-Constantinian Christian theological schools, which were generally systematic, in the West. Such distinctions have, moreover, only value for scholastic exposition, and the phases are not always easily distinguishable by time and place.

II. The Christian theological schools. The decisive turn through the birth of the schools is to be regarded as AD 70, after *Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans (cf. Lk 21:20), and AD 313, when *Constantine put an end to the persecution with the Edict of Milan (the Edict of Tolerance), officially offering Christianity his support. The leading centers of development can be identified as *Antioch and *Alexandria for the East and *Lyons and *Carthage for the West. Similar actions in erecting schools were taken at *Constantinople in opposition to the pagan schools of *Athens, and at *Rome in opposition to the pagan circle of *Milan. *Jerusalem, the heart of Judaism, soon lost its great influence over other churches, although Rome, the capital of the empire of the pagan world, lent itself to having an ever-increasing influence on expansion of Christianity in the Mediterranean world, confirmed by writers of the caliber of *Irenaeus of Lyons, who did not hesitate to exalt and praise its "mighty superiority" (*Adv. haer*. III,3,2) and to describe the cosmopolitan movement of pilgrims who were attracted there "from everywhere" to profess the faith coming from the apostles.

The disdain for Israel and the rabbinic schools (Jerome is an exception) was based on the notion that the Jewish people (understood as a whole) had crucified the Son of God and rejected Jesus as Messiah, so that Christianity alone was to be considered as the new Israel, heir also of the sacred books and the revelation of God contained therein. Nevertheless the Christians, though never modifying the structures of the rabbinic or pagan schools, had to overcome numerous obstacles from without and within, and were obligated to establish their own centers, where young men, pagan and Christian, who generally attended the same schools and read the same texts, could acquire the new culture and frameworks for ecclesiastical and administrative careers, which were often interchangeable, beyond the religious education which they normally received in their family. This explains how the classic scholastic system was able to survive beyond the chronological limits of the empire and the disturbing events of the wars and the migrations of peoples. Even when it was thought necessary to base teaching entirely on the Bible and education was directed to the formation of clerics, the classical instruction survived in the structuring of the three typese of schools: (1) the *ludus litterarius*, i.e., the primary, where children between 7 and 12 years old learned to read and write and to perform the first operations of mathematical calculations; (2) the grammar school, where adolescents learned the works and the style of the most famous Greek and Latin authors; and (3) the school of *rhetoric, the highest level, where young men obtained the summit of knowledge.

Nevertheless, one should note that in the West the study of Greek, the language of learning and commercial exchange, gradually disappeared, and in the East the study of Latin, the language of law, administration and public acts, waned. Nor does it seem that in either the East or the West, there was special public or private interest for buildings dedicated to schooling, except for the *Maenianae scholae* of Autun (*Pan. Lat*. 5) and the *scholae* of Ostia and of a small city in Tunisia.

Coercive methods and the use of memory, of which *Augustine also spoke (*Conf.* 1,9,14-15; 1,14,23), continued to be in full force, and the problem of the interpretation of texts was resolved in various ways in different cultural contexts of the empire, but primarily with the notable tendency toward *allegorical reading of even historical events described realistically, following the example of *Philo and *Paul, who considered even biblical events commonly presented as historical and the founders of the chosen people as figures and types of Christian events. Preaching, however, addressed to learned peoples, accepted with little resistance the thriving literary culture and became institutionalized in the traditional schools almost as a parallel continuation of the great classical schools, although weakened by the repetitiveness of the degraded rhetoric and the resurgence of pagan religiosity.

*Justin Martyr and *Clement of Alexandria in their schools reconsidered Hellenic philosophy; *Origen wrote the first *summa* in a Christian light; all

three of these scholars began and brought to completion a school, which did not find an equivalent in the West, which was instead marked by the condemnation of traditional culture by *Tertullian, the condemnation of religion and the pagan traditions by *Arnobius and the condemnation of philosophy *tout court* by *Lactantius. The *institutiones* would be from that point onward *divinae*, and a compendium of all the liberal arts. The openness toward classical texts by *Basil of Caesarea in *The Exhortation to Young Men on the Way of Gaining Benefit from Pagan Literature* is highly speculative and cannot be distinguished from the position of *Theodoret of Cyrrhus in his treatise *On the Way of Curing Hellenic Maladies*.

Christian young men often had pagan teachers whose teaching was tied to mythology, and one understands well not only the intransigent attitude of *Tertullian (*De idololatria* 10) but also the intransigent and openly persecutory attitude of *Julian (the Apostate) in prohibiting Christian teachers from teaching in the public schools of the pagan state. Origen's education, as recounted by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* VI,2,8-15), concretely describes the formation of a young man, who on the one hand was nourished by traditional studies and on the other hand received an education enriched by well-known biblical teaching.

There were also cases of Christian teachers who were highly regarded by pagans and pagan teachers who boasted of their Christian students: the pagan orator Libanius had a friendship with *Basil of Caesarea and *John Chrysostom; *Themistius, who was also pagan, was the teacher of *Arcadius, the son of the emperor *Theodosius I; *Prohaeresius, a Christian orator of Athens, was the teacher of *Gregory of Nazianzus and the pagan Eunapius. Augustine emphasized for his part the conversion of the famous rhetorician *Marius Victorinus (*Conf.* VIII,2,5).

From the middle of the 2nd c., Justin, former teacher at Ephesus, had in Rome as a disciple *Tatian, an opponent of Greek culture; at *Alexandria, during the 2nd c., *Pantaenus was the teacher of Clement, the brilliant author of the triptych the *Protrepticus*, the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*, which set forth Christ as a guide, a pedagogue and a teacher of humanity. And Origen, who directed the *Didaskaleion* starting from 204, was a teacher of the *enkyklia grammata* and philosophy (Eusebius, *HE* VI,3,3) at Caesarea as well. A witness to his teaching methods was *Gregory Thaumaturgus (see his *Thanksgiving for Origen* 14,170-15,173, from ca. 238). The natural sciences, geometry and astronomy only served the purpose of illuminating Christian teaching. Only later were the theological schools, communal or individual (see *Apollinaris, *Didymus the Blind, Gregory of Nazianzus: Jerome, *Ep.* 84,3; 50,1; 52,8), institutionalized.

III. Evolution of the concept of school. Eastern and Western monasticism, starting from the mid-4th c., showed itself in large part hostile to secular culture, and the young people, who were generally orphans, or appointed by someone else's decision to the monastic life, received a purely religious education founded on the sacred books.

But the libraries and the *scriptoria* "at least until the end of the 6th c. do not allow us to speak of monastic schools replacing or serving as alternatives to secular ones, in which a scholastic *cursus* was organically established and which were also open to young men who were not destined to the monastic life" (Pricoco).

The effort of giving a rational explanation for the Christian message was not exempt from the risks of syncretism, deriving from the philosophical schools in vogue such as *Platonism, *Aristotelianism and *Stoicism, as Tertullian had already warned (*Praescr.* VII, 9), but the Hellenism, or better put, a certain syncretism with Hellenism and the religion that lay underneath it, became inevitable and perhaps was a necessary condition for being able to dialogue with the culture of that time.

Around the mid-2nd c., the philosophical schools or the religious gnostic schools spread their message even among Christians (see Col 2:8), as one can perceive from the Christian apologetical treatises that fought against them, even though mixing biblical, philosophical, logical and traditional elements.

Justin Martyr, *Irenaeus of Lyons and Tertullian were the founders of this theological school which was not tied exclusively to the Scriptures.

Irenaeus represented a cultural bridge between Greek and Latin theology and spread the concept of the apostolicity of the church established on the succession of the apostles, i.e., in the final analysis on the principle of authority: the bishop is the guarantor born from the transmission of the revealed truth.

Carthage, on the other side of the Mediterranean, emphasized the authoritative principle for truth, tying it to the monarchical episcopate, because the bishop is appointed directly by God (Cyprian, *Ep.* 39), and the unity of the church took its origin from the apostle *Peter (*Un.* 5), the source of the episcopate (even in the purely chronological sense) and the first bishop of Rome (*Un.* 4,5,251). As a result, communion with Rome became the essential principle of belonging to the universal church (*Un.* 6).

Already *Ignatius of Antioch had hailed the

church of *Rome as a guide of communion in charity. The authority of the bishop—one thinks of the four Latin doctors of the church: *Ambrose, *Augustine, *Jerome and *Gregory the Great, and the four doctors of the Greek Church: *Athanasius, *Basil, *John Chrysostom and *Cyril of Alexandria—was sufficient to create institutionalized groups for teaching and catechesis and was certainly at the origin of what is called the development of dogma, a fundamentally foreign concept to the Bible, which only considered the progress from the OT to the NT. And it is therefore believable that Origen, one of the greatest and most intelligent theologians, who was clearly Platonist in orientation, marked a shift in theology and signified the summit of that great school of Alexandria, which was opposed and exalted at the same time, but nonetheless destined to fame and to making an epic turn in the study of divine revelation. Simply consider that vast avenues of his research regarding the transcendental world (God, the trinitarian mystery, the angels and souls), the historical world (the creation, the first parents of humankind, the economy of the OT, the incarnation of the Savior, resurrection and punishment), the human world (free will, wisdom and *imago Dei*) and the scriptural world (the interpretation of Scripture, symbolism).

In the West, however, despite the scholastic *summae*, the Middle Ages were impoverished in culture and institutions that the popular culture favored, because the freedom of research was bound at the beginning by the authoritative rulings of orthodoxy.

Christian philosophy inherited from Greek culture and Christianized the fundamental categories of the way of posing problems and the language and the concepts with which to express them. God is the teacher in the formation of the Christian (Augustine, *De magistro* 1, 38-46; Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestio Disputata De Magistro* XI,1-4). Thoroughly imbued with Greco-Roman culture, Augustine ties together ancient philosophy with biblical tradition and the theology of the early Christians. In his work the two worlds merge without making more visible a solution of continuity. Augustine's solution was synthesized in the formula: *Crede ut intelligas*, *intellige ut credas*. Faith helps understanding; understanding in turn must put itself at the service of faith. He was greatly indebted to the Greek tradition with respect to the teaching that human formation occurred through an interior way, the teacher of which, following Christian revelation, was Christ.

The Roman schools resisted the barbarian invasions, keeping alive, even in a reduced dimension, the literary culture among the laity, in Italy and Gaul, Spain and North Africa. Carthage maintained its well-known celebrities with such noted figures as *Dracontius, *Felicianus, *Faustus, the teacher of *Luxurius, *Symposius and *Corippus. All this leads one to believe that such schools lasted until the Byzantine reconquest and posed resistance until the Arab conquest of Africa.

In Italy, the school had a moment of glory under *Theodoric, and no one can underestimate the value of *Cassiodorus's work (see also Cassiodorus, *Variae* IX,21: MGH, *Auct. ant.* XII,286).

*Justinian with his *Pragmatic Sanction* from the year 554 devoted his attention to the teachers of grammar, rhetoric, medicine and law. As in the 4th c., the following authors were esp. read in the schools: Virgil, Terence, Horace, Ovid, Tibullus, Lucan, Cicero and *Sallustius; interest, however, for the study of Greek and philosophy seemed to be optional.

In the Greek East the imperial university of *Constantinople did not fade away, which was a prelude to the Byzantine schools. It is true that alongside the schools of the state in the 6th c. there appeared schools within the church for the formation of the clergy with a *ratio*, which kept very much in mind the Sacred *Scripture, explaining grammatical rules and even metrical rules with examples taken only from Scripture.

But the situation generally sank to such a low level from the cultural point of view that a large mass of illiterate people (*illitterati*) was pitted against a small number of instructed clerics and a few aristocrats—*honestiores*—who were also educated by home instructors.

IV. Ancient Christian "exegetical" schools. The term *school* has been traditionally marked by the particular exegesis of patristic, medieval or modern orientation, summarized in the simplistic formula: literal or allegorical orientation, with one demarcated as proper to the authors of the Antiochene "school" and the other as proper to the Alexandrian "school." It is true that these authors had to their advantage a series of works beginning with ps.-Barnabas, but esp. the exegetical impulse or direction given by the *Didaskaleion* established by *Pantaenus in Alexandria, following the path, it seems, found in the work of Philo and other Jewish authors. The meaning: *somatic* or *corporeal* and *psychic* or *animal* were almost overlooked in favor of the *pneumatic* or *spiritual* sense, with bold allegories that left even their contemporaries confused.

It is true that Origen's use of allegory did not overlook literal analysis, as one can observe from the *Hexapla*, but his successors, though in a varying and waning manor—whether in Alexandria, with

*Didymus the Blind and Cyril, or in Caesarea, with *Eusebius, or in Cappadocia with *Gregory of Nyssa, *Gregory of Nazianzus and *Basil, who constituted a sort of Alexandrian subschool—come close to their fierce opponents such as the polemical authors *Methodius of Olympus and *Epiphanius of Salamis.

Contemporaneous to the *Didaskaleion* is the other catechetical school of Antioch, which was established, it seems, by *Lucian martyr, who was fiercely attached to the literal explanation with few concessions to the messianic "types," which could boast of great individuals such as *Eustathius, *Theodore of Heraclea, *Titus of Bostra, *Eusebius of Emesa, *Polychronius of Apamea, but esp. *Diodore of Tarsus, *John Chrysostom, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, the most rationalist and antiallegorical commentator. Other authors who would likewise attest the importance of the Antiochene school were *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and the Syriac authors *Aphraates and *Ephrem.

Latin Christian authors such as *Victorinus of Petovium and *Hilary of Poitiers in large part remained slaves of their scarce mastery of Greek and therefore showed themselves on the whole to be allegorists and Origenists. *Ambrose was not known for speculative allegorism as much as for an account of an ethical and aesthetic nature, which nevertheless thwarted the "historical" data, or what was considered such, of the Bible, resulting in tortuous and not always clear moral reductions. The following authors, however, are exceptions: the strong personalities of *Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Augustine (only partially), and even *Pelagius. Afterward began and multiplied the dry collections, anthologies and florilegia of the works of earlier Christian authors, and gradually Christian scholarship entered the scholastic phase, with the dominance, apart from a few authors, of only the authoritative interpretation of the scriptural text.

M. Roger, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin*, Paris 1905; A. Müller, *Studentenleben im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*: Philologus 69 (1910) 292-317; C. Barbagallo, *Lo Stato e l'istruzione pubblica nell'Impero romano*, Catania 1911; H. Pirenne, *De l'état de l'instruction des laïques à l'époque mérovingienne*: RBen 46 (1934) 165-177; G. Bardy, *L'Église et l'enseignement au IV^e^ siècle*: RSR 14 (1934) 525-549 and 15 (1935) 1-27; L. Bréhier, *L'enseignement classique et l'enseignement religieux à Byzance*: RHPhR 21 (1941) 34-69; A. Lorcin, *La vie scolaire dans les monastères d'Irlande aux V^e^-VII^e^ siècles*: Rev. du Moyen-Âge Latin 1 (1945) 221-236; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris [2]1948; M. Pavan, *La crisi della scuola nel IV sec. d.C.*, Bari 1952; G. Bardy, *Les origines des écoles monastiques en Occident*: SE 5 (1953) 86-104; Id., *Les origines des écoles monastiques en Orient*, in *Mélanges J. de Ghellinck*, Gembloux 1951, I, 293-309; Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, Paris 1955; G. Downey, *Education in the Christian Roman Empire: Christian and Pagan Theories Under Costantine and His Successors*: Speculum 32 (1957) 48-61; J. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu*, Paris 1957 (It. tr. *Cultura umanistica e desiderio di Dio*, Florence 1965); P. Riché, *La survivance des écoles publiques en Gaule au V^e^ siècle*: MA 43 (1957) 421-436; S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, New York [2]1958; H.I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris [2]1978 (It. tr. *Sant'Agostino e la fine della cultura antica*, Milan 1987); J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique de l'Espagne wisigothique*, Paris 1959; P. Riché, *Éducation et Culture dans l'Occident barbare VI^e^-VII^e^ siècles*, Paris 1962 (It. tr. Rome 1966); var. aus., *Los monjes y los estudios*, IV Semana de estudios monásticos, Poblet 1963; H.I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris [2]1964 (It. tr. Rome [3]1978); *Centri e vie di irradiazione della civiltà nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane . . . Spoleto 11 (1964); P. Blomenkamp, *Erziehung*: RAC 6, 502-559; B.C. Hardy, *The Emperor Julian and His School Law*: ChHist 37 (1968) 131-143; *Erziehung und Bildung in der heidn. und christli. Antike*, ed. H.Th. Johann, Darmstadt 1976; V. Paladini, *L'istruzione nel mondo classico*, Naples 1968; *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Âge*, Actes du IV^e^ Congrès Int. de philos., Montréal 1969; P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris 1971; *La scuola nell'Occidente latino nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane . . . Spoleto 19 (1972); A. Di Berardino, *Maestri cristiani del III secolo nell'insegnamento classico*: Augustinianum 12 (1972) 549-556; A. Quacquarelli, *Scuola e cultura dei primi secoli cristiani*, Brescia 1974; *La cultura antica nell'Occidente latino dal VII all'XI secolo*: Settimane . . . Spoleto 22 (1975); J. Préaux, *Securus Melior Felix, l'ultime "orator urbis Romae,"* in *Corona Gratiarum . . . Dekkers*, Bruges 1975, II, 101-121; *Église et enseignement*: Actes du Colloque du X^e^ anniversaire de l'Inst. d'hist. du christ. de l'Univ. libre de Brussels, ed. J. Préaux, Brussels 1977; J. Bowen, *Storia dell'educazione occidentale*, It. tr., I, Milan 1979; P. Riché, *Les écoles et l'enseignement dans l'Occident chrétien de la fin du V^e^ siècle au milieu du XI^e^ siècle*, Paris 1979; M. Falanga, *La scuola elementare nell'antica Roma*, Rome 1979; S. Pricoco, *L'editto di Giuliano sui maestri* (CTh 13,3,5): Orpheus 1 (1980) 348-370; M. Pavan, *La scuola nel Tardo Antico*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, Atti del conv. di Rome 12-16 novembre 1979, Rome 1981, 553-560; P. Riché, *L'école dans le Haut Moyen Âge*, ibid., 561-574; G. Mialaret (ed.), *Histoire mondiale de l'éducation*, Paris 1981 (It. tr. Rome 1986-88); S.F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*, London 1977 (It. tr., *L'educazione nell'antica Roma da Catone il censore a Plinio il giovane*, Rome 1986); J. Rejmer, *De Alexandria Aegyptia eiusque civitate temporibus Origenis florente*: Meander 41 (1986) 443-458; *Christliche Antike* / ausgewählt & komm. von D. Schmitz & M. Wissemann, Frankfurt a.M. 1993; ANRW, ed. W. Haase, Berlin-New York 1993; A. Grilli, *Uno scritto sull'educazione dei ragazzi alle soglie del neoplatonismo*, in *Italia sul Baetis: studi di storia romana in memoria di Fernando Gascó*, ed. E. Gabba - P. Desideri - S. Roda, Turin 1996, 103-114; G. Bockisch, *Die Rhetorik in der Bildungsdiskussion*, AU 39 (1996) 6-18; D.W. Roller, *Augustan Literary Circles and Herod the Great*: JAC 11 (1996) 57-64; R. Frasca, *Educazione e formazione a Roma*, Bari 1996; R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta 1996; M. Caltabiano, *Litterarum numen*, Rome 1996; A.K. Gavrilov, *Techniques of Reading in Classical Antiquity*: CQN.S. 47 (1997) 56-73; T. Banchich - A. Van den Hoek, *The "Catechetical" School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage*: HThR 90 (1997) 59-87; B. Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec*, Brussels 1997; J. Rossel, *Aux racines de l'Europe occidentale*, Bâle 1995; Th. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht*, Munich 1997; K. Vössing, *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen*

Kaiserzeit, Brussels 1997; A. Cucchiarelli, *"Allegoria retorica" e filologia alessandrina*: SIFC3a ser. 15 (1997) 210-230; B. Legras, *Éducation et culture dans le monde grec*, Paris 1998; G.M. Vian, *La tradizione filologica alessandrina tra giudaismo e cristianesimo*: Cassiodorus 4 (1998) 187-197; T.J. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge-New York 1998; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Enciclopedismo e sapere cristiano tra tardo-antico e alto Medioevo* [It. tr. A. Granata], Milan 1999; A. Grilli, *Politica, cultura e filosofia in Roma antica*, Naples 2000; H. Gregory, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World*, London 2000; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville*, Turnhout 2000; A.R. Millard, *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*, Sheffield 2000; R. Cribriore, *Gymnastic of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton, NJ 2001; N. Henck, *Constantius' "paideia," Intellectual Milieu and Promotion of the Liberal Arts*: PCPhS 47 (2001) 172-186; J.M. Blázquez, *La Academia de Atenas como foco de formación humanística para paganos y cristianos*: Gerión 19 (2001) 595-628; T. Schmeller, *Schulen im Neuen Testament?: zur Stellung des Urchristentums in der Bildungswelt seiner Zeit*, Freiburg i.B. 2001; C.A. McNelis, *Greek Grammarians and Roman Society During the Early Empire*: CLA 21 (2002) 67-94.

B. Amata

SCILLITAN MARTYRS. Twelve martyrs who were later referred to with the title "Scillitan"; their individual names were as follows: Speratus, Nartzalus, Cittinus, Donata, Secunda, Laetantius, Vestia, Veturius, Felix, Aquilinus, Januaria and Generosa. They came from *Scilli, an unidentified place in Proconsular *Africa, but the location does not correspond to *Cillium* (Kassérine, Tunisia). Apart from the fact that they underwent martyrdom on 17 July 180, nothing is known of their life. The *Acts* of their martyrdom have been preserved (BHL 7527) and are among the best documents of the African hagiographic literature. The different recensions (BHL 7528-7534) illustrate very well the events through which an authentic text can be transmitted. At a later period, a basilica was built on their tomb, the name of which is often found in antiquity (Aug., *Serm.* 155 and perhaps *Serm.* 37, *Denis* 16, *Guelf.* 30; Vict. Vita, *Hist. pers. Afr. prov.* 1,9). On their feast day, *Augustine preached a sermon in their honor, from which we gather that on this occasion the account of their martyrdom was read to the people (the same sermon cited, and *Guelf.* 31, *Lambot* 9). The feast is also mentioned in the *Mart. hier.* and in the *Calendarium Carth.*; only the name of Speratus, however, appears in the Marble Calendar of *Naples.

We know that in Africa a basilica was built in their honor at the monastery of Biguas (BHL 4906). Some of their relics were preserved at Kherbet Oum el Ahdam in 359 (CIL 8, 20600), and at Dermech, near *Carthage. The bodies were transferred to France at the time of Charlemagne and laid to rest in the basilica of St. *John at Lyons (BHL 2045).

DACL 15, 1014-1021; *Vies des SS.* 7, 378-381; LTK 9, 551-552; V. Saxer, *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du III^e^ s.*, Rome 1969, 309; Id., *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Vatican City 1979, 31-34; Id., *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 185-186, 203, 213, 226, 317; G. Lanata, *Gli Atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 136-144; F. Ruggiero, *Il problema del numero dei martiri scilitani*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 9 (1988) 135-152; H.A. Gärtner, *Die Acta Scillitanorum in literarischer Interpretation*: WS 102 (1989) 149-167; P.-I. Fransen, *Les martyrs scillitains*: Connaissance des Pères de l'Église 89 (2003) 53-56.

V. Saxer

SCOTLAND. For Scotland, as for the rest of Great Britain, scholars do not know for certain about the origins of Christianity and the first steps completed by missionaries who introduced it there. The most ancient historical Scottish sources, however—drawing on the ancient litanies—mention that at the beginning of the 3rd c., around the year 203, Pope *Victor, in attempts to evangelize those lands far away, sent some missionaries. The first clear evidence of Christianity in Scotland, however, is represented in the history of St. *Ninian, who was born around the year 360 in the SW part of the country and went to *Rome to study and to be consecrated bishop by Pope *Siricius. Once he had returned to Scotland at the beginning of the 5th c., he established the first stone church in Candida Casa (today Whithorn), dedicating it to St. *Martin, where he himself was later buried (see Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* III,4). Upon his death, in 432, his successor in the delicate duty of evangelization of those lands that were hostile to the Christian was *Palladius, the apostle of Ireland, who after more than twenty years of preaching died in a place close to Aberdeen, later called Fordunn, where his cult still survives.

After having founded some monasteries in *Ireland, as the Venerable *Bede himself bears witness (III,4), *Columba came to Scotland around the year 563, along with twelve companions, and went to Iona (an island off SW Scotland) to organize the construction of an important monastery, which later had the privilege of becoming an abbey and was always considered the most important of all the Irish and Scottish monastic dwellings. Although Columba evangelized the Picts of the N, the duty of bringing the faith into the SW regions of Scotland was completed by Kentigern, who died around 612 after having become the first bishop of Glasgow, and the E regions were deeply marked by the work of *Cuthbert, concerning whose life and miracles Bede provided extensive information (IV,26-32).

The *Celtic church was tribal and monastic in its organization, and its monks, many of whom lived in

the rigidly eremitic style, were well-known for their extreme austerity and for their scrupulous adherence to the Celtic traditions (e.g., in the celebration of *Easter), an aspect which inevitably led to tensions with the influence of *Augustine of Canterbury's mission when his *Roman uses began to become widespread and accepted in N England. Gradually, Scotland began to conform to the Roman rite, esp. after having been encouraged by the bishop of Iona, *Adamnan (d. 704); and in 710 the king of the Picts, Nechtan, as Bede carefully notes (V,21), imposed on all his kingdom conformity to the Roman tradition.

G. Donaldson, *Scotland: Church and Nation Through Sixteen Centuries*, London 1960; W.C. Dickinson - G.S. Pryde, *A New History of Scotland*, I-II, New York 1962; J.H.S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland*, Oxford 1964.

M. Ghilardi

SCRIBE – RABBI. In the Jewish world the term *scribe* originally referred to a secretary with civil (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25) or military duties (2 Kgs 25:19). From the time of Ezra the term referred to an expert in the Torah (Ezra 7:6, 11); as such, Ezra read to the gathered people the Torah of *Moses, which was given by the Lord to Israel.

In the postbiblical age, the expert in matters of religious law and tradition was called "rabbi"; the rabbi traced his origins and authority to Moses through an uninterrupted chain of transmitters. The title was conferred with a religious ceremony (*semikhah* = χειροτονία), which, after being prohibited by the Romans, went into disuse. With the dominance of the Pharisaic party after AD 70, the rabbis, who were not priests, replaced the scribes as spiritual guides.

The scribes, in a Roman context (Gk. *grammateus*), were generally secretaries of public officials and magistrates with duties, and even of private individuals. The scribe is to be distinguished from the *librarius* (as well as the *scriba librarius*), who was a simple copyist. Even the emperors had their own scribes (*scriba ab epistolis* etc.). The scribes were organized into groups. The term was also used in an ecclesiastical context (*see* *notarius).

EC 11, 172-173; DACL 15, 1027-1035; PWK 21, 848-857; DAGR 4, 1123-1124; J. Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, Leiden 1975.

S. Cavalletti

SCRIPTURE, HOLY.

I. The canon - II. Versions and MSS - III. Inspiration - IV. Function of the Bible in the church.

I. The canon. That the Word of God was transmitted to his people as Sacred Scripture is something that the Christian community inherited from Judaism. Early Christian doctrinal reflection had not defined all its forms; and neither Jesus nor the apostles subordinated revelation to the scholastic ideas of the scribes and teachers of the law, ideas that the latter group would reaffirm when, after the fall of Jerusalem, Jews and Judaism closed ranks. The Hebrew Bible (which was also written in Aramaic in a very small part) was then definitively closed, with the Torah (Pentateuch) having a normative priority, with some rigorous translations for its legal interpretation. As early as *Philo, but in an entirely different spirit, the Pentateuch was the only text to be commented on. At Qumran, however, the book of Isaiah had a central role. The gospels latched onto prophetic freedom: throughout the entire NT the book of Isaiah and the Psalms enjoyed pride of place. Apocryphal literature performed a certain task not so much as a new category of holy books as much as an eschatological and messianic climate conferring unity to the prophecies. And this Galilean mentality was not lacking parallels in the Jewish diaspora, in which the apostle *Paul was reared.

The writings that make up the NT were not originally conceived by their authors as a complementary collection to be added to the Hebrew canon. The churches took care to preserve the apostolic epistles, even if the quality and the activity of the editor remain unknown: many historians have assigned to these editors an editorial role that cannot be ignored. With respect to the words and miracles of Jesus, we possess three redactions, but the early documents to which Luke alludes have been lost; moreover, to this was added the fourth gospel, which came from a special milieu. Since the beginning of the 2nd c., *Ignatius of Antioch showed that he was acquainted with many of these texts, but without citing them as an authority; in the mid-2nd c., *Justin Martyr mentions that they were read during the *liturgy; nonetheless, it is only *Irenaeus who seems to have understood them to be coherent, canonized and fixed. The polemic against the claims of the *gnostics to have secret traditions, and against those of *Marcion of choosing and correcting texts, and of rejecting the Hebrew Scriptures, contributed to reinforcing the awareness of the privilege reserved for the writings considered apostolic, depending on the reception they received within the main churces and taking into account internal criteria of reliability and orthodoxy. Because no central authority had defined the canon of Scripture, each church created particular uses of the

Scriptures: Syria, e.g., read the gospel in the *Diatessaron*. But the force of fraternal communion slowly tended toward uniformity, although qualified intellectuals (e.g., Origen, Eusebius, Jerome) led the bishops and the faithful in their choices. Although rejecting the suspect apocryphal books, many for a long time admitted a category of books which were edifying but not normative. The perplexities, which in the 2nd c. had as their object such important texts as the gospel of *John or the gospels or the apocryphal *Acts*, were reduced in the 4th c. to certain writings which are found toward the end of the modern-day NT (the epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles and the book of Revelation). The question of their apostolic origin remained particularly thorny. With respect to the OT, there were few church fathers who called into question the authority of the deuterocanonical books; and those who, like *Jerome, claimed to align themselves with the Jews and rejected these books, found no resonance among the Christian faithful. The Christian art of the catacombs allotted an extraordinary priority to the deuterocanonical legends: the three youths in the furnace or Daniel in the lion's den, or even a later account, although canonical, such as that of *Jonah. However, it is possible to identify how the citations of the Fathers demonstrate a predilection for more foundational biblical passages.

Certain authors such as *Basil of Caesarea, who at the same time used almost all the writings of our canon, generally limit their biblical sources to a rather restricted list. The history of the canon is therefore much less uniform than what scholars would sometimes have us believe. Explicit lists of biblical books upon which one can base a list of canonical texts for a given council or church father are rather rare. One of the most important documents for defining the tradition and which wound up imposing itself on others was a list authoritatively compiled by *Athanasius of Alexandria in 367 (*The Paschal letter* 39). The bishop was thinking less of the universal church but more for his own flock, esp. the monks, who continually drew edification from pious apocryphal texts. This list, however, automatically became widely read. In the West one is struck by the fact that there was an anonymous author, in the 6th c., who sought to reject, in the so-called **Decretum Gelasianum*, a long and ordered list of apocryphal texts. In fact, the Greek and Latin copyists allowed these texts to pass away, or in any case, poorly transmitted them, which, however, the *Coptic, *Syriac, Arabic and esp. the *Ethiopian churches have better preserved.

Just as even Slavic literature (after the 9th c.) is well furnished in this area, one must hold that certain Greek circles for a long time transmitted this literary production. They rarely preserved heterodox texts, but rather a Jewish Christian or *encratic literature, which was more popular than clerical.

II. Versions and MSS. Access to the original Semitic texts of the OT is the privilege of a few scholars. The NT, written in Greek, cites primarily the classic translation of Hellenistic Judaism, which has come to be called the Septuagint (LXX), although a number of citations unrelated to this version could trace back to some Aramaic Targums, or often to some of the *testimonia* already recast and adapted to their Christian function. Since the 1st c., Judaism, which had closed in on itself, rejected the LXX and produced new Greek versions, some elements of which must have contaminated a good portion of the MSS of the LXX. The spread of Christianity then led to a progressive translation effort into Latin, Coptic and Syriac; their origins are obscure because the first steps were hesitant, partial and imperfect. Nevertheless, there remain some ancient texts that reflect a social context of the rather conventional culture. They are often related to the textual forms described as Western, because they were first known in Latin (*Cyprian) but which likewise circulated in Syria and which had been poorly preserved in Greek.

The importance of "chosen passages," the *testimonia*, in early Christian literature leads one to think that completed books were not easy to acquire or perhaps easy to use. A fact of pure library technology—i.e., the replacement of the scroll (*volumen*) with the codex, in which the pages followed one after another as in our modern-day books—is nonetheless connected to the spread of the Christian Bible and suggests the existence of a vast market of readers that was separated from the old cultural conventions and desirous of consulting, and even of leafing through, the sacred books.

The study of variants demonstrates that the texts were continually reelaborated in recensions that were conscientious of grammar and also Attic purity; they introduced reminiscences of parallel passages or traditions more or less historical (the Western text); or, on the contrary, they were inspired by secular philology and systematically reverted to purer models (the Alexandrian text). The versions were then so full of corrections that they were no longer intelligible; some adhered strictly to the original, and others had the pretext of greater correctness and linguistic purity. Therefore critical editions must master a large quantity of variants, in which the accidental corruptions count for very little; it is a

rather secular endeavor of piety and culture.

J. van Haelst's *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Paris 1976) lists 567 biblical papyri (plus 50 fragments of apocryphal texts). Most have been recently discovered, which materially attests to the forms under which Scripture circulated. Textual criticism classifies both these ancient fragments of MSS that have been preserved (in all languages) and the patristic citations of the scriptural texts. This science must distinguish the editorial action of the great centers of learning (above all *Alexandria, then *Antioch, *Rome, *Edessa, *Jerusalem and many others) and identify the rare documents that have escaped these adjustments to the texts.

Many peculiarities that are attributed to whim, if one considers them to be isolated, assume a precise meaning when the framework is reconstructed. The work becomes even easier when it concerns biblical versions and when the translation variants notably increase the really different readings and feature a quotation.

III. Inspiration. No one theory was elaborated with respect to the inspiration of Scripture, nor was it imposed on reflection: the authority of the Bible was an unquestioned fact. The gnostics, who contested it, placed themselves by that very reason outside the Christian faith. The idea of an ancient and mysterious wisdom, hidden in the sacred books, was rather widespread, in an era which A. Festugière characterized as the decline of rationalism and the mode of the Eastern prophets (*La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I, Paris 1944, 1-44), during which respect for the Bible easily acquired excessive forms: a magical stick could extract all the gnosis one could desire. Because the cultural context was entirely different from the one in which the OT and the NT was edited, the reader ran into many problems, even more so if he had an education based on the training of classical humanism: the anthropomorphisms, the Jewish rites, moral examples, the historical references, the lexicon and the syntax. The work of *Philo and his refined algorithm supplied a valuable model. Moreover, Jesus and Paul had questioned the value of the Mosaic law, and this was verified with Christianity's break from Judaism. Very early on an author like *Barnabas (cf. the epistle to the Hebrews) would be led to deny the literal sense of the ancient precepts in favor of a radically spiritual exegesis. Already before *Irenaeus, an intelligent gnostic like *Ptolemy (*Lettre à Flora*, ed. G. Quispel, SC 24bis, Paris 1966) was able to propose some distinctions which were very often pertinent. The simple faith of the people, the weight of the lived tradition, the healthy framing of the Christian tradition and the analogy of faith, the responsibility of the bishops, and the charisms of the saints assured the church of the royal road, upon which the fathers of the church such as *Origen, Jerome, *John Chrysostom, *Augustine and many others had walked, with the help of strong literary preparation, dialogue with rabbinical learning, and the incentive of preaching.

All the sacred authors of the OT and the NT were inclined toward the prophetic books; even the primary characteristic of the Holy Spirit was for a long time to speak through their mouth, and precisely to him was attributed the inspiration of the fullness of truth. As a result, it was not easy to lead people to believe that one sole explanation of the biblical text could suffice to exhaust its divine meaning. Little attention was given to distinguishing between what the human author intended directly within the horizon of his own time and the interpretations that could be given by his intuition within the matrix of other cultures, just as no distinction was made between the biblical affirmation of a fact of the history of salvation from the countless metaphysical analyses that theology could give of it. Origen (and other church fathers after him) loved to emphasize the absurdity of a literal explanation, which was based on various ways of speaking that were proper to Semites and from that fact deduced the necessity of a more subtle treatment of Scripture. If statements of this type surprise modern readers, they did not prevent the early church from taking into account literary and historical context; they were sufficiently familiar with the biblical languages to take into consideration many philological phenomena and to understand, in its inner essence, the moral or mystical terminology of the prophets and the apostles. The literary *schools of antiquity were difficult to match. Whether or not, through their exegetical formation, the Fathers depended one on the other (Basil and *Gregory of Nazianzus, e.g., in the *Philocalia* united the best pages from Origen's writings on the interpretation of the Bible), it would be a misunderstanding of them if we attempted to explain them as simple scholastic routines, because each one of these authors had his own secular literary formation. When we observe one of their reactions toward the abuses of allegorism, the cause often resides in the hostility toward an ambiguous gnosticism, which presumed to derive far-fetched philosophies from the text.

There was such a strong conviction that wisdom could not have a source apart from biblical revelation that the majority of Platonizing theologians maintained that the teachers of Greek religious phi-

losophy had drawn on the writings of Moses. The controversies with a *Celsus, a *Porphyry, a *Julian, all defenders of pagan culture, forced Christian authors in this direction. This question, however, was not so important for those Christian authors who used philosophy, by subordinating it entirely to faith.

IV. Function of the Bible in the church. The liturgy of the word, which is associated with a psalmody of praise or with the Eucharist, is a communal activity, the absence of which is hard to conceive of in any church. Its primary scope is to manifest the presence of Christ in believers. It spontaneously recalls a homiletic element, which explains the literal meaning, and esp. shows the relation of the text with the gospel of Jesus Christ. The prophets, after the manner of those at Corinth, must have also put the history of salvation to a lyrical tone, in the same way in which an *Ephrem used Scripture; the rhythmic prose of a *Melito of Sardis and many others gives us an idea of this practice for the Greek world, in which the heavy encumbrance of classic versification paralyzed poetic inspiration for a long time (e.g., *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Apollinaris of Laodicea). Apologetics (against the Jews, against the Greeks) and the struggles against heresies usually led Christian authors to resort to a discussion of Scripture.

*Hippolytus was probably the first to attempt systematic commentaries for certain biblical passages and an entire book, as e.g. Daniel. Origen, who, in a very learned context, was able to undertake a scientific study of the text (*see* **Hexapla*), devoted himself to cycles of homilies on the entire content of a biblical book, and as well to lengthy, systematic written commentaries. He found models and catalysts in some gnostic works, esp. on the first chapters of the book of Genesis.

If the greatest Fathers were, evidently, familiar with the Bible and, as it seems, knew it by heart, we would also like to know to what extent a private reading of Scripture was practiced. The resistance that a new version (as in the case of the Vulgate) could meet leads us to suppose that numerous formulas of earlier translations had penetrated into the minds of Christian people. It is also a fact that during the *Diocletian persecution there was a hunt for Bibles and that the *martyrs, when at times the MSS were taken away from them, rejoiced at preserving the word of God in their hearts.

Many thousands of titles are carefully noted in the pages dedicated to the entry *Bibel* (G. Wanke; E. Plümacher; W. Schneemelcher; H. Karpp; K. Aland; S.P. Brock ecc.) in TRE 6, 1-377.

A. von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christl. Bibel*, Göttingen 1968; P.F. Ackroyd - C.F. Evans, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, I, Cambridge 1970. La *Biblia Patristica*, Paris 1975-2000, collects and places in order all of the patristic references to the Bible; seven volumes have appeared, pertaining to Philo of Alexandria and the 1st-4th c., which have allowed scholars to make enormous progress in the study of the Bible in the writings of the Fathers.

The most recent works on the canon of Scripture: H.Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon*, Philadelphia 1985; B.M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development and Significance*, Oxford 1989; E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*, Tübingen 1991; M. Tardieu (ed.), *La Formation des canons scripturaires*, Paris 1993; L.M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, Peabody, MA 1995; J.W. Miller, *The Origins of the Bible: Rethinking Canon History*, New York 1997; N.F. Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, Leiden 2001; L.M. McDonald - J.A. Sanders, *The Canon Debate*, Peabody, MA 2002; J.-M. Auwers - H.J. De Jonge, *The Biblical Canons*, Leuven 2003.

J. Gribomont

SCRIPTURE, HOLY (Ancient Versions)

I. Greek translations - II. Latin translations - III. Aramaic versions - IV. Syriac versions - V. Between East and West: Crossroad churches of cultures.

I. Greek translations. The most ancient translation of the Bible was in the Greek language and dates back to the 3rd c. BC. The translation was made for Jews in *Egypt who no longer understood Hebrew. It was called the Septuagint (LXX) because a legend attributed it to 72 Jewish scribes-translators (who then became 70) who had come from *Jerusalem. The initial term referred to the Torah, i.e., to that part of the Bible which would subsequently be called the Pentateuch by Christians. Today scholars discuss the reasons that justified a similar work. According to some, the initiative was undertaken by the king of *Alexandria Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BC) and by some scholars who, desiring to enrich the library of Alexandria with the Torah of the Jews, asked for its translation into Greek. The *Letter of *Aristeas* written in 150–100 BC is not of much historical value and probably recounts only a legend, but there are some elements of truth to it. Seventy-two scribes-translators (six for each one of the tribes of Israel), who lived an exemplary life, experts in Hebrew and Greek, were invited upon the request of the king by the high priest Eleazar of Jerusalem to Alexandria, Egypt. The *Letter of Aristeas*, despite being a forgery, intended to justify the validity of this translation. According to others the translation was necessary for the needs of the Jewish community which no longer understood Hebrew, and therefore the motive was rather liturgi-

cal. According to others, moreover, it would have belonged to the missionary tradition of Israel. Israel's task was that of proclaiming the one God, i.e., of making universal the sovereignty of the sole *Kyrios*. It was certainly an important work for many reasons, e.g., for the history of *Hellenistic Judaism and Christian origins. The first part to be translated into Greek was the Torah, i.e., the first five books of the Bible; then little by little the translation of the other books after the example of the Pentateuch. Because the Jews had begun at the beginning of our era to accept the Hebrew text which they consider to be the original, this gradually became a "standard" text for the synagogue. Destined to become the official text, the so-called Masoretic text (MT) was at times different from that text which the 70 translators translated. The need was therefore felt in the Jewish milieu of revising the Greek text acc. to the official Hebrew text.

There were then revisions by Christians. The most famous was that of *Origen of Alexandria in the 3rd c, which was called the **Hexapla*, because it used six columns: (1) Hebrew text, (2) into Greek letters, (3) *Aquila, (4); *Symmachus, (5) the Septuagint and (6) *Theodotion. While Christianity was growing and the NT was being edited, the Bible that the Christians called the OT was the Greek Bible of the Septuagint. In the first four to five centuries of the Common Era, the Septuagint was the biblical text of reference for the Christian churches without recourse to the original Hebrew. It was considered divinely inspired. In its Greek literalness it then supplied Christians those citations which with the NT were the foundation of the doctrines, the expression of piety and the forms of the Christian liturgy. Early Christianity owed to the Greek translation a good part of its language.

This translation also had a *hermeneutical* interest: it not only translated but also interpreted the Hebrew text, causing the meaning of the revelation of the OT to progress and creating an entire vocabulary which is today studied for its influence in theology, liturgy, prayer and spirituality.

The discoveries at *Qumran were also very important for the understanding of the Septuagint. Here were found Hebrew and Greek MSS. Some fragments from Qumran corresponded to the Greek model translated from the Septuagint. Therefore, the Greek version can lead us to know a more ancient biblical text, as venerable as the one received today as normative.

This translation is important, moreover, for *Greek philology*: the person who studies the evolution of the Greek language and the papyri and the inscriptions of the Hellenistic era sees the language of the Septuagint within this evolution: the Jewish Greek of Alexandria is not a Jewish dialect even if it contains many Semitisms. It preceded the Greek of the NT and occupied a place in the general history of the Greek language.

The LXX was important for *the history of Christian origins:* the birth of Christianity occurred within Jewish currents of thought that were contemporary to Jesus: the Septuagint translation was one of the data that expressed the religious ideas of this cultural context. The NT inserted itself in the evolution of the Jewish religion, for which it signals a change.

Jerome, by translating the Hebrew text that he preferred, knew well that the Greek translation of the LXX could bear witness to the state of this even more ancient text; he still did not have a sufficient notion of the multiple forms of the Hebrew text. But by only using the translations of the Bible made from the Hebrew, Christians ignored the most ancient sources of their religious history: the faith in one universal God implies that the words of revelation can reach in an authentic way every people and every tongue: is it possible to think that there exists in the world only one sacred language: Hebrew? Would vernacular languages be capable of expressing the divinely inspired words? The Bible, however, has the vocation of being translated, for all peoples, in every moment of their history. Christians associate their faith to the language in which they received the Word of God.

Certainly a translation holds for a certain time and for a given people. That time can be long: many centuries, when the language of the people becomes relatively stable, as Latin was in the Middle Ages for the clergy. It can be a shorter period of time when the world of reception undergoes a swift mutation, as was the case in the Roman era with the passage from Greek to Latin in the entire Roman Empire. Recent studies in Catholic scholarship have brought to light a fact that has been overlooked in the past. To understand the authors of the NT, one must study the cultural context in which these writings were composed. The ancient translations, esp. the Aramaic and Greek ones, constitute a permanent hermeneutic bridge between the OT and the NT. The people to whom Jesus spoke understood the Hebrew Bible through Aramaic and Greek translation. The authors of the NT benefited from the felicitous interpretations of the Alexandrian Jews both because they used the Greek translation and because they addressed a public that spoke and thought in Greek.

S.P. Brock - C.T. Frisch - S. Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*, Leiden 1973; M. Harl - G. Dorival - O. Munnich, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1986-; M. Cimosa, *Guida allo stu-*

dio della Bibbia greca (*LXX*), Rome 1995; C. Dogniez, *A Bibliography for the Septuagint: 1970-1993*, Leiden 1995; M. Müller, *The First Bible of the Church. A Plea for the Septuagint*, JSOTSup 206, Sheffield 1996; N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*, Madrid [2]1998; M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, Edinburgh-New York 2002.

II. Latin translations. The gradual and then definitive spread of the Latin language in the place of the Greek language in the world conquered by Rome allowed Christians to understand the necessity of the translations of the Sacred Scriptures even in Latin. Today the Bible that the Latin Fathers were accustomed to call the *vetus editio*, *antiqua translatio*, or *vulgata editio*, we call the *Vetus Latina* or the *Ancient Latin* versions or the *Old Latin* (as it is called in the English-speaking world)—all those translations in the popular Latin language not belonging to *Jerome and that date back to an era of the first fathers of the Latin church. These translations represent a very ancient Greek model of the Bible; they allow one to understand the origin of Christianity in the West and had much influence in the formulation of patristic theology when the Vulgate did not exist. But the term *Vulgate,* however, starting from the 16th c., was understood to refer to the most widespread Latin biblical text which became "common," as suggested by the Latin term itself, starting from the Carolingian era. This pertains not only to some of the translations made by Jerome of the Hebrew text but also the revisions that he made of the Latin versions already existing. Jerome and the Vulgate therefore are not the same thing. This is a prejudice from which modern students must still free themselves. In the use of the Latin fathers, however, including Jerome, the term "Vulgate" (*koinē*, "common") is applied to the Greek Bible in the current text, unrevised, and therefore in opposition to the learned edition of Origen and to the corrupted Latin text in use in the 4th c. From the 16th c. onward the term was used in reference to the Latin Bible; at the time of the Fathers, however, no decision had been made to give an official character to the translations of Jerome. Only the memory of Pope *Damasus in the prologue on the gospels was able to bestow authority even to the remaining part.

Subsequently, probably at the mid-5th c., Jerome's translations were supplemented by others and put together by an editor who used the terminology of *Rufinus of Aquileia. This compilation was then preserved in the Bible of Saint-Germain-des-Prés (Paris, BNF lat 11553, ca. AD 800), the Parisian Bible. The so-called Vulgate of Jerome was formed around the year 400. Mediocrity and multiplicity characterized the Latin versions of that particular historical period. Jerome was the heir of a large classical literary culture and, having gone to live in the East as a monk, was also able to enter more deeply in knowledge of the Greek text. Jerome revised the gospels in the East acc. to the best Greek MSS. These Roman revisions are explained in contact with the Jewish and Greek traditions. In actuality, his biblical adventure began with a gesture of trust by Pope Damasus, who in the spring of 384, the same year of his death, asked him to complete a revision of the existing Latin text of the gospels. It is possible to see this fact in the preface and in the dedication to Damasus of his revision of the Latin text of the NT. During his stay at *Rome (382–385) he revised the gospels, using a model of the European type, and correcting the texts of the *Vetus Latina* most likely acc. to the Greek MSS of the *koinē*. Pope Damasus looked with favor on the dedication that some authorities bestowed on this venture, which nevertheless was insufficient to give an official character to this undertaking, because Jerome, as is said in this letter, was virtually constrained to do this work at the pope's request. He thus guarded against possible criticisms on the value of his work. It seems in fact that it is the work of a novice who is learning to translate from one language into another, even if on the whole it seems to be a work of good quality. Living for many years at Bethlehem, he was also able to consult the library of Caesarea and Origen's *Hexapla*. This allowed him to closely follow the Greek Christian texts and to prepare for the Latin-speaking people a Bible corrected on the authority of the Greek text.

Jerome's first Roman revisions were done because the gospels and the *Psalms were the most read books of the Sacred *Scriptures in the liturgy; and if Pope Damasus took the initiative, it means that a true pastoral preoccupation was at the basis of this work. Having before his eyes the Greek translations of Aquila, and esp. Symmachus, Jerome undertook a translation of the OT from the Hebrew. First, however, he wrote a technical work titled *Hebrew Questions*, in which he compared the ancient translations and sought to clarify the meaning of the text. Jerome, however, did not go for theoretical questions beyond the book of Genesis. For the NT, beyond the gospels, most scholars now agree that Jerome did not edit Paul's epistles, the Catholic Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles and the book of Revelation.

We should also note that St. *Augustine spoke of Jerome's work only in reference to the OT and the gospels. Jerome added nothing to the multiplicity and diversity of translations that he combated. In his

work as a translator, like Origen, he had a twofold scope, scholarly and apologetic. Scholarly: to establish a correct Latin text from the vernacularisms and the scribal errors and to create a unity between the existing translations. Apologetic: to give Christians a biblical text that could no longer be accused by the Jews of imprecision and falsehood. Augustine preferred the critical revisions made on the Greek text (the gospels and the *Hexapla* version) rather than the translations made by Jerome directly from the Greek. As one scholar says concerning these problems: "On the whole, the exegetical work of Jerome was successful more for its philological rigor and large abundance of material used than for the coherency of method and the originality of the interpretation" (Manlio Simonetti). Jerome's exegesis was in the line of the Hebrew interpretation. His dependence on rabbinic teachers is evident.

Nevertheless it is Christian primarily because it respects the preceding Latin tradition, esp. when it pertains to God, divine actions, prayers, rites and language. It was also Christian because it was made in service of the NT, keeping in mind the exegetical interpretation of the church, and esp. Origen's. For his exegesis, Jerome drew heavily on Origen's works. Accused of this dependence, he defended himself by appealing to famous examples of Latin authors and by affirming that with his commentaries he intended to present various interpretations of biblical passages that were difficult to understand to help the reader to judge *quid verius sit* ("what is more true") and to reject phony cash as a good money changer. At the beginning of his exegetical activity, Jerome intended to put the Latin reader in contact with Eastern exegesis, to render Origen in Latin and to give him *romanis auribus* ("Roman ears"). Jerome's language, which is at certain points rhetorical, reaches a certain equilibrium and a very religious tone when he supports himself on the ancient Latin versions. His cultural preparation and esp. his literary preparation allowed him to give to his Latin language a tone of poetry and beauty. The version of the gospels reproduces an excellent Greek text. In *Letter* 57, sometimes called *De optimo genere interpretandi*, from the end of the year 395, Jerome affirmed as an ideal of translation fidelity to the meaning without excessive adherence to the words following the characteristics of the language into which one translated. Responding to the demands of Pope Damasus of revising the gospels, Jerome encountered two difficulties: one psychological, the other critical. The psychological difficulty was the reaction of the recipients to the changes that had to be made to a standard text that everyone regarded as sacred; this is what happens today in the face of numerous versions and revisions of translations of the biblical text. The critical difficulty was how to navigate through a variety of texts; Jerome would follow an even road by comparing the four gospels with the Greek codices and correcting only what he considered necessary. Above all, Jerome's place in the history of Latin translations remains unique. As a translator he stands out as a genius and a formidable exegete. This has all been said before. This holds much more than his obstinacy and his pursuit of *veritas hebraica* (to the detriment of the Greek version of the LXX) for which he was often criticized during and after his life.

T. Stramare (ed.), *La Bibbia "Vulgata" dalle origini ai nostri giorni*, Rome 1987; P.-M. Bogaert, *La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge*: Revue théologique de Louvain 19 (1988) 137-159; 276-314; *The Latin Translations: Old Latin Versions*, in MIKRA, *Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M.J. Mulder, Philadelphia 1988, 299-312; Ph. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospel: A Study of Their Texts and Language*, Oxford 2000; M. Cimosa, *Guida alla Bibbia Latina: dalla vetus latina, alla vulgata, alla neo-vulgata*, I, IPA, Rome 2007; M. Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on His Commentary on Jeremiah* (Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 90), Leiden 2007.

III. Aramaic versions. The NT, although having gradually established itself as a continuation and the fulfillment of the OT, did not inherit it as it appears today in the Bible but as it was already interpreted in Aramaic (in the Targums) and in Greek (the Greek translations then merged into the Septuagint, which I just treated). The study of the language of the Targums allows us also to know the Aramaic language spoken by Jesus. But what is the so-called Aramaic Bible and what are the Targums?

A Targum is a translation of the entire Bible in the Aramaic language first oral and written, which was used in the synagogue by the Palestinian Jews over the centuries. It corresponds to large sections of the Bible: Law, Prophets and Psalms. The Targum has a long history that deserves to be known. It originated from the liturgical needs of the synagogue in an era in which Hebrew was no longer known. It had an enormous influence on the NT. Since the beginning, Christianity inherited interpreted Bibles, both in Aramaic and in Greek (the LXX). The NT presented itself as a continuation of the OT, but of an OT not sterile but rather enriched by the countless oral traditions which converged into the targumic interpretations, i.e., in the "Aramaic Bible." The Christian Bible is not the OT plus the NT, but rather it is the result of a global work of interpretation. Only at the end were they able to distinguish two

blocks and to recognize them as inspired by God, an OT and a NT. "These *targums* were never born from academic concerns, they were not written by scholars and for scholars, but rather emerged from the demands that we could call 'pastoral.' They had the primary scope of communicating the meaning of Sacred Scripture to the masses who had a particularly critical sensibility, both historical and literary or theological: in fact, we know that during the synagogue gatherings of learned people the *targum* could be easily omitted because it was considered superfluous" (Buzzetti). The pastoral objective made it so that several particulars were paraphrased, others explained and updated.

The term *targum* refers to a biblical document orally translated from the Hebrew and Aramaic which was subsequently put in writing. According to Le Déaut, who is one of the greatest scholars of targums, the term comes from the Akkadian term *targumanu* ("interpreter") and derives from the root *ragama* ("to call"). The root is found only once in the Bible, in Ezra 4:7, before the Aramaic section: "The text of the document of written Aramaic and translated into the Aramaic language [*mtrgm 'rmyt*]. " It is interesting to note that the Greek of the LXX translates with, ". . . He wrote [*egrapsen*] in the Syriac language and interpreted . . ." "To be convinced that the *targumim* are not simply translations, it is enough to notice that the great freedom that they had with respect to the Hebrew original which is explained by turning one's back on the original meaning. . . . This fact attests that they were not such slaves to the letter as is often thought, without nuances" (Le Déaut, *Liturgie juive et Nouveau,* 26-27). Therefore, a translation from Hebrew into Aramaic was made by Jews for Jews. The Greek translation of the LXX, though having used at times targumic methods, is not a *targum* in the proper sense of the word. It is likely that in the Diaspora the Jews who no longer knew Hebrew listened to the word of God in the synagogue directly in Greek. Unfortunately we lack sufficient documentation of this practice, even if we have the opinion of the most eminent scholars.

The English term *dragoman* comes from the Byzantine Greek term *dragoumanos* and has the meaning of "interpreter" or "intermediary" and corresponds to the term *meturgeman* of the ancients. In a technical sense the term indicates the official translator of the synagogue who translated verse by verse into Aramaic the reading of the Torah and every three verses the reading of the *Haftarah* (i.e., the Prophets) but without looking at the biblical text and without having any notes in hand. The targumist followed a very precise legislation present both in the Mishnah and the Talmud. This practice gave rise to the famous rule: "The one who interprets in an overly literal manner is a falsifier, the one who adds something to the text is a blasphemer" (*Tos. Meg*. 4, 41). It is not clear that these versions were put into writing and have thus come down to us. In any case the term *meturgeman* is also found in the Aramaic Bible, in Gen 42:23, and refers to the interpreter between Joseph and his brothers. The Jews during the Babylonian exile had begun to speak Aramaic, a language which in Mesopotamia had taken the place of Akkadian. Upon returning from the exile esp., almost no one among the less wealthy classes knew Hebrew anymore; the translation of the sacred books into Aramaic thus became indispensable, esp. for use in the synagogue. Something similar would happen to the Jews of the Hellenistic Diaspora a few centuries after, when the Greek translation of the Septuagint would be born. Le Déaut writes the following: "Even before the exile, the knowledge of Aramaic must have been sufficiently widespread among the higher classes for numerous contacts with the peoples of the East, who spoke the Aramaic language. This language had become, starting from the 6th c. BC, a type of lingua franca used in the relations between the various peoples of the Near East, and Aramaic is attested to in the inscriptions in the 9th c. BC" (Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique*, 24).

Certainly after the exile the linguistic situation in Palestine must not have been so simple. The Jews who had returned from exile spoke Aramaic in their home, and they found many of their fellow countrymen who had not been deported still speaking Hebrew. It was therefore a situation of bilingualism: Hebrew and Aramaic which during the 1st c. BC then became trilingualism: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. Some writers continued to write in Hebrew, which was considered to be a scientific language (in the manner of Latin until the French Revolution), and this language then became mishnaic Hebrew or neo-Hebrew and lasted until the mid-2nd c. AD. The rabbinic tradition saw in Neh 8:1-9 the historical origin of the Aramaic translations. The text of Nehemiah recounts that there was an assembly at the SE spot of the temple, on an area that was not sacred. This assembly was called by Ezra who, surrounded by six individuals to the right and the left, made an oral and public translation of the Torah and the prophetic books in Aramaic. According to Neh 8:3, the reading was commented on for the entire people (men, women and children) who understood it because it was performed "by translating and giving the sense." It is now believed that this was the historical origin of the *targum*.

R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique*, PIB, Rome 1966; Id., *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (*Targum*), Rome 1982; Id., *Le targum*, in DBS 13, Paris 2002 (extensive and updated bibliography by C. Tassin); Id., *Liturgie juive et Nouveau Testament*, Rome 1965; C. Buzzetti, *La Bibbia e le sue trasformazioni*, Turin 1994.

IV. Syriac versions. The standard translation of the Bible in *Syriac is called the *Peshitta. The title is Aramaic-Syriac and means "common, usual" because it was a translation of the Bible much used by Christians of the Syriac church. The name was given to this translation around the 10th c. But the OT was translated very early into Syriac, a language similar to Aramaic and therefore even to Hebrew. The books of the OT were translated directly into Syriac from the Hebrew at different times and perhaps in different places. The Syriac translation did not assign much importance to the origin of the biblical versions, as had occurred, however, for the LXX with the *Letter of *Aristeas*. Some books, esp. the Pentateuch, had close ties with Aramaic targums that had survived. Today there is sufficient agreement among scholars in recognizing a direct literary relationship between the Peshitta and the targums, even if the type of relationship still remains obscure. For the book of Proverbs the relationship between the two and the targum is certainly strong, always coming from the Peshitta rather than the other way around. The most ancient translations of the OT books were made during the period in which the Hebrew text was not yet stabilized—1st c. AD—therefore the Peshitta draws less interest than does the LXX for biblical scholarship on the Hebrew text.

During the 2nd c. AD a large portion of the OT was already translated almost entirely from the Hebrew and was then slowly completed. The deuterocanonical books were translated from a recension of the Septuagint: among these the book of Sirach was translated from Hebrew. The characteristic of this translation is that of being very faithful to the original, elegant in language and clear in expression.

In addition to the standard Syriac version, the Peshitta, there was another made from the Greek text at Alexandria in ca. 615. It is known as the *Syrohexapla*, which was completed by *Paul of Tella. It was a very literal translation of the text of the Septuagint edited by *Origen in his **Hexapla* along with the diacritical marks (asterisks and obelisks) and with many marginal readings of the Greek translations made by *Aquila, *Symmachus and *Theodotion. Even if it did not survive in its entirety—for the moment, unfortunately, very little has survived of the Greek *Hexapla*—the *Syrohexapla* is of primary importance for research on the Septuagint.

Little by little, given the great regard in which the Greek version was held by Syrians, many readings taken from the Septuagint entered the Peshitta. Scholars distinguish that version of the Septuagint from the one called "Philoxenian" from around the 6th c., so named because it was ordered by Bishop *Philoxenus. It seems that it was made acc. to a recension of *Lucian Martyr and was therefore very close to the Hebrew text. There remain few fragments. The other two types are those called "Syriac Palestinian" (from ca. 600), made on Origen's *Hexapla* text and the one called the "Syriac *Hexapla*," from the 7th c. and also made on the text of Origen's *Hexapla*.

It is interesting to observe in the history of the Syriac translations a continuous fluidity between free and literal translation, which reached its climax in the 7th c.

There are many Syriac versions of the NT, the most ancient of which, from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD, is *Tatian's *Diatessaron*. It enjoyed great popularity in the Syriac church (it is uncertain whether it was composed in Greek or Syriac), but it was immediately pulled from circulation, and therefore it has not survived. The closest text that we possess is the *Commentary of Ephrem*. Even if little known in its original form, the influence of the *Diatessaron* was very great, with extensive adaptations during the Middle Ages in Persian and Arabic but also in German, Dutch, Italian and English.

The most ancient text of the Syriac gospels that has survived is known as the *Vetus Syra* and is preserved in two MSS: the *Codex Curetonianus* (in the British Library of London) and the *Codex Sinaiticus* (in the monastery of St. Catherine at Sinai). From the textual point of view it was of great importance because it contained numerous Western variants. With the *Vetus Latina* it is the most ancient translation of the Greek gospels that has survived.

In sum, for the ancient translations of the NT one should note the following:

1. The *Diatessaron*. In the 2nd c. Tatian composed a unified gospel in Greek, which he then translated into Syriac. The *Diatessaron* was very widespread even if the original Syriac has practically disappeared. There still exist some translations and citations. A Greek fragment on a parchment from the year ca. 220 was found in 1933 at *Dura Europos on the Euphrates River. It has been used very frequently in the textual criticism of the NT because of its antiquity.

2. The translation of the four separate gospels (3rd c.) preserved in two codices: the *Codex Curetonianus* and the Syriac *Sinaiticus*.

3. The Peshitta of the NT, a translation was made in the 5th c. which was less ancient than the OT, contains the entire NT, minus the five books that are not present in the Antiochene canon of Scripture (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelation).

4. The Philoxenian translation with the Heraclean revision. Asked for by Bishop *Philoxenus in the beginning of the 6th c., it included the entirety of the NT. Very little has survived. But a revision owed to *Thomas Harclensis (from Heraclea, 7th c.) has survived.

5. They Syro-Palestinian translation (from ca. 600): in Aramaic-Palestinian. The parts preserved in the liturgy have survived to this day.

V. Between East and West: crossroad churches of cultures. The ancient Christian Syriac tradition is very complex, esp. in the first centuries, which was established in a territory bordering two worlds, the Greco-Roman world and the Persian world, capable of assuming elements from different cultures. The connections between the Peshitta of the OT and the Jewish traditions are intersting as well as the Aramaic-Palestinian elements and the Jewish-Aramaic elements present in the gospels. We should recall Vergani's *Efrem il Siro: chiesa e paradiso* and its exquisite poetry, and *Isaac of Nineveh and his teaching on humility, which he understood as the way of humanization and divinization at the same time.

L. Leloir, *Le Témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron*, Louvain 1962; B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford 1977; P.B. Dirksen, *An Annotated Bibliography of the Peshitta of the Old Testament*, Leiden 1989; W.L. Petersen, *An Introduction to the Diatessaron*, Leiden 1990; S.P. Brock, *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*, Kottayam 1989; Id., *Syriac Studies: A Classified Bibliography (1960-1990)*, Kaslik 1996.

M. Cimosa

SCULPTURE. Artistic product is an expression, on the figurative plain, of the culture that is contemporaneous to it and, as a result, one can speak of "Christian" sculpture only inasmuch as it refers to the theme and the ideological and programmatic content of which it becomes a vehicle, and not to the stylistic and formal characteristics which it shares, of necessity, with all contemporareous production. Given then (1) the cultural inheritance of Judaism, with its effort to avoid the ever-present danger of idolatrous suggestions and practices, (2) the rejection repeatedly manifested by Christians toward idols (even esp. with respect to material productions), and (3) the absence of iconic statues in places of worship, we can see substantial factors that blocked and slowed for a long time, in various ways, the formation and dissemination of a Christian plastic art in the round. (See can. 26 of the Council of *Elvira which, at the beginning of the 4th c., still states the following: *Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur*; and although, in this particular case, the council seems to be making reference exclusively to painting, one cannot doubt that even sculpture of a figurative character was largely and implicitly understood.)

By this claim, I do not intend to argue that rounded sculpture was completely lacking in ancient Christianity. The existence of this artistic type is documented, e.g., by some statues, or fragments of statues, of the Good *Shepherd, which can be dated back to the 3rd and 4th c., which had been preserved at *Rome: one at the Museo Pio Cristiano in the Vatican, one at the Museum Kircherianum, one found in 1870 in the archaeological digs of the basilica of St. Clement of Rome, and one found among the ashes of a demolished house in 1887 near the Porta San Paolo, to which one can add a pillaret ending higher up with a bust of the Good Shepherd, which resides among the remains of the Mausoleum of Helena, and elsewhere, at Constantinople, Athens, Sparta and Seville. One notices, however, that, as recent studies have shown well, the first two small statues mentioned, already placed on display in the Museo Sacro della Biblioteca Vaticana, then in the Museo Lateranense and finally in the Museo Pio Cristiano, with the inventory numbers [103] 28590 and [105] 31428, originally consisting, in all likelihood, in high reliefs belonging to panels of monumental *sarcophagi, were restored and radically reworked, respectively, by the sculptors Giuseppe Angelini, in 1764, and Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, 1757, who at that time transformed them into more or less rounded statues. Such a statue was already represented by a well-noted figurine of Christ seated, young and beardless, the so-called Hellenistic, or Apollonian, which can be dated to the 4th c. and is preserved at the Museo Nazionale Romano. It is attested by various treatises from the literary sources. First, *Eusebius of Caesarea spoke of images of the Good Shepherd and Daniel molded in bronze, placed as a fountain ornament erected in the piazzas (*Vita Constant.* III,49). *Gregory of Nazianzus, in a letter written in the year 382, made mention of statues which perhaps adorned the church which he established in the city. The *Liber pontificalis*, in the biographical entry on Pope *Sylvester, explicitly mentions statues of gold and silver portraying Jesus Christ, *John the Baptist, crows and lambs, placed as

a decoration for the Lateran baptistery (*LP*, ed. Duchesne, I, XXXIV, p. 174). And the base of the statue, now lost but existing in the 17th c. in the garden of the basilica of St. *Chrysogonus in Trastevere, bore the inscription: *Fl. Tertullus de arte sua / aeclesiae donum posuit*, thus preserving a rare fact: the name of an ancient Christian sculptor. These were statues which, esp. in the pre-Constantinian age, could decorate even homes and villas of rich Christians. But, beyond these archaeological and literary testimonies, which cannot be ignored, there is no doubt that early Christian plastic art was expressed primarily and largely in the area of funerary relief (*see* *sarcophagi).

Outside the funerary context in the area of the relief, Christian sculpture exerted its influence primarily in the production of liturgical equipment such as alters, ambos, ciboria, *cathedrae*, *plutaea* and presbyterial *cancelli*.

Starting from about the 6th c.—as a result of influences exerted by Byzantine art—the almost exclusively geometrical motifs that characterized such production in Western artistic culture were enhanced by the addition of flowers, crosses, ribbons and wreaths, which in various ways were composed and intertwined with one another, an example of which is found in the decoration of the basilica of St. Clement in Rome, the ornamental repertory of which—even though, obviously, with different conceptions and stylistic renderings—remained substantially unchanged for the entire century. It should nonetheless be noted that the motifs of this repertory are not exclusive to Christian production (though, on the whole it is by that point quantitatively prevalent), but are widespread in general in all sculpture from that period.

With the waning of such influences following the important political events over the course of the 7th c. (that included, of course, the arrival, first, and then the stabilization of the *Longobards to whose artistic-cultural "influence" scholars have wished to attribute, in the past, a function and a depth far in excess of reality), as well as because of the changed economic conditions, sculpture seems to now revive, in the local sense, the characteristics already widespread in the preceding centuries and, at least in the Western regions, to show an undeniable decline in the quantity of the production (the *schola* of St. Maria Antiqua, at the Roman forum, e.g., is composed of a simple masonry enclosure decorated with paintings) destined to come back into popular use but always characterized almost exclusively by ornamental and geometric motifs, with an undoubted sense of greater awareness, in the following century.

General Themes: F. Mazzanti, *La scultura ornamentale romana nei bassi tempi*, Rome 1896; M. Simon, *Symbolisme et tradition d'atelier dans la première sculpture chrétienne*, in *Actes du V*e *Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Aix-en-Provence, 13-19 septembre 1954), Paris 1957, 307-319; *Corpus della scultura altomedievale pubblicato a cura del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo*, Spoleto 1959ff. (with extensive bibl.); F. Gerke, *La scultura paleocristiana in Occidente*, in *Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina* (Ravenna, 8-20 marzo 1959), 2, Ravenna 1959, 48-78; Id., *La scultura paleocristiana in Oriente*, ibid., 79-108; var. aus., *Corpus della scultura paleocristiana, bizantina e altomedioevale di Ravenna*, ed. G. Bovini, I-III, Rome 1968-69 (with bibl.); E. Russo, *Studi sulla scultura paleocristiana e altomedievale*: Studi medievali 15 (1974) 1-118; R. Farioli, *La cultura artistica nelle regioni bizantine d'Italia dal VI all'XI secolo*, in *I bizantini in Italia*, Milan 1982, 137-426; Id., *Ravenna, Costantinopoli. Considerazioni sulla scultura del VI secolo*, in *XXX Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina. Seminario giustinianeo* (Ravenna 6-14 marzo 1983), Ravenna 1983, 205-253; Id., *L'arte giustinianea in Italia*, in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo.* XXXIV Settimana di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo (Spoleto 3-9 aprile 1986), Spoleto 1988, I, 99-118; F. Bisconti, *Arte e artigianato nella cultura figurativa paleocristiana. Altre equivalenze tra letteratura patristica e iconografia paleocristiana*, in *Res Christiana*, ed. A. Quacquarelli, Rome 1989, 23-26; S. Casartelli Novelli, *Committenza e produzione scultorea "bassa,"* in XXXIX Settimana di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, Spoleto 1992, 531-561; N. Hannestad, *Tradition in Late Antique Sculpture. Conservation, Modernization, Production*, Aarhus 1994; D. Willers, *Das Ende der antiken Idealstatue*: Museum Helveticum 53 (1996) 170-186; N. Hannestad, *Sculptural Genres in Late Antiquity: Continuity or Discontinuity?*, in *Griechenland in der Kaiserzeit. Neue Funde und Forschungen zu Skulptur, Architektur und Topographie. Kolloquium zum sechzigsten Geburtstag von Prof. Dietrich Willers* (Bern, 12.–13. Juni 1998), Bern 2001, 137-145; Id., *Das Ende der antiken Idealstatue. Heidnische Skulptur in christlichen Häusern?*: Antike Welt 33 (2002) 635-649; E. Russo, *Considérations sur la sculpture architecturale et décorative à Nicée à l'époque paléochrétienne*: Bizantinistica 4 (2002) 1-11; EAM I-XII, Rome 1991-2002; R. Coroneo, *Scultura altomedievale in Italia*, Cagliari 2005 (extensive bibl.).

Rome: G.B. de Rossi, *Statua del buon pastore scoperta in Roma presso la porta Ostiense*: BACr, serie 4ª, 5 (1887) 136-149; Id., *Statua del buon pastore*: Bull. della Comm. Archeol. Comunale di Rome, serie 3ª, 17 (1889) 131-139; F. Mazzanti, *La scultura ornamentale romana nei bassi tempi*, Rome 1896; L. Pani Ermini, *Note sulla decorazione dei cibori a Roma nell'alto medioevo*: Bollettino d'Arte (1974) 115-126; F. Guidobaldi - C. Barsanti - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, *San Clemente. La scultura del VI secolo*, Rome 1992; C. Gennaccari, *Le "statue" del Buon pastore nei Musei Vaticani. Rilettura e additamenta alla luce di alcuni documenti del Settecento*: RivAC 75 (1999) 461-473.

Constantinople: D.T. Rice, *Sculpture in Constantinople from Constantine to Justinian*, in *I Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina* (Ravenna 31 marzo - 13 aprile 1957), Ravenna 1957, 67-72; A. Grabar, *Sculptures byzantines de Constantinople, IV*e*-X*e *siècle*, Paris 1963; H. Brandenburg, *Rilievi scultorei costantinopolitani dal IV al VI secolo*, in *XXVI Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina* (Ravenna 6-18 maggio 1979), Ravenna 1979, 13-27; B. Kiilerich, *Sculpture in the Round in the Early Byzantine Period: Constantinople and the East*, in *Aspects of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium.* Papers read at a colloquium held at the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul (31 May - 5

June 1992), Stockholm 1993, 85-97; C. Barsanti - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, *Premessa a un catalogo della scultura della Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli*, in *Bisanzio e l'Occidente. Arte, archeologia, storia. Studi in onore di Fernanda de' Maffei*, Rome 1996, 79-104; J.P. Sodini - C. Barsanti - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, *La sculpture architecturale en marbre au VI^e siècle à Constantinople et dans les régions sous influence constantinopolitaine*, in *Radovi XIII. Medunarodnog kongresa za starokršćansku arheologiju. Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae* (Split-*Poreč* 25.9. - 1.10.1994), II, Split-Vatican City 1998, 301-376; A. Guiglia Guidobaldi - C. Barsanti, *Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli. L'arredo marmoreo della grande chiesa giustinianea*, Vatican City 2004.

Ravenna: Var. aus., *Corpus della scultura paleocristiana, bizantina e altomedievale di Ravenna*, ed. G. Bovini, IIII, Rome 1968-69 (with bibl.); R. Farioli, *Il problema delle origini della scultura paleocristiana di Ravenna*: *Arheološki* vestnik 23 (1972) 167-174; Id., *Osservazioni sulla scultura di Ravenna paleocristiana*: Aquileia nostra 45-46 (1974-75) 717-740; Id., *Rilievi ravennati del VI secolo. Gli altari di Argenta e Pomposa:* Felix Ravenna 125-126 (1983) 157-174; Id., *La scultura architettonica e di arredo liturgico a Ravenna alla fine della tarda antichità: i rapporti con Costantinopoli*, in *Storia di Ravenna. Dall'età bizantina all'età ottoniana*, II, 1, Ravenna 1991, 249-267. *Regioni e località diverse*: S. Tavano, *Scultura paleocristiana e altomedioevale in Aquileia*: *Arheološki* vestnik 23 (1972) 234-256; H. Brandenburg, *Spätantike und frühchristliche Skulptur in Thessaloniki*, in *Actes du X^e Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Thessalonique 28 septembre - 4 octobre 1980), Vatican City 1984, 299-317; H. Brandenburg, *La scultura a Milano nel IV e V secolo*, in *Il millennio ambrosiano. Milano, una capitale da Ambrogio ai Carolingi*, Milan 1987, 80-129; E. Russo, *La scultura del VI secolo in Palestina. Considerazioni e proposte*: Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia 6 (1987) 113-248; C. Barsanti, *Scultura anatolica di epoca medio-bizantina*: Milion 1 (1988) 275-306; Id., *Tunisia. Indagine preliminare sulla diffusione dei manufatti di marmo proconnesio in epoca paleobizantina*, in *Costantinopoli e l'arte delle province orientali*, Rome 1990, 429-436; A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, *I capitelli della basilica giustinianea della Theotokos, oggi di S. Caterina, sul Monte Sinai*, ibid., 265-342; E. Russo, *Sculture del complesso eufrasiano di Parenzo*, Naples 1991; C. Barsanti, *La scultura paleocristiana e bizantina*, in *Scultura nelle Marche*, Florence 1993, 59-81; R. Farioli Campanati, *La decorazione scultorea cristiana della chiesa dei SS. Sergio, Bacco e Leonzio di Bosra*: Ocnus 1 (1993) 83-89; T. Weber, *Die Statuengruppe Jesu und der Haimorrhoúsa in Caesarea-Philippi*: Damaszener Mitteilungen 9 (1996) 209-216; E. Russo, *La scultura a Efeso in età paleocristiana e bizantina. Primi lineamenti*, in *Efeso paleocristiana e bizantina. Frühchristliches und byzantinisches Ephesos.* Referate des vom 22. bis 24. Februar 1996 beim Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom durchgeführten internationalen Kongresses aus Anlass des 100-jährigen Jubiläums der österreichischen Ausgrabungen in Ephesos, Vienna 1999, 26-53; Id., *Sculture paleocristiane e bizantine dell'Artemision di Efeso*, in *Der Kosmos der Artemis von Ephesos*, Vienna 2001, 265-277; H. Buschhausen, *Zur Frage des byzantinischen Historienbildes*, in *Krieg und Sieg. Narrative Wanddarstellungen von Altägypten bis ins Mittelalter*. Internationales Kolloquium im Schloss Haindorf (Langenlois 29.-30. Juli 1997), Vienna 2002, 175-200; C. Barsanti, *I plutei di Siponto, Monte Sant'Angelo e Benevento*, in *1983-1993. Dieci anni di archeologia cristiana in Italia.* Atti del VII Congr. naz. di archeologia cristiana (Cassino 20-24 settembre 1993), Cassino 2003, 745-760.

L. Spera - R. Giordani

SCYTHIA MINOR. The name taken up since the Hellenistic era by the territory contained between the Danube River and the Black Sea, corresponding almost in its entirety to the modern-day province of Dobruja (a medieval name) in Romania. Strabo called the same territory Μικρὰ Σκυθία (*Geogr*. VII, 4,5), to distinguish it from Scythia Major, which extended to the N of the Black Sea. Under *Diocletian, Scythia Minor, previously part of Moesia Inferior, was made an independent province with the specific name Scythia Minor. According to tradition, Scythia was evangelized by the apostle *Andrew (Euseb., *HE* 3,1,1). If one considers the intense contacts of the Greek colonies of the W coast of the Black Sea with the relative metropolises of Asia Minor and with the great centers of the Aegean islands and continents of Greece, as well as the large number of native soldiers of the regions already evangelized of the Near East who were encamped on the border of the Lower Danube, one can identify the presence in Scythia Minor of some isolated Christians since the first three centuries of the Common Era. In fact, the persecution that broke out against the Christians by the emperor *Diocletian must have also left numerous victims on the territory of Scythia Minor, esp. among the soldiers. Precisely in this respect, the texts of the martyrologies register many martyrs in such centers as Tomis (*Constanța*), the chief place of the province Halmyris, *Noviodunum, Dinogetia and *Axiopolis. Other martyrs were attributed to the persecution of *Licinius. In the delta of the Danube, on the right arm of the river, at Halmyris (Solomorus) are perhaps registered the first martyrs known so far on the territory of the Dobruja, and that is Epictetus and Astion, both natives of *Phrygia in Asia Minor, who had fled here around the year AD 290. For this period the bishop Evangelicus is remembered, who seems to have been the first bishop of Tomis. A fragmentary epigraph found there mentions a bishop and martyr who has not yet been identified, probably from the era of the emperor Licinius.

Until the times of the emperor *Anastasius I (491–518) at the head of the church of Scythia Minor was found only one bishop, a resident at Tomis: this is mentioned by the historians *Sozomen (*HE* VI,21) and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*HE* IV,35), by a law from the year ca. 480 of the emperor *Zeno (CI I,3,35), and from other literary sources. The first known bishop with certainty from the historical documents was St. Betronius (Bretanius or Vetranius), after whom are known another eight bishops: Gerontios Terentius (381), Theotimos I (ca. 392–407), Timotheos (431), Ioannes (445–446), Alexandros

(449), Theotimos II (458), Paternus (ca. 491–520) and Valentinianus (ca. 550), who had an epistolary correspondence with Pope *Virgilius (537–555) and whose title was *episcopus Scythiae*. During the last flourishing of Scythia Minor, which goes from the reign of the emperor Anastasius to that of *Justinian I (527–565), various episcopates were created even in other centers of the province, although the bishop of Tomis was transformed into an archepiscopate with the *metropolitan as the head. The "Scythian monks" had an important role in the religious, cultural and even the political life of Scythia Minor, among whom *Ioannes Maxentius (ca. 520) stood out. Although they did not carry out their activities in Scythia Minor, two other monks of Scythian origin acquired fame for their native province. The first was *John Cassian (ca. 360–430/435), born in modern-day Dobruja, while the other was *Dionysius Exiguus, to whom is owed, in addition to the Latin translation of numerous foundational theological works of the Greek patristic authors, the *computus of the Common Era from the birth of Christ (the Dionysian era), a calculation which, although mistaken, is still in use.

The information offered by literary sources on the church in Scythia Minor until the collapse of the Lower Danube (beginning of the 7th c.) were integrated by the archaeological discoveries made on the territory of this late Roman province and, above all, by the epigraphs and the buildings of Christian worship and their adjoined structures. The early Christian inscriptions (5th–6th c.) discovered on the territory of the modern-day Dobruja number around 100, three-fourths of which are in Greek and only one-fourth in Latin. Only one epigraph is bilingual (Greek-Latin). Almost half of the total number of the epigraphs come from Tomis; the others are spread about among Callatis (10), *Histria (10), Salsovia (1), Noviodunum and environs (4), Dinogetia (10), Axiopolis (5), Sucidava (Izvoarele, district of *Constanța*) (1), Ulmetum (5) and Tropaeum Traiani (1). More than half of these are presented as inscribed on the stones of a local rock or a marble of good quality imported from Proconnesus or from various parts of Greece, although the remaining are objects of metal (silver, bronze or lead), terra cotta, bone, glass or other metals. They are primarily funerary epigraphs; the most frequent ornament is the cross or one of the Christograms. Symbolic figures also appear on some of the epigraphic monuments: e.g., the *fish, the *dove, the *palm leaf, the *vine, the *crown etc.

Some thirty buildings of Christian worship from the 4th to the 6th c. have been discovered on the territory of Dobruja thanks to archaeological digs, all along the longitudinal layout, which have often survived fully only in the foundation or lower courses of the walls. With respect to the topographical distribution, the early Christian basilicas of Scythia Minor are divided as following: Tomis, 6 (2 not excavated); Callatis, 1; Histria, 4; Arganum, 2; Noviodunum, 2 (among which a cemetery hill not excavated); *Niculițel*, 1; Dinogetia, 1; Troesmis, 3; Beroe, 1, (not excavated); Capidava, 1 (not excavated); Axiopolis, 2 (one cemeterial); Sucidava (Izvoarele, *Constanța*), 1; Tropaeum Traiani, 5; Ibida, 1 (partially excavated). These are primarily buildings with three aisles, with an apse oriented to the E. One of these, that of Tropaeum Traiani, is the only one to have a transept or the layout of a *T.* The basilica of Callatis and the smaller of the five among the basilicas of Tomis, three of Tropaeum Traiani, one of Histria and the basilica of *Niculițel* had crypts for relics under the altar. The sole certain baptistery is the one discovered at the S of the atrium of the marble basilica of Tropaeum Traiani. Among the very numerous architectonic sculptures, one should mention one hundred of the small chapels, tombstones, banisters (Lat. *cancelli*), ciboria, pulpits, in large part from the marble of Proconnesus. The furnishings also show a great variety, among which stand forth the disc of Bishop Paternus of Tomis and an entire series of small crosses, small objects of bronze, lead, silver and gold, and numerous vases of terra cotta (amphorae, plates and lanterns) with crosses or Christian epigraphs. At Sucidava (Izvoarrele, a district of *Constanța*) in 1984 an important treasure of 17 pieces of silver was found, among which the small reliquary with a Christogram and a cross inside (*Rădulescu*, 2593-2564).

E. Popescu, *Inscripțiile grecești și latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite în România*, Bucure'ti 1976; I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; Id., *Christian Art in Romania 1*, Bucharest 1979; I.G. Coman, *Scriitori bisericești din epoca strâromână*, Bucuresti 1979; A. Barnea, *Aspetti della vita economica della Scythia Minor secondo le fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche* (*sec. IV-VI d.C.*): Quaderni Catanesi 2 (1980) 519-547; E. Popescu, *Die kirchliche Organization der Provinz Scythia minor vom vierten bis ins sechtes Jahrhundert*: JÖByz 38 (1988) 75-94; A. MacKenzie, *Archaeology in Romania: The Mystery of the Roman Occupation*, London 1986; A. *Rădulescu* - V. Lungu, *Le christianisme en Scythie mineure à la lumière des dernières découvertes archéologiques*, in Actes du XI[e] Congrès Intern. d'archéologie chrétienne, III, Rome 1989, 2561-2615; I. Barnea, *Romanité et christianisme au Bas-Danube*: Byzantiaka 10 (1990) 67-102; O. Bounegru, *Contributions stratigraphiques concernant la chronologie des édifices de Scythia Minor: la basilique chrétienne du IV[e] s. d'Histria*, in *La politique édilitaire dans les provinces de l'empire romain*, ed. D. Alicu - H. Bögli, Cluj-Napoca 1993, 195-200; E. Popescu, *Christianitas daco-romana: florilegium studiorum*, Bucuresti 1994; G.

Atanassov, *Croix-encolpions proche-orientales de la région del Dobrudjia du Sud* (*Bulgarie*), in Akten des XII Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie, I, Münster 1995, 483-501; I. Barnea, *Menasampullen auf dem Gebiet Rumäniens*, ibid., 509-514; K. Ilski, *Biskupi Mezji i Scytii IV-VI w.*, Pozna 1995 (collection of texts); EAM 10, 167-171; EAA² 4, 576-583; A. Barnea, *Une province chrétienne sous Justinien: La Scythie mineure*, in Acta XIII Congressus Intern. Arch. christianae, II, Vatican City 1998, 807-822; N. Zugravu, *Martyrs d'Occident vénerés en Scythie Mineure*: Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica 5 (1998) 73-80; A. Avram, *Inscriptiones grecques et latines de Scythie Mineure*, III, *Callatis et son territoire*, Bucarest 1999; M. Girardi, *Basilio di Cesarea, la passio di s. Saba "il goto" e la propagazione del cristianesimo nella regione del Basso Danubio fra III e IV sec.*, in *Italia e Romania*, ed. S. Santelia, Bari 2004, 157-172; M. Zahariade, *Scythia Minor: A History of a Later Roman Province (284-681)*, Amsterdam 2006.

I. Barnea

SCYTHOPOLIS. Situated at the crossroads of important routes of communication and in a fertile tract of land, 17 km (10.6 mi) S of the Sea of Galilee, Nyssa-Scythopolis (Beit She'an) was one of the most important cities of the East in antiquity. Founded in the 1st half of the 3rd c. BC probably by Ptolemy II Philadelphus, it became a city (*polis*) under the Seleucids and was part of the federation of cities known as the "Decapolis." During the Hellenistic period, the city's layout occupied the tract of land N of the hill (Tell Beit She'an, Tell el-Husn), upon which was located the ancient settlement that developed from the late Neolithic period, a location also mentioned in the Bible (Josh 5:11; Jgs 1:27) as one of the Canaanite cities not conquered by the Israelites. It was also mentioned in the letters of Tell el-Amarna, in the list of Canaanite cities of the Karnak Temple Complex and other Egyptian sources. During the Hasmonean period, between the 2nd and 1st c. BC, the city was restricted to the area including the hill and its slopes. After being conquered by Pompey in 63 BC, it reemerged with the name Scythopolis (i.e., the City of the Scythians). This time urban expansion pertained to the area S of the hill, which then became the acropolis of what was destined to become a large Roman city with temples, theaters, monuments, and streets and would remain in vogue for the entire Roman and Byzantine period before experiencing progressive decline and abandonment.

Thorough archaeological investigations were undertaken starting from the year 1921 until 1932 by the University of Pennsylvania. The streets traced and brought to light dated from the Mamluk to the Neolithic period. The circular-shaped church belonged to the Byzantine era, which was dated by archaeologists to the 1st half of the 5th c., thanks to the stylistic similarity of the capitals found there with that of the church of St. Stephen at *Jerusalem, which was built by order of the empress *Eudoxia between the years 431 and 438. The circular edifice was built on the ruins of a mono-apsidal basilica. The rotunda measured more than 38 m (124.67 ft.) and was proceeded by a porticoed atrium to the W. On the inside, two concentric circles created an ambulatory with twelve columns, interrupted by the presbytery to the E. The central area was filled with mosaics containing geometric motifs; the ambulatory was paved with slabs of stone, although a series of doors connected it with the outside and with some rooms set next to the building, among which was a rectangular room with mosaics on the floor. Scholars are not quite sure if the church was entirely covered with a roof, or rather if the central part was *sub divo*. It could have been a memorial dedicated to the martyr *Procopius, who was said, acc. to *Eusebius, to have been the first martyr of *Palestine during the *Diocletian persecution. A native of *Jerusalem, Procopius lived at Scythopolis where he served as lector, exorcist and translator of *Syriac texts. Led to *Caesarea before the judge, the suggestion was made to him numerous times to sacrifice to the gods and, given his firm resolve to reject this proposition, he was beheaded.

Under the walls of the circular church, archaeologists have traced the foundations of a Roman temple, which was probably dedicated to Zeus. In 1961–1962 a theater was excavated, and excavations followed throughout the 1960s, 70s and 80s, but only from 1986 to 1987 were systematic digs undertaken, which brought to light a large portion of the urban layout of the city of Nyssa-Scythopolis, which in the 2nd c. AD primarily developed to the W of the hill, although the entire urban area was guarded by walls. The central part of the city was found at the foot of the N mountain side of the hill. Here broad streets intersected with porticoed colonnades on the sides. Around these one finds the chief monuments: the theater, whose lower order of the *cavea* is preserved and part of the *frons scenae*. In addition to the *scena*, a colonnaded monumental road ran toward the NE, to the foot of the hill, where the roads that came from the W and E met to form the so-called monument of Antony and a colonnade that probably connected the street with another theater placed on the side of the hill. From the N side of the street, another series of monuments opened: "the central monument," a semicircular nymphaeum and a temple, which was small but elegant, with an apsed *cella* probably connected to the cult of Dionysus, the chief deity of the city (from which it took the name Nyssa). To the S there was a broad civic basilica,

from which remained only the foundation walls. More to the W, before the theater and beyond the road called Palladius, there was another colonnade, behind which spacious baths opened, and even more to the NW, one finds the remains of what was perhaps another basilica, connected to a space in which was placed a forum from the Roman era. More to the S, far from the monumental center of the city there was the hippodrome, which was changed in a second phase into another theater, which was shaped in the form of a ring.

During the late Roman and then the Byzantine age, the urban layout underwent numerous remodelings, which were due to the ever-increasing importance that the city assumed, to the point of becoming the metropolis of the province Palestina Secunda, created after the year 400. Even before the 4th c., some of the monuments at the center of the city were replaced by a series of shops, but it was in the Byzantine age that more changes took place. The earthquake of 363 caused much damage to the buildings of Scythopolis; the hippodrome was replaced by a more modest amphitheater, and some temples and monuments were destroyed; the church was constructed in a circular layout on the ruins of the Temple of Zeus on the acropolis. During the entire 6th. c., also due to the demographic explosion that pertained to all of Palestine, works of systematization and restoration consumed the city. During these years, in 525, *Cyril was born at Scythopolis, who, though still young in 543, embraced the monastic life and moved to the Judean desert, first to the laura of St. Euthymius, then to that of St. *Sabas. Through his biographies of the monks, Cyril was a witness to the most flourishing period in Palestinian *monasticism. The walls of the city were restructured, and in the periphery to the N two churches were constructed on the Monastery of Our Lady, which has preserved mosaics with human figures, birds and a representation of the zodiac, and a funerary chapel with a mosaic representation of the months and an inscription that mentions a building adapted as a bath for lepers. A synagogue was discovered, covered with mosaics, in relation to the so-called Leontius residence to the W of the center of the city. Another building outside the belt of walls to the N is perhaps to be identified with a Samaritan synagogue.

With the Arab conquest of *Palestine in 634 there began the slow but irreversible decline of Scythopolis, which today bears the name Beih She'an. Private homes and shops began to be built on the ancient streets, marketplaces and monuments—a sign of the shrinkage and impoverishment of the city also caused by a series of earthquakes such as that of 660, and esp. that of 18 January 749, which devastated a large part of Palestine and the nearby regions. During the era of the Abbasids the city centered in the N area, the occupation of which is attested to until the Mamluk period.

G.M. Fitzgerald, *Bet-Shan Excavations 1921-1923*, vol. III, *The Arab and Byzantine Levels*, Philadelphia 1931; Id., *A Sixth Century Monastery at Beth-Shan* (*Scythopolis*), Philadelphia 1939; Eusebio di Cesarea, *Storia Ecclesiastica e i Martiri della Palestina*, ed. G. del Ton, Rome 1964; *Atti dei martiri*, ed. G. Caldarelli, Alba 1975; A. Mazar, *Beth-Shean. Tel Beth-Shean and the Northern Cemetery*, in New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land 1, 214-223; G. Foerster, *Beth-Shean. Beth-Shean at the Foot of the Mound*, in ibid., 223-235; P.E. MacGovern, *Beth-Shan*, in Anchor Bible Dictionary 1, 693-696; A. Mazar, *Four Thousand Years of History at Tel Beth-Shean: An Account of the Renewed Excavations*: Biblical Archaeologist 60 (1997) 62-76; S. Hadad, *Excavations at Bet Shean*. I: *The Oil Lamps from the Hebrew University Excavations at Bet Shean*, Jerusalem 2002; A. Mazar, *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean 1989-1996*. I: *From the Late Bronze Age IIB to the Medieval Period*, Jerusalem 2006.

C. Pappalardo

SEAL

I. In Greek philosophy - II. In the Old and New Testament - III. In the writings of later Christian authors - IV. In gnosticism.

In Greek thought, the OT and the NT, the writings of Christian authors, and in *gnosticism, the image of the seal, through the idea of "mark" which evokes it, relates to one of the following: the divinity itself, the idea, the intelligence, or the representation that is impressed on the soul, or the sacraments of baptism and confirmation.

I. In Greek philosophy. One can find the concept as early as the (Orphic) *Hymns* 34, 26, where Apollo is said to possess "a seal that confers a mark on all the cosmos." For Plato, the object known—evidently reduced to the state of an idea—possesses a seal which is impressed on the soul (*Theaetetus* 192a 4-6); and the understanding "puts a mark on the path of politics" (*Polit.* 258c 4-5; see Whittaker, *Alcinoos* 109 n. 219). Just as Plato (in the *Theaet.* 192a), so too the Stoics established a comparison between the seal and the representation that is impressed on the soul (*SVF* I, 484, II, 55 von Arnim). Arius Didymus, who is mentioned in Alcinous (*Did.* 166,39-167,6 Whittaker and in *Eusebius, *PraEp. Ev.* XI,23,3-4 [Mras 51,18-52,4]—see also Diels, *Doxogr. Gr.* 447a-b) likens the unique idea-model which brings about the varied corporeal objects in which its form is reproduced to the one seal which gives origin to many

marks and images (see Dölger, *Sphragis* 66, Whittaker, *Alcinoos*, 27 app. font.).

*Philo of Alexandria, as in the case of Arius Didymus, likens the ideas to the seal (*De opif. M.* 129 I 44, 20; 134 I 46, 18 Cohn-Wendland, see Whittaker, *Alcinoos*, 109 n. 219) and has recourse to the image of the seal that is impressed on different materials, conferring its mark to a multitude of objects (*Quod. det. pot. ins. sol.* 76, I, 275, 25-28), or to that of the seal that is impressed on the soul, which is compared to wax (*Quis rer. div. her.* 181, III, 4, 18-22). Moreover, drawing near to the conception of the Orphic hymn 34, he presents the universal *logos* (which is identical to the "idea of the ideas" and to the "idea-model") or as the "seal-model" (*archetypos sphragis*, *De opif. m.* 25 I 8, 2-4, *De ebriet.* 133 II 196, 5-6), or as the "seal of God" (*sphragis theou*, *De plant.* 18 II 137, 13), or as the "universal seal" (*ton holon sphragis*, *De mut. nom.* 135 III 179, 20-21), or as simply the "seal" (*sphragis*, *De migr. Abr.* 103 II 288, 19-20; cf. Dölger, cit., 67 nn. 2, 3, 5, Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, 17). According to the information provided by Proclus (*Def.* I: Friedlein 90, 14-17), the Pythagoreans, who can be identified with the Neo-Pythagoreans from the imperial age, presented as "a seal of Rhea" the proper power of the generative divinity of life, and which is diffused in all the cosmos (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 66 n. 1).

For the Middle Platonist Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* 373 A: Bernardakis II 528, 10-13), the forms deriving from the immutable and incorruptible ideas, and ideas that are impressed upon sensible and corporeal objects, which are destined for change and corruption, are comparable to the nonlasting mark impressed by the seal upon the wax (see Whittaker, *Alcinoos*, 109 n. 219) (the image of wax derives from Platonism and Stoicism, see Plato, *Theaet.* 194c 4-8, *SVF* I 484; see in Whittaker, *Alcinoos*, 97 n. 144; Philo, *Quis rer. div. her.* 181, cf. *supra*). The idea of "seal" is referred to implicitly by Plotinus (*Enn.* V, 3,2 [300, 9-10]) to the second hypostasis, the understanding which transmits its marks (*typoi*) to the rational faculty of the third hypostasis, the universal soul (see S. Lilla in *Storia della teologia* I, ed. E. dal Covolo, 273 = *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il platonismo cristiano*, 100). The comparison that can be detected in Arius Didymus, Philo and Plutarch between the single idea that always remains the same despite its presence in various sensible images and the seal that always remains unique, although impressing itself many times on wax, is taken up by Proclus, who traces the seal back to the soul and the universal understanding (*In Parm* IV: Cousin 130,17-131,16; see also de Andia, *Henosis* 83-84).

II. In the Old and New Testament. Especially in the books of Ezekiel and Isaiah, and in the apocryphal Psalm 15 of Solomon and the *Odes of Solomon*, the sign marked by God—identical to his name—marks the righteous and protects them (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 55-63, Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 14-15). From this idea *John, in his book of Revelation, derived the theme of the "seal of the living God" marked on the foreheads of God's servants (Rev 7:2-3; 9:4; see Dölger, *Sphragis*, 57, Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 16). In the letter to the Hebrews and in St. *Paul's writings, the close connection between God the Father and the seal is clearly implicit: Christ bears "the stamp of the Father's substance" (Heb 1:3); and in *baptism God "seals" the human being through the *Holy Spirit (2 Cor 1:22; Eph 1:14, 4:30; see also Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 3-7).

III. In the writings of later Christian authors. Following the path of St. Paul—and, with respect to the *logos*, as well as the path of Philo of Alexandria—patristic authors applied the image of the seal to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (see Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1355f-1356); and, as Chadwick noted (*Origen: Contra Celsum* 342 n. 1), they related it to baptism and confirmation (for the pertinent documentation and the history of this theme, see Dölger, *Sphragis*, 70-80, 148-171, 179-193; Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 46-63, 64-93, 235-246, 297-305; *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* 1356c-1357).

Under the influence of the OT idea that the seal protects the righteous (see above), the Fathers associated the same sign also to the sign of the cross, which serves to protect them from the attacks of the devil (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 171-179; Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 261-283; *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* 1356b).

From the close relationship between the seal and baptism derived several ideas which are its corollaries: the seal is the sign of the Christian message and the Christian faith, the mark pressed on the flock of the faithful, the name of the Son of God transmitted with baptismal water, the symbol of regeneration and transformation produced by baptism (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 98-119; Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 284-296); thanks to baptism, it protects and assures the Christian of eternal life (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 119-125, 141-148); it implies that after baptism the Christian is bound to carefully observe specific duties, which cannot and must not be broken by sin (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 126-140). Its presence in the rite of baptism has a clear parallelism in the mystery rites (Dölger, *Sphragis*, 156-171).

Conforming himself to the proper tendency of the entire Christian tradition, *Origen associated

the seal to baptism (Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 162-170) and also to the Father and the Son (in *In Ioh.* I,1,6, p. 4, 25-28: Preuschen; the Lamb is the symbol of the *logos*); but also in regard to the seal he was not entirely opposed to adopting ideas characteristic of the Greek philosophical tradition: in *In Ioh.* XX,24,208 (358,23-29) he affirms that one single seal is impressed on various materials, generating numerous similar marks (cf. Arius Didymus and Philo of Alexandria), and that, analogously, the representations produced marks in various subjects (cf. the Stoics); and the same holds for the thoughts or the ideas (cf. Plutarch).

*Basil of Caesarea appropriated the association between the *logos* and the seal present in the writings of Philo of Alexandria (*Hom.* 15, *De fide:* PG 31,468B7; see also S. Lilla in *Storia della teologia* I, ed. E. dal Covolo, 271, 273 = *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il platonismo cristiano*, 98, 100).

Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite also made a connection between baptism and the seal (*De eccl. hier.* II,i, 4 [71, 17, 72, 11], II,ii,4 [75-21-76, 2]); he also made use of the image of the seal that always remains the same and detached, though giving place to different marks to explain how the divinity remains unchanged and transcendent despite being present everywhere (the difference between the various images depends not on the seal but on the nature of the matter that receives the marks; *De div. nom.* II,5 [12,7-9], II, 6 [129,12-130,4]; see also de Andia, *Henosis*, 83-84; in these last two passages the theme already present in the writings of Arius Didymus, Philo of Alexandria, Plutarch and Proclus thus returns).

IV. In gnosticism. Likewise in gnosticism the relationship between seal and baptism is constant, and in particular between the seal and the oil used in the related ceremony. *Celsus, who is cited by Origen (*C. Cels.* VI,2: Koetschau II 97, 2-5), reports the gnostic version of Jesus' baptism: the one who impresses the seal is called "Father," although the one who receives it and the who responds "I have been anointed with the white ointment of the tree of life" is called "young" and "Son" (see Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 297; Dölger, *Sphragis*, 89-94; Chadwick, *Origen*, 342 n. 2). In the gnostic texts the *Acts of Thomas* chs. 26 (Bonnet 141, 14, 16, 142, 5), 27 (142,7), 131-132 (239,3-4,8), the "seal" practically coincides with the baptism imparted with oil (Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 299; Dölger, *Sphragis*, 95-96); because of this oil God recognizes his own flock (ch. 26 [141,17-18]). In the *Acts of Philip* ch. 144 (Bonnet 86,5-8), the shining seal of Jesus Christ is associated with his glorious garment that protects the one who calls upon it and makes that person capable of proceeding beyond the "masters of the world" (*kosmokratores*) and the "wicked dragon" (*ponēros drakōn*) (see Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 303).

W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* [Forsch. zur Relig. und Liter. des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 10. Heft], Göttingen 1907 (repr. Göttingen 1973), 297-305; F.L. Dölger, *Sphragis. Eine christliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums* [Studien zur Gesch. und Kult. des Altertums Fünfter Band 3/4, Heft], Paderborn 1911; H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, Cambridge 1953, 342 nn.1-2; G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*, London [2]1967; Id., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* fasc. 5, Oxford 1968, 1355-1357; J. Whittaker, *Alcinoos: Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*, Paris 1990; S. Lilla, *L'oriente greco: dai Cappadoci allo pseudo-Dionigi l'Areopagita*, in *Storia della Teologia* I, ed. E. dal Covolo, Rome 1995, 271, 273 = *Dionigi l'Areopagita e il platonismo cristiano*, Rome 2005, 98, 100; Id., *Neuplatonisches Gedankengut in den Homilien über die Seligpreisungen Gregors von Nyssa* (Suppl. to VChr. LXVIII), Leiden 2004, 3, 3 n. 4; 9, 9 n. 33; Y. de Andia, *Henosis. L'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite* (Philosophia antiqua LXXI), Leiden 1996, 82-84; LTK 9, 567-568.

S. Lilla

SEBASTE. Sebasteia, Sebastia (modern-day Sivas), in Asia Minor, was established by Pompeii with the name of *Megalopolis* (Strabo, *Geography* XII, 37, 560) in the Roman province of Cappadocia. Renamed Sebaste under the emperor Augustus, following the administrative reform it became a metropolis within the Pontus diocese of the province of Armenia Minor, Armenia II after the reform of *Justinian. To Justinian is also owed the reconstruction of the wall (Proc, *Aedific.* 3,4). It had a strategic and commercial importance along the military roads of the empire, which joined the N of Asia Minor. It was Christian from the 2nd c. onward; it contained five suffragan sees (Sebastopolis, Nicolopis, Colonia, Satala and Berissa). The city had important figures in its bishops, from Meruzanes (3rd c.), the recipient of a letter on penance *De poenitentia* by *Dionysius of Alexandria on the *Novatian schism (Eusebius, *HE* 6,46), until Eulalius (or Eulogius), who took part in the Council of *Nicaea, and his son *Eustathius, to the martyrs Biagius and Peter I, and *Peter II of Sebaste, the younger brother of *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nyssa. Among the numerous martyrs, which spread its fame in all the Christian world, the most noteworthy were the *Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, soldiers of the Legio XII Fulminata stationed since the time of the emperor *Vespasian, who were exposed naked to the ice of a lake frozen over at Sebaste on 9 March of a year between 320 and 324 during the persecution of *Licinius, acc. to the testimony

of *Ephrem (?) (*Encom. in sanctos XL mart.*: J.S. Assemani, t. II, Rome 1743, 341-356; *Encom. in Basilium M.*: S.G. Mercati, *S. Ephraem Syri opera*, t. I/1, Rome 1915), of the *Acts* (BHG 1201ff.) and *Sozomen (*HE* 9,2) and praised by Basil of Caesarea (*in XL mart.*) and Gregory of Nyssa (*Or. III in XL marts.*) among the first. In the 12th c. the city became the see of a Turkish emirate.

DACL 15, 1107-1111; EC 11, 207-208; LTK 9, 556; G. Fedalto, I, 50-54; M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, Paris 1740 (repr. Graz 1958), I, 419-434; D.M. Girard, *Sivas, huit siècles d'histoire*: ROC 10 (1905) 79-95, 169-181, 283-288, 337-349; Fr. Hild - M. Restle, *Kappadokien* (*Kappadokia*, *Charsianon*, *Sebasteia und Lykandos*), Vienna 1981 (Tabula Imperii Byzantini, 2), 274-276; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford [2]1971, 134, 166-173; N. Garsoïan, *Nerses le Grand*, *Basile de Césarée et Eustathe de Sébaste*: REArm 17 (1983) 145-166, repr. in Id., *Armenia Between Byzantium and the Sasanians*, London 1985; Id., *Some Preliminary Precisions on the Separation of the Armenians and Imperial Churches. I. The Presence of "Armenian" Bishops at the First Five Œcumenical Councils*, in Καθηγητρια. *Essays presented to J. Hussey,* Camberley 1988, 249-285; Id., *L'Église Arménienne et le Grand Schisme d'Orient*, Louvain 1999, CSCO 574 (extensive bibl.); R.C. Blockley, *The Division of Armenia Between the Romans and the Persians at the End of the Fourth Century A.D.*: Historia 36 (1987) 222-234; M. Girardi, *Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo. Scrittura e tradizione*, Bari 1990, 121-136 ("The Fourty Soldiers of Sebaste") and passim; Id., *Basilio di Cesarea. I martiri. Panegirici per Giulitta*, *Gordio*, *40 soldati di Sebaste*, *Mamante*, tr., intr. and notes ed. M. Girardi, Rome 1999; P. Maraval, *The Earliest Developments of the Cult of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia in the Byzantine East and in the West*, in *The Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia*, *Belfast Byzantine Colloquia 1996*, 137-155.

M. Girardi

SEBASTIAN. The Roman **Depositio martyrum* recalls, for 20 January, St. Sebastian *ad catacumbas*. *Ambrose added that he was a native of *Milan (*In Ps.* 118: PL 15,1574): that he lived at the time of *Maximian and *Diocletian and underwent *martyrdom at *Rome. His passion belongs to the epic and cyclical genre: around the primary hero gather, like actors, numerous Roman martyrs, historical or not, whom he aids in prison, among which the *hagiography intertwines some bonds of relationship. This cult, which had developed initially under the shadow of the cult of the *apostles in the basilica bearing their name on the Via Appia, ended up overshadowing that cult. The body of the saint was the object of numerous transfers, certainly partial in some instances, to St. Médard at Soissons, to St. *Gregory at the Vatican, at Fulda, Farfa and other places. The relics worked numerous miracles everywhere.

A. Dufourcq, *Étude sur les Gesta martyrum romains*, I, Paris 1900, 301-302; *Vies des SS.* 1, 395-400; LTK 9, 557; BS 11, 776-801; J. Crété, *Saint Sébastien et saint Fabien*, *martyrs*: Itinéraires (Paris) 328-330 (1988-89) 106-107; C. Saliou, *Du légendier au sermonnaire: avatars de la Passio Sebastiani*: REA 36 (1990) 285-297.

V. Saxer

SEBEOS (Eusebius). Armenian bishop from the 1st half of the 7th c. According to later testimonies, he was the author of a *History of Heraclius*, only a few fragments of which are known. He was wrongly identified with the author of an anonymous treatise titled *The History of *Chosroes II* (i.e., the king of Persia, 590–628).

Editions: F. Macler, *Histoire d'Héraclius par l'évêque Sébéos*, Paris 1904; G.V. Abgaryan, *Patmow'tiwn Sebēosi [history of Sebeos]*, Erevan 1979; C. Gugerotti, *Sebïosi*, *Storia. Traduzione dall'armeno*, *introduzione e note* (Eurasiatica 4), Verona 1990; *The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos*, I, tr. and notes by R.W. Thomson; II, Historical commentary by H. Johnston, Liverpool 1999.

Studies: J.-P. Mahé, *Critical Remarks on the Newly Edited Excerpts from Sebeos*, in T. Samuelian - M. Stone, *Medieval Armenian Culture* (Armenian Texts and Studies 6), Chico, CA 1984, 218-239; R.W. Thomson, *Biblical Themes in the Armenian Historian Sebēos*, in G.I. Reinink - A.C. Klugkist, *After Bardaisan: Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor Han J.W. Drijvers*, Leuven 1999, 295-302.

S. Voicu

SECOND COMING of CHRIST. Apocryphal text. An apocalyptic text preserved the Ethiopian, translated from the Arabic; the original Greek text was written in the 2nd/3rd c.; it shares some commonalities with the *Apocalypse of Peter*. It treats the following topics: the resurrection, the last judgment, the punishment of the damned and the joy of the saved.

S. Grebaut, ROC 15 (1910) 198-214; 307-323; 425-439 (with Fr. tr.).

M. Starowieyski

SECRETUM (Secrecy). According to Heinrich Georges (p. 2559), the noun *secretum* has essentially two meanings: it can refer, first, to isolation, i.e., solitude. In this sense, this isolation can more precisely determine the spatiality, even the recollection that takes place there and the means of communication: e.g., the *secretum longum* or *ambigua secreta* or *secretum petere*.

Second, the noun *secretum* can also include the idea of secrecy or mystery, e.g., when it designates secret thoughts (*secreta nostra*, secret teachings) or actions (*secretiorae artes*, magic arts). In this sense

the term can also refer to the rites of initiation, which have as their scope one's participation in the divine destiny or the divine vital force (σωτηρία). This cultic convention, however, was rejected with the Platonist doctrine of spiritual ascent toward the divinity. One should not, therefore, exclude that these mysterious arts carried out in *secretarium* (Georges, p. 2558) also represented the most intimate essence of the *ambigua secreta*. The noun *secretarium* above all signified the separated place, i.e., the special place in which the cultic activities took place (the temple, the interior place of the sacrifices). In the Christian church it referred to a sacred place, in which the most sacred things were kept, i.e., the *Eucharist and the Sacred *Scriptures. In a broad sense, however, the term *secretarium* also contained legal and political dimensions, when it is used to refer to places of religious or political decisions. Thus the term *secretarium* was used to indicate the interrogation room in a legal context and, consequently, the political assembly hall, e.g., the *secretarium* of the senate. Subsequently the ecclesiastical synods took place in the *secretarium*, as did the Synod of *Carthage in the year 525.

Literate Christians knew the aforementioned meanings of the term *secretum*/μυστήρια. Nevertheless, its meaning was decisively changed. Both the biblical and Christian authors, in fact, related the term *secretum* esp. to the divine revelations pertaining to the kingdom of God (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ). Therefore, the term *secretum* was often used in the context of Jesus' parable narrations (*parabolē*—Mt 13:11; Mk 4:11; Lk 8:10). Thus the term *secretum* more specifically characterized the kingdom of God, but at the same time it did not yet reveal the mystery. In the *secretum*, the human being contemplates the face of God. Last, however, with this term the mystery of Christ was also expressed in a special way (Phil 2:6-9; Col 2:2). The prophecies which were still hidden were fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ. But also the church, it sacraments and its teachings were *secreta et ineffabilia sacramenta*, *secreta iudiciorum*, *secretum tabernaculi*. The Fathers, therefore, saw in the *secretum* of the incarnation of Jesus Christ the foundation of the church's mysterious marriage with Christ.

For the philosopher and rhetorician *Marius Victorinus, who had converted to Christianity, the *secretum dei* was above all *Christus dictus sapientia* (*Adv. Ar.* III, 10). Through his own cross, i.e., through the *latitudo*, *longitudo*, *altitudo* and the *profundum* of the cross, Christ has manifested to humankind God's love and in this way even love for oneself (*caritas Christi*). For Faustinus the Luciferian the mystery of the *incarnation represented the central point of the sacraments the *secretum fidei* (*De Trin.* XX, 1). Even for *Ambrose, the mystery of divine filiation (*De Patriarchis* 11,51), the *secretum altiora mysteria* (*Exp. Ps.* CXVIII, 17,11) can be perceived only if one withdraws *in secreto mentis animae* (*Exp. Ps.* CXVIII, 2,29) or *in secreto cordis* (*Exp. Ps.* XIX, 25). Already very early *Augustine also used in a figurative manner the expressions *secretarium mentis* (*De Trin.* 7,8; *Io. ev. tr.* 23,9; *En. in Ps.* 34,2,3) or *secretarium templi*, where the heart is the sanctuary where God dwells (*En. in Ps.* 78,8) and, therefore, one can bring about there in the most intense manner, the human being's encounter with God (*secretarium veritatis*). The heart, therefore, can even be the place of distance from God (*deserto secretario conscientiae*, *Gn. adv. Man.* 2,6). Consequently the orientation and the preparation of the human heart remains decisive. Thus the heart is identified with the inner person (*Lib. arb.* 2,42; see also, Orig., *Hom.* 10,3: *interiorem hominem et cordis secreta*).

Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer, 2, 748; NP 2, 315-316; G. Lampe, 1230; TWNT 4, 809-835; RAC 14, 1093-1131; H. Georges, *Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch*, Basel [9]1951, 2258-2559; G.A. Wewers, *Geheimnis und Geihmhaltung im rabbinischen Judentum*, Berlin-New York 1975; J. Pépin, *L'arcane religieux et sa transposition philosophique dans la tradition platonicienne*, in *Mélanges Mario Dal Pra*, Milan 1984, 18-35; L. Brisson, *Usages et fonctions du secret dans le pythagorisme ancien*, in P. Dujardins, *Le secret*, Paris-Lyon 1987, 87-101; W.B. Kees (ed.), *Secrecy in Religion*, Leiden 1987; M. Giebel, *Das Geheimnis der Mysterien. Antike Kulte in Griechland, Rome und Ägypten*, Zürich 1990 (It. tr. *I culti misterici nel mondo antico*, Genoa 1993); K. Vandorpe, *Breaking the Seal of Secrecy: Sealing-Practices in Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Egypt on Greek, Demotic and Latin Papyrological Evidence*, Leiden 1995.

J. Lam Cong Quy

SECUNDIANUS of Singidunum. An *Arian priest, he was the bishop of Singidunum (Belgrade) upon the death of *Ursacius (ca. 370–375). In 381 he was sentenced and deposed, along with Palladius of Ratiaria, at the Council of *Aquileia (381).

M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 441; Y.-M. Duval, *La convocation du concile d'Aquilée de 381*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V*. XXX Incontro di Studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 3-5 maggio 2001: SEA 78 (2002) 421-437.

M. Simonetti

SECUNDINUS, Manichean. Manichaean auditor at Rome (late 4th c.). *Augustine mentioned his work titled *Contra Secundinum manichaeum* as the

last of his writings explicitly against the *Manicheans (*Retr.* II,10), which suggests a date after 404 for its completion. In all actuality, the work is a letter written in response to a preceding letter written by Secundinus. We even have the fortune of possessing a letter written by Secundinus, from which Augustine cited only a few lines in his response. In effect, both letters were preserved in a single MS. Secundinus referred to himself as a Roman (and to Augustine as Punic), but we know nothing else of him. He states that he knows Augustine through his writings and greets him with flattering titles, although it seems that the two never met. In the *Retractations*, Augustine calls Secundinus an *auditor*, although it is not clear how he obtained this bit of information about this individual.

Secundinus wrote to Augustine *velut amicus, honorifice obiurgans*, but his words of praise are shown to be false by his reproaching tone, because he accused Augustine of not being able to understand the struggle undertaken by the Father, his firstborn and the Holy Spirit against the forces of evil, and he was, therefore, never a true Manichean. Secundinus's objective is that of defending Manicheism against some of the first critiques raised by Augustine, esp. pertaining to the two eternal principles and the revelatory value of the OT. Secundinus concluded with an invitation to the bishop of Hippo to turn to his earlier religion ("the way of the truth and knowledge") and to lend his eloquence to the fight against Catholicism. In addition to responding to Secundinus, the treatise *C. Secund.*, which Augustine regarded as his favorite anti-Manichaean work, gives us a brief summary of the arguments of his first controversies. Augustine's greatest merit stands in the fact that he allowed this letter to which he then responded to be preserved in the same MS.

CPL 324, 325; PL 42, 571-602; CSEL 25/2, 893-947; BA 17, 510-633; P. Alfaric, *L'évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin*, I, Paris 1918, 88-89, 215-216; F. Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IVe-Ve siècles): Étude historique et doctrinale*, II, Paris 1978, 99-108; J. van Oort, *Secundini Manichaei Epistula: Roman Manichaean "Biblical" Argument in the Age of Augustine*, in J. van Oort - O. Wermelinger - G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 49, Leiden 2001, 161-173.

J.K. Coyle

SECUNDINUS of Ireland, bishop (d. ca. 447). His name was Sechnall. He was perhaps one of the first missionaries who came (from *Gaul?) into Ireland in the 5th c.; acc. to tradition, he was the son of the "Lombard" Restitutus and *Patrick's sister. Secundinus was the author of an abecedarian hymn in honor of St. Patrick (inc. *Audite omnes*) preserved in the antiphonary of Bangor (ff. 13v-15v) and bearing the title *Ymnum Sancti Patrici* (*see *Audite omnes amantes*). During the Middle Ages, Secundinus was remembered locally as a saint on 27 November.

Kenney, I, n. 87, 258-260; CPL 1101; PL 53, 837-840; 72, 590-592; W. Stokes, *The Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, London 1887, II, 382-384; F.E. Warren, *The Antiphonary of Bangor*, London 1893-1895, II, 14-16; C. Blume, *Analecta hymnica Medii Aevi* 51, Leipzig 1908, 340-346; L. Bieler, *The Hymn of St. Secundinus*: PRIA 55 (1953) 117-127; BS 11, 805-807; L. Bieler, *St. Secundinus and Armagh*: Seanchas Ardmhacha 2 (1956) 21-27; M.W. Herren, *An Early Irish Precursor of the "Offiziendichtung" of the Carolingian and Ottonian Periods*: Euphrosyne 22 (1994) 291-300.

E. Malaspina

SECUNDUS, gnostic. One of the first disciples of the *gnostic teacher *Valentinus and therefore to be dated around the mid-2nd c. His written works no longer survive, and the only information we have about him comes from *Irenaeus, who in *Adv. Haer.* I,11,2 briefly reports some of his teachings, immediately after having explained those of Valentinus, in a form varying from these teachings, leaving one therefore to suppose that for the remainder, he thought in the manner of Valentinus: "Secundus, for his part, maintained that the first Ogdoad consisted of a Tetrad to the right and a Tetrad to the left, and taught that one was called 'light' and the other 'darkness.' In his opinion, the power that separated from the rest and fell did not proceed directly from the thirty aeons but was produced by them." As far as we can see, it seems that Secundus's ideas were very close to both *Valentinus and *Ptolemy the Gnostic, another Valentinian.

C. Colpe, *Gnosis II* (*Gnostizismus*): RAC 11 (1980) 538ff.; M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism." An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, Princeton, NJ 1996; C. Markschies, *Die Gnosis*, Munich 2001; K.L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?*, Cambridge, MA-London 2003; A. Marjanen (ed.), *Was There a Gnostic Religion?*, Göttingen 2005; K.L. King - R. van den Broek, *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, I, eds. W.J. Hannegraaff et al., Leiden-Boston 2005, 412.

I. Ramelli

SECUNDUS of Tigisis. Bishop of Tigisis (today Ain el Bordj in Algeria, between Constantine and Madauros) and the primate of *Numidia at the beginning of the 4th c. After the persecution of 303, *Mensurius the bishop of *Carthage wrote him a letter describing what had occurred at Carthage and how he had hidden the *Scriptures (Augustine, *Brev. collat.* III,13,25: CSEL 53,75). Secundus answered him describing what had occurred in Numidia during

the persecution of 303 and that he had not handed over the Scriptures. Thus we see that communion between the two primates still existed at this time. In the so-called Council of *Cirta (Constantine) from the year 305 (Lancel dates it 307)—which was in reality a gathering of 12 bishops to ordain *Silvanus in this city—Secundus, who presided over it, opened the gathering by asking that each person make an examination of conscience regarding whether he was a *traditor*. The request was justified by the fact that among those who were to be ordained were those who had been *traditores*. On this occasion Secundus was accused by Purpurius of Limata, who was also guilty of serious crimes, of having himself been guilty of being a *traditor* and other crimes (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*: CSEL 26,186-197; *Optatus of Milevis, *De schism.* I,14: CSEL 26, 16; Augustine, *Brev. collat.* III,15,27). Having obtained the general agreement of entrusting to God the responsibility of each one present, they proceeded to the ordination of Silvanus in the place of the deceased Paul.

Upon the election of *Caecilian as bishop of Carthage, the bishops of Numidia gathered together for one week in the city (311/312). Secundus presided over this meeting. These bishops, with their primate as the leader, supported the opponents of Caecilian, who had been accused of having been ordained by *Felix of Aptunga, a *traditor*, and ordained in his place *Maiorinus, who had been protected by *Lucilla. Secundus, as noted many times by *Augustine, had thus not only forgiven the *traditores* who had gathered in the meeting of Cirta, but was also unable to prove his innocence before the other bishops. In fact, even he had brought about the condemnation of an individual who was absent (Caecilian), with an unproven accusation and elected in his place another bishop, thus becoming the one responsible for the formal act of the Carthaginian dissent into a *Donatist ecclesial structure (Augustine, *Contra Gaud.* I,37,47; *Contra Ep. Parm.* I, 3,5; *Ep.* 43,2-9; *Ep.* 53,2,4). Moreover, it was the Donatists who regarded Secundus's consecration of Maiorinus as the moment in which the *schism began (see *Gesta apud Zen.*: CSEL 26,185 and 189).

Monceaux IV, 7-10; BA 32, 738-739; PCBE 1, 1052-1054; S. Lancel, *Les débuts du Donatisme: la date du "Protocole de Cirta" et l'élection épiscopale de Silvanus*: REAug 24 (1979) 217-229; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000.

A. Di Berardino

SECUNDUS of Trent (d. 512). Monk of Non who in the year 602 baptized at Mainz the king of the *Longobards (Lombards) Adaloald the son of *Agilulf and *Theodelinda. He was the author of the *Historia Langobardorum*, now lost, a text used by Paul the Deacon (*Historia Langobardorum* IV,27). During those years the church of Trent was favorably disposed to the *Three Chapters, as was Secundus of Trent; for this reason he wrote to Pope *Gregory the Great without receiving a response; he then asked Queen Theodelinda to request a response (Gregory the Great, *Ep.* 14,12). The question is asked whether Secundus should be identified with the monk *Secundinus (PCBE 2, 2014 n. 8), to whom Gregory in the year 599 sent a letter (9,147), which illustrates the question of the controversy of the Three Chapters, to which the recipient seemed favorably disposed.

K. Gardiner, *Paul the Deacon and Secundus of Trento*, in *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, eds. B. Croke - A.M. Emmett, Sidney 1983, 147-153 (on the possibility that Paul had used the preceding chronicle—now lost—of Secundus of Trent); R. Cervani, *La fonte tridentina della "Historia Langobardorum" di Paolo Diacono*: Atti. Acc. Roveretana degli Agiati 26 (1986) 97-103; G. Voltolina, *Secondo di Trento, un benedettino alla Corte dei Longobardi*: Riv. Cistercense 10 (1993) 51-58; Patrologia IV, 245; PCBE 2, 2017.

A. Di Berardino

SEDATUS of Béziers (Sedatus Biterrensis). Sedatus, or Sedatius, was the bishop of Béziers and took part in the Third Council of *Toledo (589), which saw the gathering of bishops and delegates from the entire Visigothic kingdom: *Spain and Narbonese France. During the same year, in the month of November, he was present at the Council of *Narbonne and put his signature immediately after the Metropolitan Migetius, a sign of respect owed perhaps to his advanced age (Verbraken).

Some *sermones* have been passed down under the name of Sedatus, which recent scholarship, starting from A. Wilmart and G. Jouassard, has attributed to *Sedatus of Nîmes, who was also present at the Council of *Agde (506) and perhaps that of *Toulouse of the preceding year.

Verbraken, however, has maintained that the *Epistola sancti Sedati episcopi ad consolacionem et terrorem peccatorum* (cod. A 24 Sup. from the Ambrosiana MS collection in Milan) should be attributed back to Sedatus of Béziers. This MS comes from Certosa di Asti (15th c.) and is ascribed to Sedatus of Nîmes in the CPL (n. 1005b) and the PLS (3, 445). Annotated by G. Morin, the *Epistola* was published in 1980 by Verbraken, who strongly denied authorship by the bishop of

Nîmes. The same *Epistola* was published in 1992 by M.G. Bianco, who used in addition to the Ambrosiana MS a codex from the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emmanuele of Rome (n. 1190). This scholar, who attributed it to Sedatus of Nîmes, showed, however, how parts of the text are identical to Caes. Arel., *Serm.* 56,2-3, *Faustus of Reiz, *Serm.* 14 and ps.-Aug., *App.* 249,5-6 and *App.* 260,2. A. Finally, A. Solignac is inclined to attribute the *Epistola* to Sedatus of Nîmes, in the entry *Sédat de Nîmes* for the DS (1990); Solignac, however, distinguishes, along with Verbraken, secs. 6-11 of the *Epistola*, which are probably the work of a different hand.

Lacking the formal characteristics that were specific to the composition of letters (sender, recipient, superscription, greetings, *du-Stil*), this text is, instead, more of a *monitio* than it is a letter. The following themes are discussed: the benefits of conversion, it does not matter if it occurs late in life (see Ezek 18:21); the external signs of penitence and the necessity of joining *bonae operae* to *vestimenta religiosa*; the proclamation of future punishments (*octo damnaciones*) for the sinner; the three steps (*tres mansiones*) of the sinner and the righteous, respectively death, judgment and damnation, or transit into heaven, resurrection with the saints and eternal life; the six *cogitationes* that save the soul; the five ways in which God *facit iusticiam cum sanctis suis*. What is also significant—also for the attribution to Sedatus—is the importance attributed to the question of the clothing and the mention of the tonsure, both (clothing and tonsure) at the center of the Council of Narbonne. The synod, in fact, was in direct contact with the Council of *Toledo, which had among other things made laws on the tonsure and the clothing proper to penitents. The question of the clothing of clerics was explicitly raised in the first canon.

PLS 3, cols. 445-446 (writings attributed to Sedatus of Nîmes and to Sedatus of Béziers); *Concilia Galliae. A. 511 – A. 695*, ed. C. de Clercq, CCL 148 A (1963) 257; *La collección canónica hispana*, V: *Concilios Hispanos. Segunda parte*, eds. G. Martinez Diez - F. Rodriguez (Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra. Serie Canónica 5), Madrid 1992, 141; *Epistola*: CPL 1005; CPPM 3535; P.-P. Verbraken, *Traces d'un "De consolatione peccatoris" attribuable à Sedatus de Béziers*: RBen 90 (1980) 135-139; M.G. Bianco, *Sedato di Nîmes, "Consolatio et monitio peccatoribus,"* in *"Humanitas" classica e "sapientia" cristiana. Scritti offerti a Roberto Iacoangeli*, ed. S. Felici, Rome 1992, 287-303; W. Bergmann, *Studien zu einer kritischen Sichtung der südgallischen Predigtliteratur des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts*, I, Leipzig 1898, 279-305; A. Wilmart, *Une homélie de Sedatus, évêque de Nîmes, pour la Nativité de Notre-Seigneur*: RBen 35 (1923) 5-16; G. Morin, *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine 1 (1921-1928)*: RBen 41 (1929) n. 212, 103; G. Jouassard, *Saint Césaire d'Arles et Sedatus de Nîmes*: Science Religieuse 31 (1941–1943) 211-215; P.-P. Verbraken, *Sermons jumeaux de Sedatus de Nîmes pour la fête de Noël*: RBen 88 (1978) 81-91; DS, 14, coll. 508-510 (A. Solignac).

B. Clausi

SEDATUS of Nîmes (6th c.). Sedatus had a good classical training and became the bishop of Nîmes around the year 500. (He should not be confused with *Sedatus of Béziers, as has been done in the PL 72,771-72.) He was the friend of *Ruricius of Limoges, who wrote various metrical poems for him (1, 6, 7, 8, 17, 44) and *Caesarius of Arles. Although he had written many sermons, there remains only one, on Christmas, which was quoted by Cesarius of Arles (*Sermo* 190). The other two sermons are of uncertain authenticity (one likewise on Christmas and the other on Epiphany) and three letters.

Editions: see CPL 1005: *Sermo de Natali Domini*: PLS 4, 1927-1929 [is reused by Caesarius of Arles, *Serm* 190. The same sermon is found in the Codex *Mellicensis* 218 (E. 8), where the exordium is changed]; *Sermo de Natali Domini* (uncertain): CPL 1006; PL 39, 1977-1981; *Homilia de Epiphania* (uncertain): CPL 1007; PL 39, 2013-2015; PL 72, 771-774; CSEL 21, 247-252; *Epistulae*: see CPL 1005c. *Ep.* (*inter Fausti Ep.*) 15,16,19; PL 58, 865; another unedited letter is found in the Codex A 24 Sup. Bibl. Ambr. Moreover, G. Morin thought he had found some of Sedatus's texts in the writings of Caesarius of Arles (*Serm.* 56,4; 57,4; 193; 194).

Studies: W. Bergmann, *Studien zu einer kritischen Sichtung der südgallischen Predigtliteratur*, I, Leipzig 1898, 279-305; A. Wilmart, *Une homélie de Sedatus, évêque de Nîmes pour la Nativité de Notre Seigneur*: RBen 35 (1923) 5-16; P.-P. Verbraken, *Sermons jumeaux de Sedatus de Nîmes pour la fête de Noël*: RBen 88 (1978) 81-91; Patrologia IV, 300-301.

M. Maritano

SEDULIUS. Caelius Sedulius, born in S *Gaul or in N *Spain, he was—acc. to the *subscriptio* of the *Codex Gothanus* (8th c.)—a layman who studied in *Italy and composed his works in Greece, during the time of the emperors *Theodosius II and *Valentinian III, between the years 425 and 450. The title *antistes* and *episcopus* (present in some MSS) and verses 23-25 from book 1 of the *Pasch. Carm.*, which present him as a man who worked tirelessly in his efforts for the choir, leads one to believe that he was presbyter. In five books he composed a hexameter paraphrase of the gospels, which he titled the *Paschale carmen*, drawing inspiration from the text of 1 Cor 5:7 *Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus*. The first book mentioned the salient deeds of the OT, freely chosen without rigorous order, and the other four a paraphrase of the gospel *narratio* from the annunciation to the ascension of

Christ, enriching it with digressions and enlivening it with the *colores* of classical (Virgil, but also Lucan and Claudian) and Christian poetry (*Juvencus, *Prudentius, *Paulinus of Nola).

Book 1, considered by some to be foreign to the economy of the poem, is justified from within the polemic against those who reject the OT (*gnostics, *Marcion). The two testaments have one single author and are inconceivable when separated from each other. Christ was already present in the ancient law and governed the two Testaments (1,145-146). In the OT, the Father works with the Son; in the NT, the Son acts with the Father (1,291-296). The poem is preceded by a letter written in prose addressed to Macedonius, which contains a sort of autobiographical confession as well as the poetic program of the author, which inspires the decision to compose the work and justifies the choice of the poetic form, emphasizing the learned character of the public to which it is addressed. After the dedicatory epistle there follows a *praefatio* written in eight distichs, all centered on the motif of the banquet, which, inasmuch as it is a metaphor of the Last Supper, is central in the economy of salvation. The *paschales dapes* allude to the title of the work in its subject, Christ, the sacrificial lamb becoming the eucharistic food. Lacking in this are the typical elements of the proemium acc. to the ancient instructions, which we find, however, in the first book in hexameters, which exhorts one to reject the deceitful contents of classical poetry (1,17-22), against which the paraphraser pits his poetic project, which is read for the practice of psalmody (1,23-26: *Cur ego Dauiticis adsuetus cantibus odas / cordarum resonare decem sanctoque uerenter / stare choro et placidis caelestia psallere uerbis, clara salutiferi taceam miracula Christi?*). With respect to his predecessor Juvencus, Sedulius used more sources, at times conflating them, or even a harmony of the gospels, dating back to the very tradition of the *Syriac **Diatessaron*, and the practice of a freer paraphrase, both in relation to the succession of events in the evangelical epitext and the abundant use of the resources of rhetoric (exclamation, apostrophes, rhetorical questions, amplifications, additions), and last, to the continual attention in bringing forth from the reworded episodes the theological and spiritual meaning. Essentially christocentric, Sedulius's poem does not restrict itself to the simple rewriting of the life of Christ, because he leaves space for exegesis, drawing on the Psalms and St. Paul's epistles. At times, the poet indulges in symbolic developments, as in the case when he recognizes in the four arms of the cross the four regions of heaven: Christ on the cross shows his sovereignty over heaven, extending his members to its four points (5,182-95). Shortly after the Council of *Ephesus in 431, Sedulius inserts into his poem a prayer directed to the Virgin *Mary, the Theotokos (2,63-72). The poem, which was published in the year 494 by Turcius Rufus Asterius, enjoyed great success during the Middle Ages (Springer, 128-150); Remigius of Auxerre (9th c.) has left us an *Expositio* of this poem (which was partially published in the CSEL 10,316-359).

The *Paschale carmen* was reparaphrased by Sedulius in a heavily rhetorized prose, the *Paschale opus*, which has the objective, as he himself states in the *Letter to Macedonius*, of filling some lacunae present in the *Carmen* and of answering some accusations of unfaithfulness directed at his paraphrase (*dicentque nonnulli fidem translationis esse corruptam*). Sedulius must have drawn from a biblical exegetical literature (commentaries, lists) that was widespread during his time.

Two hymns in praise of Christ have been attributed to Sedulius. The first is, in effect, a poem written in elegiac meter consisting of 55 distichs. Another one of his well-known writings was a work titled (absent in the codices) *Collatio Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, which makes reference to its typological-christological character. The hymn is a brief history of salvation and is established on episodes of the OT christologically interpreted and pertains to Christ's miracles and life. The second, *A solis ortus cardine*, is an abecedarian hymn in 23 tetrastichic strophes of iambic dimeters, used in the liturgy.

Editions: CPL 1447-1454; PL 19, 433-752, 753-770 (Hymns); J. Huemer, CSEL 10 (1885); F. Corsaro, *Sedulio poeta*, Catania 1956 (collects three studies, the second of which contains the Italian translation of the poem and the hymns).

Studies: Patrologia III, 304-308 (bibl.); G. Boissier, *Le* Carmen Paschale *et l'*Opus Paschale *de Sedulius*: Rev. Philol. 6 (1882) 28-36; Th. Mayr, *Studien zu dem* Paschale Carmen *des christlichen Dichters Sedulius*, Augsburg 1916; C. Weyman, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, Munich 1926, 121-137; A.D. McDonald, *The Iconographic Tradition of Sedulius:* Speculum 8 (1933) 150-156; E. Bitter, *Die Virgil-Interpretation der frühchristlichen Dichter Paulinus von Nola und Sedulius*, Tübingen 1948 (Diss.); G. Moretti Pieri, *Sulle fonti evangeliche di Sedulio*: Atti e Memorie Acc. Tosc. La Colombaria 34 (1969) 125-243; Ch. Witke, Numen Litterarum. *The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great*, Leiden-Cologne 1971, 206-218; I. Opelt, *Die Szenerie bei Sedulius*: JbAC 19 (1976) 109-119; R. Herzog, *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike*, Munich 1975, LII-LIV; D. Kartschoke, *Bibeldichtung*, Munich 1975, 41-45, 64-68, 87-90; C. Tibiletti, *Note al testo del* "Paschale Carmen" *di Sedulio*, in *Forma Futuri. Studi in onore del card. M. Pellegrino*, Turin 1975, 778-785; A. Grillo, *La presenza di Virgilio in Sedulio poeta parafrastico*, in R. Chevallier (ed.), *Présence de Virgile.* Actes du Colloque des 9, 11 et 12 Décembre 1976, Paris 1978, 185-194; M. Donnini, *Alcune os-*

servazioni sul programma poetico di Sedulio: RSC 26 (1978) 426-436; J. Fontaine, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien*, Paris 1981, 248-252; G. Malsbary, *Epic Exegesis and the Use of Virgil in the Early Biblical Poets*: Florilegium 7 (1985) 55-83; M. Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*, Liverpool 1985; S. Costanza, *Da Giovenco a Sedulio. I proemi degli "Evangeliorum libri" e del "Carmen Paschale"*: Civ. Cl. Cr. 6 (1985) 253-286; C. Dermot Small, *Rhetoric and Exegesis in Sedulius' Carmen Paschale*: Classica et Mediaevalia 37 (1986); C.P.E. Springer, *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity. The* Paschale Carmen *of Sedulius*, Leiden 1988; A.V. Nazzaro, *Sedulio*, in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, IV, Rome 1988, 751-752; Id., *Poesia biblica come espressione teologica: fra tardoantico e altomedioevo*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, Florence 2001, 130-152 (on Juvencus 1, 224-70 and Sedulius 2, 73-133); F. Stella, *Poesia e Teologia. L'Occidente tra IV e VIII secolo*, Milan 2001, 47-58.

A.V. Nazzaro

SELEUCIA - CTESIPHON
I. The city - II. Councils.

I. The city. Seleucia-Ctesiphon was the name of two ancient twin cities on the Tigris River ca. 60 km (37.3 mi) N of Babylon and ca. 35 km (21.7 mi) S of Baghdad. The first, Seleucia (today Tel Umar), was established by Seleucus I Nicator around the year 312 BC on the right bank of the river, with a mixed population of Greeks and Babylonians. It was destroyed by the Roman general Cassius in the year AD 164. The second, Ctesiphon (today Salman Pak), was established by the Parthians on the opposite bank of the river, thus becoming the winter residence of the Arsacids and the capital of the *Sassanids until the Arabic conquests (636). The first place to have a Christian witness was the hill of Koha, between the two cities, which was subsequently incorporated in the Sassanid Ardashir's new capital around the year 230 (the Mahoza of Jewish and Christian sources, Veh Ardashir for the Iranians). The name of the twin cities was used to refer to the center of the Persian Orthodox Church, which subsequently became *Nestorian, in all likelihood from the 3rd c. and until the Abbasids (750–1258), the era in which this center moved to Baghdad. The bishop who resided at Seleucia-Ctesiphon since the Synod of Mar *Isaac, in 410, carried the title of *catholicos and later (between 450 and 550) that of *catholicos-patriarch.* The collection of synods that were held there, which gathered probably under *Timothy I around the year 800, allows one to reconstruct for almost four centuries the expansion of the *Persian church (which was Nestorian after the synod of 486), its chronology, its prosopography, and the evolution of its teaching and discipline. This important source was published by J.-B. Chabot, which was supplemented with a French translation, titled *Synodicon orientale* (Paris 1902).

PWK 21/1, 1148-1184; PWK Suppl. 4, 1102-1118; KLP 2, 369; 5, 83-85; Ortiz de Urbina 121-122; LTK 9, 651-652; CE 13, 54; M. Streck, *Seleucia und Ktesiphon*, Leipzig 1917; M.J. Huggins, *Chronologus of the Fourth Century Metropolitans of Seleucia-Ctesiphon*: Traditio 9 (1953) 45-100; W. de Vries, *Antiochien und Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Patriarch und Katholikos?*, in *Mélanges Tisserant*, III (ST 233), Rome 1964, 429-450; J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, subs. 3A, Louvain 1970, 40-44; Encyclopedia Iranica, s.v. *Ctesiphon*.

F. Rilliet

II. Councils. Seleucia-Ctesiphon, at least since the beginning of the 4th c., was the see of the catholicos or the archbishop of the East, i.e., of the highest ecclesiastical authority of the Persian Empire. It was, therefore, the theater of numerous synods (at a certain point expressly provided for at two-year intervals), the most famous of which were the synod of 399–400, presided over by *Maruta of Maiferqat, which ratified the end of the imperial persecutions from the 2nd half of the 4th c. and nominated *Isaac to the position of catholicos; the synod of 410, presided over by Maruta and Isaac, which reorganized the ecclesiastical structure and the legislative ordinances (introducing the so-called canons of *Nicaea) and proclaimed (or rather, confirmed) the autonomy of the Persian church with respect to the "Western" church (probably the patriarchate of Antioch); the autonomy, by that point very great, became total independence with the synod of 422; the synod of 486 under *Barsauma attests the full transition of the Persian church to "*Nestorianism" and legitimated the marriage of bishops.

Palazzini 5, 41-45; J.B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale*, Paris 1902; J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224-632)*, Paris 1904; J.-M. Fiey, *Les étapes de la prise de conscience de son identité patriarcale par l'Église syrienne orientale*: Or Syr 12 (1967) 3-22; J. Gribomont, *Le symbole de foi de Séleucie-Ctésiphon (410)*, in *A Tribute to A. Vööbus*, Chicago 1977, 283-294; A. Vööbus, *The Canons Ascribed to Maruta Maipherqat and Related Sources*, CSCO 439-440/syr 191-192, Louvain 1982; C. Baumer, *Frühes Christentum zwischen Euphrat und Jangtse. Eine Zeitreise entlang der Seidenstraße zur Kirche des Ostens*, Stuttgart 2005, 65-110.

S.J. Voicu

SELEUCIA - CTESIPHON, School of. *Mar Aba, the famous teacher at the school of *Nisibis, toward the end of the years 530–540 established a second large school in the Persian capital, Seleucia-Ctesiphon, bringing with him his students *Ishai, *Thomas of Edessa and *Cyrus of Edessa, whom he respectively nominated rector, teacher and transla-

tor at the new school. This foundation made part of an attempt, on the part of one group of theologians who had gathered around their great teacher, to spread the spirit of the school of Nisibis throughout the entire Persian territory.

Baumstark, 118-123; Bettiolo, *Lineamenti*, 521, 570-571.

K. den Biesen

SELEUCIA in ISAURIA, Council of. Called by the emperor *Constantius, in conjunction with the Western Council of *Rimini, to restore peace to the church, which had been deeply disturbed by the events that occurred between the years 357 and 358 due to the age-old *Arian controversy, the Council of Seleucia of Isauria (Asia Minor) opened on 27 September 359 in the presence of nearly 160 bishops and lasted two days. The anti-Arian majority, represented in large part by the *homoiousians, led by *Silvanus of Tarsus, *Eleusius of Cyzicus and *Eustathius of Sebaste, imposed the formula of faith of Antioch (341), rejecting, after fierce debates, a formula of compromise presented by *Acacius of Caesarea, in the name of a minority that united *homoians and pro-Arians: this formula rejected on the one hand the **homoousios* and the anti-Arian **homoiousios* and on the other the Arian **anomoion*, and proposed to only affirm that Christ was similar to the Father. With this formula rejected, its supporters boycotted the council's work, which, to their detriment, promulgated an excommunication and a deposition from ecclesiastical office.

But the commission and the council, which communicated its results in October to Constantius, who was residing at *Constantinople, found the emperor to be very hostile because he favored instead the formula given by Acacius. There then followed long discussions, during which news had arrived that the Western bishops gathered at Rimini yielded to the formula of faith supported by pro-Arians and the emperor, which was in accord with the formula drafted by Acacius of Caesarea. For this reason, Constantius also ordered the signing of that formula for the representatives of the Council of Seleucia who had come to him and was able to obtain it after much insistence. The last signatures were given on the night of 31 December.

Hfl-Lecl 1, 929-955; Simonetti 314, 326-338; A. Miranda, *Chiesa "orientale" ed "occidentale" nel sinodo di Seleucia-Rimini*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli IIIV.* XXX Incontro di Studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 3-5 maggio 2001: SEA 78 (2002) 461-470.

M. Simonetti

SEMIARIANS. *Epiphanius (*Panar.* 73) referred to the *homoiousians in this manner: ἡμιάρειοι, which *Filaster (*Haer.* 67) and *Augustine (*Haer.* 51) rendered with the title *semiarriani.* The title is tendentious and arises from the overly simplistic identification of anti-*Arian orthodoxy with Nicene theology established on the term **homoousios*, misunderstanding the fundamental orthodoxy of the anti-Arian supporters of the term **homoiousios.* If ever applicable to a specific group, the title *semiarians* could have, more reasonably, characterized those homoiousians who after the year 360 separated from the group inasmuch as they refused to recognize the divinity of the *Holy Spirit and the term *homoousios*, which other homoiousians had accepted between 363 and 366. In other contexts, they were referred to as "*Macedonians."

The De haeresibus *of Saint Augustine: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary* by L.G. Müller, Washington, DC 1956, 179.

M. Simonetti

SEMI-PELAGIANS. Supporters of a theological movement that flourished in the 5th c. in *Gaul. Current tendency is to call them the teachers from Provencel or Marseille; the term "semi-Pelagians," which came into use at the beginning of the 17th c., insinuates a collusion with Pelagianism. These were the primary centers of the movement: the small island of *Lérins opposite Cannes and *Marseille. *John Cassian, a Western author who knew Eastern theology and was full of ascetic experience acquired in the deserts of *Egypt, established two monasteries at Marseille; he died around the year 435. *Honoratus, at the beginning of the century, established a monastery at Lérins, in which lived such famous monks as *Vincent of Lérins, as well as *Hilary, *Lupus, *Faustus, and *Eucherius, with his sons *Veranus and *Salonius, who were bishops in Gaul. The primary sources for this teaching were as follows: John Cassian, *Conl.* XIII, the two letters written to *Augustine by *Prosper of Aquitaine and Hilary, and the treatise *De gratia* by *Faustus, who was bishop of Riez and died at the end of the century.

The semi-Pelagians were against Pelagius no less than Augustine. They acknowledged original *sin, the necessity of baptism and *grace for salvation. They separated themselves from Augustinianism on the problem of the distribution of grace and the beginning of the salvific act. According to Augustine, from the *massa perditionis* of all humanity, God chose *ante constitutionem mundi* with a free and

merciful decree, some people, without any merit of their own, to be elect and predestined infallibly to eternal life. Other people, the object of God's just judgment and not of his mercy, were left to their own (*relinquuntur*) in a state of damnation (*Persev.* 14,35). Thus the possibility of being saved is not given to all. The semi-Pelagians taught that Christ died for all humanity and that all people were called to salvation: there is no exclusion of anyone from God's side. According to the theological anthropology of Faustus of Riez (*De gratia* II,12), God created humanity by granting not only free will, but also a *bonum naturae*, the inclination to the good, the ability to discern between good and evil, piety toward God, abundance of grace, wisdom and prudence. Evil is foreign to human nature. The natural goodness that renders human beings in the image of God is also presented in a *Stoic garment, *bonae semina voluntatis* (ibid. I,12), an idea derived from John Cassian (*Conl.* XIII).

According to Augustine, these gifts have been totally lost with original sin, not being natural (*Praed. sanct.* 5,10). Everything that pertains to eternal life derives not from nature, which is tainted, but from grace, which restores nature (Prosp., *C. Coll.* 13,5).

These gifts, however, which the semi-Pelagians considered to be natural because given with the same human nature, which God conceived and brought to completion with creation, have been seriously changed by original sin but not destroyed: what is part of nature can diminish but not entirely cease. There is present in every human being, therefore, the principle of good, operating on the level of salvation. With the gifts of nature one can enter the *vestibula salutis*; with the subsequent grace of Christ one is introduced *ad ipsa vitae penetralia* (Faust., *De gratia* II,9). In virtue of this initial *bona voluntas*, each person has an incipient faith (ibid. II,8) and can turn to God with prayer (ibid., II,12), although, for Augustine, both the *bona voluntas* (*Civ. Dei* XIV,11) and faith, in its beginnings and its progression (*Praed. sanct.* 11,22), and the ability to pray (*Persev.* 23,64) are the works of God. Salvation, even in its very beginning, for Augustine, is the work of *gratia Dei per Iesum Christum*; for the semi-Pelagians salvation can begin by *prima gratia* or the gifts of creation and must be brought to completion by *gratia Christi: dona praestita per naturam*, *sed confirmanda per gratiam* (Faust., *De gratia* II,12). God the Creator is not different from God the Redeemer; the author of nature is also the author of grace (ibid. II,10). Thus falls the objection that both salvation, in its beginning, is a human work: the human being acts with the gifts received from God in creation. The gifts of redemption are, therefore, far superior to those of creation (ibid. II,10). For Faustus, one can never attribute to oneself even the beginning of salvation (ibid. II,10): it is to be attributed entirely to God; the *gratia Christi* is always a free gift and never a recompense for merit. Human initiative made possible by the gifts of creation, far from establishing merit, is only a condition so that the *gratia Christi* may work (Faust., *Ep.* 1). Both Cassian and Faustus recognized that often, with his grace, God anticipates human initiative. The semi-Pelagians maintained that in this way they safeguarded the foundational characteristics of grace: necessity, gratuity and prevenience.

Faustus's treatise reflects the teaching of the Council of *Arles (473) and *Lyons, shortly after. Conversely, the Second Council of Orange (539), presided over by *Caesarius of Arles, states that to work, *ut expedit*, any *bonum* pertaining to eternal life is not possible *per naturae vigorem*, but only through the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit (can. 7, DS 180). Faith (*fides*) is always a gift of God and is not derived from nature (DS 200). At the same time *predestination to evil is condemned.

Faustus of Riez and the semi-Pelagians of the 5th c. cannot formally be called "heretics": only in the year 529 was the semi-Pelagian teaching condemned. The Council of Orange, not completely accepting Augustine's teaching on grace, offered no decisions on the chief point of the controversy and on the essential difference between Augustinianism and semi-Pelagianism (Koch, *Der heilige Faustus*, 194, 204).

Primary Sources: John Cassian: CPL 512-513; *Conlatio* 13: PL 49, 897-954; CSEL 13; SC 54, 147-181; Faustus of Riez: CPL 961; PL 58, 783-836; CSEL 21; Prosper: CPL 523; Letter to Augustine: PL 44, 947-954; BA 24, 392-412; Hilary, Letter to Augustine: PL 44, 954-960; BA 24, 414-434.

Studies: A. Koch, *Der heilige Faustus. Bischof von Riez. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*, Stuttgart 1895; DTC 14, 1786-1850; M. Simonetti, *Il De gratia di Fausto di Riez*: SSR I (1977) 125-144; C. Tibiletti, *Giovanni Cassiano. Formazione e dottrina*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 355-380; S. Pricoco, *L'isola dei Santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico*, Rome 1978; C. Tibiletti, *Libero arbitrio e grazia in Fausto di Riez*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 259-285; Id., *La salvezza umana in Fausto di Riez*: Orpheus n.s. 1 (1980) 371-390; furthermore, the bibl. in BA 24 and in Patrologia III, 486-496; Patrologia IV, 254-259; DSp 14 (1990) 556-568; A.Th. Smith, *De gratia: Faustus of Riez's Treatise on Grace and Its Place in the History of Theology*, Notre Dame, IN 1990; Giovanni Cassiano, *Conferenze ai Monaci*, Rome 2000; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, t. VI: *Les derniers écrits de Jérôme et l'oeuvre de Jean Cassien* (414-428), Paris 2002.

C. Tibiletti

SENATOR of Milan (5th c.). A simple priest, he was one of the few envoys sent by Pope *Leo the Great, along with *Abundius of Como and Eterius of *Capua, in the summer of 450 to carry to *Constantinople three letters pertaining to the condemnation of *Eutyches's teachings (*Ep.* 69 to the emperor *Theodosius II; *Ep.* 70 to the Empress *Pulcheria; and *Ep.* 71 to the archimandrites and the presbyters who were faithful to Bishop *Flavian). The delegation also had the objective of verifying the orthodoxy of the new bishop of Constantinople *Anatolius; moreover, the delegation also brought the *Tomus ad Flavianum* to be signed also by *Anatolius. Upon returning to *Rome the delegation presented an account of their trip to Pope *Leo.

In the following year, Senator went to *Milan, with Abundius, with one of Leo's letters to explain the outcome of the Council of *Chalcedon (the Council of *Milan [451]). He then served as the bishop of Milan for three years between 470 and 480. In a song he was also praised by *Ennodius for his learning (*Carm.* II,87).

PCBE 2, 2021-2023.

A. Di Berardino

SENECA and PAUL, Correspondence of. This apocryphal collection of letters exchanged between Seneca and *Paul was mentioned for the first time by *Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.* XII), who included the pagan philosopher in his work on famous men because this epistolary exchange was read very often. Nevertheless, *Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* VI,24,13-14) shows that at the beginning of the 4th c. this collection was not yet known; therefore, it has been commonly accepted that it was composed during the period between these two works. It seems that the coincidence that Seneca and Paul were at Rome during the latter's imprisonment, in addition to the sympathy toward the *Stoic philosopher for the closeness of his thought to Christianity, supplied the basis for the anonymous author of the correspondence to conceive that there was a friendship between the two men. The idea of the legend of such a friendship solidified during the Middle Ages.

The collection is composed of 14 brief letters in Latin, sent by Seneca to Paul and six from Paul to Seneca. Only the last five bear a date, but they are not arranged in chronological order. One would expect that they would treat theological and philosophical topics; but in these letters Seneca and Paul dwell on trifling matters, stylistic formalities and displays of mutual affection. The primary objective of this correspondence was apologetic: to promote the acceptance of Holy *Scripture despite its impoverished style in the learned context of the 4th c. through the figure of Seneca, who had come to esteem Paul's writings. It is interesting how in the letters the *pagan philosopher insistently urges Paul to write with more formal elegance, and he supposes that the apostle had written in Latin.

C.W. Barlow, *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam*, Rome 1938 (= PLS 1, 673-678); L. Bocciolini Palagi, *Epistolario apocrifo di Seneca e San Paolo*, Florence 1985; E. Liénard, *Sur la correspondance apocryphe de Sénèque et de saint Paul*: RBPh 11 (1932) 5-23; P. Benoit, *Sénèque et Paul*: RBi 53 (1946) 7-35; A. Somigliano, *Note sulla leggenda del cristianesimo di Seneca*: Rivista St. Italiana 62 (1952) 325-344; A. Kurfess, *Zum dem apokryphen Briefwechsel*: Aevum 26 (1952) 42-48; J.N. Sevenster, *Paul und Seneca*, Leiden 1961; M. Natali, *Epistolario tra Seneca e San Paolo*, Milan 1995; A. Fürst, *Pseudepigraphie und Apostolizität im apokryphen Briefwechsel zwischen Seneca und Paulus*: JbAC 41 (1998) 77-117; Th. Fuhrer - F. Siegert - P. Walter, *Der apokryphe Briefwechsel zwischen Seneca und Paulus*, Tübingen 2006.

O. Jiménez

SENIORES LAICI. A modern expression to refer to an African institution designated with different terms. The first mention of the *seniores laici* is in the writings of *Tertullian (*Apol.*. 39,5), the meaning of which, in the context and the treatise *De paenitentia* (9,4), seems to have referred to the clergy (presbyters) because it is said that they presided in the community: *Praesident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti.* Even the treatise *Passio Perpetua* uses the term, but it indicates persons who were different from the presbyters (12,4-7; cf., 13,1). In the year 303, a civil official, in a village close to *Carthage, called together the *seniores plebis*, Christians who were different from the clergy (*Passio Felicis*, ed. Musurillo, p. 266). In a legal case from the year 314 (or 315), a certain individual named Maximus who represented the *Donatist party spoke in the name of the *seniores christiani*, who were charging their bishop *Felix of a crime (*Acta purgationis Felicis*: CSEL 26, p. 198; Duval p. 234 and p. 239, where mention is also made of *tres seniores*). In the trial that took place in 320 at Cirta (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*), raised by Nundinarius against *Silvanus, reference is made numerous times to the *seniores*; from the narrative, one concludes that they were a group and that they had a certain authority distinct from that of the clergy for the secular affairs and that they could also raise charges against the bishops for internal conflicts within the community; they represented the Christian community. *Optatus of Milevis recalls

how Bishop *Mensurius of Carthage, having to leave his church as a result of the persecution of *Diocletian, entrusted the goods of the church to the *fideles seniors* (*De schismate* 1,17: PL 11,918). Using various expressions, *Augustine often made reference to laypeople who had a role in the church. One of his letters (*Ep.* 78: PL 33,267) is titled *dilectissimis fratribus, clero, senioribus et universae plebi*. He also in other places uses the term *seniores* (*Contra Cresc.* 3,29,33: PL 43, 513-514); *seniores ecclesiae* (*Contra Cresc.* 3,56,62: PL 43, 529); *seniores nobilissimi* (*Enarr. in Ps.* 36,2,20: PL 36,378). The Council of Carthage (403): *magistratus vel seniores locorum* (ed. Munier, CCL 149, p. 210; *seniores* of Nova Germani, p. 217). *Ambrosiaster affirms that at this time the *seniores* no longer existed as an institution (*Com. in Ep. Tim.* 5,1,1: PL 17, 475-476); naturally he was referring to his Italian context. The African elders of the 4th and 5th c. did not belong to the clergy and had not received ordination but were also distinct from the ordinary *fideles*; they resided among the Catholics and also among the Donatists (Augustine, *En. in ps.* 36, *sermo* 2,20: CCL 38,363; *Contra Cresc.* 3,46,62: PL 43,529); their duties had to be administrative and that of a counselor. Their institution and function derived from the synagogal tradition (Caron; Frend; Quispel), or better yet the tradition of the African villages of the Maghreb that had a council of elders, because the existence of the *seniores laici* was a typically African phenomenon (Shaw). In this case preceding forms of organization were taken up by Christian communities.

P.G. Caron, *Les seniores laici de l'Église africaine*: Revue Internationale des droits de l'antiquité 6 (1951) 7ff.; P. Monceaux, *Les seniores laici*: Bulletin Societé Nationale des Antiquaires de France (1903) 283-286; DACL 8, 1053-1064 e 15, 1198-1200; A. Vilela, *La condition collégiale des prêtres au III^e siècle*, Paris 1971; W.H.C. Frend, *The* seniores laici *and the Origins of the Church in North Africa*: JTS 12 (1961) 280-284; P.G. Caron, *I poteri giuridici del laicato nella chiesa antica*, Milan ²1975; G. Quispel, *African Christianity Before Minucius Felix and Tertullian*, in *Actus: Studies in Honour of H.L.W. Nelson*, ed. J. den Boeft - A.H.M. Kessels, Utrecht 1982, 257-335; B.D. Shaw, *The Elders of Christian Africa*, in *Mélanges offerts en hommage à Étienne Gareau*, Ottawa 1982, 207-226; D. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church*, Cambridge 1995 (see p. 141); Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000.

A. Di Berardino

SENTENTIAE EPISCOPORUM. The text, the complete title of which is *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*, is a text transmitted among *Cyprian's works. These are the statements, faithfully recorded, of 87 African bishops who participated at a council, the third of the series, held at Carthage on 1 September 256 in relation to the baptismal controversy that had arisen between Cyprian and Pope *Stephen. Cyprian, it seems, called the council, presided and acted as secretary. Eighty-seven bishops coming from Proconsular Africa, *Numidia and *Mauretania were present. Natalius of Oea represented two absent bishops. The gathering was held in the presence of the presbyters, deacons and laity. Cyprian delivered a brief opening speech and encouraged the free response of each bishop, who must not be the judge of his colleagues, because each one received authority from Jesus Christ. All the bishops intervened with one declaration, which was promptly recorded. Many of these either begin with the biblical citation or rather refer to one to justify their own statement. The bishops, repeating Cyprian's ideas, esp. those expressed in his letter to Jubaianus, took a stance against the validity of baptism administered by heretics or schismatics. Cyprian concluded the statements by saying that his *sententia* was fully expressed in a letter to Jubaianus, whose episcopal see is not mentioned. *Augustine, in the treatise *De baptismo contra donatistas*, cites almost in full and comments on the individual statements of the bishops, some at length (6,9–7,44). The list of episcopal sees, some unidentified, is very useful for the reconstruction of the intense diffusion of Christianity in North *Africa, esp. in the proconsular province. One can count more than 130 episcopal sees, some very close to each other (3/4 km [.5 mi]). There also exists a Greek version of the statements recorded both in the PL and the CCL.

CPL 56; PL 3, 1090-1116; CSEL 3, 1, 435-461; ed. G.F. Diercks, CCL III/E (2004); E.W. Benson, *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work*, London 1897, 331-436 and 565-610; DTC 1, 390-418; P. Batiffol, *Les règlements des premiers conciles africains*: BALAC 3 (1913) 1-19; P. Batiffol, *Origines de règlement des conciles*, in *Études de liturgie et d'archéologie chrétienne*, Paris 1919, 84-153; M. Bévenot, *Cyprian's Platform in the Rebaptism Controversy*: Heythrop Journal 19 (1978) 123-142; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979, 476-482; Y. Duval, *Densité et répartition des évêchés dans les provinces africaines au temps de Cyprien*: MEFRA 96 (1984) 493-521; J.A. Fischer, *Das Konzil zu Karthago im Spätsommer 256*: AHC 16 (1984) 1-39; E. Contreras, *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 407-421; Id., *Las actas del tercer concilio bautismal de Cartago del año 256*: Teología 24 (1987) 29-57; M. Marin, *Le sententiae LXXXVII episcoporum: in margine al problema del rapporto fra Sacra Scrittura e Concili*: Invigilata lucernis fons 11 (1989) 329-359; J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Paderborn 1997; P. Bernardini, *Le sententiae episcoporum del concilio cartaginese del 356 e la loro versione greca. Nuova edizione del Corpus Christianorum*: Cristianesimo nella Storia 27 (2005) 477-498.

A. Di Berardino

SENTENTIAE S. AUGUSTINI et ISIDORI. This anonymous text in PL 90,647-652 was published with the title *De computo dialogus*. It begins with *Augustine, who affirms that the four elements, like the foundation of *Scripture, are necessary in the church: the divine canon, history, number and grammar. Number because it serves to determine future events and feasts; this affirmation is illustrated with a long citation of *Isidore of Seville, who praises number, and a citation from Augustine's work (*Etymol.* 3,4; *De libero arb.* II,16,42; see Cassiodorus, *Inst.* II,4,7). Therefore, it proceeds in the form of a dialogue with questions and answers between the teacher and the student. Number (or *computus*) was established at the beginning of creation and the instrument of order in the cosmos; it is an art connected with the part of philosophy called physics, which in turn is subdivided into the quadrivium. The various numbers are then listed and explained. In the so-called Sirmond MS, the dialogue is preceded by a prologue and chapters (*capitula*), perhaps an integral part of it; and it is subsequently followed by another small work titled *De divisionibus temporum liber* (PL 90,653-664 in a later redaction). This last book taken from the division of time in 14 segments from the smallest (*Atomus*, *momentum* etc.) to the largest (*aetas*, *saeculum*, *mundus*). The three texts probably formed one sole work, a scholastic text, known and widely used by the Venerable *Bede in his treatise *De temporum ratione*.

Editions: CPL 2312; H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Siegel*, Freiburg i.Br. 1995, 175; CPPM II 3097; CPPM III,A 622/d; M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature. 400-1200*, Dublin 1985, 323. The prologue in C.W. Jones, *Bedae opera de temporibus*, Cambridge, MA 1943, 393-394; *De divisionibus temporum*: C.W. Jones, *Bedae Pseudoepigrapha*, Ithaca-London 1939, 48-51.

Studies: C.W. Jones, *Bedae opera*, 109; F. Wallis, *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, Liverpool 1999, XXIII-XXV; LXXIII; P. Piccari, *Il* Computus *nell'Alto Medioevo*, in R. Capasso - P. Piccari (ed.), *Il tempo nel Medioevo. Rappresentazioni storiche e concezioni filosofiche*, Castel Madama (Rome) 2000, 49-62; D. Ó Cróinín, *Early Irish History and Chronology*, Dublin 2003.

A. Di Berardino

SEPTEM ORDINIBUS, De. A document written probably after the year 420, but it could also have originated in *Spain at the end of the 6th c. It appears as *Ep.* 12 of ps.-Jerome. The seven levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (*fossarii*, *ostiarii*, *lectores*, *subdiaconi*, *levites* or *diaconi*, *sacerdotes*, *episcopi*) are explained esp. on the basis of the Bible and their function in the church.

CPL 764; CPPM II A 861; A.W. Kalff, *Ps.-Hieronymi De septem ordinibus ecclesiae*, Würzburg 1937; G. Morin, *Le destinataire de l'apocryphe hiéronymien "De septem ordinibus ecclesiae"*: RHE 34 (1938) 229-244; R.E. Reynolds, *The Pseudo-Hieronymian "De septem Ordinibus Ecclesiae"*: RB 80 (1970) 238-252; H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller*, Freiburg [4]1995, 534.

S. Samulowitz

SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, emperor. He was born at *Leptis Magna in 145 and died at Eboracum, modern-day York, in AD 211. About 187 he married as a second wife Julia Domna from the house of the priests of *Emesa who had introduced her to the beliefs and worship practies of the Eastern religions. In the family of Septimius Severus one thus finds the tendencies and mindsets of the empire's two most eccentric provinces, *Africa and *Syria: this would have an impact on his religious politics. He was the emperor from 193 to 211; he lived during an extremely difficult period, through internal turmoil and external wars.

With respect to the Christians, during the first years of his reign he had a tolerant attitude: the synods and the assemblies of bishops that were held in many cities to examine the question of the date of *Easter is a proof of this tolerance. There are not lacking several instances of violence which seem to be isolated (thus in the year 197 a persecution broke out at *Carthage, which should probably be put in connection to the arrival of the new proconsul). With the beginning of the 3rd c., the situation seems to have totally changed. (Perhaps the demand of maintaining the cohesion of the empire might explain this new attitude.) If one regards as authentic the information contained in the **Historia Augusta* (see Spartianus, *Septim. Sev.* 17,1), in 202 the emperor through an edict prohibited Jewish and Christian proselytism (*Iudaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit*). As a result, with a general legislative provision directed against the Christians (and Jews), their propaganda must have been halted, striking esp. the catechists.

Recent criticism has been clearly divided over the reliability of this passage from the *Historia Augusta:* several scholars in fact regard it as the fruit of fantasy or false information; others do not see any convincing reasons to accept it. Those were important years for Christianity: because of the presence of important figures—*Tertullian, *Origen, Pope *Victor (189–199) and Pope *Zephyrinus (199–217)—and because of the work of movements that by reviving apocalyptic hopes—such as *Montanism—actually weakened the unity of the empire. Undoubtedly the situation of the church seems to

have become worse in the tenth year of the reign of Septimius Severus: *Eusebius of Caesarea informs us (see *HE* 6,1ff.; 6,7ff.) of persecutions, famous martyrdoms that occurred (1) in *Alexandria, where the faithful were brought from all of *Egypt and *Thebaid and where, among others, *Leonides, *Origen's father, was martyred; (2) in Africa as inded the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis* narrates and *Tertullian confirms; and likewise (3) in Cappadocia and probably at *Antioch and *Jerusalem.

With the emperor Caracalla (211–217) the persecution subsided; one therefore concludes that if the edict did exist, it was not applied by Septimius Severus's successors. In recent decades, talk about the emperor and his religious politics has come up again. According to some scholars (Wypustek), during Septimius Severus's time the persecution against the Christians, though having a local character, had a noteworthy broadness, brought about by two elements: the growing hostility, at the popular and official level, against magic and the activity of the *Montanists, whose practices were considered close to those of the astrologers and the *magi. On the contrary, acc. to others (Daguet-Gagey), none of the emperor's edicts openly targeted the Christians; actually, the open adherence of famous individuals from the court and members of the senatorial families to the Christian faith marked a definitive act of the church's conquest of the empire (dal Covolo). And what is more, multiple contacts between the two institutions would also be reflected in the harmony between the religious ideology of the court and the monarchian hegemony of the Church of *Rome. It is certain, as has been noted (Mazzarino, *L'Impero romano*, II,483), that there has never again been such an era so dense with absurdity, to the point of paradox, as the time of Commodus and Severus: it also shows the coexistence of widely varying elements from the propensity toward the message of Christ by some important figures of that time to violent episodes of persecution against Christians.

M. Platnauer, *The Life and Reign of the Emperor L. Septimius Seuerus*, Oxford 1918; PWK, II A, 1940-2002 s.v. *Severus*; S. Mazzarino, *L'Impero romano*, II, Bari 1973, 434 ff. (bibl. on pp. 604 ff.). On the reliability of the information from the *Historia Augusta*, see among others, in the negative sense, T.D. Barnes, *Legislation Against the Christians*: JRS 58 (1968) 32-50; R. Freudenberger, *Das angebliche Christenedikt des Septimius Severus*: WS 81 (1968) 206-17; in favor, see W.H.C. Frend, *A Severan Persecution? Evidence of the Historia Augusta*, in *Forma Futuri.* Studi in onore del Card. M. Pellegrino, Turin 1975, 470-480; V. Grossi - P. Siniscalco, *La vita cristiana nei primi secoli*, Rome 1988, 37-45 and 170-205; A.R. Birley, *The African Emperor Septimius Severus*, London-New Haven ²1988; E. dal Covolo, *I Severi e il cristianesimo. Ricerche sull'ambiente storico-istituzionale delle origini cristiane tra il secondo e il terzo secolo*, Rome 1989 (extensive bibl., pertaining to the ancient sources and studies, at pp. 95-107); K. Christ, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Munich ³1994; A. Wypustek, *Magic, Montanism, Perpetua and the Severan Persecution*: VChr 51 (1997) 276-297; *Gli imperatori Severi: storia, archeologia, religione*, ed. E. dal Covolo - G. Rinaldi, Rome 1999; K. Rosen, LTK³ 9, 475; A. Daguet-Gagey, *Septime Sévère. Rome, l'Afrique et l'Orient*, Paris 2000; Id., *Septime Sévère; un empereur persécuteur des Chrétiens?*: REAug 47 (2001) 3-32.

P. Siniscalco

SERAPEION (Serapeum) in Alexandria. Every temple consecrated to the god Serapis was a Serapeion. The most famous in all antiquity was in *Alexandria, and its first nucleus seems to be due to Ptolemy I Soter; Ptolemy II enriched the temple with a library. Ptolemy III built up the temple anew; the works were supervised by the architect Parmeniscus. Emperor *Claudius enlarged the building and made it more magnificent. A first destruction of the Serapeion occurred under *Trajan, due to a Jewish revolt; it was rebuilt under *Hadrian (117–138), when a statue of the sacred bull Apis was also added to it. Its splendor and lavishness were extolled by *Ammianus Marcellinus (XII,16,12) as second only to those of Rome's Capitoline Hill. Its definitive destruction, as a symbol of paganism, took place under Bishop *Theophilus of Alexandria in AD 391. A Christian church was built up on its remains, and a community of monks settled there.

Pagan and Christian sources provide different versions of the facts. *Eunapius (*Lives of the Sophists*, 421 Boissonade) claims that the Serapeion was destroyed for no plausible reason; the statues and all sacred objects were stolen, and only the floor remained, since it was too heavy to be removed. Then, a group of monks was introduced there. *Socrates (*HE* V,16-17) recounts that Theophilus obeyed Emperor *Theodosius's order concerning the destruction of pagan sanctuaries. So "he purified the Mithreion and destroyed the Serapeion." First, he brought the sacred objects out of the temple and exposed them to ridicule. The *pagans, offended, attacked the Christians, and a sort of civil war arose in Alexandria. Theophilus had all idols destroyed apart from the statue of a deity represented as a monkey, again for the sake of derision of paganism. "The Serapeion was demolished and despoiled." During this operation, hieroglyphic inscriptions were found carved upon stones, which included signs resembling crosses, and a discussion arose concerning the possibility of a reference to Christ's cross. *Sozomen (*HE* VII,15) also indicates the public exposure of the

symbols of pagan mysteries, directed by Theophilus, as the cause that aroused the pagans' indignation, so that clashes followed between pagans and Christians in Alexandria. He goes on to say that the heathens closed themselves up in the Serapeion and used it as a fortress; they even held Christians prisoner in it and tortured and killed them. The facts were reported to Theodosius, who proclaimed the Christian victims martyrs and ordered the destruction of the pagan temples but forgave the pagans in hopes that his clemency would induce them to convert to Christianity. When the emperor's edict (dating to 16 June 391, from *Aquileia) was read, the Christians in Alexandria cried out of joy, and those in the Serapeion were frightened and fled. The Christians, then, occupied the place. Sozomen refers to both the demolition of the temple and its conversion into a Christian church. *Rufinus (*HE* XI,23), after providing a fine description of the Serapeion, reports the same version as Sozomen, but emphasizes that the Serapeion was leveled, the statue of Serapeion burnt, every bit of precious material removed, and a community of monks from the desert was established upon its ruins. He also observes that Theophilus unmasked the lies of the priests of the Serapeion (V,22). Other Christian authors who speak of the destruction of the Serapeion with satisfaction are *Sophronius, who even wrote a work titled *The Demolition of the Serapeion* (*Jerome, *Ep.* CVII,2; *Paulinus of Nola, *Carmen* XIX,109; *Theodoret, *HE* V,22,3). According to Eunapius (*Lives of the Sophists,* 472 Boissonade), Theophilus after this had many other pagan temples destroyed and many other statues eliminated.

E. Testa, *Legislazione contro il paganesimo e cristianizzazione dei templi (sec. IV-VI)*, Liber Annuus 41 (1991) 311-326, esp. 315-316; J.C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*, Baltimore 1996; S. Ensoli, *I santuari di Iside e Serapide a Roma e la resistenza pagana in età tardoantica* in *Aurea Roma*, Rome 2000, 273-282; *What Happened to the Ancient Library of Alexandria?*, ed. M. El-Abbadi - O. Fathallah, Leiden 2008.

Ilaria Ramelli

SERAPION of Antioch (2nd c.). Eighth bishop of *Antioch whose episcopate corresponds roughly to the reign of the emperor *Septimius Severus, or rather to the period 190–210. Some fragments of one of his anti-*Montanist letters have been preserved, *Epistula ad Caricum et Pontium*, and of a letter to the church of Rhosos near Antioch against the *docetic teaching contained in the *Gospel of Peter* (Euseb., *HE* 5,19,2-3 and 6,12,3-6). A long fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*, discovered by Bouriant at Akhmim in 1886, corresponds exactly to Serapion's description. *Eusebius knew of a third letter of Serapion to a certain Domnus, who had converted to *Judaism, and suggests that other writings of his probably existed which have, however, been lost (*HE* 6,12,1).

U. Bouriant, *Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Enoch et de quelques écrits attribués à saint Pierre*, in *Mémories publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire* 9/1, Paris 1892, 93-147; W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*, Tübingen [2]1964, 22-24, 146-147; J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Paderborn 1997, 23-59.

K. den Biesen

SERAPION of Thmuis (d. after 362). Friend and disciple of *Anthony the Great, Serapion was famous for the "amazing sanctity of his life and the power of his eloquence" (Sozomen, *HE* 4,9), and was nicknamed "the scholastic" for his learning, genius and erudition (see Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 99). He became the superior of a monastic community and then in 339 bishop of Thmuis, on the delta of the Nile. He had a great relationship with *Athanasius of Alexandria, from whom he received various letters: in 339 a first (PG 26, 1412-1414), in 358 another, in which he referred to the details of *Arius's death (PG 25, 685-690), then in the year 359/360 four (or three) important letters on the divinity of the Holy Spirit (PG 26,529-676), which represent an essential treatment on this question. In all likelihood Serapion was present at the Council of *Serdica in 343 and defended Athanasius (see Athan., *Apol. contra Ar.* 50); likewise in 356, with four other bishops, he refuted the libelous statements against Athanasius before the emperor *Constantius II (Sozomen, *HE* 4,9). Serapion himself suffered because of the persecution: he was exiled, and the Arian Bishop Ptolemy seized his episcopal see: for this reason Jerome called him *in confessione inclytus* (*De vir. ill.* 99). He died after 362. His feast day is celebrated on 21 March in the Latin church; 7 March, in the Coptic church.

From his noteworthy literary production (see Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 99), some letters remain (the letter of encouragement to the monks of Alexandria is important) and a treatise against the *Manicheans, *Contra Manicheos*, where he shows his great rhetorical, philosophical and theological learning, criticizing the system of the two principles, the good and the evil, and by demonstrating the contradiction and inconsistency of the foundational teachings of Manicheism. His treatise on the Psalms, however, has been lost.

The *Eucology*, which bears his name, is generally recognized as his. There are about 30 prayers: 18 refer to the eucharistic liturgy, 7 to baptism and confirmation, 3 to ordination and 2 to the blessing of the oils and the funerals. The *anaphora is explicitly attributed to Serapion. It includes the preface, the *Sanctus*, the *epiclesis of the consecration and communion addressed to the Logos and not the *Holy Spirit (a particularity that is exclusive to this anaphora), the intercession of the living for the dead, the recitation of the *diptychs and for those who have brought the oblations. It is an interesting text for the history of the Egyptian liturgy of the 4th c., in which stabilized texts and the redactor's personal edits are mixed.

Editions: CPG 2485-2495; PG 40, 895-942; *Contra Manichaeos*, ed. R.P. Casey, Cambridge, MA 1931 (the only complete edition): for new fragments of the letter, see CPG 2488-2493; *Eucology:* G. Wobbermin, TU 17/3b, Leipzig 1898; F.E. Brightman: JTS 1 (1899/1900) 88-113, 247-277; F.-X. Funk, *Didaskalia et Constitutiones Apostolicae*, II, Paderborn 1905, 158-195 (with Latin tr.); E. Lodi, *Enchiridion Euchologicum fontium liturgicorum*, Rome 1979, nn. 563-569. It. tr. A. Hamman, *Le preghiere dei primi cristiani*, Milan 1954 and 1983, 159-181.

Studies: DACL 11 (1933) 606-612; DTC 14 (1941) 1908–1912; PWK Suppl. 8 (1956) 1260-1267; Patrologia II, 81-87; A. Peters, *Het Tractaat van Serapion*: SE 2 (1949) 55-94; B. Capelle, *L'anaphore de Sérapion:* Muséon 59 (1946) 425-443; B. Botte, *L'Euchologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?*: OC 48 (1964) 50-56; K. Gamber, *Die Serapion-Anaphora ihrem altesten Bestand nach untersucht*: Ostkirliche Studien 16 (1967) 33-42; P.E. Rhodopoulos: *The Sacramentary of Serapion*, Thessaloniki 1967; M.D. Dufrasne, *Les tendences ariennes et pneumatomaques de l'Eucologue du Pseudo-Sérapion*, (Diss.) Louvain 1981; BBKL 9 (1995) 1404-1405; M.E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (OCA 249), Rome 1995; A. Verheuil, *La prière eucharistique dans l'Euchologe de Sérapion*: Questions Liturgiques 80 (1999) 374-383.

M. Maritano

SERDICA (Sardica)

I. The city and Christian origins - II. Council.

I. The city and Christian origins. As with the rest of the modern-day cities in Bulgaria, the origin of the city of Serdica (today Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria) was lost during the period before the Christian era. As an area of little importance, it was the center of the territory of the Thracian tribe of the Serdi or the Sardi, where the two forms of the name derived (Serdica or Sardica), the first of which subsequently prevailed. According to the most likely hypothesis, the name, etymologically speaking, would derive from a term whose meaning corresponds to the late Slavic term *srêda*, *sreda* ("middle, center"); therefore, after the 6th c. it was transformed by the Slavs, following the precise translation, into *Srêdec* (*-tz*).

Serdica is found on a vast and fertile tract of land, at the slopes of the mountain Skomios (now Vitosa) at the intersection of the main roads from the SW (*Macedonia), from the NW (from the famous Via Diagonalis, which began from Singidunum [modern-day Belgrade] on the Danube River through Naissus, Remesiana, Serdica, Philippopolis toward *Byzantium-*Constantinople), and finally, on one road that came down from the N along the River Oescus (today Iskur). After conquering Macedonia (146 BC), the Romans subsequently pushed toward the interior of the Balkan Peninsula; in 29/28 BC, M. Licinius Grassus subjected these regions to Rome and so too the tribes of the Serdi. Once *Thrace had also been conquered, the *strategia* of Serdica was organized in this region, including a very vast territory with the occupied center of Serdica. The site was fortified and the relative communication was organized in a stable way. During the war with the Dacians over the Danube, the emperor *Trajan (98–117) visited the Balkan Peninsula and, among other things, greatly contributed to the development of Serdica, which was organized as a *municipium* and fortified, receiving the name of *Ulpia Serdica.* With the construction of various fortresses, streets, bridges etc., having a popular memory connected to the name of the famous emperor, a section of the Via Diagonalis to the W of Serdica has preserved to this day the name *via Traiana*. Remains of the fortification built at the time of Trajan were brought to light by archaeological digs. When *Aurelian (270–275) was forced to abandon *Dacia (part of modern-day Transylvania and Wallachia), he organized the cis-Danubian into Dacia Ripensis (with Ratiaria as the center) and Dacia Mediterranea, with Serdica as the center. Serdica thus acquired a special importance as a military, administrative and cultural center, dominated by the Latin language. In the 3rd c., some walls for the protection of the city were constructed.

The greatest development was reached at the beginning of the 4th c. and that led the emperor *Constantine I (306–337), who was born in the nearby city of Naissus (today known as Niš), to promote for some time the idea of establishing his imperial residence at Serdica. In the agitated period of the 5th c., Serdica underwent invasions and destructions many times: during the years 441 and 447 by Attila the Hun, then during the 2nd half of the century, by the *Goths. At the time of the emperor *Justinian I (527–565), the city experienced a new period of splendor, its fortifications were rebuilt, and various public and

private buildings were produced. In the year 809 the city was conquered by Khan Krum (802–814) and included within the territory of the Bulgarian state (which was established in 681). In 1018 the Byzantines once again reconquered Serdica, which then passed definitively to the Bulgarians at the end of the 12th c. Many archaeological remains lie under important buildings: the ancient curia is found under the Sheraton Hotel, Roman basilicas are under the National Historical Museum, and sophisticated mosaics are under the Rila Hotel. In the environs of Serdica, the emperor *Galerius was born (d. 311), who when he was dying there issued an edict of tolerance in April of 311, in hopes of placating the God of the Christians.

The most ancient testimonies to Christianity in Thrace have a legendary character. Christianity soon entered Serdica because it was a place of transit, and the city became one of the chief centers of the new faith. The first known bishop of Serdica was *Protegenes, to whom Constantine sent a rescript on the *manumissio in ecclesia* (CI 1,13,1). *Bonosus (d. ca. 390) was the bishop of Serdica, the founder of the sect of the Bonosians.

Various ancient Christian testimonies are found at Serdica. Roman baths with a *hypocaustum* and a *calidarium*, built around the 3rd c., were transformed around the 5th c. into a Christian center of worship, the rotund church of St. George, which later, in the 11th-12th and 14th c., was enlarged and embellished with mural paintings. In the 15th c. it became a *metropolitan church. In the NW part of the city, at that time outside the walls of the city, as early as the beginning of the 4th c. the small funerary church with one aisle was built (still existing under the Hagia Sophia) which, after it had been damaged by the *Goths around the year 376 and 382, was restored at the time of Emperor Justinian I (527–565) and called the "Hagia Sophia" (*Sveta Sofija*) and embellished with mural paintings and mosaics. The church with three aisles was made of brick, covered with a dome, contained a woman's gallery and transept, and was fortified to the W by towers. The ancient church was found in a cemetery, and in one of the tombs was found a silver reliquary with a Christogram on the front side, while on the back there was a staurolite Christogram with the letters A and Ω. The name of the church already at the beginning of the year 1300 became the official name of the city of Serdica-Sredetz, as one can deduce from a written record in 1329. From the necropolises alongside the church of Hagia Sophia and elsewhere in the city some thirty Christian inscriptions have been uncovered, written in both Greek and Latin; these serve as evidence of a large Christian community since the 6th-7th c. The importance of Serdica as a Christian center is confirmed by, among other things, the fact that here in the year 343 a famous ecclesiastical council was held, the "Concilium Serdicense."

B. Filov, *Sofijskata cŭkva Sv. Sofija*, Sofia 1913; K. Mijatev, *Dekorativnata živopis na Sofijskija nekropol*, Sofia 1925; S.N. Bobčev, *Jubileina kniga na grad Sofija*, Sofia 1928 (with the studies of A. Iširkov, G.I. Katzarov, Jord. Ivanov); B. Filov, *Sofijskata cŭkva Sv. Georgi*, Sofia 1933; S.N. Bobčev, *Serdica*, Sofia 1943; V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien*, Berlin 1964, 1-20; EAA 7, 207; R. Pillinger, *Monumenti paleocristiani in Bulgaria*: RivAC 61 (1985) 275-310; *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Kultur Bulgariens zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. R. Pillinger, Vienna 1986; ODB 3, 1876.

I. Dujčev

II. Councils. To resolve the disagreements that had arisen between Western and Eastern bishops concerning the *Arian controversy (the Councils of Rome and Antioch from the year 341), at the request of the Western bishops and the emperor *Constans, a council was called at Serdica (today Sofia), a city belonging to the Western part of the empire but close to the border with the East. In the autumn of the year 343 nearly 100 Western bishops gathered, headed by *Hosius of Cordoba and *Protogenes of Serdica (Pope *Julius was represented by two priests and a deacon) and nearly seven Eastern bishops, among whom Maris of Chalcedon, *Narcissus of Neronias and Stephen of Antioch, who were pro-Arian, stood out. The Western bishops insisted that *Athanasius, *Marcellus and other Eastern bishops who had been deposed in the East because they were anti-Arian but who were rehabilitated at the Council of Rome (341) by the Western bishops take part in the work of the council. The Eastern bishops refused to admit them, and because of this difficulty the council came to an end. The Eastern bishops left Serdica after having written a synodal letter in which, after various accusations, they excommunicated the chief proponents of the Western bishops and substantially confirmed the formula of faith of *Antioch (341). The Western bishops continued their work alone: once again they rehabilitated Athanasius, Marcellus and *Asclepas of Gaza; they approved a series of disciplinary canons, among which 3 and 3b included the possibility of a bishop who had been condemned by a provincial council to have recourse through appeal to the bishop of Rome; they presented their version of the events in a synodal letter, in which they condemned the leaders of the Eastern bishops; they published a doctrinal statement in which, without using the divisive christological term

homoousios, they provided a monarchian interpretation of the Nicene Creed (325), by affirming one sole hypostasis of the Father and Son and by condemning those who, like the Eastern bishops, affirmed two distinct beings among them. The council sanctioned the break of relations with the pro-Nicene West and the predominantly anti-Nicene East (the first break to have occurred in the history of the church) and gave rise to a phase of inactivity that lasted until the death of the emperor Constans (350).

Hfl-Lecl 1, 737-823; DTC 14, 1009-1014; M. Simonetti, 161-187; L.W. Barnard, *The Council of Serdica: Some Problems Reassessed*: Annuarium Hist. Conc. 12 (1980) 1-25; Id., *The Site of the Council of Serdica*: SP 17, Oxford 1982, 9-13; Id., *The Council of Serdica 343 A.D*, Sofia 1983; I. Opelt, *Die westliche Partei auf dem Konzil von Serdica*, in *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Kultur Bulgariens zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. von R. Pillinger, Vienna 1986 85-92; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988; B.H. Stolte, *La chiesa orientale e i canoni "occidentali,"* in *Il tardoantico alle soglie del duemila: diritto, religione, società*, ed. G. Lanata, Pisa 2000, 165-175; H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, New York 2002.

M. Simonetti

SERGIA (7th c.). *Hegumen of the *monastery of St. *Olympias in *Constantinople and a contemporary of *Sergius, the patriarch between 610 and 638. From her writings we have the *Narratio Sergiae de translatione Sanctae Olympiadis* (BHG 1376), her record of the translation of the reamains of the deaconess Olympias, mentioned in the *Byzantine church on July 24-25-26 and in the *Mart. rom.* on 17 December, who was famous for the letters sent to her from exile by *John Chrysostom (SC 13bis). Sergia, who refers to herself in many places of the work as ἐγὼ ἡ ἁμαρτωλὸς Σεργία (thus removing any doubts regarding attribution) used written and oral sources and the *Vita S. Olympiadis* in her composition (BHG 1374-1375). The *Vita S. Olympiadis* was written perhaps by *Heraclidas of Nyssa and reedited by Malingrey and compiled in a completely different style. The *Narratio* was edited by Delehaye on the basis of a single MS witness (the 11th-c. Paris. 1453).

CPG 7981; H. Delehaye, *Vita Sanctae Olympiadis et Narratio Sergiae de eiusdem translatione*: AB 15 (1896) 400-423; 16 (1897) 44-51; J. Bousquet, *Récit de Sergia sur Olympias*: ROC 11 (1906) 255-268; Beck 461; Patrologia V, 108.

A. Labate

SERGIOPOLIS. A Roman fortress (*castrum*), today Resafa (Rusafa; al-Rassafa), in the province of Augusta Euphratensis; it is one of the most beautiful cities in the desert of Syria because of its ruins, 40 km (24.9 mi) from the Euphrates River, between Sura and *Palmyra (Tadmor) Anastasius on a very busy street toward *Dura Europos to the S, Callincium to the E and Aleppo to the W, in a culturally mixed border zone, and an important commercial center in the Syro-Mesopotamian steppe. After the destruction of Dura Europos, the emperor *Diocletian fortified Resafa, which had two military martyrs during the Great Persecution (of Maximian): *Sergius and Bacchus. The emperor *Anastasius (491–518) built there the cathedral and renamed the city Sergiopolis; he ordered the construction of three cisterns to supply the city with water. The episcopal see depended on the metropolitan of Hierapolis (Mabbug); but the emperor Anastasius made it a metropolitan see. The first known bishop was Marinianus (ca. 430–ca.451), who was appointed by *John of Antioch (Mansi 5, 915 and 943) and was present at a council that occurred at *Antioch (Mansi 7, 325). In the 6th c. it became a metropolitan see, which was created by the emperor Anastasius (491–518) with five dependent episcopal sees (see *Notitia episcopatuum* for Antioch: Echos d'Orient 10, 145) and took the name Anastasopolis (H. Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romani*, Leipzig 1880, 45). In 543 Bishop Candidus ransomed 1,200 prisoners taken during the sack by *Chosroes I (Procopius, *De bello pers.* 2,5,20). Bishop Abraham took part in the Council of *Constantinople 553 (Mansi 9, 390).

From the beginning of the 6th c., Resafa was not only a fortress but also a rich sanctuary and a pilgrimage center. On account of the wealth of the sanctuary, Chosroes I wanted to conquer it; at that time the emperor *Justinian fortified it with a compact wall: "He surrounded it with a solid wall and collected a large quantity of water to thus provide for the inhabitants. He also added to this place houses and porticoes and other buildings. . . . He then set up a garrison" (Procopius, *On the Buildings* II,9). Chosroes II sacked the city in 616, and subsequently the region fell into the hands of the Arabs (636). The Umayyad Caliph Hisham (724–742) favored the influx of Christian pilgrims. Around the end of the century the city was practically abandoned and sacked. Sergiopolis had a large rectangular wall belt (536 x 350 x 549 x 411 m = 1758.5 x 1148.3 x 1801.2 x 1348.4 ft), 3 meters (=9.8 ft.) thick with 15 towers; it is crossed by two chief streets: one from E to W and the other from N to S. The martyr had a great cult among the bedouin Arabic peoples from the region, and buildings were erected for his relics. Inside the city there are three churches in the longitudinal ac-

cess. Basilica B to the S of the city's center was the martyrium of St. Sergius built by Alexander Hierapolis not beyond the year 425 (the first martyrium was outside the walls); this church was built by Bishop Sergius (d. after 524) in 518, when the relics were already transferred into another church. This church with three aisles, even if smaller than that of basilica A, was one of the most beautiful churches in Syria: 48.50 x 25.70 m (159.1 x 84.3 ft). In the 8th c. it was abandoned, and part of its material was reused elsewhere. Basilica A to the SE, with three aisles, built at the end of the 5th c., became the sanctuary of Sergiopolis. Sergius, the E part, which was splendidly decorated, was destined for the systematization and cult of the martyr's relics, which were preserved in a golden *sarcophagus. The building had subsequent additions, e.g., a port to the N led to a broad courtyard for access to the pilgrims. The sanctuary of St. Sergius is impressive and remains well preserved in the conch; Bishop Abraham had undertaken some works of restoration there (this bishop was present at the Council of *Constantinople in 553) in 559. Another church, the tetraconch (i.e., a building with four apses), had space for the bishop's throne, a small baptistery and episcopal tombs, among which was that of Abraham. Some scholars maintain that this was the cathedral, which could instead be basilica A (or perhaps there were two bishops). The basilica of Holy Cross has the best-preserved ruins. At Resafa, lodging places for the pilgrims were also built.

J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947; Fedalto II, 999; T. Ulbert, *Resafa-Sergioupolis (Nordsyrien). Arbeiten 1976-1980*, in Actes du X Congrès int. d'archéologie chrétienne, Vatican City 1984, II, 635-640; T. Ulbert, *Die Basilika des Heiligen Kreuzes in Resafa-Sergiupolis*, Mainz 1986; P. Donceel-Voûte, *Les pavements des églises byzantines de Syrie et du Liban*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1988, 268-274; L. Padovese, *Guida alla Siria*, Casale Monf. 1994, 167-169; D. Woods, *The Emperor Julian and the Passion of Sergius and Bacchus*: JECS 5 (1997) 335-367; E.K. Fowden, *The Barbarian Plain: Saint Sergius Between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley, CA 1999; M. Konrad, *Der spätrömische Limes in Syrien: archäologische Untersuchungen an den Grenzkastellen von Sura, Tetrapyrgium, Cholle und in Resafa*, Mainz 2000; ODB 3, 1877.

A. Di Berardino

SERGIUS, patriarch (610–638). Sergius was of Syro-Jacobite origin. He was first a deacon and a director, at *Constantinople, of an asylum for the poor. He ascended to the patriarchal throne on 18 April 610 under the reign of the emperor *Heraclius, whose military endeavors against the Avars and the Persians he supported, esp. on the occasion of the attack orchestrated by him (the siege of Constantinople in 626), so much so as to merit the title "savior of the capital." With the objective of restoring the empire's religious unity, which had been split by *monophysitism, esp. in the E regions, he proposed the compromise of the doctrine on the sole energy in Christ (*monoenergism), writing on this topic to the Syro-Arabic bishops: George Arsas (618), *Theodore of Pharan (ca. 620), *Paul the Patriarch of Antioch (622) and Cyrus of Fasi (626), who was later the patriarch of Antioch (633). Against the opposition of *Sophronius of *Jerusalem, he released in August of 633 a synodal dogmatic decree that imposed silence on talk of the sole and double will in Christ, suggesting to others that they speak of the one soul operative in Christ. For this reason he also sought the support of Pope *Honorius, who responded by praising Sergius's prudence. In November 638, another synodal decree approved the **Ekthesis* with the condemnation of those who had rejected it. He died on 9 December 638. He was condemned as a heretic by the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople 680).

CPG 7604-7608; Grumel, Regestes 278c-293; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII*, Rome 1971, *passim* (index p. 584); L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, passim, esp. 196-205; J.L. Van Dieten, *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI.* (*610-715*), Amsterdam 1972; Fliche-Martin V, passim, spec. 103-104; ODB 3, 1878; *Patrologia* V, 100-103; F. Carcione, *Sergio di Costantinopoli e Onorio I nella controversia monothelita del VII secolo*, Rome 1985; BBKL 9, 1413-1428.

D. Stiernon

SERGIUS, pope (687–701). Upon the death of *Conon (21 September 687), the archpresbyter *Theodore was elected, who was supported by soldiers, and the archdeacon *Paschal. To overcome this division, the majority of the clergy and the people nominated the presbyter Sergius, who was of an Antiochene family, but born at Palermo, and who at that time belonged to the Roman clergy (LP I,371-372). Theodore immediately withdrew; Paschal, however, turned to the exarch, to whom he promised a hundred pounds of gold. The exarch, having arrived at Rome, recognized Sergius only after the payment of a hundred talents of gold, which had already been promised by Paschal. In 692, the emperor, who had convoked a council at *Constantinople (*Quinisext* or *in *Trullo*), sent the canons to *Rome to obtain Sergius's signature to be placed after that of the emperor. Sergius refused because he considered it to be contrary to ecclesiastical tradition (LP I,373). *Justinian II then

thought of having recourse to force, as had occurred during the time of Pope *Martin I, but the attempt failed through the opposition of the army of *Ravenna and the *Pentapolis (LP I,373-374). Sergius, following the path of the tradition established by his predecessors, also continued to be interested in some of the religious problems in England (Jaffé 2131-2133); he baptized Caedwalla, king of Wessex, who had come to Rome as a pilgrim, where he died (he was buried in the basilica of St. *Peter). He bestowed the pallium on Bertaldus of Canterbury. He encouraged the evangelizing work among the Frisians by *Willibrord (d. 739), whom he ordained bishop in 695. Moreover, he also ordained Damian, the archbishop of Ravenna (693). He introduced into the *Mass the song of the **Agnus Dei*. He undertook many remodelings in the Roman churches, esp. the basilica of St. Peter. He died on 7 September 701.

CPL 1740-1741; Verzeichnis 541; PLS 4, 2174; AASS, *Sept* III, 425-445; LP I, 371-382; BS 11, 873-875; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII*, Milan 1971, 494-504 (see index); L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 162-163; J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne: milieu du VI[e] s.-fin du IX[e] s.*, 2 vols., Brussels 1980-1993; Patrologia IV, 183-184; EPapi 1, 633-637.

A. Di Berardino

SERGIUS (ps.-Cassiodorus) (5th c.). The grammarian Donatus, whose student was *Jerome around the year 354, wrote, among other works, the *Ars* ("grammar"), a manual par excellence in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Thereafter, the work was subdivided into the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior* and had numerous commentators (e.g., Sergius, Cledonius and Pompey). Among these commentaries there is only one on the *Ars maior*, which was attributed by its first editor, Garet, in 1679, to Cassiodorus (PL 70,1219-1240). Stock, its recent editor, along with other scholars attributes this commentary to Sergius and places the author in 5th-c. Campania, because he cites *Paulinus of Milan (*Carm.* 26,4). Sergius, though being thoroughly imbued with classical culture, shows a good understanding of Christian terminology and practices.

CPPM IIIA, 117; A. Negri, *Elio Donato*, *Ars grammatica maior*, Reggio Emilia 1960; C. Stock, *Sergius* (*Ps.-Cassiodorus*), *Commentarium de oratione et de octo partibus orationis Artis Secundae Donati*. Überlieferung, Text und Kommentar. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare, Munich-Leipzig 2005.

A. Di Berardino

SERGIUS AMPHIATOR (The Sacristan). According to *John of Ephesus (*HE* 4,41), a certain Sergius participated in the secret consecration of the miaphysite patriarch of *Antioch, inasmuch as he was the sacristan (*amphiator*) and the master of ceremonies, in the winter of 579/580. When it was discovered that the ceremony was held at night, Sergius fled along with the bishops who participated in the consecration. Shortly after, he himself was consecrated as bishop and metropolitan of *Edessa by *Damian, the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of *Alexandria (578–605). Some canons attributed to Sergius have been preserved, concerning whom we know nothing else. *Syriac *hagiography has at times identified him with Sergius the Armenian, the bishop of Edessa.

Brockelmann, 263; F. Nau, *Littérature canonique syriaque*: ROC 14 (1909) 127-128. (Fr. tr. of the unpublished text of the canons); E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI[e] siècle* (CSCO 127, Subs. 2), Louvain 1951, 241-243.

K. den Biesen

SERGIUS and BACCHUS, martyrs. The *Passio* of the two official saints (BHT 1624) was probably composed by using some brief historical information (date and place of burial), in order to explain the popularity of their cults, whose center of diffusion was the castle of Resafa, 200 km (124.3 mi) E of Aleppo at the border of the Roman Empire, the destination point of the famous pilgrimage in the East (see, e.g., the anonymous author of Piacenza [CCL 175,153]). Around 500, Resafa became a city called *Sergiopolis. The emperor *Justinian displayed a special devotion to Sergius and Bacchus. Despite the Arab invasion, Sergiopolis remained a Christian city until its end, around 1260. The place of the city's burial is not yet identified. It seems that since 354 a votive basilica was erected in honor of Sergius and Bacchus at Eitha (Syria); over the course of the 6th c. the basilicas multiplied at *Bostra, *Constantinople, *Ravenna and *Rome. The depiction of the two saints in the church of S. Maria Antiqua seems to reproduce a canonical model originating at Resafa. *Gregory of Tours knew of the two saints (*Hist. Franc.* 7,31; 10,31; *Glor.mart.* 96). Their feast day was set for 7 October in the *Mart. hier.* and in the historical martyrologies, starting from the anonymous author of Lyons.

BHG 1624-1625; BHL 7599-7607; BHO 1052-1055; BS 11, 876-882; LCI 8, 329-330; BBKL 9, 1435-1436; C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence 1926, repr. Rome 2000, 461-464; E. Donckel, *Ausserrömische Heilige in Rom*, Luxemburg 1938, 92-93; B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio Religiosa. Wallfahrten in der An-*

tike und das Pilgerwesen in der alten Kirche, Münster 1950, 132-138; Chr. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei vom 4. Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart ²1992, 193-194, 210-211; E. Schurr, *Die Ikonographie der Heiligen*, Dettelbach 1997, 231-240; D. Woods, *The Emperor Julian and the Passion of Sergius and Bacchus*: JECS 5 (1997) 335-367; E.K. Fowden, *The Barbarian Plain: Saint Sergius Between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley, CA 1999.

V. SAXER - S. HEID

SERGIUS GRAMMATICUS (6th c.). A contemporary of *Severus of *Antioch, he is known to us only by the collection of letters which he exchanged with the patriarch of Antioch between 515 and 520. Although the title "grammarian" seems to allude to his profession, the interest shown by Sergius in his writings shows him to be more of a philosopher or rather a layperson with philosophical interests. The correspondence, including Sergius's three letters and their respective responses by Severus, was translated into *Syriac by *Paul bishop of Callinicum and has been transmitted to us by only one MS (BL add. 17154). Sergius reused motifs and insights that were specific to the most extreme form of *monophysitism, as it was represented at his time by *Julian of Halicarnassus. As in the case of Julian, he so emphasized the unity of the natures in Christ that he compromised the properties of the human nature and the incarnate Logos. Taken up by missionary zeal, Sergius strained to acquire supporters for the monophysite cause and asked for, among other things, their adherence to one of his "formulas" (*kephalaion*): "After the ineffable union (in Christ) we no longer speak of two natures in two properties." To avoid, on the one hand, any element of distinction in the incarnate One and on the other hand a confusion of the natures, Sergius arrived at the point of professing one sole "substance" or "essence" (*ousia*) in Jesus Christ. Applying Aristotelian categories to the definition of the christological dogma, Sergius thus introduced a new type of christological teaching. As a result, from the "sole essence" of Christ, a new and "unique property" also derived. This essence is manifested, e.g., in Christ's virgin birth, his freedom from natural instincts, the absence of *sin and his *resurrection. Nevertheless the contrast with Severus seems to be owed more to the novelty of Sergius's formulations than to the concrete image of Christ he proposed; Sergius, however, borrowed typical elements from Severus's Christology.

DTC 14, 1996-1997; Patrologia V, 203-204. *Edition*: J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephalium: eiusdem ac Sergii grammatici epistulae mutuae* (CSCO 119-120, Script. Syri 64-65) (Syriac text with Latin tr.) Louvain 1949. *Studies*: J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909, 163-172; I.R. Torrance, *Christology After Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite*, Norwich 1988; Grillmeier II, 2, 117-135; II.3.

L. PERRONE

SERGIUS of Cyprus. The bishop of Constantina (or Constantia), modern-day Salamis, on the island of *Cyprus; he convoked a provincial synod in the year 643, which then came to be known as the Second Council of Cyprus, in which he brought about the condemnation of *monothelitism. The Acts of this synod were then sent to Rome, accompanied by the *Epistula ad Theodorum papam*, written by the same Sergius, which is surprising for its extraordinarily gratifying gestures of respect toward the primacy of the Roman church.

CPG 7628; Mansi 10, 913b-916e; Hfl-Lecl III, 400; ACO (ser. 2), I, 60-65; Palazzini 1, 290; M. Maccarone, *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio*, Rome 1989 (see index).

K. DEN BIESEN

SERGIUS of Rish'ayna (d. 536). Chief doctor at Rish'ayna (Theodosiopolis), perhaps the presbyter, who was certainly a *monophysite but was challenged and criticized in subsequent monophysite literature (esp. in the writings of ps.-Zachariah) on account of his supposed luxury and avarice (accusations which nonetheless could be explained partially because of his support, late in his life, of the antimonophysite initiatives of the *Chalcedonian patriarch of *Antioch, *Ephrem), Sergius (d. 536 at *Constantinople) was one of the more talented intellectuals and learned men of the *Syrian church of his time. He studied for several years at *Alexandria, perhaps at the beginning of the year 500, and certainly his writings relating to the Aristotelian corpus bear traces of the Alexandrian interpretation of the writings of *Aristotle, which in those years were studied and implemented by *Ammonius, e.g.; and, one must add, this would have been practiced within subsequent Syriac intellectual circles, esp. monophysite ones, who were working in the Monastery of Qenneshre, established at that time, in 521, by *John bar Aphtonia. Sergius was an intelligent translator of Aristotelian works or works connected to the Aristotelian corpus; his translation of the treatise *De mundo*, e.g., is considered a masterpiece. Moreover, he was the author of various philosophical works: *Treatise on Logic; On Affirmation and Negation; On Genus, Species and the Individual; On the Cause of the Universe According to Aristotle's Principles.*

But Sergius is not only known for his writings on

logic and philosophy. Being a doctor, his activity was concentrated for a long time on the translation of Galen's works, and he even began to expound the thought of the Greek philosopher at the insistent request of his student and admirer, Theodore (not the Nestorian Theodore of Merv, as has been suggested, but the bishop of Karh Guddan, on the Tigris River). Theodore was struck by the clarity and solidity of Galen's arguments, which Sergius traced back to the teachings of Aristotle, which he regarded as the foundation of every "scientific" advance. This massive production should not cause one to forget the doctor of Rish'ayna's lasting commitment in the theological sphere. His were the first Syriac translations of the writings of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, which began to circulate around 520, before which he placed a small treatise on the spiritual life. They were edited and marked by the heavily Evagrian emphases. One should recall that Sergius retranslated the same *Gnostics Centuries*, also written by *Evagrius of Pontus, in a version that the subsequent Syriac tradition regarded as irreverent but which was much closer than the preceding version to the Greek text.

Duval 247-249, 266-273, 276-278, 315, 363-364; Baumstark 167-169; Chabot 71-72; Patrologia V, 467-468; P. Sherwood, *Sergius of Reshaina and the Syriac Versions of the Pseudo-Denys*: SE 5 (1952) 174-184; A. Guillaumont, *Les "Képhalaia gnostica" d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens*, Paris 1962, 215-227; H. Hugonnard-Roche, *Sur les versions syriaques des Catégories d'Aristote*: Journal Asiatique 275 (1987) 205-222; Id., *Aux origines de l'exégèse orientale de la logique d'Aristote: Sergius de Resh'aina*: Journal Asiatique 277 (1989) 1-17; Id., *Note sur Sergius de Resh'aina, traducteur du grec en syriaque et commentateur d'Aristote*, in *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism. Studies in the Transmission of Greek Philosophy and Sciences Dedicated to H.J. Drossaart Lulofs*, ed. G. Endress - R. Kruk, Leiden 1997, 121-143; Id., *Les "Catégories " d'Aristote comme introduction à la philosophie, dans un commentaire syriaque de Sergius de Resh'aina*: Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale 8 (1997) 339-363; Id., *Comme la cigogne au désert. Un prologue de Sergius de Resh'ayna à l'étude de la philosophie aristotélicienne en syriaque*, in *Langages et philosophie. Hommage à Jean Jolivet* (Études de philosophie médiévale 74), Paris 1997, 79-97; BBKL 9, 1432-1435.

P. Bettiolo

SERGIUS PAULUS (1st c.). Quintus Sergius Paulus (Paullus), proconsul of Cyprus, wanted to meet *Barnabas, a native of the island, and Saul of Tarsus, who were preaching in the synagogues, at their arrival at Paphos, a city on the W point of the island and the place where the governor ruled. After one of Saul's miracles, who from that point onward used the Roman *cognomen* of "*Paul," the proconsul "believed, for he was amazed at the teaching of the Lord" (Acts 13:12). This event is dated around the year 48 (see Boffo, 243-244). Why did Sergius Paulus want to meet the apostle? Did he know something about the new sect? After this encounter, Paul and Barnabas changed their missionary plans and went into the regions where the Sergii Pauli had large landholdings (Pamphylia [*see* *Lycia and Pamphylia], Pisidia, Lyconia and *Galatia). Paul's success at Antioch of Pisidia is owed without a doubt to the support of the proconsul who had become a Christian. Sergius Paulus is different from the other Roman official who had the same name and was the curator of the waters of the Tiber River.

KLP 4, 484-487; DBS 12, 693-699; L. Boffo, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia*, Brescia 1994, 243-244 and note 4; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan 2004, 36-38.

A. Di Berardino

SERGIUS the STYLITE (8th c.). Western Syrian author who wrote an apologetic treatise against the Jewish opinion that "God does not have a son and cannot conceive" (I. 1), in which he often referred to Flavius Josephus. The *Christology of the treatise can be interpreted in both a *Chalcedonian and miaphysite sense; given that it says that Sergius was born at Gusit, i.e., close to Emesa (Homs), it may also more likely be the case that he was a miaphysite. The work was written probably in the period between 730 and 770.

Baumstark, 180; A. Haymann, *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew* (CSCO 338-339), Louvain 1973.

K. den Biesen

SERMO, Sermon. Some information on the sermon during the patristic age in the Middle Ages, esp. in the transmission of patristic texts, has been marked for the entries **homily* and **homiliary*, because of the close relationship among the terms. Nevertheless, the sermon as a concept and in its evolution remains to be treated. In classical Latin the term *sermo* designates a conversation, a common discourse (analogous Latin terms are as follows: *oratio*, *locutio*, a discussion of the familiar style (analogous terms: *colloquium*, *congressus*). It is distinguished from elaborate discourse, from the peroration and the harangue, and from versified texts (poems, songs, etc.; as an exception, Horace's *Satyrae* were titled *sermones*, because they were placed within the literary genre of satiric dialogue). The equivalent Greek term was λόγος. The phrase "to address" in

Latin is *sermonem proferre*; to have a conversation with someone in Latin is *sermonem conferre cum aliquo.* A language full of sweetness and abandonment is, Cicero believed (*Off.* I, 37,134), *sermo lenis minimeque pertinax.*

In the Bible, the term *sermo* indicates a discourse (*sermonem istum proferre*: Josh 2:20), an oracle (*sermo Domini erat pretiosus in diebus illis*: 1 Sam 3:1), a teaching (*Fuit vir propheta potens in opere et sermone*: Lk 24:19), language, *labii unius et sermonum*: Gen 11:1. The ancient African biblical versions render the term λόγος with the Latin term *sermo*; the European versions instead chose the term *verbum*; the Greek term ῥῆμα is also translated with the term *sermo*. The term λόγος from the Septuagint version was not always translated with the term *verbum.* In the majority of cases, the Vulgate preferred *sermo*, perhaps because the term *verbum* had become by antonomasia the Word, the Creator and Redeemer: *Omnipotens sermo tuus de caelo*: Wis 18:15. Therefore the ancient theological equivalents added to the Hebrew term *dabar* disappear from *sermo* but remained tied to the term *verbum* (particularly the creating and renewing efficacy, which was typical of the Hebrew concept, which was by that time adopted by Christian theology). This explains why the Word was at times called the "sermon": *Nos enim Sermonem Dei scimus indutum carnis substantiam*, writes *Novatian (*De Trin.* 21: PL 3, 928C). The term is applied to the aeon (Νοῦς), in *Valentinus's theory, acc. to *Tertullian: *Emittit et ipse ex semetipso Sermonem et Vitam* (*Adv. Valent.* 7: CCL 2, 758).

The notion of act implied in *sermon*, in a precise, temporal-historical context, is found in biblical literature: *Reliqua autem sermonum Jeroboam scripta sunt in libro sermonum dierum regum Israel* (2 Kgs 14:28); *sermones*, i.e., the acts of the king; the *sermones dierum* are the animals. To the ordinary ability to speak, the natural capacity to express oneself and to communicate a line of reasoning, a supernatural reality is added. The λόγος σοφίας (*sermo sapientiae*) and the λόγος γνώσεως (*sermo scientiae*: 1 Cor 12:8) have been given by the *Holy Spirit for the good of the community, with the necessary *interpretatio sermonum*, the explanation of the charismatic message. The Word of God is essentially a *divinus sermo* (Ambr., *Ep.* I,7,5: PL 16,906B); *sermo caelestis* (Ambr., *Ep.* 30,9: PL 16,1063B); *sacer sermo* (*1 Clem* 56,3: PG 1,321A, ἅγιος λόγος). The ancient Latin version published by G. Morin (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, II, Maredsous 1894, p. 51) has the term *sanctus sermo.* For *Irenaeus of Lyons, the *sermo* is also a rational force: *paratum fieri ad susceptionem perfectae rationis*, which corresponds to the Greek phrase εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ τελείου λόγου (*Adv. haer.* II,19,4; see I,5,6). The Greek term λόγου has fallen out of the MS tradition but could be restored on the basis of other texts from the writings of Irenaeus and Tertullian (*Adv. Valent.* 25,2).

Thus the term *sermo* became an expressive sacred entity; the term itself, by that point enriched by new elements, belonged to Latin Christianity. Its first meaning pertained to a world of communicating with simplicity a religious teaching and supposed a work of reflection and editing. But there is also an attestation to an exquisitely theological concept. *Tertullian, in the context of his trinitarian theology, offered the following translation of Jn 1:1: *Sermo erat apud Deum et Deus erat sermo* (*Adv. Prax.* 5: CCL 2,1163), and distinguished the terms *sermo* and *ratio*: *Rationalis enim Deus, et ratio in ipsum prius et ita ab ipso omnia. Quae ratio sensus ipsius est. Hanc Graeci λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus ideoque iam in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse, cum magis rationem competat antiquiorem haberi, quia non sermonalis a principio sed rationalis Deus etiam ante principium, et quia ipse quoque sermo ratione consistens priorem eam ut substantiam suam ostendat.* Tertullian made a clear distinction between *sermo* and *ratio*, contrary to the African use (*in usu est nostrorum*); for Tertullian, in God, *ratio* is immanent and becomes a *sermo* after the Creator's first act: *Fiat lux* (see Ch. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, III, Rome 1965, 110; Tertull., *Adv. Prax.* 5: CCL 2,1163-1164).

The transition from λόγος (also translated *ratio*) to *sermo* and *verbum* pertains to philology and linguistic criticism. *Lactantius equated the terms: *Melius Graeci λόγον dicunt quam nos verbum, sive sermonem: λόγος enim et sermonem significat et rationem* (*Div. inst.* IV,9,1: CSEL 19,300). The Greek Fathers also knew the term διάλογος, which was at times translated with the Latin term *concertatio* (*Origen, *C. Celsum* III,1: GCS 1,203: a debate). One then finds the terms διαλογή (a term not directly translated into Latin [Epiph., *Panar.* 20,3: PG 41, 273A] but rather translated with the phrase *vocabulorum disceptatio*: ibid. 76,9: PG 42,532D) and διαλογισμός, *disputatio* (John Chrysostom, *Hom. 8 in 1 Tim.*: PG 11,590G). The verb διαλογίζομαι is translated as *reputari*; the same translation is used for λογίζομαι (Athan., *Vit. Ant.*, 42: PG 26,905AB). It is always the same reality: speech, whether public or private. But with the spread of Christian Latin, the term *sermo* would be applied to speech destined for the proclamation of the Word of God and the

edification of the audience: it is an important element of the tradition and Christian teaching. It would also become a literary genre: the Fathers preached *sermones*, which were recorded by tachygraphers (as in the case of *Augustine), and they published their texts (e.g., Pope *Leo the Great).

But at the same time the term *sermo* retained its ancient meaning of "statement, declaration" and was often qualified with an epithet: one, e.g., reads in the *Rule of Saint Benedict*: *sermo responsionis porrigatur bonus* (ch. 31: CSEL 75,96); *auditus malae rei aut otiosi sermonis* (ch. 67, p. 172). The other meanings are as follows: (1) a text: *Quae enim pagina aut qui sermo divinae auctoritatis veteris ac novi Testamenti* (*Rule of St. Benedict*, ch. 73, p. 180); (2) an expression: *Multi super hoc sermone diversa finxerunt* (Jerome, *Ep.* 20,1: CSEL 54, 104); (3) a term: Δεός *sermo graecus est*, *qui latine interpretatur "timor"* (Cassiodorus, *Exp. in ps.* 21,1: CCL 97,190); (4) an inner speech: *Quodcumque cogitaveris sermo est* (Tertull., *Adv. Prax.* 5). During the Middle Ages, the term *sermo* was also equivalent to a legal action brought about by the judge.

During the 4th c., the term *sermo* also occurred more often for every type of preaching: catechetical, exegetical and parenetic. *Ambrose pointed out: *Hesterno sermo noster ac tractatus usque ad sancti altaris sacramenta deductus est* (*De sacr.* V,1,1: PL 16,445C). *Augustine also had recourse to the terms *sermo* and *tractatus*: *Sermonem ad altare Dei debemus hodie infantibus de sacramento altaris. Tractavimus ad eos de sacramento symboli. . . . Hodie illis de hac re sermo debetur* (*Serm.* 228,3: PL 38,1102). The *tractatus* is therefore a more consistent statement, more developed than the sermon, and is usually more concise; its argument also seems to be more demanding than what occurs in the case of the sermon. The *enarratio*, the commentary, is carried out under the form of a sermon for the faithful: *Statui autem per sermones id agere*, *qui proferantur in populis*, *quas graeci* ὁμιλίας *vocant. Hoc enim iustius esse arbitror*, *ut conventus ecclesiastici non fraudentur etiam psalmi huius intelligentia*, *cuius*, *ut aliorum*, *delectari assolent cantilena* (*Enarr. in ps. 118*, proem.). The sermon was brief and listened to while standing: *Longam lectionem audivimus*, *brevis est dies: longo sermone etiam nos tenere vestram patientiam non debemus. Novimus quia patienter audistis*, *et diu stando et audiendo tanquam martyri compassi estis* (Aug., *Serm.* 274, *In natali martyris Vincentii*: PL 38,1253).

The variety of concepts are taken up by *Isidore of Seville: *Homiliae autem ad vulgus loquuntur*, *tomi vero*, *id est libri*, *maiores sunt disputationes.* Dialogus *est conlatio duorum vel plurimorum*, *quem Latini* sermonem *dicunt. Nam quos Graeci* dialogos *vocant*, *nos* sermones *vocamus.* Sermo *autem dictus quia inter utrumque seritur. Unde in Vergilio: Multa inter se serebant.* Tractatus *est unius rei multiplex expositio*, *eo quod trahat sensum in multa*, *sententiam contrectando secum. Differt autem* sermo, tractatus *et* verbum. Sermo *enim alteram eget personam;* tractatus *specialiter ad se ipsum est;* verbum *autem ad omnes. Unde et dicitur: Verbum fecit ad populum.* Commentaria *dicta quasi cum mente. Sunt enim interpretationes*, *ut commenta iuris*, *commenta Evangelii* (*Etymologiae* VI,8,2-5: PL 82,237G-238B). For Isidore of Seville, the sermon is still a dialogue, although the *verbum* is a speech directed to all people. It seems, however, that in the pastoral experience, the sermon is applied to catechetical teaching, exegetical explanation, moral and disciplinary admonition, religious exhortation, to every type of discourse for every circumstance, largely independent of the number of people in the audience. Moreover it seems that the dialogical aspect corresponds more to the simplicity of the content than to the oratorical form: moreover, the homily (*homilia*) is elaborated acc. to the methodology of sapiential theology and not acc. to a systematic or artificial criterion. *Caesarius of Arles made an anthology of sermons available for the use of the clergy: *sermones istos . . . populo frequentius recitare* (*Serm.* 2: CCL 103,19): they are easy sermons, filled with an Augustinian spirit, and adhere to the human and spiritual situation of the faithful. Bishop Felix prepared a collection of sermons (*sermones*) delivered by *Peter Chrysologus (CCL 24, 24A, 24B): evidence of an editorial policy!

The narrow interpretation of the sermon as a parenetic discourse probably comes from the *Sermo Domini in monte*, which was interpreted by *Augustine: *Inveniet in eo*, *quantum ad mores optimos pertinet*, *perfectum vitae christianae modum. . . . Nam sic ipse sermo concluditur*, *ut appareat in eo praecepta esse omnia quae ad informandam vitam pertinent* (*De sermone Domini in monte* I,1: CCL 35,1). The Sermon on the Mount is a prototype of popular preaching, a very precise literary genre, from the 4th c. onward. The homily is applied more exactly to an explanation of the biblical text proclaimed during the liturgical celebration. The sermon became a discussion carried out with a precise methodology, and not necessarily in dependence upon the biblical text. Nevertheless, the distinction is so uncertain also because the modern editors of patristic texts have at times used questionable criteria. Pope *Leo the Great's *sermones* received the title *tractatus* in the critical edition made by A. Chavasse (CCL 138-138

A), on the basis of a title given by a 9th-c. MS. Oftentimes the uncertainty of the terminology has repercussions in the description of the liturgical books from the Western and Eastern traditions. Medieval sermons were not necessarily introduced by the biblical passage (in contradistinction to the homilies), but the content distinguishes them easily from the hagiographical texts, martyrological and historical in character (martyrologies, menaea and synaxaria, passionaries and legendaries).

The sermon was a liturgical act, inserted into the celebration: the *ministerium sermonis* was connected to the *ministerium altaris*: *Qui iam ministrantes altari, quo vos accessuri estis, assistimus, nec ministerio sermonis vos fraudare debemus* (Aug., *Serm.* 214,1: PL 38,1065). The preacher participates in the "spirituality" of the sacred text: *Divinae lectiones omnes ita sibi connectuntur, tanquam una sit lectio; quia omnes ex uno ore procedunt. Multa sunt ora ministerium sermonis gerentium, sed unum est os ministros implentis* (Aug., *Serm.* 170,1,1: PL 38,927). Just as the biblical texts come from the same mouth, so too the preaching (the *sermones*) of the various preachers finds its unity in the inspiration of the *Holy Spirit: *Per ineuntem Spiritum officio oris nostri divini sensus sermo diffunditur* (Hilary, *Tract. in ps. 118*, Tau, 2: CSEL 22,541).

*Egeria heard at *Jerusalem readings and sermons in *Syriac, *Greek and Latin, which were translated by interpreters (*Itinerarium Egeriae*, 47: CCL 175,89).

During the Middle Ages the sermon was separated from the liturgy; it was a speech delivered for a given occasion and was heard in a suitable setting: *In sequenti dominica dicere matutinas et missarum ad usum praedictum et cum nota, et tali hora qua scholares post missam ire poterunt ad sermonem* (Statutes of the University of Paris, from 1380; ed. G.A. Lobineau, *Histoire de la ville de Paris*, III, Paris 1725, 498). In the inquisitorial practice, the person condemned had to listen to a *sermo publicus* or *actio fidei*, also called *a sermo generalis de fide*.

The Council of Trent, in 1562 (sess. XXII, can. 8), prescribed preaching on the biblical readings *frequenter inter missarum celebrationem . . . , diebus praesertim dominicis et festis* (DS 1749). But the liturgists considered the sermon an ordinary *interruptio* of the liturgical celebration (e.g., P. Radó, *Enchiridion liturgicum*, I, Rome 1961, 334). Only after Vatican II would the situation tend to change in a very general way; the homily was preferred to the sermon; the typical sermon in three points followed by a conclusion was also abandoned, as well as the pertinent technical oratory that was often hardly sacred (one thinks of the *Conférences* held at Notre-Dame, at Paris, which were famous Lenten sermons; or the English "sermon," a text proclaimed without gestures and vocal effects). In modern languages, the term *sermon* at times acquires an ironic note, directed at moralizing content, at arrogant and annoying expression, and at the length of the discourse.

The primary derivative terms in patristic and medieval Latinity pertain to the same concepts:

1. *Sermonarium, liber sermocinalis, sermologus:* a collection of sermons. *Sermologus, sive liber sermonum*, distinct from the *homeliarius* (Joannes Belethus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, c. 60: PL 202, 66AB; see c. 42: PL 202,69D-70A).

2. *Sermunculus:* short discourse: *Huic sermunculo adnexui* (Jerome, *Ep.* 32,1, *ad Marcellam*: CSEL 54, 252); *ad compendium studiosae intelligentiae in brevem sermunculum . . . coartamus* (Hilar., *Instructio psalmorum*, 17: CSEL 22, 15); prayer: *Quis sermunculis ocius terminatis domum egressus inter exercitus multitudinem . . . emigrat* (Adamnan of Iona, *De locis sanctis* III, 4: PL 88,912).

3. *Sermonari:* to speak: *Pullus gratiarum sermonetur tibi* (Priscill., *Tractatus* I, 31: CSEL 18, 26).

4. *Sermocinari:* to converse with: *Inductio est oratio qua rebus non dubiis captamus assensionem eius cum quo instituta est, sive inter philosophos, sive inter rhetores, sive inter sermocinantes* (Cassiodorus, *De artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum* 2: PL 70,1165A).

5. *Sermocinator:* preacher: *Sermocinator dum veritatem quam meminit loquitur* (Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Contra sermonem Fastidiosi Ariani*, 17: PL 65,523A).

6. *Sermocinatio*: discussion, conversation: *Tanti magistri non solum ad ipsos sermocinatio, sed etiam pro ipsis ad Patrem oratio* (Aug., *Tract. in Ioh.* 104,2: CCL 36,602).

M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, III, Milan 1949, 216-222: the sermon; Ch. Mohrmann, *Praedicare-Tractare-Sermo*, in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, II, Rome 1961, 63-72; J.B. Schneyer, *Geschichte der katholischen Predigt*, Freiburg i.Br. 1968; W. Schütz, *Geschichte der christlichen Predigt*, Berlin-New York 1972; R. Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux. Analyses de manuscrits*, Spoleto 1981, 18-37; RAC 16, 148-175; De Ore Domini: *Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. Th.L. Amos - E.A. Green - B.M. Kienzle, Studies in Medieval Culture 27, Kalamazoo, MI 1989, 41-60; J. Hamesse - X. Hermand, *De l'Homélie au Sermon. Histoire de la Prédication Médiévale*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1993, 186-192; R. Étaix, *Homéliaires patristiques latins: recueil d'études de manuscrits médiévaux*, Paris 1994; F.J. Tovar Paz, *Tractatus, sermones atque homiliae: el cultivo del género literario del discurso homilético en la Hispania tardoantigua y visigoda*, Cáceres 1994; F. Siegert, *Homily and Panegyrical Sermon, Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S.E. Porter, Leiden 1997, 421-443; M. Sodi - A.M. Triacca, *Dizionario di omiletica*, Turin 1998; H.O. Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the*

Christian Church, 2 vols., Grand Rapids, MI 1998; B. Mayne Kienzle, *The Sermon*, *Typologie des Sources*, Turnhout 2000.

R. Grégoire

SERMO ARIANORUM. From 418, *Augustine of Hippo had in hand this *Arian text that was sent to him so that he could refute it. Some MSS along with the refutation, *Contra sermonem Arianorum* (*Against a Sermon of the Arians*), have also transmitted to us the Arian text: it was a document circulating among the *Goths who had come to *Italy with *Alaric and Ataulf, which presents itself not as a homily but as a small compendium of radical Arianism in the West, associated with the school of *Wulfila.

CPL 701; PL 48, 677-684; Patrologia III, 97-98; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 129-134; M.G. Mara, *Der Serm. Arrian.*, in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, I, Basel 1986-1994, 454-455.

M. Simonetti

SERMON on the MOUNT (iconography). Patristic literature often makes reference to the Sermon on the Mount, although the iconography is reticent. The format of the representation of the Sermon on the Mount presents *Christus Magister* in *adlocutio* with his right hand, in his left hand is an open scroll, at the moment in which he turns to the *audientes* (*apostles or followers). These characteristics of the composition were found in a scene represented on the multicolored *sarcophagus preserved at the National Museum of Rome, dated at the end of the 3rd c.–beginning of the 4th c. AD (Rep 773b, p. 321, pl. 62): here the figure of Christ, who has a beard, draws its inspiration from the iconography of Zeus seated and draped, but the scroll is not open. In a fragment of a sarcophagus coming from Portus, dated to the 2nd quarter of the 4th c. (Rep 110, p. 80, pl. 29), the representation shows the scroll open, and those listening (*audientes*) are four young male figures, turned toward him. The same scene appears on a fragment discovered at the cemetery of Calepodius (Nestori 1971). According to Wilpert, a precedent for this depiction, in this case, the first in the order of time, should be seen in the fresco in cubicle III of the hypogeum of the Aureli (dated to ca. AD 230–240): here a bearded figure in a tunic and a pallium, seated on top of a hill, wields a scroll extended between his hands, although at the top sheep and goats eat. According to Cecchelli (1944) and more recently Himmelmann (1975), in reality it is an image of the Shepherd of the Soul inspired from the figure of the philosopher of life: the spiritual look would in fact be typical of this representation, and its interlocutors (sheep and goats) are not facing him. The same interpretive uncertainty weighs on the representation of the cubiculum A in the catacomb of the Via D. Compagni at Rome (the frescoes of this sector are dated to ca. AD 320), in which Ferrua has proposed that one can see in it Christ's Sermon on the Mount, with Christ standing on a rock; he has his arm lifted in the act of speaking to a crowd of disciples below. In contrast to Ferrua, Klauser (1962) and then Kötzsche-Breitenbruch (1976) prefer to interpret the image as that of Moses who speaks to the Israelites. Both Hempel (1961) and Klauser note in the same cubiculum the presence of the representation of Christ the teacher (*Christus Magister*) speaking to the twelve apostles, a theme that would find widespread diffusion in the mosaic decorations of 4th-c. basilicas and onward. According to Bisconti the scene should rather be attributed to a deceased person placed in the context of paradise with a bucolic background.

For the fragments of the aforementioned sarcophagi, see C. Cecchelli, *Monumenti cristiano-eretici di Roma*, Rome 1944, 14-15; F.W.Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*, I, *Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967. For the hypogeum of Althea Aureli, see the previous references in Cecchelli, op. cit., 1-119, to which one must now add those provided by N. Himmelmann, *Das Hypogäum der Aurelier am Viale Manzoni. Ikonographische Beobachtungen* (*Abh. d.Wiss. und der Lit.*, *Geistes- und Sozial-wiss. Klasse*, n. 7), Wiesbaden 1975. For the catacomb of the Via D. Compagni, see A. Ferrua, *Le pitture della nuova catacomba di Via Latina*, Vatican City 1960, 47, pl. XIV; Th. Klauser: JbAC 5 (1962) 179; H.L. Hempel, *Zum Problem derAnfänge der AT Illustration*: ZNTW 73 (1961) 300; L.Kötzsche Breitenbruch, *Die neue Katakombe an der Via Latina in Rom*: JbAC 19 (1976) 87-88; F. Bisconti, *L'ipogeo degli Aureli in viale Manzoni: un esempio di sincresi privata*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 889-903; TIP 279.

L. Ungaro Testini

SERMONS, AFRICAN (anonymous). In 1949 J. Leclercq published eight anonymous sermons of African origin (CPL 418-425), which were of Augustinian inspiration (one of the Latin *Epiphanius, another seems to be that of Augustine, and a third brief sermon draws on a sermon from *Augustine). They pertained to NT topics (eunuchs, love for neighbor, celebration of the martyrs, the lost sheep, the hundredfold recompense, the Samaritan woman and the measures). Another group of nine sermons was discovered in the *homiliarium* of Fleury. These are devoted to various Christian feasts (*Epiphany, *Ascension, *Pentecost, *John the Baptist and the celebration of the *martyrs). Moreover, other sermons of dubious authorship or total anonymity circulated

and were published by Wilmart, Morin, Lemarié and Étaix; some were attributed to Augustine, others to *Fulgentius of Ruspe. Some of these sermons, to criticize the *Vandal kings, spoke of the biblical tyrants, esp. the Pharaoh. For a list of these sermons, see A. Isola, pp. 10-19.

CPL 418-425; CPPM 1, 1935-1942; *homiliarium* of Fleury: CPL 855-863; PLS 2, 1326-1328 (A list of sermons with reference to the published text in various volumes); J. Leclerq, *Les inédits africains de l'homiliaire de Fleury*: RBen 58 (1948) 53-73; Id., *Sermons de l'école de S. Augustin:* RBen 59 (1949) 100-113; G. Morin, *Deux sermons africains du V^e^/VI^e^ siècle avec un texte inédit du symbole*: RBen 35 (1923) 233-245; J. Lemarié, *Un sermon inédit sur Matthieu 16,13-19 de l'école de Fulgence de Ruspe*: REAug 18 (1972) 116-123; Id., *Sermon africain inédit pour la fête des innocents*: AB 96 (1978) 108-116; P.P. Verbraken, *Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de Saint Augustin*, Steenbrugge 1976; A. Hamman, *La trasmission des sermons de saint Augustin: les authentiques et les apocryphes*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 311-327; R. Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux. Analyse des manuscrits*, Spoleto 1980, 263-280; A. Isola, *I cristiani dell'Africa vandalica nei Sermones del tempo (429-534)*, Milan 1990; *Dizionario di letteratura cristiana antica*, ed. S. Döpp - W. Geerlings, Rome 2006, 766.

M. Simonetti

SERMONS, ARIAN (anonymous). Published in 1992, 12 Latin sermons delivered by the same Arian author, which were found in a medieval *homilarium* from the 2nd half of the 8th c. (*Codex latinus monacensis 6329*), deriving from Freising: 4 preached on the occasion of Christmas, 3 for *Epiphany, 2 during *Lent and 3 during Holy Week: the MS is in a corrupt state: hence the difficulty of its correct interpretation. The biblical text used by the anonymous author is very special: perhaps because he at times had at hand the Greek text. He must have been bilingual and perhaps lived in a bilingual milieu, and did his best to preach in Latin. His *Arian teaching does not figure very prominently because the teaching was delivered in a sermon. The author acknowledged the *baptism of children, who are without sin; he therefore did not know of the *Pelagian controversy. Liturgical and linguistic characteristics lead one to date the author, who was a *Goth, into the 2nd half of the 4th c. in E Illyricum.

R. Étaix, *Sermons ariens inédits*: Recherches Augustiniennes 26 (1992) 143-179; R. Gryson, *Les sermons ariens du Codex latinus monacensis 6329. Étude critique*: REAug 39 (1993) 333-358.

A. Di Berardino

SERMONS, DONATIST. 1. As a result of research for the publication of a critical edition of the African homilies of minor authors, esp. of the anonymous collections gathered in the supplements to the Patrologia Latina under the name of *John Chrysostom, thanks also to the studies of Wenk, F. J. Leroy announced the discovery of 22 unpublished sermons from the time of *Augustine, to be found in the Latin MS 4147 (Rec. 499) of the Austrian National Library of Vienna.

The MS, also containing other texts, lacks initial letters and rubricated titles; it is also flawed with numerous mistakes and, on the whole, betrays a lack of proofreading; the difficult script and the numerous abbreviations appear to indicate that the text was prepared for private use. The dating is uncertain because the reference to the *Pelagian error, the absence of allusions to *Arianism and the exhortation to Christians to assume the role of judge in order to remove the brethren from the risks of a pagan judgment, which are the sole internal chronological references, allow one to consider the year 429 and the *Vandal invasion as the *terminus ante quem*.

The identification of the author-preacher of the sermons seems difficult: the stylistic considerations upon which one attempts to formulate an attribution must take into account a prose lacking special connotations that sets forth proper uses of a certain school, which can be recognized in the writings of many African authors, including *Augustine; attentive studies on the lexicon used esp. in sermon 18 are bent on demonstrating the *Donatist identity of the author.

The new sermons essentially address moral themes: the necessary obedience to the law, the search for poverty, merciful judgment toward one's brother, recognition of God's gifts, the necessity and the beauty of faith (*sermons* XI, XX, XXB., XXVII, XXIX, XXXV, LI, LIII, LV, LVI and LVII); the exhortation to an upright Christian life does not fail to pass through the examples of great famous biblical individuals and people mentioned in the gospel like Joseph, Job, Paul and Abraham (*sermons* VIII, XIII, XIV, XXXIV, XLIX and L); there are a few references to Christian practices and sacraments: respect for the *sabbath lived as a moment in which one does good, trust in God's mercy as an incentive for confession and appeals to prayer without showy displays (*sermons* X, XVII, XIX, XXXI and LX). Last, in *sermon* XLVIII there is an explicit invitation to flee from *Pelagianism. The provisional edition of the 22 unpublished sermons has been prepared by F.J. Leroy.

2. The Vienna collection forms, acc. to Leroy, a series with another collection of the Escorial Library, from which he published in 1997 a homily (no. 18), and demonstrated that it was Donatist. His enticing hypothesis is that the two collections form a unity

because of the style, thought and terminology. The readers of the sermons were not aware of their Donatist character because they circulated under the auspices John Chrysostom's name (*see* *John Chrysostom [Latin Collection]). The unknown author of these 60-some sermons does not show himself to be polemical toward the Catholic position and does not offer us much concrete information on the life of African Donatists.

3. Several Donatist sermons composed to keep alive the memory of their martyrs have also been preserved. One could mention *Sermo de passione sanctorum Donati et Advocati* (BHL 2303B)—an account of the murders of some bishops during the expulsion from their basilica at *Carthage between 316 and 321—and *Passio Marculi sacerdotis* (BHL 5271).

PLS 4, 649-850; CPL 915 app., 938, 939, 940, 941; A. Wilmart, *La collection des 38 homélies latines de S. Jean Chrysostome*: JTS 19 (1917/18) 305-327; *Tabulae codd. mss. praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum. tt. III-IV. cod. 3501-6500*, cur. Graz, Ed. Nova, 1965; F. Unterkirchen, *Die datierten Handschriften der Österreichischen Nat. Bibliothek von 1501 bis 1600*, Vienna 1976; W. Wenk, *Zur Sammlung der 38 Homilien des Chrysostomus Latinus* (*mit Edition der N. 6, 8, 27, 32 und 33*): WS 10 (1988); J.-P. Bouhot, *Les traduction latines de Jean Chrysostome du V^e au XVI^e siècle*, in *Colloques Internationaux du C.N.R.S.*, *Traductions et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, I.R.H.T. 26-28 mai 1986, Paris 1989; F.J. Leroy, *Vingt-deux homélies africaines nouvelles attribuables à l'un des anonymes du Chrysostome Latin* (*PLS 4*): RBen 104 (1994) 123-147; Id., *L'homélie donatiste ignorée du Corpus Escorial* (*Chrysostomus Latinus, PLS IV, sermon 18*): RBen 107 (1997) 250-262; Id., *Les 22 inédits de la catéchèse donatiste de Vienne. Une édition provisoire*: RechAug 31 (1999) 149-234; J.S. Alexander, *Criteria for Discerning Donatist Sermons*: SP 38 (2001) 3-7; A. Schindler, *Du nouveau sur les donatistes au temps de saint Augustin?*, in *Augustinus Afer*, ed. P. Fux, Fribourg 2003, 149-152.

D. Nuzzo

SERPENT. In the Bible the serpent (ὄφις, δράκων; *serpens*, *draco*), which in the Greek world was the object of ancient chthonic cults and was already present in the Minoan-Mycenaean religious culture, appears primarily in the story of Gen 3:1-14, where the ὄφις was called the most cunning among creatures, and it assures the woman that, if they would eat the fruit of the tree prohibited by God, they would not die but would become like gods, inasmuch as they would know how to recognize good and evil. Therefore, after the first parents ate the fruit, at the moment God rebuked them, the man attributed this fall to the woman and the woman to the serpent: ἠπάτησέν με (3:13), so that as a result the Lord cursed the serpent (3:14). Other significant appearances of the serpent in the OT are connected to *Moses: Ex 4:3, 17 and 7:15 speak of the transformation of the rod into the serpent, as a work of wonder, but esp. in Num 21, in which we find an event that would have numerous repercussions both in the later books of the OT and the NT and in the writings of the Fathers of the church. As a punishment for having spoken against the Lord, the Israelites in the desert were bitten by numerous snakes and were dying; they then besought Moses to intercede on their behalf, and the Lord ordered Moses to make a snake and to erect it as a σημεῖον ("sign"): whoever was bitten and looked at it would be able to continue to live. All this was accomplished in the following way: Moses made a bronze serpent, which would save from death all those who had been bitten so that all might turn to the serpent (21:9).

In the OT Wisdom literature, e.g., in Ps 139:4 and Pr 23:32, the serpent is characterized by its venom, danger and bite (Eccl 10:8, 11). In Job 26:13 the "apostate serpent," which God is said to have expelled, seems to be identified with the devil. Among the prophets, although Jer 8:17 announces the sending of the serpents that would bite and cause death, Is 27:1 predicts in an allegorical tone that the Lord would conquer the serpent by striking it with his knife. Subsequent reflection on this event narrated by Moses concerning the serpent that had been lifted up in the desert can be found in the more recent book of the OT, in Wis 16:4-10, and the possibility is not to be ruled out that this exegesis of this episode was given at the same time as the Christian interpretation of this passage. The author says that even in the desert, when the Israelites were dying because of the serpent bites, the wrath of God did not last for long, but soon God sent a "symbol of salvation": whoever turned to it was not saved because of the symbol that he saw but thanks to God, "the Savior of all men"; "and with this act you have convinced our enemies that you are the one who delivers us from every evil." In fact, no other remedy was found that saved their life because "they deserved to be punished" (κολασθῆναι), for God's mercy (ἔλεος) came to their help and healed them. In the gospels, in Jn 3:14-17 we find the exegesis of the events of the serpent lifted up by Moses in the desert: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life. For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him." See Jn 12:31-32: " Now is the judgment of this world; now will the ruler of this world be cast out. And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself." In Lk 10:19,

Jesus granted to his disciples the power to walk on serpents and scorpions—i.e., symbolically over "every power of the enemy," evidently the devil—without being hurt by them (likewise Mk 16:18). The serpent also has a negative meaning in Mt 23:33, where Jesus called the Scribes and the Pharisees hypocrites—"serpents, a brood of vipers," sons of those who murdered the prophets, stained by the blood of the innocent *Abel to that of Zechariah—and promised them that they would not escape "the judgment of the Gehenna." In Mt 10:16, however, the serpent also acquired a positive value as a symbol of wisdom as a supplement to meekness: Jesus urged his followers to be "wise as serpents and innocent as doves."

St. *Paul in 2 Cor 11:13 recalled the "serpent which in its wickedness deceived Eve" and fears that it can even corrupt the thoughts of his own faithful because of their simplicity; in 1 Cor 10:9, Paul mentioned that the Jews died in the desert because they were bitten by the serpents, an event which, however, also immediately calls to mind the salvation supplied by the serpent lifted up by Moses as a *figura Christi*. In Rev 12:9 and 20:2 the author foresees the eschatological defeat and the chaining of the "great dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the devil and Satan, . . . for a thousand years," after his fight with the woman and Michael the archangel; at the end of the thousand years in which he will remain locked up, he will be thrown into the "lake of fire," the "second death" in which death itself will die. As a whole the NT, the term δράκων is used only for the serpent in the book of Revelation and nowhere else: in the gospels and the epistles of St. Paul one always finds the term ὄφις.

In the writings of *Philo of Alexandria, in the first half of the 1st c. AD, esp. in his treatise *Legum Allegoriae*, the serpent appears as an allegory of pleasure that accompanies the meeting between the intellect and sensation, essential aspects of knowledge, but which symbolizes in addition to ἡδονή—an allegorical meaning found also in *Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa—σωφροσύνη or temperance: it is a double interpretation, as brought to light by F. Calabi's study, *Il serpente e il cavaliere: piacere e* sophrosyne *in Filone di Alessandria*: Annali Storia Rel. 8 (2003) 199-215.

In the writings of the fathers of the church the serpent is often associated with negative meanings and evil itself, on the basis of the narrative found in Genesis concerning original *sin, where the serpent plays an important role as the tempter. Already in the *Letter to *Diognetus* (12) the anonymous author speaks of the serpent's deception to the detriment of the first parents, which is associated with ignorance and opposed to the knowledge of God. The serpent is identified with the devil, the source of evil and the deceiver of Adam, by *Ignatius of Antioch, in his letter to the Christians of Tralles (10) and to those of the city of Philippi (11), where he calls it the "apostate," the rebel against God, the deceiver of *Adam and the one who inspired Cain, who dared even to the point of tempting Jesus in the desert. The same identification is understood in his letter to the Christians of Philadelphia (6; n.b., longer recension), where the serpent "preaches deception and error in order to destroy humankind." And the story of the deception of the serpent and his cursing in the book of Genesis is mentioned by *Justin Martyr (*Dial. Tr.* 79; 88; 124). Irenaeus (*AH* I,27) identified the serpent with the devil, the deceiver, whom he saw present in the heresies, and esp. in the *Ophite gnosis (ibid., 30), and in III,3 he mentioned that the full cursing of original sin falls on the serpent and not on the first parents (see IV, pref. 4 and 1; V, 21; 23; 26; fr. XV). And in IV,24 he stated that Christ on the cross "brought life to man [ἄνθρωπος] from the wound of the serpent." Even *Theophilus in his treatise *Ad Aut.* (II,21 and 28) thought that Satan was the one speaking through the serpent in Genesis, and *Tertullian recalled that the Fall was owed to the serpent's persuasion (*An.* 16; and *Ad Iud.* 2); in *An.* 21 he attributed evil to the serpent's instigation and not to our natural disposition; in *Carn.* 17 he saw an opposing parallel between Eve, who believed the serpent, and *Mary, who believed the angel, and in *Res.* 28 he foresaw that the ancient serpent, the same one from Genesis and Revelation, will be conquered and the dead will arise from the heart of death.

*Origen likewise (*Princ.* II,8,3, and III,2,1) interpreted the biblical serpent as an allegory of the evil spirit or as a spirit inspired by the evil one, and in his treatise *C. Cels.* (IV,36.39), he refuted, by referring to his own commentary on Genesis, *Celsus's criticism of the Genesis account, acc. to which God showed himself to be weaker than the serpent and incapable of convincing his own creatures, unlike the serpent. Origen, however, accused Celsus of confusing the Christians with the Ophites, gnostics who were not even Christians (ibid. VI,28.37.39). In *C. Cels.* VII,39 Origen interpreted the opening of the eyes of the two first parents, which was foretold by the serpent and which occurred after sin, as the opening of the eyes of the senses, which were initially closed, although they had their spiritual eyes open. If Origen associated the serpent with the Ophites, *Hippolytus of Rome (*Ref.* V,1.4.6.11-12.14; VI,7) associated it with the gnostic Naasenes, by retracing their name to the Hebrew *nahash*, "serpent"; with the Peratae,

who also appealed to the exegesis of the event recorded by Moses; and with the *Sethians. *Cyprian, in *Ep.* 33,2, identified the serpent with the devil and proclaimed his defeat by Christ thanks to the cross, therefore in 55,9 he could exhort Christians to martyrdom as a combat against the serpent, with the shield of faith. Cyprian would rebuke Demetrian for worshiping the serpent, which in the treatise *Ad Dem.* (16) is identified with the devil himself. *Methodius of Olympus (*Symp.* III,6) celebrated the victory of the Logos, God and man, over the serpent, i.e., the evil one who had brought damnation on all human beings.

Even *Gregory of Nyssa identified the serpent as Satan, e.g., by calling him "the evil one," ὁ Πονηρός (*Enc. in XL mart.*, PG 46,764,25), "the apostate serpent" (*C. Eun.* III,10.16 and *In Cant.* GNO VI,165,11), the "ancient serpent" (*Inscr. Ps.* GNO V,162,20) and the "Father of lies"; the serpent is also tied to the lie in the treatise *C. Eun.* (I,1,108) because he lied when he said that through disobedience the human being would assume the divine nature (likewise in *Vit. Mos.* 2,213). And in the treatise *Ant. adv. Apoll.* (GNO III,1,141) Gregory observed that the one who sins does not lack a *nous*, but only lacks an upright *dianoia*, "just as the serpent the beginner and discover of wickedness . . . was not said to lack a *nous*, but was even more astute than the other creatures." The serpent thus ended up becoming the symbol of wickedness (κακία), as in the *Vit. Mos.* (2,63), and Gregory, in *Ep.* 3,6-7 subsequently interpreted the enmity predicted between the woman and the serpent as the enmity between human beings and wickedness (κακία), which does not belong to human nature, so that the ancient precept "you will love your neighbor and hate your enemy" could be applied to one sole enemy, the enemy of all humankind, i.e., evil, sin. In the treatise *Vit. Mos.* (2,256) the serpent, as an incarnation of the sin of envy, is called "the father of death, the first entrance of sin, the root of wickedness, the origin of pain." The head of the serpent is the ability to invent new evils (*Diem natalem Christi*, PG 46, col. 1133,9). Furthermore, as already in the writings of Philo and Origen, upon whom he probably depended, Gregory of Nyssa interpreted the serpent as the allegory of pleasure (ἡδονή) and passion (πάθος), which follows it in the commentary *In Eccl.* (GNO V,348,15-16); "the pleasure of taste" in *Or. dom.* (280,27 and 284,10); pleasure in general that urges us to turn to an earthly and pitiable joy (ibid., 282,8 and 300,31) and *Opif. hom.* (197,27); and "wicked desire" in *Vit. Mos.* (2,275). Under the appearance of pleasure, the serpent caused the first parents to eat "the evil fruit of sin" (*Opif. hom.* 200,39); in various other cases Gregory also mentioned the pagan cults of the serpent (δράκων). In the work *In diem lum.* (GNO IX,223), in radical opposition to the serpent, Christ was called to correct our sin, to bring the human being to perfection (τέλειον) and to save him (σῴζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον). *Basil of Caesarea, in *Sermo* 21, alludes to Sir 21:2, likening the serpent to the woman and even sin, as shown in the study written by Nardi (see bibl.), which also offers a panorama of the symbolic meanings of the serpent in the classical, Jewish and gnostic world, where it was tied to the idea of virility, and the patristic world, where the serpent was seen mostly as a symbol of deception and seduction. With respect to the iconographic consequences of the theme from Genesis of the serpent, the OT Christian miniatures, esp. those depicting Eve and the serpent, seemed to derive not so much from Jewish models as much as Christian texts of the first centuries, as observed by F. De' Maffei (see bibl.).

The serpent is a symbol of a cunning that is not always negative, as in the previously mentioned text from Mt 10:16, which was cited by Ignatius of Antioch in the letter to *Polycarp (2), by *Clement of Alexandria in the *Stromata* (VII,12), and again by St. *Augustine in the *De Doctrina Christiana* (III,25[35]), where he used it to indicate an example of the positive meaning that the term "serpent" can acquire in Scripture, although its deception and destruction wrought upon Eve is an opposite example. But we esp. have a biblical episode, widely commented upon in the writings of the Fathers, where the serpent acquired a contrary meaning to the one assigned to it in Genesis: not of temptation and betrayal but of healing and salvation. In fact, the serpent lifted up by Moses in the desert on the wooden rod by God's order saves all those who are about to die and who look at it: the Fathers perceived therein a clear typological prefiguration of Jesus Christ, who saves human beings from death through his cross. Thus Ignatius of Antioch, in a letter to the Christians of Smyrna (2), also echoing Jn 12:32, mentions that "the Logos, when his flesh was lifted like the serpent of bronze in the desert, drew all human beings to himself for their eternal salvation." Although this statement appears within the longer recension of Ignatius's letters, the authenticity of which is debated and could date to the 4th c., the *Letter of Barnabas* (12), which is certainly from 2nd c., had already seen in the Mosaic episode the prefiguration of the salvation brought by the crucified one against the bites of the serpent which represent sin, the bearer of death, because of the first serpent-deceiver.

The same typological exegesis was widely developed by Justin Martyr, who in 1 *Apol.* 60 recalled the event with Moses and considered the serpent a prefiguration of the cross and also put it in parallel with a passage from the *Timaeus*, which he believed *Plato had taken from the Mosaic text, even though misunderstanding it. And in the *Dial.* (91-94 and 112), he presented an extensive interpretation of the event as a prefiguration of the mystery of the cross, "which has brought salvation to those who have been bitten by the serpent" (*Dial.*, 100). Christ is therefore the new serpent raised on the wood that neutralizes the moral effects of the ancient serpent's deception: it is not by chance that the same animal assumes these antithetical meanings: the opposing parallel is therefore all-encompassing. Christ is not only the serpent but is also the true μυστήριον. As such Christ was opposed by Justin to the μυστήριον established by the serpent of the pagan mystery cults, which is none other than Satan (1 *Apol.* 27-28), acc. to the well-developed identification of the serpent as Satan who tempted Jesus in the desert (*Dial.*103, 125), and as the "wicked spirit and the deceiver" (*Dial.* 39), which will persecute Christians until the parousia, when Christ will destroy "the serpent who sinned from the beginning" and will condemn death (*Dial.*, 45). Justin Martyr ascribed to the "deceiving serpent" the pagan counterfeiting of the Jewish-Christian truths (*Dial.*, 70). The serpent of the pagan mysteries was also mentioned by *Clement of Alexandria, who identified it with the devil, who led the first parents to death and who was, however, defeated by Jesus Christ (*Protr.* 1-2); Clement also allegorically interpreted this serpent in the book of Genesis as a symbol of pleasure (*Protr.* 11); similarly he called Satan the "deceiving serpent" (*Paed.* III,2) and said that Satan was the one to have Daniel thrown into the den of lions (*Strom.* I,21).

Likewise, Tertullian (*Ap.* 21 or *Cor.* 7) cursed the snakelike divinities of paganism, and he also allegorically interpreted the snake lifted up by Moses in the desert as a type of the cross (*Idol.* 5, *Marc.* II, 22; in III, 18 and *Iud.* 10), which has delivered us from the serpents, i.e., the devils who lead people to evil, recalling that the deeds that occurred to the people of Israel occurred figuratively, that is to say, in a typological manner. This salvation was granted even though the Israelites were suffering a just punishment for the idolatry into which they had fallen. Tertullian interpreted God's victory over the serpent prophesied by Isaiah as a victory over Satan (*Adv. Marc.* IV,24; Origen did the same in *Princ.* III,2,1). And in the appendix to the treatise *Scorpiace*, against the heresies, Tertullian affirmed that among the reasons for the veneration of the serpent by the Ophite gnostics there was also, specifically, the event recorded by Moses of the lifting of the serpent on the wood, as in the case of the Peretae mentioned by Hippolytus of Rome. Gregory of Nyssa also interpreted "the serpent of bronze lifted up, which saved the people from lethal bites," as a symbol of the "οἰκονομία which has come about by means of the cross for our salvation" (*In Cant.*—GNO VI,8,3-6; lilkewise in *Vit. Mos.* 2,31-33 and 275-277), where the typological assimilation of Jesus to a serpent, which is at first sight contradictory, is explained by the fact that the serpent was a symbol of sin and Jesus on the cross has been imputed with our sins so as to remove them (*Vit. Macr.* 24,13). St. Augustine also interpreted the Mosaic event as a prefiguration of Christ's salvific cross (*Civ. Dei* X,8, *C. Faust. Man.* XII,28-30 and XIV,8, and *Doctr. chr.* III,10[20]), and he identified the serpent with the devil, ascribing subtlety to him, as St. Paul had done (*Civ. Dei* XIV,9); therefore he clarified that the devil chose the serpent as a means of expression to deceive the first human beings, who not only sinned but also refused to recognize their fault, by attributing their own responsibility to others, the woman or the serpent (*Civ. Dei* XIV,11[14]). And the condemnation of the serpent (*Civ. Dei* XV,7) pronounced by God, Augustine maintained, was directed toward the devil, whose deception was owed to envy (*Civ. Dei* XV,23). And in *Doctr. chr.* I,14 Augustine affirmed that although the "wisdom" of the serpent imprisoned us, the "folly" of God (in the sense found in Paul's writings) has delivered us.

The presence of the serpent, mostly as a symbol, in the writings of the Fathers is extremely conspicuous; and it is not even remotely possible to give a full account of it. Only a few more details need to be mentioned. *Severian of Gabala, the bishop-lecturer who was an opponent of *John Chrysostom, among his various orations, esp. on the book of Genesis, also composed one *On the Serpent* (CPG 4196; see S. Voicu, *Fogli copti di Severiano di Gabala, De Serpente*: Augustinianum 34 [1994] 471-474). Árpád Nagy, in his essay *Figuring out the Anguipede and His Relation to Judaism*: JRA 15 (2002) 159-172, analyzed the ancient iconography of the snakelike divinities and maintained that the Hebrew root *gbr* designated various powers of the God of Israel and could in turn be connected to various attributes of the snake, whose image does not directly represent the God of Israel or even the name of God which was transposed on the image as a result of the influence of Greco-Roman culture on Jewish culture during the 1st–4th c. AD. During these same centu-

ries, I have observed that in the Christian milieu there developed the typological theology of Christ as a salvific serpent raised on the wood, who was prefigured by the serpent which Moses lifted up in the desert.

Finally, in the writings of the Fathers the serpent very often took on a symbolic meaning, mostly in connection with Satan and evil, and as an allegory of pleasure, cunning and temptation, but it could also assume an entirely antithetical meaning, as a type of Christ in his full salvific power, exclusively in reference to the Mosaic event of the serpent lifted up in the desert and to the already existing biblical reflections on it in the book of Wisdom and the gospel of *John, all texts that were well known by the Fathers and that certainly influenced their exegesis.

The motif of the serpent also extended to Christian culture in general and iconographic representations. One particular application, e.g., can be found on the Constantinian coin, acc. to C.M. Odahl, *An Eschatological Interpretation of Constantine's Labarum Coin*: San 6 (1975) 47-51. Depicting on the back a serpent pierced through by a Christian symbol, the coin represents and celebrates the end of the imperial persecutions, although it does not invite one to attack the pagans, which did not occur under the reign of *Constantine, but subsequently, when Christianization also passed through the repression of *paganism. As M.G. Mara explored in her article, *Memorie pagane nella cristianizzazione della Sabina*: SMSR 20 (1996) 287-292, the analysis of the sources pertaining to the expansion of Christianity in Sabina reveals that, before this process, snakelike pagan divinities were worshiped in the area, as shown esp. by the legend connected to the Grotto of St. Michael the Archangel on Monte Tancia or Monte San Giovanni, where Michael defeated a serpent or a dragon: it was the symbol of Christianity's victory over the local pagan cults. We already hinted at the symbolic meaning of the serpent in gnosticism, where a considerable ramification is represented by the so-called Ophite gnosis, whose connection to the serpent we have seen was taken from the heresiologies. It is not by chance that the serpent Chnoubis was an Egyptian iconographic object of the theological sort, which was widely present on gnostic gemstones, as Attilio Mastrocinque has shown in his study *Le gemme gnostiche*, in *Sylloge gemmarum gnosticarum* (A. Mastrocinque, ed., Rome 2004, I:51-112).

E. Küster, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion*, Giessen 1913; S. Davis, *The Snake Cult in Greece and the Oracle of Apollo*: Scientia 47 no. 88 (1953) 83-86; R. Merkelbach, *Drache*: RAC 4 (1959) 226-250; B. Goldman, *A Snake Goddess, Asiatic Demonology and the Gorgon*: AJA 45 (1961) 189; A. Oikonomides, *Amphiaraos, Hypsipyle and the Snake*: VTu 4 (1965) 75-78; R. Luyster, *Symbolic Elements in the Cult of Athena*: HR 5 (1965) 133-163; W. Taylour, *New Light on Mycenaean Religion*: Antiquity 44 (1970) 270-280; M. Mayer Modena, *Il tabù linguistico e alcune denominazioni del serpente in semitico*: Acme 35 (1982) 173-190; R. Hägg - Y. Lindau, *The Minoan "Snake Frame" Reconsidered*: OAth 15 (1984) 67-77; D. Sansone, *The Survival of the Bronze Age Demon*: ICS 13 (1988) 1-17; D. Barrett, *Lucretius' Snake, DRN 3.657-9*: LCM 15 (1990) 144; G.A. Samonà, *Il Sole, la terra, il serpente: antichi miti di morte, interpretazioni moderne e problemi di comparazione storico-religiosa*, Rome 1991; K. Wellesley, *Lucretius' Snake Dissected*: LCM 16 (1991) 41-42; F. Vattioni, *Nḥš ṭb = serpente buono?*: Studi Classici e Orientali 41 (1991) 457-463; V. Karageorghis, *Miscellanea from Late Bronze Age Cyprus*: Levant 24 (1992) 212-217; P. James, *Pentheus Anguigena*: BICS 38 (1991-93) 81-93; R. Simonetta, *Nascita dell'oracolo di Trofonio*: Aevum 68 (1994) 27-32; M. Sancassano, *Il lessico greco del s.*: Athenaeum 84 (1996) 49-70; Id., *Il mistero del s.*: Athenaeum 85 (1997) 355-390; Id., *Il serpente e le sue immagini*, Como 1997; M.D. Reeve, *A Rejuvenated Snake*: AAntHung 37 (1996-97) 245-258; M. Leigh, *Lucan and the Libyan Tale*: JRS 90 (2000) 95-109; K. Lapatin, *Journeys of an Icon*: JMA 13 (2000) 127-154; Id., *Mysteries of the Snake Goddess*, Boston 2002; A. Kerkeslager, *The Apophis Snake on a Coin of Domitian from Alexandria*: NC 161 (2001) 287-290; H. Egli, *Das Schlangensymbol: Geschichte, Märchen, Mythos*, Düsseldorf 2003; A. Trcková-Schulzová, *Motif of the Snake and Its Meanings in the Minoan Iconography*: Eirene 39 (2003) 119-149; M.W. Janan, *The Snake Sheds Its Skin*: CPh 99 (2004) 130-146; C. Ulbert - J.C. Wulfmeier - I. Huld-Zetsche, *Ritual Deposits of Mithraic Cult Vessels*: JRA 17 (2004) 354-370; I. Ramelli, *San Giustino Martire: il multiforme uso di* mystérion *e il lessico dell'esegesi tipologica delle Scritture*, in *Il volto del mistero. Mistero e religione nella cultura religiosa tardoantica*, ed. A.M. Mazzanti, Castel Bolognese 2006, 35-66; Id., Mystérion *negli* Stromateis *di Clemente Alessandrino: aspetti di continuità con la tradizione allegorica greca*, ibid., 83-120; C. Nardi, *"Donna come s.": l'uso di Sir. 21, 2A nell'Omelia XXI di Basilio Magno*: AATC 58 (1993) 87-130; F. De' Maffei, *Eva e il serpente*: RSBN 17-19 (1980-82) 13-35.

I. Ramelli

SERVANUS. The legendary *Passio* brings to life a Scottish bishop-saint by the name of Servanus, who flourished perhaps in the 7th c., in every sort of adventure. The center of the saint's activity and later his cult was the monastery of Culross in Scotland. According to others, Servanus lived in the 5th c. and was a disciple of *Palladius, the missionary of Scotland and the teacher of Kentigern. His feast day is on 1 July. Servan is the name of the British town in which he was born and buried and is also the place where Louis Duchesne lived, the famous editor of the *Liber pontificalis*.

BHL 7609-7610; BBKL 9, 1466; A. MacQuarrie, *Vita Sancti Servani. The Life of St Serf*: The Innes Review 44 (1993) 122-152; BBKL 11, 1466.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

SERVATIUS of Tongres (d. ca. 384). First certain Bishop of Tongres, capital of Tongres in the E part of Belgium, which in the 4th c. belonged to the province of Germania Secunda. Servatius took part in the anti-*Arian struggle of the mid-4th c. and at the Councils of *Serdica (343; today Sofia), where one finds his signature at the Councils of Sarbatios and *Rimini (359), showing him to be a zealous defender of orthodoxy. He also intervened at the supposed Council of Cologne (346), but the conciliar document is a forgery from the 8th c. He was sent as an ambassador to the court of the emperor *Constantius by the usurper Magnentius in 350, in order to obtain recognition from the legitimate emperor. He was also remembered as the builder of two churches, one at Tongern, which has been confirmed by excavations, and the other at Maastricht (Traiectum). We do not know of the date of his death. *Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* 2,5; *Gl. conf.* 71) notes that, miraculously warned of the invasion of the Huns, he went to die at Maastricht, which then became an episcopal see. His veneration is attested since the 5th c. According to legend, he was born in *Armenia and was a relative of Jesus Christ and a disciple of *Peter. His feast day appears in the *Codex Wissemburgensis* from the *Mart. hier.* for 13 May.

BHL 7611-7641; BBKL 17, 1290; R. de la Haye, *In welke eeuw leefde St. Servas*?: De Maasgouw 1 (1994) 5-28.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

SERVUS DEI. A title that could have originated from the heading of some canonical letters (Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1; Tit 1:1; Jas 1:1) with which the respective authors declare their standing before God and, more specifically, Jesus Christ. In the OT, the expression was used to refer to one's dependence on God: Moses, in the Vulgate, was called the *servus Dei* (2 Chr 24:9). As early as *Tertullian the term was used to refer to Christians, who among each other are fellow servants (*conservi*, *Adv. Marc.* 4,29; *De paen.* 10,4). Women were called "servants of the living God, fellow servants and my sisters" (see *De cultu fem.* 2,1). Latin authors such as *Cyprian and *Lactantius likewise apply these terms to all Christians. *Augustine also used the expression *servus Dei* to refer to believers (*In Ioh. Tr.* 10,7). Augustine presented himself as "*Augustinus episcopus, servus Christi servorumque Christi*" (*De bono viduit.*, see the heading; *De. pecc. meritis* 3,1; *Ep.* 130,1; see *Ep.* 217). Monica was called *servorum tuorum* (*Conf.* 9,9,22). In Augustine's writings the expression also acquired another meaning, referring to the persons dedicated to God in attaining to perfection by living acc. to the apostolic model (*Deo servientes—Civ. Dei* 22,8,3; *Ep.* 186,1), but he esp. makes reference to the monks: *servi Dei monachi*, who at that time were laypeople (*Ep.* 220,4; *Serm.* 356,15). Yet in ecclesiastical jargon along with other similar phrases (*ancilla Dei*, *famulus Dei*), the formula has become a common figure without any allusion to the virtue of humility or one's way of life. Pope *Damasus called himself *beatissimorum martyrum cultor Damasus episcopus*, *servus Dei.* Other popes were content with the title *famulus Dei.* From these simple formulas developed more complex ones such as *servus servorum Dei* by Pope *Gregory I, which became customary in the pontifical chancery and then beneficially copied by a bishop here or there (see Bede, *Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II,4). When Gregory I used the title in his correspondence with *John IV the Faster, patriarch of *Constantinople, who had proclaimed himself "ecumenical patriarch" (*John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii* II,1), he was only adopting a formula that was dear to him and one that he had already used. The title *servus Dei* was given to bishops, priests and monks; in the Code of Canon Law it is reserved for the Christian whose process of beatification has begun.

Gregory I, *Reg. Epist.*; *In Ezec.*, *praef.*; *Mor. in Job*; A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 189; DACL 1, 1973-1993; 5, 1007-1114; 15, 1360-1363; EC 11, 420-422; I. Schuster, *Il titolo di "Servus Dei" nell'epistolario di S. Gregorio M.*: Scuola Catt. 73 (1945) 137-138; M. Colombás, *El concepto de monje y vida monástica hasta fines del siglo V*: StudMon 1 (1959) 257-342; L. Johan van der Lof, *The Threefold Meaning of Servi Dei in the Writings of Saint Augustine*: Augustinian Studies 12 (1981) 43-59; A. Zumkeller, *Augustine's Ideal of the Religious Life*, New York 1986; G.P. Lawless, *An Augustine Glossary of Monastic Terms*, in *Homo spiritalis. Festgabe für L. Verheijen*, ed. von C. Mayer - K.H. Chelius, Würzburg 1987, 276-294; J. Sepulcre, *Léxico monástico en las cartas de San Agustín*: Revista agustiniana 34 (1993) 799-829.

E. Peretto - A. Di Berardino

SETHIANS. *Gnostic sectarians who derived their name from Seth, a figure who had a particularly important role in the mythology of the sect. The most ancient heresiological testimony available is that of ps.-Tertullian (*Adv. omnes haer.* 2), who names the *Sethoitae* after the *Ophites and *Cainites; but his presentation of the sect and its teachings is rather confusing. *Epiphanius's note (*Panar.* XXXIX, 1-5), which depends in part on ps.-Tertullian, is, however, more precise and detailed. The later heresiological sources (*Filaster, *Isidore of Seville, *John of Damascus etc.) are all depen-

dent on Epiphanius and therefore do not add new information. Likewise, through the heresiological testimonies, there also existed other groups that in one way or another appealed to the figure of Seth. In particular, *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer. I*, *7,5*), when speaking of the *Valentinians, attributed their division of humankind into three groups: the pneumatics, psychics and the hylics, corresponding respectively to Seth, Abel and Cain. The Sethians concerning whom ps.-*Hippolytus spoke (*Ref.* V, 19,1–22,1) have no relation to the heretics of the same name to which ps.-Tertullian and Epiphanius make reference and should rather be identified with the group concerning which Irenaeus spoke in the aforementioned passage.

Interest for the Sethian gnostic groups was reawakened by the discovery of the texts from *Nag Hammadi, in many of which Seth seems to be a figure of central importance. Some scholars (e.g., H.M. Schencke) maintain that they are able to individuate, on the basis of this new documentation, the lines of an autonomous and coherent Sethian doctrinal system. The texts of Nag Hammadi to which he refers are the following: *The Apocryphon of John* (BG 8502; NHC II,1; III,1; VI,1); the *Hypostasis of the Archons* (NHC II,4); the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (NHC III,2); the *Apocalypse of Adam* (NHC V,5); the *Three Steles of Seth* (NHC VII,5); *Zostriano* (NHC VIII,1); *Melchizedek* (NHC IX,1); *The Thought of Norea* (NHC IX,2); the *Trimorphic Protennoia* (NHC XIII,1). The adherents of this gnostic group were aware of the fact that they represented the physical and, at the same time, spiritual progeny of Seth; inasmuch as they are descendents of Seth, they are φύσει σωζόμενοι and Seth is their savior-revealer. Other characteristic elements of this doctrinal system are the divine triad (primordial father, Barbelos, αὐτογενής); the four illuminatory aeons (Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithe and Eleleth); and a theological outline of history and an outline of the theology of history. In some of these treatises, one can see an open appeal to the typical questions of the Platonic philosophical condition. The hypothesis of the existence of a sectarian group of "Sethians" or a Sethian doctrinal system organically structured is, however, still heavily debated.

F. Wisse, *The Sethians and the Nag Hammadi Library*: SBL Seminar Papers (1972) 601-607; H.M. Schenke, *Das sethianische System nach Nag-Hammadi-Handschriften*: Studia Coptica (ed. P. Nagel), Berlin 1974, 165-173; A.F.J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature*, Leiden 1977 (with bibl.); B. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, in Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven (Connecticut), March 28-31, 1978, II: *Sethian Gnosticism*, Leiden 1981; J.-M. Sevrin, *Le dossier baptismal séthien*, Québec (Canada) 1986; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, Leuven 2001.

C. Gianotto

SÉTIF. The city corresponding to the ancient Sitifis, belonging to Mauritania, it became a colony under Nerva (AD 96–98), and under *Diocletian (end of the 3rd c.) it was the capital and most important center of Mauritania Sitifiana. *Theodosius, the father of the emperor, in his struggle against Firmus, who had rebelled against him in 372, established his general quarters there (*Ammianus Marcellinus, 29,5,7.50.56). At the time of *Augustine it underwent an earthquake, which forced the inhabitants to abandon the city and to camp out for some 15 days in the countryside: at that time 2,000 people asked for *baptism (Aug., *Serm*. 19,6). During the *Vandal occupation, Sétif and its region temporarily returned and became part of the empire (442–455). Reoccupied by the *Byzantines, it again became the capital of Mauritania I; during this period, Solomon established there a new circle of much tighter walls. It remained a flourishing city during the first two centuries of the Arab occupation and fell into ruin only because of Ketania. It is not possible to invoke the inscription of Sertoria (CIL 8,8647) as a convincing argument for speaking of Christianity at Sétif in the 3rd c. In fact, the dove and the palm were not specifically Christian symbols. Moreover, the epigraph was not dated.

The proofs for a Christian presence in the city only appear at the end of the 4th c., with the inscriptions, and in the 5th c., with bishops. The inscriptions are funerary: they were discovered by P.A. Février in the basilicas he excavated. They form a continuous series from 378 to 429 (one is from 471), and they are not characterized by any specifically Christian symbol, with the exception of the Constantinian *monogram, which appears during a later era. With respect to the worship buildings, Mesnage counted there half a dozen temples and two were the objects of publication by Février.

We know the names of the following bishops: (1) Severus, beginning of the 5th c. (Aug., *Ep.* 111,7); (2) Novatus, his successor, 403–440 (*conc. Carth.* 419; Aug., *Ep.* 185,220; CIL 8,8634), and his rival from the *Donatist party Martian; (3) Lawrence, who dedicated a church to his patron saint in 452 (CIL 8,8630); (4) Donatus, 484; (5) Optatus, 525. Sétif is likewise mentioned as an episcopal see in the *Thronos alexandrinos* from the 8th c. and the list of Leo VI, also known as the Wise, in 883.

PWK 5, 393; DACL 15, 1363-1384; P.A. Février, *Fouilles de Sétif. Les basiliques chrétiennes du quartier nord-ouest*, Paris 1965; Id., *Fouilles de Sétif. Quartier nord-ouest. Rempart et cirque*, Alger 1978; R. Guéry, *La nécropole orientale de Sitifis (Sétif, Algérie): fouilles de 1966-1967*, Paris 1985.

V. Saxer

SEVEN MARTYRS of CAPSA. All the MSS of *Victor of Vita's *Historia persecutionis*, with the exception of certain MSS containing many lacunae, contain in the appendix the *Passio beatissimorum martyrum* of the seven "brothers" in the faith; the same *Historia* (III,41) makes a brief (interpolated?) mention of their martyrdom at *Carthage. Some scholars are of the view that the *Passio* was not written by Victor but by an anonymous author. In 484, the *Vandal king *Huneric, an *Arian, unleashed a persecution against the Catholics, exiling the clergy. In this milieu seven "brothers," who lived together in a monastery at Capsa (today the important city of Gafsa, in *Byzacena)—the deacon Boniface, the subdeacons Servus and Rusticus, the abbot Liberatus, and the monks Rogatus, Septimus and Maximus—were brought to Carthage, locked in prison and tortured to bring about their apostasy. When Huneric was unable to accomplish this, he had them killed; their bodies were thrown into the ocean but were carried back to shore by the waves. The Augustinian order celebrates 26 August as their feast day because it surmises that these individuals lived in the spirit of Augustinian monasticism.

BHL 4906; *Comm. Martyrologium Romanum* 343; AASS. *Aug.* 3, 454-457; BS 8, 16; G. Capello, *Il latino di Vittore di Vita*: Atti della Società italiana per il progresso delle Scienze 25 (1936) 74-108; S. Costanza, *Vittore di Vita. Storia della persecuzione vandalica in Africa*, Rome 1981; J. Moorhead, *Victor of Vita: History of the Vandal Persecution*, Liverpool 1992; S. Lancel, *Victor de Vita*, Paris 2002, 69-71 (discussion), 213-220 (text in Fr. tr.).

A. Di Berardino

SEVEN SLEEPERS of EPHESUS. The legend, acc. to the argumentation offered by Honigmann, originated in the middle of the 5th c. at *Ephesus by the work of its bishop *Stephen, who intended to increase the prestige and the power of the see of Ephesus. In fact Stephen's name appears on one of the MSS that narrates the events and was subsequently omitted or changed because he had participated at the "Robber Council of Ephesus," in 449. The first Greek redaction was immediately changed; moreover, it has numerous variations acc. to the tradition in which it has come down to us. It constitutes part of the theme of the individual who falls asleep and upon awaking finds that in the meantime the world has changed. The most ancient mentions of this story are those of *Jacob of Sarug (d. 521), *Zachariah Scholasticus (ca. 550) and *John of Ephesus (died 585) in the East, and in the West the pilgrim Theodosius (ca. 530; *De situ terrae Sanctae* 26: *In provincia Asia civitas Epheso, ubi sunt septem fratres dormientes* (CCL 175,123), who also gives their names, and *Gregory of Tours (d. 594) (*Gloria mart.* 94: *MGH SS. Rer. Mer.* I,2; n. 95; PL 71,787ff.). Paul the Deacon (*Hist.* I,4) narrates something similar, but in a different context: in a place in Germany the bodies of seven Christians with their garments are preserved intact. Photius had partly read through a passion about the seven young men (*Bibliot.*, *Cod.* 253, ed. R. Henry, 7,209-211), for which he offers a summary. The legend situated at Ephesus narrates that the emperor *Decius (249–251) went into a city, ordering that all people sacrifice to the pagan gods. Seven young men of noble birth, who were accused of being Christian, were brought before the emperor, who, being young, granted them time to reflect and recant. Taking advantage of the situation, they hid themselves in a grotto of a nearby mountain. Upon their return to the city, Decius ordered that they be sought out, and he found them through the betrayal of their parents; because they had remained faithful to the faith, they were enclosed alive in a cavern, the entry of which was sealed shut. After nearly two centuries, under the emperor *Theodosius II (d. 450), a shepherd (or owner) of the place opened the walled entrance to the cavern and the seven young men awoke, believing that they had slept only one night. One of them went to the city to buy food with a coin from the time of Decius; he found, however, that everything had changed and that nothing was recognizable on account of the presence of a large cross at the door of the city. He was then arrested because he was using a coin from the time of Decius and was brought before the governor and the bishop, before whom he laid out his story. Investigators went to the grotto, along with the emperor Theodosius, where they found the other young men. They recounted their story and immediately fell asleep in peace. The young men were buried one alongside the other; the emperor ordered the construction of a church on their tomb. The names of these young men vary acc. to the literary tradition. For Symeon Metaphastes their names are as follows: Maximillianus, Jamblicus, Martinus, Joannes, Dionysius, Exacudadius and Antoninus; for *Gregory of Tours: Maximian, Malcom, Martinianus, Constantine, Dionysius, John and Serapion. Other names are found in other contexts.

Butler sets forth the hypothesis that the legend could have a basis in the fact that the seven young men were killed and buried and their bodies were rediscovered in 479; this hypothesis, however, was refuted by the arguments set forth by Honigman. In any case, it was useful for proving the resurrection of the body. The story of seven young men was widespread in many cultures and languages: in Europe through the *Legenda aurea* written by Jacobus de Varagine, in the Greek world through the work of Symeon Metaphrastes, as well as in other Eastern regions and other languages.

There exists at Ephesus the monumental memoria beneath the gorge on the E slope of the Panayidağ, where, acc. to tradition, the seven young men were buried; it is a cemetery where Christians and Muslims still go. In 1927 it was excavated by F. Miltener, who among other things found the remains of a church, other buildings, around 700 tombs and more than 2,000 lanterns. This archaeologist dates the complex to the mid-5th c. The legend is found in the Qur'an (sura 18), which also speaks of the presence of a dog who must awake the saints, but it does not offer the location. A mosque at Chenini, 18 km (11.2 mi) from Tatouine in S Tunisia, is connected to the legend: in that place seven Christians were imprisoned and shut in prison by the Romans; they could not find rest until they became Muslims. In the Roman Martyrology, the feast is dated to 27 July (Maximianus, Malchus, Martinianus, Dionysius, Joannes, Serapion and Constantinus), although in the Byzantine calendar it is set for 4 August and 22 October.

BHG 1593-1599d; *Auctarium* 1969, p. 163; *Novum Auctarium* 1984, p. 184; BHO 1012-1022; BHL 2313-2319; AASS. Iulii, VI, 375-397; Symeon Metaphrastes: PG 115, 427-448; DACL 15, 1251-1262; BS 11, 900-907 (extensive bibl.); LTK[3] 9, 563-565; RBK 2, 192ff.; E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, New York 1962, ch. 33; I. Guidi, *Testi orientali inediti sopra i Sette Dormienti di Efeso*: Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, MAL, III, serie 11 (1984) 343-445 (with It. tr.); B. Krush: AB 12 (1893) 371-387; M. Huber, *Textbeiträge zur Siebenschläferlegende des Mittelalters*: Romanische Forschungen 26 (1909) 462-583; 825-836; Id., *Die Wanderlegende von den Siebenschläfern: eine literargeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Leipzig 1910; A. Allgeier, *Der Ursprung der griechischen Siebenschläferlegend*: Byzantinisch-neugriegische Jahrb 3 (1922) 311-323; P. Peeters, *Le texte original de la Passion des Sept Dormants*: AB 41 (1923) 369-385; I. Lévy, *Le chien des Sept Dormants*: Annales de l'Institut de philosophie 2 (1934) 579-584; C. Praschinkler - F. Miltner - H. Gerstinger, *Das Cömeterium der Sieben Schläfer*, Baden 1937; E. Honigmann, *Stephen of Ephesus (April 15, 448–Oct. 29, 451) and the Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, ST 173, Vatican City 1953, 125-168 (see AB 72 [1954] 265-266); L. Massignon, *Les Sept Dormants d'Éphèse (Ahl-Al-Kahf) en Islam et en Chrétienté*, in *Opera Minora*, III, Paris 1969, 104-160 (see J. Dumont, *Sur le culte des VII Dormants d'Éphèse, notamment au Luxembourg*: Bulletin linguistique et etnographique 7 [1952] 30-48); F. Benoît, *La Madeleine et les Dormants d'Éphèse*: Provence Historique 12 (1962) 233-235; J. van der Straeten, *Translation d'un bras de S. Maximien un des Sept Dormants*: AB 89 (1971) 363-369; J. Bonnet, *Artémis d'Éphèse et la légende des sept dormants*, Paris 1977; A. Le Roux, *Les Sept Dormants d'Éphèse: leur culte en Asie Mineure, en Afrique du Nord et en Bretagne*, Gourin 1999; R. Pillinger, *Piccola guida al cimitero dei Sette Dormienti ad Efeso*, in *Atti dell'VIII simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni apostolo*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 2001, 275-286; S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-ecclesiastici in Oriente nella tarda antichità. Il II Concilio di Efeso (449)*, Madrid 2001, 115ff.; *I sette dormienti: una leggenda fra Oriente e Occidente, [scritti di] Gregorio di Tours, Fozio; con un saggio di Louis Massignon*, intr. by G. Avezzù, Milan 2002 (contains the *Passio septem dormientium apud Ephesum* by Gregory and Codex 253 of Photius's *Bibliotheca*); V. Rosen, *Testi orientali inediti sopra i sette dormienti di Efeso* [n.d.].

A. Di Berardino

SEVERIAN of Gabala (d. 408/425). In 399–400, following the example of his contemporary Antiochus of Ptolemy, Severian left the city of Gabala (modern-day *Jeble-Ğabla*, on the Syrian coast) to seek success as a preacher in *Constantinople. His success was so great that *John Chrysostom appointed him, at the end of 401, as his vicar before leaving on his trip to Ephesus. The incidents caused by Severian's prying attitude made a public reconciliation necessary (summer 402), which turned out not to last very long, because at the Synod of the *Oak (403) Severian was one of John Chrysostom's accusers. Forced to leave Constantinople in 404, Severian was able to impose *Porphyry at *Antioch as the successor of Bishop *Flavian. All trace of him is then lost. *Gennadius of Marseille (*De vir. ill.* 21) dates his death under the reign of the emperor *Theodosius II (408–450), but Severian was probably already dead by 425, and certainly before the Council of *Ephesus (431). Although *Syriac was his mother tongue, only Severian's original works in Greek have survived: a corpus of homilies, to which are adjoined fragments of a commentary on *Paul's letters transmitted by the catenae. On account of their stylistic diversity, the two groups of texts do not seem to go back to one author, but the broken transmission of both prohibits one from reaching a definitive judgment on this question.

Severian's homilies are often cited by the 5th- and 6th-c. *florilegia, but in the direct transmission they exist almost exclusively under the name of John Chrysostom. This change of attribution, which occurred around the mid-6th c. (perhaps to avoid confusion with *Severus of Antioch, who was condemned in 536), is so generalized that recognition of its authentic authorship has become difficult and controversial, which is also complicated by the unreliability of the indirect transmission and by the

existence of ps.-Severian homilies in various languages (Greek, *Coptic, *Armenian, Arabic, Syriac and Latin).

Stylistic analysis has allowed scholars to reconstruct a corpus of more than 60 homilies, all dating back to the beginning of the Constantinopolitan period (399–402), which are generally long and disjointed, with consistent changes of theme. In his preaching, theoretical concerns prevail, esp. in the defense of the faith of *Nicaea and *trinitarian doctrine, but without substantial reflection on these topics. With the exception of a few exhortations to *almsgiving, he seems to have had little interest in ethical issues. Occasionally he displays exceptional philological erudition, but some of his biblical etymologies can only be explained by using the Syriac language as a point of departure.

His exegetical positions, which have not been studied very much, reflect various influences: the cosmology is generally Antiochene; well-noted analogies with *Eusebius of Emesa can be perceived in his exegetical terminology, even if Severian did not reject recourse to traditional allegories. At times his arguments were ancient and worthy of note, and they often depended on *Theophilus of Antioch's writings. Zellinger demonstrated that he had close contacts with *Ephrem.

CPG 4185-4295; DSp 14, 752-763; DTC 14, 2000-2006; BBKL 9, 1487-1504 (unreliable); H.D. Altendorf, *Zur Bischofsliste von Gabala*: ZNTW 50 (1959) 48-61; Id., *Untersuchungen zu Severian von Gabala*, Tübingen 1957 (diss.).

Authenticity: S.J. Voicu, *In illud: Quando ipsi subiciet omnia* (*CPG 4761*), *una omelia di Severiano di Gabala?*: Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici 27-29, n.s. 17-19 (1980-82) 5-11; Id., *Nuove restituzioni a Severiano di Gabala*: Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici 30-31, n.s. 20-21 (1983-84) 3-24; P. Regtuit, *Severian of Gabala and John Chrysostom: The Problem of Authenticity*, in *Philohistôr. Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii*, eds. A. Schoors - P. Van Deun (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 60), Leuven 1994, 135-149; K.-H. Uthemann, *Kriterien zur Abgrenzung der Homilien Severians von Gabala unter den Pseudo-Chrysostomica*, SP 20, Leuven 1989, 61-69 (unreliable); S.J. Voicu, *Confusioni e restituzioni: Severo e Severiano*: Orpheus n.s. 16 (1995) 434-440; Id., *L'omelia "In lotionem pedum"* (*CPG 4216*) *di Severiano di Gabala: Due note*: Muséon 107 (1994) 349-365; Id., *Il nome cancellato: la trasmissione delle omelie di Severiano di Gabala*: RHT n.s. 1 (2006) 317-333.

Homilies: PG 48-65 (passim); M. Aubineau, *Un traité inédit de christologie de Sévérien de Gabala "in Centurionem et contra Manichaeos et Apollinaristas"* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 5), Geneva 1983; P. Nautin, *L'homélie de Sévérien de Gabala "Sur le Centurion contre les Manichéens et les Apollinaristes." Remarques sur le texte et l'interprétation*: VChr 38 (1984) 393-399; M. Aubineau, *Sévérien de Gabala, "De Spiritu sancto." Histoire des éditions et récupération de la fin d'un texte, amputé dans la Patrologie grecque*, in *Polyanthema. Studi di letteratura cristiana antica offerti a Salvatore Costanza.* 1 (Studi Tardoantichi 7), Messina 1989, 37-47; R.E. Carter, *A Greek Homily on the Temptation (CPG 4906) by Severian of Gabala: Introduction, Critical Edition and Translation*: Traditio 52 (1997) 47-71; K.I. Dyobouniotes [Δυοβουνιώτης], "'Ιωάννου Δαμασκηνοῦ Λόγοι ἀνέκδοτοι": Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος 13 (1914) 58-69, 119-149; S. Haidacher, *Drei unedierte Chrysostomus-Texte einer Baseler Handschrift.* II: ZKTh 31 (1907) 141-171; Ch. Martin, *Note sur l'homélie de Sévérien de Gabala in illud: Pater, transeat a me calix iste* (*Mt 26,39*): Muséon 48 (1935) 311-321; A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας. I, Petroupolis 1891, 15-26; A. Olivar, *Sancti Petri Chrysologi Collectio sermonum a Felice episcopo parata, sermonibus extravagantibus adiectis.* III (CCL 24B), Turnholti 1982, 927-930; R.F. Regtuit, *Severian of Gabala, Homily on the Incarnation of Christ* (*CPG 4204*)*: Text, Translation and Introduction*, Amsterdam 1992; H. Savile, Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου . . . , Eton 1612-13, 5, 648-653, 898-906; K.-H. Uthemann - R.F. Regtuit - J.M. Tevel, *Homiliae Pseudo-Chrysostomicae. Instrumentum studiorum.* I, Turnhout 1994, 59-65, 89-102, 107-117, 124-138, 146-153, 165-172, 185-201; A. Wenger, *Notes inédites sur les empereurs Théodose I, Arcadius, Théodose II, Léon I*: REB 10 (1952) 47-59; A. Wenger, *Une homélie inédite de Sévérien de Gabala sur le lavement des pieds*: REB 25 (1967) 219-234; B.S. Pseutogas, "'Η ψευδοχρυσοστόμεια ὁμιλία στόν Τίμιο καί Ζωοποιό Σταυρό (*BHG*[3] *415*[m] and *415*[n]) εἶναι τοῦ Σεβεριανοῦ Γαβάλων": Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς 62 (1979) 299-318 [doubtful]. Severian of Gabala, *Homilies on Creation and Fall* [*In Cosmogoniam*], trans. R.C. Hill, in *Commentaries on Genesis 1–3,* ACT, Downers Grove, IL 2010, 1-93.

Armenian: J.B. Aucher, *Severiani sive Seberiani Gabalorum episcopi Emesensis homiliae . . .*, Venetiis 1827, 16-371; N. Akinian, *Ewsebeay Emesac'woy Čaṙk*[c] [*The Homilies of Bishop Eusebius of Emesa*]: HA 72 (1958) cols. 161-182, 449-474; 73 (1959) cols. 1-30, 161-182, 321-360; G. Dürks, *Eine fälschlich dem Irenäus zugeschriebene Predigt des Bischofs Severian von Gabala*: ZNTW 21 (1922) 64-69; H.J. Lehmann, *Per Piscatores - Orsordawk': Studies in the Armenian Version of a Collection of Homilies by Eusebius of Emesa and Severian of Gabala*, Aarhus 1975, 273-367; H.J. Lehmann, *Severian of Gabala: New Identifications of Texts in Armenian Translation*, in T.J. Samuelian (ed.), *Classical Armenian Culture: Influences and creativity* (Armenian Texts and Studies 4), University of Pennsylvania 1982, 113-124; H.J. Lehmann, *Severian of Gabala: Fragments of the Aucher Collection in Galata Ms 54*, in D. Kouymjian (ed.), *Armenian Studies - Études arméniennes in memoriam Haïg Berbérian*, Lisbon 1986, 477-487; H.J. Lehmann, *What Translators Veil and Reveal. Observations on Two Armenian Translation of One Greek Homily*, in H. Lehmann - J.J.S. Weitenberg, *Armenian Texts: Tasks and Tools* (Acta Jutlandica 69:1. Humanities Series 68), Aarhus 1993, 75-84

Coptic: S.J. Voicu, *Fogli copti di Severiano di Gabala*, De serpente (*CPG 4196*): Augustinianum 34 (1994) 471-474; M.E. Foat, *Encomium on Ss. Peter and Paul Attributed to Severian of Gabala*, in P. Chapman et al., *Encomiastica from the Pierpont Morgan Library: Five Coptic Homilies . . .* (*Edition*) (CSCO 544 / Copt. 47), Leuven 1993, 85-130; (*Translation*) (CSCO 545 / Copt. 48), Leuven 1993, 65-101 (spurious); E. Lucchesi, *Un sermon copte de Sévérien de Gabala sur la Nativité du Christ* (*attribué aussi à Proclus de Constantinople*): Analecta Bollandiana 97 (1979) 111-127 (spurious).

Georgian: G. Garitte, *Un fragment géorgien de l'homélie IX de Sévérien de Gabala:* Muséon 60 (1953) 97-102;M. van Esbroeck,

Deux homélies de Sévérien de Gabala (IVe-Ve siècle) conservées en géorgien: Bedi Kartlisa 36 (1978) 71-91; Id., *L'homélie "sur les apôtres" de Sévériende Gabala en version géorgienne*: Bedi Kartlisa 37 (1979)86-101; Id., *L'homélie géorgienne de Sévérien de Gabala* CPG *4216*: Muséon 104 (1991) 73-108.

Syriac: C. Moss, *Homily on the Nativity of our Lord by Severian, Bishop of Gabala*: Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 12 (1947-48) 555-566 (doubtful).

R.E. Carter, *An Index of Scriptural References in the Homilies of Severian of Gabala*: Traditio 54 (1999) 323-351; Id., *The Chronology of Twenty Homilies of Severian of Gabala*: Traditio 55 (2000) 1-17; C. Datema, *Towards a Critical Edition of the Greek Homilies of Severian of Gabala*: Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 19 (1988) 107-115; Id., *The Rôle of the Martyr in the Homilies of Severian of Gabala*, in A.A.R. Bastiaensen - A. Hilhorst - C.H. Kneepkens, *Fructus centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink . . .* (Instrumenta patristica 19), Steenbrugis 1989, 61-67; R. Goulet, *Un nouveau fragment stoïcien chez Sévérien de Gabala*: Études philosophiques (1985) 251-255; R.F. Regtuit, *Severian's Charm: The Preaching of Severian of Gabala*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica XXVII: Papers presented . . . in Oxford 1991*, Leuven 1993, 202-208; K.-H. Uthemann, *Severian von Gabala in Florilegien zum Bilderkult*: OCP 66 (2000) 5-47; S.J. Voicu, *Teofilo e gli antiocheni posteriori*: Augustinianum 46 (2006) 373-388.

Pauline Commentaries: K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*, NTA 15, Münster i.W. 1933, 213-351; S. Zincone, *L'esegesi paolina di Severiano di Gabala*: Annali di storia dell'esegesi 6 (1989) 51-75.

S.J. Voicu

SEVERINUS, pope (638–640). Roman, son of Avienus, he succeeded Pope *Honorius I in October 638 but was consecrated only on 28 May 640. The delay was caused by the fact that the emperor *Heraclius, before ratifying the election of the pope, asked the Roman apocrisaries sent to *Constantinople to sign the **Ekthesis*, a heterodox profession of faith published in September-October 638 (in the sole person of the incarnate Word there is one sole will) and was imposed by the emperor himself and the patriarch of Constantinople, *Sergius I. The legates, who could not work on behalf of the pope, were detained in the East for nearly a year and a half. In the meantime, acc. to the *Liber pontificalis*, Maritius, who was in charge of safeguarding the collection of letters—a supporter of the exarch of Ravenna Isaac—led the Roman army to seize the goods collected by Pope Honorius in the Lateran *vestiarium,* believing that their annual pay was also located there. The bishop's palace was occupied and guarded, Isaac exiled the dignitaries of the clergy, he eliminated every resistance, and he divided all the goods among soldiers, exarch and emperor. After these events, Severinus was consecrated and reigned for two months. The *Liber pontificalis* described him in the following terms: *sanctus*, *benignus super omnes homines*, *amator pauperum*, *largus*, *mitissimus* (I, 329) despite the severity and the violence of those times. He ordained various bishops and made restorations to the apse of St. Peter's Basilica. He died on 2 August 640 and was buried in the Vatican basilica.

Anastasius Bibliotecarius, PL 129, 583-586; Mansi 10, 1003-1006; Jaffé I, n. 1039, 227; LP I, 328-329; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del VII secolo*, Milan 1971, 112-113, 138, 173, 177, 192, 195, 232, 283, 300, 378, 418 and 509-512; Id., *Il Sinodo Lateranense dell'ottobre 649*, Vatican City 1989, 37, 112, 127, 171, 215, 304, 306, 374 and 394; BBKL 9, 1510-1511; *Dizionario storico del Papato*, Milan 1996, 1374-1375 (Ph. Levillain); LTK³ 9, 501-502; EPapi I, 590-592.

M. Spinelli

SEVERINUS of Cologne (late 4th c.). He succeeded *Euphratas as the bishop of Cologne. *Gregory of Tours spoke of Severinus as a man *honestae vitae et per cuncta laudabilis*, and narrated that, at the moment of the death of *Martin of Tours (397), Severinus received a revelation about this matter through the vision of a choir of angels (*De virt. S. Mart.* I,4: MGH, *scr. rer. mer.* I,590). Severinus's episcopate must therefore be dated to the 2nd half of the 4th c. He ordered the construction of the church dedicated to Sts. *Cornelius and *Cyprian, near which he was buried; this church adopted Severinus's name in the 9th c. A text titled *Doctrina de sapientia*, which consists of a series of brief statements, is attributed to Severinus. The biography of his life, which was written at the end of the 9th c. or the beginning of the 10th, lacks any basis in historical fact.

CPL 1153; PL 74, 845-848; J. Schlecht, *Doctrina XII Apostolorum. Die Apostellehre in der Liturgie der katholischen Kirche*, Freiburg i.Br. 1901, 127-129; DCB 4, 627; BS 11, 963-965; LTK 9, 699; DACL 15, 1391-1393; BBKL 10, 1507-1510; *Diz. di letteratura cristiana antica*, ed. S. Döpp et al., Rome 2006, 769.

S. Zincone

SEVERINUS of Noricum (5th c.). Saint, monk "apostle" of Noricum. Information about his life survives primarily through *Eugippius, his young disciple, who in 511 wrote a *Vita s. Severini* (CPL 678). With this text one should take into consideration the two *epistulae* exchanged between Eugippius and *Paschasius. It is somewhat likely that, being a native of a noble Latin family, perhaps Italian, Severinus also sought, in the first half of this century, the solitude of the desert in a location of the East (Eug., *Ep.* 9.10: CSEL 9, 2, 4-5) and from there around 454, led

by divine inspiration (*Sev.* 9,4), he went to Noricum Ripensis on the Danube border to bring help to those peoples who were oppressed by the continual invasions of the barbarians. These are the few personal characteristics that can be garnered from Eugippius's writings; for the remainder he tends to make Severinus out to be a promoter of the new ideal of the monastic life in adhering more properly to the spiritual and temporal demands of that century. Severinus died in Noricum in 482 after having given life, with an apostolate of less than 30 years, to a plan of moral and material relief to those people prior to the consolidation of the Christian faith in that area. Because of this spiritual awakening along the borders of the Danube River, various monasteries emerged that were at one time centers of organized resistance against the returning barbarian invasions and seats of a charitable and social assistance programs (work, health, agricultural and artisanal economy, etc.). Finally, his body—the *Vita* recounts—in 488, at the moment of the Roman population's exodus before the resumption of the barbarian offensive, was taken from his early place of burial (possibly the tomb under the St. Jakobskirche at Heiligenstadt) and taken in a procession to *Italy by his students. After a first stop at Montefeltro near Rimini, at the invitation of the rich Roman matron Barbaria, it was definitively buried around 495 in a mausoleum built at Castrum Lucullanum (Pizzofalcone) near Naples. There, after the long pilgrimage, the monastic community which had arrived from Noricum established a new monastery.

Also worthy of note are the *Hymnus in laudem sancti Severini*, perhaps from the mid-9th c. (CSEL 9, 2, 71-73), and the *Translatio s. Severini* by *John the Deacon (MGH, *scr. rer. lang. et. ital. saec. VI-IX*, 452-459) both written at a time after the transfer of the saint's remains (along with the rediscovered relics of the martyr Sossus, a companion of St. *Januarius) to Naples, in the monastery of the Benedictines that then took its name from him. The calendar of that church in the Roman martyrology commemorates him on 8 January.

AASS *Ian.*, I, Paris 1863, 483-497; BS 11, 965-971; R. Noll (ed.), *Eugippius. Das Leben des heiligen Severin*, Passau [3]1981; Ph. Régerat (ed.), *Eugippe. Vie de saint Séverin*, Paris 1991 (=SC 374); F. Lotter, *Severinus von Noricum. Legende und historische Wirklichkeit*, Stuttgart 1976; D. Norberg, *Notes critiques sur l'Hymnarius Severinianus*, Stockholm 1977; V. Pavan, *Note sul monachesimo di s. Severino e sulla cura pastorale nel Norico*: VetChr 15 (1978) 347-360; R. Noll, *Literatur zur Vita sancti Severini aus den Jahren 1975-1980*: Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österr. Ak. der Wiss. 118 (1981) 196-221; R. Pillinger, *Bibliographie zur Vita sancti Severini (1980-1998)*: MittChrArch 5 (1999) 93-96; F. Heim, *Le saint et la cité dans la tourmente des invasions barbares: l'exemple de saint Séverin du Norique*, in G. Freyburger - L. Pernot (ed.), *Du héros païen au saint chrétien* (= Actes du colloque du C.A.R.R.A., Strasbourg, 1er-2 décembre 1995), Paris 1997, 165-175; A. de Vogüé, *Il monachesimo prima di san Benedetto*, Seregno 1998; *Eugippius und Severin: der Autor, der Text und der Heilige*, ed. W. Pohl - M. Diesenberger, Vienna 2001; D. von der Nahmer, *Agiografia altomedievale e uso della Bibbia*, Naples 2001, 113-145 (= Vita Severini [prev. publ. in FS B. Jaspert, Paderborn 1995]).

V. Pavan

SEVERUS. *Encratite heretic. *Eusebius of Caesarea dates him after *Tatian and identifies him as his follower (*HE* 4,29,4). Eusebius also noted that Severus accepted the Holy *Scriptures with the exception of *Paul's epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, a revealing characteristic of Severus's Jewish-Christian cultural milieu. Severus's disciples were called "Severians." *Epiphanius of Salamis (*Haer* 45) described them as possessing *gnostic-Encratite characteristics: they maintained a dualistic theory of the creation of the world by inferior powers. Moreover, they affirmed that the seed of the devil-*serpent gave origin to the *vine and that the devil also made human sexual organs and the female: hence the necessity of abstinence from wine and *marriage.

DCB 4, 632-633; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte der Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884, 544-555; F. Bolgiani, *La tradizione eresiologica sull'encratismo*, I: *Le notizie di Ireneo*; II: *La confutazione di Clemente di Alessandria*: AAT 91 (1956-57); 96 (1961-62).

E. Prinzivalli

SEVERUS of Antioch (d. 538). Born at Sozopolis in Pisidia, he studied at *Alexandria and Berytus (Beirut), where he was converted to a more committed religious life. Baptized in 488, he entered a convent near *Gaza. His religious formation occurred in the *monophysite context of this religious confession, which he immediately embraced and soon became its most representative spokesperson on the political and cultural level. Having gone to *Constantinople in 509—he was present during the regime of the **Henoticon* that was favorable to the monophysites—he effectively spread his ideas there, and in 512 he was consecrated bishop of *Antioch. After six years of intense activity in favor of his cause, the antimonophysite reaction brought about by *Justin's ascension to the throne (518) forced him to seek refuge in *Egypt, where he continued the anti-*Chalcedonian fight by any means at his disposal, esp. with his writings. Around 535, Severus accepted *Justinian's invitation, who was seeking an agreement with the monophysites, to

come to Constantinople but, because of yet another change in course by the emperor, he was marginalized in 536, while a decree ordered his books to be burned. He again went to Egypt, where he died at Chois on 8 February 538.

Severus produced an immense amount of literary work in his doctrinal defense of moderate monophysitism, in controversy with radical monophysitism on the one hand and Chalcedonianism on the other. The condemnation issued by Justinian and the hostility of the Chalcedonians brought about the loss, with the exception of a few fragments, of the original Greek texts of his works; but they were soon translated into Syriac, and they have come down to us in this language in large number. Of his doctrinal works, all written in controversy with others, the following are anti-Chalcedonian: the treatise *To Nephalius* (ca. 508); *Philalēthēs* ("lover of truth"), written during his first stay at Constantinople, in which Severus examined the *florilegium from the writings of *Cyril of Alexandria taken in a *dyophysite sense, to vindicate the monophysite character of Cyril's theology; and the treatise *Against John the Grammarian* (in three books), in which Severus refuted an apology of the Council of *Chalcedon written by *John of Caesarea. The following treatises were written against the monophysite currents of thought that were not shared by Severus: *Against Sergius the Grammarian*, four letters written shortly after 515, in which Severus combated the radical monophysite thesis acc. to which, because of the union, the human and divine properties have been mixed in Christ, and the corpus of writings intended to combat the so-called *aphthartodocetism of *Julian of Halicarnassus, written after 518: *Critique of Julian's Tome*; *Refutation of Julian's Propositions*; *Against the Additions to the Tome*; *Against Julian's Apology*; the *Apology of the Philalēthēs*.

From Severus's writings the following have survived: 125 *Cathedral *Homilies*, delivered during the years of his episcopate at Antioch (512–518) to celebrate feast days and saints, to explain scriptural readings etc.; more than 300 completely fragmentary letters of the 4,000 that he had written, which are very important historically and doctrinally. A baptismal rite and some poems pertaining to religious topics have also survived.

Severus was a prolix author who did not tire of repeating *ad satietatem* the fundamental principles of his beliefs: he illustrates them with continual reference to *Scripture (which was ignored, however, by certain proponents of Chalcedon such as *Leontius) and to the patristic *tradition—acc. to the use of that era—among whom Cyril of Alexandria shines forth. Even though he systematically rejected recourse to Greek *philosophy, he was an excellent dialectician. He was an implacable controversialist and knew how to present the complex material that was of interest to him with remarkable clarity. For this reason he outshined other writers of his time. He was the most qualified representative of so-called verbal monophysitism, which took the name "Severian" from him. Severus primarily wanted to be an expositor and the defender of Cyril of Alexandria's teaching, without, however, some of the uncertainties and terminological waverings of his teacher that could favor the Chalcedonians, and which had been rendered rigid and organic in a monophysite sense, on the basis of the famous expression "one sole nature of God the incarnate Logos." Severus understood the term *physis* as indicative of a concrete and subsistent individual nature, which was equivalent therefore both to **hypostasis* and to **prosōpon*. This *physis* of the Logos became incarnate with the union, which is acc. to nature and acc. to hypostasis (*kata physin*, *kath' hypostasin*), where nature and hypostasis are obviously that of the Logos, which are united to the humanity of Christ. Such a humanity is intact and complete, and in the union its properties, though adhering in the nature and hypostasis of the Logos, remain distinct, without mixing and becoming fused with the divine properties (against Sergius): therefore the body of Christ before the *resurrection was corruptible and mortal (against Julian), and Christ is consubstantial with the Father acc. to the divinity and to us acc. to the humanity. As in the case of Cyril, Severus also described this union through the analogy offered by the union of the human soul with the body. He could not admit that this intact and complete humanity constituted one nature, because for him to admit two natures in Christ signified also admitting two hypostases and therefore dividing Christ after the manner of *Nestorius: for this reason he rejected Chalcedon and Pope *Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum*. He was only willing to acknowledge, like Cyril, that one could speak of Christ's two natures in theory: in this sense Christ derives from two natures (*ek duo physeōn*) and from two *hypostases*, but really from the union a single nature and a single *hypostasis* is derived, a composite nature (= *hypostasis*) because the human properties were added to the divine properties: therefore Christ cannot exist in two natures (*en duo physeis*), as the Chalcedonians maintained. Given the distinction of the properties, Severus distinguished in Christ human and divine acts, suffering and dying on the one hand, working miracles and rising from the dead on the other: but because of the

unity of the subject there is no sense in dividing these actions between man and God.

Severus's theology was closer to Chalcedonian theology than he realized, esp. neo-Chalcedonian theology; for this reason his monophysitism was called "verbal." But he never wished to acknowledge this affinity, because for him one simply had to affirm that Christ existed in two natures to evoke the *heresy of Nestorius.

Recently attention has been brought to Severus's work as an exegete. Severus was original because he joined the Alexandrian and Antiochene traditions. He was attentive to the literal interpretation of the sacred text, and even had philological and grammatical interests, but was open, esp. in the interpretation of narrative texts, to symbolic exegesis.

CPG III, 7022-7080; DTC 14, 1988-2000; J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909; Id., *La christologie du monophysisme syrien*, CGG 1, 425-580; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 403; M. Brière, *Introduction générale aux homélies de Sévère d'Antioche*: PO 29 (1960) 7-72; J. Gribomont, *La catéchèse de Sévère d'Antioche et le Credo*: Parole d'Orient 6-7 (1975-76) 125-158; L. Perrone, *Il dialogo contro gli aftartodoceti di Leonzio di Bisanzio e Severo d'Antiochia*: Cristianesimo nella storia 1 (1980) 411-443; L.R. Wickham, *Severus of Antioch on the Trinity:* SP 24 (1993) 360-372; R. Roux, *L'exégèse biblique dans les Homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, Rome 2002; P. Allen - C.T.R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, London-New York 2004.

M. Simonetti

SEVERUS of Aquileia (586–607). Paul the Deacon narrates (*Hist. Langob.* III,26) that, once Elias patriarch of *Aquileia, after 15 years of serving in the episcopate, had died, Severus succeeded him. We do not know the details of his election, but these facts must not have pleased the exarch, who would have preferred to energetically intervene to put an end to the age-old schism of the *Three Chapters. The condemnation of the Three Chapters (553) in fact—as everyone knows—met fierce opposition in the West, for which the Aquileian and the Istrian schism represents the most salient and resistant episode, which lasted until the time of Pope *Gregory the Great and with which he occasionally dealt in his collection of letters. Thus, after the energetic but useless suggestions to bring an end to the schism directed by Pope *Pelagius I to the *Byzantine authorities in *Italy in the spring of 559, after the sorrowful but futile letters written by Pope *Pelagius II to the bishops of Istria and their metropolitan Elias to convince them of the indefectible teaching of the apostolic see and to invite them to a meeting that could identify and remove the causes of the division, and once Elias had died and Severus (586–607) had been elected, the exarch Smaragdus judged opportune the use of more energetic methods than those previously adopted. In fact he arrested Severus and his three suffragan bishops (John Parentium, Severus of Trieste and Vindemius of Cyssa probably at Grado for the consecration of the metropolitan), who were led to *Ravenna and persuaded to enter *communion with the bishop of that see, John, who was an opponent of the Three Chapters.

The pleasant and suggestive gestures that John probably used, reinforced by the fear of imperial arms and the presence of the feared exarch, finally led those four bishops to reform and to cede to the double force of reason and threats; but upon returning to their sees, they returned to embrace the schismatic party, as the primary sources attest. In fact, after having been denounced by the followers of the schism, they perceived themselves to be constrained to retract the recantation in a synod of ten bishops, who had been summoned to Marano (591). The bitterness and the indignation of *Gregory the Great, who had succeeded Pope Pelagius II in 590, emerged in a letter sent to Severus of Aquileia intimating to him that he needed to present himself at Rome, along with his suffragan bishops, to put an end to the controversy in a synod. But the dissident bishops, even though agreeing to the pope's requests and to the imperial *iussio* set forth by him, preferred to send a *libellus supplex* (MGH, *Ep.* I,17-21) to the emperor. The result of this recourse and resistance to Rome's doctrinal line on the specific question of the Three Chapters represents one of the partial eclipses of the criterion of the primacy of the Roman see that history at times records among Christianity's members and even in the knowledge of some bishops. The emperor Maurice was shaken by this request and ordered Pope Gregory to adapt to the circumstances of the times. In the meanwhile, Grado, a new residence of the patriarch of Aquileia, underwent an invasion from Slavic pirates and was tormented by other natural calamities reported to us by Paul the Deacon (*Hist. Langob.* IV,2,4). Gregory did not fail to help with their misfortunes while continuing his efforts to put an end to the schism, which by that point was on the way to extinction, as in the case when the exarch Smaragdus urged that the afflicted bishop of Trieste, Firminius, not be left undefended, who, after having been reconciled with Rome (602), was obligated to face a popular uprising that was brought against him by Severus of Aquileia (MGH, *Ep.* II,360,399).

Upon his death (607), the exarch Smaragdus once again had recourse to violence to impose on

Grado a candidate favorable to Rome as a successor of Severus, namely, Candidianus. The dissidents elected another schismatic patriarch, John, with the cooperation of the *Longobard (Lombard) king *Agilulf and his duke Friuli, Gisulf II. There thus began a rival series of patriarchs of Aquileia, one who was resident at Grado with jurisdiction over the coastal strip and Istria, which was subject to the *Byzantines, and a second who was resident in the fortified Castle of Cormons with jurisdiction over the Longobard hinterland.

PCBE 2, 2062-2064; P. Paschini, *Storia del Friuli*, I, Udine 1934, 101-109; G. Cuscito, *Aquileia e Bisanzio nella controversia dei Tre Capitoli*: AAAd 12 (1977) 231-262; Id., *Testimonianze epigrafiche sullo scisma tricapitolino*: RivAC 53 (1977) 231-256; Id., *La politica religiosa della corte longobarda di fronte allo scisma dei Tre Capitoli*, in Atti VI Congr. intern. di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1980, 373-381; Id., *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 293, 295-296, 305-306, 318; Id., *Fede e politica ad Aquileia. Dibattito politico e centri di potere (secoli IV-VI)*, Udine 1987, 112-126.

G. Cuscito

SEVERUS of Málaga (d. ca. 602). Companion and friend of *Licinianus of Cartagena, and in all likelihood also of *Eutropius of Valencia, alongside whom he probably received an educational formation in the Servitan monastery (possibly in the neighborhood of Valencia). Bishop of an episcopal see that was subject to the *Byzantines, he energetically intervened in the struggles against the *Arians. After 580, he composed a booklet titled *Libellus unus adversus Vincentium* against Bishop Vincent of Saragossa, who, ceding to the pressures of King Liuvigild, became an Arian. He also wrote a treatise bearing the title *Anulus* (Isidore of Seville, *Vir. ill.* 30), on virginity, which he sent to one of his sisters. None of these works have survived. He worked together with Licinianus in the theological editing and structuring of the latter's letter to the deacon Epiphanius (*Ep. ad Epiphanium*), on the spiritual nature of the angels. He enjoyed much fame as a good theologian. He died around 602.

J. Madoz, *Liciniano de Cartagena y sus cartas*, Madrid 1948; DHEE 4, 2446; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 347-348.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

SEVERUS of Milevis. Bishop of Milevis in *Numidia at the beginning of the 5th c. Friend of *Augustine from his youth, his friend in study and therefore, along with *Alypius and *Evodius, a companion in religious life. He was in correspondence with Augustine (see Augustine's *Ep.* 62 and 63, concerning the ordination of the deacon Timothy; *Ep.* 109 is a letter of Severus's which is full of praises for the writings of his friend, to which Augustine responded with *Ep.* 110) and with *Paulinus of Nola (see Aug., *Ep.* 31,9; Paul. Nola, *Ep.* 7,1 = Aug. 32,1). In 411 Severus went to the Conference of *Carthage, but because of sickness he was unable to participate in it. His name appeared among the signatories of the letter issued by the Council of Milevis (416) on the question concerning the *Pelagian controversy (Aug., *Ep.* 176). Severus indicated his own successor to the clergy of his diocese without informing the laity: a dispute arose and was resolved peaceably with the personal intervention of Augustine (see Aug., *Ep.* 213, 1 from the year 426).

PCBE 1, 1070-1075.

F. Scorza Barcellona

SEVERUS of Minorca (d. after 419). Bishop of Minorca (Baleari) for the first decades of the 5th c. Baronius published and attributed to Severus an encyclical letter found in the Vatican Library, putting it in relation to the information of an African document (*De miraculis St. Stephani:* PL 41,833-854). The letter provides information on the tensions between Jews and Christians and on the conversion of the Jews of Mahón, when Paulus *Orosius transferred the relics of St. *Stephen Martyr; moreover, he provided information on the liturgy, politics and the social life of the island. The text, which was published by Baronius, was reprinted by the Maurinists and Migne. G. Seguí Vidal republished it in a critical edition and vindicated its authenticity and integrity, a revindication also supported by E. Dekkers, U. Domínguez del Val and F. Martí; it was rejected, however, by Blumenkranz and, with more caution, by M.C. Díaz y Díaz, who date the writing to the 8th c. and not to 418, as maintained by Baronius, or 417, as Seguí argued. In Severus's debated letter a *Commonitorium* is cited, which Seguí and J. Hillgarth identify as the *Altercatio Ecclesiae et Synagogae*, a ps.-Augustinian text (PL 42,1131-1140). Today the *Altercatio* (CPPM 2, 163 and 1565) is no longer considered Severus's work, although it could be dated to the 5th c. and not to the 11th, as A. Oepke had maintained.

Editions: CPL 576-577; CPPM 2, 1566; PL 20, 731-746; PL 41, 821-832. *Studies:* G. Seguí Vidal, *La carta-encíclica del obispo Severo. Estudio crítico de su autenticidad e integridad con un bosquejo histórico del cristianismo balear anterior al s. VIII*, Palma de Mallorca 1937, 149-185; B. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chré-*

tiens, London 1977, n. IX, 419ff.; n. XIX, 128ff.; J. Amengual i Batle, *Noves fonts per a la historia de les Balears dins el Baix Imperi*: Bolletí de la Societat Arqueològica Lulliana 37 (1979) 99-111; *Patrología* III, ed. sp. Madrid 1981, 683-685; E.D. Hunt, *St. Stephen in Minorca: An Episode in Jewish-Christian Relations in the Early 5th Century A.D.*: JTS 33 (1982) 106-123; J. Amengual i Battle, *Un prematur testimoni de la polèmica antijueva: La circular de Sever de Menorca (417)*, pres. i tr., LLuc 60, 1981; Id., *Orígenes del cristianisme a les Baleares*, II, Palma de Mallorca 1992, 12-64; Domínguez del Val, 78-81.

E. Romero Pose

SEVERUS of Naples (d. 409?). Twelfth in the catalog of bishops from Naples, acc. to a later catalog he was raised to the episcopate serving from February 363 (a date that does not seem possible) to 29 April 409, reintroducing orthodoxy after the successes of the *Arians and the pagan revivals. Severus immediately became popular by transferring to Naples the remains of his predecessor Maximus, who was persecuted by the Arians and died in exile. He was highly regarded by "all the sects," as the pagan leader *Symmachus wrote in 397–398, the senator and *praefectus Urbi*, in a letter to Decius the consul from Campania (Q. Aur. Simm., *Ep.* VII,51: ed. O. Seeck, in MGH, *Auct. ant.* VI,I [1883], 191). *Ambrose met Severus in 392 at *Capua, during a plenary council of Campania; a year later he wrote to him, affectionately commending to him the "brother and copresbyter" James, who had just come back from *Persia in the "blissful streets" of Campania and in need of peace (*Ep.* 59 [85]: PL 16,1232-1233). According to the episcopal chronicle (*Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum* [= LP *Eccl. Neapol.*]), in MGH, *Script. rerum lang. et ital.* [ed. G. Waitz], Berlin 1878, 404-405 and 437 [*Catalogus Blanchinianus*]), Severus established four basilicas and two monasteries, one of St. *Martin and the other of St. Potitus (but the second attribution was perhaps an interpolation in the Parthenopean LP). Moreover, he erected a basilica to the Savior that was rich in marble and mosaics, which was unwelcome to the Arians because it was consecrated to Jesus' divinity. The basilica was later called St. *James the Great, and only the three arched apses have been preserved. Scholars universally have attributed the construction of the baptistery of St. John in the Fountain, the most ancient in the West (which was constructed 30 years earlier than the baptistery in the Lateran Basilica built by *Sixtus III). Outside the city Severus built the cemeterial basilica of St. Fortunatus, which received the remains of Maximus and probably housed the first sepulcher even of his successor. In the underlying archaeological remains, some traces of frescoes (4th–5th c.) showed the saints from Milan *Gervasius and Protasius, confirming the bond between the church of Naples and Milan. In all likelihood, around the year 850 Severus's remains were transferred into the urban basilica.

B. Capasso, *Monumenta ad historiam Neapolitani Ducatus pertinentia* I, Naples 1881, 166-169 (*Gesta Episc.*), 223 (*Catal. Blan.*) and 269-279 (*Vita*, *miracula*, *carmen*); D. Mallardo, *S. Severo vescovo di Napoli*: Bollettino Ecc. Archidiocesi di Napoli 12 (1931) 61-66, 92-96, 121-123 and 140-142; H. Delehaye, *Hagiographie Napolitaine*: AB 59 (1941) 17-19; D. Ambrasi, *Il Cristianesimo e la Chiesa napoletana dei primi secoli*, in *Storia di Napoli* I, Naples 1967, 678-690; BS 9, 993-994; AB 110 (1992) 454; LTK³ 9, 504-505; PCBE 2, 2055 (n. 6).

M. Spinelli

SEVERUS of Ravenna (d. after 343). The only secure piece of historical information on Severus bishop of Ravenna is his participation at the Council of *Serdica (343), where, acc. to the information provided esp. from *Hilary of Poitier and *Athanasius of *Alexandria, he signed the decrees, the letter to Pope Julius II and the synodal letter to all the bishops (Mansi III,39, 42, 66). Information about him also comes from Agnello, the author of the *Liber pontificalis* of Ravenna (ca. 830–832) which reports a late hagiographical legend (*Liber Pont. Rav.* 13; 18, MGH *scr. rer. lang.*, 283-287), from the *Vita* composed by the presbyter Liutolfus of Mainz shortly after 856 (AASS February I, 88-91), from two sermons of Peter Damian (*Serm.* IV-V: PL 144,522-534), from the sources pertaining to the cult and from iconography. He died on 1 February of some year acc. to the *Mart. hier.* (AASS *Nov* II, 2, 71) and the *Liber pontificalis* of Ravenna, which mentions that his place of burial was at Classis (Classe). He was honored as a saint from the 6th c. onward and was portrayed in a mosaic in an apse from the basilia of St. Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna.

BHL 7679-7684, Suppl., 279; BS 11, 997-1004; PCBE 2052-2053.

A. Pollastri

SEVERUS of Synnada (5th c.). Bishop of Synnada (*Phrygia salutaris); he participated at the Council of *Ephesus (431), where in the first session, he signed for the deposition of *Nestorius (Mansi 4, 1224c). One of his brief speeches directed against the affirmations of the Nestorians, delivered during the council, has been preserved in *Ethiopian.

CPG III, 6141; A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica*, Leipzig 1866, 99-100; S. Euringer: Orientalia n.s. 12 (1943) 127-130 (Ger. tr.); Bardenhewer 4, 200; B.M. Weischer, *Qērellos*, IV,1: *Homil-*

ien und Briefe zum Konzil von Ephesos, Wiesbaden 1979, 39 and 62-67; Patrologia V, 33.

A. De Nicola

SEVILLE

I. Christian origins - II. Councils.

I. Christian origins. Seville was the ancient *Hispalis* in Hispania Ulterior; with the division of this province by the emperor *Augustus, it became part of *Baetica, for which it became the second most important city after the capital, Cordoba. Little by little, it grew at the expense of Cordoba, to the point of replacing it in its function. Destroyed by the *Vandal Guntheric on his way to *Africa (427), later, and for a brief time, it fell under the Suevian (441–456) and, then, under *Visigothic rule until the Muslim invasion (712). With the exception made for the brief period of *Byzantine domination in the 2nd half of the 6th c. Seville was the stage for *Hermenegild's conversion to Catholicism and his rebellion against his father, who had appointed him as governor of Baetica.

The history of Christianity in Seville, on the basis of the documentation that we have, begins for us during the era of *Diocletian, with the martyrdom of Sts. Justa and Rufina, during the episcopate of Sabinus who took part in the Council of Elvira as the titular bishop of the see of Seville. The catalog of the Codex Emilianensis speaks of another preceding bishop named Marcellus, of whom nothing else is known. But, judging from the intense Christianization of Baetica, brought to light by the aforementioned council, Christianity must have arrived much earlier, probably from Africa. Even in the religious sphere, Seville gained ground at Cordoba's expense. It is not known when it became a metropolitan see of Baetica; it is likely that the office of metropolitan was tied to one precise see, as had occurred in *Numidia. And at the end of the 5th c., Pope *Simplicius (468–483), after having praised Zeno the bishop of Seville, appointed him as his vicar for the territory—the geographic breath of which we do not know—with the duty of keeping watch over ecclesiastical discipline (*Ep.* 1: PL 58,35). The same privilege would be renewed by Pope *Hormisdas (514–523) to Bishop Sallustius, limiting him solely to the Baetica and *Lusitania provinces (*Ep.* 26: PL 63,425-426). Seville, however, reached greater prestige during the episcopate of St. *Leander (578–599) and St. *Isidore (599–636). At the local level, there emerged a celebration of two provincial councils, in 590 and 619, and perhaps a third. The episcopal school, called for by Leander, became a center of secular and theological learning; it would spread throughout all of *Spain and would nourish medieval Europe, thanks esp. to the literary production achieved by Isidore. Important for national life, Leander's influence and the conversion of Hermenegild to Catholicism should be remembered, a conversion that prepared the way for the conversion of *Recared and the entire Visigothic people. The church of Seville became the spiritual capital of Spain, and its influence was enormous through the Third (589) and Fourth (633) Councils of *Toledo, respectively animated by Leander and Isidore. After the death of these two bishops, Toledo took the lead, and the Baetican metropolitans were unable to reach their earlier prestige.

Bishops: Marcellus (?), Sabinus (ca. 300) at the time of the two martyrs Justa and Rufina, Evodius (who built or rebuilt the first cathedral), Deodatus, Sempronianus, Geminus, Glautius, Marcian, Sabinus (who had been expelled by the Suevian Rechila in 441 and taken back to the see with the arrival of the Goths in 458), Epiphanius (who had intruded during Sabinus's exile), Zeno (a contemporary of Popes Simplicius and *Felix), Asphalius, Maximian, Sallustius (a contemporary of Pope Hormisdas), Crispinus, Pigasius, Stephan, Theodulus, Hyacinth, Reparatus, Stephen II, Leander (578–599), Isidore (599–4 April 636), Honoratus (12 May 636–12 November 641), Anthony (646–653), Fugitivus (656), Bracarius (?), Julian (681), Floresindus (683–688), Felix (transferred to the see of Toledo in 693), Faustinus (693/694), Gabriel (?), Sisibert (?), Oppas (712, betrayer of King Roderic).

DHEE 2446ff., 2457; A. Morgado, *Prelados sevillanos*, Sevilla 1906; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne visigotique*, Paris 1959; D. Mansilla, *Orígenes de la organización metropolitana en la iglesia española*: Hispania Sacra 12 (1959) 267-271; ES 9; A. Blanco Freijeiro, *Historia de Sevilla. La ciudad antigua de la Prehistoria a los visigodos*, Sevilla 1984 (Christian part 167-196); J. González, *Hispalis, Colonia Romula. Ciudad y comunidad cívica en Hispania: siglos II y III d.C.*, in *Cité et communauté civique en Hispania*, Madrid 1993, 127-138; LTK³ 9, 506-507.

II. Councils. *590:* provincial. Presided over by *Leander, seven other bishops from *Baetica took part in the council. The letter that the bishops sent to Pelagius the bishop of Ecija has been preserved, informing him of the decisions that directly pertained to him. Its three canons treat the issue of some of the church's slaves freed by the bishop, whom his predecessor had given to his own relatives, and some women who lived in the homes of clerics. The letter probably only contains the council's statements that pertained to the recipient.

619: provincial. Presided over by *Isidore, it presents eight other bishops. Of its 13 canons, the first two treat the question of the boundaries between some of the dioceses of Baetica; those that follow treat the question of the freed slaves, the treasures of the churches and the monasteries. The 12th canon speaks of a certain Syrian bishop, belonging to the "*Acephali," probably a *Jacobite bishop. The most important canon is the 13th, an extensive dogmatic treatise that refutes that heresy.

624: with respect to this council, see P. Séjourné, *Saint Isidore*, Paris 1929, 29-31.

J. Vivés, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos*, Madrid 1963, 151-153; 163-185; Synoden, passim (J. Orlandís - D. Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los concilios de la España romana y visigota*, Pamplona 1986).

P. de Luis

SEXTUS, antignostic. Christian writer (end of the 2nd–beginning of the 3rd c.). Known exclusively through the mention in *Eusebius's church history (*HE* 5,27) of his name and one of his lost works *On the Resurrection*, which perhaps had anti-*gnostic contents.

E. Prinzivalli

SEXTUS, Sentences of. *Origen cited a collection of sentences (451; 610 in an enlarged edition), which had a Pythagorean tone and set forth a developed asceticism, and attributed it to the Christian Sextus. This work was used by *Basil of Caesarea (*De baptismo*) and *Evagrius of Pontus. *Rufinus translated it into Latin: more than 50 MSS (see P.M. Bogaert: RBen 82 [1972] 26-46) and some citations by *Pelagius, the Master, St. *Benedict, St. *Columbanus and others bear witness to its success. Rufinus attributed the work to Pope *Sixtus II. Two *Syriac versions, an *Armenian version, and the *Sacra Parallela* attributed to *John of Damascus, maintained the same attribution, which Chadwick does not consider unacceptable; the *Sentences* are clearly earlier for the most part, but the compilation was made in a Christian spirit, with Christian additions and revisions. The *Coptic fragments (nos. 158-180, 307-397)—bits of information from Codex XII of *Nag Hammadi (pp. 15-16 and 27-34)—unfortunately have neither the title nor the *colophon*. This small work supplies a typical example of the reception, at times unsuspected, of the asceticism and the piety of Hellenism in certain fervent contexts. In opposition to Rufinus, *Jerome tried to attribute it to a Pythagorean named Sextus, but it could be an invention that is entirely his own, given that this author does not appear in any other literary source.

CPL 1655; Verzeichnis 545; PL 50, 571-626; PLS 3, 21-23; LP I, 232, 237; III, 85; Patrologia III, 556-557; DTC 14, 2196-2199 (see Tables 4050); BS 11, 1262-1264; G. Wilpert, *La proclamazione efesina e i mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*: AST 7 (1931) 197-213; R. Krautheimer, *The Architecture of Sixtus III: A Fifth-Century Renaissance?*, in *Essays in Honor of E. Panofsky*, New York 1961, 291-302 (now in *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art*, London 1971, 181-196); Id., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*, III, Vatican City 1971, 1-60; G. Bovini, *I mosaici romani dall'epoca di Sisto III (432-440)*: CCAB 10 (1963) 67-80, 81-101; F. Magi, *Il calendario dipinto sotto Santa Maria Maggiore*, Vatican City 1972 (cf. REL 51 [1973] 41-48); N.A. Brodsky, *L'iconographie oubliée de l'arc éphésien de Sainte Marie Majeure à Rome*, Brussels 1976 (cf. RivAC 46 [1971] 179-183); Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976 (see index p. 1700); L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, 246-277; G. Zecchini, *I "Gesta de Xysti purgatione" e le fazioni aristocratiche a Roma alla metà del V secolo*: RSCI 34 (1980) 60-74; S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor. Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Vatican City 1994 (*passim*); EPapi 1, 415-423.

A. Di Berardino

SEXUALITY. Early Christianity's assessment of the origin and meaning of human sexuality within the new economy of salvation has always been the object of latent tensions, which at times have exploded into open and dramatic conflicts. The reason for this should be sought in the spiritual and ecclesiological implications, in addition to the properly speaking theological and anthropological implications, of a decision on this topic.

As far as it is possible to schematize such material, we can say with sufficient precision that there exists in the ancient Christian sources a fundamental, even if variously articulated, opposition between the supporters of a rigorously ascetic attitude of the *Encratite type and supporters of more tolerant and flexible behaviors. Of the movements practicing erotic libertinism, which are documented for the *gnostic area, we must say that they go beyond strictly Christian discourse on sexuality, inasmuch as they are deeply permeated by pagan and syncretistic motifs.

1. The Encratite interpretation of sexuality seems clearly documented for the first time around the middle of the 1st c. in the community of *Corinth. Here *Apollo of Alexandria, in the name of the eschatology "already" accomplished in the laver of *baptism, which wipes out every ethnic, social and sexual difference (see Gal 3:28), preached that "it is good for a man not to touch a woman" and that babies are born "impure" (see esp. Paul's criticism in

1 Cor 7:1ff.). Widespread at the end of the 1st c., as also appears from the controversy recorded in 1 Tim 4:3 and 2 Tim 2:18, this radically pessimistic vision of sexuality was expressed on the literary level in various *apocryphal texts such as the *Odes of Solomon* (see the bitter plant of sex in XI,21), the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, the *Coptic Gospel of Thomas* and the apocryphal acts of the apostles (of *Peter, *Paul, *Andrew, *John and *Thomas). Over the course of the 2nd c. it found convinced propagandists in such authors as the Syrian *Tatian (in his work *On Perfection According to the Savior*) and*Julius Cassianus (in his work *On Continence and Eunuchism*). The *Montanists also preached the unbinding of the conjugal bonds in view of the imminent eschatological catastrophe (from this idea *Tertullian would garner support for his sexual rigorism and condemnation of second marriage), although a bishop like *Pinytus of Cnossus, in controversy with*Dionysius of Corinth, defended ascetic rigorism as the normal ideal of Christian perfection (Eus., *HE* 4,23,6-8).

The conception of salvation history underlying such positions was based on certain principles common to different doctrinal elaborations. According to the Encratites, God created man and woman and prohibited them from touching the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but these first two human beings, by transgressing the commandment they had received, united and thus gave rise, after the creation of bodies symbolized by the tunics of skin (Gen 3:21) and expulsion from earthly paradise, to the chain of sin and concupiscence, birth and death (Gen 4:1). The revelation of Jesus Christ would then consist in offering believers the means, even sacramental ones such as the baptism font, to break the chains of corrupt generation and to inaugurate, after having set about on the path of the Teacher, a new humanity inasmuch as it is imitative, in chastity and poverty, of the example of the Lord. The ideal that towers in this way is that of the *monachos* (the word appears for the first time in the *Gospel of Thomas*, log. 16), a celibate and solitary man, a disciple and imitator of the Lord, to whom entrance into the kingdom is guaranteed (*Gospel of Thomas*, log. 49 and 75), and who already in this way participates in the angelic life thanks to his anticipation of the resurrection. The same pieces of information are garnered from the antienthusiastic controversy of the *Letter of *Barnabas* 4,10, where a negative judgment is expressed upon those who live in isolation (*monazein*) in the illusion of "already" being justified. According to the Encratites, to enter into the kingdom of heaven one must overcome sexual distinction, women must become males (*Gospel of Thomas*, log. 114). In this radically antiworldly intellectual context, the idea naturally developed that human birth is something intrinsically sinful and therefore newborns come into the world precisely stained by a congenital impurity (*rhypos/sordes*, Job 14:4), which is understood as the true and proper "sin of birth" (Ps 50:7) or "original sin" (on the properly speaking "Encratite" origins of the doctrine of original *sin, see P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milan 1978); to be liberated from the curse of Adam's sin contracted by being born and from the ensuing slavery to the devil, humanity has need of baptismal purification (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III, 100,5; ps.-Cypr., *De centesima* 2).

The structure of beliefs for which sex with its use, even within marriage, was always and everywhere considered negatively, gave place to forms of solitary life which at times reached to the point of the audacity of self-castration (see Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 29,2; Orig., *Comm. in Mt.* XV, 3; Eus., *HE* 6,8,1-4), but also to forms of ascetic cohabitation (*virgines subintroductae*, *agapētai*), which did not cease to give rise to scandals and reactions from bishops and controversialists at various times, esp. in the area of *Syria (*Didache* 11,11; Aphraates, *Dem.* VI, 4-5; John Chrys. PG 47,495-514), but also in the West (e.g., ps.-Cypr., *De singul. cler.*).

2. The controversialists who were hostile to Encratism, for their part, dialectically elaborated a theology of human sexuality which, having recourse to a different exegesis of the biblical passages involved in the discussion, rejected in no uncertain terms those things that were considered foreign excesses to the authentic Christian faith. A new theology of sex, which made reference to an anthropology based on different interpretive models of the "image of God" and "original sin," was taking form in the writings of orthodox authors of the first centuries. However, they did not hesitate to assume to themselves and to retranslate in Christian terms themes and motifs taken from the classical philosophical tradition that were markedly Stoic and Aristotelian, in the first place the issue of the legality and the goodness of a balanced use of sexuality, the just ethical ideal of *metriopatheia* .

*Clement of Alexandria, who dedicated the entire third book of the *Stromata* to refuting the gnostic and Encratite teachings, maintained that marriage is as holy as if not moreso than continence (*Strom.* VII, 12) and that marriage finds its specific reason for existence in the continuation of the species and the preservation of the world. Clement of Alexandria, as already *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer*. I,28,1), tended

to misidentify the Encratites with the gnostics, attributing their devaluation of sex to cosmological and anthropological dualism that was proper of the gnostics, esp. the *Marcionites. This presentation of Encratite asceticism, which is notably imprecise and tendentious, would also be found, as a current heresiological *topos*, in the texts of others ecclesiastical authors who would also end up simply confusing the *Messalians and the *Priscillianists, heirs of the Encratite tradition, with the *Manicheans, heirs of gnostic dualism. This confusion of identification did not prevent many Encratite teachings from being received, after adequate reelaboration, in the most broad syntheses of orthodoxy, as, e.g., the idea that religious perfection consists in virginity in imitation of Christ, the doctrine of original sin, the postlapsarian interpretation of the tunics of skin etc.

3. The debate within the Christian communities on sexuality began again with great vigor over the course of the 4th c. The objective secularization of the church with its intrinsic risks released new monastic energies and extremist reactions such as that of *Eustathius of Sebaste. The vitality of the Encratite teachings and the ascetic ethos connected to it is demonstrated by the opposite resistance of numerous itinerant groups to the ecclesiastical pressures still in the Roman Empire, which by that time had become Christian. Encratite spirituality, which was based on the principle that the true Christian is the one who prays in a state of perpetual continence, in order to always be united to God, found convinced proponents, as was said above, in Eastern Messalianism and Spanish Priscillianism, and closely conditioned, dialectically, developments within orthodox monastic theology and spirituality.

On the other side, the spokespersons of the new social classes that had converted to Christianity, and often not for disinterested reasons, did not hesitate to challenge the Christian value of virginity to justify an aristocratic conception of the sexual and conjugal life, which was still deeply tied to the more noble values of the pagan tradition, and thus to combat the indiscriminate expansion of radical asceticism, which they opposed as an expression of the dreaded "Manicheism."

Among these often bitter conflicts, orthodox authors, the bishops responsible for the spiritual and monastic life of the community, attempted the difficult path of mediation that aimed simultaneously (1) to condemn in no uncertain terms both Encratite and Manichean excesses, if necessary with the help of repressive imperial legislation, and (2) to safeguard the supreme Christian ideal of virginity without having to condemn marriage and procreation. Such a situation, which was heavily marked by conflict, gave rise to a vast literature on virginity in which the most prestigious Greek and Latin patristic authors of that time engaged: *Methodius of Olympus, *Athanasius, *Basil of Ancyra, *Gregory of Nyssa, *John Chrysostom, *Ambrose, *Jerome, *Augustine and *Pelagius, with a significant difference, however, that while in the East theological speculation on sexuality moved primarily in the direction of a rejection of extreme asceticism, in the West the defense of Christian virginity was being worked out against its detractors, first pagans and then even Christians. The result was that the Latin Fathers seem on the whole to have been more inclined than the Greek Fathers to exalt virginity and continence. It is not by chance that ecclesiastical celibacy was affirmed starting from the 4th c. precisely in the West (the Council of *Elvira, can. 33).

In the East, John Chrysostom maintained the postlapsarian character of sexuality (*De virg.* 15,2; *Hom. Gen.* XVIII,3-4), and an *Origenist like *Didymus the Blind interpreted the tunics of skin in Gen 3:21 as bodies sexually differentiated and created as a result of sin (see the Tura papyri, in SC 233, p. 250). For Gregory of Nyssa, God added in humanity the mode of bestial and irrational propagation in view of sin and mortality (*De hom. opif.* 16-17), but *Theodore of Mopsuestia maintained that humanity was created gendered and mortal in his first *katastasis*, regardless of the sin that was committed shortly thereafter (*Frag. in Gen.* III, 17).

In the West, *Zeno of Verona was the sole witness of the survival of the ancient Encratite teaching of the sexual nature of Adam's sin (*Tract.* I,3,5,8). Ambrose and Jerome, renewing the African ascetic tradition of Tertullian and *Cyprian, defended Christian virginity against the assaults on this teaching by *Helvidius, *Bonosus, *Jovinian and *Vigilantius, although Pelagius worked out the criteria of the ascetic life for the Roman aristocratic milieu. But the controversy reached its apex over the course of the controversy that saw Augustine and *Julian of Eclanum take different positions with respect to original sin. Julian, who was educated in the school of the Antiochenes and who was influenced by Aristotelian philosophy, regarded human sexuality as intrinsically good inasmuch as it is created by God; only the immoderate use of concupiscence is sinful. As a result, babies are born innocent, without original sin. According to Augustine, however, sexual concupiscence is always and everywhere an evil, even when it is used while in marriage for the end of procreation, and therefore even the children of Christian parents are born with the stain of original sin. Only in the late and recently discovered text *Ep.*

6* (Divjak) written to Atticus of Constantinople did Augustine admit the existence of the good "concupiscence of marriage," the "concupiscence of conjugal modesty," by distinguishing it from the sinful "concupiscence of the flesh." In Augustine's thought, human sexuality reflects, in its postlapsarian condition, the state of the rift and the rebellion of the body against the control of reason which in turn reproduces rebellion, which in the beginning led the spirit to withdraw from God's commandment. That notwithstanding, Augustine was one of the first to elaborate a complete theology of the matrimonial goods: faithfulness, indissolubility and procreation. In this way, Augustine, while definitively breaking from the preceding uncertainties and the ascetic tensions, authoritatively revealed in Western Christianity the ideal of the essential compatibility of human generation with Christian marriage, elevating procreation to the dignity of one of the primary ends of the nuptial sacrament.

Finally, beyond some of the controversies on the origin, function and theological meaning of human sexuality, all Christian authors were unanimous in condemning those forms of behavior which, like pederasty and homosexuality, violate the ordered distinction between the roles established since creation. These sins "against nature" were repeatedly denounced, since the time of *Paul (Rom 1:24ff), in Greek and Latin apologetic literature and in patristic sermons as distinctive signs of the irreparable moral and religious perversion that afflicted the pagan world. Pastoral and penitential practices were esp. attentive to the religious and social problems posed by such "deviations" that were not foreign even to the Christian world. These were, therefore, heavily condemned in the post-Constantinian legislation, so much so that precisely in ecclesiastical and monastic contexts such temptations did not cease to manifest themselves again with noteworthy force (see the extensive documentation found in RAC 16,337ff.).

H. Crouzel, *Virginité et mariage selon Origène* (Museum Lessianum, Sect. théol. 58), Paris-Bruges 1963; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*: Annali della Fac. di Lett. e Filos. dell'Univ. di Macerata 2 (1969) 9-217; R. Gryson, *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique*, Gembloux 1970; J.P. Broudéhoux, *Mariage et famille chez Clément d'Alexandrie* (Théologie historique 11), Paris 1970; Y.M. Duval, *L'originalité du "De virginibus" dans le mouvement ascétique occidental. Ambroise, Cyprien, Athanase*, in *Ambroise de Milan 1974. XVI^e centénaire de son élection épiscopale* (Études augustiniennes), Paris 1974, 9-66; K. Niederwimmer, *Askese und Mysterium. Über Ehe, Ehescheidung und Eheverzicht in den Anfängen des christlichen Glaubens*, Göttingen 1975; R. Cantalamessa (ed.), *Etica sessuale e matrimonio nel cristianesimo delle origini*, Milan 1976; P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milan 1978; G. Delling, *Geschlechter*: RAC 10, 780-803; Id., *Geschlechtstrieb*: ibid. 803-812; Id., *Geschlechtsverkehr*: ibid. 812-829; G. Bonner, *Some Remarks on Letters 4* and 6**, in *Les lettres de saint Augustin découvertes par Johannes Divjak*, Paris 1983, 155-164; J. Gribomont, *Askese*, IV: TRE 4, 204-225; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Enkrateia e antropologia*, Rome 1984; U. Bianchi (ed.), *La tradizione dell'Enkrateia. Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche*, Rome 1985; Ch. Munier, *Mariage et virginité dans l'Église ancienne (I^{er}-III^e siècles)* (Traditio christiana 6), Berne 1987; P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York 1988; E. Pagels, *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent*, New York 1988; P.F. Beatrice, *Keuschheit*, III. *Historisch*: TRE 18 (1989) 120-130 (bibl.); Id., *Une citation de l'Évangile de Matthieu dans l'Épître de Barnabé*, in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (BETL 86), Leuven 1989, 231-245; R.A. Markus, *Augustine's Confessions and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manicheism Revisited*, in *Collectanea Augustiniana. Mélanges T.J. Van Bavel*, Leuven 1990, 913-925; P.F. Beatrice, *L'eredità delle origini. Saggi sul cristianesimo primitivo*, Genova 1992, 193-286; S. Elm, *"Virgins of God": The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 1994; K. Hoheisel, *Homosexualität*: RAC 16 (1994) 289-364; P.F. Beatrice, *Apollos of Alexandria and the Origins of the Jewish-Christian Baptist Encratism*: ANRW II.26,2, Berlin-New York 1995, 1232-1275; V.L. Wimbush - R. Valantasis (eds.), *Asceticism*, New York 1995; P.F. Beatrice, *Verginità*, IV. *Verginità, encratismo e matrimonio nel cristianesimo antico (sec. I-V)*: DIP 9 (1997) 1882-1896; Id., *Ascetical Fasting and Original Sin in the Early Christian Writers*, in P. Allen - R. Canning - L. Cross (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, I, Brisbane 1998, 211-228; E.A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*, Princeton, NJ 1999; for Augustine, esp., broad syntheses with bibliographic updates in the articles *Asceticism* and *Asceticism, Pre-Augustine* (E.A. Clark), *Marriage* (D.G. Hunter), in *Augustine Through the Ages*, Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge 1999; G.-H. Baudry, *Le péché dit originel* (Théol. Hist. 113), Paris 2000; K.E. Børresen, *From Patristics to Matristics: Selected Articles on Christian Gender Models*, Rome 2002; Y.-M. Duval, *L'affaire Jovinien. D'une crise de la société romaine à une crise de la pensée chrétienne à la fin du IV^e et au début du V^e siècle* (SEA 83), Rome 2003; J. Wright Knust, *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity*, New York 2005.

P.F. Beatrice

SHAPUR. The name of some Persian sovereigns from the *Sassanid dynasty (Latin *Sapor;* Arabic *Sabur*). Shapur I consolidated the empire established by his father, Ardashir I, and reigned from AD 240 to 272. The *Chronicle of *Arbela*, ch. 9 [Kawerau, 34-35 = Mingana, 34] mentions the war that he waged against various peoples, among whom were the Medes of the mountains and the Geli, and esp. the Romans, with whom he battled "more times," conquering *Nisibis and Harran (Lat. *Carre*), advancing even to *Syria. Shapur I also knew how to face the ascent of Septimius Odaenathus of *Palmyra, who even came to the point of threatening Ctesiphon. Shapur I maintained *Persian power intact against the West and consolidated the Persian economy. He promoted a program of public works

and, esp. in his later years, commissioned the translation of many Greek and Indian works.

The epigraphs *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* recall the victory that marks the end of the Parthian dominion and the beginning of Persian rule (28 April AD 224) and the victories of Shapur I over the Romans. The emperor Gordian III in the battle of Rish'ayna (243) defeated Shapur I's Persians with the help of *Gothic militias, but in 244 Shapur I was able to achieve peace with the emperor *Philip the Arab, a peace that guaranteed him power in *Armenia and *Mesopotamia, and in 260, after having occupied *Dura Europos and *Antioch, in the battle of *Edessa he entirely defeated and captured the emperor *Valerian, even with less help from the *Goths at *Rome; the Roman emperor died in prison. In 260 *Commodian saw in *Valerian a persecutor of the Christians, *Nero redivivus* and the first Antichrist, and in Shapur I the *rex ab Oriente* from the *Sibylline Oracles* and the second Antichrist, who came to destroy the empire and to bring about more quickly the end the world. Just as *Plotinus was at the assistance of Gordian III in the expedition of 243–244, so too in this campaign *Mani, the founder of Manicheism, was at the service of Shapur I: the sovereign in fact kept him under his own care. Many Romans, on this occasion, were deported to Persia and, as recorded by the *Chronicle of Se'ert*, "obtained in Persia a better living than in their own homeland, and through their work Christianity made converts in the East." In the West, the successor of Valerian, the emperor *Gallienus, suspended the persecution promoted by Valerian and restored to the Christians the freedom of worship and their own properties.

With respect to Shapur II (AD 309–379), the aforementioned *Chronicle of Arbela* speaks at great length, recalling his vain attempt to lay siege to Nisibis, "a city of borders," and his decision to "uproot from his land the religion of the Romans," i.e., Christianity, which, in the post-*Constantine era, at the time of the emperor *Constantius, was regarded in Persia by that time to be the religion of the Roman Empire. Thus in 339/340 a royal edict decreed the slaughter of Christians in Persia and the destruction of their churches, even if the *mauhpata*, the Persian governors, did not uniformly apply the edict. Thus, e.g., the *mauhpata* of Adiabene Pagrasp bargained with the noble Christians of Arbela to allow for the persecution only in the month of Ilul, around September, so that only very few were killed in Adiabene. Nevertheless, with the new *mauhpata* Piroz Tamshabor, the persecution was increased from the end of the year 340, and even more with his successor Ador-Parreh, chosen by Shapur in view of a new war against the Romans, which was desired "so that the Christians might be simultaneously deprived both of their priesthood and kingdom." From that point onward the king wanted to rescind the persecution, but the Manicheans and the Jews instigated the Zorostrians to convince Shapur II to persecute the Christians, claiming that "the Christians were all spies of the Romans and that nothing occurred in the kingdom of 'Persia' that they did not write to inform their brethren from there" (Kawerau, 53 = Mingana, 50). Christians were forced to worship fire and the sun; whoever refused to do so was sentenced to death: it seems that the slayings in Persia were very numerous, in the first place ecclesiastical officials and consecrated individuals, but also laypeople, from both high and low classes. At the end of Shapur II's kingdom, which frequently was at war with Rome, requiring the military efforts both of *Constantius II and the emperor *Julian (who in 363 died during one of his Persian campaigns; shortly after *Jovian made peace with the Persians), the persecution came to an end, which was narrated by *Daniel bar Maryam (John of Arbela) in his historical work: although the Christians of the Roman Empire from Constantine onward did not experience any more persecutions—with the exception of the "cultural" persecution introduced by the emperor Julian—and enjoyed the Roman-Christian *pax*, those in Persia underwent the first persecution officially instigated by the emperor, where before they occurred only as local events of intolerance and hostility, at times even incited by the Zoroastrians.

M. Sordi, *Dionigi d'Alessandria, Commodiano e alcuni problemi della storia del III secolo*: Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia (1962-63) 144; Id., *Commodianus, Carmen apol. 892 ss.: rex ab oriente*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 203-210; A. Pagliaro, *La Civiltà iranica prima dell'Islamismo*, Rome 1935; E. Honigmann - A. Maricq, *Recherches sur les Res gestae divi Saporis*, Brussels 1953 (Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politique. Mémoires 47, 4); R. Göbl, *Der Triumph des Sāsāniden Šahpuhr über die Kaiser Gordianus, Philippus und Valerianus: die ikonographische Interpretation der Felsreliefs*, Vienna 1974 (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte Mittelasiens 3; Denkschriften / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 116); Commodiano, *Carme apologetico*, intr., ed., comm. di A. Salvatore, Turin 1977; M. Back, *Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften . . . mit einem Textcorpus der behandelten Inschriften*, Leiden-Téhéran-Liège 1978 (Acta Iranica 18. III Série. Textes et mémoires 8); E. Kettenhofen, *Die Römisch-persischen Kriege des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. nach der Inschrift Sahpuhrs 1. an der Ka beye Zartost (SKZ)*, Wiesbaden 1982 (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Reihe B: Geisteswissenschafte 55); R.N. Frye, *The History of Ancient Iran*, Munich 1983 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, III. Abt. 7); J. Wiesehöfer, *Das antike Persien: von 550 v. Chr. bis 650 n. Chr.*, Munich-Zürich 1994, with extensive bibl.; E. Kettenhofen, *Tirdad und die Inschrift von Paikuli: Kritik der Quellen zur Geschichte Armeniens im*

späten 3. und frühen 4. Jh. n. Chr., Wiesbaden 1995; I. Ramelli, *Il Chronicon di Arbela*, Madrid 2002, 21-22, 45-46, 55-56 and passim; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins: processus missionnaires chrétiens dans l'Empire Iranien*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002; I. Ramelli, *Atti di Mari*, Brescia 2007.

I. Ramelli

SHEEP. Already present in the OT and NT as a symbolic figure, the lost and found sheep of the parables in Lk 15:4-7 and Mt 18:12-14 were interpreted in various ways by the *gnostics: *Apelles believed it was the angel who regretted that he created the world, and thus acknowledged its evil (Tertull., *De car*. 8,3); the Simonians believed it was Ennoia, who, after leaving the Father's house, returned there as the redeemed church (Iren., *Adv. haer*. I,23,2; Tertull., *De anim*. 34,4; Hipp., *Haer*. VI, 19,2.3); the *Valentinians believed the 99 sheep were the incomplete *pleroma which needed to recover its unity (Iren., *Adv. Haer*. I,16,1-2).

Among orthodox Christians, the sheep of Lk 15:4-7 refers to all humankind created by God, lost, sought and found (Tertull., *Adv. Marc*. IV,32,1; Iren., *Adv. haer*. III,19,3; 23,1; Orig., *Hom. IX, 3 in Gen*.; Hilar., *In Matth*. 18,6; Cyr. Jer., *Catech*. XV,24; Jer., *In Matth*. III; Greg. Nyss., *Hom. II in Cant*.; Greg. the Great, *Hom. in Evang*. II,34,3); in other instances it refers to the sinner (Tertull., *De paenit*. VIII,3-5; Cypr., *Ep*. 55,15; Jer., *In Matth*. III), or the one who has not sinned grievously and can thus be forgiven (Tertull., *De pudic*. VII, 17-19), or the church set on top of a mountain, namely Christ (Aug., *Serm*. 37,2). The reciprocal awareness of the sheep and the Shepherd (Jn 10:14) signifies a union of family relation (Cyr. Alex., *In Ioh*. 6). Sheep is Christ's title proclaimed in Is 53:7 and Jer 11:19 (Cypr., *Testim*. II,15; Chrom., *Serm*. 23,3); it is the figure of the Jews or Gentiles on the basis of Mt 15:24 or Jn 10:16 (Aug., *In evang. Ioh*. 49,27). The sheep of Mt 18:12-14 are the poor and downtrodden (John Chrys., *Hom. 59 in Mt*.), while those of Ps 64:14 and 94:7 are the patriarchs and prophets, from whose flock *Mary came forth, the "immaculate and holy" sheep (Chrom., *Serm*. 23,3).

The meekness of the sheep accounts for their similarity to the disciple sent by Jesus (see Mt 10:16): only by being sheep can they overcome the wolves (John Chrys., *Hom. 33 in Mt*.). The sheep separated from the goats on the day of judgment (see Mt 25:31ff.) are indicative of the fruitfulness of the works performed by the righteous in contrast to the sterility of sinners (John Chrys., *Hom. 79 in Mt*.).

A. Orbe, *Parábolas evangélicas en s. Ireneo*, II, Madrid 1972.

F. Cocchini

SHENOUTE (Gk. *Sinouthios*) (ca. 350–466). *Abbot of the *monastery in the neighborhood of Atripe, near Achmim (Upper *Egypt), now called the "White Monastery" (Deir el Abiad) or the "Monastery of Shenoute" (Deir anba Shenudah). He lived from ca. 350 to 466. He was known primarily as the major original author of *Coptic literature, but his activity embraced numerous fields, spiritual and practical, and he left deep traces in the Egyptian church and monasticism. Unfortunately, the MS tradition of his works is in a deplorable state. The sources for his life are solely in Coptic because no *Greek source mentions them. Much can be deduced from his works. Study conducted in recent years by S. Emmel has permitted scholars to reconstruct in large measure the breadth and characteristics of his writings. Shenoute's works, in fact, had received, already during the life of the great archimandrite, an organization into a corpus divided into two parts: the so-called *Canones*, contained in nine books, and the *Logoi*, in seven books. Manuscripts exclusively preserved near the monastery of Shenoute were spread into groups of papers and a number of collections outside Egypt. Emmel was able to reconstruct them as much as possible. From Shenoute's works emerges a lively and intriguing figure.

Shenoute was first and foremost the head of his monastery, for which he created a broad series of rules of conduct, which were inspired by the *Pachomian rules but were adapted to the new times and demands created by the important role that monasticism had assumed in Egypt. He delivered frequent and long sermons to the monks, some of which have survived in part, which treat moral and spiritual topics. Outside the monastery, Shenoute acted in concert with the bishops of *Alexandria (he lived under *Athanasius, *Theophilus, *Cyril and *Dioscorus) to spread and consolidate Christianity in Egypt (his attitude toward a dying paganism was rather harsh) and to help the Alexandrian theses triumph in the entire catholic church (it seems that he accompanied Cyril to the Council of *Ephesus [431]). Moreover, he had numerous friendships with high-ranking civil officials, who called upon him during various difficulties, and he offered help and refuge to the nearby population during the barbarian invasions (i.e., the nomad tribes of the desert: the Blemmyes).

His literary work is a mirror of this activity. One must therefore mention the homilies and the catecheses concerning monastic topics and letters sent to various ecclesiastical and civil figures. Moreover, he also wrote theological treatises (esp. on *Nesto-

rian ideas) and a work against *gnosticizing and *Origenist currents of thought.

J. Leipoldt, *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia*, I.III. IV; CSCO 41, 42, 73; tr. H. Wiesmann: CSCO 129, 96, 108, Louvain 1906-1951; E.C. Amélineau, *OEuvres de Schenoudi*, I-II, Paris 1907-1914; K.H. Kuhn, *Pseudo-Shenoute on Christian Behaviour*: CSCO 206-207, Louvain 1960; numerous fragments have been published in various great places: see W. Kammerer, *A Coptic Bibliography*, Ann Arbor, MI 1950 (index); N. Bell, *Besa*, *The Life of Shenute*, Kalamazoo, MI (intro., tr. and notes). The only monograph was written before the edition: J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe und die Entstehung des national-ägyptischen Christentums* (TU 25,1), Leipzig 1903; S.L. Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus Ann Arbor*, UMI, 1993, 5 vols., PhD Diss. Yale University; T. Orlandi, *Shenoute d'Atripé*: DSp 14, 797-804; Coptic Encyclopedia 7, 2131-2133; Patrologia V, 544-551.

T. Orlandi

SHEPHERD, THE GOOD.
I. In the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. **In the Fathers.** Jesus referred to himself as the "Good Shepherd" in Jn 10:11, 14 and described the characteristics of such a figure: the Shepherd enters the sheepfold through the gate (10:1), he calls the sheep by their own name, leads them out from the enclosure (10:3) and walks before them (4); the sheep hear his voice (10:3, 27) and follow him (10:4, 27). The mutual awareness of the Shepherd and sheep (10:4, 14, 27) is established on the reciprocal knowledge of the Father and the Shepherd (10:15). The Good Shepherd offers his life for the sheep (10:11, 15) in comparison to the mercenary, who flees before the wolf (10:12-13); he grants them eternal life (10:28) and will also gather in the sheep that do not belong to the flock so that there may be "one flock and one shepherd" (10:16).

The use of the image of the Good Shepherd is very abundant in patristic literature from the very beginning (probably in *Abercius, *Epitaph.* 3-6). In addition to the occasional references to the Shepherd, this image was a specific object of attention in the Fathers' systematic commentaries on John (John Chrys., *Hom. 59-60 in Jn.*; Theodore of Mops., *Jn.;* Aug., *In evang. Ioh.* 45-48; Cyr. Alex., *Jn.;* Nonnus, *Par. Jn.;* Ammonius, *Jn.;* Bede, *In evang. Joh.*) and in several homilies (see Severian of Gabala, *In mem. mart.;* Aug., *Serm.* 137 and 138; Peter Chrysol., *Serm.* 40; Basil of Sel., *Or.* 26; Greg. the Great., *In evang.* 14). At times the title "Shepherd" was inserted into the list of christological titles (Orig., *Comm. in Rom.* VII, 19; *Jn.* 1,126.267; *Hom. in Jer.* I [III] 4: SC 238, 326; Basil of Caes., *Eun.* 1,7; *De Spir.* VIII,17; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 30,21; Euch., *Formulae* 6); this reveals Jesus' divinity (Orig., *Jn.* 1,22; Cyr. Jer., *Cat.* 10,3), bears witness to the necessity of an inner guide inasmuch as they are barely endowed with the Logos (Orig., *Jn.* 1,122,190.198; XIX, 39) and the care that Christ has for humankind (John Chrys., *Hom. 59 in Jn.* 2). They emphasized the adjective "Good" that qualifies the Shepherd (Jer., *Tract. in psalm.* 96,10; *In Am.* II on Amos 5:14-15; *In Is.* II on Is 5:20; XV on Is 55:3); this qualification often demonstrates in connection with Mt 19:17 and parallel passages the equality of the Father and the Son (Ephrem, *Diat.* XV, 9-12; Ambr., *De fid.* 11,2,25-26; *In Luc.* VIII, 67; Jer., *Tract. in psalm.* 142,10; *In Matth.* 19:17; Ces. Arles, *Breviarium fidei adv. haeret.*). Christ is the "shepherd of the Catholic Church throughout the world" (*Mart. Poly.* 19,2); being the Logos of the Father, he is the "watchful Shepherd of children," i.e., the *pedagogue "who leads us children to salvation" (Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1,7,53,2-3; 9,83,3–84,2); he is not only the Shepherd of believers, in a general sense, but in the soul of every person, he is the Shepherd of movements devoid of reason (Orig., *Hom. 5 in Jer.* 6; see also Philo, *De sacr. Ab. et Cain* 45). Perhaps in polemics with the *Marcionites and the *gnostics, it was emphasized how only the Good Shepherd was also the lawgiver (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 1,26,169,1-2). The Good Shepherd was compared to certain OT figures: Abel (Chromat., *Serm.* 23,2), Moses (Tertull., *De fuga* 11,1; see also Jer., *Ep.* 82,3), the shepherd spoken of by Ps 22 (see J. Daniélou, *Bibbia e liturgia*, Milan 1958, 235-253) and Ezek 34 (Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1,9,2-3; Cypr., *Ep.* 8,1-2; Didym., *In Zach.* 11,39; Aug., *Serm.* 46 and 47; Jer., *In Ezech.* XI on Ezek 34:1-31; Basil of Sel., *Or.* 26,2), and the Paschal Lamb (*Trad. Ap.* 41; Apollinaris, *Pasc.* 2,2; Orig., *Hom. 14 in Gen.* 2).

The title and the characteristics of the Good Shepherd are also attributed to men: the apostles *Peter (Aug., *Serm.* 137,4,4; 138,4,4) and *Paul (Ambr., *Spir.* 11,10,108; Aug., *Serm.* 137,9,11; *In evang. Joh.* 47,3); the apostles, bishop martyrs and St. *Cyprian (Aug., *Serm.* 138,1,1); the person of the bishop (Ign., *Philad.* 2,1; Tertull., *Pudic.* 13; *Const. App.* 2,20,1; Leo the Great, *Ep.* 10,5); the leaders of the church who are pastors acc. to the image of the Good Shepherd (Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1,6,37,3; Orig., *Hom. 12 in Lc. 2*; Cypr., *Unit. eccl.* 8; *Ep.* 69,5; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 33,15-16; Ambr., *In Luc.* VII, 50; John Chrys., *Hom. 60 in Jn.* 1); *Constantine inasmuch as he leads the flock to the knowledge and worship of God (Eus., *Laud. Const.* IV,65); and those who fight for the kingdom and sacrifice everything to the point of death for serving God (Ps. Mac. Eg., *Hom.* 17,1: TU 72,94). *Augustine clarifies the relationship between the sole Shepherd and the Good Shepherd, making the parallel be-

tween Jn 10 and Jn 21:15-17 (*Serm.* 46,23.30; 138,4,4) and declaring that the pastors are members of the Shepherd (*Serm.* 138,5,5; *In evang. Jn.* 46,7-8). From such an account one can conclude that the pastors must imitate the Good Shepherd (Basil of Caes., *Moral.* reg. 80,16; reg. 70,19; Aug., *In evang. Joh.* 47,2; 123,5), send forth his voice alone (Aug., *Serm.* 46,30), and that, esp. during the period of *persecution, the leaders of the church should not flee like mercenaries do in the face of danger (Tertull., *De fug.* 11,2; Cypr., *Ep.* 8,1-2); and when the wolf appears, one sees the difference between the mercenary and the true Shepherd (Greg. M., *In evang.* 14,2).

Other NT passages in which the image of the Shepherd is present occur in reference to God or Christ, even though lacking the designation of "Good Shepherd": Lk 15:4-7//Mt 18:12-14; Mt 15:24; Mk 14:27//Mt 26:31; Mt 25:32; Heb 13:20; 1 Pet 2:25; 5:4; Rev 7:17.

GLNT 10, 1193-1227; J. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in quatuor s. Evangelia. IV ev. secundum Joannem*, Paris [2]1906, 335-349 (for patristic references); J. Quasten, *Der gute Hirte in hellenist. und frühchristl. Theologie*: *Heilige Überlieferung*, Festschrift für I. Herwegen, Münster 1938, 51-58; I. de la Potterie, *Le Bon Pasteur*: *Populus Dei*, in Mélanges A. Card. Ottaviani, Rome 1969, 927-968; P.R. Tragan, *La parabole du "Pasteur" et ses explications*: *Jean 10, 1-18* (*La genèse, les milieux littéraires*), SA 67, Rome 1980 (bibl.).

A. Pollastri

II. Iconography. In the Asiatic tradition of the late imperial age, the pastoral theme was very widespread, responding to the need for representing the afterlife as a place of peace and serenity but at the same time an idealization of the rural leisure (*otium*). Among the various figures, a new characteristic was attributed to the one who carried the sheep or the ram on his shoulders, long considered to be the figure of Christ the Good Shepherd. The image originated from the idyllic-pastoral representations and was an abbreviated figure of a bucolic scene; it was an allegorical image before becoming the Good Shepherd in the Christian repertoire. Being a symbol of φιλανθρωπία ("philanthropy") or of humanity (*humanitas*), acc. to the iconographic tradition of the ram-bearing Hermes, in Christian art this image intends to emphasize salvific action and cannot be considered a depiction of Jesus Christ but is an ideogram, so that as a result it can be repeated more times in the same context or on the same handmade object (Wp 25; Ws 178,2; 269,1-4). The animal being carried on the shoulders is not a victim destined for sacrifice but a creature that has been rescued. Assimilating once again contemporary iconography, the salvific power of Christ was transformed into the image of the *orans*, and joining together the fundamental pair of the history of salvation: the Savior and the saved soul (Wp 117,1; Ws 1,2).

The *pagan repertoire therefore suggests an elaboration of Christian art scenes in response to the need for Christian craftsman and art patrons to introduce symbolic elements acceptable to the popular spirituality of the time and in harmony with the literary tradition of sacred texts. The theme of the Good Shepherd in fact originated from various passages in the gospels: in addition to the parable of the lost sheep (Lk 15:4-7), it recalls the words of Christ himself in the gospel of *John: "I am the Good Shepherd" (Jn 10:11), acc. to the tradition of the Shepherd affirmed several times in the OT as in the NT (Job 10:1-19; Ezek 24:11-12, 14-16, 23, 31; Is 44:28; Ps 22:1-5; 118:176, to cite only the most famous passages), who is described as the leader, guide and Logos for the Christian people, salvation for his flock of which he is the head. In this sense, *Abercius bishop of Hierapolis defines himself on his own epitaph as a "disciple of the godly Shepherd" (A Ferrua, *Epitaffio di Abercio*, 279ff.).

Particularly dear to Christians of the early church, the image of the Good Shepherd had a very wide diffusion in all the figurative genres. Some iconographic variations that bestowed a fixed narrative for a representation symbolic in itself were added to the common type of the ram-bearing Shepherd who at one moment was young and beardless, at another bearded, at another having a bald head: he is certainly displayed as his sheep drinks milk (Wp 117,1) or watches vigilantly over his flock with a shepherd's hook (*pedum*) in hand (Wp 117,2), while petting his dog and holding a pale of milk in his hand (Wp 66,2). The style of clothing is always the same with a few variants: it consists of a belt and a short tunic, *exomis* (Ws 1,2; Wp 66,1) or sleeved, at most with an *alicula* (Wp 116,2) and sandals.

One finds an exception to this rule in the so-called Good Shepherd who is in "singular dress" in a very rich Eastern style, depicted on the pavement of an oratory in *Aquileia, that has come down to us through restoration and adaptations *ab antiquo* (L. Bertacchi, *Buon Pastore dall'abito singolare*, 429ff.). On the basis of the literary evidence, this enigmatic figure is interpreted as a representation of Christ. But for this representation, as for the image of the shepherds, namely the one in the oratory of Cal estate at Aquileia (I. Bortolotto, *Sacello paleocristiano*, 26ff.), and the other on the Roman villa at Desenzano (M. Mirabella Roberti, *Mosaico col B.P.*, 393ff.), the problem still remains whether it was a representation of the Good Shepherd or rather if they should

be interpreted as an expression of a desire for peace, an idealization of the *felicitas temporum* that led people to choose bucolic themes for decorating the spaces reserved for private use.

The painting of an arcosolium in the cemetery of Balbina on the Via Ardeatina is unique and striking. The picture depicts a person with a halo wearing shepherds' clothes surrounded by twelve fish set in two lines, interpreted by the publisher according to a well-known passage of *Tertullian (*sed nos pisciculi secundum* ἰχθύν *nostrum Christum aqua nascimur*: *Bapt.* 1,3: CSEL 1,277) as an *allegorical image of Christ (A. Nestori, *Pitture inedite*, 156). The cubicle of Prestatus has a descriptive objective, but also at the same time a symbolic one (Wp 51), near the *spelunca magna*, where the Shepherd defends his flock on the right-hand side, using a **virga* to ward off a wild donkey and a pig, two symbols of evil.

The certainty of the *resurrection and the Good Shepherd's reception of the flock after death are clearly expressed in the slab of Veratius Nicatora (Diehl 4463), where the Good Shepherd is depicted as standing between *Jonah, who was spewed forth by the sea monster, and a lion, a symbol of death. Besides funerary scenes, the image was esp. widespread in the decoration of the Christian baptisteries—e.g., *Dura Europos,* Naples (WMM 36-38) and the Lateran (WMM 256-256., fig. 73)—where the Good Shepherd appears alongside OT and NT biblical episodes, clearly alluding to the theme of salvation. Probably inspired by the parable in *Matthew's gospel on the sheep and the goats and the solemn judgment at the end of time (Mt 25:31-34) is the relief on the sarcophagus lid in the Metropolitan Museum of New York (Ws 83) with the shepherd in philosopher's clothing, who is patting his flock on the right-hand side and fighting off the goats on the left. But a complete assimilation of the pastoral allegory, in what is certainly christological iconography, appears in the mosaic of the Museum of Gall Placidia at *Ravenna, where Christ, adorned with a halo above his head and holding a processional cross, sits on a mountain surrounded by his flock. Frequently appearing on small objects and utensils (e.g., C.R. Morey, *Gold Glass*, pl. III,14; XX,18; var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, 465), the ram-bearing figures are evident also on several statues in the round, interpreted through their chronology as a representation of the Good Shepherd (Ws 52,1; 52,5; 52,8), but because the provenance of these handmade objects is still unclear it is difficult to establish if they are generic pastoral representations or images of the Good Shepherd.

After an extraordinary flourishing of ancient Christian art esp. in the West, this type of iconography almost entirely disappeared during the Middle Ages, only to make its reappearance on some bas-reliefs or on the miniatures of a few codices.

DACL 13, 2272-2390; EC 9, 930-934; RAC 3, 11ff.; LCI 2, 289-299; EAA 2, 223-224; Wp I, 45ff.; Ws I, 63ff.; H.U. von Schönebeck, *Die christlichen Paradeisos Sarkophage*: RivAC 14 (1937) 289-343; J. Quasten, *Der Guter Hirt in frühchristlicher Totenliturgie and Grabeskunst*, in Misc. G. Mercati, ST 121, Vatican City 1946, 373-406; J. Fink, *Mythologische und biblische Themen in den Sarkophagplastik des 3. Jahrhunderts*: RivAC 27 (1951) 167-190; L. de Bruyne, *La décoration des baptistères paléochrétiens*, in Actes du V[e] Congrès Int. d'Archéologie Chrét., Vatican City 1967, 341-369; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim. Die Vorstellungen vom Zwischenzustand and die frühchristliche Grabeskunst*, Bonn 1957, 151ff.; Th. Klauser, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der christlichen Kunst*: JbAC I-X, 1958-1967 (see the note on p. 82 of vol. X, index); L. de Bruyne, *Les lois de l'art paléochrétien comme instrument herméneutique*: RivAC 39 (1963) 7-92; A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins*, Princeton, NJ 1968, 10-11; Id., *L'art de la fin de l'antiquité et du moyen âge*, III, Paris 1968; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse and Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster/W. 1973, 322ff.; N. Himmelmann, *Sarcofagi romani a rilievo. Problemi di cronologia e di iconografia*: ASNP 4 (1974) 139-177 (see 156ff.); P-A. Février, *Naissance d'un art chrétien*: Les Dossiers de l'archéologie 18 (1976) 18ff.; R. Giordani, *Frammento di rilievo inedito con rappresentazione di Buon Pastore nella basilica di S. Marco a Roma*: RAL 30 (1976) 342-360; W.N. Schumacher, *Hirt und "Guter Hirt,"* Rom-Freiburg-Vienna 1977; N. Himmelmann, *Ueber Hirten Genre in der antiken Kunst*, Opladen 1980. The examples cited in the text: A. Ferrua, *Nuove osservazioni sull'epitaffio di Abercio*: RivAC 20 (1943) 279-305; C.R. Morey, *The Gold Glass Collection of the Vatican Library*, Vatican City 1959; A. Nestori, *Pitture inedite del cimitero della via Ardeatina*: Rend. PARA 45 (1972/1973) 151-163; M. Guarducci, *Il Buon Pastore tra i pesci*: ibid., 165-170; I. Bortolotto, *Il sacello paleocristiano della CaL ad Aquileia*, Udine 1973; L. Bertacchi, *Il mosaico aquileiese del Buon Pastore dall'abito singolare*: AAAd 12 (1977) 429-444; var. aus., *Age of Spirituality*, New York 1978; M. Mirabella Roberti, *Un mosaico con Buon Pastore a Desenzano*, in Atti del V Congr. Naz. Arch. Crist., Rome 1982, 393-405; TIP 138-139; M. Dulaey, *Le berger divin*, in *"Des forêts de symboles." L'initiation chrétienne et la Bible (I[er]-VI[e] siècle)*, Paris 2001, 191-212.

A.M. Giuntella

SHIP. Navigation in the Mediterranean has a very ancient history, its prehistoric origins reflected in myths, such as that of the Argonauts in the Greek world and of the mystery of Isis in Egypt. The relationship of the ancients with seafaring, as in later times, is marked by contrasting sentiments of fear and daring, reflected in the variety of nautical symbolism. To navigate, in fact, means to brave a sea brimming with dangers, for which one needs a good ship, a courageous and able pilot, and also divine assistance: these elements are usually all incorporated by authors who use nautical symbolism. The idea of

daring on the part of the pilot and at the same time the necessity of divine help are clearly expressed by the names given to boats in the ancient world: *Hope*, *Joy*, *Daring*, *Providence*. Another aspect emphasized in nautical symbolism is that of the common destiny of those aboard a ship: the expression "to be in the same boat" is found already in Livy (26,22,13) and Cicero (*Ad fam.* 2,5,1). The ship in which we are all traveling is, however, variously identified by the ancient authors: the ship of the state, the soul or the world or, finally, the ship of the church. The image of the state as a well-navigated ship we find across the classical world, esp. from *Plato onward, who compares the philosopher engaged in governing the *polis* with the pilot of a boat (*Gorg.* 511d; *Polit.* 296d and *Resp.* 488d-489d, *Leg.* 902d). A Christian author like *Eusebius uses the image to describe the Christian emperor, called to be a steersman in governing the world (*Laus Const.* 10 = GCS Eusebius I, 223,12-22). In the coinage of *Constantine we find depictions of the victorious emperor at the center of the boat of the state, with the labarum planted as if it were a tree, and sails bearing the signs of Christ on the lateen yard, while at the stern we see a winged spirit or guardian angel who holds the tiller (see J. Maurice, *Numismatique constantinienne*, Paris 1911, vol. 2).

At the anthropological level, the pair navigator-ship is used to express the relationship between the *soul and the *body (e.g., in Plato, *Tim.* 73d and 85e), but also the relationship of the soul of the *world with the individuals souls which have fallen into bodies (Plato, *Phileb.* 28d). *Ambrose too, e.g., speaks of the necessity of the flesh having the soul as a pilot (*Hexam.* 6,6,39 = CSEL 32, I, 230,24), but then in Christian *symbolism the pilot becomes more commonly identified with the Logos. *Clement of Alexandria, citing Pr 11:4 with reference to Philo, points to the *nous* and the *logismos* as the steersmen of the soul (*Strom.* 2,11,51,6 = GCS Clement 2,141,4-6), while ps.-*Macarius affirms that the soul, if it is left to itself without Christ as pilot, sinks in the tempest of the passions (*Hom. Pneum.* 28,2 = PTS 4, 231,19-232,24). *Augustine, later, describes the inhabitation of the Christ in human hearts as that of a sailor in a small boat (*Enarrat. In Ps.* 34,3 and 45,5: CCL 38, 520,6-521,5). Consequently, death can be described even by a Christian author such as *Gregory of Nyssa as a shipwreck in which the corporeal elements disintegrate (*De anima et resurrect.* 7,3), an image which echoes Plato and is found also in the *Oration to the Assembly of the Saints* of Constantine (Eusebius, *Const. Orat. Ad sanct. Coet.*, 9 = GCS Eusebius I, 164,20-22). The ship therefore serves to express the Platonic doctrine of the *anima mundi*, identified by Christian authors with the Logos which vivifies the universe: as the soul guides the ship of the body, so the Logos guides the ship of the universe. Eusebius, e.g., comparing the Logos with the pilot of the universe, affirms that what occurs in the ship of the world in figure is accomplished by the *providence of the Father and the navigational art of the Logos in the ship of the church (*Syriac Theophany* I, 30,31 = GCS Eusebius III, 2,51,24-31). From the image of the ship of the world governed by the Father and the Son, there emerged that of the ship of the church governed by the same: the underlying theological vision saw the church as a ship guided expertly by the Logos, and in which individual souls, the state and the world reach their final destiny.

Christian authors, moreover, emphasize the fragility of this ship, destined to lead humanity to salvation, dwelling on the material of which it is made, wood. Wisd 14:2,5,7 (LXX), the first allegorical interpretation of the ark of Noah, underlines the value of that very small quantity of wood through which we attain salvation. The Fathers renew this repertory of images introducing the theme of the wood of the *cross: if in the first shipwreck of nature salvation came through the wood of the ark, so in the second it comes through the wood of the cross (Greg. Naz., *Or.* 4,18 = SC 309,110,2-4; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 15,26 = CSEL 40,2,116,23-26). The ark, in fact, had already been identified by *Tertullian (*Bapt.* 8,4 = CCL 1,283,17-27) as a symbol and prefiguration of the new ark of salvation, that is the church. *Hippolytus is more specific in his symbolic account of the ship, finding an equivalent for every component: if the ship is the church which braves the sea of the world, her pilot is Christ, her mast the trophy of the cross, her rudders the two testaments and her white sail is the *Holy Spirit, to limit ourselves to the essential elements (*De Antichristo* 59 = GCS Hippolytus I, 39,12-40,9). Among the biblical images which have had most influence on the image of the ship of the church, one which must be mentioned is that of Peter's boat, found in Lk 5:3, often identified with the ship in the storm guided by the same apostle in Mk 4:35-41 and parallel passages. Tertullian (*Bapt.* 12,6-7: CCL I, 288,34-43) compares the boat of the *apostles to the church tossed about by the tempestuous waves of the age, in which Christ sleeps (Mk 4:38), symbolizing Christ on the cross. The theme became traditional in subsequent authors: *Origen (*HomCt* 2,12 = GCS VIII, 58,17-26) says that Jesus, through the typology of the apostles and the boat, frees the church from the shipwreck of persecution, guides it to the coast, and leads it into the calm of the port.

Other authors insist more on the idea that the boat of the church is the boat of Peter. In the letter of *ps.-Clement to James* 3,5 (GCS Ps. Clementine I, 8) the apostle Peter, in the act of consecrating Clement bishop, speaks of the believers as under the guide of Clement as people who are on a sea journey, and therefore likens the entire church to a great ship, which gathers individuals in search of the *kingdom of God. God is the owner of this ship, while the pilot, the image of Christ, is the bishop, and the hierarchy of the crew reflects the hierarchy of the church. The image is subsequently used in the Roman tradition to ground the theology of the primacy of Peter (see Rahner, 822-824), even if it is rather the image of the miraculous catch of fish of Peter and the apostles which most richly expresses the theme. In full consonance with the letter of *ps.-Clement to James* are the **Apostolic Constitutions* (2,57,2-4; 9-11 = SC 320, 310,4-312,16; 314,36-46), which however propose a correspondence not only between the ship and the church in the sense of a spiritual reality, but also between the ship and the church building, a vessel that, as it were, journeys toward the East. Naval catalogs are frequent across the whole body of patristic literature of both East and West, becoming a common motif right up to medieval theology (see Rahner, *L'ecclesiologia*, 522-527).

Tertullian sees the ship in the storm of Mk 4:35-41 as a figure of the persecuted church (*Bapt.* 12,7 = CCL I, 288,38-43), while others insist on the fact that this vessel cannot sink because its salvation comes from the "mast" of Christ's cross (Justin Mart., 1 *Apol.* 55,3 = PTS 38,110,8-9; Ambrose, *De sp. Sanct.* 1,9,110 = CSEL 79, 62,82-63,86). If the ship headed for the port of salvation is the church, which makes progress amid the waves of the sea of this world (Orig., *Jos. Hom.* 19,4 = GCS Origen VII, 413,6-10), shipwrecks should be identified with sinners, those who do not believe and *heretics (Orig., *Ct. Com* III = GCS 8,226,3-10). *Jerome (*Alt. Lucif.* 19 = SC 473,16-22) compares the furious tempest of the *Arians, calmed by the unexpected death of *Constantius, to the end of the storm at the sea of Galilee (Mt 8:23-24), and the steersman who carries the ship to safety to the bishop, image of the true steersman, Christ. The image of the church as a ship and of the bishop as its pilot lasted right up to the medieval epoch, even in the figurative arts.

Next to the image of the church as a ship built with the wood of the cross, the idea developed early of the crucified Christ as a ship, inspired by the use of the synecdoche "wood/tree" to indicate either the cross (Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:29) or a ship. This equivalence is clearer when specific parallels are made between a ship and the cross: one of the motifs used is that of the ship made with the same wood as the cross of Christ; in a ps.-Chrysostomic text (*Or. De Adoratione Crucis* 3 = PG 529, 839) we read that the cross was constructed from cypress, pine and cedar wood, alluding to Is 60:13 (LXX). The triple wood of the cross became a common patristic theme. Also emphasized was the idea that the ship of the church is held together by the nails of the cross: *Venantius Fortunatus (*Miscell.* 2,4 = PL 88, 93A) in fact speaks of the "sweet crosses" and the "sweet nails." The act of embarkation is understood as a metaphor for mounting the cross, as for instance in Ambrose (*Exp. Ev. sec. Luc.* 6,39 = CSEL 32, 4,248,5-8).

The particular feature of the ship, however, that presents a more obvious symbol of the cross is that of the lateen yard, or more precisely the cross formed by the mast and the beam or spar of the sail: *Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* XII, 118,4 = GCS Clemente I, 83,24-30) sees in Ulysses, bound to the mast so as to resist the song of the Sirens, a prefiguration of Christ on the cross. *Minucius Felix affirms that, when a ship advances in full sail, almost spontaneously one recognizes the sign of the cross (*Oct.* 29,8 = CSEL 2,43,10-15). The yard, symbol of the cross, is therefore called by *Justin Martyr the sign of victory (*tropaion*), without which it is impossible to sail the sea of the world (1 *Apol.* 55,3 = PTS 38, 110,8-9). Tertullian makes more explicit the connection between the *tropaion*, the stake on which the victors hang the weapons of their enemies, and the yard (in *Apol.* 16,7 = CCL I, 116,30-34 and in the parallel passages of *Ad nat.* 1,12 = CCL I, 30,24-32,12), saying that the pagans unconsciously pray to crosses when they plant stakes in the ground: in this way they pray to a god by halves, not fully, as Christians do when they pray to the integral cross. In *Ad nat.* 1,12 he finds the cross symbolized in many different places, among which are the human body and the mast with the intersecting yard.

H. Rahner, *L'ecclesiologia dei Padri*, Rome1971, 397-969; U. Weber, s.v. "Schiff": LCI 4, 61-67; L. Gambassi, s.v. "Nave," in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Dizionario*, Vatican City 2000, 228-230.

C. Noce

SICCA VENERIA. The city had various names in antiquity; it was primarily given the name of Sicca or Veneria or Sicca Veneria. Today it is called "El Kef" (Tunisia). It was part of Proconsular *Africa. Rooted on Mt. Erice, where a temple to Venus stood high, which was well-known for the voluntary prostitution of the matrons (Valerius Maximus, *Fastorum*

II,6,15), and situated as well along the street which led from *Carthage to Constantine, the city soon aligned itself with the Romans; it became a Roman colony through the work of Octavian. In the 3rd c. the *curator civitatis* and the temple of Venus were the same person (CIL 8, 15881); in the 6th c. the emperor *Justinian supplied the city a new belt of fortifications (Procopius, *Aedif*. 6,7,10).

The presence of Christianity in Sicca Veneria is attested from the 3rd c. Among the bishops of Sicca Veneria we know of Castus in 256 (*Sent. Ep.* 28), Eparchius in 345–348 (*Conc. Carth. sub Grato Ep.*), Paul the Donatist and *Fortunatian the Catholic in 411 (*Conference of Carthage*). The latter was in contact with *Augustine, as was the case with Augustine's successor *Urbanus (Augustine, *Ep.* 148, 229). Augustine stayed at Sicca Veneria in 410 (*Ep.* 148,1). *Victor of Vita mentioned another Paul (*Hist. pers. Afr. prov* 2,6); Candidus was bishop in 646. Sicca Veneria was famous for *Arnobius the Elder, who was a professor of rhetoric in the city; when he converted in 295–296, his conversion so puzzled the bishop's entourage that he was asked for tangible proof of his sincerity. Arnobius fulfilled this request by writing the first two books of his *Adversus Nationes.* At the time of Augustine, the priest Apiarius of Sicca Veneria became famous by appealing to the see of Rome against the normal African customs.

The city also preserves the remains of early Christian buildings: (1) Dar-el-Kuss, a basilica dedicated to St. *Peter, as numerous keys on the façade indicate, which are still preserved; (2) the episcopal structure with a baptistery; (3) the building *à auges* adjoining to the great mosque.

DACL 8, 689-701; PWK 21/2, 2187-2188; LTK 9, 730; T. Ghalia, *Hergla et les mosaïques de pavement des basiliques chrétiennes de Tunisie: plan, décor et liturgie*, Tunis 1998.

V. Saxer

SICILY, Council of. The *homoiousian delegation that went to Rome in 365–366 and was convinced by Pope *Liberius to sign Nicene **homoousios*, during its return home made a stop in Sicily. On this occasion a council of local bishops gathered, which confirmed Liberius's stance and the validity of the Nicene Creed of 325 as a criterion of orthodoxy. A letter of the Sicilian bishops was given to the delegates, which was read at the homoiousian Council of *Tyana (*Cappadocia), held in 366. (For the *archaeology of Sicily, *see* *Italy).

Hfl-Lecl 1, 976-979; Simonetti 397; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 764; EPapi 1, 345; A. Pinzone, *Provincia Sicilia: ricerche di storia della Sicilia romana da Gaio Flaminio a Gregorio Magno*, Catania 1999.

M. Simonetti

SIDE, Council of. In this city of Pamphylia between 383 and 394 a *council of 25 bishops gathered, which was presided over by *Amphilochius of Iconium. The acts of this council have been lost, but *Photius says that he had read them along with documentation coming from various bishops pertaining to the *Messalians. The question of the Messalians was discussed at this council. Some of their leaders were present, including their head Adelphius. Because they did not provide sufficient guarantees of their change of heart, they were condemned. The council sent a letter to *Flavian of Antioch informing him of what had happened.

Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 52; Mansi 3, 651; Palazzini 4, 184; DIP 5, 1262-1263. C. Stewart, *"Working the Earth of the Heart": The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431*, Oxford 1992.

A. Di Berardino

SIDI JDIDI. This local town from the Roman province of Byzacena (Tunisia, 10 km [6.2 mi] from Hammamet) corresponds to Aradi, the ancient little town of Punic origin, identified with an epigraph, concerning which only two of its bishops are known: *Fortunatian, who was exiled to the island of Corsica by the *Vandal king *Huneric in 484, at the time of the persecution of Catholics by the *Arians, and Emilianus, who took part at the Council of *Carthage of 525. No bishop, however, was present at the Conference of Carthage of 411, but a Christian community must have already been present in the 4th c., as one can gather from the excavations. The small town contained numerous Christian artifacts, among which three churches with connected buildings that have been recently excavated, turned with the façade toward the SW and the apses toward the NE. The Christianization of the space must have kept in mind the preexistent urban structure. The S church, with mosaics, dates to the 5th c. and, acc. to the excavators' opinion, was intended for worship services or the cult of the relics; it was completely reconstructed at the time of the *Byzantine domination and again with a mosaic floor. Its funerary use was very limited: two presbyters were buried there. The episcopal complex to the N, on the periphery of the town, from the 5th c., was composed of two parallel churches ("double basilicas") joined by an *in-*

sula which were parts of the "episcopal group"; each one possessed its baptistery. The *insula*, suited for services for charitable activities, mill and olive press, was destroyed in the 2nd half of the 5th c., when the E church was no longer used. The two churches became the place for privileged burial; in the W church there was also a sarcophagus placed against the S wall, which marked the presence of the veneration of a martyr or a memorial for the bishop. This church was totally reconstructed at the moment of the Byzantine reconquest with the raising of the floor and the reorganization of the manner of operation. The baptistery was also reconstructed acc. to a cross-form layout in the most luxurious manner.

A. Ben Abed - M. Bonifay - M. Fixot - S. Roucole, *La basilique méridionale de Sidi Jdidi* (*Tunisie*), in *Le mosaïque gréco-romaine*, Tunis 1999, 1, 267-284; Id., *Les basiliques chrétiennes de Sidi Jdidi*: RivAC 76 (2000) 555-587; Id., *Sidi Jdidi, Tunisie*: MEFRA 111 (2000) 472-487; M. Fixot, *Sidi Jdidi, la troisième basilique*: MEFRA 112 (2001) 539-564; A. Ben Abed - M. Bonifay - M. Fixot - S. Roucole, *Sidi Jdidi* (*Tunisie*), *l'îlot intermédiaire entre les basiliques*: MEFRA: 114 (2002) 566-579; Id., *Les deux baptistères de Sidi Jdidi* (*Tunisie*): Antiquité Tardive 11 (2003) 129-150; Id., *Sidi Jdidi* (*Tunisie*), *l'îlot intermédiaire entre les deux basiliques du groupe épiscopal*: MEFRA 115 (2003) 511-520; Iid, *Sidi Jdidi* (*Tunisie*), *les bâtiments annexes de la basilique III*: MEFRA 116 (2004) 713-725; *Sidi Jdidi*, 1, *La Basilique sud*, ed. A. Ben Abded - Ben Khader et al., Rome 2004.

A. Di Berardino

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS (ca. 431–ca. 486). Sidonius (G. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius: all these names are placed at the beginning of poem 9) was born at *Lyons on 5 November (*Carm.* 20,1) around 431 (as one can deduce from *Ep.* VIII,6,5) to a rich family of the Gallic-Roman aristocracy. His grandfather and father were prefects of *Gaul; the first served under the usurper *Constantine III, the second under *Valentinian III. He had an excellent preparation, even in Greek, first in his city of birth, then at *Arles. At around 20 years old he married Papianilla, daughter of Avitus, who shortly thereafter, in 455, would be elected emperor. In January of 456 he accompanied his father-in-law to *Rome and celebrated the taking of the *fasces* with a *panegyric. Once Avitus had been deposed by the coalition of Maiorianus and Ricimer and defrocked and divested of the imperial prerogatives, Sidonius was unable to overcome the ruin of his father-in-law, and in 458 he received the emperor Maiorianus at Lyons with a new panegyric. Once Maiorianus had been assassinated by Ricimer, Sidonius distanced himself from public life for several years and went—to read, write and strengthen his friendships—in the landholdings of Avitacum in Alvernia. The majority of his poems collected between the *Nugae* (*Carm.* 9-24) and the first books of letters are from the years 461 to 467.

His retirement came to an end in the autumn of 467, because, called on by an official letter, Sidonius went to Rome; here, a few months later (10 January 468), he delivered a panegyric for the emperor Anthemius. In compensation he was nominated prefect of the city of Rome for the year 468. After he had completed this duty—though not without several difficulties (see *Ep.* I,10)—he returned to Gaul. Here, although the *Visigoths were advancing, Sidonius, after having passed again a period of solitude in his landholdings, changed his course of life: after having been ordained—probably—a priest, in 471 he was elected bishop of Avernum (Clermont-Ferrand). It was not an interior crisis, but a regular choice among the aristocracy of that time, to which, in face of the barbarians, he did not resist "renouncing either homeland or crown" (*Ep.* II,1,4). But Sidonius led the life of the church with great seriousness, renouncing his previous life, family and letting go of his commitment to his lofty post. He committed himself to the needs of the city when it was being taken over by the advance of the Visigoths and became the protagonist of the resistance against the barbarians. When Alvernia was in the hands of *Euric, Sidonius was forced to go into exile at Livia, near Carcassonne. At the end of 477 he was authorized to reenter Claremont, but not before having made an act of homage, even with a poem in verses, to the Visigoth king. He lived his remaining years at work in his episcopal office, composing other letters and a few poems here and there. The last of these letters is datable to 481, but in virtue of references (not entirely certain) in other letters to subsequent events, the date of Sidonius's death should be placed after 486–487. After his death he was honored as a saint; his feast day is still celebrated on 23 August at Claremont.

Sidonius's verse compositions have come down to us in a collection of 24 poems, which were compiled by the author himself, almost certainly in 469. It seems to be the result of the merging of two independent collections, those of the three panegyrics and hexameters, for Anthemius (548 verses), for Maiorianus (603 versus) and for Evitus (602 verses), each one preceded by a brief preface likewise in verses, and that of the *epigrammata* or the *nugae*, in various meters. At a later time the following additions were inserted: ch. 9 (*Ad Felicem*), which seems to constitute its dedication, ch. 22 (a description of *Burgus*), ch. 23 (eulogy of *Consentius) and ch. 16 (eulogy of *Faustus bishop of Riez), longer and

better written with respect to the other compositions, which are, apart from the two epithalamia (*Carm.* 11 and 15), two brief short works written for the occasion. Thirteen other compositions, in various meters, are inserted into the letters: they are epitaphs, inscriptions for churches and eulogies of friends and their writings. Sidonius's poems lack originality but are constructed acc. to good technique and are generally correct acc. to the meter; they are characterized by a continual imitation of Virgil, Ovid, Caecilius Statius, and *Claudian, and the mythological references are dense.

There are 147 letters, divided—acc. to the model of Pliny the Younger and *Symmachus—in nine books. Their layout is not chronological, but they obey literary and artistic preoccupations and, esp., for the objective of varying the succession of themes. Most likely the author initially published one sole book; an edition of the first seven books followed around 477, to which subsequently an eighth and ninth book were added. It is not always possible to determine the date of the letters. The most reliable dating for the majority of these letters is owed primarily to Loyen. Composed in an ornate and fairly painstakingly well-thought-out prose, supported by the constant (sometimes cloying) use of rhetorical devices, Sidonius's letters are "letters of art," edited for being published and destined for posterity. For the ideals of style to which it aimed, for the insistent professions of modesty with which the author so diminished (to the point of self-effacement) his own skills as much as he desired the applause of his friends and the recognition of his readers, for his insistence on formulas of courtesy, compliments, eulogies, for his vivid sense of patriotism, these letters are an expression of the "precious" custom of a learned and refined aristocracy, a lover of hyperbole to the point of extravagance and the more proud of his own Roman culture, the more it appeared to be beset by the presence of the barbarians. They have an exceptional historical interest because they offer us an enormous storehouse of comparisons, which are at times unique, on Gallic society of the 5th c., the situation of the empire, the aristocratic classes, the church and the barbarians.

Lost are Sidonius's translation of Philostratus's *Life of the Appollonius of Tyana* which Sidonius made during his exile at Livia (*Ep.* VIII,3,1), the *contestatiunculae* sent to bishop Megetius (*Ep.* VII,3,1) and the *Rogationes* introduced at Clermont in the winter of 472-473 (*Ep.* V, 14,1 and VII, 1,2).

Editions: CPL 986-987a; PL 58 (reproduces the ed. with Sirmond's comm., 1652); Ch. Luetjohann, MGH, *Auct. ant.* 8 (1887); P. Mohr, Teubner (1895); W.B. Anderson, Loeb (vol. 1, 1963; vol. 2, 1965); A. Loyen, Les Belles Lettres (vol. 1, 1960; vols. 2 and 3, 1970).

Studies: L.A. Chaix, *St. Sidoine Apollinaire*, 2 vols., Clermont-Ferrand 1867-68; P. Allard, *St. Sidoine Apollinaire*, Paris 1910; C.E. Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age*, Oxford 1933; A. Loyen, *Recherches historiques sur les panégyriques de Sidoine Apollinaire*, Paris 1942; Id., *Sidoine Apollinaire et l'esprit précieux en Gaule aux derniers jours de l'empire*, Paris 1943; K.F. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, 217-219, #358; S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, New York ²1958, 187-223; S. Pricoco, *Studi su Sidonio Apollinare*: NDid 15 (1965) 71-150; W.H. Semple, *Apollinaris Sidonius: A Gallo-Roman Seigneur*: BRL (1967) 136-158; F.E. Consolino, *Codice retorico e manierismo stilistico nella poesia di Sidonio Apollinare*: ASNP 4 (1974) 423-460; I. Gualandri, *Furtiva lectio. Studi su Sidonio Apollinare*, Milan 1979; F.E. Consolino, *Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica*, Naples 1979, 89-116; M. Simonetti, *La produzione letteraria latina fra romani e barbari*, Rome 1986, 123-127; M. Zelzer, *Der Brief in der Spätantike. Überlegungen zu einem literarischen Genos am Beispiel der Briefsammlung des Sidonius Apollinaris*: WS 107-108 (1994-95) 541-551; J. Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome*, Oxford 1994; A. La Penna, *Gli svaghi letterari della nobiltà gallica nella tarda antichità. Il caso di Sidonio Apollinare*: Maia 47 (1995) 3-34; F.-M. Kaufmann, *Studien zu Sidonius Apollinaris*, Frankfurt a.M. 1995; S. Tamburri, *Sidonio Apollinare: l'uomo e il letterato*, Naples 1996; D. Pérez Sánchez, *Realidad social, asentamiento bárbaro y prejuicios ideológicos en la Galia del s. V a través de la obra de Sidonio Apolinar:* Gerión 15 (1997) 223-241; S. Santelia, *Le dichiarazioni del poeta: il carme IX di Sidonio Apollinare*: Invigilata Lucernis 20 (1998) 229-254; I. Gualandri, *Figure di barbari in Sidonio Apollinare*, in *Il Tardoantico alle soglie del Duemila*, *Diritto religione società*, ed. G. Lanata, Pisa 2000, 105-129; P. Mascoli, *Gli Apollinari e l'eredità di una cultura*: Invigilata Lucernis 23 (2001) 131-145; Sidonio Apollinare, *Carme 24. Propempticon ad libellum.* Intr., tr. and comm. by S. Santelia, Bari 2002; D. Amherdt, *Sidoine Apollinaire: le quatrième livre de la correspondance: introduction et commentaire*, Bern 2001.

S. Pricoco

SIGISMUND. Saint; king of the Burgundians. After having converted from *Arianism to *Catholicism through the work of *Avitus of Vienne, around 496–499, Sigismund succeeded his father, Gundabald, in 516. He made expiation for the sin of having his son Sigeric murdered (522) by doing penance in the monastery of St. Maurice at Agaunum (Vallese), which he enlarged and enriched in 515, and in which he instituted the continual worship *laus perennis* (Mansi 8, 533; *officium psallendi die noctuque indesinenter*). Conquered in 523 by the king of the *Franks, he was led to Orléans and drowned with his second wife, Constanza, and his children, Gundobald and Giscald, in a well at S.-Péravy-la-Colombe (Loiret). Around 535 the monks buried the bodies of the "martyrs" in the chapel of St. John of Saint-Maurice. Later the relics of St. Sigismund were spread around the following locations: Matzenheim (Alsace), Prague,

Himmerod, Freising and Płock. In the *sacramentaries from that ancient era there frequently appears a *Mass in his honor to guard one from fever. His name appears in the *Mart. hier.* (1 May).

BHL 7717-7720; BS 11, 1043-1047; BBKL 10, 274-277; LMA 7, 1885; LCI 8, 349-352.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

SIGISTHEUS. *Vandal count who lived in *Africa presumably in the 5th or 6th c., the author of a brief letter of greetings addressed to a presbyter by the name of *Parthemius, which is full of deference and praise for the literary qualities of the correspondent; the response has survived.

CPL 803; PLS 3, 447-448; PCBE 1, 1077.

F. Scorza Barcellona

SILVANUS of Cirta (4th c.). The subdeacon of Bishop Paul at *Cirta (then, in the 4th c., Constantina; today Constantine, Algeria). When the Roman official, following the orders of the emperor *Diocletian, made an inventory of goods of the community of Cirta, Silvanus offered him his full collaboration. Sometime after, at the end of 304 or the beginning of 305—Lancel thinks it was the spring of 307—he was called on to succeed Paul in a very disputed and tumultuous election (see *Gesta apud Zenoph.*: CSEL 26, 192-196): because he was regarded by his adversaries to be a **traditor* and was supported by the common people, although the **seniores* offered the name of another individual from the same city whom they regarded as worthy of the office. The assembly of Cirta is well documented by the sources (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*: CSEL 26,186-197; *Optatus of Milevis, *De schism.* 1,14; Augustine, *Ep.* 43,2,3; *Contra Cresc.* 3,27,30-32). In fact, Silvanus openly handed over the sacred objects and accompanied the inquisitors into the homes of the electors to seize the sacred books. Despite the dispute among the bishops present, Silvanus was consecrated by *Secundus of Tigisis, the primate of *Numidia, who was also charged with the same crime (others were also guilty): these two individuals also contested the election of *Caecilian to the episcopal see of *Carthage (see Augustine, *Contra Cresc.* III,27,31: CSEL 52,437) and elected in his place *Maiorinus, who was supported by *Lucilla, giving rise thereby to the formal establishment of the *schism, for which they became important defenders in Numidia. Having excluded from his *communion the deacon Nundinarius, Silvanus was accused by this individual before the *consularis* Zenophilus as a *traditor*. The trial which was held at Cirta (and not at *Timgad), which at that time was the capital of the reunified province, on 8 December 320, is known to us through the *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (CSEL 26,185-197). During this trial extensive proof was given showing that Silvanus had been a *traditor*, a thief and a mercenary with regard to ordinations (*see* *simony) and as a result was condemned to exile.

Monceaux IV, 4-13, 24-32; PCBE 1, 788-789; 1, 1078-1080; S. Lancel, *Les débuts du Donatisme*: *la date du "Protocole de Cirta" et de l'élection de Silvanus*: REAug 25 (1979) 217-229; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000.

A. Di Berardino

SILVANUS of Tarsus (4th c.). He was among the chief proponents of the *homoiousians at the Council of *Seleucia (359) and also participated in the subsequent discussions at *Constantinople before the emperor *Constantius. He was deposed by the Council of Constantinople (360) along with many other homoiousians; but after Constantius's death (362), he again undertook action against the *Arians, and in 365–366 he took part in the homoiousian delegation which went to *Rome, to Pope *Liberius, for help and solidarity: during this occasion he willingly signed the *Nicene Creed, which affirmed the **homoousios*. He participated at the subsequent Council of *Tyana, in which the delegation reported its results from its mission to the West.

DCB 4, 669; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 763-764; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, see the index.

M. Simonetti

SILVERIUS, pope (536–537). The ancient sources on this pope are not in agreement and are actually at times contradictory. After the death of Pope *Agapitus at *Constantinople (22 April 536), it seems that the *Ostrogoth king Theodahad imposed the election of the subdeacon Silverius (8 June 536), the son of Pope *Hormisdas (d. 523). In the war between the Ostrogoths and the *Byzantines, he aligned himself with General *Belisarius, who, at the instigation of *Theodora, deported him to *Lycia (Liberatus *Breviar.* 22: PL 68,1040) on the accusation of being a friend of the Ostrogoths. The emperor *Justinian sent *Virgilius to *Rome in

order to make a more serious investigation of the case against Silverius, but as soon as he had arrived, because of his machinations, Silverius was exiled to Ponza (21 March 537), where he died shortly thereafter (2 December 357). Virgilius was elected in his place on 29 March 537. Silverius is venerated as a *martyr for his defense of the faith of *Chalcedon.

LP 1, 290-295; AASS *Iun.* IV, 13-18; BS 11, 1069-1071; P. Hildebrandt, *Die Absetzung des Papstes Silverius* (537): Historisches Jahrbuch 42 (1922) 213-249; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VI^e siècle*, Paris 1925, 151-154; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 129-130, 145-176; L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza dei patriarchi e imperatori bizantini* (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 133; EPapi 1, 508-512; G. Pilara, *La città di Roma fra Chiesa e Impero durante il conflitto gotico-bizantino*, Rome 2006.

A. Di Berardino

SIMEON BAR SABBA (d. 344). Called "bar Sabba," i.e., "son of the fuller." The first testimony of his cult is found in a *Syriac martyrology from the end of the 4th c., which referred to him as a martyr "in the East" (*Sassanid Empire). His *Passion*, in the brief redaction, is very ancient, inasmuch as it was known by the church historian *Sozomen (*HE* 2,9-11) and *Cassiodorus (*Hist. Trip.* 3,2). Simeon was archdeacon of the *metropolitan (*catholicos) *Papa bar Aggai of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the capital of the Sassanid Empire, and with other bishops conspired to depose him. Upon the death of the catholicos he was elected as his successor. In 340, the Sassanid king *Shapur II, after the failure in the siege of *Nisibis of 337, unleashed a persecution against the Christians upon the denunciation of the magicians and the Jews. Among other things, the king ordered the murder of the leaders of the communities, the demolition of the churches and the confiscation of church goods. Simeon refused to collect from the Christians a double tax claimed by the king. He was arrested and put in chains and carried through the city streets. He was therefore led into the summer residence of the sovereign at Karka de-Ledan, in Khuzistan (Bet Huzaye) along with a hundred Christians, among whom were many bishops. Simeon refused to venerate the king or the sun; Shapur then ordered his death. The persecution, which lasted for several years, produced many *martyrs. Scholars have greatly discussed the events that occurred at that time because the ancient sources conflict on the information even with respect to the system of dating used. Burgess dated Simeon's murder to 13 April 344 (Peeters to 341; Higgins to 14 September 344) and the "great slaughter" of the Christians to 345.

BHO 1117-1119; BHO 124; PO 4, 296-305; Patrologia Syriaca 2, 659-1047; BS 11, 1097-1100; LTK³ 9, 592; DTC 9, 166-169; J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie des Sasanides*, Paris 1904, 63-69; P. Peeters, *La date du martyre de S. Syméon archevêque de Séleucie-Ctésiphon*: AB 56 (1938) 11-143; M.J. Higgins, *Date of Martyrdom of Symeon bar Sabbae*: Traditio 11 (1955) 1-33; M.-L. Chaumont, *La christianisation de l'empire perse. Des origines aux grandes persécutions du IV^e siècle*, Louvain 1988; R.W. Burgess, *The Date of the Martyrdom of Symeon bar Sabba'e and the "Great Massacre"*: AB 117 (1999) 9-66 (R. Mercier, *The Dates in Syriac Martyr Acts*, pp. 47-63).

A. Di Berardino

SIMEON of Beth Arsham (d. before 548). Bishop of Beth Arsham on the bank of the Tigris River, Simeon was a vociferous defender of miaphysite theology in the *Sassanid Empire, which earned for him the nickname the "Persian debater" (*dārōšā parsāyā*). His ordination followed, in fact, a public disputation with the catholicos Babai (ordination 497, d. 502/503), in which Simeon was victorious. From his writings one polemic treatise against *Barsauma of Nisibis and against the gradual "Nestorianization" of the Eastern church has survived. It seems that the final redaction of the letter was after 518, the date of the emperor *Anastasius's death, who within it is mentioned as "blessed," although it was perhaps originally written around 505/506. Two letters of great historical value have also been preserved, which Simeon wrote on the recent *martyrdom of certain Christians of Yemen, esp. in the city of Najran, who were put to death by the Judaizing Himyarite king Du-Nuwas (the date of the martyrdom is uncertain: 518, 522 or 523). The so-called *Book of the *Himyarites* was also attributed to him, another account of martyrdom, but this attribution is hardly likely; this book and also the two aforementioned letters could in fact be some later revisions of one or more of the original texts written by Simeon. He died at *Constantinople before 548, i.e., before the death of the empress *Theodora, who came to visit him.

Baumstark, 145-146; BBKL 10, 361-363 (more complete bibl.); BO I, 341-386; Duval, 358-359. *Letter Against Barsauma*: BO I, 345-358: the text preserved in the third part of the Chronicle written by ps.-Dionysius of Tell-Mahre; I. Guidi: Atti della R. Academia dei Lincei, s. 3, vol. 17, 471-515 and P. Bedjan, 1, 372-392: independent text; J.N. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, Lugduni Batavorum 1862-1875, III, 235-242 (text preserved in ps.-Zacharias's *Ecclesiastical History*). *Letters on the martyrs of Nagran*: I. Guidi, *La lettera di Simeone vescovo di Beth-Arsham sopra i martiri omeriti*, Atti della R. Academia dei Lincei, s. 3, vol. 7 (1881) 471-501; A. Mobers, *The Book of the Himyarites*, Lund 1924; A. Jeffrey: Anglican Theological Review 27 (1945) 195-205 (tr. of the first letter); I. Shahid, *The Martyrs of Najran: New Documents* (Subsidia Hagiographica 49), Brussels 1971 (with tr. of the second letter and an extensive study); I. Shahid, *The Martyrs of Najran: Miscellaneous Reflections*: Muséon 93 (1980)

150-157; Id., *The Martyrs of Najran: Further Reflections*: Muséon 103 (1990) 151-153.

K. den Biesen

SIMEON of Edessa (Emesa), The Holy Fool (1st half of the 6th c.). Leontius, bishop of *Naples (modern-day Limassol, at Cyprus), a hagiographer of the 1st half of the 7th c., wrote among other things a *Life of Simeon the Mad*, a saint from *Edessa who died at *Emesa around 550. Along with his friend John, Simeon traveled to *Jerusalem, settled for forty years in the monastery of Gerasimo, and then transferred to Emesa, where he lived the life of a "fool for the love of Christ" (σαλὸς διὰ Χριστόν—*see* *saints, foolish). "For Simeon, his feigned madness was his way of obtaining exclusion from society, while also living in it: his madness and his eccentric behavior during the day were balanced by his secret prayer during the night; his presence in society was seen as a way of proclaiming the gospel" (Patrologia V,246). Only after his death was Simeon recognized as a saint, and from that time onward many who had known him earlier began to gather all their memories about his life. The importance of this *Vita*, for which *Leontius used oral and written sources, is that it is the first representative of a genre that would become very popular in the *Byzantine and Slavic tradition. For this reason the *Life of Simeon the Mad* came to establish the model for the *Life of St. Andrew the Fool.*

CPG 7883; Bardenhewer V, 137-138; BBKL 11 (1996) 351-353; BHG 1677-1677b; BHO 1127; AASS. Iulii, 1719, 129-169; Patrologia V, 246; L. Rydén, *Leben des hl. Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis*, Uppsala 1963; L. Rydén, *Bemerkungen zum Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis*, Uppsala 1970; D. Krueger, *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's "Life" and the Late Antique City*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1996.

K. den Biesen

SIMEON of Jerusalem (d. ca 107). *Martyr. Son of Clopas (Jn 19:25; cf. Cleopas, Lk 24:18), he was the cousin of the Lord. He was the second bishop of *Jerusalem and therefore the successor of *James the Less, but only after some time, if we consider the chronological information provided by *Eusebius of Caesarea: "after James's martyrdom and the conquest of Jerusalem" (*HE* 3,11). Under his episcopate, the community of Jerusalem fled to *Pella. His election emphasizes the tendency at that time to give utmost importance to blood ties in the Jewish-Christian community. From the writings of *Hegesippus we know that the emperor *Vespasian (Eus., *HE* 3,12) and also *Domitian (*HE* 3,20,1-6) had their men search for the descendants of *David. In all likelihood Simeon was able to escape these investigations. He was finally martyred under the reign of the emperor *Trajan (Eus., *Chron.* anno 107) through crucifixion after extensive torture. Although many identified him with the apostle Simon Cananeus (Simon the Zealot), ancient tradition distinguished one from the other. His feast day is 18 February.

J. Blinzler, *Simon der Apostel, Simon der Herrenbruder und Bischof Simon von Jerusalem*, in *Passauer Studien, Festschr. Simon Konrad Landersdorfer*, Passau 1953, 25-55; DCB 4, 904; BS 11, 1103-1104; J. Verheyden, *De vlucht van de christenen naar Pella*, Brussel 1988; Id., *The Flight of the Christians to Pella:* EThL 66 (1990) 368-384; R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, Edinburgh 1990.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

SIMEON STYLITES the Elder (d. 459; feast day, 27 July among the Syrians, 1 September among the Greeks). Born before 400 on the border between *Syria and *Cilicia, a shepherd of flocks, he lived for two years with some *ascetics in the area, then for 10 years at Teleda, in the monastery of Eusebonas (but later all the monasteries contended for the honor of having trained him). Because he outdid everyone in austerity, he was asked to go elsewhere. He adopted the life of a recluse, spending the whole Lent without eating any food. Finally, to withdraw from the influx of pilgrims, he began the life of a Stylite, settling on a column, always exposed to the elements, in a tight space. The columns that he later climbed on were always taller (the last was 16 m [52 ft] high). A community at his feet served both him and the crowds of his admirers. Around 430, bishops and *archimandrites, compelled by his sanctity, granted him their approval; the eulogy delivered by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*Histoire des moines de Syrie*: SC 257,158-218) offers a convincing example of it; one should also see, moreover, the *Syriac and Greek biographies. He was admired in the whole world, even in *Paris. The emperor *Marcian pressured him to profess his adherence to the doctrinal decrees offered at the Council of *Chalcedon. The sanctuary built around his column during the time of *Zeno was a second, incomparable wonder.

On the letters attributed to the saint: CPG 6640-6650; BS 11, 1116-1138; H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites*, Brussels 1923; A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne*, Paris 1959, 388-401; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, II, Louvain 1960, 207-223; G. Garitte, *Compléments à l'édition de la vie géorgienne de S. Siméon Stylite l'Ancien*: Muséon 75 (1963) 79-93; Patrologia V, 177-178; BBKL 11, 353-356.

J. Gribomont

SIMEON STYLITES the Younger (521–592). The cult of the second Simeon, a stylite on Mons Mirabilis in the vicinity of Antioch, seems to have been an attempt to replace the cult of *Simeon the Elder, who had been appropriated by the *monophysites. In 541, the young *ascetic established himself on a column; in 551 he went upon a higher one. He allowed himself to be ordained a priest in 554, to confirm his *orthodoxy. The memory of his mother St. Martha has also been preserved. Several ascetic speeches and letters (CPG 7365-7370) could be authentic, but with later amendments. Characteristic of Simeon are the images on lead or wood, which were widespread even in the West in the 8th c.

CPG 7365-7366; BS 11, 1141-1157; DSp 14, 1267-1275; P. van den Ven, *Les Écrits de s. Siméon Stylite le Jeune*: Muséon 70 (1957) 1-57; P. van den Ven, *La vie ancienne de s. Syméon Stylite le Jeune*, I-II, Brussels 1962-1970; Patrologia V, 229-230; BBKL 11, 357-358.

J. Gribomont

SIMON, apostle (apocryphal). According to ps.-Abdias, who narrated his life (6,7-23), Simon was the brother of *Judas Thaddeus and *James, and carried out his apostolate in Babylon along with Thaddeus; they were martyred in the city of Suanyr. The acts of Simon's *martyrdom exist in *Coptic and in Arabic and *Ethiopian translation. A curious Coptic legend of the 4th c. is tied to Simon, which has been preserved in fragments: the legend on the Theonoe, a virgin from the monastery of the Mount of Olives in *Jerusalem, who was imprisoned in the palace but miraculously saved by the Virgin *Mary upon the prayer of Simon. She settled the matter for her persecutor, the emperor *Trajan (Hadrian); Simon and Theonoe were killed. Simon's disciples took his body to *Egypt.

CANT 282-283; BHG 1636; BHL 7749-7754; BHO 1112-1116; LCIK 8, 367-371; Lipsius 1, 117-178; A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 435-436; Eastern Acts: in Arabic: A. Smith-Lewis, *Horae Semiticae* 3-4, London 1903, 96-100, 115-119 (with Eng. tr.); Ethiopian: E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles*, London 1899-1901 (Amsterdam 1976) 1, 67-72; 2, 58-64 (Eng. tr.); ps.-Abdias: It. tr. Erbetta 2, 561-571; Moraldi 2, 615-629; Simon and Theonoe: F. Morard, *Langues orientales anciennes*: Philologie et linguistique 4 (1993) 147-183 (Fr. ed., tr. and comm.); EAC 1, 1529-1551 (Fr. tr.).

M. Starowieyski

SIMON BARQÀJĀ (end of the 6th c.–beginning of the 7th c.). Simon Barqàjā, or rather *Garmĕqàjā*, who was a native of the Persian province of Betgarmai, lived at the time of *Chosroes II (590–628) and was the author of a *Syriac translation of a Greek chronography, which was subsequently of great importance for *Nestorian circles, who maintained that they recognized *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronicle* in it. The presence of a passing reference to a certain Andronicus who lived at the time of the emperor *Justinian is insufficient to affirm that Simon's work has reproduced the Greek text that has been lost of this individual named Andronicus.

A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluss der christlich-palaestinensischen Texte*, Bonn 1922, 135-136 (with information on the names and places of the MSS and bibl.); A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa* 2/1, Brescia 1996, 65.

C. Dell'Osso

SIMON MAGUS - SIMONIANS

I. Simon Magus and the Simonians - II. In the apocryphal texts.

I. Simon Magus and the Simonians. Contemporary of the apostles, born probably at Gitton in Samaria, where he met the deacon *Philip who had gone there by order of the apostles to spread the gospel (Acts 8:1-8). Simon was overcome by the enthusiasm and the people's acclamations for the astounding deeds that Philip performed: "This man is that power of God which is called great" (Acts 8:10). He was baptized along with other Samaritans but was puzzled by the signs and wonders that Philip did; when Peter had come to lay hands on the recently baptized, he offered him some money to acquire that mysterious power which he did not possess. Peter harshly cast him out and threatened divine punishment because he had reduced the charisms of the *Holy Spirit to a good that could be purchased with a price (Acts 8:18-25). From Simon's action derives the term **simony*, which consists in purchasing spiritual goods with money.

Heresiologists attribute the origin of the sect of the Simonians to Simon Magus, which did not possess heavily *gnostic traits. The most salient points of the teachings were as follows: Simon was considered to be the chief God and Helen, a prostitute whom he had rescued from a brothel in Tyre, was the Thought (Ennoia) that had emerged from his mind. Helen had created the intermediary powers (angels and archangels), which in turn had created the world. Envious and jealous, these created beings had enclosed Helen within a human body, forcing her to transmigrate from one body to another. To deliver Helen and all humankind from the power of the intermediary powers, Simon descended to earth,

granting people the ability to know God, as the Son in Judea, as the Father in Samaria and as the Holy Spirit in other regions. Salvation was obtained through faith in Simon's liberating power.

These teachings do not appear very much in line with gnostic systems, and the most difficult problems that arise coincide with the individuation of their primitive and central nucleus, because traits and analogies with a certain type of preaching in Samaria can be considered either as primordial or later additions. The following have a gnostic stamp: the hostility of the intermediary powers toward God and human beings, the view that the human body is a prison of the divine element and disregard for the OT. Other traits are indefinable or at least without justification as a gnostic theme: the deification of Simon and Helen, their claimed immortality, the failure to link a specific fault that justifies Simon's descent, the lack of connection between redemption and the knowledge of Simon's nature. One has the impression that this movement had moved toward *Jewish-Christian gnosticism but had not yet entered gnosticism properly speaking.

Sources: Justin: 1 *Apol* 26, 1-3; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* I, 23,1-2; 24,1-2; Hippolytus, *Refut.* VI, 3-18,7. *Studies*: A. Amman: DTC 14 (1939) 2139-2140; H. Waitz, *Simon Magus in der altchristlichen Literatur*: ZNW 5 (1904) 112-143; L. Cerfaux, *La gnose Simonienne*, in *Recueil L. Cerfaux*, Gembloux 1954, 191-258; J.M.A. Salles Dabadie, *Recherches sur Simon le Magicien*, Paris 1962; R. Grant, *La gnose et les origines chrétiennes*, Paris 1964, 63-82; J.M.A. Salles Dabadie, *Recherches sur Simon le Mage*, Paris 1969; M. Simonetti, *Testi gnostici cristiani*, Bari 1970, 1-3; J. Daniélou, *La Teologia del giudeo-cristianesimo*, Bologna 1974, 99-106; K. Beyschlag, *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis*, Tübingen 1974; A. Ferreiro, *Simon Magus and Priscillian in the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lérins*: VChr 49 (1995) 180-188; Id., *Simon Magus: The Patristic-Medieval Traditions and Historiography*: Apocrypha 7 (1996) 147-165; M.J. Edwards, *Simon Magus, the Bad Samaritan*, in *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, ed. M.J. Edwards - S.C.R. Swain, Oxford 1997, 69-91; F. Haintz, *Simon "le Magicien,"* Paris 1997; A. Ferreiro, *Simon Magus, Dogs, and Simon Peter*, in *The Devil, Heresy and Witchcraft in the Middle Ages, Essays in Honor of Jeffrey B. Russell*, ed. A. Ferreiro, Leiden 1998, 45-89; G. Theissen, *Simon Magus - die Entwicklung seines Bildes vom Charismatiker zum gnostischen Erlöser: ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der Gnosis*, in *Religionsgeschichte des Neuen Testaments: Fs K. Berger*, ed. A. von Dobbeler et al., Tübingen 2000, 407-432; S. Haar, *Simon Magus: The First Gnostic*, Göttingen 2003; A. Ferreiro, *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval and Early Modern Traditions*, Leiden-Boston 2005.

E. Peretto

II. In the apocryphal texts. The Acts of the Apostles (8:9-24) describes the conflict between Peter and Simon Magus, who desired to acquire the gifts of the Holy Spirit, thereby arriving at full conversion. According to various apocryphal texts on St. Peter and acc. to the ps.-Clementine literature, where Simon Magus had an important role, this was owed to his departure from *Palestine with his wife Helen for *Rome; there he received *Nero's favor and had drawn to himself many proselytes. After having received information about the matter, Peter also departed for Rome. The long struggle between Peter and Simon Magus was described in a dramatic and picturesque manner in the apocryphal texts. Finally, Simon, wishing to demonstrate his power, flew over the Campidoglio, but, overcome by Peter's prayer, plunged to his death. His disappearance was the cause for the persecution of the Christians, who were accused by the emperor of having assassinated Simon.

L.H. Vincent, *Le culte d'Hélène en Samarie*: RBi 45 (1936) 221-232; J. Frickel, *Die "apophasis megale" in Hippolit's Refutatio VI, 9-18*: OCA 182 (1968); J. Frickel, *Apophasis megale*, Rome 1968; A. Ferreiro, *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval and Early Modern Traditions*, Leiden-Boston 2005.

M. Starowieyski

SIMON (Simeon) of Taybutheh. Monastic author of the 2nd half of the 7th c. and an excellent representative of W Syrian mysticism. According to information provided by Barhebraeus (13th c.), Simon lived at the time of the catholicos *Henanisho (685–700) and was called a man "of grace" (or "gracious") by the name of one of his books. A collection of seven centuries has been effectively transmitted to us, which is called the *Book of Grace*, which the MS tradition once attributed to *Isaac of Nineveh, but now attributes to "Simon the Recluse." In this document one reads that the author lived in a monastery near Mt. Matut, in *Bēt Ḥuzāyē* (Susania or Khuzistan, in the S of modern-day Iran). Other sources say that Simon was the disciple of *Rabban Shabur, and therefore they allow us to posit that the *Book of Grace* spoke of the monastery of Rabban Shabur near Shushtar, not far from Mt. Matut, where they passed or spent a certain amount of time and where various such influential monks as *Dadisho' of Beth Qatraya and Isaac of Nineveh dwelt. In addition to the *Book of Grace*, a few brief writings are attributed to Simon, among which was the *Speech Spoken on the Day of the Consecration of the Cell, in the Departure of a Brother from the Cenobium*.

According to Barhebraeus, Simon was known as an excellent doctor, and this explains the numerous traces of medical knowledge in his writings. In fact, he was not only a well-learned monk who commented on the writings of ps.-*Dionysius the Are-

opagite, knew the writings of *Evagrius of Pontus, and cited the works of *Mark the Hermit, Abbot Isaiah, *Macarius (Simeon) and *Basil, but he was also an expert physician who developed a scientific understanding of the various faculties of the soul in their relation to the body. This integral vision of the human being, in fact, stands at the basis of his gnosiological theory concerning the various levels of "knowledge" (which are six and go from scientific knowledge to the mystical nonknowledge of the Creator) and his articulation of the subsequent phases of the mystical development of the monk (which number seven and go from simple obedience to superior to the ineffable contemplation of God).

Editions and Translations: A. Mingana, *Early Christian Mystics* (Woodbrooke Studies VII), Cambridge 1934, 1-69, tr. 201-230: small works and extract of Simon's book; S. Brock, *Spirituality in the Syriac Tradition* (Moran Etho 2), Kottayam 1989, 113-116 (tr. *On Various Kinds of Prayer*); Holy Transfiguration Monastery, *The Ascetical Homilies of Saint Isaac the Syrian*, Boston 1984, Appendix B, part I: tr. of select texts from the *Book of Grace*; P. Bettiolo, *Simone di Taibuteh*, *Violenza e grazia—La coltura del cuore*, Rome 1992 (It. tr. of texts published by Mingana and the hitherto unpublished *Discourse Proclaimed on the Day of the Consecration of the Cell*). *Studies*: Baumstark, 209-210; BBKL 10, 360-361; Patrologia V, 486-487; Bettiolo, *Lineamenti*, 591-593; G.G. Blum, *Vereinigung und Vermischung*, *Zwei Grundmotive christlich-orientalischer Mystik*: OC 63 (1979) 41-60; G. Bunge, *Mar Isaak von Ninive und sein "Buch der Gnade"*: OS 34/1 (1985) 3-22; P. Bettiolo, *Povertà e conoscenza. Appunti sulle Centurie gnostiche della tradizione evagriana in Siria*: PdO 15 (1988-1989) 107-125; R. Beulay, *La lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, Chevetogne 1990, passim.

K. den Biesen

SIMON the ZEALOT, apostle. Endowed with the nickname "the Cananaean" by Mk 3:18 and Mt 10:4, he was appointed to the eleventh place before *Judas Iscariot; *Luke, however, places him at the tenth place before Jude the son of James and Judas Iscariot and gave him the epithet "zealot" (Lk 6:15; Acts 1:13). The two epithets "Cananaean" and "zealot" have given rise to differing interpretations. Starting from the questionable identification with the homonymous cousin of the Lord, better known as Simon (Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3), the brother of *James the Less and his successor as the bishop of *Jerusalem from the years 62–106, *Coptic and Byzantine Christians maintain that under this name Nathanael of Canaan, or even the master of ceremonies at the wedding described in the gospels (Jn 2:8-9), lies hidden. This interpretation cannot be held because "the Cananaean" does not derive from the word "Cana" but from the Aramaic term *qĕnā'na'*, which means zealot. This title for some scholars has the meaning of an ardent religious sense of zeal, an enthusiast (see Gal 1:14); for others it would be an open indication of his membership to that religious movement of integralist fanatics, widespread and active esp. in Galilee, which had transformed during the Jewish war into a political faction, which did not permit one to distinguish a religious from a political point of view. After *Pentecost he proclaimed the gospel probably in *Egypt and *Persia, where he bore witness to Jesus Christ with the shedding of his blood. According to a late piece of information (9th c.), his tomb was to be found at Nicopius in W Caucasus, and a church was dedicated to him (Epiphanius, *Vita Andreae*: PG 120,244).

BS 11, 1169-1173; J. Blinzler, *Simon der Apostel*, *Simon der Herrenbruder und Simon Bischof von Jerusalem*, Passau 1953, 25-55; O. Cullmann, *Gesù e i rivoluzionari del suo tempo*, Brescia [2]1971, 20-22; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, Leiden 1971, 72-76; M. Borg, *The Currency of the Term "Zealot"*: JTS 22 (1971) 504-512; G.R. Edwards, *Jesus and the Politics of Violence*, New York 1972, 55-59; J.A. Morin, *Les deux derniers des Douze: Simon le Zélote et Judas Iskariôt*: RBi 80 (1973) 332-349; G. Jossa, *Gesù e i movimenti di liberazione della Palestina*, Brescia 1980, 61-77; LTK[3] 9, 597; S. Mayer, *Die Apostel Simon Zelotes und Judas Thaddäus. Eine Bibliographie zu Legende, Ikonographie und Verehrung*, Winhöring 2004.

E. Peretto

SIMONY. Simony consists in the acquiring and selling for money of spiritual goods such as priestly functions—from those of the presbyter to those of the pope—and the administration of the *sacraments. It is defined by Thomas Aquinas as "the sought after and pondered choice of buying or selling something spiritual or connected with the spiritual" (*S. Th.* II, II, q. c. a 1). The term *simony* derives from the name *Simon Magus, who acc. to the Acts of the Apostles (8:18-23) sought to purchase from St. *Peter the power of transmitting the *Holy Spirit with the imposition of hands. Peter answered him: "May your money perish with you because you have dared to think of acquiring the gift of God with money" (Acts 8:20). Its exceptional gravity derived from both the commerce of spiritual things and the concession of goods freely received. Several forms of simony also existed during the OT (see 2 Macc 4:7, 24); even the Jewish patriarchs in the 4th c. practiced a form of simony (Palladius, *Dial. de vita Johan. Chrys.* 15 [SC 341,295]).

In the first three centuries there were no clear testimonies to simony; it developed from the 4th c. onward, when by the imperial concession of benefits connected to clerical functions several men had the ambition of venturing into the clergy, esp. the higher

levels. Moreover, there was also the influence of the secular practice of purchasing with enormous sums of money certain public offices, from which one obtained noteworthy economic, social and political benefits. There were several irregular ways of obtaining an ecclesiastical ministry: a payment in some form to the one who performed the ordination, intimidation of lay and ecclesiastical electors, recourse to powerful individuals, intrigue, distribution of money, promises to bestow rewards once elected, etc. It was also important to obtain the support of the Christian people (Jer. *Ep.* 69,9; Pelag., *Com. in Ep. ad Galatas* 1,1). The electoral system almost naturally led to a certain form of propaganda for which the best people fled from posts and the ambitious were elected (Jer., *Adv. Iovinian.* 1,34; Cassiodorus, *Variae* 9,15). A Roman synod in the year 499 observed that "because of the frequent intrigues, the bothersome avarice of those who desire the office of the bishop without authority has caused the desolation of the church and the disunity of the people" (MGH AA 12,403); it was also mentioned in the synod of 501 (MGH AA 12,438-455) and 502 (MGH AA 12,426-437).

The so-called Council of *Elvira prohibited money from being received for the administration of baptism (can. 48). In the trial before Zenophilus in 320, Victor and *Maiorinus were charged because their ordination occurred after payment (Optatus *De schism.*, *App.* 1,1). *Athanasius rebuked the *Arians for practicing simony (*Hist. Arian.* 73: PG 25,781B). *Basil of Caesarea, in an encyclical letter to the *chorbishops, warned about ordaining ministers for money (*Ep* 53 and 54; *Ep.* 50; can. 90: Joannou 3, pp. 175ff.), "because some people receive money from those who are ordained" (*Ep.* 53,1). *John Chrysostom gathered a synod at *Ephesus in relation to the ordinations made by Antoninus, who had placed episcopal sees for sale in proportion to the revenues of the diocese; the seven ordained bishops answered that they had paid to escape curial duties, even using their wives' jewelry as a form of payment (Palladius, *Dial. de vita Johan. Chrys.* 13 [SC 341, 276] and 15 [SC 341, 292ff.]). One of the accusations against *Ibas of Edessa in the Council of Beirut was that he had received money for conferring ordinations (ACO II,1,3, 24 [383]). The Apostolic Canons severely condemned both the person ordained and the ordainer any time there was an act of simony: "If a bishop, presbyter or deacon has obtained office by means of money, he and the one who ordained him are to be deposed and completely excluded from communion [i.e., of the church], as was the case for Simon Magus by Peter" (can. 29). This was the first text that connected the purchase of ordination with Simon Magus. Canon 30 required the deposition of the bishop who with the support of the secular authorities has obtained a diocese (see also can. 31). Pope *Damasus (or *Jerome, who may have been the editor of the text), almost during these same years, at Rome connected simony to Simon Magus because it was thought that one could obtain a ministry *Simonis pecunia* through goodwill or popular support (*Ep. ad Gallos* V,13: PL 13,1191; ed. Duval, 42). At the request of the emperor *Marcian, the second canon of the Council of *Chalcedon brought forth this condemnation: "If a bishop performed an ordination for money or put on sale a grace that cannot be sold, and consecrated for money a bishop or a chorbishop or a presbyter or a deacon or another such cleric, or promoted someone to the post of administrator or public defender or guardian or any other ecclesiastical role for his own wicked gain, when proof has been obtained for this matter, let that person forfeit his office; and let the one who has been ordained not profit from the purchased ordination or promotion, but let him be removed from the dignity and the duty that he has obtained for money. And if anyone turns out to have been the middle-man of this exceedingly wicked and illicit activity, let that person too, even if he be a cleric, be deposed from his own office; if he be a layman or a monk, let him be anathematized." After this council the condemnations were repeated both in the East and the West.

In the East *Gennadius of Constantinople in 458/459 sent a circular letter, which was the product of the synod, to the *metropolitans against simoniac ordinations (Grumel, *Regestes* I,104; PG 85,1613-1620; Mansi 7,911-916); the Council *in *Trullo* (691/692) in can. 22 prescribed: "We decree that those who have been ordained after making a monetary payment and not as a result of an examination of the conduct of their life should be deposed, whether they be a bishop or any other type of cleric, along with those who ordained then"; in can. 23 it prohibits the exacting payment for the giving of the *Eucharist. The Second Council of *Nicaea (787) has three long canons that condemn every form of simony: can. 4, on the necessity for the bishops to abstain or to keep themselves from every barter; can. 5, those who rebuke the clerics for the fact that they were not ordained without monetary donations should be punished; can. 19, the admission of priests, monks and nuns must occur without donations, which harkens back to the Council of *Chalcedon. In *Armenia the Council of Shahapivan (444 or 447) in can. 16 goes on at length in condemning the prac-

tice of simony and, among other things, orders that "a bishop or priest who receives a gift for this purpose or any other motive should be anathematized in all the assemblies and defrocked of his authority and priestly title." *Gregory the Great writes to Isaac of Jerusalem: *Quia vero pervenit ad nos in Orientis ecclesiis nullum ad sacrum ordinem nisi ex praemiorum datione pervenire* (*Ep.* 10,46: PL 77, 1166A). For the Egyptian church, the Athanasian canons attest to a similar practice: many people were chosen because they were wealthy, although the saints, because they were poor, were rejected (can. 4; cf. 5 and 9; ed. Riedl-Crum); moreover, various individuals became bishops because they desired financial gain (can. 5; cf. can. 9).

Even the civil authorities condemned the acquiring of ecclesiastical ministries. The emperor *Leo I (457–474) in 469 prohibited ordinations performed for money: *Nemo gradum sacerdotii pretii venalitate mercetur* (CI 1,3,30), but requests conduct worthy of this office and that this *flagitium* be eliminated. The emperor *Justinian intervened many times on this prohibition (CI 1,3,51; *Nov.* 3,2; 6,1,5 and 6; 56; 123,2,3 and 16; 137,2). In the West, the emperor Glicerius (473–474) condemned the acquisition of the episcopate so that one could become equal to a secular authority: *potestas saeculi putaretur, et tyrannopolitas* (PL 56,896B); similarly, the *Ostrogoth king Atalaricus (526–534) prohibited commerce over the episcopate (Cassiodorus, *Variae* 9,15).

*Isidore of Pelusium, a city E of *Alexandria, in his letters described a situation of generalized corruption in his diocese for the abuse of the priesthood both in ordinations (selling of ministries) and the administration of the sacraments (see *Ep.* II,127; II,178; II,264; III,260; II,199; III,17; III,408; V,426; V,393; V,532, etc.). In *Egypt the phenomenon also continued in subsequent centuries with a heavy spike during Arab rule (see M. Aoun, 194ff.). Simony was referred to with the term *cheirotonia* (see M. Aoun, 195, n. 43 and *Coptic Encyclopedia* 2, 517).

In the West Pope *Damasus (d. 384) wrote that in the choice of the ministries of the altar one must look at an individual's conduct, who *meritis enim et observationibus legis ad istiusmodi dignitatis culmen accedunt; non Simonis pecunia vel gratia quis poterit pervenire favore popolari* (*Ep. ad Gallos* 5,13: PL 13,1191; ed. Duval, 42). Pope *Gelasius asked that payment be not sought for the conferring of baptism and confirmation (*Ep.* 9,5: PL 59,50). The election of the ministers by the community and by noteworthy citizens had its advantages, but it also gave place to bartering and propaganda, in which the best candidates were excluded. *Caesarius of Arles in a letter to Pope *Symmachus criticized corruption in the elections: *data pecunia sibi potentes homines suffragatores adhibeant* (*Ep.* 5 among Symmachus's *Letters*: PL 62,54); Symmachus (d. 514) responded that such a practice must be forbidden: *Si quis episcopatum desiderat, data pecunia potentes personas minime suffragatrices adhibeat: nec ad decretum sibi faciendum clericos vel cives subscribere, adhibito cuiuslibet generis timore, compellat, vel praemiis aliquibus hortetur* (*Ep.* 6,6: PL 62,55D). The speech attributed to Pope Leo the Great, but somewhat later, condemns the buying and selling of ministries: *Hoc apostolicae sententiae gladio effossi sunt omnes qui ecclesiasticos honores vel emere inhiant, vel vendere non formidant* (*Sermo* 14,5: PL 54,507D; see CPPM 1,5491). In the subsequent period the practice of simony became even more burdensome, likewise because of the political situation. Gregory the Great (d. 604) laments the situation often: *Vobis enim sacerdotibus lugens loquor, quia nonnullos vestrum cum praemiis facere ordinationes agnovimus spiritalem gratiam vendere, et de alienis iniquitatibus cum peccati damno temporalia lucra cumulare* (*Hom. in Ev.* 17,13: PL 76,1145; see 5,4: PL 76,1091): Gregory spoke of the *simoniaca haeresis* (*Ep.* V,54: PL 77,787). In *Gaul, at the time of the Merovingians, simony reached a pathological form through the mixing of political and ecclesiastical power. Aside from the Council of Orléans II (533), canons 3 and 4, and the Council of Orléans V (549), can. 10, the Council of *Tours (567), can. 28 (27) and Chalon (647/653), can. 16, Gregory the Great's numerous interventions are an eloquent testimony to it. In a letter, the pope wrote: *Quibusdam namque narrantibus agnovi quod in Galliarum vel Germaniae partibus nullus ad sacrum ordinem sine commodi datione perveniat* (*Ep.* V,53; see V,55; V,58; IX,11, 106, 107; 109, 110; XI,55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61). The testimonies for the Iberian Peninsula come from the Councils of *Toledo (638), can. 4, and *Braga (675), can. 7. The situation did not improve with the passing of time, but during the period of the fight for the investitures, it became a strong reason for the conflict between the papacy and the civil authorities.

DTC Tables 4045-4047; 14, 2141-2145; LTK[3] 9, 607-608; TRE 31, 276-277; LexMitt 7, 1922-1925; Hefele II, b, 887; 1078; 1133; IIIa, 197; 279; 313; 315; 566; RAC 9, 797-907; M. Vaes, *La papauté et l'Église franque à l'époque de Grégoire le Grand (590-604)*: RHE 6 (1905) 537-556; 755-784; N.A. Weber, *A History of Simony in the Christian Church from the Beginning to the Death of Charlemagne*, Baltimore 1909; M. Rosati, *La teologia sacramentaria: nella lotta contro la simonia e l'investitura laica del secolo XI*, Tolentino 1951; C. Vogel, *Les sanctions infligées aux laïcs et aux clercs par les conciles gallo-romains et mérovingiens*: RDC 2 (1952) 5-29; 171-194; 311-328; H.J. Horn, *Giezie und Simonie*: JbAC 7/8 (1965-1966) 189-202; A. Nothum, *La rémuneration du travail inhérent aux fonctions spirituelles et la simonie du droit*

divin, Rome 1969; G. Picasso, *Gregorio Magno e la condanna della simonia nel Medio Evo: a proposito della Causa I del "Decretum Gratiani,"* Spoleto 1994; L. Di Salvo, *Simonia e malversazioni nell'organizzazione ecclesiastica, IV-V secolo*, in *Corruzione, repressione e rivolta morale*, Catania 1999, 367-392; M. Aoun, *Aspects de la simonie en Égypte* (*VII^e-XII^e s.*): RevSR 76 (2002) 185-200.

A. Di Berardino

SIMPLICIANUS of Milan (d. 400/401). Perhaps originally from *Milan, he was a presbyter at Milan and from 397 the successor of *Ambrose in the episcopate of the same city. A learned theologian and one acquainted with *Neoplatonic philosophy, Simplicianus took part in the conversion of *Marius Victorinus and *Augustine; moreover, he was close to Ambrose in his spiritual formation (*Confess.* VIII,2,3). Ambrose sent him some letters (37, 38, 65, 67 = Maur.); Simplicianus's letters to Ambrose and Augustine, however, have been lost. Augustine dedicated to him his treatise "on various questions to Simplicianus" (*De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*), in which were discussed several points on the books of Kings and Paul's epistle to the Romans, and also sent him *Epistle* 37. Simplicianus died around 400/401.

F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300 descritti per regioni. La Lombardia*, Florence 1913, 145-150; EC 11, 648; L. Crivelli, *Simpliciano, vescovo della Chiesa milanese. Una guida dal silenzio*, Cinisello Balsamo 1994; PCBE 2, 2075-2079.

S. Zincone

SIMPLICIUS, pope (468–483). Native of Tivoli (*Italy), he succeeded Pope *Hilarus during a moment of disorder in Italy that was marked by Ricimer's revolt and the fall of the Roman Empire in the West with the deposition of Romulus Augustulus by the *Arian *Odoacer (476), who forbade the disposal of ecclesiastical *property without his authorization (PL 62,74) and ordered that he be asked for his opinion during the election of the pope. We know of very few of Simplicius's interventions in the West: he reprimanded John of *Ravenna, who had consecrated a man as bishop of Modena against his will, who rejected the office since Modena was outside John's territorial jurisdiction (Jaffé 583); he established Zeno of Seville as his vicar for *Spain (Jaffé 590); in 475 he rebuked Gaudentius the bishop, who had proceeded to perform ordinations, for not following the canonical norms (Jaffé 570). All of his attention was directed toward the East without any success: this would also be a recurring theme in subsequent decades. He refused to recognize can. 28 of the Council of *Chalcedon (Jaffé 569), which was accepted by the Emperor *Leo I with the support of the Patriarch *Acacius. The canon recognized a primacy of honor for the patriarch of *Constantinople, inasmuch as it was the "New Rome." Moreover, in the East, *Basilicus seized control, supported monasticism and condemned the Council of Chalcedon with his *Encyclical* (475): thus *monophysitism enjoyed a moment of triumph in many Eastern episcopal sees, which out of fear accepted the imperial decision. Acacius's opposition was weak and inconsistent. A record has been made of an intense epistolary correspondence between Pope Simplicius with the emperor *Zeno, who had returned to power in 476, and with Acacius, the patriarch of *Constantinople, who conveniently did not inform the pope of the grave events that had occurred with respect to orthodoxy. The pope was concerned with the situation of the *Alexandrian church first with *Timothy IV (III) Salophakiolos, who then adhered to orthodoxy, and then with the imposition of *Peter Mongus. He died, however, before becoming aware of Zeno's *Henoticon*. Simplicius established a parochial type service for penitents and *baptism for the Roman basilicas (St. Peter's, St. Lawrence's and St. Paul's; see LP I,249). Moreover he completed many works of restoration in other Roman churches and also composed dedications for newly established churches. His feast day was 2 March; from 1971 onward it was moved to 10 March.

CPL 1664; Verzeichnis 543; PL 58, 35-62; *Collectio Avell.*: CSEL 55, 124-155; Thiel 175-214; LP I, 92-93, 249-251; III, 86-87; DTC 14, 2161-2164; CE 13, 232; Fliche-Martin IV, 366-367, 421; F.X. Seppelt, *Storia dei Papi*, I, Rome 1962, 134-137; Patrologia IV, 124-125; EPapi 1, 447-450.

A. Di Berardino

SIMPLICIUS of Vienne (d. 439?). Tenth bishop of Vienne in *Gaul (end of the 4th c.–beginning of the 5th c.; what is said by Gams, *Series Ep.,* Regensburg 1873, is imprecise); he was included by *Paulinus of Nola (d. 431) in the group of prelates "who are truly worthy of God." At the Council of *Turin in 398 he defended his rights as a *metropolitan. Pope *Zosimus reminded him of the prerogatives of *Arles (PL 20,665; Jaffé 334: one should note that no. 335 is not authentic), because he did not accept the organizational changes introduced by the pope; in fact there is no evidence that he followed them. The date of his death is unknown, which was perhaps around 439. His feast day is on 11 February.

P. Courcelle, *Fragments historiques de Paulin de Nole, conservés*

par Grégoire de Tours, in *Mélanges Halphen*, Paris 1951, 146-148; DACL 15, 1351-1360 (s.v. *Vienne*); *Vies des SS* 2, 245; BS 11, 1201; R. Savarino, *Il concilio di Torino*, in *Atti del convegno internazionale nel XVI centenario del concilio di Torino*, Turin 1998, 202-227; Cath 14, 104; R.W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth Century Gaul*, Washington, DC 1988, passim.

A. Hamman

SIN

I. Personal sin - II. Original sin.

I. Personal sin. There were essentially four *theological and *liturgical places where Christian thought on the theme of personal sin developed: prebaptismal catechisms for *catechumens, the *penitential remission of sins committed after baptism, antiheretical polemic and the *monastic experience.

The most ancient lists of sins appeared in the prebaptismal instructions directed toward *pagans and *Jews who were preparing to receive the sacrament of baptism for the remission of sins (ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν). Outside the NT (see Gal 5:19ff.; 1 Cor 6:9ff.), the texts of the **Didache* 1-6 and the *Letter of *Barnabas* 18-20 illustrate the two ways of life and death, i.e., virtue and salvation on the one hand and sin and perdition on the other. In order of importance, the most grave sins were always *idolatry followed by *fornication, homicide, fraud, *magic, *abortion etc. But even many professions held by catechumens were considered sinful inasmuch as they were intrinsically involved in the idolatry of *paganism and therefore had to be abandoned (ps.-Hipp., *Trad. Ap*. 16).

The deep-rooted conviction of primitive Christianity was that before the Christian revelation sin reigned supreme in the world and was universally spread, producing its fruit of the moral and physical death of humanity (Rom 5:12; Mel. Sardis, *De Pasch* 48ff). Only with the advent of Christianity and its sacramental means of salvation was the possibility of opposing the universality of sin and death introduced.

Actual daily experience, however, must have made the church's leaders realize very early that after baptismal rebirth, Christians continued to sin, even grievously, losing the privilege of the inhabitation of the *Holy Spirit and the life-giving connection to divine *grace. The penitential remission of sins committed after *baptism must have sparked a long and touchy debate on the nature of sins, on the possibility of remitting them once they had been committed and the church's power to mediate God's mercy to sinful humanity. Above all, it established that there existed a fundamental distinction between the sins that lead to death because of their intrinsic gravity and those that are lighter and in a certain sense inevitable in the everyday life of the Christian who lives in this world (1 Jn 5:16). Although there was the awareness in the Catholic communities that all sins were considered equally pardonable on the condition of the sinner's sincere repentance, the rigorist circles inspired by *Montanism imposed the view that the ecclesiastical authority retained the power of remitting, in public *penance, only the lightest sins, though the remission of the most grave sins was reserved to God's inscrutable mercy and the violent purification of *martyrdom. It is interesting to follow the evolution of *Tertullian's thought on this question, from the Catholic positions he set forth in the *De paenitentia* to his more rigid ideas inspired by Montanism found in the *De pudicitia.* During this time, church leaders vigorously debated the efficacy that had to be accorded to martyrdom and the intercession of the *confessors of the faith for the remission of grave sins. Later, the rigorous perspective of the Montanists was adopted and developed by the *Novatians.

Afterward, various attempts to classify and enumerate the most grievous sins were not lacking. Tertullian counts seven of them: idolatry, blasphemy, homicide, *adultery, *rape, false witness and fraud (*Adv. Marc*. IV,9,6; see a very similar list in *Pud.* 19,25), but in *Idol.* I,1,2 (and again in *Pud.* 5 and 12), basing himself on the so-called Western text of the apostolic decree of Acts 15, he enumerates three: idolatry, fornication and homicide. This triad of grave sins was already present in *Irenaeus's writings (*A.H.* III,12,14) and later reappeared e.g. in *Origen's writings (*Orat*. 28,10) and *Pacian of Barcelona (*Paraen*. 3). *Augustine later criticized this reduction (*Speculum*, *de libro Act. apost*.: CSEL 12, 199-200), reaffirming the distinction between grave, mortal sins and light, everyday and venial sins, whose remission has been entrusted not to public penance but to works of *fasting, *almsgiving and above all *prayer ("Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," reads the *Lord's Prayer; see *Ep.* 167; *Serm*. 351 and 352; *In evang. Joh*. 56,4, etc.).

*Caesarius of Arles would take the same position (*Serm*. 19,2; 202,1). In the theological terminology of the 4th c., a distinction seems to have been made between the *peccatores* and the *impii*: the first were those Christians who had sinned though still having faith and who nonetheless would be judged; the second, however, did not believe and as a result would be condemned without judgment (Hilary, *In Psalm*. 1).

The Greek ecclesiastical writers, though not overlooking the problems relating to the classification of personal sins, closely investigated the question of free will as the sole efficient cause of human negative moral behavior. *Clement of Alexandria affirmed that the origin of sin is to be located in free choice and desire (*Strom.* I,84,2); to sin derives from not knowing how to judge what one must do (*Strom.* II,62,3) and is nonetheless a question of will, not of nature (*Strom.*, IV,93,3). For Origen, all of history has been put in motion by the willful disobedience of rational beings, which has thus given rise to variety in the world and the distinct categories of angels, human beings and demons (*De Prin.* II,9,2-6). In this sense, he navigated between the speculative tradition of Greek intellectualism, esp. *Aristotelian and *Stoic, but also the polemical necessity of refuting the moral determinism preached by various *gnostic sects. It is well known that the gnostics divided humanity into three categories: the *hylic* or χοϊκοί, those predestined to perdition; the *pneumatikoi*, those predestined to salvation; and the *psychikoi*, the only group from which free choice of the will is required. One can say that for the gnostics good and evil are in a certain sense innate to each category of human beings. At the beginning of the end of the 3rd. c., the *Manicheans inherited this predestinarian theology, replacing the gnostics of the 2nd and 3rd c. as the target of the orthodox controversialists. Under the condemnation of this group fell all those sects which, though not rigorously predestinarian and dualistic, preached the connaturality of evil with the physical, bodily nature of man. In particular, the *Messalians were repeatedly criticized during the course of the 4th-6th c. for maintaining the doctrine of "natural evil" and "the sin of birth."

Numerous church writers between the 4th-5th c. made sure to emphasize that only the sins freely committed deserved punishment and eternal damnation, in contrast to the impurity contracted from being born, which instead needs to be purified (Did. Alex., *Job* X, 15; Ambr. *In psalm.* 48,8-9); the sole agent responsible for evil is the individual's free will, starting from the age of reason (Did. Alex., *Exp. in Ps.* 57,5; Ambr., *Cain et Ab.* II,7,25; *Jac.* I,3,10). *Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote an entire work titled *Against Those Who Maintain That Man Sins Through Nature and Not by His Free Will* (summarized in *Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 177); at the same time, however, Augustine, after he had been delivered from the chains of Manicheism, dedicated a work in defense of free will. For Augustine, the sin of every person follows the same mechanism operative in *Adam: it essentially consists in a turning from God (*aversio a Deo*), and a simultaneous turning toward created things (*conversio ad creaturas*), caused by the autonomous and rebellious use of free will not illumined and aided by divine grace (*Quaest. Simpl.* I,2,18). Sin is, therefore, acc. to this well-known definition, the will to entertain and obtain what justice prohibits, and that from which one is free to abstain (*De duab. anima.* 11,15). Augustine's answer to Manicheism developed from his acquisition of the *Neoplatonic idea that evil is not a substance, an autonomous nature opposed to the good, but a privatization, a deficiency of the good itself that sinful humans undergo by distancing themselves from God and dividing themselves among the multiplicity of natural creatures. The existence of human freedom presupposes that the ethical life must match the precepts contained in the law, i.e., the will of God manifested in the commandments of the *Decalogue. Only by adhering to the salvific norms of God can we hope to attain the profound deliverance from slavery to sin. Monastic meditation strove primarily along this path, often reaching openly rigorous positions such as those of *Basil and *Pelagius. According to these teachers of the ascetic life, obedience to God's will must always be immediate and total, because even one very small transgression could cause one to risk the loss of all one's previous ascetical efforts and thwart the results (Basil, *De jud.* 7; *Mor.* XII,1; *Reg. fus. prooem.*). God condemned Adam not for eating an apple but because he transgressed the commandment (Pelag., *De div. leg.* 5; *De oper.* 13; *Virg. Laus* 6). From this point of view, all sins are equal, inasmuch as all equally express the will to disobey God's precept, and thus every attempt to classify sin acc. to the human standard of their relative gravity loses all meaning. In the rigorism of this ethical approach, the well-known Stoic paradox of the equality of all faults seems to reappear (see Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,16), but perhaps it comes from Jas 2:10 as well, where it is written: "For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles in one point has become guilty of all." In any case, on several occasions Christian authors intervened against such rigorism judged theoretically erroneous and inadmissible for the mass of the faithful (Aug., *Ep.* 167; Jer., *Adv. Iovin.* II,18ff.).

Ancient *monasticism also dedicated itself to the study of the psychology of *temptation in the fight against the devil. According to the learned monastic tradition of *Evagrius of Pontus (*Cap. Pract.* 6-33; *De octo vit. cog.*) and *John Cassian (*Instit.* V-XII; *Coll.* V), one must certainly attribute the first elaboration of a true and proper system of sins or the capital vices which, being eight in number, it was

believed, were controlled by specific demonic forces: gluttony, fornication, avarice, *acedia, anger, sloth, vainglory and pride. These elements reelaborated and synthesized here date back to a very ancient Jewish-Christian tradition, already present in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Shepherd* of *Hermas and Origen's writings, and which underwent at the beginning of the 5th c. a noteworthy literary reinterpretation in the *Hamartigenia* and the *Psychomachia* of the poet *Prudentius. Nevertheless, it was left to *Gregory the Great to offer a definitive synthesis of earlier patristic thought on the question: he believed that the seven capital sins derived from pride, which, acc. to Augustine's teaching, he considers the root sin, the queen of the vices (*Mor.* XXXI, 45,87-91).

M.W. Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins*, East Lansing, MI 1952; G. Teichtweier, *Die Sündenlehre des Origenes* (Studien zur Geschichte der katholischen Moraltheologie 7), Regensburg 1958; var. aus., *Theologie du péché* (Bibliothèque de théologie, série II, 7), Paris-Tournai 1960; S. Visintainer, *La dottrina del peccato in S. Girolamo* (Analecta Gregoriana 117), Rome 1962; M. Huftier, *Le tragique de la condition chrétienne chez S. Augustin*, Paris-Tournai 1964; K. Rahner, *La penitenza della Chiesa. Saggi teologici e storici* (Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 60), It. tr. Rome [2]1968, 311-876; M. Spanneut, *Tertullien et les premiers moralistes africains* (Recherches et synthèsessection de morale), Gembloux 1969; P.F. Beatrice, *L'allegoria nella Psychomachia di Prudenzio*: Studia Patavina 18 (1971) 25-73; A. et C. Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique ou le moine* (SC 170), Paris 1971, 38-112; W.E.G. Floyd, *Clement of Alexandria's Treatment of the Problem of Evil*, Oxford 1971; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Märtyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst* (MBTh 36), Münster 1973; H. Karpp, *La penitenza. Fonti sull'origine della penitenza nella Chiesa antica* (Traditio christiana 1), It. tr. Turin 1975; var. aus., *Commandements du Seigneur et libération évangélique. Études monastiques proposées et discutées à Saint Anselme 15-17 février 1976* (SA 70), Rome 1977; P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale* (SPMed 8), Milan 1978; Th. Špidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique* (OCA 206), Rome 1978; C. Rambaux, *Tertullien face aux morales des trois premiers siècles*, Paris 1979; R. Staats, *Hauptsünden*: RAC 13 (1986) 734-770 (bibl.); C. Stewart, *Working the Earth of the Heart: The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431*, Oxford 1991; P. Géhin - C. et A. Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique. Sur les pensées* (SC 438), Paris 1998; P.F. *Beatrice, Lord's Prayer*, in *Augustine Through the Ages*: *An Encyclopedia*, ed. A.D. Fitzgerald , Grand Rapids, MI 1999, 506-509; P.P. Karavites, *Evil, Freedom, and the Road to Perfection in Clement of Alexandria* (VChrS 43), Leiden 1999; J. Wetzel, *Sin*, in *Augustine Through the Ages*, 800-802; G.-H. Baudry, *Le péché dit originel* (Théol. Hist. 113), Paris 2000; P.F. Beatrice, *Sünde*, V. *Alte Kirche*: TRE 32 (2001) 389-395 (bibl.).

P.F. Beatrice

II. Original sin. The expression "original sin" indicates both the personal sin of *Adam (the original sin) and the state of sin transmitted to every person from birth (derived original sin). Even if the doctrine of original sin is not formally contained in Scripture, there are nevertheless several texts that establish a biblical foundation for the slow development of the doctrine of original sin: we are referring in particular to Gen 3:1-20 (the account of Adam's sin and its consequences) and Rom 5:12-21 (the necessity and universality of Christ's redemption), but also to other passages such as Ps 51:7 (50:7 LXX), Job 14:4 and Eph 2:3. Neither can we ignore the ancient *liturgical practice of infant *baptism and the theological notion of the universality of salvation accomplished by Christ. From these foundations, the patristic tradition before *Augustine adhered to the conviction that humanity inherited corruption and death from Adam.

Before Augustine. The typological relationship described by the apostle *Paul, i.e., Adam–Christ, as well as Eve–*Mary, respectively the cause of death and life, frequently appears in the writings of the early Fathers (Justin, *Dial.* 100,4-6; Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adv. haer.* 3,22,4; 5,19,1). *Melito of Sardis developed this position and maintained that people as a consequence of Adam's sin inevitably sin and spoke of the "sin that stamps its mark on every soul and those on whom it stamps are destined to die" (*Peri Pascha* 54). Even the principle of the solidarity of every person with Adam and Christ is present and frequently appears already in the writings of *Irenaeus, who for the first time introduced into theological literature the explicit statement: "In the first Adam we offended God by not observing his commandment; but in the second Adam we have been reconciled, having become obedient until the point of death" (*Adv. haer.* 5,16,3; see also 3,18,7). In the West, *Tertullian, though unfavorable to the baptism of newborns (*Bapt.* 18,5), recognized sin as a *vitium originis*, which, through the devil's work, has become *naturale quodammodo*, and explained its transmission with a theory of traducianism (*De anima* 40-41). And even if it is not easy to determine the connection of transgression (*collegium transgressionis*) that connects the nonbaptized with Adam (*De res.* 49,6), this, however, indicates a participation in the Fall that occurred in the Garden of Eden. *Cyprian, however, maintained the necessity of baptism for children through which sins are remitted "which are not their own, but that of another," because, even if they have not sinned personally, by being born from Adam they contract "the disease of the ancient death" (*Ep.* 64,5). For each theologian, therefore, every person is born into a sinful condition, from which baptism liberates.

In the East, *Origen, recalling the tradition of

baptizing children, affirms that the apostles themselves were aware of that stain of sin which had to be washed away with water and the *Holy Spirit (*Comm. Rom.* 5:9; *Hom. Lev.* 8:3; *Hom. Luc.* 14:5). It was this *Alexandrian father who drew the connection between Job 14:45 an Ps 51:7 (50:7 LXX) to demonstrate that every person, born in the flesh, is stained by sin. (*Basil depended on him for the same idea, using the same texts: see *Bapt.* 1,2,7-9.)

Likewise in the East, in the following century, several testimonies in favor of original sin come from *Syria (Aphraates, *Tract.* 6,14; 23,3; Ephrem, *Hymni* 4,1) and the Alexandrian tradition: *Athanasius, though never emphasizing our participation in Adam's guilt, declared that "when Adam sinned, sin was transmitted to all people" (*Contra Ar.* 1,5); and *Didymus the Blind explicitly declared that human generation was the means of the transmission of the ancient sin of Adam, from which Christ alone has been exempted because he was born of a virgin (*Contra man.* 8).

In sum, the East, which had a more optimistic vision than the West and was more attentive to emphasizing humanity's freedom and responsibility, seems to have excluded a true and proper doctrine of original sin, in particular the concept of our solidarity with Adam and therefore our participation in his sin, even though there are not lacking clear testimonies regarding the transmission of Adam's sin and its consequences.

But in general, before Augustine, the condition of humankind was seen more as a state of corruption that led toward sin, and there only rarely emerged the idea that every person was in some way involved in the same disobedience of Adam. The appearance of the affirmation that we have all sinned in Adam gradually increased in the writings of the Fathers, with specific reference to Rom 7:9-10 and 1 Cor 15:22 (Tertull., *De res.* 49,6; Orig., *Hom. Jer.* 8,1; Meth. Olymp., *De res.* 2,24; Hil. Arles, *Comm. Matth.* 18,6; Basil, *Hom. Sal.* 94,3; Greg. Naz., *Serm.* 19,14; 38,4; Cyril Jer., *Cat.* 2,4-5; Ambr., *Exp. Luc.* 7,234, often cited by Augustine). Through his grammatically imprecise translation of Rom 5:12, where ἐφ' ᾧ was translated as *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, *Ambrosiaster would make a definitive contribution to the formation of that doctrine on original sin, which was subsequently developed in the West with greater precision.

Augustine. Only with Augustine did the theology of original sin obtain its own formulation and its own terminology, even if he himself had to admit that there is nothing more difficult to understand than the nature of the "ancient sin" (*De moribus Eccl.* I,40). He was the one to create the ancient expression "original sin": it seems to have appeared for the first time around 395 in the *De div. quaest. ad Simpl.* 1,1 to refer to the sin of Adam, but only in the book *De peccatrum meritis et remissione* (1,9-10), written in 411–412, does he refer to the sin transmitted as a result of Adam's offense.

In any case, it is certain that Augustine gradually developed his reflection on the matter, even in conjunction and as a consequence of the development of various other theological themes (the origin of *evil, the efficacy of the *sacraments, the necessity of *grace, *anthropology and *soteriology). Moreover, Augustine was convinced that he stood within the church's tradition, which through great thinkers had defended and maintained the truth of original sin. On several occasions he collected patristic testimonies on the topic, citing the most representative authors of the East and West: Irenaeus, Cyprian, *Hilary, *Ambrose, *Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, *John Chrysostom and *Jerome (*Contra Iul.* 1,3,5-10; 1,4,13-6,27; 1,7,30-34; 2,10,33.37; 3,17,32; *Contra Iul. opus imp.* 4,72-73).

Already during the period of the *Donatist controversy, Augustine, when defending the doctrine of the efficacy of the infant baptism (*Bapt.* 4,24), referred to the ecclesiastical practice of maintaining that baptism given *in remissionem peccatorum* implies that they too are in some way sinners, because, even though morally innocent (*Pecc. merit.* 1,17,22; 35,65; *Retract.* 1,13,5), without Christ's redemption their entrance into the kingdom of heaven is denied (*Sermo* 294,3).

But it was primarily in the controversy with the *Pelagians that he was led to emphasize and develop the theological meaning of humanity's corruption and the absolute and universal necessity of the redemption, without which Christ's cross would be emptied (*De natura et gratia* 7; 9; 19).

To defend the integrity of humanity's free choice and will even after the Fall, Pelagius rejected the idea of a transmission of an original sin, thus reducing it to an evil example, which would certainly have had disastrous consequences with the introduction of death and a habit of disobedience, but it did not intrinsically corrupt human nature. As a result, baptism is a therapeutic and regenerative sacrament, a simple blessing for children. Grace is only an exterior help and consists fundamentally in the revelation of the divine law.

Against Pelagius, Augustine defended the absolute necessity of grace, affirming that all are born with a "sin," in the sense that the situation in which every person is born is truly similar to that in which

a person commits a personal sin, deprived of grace and with a will perverted by the control of concupiscence. His firm belief in the sinful condition in which every descendant of Adam lives led Augustine to thus devote himself to the theme of concupiscence, understood as the inheritance from Adam and the origin of personal sin and, in this perspective, considered to be the cause of sin in the nonbaptized. One understands, then, why the theology of Augustine concentrated on developing his anthropology, precisely during the most mature period of his reflection on original sin. At the center of the question was the category of freedom: the free will of Adam, whether a sinner or not, was capable of authentic freedom, i.e., of a choice on the level of being well deserving of eternal life (the true human end), only if supported by the grace of God.

The Augustinian notion of original sin therefore includes three interrelated aspects: the existence of concupiscence, the privation of grace or the death of the soul, and the moral solidarity of each person with Adam's sin, the transmission of which in a certain sense makes all his children guilty (*De nupt.* 2,28,42; *Pecc. merit.* 1,10,11; *Contra Iul. opus imp.* 1,47; *Civ. Dei* 13,14). Hence the absolute need of being saved by Jesus Christ.

The results of Augustine's doctrinal reflection were accepted by the ecclesial magisterium. After the interventions of the Council of *Diospolis (*Palestine) in the year 415, which, though absolving Pelagius, condemned the claims of his disciple *Caelestius (Aug., *De gestis Pel.:* NBA 17/2, *Appendix*, 502-507), and the African Synods of *Carthage and *Milevis in 416, which were approved by Pope *Innocent (*Sermo* 131,10; *Contra duas litt. Pel.* 2,3,5), the "plenary Council of all Africa," held at *Carthage in 418, confirmed the doctrine of original sin (DS 222-223), and Pope *Zosimus's *Epistula Tractoria* (a few fragments are found in Augustine's writings, *Ep.* 190,23; *Grat. Chr.* 2,21,24; *De anima* 2,12,17; DS 231) during the same year renewed the council's condemnation of Pelagian teachings and those who had devised them. The Council of *Ephesus (431) ratified the **Acts* of the Roman synod for this condemnation (Mansi 4,1338; for the letter of Pope Celestine, see Mansi 4,1026). A subsequent intervention took place a century later at the Council of *Orange (529), which reaffirmed the doctrine of original sin (DS 371-372). In that circumstance, *Caesarius of Arles assumed the duty of resolving the controversy between *Faustus of Riez and *Fulgentius of Ruspe. The former, who tended to be anti-Augustinian, maintained that original sin, connected to the concupiscence of the procreative act, represented a factor in death only for the body and not the soul. Fulgentius opposed him, insisting on the truly sinful character of original sin. The decisions of Orange were approved by Pope *Boniface II (DS 398-400), who made sure to insist that free choice, after sin, is certainly fallen but not extinct.

Augustine's theology on original sin was frequently reiterated both in the theological literature of the West and in the documents of the ecclesiastical magisterium. As a result, his theology of original sin would pass into the teaching of scholasticism and its core confirmed by the Council of Trent.

A. Casamassa, *Il pensiero di S. Agostino nel 396-397*, Rome 1919; J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, Paris 1924; J. de Blic, *Le péché originel selon St. Augustin*: RecSR 16 (1926) 97-119; 17 (1927) 414-433, 512-531; J. Mausbach, *Die Ethik des heil. Augustinus*, Freiburg i.Br. 1929 (I, 139-416); N. Merlin, *St. Augustin et les dogmes du péché originel et de la grâce*, Paris 1931; A. Pincherle, *La formazione della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Cagliari 1939; F. Floëri, *Le pape Zosime et la doctrine augustinienne du péché originel*: AugM, II, Paris 1954, 755-761; J. Gross, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas*, 1: *Von der Bibel bis Augustin*, Munich-Basel 1960; Ch. Boyer, *Le péché originel*, in *Théologie du peché*, Tournai 1960, 243-291; A. Sage, *Le péché originel. Naissance d'un dogme*: REAug 13 (1967) 211-248; Id., *Le péché originel dans la pensée de St. Augustin de 412 à 430*: REAug 15 (1969) 75-112; H. Rondet, *Le peché originel dans la tradition patristique et théologique*, Paris 1967; V. Grossi, *La liturgia battesimale in S. Agostino. Studio sulla catechesi del peccato originale negli anni 393-412*, Rome 1970; E. Testa, *Il peccato originale nella patristica* (*Gen III*), Jerusalem 1970; M. Flick - Z. Alszeghy, *Il peccato originale*, Brescia 1972; J. Liébaert, *La tradition patristique jusq'au Ve siècle*, in var. aus., *La culpabilité fondamentale. Péché originel*, Gembloux 1975, 34-55; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius. Die theol. Position der römischen Bischöfe im pel. Streit in der Jahren 411-432*, Stuttgart 1975; P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milan 1978 (see A. Trapè, *"Tradux Peccati." A proposito di un libro recente*: Augustinianum 19 [1979] 531-538); A. Trapè, *Introduzione generale a S. Agostino, Natura e grazia*, NBA XVII/1, 7-215 (with another bibl.); V. Grossi - L. Ladaria - P. Lecrivain - B. Sesboüé, *L'homme et son salut*, II, Paris 1995; I. Sanna (ed.), *Questioni sul peccato originale*, Padua 1996; A. Scola - G. Marengo - J.P. López, *La persona umana. Antropologia teologica*, Milan 2000.

A. Trapè - L. Longobardo

SINAI. The term *Sinai* today refers to the entire peninsula between the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aqaba; during antiquity, however, it only referred to the mountainous range in the S part. The peninsula was part of the Roman province of *Arabia established by the emperor *Trajan in 106. It was populated by nomadic tribes, and a Roman garrison was stationed at Klysma (Suez Canal). According to Christian tradition, already established since the 4th c., the events narrated in the book of *Exodus pertaining

to *Moses and the giving of the law occurred here (see Ex 3:1ff; 17 and 19:16-32:20). The mountain of the giving of the law is actually identified with modern-day Djebl Mousa (the mountain of Moses, 2285 m [=7500 ft.] high), situated 35 km (21.7 mi) from ancient Pharan (modern-day Feiran) (see Egeria, *Itin.* 1-5). Because of the veneration that Christians maintained of the place already in the 4th c., the surrounding areas of the mountain were populated by hermits, who were visited by Julian Sabas (Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 2,13: SC 234, 222ff.), Silvanus and his disciple Zachariah (Sozomen, *HE* 6,32,8), and Mark of Scete (PG 65, 296C and 312D) etc. Initially the Christian hermits established themselves in the fertile valleys of Pharan and Raithou and only subsequently on the mountain. The pilgrim *Egeria went there at the end of the year 383, finding numerous hermits close to the peak of the mountain (it was forbidden to live on the peak of the *mons Dei*), and there were four small churches for liturgical services (see also *Itin. Ant. Plac.* 37,4). Egeria, during her visit, was accompanied by the monks and the local presbyters (*deductores*), who showed her the places where the events narrated in the book of Exodus took place and read together on that spot the respective biblical texts. On the N side of Djebel Mousa was located the burning bush, and there was already a small church at the site (Egeria, *Itin.* 4,6-7). On this spot the emperor *Justinian, in the 6th c. to protect the monks from the *Saracen invasions, ordered the construction of the fortified monastery that was dedicated to the Mother of God (Procopius, *De aed.* 5, 8; see PG 111, 1071-1072). Sinai became the center of monastic life where famous writers lived such as *John Climacus, *Anastasius the Sinaite and *Nilus of Ancrya. In the 7th c., because of the attacks of the Arabs, the episcopal see of Pharan was transferred to Sinai. Only in the 9th c. did the monastery assume the name of St. *Catherine (307), whose body, acc. to legend, was transported there by the angels. Being a place of pilgrimage, it had an international character; in 6th c. there were three abbots who spoke *Latin, *Greek, *Coptic and Ge'ez (*Itin. Ant. Plac.* 37, 4). The monastery is today still very rich with *icons that were spared from the iconoclasm of 726–823. Moreover, it possesses an important collection of Greek, Arabic, *Syriac, *Georgian and other MSS; the monastery once possessed the famous 4th-c. biblical MS known as the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which included a large portion of the *Septuagint translation and the NT, to which were also added the *Shepherd* of *Hermas and the *Letter of *Barnabas*.

DACL 15, 1463-1490; G. Garitte, *Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Sinaï*, CSCO 165, subs. 9, Louvain 1956; H. Skrobucha, *Sinai*, Oxford 1966; F. Mian, *Caput vallis al Sinai in Eteria*: SBF 20 (1970) 209-223; Id., *L'anonimo Piacentino al Sinai*: VetChr 9 (1972) 267-301; B. Lifshitz, *Inscriptions du Sinaï et de Palestine*: ZPE 7 (1971) 151-163; P. Compagni - P. Acquistapace, *Il Sinai. Sulle orme dell'Esodo*, Milan 1975; K.W. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons*, I: *From the Sixth Century to the Tenth Century*, Princeton, NJ 1976; K.W. Weitzmann, *Studies in the Arts at Sinai*, Princeton, NJ 1982; J. Galey, *Il Sinai e il Monastero di S. Caterina*, Florence 1982; R. Solzbacher, *Mönche, Pilger und Sarazenen. Studien zum Frühchristentum auf der südlichen Sinaihalbinsel. Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn islamischer Herschaft*, Altenberg 1989; J.J. Hobbs, *Mount Sinai*, Austin, TX 1995; Egeria, *Itinerarium = Reisebericht*, tr. and ed. G. Röwekamp et al., Freiburg 1995. For additional bibl., see **Arabia*; ODB 3, 1997-2000; DBS 12, 1383-1389; *Giovanni Climaco e il Sinai*, ed. S. Chialà - L. Cremaschi, Magnano 2002; S. Heid, *Der Sinai - Berg der Gottesschau in frühchristlicher Tradition*: RivAC 79 (2003) 313-358.

A. Di Berardino

SINGIDUNUM (Belgrade). The place of meeting between the Sava and Danube Rivers, inhabited since prehistoric times, it became in the 3rd c. BC a fortified center for the Stordisci, a Celtic tribe. Occupied at the time of the emperor Octavian, and belonging to the province of *Moesia, Singidunum became an important military stronghold between *Sirmium (modern-day Sremska Mitrovica) and Viminacium (modern-day Kostolac) in a strategic position along the Via Militaris (Via Diagonalis), which connected the fortifications along the Danube River; the seat of the Legio IV Felix. The stronghold, which was first a municipium and then a Roman colony, was an important center for the defense of the empire in the province of Moesia Superior, and was the homeland of the emperor *Jovian. With the division of the empire in 395, Singidunum was the W border. In 441 the *Huns reduced its habitants to slavery. In the 5th c. it was often plundered by the barbarians; the emperor *Justinian reconstructed the city in 535; after 584, after a brief parenthesis, it fell definitively to the Avars, but by that point it had lost its importance. In a letter from the year 878 of Pope John VIII to the Bulgarian leader Boris I Mihailo, the name *Belgrade* ("the White city") was used for the first time. We do not know when Christianity arrived at Singidunum, but scholars think that it occurred in the 3rd c. because the city was situated on an important communication route. Some archaeological sites in the vicinity of the cathedral have Christian symbols. Certainly various *martyrdoms took place there: during the persecution of *Diocletian, the presbyter Montanus and his wife Maxima (BS 9,574; Zeiller, 106); at the time of *Licinius, the deacon Hermylus and Stratonicus.

Bishop *Ursacius, an early supporter of *Arianism, was present at the Synods of Tyre (335), *Serdica (343), where he was excommunicated, *Milan (347), *Arles (353), Milan (355), *Rimini (359) and *Constantinople (360); in 369 he was definitively excommunicated by Pope *Damasus, and not much later he died. Another Arian, *Secundianus of Singidunum, succeeded him and was present at the Council of *Aquileia (381), where he was condemned and deposed alongside *Palladius of Ratiaria.

PW 43, 234-235; H. Delehaye, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie*: AB 31 (1912) 255ff.; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain*, Paris 1918 (repr. Rome 1967); M. Mirkovic, *Singidunum et le Nord-Ouest de la province* (*Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure*), Belgrade 1976; A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London-Boston 1976, 325-338; I. Opelt, *I dissidenti del concilio di Serdica*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 783-791; Y.-M. Duval, *La convocation du concile d'Aquilée de 381*, in *I concili della cristianità occidentale, secoli III-V.* XXX Incontro di Studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 3-5 maggio 2001: SEA 78 (2002) 421-437.

A. Di Berardino

SINGULARITATE CLERICORUM, De. A ps.-Cyprian work which was transmitted by 50 MSS which are variously attributed to *Origen, *Augustine and *Cyprian of *Carthage. From the 12th c. onward, however, the work often appears in the catalogs of Cyprian's works. Erasmus (1520) was the first to demonstrate that this attribution was incorrect. In the 20th c., several scholars attempted to find a new identification, e.g., with *Macrobius the *Donatist (Morin, Harnack) or *Novatian (Blacha)—but none of these so far seem to be convincing. We can only say that the writer speaks with authority, as would a bishop to his clerics, and that he is to be dated perhaps at the end of the 3rd c. With respect to the place of the redaction and the community to whom he speaks—whether it was orthodox or heterodox—we do not know. All the attempts to resolve the mystery of the author are only more or less plausible hypotheses.

The treatise has 46 chapters distributed in three sections in which the author seeks to combat the widespread custom of clerics living together under the same roof with women. The introduction (1-7) explains the scope and the circumstances of the work's redaction. The author here presents himself as an ecclesiastical authority who exhorts his readers with speeches marked by rigidity. Already in the first verses he shows a very negative attitude toward women, who for him are an *aculeus peccati* and have created the *concupiscentiae pestilentiam*. In the central part (8-36) the author refutes straw-man arguments that are used by his opponents to justify the practice of living together, primarily with extensive use of Holy *Scripture: the citations and allusions total nearly 200. Refuting these arguments, the author rarely has recourse to theological or philosophical lines of reasoning but makes an appeal to good sense. In the conclusion (37-46) he also exhorts his readers, but here he finds more encouraging words, asking them to act in such a way that *semper in clericis ecclesiae senatus candidus constet.*

Finally, the work does not engage in a theological defense of celibacy. The author only seems to be worried that this form of behavior not hurt the church's reputation, that the testimony of *singularitas* not be overshadowed, neglected and scorned. The treatment is therefore of the same issue addressed in the third canon of the Council of *Nicaea (325).

W. Hartel, CSEL 3, 3, Vienna 1872, 173-220; F. Blacha, *Der pseudocyprianische Traktat "de singularitate clericorum," ein Werk Novatians* (Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen 2), Breslau 1904; A. Harnack, *Der pseudocyprianische Traktat de singularitate clericorum, ein Werk des donatistischen Bischofs Macrobius in Rom* (TU 24, 3), Leipzig 1903; H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*, Bonn 1926; B. Melin, *Studia in Corpus Cyprianeum*, Uppsala 1946; G. de Plinval, *Les écrits de Cyprien*: BAug 21 (1966) 529-554; P. Schepens, *L'épître "De singularitate clericorum" du Ps. Cyprien*: RSR 13 (1922) 178-210; 297-327; RSR 14 (1923) 47-65; E. Cattaneo, *La preghiera liturgica come esperienza di uguaglianza tra uomo e donna nello pseudo-ciprianeo De singulariate clericorum*, in *La preghiera nel tardo antico. Dalle origini ad Agostino*, Rome 1999, 237-248.

S. Samulowitz

SIRICIUS, pope (384–399). After having spent a long career in service of his church, after the death of Pope *Damasus, Siricius was elected bishop of Rome, with the consent of the emperor *Valentinian II. Although *Ambrose's dominant role eclipsed his authority over the Western churches, he notably developed the Roman claims of jurisdiction, which had already been advanced by his predecessor. His letters sent to the following people bear witness to this: *Himerius of Tarragona (385), the bishops of *Italy and *Africa (386), and *Anisius of Thessalonica (392). Composed in the decretal style of the imperial chancery, these letters pertained to disciplinary questions (*Ep.* 1), explained the meaning of religious virginity (*Ep.* 4 and 7) and expressed an awareness of the *sollicitiudo omnium ecclesiarum*, to which Siricius felt himself called (*Ep.* 6, 1). Siricius vociferously condemned the execution of *Priscillian and intervened in favor of his adherents. In 390 he consecrated the new basilica of St. *Paul.

CPL 1637; PL 13, 1131-1178 (Coustant); PLS III, 567ff.; CCL 149, 59-63; BS 11, 1234-1237; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976,

esp. 888-909; D. Callam, *Clerical Continence in the Fourth Century*: ThS 41 (1980) 3-50; J. Gaudemet, *Droit de l'Église*, Paris 1985, 57-64; D. Jasper, *Canones synodi romani ad Gallos episcopos – die älteste Dekretale?*: ZKG 107 (1996) 319-326; LTK^{3} 9, 631; J. Woch, *"Portamus onera omnia qui gravantur." Il Pontificato di Papa Siricio (384-399)*, Rome 2001.

B. Studer

SIRMIUM

I. Christian origins - II. Councils.

I. Christian origins. Situated on the left bank of the Sava River in modern-day Sremska Mitrovica in Serbia, the city of Sirmium came into existence during the 1st c. AD as a *castrum militare* on the border of the Roman Empire. The urban expansion began in the 3rd c., and a chain of fortified walls was built. The greatest development then took place from the beginning of the 4th c. until the death of the emperor *Valens. At that time Sirmium was the residence of the emperors (one of the seats of the emperor *Galerius), whose palace towered near the hippodrome. The area of Sirmium was fortified with city walls. Aside from the *termae*, *horrea* and other buildings for public service were also found.

During the period of the great *persecutions numerous Christians were put to death. At that time Sirmium was the chief city of *Pannonia Secunda and the see of the most important diocese of the region. The first known bishop, *Domnus, signed the creed of the Council of *Nicaea. In 441 the city passed into the hands of the *Huns; in 567 it was occupied by the *Byzantine army. The church and ecclesiastical hierarchy were then reorganized, but again, in 582, the city was destroyed by the Avars, who were led by Baian. The last bishop, Sebastian, fled to *Rome. The most ancient Christian buildings are to be found outside the city. Already in the 19th c. the martyrium of St. Sinerotis was discovered, and in the E necropolis a martyrium was found in a trilobate layout. A fourth martyrium, found in terrible shape, was excavated on the modern right bank of the Sava River. The cathedral has not yet been found.

At the end of the 4th c. the steady decline of the city began, which seems to have been destroyed by a large fire. A basilica was built over the ruins, of which only the E part has been well preserved. Perhaps it was a new cathedral built in the 2nd half of the 5th c. The building had three aisles with a towering apse and a *synthronon* (i.e., the semicircular bench combining the bishop's throne and stall for clergy behind the altar).

Many precious fragments were found at Sirmium of *mensae* of the C-type with figures on the borders, in addition to many inscriptions, capitals and other architectural pieces as well as objects of cult and small handmade objects of metal etc.

M. Mirkovic, *Sirmium: Its History from the 1st Century AD to 528 AD*: Sirmium 1 (1971) 5ff.; V. Popovic, *A Survey of the Topography and Urban Organization of Sirmium in the Late Empire*: Sirmium 1 (1971) 119ff.; A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London 1974; J. Guyon, *Sirmium chrétienne dans la Basse Antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge*: MEFRA 86 (1974) 621ff.; V. Popovic - E.L. Ochsenschager, *Der spätkaiserzeitliche Hippodrom in Sirmium*: Germania 54 (1976) 156ff.; N. Duval, *Sirmium "ville impériale" ou "capital"*: CCAB 26 (1979) 53ff.; Ch. Pietri, *La géographie de l'Illyricum ecclléstiaque et ses relations avec l'église de Rome* (V^{e}-VI^{e} *siècles*), in *Villes et peuplement dans l'Illyricum protobyzantin*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 77, Rome 1984, 21ff.; B. Bavant, *La ville dans le nord de l'Illyricum, Pannonie, Mésie I, Dacie et Dardanie*, ibid., 245ff.; A. Poulter, *The Use and Abuse of Urbanism in the Danubian Provinces during the Later Roman Empire*, in *The City in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Rich, London-New York 1996 (^{1}1992), 105ff.

N. Cambi

II. Councils. *347*. *Hilary of Poitiers (*Frag. hist.* B. II 9, 1) dates to this year a council of Eastern bishops who gathered at Sirmium against *Photinus. This statement, however, does not seem to be entirely precise because it conflicts with other information.

351. Various Eastern bishops who had *Eusebian and moderate *Arian tendencies gathered in the presence of the emperor *Constantius to bring charges against Photinus. *Basil of *Ancyra supported dialogue with Photinus, at the end of which he was condemned, deposed and sent to exile. The council published a formula of faith, which repeated the one from *Antioch of 342, furnished with 27 anathemas directed against the teaching of *Marcellus of Ancrya and Photinus.

357. Around the middle of the year, *Germinius, *Valens, *Ursacius and a few other pro-Arian bishops gathered together and published a long formula of faith which, without repeating the more radical Arian expressions, clearly *subordinated the Son to the Father and prohibited the doctrinal use of the terms **homoousios* and **homoiousios*, although they did not do likewise for the Arian teaching. Catholics both in the East and West considered this formula to be openly Arian (*blasphemia Sirmiensis*).

358–359. The publication of the Formula of Sirmium from 357 provoked a strong reaction from the *homoiousians, who were led by Basil of Ancyra. Following the Council of Ancyra of 358, Basil and some of his followers went to Sirmium and, taking advantage of the emperor Constantius's momentary favor, gathered a small council, at which several Eastern bishops who were present on site (*in loco*) participated (Sirmium was an imperial residence)

and three pro-Arian Illyrians: Valens, Ursacius and Germinius. The arguments of the homoiousians prevailed, and the homoiousians obtained the condemnation and deposition of many pro-*Arian supporters, among whom were Eudoxius and the *anomoians *Aetius and *Eunomius. The three Illyrians signed the council's decisions, which republished the (second) formula of Antioch (341), furnished with the anathemas of the Council of Sirmium (351) and by a document, which has not survived, on the terms *homoousios* and *homoiousios*. The succession of continuous upheavals between 357 and 358 made many churchmen feel the need for an ecumenical council, which was called for at *Rimini for the West and *Seleucia for the East. In preparation for these councils some Eastern bishops met at Sirmium with Valens, Ursacius and Germinius. This time Basil was in the minority among a concentration of moderate Arians and so-called *homoians: Eudoxius, *Acacius and *Mark of Arethusa. On 22 May a formula of faith was published which served as the basis for the work of subsequent councils: the formula is generic in describing the relationship between the Father and the Son, which becomes more specific in the expression of generic likeness: the Son is similar to the Father in all things, acc. to the *Scriptures.

377/378. On the basis of the information supplied by the church historian *Theodoret (*HE* IV,8.9), a council in favor of Arianism is to be dated to this period, which was held at Sirmium. The bishops who had been called there reaffirmed the Nicene faith. They affirmed the consubstantiality of the entire *Trinity, they condemned some Arian bishops, and they signed the encyclical letter to the Asian bishops to inform them of their decisions and to strengthen them in their fight against Arianism. The information pertaining to this council contains several difficulties, and not all modern scholars are convinced such a council took place.

V. Blazevic, *Concilia et synodi in territorio hodiernae Jugoslaviae celebrata*, Vicenza 1967; Y.-M. Duval, *Aquilée et Sirmium durant la crise arienne (325-400)*: AAAd 26 (1985) 331-379; W.A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien. Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Witterschlick 1986; *347, 351*: Hfl-Lecl 1, 852-862; Simonetti 202-203; *357*: Hfl-Lecl 1, 899-902; Simonetti 229-233; *358–359*: Hfl-Lecl 1, 903-933; Simonetti 241-247; H.Ch. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 5-23; *377/378*: J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes*, Paris 1918, 310-327; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 86-87; M. Simonetti 439-441; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, for the various councils, see the index p. 907.

M. Simonetti

SISBERT of Toledo (7th c.). Successor to *Julian as bishop of Toledo from 690 to 693, that is to say, until the XVI Council of Toledo, which deposed him with the accusation of high treason for having conspired against the king (can. 9: *De Sisiberto episcopo*, and can. 11: *Decretum iudicii ab universis editum*, Mansi XII,76-77 and 80). Sisbert, to be identified perhaps with the abbot of the same name who signed the acts of the XIII (683), XIV (684) and XV (688) Councils of Toledo, to give evidence of his repentance and to request forgiveness for all that he had done, could have written the *Lamentum penitentiae*, the *Exhortatio penitendi*, *Oratio pro correptione vitae flenda semper peccata*, three works that have been transmitted to us along with the majority of the codices and on account of the argument and the style that are well-suited to an individual of high social standing who was severely punished for his faults.

CPL 1227-1228, 1533; Díaz 304-306; PL 83, 1251-1274; K. Strecker (ed.), MGH, *Poet. karol.* IV, Berlin 1929, 762-780; J. Orlandis, *El elemento germánico en la Iglesia española del siglo VII*: Anuario de Estudios Medievales 3 (1966) 27-64; Id., *Historia de los concilios de la España romana y visigoda*, Pamplona 1986, 491-493; J.F. Rivera Recio, *Los arzobispos de Toledo en el siglo VII*: Anales Toledanos, III. Estudio sobre la España Visigoda, Toledo 1971, 181-217 (esp. 214-215); U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispanolusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 482-484.

P. Marone

SISEBUT of Toledo. King of the *Visigoths of *Spain (612–621), he is remembered for his military successes obtained through the generals Rechila and Suintila over the Austurians and the rebel Basques; for the successful campaigns he led against the *Byzantines, whose presence in Spain was reduced under his reign to certain strongholds in the region of the Algarvi (Isid., *Hist. Goth.* 61; ps.-Fredeg., *Chron.* IV, 33); through the fervid religious activity that unfolded in the establishment of churches such as that of St. Leocadia at *Toledo (Isid., *Chron.* a. 516); and esp. in the forced "conversion" of the Jews (*Leg. Wisig.* XII,II,13-14). His activity as an author was of great importance for the history of Christian literature in the West: several of his letters have survived, one of which he sent to *Theodelinda (*Ep.* 9) on the trinitarian faith and another to his son Theudila (*Ep.* 8), who had accomplished, with a *conversio* toward contemplative solitude, a vocation already nourished by his father; the *Vita Desiderii ep. Viennensis*; and a poetic letter, the *Carmen de luna*, written in 61 hexameters and composed in 613. Attributed to him is also the hymn titled *De ratione temporum*. As a result of his patronage, we owe the works dedicated

to him by *Isidore of Seville, who was for him a teacher and spiritual director, and titled *De natura rerum* and the *Etymologiae*.

The *Carmen de luna*, due to the number of editions (Baehrens, Goetz, Riese and Fontaine) and differing interpretations, has had particular importance. It represents Sisebut's response to Isidore's dedicatory letter to the treatise *De natura rerum*. The writings of these two authors, therefore, were united in the MS tradition until the 7th-8th c. and were, at an even earlier time, united in the common objective of giving explanations for recent celestial phenomena such as the complete eclipse of the moon on 29 August 611 and that of 2 August 612, which, in the mentality of that era, probably incited worries concerning the end of the world. In it, the king, after having lamented his sadness of not having been able to follow, on account of his military, legislative and governing duties, the teacher in contemplation and in the poem on nature, he describes, acc. to the information provided by the then-current astronomy, with precise scientific language, a lunar eclipse (vv. 15-58) and, more briefly, a solar eclipse (vv. 58-61) (*Isidore de Séville. Traité de la nature*, ed. J. Fontaine, Bordeaux 1960, 328-335). It turns out to be a short poem in which the deep Lucretian tone is softened, in dry concision, by the polished Alexandrian workmanship: an "enlightened" response to Isidore's religious *allegorism, acc. to Stach; a literary exercise of a king who was nostalgic for a life consecrated to study, acc. to Fontaine. In my opinion, this short poem represents a man's regret who, having nourished as a young man a vocation to monastic solitude and seeing himself hindered by the *congeries turbida rerum* from following the contemplative endeavors of his teacher, describes his spiritual condition with the symbol of the moon upon which is cast the earth's cone-shell shadow, which prevents his seeing the sunlight. *Nonnumquam vero*, Isidore says in the work to which the poem responds (*De nat. rer.* XVIII, 6), *eadem luna etiam ecclesia accipitur, pro eo quod sic ista a sole sicut ecclesia a Christo inluminatur* ("Sometimes, however, the church is also understood as the same moon, because it is illumined by the sun just as even the church is illumined by Christ"). With respect to the history of salvation, there is no break in continuity between the symbolic interpretation of the signs of nature, an interpretation which is indicated by Isidore in the treatise *De natura rerum*, and the image used by Sisebut to express the state of his soul. In Isidore's work requested by the Visigothic king, the *natura rerum* and the *causae astrorum* are assumed, equally with the letter of the biblical *littera*, as means for the study of God and the communication of religious experience in the Christian world. This is one of the foundational aspects of medieval culture.

Editions: CPL 1186, 1298-1301; PL 80, 363-384; 83, 1112-1114; 94, 605-606; 129, 1369-1372; MGH, *Scr. rer. mer.* III, 630-637, 662-675; MGH, *Poet. lat.* IV/2, 682-686; E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini minores*, V, 357-360 (1883); G. Goetz, Jena 1887; A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, I, n. 483; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville*, *Traité de la nature*, Bordeaux 1960, 329-335.

Studies: M. Méndez Bejarano, *El rey Sisebuto astrónomo*, Madrid 1919; W. Stach, *Bemerkungen zu den Gedichten des Westgotenkönigs Sisebuts (612-621)*, in *Corona Quernea*, Leipzig 1941, 74-96; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville*, cit., 151-161 (intr.); V. Recchia, *Sisebuto di Toledo: il "Carmen de luna,"* Bari 1971; J.C. Martín Iglesias, *Un ejemplo de influencia de la Vita Desiderii de Sisebuto en la hagiografía merovingia*: Minerva 9 (1995) 165-186; Id., *Una revisión de la tradición textual de la "Vita Desiderii" de Sisebuto*: Emerita 64 (1996) 239-248; Id., *Notas críticas sobre el texto de la "Vita Desiderii" de Sisebuto*: Archivium Latinitatis Medii Aevi 56 (1998) 127-177; V. Recchia, *Ancora sul "Carmen de Luna" di Sisebuto da Toledo*: Invigilata Lucernis 20 (1998) 201-219.

V. Recchia

SISINNIUS, Novatianist (late 4th c.). A contemporary of *John Chrysostom, he was taught by the philosopher Maximus. While a lector at the time of *Agelius, the Novatian bishop of *Constantinople, he was appointed by this bishop to succeed him, but the Novatian laity preferred Marcian over him, whom Sisinnius later, however, succeeded in 395. *Socrates (*HE* VI,22) and *Sozomen (*HE* VIII,1) present Sisinnius as a temperate person, affable, eloquent, prepared by debate, an expert in the Scriptures and well-versed in dialectic. According to Socrates's judgment (*HE* VI,22.), Sisinnius wrote various works, in which he displayed his elegant culture in expression and taste for poetic sayings; he was more highly regarded, however, in speaking than in writing. On account of his gifts, he was generally welcomed, even by the bishop Atticus (see Socr., *HE* VI,22.).

S. Zincone

SISINNIUS, pope (d. 708). Native of *Syria, he succeeded Pope *John VII. His pontificate was very brief: only 20 days, from 15 January to 4 February 708. Suffering from a serious form of gout, Sisinnius walked and used his hands with much difficulty. From the *Liber pontificalis* we know that he had intended to restore some of the walls of *Rome (even because of the dangerous times), but his untimely death hindered him from completing the project.

LP I, 388; Mansi 11, 179; Jaffé I, 247; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 413 and 706; J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne* I-II, Brussels 1983: I, 39 and 107; II, 76-7, nn. 112 and 115; *Lexikon des Mittelalters* VII, 1995, 1939-40; LTK³ 9, 636 (M. Heim); EPapi 1, 640-641 (V. von Falkenhausen).

M. Spinelli

SISINNIUS, MARTYRIUS and ALEXANDER, martyrs (d. 397/398). *Paulinus of Milan writes about "Sisinnius, Martyrius and Alexander, who in the land of Anaunia [Val di Non, Trent] during the persecution of the Gentiles, obtained the crown of martyrdom in our times, i.e., after the death of the venerable *Ambrose" (*Vita Ambr.* 52,1). These three men settled in the Val di Non for many years in order to evangelize the area, which at that time was still entirely *pagan. The deacon Sisinnius, the oldest, was a *Cappadocian; the other two were brothers and likewise from the East. They had built a church at Anagnia (= Sanzeno), which was looked after by the lector Martyrius, who had abandoned his military career, and his brother Alexander, a *doorkeeper. They devoted themselves to asceticism and evangelization, obtaining some conversions. For having in some way impeded the celebration of the pagan feast (a *lustratio*), they were massacred in May 397/398. The killing, which occurred during a time of peace, immediately had much resonance. *Vigilius, the bishop of Trent, immediately went to the site and provided information on the type of life they led in two of his letters: one sent to *Simplicianus of Milan and the other to *John Chrysostom. Sisinnius "had the primacy of blood and leadership" (*Ep. to John Chrysostom* v. 172, ed. Pizzolato). Martyrius "was full of" missionary "zeal" (*Ep. a Simpl.* v. 57); "a teacher who never stopped teaching, a man eager to win souls" (*Ep. a Simpl.*, vv. 31ff.). Liturgical song had a missionary function: Martyrius "was the first to resound the song of the divine praise to the ears of a deaf region" (*Ep. a Simpl.* vv. 29-30). Vigilius had in mind the idea of constructing a church on the site of their martyrdom (*Ep. a Simpl.*, vv. 70-71). The three martyrs were mentioned by other authors such as *Augustine, who wrote in 411: "I know in fact that in the trial of the clerics of the Val di Non, who were killed by the pagans and are today honored as martyrs, the emperor adhered without a doubt to the request that the murderers, who were at that time held in prison, be not condemned by the same death penalty" (*Ep.* 139,2); *Gaudentius of Brescia (*Tract.* 17); *Maximus of Turin (*Serm.* 105-106: CCL 23,414-418); and *Venantius Fortunatus (*Carmina* I, 2: MGH AA 4,1,8-9). The remains were taken to Trent, where a church was built by Vigilius; some of the relics were also taken to *Milan, where a blind man was healed on the very day of their arrival (*Vita Ambr.* 52,1-2); they were placed in the basilica of S. *Simplicianus. Their cult arose soon, and the *Mart. hier.* is also a witness to it, as well as some of the Ambrosian and Tridentine *sacramentaries; their *liturgical memory is set for 29 May, the date of their death, and 15 August, the date of the translation of their *relics.

BS 11, 1251-53; PCBE 2, 2087-2088; *I martiri della Valle di Non e la reazione pagana alla fine del quarto secolo*, Bologna 1985; E.M. Sironi, *Dall'Oriente in Occidente: i santi Sisinnio, Martirio e Alessandro*, Sanzeno 1989; *L'Anaunia e i suoi martiri*, ed. R. Grégoire, Bibliotheca Civis, Trent 1997; *Vigilio vescovo di Trento tra storia romana e tradizione europea.* Atti del convegno, Trento 12-13 ottobre 2000, ed. R. Codroico - D. Gobbi, Bibliotheca Civis, Trent 2000; L.F. Pizzolato, *Studi su Vigilio di Trento*, Milan 2002.

A. Di Berardino

SISINNIUS of Constantinople, archbishop (426–427). Sisinnius was a priest working in Elaia, a suburb of *Constantinople, when, upon the death of *Atticus (10 October 425) the people from the capital, after considering his piety and love for the poor, preferred him for the episcopal succession over the candidates of the clergy, *Proclus and *Philip of Side, the latter of whom, then, in his *Christian History*, criticized this popular election that occurred on 28 February 426. The same day, or shortly thereafter, the newly elected archbishop of Constantinople, along with *Theodotus the archbishop of *Antioch, promulgated a very harsh synodal letter condemning the *Messalians. The ordination performed by Sisinnius in that or the subsequent year, of Proculus as the *metropolitan of Cyzicus, met opposition from the faithful of that city. They had elected *Dalmatius and pointed out to the new archbishop of Constantinople that his presumed right of intervening in the episcopal elections of Cyzicus was a personal privilege of his predecessor, Atticus. Sisinnius died on 24 December 427. He was succeeded by *Nestorius.

PG 103, 89; DCB 3, 704-705; Grumel, *Regestes*², 49-49a; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 370 à 451*, Paris 1974, 470, 492.

D. Stiernon

SIXTUS I, pope (ca. 115–ca. 128). He perhaps succeeded *Alexander I in 115. According to the *Liber*

pontificalis, he was of Roman origin, from the region of the Via Lata, the son of a certain Pastor. The same source attributes to him the following *liturgical and disciplinary ordinances: it was only permissible for priests to touch the sacred vessels; before the canon, the people sing the *Sanctus* with the celebrant; the bishops who were called to *Rome return to their diocese and display the testimonial letters of the apostolic see (I,91 and 128; cf., Jaffé 31-33). Sixtus did not distance from ecclesiastical communion those who celebrated *Easter on a day different from Rome (Eus., *HE* 5,24,4). According to the Roman Martyrology, he was put to death on 6 April (3 April in the 1922 ed.). He exercised his pontificate perhaps until 125, but *Eusebius of Caesarea places his death around 127–128 (*HE* 4,5). The later tradition maintains that Sixtus was buried in the Vatican near St. *Peter; but acc. to more recent and rigorous studies, his sepulcher is to be found in the Alatri Cathedral (see L. De Persis, *Del pontificato di S. Sisto I papa e martire e della traslazione delle sue reliquie da Roma in Alatri*, Alatri 1884).

LP I, 54-55, 56-57 and 128; Cesare Baronio, *Annales ecclesiastici* II, Rome 1590, 79 and 95-98; LTK² 9, 643 (G. Schwaiger); EPapi 1, 216-218 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

SIXTUS II, pope (257–258). He succeeded Pope *Stephen I in August of 257. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, he was of Greek origin and a *philosophus*: this title was given to him much later because *Rufinus of Aquileia had regarded him as the author of the *Sentences of *Sextus* in the prologue of his Latin translation of that work; the *Decretum Gelasianum* regards the work as apocryphal. *Pontius, the author of the *Life of Cyprian*, refers to him as "a good and peaceful priest" (CSEL 3/3, CV). *Cyprian spoke of his *martyrdom which occurred in a cemetery (the catacomb of *Callistus) along with some of his deacons following the Edict of *Valerian (*Ep.* 80: CSEL 3/2,840), i.e., 6 August 258, and shortly before that of Cyprian himself. A few days later, his first deacon *Lawrence the great Roman martyr was put to death. Harnack attributed to Sixtus the treatise *Ad *Novatianum* (*To Novatian*) (Quasten I,598). The episode of his death was also mentioned by Pope *Damasus (A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, nn. 16 and 17). *Dionysius of Alexandria wrote to him various letters in relation to the problem of rebaptism, which was defended by Cyprian, and informed him about the spread of *Sabellius's teaching in Cyrenaica (Eus., *HE* 7,4-6; 7,9,2-6); Dionysius was able to achieve a peaceful agreement between Sixtus and the African church.

AASS *Aug.* II, 124-142; LP 1, 155-156; III, 75; BS 11, 1256-1262; 8, 108-129 (Lawrence); P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Un recente studio sul luogo del martirio di Sisto II*, in *Note agiografiche*, ST 33, Vatican City 1920, 145-178; H. Delehaye, *Recherches sur le légendier romain*: AB 51 (1933) 43-49; EPapi 1, 286-292.

A. Di Berardino

SIXTUS III, pope (432–440). Of Roman origin, he was already a presbyter in 418 under Pope *Zosimus. He was elected on 31 July 432. It seems that in his earlier years he had a soft spot for the *Pelagians, from whom he quickly distanced himself: there remain two letters written to him by *Augustine on the matter of Pelagianism (*Ep.* 191 and 194, ca. 418; see also the inscription of the Lateran baptistery: LP I, 236). With the condemnation of the Pelagians by Pope Zosimus, Sixtus also distanced himself from them and wrote to *Aurelius of Carthage and Augustine. In 439, he did not readmit *Julian of Eclanum to ecclesiastical communion because the latter did not retract his error (Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chronicon ad a. 439*: PL 51,598). Upon his episcopal consecration in 432, 200 Eastern bishops were present, to whom he entrusted two letters of a conciliar character, one for *Cyril of Alexandria and the other for the Eastern bishops (Jaffé 389-390: PL 50,583-590), to settle the disagreements following the Council of *Ephesus, and he intervened in many other ways (ACO I,IV, 93; PG 84,640). The agreement between Cyril and *John of Antioch was achieved in 433, and both men communicated information about this matter to Sixtus (ACO I, I, 4, 33 = Mansi 5,286; see Sixtus, *Ep.* 5). The pope responded to both men, rejoicing over the peace that had been achieved (*Ep.* 5 and 6), and affirmed the centrality of the Roman see. Moreover, Sixtus reaffirmed the rights of the Roman see over the bishops of Illyricum, who often turned to *Constantinople, which was also aiming to extend its powers in that region (Jaffé 393-396), where the bishop of *Thessalonica was performing functions as the vicar of Rome. He wrote to *Perigenes of Corinth, who was trying to become a metropolitan to the demise of Thessalonica (*Ep.* 7 and 8: PL 50, 610-612). In the West, however, the barbarian invasions impeded the pope's close contacts with the bishops. At the time of Sixtus's pontificate numerous sacred buildings were built at Rome. In particular, the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore was rebuilt—the first Roman church dedicated to the Madonna—with the famous triumphal arch, covered with a mosaic, which narrates the infancy of Jesus Christ and

*Mary's involvement in those early events, all with the objective of magnifying Christ, the God-man and the Son of Mary (the *Theotokos* of the Council of Ephesus) (Diehl 975a-976). This fervor for construction has led scholars to refer to Sixtus's period as the "architectural renaissance," even though it began in the 4th c. The document titled *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* is a forgery composed by the partisans of Pope *Symmachus during the trial held against him in 501 (PLS 3,1249-1255).

CPL 1655; Verzeichnis 545; PL 50, 571-626; PLS 3, 21-23; LP I, 232, 237; III, 85; Patrologia III, 556-557; DTC 14, 2196-2199 (see tables 4050); BS 11, 1262-1264; G. Wilpert, *La proclamazione efesina e i mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*: AST 7 (1931) 197-213; R. Krautheimer, *The Architecture of Sixtus III: A Fifth-Century Renaissance?*, in *Essays in Honor of E. Panofsky*, New York 1961, 291-302 (now found in *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art*, London 1971, 181-196); Id., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*, III, Vatican City 1971, 1-60; G. Bovini, *I mosaici romani dall'epoca di Sisto III (432–440)*: CCAB 10 (1963) 67-80, 81-101; F. Magi, *Il calendario dipinto sotto Santa Maria Maggiore*, Vatican City 1972 (see REL 51 [1973] 41-48); N.A. Brodsky, *L'iconographie oubliée de l'arc éphésien de Sainte Marie Majeure à Rome*, Brussels 1976 (cf. RivAC 46 [1971] 179-183); Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976 (see the index p. 1700); L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974, 246-277; G. Zecchini, *I "Gesta de Xysti purgatione" e le fazioni aristocratiche a Roma alla metà del V secolo*: RSCI 34 (1980) 60-74; S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor. Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Vatican City 1994, *passim*; EPapi 1, 415-423.

A. Di Berardino

SLAVERY. The social structure of antiquity viewed slavery as one of its numerous institutions. This factor, logically speaking, influenced the *Fathers' teaching on this topic. Nevertheless, the patristic teaching witnessed a slow evolution that led to a substantial transformation with the theory and the practice of slavery. As a general principle, we can affirm that in the first centuries equality of all humanity before God was maintained, for which reason there did not exist distinctions of race, gender, social, political or legal status. Again from the gospels (Jn 8:31-35) and from the teaching of the apostle *Paul (1 Cor 7:32; Gal 3:28; Eph 6:5-8 and Col 4:1), the discussion centered on what true freedom was, and slavery, without abandoning the social level, was also considered within the spiritual and moral sphere. Patristic thought hinged on two centers: on the one hand, the natural equality and the original freedom of all (in line with *Stoic thought) and, on the other, the observation that *original sin was the origin of slavery. It was therefore seen as a divine punishment to stop the wicked inclinations of humankind once deprived of its original innocence.

The church from the beginning received slaves within its communities without any distinction. They participated in a normal way in the *liturgical celebration, received the same *sacraments and could obtain the same ecclesiastical posts, including the episcopal office, with the same rights as free persons. *Marriage, e.g., was considered a true *coniugium*, sacred and indissoluble, and not a mere *contubernium*.

The exhortation to mutual respect between slaves and masters was a constant theme in patristic texts from the beginning (*Did.* 4,10; Ign., *Ad Polyc.* 4,3; Hermas, *Past.*, *Mand.* 8,10; *Comp.* 1,8; 9,28,8). We also find significant texts in the writings of *Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, *Paedagogus*) and *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ad Demetrianum* 8). The works of the famous authors, esp. starting from the 3rd c., are replete with references to slavery. The writings of *Augustine (*Exp. Ep. ad Galatas* 64), *John Chrysostom (*In I Cor. hom.* 40,5), *Gregory of Nyssa (*In eccl. hom.* 4) and *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Poem. th.* II, 36), just to cite a few examples, demonstrate this teaching well. Slavery was the fruit of sin, which was reflected in the division of the world caused by evil. The Fathers agreed in demanding a worthy treatment for slaves, whose master must behave himself as a true father, rejecting any type of violence and cruelty.

Starting from the 4th c., the church already exercised an important social role; the doctrine of slavery was developed not only in the writings the Fathers but also in the decisions of councils and in the imperial laws (see CTh 9,12,1).

Christianity was opposed to slavery through a slow and gradual work, which was often imperceptible, and which respected the social positions acquired over the course of history, without ever having recourse to violence. In this way the church was able, little by little, to replace the institutions and the customs that made slavery something necessary with other institutions and other customs that became incompatible with the very existence of slavery.

S. Talamo, *La schiavitù secondo i Padri della Chiesa*, Rome 1905; P. Allard, *Gli schiavi cristiani: dai primi tre secoli della Chiesa fino al termine della dominazione romana in Occidente*, Florence 1915; G. Barbero, *Il pensiero politico cristiano*, I, Turin 1962; H. Gülzow, *Christentum und Sklaverei in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Bonn 1969; P. Maraval, *L'Église du IV^e siècle et l'esclavage*: Studia Moralia 8 (1970) 319-346; J. Vogt, *Sklaverei und Humanität: Studien zur antiken Sklaverei und ihrer Erforschung*, Wiesbaden 1965 (Eng. tr. Oxford 1974); P.A. Milani, *La schiavitù nel pensiero politico I: dai greci al basso medioevo*, Milan 1972; A.A. Rupprecht, *Attitudes on Slavery Among the Church Fathers*, in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, eds. R.N. Longenecker - M.C. Tenney, Grand Rapids, MI 1974, 261-277; O. Robleda, *Il diritto degli schiavi nell'Antica Roma*,

Rome 1976; N. Brockmeyer, *Antike Sklaverei*, Darmstadt 1979; G. Corcoran, *Saint Augustine on Slavery*, Rome 1985; G. de Bonfils, *Gli schiavi degli ebrei nella legislazione del IV secolo: storia di un divieto*, Bari 1992; J.A. Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*, Tübingen 1995; P. Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine*, Cambridge 1996; A. Postiglione, *La schiavitù nella società e nella cultura antica attraverso le testimonianze degli scrittori greci e latini*, Naples 1998, 213-235; I.A.H. Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church: From the New Testament to the Beginning of the Fifth Century*, Sheffield 1998; M. Melluso, *La schiavitù nell'età giustinianea: disciplina giuridica e rilevanza sociale*, Paris 2000; J.A. Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, Oxford 2002.

J.A. Cabrera Montero

SMYRNA. An Asian city and port of *Asia Minor (Anatolia), on the Aegean Sea, Smyrna was one of the most important cities of Turkey. The most ancient site dates back to the second millennium BC, on the hill, a few kilometers from the modern city, which occupies the same site of that Hellenistic city. Before 677 BC, it was conquered by the inhabitants of Colophon and underwent influence from Ionia; it then gave resistance to the Lydians, and subsequently it was occupied and destroyed by Alyattes in 580. It ceased to exist for two centuries until it was rebuilt through a project undertaken by Alexander the Great and brought to completion by Antigonus Monophthalmus and Lysimachus on the modern-day site. Among its alternating fortunes, its history unfolded through the *Seleucids, the kingdom of Pergamum (228) and the Romans. Around 60 BC, it made up part of the Roman province of Asia. It experienced great affluence during the imperial age, and under the emperor *Hadrian it received a second imperial temple. Destroyed in 178 by an earthquake, it was reconstructed through the initiative of Aelius Aristides.

It was one of the first Christian centers and one of the seven churches of Asia mentioned in the book of Revelation, where one finds the letter of St. *John to the bishop of *Smyrna* (Rev 2:8-11).

During his trip to *Rome, to undergo *martyrdom there, Bishop *Ignatius of Antioch passed through, and from that city he wrote the letters to the communities of *Ephesus, Magnesia and Tralles, in addition to the letter to Smyrna; all these cities had sent delegates to greet him and bear witness of their solidarity with his suffering. Likewise from the city of Smyrna, he wrote to the members of the church of Rome, asking them to not hinder his desire to die for Jesus Christ.

*Polycarp of Smyrna, bishop of the city, was put to death in the amphitheater at 86 years old. The treatise *Martyrium Policarpi* speaks of his and his companions' courage when facing death and torture.

*Pionius was also a martyr of Smyrna, whose *Passio* (BHG, n. 1546) speaks about him, a source for the *Hieronymian Mart. hier.* (10 and 12 March) and some of the Greek synaxaria (*Synaxarium Eccl. Constant.*, col. 530, on 11 March).

*Irenaeus, who then became the bishop of *Lyons, was a native of Smyrna (between 140 and 160), who in the letter to the Roman priest Florinus states that during his youth he had heard the sermons of Bishop Polycarp.

According to *Polycrates of Ephesus, *Thraseas bishop of Eumenia was martyred at Smyrna (Eus., *HE* 5,18,14; 24,4). On 22 January the *Mart. hier.* celebrates for Smyrna the bishop Valerius. Under *Byzantium, which held the city until the 11th c., Smyrna was a center of modest importance. Today it is still the see of a Catholic archbishopric.

W.M. Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, London 1904; H. Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littér.*, Brussels 1921, 28-53; L. Lemmens, *Hierarchia latina Orientis* (1622): Orientalia Christiana 1 (1923) 253-254; V. Schultze, *Altchristl. Städte und Landschaften*, II, Leipzig 1926, 50-61; G. Hofmann, *L'arcivesc. di S.*: Orientalia Christiana Per. 1 (1935) 434-466; E. Iosi, s.v. *Smirne*: EC 11, 820-821; C.J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, Oxford 1938; L. Storari, *Guida con cenni storici di Smirne* (Turin 1857), repr. with a preface by G. Bowersock, Pisa 1999.

T. Sardella

SOCRATES. The figure of Socrates did not fail to leave an impression on numerous patristic authors: G. Giannantoni (see bibl.) has collected all the ancient testimonies that pertained to him that are present in the *Martyrium S. Apollonii* (19 and 41), the *Martyrium Pionii*, and in the writings of *Justin, *Tatian, *Athenagoras, *Theophilus of Antioch, *Clement of Alexandria, *Origen, the *ps.-*Clementine Homilies*, *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Tertullian, *Minucius Felix, *Cyprian, *Lactantius, *Jerome, *Augustine and *Basil of Caesarea. For many of these authors, esp. for the Greek apologists, for Clement and for Origen, Socrates became the ideal symbol of the wise man, the teacher of morality, who believed in the one and only God and for this reason was unjustly persecuted and condemned. Immediately there arose a parallel between Socrates's death and that of the first Christian martyrs, who, as in the case of the Athenian philosopher, were likewise guilty of believing in the one and only God and of rejecting official polytheism. Origen even found it natural that there was a parallel between Socrates and Jesus Christ (*C. Cels.* III,41; VII,56). For St. Augustine, Socrates was the *magister omnium qui tunc maxime claruerunt*

tenens in ea parte quae moralis vel activa dicitur principatum (*Civ. Dei* XVIII,35). Among the authors of the early centuries of the Christian church, only Tertullian, in keeping with his negative attitude toward Greek philosophy (*see* *Hellenism and Christianity), was not very favorable toward Socrates.

G. Melinossi, *Socrate nella tradizione cristiana dei primi secoli*: Didaskaleion 9 (1930) 125-176; E. Benz, *Christus und Sokrates in der alten Kirche*: ZNW 43 (1950-51) 155-223; G. Giannantoni, *Socrate. Tutte le testimonianze da Aristofane e Senofonte ai Padri cristiani*, Bari 1971; D. Jackson, *Socrates and Christianity*: CF 31 (1977) 189-206; I. Opelt, *Das Bild des Sokrates in der christlichen Literatur*: JbAC Ergänz. 10 (1983) 192-207; M.O. Young, *Justin, Socrates, and the Middle-Platonists*: SP XVIII, 2 (1989) 161-166; E. Dassmann, *Christus und Sokrates*: JbAC 36 (1993) 33-45; A.M. Ritter, *Sokrates und Christus*, in M. Baumbach (ed.), *Mousopolos Stephanos, FS H. Görgemanns*, Heidelberg 1998, 8-19; M. Fédou, *La figure de Socrate selon Justin*, in *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. B. Pouderon - J. Doré, Paris 1998, 51-66; E.W. Stegemann, *Paulus, Sokrates und Seneca: zu den Anfängen christlicher Literatur- und Philosophiegeschichte*, in *Literarische Philosophie-philosophische Literatur*, ed. R. Faber - B. Naumann, Würzburg 1999, 77-93; E.R. Sandvoss, *Die Wahrheit wird euch frei machen: Sokrates und Jesus*, Munich 2001.

S. Lilla

SOCRATES of Constantinople (Scholasticus). Church historian (d. after 439). The only source for the biography on Socrates is his *Church History*, which describes the events from the beginning of *Constantine's empire in 305 until 439. Socrates (whose conventional added appellation *Scholasticus* is only attested rather late, in an 11th-c. MS, and is therefore to be abandoned) was born around 380 or shortly thereafter, and was educated at *Constantinople by the pagan rhetoricians Helladius and Ammonius, natives of *Alexandria, where they had fled during the violent conflict between Christians and *pagans in the year 391 (*HE* 5,16,9). Socrates was a Christian, perhaps a cleric, and belonged to the circle of scholars in the Eastern capital. He wrote his history with special interest for the church of the *Novatians (see, e.g., *HE* 5,19-22); he used Novatian sources (*HE* 1,10), and in many cases he was also partial toward them. In all likelihood, the author was himself a member of the Novatian church. Moreover, *Origen's theology, *Eusebius of Caesarea's thought, his great predecessor in the field of history and the **homoousios* of the Council of *Nicaea were points of reference in his theological profile, even if he did not have deep interest in doctrinal speculation.

Eusebius, the "father of church history," was also a point of departure as a literary genre and a chronological framework: Socrates made it his objective to continue the work of his predecessor, updating it to his own day. On the methodological level, the largest challenge with respect to pre-Constantinian history was the role of the state and the emperor. Between Constantine and *Theodosius II, the church had also grown in part thanks to the support of imperial politics, but at the same time, during the debates on *trinitarian theology, it was also immersed in imperial politics, even though this intervention could be problematic. Socrates took into consideration the emperor's new role in his presentation of history (structured in seven books acc. to the period of the reigns of the individual emperors) and there reflected on it also on a theoretical level (5, pr.).

From the proemia, which are of a methodological character, it turns out, moreover, that the church history was written at the request of a certain Theodore (6, pr., 1) and that the first two books were modified and expanded (a second "dictation": 2,1,6) because of the patron's criticisms. These changes probably pertain esp. to the insertion of a large number of original documents on the *Arian controversy. Aside from this firsthand source material, Socrates indicated his primary source as *Rufinus's *Ecclesiastical History* written in Latin. Alongside this work, however, he also used the Greek work of *Gelasius of Caesarea (without mentioning it). Other important sources were Eusebius of Caesarea's *Vita Constantini* (used but not without reservations 1,1,2); the enigmatic *Synagōgē* written by *Sabinus of Heraclea; chronicle information; the works of such authors as *Athanasius, *Julian and *Libanius; and—esp. toward the end—even information that had come to him orally. As historical personages, the emperor Julian and the bishop *John Chrysostom drew the attention of the author in a special way (books 3 and 6); in both cases, Socrates provides an image that is distinguished with some nuances by the prevailing tendencies in other sources; moreover, Socrates's long excursus on the varieties of liturgical uses in various churches deserves more attention from scholars (5,22). Socrates claims to write in a clear style and that he is understandable even for simple readers (the ideal *sermo humilis*, 6, pr., 5); nevertheless, his Greek is refined, and the work is marked by much care. The historical method is oriented toward the methodology found in the historical works of Eusebius of Caesarea, even if for certain verses it comes close to secular historiography. As a historical source it is of great value because of the sober manner, detached and not polarizing, in which Socrates treats history, which places him close to the modern ideals of "tolerance" and "objectivity" (in

contradistinction to *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, e.g.).

As a basis of information, he was a great resource, therefore, to many subsequent readers and authors, esp. his immediate successor *Sozomen, who used a large portion of the material presented by Socrates and rendered it in a more “classicizing” form. Through *Cassiodorus’s *Historia tripartita*, Socrates was also the basis of knowledge on the ancient church for the medieval West. His work was translated very early on into *Armenian, and this very faithful translation is an important witness for the establishment of the text.

The historical work of Socrates is to be placed within a certain widespread classicism at Constantinople under the emperor *Theodosius II in the 1st half of the 5th c. In ecclesiastical and secular historiography, in the codification of law (*Codex Theodosianus*), in the lists of administrative and urban structures (*Notitia dignitatum* and *Notitia urbis*) “the archives of the past” are set in order and a new “Byzantine” identity is formed. In this framework and from a Novatian perspective, peace in the church and the reciprocal understanding of all Christians of goodwill appear as the objective of church history (7,48,6-7).

Editions: CPG 6028; PG 67, 28-842; R. Hussey, *Socratis Scholastici Ecclesiastica Historia*, I-III, Oxford 1853; Sokrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen, contributions by Mirinjan (GCS NF 1), Berlin 1995; Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1 (= book 1), trans. by P. Périchon - P. Maraval, intr. and notes by P. Maraval (SC 477), Paris 2004.

Studies: P. Périchon, *Pour une édition nouvelle de l’Historien Socrate: les manuscrits et les versions*: RecSR 53 (1965) 112-120; H. Leppin, *Von Constantin dem Großen zu Theodosius II. Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret* (Hypomnemata 110), Göttingen 1996; M. Wallraff, *Der Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates. Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsdarstellung, Methode und Person* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 68), Göttingen 1997; *Die Welt des Sokrates von Konstantinopel. Studien zu Politik, Religion und Kultur im späten 4. und frühen 5. Jh. n. Chr.*, ed. B. Bäbler - H.-G. Nesselrath, Munich 2001; D.F. Buck, *Socrates Scholasticus and Julian the Apostate*: Byzantion 73 (2003) 301-318; P. Van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Leuven 2004.

M. Wallraff

SODOM (iconography). In the episodes that illustrate *Lot’s departure from Sodom (Gen 19:24-26), there appears, behind the shoulders of Lot’s wife, who became a pillar of salt, the representation of the city destroyed by God to punish it for the perversity of its inhabitants. The city usually appears surrounded by very high walls and at times among flames. The most ancient scene is attested to in a *painting from the catacomb of the Via Latina at *Rome (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, tv. XXX) between 320 and 360. There then follows the *sarcophagus of Lot (a. 340 - Rep 188) from the catacomb of St. *Sebastian, where Sodom is rendered by an upright door supported by a spiral column with trabeation and a hint of gable. Prominent in the background, one catches a glimpse of the city’s walls and the rows of the windows from which tongues of fire escape. Just one example can be found in miniature, namely in the 7th-c. Pentateuch of *Tours (f. 18a, pl. VI).

L. de Bruyne, *Il sarcofago di Lot scoperto a S. Sebastiano*: RivAC 27 (1951) 112; J. Porcher, in J. Hubert - J. Porcher - W.F. Volbach, *L’Europa delle invasioni barbariche*, Milan 1968, 128; U. Könen, *Die brennenden Stadt: Sodom in spätantiken Darstellungen*, in *Actes du XI^e Congrès Int. d’Archéologie Chrétienne*, II, Vatican City 1989, 1356-1367.

A.M. Di Nino

SODOM, De. A short poem of 166 hexameters, which in some codices is attributed to *Cyprian and in others to *Tertullian, but it belongs to neither author, inasmuch as it dates to the beginning of the 5th c. The date of the work has led some scholars to conclude that it was written by *Cyprian the Poet. Some authors have attributed the poem to *Avitus of Vienne because of the similarities with his short treatises, an opinion challenged by Roncoroni and then by Morisi. The author remains unknown, as does the place and time of the poem’s composition (however, after the mid-5th c.). The short poem intends to call people to repentance and conversion. For this reason, drawing inspiration from the text of Genesis (ch. 19), it narrates the destruction of the two sinful cities, the transformation of *Lot’s wife into a pillar of salt and God’s attitude toward him. The anonymous author writes at length in describing the horrific natural calamities that occurred during the destruction of Sodom for the sins that had been committed. It is closely connected to the treatise *De Iona*, also referred to as *De Ninive*, composed of 105 verses. The text of the treatise *De Iona* is in a bad state: in fact, the author, after having mentioned God’s patience, who awaits the repentance of human beings, having laid out the invitation directed to *Jonah to go to preach at Nineveh, then moves on to narrate the vicissitudes Jonah experienced until the point of the storm that had been subdued, without saying anything about his preaching. The two short poems must have been written by the same author.

CPL 1425-1426; CPPM 2, 2146 and 2155 (*De Sodoma*); CPPM 2, 2147 and 2156 (*De Iona*); PL 2, 1159-1162 (*De Sodoma*); PL 2, 1166-1172; CSEL 3/3 (1871) 289-301; CSEL 23 (1891) 212-226; M.

Dando, *Alcimus Avitus as the Author of . . . De Sodoma and De Jona, Formerly Attributed to Tertullian and Cyprian*: CM 26 (1967) 258-275; A. Roncoroni, *L'epica lirica di Avito di Vienna*: VetChr 9 (1972) 303-329; Patrologia III, 298-299; R. Hexeter, *The Metaphorosis of Sodoma: The Ps. Cyprian "De Sodoma" as an Ovidian Episode*: Traditio 44 (1988) 1-35; M. Bertolini, *I mirabilia di Sodoma* (*Carmen de Sodoma 21-167*): Studi Classici e Orientali 39 (1989) 185-202; D.M. Kriel, *Sodoma in Fifth Century Biblical Epic*: Acta classica 34 (1991) 7-20; L. Morisi, *Versus de Sodoma*. Intr., testo critico, tr. e comm., Bologna 1993.

A. Di Berardino

SOGDIAN. The lingua franca of the Iranian family, attested to, with discontinuity, from the 1st (?) to the 10th c. in Central Asia (from Turkmenistan to Mongolia). Through the use of an Aramaic alphabet, it was used primarily to transcribe not only Buddhist texts but also *Manichean and Christian texts. Generally translated from *Syriac, the Christian texts include parts of the NT, the *Apostolic Canons*, the *Shepherd* of *Hermas, *Evagrius of Pontus, *Dadisho of Beth Qatraya and the *apophthegms, in addition to some *hagiographical works and anonymous *homilies.

F.W.K. Müller, *Soghdische Texte.* I, Berlin 1913; O. Hansen, *Berliner Soghdische Texte.* I. *Bruchstücke einer soghdischen Version der Georgspassion* (*C 1*), Berlin 1941; Id., *Berliner sogdische Texte. II. Bruchstücke der grossen Sammelhandschrift C 2*: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz 15 (1954) 819-918; O. Hansen, *Die buddhistische und christliche Literatur*: Iranistik. Literatur. 1 (= Handbuch der Orientalistik I, 4, 1), Leiden-Cologne 1968, 77-99; Id., *Die christliche Literatur der Soghdier. Eine Übersicht*: Jahrbuch der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz (1951) 296-302; Id., *Über die verschiedenen Quellen der christlichen Literatur der Sogder*: Acta Orientalia 30 (1966) 95-102; B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament, Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations*, Oxford 1977, 279-281; E. Benveniste, *Études sur quelques textes sogdiens chrétiens*: JA 243 (1955) 297-337; 247 (1959) 115-136; D.N. MacKenzie, *Christian Sogdian Notes*: Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 33 (1970) 116-124; W.B. Henning, *Selected Papers* I-II (Acta Iranica II, 14-15), Leiden-Téheran-Liège 1977; N. Sims-Williams, *The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad*: Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 44 (1981) 231-240; N. Sims-Williams, *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients. Berliner Turfantexte 12), Berlin 1985; W. Sundermann, *Ein manichäisch-sogdianisches Parallelbuch . . .* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients. Berliner Turfantexte 15), Berlin 1985; N. Sims-Williams, *Tradition Concerning the Fates of the Apostles in Syriac and Sogdian*, in *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte. Fest. K. Rudolph*, ed. H. Preissler - H. Seiwert, Marburg 1994, 287-295; M. Compareti, *Evidence of Mutual Exchange Between Byzantine and Sogdian Art*, in *Conv. int.: La persia e Bisanzio*, Atti dei Convegni Lincei 201, Rome 2004, 865-922; N. Sims-Williams, *A Greek-Sogdian Bilingual from Bulayïq*, ibid., 623-631; É. de la Vaissière, *Histoire des Marchands Sogdiens*, Paris ²2004.

S.J. Voicu

SOLEMNITATIBUS ET SABBATIS, Disputatio de. This disputation on feasts and sabbaths in letter form was falsely ascribed to *Jerome (the author refers to himself as *peregrinus*). Scholars attribute it to different authors, who lived from the 3rd c. to the period of *Columbanus (d. 615). It has no information on the recipient and ends with the expression: *ora pro nobis, venerabilis papa*. It is impossible to identify the *peregrinus* and the *papa*. According to Jones, on account of his style, the author seems to have been of Irish origin, but it is not the work of Columbanus. The author maintains that the feasts, new moons and the *sabbath prescribed in the OT should be observed spiritually and no longer materially (*spirituali observantia celebrantur*); these are only a figure and not the truth. Just as the bloody sacrifices have been abolished, so too the ancient celebrations. The author proves this point with citations from the OT and the NT. The *Passover, in which the lamb was slain, a type of Christ, was changed by Jesus Christ himself, who is the new lamb. Christ changed the sacrifice when he said: "This is my body" (Mt 26:26). Christians must therefore celebrate Passover on Sunday (*una sabbatorum*) after the 14th day of the first month (he does not mention the equinox of spring). Sabbath, a day prescribed for rest, has become for Christians a day of abstinence from sin. Likewise, the feasts of booths (*Scenophegia*) and "new moons" (*neomeniae*) should be observed spiritually. The latter signifies that the one who has been illuminated with knowledge must not cease to preach, i.e., to illuminate others.

CPL 2278; CPPM II, 530 and 826; PL 22, 1220-1224; CSEL 56, 357-363; MGH, *Epist.* 3, 177-180; F. Cabrol - H. Leclercq, *Reliquiae liturgicae vetustissimae*, II, Paris 1913, 71-73 (they maintain that the letter was written before the Council of *Nicaea); C.W. Jones, *Bedae*, *Opera de temporibus*, Cambridge, MA 1943, 108-109.

A. Di Berardino

SOLOMON (iconography). The figure of Solomon is connected to a double *symbolism. The most well-known is that which sees Solomon as the supreme judge and wise man (a symbol, therefore, of wisdom); the second, and less known, connects him to the figure of the victorious one in the fight against wicked forces. The most ancient examples of Solomon's judgment (1 Kgs 3:16-28) are on a caricatured fresco from Pompeii and, perhaps, a scene from the synagogue of *Dura Europos accompanied by an inscription pertaining to Solomon from the 1st half of the 3rd c. In a Christian context, however, the most ancient representation was applied on a silver case at

St. Nazarius at Milan (in the 4th c.), the most recent is a 7th-c. *painting. In the underground church of St. Mary on the Via Lata in Rome (WMM 37,1). Scenes relating to Solomon are very frequent in the minor arts, as on a sculpted marble, a piece of ivory in Berlin and a glass medallion. The symbolism pertaining to Solomon, the hero of the good and the triumphant one over *evil is illustrated in a series of small objects. During the Middle Ages, Solomon, who in the writings of Flavius Josephus (*Ant. Iud.* VIII, 2,5) acquired exorcist virtues, was considered a magician in the true and proper sense of the term. In testimony to this idea are a group of talismans and medallions inspired by such beliefs. A series of medallions from the Beidun Museum in Jerusalem, in relation to the *Testament of Solomon*, show Solomon, the horse rider, intent on spearing with a lance a female figure (the demon Hormias), who is under the horse's belly. This iconography has inspired the Christian iconography of St. *George and the Dragon. In a *papyrus from Oslo, Solomon is invoked along with Christ.

DACL 15, 588-602; EC 10, 1693-1694; LCI 4, 15-24; A. De Longpérier, *Une intaille antique inédite*: CRAI 24 (1880) 275; O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und mittelalterliche byzantinische und italienische Bildwerke*, Berlin 1909, I, p. 237, pl. 56, n. 1152; L.A. Costans, *Une amulette chrétienne sur papyrus*: JS 20 (1922) 181-182; O. Wulff - W.F. Volbach, *Altchristliche und mittelalterliche byzantinische und italienische Bildwerke*, Ergänzungsband, Berlin 1923, II; C.H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, The Synagogue*, New Haven, CT 1956, 349; Volbach - Hirmer, 80, pl. 115; B. Bagatti, *Altre medaglie di Salomone cavaliere e la loro origine*: RivAC 47 (1971) 331-342; J. Gutmann, *Was There Biblical Art at Pompei?*: Antike Kunst 15 (1972) 122-124.

A.M. Di Nino

SOLSTITIIS ET AEQUINOCTIIS, De. The text of an anonymous author whose title in the MSS is *De solstitia et aequinoctia conceptionis et nativitatis Domini nostri Iesu Christi et Iohannis Baptistae*. Published in the 15th c. among the spurious works of *John Chrysostom, it was not used by historians of *liturgy. It corresponds to the 17 sermons of the broad collection of 38 Latin homilies attributed to John Chrysostom and studied by Wilmart. In some MSS, the work was attributed to an author known as Pontius Maximus. According to Botte, its modern editor, because of the biblical citations, the small work was redacted in *Africa, at least in its modern-day form, and not at *Rome, as maintained by Wilmart and Lietzman; nevertheless, the original comes from a *Syriac context (Botte, Engberding). Talley, however, maintains its Western origin, because of its interpretation of Roman names of the months. The emperor *Justinian, in his letter to the inhabitants of *Jerusalem, cites the letter, attributing it to St. *Augustine; this attribution could indicate that a Greek translation also circulated. The anonymous author affirms the seasons acc. to the conception (equinox of autumn) and the birth (solstice of summer) of *John the Baptist and the conception (equinox spring) and the birth (solstice of winter) of Jesus: "Our Lord was conceived on the eighth day of the calends of April, in the month of March, which is the day of the Lord's passion and also his conception. This is the case because he suffered on the same day he was conceived" (PLS 1, 562-563).

CPL 2277; PLS 1, 557-567; B. Botte, *Les origines de la Noël et de l'épiphanie*, Louvain 1932, 93-105; A. Wilmart, *La collection des 38 homélies latines de Saint Jean Chrysostome*: JTS 19 (1917-1918) 305-327, esp. 316-317; A. Vaccari, Rassegna italiana di lingue e letterature classiche 2 (1920) 326-328; H. Engberding, *Der 25. Dezember als Tag der Feier der Geburt des Herrn*: AL 2 (1952) 25-43, esp. p. 36 (Syriac origin of the work); M. van Esbroeck: *Une lettre de l'empereur Justinien sur l'Annonciation et la Noël en 561*: AB 86 (1968) 351-357, here 354; Patrologia IV, 236-237; T.J. Talley, *Le origini dell'anno liturgico*, Brescia 1991, 94-100; S.K. Roll, *Toward the Origins of Christmas*, Den Haag 1995, 97-99.

A. Di Berardino

SOLUTIONES OBJECTIONUM ARIANORUM. The work, redacted in a dialogical form, presents the themes of the *trinitarian controversy, which is treated with rational and biblical arguments. The treatise defends the Catholic teaching on the Son's generation and preexistence and the same nature of the Father and the Son. The text was attributed by some scholars to *Vigilius bishop of Thapsus, who participated at the dramatic colloquium between Catholics and *Arians, which had been convoked by the *Vandal king *Huneric in the year 484. Today only the following works are considered authentic: *Contra Eutychetem* and the *Dialogus contra arrianos*. It seems difficult to identify with certainty the author of the *Solutiones*, which begins with the phrase: *Prima eorum obiectio est, qua dicunt impossibile esse Deum Patrem, et incorporeum, et invisibilem, de sua substantia generare* (PL 72,469). Facing the question, the author clarifies the meaning of some key terms (*natura*, *generatio*, *Deus* and *omnipotentia*) and refutes the opinions of the Arians who *asserentes impossibilem eum qui sit omnipotens* (ibid.). The other questions refer to the birth of the Son, to the theme of his "existence" and the "space" in which he was found before his Incarnation: *in corde Patris, in utero Patris, in sinu Patris, id est occultis naturae arcanis* (ibid. 470). The subsequent objection pertains to the themes *ingenitus Pater*, *genitus Filius* and *sub-*

stantia geniti atque ingeniti, which are refuted by the author of the *Solutiones* with a brief procedure concluding with the affirmation: *Patrem et Filium unius esse naturae* (ibid.). The logical and theological arguments are supported with biblical passages, esp. those coming from the gospel of *John, the book of Wisdom and the book of Genesis.

CPL 812; CPPM II/A 1696; PL 72, 469-472. G. Ficker, *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus*, Leipzig 1897, 10-25; M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, vol. 4, 2, Munich 1920 (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 8), 570-571.

W. Turek

SONG OF SONGS (Canticle of Canticles). "The whole world is worth less than the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel. All the Scriptures, in fact, are holy: but the Song of Songs is the holiest of holies" (Rabbi Aqiba, *Yadayim* 3, 5). The Song of Songs reveals the mystery of love to Israel: the love of the bridegroom for the bride, the immense love of God who creates humanity and guides his people, and the even greater love that will be manifested in the history that is to come. Israel lives the *ascesis of waiting. The Song of Songs is a paschal hymn which unites history and prophecy: God "has passed over" into the world to visit the chosen people, and "will pass over," one day, on his final visit to humanity. "Prophetic history" becomes musical prayer in "psalms" and in "canticles." At the summit is the Song of Songs: Solomon, king and prophet, surpasses David. Christ is the "one greater than Solomon" (Lk 11:31).

God is faithful to his love for his bride, which is the community, often unfaithful but always longing for the bridegroom's embrace. For a people who takes the Word of God literally, this is not just an *allegory. It is the discovery that God is "literally" in love with human beings: "Yes, as a young man marries a virgin, so your creator will marry you" (Is 62:5). *Prophecy* becomes *history* with the coming of the Messiah. The echo of the Song of Songs resounds in the gospel: the friends of the bridegroom feast because the bridegroom is present (Mt 9:15). Joy will be perfect in the "new earth," when the community will descend from heaven "prepared as a bride, adorned for her bridegroom" (Rev 21:2). Christians sing the Song of Songs for the feast of Easter: the start of spring, the time of weddings, the feast of the resurrection. God's voice is clear and needs no *exegesis: for more than a century, a reverential fear kept any Christian writer from handing down an interpretation of the Song of Songs. Only the fragrance of its perfume spread, with the perennial question: who is the bride?

*Hippolytus, echoing Paul (Eph 5:22-33) and accepting all that was spousal in the synagogue, responds: "The bride of Christ is the church." *Origen adds that this is when the idea of the *bride-church* is a lived truth and invites everyone to spousal love: the *soul-bride* is the one who takes seriously the commitment to live a holy life in the *bride-church*, until all humanity will be the *bride* of Christ. The Christian community, not yet thinking to draw a spousal theology from the Song of Songs that would illuminate the mystery of marriage, finds the "fire" of its spirituality in the mystery of God, who celebrates his marriage to humanity. The mystery of love is deepened, between eros and agape, between human love and mystical love, which speak the same language: "The lover seeks in the beloved object a fullness of happiness that it is unable to give him: he thus puts it in the place of God, making of it a supreme end. Only God is the true and adequate object of human passion" (H. Crouzel, *Le thème du mariage mystique*, 37). The *gnostics used the Song of Songs, creating with its fragrance a mystical atmosphere in which the theology of life was suffused with ritual illuminations (Iren., *Haer.* I 4,1 and 21,3; Hipp., *Ref.* V 19,3-4 and VII 22,13-16). Ecclesiastics discovered in the Song a synthesis of all biblical history and sing the event of liberation in the form of prophecy. Every image is a symbol leading to life, and the Song of Songs as a whole has an existential importance. The bride, who until now lives in the earthly garden perfumed by the presence of the divine lover, will be received in the wedding chamber at the perfect vision of God. The history of the interpretation of the Song of Songs must be based on all the allusions, citations and hermeneutical reflections spread throughout the Fathers' works, beyond just the *Commentaries on the Canticle*. The diachronic reconstruction of the interpretation of individual verses is a labor that is prior to a focus on the overall meaning of the Song of Songs for the patristic age.

The earliest Christian commentator is Hippolytus, whose commentary is preserved in a *Georgian version (*Ct.* 1,1–3,7: ed. G. Garitte, CSCO 263-264), and in *Armenian, *Syriac, *Paleoslavonic and Greek fragments. His typological exegesis, the first to identify the bridegroom with Christ and the bride with the church, follows Asiatic *Christology, centered on the humanity of Jesus and contemplating the *Trinity in its orientation to the *incarnation. The marriage of God with humanity is accomplished on the cross: Christ, consumed with love, immerses his humanity in the divine sonship already possessed by the Word and draws humanity toward the

*resurrection. In Christ's death life is not lost, since his perfume spreads over his body, the church, so as to then reach all humanity.

The next commentator is Origen, who "in the other books surpassed everyone, and in the Song of Songs surpassed himself" (Jerome, prol. to Orig., *Hom Ct.* prol.). We know his two *Homilies* in *Jerome's *Latin version (*Ct.* 1,1–2,14: ed. W.A. Baehrens, GCS 33) and four books of his *Commentary* in Rufinus's translation (*Ct.* 1,1–2,15: GCS 33), besides the Greek fragments reported by *Procopius's *Catena* and the *Philocalia* (PG 87, 1545-1554 and 13,35-36). His *ecclesiological interpretation is enriched by an *anthropological one: the human person is urged to union with God in the church. Love is the energy of the *Holy Spirit, which transforms the person's senses, making possible the penetration of the mystery. The Song of Songs reveals God to the "perfect," those who with their "spiritual smell" sense the bridegroom drawing near, to reawaken in human beings the aroma of the image of God.

*Gregory of Nyssa raises Origen's exegesis to the heights of perfect contemplation (*Ct.* 1,1–6,8: ed. H. Langerbeck, Leiden 1960). The soul is called to detach itself from all passing things so as to ascend to the royal bed of the vision of God. The aroma of a life lived in virtue is enlivened by the breath of the Spirit in the church, through the intoxicating ecstasy of the bread and wine of Christ, which unite the bride to the bridegroom. *Philo of Carpasia's *Commentary* offers the first complete interpretation of the Song of Songs: we know a Greek abridgment (ed. M.A. Giacomelli, Rome 1772 = PG 40, 27-154) and a Latin version (ed. A. Ceresa Gastaldo, Turin 1979; cf. P.F. Foggini, Rome 1750). *Nilus of Ancyra gives the reflection an ascetic-moral tone for the life of monks, addressing the theme of the relation between the contemplative life and the active life (PG 87, 1545-1754). *Theodoret of Cyrrhus rejects the *Antiochene literalistic interpretation, lashing out—without naming *Theodore of Mopsuestia—at those who interpret the Song of Songs "carnally"; he follows Origen in considering the Song a "spiritual book," but he never accepts the literal interpretation with which the Alexandrian preceded the allegorical and seeks to avoid theological expressions which threatened the results of the *Chalcedonian controversy (PG 81,27-214; cf. M. Simonetti, *Teodoreto e Origene*, 919-930).

In the Latin world, Jerome mentions commentaries of *Victorinus of Petovium and *Reticius of Autun, both lost (*Vir. ill.* 74 and 82). Five homilies inspired by Origen are attributed to *Gregory of Elvira; rich in Hippolytan resonances, they accentuate the sacramental dimension of the wedding theme (*Ct.* 1,1–3,4: ed. J. Fraipont, CCL 69). Aponius's *Commentary* is a gold mine for scholars for the originality of its language (ed. H. Bottino - J. Martini, Rome 1843 = PLS 1, 799-1031), while that of Justus of Urgell is a compendium of modest worth (PL 67, 963-994). *Ambrose strews flowers picked from the Song of Songs throughout his works, without writing a continuous commentary. He drank at the springs of spousal spirituality and conveys his thirst to believers, esp. to virgins, presenting the Song as a beacon that illumines all of the books of Scripture. The mystical message for the way of the soul has an ecclesial tinge: Christ, perfect bridegroom of humanity in the gift of the cross, renders the bride capable of being a mother (P. Meloni, *L'influsso del Commento al Cantico*, 865-890).

The figure of Mary appears in the Song of Songs (G. Bardy, *Marie et le Cantique chez les Pères*, Bibl. V. Chr 7 [1954] 32-41). Among writers who loved the Song without commenting on it as a whole were *Cyprian, *Methodius, Jerome, *Augustine and *Cyril of Alexandria; also, many pearls of the book were set in the *liturgy to mark the rhythms of the Christian life (J. Daniélou, *Bible et liturgie*, Paris 1951, 259-280). *Gregory the Great, with the *Expositio in Canticum*, closes the tradition of the Fathers and introduces the great flourishing of medieval *monastic commentaries (ed. P. Verbraken, CCL 144). The *spiritalis intelligentia* of the *mysteria litterae* is a light on the path toward perfection, which the person must travel, wisely basing his ascesis on the Song's poetic symmetries. The Christian's life is a journey toward the *sublimitas contemplationis*, which guides the person's heart and the whole church to live in union with God. The Song of Songs is the history of the encounter between God and humanity, from the moment of the "creation" to the "embrace of presence" that will take place in the nuptial suite of eternity. In the mystical atmosphere of the Song of Songs, Christians felt the divine bridegroom penetrate the human flesh of the bride, to infuse in her the lymph of his divinity.

For the fundamental bibliography up until 1975, see P. Meloni, *Il profumo dell'immortalità. L'interpretazione patristica di Cantico 1,3*, Rome 1975. Also: F. Cavallera, *Cantique des Cantiques. Historie de l'interprétation spirituelle*: DSp 2, 93-101; A.M. La Bonnardière, *Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin*: REAug 1 (1955) 225-237; V. Recchia, *L'esegesi di Gregorio Magno al Cantico dei Cantici*, Turin 1967; G. Nolli, *Cantico dei Cantici*, Turin-Rome 1968; H. Crouzel, *Origines patristiques d'un thème mystique: le trait et la blessure d'amour chez Origène:* Kyriakon I, Münster 1970, 309-319; M. Harl, *Cadeaux de fiançailles et contrat de mariage pour l'épouse du "Cantique des cantiques" selon quelques commentateurs grecs*, Mélanges H.Ch. Puech, Paris 1974, 243-261; G. Chappuzeau, *Die Auslegung des*

Hohenliedes durch Hippolyt von Rom: JbAC 19 (1976) 45-81; M. Simonetti, *Origene. Commento al Cantico dei Cantici*, Rome 1976; H. Crouzel, *Le thème du mariage mystique chez Origène*: StMiss 26 (1977) 37-57; P. Meloni, *Ippolito e il Cantico dei Cantici*, in *Ricerche su Ippolito*, Rome 1977, 97-120; R. Palla, *Temi del commento origeniano al Cantico dei Cantici nel De Isaac di Ambrogio*: ASNP 9 (1979) 563-572; A. Ceresa Gastaldo, *La dimensione dell'amore nell'interpretazione origeniana del "Cantico dei Cantici,"* in *Paradoxos Politeia*, Milan 1979, 187-194; Id., *L'esegesi origeniana del "Cantico dei Cantici,"* Origeniana secunda, Bari-Rome 1980, 245-252; P. Meloni, *L'influsso del Commento al Cantico di Ippolito sull'Expositio Psalmi CXVIII di Ambrogio*, in *Letterature comparate. Problemi e metodo.* Studi in onore di Ettore Paratore, Bologna 1981, 865-890; M. Simonetti, *Teodoreto e Origene sul Cantico dei cantici*: ibid., 919-930; G.I. Gargano, *La teoria di Gregorio di Nissa sul Cantico dei Cantici*, Rome 1981; S. Lucà, *Il Commentario al Cantico dei Cantici di Nilo di Ancira*: Studi bizantini and neogreci 174 (1983) 111-126; H. Crouzel, *La christologie d'Origène selon le Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, Praesentia Christi. Festschrift Johannes Betz, Düsseldorf 1984, 421-433; G. Ravasi, *Il Cantico dei Cantici*, Bologna 1992; Gregory of Nyssa, *Omelie sul Cantico dei Cantici*, ed. V. Bonato, Bologna 1995; E. Cattaneo, *Il "Cantico dei Cantici" nelle catechesi mistagogiche di sant'Ambrogio di Milano*: La Civiltà Cattolica (1998) III, 29-41; P. Meloni, *Risurrezione di Cristo e vita del cristiano nell'esegesi di Ambrogio al Cantico dei Cantici*, in *Nec timeo mori.* Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della morte di sant'Ambrogio, Milan 1998, 639-648; A. Cortesi, *Le* Omelie sul Cantico dei Cantici *di Gregorio di Nissa*, Rome 2000 (with ample bibl.); A. Genovese, *S. Agostino e il Cantico dei Cantici: tra esegesi e teologia*, Rome 2002.; J.R. Wright, ed., *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon*, ACCS OT 9, Downers Grove, IL, 2005.

P. Meloni

SONNATIUS of Reims. Bishop of Reims (ca. 600–631) and saint venerated on 20 October. In the *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* written by Flodoard (II,5), it is said that he succeeded Romulphus, for whom he served as an archdeacon (II,4). According to the same source he was the one *qui sinodum celebrasse reperitur cum aliis quadraginta vel eo amplius Galliarum episcopis* (II,5: MGH, *Scriptores*, XIII,451). There follows a list of bishops present (41) and the text of the conciliar canons. The statements made by Flodoard lack any information on the site and the date, but the "local" character of his *Historia* and the role of Sonnatius have led some to hypothesize that the council in question took place at Reims (Gousset). The text and the order of the canons of this supposed Synod of Reims, however, are almost identical with those of the Council of Clichy (Clippiacum) of the year 626 or 627. Sonnatius was among the bishops who signed the final document, 37 of which figure among the 41 listed by Flodoard in the alleged Council of Reims. Following the guidance of an unpublished letter of Duchesne (summarized in CRAI 1889, 94), de Clercq maintained that the only council that really took place was that of Clichy. Because the bishops spread conciliar canons under the form of synodal statutes in their respective dioceses, it would have been very easy for Flodoard to report the redaction of the decrees that were subsequently circulated among the clergy and churches of the diocese of Reims.

Similarly, in the *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, Bishop Sonnatius's testamentary regulations, which primarily benefited the basilica of St. Remigius, where he wanted to be buried, were carefully listed. Nevertheless, there were not lacking conspicuous devices for other ecclesiastical institutions that Flodoard faithfully reported. There was a valuable document of the civil and religious history of Reims (Brouette).

Certainly before the 9th c. were the *Statuta* attributed to Sonnatius (PL 80,443-446). In them, among others, were recorded modifications to the *liturgical calendar with the development of the festal cycle. Thirteen were solemn feast days to be celebrated, along with the Sundays, *absque omni opere forensi* (col. 446). The feast of the Monday of *Easter (*Resurrectio Domini cum die sequenti*) appears here for the first time, although lacking is the Feast of the *Purification. Finally, the Marian feasts have special emphasis: *Annuntiatio beatae Mariae, Assumptio beatae Maria*, *eiusdem Nativitatis*; the last two mentioned seem to have been celebrated for the first time.

Concilia Galliae. A. 511–A. 695, ed. C. de Clercq, CCL 148 A (1974) 298; *Les canons des conciles mérovingiens* (*VI*[e]*-VII*[e] *siècles*), tr. J. Gaudemet - B. Basdevant, SC 354 (1989), II, 527; *Statuta*: PL 80, 441-446; *Statuta synodalia* apud Flodoard. *Hist. Rem.* II, 5 (CPL 1312): PL 135, 102-106; MGH, *Scriptores*, XIII, Hannoverae 1881 (J. Heller - G. Waitz), 451-455. See also *Flodoard von Reims*, *Die Geschichte der Reimser Kirche*, ed. M. Stratmann, Hannover 1998 (MGH, *Scriptores* [in-4°], 36); *Flodoard*, *Histoire de l'église de Reims*, tr. di F. Guizot, 2 vols., repr. Clermont-Ferrand 2004. T. Gousset, *Les actes de la province ecclésiastique de Reims ou Canons et décrets des conciles, constitutions, statuts et lettres des évêques des différents diocèses qui dépendent ou qui dépendaient autrefois de la métropole de Reims*, 4 vols., 1842-1844; C.A.H. Kellner, *L'anno ecclesiastico e le feste dei santi nel loro svolgimento storico* (heortology), It. tr. of the 2nd Ger. ed., Rome 1906, 18-19; C. de Clercq, *La législation religieuse franque de Clovis à Charlemagne. Étude sur les actes de Conciles et les capitulaires, les statuts diocésains et les règles monastiques* (*507–814*), Louvain 1936, 65-66; BS 11, coll. 1313-1314 (É. Brouette); N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de Première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen Âge* (*III*[e]*-VIII*[e] *siècles*), Paris 1980, 348-349; O. Pontal, *Histoire des conciles mérovingiens*, Paris 1989, 215-216; Patrologia IV, 351 (Y. Hen).

B. Clausi

SOPHRONIUS (Jerome's friend) (d. after 392). According to *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 134), Sophronius composed in Greek, during his youth, some works that have now been lost (*Laudes Bethlehem*, a book on the destruction of the temple of *Serapis at *Alexandria) and translated into elegant *Greek several of Jerome's writings: his Latin translations of the *Psalms and the *Prophets, *Ep.* 22 to *Eustochium, the *Life of *Hilarion* and perhaps the *Life of Malchus*. The Greek translation of Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, however, was not his work (TU 14/1b) but that of a later translator by the same name.

CPG II, 3630-3636; Bardenhewer I, 3ff.; III, 283; CCL 72, XIV, XLVIII (bibl.); LTK³ 9, 736.

A. Pollastri

SOPHRONIUS of Jerusalem (ca. 550–638). Born in *Damascus around 550, he died at *Jerusalem on 11 March 638 (the year after the conquest of the city by the Caliph Omar). He probably was first a teacher of *rhetoric, hence the title "Sophist" (for a discussion on the identity of Sophronius the Sophist and Sophronius Patriarch, see S. Vailhé, *Sophrone le Sophiste et Sophrone le Patriarche*: ROC 7 [1902] 360-85; 8 [1903] 32-69, 356-387; G. Zuretti, *Sofronio patriarca di Gerusalemme (634–638)*: Didaskal. n.s. 4 [1926] 19-68). He became a monk in the monastery of St. *Theodosius at Jerusalem. In the company of his teacher *John Moschus, he went to *Egypt, where the two monks dedicated themselves to the conversion of the *monothelites. After subsequent pilgrimages, including one in *Sinai, where he remained for 10 years, they set sail in 615 to *Italy, when Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of the Persians in 614. Along the way, they stopped at various ports (Cyprus, Samos, perhaps North Africa). John Moschus died at *Rome in 619 (or perhaps in 634): Sophronius brought back his remains to the monastery of St. Theodosius. In 633, Sophronius was engaged in a fight against the monothelites in Egypt and *Africa, and shortly thereafter at *Constantinople against the patriarch *Sergius. After his election to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem (634), he immediately published a synodal letter, addressed to Sergius of Constantinople and *Honorius of Rome, in which, without using the formula of the two energies or operations, he sought to advocate this teaching (Mansi 11,461-510; PG 87,3,3125-3146; *Epitome of the Synodal Letter*: Nea Sion 77 [1922] 178-186). Among his other works (PG 87,3,3147-4014) there remain *hagiographical writings, among which, presented with a great perfection of form, a *panegyric to the martyrs Cyrus and John (at *Alexandria, under the emperor *Diocletian: PG 87,3,3379-3676, see BHG² 475/479). Sophronius, moreover, has left many homilies, 23 Anacreontic odes, which were composed for religious feasts (ed. M. Gigante, Rome 1957, text and It. tr.). The *Commentarius liturgicus* was not the work of Sophronius, nor was the *Vita Mariae Aegyptiacae*; although the *Homily on Palm Sunday*, which was transmitted under the name of *Eulogius patriarch of Alexandria (PG 86,2,2913-2938), most likely was his. One of his writings against monothelitism has been lost.

CPG 7635-7681; DTC 14, 2779-2783; EC 11, 906-907; BS 11, 1283-1285; LTK³ 8, 736-737; G. Cosmas, *De oeconomia incarnationis secundum s. S. Hierosolymitanum*, Rome 1940; P. Parente, *Uso e significato del termine* Qeokànhtoj *nella controversia monotelitica*: REB 11 (1953) 241-251; Chr. von Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Paris 1972; M. Albert - C. von Schönborn, *Lettre de Sophrone de Jérusalem à Arcadius de Chypre. Version syriaque inédite du texte grec perdu . . .*, PO 39, 2 (Turnhout 1978); J. Duffy, *Observations on Sophronius' Miracles of Cyrus and John'*: JTS n.s. 35 (1984) 71-90; DSp 14 (1990) 1066-1073; *Sofronio di Gerusalemme, Le omelie*, intr., tr. and note, ed. A. Gallico, Rome 1991; *Sophrone de Jérusalem, Fêtes chrétiennes à Jérusalem*, intr. and tr., ed. J. de la Ferrière, Paris 1999; Marienlexikon 6, 212-214; Patrologia V, 229-303 (see index).

T. Špidlík

SOPHRONIUS of Pompeiopolis (4th c.). He was among the chief proponents of the *homoiousians at the Council of *Seleucia (359). For this reason he was condemned and opposed in the Council of *Constantinople (360). Upon the death of the emperor *Constantius (262), along with other homoiousians, he contested the decisions of the Councils of *Rimini and Constantinople and condemned its supporters. After this event, we do not have any more information about him.

DCB 4,717; Simonetti, see the index; H.C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 193; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 764.

M. Simonetti

SORTES SANCTORUM. Human beings are always anxious to know about their own future through various means of divination or other instruments. The *pagan and Jewish world made use of complex systems of practices and prophetic beliefs; others were found in the Egyptian, Celtic and Germanic world. Even Christians used divination, although the Fathers condemned every form of oneiromancy

(i.e., divination by means of dreams), bibliomancy (divination by means of books) and other techniques that seemed too heavily tied to traditional paganism: "these thousands of foolish observances" (Aug., *De doctr. chr.* 2,20,31). Nevertheless, in practice the ancient church was tolerant, if the techniques were used within a context without pastoral or theological harm. One of these was to open a book of the Scriptures by chance (*sortes biblicae* or rather *sortes evangelicae*) and to read the first verse upon which one's eyes fell and to interpret it as prognostic of one's future. It was a Christian adaptation of the pagan practice of the *sortes homericae*, *virgilianae*, *prenestinae*, etc. *Augustine criticized the practice with benevolence: "With respect to those who read their own destiny into the pages of the gospel, although this is more preferable than running to consult the demons, I do not approve of this custom by those who wish to use the divine words offered for the future life to serve temporal affairs and the vanity of this life" (*Ep.* 55,37). He recognized, however, that by listening to a voice, even he by chance opened the apostle's book and read the famous phrase from Rom 13:13 that gave rise to his conversion (*Conf.* 8,12). In the East, the emperor *Heraclius, in the war against the Persians, after three days of *fasting turned to the Bible to learn where to stay for the winter. Because, before the invention of the printing press, the Bible in a single volume was very cumbersome, Christians consulted the books of the *Psalms, the *Prophets or the four gospels, making use of rites and ceremonies, at times after prayer and fasting. A Carolingian capitulary from the year 789 prescribed that "no one presume to read their destiny into the Psalter, the gospels or other objects." The practice continued throughout the Middle Ages and modern times. Something similar can also be found in the life of St. Francis of Assisi (Thomas of Celano, *Vita Prima* II, 92-93; *Vita Secunda* 15).

The *Gelasian Decretum* condemned the *Liber qui appellatur Sortes apostolorum* (TU 34/4,12), a book which could be the one that the medieval MSS called the *Sortes sanctorum*. Many medieval MSS of this text have been preserved. Therefore, the *Sortes sanctorum* did not make reference to the practice, mentioned above (i.e., *sortes biblicae*), but to a particular book, and were a collection of oral responses: the book that the councils condemn with this expression (can. 16 of the Council of *Vannes [462–468]; can. 42 of *Agde [506]; can. 30 of Orléans [511]). Klingshirn, against the common opinion, recently demonstrated that in reality the *Sortes sanctorum* were not the *sortes biblicae*, but a specific and concrete text starting from the 5th c.; in the 13th c., the name of this text was changed to the *sortes apostolorum*.

P. Courcelle, *L'enfant et les "sorts bibliques"*: VChr 7 (1953) 194-220; DACL 15, 1590-1592; A. van Lantschoot, *Une collection sahidique de "Sortes Sanctorum"* (Papyrus Vatican copte 1): Muséon 69 (1956) 35-52; Ph.B. Katz, *The Sortes Vergilianae: Fact and Fiction*: Classical and Modern Literature 14 (1993-1994) 245-258; *Sortes Astrampsychi*, ed. R. Stewart, Munich [2]2001; W.E. Klingshirn, *Defining the Sortes Sanctorum: Gibbon, Du Cange, and Early Christian Lot Divination*: JECS 10 (2002) 77-130; E. Montero Cartelle - A. Alondo Guardo, *Los "Libros de suertes" medievales: las Sortes sanctorum y los Pren Ostica Socratis Basilei; estudio, traducción y edición crítica*, Madrid 2004.

A. Di Berardino

SORTES SANGALLENSES. Text of an anonymous author, it received this name because it was recovered from *palimpsest 908 of St. Gall (Lowe 953). Lowe affirmed that the MS came from N *Italy and must have had connections with Bobbio. The editors, however, place its original in *Gaul and maintain that it was from the 4th c. The text is a series of responses to an oracle to some questions that have a Christian tone. A certain number of questions have been lost; those that have been preserved focus on the various problems of daily, moral and social life: life and health, *love, *marriage, *family, *friends and enemies, fears and *hopes, concerns for the home, property, choice of a profession; this text also addresses various undertakings: *travel; return home; financial, economic and professional worries; and legal trials. This text contains some similarity to the *Sortes Astrampsychi*, a collection of oracles from 2nd- or 3rd-c. *Egypt.

CPL 536; E. Svenberg, *Quelques remarques sur les "Sortes Sangallenses"*: Eranos 38 (1940) 68-78; A. Dold - R. Meister - K. Mras, *Die Orakelsprüche*: SAW 225, 4-5 (1948-51) 21-72; see A. Kurfess, *Zu den S. S.*: SAW 5 (1953) 143-146 (emendations); R. Weister - L. Krestan, *Die Orakelsprüche*: SAW 225, 5 (1951); A. Demandt, *Die Sortes Sangallenses. Eine Quelle zur spätantiken Sozialgeschichte*: Atti Accademia Roman. Cost. 8 (1990) 635-650; K. Strobel, *Soziale Wirklichkeit und irrationales Weltverstehen in der Kaiserzeit*, I: *Sortes Astrampsychi und Sortes Sangallenses*: Laverna 3 (1992) 129-141.

A. Hamman

SOTER, pope (ca. 166–ca. 175). According to the *Liber pontificalis* (1,135), he was born at Fundi (modern-day Fondi in Latina province of the Lazio region in Italy), the son of a certain Concordius. He wrote to the community of *Corinth; but his letter, which was very well received, has been lost. A passage from the epistolary response from Bishop *Dionysius, where the generosity and charity of Soter

and the Roman community is praised, is mentioned by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 4,23,9-11). In this regard, Harnack supposed that Soter's letter could in reality be the *Second Letter of *Clement*, but this opinion is hardly likely. According to the treatise **Praedestinatus* (I,26: PL 53,506), Soter wrote against the *Marcionites; in fact, during his pontificate this heresy began to spread, and one should not exclude the possibility that information of this fact came to his attention. Soter died a martyr during the reign of *Marcus Aurelius. The *Liber pontificalis* states that he was buried in the *Vatican. His *relics were subsequently transferred to the cemetery of *Callistus on the Via Appia. From the age of Pope Sergius II (844–847), Soter's remains were guarded in the Roman church of Sts. Sylvester and Martin.

AASS. *Aprilis* III, Venezia 1738, 5-7; P. Hinschius, *Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* [. . .], Leipzig 1863, 122-125; LP I, 58-59, 135; DTC XIV, 2, 2422-2423; Chr. Mohrmann, *Le conflict pascal au IIe siècle*: VChr 16 (1962) 154-171; LTK² 9, 893-894; BS 11, 1327-1328 (A. Amore); EPapi 1, 224-226 (F. Scorza Barcellona); C. Macaro, *Sotero vescovo di Roma*, in *Fondi tra antichità e Medioevo*, ed. T. Piscitelli Carpino, Fondi 2002, 81-107.

M. Spinelli

SOTERIC of Caesarea (d. 537). He was the bishop of *Caesarea, Cappadocia, and was the exarch of the diocese of *Pontus in the first decades of the 6th c. until 537, when he succeeded Theodore Ascidas on the see of Caesarea. He was appointed as *metropolitan of Caesarea by *Macedonius II of *Constantinople (496–511), and although having declared his own faith acc. to the decision of the Council of *Chalcedon, he subsequently sided with the anti-Chalcedonians so much so that at the Synod of Sidon (511) he was recognized as one of the most prominent adversaries of Chalcedon. According to *Cyril of Scythopolis, Soteric was condemned by John III, the patriarch of Jerusalem (516-524), Sts. *Sabas, *Theodosius and *Hypatius of Ephesus along with *Nestorius, *Eutyches, Severus and all the anti-Chalcedonians in 516/517. For this reason, he went to Constantinople to the patriarch *John II the Cappadocian (518–520) to declare his position, in fact accepting the Council of Chalcedon along with *Cyrus bishop of Tyana and accepting disappointment from *Severus of Antioch. That notwithstanding, Pope *Hormisdas wanted to deport him, but the emperor *Justin I defended him, and thus he remained bishop of Caesarea until his death, which occurred in 537. *Heraclian of Chalcedon sent him a christological work titled *Ad Soterichum*, the fragments of which have been preserved in the treatise *Doctrina Patrum*.

Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 56; Severus of Antioch, *Epistula ad Proclum et Eusebium*, The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus V, 13: ed. Brooks, London 1904, II, 344; G. Garitte, *Fragments coptes d'une lettre de Sévère d'Antioche à Soterichos de Césarée*: Muséon 65 (1952) 185-198; E. Honigmann, *Heraclianus of Chalcedon (537 A.D.?), Soterichus of Cesarea in Cappadocia and Achillius* (Studi e Testi 173), Vatican City 1953, 205-216; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, 2/2, Brescia 1999, 325-326.

C. Dell'Osso

SOTERIOLOGY. Belief in salvation in Jesus Christ constitutes one of the fundamental facts of the preaching and theology of the church fathers. Although Christians in the first centuries were content with confessing in the baptismal creed that the Lord Jesus died and rose for us, they did not fail to express, in their way of living and praying, what was preached to them concerning the sole savior of the world. When theologians defined their ideas about salvation, their theological reflection was essentially none other than a response to the question of knowing why Christ became human. Although refraining from taking a position on the salvific work of Christ, the bishops and synods always included it in all their concerns with respect to orthodoxy. When they defended *orthodoxy either in the resurrection of the body, or in the divinity of the Son and the *Holy Spirit, or in the one Lord Jesus Christ, God and man, i.e., in the necessity of actual *grace, they always began from the premise that Jesus Christ became human for us and that God glorified him for us, through his death and resurrection, in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Precisely because the doctrine of salvation was never dogmatically defined by a council of the church, but everywhere presupposed, it is not easy to describe it briefly. Indeed, it is all the more difficult that inasmuch as until now not only the history of *dogma and theology but also an entire series of other disciplines have been interested in clarifying the concepts of salvation and redemption: the history of Christian *spirituality, *liturgy and early Christian *archaeology, as well as the history of world religions and ancient cultures, and even the history of postclassical languages. Only those familiar with all these fields of research will be able to gather the results that are often dispersed in various scientific disciplines into a somewhat complete synthesis. With this objective, it is fitting to present the following premises: first of all, patristic soteriology does not restrict itself only to setting forth biblical

soteriology. Conditioned by their culture, personal dispositions and their pastoral concerns, the fathers of the church reinterpreted Jesus Christ's message, choosing significant aspects and placing them within the context of their time. This fact esp. appears in early Christian art which represents Christ in various ways: as the Good *Shepherd, the teacher, the ruler of the world or the crucified and Risen One. Moreover, it is certainly permissible to understand the soteriology of the Fathers, which is very complex, acc. to themes and models: *illumination, victory, *divinization and *sacrifice of reconciliation. In this regard, however, two things should be kept in mind: on the one hand, a thematic consideration of patristic soteriology should never ignore the historical development; it is necessary, i.e., to keep in mind how different ideas found a varying interest in individual eras of the patristic age. On the other hand, a theological evaluation is also necessary; in other words, one must identify in which perspectives the fathers of the church spoke of the necessity of a theophany of God for *faith, the revenge of the new *Adam over the devil, the mediation of the God-man between God and the world, the education imparted by the divine-human teacher for the vicarious sacrifice on the cross.

Keeping in mind the aforementioned premises, we will emphasize in the history of patristic soteriology the following aspects. In the postapostolic time (until 150), preaching on salvation moved still almost completely in the path of the apostolic tradition. Nevertheless, it was different through a certain deepening inasmuch as it developed the biblical reflection for a broader use of the so-called *testimonia*, it described salvation by having recourse to rather Hellenistic categories and, clearly and most esp. in the writings of *Ignatius of Antioch, it related salvation to the true incarnation of the true God. Around the middle of the 2nd c., soteriology could be titled "the triumph of the heavenly Savior." It presents Christ as a heavenly being who comes down to the earth to complete his work of salvation (the illumination of all peoples, victory over the demons), and then goes back to his Father along with all of redeemed humanity.

Around the end of the 2nd c., the controversy over the *resurrection of the body led such antignostics as *Irenaeus and *Tertullian to place the *incarnation at the center of history (*oikonomia*), in which human beings in their entirety reach likeness with the immortal God. More open to the authentic aspirations of the Hellenistic world, *Clement and *Origen of Alexandria elaborated a soteriology in which salvation is conceived as the true *gnosticism. According to these authors, the eternal Word, the mediator between God and the world leads all of indistinct humanity through the history of universal pedagogy to the knowledge of the transcendent God. In a time of crisis for the Roman Empire, *Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) presented Christ as a teacher and example of the *vera salus*, although placing himself within the perspective of the actual presence of Christ in his church, without forgetting the historical fact of the already accomplished redemption and awaiting the return of the supreme judge. Another Latin author, *Lactantius (after 300), was the author of an even more Roman doctrine. For him, Christ must be at the same time God and man, because only as God is he able to teach us the true righteousness, and only as man can he give us the example of a virtue that perseveres until death. With the turn presented by the Council of *Nicaea (325), the first ecumenical Council and the symbol of the *tempora christiana*, a new conception of Christ is proclaimed: *Eusebius of Caesarea, the theologian of *Constantine the Great, glorifies Christ as the true emperor, and both the liturgy and the art of the church now echoed the imperial. Defending the Nicene faith in the true divinity of Christ, *Athanasius (d. 373) and *Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367) understood the redemption of Christ primarily as the incarnation of the eternal Son of God, who divinizes, i.e., glorifies all humanity. Under the influence of *Neoplatonism, which by that time was the sole philosophy in the Roman Empire, *Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) conceived of the death and resurrection of Christ as the decisive turn in the history of evil as well as the beginning of a never perfected but always progressing divinization of the human being. The defense of the faith of Nicaea also lead, during the 4th c., to Christocentricism that not only characterized the liturgy, esp. *baptism which by that point was understood as a participation in the death of Jesus Christ, but also Christian spirituality, as it appears in the teaching of *Evagrius of Pontus (d. 399) on equality with Christ (*isochristisms*) and that of the *Christus omnia* of *Ambrose of Milan (d. 397).

Patristic soteriology of the first centuries certainly arrives at its culminating point with *Augustine (d. 430). For Augustine, the salvific work of Christ consists primarily in the revelation of the love of the humble God. Jesus Christ, the only mediator between God and humanity, has revealed, with his entire existence, but esp. with his teaching and example, how human beings, fallen with Adam in the misery of sin, can find their God. Likewise, with the death and resurrection, he completed in the name of all human beings the first step on the way to divine

justice in such a way that, under his guidance, the city of God can also come to completion in his church. Although the development of patristic soteriology also included from the beginning the question of the person of the Savior, this issue was not posed with clarity except toward the end of the 4th c. At that moment, however, Christian thinkers also more clearly understood that human salvation could only be established by the one Christ, true God and true man. The faith of the Council of *Chalcedon (451), declaring that the two natures of Jesus Christ exist in one person, perhaps did not make explicit all the soteriological implications of this dogma. The preaching and theology of those who prepared it, however, left no doubts.

According to *Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), the most eminent representative of the *Antiochene tradition, in fact, God has united all of creation in Christ precisely because the divinity of the Word and the humanity of Jesus were always united in him. This union in the *assumptus homo* will reach, however, its perfection only in the final resurrection.

Nevertheless, the paschal mystery of Christ has already anticipated the Christian's passage to the state of immortality and freedom, because in this glorious event, Christ became the model of hope in the eternal salvation as well as the promise of the consummation of all things. Completing the *Alexandrian tradition, which had insisted greatly on the divine-human origin of the redemption, *Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) gave it the most coherent expression. As his teaching on the priesthood of Christ shows in a special way, Cyril was primarily interested in the ontological unity of the eternal Word with assumed humanity only to anchor more deeply the historical action of Jesus in God himself.

As a faithful heir of the Latin tradition, *Leo the Great (d. 461), for his part, established his soteriology on the dogma of the double consubstantiality. Although emphasizing the distinction of the two natures, he did not overlook the fact that Jesus' obedience and abandonment have their deepest roots in the personal unity of these two with the Son of God. The extent to which, in this doctrinal position, is configured the theme of human salvation becomes clear from the way in which Leo presented his doctrine on the God-man in the framework of the celebration of the liturgical mysteries, thanks to which, acc. to him, the Risen Lord does not cease to live in his church.

*Maximus the Confessor (d. 662), certainly the most profound thinker of the late patristic age, finally affirmed in a truly grandiose way the soteriological meaning of the faith of Chalcedon. According to Maximus, the Pasch of Christians was prefigured in the Pasch of Christ. Indeed, the entire universe was recapitulated in the glorious Christ. More than all the other Fathers, Maximus established the salvific union of all things on the divine-human freedom of Christ, thus overcoming, in a more radical way, every Hellenization of the good news.

Under the formal aspect, the entire soteriology of the Fathers constitutes an ever renewed interpretation of the chief affirmations of the Bible concerning salvation. Responding to the pastoral needs of each age, the Fathers of the church used the apostolic message, always trying to remain faithful to the whole of the biblical teaching. Many of their interpretations, however, were closely tied to their own situation. Ideas such as the sacrifice of reconciliation, victory over the devil, and the return to *paradise were therefore to be considered as metaphors proposed for their time to illustrate a fundamental affirmation that was always valid.

With respect to its content, patristic soteriology understood the phrase *Christus pro nobis* primarily as the actual presence of the Savior in his church: Christ is saving "today" all those who believe in his name, and this actualization of salvation will not be complete, however, except in the final moment when Christ will return to subject all things, and finally himself, to God, his Father. This "ubiquitous" understanding of Christ's work, however, must not be isolated from the preceding history of Israel and even less from the historical events of the life of Jesus. According to the fathers of the church, Christ is working now (*nunc*) only inasmuch he came at that time (*tunc*) for our salvation.

The same connection between now and then was understood in two ways: on the one hand, Christian authors affirmed that Christ was enthroned through the Paschal mystery as the Savior. For this reason he can now save in the church all those who believe in him; on the other hand, in his journey to the Father, Christ anticipated our journey. These two chief modes of explanation, which, however, are not mutually exclusive, certainly show the effects of the ancient ideas and categories with which they were circumscribed. For this reason, we today would likely not share with the people of that time the mode of speaking about the heavenly existence of the Savior or the inclusion of all members in Christ, the suffering and risen head; nevertheless, we know well that behind those perhaps antiquated presentations of the redemption stands the *sensus fidelium:* Christ lives and saves human beings and is still doing so because he truly died and rose for us. This ever valid meaning of the faith also includes the fact that

Christ was able to save us only because he was at the same time God and man. In the final analysis, this means that Christ must be a free human being to be able to orient himself with full freedom in our place toward God, and that likewise that free choice of God could not be established except on the freedom of God himself. Along with the fathers of the church, the Christian must believe that God himself was the only one righteous on the earth and that, in his righteousness to the point of death, our salvation, i.e., our abandonment to God and human beings, has already begun for all time.

C. Andresen, *Erlösung*: RAC 6, 54-219; B. Studer, *Soteriologie in der Schrift und Patristik*: HDG III/2a, Freiburg 1978 (extensive bibl.); R. Schwager, *Der wundersame Tausch*, Munich 1986; B. Sesboüé, *Jésus Christ, l'unique médiateur*, I, Paris 1988, and II, Paris 1991; H. Wagner, *Erlösung III*: LTK³ 3, 805-808.

B. Studer

SOTERIS (Sotheris), martyr. *Ambrose (*De virg.* 3,7,37-38; *Exh. virg.* 12,82) mentions Soteris as a noble, a virgin, martyr (under *Diocletian) and member of his own family. For this reason, Ambrose set her forth as an example for his sister *Marcellina. An inscription from 401 (ICUR I,495) refers to her *dies natalis* (*see* *birthday) as 11 Feb. The same date is found in the *Mart. hier.*, along with some others which are mistaken repetitions (6 and 10 February; 12 May). The *Sacramentarium gelasianum*, historical martyrologies and the *Mart. roman.* commemorate her on 10 Feb. The 7th-c. itineraries place her tomb on the Via Appia, in the cemetery of *Callistus (CCL 175,289. 308. 317. 327. 331. 332. 341), but to this day the *ecclesia s. Soteris* has not been identified. The Greek encomium by a certain Pamphilus was likely written in Rome in the 1st half of the 7th. c. (CPG 6921). Pope Sergius II (844–847) transferred the relics of Soteris to S. Martino ai Monti in Rome.

BHG 1642; CPG 6921; BS 11, 1328-1329; RAC 9, 236-239; BBKL 10, 827-828; Ph. Pergola, *Le catacombe romane*, Rome ²1999, 209-210.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

SOUL (Human)
I. Contexts - II. Questions.

The human soul, about which, acc. to *Pamphilus, *Origen dared not write a treatise (*Apologia* 8: PG 17, 604), was a principal theme of classical and Christian antiquity, though as of yet there is still no comprehensive study on the theme. Here we will give the dialectical context and the questions developed during the first five centuries of Christianity.

I. Contexts. The cultural contexts which Christians faced were primarily *Stoicism and *Platonism. The Stoics considered the human soul to be a living principle, originating in matter and in the end dissolving with each periodic conflagration (*ekpyrōsis*); the Platonists thought of the soul as preexisting the person's birth and therefore not created simultaneously with the body, but fallen into it (Cic., *Tusculanae* 1, 10,20 and 11,22; Tertull., *De anima* 54,1-4). Stoicism thus posed to Christianity the problem of the nature and destiny of the soul; Platonism, that of the soul's relation with the body.

II. Questions. The background of the resulting questions included the problems of the concept of incorporeity linked to that of spirituality, a link that seemed contradictory, and of the communion of substance between soul and body, which was the greatest difficulty for a concept of the spirituality of the soul.

a. Nature of the soul. *Augustine (5th c.) synthesized the results of a centuries-long discussion as follows: *Natura animae . . . res spiritualis est, res incorporea est, vicina est substantiae Dei* (*En. in ps.* 145, 4,40). A *Neoplatonic conclusion (Plot., *Enneads* IV, a book dedicated entirely to the soul), it considered the soul to be a substance separate from the body and acting independent of it; spiritual and incorporeal by nature, and thus without the *quantitas* proper to bodies; rational, and therefore distinct from the irrational souls of animals; divine and eternal by nature (Plot., *Enneads* IV, 7, 10, l). Many Fathers added that the soul was immortal, esp. Augustine. On the divinity of the soul, however, the Fathers, while admitting its spirituality, specified its distance from the divine essence: it is only the "image of the image" (Greg. Nys., *De anima*). Given its possibility of error, it is far from the divine perfection (Cassiod., *De anima*: PL 70, 1287). The soul, specifies Augustine, as incorporeal is the substance nearest God (*Civ. Dei* 11, 26,1; *Quant. an.* 34,77; *Gen. ad litt.* 10,24), and as a creature is mutable and inferior to him (*In Io. ev.* 38, 10,19). *Aristotle and the Stoics thought that the substance of the soul had a corporeal nature, though of course different from that common to other bodies. The Platonic duality *psychē-nous* becomes a separation in Aristotle (*De anima* 2,2,413b), and the *nous* in particular, a point of departure of the intelligible world in Neoplatonism (Plot., *Enneads* IV, 3,1,4), was understood to be of divine constitution because it was made of the *quinta essentia* or *natura* (thesis of Eudemus) or ether (thesis of *De Philosophia*), a conception which through *Philo of Alexandria

(*Quis haeres* 57) was taken up by many Christian authors (texts in Moraux, PWK 14/1,1171-1266). The *entelecheia,* i.e., the circular movement of the heavens, was applied to the soul. The soul would thus be astral by nature and therefore divine, necessarily implying immortality (Arist., *De anima* 1,3,407a), but endowed with corporality, *corporales lineas* (Tertull., *De an.* 9,1-3), though of a substance more subtle than the bodies known to us (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 2,34). The thesis of the corporeity of the soul originated in Christian authors for many reasons: the nonidentification of the soul with God (Maximus the Confessor, *Ep.* 6: PG 91, 428); opposition to Platonism's consideration of the person as being merely his soul (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 5,6); the possibility of resurrection, with the soul being capable of assimilating itself to the body and recognizing it (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 2,33-34); and finally to explain the passions, since what is incorporeal is impassible, acc. to the Stoic adage (Tertull., *De an.* 6,4); otherwise they would have had to follow the theory of those who held that the passions could only be ascribed to the body. The immortality of the soul in this context was understood as a gift of God and not as a quality of the soul (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 2,34,1-4). In the 5th c., following the reflection on original *sin and its transmission, questions again were raised concerning the origin of the soul (by creationism or traducianism) and its spirituality and immortality (Aug., *Ep.* 166 and 167 to Jerome; see also for the opinions on the origin of the soul [4 or 5] *Ep.* 143 and 165; *De quantitate animae*; *De immortalitate animae*; *De anima et eius origine*; Claudianus Mamertus, *De statu animae*).

b. Immortality of the soul. This took on a gradual development in ancient Christianity, thanks above all to Origen and Augustine. In the 5th c. some still taught that the soul was material and mortal, like every creature. In that century *Claudianus Mamertus wrote the most complete study we have on the spirituality of the soul, from which he then deduced a proof of its immortality that was vigorously contested by *Faustus of Riez. Some read the Pauline text Col 1:16 (*in ipso condita sunt universa . . . visibilia et invisibilia*) as favoring immortality, assimilating "invisible" to "incorporeal" (*asōmatos*) (Orig., *Princ.* 1,7,1; 4,3,15; Aug., *Ep.* 238,15); others distinguished between "invisible and incorporeal," with the soul being invisible but corporeal like every created being (thesis linked to Stoicism: SVF 11, 123,16; Tertull., *De an.* 7,3; *De carne Chr.* 11). Immortality was held to be proper to God, with the soul being only invisible but not immortal, though it could become so by God's gift (*Irenaeus's thesis and that of Christians in general, who believed in resurrection). *Tertullian's statement on the immortality of the soul ("Some truths are known to us even by nature, like the immortality of the soul": *De resurr.* 3,1-3) had influence from the 2nd c. on, recognizing as it did the Neoplatonic principle that the soul contains the body, something possible only for an immaterial principle (Nemesius of Emesa, *De natura hominis*: PG 40, 540; Proclus, *In Timaeum* 90A: Diehl 1,293,22). Thus the soul assures its continuance in being vis-à-vis the body because it is by nature imperishable, i.e., immortal. The *Alexandrian school, developing Philo's idea that immortality and incorruptibility are divine qualities that mutually refer to one another (*De opif. hom.* 135), proposed the relation between *apatheia* (the impassibility acquired through moral effort, and which is a divine attribute) and *aphtharsia* (the incorruptibility that implies a link to immortality: Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 120,3; *Strom.* 8,3; Greg. Nys., *passim*). Origen places the soul at the third degree of rational creatures, among those that are incorporeal, attributing humanity's corporeity to its diversity and not to the nature of the soul which is thus in itself immortal (*Princ.* 1, 4,1; 1, 8,3; 2, 1,4 and 8,3). *Athanasius deduces the "reasonable and immortal" nature of the soul from its activity: it thinks reasonably and "moves itself" independent of the body (*Contra Gentes* 33, something already argued by Tertullian: *De an.* 43,1-2; 49,1-3; *De test. an.* 1,5; 4,1; 5,1-2). Augustine derived the immortality of the soul from the eternity of the truth it receives (*Solil.* 2, 19,33: "Thus the soul is immortal"; *Trin.* 14,4: "In the human soul, rational and intelligent, one must find the image of the Creator, immortally etched into its immortality"; see also *Ep.* 163; 166 and 202/A on the immortality of the soul, its possible creationist or *traducianist origin, and its birth in original sin; see *Ep.* 118 for the happiness of the soul with the body at the end of time). In the soul are distinguished, for Augustine, memory, intelligence and will (*Ep.* 169, 1,2), and it is transported by the weight of love (*Ep.* 157, 2,9). The soul, therefore, is not the highest good, as the Stoics and Platonists held (*Ep.* 118, 3,15-16), but it tends to God, he who is the highest good (*Ep.* 118, 3,13). Fallen into sin by its own will and not because of a previous existence, it does not undergo reincarnation (*Ep.* 166, 2,6 and 9,27).

Tertullian, *De anima* (CCL 2,779-869); *De testimonio animae* (CCL 1,173-183); *De censu animae* (lost); Origen, *La disputa con Eraclide* (SC 67, Paris 1960); Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione* (PG 46, 11-160; ed. H. Polack, *Gregorii Nyss. Opera omnia* 2, Leiden 1966; Ambrose, *De Isaac et anima* (CSEL 32/1, 641-700); Augustine, *De quantitate animae* (PL 32, 1035-1080); *De immortalitate animae* (PL 32, 1021-1034); *De anima et eius origine* (CSEL 60,423-470); Faustus of Riez, *Ep.* 3 (CSEL 11,3-

17); Claudianus Mamertus, *De statu animae* (CSEL 11,18-197); Cassiodorus, *De anima* (PL 70, 1279-1308); *Trattati sull'anima dal V al IX secolo*, Milan 1979; E. Rhode, *Psyche. Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, Freiburg i.B. 1890-1894 (It. tr. Bari 1914-1916; Fr. tr. Paris 1952); E. Bréhier, *La théorie des incorporels dans l'ancien stoïcisme*, Paris [2]1928; H. Gomperz, *AsŌmatos*: Hermes 67 (1932) 155-167; J. Goldbrunner, *Das Leib-Seele Problem bei Augustinus*, Munich 1934; Ch. Josserand, *L'âme-Dieu.* À propos d'un passage du *"Songe de Scipion"*: AC 4 (1935) 141-153; A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismègiste III. Les doctrines de l'âme*, Paris 1953; J. Coman, *L'immortalité de l'âme dans le "Phédon" et la résurrection des morts dans la littérature chrétienne des deux premiers siècles*: Helikon 3 (1963) 17-40; E.L. Fortin, *Christianisme et culture philosophique au V[e] siècle. La querelle de l'âme humaine en Occident*, Paris 1959; P. Moraux, *Quinta essentia*: PWK 24 (1963) 1171-1266; A.H. Chroust, *The Doctrine of the Soul in Aristotle's Last Dialogue "on Philosophy"*: The New Scholasticism 42 (1968) 364-373; G. Movia, *Anima e intelletto*, Padua 1968; C.G. Steel, *The Changing Self: A Study on the Soul in Later Neoplatonism*: *Iamblicus*, *Damascius and Priscianus*, Brussels 1978; C. Scanzillo, *L'anima nei Padri dei primi secoli*, in var. aus., *Problemi di attualità*, Naples 21979, 33-164; M. Di Marco, *La polemica sull'anima tra Fausto di Riez e Claudiano Mamerto* (SEA 51), Rome 1995.

V. Grossi

SOZOMEN (5th c.). Author of a *Historia Ecclesiastica.* Contemporary of *Socrates of Constantinople, the little information we have about him is drawn from his own work. The year of his birth and death are unknown, which occurred around 448. He was probably born in the village of Bethelia near *Gaza in *Palestine; he belonged to a family of committed Christians to whom was owed the institution of parishes and convents. He spoke of his grandfather who lived at the time of the emperor *Julian. His grandfather was well respected for his learning and, after his conversion, for his explanation of Holy *Scripture. Sozomen belonged to a school of monks and was always in contact with monastic circles, gathering pieces of information for his work. He studied law, perhaps at Berytus (Beirut), where instruction was offered in Latin. After a trip to *Italy, he settled definitively at *Constantinople, where he exercised the profession of *scholasticos:* this must have taken place no earlier than the death of Atticus (425), because he affirmed that he did not know this bishop; in 443 he was still working as a lawyer (*HE* II,3,10). His complete name was, as attested to by Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 30), Salamon Hermias Sozomen, but the oldest MSS also contain the variant Hermias Sozomen Salaminius.

From Sozomen we know that he had written an earlier historical work in two books, now lost, which treat the period from the ascension of Christ to the removal of *Licinius (323) and which depended on Clement (that is the *ps.-*Clementine Homilies*), from *Hegesippus, *Julius Africanus and *Eusebius of Caesarea. The nine books are a continuation (whose actual division into chapters is not to be attributed to the author) of the *HE* dedicated to *Theodosius II (d. 450) and written between 439 and 448. As Sozomen claimed, the work had to treat the period between 324 (the third consulate of Crispus and Constantine) and 439 (17th consulate of Theodosius II). It ends, however, at the year 421 (the death of the emperor *Honorius), although a few later events are barely mentioned. It has been supposed that this defect was owed to the intervention of an imperial censor, but this hypothesis is hardly likely: the MS tradition, moreover, does not allow us to establish whether the first readers had at their disposal a more complete text than the one we possess today. Redacted at the same time as the work of Socrates, the *HE* pertains to the same arc of time and depends on it in the details, even if it fails to mention this work. Jeep and Schoo in their study have also identified other sources for Sozomen's work: *Rufinus (who is not, however, cited), the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the *Vita Constantini* by Eusebius of Caesarea, a few of *Athanasius's writings (however, not all cited), *Palladius and numerous documents, synodal acts, letters of emperors and bishops, spread around in state and ecclesiastical archives and private libraries. Occasionally in the *HE*, reference is made to the orations of *Gregory of Nazianzus as well as to *Libanius and *Apollinaris of Laodicea, although the reminiscences of the works of *John Chrysostom and *Jerome are uncertain. Sozomen probably knew the writings of *Ephrem the Syrian and *Eustathius of Antioch, *Eunomius and *Eutropius; in the ninth book he makes extensive use of the writings of *Olympiodorus of Thebes. The collection of letters indicated in the *HE* as γραφαί is perhaps to be identified with the συναγωγή written by *Sabinus of Heraclea (Batiffol). Also present are the *Syriac and several other unknown writings unknown to Socrates, as shown by the passages pertaining to the history of the monks and the Persian martyrs under the reign of *Shapur II. Buck demonstrated that Sozomen did not use the work of the pagan Eunapius and therefore cannot be used to reconstruct his fragmentary work. He knew and used the *Codex Theodosianus* to reconstruct the religious legislation of the emperors. The problem of the investigation of the sources was of utmost importance to Sozomen, as appears from the proemium of the *HE*. He used all his energy to bring to light all the documentation that was possible for him to obtain. In contradistinction to Socrates, he extended his investigation to the

biographies of famous monks and used numerous sources that pertained to the events of the West.

Facing the problem of the systemization of the excessive material that he was able to find, he gave primacy to his literary demands that were connected with the canons of classical historiography and the objective of addressing with his work upper-class, but not excessively competent, readers. This explains why, when compared to the more plain and simple style of Socrates's text (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 30), Sozomen's work is hardly commendable for its fusion and synthesis of sources and documents, which is almost always accomplished in the *HE*, as well as the reluctance for theological questions and the tendency for anecdotal narration that is rich with ascetic legends and miraculous events. In the historical vision of Sozomen, one finds the continual intervention of divine providence that directs world events toward the progress of Christianity: the emperors became the guardians of orthodoxy, and the history of the church assumes apologetic tones. The following scholars have made editions of the *HE:* R. Estienne (Paris 1544), H. Valois (Paris 1668), R. Hussey (Oxford 1860) and recently Bidez - Hansen. We have a portion of a Latin version completed in the 6th c. by the monk *Epiphanius under the direction of *Cassiodorus, although Eastern translations are lacking.

Editions: CPG 6030; PG 67, 843-1630; J. Bidez - G.C. Hansen, GCS 50, Berlin 1960 (updated ed. , 1995, 526-548; text and Ger. tr. by G.C. Hansen, Turnhout 2004); the ed. is represented in the SC with a Fr. tr.: SC 306, 418 and 495, Paris 1983-2005; W. Jacob - R. Hanslik, *Cassiodori Epiphanii Historia Ecclesiastica tripartita*, CSEL 71, Vienna 1952.

Studies: L. Jeep, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu den griechischen Kirchenhistorikern*, Leipzig 1884; P. Batiffol, *Sozomène et Sabinos*: ByzZ 7 (1898) 265-284; G. Schoo, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Sozomenos*, Berlin 1911; PWK 22/1, 1240-1248; DTC 14, 2469-2471; G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I, Berlin 1958, 510-512; G. Downey, *The Perspective of the Early Church Historians*: GRBS 6 (1965) 63-66; Quasten II, 539-541; A. Primmer, *Sozomenus, Kirchengeschichte. Hrsg. von J. Bidez*: Gnomon 39 (1967) 350-358; F. Winkelmann, *Die Kirchengeschichtswerke im ostrom. Reich*: Byzantinoslavica 37 (1976) 175-177; G.F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Historians: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Evagrius*, Paris 1977; M. Mazza, *Sulla teoria della storiografia cristiana: osservazione sui proemi degli storici ecclesiastici*, in *La storiografia ecclesiastica della tarda antichità*, Messina 1980, 335-389; G. Zecchini, *Aezio. L'ultima difesa dell'Occidente romano*, Rome 1983; J. Harries, *Sozomen and Eusebius: The Lawyer as Church Historian in the Fifth Century*, in C. Holdsworth - T.P. Wiseman, *The Inheritance of Historiography 350–900*, Exeter 1986, 45-52; C. Roueché, *Theodosius II, the Cities, and the Date of the Church History of Sozomen*: JTS 37 (1986) 130-132; B. Fitzgerald, *Pagan Activities During the Reigns of Valens and Theodosius I According to the Church Historians Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret*, Diss. Princeton Theol. Seminary 1995; H. Leppin, *Von Constantin dem Grossen zu Theodosius II.: das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret*, Göttingen 1996; T. Urbainczyk, *Observations on the Differences Between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen*: Historia 46 (1997) 355-373; T. Urbainczyk, *Vice and Advice in Socrates and Sozomen*, in *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, ed. by M. Whitby, Leiden 1998, 299-319; D.F. Buck, *Did Sozomen use Eunapius' "Histories"?*: MH 55 (1999) 15-25; LACL 648-649; G. Sabbah, *D'Eusèbe à Sozomène: empereurs, évêques et moines*, in *Ad contemplandam sapientiam*, Studi in memoria di S. Leanza, Soveria Mannelli 2004, 599-618; P. Van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Leuven 2004.

A. Labate

SPAIN and PORTUGAL. The conquest of Hispania by Rome, which began in the year 218 BC, was concluded only in 19 BC with a full pacification of the peninsula. Nevertheless, its Romanization came slowly and reached the various provinces at different levels, but more swiftly and intensely than all others, it affected *Baetica. Already in 197 BC, Hispania was divided into two provinces: Citerior (NE) and Ulterior (SW). The emperor Augustus subdivided Ulterior into two provinces: Baetica (capital Cordoba), and *Lusitania (capital *Mérida); the emperor *Diocletian continued the subdivision of Citerior into three parts: *Tarragona (capital Tarragona), *Carthaginensis (capital Cartagena) and *Gallaecia (capital *Braga). The five provinces, along with *Mauritania Tingitana, made up the diocese of Hispania, and, since the time of the emperor *Constantine, constituted part of the prefecture of *Gaul.

We do not know if the apostle *Paul's desire to go to Spain (Rom 15:24) materialized; nevertheless, it remains only a hypothesis despite the abundance of testimonies from the Fathers, some of which are very ancient, such as those of *Irenaeus and *Tertullian, who espoused it. It is certain that, even if he did come, he did not leave any traces in the peninsula. Likewise, one cannot support *James's arrival in Spain; and there are not lacking those who still defend the presence of the so-called Seven Apostolic Men in Spain, despite the silence of the primary sources (literary, *archaeological, *epigraphic and *liturgical). Keeping in mind the respective and, at times, late proofs of quite a few scholars, for the most part Spanish, who lean toward the African origin of peninsular Christianity, one should conclude that Christianity arrived in Spain through the normal channels of the phenomenon of Romanization: army, commerce and missionaries sent by other Christian communities, and esp. by *Rome.

The first testimonies to Christianity in Spain come from Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, 3) and Tertullian

(*Adv. Iud.* 7,4); in fact, these are not trustworthy because they are too generic and also perhaps rhetorical. From the first clearly valid document, i.e., *Letter* 67 by *Cyprian of Carthage (254), we come to know of the existence of bishops at Mérida and at Astorga-León, as in other nearby cities, in addition to *Saragossa; we know of the existence of a persecution, during which the Christians gave an example to their pastors, and of relations with Rome (and only because of *Carthage). Through the authentic, but not the proconsular, *Acts* of the martyrdoms of St. *Fructuosus, we know of the presence of Christianity in Tarragona and some of its customs until 259. The martyrs of the Diocletian persecution bore witness to their faith in Saragossa, Calahorra, *Gerona, Cordoba, Mérida and Alcalá de Henares. But the best document for knowing the extent, the characteristics and the problems of Spanish Christianity are the *Acts* of the Council of *Elvira (beginning of the 4th c.). From these *Acts* one can conclude that there was a significant penetration of the Christian religion in Baetica and the border areas, and that Christianity there was not entirely free from *paganism, and in other respects the religion was rather rigid and traditional. During the 4th c., the Spanish church remained in a certain sense outside the major crises of Christianity. Its relationship with the *Donatism of nearby *Africa was very limited but real and can be observed in the presence of at least eight bishops at the Council of *Arles (314), as well as in the likely influence of *Hosius of Cordoba in Constantine's decisions. Hosius himself was the representative of the participation of the Spanish church in the *Arian crisis, as the emperor's ecclesiastical counselor and the leader of the anti-Arian Western party. Eight other peninsular bishops were present in the conflict, although in a different way and with a different impact: *Potamius of Lisbon, a signatory of the Arian Formula of *Sirmium (357), and *Gregory of Elvira, a committed anti-Arian to the end. The peace of the Spanish church was tested, however, at the end of the 4th c. by the *Priscillianist movement, with extensive repercussions inside and outside the Peninsula in the civil and ecclesiastical context. Priscillianism stimulated a certain literary production, which reached the extent of the production achieved by Potamius and Gregory, mentioned above, to those of the poets *Juvencus and *Prudentius, to that of *Bachiarius, *Eutropius and the writings of St. *Pacian, who all inform us about several themes of great importance in the Spanish church of that time: *penance, *marriage–*virginity, *asceticism, *clergy, *martyr cults etc. Moreover, conciliar activity began, which reached its height during the *Visigothic period.

Before the Visigoths occupied *Tarraconensis in 414, the Suevi had crossed the Pyrenees and occupied Gallaecia, along with the Asding *Vandals; the Alans had settled in Lusitania and the Silings in Baetica. Pressured by the Roman troops, the last two peoples passed immediately into *Africa (429). After the fall of the last Roman emperor of the West (476), the Visigoths invaded all of Spain, with the exception of the Basque and Suevian territories, which were then definitively incorporated into the Visigothic kingdom under *Leovigild (574 and 585 respectively). Only in 621 was the territorial unit established, after the *Byzantines were expelled, under Suintila, who, called by Athanagild from Africa in 554, had occupied the coastal zone of the province of Carthaginensis, part of Tarraconensis and much of the province of Baetica. From the religious point of view, the Suevians were initially pagans, and afterward they converted to Catholicism (448); later they went over to Arianism (465) and, at the time of St. Martin of *Dumium, back to Catholicism. The remaining groups remained Arian. The Hispanic-Roman Catholic community had to coexist with them and was at times persecuted, but Catholics generally lived in peace. In various episcopal sees two bishops coexisted, one Catholic the other Arian. During this period an intense relationship with the Roman see was maintained: the Spanish bishops had recourse to the pope, and they appointed some of his vicars for the various provinces; but already in the 4th c. these relations dissipated in the same period in which the conciliar activity intensified in such cities as Tarragona, *Toledo, *Barcelona, *Lérida and Valencia, in addition to Braga and Mérida. The civil metropolises also became ecclesiastical metropolises. The historiographers *Paulus Orosius and *Idatius belong to this first period. *Severus of Minorca, *Apringius of Beja, *Justinian of Valencia,*Licinianus of Cartegana, *Justus of Urgel and St. Martin of Dumium were also quite famous during this era. Worthy of note, then, was also the nascent *monasticism.

After having reached almost full territorial unity, stimulated more by political than religious reasons, King *Leovigild (568–586) also wanted to forge a religious unity under the Arian faith professed by the Visigothic people, not sparing for this reason pressures of various types, but his objective was unsuccessful. Religious unity, from which the Jews desired to exclude themselves, was achieved with his son and successor, *Recared, who, incited by political and religious reasons, converted to the Catholic faith in 587, as a result of a theological debate between Arian and Catholic bishops. Although there

were not lacking points of resistance, as in Mérida, the majority of the Visigothic people followed him in this conversion, and it was publicly proclaimed in the III Council of Toledo (589). Starting from that point onward, the Spanish church began a century of glory under a sign of unity. The Visigothic church, which was heavily national, recognized itself as having matured, and it worked with a considerable level of autonomy (in fact, relations with Rome were reduced to a minimum and tensions were not lacking); to govern itself through national or provincial councils, among which those of Toledo distinguished themselves through their legislative, ecclesiastical and civil activity, the prestige of the episcopal sees was generally tied to famous pastors who governed them: *Seville with St. *Leander and St. *Isidore; Saragossa with St. *Braulio and *Taio; *Mérida with *Massona; Palencia (Pallantia) with Conantius; and Toledo with St. *Eugenius, St. *Ildefonsus and St. *Julian; Braga with St. Fructuosus and Bierzo with *Valerius. Harmony between church and monarch resulted in unity of worship, which was confirmed in the III Council of Toledo (589). The Hispanic *liturgy, another legacy of this historical era, continued to build upon and fulfill its own character. The culture flourished, although it was reflected more recapitulation and transmission than creativity: this was true of secular culture but esp. of religious culture. There was no lack of authors who treated the Holy Scriptures (Isidore, Ildefonsus, Taio and Julian). The theology was apologetic and anti-Arian (Leander, Isidore) and, esp., anti-Jewish (Isidore, Ildefonsus and Julian), because in the kingdom that was civilly and religiously united the presence of Judaism was at the same time both a religious and political problem. But neither was there a lack of writings on *dogmatic theology (Isidore and Taio) and esp. *eschatology (Julian).

In legal matters, the Hispania collection remained famous, which was probably the work of Isidore, and in the field of civil law, one should mention the *Liber Iudiciorum* by Recceswinth, elaborated by Braulio. Secular history had its scholars in John of Biclaro, Isidore and Julian, and for ecclesiastical history, one should recall the treatise *De viris illustribus* by Isidore and Ildefonsus. Within this literary production the abundant *hagiographical literature and, in a special way, the legendary *Acts* of the martyrs found its own space. One should also note the work of the preservation of classical culture through the work of Isidore. Centers of this culture were the episcopal schools, among which emerged that of Seville and that of the parishes and monasteries, under the lead of the councils. In fact, it was in Spain and concretely at Toledo (Council of 527) that one perceives the institution in an official way of clerical schools for education. Monasticism flourished, after its beginnings in the earlier period, assuming various forms, some of which more than once concerned the conciliar fathers; at the same time, the monastic rules multiplied (of Leander, Isidore, Valerius of Bierzo, Fructuosus, the *Common Rule* etc.). Famous monks were Martin of Dumium, Isidore, Valerius of Bierzo and Fructuosus of Braga. With the Muslim invasion of 711, there began a new era in the history of Spain, which was very different from the previous one.

Many councils were celebrated by the Spanish churches. The number of those known from the Roman and then the Visigothic era number over 40; to these should be added some other uncertain councils and one Arian council. Through tradition, they are divided into Hispano-Roman and Hispano-Gothic, and each group is divided into *general* and *provincial*. By convention the councils called "Roman" were those that were celebrated before the conversion of the Visigoths to Catholicism (589), although some of these were celebrated during the Visigothic and Suevian rule. The provincial councils are those at which the bishops of a single province participated and where the problems that only pertained to that province were treated. The general ones, however, are those in which problems of faith were treated or that pertained to the entire peninsular church, at which all the bishops of the kingdom participated, either personally or through representatives. Despite the importance of some Hispano-Roman councils (e.g., that of Elvira) the most famous remain those of Toledo from the Visigothic era, an expression of the singular symbiosis between church and state.

DACL 5, 407-523; EC 11, 1042-1052; DHGE 15, 892-915; CE 13, 494-496; DHEE 2, 983-985; ES, Madrid 1747; Mansilla, *Geografía I*; A. González, *Epistolae, Decretales ac Rescripta Romanorum Pontificum*, Madrid 1808; P.B. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, Regensburg 1882-83; H. Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne*, Paris 1906; Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España* I-III, Madrid 1935-40; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *En torno a los orígenes del cristianismo en España*: Las raíces de España, Madrid 1967, 423-443; J. Vives, *Concilios*; M. Blázquez, *Posible origen africano del cristianismo español*: AEA (1967) 30-50; *XVII Semana española de teología, La patrología hispano-visigoda*, Madrid 1970; U. Domínguez del Val, *Cultura y teología en la España visigoda*: Salmanticensis 17 (1970) 581-612; E.A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, London 1969 (Sp. tr., Madrid 1971); R. Puertas Tricas, *Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII). Testimonios literarios*, Madrid 1975; J. Orlandís, *Concilios*; Id., *La Iglesia en la España visigoda y medieval*, Pamplona 1976; M. Sotomayor, *La Iglesia en la España romana y visigoda*, Madrid 1979; R. García Villoslada (ed.), *Historia de la Iglesia en España* 1, Madrid 1979; A. Ferreiro, *The Visigoths in Gaul and*

Spain A.D. 418–711. A Bibliography, Leiden 1988; L.A. García Moreno, *Los monjes y monasterios en las ciudades de las Españas tardoromanas y visigodas*: Habis 24 (1993) 179-192; J. Vilella, *La correspondencia entre los obispos hispanos y el papado durante el siglo V*: SEA 46 (1994) 457-481; L.A. García Moreno, *Estudios de historia eclesiástica visigoda*, Pamplona 1998; J. Pereira Lamelas, *Os primeiros passos do cristianismo no território português*: Itinerarium 46 (2000) 51-70; G. Ramis Miquel, *La iniciación cristiana en la liturgia hispánica*, Bilbao 2001; R. Teja (ed.), *La Hispania del siglo IV: administración, economía, sociedad, cristianización*, Bari 2002; C. Martin, *La géographie du pouvoir dans l'Espagne visigothique*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2003; P. Ubric Rabaneda, *La iglesia en la Hispania del siglo V*, Granada 2004; M.F. Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain and Its Cities*, Baltimore 2004; Id., *Hispania in Late Antiquity: Current Perspectives*, ed. and tr. by K. Bowes - M. Kulikowski, Leiden 2005; L. Montecchio, *I visigoti e la rinascita culturale del secolo VII*, Roncate 2005.

P. de Luis

SPES (4th–5th c). Bishop of Spoleto (Spoletium)—at the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th, normally placed before *Achilleus—and the author of a poem of 12 verses in honor of the *martyr Vitalis, whose body he had found in the vicinity of the city and whose cult he established with a celebration for 14 Feb. The author commends himself and the virgin Calventia, who was almost certainly his daughter, to this saint's intercession. Spes died after 32 years of service in the episcopate (his epitaph has been preserved) on 23 Nov. Some of his *relics were carried by Charlemagne to Aquiasgranae to decorate his chapel.

Diehl I, 364, n. 1851; CIL 11, 4966; DACL 15, 1639-1640; A.P. Frutaz, *Spes e Achilleo vescovi di Spoleto*, in *Atti del II Convegno di Studi Umbri*, Perugia 1964, 362-365; Patrologia III, 300; R. Grégoire, *L'agiografia spoletana antica*: *tra storia e tipologia*, in *Il Ducato di Spoleto*, Spoleto 1983, 335-366; C. D'Angelo, *Il vescovo Spes e la basilica spoletina dei SS. Apostoli. Nota preliminare*, op. cit., 851-858; PCBE 2, 2103-2104.

A. Di Berardino

SPIRITUAL COMBAT. Spiritual tradition, following the path opened by Scripture (see 1 Cor 9:24-27) and adding the Stoic ideal, frequently compared *ascesis to a battle, a combat against the enemies of the soul. There are many texts on the topic. For *Clement of Alexandria, the true "gnostic" must ask God to put him to the test (*Strom.* IV,7,55,1: GCS 2,273). The tested man par excellence is the monk: δόκιμος μόναχος (Pall., *Hist. Laus.* 18, ed. C. Butler, Cambridge 1904, 52). The battle comes upon us anyway, perfect or not, observes *Origen (*Hom. in Iesu Nave*: PG 12,885). If in the *apatheia* of the *Messalians there is a tendency to quietism (cf. Ps. Macarius, *Hom.* 26,14: PG 34,684), at the other extreme *Evagrius of Pontus believes temptations increase as one progresses in the spiritual life (*Prakt.* 59: SC 171,679). Scripture unmasks the enemies who wage this war: Satan, the world, the flesh (see Rom 7–8). Monastic writings distinguish between the "visible battle" and the "invisible battle." In Evagrius's explanation, the "visible battle" concerns πράγματα: objects, contact with which gives birth to the passions. In this case the remedy for resisting and defeating the demon is abstention, the renunciation of the objects themselves. "But with monks (the demons fight) mostly through the thoughts" (λογισμοί) (*Prakt.* 48: SC 171,609). The mechanism of temptation, whose various moments are linked to one another, was analyzed in depth by the Eastern spiritual writers, esp. by those of the "Sinaitic" spirituality (*Nilus, *John Climacus, Psychius, *Philotheus). The elimination of evil thoughts (*ἀπόθεσις νοημάτων*), custody of the heart, discernment of spirits, *antirrēsis* and opposing evil thoughts with scriptural texts are frequent themes in the writings of the *hesychasts. *Augustine gives much importance to the spiritual, interior battle. A dimension of the Christian life is a battle against the passions, to attain peace with God and personal peace. He also writes a work for the general public, with the significant title *De agone christiano*. It begins: "The crown of victory is only promised to those who fight. In the divine Scriptures, moreover, we find frequently that we are promised the crown, if we win. . . . We must therefore know who this adversary is whom if we defeat we will be crowned. It is the same one that our Lord defeated first; we will too, if we persevere in him" (1,1).

DSp 2, 1135-1142; 10,30; 11,348; O. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, Cambridge 1950, 95 ff.; I. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr*, Washington, DC 1950, 91ff.; H. Crouzel, *L'anthropologie d'Origène dans la perspective du combat spirituel*: RAM 31 (1955) 364-385; G.M. Colombás, *Paradis et vie spirituelle*, Paris 1961, 118ff.; A. de Vogüé, *Règle du Maître*, I, Paris 1964, 89ff.; A. Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pont.*: *Traité pratique*, *introd.*, SC 170, Paris 1971, 95; T. Špidlík, *Spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel syst.*: OCA 206, Rome 1978, 225ff.; NBA 7/2, 53-72 (intr. to the theme), 78-125 (text and tr.).

T. Špidlík

SPIRITUALITY

I. The first two c. - II. The 3rd c. - III. From Nicaea to Chalcedon.

The notion of spirituality is modern and is not found in these terms in the writings of ancient authors. They preferred to speak of spiritual theology, *asceticism and *mysticism or, simply, the Christian

and evangelical life. In this entry, we will offer a treatment on the ascetic and spiritual life.

I. The first two c. From the *Jewish-Christian communities we possess a certain number of writings such as the **Didache*, the **Odes of Solomon*, the *Letter of *Barnabas* and the *Shepherd* of *Hermas which reflect the spiritual life led by these communities. The *Didache* describes the practices of the Christian life within the framework of the Jewish and evangelical tradition: *fasting, *prayer and *works. The *Odes of Solomon* reflect a mystical inspiration, a surprising spiritual fervor for that era. The *Letter of Barnabas* developed a spirituality of *baptism and picked up a *typological reading of Holy *Scripture, in which the author portrays Christian perfection as the new temple indwelt by the *Holy Spirit (ch. 16). The author of this text provided this piece of advice: the Christian does not work for salvation in sadness but is a son of joy (4, 11). The *Shepherd* of Hermas rejected the image of an idealized church. The author was aware of the demands of baptism but also of the moral failures that can occur unexpectedly. A realist, the author combated the rigorists and did not want to lead sinners to despair, who are also called to the construction of the tower (= church), provided that they do *penance (*Sim.* VI,3,4,6). The author asked that they observe the indispensable virtues before the evangelical precepts (*Sim.* V,1,4-5) and insisted on the importance of joy and trust (*Prec.* X,1,2) and on the discernment of the spirits (*Prec.* VI,2,3-5). All these Jewish-Christian writings, esp. the *Didache*, placed emphasis on *eschatology, which polarizes the entire spiritual life: the communities were inclined toward the return of Christ, which they considered imminent.

With *Ignatius of Antioch spirituality took two complementary directions: one ecclesial, the other personal. The bishop is above all a man of the church. The spiritual life is carried out within the church, in the *assembly, the privileged place of prayer, in the *Eucharist, in obedience and *communion with the bishop. The soul of the entire spiritual life is Christ, our life, our eternal life and our inseparable life (*Eph.* 3,2; *Magn.* 1,2; *Smyrn.* 4,1). Christ fills all his letters. The spiritual life consists in putting on Christ, his passion, his death, in order to share with him in the resurrection. The Eucharist is at the same time this mystery in this *hope. *Martyrdom appears at the same time to be a *liturgy and the shortest way to reach Christ and the Father. In the writings of Ignatius and *Polycarp, we see the formation of a spiritual theology of martyrdom, as a confession of faith, the presence of Christ, a prolongation of the passion and the Eucharist, an ecclesial testimony, an affirmation of the future resurrection attested to by the acts and the passions of the martyrs.

The *apologists were more concerned with presenting Christianity to the *pagans than in explaining the spiritual life. *Justin, however, bore witness to the sacramental and community life of the faithful. Christians, illuminated by Christ, know the truth and possess grace to lead a virtuous life (2 *Apol.* 10,3). The life of Christ is a testimony to this to the point of martyrdom. The *Letter to *Diognetus* not only illustrates the Christian life but also shows its action in the world: Christians are the soul of the world (*Diogn.* 6), provided that they show forth God's love for humankind, which is the raison d'être for creation: "If we love God, we will imitate his tender affection" (10,4-5).

*Irenaeus in all his work described the progress of the ascent toward the knowledge of God and the Christian's assimilation to the Risen Christ. God slowly prepares the human being to receive the Word. Human beings are born as babies and imperfect: "It is necessary first of all to be created, grow and acquire strength, then that we multiply, and finally that we obtain full development for reaching glory and seeing the Lord" (*Adv. haer.* IV,38,3). This is a slow ascent, which is the purification and transformation of the entire human being for receiving incorruptibility (*Demonst.* 7).

*Apocryphal literature, in turn, although at times tendentious and at times manipulated by heterodox movements, reveals an exceptional spiritual fervor. Therein we find some incontestable religious values: the incursion of the *redemption into the world through Christ, the universal recovery of the cosmos through the resurrection, indestructible trust in Christ and his power, loving devotion in Jesus wherever he is present, faith in a coming eschatology and the exaltation of the woman-virgin. We have here some essential elements of Christian faith and life.

Since the 2nd c. the church was obliged to defend, against the excesses of the *Encratites and the sects, the legitimacy of *marriage and the invitation to the perfect life directed to all people.

II. The 3rd c. Two primary centers stand out in the 3rd c.: *Alexandria and *Carthage. Despite increasingly violent *persecution, the church grew, preserving its spirit of vigilance and preparation for martyrdom. The love lived within the community was manifested in concrete forms and initiatives. *Tertullian was a controversialist and a moralist more than a teacher of spirituality; nevertheless, it would

be wrong to devalue his ascetical work, which developed the following spiritual themes: baptism, prayer, martyrdom, patience and chastity, pushing these ideals that were dear to him to the point of heroism and martyrdom.

*Cyprian's literary work, just as his action, was primarily pastoral and spiritual. His preferred themes were as follows: the one church, prayer, martyrdom and vigilance. "The kingdom of God begins to be very close to us. The recompense of life, the joy of eternal salvation, perpetual delight, possession of *paradise once lost: all of this comes close to us until the world passes away." Cyprian's writings would then be among the most read during the entire history of the church.

*Clement of Alexandria's entire work, despite his metaphysical concerns, lead the "*gnostic"—i.e., the enlightened believer—toward perfection. The perfect model to imitate is Christ (*Paed.* I,2,4). The Christian people are a people of children, who must inaugurate a transparent faith. "An unceasing exercise is necessary so that gnosis becomes a habit and, once perfection has been reached through the mystical habit, it remains stable thanks to charity" (*Strom.* VI,9,78).

*Origen's entire work was oriented toward the spiritual life. His chief point of reference was the divine indwelling, which makes the righteous person the temple of God and the Holy Spirit. We find here the threefold presence, dear to Origen, of God and Christ in Scripture, the church, and the Christian. More than presence, it was a union which at the same time was the impulse and the terminus of the spiritual ascent. A union that has its final result in ecstasy. Moving from biblical images that were particularly dear to him, Origen described the purifications that prepared the encounter, beyond the exile and sin, to find interior unity (*De or.* 21,2) and to reach God. This asceticism is essentially eschatological, inasmuch as it prepares for the eternal day in which God will be all in all things (Hamman, *La Prière*, II). This was a spiritual teaching that, through *Gregory of Nyssa, *Evagrius of Pontus, ps.-*Dionysius and *Maximus the Confessor, would exert its influence in the East and West. "There is no one who is so omnipresent like Origen," said Hans Urs von Balthasar.

III. From Nicaea to Chalcedon. For the Fathers of the golden age, one must simply trace the large lines of the spiritual movements on the basis of the subject matter. Baptismal catechesis along with doctrinal, ascetic and liturgical teaching had a considerable role. It was the invitation to conversion and faith through the evangelical life (Cyril Jer., *Cat.* 1). The large number of baptismal sermons that have come down to us demonstrates the commitment of the Fathers in the preparation for the firm faith and a faith made comprehensible (see Aug., *De catechizandis rudibus*).

Lent is a time for retreat for the entire church: preparation for catechumens, reconciliation for sinners, mobilization and deepening of the faith for all. *Basil of Caesarea's *Sermons* and **Hexameron* show us the people fully involved. The preaching of the Fathers reveals the importance recognized by them for the perfection of the *laity: "To the married as well as to the monks, Jesus preached the *beatitudes" (John Chrys., *In Mt. hom.* 7,7; Aug., *De sermone in monte*).

Preaching in the East and West offered elements of spiritual teaching for Christian people. Nourished by *Scripture and the liturgy, the Fathers' preaching strove to explain the sanctification of all states of life, esp. marriage and the family. The home "is a little church," said *John Chrysostom. Archaeological testimony, such as modest potsherds with fragments extracted from the *Bible and the liturgy and inscriptions with verses from the *Psalms allow one to trace the diffusion of this catechesis. Liturgical reminiscences on the *ostraka* and on the papyri, just as the acclamations, the doxologies, the trisagion, the *maranatha* and the *Kyrie eleison* exhibit the influence exercised by the liturgy on the piety of the faithful.

Letters of spiritual direction intensified, in their own way, this work of information, primarily among influential laypeople, men and women, written by Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, *Augustine and *Paulinus of Nola. One must also add the writings for the *virgins and the *widows (Viller - Rahner, 41-42). The fervor of the martyrs esp. continued among the virgins and the monks, who multiplied and spread about, esp. after the Constantinian peace, assuming the most varied and radical forms. The writings inspired by these individuals (the *Vita S. Antonii*, the **Apophthegmata*) exerted a noteworthy influence both in the East and the West. *John Cassian established their spiritual teaching and adapted their type of life for the West. The *Vita Martini* written by *Sulpicius Severus performed an analogous function. The Constantinian age gave recourse to the cult of the martyrs, then to the saints, who by that point occupied an important place in the spiritual life of the communities. It was a cult that would in turn give life to a literature in which legend invaded history. *Hagiography would provide nourishment for generations of Christians.

A great pilgrimage movement began in the 4th c.

and increasingly grew: in this respect, *Egeria could be considered its patron and model.

In the East and West there developed the spiritual theology inherited from Origen. *Gregory of Nyssa was rightly called "the father of *mysticism." His influence was esp. felt on the spiritual teaching of *Diadochus of Photice and *Maximus the Confessor. Ps.-*Dionysius, immediately and often translated into Latin, introduced this mystical theology in the West, where he would dominate in the writings of the Victorines and St. Bonaventure.

Augustine, the teacher of interiority, with his theology of grace, his *Rule* for religious, his itinerary toward God, exerted a long-lasting influence on the Middle Ages. One of Augustine's disciples, *Gregory the Great, would supply in his *Moralia on the Book of Job*, *Homilies* and *Regula Pastoralis* manna for generations of Christians.

Entries in the DSp; P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne*, I, Paris 1926; M. Viller, *La spiritualité des premiers siècles chrétiens*, Paris 1930; M. Viller - K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik*, Freiburg 1939 (trans. of the preceding work with extensive bibl.); J. de Ghellinck, *Lectures spirituelles dans les écrits des Pères*, Paris 1935; M.J. Rouët de Journel - J. Dutilleul, *Enchiridion Asceticum*, Freiburg ²1958; L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du NT et des Pères*, Paris 1960; A. Hamman, *La prière*, II: *Les trois premiers siècles*, Paris 1963 (It. tr. Rome 1967); *Les chemins vers Dieu*, Paris 1967 (texts chosen by A. Hamman and F. Quéré); G. Bardy - A. Hamman, *La vie spirituelle des trois premiers siècles*, Paris 1968; D. Ramos-Lissón, *Espiritualidad de los primeros Cristianos*, Madrid 1979; T. Špidlík - I. Gargano, *La spiritualità dei Padri greci e orientali* (Storia della spiritualità 3/A), Rome 1983; L. Bouyer - L. Dattrino, *La spiritualità dei Padri* (*II-V secolo*): *martirio - verginità - gnosi cristiana* (Storia della spiritualità 3/A), Bologna 1984; L. Bouyer - L. Dattrino, *La spiritualità dei Padri* (*III-VI secolo*): *monachesimo antico e Padri* (Storia della spiritualità 3/B), Bologna 1986; C. Burini - E. Cavalcanti (Storia della spiritualità 3/C), *La spiritualità della vita quotidiana negli scritti dei Padri*, Bologna 1988; T. Špidlík, *Manuale fondamentale di spiritualità*, Casale Monf. 1993; R. Darricau - B. Peyrous, *Histoire de la spiritualité*, Paris ²1994; T. Špidlík, *La spiritualità dell'Oriente cristiano: manuale sistematico*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995; G. Mursell (ed.), *The Story of Christian Spirituality: 2000 Years, from East to West*, Minneapolis 2001; V. Grossi, *La spiritualità dei Padri latini* (Storia della spiritualità 3/B), Rome 2002; S.A. Panimolle (ed.), *Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica: i grandi temi della S. Scrittura per la "Lectio divina,"* Rome 1992-2003 (underway: 36 vols. published by 2003); M. Downey (ed.), *Nuovo dizionario di spiritualità* (ed. it. ed. L. Borriello), Vatican City 2003.

A. Verwilghen, *Christologie et spiritualité selon Saint Augustin: l'hymne aux Philippiens*, Paris 1985; S. Felici (ed.), *Spiritualità del lavoro nella catechesi dei Padri del III-IV secolo*, Rome 1986; C. Noce, *Il martirio: testimonianza e spiritualità nei primi secoli*, Rome 1987; V. Grossi - P. Siniscalco, *La vita cristiana nei primi secoli*, Rome 1988; L. Orabona, *Spiritualità e socialità nelle fonti cristiane dei primi secoli*, Aversa 1989; C.A. Bernard (ed.), *L'antropologia dei maestri spirituali*, Cinisello Balsamo 1991; M. Canévet (ed.), *Les sens spirituels: sens spirituel, goût spirituel, toucher, touches, gourmandise spirituelle, luxure spirituelle*, Paris 1993; K. Rahner, *Spiritualität und Theologie der Kirchenväter* (ed. A.R. Batlogg - E. Farrugia - K.H. Neufeld), Zürich-Düsseldorf 1999; P. Allen - R. Canning - L. Cross - B.J. Caiger (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, Everton Park (Australia) 2000; B. Fischer, *Frömmigkeit der Kirche: Gesammelte Studien zur christlichen Spiritualität*, ed. A. Gerhards - A. Heinz, Bonn 2000; L.F. Pizzolato - M. Rizzi (ed.), *Origene maestro di vita spirituale*, Milan 2001; W. Vogl, *Aktion und Kontemplation in der Spiritualität des antiken Judentums und Frühen Christentums: mit einem hinführenden Teil zur Theorie- Praxis-Problematik in der Antike Exzerpt zur akademischen Diskussion*, Rome 2001; S.S Andrawes, *La spiritualità monastica nell'epistolario di Isidoro di Pelusio: contributo per la ricostruzione d'una spiritualità egiziana del IV-V secolo*, Rome 2002; T. Špidlík, *La preghiera secondo la tradizione dell'Oriente cristiano*, Rome 2002.

A. Hamman - A. Grappone

SPONSA CHRISTI. Following Hosea, the prophets presented the union of Yahweh and Israel as a marriage, and the *Song of Songs was interpreted in this sense. In the NT, this theme is transposed to the union of Christ with the church, which, alongside the Song of Songs, was also developed in other OT writings such as Ps 45 (44 LXX). This interpretation of a collective sense was found, e.g., in *Hippolytus's *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, or could assist in the construction of an *ecclesiology, as in *Cyprian or *Firmilian of Caesarea, who applied the fundamental theme to the oneness of the church against *heretics, or as in *Augustine, who, through the image, described the bishop as the friend of the spouse (Jn 3:29) in the context of the controversy against the *Donatists and their notion of Christian "ministers."

The Fathers also found another way of interpreting the union: it was the individual meaning in which the spouse represented the Christian soul; this was suggested in 1 Cor 6:15-17 and 7:32-34. (The same is enriched with the parallel between Christ–church and husband–wife, applied by *Paul in Eph 5:21-33.) This individual sense is found for the first time in the writings of *Tertullian with respect to the widows and virgins (*Uxor.* I, 4,4; *Resur.* 61,6; *Virg. Vel.* 16,4), but it was esp. *Origen, in the *Com. Ct.*, *Hom.* and in other works, who heavily orchestrated this double meaning of the spouse, church and soul, thus creating the theme of the mystical marriage: the Christian soul is the spouse because it makes up part of the church-spouse: the church progresses in its quality as a spouse through the progress of souls in the church. Sin, therefore, becomes adultery with the diabolical lover, the soul's idolatry or the idolatry of the synagogue. This type of *exegesis found great success among the follow-

ers of the *Alexandrian school in their exhortational writings addressed to *virgins and *widows (*Methodius of Olympus and *Ambrose).

J. Chênevert, *L'Église dans le Commentaire d'Origène sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, Brussels 1969; D. Faul, *Ecclesia, sponsa Christi. Orígenes y Agustin ante la exégesis de Eph. 5,27*: Augustinus 15 (1970) 263-280; L. Robitaille, *L'Église, épouse du Christ, dans l'interprétation patristique du psaume 45,I-III*: Laval Théologique et Philosophique 26 (1970) 167-179, 279-306; 27 (1971) 41-65; H. Crouzel, *Le thème du mariage mystique chez Origène et ses sources*: Studia Missionalia 26 (1977) 37-57; R.A. Horsley, *Spiritual Marriage with Sophia*: VChr 33 (1979) 30-54; J. Doignon, *Points de vue comparés de Cyprien et de Firmilien de Césarée sur l'"unique épouse" des versets 4,12; 6,8 du Cantique des cantiques. Topique d'origine politique et thèmes d'inspiration origénienne*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 179-185; F.E. Consolino, *Veni huc a Libano. La* sponsa *del Cantico dei Cantici come modello per le vergini negli scritti esortatori di Ambrogio*: Athenaeum 62 (1984) 399-415; A.-G. Hamman, *Ascèse et virginité à Carthage au III*[e] *siècle*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes: miscellanea in onore di V. Saxer*, Vatican City, 1992 (Studi di antichità cristiana; 48) 503-514; M. Sherwin, *"The Friend of the Bridegroom Stands and Listens": An Analysis of the Term "Amicus Sponsi" in Augustine's Account of Divine Friendship and the Ministry of Bishops*: Augustinianum 38,1 (1998) 197-214; R.J. DeSimone, *The Bride and the Bridegroom of the Fathers: An Anthology of Patristic Interpretations of the Song of Songs*, Rome 2000; D.G. Hunter, *The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine*: Church History 69,2 (2000) 281-303.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

SPYRIDON (3rd–4th c.). Bishop of Trimethus (*Cyprus). He took part in the Council *Nicaea (325). He was among the signatories of the Council of *Serdica in 343 (Athanasius, *Apol. secunda* 50,2). According to *Rufinus (*HE* X,35), *Socrates (*HE* I,12) and *Sozomen (*HE* I,11), even as a bishop he continued the office of pastor of the flock and performed numerous *miracles. Soon his historical person was swallowed up in legend. The first *hagiographical *Vita* was entirely legendary, an iambic poem falsely attributed to Triphillius, which was lost in its original, and two paraphrases of which have been preserved in prose, one anonymous found in the *Codex Laurentianus* XI,9, although the second is a part of the *Life* of Spyridon written by the monk *Theodore of Paphos (2nd half of the 7th c.), both of which were edited by Van den Ven. The *Life* written by *Theodore of Paphos is the most important, even if it has no historical reliability: it served as the basis for the *Anonymous Metaphrase* (11th c.), a *Short Life* (11th c.), published by Van den Ven, and for the *Life* written by Simeon Metaphrastes (BHG, 1648).

P. van den Ven, *La légende de S. Spyridon évêque de Trimithonte*, Louvain 1953; Id., *L'édition des Vies de saint Spiridon*: RHE 50 (1955) 125-140; BS 11, 1334-1336; Cath. 15, 420.

E. Prinzivalli

STATUTA ECCLESIAE ANTIQUA. Among the documents that inform us about the life of the Gallo-Roman church in the 5th c., the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* occupy a special place. For a long time, they appeared in the canonical collections and in the editions of the councils, under the erroneous title of a Fourth Council of *Carthage; but such scholars as Ballerini (1757), Maassen (1870), Malnory (1888), G. Morin (1913) and B. Botte (1939) were led to gradually specify the place of origin, tendencies and even the author: the author may have been *Gennadius of Marseille, around 476/485. The *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* begin with an enumeration of the qualities required of a bishop and a profession of faith; 89 disciplinary canons follow on various topics; a brief ritual for *ordination finishes the work. Each one of these three parts follows the outline of the preceding work: the profession of faith in the prologue depends directly on Gennadius of Marseille's work titled *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*; many of the propositions were taken textually from this document. With respect to the disciplinary canons, it seems that the author follows as a model the ps.-apostolic Eastern compilations (**Didascalia*, **Apostolic Constitutions*). Last, with respect to that ritual for ordination, one can clearly see the influence of the **Apostolic Tradition* attributed to *Hippolytus; the same series of orders is also found in the solemn prayers of Holy Friday.

A complex work, where the author draws on widely differing sources, the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, nevertheless, offers a coherent whole, due to the tendencies that inspired them. The author, first and foremost, seeks to limit the powers of the monarchical episcopate, submitting it to the twofold control of the provincial synod and the "diocesan" council, the *presbyterium*, whose intervention he regards as indispensable for the most important matters: ordinations (can. 10), the judicial trials within the church (can. 14) and the administration of ecclesiastical *property (cans. 15, 50). The work is attentive to the rights of the presbyters (cans. 2, 12, 56), whose dignity he emphasizes with respect to the bishops and the deacons (cans. 57-61); he gives to the entirety of his work a clearly *ascetical stamp. From the prologue onward, he accurately enumerates the qualities for each man who is to be ordained: prudence, moderation, decorum of life and a good reputation. Nourished by the Holy *Scriptures, sound in doctrine and capable of transmitting it to his people with the appropriate language, the bishop must dedicate himself completely to prayer, meditation on the holy books and the preaching of the Word of God (can. 3), avoiding the possibility of wasting his time in the reading of secular or *heretical literature (can. 5).

Without being sophisticated in his dress and in the tenor of his life (can. 4), he must show himself to be gentle with his clerics (can. 2) and full of goodness toward people of lowly status, *humilibus affabilis* (prologue). The bishop must know how to find help with the numerous obligations that assail him (cans. 6-10); in his governance, he will not follow his own impulses or his own thinking but will remain faithful to the sound *traditions of the church, *patrum definitionibus* (prologue). The rules relating to the conduct of clerics are stringent. They must live simply (cans. 25, 26), with dignity (cans. 27, 28, 34, 68), assiduous in the liturgical offices (can. 35); the bishops must faithfully observe the prescribed fasts (cans. 76, 77), protect themselves from the dangers of too solicitous a ministry, from overly joyous banquets, from familiarity with young *widows and consecrated *virgins (cans. 27, 68, 75). The bishops are asked to be modest and serious (cans. 73, 74, 26) and to not allow themselves to fall into blasphemy, superstitious practices, or to make vulgar or obscene jokes. To escape the temptations of laziness, aimless meandering and suspect friendships (cans. 28, 34), they must commit themselves to making sure that they support themselves with the work of their hands: *artificiolo vel agricultura* (cans. 29, 45), and to enriching their free time with study (cans. 45, 79).

The author of the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* dedicates some 15 canons to recommend harmony, union, good understanding and charity toward all the members of the church, from bishops to the simple faithful. He invites the clerics to abstain from every form of backbiting, envy, false praise and gossiping (cans. 42-44). He requests excommunication for those who unjustly accuse their brethren, and he desires that the testimonies of troublemakers be accepted only with extreme caution (cans. 17, 46). In the same way, he rebukes the usurers, the supporters of discord and those who were unrelenting in vindicating the real or supposed mistakes of others, of which they themselves were victims (can. 55). He set forth very severe punishments against all those who violate the divine law of charity (cans. 17, 43, 44, 47-49); and finally, he denounced the neglect of Christian people, who were negligent in their duties and taken up by the desire for pleasure and monetary gain (cans. 69, 86), love for secular *entertainments (33), religious indifference and a lack of spiritual zeal (cans. 31, 80, 82, 20-24).

Many passages in the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* suppose that a heretical authority is present among the people, which has its own judges, liturgical assemblies and ministers (cans. 30, 80-82). Catholics were exposed to persecutions and thefts, as a result of hatred of others for their faith (can. 70). It does not seem, however, that the churches had to undergo systematic confiscations because crowds of poor people continued to receive assistance (cans. 7, 64, 70, 86).

The evidence of the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* characterizes well the era of transition that existed at the end of the 5th c., between the golden patristic age and the Early Middle Ages. The theological and mystical tendency no longer animates Christian people, who, it seems, are taken up by earthly concerns and are involved in duties of every kind; the clergy rarely performs its duties. Culture itself already seems to escape to the monasteries that are preparing the bishops of tomorrow.

To awaken the dormant faith of the Christian people, to win the barbarians to the truth, to put the church's relatively still intact riches at the service of addressing all the adversities: these were, in its main lines, the directives offered by the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* to the provincial episcopate. Since the early years of the 6th c., the councils presided over by *Caesarius of Arles made every effort to enact them among the people and the clergy.

CCL 148, 162-188; CCL 149, 343-354 (*recensio hispanica*); Ch. Munier, *Les Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, Paris 1960; Hfl-Lecl 2, 102-121; CE 13, 682; LACL 656.

Ch. Munier

STENOGRAPHY. The ancients were familiar with a swift and abbreviated method for writing called tachygraphy, the practice of which spread during the Roman era. Tiro, Cicero's freedman and secretary, developed a system of abbreviated writing called *Notae tironianae*. Knowledge about Greek stenography comes from the papyri, the wax tablets found in *Egypt and also by the manuals that have been preserved. Tachygraphy was very much in use during the 3rd and 4th c. both in the East and West. Public services and courts used stenographers called *notarii.* The Christian communities and the Fathers in turn often used some clerics as stenographers to collect public speeches and debates. When these authors wrote, it was often dictated to a stenographer. Jerome acknowledged: "I do not dictate with the same elegance with which I write. In the latter, I often take over the stylus to compose what deserves to be read; in the former, I dictate whatever comes to mind (*Ep.* 74,6,2; see Ambr., *Ep.* 47,1-2).

The stenographer committed his text to a *chartula* (paper used for a rough draft) or a small wax tablet, which was at times made of wood or boxwood. A stylus with a metallic point was used to

trace some lines on the wax. The tablets could be used indefinitely. The text was transcribed in full and was then revised by the author first to establish its definitive form. This was an exhausting revision, as *Jerome himself confesses (*In Is. comm.* 13, *praef.*; *In Zach. comm.* 2 and 3, *praef.*). *Augustine rebuked himself for not always verifying his citations and revising his own writings with the necessary attention (*Retr.* II,41,2).

See esp. the *Archiv für Stenographie*; E. Chatelain, *Introduction à la lecture des notes tironiennes*, Paris 1900; Ch. Johnen, *Geschichte der Stenographie*, Berlin 1911; A. Mentz, *Antike Stenographie*, Munich 1927; E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*, Oxford 1969; H.H. Boge, *Griechische Tachygraphie und Tironische Noten*, Berlin-Hildesheim 1974 (bibl.); H. Hagendhal, *Die Bedeutung der Stenographie*: JbAC 14 (1971) 24-38 (bibl.); N. Chionides - S. Lilla, *La brachigrafia italo-bizantina*, Vatican City 1981; D. Norberg, *Qui a composé les lettres de saint Grégoire le Grand?*: Studi Medievali 21 (1980) 1-17; H.C. Teitler, *Notarii and Exceptores: An Inquiry into the Role and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire (from the Early Principate to c. 450 A.D.)*, Amsterdam 1985; *Tironische Noten*, ed. P. Ganz, Wiesbaden 1990; Oxford Classical Dictionary, Oxford 1996, 1468-1469.

A. Hamman

STEPHEN (Eddius Stephanus). The *Vita Wilfridi* (CPL 2151; BHL 8889), the first biography on *Wilfrid of York (ca. 633–709), is attributed to a certain *Stephanus presbyter* both in the *praefatio* related by the Oxford MS (Bodleian Library, Fell III.34) and by William of Malmesbury (d. 1142), who in his *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* declares that he made a summary *quae Stephanus presbyter de Wilfrido magno verborum agmine egit* (III, *praef.*). The reference to *Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* has led scholars to identify Stephen with the *cantandi magister*: "Eddius surnamed Stephen, who was called from Kent by the most reverend Wilfrid" (IV,2). So much the more that in ch. 14 of the *Vita*, one reads that Wilfrid returned from Kent in Northumbria, carrying with him the singers Eddius and Aeona. Eddius surnamed Stephen would therefore be *Stephanus presbyter*, the author of the *Vita*, the most ancient "commemorative biography" (Farmer) of Anglo-Saxon England. The identification, however, is not entirely certain (Levison; Kirby 1983), which is why it is perhaps fitting to still speak of Stephen rather than Eddius Stephanus.

A few pieces of information on the author of the *Vita* can be garnered from the *Vita* itself, but certainly only with caution. It is certainly true, e.g., that in 703 the author was present at the Synod of Austerfield (Raine), where Wilfrid, opposing all the Anglo-Saxon bishops, was deprived of his episcopal offices and all his possessions and thereby confined to the monastery of Ripon, which he himself had established (chs. 14-15; 24; 34; 45; 47); to the contrary, however, the use of the first person in his description of the last trip to Rome leads one to believe that Stephen was with Wilfrid on that occasion (chs. 52-53), even if he was not among those who embarked for the Continent along with him (ch. 50). Other passages lead one to think of Stephen's affinity to the monastery of Ripon and its traditions (chs. 17; 45; 52-68), but the complex impression is that the redactor did not belong to the circle of the deceased bishop's closest collaborators.

The composition of the *Vita* was completed shortly before the death of the teacher, which occurred in 709 (Colgrave) or around 715 (according to others; Kirby, however, believes that it was certainly reedited between 731 and 734). One reason for its redaction was probably owed to the spread of the anonymous *Life of Cuthbert* (Colgrave; Moonen). The community of Ripon, upon whose promptings our author went to work, in some respect had to consider Cuthbert as a potential rival to its own founder. Therefore Bishop Acca and the abbot Tatberht, Wilfrid's successors respectively for the episcopal see of Hexham and for the leadership of the monastery of Ripon, commissioned the biography, as we read in the *praefatio*.

Although the author of the *Vita* was Eddius Stephanus, the contact that he had with Wilfrid for nearly 40 years and his proximity to Tatberht and Acca, both connected to the deceased bishop (chs. 65-66), could have supplied him sufficient material. In any case, sources of information are not lacking, and there were, moreover, the memories of the monks who lived in that community as well as those who knew Wilfrid. Stephen seems to have received the tradition of Ripon, which was more interested in the issues and the political events of Wilfrid's biography; less inclined, however, to receive and leave space for the traditions of Hexham, which were inclined toward the miraculous and the visionary (Kirby 1983). In any case it is beyond question that the *Vita* has a marked "political" abridgment; this is the "die politischste unter den frühen Biographien Englands" (Berschin). Its controversial character is also evident, a reflection of the framework of discord experienced by the church and the court of Northumbria between the 20s and the 30s of the 8th c.

One thus understands the attitude assumed by the author toward the protagonist of this document, who is presented with an enthusiasm and a loyalty that are not only personal and affective; but one also understands the very diverse character of the nu-

merous pages, which are substantially respectful but very detached, which Bede dedicated to the same Wilfrid in his *Historia ecclesiastica*. For this reason, it would be inappropriate to speak of a scarce sympathy of the Anglo-Saxon authors for the bishop. Stephen's Wilfrid is entirely one with the fights, ideal and real, that he undertakes and with the situation that he faces: a person gifted with a strong personality, capable of protecting his own prerogatives against the royal power, a defender of Roman orthodoxy in Northumbria (Isenberg), a convinced supporter of the teaching and liturgy of the church of *Rome. This piece of "Romanness" is a point on which the biographer insists in his reconstruction, seeing in it as a whole an aspect of Wilfred's sanctity and the cause of many of his woes and severe trials (Pezzini). His *Vita* was filled with Petrine allusions, and the exaltation of the primacy of *Peter becomes one of the structural motifs of the biographic instruction, alongside the celebrative and commemorative objective. It is significant, in this sense, that the miracles attributed to the bishop (chs. 1; 18; 23; 24; 34; 36; 37, etc.) resume the scriptural typology present in the *Vita* of *Benedict contained in the second book of *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* (Lazzari). The double relationship with the Petrine primacy and Gregory the Great, however, is not an exclusive features of the *Vita* and shows through even from what Bede writes, who, however, considerably diminishes the elements of conflict within the bishop's career.

The more hagiographical elements (presence and role of the miraculous, models of sanctity, hagiographic sources, etc.) of the *Vita* has been the object of independent studies (Berschin; Foley; Prinz 1992 and 2002), while the biblical material present in the document has been collected and analyzed (Foley), a rereading of which has been proposed in light of the instruments and categories of the then contemporary biblical *exegesis, ideas of *allegory and esp. typology (Laynesmith).

Editions: CPL 2151; BHL 8889; J. Raine, *The Historians of the Church of York*, I, London 1879, 1-103; *Vita Wilfridi I episcopi Eboracensis*, MGH, *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*, VI, Hannoverae 1913, 163-263, ed. W. Levison; *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave, Cambridge 1927 (repr. 1985); Eddius Stephanus, *Het Leven van Sint Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. C.H. Moonen (P. Honorius O.E.S.A.), 's-Hertogenbosch 1946; *Lives of the Saints: The Voyage of St Brendan; Bede: Life of Cuthbert; Eddius Stephanus: Life of Wilfrid*, trans. J.F. Webb, Harmondsworth, MD 1965, 131-206 (= *The Age of Beda*, Harmondsworth, MD 1983, 105-182); *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Heroes*, trans. C. Albertson, New York 1967, 89-162.

Studies: R.L. Poole, *Eddius' Life of Wilfrith*: English Historical Review 33 (1919) 1-24; R.L. Poole, *Saint Wilfrid and the See of Ripon: Studies in Chronology and History*, Oxford 1934, 56-81; H. Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, London 1972 ([3]1991) 129-147; *Saint Wilfrid at Hexham*, ed. D.P. Kirby, Newcastle upon Tyne 1974; A. Thacker, *The Social and Continental Background to Early Anglo-Saxon Hagiography*, Phil. Diss. University of Oxford 1976; G. Isenberg, *Die Würdigung Wilfrieds von York in der "Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum" Bedas un der "Vita Wilfridi " des Eddius. Ein Vergleich der verschiedenen literarischen Intentionen und der unterschiedlichen historischen Voraussetzungen*, Münster 1978; D.P. Kirby, *Bede, Eddius Stephanus and the "Life of Wilfrid"*: English Historical Review 98 (1983) 101-114; W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*. II, *Merowingische Biographie Italien, Spanien und die Inseln im frühen Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1988, 296-300; G.R.J. Jones, *"Broninis"*: Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 37 (1990) 125-132; I.N. Wood, *Ripon, Francia and the Franks Casket*: Northern History 26 (1990) 1-19; M. Richter, *The English Link in Hiberno-Frankish Relations in the Seventh Century*, in *Ireland and Northern France. AD 600–800*, ed. by J.-M. Picard, Dublin 1991, 95-118; A. Williams - A.P. Smyth - D.P. Kirby (eds.), *A Biographical Dictionary of Dark Age Britain: England, Scotland and Wales, c. 500–c. 1050*, London 1991, 123; S. Hollis, *Anglo-Saxon Women and the Church: Sharing a Common Fate*, Woodbridge 1992; S. Kuttner, *"Auctor noster beatus Petrus Apostolus": Pope Agatho on the Papal Office*, in *Studia in Honorem Eminentissimi Cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, ed. R.S. Castillo Lara, Rome 1992, 215-224; F. Prinz, *Kirchen und Klöster als literarische Auftraggeber*, in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, Spoleto 1992, II, 759-788; A. Scharer, *Gesellschaftliche Zustände im Spiegel des Heiligenlebens: einige Folgerungen aus den Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Cuthberth*: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 100 (1992) 103-116; W.T. Foley, *Images of Sanctity in Eddius Stephanus' "Life of Bishop Wilfrid": An Early English Saint's Life*, Lewiston, NY 1992; Patrologia IV, 413 and 426-427 (G.R. Evans); R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Turnhout 1997, 106 and 633; D. Pezzini, *Vilfredo di York*, in *Il grande libro dei santi*, 3, Cinisello Balsamo 1998, 1929-1931; M.D. Laynesmith, *Stephen of Ripon and the Bible: Allegorical and Typological Interpretations of the "Life of St Wilfrid"*: Early Medieval Europe 9 (2000) 163-182; L. Lazzari, *Il primato di Pietro nella "Vita Wilfridi,"* in *La figura di San Pietro nelle fonti del Medioevo.* Atti del Convegno tenutosi in occasione dello *Studiorum universitatum docentium congressus* (Viterbo e Rome 5-8 settembre 2000), ed. L. Lazzari - A.M. Valente Bacci, Louvain-la-Neuve 2001, 81-111; F. Prinz, *Hagiographie und Welthaltigkeit. Überlegungen zur Vielfalt des Hagiographischen Genus in Frühmittelalter*: Hagiographica 9 (2002) 1-17 (= in *Scripturus vitam. Lateinische Biographie von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart: Festgabe für Walter Berschin zum 65. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg 2002, 49-58).

B. Clausi

STEPHEN, the first martyr. The *martyrdom of Stephen constitutes the first NT account that has a *hagiographical character (Acts 6–7). Stephen was stoned to death outside *Jerusalem at a time in which the Roman prefecture was vacant, perhaps AD 31 or 32. The stoning was in conformity to Jewish customs, but it was outside the norms established by Roman judicial procedure.

The saint's *relics were found in 415 by the priest *Lucian, who was appointed to the parish at Kefar Gamala and who wrote a report in this regard (BHL 7850-7856). The relics were then transferred to Jerusalem on 26 December 415, in the church of St. Zion. The *Mart. syr.* had earlier assigned the feast of St. Stephen to 26 December. Bishop *Juvenal constructed a basilica on what was believed to be the place of the stoning and had *Cyril of Alexandria inaugurate it in 439 (PG 85,469). The empress *Eudoxia enlarged it, but the Persians destroyed it. Another basilica was built by *Melania (SC 90,255-258).

Already before *Gregory of Nyssa (PG 56,701-736), *Asterius of Amasea (PG 40,337-352) and *Basil of Seleucia (PG 85,461-473) had written the saint's *panegyric. From the *Mart. syr.*, the feast passed into the *Mart. hier.* and the *Calendarium Carth*. But the discovery of the relics in 415 and their subsequent spread gave new life to the diffusion of Stephen's cult. With respect to this evolution, *Augustine's attitude remained significant for *Africa and determinative for Western Europe. In fact, from the 5th c. onward, the saint's relics were found everywhere: in the *Baleari, *Africa, at *Constantinople, at *Rome where the church of S. Stephano Rotondo dates back to ca. 450, at Bourges, etc. Numerous episcopal churches bore his name. The letter of his feast (Acts 6:8-11; 7:54–8:1) was translated into Romance languages, and these translations, along with the Latin text, continued to be sung until the 19th c.

Vies des SS. 12, 687-702; Cath 4, 571-574; LTK 9, 1050-1052; BS 11, 1376-1392; V. Saxer, *L'épître farcie de la Saint Étienne "Sesta Lesson"*: Provence historique 23 (1973) 318-326; 24 (1974) 423-467; Id., *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*, Paris 1980, 245-278; T. Baumeister, *Das Stephanus patrozinium der Kirche im ehemaligen Isis-Tempel von Philä*: RQA 81 (1986) 187-194.

V. Saxer

STEPHEN, the first martyr (apocryphal). Stephen the deacon, known from the Acts of the Apostles (6:8–8:3) was very popular in the Christian world: there exist homilies by *Gregory of Nyssa, *Asterius of Amasea, *Basil of Seleucia, *Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Augustine and other writers, esp. after the discovery of his tomb by *Lucian of Caphar Gamala in 415. His relics were transferred to *Africa (Evodius, PL 41,833-854; Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 22,8,10-19.21), Minorca (Severus, PL 20,731-746), *Constantinople (Anastasius, PL 41,817-822), *Rome (AB 49 [1931] 112-116) and in other various episcopal sees of the West.

Lucian's work was originally written in Greek and was translated into Latin by *Avitus of Braga (PL 41,805-816). Nevertheless, doubt remains whether this translation, known as the *Revelatio S. Stefani*, is not in reality the reworking of the *apocryphal text titled *The Apocalypse of Stephen*, which was condemned by the **Decretum* (*ps.*-)*Gelasianum* 5,5,3. Unfortunately we do not have the written testimony of the original, but accounts of the *Passion of St. Stephen* exist in Greek, which are connected to the *Revelatio S. Stephani* written by Lucian. These two texts also exist in an Aramaic version (fragments), as well as *Syriac, *Armenian, *Georgian, *Ethiopian and Slavic versions. In these Stephen's preaching, stoning, burial and the subsequent discovery of the tomb, after several centuries, are recounted in several versions; mention is also made of the stoning, alongside Stephen, of Gamaliel, his son Habib and his cousin Nicodemus. According to the account offered by Lucian, their relics were also found in Stephen's tomb. The aforementioned document by Evodius's *De *miraculis S. Stephani*, in two books, provides an interesting description of St. Stephen's miracles and an important testimony to the cult of his relics.

CANT 300-303; BHG 1648-1665; BHL 7848-7895; BHO 1086-1097; F.M. Abel, DBS 2, 1933, 1132-1146; LCIK 8, 395-403; H. Leclercq, DACL 5, 624-671; BS 11, 1968, 1376-1394. N. Marr, PO 19, 1926, 629-671 (Georgian version, Fr. tr.); M. van Esbroeck, AB 102 (1984) 101-105 (Georgian tr.); Franko 3, 1902, 28-33, 256-259 (Slavic version); B.C. Mercier, ROC 30 (1946) 341-369 (Armenian version, Fr. tr.); J.P. Lang, *Anecdota Syriaca*, 3, Leiden 1870, 77-84 (Syriac text, intro. in Ger. by V. Ryssel, ZKG 15 [1895] 233-240); A. Strus, Salesianum 58 (1996) 21-54 (Greek version, It. tr.); Id., Salesianum 60 (1998) 81-96 (Greek version, It. tr.); S. Vanderinden, *Revelatio S. Stephani* (*BHL 7850-6*), REB 4 (1946) 178-217 (Lat. version, Fr. tr.). I. Franko, *Revelatio S. Stephani*: ZNW 7 (1906) 151-171; F.M. Abel, *La légende apocryphe de St. Étienne. À propos de quelques textes géorgiens*, Jerusalem 1939; J. Martin, *Die Revelatio S. Stephani und Verwandtes*: Historisches Jahrbuch 77 (1958) 419-433; M. van Esbroeck, *Jean II et les cultes de St. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix*: AB 102 (1984) 98-134; A. Strus, *L'Origine de l'apocryphe grec de la passion de S. Étienne*: EphLit 112 (1998) 18-57; Id., *Bet Gemal, Pathway of the Tradition of Saints Stephen and Gamaliel*, Rome 2000; Id., *Bet Gemal and the Byzantine Tradition Regarding St. Stephan*, in *Ecce ascendimus Jerosolymam* (*Lc 18,31*), ed. F. Mosetto, Rome 2003, 399-418.

M. Starowieyski

STEPHEN I, pope (254–257). The brief pontificate of Pope Stephen is known from *Cyprian's collection of letters (*Ep.* 67-75) and from a few pieces of information provided by *Eusebius of Caesarea's *History* (HE 7,2-9). Living between the *Decian and *Valerian persecutions, his pontificate was troubled by the controversies pertaining to *penance and *baptism. The fact that during the first controversy a

Spanish bishop appealed to him (*Ep.* 67,5) and that in the case of *Marcian the bishop of *Arles, Cyprian asked him to intervene (*Ep.* 68), displays the authority that the Roman church had obtained during that time. Pope Stephen, however, acc. to the testimony of Cyprian himself and *Firmilian, rejected any repetition of baptism and supported his position on the basis of an unchangeable *tradition (*Ep.* 74,1-2) and appealed to his Petrine succession (*Ep.* 75,17). He thereby clashed with the resistance of the African and Cappadocian churches. The two positions had different understandings of baptism. Cyprian viewed baptism as an incorporation into the church, while Stephen perceived it to be an act of Christ. The conflict, moreover, displayed more clearly to what extent the Roman church had become aware of its position of primacy in the universal church. Stephen died at the beginning of the new persecution, but not as a martyr. His death also brought an end to the controversy with the African church.

Cyprian, *Ep.* CSEL 3/2; CCL 3A. - AASS Aug. I, 112-146; K. Baus, HKG I (Freiburg [3]1965) 379-380, 401-407; U. Wickert, *Paulus, der erste Klemens und Stephan von Rom*: ZKG 79 (1968) 145-158; S.G. Hall, *Stephen of Rome and the One Baptism*: SP 17, Oxford 1982, 796-798; LTK[3] 9, 967; LACL (2000) 657; TRE 32 (2001) 153-157; EPapi 1, 281-285 (with bibl.).

B. Studer

STEPHEN II of Hierapolis-Mabbug (end of the 6th c.). Author around 592–594 of a passion of St. Golindukh. On the original lost *Syriac text depend a Greek reorganization, redacted by *Eustratius of *Constantinople, and a *Georgian translation. It is uncertain whether the same author also composed a fragmentary Greek treatise against the *monophysite sect of the *Agnoetae, transmitted under his name.

CPG III, 7005-7006; DSp 4, 1493-1494; DHGE 15, 1234-1235; F. Diekamp, *Analecta patristica* (OCA 117), Rome 1938, 154-160; G. Garitte, *La passion géorgienne de sainte Golindouch*: AB 74 (1956) 405-440.

S.J. Voicu

STEPHEN BAR SUDHAILE (5th–6th c.). We have information on Stephen bar Sudhaile thanks to two of his opponents, both anti-*Chalcedonians, as well as major authors of Syriac literature, namely *Jacob of Sarug (d. 521) and *Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 523), who allow for a chronological dating between the 2nd half of the 5th and the 1st quarter of the 6th c. Although Jacob of Sarug, in a letter he sent with respect, rebuked Stephen for a theory on the termination of hell and the absence of a final judgment, which threw into crisis the concept of divine retribution, Philoxenus of Mabbug's letter, which he wrote around 510 to two presbyters of *Edessa, Abraham and Orestes, at a time in which Stephen had emigrated to *Jerusalem and devoted himself to an anonymous correspondence with monks and nuns, also sending them his works, is very circumscribed. According to the bishop, Stephen was trying (1) to assimilate the whole creation to God, inasmuch as everything will have to become like him; (2) to exaggerate divine mercy toward sin, to the point that there will be no last judgment, thereby annulling the meaning of *baptism, *Eucharist and asceticism; and (3) to theorize that everything possesses God's nature. Moreover, the bishop provided information on the mystical exegesis of Lk 13:32 ("Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I finish my course"), where the three days are understood in a cosmological and mystical sense: Friday, the sixth day of the week, is a day in which the world was established and is a place of evil (crucifixion); Saturday is the day of rest (*descensus ad inferos*), in which Christ is all and is in every human being, although the first day of the week (Sunday) is the time of the consummation, when God will become all in all things (1 Cor 15:28), one nature, one substance and one divinity. At that time there will be no distinction between creature and Creator and neither between *Father, Son and *Holy Spirit, inasmuch as all things will be mixed together. Moreover, Philoxenus makes known that on the wall of Stephen's cell the following was written: "Every nature [*kull kyān*] is consubstantial [*bar kyānā*] with the essence [*ītūtā*]," and that the monk visited for a certain period a heretic named *John the Egyptian. All of these accusations, which only rarely seem to report Stephen's actual words and that often take the monk's positions to an extreme, give us a glimpse, however, into a world of ideas taken from the *Origenian matrix filtered through the writings of *Evagrius of Pontus and taken to extreme consequences.

The primary critical problem pertaining to Stephen bar Sudhaile is posed by the existence in *Syriac of a text entitled *The Book of St. *Hierotheus* behind the pseudonym that the medieval Syriac tradition identified with Stephen bar Sudhaile spoken of by Jacob of Sarug and Philoxenus of Mabbug: this attribution dates back to the Syrian-orthodox patriarch Cyriacus (793–817) and is maintained by the commentary on the *Book of Hierotheus* written by the patriarch Theodosius (887–896) and then by that text written by Gregory bar Hebraeus (13th c.).

Before facing the question of the relationship between Stephen and the Syriac work, it is necessary to briefly present the problem of the pseudonym. A Hierotheus, identified by modern scholarship as a possible pseudonym for the philosopher *Proclus or a *Neoplatonist Christian teacher, is cited in the writings of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite: he also appears there as a teacher of Dionysius, who in turn was a disciple of *Paul of Tarsus (Acts 17:34). The ps.-Dionysian corpus dates back to around the year AD 500, inasmuch as *Severus of Antioch cites them in 518/520 and again in 528, and they also seem to presuppose the speculations of the Neoplatonist philosopher Proclus, who died in 485. From this fact one can conclude that the Syriac work makes the claim to having been written by the teacher of ps.-Dionysius, presenting himself in a certain way as the secret and original source of the ps.-Dionysian literature.

The book, which has come down to us thanks to the Syro-Western MS tradition and is rather large, is divided into five parts (*mēmrê*): the first speaks of the ordering of the cosmos; the second, the third and fourth treat the rise of the νοῦς; the fifth treats the question of *eschatology.

There have been various suggestions for interpreting the *Book of Hierotheus* both with respect to its unity and its relation to Stephen bar Sudhaile, which is described by Philoxenus of Mabbug. In its major features, the book displays the clear influence of Evagrius of Pontus, but there are also primary lexical and conceptual contacts with the writings of ps.-Dionysius and other traditions of Egyptian and Palestinian *monasticism. This fact, like numerous incongruencies of structure and vocabulary, has opened a literary debate that is not easy to resolve, which has witnessed the dominance of two primary theses: (1) the work is written by one person, but its author was unable to unite all the sources at his disposal; (2) the work exhibits traces not only of interpolations but also of real editorial interventions, and therefore it is not at all unified work but was composed at two separate stages by different authors. However, the problem of the relationship between the content of the work and what Philoxenus of Mabbug affirmed with respect to Stephen's theology remains an unsettled debate: there are certainly many points of contact, but there are also some missing points in the *Book of Hierotheus* that make it difficult to hypothesize that the bishop reacted to the work as we know it today. Today, the thesis that the *Book of Hierotheus* presupposes the existence of the ps.-Dionysian corpus, placing itself in a dialectical relationship with it, has won a certain following: by now it is certain that this work was written after the appearance of this body of literature.

The framework recently proposed by Pinggéra appears to be a clever attempt to resolve the perplexing difficulties of research on Stephen. He sets forth the distinction between two redactional strata: the first is saturated with Evagrian thought; the second, which is likewise Evagrian in orientation, is also in dialectic with the formal aspects and the language of the ps.-Dionysian corpus, which he knew well, and the anti-Evagrian potential of which he was fully aware. To the second redactional phase one must trace (1) the idea of creating a pseudonym for the author of the book, that Hierotheus the teacher of Dionysius was at the origin of the latter's theology; (2) the presence of ps.-Dionysian material, although an Evagrian orientation remains; (3) the reaction against the letter of Philoxenus of Mabbug, to whose criticisms the second redactor would be responding.

Duval 356-358; Baumstark 167, 350; Chabot 66-67; Ortiz de Urbina 103-104; DSp 4, 1481-1488; Patrologia V, 468-469. Edition of Jacob of Sarug and Philoxenus of Mabbug 's Letters: A.L. Frothimgham, *Stephen Bar Sudhaili the Syrian Mystic* (*c. 500 A.D.*) *and the Book of Hierotheos on the Hidden Treasures of the Divinity*, Leiden 1886. Ed. of the text: F.S. Marsh, *The Book of the Holy Hierotheos Ascribed to Stephen bar Sudhaile*, London-Oxford 1927. On the book, its contents and critical problems, in addition to the introduction by Marsh, see: I. Hausherr, *L'influence du "Livre de saint Hiérothée,"* in *De doctrina spirituali christianorum orientalium quaestiones et scripta* I, in *Orientalia Christiana* 30, Rome 1933, 176-211; A. Guillaumont, *Les "Képhalaia gnostica" d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens*, Paris 1962; K. Pinggéra, *All-Erlösung und All-Einheit. Studien zum Buch des heiligen Hierotheos und seiner Rezeption in der syrisch-orthodoxen Theologie* (Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients, 10), Wiesbaden 2002.

A. Camplani

STEPHEN GOBAR (6th c.). *Monophysite, follower of the so-called *tritheism of *John Philoponus, who—it seems—lived in the 6th c. *Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 232) describes one of his works which treated 52 questions of various topics (*theology, *cosmology, *anthropology and *eschatology), providing for each question passages from authors who represented the official teaching of the church and passages of authors who supported erroneous teachings.

CPG III, 7300; PG 103, 1092-1105 (fragments); R. Henry, Photius, *Bibliothèque*, Paris 1967, V, 67ff.; G. Bardy, *Le florilège d'Étienne Gobar*: REB 5 (1947) 5-30; 7 (1949) 51-52; BBKL X, 1371-1374; Patrologia V, 388-389.

M. Simonetti

STEPHEN of Bostra (7th–8th c.). One cannot prove that he was the bishop of the city (in the province of Arabia). He lived between the 7th and 8th c., certainly before *John of Damascus, who reports from his work *Against the Jews* (Λόγος κατὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων), who were evidently favorable to the iconoclasts, two passages in defense of the cult to the sacred images (*De imag.* III, *testimonia*: PG 94,1376). The work was also mentioned and cited by other writers. All the fragments were collected by A. Mai (*Opere minori*, ST 76, Rome 1937, 202-207).

CPG III, 7790; Bardenhewer 5, 47; Beck 447 and 831 (index); DHGE 15, 1211; Patrologia V, 297-298.

A. De Nicola

STEPHEN of Ephesus (5th c). First a presbyter (ca. 400) and then the bishop of *Ephesus (448), at an advanced age he went to recover with force *Bassianus's episcopal see, who in turn from 444, although being appointed by Bishop *Memnon to another episcopal see, was placed by the people at the head of the church of Ephesus. Stephen sought to depose Bassianus through the pope, but the emperor *Theodosius II deferred a decision on this matter to the Council of *Chalcedon (451), which in its 11th and 12th sessions deprived both bishops of their ecclesiastical office, judging them unworthy of governing the church (Mansi VII,271-300). Stephen aligned himself against *Flavian of Constantinople to increase the prestige of his episcopal see. According to Honigmann, Stephen redacted the original Greek version of the legend of the *Seven Sleepers of Ephesus to increase the political and ecclesiastical weight of the see of Ephesus.

CPG 8964, 9014, 9016; ACO II, I, 3, 42-56; DHGE VI, 1274-1275; DCB IV, 738-739; E. Honigmann, *Stephen of Ephesus* (*April 15, 448 - Oct. 29, 451*) *and the Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, ST 173, Vatican City 1953, 125-168; S. Acerbi, *Conflitti politico-ecclesiastici in Oriente nella tarda antichità. Il II Concilio di Efeso* (*449*), Madrid 2001 (passim).

P. Marone

STEPHEN of Larissa (6th c.). Bishop of Larissa at the time of the emperor *Justinian (527–565). He is known from the acts of the Roman council that was held *in consistorio B*(*eati*) *Andreae* on 7 and 9 December 531 and presided over by Pope *Boniface II (530–532). Stephen, although a layman and a soldier, was called by the clergy and the people of Larissa to succeed Bishop Proclus, who had died shortly before. The presbyter Anthony and two suffragan bishops, Demetrius and Probian, who also had approved election, turned to *Epiphanius patriarch of Constantinople (520–535) against this ordination, claiming that it was performed against the canonical norms. Epiphanius immediately deposed Stephen without providing any reasons and brought him by force to *Constantinople, where he held him prisoner. Stephen, who from the beginning had made an appeal to *Rome, because since ancient times *Thessaly had belonged to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, was able to send from Constantinople two letters to the pope, which, in addition to affirming the pope's primacy over the entire church, attested to Rome's jurisdiction over Illyricum. The second letter narrates the trial to which Stephen was subjected by the patriarch at Constantinople. The patriarch did not at all take into account Stephen's appeal to the pope; in fact the appeal had irritated him even more, so that as a result Stephen was accused of attacking the rights of the patriarchal church. Epiphanius did everything in his power to prevent the appeal from arriving to Rome, but he was unsuccessful. Theodosius, the suffragan bishop of Larissa, came to Rome and delivered Stephen's letters and some of the other suffragan bishops of Larissa, letters which were accompanied by 26 documents (letters), almost all of popes and emperors, which confirmed Rome's jurisdiction over Illyricum. During the council the letters of appeal were read and the authenticity of the attached documents was verified with the originals that were preserved in the archives of the Church of Rome.

The judgment the council delivered has not survived, because the *Acts* are missing from the end of the document. The events surrounding Stephen should be framed within Constantinople's attempts to remove Illyricum from Rome's jurisdiction.

Mansi 8, 739-784; critical ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Epistolae Roman. Pontif. ad vicarios per Illyr . . . Collectio Thessalonic.*: Textus et documenta. Series Theologica 23, Rome 1937; Hfl-Lecl 2,2, 1117-1119; DCB 4, 740, n. 22; Fliche-Martin IV, n. 809, 676.

A. De Nicola

STEPHEN of Thebes. The multifaceted monastic literature that developed following the great *christological controversies included some writings of the monk Stephen of Thebes. To his name were ascribed the *Logos askētikos*, the *Diataxis* and the *Entolai*, these last two conjointly published on the basis of a single testimony, along with a prayer to Christ, perhaps by the same author. Edited in Greek, Arabic and Georgian versions, the *Logos askētikos* collects the teachings for the noncenobitic monastic life, i.e., it

treats the renunciation of the world, asceticism, the practice of remaining in one's cell and how to ward off evil thoughts. In a different way, the *Diataxis* and the *Entolai* pertain to instructions for the already-advanced monk's outward behavior, with advice for trips outside the monastery, meals, psalmody, going to sleep, visits and the reception of guests.

Until today, the historical identity of Stephen of Thebes remains uncertain. Although scholars entertain reservations concerning the identification of the Thebain monk of the *Diataxis*, inasmuch as he partially overlaps the *Logoi* 3 and 4 of the monk Isaiah of Sceti (E. Lucchesi), one must discard the hypothesis that the MS tradition errs with regard to the name. In fact, the first editor thought that the monk could have been identified with Stephen the Sabaite, an 8th-c. monk and a nephew of *John of Damascus, but textual criticism rejects this identification (J. Darrouzès).

J. Darrouzès, v. *Étienne le Thébain*: DSp IV (1961) 1525-1526; J.-M. Sauget, *Une version arabe du "Sermon ascétique" d'Étienne le Thébain*: Muséon 77 (1964) 367-406; É. Des Places, *Le "Discours ascétique" d'Étienne de Thèbes. Texte grec inédite et traduction*: Muséon 82 (1969) 35-59; G. Garitte, *Le "Discours ascétique" d'Étienne le Thébain en géorgien*: Muséon 83 (1970) 73-93; E. Lucchesi, *Une version copte du* Sermo asceticus *d'Étienne le Thébain*: AB 115 (1997) 252; P. Bruns, v. *Stefano Tebaita*, in *Dizionario di letteratura cristiana antica*, Rome 2006, 793.

V. Lombino

STILICHO, Flavius (ca. 360–408). General of the *Vandals, born around 360, he made a name for himself during the war against the *Visigoths (391–392), reaching the rank of *magister militum*. Even though he married Serena, niece of the emperor *Theodosius I, he had to battle against the resistance of the Roman aristocracy. Despite repeated military successes, he quickly had to abandon the E part of the empire, exercising in the West the guardianship of the emperor *Honorius. He fought victoriously in *Africa against *Gildo (398); he then defeated *Alaric, the first time during the invasion of 401 and subsequently in the battle of Pollentium. In 406, he was again victorious against Radagaisus. Stilicho's successes in war were insufficient in preventing the loss of the Western emperor's sympathy. In 408, a rebellion broke out against which he would not and could not defend himself and, delivered ino the hands of the rebels, he was executed along with his wife Serena and his son Eucherius.

An ungrateful judgment weighed on Stilicho's attempt to govern the state in a traditional way, the state by that point at the crossroads between propensities toward special interests and the new demands of the barbarians. *Augustine's cautious silence is contrasted with the open accusations of *Jerome and *Orosius. An opposing voice based on objective data was that of Rutilius Namatianus.

S. Mazzarino, *S. La crisi imperiale dopo Teodosio*, Rome 1942 = Milan 1990, with extensive introduction by A. Giardina; E. Nischer-Falkenhof, *Stilicho*, Vienna 1947; L. Cracco Ruggini, *"De morte persecutorum" e polemica antibarbarica nella storiografia pagana e cristiana. A proposito della disgrazia di Stilicho*: RSLR 4 (1968) 433-447; L. Vàrady, *Stilicho proditor arcani imperii*: Acta Antiqua Hung. 16 (1968) 413-432; A.D.E. Cameron, *Theodosius the Great and the Regency of Stilicho*: Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 73 (1969) 247-280; M.R. Alföldi, *Zum Datum der Aufgabe der Residenz Treviri unter Stilicho*: Jahrbuch f. Numismatik und Geldgeschichte 20 (1970) 241-248; M. Miller, *Stilicho's Pictish War*: Britannia 6 (1975) 141-145; S. Cristo, *The Relationship of Symmachus to Stilicho and Claudian*: Atene e Rome 21 (1976) 53-59; J.L. Sebesta, *On Stilicho's Consulship: Variations on a Theme by Claudian*: The Classical Bulletin 54 (1977-78) 72-75; C. Castello, *L'umanesimo cristiano di Stilicho*, in *Atti del IV Convegno int. dell'Accademia romaistica Costantiniana*, Perugia 1981, 65-96; A. Marcone, *Simmaco e Stilicho*: F. Paschoud (ed.), *Colloque genèvois sur Symmaque*, Paris 1986, 145-162; Id., *Stilicho "parens publicus"*: ZPE 70 (1987) 222-224; R. Scharf, *Die Kanzleireform des Stilichs und das römische Britannien*: Historia 39 (1990) 461-474; B. Isaac, *The Limits of Empire: The Roman Army in the East*, Oxford [2]1992; P. MacGeorge, *Late Roman Warlords*, Oxford 2002.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

STOBI. Ancient city of Macedonia (former Yugoslavia) at the intersection of the Crna (Erigon) and Vardar (Axios) Rivers, nearly 160 km (99.4 mi) N of Thessalonica, the episcopal see of *Macedonia Salutaris and subsequently of Macedonia Secunda. The city existed as a part of Paeonia from the end of the 4th c. and at the beginning of the 3rd c. BC; it became a municipium in the first years of the Roman Empire and was likewise making its own coins at least from AD 69 to 222. John Stobaeus (5th c.) was a native of Stobi. The city was abandoned, then destroyed, perhaps by an earthquake, before the end of the 6th c., although the bishops continued to bear the name of the see at least until the end of the 7th c.

Excavations carried out by American and Yugoslavian scholars during the 1970s and 1980s have considerably increased our understanding of the culture and art of Stobi, esp. with respect to Late Antiquity. Earlier Yugoslavian excavations (1924–1940) had already brought to light part of the urban center. The excavations were particularly important not only for understanding the evolution of the urban structure during the first six c. AD, but also for the well-preserved architecture and the monumental decorative arts, esp. the mosaics and the frescoes. The 4th c. was represented by the imperial palaces—which continued in the 5th c.—such as the palace of

*Theodosius and the adjacent house of Parthenius, and the house of Peristeria: all buildings with a rich variety of floor mosaics. The palace of Theodosius even had some wall mosaics in a room and an open courtyard paved in marble *opus sectile* or wallpaper templates. To the S of the synagogue, near the theater, was the most ancient and well-preserved church of the Balkan Peninsula: the basilica with three aisles constructed in the 4th c. with floor mosaics containing geometric designs in the central aisle and in the presbyterium—combined here with *opus sectile*—a red limestone floor in the aisles and frescoes on the walls and the ceiling.

Both the synagogue and the early church were reconstructed in the 5th c. with larger Christian basilicas (respectively the central and the episcopal basilica); moreover, another four basilicas are known for this period: there is one to the N with a small cross-shaped baptistery, the cemeterial basilica just beyond that door that opened onto the street to Heraclea Lyncestis, the Palikura basilica nearly 2 km (1.2 mi) to the S and last the basilica beyond the Erigon River. The episcopal basilica is of special interest because of the quantity of mosaics preserved in the S aisle, the narthex in a room to the S and in the central aisle, and for the frescoes and mosaics in the baptistery, which has been very well preserved, a tetraconch contained in a squared structure. In it, the mosaic that circles the broad baptismal pool has four primary scenes, two of deer and two of peacocks alongside an overflowing *kantharos*. The life-size paintings on the baptistery's walls include scenes perhaps from the life of Christ and images of the saints addressing an audience. The architectural embellishments of the baptistery and the episcopal basilica, with decorations of the capitals, later increased the importance of this ancient city for the study of Late Antique art and architecture.

E. Kitzinger, *A Survey of the Early Christian Town of Stobi*: DOP 3 (1946) 81-161; R.E. Hoddinot, *Early Byzantine Churches in Macedonia and Southern Serbia*, London 1962; J.R. Wiseman, *Stobi in Yugoslavian Macedonia: Excavations and Research*: Journal of Field Archaeology 5 (1978) 391-491 (with bibl.); *Studies in the Antiquities of Stobi*, I-II, ed. J.R. Wiseman, Beograd 1973-75; III, ed. B. Aleksova - J. Wiseman, Titov Veles 1981; J.R. Wiseman, *The City in Macedonia Secunda*, in *Villes et peuplement dans l'Illyricum protobyzantin*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome, Rome 1984, 289-314; J. Wiseman, *Archaeology and History at Stobi, Macedonia*, in *Rome and Provinces*, ed. B. McClendon, New Haven, CT 1986, 37-83; B. Aleksova, *The Old Episcopal Basilica at Stobi*, Thessaloniki 1991; B. Aleksova, *Early Christian and Slav Religious Centres in Macedonia*, in *Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae*, Split-Poreč 25 settembre - 1 ottobre 1994, Vatican City 1998, 7-28.

N. Cambi

STOICISM and the FATHERS. Early Christian preaching and exposition had a primarily Semitic structure, even though the *koinē* language of certain books of the OT had already given signs of contact with *Hellenistic culture. Initially, Christianity spread quickly in *Syria, *Asia Minor and *Egypt. Subsequently, through the same routes and in the same period in which other Eastern religions worked out their great achievements, Christianity had recourse to the *koinē*, also spreading in Hellenistic-Roman cultural areas, and it gradually undertook a process of creating a special language that, on the one hand, assumed concepts and terms typical of Western thought and, on the other, requalified them semantically by properly biblical conceptions. Some expressive models of the Greco-Roman context, esp. the various forms of *Middle Platonism and *Platonism, in the eyes of various Christian thinkers seemed esp. suitable with respect to the demands of preaching and the first formal elaboration of the truth announced and believed. But at least until *Clement of Alexandria, around 230, when the Platonic influence prevailed, Christianity was seen primarily in comparison with Stoicism.

The Academy, in fact, in its various reformulations, presented itself as a bitter rival of the Stoa, but always in a dialectical relation of distinction-assimilation, emphasized esp. by Antiochus of Ascalona, who came to the point of maintaining that Zeno the Stoic was a Platonist reformer, definitively proposing instead of Platonism an eclectic Stoicism of the type that was already introduced in the Academy by Panaetius and Posidonius. In the last two centuries before Christ, becoming less rigid and opening toward a certain eclecticism common to all contemporary philosophical positions, Stoicism came close to the Platonism of the Academy, the philosophical institution that at that time was ready to receive in large measure Stoic teaching, esp. the theory—accepted even by the Platonists and *Aristotelians—of the eternity of the cosmos. At the same time, Panaetius of Rhodes, who arrived at Rome in 143 BC with Scipio Africanus, spread among the Roman aristocracy a type of modified Stoicism, which not only abandoned the traditional theory of the cosmic conflagration but also divination (a theme connected to the concepts of divinity and providence), attributing value, at least relative, to exterior goods and pleasure. To Posidonius and the milieu of Stoicized Platonism, or Platonizing Stoicism, belong the Platonic ideas identifiable, at least acc. to Antiochus of Ascalon, with inherent wisdom in the mind produced from the divine and provident fiery-reason; as well as the ideas of astral im-

mortality (the souls of good human beings return to the ethereal regions of their provenance); ideas of the contemplation of the movement of celestial bodies as a precursor of the functioning of the divine reason; and ideas of the eternal cosmos conceived as a single organism governed by a divine power, that has a place and is manifested in the luminous regions, in the visible gods (the sun and other celestial bodies), and to which is also akin the highest part of the human being.

The Stoicism contemporary to Christianity is presented on the one hand as a speculative "vision of the world" and, on the other hand, as a sincere concern and a participant in the needs of the age even if "one will have to attribute to the Stoa the notions that Middle Platonism transmitted to the Fathers, when they bear the specific stamp of the Stoic school" (Spanneut IV,154). Also to be regarded as akin to Stoicism is any idea present in the Holy *Scriptures but which was developed with special insistence by Stoicism (*Philo of Alexandria, the Jew, was able to find, in a certain way "hidden" in the folds of the biblical books, the ethics of the Cynics, the physical and psychological theology of the ancient Stoics and a good dose of mixed Platonism, as well as the mysticism of neo-Pythagorean numbers), although in the extant texts of the ancient and middle Stoa traces of *Judaism did not emerge (Spanneut II,130). The foundational concepts of Zeno's Stoicism of cosmopolitanism, humanitarianism and universal brotherhood; the reconciliation of humanity; and the idea of the existence of the divine natural law turned out to be mediated and purified by the middle Stoa, Cicero and Seneca (P. Wendland, *La cultura ellenistico-romana nei suoi rapporti con giudaismo e cristianesimo*, Brescia [4]1986, 66-67).

During the first two centuries, Christians used the great Stoics, whose works we possess: (1) Seneca, *Nero's teacher, who can be considered a true eclectic inasmuch as he was a Stoic and at the same time an admirer of Epicurus; (2) Musonius Rufus, a puritan, a preacher of chastity, the family established on marriage, and rural life as an existence typical of the philosopher; (3) Epictetus, a former slave, a traditionalist preacher of morality and religion (understood as a joyous resignation to divine providence, which is assimilable to a transcendent personal God); and (4) Marcus Aurelius, who was close to the thought of Plato, whose belief in immortality, however, he did not share because of his peculiar pessimism in view of the vanity of earthly things.

The influence of Stoicism on Christianity pertained both to the terminology, often assumed by certain Christian thinkers, and the concepts that could be shared and readapted, or rather received and inserted into the living framework of the Christian doctrinal formulation. At other times, reference to the Stoa consisted only in a general tone, which seems to echo the spiritual orientation and Stoic optimism.

We will restrict this investigation to noting some specific convergences and the chief points of contact between Stoicism and Christian writers.

1. Against the radical dualism of some currents within Academic Platonism that reduced the body to a prison of the soul, Stoicism maintained the unitary conception of the body as an *animal rationale* (Seneca, *Ep.* 41,8): the soul, likewise material, grows and develops with the body and follows its destiny (*compati corpori*: Tertullian, *De an.* 5,5 = SVF I,518; cf. SVF III,96). Already acc. to Aristotle, the soul communicates with the body through a material vehicle called the *pneuma*, a generative heat which grants life, the active material principle that, under the influence of the movement of the desire in the soul, produces bodily movement: an element taken from Pythagorean philosophy and one that had great influence on the Stoics.

The 2nd-c. Fathers followed this approach. Thus, for Irenaeus the body is a part of the human being, just as the soul: the perfect human being turns out to be flesh, soul and Spirit (*Adv. haer.* 5,6,1). Even in the writings of Tertullian, the human being has a unitary structure: soul and body form a solid whole, a *textura* (*De res.* 34,10), a *collegium* (*De res.* 15,3) and a *societas* (*De res.* 15,1-6). As in the Stoa (SVF II,604; Seneca, *De provid.* 6,9), death is the separation of the soul from the body (*De res.* 19,3; *De an.* 51,1). This anthropological conception allowed Irenaeus and Tertullian to defend, against the *gnostics, esp. the *Valentinians, who were evidently the most Platonizing, the resurrection and the recomposition of the soul and the body in view of the last judgment (*De res.* 34,8).

2. For the Stoics, every reality is corporeal, and what does not have a *corpus* is not real: the body (*sōma*) is the essence of the *ousia*, or rather, that through which a being exists (SVF II,359). Thus *Tertullian: *nihil si non corpus* (*De an.* 7,3); *nihil est incorporale nisi quod non est* (*De carne Chr.* 11,4). Even the soul, therefore, is corporeal (*corporalis*) and is born from the breath (*flatus*) of God (*De an.* 22,2), which is something else with respect to the spirit (*Adv. Marc.* II,9,1). Tertullian seems to agree with the Stoic position that the arts were corporeal, and from the moment that the soul was nourished by the arts, it too had to be corporeal (*De an.* 6). "Corporeal" does not equal "material" (*De an.* 3,4) but expresses the idea of "existent" as the antithesis

of nonexistent. He certainly would have acknowledged that corporeal and incorporeal constitute a logical antithesis (*Adv. Herm.* 35), but he would have also added that the thing that is not corporeal is also to be considered nonexistent (*De carne Chr.* 2; *De res.* 2, 53; *De an.* 7). The soul (*flatus*) is an idea of the Stoics, who presented it under the physical aspect as ether and *pneuma* (SVF I,135) and under the spiritual aspect, as the soul of the world, the primordial divine force that pervades the cosmos and holds together the individual entities, but it is likewise a biblical idea. In any case, the Tertullian-as-Stoic thesis is not to be understood as antispiritualistic. Instead, it realistically seeks to assert the already-here-outside-now of the communicative animal consciousness. In one of Irenaeus's writings, we read: "Souls are incorporeal if compared to mortal bodies" (*Adv. Haer.* 5,7,1), where one seems to find the affirmation of, in a Stoicizing context, a certain corporeality of the soul, even if perhaps only to affirm its creatureliness with respect to the divine incorporeality (A. Orbe, *Antropología de San Ireneo*, Madrid 1969, 440). This thesis would pass into the anthropology of *John Cassian: souls are not to be considered incorporeal; God alone is incorporeal (*Conl.* 7,13).

3. According to the Stoicism of Cicero and Seneca, the soul possesses by nature an ontological and moral good that lasts even though at times it is enveloped and suffocated by prejudices and errors (*Tusc.* III,1,2; *De fin.* V,15,43 and 21,59-60; Seneca, *Ep.* 22,15; 94,31.54.55.56; 108,8). In Tertullian's writings, we see an analogous *bonum naturae* (*De an.* 41): this is at the basis of the Christian soul's *testimonium* by nature, established on the soul's *sanitas* (*Apol.* 17,4-6). Even for *Clement of Alexandria, the good life, which can only be reached in Christ, is portrayed not without the influence of the Stoicism of Musonius Rufus. The initiative of the good, made possible by the *bonum* of nature, returns in the 4th c. in the writings of *Basil of Caesarea in a Stoicizing context (*Regul. fusius tract.*: PG 31,908.909.912, etc.); *John Chrysostom (*In epist. II ad Cor.*: PG 61,397; *In epist. ad Heb*: PG 43,99); *Optatus of Milevis (*Tract.* 2,20); *Jerome (*Dial. adv. Pelag.* III,1). The *bonum naturae* is a leitmotif in the writings of *Pelagius (*Ep. to Demetrias* 2.3.4.7.8.9). Hence the norm for living acc. to nature (SVF III,65; Seneca, *Ep.* 41,8; M. Aurelius, *Meditations* II,17), which would find much diffusion in the Roman and Christian ethical and legal milieu. Human beings use interior energies that allow them to achieve the ethical ideal; the same law of physical nature assumes a moral value, inasmuch as human beings are an integral part of the cosmos. Even for Tertullian, nature is the first teacher; the natural law binds because God is its author (*De virg. vel.* 11,6; *De cor.* 5,1); what does not come from nature comes from the devil (*De c. fem.* I,8,2; see Spanneut IV,164).

4. The *bonum naturae* is also reflected in the concept—Stoic in origin—of "seeds of virtue" (*semina virtutum*), known to Cicero (*De fin.* V,15,43; V,7-18) and Seneca (*Ep.* 73,16; 94,29; 108,8; 120,4). Such seeds are innate and come from nature acc. to the thought of *John Cassian (*Conl.* 13,12; 23,11) and *Faustus of Riez (*De gratia* I,12).

5. In Stoicism, the immanent God is revealed through the order (*kosmos*) of the world (see Chrysippus in SVF II,1099; who developed the thought of Cleanthes, in *Nat. Deor.* II,5,13-15). Tertullian, not without the biblical influences of the OT (the theme of the recognition of the Creator starting from creatures), believed that God was knowable *ex operibus* (*Apol.* 17,4). The world was created so that God, through it, might be known (*Adv. Marc.* I,10,1). Similar ideas can be found in the writings of *Aristides (*Apol.* 1,1).

Stoicism sang of the world's beauty. The cosmos—the *diakosmēsis* of Aristotle (*Peri philosophias* 12b)—is found in the writings of Marcus Aurelius (*Meditations* 9,1; 12,5). *Aristides (*Apol.* 1,1) and *Basil of Caesarea (*Exaem. hom.* 1,1.5.6) used the term in the same sense, although *Athenagoras used the verb *diakosmeō* four times in a cosmological sense (*Legat.* 7,1; 10,1; 22,12; 24,3). The term enjoyed exceptional favor in the writings of the Fathers (Spanneut I,364). The optimistic Stoic teaching that perceived the cosmos to be permeated by the divinity (Virgil, *Aen.* 6,726-727) was antithetical to the cosmic pessimism of certain *gnostic movements (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* I,13,5; 14,3-5).

6. In the letter *Ad Diognetum* (beginning of the 3rd c.), Christians perform in the world the same function that Stoicism had assigned to the soul of the world: they are the principle of cohesion (6,7). The action is expressed by the verb *synechein* ("to keep together from within"), which was proper to Stoic cosmology (SVF II,439): Wis 1:7 drew on the Stoic tradition, where the term refers to the cosmic action of the spirit, and in this sense, through Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* V, 2,3) and Athenagoras (*Legat.* 6,2), it then passed into the letter *Ad Diognetum*.

7. Stoicism knew of God's providence (*pronoia*), which with the *logos* and the *eimarmenē* characterizes Stoic language to render the concept of the cosmic soul which manifests the primordial divine power (SVF II,1106-1126; Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* 9,1). The *pronoia* is to be identified with the world itself, inasmuch as the divinity rules the indi-

vidual things (SVF II, 528). God is immanent in the world (Cicero, *De nat. Deor.* II, 22,58; Seneca, *De providentia* 5; *Nat. Quaest.*, praef.). Aristides attributed to God's *pronoia* his coming into the world: the Stoic concept is thus assumed and charged with *christological resonances (*Apol.* 1,1; see also Athenagoras, *Legat.* 8,4; 19,3; 24,3; 25,2).

8. The Stoic distinction between *logos endiathetos* and *prophorikos* (SVF II,135) designates in Christianity the external logos, immanent within the bosom of the Father or manifested externally (Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autol.* II,10; II,22).

9. The Stoic divine-human cosmopolitanism expounded by Cicero (*mundus quasi communis deorum atque hominum domus*: *De nat. Deor.* II,62; SVF II,1131) and by Seneca (*respublica magna et vere publica*, *qua dii atque homines continentur*: *De otio* 4,1), and whose borders are marked by the sun (see also Marc. Aurel., *Meditations* 6,44), finds a deliberate echo in the thought of Tertullian: *unum omnium rem publicam agnoscimus*, *mundum* (*Apol.* 38,3), even if limited to the consortium of "all" and not "the gods and human beings," as well as in the writings of *Minucius Felix (*hanc communem omnium mundi civitatem*: *Oct.* 17,2). It is necessary, moreover, to note that Stoic cosmopolitanism, anchored in a substantial intellectualism, remained, nonetheless, tied to the aristocratic attitude of ancient philosophy, while Christianity sought to establish its own universalism on other bases that were not exclusively intellectual.

10. The doctrine of cosmic anthropocentrism was Stoic, which places the world at the service of human beings (SVF II,1152-1167). A broad development of this teaching can be found in Cicero's writings: *omnia quae sint in hoc mundo*, *quibus utantur homines*, *hominum causa facta esse et parata* (*De nat. Deor.* II, 61,154). God has created the things of the world for the benefit (not in view of) of human beings: in this respect, see the writings of *Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 10,2; 2 *Apol.* 4,2; 5,2); *Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autol.* I,6; II,18); the letter *Ad *Diognetum* (4,2; 10,2); Tertullian (*De an.* 33,9; *De pat.* 4,3; *De spect.* 2,4: *universitatem tam bonam quam homini mancipatam*); *Ambrose (*De off.* I,132). Even if there appear strong resemblances with the biblical accounts of *creation (Gen 1:26, 28-30) and with certain Psalms, the theme in the writings of Christian authors seems to derive from Stoicism, which would be in agreement with the Holy Scriptures, even though not depending on them (Waszink, *Tertulliani De Anima*, Amsterdam 1947, 296).

11. A text of Seneca (*Benef.* IV,7; SVF II,1024) identifies nature with God and the divine reason that pervades the cosmos, in line with the Stoic sensibility that emphasizes the idea that the world, in all its components, is full of divine Powers which manifest their own effects within it. We find an echo of this in the writings of Minucius Felix: *quid aliud Deus quam mens et ratio et spiritus* (*Oct.* 19,2). Even Tertullian equated "natural" with "rational" (*De an.* 43,7); for this reason he regarded creation as the work of the *verbum*, the *ratio*, the *spiritus* (*Apol.* 17,1). Tertullian wrote the following: *Dei ratio quia Deus omnium conditor nihil non ratione providit disposuit ordinavit* (*De paenit.* 1,2): God and the world are connected, even though to the exclusion of Stoic monism. *Clement of Alexandria sang of the natural order of the world in a way that recalls the Stoa (*Strom.* VI,155,3).

12. The Stoic sources, esp. the more recent ones, assigned to marriage the sole objective of procreation: *gamos* and *paidopoiia* are inseparable. For this reason, pleasure isolated from procreation is excluded. See the writings of Epictetus (*Diss.* III,7,2; III,12,7); Lucan (*Bell. Civ.* II,387-391); Seneca (*Consol. ad Elv.* 13,3; SVF III,686). The teaching of the following Christian authors is identical: Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 29,1), Athenagoras (*Legat.* 33,1), Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 31,5), Tertullian (*Ad ux.* I, 2,1) and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* II,10,92,2; 10,95,3). This type of rigorism in conjugal relations goes back more to Stoicism than to the Bible, since, acc. to the Stoics, pleasure is the irrational exaltation of the soul (SVF III,406) and, as such, is reprehensible: the *logos* alone must triumph (SVF III,404); the passions, inasmuch as they are deviations from reason, must be eradicated (Cicero, *Tusc.* IV,19,43).

13. One should emphasize the influence of Stoicism, esp. the Stoicism of Epictetus, on *monasticism: the perfect monk would be described with traits of the Stoic sage. And in the writings of *John Chrysostom one also finds noteworthy Stoic elements (Pohlenz, *Stoa*, II,334-338); in the treatise *Comparatio regis et monachi* (PG 47,387-392), a parallel between the monk and the king returns, which corresponds to a common refrain in Stoicism, as a Christian equivalent of the parallel between the philosopher and the tyrant in the ninth book of Plato's *Republic*.

14. The popularity of Stoicism in the writings of the Fathers was established on its analogies, which were at times only exterior or linguistic, with Christianity, but its influence is undeniable in the theological, anthropological, cosmological and ethical spheres. *Seneca saepe noster* (*De an.* 20,1) was the expression Tertullian used to express all the confidence he had in the face of Stoicism, and Jerome

would say: *Stoici nostro dogmati in plerisque concordant* (*In Esaiam* IV,11). Terms and categories of thought, as well as doctrinal Stoic elements, which compete with the scientific formulation of Christianity, even when they come together in the heritage of philosophical *koinē*, attest to the special modality of the "enculturation" that was followed by the theorists of Christian teaching as well as the vitality of the movement from which they came.

Sources: H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (= SVF) I-IV, Stuttgart 1905, repr. 1964; *Stoici antichi*, ed. M. Isnardi Parente, Turin 1989. *General treatments*: J. Stelzenberger, *Die Beziehungen der frühchristlichen Sittenlehre zur Ethik der Stoa*, Munich 1933; M. Pohlenz, *La Stoa. Storia di un movimento spirituale*, It. tr. Florence 1967, 2 vols. (for our theme: II, 261-400); M. Spanneut, *Le Stoïcisme des Pères de l'Église de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris [2]1969 (= Spanneut, I); Id., *Permanence du Stoïcisme de Zénon à Malraux*, Gembloux 1973 (= Spanneut, II); D. Tsekourakis, *Studies in the Terminology of Early Stoic Ethics*, Wiesbaden 1974; F.-H. Sandbach, *The Stoics*, New York 1975; D.E. Hahm, *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*, Columbus 1977; P. Wendland, *La cultura ellenistico-romana nei suoi rapporti con giudaismo e cristianesimo*, Brescia 1986.

Studies: J.-H. Waszink, *Tertulliani De anima*, Amsterdam 1947; Tertullian, *De Testimonio animae*, intr. text and comm. by C. Tibiletti, Turin 1959; S. Otto, *Natura und Dispositio. Untersuchung zum Naturbegriff und zur Denkform Tertullians*, Munich 1960; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Ann. Fac. Lettere Univ. di Macerata II (1969) 1-217: Rome [2]1983; R. Joly, *Christianisme et Philosophie*, Brussels 1973; M. Spanneut, *Le Stoïcisme et Saint Augustin*, in *Forma Futuri*, Studi M. Pellegrino, Turin 1975, 896-914 (= Spanneut, III); C. Tibiletti, *Stoicismo nell'Ad martyras di Tertulliano:* Augustinianum 15 (1975) 309-323; G. Jossa, *Epitteto e i cristiani*, in Id., *Giudei, pagani e cristiani*, Naples 1977, 81-108; C. Moreschini, *Tertulliano tra Stoicismo e Platonismo*, in *Kerygma und Logos*, Festschrift C. Andresen, Göttingen 1979, 367-379; M. Spanneut, *Les normes morales du Stoïcisme chez les Pères de l'Église*: Studia Moralia 19 (1981) 153-175 (= Spanneut, IV); M. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, Leiden 1985; J. Daniélou, *Lo stoicismo di Tertulliano*, in Id., *Le origini del cristianesimo latino*, Bologna 1993, 206-222; M. Spanneut, *Apatheia*: ANRW II, 36 (1994) 4641-4717.

C. Tibiletti - L. Longobardo

STRATEGIUS (Strategus). 7th-c. monk from the laura of Mar Saba, the author of *De Persica captivitate*, which includes (1) the narration on the siege and fall of *Jerusalem brought about by the Persians in 614 (or 615 acc. to A. Butler, *The Arab Conquest of Egypt*, Oxford 1902, 61), (2) the account of a certain Thomas, a Christian of Jerusalem, who, after the departure of the enemies, buried the dead and compiled a list of their names, and, as an epilogue, (3) an account of the return of the holy cross decreed by the emperor *Heraclius. Only three fragments of the work remain in Greek: (1) *Epistula Zachariae Hierosolymitani*, (2) *De Persica captivitate opusculum* and (3) *Narratio in apophthegmatibus* (BHG[a] 1448 s.; Marr, *Antioh Stratig.*, 42-44). We have, however, an Arabic version and a *Georgian version, the text of which, with a translation, Garitte published in the CSCO. The name *Sṭraṭiki* (Στρατηγός or Στρατήγιος) figures in the the title of the Georgian version, although in the cod. Vatic. Arab. 697 discovered by Peeters, the author of the work is listed as an unspecified E(u)stratios: but the difference between the two names could be paleographic (Peeters, *La prise de Jérusalem*, 84-85). Marr holds that Strategius is to be identified with *Antiochus (CPG 7842-7844), the abbot and not a monk of Mar Saba and the author of the treatise titled *Exomologesis* (PG 89, 1849-1856). His argument—which appears in the title of his study and which was adopted by I. Phokylides: Ekkesiastikos Pharos 22 (1923) 188-205)—nevertheless appears untenable since the *Exomologesis*, although drawing on the same events, has a different character from the *De Persica captivitate*. Given our current state of knowledge, it is also impossible, despite the chronological coincidence, to identify Strategius of Mar Saba with Strategius abbot of the monastery of St. Theodosius cited by *John Moschus (PG 87, 2961).

CPG 7846; PG 86, 3227-3268 and 89, 1849-1856; N. Marr, *Antioh Stratig. Plĕnenie Ierusalima Persami V 614 g.*, St. Petersburg 1909, 42-44; G. Garitte, *La prise de Jérusalem par les Perses en 614*, CSCO 202/203, Louvain 1960; G. Garitte, *Expugnationis Hierosolymae a.d. 614 recensiones arabicae*, I: *A et B*, CSCO 340/341, Louvain 1973; II: *C et V*, CSCO 347-348, Louvain 1974; P. Peeters, *La prise de Jérusalem par les Perses*: Mél. de l'Univ. Saint-Joseph 9 (1923-24) 3-42 (= Rech. d'hist. et de philol. orient., I, Brussels 1951, 78-116); Beck 449-450; B. Flusin, *Saint Athanase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII[e] siècle*, II. *Commentaire*, Paris 1992, 129-172 passim; Patrologia V,303-304; B. Pirone, *La presa di Gerusalemme nel sermone del monaco Strategio*: Studia Orientalia Christiana Collect. 28 (1995) 67-236 (It. tr. of the Arabic text published by Garitte); EPapi 1, 598-603 (Martino papa); LACL 658.

A. Labate

STYLITE – STYLITISM. For the ascetic exercise of *stasis* ("standing"), various examples can be found in the 4th c. (*Peregrinatio Aetheriae* 20,6: CSEL 39,65); in the sense of standing on a pillar, non-Christian parallels have been sought (Lucian, *De Syria Dea* 28-29, Hieropolis, 2nd c. BC). *Simeon Stylites the Elder began this type of life among Christians (d. ca. 459: BS 11,1116-1118), at Telanissos or Telnešin (today Der Sim'an) and then at Qalat Seman, NE of *Antioch and W of Aleppo, where in 413 or 415 he was yearning "to fly toward heaven" and desired to withdraw from the crowd. Simeon set himself up on a

series of columns (Gk. *stylos*), each out in the open, each one higher (the last column would be 16 m [52.49 ft] high). Someone at the bottom of the column was at his service, even for controlling the influx of the pilgrims. From the apology of Simeon, which was outlined by *Theodoret (*Hist. Religiosa* 26,12), one could argue that this unusual form of asceticism was criticized in religious circles. But this religious practice found numerous imitators in *Syria, *Egypt, *Palestine, *Asia Minor and Greece: *Daniel of Constantinople (d. 493) (BS 4,470-471), *Simeon Stylites the Younger (d. 592) (BS 11,1141-1157), Alypius, near Adrianople in Paphlagonia (7th c.) (BS 1,867-870), Luke the Stylite (d. 979) (BS 8,225-226) and others. There also existed, but rarely, some female stylites (AB 27 [1908] 391-392). The columns varied by height and had a platform on top with a hut for shelter from bad weather and from the heat of the desert. At the bottom of the columns, an admirer or an assistant supplied food to the *ascetic. The stylites dedicated themselves to prayer and the instruction of pilgrims. Many columns that now lie on the ground in Syria still preserve the memory of that form of asceticism. Eustathius of Thessalonica (d. between 1193 and 1198) wrote a tribute to the stylites (*Ad stylitam quemdam Thessalonicensem*: PG 136, 217-264).

DSp 14, 1267-1275; DIP 9, 245-246; LTK³ 8, 1065; EC 11, 1337-1338; DACL 15, 1697-1718; H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites*, Brussels 1923; B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa*, Münster 1950, 113-118; P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*, Brussels 1950, 93-136; T. Špidlík, CE 13, 750-751; I. Peña - P. Castellana - R. Fernández, *Les stylites syriens*, Jerusalem-Milan 1975; I. Peña, *La straordinaria vita dei monaci siri: secoli IV-VI*, Cinisello Balsamo 1990.

T. Špidlík

SUB TUUM PRAESIDIUM. The *troparion*, known from the *Coptic, *Ambrosian and Roman liturgies, is one of the most ancient prayers addressed to the Virgin *Mary, as confirmed by the Rylands Papyrus 470, discovered in Egypt in 1917, and, based on paleographic examination, dating from the 3rd c. The text transmitted by the papyrus allows the following literal recomposition: "Under your mercy, we take refuge, O Bearer of God; do not reject our entreaties in times of need, but deliver us from danger, you who alone are chaste, you who alone are blessed" (G. Giamberardini, Il "Sub tuum praesidium": Marianum 31 [1969] 330). The *troparion* has a twofold value: on the historical-liturgical level, it is the most ancient document known thus far with respect to the veneration of the Mother of God during the period before the Council of *Ephesus; on the theological level, it records the technical term **Theotokos*, which pertains to the divine motherhood; the two titles "you who alone are chaste" and "you who alone are blessed" refer to Mary's sanctity, eminence and moral integrity as well as faith in her mediation, which is connected to the statements "under your mercy, we take refuge . . . deliver us from danger." Present in the chief liturgies that go around the coast of the Mediterranean, only the *Byzantine rite has preserved the simplest inflection and is closest to the prayer on the papyrus. Despite its placement in the liturgy (it changes from rite to rite) one can discern a common denominator that consists, in modern rites, in considering it as part of the Marian liturgy, and in the ancient rites, in conveying it with more specific indications for a Marian feast as the antiphon after the office of the gospel. It was probably part of the *troparia* for the office of the feast of *Epiphany, celebrated in *Egypt since the 3rd c. with Marian emphasis. Regarding the 3rd-c. dating of the prayer, some scholars have posed certain difficulties because of the presence of the term *Theotokos*, which became common after the Council of Ephesus, but it could have been adopted in the liturgy either before or while theologians were discussing its meaning and the extent of its acceptability.

C.H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, III, in *Theological and Literary Texts*, Manchester 1938, 46-47; F. Mercenier, *L'Antienne mariale grecque la plus ancienne*: Muséon 52 (1939) 229-233; V. Buffon, *L'antica preghiera mariana "Sub tuum praesidium"*: Mater Ecclesiae 2 (1966) 142-145; P.I. Cecchetti, *Il fidente ricordo al materno cuore di Maria. Il "Sub tuum praesidium," primo cenno al culto di Maria*: Lateranum 33 (1967) 281-293; G. Giamberardini, *Il "Sub tuum praesidium" e il titolo "Theotokos" nella tradizione egiziana*: Marianum 31 (1969) 324-362; A. Malo, *La plus ancienne prière à Notre Dâme*, in *De Primordiis cultus mariani*, II, Rome 1970, 475-485; H. Quecke, *Das "Sub tuum praesidium" in koptischen Horologion*: Enchoria 1 (1971) 9-17; Marienlexikon 6, 327-328; H. Förster, *Zur ältesten Überlieferung der marianischen Antiphon Sub tuum praesidium*: Biblos 44 (1995) 183-192; *Sub tuum praesidium*, in *Fontes. Documenti fondamentali di storia della Chiesa*, ed. L. Martínez - P. Guidacci, Cinisello Balsamo 2005, 67-69.

E. Peretto

SUBDEACON. *Cyprian of Carthage normally used the term *hypodiaconus* (*Ep.* 9,1; 29,2; 34,4; 36,1; 45,4; 47,2; 69,1). If the term specifies the office, then subdeacons had to be at the service of the deacons (*see* *diakonia - diaconate) and help in their *liturgical functions; this function could trigger some subdeacons to claim the prerogatives of the deacons. This invasion of their field was fought by the so-

called Council of *Laodicea. According to the **Liber pontificalis*, Pope *Fabian (d. 250) divided the city of Rome into seven regions for the seven deacons *et fecit VII subdiaconos* (1,148 ed. Duchesne). Cyprian often appointed subdeacons with several different functions, among which were bearers of the readings (*Ep.* 9,1; 20; 36; 45; 7;7; 79); in 251, Pope *Cornelius (d. 253), writing to *Fabius of Antioch, said that in the Roman church there were seven deacons and seven subdeacons (Eus., HE 6,43,11), which was also true in the Eastern Churches (Athan., *Ep.* 2). It was a minor order at the service of the deacons. In the churches, like the Roman one, who followed the tradition of the seven deacons, in relation to the Seven of the Acts of the Apostles (6:1-6), the office of the subdiaconate was the most important among the minor orders. The so-called **Apostolic Tradition* prescribed that subdeacons were not to receive the *laying on of hands (ordination), but were only *appointed* because "they follow the deacon"—so too the *Canons of Hippolytus—while the **Apostolic Constitutions* required the laying on of hands (8,21,1-4) as opposed to what *Theodore of Mopsuestia said (*In Ep. Pauli Com.*, ed. Swete 1982, II,123-124). According to the prayer of the *Constitutions*, it seems that their office was to guard the sacred vessels and bring water for the *lavabo* and washing (8,11). The Council of *Antioch in 341 admitted that subdeacon could be ordained by a *chorbishop (can. 10). The difference in the liturgical rite should be interpreted in the context of the time, but it does not mean that the subdeacons were ordained like the deacons. The Council of *Neocaesarea (314-319) stated that a deacon who had committed a carnal sin before ordination should be relegated to the rank of subdeacon (can. 10); the so-called Council of Laodicea stated that subdeacons should honor the deacons (can. 20) and "must not occupy the place designated for deacons [*diaconicon*] and touch the sacred vessels" (can. 21) and should not "put on the diaconal stole" and must remain at the doors (can. 22), that "they must not leave even for a short time and devote themselves to prayer" (can. 43); they "cannot distribute the consecrated bread or the cup of blessing" (can. 25). This prohibition sought to prevent any abuse. In *Visigothic *Spain there were subdeacons who could carry the sacred vessels of the altar (Council of *Braga in 561: can. 10; in 572: can. 41). According to that council the subdeacons were to control the doors (can. 43); acc. to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, however, the subdeacons control the doors where men enter, while the deaconesses control those of the women (2,25,26). From this it seems that the office corresponded to *doorkeeper in the Latin Church.

The decretals of some of the popes record that the subdeacons belonged to the lower clergy (Siricius, *Ep.* 1,11: PL 13,1144; Sylvester, *Ep.* 15: PL 8,848; *Ep.* 7: PL8,835; Innocence, *Ep.* 37,5: PL 20,604; Zosimus, *Ep.* 11,1: PL 20,642; Boniface, *Ep.* 1,2: PL20,751; Leo, *Ep.* 1,5: PL 54,596s; Pelagius I, *Ep.* 72 [Gassó Batle 184]; *Conc. Cart.* a. 410, c. 28 [ed. Munier, CL 148, p. 143]). Pellergini notes that "with *Gregory the Great one witnesses a progressive change in the functions and role of the subdeacon, also from a liturgical point of view. The Council of *Rome in 595 forbade the Roman deacons, honored by the *ministerium sacri ordinis*, to sing at liturgical ceremonies and entrusted this task to the subdeacons and *minores ordines*" (p. 81). Meanwhile, *celibacy was also imposed upon the subdeacons. As early as 419 in *Carthage, it was established that even married subdeacons, like other members of the higher clergy, had *ab uxoribus continere* (Munier, *Concilia Africae*, CCL 149, pp. 108; 126; 142). The Council of *Toledo (397-400) did not allow subdeacon widowers to remarry (can. 4). The Council of *Gerona (517) prohibited cohabitation "with her who was his wife and who now has become his sister" (can. 6). The Council of *Vannes (461-491) spoke of those who cannot marry (can. 11). The Council of Orleans (538) prohibited taking a wife (can. 2). The Council of *Tours in 567 noted that "the deacons and subdeacons, certainly not all but many, are suspected by the people of living with their wives" (can. 20); it also added: "In truth . . . if a subdeacon is found with his subdeaconess [= his wife], he should be excommunicated for an entire year and be deposed from every clerical office; however, he should be informed that he can participate in worship together with the laity, and, with permission, take his place among the readers in the choir of singers" (can. 20; cf. Council of Auxerre of 561-605, cans. 20-21). The Council of Toledo in 527 allowed the ordination, at the age of twenty-one, of a subdeacon who promised to be chaste. The *Constitum Silvestri*, anonymously written about the year 550, required celibacy of subdeacons (ch. 8: PL 8,835; cf. PL 8,836). Popes *Pelagius and Gregory the Great (d. 604) required the imposition of celibacy, or continent marriage *ad similitudinem apostolicae sedis*, upon subdeacons in Sicily and Calabria. The prohibition of the Roman practice was indirectly confirmed by the Council *in *Trullo* in 692 (can. 13), which *permitted* married deacons and subdeacons living together in married life.

The emperor *Constantine also exempted subdeacons from *munera curialia* (CTh 16,27 del 330); they could keep their income if there was the consent of the *municipalis curia* for their entry into the

clergy (CTh 12,1,49 of 361), but if they had entered illegally, then they were forced to take the *munera* with which they entered (CTh 12,163 of 399). This last law was issued at Constantinople and concerned, for the moment, Eastern clergy. Sometimes even after decades they could be obliged to return to being members of the *curia municipale*. In 535 *Justinian ruled that in the church of Hagia Sophia in *Constantinople the number of subdeacons should not exceed ninety (*Novella* 1,1). *Isidore of Seville summarized the ministry of subdeacons thus: they receive offerings from the people, bring the sacred vessels to the deacons at the altar; they must be *casti et continentes*; they do not receive the laying on of hands at ordination, but only the paten and the chalice from the hands of the bishop and from the archdeacon, the water jug, tray and *manutergio* (*De off.* 2,10: PL 83,790s). The Gallican Liturgy contains the rite and blessing of the subdeacon with the bestowal of the empty chalice and paten (PL 72,319).

The ministry of the subdiaconate continues in the Eastern Churches; and the subdeacon serves the bishop. In the Latin Catholic Church, it was abolished in 1972 by Pope Paul VI after Vatican II (*Ministeria quaedam*: *Enchiridion Vaticanum* 4,1749-1770).

DTC 14,2459-2466; DACL 15,1619-1626; J. Roberkof, *Le sous-diaconat est-il un sacrement?*: Revue augustinienne 15 (1909) 86-105; M. Andrieu, *Les ordres mineurs dans l'ancien rituel romain*: RevSR 5 (1925) 232-274; J.G. Davies, *Deacons, Deaconesses and Minor Orders in the Patristic Period*: JEH 14 (1963) 1-15; J. Lécuyer, *Les ordres mineurs en question*: Maison-Dieu 102 (1970) 97-107; R. Gryson, *Les origines des célibat ecclésiastique du premier au septième siècle*, Gembloux 1970, 194-196; R. E. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ from Their Origins to the Twelfth Century*, Berlin-New York 1978; R. Seagraves, *Pascentes cum disciplina. A Lexical Study of the Clergy in the Cyprianic Correspondence*, Fribourg 1993, 133-141; T. Citrini, *La questione teologia dei ministeri*, in *I laici nella Chiesa*, Turin 1986, 57-72; R.E. Reynolds. *The Subdiaconate as a Sacred and Superior Order*, in *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages. Hierarchy and Image*, Aldershot 1999, ch. 4; R. E. Reynolds, *Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages: Duties and Ordination* Ashgate 1999; T. Sardella, *Alcune considerazioni in margine al matrimonio dei suddiaconi in Calabria e Sicilia* (*Greg., epist. 1,42*), in La *Sicilia nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo. Religione e società*, ed. R. Barcellona and S. Pricoco, Soveria Mannelli 1999,73-85; S. Heid, *Celibacy in the Early Church: The Beginnings of a Discipline of Obligatory Continence for Clerics in East and West*, San Francisco 2000; P. Pellergini, *Militia clericatus, monachici ordines. Istituzioni ecclesiastiche e società in Gregorio Magno*, Catania 2008.

A. Di Berardino

ŠUBḤALMARAN. Polemical and monastic author of the Eastern church who wrote at the end of 6th and the beginning of the 7th c. He was the metropolitan of Karkā d-Bēt Slōk at the time of the catholicos Gregory I (first decade of the 7th c.), but after Gregory's death he was sent into exile by *Chosroes II (590–627). The medieval author ʿAbdīšō bar Brīkā (d. 1318) attributes to him some treatises against Gabriel of Šingar, the influential doctor of the court and a proponent of miaphysite theology, a collection of ascetic sentences that follows the example of the Evagrian *Centuries*, and a *Book of Gifts*, a critical edition of which D.J. Lane has prepared for CSCO.

Baumstark, 133; Patrologia V, 482-483; G. Troupeau, *Une page retrouvée du "Livre des Parties" de Šubḥalmaran, évêque de Beit Seluk*: OCA 205 (1978) 57-61; D.J. Lane, *Mar Šubḥalmaran's Book of Gifts: An Example of a Syriac Literary Genre*, in *IV Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 229), Rome 1987, 411-417; Id., *A Nestorian Creed: The Creed of Šubḥalmaran*, in *V Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 236), Rome 1990, 155-162; Id., *Admonition and Analogy: 13 Chapter from Šubḥalmaran*: ARAM 5 (1993) 277-284; *Šubḥalmaran, The Book of Gifts*, ed. D.J. Lane, CSCO 612-613, Scriptores Syri 236-237, Louvain 2004.

K. den Biesen

SUBORDINATIONISM. This term refers to the strong movement in the theology of the 2nd and 3rd c. that regarded Christ, inasmuch as he was the Son of God, as inferior to the Father. At the basis of this tendency were passages from the gospels in which Christ himself declared his inferiority (e.g., Mk 10:18; 13:32; Jn 14:28), and this was developed primarily by the *Logoschristologie*. This theology, in fact, likewise under the influence of *Middle Platonism, regarded Christ, the logos and the divine wisdom through a connection and mediation between the transcendent divinity of the Father and the world, and therefore in a subordinate position with respect to it. When early Christian theologians began to include the *Holy Spirit in their understanding of the *Trinity, as in the case of *Origen, the Spirit was in turn regarded as inferior to the Son. Subordinationist tendencies are evident esp. in the writings of such theologians as *Justin Martyr, *Tertullian, Origen and *Novatian; but also in the writings of *Irenaeus of Lyons, which are void of speculations on the nature of the Trinity. When treating Jn 14:28, e.g., Irenaeus had no difficulty in regarding Christ as inferior to the Father.

In the controversy with the *monarchians, subordinationism tended to become radicalized because the inferiority of the Son was emphasized in order to better highlight the distinction of the Son from the Father, which they denied. This was the case with *Dionysius of Alexandria and esp. *Arius: although the moderate subordinationism of his predecessors did not call into question the idea that Christ was the true Son of God and a participant in

his divine nature, Arius believed that the Son was created, more than generated, and foreign to the Father's nature and was, therefore, of a second order of the divine nature. In order to respond to this radical subordinationism, the anti-Arian theologians, esp. *Athanasius and then the Cappadocians, eliminated every trace of subordinationism between the three divine persons and considered them equal by nature and dignity.

W. Marcus, *Der Subordinationimus als historisches Phänomen*, Munich 1963; LTK³ 9, 1075-1076; A. Grillmeier, *Le Christ dans la tradition chrétienne. De l'âge apostolique au concile de Chalcédonie*, Paris ²2003.

M. Simonetti

SUCCENSUS (d. ca. 440). The bishop of Diocaesarea (Ouzoundja-Bourdj) in Isauria (R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche*, Paris 1945, 147). His death dates back to 440. After the acceptance of the "symbol of union" (433), which was a compromise with respect to the 12 anathemas issued by *Cyril of Alexandria, among the Cyrillians there arose difficulties that Cyril himself sought to dissipate with some epistolary interventions (A. Rehrmann, *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien*, Hildesheim 1901, 131-132: Fliche-Martin IV,247ff.). Among his correspondents during this occasion was Succensus, from whose letters have remained some fragments preserved among the writings of Cyril and two extracts in *Syriac that Van Roey discovered in a MS from the British Museum (Add. 17197). The bishop reveals the dissatisfaction of those who are around him, but he does not disclose his personal opinion. In the *catenae for the book of *Genesis, three fragments have come down under Succensus's name: they pertain to 4:7b (Cain and the Lord), 22:5b-6 and 22:7-9 (the sacrifice of Isaac).

CPG 6488-6489; ACO I, I,6, 158^{8-10}, 155^{9-10}, 160^{14-17}, 161^{19-25}; ACO I,4, 119^{23-33}, $237^{8-9/37-39}$, 238^{20-30}, 239^{9-14}; ACO I,5, 299^{37}, $300^{2/30-32}$, 301, 302^{10-12}; A. van Roey, *Deux fragments inédits des lettres de Succensus, évêque de Diocésarée à Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*: Museón 55 (1942) 87-92; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois*, ST 201, Vatican City 1959, 180; *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, ed. F. Petit, CCG 2, Turnhout-Leuven 1977, 162; Patrologia V, 189; F. Petit, *La chaine sur la Genèse*, 4 vols., Leuven 1992-96, II, 15ff.; III, 421 (index).

A. Labate

SUCCESSION, APOSTOLIC. In their role as receivers of a unique salvific historical revelation, the apostles could not choose their successors directly, although succession in the "apostolic office" had to take into consideration the responsibility to proclaim and preserve the gospel and to implement it in community life. The appeal to continuity and succession in the proclamation and the explanation of the normative gospel, attested to through an apostle or the apostles, is implicit in 1 Pet and is explicitly affirmed by *Paul in the Acts of the Apostles and practiced by the author of the epistle to the Ephesians. The notion of apostolic succession is an element of the system developed in the ancient church in order to ensure fidelity to the origins, the gospel and to Jesus Christ; this is the meaning of the adjective *apostolic.* In this system the notion of *diadochē* completes and strengthens the notion of ministry and ensures apostolic authority. One thus explains why ecclesiastical preaching, transmitted by the apostles through the succession, also subsists in the present within the churches (Orig., *Princ.* praef. 2). This succession, which seems to be essentially doctrinal, assumes an institutional aspect because it pertains not only to guaranteeing the truth of doctrine but also of ensuring the safe path found in the ecclesiastical institution.

Josephus used for the succession of Jewish high priests the same terminology that was later used by Christians to refer to the succession of the apostles; but these were common Greek terms for these types of relations. The verb *diadechomai* and the noun *diadochē* were used in the same way for the succession of high priests, the teachers in the Hellenistic philosophical schools and in places of state administration. 1 *Clement* (42,1-4; 44,1-3) speaks of the succession of presbyters to their predecessors in the office in the local church. The weight of his argument is based on the principle of the hierarchy established by divine law. This idea of succession was barely mentioned in the writings of *Ignatius of Antioch, although he regarded the divine mission as the foundation of every episcopal authority. For Ignatius, the authority of the apostles finds its background beyond the Christian structure of his time. In the interval between the death of *Paul and the writing of the book of Revelation and, later, to the age of Ignatius and *Polycarp, the passage was achieved from the missionary apostolate to the local bishop. Each community has a college of local administrators and, as a result, it is particularly the *eucharistic celebration that renders it, among other reasons, monarchical. Although the office of the apostles, as immediate witnesses of the *incarnation and the first doers of Christ's will, was unique, the commission to the apostles contained a mission that went beyond the time of their earthly existence.

With that, the idea of apostolic succession remained objectively established. The Catholic Church was distinguished from the majority of the early *heresies precisely because it did not abandon the doctrinal and illuminative tradition into the hands of self-appointed spiritual guides, teachers or prophets, but possessed a group of leaders. The succession of teachers in the literature of the Hellenistic philosophical schools coincided with the idea of Christian succession at the moment in which the transmission of doctrine was emphasized.

In the 2nd c., the concepts of tradition and succession assumed new theological weight and acquired their technical meaning. One cannot prove that the idea of doctrinal transmission appeared first in the context of *gnosticism and its free magisterium (Ptolemy, in Epiph., *Haer.* 33,7,9); nevertheless, it acquired the typically Catholic form when it was connected to the succession of monarchical bishops. *Hegesippus seems to have been a disseminator of this model. He provided a list of names, as did the gnostics (*Basilides, in Hipp., *Philosoph.* 7,20,1; *Valentinus, in Clem., *Strom.* 7,106,4), but he did so in a succession in the form of a definite chain from the monarchical episcopal office. In so doing, he seems to have conceived of the history of the heresies as a pseudo-apostolic succession (Eus., *HE* 4,22,5-6). In defense of the faith of the church, he specifically used the principle of succession (Eus., *HE* 4,22,3), and, having arrived at *Rome, he composed a list of bishops of this see until *Anicetus (Epiph., *Haer.* 27,6), although not qualifying the episcopal successions as "apostolic" (Eusebius did so, however, indirectly, *HE* 4,8,2). Irenaeus fought on the same anti-gnostic front and could have taken the idea of succession from Hegesippus. Against the gnostic doctrine of the esoteric tradition, he forwarded the argument that if the apostles had known the hidden mysteries in order to teach them to those who were perfect, they certainly would have transmitted them to those upon whom the church established its missionary program. Moreover, he did not separate the pastoral function of governing from doctrinal responsibility (*HE* 3,3,1). For this reason, it is necessary to listen to the word of the church's presbyters, because they are successors of the apostles, and with the episcopal succession they have received the charism of the truth. This rule of faith was maintained in the church under the action of the *Holy Spirit. Irenaeus's most original contribution concerned the role of the Holy Spirit, who, as the source of the truth and the life that has emanated from Christ, flows only in the catholic and hierarchical church. In *Adv. haer.* III,3,1, he affirmed that the truth can be known by all people in all the churches through the succession of bishops, the guardians of the apostolic tradition. Because it would be too long to enumerate the successions of all the churches, he chose the church of *Rome (III,3,2-3). It is necessary to remain united to those who have not separated from the original succession (IV,26,5; 33,8). For this reason, the continuity of the true faith and the apostolic succession are inseparable. Likewise for *Hippolytus, who from the doctrinal point of view was a disciple of Irenaeus, the creator of the ecclesiastical life is properly speaking the Spirit with his gifts; but he equally emphasized that the bishops were those who, as successors of the apostles, have received the Spirit.

In the *Trad. Apost.* 3, the bishop is seen in continuity with the apostolic ministry. For *Tertullian (*Praescr.* 32,1; *Adv. Marc.* IV,5,3; IV,29), the uninterrupted succession of bishops is the convincing sign of the apostolic character of the churches. On the whole, he perceived it to be more a succession of apostolic churches than apostolic bishops (*Praescr.* 20,5-6). After having become a *Montanist, he abandoned this idea (*De Pudic.* 21,7). After Tertullian, the appeal to apostolic succession lost its force in Christian apologetics. In the writings of *Cyprian, the theme of apostolic succession became a commonplace: *Ep.* 66,4; 75,16 (*Firmilian); *Sent. Ep.* 79 (Clarus of Mascula). Cyprian emphasizes the order of the bishops as successors (*Ep.* 45,3) and its relationship to the church in its totality (*Ep.* 33,1). *Clement of Alexandria used the concept of succession starting from the apostles, but he applied it to the teachers who teach the apostolic doctrine (*Strom.* VI, 61,3), because he was interested in the true gnostic, the perfect Christian (*Strom.* VI,106,2; VII,77,4). Facing the challenge of the heretics, however, he also emphasized the priority of the ecclesiastical tradition (*Strom.* VII, 104,1). In the writings of *Origen, the vocabulary with respect to succession seems to be limited (*Princ.* praef. 2; IV,22; *In Mt. comm.*, *ser.* 46); among the apostles and the then-contemporary preaching, he inserted the succession in the church. His perspective is the expression of a parity between presbyters and teachers whose function, however, he distinguishes (*Hom. in Lev.* VI,6). Apostolic succession was a theme dear to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* I,1,1; III,3,3; 4,11; VII,32,32; VIII, praef.). It is the guarantee of tradition (V,6,5; VI,9,1). He mentioned the succession established by Hegesippus that went until Anicetus (IV,22,3), and the one established by *Irenaeus of Lyons that went until *Eleutherus (V,5,9–VI, 5). He applied the common term of succession also to the teachers of the *school of Alexandria

(V,10,1; 11,2; VI,6; 29,4) and to the same Greek philosophical schools (VII,32,6). His interest is more historical than doctrinal; but what remains chiefly interesting for him is the succession of bishops starting from the apostles. Very often he mentions the succession of the bishops in the four chief sees, on which he established the majority of Christian information for his *Chronicle*. Neither in the writings of Irenaeus nor Eusebius were the apostles inserted into the list of bishops. But the identification of the episcopate with the apostolate, which is found in the writings of Cyprian (*Ep.* 3,3; 67,4), continued to appear sporadically in the East (Socr., *HE* VI,8); in the West there was a common respect for the Roman see. *Leo the Great (*Serm.* 4,2-3; 3,3-4; *Ep.* 45,2; *Serm.* 5.4) expressed the crucial meaning of the Petrine succession in the Roman see: *Peter as the chief of the apostles and the primate of the universal church. *Gregory the Great (*Ep.* 2,48; 3,30; 7,40; 9,59) collected all this teaching in the principle of papal authority, although he did not have Leo's proper legal language.

G. Dix, *The Ministry in the Early Church*, in K.E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry*, London 1946, 183-303 (Fr. tr. of Dix's text, Neuchâtel 1955); H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliches Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen 1953 (Eng. tr. London 1969); E. Molland, *Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the Apostolic Succession*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 1 (1950) 12-28; Id., *Le développement de l'idée de succession apostolique*: RHPhR 34 (1954) 1-29; A. Ehrhard, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church*, London 1953; B. Botte, *À propos de l'Adversus Haereses III,3,2 de Saint Irénée*: Irénikon 30 (1957) 156-163; R.P.C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church*, London 1962; A.M. Javierre, *El tema literario de la suceśión*, Zürich 1963; G.G. Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession*, Berlin-Hamburg 1963; O. Perler, *L'évêque, représentant du Christ, selon les documents des premiers siècles*, in Y. Congar - B.D. Dupuy, *L'épiscopat et l'Église universelle*, Paris 1964 (It. tr. Rome 1965) 31-66; H. Küng, *Structures of the Church*, Eng. tr., New York [2]1982; J. Cobson, *Ministre de J.C. ou le sacerdoce de l'Évangile*, Paris 1966; A. Lemaire, *Les ministères aux origines de l'Église*, Paris 1971; R.F. Evans, *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought*, London 1972; *Mysterium Salutis*, Brescia 1972, VII, 639-713; J. Finkenzeller, *Zur Diskussion über das Verständnis der apostolischen Sukzession*: Theol. Prakt. Quart. 123 (1975) 321-340; M.M. Garijo, *La suceśión apostólica en los tres primeros siglos*: Diálogo ecúmenico 2 (1976) 179-231; TRE 4, 430-466; A. Vögtle, *Exegetische Reflexionen zur Apostolizität des Amtes und zur Amtssukzession*, in *Offenbarungsgeschehen und Wirkungsgeschichte. Neutestamentliche Beiträge*, Freiburg i.Br. 1985, 221-279; R. Trevijano, *Ministerio y Regla de fe*: Teología del Sacerdocio 21 (Burgos 1990) 81-126; A. Benoit, *Ministère et succession apostolique aux trois premiers siècles*: TS 21 (1990) 127-148; A. Brent, *Diogenes Laertius and the Apostolic Succession*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 44 (1993) 367-389; J. Ysebaert, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der Alten Kirche*, Breda 1994.

R. Trevijano

SUETONIUS (70–ca. 140). Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus was a learned Roman historian. His treatise *De vita Caesarum*, a work dated around the year 121, in which he collected the biographies of the first twelve Roman emperors, from Julius Caesar to *Domitian, contains some references to Christians. The first is found in the *Life of Claudius* 25: Suetonius reports that the emperor decreed the expulsion of the Jews from Rome because they were continually in an uproar over a certain Chrestus, understood as a proper name. The Roman emperors incorrectly perceived this title to be a proper name. Suetonius, therefore, misunderstood the facts: the disagreements that arose within the Jewish community of *Rome, between the Jews who were faithful to the tradition and those who had passed over to the new faith in Christ, were understood by him as confrontations incited by the unruly activity of Chrestus. The expulsion of the Jews from Rome is also attested by Acts 18:2. The year this took place, however, is uncertain; Cassius Dio believed that this event was to be dated to the year 41 (*Historiae Romanae* 60,6); *Orosius, in 49 (*Historiae adversum paganos* 7,6,15). Another indication, this time directed toward the Christians, is found in the *Life of Nero* 16: here the historian reports that the emperor condemned the Christians to death, a people given to a new and reprehensible superstition. The information is preserved and integrated by Tacitus, *Annales* 15,44, who, in a more circumscribed way, narrates that *Nero, to avert from himself the suspicion of having burned Rome, accused a group already disliked by the population, namely the Christians, the followers of Chrestus. Probable references to some Christians can be found in the *Life of Domitian:* at ch. 10, the condemnation of *Acilius Glabrio to exile, who was guilty of not having thought up better novelties; at ch. 15, Suetonius narrates the sentencing to death of *Flavius Clemens, a relative of *Domitian, on the basis of an insubstantial charge that Suetonius, however, does not explain. Cassius Dio associates the charge of atheism with a similar charge of drifting toward Jewish customs, charges that can lead one to think that he possibly converted to Christianity (*Hist. Rom.* 67,13-14). According to the testimony of Cassius Dio, the wife of Flavius Clemens, Flavia Domitilla, was condemned to forced confinement at *Pandataria*, modern-day Ventotene. *Eusebius of Caesarea mentions Flavia *Domitilla, niece of Flavius Clemens, who was exiled to Ponza for being a Christian (*HE* 3,18,4).

G. Howard, *The Beginning of Christianity in Rome: A Note on Suetonius, Life of Cladius 25.4*: Restoration Quarterly 24 (1981) 175-177; P. Carrara, *I pagani di fronte ai cristianesimo: Testimo-*

nianze dei secoli I e II, Florence 1984, 69-73; J. Gascou, *Suétone historien*, Rome 1984; BBKL 20 (2001) 503-519; R.E. van Voorst, *Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence*, Grand Rapids, MI 2000; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan 2004.

G. Caruso

SUICIDE. In Greek and Latin a specific term does not exist for referring to the modern concept of suicide. The Greek term *autoktonia* ("to yield to death") is only found in the ps.-*Clementine literature (*Hom.* 12,14). The Latin term *suicidium*, from which derives the Italian word *suicidio* (Span. *suicidio*, Fr. *suicide*; Eng. *suicide*) is late medieval (in Latin it only signifies the killing of a pig). The Latin expression was *mors voluntaria* (and thus the Greek equivalent), but there exists such terms as *homicidium*, *parricidium*. The moralists used the terminology "direct suicide," "indirect active suicide," "indirect passive suicide" (a death sentence inflicted by others and accepted for the sake of values and that is impossible to avoid). The *pagan world discussed the legitimacy and value of suicide. Some did not recognize it: Plato (*Phaedo* 61d; 67 and 80) allowed for it only in cases of an incurable sickness (*Laws* 11,873), as did the *Platonists *Plotinus and *Porphyry. Aristotle condemned the practice (*Ethics Nic.* 3,11, p. 1116, 10-16), although it was permitted by the Cynics; the *Stoics, although condemning it in general, accepted it if it was justified. Death in battle became glorious for one's own homeland and granted nobility to the person, acc. to a statement from Horace: *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* (*Odes* III,2,13). The reasons for suicide were primarily reasons of honor and shame (defeat in battle to avoid a worse death; for women whose chastity had been violated). For a person sentenced to death, suicide was preferable. In the Roman tradition there existed the *devotio*, a ritual and religious death to earn the favor of the gods for their army. The zealots of Masada, in order not to wind up as prisoners, committed mass suicide. In the 1st c., for some people suicide was a superior way to die; people even sought advice from their friends on how to commit suicide. At times, people sought to dissuade the person who was contemplating suicide. Certain authors lauded suicide (Lucan, *Pharsalia* 4.478-480; 4.517-520; Epictetus, 1,24-25). Famous suicides, as a sign of freedom, included Cato, Brutus, Cassius and Seneca (Seneca, *De ira* 3,15.4). Suicide, however, was not approved by all people, as Seneca himself acknowledged (*Ep.* 70,14; cf., Pliny, *Ep.* 1,12; Martial 2,80). The jurist Marcian considered suicide to be a wicked act (*Digest* 43,21,3,6). The Romans, moreover, had a divided and complex attitude toward suicide. In any case, it had to be rational: the reasons were determinative for choosing to carry it out such as sickness, suffering, the death sentence, shame, loyalty etc. (see Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1,74; Pliny, *Ep.* 1,12; 6,24; Seneca, *Ep.* 30,2; Tacitus, *Histories* 2,49; Tacitus, *Ann.* 13,30). The *taedium vitae* was a good reason, and one's inheritance was preserved (*Digest* 3,2,11,3; 28,3,6,7; 29,5,1,23; 48,21,3). Psychological motivations were not taken into consideration.

Christians were opposed to suicide from the beginning. Certain Christian movements were radical and considered the testimony of martyrdom essential. The *Montanists sought *martyrdom as a true form of Christian life because Christ was glorified in it (Tertull., *De fuga* 9,4). Even the *Marcionite *gnostics, although professing a different theology, desired martyrdom as an expression of disregard for the body and the Demiurge (Eus., *HE* 5,16,21). We know of the sect of the *Patriciani, which, acc. to *Filaster, were instructed by their founder, the Roman *Patricius, that the human body was not created by God but the devil; they therefore disregarded it, even to the point of suicide (*De haer.* 62: CSEL 38, 32; see Aug., *De haer.* 61; Aug., *Contra adv. legis* 11,12,40). The *Praedestinatus* (61: PL 53,608) adds that they, at times, asked others to kill them and that the sect was widespread in *Mauretania and *Numidia, subsequently followed by the *Donatists (see also Ambrosiaster, *In I Ep. Tim.* 4: PL 17, 499). Certain Donatists sought death in various ways and were then venerated by their coreligionists (*Ep.* 185,14: CSEL 57, 13; *C. Gaud.* 1,26,29; 27,31; *C. Petil.* 2,183).

Connected with suicide was voluntary martyrdom, which could take on various forms acc. to the various moments and historical contexts: rejection of flight, provocation, offering oneself voluntarily, collaborating without offering any gesture of resistance, procuring one's death. It was not always easy to distinguish clearly between martyrdom and suicide. Jesus taught that the giving of one's life for one's friends was the greatest sign of love (Jn 15:13); the gospel of *John insisted on affirming that Christ's death was voluntary (Jn 10:17-18). The act of Christians seeking death from their persecutors was strongly discouraged, because it put one at risk of denying the faith. *Clement of Alexandria expressed the common belief of the church when he said: "We also criticize those who run around seeking after death: in fact, there are some people—though not belonging to us, but sharing only with us a common name—who hasten to hand themselves over, un-

happy and desirous of death for hatred of the Creator of the world. We call them 'suicides,' and maintain that their death, although they are executed by order of the authorities, is not a martyrdom" (*Stromata* IV,17,1-2; see also IV,4,16; IV,10,76; VII,11,66; see *Cyprian of Carthage, *Ep.* 11,7,3; 13,4,3; 14,2; 19,1; 81,4). Martyrdom required spiritual preparation, and not everyone possessed it, another reason for discouraging one from offering oneself voluntarily or from provoking the authorities. In any case, martyrs drew admiration because the *pagans, who were present at the trials, were shocked by the resolve of Christians when undergoing death, and at times they converted to Christianity (*Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 110; 2 *Apol.* 12; *Passio Perp.* 17,3; *Hippolytus, *Comm. on Daniele* 2,38). Pagans knew of the search or at least the great openness of Christians toward martyrdom. They criticized it as an irrational and foolish choice because, as *Celsus wrote: "You have been overcome by an unhealthy foolishness, and you allow yourselves to be crucified" (Origen, *Against Celsus* 7,40; see 2,45; 8,65); "you abandon [the body] to torture as if it were something without value" (ibid., 8,49; see Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* 9,3,2; see G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 54, 106, 116, 190).

There were cases of voluntary death, sought or rather procured, in specific circumstances. *Eusebius of Caesarea mentions various incidents of this sort: during the *Decian persecution, *Apollinia, threatened with being burned alive, threw herself into the fire (*HE* 6,41,7); and an Antiochene mother counseled her daughters to commit voluntary death by throwing themselves into the Orontes River rather than being disgraced by the soldiers (*HE* 8,12): Domnina, their mother, and her two daughters Bernice and Prosdoke. Eusebius adds that many preferred death to the cruelty of the ungodly (*HE* 8,12,2); he alludes to *Pelagia, without mentioning her. The case of these women became well known because even St. Thomas Aquinas mentioned it as an objection to martyrdom. *Prudentius spoke of the martyr Massa Candida (*Africa), who threw herself into a boiling pot of lime to avoid sacrificing to the idols (*Peristephanon* 13,76-87).

The cult of these voluntary martyrs was accepted by the Christian community and celebrated by preachers (H. Delehaye, *Les origines*, 230ff.), such as *Eusebius of Emesa (E.M. Buytaert, *Eusèbe d'Emèse. Discours conservés en latin*, 1, Louvain 1953, 151-174); *John Chrysostom (PG 50, 579-585) and *Ambrose on two occasions (*De virg.* 3,7,33-34: PL 16, 229; *Ep.* 37: PL 16,1093). *Jerome, while condemning suicide, affirmed that "it is not permissible to commit suicide under persecution, except in cases where the loss of chastity is threatened" (*In Ion. com.* 1,12: PL 25,1129; SC 3,72). For *Augustine, martyrdom is a gift from God; therefore, every trace of suicide should be rejected (*De patientia* 13,10). Handing oneself over to death is not permissible for fear of martyrdom or to wash away shame, because sin only exists in the soul (*Civ. Dei* 1,19 and 28), nor is it permissible for fear of sin (*Civ. Dei* 1,25 and 27) or for the fear of not achieving salvation. If suicide is also prohibited even after having undergone violence, so much more is it not permissible for fear of a possible uncertain sexual violation (*Civ. Dei* 1,18; *De morib. ecc.* 17,55). Augustine admired the courage and the resolve of these persons, even though he refrained from giving his judgment on specific cases: "Those who have killed themselves, if perhaps they are to be admired for their magnanimity, are not to be praised for the soundness of their judgment" (*Civ. Dei* 1,22,1). Augustine regarded every suicide, even the one that could possibly be considered a voluntary martyrdom, a homicide and therefore always to be condemned. "But this we affirm, this we maintain, this we every way pronounce to be right, that we ought not to commit suicide, for this is to escape suffering in time by plunging into that of eternity; that we ought not to do so because of another's sins, for this is to escape a guilt which could not defile us, by incurring a great guilt of our own; that we ought not to do so on because of own past sins, for we have all the more need of this life that these sins may be redeemed by repentance; that none of us should put an end to this life to obtain that better life we look for after death, for those who die by their own hand have no better life after death" (*Civ. Dei* 1,26). The idea that a violation of chastity was a sin was so widespread that Augustine fought against it, setting forth the idea that sin exists only in the consent of the will and not in the physicality of the act. Purity is a virtue of the soul, but not a physical good like beauty and health: "If it is then a good of the soul, it is not lost even if the body undergoes sexual violence. Even if the good of a holy continence does not consent to the contamination of fleshly desires, the body is also made holy" (*Civ. Dei* 1,18). Augustine also had in mind the case of virgins and the women violated and raped at the time of the sack of *Rome by *Alaric in 410. As a way to prove their own innocence, some of them wanted to commit suicide for the dishonor and shame they underwent. For Augustine, virtue is a spiritual good and not bodily impurity independent of the will, because personal consent is necessary for each sin (*Civ. Dei* 1,19). With respect to the authors cited, Augustine had a more

spiritual understanding of chastity, because the fault is in the will which allows one to commit evil.

In subsequent times, suicide was considered a *crimen*, therefore the person who had attempted suicide but was unsuccessful was still punished with death. This idea is very ancient because it was already formulated for the first time by the Roman jurist Herrenius Modestinus for the case of an attempted suicide that was not done because of a serious problem. The reason given was that if someone *sine causa sibi manus intulit, puniendus est: qui enim sibi non pepercit, multo minus alii parcet* (Digest 48.21.3.6).

E. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, Paris 1891, 57-67; H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels 1912; B. Kötting, *Martyrium und Provokation*, in *Kerygma und Logos. Festschrift für C. Andresen zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Ritter, Göttingen 1979, 329-336; Y. Grisé, *Le suicide dans la Rome antique*, Paris 1982; C. Nardi, *Il martirio volontario nelle omelie di Giovanni Crisostomo sulle martiri antiochene:* Ho Theologos 1 (1983) 207-278; P. Veyne (ed.), *Histoire de la vie privée*, 1, *De l'Empire romaine à l'an mil*, Paris 1985, 172; M. Griffin, *Philosophy, Cato and Roman Suicide*: Greece & Rome 33 (1986) 64-77, 330-337 (dedicated esp. to the Stoic school); Enciclopedia Virgiliana IV, 1065-1066; J.L. Voisin, *L'éducation de la mort volontaire à Rome*, in Id. (ed.), *Sociabilité, pouvoirs et société*, Rouen 1987, 91-97; P. Baudet, *L'opinion de saint Augustin sur le suicide*, in P. Ranson, *Saint Augustin, dossier conçu et dirigé*, Lausanne-Paris 1988, 125-152; A.J.L. van Hoof, *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*, London 1990 (CPh 1993, 173-176); *A Noble Death, Suicide and Martyrdom Among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*, ed. A.J. Droge - J.D. Tabor, San Francisco 1992; G. Minois, *Histoire du suicide. La société occidentale face à la mort volontaire*, Paris 1995; P. Plass, *The Game of Death in Ancient Rome: Arena Sport and Political Suicide*, Madison, WI 1995; P. Buc, *Martyre et ritualité dans l'Antiquité tardive. Horizons de l'écriture médiévale des rituels*: Annales - Histoire, Sciences sociales 52 (1997) 63-92; T. Hill, *Ambitiosa Mors: Suicide and the Self in Ancient Rome*, New York 2004.

A. Di Berardino

SUIDAS (Sudas). Anonymous lexicographical Byzantine compilation from the end of the 10th c.; Sudas, however, does not indicate the name of the author, who is unknown, but the title of the monumental lexicon. Moreover, this title is written as "Suidas" or "Sudas," acc. to historical or etymological preference. The compilation includes nearly 30,000 entries; for this reason it has the character of an encyclopedia more than a lexicon. Under numerous entries, it addresses questions of secular and sacred history; it provides information on writers of classical and Christian antiquity. The historical information is important and abundant for authors and deeds either unknown or barely mentioned by other sources; the numerous citations allow scholars to reconstruct or fill in literary works that have been lost or are fragmentary. In order to complete this heavily compilatory work, the author used, for the grammatical and etymological part, the lexicons of his time, one of which was probably owed to *Photius, which contained scholia on the writings of Homer, Sophocles, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Thucydides and *Gregory of Nazianzus; for the historical part, the author used the *Byzantine chronicles, esp. from the collection of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; for the biographical part, the author used various biographies, the Epitome of *Hesychius of Miletus, the lives of Diogenes Laertius etc; for the philosophical part, he used commentaries on the writings of Aristotle, Plato etc. He took much from the authors extant at this time. The work's value is not uniform: it is not very important for the lexical and scientific part, but it is in the historical-literary portion. The author has methodological flaws and uncritically places the information in a rather confused order.

Suidas, PG 117, 1193-1424; A. Adler, *Lexicographi graeci*, 5 vols., Leipzig 1928-38; P. Maas, *Der Titel des Suidas*: ByzZ 32 (1932) 1; F. Dölger, *Der Titel des sogenannten Suidaslexikons*: Sit. Bayer. Ak. Wiss. 6 (1936) 1-37; Id., *Zur* Σοῦδα-Frage: ByzZ 3 (1938) 36-58; KLP 5, 407-408; S.G. Mercati, *Intorno ai titoli dei lessici Suida-Suda e di Papia*: MAL Ser. 8, X, 1, Rome 1960 (now also in Id., *Collectanea Byzantina*, I, Bari 1970, 641-708); N. Walter, *Suda. Ein Literaturbericht zum Titel des sogenannten Suidas Lexikon*: Altertum 8 (1962) 169-175; C. Theodoridis, *Quellenkritische Bemerkungen zum Lexikon des Suidas*: Hermes 116 (1988) 468-475; A. Steiner, *Byzantinisches im Wortschatz der Suda*, in *Studien zur bizantinisches Lexikographie*, ed. E. Trapp, Vienna 1988, 149-181; A. Ruiz de Elvira, *Suidas, y no "la Suda"*: Myrtia 12 (1997) 5-8; B. Hemmerdinger, *Suidas, et non la "Souda"*: Bollettino dei classici Ser. 3a 19 (1998) 31-32; ODB 3, 1930; B. Baldwin, *Aspects of the Suda*: Byzantion 76 (2006) 11-31.

E. Peretto

SULPICIUS SEVERUS (ca. 360–ca. 420). A lawyer of *Bordeaux, "distinguished by his birth and literary works" (Genn., *De vir. ill.* 19), who was converted by his mother-in-law Bassula (from a rich consular family: Paul. Nola, *Ep.* 5,5) to Martinian asceticism; this Aquitainian, born around 360, became a zealous and gifted propagandist of this form of religious life: at times with personal action (he organized a "Martinian" community on the property of Primuliacum, probably situated around "the Lauraguais Road," not far from the road from *Toulouse to *Narbonne) and, esp., with his sharp and subtle pen. He was a friend and correspondent with *Paulinus of Nola (Paul. Nola, *Ep.* 1, 5, 11, 17, 22-24, 27-32), who sent him his lengthy *Ep.* 22, which was full of epigraphical poems intended for religious buildings (baptistery and churches) built by Sulpi-

cius Severus at Primuliacum. He was a typical representative of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy, who, at the schools of Bordeaux, was a disciple of the *professores* described in a series of epigrams by *Ausonius (book 5 of his poems). But he belonged, more specifically, to that active minority that had converted to the radical and demanding evangelism of the monastic asceticism that objected, to the point of anticlericalism, to the "worldly" bishops of the Gallo-Roman church "established" within the empire.

The success of *Martin's works contributed much to the literary and, as a result, religious popularity of St. Martin, whom the ascetics of *Gaul and *Italy, starting from the end of the 4th c., made their model and, in some sense, standard-bearer. Sulpicius ended his life serving as a priest, and, after having been tainted by the heresy of *Pelagianism, he lived in old age silently consecrated to *penance (if we are to believe Genn., *De vir. ill.* 19).

The essential part of Sulpicius's work consisted in a triptych consecrated to St. Martin, copied and spread extensively during the Middle Ages under the (new) name of Martinellus ("the little Martin"); it includes the *Vita Martini*, which was probably finished in 397 before Martin's death, three letters likewise dedicated to Martin; last, the two (or three) books of *Dialogues*, a *dossier* connected to the *Vita*, in a dialogical form, acc. to the schema of this ancient literary genre. Sulpicius was also the author of a *Chronicle* in two books that encompassed sacred history from the creation of the world to his own time: the universal background, then the Gallo-Roman, leading to his exaltation of Martinian asceticism (the *Chronicle* came to an end at the consulate of *Stilicho in 400.)

A "masterpiece" in the double sense of chronology and literary quality, of ascetic and episcopal biography in the Latin West, the *Vita Martini* is a brilliant manifesto of the most ancient Latin *monasticism, through the deeds and acts of a bishop-monk, thaumaturge and evangelist, spiritual teacher and confessor of the faith. The *Vita Martini* for many centuries established the outlines of a cumulative model of Christian sanctity integrated with ancient models (apostolic, martyrological, episcopal and ascetic), just as they had already been presented, esp. in the NT, the *Acts* and the *Passions*, the *Life of Cyprian*, and the Latin translations of the *Life of *Anthony* written in Greek by *Athanasius. The richness of Sulpicius's early Christian literary culture was best adapted to the ideal of life which was, historically, that of Martin: an imperial guard who became a soldier of Christ, the apostle of the countryside, a witness to the orthodox faith and the demands of the gospel, a man who at various times was persecuted by the *Arians and worldly bishops, a shepherd trained by *Hilary for the responsibilities of *evangelization; finally, he was the mediator of monastic asceticism he had known at *Poitiers and *Milan.

Although criticized in radical and positivistic terms at the beginning of the 20th c., the historicity of the deeds recorded by Sulpicius's works concerning Martin requires a prudent literary analysis that follows the steps of the perception of the facts: Martin's own interpretation of his experience; the establishment of the oral traditions in which Gallo-Roman imagination (Celtic and Latin, popular and literary) played a key role, which today is difficult to decipher; finally, the individual virtuosity of a biographer who writes for a certain literary audience that was aristocratic, a bit elitist, and perhaps even a clique.

A fervent admirer of *Sallustius, Sulpicius Severus imitated him well even to the point of his stylistic mannerisms. His vivid imagination, disciplined by a rigorous work of form, offered an apparently objective narrative of miraculous, or sometimes frankly fantastic, events. The new Alexandrianism of the 4th c., represented so well in the poetry of Ausonius of Bordeaux, led Sulpicius to develop subtle and dramatic effects in which are reflected the Hellenistic values of pathos and grace. Hence, the indisputable literary eloquence of these accounts and, as a result, their effectiveness. Sulpicius's Martinian dossier was exceptionally popular in the religious and literary culture of the Middle Ages and not only in the already vast field of *hagiography: the text was put to Latin verse by *Paulinus of Périgueux in the middle of the 5th c. and by *Venantius Fortunatus of Ravenna (who at that time was "of Poitiers") over the course of the 6th c.

But the Sallustianism of Sulpicius is so precise that it does not remain formal. The Roman historian's grumbling, bitter and dramatic moralism tainted his vision of sacred history—and even more so of his own era, in the *Chronicle*—with black and white. The second book is almost entirely devoted to the *Arian controversy in *Gaul, the *Priscillianist heresy and, even more, through this gloomy event, to the scandal provoked by the worldly bishops that had worsened the struggle against this *heresy to the point of the shedding of blood at *Trier. Sulpicius rewrites the events like a new *Conspiracy of Cataline*; the victims and butchers are confused in the same violent and merciless invective. And more than in the Martinian dossier, Sulpicius shows himself to be a passionate, enthusiastic and vindictive man, without whose strange personality, in the face of the "negative" image of

Priscillian, the figure of Martin would have perhaps appeared less radiant.

Editions: CPL 474-476; PL 20, 95-240; CSEL 1; *Vita Martini*: ed. J. Fontaine, SC 133-135, Paris 1967-1969 (includes the three letters; critical text, intro. and extensive comm.); ed. J.W. Smit (critical texts and notes in It.) and L. Canali (It. tr.), Coll. Vita dei Santi 4, Milan s.d. (1975), IX-XXX (intr. by Chr. Mohrmann), 1-67 (text and tr.), 245-290 (notes and bibl.); *Vita di Martino*, ed. F. Ruggiero, Bologna 2003; *Dialogi*: trans. by P. Monceaux, Paris 1926 (with the collection of the Martinian *dossier*); repr. of J. Fontaine's trans. of the *Vita* and some of the letters, and P. Monceaux's trans. of the *Dialogi*, with an intr. by L. Pietri, Ligugé 1978; *Chronica*: ed. A. Lavertujon, with annotations (questionable), Paris 1895-99; ed. G. de Senneville-Grave, SC 441, Paris 1999.

Studies: Intr. by J. Fontaine and Chr. Mohrmann for the editions mentioned above. On the *Vita*, the studies of J. Fontaine, *Sulpice Sévère a-t-il travesti S. Martin de Tours en martyr militaire?*: AB 81 (1963) 35-58; Id., *Une clé littéraire de la Vita Martini de Sulpice Sévère, la typologie prophétique*, in *Mélanges Chr. Mohrmann*, Utrecht-Anvers 1963, 84-95; Id., *Alle fonti della agiografia europea. Storia e leggenda nella vita di S. Martino di Tours*: RSLR 2 (1966) 187-206; on the *Chronica*: J. Fontaine, *L'affaire Priscillien ou l'ère des nouveaux Catilina. Observations sur le sallustianisme de Sulpice Sévère*, in *Classica et Iberica. A Festschrift in Honor of the Reverned Joseph M.-F. Marique*, ed. P.T. Brannan,Worcester, MA 1975, 355-391; K. van Andel, *The Christian Concept of History in the "Chronicle" of Sulpicius Severus*, Amsterdam 1976; F. Murru, *La concezione della storia nel Chronica di Sulpicio Severo, alcune idee di studio*: Latomus 38 (1979) 961-981; F. Ghizzoni, *Sulpicio Severo*, Rome 1983; Cl. Stancliffe, *St. Martin and His Hagiographer, History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*, Oxford 1983; for the role of Sulpicius Severus in the development of the cult of Saint Martin, see: L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IV^e^ siècle: naissance d'une cité chrétienne*, Rome 1983; S. Weber, *Die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus: Charakteristika und Intentionen*, Trier 1997; M. Kránitz, *Il monachesimo occidentale e la "militia Christi" nella "Vita Martini" di Sulpicio Severo*, in *Il monachesimo occidentale dalle origini alla Regula Magistri.* XXVI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome 8-10 maggio 1997, SEA 66, Rome 1998, 163-167; J. Fontaine, *Sulpice Sévère et l'esthétique de la prose théodosienne*: REL 83 (2005) 179-193.

J. Fontaine

SUN, CULT of the. The existence of solar deities is a fact known to be widespread in various religious contexts, esp. in those that were polytheistic, characterized by divine personalities connected to functions and cosmic "departments." Think only of the Babylonian Shamash, the Egyptian Amon-Ra—the god of Thebes—and Aton of Heliopolis, likewise a solar divinity, who at the time of Amenophis IV (Akhenaton) (1375–1358 BC) was at the center of a well-known "henotheistic" religious reform. Although in the Greek world the importance of the god Helios was very limited during the classical and Hellenistic period, in the context of the Roman Empire, the cults of solar deities of Eastern origin, esp. Syriac, had spread widely. The ascent of the Syriac gods proceeded parallel to the affirmation of the dynasties of Eastern origin on the imperial throne. Thus, at the time of *Caracalla, we see the establishment of the cult of the solar god of *Emesa, the homeland of the emperor's mother, Julia Domna, who was of the priestly line and who performed a fundamental role in the religious politics of the time. With the ascent of Elagabalus, this cult reached its apex, seeing that he was the priest of Helios of Emesa, which he intended to make the chief god of the empire. *Rome then housed, in the temple built for this purpose, the rock fallen from heaven, the locus and manifestation of the god, whose cult was celebrated in typical Eastern forms. The fall of Elagabalus caused the sacred rock to be sent back to Emesa and brought the cessation of the cult in the Roman temple. Nevertheless, interest in the solar Eastern deities, or deities qualified by important luminous and celestial associations, did not diminish. Among these, one simply has to think of the Iranian Mithra, a subject of the mystery cult, who was also characterized in a solar sense to the point of being invoked as "Mithra the unconquered Sun," although Mithraism includes, as a distinct figure, Sol with whom Mithra himself has relationships represented in various ways.

The Egyptian Serapis also assumed definite solar characteristics, a god with a complex personality, connected to the underworld and fertility. Interest in the sun god, which was also expressed at the level of philosophical and theological speculations in the writings of such Neoplatonist authors as *Porphyry, the emperor *Julian and, later, *Macrobius, found its most vivid expression in the solar cult introduced by the emperor *Aurelian (270–775). This emperor, after having entered Emesa victorious, recognized in the solar god of the city the protector of the empire; he transferred the cult of this god into a temple erected through state funds and established an official cult. A sacerdotal college was commissioned to oversee the cult, and a quadrennial contest was instituted on 25 December, the *dies natalis* of the *Sol invictus*.

F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris [4]1929; F. Altheim, *Der unbesiegte Gott*, Hamburg 1957 (It. tr. Milan 1960); G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Le religioni orientali nel mondo ellenistico-romano*, in G. Castellani (ed.), *Storia delle religioni*, III, Turin 1971, 423-564; G.H. Halsberghe, *The Cult of Sol Invictus*, EPRO 23, Leiden 1972; G.H. Halsberghe, *Le cult de Deus Sol Invictus à Rome au III^e^ siècle après J.C.*, in ANRW, II, 17, 4, Berlin-New York 1984, 2181-2201; W. Fauth, *Helios Megistos. Zur synkretistischen Theologie der Spätantike*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 125, Leiden 1995; St.E. Hijmans, *The Sun Which Did Not Rise in the East: The Cult of the*

Sol Invictus in the Light of Non-Literary Evidence: Babesch 71 (1996) 115-150; M. Wallraff, *Christus verus Sol. Sonnenverehrung und Christentum in der Spätantike*, JAC Ergänzungsband 32, Münster West. 2001.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

SUNDAY

I. Origin - II. The oldest form of the Sunday celebration - III. Significance - IV. The letter concerning Sunday.

I. Origin. It has on a number of occasions been claimed that the Christian Sunday depends on a pre-existing non-Christian institution.

1. A day dedicated to the sun, from which it took its name, is found in Greco-Roman antiquity from the 1st c. AD; it is the second day of the planetary *week. There is no mention, however, of a Sunday *celebration* in non-Christian antiquity; nor in the cult of Mithras did this day assume particular importance at such an early date. It is thus a weak hypothesis to suppose an *originary* influence of sun worship on the Christian Sunday (contra S. Bacchiocchi); a *secondary* influence is nonetheless detectable (see below).

2. Recently a Jewish precursor to the Christian Sunday was claimed to have been found: after the discoveries at *Qumran, a solar calendar used by this sect was reconstructed; in this calendar the feasts occurred each year on the same day of the week: on Wednesday, Friday or Sunday (A. Jaubert). Thus far, however, there has been no proof that at Qumran the *weekly* Sunday had particular importance. It is therefore hasty to speak of an influence of Qumran on the Christian Sunday (contra E. Higert), esp. if one simultaneously supposes a genuinely Christian origin of the Sunday celebration (contra C.S. Mosna).

3. The Sunday celebration thus appears to be a creation of the Christian church (first mention: 1 Cor 16:2). How did this come about? Generally the response is that the *resurrection of Christ on Easter morning* led to this prominence given to Sunday. This answer is only partially correct, however. In fact, on the one hand the first Christian Sunday celebrations took place not in the morning but in the evening (Acts 20:7); on the other hand, until the 2nd c. the resurrection of Jesus on Easter morning is mentioned only in passing as a reason for the Sunday celebration (*Barn.* 15.9; Just., *Apol.* I, 67,7). Scholars thus offer two theses that, though different, are more precise.

4. Initially the Christians are assumed to have met on Saturday (H. Riesenfeld; R. Staats). For practical reasons, it was most natural to come together to "break the bread" in accordance with the Jewish *sabbath (which the first Christians still celebrated). Only in the 2nd c. was the celebration moved to Sunday morning, in memory of Christ's resurrection.

5. Since the thesis of a "moving" of the celebration creates difficulties, it seems better founded to suppose that the first Christians met for the Eucharist on *Sunday evening* (Acts 20:7; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* X,96,7), in continuity with Christ's appearances on the evening of Easter (Jn 20:19) and the Sunday after (Jn 20:26), and also in continuity with his taking a meal with his disciples (Lk 24:30, 41-43; Acts 1:3f.). Thus, e.g., C. Callewaert, O. Cullmann, H. Dumaine, W. Rordorf.

6. The adventist thesis (now newly represented by S. Bacchiocchi) acc. to which the Sunday celebration was introduced in the late 2nd c. through the church of Rome, as an anti-Jewish reaction and in dependency on the pagan cult of the sun, is weakly based (cf. ZKG 91 [1980] 112-116).

II. The oldest form of the Sunday celebration. This can be deduced from the descriptions contained in the **Didache*, in the *Letter* of Pliny, in Justin and in the **Apostolic Tradition*.

1. At the beginning the *Eucharist was celebrated in the evening, in the context of a full meal (1 Cor 11:25; *Did.* 10,1; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* X,96,7: second meeting). This celebration had an *eschatological character, not exclusively in the sense of expecting the end of the world but in the fact that it was conscious of the presence of the glorified Lord and therefore concerned the community's holiness.

For this reason people underwent a serious examination of conscience before Communion, and pardoned one another's faults (1 Cor 11:28ff.; *Did.* 10,6; 14,1-2 [in reference to Mt 5:23f.]; Tertull., *Apol.* 39). The evening communal meal was continued for a long time with the *agapes*.

2. Besides this, perhaps quite early, there was a Christian celebration in the morning before dawn, the first evidence of which is in Pliny (*Ep.* X,96,7); it was certainly related to the conferral of *baptism. After the evening celebration was abolished during the same period (Pliny's letter gives a reason: the prohibition of *hetairai*), Christians celebrated the liturgy only early on Sunday morning.

3. This is exactly what we find in Justin, who in 1 *Apol.* 65 describes the celebration of baptism. Since it, like the Sunday morning celebration described in 1 *Apol.* 67, concluded with the Eucharist, we can suppose that the celebration of baptism at Justin's time was still linked to the Sunday morning liturgy. After the baptism, which took place in running water

(Acts 8:38; *Did.* 7,1), the newly baptized were led among the gathered community. The liturgy of the word then began, consisting, acc. to the synagogue model, in readings followed by an explanation by the presider. Then all prayed, standing (recalling the resurrection: Tertull., *Cor.* 3; Basil., *Spir. sanct.* 27,67). Deacons brought *Communion to those who were absent, and a collection was taken up for the needy.

4. Preserved for the first time in the **Apostolic Tradition* (4), in the context of an episcopal ordination (which also took place on Sunday: *Apost. Trad.* 3), is a complete eucharistic *liturgy which not only godfathered, in antiquity, the eucharistic liturgies of both East and West, but which has recently played a major role in the attempts at liturgical reform in all the churches.

III. Significance. This will be described by examining the various names for Sunday in the Christian tradition, acc. to the theological importance of each title.

1. *The Lord's Day* (*kyriakē hēmera*). The new Christian name for this day, which has been preserved in various languages (esp. in the Slavic and Romance languages). It is first attested in Rev 1:10, then in *Did.* 14,1; *Ev. Petr.* 35.50; Dionysius of Corinth (= Eus., *HE* IV,23,11), etc. "The Lord's Day" is a form analogous to "the Lord's Supper" of 1 Cor 11:20: Sunday is the day that remembers the Lord (Christ), perhaps esp. because on it the "Lord's Supper" is celebrated. The central significance of the Eucharist stands out in the texts cited in section 2 above. All Christians took part (Just., 1 *Apol.* 67,3.5), even at the risk of their life (Tertull., *Fuga* 14,1; *Acta Saturnini, Dativi et al.* 9.11). The rediscovery of the Sunday Communion of the whole community is one of the most welcome characteristics of our ecumenical age, whose greatest strength is drawn from a deeper reliance on the tradition.

2. *The eighth day*. This name (*Barn.* 15,8-9, Just., *Dial.* 41,4; 138,1; Cypr., *Ep.* 64,4; *Didascalia* VI,18,11-16; Ambrosiaster, *Liber quaest.* 95,2; Basil., *Spir. sanct.* 27,64) expressed, on the one hand, that the reality of Sunday "transcends" the week, and as such represents an open window on eternity. On the other hand, in Jewish and Greek antiquity the *Ogdoad was a symbol of perfection, which Christians related to the effusion of the *Holy Spirit in baptism (on Sunday) (1 Pet 3:18-21; 2 Pet 2:5; Ambr., *Ep.* 41 [44], 6 [4]. 17 [15]; cf. octagonal baptisteries), and which in heretical (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I,5,3; Clem. Alex., *Exc. ex Theod.* 63,1) and ecclesiastical speculation (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* V,106, 2; VI, 108, 1; Orig., *Comm. in Ps.* 118,4; Aug., *Ep.* 55,23) became a symbol of drawing near to God.

3. *The first day*. The name for Sunday in Jewish tradition and in the gospels (Mk 16:2 and par.; Jn 20:19). The Christian week thus *begins* with Sunday; it would be good to remember this in our age of the absolute predominance of an economic perspective. The festive day opens a medley of working days (K. Barth, *Kirchl. Dogm.* III,4,51-79). In the biblical tradition, this is the day of the creation of light (Gen 1:3; cf. Just., 1 *Apol.* 67,7; Eus., *Comm. in Ps.* 91 [92]), a fact which made it possible for Christians to readily adopt the pagan name *day of the sun* (first in Just., 1 *Apol.* 67,3), which is affirmed in Germanic and Anglo-Saxon languages (Sunday); moreover, Christ was also compared to the sun (Ign. Antioch, *Magn.* 9,1; Just., *Dial.* 100,4; Mel. Sardis, *Bapt.* 4; Orig., *In Lev. hom.* 9,10; Athan., *De sabbato et circumc.* 5; Jer., *In die dom. Paschae hom.*). This obviously also ran the risk of syncretism (Tertull., *Nat.* 1,13,1-5; *Apol.* 16,9-11; Eus., *Vita Const.* IV. 19-20; cf. the fixing of Christmas on 25 December).

4. The most serious confusion, however, was misunderstanding Sunday as though it were a *Christian* *Sabbath. This false step was taken by the church after Constantine the Great, in 321, proclaimed Sunday a public day of rest in the Roman Empire (CI III,12,2; CTh II,8,1). To give a sense to the obligatory Sunday rest (Christians, however, at first continued to work: Jer., *Ep.* 108,20,3; Pall., *Hist. Laus.* 59,2; Benedict of Nursia, *Reg.* 48,22f.), the unfortunate idea was advanced of explaining the Sunday rest using the commandment concerning the sabbath (Eus., *Comm. in Ps.* 91 [92]; Ephr. Syr., *Sermo ad noct. dom. resurrectionis* 4; John Chrys., *Bapt. Christi hom.* 1; Id., *In Gen. hom.* 10,7; Eus. Alex., *Sermo* 16); in the 6th c. the equation of Sunday with the sabbath was completely established (Caes. Arles, *Sermo* 10,3,5; Counc. of Orléans, can. 31,28; Mart. Braga, *De correctione rust.* 18; Ishoyahb, *Ep. can. ad Iacobum* 4; II Counc. of Mâcon, can. 1; Counc. of Narbonne, can. 4). Such a change would not have been possible in the church before Constantine, both because Sunday rest was unknown and, esp., because the church had reached the conclusion that the sabbath commandment was no longer obligatory in the New Covenant and thus had nothing to do with the Christian Sunday (sabbath). It would be better today to stress the original definition of Sunday as the day on which the eucharistic liturgy is celebrated. Sunday rest, whose ethical-social significance should in no way be diminished (here the OT sabbath legislation got many things right), has been associated with Sunday not by the will of God but by the grace of the emperor; it is not necessary that the two remain forever linked.

H. Dumaine, *Dimanche*: DACL 4,858-954; C. Callewaert, *La synaxe eucharistique à Jérusalem, berceau du dimanche*: EThL 15 (1938) 34-73; var. aus., *Der christliche Sonntag. Probleme und Aufgaben*, Vienna 1956; J. Gaillard, *Dimanche*: DSp III, 948-982; A. Jaubert, *La date de la Cène*, Paris 1957; var. aus., *Der Tag des Herrn, Die Heiligung des Sonntags im Wandel der Zeit*, Vienna 1958; var. aus., *Verlorener Sonntag?*, Kirche im Volk 22, Stuttgart 1959; H. Riesenfeld, *Sabbat et jour du Seigneur*, in *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, ed. AJ.B. Higgins, Manchester 1959, 210-218 (= The Sabbath and the Lord's Day, The Gospel Tradition, Oxford 1970, 111-137); F.A. Reagan, *Dies dominica and dies solis: The Beginnings of the Lord's Day in Christian Antiquity* (Diss.), Washington, DC 1961; O. Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*: Abh. z. Theol. des AT. u. NT. 3 ([4]1962) 14ff.; W. Rordorf, *Der Sonntag. Geschichte des Ruhe- und Gottesdiensttages im ältesten Christentum*: Abh. z. Theol. des A.T. u. N.T. 43, Zürich 1962 (Eng.: London-New York 1968; Sp.: Barcelona 1972); E. Hilgert, *Jubilees and the Origin of Sunday*: Andrews University Sem. Studies 3 (1963) 44-51; var. aus., *Le dimanche*: La MaisonD. 83 (1965); var. aus., *Le dimanche*: Lex Orandi 39, Paris 1965; C.S. Mosna, *Storia della domenica dalle origini fino agli inizi del V secolo. Problema delle origini e sviluppo. Culto e riposo, Aspetti pastorali e liturgici*: Analecta Gregoriana 170, Rome 1969; P.K. Jewett, *The Lord's Day: A Theological Guide to the Christian Day of Worship*, Grand Rapids, MI 1971; W. Rordorf, *Sabbat und Sonntag in den Alten Kirche*: Traditio Christiana 2, Zürich 1972 (Fr.: Neuchâtel-Paris 1972; It.: Turin 1979); R. Staats, *Ogdoas als Symbol für die Auferstehung*: VChr 26 (1972) 29-52; G. Troxler, *Das Kirchengebot der Sonntagsmesspflicht als moral theologisches Problem in Geschichte und Gegenwart*: Arbeiten zur prakt. Theol. 2, Fribourg 1971; S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, Rome 1977; R. Staats, *Die Sonntagnachtgottesdienste der christlichen Frühzeit*: ZNTW 66 (1975) 242-263; R.T. Beckwith - W. Stott, *This Is the Day: The Biblical Doctrine of the Christian Sunday*, London 1978; Th. Bergholz, *Sonntag*: TRE 31 (2000) 449-472 (bibl.); A. Di Berardino, *La cristianizzazione del tempo nei secoli IV-V: la domenica*: Augustinianum 41 (2002) 97-125.

W. Rordorf

IV. The Letter concerning Sunday (apocryphal). Ancient tradition (*Lucian of Samosata, *Epistolai Chronikai*) includes a tradition of letters falling from heaven, as does (esp.) the Christian tradition: besides the *Odes of Solomon* and the *Song of the Pearl* we have a large number of texts, in various languages, of letters fallen from heaven. Common elements regarding these letters include: (1) a letter falls on an altar (Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Bethlehem etc.); (2) in it Christ asks that Sunday be respected, promising terrible punishments to all those who do not; other prescriptions are later added. Some versions also mention the date on which the letter fell. The first mention of such a letter comes from the letter of Licinianus of Cartagena of 584, but it was probably known to Caesarius of Arles (d. 543). According to M. van Esbroeck, the letter originated in Jerusalem between 451 and 453; we find some letters concerning Sunday in the Carolingian period, in India, during the French Revolution and in the modern period; the presence of such letters in various popular cultures is attested by ethnographers.

CANT 311; BHG 812i-r; M. Bittner, *Der von Himmel gefallene Brief Christi in seinen morgenländischen Versionen und Rezensionen*, Denkschriften d. k. Akad. d. Wiss. in Vienna, Philos.-hist. Klasse 51, 1905, 1-232 (12 Greek texts, 7 Syriac, 5 Karshuni, 7 Arabic, 3 Ethiopic). *Translations*: It. - Erbetta 3, 113-118; Polish - Starowieyski 3,96-106 (M. Zowczak, ibid. 106-111, bibl., ibid. 358-360); Sp. - Santos Otero 664-676. Fr. - R. Renoir: DACL 3 (1913) 1534-1546; H. Delehaye, in *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine*, Brussels 1966, 150-178; M. van Esbroeck: AB 107 (1989) 267-284; Eng. - R. Faerber: Apocrypha 12 (2001) 173-209.

M. Starowieyski

SUPERSTITION. The term *superstition* generally indicates every form of human relationship with the sphere of the divine that does not enter the "official" religious tradition; and in the classical understanding of the term, it characterizes superfluous religion, vitiated by superstitious practices, vain observance and an excess of religious scrupulosity. The *pagans saw in Christianity a *superstitio nova et malefica* (Suetonius, *Ner.* 16,3), *prava et immodica* (Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* X,96): they meant by this term a foreign religion. In the Vulgate, the term *superstitio* translated two different Greek expressions: δεισιδαιμονία (Acts 17:22; 25:19), with the meaning of divinities and suspicious practices; and ἐθελοθρησκία (Col 2:23), a showy and feigned religiosity.

In the writings of the Greek fathers, the two terms have the meanings of idolatry (Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 2; *Strom.* II,8; VII,4; *Orig., *C. Cels.* 6,17; *Greg. Nyss., *Or. cat.* 18) and superstition or vain cult, or applied to Judaism, heresy or paganism. For the Latin fathers, superstition was a falsification of the true religion; it is the religion of the false gods: *Veri (Dei) cultus est, superstitio falsi* (Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* IV,28,11; see also Aug., *Ep.* 102, III, 18; *De vera rel.* 111); ancient, vain practices and false, irrational beliefs (see Aug., *Civ. Dei* IV,30). *Constantine and subsequent Roman emperors would gradually suppress, as a superstition, pagan cults and aberrant Christian movements. The term would then be extended to the vestiges of paganism, divination, formulas and magical practices, religions and sects contrary to the catholic faith and the heresies (see, e.g., *Cod. Theod.* XII,1,158; XVI,5,10.34.39; XVI,7,6; XVI,8,28; XVI,10,20).

J.P. Migne, *Dictionnaire des sciences occultes*, I-II, Paris 1846; DTC 14b (1941) 2763-2766; DACL 15 (1953) 1730-1736; EC 11 (1953) 1574-1576; S. Calderone, *Superstitio*, in ANRW I, 2 (1972) 377-396; L.F. Janssen, *Die Bedeutungentwicklung von Superstitio-*

Superstes: Mnemosyne 26 (1975) 135-188; Id., *Superstitio and the Persecution of the Christians*: VChr 33 (1979) 131-159; D. Harmening, *Superstitio*, Berlin 1979; M. Sachot, *Religio/superstitio: histoire d'une subversion et d'un retournement*: RHR 208 (1991) 355-394; D.M. Moser (ed.), *Glaube im Abseits. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Aberglaubens*, Darmstadt 1992; LTK³ 1, 40-46; D.B. Martin, *Inventing Superstition: From the Hippocratics to the Christians*, Cambridge, MA-London 2004; X. Levieils, *Crises dans l'empire romain et lutte contre la superstition chrètienne* (*Ier-IVe siècles*): RSLR 41 (2005) 1-38.

M. Maritano

SUSANNA

I. In the writings of the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the writings of the Fathers. The story of Susanna (Dan 13:1-65) is found in the LXX, *Theodotion's version and the Vulgate as a deuterocanonical part of the book of *Daniel. In the LXX, the account is set as the first supplementary chapter, although in Theodotion's version it constitutes the first chapter of the book of Daniel. The Fathers used this latter translation, which presents a more dramatic and elaborate story. In Christian literature, *Tertullian, though not citing the text, was the first to speak about the story of Susanna (*De corona* 4,3) with respect to the use of the veil as an indication of modesty, mentioning her inasmuch as she was an example for Christian women. In the writings of *Cyprian (*Ep.* 43,4), who like Tertullian does not cite the text, the chaste Susanna accused by the elders is used *allegorically as a symbol of the church of Carthage, whose decency and evangelical truth appear to be threatened by *Felicissimus and his five presbyters. The first commentator on this OT account was *Hippolytus (*Comm. in Dan.* 1,12,33ff.). Using Theodotion's version, he commented on the story in an allegorical-typological sense: Susanna symbolizes the church; her husband Joakim, Christ; the two seductive elders represent the Jews and pagans; the garden is the community of the elect; Babylon, the world. Susanna's bath symbolizes baptism: faith and charity serve her; the perfumes represent the commandments of the Word, although the oil represents the power of the *Holy Spirit. In a letter sent to *Origen (ca. 240), *Julius Africanus called into question the authenticity and canonicity of the story of Susanna. Origen's response was peremptory, declaring in favor of the complete authenticity of the text (*Epist. ad Afric.* 9). The story of Susanna was written about by *Jerome, who provided philological commentary on it, and the great 4th-c. Fathers, who saw in Susanna a model of charity (Greg. Naz., *Poem. mor.* 2,195; ps.-Aug., *Serm.* 112,2), a sign of conjugal modesty (Aug., *Serm.* 343,1-8), and of silent innocence (Aug., *Serm.* 318,2), because Susanna is similar to Christ in his trial (Ambr., *Exp. in Lc.* 10,97). In the most ancient liturgical texts, Susanna is mentioned as an example of a person saved by God from an unjust judgment.

J.R. Busto Saiz, *El texto Teodociónico de Daniel y la tradición de Símaco*: Sefarad 40 (1980) 41-55; J. Schüpphaus, *Das Verhältnis von LXX- und Theodotion-Text in den apokryphen Zusätzen zum Danielbuch*: ZAW 83 (1971) 49-72; H. Engel, *Die Susanna-Erzählung. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (OBO 61) Freiburg-Göttingen 1985.

S. Samulowitz

II. Iconography. A model of salvation and prefiguration of Christ, who as an innocent victim that was to be sacrificed, the figure of Susanna appears in the iconography of the Christian community relatively late (3rd–4th c.) with respect to the other themes. Often represented only between two trees, praying (London, British Museum, glass cup from St. Severinus, Cologne; Oxford, Pusey House, glass plate) or between the two elders—represented, however, always with youthful appearance—(*Rome, Cemetery of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus: 2nd half of the 4th c., Cemetery of Domitilla: 1st half of the 4th c.; greater cemetery: 2nd half of the 4th c.; Leningrad, Museum of the Hermitage, glass club from Prodgoritza: 5th c.), Susanna is also found together with *Daniel in the scene of the judgment (Rome, Cemetery of *Callistus: 2nd half of 3rd c.); and once the representation assumes the aspect of an antiheretical allegory (Rome, the Cemetery of *Praetextatus, the so-called arcosolium of Celerina, threatened by two wolves: 2nd half of the 4th c.).

Especially from the 4th c. the episodes that characterized the story of Susanna—Susanna's temptation, accusation by the elders, their sentence, Susanna's vindication, the execution of one or both of the elders, Daniel with a companion—are subdivided into three scenes (Rome, Cemetery of Priscilla, Greek Chapel; Rome, Museum delle Terme, *sarcophagus: 1st third of the 4th c.; Brescia, Museo Cristiano, reliquary: 4th c.; Rome, Mausoleum of Constanza, lost decoration of the dome: 4th c.), in four scenes (Rome, Museo Pio Cristiano Vaticano, sarcophagus: 2nd third of the 4th c.), and in five scenes (Girona, church of St. Felix, sarcophagus: the first decades of the 4th c.). On a sarcophagus from *Arles, and on one lost from Cahors, Daniel, a judge in the scene of the judgment of Susanna, is matched on the opposite side with Pilate, in a clear allusion to Susanna's function as a parallel to Christ, the predestined victim. Finally, to note a unique representa-

tion, there is the one on the glass cup of Homblières (Paris, the Louvre Museum: 4th c.) where Susanna appears naked between the two elders.

P. Testini: EC 11, 1589ff.; H. Schlosser: LCI 4, 228-231; Wp 334ff.; Ws II, 251ff.; L. de Bruyne, *L'imposition des mains dans l'art chrétien ancien. Contribution iconologique à l'histoire du geste*: RivAC 20 (1943) 248-252 (the judgment of Susanna); H. Schlosser, *Die Daniel-Susanna Erzählung in Bild und Literatur der christlichen Frühzeit*: ROE Suppl. 30 (1965) 243-249; MC. Dagens, *Autour du pape Libère. L'iconographie de Suzanne et des martyrs romains sur l'arcosolium de Celerina*: MEFR Ant. 78 (1966) 327-381; M.M. Cecchelli Trinci, *Studio su Susanna nella interpretazione patristica e nell'antica iconografia cristiana*: Miscellanea G.L. Messina, Rome n.d.; TIP 282-284.

G. Santagata

SUSANNA, martyr – CHURCH of SAINT SUSANNA. The presence at the Roman synod of 595 (MGH, *Epist.*, I,367) of presbyters representing a *titulus Sanctae Susannae* introduces the complex historical and archaeological question centered on this person, whose story is narrated by a *Passio* that can be dated to the 6th c. (AASS., *Aug.*, II,632ff.): acc. to this *hagiographical account at the time of the emperor *Diocletian, Susanna underwent *martyrdom in the house of her father, the presbyter Gabinius, a place near the Porta Salaria, and there Pope *Caius, her Father's brother, instituted a *statio*. The legend adds that the same pope lived in the house nearby, which was esp. significant because it connected with the place designation *ad duas domos*, which evidently recalls the memory of the two contiguous inhabitations and which the *Mart. hier.* (in the Bernese version: AASS., *Nov.*, II.1, 104; II.2, 434-436) cites to situate there the veneration of the saints on 11 Aug. Moreover, the topographical details inserted both in the *Passio* and in the martyrology, in which the author specifies that the site is found near the baths of Diocletian, lead with clarity to locating the place where the church was built, today facing the modern Via XX Settembre.

The gap present until the first mention of the basilica at the tail end of the 6th c. could be filled by the presence, at the preceding synod of 499 (MGH, *AA* XII, 413), of representatives of a *titulus Gai*, which by name mentions the pontiff-uncle of Susanna and which early on must have disappeared only to be replaced by the title dedicated to her.

With respect to the church building, nothing, or almost nothing, is preserved of the early Christian construction, which was the object of important donations by Pope *Sergius I (687–701: LP I,375) and a restoration commissioned by *Hadrian I (772–795: LP I,507): the building was entirely reconstructed at the beginning of the 9th c. by order of Pope *Leo III (795–816: LP II,3), who moreover furnished the apsidal basin with an interesting depiction, unfortunately now lost, in which at the end of the row of saints standing next to Christ and the Virgin *Mary, there appeared the pontiff on one side and the lay emperor Charlemagne on the other.

Of this three-aisled Carolingian basilica there remains, under the superfluous additions that occurred over the centuries, only the central aisle, the result of the reduction ordered by Pope Sixtus IV in the 2nd half of the 15th c. Digs conducted in the area in 1830 and 1938 brought to light remains belonging to structural residences from the imperial age that were suggestively considered an allusion to the place designation *ad duas domos;* although a subsequent investigation during the 1990s allowed scholars to identify a small early medieval graveyard of considerable interest, situated in the area corresponding to the left aisle of the Leonine basilica, which had obliterated it. Between the burials, which were certainly done in relation to the most ancient worship building, then subsequently lost, a reused sarcophagus stands out in bold relief inside of which, in addition to the skeleton of a deceased person, were found fragments of a fresco decoration, detached and interred here so that it might be preserved as a sort of *relic. The restoration of such fragments has allowed scholars to reconstruct three decorative nuclei: the representation of the Madonna with Child on the throne between two saints, some heads of saints and esp. a gabled-form fresco at the top, the representation of the *Agnus Dei* identified by St. *John the Baptist and St. *John the Evangelist. The most probable hypothesis leads one to recognize these fragments as part of the decoration of the early Christian *titulus* of St. Susanna that was destroyed and replaced by the new basilica completed by Leo III. A similar discovery turned out to be of extreme interest for the means of extraction and preservation of fragments because it was a work of detachment, completed with great care during the occasion of the reconstruction of the church with the goal of preserving the pictorial testimonies not so that they might be reused or serve some other function, but to be enclosed within the sarcophagus that was destined to be covered by the foundation of the new basilica, the circumstance that makes evident the enormous value that had to be attributed to them. The dating of the frescoes still remains unsettled: the attribution to the intervention by Hadrian I, proposed by M. Andaloro, could however find a more stimulating explanation advanced by M. Cechelli if connected with the activity of Sergius I, whose determined po-

sition in relation to the representation of the lamb had even led him, as is well known, to oppose the Eastern emperor. A similar origin could justify the special treatment that was reserved for these paintings during the 9th c.

B.M. Apollonj Ghetti, *Santa Susanna* (Le chiese di Rome illustrate, 85), Rome 1965; R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*, IV, Vatican City 1976, 243-266; A. Bonanni, *Scavi e ricerche in S. Susanna a Roma. Le fasi paleocristiane e altomedievali*, in Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Archeologia Cristiana (Cassino 1993), I, Cassino 2003, 359-373; M. Andaloro, *I dipinti murali depositati nel sarcofago dell'area di Santa Susanna a Roma*, ibid., 377-383; V. von Falkenhausen, *Sergio I*: EPapi 1, 633-636; M. Cecchelli - M. Andaloro, *Santa Susanna. Le indagini archeologiche; Gli affreschi frammentati*, in M.S. Arena et al. (ed.), *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo Nazionale Romano Crypta Balbi*, Milan 2001, 641-645; M. Cecchelli *et al.*, *Santa Susanna*, in L. Paroli - L. Vendittelli, *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo II. Contesti tardoantichi e altomedievali*, Milan 2004, 328-341.

A. Milella

SYAGRIUS (mid-5th c.). Anti-Priscillianist, belonging to the *conventus* of Lugo (Gabizia). Along with *Pastor he was ordained bishop against the will of *Agrestius, the *metropolitan of Lugo and, as it seems, acc. to *Hydatius the pro-Roman (see *Chron.* 102), a sympathizer with *Priscillian. According to C. Torres, Agrestius's opposition could have been motivated by the fact that Pastor and Syagrius were partisans of Hermeric and faithful to the pro-Suevian party. During the confusing and tense situation in the ecclesiastical province of *Gallaecia after the invasions, acc. to the information provided by *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 65 [66]), Syagrius wrote a book on the *Trinity, toning down the original terms used by the *heretics. One of his writings has been preserved: *Regulae definitionum contra haereticos prolatae.* K. Künstle attributed also to him, among other writings, the treatise *Ad neophytos de symbolo* written by ps.-Ambrose, and the ps.-Augustinian sermons 237, 238 and 239. Scholars have cautiously and partially accepted Künstle's attributions. One must not confuse the Gallaecian Syagrius with the Syagrius mentioned by Consentius.

Reg. definitionum: CPL 560.702 - PL 13, 639-642; K. Künstle, *Antipriscilliana*, Freiburg 1902, 142-159; PLS 3, 132-140; *Ad neophytos*: CPL 178 - PLS 1, 606.1749, K. Künstle, op. cit.; *Serm.* 237, 238, 239: CPL 368 - PL 39, 1735-2354, K. Künstle, op. cit.; P.B. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, II/I, Regensburg 1864 (Graz 1956), 466-467; G. Morin, *Pastor et Syagrius, deux écrivains perdus du cinquième siècle*: RBen 10 (1893) 385-390; A.C. Vega, *Un poema inédito titulado "De fide" de Agrestio obispo de Lugo, siglo V*: Boletín R. Acad. Hist. 159 (1966) 167-209; C. Torres, *Galicia sueva*, La Coruña 1977, 76; *Patrología* III, Spanish ed. Madrid 1981, 685; H. Chadwick, *Prisciliano de Avila*, Madrid 1978, 285-287; Domínguez del Val, 63-64.

E. Romero Pose

SYAGRIUS of Autun (d. ca. 600). Not a single biography written about Syagrius's life has survived. To compensate for this, scholars have used strong testimonies about the prestige he enjoyed among well-noted individuals from this time, beginning with Pope *Gregory the Great (Jaffé: *Ep.* 1438, 1491, 1743, 1747-48). He was elected bishop of *Autun around 560. King Guntram ordered Syagrius to accompany him to the ceremony of *Chlothar II's baptism in 591. He had access to all the courts in *Gaul (Burdundy-Neustria-Austrasia-Aquitania), but esp. that of Childebert II, king of the *Franks, during the regency of his mother Brunhilde. Gregory the Great commended to him the missionaries sent to England and even wanted to appoint him as head over the bishops of the province of *Lyons. He participated at almost all the councils that were held in France during his time, and he was commissioned by the pontiff to organize and preside over a general council of the churches in Gaul, but it seems that his death (599–600?) did not permit him to accomplish this project.

For Gregory the Great's *Letters* sent to him, see also *Registrum Epistolarum*, ed. P.E. Wald - L.M. Hartmann, in MGH, *Ep.* I and II. See EC 11, 504; LTK³ 9, 1151; BS 11, 1016-1018; Catholicisme 14, 628; L. Pietri, *Grégoire le Grand et la Gaule: le projet pour la réforme de l'Église gauloise*, in *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo*, Rome 1991, I, 109-128; BBKL 11, 312-313.

L. Dattrino

SYLVESTER I, pope (314–335). Very little is known for certain concerning the rather long pontificate of Pope Sylvester I. He did not participate, however, in the Council of *Arles. Nevertheless, he received from this gathering a rather courteous letter, in which he was invited to communicate the decisions of this council to the bishops (Mirbt n. 239). At the Council of *Nicaea (325) he was represented by two presbyters, without having a direct influence on the council's decisions. Nor does he seem to have been involved in the subsequent activities of *Constantine, either on the level of the universal church or on that of the Roman community (construction of churches etc.). Only from the 5th c. onward did legend connect him to the conversion and baptism of the emperor *Constantine, thus supplying the supposed historical foundation for the author of the so-called *Donation of Constantine.

CPL 244; 2235. E. Ewig, *Das Bild Constantins des Grossen in den ersten Jahrhunderten des abendländischen Mittelalters*: Historisches Jahrbuch 75 (1956) 1-46 (legend); R.J. Loenertz, *"Actus Sylvestri." Genèse d'une legende*: RHE 70 (1975) 426-439; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976, 168-187 (bibl.); W. Pohlkamp, *Tradition und Topographie: Papst Silvester und der Drache vom Forum Romanum*: Römische Quartalschrift 78 (1983) 1-100; Id., LMA 7, 1905-1908; LTK³ 9, 587; LACL (2000) 641; T. Canella, *Gli Actus Silvestri. Genesi di una leggenda su Costantino imperatore*, Spoleto 2006.

B. Studer

SYLVIA (d. before 594). The few pieces of information that we have about Sylvia come from the writings of Pope *Gregory the Great and from his biographies written by Paul the Deacon and John the Deacon. She was the wife of Gordianus, a regionary of Rome (i.e., a cleric or lay official attached to one of the ecclesiastical regions of Rome), with whom she had two children, Gregory, the future bishop of Rome, and Palatinus (Gregory, *Ep.* 11,4). Gordianus's home at the Clivus Scauri on the Caelian Hill was transformed by Gregory into a monastery dedicated to St. Andrew probably upon the death of his father (John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii* I,9). Sylvia then led an almost monastic solitary life in the monastery of Cella Nova near the church of St. *Sabas on the Aventine Hill. The fact that Gregory in a sermon spoke of Sylvia as present at the death of her paternal aunt Trasilla (*Hom. in Ev.* II,38,15), which occurred in 592, and then did not mention her in the *Dialogues* (IV,6) when mentioning this event, leads one to suspect that Sylvia had died between 592 and 594, the date of the composition of Gregory's *Dialogues*. Gregory the Great desired that an image of his mother be placed alongside that of Gordianus in the church of St. Andrew on the Caelian Hill (John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii* IV,83). John the Deacon (*Vita Gregorii* I,9) spoke of an oratory dedicated to Sylvia near the church of St. Sabas. In the Roman Martyrology the feast day for this saint is recorded for 3 November.

AASS *Nov.* III, 658-662; BS 11, 1082-1083; LCI 8, 359-360; BBKL 10 (1995), 348-349; LTK 9, 590; PCBE II, *Italie*, 2, 2072.

G. Pilara

SYMBOLS – SYMBOLISM

I. In literary tradition - II. In art.

I. In literary tradition. In general the symbols used by the iconographic Christian tradition are also attested and discussed by the written sources. They are placed alongside these numerous symbols that are attested exclusively at the literary level and are often hidden by use of two of the most widespread exegetical techniques in the ancient church: *allegory and *typology. The chief sources of these symbols were obviously the Scriptures of the OT and the NT, which were very soon joined by themes taken from the surrounding *pagan culture. Occasionally one can perceive the presence of extrabiblical Jewish traditions and *apocryphal texts.

Here we briefly mention some special categories of symbols, because there still does not exist a systematic treatment of symbols in general.

**Numbers.* Among the most widespread literary conventions in the OT there is that which attributes specific meanings to the use of specific "perfect" numbers (3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 40 . . .). In the NT, only *John's book of Revelation made abundant use of this type of symbol (7 churches, 7 seals, 666: number of the beast, 12 ×12 × 1000 elect; the dimensions of the heavenly city); elsewhere such numbers are rather rare (though note the "70 × 7" from Mt 18:22 and the "third heaven" of 2 Cor 12:2), even if the typological intention is evident which causes the number of *apostles to coincide with that of the twelve tribes of Israel (and establishes that of the disciples in 72, a multiple of the preceding figure). In the subsequent Christian tradition this type of symbolism, which borders allegory, became relatively rare, perhaps because of its very frequent use in*gnosticism (see the 30 *aeons of the *Valentinians, which became 10 for *Mark the Gnostic and 3 among the *Simonians, etc.). Notable exceptions are the *ogdoad, which represents the resurrection and eternity (with its architectonic facets) and some passages from the writings of *Irenaeus (the correspondence between the gospels and the four corners of the earth and the four winds: *Adv. haer.* 3,11,8; the seven heavens and the seven gifts of the Spirit: *Epid.* 9). The letters of the Greek alphabet also have a numeric value. This property at times was used for arithmological speculations, analogous to rabbinic Kabbalah; thus *Barnabas (*Ep.* 9,8) saw in the 318 servants of *Abraham (see Gen 17:23 and 14:14) an image of the cross of Christ because the *iota* (10) and the *tau* (8) are the initials of Jesus' name and the letter *tau* (300) recalls with the same design the cross of Christ. The letters of the Greek alphabet, however, which are found on the garments of male figures, have a christological meaning (*see* *gammadia). Other uses of the same type also found in the writings of the gnostics, who also used other techniques such as that of adding the numeric values of the letters of one word: see the case of περιστερά ("dove") which for the Marcosians is a symbol of the heavenly Christ, inasmuch as it is the sum of his let-

ters (801) and is equal to that of the alpha (1) and the omega (800). The symbolism of the *alpha and the omega also goes back to the book of Revelation ("I am the Alpha and the Omega, says the Lord God, the one who is, was and is to come," 1:8; 21:6; 22:13) to express that Christ is the beginning and the end of all things, the creator and judge beyond time and space (Origen, *Commentary on John* 1, 34-35): these letters are very common in Christian epigraphy.

With respect to the symbolic value of names (which were widespread in the OT and generally in the Semitic world), there are a few examples in the NT, the most famous of which was the change of the name Simon ("dove") into Cephas-Peter ("rock"), and the very name of Jesus ("God saves").

There are rare acrostics and abbreviated forms: alongside the well-known ἰχθύς ("fish"), we should also mention the one that makes of *Adam a symbol of the entire world, inasmuch as it is formed by the initial four cardinal points (Adam [*anatolē*, *dysis*, *arktos*, *mesēmbria*]*;* ps.-*Cyprian, *De montibus Sina et Sion* 4). Two common abbreviations, esp. in the epigraphic field, are Dom = *Deo Optimo Maximo* (an adaptation of the pagan DM = *Diis Manibus*?) and the monogram of Christ formed by overlapping the *chi* (or a cross) and the letter of *rho*: ☧. The etymological and symbolic interpretations of the names are collected in the onomastic lexicons. Among the most famous apparent etymologies is the heavily polemical etymology that connects *Mani to *mania,* "fierce madness."

The path to the symbolic interpretation of animals, plants and natural phenomena was already opened by the Scriptures (see the numerous parables in the gospels which have as their theme seeds and fruits; or also Mt 10:16: "Be wise as serpents and innocent as doves"; Jn 1:29: Jesus "the Lamb of God," etc.), and would be explored with enthusiasm by the various ancient exegetical schools.

The most interesting among the repertories of this type of symbol is the *Physiologus* (4th c.?), which proposes more than forty of them among the animals, plants and minerals, either christological or ascetic, taking up scriptural themes but also some from pagan sources.

Materials deriving from the pagan world very soon entered the Christian tradition; already *Clement of Rome (end of the 1st c.) mentioned the theme of the phoenix to explain the resurrection of Christ (*1 Cor* 26,1). The use of other pagan themes are more well known: *Orpheus, the **orans*, the *peacock, the good *shepherd etc.

Probably in the wake of the positive perception of the world, in which the *logos spermatikos* dwells, proposed by *Justin Martyr, the opportunity or the need to employ themes from the pagan tradition was explicitly given a theoretical rationale by *Clement of Alexandria (see *Protr.* 12,119,1 and passim); Clement was probably the first to introduce into the Christian world the terminology of the pagan banquets and mysteries to refer to the *Eucharist.

An important characteristic of some Christian symbols is their polyvalence: the lion can represent an Evangelist (*John in the East, *Mark in the West), the incarnation and the resurrection of Christ (*Physiologus* 1); the *devil (see 1 Pet 5:8), royal power (in the writings of the Antiochene authors). *Noah as the antitype of Adam (*Athanasius, *Orat. C. ar*. 2,51), as the saved person, as a figure of Christ inasmuch as he saves the righteous in the flood; his ark is a symbol of the church composed of righteous and sinners; Noah and the dove with the small olive branch prefiguring Christ and his baptism; Noah in the ark is a figure of Christ who has been buried, etc.

Many biblical persons, whether in literary texts or those represented in the figurative arts, have a symbolic and typological meaning: e.g., *Daniel in the lions' den, the prototype of the just person persecuted and saved by God through his faith (Clem. Rome, *1 Clem*. 45,6-8); *Elijah, to whom *Ambrose of *Milan dedicated one of his treatises, a model for ascetics; *Job, a prototype of the patient person, the righteous one, the martyr, the athlete of faith, acceptance of the divine will; *Jonah, the prefiguration of Christ, who remains buried for three days, and of the universality of the church; *Joshua, who is also a prefiguration of Christ; *Moses with his staff, a prototype of Christ the Savior; Noah, a symbol of the saved person, and the righteous Noah, a type of Christ, etc.

Now, as an example, let us give the interpretation of some of the most noteworthy Christian symbols: the eagle (Mark in the West, John in the East; baptism, subsequently penance in the *Physiologus*); the anchor (as an instrument of salvation during the time of shipwreck or in a storm of life: Aug., *Serm.* 117,8; John Chrys. *Hom. in Ps*. 9,5); plow (creation, cross and the two natures of Christ); ax (aside from being a symbol of a trade or something else, its meaning should be seen in individual contexts such as the symbols of eternity or the cross [Justin Mart., *Dial.* 86,6; Iren., *Adv. Haer*. 4,34,4]); the Good Shepherd (a symbol of the Savior); cathedra, as a symbol of teaching and therefore the bishop; donkey (pagan peoples: see Mt 21:5-7 esp.); boat, ship (symbol of the church; see Noah's ark and Peter's boat; the mast of the ship represents the cross); ox (Luke the Evangelist); crow (Jesus Christ who kills the *serpent or

dragon, symbols of the devil, apparent etymology); dove (*Holy Spirit; virginity, the soul of the deceased person or rather the afterlife); the crown (the symbol of victory and reward, often associated with the *palm, as an attribute of the martyr); *dextrarum iunctio* (the main gesture of the wedding ceremony); **he-toimasia* (to express the invisible presence of God); phoenix (the resurrection of the flesh); crow (chastity in the *Physiologus;* uncleanness in the writings of the Antiochenes: see PG 59,513); panther (the crucifixion of Christ, baptism and Eucharist, which originated from the water and blood that emerged from the side of Christ); rock, stone (Jesus Christ the cornerstone, the rock from which the water flowed in the desert); tower (church); the lighthouse symbolizes the final destination of the *navigatio animae* (Clem. Alex., *Protrepticus* 8,84; Cypr., *De mort.* 26).

TIP; LexM 8, 353-358; TRE 32, 479-496; F. Wutz, *Onomastica sacra. Untersuchungen zum Liber interpretationis nominum Hebraicorum des hl. Hieronymus*, TU 41, 1-2, Leipzig 1914-1915; H. Rahner, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, Zürich 1945 (It. tr. *Miti greci nell'interpretazione cristiana*, Bologna 1971); J. Daniélou, *Les symboles chrétiens primitifs*, Paris 1961 (It. tr. *I simboli cristiani primitivi*, Rome 1990); E. Testa, *Il simbolismo dei Giudeo-Cristiani*, Jerusalem 1962; H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche. Die Ekklesiologie der Väter*, Salzburg 1964 (It. tr. *L'ecclesiologia dei Padri: simboli della Chiesa*, Rome 1971, repr. Cinisello Balsamo 1994); S. Sterckx - G. de Champeaux, *Introduction au monde des symboles*, La-Pierre-qui-vire 1966; A. Quacquarelli, *L'ogdoade patristica e i suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei monumenti*, Bari 1973; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition*, Cambridge 1975; A. Quacquarelli, *Il leone e il drago nella simbolica dell'età patristica*, Bari 1975; M. Schmitt (ed.), *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*, Regensburg 1982; M. Bonino, *Barche, navi e simboli navali nel cimitero di Priscilla*: RivAC 59 (1983) 277-311; *Lexikon der mittelalterlichen Zahlendbedeutungen*, ed. H. Mayer - R. Suntry, Munich 1987; W. Bies, *Bibliographie zur Symbolik, Ikonographie und Mythologie*, Baden-Baden 1988; G. Spitzing, *Lexikon byzantinisch-christlicher Symbole*, Munich 1989; G. Biamonte, *Dal segno pagano al simbolo cristiano*: SMSR 16 (1992) 93-123; G.B. Ladner, *Handbuch der frühchristlichen Symbolik, Gott Kosmos Mensch*, Stuttgart-Zürich 1992 (Eng. tr.: *God, Cosmos, and Humankind. The World of the Early Christian Symbolism*, Berkeley, CA 1995); N. Gourdier, *Le vêtement et l'alphabet mystique chez les coptes*, in M. Rassart-Debergh - J. Ries (eds.), *Actes du IVe congrès copte*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1992, 135-140; Ch. Ratkowitsch, *Die Edelsteinsymbolik in der lateinischen Dichtung des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts*: WS 105 (1992) 195-232; M. Dulaey, *"Des forêts de symboles": l'initiation chrétienne et la Bible (Ier-VIe siècle)*, Paris 2001 (It. tr. *I simboli cristiani. Catechesi e Bibbia (I-VI secolo)*, Cinisello Balsamo 2004); M.P. Ciccarese, *Animali simbolici: alle origini del bestiario cristiano*, Bologna 2002; I. Bodrozic, *La numerologia in Sant'Agostino*, Zagrabiae [s.n.] 2002; A. Di Pilla, *La rondine nella letteratura cristiana greca e latina di epoca patristica*, in *Curiositas. Studi di cultura classica e medievale in onore di Ubaldo Pizzani*, ed. A. Isola et al., Naples 2002, 423-459; S.J. Voicu, *Adamo, acrostico del mondo*: Apocrypha 2007.

S.J. Voicu

II. In art. Analogous to the literary production and the liturgical practice, the figurative documentation of the early Christian communities shows that they had left considerable room for the use of symbolic figuration. Its primary function was that of visibly synthesizing some of the fundamental principles of Christian teaching through a process of transposition, which allowed a coherent and immediate connection of the images. This process, which already in its first manifestations was configured surprisingly maturely, demanded the formation of a repertory acc. to a code of interpretation clearly illustrated in oral teaching (catechesis and homilies). Figures and scenes develop that, although evolving and becoming rich with meaning, still remain ideologically intact in substance and never lose the necessary capacity of transmitting the message. Symbolic language enjoyed a mature development over the course of the 3rd c., when a sort of discipline of the *arcane, which was natural and almost the necessary consequence of the general situation that opposed the spread of Christianity, could constitute and in fact did constitute a formidable element of cohesion for the early communities.

From the formal point of view, the figurative subjects used as symbols were obviously taken from the heritage of the Roman world in which—it is good to emphasize—esp. in the period of Late Antiquity a general tendency toward visual communication in symbolic language was widespread, esp. in funerary iconography. When necessary recourse was made to the same mythology of elaborate ideograms capable of expressing concepts of the faith of Christians: one thinks of the myths of Cupid, Psyche and *Orpheus frescoed in the catacombs of *Domitilla (Wp pl. 53) and St. *Callistus (Wp pl. 37), that is to say, into community cemeteries (which signifies that they were administrated directly by the ecclesiastical hierarchy); the Four Seasons; the Cupids; and the series of animals in which, through universal convention, were seen as reflections of the positive and negative human qualities. Evidently, it was held that specific mythological themes, at least as an instrument of communication, where not irreconcilable with Christian teaching.

Some of the most ancient and widespread symbols—those that appear primarily in the constitutive nuclei of the Roman cemeteries that are datable between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd c.—refer to the person of Christ; and it is primarily in reference to Christ that Christian artists used such images as the fish, anchor and the lamb.

The fish, considered in relation to the Greek homologue ΙΧΘΥΣ, an acrostic of the series of words

Ἰ(ησοῦς) Χ(ριστός) Θ(εοῦ) Υ(ἱὸς) Σ(ωτήρ), seems to have been used since the beginning, esp. in the paintings and funerary slabs, and tends to disappear as eaerly as the advent of the Constantinian age. The famous and most ancient funerary poems of *Abercius of Hierapolis (Guarducci IV, n. 1, p. 377) and *Pektorious of Autun (Guarducci IV, n. 1, p. 487) explicitly mention the fish. At the beginning of the 3rd c., alongside a basket of bread and a chalice of wine—therefore in the context that evokes the salvific food of the *Eucharist—the fish was frescoed in a cubicle in the region of Cornelius from the cemetery of St. Callistus (Wp pl. 28). In certain scenes of the fish, as, e.g., on those of the frescoes in the cubicle "of the sacraments" in the cemetery of St. Callistus (Wp pl. 27,2-3), the fish can represent the faithful person who has been saved by Christ, the baptized person; this meaning found immediate influence in the famous passage from *Tertullian's *De baptismo* (I,3: CCL 1, p. 277), in which Christians are referred to as *pisciculi* ("little fish") and Christ as ἰχθύς. The anchor, likewise a very ancient image and often connected to the fish, was considered a symbol of hope and eternal life, and because of its form, an allusion to the cross of Christ. The combination anchor–fish, highly meaningful in content, occurs between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd c. in a group of Greek and Latin inscriptions in the sandstone structure under the basilica Apostulorum on the Via Appia at *Rome (ICUR V, 12891, 12892, 12900). The hypothesis that the anchor represented on Christian monuments lacked any symbolic meaning (Stumpf, s.v. *Anker*: RAC I, 441) truly seems to be in clear contrast to the extant figurative documentation.

In the context of christological symbols the so-called stellar Christogram reentered, when it was not used as a *compendium scripturae* of Christ's name. Consisting of crossed Greek initials of the name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, it appears very rarely in the West, although it enjoyed extensive use esp. in Asia Minor. Within the Christian world, its use was probably also favored by the fact that it, already during classical antiquity, was accepted as a generic symbol of divinity and light. At the beginning of the 4th c., this original type of Christogram replaced the so-called Constantinian (or deccusate) monogram, which came about as a result of the mixture, in one sign, of the first two letters of the name Χριστός. Heavily used primarily at Rome and esp. in funerary *epigraphy, over the course of the 4th c. it progressively enriched in its symbolic meaning, with the use, on its sides, of the apocalyptic letters **alpha* and *omega.* Alongside the decussate forms, starting from the 4th c., another Christogram called the "monogrammatic cross" spread.

Some symbols allude directly to the faithful person seen in relation to earthly existence or, more properly, to the afterlife. Thus the sheep, esp. inserted in the context of the afterlife, is depicted as the image of the soul; in the same way the figuration of the *peacock should be interpreted, in which the concept of immortality is also to be understood. The two appear significantly together in a funerary description dedicated to a deceased person by the name of *Aurelia Proba* (ICUR III, 8787). Among the images alluding to the attainment of eternal salvation are the ship and the lighthouse, represented primarily on the funerary slabs, in which they often appear together.

To the allegorical images of life such as the race, to which St. Paul also makes frequent reference, are connected the figurations of the crown, the palm and the horse. Sitting on the palm or standing by itself, the mythical phoenix was depicted to symbolize the resurrection; it appears in frescoes (the so-called Greek chapel in the catacombs of St. Priscilla, which is perhaps the most ancient Christian figuration) and mosaics, likewise on the apses of basilicas (see, e.g., the basilica of Sts. *Cosmas and Damian at Rome). The palm and the crown enjoyed widespread diffusion; the latter esp., starting from the Constantinian age, was also configured as a symbol of *martyrdom, to become almost a constant theme in the *iconography of the martyrs on the walls of the hypogea and in the basilicas (e.g., the famous "procession" of male and female saints in the nave of the basilica of St. Apollinare a *Ravenna).

The vine—a polyvalent symbol because it is a natural part of human existence and allusive to blood, the vehicle of life and the ultimate price of sacrifice— not only generally refers to the heavenly **refrigerium* but also acquires an *ecclesiological and *christological value in connection to Jn 15:1 and 15:5: *Ego sum vitis vera*, *Ego sum vitis vos palmites*; analogously the cluster of grapes can represent the vine under the form of an *imago brevis*, likewise alluding either to the fullness of Paradise's goods or in reference to the episode of the spies of *Israel in the land of Canaan (Num 13:1-26) to evoke the image of the promised land.

In addition to the goat and the lamb, the figurations most heavily used to symbolize the soul were the **orans* and the dove. A figure, whether male or female, but always in a posture of prayer with hands extended (*expansis manibus*), the so-called *orans* found its formal antecedent in Roman *pietas*, but it did not intend to signify a request for help, but

rather, as noted by de Bruyne (*Les lois* . . . , 12ff.) the state of the salvation that had been achieved. This explains how this act could be common to all the images, whether of the OT or the NT (*Noah, *Daniel, *Mary, a deceased person etc.). One should also consider the dove along the same lines, which is the image of the soul that has already entered heavenly rest, often displayed in isolation, in other cases resting on a tree or rather holding a palm or an olive branch in its beak, or also in the act of preparing itself for approaching a *cantharus* to quench its thirst or to nibble on a cluster of grapes. The surrounding elements that are associated with the image of the dove (trees, olives, palm branches, cantharus and grapes) acquire the function of characterizing the afterlife as the new view of paradise and, therefore, as a garden. Inserted into other contexts, the dove, however, could assume enhanced meanings: thus in scenes of the *baptism of Christ (see, e.g., Wp pls. 29,1; 27,3; 240,1), it represents the *Holy Spirit; in scenes of Noah and the ark in baptistery contexts, it is the bearer of peace; in scenes with the number twelve, it symbolizes the apostolic college (WMM, pl. 88, baptistery of Albenga); and finally, with the nimbus cloud, it signifies Christ among his apostles (the hypogeum of Leo in the catacomb of Commodilla at Rome: RivAC 34 [1958], 9 = J.G. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Commodilla." Repertorium der Malerein*, nr.5).

F.J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ, IV-V, Münster i.W. 1927-43; M. Guarducci, *I graffiti sotto la confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano*, I-III, Vatican City 1958; J. Daniélou, *Les symboles chrétiens primitifs*, Paris 1961; E. Testa, *Il simbolismo dei Giudeo-Cristiani*, Jerusalem 1962; P. Bruun, *Symboles signes monogrammes*, in *Sylloge Inscriptionum Christianarum Veterum Musei Vaticani*, 2, Helsinki-Helsingfors 1963, 73-166; D. Mazzoleni, *Origine e cronologia dei monogrammi: riflessi nelle iscrizioni dei Musei Vaticani*, in I. Di Stefano Manzella (ed.), *Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano. Materiali e contributi scientifici per una mostra epigrafica* (Inscriptiones Sanctae Sedis 2), Vatican City 1997, 165-168; C. Carletti, ΙΧΘΥΣ ΖΩΝΤΩΝ *Chiose a* ICVR, *II 4246*, in ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΑΙ *Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, ed. G. Paci, Rome 2000, 189-204; as well as the individual entries in the DACL, the LCI, the RivAC and in F. Bisconti (ed.), *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000. For the specific aforementioned themes, see L. de Bruyne, *Les "lois" de l'art paléochrétien comme instrument herméneutique*: RivAC 39 (1963) 7-92; P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma*, Bologna 1966, 255-340, 359-366; H.W. Bartsch, *Das alttestamentliche Bilderverbot und die frühchristliche Verwendung des Bildes im Wort und in den Anfängen christlicher Kunst*: Symbolon 6 (1968) 150-178; P. Testini, *Il sarcofago del Tuscolo*: RivAC 52 (1976) esp. 72ff.; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, IV, Rome 1978 (*see* also **epigraphy*).

C. Carletti

SYMBOLUM NICAENUM, Commentarius in. Turner published in 1913, from a 9th-c. Vatican MS (*Reg. Lat.* 1997), an extensive commentary on the individual affirmations from the Council of *Nicaea's profession of faith (325) on the Father and the Son. The *Holy Spirit was only mentioned by name; the final part of the creed is not commented on because the anonymous author was only interested in refuting *Arian *Christology. The incipit of the commentary reads as follows: *Fides quae a patribus nostris exposita est*. The author weaves his entire discussion with biblical citations. He naturally appeals to the traditional texts: Pr 8:22-23, the prologue of the gospel of *John and Col 1:15. According to Turner, the Arian opponent could be Urbanus the bishop of Piacenza (who died after 381), which is suggested by the terms *urbanitas* (16,16) and *urbanus* (17,5). In any case, the composition of the work is situated within N *Italy to the 2nd half of the 4th c. on account of the biblical text used.

CPL 1745; PLS 1, 220-240. EOMIA I, 2, 1, 329-354; *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, ed. R. Herzog, Turnhout-Paris 1993, V, 553-554; PCBE 2, 2344-2345.

A. Di Berardino

SYMBOLUM NICAENUM, Enarratio in. This ancient commentary on the Nicene Creed, transmitted in a MS from the Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona, is attributed to *Athanasius. The text was attributed to *Vigilius of Thapsus by its first editor, Bianchini. But it seems that it was written in *Gaul. The incipit reads as follows: *Una fides, sed non in omnibus una mensura est*. Each affirmation from the creed is briefly explained; the last pertains to "holy mother church." The explanation of faith and the *Holy Spirit is interesting, the fullness of whose divinity is affirmed: the three persons of the *unius Deitatis*.

CPL 1744a; PLS 1, 786-790; *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, ed. R. Herzog, Turnhout-Paris 1993, V, 554.

A. Di Berardino

SYMMACHIAN FORGERIES. A group of falsifications composed early in the 6th c. in defense of Pope *Symmachus at the time of the *Laurentian schism. There are 11 documents, the most important of which are (1) *Constitutum Silvestri* (PL 8, 829-840; 8,822-824), (2) *Gesta Liberii* (PL 8,1388-1393), (3) *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* (PLS 3,1249-1252), (4) *Gesta de Polichronii Jerosol. epicopi accusatione* (PLS 3,1252-1255) and (5) *Synodus Sinuessana* or *Gesta Marcellini* (PL 6,11-20; Mansi 1,1249-1257). All of

these documents are important for their ecclesiastical discipline and papal prerogatives, and greatly influenced canon law. Soon inserted in some canonical collections, they were widely circulated (in the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, but only at a later point, in the *Collectio Sanblasiana*); they also influenced the compiling of the *Liber pontificalis*.

The *Constitutum Silvestri* is a collection of 20 canons from a false Roman synod of 284 bishops, held at *Rome (at Trajan's baths) in the presence of the emperor *Constantine in 324, before the Council of *Nicaea; the supposed synod condemned a Bishop Victorius, who had published false Easter cycles. It also contains norms making it difficult to bring accusations against members of the clergy. All of the texts that followed are in some way a concrete application of these norms in four specific cases. There is a different redaction of a synod of 275 bishops (*Synodus CCLXXV episcoporum)*, held after the Council of Nicaea on 25 September 325. This text has many similarities, though many differences as well, with respect to the other redaction. *Gesta Liberii* tell of events concerning Pope *Liberius (352–366) at the time of the emperor Constantius. The *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* relate a trial against Pope Sixtus (432–440), accused of immoral habits, in the basilica of St. Helen (Santa Croce), which took place in the presence of the pope himself and of the emperor *Valentinian; the pope was acquitted, and the accusers died—the point being to defend the thesis that the pope cannot be judged by anyone. The *Gesta de Polichronii accusatione* speaks of Pope Sixtus's interventions regarding Polychronius the bishop of *Jerusalem, who had been accused by another bishop, and his consequent acquittal. In the apocrypha of the *Synodus Sinuessana* the thesis is affirmed that *prima sedes a nemine iudicatur*: Pope *Marcellinus (296–304) sacrificed to the gods in a time of persecution, but is not condemned in an episcopal assembly but exhorted to condemn himself.

CPL 1679-1682; B. Mombrizio, *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*, Milan 1479, repr. New York 1978, II, 508-531; LP CXXXIV-CXXXV; P. De Leo, *Ricerche sui falsi medievali*, I, *Il "Constitum Constantini": Compilazione agiografica del sec. VIII*, Reggio Calabria 1975, 151-221; DTC 14,2986-2990; *Le concile romain de 498*, in Hefele-Leclercq II, 1349-1366; S. Kuttner, *Notes of the Medieval Trasmission of the Constitutum Silvestri*: Traditio 3 (1945) 203f.; R.-J. Laenertz, *Actus Sylvestri. Genèse*: RHE 70 (1975) 426-439; F. Parente, *Qualche appunto sugli Actus Beati Silvestri*: Rivista Storica Italiana 90 (1978) 878-897; G. Zecchini, *I "gesta de Xysti purgation" e le fazioni aristocratiche a Roma alla metà del V secolo*: RSCI 34 (1980) 60-74; W. Pohlkamp, *Textfassungen, literarische Formen und geschichtliche Funktionen der römischen Silvester-Akten*: France 19/1 (1992) 115-196; S. Vacca, *Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur. Genesi e sviluppo storico dell'assioma fino al Decreto di Graziano*, Rome 1993 (Symmachus, 33-78); E. Wirbelauer, *Zwei Päpste in Rom*, Munich 1993 (with ed. and Ger. tr. of the apocrypha, 238-342); P.V. Aimone, *Le falsificazioni simmachiane*: Apollinaris 68 (1995) 205-220; T. Sardella, *Stato e chiesa nell'età teodericiana: papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996; S. Vacca, *Il principio "Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur." Genesi e sviluppo fino a Papa Simmaco (498-514)*, in *Il papato di San Simmaco: 498–514*, eds. G. Mele - N. Spaccapelo, Cagliari 2000, 153-190; A. Fadda, "*Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur." Rilevanza e conseguenze di un principio ecclesiologico*, in ibid., 337-349; P.V. Aimone, *Gli autori delle falsificazioni simmachiane*, in ibid., 53-72; EPapi, I, 328-332; V. Aiello, *Cronaca di una eclisse. Osservazioni sulla vicenda di Silvestro I vescovo di Roma*, in *Tardoantico alle soglie del duemila. Diritto religione e società*, Pisa 2002, 229-248.

A. Di Berardino

SYMMACHIANS. *Jewish-Christian sect mentioned only by Latin Christian writers. They took their origin from the Pharisees (*Ambrosiaster) or from *James (*Marius Victorinus). *Filaster's comment that the Symmachians were libertines is in opposition to their supposed Jewish background. There is no concrete information on this group aside from what is found in the writings of Marius Victorinus, who wrote that they said that Jesus was *Adam and the *anima generalis* (*In epist. ad Gal.* 1,15).

A.F.J. Klijn - G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian Sects*, in *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 36, Leiden 1973, 52-54; M. Tardieu, *Les symmachiens de Marius Victorinus et ceux du manichéen Faustus*, in *Le judéo-christianisme dans tous ses états*, ed. S.C. Mimouni, Paris 2001, 322-334.

A.F.J. Klijn

SYMMACHUS, Aurelius Anicius (ca. 380–ca. 430). Grandson of the famous orator Quintus Aurelius *Symmachus and related to the noble family of the Anicii; he was the *proconsul Africae* (415) and *praefectus urbis* (24 December 418–early 420). Anicius Symmachus played a role of primary importance during the troubled events pertaining to the election of the successor of Pope *Zosimus (d. 26 December 418). Disagreements and mutual accusations in fact determined the splitting of the Roman clergy in favor of the two candidates *Eulalius, the *archdeacon of the basilica of St. *Lawrence, and the priest *Boniface. Symmachus had the duty of informing the court at *Ravenna and esp. *Galla Placidia, who supported Boniface, on the uncertain course of the papal election. His letters have been preserved in the *Collectio Avellana* (*Epistulae* 14-34, from 28 December 418 to 8 April 419). Symmachus's intervention was therefore decisive at *Easter of 419: he brought about the liberation of the Lateran basilica, in which Eulalius and his supporters had shut themselves,

and restored it to Bishop *Achilleus of Spoleto, who had come to Rome to preside over the Paschal celebrations. This event determined the defeat of Boniface's adversary, who no longer provided obstacles to the succession.

PWK 23/1, 1158-1159; Fliche-Martin IV, 549; PLRE II, 1043-1044; S.J.B. Barnish, *Transformation and Survival in the Western Senatorial Aristocracy, c. AD 400-700*: PBSR 56 (1988) 120-155; A. Cameron, *Cassiodorus, Jordanes and the Anicii: 11th Byzantine Studies Conference*, Toronto 1985; G.A. Cecconi, *Governo imperiale ed élites dirigenti nell'Italia tardoantica: problemi di storia politicoamministrativa, 270-476 d.C.*, Como 1994; A. Marcone, *Late Roman Social Relations*: CAH² XIII, Cambridge 1998, 338-370; EPapi 1, 398-403.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

SYMMACHUS, exegete. Exegete of the 5th c. who is otherwise unknown, the presumed author of a *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, an extensive fragment of which remains in a *Syriac version. On the basis of a recurring abbreviation in the catena on the Proverbs from Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1802, some scholars have thought that Symmachus also commented on the book of Proverbs, but the hypothesis is subject to debate.

CPG 6547: C. van den Eynde, *La version syriaque du Commentaire de Grégoire de Nysse sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 10), Louvain 1939, 77-89 (text), 104-116 (Fr. tr.); M. Faulhaber, *Hohelied, Proverbien- und Prediger-Catenen*, Vienna 1902, 90-94; G. Mercati, *Pro Symmacho*, in *Nuove note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica* (ST 95), Rome 1941, 91-93; M. Richard, *Les fragments du commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur les Proverbes de Salomon*: Muséon 78 (1965) 286-287 and Muséon 80 (1967) 356, n. 41 (= Opera minora, Turnhout-Leuven 1976, n. 17); LMA 8, 368; Patrologia V, 265-635.

F. Scorza Barcellona

SYMMACHUS, pope (498–514). A native of *Sardinia, Symmachus was elected by the majority, which was dissatisfied with the pro-Byzantine politics of *Anastasius II, although the minority chose *Laurentius. Despite *Theodoric's interventions, the dissidents remained within the Roman community. The very synod (501), which acc. to the intention of the king of the *Goths had to make a decision, declared that Symmachus as the bishop of the first see did not have to be called before any human tribunal (MGH, *Auct. ant.* XII,416-437). The entire *schism reflected the differences between the clergy and the Senate, between *Rome and *Byzantium, as well as the tendency to liberate the affairs the church from every foreign influence. For four years Symmachus's role was limited. Only when Theodoric abandoned Laurentius and his pro-Byzantine followers did Symmachus enter the full exercise of his prerogatives. He defended orthodoxy against the so-called **Henoticon*. He helped the Catholics who were persecuted by *Arian leaders. He established *Caesarius of Arles as the primate of *Gaul and *Spain. During his pontificate, *Sigismund of Burgundy came to Rome, and perhaps *Clovis I was baptized. Forgeries attributed to Pope Symmachus also date back to his time. The author of the *Symmachian forgeries attempted to demonstrate the adage: *prima sedes a nemine iudicatur.* Here is a list of these texts: *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* (PLS 3,1249-1255), *Synodi Sinuessanae de Marcellino papa* (PL 6,11-20), *Gesta Liberii* (PL 8,1388-1393) and *Constitutum Sylvestri* (PL 8,829-840). Under the reign of Pope Symmachus important councils were held at Rome.

CPL 1678-1682; Thiel I, 641-734; LP I, 44-46, 260-268; III, 87-88. A. Alessandrini, *Teodorico e papa Simmaco durante lo scisma laurenziano*: Archivio della Società romana di Storia patria 67 (1944) 152-207; G.B. Picotti, *I sinodi romani nello scisma laurenziano*, in *Studi in onore di G. Volpe*, II, Florence 1958, 741-786; G. Sigismondi, *I sinodi simmachiani e la sede episcopale di Nocera Umbra*: Boll. di Deput. di Storia Patria Umbra 59 (1962) 5-42; H. Fuhrmann, *Die Fälschungen im Mittelalter*: Historische Zeitschrift 197 (1963) 529-554; G. Zecchini, *I "Gesta de Xysti purgatione" e le fazioni aristocratiche a Roma alla metà del V secolo*: RSCI 34 (1980) 60-74; W. Wirbelauer, *Zwei Päpste in Rom*, Munich 1993; S. Vacca, *Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur*, Rome 1993, 33-78; J.D. Alchermes, *Petrine Politics: Pope S. and the Rotunda of St. Andrew*: CHR 81 (1995) 1-40; Patrologia IV, 132-134 (bibl.); T. Sardella, *Società, chiesa e stato nell'età di Teoderico: papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano*, Soveria Mannelli 1996; EPapi 1, 464-473; LTK³ 9, 1166-1167; LACL (2002) 662-663; G. Pilara, *Ancora un momento di riflessione sulla politica italiana di Teoderico re dei Goti*: StudRom 53/3-4 (2005) 431-469.

B. Studer

SYMMACHUS, Quintus Aurelius (340–402). Symmachus played an important role in the public and religious life of the empire. A member of the council of the crown in 369 at *tertii ordinis*, he was nominated proconsul of *Africa in 373 under *Valentinian I, *praefectus urbis* around 384 under the emperor *Valentinian II, consul with *Theodosius in 391. Ambrose's *De exc. fratris* (I,32) and a letter written by Symmachus (*Ep.* I,63) allude to a possible familial relationship between the two. More certain is their friendship in youth from the Roman period and their unwavering mutual respect (see Ambrose, *Ep.* 17,6; 57,2) even during the controversy over the *Altar of Victory. After the second removal of this altar, decreed by the emperor *Gratian in 382, the Senate requested its restitution through Symmachus in vain. In 384 Symmachus (*Relatio* III) presented to

Valentinian II the remonstrance of his companions who were of pagan belief, recalling the empire's religious heritage and calling for the abrogation of the chief antipagan measures decreed by Gratian in 382. Symmachus's protest had no hope for success because of Ambrose's intervention (*Ep.* 17 and 18) in the presence of Valentinian II. Toward the end of 389, Ambrose (*Ep.* 57,4) returned to the problem of the Altar of Victory following a new petition made by Symmachus. Symmachus's theses in *Relatio* III and the refutation of these offered by Ambrose would be taken up again by the poet *Prudentius in his two books *Against Symmachus*. At the origin of the controversy between Symmachus and Ambrose was the conflict between politics and religion: for the Roman tradition which in the 4th c. had in Symmachus its foremost proponent, such a relationship was of close alliance; for Christianity this relationship was one of distinction, even though with difficulties and contradictions which, in the practical sphere, such a distinction brought with it.

MGH, *Auct. ant.* VI, 1; F. Paschoud, *Réflexions sur l'idéal religieux de Symmaque*: Historia 14 (1965) 215-235; F. Canfora, *Simmaco e Ambrogio o di un'antica controversia sulla tolleranza e sull'intolleranza*, Bari 1970; R. Klein, *Symmachus. Eine tragische Gestalt des ausgehenden Heidentums*, Darmstadt 1971; Id., *Der Streit um den Victoriaaltar. Die dritte Relatio des Symmachus und die Briefe 17, 18 und 57 des Mailänder Bischof Ambrosius*, Darmstadt 1972; F. Zuddas Del Chicca, *Rassegna di studi simmachiani*: StudRom 20 (1972) 526-540; M. Forlin Patrucco - S. Roda, *Le lettere di Simmaco ad Ambrogio. Vent'anni di rapporti amichevoli*, in *Ambrosius episcopus*. Atti del Congr. int. di studi ambrosiani, II, Milan 1976, 284-297; P. Meloni, *Il tempo e la storia in Simmaco e Ambrogio*: SSR I (1977) 105-123; Id., *Il rapporto fra impegno politico e fede religiosa in Simmaco e Ambrogio*: Sandalion 1 (1978) 153-169; M. Sordi, *L'impero romano cristiano. Problemi politici, religiosi, culturali*, Rome 1991; PCBE II, 2143-2144.

M.G. Mara

SYMMACHUS, Quintus Aurelius Memmius (ca. 450–525). Historian and orator, great-grandson of the famous Quintus Aurelius Symmachus. Consul (485) and *patricius*, he was the most authoritative proponent of the Senate during the reign of *Theodoric, whose objective of weakening the Senate he tried to contain. After the death of his son-in-law *Boethius (524), he was suspected of treason and executed. *Ennodius mentions him among the most learned of his time. Symmachus was very culturally active. He revised Macrobius's commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*—which bore the famous subtitle: *Aurelius Memmius Symmachus v. c. emendabam vel distinguebam meum* (sc. *exemplar*) *Ravennae cum Macrobio Plotio Eudoxio v. c.* He also compiled a *History of Rome* in seven books, which has not been preserved and which is clearly marked by a Christian spirit. He had cultural exchanges with Boethius (*Cons. phil.* 1,40,40 and 2,4,5), Ennodius, *Cassiodorus and the grammarian *Priscian.

PWK 23/1, 1160; KLP 5, 446; Schanz IV, 2, 83-84; PLRE II, 1044-1046; W. Ensslin, *Des Symmachus Historia romana als Quelle für Iordanes*, Munich 1949; A. Momigliano, *Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del VI sec. d.C.*: RAL ser. 8ª 11 (1956) 279-297; G. Della Valle, *Teodorico e Roma*: Rendiconti Acc. Archeol. Lett. Belle Arti Naples 34 (1959) 119-176; A. Chastagnol, *Le sénat romain sous le règne d'Odoacre: Recherches sur l'épigraphie du Colisée au Vᵉ siècle*, Bonn 1966; B. Luiselli, *Note sulla perduta Historia Romana di Quinto Aurelio Memmio Simmaco*: Studi Urbinati 49 (1975) 529-535; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Nobiltà romana e potere nell'età di Boezio*, in Atti del Congr. Int. di studi boeziani, Rome 1981, 73-96; R.S. Bagnall et al. (eds.), *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987, s.v.; S.J.B. Barnish, *Transformation and Survival in the Western Senatorial Aristocracy, c. AD 400–700*: PBSR 56 (1988) 120-155; A. Marcone, *Late Roman Social Relations*: CAH² XIII, Cambridge 1998, 338-370; M. Humphries, *Italy A.D. 425–605*: CAH² XIV, Cambridge 2000, 525-551.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

SYMMACHUS, translator (late 2nd c.). The author of a Greek translation of the Hebrew text of the OT, which in Origen's **Hexapla* occupies the column after the translation of *Aquila and before that of the Septuagint (LXX) and *Theodotion. *Eusebius of Caesarea, who considered Symmachus an *Ebionite, mentions him as the author of biblical commentaries that Origen received from a certain Juliana, who received them from Symmachus himself (*HE* VI,17; see also *Dem. ev.* VII,1. With respect to this Juliana, see the information provided by *Palladius in *Hist. Laus.* 64, ed. Bartelink, 272).

*Jerome also considered Symmachus an Ebionite and added that he wrote commentaries on the gospel of *Matthew, on the basis of which he attempted to confirm his doctrinal teachings (*Vir. ill.* 54). According to *Epiphanius, however, Symmachus was a *Samaritan who converted to *Judaism (*Mens.* 16).

H.J. Schoeps, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Tübingen 1950, 82-119; N. Fernández Marcos, *Bibbia dei Settanta*, Brescia 2000.

S. Zincone

SYMPHOROSA. On 28 July the *Mart. hier.* mentions Symphorosa (= Helper) and her seven sons (Peter, Marcellinus, Gennaro, Dionysius, Symphonius, Clement, Germanus and also Irenaeus) (*Mart. hier.* 382) at *Rome on the Via Tiburtina. It also only mentions for 29 May the memorial of the seven

brothers (*Romae via Tiburtina*) (*Mart. hier.* 382) at Rome on the Via Tiburtina, as well as for 27 June, but with different names (*Mart. hier.* 337: Crispus, Crispinianus, Felix etc.). A brief *Passion* narrates that the emperor *Hadrian (d. 138), during the occasion of the inauguration of his villa at Tivoli, upon the complaint of the members of the constitutional court, ordered that the widow Symphorosa sacrifice in the temple of Hercules. Upon refusing to worship the gods, the widow, whose husband Getulius was martyred along with Amantius, who were both tribunals of the emperor, was thrown with a rock on her neck into the Aniene River. Her brother Eugenius recovered the body. Her seven sons (Cresens, Julian, Nemesius, Primitivus, Justin, Stracteus and Eugenius) were then put to death for the Christian faith. The names of the sons mentioned in the passion are different from those in the *Mart. hier.*, which drew on other sources, and are also reported by the *Roman Martyrology* for 18 July (p. 294). All the sources agree that the martyrdom occurred on the Via Tiburtina at the ninth mile (or the eighth mile). The passion adds that their bodies rest at the ninth mile of the Via Tiburtina. The 7th-c. text *De locis sanctis martyrum* vaguely places their tomb in the vicinities of the basilica of St. Lawrence at the Verano cemetery but without other specifications because the pilgrim had not visited it. Bosius discovered the remains of the basilica in a small town called "Seven Brothers" at the ninth mile of the Via Tiburtina, a discovery confirmed by other observers. Stephenson studied the remains of the basilica of Symphorosa at the ninth mile: the most ancient phase could date back to the 4th c. and was enlarged over the course of the 5th. According to an inscription discovered in 1640, the relics were taken to Rome at the time of a pope by the name of Stephen (perhaps Pope Stephen III [752–757]) in the church of St. Michael the Archangel (or St. Angel in Pescheria) in the portico of Octavia; acc. to another text (*De laudibus Papiae*) these are to be found at Pavia. It is not to be ruled out that only a few bones were taken to Pavia, although the others remained at Rome.

BHL 2971; AASS., Iulii IV, Venezia 1748, 350-359 (Sp. tr.: D. Ruiz Bueno, *Actas de los mártires*, Madrid 1951, 259-262); EC 9, 700-701; DACL 15, 1817-1822; BS 11, 1218-1229; LTK³ 9, 1167-1168; BBKL 11, 367-368; A. Bosio, *Roma sotterranea*, Rome 1650 (repr. 1998), 105-109; E. Stevenson, *Scoperta della basilica di Santa Sinforosa e dei setti figli al nono miliario della Via Tiburtina*, Rome 1878; H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels ²1933, 278; Id., *Étude sur le légendier romain*, Brussels 1936, 121-123; R. Valentini - G. Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, II, Rome 1942 (repr. Turin 1982), 114.

A. Di Berardino

SYMPHOSIUS (Symposius). The **Anthologia Salmasiana*, so called by the humanist Saumaise, who discovered it (*cod. Parisinus* 10318), contains 100 *Aenigmata* ("puzzles") in hexameters of a certain Symphosius, who lived between the 5th and 6th c., belonging to the Carthaginian milieu. One particular scholar maintains that the name indicates no specific person, but refers to the term "symposium." The collection also had an autonomous MS tradition, and at times the *Aenigmata* were used in other collections (see CCL 133,612-615 on the MS tradition). The author also alludes to Christian authors, and the text was much used during the Middle Ages. He expresses his concrete world of various topics by making use of the first person; he preferred the use of paradox. Every enigma is dedicated to a specific subject; many pertain to plants and animals.

CPL 1517; ed. F. Bücheler - A. Riese, *Anthologia latina* I, 1, Leipzig 1894, 221-246; F. Glorie, CCL 133A, 621-721; ed. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina*, I: *Carmina in codicibus scripta*, Fasc. I: *Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina*, Stuttgart 1982; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Para la crítica de los Aenigmata de Sinfosio*: Helmantica 28 (1977) 121-136; M. Spallone, *Il Par. lat. 10138 (Salmasiano): dal manoscritto alto-medievale ad una raccolta enciclopedica tardo-antica*: Italia Medievale e Umanistica 25 (1982) 1-71; M. Spallone, *Symphosius o Symposius? Un problema di fonetica nell'Anthologia Latina*: Quaderni dell'Ist. di Lingua e lett. latina 4 (1982) 41-48; Z. Pavlovskis, *The Riddler's Microcosm. From Symphosius to St. Boniface*: C&M 39 (1988) 219-251; M. Bergamin, *Note a Simposio*: Atti e Memorie dell'Acc. Virgiliana 62 (1994) 37-68; J. Pizarro Sánchez, *Estructura y tipología de los "Aenigmata Symphosii"*: CFC(L) 16 (1999) 239-246.

A. Di Berardino

SYMPRONIANUS (4th c.). A learned Spanish *Novatian, only known through the three letters that *Pacian sent to him; these documents allow us to reconstruct his thought. Sympronianus, first and without having met him, wrote to Pacian asking him for explanations on the use of the title *Catholic*, on penitence and on repentance (Pacian, *Ep.* 1). Responding to Pacian, Sympronianus sent him a letter and a treatise, where he maintained that "repentance, after baptism, does not exist; the church cannot forgive mortal *sin; in fact the church self-destructs by readmitting sinners" (Pacian, *Ep.* 3,1: PL 13,1065). He demonstrated his theses by making recourse to the *Scriptures and adducing theological arguments.

CPL 784; PL 13, 1051-1082; L. Rubio Fernández, *San Paciano. Obras*, Barcelona 1958, 48-134; L. Wohleb, *Bischof Pacianus von Barcelona und seiner Gegner Novatianer Sympronianus*: Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft 2 (1930) 25-35; Schanz VI, 1, 369; Patrologia III, 124-126; Domínguez del Val 1, 390ff.

A. Di Berardino

SYNAGOGUE. The institution of the synagogue had a pivotal role in the development of Judaism both before and after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, which occurred in AD 70. The synagogue had numerous functions, which were not only religious: readings and study of the law, communal prayer, resolution of legal questions, civic administration, common meals and a hospice for foreigners.

The origin of the synagogue, both as an institution and as a building, is still unclear. The first references to an assembly are found in the Bible, which in many passages mentions a group of Jews who gathered to listen to the prophets (Ezek 11:16). Some authors from the 1st c. BC referred to the synagogue by comparing it to the Roman *collegia*. Around 45 BC the collegia were prohibited by Julius Caesar, with the exception of those of the Jews, because they were considered among the most ancient. In sources from the 1st c., there are reports of synagogues both in Palestine and in the Diaspora. *Philo tells us about the synagogue of *Alexandria (*Ad Gaium* 156 *Vita Mosis* 2,216; *De Somniis* 2,156), Flavius Josephus mentions the synagogue of Tiberius, in which gatherings were held after prayer (*Vita* 77). In the NT frequent mention is made of the synagogue. The term *synagōgē* occurs 56 times in the NT, a good 34 of which occur in the Lukan corpus (i.e., the gospel and the Acts of the Apostles). The term *proseuchē* is found therein with the most common meaning of "prayer"; only in two places could it refer to a place of gathering (Acts 16:13-16).

The birth of a building for gathering within Judaism is a debated topic among scholars. Some maintain that one must go back to the period before the Babylonian exile, even to *Moses, acc. to a common idea starting from the 1st c. AD. On the origin of the synagogue, various hypotheses have been formulated in modern times. Some date the institution before the exile, to the time of the prophet Jeremiah. Others push the date back to the period of the reform made at the time of King Josiah, around 621, who prohibited worship in the temples on the high places in favor of the temple of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 23; Ps 74:8). Others hold that the synagogue arose during the Babylonian exile. The destruction of the temple in 586 and the subsequent deportation brought about the birth of the religious assemblies, which were not tied to cultic sacrifice, thanks to the rise of charismatic figures like the prophet Ezekiel. The synagogue, which arose in Babylon, then developed in Palestine. Finally, one can conclude, on the basis of epigraphic and archaeological evidence, that the first synagogues were seen in Egypt and the rest of the Diaspora starting from the 3rd c. BC, although in *Palestine they can be detected only from the Hasmonean era. The synagogue definitively was born as part of a gradual process during the period of the second temple. Its remote origins are perhaps to be sought in the assemblies that were held near the city entrance, which during the entire biblical period was the place of many activities, similar to those that were then held in the synagogue. The transferral of these activities from one open place to an enclosed building gradually occurred during the Hellenistic era, probably in the late 2nd or early 1st c. BC. Therefore, one can come to some firm conclusions: starting from the 2nd c. BC, one can verify a definite bond between the sabbath and the communal reading of the law, starting from the account of the assembly that gathered to listen to the biblical reading made by Ezra the scribe (Neh 8–10), which became a model to imitate, in an assembly different from that of the temple, but not at all opposed to the latter; substantial transformations to the institution of the synagogue occurred over the course of the 2nd c. AD, when the synagogue assumed a specifically liturgical role in replacing the sacrificial cult of the temple of Jerusalem, which by that point had disappeared (Perrot, *DBS* 13,686). Starting from the 3rd c. BC, certain epigraphic testimonies attest to the existence of the *proseuchai*, buildings in which the Jews gathered in an assembly, in *Egypt as well as in *Rome, and even at Tiberias (Flavius Josephus, *Vita* 277). Only starting from the 1st c. AD was the term *synagōgē* imposed to refer to the building for the assemblies.

The birth of the *proseuchai* is to be framed within the Hellenistic cultural context. There existed, in fact, in the Hellenistic world associations, corporations, groups of various types with cultural, religious and social ends. The Jewish *proseuchai*, therefore, responded to a twofold demand: that of setting themselves up as a well-defined entity, from the legal point of view, like the pagan corporations, and that of gathering the Jewish community that was far from the temple of Jerusalem together for prayer. In Egypt, first Ptolemy III and then Ptolemy V undertook a political action of restoration of the temples and the various cults. This had an influence on the numerous Jewish communities in Egypt. Scholars are aware of more than one Jewish temple from this period in Egypt. The most famous is that of *Yaho* at Elephantine, but there is also information from temples in Cyrenaica, at Leontopolis, at Iraq el-Amir, at Lakish, and esp. from the Samaritan temple on Gerizim. It is likely that these temples were built at the behest of the Ptolemies, who intended to oppose the centrality of the temple of Jerusalem and to weaken

the bond between the Jews of the Diaspora and their homeland. The synagogue of *Antioch mentioned by Flavius Josephus (*Jewish War* 7,44-145) was perhaps also built at the behest of the Seleucid Demetrius I Soter (162–150 BC) with the same purpose. At Rome there is evidence of Jewish "private altars" in 139 BC (Valerius Maximus, *De Superstitionibus* I,3,3). The *proseuchai* were tied to sabbath prayer, notes Josephus (*Against Apion* I,209); the historian Agatharchides of Cnidus (181–146 BC) says that the Jews were accustomed to rest on the sabbath and not to do anything except gather together in sacred places (*hieroi*) toward the evening to pray with hands lifted up (Philo, *In Flaccum* 48-49). The *proseuchai* were also the schools that were modeled after the style of the philosophical *didaskaleia*, in which people were taught to live acc. to the principles of the law (*Vita Mosis* 2,216). Well attested as well were the practices of the funerary college and commercial activities connected to the *proseuchē*.

The importance of the function that the *proseuchai* acquired within the Diaspora starting from the 3rd c. BC immediately had a certain amount of influence in Palestine. After the ethnic-religious reawakening during the Maccabean era, religious circles began to develop, esp. of the rabbinic-Pharisaic extraction, in which legal questions were discussed in light of the Mosaic law. The synagogues in Israel were therefore born with a well-distinguished cultural function reserved for the temple of Jerusalem: the hearing and the learning of the law on the sabbath (Flavius Josephus, *Against Apion* II,175). The first synagogues therefore responded to the demand, always increasingly felt in the Pharisaic milieu, of celebrating the sabbath (2 Macc 8:27; 12:38; Neh 9:14). Over the course of the 1st c. AD the bond became evident (Flavius Josephus, *Against Apion* II,175; Philo, *Quod omnis probus* 81), also thanks to the decree of Halicarnassus mentioned by Flavius Josephus (*Antiquities* 14,258). From this moment onward, the places in which the sabbath gatherings took place had their own well-established architectural tradition, so that already in the 1st c. BC Augustus's edict mentioned by Flavius Josephus (*Antiquities* 16,164) referred to the building, calling it the "house the sabbath" (*sabbateion*). The first synagogues, in contrast to the *proseuchai* at Egypt constructed and dedicated by the authorities, were simple spaces or buildings, which would acquire increasing importance with the passing of time, to the point of adopting some specific aspects even from the architectural point of view.

On the basis of what was said in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Meg.*73d), there were 480 (or 394) synagogues at Jerusalem. This exaggerated number could only be an indication of the existence of many of these buildings at Jerusalem during the 1st c. AD. In any case, the book of Acts attests to the existence of many synagogues at Jerusalem (Acts 6:9; 24:12). In this regard, the testimony given to us by the anonymous pilgrim of Bordeaux, who came to Jerusalem in 333, should be mentioned. This individual says that of the seven synagogues that were on Mount Zion, only one had remained (Baldi, *Enchiridion Locorum Sanctorum*, 729).

While until AD 70 the buildings used for the reading and the study of the law of Moses did not have architectural characteristics that distinguished them from others, after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem they began to acquire well-defined characteristics. The classical theory on the development of the synagogue, elaborated by Khol and Watzinger, well emphasizes the three chief types of synagogue building that can be found in Palestine from the 2nd c. until the 7th c. AD. The type called "Galilean" was made in a basilica-form layout, with three doors on the monumental façade which faces Jerusalem, with two aisles of columns on the sides and one on the back wall dividing the central space from those on the three sides, occupied in part by a flight of stairs that runs along the walls. The direction of prayer was probably toward the S, i.e., toward Jerusalem, although the place in which the scroll of the law was preserved and the place from which the reading was proclaimed are difficult to identify. The most beautiful example of this type of synagogue is that of Capernaum, along with that of Baram, Chorazim and Meron. The oblong rectangular layout type, also called "transitional" or "Jewish," oriented the prayer on one of the long sides, which also often contained a niche in which the scrolls of the law were placed. The following synagogues belong to this type of synagogue: Beth Shearim, Ein Ghedhi and Hammat Tiberias. The third type takes up the basilica layout, with two rows of columns and an apse in the back to preserve the scrolls and to indicate the direction of prayer. The following synagogues are of this type: Beth Alpha, Na'aran and Ma'oz.

Although from the typological point of view this tripartite model can still be accepted today, questions pertaining to the chronological development are very much debated. In particular one can no longer maintain, in light of the archaeological data, that the Galilean type was the most ancient, dating back to the 2nd–4th c., when it is certain that the synagogue of Capernaum ought to be dated at the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th c. Therefore, many

synagogues that were considered to be the most ancient are today dated to the 4th, 5th or 6th c. (Meroth, Capernaum and Nabratein). The synagogue of Khirbet Sheamaʿ, a clear example of the transition type, was constructed in the 3rd c.; thus it turns out to be contemporaneous to the synagogue of Meiron, a classic example of the Galilean type. The most ancient phase of the synagogue of Hammat Tiberias encloses all the elements characteristic of the three various types. Some synagogues from the Golan Heights, which in certain aspects recall the most ancient type and others the most recent, were constructed between the 5th and 7th c. It is therefore more likely that the first two types of buildings coexisted until the 5th or 6th c., the period that is said to mark the third type.

Another highly debated question is that of the synagogue building's orientation. To identify the direction of prayer in ancient synagogue buildings, archaeologists have used some rigorous criteria that can be broken down into the following points: the building's architectural elements, columns, apse and niche; the direction toward which the Jewish symbols were designed in the mosaic floors; the furnishings present in the synagogue hall, like a platform or screen; and the external form of the building, in particular the layout of the door. Looking at the archaeological data, it is possible to assume as valid the hypothesis that around the 4th c. the majority of synagogue buildings were facing Jerusalem, although examples that go against this convention are not lacking. However, it is also true that it has not yet been confirmed that there was just one type of building. Starting in the 5th c. some Jewish communities, those that lived near the urban centers of a certain importance and therefore in close contact with the Christian communities which by that point had been well-rooted, adapted the basilica layout, which had become a typical form of the churches, to meet the demands of their meetings and worship services. Therefore, a century after the basilica with an apse had become a standard element for buildings of Christian worship, some Jewish communities adopted the same model (Milson, *Art and Architecture*, 84-105).

The synagogue architecture has more than one precedent. The Roman basilica certainly had an essential role in the inspiration of the Galilean type, although for the second type the prototypes must be sought in the triclinium of the Hellenistic age, in some Nabataean temples and in the *bouleuterion* of many Hellenistic cities. Finally, for the third model, in the basilica form with an apse, the Christian basilica of the *Byzantine age certainly played a foundational role.

The most widespread terms to refer to the building for Jewish gatherings were *proseuchē*, a term used in the most ancient inscriptions found in Egypt and elsewhere starting from the 3rd c. BC, and *synagōgē*, a term used to refer to the worship building, only starting from the 1st c. AD, as shown by the inscription from Berenice dated to AD 56. At Jerusalem the term was used before AD 70 in the Theodotos inscription. In addition to these two terms, less widespread words were recorded, such as *sabbateion* or *sambatheion* ("house/place of the sabbath"—Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities* 16,164: CIG 752), *proseuchtērion*, *eucheion* ("place of prayer") *didaskaleion* ("school"—Philo, *Vita Mosis* 2,216), *ho oikos* ("the house"—Lifschitz, *Donateurs*, 13.20.33), *ho hagios topos* ("the holy place"—Lifschitz, *Donateurs*, 10; CIJ 694), *ho topos* ("the place"—Lifschitz, *Donateurs*, 31), *to hieron* ("the temple"—Flavius Josephus, *Jewish War* 4,408; 7,44-45).

Dedicatory inscriptions dating to the mid-3rd c. BC and to the 2nd c. BC and found in Egypt refer to the building for the common prayer of the Jews with the term *proseuchē*. In particular the dedicatory inscription of the *proseuchē* at Schedia (Boffo, *Iscrizioni*, 1), a place near the W branch of the Nile Delta, which was written on limestone, mentioned the Jews who made the *proseuchē* for King Ptolemy, Queen Berenice and their children. The mention of the two sovereigns leads scholars to date the inscription to the years between about 247 and 221 BC and is, along with an inscription of the Crocodilopolis, the most ancient attestation to the existence of Jewish buildings of worship in Egypt. Another dedication of a *proseuchē* was found at Athribis (Boffo, *Iscrizioni*, 10), local places on the S point of the Nile Delta. The inscription names King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra, thanks to whom Ptolemy the son of Epicurus and the Jews of Athribis made a *proseuchē* to the most high God. Given the uncertainty of this Ptolemy and that Cleopatra, the date can be between 186 or 172 or even 145 BC. A slab in alabaster coming from an imprecise location of lower Egypt (Boffo, *Iscrizioni*, 12), speaks of the replacement trophy with the dedicatory inscription with this which indicates how the *proseuchē* was declared by King Ptolemy Euergetes to be a place of asylum. The mention of Ptolemy is generic, and one can find various datings. Ptolemy II with a provision from the year 118 proclaims the Egyptian temples to be places of asylum; the occasion mentioned could be this one. Other scholars think that the king and queen mentioned in the text are instead Cleopatra VII and Caesarion and thus date the inscription to

42–30 BC. Two inscriptions (Boffo, *Iscrizioni*, 2-3), one dated to the years 250–175, the other to 150–50, mention the Israelites of Delo who sent tribute to the holy temple on Gerizim, and although they do not refer to a specific building they bear witness to the existence of a Samaritan community on the island of Delo. At Corinth (Boffo, *Iscrizioni*, 45) etched on a rock, perhaps the architrave of a door, one finds the words "synagogue of the Jews." The inscription is probably to be dated to the 2nd c. AD. Found at Berenice, modern-day Benghazi in Cyrenaica, an inscription reports the list of people who were involved in organizing the synagogue, the second year of the Emperor Nero, 2 December 56 (Lifschitz, *Donateurs*, 100). From the epigraphic point of view, information on a synagogue in Palestine and on the Golan Heights comes from the Theodotos inscription (Boffo, *Iscrizioni*, 31). It is a Greek inscription etched on a slab of calcium rock, found in a cistern during an excavation on the SE heel of Jerusalem (Ophel). The text refers to a certain Theodotos, priest and head of the synagogue, who restored the synagogue construction made by his ancestors and the hospice for foreigners with a hydraulic layout. The inscription should be dated to the 1st half of the 1st c. AD, therefore before AD 70, and attests to the existence of a building of Jewish worship even before the destruction of the temple, even at Jerusalem (Kloppenborg Verbin, *Dating Theodotos*). From these last two inscriptions it is clear how during the 1st half of the 1st c. AD the term *proseuchē* gave way to the term *synagōgē* to refer to the building of Jewish worship.

With respect to the archaeological data, in Palestine, four buildings from the 1st c. AD are to be considered synagogues: the one in Masada was a simple room, adapted by the Jews who were rebelling against Rome to accommodate a synagogue, with the construction of steps along the walls of the room and a small room set against a corner, which probably served as a *genizah*, i.e., a storeroom for the sacred scrolls. On the *Herodium*, a synagogue from the same era was identified in a triclinium of the Herodian edifice, which was readapted to the need of the community, close to which a small bath for ritual ablutions was also constructed. The discovery of the synagogue at Gamla on the Golan Heights has shed new light on the synagogue of the 1st c. AD, because it was not an adapted building, but a synagogue inserted within the urban layout, with typical characteristics of the synagogue hall: rectangular form, columns dividing the internal space and small steps along the wall for receiving the assembly. At Jericho the discovery of a synagogue dated to the Hasmonean period (75–50 BC) confirmed the evidence already discovered at Gamla. The building had three phases, and although only the second was clear, we can speak of a building that served as the hall for the synagogue meeting. From this point of view there are multiple similarities between the building at Gamla and that at Jericho. The adaptations at Masada and Herodium are explained by the desire to insert in the buildings some functional elements considered essential for a synagogue. These elements can briefly be summarized as follows: a rectangular hall with benches on the four sides, a series of columns or pillars to form lateral aisles around the central space, the lack of any element characterizing the function of the building on the external walls, the absence of a clear orientation of the building, the presence of a niche or small room in which the scrolls of the Sacred Scriptures were placed, a plumbing system in connection to the hall, in relation to the restrooms or the ritual ablutions. Other functional elements could be present, but they could also vary from building to building or in various ages or regions, and they did not therefore represent an element of specific identification for the synagogue (Netzer, *The Synagogues*, 282-284).

Recently two other buildings with the aforementioned characteristics have been discovered. Scholars think that they could be synagogues from the 1st c. BC such as that in Jericho: at Kiryat Sefer and Khirbet Um el-'Umdan, two villages that are not too far from Jerusalem (Milson, *Art and Architecture*, 3-9). At Magdala a building with small dimensions was discovered, which is considered to be a synagogue. Rectangular with small steps and sides, the building after AD 70 was transformed into a basin for the collection and the distribution of water (V.C. Corbo, *Scavi archeologici a Magdala*: Liber Annuus 24 [1974] 204-245).

Archaeological evidence for synagogues that can be dated to the time after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem (AD 70) has been discovered in dozens of locations belonging to the Roman province of Palaestina. Few can be dated with certainty, and of these the most ancient date to the 4th c. At Horvat Ammudim in Upper Galilee the synagogue has a basilica form and a door on the S side. Two rows of seven columns, more than two in the back, divided the internal space. Traces of a mosaic flooring and geometric motifs and a fragmentary inscription in Aramaic were found. From the ceramics and the coins discovered during the excavation, the synagogue was dated to the first decades of the 4th c. The synagogue of Khirbet Shema was a rectangular oblong. The chief entrance was found on

the N side, and a second entrance is found on the W side, occupied by an elevated gallery. The room has two rows of four columns placed on the stylobate. A lifted platform of a few centimeters came against the S wall to form a bema seat, upon which there must have been an aedicule to store the scrolls of the law. The date of the construction of the synagogue, for which two separate phases are supposed, is believed by some to go back to the late 4th or early 5th c. At Gush Halav the synagogue, which is rectangular with two rows of columns, is to be dated in its various phases to the 2nd half of the 5th c., although it remained in use probably until the beginning of the 8th c.

In addition to being mentioned in the NT, the synagogue of Capernaum is also known as the most beautiful and best preserved example of a Galilean synagogue. Basilica-shaped, it has in its internal portion two rows of columns in a N-S direction plus another row along its northern side. Three doors open to the N side, although on the E side a door puts the synagogue hall in contact with a three-porticoed courtyard in the form of an irregular trapezium. The digs starting from 1968 have allowed scholars to identify the chronology of the various phases of the building's construction, which took place over the course of the 5th c. and was completed in the last quarter of that c. The synagogue of Sepphoris is in the form of a very elongated rectangle with shorter sides placed to the SW and the NE. A single door leads to the room through the SW wall, near the S corner. A single row of five columns runs parallel to the long sides of the building, next to the NE wall. Near the NW corner of the room is an elevated masonry platform. The floor of the room turns out to have mosaics with a multicolored tapestry and seven sectors: in the first two, one finds representations of scenes pertaining to the visitation of the angels to Abraham and Sarah and the sacrifice of Isaac; in the third there is a representation, recurring on the mosaic flooring of the synagogues, namely the zodiac, with the sun at the center carried on a quadriga and on the four corners, the personification of the seasons. The fourth sector has three paintings that depict offerings at the temple: a basket with the firstfruits, the table with the showbread and in the third panel the sacrificial lamb, money offerings, a jar with oil, a flesh offering and two horns. In the fifth sector, which has been severely damaged, the daily offering and sacrifice before the tabernacle is represented; at the center, Aaron was probably represented. The sixth sector consists of three panels, the center one depicting the chest of the Scriptures with the curtains lifted up, with two seven-arm candelabra beside the horn, tongs, palm, cedar and myrtle. The final sector, the seventh, depicts at the center a medallion which contained an inscription in Greek which has only remained in fragments, with two lions facing each other at the sides. The upper part of the mosaic tapestry was probably covered or destroyed with the construction of the bema's platform. On the N side ran a bar of geometric themes interwoven and multicolored with some of the central squares containing inscriptions in Hebrew.

The basilica-shaped building of the synagogue of Gaza has five aisles and perhaps an apse to the E. It imitates the schema of Christian basilicas and is identified as a synagogue only thanks to the decorative motifs and the inscription on the mosaic flooring, which reports the names of those who offered it and the date of the construction, i.e., AD 508–509. There remains very little from the decorative flooring motif. From the panels of the canvas that decorated the central aisle, only a part remains, in which the classic motif of David with a lyre is depicted. Another abundant fragment is preserved in the S aisle, in which inside a series of spirals of vines, some animals are represented and in one of these architectural swirls a dedicatory inscription (A. Ovadiah, *The Synagogue at Gaza*, in *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, 129-132). Also at Nabratein there is a basilica-shaped synagogue, with an entry on the S side, which is divided into three aisles by two rows of four columns; traces of benches were found in the shelter of the E and W walls. A lintel is carved with an inscription flanked by a menorah enclosed in a wreath. The inscription bears the date of the building's construction, AD 564. The synagogue of Beth Alpha is a basilica-shaped building with three aisles, with a narthex and an atrium to the N, and an apse on the S side. The mosaic flooring is composed of three panels, the first near the apse to the S represents the chest used to preserve the scrolls of the Torah, surrounded by lions and two seven-arm candelabra; on the central panel a zodiac with the chariot of the sun at the center is depicted; finally, on the N panel, Abraham and his son Isaac are depicted in the biblical event of the sacrifice. An inscription in Aramaic attests that the mosaic was made at the time of the emperor Justin (*Justin I, 518–527; *Justin II, 565–578), while a Greek inscription reports the names of the mosaicists Marianus and his son Hanina.

The synagogue of Bar'am is among the most beautiful examples of the Galilean type of synagogue. Through a porticoed colonnade and three entry doors located on the beautiful façade, one enters the basilica-shaped room colonnaded on three

sides. The floor consists of slabs of rock. Several investigations recently completed have brought to light the existence of a more ancient building below what is now at the surface level, which is likely to be dated to the 1st half of the 5th c. A substantial redecorating of the building took place at the beginning of the 7th c. The entry doors on the S side were closed, while from the N side, the length of the room was reduced, thus erecting a new façade with three entry doors. The portico and the courtyard on the S side were converted into small rooms, used together with the synagogue until the 12th c.

The synagogue of Meroth is a basilica-shaped building with a portico and a courtyard in front of the S façade. The benches on the wall ran under the protection of the lateral walls. Three floor levels bear witness to various phases of the building. The most ancient floor was a simple floor of lime; at the intermediary level one finds a multicolored mosaic, which is datable to the 2nd half of the 5th c., while the upper floor in slabs of rock is dated to the end of the 5th or early 6th c.

At Nabratein the building imitates the Galilean basilica model and had various phases, the most ancient of which dates back to the 3rd c., the others to the 4th and 6th c. At Meiron the synagogue follows the Galilean model, rectangular, entry to the S, two rows of columns on the sides and one row toward the N wall; the façade of the N entry is preceded by a portico and a flight of stairs of four steps. The dating of the building is placed at the end of the 3rd or early 4th c.

At Chorazin, 4 km (2.5 mi) to the N of Capernaum, one finds the remains of a synagogue in the Galilean form. The building, in local basalt, seems to have been constructed before the 4th c. and remained in use until the beginning of the 7th c.

The synagogue of Arbel has a basilica layout, with three aisles divided by two rows of five columns and another two on the N side. The chief entrance is found to the E, and remains of benches along the walls are found under the protection of the E and W walls. Under the paved flooring are traces of a previous floor with a mosaic. The building had two or perhaps three phases, which, however, kept the building unchanged in its layout. The first phase is to be dated to the 4th c., the last to the 8th c.

At Hammath Tiberias the synagogue with a central room and some small adjacent rooms was constructed in the first half of the 3rd c. The building was reorganized at the beginning of the 4th c. with the closing of the rooms to the S and with the opening of the entry door to the N. Divided into four aisles, with the central aisle adjoined by a smaller aisle to the W and two to the E, the synagogue had mosaics on the floor, with the usual themes: two lions facing each other to a series of six square panels containing inscriptions in Greek, which mentioned the benefactors who took care of the building's accommodations; at the center a panel with the zodiac around the personification of the sun on the chariot, and at the corners the four seasons; close to the step to the bema was the representation of the chest containing the scrolls of the law, accompanied by two candelabra with seven arms and the usual Jewish symbols. A larger building was subsequently built over this synagogue in the form of a regular basilica, on the pattern typical of the Galilean synagogue. Three doors on the W side were connected to a courtyard, and an apsed bema occupied the S wall. This synagogue also had two different construction phases that are datable to the mid-7th c. The mosaic flooring had geometric themes typical of the mosaics from that era. The synagogue probably remained in use until the mid-8th c.

At Beth Yerach one finds a building enclosed by a wall with two towers on either side and three rooms on the N side. The synagogue has a basilica layout with three aisles and an apse, and two service rooms on the S side. A few fragments of a mosaic scattered along the aisles, containing vegetable, animal and geometric themes, are all that remains of the floor. Archaeologists have distinguished two phases of the building, both dating to the 4th and 5th c.

The synagogue of Beth She'arim is a basilica with three aisles separated by two rows of eight pillars; it has a narthex in front from which three doors gave access to the hall. A platform was found adjacent to the NW wall. Later touchups are to be attributed to the closing of the central door of the SE to create a sort of polygonal apse. The building, not well dated but going back to the mid-3rd. to early 4th c., was destroyed around the mid-4th c.

At Hammath Gader the layout of the synagogue is that of a basilica, with an apse on the S side, which was added in the last of the three phases, dating to the 6th c. The first phase is difficult to date, while the second phase is similar to the third, with the exception of the apse, and is dated to the end of the 3rd or early 4th c. The synagogue of Ma'oz Hayyim has three distinct phases of construction. The most ancient phase, which is dated to the end of the 3rd or early 4th c., included a rectangular building, with an entryway to the W. Upon the remains of the wall of this first structure was a building in the shape of a basilica with three aisles and an apse on the S side. Upon the fragments of the mosaic flooring a menorah and a shofar were represented. In a third phase

of the building (1st half of the 6th c.) new mosaic flooring, some fragments of which remain in the N and E sector, and the masonry platform built at the S apse, overhanging on the central aisle, were added. The building was destroyed by a fire at the beginning of the 7th c. The synagogue building of Rehov has a basilica layout divided into three aisles by pillars and is dated, in its first phase, to the 4th c. At the end of the fourth or beginning of the 5th c., a stone platform was added to the S wall and a multicolored mosaic floor; the walls were decorated with stucco and the pillars carved with some Aramaic inscriptions. To the final phase, usually dated between the 6th and 7th c., belong the restorations of the mosaic flooring, the raising of the platform, the construction of some stone benches on the two sides and the addition of a narthex at the S entry, in which a long inscription containing some ritual requirements and prohibitions was found.

At Ein Gedi a rectangular hall with irregular dimensions constituted the synagogue. Archaeologists have been able to distinguish three construction phases datable from the late 2nd or early 3rd c. until the last decades of the 6th. The building in the first phase consisted of the rectangular hall with two entry doors on the E side and a white mosaic floor with a rectangular frame of black and white tiles containing three square panels decorated with very simple geometric motifs, the only quasi-complete panel is the S panel containing a swastika cross in black tiles. Subsequently the two entries to the E were blocked, the hall was expanded on the W side with the opening of three new entry doors. Third, a narthex was added to the W with a basin for ritual ablutions which was placed at the SW corner. The platform was constructed under the shelter of the W wall. The mosaic floor preserves at the center a geometric theme given by two crossed panels with some birds at the center and at the sides, facing each other two by two. On the small W aisle the mosaic tapestry contains a series of two inscriptions in Hebrew, which records the text of 1 Chr 1:1-4, the list of the zodiac, some months of the year and several patriarchs, while in three Aramaic inscriptions are recorded the names of the benefactors and a curse against those who reveal the city's secret.

The building found out Susya is composed of a rectangular hall with the major sides to the N and S, a narthex and a porticoed courtyard to the E. Two raised platforms were set against the N wall to indicate the place in which the scrolls were preserved and the place in which the synagogue reading was done. Three levels with mosaics have been found; the second contained a representation of Daniel in the lion's den, although the lowest one was made of white squares and the highest level with geometric colored motifs with a representation of the chest of the law, flanked by two seven-arm candelabra. Three inscriptions in Aramaic and one in Hebrew have been found in the mosaic floor of the hall and the E portico. The date proposed for the erection of this building is the 4th c. with remodeling and reordering over the course of the 5th c., when the narthex was built, and the 6th c.

Of the buildings taken into consideration, i.e., the most significant ones, only seven can be dated with a certain reliability from the 4th to 6th c. Three of these were first considered to be from the 2nd c., starting from the similarities of the architectural and stylistic type (Horvat ʿAmmudim, Caparnaum and Nabratein III). Now they are dated with some certainty respectively to the 4th, late 5th and the 6th c., thanks to the archaeological information coming from the archaeological digs and the metrological and dimensional analysis, which have seemed to converge (Milson, *Art and Architecture*, 83).

The birth of the synagogue within the Samaritan community from the historical perspective is tied to the figure of Baba Rabbah, the Samaritan leader mentioned by the *Samaritan Chronicles*, a medieval document. The *Chronicles* attest that Baba Rabbah over the course the 4th c. constructed eight synagogues in Samaria. To date three synagogues have been discovered outside Samaria (Beit-She'an, Sha'albim, perhaps at Tel Aviv) and five within Samaria. At Khirbet Samara, one synagogue is part of a broader complex. The synagogue hall is rectangular, with maps on the E side, benches on the N and S sides, a narthex and a semicircular atrium, a courtyard on the N side, and various rooms around. The synagogue was constructed on the masonry of a Roman building. Three floor levels have been discovered in the hall. The most ancient is that made of stone slabs belonging to the previous building. The floor mosaic, which can be dated to the 4th c., belongs to the original phase of this synagogue. The mosaic with small tiles had a black background, on which three different rectangular registers were developed, are severely damaged. Over the mosaic, a floor of stone slabs was laid out, evidence of a building period that can be dated perhaps after the Samaritan revolt of 529.

At al-Khirbe, near Sebaste, a synagogue in the form of a rectangle with benches for the assembly on the four sides, a paved courtyard to the S, and an exedra to the N has been found. The mosaic flooring has preserved six inscriptions in Greek and the typical theme of the seven-arm candelabra with

other religious symbols around. The synagogue is to be dated to the 4th c., which was probably damaged at the time of the revolt of 529. It was restored shortly after and remained in use until the beginning of the 8th c.

To the NW of Shechem there is a local town, which, acc. to its Samaritan tradition, is to be identified with the field acquired by Jacob (Gen 33:18-20). The same tradition mentions the synagogue constructed in 362 and confiscated by the emperor *Zeno at the time of the revolt of 484. The present-day building is found alongside a mosque, in which the minaret is constructed on the most ancient remains of the building.

At Khirbet Majdal the archaeological digs have brought to light a *Byzantine monastery and another building identified with a Samaritan synagogue, which was made up of a rectangular hall with an apse, a narthex and an atrium. Fragments of the decorated mosaic and an inscription that recalls the benefactors were discovered in the hall.

At Kefar Fahma some architectural elements discovered on site, including an architrave inscribed with a menorah, suggest the existence of a synagogue building, but for which no other trace remains. The archaeological digs conducted on Mt. Gerizim have brought to light the remains of the octagonal church dedicated to *Mary the Mother of God. The digs under the structures of the church have revealed the existence of a more ancient building, perhaps a synagogue or the Samaritan temple, which was constructed in the late Roman period and destroyed, as some literary sources report, by the emperor Zeno in order to construct the octagonal church. So say the **Chronicon Paschale* and the *Samaritan Chronicles*, while *Procopius of Caesarea in his treatise *De Aedificiis* simply says that permission was granted to the Samaritans to ascend the mountain to pray until such time as Zeno decided to build a church on the summit, without making any reference to a previous sacred building.

Even outside the Palestinian territory some synagogues have been found. The most famous is certainly that of *Dura Europos. The city on the Euphrates River was destroyed by the Persians in 256. Archaeological digs have brought to light a synagogue among other buildings, whose walls have preserved the frescoes intact. The dedicatory inscription reports the date of 244–245. Rectangular in shape, the building was preceded to the E by a porticoed atrium on the three sides, from which one approached through two doors to the synagogue hall. On the inside, benches ran along the sides of all four walls. On the W side a niche and a more prominent bench indicate the place in which the scrolls were placed and from which the reading was proclaimed. Of the frescoes on the walls, which are divided into five registers, the lower one depicts animals, masks and other things; the higher register has almost vanished, although of the three intermediary registers, 29 panels have been preserved, which depict scenes from the OT.

Of all the ancient synagogues, that of Sardis is certainly the most monumental. Contained within the large complex of the gymnasium and the baths near the chief hub of the city, the basilica hall runs nearly 60 m (196 ft) long and 20 m (65 ft) wide; it was preceded by a porticoed atrium of approximately 20 meters on the side, which during the first phase must have been a part of the synagogue hall, which was even broader. The building was remodeled over the course of the 4th c., adapting some rooms originally belonging to the *apoditerium* of the gymnasium, which was constructed over the course of the 2nd c. AD. The large room with its mosaic flooring and the walls covered with marble and panels in *opus sectile*, the two beautiful aedicules set against the E wall, the table supported by two pedestals in masonry with eagles sculpted and flanked by two sculptures depicting two seated lions, the *synthronon* on the apse, the porticoed atrium with a beautiful fountain at the center—all were completed in the 2nd half of the 4th c.

On the island of Delos a building was identified as a synagogue in use starting from the 1st half of the 1st c. BC and into the 2nd c. AD. It was a private building adapted for use as a synagogue. The building consisted of a courtyard to the E facing the sea, a series of small rooms to the S, connected to the antechamber from which access was gained through three doors to the assembly room, which was found in the NW area of the building.

At Ostia, which was the port for Rome, a building dating to the 4th c. was found; it was composed of a room for gatherings with three entry doors, which opened to a vestibule with a staircase and a propylaeum. In the SE corner of the room there was an aedicule with two columns, where Torah scolls were likely stored. Set against the SW wall there was a raised platform, which served to accommodate those who proclaimed the reading or the more noteworthy individuals of the community. Close to the S wall arose another room with some benches along its S wall, perhaps a room for study, and more to the E, a room considered to have been a hospice for strangers. Under the walls of this building were unearthed walls belonging perhaps to a more ancient synagogue. An inscription found during the excavation men-

tions Faustus, who constructed the synagogue and organized the aedicule for the law scrolls. Situated between the Roman villa and a necropolis, the synagogue of Bova Marina, which is dated to the 4th c., is composed of some rooms around a central room, with mosaic flooring, in which are represented, within the geometric motifs, some of the most common Jewish symbols, candelabrum, cedar, palm and horn. Over the course of the 6th c. the building underwent several adaptations: an atrium was created to the W of the synagogue hall, on the wall of which an apse was constructed with a raised bema and a parapet in front. The building and the entire site was abandoned at the beginning of the 7th c. A small synagogue, situated at the center of the complex, with an apse on the W wall, made up part of a villa discovered to the S of Tunis. The inscription discovered in the mosaic flooring of one of the villa's rooms mentions a Juliana, who ordered the construction of the synagogue. The dating of the building is doubtful and is placed in the 4th, 5th or 6th c.

Although traces of the ancient synagogues at Rome have not remained, information about them exists thanks to numerous pieces of epigraphic evidence. There are nearly 40 inscriptions that mention Roman synagogues, the number of which is estimated from 10 to 16 buildings, in use from the end of the 2nd to the entire 5th c. (Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 263-266).

The synagogue building, once it had been proclaimed as such, performed various functions: primarily serving the community assembly for the study of the law; as a tribunal for solving internal questions; for organizing the collection of the offerings to send to the temple of Jerusalem; as a hospice for welcoming of strangers; for helping the poor, widows and orphans; and organizing common meals. This synagogue became a place of community prayer probably first in the Diaspora and later in Palestine, where until AD 70 the "house" of prayer par excellence remained the temple (Neh 8:5-6; 9:3; 2 Macc 8:27; Mt 6:5-6; Mk 11:17). After the destruction of the temple, the situation changed; the cultic function of the synagogue broadened, becoming the chief function, and some customs of the temple were transferred to it, contributing to the birth of a true and proper synagogue liturgy, bringing it about that the building increasingly became the pivot around which all the activities of the Jewish community starting from the 1st c. AD onward revolved.

H. Kohl - C. Watzinger, *Antike Synagogen in Galilea*, Leipzig 1916; B. Lifschitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives. Répertoire des dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues*, Paris 1967; J. Gutmann, *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*, New York 1975; V.C. Corbo, *Cafarnao. 1. Gli edifici della città*, Jerusalem 1975; M. Avi-Yonah, *Synagogues*, in Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land 4, Jerusalem 1978, 1129-1138; J.F. Strange, *Archaeology and the Religion of Judaism in Palestine*, in ANRW II. *Principat 19.1. Religion* (*Judentum: Algemeines*; *Palästinisches Judentum*), Berlin-New York 1979, 646-685; A.Th. Kraabel, *The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence Since Sukenik*, in ANRW II. *Principat 19.1. Religion* (*Judentum: Algemeines*; *Palästinisches Judentum*), Berlin-New York 1979, 477-510; L. Levine (ed.), *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, Jerusalem 1981; Id., *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1987; R. Hachlili (ed.), *Ancient Synagogues in Israel*, Oxford-Haifa 1989; H.C. Kee, *The Transformation of the Synagogue After 70 C.E.: Its Import for Early Christianity*: New Testament Studies 36 (1990) 1-24; S. Loffreda, *Capernaum*, in New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land 1, Jerusalem 1993, 291-295; L.I. Levine, *Synagogues*, in New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land 4, Jerusalem 1993, 1421-1424; I. Magen, *Samaritan Synagogues*, in ibid., 1424-1427; L. Boffo, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia*, Brescia 1994; D. Urman - P.V.M. Flesher (eds.), *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1995; S.S. Miller, *On the Number of Synagogues in the Cities of 'Ereẓ Israel*: Journal of Jewish Studies 49 (1998) 51-66; L. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, New Haven-London 1999; J.S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Dating Theodotos* (*CIJ II 1404*): Journal of Jewish Studies 51 (2000) 243-280; A. Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue*, Stockholm 2001; J. Magness, *The Question of the Synagogue: The Problem of Typology*, in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Part III, vol. IV. *Where We Stand: Issues and Debates in Ancient Judaism: The Special Problem of the Synagogue*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2001, 1-48; J. Wilkinson, *From Synagogue to Church: The Traditional Design*, London-New York 2002; B. Olsson - M. Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins Until 200 C.E.*, Stockholm 2003; Ch. Perrot, *Synagogue. I-VII*, in Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible 13, Paris 2003, 653-751; E. Netzer, *The Synagogues from the Second Temple Period According to Archaeological Finds and in Light of the Literary Sources*, in *One Land—Many Cultures: Archaeological Studies in Honour of Stanislao Loffreda, OFM*, Jerusalem 2003, 277-285; D. Milson, *Art and Architecture of the Synagogue in Late Antique Palestine: In the Shadow of the Church*, Leiden-Boston 2006.

C. Pappalardo

SYNAXIS. A term almost unknown before the appearance of Christianity, which became a technical term in the *Byzantine *liturgy to refer both to the assembly of the faithful and the *Eucharist, more specifically *Communion. *Synaxis* and the synonym *synagogue* come from the same Greek root. To distinguish their assemblies from those of the Jews and subsequently from those of the heretics, the first Christians adopted a different ending (see Epiph., *Panar.* 30,18). *Cyril of Jerusalem clearly distinguished the assemblies which took place on Sunday and the day of the Lord's ascension, from which he established the order of the readings (*Cat.* XIV,24), from those during which his catechetical instruc-

tions were conducted. Although *John Chrysostom did not seem to maintain such a distinction (*Hom. 29 in Act*; *Hom. 5 in Mt.*), *Basil spoke of a visible synaxis and a spiritual synaxis of the faithful, who served God in spirit and in truth, and called it holy (*Hom. I in Psalmum* 28). The term also refers to the participation of the faithful at the celebration of the holy mysteries and their intimate union with Christ (ps.-Dionysius, *Hier. cael.* I,3) and also, yet distanced from its original meaning, the form of prayer or worship of monks and nuns (*Apophthegmata Patrum*: PG 65,220). In the Latin monastic context it appeared late with the meaning of *collecta* (see John Cass., *Conlat.* VIII,16; IX,36; *Vitae Patrum Jurensium* 52,9; 64,5; 130,2) and refers to both the liturgical celebration culminating in the Eucharist and the celebration composed of prayer and psalmody (*Reg. S. Bened.* XVII, 17).

DACL 15, 1835-1836; Lampe 1302-1303; *Storia del cristianesimo* I, [2003], 414-462; *see* Assembly.

E. Peretto

SYNCLETICA. Virgin and deaconess from the 5th c. praised by the poet *Sedulius who, in a letter to the presbyter Macedonius (CSEL 10,9), praises Syncletica's humility, despite the fact that she was from a noble family, and lauds her theological training.

DCB 4, 756.

S. Zincone

SYNCLETICA, nun. The historical existence of Syncletica, a nun in Egypt, is not documented except by the Greek *Life* attributed, it seems first by Nicephorus (*HE* VIII,40), to *Athanasius of Alexandria. According to this life, Syncletica, whose family was originally from Macedonia, was born at *Alexandria, *Egypt. Having consecrated herself to God, she spent her youth in prayer and penance and, upon the death of her parents, went into solitude. With her popularity having quickly spread, some women gathered around her and asked that she lead them as a spiritual director. She died in old age, after having nobly undergone painful and sharp illnesses. During this time, she consoled and comforted to the very end the individuals who assisted her.

BS 11, 1209-1210.

S. Zincone

SYNCRETISM. This term, deriving from the Greek σύγκρασις ("mixing"), refers to the union and fusion of elements and of different origin, which together form either a new religious belief or a new philosophical system. This process of synthesis, both on the religious and philosophical level, is primarily characteristic of the Hellenistic-Roman period and had one of its chief centers in *Alexandria, Egypt. Apart from the syncretistic religions of the Hellenistic-Roman era, it is fitting to briefly mention here the syncretistic character of both *pagan and Christian *gnosticism and that of Hellenistic and Late Antique thought, which the Fathers could not ignore. Pagan gnosticism, which found its greatest expression in that conglomerate of treatises known as the *Corpus hermeticum*, which came together in Egypt during the first centuries of the Common Era, was a combination of astrology, hidden sciences, Neo-Pythagoreanism, *Platonism, *Stoicism and, acc. to Reitzenstein, Iranian religious teachings as well; Christian gnosticism exhibited some close analogies to pagan gnosticism (one simply has to think of the theme of *gnōsis*—present both in the *Corp. Herm.* I and XIII and the *Valentinian system (*see* *Ogdoad)—as well as the *Himmelreise* or the gnostic soul's journey which, having crossed through the seven lower heavens, reaches the eighth heaven or the Ogdoas and encompasses within itself occultism; astrological, Neo-Pythagorean and Platonic teachings; more or less fanciful interpretations of the OT and the NT; and heterodox tendencies from late *Judaism, Zoroastrianism and myths of Eastern origin. (One has only to think of the theme of the fall of Sophia, which is presented again in various gnostic systems of thought.)

In Hellenistic thought, the most famous examples of the "syncretistic" tendency were represented by the Stoic Possidonius (2nd c. BC) and the academic Antiochus of Ascalona (1st c. BC). Possidonius dedicated a commentary to Plato's *Timaeus*, a commentary which remained famous in all of Late Antiquity and was used, in all likelihood, by such authors as *Philo of Alexandria, *Plotinus, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Basil the Great and *Nemesius of Emesa; clear "Platonic" themes in his thought were the image of the charioteer who drives two horses, deriving from the *Phaedrus* (246b), the ethics of simple moderation of the passions, present in the *Republic* (IV,423a 4-5, 431c 5-7; X,619a 5-6) and the doctrine of the tripartition of the human soul (even if Possidonius prefers to speak of the "functions" of the soul rather than "parts" of the soul; see S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 87 n. 1, 98 n. 4, 100 n. 3). The entire teaching of Antiochus of Ascalona aims to demonstrate the substantial agreement between the Academy and the Peripatetic

school (see Cicero, *Ac. post.* I,37 and 38) and was deeply influenced by the "Middle Stoicism" of Panaetius and Possidonius: Antiochus could be called a "Stoicizing Platonist." The same syncretistic orientation can be observed in some proponents of the so-called *Middle Platonism of the first two centuries AD such as Plutarch and Alcinous, in whose writings the presence of Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic elements (despite Plutarch's controversy against Stoicism) emerges with special emphasis. A syncretism very close to that of Middle Platonism, but enriched by various Neo-Pythagorean motifs, can be observed in the writings of *Philo of Alexandria (*see* *Hellenistic Judaism). The "syncretistic" orientation is one of the chief characteristics of all Neoplatonism, starting from *Ammonius Saccas until its late proponents. As Hierocles recalls in his treatise *On Providence*, Ammonius aimed to show the agreement between the teaching of Plato and Aristotle (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 214) and had joined the teachings of the two great philosophers into one system, which he transmitted to Plotinus and *Origen the Neoplatonist (Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 251). In chapter 14 of his *Life of Plotinus* (*Vita Plotini*), *Porphyry (I, pp. 15-16 Bréhier) mentions that Plotinus, during his lectures, examined and commented on the works of numerous Greek philosophers (Stoics, Peripatetics, Platonists and Neo-Pythagoreans), accepting many of their teachings and following Ammonius's example (see p. 15, 15-16): this final affirmation proves that Ammonius, in addition to demonstrating the agreement between the teachings of Plato and Aristotle, also subjected the chief philosophical currents of thought to careful examination. In effect, as E.R. Dodds and W. Theiler noted (see biblio.), the entirety of Plotinus's thought denotes a vast synthesis of Neo-Pythagorean, Peripatetic and Stoic teachings in addition to Platonist and Middle Platonist doctrines. The same type of syncretism can also be observed in the writings of the subsequent proponents of Neoplatonism such as Porphyry, *Iamblicus, *Julian the Apostate, Proclus and the *Damascius, even if it, in each one of the writings of these authors, could acquire different nuances, being enriched along the way with new contributions such as the solar religion, that of the *Chaldean Oracles*, magic and theurgy (in this regard, *see* *Neoplatonism).

During the patristic era syncretism found its theoretical formulation (on the level of the theological interpretation of history) and its practical implementation (on the doctrinal level) in the writings of *Justin Martyr and esp. those of *Clement of Alexandria: tracing Greek philosophy back to the inspiring or "seminal" action of the *Logos, in addition to the use of *Moses's books by the Greeks (*see* *Hellenism and Christianity); they felt that they had the right to incorporate within their thought the teachings of various Greek philosophical schools and thus produced a sort of syncretism entirely analogous to that of Middle Platonism and of Philo of Alexandria. (The influence of Philo's syncretism on Clement of Alexandria is direct and well known, although it cannot be proved in the case of Justin Martyr, who probably did not know of Philo's writings but instead depended on the Middle Platonism of the 2nd c. AD; see H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 4.) According to the testimony of *Gregory Thaumaturgus (*Thanksgiving to Origen* XIII,150-153), *Origen the Christian had his students study the works of many Greek philosophers, except the atheists: in this way he followed the example of Plotinus and of his teacher Ammonius Saccas. Likewise in the thought of Origen—as moreover in that of Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa and *Gregory of Nazianzus—one can perceive a synthesis of Platonist, Stoic and Aristotelian-Peripatetic teachings (*see* *Aristotelianism, *Platonism, *Stoicism and the Fathers).

R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig 1904; Id., *Die Göttin Psyche in der hellenistischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Heidelberg 1917; Id., *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland*, Leipzig 1926; Id., *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Darmstadt 1956 (repr. of the 1927 ed.); H. Strache, *Der Eklektizismus des Antiochos von Askalon*, Berlin 1921; E.R. Dodds, *The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One*: CQ 22 (1928) 129-142 (on Plotinus's dependence on Neo-Pythagoreanism in the interpretation of the *Parmenides*); Id., *Tradition and Personal Achievement in the Philosophy of Plotinus*: JRS 50 (1960) 2 (on the "syncretistic" character of Plotinian philosophy); F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris [4]1929; W. Theiler, *Plotin und die antike Philosophie*: MH 1 (1944) 209-225 (on the syncretistic character of Plotinian philosophy); Id., *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1930 (on Possidonius's dependence on Plotinus); Id., *Philo von Alexandreia und der Beginn des Kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus. Parusia, Festgabe J. Hirschberger*, Frankfurt 1965, 199-218; H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, 5-7; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971 (on the substantial agreement between the syncretism of Clement and Philo of Alexandria and that of Middle Platonism); A. Graeser, *Plotinus and the Stoics*, Leiden 1972; A. Böhlig, *Gnosis und Synkretismus*, Tübingen 1989; W. Fauth, *Helios Megistos. Zur synkretistischen Theologie der Spätantike*, Leiden 1995; *Les Syncrétismes religieux dans le monde méditerranéen antique*, ed. C. Bonnet - A. Motte, Brussels 1999.

S. Lilla

SYNESIUS of Cyrene (ca. 370–ca. 413). Synesius was born at Cyrene, in *Libya, between 370 and 375 to a noble *pagan family; he completed advanced

studies at *Alexandria, where he was initiated into *Neoplatonism by the famous *Hypatia. A trip to Greece left him very disillusioned on account of the cultural decadence of *Athens (*Ep.* 136). In 399, he was chosen by his countrymen for permission to request from the emperor *Arcadius, at *Constantinople, a reduction of the taxes for the region of Pentapolis, which had been impoverished by the barbarian invasions, earthquakes and famines. His *Discourse on Royalty*, delivered at Constantinople in 400, is a courageous address to the emperor, in which he criticizes the court's luxury and lifestyle which has caused it to lose contact with reality. Even the treatise *On Providence* was begun at Constantinople and finished in *Egypt: in an *allegorical form this document narrates what the author saw at Constantinople within the hermeneutical key of the relationship—conflict between *virtue and vice.

In 402, Synesius returned to Cyrene after having obtained a reduction in taxes. Between this date and 405–406, Synesius contracted a Christian *marriage at Alexandria in the presence of the patriarch *Theophilus (*Ep.* 105) and defended the city from the invasions of the Macheti. Nothing is known about the period when he received *baptism. In 410, he was elected bishop of Cyrene and metropolitan of Ptolemais by the clergy and the people. Synesius hesitated for a long time to accept the episcopal ministry: *Epistles* 105 and 110 are a sincere explanation to *Theophilus of Alexandria for the reasons of his reservations: a feared conflict between the truth of the intellectual and the religion of the "common man"; several elements from Neoplatonic philosophy that he considered nonnegotiable; and a certain attachment to a noble life lived in the countryside. Synesius, who had already had three children, moreover asked to remain in a married state. Theophilus consecrated him bishop. These were difficult years for the entire populace because of the continuous and bloody barbarian invasions, as his two speeches (*Catastasis*) bear witness. No information or documents come from Synesius's pen beyond the year 413.

In addition to Synesius's writings that have survived (*Discourse on Royalty*, the treatise *On Providence*, *Dion*, *In Praise of Baldness*, the treatise *On Dreams*, *The Gift*, the *Letters* [156], the *Hymns*, two *Speeches* and two fragments of *Homilies*), scholars have supposed that as a young man Synesius wrote poetical works inspired by Anacreontics (see E. Cavalcanti, *Studi Eunomiani*, 106, n. 2). From the writings that have survived, the following texts come from his Christian period: a few of the 156 letters; the two *Speeches*; the two fragments of *Homilies* and nine of the *Hymns*, the 10th certainly being spurious; the first 5 (acc. to the enumeration of the modern editors) have a theological theme; the other 4 have the character of prayer or celebration.

Synesius's thought expressed in the *Hymns*—esp. of the first five—is extremely complex. In the past, scholars limited themselves to describing it as a "web of echoes," and at most it was studied for these reminiscences, taking for granted that the work had very little Christian character to it. Scholars in the past rejected the notion of Synesius as bishop. More recent studies have raised the issue of Synesius's thought in relation to the Neoplatonist sources that were common to him and *Marius Victorinus (P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, I,461-474). Other research has established a relationship between the events of ecclesial life that Synesius faced during his episcopate and—at the thought level—the more complex themes of the *Hymns*. Epistle 141, in particular, and 142 attest the presence of a late *Eunomian propaganda in Cyrenaica, tied to an intellectual current of thought in the imperial court and supported on the position of the prefect Andronicus, with whom Synesius experienced serious disagreements between the end of 411 and 412. The hermit *Isidore of Pelusium supported Synesius in the fight. The clergy was divided, and local interests were marked by tones of late *Arian opposition (see *Ep.* 141). The trinitarian theme contained in the hymns is not detached from the anti-Eunomian controversy; in particular, the first and the second hymns—which are parallel in structure—and the fifth allow for the emergence of an antitechnical and antinominalistic theological elaboration. Moreover, in Synesius's trinitarian elaboration, several elements are present from the Origenian-Alexandrian tradition, esp. with respect to aspects of the generation within the *Trinity and the theology of the *Holy Spirit, upon which he brings to bear his thought pertaining to the divine nature and the trinitarian relations (see *Hymn* III).

CPG III, 5630-5640 *Suppl.* pp. 364-366, biblio. where, for each work, the editions and chief studies are indicated. Nevertheless, for the web of difficulties and the studies that pertain to Synesius, the reader should consult the synthesis contained in E. Cavalcanti, *Studi Eunomiani*, OCA 202, Rome 1976, 106-128. The most recent editions should also be included: Synesii Cyrenensis, *Epistolae*, rec. A. Garzya, Rome 1979; Sinesio di Cirene, *Opere*: *Epistole*, *Operette*, *Inni*, ed. A. Garzya, Turin 1989. Synesius's writings are in PG 66, 1021-1756; Fr. tr.: H. Druon, Paris 1878; Eng. tr.: A. Fitzgerald, 3 vols., London 1926-1930; It. tr.: *Sulla provvidenza*, S. Nicolosi, Palermo 1959; *Inni* (ed. and tr.) A. Dell'Era, Rome 1968; *Sul regno*, A. Garzya, Naples 1973; *I sogni*, D. Susannetti, Bari 1992; Ger. tr.: *Hymnen*, J. Gruber - H. Strohm, Heidelberg 1991; Sp. tr.: *Himnos; Tratados*, F.A. García Romero, Madrid 1993.

Studies: G. Grützmacher, *Synesios von Kyrene, ein Charakterbild aus dem Untergang des Hellenentums*, Leipzig 1913; G. Bettini, *L'attività pubblica di Sinesio di Cirene*, Udine 1938; J.C. Pando, *The Life and Times of Synesius of Cyrene as Revealed in His Work*, Washington, DC 1940; C. Bizzochi, *La tradizione storica della consacrazione episcopale di Sinesio di Cirene*: Gregorianum 25 (1944) 130-170; Id., *La irregolarità della consacrazione di Sinesio come congettura?*: Gregorianum 27 (1946) 261-299; H.I. Marrou, *La "conversion" de Synésius*: REG 65 (1952) 474-484; Id., *Synesius of Cyrene and Alexandrian Neoplatonism*, in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano, Oxford 1963, 126-150; P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, Paris 1968, 461-474 (It. tr. ed. G. Girgenti - G. Reale, Milan 1993); A.J. Bregman, *Synesius of Cyrene: Early Life and Conversion to Philosophy*: California Studies in Class. Antiquity 7 (1974) 55-88; A. Garzya, *Storia e interpretazione di testi bizantini. Saggi e ricerche*, London 1974 (repr. of nine previous articles on Synesius); G. Gellie, *Repetitions on the Letters of Synesius*: Antichthon 13 (1979) 70-102; A.J. Bregman, *Synesius of Cyrene, Philosopher Bishop*, Berkeley, CA 1982; D. Roques, *Synésios, évêque et philosophe*: Revue des études grecques 95 (1982) 537-539; S. Vollenweider, *Synesios von Kyrene über das Bischofsamt*: SP 18 (1985) 233-237; D. Roques, *Synésios de Cyrène et la Cirénaïque du Bas-Empire*: Études d'Antiquités africaines, Paris 1987; M. Ceccon, *Intorno ad alcuni passi dell'Inno I di Sinesio*: Civiltà classica e cristiana 11/3 (1990) 295-313; M. Di Pasquale Barbanti, *Filosofia e cultura in Sinesio di Cirene*, Florence 1994; H. Seng, *Untersuchungen zum Vokabular und zur Metrik in den Hymnen des Synesios*, Frankfurt 1994; D. Roques, *Synésios à Constantinople: 399-402*: Byzantion 65 (1995) 405-439; T. Schmitt, *Die Bekehrung des Synesios von Kyrene: Politik und Philosophie, Hof und Provinz als Handlungsräume eines Aristokraten bis zu seiner Wahl zum Metropoliten von Ptolemaïs*, Munich 2001, with extensive and updated bibliography on pp. 769-804.

E. Cavalcanti

SYNODITES. This name was used to refer to *Chalcedonians in the document titled *De sectis*, which was attributed to *Leontius Scholasticus (end of the 6th c.). In particular, they are mentioned for their use of the paradigm of the soul and the body in *Christology; in fact, they were rebuked for asserting three natures in Christ, or rather two of the humanity and one of the divinity. For this reason Leontius Scholasticus distanced himself from this paradigm, considering it to be outside the norm for understanding of the unity of the humanity and divinity in Jesus Christ.

De sectis VII; PG 86, 1248C; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa* 2/2, Brescia 1999, 605-606; C. Dell'Osso, *L'analogia antropologica. Riflessioni sui concetti di anima e corpo in alcuni testi patristici*: Alpha Omega 6 (2003) 215-232.

C. Dell'Osso

SYNODOS ALEXANDRINA. Better known as the *Canones ecclesiastici* (5th c.), this collection of canonical texts of the *Alexandrian church was preserved in *Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic), Arabic and Ethiopian, but its original was in Greek. The Ethiopian translation derived from the Arabic and is the most complete, even though it contains some interpolations. In the Arabic translation, it constitutes the first book of the collection, in two books, published by Lagarde, of the *127 Canons of the Apostles*. The collection in Coptic is subdivided into 78 canons, 71 in Arabic. The *Synodos Alexandrina* (PO 8,573[23]-623[113]) includes (1) *The Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Apostles* (referred to by Botte as the *Canons of the Apostles*) (cans. 1-30; Arabic 1-20); (2) *The Apostolic Tradition* (also called *The Constitution of the Egyptian Church*) (cans. 31-62, Arabic 21-47), but it also has a definite relationship with the **Testamentum Domini* and the *Canons of Hippolytus;* and (3) part of book 8 of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, with an addition of prayers (cans. 63-78, Arabic 48-71).

Editions: CPG 1732. Ethiopian: G.W. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclessiastici*, London 1904 (text and tr.), 1-87; H. Duensing, *Der aethiopische Text der Kirchenordung des Hippolyt*, Göttingen 1946. Sahidic: P.A. de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, Göttingen 1883 (repr. Osnabrück 1972), 209-291; U. Bouriant, *Les canons apostoliques de Clément de Rome*: Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes 5 (1884) 192-216; 6 (1885) 97-115; J. Leipold, *Saidische Auszüge aus dem 8. Buche der Apostolischen Konstitutionen*, Leipzig 1904; W. Till - J. Leipold, *Der Koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*, Berlin 1954 (ed. of the central part). Boharic: H. Tattam, *The Apostolic Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles in Coptic with an English Translation*, London 1948. Arabic: G.W. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici*, London 1904 (text and tr.), 89-125; J. Périer - A. Périer, *Les "127 canons des apôtres,"* Paris 1912 (repr. in PO 8,4 = 39, Turnhout 1971).

Studies: W. Riedel, *Die kirchenrechtlichen Quellen Patriarchats Alexandrien*, Leipzig 1900 (repr. Aalen 1968); J.-M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte. Ses documents. Son titulaire. Ses origines et son caractère*, Rome 1959, [2]1965, 31-47 and 519-526; B. Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique de Saint Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution*, Münster 1963, [5]1989, XII-XXVI; *Vertex Traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 134-140; Coptic Encyclopedia 2, 453-456 (s.v. *Ecclesiastical Canons*).

A. Di Berardino

SYNOUSIASTS. From *syn* ("with, together") and *ousia* ("essence, substance"). The ancient Christian authors referred to the *Apollinarians with this title, inasmuch as the Apollinarians affirmed that in Christ the human and the divine substance were united such a way that they resulted in one substance (*Diodore: PG 33, 1560; Eust. M.: PG 86, 940A).

Lampe, s.v. 1337.

M. Simonetti

SYRACUSE
I. The city - II. Archaeology.

I. The city. In 734 BC a colony of Corinthians, led by Archias, founded Syracuse (Thucydides,VI, 3,2; Strabo, VI, 269). Having docked at Ortygia, they expelled the Sicels (Siculi) who lived along the coast and subjugated those peoples who lived inland, the ancestors of the future Cilliri mentioned by Herodotus (VII, 155), as servants of the nobles (*Gamoroi*). The etymology of the name *Syracuse* is uncertain: certain scholars consider it to be of Phoenician origin ("the rock of the Gabbiani); others hold that it derives from the term *Syraco*, a marshland to the S of the city. Syracuse's ascendancy began with Gelon (ca. 540–478 BC), from whom the Greeks sought help in vain against the Persians (Herodotus, VII, 145ff). He affirmed his supremacy over all of W Sicily and conquered the Carthaginians at Himera (480). The splendor of the city continued under Hiero (477–461 BC). In 466 a coup d'état began the democracy, which would last until 405. After having faced Athens in battle twice (427–424 and 415–413 BC), Syracuse reached the apex of its power with Dionysius the Elder (405–367 BC), Timoleon (333–337/336 BC), Agathocles (317–289 BC) and Hiero II (269–215 BC). It then passed under the dominion of *Rome (212 BC), becoming its colony under the emperor *Augustus (21 BC). The emperors did not give it much political significance, because they were worried by the situation on the borders. During the years of the barbarian invasions, Sicily was conquered by the *Vandals, then by *Odoacer and the *Goths. In AD 535 with Bellisarius, it passed under the dominion of *Byzantium, becoming the capital of Sicily. In AD 663, with *Constans II (d. AD 668), it rose to be the capital of the empire. In AD 878 it was conquered by the Arabs.

The origins of Christianity at Syracuse are not well known. Scholars only know with certainty that when *Paul was traveling toward Rome, he remained there for three days (Acts 28:12). During the pre-Constantinian period, there must have been a community of a certain importance, if it had to face the problem of lapsed Christians (*lapsi*—see Cyprian, 30,5: CSEL 3,2,553). During the *Diocletian persecution, acc. to tradition, Syracuse witnessed the *martyrdom of *Lucia, an attestation to whom can perhaps be found in the catacomb. In 384, Bishop Ursus of *Ravenna dedicated a church to her, and in the 6th c. a *monastery was dedicated in her honor (Gregory the Great, *Ep.* VIII,36: MGH *Ep.* I,1,484).

The first bishop seems to have been Marcian, a legendary figure whom the sources, much later, depicted as another Christ. More specific information, however, is provided for Chrestus, who was invited by the emperor *Constantine to the Council of *Arles (314) to discuss the question of the *Donatist controversy (Euseb., *HE* X,5,21-24, with the emperor's letter); he went there with his deacon Florus and was the first to sign the acts. Another authoritative figure was Bishop Eulalius, present at the Council of Rome (502) to refute the decree of Basil, Odoacer's prefect, which prevented the election of the successor of Pope *Simplicius without the king's approval (Mansi 8,266); he was also present at the council of 503 (Mansi 8,299). The *Life of Saint Fulgentius* 8 (PL 65,128-130) extends an elegy toward him, acc. to which *Fulgentius, after having left the city in order to embrace the ascetic life of the monks of the *Thebaid, and heading, for this reason, to Carthage, docked at Syracuse, where he met Eulalius, "a bishop of extraordinary sanctity, marvelous hospitality and perfect charity, who hid within his heart a treasure of spiritual wisdom," and who was a lover of the monastic life. Once he had come to know of Fulgentius's intention, Eulalius was able to dissuade him, telling him that the community of Thebaid had become heretical. Moreover, Eulalius seems to have been the recipient of a letter from Ennodius of Pavia (3,18: MGH, *Auct. ant.* 7,116).

The bishops Maximian (591–594) and John (595–609) reigned under Pope *Gregory the Great. The first, who was already the *abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew at Rome, was the pope's representative for ecclesiastical discipline in Sicily (*Ep.* V,54: MGH, *Ep.* I,1,358); the second had the same duty and was responsible for the ecclesiastical goods (*Ep.* VI,20: MGH, *Ep.* I,1,302).

PWK Suppl. 8 (1973) 815-836; EC 11, 718-726; EI 31, 869-878; EAA 7, 329-339; CE 13, 892-893; C. Barreca, *I primordi del cristianesimo in Siracusa*, Rome 1935; L. Giuliano, *Storia di Siracusa antica*, Milan 1936; A. Amore, *S. Marciano di Siracusa*, Vatican City 1958; A. Pincherle, *Sulle origini del cristianesimo in Sicilia*: Kokalos 10/11 (1964-1965) 547-564; F.P. Rizzo, *Fulgenzio a Siracusa*: *Studi di filologia classica in onore di G. Monaco*, IV, Palermo 1991, 1473-1482; M. Sgarlata, *Il cristianesimo primitivo in Sicilia alla luce delle più recenti scoperte archeologiche*: SMSR 22 (1998) 2, 275-310; G. Greco, *Pagani e cristiani a Siracusa tra il III e IV secolo d.C.*, Rome 1999.

S. Borzì

II. Archaeology. Within the framework of the monumental testimonies to ancient Christianity in Sicily, Syracuse acquires a character and role of first importance for the richness and quality of the extant monuments, even if in the majority of cases they are funerary. These monuments can be subdivided into

four large groups by their technical and iconographic characteristics and by their different topographical dislocation with respect to the ancient city.

The first group is constituted by the four great catacombs (S. *Lucia, S. Maria di Gesù, Vigna Cassia and S. Giovanni) which are distributed from E to W along the S slope of the middle and W Acradina. The building of St. Lucia, in its initial nucleus predating the religious peace (313), was developed around the martyr's sepulcher in four regions and on three levels, with characteristics that go from those that are typically archaic in region A, to the use of hydraulic systems in B, within the inclusion of classic rooms in C and D. The long period in which visitors came to the cemetery is attested by two *Byzantine orators and the presence of early medieval sculptural fragments.

More to the W, the catacomb of S. Maria di Gesù, less developed and connected through an arm of an ancient aqueduct with the adjacent Vigna Cassia, essentially consists of two right-angle axes, which distinguish two chronological phases, the most ancient of which (post-Constantinian) witnessed the use of arcosolia containing more than one body (*see* *Italy: Sicily).

The cemetery of Vigna Cassia, which developed around a rectangular room now exposed to the open sky and which is of debated date and purpose, displays a vast area, resulting from the multiplication of several nuclei that make use of hydraulic systems developed from the 3rd c. to the entire 4th. This sits opposite a sector, dating later than the peace of the church, characterized by large arcosolia containing more than twenty burials, in which the well-known tomb of Marcia stands out, which is decorated with paintings.

A substantially rectangular schema characterizes the excavation of the monumental catacomb of S. Giovanni, where the particular nature of the rock has allowed for the opening of a long and broad *decumanus* stretching from E to W, which divides the cemeterial web into two large halves that are more or less equivalent, upon which are inserted, primarily in the S sector, *cardines* intersected by a smaller *decumanus*. To the S, traces of shorter galleries gravitate toward circular or quadrangular rooms. Among these, to which are also added two in the N sector, a few are distinguished: those that bear the names of Adelphia from which comes the famous sarcophagus (from the Constantinian age) of the Seven Virgins, Antiochia, Eusebius and the Sacred Ampulla. The architectural structure of the cemetery, the remaining frescoes and the aforementioned sarcophagus of Adelphia suggests that its origin was in the first decades of the 4th c.; moreover, the chronology is confirmed by the most ancient inscription found dating to the year 349, while epigraphy bears witness to the use of the hall until at least 452.

A short distance from the structure of San Giovanni, in the Villa Landolia, is found the catacomb of Predio Maltese, which in the past was considered to be a part of the preceding and more recently has been recognized as autonomous. In the same area, the three-apsed crypt of S. Marciano, inserted within the complex of classical monuments, is connected to the figure of the martyr Marcian, the presumed first bishop of Syracuse, and reveals various instances of remodeling until the Norman era and beyond.

The second group of cemeterial systems is that of the hypogea found between Predio Adorno-Avolio, the Capuchin convent and the coast of Pietralonga in E Acradina. These (catacombs Führer, Attanasio, Branciamore, the Cappuchins, Belloni-Monteforte, Troia, Trigilia, Mauceri, Russo, Bonaiuto, Fortuna and Grotticelli), likewise pre-Constantinian in origin, are characterized by less crowding of the burials, although with the usual typological characteristics. These hypogea seem to be traced to small groups, perhaps also familial, which, as the discoveries show, esp. the pottery, are expressed with a noteworthy freedom outside the control of the community.

The third group, from a later era, includes sepulchers that reuse or are inserted into classical monuments. Along the path of the tombs and in the rocky part of the Colle Temenite surrounding the Greek theater open out numerous cubicles in a cross-form layout with arcosolia, including one that was installed in the Nymphaeum and which was later transformed into a room for Christian worship.

In connection with the city, we must consider a group of suburban hypogea, from those of Riuzzo and Manomozza at Priolo to the catacombs of Molinello, near the harbor of Augusta at the station of Megara Iblea. These are divided mostly in cubicles and in sepulchral rooms which gravitate toward large sepulchers with canopies and thus differentiating themselves, even if they are chronologically of the same era, from those of the city proper, from which such a typology is absent.

One could also trace the early cathedral back to the cemeterial context. In fact, over the aforementioned crypt of S. Marciano stand the remains of a very large basilica, now dedicated to St. John, but originally it was believed to have been dedicated to the bishop-martyr, containing three columned aisles, with a semicircular apse and a presbytery, which was perhaps elevated and whose covering was

imagined to have been a roof. The construction was assigned to the 6th c., and scholars have ascribed to it the dignity of being an episcopal church until the 7th c., when this dignity was transferred within the city to Ortygia, in the new church dedicated to the Virgin and adapted from the temple of Athena. This church, with three aisles, which was created by reversing the building's orientation and opening arcades in the walls of the *cella*, shows, despite much remodeling, esp. in the N apsidiole, clear remains of the original building.

The reuse of preexisting buildings was frequent at Syracuse, as shown, e.g., by the church contained in the *naos* of the temple of Diana, also in Ortygia; or the two smaller places of worship, the one inserted in the context of the bathing area connected to the amphitheater and today called "Piscina di S. Nicolò" (after the church above it) and the other, a hypogeum, discovered under the city's train station. The architectural urban heritage is completed by the church of St. *Peter *intra moenia*, also in Ortygia—with a longitudinal layout with three aisles with pillars in a rectangular section, a semicircular apse and a covering with a barrel-vaulted roof—and that of St. Martin, likewise with three pillared aisles and a semicircular apse, and characterized by an emphasis of the longitudinal scheme.

In the suburbs, the church of S. Pietro ad Baias, with three pillared aisles and a Trichorate presbytery, datable to the 2nd half of the 5th c., sets forth again the characteristic iconography of the presbytery present in other churches on the island (*see* *Italy: Sicily), while in the Syracusan countryside, the church of S. Focà di Priolo presents, along with the aforementioned from St. Peter's, the peculiarity that the perimeter walls are traversed by corresponding arches to those of the aisles, interpreted in the past as continuous openings which were subsequently blocked up.

P. Testini, *Archeologia cristiana*, Bari [2]1980, 272ff., 292-293, and esp. 809-810; O. Garana, *Le catacombe siciliane e i loro martiri*, Palermo 1961; G. Agnello, *Recenti scoperte di monumenti paleocristiani nel siracusano*, in *Akten des VII. Intern. Kongresses f. christliche Archäologie*, Vatican City-Berlin 1969, 309-326; Id., *Nuovi ritrovamenti nella catacomba di S. Maria a Siracusa*: RivAC 49 (1973) 7-31; S.L. Agnello, *Siracusa sotterranea*: *nuovi contributi*, in *Atti del III Congr. Naz. Archeol. Cristiana*, Trieste 1974, 467-473; Id., *Chiese siracusane del VI secolo*: CCAB 27(1980) 13-26; P. Testini, *La cultura artistica in Italia nella antichità*, in *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo*, Rome 1981, 812-815 (see p. 810); P. Pelagatti, *Siracusa. Le ultime ricerche in Ortigia*: ASAA 54 (1982) 117-163; G. Vallet - G. Voza, *Dal neolitico all'era industriale nel territorio da Augusta a Siracusa*, Siracusa 1984; L. Polacco - M. Trojani - A.C. Scolari, *Ricerche e scavi nell'area del teatro antico di Siracusa, 1970-1983*: Kokalos 30-31 (1984-1985) 839-846; M. Griesheimer, *Genèse et développement de la catacombe Saint-Jean à Syracuse*: MEFRA 101 (1989) 751-782; Id., *Nouvelles inscriptions funéraires de la catacombe Saint-Jean*: RivAC 72 (1996) 1-2, 115-132; A. Ahlqvist, *Pitture e mosaici nei cimiteri paleocristiani di Siracusa: corpus iconographicum*, Venezia 1995.

L. Pani Ermini - R. Giordani - S. Borzì

SYRIA

I. The provinces and Christian origins - II. Archaeology.

I. The provinces and Christian origins. Conquering Syria during the years 65–62 BC, Pompey transformed it into a Roman province, although leaving various independent cities and numerous indigenous leaders who were in one way or another subjected to *Rome. Its borders were not well defined, and it went from the Taurus to Arabia and Egypt (Flavius Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* 12,317-321); the Euphrates River constituted the E border. Syria was geographically and ethnically diverse, including the flourishing coast (where Greek was spoken), the hinterland with valleys and highlands (of Aramaic language) and a desert area (Arabic-speaking Bedouins, but the languages were mixed everywhere; Latin was used in the army and the administration). Syria was a mosaic of different political situations, which extended even to the 1st c. AD, although a process of annexations and transformations of some territories into imperial properties continued to develop. Moreover, Syria's borders underwent radical changes over the course of time; at the end of the 1st c., they went from the Amanus mountain chain with Commagene, which was annexed in AD 72 with Samosata, along the Euphrates and W to beyond Mount Carmel and Hauran. Scholars do not know when *Palmyra was annexed. After the Jewish war of AD 70, it was separated from the province of Judea, which from the time of the emperor *Hadrian onward would have the official name of *Syria Palaestina* and only later *Palaestina* with the capital *Caesarea (*see* *Palestine). In 106, the emperor Trajan transformed the vassal kingdom of the Nabataeans into the Roman province of Arabia, with the capital *Bostra. Later, *Septimius Severus subdivided Syria into two provinces: Syria Coele (or Coelesyria) to the N, with Antioch as the capital, after a brief parenthesis with Laodicea and Syria Phoenice to the S with the capital Berytus (Beirut). Over the course of the 4th c. a new subdivision was instituted (the dates are not well known) with four provinces: Augusta Euphratensis (Commagene, Cyrrhestica, the cities along the Euphrates River until Circesium), Augusta Libanensis (the territory of Phoenicia beyond Lebanon and Hermon), Phoenice

(along the coast) and Syria Coele (the area of Antioch). All the provinces belonged to the diocese Oriens. Syria, which was Hellenized in the cities, preserved the local languages in the villages and in the countryside. It enjoyed a large commercial and cultural development during the Roman period; in its territory there were large cities such as *Antioch, *Seleucia, *Apamea, *Laodicea, *Damascus, Ptolemais, *Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, *Emesa (Homs), *Palmyra, Samosata, Gabala, Epiphania, etc. Around the mid-3rd c. it underwent invasions from the *Sassanids with *Shapur I, who also occupied Antioch, destroyed *Dura Europos and deported much of the population, including even Bishop Demetrian (see BS 4,550-551). Syria was occupied by the Sassanids from 609 to 628, and shortly thereafter it came under the rule of the Arabs.

NT writers often referred to Syria and understood it in the sense of the territory of the Roman province (Mt 4:24; Lk 2:2; Acts 15:23; 18:18; 20:3; Gal 1:21). Christianity spread there very early, already during the first Christian missions (e.g., Tyre, Acts 21:4-7; Ptolemais, Acts 21:7; Damascus, Acts 9:2-22; Sidon, Acts 27:3; Antioch, Acts 11:19ff, etc.). For certain locations a Christian presence is documented only starting from the 2nd or 3rd c. In any case, in the 3rd c. Syria was one of the most Christian regions of the Roman Empire.

Although geographically and politically, in antiquity, the Euphrates River constituted the E border of Syria, the same cannot be said from the ethnic, cultural and linguistic point of view; in this respect it went beyond natural borders. Culturally and linguistically, *Syriac literature embraces all those writers who expressed themselves in Syriac, even if coming from Persia, *Adiabene, Palestine or other regions. For this reason with the expression "Syriac fathers," we intend to refer, in the broad sense, not only to authors who came from Syria proper but to all those who, independent of the geographic area, wrote in Syriac, and in a special way the writers from the territory included between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, i.e., *Mesopotamia. A monastic spirituality dominates among the educated but esp. among the general population. The patriarchate of Antioch included several Roman provinces, in particular, Syria, Phoenicia, Arabia, *Osroene, Mesopotamia, Isauria and the island of *Cyprus. *Cappadocia depended on the patriarch of *Constantinople.

The emperor *Trajan was the first to extend Roman dominion beyond the Euphrates River, establishing the provinces of Mesopotamia and Assyria, which were nevertheless abandoned by his successor Hadrian. The emperors Lucius Verus and *Marcus Aurelius re-created the province of Mesopotamia, which in antiquity was always a theater for wars, first with the *Parthians and then with the Sassanids. The emperor Septimius Severus expanded his territory and created the provinces of Osroene, with the capital *Edessa, and Mesopotamia to the E, with the capital of *Nisibis, a city that passed over to the Sassanids in 363 after the defeat of *Julian. The last Roman outpost remained the city of Circesium, situated at the confluence of the Euphrates and Khabur Rivers. Syria was the territory of meeting between the Christianity of the Greek language and the Semitic traditions. Economic downfall in Syria, caused by numerous earthquakes (e.g., that of Antioch in 588), plagues and wars, is recorded starting from the mid-6th c. In the region there was a strong Roman military presence and then Byzantine presence through the numerous wars with the Persians first and then the Sassanids. Modern-day Syria corresponds, in the general lines, to the ancient one; nevertheless, a N portion today belongs to Turkey, and a S portion belongs to Lebanon, with a small extension into Mesopotamia.

The first spread of Christianity in Mesopotamia is a vigorously debated historical topic, inasmuch as the first sources and traditions, which maintained that this event dated back to the evangelization of Thaddaeus (*Addai) and his disciples Aggai and Mari, are not entirely reliable. Nevertheless, a series of documents attests that Christianity had some strength at the end of 2nd c., a strength that had rather remote roots, dating back to *Jewish Christian missionaries. In Mesopotamia, from the 3rd c. onward, the Syriac language, which derived from spoken Aramaic at Edessa, increasingly acquired literary value. The bishops of Mesopotamia, who were supporters of *Nestorius, after the Council of *Ephesus (431), established the so-called Nestorian church, which separated from the patriarchate of Antioch, thus establishing the episcopal see of their *catholicos at *Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Moreover, after the Council of Ephesus, the *monophysites, who were at that time called "*Jacobites," obtained the upper hand in Syria and N Mesopotamia. Both in Syria and Mesopotamia monasticism enjoyed a special development, establishing a form of Christianity that was very different from that in Western countries. Monasticism developed in every region of the East; the first Syrian monasticism is is recorded in *Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Historia Religiosa*. Original forms such as those of the *stylites also developed. The column of St. *Simeon Stylites, surrounded by religious buildings, also became the center of pilgrimage. The monasteries assumed importance as

centers of cultural and religious life.

PWK 23/2 (1932) 1622-1727; EC 9, 737-740; EAA 6, 576-578; RGG³ 6, 571-581; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e s.*, CSCO 127, subs. 2, Louvain 1951; Id., *Le couvent de Bar Sauma et le patriarcat jacobite d'Antioche et de Syrie*, CSCO 146, subs. 7, Louvain 1954; A. Vööbus, *A History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, 3 vols., Louvain 1958-88; W. Hage, *Die syrisch-Jacobitische Kirche in frühislamischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1966; J. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, subs. 36, Louvain 1970; J.B. Segal, *Edessa, the "Blessed City,"* Oxford 1970; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford ²1971, 226-294; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, Cambridge 1975 (with intr. on Christian origins and bibl.); B. Lifshitz, *Études sur l'histoire de la province romaine de Syrie*: ANRW II, 8, 3-30; J.P. Rey-Coquais, *Syrie romaine de Pompée à Dioclétien*: JRS 68 (1978) 44-73; E. Peretto, *Il problema degli inizi del cristianesimo in Siria*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 197-214; U. Bianchi, *Questioni storico-religiose relative al cristianesimo in Siria nei secoli II-IV*: ibid. 19 (1979) 41-52; W.S. McCulloug, *A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, Chico, CA 1982; S. Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, London 1984; I. Peña, *La desconcertante vida de los monjes sirios. Siglos IV-VI*, Salamanca 1985 (It. tr. Cinisello Balsamo 1990); R. Contini, *Il Hawran preislamico: ipotesi di una storia linguistica*: Felix Ravenna 133-134, fasc. 1/2 (1987) 24-79; P. Canivet - J.-P. Rey-Coquais (eds.), *La Syrie, de Byzance à l'Islam. VII^e-VIII^e siècles*, Dams 1992; J.-M. Fiey, *Pour un Oriens Christianus novus. Répertoire des diocèses syriaques orientaux et occidentaux*, Beirut 1993; *Syrien von den Aposteln zu den Kalifen*, Linz 1993; F. Millar, *Il ruolo delle lingue semitiche nel vicino oriente tardo-romano (V-VI secolo)*: Mediterraneo Antico 1 (1998) 71-94; H.J.W. Drijvers, *Syriac Culture in Late Antiquity: Hellenism and Local Traditions*, Mediterraneo Antico 1 (1998) 95-113; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins: processus missionnaires chrétiens dans l'Empire Iranien*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002.

A. Di Berardino

II. Archaeology. During the first Christian centuries, Syria was part of the patriarchate of *Antioch and extended from the Gulf of Antalya to the Tigris River, from the mountains of Taurus to the E shore of the Dead Sea. This latter part formed Arabia. Syria had different regions by language and custom: in this brief summary, we begin from the W, acc. to the scheme outlined by R. Devreesse (*Patriarcat d'Antioche*, Paris 1945).

Isauria. Today in Turkey, this region extended along the coasts of the Mediterranean opposite Cyprus. The chief city was Seleucia on the Kalykadnos, today Silifke, and was the port of this province. Its bishop Agapius was present at the Council of *Nicaea (325). In 359, a council called by the emperor *Constantius was held in the city. *Egeria went to Seleucia to see St. *Thecla, from whose famous sanctuary, placed to the N the city, some remains were discovered at Merianlik. Egeria wrote that it "was located above the city on an elevated plateau. . . . Near the sanctuary, there was nothing but countless monasteries of men and women" (*Pereg.* 23,2). The church, 80 m (262 ft) long, was constructed on a grotto, in which Thecla was said to have dwelt. It had a semicircular apse, a narthex and a portico to the S. On the spot are the remains of a church constructed in the 5th c. by the emperor *Zeno, with a rectangular layout and dome, and the ruins of a third basilica-style church (Guyer - Herzfeld, *Mon. Asiae min. ant.*, II; Keil- Wilhelm, *Mon. Asiae min. ant.* III). Near Kaulidivan four churches were found. At the Alahan Monastery (ancient Apadnas), in the heart of Isauria, are the remains of a pilgrimage center dedicated to St. Conon; spread about in various places are the remains of Christian buildings constructed between the 5th and 6th c.

Diocaesarea. Today Uzuncaburç, this city has the remains of the church built on the site of the large temple of Jupiter as well as of two basilicas, a cemetery constructed on the tomb of the martyr Lucius and another dedicated to St. *Stephen in the 4th c. (Keil-Wilhelm, *Mon. Asiae min. ant.*, III, 44-79). Other ruins of churches have been brought to light at Olba, modern-day Ura, with three buildings (Keil-Wilhelm, *Mon. Asiae min. ant.*, III, 86). Syria properly so-called is divided into two parts: the first in the N and the second to the S. In the N part are found the chief monuments which have brought great fame to the religious architecture of Syria, esp. in the three mountains: Jebel Barisha, Jebel al-ʿAla and Jebel Seman with the well-known sanctuary of St. Simeon Stylites. The comprehensive and detailed study done by G. Tchalenko and other recent studies done by I. Peña - P. Castellana - R. Fernández offer us a description of the various places.

Neocaesarea (today Dibsi Faraj). This site has remains of a church from the 4th c. with mosaics (Donceel-Voûte, *Les pavements*, 69-86).

Beroea. Today Aleppo, in NW Syria halfway between the Euphrates River and the ocean, Beroea was one of the primary dioceses. Archaeologists have found traces of the church that was built by *Helena with a quadrilobate layout, in the mosque called *Halawiya*, which contains an amalgam of epochs. The city also had a Jewish-Christian community; it is also true that St. *Jerome was able to consult the Aramaic gospel of the Hebrews there (Bagatti, *Church from Circumcision*, 84). Sixty km (37.3 mi) from Aleppo at Qalat Seman is the church of St. Simeon Stylites (d. 459), who lived here on top of a column for 37 years.

Anasartha (called Theodoropolis by the emperor *Justinian). Today Khanasir, situated 60 km (37.3 mi) to the S of Aleppo, Anasartha still preserves the ancient circuit of walls around the city. Two large ar-

chitraves have been preserved, one of which is near the large 5th-c. church and the other located more to the SE. The church is the martyrium constructed by Silvanus, the *dux Arabiae*, and in the architrave is found a scupture of the image of the Virgin with baby Jesus and two angels, who are in the act of transporting her into heaven (Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 252, 294). In the region many Christian inscriptions have been found (Devreesse, *Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 164-167).

Epiphania. Today Hama, located at a road junction, Epiphania was admired by Jerome on account of its splendor (*De locis hebraicis*). It preserves in the large mosque the Qubbat al-Khazna made with columns and Byzantine capitals coming from various churches, probably from the one constructed on the pagan temple, which was then changed into a mosque, the Jamia el-Kebir. It was inhabited by a recluse (Peña - Castellana - Fernández, *Reclus*, 293-295). The archaeological digs have brought to light traces of the Byzantine era with a church and a "refuge," dedicated to the Virgin and Sts. *Cosmas and Damian. The inscriptions also mention the sanctuary of St. *Sergius and Bacchus with liturgical objects offered by the faithful (Jalabert - Mouterde, *Inscriptions*, V,15-38). Likewise in this region numerous testimonies of ancient Christianity remain (Devreesse, *Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 184-191). A low relief found to the E of Hama bears an image of St. Simeon Stylites with his disciple, who brings him food (Peña - Castellana - Fernández, *Stylites*, 181-183).

Phoenicia. Also divided into two parts: the first on the Mediterranean Sea, the second extended toward the E.

Sidon. Today Saida, the city preserves a church with a mosaic floor with geometric motifs from the 4th c. Many Christian lanterns with crosses and the image of *David with his sling were found in the cistern; all these objects today reside in the Museum of the Flagellation in Jerusalem.

Beirut. Studies on the topography of the city have confirmed that the church, or cathedral, called *Anastasis*, stood near the modern-day Greek Orthodox church of St. George. A law school was in the neighborhood. It does not seem certain, however, that the wall under the medieval church of St. John the Baptist belonged to a Byzantine church; it seems more likely that it was part of the nearby baths. An inscription of Ps 28:3 on a rock reused in the same church suggests that a Byzantine baptistery was nearby. Mosaic flooring and remains of an apse were also found to the E of St. George Maronite Cathedral. In the city's museum many mosaics of the region are preserved, among which is that from Jenat with the representation of the Good *Shepherd, who has the appearance of a young man with many animals.

Byblos (today Gebal). This city been restored, and the archaeological dig at the foot of the Acropolis has uncovered the well-known bas-relief of *Orpheus surrounded by exotic animals, reminiscent of the paintings of the catacomb of *Domitilla. The excavation of 1961 has also brought to light some early Christian mosaics.

Antaradus (today Tartus). In the N wall of the medieval church is perhaps preserved a trace of a more ancient chapel, as shown by the Corinthian capitals that were reused. A piece of marble bears a house inscription with two crosses at the beginning and at the end of the text.

Heliopolis (today Baalbek). This city had a church in the atrium of the large temple of Jupiter, with a polygon apse on the outside and a circular apse within. The orientation to the W, like the temple itself, was changed in 6th c. The church, which had been very well preserved, was destroyed in 1933 to investigate the original structure of the pagan temple; as a result, no trace of the building can be seen today. In the circular temple of Venus, which was converted into the church of St. Barbara, a cross in the internal portion of the wall has been preserved. The Christians said that even the Great Mosque rested on a church; it is also true that one can see some remains of the baptistery, pushed against an archway of the N part. Christian funerary remains have been noted in various grottoes.

Salamias (today Salamiyah). Scholars know of a 5th-c. church dedicated to St. Sergius and another from the 7th c. dedicated to the Virgin *Mary (Devreesse, *Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 207). The inscriptions also mentioned an "asylum" of the martyr *Cyriacus and various deceased persons. An encolpion made of wood bears the figure of Christ (Jalabert - Mouterde, *Inscriptions*, V,221-231).

In the central region of Syria and in the Hauran, ruins of churches and monasteries are scattered throughout in villages and small inhabited centers; the area to the S and W of Aleppo, between Antioch and Apamea, is an immense field of ruins of hundreds of monumental Christian testimonies that at times have been very well preserved, esp. in the territories of Jebel Shaik Barakat and Jebel Seman (where the monastery of St. Simen Stylites was located) to the E of Aleppo, Jebel Barisha and Jebel al-'Ala near the border with Turkey, and Jebel Zawiya in the SW toward the valley of the Oronte. This rural area was called the region of the "dead city," being a semidesert; nearly 1,200 churches have

been counted, the mark of the deeply religious Christian population: many inhabited centers counted only some 10 inhabitants. There are numerous monasteries, the impressive remains of which have been preserved. After the 7th c., many churches were abandoned, even if various monasteries continued to exist, esp. that of St. Simeon Stylites, until the 10th c. One can mention several of these Christian buildings. *Brad* (Barad) (Jebel Seman; ancient Kaprobarada): the cathedral with three aisles with a portico dated to the years 399–402 and two monasteries; Kharba Shams (Jebel Seman), a well-preserved church from the 4th c. repaired in the 5th; Qasr al-Banat, near the Turkish border, a large monastic building; Al-Bara (ancient Kapropera, in Jebel Zawiya): five churches and six monasteries; in the vicinity there is the monastery of Dayr Sobat at Ruwayha (Jebel Zawiya), one of the largest churches in the region, with two towers; Serğile (Sergilla) and Jebel Zawiya Qalb Loze (Lauzeh, in Jebel Barisha), perhaps a center for pilgrims likewise having hospices, it possesses one of the best desert churches of Syria from the middle of the 5th c. with two towers on the façade: with three aisles and twenty small windows; at Deir Qita (Jebel Barisha) two Christian inscriptions from 350 and 355 attest to the presence of Christians, the church of 418, a hospice of 436, the church of St. Sergius (537), that of the Most Holy Trinity (551), and two baptisteries from the years 515 and 567; and Deir Dehes (Jebel Barisha), in the limy rock of N Syria, a large monastic center (J.-L. Biscop, *Deir Déhès. Monastère d'Antiochène*, Beyrouth 1997). Also worthy of note are Qanawāt (ancient Kanatha), deir el-'Adadas, Deir es-Sleib, Haourte and Hir esh-Sheik. The most important center was the structure of St. Simeon Stylites (Qalaat Semaan), constructed on a plateau during the years 480–490. Simeon lived for a long time on top of a column; around this column, after his death, were built the monastery and the church and subsequently a wall surrounding the city. The chief entrance was from the S through a monumental arch for pilgrims who came from Dair Samaan (ancient Telannisos), situated further down, St. Simeon's first place of residence, a village for pilgrims with churches, monasteries and hospices for lodging. Not far away, on the E side, are also found the ruins of Taqleh, with the 5th-c. church, and Fafertin, with a church dated to the year 372, the second oldest church of Syria after that of *Dura Europos.

The E provinces of Syria include the following: Euphratensis, with cities located to the W of the Euphrates; Osroene, with cities located to the E of the same river; and Mesopotamia, which reached to the point of the Tigris River, to the borders of the empire. The pilgrim *Egeria stayed in Euphratensis, the chief city Hierapolis (Mabbug, today Manbij), and found that it was "very beautiful and rich and everything abounds," but did not speak of its bishops or churches (*Pereg.* 18,1). The city does not preserve any ancient buildings, because the stones were reused for new ones. A bronze cross, or an encolpion, was found, with the figure, it seems, of St. *Chrysogonus, a martyr who lived under the emperor *Diocletian. At el-Bire, located 18 km (11.2 mi) to the SE of Hierapolis, a mosaic of flowers and birds remains, as well as an inscription that mentions an oratory of the martyrs.

Cyrrhus. Seventy km (43.5 mi) N of Aleppo, near the border with Turkey, Cyrrhus today is a field of ruins. In the urban area, to the SW, are traces of buildings, attributed to the pagan temple, which was followed by a Christian chapel, perhaps that of the martyrs *Cosmas and Damian.

Carrhae (modern-day Harran, Turkey). This is a small village where archaeological remains from the early Christian era have been preserved.

With respect to Mesopotamia, one can find some dioceses in E Turkey such as Amida (modern-day Diyarbakir), situated on the plateau of basalt near the bank of the Tigris River (Dicle Nehri).

In the fortress, a building is believed to have been a Nestorian church, which was constructed using local technique. It has two distinct parts and various remodelings. The historical era of the construction is much debated, but in all likelihood it is pre-Islamic (Monneret de Villard, *Chiese della Mesopotamia*, 31). There is also a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary (Meryem Ana Kilisesi) with a central layout (Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, XXIX,154), which is still open for worship services.

Ctesiphon (*see* *Seleucia-Ctesiphon; modern-day Takh i Kesra, Iran). Set on the Tigris River, 40 km (24.9 mi) S of Baghdad, Ctesiphon was the capital of the Persian Empire, and it had numerous churches. Only two Nestorian churches remain that belong to the patristic era, one lying over the other. The lower church, longitudinal in layout, contains large walls and columns almost butting up against them; the higher one has pillars and three rectangular cells like apses, the center of which shows three rectangular niches. The doors are numerous and always along the long sides (Monneret de Villard, *Chiese della Mesopotamia*, 9-31).

Al-Hirah (in Iraqi territory). Two Nestorian churches have been excavated here, although not completely. Both have large walls and columns close

to them, as in the case of Ctesiphon. One, known as XI, contains a square apse with an altar in the back to the E and two side rooms; in the middle, there is the bema with semicircular sedilia. The other church, known as V, is simpler but not completely excavated; it is oriented like the other and has columns close to the walls (Monneret de Villard, *Chiese della Mesopotamia*, 32-44); so far it is not known to which saints the two churches were dedicated, because there were many of them. Scholars know that Christians were transferred into Mesopotamia during the wars, and therefore it comes as no surprise to find worship buildings in the forms proper to the host country. The bema seat, in this region, probably assumes a different function from the one it had in Syria, i.e., to liturgically imitate the functions that were done at Jerusalem at the Holy Sepulcher (Blomme, *La liturgie*: SBF 29 [1979] 221-237). For the patristic period, under the Sassanids, belong, among other things, several figurative seals with scenes from the OT, like the Sacrifice of Abraham; Daniel among the lions; and in the NT, Mary and baby Jesus, the Visitation, and Jesus' *Entry into Jerusalem.

An example of a monophysite church, closer to Syria than the Nestorian ones, can be seen at Qasr Serij, 60 km (37.3 mi) NW of Mosul. The church had a well-developed portico on three sides and was dedicated to St. Sergius.

S. Guyer - E. Herzfeld, *Meriamlik und Korykos. Zwei christliche Ruinenstätten des rauhen Kilikiens. Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*, II, Manchester 1930; J. Keil - A. Wilhelm, *Denkmäler aus dem rauhen Kilikien. Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*, III, Manchester 1931; U. Monneret de Villard, *Le chiese della Mesopotamia*, Rome 1940; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947; G. Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord*, I-III, Paris 1953-58; L. Jalabert - R. Mouterde, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, V, Paris 1959; B. Bagatti, *The Church from the Circumcision*, Jerusalem 1971; I. Peña - P. Castellana - R. Fernández, *Les stylites syriens*, Jerusalem 1975; Id., *Les reclus syriens*, Jerusalem 1980; J.A. Lerner, *Christian Seals in the Sassanian Period*, Nederlands Inst. Istanbul 1977; V. Blomme, *La liturgie de Jérusalem et son influence sur les Églises nestorienne et syrienne*: SBF 29 (1979) 221-237; J. Peña - P. Castellana - R. Fernández, *Les Cénobites Syriens*, Jerusalem 1983; J.-M. Dentzer, *Hauran. Recherches archéologiques sur la Syrie du Sud à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, 2 vols., Paris 1985-86; S.Th. Parker, *Romans and Saracens: A History of the Arabian Frontier*, Winona Lake, IN 1986; P. Donceel-Voûte, *Les pavements des églises byzantines de Syrie et du Liban*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1988; M. Tardieu, *Les paysages reliques. Routes et haltes syriennes d'Isidore à Simplicius*, Louvain 1990; P. Canivet - J.-P. Rey-Coquais (eds.), *La Syrie, de Byzance à l'Islam. VII^e-VIII^e siècles*, Actes du colloque international de Lyon, Lyon 1992; S.P. Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity: History, Literature and Theology*, London 1992; R. Burns, *Monuments of Syria: An Historical Guide*, New York-London 1994; I. Peña, *El arte cristiano de la Siria bizantina*, Madrid 1995; *After Bardaisan: Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honor of Han J.W. Drijvers*, ed. G.J. Reinink - A.C. Klugkist, Leuven 1999; G. del Olmo Lete - J.L. Montero Fenollós (eds.), *Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates*, Barcelona 1999; W. Ball, *Rome in the East: The Transformation of an Empire*, London-New York 2000; K. Butcher, *Roman Syria and the Near East*, Los Angeles 2004.

B. Bagatti

SYRIAC

I. Premise - II. Language - III. Literature - IV. Liturgy - V. Syriac studies.

I. Premise. Because of its geographic diffusion and the endurance of its use, and also because of its closeness to the dialect used by Jesus of Nazareth to proclaim the coming of the kingdom of God, Syriac is the most important language of the Christian *East. It was the mother tongue of the original orthodox community, which then became *Nestorian (Assyrian or Eastern Syrian or Chaldean, today the Eastern Church), *monophysite (*Jacobite or Western Syrian, today the Orthodox Syrian Church), *Maronite (from the monk *John Maron [d. ca. 410], and his disciples from the convent of the region of *Apamea, where in the 7th c. this branch of the Antiochene church began) and *Melkite (from *malkō*, "king," i.e., to refer to the communities that depended on the *Byzantine [= Orthodox emperor]) communities of Syria and Mesopotamia, thus the majority of the Eastern dioceses of the Roman Empire, but also of Persia. The missionary bent of these churches, moreover, led Syria to India during the early centuries (the Malabar and Malankarica churches are their heirs) and even *China. For various issues—from history to *hagiography, touching *exegesis and the history of *dogma—Syriac is essential for patristic studies, because of the relationship of the Aramaic culture and the translation of the Greek fathers, which have often been lost in the original language. Moreover, one should emphasize the mediating position that the Syriac churches acquired with respect to the nearby *Armenian and *Georgian churches, and their important role in the transmission to the Arabs (and through them to Westerners) of the classic Greek and ancient *Mesopotamian cultural heritage.

II. Language. This Semitic language assimilated such an extensive number of foreign words (Akkadian, Hebrew, Persian and esp. Greek) that it was rightly qualified as the "least Semitic of all the Semitic languages" (see biblio. B1). It is generally referred to as a late Aramaic dialect, deriving from the common Semitic northwestern root.

Having derived from Edessene (to which the most ancient *pagan inscriptions bear witness), Syriac was, thanks to the prestige of the small kingdom of *Osroene (capital *Edessa; Roman province after 217), the lingua franca of the Aramaic populations in Mesopotamia and *Syria. It established itself as a literary language in the 4th c., when these populations had by that point adhered in large part to the Christian faith. Subsequently, it was due to the defense of its own cultural and political identity in face of the Roman, Byzantine, Persian and Arab pressure that Syriac owed its growth and survival. Even though from the 8th c. onward *Arabic quickly supplanted it as a spoken language, it nevertheless remained very much alive as a literary and liturgical language. It is still used as a learned and liturgical language in some places of E Turkey, Syria and Iraq.

Syriac writing derives from a square Hebrew script: it contains many similarities with *Palmyran cursive in the first examples, that is to say, in the pagan inscriptions from the region of Edessa (1st and 2nd c. AD). From the beginning of the 5th c., the alphabet became uniform in a clear and distinct script, which was called "Estrangelo" (from the Greek term *strongylos*, "round, stout"). From the 8th c. onward two other alphabets developed alongside it: "Serta" in Jacobite and Maronite contexts and "Chaldean" among the Easterners. Until the 8th c., the vowels were indicated by diacritical marks (above and below the word). This system was subsequently developed in the East, and in the West it was replaced by Greek vowels.

We possess a considerable number of MSS in Syriac (scarce papyri), the most ancient of which are preserved in Europe. These collections are rather well documented, even if the catalogs were not edited with the same criteria. The MSS preserved in the East are less well known and have many surprises in store for Syriac scholars. Recent discoveries of MSS on Mount *Sinai and China bear this out. The most ancient parchments (the first dates back to 411) are of utmost importance, and their antiquity is determinative for the MS tradition of works translated from Greek.

III. Literature. *A. 2nd–4th c.* Although Edessa since the 3rd c. was the chief center of Aramaic Christianity, its *evangelization must date back to the end of the 1st c. Through the work of *Jewish Christians coming from Jewish communities of Palestinian obedience from the small kingdom of *Adiabene (to the E of the Tigris River; *see* *Persia). In these places the first attempts of a Syriac translation of the OT were worked out, as shown by the reciprocal relationships of some parts of the *Peshitta and the *Targumim.

It was in these Persian regions of Mesopotamia, without forgetting *Nisibis, which possessed a rabbinic school, and the syncretistic context of Edessa and in bilingual Syria, that the first writings in the Syriac language were redacted in the 2nd and 3rd c. and beginning of the 4th. These were rather connected or tied to *gnosticism, heterodox Judaism (*Ebionites, *Elkesaites) and Jewish Christianity. Many of these have survived in other languages (*Coptic, Greek: certain scholars still hesitate to take a position concerning an original Syriac text) or were reused in works compiled later. The most famous were as follows: the corpus of translations pertaining to *Thomas, among which was the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Hymn of the Pearl;* the *Gospel of Philip;* the *Odes of Solomon;* the *ps.-*Clementines;* Tatian's **Diatessaron;* the **Didascalia;* and, moreover, the *Acts of Thomas* and the *Manichean Psalter*. The teaching of the gnostic astrologer *Bardesanes (d. 222) merits honorable mention.

This literature highlights the role and the originality of the two chief orthodox figures for Syriac literature: *Aphraates the Persian Sage (d. 345) and *Ephrem of Nisibis (d. 373) and, in their line, *Maruta of Maiferqat (d. ca. 420), just as several minor Edessene writers from the end of the 4th c. (esp. *Cyrillona). The chief characteristics of their Christianity, which was not yet contaminated by Hellenism, are the following: biblicism and "asceticism-*Encratism" (see the tendencies of Tatian's *Diatessaron*), Jewish translations (Targumim, Midrash and *liturgy) but also anti-Judaism, Mesopotamian traditions, *symbolism, and apophatic theology and poetic form.

We subsequently find these elements in the writings of the great Syrian authors such as *Jacob of Sarug (d. 521) but weakened and often in the shadow of Greek traditions. In effect, the minor isolation of the Persian communities, their frequent contact with *Antioch and *Constantinople, the growing organization and centralization of the Syriac churches both in the Persian and Roman territories, led them to Hellenize heavily at the beginning of the 5th c. Before this date translations of the NT had already been completed, which went under the name of *Vetus Syriaca* (known through the citations of writers and fragments contained in two very ancient MSS: *Sinaiticus* and *Curetonianus*) and some translations of the Greek fathers.

B. 5th–7th c. Although the beginnings of Syriac literature were primarily "Persian," and even though Syriac Christianity gives the impression of having gravitated toward small centers, with the beginning

of the 5th c., we see the organization of two blocs: on the one hand, one sees Persian Christianity, having as its administrative center *Seleucia-Ctesiphon and as centers of study Edessa, then Nisibis and Seleucia-Ctesiphon; on the other hand, the Eastern provinces of the dioceses of the East (Mesopotamia, Osroene, Euphratesia, Syria I and II), which intellectually orbited around Edessa, which lost, however, the school of the Persians in 489, and, from the administrative point of view, was likewise dependent on Antioch. Alongside a still orthodox production, the evidences of which are *Balai (d. 435), the *Liber Graduum*, the **Spelunca Thesaurorum* and *John of Apamea, the 5th c. saw an increase of translations, beginning with that of the "standard" version of the NT (Peshitta). To the school of Edessa, esp. under the episcopate of *Rabbula (d. 435) and *Ibas (d. 457), the chief Greek fathers were slowly translated as need presented itself. The importance of the monastic institution, which developed greatly starting from this age, and the division of Syriac Christianity explain the existence of various translations of the same work. The great *schism from the end of this century led to the classification, after this age, of writers acc. to their religious confession. The chief authors were for the Nestorian-Persian part: *Narsai (d. 502); Barsuma (*Barsauma) (d. around 495) and the founder of the School of Seleucia Mar *Aba (d. 552); then *Isho'yahb I (596) and *Babai the Great (d. 628); for the monophysite side *Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 522); Polycarp, author of the new translation of the NT (the Philoxenian), which bore the name of its source of inspiration; the moderate Jacob of Sarug (d. 521); *Jacob Bardeus (d. 578), who gave his name to the Jacobites; *John of Tella (d.538); the historian *John of Ephesus (d. 586); *Peter of Callinicum (d. 591); *Henana of Adiabene (d.610); and Thomas of Harkel. The latter, who had taken refuge in *Alexandria during the outbreak of the Muslim invasion, was the author of a new translation of the NT, which was made on the basis of the Philoxenian, which is now lost. At the same time in Alexandria, Paul of Tella completed the Syro-Hexplar version of the OT, which was based on *Origen's **Hexapla*.

C. 7th–10th c. With the Muslim invasion (the fall of the Persian Empire in 636; the occupation of Syria in 638), the Syriac-speaking churches benefited from a certain tolerance. They recovered their role as a cultural bridge between their own Aramaic and Greek heritage (esp. philosophical and medical) and the new culture. As Chabot says (p. 80), "The lively theological controversies of the preceding schools . . . were about to finish. Exegesis no longer had as its chief objective that of atomizing the text for finding dogmatic arguments; it became a literal and philological exegesis. The long treatises of moral teaching gave way to hagiographic accounts, and history assumed an important role in literature. . . . Arabic progressed to the detriment of Syriac, and the official language early on became the popular tongue." This period can therefore be called that of the advance of translations (and thereafter that of the retranslations of Syriac into *Arabic), reflection on the past, commentary and compilation. We note some of the most important writers from this era: church historian *Theodore Bar Koni, *Isaac of Nineveh (d. around 680), *Martyrius (Sahdona), *Timothy I (d. 823); and in the *Jacobite church: *Jacob of Edessa (d. 708), who in particular undertook the translation of the writings of *Severus of Antioch, which had been done by *Paul of Callinicum while the patriarch of Antioch was still alive, Bishop *George of the Arabs (d. 724), and Moses Bar Kepha (d. 903).

D. 10th–16th c. This historical era witnessed the decline of Syriac literature, despite a renaissance during the 12th and 13th c. One should mention several important authors for patristic studies: Dionysius Bar Salibi (d. 1171), Michael the Syrian (d. 1199), Bar Hebraeus (d. 1282) and Abdišo Berika (Ebedjesu) (1318). These last two authors wrote both in Syriac and Arabic.

IV. Liturgy. We can observe in *liturgy the same general movement already outlined for literature. The Persian and Edessene was a primitive period, characterized on the one hand by its relationships with Judaism, which is perceived not only with the date of *Easter, 14 Nisan (= *Quartodeciman), but also in the form of *eucharistic blessings, baptismal rites and the architecture of the sanctuary (see the well-known *bema*) and in music; on the other hand, for its relationship with Mesopotamia, traces of which are found primarily in liturgical poetry: the hymns (of Edessene origin?), the dramatic poem (*sōgitō*). These elements are found often corrected in the second era, that of Hellenization (see, e.g., the prestige of the sacramental theology of *Theodore of Mopsuestia in the school of the Persians). By that point the liturgies were being formed in the various geographically delimited areas, without interrupting links or mutual influences. Thus the Chaldean rite is composed primarily of Edessene and Persian elements (see, e.g., the anaphora of *Addai and Mari); the Syriac rite unites Antiochene, *Jerusalem (see the *anaphora of St. James) and Edessene tradition; the *Maronite rite depends on *Edessa, even though it underwent many Syriac influences. Another im-

portant factor for this historical era, at most tied to the formation of the office, is the growing influence of the monasteries. The third period can be called that of the *commentaries, compilations, repetitions and prolixities (see, e.g., the proliferation of poetic excerpts, often attributed either to Ephrem or Jacob of Sarug, in the Syriac and Maronite rites).

V. Syriac studies. Although humanism witnessed the printing of the first grammar (1539) and the first printing of the NT (1555; see W. Strothmann, *Die Anfänge der syrischen Studien in Europa*, Göttingen 1971) and although Renaudot (1646–1720) had to undertake important work, only the transfer of Eastern MSS into Europe, esp. those from the monastery of the Syrians in the *desert of Nitria, favored Syriac studies. Since the beginning of the 18th c., at *Rome, the work of the learned Maronite Assemani family revealed the wealth contained in Syriac literature (see the well-known constant *Bibliotheca Orientalis* by J.S. Assemani). A little more than a century later the formation, at London, of the most famous religious collection of MSS gave rise to countless studies and editions. The catalog of MSS of the British Museum (today the British Library) by W. Wright (1870–1872) continues to inspire new studies. At the beginning of the 20th c. the large collections of Syriac texts were born: the CSCO of Louvain and the PO of Paris.

A. General: (1) *Introductions*: J. Assfalg - A. Krüger, *Kleines Wörterbuch des christlichen Orients*, Wiesbaden 1975; M. Albert, *Langue et littérature syriaques*, in M. Albert et al., *Christianismes Orientaux - lntroduction à l'étude des langues et des littératures*, Paris 1993, 299-379; S.P. Brock, *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature*, Kottayam 1997; P. Bettiolo, *Lineamenti di patrologia siriaca*, in A. Quacquarelli, *Complementi interdisciplinari di Patrologia*, Rome 1989, 503-603; Patrologia V, 415-493. (2) *Histories of the literature:* alongside the classical works written by Wright, Duval and Chabot, one should note esp. A. Baumstark and I. Ortiz de Urbina. (3) *Bibliographies:* C. Moss, *Catalogue of Syriac Printed Books and Related Literature in the British Museum*, London 1962; S.P. Brock, *Syriac Studies*: *A Classified Bibliography (1960–1990)*, Kaslik 1996.

B. Language: (1) R. Köbert: EC 9, 734-740; (2) *Grammars:* alongside the classical works written by Duval, Nöldeke and Brockelmann, one could consult the following: L. Palacios, *Grammatica Syriaca*, Rome 1954; L. Costaz, *Grammaire syriaque*, Beirut 1955; H. Healey, *First Studies in Syriac*, Rome 1981; (3) *Dictionaries:* the most accessible are: C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum*, Berlin 1895 (repr. 1966); J. Payne Smith, *Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford 1903 (repr. numerous times); W. Jenning, *A Lexicon to the Syriac NT*, Oxford 1926 (repr.); L. Costaz, *Dictionnaire syriaque-français* (*anglais-arabe*), Beirut 1963; the chief reference work remains the *Thesaurus Syriacus* by R. Payne-Smith, Oxford 1889-1901.

C. Auxiliary bibliography: (1) *Epigraphy:* see Ortiz de Urbina 23; and the bibl. in Patrologia V, 420; (2) *Manuscripts:* (a) *Catalogs:* see Ortiz de Urbina 3; S.P. Brock, above A(3) and A. Desreumaux, *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits syriaques*, Paris 1991; (b) *Paleography:* W.H.P. Hatch, *An Album of Dated Syriac Manuscripts*, Boston 1946; (c) *Codicology*: see above A(3), and esp. the writings of J.-M. Sauget and by the same author, *Un cas très curieux de restauration de manuscrit*: *le Borgia syriaque 39*, ST 292, Vatican City 1981; (d) *Iconography:* J. Leroy, *Les manuscrits syriaques à peintures*, Paris 1964.

D. Collections: (1) *Patrologia Syriaca*, PO (Paris), CSCO (Louvain), OCA, Göttinger Orient Forschung; see esp. the *Symposia syriaca* in OCA and the miscellanea dedicated to Vööbus, Graffin and Strothmann. (2) *Journals:* (see the list of abbreviations provided in the first volume) AB, Le Muséon, OC, OCP, "Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica," OrSyr, PdO, "Revue de l'Orient chrétien," "Journal of the Syriac Academy" (Baghdad, in Arabic), ARAM, "Rivista di studi orientali."

E. (1) *History:* see above A(3) and the biblio. by J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, subs. 36, 1970; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972; general framework: A.S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, London 1968; (2) *Bible:* I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangelium Syrorum: Diatessaron Tatiani*, Madrid 1967; the publications issued by the Peshitta Institute Cessation of the Law (2:18-19): Old vs. New Interpretation at Leiden (ed. P.A.H. Boer); B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the NT*, Oxford 1977; S.P. Brock, *The Peshitta Old Testament—Between Judaism and Christianity*: Cristianesimo nella storia 19 (1998) 483-502; B. Aland, *Bibelübersetzungen - 4: Die Übersetzungen ins Syrische 2. Neues Testament*: TRE 6 (1980) 189-196; (3) *Theology:* see above A(2) and A(3), and R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, Cambridge 1975 (with an intro. on the origins of Syriac Christianity and biblio.); (4) *Liturgy:* see above A(2) and A(3) and J.M. Sauget, *Bibliographie des liturgies orientales*, 1900-1960, Rome 1962; S. Janeras, *Bibliografia sulle Liturgie Orientali*, Rome 1969 (p.m.); P. Youssif, *A Classified Bibliography on the East Syriac Liturgy*, Rome 1990; (5) *Hagiographies:* P. Peeters, *Orient et Byzance: le tréfonds oriental de l'Hagiographie byzantine*, Brussels 1950; (6) *Spirituality:* A. Guillaumont - I. Dalmais, *Spiritualité syriaque*: Dsp 14 (1990) 1429-1450; R. Beulay, *La lumière sans forme. Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, Chevetogne 1987; (7) *Cultural Exchanges:* var. aus., *Syncretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*, in *Ab.d. Ak.d. Wiss. in Göttingen*, *Phil.-hist. Kb.*, III F. 96, Göttingen 1975; J.-M. Sauget, *L'apport des traductions syriaques pour la patristique grecque*: RThPh 110 (1978) 139-148 and Patrologia V, 420-421.

F. Rilliet

SYRIAC, PALESTINIAN CHRISTIAN. This language could also be called "Palestinian Christian Aramaic"; it is an Aramaic dialect used as a written language in certain areas of *Palestine and the Transjordan from the 5th to the 14th c. It is known through a small number of inscriptions and MSS, the most ancient of which (between the 5th and 8th c.) are all in fragments; in many cases the texts of Palestinian Christian Aramaic have been preserved in the underwriting of *palimpsests. Complete MSS date to the 11th c. or even later. With the ex-

ception of a letter in papyrus and a document on *magic, all the texts that have been preserved are translations from the Greek. With respect to what has been preserved, the corpus embraces three chief areas: biblical, patristic and *liturgical. The majority of biblical texts come from lectionaries; the most ancient fragments at times contain rubrics acc. to the ancient rite of *Jerusalem, better known by *Armenian and *Georgian sources. The most ancient of the three complete gospel lectionaries (*Vat. Syr*. 19) is dated to the year 1030 (the other two are dated to 1104 and 1118).

Patristic texts are only found among the most ancient fragments (ca. 5th/8th c.): the best preserved are passages from *Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catecheses* and two *hagiographic texts, the forty martyrs of Sinai and the story of Eulogius the rock cutter (from the cycle of texts associated with *Daniel of Scete). The other fragments include texts of (or are attributed to) *John Chrysostom (on the prodigal son), the Greek text of *Ephrem, the *Life of Anthony* by *Athanasius of *Alexandria, certain apocryphal texts of the NT (e.g., the *Acts* of Andrew and Matthias, the *Acts* of *Pilate, the *Koimesis* of *Mary in the account of the finding of *Stephen's bones), several **apophthegmata*, different hagiographic pieces, including Alessius "the man of God," Abraham of Qidun and Philemon and Hadrian. Various other fragments must still be identified.

Almost all MSS after the 8th c. are liturgical; although the majority are in fragments, there are almost complete copies of an Eucologion and a Horologion, in addition to the three aforementioned gospel lectionaries. The liturgical texts clearly indicate that they were produced by an orthodox Chalcedonian Melkite community. This explains why many of the preserved MSS of the Palestinian Christian Aramaic belong, or rather at one time belonged, to the monastery of St. Catherine of Sinai.

The first editors of these texts were E. Miniscalchi (editor of the *Vat. Syr*. 19, 1861-64), J.P.N. Land (in *Anecdota Syriaca* IV,1875), G. Margoliouth, the twins Agnes Lewis and Margaret Dunlop (and various issues of the journals *Studia Sinaitica* and *Horae Semiticae*), P. Kokowzoff, F. Schulthess, H. Duensing and N. Pigoulewsky. The most ancient texts of Palestinian Christian Aramaic are now underway in preparation for their publication in considerably improved editions. Certainly the technical advances in the reading of palimpsests will lead to greater progress.

In general: D.G.K. Taylor, in S. Brock (ed.), *The Hidden Pearl: The Syrian Orthodox Church and Its Ancient Aramaic Heritage*, II, Rome 2001, 95-98.

Editions: A.S. Lewis - M.D. Gibson, *The Palestinian Syriac Literature of the Gospels*, London 1899; M. Back, *Rituale Melchitarum: A Christian Palestinian Euchologium*, Stuttgart 1938; Id., *A Christian Palestinian Syriac Horologion*, Cambridge 1954; C. Müller-Kessler - M. Sokoloff, *A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*, I (OT and Apocryphal texts), IIAB (NT), III (XL Martyrs of Sinai, Eulogius, Anastasias), IV (near publication), V (Cyril Jer., *Catecheses*), Groningen 199ff. For a complete bibl., see C. Müller-Kessler, *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinisch-Aramäischen*, I, Hildesheim 1991, XXV-XXXIV, with supplements in *Syriac Studies: A Classified Bibliography*: Parole de l'Orient 23 (1998) and 29 (2004).

S.P. Brock

SYRO-ROMAN LAWBOOK. This expression was used to refer to an anonymous private compilation which was translated several times into *Syriac, originally drafted in Greek—the early texts were in Latin—in the 5th c.; it contains a synthesis of *leges* ("laws") and *iura* ("rights") of Roman law—without reference to local Eastern Greek law (Selb) starting from the emperor *Constantine until the emperor *Leo I (457–473). The author (or the compiler) does not mention the names of the emperors or the dates of the issuing of the laws. The compilation enjoyed large diffusion among Christians in the Middle East, esp. under Arab domination; perhaps it must have been a small booklet for use in schools, but in reality it would then serve bishops in the **audientia episcopalis*, because it primarily treats problems of succession, testaments, donations, the emancipation and the manumission of slaves, property relationships between spouses, and criminal and penal subject matter, etc. The compilation was also translated into *Armenian and *Arabic (11th c.).

Editions: K.G. Bruns, *Syrisch-römisches Rechtsbuch aus dem fünften Jahrhundert*, Leipzig (repr. 1961); FIRA 2, 751 (Latin text); DDC 3, 336-340; A. Vööbus, *The Syro-Roman Lawbook*, Stockholm 1982 (with Eng. tr.); W. Selb - H. Kaufhold, *Das Syrisch-römische Rechtsbuch*, 3 vols., Vienna 2002.

Studies: G. Nallino, *Sul libro siro-romano e sul presunto diritto siriaco*, in *Studi in onore di P. Bonfante*, Milan 1930, I, 203-261; E. Volterra, *Il Libro siro-romano nelle recenti ricerche*, in *Problemi attuali di scienza e di cultura*, Rome 1964, 298-328; W. Selb, *Zur Bedeutung des syrisch-römischen Rechtsbuches*, Munich 1964; A. Vööbus, *An Important Milestone in the History of Research on the Syro Roman Lawbook*, in *Sodalitas. Scripta A Guarino*, V, Naples 1984, 2105-2108; Id., *A New Source for the Syro-Roman Lawbook*: Labeo 21 (1975) 7-9; W. Selb, *Die Geschichte des Kirchenrechts der Nestorianer* (*von den Anfängen bis zur Mongolenzeit*), Vienna 1981; G.L. Falchi, *Sull'origine delle due classi di manoscritti del Libro Siro-Romano di diritto*: SDHI 58 (1992) 143-167; Id., *Il diritto romano canonico nell'esperienza giuridica delle comunità cristiane dell'Oriente mediterraneo*, in *Il diritto romano-canonico quale diritto proprio delle comunità cristiane dell'Oriente mediterraneo*, IX Colloquio int. romanistico-canonistico, Vatican City 1994, 1-72; W.

Selb, *Diritto romano nella tradizione delle comunità cristiane dell'Oriente mediterraneo?*, ibid., 538 (provides a brief one-page synthesis); J.-M. Carrié, *Dioclétien et la fiscalité*: Antiquité Tardive 2 (1994) 33-64; G. Falchi, *Matrimonio cum scriptis et sine scriptis nel libro Siro-romano*: SDHI 61 (1995) 875-887; G.R.M. Frakes, *The Syro-Roman Lawbook and the Defensor Civitatis*: Byzantion 68 (1998) 347-355.

A. Di Berardino

T

TABARKA. Thabraca, modern-day Tabarka (Tunisia), was a *municipium* at the beginning of the empire, a colony under *Antoninus Pius, but it did not truly develop until the 4th c. It was part of Proconsular Africa. The presence of Christianity is attested to in the city in the 3rd c. with Bishop Victoricus, who signed the synodal letters from the spring of 253, from 254/255, and the acts of the Council of Carthage from 1 September 256 (Cyprian, *Epp*. 57; 67; *Sent. epp*. 25). After him were Bishop Clarentius, who was present at the Conference of Carthage (411), and his *Donatist rival Rusticianus. *Victor of Vita mentions a *monastery at Tabarka (*Hist. pers. Afr. prov*. 1,10).

From the early Christian and Byzantine era two basilicas have been preserved: the urban basilica with an almost square central nave and the baptistery attached to the northern perimeter wall; a funerary basilica, without a doubt a *memoria* of a martyr unknown to us, which was noteworthy for its *sarcophagi with mosaic decoration: the deceased person is in the act of prayer between two lit candles; a chalice from which peacocks and doves quench their thirst; different animals, birds, lambs, fish in the middle of flowers, at times together with the deceased person, who is in the posture of prayer (DACL 1, 716-719; figs. 152-155). Another mosaic is famous because of its representation of an African-type church, a symbol of *Ecclesia Mater* (DACL 4, 2231-2234, with a color plate).

PWK 9, 1178-1179; LTK 10, 6; DACL 15, 2146-2169; M. Langerstay, *Nouvelles fouilles à Tabarka* (*antique Thabraca*): Africa 10 (1988) 220-253.

V. Saxer

TABITHA (iconography). A symbol, like other scenes of the early Christian figurative repertoire, of faith in the *resurrection (Acts 9:36-46), Tabitha appears for the first time in *sarcophagus of the Fermo Cathedral (Ws 116,3) from the end of the 4th c. The miracle performed by *Peter is presented in two scenes: Peter's arrival to the house of Tabitha and the resurrection of Tabitha, who is not on her bed but is standing, holding *Peter's hand. Other examples are found on two sarcophagi from *Gaul. One is a fragment from the Museum of Arles (Ws 145,6 = Benoit, Sarc. VII, 4), from the end of the 4th c., in which the event is portrayed in two moments: the arrival of Peter to Tabitha's home (damaged in part) and the resurrection (with two women standing and two under Tabitha's bed): Peter takes the little girl's wrist, who is lying on the floor, and lifts her up. A similar formulation appears on the lower side of a sarcophagus from the crypt of St. Maximin (Ws 145,5), from the same era. Stylistically it has a more lively and swift rhythm with respect to the one from Arles. There is just one example in the sumptuary arts on an ivory panel from the British Museum from the 1st decade of the 5th c.

DACL 15/2, 1947-48; EC 11, 1684; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952, pl. 38,117; M. Sotomayor, *S. Pedro en la iconografía paleocristiana*, Granada 1962, 156-160; TIP 284-285.

A.M. Di Nino

TABULA PASCHALIS PETROCORICENSIS. The Easter table of Périgueux, which is inscribed in uncial characters on a marble slab, was found at one time on the right side of the altar of the choir in the Church of St. Stephen, once the Cathedral of Périgueux (Dordogna), although it is now inserted on the E side of the S wall in the same church. It begins with the words: *"Hoc est Pascha sine termino et numero: cum finierit a capite reincipe,"* followed by 91 dates for *Easter, with only the indication of the days and the months but without reference to any years, from which one concludes that the author proposed a perpetual Easter table. From the com-

parison with the Easter tables inspired by the 19-year Alexandrian cycle, popularized in the West through the work of *Dionysius Exiguus, one gathers that the table from Périgueux indicates the dates for Easter from 631 to 721.

A. Cordoliani, *La table pascale de Périgueux*: CCM 4 (1961) 57-60; CPL, *Addenda* 2297 b, Kl. Fitschen: LACL (1998) 581.

V. Loi - B. Amata

TABULAE ALBERTINI. These are inscriptions of 45 legal acts on small tables of cedar from the *Vandal age, Christian in origin, that were discovered in Algeria, ca. 90 km (55.9 mi) from *Tebessa at the border with Tunisia (Djebel Mrata) in 1928 and were studied for the first time by E. Albertini. These were written in cursive Latin between 17 September 493 and 21 April 496, at the time of King Gunthamund. They pertain to various topics, among which are the selling of lands, olive trees, a slave, a woman's dowry etc. The majority of the texts were edited by the *magistri* of the village or a priest. This documentation is a sign of the cultural and administrative continuity under the Vandal reign.

CPL 1837a; Ch. Courtois - L. Leschi - Ch. Perrat - Ch. Saumagne (eds.), *Tablettes Albertini, actes privés de l'époque vandale* (*fin du Vᵉ siècle*), Paris 1952; V. Väänänen, *Étude sur le texte et la langue des tablettes Albertini*, Helsinki 1965; H. Wessel, *Das Recht der Tablettes Albertini*, Berlin 2003.

A. Di Berardino

TACITUS on CHRISTIANS. Tacitus was a well-known Roman historian who lived between AD 55 and 120. His *cursus honorum* was aided by his marriage to the daughter of Julius Agricola. He kept to himself during the reign of *Domitian; in the year 97, under Nerva, he was made consul. He wrote his historical works during the 20-year period which goes from Nerva to the beginning of the reign of *Hadrian. Recalling the fire of *Rome of 19 July AD 64, he writes that *Nero blamed the Christians in order to ward away suspicions that had mounted against him. His judgment on them, which is different from the rather benevolent judgment given by *Pliny the Younger, is bitter, unjustified, and was owed to an indirect and distorted understanding of Christians and Christianity. He reports that the emperor "presented as guilty and subjected to the most exquisite tortures those people whom the masses, loathing them for their crimes, called 'Chrestians.' The author of this sect, 'Chrestus,' under the reign of *Tiberius was sentenced to death by the procurator Pontius *Pilate; although repressed for a while, the lethal superstition burst forth again, not only in Judea, the place of the evil's origin, but also the city of Rome, where they converge from every area and all the atrocious and shameful things have been exalted. First of all, those people were arrested who confessed their faith, then, at their accusation, a multitude of others, accusing them not so much of having set fire to the city, but more so for hatred of mankind" (*Annals* XV,44). Tacitus continues by describing the punishments to which the Christians have been condemned. Starting from the swift judgment expressed by the historian, the testimony confirms some foundational pieces of information about the life of *Jesus transmitted by the gospels and about the spread of Christianity to Rome. Although regarding the Christians as guilty of other crimes, which he carefully avoids listing probably because he did not have any proof—and the hostility of the people could not be considered a proof—he acknowledged that they were sacrificed not for the general interest of the people but because of Nero's cruelty, the person who was truly responsible for the disaster.

Tacitus's description, which is limited to the essential points, attests that during the 70s of the 1st c., the Christian community of Rome had a considerable number of members (*ingens multitudo*) and that the reason for the *persecution was not that authorities had discovered in Christianity a threat to the state but that Nero had used the *pagan population's hostility to vindicate himself from the serious charge of arson. The Christian religion was therefore not punished per se. The accusation of *odium humani generis* hinges essentially on the fact that the Roman Christians, living according to their customs, appeared to be suspect. A norm of behavior in Greco-Roman society was humanistic philanthropy, which was opposed to misanthropy (*odium generis humani*), which during the 2nd c. allowed the authorities to charge the Christians with the worship of the donkey, ritual crimes and incest. It was the first small step of the pagans' judgment on the Christians that Tacitus noted and reported. *Suetonius (*Vita Caesarum: Claudius* XXIX,1; *Nero* XVI,3) upheld the accusation of seditious activity linked to messianism.

H. Fuchs, *Tacitus über die Christen*: VChr 4 (1950) 69-74; J.B. Bauer, *Tacitus und die Christen*: Gymnasium 69 (1957) 495-503; J. Beaujeu, *L'incendie de Rome en 64 et les Chrétiens*, Brussels 1960; J. Daniélou - H. Marrou, *Nuova Storia della chiesa. I. Dalle origini a S. Gregorio Magno*, Turin 1970, 123-124; K. Baus, *Storia della chiesa. I. Le origini*, Milan 1976, 168-169; *I pagani di fronte al cristianesimo*, ed. P. Carrara, Florence 1984, 31-37; A. Giovannini, *Tacite, l'incendium Neronis et les chrétiens*: REAug

30 (1984) 3-23; M.J.G. Gary-Fow, *Why the Christians? Nero and the Great Fire*: Latomus 57 (1998) 595-616; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan ²2004, 49-74.

E. Peretto

TAIO of Saragossa (7th c.). Bishop of *Saragossa after *Braulio (651–683), he wrote a work titled the *Sententiae,* in five books: the first two are theological and exegetical (the first is on God and the OT, the second is on Christ and the church); the other three primarily pertain to moral questions: virtues, sins and the day of judgment. According to the custom of that time, the work was a collage of passages from other authors: alongside *Augustine's works, the writings of *Gregory the Great were primarily used, concerning whom Taio wrote a lofty elegy in one of his surviving letters to *Eugenius of Toledo. During a trip to *Rome, he transcribed by his own hand various works from Gregory's writings that he did not already possess.

CPL 1267-1270; Díaz 205-210; PL 80, 727-990; DHEE 4, 2516-2517; A.C. Vega, *Tajón de Zaragoza. Una obra inédita*: Ciudad de Dios 156 (1943) 145-177; P. Martínez, *El pensamiento penitencial de Tajón*: RET 6 (1946) 185-222; A. Palacios Martín, *Tajón de Zaragoza y la "Explicatio in Cantica canticorum"*: Anuario de Estudios Filológicos 3 (1980) 115-127; Patrologia IV, 107-109.

M. Simonetti

TALMUD and MISHNAH. *Mishnah,* a term deriving from the Hebrew *shānāh,* which means "to repeat" (from which derived the verbs "to study," "to teach"), suggests what is imparted by memory through repetition and refers to the entirety of the oral law and its study—in contradistinction to *Miqra,'* which refers to the *Scriptures and its study; and during a later period, the term **Tanakh* (TaNaKh) was also used, which is an acronym based on the initial Hebrew letters of the terms indicating each of the three parts in which Scripture was subdivided: *Torah* (instruction; these are "the five books of *Moses" [the Pentateuch]), *Nevi'im* (the Prophets) and *Ketuvim* (the Writings); *Eusebius of Caesarea spoke of the δευτέρωσις (*Praep. Ev.* 12,4). *Mishnah* could also refer to the totality of the *halakhah* (legislative part) or a form of a teaching that no longer takes its point of departure from the biblical text but begins instead from the judgments of the teachers of the tradition with respect to concrete problems. *Mishnah* is primarily the name given to the compilation of decisions of the *Tannaim* (doctors before the 3rd c.), arranged and reassessed, around the year AD 200, by Judah the prince in Galilee. The tradition mentions some of the preceding collections such as the one made by Rabbi Aqiba (d. 135) or the collection made by his student Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Judah's decision with respect to the opinions to be adopted thus established the *halakhah* (a practical decision concerning legal, ritual or religious questions), so much so that the work is not only a collection of oral law but also was immediately considered the official and canonical code of Jewish life. Written in late Hebrew, it was arranged, according to topics, 6 orders (*sedarim*) and 63 treatises. The tannaitic traditions that were not incorporated into the Mishnah were called *baraitoth* ("exterior"); a part of this was collected around 250, in the collection called *Tosefta* ("supplement, addition") and in the Talmud, which follow the same order of the Mishnah.

The oral tradition, once committed to writing, continued to be a matter of discussion and further reflection in the academies of Palestine and Babylonia: the *Gemara* ("supplement") is the commentary produced by the *Amoraim* (teachers from the 3rd to the 5th c.). *Mishnah* + *Gemara* = *Talmud* (lit.: "teaching"; abbreviation of the *Talmud Torah*). Two redactions exist, which are very different with respect to their content, method and language: the *Palestinian Talmud* (or "of Jerusalem"; *Talmud Yerushalmi*), finished around the end of the 4th c., and the *Babylonian Talmud* (*Talmud Bavli;* TB), finished a century later. Although both works only provide commentary for half the treatises of the Mishnah, the Babylonian Talmud does so much more extensively. The historical circumstances explain how the Babylonian Talmud soon eclipsed its Palestinian counterpart and was regarded as the sole canonical and normative Talmud. The text of the Mishnah implies numerous variants in the two versions of the Talmud to the point that it was even thought that there were two recensions. The Babylonian Talmud contains twice as many *haggadah* (the totality of the nonjuridical traditions) with respect to the Talmud edited in Palestine, where it had found a place in the midrashim. The Talmud is presented as the verbally concise and barely retouched Talmud of the academic disputes (with the names of the protagonists): and this explains the exuberant richness of its content, as well as the difficulty of its interpretation. The work of righteous men consumed in exegesis and law, who draw on the resources of dialectic in order to obtain all the possible meanings from the text and to justify their own point of view, the *Gemara* addressed, often without order and continuation, every type of topic (casuistry, philosophy, morality, geography, zoology, botany, superstitions and popular

beliefs, etc.). There one finds all the opinions expressed, even the most diverse and contradictory, without seeking to impose them on others; J. Neusner has for this reason rightly emphasized this "nondogmatic quality of Talmudic discourse" (*Invitation to the Talmud,* 241). During the 8th c. the Karaite movement rejected the authority of the Talmud and accepted the Scriptures (*Miqra'*) as the sole religious authority.

All the additions of the Babylonian Talmud reproduce the pagination structure (folio a-b) of the Venetian *editio princeps* (1520–1524). Many editions also contain twelve treatises (the "small treatises"), regarded as noncanonical.

Mishnah: EJ 12, 93-109; M. Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*, Cincinnati 1894 (repr. New York 1968, 1977); M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Bavli, Talmud Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature*, London 1903 (Peabody, MA [4]2005); H.L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, Munich 1930 (Eng. trans. Philadelphia 1931); S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, New York 1962, 83-99; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, Cambridge 1969, 53-61; C. Albeck, *Einführung in die Mischnah*, Berlin-New York 1971; R. Travers Hertford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, Farnebourgh [3]1973; J. Neusner, *Classical Judaism: Torah, Learning, Virtue: An Anthology of the Mishnah, Talmud and Midrash*, 3 vols., Frankfurt 1993; F. Manns, *Leggere la Mishnah*, Brescia 1987; F. Alvarez-Pereyre, *La Transmission orale de la Misnah: Une méthode d'analyse appliquée à la tradition d'Alep*, Paris 1990; H. Strack - G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Atlanta 1992; G. Stemberger, *Introduzione al Talmud e al Midrash*, Rome 1995; J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: An Introduction*, Lanham, MD 2004; G. Stemberger, *Il Midrash. Uso rabbinico della Bibbia. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, Bologna 2006.

Translations: H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, Oxford 1933; P. Blackman, *Mishnayoth* (Hebrew text and Eng. trans.), 7 vols., London 1951-56; New York [2]1964; V. Castiglioni, *Mishnaiot*, 3 vols., Rome [3]1962-65; J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, Yale 1988; Id., *Il Giudaismo nella testimonianza della Mishnah*, It. trans., Bologna 1996; E. Schürer - G. Vermes - F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People*, I, Edinburgh 1973, 80-84.

Talmud: EJ 15, 750-768, 772-779; Interpr. Dict. Bible, Suppl., 511-515 (I. Epstein). Cf. Mielziner, Strack, Bowker beforementioned *Talmud di Gerusalemme*: ed. printed at Krotoschin, 1866; Fr. trans. M. Schwab, Paris 1878-89, repr. 1960. *Babylonian Talmud*: text and Ger. trans. L. Goldschmidt, 12 vols., Berlin 1929-36, repr. 1965; Eng. trans. I. Epstein, London 1935-52 (in 35 vols.), 1961 (in 18 vols.), 1962 (ed. with the text also included); J. Neusner, *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*, 22 vols., Peabody, MA 2005; E. Schürer - G. Vermes - F. Millar, op. cit., 89-90; E. Zolli - S. Cavalletti, *Il trattato delle benedizioni del Talmud babilonese*, Turin 1968; J. Neusner, *Invitation to the Talmud*, New York 1976; G. Stemberger, *Der Talmud. Einführung-Texte-Erläuterungen*, 1982; It. trans. *Il Talmud. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, Bologna [4]1999; S. Rosso - N. Deteschi - E. Turco, *Quattro "porte" per conoscere l'ebraismo. Midrash, Mishnah, Talmud, Targum*, Turin 1998; J. Neusner, *Sources and Traditions: Types of Compositions in the Talmud of Babylonia*, Atlanta 1992; *Il Talmud*, ed. E. Rostagno, 2 vols., Milan 2002; A. Cohen, *Everyman's Talmud: The Major Teachings of the Rabbinic Sages*, New York 1995; A. Cohen, *Il Talmud*, trans. A. Toaff, Rome-Bari [4]2003; A. Steinsaltz, *Cos'è il Talmud*, Florence 2004; Zadoq ben Ahron, *Talmud Lexikon*, Neu Isenburg 2006; E. Friedheim, *Rabbinisme et paganisme en Palestine romaine: étude historique des Realia talmudiques (I[er]-IV[e] siècles)*, Leiden-Boston 2006; J. Neusner, *The Talmud: What It Is and What It Says*, Lanham, MD 2006.

R. Le Déaut

TANAKH. The term is an acronym to refer to the Hebrew Bible (the Christian OT), resulting from the three initial Hebrew letters of the name that indicates the three parts in which it was subdivided (TaNaKh): (1) *Torah* (instruction, also called *Shumash,* "the five," that is, the five books of *Moses; it corresponds to the Pentateuch); (2) *Nevi'im* (the *Prophets); (3) *Ketuvim* (the Writings; the Hagiographers). The term used during the Second Temple and during the rabbinic period was *Miqra'* ("what is read"), when this division was already in use, and is still in use along with the acronym. The Tanakh includes, according to the Jewish tradition, 24 books, that is, the five books of the Torah, the eight books of the *Nevi'im* (among the Prophets are included Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; Joshua, Judges, Samuel; the book of Kings; the 12 Minor Prophets are regarded as one book), and the 11 *Ketuvim* (*Psalms, Proverbs, Job, *Song of Songs [Canticle of Canticles], Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes [Qohelet], Esther, Daniel, Ezra [and Nehemiah] and Chronicles). This canon corresponds to the one used by Protestants, but with a different order and a different number, because some books have acquired the subdivision totaling 39 separate books (for example, Samuel in two books; the book of Kings in two books; Chronicles in two books; Ezra in Ezra and Nehemiah). Orthodox and Roman Catholics, moreover, include another seven books in the biblical canon of the OT (Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Sirach and Baruch), which Protestants call the "Apocrypha" and Roman Catholics "Deuterocanonical." The book of *Daniel, moreover, and the book of Esther include additional material regarded as deuterocanonical in the Jewish Bible and among many Protestant groups. In ancient times, the Hebrew Bible was only written with consonants; in the Middle Ages, however, vowel pointing was introduced by the Masoretes. The subdivision into chapters and verses, however, was adopted from the one in use among Christians and introduced into *Spain for ease of use in debates with them; it is still preserved for facility of citation and is often only indicated at the margin of the page in order to not interrupt the continuity of the text.

RAC 14, 184-223; R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*, London 1985; J. Terbolle Barbera, *La Biblia Judía y la Biblia cristiana, Introducción a la historia de la Biblia*, Madrid 1993; *Tanach: The Stone Edition*, Hebrew with Eng. trans., Brooklyn 1996; A. Berlin, *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society Tanakh Translation*, New York 2004.

R. Le Déaut

TANNAIM (literally "teachers"). The plural form of the term *tannā* from a root that, in Aramaic, means "to repeat, transmit orally," and hence "to teach." The name given to the succession of Jewish teachers from the 1st and 2nd c. starting from Hillel and Shammai. The collection of their opinions constitutes the Mishnah (*see* *Talmud and Mishnah); those that were not included, the *baraitoth,* found a place in the Tosefta and the Talmud. They were also the creators of the ancient midrashim (called *tannaitic*) that were published by their successors the *Amoraim*.

Jewish Encyclopedia 12, 49; EJ 15, 798-803.

R. Le Déaut

TARGUM. Aramaic for "translation" or "interpretation." Targums were Aramaic versions of the OT biblical books written as soon as Aramaic supplanted Hebrew as the vernacular. The biblical texts (that is, of the Torah and the Prophets) were at that time translated by memory in the synagogue, after the text was read in Hebrew. Aiming to render the text immediately understandable and suited to their audience, the translator did not hesitate to conclude, gloss, clarify and even paraphrase, often taking as a model of inspiration all the sources of the midrash. Therefore, a targum is not a translation in the modern sense, but a transposition that reflects the religious conceptions of a certain era and esp. demonstrates how the Bible was understood in ancient times; hence its interest for the study of the NT and ancient Judaism. Moreover, targumic traditions have often been attested to in the writings of the Fathers (*Origen, *Jerome and *Ephrem).

Targums exist for the whole Bible (with the exception of Ezra-Nehemiah and *Daniel), but the composition of these texts spans some ten centuries. The discovery of fragments of Lev 16 and Job 17–42 at *Qumran proves the existence of texts written in the 1st c. BC.

The official targums of the Pentateuch (*Onkelos*) and that of the Prophets (*Jonathan ben Uziel*), in literary Aramaic, date back to a foundational text compiled in *Palestine at the beginning of the 2nd c., later published in the Babylonian academies (4th–5th c.). These two versions follow the Hebrew very closely, but they also contain numerous original interpretations. Also from Palestine come two complete recensions of the targums of the Pentateuch: (1) the Vatican codex *Neophyti I*, in Palestinian Aramaic close to that of the Talmud, which could substantially date back to the 3rd c.; (2) the late compilation (7th c.?) said to be the work of (ps.-) Jonathan derived from original material coming from the Palestinian recension and elements taken from *Onkelos* and the midrashim. Other recensions of the Palestinian translations have survived in the so-called fragmentary targum (ca. 800 verses) and in the Cairo Genizah fragments (whose affinity with *Neophyti* is evident), published in 1930 by P. Kahle.

The *Targum of the Hagiographa,* Palestinian in origin, are of more recent dates (from the 4th to the 8th c.), and each one of these has its own special problems. Some, such as the one for the book of Esther and the Song of Songs, have been paraphrased so much that they could be considered midrashim. Last, we note that the *Samaritan Pentateuch* also had its targum, which could date back to the 3rd–4th c.

With respect to these texts, one should note that the exegetical traditions that they encompass could also be more ancient than the date at which they were committed to writing and the Aramaic dialects that have transmitted them.

Texts: B. Walton, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, London 1653-57 (with Lat. trans.); J.W. Etheridge, *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel* . . . , 2 vols., London 1862-65 (repr. New York 1968, only translation); P. de Lagarde, *Prophetae Chaldaice*, Leipzig 1872 (repr. Osnabrück 1967); *Hagiographa Chaldaice*, Leipzig 1873 (repr. Osnabrück 1967); A. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, Berlin 1884; P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, II, Stuttgart 1930; J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949 (text and trans.); A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 4 vols., Leiden 1959-73; A. Díez Macho, *Ms. Neophyti 1*, 6 vols., Madrid-Barcelona 1968-79 (with Sp., Fr. and Eng. trans.); R. Le Déaut - J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques*, Rome 1971 (text and trans.); D. Rieder, *Pseudo-Jonathan—Targum Jonathan ben Uziel on the Pentateuch*, Jerusalem 1974; R. Le Déaut, *Targum du Pentateuque* (*Neofiti et Ps. Jonathan*), 4 vols. (SC 245, 256, 261, 271), Paris 1978-80 (only trans.); M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch*, Rome 1980.

Studies: R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique*, Rome 1966; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, Cambridge 1969; M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament*, Shannon 1972; Id., *Targums*, in Interp. Dict. Bible (Suppl.), 856-861; A. Díez Macho, *El Targum*, Barcelona 1972 (repr. 1979), B. Grossfeld, *Bibliography of Targum Literature*, 2 vols., Cincinnati 1972, 1977; J.T. Forestell, *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament*, Missoula 1981. Also see E. Schürer - G. Vermes - F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People*, I, Edinburgh 1973, 99-114.

R. Le Déaut

TARRA. During the *Visigoth reign of *Recared I (586–601), Tarra, a monk from the prestigious monastery of Cauliana, in the vicinity of Mérida, was accused of adultery and banished from the monastery. Once the accusation had been called into question, the monk wrote a letter of appeal to King Recared in which he presented himself as persecuted by not well-specified detractors and innocent of the accusation of having sexual relations with a prostitute. He swore, finally, that he had never kissed or touched a woman since the death of his wife and his entrance into the monastery. Beyond the specific question of Tarra's innocence and guilt, the letter, which is his only surviving document, provides scholars with a better ability to understand the ecclesial and monastic life of the Iberian Peninsula at the time in which the Visigoths converted to Catholicism and Recared, the first Visigothic Catholic King, was recognized to hold an ecclesial authority equal to that enjoyed by the Christian emperor in the East. The king also had the prerogative of superior judgment in questions between bishops and the faithful, although in the monasteries the monks during the Visigothic era, thanks to the *pactum* stipulated with respective *abbots, enjoyed the *ius appelationis.* From its original meaning of "sacred commitment" to an absolutely chaste life (*pactum virginitatis* in *Conc. Illiberitanum* from ca. 300, can. 13: PL 84,303), the *pactum,* esp. thanks to *Isidore (560–636) and then *Fructuosus (d. 665), became a true legal document that governed the duties of each party, abbots and monks, and defended the latter from the possible abuses of the abbot's power, with the right to appeal to other abbots or an ecclesiastical or civil authority (A. Mundò). In the specific case of Tarra, the resolution of a specific case by recourse to the authority of the king, however, seems to have been anticipated and foreseen by a special law that would be sanctioned only in the 7th c. by King Chindasuinth (*Lex visig.* VI,1,6). According to this law, anyone who was a victim of false accusations could have recourse to the king either directly or through someone *fidelis regis* (I. Velázquez).

E. Dümler - W. Gundlach, MGH III, *Ep. Merowingii et Karolini aevi I*, 676-671 (= PLS 4, 1593-1595); J. Gil, *Miscellanea Wisigothica*, Sevilla 972, 28-29.

Studies: A. Mundò, *Il monachesimo nella penisola iberica*: *Il Monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*, in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, Spoleto 1957, 73-108; I. Velázquez, *El* suggerrendum *de Tarra a Recaredo*: Antiquité Tardive 4 (1966) 291-298; Domínguez del Val 2, 359; S. Castellanos, *The Significance of Social Unanimity in a Visigotic Hagiography: Key to an Ideological Screen*: Journal of Early Christian Studies 11 (2003) 387-419.

V. Lombino

TARRACONENSIS
I. History - II. Christianization - III. Archaeology.

I. History. Hispano-Roman province whose capital was Tarraco (*Tarragona); it was created by Augustus in ca. 27 BC starting from Hispania Citerior, which included a large part of the E and N territories of the Iberian Peninsula. The emperor *Diocletian (ca. 297) reduced its dimensions, taking the Valley of the Ebro as a central axis of the territory of the new Tarragona, whose border to the N was with *Gaul (separated from it by the Pyrenees); to the S, with Carthaginensis; to the W, with *Gallaecia; and to the E, with the Mediterranean Sea. During the mid-3rd c., Tarragona underwent the first Germanic wave (256–262), coinciding with the *martyrdom of Bishop *Fructuosus at Tarragona (259). Subsequently, in 409, the Alans, Suevi and the *Vandals penetrated again through the Pyrenees, and Tarragona was forced to stop both the advance of these peoples as well as the citizen revolts of the Bagaudi. The *Visigoths changed Barcino (Barcelona), a small coastal city of Tarragona, into a powerful royal seat during the time of Ataulf and Galla Placidia (415) and an occasional refuge for the *Gothic court each time the Franks threatened Narbo (Narbona). In 475, Euric incorporated Tarragona within the area of Visigothic rule and began to take away a stable Gothic settlement, which was accentuated after the defeat of Vouillé (507) and the Frankish invasion of 541. The Hispano-Roman aristocracy was not easily subjected, as shown by the failed attempts of Peter's rebellion, who was the military leader of Dertosa (Tortosa; 506), and the duke Paul, who, being of *Byzantine origin, was proclaimed king over Narbonensis (672–673), with the support of numerous ecclesial and civil leaders of Tarragona. Starting from 712, the province fell almost completely into the hands of the Arabs, but the immediate repression by the Visigoths (who had been barricaded in the Pyrenees) and the Franks resulted in the N territories of ancient Tarragona becoming structured as embryos of the medieval kingdoms of Asturia, Navarre and Catalonia-Aragon.

II. Christianization. Although the tradition (Jerome, *Ep.* 65,12; 71,1; 120,9; Theodoret, *Interpr. epist. II ad Tim.* 4,17) assumed that the trip planned by *Paul to Hispania was completed (Rom 15:24; 15:28), the presence of Christianity is attested with certainty for the first time thanks to *Cyprian of Carthage's *Letter* 67 (mid-3rd c.), from which emerges the controversy of the *libellatici,* which had erupted during the *Valerian persecution and where the existence of

a bishop named Felix at Caesaraugusta is mentioned. The metropolitan see, at Tarragona, is documented in 385 by the decretal of the Roman bishop *Siricius to the bishop *Himerius, where it is said that the metropolitan of Tarragona was by that point the papal primate of Hispania. Consentius's letters to *Augustine bring to light the presence of *Priscillianism in Tarragona around 419.

The episcopal sees of Tarragona were as follows: Ampuria (Castelló de Empúries; 516), Barcelona (342), Calagurris (Calahorra; ca. 300), Gerunda (Gerona; 400-405), Osca (Huesca; 419), Ilerda (Lleida; 419), Auca (Oca; 589), Pompaelo (Pamplona; 589), Turiasso (Tarazona; 449), Tarragona (259), Egara (*Terrassa; 450), Tortosa (516), Urgellum (Seo de Urgell; 527), Ausona (Vic; 516) and *Saragossa (254). There exist noteworthy differences between these cities in the way in which they faced the changes that occurred during Late Antiquity: while Tarragona, Barcelona and Saragossa enjoyed a certain prosperity, other cities such as Bilbilis (Calatayud), Calahorra or Lledia were much less known.

The councils that gathered at Tarragona were as follows: Saragossa I (378/380), Tarragona (419), Tarragona (516), Gerona (517), Barcelona I (ca. 540), Lleida (546), Saragossa II (592), *Huesca (598), Barcelona II (599), Terrassa (614) and Saragossa III (691), and also a council at the beginning of the 5th c., summoned by the Roman bishop *Innocent, whose location is not mentioned, and others at the mid-5th c., which are well known thanks to the correspondence of the bishops of Tarragona with Pope *Hilarius of *Rome.

III. Archaeology. In the cities of Tarragona, the archaeology presents a highly mutable panorama for the discoveries and the research completed in recent years. The majority of the nuclei of certain entities—and esp. the episcopal sees—present a profile type, with the cathedral and its dependencies within the walls replacing the preceding administrative centers and incorporating the necropolises around it. To this was added a series of churches inside and outside the strictly urban perimeter, often above ancient funerary *pagan estates or above structures of abandoned habitations. All this contributed to the structure of the later Early Medieval city. The archaeological discoveries of Valencia, Tarragona and Barcelona are conspicuous. At Valencia, archaeologists determined the location of an important part of an episcopal group (dated to the 5th–7th c.): the apse of the cathedral, a small appended funerary cross-shaped church, and then another church in the area of Almoina. At Tarragona, the remains of a new basilica at the Francoli River and the identification of fragments of churches within the urban enclosure help scholars outline better the aspect of the first Christian city. At Barcelona the possibility has been ruled out that the building (discovered in 1944) with three naves joined to the baptistery was the early Christian basilica—which must instead be found under the modern-day cathedral—and was instead an episcopal hall; conversely, some ten meters away, in the Plaza del Rey, a cross-shaped church has been identified from the end of the 6th c. together with a necropolis; all of this in connection with the monumentalization and broadening of the Barcelonan episcopal group. At Terrassa, the recent digs in the complex of Sant Pere date its construction starting from the end of the 4th c. and display a planned monumental trajectory of this complex. At Ampuria recent archaeological digs were pushed forward near the Churches of St. Margarina and St. Magdalena, which in the beginning was believed to be from the Early Middle Ages but which, given the chronology of the Late Antique foundation, must be put in relation to the episcopal city and with the already known churches of Neapolis and Sant Marti.

In the countryside, the ancient Roman villas were renewed and adorned, among other things thanks to the settling of the courtly officials within them—who did not accept the episcopate—to escape the excessive taxation that struck the cities. The large landholdings were localized esp. in the internal areas and that level ground of Tarragona, far from urban centers. In many cases, there exists documentation for wealth in relation to the appearance of Christian churches within these rural structures, which, in many cases, did not hesitate to change into parishes and, therefore, into fiscal centers. In addition to the already known churches of Villa Fortunatus (Huesca), Sant Cugat del Vallès and Santa Margarita de Martorell (Gavà) or Marialba (Léon), in recent years there has been added to the list a good number of churches and rugged monasteries from the area of ancient Pastiglia and other such buildings as the Church of Monto de Tiermes (Soria) or the Basilica de Gavà (Barcelona), with the horseshoe-shaped apse. Scholars have well underscored the proliferation of mosaic sepulchral stones: at Al faro (La Rioja), at Coscojuela de Fantova (Huesca) and in the early Christian necropolis of Tarragona.

J. Blanch, *Arxiepiscopologi de la Santa Església Metropolitana i Primada de Tarragona*, Tarragona 1951; A. Fàbrega, *Pasionario Hispánico (siglos VII-XI)*, Madrid-Barcelona 1953-55; J. Vives, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano romanos*, Barcelona-Madrid 1963; P. de Palol, *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; R. Puertas, *Iglesias hispánicas (siglos*

IV al VIII). Testimonios literarios, Madrid 1975; F. Udina, *La Tarraconense y la Narbonense en la época del III Concilio de Toledo*: Concilio III de Toledo. XIV centenario 589-1989, Toledo 1991, 641-657; P. de Palol, *Transformaciones urbanas en Hispania durante el Bajo Imperio: los ejemplos de Barcino, Tarraco y Clunia. Transcendencia del modelo en época visigoda: Toledo*, in *Felix temporis reparatio*, Atti del conv. arch. int. "Milano capitale dell'impero romano," Milan 1992, 381-394; J. Amengual, *Vestigis d'edilícia a les cartes de Consenci i Sever*: III Reunió d'Arqueologia Cristiana Hispánica, Barcelona 1994, 489-497; S. Fernández-Ardanaz, *Cristianizzazione e cambiamenti sociali nelle culture montane del nord dell'Hispania*, in *Cristianesimo e specificità regionali nel Mediterraneo latino (sec. IV-VI)*, Rome 1994, 483-512; J. Vilella, *La correspondencia entre los obispos hispanos y el papado durante el siglo V*, in ibid., 457-481; J.C. Sánchez, *Los Bagaudas: rebeldes, demonios, mártires. Revueltas campesinas en Galia e Hispania durante el Bajo Imperio*, Jaén 1996; J.A. Abásolo, *La ciudad romana en la Meseta Norte durante la Antigüedad Tardía*: Acta Antiqua Complutensia 1, Alcalá de Henares 1999, 87-99; S. Castellanos, *Hagiografía y sociedad en la Hispania visigoda. La* Vita Aemiliani *y el actual territorio riojano (siglo VI)*, Logroño 1999; var. aus., *Del romá al románic. História, art i cultura de la Tarraconense mediterránia entre els segles IV i IX*, Barcelona 1999; Ch. Bonnet - J. Beltrán de Heredia, *El primer grupo episcopal de Barcelona*, in Sedes regiae (ann. 400-800), Barcelona 2000, 467-490; J. Beltrán de Heredia, *Continuidad y cambio en la topografía urbana. Los testimonios arqueológicos del cuadrante nordeste de la ciudad*, in *De Barcino a Barcinona (siglos I-VII). Los restos arqueológicos de la plaza del Rey de Barcelona*, Barcelona 2001, 96-107; C. Buenacasa - J. Sales, *Importancia geopolítica d'una ciutat en època visigoda: Girona després de Vouillé (ss. VI-VII)*: Annals de l'Institut d'Estudis Gironins 42 (2001) 59-75; J. Vilella, *Los concilios eclesiásticos de la* Tarraconensis *durante el siglo V*: Florentia Iliberritana 13 (2002) 327-344.

J. Sales

TARRAGONA

I. City - II. Councils - III. Archaeology.

I. City. The ancient Tarraco was the capital of Hispania Citerior from 197 BC and, after its division into three provinces, by the emperor *Diocletian, the capital of the *Tarraconensis province. During the entire Roman period, it was a flourishing city. In 456 it was conquered by the *Visigoth *Euric, and in 714 it was occupied and destroyed by the Muslims. Scholars do not know when Christianity arrived, but it must have arrived there very early, given the position of the port in connection to Rome and the importance of the city itself. The first valid document is the acts of the martyrdom of St. *Fructuosus, bishop of the city, and his deacons Augurius and Eulogius. These acts present us with a flourishing Christian community without conflicts with *pagans. In the year 385, Pope *Siricius sent a letter to Bishop *Himerius of Tarragona, in response to one of his letters, which had been sent by Pope *Damasus. Tarragona, the capital's province, must have already been the metropolitan see, given that Himerius must have made known the text of the letter to the bishops of his province (*Ep. ad Himerium* 16: PL 56, 562). But it did not take very long before it also became a religious metropolis. In 468, Pope *Hilary referred to Bishop Ascanius with the title of metropolitan (*Ep. ad Ascanium*: PL 58,17), a dignity that was recognized by the bishop of *Saragossa who appealed to him, precisely because he was a metropolitan, because the bishop of Calahorra, his suffragan bishop, was doing as he pleased. Ascanius's entire behavior confirms this title, and in the Council of *Toledo (516) it was stated *expressis verbis* that Tarragona was a metropolitan see.

Bishops: St. Fructuosus (d. 259), Himerius (before 385), Hilary (402), Ascanius (465ff.), John (516), Sergius (520–555), Tranquillinus (ca. 560), Stephen (d. 589), Arthemius (d. 599), Asiaticus (d. 599), Eusebius (610–632), Audax (ca. 633), Protasius (638–646), Faulax (645–668?), Cyprian (683–688), Vera (693), St. Prosper (711?).

E. Flórez, ES 24 and 25; DHEE 4, 2527-2531; NP 12,36-37; PW Suppl. 15, 570-644; P. de Palol, *Tarraco hispanovisigoda*, Tarragona 1953; J. Blanch, *Arxiepiscologi de la santa Esglesia metropolitana i primada de Tarragona*, Tarragona 1955; D. Mansifia, *Orígenes de la organización metropolitana en la iglesia española*: Hispania Sacra 12 (1959) 262-267; R. Puertas, *Iglesias hispánicas (siglos IV al VIII). Testimonios literarios*, Madrid 1975; E. Morera Llauradó, *Tarragona Cristiana*, Tarragona 1981.

II. Councils. *464*. That there was a celebration of the provincial council in Tarragona is deduced by some authors (Hefele-Leclercq) from the letter of Ascanius and other bishops from the province of *Tarraconensis to Pope *Hilarius to learn what approach to take with respect to Silvanus of Calahorra, who was illicitly performing ordinations; in the same letter, they sought advice on the transfer of Irenaeus from *Terrassa to the city of *Barcelona (PL 58,15). No other information exists that makes reference to this council.

516. Presided over by the metropolitan John. Seven other bishops from the province as well as the metropolitan of *Carthage and the bishop of Elvira were present. It has 13 canons aimed at regulating the life of the clergy (and the monks: can. 11). Of note was the decision to excommunicate *ad tempus* a bishop who, although summoned, was absent from the council for no reason (can. 6) and the invitation to the bishops to also bring with them countryside priests and several laypeople (can. 13).

Mansi 7,957-958; 8,539-546; E. Morera Llauradó, *Tarragona Cristiana*, Tarragona 1981; Synoden 124-126; 128-133 et passim.

P. de Luis

III. Archaeology. Hispano-Roman coastal city established during the Second Punic war by the Scipioni (218 BC) on top of the indigenous nucleus of Kesse. It was the capital of Hispania Citerior and subsequently *Tarraconensis (from 197 BC onward), and the center of the *conventus Tarraconensis*. Tarragona was damaged by the Frankish invasions of 260 (Eutropius, 9,8,2) and by those of the Alans, Suevi and *Vandals (409). In 475 it was occupied by the *Visigoths. It was a Visigothic city from Liuvigild (568–586) until Agila II (710–714) and maintained its economic preponderance with respect to the other nuclei of Tarraconensis. The Muslims took possession of Tarragona in 713, after the escape of Bishop Prosper and the church officials.

Although the tradition assumed that *Paul's trip to Hispania (Rom 15:24; 15:28) was completed (Jerome, *Ep.*, 65,12; 71,1; 120,9; Theodoret, *Interpr. Epist. II ad Tim.*, 4,17), the presence of Christianity is not attested with certainty until the time of the *Valerian persecution (259), through the martyrial acts of Bishop *Fructuosus and his deacons Augurius and Eulogius. Consentius's *Letter* 11 (ca. 419) traces a detailed panorama of the social-religious fabric in Tarragona already fully immersed in Christianity. The metropolitan see is documented for the first time in 385, through the decretal of the Roman bishop *Siricius addressed to Bishop *Himerius, where it is said that the bishop of Tarraconensis was changed into the papal primate of Hispania.

The Christian archaeology of the city provides some written sources: (1) Consentius's letter, which mentions the cathedral's *secretarium* and the monastery of Frontón; (2) the funerary *carmen* of Bishop Sergius—transmitted through the *Anthologia Hispana* (an Early Medieval document)—that praises his restoration of the roof of a church and the founding of a *cenobium; and (3) the *Liber Orationum de festivitatibus* (beginning of the 8th c.), which lists the churches of Santa Jerusalén, San Fructuoso, San Pedro and a fourth whose title is not indicated.

The material remains were more abundant than the written ones. In addition to the very numerous, although fragmentary and dispersed, sculptural, architectural, ceramic and other such remains, there is also extant a series of better preserved monuments. Within the walls—where one can trace the disappearance of large urban areas between the 2nd half of the 3rd c. and the end of the 4th—the following are documented: the martyrial basilica of the amphitheater (Visigothic era), constructed in the arena (certainly the church of San Fructuoso mentioned in the *Liber Orationum de festivitatibus*); fragmentary remains of the church in the Rovellat plaza; and the presumed identification of the site of the early Christian episcopal see under the modern-day cathedral, in the upper part of the Roman city.

Within the walls, in the suburbs of Tarragona, one finds the most spectacular remains. On the one side, the extensive early Christian necropolises of Francoli (chronologically late-imperial and Visigothic) contain the remains of a basilica and more than two thousand places of burial of various types and decorations, among which the *sarcophagi and mosaic stones—the stones of *Ampelius, Optimum* etc.—stand out for the epigraphical, iconographic and onomastic information they supply. These are necropolises *ad sanctos* (*see* *depositio ad sanctos) in the vicinity of the relics of Fructuosus and his deacons, in the cemetery's basilica. Thanks to the study of numerous sarcophagi discovered in this field, one could say that Tarragona was one of the smallest cities of the W Mediterranean to produce its own funerary sculpture during *Late Antiquity. On the other side stands the complex of the central park, near the early Christian necropolises, which was recently discovered and excavated, and which appears to be an important, probably monastic complex of 6 buildings presided over by a funerary basilica with an atrium surrounded by dependent structures; the discovery of a funerary inscription dedicated to blessed *Thecla stand out. Within the *ager* near Tarragona, the rich Villa dels Munts stands out (Altafulla), with clear indications of Christianization, as does the early Christian mausoleum of Centcelles (Constanti), with an impressive dome decorated with cynegetic mosaics and with scenes from the OT and NT, while various individuals enthroned and dressed in robes stand out in bold relief. Its iconographic interpretation—and therefore the identification of its owner—is still uncertain, although one cannot doubt the importance and influence that the person buried in that place wanted to display.

E. Morera, *Tarragona cristiana*, I-IV, Tarragona 1897-1959; J. Serra, *Excavaciones en la necrópolis romano-cristiana de Tarragona*, Madrid 1929; Id., *La necrópolis de San Fructuoso*, Tarragona 1948; Id., *Santa Tecla la Vieja. La primitiva catedral de Tarragona*, Tarragona 1960; J. Blanch, *Arxiepiscopologi de la Santa Església Metropolitana i Primada de Tarragona*, Tarragona 1951; A. Fàbrega, *Pasionario Hispánico* (*siglos VII-XI*), Madrid-Barcelona 1953-55; P. de Palol, *Tarraco hispanovisigoda*, Tarragona 1953; Id., *Arqueología cristiana de la España romana*, Madrid-Valladolid 1967; G. Alföldy, *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco*, Berlin 1975; R. Puertas, *Iglesias hispánicas* (*siglos IV al VIII*). *Testimonios literarios*, Madrid 1975; M. Del Amo, *Estudio crítico de la necrópolis paleocristiana de Tarragona* (3 vols.), Tarragona 1979-1989; Th. Hauschild, *Arquitectura romana de Tarragona*, Tarragona 1983; TED'A, *L'amfiteatre romà de Tarragona, la basílica visigótica i l'església románica*, Tarragona 1990; Id., *Noves aportacions a l'estudi de la basílica cristiana*

de l'amfiteatre de Tàrraco: III Reunió d'Arqueologia Cristiana Hispánica, Barcelona 1994, 167-184; G. Alföldy, *Tarraco*, Tarragona 1991; P. de Palol, *Transformaciones urbanas en Hispania durante el Bajo Imperio: los ejemplos de Barcino, Tarraco y Clunia. Transcendencia del modelo en época visigoda: Toledo*, in *Felix temporis reparatio*. Atti del Conv. Arch. Int. "Milano capitale dell'impero romano," Milan 1992, 381-394; X. Aquilué, *La seu del Collegi d'Arquitectes. Una intervenció arqueològica en el centre històric de Tarragona*, Tarragona 1993; C. Godoy - M. Gros, *L'oracional hispànic de Verona i la topografia cristiana de Tarraco a l'antiguitat tardana: possibilitats i límits*: Pyrenae 25 (1994) 245-258; J. Amengual, *Vestigis d'edilícia a les cartes de Consenci i Sever*: III Reunió d'Arqueologia Cristiana Hispànica, Barcelona 1994, 489-497; Th. Hauschild, *Hallazgos de la época visigoda en la parte alta de Tarragona*: ibid., 151-156; X. Aquilué, *Referent a les estructures de l'Antiguitat Tardana de la plaça de Rovellat* (*Tarragona*): Annals de l'Institut d'Estudis Gironins 37 (1996-97) 1169-1185; M. Miró, *Epigrafia mètrica de transmissió exclusivament manuscrita: a propòsit de les inscripcions cristianes de Tarragona conservades en l'*Anthologia Hispana: Annals de l'Institut d'Estudis Gironins 37 (1996-97) 953-971; R. Mar et al., *El conjunto paleocristiano del Francolí en Tarragona. Nuevas aportaciones*: Antiquité Tardive 4 (1996) 320-324; J. Sales: *Necrópolis cristianas tardoantiguas en el área catalana: estado de la cuestión*, in *Santos obispos y reliquias*, Alcalá de Henares 2003, 319-333.

J. Sales

TARSICIUS (Tarcisius). The first testimony on Tarsicius is offered to us by Pope *Damasus (A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Vatican City 1942, 117-119). The pope compared him to *Stephen the first *martyr, probably because both were subjected to stoning. But from this parallel we cannot draw any conclusions with respect to Tarsicius's membership in the hierarchy. There remains the fact that he died for refusing to hand over the *Eucharist. Damasus does not say anything about the date of his martyrdom. The 7th-c. *Itineraries place his tomb in the catacombs of St. *Callistus on the Via Appia near that of Pope *Zephyrinus (CCL 175,317.327). According to the *Passio S. Stephani pp*. (BHL 7845), he was an acolyte of the Roman church. The *Passio* belongs to the epical type and is from a later era. The first to introduce the mention of the saint and his martyrology was Ado (15 August).

BS 12, 136-138; LCI 8, 420-421; BBKL 11, 543-544.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

TARSUS. A city of Cilia Campestris, on the River Cydnus (today Tarsus Çay), of very ancient origin (information about the place dates from the 9th c. BC), it was situated in the W part of the alluvial and fertile tract of land which developed over time by work of the three rivers Cydnus (Tarsus Çay), Sarus (Seyhan) and Pyramus (Ceyhan). At ca. 15 km (9.3 mi) from the ocean, one was nearly constrained, when one traveled by land, to go through it as a route between E and W, between Anatolia and the Mesopotamian flatland. The city was also connected with the ocean through river navigation. It was the capital of the Cilician kings and the Persian satraps: but the Greek coins issued by the local mints in the 5th and 4th c. BC indicate that it soon became autonomous and that Hellenization deeply penetrated it. It underwent the rule of Alexander and subsequently that of the Seleucids of Syria: annexed to the Roman state by Pompey in 67 BC, during the campaign against the pirates, it received from Antony the status of a free city, in addition to the concession of extensive benefits for groups of its citizens. Antony and Cleopatra met at Tarsus. With the creation of the province of Cilicia, it became its capital; its internal constitution was timocratic, and it included, among other things, the imposition of a tax of 500 drachmae on the exercise of civil rights, excluding from it, therefore, the majority of the population. A famous inscription that mentions the passage of *Septimius Severus through the passageway of the *Pylae Ciliciae,* which is not too far from the city, praised it as the largest and most beautiful metropolis of the three provinces of Cilicia, Isauria and Lyconia; with the *Diocletian reform, it became the capital of Cilicia Prima. Perhaps at the time of the emperor *Arcadius, in the system of the multiplication of the provinces, the *campestris* was subdivided into Cilicia Prima (metropolis, Tarsus) and Cilicia Secunda (metropolis, Anazarbus); in this way, the extension of its province and the importance of its metropolis was thus reduced. Different emperors were buried at Tarsus: Tacitus, *Maximinus Daia (313) and *Julian the Apostate (363), who had ordered the reopening of a *pagan temple there.

A center of lively productive activities (the local linen industries were famous), Tarsus was also the flourishing center of cultural life, the location of a reformed school of philosophy that had nothing to envy of those in *Athens and *Alexandria (see Strab., *Geogr*. XIV,5,13-14). Many of its professors went to *Rome; Strabo lists the numerous famous individuals. Even Dio Chrysostom (Dion of Prusa), around 110, praised its high intellectual and cultural standing and economic prosperity (*Or*. 33 and 34). Cilicia was the land of different cultural influences from both East and West. In the 4th c., although remaining the most important city of Cilicia, Tarsus lost its prestige (*Ammianus still describes it as "Tarsus, the well-known city, makes Cilicia noble" [*Ciliciam . . . Tarsus nobilitat, urbs perspectabilis*: *Rerum gest*], 14,8,3).

*Paul was born there (Acts 9:11); he spent his childhood there and returned there for some time even after his conversion (Acts 9:30); he was joined there by *Barnabas (Acts 11:25). This date could be the beginning of the Christian community at Tarsus. It was an episcopal see of great importance, and it already had bishops during the apostolic age, starting from Jason, a disciple of Paul (Rom 16:21), and his successor Urban; there followed, among the known names, Helenus (252–269), who at various times went to *Antioch during the controversy with *Paul of Samosata (Eus., *HE* 6,44; 7,5). *Cyprian of Carthage did not want to be in communion with him (Eus., *HE* 7,5,4). There followed Athanasius (a martyr in 259), Clino Lupus (314–325), who was present at the Council of *Ancyra in 314, Theodore (at *Nicaea), Antony (*Arian) and Silvanus (head of the *homoiousians, but deposed after the Council of *Constantinople [360], he died perhaps in 371). *Basil of Caesarea was worried about the divisions within the community of Tarsus (*Epp.* 113 and 114). Then there came the great exegete *Diodore (379–392), who was present at the Councils of Antioch and Constantinople (381), Falerus (394), Dositheus (415), Marianus, Helladius (431–434), who was deposed in the Council of *Ephesus and made recourse to the pope in 433, Theodore (449–451), Pelagius (458), Nestor (489), Syncletius (530), Peter (553) and Theodore (680). In the 6th c., the see of Tarsus had seven suffragan bishops and was dependent on the patriarchate of Antioch. During the persecutions, it had numerous *martyrs, among whom were *Pelagia, Boniface, Marianus, Diomedes, and Julietta and her son *Quiricus, natives of Iconia. During the Great Persecution, many Christians were deported into the mines of Cilicia (Eus., *The Martyrs of Palestine* 10,1-2). Tarsus came under Arab rule in the 7th c., around 660. In the 10th c. the Armenians established there one of their episcopal sees.

W. Ruge, *Tarsos*: PWK 23, 2, 2413-2439; W.M. Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul*, London 1907, 85-244; V. Schultze, *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften*, Gütersloh 1913-1926, II, 266-290; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor: To the End of the Third Century*, Princeton 1950, 272ff.; J.D. Bing, *Tarsus: Forgotten Colony of Lindos*: Journal of Near Eastern Studies 30 (1971) 99-109; M.A.G. Haykin, *And Who Is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus*: VChr 41 (1987) 377-385; P. Desideri, *Le città della pianura di Cilicia in Strabone (14, 5, 8-19)*, in *Hestíasis*, Studi offerti a Salvatore Calderone, II, Messina 1986-88, 331-346; Id., *La Cilicia ellenistica*: Quaderni storici 76 (1991) 141ff.; A. Bilban Yalçin, *Alcune sconosciute sepolture bizantine di Tarso*, in *VI Simposio di Tarso*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 2000, 325-334; Id., *Sculture bizantine di Tarso*, in *VII Simposio di Tarso*, ed. L. Padovese, Rome 2002, 335-344.

M. Forlin Patrucco - A. Di Berardino

TATIAN (mid-2nd c.). A Christian writer cataloged among the *Apologists. Of Eastern origin (he said of himself that he was "born in the land of the Assyrians" [*Disc.* 42]), that is, Mesopotamia true and proper or, generically, Syria, but of Hellenistic education. After various trips and vicissitudes of every type (*Disc.* 35), he stumbled on the *Scriptures of the Christians and converted (*Disc.* 29). He was a friend of *Justin, of whom he considered himself and was considered (at least for the early days after his conversion) a disciple; along with Justin he was involved in a controversy with the Cynic philosopher Crescens, who paid both men back threatening them with death (*Disc.* 19).

His *Discourse to the Greeks* (Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας)—his only work that has remained because it was transmitted originally in the compendium of the Greek Apologists compiled by Aretas of Caesarea (cod. *Par. gr.* 451: in which, however, the sheets containing Tatian's works were subsequently lost: there remain, however, exact copies)—is a violent polemic against all the culture of the Greeks, mingled with a defense of the Christian ideas that are thus laid out with apologetic ends. The date of composition is uncertain: according to several points of view it is to be placed between 155 (very close presumably to his conversion to Christianity) and 170 (the final, although confused, pieces of information about his activity). Tatian accused the Greeks of depending on the barbarian cultures, although the sole invention of the Greeks was philosophy, which Tatian reviles in the person of its representatives, the philosophers, who fall into contradiction and who pontificate in the most foolish ways, even if he himself then makes extensive recourse to conceptual instruments that were originally philosophical (primarily *Stoic). He never mentions Christianity or Christians by name because his objective is not the comparison of the two religions, but ways of seeing the truth and life and therefore about personal and social ethics.

An orator, well-equipped with the most refined sophistic cavils to the point of prodding his opponents with polemical subtlety and aggressiveness, he ostensibly presented himself as a "barbarian," rich with that wisdom that the Greeks however mocked, the wisdom that is in fact to be identified in the biblical tradition. In this way, Tatian united Eastern nationalism, Christian *faith, restless theological speculation, intransigent polemic, sarcasm and contempt for his opponents. As it appears from the *Discourse to the Greeks,* he seems to have been a man of violent character, passionate, often dark, aspiring to formulations of thought that aim to be original, even

through the accumulation of arguments that are not always coherent.

His theology had, on account of certain characteristics, an ancient character (*Jewish-Christian); with respect to other aspects, it anticipated or echoed radical, almost gnosticizing, tendencies. After a violent opening polemic against the intellectual culture of the Greeks and esp. the philosophers (chs. 1-3), Tatian summarizes the Christian concept of God (ch. 4), the relationship of the God-Logos and the creation of matter (ch. 5), the doctrine of the resurrection, a consequence of divine omnipotence (ch. 6), the creation of the angelic beings (ch. 7), and the fall of the angels and the protoparents, which led to the introduction of idolatry and *astrology (ch. 8). After a polemical interlude against idolatry, Tatian goes on to treat the topic of demonology, pneumatology, psychology and *soteriology (chs. 9-16), according to a theological scheme that might seem strange but which in fact is consistent for those times and for which there are still traces even in *Origen's *De Principiis*. This exposition is caused by continual polemical attacks against the various opinions of the Greeks, and it continues by accusing, as of demonic origin, the use of drugs, medicine, shows, *pagan moral behavior and their political regimes (chs. 17-28). Evident in this entire section is the influence of Jewish *apocryphal literature (esp. the *Book of Enoch*).

After another autobiographical interlude (chs. 29-30), Tatian develops two arguments. The first pertains to the moral superiority of the "Christian (or "barbarian") philosophy," which was contrary to the dissoluteness of the Greeks, demonstrated by the low moral level of their most famous men, by their works of art which were vulgarly immoral (catalog of statues), and by their mythological accounts that taught immorality and corrupted young people (chs. 31-35). The second argument, broadly developed in the second part of the *Discourse* (chs. 36-41), is the so-called chronological argument, intending to prove that the barbarians (that is, the Jews and, after them, the Christians), because they date back to *Moses, are earlier in time and are therefore more ancient and more authoritative than the Greeks. The former date back to Moses, the latter to Homer: on the basis of a series of compared chronological calculations, Tatian, broadly following the already beaten path of Jewish-Alexandrian apologetics, concludes with the superiority—on the basis of their greater antiquity—of the Christians with respect to the pagans. The *Discourse* closes (ch. 42) with a statement of faith ("I know the one who is God and his creation") and with Tatian's challenge that he is ready for a confrontation with the ideas of his opponents.

Tatian's newer and more original theological positions are those that pertain to the procession of the Logos, the presentation of the theme of the resurrection and his very extensive demonological development. The framework of his pneumatology and his cosmic conception of the fall of the angels is more archaic. Traces of rigorous asceticism are contained in the *Discourse,* even though it is difficult to say if it already pertains to the properly heretical positions.

After the death of Justin, as far as the heresiological tradition tells us (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I,28,1; III,23,8; Eus., *HE* 4,29,1; Epiph., *Pan.* 46), Tatian separated himself from the mainstream church and instead leaned toward *encratism; he emphasized his pessimism with respect to the problem of the fall of humankind to the point of maintaining the doctrine of *Adam's damnation. These ideas seemed to make him close, at least in a certain sense, to ideas that were not only encratic but actually gnostic (the economy of the OT subjected to Satan or even a lower god). Tatian wrote various other works. In addition to the **Diatessaron*—which is the work that assured him greater fame in subsequent centuries, esp. in the East—even before the *Discourse* he had written a treatise *On the Animals,* which, in spite of the name, should have been most likely a treatise of natural anthropology of a heavily pessimistic tone. He had likewise devoted another document to demonology (*Disc.* ch. 16). A clearly encratic ascetic work is instead *The Perfection According to the Savior* (Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ), which is cited and refuted by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III,12,81,1ff.), in which, among other things, Tatian interpreted *Paul's words in 1 Cor 7:5 in the sense that only abstention from marriage united one to God, while the custom of matrimony signified a communion of incontinence and fornication with the devil. In this treatise, Tatian set forth Christ as a model, who was a virgin and a continent man (and poor), contrasting radically the new man (Christ and with him the continent Christian) to the old man (Adam, who was condemned for this reason). Tatian also composed another treatise, titled the *Problems,* pertaining to difficult questions present in the sacred texts, of which one of his disciples, *Rhodo, had proposed, in turn, an explanation. It could be the case (but it is not certain) that in this work of Tatian even that peculiar exegesis of Gen 1:3 (*fiat lux*) found a home, which was understood as an imploring demand by God the Creator to the supreme God so that there might be light, an interpretation that seems to have

had a clearly gnostic-*Valentinian orientation (Clem. Alex., *Ecl. Proph.* 38,1; Orig., *C. Cels.* VI,51; *De orat.* 24,5). Likewise working from information provided from a later age (and not very certain), Tatian also substituted water for the wine in the *Eucharist, being consistent with the Encratite convictions that prohibited the use of wine (Epiph., *Pan.* 46; Jer., *In Amos* 2,12). Of the NT *Scriptures, Tatian rejected a certain number of Paul's epistles; for some of Paul's writings, he corrected certain expressions (according to Eus., *HE* 4,29,6), although he accepted the Pastoral Epistles. According to the information provided by *Epiphanius, once he had returned to the East, Tatian spread his Encratite ideas from *Antioch on the Daphne toward *Cilicia, Pisidia and elsewhere. Even though these last pieces of information could pertain to the development of the Encratite movements that were contemporaneous with Epiphanius (loc. cit.), the information could have a some foundation, given the fact that this region was the place in which the most well-known work of Tatian, the *Diatessaron,* was spread and remained for a long time the official gospel text of the local churches.

Editions: CPG 1104-1110; PG 6, 803-888; E. Schwartz, *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*, TU IV, 1, Leipzig 1888 (with witnesses and fragments); E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen 1914 (Schwartz's text, 266-305, without the fragments); M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1995.

Translations: Ger.: R.C. Kukula, BKV² 12, Kempten 1913; Fr.: A. Puech, *Recherches sur le Discours aux Grecs de Tatien*, *suivies d'une traduction française du Discours avec notes*, Paris 1903; It.: P. Ubaldi, Turin 1931; M. Fermi, Rome 1924; C. Burini, Rome 1986; S. Di Cristina, Rome 1991; Sp.: D. Ruiz Bueno, BAC 116, Madrid 1954, 572-628 (with Greek text); Eng.: M. Whittaker, *T. Oratio ad Graecos and fragments*, Oxford 1982.

Studies: C.W. Steuer, *Die Gottes- und Logoslehre des T.* (*Diss.*), Jena 1892; R.C. Kukula, *Tatians sogennante Apologie*, Leipzig 1900; Id., *"Altersbeweis" und "Künstlerkatalog" in Tatians Rede an die Griechen*, Vienna 1900; A. Puech, op.cit.; R.M. Grant, *The Date of Tatian's Oration*: HThR 46 (1953) 99-101; Id., *The Heresy of Tatian*: JTS n.s. 5 (1954) 62-68; Id., *Tatian and the Bible*: SP 1 (1957) 297-308; Id., *Tatian's Theological Method*: HThR 51 (1958) 123-128; F. Bolgiani, *La tradizione eresiologica sull'encratismo*, I: *Le notizie di Ireneo;* II: *La confutazione di Clemente di Alessandria*: AAT 91 (1956-57); 96 (1961–62); A. Orbe, *A propósito de Gen. 1,3 en la exégesis de T.*: Gregorianum 42 (1961) 401-443; M. Elze, *T. und seine Theologie*, Göttingen 1960; S. Di Cristina, *L'idea di dynamis nel "De mundo" e nell' "Oratio ad Graecos" di Taziano*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 485-504; E. Norelli, *La critique du pluralisme grec dans le "Discours aux Grecs" de Tatien*, in *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. B. Pouderon and J. Doré, Paris 1998, 81-120; E.J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century, The Case of Tatian*, London 2003; K.L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity*, Berkeley, CA 2003; U.B. Schmid, *In Search of Tatian's Diatessaron in the West*: VCh 57 (2003) 176-199; U.B. Schmid, *Unum ex quattuor. Eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung*, Freiburg 2005.

F. Bolgiani

TATWINE. Born in Mercia, he was a priest in the monastery of Bredon and then the archbishop of *Canterbury from 731–734, receiving the pallium from Gregory III in 733 and establishing the primacy of Canterbury over *York. A man praiseworthy on account of his teaching and prudence, well-versed in the Sacred *Scriptures (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* V,23: PL 95,283-284), Tatwine wrote an *Ars grammatica* (*Ars Tatuini*), inspired by *Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* and Priscian's *Institutio de nomine*, and 40 riddles (*Aenigmata*) written in hexameters, analogous to those composed by Eusebius the abbot of Jarrow. He died in 734.

CPL 1563, 1564; M. de Mauro - F. Glorie eds., CCL 133, Turnhout 1968, 1-93, 167-208; S.P. Cobbs, *Prolegomena to the Ars grammatica Tatuini*, Diss. University of Chicago 1937; V. Law, *The Latin and Old English Glosses in the Ars Tatuini*: ASE 6 (1977) 77-89; Id., *The Transmission of the Ars Bonifacii and the Ars Tatuini*: RHT 9 (1979) 281-288; R. Whitman, *Aenigmata Tatuini*: NM 88 (1987) 8-17; Z. Pavlovskis, *The Riddler's Microcosm: From Symphosius to St. Boniface*: Classica et Mediaevalia 39 (1988) 219-251; Patrologia IV, 414.

P. Marone

TAUROBOLIUM. A sacrificial rite belonging to the cult of the Great Mother Cybele, who was of Phrygian origin and officially accepted at *Rome in 204 BC. The rite, which is attested for the first time in AD 160, from an inscription at *Lyons, consisted in the sacrifice of a bull, at times accompanied by that of a male sheep (*criobolium*) and could have a dual purpose, public and private. In the first case, the taurobolium was celebrated for the benefit of the emperor (*pro salute imperatoris*), with whom other members of the imperial family were at times associated, and was intended to ensure the favor of the goddess for the supreme representative of the state, for the foundation and guarantee of the common good. The taurobolium completed by individual members of the faithful regarded as a personal benefit developed starting from the 3rd c. AD. A vivid description of this form of private taurobolium seems to be supplied in *Prudentius's *Peristephanon* (X,1006-1050) and in the anonymous **Carmen adversus paganos* (vv. 57-62). Despite the heavy polemical tone of each document, the rite suggested in these can be identified with the Metroac form of the taurobolium, which therefore consisted of a sort of sprinkling of blood that the faithful received while standing within a pit covered by a trellis (i.e., a crisscrossing structure of bars of wood or metal)

upon which an animal was slaughtered. The taurobolic rite, moreover, from the inner documentation turns out to have had a preeminently cathartic purpose, with the efficacy limited to a period of 20 years, after which it had been finished, the ceremony could be repeated. Notably spread throughout the empire during the 2nd–4th c., the rite met with special favor in the aristocratic Roman circles from the 2nd half of the 4th c., who had remained faithful to the traditional cults and were vociferous defenders of it against Christianity, which by that point had been officially recognized by the public authorities. The quality of "tauroboliate" of the Great Mother was placed as a seal for numerous religious duties of noteworthy proponents of the Roman aristocracy such as Vettius Agorius *Praetextatus (CIL VI,1778), although another personage from the same context declared himself, through it, *in aeternum renatus* ("born again forever") (CIL VI,510).

H. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle, Mère des dieux à Rome et dans l'Empire romain*, Rome 1916; R. Duthoy, *The Taurobolium. Its Evolution and Terminology*, Leiden 1969; M.J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis. The Myth and the Cult*, London 1977; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Soteriologia e aspetti mistici nel culto di Cibele e Attis*, Palermo 1979; Eng. tr. with additions and modifications, *Soteriology and Mystic Aspects in the Cult of Cybele and Attis* (EPRO 103), Leiden 1985; Ph. Borgeaud, *La Mère des dieux. De Cybèle à la Vierge Marie*, Paris 1996; Ph. Borgeaud, *Taurobolion*, in F. Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale. Geburtstags - Symposium für Walter Burkert Castelen bei Basel 15. bis 18. März 1996*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998, 183-198.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

TAURUS, praetorian prefect. A personal correspondent with *John of Antioch (*Ep*. 123, PG 84,739) and *Isidore of Pelusium (*Epp*. III,224, PG 78,879-880; III,365, PG 78,1017-1018; V,40, PG 78,1351-1352), he presided over the general Council of *Rimini (359) and was able to convince all the bishops that took part to subscribe to a creed that was amenable to the theological position of the emperor *Constantius II.

CPG 6320; ACO I, 4,154; PLRE II, 1056-1057.

P. Marone

TE DECET LAUS. More than a hymn, it is a liturgical formula sung in the mode of the acclamation of the glory of the *Trinity. As in the case of the hymn *Gloria Patri,* it is made up of a minor *doxology, in contradistinction to the **Te Deum,* which is considered a major doxology. Very ancient in origin, it already appeared in the **Apostolic Constitutions* (VII,48) and the *Byzantine liturgy for the morning hours. St. *Benedict introduced it into the divine office in this form: *Te decet laus / Te decet hymnus / Tibi gloria Deo Patri / Et Filio, cum Sancto Spiritu / in saecula saeculorum. Amen.* It is no longer used in the Roman liturgy.

M. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, I, Milan [2]1950, 201, see EC 11, 1861; G.M. Dreves - C. Blume, *Lateinischer Hymnendichtung,* Leipzig 1909, 178.

L. Dattrino

TE DEUM. A Latin hymn in praise of the *Trinity. Hincmar of Reims (*Praedestinatione* XXIX) in the 9th c. attributed it to *Ambrose and *Augustine, who had composed it during the *baptism of the latter, but modern scholarship has refuted such a theory of authorship. *Niceta of Remesiana has therefore been considered the author, based on *Paulinus of Nola's statements concerning Niceta's composition of liturgical hymns and chants (*Carm.* 17,90ff.). The rhythmic prose in which the *Te Deum* was composed, which was unusual in Latin hymnology, has led scholars to put forward the hypothesis that the hymn was derived from a Greek source. The *Te Deum* was recited during the morning office according to the testimony of *Caesarius of Arles (*Reg. mon.* 21).

A.E. Burn, *The Hymn* Te Deum *and Its Author*, London 1926; M. Simonetti, *Studi sull'innologia popolare cristiana dei primi secoli*: Atti Acc. Nazionale Lincei, Memorie, ser. 8, vol. 4 (1952) 478-481; Patrologia III, 183; K. Gamber, *Das "Te Deum" und sein Autor*: RBen 74 (1964) 318-321; LTK[3] 9, 1306-1307.

M.G. Mara

TEBESSA. Theveste, modern-day Tébessa (Algeria), a large agricultural market and an important strategic point, is one of the most ancient cities of North *Africa. The III Augustan Legion, at least from the age of *Vespasian (AD 69–79) until the beginning of the 2nd c., was stationed there. The city became a *municipium* under the Flavians and a colony under *Trajan. We do not know to which province it belonged at that time, but from the age of *Diocletian it was part of Proconsular Africa. It reached its apex in the 3rd c., as the arch of the triumph of Caracalla (inserted as a northern door in the Byzantine city walls), the temple of Minerva (the city's museum), the amphitheater and the forum all bear witness. The *Vandals destroyed its walls in 429, but the *magister militum* Solomon reconstructed them after *Belisarius's reconquest (CIL 8,16507). The walls still exist—a reason that the urban agglomerate never

ceased to be inhabited. In the 11th c., the Arab geographer El Bekri praised the city's wealth.

Christianity appeared at Tebessa in the 3rd c. Lucius was among the bishops of the Council of *Carthage (1 September 256), which deliberated on the question of the baptism of heretics (*Sent. epp.* 31). A note on the margin of its **Acts* that referred to him later than 259 call him a "confessor and martyr." His name appears in the *Mart. hier.* (18 January). This has led scholars to conclude that he died in 259. In 361–363 a *Donatist council was held at Tebessa (Optatus of Milevis, *Schism. don.* 2,18), but, despite this fact, the city was never a stronghold for the schismatic movement. Among the bishops, we know about a certain Romulus (Council of Carthage 345/348), Urbicus and his Donatist counterpart Perseverantius at the conference of 411, Felix who participated at the conference of 484, a bishop Palladius who was known thanks to his epitaph (CIL 8, 2011), which dates to the beginning of the 5th c., and finally a Faustinus in the 6th c. The city's martyrological *fasti* note for the date 12 March 295 the martyrdom of the draftee *Maximilian, who was buried at *Carthage (BHL 5813), and *Crispina and her companions for 5 December 304 (BHL 1988ab). On their tomb, under *Theodosius (383–395), was constructed a large basilica, which was the destination point for pilgrimages. Likewise in 883, Leo VI the Wise would mention Tebessa among the African episcopates.

PWK 11, 249-252; DACL 15, 1998-2028; LTK 10, 111-112; J. Christern, *Das frühchristliche Pilgerheiligtum von Tebessa*, Wiesbaden 1976; S. Ferdi, *Augustin: de retour en Afrique 388–430; repères archéologiques dans le patrimoine algérien*, Fribourg 2000.

V. Saxer

TELESPHORUS, pope (ca. 125–ca. 136). Greek or from Magna Graecia; he died ca. 136 following a "glorious martyrdom" (Iren., *Adv. haer.* III,3,3) after 11 years, 3 months and 25 days of his pontificate (LP I,129). The following have been attributed to Telesphorus: the institution of the Christmas midnight Mass, the Lenten fast, the hymn *Gloria in excelsis Deo* and some liturgical laws, but the decretal in question is a forgery (Jaffé 34). The *Roman Martyrology* and the missal mention him for 15 January.

LP I, 56-57, 129 and 263; Eus. *HE* 5, 6,4; L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* I, Paris 1923, 236-237; DTC 15, 82 (E. Amann); BS 12, 188-189 (N. Del Re); EPapi I, 218-219 (F. Scorza Barcellona).

M. Spinelli

TEMPLE. We are accustomed to investigating, with a somewhat anachronistic vision, the use of the "temple" during the earliest period of Christianity, without keeping in mind the literary nature of the sources, esp. during the first three centuries. Oddly enough, it is archaeology that confirms the claim found in the book of Revelation: "And I saw no temple in it" (i.e., *Jerusalem) (Rev 21:22); early Christian architecture of the 3rd c. does not exist (B.M. Apollonji-Ghetti, 1).

In effect, we derive only a few marginal allusions to the first Christian community and its presence in the temple of Jerusalem from Luke (e.g., Lk 24:53; Acts 2:36; 3:1); both the Pauline corpus and the book of Revelation allude to the temple in christological, ecclesiological and anthropological senses. It is therefore necessary to keep in mind the entire liturgical reflection offered by the epistle to the Hebrews with respect to the new covenant. Certainly the veil of the temple was torn (Mk 15:38) for the first Christian communities, which, from that time onward, offered the worship owed to God in the temple of creation (see Is 66:1-2, cited by *Stephen in Acts 7:48-50), or more specifically in the temple of their anointed flesh (see, e.g., Jn 2:19-21; 1 Cor 3:16; Eph 2:21; Ignatius, *Ad Eph.* 9,2; ps.-Barnabas 16,1; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 86,6; II Clement to the Corinthians 9,3-5; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5,6,2; Tertullian, *De pudic.* 16,8). In the 3rd c. the idea continued (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,27; ps.-Cyprian, *De cent.* 58; ps.-Cyprian, *De mont.* 4,3). The Alexandrians, with more reservations in directly applying to the body and the flesh the quality of being the temple of God, emphasized the role of the soul, but in certain cases, they gave an anthropological interpretation to the concept of "temple" (see Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6,7,60; Origen, *Ad Rom.* 2,5; 6,9). The model, with its due adaptations, was also operative among the *gnostics from the very beginning (see *Heracleon, fr. 16).

The same fact appears again *in the contrary sense* in light of the results of historical and archaeological research (P. Lampe, 309; A. Provoost, 324), which indicate the nonspecific places that Christian gathered for worship (Justin Martyr, *Acta* 3,1-3; Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 32,1). The transition from private homes to the space that was the property of the community (*domus ecclesiae*), which was required by practical demands, must be seen in relation to the greater number of Christians and their greater ability to make purchases. However, the function of this *domus* was manifold: eucharistic gatherings, synods, the dwelling of the bishop or virgins *subintroductae* etc. The appearance of basilicas during the period between the years 200 and 320 does not imply of it-

self a change of mindset among the Christians and finds its explanation, once again, in practical motivations that led the Christian communities, in a time of relative prosperity, to adopt existing buildings or to build them *ex novo* (A. Provoost, 324-325).

It remains clear that the Christian mentality was novel. Their worship did not take place in the typical spaces used by *pagans or Jews. A testimony to this is the famous passage from the *Letter to *Diognetus* (5,1ff.), where the author describes Christian worship after having analyzed pagan and Jewish worship. Witnesses to this fact were also the pagans themselves, who particularly accused the Christians of being atheists because they did not possess temples or altars (Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 6,1). Christians must not divide themselves into castes. The Christian community does not know of any separation or gradation. The Christian states that the entire creation is holy. The Christian does not build enclosures in contradistinction to the pagans, who were accustomed to distinguish between the holy and the profane.

Nevertheless, in a short amount of time, the sources begin to reflect a change. Terms such as *consecrated,* which were at first used to refer to the baptized (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4,16,1), now designated the buildings for woship constructed by *Constantine (Eus. Caes., *De laudibus* 17,4); the criticisms that the Christians leveled against the pagans (Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 6,1) were completely reversed when *Faustus the Manichean accused the Christians of behaving like pagans (*Aug., *Contra Faustum* 20,4). The preoccupation became perceptible in Christian preaching (see C. Sotinel) when *Zeno of Verona had to warn his faithful of not falling into the same mindset of the pagans and the Jews with respect to the temple (see *Tract.* 2,6). In reality, the pagan temptation of defining sacred and profane spaces never left a church that was born amid the religions that were widespread in the empire. Thus, in the writings of such famous figures as Cyprian, one perceives a tendency to restrict, in imitation of the pagan model, the vast semantic field of the liturgical vocabulary of the early Christians (see, e.g., *Ep.* 76,3). This tendency of *superficially* Christianizing the pagan structures for worship, or in a different way, of paganizing those structures that had been Christianized, could be facilitated by the turn that took place in the 4th c. in the relations between the state and the Christians. Thus church leaders were able to put the Christian cult in perfect symmetry with the pagan cult with complete tranquility (see Zeno, *Tract.* 2,7), which was unthinkable during the first three centuries.

Finally, one must not forget the respect in which the so-called temple Christology or indwelling, which was used indistinctly by every type of informed Christian thinker during the first centuries (see P. De Navascués, 307-323), was eventually freed from its possible divisive connotations (*Nestorian). *Cyril of Alexandria, who in the beginning used it, only to then forget it, is a reflection of this approach (F.R. Gahbauer, 370-381). This fact could contribute to the weakening of the dogmatic basis of the liturgical anthropology or the dogmatic basis of the temple. Along the same lines, the doctrine that made of each Christian or of each member of Christ a temple and which, for this reason, excluded any other meaning of the term *temple*, would thus lose its concreteness. In effect, during the time of Cyril of Alexandria, this line of thought was already receding before the new wave of the construction of temples was completed, something that some scholars consider to be the fruit of the Christian conquest of time and space, or which, at times with greater caution, they consider to be a phenomenon of ambiguous meaning, in the sense that, at the same time in which Christianity was geographically spreading with its temples, in a latent way there spread the ancient temptation of calling profane what God had declared holy. For this reason, from the 4th c. onward, the history of the temple or the places of worship must be seen more from an artistic point of view than from dogmatic reflection.

B.M. Apollonji-Ghetti, *Problemi relativi alle origini dell'architettura paleocristiana*: IX Congr. Int. di Archeologia Cristiana, Rome 1975; F.R. Gahbauer, *Das anthropologische Modell*, Würzburg 1984; P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen 1989; A. Provoost, *L'implantation des édifices ecclésiastiques d'après les textes littéraires antérieurs à 400 ap. J.-C.*, in Actes du XI^e Congrès Int. d'Archéologie Chrétienne, ed. N. Duval, I, Rome 1989, 323-326; C. Sotinel, *Locus orationis ou domus Dei? Le témoignage de Zénon de Vérone sur l'évolution des églises (tractatus II,6)*: SP 29 (1997) 141-147; P. de Navascués, *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios*, Rome 2004.

P. de Navascués

TEMPTATION

I. Temptation in general and the temptation of Jesus - II. Typology of paradise: Christ, the new Adam - III. Typology of the desert: Christ, the true Israel - IV. Temptation and baptism - V. Temptation and passion - VI. Ecclesial dimension of Jesus's temptation.

I. Temptation in general and the temptation of Jesus. With respect to temptation, both the Greek and Latin fathers expressed a collection of reflec-

tions that can be schematically summarized in the following manner: (1) *Types* of temptation coming from the challenges and the troubles of life (emblematic figure: *Job) and temptation coming from affluence and prosperity (figure-type: the rich man in the gospels). Others drew a distinction between internal and external temptations. The most illuminating distinction we find, however, is in *Augustine of Hippo, who speaks of temptation as a "test" and as a "seduction": *Alia est tentatio seductionis, alia tentatio probationis* (*Ep.* 205,16). (2) Temptation *in relation to God:* properly speaking, God does not tempt anyone but "puts one to the test," to test, purify and educate. (3) *In relation to the devil:* temptation is attributable to him inasmuch as one is incited to evil. This aspect is esp. present in ascetical literature, esp. with respect to monks and hermits (*Athanasius, *Nilus, *Palladius, *Maximus the Confessor, *Jerome and *John Cassian). (4) *Behavior* in temptation: the following are recommended: courage and patience, prayer and fasting, obedience and prudence (in the sense of not willfully exposing oneself to temptations). (5) *Effects:* the proper behavior in temptation bears witness to one's love for God, nourishes humility and favors one's progress in the spiritual life.

Alongside this range of generally ascetic-spiritual meanings, the vocabulary of temptation was loaded with a more strictly theological, or historical-salvific, import, which was made explicit with respect to the temptation of Jesus. For this meaning, we will therefore reserve a more extensive treatment. An analysis of the synoptic gospels' account of the temptation, which was connected to the messianic character, will unveil an interweaving of other themes that were strictly connected to the antecedent biblical history (Christ, new *Adam, new Israel, new *Moses), with other mysteries of the life of Jesus (*baptism, passion), and with the life of the Christian community (exemplary and redemptive value of Christ's struggle with the devil). We will examine the patristic interpretation by returning to these themes (the synchronic aspect) and by emphasizing the contributions and the overtones of various authors (the diachronic aspect).

II. Typology of paradise: Christ, the new Adam. The parallelism already present in the writings of *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 103) was elaborated in an organic way by *Irenaeus in the framework of "recapitulation" (*Adv. haer.* V,21). In fact, starting from the threefold temptation of Jesus, he reconstructed a threefold temptation of Adam (V,21,2). The connection between the two events is based on Gen 3:15 and transferred to Christ through Gal 3:19 and 4:4 (V,21,1). According to *Tertullian, Jesus with his fasting "inaugurated the new man in the reproach of the old man" (*novum hominem in veteris sugillationem fastidiendi cibi initiabat*: *De ieiun,* 8,2). For *Origen, the devil, moved by jealousy, attempted to make Jesus fall from the dignity of the Son of God using the same tactic employed with the first man (see *Fragm. in Lc.* 56). *Hilary of Poitiers described the temptations of Jesus on the model of those temptations underwent by Adam (*tenens ordinem fraudis antiquae, In Mt.* 3,5); he was followed in that respect by *Ambrose of Milan, whose eloquent text we cite: "In the desert Adam, in the desert Christ; he knew in fact where to find a condemned man in order to lead him back to paradise after having delivered him from his error" (*Exp. in Lc.* 4,7). The comparison between the two Adams, present in the thinking of all the 4th–5th c. Fathers, is esp. elaborated by *Maximus of Turin: "The Savior behaved himself in such a way as to destroy the offenses by following the same tracks [*eisdem vestigiis*] with which they were committed" (*Serm.* 51a: CCL 23,202), an idea to which *Gregory the Great alluded: "[The devil] was conquered by the second man with the same methods [*eisdem modis*] with which he boasted that he had defeated the first man" (*In Ev. hom.* XVI).

III. Typology of the desert: Christ, the true Israel. The parallelism, in its precise configuration as it is present in Mt, is evoked only incidentally by the Fathers. The first to recall the opposition between the temptation of the people in the desert and that of Jesus was Tertullian, for whom the outcome of the first temptation marked the passage from the ancient carnal people to the authentic representative of the people of God, who "turned back on himself the rebuke which Israel had incurred" (*de figura Israelis exprobrationem in ipsum retorsit, Bapt.* 20,4). Another similar text is the one in which Tertullian deplored Israel's inability to resist hunger, thus bringing upon itself the punishment of God (*Nunquam non per impatientiam delinquendo perierunt, De pat.* 5,25). According to Origen, Israel did not fulfill its historical duty by rejecting the true manna, which is the Word of God in which, on the contrary, Jesus found his true nourishment (see *Fragm. in Mt.* 63). For both authors, Christ in the desert therefore inaugurates the new man, bringing to completion the divine pedagogy disregarded by Israel's experience. To give more stress to absolute faith in God and his Word, both authors eliminated the term *alone* in Jesus' response, thereby emphasizing the spiritualization of Dt 8:2-3 in light of Wis 16:26. The later Fa-

thers, although appealing to Israel's experience in the desert, did not interpret it in a typological-antithetical sense, but they mentioned it under the miraculous aspect, as a time of prodigious nourishment (manna and meat), a time that Hilary, e.g., referred to as "angelic" (*In Mt.* 3,1). It seems that one should understand the text of *Maximus of Turin in this manner (*Serm.* 51), although one could interpret another text from Hilary, in which he spoke of the "resistance to hunger" (*patientia esuritionis*) by Jesus—most likely depending on the aforementioned text from Tertullian—in a typological-antithetical sense. The miraculous nourishment unanimously recalled the figures of Moses, Elijah, Elisha and the Baptist himself.

IV. Temptation and baptism. The connection between the two events in the life of *Jesus and his disciples was systematically made by all the tradition. The first mention is found in the writings of *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 103ff.). But "the most definite ancient testimony that has survived concerning this theme, which was very dear to the meditation of early Christianity" (Steiner, 43), comes to us from the *Extracts of Theodotus* (85), a *gnostic text where the parallel between the temptations of the gnostic and those of Jesus is closely connected to the rite of baptism. The connection is inferred by Tertullian (*Bapt.* 20,3) and esp. by Origen, according to whom, after baptism, in which both Jesus and the Christian "break the hammer of the whole earth" (see Jer 50:23), that is, the devil, it is necessary to be ready for a more arduous fight: "You have come to the water of baptism: this is the beginning of the spiritual combat: from this point forward your combat against the devil begins" (*Hom. in Iud.* 9,2). The devil, Hilary insisted, esp. tempts the "sanctified," that is, the baptized, just as he tempted Jesus after his baptism in the Jordan River: "The Lord therefore was tempted immediately after (*statim post*) his baptism, indicating with his temptation that the devil's temptations rage esp. when we have been sanctified [*in sanctificatis*], because, for him, a victory over the saints is desirable" (*quia victoria ei est magis exoptata de sanctis, In Mt.* 3,1). Likewise for *Cyril of Alexandria, temptations greatly test the Christian because the *Holy Spirit, who has been received, grants one strength for the combat; before baptism, however, it would be impossible to resist the onslaughts of the devil (*Ad reginas*, 36). *John Chrysostom, in turn, warned the baptized Christian not to become disturbed, as if it were something unexpected, if after baptism one experienced stronger temptations. Rather than become disturbed, resist and endure everything with courage, as if it were something normal. Believers receive weapons not to remain idle but so that they may become aware of having become stronger than steel, and as confirming evidence of the treasure that they have received (baptism). The devil would not assault them if the devil had not perceived that they had been exalted by such an honor (see *Com. in Mt. hom.* 13). The author of the treatise *Opus imp. in Mt* follow the same lines: in contradistinction to the catechumen, the baptized person is more exposed to temptations because, having been withdrawn from the devil, the baptized person has become a child of God and, having been anointed as an athlete of the Spirit, the baptized person belongs now to Christ, and like him this person is thrust into the desert to fight and win (*Hom.* 5).

V. Temptation and passion. This aspect was also seen by the Fathers as referring simultaneously to Christ and the faithful. Sufficiently alluded to in the writings of Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 125,4-5) but little emphasized by Irenaeus (but see *Adv. haer.* V,23,2), and only touched on by Tertullian (*Scorp.* 15,6), the theme comes to prominence in the writings of Origen. The most vigorous text is in his comments on Jer 50:23, which was already mentioned with respect to the baptism: "In that moment [i.e., in the desert] Jesus did not crush but only broke the hammer of all the earth. But when he returned, then . . . it was not only broken but also crushed. And because the hammer of all the earth was first broken, and then crushed, for this reason he was also broken by each one of us when we are introduced into the church and we advance in the faith; he is then crushed by us when we reach perfection" (*Hom. in Jer.* 20,2). For Origen, the apex of the "perfection" is *martyrdom, the supreme proof that most esp. conforms one to the passion of Christ the Lord. The parallelism between temptation and passion, which was not often discussed in the writings of subsequent Fathers, is alluded to by Ambrose of Milan (*In Lc.* 35) and is more explicit in Augustine: "Inasmuch as he is a teacher, he desired to be tempted in all things because we have been tempted; he wished to die because we die; he wished to rise, because we will rise" (*In Ps. 60 serm.* 2; cf., *Serm.* 284). This idea returns in a virtually identical form in the writings of *Maximus of Turin and *Gregory the Great: "It was fitting that he overcome our temptations with his own temptation, just as he defeated our death with his own death" (*In Ev. hom.* 16). Last, with a personal touch, we read: "He was led into the desert by the Spirit in order to be baptized in the fire of

temptation, just as he would later have to be baptized in the fire of death" (*Op. imp. in Mt. hom.* 5).

VI. Ecclesial dimension of Jesus's temptation. The exemplary and salvific character of Jesus's temptation, already mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, constitutes the preeminent aspect of the Fathers' reflection. We must confine our examination to the chief witnesses. For Irenaeus, Christ's victory becomes the victory of each Christian. He cites in this regard Lk 10:19, a logion that would be continually repeated by the tradition in the context of the temptation (see *Adv. haer.* V,24,4). Origen offered a more vibrant portrayal of the paradigmatic and soteriological aspect of Jesus's temptation. Jesus's combat is seen by him in light of the "more authentic" combat that Christ waged in his church: "He was tempted so that even we might conquer thanks to his victory" (*Hom. in Lc.* 29,3). Athanasius gives us a valuable lesson in the *Vita Antonii:* what the Lord said and did in the third temptation he said and did for us (37,1-2); he fought *in* and *with* Anthony (5,7; 7,1; 10,2-3; 34,1; 41,5-6; 42,2; 91,3). According to *Cyril of Alexandria, the Lord subjected himself to temptation "not because fasting was necessary for him, but to set his deeds before us as a type and model, and to lay out for us the ideal of an excellent and marvelous life" (*Com. in Lc.* 4). "We have conquered in Christ. . . . Christ, by conquering, has given us the strength to conquer [*to dynasthai nikan*]" (ibid.). And again: "Christ first conquered for us, so that we might have peace after having trampled and conquered the enemy [see Lk 10:19]. It was necessary that he contend with Satan on our behalf to render us participants in his fullness. . . . Having fallen in Adam, in Christ we conquer" (*Ad reginas* 36). *Theodore of Mopsuestia famously said: "The Lord, having prevailed over the devil three times, has given us the victory he has accomplished" (*Fragm. dogm. ex libro incarn. Filii Dei* XIII). Especially rich and stimulating are *John Chrysostom's words on this topic (*Com. in Mt. hom.* 13; *Op. imp. in Mt. hom.* 5). With an original approach, *Hilary of Poitiers emphasized the true hunger of Jesus: the salvation of humankind: "He was hungry no longer for the food of human beings but for their salvation" (*Non cibum etiam hominum esuriit, sed salutem . . . esuritionem se humanae salutis habiturum*: *In Mt.* 3,2). "The Lord was hungry less for the bread than for the salvation of human beings" (*non panem potius quam salutem hominum esuriens*: *In Mt.* 3,3). With clear dependence on Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose stated: "The one who for 40 days was unable to be hungry brought me to understand that he did not at that time desire the nourishment of the body but rather the salvation of mankind" (*se non cibum esurisse corporis, sed salutem*: *In Lc.* 4,16). Maximus of Turin insisted on this same point: "For he was hungry not for the food of human beings but for salvation" (*Esuriit enim non cibum hominum sed salutem*: *Serm.* 60,4). With respect to the exemplary and salvific character, Ambrose also offers us very delightful points of reflection: "He allowed himself to be tempted by the devil so that all of us would know how to conquer in him" (*In Lc.* 4,4). "We therefore follow his footsteps so that from the desert we may return to paradise" (ibid. 4,12). "Therefore you too learn how to beat the devil. The Spirit leads you; follow the Spirit" (ibid., 4,24).

The exemplary and soteriological meaning of Jesus's temptation reaches its most theologically profound and stylistically more efficacious expression in the writings of Augustine: "He was the first to be tempted so that we too might not be conquered in temptation. Temptation was in fact not necessary for him: Christ's temptation is our lesson" (*tentatio Christi*, *nostra doctrina*: *In Ps. 90*, *serm.* 1). "If he had not conquered the tempter, how would you have learned to combat the tempter?" (ibid., *serm.* 2). But the most expressive text in this regard is in his comments on Ps 60, where the theme is centered on the category of the "whole Christ." We provide here the most significant passage: "Our life in this pilgrimage cannot be absent from tests, and our progress is achieved through temptation. No one can know himself if he is not tempted, nor can one be crowned without having conquered, nor can one conquer without waging combat; the combat presupposes an enemy, a test. . . . The Lord desired to *prefigurare* us, we who are his body, in the events of that body in which he died, arose and ascended into heaven. In this way, even the members can hope to reach where the head has preceded. He therefore possesses us as those who have been transfigured in himself when he desired to be tempted by Satan. . . . Christ was tempted by Satan, but in Christ you also were tempted. Because Christ took from you his flesh, but from himself he gives you salvation; from you, death; from himself, your life; from you, humiliation; from himself, your glory; from himself, your victory. If we have been tempted in him, it will be precisely in him that we will conquer the devil. You focus your attention on the fact that Christ was tempted: why do you not also consider the fact that he has conquered? It was you who were tempted in him, but recognize that in him you are a conqueror. He could have kept the devil far away from himself, but unless he had allowed himself to be tempted, he would not have

taught you to conquer when you are tempted" (*En. in Ps.* 60,3).

K.P. Köppen, *Die Auslegung der Versuchungsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Alten Kirche*, Tübingen 1961; M.-F. Berrouard, *Le thème de la tentation dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin*: Lumière et vie 10 (1961) 52-87; M. Steiner, *La tentation de Jésus dans l'interprétation patristique de saint Justin à Origène*, Paris 1962; F.G. Cremer, *Die Fastenansage Jesu: Mk 2,20 und Parallelen, in der Sicht der patristischen und scholastischen Exegese*, Bonn 1965; G. Leonardi, *Le tentazioni di Gesù nella interpretazione patristica*: Studia Patavina 15 (1968) 229-262; S. Raponi, *Tentazione ed esistenza cristiana. Il racconto sinottico della tentazione di Gesù alla luce della storia della salvezza nella prima letteratura patristica*, Rome 1974; Id., *Tentazione*, Diz. spirit. laici, Milan 1981, 332-333; Id., *Cristo tentato e il cristiano. La lezione dei Padri*: Studia Moralia 21 (1983) 209-236; J. Doignon, *L'Argumentatio d'Hilaire de Poitiers dans l'exemplum de la tentation de Jésus* (*"In Matthaeum," 3,1-5*): VChr 29 (1975) 296-308; J.-L. Chrétien, *Nulla tentatio omnis tentatio*: Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 60 (1980) 35-51; L. Panier, *Récit et commentaires de la Tentation de Jésus au désert: approche sémiotique du discours interprétatif*, Paris 1984; H. Crouzel, *Diable et démons dans les homélies d'Origène*: Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique 95 (1994) 303-331; J.B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*, Sheffield 1995, J. Follon, *Réflexions sur les tentations du Christ au désert comparées aux genres de vie distingués par les philosophes de l'Antiquité*: Kernos 14 (2001) 133-146.

S. Raponi

TERASIA (ca. 370–409/415). Born in Hispania to a noble and rich family around 370, she died between 409 and 415 at Nola. In ca. 389, Terasia married the young prominent Meropius Pontius *Paulinus, and together they converted to Christianity, receiving baptism that same year at Burdigala (*Bordeaux); soon after, the couple moved to Hispania. In 392 they had a son named Celsus, but he died eight days after he was born and was buried at Complutum near the tomb of the martyrs, as mentioned by Paulinus himself (*Carm.* XXXI,605-610). After the death of her son Celsus, she along with her husband moved to *Barcelona; there Paulinus was ordained a presbyter by Lampio (394). During the summer of 395 they went together to Nola near the tomb of the martyr *Felix, where they decided to live a form of monasticism by practicing conjugal continence. In 408 she participated along with her husband at the wedding ceremony of Titia and *Julian, the son of Aemilius, the bishop of Benevento, who would then become the famous bishop of Eclanum. A year later, in 409, Paulinus became the bishop of Nola, but from that point onward we do not know anything about Terasia's life. Paulinus survived his wife, dying himself in 431.

Along with Paulinus, Terasia established an epistolary relationship with the African bishops *Augustine (Hippo Regius) and *Alypius (Thagaste), showing themselves to be closely united in Christian marriage and the common search for holiness (Aug., *Ep.* 31,6), and was praised as a *sancta conserva* by *Jerome (*Ep.* 58,6.11).

Gregorius Turonensis, *Liber de gloria beatorum confessorum*, 110-111 (on pp. 107-108); PL 71, 907-910; PCBE 2, 2190-2192; J. Lienhard, *Paulinus of Nola and Early Western Monasticism*, Cologne 1977 (with bibl.); P. Courcelle, *Les lacunes de la correspondance entre saint Augustin et Paulin de Nole*: REAug 53 (1951) 253-300; H. Crouzel, *Les échanges littéraires entre Bordeaux et l'Orient au iV^e siècle: Sant Jerôme et ses amis aquitains*: Revue Française d'Histoire du Livre (1973) 301-326; J. Desmulliez, *Paulin de Nole. Études chronologiques (393-397)*: RecAug 20 (1985) 35-64; D.E. Trout, *The Dates of the Ordination of Paulinus of Bordeaux and of His Departure for Nola*: REAug 37 (1991) 237-260; F. Navarro, *La correspondencia de Paulino de Nola con África durante los años 394 y 395. Una reconstrucción*: Vichiana 1 (1999) 62-81; A. Ruggiero, *I rapporti tra Paolino di Nola e Terasia negli scritti di Paolino e nella testimonianza di Ambrogio, Agostino, Girolamo e Gregorio di Tours*: Impegno e Dialogo 15 (2002-06) 147-165.

M. Mendoza

TERRASSA (ancient Egara). The archaeological data bear witness to the presence of Christianity starting from the 4th c. The city was promoted to the status of a diocese in 450; around 465, its bishop Irenaeus was irregularly appointed successor of the bishop of *Barcelona, bringing it about that Pope *Hilarius demanded of him an immediate return to Terrassa with the threat of removing him from the episcopal cathedral. In 614 a council of the *Tarraconensis province was celebrated in the city, presided over by the metropolitan Eusebius. Twelve bishops participated and only two were represented by vicars. Its only canon confirms how much was decreed in the Council of *Huesca (598), and it extended to bishops the decrees pertaining to the lower clerics concerning chastity.

Mansilla, *Geografía* I, 154-156; Hfl-Lecl III, 1, 250; Mansi 10, 532; ES 3, 193-194; Palazzini, 2, 39; Vives, *Concilios*, 162; Martínez Díez, *Hispana* I, 119.

P. de Luis

TERTIUM GENUS. This statement was used to designate and distinguish—at the level of belief—Christians from *Jews and *pagans. 1 Pet 2:9 referred to Christians as "a chosen race" (cf. Is 43:20), "God's people," "the object of mercy" (see Hos 1:8-9; 2:1, 23-24) remaining on the terrain of fidelity, with veiled allusions to Israel's deviations. Eph 2:11-22 develops a concept that was not dissimilar with special attention to the former Gentiles, historically saved with Israel forming with them, in one church, one new man (an allusion to *Adam). The text of *Paul's epistle to the

Ephesians sets the stage for the establishment and the subsequent evolution of the concept of *tertium genus* that leads back to one evident reality "Christ, our peace" (Eph 2:14), with obvious allusion to the elimination of relgious conflict between Jews and Gentiles (Eph 2:17) and the unification of the two operative zones ideally occupied and defended by two opposing religious components, namely Jewish and pagan.

The first clear mention was made in the *Martyrdom of *Polycarp* (3,2): the crowd that awaited in the stadium for the arrival of the bishop remained stunned "before the courage of the holy and pious race [γένος] of the Christians." The term "race" should be taken in a religious sense, as well as in the *Letter to *Diognetus* I, where it is asked, "Why has this new race come to light now and not earlier?" The title of *tertium genus,* as specific to the Christians, inasmuch as they are in a situation that is different and distinct from that of the Jews and Gentiles, occurs in the *Kerygma of Peter* (fr. V) and is closely connected to the new worship of God through Christ and the new covenant. *Clement of Alexandria explains what occurs: "They have been gathered in one sole race of people, which is saved, from the Hellenistic and the legal [Jewish] *paideia. The three peoples are not divided among themselves chronologically because no one thinks of three natures, but they were educated with three different Testaments of the word of one sole Lord, because there is just one Lord" (*Strom.* VI,5). It is a distinction not at the ethnographic level but at the level of religious ideas (see *To Diognetus* V-VI). *Aristides (*Apol.* II) reports the notion and term, but the uncertainty of the textual traditions of his work (i.e., Greek, *Armenian and *Syriac) does not allow us to be precise. According to the Syriac addition of the *Apologia,* there are four types of races of human beings that are distinguished by religious themes: the barbarians through Cronos and Rhea, the Greeks through Helen, the Jews through *Abraham and the Christians through *Jesus Christ. Although the religious theme is clear for Christians and barbarians, it is not clear for Jews and Greeks. According to Aristides, Christian particularity does not isolate the faithful because Christianity is a universal religion that is immanent to the entire universe (*Apol.* XV-XVII), and Christians participate in the history of the life of the world (*To Diognetus* VI,2). *Irenaeus moved along the same lines of the *tertium genus* (with an eye set on Eph 2:11ff.) with much delicacy and elegance, recalling the salvific project, to which God awaits from the very beginning (*Epideixis* 8.34). *Tertullian was the first who used the expression *tertium genus* as an insult for the Christians, an insult that derives from the circus and as a term of exclusion of Christians from society (*Scorp.* 10; *Ad Nation.* 1,8,1). For this reason, the author of the *Letter to Diognetus* and Tertullian held to this in affirming that the Christians were everywhere. But then the expression was accepted to refer to Christians, and it acquired a positive value for indicating the Christian identity, with a new form of life, which occurred through a new birth (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 3,70,2; ps.-*Cypr., *De pasc. comp.* 17: PL 4, 962; ps.-Cypr., *De montibus* 2).

A. von Harnack, *Missione e propagazione del cristianesimo nei primi tre secoli*, Turin 1906, 31-52; C. Vona, *L'Apologia di Aristide*, Rome 1950; P. Batiffol, *La Chiesa nascente e il cattolicesimo*, Florence 1971, 87-88; Ch. Mohrmann, *"Tertium genus,"* in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, IV, Rome 1977, 195-210; DSp 13, 23-25 (*race*); H. Inglebert, *Les romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome, Histoire, christianisme et romanités en Occident dans l'Antiquité tardive (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, Paris 1996; RAC 2, 1114-1138 (esp. 1124-1125); J.M. Lieu, *The Race of God-Fearers*: JTS 46 (1995) 483-501 (also *tertium genus*); J.W. Hargis, *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*, New York 1999.

E. Peretto

TERTULLIAN

I. Life and works - II. Teaching and problems.

I. Life and works. There are few pieces of information that we have concerning the life of Tertullian. They derive from a few remarks in his writings and from *Jerome's words in the *De viris illustribus* 53 (but there are those who have doubts about several pieces of information given by Jerome; for example, Tertullian's priestly ordination). Even the dates of his birth and death remain unknown to us. One can affirm with certainty that his literary activity is to be bracketed between the last years of the 2nd c. and the first decades of the 3rd and that his early writings, which can be dated with certainty, namely the *Ad nationes* and the *Apologeticum* (AD 197), reveal a mature spirit, a master of his tools.

Tertullian was a native of *Africa, more specifically, *Carthage, and, according to the information provided by Jerome (op. cit.), he was the son of a proconsular centurion. He, therefore, lived in a geographical area in which Christianity seems to have assumed from the very beginning a special characteristic that was expressed in the spirit of autonomy and at times particularism, a spirit that had deep roots in the fidelity with which the Africans always looked on their origins and their restlessness often shown toward the dominion of *Rome. So Christianity turned out be the catalyzing agent of long-standing impatience in that land and gatherered about itself over the course of time forms of latent resistance to Roman power. It was perhaps no coin-

cidence then that Tertullian protested with a sarcastic tone against the abandonment of the ways and customs that were typically Carthaginian in favor of Roman habits (he did so in a treatise titled *De pallio* [1,2], which, on the one hand, establishes a true crux for scholars and which, on the other hand, inasmuch as it is in a certain sense an autobiographical work, well represents the enigmatic figure of the one who wrote it). Tertullian worked under the emperors *Septimius Severus (193–211) and Antoninus *Caracalla (211–217), in a period that was critical for Rome because of internal troubles and the external wars. Episodes of violence against the Christians were not lacking (we have information about the death sentences delivered in *Palestine, *Egypt and *Africa, just as, for Africa, one finds evidence in the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis*). In 202 the emperor then prohibited Jewish and Christian proselytism (but the information contained in the **Historia Augusta,* Aelius Spartianus, *Septim. Sev.* 17,1, has been regarded by some scholars as inauthentic). Those were very important years for the church, which saw the rise within its own domain figures of great importance: one thinks of Pope *Victor (189–198), Pope *Zephyrinus (199–217) and Pope *Callistus (217–222), among the bishops of Rome; or *Hippolytus of Rome, *Clement of Alexandria and Origen, among the writers in Greek.

Within these coordinates Tertullian lived his life, as was said, in such a way that it is difficult to reconstruct. He was born in the heart of a pagan family and was instructed in the schools of that age; he drew much benefit from his study, which he also subsequently nourished: his writings attest to his exceptional preparation in various fields, from history to philosophy to rhetoric and languages (in addition to Latin, he knew Greek to such an extent that he was able to compose treatises in this language). With respect to law, the identification by some scholars proposed between our author and the jurist bearing the same *cognomen,* the author of a treatise titled *Liber singularis de castrensi peculio,* fragments of which have been preserved in the *Digest,* has once again been rejected in recent years (see R. Martini, *Tertulliano giurista*, 79ff.). And scholars still debate whether the argumentation found in the *Apologeticum* is that of a jurist (see J. Gaudemet, *Le droit romain*, 15ff.) or rather that of an advocate. His passionate and lustful temperament led him as a young man to a dissolute lifestyle (see *Ad nat.* I, 10,47; *Apol.* 15,5; *De res.* 59,3); he had a wife, whom he addressed in the treatise *Ad uxorem* (1,1); at a time in which it is impossible for us to identify (before 197), he converted to Christianity, after perhaps having been drawn by the example of the *martyrs (see *Apol.* 50,15; *Ad Scap.* 5,4). In this way, one comes upon the first Christian author in the Latin language, or—as maintained by some scholars that set *Minucius Felix chronologically before him—one of the earliest, whose works are linked to a distinct personality. (It is well known, in fact, that J. Daniélou esp. [see *Les origines du christianisme latin*] proposed to identify in a series of ps.-Cyprianic treatises as an expression of an earlier *Jewish-Christian Latin literature, against which Tertullian himself reacted; thus Minucius Felix should be credited with being the first to have assimilated the Christian message to the structures and ways of thinking proper to the Latin West first, followed by Tertullian. This thesis, however, is far from being universally accepted.)

Tertullian's works are often divided according to their content into three categories: (1) apologetic, (2) doctrinal and polemical, and (3) moral and ascetic. This convenient and pedagogically clear division, however, does not actually correspond to the complex features of his literary production. The following list instead follows a chronological criterion: this allows us, among other things, to perceive the author's religious evolution, although raising difficulties where we do not find internal or external criteria that are able to chronologically situate one or the other work. This is the case with the treatise *De pallio,* the author's polemical and bitter response to those of his fellow citizens who mocked him because he had left the Roman toga to wear the mantle of the philosophers: in its brevity and obscurity, it has at one time been assigned as the first, at another as the last of Tertullian's treatises, or still at others as an intermediary work. The two most well-known apologetic works date to the year 197, the *Ad nationes* in two books and the *Apologeticum*, which were directed against the accusations of the pagans toward the new religion; in them, the defense and the illustration of the customs and the Christian teachings alternate in attacking the conduct and beliefs of the Gentiles. The dating of the *Ad martyras,* a brief but intense exhortation to his fellows to stand courageously in the face of persecution, is uncertain. It has placed at the beginning of 197 or over the course of that same year or in 202/203: in this latter case the recipients could be the martyrs known through another ancient document, namely the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis,* a text attributed at times, by the editor, to Tertullian himself (recent research, however, opposes this hypotheses on the basis of linguistic and stylistic observations [see R. Braun, *Nouvelles observations*, 105ff.]). No less problematic is the dating attributed to the *Adversus Iudaeos,* which

presents itself as the completion of an unfinished debate between a Christian and a Jewish proselyte and which sets forth the chief points of the Jewish–Christian controversy. The work, whose authenticity has been discussed for a long time, has been dated to 200 or, according to other scholars, before 197. The *De testimonio animae*, an apologetic document in which he makes recourse to the witness of the soul to demonstrate God's existence and the other truths affirmed by Christian doctrine, seems to have been composed shortly before 200. Between ca. 200 and 206 is placed a series of important moral treatises and more specifically *De spectaculis* (a condemnation of circus games, the stadium and the amphitheater, and a prohibition for Christians to participate in them); *De oratione* (on prayer and in a special way on the *Pater noster*); *De patientia* (on the importance of Christian *patientia,* for which Jesus is the example); *De paenitentia* (on first "penance," necessary for receiving baptism, and on the second penance, after the sacrament of initiation, which precedes ecclesiastical reconciliation); *De cultu feminarum* (on the dress and the ornaments of women and on the necessity for modesty); and *Ad uxorem* (a sort of spiritual testament in which he urges his wife not to remarry), written in two books. To the same period are added the three other important works: *De baptismo,* against the Cainite sect (on baptism, on its necessity, its effects, on the invalidity of the baptism administered by heretics), *De praescriptione haereticorum* (on the right of possessing and therefore interpreting the Sacred *Scriptures, a right reserved not for the heretics, but only for the church, which is its heir, through legitimate transmission, inasmuch as she has received the Scriptures from Christ through the *apostles; on the reasons why the heresies are in error; the term *praescriptio* was understood by our author in at least two ways: with a specifically legal meaning and with a rhetorical and dialectical meaning), and finally *Adversus Hermogenem* (a defense of the Christian doctrine of creation against those who, among the *gnostics, regarded matter eternal).

In the treatises composed starting from 207 we find an increasingly clear influence of *Montanism, the Phrygian religious movement that began in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. to which Tertullian wound up adhering. From 207 to 212 there followed numerous texts of a doctrinal and antignostic character: the first four books of *Adversus Marcionem* (this is a third edition of a work already previously elaborated against *Marcion and his every attempt to separate the God of the OT from the one of the NT), *Adversus Valentinianos* (an exposition and refutation of the teaching of the *Valentinian gnostics), *De anima* (with respect to the nature, origin, development and destiny of the soul, which is at the same time a refutation of heretical teachings), *De carne Christi* (on the incarnation of the Lord), *De resurrectione mortuorum* (on the second coming of Christ, the salvation of the body, which is destined to rejoin the soul, the demand for the judgment and the necessity of the resurrection), and book 5 of *Adversus Marcionem*. Within this great doctrinal undertaking, Tertullian seems to want to expound the essential points of the **regula fidei* within a framework which has in mind the difficulties and the objections of the heretics and, more generally speaking, the mentality and culture of his age. Other works composed during this season of his literary activity, which was the most intense and fruitful, have a moral and practical character and clearly reveal the Montanist tendencies of the author: this was the case for *De exhortatione castitatis* (likewise on second marriage, but with a more rigid stance), *De virginibus velandis* (with respect to the need that virgins wear the veil not only in church but in every public place), *De corona* (which treats the incompatibility between Christianity and military service) and *Scorpiace* (or the medicine against the scorpion's sting, that is, every gnostic heresy, in which the value of martyrdom is exalted but is denied to the heretics). *Ad Scapulam* is somewhat of an open letter, apologetic in nature, addressed to Scapula, the proconsul of Africa, who around 211 began to persecute the Christians. As to the dating of *De idolatria* (a treatise against every idolatrous practice and against every activity or profession that comes into contact with it), scholars are divided: although many historians believe that it was composed shortly before 212, others propose 197 or the years immediately thereafter.

The third and last period saw Tertullian by that point positioned against the Great Church on the side of the Montanists. Scholars have examined the character of African Montanism with respect to that of *Phrygia; and although some scholars have suspected some differences, others have denied them, identifying the first with the so-called Tertullianist movement (see D. Powell, *Tertullianists and Cataphrygians*, 33ff.). From 212/213 onward his corpus, therefore, includes *De fuga in persecutione* (on the inadmissibility of flight during persecution); *Adversus Praxean* (against patripassian *Praxeas, he sets forth the teaching concerning the Trinity), *De monogamia* (likewise against second marriage, with more radical and harsh theses), *De ieiunio adversus Psychicos* (this is a defense of the Montanist practice on fasting and an attack on the *psychici,* that is, the

*Catholics who had been accused of being lax) and *De pudicitia,* in which the church is denied the right of remitting sins, reserving it solely for "spiritual men," that is to say, the apostles and the prophets; he affirms that some very grave sins (idolatry, fornication and homicide) cannot be forgiven by anyone, and he is astonished at a bishop who, with respect to the last point, has expressed an opposite opinion. Tertullian's religious parabola has reached its end: the controversy that he set in motion is at its peak, so much so that many of the ideas that one reads in his last works are contradicted by the early ones.

Jerome (see *De vir. ill.* 53) suggests a reason for the African writer's entrance into the world of Montanism that is difficult to verify: the *invidia* and the *contumeliae* that the Roman clergy directed toward him in a disagreement the details of which we know nothing about and which, even if it did occur, we can suppose pertained to disciplinary questions; neither should we forget in this respect the resentment that Jerome had toward the Roman clergy. In all likelihood, external circumstances and interior correspondences led Tertullian to adhere to the Montanist movement, allowing him to develop to their extreme consequences an ideal of a rigid life, that is, a life without compromise toward which he always had a strong propensity; this facet was certainly favored by Tertullian's understanding of the moral life: his ascetic and rigorist spirit was permeated by notions of justice, retribution, fear, as well as hope, but it was not always sufficiently inspired by love. In this sense, Montanism only accelerated a process that had begun much earlier, a process that had emerged from his deep personal experience as a human being.

With *De pudicitia,* one of his last works (217–222), all trace of Tertullian is lost. *Cyprian bishop of *Carthage (d. 258) knew of his works but does not mention him by name. Jerome, covering himself behind a prudent "it is said," reports that Tertullian lived to an old age. Finally, *Augustine (*De haeres.* 86) affirms that Tertullian quickly fell into conflict with the Montanists and gave birth to his own *conventiculae* that existed at Carthage during his own time; indeed, Augustine's work contributed toward reconciling them with the church.

Among the lost works, one could mention *De spe fidelium, De paradiso, Adversus Apelleiacos* (against the followers of *Apelles, a disciple of *Marcion), *De censu animae* (on the soul's origin against Hermogenes), *De fato, Ad amicum philosophum* (on the difficulties of married life), and *De ecstasi,* in seven books (in defense of Montanism, against the church and the Asiatic bishop *Apollonius). The following titles are among the inauthentic writings that have been attributed to him by the tradition: *Adversus omnes haereses, De execrandis gentium diis,* the poem in five books titled **Carmen adversus Marcionem, Carmen ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum et de iudicio Domini*, and other minor works.

II. Teaching and problems. Tertullian's surviving works are so numerous that it would seem sufficient to give the man and the writer himself a definite interpretation, but this is not the case. The complexity of his texts accompany the enigma of his personal life, when, after having delineated individual treatises with patience, scholars try to understand them in their totality. There is no question about Tertullian's historical importance for understanding the time in which he lived, just as there is no question that he made a very noteworthy contribution to the formation of Western Christian theological teaching. With respect to the articles of the *regula fidei,* formulated many times (see *De praescr. haer.* 13,1-6; *De virg. vel.* 1,3; *Adv. Prax.* 2,1), one perceives his most relevant doctrinal importance begins with his trinitarian theology. He was the first to speak of the *trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus* (*De pud.* 21,16); he was the first to use the Latin term *persona* in a theological sense: *persona . . . quia iam adhaerebat illi Filius secunda persona, sermo ipsius et tertia, Spiritus in sermone, ideo pluraliter pronuntiavit "faciamus" et "nostram" et "nobis"; alium quomodo accipere debeas iam professus sum, personae, non substantiae nomine, ad distinctionem, non ad divisionem, Adv. Prax.* 12,3 and 6). He was the first to elaborate the formula of the dogma: one sole substance in three persons, even if it carries with it a certain subordinationist influence. With respect to *Christology, to him is owed the affirmation of two "substances" in one sole person: *Videmus duplicem statum, non confusum sed coniunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Iesum—de Christo autem differo—et adeo salva est utriusque proprietas substantiae* (*Adv. Prax.* 27,11).

These and many other expressions are of great interest which, however, in order to be fully understood, must be on the one hand inserted in the context of the works that belong to him and, on the other, considered in light of a historically rigorous terminological study (see R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum*, 141ff.). In this way, one can perceive the birth of a systematic theological reflection in a particular work on the early Christian teaching on the Trinity on the pages pertaining to Tertullian (see J. Moingt, *Théologie Trinitaire*, I, 8ff.), without for this reason having to believe that Tertullian

was the founder of Western theology, given the fact that his thought borrowed from more than one source, which he also developed and articulated with an even greater synthesis. An analogous discussion can be had for the conception that he gave of the church, which is called "mother" throughout the entire course of his work, even during the Montanist period (see *Ad mart.* 1,1; *De orat.* 2,6; *Bapt.* 20,5: *De pud.* 5,14, etc.). For different aspects of this it is noteworthy to follow the way in which the idea of the church, at first along the lines of the preceding tradition, of which Irenaeus was also an interpreter, reflects, in the last period, the perspective of Montanism. However, it is interesting to point out the character of his eschatological teaching that was marked, in a special way in some of his treatises, by a clear opposition to gnostic interpretations (one thinks of the defense of the material element of the human being, the reasons used to prove the resurrection of the flesh etc.), which required him to develop an anthropology established on the account given in the book of Genesis. On other points, the content of his documents also appears relevant to understand trends in the Christian communities of that time: on the Eucharist, Roman primacy, traducianism, penance, *Mary's virginity, which—in order to oppose *Docetism—he denied *in partu* and *post partum,* according to H. Koch, *Virgo Eva;* but more recent studies (E. dal Covolo, *Riferimenti mariologici*, 121ff.) have emphasized the necessity of understanding that his ideas about this topic were more nuanced. Tertullian is, therefore, an originator and a witness to a milieu and an epoch; and much is known about his life and thought; nevertheless, scholarship, which in recent decades has dedicated to him an impressive number of studies, is far from unanimous in delineating his personality. If one could overlap, like photographic negatives, the different portraits that scholars have made of the African writer, one would only see a few clear common features, with respect to many others that do not coincide, so that in the end it would be difficult to easily identify the subject (see J.-C. Fredouille, *Tertullien*, 17).

One can usefully identify at least three areas around which the most lively discussions in recent decades have taken place. The first concerns Tertullian's attitude toward the *res publica* and pagan society. It has often been affirmed that he is one of the most rigid and inflexible representatives of the position that considers Christianity irreconcilable with the *saeculum* (Ch. Guignebert: other names could easily be added to those mentioned here, which are given solely as an example); it has been said that he maintained the separation of Christians from the *romanitas,* because between the believer and those who surround him there can be no bond of solidarity (Ch.N. Cochrane); consequently, some scholars have perceived in his character a revolutionary mindset established on apocalyptic hopes, which was dominated by the exaltation of martyrdom, such that it made him desire the overthrow of the society of that time (W.H.C. Frend). A far more nuanced position is held by other scholars (J.M. Hornus, W. Rordorf), which nevertheless is denied by others, on the basis of a contrary thesis, namely that Tertullian is a representative of a line of thought aimed at preparing the harmonious understanding between Christianity and Roman *civitas* (R. Klein).

Another area that has provided material for much debate pertains to the author's attitude toward ancient philosophy and reason itself. Some scholars have maintained that he radically opposed philosophy and that his antiphilosophism was the source of his most famous formulas when it developed into an antirationalism that rejected philosophy per se and not merely certain systems or certain philosophers of his time. In short, he exhibited a substantial mistrust that appears in the opposition between the irrational truth of the gospel and the rational "truths" discovered by the human mind (C.G. Jung, A. Labhardt). Others have reached differnet conclusions. Departing from the passages called on in support of his antirationalism (see, e.g., *De carn. Chr.* 5,4; *De praescr. haer.* 7,9), the problem is reframed by making reference to other pieces of information that seem essential for his understanding, esp. in a historical literary perspective (Decarié, Siniscalco, Ayers and Sider). In fact, on the one hand, it permits a better understanding of Tertullian's confrontation with heretics and pagan philosophers, inasmuch as they professed theories that contributed to the elaboration of heretical speculations, and, on the other hand, it avoids ignoring the antiphilosophical tradition that was much earlier than his (see J.-C. Fredouille: REAug 26 [1980] 327). This makes it possible to explain Tertullian's arguments against philosophy (see J.-C. Fredouille, *Tertullien*, 337ff.) while at the same time not being surprised by his use of philosophical concepts to construct his theology (R. Braun, J. Moingt).

A third area, finally, namely the linguistic and literary sphere, has proven to be the most fruitful in terms of results and the most suitable in supplying useful interpretive keys (including the writer's attitude toward philosophy and reason). Alongside the original elements—present in large number in his

work—the strength of the literary tradition has put in evidence not only his use of the *virtutes dicendi* or taste imposed by the Second Sophistic movement, but also in the elaboration of the structure of his writings, his search for argumentative tools that were proper to the philosophical logic that was dear to the ancients. In particular, the study of his work, in light of *rhetoric (with respect to *elocutio* and, esp., the *dispositio* and the *inventio* in a speech), has contributed to better individuating the various rhetorical features of Tertullian's writing (P. Siniscalco, *Ricerche*, 77ff.; R.D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric*; J.-C. Fredouille, *Tertullien*, 29ff.). A separate chapter of great interest and use is established by the language employed by Tertullian, who is no longer considered the creator of Christian *Latin but rather the creator of theological Latin inasmuch as it was a structured language (see R. Braun, *Deus christianorum*, 10ff.; 687-688; Puente Sandidrián, 106ff.).

In the past two decades research on Tertullian has continued to multiply. To deal with it in general and necessarily approximate terms, one could say that the aforementioned topics have remained at the center of interest: if , however, the theme of the relationship between faith and reason, and more generally that of Tertullian and ancient culture, enjoys less attention (but see J.-C. Fredouille, 1982; F.-R. Doumas, 1995; A. Dihle, 1995; E. Osborn, 1997, C. Moreschini, 1999), the same cannot be said with respect to Tertullian and his position toward the empire. Scholars have continued to devote their attention to this topic (J.-C. Fredouille, 1984; R. Braun, 1990; A.Z. Ahondopke, 1991-92), broadening at times their look at the society of that time (G. Schöllgen, 1984), pagan religion (E. Heck, 1987), culture (H. Steiner, 1989) and military service (H.C. Brennecke, 1997, etc.). Moreover, a considerable number of studies have considered the linguistic, rhetorical, exegetical and literary sphere pertaining to Tertullian's works (J.-C. Fredouille, 1984 and 1992; P.A. Gramaglia, 1985; P. Puente Santidrián, 1987; P. Siniscalco, 1987; Ch. Munier, 1989; P. Raiskila, 1990; C.J. Classen, 1992; M.-L. Costantini, 1994; J.C.M. Van Winden, 1995; D. Rankin, 1995; R. Uglione, 1995; M. Kooreman, 1995; V. Ugenti, 1995; F. Chapot, 1996; R. Braun, 1997; H. Quellet, 1997; I. Cadoppi, 1996; M. Wellstein, 1999, etc.). Aside from the general presentations of Tertullian—one need only recall the volume written by T.D. Barnes, 1985—we must emphasize just two other types of contribution that have proven to be fruitful: the first pertains to the doctrines delineated by Tertullian's very extensive and complex work (B.J. Hilberath, 1986, on the concept of "person"; A. Viciano, 1986, P. Mattei, 1986, on divorce; C. Tibiletti, 1988, on the soul's lot after death; E. Lamirande, 1989, on marriage; P. Siniscalco, 1992 and 2000, on eschatology; G. Hébert, 1993, on his history of theology; D. Rankin, 1995, on the church; E. Osborn, 1995, on the *concordia oppositorum* in Tertullian's theology; G. Uríbarri Bilbao, 1996, on the divine "monarchy" and the Trinity pp. 141-227; C. Moreschini, 1997; E. Rossin, 1997, on the salvation of the "flesh"; P. Mattei, 2000, on ecclesiology; R. Kearsley, 1998, on God's power; J. Alexandre, 2001 and J. Leal, 2001, on anthropology; P. Mattei, 2001, on the conception of the human being as the "image" of God; W. Bähnk, 2001, on the theology of martyrdom, etc.).

The second type of research, among others, that for reasons of space can barely be mentioned here, pertains to Tertullian's individual works: in the last 20 years their number has become truly daunting: these are editions of his works that are most often supplied with introductions, critical text, commentary and translation in modern languages; or annotated translations with an introduction; or studies of individual works or articles on textual scholarship; or notes on individual passages. In the bibliography that follows, some of these publications have been listed. From the entirety of the recent bibliography there emerge, therefore, certain data of noteworthy importance on Tertullian's personality, alongside other more nuanced and ambivalent points. In any case, he enjoys a place of noteworthy importance in the history of the world, which by his lifetime was on the cusp of *Late Antiquity. His debt toward earlier pagan and Christian authors is clear (and among these latter it is opportune to mention esp. *Irenaeus); nevertheless, he was original and highly personal, as shown by his attempt to harmonize not only pagan culture with respect to certain elements in it (e.g., philosophical, legal, rhetorical, linguistic etc.) with the Christian faith, but also to reach new results, even if at times they were imperfect and unsatisfying. For a long time now, on the basis of an established analysis of the texts, it is no longer possible to accept the image of Tertullian that often occurs in modern manuals, namely that he was a man and writer bent on demonstrating the irreconcilability between Christianity and the pagan world. His person and his writings, one could say, are more coherent and, at any rate, more complex than previously thought.

For an update on Tertullian, the *Chronica Tertullianea* (*et Cyprianea*), which is published each year by the REAug, has proven and continues to prove useful, not only for the bibliographic entries but also for the notes and assessments for each title. In this

respect, one should note that in 1999 a volume of more than 640 pages was released that collected the *Chronica Tertullianea et Cyprianea* from 1975, the year of its beginning, to 1994. The subtitle of the volume—published at Paris by the Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, by R. Braun - F. Chapot - S. Deléani - F. Dolbeau - J.-C. Fredouille—well reflects its contents: *Bibliographie critique de la première littérature latine chrétienne*. It presents, along with supplements of the publications, a selection of reviews (limited to the editions, translations and commentaries on the works) and "tables" (indexes of modern authors, names, words, subject matter etc.), which turn out to be very valuable if not indispensable for those who study Tertullian's life and works and, in a broader sense, for historians of early Latin literature and Late Antiquity.

CPL 1-36; PL 1-2; PLS 1, 29-32; CSEL 20, 47, 69, 70, 76; CCL 1-2; G. Claesson, *Index Tertullianeus*, 3 vols., Paris 1974-75. Given the breadth of numerous editions, commentaries, translations and modern languages of each individual work and critical studies, this entry has set limits by providing information that pertains to the tools that collect important information with respect to the aforementioned topics, although adding some information with special regard for the publications that appeared after the first edition of this encyclopedia (i.e., 1984). See *Bibliographia selecta*, in CCL 1, pp. XII-XIV (up to 1954); the *Index bibliographicus*, in R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum*, 2nd ed. , 596-598 (up to 1976). As was said above, since 1975 the REAug has annually published a nearly exhaustive bibliographic review, one section of which is dedicated to the editions and another to the translations. A useful index, which allows one to track down with ease the critical editions, translations and discussions on specific texts, concordances etc., is found in the aforementioned *Chronica Tertullianea et Cyprianea. Bibliographie critique de la première littérature latine chrétienne*, that collects titles from 1975 to 1994, pp. 621-627, s.v. *Tertullien.* Numerous general references to editions, translations and studies in BBKL 11, 700-720.

Critical editions of some particular works (which in the majority of cases have been translated into modern languages, commented on and prefaced with introductions): *Ad Martyras*: A. Quacquarelli, Rome-Parigi-Tournai-New York 1963; *Ad nationes*: J. Borleffs, Leiden 1929; A. Schneider (I), Inst. Suisse de Rome 1968; *Ad uxorem*: Ch. Munier, SC 273, Paris 1980; *Adv. Herm.*: F. Chapot, SC 439, Paris 1999; *Adv. Iudaeos*: H. Tränkle, Wiesbaden 1964; *Adv. Marcionem*: C. Moreschini, Milan 1971; books I and II: R. Braun, SC 365 (book I), SC 368 (book II), Paris 1991; R. Braun, SC 399 (book III); R. Braun, SC 456 (book IV), Paris 2000; *De baptismo*: B. Luiselli, Turin ²1968; R.-F. Refoulé - M. Drouzy, SC 35, repr. Paris 2002; *Adv. Praxean*: G. Scarpat, Turin 1985; *Adv. Valentinianos*: J.-C. Fredouille, SC 280, (vol. I), Paris 1980; vol. II, Paris 1981; *Apologeticum*: J.P. Waltzing, Paris 1929; J. Martin, Bonn 1933; *De anima*: J.H. Waszing, Amsterdam 1947; *De carne Christi*: J.-P. Mahé, SC 216 and 217, Paris 1975; *De corona*: G. Marra, Turin ²1951; J. Fontaine, Paris 1966; F. Ruggiero, Milan 1992; *De cultu foem.*: G. Marra, Turin ²1951; M. Turcan, SC 173, Paris 1971; S. Isetta, Florence 1986; *De exhort. castitatis*: C. Moreschini - J.-C. Fredouille, SC 319, Paris 1985; *De idololatria*: J.C.M. van Winden, Leiden 1987; *De monogamia*: P. Mattei, SC 343, Paris 1988; *De oratione*: G.F. Diercks, Bussum 1947; *De paenitentia*: G. Rauschen, Bonn 1915; Ch. Munier, SC 316, Paris 1984; *De pallio*: G. Marra, Turin 1932; A. Gerlo, Wetteren 1940; S. Costanza, Naples 1968; *De patientia*: J.-C. Fredouille, SC 310, Paris 1984; *De paenitentia*: E. Preuschen, Tübingen ²1910; G. Rauschen, Bonn 1915; Ch. Munier, SC 316, Paris 1984; *De praescriptione haeretic.*: J. Martin, Bonn 1930; R.-F. Refoulé - P. de Labriolle, SC 46, Paris 1957; *De pudicitia*: E. Preuschen, Tübingen ²1910; G. Rauschen, Bonn 1915; C. Micaelli - Ch. Munier, SC 394-395, Paris 1993; *De spectaculis*: E. Castorina, Florence 1961; *De testimonio animae*: C. Tibiletti, Florence 1984; *De virginibus velandis*: P. Mattei - E. Schulz Flügel, SC 424, Paris 1997; *Scorpiace*: G. Azzali Bernardelli, Florence 1990.

The critical biography is extensive: in addition to CCL 1, pp. XV-XXV and R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum*, 599-623, 726-732, see J. Quasten, *Patrologia*, Turin 1967, 494ff.; B. Altaner - A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*, Freiburg i. Br. 81978, 118ff. and 149-150. Here it will be sufficient to mention a few of them, referring, even if not exclusively, to the portion of works used in the editing of this entry: C. Guignebert, *T. Études sur les sentiments à l'égard de l'Empire et de la société civile*, Paris 1901; P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, t. I, Paris 1901; A. D'Alès, *La théologie de T.*, Paris 1905; C.G. Jung, *Psychologische Typen*, Zürich 1921; R. Roberts, *The Theology of T.*, London 1924; J. Lortz, *T. als Apologet*, 2 vols., Münster 1927; J. Morgan, *The Importance of T. in the Development of Christian Dogma*, London 1928; C.L. Shortt, *The Influence of Philosophy on the Mind of T.*, London 1933; Ch.N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, New York 1940; A. Labhardt, *T. et la philosophie ou la recherche d'une "position pure"*: MH 7 (1950) 159-180; B. Nisters, *T. Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Schicksal*, Münster 1950; F. Refoulé, *T. et la philosophie*: RSR 30 (1956) 42-45; H. Finé, *Die Terminologie der Jenseitsvorstellungen*, Bonn 1958; J.M. Hornus, *Évangile et Labarum. Étude sur l'aptitude du christianisme primitif devant les problèmes de l'État, de la guerre et de la violence*, Geneva 1960 (rev. Eng. ed. , Scottdale, PA-Kitchener [Ontario] 1980); P. Siniscalco, *Il motivo razionale della resurrezione in due passi di T.* (*Apol. 48,4*; *De res. 14,3 ss.*): AAT 95 (1960–61) 195-221; V. Decarié, *Le paradoxe de T.*: VChr 15 (1961) 23-31; W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, Oxford 1965; J. Moingt, *Théologie Trinitaire de T. Histoire*, *Doctrine*, *Méthodes*, 4 vols., Paris 1966-69; P. Siniscalco, *Ricerche sul "De resurrectione" di T.*, Rome 1966; R. Klein, *T. und das römische Reich*, Heidelberg 1968; W. Rordorf, *T.s Beurteilung des Soldatenstandes*: VChr 23 (1969) 105-141; T.D. Barnes, *T. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1971; R.D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of T.*, Oxford 1971; R. Martini, *T. giurista e T. padre della Chiesa*: SDHI 41 (1975) 79-124; J.C. Fredouille, *T. et la conversion de la culture antique*, Paris 1972; D. Powell, *Tertullianists and Cataphrygians*: VChr 29 (1975) 33-54; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de T.*, Paris ²1977; J. Daniélou, *Les origines du christianisme latin*, Paris 1978; J. Gaudemet, *Le droit romain dans la littérature chrétienne occidentale du IIIᵉ au Vᵉ siècle*, Milan 1978, 15ff.; R.H. Ayers, *Language, Logic and Reason in the Church Fathers*: *A Study of T.*, *Augustine and Aquinas*, Hildesheim-New York 1979; R. Braun, *Nouvelles observations sur le rédacteur de la "Passio Perpetuae"*: VChr 33 (1979) 105-117; P. Puente Santidrián, *T. y el latín cristiano. Revisión de las diversas posiciones*: Durius 6 (1978) 93-115; R.D. Sider, *Credo quia absurdum?*: Class. World 73 (1980) 417-419; S. Vicastillo, *T. y la muerte del hombre*, Madrid 1980; J.-C. Fredouille, *Tertullien et la culture antique*, in *Mélanges E. Gareau*, Ottawa 1982; Q. Quispel, *African Christianity before Minucius Felix and T.*, in

Studies in honour of H.L.W. Nelson, Talen 1982, 257-335; J.-C. Fredouille, *Argumentation et rhétorique dans le 'De corona' de T.*: MH 41 (1984) 96-116; Id., *T. et l'Empire*: RecAug 19 (1984) 111-131; G. Schöllgen, *Ecclesia sordida. Zur Frage der sozialen Schichtung frühchristlicher Gemeinden am Beipsiel Karthagos zur Zeit T.s* (JbAC, Ergänzungsb., 12), Münster 1984; T.D. Barnes, *T. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1985; P.A. Gramaglia, *Il linguaggio eresiologico in T. L'approccio cattolico all'eresia*: Augustinianum 25 (1985) 667-710; B.J. Hilberath, *Der Personbegriff der Trinitätstheologie in Rückfrage von Karl Rahner zu T.s 'Adversus Praxean,'* Innsbruck-Vienna 1986; A. Viciano, *Cristo Salvador y Liberator del hombre. Estudio sobre la soteriología de T.*, Pamplona 1986; P. Mattei, *Le divorce chez T. Examen de la question à la lumière des développements que le 'De monogamia' consacre à ce sujet*: RSR 60 (1986) 208-234; P. Puente Santidrián, *La terminología de la resurrección en T. con un excursus comparativo de esta con la correspondente en Minucio Felix*, Burgos 1987; P. Siniscalco, *Appunti sulla terminologia esegetica di T.*, in *La terminologia esegetica nell'antichità*, Bari 1987, 103-122; P. Petitmengin, *Recherches sur le citations d'Isaïe chez T.*, in *Recherches sur l'histoire de la Bible latine*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1987, 21-41; C. Tibiletti, *Le anime dopo la morte: stato intermedio o visione di Dio?* (*dalla patristica al sec. XIV*): Augustinianum 28 (1988) 631-659; E. Lamirande, *T. et le marriage. Quand un moraliste s'adresse à son épouse*: Église et Théologie 20 (1989) 47-75; H. Steiner, *Das Verhältnis T.s zur antiken Paideia*, St. Ottilien 1989; P. Raiskila, *Periphrastic Use of 'habere' in T.*, in *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif.* II. Actes du II[e] Colloque int. sur le latin vulgaire e tardif, Tübingen 1990, 209-217; R. Braun, *Christianisme et pouvoir impérial d'après T. - Aspects de l'oeuvre de T.*, Toulouse 1990 (now in R. Braun, *Approches de T. Vingt-six études sur l'auteur et l'oeuvre [1955-1990]*, Paris 1992); A.Z. Ahondopke, *La vision de Rome chez T.*, (thèse de doctorat), Besançon 1991-92; J.-C. Fredouille, *Langue philosophique et théologie d'expression latine* (*II[e]-III[e] siècle*), in *La langue latine, langue de philosophie*, École française de Rome, Rome 1992, 187-199; C.J. Classen, *Der Stil T.s. Beobachtungen zum 'Apologeticum'*: Voces 3 (1992) 93-107; P. Siniscalco, *Argomentazioni escatologiche e pubblico in alcune opere di T.*, in *De T. aux Mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine*, t. I, Paris 1992, 393-402; G. Hébert, *T. une philosophie de l'histoire*, in *Penser la foi. Recherches en théologie aujourd'hui. Mélanges offerts à Joseph Moingt*, Paris 1993, 413-423; M.-L. Costantini, *Le terme 'caro' dans le 'De carne Christi' de T. Essai d'interprétation structuraliste et intersubjective*, in *Nomina rerum. Hommage à Jacqueline Manessy-Guitton*, Nice 1994, 133-150; J.C.M. Winden, *The Adverbial Use of 'cum maxime' in T.*: VChr 49 (1995) 209-214; D. Rankin, *T.'s Use of the Word 'potestas'*: JRH 19 (1995) 1-9; R. Uglione, *Gli 'hapax' tertullianei di matrice fonica*: BBStudLat 25 (1995) 529-541; V. Ugenti, *Norme prosodiche delle clausole metriche nel 'De idololatria' di T.*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 241-258; F.-R. Doumas, *Les attitudes de T. devant la philosophie et les philosophes. Études chronologiques*, Lyon 1995; D. Rankin, *T. and the Church*, Cambridge 1995; A. Dihle, *T.s Lehre vom zweifachen Willen Gottes*, in *Panchaia. FS f. Klaus Thraedde*, Münster (Westf.) 1995, 61-65; E. Osborn, *The Conflict of Opposites in the Theology of T.*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 623-639; F. Chapot, *La préverbation en 'prae' chez T.*: RechAug 29 (1996) 75-89; G. Uríbarri Bilbao, *Monarquía y Trinidad. El concepto teológico 'monarchia' en la controversia 'monarchiana,'* Madrid 1996; E. Osborn, *T., First Theologian of the West*, Cambridge 1997; D. Rankin, *Was T. a Jurist?*: SP 31 (1997) 335-342; H.C. Brennecke, *'An fidelis ad militiam converti possit?'* (*T., 'De idololatria' 19, 1*). *Frühchristliche Bekenntnis und Militärdienst im Wiederspruch?*, in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der alte Kirche. FS f. U. Wickert*, Berlin 1997, 45-100; C. Moreschini, *T. e la salvezza della carne*, in *Liturgia e incarnazione*, ed. A.N. Terrin, Padova 1997, 93-111; E. Rossin, *'Caro cardo salutis'. Una promessa di salvezza a partire dalla 'carne' di T.*, in *Liturgia e incarnazione*, cit., 113-164; R. Kearsley, *T.'s Theology of the Divine Power*, Carlisle-Edinburgh 1998; M. Wellstein, *Nova verba in T.s Schriften gegen Häretiker aus montanistischer Zeit*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999; P. Mattei, *L'ecclésiologie de T. Bilan provisoire*, in *Anthropos laikos. Mélanges A. Faivre*, ed. M.A. Vanner - O. Wermelinger - G. Wurst, Fribourg (CH) 2000, 162-178; P. Siniscalco, *L'escatologia in T. tra rivelazione scritturale e dati razionali, 'psicologici,' naturali*: Annali di storia dell'esegesi 17/1 (2000) 73-89; J. Alexandre, *Une chair pour la gloire, L'anthropologie réaliste e mystique de T.*, Paris 2001; J. Leal, *La antropología de T. Estudio de los tratados polémicos de los años 207–212 d.C.*, Rome 2001; P. Mattei, *'Angelus ad imaginem'? L'anthropologie de T.: vue d'ensemble et nouveaux aperçus par le biais de son angélologie* (*avec une note sur Novatien*): Augustinianum 41 (2001) 291-327; W. Bähnk, *Von der Notwendigkeit des Leidens. Die Theologie des Martyriums bei T.*, Göttingen 2001; G. Dunn, *T.*, London 2004.

P. Siniscalco

TERTULLIANISTS. The idea that the Tertullianists were simply African *Montanists has been criticized by T.D. Barnes. The information that we have about *Tertullian's followers is limited to a few words in two treatises: *Augustine's *De haeresibus* (428–429) and the *Praedestinatus,* a work that is difficult to date and whose author is difficult to identify (it was probably written around 435 by *Arnobius).

Augustine tells us that Tertullian had doctrinal successors whose enthusiasm had waned slowly over time, and that a few had remained at *Carthage. They reentered the mainstream church, even handing over their basilica. The chief characteristic of their teaching was the corporality of the soul, which was also reflected in their corporeal conception of God. They understood the corporality of the soul as its existence. Augustine affirms that that teaching did not necessarily mean that they had on that point fallen into heresy. It was, instead, a step toward the sect of the *Cataphrygas,* united to an attitude hostile toward second marriage. They subsequently separated also from this group and began their own gatherings (*conventicula*). According to this testimony, Tertullian had also stated that the souls of wicked human beings change into demons after death, although in Tertullian's extant works, one does not find this claim.

The *Praedestinatus,* in turn, informs us that the Tertullianists were condemned by Pope *Soter (166 and 174) and also tells the story of a certain *Octaviana,* who had acted together with a Tertullianist presbyter who affirmed that the saints Processus and Martinianus were also *Phryges.* Under the emperor *Theodosius (379–395), this presbyter fled, and no

one ever heard anything about him after. According to this document, the entrance of the Tertullianists into the Catholic Church was owed to Augustine's credit.

The close analysis done by Powell completes the framework of the Tertullianists. They had prayer meetings outside, adding such things to the usual ceremonies of the church because they did not constitute (at least when Tertullian was alive) a schismatic group but an *ecclesiola in Ecclesia*. In fact, the Tertullianists' differences with the Montanists are very apparent: they neither rejected the *Eucharist nor did they remain separate from Catholics in the assemblies. *Cyprian would not have been able to consider Tertullian his teacher (according to *Jerome's testimony) if he or the Tertullianists were notoriously schismatic. For the same reason we do not have evidence of the moment at which the Tertullianists became a schismatic movement, as they had become by the time of Augustine. They were initially associated with the new prophecy because the name of *Montanism arose only in the 4th c., and, along with the terminological aspect, one must emphasize that the development of the new prophecy in Montanism was only a geographical phenomenon, which caused it to evolve into the *Cataphrygian sect. Its condemnation did not have a bearing on the Tertullianists, who remained circumscribed to the West. Labriolle correctly affirmed that the Tertullianists wanted to be distinguished from the Cataphrygian sect, and Massingberd-Ford observed that Tertullian's Montanism was different from the new prophecy. If the Tertullianists initially remained within the Catholic Church, they certainly did so by remaining moderate in their disposition, seeking to revitalize the church from within.

Augustine, *De Haeresibus* LXXXVI; Arnobius, *Praedestinatus*, I.86; P. De Labriolle, *La Crise Montaniste*, Fribourg-Paris 1913; J. Massingberd-Ford, *Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?:* Journal of Ecclesiastical History 17 (1966) 145-158; T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1971; D. Powell, *Tertullianists and Cataphrygians*: VChr 29 (1975) 33-54.

J. Leal

TESTAMENTS of the TWELVE PATRIARCHS. *Jewish-Christian apocryphal text. The *Testaments* constitutes one of the most interesting Jewish works of *Late Antiquity. It was written on the inspiration of Jacob's blessing (Gen 49:1-27); the text's message is directed toward all the people. It consists of the testaments of the 12 sons of Jacob: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Zebulon, Issachar, Dan, Gad, Asher, Naphtali, Joseph and Benjamin. The work contains 12 units composed according to the same schema: the autobiography of a patriarch (hagiographic midrash), then a parenesis based on the elements of the preceding autobiography with an exhortation to faithfulness to the law of the Lord and preparation for difficult times, and, lastly, an eschatological-messianic or historical emphasis. The pivotal *Testament* is that of Joseph, although that of Levi is the most important (thus emphasizing the role of his line); that of Benjamin finishes the collection. The text contains interesting pieces of information on morality (love for God and neighbor) and Jewish messianism. It is difficult to identify the location of this work's composition. The text was probably composed in a Hebrew milieu, but there also exists *The Testament of Judah* and that of *Naphtali* in late Hebrew in a different version; moreover, there exist fragments in Aramean of *The Testament of Levi,* which were discovered at *Qumran and Cairo Genizah (i.e., storage-depository room in a Jewish synagogue or cemetery) and the other patriarchs discovered at Qumran, but these also come from a different version. The entire work exists in two versions, *Greek and *Armenian; moreover, there also exist *Syriac and *Paleoslavonic versions. The work was probably written in the 2nd c. BC, then redacted in the 1st c. and finally Christianized in the 2nd c. AD perhaps in Palestine. Another hypothesis suggests that it had an Alexandrian or Syrian provenance. The text was known to Christian authors but was rarely cited (e.g., *Irenaeus, *Origen and *Jerome); it is cited in the lists of apocryphal books: Nicephorus's *Stichometria* (13th c.), ps.-Athanasius *Synopsis* and by other authors; in the 13th c. it was translated into Latin by Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253).

Alongside the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* there exist many other testaments ascribed to single individuals (e.g., *Abraham, Isaac, *James, *Job, *Moses, *Solomon, *Adam, Qehat and Amran); this phenomenon reveals the existence of the literary genre of the "testaments," which was popular in the Jewish world of this era.

CAVT 118; BHG 2358-2360. Greek text: M. de Jonge, Leiden 1978; ed. of the Armenian text begun by M.E. Stone (*Testament of Levi*, Jerusalem 1969); ed. of the Slavonic texts in the collection of the apocrypha made by the following scholars: N.S. Tichonravov, N.A. Pypin, I. Franko, I.Y. Porfir'ev, J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*, Leiden 1970; H.D. Singerland, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Missoula, MT 1977; M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints*: ANRW II, 20/1 (1987) 359-420 (*status quaestionis*); Denis, 1, 227-289. *Translations:* It.: P. Sacchi, 1, 725-948 (intr., bibl.); Fr.: M. Philonenko, in A. Dupont-Somer - M. Philonenko, *La Bible, Écrits intertestamentaires*, Paris 1987, 813-944; Span.: A.

Piñero, in A. Díez Macho, *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, 5, Madrid 1987, 9-158; R.M. Boixareu i Viplana, *El gènre literari dels Testaments dels Dotze Patriarques*, Barcelona 1999; M. de Jonge, TRE 33 (2002) 107-113 (along with other *Testaments*); Id., *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, Leiden-Boston 2003.

M. Starowieyski

TESTAMENTUM DOMINI (Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ). Various works bear this title. The most well known is a liturgical-canonical treatise preserved in *Syriac. In 1853, Lagarde published fragments of a Syriac translation of the *Testament,* and then in 1893 James released two *Latin fragments of the apocalyptic portion, but only in 1899 was it published in its entirety by Rahmani from a MS of the Metropolitan Library of the Syriac Catholics of Mossul and translated into Latin. The primitive text, now lost, was written in Greek and edited in *Syria. (Scholars surmise that it was written in the mid-5th c. because it was cited by *Severus of Antioch.) It presents itself as a text written by the *apostles, reporting a conversation that *Jesus had with them after the resurrection. One finds the following elements in this text: (1) a description of the precursory signs of the coming of the *Antichrist (it must have circulated as an independent text); (2) a few rules for the construction of church buildings; and (3) some norms concerning ordination and the duties of clerics, the *Eucharist, *baptism and the Christian life. This third section has as its foundation the **Apostolic Tradition* (as one reads in the Latin, *Coptic, *Arabic and *Ethiopian collections), but the prayers there are considerably developed, while other prayers and rites are included. Some of the *Testament*'s prayers are still used in the Syriac Pontifical. The same treatise exists in an Arabic and Ethiopian version. Another *Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ,* in Ethiopian, which was published by H. Geurrier and S. Greébaut in the PO IX,2, has nothing to do with the preceding text and is less interesting. Fragments of the *Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ* were identified in 1992.

CPG 1743; P.A. de Lagarde, *Reliquiae iuris ecclesiastici antiquissimae. Graece et syriace* (partial ed.), Leipzig 1856 (repr. Osnabrück 1967) (partial Syriac text with retroversion in Greek); I.E. Rahmani, *Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, Mainz 1899 (Syriac and Latin trans.); F. Nau, *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clément traduite en français*, Paris 1913, 18-77, new ed. by P. Ciprotti, Milan 1967; liturgical passages: J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima*, Bonn 1935-37, 235-273; A. Vööbus, *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, I, CSCO 367, Louvain 1975, 1-49 (text); CSCO 368, Louvain 1975, 27-64 (Eng. trans.); R. Beylot, *Le Testamentum Domini éthiopien*, Louvain 1984 (1-143 [text], 144-234 [Fr. trans.]); J. Cooper - A. Maclean, *The Testament of Our Lord Translated in English from Syriac*, Edinburgh 1902 (on the text of Rahmani, with an excellent commentary); E. Lodi, *Enchiridion Euchologicum*, Bologna 1979, 510-529 (chosen passages).

Studies: DACL 2, 1909, 1936-1938 and 1949-1950; R.-G. Coquin, *Le Testamentum Domini: problèmes de tradition textuelle*: Parole de l'Orient 5 (1974) 165-188; B. Steimer, *Vertex Traditionis. Die Gattung der altchristlichen Kirchenordnungen*, Berlin 1992, 95-105; B. Gain, *Fragments grecs inédits du* Testamentum Domini *attribués à saint Basile*: Augustinianum 32 (1992) 261-277; LACL 672-673.

P. Nautin

TESTIMONIA. J.R. Harris coined this term to refer to the systematic collections of citations, esp. of the Prophets, *Psalms and the OT in general, whose existence he recognized as the basis of many pages of the most ancient Christian literature, which was characterized by some stereotypical citations from textual variants and tendentious interpretations (*Testimonies*, I-II, London 1916-20). It was difficult to acknowledge that these texts came directly from the Hebrew or Greek *Bible; outside their original context, these elements seemed to evolve, in turn illuminating each other, changing the attribution of the author and tending toward *midrash. The very work of selection which was at the basis of these collections privileged certain themes, not only the person and the work of Christ, but also all those matters on which depended theological controversy, reflection and worship. We have here an ancient phase of early theology, even earlier than the redaction of the first gospel (K. Stendahl, *The School of S. Matthew*, Uppsala 1954), the writings of *Paul and *John (C.H. Dodd, *According to Scriptures*, London 1952; Id., *Historical Tradition in the IV. Gospel*, Cambridge 1965), the Acts of the Apostles (J. Dupont, *Études sur les Actes*, Paris 1967, 245-390) and, of course, *Barnabas, *Justin Martyr et al. The proper exegesis of many pages of ancient Christian literature presupposes the reconstruction of these collections in their history. The only collections that have survived are very elaborated and revised according to the originals (Cypr., *Ad Quirinum* [ed. R. Weber, CCL 3, Turnhout 1972] and Basil, *Moral Rules* [PG 31, 653-869]).

J. Daniélou, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne* (*Les Testimonia*), Paris 1966; E. Lupieri, *Il cielo è il mio trono. Is. 40,12 e 66,1 nella tradizione testimoniaria*, Rome 1980; P. Monat, *Les testimonia bibliques de Cyprien à Lactance*, in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, Paris 1985, 499-507; E. Cavalcanti, *Dai "testimonia" all' "armonia delle Scritture": la raccolta dei profeti nel libro XVIII del "De civitate Dei"*: AnnSE 11 (1994) 491-510.

J. Gribomont

TESTIMONIES ON THE FATHER AND THE SON AND THE HOLY SPIRIT (or The Florilegium Fuldense) (5th c.; *Africa). Probably a 5th-c. anti-*Arian text coming from Africa and transmitted in the *Codex Fuldensis Bonifatianus 2* (8th c.). Its presence in the ps.-Augustine text *De Trinitate contra Felicianum Arrianum* led to its being regarded in the past as a document written by Augustine himself; because he lived before the composition of this work, however, this idea is no longer tenable. The MS tradition of this latter text, even though it attributed it to Augustine, was always included and transmitted along with the writings of *Quodvultdeus and *Fulgentius of Ruspe, confirming the extensive African tradition in the use of the work, and allowing us to date it not beyond the 2nd half of the 5th c. The authoritative opinion held by de Bruyne has definitively established the anonymous origin of the document.

The eight chapters of the *Testimonia* are developed by a list of citations, even though not primarily from the NT, inasmuch as 41 of the 81 citations come from the OT. The *Testimonia* are gathered in thematic form and laid out in the following order: (1) *De uno Deo;* (2) *De distinctione personarum Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti;* (3) *De Spiritu Sancto;* (4) *De substantia Dei;* (5) *De Spiritu Dei;* (6) *Quod in Christo est Deus;* (7) *Quod non est alius Deus praeter Deum nostrum;* (8) *De Spiritu Sancto, quia Deus est*. In the anti-Arian *expositio,* the doctrine on the Son can be perceived primarily in ch. 6; the biblical argument is established on Is 45:14-15: *tu est Deus . . . salvator noster,* and reaffirmed in Col 1:19 and 2:2-3 with respect to the *plenitudo divinitatis* in the person of Christ, seeking to establish, at the christological level, the right relationship between the *substantia* and the *distinctio personarum,* according to the African interpretation of Arian teaching (Aug., *De haer.* 45), explained in chs. 2 and 4. In the *Testimonia,* however, there appears a greater preoccupation with pneumatology, offering biblical arguments on the divinity, the procession and the action of the *Holy Spirit in the history of salvation, esp. in relation to the Son, that is, *Jesus Christ; probably in contradistinction to the semi-Arian doctrine maintained by the *Visigothic barbarians, inasmuch as the *De Trinitate contra Felicianum Arrianum* 3 takes into consideration the disputation between *Ambrose and the disciple of *Wulfila, the bishop of Auxentius, even if one cannot exclude the Macedonians and the Eunomians, esp. the latter group, on account of the doctrinal rapprochement between Wulfila and *Eunomius.

CCL 90, 225-233; CPL 386; D. de Bruyne, *Un florilège biblique inédit*: ZNTW 29 (1930) 197-208; R. Kurz, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus* V, 1, Vienna 1976, 237.

M. Mendoza

TESTIMONIUM FLAVIANUM. The phrase *Testimonium Flavianum* commonly refers to the text that was read in Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* 18,63-64. The text in question affirms that *Jesus is the Christ and that, after having been crucified under Pontius Pilate because of the hostile schemes of the Jews, he was raised from the dead. In an eloquently doubtful form, he insinuates, moreover, the idea that Jesus was more than a simple human being. This text, which seems more likey to have been the work of a Christian than a Jew, caused some scholars beginning as early as 1592 (Lucas Osiander, *Epitomes Historiae Ecclesiasticae*) to doubt whether the entire text of the *Testimonium Flavianum* was a Christian interpolation into Flavius Josephus's work. The controversy has dragged on until our day, with the appearance of three schools of thought: one that considers the entire *Testimonium Flavianum* an interpolated text, a second that accepts it *in toto,* and a third, now the majority, a group that maintains that the *Testimonium Flavianum* known to us is the fruit of a combination of Josephus's authentic core of information with some Christian interpolations. It remains, however, almost impossible to attempt to reconstruct, apart from conjecture, Josephus's original text inasmuch as the entire MS tradition is unanimous in reporting the common text of the *Testimonium Flavianum,* with a noteworthy exception of an Arabic version reported by Agapius of Mabbug's [Membiğ-Hierapolis's] *Universal History* (10th c.), which, even though possibly interpolated, is so only moderately. In the writings of *Origen, there are three references that could suggest, albeit in a problematic way, the *Testimonium Flavianum*. They can be found in the following texts: *Contra Celsum* 1,41; 2,13 and in the *In Matthaeum* 10,17. In these texts, Origen, maintaining that he is reporting an idea from Josephus, makes the destruction of *Jerusalem out to be a divine punishment for the murder of *James the brother of the Lord. In fact, Josephus in the *Antiquitates* 20,200 writes about "James, the brother of the Lord, called the Christ," but without any reference to the disaster at Jerusalem. Origen's imprecision requires much caution on the part of the reader in accepting it as a witness for or against the *Testimonium Flavianum*. His contribution, however, makes Josephus's second reference to Christ

plausible (namely the one from *Antiquitates* 20,200) and, because it seems that Josephus makes mention of an individual already known, namely the Christ, it gives a certain value also to the authenticity of the *Testimonium Flavianum;* however, Origen rebuked Josephus for not having maintained that Jesus was the Christ, a rebuke that would have been unmerited if the common text of the *Testimonium Flavianum* were authentic. *Eusebius of Caesarea, however, provided the text of the *Testimonium Flavianum* three times in a form that was substantially identical to that of the common text: see *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1,11,7-8; *Demonstratio Evangelica* 3,5,105-106 and *Theophania* 5,44. *Jerome, translating the text of the *Testimonium Flavianum* from Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia Ecclesiastica,* attempted to attenuate its heavily Christian tone (*De vir. illus.* XIII). It seems that one can therefore conclude that the Christian interpolations of Josephus's text must have taken place in the 2nd half of the 3rd c., that is, in the arc of time between the work of Origen and Eusebius.

L.H. Feldman - G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, Leiden 1987; M.E. Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius*, Atlanta 1988; P.A. Gramaglia, *Il* Testimonium Flavianum. *Analisi linguistica*: Henoch 20 (1998) 153-177; S. Bardet, *Le* Testimonium Flavianum. *Examen historique, considérations historiographiques*, Paris 2002; A. Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times*, Frankfurt a.M. 2003; G. Jossa, *Jews, Romans and Christians: From the* Bellum Judaicum *to the* Antiquitates, in J. Sievers - G. Lembi (eds.), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, Leiden-Boston 2005, 331-342.

C. Caruso

TESTIMONY – WITNESS. Very frequent terms that appear in ancient literature. Their presence confers to the account a sense of veracity. *Testimony* is the active form of presenting oneself and giving evidence as a witness (Homer, *Odyssey* XI,235). The primitive meaning, connected to the etymology, connotes becoming aware of a remote reality that cannot be forgotten but is brought to the attention of others (Plato, *Symp*. 179b).

In the Greek Bible those cases deserve attention where the term "testimony" calls to mind the meaning of the corroborating document that recalls a specific event or rather that of the documents of the law or the covenant. The phrases "tent of the covenant" (or "testimony") and "ark of the covenant" (or "testimony") respectively call to mind the time or the place where the agreement with Yahweh occurred and where documentation of this event is preserved (see Ex 29:4ff.; 40:2ff.; Lev 4:4ff.; Num 4:25ff.). The OT is not aware of a testimony expressed on the basis of a subjective, unverifiable conviction, but presupposes a personal knowledge of the event.

The NT, although it considers fundamental the testimony made on the facts, leaves broad space for the subjective conviction of the truth (religious) for which proofs were admitted and one was disposed to give one's life (see Mk 6:11 and parallel texts in the Synoptic gospels, Mk 13:9; Lk 21:13). With respect to the terms "witness" and "testimony," which occur with almost equal frequency, the mention of the legal use of false witnesses in the condemnation of *Jesus (see Mk 14: 55, 56, 59 and 63 and parallel texts in the Synoptic gospels) and in that of *Stephen (Acts 6:13; 7:58) is significant. In *Paul's epistles, the message of salvation in Christ, which is the object of the proclamation, coincides with the testimony (see 1 Cor 2:1; 2 Th 1:10); the Acts of the Apostles, however, discounting the utterances of human testimonies, introduces the meaning of "giving testimony," which is understood as the preaching of Christ, which was entrusted to Paul at *Rome (Acts 23:11; see Acts 4:33). The apostles and the disciples, esp. because they were in a position to give testimony to the resurrection and the works of Jesus (Acts 2:32; 3:15; 13:31; 22:15; 26:16ff.), were charged with spreading the message. The Johannine writings present testimony in the following forms: indicative in the Baptist, personal in Jesus and needing to be proclaimed in the disciples.

In the fourth gospel, testimony primarily has as its object, in addition to documentable facts, the self-communication of God in Jesus Christ in line with the prophets. This concept, which is typically Johannine, is integrated by the testimony of the *Holy Spirit (Jn 15:25, 27) and by those who have received the Word, thus confirming the truth of God (Jn 3:33; 4:39). In 1 Jn 5:10, testimony, knowledge and the message of the faith are identical. Here the experience of the senses does not say much, but only one's involvement in faith.

In patristic literature classical semantics had great importance and was combined with biblical semantics. The Greek term μάρτυς ("witness"), which pertained to the legal sphere, starting from the 2nd c., began to refer, in Christian language, exclusively to the believer who suffers and dies on account of the faith, rendering an oral testimony to Christ, who was confirmed by torture and death (*Mart. Polyc.* 19,1); μάρτυς would also then include those who died in prison or exile. The term underwent a semantic evolution in the Christian milieu by acquiring other meanings. The term *martyrion,* however, indicated the testimony itself (see Eus., *HE* 5,2,3-4). The two

Greek words, which were only transliterated in Latin, had the same meaning. During the first centuries of the Common Era, Christianity, in its political and social aspects, presented itself as a "testimony" to the "initial event of Jesus of Nazareth, the suffering and crucified Messiah." This testimony was articulated in different ways: orally, with his own life, but also with death because of faith in Christ or through love for Christ: "And you will be dragged before governors and kings for my sake, to bear testimony before them and the Gentiles" (Mt 10:18). God testifies on behalf of Christ in *Scripture (Clem. of Alex., *Paed.* III,1) and in Christ's *baptism (*Const. Apost.* II,32,2). Christians, faithful to the decision they have made, are witnesses to Christ (*Letter to Diognetus* 12,6; Clem. of Alex., *Strom.* IV,6; Orig., *Contra Celsum* I,8), moved by charity (John Chrys., *Hom. 27,3 in Rom.*), and give their lives for Christ and for the faith (Eus., *HE* 5,21,4; John Chrys., *Hom. 66 in Gen.*). In the writings of the Fathers, where the abstract term is privileged, the distinctive semantic features do not change: God testifies on behalf of Christ (Orig., *Contra Celsum* VIII,9) and on behalf of Christians (Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 123-124; Tatian, *Ad Graecos* 12). The testimony of Christians to their faith is an act of thanks to God (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 4), performed through the power of the love that is in them (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV, 4.7). The martyrs, shedding their blood, have given testimony to God the Father (Athan., *Contra Arianos* III, 10), to Christ (Polyc., *Mart.* 2,25; Orig., *Mart.* 14), whom the heavenly Father has presented as his first begotten son in baptism (Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 16; Meth. Olymp., *Symp.* VII,1), and to the *Holy Spirit (*Hipp., *In Danielem* 2,21,1; Athan., *De fuga* 22; *Didymus the Blind, *De Trinitate* II,1), and have proclaimed the superiority of the Christian religion over all others (*Iren., *Adv. haer.* V,9,2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* IV,5). The purity of God's testimony to Scripture, the *prophets, Christ and the bishops (*Const. Apost.* II, 25) is the object of contamination by the heretics (Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV,33,9).

C.L. Masson, *Le témoignage de Jean*: RThPh 38 (1950) 5-63; L. Cerfaux, *Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes*, in *Recueil L. Cerfaux* II, Gembloux 1954, 157-174; A. Vanhoye, *Témoignage et vie en Dieu selon le quatrième évangile*: Christus 16 (1955) 150-171; R. Koch, *Témoignage d'après les Actes*: Masses Ouvrières 129 (1957) 16-33; 131 (1957) 4-25; I. de la Potterie, *La notion de témoignage dans Saint Jean*, in *Sacra Pagina* II, Paris 1959, 193-208; H. Strathmann, μάρτυς: GLNT VI, 1269-1392; Enc. Bibbia, Turin 1971, VI, 907-910; E. Günther, *Zeuge und Martyrer*: ZNTW 47 (1956) 145-161; H.A.M. Hoppenbrouwers, *Recherches sur la terminologie du martyr de Tertullien à Lactance*, Nijmegen 1961; E. Weiner - A. Weiner, *The Martyr's Conviction*, Atlanta 1990; T. Baumeister, *La teologia del martirio nella Chiesa antica*, Turin 1995; J.-P. Mahé, *Le témoignage véritable* (*NH IX, 3*). *Gnose et martyre*, Leuven 1996; S.Th. Pinkaers, *La spiritualité du martyre*, Fribourg 2000, 51-66.

E. Peretto

TETRAMORPH. The image of the Tetramorph is in itself a monstrous OT apocalyptic apparition presented in the context of the vision of the "chariot of the Lord" in Ezek 1 and later taken up in the image of the cherubim in ch. 10. It should be stated immediately, however, that the versions known to us in early Christian iconography also received the variants of this theophanic motif as construed by the NT book of the Apocalypse. In the book of Ezekiel, the vision of the Tetramorph is presented as a vision of four distinct "living beings, and this was their appearance: they had a human form and each one had four faces and four wings"; with a four-sided head, "each one of the four had the features of a human being; then the features of a lion to the right, the features of an ox to the left and the features of an eagle to the back" (Ezek 1:5-6, 10). Ezekiel mentions, in his text, the image of the Assyrian *kâribu* (whose mythical name corresponds to that of the cherubim of the ark of the covenant in Ex 25:18), beings which possess a human head, the body of a lion, the feet of a bull and the wings of an eagle, and were regarded as the servants of the gods, and their idol was placed as a protection for the Babylonian palaces. Because they were images of God's transcendence, Ezekiel made use of them in his vision of the chariot of fire.

*John's Apocalypse adopts this vision in the composition of the great revelation of the "great day" of God that begins in ch. 4. Reflecting on the Jewish cosmology that was contemporaneous to him, the author of the book understands the four living beings as the angels who rule the world (the number of the cardinal points, of the winds). To the animals of the Tetramorph, he attributes some characteristics of the cherubim in Ezek 10, just as the wings of many eyes (which in the Apocalypse, however, are six, instead of four), interpreted as a symbol of divine omniscience and providence. The reference to the preservation of the creature is emphasized by the words that the 25 elders direct to "the One who sits upon the throne" each time the four winds sang to him the **Trisagion*: "You are worthy, O Lord and our God, to receive glory, honor and power, because you have created all things and through your will they were created and subsist" (Rev 4:10, 11). The fathers of the church, beginning with *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* 4,20,10-11), perceived in these four "servants" of the Lord the figures of the four Evangelists, for which they took pains to identify the corresponding

animal, set around Christ, the King/Messiah who sits on the throne of the *parousia.

The image of Christ in the mandorla, surrounded by the Tetramorph and the angels—which van der Meer refers to as "the Theophany of the *Trisagion*" (van der Meer 1938)—appears initially in *Egypt, most likely in the declarations found in apses, but the first known example is that on a wood panel from the door of basilica of Santa Sabina (at *Rome), from the beginning of the 5th c., in which the Christ of the parousia, appearing as a young man and depicted intact, sitting in the posture of a ruler holding a scroll bearing the letters *alpha* and *omega,* is inserted into a round shield/mandorla, on the outside of which are placed the four animals of the Tetramorph. At the bottom, under the starred firmament, is perhaps *Mary among *Peter and *Paul, who are holding a small shield (or stylized crown). The entirety of this decoration recalls the Eastern iconography (later!) of the ascension—which is also present on the door in the iconography with the divine hand—and bears witness to the connections of that iconography with the theme of the glorious advent of the Lord at the end of time, just as the voices at the ascension and the parousia clarify.

At the beginning of the 6th c., the scene of the "theophany of the *Trisagion*" appears more times on the frescoed apses of Bawît, where Christ is on the apocalyptic throne, within the circular mandorla. On one of the apses (chapel XVII), the animals of the Tetramorph are in turn inserted on wheels of fire; this representation is thus faithful to the actual text of the chariot of fire found in Ezek 1. In chapel XXVI, the mandorla is on a true and proper fiery chariot and the animals are depicted in their entirety with six wings with six eyes interspersed (the vision of the Apocalypse). The chapels of Bawît, a true shrine of the iconography of the Tetramorph, have variants that subsequently illuminate its meaning: in various chapels, the register painted under the dome has the array of *Mary with the twelve apostles on the model of the Eastern ascension-parousia, while in one of these Ezekiel stands in place of *Mary (the prophet is also present in the portrait), and in another in place of the apostles are 24 elders, this time a citation of Rev 4:11. Among the *Syriac ascensions, one should at least mention that of the Codex of *Rabbula (586), with the chariot of fire joined to the Tetramorph and placed beneath at the foundation of the mandorla with Christ.

The image of the four distinct animals is, however, proper, in early Christian iconography, to the most accurate description of the vision of Rev 4, the vision that is of the throne of the One who is seated on it, known as the portrayal of the *hetoimasia* (i.e., the prepared throne of Christ or the throne of the second coming). Alongside it—generally occupied by the glorious cross (a symbolic replacement of the Christ of the passion and the last judgment) or the Lamb or an image of Christ himself—appear the seven-branched candlestick and the four distinct animals, in addition to the group of the 24 elders, which are occasionally omitted. A first depiction, not perfectly coherent with the account, but off balance in the christological clarification (there the apostles take the place of the elders alongside Christ), is in the apse of St. *Pudentiana, with the animals of the Tetramorph on the top, in the celestial part. But the scene would immediately be transmitted to the apse arches, leaving the Christ of the parousia in the dome portion and only preserving the hetoimatic throne. This is what one finds, for example, in the mosaics of Sts. *Cosmas and Damian (and in the later basilica of St. *Praxedis that was inspired from it) and St. Paul Outside the Walls, at Rome, and in those of the churches of *Ravenna of S. Michele in Africisco (today at Berlin), with Christ depicted in his entirety, to S. Apollinare in Classe and in the lost decoration of St. *John the Evangelist. Other examples exhibit the animals with the hetoimatic throne appearing on the vault of the basilica of S. Matrona in S. Prisco, at the basilica of S. Maria Capua Vetere, or rather in the starred sky of the vault of the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia, still at Ravenna, where one finds in place of the throne the glorious cross of the Risen One. In subsequent centuries, the scenes of the *Trisagion* and the *hetoimasia* would be slowly abandoned, and the animals of the Tetramorph would increasingly appear more as a mere attribute of the figures of the four Evangelists, losing any apocalyptic connotation of the coming of Christ the Judge at the end of time.

F. van der Meer, *Maiestas Domini. Théophanies de l'Apocalypse dans l'art chrétien. Étude sur les origines d'une iconographie spéciale du Christ*, Vatican City 1938; G. Vezin, *L'Apocalypse et la fin des temps. Étude des influences égyptiennes et asiatiques sur les religions et les arts*, Paris 1973; F. van der Meer, *L'Apocalypse dans l'art*, Anvers 1978; R. Petraglio et al., *L'Apocalypse de Jean: Traditions exégétiques et iconographiques, III^e-XIII^e siècles* (Actes du Colloque de la Fondation Hardt, 29 février-3 mars 1976, Section d'Histoire de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Genève), Geneva 1979 (see F. Bisconti: RivAC 56 [1980] 209-213); U. Utro, s.v. *Tetramorfo*: TIP 286-287.

U. Utro

THAGASTE. In Proconsular Numidia, today Souk Ahras (the market of the lions) in NE Algeria in the sector of Constantine, ca. 80 km (49.7 mi),

S of *Hippo (today Annaba) and 30 km (18.6 mi) N of Madaura, where *Augustine completed his first studies. The toponym was written Thagaste or Tagaste. The site was identified through two inscriptions discovered onsite (CIL VIII,5145-5146). The city, already mentioned by *Pliny (V,4,4) and the *Itinerarium Antonini* (44), was called a *municipium* by Augustine (*Conf.* 2,3,5; 4,4,7; 67,11; *C. Acad.* 2,2,3): it was a *municipium* from the 2nd c. onward (CIL VIII,5145). *Patricius, Augustine's Father, was a *curialis* (Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 1,1-2); he did not belong to the upper, wealthy class but owned some properties there: when Augustine returned to Thagaste, after staying in *Italy, he was able to establish a *monastery on his family's property (Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 3,1). Among his family members there was also *Severus, who then became the bishop of Milevis. The first known bishop was Firmus at the end of the 3rd c. The Christians for a few decades were *Donatists but then became Catholics. Between the 4th and 5th c., *Alypius was the bishop; in the 2nd half of the 5th c., the office was held by certain Januarius, who had been sent into exile by *Huneric in 484. It belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Numidia and not to Proconsular *Africa (Aug., *Ep.* 227; Mansi 3, 870-871; 4,334, 433, 497, 509). Even during the period of Byzantine rule, it was still an episcopal see. There are no significant archaeological remains as in the case of Hippo; many vestiges were destroyed by the construction of the buildings in the modern city. Much archaeological documentation has been destroyed or lost since 1960. Different inscriptions, some Christian, allow us to perceive partially the city's social and religious life.

Augustine was born at Thagaste (13 November 354). Among the other natives of Thagaste, one could mention the following people: Alypius, who studied law, and his relative *Romanianus (*Ep.* 27); a rich benefactor (CIL VIII *suppl.*, 17226) named Cornelius, and his son *Licentius (*C. Acad.* 2,3,8; *De ord.* 1,3,7; 1,8,23); and *Evodius (*Conf.* 4,4,7) bishop of Uzalis. The rich Romans *Pinianus and *Melania owned vast properties at Thagaste. Inscriptions also attest to important individuals in the imperial administration. There existed various monasteries at Thagaste, some of which were constructed by order of Pinianus and Melania.

DACL 15, 2169-2170; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1981; O. Perler, *Les voyages de saint Augustin*: RechAug 1 (1958) 5-42; A. Caserta, *Evodio di Tagaste amico e discepolo di S. Agostino*: Asprenas 3 (1956/1957) 123-152; A. Gabillon, *Romanianus, alias Cornelius. Du nouveau sur le bienfaiteur et l'ami de saint Augustin*: REAug 24 (1978) 58-70; T. Kotula, *Les principales d'Afrique. Étude sur l'élite municipale nordafricaine au Bas-Empire romani*, Wrocław 1982; N. Benseddik, *À la recherche de Thagaste, patrie de saint Augustin*, in *Augustinus Afer*, ed. P.-Y. Fux - J.-M. Roessli - O. Wermelinger, Fribourg 2003, 413-436; M. Bouchenaki, *Augustin et l'africanité à partir des oeuvres historiques et de l'étude des sites de Thagaste, d'Hippone, et de Carthage*, in op. cit. 2003, 131-139.

A. Di Berardino

THALASSIUS. Abbot of a monastery in the Libyan desert, probably near *Carthage (ca. 650). He was a friend of *Maximus the Confessor, who dedicated to Thallasius his 65 *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* and wrote to him five letters, two of which have survived. Thalassius wrote the treatise *Centuriae IV de caritate et continentia,* *Georgian and Arabic translations of which still exist; the work is about aphorisms in which one perceives the influence of *Evagrius of Pontus and ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite on the relationship between the body and the *soul. The so-called *Libellus ad imperatores* (CPG 5774) is another one of Thalassius's works.

CPG 7848; PG 91, 1428-1470. G.E.H. Palmer - P. Sherrard - K. Ware, *The Philokalia: The Complete Text Compiled by St Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St Makarios of Corinth*, 2, London 1979, 306-332; M.T. Dissidier, *Le témoignage spirituel de Thalassius le Libyen*: REByz 2 (1944) 79-118; M. van Parys, *Un maître spirituel oublié: Thalassius*: Irénikon 52 (1979) 214-240; Patrologia V, 131-132.

S. Samulowitz

THALASSIUS of Angers. Bishop of Angers during the mid-4th c. During his ordination at Angers (*Andegavum*) a council was also held (Mansi 7,941), at which he participated. Lupus of Troyes sent a letter to him in response to some of his questions concerning the way to celebrate the vigils for *Christmas, *Epiphany, *Easter and the new marriage of minor clerics (CPL 988).

PL 58, 66; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, II, Paris 1912, 246-250; P.M. Duval, *La Gaule jusqu'au milieu du Ve siècle*, Paris 1971, 808.

F. Cocchini

THAMUGADI. *See* *TIMGAD

THEBAID. Southern region of *Egypt and one of the provinces in which the diocese of Egypt had been divided under *Diocletian. It took the name from the ancient city of Thebes. In the monastic texts, however, this name is extended to refer generically to the desert on the two sides of the Nile Valley,

in which the monks took residence to exercise various types of *ascesis.

PWK 48, 1577-1582; CE 14, 6-7 (bibl.); LTK³ 9, 1385; Coptic Encyclopedia 4, 1225.

T. Orlandi

THEBAN LEGION. Around 450 Bishop *Eucherius of Lyons wrote the first *Passio* (CPL 490): under the emperor *Maximian, an Egyptian Legion of Thebes, under the *primicerius* *Mauricius, the *campidoctor* Exuperius and the *senator militum* Candidus, was crossing the Alps, and they were put to death at Agaunum for collectively refusing to sacrifice to the gods (St. Maurice el Gran S. Bernardo). This large number of Christian soldiers continually provoked new legends and cults: Sts. Felix and Regula at Zürich, St. Tirsus at Trier, Sts. Cassius and Florentius at Bonn, St. Gereon at Cologne, and St. Victor at Xanten. Bishop Theodulus of Octodurum (Martigny) rediscovered the relics and constructed a basilica in their honor. We know that in the 4th c. there were in fact numerous legions that bore this nickname: the *II Flavia Constantia,* stationed at Cusa, 296–297; the *II Flavia Constantia Thebaea,* removed by *Constantius from the previous location, which depended on the *magister militum per Orientem;* the *II Felix Valentis Thebaea,* which probably formed one unit with the *II Valentiniana* in Egypt; the *I Maximiana Thebaea* and the *II Diocletiana Thebaea;* the *Thebeae legiones* spoken of by Ammianus Marcellinus; and the *Thebaei,* stationed in *Italy. Of these bodies of troops, only those that bore the name of Maximian or Diocletian were stationed in Europe, more specifically in *Thrace, and there were those that were identified with the Theban Legion of the *Passio mm. Acaunensium*. But there is a strong likelihood that all of this is nothing more than a hagiographic novel, whose topographical precision does not guarantee its historical accuracy.

BHL 5737-5764; BS 9, 193-205; LCI 8, 429-432; BBKL 11, 784-791; E. Chevalley, *La passion anonyme de saint Maurice d'Agaune*: Vallesia 45 (1990) 37-120; J. Kremer, *Studien zum frühen Christentum in Niedergermanien*, Cologne 1993, 201-228; *Mauritius und die Thebäische Legion*, ed. O. Wermelinger, Fribourg 2005.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

THECLA. Different saints with this name were venerated during Antiquity. The most known was the native of *Iconium. *Egeria, who had set off from *Tarsus after 384, went to *Seleucia in Isauria to see the tomb of St. Thecla, which stood over a place today called Meriamlik; the remains preserved date back to the 5th c. The life of Thecla is narrated in the *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, which was composed around 180 in *Asia Minor. Egeria went to the church where the tomb was found and venerated the saint; she spent two days there. The cult of Thecla spread greatly in the East. Other saints with this name are as follows: (1) Thecla of *Aquileia and Trieste is a doubling of the saint from Iconium; (2) in the Santa Sophia, at Benevento, the faithful pretended to possess the relics of the 12 children of a certain Boniface and Thecla who are certainly to be identified with the martyrs of Hadrumetum in *Africa, or with those of *Abitina; (3) at Chamalières in Auvergne the faithful venerated the relics of the saint from Iconium in a 7th-c. monastery; (4) in *Palestine, *Eusebius of Caesarea (*Mart. Palest.* 3,1) and the *Mart. hier.* (24–25 March) mention a martyr with this name at Gaza; (5) at *Rome, on the Via Labicana, this saint's name is mentioned without a doubt in the *Mart. rom.* (25–26 March), which was caused by the author confusing this saint with the preceding one; (6) likewise at Rome, on the Via Ostiense, a 3rd-c. catacomb was rediscovered in 1963 with the tomb of a martyr who had this name.

G. Morin, *La formation des légendes provençales. Faits et aperçus nouveaux*: RBen 26 (1909) 24-33; Monceaux 3, 140-147; U. Fasola, *Il complesso catacombale di S. Tecla*: RivAC 40 (1964) 19-50; Id., *La basilica sotterranea di S. Tecla*: ibid. 46 (1970) 193-288; *Vies des SS.* 9, 477-484; BS 12, 172-181; *Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle*, texte grec, tr. et comm. par G. Dagron, Brussels 1978; W. Rordorf, *Sainte Thècle dans la tradition hagiographique occidentale*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 73-81; L. Hayne, *Thecla and the Church Fathers*: VChr 48 (1994) 209-218; BBKL 9, 816-814 (extensive bibl.); C. Nissen, *Un oracle médical de Sarpédon à Séleucie du Calycadnos*: Kernos 14 (2001) 111-131; S.J. Davis, *The Cult of St. Thecla: A Tradition of Women's Piety in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2001.

V. Saxer - A. Di Berardino

THECLA, ACTS of. In the *Acts of Paul* one finds the story of Thecla of Iconium, a young virgin follower of *Paul who rejected her fiancé out of love for chastity, suffered persecution and was thrown to wild beasts in the theater, where she was baptized alone and found protection from Queen Tryphaena (a historical figure); she then went to *Seleucia in Isauria, where she died. Seleucia was the center of the cult of Thecla, which spread throughout the entire East (*Egypt, *Palestine and *Cyprus). Later legends exist of the rock that opened and received Thecla. This part of the *Acts of Paul,* which was ad hoc and even independent of the *Acts,* was very pop-

ular; it was translated and paraphrased into various languages. The figure of Thecla, virgin-martyr, became a symbol of virginity (the song of Thecla in *Methodius of Olympus's *Symposium*), which was praised by *Gregory of Nazianzus, *Gregory of Nyssa, ps.-*John Chrysostom, *Theodore Mopsuestia (?), *Severus of Antioch and many others. A very interesting work titled *The Life and Miracles of St. Thecla,* in two books, was written by a presbyter of Seleucia; in the second book, one finds a description of the sanctuary in Seleucia, which was one of the most important centers of the cult in Antiquity and the miracles of Thecla.

CANT 211v; BHG 1710-1722; BHL 8020-8025; BHO 1152-1156; LCIK 8, 432-436; BS 12, 176-177; DACL 13 (1998) 2666-2677. *Editions: Acts:* Lipsius-Bonnet 1, 104-117; L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul*, Paris 1913, 146-238. The *Acts* in Turkish: P. Zieme: Apocrypha 13 (2002) 53-62. *Life and Miracles:* G. Dagron, Brussels 1978; trans. in all the collections of the translations of the apocrypha. C. Holzhey, *Die Thecla-Akten. Ihre Verbreitung und Berurteilung in der Kirche*, Munich 1905; J. Festugière, *Les origines de S. Thècle*: Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (1968) 52-63; M. Aubineau, *Compléments au dossier de Sainte Thècle*: AB 93 (1975) 256-262; W. Rordorf, *Sainte Thècle*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 73-81; L. Hague, *Thecla and the Church Fathers*: VChr 48 (1994) 209-218; F. Corsaro, *Elementi romanzeschi e aretologia negli Atti apocrifi di Paolo e Tecla*, in *La narrativa cristiana antica*, Rome 1995, 77-99; A. Jensen, *Thecla, die Apostolin*, Freiburg 1995; J.N. Bremmer, *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Kampen 1996 (bibl.).

M. Starowieyski

THEFT of the GREEKS. With this expression it is customary to indicate the idea that Greek wisdom (and esp. of philosophy) derived from the Jewish wisdom contained in the OT (see W. Löhr, *The Theft of the Greeks*: RHE 95 [2000] 403). Its origin and its growth should be sought in *Hellenistic-Jewish environments: Already present in Artapanus (Löhr, 404) and in ps.-Hecataeus, cited by *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*. V,113,1 [II, 402,17]) and an author, according to Schürer (*Gesch. des jüdisch. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* III, Leipzig [4]1909, 595-597), of falsified verses attributed to Greek poets, it was developed above all by Aristobulus, the most outstanding exponent of this tendency. It reappears also in *Philo and in Flavius Josephus (Löhr, 405-406). In the Christian field, this motif is adopted in greater or lesser degree by various authors, such as *Justin Martyr, ps.-Justin (in *Cohortatio ad Graecos* and in *De monarchia*), *Tatian, Isidore (cited by Clement, *Strom*. VI, 53,2-5, II, 458,19-459,5), *Theophilus of Antioch, *John Cassian, *Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria—whose *Stromata*, esp. in book 1, 5 and 6, contain the largest and most erudite treatment of the theme—*Eusebius of Caesarea and *Theodoret; *Origen mentions it only occasionally (for the various references see Löhr, 411-425; on Clement, Eusebius and Theodoret, see in particular D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses*, Göteborg 1995, pp. 29-139, 139-196, 197-239 respectively). Among non-Christian authors, the Neo-Pythagorean philosopher Numenius seems to approach this thesis when he defines Plato as "a Moses who speaks Attic" (fr. 8, 13 des Places; *see also* Numenius of Apamea).

Beyond the studies of Valckenaer, Boeckh, Scheck, Schürer and Walter cited in *Hellenistic Judaism and in the related bibl. and those of Elter, Hody and Simon related to Aristobulus cited by Walter, pp. XIII, XV, XVIII, see also: W. Christ, *Philologische Studien zu Clemens Alexandrinus*, ABAW 21, Abt. 3, Munich 1901, 457-526 (on the dependence of Clement on Tatian, Cassian, Dionysus of Halicarnassus, Apollodorus, Tallus, Justus of Tiberias); L. Gabriellson, *Über die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus*, Uppsala 1906 (on the dependence of Clement on Favorinus); W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Göttingen 1915, 205-218, 219-236 (repr. Hildesheim-New York 1975) (in the erudite treatment of the "Theft of the Greeks," *Diebstahl der Hellenen*, 205, Clement would have used an already constituted source, "ein Fremdkörper," "ein umfangreiches zusammenhängendes Werk" 216, which he would have incorporated later into the original text of the Stromata, see above all 216-218); J. Munck, *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria*, Stuttgart 1933, 136-142 (critique of the Bousset thesis); E. Molland, *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology*, Oslo 1938, 52-65; J. Whittaker, *Moses Atticizing*: Phoenix 21 (1967) 196-201 (= *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*, London 1984, VII); S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 29-31, 31-33; W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I, 2, Munich 1971, 160-163; M.J. Edward, *Atticizing Moses? Numenius, The Fathers and the Jews*: VChr 44 (1990) 64-75; P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron Kreitton. Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*, Tübingen 1990; D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses: The Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 59), Göteborg 1995; W. Löhr, *The Theft of the Greeks*: RHE 95 (2000) 403-426.

S. Lilla

THELA (Thelepte), Council of. On 24 February 418, some 30 bishops of *Byzacena (*Africa) met under the presidency of their primate Donatianus of Thelepte, in the presence of Vincent and Fortunatian, legates to Proconsular Africa. It is likely that this council discussed some problems pertaining to *Pelagianism, thus preparing the plenary African council of 1 May 418, but what remains of the conciliar acts only addresses the reading of the circular letter sent by Pope *Siricius to all the African bishops to communicate to them the decisions reached in the Roman council of January 386. With this reading, the council accepted the Roman conciliar norms of

386, but modified them somewhat according to the African juridical tradition.

CCL 149, 54-65; Hfl-Lecl II, 68-75; Palazzini 5, 298; M.-E. Mombili Thumaini, *L'aspect d'autonomie et de communion dans la praxis africaine des recours à Rome (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, Rome 2001, 173ff.; 202ff.

CH. MUNIER

THEMISTIUS. Deacon of *Alexandria (6th c.). A *monophysite Severian who opposed the doctrine embraced by the adherents of *Julian of Halicarnassus. According to *Liberatus of Carthage (*Breviarium* 19), during the patriarchate of *Timothy of Alexandria (517–535), Themistius revealed his conviction that "if we admit that the Christ's body is corruptible, we must also say that he was ignorant on any given topic, such as when he spoke about Lazarus." In response to Timothy's objections, Themistius began a *schism with Timothy's followers who were called the "*Agnoetae," or "those who do not know." *Theodosius, the patriarch of Alexandria at the time, went to *Constantinople in 536 and composed his *Tomus ad Theodoram Augustam* against Themistius, who responded in a first and a second *antirrētikos*, but only one has survived. Three other works of Themistius, which are attested to by the Lateran Council of 649, pertain directly to the agnoetic controversy. Among these is a document written "against what had been written by Constantine, bishop of Laodicea," which attempts to provide a response to a letter of *Constantine of Laodicea (d. 553) to the empress *Theodora (d. 548), a text that has only recently come to light. From *Photius's *Bibliotheca* (cod. 108) we learn that for a long time scholars knew about a debate between Themistius and the Alexandrian monk Theodore; nevertheless, only recently have many fragments from Theodore's work been edited and translated. The influence of Themistius's teaching on Christ's ignorance was not limited to monophysite circles nor to those of *Alexandria or *Constantinople. When Damian succeeded to the patriarchal throne in 578, he judged it necessary to write to the clergy in the monasteries of the East to condemn the Agnoetae. *Stephen, the Chalcedonian bishop of Hierapolis, who died before 594, condemned those who professed one sole nature in Christ and who used the *Scriptures to prove Christ's ignorance. *Gregory the Great in his *Letter* X,21 wrote a list of biblical objections against the doctrine of the Agnoetae.

CPG 7285-7292. For the editions, see E. Amman: DTC 15 (1946) 219-222; T. Hermann, *Monophysitica*: ZNW 32 (1933) 287-294; A. Grillmeier, 2/2, 1989, 379-400; A. Van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, OLA 56, Leuven 1994, 3-102; Patrologia V, 152-153; 359-362.

P. ALLEN

THEOCTISTUS of Caesarea (d. after 260). Bishop of Palestinian *Caesarea, he was a friend and protector of *Origen. In agreement with *Alexander of Jerusalem he made him preach when he was still a layman, and in this respect he answered the protests voiced by *Demetrius of Alexandria (Eus., *HE* 6,19,16-19). Later, he ordained Origen a priest, according to *Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 118)—who confused him with his successor *Theotecnus—and received him at Caesarea when he was expelled from *Egypt. Upon Origen's death, he received from *Dionysius of Alexandria a letter of condolence (Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 232, 291B). He invited the same Dionysius to the Council of *Antioch, which addressed the question of the *Novatian schism (Eus., *HE* 6,46,3). He survived the *Decian and *Valerian persecutions and died after 260 under *Gallienus (*HE* 7,5,1; 7,14).

H. CROUZEL

THEODELINDA (Theodolinda). Queen of the *Longobards (Lombards) (ca. 589–616). The daughter of Garibald, king of the Bavarians, she married Authuri, king of the Longobards (probably in 589), and upon his death (590) she married *Agilulf, making him king. She obtained from him Catholic *baptism for their son Adaloald (who was born in 603). She received various letters from *Gregory the Great (*Ep.* IV,4 and 33; IX,67; XIV,12), who also made mention of her in other letters (IV,2 and 37). She helped reconcile the Longobards with the Roman population, but she opposed the condemnation of the *Three Chapters, in contrast to Constantius bishop of *Milan. Upon the death of Agilulf (616), Theodelinda continued to reign with Adaloald: a letter of the *Visigothic king *Sisebut sent to this king and queen has been preserved (*Ep. Wisig.* 9). Some precious objects preserved in the treasure of the Cathedral of Monza have been traced back to her, as in the case of the famous Iron Crown.

CPL 1719a; PLRE III 1235-1236; EC 11,1925.

E. MALASPINA

THEODERIC (Theodoric) the Great. King of the *Ostrogoths (471–526) and ruler over *Italy (493–526). Born in *Pannonia to Theodemir, who belonged to

the Amaling family, and his Catholic mother Ereleuva; he was held hostage at *Constantinople, where he was educated (461–471). Having succeeded his father as the head of the Ostrogoths stationed around Novae in Moesia Inferior (i.e., N Bulgaria/coastal Romania), he supported the recovery of the imperial power by *Zeno (476), who as a reward appointed him as *patricius* and *magister militum praesentalis,* uniting him more closely to himself with a treaty for adoption. After years of warfare in *Macedonia, *Epirus and *Thessaly, Theoderic renewed his alliance with Zeno (483), which allowed him to establish himself with his people in Dacia Ripensis and in Moesia Inferior, appointing him again as the *magister militum praesentalis* and conferring on him the consulate (484). But when the Ostrogoths found themselves suffering again from starvation, Theoderic undertook to sack *Thrace, even to the point of threatening Constantinople. Finally, in 488 Zeno offered him the opportunity to organize his people in Italy, substituting him in the place of *Odoacer: once the Gepids had been conquered at *Sirmium, Theoderic's Ostrogoths reached Italy in August of 489 and defeated Odoacer at Soča and then at Verona; Odoacer fled to *Ravenna, while Theoderic established himself at *Milan. Besieged by Odoacer at Pavia, Theoderic freed himself with the assistance of the *Visigoths and defeated him on the Adda River, besieging him then for three years at Ravenna; after he had made peace with him, he shortly thereafter killed him, thus becoming the king of Italy (493). Already in 490, Theoderic had asked Zeno for the imperial insignia for a formal recognition of his authority in the West, but *Anastasius, who had succeeded Zeno (491), repeatedly evaded his requests until 497, when he sent Theoderic the insignia of power sent to him by Odoacer to Constantinople; however, he did not receive the purple garment and retained the title of *rex* but not *Augustus*.

Conceiving of the West as a confederation of Germanic nations presided over by the king of Italy through a web of alliances, Theoderic gave his daughter Theodegotha as wife to the *Visigothic king Alaric II and his Ostrogoth daughter Arevagni to *Sigismund, the hereditary Burgundian prince, while he himself in 493 underwent a second marriage with Audofleda, the sister of the Frankish king *Clovis I; in 500, moreover, he gave his sister Amalfrida as wife to the *Vandal king Thrasamund, whose daughter from his first marriage, Amalberga, married Ermanaric the king of the Thuringii; he adopted *per arma* Rudolf king of the Eruli. With diplomatic action, Theoderic sought to check Frankish expansionism, receiving in 506 the Alemanni, who had been defeated by Clovis, and then by attempting to impede the Franco-Burgundian coalition against the Visigoths, who were, however, defeated at Vouillé (507). After the death of his son-in-law Alaric II, Theoderic took over the Visigothic hegemony in southern *Gaul, warding off the Frankish occupation (508), while operating in the capacity of regent for his grandson Amalaric.

As king of Italy, he governed the *Arian Goths and the Romans by placing special value on Roman expertise in service of the public administration and encouraging the preservation of the bellicose traditions of the Gothic aristocracy. He promoted public works, esp. at *Rome and Ravenna; he allowed for the recommencement of the shows but called back the Roman officials to safeguard the public order. Among his collaborators were *Cassiodorus and *Boethius; *Ennodius commemorated him with a long *panegyric, composed shortly before the Battle of Vouillé (507); Cassiodorus's *Variae* contain many letters inspired by Theoderic and written in his name. One should perhaps also attribute to the Visigothic Theodoric II (453–466) the so-called *Edictum Theodorici,* which was decreed for Romans and Goths from the kingdom of *Toulouse, but in Italy Theoderic began the codification of Ostrogoth law (see Anon. Vales. 60). Perhaps under his kingdom at Ravenna the *Codex Brixianus* and the *Codex Argenteus* were composed, which contain *Wulfila's translation of the Bible. He promoted the healing of the Laurentian schism (499–506) which had broken out at Rome after the election of Pope *Symmachus, and he sent to the Senate the *praeceptum Contra sacerdotes substantiae ecclesiae alienatores,* dated to 11 March 507 or 508. But it was precisely at that time that the emperor Anastasius I preferred the Frankish king Clovis, the conqueror of the Visigoths, over Theoderic as his own Western partner (see Greg. Tur., *Franc.* II, 37). Worried about the destiny of his own kingdom—after the death of his son-in-law Eutharic (522)—the pro-Byzantine politics of the new Vandal king Hilderic and the imprisoning of the Burgundian King *Sigismund by work of the Franks (523), Theoderic suspected several Roman officials of treason—among whom were Albinus, Boethius and his father-in-law Thrasymachus—and accusing them of conniving with the emperor *Justin I, he sentenced them to death (524–525). Although the Byzantine court increasingly hardened its political action toward the Arians, Theoderic had Pope *John I go to Constantinople and intercede before Justin (525). Suspicious of the triumphal reception received by the pope, upon the pope's return to Ravenna, Theoderic ordered that he be imprisoned,

where John died shortly thereafter. Three months later (30 August 526), Theoderic also died and was buried at Ravenna in the mausoleum that he had prepared for himself. His grandson Athalaric succeeded him under the regency of his mother Amalasuntha, the daughter of Theoderic and Audofleda. In the Germanic sagas, Theoderic is remembered with the name of Dietrich von Bern.

CPL 1806-1807; PLRE II, 1077-1084; A. Lippold: KLP 5, 685-687 (with bibl.). – MGH, *Auct. ant.* XII, 1894, 392.420-422.424 (T. Mommsen).

Studies: G. Della Valle, *Teoderico e Roma*: Rend. Acc. Arch. Lett. Napoli 34 (1959) 119-176; W. Ensslin, *Theoderich der Grosse*, Munich [2]1959; G. Astuti, *Note sull'origine e attribuzione dell'Edictum Theoderici regis*, in *Studi in onore di E. Volterra*, Milan 1971, V, 647-686; O. Hoelfler, *Theoderich der Grosse und sein Bild in der Sage*: AAWW 111 (1974) 349-372; D. Claude, *Universale und partikulare Züge in der Politik Theoderichs*: Francia 6 (1978) 19-58; G. Vismara, *Edictum Theoderici*, in *Scritti di storia giuridica*, 1, Milan 1987, 1-338; *Teoderico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia.* Atti del XIII Congr. Int. di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, Milan 2-6 novembre 1992, Spoleto 1993; B. Luiselli, *Teodorico e gli Ostrogoti tra romanizzazione e nazionalismo gotico*: RomBarb 13 (1994-95) 75-98; A. Garzya, *Teoderico a Bisanzio. Teoderico e i Goti fra Oriente e Occidente*, Ravenna 1995; F. Delle Donne, *Teoderico "rex genitus": il concetto della nobiltà di stirpe nel panegirico di Ennodio*: Invigilata lucernis 20 (1998) 73-84; U. Pizzani, *Le lettere di Teoderico a Boezio e la mediazione culturale di Cassiodoro*: Cassiodorus 4 (1998) 141-161; B. Saitta, *The Ostrogoths in Italy*: Polis 11 (1999) 197-216; S. Rota, *Teoderico il Grande fra "Graecia" e "Ausonia": la rappresentazione del re ostrogotico nel "Panegyricus" di Ennodio*: MEFRM 113/1 (2001) 203-243; G. Pilara, *Ancora un momento di riflessione sulla politica italiana di Teoderico re dei Goti*: StudRom 53/3-4 (2005) 431-469.

E. Malaspina

THEODORA (497–548). Empress of the East (527–548), wife of *Justinian I. Daughter of a guard of the hippodrome, she was born at *Constantinople in 497; an actress and a courtesan, she then followed one of her lovers into the Libyan *Pentapolis. In the East, she came into contact with the *monophysite hierarchy; she renounced her previous way of life and returned a redeemed woman to the capital, where she supported herself by spinning wool. In 520, she met *Justinian, who married her only after having abolished the restrictive juridical norms (CI 5,4,23) and after having elevated Theodora to the patrician rank (524/525). Theodora had an exceptional personality, a sharp mind, life experience and an energetic character. As the Augusta from 527 and co-regent of her husband, she had an important role in the leadership of the state, more than any other queen before or after her. Her name was mentioned in decretals and treatises; she demanded the *proskynēsis*; she met with ambassadors and exerted great influence on all the political officials. She supported the monophysites and was a friend of *Severus of Antioch, whom she recalled from exile, and facilitated the placement of *Anthimus of Trebisond over the patriarchal see of Constantinople. She favored the deposition of Pope *Silverius and the election of *Vigilius in 537. With her immense power, she supported ecclesiastical and humanitarian initiatives. Majestic and autocratic, she appears at the side of her husband in the mosaic of the basilica of S. Vitale in *Ravenna. She died on 28 June 548 and was buried in the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople. The contemporary historian *Procopius, who expressed the interests of the Senate and the landholding aristocracy, has distorted Theodora's image, emphasizing her negative qualities and thus also influencing subsequent biographies.

PWK 5A, 1776-1791; R. Browning, *Justinian and Theodora*, London 1971; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972; M. Amelotti, *Teodora, moglie o imperatrice?*: AFGG 20 (1984-85) 13-22; L. Migliardi Zingale, *Osservazioni sulla domus divina di Teodora*: AFGG 20 (1984-85) 142-149; H.-G. Beck, *Lo storico e la sua vittima. Teodora e Procopio*, Bari 1988; C. Capizzi, *Giustiniano I tra politica e religione*, Messina 1994; M.L. Silvestre, *Prospettive politiche femminili tra tardo-antico e altomedioevo: Teodora e Amalasunta*: Koinonia 21 (1997) 83-104.

J. Irmscher

THEODORA and DIDYMUS, martyrs. The memory of these two names should be connected to a text from the 4th c.: the *Passio ss. Didymi et Theodorae*. We possess an ancient Greek and Latin redaction of this text, for which we have two primary versions, one by *Eusebius of Emesa and the other by *Jerome. In sum, the work treats the episode of a virgin from *Alexandria who is sentenced by the law to the place of dishonor (i.e., the brothel), but she is rescued by the heroism of a young Christian man. The episode occurred in Alexandria when Culcianus, a man to be forgotten, persecuted the Christians (*in magna illa aliquando Alexandrinorum civitate*). Theodora was a virgin consecrated to God, as we know from the very moment she was summoned before him (*Vocate Theodoram virginem*). This detail allows us to understand that she was not a mere *puella,* but a *virgo perpetua*. In fact, in response to the judge's usual question about her condition, she answered: *Christiana sum*. To the judge's second question, whether she was a free woman or a slave, the young woman responded that she had been freed by Christ. Franchi de' Cavalieri, who has studied this text extensively both in Latin and in Greek, believes that

the work was interpolated by a later hand.

Aside from all the philological discussions, one notes the courage of the young woman before the judge to give testimony to her faith during the trial and her resolve to maintain her identity as a virgin consecrated to God. One also sees this quality in her when, contrary to her ideal of life, a few days after she had been thrown into prison, the young woman was forced to obey the edict and sacrifice to the gods (*Imperatores statuerunt vos quae estis vergines aut diis sacrificare aut iniuria meritorii provocari*). He was unable to change her will in remaining resolute in her Christian faith. Her response bears witness to her faith and the Lord's promise (*Nam et ego in Deo volo manere; Dei enim est promissio quantum ad meum votum pertinet: ipsi enim adiacet virginitas et confessio*). With her usual calm, the young woman responded that she wished to maintain her promise of chastity to Christ.

This type of loyalty to God, an expression of her hope in Christ, should be considered an act of civil disobedience and even an attitude of disregard for imperial law, esp. when she reaffirms that she does not fear the emperors, but the King of the Martyrs (*Ego confiteor Christum Dominum*). For this reason, the judge allowed her three days of reflection before the sentencing. In jail, a young Christian man named Didymus arrived dressed in military clothes in order to deliver her. Following Didymus's instructions, she puts on the clothes of her deliverer (*masculi vestimenta induta, imitabatur et habitum*). Didymus remained in the place of the young woman, dressed in her clothing. When the soldier enters and sees a man, he does not hide his surprise (*video enim virginem ad virum translatam et stupeo*). Finally, Didymus, the athlete of Christ, is taken for martyrdom, and the young woman remains a virgin. The chief of the tribunal, taken over by anger and wanting to know nothing about his identity, orders the executioners to torture and decapitate him.

With respect to the value of the text, we maintain that despite the interpolations of the hagiographer, the *Passio ss. Didymi et Theodorae* can be considered authentic. The dialogue of the interrogation follows the procedure and the form of the judicial process, which was well known for the sobriety and the naturalness of its style, without insisting on the identity of Theodora. Nothing is known of her family or the circumstances of her arrest. According to Franchi de' Cavalieri, such a "disposition [condemnation to a brothel] must not have existed; we can be morally certain about this. Above all, the most authoritative sources—most notably Eusebius of Caesarea, who summarizes the contents of the various Diocletian edicts against the Christians—are completely silent about this" (ST 65,261). From the historical point of view, it seems strange that the name of the prefect is ignored. The redactor of this *passio* actually ignores not only the name of the prefect but also the name of the judge. Given this line of thought, the information that places the episode of this *passio* at *Antioch should be deemed a *lapsus memoriae* on the part of St. *Ambrose.

AASS. *Aprilis*, III, Venezia 1738, 570-575; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografiche*: ST 65, Vatican City 1935, 233-278; A. Galuzzi, *Teodora e Didimo*: BS 12 (1969) 227-228; J. Gerard, *Ces femmes qui firent l'histoire*, Brussels s.d.; J.P. Kirsch, *Theodora*: LTK[1] 10, 45, and B. Kötting, *Theodora*: LTK[2] 10, 29-30; C. Lanéry, *La Passion de Théodore et Dydime. Édition des trad. latines BHL 8072 et 8073*: AB 122 (2004) 5-50.

M.W. Libambu

THEODORE, martyr. Theodore, a soldier, died a martyr at *Amasea and was buried at Euchaita in *Pontus (Aukhat, Turkey), where his tomb became a destination point for *pilgrimage, famous from the 4th c. onward. *Gregory of Nyssa delivered a homily (PG 46,736-748) there, which establishes our most ancient piece of information about Theodore. His feast day was celebrated there on 17 February. Other churches in his honor were constructed at *Constantinople in 452 (dedication 5 November), at *Ancyra (5 November 518), in Asia Minor and throughout the East. At *Rome, he is depicted on the apse mosaic of Sts. *Cosmas and Damian and is venerated in a church that bears his name located at the foot of the Palatine (dedication 9 November). Testimonies of the cult attributed to him exist at Messina, *Ravenna, *Naples, in Latium, Venice and Vercelli. In the 9th c., the legend divided the saint into a soldier and general, thus bringing with it a division of the liturgical feasts.

H. Delehaye, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires*, Brussels 1909, 11-43, 121-202; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Attorno al più antico testo del Martyrium S. Theodori tironis*, ST 22, 91-107; *Vies des SS.* 2, 150-52; LTK 10, 39-40; BS 12, 238-242; N. Oikonomides, *Le dédoublement de saint Théodore et les villes d'Euchaita et d'Euchaneia*: AB 104 (1986) 327-335; C. Zuckermann, *The Reign of Constantine V in the Miracles of Theodore the Recruit* (*BHG* 1764): REByz 46 (1988) 191-210.

V. Saxer

THEODORE, monk (6th c.). *Photius (cod. 108) spoke of the debate between *Themistius, the head of the *Agnoetae, and the Alexandrian monk Theodore, whose work titled the *Confutatio brevis* has recently been published. It is now possible to better

document the development of the discussion between the two supporters of the doctrine of the sole nature in Christ. According to Photius, Themistius primarily set forth arguments to prove Christ's ignorance; Theodore responded to this challenge. Themistius subsequently wrote against Theodore a *monobiblion* titled *Kalonymus, alias Themistius, Apologia pro Theophobio,* which Theodore refuted in three volumes. Photius had read one of Theodore's works titled the *Confutatio brevis*. Just as the apology for Theophobius is cited in the recently edited fragments, the *Confutatio brevis* must be identified with the apology in three volumes. Given that in Theodosius of Alexandria's text, it is spoken of in the past tense, a dating subsequent to the death of Theodosius in 566 can be assigned to the apology. Theodore's refutation of Themistius, then, was not a compendium, as the title could suggest.

Seven fragments from Theodore's work have been preserved. In the first two, the monk affirms that Christ as a human being was ignorant; he was responsible for this fault. In the third fragment, Theodore concludes that the knowledge that Christ possessed did not come from his humanity but that the humanity becomes perfect in knowledge because of the hypostatic union. Then the monk summarizes the proof starting from the teachers of the orthodox faith on the question (fr. 5). In the last two fragments he attempts to refute Themistius's claims that the doctors of the church, esp. *Cyril of Alexandria, contradict each other. Theodore's *Confutatio brevis* helps illuminate Themistius's teaching and likewise demonstrates the crucial importance of patristic proof in the agnoetic debate.

CPG 7295; A. Van Roey - P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, OLA 56, Leuven 1994, 78-102 with Latin trans.; see Photius, *Bibliotheca* 108. T. Hermann, *Monophysitica*: ZNW 32 (1933) 287-293; W. Ensslin, PWK 2. Reihe, 5 (1934) 1916-1917; A. Van Roey, *Unedited Monophysite Documents of the Sixth Century*: SP 20 (1989) 79; A. Grillmeier 2/2, 1989, 380-383; Van Roey - Allen, 3-15, 72-77.

P. Allen

THEODORE, pope (642–649). Theodore's Father was a Greek from *Jerusalem. Upon succeeding Pope *John IV, he was consecrated on 24 November 642. During this historical period, many exiles from the Middle East, which had been invaded by the Arabs, came to *Rome. He lived the first months of his pontificate during the revolt of the chartularios Maurice at Rome against the exarch of *Ravenna Isaac the Armenian (LP I,331-332). Theodore's selection is a sign of the close relations between Rome and *Palestine, which, with *Africa, was a center of opposition to *monothelitism (Bertolini, 327-328). Theodore continued these relations by deposing *Sergius of Jerusalem and appointing his vicar Stephen of Dor, primarily to safeguard orthodoxy in that location (Mansi 10,891). Immediately upon being elected, he received three letters from *Constantinople: from the emperor *Constans II (641–668); the synodical letter of *Paul, the new patriarch who had succeeded *Pyrrhus; and a letter from consecrated bishops, which was sent to John IV, who in the meanwhile had died. Theodore responded to all three individuals (Jaffé 2049-2050; 2052). In a letter to Paul, he demanded as a condition of his recognition a regular juridical procedure for the deposition of Pyrrhus, and asked from all the condemnation of monothelite teaching. Pyrrhus, moreover, went to Africa where, in 645, he was refuted in a public debate by *Maximus the Confessor (Mansi 10,709-760); then he went to Rome along with Maximus: here he publicly and solemnly recanted and was treated with all honor (LP I,332); but subsequently, having fled to Ravenna at the court near the exarch Plato, he returned to monothelitism, for which reason Theodore excommunicated him (LP I,332), and he (i.e., Pyrrhus) went to Constantinople. In the meanwhile, relations with Paul also became more tense; through pressure from the African bishops (Jaffé 2055), Theodore sent a delegation to Constantinople to demand a profession of faith from Paul, who responded by professing his open adherence to monothelitism (Mansi 10,1019-1026). As a result, the pope deposed him (LP I,333; Mansi 10,878), and the patriarch responded with harsh rejoinders (LP I,333). The emperor Constans, with the objective of overcoming the debates, published in 648 the *Typos* (Mansi 10,1029-1039; see Martino 1), which was condemned with *Heraclius's *Ekthesis* in the Lateran Council of 649. Theodore had several religious building projects undertaken at Rome, esp. in the chapel of St. Venantius in S. Giovanni in Fonte, where he is represented on a mosaic. He died on 14 May 649 and was buried in St. *Peter's Basilica; *Martin I succeeded him.

CPL 1732; Verzeichnis 558; PL 78, 75-102; PLS 4, 1997–1999; LP I, 331-335; III, 94; DTC 15, 224-226; CE 14, 16; Fliche-Martin V, 230-235, 531-532; G. Ladner, *Die Bildnisse der östlichen Päpste des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts in römischen Mosaiken und Wandgemälden*, in Atti del V Congr. Int. Studi Bizantini, II, Rome 1940, 169-182 (repr. 1978); O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Bologna 1941, 327-337; P. Conte, *Chiesa e Primato nelle lettere dei Papi del secolo VII*, Milan 1971, 433-442 (MS tradition and discussion on the epistolary correspondence; moreover, see the index on p. 585); L. Magi, *La sede romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizan-*

tini (*VI-VII sec.*), Rome-Louvain 1972, 212-221; A.N. Stratos, *Il Patriarca Pirro*: Byzantina 8 (1976) 9-19 (in Greek); J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne: milieu du VI^e s. - fin du IX^e s.*, 2 vols., Brussels 1980-93; P. Conte, *Il sinodo lateranense dell'ottobre del 649*, Rome 1989; EPapi 1, 594-598.

A. Di Berardino

THEODORE, presbyter (d. after 687). The presbyter Theodore, who was twice a candidate for the bishop of *Rome, is probably to be identified with the Roman legate of the same name at the Sixth Council of *Constantinople (680). The first time, upon the death of John V (2 August 686), he was supported by the military party against the archpriest Peter, the clergy's candidate. After two months of disagreement, the two parties agreed on the name of *Conon, who was consecrated pope on 21 October 686. After Conon died on 21 September 687, Theodore, who had become archpresbyter in the meantime, supported by the army entered the fray onc eagain against the archpresbyter Paschal. Over these two competitors, a third candidate was once again preferred, the priest *Sergius, who was of Eastern origin. When he had entered the Lateran basilica, forcing its doors open, Theodore, in contrast to Paschal, refrained from any form of resistance and professed obedience to him and gave him the kiss of peace. The events surrounding Theodore revealed the divisions existing at Rome at the end of the 7th c.

LP I, 350.368, 371-372; EC 11, 1932; EPapi 1, 627, 629-633.

A.V. Nazzaro

THEODORE ABU QURRAH (8th–9th c.)
I. Introduction - II. Life - III. Works.

I. Introduction. "The first Father of the church who wrote in Arabic," according to Becker (*Christliche Polemik*, 1912), and we can certainly say that he was a representative of the *Melkite Church, who provided the most extensive interpretation of the changes underway in the Eastern churches after the Arab rule, which occurred in the 1st half of the 7th c., changes that led to an attitude of absolute closure to a climate of cultural confrontation.

II. Life. For the reference that he himself made in the treatise on the defense of icons, we know that he was born at *Edessa; however, with respect to the date of his birth, various hypotheses have been made starting from certain pieces of information interpreted in different ways. The first piece of information is that Abu Qurrah himself says that he was the spiritual disciple of *John of Damascus. The second piece of information pertains to his presence in 824 at the court of the Caliph al-Ma'mūn, after which he held a long discussion with the caliph in the year 829 (a third marker). The reconstructions of the dates of his birth and death depend on the interpretation of these three pieces of information. Generally speaking, the wavering goes from 720 to 755 for the date of his birth, depending whether, on the one hand, the mention of discipleship under John of Damascus in the monastery of St. *Sabas is understood only spiritually, without conceding that the two men ever met or, on the other hand, whether it is understood as a true and direct discipleship. Following from these data and related to them, it is proposed that his itinerant ministry (more difficult to allow in an advanced age) and the debates with the Caliph al-Ma'mūn (assuming they actually took place) are easier to accept if they occurred in an advanced age rather than when he was almost 100 years old.

Having been formed at Edessa in a Syrian milieu, he entered as a young man in the laura of St. Sabas, where he studied theology and the writings of the church fathers and where he acquired a knowledge of Greek. He was appointed Bishop of Ḥarrān in 795. Between 812 and 815, he began his itinerant activity when he went to *Armenia for a debate with a representative of the *Jacobite church after having sent a letter to the king of Armenia at the request of Thomas patriarch of *Jerusalem (811–820). His itinerant activity continued in *Egypt at *Alexandria and at Jerusalem, where he convinced his Jacobite friend David to become a Melkite Christian. His trip to Baghdad is disputed, but he was certainly reelected bishop of Ḥarrān around 820. Those who maintain the authenticity of the dialogue with the Caliph al-Ma' mūn of 829 set this date as the *terminus post quem* of his death.

III. Works. According to Bach, his literary production began at the monastery of St. Sabas and did not stop once he entered the episcopate. He embraced three languages: *Greek, *Syriac and *Arabic. Nothing remains of the 30 treatises in Syriac that he tells us he wrote, although his literary production in Greek and Arabic has survived. His literary production in Greek includes 43 works of various lengths that were published in the PG 97,1461-1610. Scholars have debated the authenticity of this literary production, recognizing, however, that the brief and concise style of the dialogues and the procedure of the theological thought that rest primarily on logic rather than on the authority of the *Scriptures cor-

respond to Abu Qurrah's style. Dick maintained that the dialogues occurred in Arabic and were transcribed in Greek at a later time. Nevertheless, the critical edition is lacking. The literary production in Arabic includes 19 works that have already been published and partially translated into the major European languages and nine unpublished works, along with some works that have been attributed to him. Among his major compositions in Arabic, the following treatises are of note: *On the Existence of the Creator and the True Religion; On the Veneration of Images; Freedom; On the Path of the Knowledge of God and the Truth of the Eternal Son*, a treatise that refutes those who deny the incarnation and substantiation of God the Son; *On the Fact That Christ Died by His Own Choice; A Refutation of the Armenians with Respect to Confessional Questions; A Debate with the Muslim Mutakallimūn at the Court of al-Ma'mūn.*

S.K. Samir, *Abū Qurrah. Al-sīrah wa-al-marāgi,'* Beirut 2000 (this is the Arabic text with biographical information and the most updated bibl.); S.K. Samir, *Abū Qurrah. Al-mu'allafāt*, Beirut 2000 (in Arabic, the author attempts to create a complete portrait of Abu Qurrah); Teodoro Abū Qurrah, *La libertà*, Arabic text, ed. S.K. Samir, intr. and tr. ed. P. Pizzi, Turin 2001 (in the intro., the author draws a complete picture of the life and all the literary works of Abu Qurrah); S.H. Griffith, *Reflections on the Biography of Theodore Abū Qurrah*: Parole de l'Orient 18 (1993) 150-152; Teodoro Abū Qurrah, *La difesa delle icone. Trattato sulla venerazione delle immagini*, ed. P. Pizzo, Patrimonio Culturale Arabo Cristiano 1, Milan 1995; C. Bacha, *Mayāmir Tāwdūrus Abī Qurrah usquf Ḥarrān*, Beirut 1904; Id., *Un traité des oeuvres arabes de Théodore Abou-Kurra, évêque de Haran, publié et traduit en Français pour la première fois*, Tripoli-Rome 1905; H. Becker, *Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung*: Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete 26 (1912) 175-195, now in *Islamstudien*: *Vom Werden und Wesen der islamische Welt*, Hildesheim 1967, vol. 1; I. Dick, *Maymar fī wuǧud al-hāliq wa-l-dīn al-qawīm li-Tāwdūrus Abī Qurrah (al-mutawaffā ḥawla sanat 825 m.)*, Junieh-Rome 1982; G. Graf, *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur*, II: *Die Schriftsteller bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, ST 133, Vatican City 1947, 3-26; Id., *Die arabischen Schriften des Theodor Abū Qurra, Bischofs von Ḥarrān (ca. 740-820). Literarhistorische Untersuchungen und Übersetzung*, Forschungen zur christlichen Literaturund Dogmengeschichte, 10 Band, 3 und 4 Heft, Paderborn 1910; S.H. Griffith, *Free Will in Christian Kalām: The Doctrine of Theodore Abū Qurrah*: Parole de l'Orient 14 (1987) 79-107; J. Nasrallah, *Histoire du mouvement littéraire dans l'église melchite du Ve au XXe siècle*, t. II/2, (*750-Xe s.*), Louvain 1987, with respect to Abu Qurrah, see esp. pp. 104-134; B.N. Nassif, *Religious Dialogue in Eighth Century: Example from Theodore Abu Qurra Treatise*: Parole de l'Orient 30 (2005) 333-340.

D. Righi

THEODORE ASKIDAS (d. 558). Archbishop of *Caesarea in *Cappadocia, he died in January 558 at *Constantinople. Theodore was the abbot of the New *Laura near *Jerusalem. He was a strong admirer of *Origen and was secretly favorable to *monophysitism. He participated at the Council of Constantinople (536) and remained in the capital, where he enjoyed much respect before the empress *Theodora and became an intimate friend with the emperor *Justinian (Evagr. Schol., *HE* 4,38). In 537 he obtained the metropolitan see of Cappadocia, but he resided more often in the imperial court than in his own diocese. Theodore, however, was unable in 543 to hinder Justinian and the patriarch *Menas from condemning the Origenists, and he signed the edict. In 544–545, probably to vindicate Origen from this condemnation (Liberatus of Byzacena, *Brev.* 24,167-169), he suggested to the emperor that the best means for bringing the monophysites back to ecclesial unity was to condemn as infested with *Nestorianism the so-called *Three Chapters, and Justinian did this very thing. This act incited a broad controversy, during which Pope *Vigilius, who was already under surveillance, deposed Theodore in 551. In the following year, Theodore submitted; as a result, the last years of his life were spent in peace. Only one fragment from his writings exist in a work written by *Evagrius Scholasticus (*HE* 4,38) in which he says that after the resurrection all human beings will be equal to Christ.

CPG 6988; PG 86, 2777c-2780d; E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians* (ABAW.PPH. 18), Munich 1939; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 279-280; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 75; B. Daley, *What Did "Origenism" Mean in the Sixth Century?*, in *Origeniana Sexta*, Leuven 1995, 626-638; Patrologia V, 316-317.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEODORE BAR KONI (8th c.). Theodore bar Koni was a monk at Kaskar, in Beth Aramaye (Iraq), near the school of which, probably established toward the end of the 6th c., he taught biblical *exegesis. The document by which he is known to us and which was probably completed around 792 bears the title of *The Book of the Scholia,* a title in conformity with the custom of thus naming the collections of brief notes of clarification pertaining to the passages and topics of specific points of difficulty in the *Scriptures or in theological debate. What Theodore, therefore, proposed was the composition of a manual that introduced students to the exegesis practiced in the schools, or rather, to the teaching of the interpreter par excellence of the Scriptures in the *dyophysite milieu, namely *Theodore of Mopsues-

tia. Of the eleven treatises that compose the work, nine correspond to this project, containing notes in the forms of questions and answers, pertaining to the methodological questions that were philosophical-theological and exegetical in the strict sense. At the end of the ninth treatise, the copyist's note could allow one to conclude that this was probably the point at which a first redaction of the text came to an end. There are, however, two subsequent "books" added to the first, in which Theodore redacted an apology for Christianity against Islam (one should recall that Kaskar was near the Arab city of al-Wasit, established in 702; for this reason relations with the Islamic world were esp. intense in the region) and, therefore, a list of the heresies that contains at times information of extraordinary interest such as that pertaining to *Bardesanes, *Mani and the *Mandeans, which Theodore derived directly from the original sources in Aramaic. The *Book of the Scholia* has come down to us in two recensions of different sizes and internal organization, with slightly different materials.

Duval 368-369; Baumstark 218-219; Chabot 107-108; Ortiz de Urbina 216-221; BBKL 11, 967-968; Patrologia V, 492-493. *Editions*: CSCO *Scriptores syri* 19, 26; 187-188; 193-194; 197-198.

Studies: E. Benveniste, *Le témoignage de Théodore bar Konai sur le Zoroastrisme*: Le Monde Oriental 26 (1932) 170-215; L. Brade, *Untersuchungen zum Scholienbuch des Theodoros bar Konai; die Übernahme des Erbes von Theodoros von Mopsuestia in der nestorianischen Kirche*, Wiesbaden 1975; Id., *Die Herkunft von Prologen in den Paulusbriefexegesen des Theodors bar Konai und Ishodad von Merv*: OC 60 (1976) 162-171; S.H. Griffith, *Chapter Ten of the "Scholion": Theodore bar Kônî's Apology for Christianity*: OCP 47 (1981) 158-188; D. Kruisheer, *Theodore Bar Koni's Ktābā d-ʿeskolyon as a Source for the Study of Early Mandeism*: Jahrbuch "Ex Oriente Lux" 33 (1993–94) [1995] 151-169.

P. Bettiolo

THEODORE of Alexandria (6th c.). *Jacobite patriarch of *Alexandria; the successor of *Theodosius after a certain interval of time. The circumstances of his ordination are interesting for the history of *monophysitism. Theodosius, the archpresbyter, with his nephew Theodore the archdeacon, sent *Longinus bishop of Nobadae, in Nubia, to consecrate a new patriarch. While on his way to Alexandria (575), in the monastery of Rhamnis, Longinus, along with two Syrian bishops, consecrated Abbot Theodore to the patriarchate, a man who was of Syrian origin, and that against the latter's will. Paul, who was the suspended patriarch of *Antioch and who was found by Longinus in the monastery of Mareotis, stated that he was in agreement with the ordination. In a letter, Longinus informed the Alexandrian Christians of what had taken place, but the clergy became outraged because they already had Peter as their patriarch. Although Theodore had already changed the *synodica* with Paul (John of Ephesus, *HE* 4,48), he remained in his monastery; he was a humble and peaceful monk and did not fret about his ordination. After Peter's death (577), the Alexandrians left him alone and proceeded to elect *Damian. Theodore was still alive in the year *Paul of Antioch died (582). His letter to Paul has been preserved (in *Syriac).

CPG 7236. 7205; I.-B. Chabot: CSCO 17, 298-308; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, Louvain 1951, 200-204 (see the index); J. Maspéro, *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1923; Patrologia V, 391-392.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEODORE of Aquileia (d. 319?). When *Constantine promulgated the edict of freedom (i.e., *Edict of Milan, 313), Theodora was governing the church of *Aquileia. Later episcopal lists (9th c.) situate him in the fourth or fifth place in a series of Aquileian bishops. Scholars have debated the years of his episcopate (308–319?), but a definite date for his life and participation is attested to at the anti-*Donatist Synod of *Arles in 314, where, along with his deacon Agatho, he signed the synodal Acts as the *episcopus de civitate Aquileiensi, provincia Dalmatiae.* But more than his participation at this council, the most eloquent testament to his work are two famous inscriptions on the splendid mosaic floor from the first buildings built by him in the rich and populated Adriatic metropolis immediately after Constantine's Edict of Milan.

PCBE 2, 2166; G.C. Menis, *Nuovi studi iconologici sui mosaici teodoriani di Aquileia*, Udine 1971; G. Cuscito, *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 156-168 (with bibl.); G.C. Menis, *La cultura teologica del clero aquileiese all'inizio del IV secolo*: AAAd 22 (1982) 463-527.

G. Cuscito

THEODORE of Bostra (d. after 570). Along with *Jacob Baradeus (542–578), Theodore had a decisive influence on the survival of the *monophysite church (*Jacobite) after the death of *Severus patriarch of *Antioch (d. 538). When the Ghassanid Emir Hareth bar Gabala asked the empress *Theodora for two monophysite bishops for the regions of *Mesopotamia, *Syria, *Palestine and *Arabia, the patriarch of *Alexandria Theodosius, a monophysite who had been exiled to *Constantinople, appointed

in 542 (1) Jacob Baradeus (hence the name "Jacobite church") for the see of *Edessa, and (2) Theodore, a monk from Arabia, for the province of Arabia Secunda, whose metropolis was *Bostra. Theodore never resided in the city but in the *Field* (*hertha*) of the Saracens, located in Golan. Theodore's episcopal activity was not extraordinary: it was certainly less known than that of Jacob Baradeus. While he was at Constantinople in 564, he certainly approved with the *Letter to Paul of Beth Ukkāmē* the election of *Paul as patriarch of Antioch (J.B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas,* CSCO 17, 94-96: text; 113, 65-66: translation). In 567 he was in the East; in 569 he was again at Constantinople, where he attacked the tritheists and excommunicated *Conon of Tarsus. In 570, while he was in the East, he was sent by *Justin II (565–578) to discuss issues about the faith at Constantinople, once he was able to return to the East with safe conduct, despite the opposition of patriarch John of Sirmin. He died shortly after 570. There also remain two fragments from *Letters* written along with Jacob Baradeus, one directed to the monks to exhort them to protect themselves from the tritheists, and the other to Paul of Antioch to comfort him in his persecutions (J.B. Chabot, CSCO 17, 165-166 and 179-180: text; 113, 115-116 and 125-126: translation).

CPG III, 7201, see 7173-7174; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VI*[e] *siècle*: CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, 157-164. 169. 172. 176. 185. 201, 1.211,5; Patrologia V, 320.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Canterbury. Greek monk residing at *Rome but a native of *Cilicia. Already 70 years old, he was ordained on 26 March 668 as the archbishop of *Canterbury by Pope *Vitalian by appointment of the abbot *Hadrian of Nisida, who followed Theodore to England. Here the church's condition had for a long time deteriorated through a lack of bishops and the inadequacy for the role of the few who had remained, with disastrous results for all aspects of religious life. Theodore dedicated himself with great energy to quelling the abuses and to filling the gaps of the episcopate. In 673 he convoked a council at Hertford to provide a more solid disciplinary organization for the church of England. With Hadrian's collaboration, he promoted study and introduced the use of Gregorian chant in England. He did not hesitate to depose *Wilfrid from his see of *York because he regarded him as insufficiently deferential to his authority. His great achievement was the reorganization of England's dioceses: he divided the dioceses of Mercia and Northumbria, which were too large; he was able to stop idiosyncratic movements and provided unity for the entire ecclesiastical organization. With him, after the troubled results from *Augustine's mission, the church of England assumed a structure that was destined to remain definitive. He died in 690.

CPL 1885; DCB 4, 926-932; W. Reany, *St. Theodore of Canterbury*, Saint Louis 1944; BS 12, 243-244; *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. M. Lapidge, Cambridge 1995; BBKL 11, 869-874.

M. Simonetti

THEODORE of Constantinople (7th c.). Deacon and also rhetorician and *synodicarius* of patriarch *Paul II of Constantinople (641–654), Theodore was the author of two *aporiae* ("questions" or "difficulties") against the orthodox teaching of the two wills in Christ. These are to be found among the writings of *Maximus the Confessor (580–662; PG 91,216-217), who provided his response to the presbyter Marinus (PG 91,217-228). The first *aporia* such as ignorance places ignorance and will in Christ on the same level and therefore concludes that in Christ the will must be preached κατ' οἰκείωσιν ("according to appropriation"); Maximus showed that the *aporia* is contradictory in its own terms: in fact, the will signifies the position of something, although ignorance is its destruction; if then the will and ignorance have the same rationale (λόγος), it follows that in God there is ignorance and that inanimate things have a will; he, therefore, lists the consequences for *Christology (there would be in Christ two ignorances and two wills; according to the mode of understanding the *appropriation* falls into *Docetism, *Apollinarism etc.). The second *aporia* affirms that the statement "natural will," which, not having been used by the church fathers, leads to a new teaching; Maximus approved the patristic use of the expression and affirmed that the Fathers attributed the will to nature.

CPG III, 7632; Bardenhewer 5, 20; Beck 433.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Copros. *Monophysite deacon of Copros (or Copris near *Alexandria) in the 2nd half of the 6th c. He is perhaps the same individual named by *John of Ephesus as the *archdeacon. He, along with the presbyter and the church attorney (ἐκκλησιέκδικος) Theodosius (John of Ephesus speaks of an archpresbyter Theodosius), invited *Longinus, bishop for six years of Nobadae (a people of *Nubia

near the border with the Byzantine Empire), to come secretly to Mareotis (near Alexandria) to consecrate a patriarch for the *Jacobite church of Alexandria, whose see had been vacant for nine years: Theodore the Syrian *archimandrite was ordained (575; John of Ephesus IV,9, in E.W. Brooks, CSCO 105,188-189: text; 106, pp. 140-141: translation). The fragment of the *Letter to Longinus* is in J.B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas* (CSCO 17,273-274: text; 103, 191: translation).

CPG III, 7225; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VI^e siècle*: CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, 226-227; Patrologia V, 405.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Echinus (5th c.). Bishop of Echinus in *Thessaly in the 1st quarter of the 5th c. The city of Echinus was Christianized after *Constantine's victory. We know very little concerning the life of this church; the only thing we know is that four of its bishops, one of which was Theodore, took part in the Council of *Ephesus (431) and signed its conciliar acts.

G. Ladocsi

THEODORE of Heraclea (d. ca. 355). Elected bishop of Heraclea—ancient Perinthus, situated on the Sea of Marmara and the metropolis of the Diocletian province of Europa (modern-day Marmara Ereğlisi)—Theodore was one of the proponents of the anti-Nicene front established and guided by *Eusebius of Nicomedia. Although *Gelasius of Cyzicus named him among the representatives of that minority of the Council of *Nicaea that supported the teaching of *Arius (*HE* II,7), the documentation pertaining to the list of participants attests that instead it was his predecessor Paideros who took part in that council (Turner I,1 n. 203). His election as bishop occurred in the context of the personal politics led by Eusebius of Nicomedia against the Nicene front. It could not have occurred before 328, the year of the latter's reentry from exile to which he was sentenced immediately after the Council of *Nicaea (*Socrates, *HE* I, 23), and certainly not after 333/334, the year in which Theodore appears for the first time in the sources, mentioned by *Sozomen (*HE* III,1), inasmuch as he was an opponent of the election of *Paul of Samosata as bishop of *Constantinople (334). During the Council of *Tyre (335) he was among the chief opponents of *Athanasius and took part in the synodal commission charged with examining the validity of the protests forwarded by the Meletians against him (Soz., *HE* II,25; Athan., *Apol.* 13,2; Socr., *HE* I,31; Theod., *HE* I,30). Not all the sources are in agreement on his presence at the Council of Constantinople, which was convoked by *Constantine to reexamine the case of Athanasius (336), although it is certain that he participated in 342 in the delegation sent to provide clarifications for the emperor *Constans II concerning the deposition of *Paul of Samosata and Athanasius, in an attempt to bring an end to the differences between Easterners and Westerners (Soz., *HE* III,10; Socr., II,18). He was among the signatories of the council of Eastern bishops that occurred at Philippopolis in 343 (Theod., *HE* II,8; Athan., *Apol.* 46,1.47,3) and, precisely because of his influence within the anti-Nicene front, was excommunicated by the parallel Council of *Sardica (343), which was held by the Westerners (Hilary, FH B II, 1). His name is also found among the list of signatories of the theological formula of the Council of *Sirmium of 351 (Hilary, FH B VII,9; Athan., *De Synod.*, 27,2). He was opposed to Athanasius's reentry at *Alexandria, participating at a gathering of nearly 30 bishops at *Antioch which Sozomen dated between the death of Pope *Julius (352) and the Council of *Milan of 355 (*HE* IV,8). During this same year, Pope *Liberius informed the emperor *Constantius of his death (Theod., *HE* II,16).

The majority of the information pertaining to his exegetical activity is owed to *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 90), who states that he knew his commentaries on *Matthew, *John, the *Psalms and Paul's epistles, appreciating his style and exegetical insight. In the 5th c., *Theodoret referred generically to Theodore's commentaries on the gospels, thereby confirming Jerome's judgment (*HE* II,2) and, likewise in the 2nd half of the 6th c., *Ammonius of Alexandria used his commentary on the gospel of John (Reuss, *Der Presbyter Ammonios,* 159ff.). Of all his work, only fragments preserved in the catena remain, limited to commentaries on Matthew, John and Isaiah, in which he shows that he was very well-versed in the different techniques of interpretation used by the representatives of the two exegetical schools of the time, without, however, subjecting the biblical text to one method over another, but choosing to make use of an exegetical procedure that was different in relation to the meaning that he wished to attribute to each passage of Scripture. In particular, even those passages on which he seems to have commented according to a rigidly literal exegetical perspective and in which he allows himself to engage in an extensive paraphrase, he always lets his readers know that the

true understanding of Scripture is the spiritual meaning, regardles of whether in order to reach it, it is sufficient to stop at the literal sense or it is necessary to have recourse to an *allegorical procedure.

From the doctrinal point of view, his christological formulation is heavily subordinationist, even though far from the radical positions articulated by *Arius. The inferiority of the Logos is established primarily between the Father, who is the only unbegotten, and the Son, who is the only begotten from the Father, and who were conceived as two subsistent hypostases. The intermediary function of the Son is understood according to the traditional thinking in which the incarnation is the fulfillment of the revelatory activity of the Logos, already begun with the OT theophanies, to which is added the soteriological character of the death and resurrection of the Son. Trinitarian theology is, practically speaking, absent, although there is the exception for the very few references to the *Holy Spirit, which reveal the Spirit's subordination to the Father and the Son and a function of mediation between God and the world, which is more limited with respect to the latter. This perspective is perfectly inserted within the framework of the trinitarian reflection of the first phase of the Arian controversy, during which the question of the Holy Spirit had little importance. Among the fragments published under his name, some have been included that contain the term *homoousios*, but precisely for this reason they cannot be attributed to him (see frags. 133, 134 on Mt and frags. 70, 257, and 334 on Jn). Likewise for doctrinal reasons, one cannot consider authentic those fragments whose contents refer to later theological contexts, which can be traced back to *Apollinaris of Laodicea and *Basil of Caesarea (see frags. 117, 126, 302, 310, 315 and 336 on Jn). In the commentary on Isaiah, however, one uncovers the problems of attribution owed to the disagreement between the MSS which can in large part be attributed to errors of erasure and transcription of lemmata (see frags. on Is 26:10, Is 26:14, Is 32:15, Is 57:15, Is 60:10, Is 64:5).

CPG III, 3561-3567; DCB 4, 933; LTK 10, 40; A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, VI, 6, Rome 1853; M. Faulhaber, *Die Propheten-Katenen*, Freiburg 1899, 39-62; J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Berlin 1957 (TU 61), 55-95; Id., *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Berlin 1966 (TU 89), 65-176; Id., *Der Presbyter Ammonios von Alexandrien und sein Kommentar zum Johannesevangelium*: Biblica 44 (1963) 159-170; Simonetti 596; K.Ch. Felmy, *Orthodoxe Theologie. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1990, 40ff.; BBKL 24, 1479-1485; K. Schäferdiek, *Theodor von Heraklea (328/34-351/55). Ein wenig beachteter Kirchenpolitiker und Exeget des 4. Jhs.*, in *Romanitas-Christianitas. FS J. Straub*, Berlin 1982, 392-410.

E. Valeriani

THEODORE of Marseille (d. 594). Theodore lived at the time of the internal wars which, because of dynastic reasons, disrupted the city of *Marseille after the death of the Merovingian king *Chlothar I (561). Theodore actively participated there once he had become bishop (575), just as he had undertaken under the religious aspect to reorder a diocese which was otherwise rebellious and in an uproar. Imprisoned twice (the second time for having supported the nomination of Gundovald, who came from *Constantinople and was perhaps sent by the emperor Tiberius II: hence the hypothesis of Theodore's Eastern origin—Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* VI,24) and was persecuted for a long time but was always miraculously delivered from death (Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* VIII, 12). He participated at the Synod of Macon (Mansi 9, 957). *Gregory the Great wrote to him advising him of the need for greater meekness and more active work in preaching and his commitment to the Christianization of the *Jews (*Ep.* I, 45). He died on 2 January 594.

BS 12, 253-257; S. Boesch Gaiano, *Per una storia degli Ebrei in Occidente tra Antichità e Medioevo. La testimonianza di Gregorio*: Quaderni Medievali 8 (1979) 12-43.

F. Cocchini

THEODORE of Martigny (d. after 390). First bishop of Martigny (Octodurus), he participated along with *Ambrose of Milan at the Council of *Aquileia in 381 (Mansi 3,599) and that of *Milan around 390, signing the letter sent by the synod to Pope *Siricius (Mansi 3,664-667; 689-690). According to the letter written by *Eucherius to bishop *Salvius, Theodore is the source of the information pertaining to the *martyrdom of St. *Maurice and his companions at Agaunum (Eucher., *Ep. ad Salv.*: CSEL 31,173). He had found their bodies and constructed a basilica in their honor (Eucher., *Pass. Acaun.* 7). For the miraculous events attributed to Theodore and the spread of his cult, see BS 12,257-258.

L. Lathion, *Théodore d'Octodure et les origines chrétiennes du Valois*, Lausanne 1961; BBKL 11, 881-884 (bibl.); LTK[3] 9, 1416 (bibl.).

A. Pollastri

THEODORE of Mopsuestia (d. 428). Student of *Diodore of Tarsus, who was likewise an Antiochene, Theodore's birth can be set around 350. If he is to be identified with the Theodore whom *John Chrysostom addressed, he was one of his fellow students at the school of *Libanius and a monk, whom his

friend dissuaded from abandoning the ascetic for a worldly life. A presbyter around 383, he was ordained bishop of *Mopsuestia (*Cilicia) in 392 and died in 428. A famous representative of Antiochene *exegesis and theology, he was highly valued and admired during his life, but he subsequently became involved in the *Nestorian controversy inasmuch as he was considered, as with Diodore of Tarsus, a forerunner of *Nestorius's *Christology. Having become the favorite target of the *monophysites, he was condemned at the Council of *Constantinople of 553 (the controversy of the *Three Chapters).

The condemnation of Theodore at the Council of Constantinople brought about the disappearance of almost all his numerous theological and exegetical writings. The few remains are almost all in *Syriac translation because his legacy was greatly respected in the Nestorian Church. The Nestorian Ebedjesu (14th c.) has left us a catalog of his works. Apart from three ascetic treatises (*The Priesthood, To the Monks* and *Perfect Direction*), and a collection of letters (*Book of the Pearls*), all of which have been lost with the exception of fragments and one of his responses to the emperor *Julian's treatise *Against the Galileans,* few fragments of which remain, Theodore's work is divided between theology and exegesis. In the first area, his interests pertain (1) to the *Arian controversy (*For Basil, Against Eunomius*, in which he refuted *Eunomius's response to *Basil' work, a description of which remains in Photius [*Bibl.,* cod. 4]; *Disputation with the Macedonians*, which has come down to us in a Syriac translation and which refers to a debate that actually occurred in 392 at Anazarbus); (2) to the Apollinarist controversy (*The Assumer and the Assumed,* now lost); and (3) to questions pertaining to free will and original *sin (*Against Magic,* spoken of by Photius [*Bibl.,* cod. 81]; *Against the Defenders of Original Sin,* likewise described by Photius [*Bibl.*, cod. 177]). This last work took a stance against *Augustine and the supporters of original sin as inherent to our nature. In effect Theodore amicably hosted *Julian of Eclanum, Augustine's opponent who, after having been condemned in the West, sought help and protection in the East.

Theodore's most important and controversial doctrinal work was the *Incarnation,* written in 15 books and directed against the *Anomoians and *Apollinarists, in which he treated difficulties pertaining to the *Trinity, Christology and anthropology. In 1905 a Syriac translation of the work was discovered in the East, but the MS was lost during World War I (1914–1918). Numerous fragments of the work, however, remain in Latin, Greek and Syriac, but these fragments should be examined with much caution because they were collected either by defenders or opponents of Theodore.

A better knowledge of his Christology, along with information of cultic and liturgical character, we gather from his *Catechetical Homilies,* a collection of 16 texts discovered in 1932 in Syriac translation. According to traditional use, the first ten, directed at catechumens, treat topics pertaining to the Trinity and Christology in commenting upon the *Nicene Creed; the other six explain the Our Father (*see* *Lord's Prayer) and the baptismal and eucharistic liturgy. In addition to a trinitarian theology which by that point had become traditional in the anti-Arian sense and affirmed the unity of the divine substance in three distinct hypostases of equal dignity, the homilies present us with a treatment of the christological question that kept in mind some of the difficulties brought to light by the Apollinarist controversy. Theodore was a typical representative of the Antiochene tradition; he therefore placed utmost value on the humanity assumed by the divine Logos and his capacity to operate in an autonomous way: it represents a true and proper subject that Theodore loved to call the "Son of David" in correlation with the Son of God, the Logos. It is unnecessary to note that he made a normal use of the phraseology of the *homo assumptus* to present the union (the inhabitation of the Logos in time represented by the body etc.). But Theodore was also aware of the criticisms that the Apollinarists directed at this so clearly divisionist Christology, and therefore he was certain to also outline the union between the two components, human and divine, of Christ, with more attention than had been used in the Antiochene milieu. He denied that one could speak of two Lords and two Sons, because the two natures were united in an ineffable and eternally indissoluble way in one sole **prosōpon*. Just as the union was not destroyed by the distinction of the natures, so too this distinction did not prevent the two from being one. It is evident that Theodore took great pains at safeguarding the unity of Christ without denigrating the integrity and autonomy of his human nature: but it is beyond a shadow of a doubt that to an Alexandrian the result appeared insufficient, both in the terminology used and because the way in which the union was achieved is unclear, so much so because the *prosōpon* ("figure, external aspect") seemed to be less substantial than the *hypostasis to refer to this union. In effect, Theodore, esp. in his *Commentary on John,* treated Christ, man and God, as two subjects that were distinct from each other.

Theodore was above all a biblical exegete, the

most typical example of Antiochene exegesis in opposition to Alexandrian *allegorism. We know that he wrote *commentaries on Genesis, the other books of the Pentateuch, the *Psalms, the Major and Minor *Prophets, *Job, *Exodus and Ecclesiastes. In a letter he made known his thoughts about the *Song of Songs. With respect to the NT, we are aware of his commentaries on Matthew, Luke, John, Acts and Paul's epistles. In addition to numerous fragments for chs. 1–3 of Genesis, there remain the following commentaries: the *Commentary on John* in the original Greek, the *Commentary on John* in Syriac translation, the *Commentary on Paul's Minor Letters* in *Latin translation and more fragments of the *Commentary on Paul's Four Major Letters*. Moreover, Devreesse, making full use of the catenae, Julian of Eclanum's Latin translation and other testimonies, has reconstructed his commentary on Psalms 1–80.

Theodore proceeds in his commentary on a book of Scripture by an introduction in which he describes the characteristics of this particular book and offers a brief treatment about the author and the chronology. His historical observations here are noteworthy: he, for example, understood that the historical situations described in the book of Psalms were often later than *David, who was traditionally considered the author of the entire book, and to salvage the authority of this biblical author, he explained that, inasmuch as he was a prophet, David described the deeds and situations that took place after him. His interpretation of texts moves along very quickly, attentive to the literal sense with historical, linguistic, grammatical and, less frequently, doctrinal observations. Even though attention is given to passages that are difficult to interpret, for large portions the commentary is reduced to a long paraphrase of the biblical text. Theodore was esp. attentive to emphasize that, when the sacred text contains a number, this number has no other objective than that of the obvious objective of determining the quantity of persons or things, in clear opposition to the Alexandrians, who were always quick to assign symbolic values to numbers. And when a text communicates in an emphatic and figurative language, he always explains it in a literal sense, making use of the figures of hyperbole, in instances where the Alexandrians, as a normal course of operation, detected difficulties in literal interpretation and without a doubt skipped over to the allegorical meaning.

However, Theodore does not at all deny that various passages of the OT are to be interpreted as a prefiguration, *typoi* of the deeds and figures of the NT: *Jonah is a figure of Christ; the deliverance of the Israelites from *Egypt, the legal prescriptions and the episode of the serpent of bronze are *typoi* of Christ's death and the deliverance from sin accomplished by him. He specifies that an OT deed, in order to be considered a *typos* of a NT deed, must present a likeness with it, turning out to be useful for its own time and expressing a lesser reality than that in the future time (PG 66,320ff). Establishing himself on this passage and other analogous ones, some modern scholars have sought to minimize the differences between Theodore's literalism and Alexandrian allegorism in the interpretation of the OT, but, if one goes beyond this theory to the actual facts, we note that Theodore reduces as much as possible the number of OT passages that he considers *typoi* of the NT: he would only list four of those types of texts in the Psalms (2, 8, 44, 109) and very few prophetic passages, rejecting typologies, however traditional they may have been considered, such as the one that referred to Christ, the sun of justice from Mal 4:2 (3:20 LXX). He preferred to believe that almost all the prophetic passages that were usually referred to Jesus Christ and the church were fulfilled at the time of Zerubbabel and the Maccabees. He was the only one, or nearly so, among all the Antiochene exegetes, who denied that the husband and wife from the Song of Songs could be considered *typoi* of Christ and the church, thereby reducing the work to a love song written by Solomon for an Egyptian princess. In fact, Theodore tended to consider the OT an expression of an economy finalized in itself, namely that of Jewish monotheism, in contradistinction to pagan polytheism and Christian trinitarianism, which is expressed in the NT. Moreover, his teaching of the two ages, opposing the present age, namely the age of sin, to the future age, the age of liberation and happiness, and recognizing in face of the present age inaugurated by the incarnation of Christ the anticipation of the future age, led him to read the NT more as a projection of the future than as a continuation of the past. Theological presuppositions and systematic rejection of excessive allegorism of the Alexandrians led Theodore to minimize the presence of Christ in the OT. The NT does not pose the same problems for Theodore because here the sacred text presents Christ and the church directly, and therefore his interpretation is systematically and exclusively literal. But precisely for this reason, a text like *John's gospel, which is so rich with symbolic meanings, emerges extrememly impoverished from his flat literal explanation, which contains only a few doctrinal overtures. By contrast, the aforementioned tendency to identify more of a fracture than a continuity between the OT and the NT placed

Theodore in perfect harmony with the thought of the apostle *Paul, in contradistinction to earlier commentators who, because of antignostic concerns, sought to read Paul in harmony with the OT. Theodore in fact knew how to fully receive and illustrate with eloquence the Pauline opposition between the law and grace, the slavery of the old man and the freedom of the new.

CPG II, 3827-3873; PG 66, CCL 88A (Latin trans. of the *Exp. in ps.* by Julian of Eclanum); CSCO 115-116 (*Com. Jn.*); PO 9, 637-667 (*Disp. Mac.*); H.B. Swete, *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni in epistulas B. Pauli commentarii*, I-II, Cambridge 1880-82; R. Devreesse, *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes*, ST 93, Vatican City 1933; *Commentarius in XII prophetas*, ed. H.N. von Sprenger, Göttingen 1977; K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Münster 1933, 113-172; R. Tonneau - R. Devreesse, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*, ST 145, Vatican City 1949; R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, ST 141, Vatican City 1949; DTC 15, 235-279; Quasten II, 405-426 (bibl.); U. Wickert, *Studien zu den Pauluskommentaren Theodors von Mopsuestia*, Berlin 1962; R.A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ*, Oxford 1963; J.M. Lera, *". . . y se hizo hombre." La economía trinitaria en las Catequesis de Teodoro de Mopsuestia*, Bilbao 1977; M. Simonetti, *Note sull'esegesi veterotestamentaria di Teodoro di Mopsuestia*: VetChr 14 (1977) 69-102; L. Fatica, *I Commentari a Giovanni di Teodoro di Mopsuestia e Cirillo di Alessandria. Confronto tra metodi esegetici e teologici*, Rome 1988; D.Z. Zaharopulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible: A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis*, New York 1988; S. Zincone, *Studi sulla visione dell'uomo in ambito antiocheno* (*Diodoro, Crisostomo, Teodoro, Teodoreto*), L'Aquila-Rome 1988; TRE 33, 240-246 (bibl.); *Replica a Giuliano imperatore*, ed. A. Guida, Florence 1994; D. Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*, Oxford 2003; S. Gerber, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum: Studien zu den katechischen Homilien*, Leiden-Boston 2000; G. Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Early Christian Studies 7), Sydney 2004; R.C. Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, Washington, DC 2004; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, ed. and trans. by M. Conti (ACT), Downers Grove, IL 2010.

M. Simonetti

THEODORE of Paphos (7th c.). Bishop of Paphos (island of *Cyprus) around the mid-7th c., on 12 December 655 delivered the *panegyric for the feast of St. *Spyridion, a speech that has survived to our time. Spyridion, a shepherd who was married and had children, was the bishop of Trimethus (Cyprus); it is uncertain whether he participated at the Council of *Nicaea (325); he signed the *acts of the Council of *Sardica (343; Athan., *Apol. c. Arian.* 2: PG 25, 340b; Mansi 3,69a). Spyridion is mentioned by *Rufinus (*HE* 1,5: PL 21,471-472), *Socrates (*HE* 1,12: PG 67, 164-165, which depended on Rufinus's work) and *Sozomen (*HE* 1,11: PG 67,885-889). Around the person of this saint there circled oral traditions and biographies (lost) and also a poem in iambic verses attributed to Triphyllios (also lost). This poem was used by Theodore; Theodore's panegyric was in turn reformulated by Simon Metaphrastes and by the two anonymous *Lives* of St. Spyridon.

CPG III, 7987; Bardenhewer 5, 138-139; P. van den Ven, *La légende de S. Spiridon*: Bibliothèque du Muséon 33, Louvain 1933; Beck 463, see 456, 1; BS 11, 1354-1356; Altaner 247; Patrologia V, 248-249.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Petra (6th c.). Theodore was the author of a *panegyric for St. *Theodosius the cenobiarch. From this work one can deduce that he was a disciple of the saint in the monastery established by Theodosius. The encomium, which is very verbose and composed according to the rhetorical canons of that literary genre, was held for the monks of the monastery on the first anniversary of Theodosius's death, that is, 11 January 530, and, after having been revised on several points, was published after 552 (the date of death for the patriarch *Peter of Jerusalem). From the heading we see that Theodore was later bishop of *Petra (*Arabia).

CPG III, 7533; H Usener, *Der heilige Theodosios. Schriften des Theodoros und Kyrillos*, Leipzig 1890; A.J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient*, III, 3, Paris 1963, 83-160; Bardenhewer 5, 128-129; Beck 406 and 409; Patrologia V, 288-289; 294.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Pharan (570–ca. 638). Bishop of Pharan in the western Sinai desert, from the 6th or the 7th c. According to the documents of the Council of *Rome (649), he was the first representative of *monoenergism, following the requests of the patriarch of *Constantinople, *Sergius I. The Sixth Ecumenical Council of *Constantinople in 681 condemned him along with Sergius I. The acts of the two aforementioned councils cited several passages from his letter to Sergius of Arsinoe, in *Egypt, and his commentary on the sayings of the Fathers. Theodore became interested in the question concerning the union of the two natures in Christ without having ever been an observant *monophysite. In all likelihood, he is to be identified with *Theodore of Raithu.

BBKL 14, 1545-1546; W. Elert, *Theodor von Pharan und Theodor von Raithu*: Theologische Literaturzeitung 76 (1951) 67-76; Id., *Der Ausgang der altkirchlichen Christologie*, Berlin 1957; K.-H. Uthemann, *Neuchalkedonismus*: SP 29 (1997) 373-413.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEODORE of Philae (d. 570/584). *Monophysite bishop of Philae in Upper *Thebaid. Along with *Longinus, bishop of Nobadae (a people near the Roman border), he was an eminent figure in the *Jacobite Church of *Egypt in the middle of the 6th c. He was consecrated by *Timothy IV (517–535) in 525/526 and ruled his own diocese for nearly 50 years: he died between 577 and 584. For a period of 18 years, the Nobadae were entrusted to him. In 575 Theodore prescribed a *mandatum* (*entolikon*) to Longinus with which he authorized him to also proceed in his name to the consecration of a Jacobite patriarch of *Alexandria, which had been vacant for nine years (J.B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*: CSCO 17, 274-275: text; 103, 192: translation). Indeed Longinus, unknown to the civil authorities of Nubia, went with this mission (he had been called by *Theodore of Copros and the presbyter Theodosius) to Mareotis (near Alexandria); when he passed through Philae, he invited the elderly Theodore to accompany him, but Theodore did not want to join him because of his advanced age and also "because of the wickedness [*neklo, dolum*: translation] of those who at the time governed the churches" (this was perhaps an allusion to Bishop John of Keliya); he gave him, however, the mandate for ordination.

CPG III, 7227; John of Ephesus, IV, 7,9; R. Payne Smith, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus*, Oxford 1860, 255.259; W. Brooks: CSCO 105, 186-189: text; 106, 139-141: translation; *Theodorus* (36), DCB 4, 949; J. Maspéro, *Théodore de Philae*: RHR 59 (1909) 299-317; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VI^e siècle*: CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, 175.224-227.232-233; Patrologia V, 405-406.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Raithu (d. 649?). Monk and priest in the monastic colony near Raithu, a port city in the SW portion of the Sinai Peninsula; he was the author of a προπαρασκευή, a propaedeutic text that included a heresiological and a dialectical part (philosophical ideas); it was distinguished by its *Neochalcedonian tendencies, which was characterized by the pressure of harmonizing the formulas of the Council of *Chalcedon with that of *Cyril of Alexandria. According to Richard, one must attribute to him the treatise *De Sectis* (CPG III, n. 6823), composed after 579, a sort of summary of contemporary theology, with a severe criticism of *Leontius of Byzantium and the religious politics of *Justinian I. Other scholars, however, believe that *Leontius Scholasticus was the author of this text. If, however, one agrees with Elert in identifying Theodore with *Theodore of Pharan, a city near Raithu, these would be the following consequences. Theodore would have been one of the first eminent representatives of *monoenergism—something that should not be excluded even for a theologian who was previously Neochalcedonian (Beck). Moreover, he would have been a confidant of *Sergius patriarch of Constantinople and condemned along with him by the Council of *Constantinople of 680/681. Finally, the date of his death would have to be placed no later than 649, probably, however, in 638. W. Klein, following A.Th. Niklas (Athens 1981), rejects this identification.

Editions: CPG III, 7600ff., see 6823; PG 91, 1484-1504 (incomplete); F. Diekamp, Analecta Patristica, Rome 1938, 173-227; Mansi 10, 957-961; 11, 567-572 (fragments); PG 86, 1193-1268 (= De Sectis).

Studies: DTC 15/1, 282ff.; W. Elert, *Der Ausgang der altkirchlichen Christologie*, Berlin 1957; Beck 374, 382-383, 430-431; J. Speigl, *Der Autor der Schrift "De Sectis" über die Konzilien und die Religionspolitik Justinians*: Annuarium Hist. Conc. 2 (1970) 207-230; A. Grillmeier - T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus* II/2, 514-523; Patrologia V, 306; T. Hainthaler, *Bemerkungen zur Christologie des Ps. Dionysius*, in Y. de Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite*, Paris 1997, 269-292; LTK 9, 1417-1418 (the two entries: T. of Raithou - T. of Pharan); LACL (2002) 680-681; W. Klein, in TRE 33 (2002) 246ff.; BBKL 14, 1545-1547.

B. Studer

THEODORE of Scythopolis. Palestinian *Origenist of the 6th c., from the faction of the **isochrists* who had as their center the New *Laura. Theodore was its *hegumen before becoming the *staurophylax* and the metropolitan of *Scythopolis thanks to the support of *Theodore Ascidas (Cyril of Scythopolis, *V. Sab*. 89). Subsequently, by an inversion of *Justinian's religious politics that would lead to the condemnation of Origenism at the Council of *Constantinople (553), Theodore was forced to retract his convictions. The *Libellus de erroribus Origenianis,* which was redacted at Constantinople probably around the end of 552, contains 12 anathemas broadly directed against the following teachings: the preexistence of souls and the *apokatastasis* and, more specifically, against the christological and soteriological developments of the *isochrists*.

CPG 6993, PG 86, 232-236; F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Concil*, Münster i.W. 1899, 125-129; B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'oeuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris 1983; D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, Rome 2001; L. Perrone, *Palestinian Monasticism, the Bible, and Theology in the Wake of the Second Origenist Controversy*, in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage*

in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present, Leuven 2001, 245-259.

L. Perrone

THEODORE of Tabennesi (d. 368). Religious superior of the monastery of Tabennesi, and as such, head of the Pachomian monasteries from ca. 350 until his death in 368. The office was assigned to him by *Horsiesi, who, it seems, was unable to bring an end to the disagreement that had arisen after the death of *Pachomius. Theodore brought back peace to the monasteries so much so that after 368 Horsiesi was able to take up the leadership of the monasteries without difficulty. Information about his life is found in several more extensive redactions of the works of Pachomius. *Jerome translated one of his letters into Latin along with other works of Pachomius and Horsiesi. Another one of his letters was recently discovered in *Coptic—therefore in the original redaction—a document addressed to convents during the annual gathering of the month of Mesor, at which they celebrated the festival of the "remission" (of sins?).

CPG 2373-2376; PG 23, 99-100; A. Boon, *Pachomiana latina*, Louvain 1932, 105-106; AASS, *Mai* 3, 63-71; L.Th. Lefort, CSCO 159, Louvain 1959, 37-62 (text); CSCO 160, 195, 38-62 (Fr. trans.); Patrologia II, 161-162; C. Joest, *Pachom und Theodoros: Konflikte im Autoritätsverständnis bei den Pachomianem*: Theologie und Philosophie 68 (1993) 516-529; Id., *Ein Versuch zur Chronologie Pachoms und Theodoros*: ZNTW 85 (1994) 132-144; Coptic Encyclopedia 7, 2239-2240.

T. Orlandi

THEODORE of Trimethus. Bishop of Trimethus (*Trimithousa* on the island of *Cyprus), he participated at the sixth ecumenical council (Constantinople III, 680), from the 14th session onward, representing Epiphanius II, archbishop of Constantia, Cyprus (Mansi 11,584e, 603c, 613a: Basil was substituted with Theodore, 625c). He once spoke there with the bishops of Cyprus in favor of the two wills in Christ (Mansi 11,596e, see, Hfl-Lecl 3,1,506: the reading of a speech of *Athanasius) and signed its *acts (Mansi 11,640e, 669b, 688de). He was the author of a life of St. *John Chrysostom, published for the first time by A. Mai (*Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, VI,263ff.) and reproduced in PG (47,51-88). This life, which is better than the one attributed to patriarch *George of Alexandria (see Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 96; Beck 460), provides extensive documents that illustrate the final, tormented period of the saint's life (the *Letters* of *Arcadius, *Honorius, Pope *Innocent, *Theophilus, the Roman synod, *Eudoxia etc.).

CPG III, 7989; F. Halkin, *Douze récits byzantins sur saint Jean Chrysostome*: Subs. Hagiogr. 60, Brussels 1977, 7-68; Bardenhewer 5, 140; Beck 460 and 463; Patrologia V, 249; BBKL 11, 917-918.

A. De Nicola

THEODORE of Tyana (4th c.). Bishop of *Tyana (from 383 until at least 404), metropolis of *Cappadocia II, detached from *Caesarea at the beginning of *Basil of Caesarea's episcopate, with vociferous appeals for ecclesiastical autonomy by its bishop *Anthimus. Theodore was, therefore, the metropolitan of *Gregory of Nazianzus, who dedicated to him the *Philocalia,* drawn from the writings of *Origen, and wrote him the following letters: 139, 152, 157, 160-163 and certainly 122-124, but not 77 and 183. He showed sympathy toward *John Chrysostom during his exile (*Palladius, *Dialogue* 132,4).

M.M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, Bonn 1970, 161-162.

J. Gribomont

THEODORE SPUDAEUS (7th c.). With respect to the Σπουδαῖοι, see S. Pétridès, *Le monastère des Spoudaei à Jérusalem et les Spoudaei de Constantinople*: EO 4 (1900-01) 225-231; 7 (1904) 341-348. Theodore was almost certainly the author of the *Commemoratio* (Sirmond, 81-113) and the *Hypomnesticum* (Sirmond, 251-272; BHG 2261), testimonies of first importance with respect to the persecutions connected to the debates on *monothelitism. The first certain pieces of information concerning him date back to the year 653, when he was present at the arrival of Pope *Martin I to *Constantinople, who had been led there after he was arrested upon the order of *Constans II. Thoroughly moved by the sad sight, Theodore came into contact, we do not know in what way, with the prisoner and received two letters from him; namely, the *Quoniam agnovi* (Jaffé 2078) and the *Noscere voluit* (Jaffé 2079), which he summarized in the *Commemoratio*. The work, probably composed around the end of 654 (Devreesse, *Le texte grec*, 58), illustrates the vicissitudes undergone by Pope Martin I and was addressed to the faithful of *Rome and *Africa to praise the pope's behavior. We have only a Latin version of this document thanks to Anastasius Bibliothecarius. The *Hypomnesticum,* published by Devreesse (who at one point attributed the work to *Theodosius of Gangra, Theodore's brother: *Le texte grec*, 49) on the basis of a single MS witness, the *Vatic.* 1671 (10th c.), previously known by the Latin version of the Anastasius

Bibliothecarius (BHL 5844), presents the events of other victims of monothelitism, Anastasius the Apocrisarius, his two disciples, the brothers Theodore and Euprepius, *Maximus the monk and his disciple Anastasius. They were all friends of Theodore, whom he often went to visit and comfort in their exile. The document closes with an extensive doxology that, from a grammatical and stylistic point of view, contains numerous errors: the author is aware of this; he maintains, however, that it is necessary to present the work of the martyrs and to invite the faithful to prayer so that the persecutions may end as soon as possible.

CPG 7968-7969; BHL 5593-5598, Suppl. 1911, 220, Suppl. 1986, 615; CPL 1734; PL 129, 591-604, 681-690; PG 90, 173-178, 193-202; R. Devreesse, *Le texte grec de l'Hypomnesticum de Théodore Spoudée* (*le supplice, l'exil et la mort des victimes illustres du monothélisme*): AB 53 (1935) 49-80; Beck 462-463; M. Simonetti, *Un falso Ippolito nella polemica monotelita*: VetChr 24 (1987) 113-146; P. Allen - B. Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia*, Turnhout-Leuven 1999, 199-227; *Maximus the Confessor and His Companions: Documents from Exile*, ed. and trans. by P. Allen and B. Neil, Oxford 2002, 148-171 (Latin and Greek text and English translation of the *Hypomnesticum*); Patrologia V, 131.

A. Labate

THEODORE SYNCELLUS (7th c.). Presbyter and syncellus of the "Great Church" (Hagia Sophia) of *Constantinople, he took part in the embassy sent by the emperor *Heraclius, in July of 626, at Hadrianopolis on a mission of peace to the khan of the Avars, who were moving toward the Byzantine capital (*Chronicon paschale*: PG 82,1009 BD). Passed down under his name by several codices (others transmit it without name) is a *Discourse* on the discovery at *Jerusalem, the translation to Constantinople and the internment in the sanctuary of Blachernae of the clothing of the Mother of God, a speech held on 2 July between 620 and 626 (BHG 1058). Moreover, another *Logos* has been preserved for the feast of the *Deliverance of Constantinople* from the siege of the Avars in August 626.

CPG 7935-7936; A. Wenger, *L'Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle*, Paris 1955, 111-136, 294-303; Beck 545 (with a mistaken reference to the 9th c.); J.L. van Dieten, *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI.* (*610-715*), Amsterdam 1972, 114-121, 174-178; ODB 3, 2048; Patrologia V, 105-106.

D. Stiernon

THEODORE the LECTOR. Church historian (beginning of the 6th c.). A lector at the Hagia Sophia who was sympathetic to the Chalcedonians, he was the author of a "tripartite history," a compilation in four treatises derived from the ecclesiastical histories of *Socrates, *Sozomen and *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, through the age from *Constantine until the reign of *Theodosius II. Extensive portions of this work, which are important for the reconstruction of the textual form of the original models, were translated into Latin by the monk *Epiphanius for the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* by *Cassiodorus (ca. 560). Theodore followed it with his own original *Ecclesiastical History,* which was also written in four books, for the historical era from 439 to the reign of *Justin I (518). One finds within it an intense interest in the political-ecclesiastical aspects compared with the general history of the empire, esp. in the narrow horizon of *Constantinople and with a strong misunderstanding of Anastasius's overtures toward the *monophysites. Both works have come down in a fragmentary state, but it is possible to reconstruct its layout and individual parts thanks to an *Abridgment* of the ecclesiastical history redacted between the 7th and the 8th c.

CPG 7502-7503; PG 86, 165-228; G.C. Hansen, *Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte* (GCS), Berlin 1971; PWK 24/2 (1934) 1869-1881; G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* I, Berlin-DDR [2]1958, 519-520; P. Allen, *Teodoro il Lettore*, in Patrologia V, 42-43; BBKL 11, 971-972; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople* (*451-491*)*: de l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Rome 2006, passim.

L. Perrone

THEODORET of CYRRHUS (ca. 393–ca. 466). Born at *Antioch of *Syria around 393. He was brought up in *Syriac monastic circles, where he learned Christian and classical culture. He would bring to life again the ascetic milieu in a collection of 30 chapters of biography of 28 monks and three women, the *Religious History* or *Manners of Ascetic Life*. Some traditions, which have not been proven, maintain that he had *John Chrysostom and *Theodore of Mopsuestia among his teachers, and *Nestorius and *John of Antioch among his fellow disciples (see Tillemont, XV, 207ff.).

In 423 he was elected bishop of Cyrrhus; it seems that at the beginning of his episcopate he dealt with various heresies present in the communities of his region in various writings that have now been lost: in addition to refuting the *Jews, he wrote against the *Arians, the *Macedonians and the *Marcionites. From the first period, he must have also written the refutation of Hellenic paganism, *Graecarum affectionum curatio,* the last of the Christian apologies, preserved intact, which consists of 12 speeches

where pagan and Christian ideas are set against each other in response to philosophical questions. From a theological point of view, the years immediately preceding the Council of *Ephesus were probably the most demanding and decisive for Theodoret: when *Cyril of Alexandria wrote his 12 anathemas against Nestorius (November 430), Theodoret undertook to defend the latter and wrote, at the beginning of 431, the refutation of the *Anathemas* upon the request of John of Antioch. Because this document, *Reprehensio duodecim capitum seu anathematismorum Cyrilli*, was condemned by the fifth ecumenical council (*Constantinople 553), it has been lost; however, because Cyril defended his *Anathemas* with three apologies, the second of these (*Epistula ad Euoptium adversus impugnationem duodecim capitum a Theodoreto editam* [PG 76,385-452]) preserves Theodoret's text.

We are now at the most delicate moment of the controversies between schools of Antioch and Alexandria; Theodoret developed what was historically the most interesting characteristic of his theological work: a reexamination and reevaluation of the tradition until this time. Cyril of Alexandria was portrayed as dependent on *Apollinaris of Laodicea and at risk of denying the full humanity of Christ; at the same time, he pointed out the Arian danger of a teaching that did not distinguish the humanity from the divinity in the incarnate Word.

In the same years immediately preceding the Council of *Ephesus, he wrote two books, *De sancta et vivifica Trinitate* and *De incarnatione Domini,* which have come down to us under the name of Cyril of Alexandria (PG 75,1147-1190, 1419-1478) and which were restored to Theodoret by A. Ehrhard. These are documents of extreme interest because the Athanasian tradition is called on to distinguish *theology* from *economy,* and on this basis Theodoret constructs and justifies the divisive Christology: the text of Phil 2:5-8: “Christ Jesus though being of a divine nature . . . emptied himself, assuming the condition of a servant,” performs an important role in such a formulation.

It was probably in this environment and climate that the ps.-Athanasian writings were written: this seems to be the historical context for the two ps.-Athanasian dialogues *C. Macedonianos* (PG 28, 1291-1338).

After the council, Theodoret published five books once again attacking Cyril of Alexandria's ideas and the council's decisions in a work titled the *Pentalogus*. These works have also been lost as a result of their condemnation in 553. Latin fragments remain in the *Collectio Palatina* and some Greek citations in Niceta of Heraclea's *catena on the gospel of *Luke.

The attempts at union in 433, although Theodoret almost certainly was employed firsthand to draft the formula of reconciliation, did not lead to his personal commitment because it still required the endorsement of the condemnation of Nestorius (see *Ep*. 171).

In 447 Theodoret composed *Eranistes* (“the beggar”) or *Polymorphos* (“the man of many shapes”): this is a work of great theological importance, which was composed to refute the *monophysite teaching that *Eutyches was spreading at *Constantinople and which was successful in *Egypt, esp. at *Alexandria, through the support of Cyril's successor, the patriarch *Dioscorus. The work, composed of four books, is written in the form of a dialogue between an orthodox and monophysite Christian (a beggar, or a man in many forms, because in his teaching one finds elements from preceding heresies scraped together, beginning with *Docetism and ending with *Apollinarianism). It is a document that is truly typical of that historical era and Theodoret's operative method: the era and methods of evaluation and synthesis of tradition; compilation of florilegia; extensive use of the sources (the *Eranistes* preserves 238 passages of 88 patristic sources). All of this is important for the sense of the tradition that was developing, at least for the transmission of parts of works which we would otherwise know nothing about; it has its limits, if we keep in mind that, alongside the sense of tradition, there was likewise developing a tendency to manipulate preceding materials, from *pseudepigraphal production intended for polemics to the uses of the tradition that were not exempt from confusion. *Eranistes* has come down to us in a second edition that was expanded after the Council of *Chalcedon.

During the so-called robber council (*latrocinium*) of *Ephesus, which forcibly imposed Eutyches's exoneration, who had already been condemned by Pope *Leo the Great with a dogmatic letter, Theodoret was deposed from his episcopal see. He was restored, however, by the Council of Chalcedon (451), in which he agreed to endorse the condemnation of Nestorius, certainly not for personal gain, but more so for a sense of condescension to the real needs of the entire church, because a sufficiently comprehensive formulation of certain fundamental requirements of Antiochene Christology had been reached.

Theodoret remained the head of the church of Cyrrhus until his death, which occurred around 466.

Theodoret's *exegesis remains attested in various works in which the two genres are distinguished: on

the one hand, there is a series of continuous commentaries: *Interpretation of the Psalms,* a commentary on the *Song of Songs, the Major and Minor Prophets, Chronicles, St. *Paul's epistles; on the other hand, we have a type of commentary elaborated in the form of questions and answers: on the Octateuch and the book of Kings. *Paleoslavonic versions remain, complete or in part, of almost all Theodoret's exegetical works; from the *Commentary on the Psalms* there remains an *Armenian and *Georgian version; from the *Commentary on *Ezekiel* there remains an Armenian version. The *Ten Speeches on Providence,* the dating of which is highly contested, should be placed later than the Council of Ephesus. From several citations that Theodoret himself made from it, we know that he also wrote a work of refutation against the attitude of the Persians toward the Christians (*Replies to the Magi*). In recent years many significant steps forward have been made in the knowledge and evaluation of Theodoret's exegetical work, and two different but not antithetical readings between them have been made: Theodoret appears, on the one hand, as an exegete of definite Antiochene stamp, who knew, however, how to work in an entirely original way with the influences of the school of Alexandria, esp. Origen, to the point of creating a "plural" method, that is, he changes from a literal, historical/allegorical reading according to the text commented on; on the other hand, it reveals the difficulty of framing Theodoret's exegetical *ratio* within a definite milieu, although one recognizes on the one hand his strict dependence on *Diodore of Tarsus and *Theodore of Mopsuestia, and on the other hand the presence of interpretive peculiarities which, for the christological sense, send one back to Origen.

Theodoret's historical work was extensive: in addition to the aforementioned *Religious History,* he wrote an *Ecclesiastical History,* which continued the work of *Eusebius of Caesarea, from 323 to 428, and which is also—according to Theodoret's method—a treasure chest of sources and otherwise unknown pieces of documentation. Finally, he wrote a treatise titled *Haereticorum fabularum compendium,* in five books: the first four describe the heresies from *Simon Magus to Nestorius and Eutyches; the fifth compares the chief heretical doctrines with the teaching of the church.

There remain fragments from his *Sermons,* and more than 200 of his *Letters* have survived, which are a valuable historical source for the events of that age and a testament to his pastoral commitment.

Two works passed down under the name of *Justin have been traced back by various scholars to the Antiochene milieu and probably to Theodoret: the *Expositio rectae fidei* and *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*. Other scholars attribute to Theodoret a treatise titled *There Is Only One Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ* (PG 83,1433-1441).

CPG III, 6200-6288 *Suppl.* 382-384; *Editions:* Theodoret's works are found in PG 80-84; SC 40, 57, 98, 111, 234, 257, 276, 295, 315, 429; Theodoretus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, por N. Fernández - A. Sáenz Badillos, Madrid 1979; E. Cavalcanti, *I Dialoghi pseudoatanasiani contro i Macedoniani*, critical text, trans. and comm., Turin 1983, 157-169; Theodoretus, *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena*, ed. N. Fernández - J.R. Busto Saíz, Madrid 1984; Theodoret, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. L. Parmentier, GCS, Neue Folge, Bd. 5, Berlin 1998.

Translations of Individual Works: Eng. trans.: *On Divine Providence*, T. Halton, New York 1988; A.C. Vrame, *Theodoret, Bishop of Kyros as an Exegete of Isaiah 1: A Translation of His Commentary with an Introduction*: The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 34 (1989) 127-147; *Commentary on the Psalms*, R.C. Hill, Washington, DC 2000-2001; *Eranistes*, G.H. Ettlinger, Washington, DC 2003 (with bibl. on pp. ix-x); Ital. trans.: *Il mendicante*, G. Desantis, Rome 1997; *Commentario alla Lettera ai Romani*, F. Cocchini - L. Scarampi, Rome 1998; *Storia ecclesiastica*, A. Gallico, Rome 2000; D. Borrelli, *Teodoreto di Cirro, Commento a Daniele*, intr. trans. and notes, Rome 2006.

Studies: A. Ehrhard, *Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene Schrift* Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, *ein Werk des Theodoret von Cyrus*, Tübingen 1888; J.T. Lienhard, *The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus*: VChr 37 (1983) 340-359; J.-N. Guinot, *La christologie de Théodoret de Cyr dans son Commentaire sur le Cantique*: VChr 39 (1985) 256-272; M. Simonetti, *La tecnica esegetica di Teodoreto nel Commento ai Salmi*: VetChr 23 (1986) 81-116; P. Allen, *Some Aspects of Hellenism in the Early Greek Church Historians*: Traditio 43 (1987) 368-381; J.-N. Guinot, *L'exégèse du bouc émissaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie et Théodoret de Cyr*: Augustinianum 28 (1988) 603-630; M. Simonetti, *Le "Quaestiones" di Teodoreto su Genesi e Esodo*: Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi 5 (1988) 39-56; S. Zincone, *Studi sulla visione dell'Uomo in ambito antiocheno: Diodoro, Crisostomo, Teodoro, Teodoreto*, L'Aquila-Rome 1988; A. Camplani, *In margine alla storia dei Meliziani*: Augustinianum 30 (1990) 313-351; A. Viciano, *Cristo el autor de nuestra salvación*, Pamplona 1990; S.-P. Bergjan, *Theodoret von Cyrus und der Neunizänismus: Aspekte der altkirchlichen Trinitätslehre*, Berlin 1994; F. Cocchini, *L'esegesi paolina di Teodoreto di Cirro*: Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi 11/2 (1994) 511-532; J.-N. Guinot, *Théodoret de Cyr. Une lecture critique de la Septante: "Selon les Septante."* Hommage à Marguerite Harl, ed. G. Dorival - O. Munnich, Paris 1995, 393-407; Id., *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, Paris 1995; P. Crego, *Theodoret of Kyros on the Relationship of the Body and Soul Before Birth*: The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 41 (1996) 19-37; J.-N. Guinot, *Les fondements scripturaires de la polémique entre Juifs et chrétiens dans les commentaires de Théodoret de Cyr*: Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi 14/1 (1997) 153-178; D. Krueger, *Typological Figuration in Theodoret of Cyrrhus's "Religious History" and the Art of Postbiblical Narrative*: JECS 5 (1997) 393-419; Id., *Writing as Devotion: Hagiographical Composition and the Cult of the Saints in Theodoret of Cyrrus and Cyril of Scythopolis*: Church History 66 (1997) 707-719; M.A. Calvet-Sebasti, *Comment écrire à un païen? L'exemple de Grégoire de Nazianze et de Théo-*

doret de Cyr, in *Les Apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. B. Pouderon - J. Doré, Paris 1998, 369-381; J.-N. Guinot, *Foi et raison dans la démarche apologétique d'Eusèbe et de Théodoret*, ibid., 383-402; H. Patapios, *The Alexandrian and the Antiochene Methods of Exegesis: Towards a Reconsideration*: The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 44 (1999) 187-198; R.C. Hill, *Theodoret, Commentator on the Psalms*: EThL 76 (2000) 88-104; T. Urbainczyk, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus: The Bishop and the Holy Man*, Ann Arbor, MI 2002.

E. Cavalcanti

THEODOSIUS, archdeacon (6th c.). Around 530 he composed the treatise *De situ terrae sanctae* (or the *Expositio civitatis Ierusalem*), which was discovered in 1864. This work contains a brief description of *Palestine. The author shows that he was well acquainted with the buildings that were constructed at *Jerusalem by the emperor *Anastasius I but not those by *Justinian; from this fact scholars can infer the dating of the document. Theodosius's North African origin was conjectured from the fact that in a passage of the *De situ terrae sanctae* (ch. 14), the opposition between *Arians and *Catholics was seen in terms of *Vandals versus Romans.

CPL 2328; PLS IV, 1456-1463; J. Gildemeister, *Theodosius de situ terrae sanctae*, Bonn 1882; CSEL 39, 137-150; CCL 175, 113-125; LTK 10, 50; BBKL 18, 1370-1371.

S. Zincone

THEODOSIUS, cenobiarch (423–529). Saint (feast day 11 January). Born in 423 at Mogariso (Mogariasso, Garisso) in *Cappadocia to a pious and religious family, Theodosius was ordained as a lector while still a young man. He visited St. *Simeon the Stylite in the neighborhood of *Antioch. At *Jerusalem, he submitted to the spiritual direction of the aged ascetic *Longinus in the Tower of David (451). He then went (455) to the Monastery of the Theotokos of the Kathisma (between Jerusalem and Bethlehem), established by the pious Ikelia, but in order to not become its *hegumen, he retired to the monastery of Metopa and, in the solitude of the Grotto of the Magi (the desert of Judah, northeast of Bethlehem), he lived for 38 years in great austerity and continual prayer. Not wanting to reject the numerous faithful who wished to become his disciples, he established a monastery with adjoining buildings for the sick, the elderly, those suffering from mental illness (called *energumens,* that is, "the possessed"), and pilgrims. The psalmody was in *Greek, *Armenian and *Paleoslavonic, and each group worshiped in their own chapel. But everyone gathered together in the Greek chapel for the liturgy and Communion; a fourth church was for the penitents. Even today the place is called *Deir Dosi* ("monastery of Theodosius"), and there the church was rebuilt with the monastery. In 494, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Sallustius, appointed Theodosius as *archimandrite of the cenobium (hence his name), and St. *Sabas as archimandrite of the laurae in his jurisdiction. Theodosius along with St. Sabas fought against *monophysitism, which was being promoted by the emperor *Anastasius. Anastasius exiled him, but the emperor's death (1 July 518) allowed Theodosius to return to his monastery with the favor of the emperor *Justin I, a fervently orthodox man.

Theodosius died in 529 and was buried in the Grotto of the Magi, where he had begun the life of a recluse. The *Life* (encomium) was written by his disciple *Theodore, who subsequently became bishop of *Petra (H. Usener, *Der heilige Theodosios*, Leipzig 1890, 5-101), and by *Cyril of Scythopolis (H. Usener, op. cit., 105-113; ed. Schwartz, *Cyrillos von Skythopolis*, TU 49,2, Leipzig 1939, 235-241); it was later reworked by Simeon Metaphrastes (PG 114, 469-553).

CPG III, 7533 (Theodore of Petra), 7539 (Cyril of Scythopolis); AASS *Ianuar.*, Venezia 1734, I, 680-701; Bardenhewer V, 128-129; EC 11, 1940-1942; Beck 833 (index); LTK 10, 48-49 (Theodosios Koinobiarches) and 49 (Theodosioskloster); BS 12, 290-292; Patrologia V, 294; BBKL 11, 996-997.

A. De Nicola

THEODOSIUS, monk (5th c.). *Monophysite zealot who lived after the Council of *Chalcedon (451). According to the testimony of *Evagrius Scholasticus, he was first removed from his monastery because of his sins; he subsequently incited a revolt among the Alexandrian people and therefore, after having been flogged as subversive, he was dragged through the city streets (*HE* 2,5). During the Council of Chalcedon and immediately after its closure, he incited another revolt in the church of *Jerusalem by forging a letter from Pope *Leo the Great. He found a great protector in the person of *Eudoxia, the widow of *Theodosius II, who was living at Jerusalem far from the imperial court. After having incited the population, Theodosius sought to force the patriarch *Juvenal (422–458), once he had returned from Chalcedon, to deny the Council's decisions; Juvenal refused, but after having undergone an attack, he fled to *Constantinople (Nicephorus Callistus, *HE* 15,9). Theodosius was therefore ordained in the church of the Anastasis, and he subsequently ordained bishops throughout *Palestine. Finally, in 453, the emperor *Marcian was able to deprive him of his office, and Theodosius fled to an unknown hideaway.

E. Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*: Dumbarton Oaks Papers 5 (1950) 209-279; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEODOSIUS I (the Great), emperor (347–395). Of Spanish origin, appointed Augustus for the Eastern Roman Empire in 379, he died at *Milan on 17 January 395 at 48 years of age. His political-military action was particularly vigilant on two fronts: namely that of Illyricum, where *Gratian had entrusted to him the duty of reestablishing peace, which he sought to accomplish by establishing a *foedus* with the *Goths stationed there; and that of the West, where the continually unstable situation led him to first intervene in favor of *Valentinian II against the usurper *Maximus, then against the *Frankish Arbogast, then against the Catholic *Eugenius. Of no less interest was his religious politics, which was committed to totally changing the religious situation established by the emperor *Valens. Also in view of the political unity, Theodosius was committed to pursuing the religious unity of the empire. To this objective, on the one hand, he pursued antipagan politics, and on the other, he sought to heal the existing fracture within the Christian sphere between *Catholics and *Arians. A convinced supporter of the *Nicene Creed (for his baptism, see Socr., *HE* V,6), he issued in 380 a decree to *Thessalonica, in which he ordered his subjects to follow the Catholic faith of *Rome and *Alexandria (CT XVI,1,2). Likewise in 380, he forced the Arian *Demophilus to resign from the patriarchate of *Constantinople in order to put in his place the Catholic *Gregory of Nazianzus, prohibiting in the city the gatherings of those who did not profess the Nicene faith (CT XVI,5,6). The Council of Constantinople was convoked by him (381), and the council *fathers credited him with having established peace among Christians (Mansi 3,557; Socr., *HE* V,8; Soz., *HE* VII,9), while they were asking for the ratification of the sanctions promulgated against the *heresies connected in various ways to the Arian controversy (CT XVI, 1, 3). Between 381 and 383, the imperial depositions against the *pagans and *apostates followed (CT XVI,7,1-2).

Once his attempt at doctrinal unification between Christians had failed, through a series of edicts (25 July and 23 December 383, 21 January 384), he recognized the Catholic religion alone, confiscating and depriving places of worship from the heretics (CT XVI,5,11-13; Philostorgius, *HE* X,6). A law from 14 June 388 once again struck the heretics (CT XVI,5,15). To the anti-Arian controversy also belong *Letters* 13 and 14 of Ambrose to Theodosius in the name of the bishops of Italy who had participated at the Council of *Aquileia (381). Other letters written by Ambrose to Theodosius were likewise indicative of the action carried out by the emperor and the intervention of the bishop of Milan. In Ambrose's *Ep.* 40 one finds extensive echoes of the imperial orders after the episode of Callinicum and the position taken by the bishop of Milan (see also *Ep.* 41 and Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambr.* 22). *Ep.* 51 marks Ambrose's intervention after the massacre of *Thessalonica of 390 (on the remote motivation behind the slaughter, see the various interpretations offered by Palanque, *Saint Ambroise*, 228ff., and Mazzarino, *L'impero romano*, III: Bari 1973, 379ff.). In the letter, Ambrose also laments the imperial orders directed against his own person (*Ep.* 51,2) of a series of orders that were hardly favorable to the church (CT XII,1,121; XVI, 2,27), but he alludes esp. to his various interventions to avoid the massacre (with respect to the number of the victims, see Soz., *HE* VII, 25; Theodoret, *HE* V,17-18; see CT IX,40,13) before explicitly inviting Theodosius to do public *penance. Reconciliation took place on Christmas of 390 (Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambr.* 24; Aug., *Civ. Dei* V,26,9-16). Ambrose's *Epp.* 61 and 62 are likewise directed to Theodosius; the first for justifying the recognition by him to Eugenius, the second for asking for clemency for those defeated.

The extent to which Theodosius became a point of reference for orthodoxy is shown by the *Libellus precum* sent to him in 384 by *Faustinus to obtain his intervention in favor of the *Luciferians. To establish the order disturbed repeatedly by the monks, imperial orders followed on 2 September 390 (CT XVI,3,1), 9 April 392 (CT XI,36,31) and 17 April 392 (CT XVI,3,2). No less significant was Theodosius's action against paganism. 25 May 385 (CT XVI,10,9) witnessed the renewal of the prohibition against bloody and divinatory sacrifices. 24 February 391 saw the prohibition against any pagan ceremony at *Rome (CT XVI,10,10) and then extended the prohibition to *Egypt (CT XVI,10,11). While the Edict of Concordia of 391 stripped the apostates from any civil or political rights (CT XVI,7,4-5), that of Constantinople on 8 November 392 outlawed paganism outright (CT XVI,10,12). The funerary oration in honor of Theodosius delivered by Ambrose (*De obitu Theod.*) is indicative of the harmony reached by the emperor and bishop. A panegyric in honor of Theodosius was requested from *Paulinus of Nola by a certain Endelechius (Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 28).

A. Guldenpennung, *Kaiser Theodosius der Grosse*, Halle 1878; J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain*, Paris 1933; W. Ensslin, *La politica ecclesiastica dell'imperatore Teodosio agli inizi del suo governo*: NDid 2 (1948) 5-35; M. Pavan, *I cristiani e il mondo ebraico nell'età di Teodosio il Grande*: AFLPer 3 (1965-66) 367-550; Y.M. Duval, *L'éloge de Théodose dans la Cité de Dieu* (*V 26,1*). *Sa place, son sens et ses sources*: RecAug 4 (1966) 135-179; A. Lippold, *Theodosius der Grosse und seine Zeit*, Stuttgart 1968; J. Rougé, *La législation de Théodose contre les hérétiques. Traduction de CTh. XVI 5,6-24*, in *Epektasis, Mélanges J. Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 636ff.; M.G. Mara, *La storia di Naboth*, L'Aquila 1975, 12-23; L. De Giovanni, *Chiesa e Stato nel Codice Teodosiano. Saggio sul libro XVI*, Naples 1980; A. Paredi, *Ambrogio, Graziano, Teodosio*, in Antichità altoadriatiche 22, Udine 1982; A. Lovino, *Su alcune affinità tra il Panegirico per Teodosio di Pacato Drepanio e il De obitu Theodosii di Sant'Ambrogio*: VetChr 26 (1982) 371-376; P. Volpe Cacciatore, *I panegirici di Temistio e Pacato per l'imperatore Teodosio*, in *Politica, cultura e religione nell'impero romano* (*sec. IV-VI*) *tra oriente e occidente*, Atti del II Conv. dell'Ass. di Studi Tardoantichi, Naples 1993, 315-324; S. Williams - G. Friell, *Theodosius: The Empire at Bay*, London 1994; H. Leppin, *Theodosius der Grosse*, Darmstadt 2003.

M.G. Mara

THEODOSIUS II, emperor (401–450). Emperor of the Eastern portion of the Roman Empire, born on 10 April 401 at *Constantinople, died on 28 July 450. The son of *Arcadius and *Eudoxia and the grandson of *Theodosius I. In 402, while he was still an infant, he was appointed Augustus. Succeeding his father in 408 he became the sole sovereign of the Eastern empire. Theodosius was weak in character and was attached to the honors of the imperial dignity. For the entirety of his life he was a slave to the high dignitaries and the women of his court, namely his tutor, the *praefectus praetorio* Antemius; his sister *Pulcheria; his wife Athenais; Bishops *Atticus, *Nestorius and *Proclus; and the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* Chysaphius. His reign witnessed wars with the Persians and the Armenians and the great empire of the Huns, to whom, from 430 onward, he was forced to pay large tributes. In 424/425, Theodosius once again gave official recognition to *Valentinian III and, therefore, his dynasty, over the Western empire. The **Codex Theodosianus,* which during the years 429–438 continued the collection of the imperial edicts from 312 onward, was promulgated in the name of the two emperors and entered into effect in the two portions of the empire. With respect to the capital (i.e., Constantinople), Theodosius made a name for himself by the construction of the city wall, which is preserved to this day, and for the reorganization of higher education.

PWK, Suppl. 13, 961-1044; E. Karagiannópoulos, Ἱστορία βυζαντινοῦ κράτους, 1, Thessaloniki 1978, 231-275; P.E. Pieler, in H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2, Munich 1978, 388-390 (for the *Codex Theodosianus*); editions of the CTh: Th. Mommsen - P.M. Meyer, 2 vols., Berlin 1905; P. Krüger, 2 vols., Berlin 1923-26 (only books 1-8); G.G. Archi, *Teodosio II e la sua codificazione*, Naples 1976; T. Barnes, *The Baptism of Theodosius II:* SP XIX, 8-12; L. Brottier, *L'impératrice Eudoxie et ses enfants*: RSR 70 (1996) 313-332; E. Dovere, *Contestazione religiosa e regionalismo: la "medicina legum" in Oriente a metà del sec. V*: AHC 30 (1998) 1-36; S. Wessel, *The Ecclesiastical Policy of Theodosius II*: AHC 33 (2001) 285-308.

J. Irmscher

THEODOSIUS of Alexandria (6th c.). A *monophysite presbyter and legal ecclesiastical consultant, Theodosius lived in the 2nd half of the 6th c. Along with the monophysite deacon *Theodore of Copros, he invited *Longinus to come to Mareotis, which was near *Alexandria, to consecrate a patriarch for the *Jacobite Church of Alexandria. In a collection of *capitula,* which has been handed down in a *Syriac translation, composed by the archimandrite John Claudus from the monastery of Mar Bassus, one finds one of Theodosius's letters, who by that point was presbyter in Alexandria, then bishop in *Nubia: the author exhorts the recipient to enter communion with *Theodore bishop of Philae.

CPG III, 7223; J.B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*, Louvain [2]1952, 273-276 (text), 191-193 (trans.); E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VI^e siècle*, Louvain 1951, 226-227, W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972; Grillmeier 2/4, Freiburg i.B. 1990, 72.

J. Irmscher

THEODOSIUS of Carthage, deacon (6th c.). Nothing is known about the life of this individual (he is not to be found in the PCBE); his name is given by the signature for the MS in the Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona (ms. LX [58]) with the name *Theodosius diaconus*. Attributed to him is the *Collectio Theodosii,* discovered by Maffei, a debated canonical collection made around 530. It reproduces 27 documents, among which are the texts of the Council of *Nicaea (in the version said to be that of *Caecilian but which in reality is from the beginning of the 5th c.), *Neocaesarea (*Pontus), *Gangra, *Laodicea, *Constantinople, *Ancyra, *Chalcedon, *Breviarium Hipponense, *Carthage (from the year 421), the *Canones Apostolorum* (translation of *Dionysius Exiguus) and other documents: a letter of the Council of Nicaea to the Egyptian bishops, the letter of the Council of *Rome from 378 addressed to the Eastern bishops, a document pertaining to the Council of

*Sardica, the biography of *Athanasius, the letter of *Constantine to the church of *Alexandria, *Constantine's edict against *Arianism, two letters on the origin of the *Meletian schism, the Creed of the Council of Constantinople (it reads as follows: *symbolus sanctae synodici Sardici*), and *Gennadius's *Definitio dogmatum* (incomplete).

PL 56, 143-148; F. Maassen, *Geschichte*, 546-559; Verzeichnis, ed. 1995, 354-355, esp. numbers 13-27; Hfl-Lecl II, 2, 1367; DDC 7, 1214-1215; J. Friedrich, *Die sardischen Aktenstücke der Sammlung des Theodosius Diaconus*, in Sitz. phil. philol. hist. Kl. der bayr. Akad. Wiss. zu Munich 1903, 321-343; W. Telfer, *The Codex Verona LX (58)*: HTR 36 (1943) 169-246; C.H. Turner, EOMIA 1, 625-671; G. Turrini, *Indice dei Codici Capitolati di Verona*, Verona 1965; ODC, 1601-1602; A. Martin - M. Albert, *Histoire 'acephale' et Index syriaque des Lettres festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, SC 317, Paris 1985, 13-19; 107.

A. Di Berardino

THEODOSIUS of Gangra (d. after 662). Monk, brother of *Theodore Spudaeus. His work enters the complex *monothelite controversy, during which time, in close connection with the thought and activity of *Anastasius Apocrisarius, he along with his brother produced a body of documents pertaining to the controversy and *martyrdom of *Maximus the Confessor (13 August 662), Anastasius the Disciple (22 or 24 July 662) and the same Anastasius the Apocrisary (11 October 666). In particular, in Anastasius's letter sent to Theodosius one finds the condemned man describing the fate inflicted on him and his companions in exile after the trial, and he announces Maximus's near end. This corpus of documents ends with a text known by the name of *Scholium sive Hypomnesticum,* which is of uncertain attribution, and which, in addition to providing historical information on the events and the persecutions brought against the opponents of monothelitism, offers several pieces of information on Theodosius and his commitment to helping the exiles and those condemned, spreading word, moreover, about their texts and witness to the faith.

R. Devreesse, *Le texte grec de l'Hypomnesticum de Théodore Spoudée (le supplice, l'exil et la mort des victimes illustres du monothélisme)*: AB 53 (1935) 49-80; Beck 462-463; Patrologia V, 130; M. Simonetti, *Un falso Ippolito nella polemica monotelita*: VetChr 24 (1987) 113-146.

G. Pilara

THEODOTION (2nd c.). Author of a Greek version of the OT. The ancient biographical information about him is not in agreement. According to *Irenaeus, he was a proselyte from *Ephesus (*Adv. Haer.* 3,21,2). It is hardly likely that he was an *Ebionite (*Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 54,6; *Comm. in Daniel.*, *Prol.*: PL 25,493) or a disciple of *Marcion (*Epiphanius, *Mens. et pond.* 17). Theodotion's translation on the whole is substantially a revision of the *Septuagint, harmonized with the Hebrew text. It seems, however, that in many passages of the Bible he did nothing more than retouch the Jewish-Palestinian revision of the Septuagint, which was probably used by the authors of the NT. His translation is of great importance esp. for the book of *Daniel because it contained the deuterocanonical portions of the book. His version constituted the sixth column of *Origen's *Hexapla* and is present in the fifth column *sub asterico*. Theodotion's work was not highly regarded by the *Jews and *Eusebius of Caesarea, but it was highly esteemed by ancient Christians, esp. Origen.

D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton*, Leiden 1963, 144-157; R. Bodenmann, *Naissance d'une Exégèse*, Tübingen 1986; G. Dorival - M. Harl - O. Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante*, Paris 1988, 151-157; E. Würthwein, *Der Text des AT*, Stuttgart [5]1988; M. Pazzini, *La trascrizione dell'ebraico nella traduzione di Teodozione*: Liber Annuus (1991) 201-222; M. Cimosa, *Guida allo studio della Bibbia Greca (LXX). Storia - Lingua - Testi*, Rome 1995; N. Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, Brescia 1998, 147-158.

S. Samulowitz

THEODOTUS and the SEVEN VIRGINS. All *martyrs at *Ancyra (Theodotus is not to be confused with Bishop *Theodotus of Ancyra). Accused of being Christians during the *Diocletian persecution, seven virgins of an advanced age were drowned in a pond: Thecusa, Alexandra, Fainé, Claudia, Euphrasia, Matrona and Julitta. Thecusa's nephew, the innkeeper Theodotus, recovered their bodies and gave them a proper burial, but he in turn underwent martyrdom. Theodotus's martyrdom was told by a certain Nilus, who claims to have been an eyewitness of the event (BHG 1782). Delehaye thought that the account was a hagiographical romance; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri on the whole agrees with him but recognizes a historical foundation in the text. The saints are commemorated on 18 May.

BHG 1782-1783; BS 12, 309-312; LCI 8, 455; H. Delehaye, *La Passion de S. Théodote d'Ancyre*: AB 22 (1903) 320-328; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Sopra alcuni Atti di martiri di Settimio Severo e di Massimo Daza*: NBAC 10 (1904) 27-37; Id., *I martìri di S. Teodoto e di S. Ariadne*, Rome 1901, 7-87; H. Grégoire - P. Orgels, *La passion de S. Théodote, oeuvre du Pseudo-Nil, et son noyau montaniste*: ByzZ 44 (1951) 165-184.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

THEODOTUS of Ancyra (d. before 446). Bishop of *Ancyra (Galatia), first a friend of *Nestorius and then his enemy at the Council of *Ephesus (Mansi 4,1457-1464). He was a member of the delegation that the orthodox side of the council sent to the emperor *Theodosius II to inform him about the actions taken by *John patriarch of *Antioch and the small gathering of church leaders he presided over (at Ephesus, see *Synodicum* 38: PG 84,640-641; 432). He died before 446, so that as a result his successor was consecrated by *Proclus of Constantinople (434–446; see Mansi 7,452b). The iconoclast Council of *Constantinople (754) cites one of his supposed texts against sacred images, but in the Council of Nicaea II (784), it was demonstrated that the citation did not belong to any of Theodotus's works, for which the council provides us the list (Mansi 13, 309-311).

The following works written by Theodotus have survived: *Three Books Against Nestorius;* the *Expositio symboli Nicaeni,* directed against the Nestorians, in which he demonstrates that there is only one Son of God, who has two natures; a fragment of the *Epistula ad Vitalem monachum* (PG 84,814; ACO 1,4, p. 212); and six or seven *Homilies*. The two homilies *In diem nativitatis Domini* (I and II), delivered at Ancyra, were read in the Council of *Ephesus; here too was given homily (III) *In Nestorium*—all three, which were included in the conciliar acts, were directed against Nestorius (who is not mentioned by name), whom they accuse, among other things, of renewing *Photinus's error; likewise against Nestorius is homily IV, *In s. Deiparam et in Simeonem* (referred to by the Council of Nicaea II as Εἰς τα φῶτα); homily V, *In Domini nostri Iesu Christi diem natalem*, first only known in Latin, was published in the original text by M. Aubineau (*Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité du Seigneur*: OCP 26 [1960], 221-250), and so too VI, *In s. Deiparam et in navititatem Domini,* by M. Jugie (*Homélies mariales byzantines*: PO 19,289-317 [intr.], 318-335 [text and Latin trans.]), the genuineness of which, however, raises a few doubts among scholars; finally, there is preserved in Ethiopian a homily given at Ephesus during the council (A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica,* Leipzig 1866, 103-106). The homily *In baptisma Domini* is doubtful (ed. M. Aubineau, in Διακονία πίστεως, Mélanges J.A. de Aldama, Granada 1969, 6-30).

Theodotus was called *Cyril of Alexandria's comrade-in-war (συναγωνιστής) by the Council of Nicaea II; he clearly professed the two natures of the one sole person of Christ, but he did not want to investigate the mystery of the mode of their union; he eloquently praised *Mary, whose perpetual virginity, which was connected to the divine maternity, he esp. lauded.

CPG III, 6124-6141; PG 77, 1308-1432; Hfl-Lecl 2 (passim); Bardenhewer 4, 197-200; DTC 15, 328-330; BBKL 11, 997-999; G. Roschini, *Dizionario di Mariologia*, Rome 1960, 474-475; Id., *Maria SS. nella storia della salvezza*, I, Isola del Liri 1969, 314; LTK 10, 51; L. Cignelli, *Maria Nuova Eva*, Assisi 1966, 157-201; Patrologia V, 35; M. O'Carroll, *Theotokos. A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, Wilmington, DE 1982, 339-340; F.E. Sciuto, *Identificazione di una citazione da Teodoto d'Ancira nel VII secolo*: Orpheus n.s. 13 (1992) 84-92; *Teodoto di Ancira, Omelie cristologiche e mariane*, trans., intro. and notes by G. Lo Castro, Rome 1992.

A. De Nicola

THEODOTUS of Antioch (d. 429). Theodotus succeeded *Alexander as the bishop of *Antioch in 420. Like his predecessor, he rehabilitated *John Chrysostom. He readmitted the *Apollinarians to the church (Theodoret, *HE* V,38). He condemned *Pelagius in a synod at *Antioch, perhaps that he himself presided over, in 422 (Mansi 4,296). He died in 429. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus had great words of praise for him (*HE* V,38; *Ep. ad Dioscorum*). Two fragments remain from his works.

CPG 6505-6506; DCB 4, 983; Fedalto 2, 682; LACL 687; LTK[3] 9, 1425; Patrologia V, 181.

E. Prinzivalli

THEODOTUS of Byzantium, banker. Disciple of *Theodotus the Tanner, he devised the Melchizedekian variant of *adoptionism between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd c.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884, 611-612; DTC 10, 514-515; 5, 2427; 7, 464; 8, 1256; EPapi 1, 234; P. Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis 2003, 344-348.

M. Simonetti

THEODOTUS of Byzantium, tanner. Toward the end of the 2nd c. Theodotus spread the teaching of *adoptionism (so-called) at *Rome. He had maintained that Christ was only man to mitigate in some way the weightiness of the apostasy into which he had fallen during a persecution, inasmuch as he had denied a man and not God.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884, 610-611; DTC 5, 2427 (see 8, 1255; 10, 2197-2198); EPapi 1, 234, P. Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, Minneapolis 2003, 344-348.

M. Simonetti

THEODOTUS of Laodicea (4th c.). Bishop of *Laodicea (*Syria), modern-day Latakia, a port city for many years. Theodotus was highly regarded by *Eusebius of Caesarea because "he made a name for himself in the knowledge of healing the body but also in spiritual therapeutics" (*HE* 7,32,23). He was among the supporters of *Arius from the very beginning (Theodoret, *HE* I,5 and V,7, Athanasius, *De Synodis Arim. et Seleuc.* I,17) and as such was condemned along with Eusebius of Caesarea and *Narcissus of Neronias in the council held at *Antioch shortly before the Council of *Nicaea (325). No record was made of his presence at Nicaea, but immediately after *Constantine threatened to punish him if he continued to assist the Arians. In 327 he was among the bishops in the Council of Antioch, presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea; they condemned and deposed *Eustathius (Theodoret, *HE* I,21). He had clearly died by 341, inasmuch as at the Council of Antioch (*Encaeniis*), which was held that year, his successor George was present (Sozomen, *HE* III,5), but neither was he present at the Council of *Tyre (335). According to *Socrates (*HE* II,46) and *Sozomen (*HE* VI,25), Theodotus had some disagreements with the two *Apollinarises, father and son, who resided at Antioch.

DCB 4, 981 (confuses our author with *Theodore of Heraclea and with the Theodotus who was present at the Council of *Seleucia in 359); Simonetti 596; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 146.

M. Simonetti

THEODOTUS the Valentinian (2nd c.). Among the works of *Clement of Alexandria, another work has been transmitted, which is titled: *Extracts from the Writings of Theodotus and the Eastern School at the Time of Valentinus*. We have no other information about Theodotus than the figure, in the work, as the author of some *gnostic propositions cited by Clement. But other information is generically attributed to the followers of *Valentinus. The character of the extracts is heavily dependent on other sources and, in addition to the passages that are the work of Clement himself, it presents derivations from more Valentinian sources of a different orientation. Therefore, although the *Extracts* are very important for the knowledge of Valentinian teaching in general and in its various ramifications, it seems difficult to obtain from them something specific about Theodotus.

CPG 1139; SC 23, Paris 1948; CE 14, 27; A.-J. Festugière, *Notes sur les Extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie*: VChr 3 (1949) 193-207; A. Orbe, *A propósito de Excerpta ex Theodoto 54,2* (κατ' ἰδίαν): Gregorianum 41 (1960) 481-485; Id., *La trinidad maléfica* (*A propósito de "Excerpta ex Theodoto" 80,3*): i Gregorianum 49 (1968) 726-761; J.F. McCue, *Conflicting Versions of Valentinianism? Irenaeus and the Excerpta ex Theodoto*, in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I: *The School of Valentinus*, ed. by B. Layton, Leiden 1980, 404-416; LACL 687-688.

M. Simonetti

THEODULUS (5th c.). Presbyter of Coele-Syria; he died at the time of the emperor *Zeno (474–491) and was probably a disciple of *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Ebedjesu referred to him as a "Nestorian" (*Catalog.* 21). According to *Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 91), Theodulus wrote many books, all of which have been lost, with the exception of five groups of fragments which are as follows: (1) *De consonantia Veteris et Novi Testamenti,* an antiheretical work probably directed either against the *Manicheans or the *Marcionites; (2) *Fragmenta duo in Iudices;* (3) *Fragmentum in Isaiam,* originally contained in two volumes; (4) *Fragmentum in Ps 73,4,* and 5 and the best way of reciting them; and (5) *Fragmentum in epist. ad Romanos 9,11.* In the *Doctrina Patrum,* he appears among the witnesses in favor of *monoenergism and the veneration of icons.

CPG 6540-6544; F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, Münster [2]1981 (= [1]1907), 315; Patrologia V, 196.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEOGNIOS. Presbyter of the church of *Jerusalem who can be identified with the monk and bishop of the same name of Betalia (425–522), concerning whom the *Vitae* of *Paul of Elusa (ed. I. Van den Gheyn: AB 10 [1891] 78-113) and *Cyril of Scythopolis speak (ed. E. Schwartz: TU 49/2 [1939]). Theognios wrote the *Homilia in ramos palmarum,* a work that is not particularly original but which allows one to catch a glimpse of the deep repercussions of the 5th-c. doctrinal controversies.

CPG 7378; J. Noret, *Une homélie inédite sur les Rameaux par Théognios, prêtre de Jérusalem* (*vers 460?*): AB 89 (1971) 113-142; I. v. d. Gheyn, *Théognios, évêque de Bétélie*, Revue des Questions Historiques 50 (1891) 559-567; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina*, Brescia 1980, 97, 111 and 228.

P. Marone

THEOGNIS of Nicaea (4th c.). Disciple of *Lucian of *Antioch and bishop of *Nicaea in *Bithynia, he was among *Arius's supporters from the very beginning. At Nicaea he succumbed to signing the anti-Arian formula of faith as a result of *Constantine's

pressure, but shortly thereafter he was deposed and exiled along with *Eusebius of Nicomedia, by Constantine himself, because he continued to support the Arians. Exiled to *Gaul, he returned in 328 and reobtained his episcopal see. In 335 he was among the protagonists both at the Council of *Tyre and subsequent discussions at *Constantinople before the emperor, which had as an effect the condemnation, deposition and exile of *Athanasius. *Sozomen (*HE* III,7) says that in 342 Theognis ordained *Macedonius bishop of Constantinople, after the death of Eusebius, but it does not seem that at that moment this election was recognized to be valid. He must have died shortly thereafter because he was not among the participants at the Council of *Sardica (343).

DCB 4, 989; Quasten II, 195-196; D. de Bruyne, *Deux lettres inconnues de Theognius*: ZNTW 27 (1908) 107-110; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur S. Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936, 210-216; Simonetti 597; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, see index; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328-373)*, Rome 1996; LACL 688-689.

M. Simonetti

THEOGNOSTUS (3rd c.). Information derived from *Philip of Side places Theognostus at the head of the school of *Alexandria after *Pierius, that is, ca. 300; but such a late date seems unacceptable; therefore, scholars usually place Theognostus's scholarchate between that of *Dionysius and Pierius, between ca. 265 and 280. His only work that we are aware of was the *Hypotyposeis,* provided by the description of *Photius (*Bibl*., cod. 106). Written in seven books, it treated the following topics: God the Father and the creation of the world, the Son, the *Holy Spirit, other spiritual creatures and the *incarnation of the Son. Photius praised his literary gifts and pious spirit, but he rejected his erroneous opinions on the Son, the Holy Spirit and rational creatures, ideas derived from *Origen. In fact, the *Hypotyposeis* seems to have been a work similar in structure and content to Origen's *De principiis,* that is, a work of synthesis dedicated to the treatment of questions pertaining to God and the world. And the very few fragments that have survived, which are cited by *Athanasius and other authors, confirm Theognostus's close adherence to Origen's thought.

In two of these fragments, which are theologically very important, Theognostus, perhaps in controversy with *Lucian of Antioch, maintained that the **ousia* ("essence, substance") of the Son does not derive from nothing, but precisely from the *ousia* of the Father, just as the reflection derives from the light and the vapor of the water: the Son is the emanation (*aporroia*) of the Father's *ousia*. Therefore, the Son, inasmuch as he is the Logos and the wisdom of the Father, is similar to him with respect to the *ousia,* a concept which in the 4th c. would be rejected by the *homoiousians.

CPG 1626-1629; PG 10, 235-242; Quasten I, 375-376; F. Diekamp, *Ein neues Fragment aus den Hypotyposen des Alexandriners Theognostus*: ThQ 84 (1902) 481-494; A. v. Harnack, *Die Hypotyposen des Theognost* (TU 24,3), Leipzig 1903, 73-92; L.B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria*: *Theognostus*, *Pierius and Peter*, Cambridge 1908, 1-43; J.A. Munitiz, *A Fragment Attributed to Theognostus*: JTS 30 (1979) 56-66; G. Anesi, *La notizia di Fozio sulle Hypotyposeis di Teognosto*: Augustinianum 21 (1981) 491-516; J. Naumowicz, *La question de la perigraphe du Christ chez Théognoste d'Alexandrie d'après la Bibliothèque de Photius*: SP 19 (1987) 216-220; LACL 689; A. Grillmeier, *Le Christ dans la tradition chrétienne. De l'âge apostolique au concile de Chalcédoine*, Paris [2]2003, 402-407.

M. Simonetti

THEOGNOSTUS (5th c.). Presbyter of the church of *Alexandria in the 5th c., with the presbyter Carmosinus and the deacon Leontius, was the *apocrisarius of *Cyril of Alexandria at *Constantinople, and in this capacity he received a letter from the patriarch of Alexandria (Cyril, *Ep*. 37: PG 77, 167-170).

CPG 5337; ACO I, 4, 123-124.

P. Marone

THEOLOGIA NEGATIVA – VIA NEGATIVA
I. Apophatism and Neoplatonism - II. Negative and mystical theology.

I. Apophatism and Neoplatonism. 1. *Definition of negation* (ἀπόφασις, ἀφαίρεσις). The term ἀφαίρεσις indicates the movement of distancing (*remotio*), exclusion or privation of something (Plato, *Critias* 46 c.). It is opposed to πρόσθεσις, the action of placing (Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 13). It is a term typically found in the writings of the mathematicians: *Aristotle opposes ἀφαίρεσις to πρόσθεσις in his *Metaphysics* A2, 982a28, as "subtraction" to "addition"—and it is also a term used in logic: ἐξ ἀφαιρέσεως means "through abstraction" in Aristotle's *Second Analytics* (I,18,7), and this was the meaning that was adopted by many Latin versions that translated the term ἀφαίρεσις with *abstractio*. 'Αφαίρεσις is opposed to θέσις as negation is to affirmation but is also distinguished from ἀπόφασις, which likewise means negation, inasmuch as ἀφαίρεσις indicates an overcoming or transcendence.

Latin translators rendered the term ἀφαίρεσις, on the basis of the context, both according to the concrete meaning of "diminution" or "suppression" (*ablatio*) and according to the meaning of abstraction (*abstractio*) or negation (*negatio*). Thomas Aquinas pointed out the two meanings, namely, the concrete and abstract sense of ἀφαίρεσις which is translated, on the principle of its force, with *remotio* and, subsequently, with *negatio*.

a. For Aristotle, the aphaeretic method is a process of separation or subtraction of additions that leads to the loss (νόησις) of an intelligible form or an essence. This method of separation or diminution is the abstraction. This abstraction goes from the complex to the simple and from the visible to the invisible.

b. This method is represented by the authors of *Middle Platonism such as Alcinous who, in the *Didaskalos* (ch. 12), distinguishes four ways through which the human spirit can elevate itself to God: affirmation, analogy, transcendence and negation.

2. *Plato's* Parmenides *and its Neoplatonist commentaries. a.* The foundational text of negative theology is that of the first hypothesis of the *Parmenides,* that "the One is one," where, after having affirmed that "the One does not participate in any way in being, and does not have sufficient being to be one because it would *be* and would participate at once in being" (141e), Parmenides adds to this daunting statement: "It is clear, on the contrary, that the One is not one, and that the One does not exist" (141e), which is itself the negation of the hypothesis, namely that "the One is one." The result of the first hypothesis is therefore the unknowable and ineffable character of the One: "Therefore no name belongs to it; it has no definition, no knowledge, no sensation and no opinion" (142a). "So the One has no name, no definition, no knowledge, no sensation, no opinion."

b. We find this apophatism in the Neoplatonist commentaries on the *Parmenides,* with a reference to the anonymous commentary, whose author has been identified as *Porphyry by Pierre Hadot (*Porphyre et Victorinus,* Paris 1968), or to that of Proclus.

This unknowability and this ineffability of the One from the first hypothesis of the *Parmenides* is a teaching common to the "Platonic theology" of *Proclus of Constantinople and the apophatic theology of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite.

II. Negative and mystical theology. *1. Apophatic theology. a. Philo of Alexandria and the early fathers of the church.* *Philo was at the origin of the entire reflection on the incomprehensibility of the divine essence (οὐσία): "The greatest good is in understanding that God, according to his essence [κατὰ τὸ εἶναι] is incomprehensible [ἀκατάληπτος]" (*Poster.* 15). The affirmation that the knowledge of the divine being transcends human natural forces is a commonplace in the writings of the early Christian theologians (Justin Mart., *Dialogue* 127,2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* II,2; Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV,20,5; Orig., *Against Celsus* VII,42).

b. The Eunomian crisis and the Cappadocians' refutation. Against the heresy of *Eunomius, who, identifying the divine essence with character of the unbegotten (ἀγέννητος), denied its incomprehensibility, the Cappadocians and *John Chrysostom elaborated a teaching of Christian negative theology. For Eunomius, the concept of being unbegotten properly expressed (ἀκριβῶς) the divine essence in the sense that the divine essence does not present any mystery and that we know God as God knows himself: "God knows no more of his own being than we know about him; his being is no more clear to him than it is to us" (Socrates, *HE* IV,7).

*Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nyssa, in their treatises *Against Eunomius,* indicate that there is no concept that properly expresses the divine essence (it remains unknowable), and they seek to define the properties and the relations of the divine persons. Finally, negative theology is articulate in a positive way and in a superior way. The Word prevents the human being from falling into the impossibility of speaking, the Neoplatonist ἀλογία. Gregory of Nyssa would express this deep meaning of God's mystery in such mystical works as the *Life of Moses* and the *Homilies on the Song of Songs*.

John Chrysostom explored the arguments put forward by the Cappadocians, not when addressing theologians but rather when speaking to the faithful. He delivered two series of homilies against the Eunomians at *Antioch in 386–387, and at *Constantinople, after 398. "The essence of God is incomprehensible for every creature" (IV,6). All this is true for natural reason as well as for the Bible: the psalmist "standing before the infinite and expanded ocean of God's wisdom is overcome by dizziness" (Ps 138:6); *Moses maintained that "no one could see God without dying" (Ex 33:20); and Paul says that God's judgments are "difficult to understand" and his ways "inaccessible" (Rom 11:53).

These authors used a certain number of terms that derived from the NT such as "invisible" (ἀόρατος), "unspeakable" (ἄρρητος), "indescribable" (ἀνεκδιήγητος), "inscrutable" (ἀνερεύνητος) and "inaccessible" (ἀπρόσιτος). Other terms derive from the writings of Philo of Alexandria: "incomprehensible" (ἀπερινόητος), "impossible to circumscribe" (ἀπερίγραπτος), "impossible to describe"

(ἀσχημάτιστος) and "impossible to contemplate" (ἀθέατος). Last, the term ἄφατος ("ineffable") derives from the writings of the Neoplatonists. The vocabulary of negative theology was constructed in this manner.

This vocabulary is found in the *Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom,* the *Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil* and in the spirituality of *Maximus the Confessor and Symeon the New Theologian.

2. The affirmative and negative theology in the writings of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. Dionysius was the first to systematize the relationship between affirmative and negative (or apophatic) theology in the *Mystical Theology*. Affirmative theology takes into consideration the divine names that negative theology denies in order to demonstrate that God is always beyond such names. It is therefore in relation to the transcendent Cause that Dionysius defines the state of negation in relation to superiority.

a. The state of negation. Negation is defined by three points of view:

(1) *As a noncontradiction of the affirmations and the negations*. In fact the negation is not in contradiction to the affirmation. This would be true if it remained in the sphere of beings, but it does not pertain to the transcendent Cause.

(2) *As an overcoming of each privation*. The negation must not be understood according to privation (κατά στέρησιν) but, as in the case of Darkness, according to transcendence or superiority (καθ' ὑπεροχήν). The Darkness is still a negative metaphor of the transcendence of the inaccessible light. To say that the negation (ἀφαίρεσις) is not a privation (στέρησις) is like affirming that privation does not exist in the Cause, that it "is superior to the privations," and, from that point onward, to affirm a certain positivity of the negation through transcendence (ὑπεροχικὴ ἀφαίρεσις) in the doubling of the negation. This idea would be developed later by such medieval authors as St. Thomas Aquinas, for whom negation, when it pertains to God, is a negation of the privation itself.

(3) *As beyond every negation and every position*. The overcoming of privation is doubled with an overcoming of the negation and the position. In this case Dionysius used the term ἀφαίρεσις and not ἀπόφασις in the opposition between ἀφαίρεσις-θέσις.

b. The double limit of the negation. Negative theology is also defined in relation to this double overcoming of the Cause that marks its dual upper and lower limits.

(1) *The negation of the privation*. On the one hand, negative theology is not a negation according to privation but according to transcendence. On the other hand, negative theology is itself superseded by the Cause which is beyond the negation of position. "We do not affirm anything," says Dionysius, "and we do not deny anything because the sole Cause is beyond every affirmation and is the transcendence beyond every negation" (MT V,1048 B). There is a doubling of the negation of transcendence: it is a negation because it affirms something, and it is a negation because it denies something. It is so to speak: "neither . . . nor . . ." or "nothing."

(2) *Beyond the negation*. What does "nothing" mean? This nothing is the inverse of beyond. It is the same thing as saying: "The Cause is beyond the negation of position" or "we do not affirm anything and we do not deny anything."

c. The negation and the superiority. God is named according to the superiority as: "the One who is beyond every essence and knowledge," "the One who is beyond everything," "the One who is above everything," "the One who is totally unknown," "the One who overcomes vision and knowledge," "the ineffable," "the Cause of everything and the One who is above everything," "the transcendence of the One who is absolutely free from everything and beyond everything."

He is qualified by a twofold series of adjectives containing a *hyper-* or an *alpha*-privative. On the one hand, he is beyond Being, the Good and the Divine (ὑπερούσιος, ὑπεράγαθος, ὑπέρθεος), hyper-luminous (ὑπερφανής) and hyper-unknowable (ὑπεράγνωστος). On the other hand, he is invisible (ἀόρατος), intangible (ἀναφής), ineffable (ἄρρητος) and invisible (ἀθέατος), void of intellect (ἄνους), void of word (ἄλογος), void of life (ἄζωος), void of substance (ἀνούσιος), and unutterable (ἄφθεγκτος).

God could be called Silence (σιγή), Rest (ἡσυχία), Ineffable (ἀφθεγξία). God eluds every vision and every contact, just as eludes every form of knowledge. This is because mysticism, to know, to carry out a "union" of all the operations of the senses of the intelligence requires a suspension of every knowledge or absence of every intellectual activity (ἀνενεργησία), closure of the mouth, closure of the eyes (ἀβλεψία), absence of vision and knowledge (ἀγνωσία). In this way, *Moses, in penetrating through the truly mystical cloud of unknowing, "stares at all the fears of knowledge frees himself from the spectacle and the spectators."

The mystical journey values the negative way, but negative theology is not to be confused with mystical theology that goes beyond it.

Y. de Andia, *Négative* (*théologie*): Dictionaire citique de théologie, 791-795, D. Carabine, "'Απόφασις" in *East and West*: RTAM 55 (1988) 5-29; M. Corbin, *Négation et transcendance dans*

l'oeuvre de Denys: RSPT 69 (1985) 41-76; É. Des Places, *La théologie négative du Pseudo-Denys. Ses antécédents platoniciens et son influence au seuil du Moyen Âge*: SP 17, 81-92; J.W. Douglass, *The Negative Theology of Dionysius the Areopagite*: DR 81 (1963) 115-124; A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, IV. *Le Dieu inconnu et la Gnose*, Paris 1954, ch. 4, § 6: "La voie de négation"; C. Guérard, *La Théologie négative dans l'apophatisme grec*: RSPT 68 (1984) 183-200; P. Hadot, *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique*, Paris 1981, ch. 8, p. 185-193: "Apophatisme et théologie negative"; Id., *Théologie négative*: Encyclopaedia Universalis, 22, Paris 1990, 495-498; J. Hochstaffl, *Negative Theologie. Ein Versuch zur Vermittlung des patristischen Begriffs*, Munich 1976; M.J. Krahe, *Von der Wesenheit negativer Theologie* (diss.), Munich 1976, H.-J. Krämer, *Die Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*, Amsterdam 1967, S. Lilla, *La Teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino* (First part): Helikon 22-27 (1982-87) 211-279; (First part: continuation): 28 (1988) 203-279; V. Lossky, *La théologie négative dans la doctrine de Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*: RSPT 5 (1930) 204-221; Id., *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient*, Paris 1944; Id., *Théologie négative et connaissance de Dieu chez Maître Eckhart*, Paris 1960; R. Mortley, *From Word to Silence, I. The Rise and Fall of Logos, II. The Way of Negation*, Theophania 30-31, Bonn 1986; H. Theill-Wunder, *Die archaische Verborgenheit. Die philosophischen Wurzeln der negativen Theologie*, Munich 1970; H.D. Saffrey, *Connaissance et inconnaissance de Dieu: Porphyre et la Théosophie de Tübingen*, *Gonimos*, Buffalo, NY 1988, repr. in *Recherches sur le Néoplatonisme après Plotin*, Paris 1990, 11-20; J. Whittaker, *Neopythagoreanism and Negative Theology*: Symbolae Osloenses 44 (1969) 109-125; H.A. Wolfson, *Albinus and Plotinus on Divine Attributes*: HTR 45 (1952) 115ff.; Id., *Infinitive and Privative Judgments in Aristotle, Averroes and Kant*: Philosophy and Phenomenological Research VII (1947) 173ff.; É. Zum Brunn - A. de Libera, *Métaphysique du Verbe et Théologie négative*, Paris 1984.

Y. de Andia

THEOLOGY. For Greek *pagans, the term θεολογία and the related words θεολογεῖν and θεόλογος refer primarily to the mystical-religious world of speaking about the gods, their origin and their relation to the world (Plat., *Rep.* 379[a]). *Aristotle, however, rather exceptionally, used the term θεολογική for a portion of philosophy (*Metaph.* 1026a.19). During the Hellenistic period there appears, above all in the writings of the *Stoics, the distinction between mythical, political and natural theology. This was a concept that helped describe religious phenomena: those phenomena concerning which the poets spoke, esp. in the case of Homer, those things that, according to the politicians and the historiographers, guarantee the *salus publica,* and those for which the philosophers were interested, esp. in the *allegorical interpretation of poems. Otherwise, one finds in the *Middle Platonist contexts the tripartite scheme according to which a distinction is made between dialectical, ethical and theoretical philosophy, the last of which was in turn subdivided into theology, physics and mathematics.

Christian authors such as *Origen and then the authors of the imperial church did not hesitate to adopt this language (Lampe, 627ff.). Because the mythical-religious meaning remained prevalent, one can understand why Christian authors until the 3rd c., although speaking of the true philosophy, used the term θεολογία only in the negative sense of pagan mythology. In the *Praeparatio evangelica,* *Eusebius of Caesarea, responding to his context, adopted the word to designate the pagan speculations about the divine (see *Praep. evang.* IV,5,1: SC 262,110ff., with a reference to A.M. Malingrey, *Philosophia,* 189-194). Nevertheless, in Origen's writings one finds the specifically Christian use of the term *theology* (*C. Cels.* VI,18: SC 147,224; VII,41: SC 150,110), which, thanks esp. to *Eusebius of Caesarea, became commonplace in the 4th c. Thereafter, Christian authors called the hagiographers or even the angels of praise to God "theologians" (see Eus., *HE* 1,2,5; 5,28,5; 10,4,70). They used the terms θεολογία and θεολογεῖν (Basil Caes., *CE* II,16: SC 305,62; see the index SC 305,328; Gregory Naz., *Or.* 27,1: SC 250,80; see the index SC 250,263). Following Origen's lead (*Com. Io.* II,34,205: SC 120,346), Eusebius in particular introduced the trinitarian meaning of θεολογία (see *HE* 1,1,7; 2 praef. 1; *Dem.* III pr.: PG 22,164A; *C. Marc.* I,1: PG 24,721A-C, etc.). Subsequently, it became very common to express with the term θεολογία the divinity of the Son and the *Holy Spirit or for presenting with this word the doctrine of the Trinity, which was often distinct from the doctrine on the salvific incarnation of the Word, called οἰκονομία (Basil Caes., *CE* II,3: SC 305,16; Gregory Naz., *Or.* 12,6: SC 405,360; 38.8: SC 358,118; Theodoret, *In 1 Cor.*: PG 82,309C; see Plagnieux, *Grégoire*, 168-196). In a similar way, they apply the title "theologians" to the sacred authors or those who spoke correctly about Christ's divinity (*John the Evangelist, *Athanasius and *Gregory of Nazianzus). Also worth noting are several special uses of the term *theology*: for the **Trisagion* (Cyril Jer., *Cat.* 23,6), for mystical theology in the writings of monastic authors, and for negative and affirmative theology in the writings of ps.-*Dionysius (*Myst.* 3).

On the Latin side, only *Marius Victorinus (*Ephes. prol.*) adopted from the Greek authors the term θεολογία in the positive sense. *Augustine rarely used the word *theologia*. He does so almost exclusively in the *De civitate Dei*. Elsewhere, he used it in the pagan sense (see *Ep.* 149,2; *Doct. chr.* II, 28,43; *C. Faust.* XII, 40). In his apology he used the term *theologia* when discussing tripartite theology (*Civ.* VI, 5-12; VII, passim; VIII,1.5.12). Discussing this topic, he also spoke in a positive sense of theol-

ogy. But it always concerned the theology of the Greek philosophers, whom Augustine recognized as *verae sapientiae amatores* (*Civ.* VIII,1, see esp., *Neque enim hoc opere omnes omnium philosophorum vanas opinones refutare suscepi, sed eas tantum quae ad theologiam pertinent quo verbo graeco significari intelligimus de divinitate rationem sive sermonem* ("For in this work I have not undertaken to refute all the vain opinions of all the philosophers, but only those opinions that pertain to theology by which Greek word we understand to be signified that reason or speech concerning the divinity"; see also VI,8,1; XVIII,41,2). When, however, the development of the Christian faith is in question, the *intellectus fidei,* Augustine preferred to speak of *verissima philosophia* (see Studer, *Schola*, 14, with *Acad.* III,20,43; *ord.* II,5,15. See G. Madec, *Philosophie*: HWP 7 [1989] 630-633, with bibl.). Only indirectly did he prepare the later Christian use of the phrase "Christian theology." Moreover, Augustine was not the first to treat the question of tripartite theology, which he himself attributed to Varro. Other Christian writers before him pursued this topic and that even in apologetic texts; for this point, see the following authors: *Tertullian (*Nat.* II,1,2), Origen (*C. Cels.* VII,41ff.; III,48; IV,99), *Lactantius (*Instit. div.*), Basil of Caesarea (*Ad iuv.* 2,85) and esp. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Praep. evang.*, passim) (see Studer, *Schola,* 33).

DTC 1511, 341-346 (bibl.); J. Plagnieux, *S. Grégoire de Nazianze théologien*, Paris 1951; K. Bärthlein, θεολογία: JbAC 15 (1972) 181-185; G. Lieberg, *Theologia tripartita in Forschung und Bezeugung*: ANRW I,4 (Berlin 1973), 63-115; J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, Paris ²1976 (with response to Lieberg); A. Dihle, *Die Theologia tripartita bei Augustin*: FS M. Hengel II (Tübingen 1996), 183-202; B. Studer, *Schola Christiana. Die Theologie zwischen Nizäa und Chalzedon*, Paderborn 1998 (bibl.).

B. STUDER

THEONAS of Alexandria (d. ca. 300). Bishop of *Alexandria, saint, feast day 23 August. He succeeded Maximus and ruled from 281/282 to ca. 300. He placed *Achillas over the school of Alexandria and ordained *Peter, who became Theonas's successor, and *Pierius (Eus., *HE* 7,32,30). There is a letter to *Diocletian's chamberlain, Lucian, transmitted under Theonas's name (PG 10,1567-1574).

BS 12, 354; Cath 14, 1109.

E. PRINZIVALLI

THEONAS TRITHEIST. *Monophysite bishop of Marmarica, in the 2nd half of the 6th c. After having been deposed, Theonas supported *Eugenius of Seleucia and *Conon (bishop of *Tarsus) in the spread of tritheist teaching in the East and West, likely able to escape the persecution of the monophysites commissioned by the emperor *Justin II (571). From the writings of Theonas there remain fragments in *Syriac of a letter that he wrote with Eugenius and Conon (*Ep. ad eorum asseclas*) to refute the trinitarian teaching of *John Philoponus.

CPG 7283; A. Van Roey, *Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon*: Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 11 (1980) 141-143; G. Furlani, *Un florilegio antitriteistico in lingua siriaca*: Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti 83 (1923-1924), second part, 671-673; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure au VIᵉ siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, 179-187; A. Van Roey, *La controverse trithéite jusqu'à l'excommunication de Conon et d'Eugène* (557-569): OLP 16 (1985) 141-165.

P. MARONE

THEOPASCHITES. The theologians who insisted on the distinction of the two natures in Christ (anti-*Arians, anti-*Apollinarists, *Nestorians and Chalcedonians) referred to those who attributed the suffering and death to the Word itself as theopaschites (θεός, "God"; πάσχειν, "to suffer"). Against them, orthodox authors at first pointed to the biblical titles that expressed the humanity of Christ as the Son of *David (see the texts cited in Grillmeier, *Christus* I, 20[54]) and the Son of Man (see Grillmeier, *Christus* I,56-57; I, 379, with anti-Arian texts). After the Council of *Chalcedon, the controversy pertained primarily to the two formulas: *qui crucifixus est pro nobis,* added to the **Trisagion* (Grillmeier, *Christus* II/2,268-277) and the *unus de Trinitate passus est* (Grillmeier, *Christus* II/2,333-359). In reality, the controversy was about an aspect of the teaching of the *communicatio idiomatum,* which was understood differently, on the one hand, by the Alexandrians, and, on the other, by the Antiochenes and the Latins, but which in the end was accepted by all according to the Alexandrian meaning, a meaning which was sanctioned already by *Cyril's 12th anathema (DS 263) and was deeply understood in the title of the *theotokos,* recognized by the Council of *Ephesus. Progress on this question was made esp. by *Severus of Antioch (see *Hom.* 125: PO 29,245); by his opponent *John of Scythopolis (see *scholia*: PG 4,196C; 221D-224A); by the so-called monks who sought to combine the christological formulas of *Chalcedon and Cyril and came together on this question at *Rome (see Maxentius, *Ep.* in CCL 85A,134-135); by the emperor *Justinian (see. *Cod. Iustin.* I,1,5, an 527); by *Boethius (see *C. Nest. Eutych.* 3: PL 64,1345AB); and finally by Pope *John II

(cf. DS 401-402). Theopaschites properly so-called should be distinguished from the *patripassians who, ignoring the distinction of the two natures, confused the persons of the Father and the Son. Nevertheless, in an extended sense, the patripassians too are also called "theopaschites," inasmuch as they spoke, in an even less differentiated way, of God's death (see Ign., *Rom.* 6,2; *Eph.* 1,1).

TRE 24 (1994) 289-296; LTK³ 9, 1464-1465; A. Grillmeier, *Vorbereitung des MA*: Chalkedon II, Würzburg 1953, 791-839; L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980; B. Studer, *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der Alten Kirche*, Düsseldorf 1985 (It. trans. 1986), 262-283 (bibl.); Grillmeier I and II/1-4, Freiburg 1979-2002 (see the indexes).

B. Studer

THEOPHANES the CONFESSOR (760–818). A Byzantine monk born in *Constantinople around 760, in the years 810–814 he wrote a *Chronography* that extends from the years 284 to 813. In the work, in addition to the narration of the creation of the world and the birth of *Jesus, we have many pieces of information on the years of governance for Byzantine emperors, Persian and Arab leaders, popes, and four patriarchs. This *Chronography* is important for its enumeration according to the cycles of the indictions and the events of the 7th and 8th c., for which Nicephorus is the only source. The work was translated into *Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the 9th c. Theophanes was a vociferous defender of the veneration of images; he was sent into exile in a land far from Constantinople and died there in the year 818.

C. de Boor (ed.), *Chronografia*, Leipzig 1883-85 (repr. Hildesheim 1963); A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa* 2/1, Brescia 1996, 62; P. Yannopoulos, *Constantin Porphyrogénète et Théophane le Confesseur*: Byzantion 75 (2005) 362-372; F.J. Thomson, *The Name of the Monastery Where Theophanes the Confessor Became a Monk*: AB 125 (2007) 120-138.

C. Dell'Osso

THEOPHANY (iconography). The emergence of theophanic iconographic themes are to be connected to the invasion of apocalyptic subjects into Christian art, which took place around 400 with regard to *christological concerns. The triumphal character of such scenes likewise signaled a return to compositions reflecting the hieratism of imperial apotheoses after the Christian "naturalism" of the first centuries.

In the strict sense, many other divine appearances should be considered scenes of theophany, all inspired by the biblical *Scriptures and elaborated independently in the slow formation of the early Christian figurative repertory. A first broad group of such scenes pertains to OT theophanies. A series of these is used to indicate the divine appearance of the sending of the divine hand that appears from heaven, which was used to indicate the acceptance or rejection of the offerings made by Cain and *Abel, or to intervene on behalf of *Noah in the scenes of the universal flood. The hand is also the sign of God's self-manifestation to *Abraham, to deliver Isaac from the sacrifice and, in the MSS, to promise him descendants as numerous as the stars of the sky. As a more explicit sign, the scene of the three angels (interpreted as an image of the *Trinity) who appeared to Abraham near the Oak of Mamre: at S. Maria Maggiore (Rome), the theophanic element, otherwise hardly evident, is enhanced by the use of the mandorla of light, which indicates the eruption of the divine light. The appearance of the *scala coeli* to *Jacob is likewise a theophany. The cycle of *Moses was also interspersed with theophanies. Moses was often depicted with the assistance of the divine hand; moreover, the *virga* itself is the image in a certain sense of that hand referred to in the Bible as the "finger of God" (Ex 8:15). Another theophany, in the stories of *Exodus, was the appearance of the pillar of fire, which led the people of Israel toward the shallow place of the Red Sea. Other OT theophanies were those of the appearances of angels, God's messengers and images of his salvific presence (the young men in the fiery furnace; *Habakkuk), or even the apocalyptic scene of the *tetramorph narrated in Ezek 1.

The NT theophanies are often connected to the scenes of the life of Christ, starting from the appearance of the angel to *Mary during the Annunciation or the portrayal of the angelic theophany that provokes and precedes the adoration of the shepherds. The scene of the *magi also has a theophanic implication in the sense of the divine manifestation of *Jesus. At the *baptism of Christ, the divine appearance is manifested through the divine hand that comes from heaven and sends the dove of the *Holy Spirit. At the Transfiguration, the luminous halo of the mandorla, although once again God's hand, often appears on the scene of the crucifixion. Again an angelic theophany marks the proclamation of the resurrection to the pious women, and at the ascension God manifests himself in the hand of Western iconography and in vision of the Eastern Syro-Palestinian tetramorph (as in the Rabula Gospels).

In the Acts of the Apostles, an angel appears to *Peter to deliver him from prison, while the mosaics

found in S. Maria Maggiore depict Christ's appearance to *Paul from heaven in the same likeness as God in the story from Exodus. Numerous theophanic scenes were taken from *John's *Apocalypse and interpreted in an overtly christological sense: from the theophany of the *Lamb, to the scenes of the *parousia, the numerous vision such as that of the candelabra, of the "one who is seated on the throne" (Rev 4; the throne that is singled out in the representation of the Hetoimasia), or even the theophany of the **Trisagion* (sung by the worshiping tetramorph).

Christological scenes not tied to specific biblical citations such as that of the *Maiestas Domini* or the **Traditio Legis* have elements connoting a theophany.

F. van der Meer, *Maiestas Domini. Théophanies de l'Apocalypse dans l'art chrétien. Étude sur les origines d'une iconographie spéciale du Christ*, Vatican City 1938; Id., *L'Apocalypse dans l'art*, Anvers 1978; R. Petraglio et al., *L'Apocalypse de Jean: Traditions exégétiques et iconographiques, IIIe-XIIIe siècles* (Actes du Colloque de la Fondation Hardt, 29 février - 3 mars 1976, Section d'Histoire de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Genève), Geneva 1979; J. Engemann, *Images parousiaques dans l'art paléochrétien*, ibid., 73-107; F. Bisconti, recensione a R. Petraglio et al., *L'Apocalypse de Jean . . .* : RivAC 56 (1980) 209-213; M. Perraymond, *Sogni, visioni e profezie nell'antico cristianesimo: Abramo, Giacobbe, Ezechiele, Pastore d'Erma, Felicita e Perpetua*, in Atti del XVII Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana, Roma 5-7 maggio 1988, Rome 1989, 549-563; U. Utro, s.v. *Teofania*, in TIP 285-286.

U. Utro

THEOPHILUS of Alexandria, patriarch (385–412). Uncle of St. *Cyril of Alexandria, his successor. He was an exceptional individual. Intelligent, gifted with energy and decisiveness, and aware of the prestige that his position conferred on him, he was at the same time somewhat inflexible and did not think very much about the means he employed to achieve his objectives. The literary sources (*Palladius, *Socrates and *Sozomen) are hostile toward him; nevertheless, good assessments of his character were offered by *Arnobius, *Theodoret, *Leo the Great, Vigilius of Thapsus and monastic circles.

At the beginning of his pontificate, he used violent means to bring about the end of *paganism in *Egypt: he was famous for the destruction of the *Serapeion (391; the adjoining library was also destroyed). Theophilus, however, was a great builder of churches. In ecclesiastical questions, he was, for a brief period, a peacemaker (e.g., the Antiochene schism, the disagreement between *Jerome and *Rufinus), but he subsequently acted in a rather inconsiderate and imprudent manner. Although initially an admirer of *Origen, he became in 399 his staunch opponent; he condemned him in a synod of 401 and persecuted his supporters at all costs, among whom were the four "long brothers"—Dioscorus, Ammon, *Eusebius and Euthymius. When these men accused Theophilus before the emperor *Arcadius and when they had found hospitality with *John Chrysostom, Theophilus was very resentful and began to plot against John Chrysostom, whom he himself had consecrated (398). Called to *Constantinople to defend himself in a synod presided over by the patriarch, at the behest of the emperor, he formed a coalition with John's numerous enemies and the accused became, through intrigue, John's accuser, and in the Synod of *Oak (403) Theophilus deposed John. The popular riots that immediately broke out following John's departure for exile forced Theophilus to make a quick flight from Constantinople. *Innocent I, to whom John had made an appeal, excommunicated Theophilus. In the Byzantine and Latin churches, Theophilus was always judged with severity and disfavor because of the dark shadows that have concealed his person; he enjoys, however, considerable esteem among the Copts and the Syrians, who venerate him as a saint.

From Theophilus's numerous writings, scarce relics remain, and very few in the original text. Jerome's *Epistolary* (87, 89, 90, 92, 96, 98, 100) respectively preserves two letters sent to Jerome by Theophilus, one to *Epiphanius, a synodical letter to the bishops of *Palestine and *Cyprus, and three festal letters from the years 401, 402 and 404: all provide an up-close look at the Origenist controversy and partly *Apollinarianism. The *Ep. ad Theodosium imp.,* preserved intact only in *Latin, is a dedicatory letter that functions as a preface to the Paschal cycle for the years 380–479 sent to the emperor so that he might adopt it. For many other letters, including the festal ones, we possess only fragments or only know the names of the recipients. The *Homilia in mysticam coenam* belongs to Theophilus, which is included among the works of Cyril of Alexandria (PG 77,1016-1029) and provides a commentary on Christ's Last Supper. Among the numerous homilies that have survived in *Coptic under his name, two could possibly be authentic (*De crucifixione* and *De poenitentia*), although others should be attributed to late legendary constructions. We have fragments of some other writings: *De morte et iudicio* (PG 65,200), on the woman with the issue of blood (F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, Münster i.W. 1907, 120 under the title *De poenitentia*) etc. Numerous other homilies and narrations of doubtful or no authenticity have been passed down under his name. Theophilus also wrote against Origen and John Chrysostom; he

commented on various books of Sacred *Scripture and promulgated ecclesiastical canons. His various *apophthegmata circled among the monks of the desert (PG 65,197-201). Numerous homilies survive in *Armenian that have been attributed to Theophilus; their authenticity is still to be examined.

CPG II, 2580-2684; PG 65, 33-68; DTC 15, 523-530; LTK 10, 80; DSp 15, 524-530; F. Rossi, *I papiri copti del Museo Egizio di Torino*, I, Turin 1887, 64-90; E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Homilies in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1910, 65-225 (text and Eng. trans.); G. Lazzati, *Teofilo d'Alessandria*, Milan 1936; A. Favale, *Teofilo d'Alessandria. Scritti, vita e dottrina*, Turin 1958; Bardenhewer 3, 115-117; Quasten 2, 102-108; Altaner 291; Fliche-Martin IV, 21-193 (passim); S. Der Nersessian, *Armenian Homilies Attributed to Theophilus*, in P. Granfield - J.A. Jungman, *Kyriakon. FS J. Quasten. I*, Münster Westf. 1970, pp. 390-399; Patrologia V, index.

A. De Nicola

THEOPHILUS of Antioch (2nd c.). Bishop of *Antioch in Syria, he composed, at the end of the 2nd c., at least four works. The only one that has been preserved, the *Ad Autolycum,* provides us a few pieces of biographical information on Theophilus: born not far from the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers (2,24), he converted to Christianity (1,24) and lived among the Christians, who were an opposed and denigrated minority (3,4); when he finished the *Ad Autolycum,* the emperor *Marcus Aurelius was already dead (3,28): he therefore wrote after 17 March 180. Autolycus, to whom the work is dedicated, was a learned *pagan man who did not know why someone would become a Christian. Theophilus sought not only to respond to his objections but also to vindicate his faith in the invisible God, the creator, and the resurrection (book 1). Book 2 emphasizes the contradictions of the philosophers and Greek poets with respect to God and the origin of the world; he sets them against the prophets, who were inspired by God. We therefore find the first Christian commentary on the beginning of the book of *Genesis and, in 2,15, the first example of the use of the term "*Trinity" (*trias*), to refer to the "God, Word and Wisdom" (*Holy Spirit). Book 3 contains a chronology of the world aimed at demonstrating that *Moses was before Homer and the most ancient Greek writers.

Another one of his works was written *Against Hermogenes*. *Eusebius only mentions that John's *Apocalypse was cited (*HE* 4,24). *Jerome specifies that it consisted of "one sole book" (*Vir. ill.* 25). Scholars have been able to determine that it was the source for *Tertullian's *Adversus Hermogenem*. And in all likelihood Theophilus made an allusion to that treatise through his *Ad Autolycum* (2,28), where he affirms that he had explained elsewhere that the dragon or the devil in the beginning was an angel (see Rev 20:3); in Tertullian's *Adversus Hermogenem* (11,3) one in fact finds a mention of this explanation.

Theophilus also composed a text titled *Against Marcion,* which is described by Eusebius as "a work of great value" (*HE* 4,24). The undeniable influence of Theophilus on *Irenaeus and his *Adversus Haereses* is probably explained through the latter's reading of this treatise mentioned by Eusebius.

Theophilus himself makes recourse to a work *On History* that he had published in multiple books (*Ad Autol.* 2,30,31; 3,19). There he establishes the genealogy of humanity after Seth. He identifies *Noah with Deucalion and lists the descendents of Shem, Ham and Japheth. It was probably there that *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I, 21,142,1) and the author of the *List* (10,31) discovered, independently, that the descendents of Shem, Ham and Japheth formed 72 nations (see RHR 130 [1971] 164-166).

In his reference to Theophilus, *Jerome affirms that he had "read under his name some commentaries on the gospel and the Proverbs of Solomon," whose authenticity seemed to him to be doubtful (*Vir. ill.* 25). He also specifies (*Ep.* 121,6) that the first was a synoptic commentary on the four gospels. The influence of Theophilus's *exegesis can be detected in the writings of later Antiochene authors.

Editions: CPG 1107ff. Best eds.: R.M. Grant, Oxford 1970, with Eng. trans.; G. Bardy, SC 20, with Fr. trans., Paris 1948; Marcovich, New York-Berlin 1995 (marred by risky conjectures); It. trans.: C. Burini, *Gli apologisti greci*, Rome 1986, 363-462.

Studies: W. Hartke, *Über Jahrespunkte und Feste, insbesondere das Weihnachtsfest*: Akad. der Wiss., Sektion für Altertumwiss., 6 (Berlin), 1956, 13-17; M. Simonetti, *La Sacra Scrittura in Teofilo di Antiochia*, in *Epektasis, Mélanges J. Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 197-207; P. Nautin, *Ciel, pneuma et lumière chez Théophile d'Antioche* (*Notes critiques sur Ad Autol. 2,13*): VChr 27 (1973) 165-171; N. Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *La création de l'homme chez Théophile* (*Gen 1,26*): VChr 30 (1976) 258-267; F. Bolgiani, *L'ascesi di Noè. Apposito di Th., Autol III, 19*, in *Forma futuri* (*Studi . . . M. Pellegrino*), Turin 1975, 295-333; F. Bolgiani, *Sullo scritto perduto contro Ermogene*, in *Paradoxos Politeia* (Misc. G. Lazzati), Milan 1979, 77-118; A.J. Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, Tübingen 1989, 102-123; N. Zeegers, *Les trois cultures de Théophile d'Antioche*, in *Les apologètes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. B. Pouderon - J. Doré, Paris 1998, 135-176; R.M. Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch*, Lanham 2000; S.J. Voicu, *Teofilo e gli antiocheni posteriori*: Augustinianum 46 (2006) 375-388.

P. Nautin

THEOPHILUS of Antioch (pseudo). He lived between the 5th and the 6th c. in S *Gaul; he is believed to be the author of a commentary on the four gospels

that was attributed by the MS tradition to *Theophilus of Antioch or even to *John of Jerusalem. Theophilus composed this work keeping in mind *Jerome's writings and the exegetical solutions proposed in *Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum,* *Maximus of Turin's *Expositio de capitulis evangeliorum,* *Eucherius of Lyons's *Formulae* and in *Arnobius's *Adversus nationes.*

CPL 1001; T. Zahn, *Der Evangelienkommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien*: Forschungen zur Geschichte des nt. Kanons 2 (1883) 29-85; PLS 3, 1282-1329; G. Morin, *Homélies inédites attribuées à Jean de Jérusalem du ms. 427 de Reims*: RBen 22 (1905) 12-14; H. Quentin, *Jean de Jérusalem et le commentaire sur les Évangiles attribué à Théophile d'Antioche*: RBen 24 (1907) 107-109; R. Hessling (ed.), ZKG 33 (1912) 529-536; Patrologia IV, 299-300.

P. Marone

THEOPHILUS of Caesarea. Bishop of Caesarea, in *Palestine, end of the 2nd c. At the time of Pope *Victor (189–199), along with *Narcissus bishop of *Jerusalem, Theophilus was at the head of the provincial council called to bring an end to the controversy over the date of *Easter. Once the decision had been made, he wrote an encyclical letter which the council also sent to *Rome, in which they declared that having celebrated Easter on the Sunday after 14 Nisan, they, just like the Romans and the Alexandrians, followed their apostolic tradition (Eus., *HE* 5,22 and 25). Under his name survive this council's acts (which are certainly forgeries), as well as a polemical document on the date of Easter, likewise apocryphal, probably the work of a British author from the 6th or 7th c.

B. Lohse, *Das Passahfest der Quartadezimaner*, Göttingen 1953; P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des IIe et IIIe siècles*, Paris 1961, 85-89; J.A. Fischer, *Die Synoden im Osterfeststreit des 2. Jh.*: AHC 8 (1976) 15-39; A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Berlin 1977; K. Gerlach, *The Antenicene Pascha*, Leuven 1998.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEOPHILUS of Castabala (d. 377). He was at first a bishop in *Palestine (Soz., *HE* IV,24). Transferred then by *Silvanus of Tarsus to Castabala in *Cilicia, he exercised the episcopate there from 362 to 375. In 362 he appears among the leaders of the *homoiousians and took part, with Silvanus and *Eustathius of Sebaste, in the embassy sent to *Rome by the Synod of *Lampascus. He signed the *Nicene Creed and was received in communion by Pope *Liberius. In 375 he contributed to the split between his friend Eustathius and *Basil of Caesarea. He later became a member of the **pneumatomachi* (see Basil of Caesarea, *Epp.* 130,1; 244,2; 245).

DCB 4, 999; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche*, Paris 1945, 157; Simonetti 393.395.415; BBKL 26, 1480-1482.

J. Gribomont

THEOPHILUS the INDIAN (d. 361). Called the Thaumaturge, he is written about by the *Arian historian *Philostorgius (d. 430). An *anomoian bishop and native of Diva (or Dibus, perhaps modern-day Sokotra opposite Somalia, another location in the Gulf of Oman), he was considere by *Gregory of Nyssa to be from the tribe of the Blemmi (*Contra Eunomium* I, ed. W. Jaeger, 38) in *Nubia. Taken as a young man as a hostage by the Romans, under *Constantine he converted and dedicated himself to the monastic life. He was consecrated a deacon and then presbyter by *Eusebius of Nicomedia (d. 341). Upon becoming bishop, he was sent by *Constantius II (337–361) on missionary journeys, first among the Sabaeans, among whom he established three churches, at Taphanam, Adane (Aden, Yemen) and Hormuz, then to the *Ethiopians (who had already been evangelized by *Frumentius, who had been sent by *Athanasius in 327). Exiled the first time by Constantius for interceding in favor of the Caesar Gallus, he was recalled to heal his sick wife, on account of his thaumaturgic powers. A partisan of *Aetius, Theophilus was exiled by the Council of *Seleucia (359), to Heraclea Pontica. He returned upon the advent of the emperor *Julian. He was present at *Eudoxius's consecration as patriarch of Constantinople (360) and the election of Bishop Aetius in the Arian synod of 362.

Philostorgius, *HE*, ed. J. Bidez, F. Winkelmann, GCS 21, 1981[3], 18, 33-36, 57, 61-63, 69, 84, 105, 116 and 125.

J. Ryckmans, *Le christianisme en Arabie du Sud préislamique*, in Atti del conv. int. "L'Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà," Rome 1964, 413-454, esp. 416-420; A. Dihle, *Die Sendung des Inders Theophilos*, in *Politeia und Res publica*, FS R. Starks, ed. P. Steinmetz, Wiesbaden 1969, 330-336; N. Pigulewskaja, *Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien*: Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten 36 (1969) 72-78 and 213; G. Fiaccadori, *Teofilo Indiano*: Studi classici e orientali 33 (1983) 295-331; 34 (1984) 271-308; I. Shahîd, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth Century*, Washington, DC 1984, 86-104; ODB 3, 2067; G. Fernández, *The Evangelizing Mission of Theophilus "the Indian" and the Ecclesiastical Policy of Constantius II*: Klio 71 (1989) 361-366; BBKL 11, 1030-1033.

E. Prinzivalli

THEOPHYLACT SIMOCATTA (ca. 580–after 630). Of Egyptian origin, he studied at *Alexandria

only to then transfer as a young man to *Constantinople, where perhaps he was at the service of the patriarch *Sergius. He is the author of a *History* in eight books, which remained incomplete, on the reign of the emperor Maurice (582–602), compiled around 630 without a specific plan and with many concessions to the anecdotal method. He also composed, in addition to 84 letters (many of which are fictitious), some *Quaestiones physicae* and a treatise *De praedestinatione.*

BBKL 11, 1033-1035; Krumbacher 247-251; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. I (Byzantinisches Handbuch 5, I), Munich 1978, 313-319. *Historiae:* C. de Boor, *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, Leipzig 1887; P. Schreiner, *Theophylaktos Simokates, Geschichte* (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 20: Abteilung Byzantinistik), Stuttgart 1985; M. Whitby - M. Whitby, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta: An English Translation with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford 1986 [1988; 1997]; A.M. Taragna, *Sul testo delle Historiae di Teofilatto Simocatta: 4.14.10, 5.4.11*: Sileno 25 (1999) 345-349; Peter Schreiner, *Theophylaktos Simokattes und das Perserbild der Byzantiner im 6. und 7. Jh.*, in *XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 24. bis 29. März 1980 in Berlin. Ausgewählte Vorträge*, ed. Fritz Steppat (ZDMG. Suppl. 5), Wiesbaden 1983, 301-306; M. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian: Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare* (Oxford historical monographs), Oxford 1988; M. Popoviç, *Zur Lokalisierung des "Trajansweges" des Theophylaktos Simokattes*: JOEByz 53 (2003) 83-95.

Letters: R. Hercher, *Epistolographi graeci*, Paris 1873, 763-786; I. Zanetto, *Theophylacti Simocatae epistulae* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1985; C.A. Ciancaglini, *Le "Lettere persiane" nella storia di Teofilatto Simocatta*, in *La Persia e Bisanzio*, Atti dei Convegni Lincei 201, Rome 2004, 633-664.

Quaestiones physicae: L. Massa Positano, *Teofilatto Simocatta. Questioni naturali*, Naples 1965.

De praedestinatione: C. Garton - L.G. Westerink, *Theophylactus Simocates, On Predestined Terms of Life* (Arethusa monographs 6), Buffalo 1978; B. Baldwin, *Theophylact's Knowledge of Latin*: Byzantion 47 (1977) 357-360; Th. Olajos, *Les sources de Théophylacte Simocatta* (Byzantina Neerlandica 10), Leiden-New York 1987.

S.J. Voicu

THEOPISTE, deacon (pseudo) (6th c.). Scholars have attributed to the deacon Theopiste a *History of Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria,* which recalls the events connected to the Council of *Chalcedon and the subsequent exile of the Alexandrian patriarch. The text was probably written shortly after the patriarch's death, but the *Syriac translation that we possess is the fruit of a reworking of the text that can be traced back to the *monophysite milieu of *Palestine, and is therefore presumably datable to after 518. The preservation of some fragments in *Coptic bears witness to its diffusion even in an Egyptian context (BHO 258). The work, which has been regarded by some scholars as a "historical romance," does not therefore belong to Theopiste, the presumed deacon of patriarch *Dioscorus, but it would be included among that polemical literature that was an expression of the anti-Chalcedonian dissent that flourished in the 1st half of the 6th c.

CPG 5470; BHO 258; F.N. Nau, *Histoire de Dioscore Patriarche d'Alexandrie écrite par son disciple Théopiste*: Journal Asiatique 10,1 (1903) 5-108, 241-310; W.E. Crum, *Coptic Texts Relating to Dioscorus of Alexandria*: Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology 25 (1903) 267-276; T. Orlandi, *La Patrologia copta*, in A. Quaquarelli (ed.), *Complementi interdisciplinari di Patrologia*, Rome 1989, 493-495; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa* 2/1, Brescia 1996, 78; Patrologia V, 352, 362 and 567.

C. Dell'Osso

THEORIA. In all of Greek thought, from the pre-Socratics until the *Corpus Hermeticum* and later to *Neoplatonism, the terms θεωρία ("contemplation") and θεωρεῖν ("to contemplate"), along with other analogous terms such as θέα, θεᾶσθαι, ὅρασις and ὁρᾶν, referred to the highest form of knowledge that the human mind was able to attain (see the article by R. Arnou cited in the bibl.). As early as the writings of *Plato, the notion of contemplation acquired primary importance (see R. Arnou's article and A.J. Festugière's book, cited in the bibl.; the most important passages from Plato are also collected in S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 165). But it was primarily *Aristotle who praised *theoria*: he regarded it as the highest end of man (*Protr*. fr. 6 Walzer [*Aristotelis dialog. fragm*., Florence 1934, 35, 13-41]). It was closely connected to his love for knowledge (*Protr*. fr. 2 Walzer), it is the most pleasurable and lofty thing that exists (*Met*. Λ1072b 24), and it produces pleasure and happiness (*Eth. Nic*. VII, 1152b 36-1153a 1; X, 1178b 28-32). In the entire *Platonic tradition—from Plato until *Philo of Alexandria, to *Middle Platonism and *Neoplatonism—*theoria* often appears associated to the terms taken from mystery language such as ἐποπτεία and ἐποπτεύειν, and it thus comes to acquire an esoteric stamp. The Greek Fathers fully accepted this understanding of *theoria*: like Plato, Philo, and the proponents of Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, such authors as *Clement of Alexandria, *Origen, *Gregory of Nyssa, *Evagrius and ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite regarded *theoria* as contemplation—on the part of the human *nous*—of the transcendent realities or ideas which for them are all joined in the divine *logos*. They closely associate it to the terminol-

ogy taken from the mystery language and therefore identified it with the superior esoteric *gnōsis,* which, in the writing of such "mystical" authors as Gregory of Nyssa and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, still remains distinct from the ἕνωσις with the chief principle, the experience that transcends any form of intellectual knowledge (even in Neoplatonism, the concept of *theoria* and ἕνωσις remained distinct. In the writings of Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and in ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite's *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,* the term *theoria* also refers to the exegetical method that allows for the discovery of the spiritual meaning of Scripture (see J. Daniélou, *L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse*, 1, 9, 10; S. Lilla, *Pseudo-Dionigi l'Areopagita, La gerarchia ecclesiastica*, 10). Contemplation also performs an important role in the writings of St. *Augustine and *John Cassian (see the contribution of M. Olphe-Galliard in the bibl. below).

As E. Kihn (ThQ 62 [1880] 581-582) and esp. A. Vaccari have shown (Biblica 1 [1920] 4-36 [= *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, I, Rome 1952, 101-142]), the concept of *theoria* used in the Antiochene school seems closely connected to the type of scriptural *exegesis that firmly rejects the *allegorism practiced by the Alexandrian school, which operated according to Philo's example. *Diodore of Tarsus wrote a treatise on the differences between *theōria* and *allēgoria,* of which the preface for his commentary on Psalm 118 (which is preserved in the codex Paris gr. Coislin. 275 and ed. L. Mariés) functions as a summary (see Vaccari, *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, I,101-102, 110-111). A concise definition for the term *theoria* in the Antiochene sense was given by *Julian of Eclanum (PL 21, 971B; see Vaccari, *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia,* I,111-112). *Severian of Gabala and St. *John Chrysostom, among others, held to this type of *theoria* (see Vaccari, *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, 109-110). *See also* *allegory – typology; *exegesis, patristic).

R. Arnou, *La contemplation chez les anciens philosophes du monde gréco-romain*: DSp 2, 1716-1742; J. Daniélou, *Mystique de la ténèbre chez Grégoire de Nysse*: DSp 2, 1872-1885; J. Lemaître - R. Roques - M. Viller, *Contemplation chez les grecs et autres orientaux chrétiens*: DSp 2, 1762-1787; M. Olphe-Galliard, *La contemplation dans la littérature chrétienne latine*: DSp 2, 1911-1929; R. Roques, *Contemplation, extase et ténèbre chez le pseudo-Denys*: DSp 2, 1885-1911; E. Kihn, *Über* θεωρία *und* ἀλληγορία *nach den verlorenen hermeneutischen Schriften der Antiochener*: ThQ 62 (1880) 581-582; A. Vaccari, *La "teoria esegetica" della scuola antiochena*: Biblica 1 (1920) 4-36 (= *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, I, Rome 1952, 101-142); J. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*, Münster 1914, 350-354; A.J. Festugière, *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Platon*, Paris 1936; W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles*, Berlin ²1955, 81ff.; Id., *On the Origin and Cycle of the Philosophical Ideal of Life*, Appendix II of the Eng. trans. of his *Aristoteles*, ed. R. Robinson, Oxford 1948, 430-431; W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, TU 57, Berlin 1952, 316-321, 403-411; E. Fascher, *Epoptie*: RAC 5, 973-983; J. Daniélou, *L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse*, Leiden 1970, 1-17; S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971, 163-169; var. aus., *Terminologia esegetica nell'antichità*, Bari 1987; O. Gigon, *La teoria e i suoi problemi in Platone e Aristotele*, Naples 1987; DSp 16 (1994) 592-623 (Vie active, Vie contemplative); Th. Böhme, *Theorie*, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* 10 (1998) 1128-1134 (bibl.); S. Lilla, *Pseudo-Dionigi l'Areopagita, La gerarchia ecclesiastica*, Rome 2002, 10.

S. Lilla

THEOSEBIA. Sister of *Gregory of Nyssa, *Macrina and *Basil. *Gregory of Nazianzus in *Letter* 197 consoles his friend Gregory of Nyssa on the death of his σύζυγος Theosebia, who is sometimes assumed to have been Gregory's wife but in fact was his sister. Theosebia was a consecrated virgin, like her sister Macrina, to whose house she probably belonged, at least initially. It is true that Gregory was married, but not to Theosebia; indeed, in *De virginitate* he states that he is cut off by a gulf from "the glory of virginity," but his depiction theren of grief for the death of a young wife in childbirth suggests such an intense participation that it seems likely that he experienced it personally. If this be the case, Gregory's marriage must not have lasted long. In his *Letter* 11, Gregory of Nazianzus reproaches Gregory of Nyssa for preferring to be called a rhetor rather than a Christian, for relapsing little by little to the "lower life," and for making a "bad decision" in choosing the career of a rhetorician instead of pursuing the path to priesthood. Gregory of Nyssa's marriage must be located in this phase. But his wife was a different woman than Theosebia, whose death is lamented in Gregory of Nazianzus's *Letter* 197 to Gregory of Nyssa.

This is demonstrated by both this letter and Gregory of Nazianzus's *Epigrams* 161 and 164, where Theosebia is described as one of Emmelia's daughters—and therefore Gregory's sister—σύζυγος of a priest, the great Gregory. She is said to have been a "support of pious women" and to have died "at a seasonable age" (thus, not in childbirth, as I think is indicated also by *Letter* 197, where she is said to have escaped "the sad experiences of life" [τὰ δὲ λυπηρὰ διαφυγοῦσα]). Now, in *Letter* 197, too, Gregory of Nazianzus states that Theosebia was σύζυγος of Gregory when he was a priest, and at the same time he attests that she was his sister: τῆς ἁγίας ἀδελφῆς ὑμῶν καὶ μακαρίας. Here, too, he says that she died at a "seasonable age." All this suggests that Theosebia was Gregory's celibate sister who lived in close as-

sociation with him at Nyssa: Gregory of Nazianzus indeed speaks of Gregory's life together with her (τὸ τοιαύτῃ συζῆσαι). This was first hypothesized by the Benedictine editors of PG 35,46-54 and 37,322 n. 54, who also considered her to be a deacon of the church of Nyssa. Silvas (100) regards it as "conceivable that she was the founder and *presbytera* of the 'choir of virgins' at Nyssa," which is described by Gregory in *Letter* 6.10.

In fact, in Gregory of Nazianzus's *Epigram* 164 she is praised as "the support of pious women," and, what is more, in his *Letter* 197 she is celebrated as "the glory of the church, the adornment of Christ, the advantage of our generation, the confidence and daring of women [τὴν γυναικῶν παρρησίαν], the fairest and most outstanding [εὐπρεπεστάτην καὶ διαφανεστάτην] amid such a splendor of siblings, Theosebia, the truly sacred [τὴν ὄντως ἱεράν] and truly fellow of a priest [ἱερέως σύζυγον; cf. *Epigram* 161: ἱερῆος σύζυγος], of equal honor and worthy of the great mysteries [ὁμότιμον καὶ τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀξίαν]." It is notable that a priest and a bishop (who revered her and called her Θεοσεβίαν τὴν ἐμήν for "her life devoted to God," *Ep.* 197) said that Theosebia had an honor equal to that of a priest and participated in the celebration of the great liturgical mysteries, surely those of the Mass. That this was not an isolated case in the early church, where women διάκονοι and πρεσβύτεραι—and even one ἐπίσκοπα—are repeatedly attested, is demonstrated by several studies. A close comparison that I have drawn with a few women *diakonoi* in *Cappadocia at the end of the 4th c. confirms the supposition that Theosebia may have been a *presbytera* charged with liturgical functions in the celebration of the Mass and probably also of the Divine Office, the spiritual and material support of women in Nyssa, and the defense of orthodoxy. It is also probable that she was in charge of his brother's community during his exile.

J. Mayer, *Monumenta de viduis diaconissis virginibusque tractantia*, Bonn 1938; R. Gryson, *Le ministère des femmes dans l'église ancienne*, Gembloux 1972; G. Otranto, *Note sul sacerdozio femminile nell'antichità*, VetChr 19 (1982) 341-360; U. Eisen, *Amsträgerinnen in frühen Christentum. Epigraphische und literarische Studien*, Göttingen 1996; K. Madigan - C. Osiek, *Ordained Women in the Early Church: A Documentary History*, Baltimore-London 2005; A.M. Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters* [VCS 83], Leiden 2007; G. Macy, *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination*, Oxford 2008; I. Ramelli, *Teosebia* in ministerio Ecclesiae*: un esempio di* diakonia *nella Cappadocia del tardo IV secolo?*, in *Diaconia, Diaconie.* XXXVIII Incontro di Studiosi di Antichità Cristiane, Roma, Augustinianum, 8-10 May 2009 [SEA], Rome 2010.

Ilaria Ramelli

THEOSIS. *See* *DIVINIZATION

THEOSOPHY. This treatise is commonly known among those appointed to study the work as the *Theosophy of Tübingen*, from the city in whose university library the MS containing the fragment on the "Oracle of the Pagans" is preserved, which was published for the first time by Karl Buresch (1889). The original title, however, was simply *Theosophy*. It consists of four books and constitutes the appendix of a theological treatise written in seven books *On the Orthodox Faith*. Nevertheless, the complete treatise has been lost, clearly because of its *monophysite orientation, although incomplete fragments from the *Theosophy* have been preserved. Thanks to the pioneering work of Mras (1906) and Erbse (1941 and 1995), it has been possible for us to follow the research in the direction of a reconstitution, although partial and open to subsequent developments, of the original text of the *Theosophy,* which allows us today to evaluate its specific contributions even for the knowledge of patristic literature and theology, in addition to the religious and philosophical pagan traditions of *Late Antiquity.

The work should be dated around 502/503. Its author reveals clear millennialist and monophysite tendencies (his christological thought moves in the direction between *Cyril of Alexandria and *Zeno's **Henoticon*). The author places the death of Christ in the year 5500 from the creation, that is, in the year 500 of the 6th and last millennium. This signified that the author was awaiting the end of the world for the year 507/508 (according to the Alexandrian *computus). At the same time the author shows that he was in possession of a vast knowledge of the Eastern pagan world. If one must, however, exclude definitively any relationship with the inaccessible figure of the *Manichean Aristocritus (the name proposed for the first time by Brinkmann), one could reasonably attribute the work, with noteworthy proximity, to a theologian such as Severus of Sozopolis, or even a person who lived in those same milieu and who shared those religious and intellectual experiences.

Developing the logical apologetics of such authors as *Lactantius, the ps.-Justin of the *Collatio,* the author of the *De Trinitate* (*Didymus the Blind) and Cyril of Alexandria, the author of the *Theosophy* proposes to demonstrate that there exists a substantial harmony (*symphonia*) between the religious and philosophical wisdom of the pagans (Greeks, Egyptians and Persians), who have been illuminated by God, and the truths contained in *Scripture, esp. the typically Christian doctrines, namely those of the *Trinity and the

*incarnation. In completing this task, the author seems to desire to place himself explicitly against *Porphyry of Tyre, who, in the *Philosophy of the Oracles,* proposed to lead to "theosophy" whoever would receive the true philosophy that is found in harmony with the oracles of the gods. One should also note that the title also echoes the use that ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite had recently made of the word-key "theosophy." The work is therefore to be placed as an anthology or a *florilegium in which a systematic comparison is made of citations from pagan texts (or presented as such) with biblical passages.

The first book collects numerous oracles of the gods (Apollo, Serapis, Hermes and Artemis) and some valuable inscriptions from which the author establishes the argument that pagan Egyptian theology recognized such teachings as the virginal birth of the Logos-Son and the consubstantiality (**homoousios*) of the Logos-Son with the Nous-Father. The second book contains the sentences of Greek wise men, that is, the philosophers (Orphaeus, Heraclitus, Diagoras, *Plato, *Aristotle, Plutarch, *Porphyry, Syrian etc.) and the poets (Sophocles, Euripides, Menander etc.), and passages from the revelations of Hermes Trismegistus (in part already known through *Cyril of Alexandria). The third book, whose impressive literal citation of Firmianus (*Lactantius) in Latin deserves to be noted, is devoted to the *Sibylline oracles, among which is the famous Oracle of *Baalbek, or the Tiburtine Sibyl. The fourth book contained citations taken from the *Book of Istape,* but unfortunately only Zoroaster's messianic prophecy has been preserved in *Syriac translation. The work concludes with the universal Chronicle that goes from *Adam to *Zeno, in which extensive passages from *Hippolytus's *Chronicle* and the **Protevangelium of James* are transcribed. Fortunately, this *Chronicle* has survived even though incomplete and written in an appalling Latin, in a translation from the Merovingian age known as the *Excerpta Latina Barbari* or *Barbarus Scaligeri* (the latter deriving from the name of its first editor).

In order to demonstrate his thesis, the author does not hesitate to make recourse to true and proper propagandist forgeries produced in the 2nd half of the 5th c., as in the case, for example, of the Oracle of Apollo, which contains a confession of the monophysite faith, or the Oracle of Apollo on the consecration of the Parthenon to *Mary. Other famous forgeries such as the *Testament of Orphaeus* and the *Sibylline Oracles* circulated, however, as early as the 2nd c. The *Theosophy* offers important pieces of information concerning the reception of these pseudepigraphal texts in ancient Christianity. Zoroaster's messianic prophecy was found in the Christianized redaction of the *Book of Istape,* which likewise dates back to the 2nd c. But on the whole, the pagan material reproduced is of great documentary value and awaits systematic analysis and commentary.

P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia: An Attempt at Reconstruction* (VChrS 56), Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2001 (bibl.); Id., *Forgery, Propaganda and Power in Christian Antiquity: Some Methodological Remarks*: Alvarium. Festschrift C. Gnilka (JbAC-Erg. Bd. 33), Münster 2002, 39-51; Id., *The Word "Homoousios" from Hellenism to Christianity*: ChHist 71 (2002) 243-272; A. Busine, *Paroles d'Apollon. Pratiques et traditions oraculaires dans l'Antiquité Tardive (IIe-VIe siècles)* (RGRW 156), Leiden-Boston 2005.

P.F. Beatrice

THEOTECNUS of Caesarea, bishop. Bishop of *Caesarea in *Palestine (3rd c.). During his episcopate he met the centurion Marinus shortly before he underwent *martyrdom (Eus., *HE* 7,15,4: SC 41,189-190) and took part in the Council of *Antioch (264) by drafting, along with the other conciliar fathers, the formula of faith that *Paul of Samosata had to sign (*Ep. Hymenaei Hierosolymitani, Theophili, Theotecni, Maximi, Bolani ad Paulum Samosatenum*, in Eus., *HE* 7,28,1: SC 41,212).

CPG 1705; E. Schwartz, *Eine fingierte Korrespondenz mit Paulus dem Samosatener*: Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Munich 3 (1927) 42-46; G. Bardy, *La lettre des six évêques à Paul de Samosate*: RSR 6 (1916) 17-33; Id., *Paul de Samosate*, Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 4, Louvain 1929[2], 9-34; F. Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata*: TU 44/5 (1924) 108-110, 265-283; H. De Riedmatten, *Les Actes du procès de Paul de Samosate. Étude sur la christologie du IIIe au IVe siècle*, Freiburg 1952, 121-134.

P. Marone

THEOTECNUS of Livia. Bishop of Livia in *Palestine (Tell er-Ram: in the eastern Jordan area near the Dead Sea) between the 6th and 7th c. One of his homilies on the assumption of *Mary (15 August) remains extant as one of the earliest explicit witnesses to his existence. The name of the feast is significant: Ἀνάληψις τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου. The homily explicitly and numerous times affirms that Mary was assumed into heaven body and soul, so that only for a brief time the former might remain separated from the latter, but remaining incorrupt. The author, although appealing to the traditions found in the apocrypha on the death and assumption of Mary, established the dogmatic foundation for affirming her assumption into heaven in her relationship to the mystery of the *incarnation: in fact Mary's dignity

as the Mother of God, her perpetual virginity and exalted sanctity, demanded that her body be made exempt from corruption, and that it be assumed to heaven and reunited to the soul so that the Virgin might enjoy the glory of her Son. All the theological arguments used by Theotecnus in favor of the dogma of the assumption were reused by later Byzantine homilists.

CPG III, 7418; A. Wenger, *L'Assomption de la très sainte Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle. Études et documents*, Paris 1955, 96-110, 271-291; Id., in *Maria*: *Études sur la S. Vierge*, ed. H. du Manoir, 5, Paris 1958, 936-938; Beck 400; Altaner 555; G. Söll, *Storia dei dogmi mariani*, Rome 1981, 192-196 and 429; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, ed. A. Gharib, 2, Rome 1988, 80-97; Patrologia V, 288; BBKL 11, 1035-1037.

A. De Nicola

THEOTIMUS of Tomi (4th–5th c.). Bishop of *Tomi (modern-day Constanţa), in Scythia, between the end of the 4th c. and the first decades of the 5th. He was referred to as the "philosopher." Initially he was a pagan philosopher (Socr., *HE* 6,12; Soz., *HE* 7,16; 8,14), but shortly after his conversion he was ordained a bishop (in ca. 392). He had great success when working among the pagan tribes of the *Huns and the *Goths in spreading the worship of the Christian God, whom the barbarians called "the God of the Romans." *Jerome was also aware of some of his dialogues (*Vir. ill.* 131), but all of these works are now lost. He was a friend of *John Chrysostom and defended him against *Theophilus of Alexandria. In 403 Theotimus objected to the condemnation of *Origen. He died before the Council of *Ephesus (431), where his successor Timothy was present.

G. Ladocsi - S. Samulowitz

THEOTIMUS the Valentinian (2nd half of the 2nd c.). *Valentinian *gnostic who was active perhaps at *Rome. According to *Tertullian (*Adv. Valent.* 4), who mentions him alongside *Secundus the Gnostic and Mark the magician (*Mark the Gnostic), he was the author of a work titled *On the Images of the Law,* most likely on the *allegorical exegesis of the OT. It is possible that some texts that come from this work are cited by *Irenaeus in *Adv. Haer.* I, 17,1-18,3 as representative of Valentinian OT exegesis and are often attributed, however, to Mark the Gnostic, the disciple of *Valentinus at *Alexandria, who was then active at *Lyons, where Irenaeus knew him well and extensively documented his teachings, also including Sigé, the silence, as the feminine counterpart of the first divinity.

Because this aspect seems to be absent in chs. 17-18 of Irenaeus's book 2, it could also be the result of derivations from Theotimus's work. One finds an exposition there of how the creation was the work of the Demiurge through the Mother, according to the (Platonizing) model of the invisible realities: for example, the four elements were modeled on the primordial Tetrad and their operations on the *Ogdoad; the 12 zones of the world on the Duodecad, etc. Likewise dependent on Plato, the Demiurge created time to seek to imitate infinity and eternity; nevertheless, the work adds that because the truth escaped him, he followed the lie and therefore, in the fullness of time, his work will perish. All of this continues through ch. 17. Ch. 18 is more strictly exegetical and is more likely to derive from Theotimus. In Gen 1:1, God, the beginning, heaven and earth are identified with the Tetrad; the second Tetrad, derived from the first, is individuated in the abyss, in darkness, in the spirit and in the waters that the text of Genesis mentions immediately after. Similarly, the Decad, the Duodecad and the Triacontad are identified in the various realities created later. Even human beings were created in the image of the higher power, having in themselves in the end the faculties that proceed from the One and from which arise four other faculties on the model of the Tetrad: sight, hearing, smell and taste. The Ogdoad is reflected in the *anthrōpos* inasmuch as it has two eyes, two ears, two nostrils and two tastes, sweet and bitter. Similarly, the Decad, the Duodecad and the Triacontad are individuated in the human being. On the fourth day the Sun was formed, with reference to the Tetrad, which would be symbolized also by the curtains of *Moses's tabernacle, which was composed of flax, blue, purple and scarlet, and also the four rows of precious stones of the high priest, and generally speaking everything that was found in numbers of four in the OT. Some considered the *anthrōpos* male and female at the same time, created in the image and likeness of God, just as the spiritual human, before the human that was formed from the earth (a Philonian and then an Origenian idea). Moreover, the eight persons saved on Noah's ark in the flood would correspond to the salvific Ogdoad and to *David, who was the eighth of his brethren, and to circumcision on the eighth day, and so too the other things occurring in numbers of eight in the OT. The ten nations promised to *Abraham by God would symbolize the Decad, and thus many other things occurring in numbers of 10 in the OT. The Duodecad is omnipresent in the OT: the twelve tribes of Israel etc. And the Triacontad, the union of the preceding numbers, is seen in the

height of thirty cubits of *Noah's ark and in other occurrences of the same number. All of this seems to be an allegorical reading of the Bible on the basis of numerology.

C. Colpe, *Gnosis II* (Gnostizismus): RAC 11 (1980) 538ff.; M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, Princeton, NJ 1996; C. Markschies, *Die Gnosis*, Munich 2001; K.L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?*, Cambridge, MA-London 2003; A. Marjanen (ed.), *Was There a Gnostic Religion?*, Göttingen 2005; K.L. King - R. Van der Broek, *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, I, ed. W.J. Hannegraaff et al., Leiden-Boston 2005, 412; LACL 691.

I. Ramelli

THEOTOKOS. Title given to *Mary inasmuch as she was the mother of God, the origin of which must be sought in the Alexandrian school. *Origen, in his *Homilies on Luke,* affirms the concept of Mary's divine maternity with analogous formulas (*Hom.* VII,6; VIII,4). According to *Philip of Side, *Pierius of Alexandria (281–ca. 300) delivered a speech concerning the Theotokos. *Peter Martyr (d. 311) knew of it and used the title. Certainly attested by *Alexander of Alexandria and *Athanasius, the most certain evidence is given by the troparion **Sub tuum praesidium,* where the term was used in its current form. From the 4th c. onward, the writers and fathers of the church commonly used it as a specific title for Mary. *Nestorius objected to the term as improper, unbiblical and absent from the terminology used by the Council of *Nicaea, tainted by *paganism (because it presents Mary as a goddess) and argued that instead the term should be replaced with *Christotokos.* A definitive response to his objections were given by the Council of *Ephesus (431), which approved the legitimacy of the use of this term and gave it a precise meaning.

Philip of Side, *Historia christiana, fragmenta*, TU, 5/2, 171; Peter Martyr, *Fragmenta*: PG 18, 517; Alexander of Alexandria, *Epistola I ad Alexandrum episcopum Constantinopolitanum* I, 12: PG 18, 568; Athanasius, *Contra Arianos, Oratio* III, 14.29.33; Id., *Vita Antonii* 36; Id., *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* 22; H. Rahner, *Hippolytus von Rom als Zeuge der Ausdruck Theotokos*: ZKTh 59 (1935) 73-81; G. Giamberardini, *Il "Sub tuum Praesidium" e il titolo Theotokos nella tradizione egiziana*: Marianum 31 (1969) 350-358; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, London ²1975, 392-413; G. Söll, *Storia dei dogmi mariani*, Rome 1981, 90-91, 108-113, 152-164; A. Poós, *La "Theotokos" ad Efeso, Calcedonia e nel Vaticano II*, Rome 1981; Marienlexikon 6, 390-391; *Theotokos. A Theol. Encycl. of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, Dublin 1982, 342-343; S.J. Voicu, *"Kyriotokos" e "Theotokos" nelle omelie di Severiano di Gabala*: Theotokos 12 (2004) 329-335 (demonstrates that Severian did not use the term Theotokos).

E. Peretto

THERMAL BATHS (*Thermae, balnea, balneae*). In the first centuries of Christianity, esp. in the West, thermal baths were widespread and public; their use was an integral part of the culture. Over time, the voluntary abstention of Christians from them annoyed the pagans less. The practices of the ancient age would continue. There were two tendencies among Christians: abstaining from enervating hot baths and engaging in cold baths (in the N) practiced to sedate the flesh. Nevertheless during the first centuries there was no systematic prohibition of these baths. There was rigorism esp. in the milieu of Eastern asceticism (*Jerome, *Anthony) and in the West with *Fulgentius of Ruspe. The Western monastic rules, however, were more moderate (Aug., *Ep.* 211, 13; CSEL 57,367; *Regula Benedicti* 36). Fathers and councils did not condemn the baths per se, but they repressed the abuses found either in the multiplication of licentious baths or, even though separated by gender but still in common use, those that were exacerbated by refinements before and after the bath.

The condemnation issued by the Council of *Laodicea in 320 (Mansi 2,569), which was made more severe by the Council *in *Trullo* (can. 77 = the cleric was deposed, the layman separated from the congregation: Mansi 9,978), was accompanied by that of the Fathers (Clement of Alex., *Paed.* III, 5: PG 8,600; Cypr., *De habitu virg.* 19: PL 4,471-472; Jer., *Adv. Iovin.* 2,36: PL 23,349-350). Legislation issued by the emperor *Justinian in 528 agreed with this condemnation by considering it a grounds for divorce for the husband if his wife went to the baths among males *libidinis causa,* although a man who had forced a woman to the baths was subject to the death penalty (CJ V,17,11). Christians practiced baths of purification after sexual intercourse in marriage, before receiving the *Eucharist, on Sunday and before feast days. *John Chrysostom generally recognized the benefits of the baths (*Ad pop. Ant. hom.* XIV,6: PG 49,151-152); at times it is clearly acknowledged (Greg. the Great, *Ep.* XIII,1: PL 77,1254). There is a rich symbolism in the writings of the Fathers concerning the baths, with a special ecclesial meaning (John Chrysostom, *In Ep. II ad Cor. hom.* 15: PG 61,510) (see H. Dumaine, *Bains*, 98-100). At *Rome, through the interest of the popes (e.g., *Damasus [366–384] and *Symmachus [498–514]), and *Constantinople through the work of the emperors (e.g., *Constantine) and elsewhere, through the initiative of the bishops (e.g., at *Ravenna, bishop Victor), baths were constructed for Christians.

H. Dumaine, *Bains:* DACL 2, 72-177; J. Zellinger, *Bad und Bäder in der altchristlischen Kirche*, Munich 1928; L. Gougaud,

Bains: DSp 1, 1197-1200; C. Testore, *Bagno*: EC 2, 686-688; H. Leclercq, *Thermes*: DACL 15, 2271-2272; PWK II, 2743ff.; R. Paribeni, *Bagno*, in Enc. Ital. Treccani 1930, 856-862 (Antichità classica); R. Gabetti, *Bagno* (*nell'antichità*), in Nova, l'Enciclopedia Utet, I, Turin 2001, 834-835.

O. Pasquato

THESSALONICA

I. City and Christianity - II. Archaeology.

I. City and Christianity. Thessalonica (modern-day Thessaloniki) was established in 316/315 BC by Cassander, who gave the city the name of his wife, the sister of Alexander the Great. The city's almost perfect geographical position brought about its rapid development, and immediately after the Roman conquest of *Macedonia (186 BC) it became the capital of the second of the fourth autonomous districts into which the entire territory was divided; the city later became the capital of the entire eparchy of Macedonia (146 BC) with the exceptional title of "free city." Thessalonica always excelled throughout the entire Roman period because of its excellent commercial and political position, increasingly earning recognition from *Rome with the title guardian of the temple (*neōkoros*)—in fact, it had the honor of housing the imperial temple—and later with the title of "Roman colony." During the era of the tetrarchy (AD 300), it reached the height of its prosperity as the seat of the Caesar *Galerius, who embellished it with many buildings. The language used during the Roman period remained Greek as attested by epigraphic documents. The religion, which in the beginning was solely Hellenic, slowly declined toward a syncretism with other foreign divinities, until the Christian religion emerged at the beginning of the 4th c. When, in AD 50, the apostle *Paul reached the city, he found the terrain suited for the preaching of the new faith. In subsequent centuries the city was marked as the center in which the leaders of the surrounding churches came together to experience the climate of a notable religiosity, as mentioned by the archbishop of the city Aetius at the Synod of *Sardica (343). Having come into contact with this environment, *Theodosius the Great (379–395) also decided to officially embrace Christianity, and here in 380 he promulgated the decree with which the decisions of the Council of *Nicaea were recognized and *Arianism condemned. When a sedition broke out at Thessalonica in 390, the emperor's repressive measures caused a massacre in the circus. *Ambrose then imposed a public penance on him.

Because Thessalonica was a center of an important road network and a point of encounter between the Greek East and the Latin West, it already received its first evangelization during the apostolic age. At the beginning of his second missionary journey, during the first months of the year 50, Paul, after having preached at *Philippi (Acts 16), where he had already met opposition from the Jews who had caused him "suffering and abuse" (1 Th 2:2), headed with Silas (Acts 16:25–17:4), who was also called "Silvanus," and *Timothy toward *Thessaly and, passing through Amphipolis and Apollinia, arrived at Thessalonica. There in the synagogue for three straight *Sabbaths he explained the Sacred *Scriptures, demonstrating that *Jesus was the Messiah. Some Jews believed and joined Paul and Silas; they were also joined by "a great many of the devout Greeks and not a few of the leading women" (Acts 17:4). The Jews, being envious, incited some people to remove Paul and Silas from the city, but they had already fled by night for Berea, to then go to *Athens, where Paul sent for Silas and Timothy (Acts 17:15; 18:5), who then returned to Thessalonica (1 Th 3:1).

At Thessalonica Paul had established the second Christian community in Europe, after Philippi. From Athens, Paul wrote the First Letter to the Thessalonians, after which, Timothy, who had been sent from Athens to Thessalonica, had communicated to him about the condition of the Christian community there, which had been persecuted by the Jews but was resolved in their faith. A few months afterward, it seems, Paul wrote the Second Letter to the Thessalonians. The Christian community developed thereafter (see the edict of *Antoninus Pius [138–161] mentioned by *Melito of Sardis in Eus., *HE* 4,26,16). During the *Diocletian persecution, in 304, the sisters *Agape, Chione and Irene were *martyred there (see P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Il testo greco originale degli atti delle ss. Agape, Irene e Chione*: ST 9, Vatican City 1902, 3-19), who are mentioned in the *Hieronymian Martyrology* for 1 April and in the *Syriac Breviary* for 2 April (*Passio graeca*, in BHG 2,34). Under the emperor Galerius (305–311), Agathopus and Theodulus were martyred, who are remembered on 4 April (*Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae,* 583). The martyr *Demetrius was also venerated there (BHG 2,496-547; H. Delehaye, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires*, Paris 1909, 107-108). David (ca. 535) and Theodora (ca. 893) were also saints from Thessalonica.

The episcopal lists are fragmentary so that as a result very few names are certain before the 4th c. The first bishop would have been Aristarchus the disciple of Paul. Bishop Demetrius, the patron of the city, died as a martyr in 290 or in 306 (AASS *Octobr.*

IV,50-209). The metropolitan bishop Alexander participated at the Council of *Nicaea (325) and the dedication of the basilica of the Holy Sepulcher at *Jerusalem (335) (see Eus., *Vita Constant.* IV,43,3). After 379, Macedonia, although united to the East, remained under the patriarchate of Rome; the metropolitans of Thessalonica from 382 to 389 were apostolic vicars for eastern Illyricum. After a council called at Capua in 391 under Pope *Siricius (384–399) had treated the questions raised by *Bonosus bishop of Naissus in Dacia Inferior, who denied *Mary's virginity and reiterated the trinitarian errors of *Photinus of Sirmium, the bishops of Illyricum more carefully reexamined Bonsosus's teachings: for this purpose *Anasius the archbishop of Thessalonica convoked and presided over a council that also addressed the validity of the ordinations performed by Bonosus, once he had been deposed by the Council of Capua. *Ambrose (*Ep.* 56), who was monitoring the council's progress and had deferred the judgment on Bonosus to Anisius, wrote to Bonosus, who was obliged to obey the council's decisions. In 518 another council was held at Thessalonica. From 649 onward Thessalonica entered into conflict with Rome (Hfl-Lecl III,208), so that as a result, in 732, the emperor *Leo III separated Illyria from Rome. Thessalonica, the homeland of Cyril and Methodius, from 820 onward was the center for the evangelization of the Slavs.

O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique des origines jusqu'au XIVe siècle*, Paris 1919; Fr. Tafel, *De Thessalonica eiusque agro dissertatio geographica*, Berlin 1939; on the first Council of Thessalonica, see Mansi 3, 689; Jaffé, nn. 261, 299 and 303; Palazzini 5, 966-967; C.W.R. Larson, *Theodosius and Thessalonian Massacre Revisited yet Again*: SP 10, 297-301; V. Parlato, *Il vicariato di Tessalonica* (*IV-VII sec.*): Studi Urbinati di Scienze Giur. 49-50 (Rimini 1980-82) 133-150; P. Nautin, *La lettre de Félix III à André de Thessalonique et sa doctrine sur l'église et l'Empire*: RHE 77 (1982) 5-34; A. Vecchio, *La strage di Tessalonica. Nuove ricerche sulla data: 389 o 390?*, in *Humanitas classica e sapientia cristiana, Scritti offerti a R. Iacoangeli*, ed. S. Felici, Rome 1992, 115-144; R.C. Ascough, *The Thessalonian Christian Community as a Professional Voluntary Association*: JBL 119 (2000) 311-328; C. von Brocke, *Thessaloniki: Stadt des Kassander und Gemeinde des Paulus: eine frühe christliche Gemeinde in ihrer heidnischen Umwelt*, Tübingen 2001; R. Börschel, *Die Konstruktion einer christlichen Identität: Paulus und die Gemeinde von Thessalonich in ihrer hellenistisch-römischen Umwelt*, Berlin 2001; L. Nasrallah, *Empire and Apocalypse in Thessaloniki: Interpreting the Early Christian Rotunda*: JECS 13 (2005) 464-508; *Frühchristlicher Thessaloniki*, ed. C. Breytenbach, Tübingen 2007.

E. Pelekanidou - C. Nardi

II. Archaeology. From the era of *Theodosius the Great, the first Christian buildings were constructed at Thessalonica and subsequently enlarged and lavishly decorated.

St. George (the so-called Rotunda). The Rotunda, as it is locally referred to because of its circular layout, being contemporaneous to Galerius's triumphal arch, dates to the end of the 3rd c. or to the 1st decades of the 4th. At the end of the 4th and toward the mid-5th c., it was transformed into a church with the addition of a vast circular corridor. The chief entrance was moved to the E side; the apse was added and decorated on the inside with splendid mosaics. Windows and rosettes show simple themes that are also found on the floor mosaics: in various positions and at irregular distances, birds, baskets full of fruit and isolated fruits portrayed in stark colors are found on a golden or silver background; even the frames are animated by animals, birds and fruit. The chief decoration is found in the vault of the dome, which is divided into two sections: the first, by architecture framing various saints; the second filling the remaining surface. In the architecture one finds *exedrae* that enclose the altars, and their forms recall the structure of the tomb of *Petra and the temple of Dionysius and Baalbek. On the bases and the plinths of these amazing constructions are the *martyrs in a posture of prayer depicted in their entirety and facing the viewer. The large mosaic compositions once set above this area have been lost; from what remains, however, it is possible to reconstruct their general schema: 22 figures filled the entire surface, which is today barren; at the top ran bands representing a heavenly arch; another band was decorated with blue stars on a golden background and an ornate wreath of leaves and fruits. At the center, supported by four angels, is Christ standing and in the act of blessing. The apse is decorated with a fresco of Christ's *ascension, which is divided into two areas: in the upper part, Christ is on a luminous aureole, flanked by two angels; in the lower part, the praying Virgin is between two angels, surrounded by the *apostles. The fresco dates to the 9th c.

Monì Latomou (Hosios David). The small church of *Monì Latomou,* known today by the name of "Hosios David," dates after the mid-5th c. The building, of which only the W part remains, was originally in the form of a Greek cross with a dome. The mosaic of the apse represents the vision of *Ezekiel: Christ, a young beardless man seated on a heavenly arch, is wrapped in a large and transparent aureole; at the four chief points are the *symbols of the evangelists who lift up the gospels; at the feet of Christ are the four rivers of Eden: Pishon, Gihon, Tigris and Euphrates, whose waters flow into the river Chebar, which unfolds solitary, blue and full of fish; in the middle of the waters, alongside the feet of Christ, the personification of the river, a bearded man with

his back emerges from the water; in the left corner is Ezekiel, a prisoner in the land of the Chaldeans, on the banks of the River Chebar; in the right corner, inside a cave hewn in the rock, *Habakkuk is awaiting the word of God. The artist shows himself to be a master not only with respect to the colors and the general design of the work but also with respect to the heavy psychological effects of the forms. A strong expressive realism in the rendering of the storm and the climate of agitation characterizes Ezekiel's vision, while a quiet serenity and an attitude of deep meditation shine from the face and position of Habakkuk.

St. Demetrius. The most important monument of the city, connected to the national history of Greece, is the basilica of St. *Demetrius, which contains five naves with a transept and was established on the place of an oratory or a martyrium at the beginning of the 5th c. The eparch of Illyricum at that time, Leontius (412–413), after having been healed through the intervention of the saint, out of gratitude wanted to build a church that was worthy of him. The church, which was destroyed by a fire in the 1st half of the 7th c., was reconstructed almost immediately after and, in subsequent centuries, preserved its splendor despite its rearrangements and depredations by the *Saracens, Normans, Franks and Turks. When at the beginning of the 5th c. the large basilica emerged by work of Leontius, many parts of the old thermal baths, both because the architectural elements were indispensable and because these subterranean elements were closely connected to the imprisonment and martyrdom of St. Demetrius, were incorporated into the new edifice and esp. into the crypt. At the same time the old Roman constructions, with opportune completions and modifications, served as subfoundations of the apse, the transept and in general the entire E part of the basilica. The central nave, the narthex and a part of the altar were covered with polychrome marble. In the central nave, in addition to this decoration, an ornamentation in *opus sectile* depicted the various geometric and floral motifs. More precious marble decorated the *trabelon,* entirely covered with green fabric, hung in the lower part among small turquoise columns. One should note that the variety of the capitals is unique: all types of early Christian capitals are represented there, from the Theodosian to the wavy and stylized with leaves moved by the wind; the capitals of the pillars have a decoration of birds that drink from vases. The *cancelli,* which date from the 5th and the 9th c., also present a remarkable variety. The pictorial decoration does not follow a specific plan: at numerous points, to make place for the representations of the mosaics and the frescoes, slabs of the marble decoration were removed, although undesirable compositions or images were covered with marble. The mosaics date between the 5th and the 9th c. or at most the 10th c. The mosaic with the healing of the children, which is found on the W wall of the S nave, and an angel, which is all that is left of a representation from the W wall of the N nave, are from the 5th c. To the 7th c. belong the mosaics of the founders on the N façade of the pillar NE of the altar, the scene of St. Demetrius with the two children on the W façade of the pillar NE of the altar, the mosaic of St. Demetrius with a bishop on the W façade of the pillar SW of the apse, the portrayal of the saint with four clerics in the N sector of the *tribelon*, which is preserved in good condition, the mosaic of St. Demetrius, which is now protected in the chapel of the crypt (one of the most important because it pertains to the reconstruction of the church in the 7th c. and bears the name of the eparch who in that period governed Illyricum), and the mosaic of St. Sergius on the façade of the pillar SE of the altar. The mosaic of the Madonna with St. Theodore, which is found on the façade of the pillar NE of the apse, is from the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th c. Few fragments have been preserved to this date in good condition: the most noteworthy is found on the wall of the basilica, and it dates to the 7th c.

The Acheiropoieta. Built seemingly after the condemnation of *Nestorius by the Third Ecumenical Council (431), the church took its name from an icon of the Madonna and Child, which was then miraculously transformed into a Madonna standing in prayer without a Child. Because some regarded this transformation as having occurred without the intervention of any painter, the icon was called **Acheiropoieta,* "made without human hands." The basilica with three naves divided by columns standing on wide stylobates has lost its marble that covered all the walls; nevertheless, it is one of the few early Christian churches that has preserved intact many architectural elements (columns, Theodosian capitals, frames etc.). The only mosaics that have survived are those that covered the inner borders of the arches of the columns. The decoration of the three arches of the *tribelon* against a golden background presents a large variety of colors, designs and forms. The mosaics of the *Acheiropoieta* are among the most important of the 5th c.; the presence of some motifs such as the lotus reveal a technique, as in the case of the mosaics of St. George, which was still under the influence of classical art.

1. General works: O. Tafrali, *Topographie de Thessalonique*, Paris 1913; Ch. Diehl - M. Le Tourneau - H. Saladin, *Les monuments chrétiens de Salonique*, Paris 1918; C. Pietramellara, *Salonicco capitale dell'impero nel IV secolo*, in *L'imperatore Giustiniano. Storia e mito. Giornate di studio a Ravenna, 14-16 ottobre 1976*, ed. G.G. Archi, Milan 1978, 273-304; G. Gounaris, *L'archéologie chrétienne en Grèce de 1974 à 1985*, in Actes du XI[e] Congrès Int. d'archéologie chrétienne, III, Rome 1989, 2687-2711, esp. 2702ff.

2. Rotunda (*St. George*)*:* E. Dyggve, *Recherches sur le palais impérial de Thessalonique*, in *Studia orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata*, Köbenhavn 1953, 59ff.; H. Thorp, *Quelques remarques sur les mosaïques de l'église Saint-Georges à Thessalonique*, in *Acta of the IXth Int. Byzant. Congr.*, Thessaloniki 1953, 489-498; St. Pelekanidis, *Gli affreschi paleocristiani ed i più antichi mosaici parietali di Salonicco*, Ravenna 1963; P. Cattani, *La rotonda ed i mosaici di San Giorgio a Salonicco*, Bologna 1972.

3. Hosios David (Monì Latomou)*:* J. Papadopoulos, *Une mosaïque byzantine de Salonique*: CRAI 1927, 215-218; Ch. Diehl, *Une mosaïque byzantine de Salonique*: CRAI 1927, 256-261; P. Grumel, *La mosaïque du "Dieu Sauveur" au monastère de Latomou à Salonique*: EO 33 (1930) 157-175; C. Diehl, *À propos de la mosaïque de Hosios David à Salonique*: Byzantion 7 (1932) 333-338; St. Pelekanidis, Παλαιοχριστιανικά Μνημεῖα Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἀχειροποίητος, Μονή Λατόμου, Thessaloniki 1949.

4. St. Demetrius: G. and M. Sotiriou, Ἡ Βασιληκή τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Athens 1952; St. Pelekanidis, Γραπτή παράδοση καὶ εἰκαστικέ. τέχνες γιά τὴν προσωπικότητα τοὺ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου, Thessaloniki 1970; C. Bakirtzis, *Le culte de saint Démétrios*, in *Akten des XII Int. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, I, Münster 1995, 58-68.

5. Acheiropoieta*:* St. Pelekanidis, Παλαιοχριστιανικά Μνημεῖα Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἀχειροποίητος, Thessaloniki 1949; A. Xyngopoulos, *Concerning Acheiropoietos Thessalonica*: Μακεδονικά 2 (1941-52) 472ff.; J.-M. Spieser, *Thessalonique et ses monuments du IV[e] au VI[e] siècle. Contribution à l'étude d'une ville paléochrétienne*, Paris 1984; H. Torp, *Thessalonique paléochrétienne. Une esquisse*, in *Aspects of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium*, Stockholm 1993, 113-132; EAM 8 (1997) 65-71; 10 (1999) 274-281; EAA2 5, 73-77; RBK 5 (1995) 982-1220.

E. Pelekanidou

THESSALY. When the Delphic Amphictyonic League was reconstructed during the Augustan era, the term *Thessaly* acquired a new political meaning. This term was meant to refer to the region that went from Thermopylae to Mt. Olympus, as far as Perrebia. Under the emperors *Hadrian (117–138) and *Antoninus Pius (138–161), Thessaly was annexed administratively to *Macedonia: both provinces were governed by one governor, although in special circumstances Thessaly had its own administrator and was called an "eparchy." In the MS known as *Laterculus Veronensis,* which provides an image of the empire at the time of *Diocletian, Thessaly makes up part of one of the 12 dioceses, namely that of the Moesia, and constitutes an eparchy with an autonomous administration. During this period the last remaining independent state was annexed, namely that of the Magneti, so that that eparchy of Thessaly might attain the maximum geographical reach. During that era, the borders of Thessaly were therefore Mt. Olympus to the N, in the area of Pirgetus; the valley of the River Titharesios (now Sarantàporos) to the W; the ridge of the Khasiá Mountains and the Pindus massif, separating Thessaly from *Epirus; the Spercheios valley to the S and the Aegean Sea to the E. Later, and more specifically around the mid-4th c. AD, as appears from the catalog referred to as the *Breviarium,* Macedonia became an independent diocese including the eparchies of Macedonia, Thessaly, *Achaia, the two Epiri etc. This administrative order appears in the *Notitia dignitatum,* where there is an affirmation that the diocese of Macedonia was composed of six eparchies, among which was Thessaly. During this period, Thessaly was covered by an archon (*praeses*) and belonged to the broadest administrative region of the *Praefectura praetorio per Illyricum*. In the 5th c., specifically in 417, Paul *Orosius, in his enumeration of the eparchies, included Thessaly after the entry for Macedonia: *Macedonia habet ab Oriente Aegaeum mare, a Borea Thraciam . . . a meridie Achaiam.* *Eunapius also reports that Macedonia and Thessaly were joined to *Thrace. Likewise, *Zosimus notes that the passageway that led from Thessaly to Nicopolis in Epirus crosses, along the N-W axis, the springs of the Peneios in the Pindus. The chief 6th-c. source is Herocles's *Synekdēmos,* a fundamental work of political geography for the years preceding AD 537, integrated from Procopius's writings and archaeological discoveries. According to Herocles's *Synekdēmos,* the eparchy of Thessaly, governed by a ἡγεμών, made up part of the *Praefectura praetorio per Illyricum;* the cities of Diocletianopolis and Caesarea belong to it. This means that Thessaly extended to the NW—in comparison to its extension at the time of Diocletian—given that Diocletianopolis was found near Lake Kastorià, and Caesarea was 16 km (= 9.9 mi) S of Kozani, according to the location established by A. Keramopoulos. In the 8th c. the statement "Thessaly and the Eparchy of Thessaly" occurs in many literary and historical works; the author of the *Cosmography* notes that Thessaly bordered Macedonia and otherwise uses the expression: *Patria que dicitur Ellas Thessalie,* thus geographically associating Hellas and Thessaly.

The literary sources as well as the archaeological finds known to us until now indicate that until the 4th c. Thessaly existed in conditions of prosperity. In AD 376 it was, however, subjected by the Scythians,

as witnessed to by Eunapius. Its geographical position, although marginal to the political aims of the Byzantine Empire, was still such to feel the great turmoil that struck the Balkan Peninsula; its importance for maritime traffic threatened its fortune. The invasions of the Germanic tribes and the Huns in the first centuries of the Christian era led to a radical modification of the urban structure and the demographic order, upon which the impact of the new Christian religion was otherwise great, which by that time had become the official religion of the empire. The Slavic invasions of the 6th c. and then the Arab invasions brought about destructions, as stated explicitly by the *Chronicle of the Foundation of Monemvasia:* "In another invasion, all of Thessaly and Hellas were destroyed." The Slavic expansion in Thessaly is also mentioned in the *Miracles of Saint Demetrius,* where a description is given of the siege of *Thessalonica (7th c.). From the same source we also learned that, during the years 675–677, those besieged sought to purchase grain from the Belegezite Slavs of Thebae Phthiotides and Demetrias. From the early years of the Christian era until the 7th c., many cities flourished in the eparchy of Thessaly. Some of them were continually mentioned by the sources; others, however, were completely ignored by documents written after the 7th c. Some still preserve the ancient name, although others have changed it.

One of the most important cities of Thessaly, Larissa, still preserves both the ancient site and its original name. During the early Christian era, the city reached its greatest splendor; a chain of walls separated the acropolis from the lower quarters. The fortress on the acropolis was erected during the first years of the Christian era. Standing on the schematic reconstruction of the *Tabula Peutingeriana,* it must have possessed two doors. Nothing remains of the walls, and no remains of the foundations have as of yet been brought to light. In ancient times pieces of columns and other architectonic elements on the castle hill were discovered, but until 1978 no building had been found. During that year, remains of the Christian basilica were discovered with three naves of exceptional dimensions. Its dating is not yet known, but research has not yet been completed; an interesting inscription, however, has been recovered with the name of *Achilleus, the first metropolitan of Larissa, which perhaps may relate to the foundation of the same basilica. During the course of the archaeological digs, two tombs of exceptional interest were also brought to light, one of which must have belonged to an important figure, given that it was found in the N sector of the temple within the area of the altar. Another important discovery was the cemetery, found alongside the basilica, which seems to have been used many times. We maintain, therefore, that the first chronological phase of the cemetery corresponds to the foundation of the sanctuary and that it was a series of tombs that functioned as a **depositio ad sanctos.* During the same period, the remains of another basilica were excavated, in the neighborhood of one of the central roads of the city. This likewise had large dimensions, greater than those of the basilica discovered on the hill of the fortress. It was a majestic edifice which, like the others that have been discovered up to this time, was located in the center of Larissa. The walls were decorated with frescoes and floors with mosaics containing geometric themes. In the surviving section of the narthex, the mosaic surface is also decorated with two peacocks facing each other with an amphora at the center. The decoration is perpendicular to the axis of the church and was exactly in front of the central entrance. The remaining portions of the basilica have not yet been discovered, and they are to be found perhaps under the ancient buildings that were alongside the central city road. The two buildings belonged, in our opinion, to the age of Achilleus, that is, the 1st half of the 4th c.; as we learn from the synaxaria, he adorned the city of Larissa with marvelous constructions that were rich with religious and decorative elements. Unfortunately, research on the city during the early Christian age is recent, and the discoveries that pertain to this period are meager. The information acquired thus far bears witness, however, that even this ancient Thessalian city was one of the most important centers of the Hellenic world even during the early Christian era.

Another Thessalian center of the same era is the city of Thebae Phthiotides, modern-day Néa Ankhíalos. Archaeological digs until now have brought to light many remains, mostly dating to the 5th–7th c. Classified third among the most important cities by Hierocles's *Synekdēmos,* Thebae was identified with the ancient Pirasus. George Sotirìou, its first discoverer, brought to light the remains of both sacred and secular buildings. Six complexes with a structure typical of the early Christian basilica have been identified: (1) basilica A, or the basilica of St. Demetrius, which is datable to the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th c.; (2) basilica B, called "of Elpidius," dates to the same period; (3) basilica C, the most daunting, called "of the archpriest Peter" because of an epigraph of restoration, is a complex developed in various constructions from various architectural periods that are chronologically classifi-

able between the 4th c. and the 1st years of the 5th; it was destroyed by a fire in the 7th c.; (4) the cemeterial basilica D, beginning of the 7th c. Two other basilicas were identified, but the excavation has not yet been finished. The site of a secular building, moreover, has been determined, but its identity has not, which contains the conspicuous remains of *thermal baths, a large street and an episcopal palace. The episcopal cathedral of Thebae Phthiotides was held by that ἐπίσκοπος Θηβῶν who signed the acts of the First Ecumenical Council of *Nicaea. The recovered monuments give the image of a rich city, whose inscriptions provide us information about its daily life. From these we come to know the profession and the place of origin of various individuals. The epigraph bears witness, moreover, to the great commercial activity that was bubbling in the mercantile port of Thebae Phthiotides. The discovered coins coming primarily from *Constantinople and *Nicomedia provide a clear idea of the active mercantile city's importance. Thebae, which had been destroyed in the 7th c. AD, starting from the 2nd half of that century was no longer mentioned in the sources: the cause of the destruction must have been a fire, as appears from the archaeological discoveries. The name of the city, however, survived the destruction at least until the 14th c. The archaeological research undertaken, although very clear, has unfortunately not yet been published. It is, therefore, not possible to attempt a conjectural reconstruction of the artistic and cultural climate of that period, despite the prodigious richness of the discoveries. Large floor surfaces hide under the numerous mosaic capitals and the other architectural elements; much information on the rediscovered pottery awaits publication. All of these are discoveries that can give an idea of the wealth and the splendor of this city.

Other cities of Thessaly are mentioned in Hierocles's *Synekdēmos,* centers that had a noteworthy consistency during this period. The sources mention Demetrias, Nèai Patria (modern-day Ipàti), Echìnos, Pharalus etc. However, archaeological research still has nothing significant to say, or it is only in its early stages. A major reason for the lack of evidence to illustrate the culture of the cities has been the sometimes total destruction of the cities. Naturally, the two chief centers, Larissa and Thebae Phthiotides, only constitute the most important part of the archaeological research; fragmentary pieces of information in our possession, also coming from other areas, attest to the existence of cities and centers inhabited in numerous other districts of Thessaly. In 9th-c. Thessaly the monastic movement arose at Meteora with the construction of the Skéte of the Madonna (Panagía) of Doupiani. Athanasius the Meteorite (14th c.) was very famous; the life of the saint was published in 1990 by D. Sofianos.

Fr. Stählin, *Das hellenische Thessalien*, Stuttgart 1924; G. Sotiriou, Αἱ χριστιανικαί Θῆβαι τῆς Θεσσαλίας: AE (1929) 1-158; Y. Bequignon, *La vallée du Spercheios dès origines au IVe siècle*, *Études d'archéologie et de topographie*, Paris 1937; E. Honigmann, *Le Synekdèmos d'Hiéroklès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre*, Brussels 1939; G. Sotiriou, Ἀνασκαφαί ἐν Νέᾳ Ἀγχιάλῳ, in PAAH 1924, 1926, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1954, 1955, 1956; A. Avramea, Ἡ Βυζαντινή Θεσσαλία μέχρι τοῦ *1204*, Συμβολή εἰς τήν ἱστορικήν γεωγραφία, Athens 1974; L. Deriziotis, Παλαιοχριστιανικόν ψηφιδωτόν δάπεδον εἰς τήν θέσιν "Παληά" τής πόλεως τοῦ Βόλου, in *La Thessalie*, Actes de la table-ronde, Lyon 1975, 293-298; H. Hunger, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* (*Hellas und Thessalia*), Vienna 1976; P. Lazaridis, Ἀνασκαφαί Νέας Ἀγχιάλου, in PAAH 1959; 1960, pp. 60-66; 1961–1979; L. Deriziotis, *Comunicazione sugli edifici protocristiani di Larissa*, in X Congr. Int. della Società di Archeologia Cristiana, Thessaloniki 1980 (unpublished); *Achilleo*: DHGE 1, 312; BS 1, 157-158; A. Avraméa, *Les villes et agglomérations urbaines de la Thessalie byzantine jusqu'en 1204*, in *La Thessalie. Actes de la table ronde*, Lyon 1979, 281-291; I. Chassiotis, Θεσσαλική βιβλιογραφία. Πρώτη ἀπογραφή (1636-1962), Volos 1971; N. Nikonanos, Βυζαντινοί ναοί τῆς Θεσσαλίας ἀπό τό *10*ο αἰώνα ὥς τήν κατάκτηση τῆς περιοχῆς ἀπό τούς Τούρκους τό *1393*. Συμβολή στή βυζαντινή ἀρχιτεκτονική, Athens 1979; K. Spanos, Ἐπιγραφές καὶ ἐνθυμήσεις ἀπὸ τὰ χωρία Στόμιο καὶ Καρίτσα τῆς Λάρισας (*4*ος μ.Χ. αἰώνας), Thessaloniki 1979; A. Glavinas, Ὁ ἅγιος Διονύσιος ὁ ἐν τῷ Ὀλύμπῳ, Thessaloniki 1981; L. Arseniou, Ἡ Θεσσαλία στήν Τουρκοκρατία, Athens 1984; N. Nikonanos, *Meteora: A Complete Guide to the Monasteries and Their History*, Athens 1987; D. Valais, Συμβολή στήν ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία τῆς Ἀγχιάλου κατά τόν *17*ο αἰώνα μέ βάση ἀνέκδοτα πατριαρχικά ἔγγραφα: Κληρονομία 26 (1994) 137-177; A. Papathanasiou, Μαγνησία καί τό Πήλιο στόν ὕστερο μεσαίωνα (*1204-1423*), Volos 1998; Chr. Motsiou, Οἱ ἅγιοι τῶν Μετεώρων, Larissa 2000; Chr. Ntamplias, Ἡ ἱστορία τῆς Θεσσαλίας τόν *13*ο αἰώνα, Thessaloniki 2000; Ch. Stergioulis, Οἱ ἅγιοι τῆς Θεσσαλίας. Ἁγιολογικά καί λειτουργικά χειρόγραφα καί κείμενα, Larissa 2001.

L. Deriziotis - F. Ioannidis

THEURGY. E.R. Dodds (*Theurgy,* 55) and H. Lewy (*Chaldean,* 461) have demonstrated that the term *theurgy* had two meanings in ancient philosophical texts, namely the "performance of divine operations" and "making man a god." According to *Iamblichus, theurgy is the art of "the performance of the 'divine' operations" (*De myst.* I,93, p. 33,9-10 des Places), "the sacred performance of the ineffable operations that are above every thought and fitting for God" (*De myst.* II,96,17-19, p. 96 des Places). According to the Byzantine monk Michael Psellus: "We become similar to God even according to the theurgic virtues, and this is the most perfect likeness . . . the ability to make man a god [*theopoiein*], to distance him from matter and to deliver him from the passions in

such a way that he can 'in turn' make another person a god [*theourgia*]" (*De omnif. doctr*. ch. 71,5-11, pp. 45-46 Westerink); "the one who possesses the theurgic virtue . . . makes men gods" (*De omnif. doctr.*, ch. 74,1-2, p. 47 Westerink). In these two passages, Psellus merely reproduces the Proclian and Iamblican concepts (something which Westerink did not note in the *apparatus fontium* of his edition of the *De omnifaria doctrina*): both for *Proclus and Iamblichus it was precisely the "theurgic virtues" to represent the highest level of human elevation (see Marinus, *Vita Procli*, chs. 26, pp. 30-32 Saffrey-Segonds).

As it appears from the *Lexikon Suidas*, the first person to officially receive the title *theurgist* was a certain Julian, a contemporary to the emperor *Marcus Aurelius and the author of a work titled *Logia d'epòn*, identical in all likelihood to the *Chaldean Oracles* (see Dodds, *Theurgy*, 55), numerous fragments of which have remained, which were first edited by W. Kroll (*De oraculis chaldaicis*, Breslau 1894) and more recently by E. des Places (*Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris 1971). It is very likely that Julian also composed a commentary on these *Logia*, a work possibly titled *Theurgika:* Proclus, *Marinus and *Damascius seem to have alluded to this text (see Dodds, *Theurgy*, 56). The term *theurgist* appears in the very text of the oracles: in fr. 153, des Places (p. 103) maintains that the "theurgists do not fall under the mass of humanity subjected to fate." The primary objective of theurgy is therefore the liberation of the human being from the iron laws of the material world, which is an indispensable premise of his "deification," and which is clearly affirmed, for example, in fr. 97 (p. 90 des Places).

Dodds (*Theurgy*, 56) emphasizes the fact that the *Chaldean Oracles* contained instructions for the cult of the sun and the fire and magical directions aiming to evoke specific spirits or divinities (in this manner, the function of theurgy corresponds to that of the *medium* of our era). It is impossible here to provide a detailed description of the various rituals and magical practices: on this point, we simply encourage the reader to consult Dodds's article (*Theurgy*, 61-69) and Lewy's book (*Chaldean*, 227-257, 467-471). This emphasis placed on magical practices, moreover, fully corresponds to the philosophical-religious tendencies of the 2nd c. AD: Apuleius in his sketch of the life of *Apollonius of Tyana passed down to us by Philostratus provides clear examples in this respect. The close connection between theurgic practices and magical papyri has been demonstrated by S. Eitrem (*La théurgie*, esp. 53-58).

A schema analogous to the one observed in the *Chaldean Oracles* can be found in the *Poimandes*, in which the soul's *Himmelreise* finishes with its deification: the human soul, with all the passions, having abandoned the impurities and evil inclinations in the seven lower heavens, ascends to the eighth heaven (*ogdoatikē physis*), becomes a divine power, enters God and becomes deified (*Corpus Hermeticum* I,25-26, pp. 15,15–16,13 Nock-Festugière; see also in this regard the work of E. des Places, *La religion grecque*, Paris 1969, 324, who rightly puts this motif in relation to theurgy).

The dominant philosophical movement of *Late Antiquity, that is, *Neoplatonism, represented by *Plotinus, remained substantially immune from the influences of theurgy in its initial phase. Dodds (*Theurgy*, 57-58, 60-61) rightly notes that Plotinus, despite the interpretation that certain modern scholars have given of him, was not a theurgist but a pure rationalist who shows no interest for theurgy and does not hide his disregard for the magical practices that were quite in vogue during his time. Only with *Porphyry of Tyre did theurgy enter the Neoplatonic tradition, to the point of becoming one of the most salient characteristics of *Neoplatonism of the 4th and the 5th c., namely the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus, Proclus and Damascius. The young *Porphyry, even before meeting Plotinus, nurtured a great interest for the "oracles," as shown by his work written during his youth, the *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda*, in which he does not seem, however, to have been aware of the *Chaldean Oracles* (see Dodds, *Theurgy*, 58; des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques*, 18-19; fragments of this work were collected and edited by W. Wolff, Berlin 1856). Having toned down this belief during the period in which he was a disciple of Plotinus and whose influence he greatly underwent—the *Letter to Anebo*, which was heavily critical of magical practices and occultism—Porphyry's interest for "oracular wisdom" came back to life after the death of his master: he discovered the *Chaldean Oracles*, devoted a commentary to it and made a continual use of this work in his treatise titled *De regressu animae* (see Dodds, *Theurgy*, 58; des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques*, 18-19 and 23-24). In the *De regressu animae*, however, although reevaluating partially the role of theurgy, he does not show the unconditional admiration for it that shines through in the *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda*, which was written several years earlier (see des Places, 247): Bidez, in fr. 2 of the *De regressu animae*, although on the one hand acknowledging that theurgy could contribute to the purification of the interior or "spiritual" part of the soul, on the other hand specifies that theurgy has no effect on the soul's conver-

sion to God of its higher or "intellectual" part, and reaffirms his condemnation of the lowest magical practices (*see* the section dedicated to Porphyry in *Neoplatonism). As Dodds noted (*Theurgy,* 58), in this precise demarcation of the role of theurgy, Porphyry is still, even though partially, under the influence of Plotinus.

In the writings of Iamblichus, theurgy performed a role that was far superior to the one assigned to it by Porphyry: he not only regarded the *Chaldean Oracles* as somewhat of a sacred book and composed a commentary on it (see E. des Places, *Jamblique*, *Les mystères d'Égypte*, Paris 1966, 15; Dodds, *Theurgy*, 58), but he also wrote the *De mysteriis Aegyptiorum* under the name of Anebo—the recipient of the letter in which Porphyry had criticized magical practices—precisely in order to respond to Porphyry's charges. "It is not thought—Iamblichus says—that unites the theurgists with the gods. If this were the case, what would prevent the theoretical philosophers from possessing theurgic union with the gods? But this is not the case: it is the sacred performance of the ineffable works—superior to every thought and suitable to God—and the power of the ineffable symbols—which only the gods can think of—that produce the theurgic union" (*De myst.* I,11, 96,13-97,2, p. 96 des Places).

The emperor *Julian deeply underwent the influence of Iamblichus (on this point, *see* also the section dedicated to Iamblichus and Julian the Apostate in *Neoplatonism). In a letter (*Ep.* 12 ed. Bidez, *L'empereur Julien, OEuvres complètes,* I,2, Paris 1924, 118-119) he exhorted Priscus to "find everything that Iamblichus wrote about my namesake" (namely Iamblichus's commentary on Julian's *Chaldean Oracles*), and confesses: "I am crazy about Iamblichus with respect to philosophy and my namesake with respect to theosophy" (that is, theurgy; see Dodds, *Theurgy,* 59).

Iamblichus's example was also followed by the Athenian Neoplatonic school of the 5th c., and at the beginning of the 6th c., *Olympiodorus (*In Platonis Phaedonem,* 170) would mention Syrian, Iamblichus and Proclus among the students of theurgy, contrasting them to the pure philosophers, who were represented by Plotinus and Porphyry; and Michael Psellus recalls Proclus as the one who, along with Iamblichus, abandoned the Greek methods of reasoning in order to embrace the Chaldean teaching (on these two references, see des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques,* 24). As in the case of Porphyry and Iamblichus, Proclus likewise composed a *Commentary on Chaldean Philosophy* (the fragments have been collected by des Places in *Oracles chaldaïques,* 206-212). Psellus's judgment on Proclus is, however, only partly true; in reality, in Proclus's thought two components coexist without opposition: namely, the rationalist-philosophical teaching (one merely has to think of his *Elements of Theology*) and the "supra-rational" and the "mystico-religious," which does not hesitate to appeal to theurgy and its magical practices (even for Proclus the union with the supreme principle, above being and ikntelligence, cannot be achieved by human intelligence, which at best can reach the highest point in contemplating absolute being, but it is something that transcends its faculties; *see* *Neoplatonism). Dodds (*Theurgy,* 61) has called attention to a passage from the *Platonic Theology* (I, 25, I, 113, 6-10 Saffrey-Westerink) in which Proclus expresses his ideas on theurgy in the following manner: "Other things are finally saved by the theurgic power, which is better than every human wisdom and knowledge, inasmuch as it collects in itself the benefits of the divinatory art, the purifying powers that are proper to the performance of the rites and, in sum, all the effects of the divine possession." We have already had the opportunity to note that according to Marinus (*Vita Procli* 26, pp. 30-32 Saffrey-Segonds) both Iamblichus and Proclus saw in the "theurgic virtues" the highest virtues, those capable of producing in the soul the maximum level of deification. Marinus likewise (*Vita Procli* 28, pp. 33-34 Saffrey-Segonds) recalls Proclus's familiarity with theurgic practices and the related rites. Damascius, like his predecessors, regarded the Chaldean philosophy as the "most mystical" (*Dub. et sol.* 111, III, 108,19-20 Westerink) and did not hesitate to call such philosophers as *Orpheus and Plato, who had received their philosophy from divine revelation, "theurgists" (*Dub. et sol.* 111, III, 109,7-10 Westerink). He considered theurgy a "sacred practice" (*Vita Is.* 227; see Eitrem, *La théurgie*, 50).

PWK 24, 258-270; J. Bidez, *Le philosophe Jamblique et son école*: REG 32 (1919) 29-40; J. Bidez - F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, Paris 1938, I, 158-163; II, 251-263; O. Faller, *Griechische Vergottung und christliche Vergöttlichung*: Gregorianum 6 (1925) 405-435; F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris 1929, 115.173–175.294, notes 87-89; S. Eitrem, *La théurgie chez les néoplatoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques*: SO 22 (1942) 49-79; E.R. Dodds, *Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism*: JRS 37 (1947) 55-69 (in *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1956, 283-311); A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I: *L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris 1950, 283-308; Id., *Contemplation philosophique et art théurgique chez Proclus*, in *Études de philosophie grecque*, Paris 1971, 585ff.; Id., *De la religion à la magie*, in *Études d'histoire et de philosophie*, Paris 1971, 9-156; P. Boyancé, *Théurgie et télestique néoplatoniciennes*: RHR 147 (1955) 189-209; W. Theiler, *Gott und Seele in kaiserzeitlichen Denken*, in *Recherches sur la trad. plat.* (Entr. sur l'ant. class. III), Geneva 1955, 65-90 (= *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 104-123); H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*, Le Caire 1956 (Paris

[2]1978); W. Beierwaltes, *Proklos. Grundzüge seiner Metaphysik*, Frankfurt a.M. 1965, 328, 385-390 (this last section pertains esp. to deification); A.A. Barb, *La sopravvivenza delle arti magiche*, in *Il conflitto tra paganesimo e Cristianesimo nel IV secolo*, ed. A. Momigliano, Turin 1968, 111ff.; E. des Places, *Jamblique. Les mystères d'Égypte*, Paris 1966; Id., *La religion grecque*, Paris 1969, 300-304, 324; Id., *Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris 1971; A. Louth, *Pagan Theurgy and Christian Sacramentalism in Denys the Areopagite*: JTS 37 (1986) 432-438; B. Nasemann, *Theurgie und Philosophie in Jamblichs De mysteriis*, Stuttgart 1991; G. Shaw, *Theurgy and Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*, University Park, PA 1995; T. Stäcker, *Die Stellung der Theurgie in der Lehre Jamblichs*, Bern 1995; J.-B. Clerc, *Homines Magici*, Berlin 1995; Id., *"Theurgica legibus prohibita": à propos de l'interdiction de la théurgie (Augustin, La cité de Dieu 10, 9, 1. 16, 2, Code théodosien 9, 16, 4)*: REAug 42 (1996) 57-64; C. Van Liefferinge, *La théurgie: des "Oracles chaldaïques" à Proclus*, Liège 1999; P.T. Struck, *Pagan and Christian Theurgies: Iamblichus, Pseudo-Dionysius, Religion and Magic in Late Antiquity*: Ancient World 32 (2001) 25-38.

S. Lilla

THIEF, GOOD. Mentioned once in the gospels (Lk 23:39-43, par.) and several times in the apocrypha: in the *Arab Gospel* (30), the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (10), the *Visio Theophili* and esp. in the *History of Joseph of Arimathea*. These works give him various names: Titus, Demas, Dismas. He is mentioned often by the church fathers (*Gregory of Nazianzus, *John Chrysostom, *Jacob of Sarug and others). The books of the apocrypha seek to resolve the question of how one thief was saved and the other not, and recount the story of both: Dismas was educated by Mary and, as a thief, took from the rich and gave to others, whereas the other (Dumachus) had always been evil. Both met the Holy Family in Egypt, the good thief expressing his piety toward them. In the *History of Joseph of Arimathea* the author dedicates a sizable part to the good thief (1; 3-5), who after his death appears, full of light, to Joseph and John. The cult of the good thief grew in the Middle Ages; he is in the calendar (23 March) and mentioned in the Martyrology of Usuard; various foundations were established under his name to help repentant prisoners.

CANT 78; BS 3, 595-600; AASS Martii III, 543 (ed. 1769); Gr. M. van Esbroeck, *Une homélie inédite ephrémienne sur le Bon Larron en grec, géorgien et arabe*: AB 101 (1983) 327-362 (texts); M.R. James, *Latin Infancy Gospels*, Cambridge 1929, 120-126; M. Geerard, *Le bon larron. Un apocryphe inédit*, in FS J.H. Frede, W. Thiele, ed. R. Gryson, Vetus Latina, 24,2, Freiburg 1993, 355-363 (text Latin).

M. Starowieyski

THOMAS, apostle. Thomas is spoken of in Mk 3:18 and parallel texts. In Jn 11:16, 20:24 and 21:2 he is identified as the "one called Didymus" ("the Twin"). The Hebrew root *ta'am* means "being double, twin." The *Acta Thom.* 1,1 and the legend of *Abgar (Eus., *HE* 1,13,11) refer to him as Judas Thomas. Jn 14:22 mentions "Judas, not Iscariot," and the Sinaitic *Syriac and Curatonian respectively read "Thomas" and "Judas Thomas." The beginning of the *Coptic *Ev. Thom.* refers to him as "Didymus Judas Thomas." The designation with the nickname "Thomas" turns out to be natural for distinguishing him from the other two Judases (Lk 6:16) in the group of the Twelve. His identity with Jude the brother of the Lord seems to be more of a later confusion than an early tradition. Thomas "the Twin" exerted a particular fascination over *gnostic speculation. The title "twin of the Lord" certainly did not imply consanguinity but intended to indicate the type of perfect gnostic. According to *Pistis Sophia* 42 and 53, *Philip, Thomas and *Matthew (or Matthias) are the authors of the three most accredited gospels in the influential gnostic circles. In the NHC II one finds the *Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Philip* and the *Book of Thomas the Contender*. This latter work contains the secret words of the Savior to Judas Thomas, which are then passed down by Matthew. On the other hand, the Greek MSS of group A of the *Gospel of Thomas* (gospel of the infancy) report the "account of Thomas, the Israelite philosopher" on the infancy of the Lord, while the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* is a broad collection of the Lord's sayings. The Jewish Christian who converted to gnosticism compiled a tradition of independent sayings like those of the synoptic gospels with the intention that they might have a propaedeutic character for initiation into gnosticism. Beginning with the Jewish-Christian logia (as in the case of log. 12, which reflected the primacy of *James in the community that spread this work) and drawing inspiration on the twins already created in this tradition, he composed others cautiously or openly gnostic, such as log. 13 (a rereading of *Peter's confession found in the canonical gospels). For the selection of Thomas as a gnostic prototype, his own local Christian tradition must have favored this choice, which already appealed to this apostle. The distinct references to the authority of James, Peter or Thomas represent developments of different churches in *Syria from the last decades of the 1st c. The Christians of *Edessa attributed their origin to the apostle Thomas's command to preach the gospel in the city. Putting aside the legend of Thaddaeus who was sent to Edessa by Thomas (Eus., *HE* 1,13,1-22; 2,1,6-7), one can trace the beginning of the Syriac church back to the Jewish Christians. When Syriac Jewish Christianity identified Thomas with Jude the

brother of the Lord, regarding him as the "Twin" of James, the apostolic origin of this community remained under the Jewish Christians of the Transjordan, who appealed to the authority of James. In the gnostic rereading, Jude Thomas, the brother of the Lord, undoubtedly becomes his twin in the sense of one of his "alter egos" within the divine sphere. There remains an undercurrent like that of the *Valentinian eschatological speculation. The *Gospel of Thomas* represents the hinge of the two trajectories. On the one side, gnosticism results in *Manicheism, and on the other side, it results in a type of *encratism peculiar to Syriac Christianity. The *Gospel of Thomas* is datable between the Odes of Solomon (ca. 130) and the *Acts of Thomas* (ca. 235), which stresses sexual continence more strongly. The *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Acts of Thomas* must provide the historical context for the *Book of Thomas the Contender* (NHC II,7). This book, which presents the secret sayings revealed by the Lord to Jude Thomas (whom he calls the "brother of Thomas") and committed to writing by Matthew, explains in what sense one must understand what was said of the one who is his brother and true companion: a perfect disciple, a repository of the secret revelations. He expounds an ascetic teaching that is more evident in encratism than in gnosticism. In the tradition of the Thomas of Syriac asceticism, this book occupies an intermediary position between the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Acts of Thomas*. Conversely, in the *Apocalypse of Thomas* (before the 5th c., highly regarded and probably reworked by the *Priscillianists and the Manicheans) the Savior describes to Thomas in parables how the events of the end of the world will be distributed in seven days. We should also mention the *Psalms of Thomas,* a Psalter attributed to Thomas, the disciple of Mani, composed between 250 and 275. The *Acts of Thomas*—the only one of the five ancient apocryphal acts that have come down to us complete, a work composed in Syriac at Edessa in the 1st half of the 3rd c.—has as its theme the mission of Thomas as far as the Indies (in reality, as far as Iran). *Origen (Eus., *HE* 3,1,1) and ps.-*Clement (*Recogn*. IX, 29) depict Thomas as the apostle of the Parthians. *Heracleon (Clem. Al., *Strom*. IV,71,3) recalls his natural death, speaking of Lk 12:8-11; nevertheless, in the *Acta Thom*. 164,168 and in the Manichean *Lib. Ps.,* it is said that he was killed with a lance by some soldiers. Echoes of the *Acta Thom*. are found in the writings of *Gregory of Tours (*Glor. Mart*. 31-32). The Parthian king Gundofar, by means of the account in the *Acta Thom.*, wound up becoming King Caspar in Western legend. The **Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* says that the *magi were baptized by Thomas; this theme was also developed in Zouqnîn's Syriac *Monastic Chronicle* (8th c.). In the Middle Ages, moreover, the legend of Thomas and the magi would culminate in that of Prester John.

Christianity penetrated the Indian subcontinent following two roads: to the S by means of the ocean, departing from *Egypt, beginning at the end of the 2nd c., thanks to the merchants and travelers who brought with them the gospel of Matthew (Eus., *HE* 5,10,2-3); to the N, from *Mesopotamia and Iran in a continual flux of "Thomas Christians." Once the maritime contacts between the N and the S of India had ceased, both regions attributed their evangelization to Thomas. The tomb of the apostle, which had been venerated for a long time at Edessa (*Acta Thom.* 170; *Chronic. Edes.* 38), was located on the coast of Malabar.

R.A. Lipsius - M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Leipzig 1903 (Darmstadt 1959); G. Bornkamm, *Mythos und Legende in den apocryphen Thomas-Akten*, Göttingen 1933; A.F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas*, Leiden 1962; J. Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d'Égypte*, II, Paris 1959; Erbetta I, 253-288; II, 305-391 (Acts); C. Colpe, *Die Thomaspsalmen als chronologischer Fixpunkt in der Geschichte der orientalischen Gnosis:* JbAC 7 (1964) 77-93; H.H. Koester, Γνώμαι διάφοροι. *The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity*: HThR 58 (1965) 279-318; G. Garitte, *Le martyre géorgien de l'apôtre Thomas:* Muséon 83 (1970) 497-532; G. Garitte, *La passion arménienne de S. Thomas l'apôtre et son model grec:* Muséon 84 (1971) 191-195; F. Halkin, *Une nouvelle recension grecque du martyre de S. Thomas l'apôtre:* AB 89 (1971) 386; W.A. Bienert, *Jesu Verwandschaft*, in W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apocryphen* I, Tübingen [5]1987, 373-386; A. de Santos Otero, *Thomasapokalypse*, in Schneemelcher, II, Tübingen [5]1989, 675-679; H. Koester, *Évangiles apocryphes et évangiles canoniques*, in H. Koester - F. Bovon, *Genèse de l'Écriture chrétienne*, Turnhout 1991, 59-106; R. Kuntzmann, *Le "Livre de Thomas" (NH II, 7), et la tradition de Thomas*, in L. Painchaud - A. Pasquier, *Les textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification*, Québec-Louvain 1995, 295-309; R. Trevijano, *Santiago el Justo y Tomás el Mellizo* (*Evangelio de Tomás, log. 12 y 13*), in *Estudios sobre el Evangelio de Tomás*, PT 2, Madrid 1997, 285-320; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionnaires chrétiens dans l'empire iranien*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002, 79-110; G.W. Most, *Doubting Thomas*, Cambridge 2005.

R. Trevijano

THOMAS (apocryphal). The apostle Thomas, according to *Origen, carried out his mission among the Parthians (*In Gen* 3); a tradition ascribes to Thomas a mission in India, where, in Calamine, he underwent *martyrdom. His tomb is found in Mailapur; according to another tradition known already in the 4th c., his body was transferred to *Edessa, where there is an attestation to the presence

of his sepulcher. In some texts Thomas is also connected to the history of Abgar. The texts concerning Thomas can be divided into two groups: (1) the *Acts of Thomas* and (2) the other texts.

1. The *Acts of Thomas* constitutes the only text preserved in its entirety among the five great acts written in the 2nd/3rd c.; they were probably redacted in *Edessa. The original language of the *Acts* seems to have been *Syriac, but one cannot exclude that some fragments were written in *Greek. There exist two versions of the text: Syriac, which underwent modifications, and Greek—a text closer to the original with *Encratite tendencies. The work is complex and has many levels. The text is composed with the addition of many poetic texts of great artistic value; it is divided into 13 acts (Gk. *praxeis*) and a martyrdom. The *Acts of Thomas* can be divided into three parts: an introduction, where an account is given of the trip undertaken by the slave Thomas to India, the miracles performed in India and last the passion of Thomas. The poetic fragments possess extraordinary beauty. Some examples of these are the following: the famous *Hymn of the Pearl* (chs. 108-113)—*Ephrem adopts the same theme with his *Hymns of the Pearl*—or rather the *Ode of Sophia* (ch. 6-7). Some fragments have an Encratite and *gnostic flavor to them; elsewhere, these elements are more attenuated. Many translations, paraphrases and abbreviations of the *Acts of Thomas* exist in all the languages of Christian antiquity, in the Latin of ps.-Abdias, book 9, which contains the life of Thomas. The *Acts of Thomas* were used by the Encratites, *Manicheans and the *Priscillianists and condemned many times by the fathers of the church and the *Decretum (ps.-)*Gelasianum* (5,2,3).

2. A center of Thomas's cult existed in Edessa: a *martyrion* of Thomas where the apostle's bones were transported, a place known by St. Ephrem and visited in 384 by *Egeria (17,1; 19,3). Scholars suppose that the apocryphal texts connected to Thomas were written at Edessa, as in the case of some gnostic texts coming from *Nag Hammadi which bear the name of Thomas: the *Gospel of Thomas* (Codex II), perhaps from the 2nd c., contains 114 logia of *Jesus in *Coptic (some fragments in Greek on the papyri of Oxyrhynchus [1, 655, 656]); a *Book of Thomas the Contender* (Codex II) and a *Psalter of Thomas*. Moreover, two recensions of the Latin *Apocalypse of Thomas* exist from the 5th c.; the original Greek, perhaps from the 3rd c., has been lost; the apocalypses, which were produced perhaps by Manichean or gnostic circles, were used by the Priscillianists. An *Apocalypse of Thomas* was condemned by the *Decretum (ps.-)Gelasianum* (5,2,2). In the *Gospel of the Infancy* (*Paidika Kyriou*), the name of Thomas (but not the apostle) was added late for unknown reasons. *Gregory of Tours wrote a work titled *De miraculis s. Thomae apostoli*.

An extensive homiletical literature connected to Thomas exists. There also remain various sermons in honor of Thomas that speak of Thomas: in Syriac, the sermons of Ephrem, *Jacob of Sarug and George of Alkosh; in Arabic, in the sermons of Elias of Nisibis; in Greek, ps.-*John Chrysostom and *Basil of Seleucia; in Latin, *Gregory the Great. The sermons often allude to the scenes of the *Acts of Thomas*.

Acts of Thomas: CANT 245-249; BHG 1800-1844; BHL 8136-8149; Lipsius 1, 225-347; Y. Tissot, ANWR II, 25,6, 4415-4439 (encratism); LCIK 8, 468-475; BS 12, 1969, 539-544. *Acts*: in Syriac: W. Wright: *Apocryphal Acts*, London 1871, 1, 172-333; 2, 146-298 (with Engl. trans.); Greek: Lisius - Bonnet 2, 99-291; P.H. Poirier, *L'Hymne de la Perle des Actes de Thomas*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1981; Lat.: M. Zelzer, *Die alten lateinischen Thomasakten*: TU 122 (1977) (with the *Miracles of Thomas*); Coptic: P.H. Poirier [and E. Lucchesi], *La version copte de la Prédication et du Martyre de Thomas*, Brussels 1984 (Coptic version); Concordance: M. Lipinski, *Konkordanz zu den Thomasakten*, Bonn 1988 (from the Greek). *Translations*: German: H.J.W. Drijvers, in Schneemelcher 2, 289-367; It.: Erbetta 2, 305-391; Moraldi 2, 303-428, 653-679; Fr.: A.J. Festugière, *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 6, Geneva 1983, 45-117; P.H. Poirier - Y. Tissot, EApC I, 1323-1470; Eng.: Elliott 439-511; A.F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas*, Leiden 1962.

J. Halévy, *Cantiques syriaques sur St. Thomas*: RevSem 16 (1908) 85-94, 168-175; W. Strothmann, *Die Thomasgeschichte des Jakob von Sarug*: ZDMG suppl. 1, 2 (1969) 363-369; *Drei Gedichte über den Apostel Thomas in Indien*, ed. W. Strothmann, Wiesbaden 1976; E.N. Meščerskaja, *Dejanija Iudy Fomy, kulturno-istoričeskaja obuslovennost rannesirijskoj legendy*, Moskva 1990; H. Waldmann, *Das Christentum in Indien und der Königsweg der Apostel in Edessa, Indien und Rom*, Tübingen 1996; P.H. Poirier, *Évangile de Thomas, Actes de Thomas, Livre de Thomas*: Apocrypha 7 (1996) 9-26; P.H. Poirier, *Les Actes de Thomas et le manichéisme*: Apocrypha 9 (1998) 263-290; J. Turgach, *Der Apostel Thomas in China*: ZKG 108 (1997) 58-74; C. Dognini - I. Ramelli, *Gli Apostoli in India nella patristica e nella letteratura sanscrita*, Parma 2001; C. Jullien - F. Jullien, *Apôtres des confins. Processus missionnaires chrétiens dans l'empire iranien*, Bures-sur-Yvette 2002, 79-110; G. Fiaccadori, *Tommaso in Etiopia*: Studi Classici e Orientali 34 (1984) 298-307; L. Thomaz, *A legenda de S. Tomé e a Expansão Portuguesa*: Lusitania Sacra 3 (1991) 349-418; R. Uro, *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas*, London 2003 (bibl.); *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas*, ed. by J.M. Asgeirsson - A.D. DeConick - R. Uro, Leiden-Boston 2006.

Gospel of Thomas (Paidika): CANT 57; BHG 779p-pb, is found in all the collections of the apocryphal gospels, see esp. the important French translation of S. Voicu, EApC 191-204 and the article by the same author in Apocrypha 9 (1998) 1-95. A. Fuchs, *Konkordanz zum Thomas-Evangelium*, Linz 1978; A. de Santos Otero, *Kirchenslavische Evangelium des Thomas*, Berlin 1967; T. Rosén, *The Slavonic Translation of the Apocryphal Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, Uppsala 1997 (ed. of the text)

Acts of Thomas: CANT 19 and the other texts of Nag Hammadi (CPG 1181) are usually found in the collections of the NT apocrypha and in the editions and translations of the texts of Nag Hammadi and Gnostic texts.

Apocalypse of Thomas: CANT 326 in the collections of the apocrypha, among the apocryphal apocalypses.

M. Starowieyski

THOMAS of Edessa (d. before 544). *Nestorian author, to whom the catalog of Ebedjesu/ʿAbdišoʿ attributes several works, from which there only survives a treatise on the *Epiphany (unpublished) and one on the *Nativity. With respect to his life, we only know that he accompanied the future Nestorian patriarch Mar *Aba to *Constantinople, from which both were forced to flee for having refused to sign the condemnation of the *Three Chapters.

BBKL 11, 1383-1384; Ortiz de Urbina 127; S.J. Carr, *Thomae Edesseni Tractatus de Nativitate Domini nostri Iesu Christi . . .*, Rome 1898; W.F. Macomber, *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa . . .* II *Translation*, CSCO 356/syr. 156, Louvain 1974, viii-x, N.J. van der Vliet, *Gleanings from Christian Northern Nubia*: JJP 32 (2002) 175-192; D.A. Welsbry, *The Medieval Kingdoms of Nubia: Pagans, Christians and Muslims Along the Middle Nile*, London 2002; Th. Hainthaler, *Thomas of Edessa, Causa de Nativitate: Some Considerations*: PdO 31 (2006) 63-85.

S.J. Voicu

THOMAS of Germanicia (Euphrates) (d. ca. 541). *Monophysite bishop of Germanicia (Euphratesia), expelled from his episcopal see following the anti-monophysite persecution carried out by the emperor *Justin (520), he was one of the six Severian bishops called to *Constantinople by *Justinian to meet with their orthodox colleagues (533). A signatory and recipient of some letters that have come down to us only in *Syriac, Thomas in 535 with *Constantine of Laodicea (*Syria) and other ecclesiastical officials of the Eastern church took part in the drafting of the ecclesiastical canons. He died in exile at Samosata around 541 before the consecration of *Jacob Baradeus.

CPG 7071.66; 7108; 7123; F. Nau, *Littérature canonique syriaque inédite*: ROC 14 (1909) 113-115; S.P. Brock, *Some New Letters of Patriarch Severos*: SP 12 (1975) 20; R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (Studi e Testi 201), Vatican City 1959, 200 n. 72; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e^ siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain 1951, 73-74.

P. Marone

THOMAS of Heraclea (d. after 616). Born at Ḥarqel (*Heraclea*), Thomas was a student in the monastery founded by John bar Aphtōnyā at Qennešrē, on the left bank of the Euphrates River, which was a center of both *Greek and *Syriac studies. For a certain amount of time he lived as a monk in the monastery of Tarʿil; he became a bishop of Mabbōg [Mabbug] and, because of his miaphysite faith, he was sent into exile by the emperor *Maurice (582–602). He then dwelt in *Egypt, in the monastery near *Alexandria, where he participated in the peace negotiations between the patriarchs of *Antioch and *Alexandria in 609/610. During the years 615–616, he made a new Syriac translation of the NT, the so-called *Harklensis,* in which he included 2 Pet, 2 and 3 Jn, which did not make up part of the scriptural *canon of the churches of the Syriac tradition.

Baumstark 188-189; BO II, 90-95; S. Brock, *Syriac Studies: A Classified Bibliography (1960–1990)*, Kaslik 1996, 61; J. White, *Sacrorum Evangeliorum, Actorum Apostolorum et Epistolarum tam catholicarum quam paulinarum Versio Syriaca Philoxeniana*, 3 vols., Oxford 1778-1803 (sole complete ed.); B. Aland - A. Jückel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, Berlin, 1986– (text of the Peshitta and *Harklensis*); G. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, 4 vols., Leiden 1996 (text of the *Vetus Syra*, Peshitta and the *Harklensis*, with extensive intr. for the latter by A. Jückel on pp. xxxi-lxxxii); A. Vööbus, *The Apocalypse in the Harklean Version: A Facsimile Edition of Ms Mardin Orth. 35* (CSCO 400), Louvain 1978; BBKL 11, 1387.

K. den Biesen

THOMAS of Marga (d. after 850). Author of a very important monastic history, the so-called *Book of the Superiors,* which constitutes our only source on his life (see, for example, I,40 and II,32). Born in 822 at Nehšōn in the diocese of Salāh, Thomas entered the *monastery of Bēt ʿAbē in the region of Margā, in *Adiabene, ca. 80 km (49.7 mi) E of Mossul. At a certain point he became the secretary of the *catholicos of the church of the East, Abraham II, who consecrated him bishop of Margā (not to be confused with his contemporary of the same name, Thomas the metropolitan of Bēt Garmai). When he finished his monastic history, after the death of Abraham II in 850, he still remained the bishop of Margā; we know nothing of the subsequent period and the date of his death.

A History of Some Saints is also attributed to him, a work written during his youth that has been preserved treating primarily the monastery of Rabban Cyprian in the region of Birtā; in all the MSS it constitutes the last book of the *Book of the Superiors,* but J.M. Fiey has demonstrated that it is an independent work written before the *Book of the Superiors*.

The *Liber superiorum* is dedicated primarily to the history of the monastery of Bēt ʿAbē in which Thomas was raised and which was established at the end of the 6th c. The work also discusses the monks who lived in all the area E and S of Mossul, and it constitutes, moreover, a rich source of information on the church of the East during that era. The *monasticism described by Thomas was clearly that of a laura, with numerous cells for the hermits and a *cenobium for the novices. The monastic life was the traditional form, carried out in solitude, silence and combat against the passions and a quest for continual prayer, and practiced with the usual idiorrhythmic style. In fact, a rule is never mentioned, and the role of the superiors was primarily that of a spiritual guide.

Brockelmann, 233-234; BO III/1, 463-501; DSp 15, 847-849; Duval, 206-207; E.A.W. Budge, *Thomas of Marga, Book of Governors*, London 1893 (text with trans.); P. Bedjan, *Liber superiorum seu historia monastica auctore Thoma, episcopo Margensi*, Paris-Leipzig 1901; J.-M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, I, Beyrouth 1965, 25-26, 236-248; J.-M. Fiey, *Thomas de Marga. Notule de littérature syriaque*: Muséon 78 (1965) 361-366; BBKL 11, 1400-1402.

K. den Biesen

THRACE. Ancient name of the E and SE region of the Balkan Peninsula. In the millennium before Christ, this territory was inhabited by the Thracians, a people divided into many tribes, who, according to Herodotus, were, after the Indians, the most numerous people on earth (*Hist*. V,3). From the geographical point of view, the territorial range of Thrace changed over the centuries, more than once with respect to its extension. Thrace's borders had the Danube to the N, the shore of the Euxine (Black) Sea to the E (that is, modern-day Černo More), the Aegean Sea and the Propontis (Sea of Marmara) to the S and SE, and the Rivers Utus (Vit) and Nestos (Mesta), which still preserve their old names, only partially changed, to the W and SW.

After conquering and organizing Macedonia as a province (148 BC), the Romans strove toward Thrace, but they had to fight for almost two centuries to overcome the resistance of the Thracians, conquer its territory and transform it around the year AD 46 into a Roman province, including the region to the S of Mt. Haemus (today Stara Planina), the Euxine Sea, the Propontis and the Aegean Sea, as far as the River Nestos. While in *Moesia, to the N, the Latin language and civilization ruled, Thrace underwent the influence of Hellenism in language and culture, being the border to the great Greek centers. Because after the beginning of the 1st c. AD it was not a border province, fewer Roman troops were stationed there, and the territory therefore was able to better preserve its ethnic character. The territory was only crossed by two large arterial roads: the Via Diagonalis (between *Singidunum; modern-day Belgrade; *Sardica, now Sophia; and *Byzantium, that is, *Constantinople) and the Via Egnatia, which began from Dyrrachium (Durazzo, Durrës) to reach Byzantium, passing through *Macedonia, *Thessaly and the Aegean Thrace. For many centuries, on the shores of the respective tract of the Euxine Sea and the Propontis were the ancient Greek colonies that had developed into opulent cities: Abdera, Amphipolis, Maronia, Perinthus and Byzantium on the Bosporus, which then became famous as the capital of the Roman Empire of the East with the name of Constantinople. Within Thrace, there formed from the ancient settlements of the Thracians several centers of particular importance: Beroë became Augusta Traiana (modern-day Stara Zagora, on a fertile plain), Pulpudeva gave way to Philippopolis (modern-day Plovdiv) and from Uscudama was born Hadrianopolis (Edrene, Odrin), an important *statio* on the Via Diagonalis.

Situated rather far from the N border of the *limes danubianus,* the cities, in addition to being fortified, were hardly touched by the "barbarian" invasions of the *Huns, *Goths, Avars etc., and thus they preserved their cultural richness and population more or less intact. Not even the population living out on the plains suffered much on account of the invasions, and there were rather rare cases in which the invaders who were not stopped at the border of the Danube were able to reach quite deeply within so as to reach the areas near the Aegean Sea and the Propontis. Among the invaders, the most daring were the Slavs, who, during the 1st half of the 6th c., came to the seashores, destroying such centers as the city of Topiros, at the estuary of the River Nestos in 549/550. One cannot, however, establish with precision the age in which damage and destruction were brought upon such cities as Amphipolis, at the mouth of the River Strymon, and *Philippi, an ancient early Christian center. However, exchanges between the ancient Thracian population and the Hellenic population which dwelt in this part of Thrace did not occur, it seems, brusquely, but rather gradually so that there was not an end of continuity with the new inhabitants who received among other things a noticeable number of ancient hydronyms and toponyms such as the name of the colony *Deultum* (today the village of Develt), the city of *Anchialos* (Bulgar Achelos, modern-day Pomorie) on the Black Sea, *Messembria* (modern-day Nesebŭr), *Agathopolis* (Achtopol),

Nicopolis ad Nestum (Nevrokop in S Bulgaria), *Astibus* (Stip, in NE Macedonia), etc.; and the names of various rivers: *Strymon* (modern-day Struma), *Nestus* (now Mesta), *Hebrus* (Ibŭr near the source, then more commonly with the name Maritza), *Tonzus* (Tungia, flowing from the Hebrus), *Syrmus* (now Strjama, Strema), and the mountain of the *Rhodopes* (now Rodopi), etc.

Following *Diocletian's administrative reorganization, the diocese of Thrace was subdivided into six provinces, four of which already made part of Thrace: Europa, Rhodope, Thracia and Haemimontus, with two others: *Scythia and Moesia Inferior, according to the testimony of the *Laterculus Veronensis* and a piece of information confirmed also by other historical sources, for example, the *Notitia dignitatum* and by Hierocles's *Synekdēmos*. The diocese of Thrace made up part of the *Praefectura per Orientem vicarius,* and therefore what pertained to the "civil" affairs was found to depend on a *vir spectabilis,* while for the military affairs it was governed by a *magister militum per Thracias, vir illustris*. When *Constantine the Great in 330 officially transferred the capital of the empire from *Rome to Byzantium, Constantinople, Thrace ceased to be a periphery province of the empire and became the backdrop of the capital, thereby acquiring a special importance both from the strategic-military point of view, and the economic point of view, for the purchase of provisions. This privileged, so to speak, position of Thrace, however, wound up attracting more invaders who were willing to go beyond the Danube. And the situation became particularly critical over the course of the 4th then the 5th c., following the invasions of the Huns and the Goths. Having penetrated into the diocese of Thrace, the *Visigoths, who had allied themselves with the *Ostrogoths and the Huns, ruthlessly devastated the territory of Thrace. Once the war against the Persians had been forsaken, the emperor *Valens (364–378) gathered his army together in Thrace in order to oppose the Goths, but in the battle near Hadrianopolis (9 August 378) he was completely routed and even lost his life. The danger of the "Germanization" of the empire became esp. present when two military leaders of the Goths—Theodoric Strabo and *Theoderic Amaling (the Great)—who had received from the Constantinopolitan government the most famous military dignities, betrayed their oaths as federates and undertook to devastate the territory of Thrace. It was only in the last decades of the 5th c. that the territory was able to free itself from them: the first died in 481; the second was persuaded to leave the Balkan Peninsula in 488 and turned his eyes toward *Italy. Several decades later the territory of Thrace was forced to undergo the invasions of the Huns, during the 1st half of the 5th c. until the death of *Attila in the spring of 453, when his successors attempted to reconquer the Balkan lands. At the very end of the 5th c. and at the beginning of the following, the invasions of the Slavs began, who crossed the Danube en masse.

Christianity spread in Thrace already during the early centuries of the Christian era: Christian communities, grouped around some building of worship, formed in various centers. Setting aside for the moment the communities of Scythia Minor and those of Thrace in the area subject to the rule of the Roman Empire of the East, one must recall esp. the Christian centers and territory in which the Bulgarian state was located, which had arisen in 681. Information used to reconstruct the history of these Christian groups has come down to us from a few pieces of written, epigraphic and archaeological documentation. The remains of nearly 150 churches from the early Christian period, which date to the 4th–6th c. (Tchaneva-Detchevska, 2494 a map). Thus in the ancient city of Pautalia (modern-day Kjustendil, SW Bulgaria) and in its vicinity ancient Christian inscriptions in Greek and Latin from the 4th to 6th c. were discovered. Interestingly enough, among other things, a metrical inscription in beautiful Greek characters was found, somewhat damaged, the text of which reveals traces of the 4th-c. christological discussions. An important Christian center was the city of Messembria (on the Black Sea, Nesebŭr), which was of a Hellenic culture, where various Christian inscriptions were discovered, esp. from the 6th c., but also from later ages. From one of these inscriptions, which is unfortunately very damaged, one must conclude that in this maritime center Christianity spread through the work of people who had come from *Asia Minor. The cathedral church from the 2nd half of the 5th c., which has been preserved rather well, contained three aisles; on the outside, under the modern-day street, are important mosaics. In a Greek inscription found at the Aquae calidae (the region of Burgas, on the coast of the Black Sea, in E Bulgaria), datable to the 6th c., there is a mention of a bishop, a deacon, an *oeconomos* and a vicar, all of which are a testimony to its very developed ecclesiastical organization. In the ancient fortress of Deultum (today the village of Develt, on the coast of the Black Sea) and in the maritime city of Sozopolis there existed Christian communities, to which several sepulchral inscriptions written in the Greek language from the 5th to the 6th c. refer. Another Christian center was the ancient

city of Augusta Traiana (a temple of Beroë, modern-day Stara Zagora), where Christian sepulchral inscriptions were found, probably from the 5th to the 6th c., as well as the different Christian tombs (Pillinger, *Monumenti,* 302).

At Philippopolis (now Plovdiv), metropolis of Thrace, Greek Christian inscriptions were discovered, one of which from perhaps the 4th c. contains *gnostic content: the author, *Tatian, came from *Asia through *Egypt; this confirms the hypothesis that religious movements that had come from the East were present in Thrace. In the archaeological digs carried out between 1983 and 1986 in the center of Plovdiv, a large Christian basilica with three aisles was discovered next to the ancient forum with rich mosaic ornamentation. In Hissar (N of Philippopolis), most likely to be identified with the ancient city of Diocletianopolis, reconstructed by *Diocletian between 295 and 305, Christian inscriptions written in Greek have come to light from the 5th–6th c., and massive remains are still preserved of a good nine churches; in one church, there is an inscription in honor of *Stephen the first martyr (Pillinger, *Monumenti,* 281-283). The most ancient basilica, number 4, from the 4th c., was constructed over a pagan temple (Madjarov, 2526). The episcopal see depended on Philippopolis; its bishop was present at the Council of *Ephesus (431) and that of *Chalcedon (451). At Zapara (not identified with certainty, but probably to be situated at Vrač Bulgaria; now Sandanski in the Valley of Struma) was the see for a bishop in the 6th c., given the testimony of a mosaic inscription. The inscription speaks of a certain John who had completed the church, which was begun by his predecessor. Sandanski is identified with Parthicopolis (Pillinger, *Monumenti,* 295-298). The Museum of Art and History of Varna, the ancient Odessos (Pillinger, *Monumenti,* 293 and 304-307) on the Black Sea possesses many early Christian objects. Odessos was an important Christian center. Remains of a church are found at Džanavar-tepe near Varna (Pillinger, *Monumenti,* 285ff.). From Storgosia (Pleven), not far from Romania, one finds a Latin inscription with the beginning words of Ps 42:4 (Pillinger, *Monumenti,* 299).

The foundation of the Bulgarian state in 681 also had an effect on the political and cultural situation of Thrace, which, not having been occupied by the Bulgarians, possibly remained under the rule of the Byzantine Empire. The political-administrative reform undertaken by *Heraclius (610–641), which was then completed by his successor Constantine IV (668–685), was owed to the situation that had emerged following the rise of the new state, potentially an opponent, despite the peace treaty that was reached in September of 681. The diocese of Thrace was transformed into a *thema,* that is, a political-military unit, under the command of a *strategos* who reunited the civil and military power: this was done in order to better ensure the defense before the threat of the new state. Pushing toward the S, the Slavs were able, however, to establish themselves in a more peaceful way, even in the S regions of SE Europe, thus changing the ethnic composition of a good part of the territories subject to the direct rule of Constantinople. In the most critical period of the "barbarian" invasions of the Huns or the Avars in the 5th and 6th c., it was precisely the representatives of the Christian clergy who organized the defense of some inhabited centers and who undertook peace talks with the enemies. Thus, during the 1st half of the 6th c., the bishop of the city of Margus (at the mouth of the River Morava), even though saving the city from the reprisal of the Huns, made the decision to open to the invaders the doors of the stronghold. During the 2nd half of the 6th c., in the emperor Maurice's fight (582–602) against the Slavs and the Avars, the inhabitants of the small city of Asemus, situated in the region toward the Danube, had organized, with the privilege of the emperor *Justin II (565–578), an army specifically for their defense. When the Constantinopolitan *taxiarcha* Guentzon attempted to enlist the city's troops in his army, he was unable to fulfill his wish on account of the resistance posed by the bishop of that place. The sanctuary dedicated to the martyr St. Alexander Romanus (see BHG, 48-49, martyred *sub Maximiano*) in the village of Druzipera (region of Hadrianopolis) was destroyed by the Avars before the end of the 6th c.

Tabula Imperii romani, *Naissus, Dyrrhachion, Scupi, Serdica, Thessalonike*, Ljubljana 1976; M.P. Soustal, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini, Thrakien: (Thrakē, Rodopē und Haimimontos)*, Vienna 1991; PWK, s.v. *Thrake* (*römisch*) 25 (1936) 452-472; EAA 7, 837-839; KLP 5, 777-781; D. Concev, *Hisarskite bani*, Sofia 1937; V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien*, Berlin 1964; K. Mijatev, *Architektura v srednovekovna Bŭlgarija*, Sofia 1965, 7-26; R.F. Hoddinott, *Bulgaria in Antiquity: An Archaeological Introduction*, London 1975; I. Dujčev, *Testimonianze epigrafiche e archeologiche sul paleocristianesimo in Bulgaria*: Atti dell'Accademia pontificia di archeologia 53/54 (1980-82) 181-205; J. Fitz, *L'administration des provinces danubiennes sous le Bas-Empire romain*, Brussels 1983; N. Tscanewa-Detschewska, *Die frühchristliche Architektur in Bulgarien*, in Actes du X[e] Congrès int. d'archéologie chrétienne, II, Vatican City 1984, 613-623; C. Poulter (ed.), *Ancient Bulgaria*, Nottingham 1983; R. Pillinger, *Monumenti paleocristiani in Bulgaria*: RivAC 61 (1985) 275-310; *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Kultur Bulgariens zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. R. Pillinger, Vienna 1986; V. Giuzelev, *Medieval Bulgaria, Byzantine Empire, Black Sea, Venice, Genoa*, Villach 1988; N. Tscanewa-Detschewska, *Les édifices cultuels sur le territoire*

bulgare pendant la période paléochrétienne à la lumière des nouvelles données, in Actes du XI[e] Congrès int. d'archéologie chrétienne, III, Rome 1989, 2491-2509; J. Valeva, *Les nécropoles paléochrétiennes de Bulgarie et les tombes peintes*, in op. cit., 1243-1258; M. Madjarov, *Diocletianopolis, ville paléochrétienne de Thrace*, in op. cit., 2521-2519; E. Kessialova, *Una nouvelle basilique à Philippopolis*, in op. cit., 2539-2559; M. Madjarov, *Early Christian Cult Buildings in the Province of Thrace* (*IV-V c.*), in *Akten des XII Intern. Kongresses f. christl. Archäologie*, II, Münster 1995, 993-996; I. Djambov, *L'édifice cultuel et sa nécropole. Nouvelles découvertes près de la ville de Sopot*, in op. cit., 705-709. For the bishops and the dioceses: Fedalto 301-311; 1, 554-564; B. Gerov, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien*, Amsterdam 1997; C. Asdracha, *Inscriptions chrétiennes et protobyzantines de la Thrace orientale et de l'île d'Imbros: (III[e]-VII[e] siècles): présentation et commentaire historique*: Archaiologikon deltion 49-50 (1994-95) 279-356; 51-52 (1996-97) 333-386; 53 (1998) 455-521.

I. Dujčev

THRASEAS of Eumenia (2nd c.). Bishop of Eumenia in Asia Proconsularis who was put to death in the 3rd quarter of the 2nd c. Two ancient documents preserve his name: the controversy of the apologist *Apollonius against *Montanus mentions him as one of the martyrs of that time (Eus., *HE* 5,18,14); *Polycrates's letter, bishop of *Ephesus, to Pope *Victor, contains this information: "There is Thraseas of Eumenia, bishop and martyr, who lays at rest in Smyrna" and adds that Thraseas, like all the bishops of Asia, celebrated *Easter on 14 Nisan, that is, differently from the Roman and Alexandrian or Palestinian tradition (Eus., *HE* 5,24,4 and 6).

BS 12, 640.

G. Ladocsi

THREE CHAPTERS, Controversy of the. Within the framework of the attempts aiming to seek an agreement with the *monophysites, the emperor *Justinian published in ca. 544 an edict, only fragments of which remain, in which he condemned *post mortem* *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and *Ibas of Edessa (the Three Chapters), whom the monophysites hated inasmuch they were the inspirers and supporters of *Nestorius. He requested Rome's approval and, facing the equivocations of Pope *Vigilius, had him arrested and transported to *Constantinople, where the pope came at the beginning of 547. Vigilius had time and the opportunity to consult many members of the Western episcopate; he therefore gave much resistance to the pressures of his environment, so that on 11 April 548, he sent the *Iudicatum* to the patriarch *Menas of Constantinople, in which he condemned the Three Chapters and reaffirmed the validity of the Council of *Chalcedon. Similarly, only a few fragments from this document have survived. The reactions of the Western episcopate were very violent toward this piece of news, such that Vigilius subsequently retracted the document and requested the convocation of an ecumenical synod. While waiting for the gathering of this body, Vigilius had to undergo injustices of every type, but his *Constitutum* on 14 May 553, even though it condemned many doctrinal propositions extracted from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, refused to condemn his memory, as well as that of Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa. But the council, which had begun a few days earlier at Constantinople, without the pope's participation, condemned the Three Chapters, and Vigilius confirmed the condemnation on 8 December 553.

The reactions of the West were negative, esp. in *Africa and N *Italy. And although in Africa *Justinian imposed the approval of the condemnation with force, the churches of N Italy separated themselves from communion with Rome. The *schism was supported for political reasons by the *Longobards (Lombards), who shortly thereafter invaded Italy, and despite the attempts to restore church unity by *Gregory the Great and other popes, it came to an end only toward the end of the 7th c. (ca. 689), following a council of bishops from the affected regions gathered at Pavia (Ticinum) by decision of King Cunipert, with the agreement of Pope *Sergius I.

Fliche-Martin, IV, 581-589; Storia del Cristianesimo, III, 395-404, 407-432; DTC 15, 1868-1924; EC 12, 456-460; R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (ST 141), Vatican City 1948, 194-272; G. Chediath, *La controverse des Trois Chapitres. Histoire de la controverse*: Istina 43 (1998) 75-89.

M. Simonetti

TIBERIANUS. Spanish *Priscillianist from *Baetica. After being condemned, his goods were confiscated; he was then exiled to the Scilly Isles with *Istantius. *Jerome mentions him as the author of an apologetic document, composed to defend himself from the charge of heresy (*Vir. ill.* 123).

H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford 1976, 47, 144-145; V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995, 27-78.

S. Zincone

TIBERIUS, emperor (42 BC–AD 37). Tiberius Claudius Nero, Roman emperor, governed from 14

to 37. He did not attempt to make new territorial conquests but had to face at *Rome a very difficult political situation, given the fact that revitalized ideological movements against the principality and the aristocratic Claudian family had arisen. After the failed conspiracy of the praetorian prefect Sejanus (31), Tiberius reigned with an iron fist, launching a politics of union and a leveling of the peoples of the empire, to the detriment of the Italians. He took measures against foreign religions: he expelled the Jews from Italy (Garzetti, 31) and prohibited Druidical rites. He refused to accept divine honors. *Jesus Christ lived and died under Tiberius; according to *Tertullian, the emperor was informed by the procurator of Judea, namely Pontius *Pilate, about the events that occurred at *Palestine and the conflict between the Christian community of *Jerusalem and official Judaism. Tiberius, likewise according to Tertullian (*Apol.* V, ff.), proposed to the Senate the *consecratio* of Christ and the legitimacy of his cult, but this proposal was rejected. The emperor Tiberius appeared extensively in early Christian apocryphal literature, in which he is presented in positive terms to the detriment to Pontius Pilate (see L. Moraldi, *Gli apocrifi del NT,* Turin 1971, II, 2013 = index).

A. Garzetti, *L'impero da Tiberio agli Antonini*, Bologna 1960; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; F. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Rome et l'intégration de l'Empire*, Paris [7]2010; B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, London-New York [2]1999; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001; M. Sordi - I. Ramelli, *Il senatoconsulto del 35 contro i Cristiani in un frammento porfiriano*: Aevum 78 (2004) 59-67.

L. Navarra

TIBURTINE SIBYL. The list of Sibyls formalized by Varro, which is cited by *Lactantius in the first book of the *Divinae institutiones* (I,6,6-12), concludes with the following claims: "The tenth is that of (Tibur) Tivoli, referred to as Albunea, who is worshiped as a goddess at Tivoli on the rivers of the Aniene River, in the course of which—it is said—her statue was discovered holding a book in hand. The Senate ordered that the oracles contained in this book be transferred to the Capitoline Hill."

In Varro's text, one perceives the antiquarian's desire, or that of his source, to supply a homogeneous framework to the disorderly traditional material regarding the oracular production circulating in the Mediterranean world from ancient times under the name of the Sibyl, the mythical itinerant prophetess, to whose inspired word Heraclitus had already referred as "a voice without smiles, decoration, perfumes, but which crosses through the centuries because of God's power" (fr. 92 DK in Plutarch, *De Pyth. or.* 6,397A). The personage, who was capable of openly prophesying under the influence of divine inspiration, without being subject to consultation, in fact, was at the same time portrayed as unique and multiple, refracting herself into numerous figures connected to specific locations such as the place of her birth or of her oracular manifestation. As is well known, in face of the mobile and variegated oracular Sibylline literature that freely circled in Greece and in the various Mediterranean regions, an official corpus of texts was established, the *Sibylline Books,* which was placed under the authority of the Senate and entrusted to the priestly college, which alone was able to consult and interpret their meaning during a serious state crisis, in order to proceed to the pertinent sacred ceremonies performed for reestablishing the *pax deorum*. This oracular collection was connected by tradition, for which Varro himself was made a spokesman in the aforementioned text of Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* VI,6,10-11), with the Cumaean Sibyl and with the Etruscan phase of the Roman royalty. The Tiburtine Sibyl also turned out to be connected to that heritage of texts, once the *sortes* contained in the book, of which she was the owner, and were presented as having been transferred by the Senate into the *Capitolium,* the most venerable of the Roman temples in its function as the home of the triad divinity established by Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, in the *Sibylline Books*.

As in the case of the other Sibyls, and esp. that of the Erythraean Sibyl, the Tiburtine Sibyl, who with her name also assumed the characteristics of a local divine figure, the Albunea nymph (see Virgil, *En.* VII, 79-95), was subjected to a process of "Judaization" and "Christianization" (*see* *Oracles), becoming the owner of an oracular composition with a clearly Christian character, known as the *Tiburtine Oracle*. The original text, which was composed in Greek, seems to be dated to the end of the 4th c. AD and witnessed a long history of additions and elaborations, both in the Greek original (*see* *Baalbek Oracle) and in the Latin translations that were made until the 14th c. and reflect the historical events and peculiar apocalyptic tendencies of a given time. The oracle's central nucleus is established by the Sibyl's convocation to Rome by order of the Senate, so that she may offer an explanation for a dream, which was shared by 100 senators, that pertained to the apparition of new suns. The prophetess interpreted the vision as a symbolic expression of the seven "generations" or rather the major phases of human history.

Among them, the fourth phase (or according to the other versions, the fifth) appears to be the central one, which constitutes a sort of "Sibylline gospel," inasmuch as it evokes the essential moments of the life of Jesus, from his birth to his death, which was caused by the hostility of the "priests of the Jews." The subsequent phases were characterized by events connected to various Roman emperors until the time of *Constantine, who is presented as the relentless destroyer of pagan temples and the protector of Christians. Mention is also made of the discovery of the cross of Christ by the pious *Helena, the emperor's mother, the founder of the new capital *Constantinople. Less explicit are the historical references of the subsequent "generations" which, after the original version, brought in the succession of the Latin versions that were made *ad libitum,* to the point of reaching events that occurred during the Middle Ages. Once again, through the complex history of the tradition of an oracular Sibylline composition, one can agree with the ancient philosopher who attributed to the prophetess's unadorned but efficacious voice the ability to penetrate without any limit into the temple to make heard the divine word.

P.J. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek: The Tiburtine Sibyl in Greek Dress*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 10, Washington, DC 1967; H.W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, New York 1988, B. McGinn, *Oracular Trasformations: The "Sibylla Tiburtina" in the Middle Age*, in I. Chirassi Colombo - T. Seppilli (eds.), *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari. Mito Storia Tradizione*, Atti del Convegno Macerata-Norcia, settembre 1994, Pisa-Rome 1999, 603-644; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Profeti Oracoli Sibille. Rivelazione e salvezza nel mondo antico*, Rome 2002.

G. Sfameni Gasparro

TIME. The God of the *Jews and the Christians reveals himself above all in history, and this history, in the divine plan, has powerful moments, decisive turns that must be observed in order to understand their meaning. Within this perspective, time has a fundamental importance inasmuch as the salvific acts pertaining to humanity, as a whole and individually, have taken place within it, as have the collective and individual responses of humankind. The patristic age kept in mind this dimension very well, which recurs with a variety of emphases and a wealth of images in Christian literature.

To briefly examine the most important features that have characterized the perception of time among Christians, it is opportune to make mention of the scholarly debate that occurred around the mid-20th c. in order to draw from it several points of reflection. Oscar Cullman's thesis is well known, according to which for early Christianity, as in the case of Judaism and Iranian religion, the symbolic expression of time was a line, although for Hellenism it was a circle. According to this vision, the center of history is not—as maintained by A. Schweitzer and M. Werner—in the *Parousia and therefore in the future, but in the past: Christ has come, proclaimed his message and died for the salvation of humankind, already inaugurating something new, in the expectation that with the final events everything will be perfected and the Spirit will take possession of the world of matter. This vision contrasts with that of Bultmann, for whom the imminent expectation of the end of the world belongs to mythology. The intense debate that followed revolved around three points: the effective presence of the "history of salvation" in the NT writings; the adequacy and the meaning of the representation of "linear" time in reference to the ancient Christian sources; the legitimacy of the conception of "cyclic" time attributed to Hellenism. Scholars have observed that one should not attribute the "cyclical" notion of time to all Greek thought: in fact, the great historians such as Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius did not think of history in terms of cycles (Momigliano); therefore the mode of conceiving time was not unambiguous among the Greeks and one should not oversimplify the contrast between Greeks and Jews on this point. Some scholars have shifted the focus of the problem by maintaining that the true contrast within the ancient world was that between a doctrine that allowed for the generation and corruption of the cosmos and a doctrine that made the cosmos itself eternal, while others have dismissed the problem altogether (even Christianity, on the cosmological level, expressed a cyclical conception, as shown by the testimony of 2 Pet 3:5 [Mazzarino]). Scholars now emphasize the insufficiency of the symbol of the line to indicate the history of salvation, and they prefer to speak of a spiral line or a progressive or even a vertical line. (This model tends toward eternity and not temporal length.)

This admittedly quick glance at some of the positions of recent scholarship allows us to assess the complexity of the problem, witnessed also by the divergence of opinions that base themselves on differing interpretations of or on differing emphases within the ancient pagan and Christian sources.

In any case, it is perhaps possible to bring to light a few points pertaining to time that seem to have been shared by early ecclesiastical writers: for one thing, their clear detachment from the horizon of the archetypes and repetition, which was common to "traditional" societies; in the vision that they set

forth, there is no return in a strict sense, even if the idea of periodization was dear to many of them. Moreover, the importance attributed to all three parts of which, according to human schemes, time is constituted: past, present and future; and along these, the individuation of a continual historical line, planned by God, of which the coming of Christ forms the center, and the end of which, however, is unknown: time is necessary to allow for the complete growth of the body of Christ, which must reach its perfect stature (see H.-I. Marrou, *Teologia della storia,* 39). Consequently, one understands the tension of the Christian life between the first and second coming of the Lord, the expectation, even the desire, of the last things, which in the majority of cases does not lead one to resignation and apathy but to full and passionate engagement in the world; the acute and vivid feeling of the irretrievable passing of time, a constant theme in patristic writings, leads one to make good use of it: because it is in time that human beings decide their destiny.

If from the perspective of the "long-term" one passes over to what could be defined as the "time of daily life," one must note that *Late Antiquity (just as the Middle Ages) was deeply marked by the inauguration of new rhythms: in the first place, the calendar year aimed to bring to life the memory of the great events of the life of Christ: his birth, Christmas, which was preceded by the period of Advent, until his resurrection, *Easter, which was preceded by *Lent, which was followed by the *ascension and *Pentecost. Moreover, each day was interspersed with the memory of the saints, whose lives were set forth as models for the faithful. Liturgical time was a circular time—and in that one feels the effect of a more ancient Greco-Roman vision (moreover, there were numerous pagan feasts that mutated into Christian feasts, which were often celebrated on the same days)—and nevertheless it did not recall the idea of the eternal return. Rather it was a commemorative cycle of the work of redemption completed by Christ once and for all. As early as the 5th c. in some churches (and the reference is to the Church of Rome) liturgical gatherings took place, accompanied by fasting, at the beginning of the four seasons. Another novelty of Late Antique Christian time was introduced by the week, which set aside six days for work and one day for rest, which was dedicated to the Lord. Christianity inherited this sevenfold rhythm from Judaism, which in turn drew this rhythm from the very account of the first book of the Bible on the creation of the world, according to which God worked during six days, only to then rest on the seventh. Upon this temporal sequence the life of society unfolded—but also the course of the "history of salvation," conceived in seven (or eight) ages—and it refashioned human activity. With the advancing of the years even the unfolding of the day received a different meaning: the "canonical" hours were introduced: Matins, Lauds, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, Compline and Nocturn. The last one is the most ancient part of the canonical hours, to which were gradually added the others, and they thus established the *Officium divinum,* in the form of public prayer recited in the name of the church or by all the people and by its members who were esp. committed to it, *in primis* by the ascetics and the monks and, subsequently, also by the secular clergy. For the most numerous multitude, namely that of the laity, the sound of the bells at the first glimmer of the morning, at midday and evening was a reminder of that prayer that others had made themselves available to complete. In this way, even time in its most humble dimension, which touches the life of all people, received a specifically and professedly Christian stamp.

O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit*, Zürich 1946 (Eng. tr. *Christ and Time*, London ³1971); H.-I. Marrou, *L'ambivalence du temps de l'histoire chez Saint Augustin*, Montréal 1950; A. Luneau, *L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Église. La doctrine des âges du monde*, Paris 1964; A. Momigliano, *Time in Ancient Historiography*: History and Theory 6 (1966) 1-23 (= *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1969, 13-41); S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, II, 2, Bari 1966, 412-461, note 555 on the perception of time in classical historiography; H.-I. Marrou, *Théologie de l'histoire*, Paris 1968 (It. trans. Milan 1969); var. aus., *Le temps chrétien de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge (IIIᵉ-XIIIᵉ siècle)*, ed. Ch. Pietri - G. Dagron - J. Le Goff, Paris 1984; P. Siniscalco, *La concezione della storia nel cristianesimo antico*, Aosta 1988, 155-176; Id., *Un modulo storiografico fortunato: le età del mondo dall'epoca patristica al Medioevo*, in var. aus., *Il Battistero di Parma. Iconografia, iconologia, fonti letterarie*, Milan 1999, 321-350; Id., *Tempo e giubileo tra giudaismo e cristianesimo*: Il Veltro 43 (1999) 93-103 (the last three articles are now in P. Siniscalco, *Il senso della storia, Studi sulla storiografia cristiana antica*, Soveria Mannelli 2003, respectively at pp. 7-29, 299-313 and 213-260; J. Le Goff, *L'Occidente medievale e il tempo*, in Id., *I riti, il tempo, il riso. Cinque saggi di storia medievale*, Ital. trans., Rome-Bari 2001, 115-133; P. Tzamalikos, *Origen: Cosmology and Ontology of Time*, Leiden 2006.

P. Siniscalco

TIMGAD. The ancient name of the city was Thamugadi. Created in 100 by request of *Trajan, his chessboard pattern covered an area of 60 hectares. It was situated at the crossroads that went from *Lambaesis to *Tebessa and from *Cirta (Constantine) to Aurès, on the highlands of Numidia. It only had thin wall fortifications, which were unable to provide re-

sistance against the Moors, who had risen against the *Vandals at the beginning of the 6th c. They destroyed the city, which experienced only a partial rebirth under the rule of the Byzantines, before disappearing under the desert sand.

The following bishops of Timgad are known to us: (1) Novatus, who was present at the Council of Carthage of 256 (*Sent. epp.* 4); (2) Sextus, in 320 (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*); (3) *Optatus (388–398), *Gildo's second-in-command, champion of *Donatism and leader, who fell along with Gildo; (4) his successor *Gaudentius, who spoke in the name of the Donatists at the Conference of Carthage (411); (5) Faustinianus, his Catholic opponent; (6) Secundus, who was present at the Conference of Carthage (484).

P. Monceaux, who believes that there is a historical foundation to the *Passio Mammarii* (BHL 5205-5206), regards Lawrence, Faustinianus, Ziddinus, Crispinus and Leucius as *martyrs of Timgad in 259.

A *pagan cemetery is found on the road toward Lambaesis; a Christian cemetery, 250 meters (273.4 yds) from the walls; another likewise on the Aurès Road to the S side. Outside the walls in the W suburb one also finds two episcopal groups, a Catholic one to the N and a Donatist one to the S; on the road that leads S, outside the Byzantine fort, stands the chapel of the patrician Gregory (ca. 645). Inside the city some sanctuaries were built during the Byzantine era.

P. Monceaux, *Timgad chrétien*, Paris 1911-12; PWK 24, 1235-1236; DACL 15, 2313-2338; LTK 10, 197-198; P. Romanelli, *Topografia e archeologia dell'Africa romana*, Turin 1970 (see index); P.-A. Février, *Urbanisation et urbanisme de l'Afrique romaine*: ANRW II, 10, 321-396; G. Zimmer, *Locus datus decreto decurionum: zur Statuenaufstellung zweier Forumsanlagen im römischen Afrika*, Munich 1989; N. Davis, *Ruined Cities Within Numidian and Carthaginian Territories*, London 2001.

V. Saxer

TIMOTHY, Apollinarist (bishop of Berytus, ca. 381–399). In the subdivisions that formed among the disciples of *Apollinaris of Laodicea, Timothy bishop of Berytus (modern-day Beirut) appears to have been the head of the group that was at the opposite side of the spectrum from *Polemon. Timothy attempted to reach an agreement with the "Great Church": he did in fact sign the canons of the Council of *Constantinople of 381 (see Mansi 3,568C). Toward the end of *Constantius's reign (361) or at the beginning of that of *Valens (364), in any case before *Athanasius's death, he had gone to Rome at Athanasius's behest and had returned with an *epistula canonica* to "Bishop" Apollinaris (see Leontius, *Fraud.* 151: PG 86,1976). Around 373, in the middle of the Antiochene schism, Timothy sought as much as possible an identity that distinguished Apollinarianism from both the old and the new Nicenes: he declared anathemas against *Paulinus, *Epiphanius, *Diodore of Tarsus, and, gradually, against *Peter of Alexandria and *Basil of Caesarea (see Lietzmann, pp. 23, 27). In 377 he was already bishop of Berytus; he went a second time to *Rome by order of Apollinaris, with the objective of defending their group's interests at the council held that year (Leontius, *Fraud.* 151: PG 86,1976), which condemned Apollinarianism (Mansi 3,427).

*Leontius of Constantinople has preserved the following texts from Timothy's writings (*Fraud.* 138): an *Ep. ad Homonium episcopum* (Lietzmann, 277), in which Timothy distanced himself from the "*synousiasts," that is, those who were on the other side of the spectrum within the Apollinarian movement: there he affirms not only the consubstantiality of the incarnate Christ with the human nature but also the distinction of the Logos; the two fragments from the *Catechesis* are along the same lines (Lietzmann, fr. 181, pp. 278-279). We then have a fragment from the *Historia ecclesiastica,* which preserves the *Ep. ad Iovianum*, a work attributed by the Athanasian MSS to the bishop of *Alexandria (Lietzmann, fr. 182, pp. 279-283; see CPG II,2135). Finally, we possess an *Ep. ad Prosdocium* (Lietzmann, pp. 283-286), which is a true and proper confession of faith of this movement within Apollinarianism. It has been passed down among the writings of Pope *Julius (PL 8,954-959). Extant are the *Syriac and *Armenian versions and fragments in *Latin, Syriac and Armenian (see CPG 3726).

CPG II, 3723 *Suppl.* 205-206; DCB 4, 1029, 3726; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 5, 23, 27, 153-157; fragments 277-286; G. Voisin, *L'apollinarisme. Étude historique littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IVe siècle*, Louvain 1901, 112-113; BBKL 12, 147-148.

E. Cavalcanti

TIMOTHY, apostle (apocryphal). With respect to Timothy the disciple of St. *Paul, we find pieces of information from the epistles of St. Paul (1 and 2 Tim) and the Acts of the Apostles. We possess some patristic commentaries on the two epistles to Timothy; in Greek: complete commentaries by *John Chrysostom (plus 2 homilies), *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, ps.-John of Damascus and authors whose work is fragmentary: *Severian of Gabala and Oecumenius (CPG 5, index,

145-146); in Latin: *Ambrosiaster, *Pelagius and the fragmentary work of *Hilary of Poitiers (CPL, index, 777). According to *Jerome, Timothy was St. Paul's translator (*Epist.* 120,11); after his death, he became the bishop of *Ephesus (Eus., *HE* 3,4,5). There exists a *Martyrdom of Timothy,* which is ascribed to *Polycrates the bishop of Ephesus, in which a description is instead offered for St. Paul and St. *John's activity in Ephesus. After the exile of the latter, Timothy presided over the church of Ephesus and was put to death during the pagan feast of Katagogia. The work was written after the Council of Chalcedon, defending the apostolicity of Ephesus against the growing claims of *Constantinople; the first witness to this work was *Photius (*Cod.* 254). Timothy's relics remained in Ephesus until 356; in that year they were transferred to *Constantinople and deposited in the Church of the Holy Apostles. They were probably stolen by the Crusaders in 1204 but were rediscovered in 1945 at Termoli. Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite dedicated two of his works to Timothy: *De divinis nominibus* and *De mystica teologia;* Timothy must have been present at *Mary's funeral (John of Damascus, *II hom. in Dormit.* 18).

CANT 295-297; BHG 1847-1848; BHL 8294-8295; BHO 1229 (Armenian *passio*); BS 12, 482-488; LCIK 8, 494-495; Lipsius 2, 2, 372-400. Vita greca: H. Usener, Bonn 1877; latina, ibid. 7-13; Symeon Metafrastes: PG 114, 761-773; PG 5, 1363-1366; H. Delehaye, *Les Actes de S. Timothée*, in *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine* (SH 42), Brussels 1966, 408-415; F.X. Plötzl, *Die Mitarbeiter des Weltapostels Paulus*, Regensburg 1911, 103-125; J. Keil, *Zum Martyrium des heiligen Timotheus in Ephesos*: Jahreshefte des Österr. archäolog. Institut 29 (1934) 82-92; R.W. Burgess, *The Passio S. Artemii, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translation of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke*: AB 121 (2003) 5-36.

M. Starowieyski

TIMOTHY, disciple of Paul. The most highly esteemed disciple and coworker of the apostle *Paul; he is named 17 times in the epistles, six times in the book of Acts and once in the epistle to the Hebrews (13:23). In the apocryphal acts, he barely appears. He was mentioned in the *Acta Titi* 6, the *Acta Petri cum Sim.* 4 and in the *Apocal. Pauli* 51. According to the *Acta Petri* 4, when *Simon Magus came to *Rome, the Christian community relied neither on Paul nor Timothy and *Barnabas, who were sent by Paul to *Macedonia. According to the *Apocal. Pauli* 51, after the divine wrath, Paul was transported to the Mount of Olives, where he found the apostles gathered together, to whom he recounts what he had seen and heard, and they enjoined him, along with *Mark and Timothy, to commit everything to writing. According to the *Passio* (BHG 1847; BHL 8294), a late text redacted during the period of the controversies on the antiquity of the various episcopal sees, Timothy preached and performed miracles at *Ephesus, where the pagans of that area killed him. *Eusebius (*HE* III,4,5) also received the traditions according to which Timothy was the first bishop of Ephesus, and he was mentioned as such in the Council of *Chalcedon (Mansi 7,293). It could be the case that this tradition is based on 1 Tim 1:3. Nevertheless, *Polycrates of Ephesus appealed to the tradition of *John and does not even mention Timothy (Eus., *HE* 3,24,2-7). The circumcision of Timothy by Paul (Acts 16:3) created numerous theological and exegetical difficulties for the Fathers. The Fathers generally justified it as an adaptation to Jewish prejudice and an act done in view of being accepted by the *Jews (*Iren., *Adv. haer.* III,13,3; *Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* I,20,2-3; *Praescr.* 24,2; *Clem. of Alex., *Strom.* VI,124,1; *Orig., *Comm. in Mt.* 11,8). This point was also debated between *Augustine and *Jerome (*Ep.* 56,3-5; 112,4-17). Augustine maintained that during apostolic times it was absolutely legitimate for those who were born Jews, in their passage toward Christianity, to regard the *paternae traditiones* as customs that had been transmitted to them. The Jewish Christians, however, could continue to observe the laws in use for the rituals; this, however, was not the case for the pagans. According to Jerome, the law was no longer valid after the *passio domini.* It was not the apostles' prerogative to decide whether one should observe the law. In the passages where Scripture says that the apostles observed it, Jerome explains that this either pertained to fear they had of the Jews or the fact that they pretended to do so in order to gain the friendship of the Jews.

AASS *Ianuar.* 2, 562-569; BS 5, 2217-2217; EC 12, 107-108; BS 12, 482-488; R. Hennings, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um der Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal 2,11-14*, Leiden 1994, 121-130.

R. Trevijano

TIMOTHY and AQUILA, Dialogue of. A Christian text of a supposed public debate that occurred at *Alexandria at the time of Bishop *Cyril in the 1st half of the 5th c., between the Christian Timothy and the Jew Aquila. Timothy is not presented as the famous companion of *Paul, and Aquila is distinguished from the 2nd-c. biblical translator (they actually discuss this individual at one point). Two Greek recensions of the work exist: one brief (RB) and one long (RL); both are clearly from the end of the 6th c. and were adapted from a now-lost original

dating to the beginning of that century; both recensions come from Alexandria. Even if the original partly reflected a possible debate from Cyril's time, the recensions could have elements from the works *contra Iudaeos* that were composed in Alexandria by a certain Cosmas and functioned as missionary tools when working with the *Jews of that area (John Moschus, *Pratum spirituale* 172). Both reflect, in many respects, an actual *Jewish-Christian debate.

The RL is the better known of the two texts. Its length is almost half of *Justin Martyr's *Dialogue,* which does not seem to have had any influence on it. Its way of citing biblical texts is interesting, which at times manifests a dependence, for the OT, on *Origen's *Hexapla* and for the gospels, perhaps a harmonizing tradition. Various biblical passages are combined with skill, interwoven and adapted among each other. For example, Aquila cites Mt 1:16 in such a way that *Joseph begets *Jesus (17:3). In the RL, Timothy is a laymen until Cyril ordains him a deacon and then a presbyter, before Aquila is baptized alone; although in the RB, Timothy, already a cleric from the very beginning, is invited by Cyril to debate with Aquila, and, at the end, many Jews and Greeks are baptized with Aquila. The RB, although just half the length of the other, contains material exclusive to it. Among other things, there is a discussion about the Antichrist from the tribe of Dan and a long speech made by Timothy on the ten days of the creation of the world and the seven heavens, which has a remarkable similarity to ancient and medieval Jewish speculations.

The work shares material with two other dialogues: namely, the Greek *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus,* from the end of the 4th c., and the *Latin version of *Evagrius's *The Debate Between Simon the Jew and Timothy the Christian.* The shared material probably indicates that all three works used an ancient Jewish-Christian dialogic source; namely, the *Disputation Between Jason and Papiscus* from ca. 140, which existed in a Latin translation from the 1st half of the 3rd c. (*see* *Celsus). The RL has also been preserved in a medieval Slavic translation.

M. Taube, *Une source inconnue de la chronographie russe: Le Dialogue de Timothée et Aquila*: Revue des études slaves 63 (1991) 113-122; L. Lahey, *Jewish Biblical Interpretation and Genuine Jewish-Christian Debate in The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*: Journal of Jewish Studies 51 (2000) 281-296; Id., *The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila: Critical Greek Text and English Translation of the Short Recension with an Introduction Including a Source Critical Study* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Cambridge, 2000), Tübingen 2007; W. Varner, *Ancient Jewish-Christian Dialogues: Athanasius and Zacchaeus, Simon and Theophilus, Timothy and Aquila*, Lewiston, NY 2004.

L. Lahey

TIMOTHY I, Nestorian (ca. 727–823). Born in 727 or 728 at Hazza (near *Arbela, in Iraq) and educated by the monk Abraham bar Dašandāt, he succeeded his uncle George in the episcopate of Beit Bagas, and in 779 he was able with a few maneuvers to be elected *catholicos, but it took two years to get himself recognized and to make peace with his opponents and adversaries. From that point onward until his death (823), he governed his church with relative tranquility. He enjoyed the friendship of the Abbasid caliphs and the protection of eminent persons of the court. Timothy was a learned man: in addition to *Syriac, he knew Greek and *Arabic and was not ignorant of Persian, the language of a considerable portion of his flock, and he had some knowledge of Hebrew. He loved books, copied them and had them copied, and he encouraged others to make translations. He had understood that in order for his church to be save from apostasy to Islam and *Jacobite *monophysitism, it had need of a well-educated clergy of irreproachable morals, led by good bishops and metropolitans. He therefore committed himself with zeal to the instruction and formation of the clergy and the selection of worthy pastors. Under his catholicate, the *Nestorian church reached its high point and sent missionaries to India, China, Tibet, *Persia and among the Turks. The following texts from Timothy's literary corpus have been lost: the treatise on astronomy, the book of questions and discussions with the Jacobite patriarch George of Be'eltam, and the commentary on *Gregory of Nazianzus. Of the nearly 200 *Letters* he wrote, 58 have survived. These are extremely important for understanding his life, work and times; there also remains an apology for Christianity delivered before the caliph (*Questions and Answers Spoken During the Meeting Between Timothy and the Al Mahid, Emir of the Believers);* *canonical texts (*Provisions on Ecclesiastical Judgments and Inheritances*; *Synodical Tomes*). In the apology, Timothy was able to defend with finesse the dogmas of Christianity (the *Trinity, the *incarnation of the Word etc.) without upsetting the emir or making concessions to Islam. The *Letters* often treat dogmatic questions. Timothy was a moderate Nestorian; he used christological formulas that were rejected by rigid Nestorians; he affirmed (almost as if he were a *monothelite) the unity of the operations in Christ (synergism); the goal of the incarnation is universal renewal; the human being is conceived according to *Aristotelian philosophy; the souls of the deceased live in a type of hibernation until the day of judgment; the necessity of grace; for the validity of *baptism, orthodox faith in the minister (priest) is required; the *Eucharist is the body of

Christ; the church is a pentarchy, in which the Nestorian patriarch possesses the primacy.

Letters: CSCO 67. *Apology:* A. Mingana, Woodbrook Studies 2, Cambridge 1928, 1-62. *Canonical Texts:* E. Sachau, *Syr. Rechtsbücher* 2, Berlin 1908, 53-117; O. Braun, OC 2 (1902) 283-311; M. Jugie, *Theol. dogm. christ. orient.*, V: *Theol. dogm. nest. et monoph.*, Paris 1935; DTC 15, 1121-1139; EC 12, 111-112; LTK 10, 200-201; Duval 382; Ortiz de Urbina 215-216; BBKL 12, 151-154 (bibl.).

A. De Nicola

TIMOTHY I of Alexandria (d. ca. 385). Brother of *Peter II of Alexandria and priest in that city, he was consecrated bishop at the beginning of 381, upon the death of his brother, and held the post until ca. 385. He came late to the Council of *Constantinople (381) and successfully opposed both the election of *Gregory of Nazianzus as bishop of Constantinople and, without success, the third canon, which sanctioned Constantinople's second place of honor after *Rome, to the detriment of *Alexandria. He was very committed to promoting monastic life. From his writings, 18 canons pertaining to ecclesiastical discipline survive.

CPG 2520-2530; PG 33, 1296-1308; Joannou, II, 240-258; DCB 4, 1029-1030; Coptic Encyclopedia 7, 2263; LACL 694.

M. Simonetti

TIMOTHY II of Alexandria (Ailouros or Aelurus) (d. 477). Priest of *Alexandria at the time of *Dioscorus and nicknamed "the Cat " on account of his slenderness. He was present at the Council of *Ephesus with his bishop in 449. He remained faithful to Dioscorus even after he was deposed following the decisions of the Council of *Chalcedon (451) and organized the *monophysite opposition in *Egypt together with *Peter Mongus. When this opposition, upon the death of the pro-Chalcedonian emperor *Marcian (457), incited the murder of *Proterius, Dioscorus's Chalcedonian successor, by means of an enraged mob, Timothy, who had been consecrated bishop shortly before by monophysite proponents, consolidated his power and worked actively in favor of his party. But this activity and his doctrinal position against the decisions reached by the Council of Chalcedon and *Leo of Rome's *Tome* led the emperor *Leo I to expel him from Alexandria (460) and send him into exile first into Paphlagonia, then to Crimea (near the Ukraine). Only in 475, upon the advent of the promonophysite usurper *Basiliscus, was Timothy recalled. Received with honor at *Constantinople by the emperor, but not by the patriarch *Acacius, he held a promonophysite council at Ephesus and then returned to Alexandria, where he was once again established in his own episcopal see. The subsequent antimonophysite measures taken by the emperor *Zeno were not carried out in time to affect him because he died in 477.

His chief work was an extensive *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon,* which has come down to us in a complete *Armenian translation, which was then edited at Leipzig in 1908 without the addition of a translation into a modern language. Two other brief works, one against Chalcedon and the other against Leo's **Tomus ad Flavianum,* have come down to us in a *Syriac translation; the second is unpublished; passages from the first have been edited in PO 13, along with fragments of an *Ecclesiastical History*. Some of his letters have been published. The *Homily on the Rock,* composed in *Coptic, is spurious.

Timothy was a proponent of moderate monophysitism, of the type that was subsequently developed by *Severus of Antioch and which was esp. characterized by hostility toward the Council of Chalcedon and Leo's *Tomus ad Flavianum,* both of which were considered to be Nestorian in tendency. Following in the steps of *Cyril of Alexandria, he maintained that there is only the nature of the incarnate Logos, inasmuch as the humanity assumed by the Logos, void of its own specific *hypostasis and incapable of subsisting in and of itself, cannot be called a nature. This humanity, however, is complete and intact and united to the divine nature without alteration or confusion, so that Christ, by becoming incarnate and by becoming a human being according to the *economy, is consubstantial and akin to other human beings according to the flesh, although he is consubstantial with God according to nature. On the basis of this union, Timothy, as in the case of *Cyril of Alexandria, can affirm that the Logos, although remaining impassible in the divine nature, suffered on the cross thanks to the flesh that he assumed.

CPG 5475-5491; PO 13, 202-236; DCB 4, 1031-1033; F. Nau, *Sur la christologie de Timothée Aelure*: ROC 14 (1909) 99-103; J. Lebon, *La christologie de Timothée Aelure*: RHE 9 (1908) 677-702; Id., *La christologie du monophysisme syrien*, in CGG I, 425ff.; A.B. Schmidt, *Die "Refutatio" des Timotheus Aelurus gegen das Konzil von Chalcedon. Ihre Bedeutung für die Bekenntnisentwicklung der armenischen Kirche Persiens im 6. Jahrhundert*: Oriens Christianus 73 (1989) 149-165; P. Blaudeau, *Timothée Aelure et la direction ecclésiale de l'empire post-chalcédonien*: ReByz 54 (1996) 107-133; Patrologia V, 353-356; BBKL XII, 143-145; A. Boud'hors - R. Boutros, *L'homélie sur l'Église du Rocher attribuée à Timothée Aelure* (PO 49, 1), Turnhout 2001; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491): de l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Rome 2006, passim.

M. Simonetti

TIMOTHY IV (III) of Alexandria (517–535). *Monophysite patriarch of *Alexandria, the anti-Chalcedonian successor of Dioscorus II. He was therefore opposed to *Leo the Great's **Tomus ad Flavianum* and the Chalcedonian profession of faith (Evagrius, *HE* IV,4). As a friend of *Severus of Antioch, he apprehensively perceived that *Julian of Halicarnassus had a growing number of supporters (Liberatus, *Breviarium* 19). Nevertheless, from the primary sources one gathers that he was an opportunist: at times he favored Severus; at other times, Julian (*De Sectis*, V,4: PG 86,1232a). He supported the Christianization of *Egypt, appointing a bishop to Philae. Upon his death, a *schism broke out in the monophysite church of Alexandria between his successor *Theodosius and *Gaianus. The following have been preserved from Timothy's works: a complete homily in *Syriac and fragments of other homilies in Greek in *Cosmas Indicopleustes's *Topographia*.

CPG 7090-7100; Liberatus, *Breviarium* 19-20: PL 68, 1032-1038; J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1923; S.P. Brock, *A New Syriac Baptismal Ordo Attributed to Timothy of Alexandria*: Muséon 83 (1970) 367-431 (6th-c. Antiochene text); W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972; PWK 25, 1357-1358; P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus: The Church Historian*, Leuven 1981, 176; Coptic Encycl. 7, 2268; Patrologia V, 358-359 (see index).

A. Di Berardino

TIMOTHY of Alexandria (5th c.). Archdeacon of *Alexandria in 412, he seems to have been the author of the original Greek text of the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* or the *Liber de vitis patrum*. If this is the case, Timothy would be identified with one of the seven young monks, specifically the deacon, who went to visit the Egyptian monks and drafted in Greek the account of the visitation and the stories heard. *Sozomen attributes the composition of this account to Timothy the bishop of Alexandria (d. 385), but it seems more plausible that this work should be attributed to the archdeacon of the city with the same name. The Latin text of the *Historia monachorum,* for which *Rufinus is the author (see Ruf., *HE* 11,4, and Jer., *Ep.* 133), presents variants that depend both on the personal intervention of Rufinus and on the fact that he could make use of an original text that was different from the one that has survived in the MSS, which allow us to identify three Greek recensions (*see *Historia monachorum*).

Editions: PL 21, 387-462; E. Preuschen, *Palladius und Rufinus*, Giessen 1897, 1-131 (Greek text); A.J. Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, Brussels 1971 (Greek text in critical ed.). *Studies:* F.X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, Washington, DC 1945; A.J. Festugière, *Le problème littéraire de l'Historia monachorum*: Hermes 83 (1955) 257-284; Id., *Les moines d'Orient*, I, *Culture ou sainteté*, Paris 1961; Id., *Les moines d'Orient*, IV, 1: *Enquête sur les moines d'Égypte*, Paris 1964; BBLK 12, 145-147; P. Devos, *Les nombres dans l' "Historia monachorum in Aegypto"*: AB 92 (1974) 97-108; *Inchiesta sui monaci d'Egitto*, intr., tr. and notes, ed. M. Paparozzi, Milan 1981; B. Ward, *"Signs and Words": Miracles in the Desert Tradition*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), Studia Patristica XVII/2, Oxford 1982, 539-542; J. Karayannopulos - G. Weiss, *Quellenkunde zur Geschichte von Byzanz (324-1453)*, II, Wiesbaden 1982, 246.

M.G. Bianco

TIMOTHY of Antioch. One of the pseudonyms used by the presbyter *Leontius of Constantinople (6th c.). Timothy is known for having written the *Sermo in crucem et in transfigurationem,* a Lenten homily on the crucifixion and Transfiguration, attributed in the past to Timothy, a presbyter of *Jerusalem (Capelle) and recently reattributed to the homiletical activity of Leontius of Constantinople (Sachot).

CPG 7406; BHG 434h; PG 86, 256-265; B. Capelle, *Les homélies liturgiques du prétendu Timothée de Jérusalem*: EphemLiturg 63 (1949) 5-26; M. Sachot, *Les homélies de Léonce, prêtre de Constantinople*: RSR 51 (1977) 234-254; Id., *L'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Transfiguration CPG 4724, BHG 1975*, Frankfurt a.M.-Bern 1981; C. Datema - P. Allen (eds.), *Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae*, CCG 17, Turnhout-Leuven 1987; Patrologia V, 318-319; S.J. Voicu, *Dieci omelie di Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Studi sull'Oriente cristiano 5 (2001) 165-190.

P. Marone

TIMOTHY of Constantinople (6th–7th c.). Timothy is only known by the work that was attributed to him by the MS tradition: *De iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt* or *De receptione haereticorum,* dedicated to the presbyter John. In addition to identifying him as the presbyter of the "Great Church" (Hagia Sophia), several MSS also refer to him as *scaevophylax* ("treasurer") of the Church of the Mother of God of Chalcopratia at *Constantinople, a title that other codices, however, attribute to the recipient of the short work, namely John.

In the aforementioned work, Timothy primarily distinguishes penitent heretics into three groups (*taxeis*) who are admitted into the Catholic Church: those who must receive *baptism; those who are anointed with oil; and finally, those who are only asked to renounce their own and all other forms of heresy. Moreover, in the treatment of the first category, he lists and briefly describes 26 heretical sects: from the *tascodrugi* (or **ascitae* or *ascodrugitae*) to

the Melchizedekians, focusing esp. on the *Manicheans. In the second category, however, are placed the following groups: the *Quartodecimans, the *Novatianists, the Sabbatians, the *Arians, the *Macedonians or the **pneumatomachi* and *Apollinarians; last, in the third are placed the followers of *Meletius, the *Nestorians and *Eutyches. There then follows under the title "Brief Account" (*Brevis narratio*)—with the objective of demonstrating the various branches of the heresy of the *acephali or the *theopaschites—the list of the various *monophysite factions subdivided into two chief denominations: Theodosians (who were in turn divided into *agnoetae, Paulianists [*Paulinians], *tritheists, *Gaianites or Julianites [*aphthartodocetists], *Dioscorians etc.) and the Marcianites (*Messalians, Euchites, enthusiasts and *Eustathians).

The work closes with a brief treatise *On the Schisms of the So-Called *Diacrinomeni* (*Haesitantes*), listing the 12 sects of the anti-Chalcedonians, among which are found the various religious factions listed in order of precedence, with special attention to the various nuances of the *severitae* or the *Severians.

Timothy's work after the Second Council of *Constantinople (553) seems, however, to have been written before the appearance of *monothelitism. "There is no other source better than these pages that allows one to perceive the range of heterodox sects that were operative at the margins and, at times, in the heart of the Byzantine church around the year 600" (J. Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine de 527 à 847*, Paris [3]1923, 135).

CPG 7016; PG 86, 12-74; Beck 401-402; V. Beneševič, *Syntagma XIV titulorum sine scholiis*, Pietroburgo 1906, 707-738; J. Meyendorff, *Le Christ dans la théologie byzantine*, Paris 1969, 163-167; Patrologia V, 105.

D. Stiernon

TIMOTHY of Jerusalem (6th c.). Priest and homilist. It is not clear if he actually existed or if this was merely a pen name. In the MS tradition, he appears as an author of two homilies for the feast of the presentation: the *Oratio in Symeonem,* which has been preserved for us in *Greek and in a *Georgian version and the *In occursum Domini,* attested only in Georgian. On the basis of stylistic peculiarities that can be distinguished in the first (a sophisticated vocabulary, formulas characteristic for introducing biblical citations and other oratorical procedures) scholars determined to assign to Timothy of Jerusalem the authorship of four other homilies (Capelle). These are the sermon *In Crucem et in Transfigurationem,* attributed by the MSS to a "Timothy, priest of Antioch," and three ps.-Athanasian speeches now attributed to *Proclus of Constantinople (*In nativitatem Praecursoris; in Elisabeth et in Deiparam; In censum sive descriptionem S. Mariae et in Iosephum; In caecum a nativitate*). The first two of these speeches are still considered to be reworkings of *Amphilochius of Iconium's homilies, perhaps this work of Timothy of Jerusalem (Caro). Nevertheless, the diversity of attribution has caused scholars to discuss the author's identity. Recently it was maintained that these texts make up part of a vast homiletic collection that can be traced back to *Leontius of Constantinople; Timothy of Jerusalem would only be a pseudonym used by this person to spread his own work (Sachot). This thesis has not drawn much consensus, but there remain certain doubts on the extent of the corpus and the setting of the homilies, for which an Antiochene context was also proposed. Timothy of Jerusalem has also drawn the attention of theologians for a statement from the *Oratio in Symeonem* (PG 86, 245 CD), understood by some as the most ancient patristic testimony in favor of the bodily assumption of *Mary. The passage, however, is limited to affirming the immortality of the Virgin "until the present day" and her translation into heaven. B. Capelle has argued that three ps.-Athanasian homilies belong to the same preacher. M. Sachot, who is followed by S.J. Voicu, has demonstrated that the five homilies belong to the presbyter Leontius of Constantinople.

CPG 7405-7410; PG 86, 237-252, 256-265; EC 12, 111; M. Jugie, *La mort et l'Assomption de la S. Vierge* (ST 114), Vatican City 1944; B. Capelle, *Les homélies liturgiques du prétendu Timothée de Jérusalem*: EphLit 63 (1949) 5-26; R. Caro, *La Homilética Mariana Griega en el Siglo V* (Marian Library Studies 3), Dayton, OH 1971; M. Sachot, *L'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Transfiguration CPG 4724, BHG 1975*, Frankfurt a.M.-Bern 1981; *Testi mariani del primo millennio*, II, ed. G. Gharib, Rome 1988, 43-49; K.-H. Uthemann, *Timotheos von Jerusalem*, in BBKL 12, 148-150; P. Allen, *The Sixth-Century Greek Homily: A Re-Assessment*, in *The Preacher and the Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden 1998, 201-225; Patrologia V, 318-319; S.J. Voicu, *Dieci omelie di Leonzio di Costantinopoli*: Studi sull'Oriente cristiano 5 (2001) 165-190.

L. Perrone

TIMOTHY SALOFACIOLUS (d. 482). The patriarch of *Alexandria, an adherent to the faith of *Chalcedon; he was elected after the exile of *Timothy Ailouros (460). He was nicknamed "Salofaciolus" (i.e., white turban). Despite his conciliatory spirit, he always had trouble with the *monophysite opposition. He was the recipient of a letter from *Leo the

Great (*Ep.* 171), who exhorted him to combat the *Nestorians and the *Eutychians. He was confined to a Pachomian monastery as soon as Timothy Ailouros, taking advantage of *Basiliscus's attempted usurpation, returned to his episcopal see in 475. The emperor *Zeno accepted him on the condition that he accept the Chalcedonians and sign the **Henoticon*. Upon the death of Timothy Ailouros, the monophysites selected *Peter Mongus, but the emperor Zeno reinstated Salofaciolus. Despite the disturbances caused by Peter Mongus, Timothy ruled until his death in 482. Timothy's character made him well liked by all the Alexandrian people (Liberatus, *Brev.* 16).

DCB 4, 1033-1034; Fliche-Martin IV, 416; J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1923; Coptic Encyclopedia 7, 2268-2269; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491): de l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Rome 2006, passim.

E. Prinzivalli

TIPASSA

I. The City - II. Christianity - III. Hagiography - IV. Archaeology.

I. The City. In AD 39 *Caligula brought an end to the Roman protectorate over *Mauretania by assassinating King Juba at *Lyons and then proceeding to annex the ancient kingdom to the Roman Empire. Tipassa at that point became a Roman city; in 46 it became a *municipium* under Latin law, and around 145 a colony. The primitive city was created on a central promontory, which since antiquity was called "temple hill," where the remains of the forum, the capital, the curia and the judicial basilica are found, along with the lighthouse, from the modern era. During the mid-2nd c., it witnessed considerable growth, as attested by the theater, the amphitheater and the large wall fortification that circles the city between Kudiat Zarur to the E and Ras Knissia to the W, walls that were able to victoriously resist Firmus's siege (371–372). In 373, *Theodosius received there the submission of the Maziri, who had been lured into Firmus's revolt. Conquered by the *Vandals around 430 and demolished by them in 455, the city was reconquered by the *Byzantines, certainly at the same time as Caesarea (Cherchel) (534). After the 6th c., the city continued to experience hardship, as shown by the reuse at a later age of materials from earlier monuments. The city was then abandoned.

II. Christianity. It is the general conviction of scholars that at Tipassa Christians were present during the first three decades of the 3rd c. As evidence for this position, scholars have appealed to the inscription of Rasinia Secunda, AD 238 (CIL 8,20856), and others, all of which were made before the *peace of the church (CIL 8,20891-20894). In any case, it is certain that the community must have organized itself and created an episcopal hierarchy over the course of the 3rd c.: it is in fact the common opinion that the nine *iusti priores,* whose tombs were organized in the basilica of Alexander, were Alexander's predecessors (CIL 8,20903). We know, thanks to his epitaph, that Alexander himself was the city's bishop and that he built the basilica named for him (CIL 8,20915): it seems that he lived at the end of the 4th to the beginning of the 5th c. With respect to Renatus, whose epitaph was found ca. 1914 (Bulletin Soc. Ant. de France [1928] 121-124), we do not know whether he lived before or after Alexander. He was, however, buried in the basilica that is named after the latter, and he does not appear in the list of the nine *iusti priores*. As regards Potentius, who is spoken of in a letter written by *Leo the Great (PL 54,646-653), he was the pope's emissary for Mauretania; his status as bishop of the place seems to be apparent only from the inscription that he himself ordered to be placed in the basilica of St. Salsa in memory of the work he had carried out (CIL 8,20914). The last known bishop is Reparatus, who was present at the Conference of *Carthage (484); a note on the margin for the list of bishops who were present states concerning him: *prbt* (= *peribat*).

III. Hagiography. Other pieces of information about Tipassa come from literary and hagiographical texts. *Optatus of Milevis (*Schism. don.* 2,18-19) recounts some of the violent acts carried out against the Catholic population by two bishops who had come from *Numidia, bishops who were supported by the prefect Athenius: "The people of Catholic faith were dispersed with violence and massacred; they were expelled from their homes; men were mistreated; women were dragged away by force; some of the children were slaughtered; some expectant mothers were forced to have abortions." A century later, *Victor of Vita (*Hist. pers. Afr. prov.* 3,29-30) provides a picture of the persecution unleashed by the Vandals. In place of Reparatus, an *Arian bishop was sent from *Carthage to Tipassa. The large majority of the population set sail and found refuge in *Spain. For those who had remained, because they were unable to set sail, the count who had been sent on this mission by King *Huneric had their right hands and tongues removed: but despite this mutilation, they continued to speak. As a witness to this miracle, the African historian provides an example

with a deacon of Tipassa named Reparatus, who had found refuge at *Constantinople and lived at the court of the emperor *Zeno. The Byzantine historians also speak about this event, but only Victor of Vita situates the miracle at Tipassa.

Finally, there exists the *Passion of Salsa* (BHL 7467). This 14-year-old girl, at a time when Christianity still had few adherents (*rara fides*), had tossed an idol depicting the protector dragon of the city into the ocean from the *collis Templensis*. Seen as sacrilegious, she was therefore lynched and flung down the cliff. Her body was miraculously found by some Gallic sailors, who had taken refuge in the port during a storm. They buried her on the cliffs to the E: the episode occurred in a period after the peace of the church.

IV. Archaeology. The burial of St. Salsa brings us to the very rich Christian archaeological heritage of Tipassa, which is found more specifically in the E necropolis of the city. Above Salsa's tomb at first was built a small funerary chapel, but perhaps it was placed in a preexisting chapel belonging to her family; the vestiges of a room for banquets remain and a funerary *mensa. Later, after 371–373, perhaps only around 450, to the side site was built a large basilica, around and within which were placed the tombs of the faithful. This cemetery, because of the organizing work for the basilica, seems to have still been in use in the 6th c. It has been entirely excavated and offers an exhaustive idea of an ancient Christian necropolis. At the N edge of the city, placed against the W wall, a small basilica from the end of the 5th c. was found, consecrated, as revealed by an inscription, to the apostles *Peter and *Paul. From the opposite side of the city, the W necropolis unfolds seamlessly with the Punic and pre-Roman necropolis. One can distinguish in it numerous Christian centers: (1) a large circular mausoleum (20 m [= 65.6 ft]), whose function remains unknown, but which resembles a martyrium; (2) the basilica of Alexander, flanked to the N and the S by two funerary enclosures; (3) the necropolis of Matares, with four enclosures, excavated in 1968–1972, over the course of an archaeological rescue dig. All the cemeteries of Tipassa have in common the following characteristics: funerary *mensae* for **refrigeria*; hydraulic installations for allowing water to reach the *mensae* and the tombs; and enclosed spaces, of various sizes, intended for families or groups. In the internal NW corner of the city, on the Ras Knissia, the episcopal building stood at the cliff looking over the sea. It included a large basilica with five aisles with a jutting apse supported by two enormous buttresses, which also reinforced the cliff; a baptistery with a squared layout with a round pool; private baths; and, without a doubt, the bishop's dwelling. Nothing remains of the church's liturgical decoration. At the center of the city, the judicial basilica and the courtyard of the new temple were also transformed into a church probably in the 5th c.

PWK 12, 1413-1429; LTK 10, 202-203; DACL 15, 2338-2406; EC 12, 118-122; J. Christern, *Basilika und Memoria der hl. Salsa in Tipasa*: BAA 3 (1968) 193-257; S. Lancel - M. Bouchenaki, *Tipasa de Maurétanie*, Alger 1971; M. Bouchenaki, *Fouilles de la nécropole occidentale de Tipasa, 1968-72*, Alger 1975; H.I. Marrou, *Une inscription chrétienne de Tipasa et le refrigerium*: AntiAfric. 15 (1979) 261-269; S. Lancel, *Tipasa de Maurétanie; histoire et archéologie*: I. *État des questions des origines préromaines à la fin du III^e siècle*: ANRW II, 10,2 (1982) 739-786; M.M. Morciano, *Tipasa d'Algeria: un esempio di pianificazione antica*: L'Africa romana X/1 (1992) 403-418; S. Ferdi, *Augustin: de retour en Afrique 388-430; repères archéologiques dans le patrimoine Algérien*, Fribourg 2000; LTK[3] 10, 47-48.

V. Saxer

TÍRECHÁN. A disciple of Bishop Ultán (d. 657) and who in turn became a bishop of the Irish church between 670 and ca. 700, Tírechán is considered to be the author of the *Adnotationes* on the evangelizing mission of St. *Patrick, which was then incorporated into the **Book of Armagh* (ca. 807), and with reference to the Irish saints who lived between 440 and 665 could have composed the *Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae*.

CPL 1105; J. Gwynn, *The Book of Armagh*, Dublin 1913, XLV-LXIII, 17-30, 453-454; L. Bieler, *Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh* (Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 10), Dublin 1979, 124-162; J.B. Bury, *Tírechán's Memoir of St. Patrick*: English Historical Review 17 (1902) 235-267 and 700-704; K. Mulchrone, *Tírechán and the Tripartite Life*: Irish Ecclesiastical Record 79 (1953) 186-193; L. de Paor, *The Aggrandisement of Armagh*: Historical Studies 8 (1971) 95-110; J. Stevenson, *Literacy in Ireland: The Evidence of the Patrick Dossier in the Book of Armagh*, in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge 1990, 11-35.

P. Marone

TITULI PSALMORUM. In the Hebrew *Bible, many *psalms have a title, which is oftentimes obscure and which includes various elements—evidence of its belonging to an original collection, musical or liturgical rubrics, and the presumed occasion of composition. The Septuagint added other titles; the *Syriac version presents another series. The patristic commentators willingly turned their attention to these mysterious pieces of information (*Diodore of Tarsus and others, however, rejected their

authority): these titles established the exegetical keys for their interpretation. *Gregory of Nyssa dedicated a relatively systematic treatise to them. To these titles that came from the Greek Bible, the Latin Psalters often added directions for Christian prayer, of the *Vox Christi* type. The *Tituli* are divided into six series, many of which are very ancient; the first was transmitted with considerable variants, which presuppose a living use. One can draw much data from them for the history of *liturgy and *piety.

All the commentaries on the Psalter; P. Salmon, *Les Tituli Psalmorum des manuscrits latin*, Rome 1959; W. Bloemendaal, *The Headings of the Psalms in the East Syrian Church*, Leiden 1960; Grégoire de Nysse, *Sur les titres des psaumes* (SC 466), ed. J. Reynard, Paris 2002.

J. Gribomont

TITULUS. This term, which belongs to classical and ecclesiastical terminology, has different meanings, which derive from τλάω, *tuli* ("to carry, to support"): (1) in everyday language, it referred to every particular that allows one to know nature, value, content, use or the owner of an object; (2) in Roman legal language, the *titulus* is an act that establishes a right or that makes known the reason for a condemnation. The gospel of John (19:19) shows how the Latin term was transferred, with this meaning, into the Greek language. Among the martyrs of *Lyons of 177, Attalus bore around his neck a placard with the words "Attalus the Christian" (Eus., *HE* 5,1,44). (3) In a book, the *titulus* is established by the title indicating the author and the content; in legal works, esp. the digests and the decretals, it also served to subdivide the book; (4) in social contexts, it refers to the duties, honors and the deeds of a noble or famous individual or a public personage: the totality of these signs constitutes the titles of the personage—for example, that of the emperors—as the inscriptions reveal; (5) in funerary archaeology, the *titulus* is identified with the inscription affixed to the place of burial, which identifies the one to whom the monument is assigned and the one by whom it was built. This use was present everywhere, but it was particularly frequent at *Rome and *Trier. The term *titulus* signifies in the first place the inscription itself (Diehl 1787, 1991, 2138B, 3581, 4742), but it can also refer, by metonymy, to the funerary monument (Diehl 177, 3500, 3574A, 3578, 3592A, 4169A). One can deduce the importance the use of these *tituli* acquired from the care that was placed in restoring them in cases of vandalism. The famous example of this type of restoration is given from the inscription of M.A.I. Severian of Caesarea (Cherchel) (Diehl 1583); in fact, these not only constitute a *titulus* of property, but they often also governed the honors to be given to the dead. (6) Finally, in Roman ecclesiastical language the *titulus* was a parochial church of the city, in which the religious service was attended to by one or more priests. Their origin dates to the time in which ecclesiastical property did not exist according to law, when places of worship were private property, whose name appeared on a table near the entryway. An inscription dated to 377 attests to the most ancient *titulus* we know of: *Cinammius Opas lector tituli Fasciole* (Diehl 1269). The Roman synods of 499 and 595 allow one to establish the list and the topographical repartition of the *tituli* for the 5th and the 6th c.; between these two dates, the *tituli* change names, assuming that of the saint; it often occurred that the early titulary was considered such. It is likely that the *tituli* were instituted in the 3rd c., but we are unable to identify with certainty those that date to that era.

LTK[3] 10, 54-56; LMA 8, 811-816; J.P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum*, Paderborn 1918; F. Lanzoni, *I titoli presbiteriali di Roma antica nella storia e nella leggenda*: RivAC 2 (1925) 195-257; R. Vielliard, *Recherches sur les origines de la Rome chrétienne*, Rome [2]1959, 19-55; J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, Rome 1987, 105-118; F. Guidobaldi, *L'inserimento delle Chiese Titolari di Roma nel tessuto urbano preesistente*: Quaeritur, inventus colitur 1, Vatican City 1989, 381-396; V. Saxer, *L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain. L'exemple de Rome dans l'Antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge*, in *Actes du XI[e] Congrès Int. d'Archéologie Chrétienne* 2, Vatican City 1989, 917-1033; M. Jost, *Die Patrozinien der Kirchen Roms während des ersten Jahrtausends*: Hagiographica 8 (2001) 1-34; *Christiana Loca* 1, Rome 2000, 123-129; 2, Rome 2001, 186-203.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

TITUS. Coworker with the apostle *Paul, mentioned in the Pauline epistles (2 Cor 2:13; 8:6, 16, 23 and Gal 2:1-3). One of the Pastoral Epistles was sent to him (Tit). He is also mentioned in 2 Tim (4:10). Ecclesiastical tradition makes reference to Tit 1:5. *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 3,4,5) listed him among the bishops of *Crete. The following writers do the same: *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (PG 82,804C), *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* 20) and the **Apostolic Constitutions* (VII,46,8). The **Chronicon Paschale* goes so far as to identify him with one of the 72 disciples mentioned in Lk 10:1.

Titus does not appear in the Acts of the Apostles, but appears in those of the apocrypha. According to the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* 2-3, Onesiphorus recognized Paul in Iconium thanks to the "famous" description that Titus had made of him. In the account of the *Martyr. Pauli* 1, Luke, having come from

*Gaul, and Titus, from *Dalmatia (see 2 Tim 4:10), waited for Paul at *Rome. In ch. 6 (a section of the *Acta Pauli*), Titus administers the sacrament of baptism with *Luke, near the tomb of the apostle, to the prefect and the centurion whom Paul had evangelized while in prison. The *Acta Titi,* written in Greek, certainly used the *Acta Pauli*. The *Epistle of Titus,* a disciple of Paul, a text devoted to the state of chastity, has a concrete ascetic objective: the praise of the chaste life. The author makes extensive use of every type of apocryphal text, esp. the apocryphal acts and some apocalypses, and was inspired by earlier ascetical writings from ps.-Cyprian to the writings of *Jerome, ps.-Jerome and *Bachiarius. The recipients of this letter are the ascetics of each gender, who lived in celibacy but with a few deviations, among which was "spiritual marriage." For this phenomenon, one needs to search for his readers in the context of the *Priscillianist movement in the 5th-c. Hispanic ascetic circles.

As in the case of *Timothy, the Fathers addressed the problem of Titus's possible circumcision. The majority of commentators understood Gal 2:3 in the sense that Titus was uncircumcised, although *Jerome, *Pelagius and *Augustine followed *Irenaeus and *Tertullian in regarding him as circumcised.

Erbetta 3, 93-110; BS 12, 503-505; F. Halkin, *La légende crétoise de saint Tite*: AB 79 (1961) 241-246, A. de Santos Otero, *Der Pseudo-Titus-Brief*: Schneemelcher, II, Tübingen [5]1989, 50-70.

R. TREVIJANO

TITUS (apocryphal). There exists a letter of St. *Paul to Titus for which we have some patristic commentaries: in Greek the following are complete: *John Chrysostom (plus one homily), *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus and ps.-John of Damascus; fragmentary commentaries in Greek are found in *Origen, *Severian of Gabala and *Oecumenius (CPG, 5, index, p. 146); and in Latin we have *Jerome's commentary (CPL, index, p. 777). *Andrew of Crete wrote a *panegyric to Titus. In the literary corpus of ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, we find a letter to Titus (IX). According to *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 3,4,6), Titus was a bishop of Crete; according to *Jerome (*Ad Titum*) and ps.-Isidore (*De vita et obitu Patrum* 85), Titus remained a virgin until his death, and this is the likely reason for the attribution of the *Epistle of Titus* to him (*Epistula Titi, discipuli Pauli de dispositione sanctimonii*), a 5th-c. homily; the Latin text, written in a rather unusual language, is probably the original; the author speaks with enthusiasm about chastity and virginity: he addresses the *virgines et spadones* and condemns the abuses connected to the *virgines subintroductae;* he often cites Sacred *Scripture and the apocrypha. According to the *Acts of Paul,* Titus preached in *Dalmatia (14,1), according to ps.-Linus, he converted three soldiers, with *Luke's assistance (*Mart. Pauli* 19). There exists a Cretan legend (6th–10th c.), attributed to Zena (see Tit 3:13), recommended by St. Paul to Titus. According to this account, Titus was a Cretan in origin, a descendant of Mino and an individual who personally knew *Jesus; he was present with the 120 disciples during the descent of the *Holy Spirit and consecrated eight bishops of Crete; Titus had a sister, Euphemia, a virgin. Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite wrote two letters to Titus on the death of Sts. *Peter and Paul and on *Mary's *Transitus.*

CANT 298; BHG 1850z-1852; BHL, 1202; BHO 1233 (Armenian *passio*); BS 12, 503-505; LCIK 8, 496; Lipsius 2, 2, 401-406; *Vita*: F. Halkin: ABol 79 (1961) 241-256 (2 recensions) = F. Halkin, *Études d'épigraphie et d'hagiographie byzantine*, London 1973, IX; R.I. Pervo, *The Acts of Titus, a Preliminary Translation*, Society of Biblical Literature 1996, Seminary Papers 455-482; M.R. James, *The Acts of Titus and the Acts of Paul*: JTS 6 (1905) 549-556; F.X. Plötzl, *Die Mitarbeiter des Weltapostels Paulus*, Regensburg 1911, 103-125. *Lettera di Tito*: CANT 307; PLS 2, 1960, 1522-1542.

Translations: Eng.: A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 53-74; It.: Erbetta 3, 93-103; Moraldi 3, 115-146; Pol.: Starowieyski, 3, 65-95, 358; Ger.: A. de Santos Otero, in Schneemelcher 2, 50-70. G. Sfameni Gasparro, ANRW 2, 25, 6, 1988, 4551-4664; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *L'Epistula Titi e la tradizione dell'enkrateia*, in Id., *Agostino, tra etica e religione*, Brescia 1999, 191-304.

M. STAROWIEYSKI

TITUS, emperor (AD 39–81). Titus Flavius Vespasian, Roman emperor from 79 to 81, son of *Vespasian and Flavia Domitilla, as a general in service of his father, he finished the Jewish war with the conquest of *Jerusalem (70). Upon the death of Vespasian (79), he succeeded him, developing his politics of firm agreement with the Senate. His attentive interventions in Campania after the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius and at *Rome after a plague and a destructive fire in the year 80, along with cautious action for the improvement of the administration of justice, earned for him the epithet of *amor et deliciae generis humani*. He died of a fever in 81 at Sabina.

In the Flavian court, there were no expressions of anti-Christian sentiment. According to *Sulpicius Severus (*Chron*. II,30), however, Titus thought of eliminating Judaism and Christianity with the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem: but it is very difficult to substantiate this claim.

S.G.F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London 1951; H. Montefiore, *Sulpicius Severus and Titus' Council of War*: Historia 11 (1962) 156ff.; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; P. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Roma e il suo impero*, It. trans. Rome-Bari 1992; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001.

L. Navarra

TITUS of Bostra (d. ca. 378). A letter from the emperor *Julian (*Ep.* 52), dated to 1 August 362, sent to the population of *Bostra, the capital of the province of *Arabia, invites its citizens to expel from their city the bishop Titus, who—the emperor says—accused them of being rebellious and of not having reached excesses only because they were held back by the bishop and the clerics. This leads one to suspect that there were troubles and disturbances in the city of Bostra and appeals from the bishop to the emperor in support of that populace. In 363 Titus was among the signatories of the document that the synod of Antioch, which was convoked by *Meletius after *Jovian became emperor in an attempt to reconstruct a *Neonicene unity, drew up and sent to the emperor (Socr., *HE* III, 25). According to *Jerome, Titus died under the emperor *Valens, that is, before 378 (*De vir. ill.* 102).

Titus wrote a work in four books *Against the *Manicheans* after the death of Julian (26 June 363), to whom he makes allusion. This text survives complete only in the *Syriac version. From the original Greek there remain two books and one part of the third (chs. 1-29). Some fragments in Arabic have also been preserved. Only one fragment of a *Commentary on Luke* remains, through which one perceives that it was a series of homilies (Sickenberger, 140-245). Some fragments of this commentary are found in a *Coptic *catena on the gospels, and a fragment in an Arabic catena. Some fragments on *Daniel could belong to the same commentary on Luke or to a homily (Sickenberger, 130-134, 246-248). The Syriac **Florilegium Edessenum anonymum* preserves four fragments of a sermon *On Epiphany*.

An *Oratio in ramos palmarum* (PG 18,1264-1277) has not been considered authentic, for which there exists a shorter *Georgian version of the Greek text, which has perhaps been interpolated. Considered equally spurious is a commentary on Lk 18:2 (the iniquitous judge and the insistent widow), a *cento derived from the commentaries of *Cyril of Alexandria, *John Chrysostom and *Isidore of Pelusium (Sickenberger, 137).

CPG II, 3575-3581 *Suppl.* 194-195; PG 18; PWK 25, 6, 1586-1591; DTC 15, 1143-1144; P. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos libri IV syriace*, Berlin 1859, ²1924; P. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi seruata sunt graece*, Berlin 1859; P. Nagel, *Neues griechisches Material zu Titus von Bostra*, in *Studia Byzantina*, Folge II, Berlin 1973, 285-350; J. Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra, Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien* (TU 21,1), Leipzig 1901; I. Rucker, *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum*: Sitzungsberichte Bayer. Akad. der Wiss. 5 (1933) 82-87; W.W. Klein, *Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica*, Wiesbaden 1991; BBKL 12, 243-245.

E. Cavalcanti

TOBIT

I. In the Writings of the Fathers - II. Iconography.

I. In the Writings of the Fathers. The sapiential OT book of Tobit (in the Septuagint Τωβιτ, Τωβιθ = "Yahweh is good"), which relates the story of the two Tobits, the elder (Tobit) and the younger (Tobias), was considered inspired, canonical by the fathers of the church, although it was uncertain whether it was originally written in Hebrew. It is not included in the Hebrew canon, and it is regarded as apocryphal by Protestants. *Jerome writes that the book of Tobit, although not included in the (Hebrew) canon, is used by Christian authors, and for this reason he also cites it (*Com. in Jonam, prol.*: PL 25,1119). In fact, at the request of *Chromatius of Aquileia and *Heliodorus, he decided to translate the work into Latin. Now, the writings of the Fathers attest rather early to the popularity of this book in the Christian milieu: the letter of *Polycarp to the Philippians cites a passage from it (Tob 4:10 = *Phil.* 10,2); it is also mentioned by *Hermas (*Praec.* V,11,3). Tobit, who lived in the eastern diaspora, was a hero of fidelity to the law of God and the love of neighbor, the one who jeopardized his own life in order to fulfill divine precepts. Christians saw in Tobit the actualization of piety and charity, that is, the example of the virtues characteristic of true Christians: In this way, Tobit became the prototype of the Christian. Tobit's patience, who had become blind, assumed great importance for the Fathers. *Pontius compared St. *Cyprian to Tobit because of his magnanimity even toward the pagans during the plague at *Carthage (*Vita Cypr.* 10). Cyprian himself oftentimes made allusion to the book of Tobit (*Test. ad Quir.* III,1 and 6) or to the figure of Tobit, who after many righteous works and wonderful actions of mercy was put to the test with the loss of his vision (*De bono pat.* 18). Tobit served as an example of endurance, faith and strength in temptation (*Liber de mort.* 10: PL 4, 610); he was an example of someone always in prayer and practicing acts of righteousness, to which the angel

Raphael was also a witness (*De orat.* 33). Parents should behave like Tobit in the education of their children (*De opere* 20: PL 4,640). *Clement of Alexandria emphasized Tobit's continual fasting (*Strom.* VI,102) and the marriage of the young Tobias with Sarah, which occurred through the advice of the angel *Gabriel (*Strom.* I,123); Tobit therefore came to be considered the symbol of the soul guided by a guardian angel. Tobit's journey toward Ecbatana reflects the journey toward beatitude, toward God. *Optatus of Milevis (*De schim.* 3,2,1) connected to the sacrament of *baptism the fish caught in the Tigris River (Christ), with whose inner parts Tobit healed Sarah, a symbol of the church (Tob 6:2-9; 8:2ff.). This theme was adopted by *Quodvultdeus, who saw in the fish the symbol of the great Fish (Christ), who through the effect of his passion heals one from physical maladies but esp. from sin when there is repentance (*Liber de prom.* 2,90: SC 102,493), and Tobit prophesied Christ (*Liber de prom.*, 2,89: SC 102,493). *Ambrose delivered two speeches on the book of Tobit (*De Tobia*), in which he lauded Tobit as "a righteous, hospitable and merciful man," a symbol of patience in enduring some difficulties, but esp. godly for devoting himself to the burial of the dead and generous in loaning money. Tobias mostly appears in the catacomb frescoes with fish, although—according to St. *Paulinus of Nola—the elder Tobit appears in the depiction in the atrium of the basilica of Nola (*Carm.* XXVII,25).

LTK[3] 10, 63-65; EC 12, 176-180; LCI 4, 320-326; J. Gamberoni, *Die Auslegung des Buches Tobias in der griechischlateinischen Kirche der Antike und der Christenheit des Westens bis 1680*, Mainz 1969; F. Vattioni, *Studi e note sul libro di Tobia*: Augustinianum 10 (1970) 241-284; F. Vattioni, *Tobia nello Speculum e nella Bibbia di Alcalá:* Augustinianum 15 (1975) 169-200 (bibl.); J. Doignon, *Tobie et le poisson dans la littérature et l'iconographie occidentale (III[e]-V[e] siècle):* RHR 190 (1976) 113-126; J. Doignon, *"Un bâton de vieillesse," à propos de "Tobit" 5,23 et 10,4 ("Vulgate")*: RHPhR 71 (1991) 33-37; TRE 33 (2002) 573-579; V.T.M. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses*, Atlanta 2000.

L. Vanyó - A. Di Berardino

II. Iconography. The Fathers often spoke of Tobit as a figure of the righteous person who suffers but is rewarded after misfortune. Polycarp and Hermas were the first to make reference to the book of Tobit (SC 10,188; 53,166). The figure of Tobit is connected to the symbol of the soul of the deceased person whom God protects by means of his angels from the attacks of the enemy on the journey toward eternity. His figure, however, was very rarely depicted in early Christian art. The most ancient representation of Tobit with the fish is found in cubicle III of Domitilla (Wp 135), from the mid-3rd c.; then follow those from the hypogeum of the Via Yser (Wp 164,2), the catacomb of Vigna Massimo (of the Jordani), where the angel appears, and on the Via Dino Compagni (Ferrua, *Via Latina*, XVIII) between 320 and 360. Tobit's encounter with the angel is also found in the so-called *sarcophagus of *Balaam, in the Museum of S. Sebastiano, from the 1st half of the 4th c. (Rep. 176), which, moreover, constitutes a *unicum* in the area of plastic art: here Tobit emerges from the water clothed in a *colobium* and with a *petasos* on his head. The scene refers to Tob 6:9. One should mention, last, the cover of the sarcophagus of the Mas-d'Aire (Ws 65,5), which shows Tobit in the act of removing the inner parts of the fish. The sarcophagus is dated to the 3rd c.

DACL 15, 2418-2420; EC 12, 180; LCI 4, 320-326; L. de Bruyne, *Sarcofago cristiano con nuovi temi iconografici scoperto a S. Sebastiano sulla via Appia:* RivAC 16 (1939) 262-263, fig. 7; U.M. Fasola, *Le recenti scoperte nelle catacombe sotto Villa Savoia. Il coemeterium Jordanorum ad Alexandrum*, in Actas VIII Congr. Int. Arq. Cristiana, Vatican City-Barcelona 1972, 263ff.; TIP 287-288.

A.M. Di Nino

TOLEDO

I. Christianity - II. Councils.

I. Christianity. Ancient Toletum was situated in Hispania Citerior and, after the division decreed by *Diocletian, it was transferred to the *Carthaginensis province. After having undergone the invasion of the Alans (411–418), it came under *Gothic rule. King Athanagild (551–568) chose it as his court residence, and with *Leovigild (568–586) it became the capital of the *Visigothic kingdom. With the conversion of *Recared and his entire people, which was announced in the III Council of Toledo (589), the city became the official see of all national, civil and ecclesiastical politics in the kingdom. When it fell under Muslim rule (712) and the capital was transferred to Cordoba, Toledo lost its political importance. Christianity must have arrived there relatively late, given the scarce importance of the city during the early centuries of the church's presence in Spain; nevertheless, it was found on the road that went from Saragossa (Caesaraugusta) to *Mérida (Emerita). The first document on this matter we find is in the acts of the Council of *Elvira (ca. 303), where Melantius signs as bishop of Toledo. Less reliable is the information about St. Leocadia, a martyr under Diocletian, and the data on St. Eugenius, the city's presumed 1st-c. bishop. During the *Priscillianist

crisis, perhaps because of its location at the center of the territory, Toledo was the see of a council against this heretical sect (ca. 400), earning in this way prestige to the detriment of Cordoba, the civil metropolis; and already in the II Council of Toledo (527) its bishop *Montanus (522–531) appears as the metropolitan, and he is entrusted with the duty of organizing a future council. Two of Montanus's letters show him cognizant of his role as a metropolitan, although perhaps he regarded himself as such only for a part of the province—that is, for the region of Celtiberia and for Carpetania—as we might also infer from the signature of Bishop Euphemius at the III Council of Toledo (589). In any case, a synod of bishops from the province, upon the suggestion of King Gunderic, officially recognized Toledo as a metropolitan see of the Carthaginian province (610). Two factors converged on all this: Toledo was already a royal city, and Cartagena (Carthago Nova) had fallen under *Byzantine rule. In the VII Council of Toledo (646) the order was given that all the suffragan bishops spend a month each year with the metropolitan in order to establish a sort of permanent synod. The XII council (681), formally recognized the right of the metropolitan to consecrate all the bishops of the kingdom elected with the concurrence of the monarch. In this manner, Toledo reached the height of its prestige, a prestige that had been earned during the 7th c., thanks esp. to the work of its great bishops: *Eugenius (646–657), *Ildefonsus (657–667) and *Julian (680–690), men of great civil and religious authority and, additionally, cultured individuals who greatly contributed to the cultural splendor of the Visigothic church in that century, in which even the monarchs were cultured men. Even the monasteries, and in particular that of the Agali, contributed to this splendor, preparing future bishops and producing culture. Enormously important, then, was the fact that Toledo was inexorably connected to the vast series of provincial and national councils that constructed the symbiosis between church and state that characterized the entire Visigothic period.

Bishops: Melantius (ca. 303), Patrunus, Turibius, Quintus, Vincentius, Paulatus, Natalis, *Audentius (the entire 4th c.), Asturius (395–412), Isitius, Martin, Castinus, Campeius, Sintitius, Praumatus, Peter (entire 5th c.), Celsus, *Montanus (522–531), Julian, Bacaudas, Peter II, Euphemius (589), Exuperius, Adelphius, Conantius (these last two perhaps in a reversed order), *Aurasius (603–615), Eladius (615–633), *Justus (633–636), Eugenius (636–646), St. Eugenius II (646–13 November 657), St. Ildefonsus (657–23 January 667), Quiricus (667–680), St. Julian (680–6 March 690), *Sisibert (690–2 May 693), Felix (2 May 694–ca. 700), Guntheric (ca. 700–710), Sintheredus (d. 711), Urban, Sinieredus, Concordius and Cisila (745–754).

ES 5 and 6; D. Mansilla Reoyo, *Geografía Ec de España I*, Rome 1994, 149-152; 309-322; 346-355; J.F. Rivera, *Encumbramiento de la sede toledana durante la dominación visigoda*: Hispania Sacra 8 (1955) 1-32; J.F. Rivera, *Los arzobispos de Toledo. Desde sus orígenes hasta fines del siglo XI*, Toledo 1973; DHEE 4, 2264ff.

II. Councils. *I Toledo* (400, national). The date, although debated, should likely be considered authentic. 19 bishops were present, whose residences are not known, with the exception of that of Patrunus (probably *Mérida), that of Asturius (Toledo) and Lampius (*Barcelona). Most of its 20 disciplinary canons pertain to the life of the clergy and, in particular, the recruitment and ordination of clerics, to face the consequences of *Priscillianism. Pope *Innocent I sent a letter to those present (*Ep*. III: PL 20,486-493). In the *acts there appears a profession of faith, without a doubt later than the council, against all heretics and esp. against *Priscillianists.

447. The possible existence of this council, whose location is conventional, is derived from a letter sent by Pope *Leo the Great to the bishops of the Spanish provinces (*Baetica is not mentioned) to celebrate the general council. Currently there is no convincing evidence of the celebration of this council. With respect to the celebration of a provincial council in *Gallaecia (the same pope suggested this possibility), we only have circumstantial evidence.

II Toledo (531, provincial). Presided over by the bishop of Toledo *Montanus. 4 suffragan bishops and 1 in exile, Marcianus, signed the acts. At a later time, Bishops Nebridius and *Justus (respectively from Terrassa and Urgel) provided their signatures. The first 4 canons pertain to clerics, the 5th to consanguineous marriage. In certain MSS, one also finds added to the acts Montanus's two letters to the people of Palencia and their bishop Turibius. (In 580 an *Arian synod was convoked by Leovigild, to promote the religious unity of *Spain under the Arian faith.)

With the III Council of Toledo there began a series of Hispano-Visigothic Toledan councils, institutionalized in the IV Council of Toledo (633), some general from the entire kingdom and others provincial. These councils appear with particularly uniform characteristics, among which appear: (1) the sovereign's participation (who calls them, sets forth the themes to be treated by means of a royal *tomus* and confirms their canons, which by this means ac-

quire the character of civil law); (2) the presence, starting from the 8th c., of *abbots and laymen, generally nobles, who at times also sign the acts, who appear as a manifestation of the courts of the kingdom; (3) the simultaneous treatment of civil and ecclesiastical questions; (4) their irregular celebration, which was determined by various ecclesial and political circumstances; (5) the different *ordo* of celebration, whether general or provincial, an *ordo* elaborated in its essential forms beginning from the fourth canon of the IV Council of Toledo and modified repeatedly with the passing of time.

III Toledo (589, general). This council was convoked by *Recared and presided over by Leander, who was also perhaps its promoter, for celebrating the Visigothic people's conversion to Catholicism. Present at this council were 61 (or 63) bishops (8 or 9 converted Arians) and 6 delegates, belonging to the entire Visigothic kingdom: Spain and Narbonese, France. After the king and queen had renounced Arianism and had professed their adherence to the Catholic faith, according to the style of the first 4 ecumenical councils, the Arian bishops did the same thing, and immediately after the presbyters, deacons and nobles. The second part of the council attended to themes proposed by the king. 23 disciplinary canons were promulgated, which brought the following innovations: bestowing the force of law to papal letters (can. 1); the singing of the creed in the religious solemnities (can. 2); the participation of judges and tax collectors at the councils, in order to be instructed by the bishops (can. 18); etc. Numerous canons treated matters connected to the life and discipline of the clergy and the patrimony of the church. A royal decree confirmed all the canons of this council, giving them the force of civil law. The closing homily was delivered by Leander. This council symbolized the political and religious unity of Spain and the beginning of the close collaboration between church and state, a phenomenon typical of that kingdom.

597, interprovincial. Three metropolitans were in attendance (*Mérida, *Narbonne and Toledo) and 12 bishops from different provinces. Its 2 canons treat the topic of priestly chastity and the administration of the churches. It is not included within formal series of Toledan councils.

610, provincial. 15 bishops signed and confirmed *Gundemar's decree proclaiming Toledo as the metropolitan see of the entire province of *Carthaginensis.

IV Toledo (633, general). Presided over by St. *Isidore. 6 metropolitans of the kingdom were present, and 56 bishops and 7 representatives of other bishops. It is the most important of all the Toledan councils for its decisions contained in its 75 canons, the first of which merits special attention (profession of faith with an extensive exposition of the doctrine of the *Trinity and the **filioque*); the second (unification of the kingdom in the context of the liturgical celebrations and the rights); the third (institutionalization of the general councils): can. 75, essentially political in nature, was considered to be a foundational law for the Visigothic-Catholic monarchy (an element of connection between the two great social forces: the Gothic aristocracy and the episcopate).

V Toledo (636, general). *Eugenius of Toledo presided over this council. The majority of the 22 bishops present belonged to the province of Carthaginensis. The fact that 7 of its 9 canons speak of the king and his family, esp. of the succession, reveals King Chintila's purely political intent in convoking it.

VI Toledo (638, general). Selva, metropolitan of Narbonensis, signed first; after him, 48 bishops gave their signature (5 metropolitans) and 5 delegates. 19 canons pertaining primarily to politics (referring to the royal succession and its protection) and church matters were promulgated, with a majority of the latter. Can. 3 is of special interest because of its severity shown toward the Jews.

VII Toledo (646, general). Orontius, metropolitan of Mérida, presided over 30 bishops (four metropolitans) and 11 representatives. This council promulgated six canons on ecclesiastical discipline. Can. 6 instituted a type of permanent synod in Toledo, whose authority grew. The political importance of this council appears in can. 1, which threatened severe penalties against rebels and traitors.

VIII Toledo (653, general). Orontius of Mérida presided over it. 51 bishops signed (4 metropolitans), 8 episcopal vicars, 12 abbots (for the first time) and some noblemen, who for the first time signed the acts. 12 rather long canons were issued in response to the royal *tomus*.

IX Toledo (655, provincial). *Eugenius of Toledo presided over this council. 13 suffragan bishops of the province of Carthaginensis, 2 bishops from the province of *Tarraconensis, 1 episcopal vicar, 6 abbots, 2 Toledan clerics and 4 nobles signed the acts. 17 canons speak of the administration of ecclesiastical goods.

X Toledo (656, general). Eugenius of Toledo presided over this council. 16 other bishops (2 metropolitans) and 5 representatives were present. The representatives of the abbots and the noblemen, unlike the case of the two preceding councils, did not sign the acts. It promulgated 7 canons on ecclesiastical discipline. It was the first council to decide that

throughout the kingdom the solemnity of the Mother of God would be celebrated on 18 December. It deposed Potamius of Braga, who had been accused of fornication, and replaced him with *Fructuosus of Dumium; it also annulled the will of Recimir of Dumium, to the detriment of the church.

XI Toledo (675, provincial). Quiricus presided over this council. 16 bishops, 2 deacons representing their own bishops and 8 abbots were present. It promulgated 16 canons on ecclesiastical discipline. The creed promulgated on this occasion remained famous, something which turns out to be the most important act sanctioned in a Toledan council.

XII Toledo (681, general). Julian of Seville presided over this council; the following officials were present: 35 bishops (4 metropolitans) and 3 delegates; 4 abbots and 16 noblemen also signed its acts. It was convoked by Ervigius in order to legalize his ascent to the throne after the bizarre deposition of Wamba. The council supported the king's wishes. Of its 13 canons, can. 9 is important because it confirms the monarch's anti-Jewish legislation and, esp., can. 6, in which the metropolitan of Toledo is granted the right to consecrate all the bishops of the kingdom. In this way, Toledo acquired the primacy over all the episcopal sees.

XIII Toledo (683, provincial). *Julian of Toledo presided over this council. Among the signatories were 47 other bishops (4 metropolitans), 26 vicars of the same number of bishops, 8 abbots, 1 **primicerius* and 26 nobles. It promulgated 13 canons, 6 of which pertain to political life and the others to ecclesiastical life.

XIV Toledo (684, provincial). Julian of Toledo presided over this council. Among those present were 17 bishops and 2 vicars of other bishops. The following officials, moreover, signed the acts: 5 abbots, 1 archpriest and 8 delegates of other metropolitan cities in the kingdom. This council was celebrated in place of the general council requested by Pope Leo II, who was unable to convoke it. At this council, fulfilling the pope's desire, the acts of the III Council of Constantinople were confirmed, as well as the *Apologeticum,* which Julian sent to the pope. The decisions were collected in 12 canons.

XV Toledo (688, general). Julian of Toledo presided over this council. 60 bishops (5 metropolitans) and 5 delegates took part in the meetings. 8 abbots, 3 ecclesiastical officials and 17 nobles also signed the acts. Having addressed other political questions of that time, the council examined Julian's *Apologeticum,* in which Benedict II had found troublesome expressions. In the acts, which exhibit a certain animosity toward *Rome, the council confirmed its complete orthodoxy.

XVI Toledo (693, general). This council was presided over by Felix the bishop of *Seville, the first administrator of the Toledan see, appointed in order to replace *Sisbert of Toledo, who had been deposed because he was accused of a conspiracy. The following individuals were present: 58 bishops (5 metropolitans), 5 abbots, 3 delegates and 16 noblemen. It composed a creed and promulgated 11 canons pertaining to religious and civic matters, along the lines of what had been outline in the royal *tomus,* including the Jewish question.

XVII Toledo (694, general). The number of participants at this council remains unknown, but a majority of the kingdom's bishops took part. It promulgated 8 canons, 6 of which were on ecclesiastical discipline and the last 2 on the necessity of protecting the royal family, with the ensuing condemnation of the Jews, who according to the king were conspirators against the monarchy.

XVIII Toledo (probably from 703). We only know that there were 50 participants. One can conclude that it was a general council. This is the last Toledan council for which we have information, but perhaps it was not the last to be held in that city.

Palazzini 5, 317-328; R. d'Abadal, *Els concils de Toledo*: *Dels visigots als catalans*, Barcelona 1968; J. Vives, *Concilios* 19-33 (I); 42-52 (II); 107-145 (III); 186-324 (IV-X); 344-369 (XI); 380-474 (XII-XV); 482-537 (XVI-XVII); Martínez Díez, *Hispana* IV, 323-366 (I-II); V (III-X); Orlandís, *Concilios*, 80-97 (I); 114-120 (II); 197-226 (III); 261-368 (IV-X); 382-384 (XI); 402-465 (XII-XV); 478-507 (XVI-XVIII); *El concilio III de Toledo. XIV Centenario (589-1989)*, Toledo 1991 (Actas del Congreso conmemorativo); A. Weckwerth, *Das erste Konzil von Toledo*, Münster 2004.

P. de Luis

TOMI or TOMIS (Constanţa, Romania). Tomi emerged as a colony of Miletus, on the shore of the Black Sea, in what is now Dobrudja, capital of the respective province and see of the bishop of *Scythia Minor. Thanks to the contacts with the already Christianized centers of the Aegean, it received Christianity from the very earliest centuries. The martyrologies record for Tomi the greatest number of Christian martyrs of Scythia Minor (more than 60), almost all from the persecution of *Diocletian from the years 303–304. A fragmentary epigraph in Greek mentions a "martyr and bishop," probably from the persecution of *Licinius between 320 and 323, whose name has remained unknown. Starting from the 4th c., the bishops of Tomi seem to have been passionate defenders of orthodoxy, and they rigorously preserved relations with the leading centers of the Christian world.

During the years 368–369, Bishop Bretanius (Betranius) enthusiastically opposed the emperor *Valens, who, when passing through Tomi, attempted to impose the *Arian heresy on it. The Christian community must have grown after 312 given the existence of an important Christian necropolis, which confirms the presence of Christianity for a very long period of time previous.

Although the superimposition of the modern city of Constanţa over the ancient city has impeded systematic archaeological digs, various incidental discoveries and several investigations undertaken for safeguarding the site have brought to light more early Christian monuments than in any other center of Scythia Minor. Among the most important monuments are the nearly 50 epigraphs in Greek that provide valuable pieces of information on the ecclesiastical organization and the life of the Christian community during the 4th–6th c. A cornelian gem, now in the British Museum, on which was inscribed the image of Christ on the cross, flanked by the 12 apostles with the word ΙΧΘΥΣ written above, was erroneously dated to the 2nd and 3rd c.; such a dating, however, is opposed by the fact that the image of Christ on the cross was an iconographic theme avoided by the Christians until the 4th–5th c. A block of limestone in the shape of a table with two solid legs and the upper surface decorated with a relief border, bearing on the front surface a Greek epigraph with the name of "blessed Timothy," perhaps the bishop of the same name who participated at the Third Ecumenical Council of *Ephesus (431). A large and well-known silver-gilt paten, now housed in the State Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg, bears a Latin epigraph with the name of the bishop Paternus (491–520). An inscription in Latin is the only text from Scythia Minor that makes mention of a priest (*presbyter*); another mentions a subdeacon (ὑποδιάκονος); a third, a "lector of the whole universal church," although a fourth an "administrator [πραγματευτής] of the church of St. John." Other funerary epigraphs bear the names of some superior civil officers or simple foot soldiers; in certain instances the ethnic origin or the place of birth of the deceased person is indicated, although on others biblical or liturgical texts are cited.

Early Christian places of worship of the city of Tomi, razed to the ground, at times even to their foundations, were identified and brought to light after 1960, following a vast urbanizing and building program called for by the city of Constanţa. Meager remains of two basilicas—including one (probably the city's 5th-6th-c. cathedral) almost 50 m (164 ft) long—were discovered in the W sector of the ancient city. Two others were discovered in the area of the port and two others, still unpublished, near the point of the peninsula of Tomi. Noteworthy is the fact that five of the six basilicas discovered have crypts for relics under the altar, among which the Great Basilica of the W sector of the city is considered the largest cruciform structure for early Christian worship. Recently on the Karl Marx Road a building shaped on the model of the basilica was discovered, which had been damaged by the excavations, whose crypt has been studied. It is odd, however, that even until now traces of the baptistery have not been found in the perimeter of the bishop of Tomi's residence. For the pictorial decoration of the basilicas, one should note the preservation of fragments from a fresco in a geometric and floral shape preserved on the walls and on the vaulted ceiling of the crypt of the basilica identified under Constanţa's Lyceum no. 2 at the upper end of the ancient port. Although belonging to worship buildings, one should recall the two floor mosaics that offer an image of this type of flooring at Tomi between the 5th and the 6th c. The numerous pieces of architectural sculpture, esp. the capitals, provide scholars an attestation to the activity of the local workshops; likewise rich are the imported furnishings as well as native ones, including metal, glass and esp. ceramic objects.

Em. Popescu, *Inscripţiile greceşti şi latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite in România*, Bucuresti 1976; I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; I. Barnea, *Christian Art in Romania*, I, Bucarest 1979; A.V. Rădulescu, *Le Monument Triomphal d'Adamclisi*, Constantza 1982; A. Rădulescu - V. Lungu, *Le christianisme en Scythie mineure à la lumière des dernières découvertes archéologiques*, in Actes du XI[e] Congrès Int. d'archéologie chrétienne, III, Rome 1989, 2561-2615, esp. 2565-2578; A. Barnea, *Une province chrétienne sous Justinien: La Scythie mineure*, in Acta XIII Congressus Intern. Arch. christianae, II, Vatican City 1998, 807-822, esp. 818.

I. Barnea

TOMUS AD FLAVIANUM. Appealed to first by *Eutyches and then by *Flavian of Constantinople, *Leo I, during the month of June 499, took a position in the christological controversy that had broken out in the East, elaborating, with the help of *Prosper of Aquitaine, his secretary, a dogmatic letter (*Ep.* 28), called the *Tomus ad Flavianum*. Integrating long citations from his sermons, he presented his *Christology, which was centered on the two natures in one sole person. Because the Roman delegation was unable to transmit this document to the members of the Synod of *Ephesus (August 449)—indeed they withdrew in protest to the condemnation of

Flavian—Leo, in the following year, entrusted his *Tome,* strengthened by a patristic *florilegium, to another delegation that, after the death of *Theodosius II, was well-received at *Constantinople. The *Tome* was translated into Greek and accepted by a synod (October 450). Finally, at the Council of *Chalcedon (October 451), it was recognized as being in accord with the teaching of *Cyril of Alexandria and in part used for the composition of the Creed of Chalcedon. After the council, the so-called *monophysites rejected it along with the Creed of Chalcedon, stigmatizing Leo as a *Nestorian, esp. because of the *Tome*'s formula *agit utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est* (Silva-Tarouca n. 94). Among the most bitter opponents, one should mention *Timothy Ailouros (d. 475) and other patriarchs of Alexandria, *Severus of Antioch (d. 538) (see *C. imp. grammat.* III,38: CSCO 102,175-176) and *John Philoponus (d. 575). The supporters of Chalcedon's decisions, however, defended the *Tome;* they even supported their position on it. For this approach, see the example of *John Scythopolis (1st half of the 7th c.), *Leontius of Byzantium (d. ca. 543), *Ephrem of Antioch (d. 545), *Anastasius I of Antioch (d. 599), who also composed an *Apologia tomi Leonis* (CPG 6952), and *Eulogius of Alexandria (d. 607). Although still contested subsequently by the *monophysites, the *Tome,* as a witness to Latin Christology, entered the dogmatic heritage both of the Byzantine and esp. the Latin church. In modern research, however, it is often too highly regarded. Some not only exaggerate its influence on the Council of Chalcedon, but they also overshadow both the anti-Eutychian and the anti-Nestorian Christology that Leo developed after 451, esp. in *Ep.* 124, which was the foundation of the *Tomus ad Leonem* (*Ep.* 165).

Editions: PL 54, 755-782; C. Silva-Tarouca, Rome 1932; ACO II/2, 1, 24-33. *Studies*: A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I-II/1-4, Freiburg 1979-2002 (bibl.); H. Arens, *Die christologische Sprache Leos des Grossen. Analyse des Tomus an den Patriarchen Flavian*, Freiburg 1982; L. Casula, *La cristologia di s. Leone Magno*, Milan 2000 (bibl.).

B. Studer

TONANTIUS (Ferreolus) (5th c.). An aristocratic Gallic friend of *Sidonius Apollinaris, through whom we have come to know about him. Prefect of *Gaul (Sid., *Epp.* I,7; VII,12: PL 58,458, 581), Tonatnius is mentioned in Sidonius's *Carm.* 24,35 (PL 58,746), praised along with his mother (*Ep.* II,9: PL 58,485) and the recipient of some hendecasyllables (*Epp.* IX,13; IX,15: PL 58,629-633, 635). He should not be confused with the similarly named bishop of Cartagena mentioned by *Capreolus (5th c.; CPL 398-399; PL 53,849).

PWK 6, 2221-2222 (s.v. *Ferreolus*); PLRE 2, 1123; J. Harris, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome AD 407–485* (see index); F.-M. Kaufman, *Studien zu Sidonius Apollinaris*, Frankfurt 1995, esp. p. 352.

E. Romero Pose

TONSURE. Τριχοκουρία, in the Greek church, was the ritual haircut for children, on the seventh day after *baptism. It was made in the form of a cross in order to signify the descent of God's blessing on the head of the newly baptized. The haircut, moreover, signified their first offering to God (Goar, *Euchol.*, 306).

At the time of *Gregory the Great there were present in the papal court some *cubicularii tonsurati* (Ewald - Hartmann [eds.], *Reg. epist.* 5,57; vol. I,363). These were clerics who received the tonsure in imitation of the monks, for whom it was a symbol of complete consecration to God. The Gregorian *Hadrianum* sacramentary contains a prayer *Ad clericum faciendum* which speaks of "*Ad deponendam comam capitis sui propter amorem Christi*" (Deshusses, *Le Sacram. Grégorien*, I, 417). The same prayer mentions the *habitus religionis* of the clerics, which the *Holy Spirit has caused them always to wear. Already at this ancient stage, therefore, the clerical status began to assimilate monastic elements.

While the monks, and later the clerics, wore the tonsure, other Christians, at least until the 5th c., kept their hair relatively long. One can observe this in the catacombs, where the men are depicted without a tonsure, but without long hair. *Jerome himself noted: "*Perspicue demonstratur nec rasis capitibus, sicut sacerdotes cultoresque Isidis atque Sarapidis nos esse debere, nec rursum comam dimittere, quod proprium luxuriosum est, barbarorumque et militantium*" (*In Ezech.* 13,44: PL 25,437).

J. Goar (ed.), *Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum*, Venezia 1730 (repr. Graz 1960); T. Schuster, *Liber Sacramentorum*, magnificent and updated ed. by C. D'Amato, Casale Monf. 1967; J. Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien*, Fribourg (Switz.) 1971 (Spicil. Friburg. 16); L. Trichet, *La tonsure*, Paris 1990; M. Nin, *Monastic Profession in the East*: Handbook for Liturgical Studies 4 (2000) 308, 311.

A. Chupungco

TOPOGRAPHY, CHRISTIAN. In the 1970s the first systematic studies of Christian topography began. Their purpose was to reconstruct the process

of the "Christianization of space," which, starting from the 4th c., more or less, pertained to all the urban centers in which a Christian community was organized. A seminal moment was the founding (1974) of the research group gathered by N. Duval, P.-A. Février and Ch. Pietri for the project titled "*Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule, des origine au milieu du VIII*[e] *siècle*," a systematic study of all the episcopal centers of *Gaul, which through 2007 comprises fifteen volumes (*Topographie chrétienne* . . . , I-XV, 1986-2007). This project has served as the point of reference for other milestones that are no less significant, such as the VI Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana in *Italy (Pesaro-Ancona 1983: Testini 1985; Mansuelli 1985; Cantino Wataghin 1985) and, at the international level, the XI Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana (Lione 1986: *XI CIAC*, 1989), which has made the chief topic of its research early Christian topography, namely in episcopal centers. Contributions to this effort subsequently multiplied, along with the broadening of the investigation into various areas of the late Roman world, in particular its western part.

Research on the distribution of the places of Christian worship in the Late Antique city, their relationship to the urban context and their influence on the developments of this urban context and on the Early Middle Ages has developed themes focused on the ancient city and its transformations over the centuries. These themes became manifest starting from the end of the 1950s (Bognetti 1959; Hubert 1959; Cagiano 1974).

This new research has been accompanied by innovations in the method of investigation, involving a rigorously critical rereading of the sources—sources which included information gleaned from archaeological digs, documents, and various literary and hagiographical texts. This critical rereading of the sources occurred within the framework of an integration of all the available documentation and a careful reexamination of traditions, which were often both consolidated with and the product of hypotheses—hypotheses which, in turn, were no longer taken as self-evident, even though over time they had ascended to the level of presumed certainties. Typical examples of these sorts of hypotheses are the affirmations in favor of the cemeterial origins of the first places of Christian worship, namely those structures that in the Early Middle Ages would be identified as cathedrals (see again Violante and Fonseca 1966). Another example of this type of hypothesis is the claim that there is a direct relationship between churches and former places of pagan worship, which were replaced by Christian buildings in a general process of exauguration (i.e., the process of unhallowing a building or objects used for worship), following the recognition of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman state (380, Edict of Thessalonica) (Mâle 1950).

At the same time, extensive new excavations, which were planned and carried out with appropriate stratigraphical methodologies (Geneva, Grenoble, Lyon, Turin, Barcelona, numerous Roman titular churches), and renewed analyses of archaeological areas already begun in the past (in Italy: *Milan, *Verona and *Aquileia) have allowed scholars to acquire a mass of data that, although often fragmentary and at times problematic, has supplied new and valuable points of reference. Moreover, the framework of knowledge is in rapid transition because of the multiplication of archaeological investigations, as well as the continuous development of those that have already been undertaken in past decades.

With the current state of our knowledge, it seems clear that the foundations of Christian topography were established with the advent of the Constantinian Age and the beginning of a new religious policy on the part of the empire (313), when worship buildings assumed a precise architectural identity—in response to the fundamental demands of religious life and programs with a more or less explicit agenda—in those contexts in which episcopal authority was firmly established. In the initial phases, the celebration of the breaking of bread (*fractio panis*) took place in private homes, made available from time to time by individual believers (Acts of the Apostles; Paul's Epistles). Beginning in the 3rd c., the Christian community, where it was firmly established and endowed to some extent with an organizational structure, developed permanent gathering centers where liturgical celebrations were reported to have taken place. Still, these *domus ecclesiae* lack the structural particularities that allow scholars to identify them with precision. The *domus ecclesiae* did not have a direct bearing on the urban panorama, nor did they prefigure the location of the churches subsequently built. The theory that many Roman titular churches, whose existence is supported with documentary evidence in the 4th-5th c., were preceded by the *domus ecclesiae* of the 3rd c. (Kirsch 1918) was in time (Pietri 1976 and 1978; Guidobaldi 1989) supplanted by a more careful evaluation of the relationship of the churches themselves to the densely constructed urban web and the dynamics of their founding (see below). This type of evaluation ruled out any possibility of a direct connection between the Roman titular churches and the *domus ecclesiae*.

The investigations carried out thus far exhibit a consistent pattern of Christian topography, that is, of the layout of worship buildings in the Late Antique city. This pattern developed on two complementary poles at the functional level, and the poles were topographically distinct. The first pole was the *ecclesia mater* of the community (the *ecclesia mater* was destined to be used for the weekly liturgy, community gatherings around the bishop on the occasion of major feast days, esp. those gatherings pertaining to *Easter, preparation for baptism and the reconciliation of penitents). The *ecclesia mater* has been conventionally called by scholars "the episcopal church" or more simply as "the cathedral" (despite the term being somewhat anachronistic). Because of their functions, the baptistery, the episcopal *domus*, spaces that were intended for assistance of the poor and administration, and possibly living areas for the clergy were all connected to the *ecclesia mater*. This church would quickly develop into complex episcopal groups, with the original building being turned into a monument with the addition of further spaces for worship. A frequent case of this phenomenon, not entirely clarified in its functional dynamics, is that of the "double basilicas" (Duval, Caillet 1996). The second pole was represented by churches dedicated to the cult of the martyrs and/or funerary rites—the two functions tightly integrated from the moment that the practice of being buried near venerated tombs (*depositio ad sanctos*) turned the martyrial churches into the fulcrum of the cemeterial areas that were being greatly exploited for the aforementioned purposes. The first pole (the *ecclesia mater*), consistent with its functions, maintained a privileged relationship with the inhabitants of the city and could, therefore, be generically identified as "urban." The second (churches dedicated to martyrs and/or funerary rites), however, were suburban, that is, they were located outside the perimeter of the city where the pagan and Christian funerary areas were located. Within these areas were the tombs of the martyrs. These churches were located outside the perimeter of the city out of respect for Roman law and its practices that excluded burials *in urbe*.

This schema took shape in *Rome as early as the Constantinian Age with the establishment of the Lateran Basilica by the empire (*basilica costantiniana*, *basilica Salvatoris*, then St. John Lateran's Basilica, which was finished around 324), which today still serves as the city's cathedral. Moreover, it took shape with the foundation of the memorial *martyrium* on the tomb of St. *Peter, the *basilica Apostolorum* (subsequently the basilica of St. Sebastian) on the Via Appia, in the area near the catcombs (*ad catacumbas*), which since the 3rd c. was connected to the memory of Peter and Paul; also contributing to this schema was the foundation of the funerary churches on the *Via Labicana* (Sts. Peter and Marcellinus) and the *Via Nomentana* (St. Agnes), connected to two imperial mausoleums (Tor Pignattara and St. Costanza). The same pattern is then found in the rather vast geographical horizon from Milan to Aquileia, from Aosta to Geneva and Lyons, from *Paris to Tarragona and Grenoble, from Barcelona and Mérida at Arles, Tours, Verona and Brescia, to mention only the best-known cases (Cantino Wataghin, Gurt, Guyon 1996; Cantino Wataghin 2005; Guyon 2006). This framework does not always appear the same in every instance of its occurrence. Some cities seem to present a placement of a given *ecclesia* within the cemeterial context, with these two entities usually having two separate functions. The Sardinian diocesan centers, for example, with the exception of Tharros (Giuntella, Pani Ermini 1989; but so too Concordia and Modena: Cantino Wataghin, Guyon), provide a case in point. These centers exhibit locations that are framed within the context of specific developments of the urban settlement and the local Christian community. Such centers, however, do not invalidate the primary pattern of reference—a "pattern" which is not the usual result elsewhere—but were in essence, as mentioned above, functional factors for the specific demands of the worshiping community in that place.

The times in which Christian topography took shape were different from one location to the next. Nor should one find it puzzling that, independent of legislation, Christianization was at times an ongoing process and not a fait accompli. Furthermore, it should not be surprising that the communities found themselves confronted, on the one hand, with the pagan world and its traditions and, on the other hand, with the problem of the material consolidation of its own organizational structures. A determinative factor, even though insufficient per se, was, however, represented by the presence of the bishop. In other words, the foundation of the *ecclesia mater* occurred within a progression that followed, in its outline, the time frame of the founding of the dioceses. The foundation of the cemeterial/martyrial churches, however, was subject to greater variables. One often finds that it was only in the 5th-6th c., with the strengthening of the cult of the martyrs and the increase of the economic resources at the disposition of the churches, that the memorial basilicas were established. Such basilicas frequently took the place of more modest memorials, thereby completing the schema of the local Christian topography.

Beyond the double polarity referred to above, Christianization does not present uniform outlines. The location of the episcopal church in the urban context does not correspond to norms or predictable patterns; the only consistent piece of data is the building's placement *within* the city walls, that is, when walls were in fact present. The episcopal church could often be found close to such walls (*Rome, Brescia, Barcelona, Tours, Turin, Grenoble, *Trier and *Arles). Sometimes the episcopal church could be found in a more central area (Aosta, Tarragona) or somewhere in between (Milan). The different possibilities of placement need not be attributable to any factors other than the specific contingencies of a particular area. According to a traditional reading, the location of the cathedral in proximity to some of the walls would not imply an intentional marginalization in relation to an urban core, which might otherwise carry with it a heavy connotation of pagan associations. Rome is a prime example in this regard because the position of the Lateran Basilica would reflect *Constantine's scruple not to annoy the senatorial aristocracy, who, for the most part, were opposed to Christianity (Krautheimer 1987). In reality, the grounds for this choice of placement seem rather to have been of a more practical order: primarily the scarce availability of land that could be set apart in the central areas of the cities—in Rome no less than elsewhere—at a time when their civic structures were still fully functioning. Moreover, one also needs to consider, on the one hand, that the monumental character of these Christian buildings—the Lateran Basilica being the first and foremost among such monuments—rendered them an imposing presence in the urban landscape. On the other hand, one also needs to consider that the *de facto* reduced extension of Christian buildings into the middle of Roman cities renders moot and improper the use and even more so the contraposition of such terms as "central" or "peripheral." The placement of the cathedral, rather, occurred through the bringing together of a number of different forces: the time and manner of its being founded; the social and economic makeup of the community, including its size, the community's role and specifically the role of its bishop in the complex civil structure; and the quality of the urban building itself. The planting of worship buildings initially was substantially pragmatic; only later was it accompanied by an ideological perspective that in time led to the reappropriation of pagan temples for Christian use or to the Christian occupation of central public areas (Caillet 1996). The cathedrals that had been initially situated on the periphery were later transferred only by chance to such central public areas (Aix-en-Provence; Arles) (Gauthier 1999). In any case, given the reconstructions and the subsequent modifications to Christian buildings through the centuries, the movement of the *ecclesia* remained a relatively rare occurrence in comparison to the usual continuity of the early Christian building.

Even the establishment and, therefore, the placement of the martyrial and cemeterial churches was subject to variables that could not be reduced to consistent procedures, except in very general terms. The tombs of the martyrs and, therefore, the venerated saints and, therefore, the funerary areas that protected them were the privileged point of reference; this, moreover, did not exclude other choices where the objects of the cult were movable relics. The Constantinian establishments of Rome undoubtedly delineated a rather systematic "Christian occupation" of suburban space. An organic project also appears possible at Milan, where the construction of the churches that marked the city's suburbs along the chief major roads outside the city (*basilica apostolorum*/St. Nazarus; *basilica ambrosiana*/St. *Ambrose; St. Dionysius; most likely St. *Simplicianus), was the fruit of Ambrose's initiative (bishop from 374 to 397). This layout also allows for a symbolic interpretation as churches from that time began to be built in the shape of a cross. The literary sources reveal a precise correspondence to this architectural phenomenon in the frequent evocation of the role of the saints as a defense for the city, saints who were otherwise, or even more so efficaciously, a bulwark of the city's walls.

Thus, by the 6th c., in the period under examination, in the metropolises or capitals of the Late Antique world (in the West: Rome, *Ravenna and *Carthage; in the East: *Alexandria, *Antioch and *Constantinople) places of worship multiplied even within the city with the establishment of "parochial" churches, objects of devotion and monasteries. This multiplication occurred in response to the demands of a large community which was spread out over rather vast spaces, as well as in response to particular conditions under the political, social, economic, cultural and religious landscape. One such condition could be the presence of *Arian communities following the settlement of Gothic groups and later the *Longobards (Lombards). The phenomenon concerning the multiplication of churches, as far as we can tell at the moment, was not systematically recurrent elsewhere, even though we must reserve judgment on whether this phenomenon was due to necessity, in view of the limits of the available archaeological and textual documentation (Cantino

Wataghin, Gurt, Guyon 1996): the *ecclesia* seems, rather, to have remained the sole place for urban worship, a fact that can find explanation in the dimensions and the modest means of the majority of the episcopal centers; an additional factor was the shrinking population underway from the 5th c. on, if not already from the 4th c.

In the face of these realities, to the Lateran Basilica are to be added memorial churches such as S. *Maria Maggiore (432-440) and S. Stefano Rotondo (consecrated by Pope *Simplicius: 468-483); some 29 *tituli* (i.e., titular churches, decentralized sees of the ecclesiastical administration and the pastoral activity of the city, normally endowed with churches, comparable to parishes) are attested by the signatures of the *presbyters participating at the synod of 499 (the number was reduced to 25 *tituli* in 595, most likely following a reorganization of the city's ecclesiastical geography), which were founded starting from the Constantinian Age. Among the two attestations, a change is recorded in the naming of the *tituli*, which in the second make reference to titular saints (St. Martin at Monti; St. *Chrysogonus; St. *Clement; St. Eusebius; St. Lawrence in Lucina; St. Vitale, Sts. John and Paul, etc.), while in the first, the same are indicated with proper names (*titulus Aequitii, Crysogoni, Clementis, Eusebii, Lucinae, Vestinae, Pammachi*). In some cases, these can be identified with the faithful (occasionally known from other sources such as *Pamachius who is also mentioned by St. *Jerome, for the construction of a hospice for pilgrims at Porto), to whom is owed the establishment of the *titulus*, that is, the gift to the church of the resources necessary for the building's construction and maintenance.

At Rome as elsewhere, private donations played an important role in providing physical facilities for the church's basic needs (liturgical, pastoral and administrative); imperial donations were limited to a small, though noticeable, number of cases. Donations of movable and immovable property were made in growing measure as a result of the increase in conversions and the choice of renouncing the world in favor of the ascetic life by the members of the aristocracy. The inscriptions on the floor mosaics of the churches from the area of Aquileia and more generally from the upper Adriatic attest, on the other hand, to the contribution of common laypeople to portions, at times modest, of the expenses paid for the building's construction (Caillet 1993). Houses account for a significant portion of the donations, as the literary sources and the archaeological evidence demonstrate. Even outside Rome the number of churches that arose in areas occupied previously by residential buildings was rather high (Turin, Luni, Parenzo, Milan, Vicenza, Florence, Lucca and Teramo), even though there are many cases of churches being built upon what were once public buildings—buildings that were made available by the authorities (baths, warehouses, civic basilicas, the Lateran Basilica replaced what was formerly the *castra nova equitum singularium*, that is, the barracks of the Imperial Guard who were freed from their service by the Emperor *Constantine). At Trier the cathedral stands upon a worship building at the edges of the forum. From this perspective, we can see a rather strong element of randomness when mapping out the process of Christian topography, although not ruling out that there was a semblance of design and planning by the church as well: even the gift of a building from a government official could be sought out. It was often possible that church officials had a choice between various options, with considerations of a building's usability and aesthetics usually winning out.

With the establishment of Christian churches, a process of "reuse" was begun that radically transformed the landscape of the ancient city, both urban and suburban, and the modes of the use of spaces (Cantino Wataghin 1999). Christian worship buildings were designed with new factors that contributed to a complex aggregation: on the one hand, as individual landmarks in the urban network, and, on the other, as nodes of a web, whose network was established by the devotional itineraries suggested by the articulations of the liturgical calendar. Independent of the stational liturgy, the community under the guidance of the bishop was found at specific dates in preestablished places for certain celebrations, whether these were anniversaries of the martyrs or vigils for the major feast days. It was upon such Christian topography, outlined above between the 4th and 6th c., that urban developments unfolded in the transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages.

J.P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum*, Paderborn 1918; J. Hubert, *Évolution de la topographie et de l'aspect des villes de Gaule de V^e au X^e siècle*, in *La città nell'Alto Medioevo*, VI Settimana CISAM, Spoleto 1959, 529-557; G.P. Bognetti, *Problemi di metodo e oggetti di studio nella storia delle città italiane dell'Alto Medioevo*, ibid., 59-87; C. Violante - C.D. Fonseca, *Ubicazione e dedicazione delle cattedrali dalle origini al periodo romanico nelle città dell'Italia centro-settentrionale*, in *Il romanico pistoiese nei suoi rapporti con l'arte romanica dell'Occidente*, I Conv. Int. di Studi Medievali di Storia dell'Arte (Pistoia 1964), Pistoia 1966, 303-346; M. Cagiano de Azevedo, *Aspetti urbanistici delle città altomedievali*, in XXI Settimana CISAM, Spoleto 1974, 641-677; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Rome 1976; Ch. Pietri, *Recherches sur les domus ecclesiae*: REAug 24 (1978) 3-21; G. Cantino Wataghin, *Appunti per una topografia cristiana: i centri episcopali piemontesi*, in Atti VI Congr. naz. di Archeologia Cristiana

(Pesaro-Ancona 19-23 settembre 1983), Florence 1985, 91-112; R. Krautheimer, Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics, Berkeley 1987; J.-Ch. Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au X^{e} siècle*, École Française de Rome 1988; F. Guidobaldi, *L'inserimento delle chiese titolari di Roma nel tessuto urbano preesistente: osservazioni e implicazioni*, in *Quaeritur inventus colitur*, Miscellanea in onore di Padre Umberto Maria Fasola, B., Vatican City 1989 (Studi di antichità cristiana 40), I, 383-396; P. Testini - G. Cantino Wataghin - L. Pani Ermini, *La cattedrale in Italia*, in Actes du XI Congrès Int. d'Archéologie Chrétienne (Lyon - Vienna - Grenoble - Genève - Aoste 21-28 septembre 1986), Vatican City 1989; 5-229; L. Reekmans, *L'implantation monumentale chrétienne dans le paysage urbain de Rome de 300 à 850*, ibid., 861-915; V. Saxer, *L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain: l'exemple de Rome dans l'Antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge*, ibid., 917-1033; G. Cantino Wataghin, *Urbanistica tardoantica e topografia cristiana: termini di un problema*, in *Felix temporis reparatio*, Atti del convegno "Milano capitale dell'impero romano" (Milano 8-11 marzo 1990), ed. G. Sena Chiesa - E.A. Arslan, Milan 1992, 171-192; J. Guyon - B. Boissavit-Camus - V. Souilhac, *Topographie chrétienne des agglomérations du Sud-Ouest*, in *Villes et agglomérations urbaines antiques du Sud-Ouest de la Gaule: histoire et archéologie*, Bordeaux 1992, 391-430; J.-P. Caillet, *L'évergétisme monumental chrétien en Italie et à ses marges, d'après l'épigraphie des pavements de mosaïques*, Rome 1993; A. Chavasse, *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du V^{e} au VIII^{e} siècle. Une liturgie conditionnée par l'organisation de la vie in Urbe et Extra Muros*, Rome 1993; Ph. Pergola, "*Civitas" episcopale tardoantica e sede diocesana altomedievale: continuità o mutamento?*, in *Materiali per una topografia urbana. "Status quaestionis" e nuove acquisizioni*, in V Conv. sull'Archeologia Tardoromana e Medievale in Sardegna (Cagliari-Cuglieri 1988), Oristano 1995, 193-200; G. Cantino Wataghin - J.M. Gurt Esparraguera - J. Guyon, *Topografia della "civitas christiana" tra IV e VI sec.*, in *Early Medieval Towns in West Mediterranean*, Atti del Convegno (Ravello 1994), ed. O. Banti, Mantova 1996, 17-43; N. Duval - J.-P. Caillet (ed.), *Les "églises doubles" et les "familles d'églises"*: AntTard 4 (1996) 7-234; M.Y. Perrin, *Le nouveau style missionnaire: la conquête de l'espace et du temps*, in *Histoire du Christianisme*, III, *Les Églises d'Orient et d'Occident*, ed. L. Pietri, Paris 1998, 585-621; F. Guidobaldi, *Spazio urbano e organizzazione ecclesiastica a Roma nel VI e VII secolo*, in Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae, Split-Poreč 25.IX–1.X.1994, II, Vatican City 1998, 29-54; N. Gauthier, *La Topographie chrétienne entre idéologie et pragmatisme*, in *The Idea and Ideal of the Town Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. G.P. Brogiolo - B. Ward Perkins, Leiden-Boston-Cologne 1999, 195-209; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Strutture funerarie e edifici di culto paleocristiani di Roma dal IV al VI secolo*, Vatican City 2001; J. Hillner, *Le chiese paleocristiane di Roma e l'occupazione degli spazi pubblici*, in *Ecclesiae urbis*, Atti del Congr. int. di studi sulle chiese di Roma (IV-X secolo), ed. F. Guidobaldi - A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Rome 2002, 321-329; A. Cerrito, *Oratori e edifici di culto minori di Roma tra il IV secolo e i primi decenni del V*, ibid., 397-418; G. Cantino Wataghin, *Christian Topography in the Late Antique Town: Recent Research and Open Questions*, in *Theory and Practice in Late Antique Archaeology*, ed. L. Lavan - W. Bowden, Leiden-Boston 2003, 224-253; J. Guyon, *La topographie chrétienne des villes de la Gaule*, in *Die Stadt in der Spätantike - Niedergang oder Wandel?*, ed. J.-U. Krause - Ch. Witschel (Historia Einzelschriften), Stuttgart 2006, 105-128; *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule, des origines au milieu du VIII^{e} siècle*, I-XV, Paris 1986-2007.

G. Cantino Wataghin

TOTILA (ca. 510–552). *Ostrogothic king, successor of Eraric, he ruled from 541 to 552. His extraordinary military qualities were conjoined with a sense of justice toward the Italian populations oppressed by *Byzantine taxation. Coming from the *Gothic aristocracy, he did not follow the same political culture that had characterized the Amaling family and deliberately distanced himself from Roman intellectual life. Once *Belisarius left *Italy, Totila advanced to conquer S Italy. Once the Byzantine general had returned, he was forced to engage in arduous battles for the capture of *Rome (548). When Belisarius had departed in the direction of *Constantinople, General *Narses was sent to fight against Totila. He defeated Totila at Tegina, where the latter lost his life (552).

H.N. Roisl, PWK 14, 799-809; A. Mundö, *Sur la date de la visite de T. à saint Benoît*: RB 59 (1949) 203-206; G. Sigismondi, *La battaglia tra Narsete e T. nel 552 d.C. in Procopio*: Boll. Deputazione di storia patria Umbria 65 (1968) 5-68; Z.V. Udalcova, *La campagne de Narsès et l'écrasement de T.*: CCAB 17 (1971) 557-564; Id., *L'Italie et Byzance au VI^{e} siècle*: CCAB 18 (1971) 547-555; P.A. Cusak, *Some Literary Antecedents of the Totila Encounter in the Second Dialogue of Pope Gregory I*: SP 12 (1975) 87-90; B. Steidle, *Der Gottesmann Benedikt und der Ostgotenkönig T. zu Papst Gregor, Dial. 2,14-15*: Erbe und Auftrag 56 (1980) 359-370; H.N. Roisl, *T. und die Schlacht bei den Busta Gallorum, Ende Juni / Anfang Julie 552*: Jahrbuch der öst. Byz. 30 (1981) 25-50; F. Marazzi, *Dall'impero d'Occidente ai regni germanici*, in var. aus., *Storia medievale*, Rome 1998, 98-103; J. Moorhead, *Totila the Revolutionary*: Historia 49 (2000) 382-386; E. Chrysos, *Vernichtungskriege des 6. Jahrhunderts*, in H.-H. Kortüm (ed.), *Krieg im Mittelalter*, Berlin 2001, 46-58; G. Pilara, *La città di Roma fra Chiesa e Impero durante il conflitto gotico-bizantino*, Rome 2006.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

TOULOUSE. The city of Toulouse (probably an Indo-European name), which received the title of the colony *Palladia* from the emperor *Domitian, experienced great fortune already before the advent of Christianity. The first Christian signs that have survived from the city are the names of the bishops, five of whom are known: *Saturninus, who was martyred under the emperor *Decius in 250; Hilary, *Rhodanius and Silvius in the 4th c.; and *Exuperius from the 5th. Christianization occurred gradually during the 4th and 5th c., as becomes evident in the growing number of such Christian buildings as necropolises and Christian basilicas, which have been discovered in the last decade outside the walls. The most important event during this period was the construction of the basilica dedicated to the martyr Saturninus (Saint-Sernin), begun by Silvius and brought to completion by Exuperius and conse-

crated by the latter on 1 November 402. (The *Passio S. Saturnini* and the Mass for the translation of the saint, which have been preserved through the *Liber mosarabicus sacramentorum,* were made shortly after.) In Toulouse, the capital of the *Arian *Visigothic kings, Arians, *Catholics and Jews lived together in large number. *Jerome's epistolary correspondence introduces to us the following related to Toulouse: (1) a deacon and monk Sisinnius from Toulouse, who was sent in 402 and 406 to the East by Exuperius to carry alms to the monks of *Palestine and *Egypt and a voluminous epistolary correspondence to Jerome (*Ep.* 102, 105, 109 and 119); (2) the monks Minervius and Alexander, two former lawyers and close relatives to whom Jerome dedicated his *Commentary on Malachi* (*Prol.* CCL 76 A, p. 902) and wrote the letter 119, in which he responds to their exegetical difficulties; (3) the priest Riparius, whom we find in the *civitas* of Toulouse, but close to the region of Comminges, who reported to Jerome the propaganda carried out by *Vigilantius (*Ep.* 109), sending him in 406, through Sissinius, the writings of Vigilantius which had been gathered by Riparius and his confrère Desiderius. It seems that the city became Christian at the beginning of the 5th c., given that the *pagan temple constructed on the "Capitol" during the imperial era was demolished around 400. A Christian church was built on this site only in 567.

M. Labrousse, *Toulouse antique des origines à l'établissement des Wisigoths*, Paris 1968 (Bibl. des Écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome 212); H. Crouzel, *Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains*: BLE 73 (1972) 125-146; Id., *Saint Exupère, évêque de Toulouse, et trois membres de son clergé selon les témoignages anciens*: Mém. de l'Acad. des Sciences, Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres de Toulouse 8,16 (1987) 177-193; J.-M. Pailler, *Domitien et la Cité de Pallas. Un tournant dans l'histoire de Toulouse antique*: Pallas 34 (1988) 99-109; A.M. Jiménez Garnica, *La coexistencia con los judíos en el reino de Tolosa*: Gerión 12 (1994) 270-278; P. Moret, *Le nom de Toulouse*: Pallas 44 (1996) 7-23; J.-Ch. Arramond - J.-L. Bondartchouk, *La destruction du temple du forum de Toulouse à la fin du IVe s.*: Aquitania 14 (1996) 31-33; Qu. Cazes, *Les nécropoles et les églises funéraires de Toulouse à la fin de l'Antiquité*: Aquitania 14 (1996) 149-151; Qu. Cazes, *Toulouse à la fin de l'Antiquité*: RivAC 73,1 (1997) 278-280.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

TOURS
I. Christianity - II. Council.

I. Christianity. Tours was the ancient Caesarodunum, the capital of the *civitas* of the Turoni. In the Late Empire it became the *civitas Turonorum,* promoted in the 2nd half of the 4th c. to the capital of the province of Lugdunensis III; then in the 6th c. it became the *Urbs Turonica.* A late tradition collected by *Gregory of Tours attributes the founding of the Turonic church to Gatianus, one of the seven missionaries sent around 250, in order to evangelize *Gaul. The historical sources, however, ignore Gatianus and present as the first bishop of Tours an individual who appears in the second place in Gregory's episcopal list: Litorius (337/338–370). The Turonic church emerged from obscurity with the successor of Litorius, *Martin (372–397): with his evangelizing activity, the fervor of his charity and his "virtues" as a thaumaturge, he gave a distinct thrust to the Christianity of Tours. Highly praised in the work of his biographer, *Sulpicius Severus, Martin's person and work served as an enduring model for all Christians enamored of asceticism. In Tours itself, after the long and mediocre episcopate of Bricius (397–442), who strove to overshadow his two illustrious predecessors, the bishops began to claim for their own church, which had become a metropolitan of an ecclesiastical province, the spiritual inheritance transmitted by Martin. Eustochius (442–458/459), *Perpetuus (458/459–488/489)—the most famous—then Volusianus (488/489–495/496) and Verus (495/496–507) worked to officially place Tours under Martin's patronage: in a large basilica, erected over his tomb, from that time onward two annual feasts were celebrated in his memory (11 November: *depositio*; 4 July: ordination). Strong in this protection, the community of Tours, when stripped from the Roman Empire and falling under the rule of the *Visigothic *Arians (471–507), remained closely connected to its *Nicene faith. Then, when the political situation allowed for it, it gave a sign of resistance to the occupier, establishing relations with the still-pagan *Franks, who had settled in the N of Loire, and, relying on their king *Clovis's conversion to *Catholicism, Volusianus and Verus called on the latter as a deliverer: both men were repaid for this initiative with a sentence of exile. It was their successor, *Licinius (507–519), who received Clovis at Tours, in 508, who in the meantime was baptized, after the recent triumph over the Visigoths. The Frankish king, putting on the purple tunic and the diadem sent by the Eastern emperor *Anastasius in the basilica of Martin, did homage to Martin for his victory. But Clovis's successors, desiring to protect a city so precious, arrogated to themselves the right of appointing the prelates of Tours. Martin's see then experienced a long dark period, under the short-sighted leadership of old and compliant bishops: Theodore and Proculus (519–521), Dinifius (521–522), Ommatius (522–526), Leo (526), Francilio (526–529), Injuriosus (529–546), Baudinus (546–552) and Gun-

thar (552–555). But Eufronius (556–573) and esp. *Gregory the bishop-historian were able to restore to the church its independence and prestige. During Gregory's time, despite the wars and natural disasters, Tours shined with its most lively splendor, appearing as Martin's city par excellence. The organization of pilgrimages contributed to the success of this initiative, which was begun by Perpetuus and brought to completion by Gregory. By making known, through their writings or those of the contemporary poets, the ongoing miracles of Martin at his tomb, the bishops attracted an increasing number of pilgrims. The city at the end of the 6th c. became the largest center of pilgrimage in Gaul.

In this period, Martin's memory visibly adds to the topography of Tours; remodeled according to the scheme of a spiritual geography, Tours also appears from this point of view as the *Urbs Martini*. To the E, within the walls of the ancient *castrum,* tower the buildings of the episcopal complex, esp. the *ecclesia prima,* the first cathedral, built by Litorius and reconstructed by Gregory. Sanctified by the relics of the martyrs of Agaunum (from which derives the patronage of St. *Mauricius attested to since the 8th c.), it is presented esp. as the venerable sanctuary in which Martin was consecrated to the episcopate and where several "paintings" recall the most famous miracles performed by the confessor while he was still alive. To the E of the *castrum,* an early funerary basilica, erected by Litorius (St. Lidoire), was eclipsed by St. Martin's basilica, built by Perpetuus. To this vast sanctuary, adorned with "paintings," with their legends celebrating the posthumous power of the thaumaturge, flocked the multitude of the devoted, namely the faithful from Tours and pilgrims. Numerous sanctuaries were built in the shadow of St. Martin, in the atrium of the basilica (subsequently two baptisteries) or in a radius of some hundreds of meters (basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul; the monastery of St. Venantius). Thus before the ancient *castrum,* a new urban center began to form that later would adopt the significant name of *Martinopolis*. Already between these two poles of the life of Tours appeared the first rings of a web that would subsequently reunite, esp. with the construction, at the time of Gregory, of the monastic basilica dedicated to St. *Julian of Brioude. Finally, on the right bank of the Loire, the monastery, once founded by Martin, became the *Maius Monasterium* (Marmoutier), the largest monastic complex of Tours and the third pole of its Martinian geography. After Gregory's death and before the Carolingian Renaissance, Tours, through a lack of sufficiently numerous testimonies, returned to obscurity. Its bishops, for the most part, are only names transmitted to us by a signature at the bottom of a document or a conciliar act. The following bishops came after Pelagius, the successor of Gregory, in the 7th c.: Leupacarius (before 609–before 614), Egiric (616), Gwalac, Sigilaic, Leubald, Medigisilus (before 627–after 638), Latinus (650), Caregiselus, Rigobert (654), Papolenus, Chrodobert (before 668–after 672), Bertus (before 680–after 688), Peladius, Ebarcius (696/698); we also know of the following bishops who worked in the city of Tours in the 1st half of the 8th c.: Ibbo (ca. 710), Gumtramnus, Dido, Ragambert, Audbert, Ostald and Eusebius (757–762).

Duchesne, *Fastes* II, 283-312; var. aus., *Mémorial de l'année martinienne*, Paris 1962; *Histoire religieuse de la Touraine* (under the direction of S. Oury), Tours 1975; L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IV^e au VI^e s.: naissance d'une cité chrétienne*, Rome 1983; N. Gauthier, *L'évêque Martin et la ville de Tours*: RHEF 82 (1996) 249-262.

L. Pietri

II. Council. Many bishops from the province of Tours and the neighboring provinces (Bourges [Bituriga], Le Mans [Cenomannis]) gathered on 18 November 461 for the feast of St. Martin, and during the occasion they promulgated 13 disciplinary canons pertaining to the duties of the clergy (chastity, sobriety, permanence and selflessness), consecrated virgins and penitents.

CCL 148, 142-149; Hfl-Lecl II, 898ff.; Palazzini 5, 371.

Ch. Munier

TRACTATUS. *Tractare-tractatus. Tractare* is a verb that through time had a large gamut of meanings. In secular language, it meant "treating something verbally" or "through writing," to give an "oral" or "written" exposition and, in a figurative sense, "speaking of," and even "studying a text," "to research," "to examine" and "to reflect." Within the writings of Christian authors, starting from *Tertullian, the term meant "to discuss"; the expression *sermone tractare* meant "to express with the word." In the writings of *Cyprian, the verb *tractare* indicates "to exercise the ministry of the word," "to preach" in an absolute sense, and is not very far from *docere* (see Cypr., *Ep.* 55,14,1). This meaning is also found in the *Acta Mariani et Iacobi,* and in the writings of *Optatus of Milevis, *Paulinus of Nola (see *Vita Ambrosii* 17,18,23), *Augustine and other authors. In the *Sacramentarium gregorianum,* the verb *tractare* means "to celebrate the *Eucharist." But one should not forget that even in the writings of Christian authors the

verb *tractare* continued to mean "to speak." The term *tractatus* follows, at least partially, the verb in its most common meaning, although acquiring new meanings along its journey in Christian language. In fact, in Tertullian's writings it was also applied to trinitarian language as "a treatment aimed at shedding light on the unity of the three persons"; in the writings of Cyprian, it acquired the sense of "episcopal gathering," "counsel" and "council." Much more frequently, however, *tractatus,* following the course taken by the verb, signified "homily," "sermon"—this is the case in the writings of *Ambrose and Augustine—or even, at times, "catechetical preaching" (see Ambr., *De sacr.* 3,2,15); but, inasmuch as the source of teaching is Sacred *Scripture, *tractatus* came to mean "scriptural commentary," "exegetical treatise" (one thinks of, for example, the *Tractatus in Cantica Cantocorum* or the *Tractatus in Sacram Scripturam* written by *Gregory of Elvira), and *tractator divinarum Scripturarum* designates one as a "commentator of the holy books" (just as the phrase *tractare* indicates the explanation of a biblical passage) and not rarely does it refer to the explanation or the commentary on the sacred text heard during the *lectio* in the 1st half of the liturgical synaxis (see Ambr., *Ep.* 20,4; *De off.* I,99-101). Moreover, it is necessary to recall that often the "exegetical commentary" emerges as a preparation for homiletical activity or is its result.

G. Bardy, *Tractatus*, *tractare:* RecSR 33 (1946) 211-235; Ch. Mohrmann, *Praedicare-Tractare-Sermo. Essai sur la terminologie de la prédication paléochrétienne*: La MaisonD. 39 (1954) 97-107 (repr. in *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens*, II, Rome 1961, 63-72), A.F. Memoli, *Originalità, fortuna e arte di un nuovo genere letterario: il sermone latino cristiano*, in *Studi sulla prosa d'arte negli scrittori cristiani*, Naples 1979, 56-78, F.J. Tovar Paz, *Tractatus, sermones atque homiliae: el cultivo del género literario del discurso homilético en la Hispania tardoantigua y visigótica*, Cáceres 1994.

P. Siniscalco

TRACTATUS CONTRA ARIANOS. This is the name usually assigned to a long passage from an anti-*Arian work written by an anonymous author included within the famous codex *Vindobonensis* 2160, containing part of *Hilary of Poitiers's *De Trinitate*. The unknown author sets forth several difficulties to the Arians that arise from believing that the Son is a creature and a different substance from the Father. The fragment seems to be a document written before the end of the 4th c.

CPL 748a; CPPM II, 1427; PLS 1, 1544-1548; H.S. Sedlmayer, *Der Tractatus contra Arianos in der Wiener Hilarius-Handschrift*: SAW 146, 2 (1903) 1-18; G. Morin, ibid. 18-21; Id., *Deux fragments d'un Traité contre les Ariens attribués parfois à St. Hilaire*: RBen 20 (1903) 125-131; C. Martini, *Ambrosiaster*, Rome 1944, 189-194; Id., *Sei frammenti del De fide trinitatis di Pelagio*: Ricerche Rel. 20 (1949) 35-64.

M. Simonetti

TRADITIO LEGIS ET CLAVIUM (iconography). The scenes of the *traditio legis* and the *traditio clavium* are placed within the repertoire of the thematic solutions that have as a basic schema the ternary composition of Christ-*Peter-*Paul. The representation of the *traditio legis,* the act of entrusting the law to one of the chief apostles, most frequently Peter, does not find precise correspondence in the scriptural tradition, although developing, through semantic enhancement, the OT theme of the giving of the law to *Moses; it is exhibited in the panorama of Christian iconography around the mid-4th c. as a completely new formulation revealing meanings, whose numerous attestations in the figurative arts conform, for the most part, to a fixed schematic elaboration, with few variants of great importance. The figure of Christ constitutes the center of the composition, and on his sides, in an often heavily pyramidal articulation, are the two apostles, generally Peter to the left and Paul to the right: Christ, with or without a beard, clothed in a tunic and a pallium like Peter and Paul, is depicted seated on the throne or rather, more often, standing on the mount of paradise from which emerges four rivers. He has his right hand lifted up in the act of speaking and with the left holds the border of an open *volumen,* on which, at times, was transcribed the expression *Dominus legem dat* and which is received by Peter with hands veiled by his pallium. For the apostle almost always carries, resting on his shoulder, a processional or monogrammatic cross, a sign of his triumph over death through *martyrdom. On the opposite side, Paul, by his ever well-defined physiognomy, completes with his right hand the gesture of *acclamatio,* a demonstration of reverence and wonder, while with his left he clasps a scroll or holds the edge of the pallium. The setting of the scene in an extraterrestrial *habitat* is emphasized by the presence of two date palms on the sides of the composition; on the branches of the first palm on the shoulder of the apostle Paul is the *phoenix, the mythical bird that strengthens the symbolic role performed by the trees. For the completion of the scene, almost systematically, in the lower register, the eschatological theme of the *Agnus Dei is developed, which evokes the expiatory sacrifice, the Paschal victim, depicted in the axial position with respect to the fig-

ure of Christ on the mount of paradise with the two groups of angels on his sides in various numbers (one, two, three or six), a zoomorphic reinterpretation of the apostolic college, which emerges from the two *ecclesiae* of Bethlehem and Jerusalem, placed, in the tectonic organization of the scene, in correspondence to the two palms.

The thematic choice of the *traditio legis* characterizes figurative handmade objects of a different typology created for the decoration of the buildings, and for products pertaining to funerary plastic art, and objects that could be framed within the so-called minor arts. Representations on mosaics have been preserved in the mausoleum of *Constantia at *Rome, which was constructed in the final years of the 1st half of the 4th c., esp. in the S apse, where the anomalies with respect to the scheme delineated (the lack of the Agnus Dei under the feet of Christ and the phoenix on the palm, the presence of the three rivers from the mount of paradise, a unique "virga," most likely the remains of a cross, in Peter's left hand, and perhaps even the fourfold number of lambs) are probably to be ascribed to the extensive tampering during repeated restorations (Stanley). Mosaics of the *traditio legis* can also be found in the baptistery of the cathedral of *Naples (Maier), which is from a time shortly thereafter. Here the scene, containing gaps to the left, displays a slope of the pavilion vault and is developed in a simplified but solemn design, with Christ standing on the globe, an element that emphasizes the universality of the event, in the act of offering the scroll unfolded to a deferent and cross-bearing Peter. An image of the *traditio legis* also decorates, in a stucco version, a niche of the *Ravenna baptistery of the Orthodox, decorated by Bishop Neo (451–475), with the three figures organized according to a pyramidal layout that adapts itself perfectly to the surface condition by the underlying tympanum. Christ is depicted there as beardless and seated on his throne. He bears in his left hand a processional cross and grants to Peter with his right the scroll, while on the left Paul is in the act of acclamation. In a painting, an image of the *traditio legis* adorns an arcosolium of the catacomb *ad decimum* of Grottaferrata (Rome), which is also datable to the end of the 4th c. This work presents some variants for the most widely used schema: Christ proceeds on a carpet of clouds and presents, at the sides of his head, the apostolic letters *alpha* and *omega,* although on the other side, the divine hand bears the conqueror's crown. In a room of the underground complex of *Priscilla at Rome, there is perhaps an analogous representation to one at Naples, with Christ standing on a globe, which is documented by a drawing made from memory by Wilpert before its collapse, while a later version, presumably of the late 6th c., was drawn in the Neapolitan catacomb of San Gennaro (Ciavolino).

A particular spreading of the theme should be identified in the repertory of *sarcophagi produced in the final decades of the 4th c. and at the beginning of the subsequent century by Roman and Gallic workshops, which can be attributed essentially to the typologies "for the columns" or "for the city gates," in which the succession of niches often invited artists to develop scenes containing the entire apostolic college which participated in the act of acclamation. The first group are the specimens which are universally recognized as the oldest preserved formulations of the *traditio legis*; the Lateran 174 (*Repertorium* I,677), dated around the year 360, reveals a clear thematic development of the scheme that had already been experimented with, namely the one with Christ on the throne sitting among the apostles. In fact, a beardless Christ is depicted as seated with his right hand bent and with his feet on the personification of Heaven, a nexus that seems to constitute a *unicum* in the extant repertory. On a fragment from the Metropolitan Museum of New York, which is to be dated around 370, the Lord is standing and wearing a beard on the mount of paradise, but lacking are the palms for the completion of the scene, which do, however, appear in the virtually contemporaneous sarcophagus from the catacomb of S. Sebastiano in Rome (*Repertorium* I,1,200), in which the image is also enriched by other formative elements, the Agnus Dei bearing the image of the cross to the left of Christ and the phoenix on the palm parallel to Paul. To the group of sarcophagi "at the doors of the city" belong exemplars of great importance such as that of St. *Ambrose at Milan, the Borghese sarcophagus of the Louvre Museum, Flavius Gorgonius at the Museo Diocesano di Ancona, and the chapel of St. Metrias in the Cathedral of San Salvatore at Aix-en-Provence (Sansoni), which could be dated within the two last decades of the 4th c. and the 1st years of the 5th, which apply the complete canonical model, placing, it has been said, the three chief individuals before the apostolic college. At Christ's feet the new element, evidently tied to the wealthiest customer base for these handmade objects, is made up of the presence of two deceased donors in *proskynēsis* (Gk. "adoration, worship"). To the same chronological horizon of the sarcophagi also belongs the well-known engraved slab of the Anagni coming from the Roman catacomb of the Jordani and attributed to ca. 390, on which the rendering of the theme repeats the complete schema of

all its elements, with the special detail that the three rivers, instead of four, cross the mountain on which the Agnus Dei is standing.

Numerous examples of representations of the *traditio legis* also come from the minor arts, on products of inscribed glass or gold leaf, metal (medallions of devotion and esp. small bronze statues) and ivory, sometimes fully restoring the compositional complexity such as the images to be seen (1) on the cover of the ivory casket of Samagher (Fink), (2) on the small marble box found in church of S. Giovanni Battista at Ravenna (Bartoccini), (3) on a circular fragmentary array found at Trier (Binsfeld) or (4) on a gilded glass at the Vatican Museum (Testini, *L'iconografia degli apostoli*, Catalogo n. 196; on this object there is a division by a line into two sectors: the upper one with Christ between Peter and Paul, the lower one with the Agnus Dei on the mountain between the lambs and the *ecclesiae*, with the legends IERUSALE-IORDANES-BECLE clearly recalling a large-scale apsidal decoration). More often this is seen through simplified formulations adapted to the reduced surfaces of the objects.

An extensive debate is connected to the interpretation of the theme with respect to the definition of the complex ideology which is its basis, in which deeper ecclesiological meanings, theological and institutional objectives, and evident eschatological values converge: more than a simple iconographic tradition of the idea of Petrine primacy, the *traditio legis* suggests and develops, through a heavily symbolic language loaded with apocalyptic evocations, the concept of divine sovereignty, the *mandatum* entrusted by Christ to the church, represented esp. by Peter, the depository of the teaching and the guarantee of its unquestionable legislative value. The *lex,* to be understood here, therefore, as suggested by Wilpert, as the "sum of the precepts and articles of faith in Christ" (Wilpert, I,47), introduces to the journey of salvation the advent of the new world, the *parousia of Christ. Thus on the lantern found at Rome on the Caelian Hill and preserved at Florence, a gift from Valerius Severus Eutropius for his baptism, according to de Rossi, in the absence of the representation with the *traditio legis,* the role of recalling is assigned to the inscription *Dominus legem dat Valerio Severi Eutropi vivas,* which reinforces the image of the *orans* within the mystical ship, an *allegory of the church. Moreover, one should keep in mind that precisely such a strong potential of ideological suggestions inherent within the iconographic formulation found an immediate connection with the lofty patronage that characterized many of the works pertaining to the scenes of the *traditio legis,* esp. the sarcophagi belonging to prestigious administrators within the senatorial aristocracy which were placed in privilieged contexts, as at Rome, in the structures of St. Peter's, St. Paul's and the catacomb of St. Sebastian.

Under the profile of the formal articulation of the language of the signs and the attributes, the sign of the *traditio legis* draws in toto on the courtly and ceremonial iconography of the court. Christ is depicted as standing as an emperor who fulfills the act of the *adlocutio* or seated on a throne. Peter takes the law with veiled hands, as was the duty of receiving from the sacred person of a sovereign. Paul evokes the gestural expressiveness that was specific to the senators in the ceremony of the *acclamatio.* All these are elements of a secular ritual, nourished by theocratic perspectives, widely documented in the repertory of late imperial figurative art. Thus, for example, the relief with the *largitio* from the Arch of *Constantine, constantly flanked by the image of the *traditio legis* and in the various scenes of the investiture or the commissioning of duties, among which the *traditio legis* on the missorium of *Theodosius I, with the emperor between *Honorius and *Arcadius, who entrusts a scroll to a dignitary, constitutes a significant testimony.

The natural place of the first formulations of the *traditio legis* must be considered, therefore, as Constantinian and post-Constantinian Rome, in which the political and ideological scene reveals deep interferences in the institutional order of the church owed on the one hand to heresies (*Arianism had esp. won an important boost from *Constantius II's victory over Magnentius in 553), and on the other to the reorganization of *paganism through work of *Julian the Apostate, phenomena in relation to which the papacy brings to maturity that program of the gradual consolidation of the Roman church's power which culminated in the Decree of *Thessalonica (380). Within this framework, the debated reading on the scroll of the mosaic of the mausoleum of *Constantia with the variant *Dominus pacem dat* ("the Lord grants peace") can appear significant. This is an expression that bears, according to Testini (*La lapide di Anagni,* 731), legends of the coins made by the emperors from the 2nd half of the 4th c., but that is somehow individually repeated in a much later work. In Farfa Abbey the pictorial cycle attributed to the 11th c. (Markthaler, 80) in fact includes a scene of the *traditio legis,* within which the inscription on the scroll *D*(*omi*)*n*(*u*)*s lege*(*m*) *dad* [*sic*] is extended with the addition of the biblical passage from Jn 14:27 *pac*(*em*) *mea*(*m*) *do vo*(*bis*) ("my peace I give unto you").

Wilpert's hypothesis posited that the *traditio legis* was placed in a baptisterial context (47 and 175; the scholar had supposed that a scene of the *traditio legis* decorated the Lateran baptistery)—a hypothesis adopted by some (Thérel) but opposed by many. De Francovich supposed another sort of liturgical room. For the origin of the theme one must most likely go back to a funerary and martyrial context. For many scholars (Kollwitz, Schumacher) the first formulation of the *traditio legis,* the essential model for the reiteration and the development of the theme, decorated the apse of the Constantinian basilica (Ruysschaert). Others (Sotomayor, Testini, Recio Veganzones and Bisconti) have preferred to attribute the formative process of the image to the image workshops for sarcophagi, where the ternary compositive schema Christ-Peter-Paul had already found extensive experimentation and application in handmade objects with scenes of the "passion" produced in the preceding decades.

Developed, therefore, in a Roman milieu, the theme of the *traditio legis* was widespread throughout the West (from Tunisia comes an interesting sarcophagus, information on which has been published by Bejaoui), entering as well, though to a lesser extent, the figurative repertory of the Eastern workshops, as evidenced, for example, by a silver reliquary from the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki discovered at Nea Herakleia (Buschhausen, n. B12). To these workshops, one generally attributes the genesis of a varied formulation of the *traditio legis,* with the entrusting of the law to Paul, who, at the right hand of Christ seated on a throne, collects a closed scroll with his veiled hands. Such a thematic explanation, certainly later by several decades to the *traditio legis* containing the image of the apostle Peter, is present on some sarcophagi from Ravenna, those of the twelve apostles in the basilica of S. Apollinare in Classe, which is dated around 440, and Liberius from the church of St. Francis (De Francovich), in addition to the presence of the *traditio legis* on smaller objects such as the bronze situla discovered near the basilica of S. Marco at Rome and now in the Vatican Museum (Testini, *L'iconografia degli apostoli*, Catalogo n. 70), and a table with a trim decorated with many figures (Pani Ermini), all artifacts traceable to workshops under the influence of Constantinople. These objects, rather than expressing a desire to oppose Rome—an anachronistic idea for the era of the production of such works within the 5th c. and an idea that was presupposed in the past—seem to reflect devotional movements directed toward emphasis on the figure of Paul.

A particular case in the repertory of the scenes of the *traditio legis* is represented by the Ravenna sarcophagus of S. Maria in Porto: the personage who receives the law with hands veiled, in fact, is identified with Paul in the upper part and Peter in the lower, according to Testini (*L'apostolo Paolo*) through a voluntary typological mixing of the two apostles, which inserted a simultaneous *traditio legis,* which was, on account of its thematic meaning, analogous to the one on a fresco discovered in 1689 at the bottom of the Caelian Hill and attributed to Pope Formosus (891–896), with the conferring of the law to Peter and Paul (de Rossi, *Utensili cristiani*).

The same constituent model of the *traditio legis* was also adopted through the iconographic definition of the scene of the bestowal of the keys to Peter, which translates the passage from Mt 16:19: *Tibi dabo claves regni coelorum* ("I shall grant to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven"), with Christ depicted in the act of extending one or two keys and the apostle who reverently receives them, with hands veiled or holding a receptacle, the flag of the *ianitor aethereus,* as he is called by the poet Blossius Aemilius *Dracontius (PL 60,857). The connection with the theme of the transmission of the law, which is completed by the *traditio clavium* and empowers the symbolic message, is well evident from the association of the two images on the most ancient monuments. Thus in the Mausoleum of Constantia, where the N apsidiole bears the representation on a mosaic, which has been very compromised by acts of restoration, of Christ seated on a globe between palms with a scroll in his left hand, and who with his right hand extends to Peter perhaps one key (the subsequent integrations have reduced a singular triangular element; for a different interpretation of the same image, see Théral), and the sarcophagus *Repertorium* I,200 from St. Sebastian and in that of Gregory V from the Vatican Basilica (*Repertorium* I,676), both datable to the last third of the 4th c. Likewise in the Ravenna sarcophagus of the twelve apostles, the presence of Peter with the attribute of the key alongside the cross intends to express a device that empowers the basic image of the bestowal to Paul, valuing, through the symbol of investiture, the figure of the apostle. Conversely, a synthetic reference to the *traditio legis* must be identified in the depiction of a sarcophagus from Civita Castellana (Ranucci Rossi), where at the feet of Christ, who places the key in a receptacle held out by Peter, are two *volumina* that recall the incisiveness of the magisterium through the apostle, the legal head of the church and the guarantor of the process of salvation.

Therefore, even in its autonomous formation, the

traditio clavium is attested to almost entirely in funerary contexts, esp. on sarcophagi, which can be traced to Roman and Gallic manufacturers and datable within the 5th c., but also in painting, as revealed by the frescoes preserved in the small basilica of Sts. Felix and Adauctus at Commodilla, which is attributed to the 2nd half of the 7th c. (Deckers - Mietke - Weiland). In the minor arts a silver amulet preserved at the British Museum (Testini, *L'iconografia degli apostoli,* Catalogo n. 55), a work from the 5th/6th c. repeats the simple constituent schema of the plastic art: Christ, young and standing, is faced by Peter, who receives with veiled hands a large key; nevertheless, the development of the theme, from the 5th c., is marked by the reduction of the original binary articulation to the sole image of Peter the key bearer, which was widespread esp. in the decoration of the ivory diptychs and small objects.

G.B. de Rossi, *Utensili cristiani scoperti a Porto*: BACr I, 6 (1868) 42-43; Id., *Le medaglie di devozione dei primi sei o sette secoli della chiesa*: BACr I, 7 (1869) 43-45; Id., *Notizie. Roma e Modena. Medaglie di devozione*: BACr II, 2 (1871) 150-151; Id., *Nuove scoperte nel cimitero di Priscilla er le escavazioni fatte nell'a. 1887*: BACr IV, 5 (1887) 23-29, pl. VII; J. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane*, Rome 1903; P. Markthaler, *Sulle recenti scoperte nell'abbazia imperiale di Farfa*: RivAC 5 (1928) 37-88; R. Bartoccini, *Notizie. La capsella marmorea di Ravenna*: RivAC 7 (1930) 299-302; J. Kollwitz, *Christus als Lehrer und die Gesetzesübergabe an Petrus in der konstantinischen K. Roms*: Römische Quartalschrift 44 (1936) 45-66; G. Greselin, *Frammenti inediti di sarcofagi antichi del Regio Museo di Aquileia*: RivAC 14 (1937) 227-241; L. de Bruyne, *Notizie. Frammento di sarcofago con resti di una "traditio legis" scoperto a San Sebastiano sulla via Appia*: RivAC 16 (1939) 337-345; G. De Francovich, *Studi sulla scultura ravennate,* I. *I sarcofagi*: Felix Ravenna 77-78 (1958) 5-171; W.N. Schumacher, *"Dominus legem dat"*: Römische Quartalschrift 54 (1959) 1-39; W.N. Schumacher, *Eine römische Apsiskomposition*: Römische Quartalschrift 54 (1959) 137-202; C. Davis-Weyer, *Das* Traditio-Legis-*Bild und seine Nachfolge*: Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst 12 (1961) 7-45; M. Sotomayor, *Über die Herkunft der "traditio legis"*: Römische Quartalschrift 56 (1961) 215-230; Y.-M.-J. Congar, *Le thème du "don de la loi" dans l'art paléochrétien:* NRTh 94 (1962) 915-933; M. Sotomayor, *S. Pedro en la iconografia paleocristiana*, Granada 1962; P. Vallin, *"Dominus pacem dat." À propos du mausolée de Constantina à Rome*: RecSR 51 (1963) 579-592; J.L. Maier, *Le baptistère de Naples et ses mosaïques. Étude historique et iconographique*, Fribourg 1964, 108-120, pl. VIII; G. Bovini, *Un frammento inedito di sarcofago paleocristiano con resti della scena della "traditio legis" nel Museo Civico di Rimini*, in *Miscellanea di studi dedicati a E. Várady*, Modena 1966, 1-7; F.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg, Repertorium *der christlich-antiken Sarkophage.* I. *Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967; J. Ruysschaert, *L'inscription absidale primitive de S.-Pierre. Texte et contextes*: Rend. PARA 40 (1967-68) 171-190; P. Testini, *Gli apostoli Pietro e Paolo nella più antica iconografia cristiana*, in *Studi petriani*, ed. S. Garofalo et al., Rome 1968, 103-130; G. Montanari, *I dodici Apostoli nei monumenti ravennati.* Traditio legis *e collegialità*, in *Atti dei convegni di Cesena e Ravenna (1966-1967)*, I, Cesena 1969, 337-369; F. Nikolasch, *Zur Deutung der "Dominus-legem-dat"-Szene*: Römische Quartalschrift 64 (1969) 35-73; R. Sansoni, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani a porte di città*, Bologna 1969; P. Testini, *L'apostolo Paolo nell'iconografia cristiana fino al VI secolo*, in *Studi paolini*, Rome 1969, 69-72; P. Testini, *L'iconografia degli apostoli Pietro e Paolo nelle cosiddette "arti minori,"* in *Saecularia Petri et Pauli.* Conferenze per il centenario del martirio degli apostoli Pietro e Paolo tenute nel Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, Vatican City 1969, 241-323; H. Buschhausen, *Die spätrömischen Metalscrinia und frühchristlichen Reliquiare.* I Teil: *Katalog*, Vienna 1971; P. Franke, *"Traditio legis" und Petrusprimat. Eine Entgegung auf Franz Nikolasch*: VChr 26 (1972) 263-271; J. Poeschke, s.v. *Schlüsselübergabe an Petrus*: LCI 4, 82-85; W.N. Schumacher, s.v. *Traditio legis*: LCI 4, 347-351; P. Borraccino, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani di Marsiglia*, Bologna 1973, 59-65; K. Berger, *Der traditiongeschichtliche Ursprung der traditio legis*: VChr 27 (1973) 104-122; Y. Christe, *Victoria - Imperium - Iudicium. Un schème antique du pouvoir dans l'art paléochrétien et médiéval*: RivAC 49 (1973) 87-109; M.-L. Thérel, *Les symboles de l' "ecclesia" dans la création iconographique de l'art chrétien du III^e au VI^e siècle*, Rome 1973, 75-101; P. Testini, *La lapide di Anagni con la "traditio legis." Nota sull'origine del tema*: RivAC 25-26 (1973–74) 718-740; Y. Christe, *Apocalypse et "traditio legis"*: Römische Quartalschrift 71 (1976) 42-55; J. Fink, *Das Petrusreliquiar von Samagher*: Römische Quartalschrift 71 (1976) 22-41; Ch. Pietri, *Roma christiana. Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)*, Rome 1976, 1414-1445; L. Pani Ermini, *Una mensa paleocristiana con bordo istoriato*: Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte 1 (1978) 89-117; F. Bisconti, *Lastra incisa inedita della catacomba di Priscilla (con note di revisione critica sul metodo di individuazione della fenice nell'arte paleocristiana)*: RivAC 57 (1981) 60-61; A. Recio Veganzones, *Las pinturas de la catacumba* "ad decimum" *de Grottaferrata*: RivAC 59 (1983) 363-409; A. Recio Veganzones, *Sarcófago paleocristiano y parte de otro pagano en la fachada de la basílica de la abadía de Farfa*: RivAC 61 (1985) 77-112; R. Sörries, *Das Bild des Christus-Rex in der Sarkophagplastik des vierten Jahrhunderts*, in *Studien fur frühchristilichen Kunst II* (ed. G. Koch), Wiesbaden 1986, 139-159; W. Binsfeld, *Eine frühchristiliche Darstellung in Trier*: Trierer Zeitschrift 50 (1987) 293-299; D.J. Stanley, *The Apse Mosaics at Santa Costanza: Observations on Restorations and Antique Mosaics*: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung 94 (1987) 29-42; G. Cantino Wataghin, *La trasmissione del potere: traditio imperii, traditio legis*, in *Civiltà dei Romani. Un linguaggio comune*, ed. S. Settis, Milan 1993, 62-75; J. Deckers - G. Mietke - A. Weiland, *Die Katakombe "Commodilla." Repertorium der Malereien. Mit einen Beitrag zu Geschichte und Topographie von C. Carletti*, Vatican City 1994, 50-57, Farbtaf. 3a; F. Bisconti, s.v. *Paolo* and s.v. *Pietro*: EAM 9, 152-156, 393-397; C. Ranucci Rossi, *Gesti ed atteggiamenti nella plastica paleocristiana: note sul sarcofago di Civita Castellana*: RivAC 74 (1998) 297-310; M.B. Rassmussen, *Traditio legis?*: CArch 44 (1999) 5-37; L. Spera, s.v. *Traditio legis et clavium*: TIP 288-293; M.B. Rassmussen, Traditio legis - *Bedeutung und Kontext*: Acta Hyperborea 8 (2001) 21-52; F. Bejaoui, *Le sarcophage de Lemta*, in *Akten des Symposiums "Frühchristliche Sarkophage"* (Marburg, 30.VI–4.VII.1999), Mainz 2002, 13-27; F. Bisconti, *Variazioni sul tema della* Traditio legis. *Vecchie e nuove acquisizioni*: VetChr 40 (2003) 251-270; N. Ciavolino, *Scavi e scoperte di archeologia cristiana in Campania dal 1983 al 1993*, in Atti del VII Congr. Naz. di Arch. Cristiana (Cassino, 20–24 settembre 1993), Cassino 2003, 657-659; E. Canetri, *Nota sulla ricostruzione del sarcofago della 'Traditio Legis' nel Museo di S. Sebastiano a Roma*, in *Sarcofagi tardoantichi, paleocristiani e altomedievali*, ed. F. Bisconti e H. Brandenburg, Vatican City 2004,

185-199; B. Snelders, *The Traditio Legis on Early Christian Sarcophagi*: Antiquité tardive 13 (2005) 321-333; L. Hodne, *The "Double Apostolate" as an Image of the Church: A Study of Early Medieval Apse Mosaic in Rome*: Acta ad Archeol. et Artium Hist. Pert. 20 (2006) 143-162.

L. Spera

TRADITION. Faced with the question of tradition in the ancient church, we must first recall that the *canon of the NT was not formed until the end of the 2nd c. If we set aside the OT, which by this point had already received its definitive canonical form and therefore did not pose a problem of tradition, but only interpretation, there was therefore, during this long interval of 200 years, no "*Scripture" alongside "tradition," but instead the totality of the preaching and teaching that referred to *Jesus and the *apostles constituted "tradition," παράδοσις.

We therefore seek to trace the steps in the evolution of this idea during this era. From the chronological point of view, the Pauline come first. O. Cullmann brought forth convincing arguments that in the writings of the apostle Paul a twofold conception of tradition is found: on the one hand, inasmuch as he was a theologian who received his training in the school of the rabbis, he faithfully transmitted the tradition that he himself had received; on the other hand, inasmuch as he was an apostle who had received his mission from the Risen Lord, he considered himself vested with the power of transmitting this tradition with the authority of the living Lord himself (see 1 Cor 11:23-24; 15:1-4). The Lord Jesus is therefore not just the object but also the acting subject of the preaching. Now, it is precisely because of the apostle's awareness of his own authority, conferred by the *Holy Spirit, that Paul tends to distinguish clearly between the tradition received and its explanation and application, which can and must change according to concrete circumstances (see 1 Cor 7:10-12:25, 40). L. Goppelt has esp. insisted on this "hierarchy" of the traditions in the apostle's writings.

During the "pseudepigraphal" period that followed and that went from ca. AD 60 to 120, the canonical gospels were drafted just as the so-called deuteropauline and Catholic Epistles were. These writings are characterized by the same desire to speak in the name of the apostolic authority that faithfully transmitted the tradition, but they do not hesitate to apply it freely and sovereignly, according to the needs of preaching and exhortation. In relation to what we see in the Pauline writings, it is evident that the meaning of the hierarchy of the traditions, and hence some of the differences of value that we must attribute to them, tends to disappear; it is significant that the Pastoral Epistles, for example, only speak of the "deposit" that must be preserved as such (see 1 Tim 6:20), and we often find by this point the stereotypical formula that the tradition must be maintained "without adding or taking anything away."

In the 2nd c. the church passed through a real crisis of tradition. The generation of the apostles and their disciples, of prophets and charismatic teachers had disappeared; Christian communities were dispersed into different provinces of the empire, without being interconnected by a central court of appeals. During this precarious situation, they began to emphasize the apostolic *succession of the bishops that would guarantee the authenticity of the tradition (see *1 Clem*. 42-44), and they had recourse to such recognized authorities as the apostle Paul (see Polycarp, *Phil.* 3,2) and the presbyters (Papias, in Eus., *HE* 3,39,3-4), as well as the "rule of faith" (**regula fidei*) (see Arist., *Apol.* 15,2). Nevertheless, in face of the *gnostic movement, which was spreading rapidly and universally at this time, even if under different forms, with a clear bent toward dissolving the tradition, the Great Church, to avoid its foundations being called into question, had to find a more coherent and solid position.

It is not our objective to outline here the concept of tradition as it appears in the various gnostic schools. It suffices to say that the gnostics were not content with simply interpreting the common apostolic tradition in their own way, but they referred to a vast treasure of esoteric apostolic tradition. The gnostic writings also insist on a form of "apostolic succession" (see Ptolemy, *Epistle to Flora*, in Epiph., *Pan.* 33,7,9). *Irenaeus, *Tertullian and *Clement of Alexandria intervened at that time—each one in his own way and in a specific place—to energetically prevent gnosticism's peaceful infiltration into the church. Thanks to these theologians, the tide of gnosticism was blocked, and the church received the doctrinal pillars on which it would then be built. It is worth examining more closely the respective positions of these three Fathers on this topic.

For Irenaeus of Lyons the canon of the writings of the NT, which had recently been formed in response to *Marcion, became the chief weapon in his battle against gnosticism. But he was aware that this weapon, by itself, was not enough. He had to provide proof, moreover, that this canon of the church contained the complete and authentic apostolic tradition and also that this tradition was correctly interpreted in the church. The first proof was supplied,

in Irenaeus's eyes, by the uninterrupted succession of the bishops in the apostolic churches (see *Adv. haer.* III, praef.; 1,1; 2,1-4,1); the second proof is given by the fact that there is a perfect concordance between the "rule of faith" of the apostolic churches and their interpretation of Scripture. Irenaeus also affirmed that the bishops have received the *charisma veritatis* (*Adv. haer.* IV,26,2), but scholarly opinion is divided concerning the precise implications of this concept.

In his *De praescriptione haereticorum,* *Tertullian apparently follows the path outlined by Irenaeus, but his thought is more legal in orientation, more marked by formal logic with respect to that of his predecessor: according to Tertullian, in fact, the transmission of tradition is done within the churches that are connected to each other by relations of kinship; this transmission thus corresponds to the administration of an inheritance left by a founder, an administration that is only entrusted to the legitimate descendants, members of the family. The heretics are, on every count, usurpers; their claims can be rejected by means of *praescriptiones* (see *Praescr.* 19-21).

Lastly, *Clement of Alexandria strove to render innocuous the attraction that gnosticism exerted over certain Christians, showing that the sources of the "true gnosis" are found within the heart of traditional Christianity and that there would never be sufficient progress on the arduous path that leads to perfection; Clement thus hoped to encourage the best Christians to undertake this path (see *Strom.* VI,7,61,1-3; 15,124,3-5; 131,4-5; VII,16,103,5; 104,1-2). The Great Church, moreover, also has its "secret" apostolic tradition that is unknown to the mass of believers but was transmitted by a master to a pupil (*Strom.* I,1,11,3-12,1; *Hypotyposeis*, in Eus., *HE* 2,1,4).

With these responses, differing in detail but converging at their core, gnosticism was by that time considered as heresy. But not all the difficulties were thus solved. On another level, it was precisely during this era that there emerged another discussion. In fact, despite the value of the Scriptures, interpreted according to the norms of the rule of faith and in continuity with the apostolic origins due to the uninterrupted succession of bishops, there remained some "gray areas" that could not be filled by a simple recourse to the already established tradition. What must one think, esp., of the liturgical and disciplinary tradition of the church? Does this have the same value as the doctrinal tradition? Tertullian himself, whom we saw at work as a convinced heresiologist, once he became a Montanist, spoke for the first time of "traditions" in the plural, and meant by that some liturgical and disciplinary customs of the church that have no biblical foundation; these customs are connected to the ecclesiastical *consuetudo* and can be explained rationally (*Cor.* 3-4). To the same era are joined a series of liturgical formularies and disciplinary rules in a book known by the revealing title of **Apostolic Tradition*.

Now, we must emphasize that the church was still aware of the fact that this customary practice was not to be confused with the kerygmatic and doctrinal tradition, which alone was normative.

Two episodes from that age provide us sufficiently clear information on this matter: the first, on the one hand, was with respect to the controversy on the date of Easter at the end of the 2nd c. (see Eus., *HE* 5,24,2-6.13), and on the other, the controversy concerning the baptism of the heretics in the mid-3rd c. (see Cypr., *Ep.* 71-75). In these two cases, the bishop of *Rome—in the first case *Victor, in the second case *Stephen I—sought to impose on other churches the customary practice of their own church; in the two cases, however, the attempt was unsuccessful. First Irenaeus, then *Cyprian, *Firmilian and *Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eus., *HE* 7,3-4) argue that the bishop of Rome transgressed the limits of his competency by threatening to excommunicate sister churches that followed another tradition that was just as well established as that of the Church of Rome. The church from the end of the 2nd and the 3rd c. still tolerated a certain pluralism in liturgical and disciplinary matters. Nevertheless, it was not only in the sphere of ecclesiastical customs that there remained a "gray area" but also in the area of doctrine; it was here that personal theological research found a broad area of exercise and one which the theological schools developed. After humble and traditional beginnings in 2nd-c. apologetics (see Just., 1 *Apol.* 6,2; 10,1; 66,1), this theology first developed at *Alexandria. *Origen began his systematic investigation *On First Principles,* stating that he wanted precisely to study the questions that the "rule of faith" (*regula fidei*) had left open (see *De princ.* I, praef. 2-3; 7-8; 10). As long as the fruits of this theological search remained the private affair of a teacher and the circle of his students, the plurality of opinions posed no difficulty; but when these opinions reached the broader public, finding a large audience and also inciting opposition, it was necessary to find a general and common solution for the questions that had been raised. The church would find itself faced with this difficulty over the course of the following two centuries.

In effect, the division of the church provoked by the trinitarian debates at the beginning of the 4th c.

took on dimensions such that a new court of appeals had to be created for decisions in areas pertaining to dogmatics and discipline. This court of appeals was the ecumenical council. The particular circumstances that, following the conversion of the emperor, transformed the church of the martyrs into an institution supported by the state made it possible for the pre-Constantinian model of the provincial synod to manifest itself within the universal church. The emperor himself convoked the council, participated in the deliberations and enforced the application of the conciliar decisions. One cannot overestimate the importance of the First Ecumenical Council of *Nicaea. It was, in fact, a theological event of first importance, but it also marked a turn in the evolution of the concept of tradition and church. What made this event important was neither the number of bishops present nor the relevance of imperial protection, but rather the notable fact afterward: for the first time, and in full awareness of the implications of its act, a council formulated a doctrine that went beyond the limits of the tradition received in the church, whose exclusive norm until that time had been the testimony of the Scriptures and its interpretation that was in keeping with the rule of faith: now, however, a council had adopted the term ὁμοούσιος (*homoousios*) in the creed, a term that had no scriptural basis and that, moreover, was rather compromised by its prehistory. The disputes surrounding this crucial problem would last throughout the entire 4th c.: on the one hand, one found the *Arians and their sympathizers, who made themselves out to be the "traditionalists," and, on the other, *Athanasius and his friends, who carried out the role of the "progressives"; the latter group had to provide proof against the former that, in this particular case, a term that was nontraditional matched the "spirit" of the tradition better than did the traditional theological language (see Athan., *Ep. ad Afros* 6).

It is fascinating to see that during the same era patristic proof made its appearance in the Christian tradition. The Fathers—esp. the fathers of Nicaea—now constituted a new authority to which one must subject oneself. Their definition of the dogma of the *Trinity created a new tradition that was juxtaposed to the ancient one inasmuch as it was its correct interpretation and elucidation. Moreover, the bishops were no longer solely the guarantors and the administrators of the apostolic heritage (e.g., when facing heretical falsifications), but they were enabled—inasmuch as they were a conciliar assembly—to create a new tradition in the name of the apostolic spirit.

Athanasius decidedly made this his point of view and defended it on several occasions. But it was esp. *Basil the Great who reflected this new concept of tradition in his definition of the doctrine of the *Holy Spirit, which would find its dogmatic formulation of the Council of *Constantinople in 381. In his work *On the Holy Spirit,* Basil appealed to the liturgical customs of his church, customs derived from the trinitarian baptismal formula, in order to make the case for the *homoousia* of the Holy Spirit with the *Father and the Son. The *lex orandi* became the *lex credendi:* Basil strove, it is true, to demonstrate the ancient origins of the *lex orandi,* but at the end of the day, he began from the axiom of the "*apostolicity" of everything that the church, in its living reality animated by the Spirit, represented and confessed, and thought that it would be wrong to abolish that principle. As one can see, the nonwritten traditions that were regarded as *adiaphora* in the 3rd c. now received the consecration of the apostolicity and became constituent.

The Greek fathers after Basil of Caesarea frequently referred to 2 Th 2:15 to provide biblical justification for tradition in its twofold written and oral form (see, e.g., John Chrysostom, *In Ep. II ad Thess. hom.* 4,2; John of Damascus, *De fide orth.* IV,16). It is truly puzzling that the Eastern churches did not subsequently develop their tradition, despite the fundamental affirmation—expressed esp. by *Gregory of Nazianzus (*Oratio* 31,26-27)—that an evolution of dogma is possible. In the West, the Council of Trent would not fail to cite St. Basil, which would cause the Protestant Reformers to object to this placement of "Tradition" and "traditions" on an equal plane (see H. Beintker).

In the West, the evolution followed yet another course, in conformity to the taste of the Latin spirit for the clear and established order. On the one hand, we find here some texts that bear witness to the same regard for conciliar decisions as for the tradition of the Fathers. In particular, St. *Augustine—just as Basil of Caesarea before him—willingly attributed an apostolic origin to the ecclesiastical traditions universally spread in the church of his time (see *Bapt.* II,7,12; V,17,23; 23,31; *De Genesi ad litt.* I,10,20). On the other hand, the Fathers reflected on the criteria that allowed one to accept tradition in a critical way: what is it that allows one to distinguish authentic and acceptable tradition from inauthentic and unacceptable tradition? *Vincent of Lérins had the credit of having raised, in his *Commonitorium,* in dialogue with the Augustinian inheritance, the systematic bases that determined the concept of tradition in the West. Vincent placed Scripture above tradition without equivocation (*Comm.* 2,1-2). Now,

the correct interpretation of Scripture is not without problems and the church must have recourse to tradition (*Comm.* 2,2). Nevertheless, tradition is presented under different forms: all its aspects are not of the same value. It was in this context that Vincent articulated his definition that became famous: *Id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* ("Let us hold onto what has been believed everywhere, always and by all," *Comm.*, 2,3). It is important for understanding this definition that these three criteria of *universitas, antiquitas* and *consensio* not be placed on the same level. When the present situation of the church does not allow a debated question to be resolved by the majority of the churches in a definite sense (*ubique*), one must have recourse to tradition (*semper*); within the tradition, however, are the conciliar decisions (*ab omnibus*), which account for more than the isolated voices of the Fathers. It is evident that recourse to tradition cannot be the solution to all problems. Vincent admitted, for this reason, the possibility of a doctrinal evolution in the church (*Comm.*, 23,28). It is interesting to note the role that he, in this context, attributed to the councils (*Comm.*, 23,32). The definition of the function and authority of tradition proposed by Vincent of Lérins can still provide a valuable service in ecumenical dialogue.

DTC 15, 1252-1350; D. van den Eynde, *Les Normes de l'Enseignement Chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles*, Gembloux-Paris 1933; O. Cullmann, *La Tradition. Problème exégétique, historique et théologique*, Neuchâtel-Paris 1953 ([2]1968); E. Flesseman van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, Assen 1954; R.P.C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition*, London 1954; H.E.W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations Between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*, London 1954; L. Goppelt, *Tradition nach Paulus*: Kerygma und Dogma 4 (1958) 213-233; J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, *Traditio im theologischen Sinne*: VChr 13 (1959) 65-85; M. Kremser, *Die Bedeutung des Vincenz von Lerinum für die römischkatholische Wertung der Tradition* (Tesi), Hamburg 1959; Y. Congar, *La Tradition et les traditions. Essai historique*, Paris 1960 (Eng. trans. London 1966); H. Holstein, *La tradition dans l'Église*, Paris 1960; H. Beintker, *Die evangelische Lehre von der Heiligen Schrift und von der Tradition*, Lüneburg 1961; G.G. Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession. Studien zum Normbegriff des Apostolischen von Paulus bis Irenäus*, Berlin-Hamburg 1963; H. v. Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht*, Tübingen [2]1963; R.P.C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church*, London 1962, Philadelphia 1963; H. v. Campenhausen, *Schrift und Tradition*, Zürich 1963; B. Studer, *Träger der Vermittlung*: MySal I, Einsiedeln 1965, 545-605 (It. trans. Brescia 1968, vol. II, 69-144); J. Beumer, *La Tradition orale*, Paris 1967 (Ger. orig. 1962); G.G. Blum, *Offenbarung und Überlieferung. Die dogmatische Konstitution Dei Verbum des II. Vaticanums im Lichte altkirchlicher und moderner Theologie*, Göttingen 1971; J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, I, Chicago-London 1971; T.B. Bauer, *Das Verständnis der Tradition in der Patristik*: Kairos 20 (1978) 193-208; R.E. Person, *The Mode of Theological Decision Making at the Early Ecumenical Councils*, Basel 1978; H.J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn . . . 1979; var. aus., *La Tradition Apostolique régulatrice de la communauté ecclésiale aux premiers siècles*: L'Année canonique 23 (1979); W. Rordorf - A. Schneider, *L'évolution du concept de tradition dans l'Église ancienne*, Bern 1982; G. Gassmann, *Tradition*: Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon 4 (1996), 925-930 (bibl.); J.-G. Boeghlin, *La question de la Tradition dans la théologie catholique contemporaine*, Paris 1998; P. Grelot, *Regole e Tradizione del cristianesimo primitivo*, Casale Monf. 1998.

W. Rordorf

TRADITOR (Traitor). The substantive *traditor* was rarely used in classical Latin, contrary to the frequent use of the verb *tradere*. It generally refers to a person who handed something over. It primarily describes a negative characteristic, referring to someone who goes against the trust shown to him by one or more persons and expresses in this case the meaning similar to that of *proditor*. The term is used, among other ways, by *Tacitus in the following sense: *Quin potius interfecto traditore fortunam virtutemque suam malo omine exsolverent* ("How much better by slaying the traitor, to set free our valour and our fortune from these evil auspices!"– *Hist.* 4,24); by Anneus Florus: *Ordinataque erat in duodecim tabulis tota iustitia, cum tamen traditor fasces regio quodam furore retinebat* ("All justice had been laid out on twelve tablets when, however, a traitor retained the fasces in the lawless spirit of the kings," 1,17). Latin Christians used the term *traditor* also because the idea itself of "betrayal" was present both in the classical Greek literature (Herodotus, *Histories* 8,30; Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 94; Plato, *Laws* 9) and in Sacred *Scripture. In the OT the concept of "betrayal" was expressed, for example, in 1 Macc 12:42-13:23; 16,15-16; 2 Sam 3:27; in the NT the traitor by antonomasia was *Judas Iscariot (Lk 6:16). In the Bible the Jews are also traitors who put Christ to death and before him the prophets (Acts 7:51-53), just as those who hand their friend over to persecutors (2 Tim 3:4). In ancient Christian literature, apostates (Origen, *In Io.* 28,23) and those who denounce their parents are described in this way (Hermas, *Vis.* 2,2,2). The very term *traditor* appears very early on in Latin Christian literature, as one can perceive from this passage written by *Tertullian: *Iudam quoque aliquamdiu cum electis deputatum usque ad loculorum officium, etsi iam fraudatorem, traditorem tamen nondum, postea diabolus intravit* ("Judas likewise was for a long time reckoned among the elect and was even appointed to the office of their treasurer; he was not yet the traitor, although he was become fraudulent; but afterwards the devil

entered into him," *De an.* 11,5). Moreover, the Latin term *traditor* indicated—following the footsteps of classical Latin, also, without the negative connotation—the person who taught and passed down the elements of a subject. The term was used in this sense of teaching *alicuius materiae,* for example, by *Arnobius: *Neque enim traditor alicuius esse scientiae potis est, ut non eius quod tradit praecepta habeat cognita* ("For neither is one capable of being a teacher of any science who does not know precepts of the subject he teaches," *Adv. nat.* 3,22), and Tertullian, who describes the *traditor* as a teacher of a tradition: *Hanc nunc expostula, salvo traditionis respectu, quocumque traditore censetur* (*De cor.* 4,7).

In the context of the persecutions ordered by the emperor *Diocletian, the term *traditor* assumed a technical meaning in Roman *Africa, inasmuch as it referred to the one who had handed over the books of the Sacred *Scriptures to the Roman authorities. Starting from February 303, Diocletian ordered, among other things, to seek out and burn the sacred books (Lactantius, *De mort. persec.* 13; *Eus., *HE* 8,2,4-5). This edict was applied in Africa with special zeal. The fact of having handed over the sacred books and the liturgical furnishings (*traditio*) was considered a very grave offense in the church. A verbal record of a very careful investigation carried out at Cirta has been preserved (*Gesta apud Zenophilum*: CSEL 26,186), which describes how the search and the consignment of the books was carried out. In Africa several clerics did not offer any resistance; others (e.g., *Mensurius at *Carthage) handed over heretical works; others, however, refused to do so and suffered the consequences. At the end of the persecution some Christians who had rigorist leanings refused to enter communion with those who had given in and thus created a schism (the *Donatists; *pars Donati*) and accused the others of being *traditores*. The ordinations conferred by the bishop-*traditores* came to be seen as invalid by the Donatists (Aug., *Bapt.* 7,2). They considered themselves to be the heirs of the church of the martyrs and the saints, the only church of Christ, while they accused the Catholic church of being the church of the *traditores*, that is, of those who had handed over the Scriptures: "The Donatists insult us by calling us *traditores*" (Aug., *Bapt.* 7,2,3). "It was not permissible," therefore, "that in the church of God there be martyrs and traitors" (*Acta Saturnini* 2: ST 65, 50). The term recalled the *traditio* of Jesus by Judas Iscariot: "Judas handed over Christ in his flesh; you, taken up by spiritual madness, have handed over the gospel to the sacrilegious flames. Judas handed over the Lawgiver to the infidels; you have handed over the Law of God to human beings or, so to speak, its remains, in order to be destroyed" (Aug., *Contra litt. Petiliani* 2,8,17; *Bapt.* 7,25,48). The *traditio* was regarded as a denial of the Word of God and a voluntary placement of oneself outside the church. The Donatists regarded all Catholics as *traditores*, inasmuch as they had inherited such a *crimen* through contamination. The debates on this issue continued for more than a century; the Catholics showed that even among the first Donatists there were *traditores* and that Mensurius was not a *traditor*; but they attempted to do so in vain. For the Donatists the sacraments (baptism, ordination) administered by the *traditores*, or by those who had remained in union with them (there is a physical contamination in the transmission of evil), were invalid. The *traditores* drew on the water of baptism not from the "living stream" of Christ but from "dry cisterns" (Jer 2:13; see Aug., *Adversus donatistas* 4,9,1; 7,2,3). The Donatist church enjoyed widespread diffusion in Africa: 270 Donatist bishops gathered at Carthage in 336 (see Aug., *Ep.* 93,10,43: CSEL 34,486); and 310 bishops at Bagai in 394 (see Aug., *Contra Cresconium* III,52,58: CSEL 52,463). Only in the conference of 411 at Carthage were the conditions for overcoming the African schism laid down in principle.

BA 31, 839-842; 32, 705-706; C. Lepelley, *Augustin et la cité romano-africaine*, in *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin*, Actes du Colloque de Chantilly, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris 1975, 13-39; B. Kriegbaum, *Kirche der Traditoren oder Kirche der Märtyrer? Die Vorgeschichte des Donatismus*, Innsbruck-Vienna 1986; Y. Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne: les premiers échos de la grande persécution*, Paris 2000; E. Zocca, *Dai Santi al Santo: un percorso storico-culturale intorno all'idea di santità* (*Africa romana, secc. 2.-5.*), Rome 2003.

W. Turek

TRADUCIANISM. In Antiquity traducianism was set forth as one of the solutions to the problem of the soul's origin: (1) originated from matter which is destroyed at the end of each cyclic conflagration (*Stoicism); (2) created before the birth of each human being and therefore preexistent to its fall in the body (*Platonism); (3) created simultaneously with the body (Christian creationism) or transmitted through generation simultaneously with the body (traducianism both of the material and the spiritual nature, also called in modern times "generationism"). In the writings of Christian authors before the 5th c., esp. *Tertullian (*De anima*) for the West and *Apollinaris (ps.-Athan., *C. Apoll.* 2,8: PG 26, 1143) and *Gregory of Nyssa (*De hom. opif.* 29) for the East, traducianism was connected to the conception of the "corporeal substance" of the soul, even if such

corporality was different from what commonly falls under the experience of the senses. Traducianism drew attention in the 5th c., and esp. in the West, following the controversy with *Pelagianism over original *sin and its transmission to each of *Adam's descendants. For the Pelagians (esp. *Julian of Eclanum), acknowledging the transmission of original sin involved the acceptance of the thesis of the traducianism of the soul, in opposition to the established Christian doctrine of creationism. The circle of the Roman Origenists, connected to powerful families of that time, over which Pelagius was head, had already produced *Rufinus's *Liber de fide,* an antitraducianist work. Those who believed in original sin were called, acc. to the testimony of *Augustine (*Op. imp. c. Iul.* I,6), "traducianists." The following authors extensively discussed this question at that time: *Jerome (*Ep.* 126; *C. Rufinum* 2,8; 13, 28,30), an anonymous author in his dialogue *De origine animarum* (PL 30,270) and Augustine (*Ep.* 166 and 190; *De gen. ad litt.* chs. 6; 7; 10, 11-26; *De origine animae* = *Ep.* 176 and 177; *De anima et eius origine* 1, 16,26; 4, 11,2). Augustine, though rejecting traducianism of the material soul, maintained that it was possible to accept spiritual traducianism alongside creationism (*Retr.* I,1,3; II,45 and 56), because in each case, faith in the transmission of original sin was not compromised (*Op. imp. c. Iul.* 11,168). This possibility was also accepted by Augustine's disciples, for example, *Fulgentius of Ruspe (*De vera praedest.* 3,28) up to *Gregory the Great (*Ep.* 9,52).

DTC 15, 1350-1365; CE 14, 230; Patrologia IV, 244-245; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Dialogus sub nomine Hieronymi*, in *Paideia Christiana*, Studi in onore di M. Naldini, Rome 1994, 115-130; bibl. s.v. *anima*; M. Di Marco, *La polemica sull'anima tra "Fausto di Riez" e Claudiano Mamerto*, Rome 1995 (SEA 51).

V. Grossi

TRAJAN, emperor (53–117). Marcus Ulpius Trajan, Roman emperor from 98 to 117, native of Hispania *Baetica, a brave military commander, famous esp. for his conquest of *Dacia (described in the reliefs of Trajan's column) and for the great public works that he undertook in *Rome (markets, forum and the Basilica Ulpia). There were serious financial difficulties during his rule. He died at Selinous in *Cilicia in 117, after a military campaign against the Parthians. He possessed the title *Optimus princeps*. *Pliny the Younger wrote a famous **Panegyric* in his honor.

Under Trajan there was a new persecution of the Christians, who were guilty of *superstitio illicita*: among the victims were *Simeon of Jerusalem and *Ignatius of Antioch. The proconsul of *Bithynia and Pontus, Pliny the Younger, who was responsible for sentencing numerous Christians to death, asked the emperor in 112 (*Ep.* X, 96) for instructions on this point: Trajan, with a rescript, posited that there was no need to officially seek out the followers of the new religion, but if they were denounced and if they acknowledged the charge, they had to be punished, but never after anonymous accusations. *Tertullian (*Apol.* II,8) criticized the ambiguity in the emperor's wish not to seek out Christians inasmuch as they were innocent, ordering at the same time to punish them as guilty if denounced. Trajan's rescript served for a long time to oppose Christianity, but the state's formal renunciation of every persecutory initiative (*conquirendi non sunt*) favored, in a certain way, the existence of Christians in the empire. Trajan did not really regard Christians as a political threat and therefore, as much as possible, sought to tolerate or ignore them.

A. Garzetti, *L'impero da Tiberio agli Antonini*, Bologna 1960; G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali*, Milan 1973, 58ff.; R. McMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100–400*, New Haven, CT 1984; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; *Trajano Emperador de Roma*, ed. J. González, Rome 2000; BBKL 12, 394-410.

L. Navarra

TRANSITUS MARIAE. A group of apocryphal Marian texts. In patristic, early medieval, *Byzantine and Eastern literature, there exists a group of more than 80 texts pertaining to *Mary's last days (Dormition, Assumption). These are contained in *Greek, *Coptic, *Latin, *Syriac, *Arabic, *Ethiopian, *Armenian, *Georgian, *Irish and *Paleoslavonic texts, which are generally referred to with the Latin title *Transitus Mariae* ("passage, transfer"), but which bear other names such as the Latin *Dormitio Mariae* and the Greek *Koimēsis Marias* etc.

These texts and their translations into various languages were gradually published during the 19th and 20th c.: the most important editors are as follows: for the Greek texts: Tischendorf, Jugie and Wenger; for the Latin texts, Tischendorf, Wilmart, Capelle, Wenger and Haibach-Reinisch; for the Syriac texts: Wright and Smith Lewis; for the Arabic texts: Enger; for the Coptic texts: Revillout, Budge, Evelyn White, Chaine and Arras; for the Ethiopian texts, Arras and Chaine; for the Armenian texts, Vetter and van Esbroeck; for the Georgian texts, van Esbroeck; and for the Irish texts, Donahue. As in the case of the apocryphal acts, these texts are often attributed to various famous individuals such as *John

the Evangelist, *Joseph of Arimathea, *Melito of Sardis, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Theophilus of Alexandria, *Evodius bishop of Rome and others.

These texts were liturgical, that is, they were intended to be read or recited during the liturgy of the feast of the *Assumption of Mary, the most important of the Marian feasts, which was introduced by the emperor Maurice (582–602; but this Marian feast could be the most ancient). The texts could be divided into "narratives" (that is, readings for the Marian feast with a specific emphasis on the description of Mary's *transitus*) and "homilies" (where the descriptive and encomiastic elements coexist), just as the trilogies of the homilies on the Assumption by *Germanus of Constantinople, *John of Damascus and *Andrew of Crete. There exists, moreover, other homilies in the following languages: Greek (e.g., those of *John of Thessalonica), Latin (e.g., *Cosmas Vestitor), Syriac (e.g., *Jacob of Sarug and John of Birtha), Ethiopian (e.g., ps.-Cyril of Jerusalem and *Cyriacus of al-Bahnasa), Arabic (e.g., Cyril of Alexandria) and Coptic (e.g., ps.-Evodius).

All these texts appear related: they speak of Mary's dormition (avoiding the word "death") and her assumption. This schema of the *transitus* is almost the same in all the texts: an announcement to Mary concerning her "passing" from this world; the arrival of the apostles and their gathering around the Virgin; Christ's arrival, who brings with himself Mary's soul and carries her into heaven; Jewish insults during Mary's solemn funeral rites; punishment of one of these mockers and followed by the miraculous healing of the same individual; the interment of Mary's body in the tomb of Gethsemane; the translation of her body into paradise. In some texts it is the apostles themselves who carry Mary's body into paradise; in others, Mary appears with St. *Thomas. At times the text of the *transitus* is connected to that of the *Apocalypse of Mary*. Although this schema is generally the same, the theological tendencies, which were generally expressed in the last chapters of the work, are often different.

Scholars generally accept the existence of an archetype of the *transitus,* which was most likely originally written in Greek; the Ethiopian and the Syriac texts are probably the closest to the original. There remains, however, the problem of the dating of the first *transitus*. It is common opinion today that the most ancient texts dates to a period between the end of the 4th c. and the 2nd half of the 5th. The possibility that some texts go back even to the 2nd–3rd c. was proposed by B. Bagatti and E. Testa; the dating of the texts, however, are assigned to the 4th c. by J. Gribomont.

The theme of the *transitus* had great success, and the text was very popular in ancient literature, esp. Byzantine and Eastern; it immediately entered the great collections of legends and had a deep influence on Byzantine painting and on that of the countries under its influence (Orthodox iconography): in all the Eastern churches, there exists at least one image of the Dormition of Mary.

Lists of the Transitus*:* CANT 100-177 (100A-100F various solutions for the relationship between the texts; and the solution proposed by Aranda Pérez 33-36); more complete in G. Aranda Pérez, *Dormición de la Virgen relatos de la tradición copta*, Madrid 1995, 285-292. BHG 1055-1057a; BHL 5349-5355; BHO.

Translations: Fr.: S.C. Mimouni - S. Voicu, *La tradition grecque de la Dormition et de l'Assomption de Marie*, Paris 2003; It.: Erbetta 1/2, 409-649 (the most complete collection); Moraldi 3, 163-282; Craveri, 449-474; Polish: Starowieyski 1/2, 777-834; Sp.: Santos Otero, 568-651; Aranda Pérez (Coptic texts).

Studies: M. Jugie, *La Mort et l'Assomption de la S. Vierge*, Vatican City 1944; B. Capelle, *La fête de la Vierge Marie à Jérusalem au V^e^ s.*: Muséon 56 (1943) 1-33; A. van Lantschoot, *L'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge chez les Coptes*: Gregorianum 27 (1946) 493-526; H. Lausberg, *Zur literarischen Gestaltung des "Transitus Beatae Mariae"*: Historisches Jahrbuch 72 (1953) 25-49; A. Wenger, *L'Assomption de la T. S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine, du VI^e^ au X^e^ s.*, Paris 1955; E. Cothenet, *Marie dans les récits apocryphes de l'Assomption*, in *Maria* 6, 1961, 137-141; L. Cignelli, *Il prototipo giudeo-cristiano degli apocrifi assunzionisti*, in *Studia Hierosolymitana*, FS B. Bagatti, Jerusalem 1976, 259-277; E. Testa, *Lo sviluppo della "Dormitio Mariae" nella letteratura, nella teologia e nell'archeologia*: Marianum 44 (1982) 316-389; Id., *L'origine e lo sviluppo della "Dormitio Mariae"*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 249-262; F. Manns, *Le récit de la Dormition de Marie* (*Vat. grec. 1982*)*. Contribution à l'étude de l'exégèse chrétienne*, Jérusalem 1989; S. Mimouni, *Dormition et Assomption de Marie. Histoire des traditions anciennes*, Paris 1995 (important bibl.); M. van Esbroeck, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*, Aldershot 1995 (collection of articles); M. Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge 1998; M. Clayton, *The Transitus Mariae: The Tradition and Its Origin*: Apocrypha 10 (1999) 74-98.

Iconography: J. Duhr, *L'évolution iconographique de l'Assomption*: NRTh 68 (1946) 671-683; Id., *La Dormition de Marie dans l'art chrétien*, ibid. 72 (1950) 134-157; B. Bagatti, *L'iconografia della Koimesis o Dormitio Mariae*: Liber Annuus 25 (1975) 225-253.

M. Starowieyski

TRANSLATIO IMPERII. Since early Christian times a historiographical model has allowed people to understand historical events in a relatively unitary way: that of the *translatio imperii*. Greek in origin, according to some scholars (Trieber), or Eastern, according to others (Swain), it refers to the passage of the political and military hegemony from one people to another. The model features widely among pagan historians (one simply has to think of

Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* I,2,2ff., 3,3; Appian, *Hist. Rom.* praef. 9-10; or Pompeius Trogus, in Justin, *Hist. Philippicarum Epit.* 41,1,1ff.; 43,1,1-2), and among the Jews, chs. 2 and 7 of the OT book of Daniel are a confirmation. Even in this respect, one should note that after the Mithridatic Wars and after the Roman conquests in the East, the theory of the empires and their "passing" became a weapon of anti-Roman propaganda, as attested by such writings as the so-called *Oracle of Hystapes,* the *Sibylline Oracles* or the *Psalms of Solomon*. In this way, discourse opens up on both the Jewish and Christian apocalyptic and on the earliest Christian literature and the place that the book of Daniel held there. It seems well-established that in ancient Christianity the introduction of the theory spoken of here derives in the first place from exegesis on the book of Daniel and that on the other hand his visions—setting aside the interpretations of a moral and "nonpolitical" character—in reference to *Rome give rise to different outcomes, so that from an ideological perspective, Rome and the kingdom of God are almost identified, and from an eschatological perspective, the two entities are set each against other and considered incompatible. One should also consult, among other things, the statements of *Jerome (*Comm. in Dan.* 2,38ff.) and *Orosius (*Hist. adv. Paganos* 2,1,1ff.). Jerome drew his inspiration precisely at the point where one reads in the book of Daniel (2:21) that God veils the mystery of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and the prophet thanks the Lord who *mutat tempora et aetates; transfert regna atque constituit; dat sapientiam sapientibus* [. . .]. See also Sir 10:8: "A kingdom is translated from one people to another, because of injustices and wrongs and injuries, and various types of deceits" (*Regnum a gente in gentem transfertur propter iniustitias et iniurias et contumelias et diversos dolos*). Orosius, for his part, united the theme of the *translatio* with that of the four kingdoms (see below), for which Babylon was placed at the beginning and Rome at the end among the earthly powers. At the foundation stands the idea that God is the Lord of history and the idea that *virtus* and moral purity are the cause of the prosperity of the kingdoms and the empires. The theory of the *translatio* was considered by authors both in its chronological aspect (in every period one sole "kingdom" takes the place of another and stands as a guide for the "civilized world") and in the spatial world (it follows, according to many interpreters, a movement that goes from E to W; there are not lacking, however, variants of this schema, with the "kingdoms" corresponding to the four cardinal points). During the first centuries of the Common Era, Rome was commonly regarded as the heir of the earlier empires (Babylon, Media, Persia, Macedonia and Carthage): its exaltation is mitigated, esp. by Jewish and Christian authors, who emphasize its fragility and announce its approaching end. Thus an interpretive model of universal history sets forth a transhistorical goal, affirming, beyond the human kingdoms that are bound to disappear, the coming of the definitive kingdom of God. The theory of the *translatio* would continue to be adopted and have considerable support in both the Middle Ages—esp. through the *Chronicles*—and in subsequent ages. In the 12th and subsequent centuries, several historians would see in the coronation of Charlemagne the *translatio* from the Romans to the Germans. From the 13th c. onward, Roman curial theology would provoke disagreements and controversies between the pope and the emperor.

C. Trieber, *Die Idee der vier Weltreiche*: Hermes 27 (1892) 321-344; J.W. Swain, *The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History Under the Roman Empire*: CPh 35 (1940) 1-21; W. Baumgartner, *Zu den vier Reichen von Daniel 2*: ThZ 1 (1945) 17-22; P.A. van den Baan, *Die Kirchliche Lehre der* Translatio Imperii Romani: Analecta Gregoriana 78, Rome 1956; W. Goez, *Translatio Imperii. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien in Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen 1958, 4-36 (for the period that interests us here); B. Gatz, *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*, Hildesheim 1967, 106-107 and passim. On Daniel's prophecy (chs. 2 and 7) see the contributions offered by M. Delcor (on Jewish and Christian apocalypticism), F. Lucrezi (on book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles*), M. Simonetti (on patristic exegesis in the 2nd and 3rd c.), M. Pavan (on the Latin writers after Constantine) and G. Podskalsky (on the writers of the Eastern Roman Empire), in *Popoli e Spazio romano tra diritto e profezia*, "Da Roma alla Terza Roma," Studi III, Naples 1986, respectively on pp. 11, 25, 37, 291 and 309; H. Thomas, *Julius Caesar und die Deutschen*, in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. St. Weinfurter, III, Sigmaringen 1991, 245-278; H. Thomas, LMA 8, 944-946, s.v. *Translatio imperii*; M. Ditsche, LTK 10, 170-171, s.v. *Translationstheorie*.

P. Siniscalco

TRANSLATIO STUDII. With this expression, scholars refer to the passing of the cultural hegemony from one place to another. This theory maintains that the centers of high formation, study, culture and learning transfer from one city or people to another. There exists a parallelism between the notion of **translatio imperii* and that of *traditio studii,* since the second in a certain way is a necessary restraint on the image conveyed by the first, which represents political power and rule. The idea is already present in the writings of *Cassiodorus and *Isidore of Seville; it became clearer during the Carolingian era: one thinks of the work of Notker Balbu-

lus from the title *Gesta Karoli Magni*. But this also reappears in subsequent ages. The idea of the *translatio studii* becomes, in short, an interpretive model of history (as is the case with the *translatio imperii*), adopted from a long interval of time: in the 17th c., for example, Voltaire—in the introduction to the *Le siècle de Louis XIV*, 1751—with the intention of demonstrating that the sciences, like empires, transfer through various provinces, in a movement from the East and from Greece that leads toward the West, first to the Rome of Augustus, then to the Florence of the Medici and finally to the Paris of Cardinal Richelieu and King Louis XIV.

A.G. Jongkees, *Translatio studii: les avatars d'un thème médiéval*, in *Miscell. Mediev.*, ed. J.F. Niermeyer, Groningen 1967, 41-51; P. Siniscalco, in *Popoli e spazio romano tra diritto e profezia*, "Da Roma alla Terza Roma," Studi III, Naples 1986, XXIff.; J. Verger, LMA X, 946-947, s.v. *Translatio studii.*

P. Siniscalco

TRANSLATIONS, PATRISTIC. Alongside the versions of *Scripture, liturgical and hagiographical texts, patristic translations had a foundational role in the inception of theological reflection in various linguistic contexts. But, in addition to their influence on the intellectual life of the Christian communities, the patristic translations are valuable on the specifically philological level, because they were often taken from models independent of (or more ancient than) those that have been passed down in a direct MS tradition, when works are no longer extant or recensions have been lost in their original language.

The patristic translations pertain, in greater or lesser measure, to almost all the linguistic areas in which Christianity spread from Antiquity until the High and Late Middle Ages. The following presents, in alphabetical order, an overview of the translations; this information should be read in conjunction with the entries dedicated to the body of Christian literature contained in each of these respective languages.

Arabic. Starting from the 7th c., during the Islamic age, scholars began to translate numerous works, first from *Syriac (in a *Nestorian or *monophysite context), then, almost immediately, from *Greek (among the *Melkites), from the *Coptic (in *Egypt) and from the Palestinian Aramaic (in *Palestine). The language used for these translations presents particularities that distinguish it from the Arabic of the Qur'an and is called "Christian Arabic." Starting from the 8th c., scholars translated from the Arabic into other languages: in *Georgian and *Armenian in the Near East and in *Latin and in Spanish in the Iberian Peninsula; in the 13th c., scholars began to make translations in *Ethiopian.

G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, I, *Die Übersetzungen* (ST 118), Vatican City 1944; J. Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic*, I-III (CSCO 267, 276, 279 / Subs. 27-29), Lovanii 1966-73; *Symposium Graeco-Arabicum*: Akten des zweiten Symposium Graeco-Arabicum, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 3.-5. März 1987: mit einer Synopse des Symposium Graeco-Arabicum I, Wassenaar, 19.-21. Februar 1985, ed. G. Endress et al., Amsterdam 1989; *Aristoteles semitico-latinus*, Amsterdam 1975ff. (13 vols. appeared as of 2003); M. Van Esbroek, *Incidence des versions arabes chrétiennes pour la restitution des textes perdus*, in *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, Paris 1989, 133-143.

Aramaic (Palestinian or Christian). During the first millennium, in the Palestinian Melkite context, some translations were made from Greek; some of these texts were then translated into Arabic.

A. Desreumaux, *Les oeuvres de la littérature apocryphe chrétienne en araméen christo-palestinien*: Bulletin de l'AELAC 9 (1999) 9-14; Ch. Müller-Kessler - M. Sokoloff, *A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic* (5 vols. appeared as of 1999), Groningen 1996ff.; C.A. Ciancaglini, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in siriaco e aramaico*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 1009-1022.

Armenian. From the beginning of the 5th c. until the Late Middle Ages numerous translations followed from the Syriac and the Greek; from the 7th c., translations were also made from Arabic. For the most ancient period a distinction is made between the "golden age" (1st half of the 5th c.) and then the "Hellenophile Age" (6th c.?), which was characterized by literalist tendencies, which were at times extreme. Many ancient Georgian translations were carried out on Armenian texts. Many lost works in Greek are preserved in Armenian: books 4-5 of *Irenaeus of Lyons's *Adversus haereses* and the *Epideixis*, some treatises attributed to *Philo of Alexandria, the homilies of *Eusebius of Emesa, *Hesychius of Jerusalem and *Severian of Gabala, *Timothy (II) Ailuros's apology against the Council of *Chalcedon, as well as hermetic fragments and, esp., the ancient lectionaries of Jerusalem dating back to the 5th c. The Armenian also preserves works lost in the original Syriac: many texts belong to *Ephrem (the commentaries on *Genesis, the **Diatessaron*, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline epistles, various hymns).

J.-P. Mahé, *L'Arménie et les Pères de l'Église: histoire et modes d'emploi*, in J.-C. Fredouille - R.-M. Roberge, *La documentation patristique*, Laval-Paris 1995, 158-179; V. Calzolari Bouvier - J. D. Kaestli - B. Outtier, *Apocryphes arméniens: transmission, traduction, création, iconographie*, Lausanne 1999; R. Ajello, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in armeno*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cul-*

tura, Arte, Società. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 973-983.

Coptic. The first translations from Greek were made at the same time as the creation of the alphabet (3rd c.): these were texts of Asian origin, such as *Melito of Sardis's *De anima et corpore* and Melito's *De pascha,* and the ps.-Basilian homily *De templo Salomonis*. During the 4th–5th c. the writings of many famous patristic authors were translated into Sahidic, esp. those of Alexandrian origin. In the 7th c., after the Islamic invasion, translations were made from Coptic into Arabic. Of utmost importance are some lost works in Greek such as the festal letters of *Athanasius, and the *gnostic texts of *Nag Hammadi and those of the *Manicheans from Medinet Habu.

T. Orlandi, *Traduzioni dal greco al copto: quali e perché: Autori classici in lingue del Vicino e Medio Oriente*, in *Atti del III, IV e V Seminario sul tema: "Recupero di testi classici attraverso ricezioni in lingue del Vicino e Medio Oriente" . . . 1984-1986*, ed. G. Fiaccadori, Rome 1990, 93-104; P. Marrassini, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in copto ed etiopico*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 985-1008; A. Camplani, *Sulla trasmissione dei testi gnostici in copto: L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica* (SEA 56), Rome 1996, 121-175; M.N. Swason, *Recent Developments in Copto-Arabic Studies, 1996-2000*, in *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium*, ed. M. Immerzeel - J. van der Vliet, Leuven 2004, 239-268.

Ethiopian. After the conversion of the kingdom of *Aksum (4th c.) and until the 6th c., many works were translated from the Greek. Among these, one should note the Qērellos, that is, a particular recension of the acts of the Council of *Ephesus (431). After a long period of silence, in the 13th c., scholars began to make translations from Arabic. The sole complete form of the early Christian *Apocalypse of Peter* dates back to this period.

G. Lusini, *Appunti sulla patristica greca di tradizione etiopica*: Studi classici e orientali 38 (1988) 469-493; P. Marrassini, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in copto ed etiopico*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 985-1008; P. Piovanelli, *Les aventures des apocryphes en Éthiopie*: Apocrypha 4 (1993) 197-224; M. Kropp, *Arabisch-äthiopische Übersetzungstechnik am Beispiel der Zena Ayhud* (*Yosippon*) *und des Tarikä Wäldä-ʿAmid*: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 136 (1986) 314-346; A. Bausi, *San Clemente e le tradizioni clementine nella letteratura etiopica canonico-liturgica*, in *Studi su Clemente Romano*, ed. Ph. Luisier, Rome 2003, 12-55.

Georgian. As early as the 5th c., translations were made from Armenian, Greek and Syriac texts: then, in the 8th c., even from Arabic. Finally, in the 10th c., in the monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos, they returned to translating from Greek. Of special importance are some lost works of *Hippolytus and the ancient lectionaries of *Jerusalem, which were translated between the 2nd half of the 5th and the 8th c.

G. Shurgaia, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in georgiano*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 1053-1070; M. Tarchnischvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem* (*Ve-VIIIe siècle*), I-II (CSCO 188-189, 204-205 / Iber. 9-10, 13-14), Louvain 1959-60.

Gothic. The most important nonbiblical translation is the Skeireins (ca. 400), which preserves the lost commentary of *Theodore of Heraclea on the gospel of *John.

R. Del Pezzo Costabile, *La Skeireins: testo, traduzione, glossario*, Naples 1973; K. Schäferdiek, *Die Fragmente der "Skeireins" und der Johanneskommentar des Theodor von Herakleia*, in *Schwellenzeit: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Christentums in Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*, ed. W.A. Löhr - H.Ch. Brennecke (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 64), Berlin 1996, 69-87.

Greek. Translations were made from Latin already in the 3rd c. (acts of the *Scillitan martyrs of *Perpetua and Felicity; Epistle 70 of *Cyprian of Carthage); then *Jerome (*De viris illustribus* and the *Vitae Patrum*), as well as the *Dialogus* and *Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis,* translated by his successor Pope *Zachariah. *Augustine would only be translated in the 13th c. at *Constantinople. There are few translations from Armenian (*Agathangelos and the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*), from Georgian (*Barlaam and Joseph) and from Syriac (*Bardesanes, *Ephrem and hagiographical works).

E. Dekkers, *Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins*: SE 5 (1953) 193-233; D.Z. Nikitas, *Traduzioni greche di opere latine*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 1035-1051; G. Rigotti, *I Padri latini a Bisanzio: traduzioni di Agostino nel secolo XIV*, in *Tradizioni patristiche nell'umanesimo*, ed. M. Cortesi e C. Leonardi, Florence 2000, 273-282; D. Bianconi, *Le traduzioni in greco di testi latini*, in *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo*. 3. *Le culture circostanti*. I. *La cultura bizantina*, ed. G. Cavallo, Rome 2004, 519-568; R. Gounelle, *Traductions de textes hagiographiques et apocryphes latins en grec*: Apocrypha 16 (2005) 35-74.

Irish. As early as the 7th c. several NT apocryphal texts were translated, which, however, were often rewritten.

M. McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*, Dublin 1984.

Nubian. The translations of several hagiographic and patristic texts date back to the 8th–9th c., from Greek, Coptic and perhaps Arabic models.

Pahlavi. Already before the 7th c. there existed

translations from Syriac, primarily of scientific or *Manichean texts.

A.M. Piemontese, *Percorsi di testi narrativi greci in versione persiana, Atti del convegno Vettori e percorsi tematici nel Mediterraneo romanzo . . .*, ed. F. Beggiato - S. Marinetti (Medioevo Romanzo e Orientale. Colloqui 6), Soveria Mannelli 2002, 135-143 (the Passion of St. Parthenope).

Paleoslavonic. Translations have been made from Greek since the 9th c. (the mission of Cyril and Methodius); later also from Latin in W Slavia (Croatia).

F.J. Thomson, *Towards a Typology of Errors in Slavonic Translations: Christianity Among the Slavs: The Heritage of Saints Cyril and Methodius*, ed. E.G. Farrugia - R.F. Taft - G.K. Piovesana (OCA 231), Rome 1988, 351-380; A. de Santos Otero, *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen*, I (PTS 20), Berlin-New York 1978; H. Kølln, *Westkirchliches in altkirchenslavischer Literatur aus Grossmähren und Böhmen* (Historiskfilosofiske meddelelser 87), Copenhagen 2003.

Sogdian. Before the 9th c., Christian, Manichean and Buddhist texts found at Turpan in Chinese Turkestan were translated from the Syriac.

Syriac. Among the translated works from Greek since the 3rd c. onward, many have been lost or have been reduced to fragments in their direct transmission (*Aristides's *Apologia,* *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Theophania,* *Epiphanius of Salamis's *De mensuris et ponderibus,* etc.), esp. of condemned authors (e.g., *Evagrius, *Nestorius, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Severus of Antioch). The Syriac is the source of many Armenian, Georgian, Arabic and Sogdian translations.

S. Brock, *Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique*, in R. Lavenant (ed.), III Symposium Syriacum, 1980. *Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures* (Goslar, 7-11 septembre 1980) (OCA 221), Rome 1983, 1-14 [= Id., *Studies in Syriac Christianity: History, Literature and Theology*, London 1992, num. X]; C.A. Ciancaglini, *Traduzioni e citazioni dal greco in siriaco e aramaico*, in *I Greci, Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, ed. S. Settis, Turin 2001, 1009-1022; S. Brock, *Du grec en syriaque: l'art de la traduction chez les syriaques*, in *Les syriaques transmetteurs de civilisations: l'expérience du Bilad el-Sham à l'époque omeyyade*, Antelias-Paris 2005, 11-34; Id., *Syriac Sources and Resources for Byzantinists*, in *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London*, I, Aldershot 2006, 193-210.

Other languages. Translations of patristic texts exist in many other European medieval languages; others have left traces in Sanskrit, Uyghur and Chinese Buddhist texts.

The opposite path was followed by the romance of *Barlaam and Joseph, which reports the Sanskrit traditions on the birth of the Buddha, transmitted through Sogdian and Arabic, used in the Georgian redaction of Euthymius the Hagiorite (ca. 1000), which in turn was the model of the Greek translation, from which the versions in the medieval European languages derived through the Latin.

T.N. Hall, *Herod's Burning of the Jewish Genealogies*, in *Gydinga Saga in the Second Old Norwegian Epiphany Homily*: Mediaeval Studies 61 (1999) 173-204; O. Hjelde, *Norsk preken i det 12. århundre: Studier i gammel norsk homiliebok* [Norwegian homilies of the twelfth century. Studies on the ancient Norwegian book of homilies], Oslo 1990; S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies 45), Leiden 1998, 42-54; J.D.M. Derrett, *The Picnic, The Buddha, and St. Matthew*: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society s. III, 14 (2004) 73-79; J.H. Walker, *An Argument from the Chinese for the Antiochene Origin of the Didache*: SP 8, 44-50; G.R. Woodward - H. Mattingly, *Barlaam and Ioasaph*, with an English translation. Introduction by D.M. Lang (LCL 34), Cambridge, MA-London 1983, XXXII-XXXV.

S.J. Voicu

TRAVEL – MEANS of COMMUNICATION. The Romans since the earliest times of their history showed that they were aware of the importance of communication and esp. roads. Under the principate, the road system, which had already developed during the era of the Republic, subsequently broadened, making provisions for the construction and maintenance of roads, esp. in the provinces. In the 2nd c. AD the web of communication and traffic reached its maximum level of extension and efficiency.

It is impossible to concretely reconstruct the means and times of travel carried out in *Late Antiquity. At that time many movements occurred by sea, at least from spring to autumn (in the early days of November to March the sea was regarded as "closed," and few put themselves at the risk of a winter navigation if they were not forced to do so). By sea, therefore, with good weather and moderate winds, one could travel nearly 70 km (43.5 mi) per day: a ship arrived in three days from Pozzuoli (Lat. *Puteoli*) to the mouth of the Tiber River, stopping by Gaeta (Lat. *Caieta*) and Anzio (Lat. *Antium*) along the way. But, with a favorable wind, one was able to cover a greater distance in less time, as proven by the case of the apostle *Paul, who in a day or less reached Pozzuoli from Reggio (Lat. *Rhegium*) (see Acts 28:13). A daily trip of 100 km (62.1 mi), and even greater distances, was not unusual. Navigation by river, however, was slower. Scholars know that in *Gaul there existed a web of navigable canals and rivers that covered the entire territory; to cross it from the mouth of the Seine River to the delta of the Rhone required nearly 30 days, with an average of 33

km (20.5 mi) every 24 hours. There were very few countries, however, that could avail themselves in a systematic way of this type of navigation, which presupposed specific topographical and technological factors. By land, the speed of movements and transportation depended on the means used. By horse, if one could acquire a fresh horse at various stations along the route, one could at best reach 300 km (186.4 mi) a day, as was the case with *Tiberius, when from Ticinum—modern-day Pavia—he went toward *Germany, accompanied only by one messenger, in order to visit his ailing son Drusus. But covering 150-200 km (93-124 mi) over a 24-hour span, by continually changing horses, signified that one was already moving with great speed. Usually travelers used wagons and made stops in order to rest for the night, in taverns or hotels which were interspersed along this system of communication. In this way, they took three to six times longer, but making progress at around 50 km (31 mi) a day: from Brindisi (Lat. *Brundisium*) to Rome, for example, a traveler needed about 10 days; from *Byzantium to *Alexandria, *Egypt, around 40 days; through a trip by land and sea one came to Rome from Byzantium in approximately 24 days. The person, however, who went by foot *pedibus calcantibus* was able to reach by night, if not the same *mansio* in which those who traveled by wagon, a *mansio* not too far from it: by walking one could usually cover a distance of about 30-40 km (18.6-24.9 mi) a day. But naturally the effort needed for long journeys required that days of walking be interspersed with days of rest (see, e.g., *Itin. Egeriae* 6,1 and passim).

A very extensive web of communication (at the time of the emperor Diocletian, it constituted a good 372 roads for a total of 78,000 km [48,467 mi]), the reasonable time to travel them, and the assistance and organization that supported wayfarers all allowed for excellent mobility to a considerable number of individuals: officials, artists, professors, students, scientists and even large crowds, who moved for religious or secular reasons and were drawn by sanctuaries or solemnities, feasts or shows. But among those who drew the greatest benefit from this system, one should certainly mention merchants, who not only sailed the Mediterranean but even forged beyond the West, that is, beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and to the East, to India and *China, according to the witness of written documents and archaeological discoveries.

What has been said holds on a broader scale, as is evident, because, along the centuries of Late Antiquity, according to the favorable political, military and social conditions, other, more critical factors intermixed, which immediately had repercussions on the system of communication and the concrete possibilities of moving from one place to another in the *oikoumenē*. This conglomerate of external conditions undoubtedly facilitated the spread of *evangelization and Christian mission that stretched throughout the Roman Empire and which surpassed its limits esp. toward the East. Of great interest for the history of early Christian topography are the *Itineraria;* this was a specific literary genre made up of travel diaries and guides; so too the purely geographical descriptions also proved to be useful such as the *Tabula Peutingeriana* or the work of the *Chronograph of Ravenna*. Among the *Itineraria* one must distinguish the ones pertaining to the Holy Land and those pertaining to Rome. The first describe the land and sea routes taken by the authors themselves or by third parties toward *Jerusalem and places in *Palestine and the Near East: one simply has to think of the *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (333), the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (383), the *Breviarius de Hierosolyma* (1st decades of the 6th c.), the *De situ Terrae Sanctae* (middle of the 6th c.) attributed to a certain Theodosius, the *Itinerarium Antonini Placentini* (570), to which are added others until the High Middle Ages and beyond. Among the second, that is, those who provide information on the journey toward Rome or the monuments of Rome, one should consult the *Itinerarium of John the Priest* (under the pontificate of *Gregory the Great [590–604]), the *Itinerarium* of Malmesbury (648–682), the *Itinerarium* of Einsiedeln (dating to the age of Charlemagne) and others as well. *See* *Itineraries; *Pilgrimages.

Critical edition of the major Itineraries in CCL 175-176, ed. by Fr. Glorie, 1965; L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, I, Leipzig [10]1922, 318ff.; D. Gorce, *Les voyages, l'hospitalité et le port des lettres dans le monde chrétien du IVᵉ et Vᵉ siècles*, Paris 1925; M.P. Charlesworth, *The Trade-Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge [2]1926; V. von Hagen, *The Roads That Led to Rome*, Cleveland-New York 1967; G. Radke: PWK, suppl. 13, 1417ff., s.v. *Viae publicae Romanae* (It. trans. Bologna 1981); P. Siniscalco, *Le vie di commercio e la diffusione del cristianesimo*, in var. aus., *Mondo classico e cristianesimo*, Rome 1982, 17-28; P. Siniscalco, *Viaggi e viaggiatori nei primi secoli della nostra era*, in *Vie di comunicazione e incontri di culture dall'Antichità al Medioevo tra Oriente e Occidente*, ed. M. Vacchina, Trento 1994, 21-35; R. Fellmann, *Réseaux routiers et échanges à travers les cols alpins occidentaux*, ibid., 81-92; P. Di Paola, *Viaggi, trasporto e istituzioni. Studi sul cursus publicus*, Messina 1999; S. Medas, *De rebus nauticis. L'arte della navigazione nel mondo antico*, Rome 2004; *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane*, ed. L. Ellis - F.L. Kidner, Ashgate 2004; C. Regnier, *Paul de Tarse en Méditerranée: Recherche autour de la navigation dans l'Antiquité* (*Ac 27-28,16*), Paris 2006.

P. Siniscalco

TRIER
I. Christianity - II. Council.

I. Christianity. The ancient Colonia Augusta, capital of the Treviri, then the civitas Treverorum (4th c.), the seat of the prefecture of the praetorian, the capital of the diocese of *Gaul and of the Belgica Prima province; Urbs Treverica, Treverus (7th c.). The Christian origins of this city are not well known; the episcopal list, which Duchesne regards as a reliable document, mentions three bishops before *Agricius, a signatory at the Council of *Arles in 314. The first church prelate, Eucharius, may have occupied the see during the last quarter of the 3rd c. He is not attested, however, before the 5th c., when bishop Cyril dedicated to him a *memoria* along with Valerius, the second bishop on the list (Gauthier, *Évangélisation,* 11-16). Maternus, mentioned third on the list, is actually attested to for Cologne: his presence in the catalog of Trier is perhaps owed to the introduction of his relics. The *Vita Eucharii, Valerii et Materni* (BHL 2655), which was redacted in the 10th c., is of no historical value.

The Christian history of Trier begins in the 4th c., precisely when the city, which for a century had become an imperial residence, witnessed new structural and demographic developments. Hence the growing role within ecclesiastical politics of its bishops close to power and the remarkable advances in conversions, attested by epigraphy (Gauthier, *Recueil,* I,59; Gauthier, *Évangélisation,* 84-86). After Agricius (314), *Maximinus (335–before 351), who knew *Athanasius during his exile at Trier (335), performed an effective role in the negotiations that preceded the Council of *Sardica (343); his predecessor *Paulinus, who also opposed the *Arianizing politics of the emperor *Constantius II, was expelled from his episcopal see for having refused to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, at the Council of *Arles (353), and died in exile (358). Succeeding a little-known Bonosius (d. 375), Britto, who had connections with *Ithacius, the Spanish bishop and enemy of *Priscillian, seems to have been indirectly involved in Priscillian's trial and was exposed, until his death, to the hostility of an entire party of bishops who condemned the emperor *Maximus's intervention. After the plundering of the city (an event recalled by *Salvian), Trier experienced a period of tumults that ended at the end of the 5th c. with the Frankish annexation. Little is known of the bishops Maurice, Legontius (perhaps, according to Ewig [*Trier,* 40], mentioned in a letter of Pope *Leo), Severus, a disciple of *Lupus of Troyes, who evangelized the Alamanni, Cyril, known from one of his funerary poems (Gauthier, *Recueil,* I,59), and Iamblichus, who had to leave Trier and died at Chalon-sur-Saône. Afterward there were bishops who were entirely unknown: Emerus (?), Marus, Volusianus, Miletus and Modestus, attested in the *Hieronymian Martyrology* (19 September), and last Apricolus, mentioned by *Gregory of Tours (*Vitae Patrum* VI,3). The 6th c. was dominated by two metropolitans: *Nicetius (525–566/569), a monk who owed his episcopate to King Theodoric I, king of Austrasia, and Magneric, his successor (d. after 587). Both men were great builders: Nicetius restored the episcopal complex and erected a *castellum* at *Mediolanus;* Magneric built St. Martin's. Nicetius, moreover, an ascetical figure, celebrated as the protector of the weak, having been contested by the Frankish aristocracy, enjoyed a prestige that authorized him to write to the emperor *Justinian a letter of rebuke on the condemnation of the "*Three Chapters" in a letter to Chlothsind, wife of the *Longobard (Lombard) king Alboin, an *Arian, exhorting Clovis's granddaughter to imitate *Clotilde (CPL 1063). For the 7th c., the episcopal list mentions Guntheric, Sabaudus (Council of Paris 614), Modoald, who is less obscure (Council of Clichy, 627), propagator, according to the *Gesta Treverorum* (9th c.), of *monasticism, Numerian (643/647), Basinus and Leothwine, who was succeeded by his son Milo (723/751), also titular of the see of *Reims. The epigraphic testimony (esp. for the 4th and the 5th c.: see *Recueil*, pl. VII), and esp. the monumental development, exhibits the splendor and then the decline of Trier: inside the walls, the episcopal complex appears as one of the most important of the 4th c., with two basilicas (St. Peter's and, to the S, St. Mary: see Kempf; and Oswald, 340-341), a baptistery and the *monasterium S. Mariae* (Modoald's?); outside the walls, in the cemeterial area to the N, Felix built a *memoria* of Eucharius for his predecessor Paulinus, to which was added, before the 6th c., the basilica dedicated to St. Maximinus; to the NW, St. Martin; and to the S of the *memoria* of Eucharius (St. Mathias's) founded by Cyril in the 5th c. (Cüppers), without counting some foundations of an uncertain date attested by later texts (*Gesta Treverorum* from the 11th c., *ecclesia S. Symphoriani*, *S. Crucis*).

Duchesne, *Fastes* III, 33-39; E. Ewig, *Trier in Merowingerreich. Civitas, Stadt, Bistum*, Trier 1954; Th.K. Kempf, *Untersuchungen und Beobachtungen am Trierer Dom 1961-1963*: Germania 42 (1964) 126-141; H. Cüppers, *Das Gräberfeld von St. Matthias . . .*, in W. Reusch, *Frühchristliche Zeugnisse*, Trier 1965, 165-174 and TZ 32 (1969) 269ff.; F. Oswald, *Vorromanische Kirchenbauten*, Munich 1971, III, 340-350; N. Gauthier, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, I, Paris 1975, 1-237; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle*, Paris 1980 (bibl.); N.

Gauthier, *Trèves*, in *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII*[e] *siècle. I. Province ecclésiastique de Trèves* (Belgica Prima), Paris 1986, 13-32.

Ch. Pietri - M. Ghilardi

II. Council. Despite the reservations expressed by *Ambrose of Milan, *Martin of Tours, *Hyginus of Cordoba and many other Western bishops, many Gallic bishops who had gathered at Trier approved of the conduct of *Ithacius of Ossonuba (or Ossobona?) during the case of *Priscillian and urged the emperor *Maximus to take new measures against the partisans of the same group. They provided Felix as the successor to Britto of Trier. Hence, the name of the Felician "schism" assigned to this division of the episcopate.

CCL 148, 47-48; SC 241, 117-123; Palazzini 5, 407.

Ch. Munier

TRIFOLIUS, presbyter (6th c.). As a presbyter of the church of *Rome, probably before 519, Trifolius sent to Senator Faustus (see PLRE II,454-455 n. 9), who had evidently made the request, a report on the *Acacian schism (*Ep. Trifolii presbyteri ad beatum Faustum senatorem*), in which, on the basis of the authority of the Council of *Chalcedon (451), he judged as dubious the *theopaschite formula *Unus de Trinitate passus est,* recognized by the Scythian monks who were led by *John Maxentius. According to Trifolius, the idea of a direct suffering of the divine nature, which could be implied in that formula, might give rise to heretical interpretations.

CPL 655; PL 63, 533-536; E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 59: ABAW 10 (1934) 115-117; CCL 85A, 137-138; J.A. McGuckin, *The "Theopaschite Confession"* (*Text and Historical Context*)*: A Study in the Cyrilline Re-interpretation of Chalcedon*: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 35 (1984) 239-255; F. Carcione, *La controversia tra Ormisda e i monaci sciti sulla formula "Unus de Trinitate passus est carne": calcedonismo integralista e calcedonismo integrato a confronto*, in *Atti del Convegno su Papa Ormisda* (514-523). *Magistero, cura pastorale ed impegno ecumenico*, ed. C. Noce, Frosinone 1993, 57ff.; C. Sotinel, *Le rôle des expertises dans les débats théologiques du VI*[e] *siècle*: SP 34 (2001) 242-246; PCBE 2, 2213-2214.

P. Marone

TRINITATE FIDEI CATHOLICAE, De. This *Priscillianist work was discovered by Turner in the MS of Laon (France) from the Carolingian era and was published by G. Morin in 1913. The author is unknown, who could be Priscillian, Istantius or some anonymous Priscillianist. His trinitarian theology is the ancient type marked by *monarchianism. The author is not concerned about the distinction between the three divine persons: he acknowledges and justifies it. The Son is the first in time, although the *Holy Spirit is "proffered" *in tempore* and begins his existence with the outpouring of the Word on human beings. There exists a priority, which does not include a distinction, that would equal a separation, as in the material domain.

CPL 788; PLS 2, 1487-1507; G. Morin, *Un traité priscillianiste inédit sur la Trinité*: RBen 26 (1909) 255-280 = G. Morin, *Études, textes, découvertes*, Maredsous 1913, 151-205; G. Mercati, *Opere minori*, ST 78, Vatican City 1937, 502-510; A. Orbe, *Doctrina trinitaria del anónimo priscilianista "De Trinitate fidei catholicae"*: Gregorianum 49 (1968) 510-562; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: the Occult and the Charismatic in The Early Church*, Oxford 1976, 100-102.

A. Di Berardino

TRINITATE, De, (ps.-)Athanasius. This is a collection of various documents pertaining to the doctrine of the Trinity, mistakenly attributed to *Athanasius. Books 9-12 are entirely independent of the first group, formed more homogeneously from books 1-8. These, in turn, have come down to us in a double redaction; the first, more brief and ancient (1-7), the other later and more worked out (1-8). There still remains the uncertainty of its author, place of origin and historical era. The position that attributes this work to *Eusebius of Vercelli lacks reliable arguments. The work reveals the author's primary intention in insisting on the unity of the trinitarian mystery (1-2). With book 3, the author passes on to the mystery of the *incarnation, with the relevant allusion to the two natures in Christ. Books 4-6 refute heretical movements, esp. those that deny the divinity of the *Holy Spirit. Book 7 returns to the trinitarian mystery. Moreover, the entire treatise expresses very advanced trinitarian teaching. The chief basis remains the baptismal formula of Mt 28:19. The *Christology insists esp. on the reality of the human nature, expressed in the formula *homo adsumptus* (III,16-18). The certainty with which the author tends to prove the divinity of the third person is quite impressive. This aspect of the treatise leads more recent scholars to date the work from 380 onward. A characteristic of the work is the appearance of the so-called Johannine comma (1 Jn 4:7) (*Trin.* I,43): the presence of the passage seems to indicate the treatise's belonging to the Spanish milieu of the last decades of the 4th c.

PL 62, 237ff.: CCL 9 (Bulhart) 1-99. It. trans.: L. Dattrino, *Ps. Atanasio. La Trinità*, Rome 1980; M. Simonetti, *Studi sul "De*

Trinitate" ps. atanasiano: NuovoDid 3 (1949) 57ff.; M. Simonetti, *Qualche osservazione sul De Trinitate attribuito ad Eusebio di Vercelli*: RCCM 5 (1963) 386ff.; L. Dattrino, *Il De Trinitate ps. atanasiano*, Rome 1976; L. Dattrino, *Il De Trinitate ps. atanasiano, opera di catechesi?*: Lateranum n.s. 44 (1978) 425-448; Id., *Nuovi studi sul De Trinitate Pseudoatanasiano*, Rome 1991.

L. Dattrino

TRINITY

I. Premises - II. The Ante-Nicene period - III. The Nicene dogma and its universal reception - IV. The inheritance of the Fathers.

I. Premises. There is no doubt that Christians, from the very beginning, were very different from other believers, Jews and non-Jews, inasmuch as they admitted converts to the community of Jesus Christ, baptizing them in the name of the *Father, the Son and the *Holy Spirit (Mt 28:19; *Didache* 7; Justin, 1 *Apol.* 61; *Acts of Thomas*, 121; ps.-Clem., *Hom. XI* 26,2; *Apostolic Tradition* 21). The origin of this form of initiation, established by Christ's command, has not yet been clarified (with respect to this point, one should keep in mind the exegetical decisions on the apostolic origins of the trinitarian faith). Nevertheless, two things are certain: on the one hand, baptismal faith has its roots in the Easter experience of the early communities, an experience established on the prophetic experience of Jesus, who felt himself so united to the Father to speak in his name and die according to his will for the salvation of humankind, an experience prepared by the faith of Israel in the one God, the creator of all things and the savior of the righteous, and supported by the hope in the coming of the Messiah and the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, this baptismal faith, which was based on the experience of the spiritual presence of Jesus of Nazareth, who had been confirmed by God in the resurrection as Christ and Lord, represented a decisive influence for the entire evolution of trinitarian dogma and theology. As the *norma normans* (see baptismal creeds; **regula fidei*; the structure of the synodal creeds) has above all determined three aspects: it caused Father-Son-Spirit terminology to prevail; it indicated the order of these three guarantors of Christian baptism; and it suggested that all three exist equally in the divine sphere.

The baptismal creed, in fact, was continually reinterpreted during the entire patristic era such that orthodoxy was evaluated in relation to it. The horizon of this reinterpretation was also continually changed. During the first period, which was concluded by the Council of *Nicaea (325), this horizon was primarily *apocalyptic, *soteriological and *gnostic. During the second period, however (325–381), which was dominated by the discussions concerning the Nicene faith, the context was creational and politico-dogmatic. In a sort of epilogue, finally, the reinterpretation of the baptismal faith was made under the influence of the christological discussions and under the preoccupation, more than ever, of preserving intact the faith of the Fathers. For an evaluation of this entire doctrinal evolution, it is not enough, however, to consider the general formulation of Christian theology. One must also keep in mind other factors of the evolution which are partly common to the various stages and often connected to each other: the development of Christian exegesis, the development of the liturgy, esp. of Christian initiation which also included the anamnesis of the Paschal mystery (Sunday feast of *Easter), the development of Christian spirituality, with the charismatic experiences of conversion, *martyrdom and the synodal and nonsynodal unity of the communities, the development of the theological language catalyzed esp. by the transitioin from the Semitic culture to the Greco-Roman one and, finally, the external development of the communities conditioned by their growth and political circumstances. Moreover, one must also keep in mind some of the difficulties of a hermeneutic which had to make clear distinctions between the experience of faith and its expression, realities that mutually permeate each other, and one must carefully consider the influences of the first formulas over the later ones and the interpretation of the former in light of the latter (see Studer, *Dio*, 16ff.).

II. The Ante-Nicene period. The evolution of the trinitarian teaching during the first three centuries was characterized primarily by the transition in which the baptismal faith passed from the apocalyptic to the Hellenistic context. Before 150, the apocalyptic horizon that had established the framework in which the first Christians confessed and understood the baptismal faith still remained present, more or less so in different regions. They therefore regarded Christ and the Spirit, through whom God accomplished his purpose of salvation, chiefly under the aspect of the revelation in which was manifested the correspondence between what took place in the church and what existed in heaven (see the exegesis of Is 6, the theme of the two paracletes, the heavenly church and the earthly church, as developed in the *Ascension of Isaiah,* the *Shepherd* of Hermas and in other writings of this sort). There always prevailed, therefore, the economic consideration that insisted on functionality, the salvific role of the Son and the

Spirit, who led believers from this world to the Father. Nevertheless, there was not lacking a certain sensibility for the preexistence of Christ as shown by the title supplied to him: Name–Law–Light–Beginning (see Daniélou, *Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes*, I,195-226), titles which in Judaism connoted the heavenly origin and, therefore, in that specifically apocalyptic climate were easily referred to the Risen Christ. Moreover, there were no doubts concerning the divine origin of the Spirit, which was often called "prophetic," and which, however, was considered more a messianic gift than a giver of grace (see Martín, *Espíritu Santo;* Dünzl, *Pneuma*).

Soon after, however, one perceives a shift in theological approach. The following factors indicate this change: a greater interest in the divinity of *Jesus, who by that time was more frequently called "God" (see Ignatius; *2 Clem.* 1), the reinterpretation of the messianic titles of the Son of God and the Son of Man (see Studer, *Dio,* 35), and the new anthropological nuances in *pneumatology (see Dünzl, *Pneuma*). From the mid-2nd c. onward, however, the influence of *Hellenism which had already provoked those aforementioned events became considerable. This appears in what is called the "soteriological horizon." *Justin Martyr and other Greek apologists were concerned with the salvation of all human beings, even those who had lived before the coming of Christ (see 1 *Apol.* 46; *Ep. ad Diogn.* 9). Responding to the question of why Christ came so late (*cur tam sero?*), they developed the biblical concept of the Logos of God, which was always present at all times in the history of the world. Because this soteriological universalism required the preexistence of Christ, they had recourse to texts from Genesis (1:1) and the Wisdom books (Prov 8:22ff.), with the consequence that the idea of the Word was even more deeply connected to the idea of the creation, which we find in the apocalyptic horizon of the NT (Jn 1:1-4; Col 1:15; Heb 1:1-3). Just as the apologists, even for apologetic reasons, reread the biblical theme of the Word with God in the context of *Middle Platonism, the profession of faith in the Trinity (τρίας, which occurred for the first time in the writings of *Theophilus of Antioch) clearly took on metaphysical nuances. It was understood in the Greek context of being (οὐσία), participation and divine immutability (see Daniélou, II,297-353). This transition to a more philosophical consideration was favored, moreover, by the necessity of explaining the invocation of Christ, practiced primarily by the martyrs (see the literature pertaining to the *Passiones;* see also J. Lebreton, *Trinità* II; Pelikan, *Emergence*, 1,173ff.). The problem of universal salvation was exacerbated in the gnostic context (*see* *gnosticism; *soteriology). On the one hand, there was the need to explain the origin of evil (even of persecution), without compromising human freedom or the unity of God the Creator. On the other hand, at issue was the resurrection and the salvation of the whole person. To this challenge, set even more clearly within a Hellenistic framework, the theologians of the Great Church initially responded defensively. Against the gnostic speculations on the emanations, they insisted on the mystery of God (Iren., *Adv. haer*. III,19,2). They likewise insisted on the realism of the incarnation, although leaving open the question how the true death of Jesus could be harmonized with the fact of his divinity. Because these antignostic discussions included an even greater evaluation of the apostolic writings, we see at the same time a much wider recovery of the trinitarian perspectives of *Paul and *John (see Studer, *Dio,* 94ff., with Iren., *Adv. haer.* IV,20, and other texts). Because, on the other hand, the antignostic reaction, reinforced by certain Jewish movements, led to a strong unitarian tendency, it was necessary to defend the real distinction between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Such writers as the author of the *Contra Noetum,* *Tertullian and *Novatian did so by basing their claims primarily on the traditional *Testimonia* of the Bible (see Uribarri, *Trinidad*). Though able to formulate well, even with technical terms (esp. *persona*), the distinction of the divine persons (*distributio*), they were less successful in expressing the substantial unity in the distinction, unable to overcome a certain subordinationist tendency (ontological gradation of the persons in the overly close connection of the origin of the Son and the Spirit with the *creation).

The positions adopted, which were caused more or less directly by the gnostic movement of the 2nd c., could not remain strictly negative, nor at the level of the speculations on the origin of the Son and the Holy Spirit. In fact, almost simultaneous with Tertullian and Hippolytus, Origen worked out his Christian gnosis (see Studer, *Dio,* 116-130; Studer, *Incarnazione;* Pazzini, *Figlio*). In this cosmic-soteriological framework, adopting the true aspirations of the gnostics, he seems at first to emphasize completely the mediation of the Logos between the only God and the multiple world. In fact, adhering closely to the *regula fidei,* he does not simply replace the soul, that is, the world, with the Holy Spirit, but clearly puts the Spirit on the side of the Trinity, which is incorporeal and worthy of worship, distinct from all creatures (*Princ.* I,6,4; II,2,2; *Com. Io.* VI,33,166), although leaving aside the question of the

Spirit's origin (see *Princ. pr.* 4, and also I,3,1 on the ignorance of the philosophers). He also does not fail to seek an explanation for the unity of the three hypostases (*Com. Io.* II,10,75), insisting on the principality of the Father, the principle (ἀρχή) of all principles (*Com. Rom.* 7,13; *Dial. Eracl.* 3). Nevertheless, neither is he able to distinguish sufficiently between the eternal generation of the Son and the temporal creation of rational beings, not to mention that he does not dare to take a position on the procession of the Holy Spirit (see *Princ. pr.* 4). He therefore left to posterity a trinitarian theology that clarified the actual distinction between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, against every modalist simplification, but which does not formulate with the necessary clarity either the equality or the eternal union of the three divine persons. Neither did his *aporiae* find an immediate solution after him (*see* *Dionysius of Alexandria), but they instead led to the *Arian crisis. Moreover, it is worthy of note that the primary scope of Origen's *De Principiis* was to make Christ, the truth of God, better known (see *Princ. pr.* 1). It is likewise interesting that Origen developed his trinitarian thought partly by addressing liturgical concerns. He in fact raised the question of baptism in the name of the Holy Spirit (see *Princ.* I,3,5) and prayer directed toward Christ (*Dial. Heracl.*).

III. The Nicene dogma and its universal reception. Because the major theologians of the 3rd c., despite their tireless efforts, were unable to find either a formula in which unity and distinction of the divine persons were counterbalanced or, even less so, to explain the unique divinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, it should not surprise us to find, at the beginning of the 4th c., two opposed movements in trinitarian theology, namely the "pluralistic" and the "unitarian." A clashing of these two movements with the passing of time was inevitable. But it was not immediately a head-on collision. Instead, the crisis broke out in the heart of the first movement, defended primarily by the disciples of Origen, such that one can speak of an Origenian crisis, that is, a crisis of Origen's Logos-Christology (see Studer, *Dio,* 148-155). In fact, for reasons difficult to delineate, *Arius, an Alexandrian presbyter, radicalized the Origenian positions concerning the principality of the Father in such a way that the Son had to appear as a creature and that his origin seemed to be confused with that of creatures. In a new situation in which the biblical doctrine on the *creatio ex nihilo* had obviously made the theologians more sensible to the temporality of the creation, Arius's teaching, namely that Christ was the first creature, could not be left unchallenged by others (see Ricken, *Nikaia als Krisis*).

In any case, his bishop *Alexander, who likewise was an heir of Origenian theology, brought his incorrigible presbyter to trial. In fact, to break his resistance, which by that time was supported by many affluent friends such as *Eusebius of Caesarea, the bishop of Alexandria allied himself, despite his Origenian preferences, with the bishops of the unitarian movement. Thus, soon after the Council of Nicaea, which had been convoked in 325 by *Constantine, the two movements met face to face. It was no longer a question about Christ, the only-begotten Son or the first creature, points that had been debated since the synod of the 318 Fathers, but increasingly also a question of one or three **hypostases*.

The Council of Nicaea itself, clearly appealing to the baptismal profession of faith, decreed in favor of the divinity of Christ, insisting on his filiation (see the Creed [DS 125]: "only begotten, generated, not created, through whom all things were made"), expressing it in the same creed with technical terms ("from the *ousia* of the Father," "consubstantial, i.e., one in being with the Father"; see Stead, *Homoousios*). The use of these terms, however, was not yet precise inasmuch as the words οὐσία and ὑπόστασις were used interchangeably (see the anathemas: DS 126). The problem of the nature of the Holy Spirit was not even touched. Moreover, not even the dogma on the Son, who was not created but generated, remained sufficiently circumscribed. These open questions could not remain unanswered. The bishops and theologians, therefore, with more or less complicity with civil authorities, engaged in an exacerbated controversy concerning the true understanding of Christian orthodoxy, the basis by that time not only for the communion of the churches but also the unity of the Roman Empire. It would be false, however, to see in these doctrinal debates only disagreements between political and ecclesiastical factions. Spiritual beliefs such as the divine adoption of believers and their union with Christ, true God and true man, were at stake.

The post-Nicene fight with respect to the true faith was waged at the beginning primarily on the level of ecclesiastical politics. Nevertheless, we should note that a controversy broke out very early between Eusebius of Caesarea and *Marcellus of Ancyra (see Strutwolf, *Trinität*). Eusebius, although still regarded today, whether incorrectly or not, as a pro-Arian, had the merit of defending theology, the immanent Trinity, as is said today, against the insufficient opinions of Marcellus (see *C. Marc.* II, 2: PG 24, 797A) and argued with all clarity that the trini-

tarian faith goes back to *Jesus himself (see *C. Marc.* I,1: PG 24,716B). After Constantine's death (337), discussions were also carried out at the level of the synodal search for a confession of faith that could unite both the defenders and the opponents of the Nicene Creed (see esp. DS 139-140). From ca. 350 onward, the discussions took a more strictly theological character. Under the leadership of *Aetius and *Eunomius, the Arian positions of an earlier time were radicalized to the point that almost led to a *rapprochement* of less intransigent theologians, namely the Nicenes, led esp. by Athanasius, and the so-called *homoiousians, under the leadership of *Basil of Ancyra. The reconciliation of the more moderate parties, moreover, took place at the Council of Alexandria (362), which admitted both the formula of the three *hypostases* and that of the one *ousia* (see Simonetti, *Crisi ariana,* 367-368). On the basis of this agreement, *Basil of Caesarea and the other Cappadocians worked out a logical distinction between the *hypostases* and the *ousia* which allowed them to come to the formula of the one *ousia* and the three *hypostases* (not before 375; see Sesboüé, *Basile;* Drecoll, *Basilius*). The formula certainly expresses well that the reception of the Nicene faith reached a via media between Arius and *Sabellius, between the two positions that exaggerated both the distinctions of the three persons and the divine unity. Whether it is fitting to use the term **Neonicenism*, the via media of which *Gregory of Nazianzus explicitly spoke, is another question altogether. However, the formula commonly accepted was not so successful from the theological aspect. It does not correspond well either to Basil's teaching on the Father-*archē* or *Augustine's teaching on the Father, whom he regarded as the beginning without beginning. During those same years the Cappadocians again took up the question of the Holy Spirit, which had already been posed by Athanasius, around 360, and already addressed even by Eusebius of Caesarea and *Cyril of Jerusalem. Seeking to remain as faithful as possible to the baptismal profession of faith, Basil demonstrated, in the end, in his magisterial work *De Spiritu sancto* (375), that the third person truly makes up part of the Trinity, being substantially distinct from all spirits and the giver of all life and worthy of the same adoration given to the Father and the Son. Under the leadership of *Gregory of Nazianzus and *Gregory of Nyssa, the reinterpretation of the baptismal profession of faith was officially accepted by the Council of *Constantinople (381) (DS 150). During the same period, although not directly involved in the synod, *Damasus of Rome and *Ambrose of Milan, primarily combating the "Western Arians," also led the Western churches to accept Nicene orthodoxy, as it had formed after 360, including the teaching on the divinity of the Holy Spirit in the explicit exclusion of the Sabellian doctrinal positions of Marcellus of Ancyra (see *Tomus Damasi:* DS 152-180, as well as C. Markschies, *Ambrosius*, with references to the *De Fide* and the *De Spiritu sancto*). The same also holds for the Eastern churches that were established outside the Roman Empire, although their reception of the Nicene faith bears less traces of Greek philosophical culture (see Studer, *Dio*, 230ff.). Thus, toward the end of the 4th c., all the Christian churches, with the exception of the Gothic communities, appeared unanimous in the baptismal profession of faith, as it was reinterpreted by the Council of Nicaea and Constantinople and as the religious basis of the political unity of the Roman Empire (see the decree of the three emperors: Mirbt n. 310).

IV. The inheritance of the Fathers. Over the course of the discussions concerning the Nicene faith, in addition to the concept of orthodoxy, the common faith of all the Catholic churches and the basis of the political unity of the empire, the idea of the authority of the Fathers was formed (*see* *argumentation). The first step in this direction was already made by Eusebius of Caesarea. From the time of Athanasius onward, recourse was made to the decisions of the council fathers of Nicaea, and slowly the same authority was attributed to all bishops and even theologians who were regarded as witnesses to the true faith. Within this framework, trinitarian theology itself became primarily a theology of the Fathers (see Studer, in *Storia della Teologia* I, 583-598). Witnesses to this in the East were the trinitarian writings of *Cyril of Alexandria (see Boulnois, *Trinità*), the numerous treatises on theology and economy and finally the most famous expression of the theology of the Fathers, *John of Damascus's *Expositio fidei* (see Studer, in *Patrologia* V,233-242). In the West, Augustine, in his *De Trinitate,* primarily intended to retrieve the entire patristic patrimony on this subject (see *Trin.* I,4,7; already in the *Fid. symb.* 1,1). He was followed by others, esp. *Fulgentius of Ruspe.

This fidelity to the doctrinal inheritance of the Fathers, however, was not lacking in a certain creativity. First of all, esp. in the East, a subsequent development occurred in the christological horizon of later patristic theology. It is true that the christological controversies that dated back to 360 are nothing more than a logical consequence of the discussions on the trinitarian faith. Theologians esp.

tried to harmonize the theology used for the mystery of the Trinity (οὐσία-ὑπόστασις) with that of Christology. But all these attempts to formulate the faith in the true humanity of Jesus and in the true unity of Christ, God and Man, by means of an already recognized trinitarian terminology could not but have repercussions on trinitarian theology itself (see Studer, *Dio,* 322-332). Accepting, in fact, the christological adage **unus ex Trinitate passus est*, the Byzantine and Latin theologians definitively excluded any *patripassianism. Discussing the meaning of the one *hypostasis* of Christ, which had been defined by the Council of *Chalcedon (451), *Leontius of Byzantium and other Greek theologians completed Basil's concept of ὑπόστασις χαρακτηριστική with the definition of the *hypostasis* as the καθ' ἑαυτὸ εἶναι. Suited for the explanation of the hypostatic union, this definition, in which the hypostasis was included as the subject of the individual properties and at the same time as subsistence, created difficulties, however, with respect to the Trinity. One had to avoid speaking of three subsistent beings, that is, tritheism. Evidence of this can be perceived primarily in the controversies with respect to *John Philoponus (see Hainthaler, *Jesus Christus,* II/3). Theologians, therefore, equated the threefold καθ' ἑαυτὸ εἶναι, inasmuch as it was the common being, with the divine essence.

All these subsequent developments, completed under the influence of the *Aristotelianism of Neoplatonist Alexandrians, were not ignored in the West. In a christological and philosophical context very similar to the evolution of trinitarian theology, Boethius contributed greatly to the evolution of trinitarian theology, both with his definition of person as *naturae rationalis individua substantia* and his adage *est relatio quae multiplicat trinitatem* (see Schurr).

No less original during this later period was the contribution of Augustine, esp. in his treatise *De Trinitate,* his most theological work. Developing this document in a spirit of rigorous investigation (see *Trin.* IX,1,1: *quaerere faciem Dei*; *Trin.* XV,1,1-2: *exercere lectorem; quaerere semper*), he laid the doctrinal foundations of Western trinitarian doctrine. In the first four books, he demonstrates with care that the Catholic faith (Nicene), concerning the *aequalitas* and the *unitas* of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, corresponds to the message of Sacred Scripture. He therefore refutes the false or insufficient interpretations of biblical texts concerning the theophanies and missions of the Son and the Spirit. He thus comes to emphasize the incarnation of the Son of God, a temporal manifestation of the eternal Trinity (see Studer, *Teologia*). Books V-VII are intended to clarify in what sense the affirmations, whether dogmatic or biblical (e.g., 1 Cor 1:24), are to be applied to the *Trinitas quae est unus Deus*. The second part of the work (*Trin.* IX-XV), introduced by book VIII, constitutes a dialectic leap toward the analogies of the trinitarian life that are found in the human soul. With the analogy of love abandoned, Augustine therefore passed through the perception of the senses and the imagination of the memory, knowledge and faith to the image of God. To this highest step, the believer does not stop to remember himself, to knowing and to love himself. He seeks rather to grow in the memory, knowledge and love of the *Trinitas quae est unus Deus* (*Trin.* XV,20,39). The result of this search for reality through similarities is, however, rather negative (see *Trin.* XV,22,43). The believer does nothing else than understand what he ought by believing (*diligere*) his God (*Trin.* VIII,5,8), that is, to put everything behind and to extend love and hope toward the *Trinitas quae est unus Deus* (*Trin.* IX,1,1, with Phil 3:13; XII,7,10). In the later reception of the *De Trinitate,* a portion of theologians were content with some dogmatic expressions. They esp. made reference to the Augustinian doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. The authors of the creed *Quicumque,* Alcuin and the Protestant Reformers took this approach. Some attributed great importance to the so-called psychological theory (see Schmaus). Unfortunately, until recent decades, few have sought to stand up for the great "potential" of Augustine's most theological work and thereby refute the unjust criticisms against it. Augustine's trinitarian thought deserves to be studied more inasmuch as his very biblical teachings concerning the essential missions and the personal properties of the divine persons are to be seen esp. in the way in which he presents the incarnation as the *summa gratia,* which allows Christians to seek God's face, to love in faith the *Trinitas quae est unus Deus*.

1. *For the biography:* for earlier studies, see V. Venanzi, *Dogma e linguaggio trinitario nei Padri della Chiesa. Un panorama bibliografico*: AugR 13 (1973) 425-453; for the studies published after 1973, see the bibl. of the general presentations.

2. *General presentations:* G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, London [2]1952; J. Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition*, I, Chicago 1971; J.N.D. Kelly, *Il pensiero cristiano delle origini*, Bologna 1972; A. Grillmeier (T. Hainthaler), *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I u. II/1-4, Freiburg 1979-2001; B. Studer, *Der Glaube an Gott und die Erlösung im Glauben der Alten Kirche*, Düsseldorf 1985; F. Courth, *Trinität in der Schrift und Patristik*: HDG II/1a, Freiburg 1988 (bibl.); A. Di Berardino (ed.), *Storia della Teologia*, Casale Monf. 1993; N. Ciola, *Teologia trinitaria: storia, metodo, propettive*, Bologna 1996; B.

Studer, *Mysterium Caritatis. Studien zur Exegese und zur Trinitätslehre in der Alten Kirche*, Rome 1999; L.F. Ladaria, *Il Dio vivo e vero: il mistero della Trinità*, Casale Monf. ^{2}2002; A.M. Ritter, *Trinität*, I. *Alte Kirche*: TRE 34 (2002) 91-99 (bibl.); B. Studer, *Ortodossia classica: dottrine trinitarie e cristologiche*, in *Cristianesimo. Grande Atlante*, III, ed. G. Ruggieri, Turin 2006, 1016-1044; 1354-1355.

3. Pre-Nicene Period: J. Lebreton, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité*, II, *De s. Clément à s. Irénée*, Paris 1928; A. Orbe, *Estudios Valentinianos*, 6 vols., Rome 1956-66; J. Daniélou, *Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée*, 3 vols., Paris 1958, 1961, 1978; F. Ricken, *Nikaia als Krisis des altchristlichen Platonismus*: Theologie und Philosophie 44 (1969) 321-341; J.P. Martín, *El Espíritu Santo en los orígenes del cristianismo*, Zürich 1971; A. Benoît - C. Munier, *Le baptême dans l'église ancienne*, Berna 1994; B. Uríbarri, *La emergencia de la Trinidad inmanente: Hipólito y Tertuliano*, Madrid 1999; F. Dünzl, *Pneuma: Funktionen des theologischen Begriffs in frühchristlicher Literatur*, Münster 2000; D. Pazzini, *Figlio*: Origene. Dizionario (2000), 161-168; B. Studer, *Incarnazione*: ibid., 225-229.

4. Nicene Period: E. Boularand, *L'hérésie d'Arius et la "foi" de Nicée*, Paris 1972; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel quarto secolo*, Rome 1975 (in the bibl., see earlier studies of the same author); A.M. Ritter, *Arianismus*: TRE 3 (1978) 692-719; A.M. Ritter, *Konstantinopel*: TRE 19 (1990) 518-524. C. Stead, *Homoousios*: RAC 16 (1992) 364-433; J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, Berlin 1994; C. Markschies, *Ambrosius von Mailand und die Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen 1995; V. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: sein Weg vom Homöousianer zum Neonizäner*, Göttingen 1996; B. Sesboüé, *Saint Basile et la Trinité: un acte théologique au IV^{e} siècle: le rôle de Basile de Césarée dans l'élaboration de la doctrine du langage trinitaire*, Paris 1998; H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätslehre und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea: eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen 1999; O. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis: ein Kommentar zum "Ancoratus,"* Göttingen 2003.

5. Later Patristic Authors: V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der skytischen Kontroversen*, Paderborn 1935; S. Otto, *Person und Subistenz. Die philosophische Anthropologie des Leontius von Byzanz*, Munich 1968; L. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milan 1974; M.B. Boulnois, *Le paradoxe trinitarie chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Herméneutique, analyses philologiques et argumentation théologique*, Paris 1994; A. Di Berardino (ed.), *Patrologia* V, Genova 2000.

6. Augustine: M. Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre der hl. Augustinus*, Münster 1927, ^{2}1967; L. Maier, *Les missions divines selon s. Augustin*, Fribourg 1960; A. Schindler, *Wort und Analogie in Augustins Trinitätslehre*, Tübingen 1965; B. Studer, *Gratia Christi – Gratia Dei bei Augustinus von Hippo*, Rome 1993; B. Studer, *La teologia trinitaria in Agostino d'Ippona*, SEA 46, Rome 1994, 161-177 (against the thesis of De Régnon); B. Studer, *Zur Pneumatologie des Augustinus von Hippo*: AugR 35 (1995) 568-583; M.R. Barnes, *Exegesis and Polemic in Augustine's De Trinitate*: AugStud 30 (1999) 43-59; R. Williams, *Trinitate, De*: Augustine (1999) 845-851; R. Kany, *Opus laboriosum. Bilanz, Kritik und Weiterführung der Forschung des neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert zu Augustins "De Trinitate"* (Diss.), Bochum 2002 (extensive bibl.); G. Strzelczyk, *Communicatio idiomatum = lo scambio delle proprietà: storia, status quaestionis e prospettive*, Rome 2004; B. Studer, *Augustinus, De Trinitate. Eine Einführung*, Düsseldorf 2005; Id., *Durch Geschichte zum Glauben*, Rome 2006 (with studies on Augustine).

B. Studer

TRISAGION. The Trisagion—"Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us"—seems to have been introduced in the Eastern liturgies after 450. *John of Damascus claims that it was revealed to St. *Proclus (*De fide orth.* III,10: PG 94,1021). It was first recited before the readings, with the exception of the Egyptian liturgy, where it was placed before the gospel. Both *Antioch and *Constantinople had a fixed formula, against the attempts of modification through the addition of the phrase ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς. The *Egyptian liturgies, however, esp. the *Jacobite Abyssinians, have a formula that assimilates elements of the creed.

The Trisagion was introduced in the *Gallican liturgies before the readings, as in the *Byzantine liturgy, and before the gospel, as in the Egyptian liturgies. The *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae* simply refers to it as *Aius* and explains why it is sung both in Greek and Latin. The Hispanic liturgy, however, which only recited it in the solemn feasts, uses the Latin exclusively, with an edition similar to the Egyptian ones. The Roman liturgy did not receive the Trisagion until the 11th c. and only for the adoration of the cross on Good Friday (*Ordo Romanus* 31). The Trisagion did not reach *Rome directly from the East, but through the Gallican liturgies.

J. Quasten (ed.), *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae*, Münster 1934; J. Quasten, *Oriental Influence in the Gallican Liturgy*: Traditio 1 (1943) 55-78; J. Mateos, *La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine*: OCA 191 (1971) 91-126; S. Brock, *The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy*: Sobornost 7 (1985) 24-34; S. Parenti, *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the East: The Various Orders of Celebration*: Handbook for Liturgical Studies 3 (1999) 63-64; E. Lodi, *The Oriental Anaphoras*: Handbook for Liturgical Studies 3 (1999) 84-85; G. Woolfenden, "*Trisagion*": *New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, London 2002, 459.

A. Chupungco

TRITHEISM. During the patristic era, the accusation of defending tritheism (τριθεΐα) or of being a tritheist (τριθεΐτης) was made at different theological movements and for various reasons (Lampe 1408; Isid., *Etym.* 8,5,68). *Dionysius of Rome would rebuke certain anti-*Sabellians of dividing the monarchy into three *hypostases* and of speaking, therefore, of three gods (DS 112). The Eunomians and *Macedonians accused the Cappadocians of trithe-

ism because they acknowledged the divinity of the Son and the *Holy Spirit and were unable to safeguard the sole *ousia* of God (*Ep.* 38 attributed to *Basil of Caesarea; Greg. Nyss., *Tres dii*; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 31,13). Later, this criticism was also leveled against the *Nestorians (Leontius of Jerusalem, *Adv. Nest.* 2,6: PG 86/1,1544C-1549C) and with greater justification against *John Philoponus (Leontius Scholasticus *Sect.* 5,6: PG 86/1,1232D-1233B), because they overly confused nature and *hypostasis*.

Not only on the patristic front (first phase of the controversy) but also on the philosophical, the tritheist controversy revolved around John Philoponus, who flourished between 520 and 570. This famous commentator on Aristotle's writings took from the *monophysite tradition the identification between nature and *hypostasis*. He applied it in the sense of *Aristotelian realism to the trinitarian doctrine. He therefore equated to the three *hypostases* three natures, which he regarded as distinct among each other but consubstantial. He attributed, however, to the common nature (κοινόν) only a logical existence and regarded it as the genus "God," of which the *hypostases* are the concrete exemplars. For this reason his opponents accused him of tritheism. The following group of theologians raised this accusation when they gathered in 567 at Constantinople: Peter, patriarch of Antioch (d. 591), *Damian of Alexandria (d. 607), and esp. *Eutychius of Constantinople (d. 582) in the *De differentia naturae et hypostaseos* (CPG 6940) and *Anastasius of Antioch (d. 599) in the *C. Io. Phil.* "Diaetem" (CPG 6956). In the end, however, it was more of a verbal tritheism. Behind the misunderstanding one finds an overly rigid fidelity toward the trinitarian terminology of the Cappadocians and esp. a problematic use of then-contemporary philosophical terminology. Nonetheless, more research might determine whether Philoponus's position was to speak of a God in three persons in response to those who put the divinity before the Trinity.

M. Simonetti, *Giovanni Filopono*: NDPAC 2238-2240; A. Grillmeier (T. Hainthaler), *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, II/4, Freiburg 1990, 109-149, esp. 134-141: *G. e il triteismo*; op. cit., II, 3, Freiburg 2002, 279-291: *La controversia triteita e la cristologia siriaca*; B.R. Suchla, *Joh. Philoponus*: LACL[2] (1999) 397-398. (bibl.); G. Greshake, *Tritheismus*: LTK[3] 10, 263.

B. Studer

TRIUMPHUS CHRISTI HEROICUS. The first known attestation to the *Triumphus Christi heroicus* is the edition by Th. Poelmann following the text by Juvencus (Basel 1537) and with the marginal note: *in exemplari auctoris nomen non erat adscriptum* (see p. 122). Poelmann does not indicate the *exemplar* used for the transcription of the *Triumphus*. It is likely (but not surely) a MS of Juvencus himself; at present we might only pronounce in favor of a cautious *non liquet,* which, nonetheless, cannot validate the attribution of the work to the humanistic age.

In 1541 Bartolomeus Westheimer edited a second version of *Triumphus Christi heroicus,* once more in Basel, which shows its debt toward Poelmann's edition—which should be considered definitively better. The poem, by an unknown author, has been handed down like many other short, anonymous poems of the same tenor, i.e., added to or passed on, by MS tradition, within the corpus of authenticated works of famous authors. Ps.-Juvencus, as we might call the author, is likely to be a Christian militant of the 4th or 5th c. who proves to be a cultivated poet, with a good knowledge of secular texts, perfectly assimilated, as well as of the Holy Scriptures and the apocryphal gospels. Brought up in the schools of the empire, imbued with classical rhetoric, he can rightly be ascribed within the literary group of Christian authors who thought the "imitation-emulation" technique to be useful to the diffusion of Christian poetry—and who selectively and intelligently used it. The original aspect of his poetry lies in the daring poetic procedures, in a new rhythm of composition and the use of neologisms (see *agnifer,* line 54), in a new way of making up words (see *sordifluus,* line 101), in Graecisms (see *plasma,* line 58, and *syngrapha,* line 99) and in rare but significant terms (see *elinguis,* line 99). A concise linguistic analysis—which here is impossible—would highlight significant consonances with Iuvencus's poetical lexicon.

Under several aspects, the poem bares the features of a homily in verses, similar to those marking the rhythmic prose in Melito and in many other unknown authors from the 2nd c. onward (worthy of note is the Holy Saturday homily by ps.-Epiphanius, preserved in PG 43,440-464); furthermore, the poem is imbued with an eschatological suspense which unravels throughout a series of descriptions placed within an ascending climax. Celebrating the triumph of Christ over the underworld, evil and human sin, the poem can be divided into two parts. In the first (lines 1-78), the poet describes Christ's descent into the underworld to set free the souls of the just. At the gate of hell, Christ shows himself covered in sores and blood. Satan (who in the poem keeps the mythological name of Pluto) utters a desperate cry and, with vigorous words, calls to arms the hellish army. In a surreal silence barricades are

put up and the siege is prepared. Christ appears in his full light (lines 19-20: *ecce autem Christus per tetra silentia rupit / lumine sidereo, claraque in luce refulsit*). The entire army of darkness, frightened, runs away. The blessed and the saints run in crowds: *Adam, *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, *Joseph, *Moses, Aaron, *Joshua, Judas Maccabeus and *John the Baptist all gather around the liberator; at the head of the redeemed is the king of the line of Jesse, who, as their interpreter, starts singing to the Lamb the blessing hymn: *salve, Erebi victor, domitor salve inclite mortis, / destructor scelerum, salve, o fortissime vindex / amissae vitae, salve, o spes una salutis, / aspice plasma tuum, sancte, et venerande Creator, / et post tot gemitus nos duc ad regna polorum* (lines 55-59). This passage is strongly influenced by the *Gospel of Nicodemus,* which is quite faithfully paraphrased. In the second part (lines 79-108), the cross of Christ is celebrated as an instrument of redemption, of victory and of salvation; together with the cross, Christ our king is also celebrated, whose royalty is the revealed truth in the Old and the in New Testaments. The final lines express the poet's deep emotion as he sees the cross, from whose branches hang the enemy spoils for the redemption of humankind. The poet, drawing inspiration from the optimism of the Christian faith, ends his poem glorifying *Christum, cuius victoria nostra est* (line 107).

Th. Poelmann, *Iuvenci Evangelicae Historiae libri IV*, Basil 1537 [?]; B. Westheimer, *Sedulli Paschale opus*, Basilmerus 1541; F. Arevalo, *Iuvenci Historiae Evangelicae libri IV*, 1792; *P.L.* XIX (*proll.*19), coll. 385-388; A. Salzano, *Agli inizi della poesia cristiana latina. Autori anonimi dei secoli IV-V*, Salerno 2007 (pp. 126-151).

Aniello Salzano

TROJANUS of Saintes (d. before 533). An individual of great authority and highly esteemed by his fellow citizens, he was the bishop of Saintes (the Roman Mediolanum Santonum in Aquitaine) after 511, and he died before 533. He was highly regarded also by *Gregory of Tours, who sings his praises (see *Liber in gloria confessorum* 58). His feast day is on 30 November.

He sent one of his letters to Bishop Eumerius of Nantes, who was present at the Council of Orléans of 533, in which he treats a case of conscience: if one doubts whether one was baptized as a child, he should be baptized again.

Editions: see CPL 1074; PL 67, 995; Gundlach, MHG, *Ep* 3, (Hannover 1892) 437 = CCL 157 (1957) 489. *Studies:* BS 12, 678-679 (bibl.); Patrologia IV, 287.

M. Maritano

TROPAEUM TRAIANI (Adamclisi, district of Constanța, Romania). A city founded by the emperor *Trajan in proximity to the triumphal monument of the same emperor (dedicated to Mars Ultor, during the years 107/108), rebuilt from the foundations by *Constantine the Great and *Licinius (313–316), restored under *Anastasius and *Justinian, abandoned and fallen into ruin after the year 600: archaeological digs, undertaken from 1891 to 1909 under the direction of Gr. Tocilescu, revealed five Christian basilicas from the 4th to the 6th c., four of which were inside the walls, the fifth in the cemetery placed on the slope of the hills N of the city.

The "simple" basilica (A), discovered ca. 50 m (164 ft) from the E door and to the N of the Via Principalis, well proportioned (30 x 17.6 m [98 ft x 57 ft]), has three aisles, a tripartite narthex, a semicircular apse to the E, an atrium to the W discovered with the crypt underneath the presbytery (2.70 x 2.3 m [8.8 x 7.5 ft]; height ca. 2.50 m [8.2 ft], barrel vault) in 1971–1973. Attached to the S side is a construction with five rooms; to the N, one finds other room additions. The dating of this structure goes back to the era of the emperor *Anastasius (491–518).

The transept or T-shaped basilica (D), the only one of this type from *Scythia Minor, opposite the "simple" basilica and to the S of the Via Principalis, has an internal length of 33.8 m (110.89 ft): in the apse, a semicircular synthronon; between this and the wall of the apse lies a small gallery for walking (*deambulatorium*); in front of the *synthronos* most likely placed under a ciborium, an altar, with a small crypt for relics; a narthex divided into three rooms in correspondence to the nave of the basilica; toward the W, connected with two steps, an atrium with a triportico and a small internal courtyard (8 x 6 m [26.2 x 19.6 ft]) containing a brick floor. This construction dates to the 6th c.

The "marble" basilica (B), called thus on account of the great quantity of marble used in its construction or because of a remodeling carried out during the Justinian age (527–565), presents, to the W, a triportico atrium connected to the narthex, situated 0.6 m (1.9 ft) above the level of the atrium, by two entrances placed in correspondence to the entrances to the N and S. A third entryway, situated on the short (S) side of the narthex, was preceded by a beautiful *propylon*. Three stone steps connected the narthex to the nave, which was on a higher level. The presbytery, under which no crypt was found, extended under the central nave as far as the enclosure of the *cancelli,* the foundations of which have been found. A small and elegant baptistery stood to the S of the atrium.

To the S of the main road and ca. 30 m (98.4 ft) from the great W gate of the city were found the ruins of the "cistern" basilica (C) so-called because it rose above a Roman cistern from the 2nd–3rd c. The dimensions of the basilica were 19.7 x 6.8 m [64.6 x 22.3ft.]; toward the extreme E, under the presbytery, a small crypt for relics was constructed later (6th c.). A platform paved with stone slabs, discovered to the W of the basilica, was probably the internal area of the atrium.

I. Barnea, *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Roumanie*, Vatican City 1977; I. Barnea, *Christian Art in Romania*, 1, Bucharest 1979; N. Duval, *Revue archéologique*, 2, Paris 1980, 333-336; A.V. Rădulescu, *Le Monument Triomphal d'Adamclisi*, Constantza 1982; EAA² 5, 862-864; A. Barnea, *Une province chrétienne sous Justinien: La Scythie mineure*, in Acta XIII Congressus Intern. Archaeologiae christianae, II, Vatican City 1998, 807-822, esp. 819-820.

I. Barnea

TROPHIES of DAMASCUS. The *Trophies of Damascus* is an anonymous anti-Jewish dialogue in Greek—which presents a relatively coherent and homogeneous structure—and was composed of a prologue and four διαλέξεις, that correspond to the space of four days. On the basis of the evidence internal to the text, the work is to be dated to the 7th c. (661 or 681), although provenance in Syria would be required if only because of the title. There is no information about its author; Bardy hypothesized that the author could have been a monk who was active during the time of the iconoclastic controversy. The title of the document indicates its objective, namely, to proclaim the victory of the Christian protagonist over the Jewish antagonists. The dispute occurred in the presence of spectators among whom were included, in addition to Jews and Christians, pagans, *Saracens, *Samaritans and heretics. Various Jews intervene in the debate: initially only one, whose name is not identified, who then declares that he has been defeated and is no longer able to continue the discussion. He has himself replaced by men more learned in the law, who are presented as wise men and animated by a great zeal in the search for the truth. Despite their ability, they too are reduced to silence and replaced, in turn, by some Jews from *Cappadocia, who do not show themselves to be any better. The work concludes with the Christian's victory, a commonplace in these types of documents, and the Jews' admission of their error. In addition to setting forth the christological and christocentric exegesis with a repertory of traditional biblical *loci,* it is characterized by a justification of the veneration of the cross and images. In reference to the question of images, the *Trophies of Damascus* contains themes in common, esp., with the *Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo,* the writings of *Stephen of Bostra, *Jerome of Jerusalem, *Leontius of Neapolis and *John of Damascus, who connected the veneration of the cross and icons to the themes of the commemoration, glorification and encouragement to imitation. The biblical citations were used to demonstrate that in the OT there are recurring instances, with a positive meaning, of the construction of images and the use of artifacts in a religious sense. By means of these objects, veneration was given to the persons represented and not to the matter out of which they were made. To this end, the *Trophies of Damascus* expands the scriptural *dossier* of the iconophile literature, because they make reference to passages from the OT rarely used before to also demonstrate the typological prefiguration of the cross of Christ, on whose work the author reflects at length several times. Although within a literary tradition which in the course of the centuries reused the same polemical arguments, the work presents some points of convergence with the *Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo,* which are at times very close to the verbal template, suggesting a close connection between the two documents, most likely due to the use of a common source.

With respect to the discussion on the Messiah and the conditions of peace which would have had to occur upon his advent as foretold by the *Prophets, the Jew in the work affirms that he does not believe that the Messiah has come because many Christians have been imprisoned and numerous wars have been waged against them. As Bardy believes, this brings to mind the campaigns against the Arabs, who in 632 conquered *Jerusalem and in 635 *Damascus. Following the invasions of the Persians and the Arabs, to the traditional argument of the Christians that the Jews had been dispersed for centuries and deprived of a leader while the Roman and Christian empire extended over the entire earth, the Jews in fact can object that the Roman and Christian peace has come to an end, the empire has lost many cities and provinces, and the reunification of the Jewish people is no longer impossible.

CPG 7797. *Edition:* G. Bardy (ed.), *Les Trophées de Damas. Controverse judéo-chrétienne du VIIᵉ siècle*, texte grec édité et traduit, (PO 15/2), Paris 1920.

Studies: M. Waegeman, *Les traités Adversus Judaeos. Aspects des relations Judéo-chrétiennes dans le monde grec*: Byzantion 56 (1986) 295-313; V. Déroche, *La polémique antijudaïque au VIᵉ et au VIIᵉ siècle. Un mémento inédit, les Képhalaia*: Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991) 275-311; H.G. Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit*

vor dem Bilderstreit, Berlin 1992; Av. Cameron, *The Jews in Seventh-Century Palestine*: Scripta Classica Israelica 13 (1994) 75-93; Av. Cameron, *The Trophies of Damascus: The Church, the Temple and Sacred Space*, in *Le temple lieu de conflit*, Actes du colloque de Cartigny 1991 (Les cahiers du CEPOA 7), Leuven 1994, 203-212; D.M. Olster, *Roman Defeat, Christian Response and the Literary Construction of the Jew*, Philadelphia 1994; A. Külzer, *Disputationes Graecae contra Iudaeos. Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen antijüdischen Dialogliteratur und ihrem Judenbild*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999; P. Andrist, *Pour un répertoire des manuscrits de polémique antijudaïque*: Byzantion 70 (2000) 270-306; Av. Cameron, *Blaming the Jews: The Seventh-Century Invasions of Palestine in Context*: Travaux et Mémoires 14 (2002) 57-78; I. Aulisa, *"Papisci et Philonis Iudaeorum cum monacho colloquium": note per una ricostruzione del confronto tra giudei e cristiani in epoca altomedievale*: VetChr 40 (2003) 17-41; I. Aulisa - C. Schiano, *Dialogo di Papisco e Filone giudei con un monaco*, Bari 2005.

I. Aulisa

TROPHIMUS of Arles (3rd c.). Probably the bishop of Arles around or at the mid-3rd c., or rather, before it. Pope *Innocent I claimed for *Rome the evangelization of the West: *Italy, *Gaul, *Spain, *Africa and Sicily (PL 20,552). The inhabitants of *Arles with *Patroclus reiterated this claim (412–426), affirming that their bishop, Trophimus, had been sent to Arles precisely from Rome, an affirmation that Pope *Zosimus adopted for his own advantage (417–418). In 450, 19 bishops of the province of Arles reaffirmed the antiquity and, in a letter to Pope *Leo I, made Trophimus out to be a disciple of the apostle *Peter, and the teacher of the three other Gallic bishops. The apostolic legends began in this way. *Gregory of Tours placed Trophimus in the 3rd c. at the time of the emperor *Decius (249–251), making him out to be a companion of six other missionaries sent by Rome, among whom were Catianus of Tours, *Saturninus of Toulouse and *Dionysius of Paris, but he did not give his endorsement to the claims of Arles (*Hist. Franc.* 1,30). His *Vita* has little historical value.

BHL 8318b-8319; BS 12, 665-672; LMA 8, 1044-1045; BBKL 22, 1362-1363.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

TROPICI. *Athanasius used this title to refer to a group of people (*Serap.* 1,10) on account of their method of interpreting *Scripture (according to τρόποι, "figures"), when he refuted their teaching, writing to *Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, when the latter had brought this teaching to his attention. The Tropici, who were active in *Egypt, maintained the nondivinity of the *Holy Spirit on the basis of Amos 4:13 (see Didymus, *De Spir. sanc.* I,14-15); Zech 1:9 and 1 Tim 5:21—otherwise the Spirit would also have been a Son—and therefore his creatureliness, though as an angel superior over the others. In respect to the doctrine concerning the Son, they had moved from *Arianism to orthodoxy (*Serap.* 1,1). The hypothesis has been forwarded that the Tropici are to be identified with the **pneumatomachi* who were mentioned by *Hilary of Poitiers (*Trin.* XII,55-56).

A. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen*, Leipzig 1969, 30-35; Simonetti 365-366; *Atanasio. Lettere a Serapione. Lo Spirito santo*, ed. E. Cattaneo, Rome 1986.

F. Cocchini

TROPOLOGY. The term *tropology* was initially used by ancient authors as a synonym for *allēgoria,* to indicate the hermeneutical process that allowed one to discover the hidden meaning of a text that was hidden under the literal meaning. The verbs *ainissomai* and *tropologeō* are used as synonyms of *allēgoreo*, just as the substantives *ainigma*, *symbolon* and *tropologia* have the same meaning of *allēgoria*. The verb *tropologeō* is found for the first time in the *Letter of ps.-Aristeas* (§ 150), although the corresponding substantive is used as a synonym of *typos* by *Justin Martyr to indicate the deep sense of the law, the prefiguration of Christ and the church (*Dial. Triph.* 57,2; 114,2; 129,2). *Origen, who in the treatise on hermeneutics contained in Book IV of the treatise *On the First Principles* sets forth a tripartition of the meanings of Scripture (literal-moral-spiritual sense) corresponding to the three parts which, according to the Pauline anthropological schema, make up the human being (*incipientes-progredientes-perfecti*), continued to use the terms *allēgoria* and *tropologia* indistinguishably to indicate the technical procedure that brings to light the spiritual meaning of Scripture. The spiritual meaning and its specifically Christian content is defined by Origen with the term *anagōgē*, although it is possible to also find the interchangeable terms *allēgoria* (more precisely indicating the technical procedure to reach such a meaning) and *tropologia*. Other authors used the term in the same way, such as *Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nyssa who, however, at times, in polemical disputes with an overly allegorizing exegesis gave a negative connotation to the word (see, e.g., the negative meaning given to *tropikos* by Basil in *Hexaem.* 2,5 and 3,9, or the statement of having avoided the *tropikē allēgoria* by Gregory of Nyssa in *Hexaem.*: PG 44, 121d). As a

matter of fact, Gregory of Nyssa seems to have preferred the terms *theōria, dianoia, ainigma,* and *anagōgē* to *tropologia*. It is in the context of the Antiochene school, moreover, that one finds recorded the first true and proper distinction between the terms *tropologia* and *allēgoria*: *Diodore of Tarsus, in fact, in the preface to Psalm 118 (CCG 6 LXXII) recognizes in *tropologia* every type of figurative discourse, although in the second only that type of account whose literal meaning is denied.

The term *tropologia* was used by *Jerome primarily in the original form of a synonym of *allēgoria;* but, for example, in *Ep.* 120,12, it is inserted, in the tripartition of the senses of Scripture prevailing since Origen's time, at the level of the moral interpretation, according to a schema that would continue until the Middle Ages. *John Cassian (*Coll.* 14,8) introduced a fourfold partition in the meaning of Scripture: he distinguishes in fact the *historica interpretatio* from the *spiritalis intelligentia,* which is articulated on three levels. There is the *tropologia,* that is, moral exegesis, the *allēgoria,* which one can understand as the typological sense, and the *anagōgē,* which is the highest spiritual sense, geared toward deciphering the most lofty and sublime mysteries.

M. Simonetti, *Lettera e/o allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985; A. Quacquarelli, *Esegesi biblica e patristica fra tardoantico e altomedioevo* (Quaderni di VetChr 23), Bari 1991; D. Barthélemy, *Découvrir l'écriture*, Paris 2000; R.D. Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian*, Leuven 2000.

C. Noce

TRULLO (Quinisext), Council in. The two ecumenical councils, the fifth (553) and the sixth (680–681), did not draft disciplinary canons, but only dogmatic decisions, as is stated in the letter to the emperor *Justinian II written by the council fathers. The emperor convoked a council to be held in *Constantinople in 692 (or perhaps in 691) in the dome-shaped hall (*trullo*) where the preceding council was held. Hence the wording *in Trullo,* which has no specific but only historical resonances; but the other title (*Synodos*) *Penthektē* or (*Concilium*) *Quinisextum* (that is, fifth/sixth), a Greek neologism of the 12th c., places it in the line of the enumeration of the ecumenical councils, as a supplement of the fifth (553) and the sixth (680–681). In this case, it would have been an ecumenical council that took place without the participation of the Western bishops. The bishops present or represented were 220, 183 of which belonged to the patriarchate of Constantinople, 10 to Illyricum, along with some Armenian bishops and patriarchs of *Jerusalem, *Alexandria and *Antioch. Present at the council was Basil of Gortina (Crete) from the Western patriarchate, who regarded himself as the pontifical delegate. The emperor laid out the program of the council, which was not to address doctrinal questions, but ecclesiastical discipline, and in fact published 102 canons, many of which were rather long for the canonical literary genre. This council represents a noteworthy effort of unification of the Greek canonical legislation; it sought to impose uniformity at the expense of legitimate local differences. After a profession of faith (can. 1), the second canon confirmed the preceding councils (ecumenical and local), which were all Eastern, with the exception of those African canons, the canonical epistles of the Greek fathers and a passage from the writings of *Cyprian. The emperor's objective was to make laws for all of Christianity: the majority of the canons repeat or correct preceding norms; the new ones condemn some practices that became prevalent in the patriarchate of Constantinople or others in disagreement with the Constantinopolitan tradition (e.g., the Roman clergy are prohibited from fasting on Saturday [can. 55]; the Armenians were prohibited from eating eggs and cheese on Saturday and on Sundays during the Lenten period [can. 56]). Can. 13 criticizes the Roman tradition on ecclesiastical celibacy; can. 36 mentions can. 28 of the Council of *Chalcedon on the patriarchal see, as the second Rome. It decrees a law on clerics, monks and marriage, but also on aspects of social life (shows, holidays), on *paganism and Jews. The council allowed presbyters to marry before ordination, although bishops cannot live with their own wives. It prohibits the representation of Christ as a lamb. The emperor sent canons to *Rome to obtain Pope *Sergius's signature, which was to be placed after his own. Sergius refused because he regarded some canons as contrary to ecclesiastical tradition (LP I,373). Justinian II then decided to use force, but the attempt failed due to the opposition of the army of *Ravenna and the Pentapolis of Marche (LP I,373-374). The imperial emissary who had come to arrest the pope was spared from lynching by the pope himself. In the conciliar text there was also space for the signature of the bishop of *Ravenna and the two bishops of Illyricum (*Thessalonica and *Corinth, who are dependent on Rome). The ecumenical character of the Council of Trullo remains a debated question: although it is fully accepted in the *Byzantine world, the canons in their totality were never approved by the Roman see. After the Second Council of *Nicaea

(787), the canons are regarded as issued by the Sixth Ecumenical Council; some were cited in Gratian's *Decretum*. They are still in full effect in the Byzantine Church.

CPG 9443-9444; Hfl-Lecl 3, 560-578; Mansi 11, 921-1006; Joannou, I, 1, 101-111; DTC 13, 1581-1597 (see Tables 1, 732f.); *I canoni dei concili della Chiesa antica*, I, *I concili greci*, ed. A. Di Berardino, Rome 2006, 91-182 (Greek text and Ital. trans.), R.M.T. Cholij, *Married Clergy and Ecclesiastical Continence in Light of the Council of Trullo (691)*: AHC 19 (1987) 71-230; 241-299; H. Ohme, *Das Concilium Quinisextum und seine Bischofsliste. Studien zum Konstantinopoler Konzil von 692*, Berlin-New York 1990; *Holy Cross Conference: The Council "in Trullo"; Basis for Ecclesiastical Reform?*, A Conference Commemorating the 1300th Anniversary of the Penthekte Ecumenical Council "in Trullo," Brookline, MA 1995; H. Ohme, *Das concilium Quinisextum. Neue Einsichten zu einem umstrittenen Konzil*: OCP 58 (1992) 367-400; G. Nedungatt - M. Featherstone, *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, Rome 1995; A.C. Calivas, *The Penthekte Synod and Liturgical Reform*: The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 40 (1995) 125-147; M. van Esbroeck, *Armenien und die Penthektè*: AHC 24 (1992) 78-94; H. Ohme, *The Causes of the Conflict about the Quinisext Council: New Perspectives on a Disputed Council:* The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 40 (1995) 17-43; EPapi 1, 633-637.

A. Di Berardino

TRUTH

I. A complex concept - II. The historical developments of the concept of *veritas* - III. The search for the truth.

I. A complex concept. It is not easy to circumscribe the use that Christian authors made of the term *truth* (ἀλήθεια, *veritas*). The term was used with very many different meanings. The extent of the complexity of the issue appears clearly from *Augustine's *De Trinitate* (see Studer, *Veritas Dei;* Cipriani, *Rivelazione*). In the *opus laboriosum* the author often opposes truth to lie and error. He uses the word in the context of daily life and school. Those who study philosophy aspire to the knowledge of the truth. Those who are engaged in the study of the Sacred *Scriptures do likewise. Christians hold onto the Catholic truth that is preached in the orthodox church. Both on the level of philosophy and that of theology, the concept of truth is compared with that of faith. *Veritas* is understood as a deepening or perfection of *fides*. Last, truth has a christological meaning, Christ, the Word of God, is the truth. He bears this name in formulas of citations (*Veritas ait*). He is called "truth" in various biblical texts as in the case of passages often cited from Jn 1:14 and Jn 14:6.

The variety of meanings that Augustine attests is likewise found in the writings of other Christian authors such as *Tertullian (see Claesson, *Index*), *Clement of Alexandria (see BKV2 20,404-405), *Origen (see Studer, *Liebe zur Wahrheit*), *Athanasius (see Mueller, *Lexicon*) and *Gregory of Nyssa (see *Lexicon Gregorianum* I, 175ff.). The case of the exegetical terminology used by *Ambrose is interesting (see Hahn, *Gesetz*). He was aware of the different meanings contained in the term *veritas* (see *Sp.S.* III, 11,73: *plurimae veritates*). He distinguished *veritas* from *mendacium*. Beginning primarily from the antithesis between *veritas* and *species,* which was common in the Platonic tradition, he applied it to various fields. Presupposing and even defending the unity of the two Testaments, he opposed in exegesis *veritas* to *figura, typus, umbra* (see *Exp. Ps.* 118,35-39; the theme depended on Origen's thought: see Studer, *Liebe zur Wahrheit*). Furthermore, reflecting on the end of time, Ambrose speaks of *umbra, imago* and *veritas* (*Exp. Ps.* 38,25). With reference to biblical texts where one finds *spiritus veritatis* (Jn 16:13), he uses the term *veritas,* esp. in the sense of reality, in its trinitarian and christological teachings (*Fid.* I,17,108; *Incarn.* 2,13). Similar to the exegetical use is the sacramental use of the term (see *Sacr.* I, 5,15). Ambrose, moreover, opposes the *verba philosophorum* to the *veritas piscatorum* (*Incarn.* 9,89) and speaks of the *veritas evangelii* (*Ep.* II, 7,21), and the *regula veritatis* (*Exaem.* II,1,3) and the *veritas ecclesiae* (*Jac.* II,7,33; for the term "truth" in the writings of Origen [Greek and Latin], see Studer, *Liebe zur Wahrheit*).

Considering closely the use that Christian authors made of the term *veritas,* one becomes aware on the one hand of the interference of the Hebrew term *emeth,* which signifies credibility, import and fidelity, with both the Greek term *alētheia* and the Latin *veritas.* The tension between *emeth* and *alētheia/veritas* appears esp. in the texts often cited and commented on from Jn 1:14 and 1:17, where one reads "grace and truth." Origen (*Co. Io.* 6,37ff.; *Princ. pr.* 1, Latin text; *C. Cels.* 6,70) and Augustine provide suggestive examples (*Trin.* XIII,19,24). One should add that the biblical pair *hesed* and *emeth* was also translated with *misericordia* and *veritas* (see Hilary, *Exp. Ps.* 56,4; *Exp. Ps.* 35,2 and 18; *Exp. Ps.* 118,20,30). With respect to the Greek-Latin authors, they understood by the term *truth* something real, certainly coming close to the biblical language. However, for these authors, truth often connotes an intellectual meaning: a reality that is revealed, taught and learned. They, therefore, often perceived the biblical message in the new light of Hellenistic and imperial culture.

II. The historical developments of the concept of veritas. The documents composed in the 1st half of

the 2nd c. still heavily reflect some of the influences of the OT Scriptures. This esp. holds for the *Didache (5,2; 11,10), the *First Epistle of Clement* (see 16,6; 31,2; 35,5; 60,2), the *Epistle of* *Barnabas (20,2) and the *Shepherd* of *Hermas (see *Mand.* III,1-4), writings marked by a Jewish-Christian stamp. Characteristics of this mark are the statement that true believers walk in "fear and truth" (*1 Clem.* 19,1; *2 Phil.* 2,1; *Mand.* XII,3) and the enumeration of truth among the Christian virtues (*1 Clem.* 35,2; *Mand.* IX,15—see 1 Sam 12:24). This was, however, the beginning of a new reflection on truth. The first Christian authors connect the truth to Christ, just as John did in his gospel (see *Didache* 16,6; Polycarp, *Phil.* 2, 5,2). Following the lead of the Pastoral Epistles (see 1 Tim 2:15) and the first epistle of John (see 1 Jn 5:6), *Ignatius of Antioch understood by the term *truth* the true doctrine of the church (*Eph* 6,2; *Smirn.* 5,1; *Polyc.* 3,2). The author of the *Shepherd* of Hermas, although insisting on faith (*Mand.* XI,43,4; *Sim.* VIII,9), makes it clear that faith is insufficient, and that exegetical and theological work is necessary, an investigation of the truth (in the Scriptures) and the divinity (see *Vis.* III,3,5; *Mand.* X,40,4-6). In fact, the *Second Epistle of Clement* was already announcing the ideal of the *gnostics who desire to know the "Father of the truth" (see 3,1; 12,3; 20,5).

The aspirations to the knowledge of the truth emerged with the Greek apologists who, being the first to compare the truth of the gospel with Hellenistic philosophy, developed the theology of the Logos. The most eminent among them, *Justin Martyr, declares already at the beginning of his *Apologia:* "Reason demands that those who are truly philosophers and godly have regard for the truth alone, setting aside the opinions of the ancients if they be in error" (1 *Apol.* 2,1; see *Dial.* 2,2). He also admits that seeds of the truth are found among the philosophers (1 *Apol.* 44,10; see Athenag., *Leg.* 7; 23-24: truth in the writings of Plato). By staying closely tied to the Bible, however, Justin cites biblical texts that speak of truth (*Dial.* 24,2; 38,3; 73,4; 123,8); he refers to truth in the Scriptures (*Dial.* 110,6; 129,2) and in the words of *Jesus (*Dial.* 139,5; see 39,5) and distinguishes it from faith (*Dial.* 131,2). In fact, he presents Christ as the Word and truth (1 *Apol.* 68,1) and as Word of truth and wisdom of God (*Dial.* 139,5).

The search for the truth was also exhibited more intensely in 2nd-c. gnosticism. The adherents to these marginal Christian groups were concerned with knowing the origin and end of the world and humankind. The gnosis through which human beings are saved from every fear and death is in the end truth. The depth of the union between gnosis and truth appears in a document that seems to belong to the *Valentinian tradition and which is presented as the *Gospel of Truth* (see LACL 257, with Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III,11,9). The Valentinians also enumerated the truths among the Aeons (see Iren., *Adv. Haer.* I,14,3 and passim; Tertull., *Praescr.* 33,18). The claims of the gnostics provoked a reaction from the church. Attentive to their interest for the truth as belonging to the Aeons, and even borrowing from them the intimate relationship between gnosis and truth, *Irenaeus devotes much space to the truth that is preached, believed and lived in the church (see *Adv. Haer.* IV,6,6-7; *Epid.* 98). In contradistinction to the teachings that are diverse and full of contradictions, the truth is unique; it forms one sole body (*Adv. Haer.* I, pr. 1-2; I,8,1; I,31,4; *Epid.* 1). Preached everywhere (*Adv. Haer.* I,10,2), it pertains to the one God and his Son (see *Adv. Haer.* I,22,1; IV,2,2; IV,6,7). Transmitted by the Son of God to the *apostles (*Adv. Haer.* III, pr.) and preserved in the church (*Adv. Haer.* 3,1–4,1), the truth constitutes the rule according to which one can evaluate the heresies (*Adv. Haer.* I,22,1); one must interpret the Sacred *Scriptures and respond to the questions connected to it (*Adv. Haer.* I,9,4; II,27,1; 28,1; IV,26,5). Although calling the Father (see *Adv. Haer.* II,13,9; III,13,2) or the *Holy Spirit (*Adv. Haer.* III,24,1) "truth," Irenaeus primarily identifies the truth with Christ (cf. *Adv. Haer.* III,5,1; IV,7,3 with Jn 14:6. See the gnostic position in *Adv. Haer.* I,21,3). Against gnostic *Docetism he also emphasized the truth (reality) of the incarnation (*Adv. Haer.* V,1,2). *Tertullian combated the Valentinians as well as *Marcion, reducing these heresies to Greek philosophies (*Praescr.* 7). To make his arguments effective, he developed the principles of the true gnosis in his treatise *De praescriptione haereticorum* (see 12,1: *Apud haereticos . . . omnia extranea et adversaria nostrae veritatis;* 13,1: *regula fidei*; 19,3: where the *veritas disciplinae et fidei christianae*, there is also the *veritas* of the Scriptures, the *veritas* of the interpretations and Christian traditions, see also *Marc.* I,3,1).

Seeking to reconcile the gospel message with Hellenistic culture, the most eminent authors of Alexandria, Clement and Origen, valued the gnostic ideal more positively than did Irenaeus and Tertullian. They made use of philosophical traditions to develop the true gnosis. Clement, who recognized the connection between gnosis and truth (see *Paedag.* I, 1,1), discusses in the *Stromata,* his chief work, as the title says, "the gnostic notes according to the true philosophy." According to him, Christianity is not only the true philosophy, but the very truth of philosophy (see Méhat, *Clément,* 112ff.). He

therefore opposes the sole truth to the dispersion of truths by the philosophers and, therefore, the conflicting opinions of the gnostics. Origen, for his part, in his treatise *De Principiis*, which largely represents a response to the gnostics, places Christ-Truth in the center of his theological thought (see below).

Tertullian, Origen and even *Novatian not only had to face the opinions of progressive Christian thinkers who lived outside the church, but they also had to deal with the fundamentalist faithful who within the Christian communities defended ideas that were too restrictive on the unity of God. Tertullian combated so-called *monarchianism in his treatise *Adversus Praxean*. Instead of overly identifying the *Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, one should rather be instructed by the Holy Spirit, who leads to all the truth, that is, in faith in the *oikonomia* which orders the unity in the *Trinity (*Prax.* 2). Origen distinguishes between the errors that need to be excluded, that is, those of the gnostics, and the others that are found with in the Christian communities and turn out to be less serious (see Vogt, *Kirchenverständnis,* 290-298, with *FrTit* 33 and 35). Although the adherents of the first group are completely alienated from the truth, the others are opposed to Christ, who is the truth. In a dialogue with Heraclides in which Origen combats monarchianism, he focuses his discussion on the truth which is found in the Bible (*Dial.* 11). His general principle is interesting, which maintains that the Christian believes only in the truth in conformity to the ecclesiastical and apostolic *tradition (*Prin.* I, *praef.* 2; see Studer, *Liebe zur Wahrheit*, I,3: ecclesiastical truth). Novatian, for his part, as in the case of Irenaeus, opposes truth to heresy (*Trin.* 9,47; 11,58). Beginning his discourse on the Father and the Son, he begins from the **regula fidei* (*Trin.* 1,1; 9,46). Faith itself must be complete; otherwise the rule of truth is compromised (*Trin.* 11,61). The truth of the faith must not hesitate where the authority of the Bible has never wavered (*Trin.* 12,62). Last, Novatian maintained that the authority of the OT does not waver because it is supported by the NT and that the power (*potestas*) of the NT is not impeded when the truth is rooted in the OT (*Trin.* 16,97).

The means of opposing truth to heresy, the rule of the sole truth, established on the true tradition of the church, to the dispersion of heretical opinions could be referred to as the dogmatic use of the truth (see Studer, *Schola,* 215-216). This approach to the Sacred Scriptures was also reinforced in the doctrinal controversies starting from the Council of *Nicaea (325). The concept of truth does not cease to appear in the methodological reflections, as the discussion between Basil of Caesarea and *Eunomius shows (see the index in SC 305,320). Two new aspects, however, were imposed. On the one hand, the *regula fidei* was not supported solely on the authority of the Scriptures and the truth of the ecclesiastical teaching but also on the authority of the synodal fathers and the fathers of the church (*see* *argumentation). Moreover, the union between *veritas* and *auctoritas,* begun by Tertullian, acquired ever-increasingly precise connotations (Ring, *Auctoritas*). On the other hand, the exegesis of the Bible did not so much serve to find the truth therein. The preachers and the theology instead sought to confirm the ecclesiastical truth by means of biblical passages. They also distinguished the statements about the divinity from those on the humanity of Christ. With respect to the content of dogmatic research, the identification of the truth with God and Christ becomes more important. To impose the divinity of Christ, the Council of Nicaea confessed that the Son of God is true God from true God: *veritas ex veritate* (see Ambrose, *Fid.* I,17,108-117). The title of truth, which is attributed to Christ, therefore becomes one of the fathers' favorite names. They first sought to refer to the Johannine texts which represent Christ as the truth (Jn 1:14 and 18; 14:6) (see, for example, Hilary, *Trin.* 3,4; Gregory of Nyssa, *HCant* II [5,3] *FChr* 16/3, 596ff.; Ambrose, *Fid.* III,7,51; IV,10,118). Instead, on the christological level, where the two natures of Christ are discussed, *veritas* in the sense of reality, opposed to fantasy, serves to emphasize that Christ became truly human, the genuine brother of all human beings (see, for example, Ambrose, *Incarn.* 2,13; 5,37). Moreover, I would say, it is noteworthy that the philosophical use is not absent in this theology, which is marked by the *veritas fidei*. Thus Gregory of Nyssa, in his *Catechetical Discourse,* speaks of the truth that one reaches by means of (logical) argumentation (*Or. cat. pr.* 25-28; 3,14-20). Similarly, introducing the mystery of the incarnation, he defines the truth as the sure apprehension of real being, whereas error is an illusion in reference to a being that does not exist (*Vit. Moys.* 23; see also John of Damascus, *C. Manich.* 1).

Just as *Paul's speech on the Areopagus attests, Christians from the beginning perceived themselves to be challenged by Hellenistic paganism. The encounter took broader dimensions in the mid-2nd c. (see above). From 200 onward, until the 5th c., apologies written by eminent authors and less famous writers followed (see Fiedrowicz, *Apologie*). In this field, it is fitting to distinguish two approaches: the first of a religious character and the other of an intellectual character. The two are also found united, as

attested to esp. by *Lactantius, who dedicated the fourth book of his *Institutiones* to the true wisdom and the true religion (see *Instit.* IV,2,5; 3,4-8). Tertullian and Novatian had already spoken of *veritas dei et devotio* (*Apol.* 30,7) and *fides una, veritas una atque eadem religio* (*Trin.* 1,51). Origen, as he states toward the end of his treatise *Contra Celsum,* wished to emphasize the spirit of the true God, piety toward him and the truth of sound doctrine (*C. Cels.* 8,76). *Eusebius intended to speak of the philosophy and piety of the Jews (*Praep.* VIII,1,1). Ambrose mentioned the *devotionis et fidei certamen* and the *studium veritatis* (*Ep.* IV, 11,23). Last, Augustine was convinced: *aliam esse philosophiam, id est sapientiae studium, et aliam religionem* (*Vera rel.* 5,8; see *Civ.* X, 32,1). The interest, however, for true worship (*eusebeia*, *pietas*) prevails at times (see Fiedrowicz, *Apologie,* 240-243). Tertullian notes the *vera religio veri Dei* (*Apolog.* 24,2). Seeking to convert a Manichean friend, Augustine wrote the treatise *De vera religione,* in the beginning of which he combats paganism (see 2,2) and anticipates, therefore, the first books of the *De civitate Dei,* in which he discusses true worship (see *Civ. Dei* VI,4; X,32,1). Just as the true religion depends on the knowledge of the true God, it is not surprising that the authors insist more heavily on the true philosophy (Fiedrowicz, *Apologie,* 291-300). From the moment that Christians had to face Hellenistic philosophy, they emphasized that Christianity was the true philosophy. *Tatian states: "Our philosophy is the most ancient" (Tatian, *Or.* 3,1; see Justin Martyr, 2 *Apol.* 15,3; *Dial.* 8). On this line the later apologists demonstrate the superiority of Christianity by referring to barbarian philosophy, that is, the original philosophy, and by insisting on the anteriority of *Moses with respect to *Plato (see Opelt-Speyer, 269-271, with texts from Orig., *C. Cels.* 6,7; Eus., *Praep.* X and XI,10,14-15; Cyril Alex., *C. Iul.* I: PG 70,513 BC and passim; Theodoret, *Affect.* II, see PG 83,785B). The most eminent witness and chief source from the later apologies was Clement of Alexandria (see *Str.* I,66-73). He opposes Christian truth that comes from God or Christ, who is the truth (see Jn 14:6), to philosophy that constitutes the search for truth and the essence of things (*Str.* I,32,4; I,99,1; see II,12,1: Logos is truth). In fact, he defines the true gnostic rule as the perception of truth by means of the truth (see Jn 14:6) (*Str.* V,1,4). In this sense, Eusebius praises Christ himself as the greatest philosopher (*Dem.* III,6,6; see 2,6). The apologists, therefore, saw in the Christian religion the true love of wisdom. Borrowing from Cicero, according to whom the *studium veritatis* leads to beatitude (see *Acad.* I,2,5-6), Augustine himself saw in Christianity the *verissima philosophia,* not without emphasizing, however, that this was never possible without the appearance of the divine intellect (*Acad.* III, 9,42; see *Civ. Dei* X, 32,1: Studer, *Schola*, 166-170).

The discussions of true worship and true wisdom were carried out not only on the rhetorical and philosophical levels but also on the historiographical. These pertain to the *veritas historica* (Orig., *Hier.* 20.7; Aug., *Trin.* XII,12,19). Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea and Augustine, who had to face the arguments made by *Celsus and *Porphyry of Tyre, were the chief witnesses to this concern (see Studer, *Glaube und Geschichte;* Studer, *Historische Theologie;* Fiedrowicz, *Apologie,* 208-226). The battle against these two pagan opponents, who fought on the historiographical level against Christianity, revolved around two issues. On the one hand, the apologists had to guarantee the authority of the text that documented the history of Israel, Jesus and the beginning of the church. In this regard, they distinguished between myth and history (*narratio vera*) (see Orig., *C. Cels.* 1,42.2,56ff. 4.42; Aug., *Doct. chr.* II,28,44; *Civ. Dei* 6,5-9. 18,16; *Ep.* 101,2; *Ep.* 143,12). To then bring to light the credibility of the witnesses, prophets and apostles, the Christian authors recalled their simplicity, competence, their agreement with one another, and esp. their willingness to endure so many difficulties to the point of martyrdom (see Orig., *C. Cels.* 1,9ff.; III,39; Eus., *Dem.* I,5). They esp. noted the vast and rapid spread of the preaching of the gospel (see, e.g., Orig., *C. Cels.* III,29; in Fiedrowicz, *Apologie,* 222ff.). Eusebius esp. regarded *Moses as a historian worthy of trust (see SC 215,57-58, with *Praep.* VII,8,1-3 and XI,4,4-5). Origen saw in Christ himself the most credible witness to the divine truth (see *C. Cels.* 1,43-44). On the other hand, the defenders of the historical truth of Christianity sought to demonstrate the value and use of faith for the knowledge of the truth (see Studer, *Geschichte und Glaube,* 187-193). Referring to daily life—the work of farmers, marriage, the undertakings of sailors and merchants—they demonstrated the necessity of trust and hope for human life and, therefore, also for religious and moral life (see Orig., *C. Cels.* 1,9ff.; Eus., *Dem.* 1,5; Aug., *Util. cred.* 7,16; 12,26). Reviewing the biblical and Greco-Roman ideals, the apologists also emphasized the exemplary nature of the persons whose lives were told.

To fully understand the meaning of historical truth, it is necessary to distinguish between historic faith and spiritual faith (see Studer, *Geschichte und Glaube,* 194-197, with Aug., *Vera rel.* 50.99). Admitting as true what is recounted in the *historia sacra* (Bible), each one recognizes with historic faith

things accessible to human experience. Leading to a deeper meaning in the biblical story, both a prophecy and a figure of a later event reveal a superior truth (see above for Ambrose's exegetical terminology). But this knowledge is not yet spiritual faith in which the Christian shares the faith of the biblical witnesses, for example, the faith of *Peter, who confesses that Jesus is the Son of God. Only those who look on the eternal truth (see Phil 3:13), which is not perceived with human powers alone, believe with spiritual faith (see Aug., *Vera rel.* 7,13; *Trin.* IV,16,21; XIII,20,25; *Ep.* 147,4,10). Adhering to Christ, they bring to fulfillment the prophetic and apostolic message (see Orig., *C. Cels.* III,39 and 43; Eus., *EcclTh* 3,5, according to which faith in the Trinity is not owed to Moses and even less to Plato, but to Christ). Assisted by divine grace, spiritual faith enjoys a certainty that is superior to every form of human knowledge (see Orig., *C. Cels.* III,3; *HGen* 10,2: Aug., *En. Ps.* 104,27).

III. The search for the truth. Desiring to better understand the gospel message, the Christian authors of the ancient church at first did not seek to respond to such questions as what is God, the world and the human being, in and of themselves. Their chief concern was rather to know how to become united to God, how to hold fast to Christ, how to find the vision of truth. The spirituality of the search of truth is attested esp. by three eminent witnesses: Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine.

In the prologue of his chief theological work, Origen announces his objective of wanting to lead his readers to Christ, who is the truth (*Princ.* I *praef.* 1; see the beginning of the hermeneutical part *Princ.* IV,1,1, where it is the truth that is spread through the doctrines of Christ; see Studer, *Begegnung;* Studer, *Liebe zu Christus*). Origen does not speak here of the truth in a philosophical sense. He includes it, instead, in the meaning that *John attributed to it in his gospel. This is not surprising, if one keeps in mind that he composed his *De Principiis* in a time in which he was concerned with the first verses of the fourth gospel and was developing esp. his thoughts on the *epinoiai* ("names, titles") of Christ, among which the "truth" occupies an eminent place (see *CIo* I,21,125-139). Origen therefore looks at the truth that leads to life as well as the message on the origin of love. In fact, he suggests that only those who love Christ in an entirely personal way will be able to contemplate the truth that delivers them. How much Origen holds to this entirely personal approach to the truth is confirmed by *Princ* II,11, where he demonstrates that in life after death believers continue their search for the truth under the guidance of Christ, who leads them to the vision of God (see esp. *Princ* II,11,1-2; see *H36Ps* 2,1). The meaning of the encounter with Christ who is the truth then appears in the passages in which Origen speaks of Christ who opens the meaning of the Bible to believers (see esp. the text in which Origen explains 2 Cor 3:16-17, where the question of the veil that Christ takes away is presented: *HLv* 1,1; *HEx* 12,4, SC 321, 29-30). At the same time, the references to the place, the house were Christ who is the truth may be found, are interesting (see *HGn* 12,4; *HLv* 9,5). Convinced that Christ himself is the truth, Origen often interrupts his exegesis with prayers, asking his teacher for a solution to difficult questions (see *HLv* 6,6; *HIud* 8,5; *HIer* 9,10-11; see Monaci, *Predicatore*, 74-75). Perhaps the most beautiful testimony is found in his homily on Lk 4:16-30, in which Origen invites the faithful to look with the eyes of the human heart to Jesus, who will illuminate their face (*HLc* 32,6). In fact, in this prayer he addresses his teacher and Lord (see *HIer* 13,1; *HLv* 12,1; *HNum* 6,3). Although defending the tradition in which the community turns to the Father, he does not hesitate, therefore, to ask Christ for knowledge of the truth in the Bible.

The theological thought of Gregory of Nyssa is not characterized as much by the love of Christ who is the truth. Nevertheless, although expressing himself in a rather philosophical way on the search for the truth, he does not fail to emphasize that God, the highest truth, transcendent and accessible only through revelation, was manifested in the incarnation of the Word. However, the purification of the spirit and the life required from the human being is not reached without the help and example of Christ. It seems perhaps strange that the theme of truth does not have much importance in his *Oratio Catechetica Magna* (see 8-9 SC 453, 200ff.: The mystery of the truth). The chief spiritual works, however, the *Vita Moysis* and the *Homilies on the Song of Songs,* are strongly marked with this theme. The second part of the *Vita Moysis* is devoted to the contemplation of perfection (see J. Daniélou, in SC 1bis, 26-31, with *VitaM* 2,16-30: Ex 3:1-12). In the school of the mysteries of the faith, the believer, along with Moses, crosses the darkness to reach God, the light and the truth. The light is symbolized by the burning bush. The truth is the perception of being which is above every changeable being. The one who contemplates becomes an image of the infinite, although remaining mutable. In the sermons on the *Song of Songs, Gregory develops the mystagogy of darkness (*HCant* 11 on *Cant* 5,2: *FChr* 16/3, 586-591). Explaining the symbol of the door (*Cant* 5,1b), he emphasizes that the truth is outside human knowledge.

The soul must, therefore, request the keys from the Logos in order to open the door. Those who enter will not meet rain, but only a few drops of the truth. Their knowledge remains fragmentary (see also *HCant proem.*: *FChr* 16/1, 116: Love toward the spouse, Christ, leads to the truth; *HCant* 3 [1:9]: *FChr* 16/1, 204: Knowledge of himself is the way to the truth; *HCant* 14 on *Cant* 8:15: *FChr* 16/3, 742ff.: Christ is the foundation of the truth; the pillars are those who support with a good life and sound teaching the body of the church).

Augustine's spirituality was dominated by the search for the truth, as appears esp. from the *Confessions* and the *De Trinitate* (see Studer, *Veritas Dei*). In the account of his life, he described the circuitous journey that led him to Christ, the truth of God. At the beginning he was encouraged by Cicero's *studium veritatis* (*Conf.* III,5,7-8). Not finding the truth in the Bible, he was temporarily comforted by the truth of the *Manicheans (see *Conf.* III,6,10). Academic skepticism helped him overcome their error (*Conf.* V,6,10; VI,4,6). Ambrose helped him discover the truth in the sacred writings (*Conf.* VI,3,4) and the necessity of authority for their true understanding (*Conf.* VI,5,8). At the same time, he was delivered from philosophical difficulties through reading the books of the *Platonists (*Conf.* VII,4,6; VII,9,1-8). Knowing, at last, how to interpret the Bible, he recognized his God, who is the truth (*Conf.* X,23,33ff.). In fact, he even intuited that the Word through which God created all things is properly speaking the truth (*Conf.* XI,6,8-9,11). Augustine did not fail to resume his long journey toward the truth (*Conf.* VI,11,18).

In the *De Trinitate* Augustine's thought on truth is shown to be conditioned by two objectives: he seeks to help the faithful who were disturbed by the *Arian objections against the Catholic faith and at the same time tries to reassure certain intellectuals that there is no ascent to beatitude without the mediation of Christ (Studer, *Einführung,* 172; 209-210). According to the first approach, he deals with the truth of the eternal Word. Starting from the concept of the interior word (see esp. *Trin.* XV,10,17-1626), he demonstrates that the Word is the truth that allows one to see that it exists (see *Trin.* XV,11,20; XV,14,23). In view of the Nicene faith, Augustine affirms that the Word inasmuch as it is the truth is entirely similar to the Father. He maintains this perfect conformity for two reasons. On the one hand, the Word is *substantialiter* similar to the Father as the word corresponding to the knowledge (*notitia*) of the one who speaks (*Trin.* XV,11,20). On the other hand, the equality of the Son with the Father resembles the intimate relationship between action and the one who acts (*Trin.* XV,11,20). Moreover, Augustine develops his thoughts by continually basing his claims on the biblical texts (such as Jn 5:19-20 and Jn 14:6; also 2 Cor 1:18ff.), as well as the tradition, esp. *Hilary of Poitiers (*Trin.* VI, 10,11). Concerning himself with the knowledge of God along with other intellectuals of his own time, Augustine inserts in his exposition of the trinitarian faith some considerations on the ascent toward eternal life. Drawing inspiration from the writings of Cicero, for whom the *studium veritatis* leads one to *beatitudo,* he emphasizes that in the course that consists in the love and the search for the truth, only those who believe in the mediation of Christ succeed (*Trin.* XIV, 19,26). The thought that expresses with greater clarity the meaning of the entire search for the face of God, undertaken in the *De Trinitate* (see *Trin.* IX,1,1; XV,2,2), finds confirmation in the fourth book, both in the prologue, in which he speaks of those who know themselves and therefore intend to return by way of the truth to the immutable essence of God (*Trin.* IV, pr. 1), and in ch. 18, in which he provides a treatment of the purification by faith that leads one to the eternal truth (*Trin.* IV,18,24). At the same time Augustine developed his thought on the journey toward the vision of the truth with his considerations on truth which, illuminating the mind, make sure knowledge possible (*Trin.* IX,1,1-6,11; see *Mag.* 12,40). Finally, one should not forget that he never ceased to recall the personal intimacy that united him to Christ the Truth. Precisely his ideas on illumination recall his favorite theme on the sole teacher, a theme that would clearly express his personal relationship to Christ (see Studer, *Schule;* Studer, *Die Liebe zu Christus*). In fact, Augustine addressed Christ himself: "You have made heaven, earth and all things, . . . but your mercy is greater, which has led you to spread your truth around yourself (*En. Ps.* 88, 1,9, with Ps 88:9; see *Io. eu. tr.* 10,13; *ser.* 136,5).

G. Mueller, *Lexicon Athanasianum*, Berlin 1952; A. Méhat, *Étude sur les Stromates de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1966; I. Opelt - W. Speyer, *Barbar*: JbAC 10 (1967) 251-290; V. Hahn, *Das wahre Gesetz*, Münster 1968; H.J. Vogt, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Origenes*, Cologne 1974; G. Claesson, *Index Tertullianeus*, Paris 1974-75; T.G. Ring, *Auctoritas bei Tertullian, Cyprian und Ambrosius*, Würzburg 1975; A. Monaci, *Origene predicatore*, Milan 1987; F. Mann, *Lexicon Gregorianum I*, Leiden 1999; M. Fiedrowicz, *Apologie im frühen Christentum*, Paderborn 2000; N. Cipriani, *Rivelazione cristiana*: AugR 41 (2001) 498-598; Th. Böhm, *Wahrheit, C. Patristik*: HWP 12 (2004) 57-60; B. Studer, Schola Christiana, *Die Theologie zwischen Nizäa und Chalzedon*, Paderborn 1998; B. Studer, *Die Kirche als Schule des Herrn bei Augustinus von Hippo*: SA 127 (1999) 119-222; B. Studer, *Augustinus*, De Trinitate. *Eine Einführung*, Paderborn 2005; B. Studer, *Die historische Theologie des*

Eusebius von Cäsarea: SA 141 (Rome 2006), 205-251; B. Studer, *Glaube und Geschichte bei Origenes und Augustinus*: SA 141 (Rome 2006), 177-203; B. Studer, *Theologie als Begegnung mit Christus*: SA 141 (Rome 2006), 137-45; B. Studer, Veritas Dei *in der Theologie des heiligen Augustinus*: Augustinianum 46 (2007) 411-455; B. Studer, *Die Liebe zur Wahrheit in Origenes* in *Origeniana Nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of His Time*, papers of the 9th International Origen Congress, Pécs, Hungary, 29 August - 2 September 2005, ed. G. Heidl - R. Somos, Leuven 2009, 669-689; B. Studer, *Die Liebe zu Christus bei Origenes und Augustinus* (at press).

B. Studer

TUR ʿABDIN. A mountainous massif found in the SE part of Turkey, at the border with *Syria and Iraq, to the E of Dyarbakir (ancient Amida) and Mardin which it borders. The Tigris River is its E border. In the S part is found Mt. Izla (Izlo; in Greek *Izala*). The modern-day chief center is the city of Midyat. After 363, until *Justinian, it constituted the Roman district at the border of the Roman Empire; around 640 it passed under Muslim rule, but the inhabitants remained Christian, although in recent decades their numbers have been quickly dwindling. Christianity spread in the region over the course of the 4th c. with *monasticism and the construction of more than 80 churches and monasteries. *Ammianus Marcellinus wrote that some of the monks were captured by the *Sassanid *Shapur in the territory between Amida and Mardin (18,10,4). The area is still very important for the Syrian Orthodox (or Syrian *Jacobites), because of the numerous monasteries and churches, both of which are witnesses to a very ancient Christianity. In the Middle Ages there were also *Nestorian monasteries. Tur ʿAbdin signifies in *Syriac "mountain of God's servants." The capital Hah (today Anitli) to the E of the region had at least eight churches, six of which are preserved. At the center of the little town remains the Church of the Virgin *Mary (known as Hadra), which was constructed in the 7th c., a quasi-square-shaped building. The church of the martyr Sovo, a Persian Christian prince who was killed around the mid-4th c., preserves the remains of a 5th-c. structure. Likewise in the nearby villages of Keferzi and Arnas, the churches seem to date back to the 7th c.

To the SW of Midyat, at ca. 20 km (12.42 mi), towers the important and grandiose monastery of Mar (Mor) Gabriel (near the village of Qartmin), known in ancient times as Mor Simeon, the most ancient monastery established by the monk Samuel at the end of the 4th c., the see of the metropolitan bishop of Tur ʿAbdin. The monastery received assistance from emperors *Arcadius, *Theodosius II and *Anastasius (d. 518), who financed the construction of a church partially preserved in the original and still in use today. Mosaics remain in the vault containing three crosses in medallions and fragments of floral designs, as in the case of the flooring in *opus sectile* consisting of marble in six different colors. There are no representations of animate figures. Near this church, in the NW part, there is a small octagonal church (called the Church of Theodora), possessing a diameter of 10.5 m (34.44 ft), dating back to the 6th c., most likely contemporaneous to the preceding one. The octagonal form recovers the number eight, which expresses "the fullness of the resurrection" (Ambrose, *Ex. in Lucam* 7,173) and is therefore well-suited to being a baptistery. At 6 km (3.7 mi) from the city of Mardin, one finds the monastery of Mor Hananyo (Kurkmo Dayro in Syriac and Deir al-Za`faran in Arabic), which dates to the end of the 5th c.; it was the see of the Syrian Orthodox patriarch from 1160 until 1932; the modern-day patriarch Ignatius Zakka resides at *Damascus.

G. Bell, *The Churches and Monasteries of the Tur ʿAbdin*, intro. and notes by M. Mundell Mango, London 1982; J.P. Foudrin, *Les églises à nef transversale d'Apamée et de Tur Abdin*: Syria 62 (1985) 319-335; A. Palmer, *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier: The Early History of Tur ʿAbdin*, Cambridge 1990; G. Wiessner, *Christliche Kultbauten im Tur ʿAbdin*: III-IV; EAM 11, 374-377; H. Hollerweger, *Turabdin: Lebendiges Kulturerbe / Living Cultural Heritage / Canli Kültür Mirasi*, Linz 1999.

A. Di Berardino

TURA. In August of 1941, some Egyptian workers who were commissioned by the English army to clean out the grottoes excavated in the ancient rock caves of Tura (ca. 12 km [7.45 mi] S of Cairo) discovered in a gallery at least 2,016 pages of *papyrus containing the writings of *Origen and *Didymus the Blind. The discovery was announced to the world only after the World War II had finished, with a detailed account which made known the fortuitous circumstances surrounding the discovery and the subsequent difficulties to gather the majority of the papyri discovered and stolen by the same men who had found them (Guéraud). Their spread was also favored by the conditions in which the papyri had lain for centuries. Belonging to eight original codices, they were found unfastened from their binding and in the form of fascicles (averaging 16 pages in length), grouped together or wrapped into the form of a scroll, before being deposited into the gallery. The unfastening of the papyri, which were palimpsests with the presence of holes antecedent to the rewriting, was initially performed by expert hands. The type of writing and corrections date the texts

starting from the end of the 6th c. (Koenen - Doutreleau, 551-564).

Even after more than 60 years since the discovery, it is still impossible to give a precise summary on the inventory of the original deposit because of the dispersion of the texts throughout the world. Of the 913 codices and the two scrolls which are in folio layout, concerning which we have clear verification, the majority are found in the Museum of Egyptian Antiquities in Cairo (604 fol.), a fair amount are found at the University of Cologne, Institut für Altertumskunde (117 fol.), and the remainder are located at the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana (or Bodmer Library) of Cologny, Switzerland (25 fol.), the British Library of London (7 fol.), the state Institute of Papyrology of the University of Milan (2 half pages); and a very small portion (158 fol.) are in the hands of private collectors, some known and others not. All information, however, is lacking for 92 pages of the original discovery (Aland - Rosenbaum, 470-471).

According to the most accepted hypothesis, the codices belonged to and came from the Greek monastery of Arsenius (d. 449), the remains of which are found on a terrace of the mountain of the quarry of Tura, slightly higher than the place of discovery (Koenen - Müller-Wiener, 48-51; Aland - Rosenbaum, 471). A possible reason for the location of the papyri in a dark place of the ancient caves of the pharaohs has been thought to lie in an expurgation of the monastery's library following the condemnation of Origen and Didymus at the Synod of *Constantinople of 543 and at the Council of Constantinople of 553. But this is a presupposition that cannot be held with certainty given the traces of numerous corrections already within the same texts. Due to the professional unbinding of the papyri and the presence of glue between the pages, it has also been hypothesized that the discovered gallery, adjacent to a large room excavated in the rock, was a type of depository for the monastery's library office. Still, the lack of clear evidence leaves unresolved the question concerning the reason for the deposit of codices in the obscurity of that gallery, an event that certainly took place between the end of the 6th and the 7th c. (Aland - Rosenbaum, 471).

The papyri lack both title and *subscriptio*. The attribution of the texts to Origen and Didymus was made possible only following a work of comparison with the *catenae and a comparison of the theological contents of the documents. For the restitution of the first known texts, or those known only in translation, the discovery contributed to a better understanding of the two Alexandrians. With respect to Origen, the papyri of Tura contained the *Dialogue with Heraclides* and the two treatises *On Easter*; moreover, extracts from the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, the text of which was only possessed in *Rufinus's Latin translation and the catenae; *Contra Celsus*; part of the *Homily on the Witch of Endor* (1 Sam 28); a homily (attributed to Origen with reservations) on the *gradual* Psalms: 125,1a-b; 129,1-5; 130,2b-c; 131,1b.2a.7a.8a.9b.12.17a; 132,1.3a; 133,2a.

For the corpus of Didymus (313–398), the documents of Tura contain the following: (1) five commentaries on OT books (Gen; Job; Zech; Ps; Eccl); (2) a short commentary on Jn 6:3-33; and (3) a dogmatic text in the form of a dialogue between Didymus and a heretic. Thanks to the OT commentaries (only several fragments from the catenae remained in Greek), scholars are now capable of better evaluating Didymus's stature as a famous exegete and theologian of his time, in line with Origen's teaching. With respect to the exegetical tradition, his commentary on Genesis, which extends to ch. 17, seems to be particularly original. Didymus thus went beyond the majority of previous commentaries on the text of *Genesis, which stopped at the six days of creation (*Basil of Caesarea and *Gregory of Nyssa). The Tura commentaries have also allowed scholars to discover Didymus's influence on subsequent exegesis. The commentary on Zechariah, through *Jerome and his commentary *In Zachariam*, whose spiritual interpretations faithfully imitate Didymus, influenced the exegesis of this prophet's text until the end of the 19th c.; and with respect to his commentary on Ecclesiastes, the respective commentaries on this sapiential text of Jerome and *Olympiodorus depend on Didymus's work. For the dogmatic aspect, the Tura commentaries reveal the importance of his *Christology. In order to defend the divine and human reality of Christ, neither God nor man, but God *who became man* (ἐνανθρώπησις), with a complete body, soul and spirit (*In Zac.* IV,235), Didymus combats various heretics, *docetists and *Arians, and esp. in the commentaries on Zechariah and the Psalms against the teaching of *Apollinaris of Laodicea (Ghattas).

O. Guéraud, *Note préliminaire sur les papyrus d'Origène découverts à Toura*: RHR 131 (1946) 85-108; H.-Ch. Puech, *Les nouveaux écrits d'Origène et de Didyme découverts à Toura*: RHPhR 31 (1951) 293-329; P. Nautin, *Homélies paschales II, Trois homélies dans la tradition d'Origène* (SC 36), Paris 1953; L. Doutreleau, *Que savons-nous aujourd'hui des Papyrus de Tura?*: RechSR 43 (1955) 161-193; J. Scherer, *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide* (SC 67), Paris 1960; L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle. Sur Zacharie*, I-III, (SC 83-85), Paris 1962; L. Koenen - L. Doutreleau, *Nouvel inventaire des papyrus de Tura*: RechSR

55 (1967) 547-564; L. Koenen - W. Müller-Wiener, *Zu den Papyri aus dem Arsenioskloster bei Tura*: ZPE 2 (1968) 41-63; L. Moraldi, *Opere esegetiche di Didimo il Cieco nei papiri di Tura*: Athaeneum 58 (1970) 401-407; B. Kramer, *Eine Psalmenhomelie aus dem Tura-Fund*: ZPE 16 (1975) 164-213; P. Nautin - L. Doutreleau, *Sur la Genèse*, I-II (SC 233; 244), Paris 1976/78; O. Guéraud - P. Nautin (eds.), *Origène. Sur la Pâque. Traité inédit publié d'après un papyrus de Toura*, Paris 1979; B. Kramer, *Didymus von Alexandrien*: TRE 8 (1981) 741-746; G. Sgherri (ed.), *Origene. Sulla Pasqua. Il papiro di Tura*, Milan 1989; K. Aland - H.-U. Rosenbaum, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* II, Berlin-New York 1995 (bibl. of the sources); M. Ghattas, *Die Christologie Didymos' des Blinden von Alexandria in den Schriften von Tura*, Münster-Hamburg-London 2002; M. Ghattas, *Didymos der Blinde von Alexandrien in der Auseinandersetzung mit Apollinaris von Laodicaea und seinen Lehren*, in P. Gemeinhardt (ed.), *Patristica et Oecumenica. Festschrift für Wolfgang A. Bienert zum 65. Geburtstag*, Marburg 2004, 45-49; E. Prinzivalli (ed.), *Didimo il Cieco. Lezioni sui salmi. Il commento ai salmi scoperto a Tura*, Milan 2005.

V. Lombino

TURIBIUS of Astorga. Bishop of Astorga toward the mid-5th c. In order to combat the *Priscillianists, he composed a *Commonitorium* and a *Libellus* which, through the deacon Pervincus, he sent to Pope *Leo. These works have not survived, but on the basis of what is related to us from Pope Leo's detailed response, which has been preserved in the Hispanic Canonical Collection (*Decret.* 61), we know that in the *Commonitorium* a general speech was made on the pastoral action of the bishop and on the doctrinal questions pertaining to *Priscillianism, although in the *Libellus,* in a systematic way, the chief errors of Priscillianism were summarized and refuted in ten points. Extant is one of his letters to the Gallaecian bishops *Idatius and Ceponius (*Ep. ad Hidatium et Ceponium*) on the apocrypha used by the Priscillianists. It seems that he traveled quite a bit, as appears from this letter, the authenticity of which cannot be considered definitively proven. Perhaps a local and late cult was established for him, but it is unfortunately impossible to determine whether it was really for him or whether he was confused with Bishop Turibius of Palencia, who lived in the 6th c.

CPL 564; PL 54, 693-695; L. Alonso Luengo, *Santo Toribio de Astorga*, Madrid 1939; DHEE 4, 2575; B. de Gaiffier, *Vie et miracles de S. Turibius*: AB 59 (1941) 34-37; J. Campos, *La epístola antipriscilianista de San León Magno*: Helmantica 13 (1962) 269-308; H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, Oxford 1976, 208ff.; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispanolusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 57-61.

P. Marone

TURIN

I. Christian origins - II. Council.

I. Christian origins. Roman Augusta Taurinorum was perhaps constructed on the ancient Taurasia, the capital of the Taurini. Christianity reached the city in the 3rd c.; the first signs, however, of the Christian presence were several *martyrs: Adventor, Solutor and Octavius, whose cult was already widespread in the 4th c. (Maximus of Turin, *Serm.* 12: CCL 23,41-42; BS 1,663-667). Nevertheless, the first known bishop was *Maximus, between the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th c. (d. ca. 420); the chief Christian see and even the first in Piemonte was Vercelli (Vercellae), which was established around 345; it was known for the action of its bishop *Eusebius (d. 371), but also as an important Roman city, where the governor of the province of Liguria often went. With his preaching, Maximus makes known to us the importance of his community, which was primarily made up of catechumens and neophytes, and the difficulties that he encountered in the midst of a very strong pagan presence in the city, esp. in the countryside, which he was only able to convert through the action of the landholders (*Serm.* 82). Until his time, the territory of Turin depended on the episcopal see of Vercelli. Maximus participated at the Synod of Turin, which was celebrated in 398 (see *Serm.* 21 and 58); he died after 412 (see *Serm.* 30 and 31). Other bishops of significant importance are as follows: *Maximus II (see var. aus. *Congrès,* 502-509), who was present at the Synods of Milan (451) and Rome (465) and delivered a speech at Milan for the inauguration of the *ecclesia maior*; around the end of that century, we meet Victor, a friend of *Epiphanius of Pavia, who went with him to the court of the *Burgundians for the liberation of the Itali, who had been taken as hostages to *Gaul; Bishop Ursinus lived in the 2nd half of the 6th c. (ca. 562–ca. 609), as soon as his diocese was split apart, despite his opposition and that of *Gregory the Great (*Ep.* IX,214: MGH *Epist.* II,200; IX,226: MGH *Epist.* II,217). Around 570 Turin passed under the rule of the *Longobards (Lombards), who turned it into an important duchy.

EC 12, 318-319; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, II, Faenza 1927, 1044-1050; var. aus., *Congrès archéologique du Piémont (1971)*, Paris 1978 (important articles); G. Casiraghi, *Il problema della diocesi di Torino nel Medioevo*: Bollettino storico-bibl. subalpino 75 (1977) 405-534; F. Bolgiani, *La penetrazione del cristianesimo in Piemonte*, in Atti del V Congr. naz. di archeol. cristiana, I, Rome 1982, 37-61; A. Fitzgerald, *The Relationship of Maximus of Turin to Rome and Milan: A Study of Penance and Pardon at Turin of the Fifth Century*: Augustinianum 27 (1987) 465-486; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Torino romana e cristiana*, in *Sto-*

ria illustrata di Torino, ed. V. Castronovo, Turin 1992, 21-40; C. De Filippis Cappai, *Massimo, vescovo di Torino e il suo tempo*, Turin 1995; *Massimo di Torino*, Atti del conv. int. nel XVI centenario del concilio di Torino, Turin 1998.

II. Council. Summoned in 398 by bishop *Simplicianus (the successor to *Ambrose of Milan) and the pope, who had sent some letters, upon the request of the Gallican episcopate (*ad postulationem provinciarum Galliae sacerdotum*), who had been unable to settle several conflicts. The council lasted for several days and finished on 22 September; it was perhaps presided over by Simplicianus of Milan and not by Maximus (the signatures are lacking). This brought an end to the internal conflicts that the churches of Gaul had among each other in relation to the events concerning *Priscillianism and the competition between some episcopal sees. *Felix of Trier, for the good of peace (*pacis bonum*), resigned as bishop, and with this action brought the Felician schism to an end. At the same time, the following disputes were also resolved: that between Proculus of Marseille and his suffragan bishops (can. 1); that between the bishops of *Arles and *Vienne (Gaul), who disagreed over the title of primate (can. 2) in Viennensis and in Narbonensis Secunda, and that between the Martinians of Tours and Bishop Bricius. On the basis of canons 1 and 2, the metropolitan had the prerogative in the ordinations over all his province. During the council, the hosting bishop, Maximus, delivered two speeches (21 and 88).

CCL 148, 52-60; SC 241, 133-145; Hfl-Lecl 2, 129-134; Palazzini 5, 345-346; L. Duchesne, *Le concile de Turin:* Revue Hist. 87 (1905) 178-302; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, I, Paris [2]1964 (see index); Id., *La date du concile de Turin* (398 or 417): BLE 74 (1973) 289-295; M. Kulikowski, *Two Councils of Turin*: JTS 47 (1996) 159-168; R. Savarino, *Il concilio di Torino*, in Atti del conv. int. nel XVI centenario del concilio di Torino, Turin 1998, 202-227.

Ch. Munier - G. Pilara

TYANA

I. City - II. Council.

I. City. Tyana (modern-day Kemerhisar) is situated in SE *Cappadocia near the mountains of Taurus, which separates the coastal area from the Anatolian highland; the city was known esp. as the homeland of the famous *Apollonius, who lived during the 1st c. AD, a philosopher and theurge who was somewhat of a pagan counterpart to *Jesus Christ, whose life was narrated by Philostratus in the 3rd c. *Porphyry of Tyre also made a parallel between Christ and Apollonius. A sanctuary was dedicated to him, which had been restored by the emperor *Caracalla (Cassius Dio, *History* 77,18,4). There was an important *statio* on the main street (*Itin. Ant.* 145,2; *Itin. Burd.* 577,7, p. 93; *Tabula Peut.* IX,2) for *Syria through the *Cilician ports (Strabo, XII,537; XIII,587), where in the northern part the three roads from *Ancyra, Mazaca and *Iconium converged. The territory was called *Tyanitis.* It was a city that had very ancient origins; it was the capital of the Hittite kingdom in the second millennium BC and a flourishing commercial center during the Persian Empire. According to Strabo (XII,2,7,538C), it was, with Mazaca (later known as *Caesarea), the only city in Cappadocia worthy of this name, and it was deeply Hellenized in a country that generally was seldom touched by Hellenism and with essentially rural characteristics (see Philostr., *Vita Apoll.* I,4) due to an abundance of water. At the time of Caracalla, it received the title *Antoniniana colonia Tyana*. A long aqueduct supplied the city with water. In 377, the emperor *Valens created the province of Cappadocia Secunda, whose metropolis was *Tyana, which also became a metropolitan see; this division met fierce resistance from *Basil of Caesarea, who lost a part of his territory. Ongoing archaeological digs reveal the various remains of the Roman city.

Bishops: Eupsychius (at *Nicaea), Theophronius (at the Council of *Antioch in 341), *Anthimus (372, an enemy of Basil of Caesarea), Etherius, *Theodore, the friend of *John Chrysostom (d. 404), Callopius, Longinus, Theodore II, Eutherius (at the Council of *Ephesus), Patricius (448 at the Council of *Constantinople), Cyrus, Cyriacus, Paul (536), Euphratas (553), Justin (680) and Paphnutius.

PWK VII, A2, 1630-1642; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford [2]1971, 177ff., 181ff., 185ff.; for the bishops, see M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, I, Paris 1740, 395-396; Fedalto 1, 30-31; D.H. French, *The Roman Road-System of Asia Minor*: ANRW, II, 7,2 (1980) 698-729; D. Berges - Jh. Nollé, *Tyana*, I-II, *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, Bonn 2000.

M. Forlin Patrucco

II. Council. In this Cappadocian city in 366 many *homoiousian bishops met together, coming from Syria and the regions of *Asia Minor near Syria, among whom were *Eusebius of Caesarea (that is, of Cappadocia), *Athanasius of Ancyra, *Pelagius of Laodicea and Gregory of Nazianzus, the father of the famous orator. They approved of the work conducted by the homoiousian delegation (*Eustathius of Sebaste, *Silvanus of Tarsus and *Theophilus of Castabala) who sent to Pope *Liberius in the West for assistance and solidarity against the persecution imposed by the emperor *Valens; he was persuaded

to sign the Nicene *homoousios*. They also arranged that the Eastern bishops receive a copy of the letters (of Liberius and the bishops of *Gaul, *Africa and *Sicily) that the delegates had brought with them. To then ratify communion with the Western bishops, they proposed the gathering of a new council at *Tarsus, in *Cilicia, which, however, never materialized.

Hfl-Lecl 1, 979; Simonetti 398.

M. Simonetti

TYCHON (Tikhon, Tichon), saint. We know little about Tychon, bishop of Amathus in Cyprus, modern Limassol, consecrated by *Epiphanius of Salamis. What we do know comes from two not very reliable editions of a late *Vita* attributed to *John the Almsgiver (d. 617). John, bishop of Alexandria, and originally from Cyprus, wanted to be buried at the church dedicated to Tychon. Around the 7th c., a church arose over the tomb of Tychon which had become the object of pilgrimages. Tychon is considered the patron of vine growers because of a miraculous episode recounted in the *Vita*. From this episode, H. Usener (1834-1905) has supported the well-known theory by which devotion to the patron of vine growers was connected to the Christianization of a rural pagan deity, linked to regeneration and fertility cults. Usener's thesis, valued by philologists for its detailed investigation of the author's style (reviewed by P. Maas, ByzZ 17 [1908] 609-613 and G. Pasquali, *Rivista Filologica Classica* 37 [1909] 277-280), was subject in time, on the historical-religious side, to criticism by some of those same philologists (P. Maas, *cit.* 613) and esp. by H. Delehaye (1859–1941). Although his thesis was of a limited value within the historical-religious research of the time, the investigation by Usener on Tychon contributed remarkably to the study of links between the ancient Greek religions and Christian worship. The **Byzantine Synaxary* and the *Roman Martyrology* commemorate Tychon on 16 June.

BHG, II, 309-310; LTK 10/2, 419; BS 12, 471-472; H. Usener, *Sonderbare heilige. Texte und Untersuchungen*, I, *Der heilige Tychon*, ed. A. Brinkmann, Leipzig-Berlin 1907; Id., *San Ticone*, ed. by I. Sforza, Brescia, 2007; H. Delehaye, *Saint de Chypre*, AB 26 (1907) 116-301, esp. 229-232 and 244-245; Id., reviewed by Usener, AB 26 (1909) 119-123.

R. Ronzani

TYCONIUS (d. before 400). *Augustine (see *Ep. Parm.* I,1,1; I,2,2; II,21,40; II,22,42; III,3,17-29; *De doctI rin. christ.* III,20,42; III,33,46; *Quaest. in Hept.* II,47,102; *C. litt. Pet.* II,83,184; *Ep.* 41,2; 87,10; 92,14; 93,10.43.44.45; *Retract.* II, 18) presented Tyconius (ca. 330–390) the lay *Donatist exegete as a man of penetrating genius, who as a Donatist defended the universality of the church to the point of bringing about his condemnation in a Donatist council in 380. Tyconius continued to regard himself as a Donatist and did not back down in his fight against *Parmenian, providing an example of how the good and the evil coexist within the bosom of the church until the end of time.

Augustine used and recommended Tyconius's writings, but he also introduced some nuances to them. He made special use of the work *Liber regularum* (*De doctr. christ.* III,30,42-47,56) and the *Commentary on the Apocalypse,* which he cited explicitly (*De doctr. christ.* III,30,42), in addition to making recourse to this treatise implicitly in other places of his work. *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 18) completes Augustine's mention of this work by ascribing two more works to Tyconius: the *De bello intestino* and the *Expositiones diversarum causarum,* which were written in 370/375 but are now lost. With respect to Tyconius, Gennadius emphasized his spiritual interpretation, the corporality of the angels, his millennialist ideas and those concerning the resurrection. Other references to Tyconius and his works can be found in the writings of *Quodvultdeus (*Dim. temp.* XIII, 22), *Primasius, *Cassiodorus and Ambrosius Autpertus. Primasius (PL 68,793-936; PLS IV,1208-1220) collected and expurgated Tyconius's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*. Cassiodorus (PL 70,1406-1418) on a few points, and Ambrosius Autpertus, in many, follow Tyconius, but take into account critical statements made by Primasius. Bede (PL 93,129-200) summarizes the *Lib. reg.* and the *Comm.*; *Caesarius (PL 35,2417-2452; ed. Morin, Maredsous 1942, II,209-277) summarizes them more to the letter; *Beatus of Liébana, along with the anonymous author of the *Tyconian Fragments* of Turin, faithfully preserves, in the form of catenae, the majority of the lost commentary (starting from the 9th c.). All these authors praised Tyconius's exegetical and doctrinal subtlety, but they eliminate and correct what they regarded as tending toward heterodoxy (see ps.-Isidore: PLS IV, 851, 7-47). Beatus, however, was an exception. Hence the fact that, although the original *Commentary* has been lost, it is possible to reconstruct it by starting from the way in which Catholic commentators followed it: *Victorinus (*Jerome), Caesarius of Arles, Primasius, *Apringius, Cassiodorus, Bede, Ambrosius Autpertus, Beatus and the Turin *Fragments*.

Tyconius's explicit interpretations of the Apoca-

lypse that have been preserved are very few: Rev 5:6 (Bede: PL 93,145,49-50); Rev 8:7 (Bede: PL 93,145,55-56); Rev 8:7 (Bede: PL 93,156,12-16); Rev 9:3-11 (Cassiodorus: PL 70,1410,40-44); Rev 9:16 (Primasius: PL 68,861,11-15; Ambrosius Autpertus: CCL, cont. med. 27, 359, 24-27); Rev 12:4 (Bede: PL 93,166,36-39); Rev 12:5-6 (Cassiodorus: PL 70,1411,25-30); Rev 14:5 (Bede: PL 93,174,22-23); Rev 14:18-19 (Bede: PL 93,178,6-15); Rev 15:5 (Ambrosius Autpertus: CCL, cont. med. 27A, 589,10–590,15); Rev 16:17 (Bede: PL 93,181,48-182,10); Rev 17:6-7 (Bede: PL 93,183,37-43); Rev 17:9 (Bede: PL 93,183,44-48); Rev 19,21 (Bede: PL 93,191,6-9); Rev 20:13 (Bede: PL 93,194,11-14). The other citations are not explicit. With respect to the *De bello int.* and the *Expositiones divers. caus.,* one can only identify the content of these works through conjecture. The *Lib. reg.,* written in 392, is a manual of hermeneutics: seven rules (the complete work has not survived) with which the exegete—using a certain rationale—uncovers the secrets of Scripture pertaining to the great revelation: Christ and the church. With these rules, the exegete can identify whether the text is speaking of the Lord or his body (Rule 1), the bipartite body (Rule 2), the promises and the law (Rule 3), the species or the genus, the part or the whole (Rule 4), recapitulation (Rule 6), the devil or his body (Rule 7). To demonstrate the validity of these rules, and to respond to the ecclesial problems against Donatists and Catholics, Tyconius commented on the entire Apocalypse, the final exhaustive revelation about the church. One perceives in the author an interest in healing the schism and finding a purer church: one finds traces of gnostic interpretations, and the entire commentary has roots in the traditions present in the writings of ps.-*Barnabas, *Irenaeus, *Hippolytus, *Tertullian, *Cyprian and in the short ps.-Cyprian treatises.

All of these traditions, laid out with logic and skill, reinforce his *ecclesiology: the authentic church is the one that is persecuted just as its head (Christ). Ecclesiology and *Christology always go together. Only the elect enter the kingdom (church-kingdom). The day of judgment will lay bare before everyone hypocrisy, the worst of evils, which is now latent.

Tyconius does not accept the sum *saints + sinners,* but instead the opposition *saints* or *sinners*. The church is universal; but Tyconius, instead of opting for an intensive catholicity in opposition to an extensive catholicity, admitted both concepts. Each passage of the Apocalypse allowed him to demonstrate how the holy, universal and bipartite church walks in history in the midst of hypocrisy, persecution and other manifestations of the *Antichrist.

Editions: CPL 709-710; *The Book of Rules of T.*, ed. F.C. Burkitt, Cambridge 1894 (repr. Kraus 1967); PL 18, 15-66; D.L. Anderson, *The Book of Rules of T.: An Introd. and Transl. with Comm.*, Louisville, KY 1974; *T. Afri fragmenta . . .* , ed. Amelli, Monte Cassino 1897 (= PLS I, 622-652); *The Turin Fragments of T. Commentary on Revelation*, ed. F. Lo Bue, Cambridge 1963.

Studies: T. Hahn, *Tyconius Studien*, Leipzig 1900 (repr. Aalen 1971); W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, Göttingen [6]1906, 53-72; Monceaux V, 163-219; Patrologia III, 109-112; A. Pincherle, *L'ecclesiologia nella controversia donatista*: Ricerche Rel. 1 (1925) 134-148; Id., *Da T. a Sant'Ambrogio*: ibid. 1 (1925) 443-446; Id., *Nuovi frammenti di T.*: RSLR 3 (1969) 756-757; Id., *Alla ricerca di T.*: SSR 2 (1978) 357-365; H. van Barkel, *T., Augustinus ante Augustinum*: NTT 19 (1930) 36-57; J. Ratzinger, *Beobachtungen zum Kirchenbegriff des T. im Liber Reg.*: REAug 2 (1956) 173-186; L.J. van der Lof, *Warum wurde T. nicht katholisch?*: ZNTW 57 (1966) 260-282; P. Cazier, *Le Livre des règles de T. Sa transmission du Doctr. Christ. aux Sent. d'Isidore de Séville*: REAug 19 (1973) 241-261; E. Romero Pose, *T. y el sermón in nat. sanct. innoc.*: Gregorianum 60 (1979) 129-149; Id., *Et caelum ecclesia et terra ecclesia. Exégesis ticoniana del Ap. 4,1*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 469-486; Id., *Una nueva edición del Comentario de Beato de L.*: Accad. N. dei Lincei, Boll. dei Classici 1 (1980) 221-231; Id., *La Iglesia y la mujer del Ap. 12 (Exégesis ticoniana del Ap. 12, 1-2)*: Compostellanum 24 (1979) 293-307; Id., *Símbolos eclesiales en el comento a Ap. 1,13-3,22 de T.*, diss. P.U.G., Rome 1978; PCBE 1, 1122-1127; K.B. Steinhauser, *The Structure of Ticonius' Apocalypse Commentary*: VChr 35 (1981) 354-357; Id., *The Apocalypse Commentary of T.: A History of its Reception and Influence*, Frankfurt a.M. 1987; M.G. Cox, *Augustine, Jerome, T. and the Lingua Punica*: Studia Orientalia 64 (1988) 83ff.; G. Gaeta, *Il "Liber Regularum" di Ticonio: studio sull'ermeneutica scritturistica*: AnSE 5 (1988) 103-124; P.C. Bori, *La ricezione delle "Regole" di Ticonio, da Agostino a Erasmo*: AnSE 5 (1988) 125-142; M. Dulaey, *La sixième Règle de T. et son résumé dans le De doctrina christiana*: REAug 35 (1989) 83-103; J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier du donatisme*, Berlin 1989; E. Romero Pose, *El Comentario al Apocalipsis de Ticonio*: CrSt 11 (1990) 179-186; C. Mandolfo, *Le "Regole" di Ticonio e le "Quaestiones et responsiones" di Eucherio di Lione*: AnSE 8 (1991) 535-546; L. Ayres, *Agustín y Ticonio sobre metafísica y exégesis*: Augustinus 40 (1995) 13-30; M.A. Tilley, *Agustín: ¿interpretó mal a Ticonio?*: Augustinus 40 (1995) 297-302; E. Romero Pose, *El milenio en Ticonio: exégesis al Apoc. 20, 1-6*: AnSE 12 (1995) 327-346; E. Romero Pose, *Los ángeles de las Iglesias: (Exégesis de Ticonio al Apoc.1, 20-3, 22)*: Augustinianum 35 (1995) 119-136; K.B. Steinhauser, *Ticonio: ¿era griego?*: Augustinus 40 (1995) 283-290; R. Gryson, *Fragments inédits du commentaire de Tyconius sur l'"Apocalypse"*: RBen 107 (1997) 107, 189-226; *Sette regole per la Scrittura / Ticonio*, ed. L. Leoni - D. Leoni, Bologna 1997; P. Camastra, *Il Liber regularum di Ticonio: contributo alla lettura*, Rome 1998; P.B. Harvey, *Approaching the Apocalypse: Augustine Reads John's Revelation*: AugStud 30 (1999) 133-151 P. Marone, *L'uso delle regole di Ticonio nella produzione letteraria di Agostino*: SMSR 24 (2000) 241-254; Ead., *La continuità esegetica che caratterizza le opere di Ticonio ovvero l'applicazione delle regole nel "Commento all'Apocalisse"*: SMSR 25 (2001) 253-270; J.-M. Vercruyse, *Tyconius. Le livre des Règles*, Paris 2004.

E. Romero Pose

TYPOLOGY. The term comes from the Greek *typos* (Lat.: *typus*, *figura*, *forma*, *imago*) which means

"mark, sign, representation, image" etc. The apostle *Thomas said that he would not believe unless he put his hand "in the sign [*typos*] of the nails" (Jn 20:25). A belief in the unity of the two Testaments led early Christians to see a close connection and correspondence between persons, events and institutions of the first covenant with the second. This correspondence did not pertain to the details, but the essential element; by and large such a correspondence was only affirmed. It was based on the conviction that the character of God's action does not change over the course of salvation. Already in the OT one found a correspondence between events: for example, the traditions of the *exodus were seen as a type of the final redemption of Israel (Is 51:10-11; 52:7-12). When the preceding tradition or personage is interpreted as an expression of God's new action in history, it is the *typos* of a new reality (*antitype*, see Heb 9:24, where the term *antitypos* appears in the plural), which is its fulfillment. That an individual or an event is the *typos* of something else can only be seen a posteriori. This means that the OT writer was not aware that he was communicating a typological message which was only understood at a subsequent time. The typological interpretation sought to make manifest the understood correspondence to a person, or otherwise, according to the saying that the "New Testament is hidden in the Old, and that the New reveals the Old." In the gospel of *John it is affirmed that the Scriptures speak of Christ (5:39); it is Christ who provides meaning for the OT and the NT. *Melchizedek becomes a type of Christ in the epistle to the Hebrews. Because Christ is the fulfillment of the OT, many individuals and events are interpreted as types of Christ. The types of the OT (*Adam, *Abel, *Abraham, Melchizedek, Isaac, *Job, *Jacob, Sarah, *Aaron, etc.) provided meaning to the living continuity of sacred history. Aaron, for example, is a type of Christ, although his son is a type of the bishop (Methodius, *De lepr.* 7). Jacob is a symbol of the Christian people, although the limping Jacob is a figure of the church, which is limping on account of the presence of sinners (Aug., *Sermo* 5,8). The individuals and the events, who are truly historical, assume an exemplary condition of another future reality within a unified history. The *Sabbath is the type and image of the future kingdom of the saints (Hippolytus, *In Dan.* 1,14.6). The chief characteristic of typology is the affirmation of the unity of all Scripture. *Ambrose states: *ille* [Melchizedek] *in typo, hic* [Christus] *in veritate: typus autem sit umbra veritatis* (*De David* 11). The distinction between allegory and typology is fluid inasmuch as they are not entirely differentiated interpretive methods but rather are mixed. *See* *allegory – typology and its bibliography.

J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum futuri*, Paris 1950; G.W.H. Lampe - K.J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology*, London 1957; J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, Paris ²1976 (bibl.); R.M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, Berrien Springs 1981; M. Simonetti, *Lettera e/o allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica*, Rome 1985; M. Simonetti, *Sul significato di alcuni termini tecnici nella letteratura esegetica greca*: *la terminologia esegetica nell'antichità*: VetChr 20 (1987) 25-58; J.N. Guinot, *La typologie comme technique herméneutique*: *Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères* (Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 2), Strasbourg 1989, 1-34; J.N. Guinot - M. Simonetti, *Ancora su allegoria e termini affini negli scrittori greci*: AnSE 8/2 (1991) 363-384; G.W. Buchanan, *Typology and the Gospel*, Lanham, MD 1987; Hist. Wörterbuch der Rhetorik I (1992) 330-393; R. Trevijano, *La Biblia en el cristianismo antiguo*, Estella Navarra 2001, 83-108; Ch. Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, I, Leiden 2004, 228-242; 251-256; Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexikon*, s.v., 1418-1820; J.G. Muller, *L'Ancien Testament dans l'ecclésiologie des Pères. Une lecture des Constitutions Apostoliques*, Turnhout 2004.

A. Di Berardino

TYRE

I. City and Christian origins - II. Councils - III. Archaeology.

I. City and Christian origins. Tyre (today Sûr in Lebanon) was an ancient Phoenician city on the Lebanese coast, whose inhabitants in the 8th c. BC established numerous colonies on the coasts of the W Mediterranean Sea, among which were *Carthage and *Hippo. In ancient times it was an island, now united to the continent with a strip of land. It possessed two ports and was well connected to the hinterland by means of streets and with navigation routes with other Mediterranean cities; during the Roman period it also had a *statio* at Puzzuoli, near Neapolis, and in many W cities, inasmuch as it exported the grain from the plain of Hauran. It was conquered by Alexander the Great in 332 BC; in 64 BC, Pompey assigned it to the Roman province of *Syria. Herod the Great had numerous buildings constructed there. *Septimius Severus, who was supported by its inhabitants in his struggle against Pescennius Niger, adorned it with monuments and lifted it to the status of a colony, also sending some military veterans there. It was an important commercial and industrial center esp. because of its port and famous glass and purple factories. A philosophical school was also found there; the pagan *Porphyry, who wrote against the Christians at the end of the 3rd c., was from Tyre. *Jerome called it the most beautiful city of Phoenicia (*Comm. in Ezech.* 26,7; 27,2: PL 25, 241ff.; 246-247). With the division of

Phoenicia into two provinces, which occurred before 425, Tyre became the civil and religious metropolis of Phoenicia Prima, with the exception of Berytus which enjoyed the autonomy of self-governance. It fell under Arab rule in 638.

The city of Tyre is mentioned many times in the gospels, usually along with Sidon (Mt 11:21-22; 15:21; Mk 3:8; 7:24; Lk 6:17; 10:13). The apostle *Paul, upon coming to Tyre in ca. 57, already found some Christians there (Acts 21:4-7). According to the ps.-Clementine literature, *Peter preached there (*Hom.* 3,58ff.: PG 2,147-148). Its first known bishop was Cassius, who participated at the council of 190 on the celebration of *Easter (Eus., *HE* 5,25); from the mid-3rd c., its bishop was Marinus, who was mentioned by *Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus., *HE* 7,5,1). *Origen died at Tyre (Jer., *De vir. ill.* 54; *Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 118; see *Epiph., *Pan.* LXIV, 3,6: PG 41,1074). According to Jerome, *Methodius of Olympus was bishop there (*De vir. ill.* 83). During the *Diocletian persecution, there were many *martyrs in that city, among whom was Bishop Tyrannius (Eus., *HE* 8,13,3); Theodosia, who besought the confessors who were awaiting execution to remember her when they received their heavenly reward (Eus., *De mart. Pal.* 7,1); and Ulpian (Eus., *De mart. Pal.* 5,1). *Eusebius of Caesarea, moreover, found there a letter affixed by the emperor *Maximinus Daia, who praised its inhabitants for having issued decrees against the Christians (*HE* 9,7,3). The well-learned priest *Dorotheus, who lived perhaps at the time of Diocletian, was appointed there by the emperor as procurator of the imperial purple-dyery, and Eusebius had "heard him explain the Scriptures with much insight" (*HE* 7,32,4). The Christian community of Tyre had to have had many members and must have possessed much wealth because, after the great persecution, it was able to construct a large church. During that occasion, *Eusebius delivered an inaugural speech (*HE* 10,4,2-72), also providing a description of the church, which he called the most beautiful of all Phoenicia (*HE* 10,4,1). During this period, the bishop of Tyre was *Paulinus, who was first a priest of Antioch, to whom Eusebius dedicated the 10th book of his *Ecclesiastical History* (see 10,1,2). At the Council of *Nicaea (325), Zeno the bishop of Tyre was in attendance; he was succeeded by Paul. At the Synod of Tyre in 335, *Athanasius was condemned. Likewise from Tyre were Edesius and *Frumentius, who landed by chance in *Ethiopia and found some Christians there. During the mid-4th c., the *Arian Uranius was bishop of Tyre (Athan., *De synod.* 12: PG 26,702; Socr., *HE* II,41; Epiph., *Pan.* LXXXIII,23), who was succeeded by Zeno II, who had been ordained by *Meletius of Antioch and who participated at the Synod of *Tyana in 365 (Soz., *HE* VI, 12) and that of Constantinople in 381 (Mansi 3, 568). A tenacious opponent of *Nestorianism was Photius bishop of Tyre, who was elected in 448 and took part at the Robber Council of *Ephesus (also known as the *latrocinium*) and at the Council of *Chalcedon. At the Council of Constantinople (553), Eusebius was present, who had also been invited by Pope *Vigilius.

PWK 26, 1876-1908; EC 12, 135-137; CE 14, 355-356; W.B. Fleming, *The History of Tyre*, New York 1915; G. Bardy, *Sur Paulin de Tyr*: RSR 2 (1922) 35-45; N. Jidejian, *Tyre through the Ages*, Beirut 1969; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford ²1971. With respect to the bishops: Fedalto 2, 708-709; C. Smith, *Christian Rhetoric in Eusebius' Panegyric at Tyre*: VChr 43 (1989) 226-247.

A. Di Berardino

II. Councils. *335*. The anti-Nicene reaction that developed in the East after 327 also struck *Athanasius in 335. The *Eusebians seized as a pretext some violent measures to which the followers of Athanasius were constrained during the struggle against the schismatic *Meletians and, having *Constantine on their side, they convoked a council at Tyre, to which Athanasius was obliged by a letter from the emperor to present himself. Nearly 60 Eastern bishops as well as many *Egyptians who had come with their patriarch participated there. Among the enemies of Athanasius were the following: *Eusebius of Caesarea, *Eusebius of Nicomedia and *Flaccillus of Antioch, who was the presider. The accusations of the Meletians were presented against Athanasius, and in order to obtain confirmation of these charges, an investigative committee was sent to Mareotis. The Egyptian faithful protested against the partiality with which the committee conducted its work but without obtaining their desired results. Athanasius then fled secretly from Tyre to appeal directly to the emperor. In his absence, the council condemned him for crimes and insubordination and deposed him from his see (September 335). On 30 October Athanasius presented himself at *Constantinople before the emperor, but the emperor confirmed the verdict and exiled him to *Trier.

448. In the aftermath of the *Nestorian controversy, *Ibas of Edessa, who in a letter to *Maris had heavily criticized *Cyril of Alexandria's actions, by order of the emperor *Theodosius II was judged by a council that had gathered at Tyre and Berytus. Denying that he was a Nestorian, he was sent away acquitted.

513/515. On an uncertain date, within these two years, *Severus of Antioch gathered at Tyre a coun-

cil of Syrian bishops who belonged to the *monophysite movement, among whom were *Philoxenus of Mabbug. An overtly promonophysite interpretation was given to *Zeno's *Henoticon*. Such an interpretation drew opposition from both the more moderate supporters of the *Henoticon* and the radical monophysites, who completely rejected that formula of faith.

518. A small council held on 16 September approved the antimonophysite decisions reached during the preceding July by the Council of *Constantinople.

335: Hfl-Lecl 1, 659-666; Simonetti 124-128; K.M. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht. Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreits (313–315) und zum Prozeß des Athanasius von Alexandrien (328-346)*, Bonn 1975; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 259-263; A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, see *Index*. *448*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 493-498. *513/515*: Palazzini 5, 431-432. *518*: Hfl-Lecl 2, 1049.

M. Simonetti

III. Archaeology. At the border of the modern-day city of Sûr, a monumental arch was found with a Christian chapel, already decorated with wall mosaics with the representation of the Virgin and the saints. Many Christian *sarcophagi come from Tyre which, although they cannot rival those possessed by the pagans that are rich with figures, remain as an important testimony to the existence of Christianity. There are many Christian funerary inscriptions that bear the indication of the job once held by the deceased: two deacons, one worked as a carpenter; the other, a jeweler; a subdeacon sold fabric; two cantors, one served at the Church of the Virgin *Mary, the other at the Church of Old St. Mary's. There also appears to have been a consecrated virgin. There is also an exceptional invocation: "O Lord, you who have undergone death, grant [me] rest" (Jidejian, *Tyre*, 118). There are no inscriptions of bishops or presbyters. Archaeologists do not know the whereabouts of their tombs nor that of *Origen of Alexandria, who died in this city. With respect to the cathedral constructed at the time of the emperor *Constantine by Bishop *Paulinus of Tyre, for which *Eusebius provides us an extensive description (*HE* 10,37-49), it seems that the remains of this building lie under the Crusader Church. There are no archaeological remains of the other three early Christian churches, as in the case of the monasteries and the oratories outside the city, which became places of pilgrimage. The rural church of St. Zechariah enjoyed the right of asylum as a result of an imperial concession (CIG 8800; A. Dain - G. Rouillard, *Une inscription relative au droit d'asile, conservée au Louvre*: Byzantion 5 [1930] 315-326). From Tyre derives a terra cotta with the representation of the "personified cross" (Bagatti, *Church from Circumcision*, 222-223). From the territory very near to the city, the mosaic of the Church of St. Christopher Qabr Hiran is well-known, with scenes taken from real life, seasons, etc., replete with theological and liturgical meaning.

N. Jidejian, *Tyre Through the Ages*, Beirut 1969; B. Bagatti, *The Church from the Circumcision*, Jerusalem 1971; J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions grecques et latines dans les fouilles de Tyr (1963-1974)*. I. *Inscriptions de la nécropole*, Paris 1977; D. Feissel, *Notes d'épigraphie chrétienne III:* BCH 102 (1978) 545-555; M. Chehab, *Une nécropole paléochrétienne à Tyr*, in Atti del IX Congr. int. di archeologia cristiana (Roma, 21-27 settembre 1975), II, Vatican City 1978, 157-161; J.P. Rey-Coquais, *Fortune et rang social des gens de métiers de Tyr au Bas Empire*: Ktèma 4 (1979) 281-292; J. Wilkinson, *Paulinus' Temple at Tyre*: JOEByz 32 (1982) 553-561; C. Smith, *Christian Rhetoric in Eusebius' Panegyric at Tyre*: VChr 43 (1989) 226-247; J.P. Rey-Coquais, *Tyr, métropole de Carthage et de beaucoup d'autres villes, aux époques romaine et paléochrétienne*, in *Africa romana*, 10, Sassari 1994, 1339-1353.

B. Bagatti

U

ULFILA. *See* *WULFILA

UNITY. Unity was an important notion in the Greek philosophical tradition, esp. *Platonism, which had its roots in Eleaticism, but also represents a development of it, insofar as, unlike Parmenides, Plato did not deny multiplicity but rather resolved it into unity. Suffice it to think of Plato's conception of each Idea, which constitutes the unity of a multiplicity of realities participating in that Idea, and of his protology, which is based on the transcendent principles of the One and of the indefinite Dyad. For Plato, the One coincides with the Good; for Aristotle, the One conincides with Being. In *Neoplatonism, Plotinus's One (ἕν) is the first of his Triad, which transcends not only the sense-perceptible world, but even the intellectual one and Being itself.

In the NT, unity is emphasized esp. in John 17, in the fundamental prayer of Jesus for unity: he prays that his followers may be one (ἕν) as he and the Father are one. This prayer proved to be an important point of departure for patristic reflection on unity, the unity of the *Trinity, the unity of the church, the unity of the Logos and, esp. in the case of the Origenian tradition, the unity of all with God at the beginning and in the end.

*Clement of Alexandria, *Origen and *Gregory of Nyssa esp. applied the notion of transcendent unity to the Christ-Logos as the seat of the Ideas/*logoi* of all existing beings and to Christ's humanity as coinciding with all of humankind. The latter concept has important consequences in Origen's and Gregory of Nyssa's eschatology in relation to the eventual resurrection and restoration.

In *Middle Platonism, the Logos is the seat of the Ideas, which are the paradigms of reality, and joins them all in unity. Plato's Ideas indeed have become thoughts of God and are located in God's mind, that is, in God's Logos. *Philo, who was close to Middle Platonism, saw in the Logos, which is one, the totality of powers which are identical to the Ideas, the intelligible paradigms of sense-perceptible realities. Like an architect who forms the paradigm of a city in his mind, God's Logos is the seat of "the world composed by the Ideas" (*De opif. mund.* 17-20). The Logos, according to Philo, plays a core role in the creation of the world. Now, shortly after Philo, John in his prologue also assigned this role to the Logos, which he already identified with Christ, as Clement, Origen and many Fathers did afterward. The Logos, in Philo's view, is a real μεσίτης or intermediary between God and the world, and between unity and multiplicity (*LA* III 150; *Leg. ad G.* 55). The latter respect is precisely that which is most developed by Clement of Alexandria, who also took over Philo's doctrine of the divine *dynameis* and mostly transferred them onto the Logos.

In *Strom.* IV 25,155-156 Clement observes that, according to Plato, the *nous,* or Intellect, is like a divinity which is able to contemplate the Ideas and the invisible God and inhabits human beings. It is the seat of the Ideas and is itself God. Plato's soul absorbed in the contemplation of the Ideas and detached from the sense-perceptible world is assimilated by Clement to an angel who is with Christ. Clement constructs the equation "soul : Ideas = angel : Christ," drawing a parallel not only between the soul and an angel but also between the Ideas and Christ. For Christ is the Logos and, as such, the seat of the Ideas. Immediately afterward, in 156,1, indeed, Clement describes the Logos as Wisdom, Science and Truth, all notions pertaining to the gnoseological field, which is related to the function of Christ-Logos as teacher in Clement. The Son, in Clement's view, is the sum and unification of all the powers of the spirit, "all in one"; they "concur to constitute the Son," "contribute to the Son," so that the Son is the sum of all these spiritual *dynameis,* which were probably assimilated by Clement to the Ideas in the Logos and the angels. (Indeed, he seems to have joined the speculation on the Logos to the Jewish-

Christian doctrine on the angelic powers.) But Clement adds that the Son is not determined by the notion of each one of his powers. This suggests that Christ-Logos is not simply the sum of all these *dynameis,* but transcends them in a superior unity. Indeed, Clement goes on to say in 156,2 that "the Son is not simply 'one thing' as one thing; nor is he 'many things' as parts of a sum, but he is *One thing as All things,*" ὡς πάντα ἕν. The Logos is not only One and not only All but All in One and One as All, the unity of multiplicity that transcends the many and makes them one. "Hence also all things; for the Son himself is the circle that *embraces all the powers,* which are encircled and *unified into one.*" The Logos is the principle of all things because it embraces all in a superior unity and because it is the agent of creation. The notion of circularity in reference to the Logos's encompassing all in unity is further developed by Clement in 157,1: "For this reason the Logos is said to be the Alpha and the Omega [Rev 1:8; 22:13], because only in his case does the end coincide with the beginning; the Logos ends with the first principle without admitting of any interruption at any point." The Logos, being God, has no duality, no multiplicity, no division, but resolves every division and unifies multiplicity. Since the Logos is the transcendent unity of all, "to believe *in* Christ and *through* Christ means to become *unified* and simple, being *unified* in the Logos continually, without distractions or interruptions, whereas not to believe means to be in disagreement, separated and divided" (IV 25,157,2).

Clement's conception was taken up by Origen. The section of his *Commentary on John* devoted to the great prayer for unity in John 17 is lost, but a fragment on John 17:11 survives from the catenae (fr. 140), in which Origen explains, taking up a famous Aristotelian expression but applying it to a Platonic issue, that "unity has many meanings" (τὸ ἓν πολλαχῶς λέγεται); such as according to harmony and agreement, or according to similarity of nature, the unity of all human beings in Adam and in Christ is of the latter kind.

In *Comm. in Io.* I 20,119 Origen develops the idea of unity by observing that, whereas God the Father is One and absolutely simply One, Christ the Logos is "One through All." Christ is said to be "the first and the last" in Revelation because he is the first, the last and all that is in between, as Christ-Logos is "all things" (ibid., I 31,219), "all and in all" (ibid., I 31,225). The unity of the Logos is emphasized in *Comm. in Io.* XX 6,43-44 against those who "want to kill the Logos and to break him to pieces . . . to destroy the unity [ἑνότης] of the greatness of the Logos."

In *Comm. in Io.* I 19,114-115 Origen uses the metaphor of the project in the architect's mind employed by Philo to explain the relation between the Logos and the paradigm of the world; the living Wisdom of God is the Logos, who contains all the archetypal *logoi* that are the paradigms of all creation. That the *logoi* existed in unity in God's Logos-Wisdom *ab aeterno,* before their creation as substances, is declared by Origen in *Princ.* I 4,5. The Son/Logos/Wisdom contained in itself *ab aeterno* the "principles," "reasons" and "forms" of the whole creation (*initia, rationes* and *species* in Rufinus's version, corresponding to ἀρχαί, λόγοι and εἴδη), the Ideas in which every existing being participates (*Princ.* I 2,2). This, of course, depends on the Son himself existing *ab aeterno* as well as the Father, a point that Origen strongly defended against pre-Arian tendencies, according to which "there was a time when [the Son] did not exist." In *The Trinitarian Theology of Gregory of Nyssa in his* In Illud: Tunc et ipse Filius*: His Polemic Against "Arian" Subordinationism and the Apokatastasis,* a lecture at the International Congress on Gregory of Nyssa, Tübingen, Sept 2008, I demonstrated that Origen, far from being the inspirer of the Arians, was the inspirer of the Cappadocians' trinitarian theology and their anti-Arianism.

The dialectic between unity and multiplicity is an important theme in Origen's thought. Multiplicity is subsumed and transcended in the Logos's unity and, through Christ-Logos, in the eschatological unity of all rational creatures in God. This, the θέωσις, has often been misrepresented as pantheism, as though a substantial confusion should occur between God and creatures. But this is excluded by divine transcendence itself; the "divinization" of the *noes* will be their leading a divine life, and their unity in God is for Origen a unity of will. For all rational creatures will be oriented only to the Good, i.e., God, no longer to evil; neither will it be dispersed among minor or apparent goods, but God will be all good things, in one, for all. This eschatological unity will be unity in *agapē,* which is why there will be no more fall from unity in the *apokatastasis*: because *caritas numquam cadit* (*Comm. in Rom.* V 10,158-240). This *agapē* will keep all rational creatures in unity within themselves and with God, because *agapē* is a centripetal force: *Tanta caritatis vis est ut ad se omnia trahat* (ibid., V 10,226). The first fall, of Satan and Adam, took place before the manifestation of Christ's *agapē,* but in the *apokatastasis agapē* will be perfect (as the end will be not only similar to but even *better* than the beginning). The unity of the *apokatastasis* will never be disrupted by one rational creature's free will, which could endure forever in the rejection of God. Origen takes up Paul's revela-

tion that nothing will be able to separate us from God's love, not even death, therefore, not even our free will (V 10,212-222). The fact that each rational creature's free will shall spontaneously adhere to the Good will also constitute the main feature of the final unity.

The current multiplicity of the rational creatures' wills and conditions will be subsumed and transcended in the final unity. The unity-multiplicity dialectic is clear in the following statement: *Sicut multorum unus finis, ita ab uno initio multae differentiae ac varietates, quae rursum per bonitatem Dei, per subiectionem Christi atque unitatem Spiritus sancti in unum finem, qui sit initio similis, revocantur* ("As there is one end to many things, so there spring from one beginning many differences and varieties, which again, through the goodness of God, and by subjection to Christ, and through the unity of the Holy Spirit, are recalled to one end, which is similar to the beginning," *Princ.* I 6,2). That the final unity is a unity of will is demonstrated also by Origen's statement that the cause of the multiplicity and diversity of the present state of things is precisely the rational creatures' free will, oriented in different directions after the fall, before which there was *unitas* and *concordia* (*Princ.* II 1,1): the initial unity was a concord of will, lost with the fall, when the *noes* began to wish something else than the Good, and dispersed itself into a multiplicity of volitions. Likewise, the final unity will be a unity of will. In I 6,2, the universality of the submission to Christ in Phil 2:10 is stressed, as well as the dialectic between the multiplicity of all creatures (*omnes, omnis universitas*) and the unity of the *telos* (*unum finem*); cf. I 6,4: *Dispersio illa unius principii atque divisio ad unum et eundem finem et similitudinem reparatur* ("That separation from the one beginning is undergoing a process of restoration to one and the same end and likeness"). It is precisely the unity of the *telos* that induces Origen to assume that not even the demons will be left outside (I 6,3: *ab illa etiam finali unitate ac convenientia discrepabit* ["whether that portion (which is evil) will differ from the final unity and fitness of all things"]).

Origen also employs the concept of unity in his anti-Marcionite and antignostic polemic, maintaining the unity of all Scripture, OT and NT, which in his view constitutes one and the same body, that of Christ (e.g., *Comm. in Io.* 10,18,107: "the unity [ἑνότης] of Spirit in all the Scriptures"). And he insists on the unity obtaining within the Trinity (e.g., *Princ.* 1,3,4: *unitas Trinitatis*).

Gregory of Nyssa also describes Christ-Logos-Wisdom as the seat of all Ideas of realities before creation (*De Perf.* 260B). Through God's *dynamis*, who is the Christ-Logos, these Ideas became creatures. This is the creation of the world performed by the Christ-Logos, which perfectly corresponds to *In Hex.* 72B: the Ideas of all things were contemplated by God, in the divine Mind-Logos, before their creation as realities, and it was "the Logos of *dynamis*" that brought these Ideas to reality. The "divine *dynamis*" is again said to have created all things in *De hom. op.* 3: "The creation [κτίσις] was made impromptu, so to say, by the divine *dynamis,* in that it was constituted at the same time as the order was given."

Differently from what he seems to imply in his own *De perfectione* and *In Hexaemeron,* however, but with a parallel with the special status of the *logikoi* in Origen, Gregory in *De hominis opificio* applies the notion of the preexistence of the Ideas of creatures in the Logos only (or to a greater degree) to the human being, "in such a way that the human being could be allotted a dignity *more ancient* than its birth. . . . It is only the creation of the human being that the Creator of the universe approached with extreme care and circumspection, to the point that he prepared even matter *in advance* for it, *before its realization,* and made its form similar to an archetypal Beauty. And, after establishing *in advance* the end for which this being had to appear in the world, he produced its nature in conformity with that end, and appropriate to its activities, so to be apt to the established objective." All creatures are brought to being by the Logos, but only for the human being, image of the archetypal Beauty, does the Logos seem to have had a plan *ab aeterno,* or at least a particularly careful plan and aim.

Gregory also took over Origen's reflection on the dialectic between unity and multiplicity in respect to the beginning and the end of this world. In the present life, division and multiplicity are due to the different choices of the rational creatures' will. The beginning and the end are characterized by unity and uniformity, which are essentially a unity of will, directed to the Good (e.g., *De an.* 81Bff.). This will be the assimilation to God (*De an.* 89ff.), which, too, had a counterpart at the beginning, when "human nature was 'something divine,' before the human being acquired the impulse to evil" (ibid., 148AB). It was divine because it was all in the Good, in unity, and it will be divine in the end, when all will voluntarily adhere to the Good and nobody will choose evil any more.

The unity of the Logos as "all things in one," subsuming and transcending multiplicity, is also present in Origen's and Gregory of Nyssa's conception of the assumption of all humanity on the part of Christ,

so that the body of Christ is all humankind, and of the eventual presence of God "all in all," where the latter "all" are primarily all humans *qua* subsumed in Christ. This emerges, for instance, from Origen's *Hom. in Lev.* 7,2,10-12, and entails that the resurrection of Christ was not only the one which occurred historically but also the great, general resurrection of humanity in the end. The theme of human beings "scattered" in death/perdition and brought to unity by, and in, the Christ-Logos is emphasized by Origen also in connection with the motif of Jesus's gathering into ἕν the scattered children of God, which repeatedly appears in Origen's *Commentary on John,* in which the theme of unity through Christ, esp. based on John 17:21, is essential. In XXVIII 21,185 Origen even joins these two motifs. The eschatological reconstitution of Christ's body is connected to the interpretation of 1 Cor 15:28 and the equation between universal submission to Christ and God in the *telos* and universal salvation. Gregory of Nyssa takes up this whole set of ideas in his *In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius,* as I have argued elsewhere (SP 44 [2010]). Christ will have finished the "work" to which he refers in John 17:4 after making even the last sinner just. Until not one rational creature remains outside the body of Christ and all are in submission to him, Christ will not be able to submit to God. In all humanity (his body), made perfect by him, Christ will accomplish his work, as the result of which "God will be all in all" (Orig. *Hom. in Lev.* 7.2.6). Christ-Logos is the superior unity of all human creatures together, "all in One," and his eventual submission to the Father, that is, the submission of all humanity to God, will have as a result that God, who is One, and the One par excellence, will be in all, and for each of these "all" will be "all," that is, all things. This conception of God as the One who includes and transcends all things in a superior unity, and the One in whom all will be in the end, passes through Christ-Logos as the unity of all human beings. Gregory of Nyssa draws on these notions in his *Tunc et Ipse*. In *Comm. in Io.* X 35-36.225-238 Origen affirms that Christ's body, which is the temple of living stones erected on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, and which thus typologically represents the church, will rise again at the resurrection of all humanity. All the bones of this dispersed body will be reassembled. The *resurrection of Christ from his death on the cross,* which occurred in the past, embraces the mystery of the *resurrection of the whole body of Christ* (i.e., all humankind). Christ's body has not yet risen in the final, blessed resurrection that is the object of our hopes, a "great and difficult mystery" foreseen in Ezek 37:1-11 (related to the resurrection also in Gregory's *De anima*). These are Christ's scattered bones that will be reassembled in the end (233-236): "At the resurrection of *Christ's true and most perfect body*, Christ's limbs and bones, now dry . . . will be reassembled, up to the perfect *anthrōpos* [Eph 4:13]." In his lost commentary on Ephesians, fr. 16,15, this theme of the eschatological building up of Christ's body is connected to the unity assured by *agapē*: "Endeavoring to keep the unity of spirit in love . . . now, the unity of spirit is kept when love binds together those who are unified according to the Spirit, and gathers them together into one and the same body, that of Christ." In 9,65ff., Origen more directly refers this theme to 1 Cor 15:28: God "subjected everything under Christ's feet, and constituted Christ as the head over all beings, for the church, which is his body, the perfect totality of the one who perfectly accomplishes and completes all in all." Origen in his commentary identified the church, Christ's body, with all humans and angels, the same rational creatures portrayed by Gregory in *De an.* 132-136, as participating in the heavenly feast of *apokatastasis.* Origen in *Comm. in Io.* X 14.83 already described such heavenly feasts too.

Gregory in *Tunc et Ipse* supported a nonsubordinationist and "anti-Arian" interpretation of 1 Cor 15:28, which was anticipated by Origen; he took up both the main pillars and the tiniest details of Origen's exegesis, as I demonstrated thoroughly in *Trinitarian Theology*. In Gregory's argument, the eschatological submission of Christ to God, fully achieved after the rejection of evil on the part of all, is the submission of his body, that is, all human beings joined in unity (*In Illud* 19,19–20,7). Since the body of Christ is also the church (Col 1:24-25), the church will coincide with all humankind. In the relevant passage the dialectic between "all" (humans) and "one" (body of Christ) is highlighted by Gregory from the very beginning. "All," through participation, will contribute to the construction of Christ's body; all will reach unity of faith and knowledge and will make up Christ in perfect wholeness, as Gregory says drawing on Origen (*Princ.* 1,6,2; 1,2,10; 2,8,5). Gregory insists on unity and concord/harmony in the *apokatastasis*: the "whole body" of Christ will be "in accord with itself"; "the entire creation" will be "in harmony with itself" (*In Illud* 20.10-11), and, according to Phil 2:10-11, to which Gregory expressly refers, every knee will bend, of all beings in heaven, on earth and in the underworld, and all will proclaim that Christ is the Lord, which means, in his view, that all will believe and be saved. The whole creation will become "one single body" (ἕν, *In Illud* 20.14). The unity of all humans in the

one body of Christ is extended to all creatures. On the basis of the aforementioned arguments, Gregory in *In Illud* 21 proposes a cogent syllogism: if submission means salvation, according to Origen's equation and Ps 61:2, and if "every being" that is in Christ, conceived as unity in multiplicity, is saved, then, since all will be in Christ's body, "no being will remain outside the saved." This, together with several other unequivocal passages, also refutes the hypothesis that the *apokatastasis* is "simply" the final resurrection for Gregory and thus does not imply universal salvation. In *In Illud* 23, too, Gregory argues in the same way, moreover introducing, like Origen, the key concept of *agapē* in the *telos*: if the Father loves the Son, according to John 17:23, and all human beings are in the Son, again as multiplicity subsumed in unity, then the Father loves all human beings as the Son's body, and the Son's submission to the Father means that all humanity will "attain the knowledge of God and be saved" (1 Tim 2:4-6). Gregory depends on the notion of the Christ-Logos being the unity of all human beings when in *In Illud* 21 he states that the elimination of death will have as a consequence that all will be in life, because all will be in Christ, who is "the Life" (John 11:25), and Christ's body will be constituted by all human beings. Similarly, Origen argued that in the end all will be in life, because eternal life, i.e., Christ, excludes eternal death altogether (*Comm. in Rom.* 5.7), since they are incompatible with one another; thus, one must be eliminated, and 1 Cor 15:25-28 reveals that what will be eliminated is death. According to Gregory, Christ is the Mediator in that he unifies all to himself and to the Father, in a function of unification of multiplicity (*In Illud* 21,10-16; cf. Origen, *Princ.* 2,6,1; *C. Cels.* 3,34). Christ unifies all human beings in himself and unites them to the Father through himself, i.e., through his subsuming them in unity in his body.

Consistent with the notion of the Christ-Logos as unity of multiplicity, Gregory in *In Illud* 22-23 insists on Christ's prayer for unity in John 17:20-23. He observes that Christ "unifies all" in himself and to the Father; all become "one and the same thing," ἕν, with Christ and God who are one; Christ, being in the Father, by joining us to himself in unity accomplishes the union of all human beings with God. Christ's prayer for unity in John 17:20-23 was one of Origen's favorite biblical quotations in support of the idea of perfect unity in the *apokatastasis,* which, in his view, will be the accomplishment of the subsumption of all multiplicity in a superior unity, e.g., in *Princ.* 1,6,2 (*restituetur in illam unitatem quam promittit Dominus* . . .) and 2.3.5: *Quod dicit Salvator . . . "Sicut ego et tu unum sumus, ut et isti in nobis unum sint," ostendere videatur . . . id cum iam non in saeculo sunt omnia, sed omnia et in omnibus Deus.* All beings will be God through θέωσις. In 3,6,1, Origen expresses the same idea against the background of the eschatological passage, from image of God to likeness with God and from likeness to unity in God (ἕνωσις). The unity of all will depend on the fact that all will eventually be in God and God will be all in all (see also ibid., 3,2,4; 3,6,6, in which unity is again emphasized). According to Gregory, the eschatological unity of all will be brought about by the Spirit (*In Illud* 22), which will restore all human beings to unity among themselves and with God, after separation due to sin; Origen had already assigned to the Spirit an essential role in the return of all human beings to unity in God (see, e.g., *Comm. in Rom.* 8,4).

Eusebius, who was an admirer of Origen, like him insists on the unity that will characterize the *apokatastasis* with quotations from John. All humanity's unity with God (οἱ πάντες εἷς, ἑνωθέντες τῇ θεότητι) in the *apokatastasis* will be, not a unity of substance, as though a confusion of essences should occur (οὐ κατὰ συναλοιφὴν μιᾶς οὐσίας), but a unity of perfect virtue, to which all will be brought: κατὰ δὲ τελείωσιν τῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἀρετῆς . . . τέλειοι κατεργρασθέντες. "All" (οἱ πάντες) will achieve unity with God. As the Son is one with the Father, according to Jesus's declarations in the gospel of John, so will "all" imitate this unity: πάντας ἡμᾶς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ μίμησιν τῆς ἑνότητος.

Two authors who knew very well the Origenian tradition and the works of the Cappadocians, Ps.-*Dionysius and *Maximus the Confessor, also take up the perspective of the importance of unity. In Dionysius, this notion is extraordinarily emphasized and is articulated in the (Neoplatonic) development from μονή to πρόοδος to ἐπιστροφή: initial unity in God, who is the One, dispersion into multiplicity, and return to unity in God in the *apokatastasis,* a progression that was also stressed by *Evagrius, another supporter of the *apokatastasis,* who saw the latter as strongly characterized by unity. Esp. his followers later theorized an initial monad, which will be reconstituted in the eventual restoration. In Maximus, the concept of unity is highlighted both in connection with the return of all to God (on which see Ramelli, *Apocatastasi,* chapter on Maximus) and in relation to the notion of the Christ-Logos, who is presented by him, too, as the superior unity of all the *logoi* of creation (for which see Tollefsen).

T.T. Tollefsen, *The Christocentric Cosmology of St Maximus the Confessor*, Oxford 2008; I. Ramelli, *Clement's Notion of the Logos "All Things as One": Its Alexandrian Background in Philo*

and Its Developments in Origen and Nyssen, in *Alexandrian Personae: Scholarly Culture and Religious Traditions in Ancient Alexandria (1st ct. BCE–4th ct. CE)*, eds. Z. Plese–R. Hirsch-Luipold, Tübingen 2010; id., *Apocatastasi*, Milan 2009; id., *"In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius . . ." (1Cor 15,27-28): Gregory of Nyssa's Exegesis, Its Derivations from Origen, and Early Patristic Interpretations Related to Origen's*, seminar paper at the 2007 *Oxford Patristic Conference*, SP 44 (2010).

I. Ramelli

UNUS EX TRINITATE PASSUS EST. Basing its claim on the 12th anathema of *Cyril of Alexandria (DS 263; 401), the *monophysite tradition introduced the christological formula *unus ex Trinitate passus est*, which, for its opponents, only signified theopaschitism, a charge leveled by the *dyophysites against Cyril and his followers. It was only gradually received by the Chalcedonians, who were protected by the emperor *Justinian. Under the influence of the Scythian monks, led by Maxentius and supported by *Boethius, and through *Dionysius Exiguus (d. ca. 545) was it finally also imposed under Pope *John II in the Latin Church (DS 401).

V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der skytischen Kontroversen*, Paderborn 1935; A. Grillmeier, *Vorbereitung des Mittelalters*: CGG 2, 791-839; J. Chéné, *Unus de Trinitate passus est . . .* : RecSR 53/4 (1965) 545ff.; Grillmeier, II/2, Freiburg 1989, 336-355: *Giustiniano e gli Sciti*; 536-559: *Giovanni II.*

B. Studer

URANIUS, presbyter. Disciple of *Paulinus of Nola; in 431 he wrote a letter on the death of his teacher, addressed to a certain *Pacatus who desired to illustrate Paulinus's life in Latin verse (see par. 1 of *Ep.*: PL 53,860).

CPL 207; PL 53, 859-866; P.-M. Duval, *La Gaule jusqu'au milieu du Ve siècle*, Paris 1971, n. 298, pp. 700-701; A. Pastorino, *Il De obitu sancti Paolini di Uranio*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 115-141; PCBE 2, 2342-2343.

S. Zincone

URBAN I, pope (222–230). Urban I succeeded Pope *Callistus I and died in 230, after eight years of his pontificate (Eus., *HE* 6,21,23). Urban was bishop of Rome in a period of religious peace, even though the Christian community of the city of *Rome was still in an upheaval over the schism of *Hippolytus. Tradition venerates him as a *martyr on 25 May, but his supposed martyrdom lacks any historical foundations, particularly because we lack any evidence that the empire of *Alexander Severus pursued anti-Christian persecutions during those years. The legend, moreover, anachronistically associates this pontiff with the martyr *Cecilia (LP I, 63). Urban was buried in the cemetery of St. Callistus, where the inscription pertaining to him was found.

AASS *Maii* VI, Antwerp 1688, 11-14; Eus., *HE* 6, 21,2; 6,23,3 and 6,43,6; LP I, XCIII-XCIV, CCXLVI-CCXLVII, 4 and 5, 62 and 63, 143-144; 509; II, 56 and III, 74; Jaffé 87, 13-14 (apocryphal letter); G.B. de Rossi, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana*, II, Rome 1867, XX-XXI, XXIII-XXV, XLI, 24, 33-48, 51-54, 132, 148-152, pl. II, 3; G. Wilpert, *La cripta dei papi e la cappella di Santa Cecilia nel cimitero di Callisto*, Rome 1910, 15, 17-18, 25, 33-34, pl. II, 8; P. Allard, *Storia critica delle persecuzioni* I, Florence 1931, 393-394, 399-401; *Storia critica delle persecuzioni* II, Florence 1935, 186; AB 88 (1960) 192-193; BS 12, 837-840, 840-841 (A. Amore - M.C. Celletti); *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford-New York 1986, 15-16; EPapi I, 258-261 (F. Fatti); LTK³ 10, 454 (S.Ch. Kessler).

M. Spinelli

URBANUS of Sicca (5th c.). Bishop of *Sicca Veneria, successor of *Fortunatian, during the 1st years of the 5th c. (Aug., *Epp.* 148,1; 149,3,34), and a disciple of *Augustine. He was the one who provided Augustine with information about Darius, the court magistrate (*Ep.* 229,1), who in turn, with a letter (230,1) praised him in Augustine's presence. In 418 Urbanus excommunicated his presbyter, *Apiarius of Sicca, for certain crimes, otherwise unknown, and this individual appealed to the Roman see, an unusual course of action for a nonbishop. But Pope *Zosimus accepted this recourse and sent three delegates to *Africa to resolve the dispute, which was discussed in May of 419. This act of the pope provoked reciprocal embassies and tensions between the Roman see and the African church.

DTC 15, 2307-2312; PCBE 1, 1232-1233; J. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine*, New Haven, CT 1997, 111ff.

E. Romero Pose

URBS BEATA JERUSALEM. A hymn of rare beauty, its author is unknown. Composed presumably around the 8th–9th c., it is present in some liturgical books starting from the end of the 9th c. We find it codified for the first time in the Pontifical of Poitiers, now in the modern-day Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal in Paris (cod. 227). Initially composed according to a trochaic meter, it was changed into iambics at the time of Pope Urban VIII (1623–1644). The reform of the hymnary by the Second Vatican Council divided the hymn into two parts and has remained in this form in the *Editio typica altera* 1985: the first part is set forth as a hymn at Vespers (ss. 1-24), although

the second constitutes the hymn for Lauds (ss. 25-48). Both hymns finish with the same trinitarian doxology (ss. 49-51). It was used as the hymn for the dedication of a church and celebrates the praises of the heavenly *Jerusalem, a figure of the earthly church. In its essential structure it speaks to us of a double dimension of the church, namely that of heaven and that of earth. The living stones of the heavenly Jerusalem are arranged in unity, having as its cornerstone Christ himself. While singing the hymn we contemplate the church in its celestial reality, so that the pilgrim church on earth can anticipate the beauty of heaven in its journey toward the kingdom. This hymn contains no negative or pessimistic allusion to the final destiny of humanity.

G.M. Dreves - C. Blume (eds.), *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, Leipzig-Frankfurt a.M. 51 (1908) 110-112; A. Lentini, *Hymni instaurandi Breviarii romani*, Vatican City 1968, 143 (with comm.); P. Tena, *Ritual de dedicación de Iglesias*: Phase 111 (1979) 183-221; H. Rahner, *Mater Ecclesia* (Hymns of praise for the church, taken from the first millennium of Christian literature), Milan 1972; N. Zanini, *Urbs Jerusalem beata* (historical, liturgical and theological study), Rome 2002.

L. Dattrino

URSACIUS of Singidunum (d. after 369). *Arian bishop of Singidunum (Moesia Superior), a disciple of *Arius himself. Regarded by *Hilary as an ignorant and perverse man (*Oratio synodi Sardicensis ad Constantium imperatorem,* I,5: CSEL 65,184), he was for 30 years with *Valens of Mursa one of the most active and unscrupulous opponents of *Athanasius. He sided against Athanasius during the Council of *Tyre (335) and with the calumnies that he had circulated at *Constantinople, he was able to have Athanasius exiled by the emperor *Constantine. Excommunicated and opposed by the Council of *Serdica (343), Ursacius was able to obtain readmission into ecclesiastical communion during the Synod of *Milan (347), after the condemnation of the Arian teaching and the retraction of everything he had said up until that point concerning Athanasius. Nevertheless, he again sided against Athanasius at the synod of *Arles of 353 and at the synod of Milan of 355. Then in 357–358, he was among the redactors of the formulas of faith signed by Hosius of Cordoba and *Basil of Ancyra, and in 359 he participated in the composition of the *homoian formula, which was at the basis of the convocation of the Council of *Rimini (359). Finally, after having worked within the synod of Constantinople (360), because even the emperor Constantius favored the affirmation of the homoian doctrine, in 369 he was definitively excommunicated by Pope *Damasus and died shortly thereafter.

CPG 2123.13-14.24; H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, II,I, Berlin 1935-41, 138 and 152-153; Y.-M. Duval, *La "manoeuvre frauduleuse" de Rimini. À la recherche du "Liber adversus Ursacium et Valentem,"* in *Hilaire et son temps. Actes du Colloque de Poitiers 29 septembre – 3 octobre 1968*, Études Augustiniennes 1969, 51-103.

P. Marone

URSINIUS, Testimony of (apocryphal). Two *Syriac texts, erroneously called *epistula,* found under the name of a philosopher Ursinius (an unknown figure). They speak of the signs that accompanied the death of Christ and the spread of the Christian faith; they were transmitted in Syriac from the late works in the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian and in the *Chronography* of Bar Hebraeus and in Arabic by the *Chronicle* of Agapius; they seem to come from the 5th–7th c.

CANT 309; W. Witakowski, in Starowieyski 1/2, 570-572; N. Zeegers Van der Vorst: OCA 221 (1983) 63-77.

M. Starowieyski

URSINUS, antipope (d. 385). The most ancient source that speaks about the origin of the Ursinian *schism is a document against *Damasus (*Coll. Avel.* 1: CSEL 55, 1-4), which substantially agrees with the information provided by *Ammianus Marcellinus and *Jerome. Immediately after the death of Pope *Liberius (24 September 366), several priests and deacons elected *Damasus in the basilica of S. Lorenzo in Lucina, although others elected the deacon Ursinus in the Basilica Iulii (the modern-day basilica of S. Maria in Trastevere), who was immediately consecrated by Paul bishop of Tivoli. Damasus's supporters at once laid siege to the basilica for three days, and various people were injured. In the meanwhile, Damasus established himself in the Lateran Basilica and was consecrated. Ursinus along with the others was exiled by Viventius, prefect of the city, but his followers occupied the Liberian Basilica (Basilica Sicinini), where they were besieged by Damasus's supporters, and on 16 October 366, a massacre occurred (*Coll. Avel.* 1,7: CSEL 55, 3; Ammianus, *Rerum gest.* XXVII, 3,11ff.). On 15 September 367, Ursinus and his exiled followers were allowed to return to *Rome, and immediately they occupied some churches, for which reason the prefect expelled them again on 16 November of the same year. Because many of his followers had stayed at Rome, fights occurred once again, which prompted the intervention of the prefect and the emperor, who prohibited the supporters of Ursinus from residing in the city or other places

nearby. Nevertheless, the schismatic group continued to harass Damasus by making use of the convert *Isaac the Jew. Ursinus and some of his supporters were sent to *Gaul (*Coll. Avel.* 11 and 12: CSEL 55,52-54); subsequently, Ursinus was at *Milan, where he joined forces with the *Arians (Ambr., *Ep.* 4) and was therefore banished to the city of *Cologne, Germany, before the year 378; upon the death of Pope Damasus (11 December 384), Ursinus's supporters once again plotted to bring about his election, but *Siricius was elected by unanimous vote.

DCB 4, 1068-1070; EC 12, 923-924; Fliche-Martin III, 241-242; M. Green, *The Supporters of the Antipope Ursinus*: JTS 22 (1971) 531-538; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, I, Rome 1976, 408-423, 733-737 (see also the Index: II, 1701); PCBE 2, 2356-2358; EPapi I, 372-374; G. Pilara, *Problemi ancora aperti nel pontificato damasiano. Lo scisma ursiniano e i concili romani nel pontificato di Damaso*: Clio 28/1 (2002) 115-133.

A. Di Berardino

URSINUS of Bourges (3rd c.). The cult of Ursinus dates back to the 6th c., when Bishop Probianus of Bourges, between 558 and 573, recognized his body preserved in a *sarcophagus, which he transferred into the Church of St. Synphorianus, built by him outside the city walls, near *Germanus of Paris. This church would subsequently be called "St. Ursinus." He was the first bishop of Bourges (*Aventicum, Bituriga* etc.) according to the 9th-c. episcopal list (Duchesne II,22). *Gregory of Tours, in the *Historia Francorum* (1,31), attributes the evangelization of the territory to an anonymous disciple of seven evangelizing bishops of the mid-3rd c., while in the *Gloria confessorum* he writes that Ursinus was the first apostle of Bourges, referring to him as *a discipulis apostolorum episcopus ordinatus* (*Gloria Conf.* 80: PL 71,887), without giving a precise date, but adds that his memory was lost until Probianus's miraculous discovery. The *Ecclesia prima* of Bourges is very ancient, inasmuch as, according to Gregory of Tours, it was constructed by the wealthy Leocadius, a descendant of the *martyr of *Lyons of 177, Vettius Epagatus (*Hist. Franc.* 1,31), and should be dated around the mid-3rd c. Ursinus's feast is celebrated on 9 November (likewise according to the *Roman Martyrology*) and 29 December.

BHL 8411-8415; BS 12, 861-863; Cath 15, 560; BBKL 12, 947-951; L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, II, [2]1910, 22-26; 122-124; J.-J. Villepet, *Nos saints berrichons*, Bourges 1931, 192-198; M. de Laugardière, *L'Église de Bourges avant Charlemagne*, Paris 1951, 16-27, 92-97; É. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, I, [2]1964, 109-115; *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule*, VI, *Prov. eccl. de Bourges*, Paris 1989, 20ff.

A. Di Berardino

URSULA and the 11,000 virgin martyrs. The point of departure for the cult is an inscription of the senator Clematius (CIL 13,1313*: *sanctae virgines pro nomine XPi sanguinem suum fuderunt*): whether this is an early Christian inscription (4th–5th c.) or the medieval copy of an ancient one, it attests the cult of the anonymous virgins in a cemeterial church, now St. Ursula, N of the walls of the Roman city of Colonia (Cologne). For the following five centuries, there is no other documentation of a martyrial cult in this place. Nor does the Gallican version of the *Mart. hier.* know the virgins of Cologne. Only from the 9th c. did the legend of 11 virgins, linked with that church (a funerary monument with 11 places), spread, and in a subsequent period there is information about Ursula and the 11,000 virgins. Near the basilica was a convent of nuns, called *monasterium beatarum virginum*, ceded in 922 to the ladies of Gerresheim. In the 10th–11th c. the legend of St. Ursula developed: she was the daughter of a British king who had made a vow of virginity. With 11,000 virgins she passed through Cologne on a pilgrimage to Rome, where she was baptized by Pope Cyriacus (unknown from pontifical records); back in Cologne, all of them were martyred by Attila. The new wall, which in 1106 joined the convent of St. Ursula to the city, was the occasion for seeking out the relics of the 11,000 virgins (now in the "golden room"). Their cult spread from Cologne to all of Europe; their feast is 21 October (*Mart. rom.*).

BHL 8426-8451; BS 9, 1252-1271; LCI 8, 521-527; RAC 10, 583-585; N. Gauthier, *Origine et premiers développements de la légende de Sainte Ursule a Cologne*: Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres des séances de l'année 1973 Janvier-Mars, Paris 1973, 108-121; J. Kremer, *Studien zum frühen Christentum in Niedergermanien*, Diss., Bonn 1993, 165-180; W. Rosen - L. Wirtler (eds.), *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Köln* 1, Cologne 1999, 53-58; G. Wolff, *Das römisch-germanische Köln*, Cologne [5]2000, 253-255; G. Nürnberger, *Die Ausgrabungen in St. Ursula zu Köln*, Diss., Bonn 2002; N. Gauthier, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII[e] siècle*, 12, Paris 2002, 56-60.

S. Heid

USURY. Even though the NT does not explicitly denounce usury (Lk 6:34 cannot be so interpreted), the Fathers, appealing esp. to texts of the OT (Ex 18:7-8; 22:25; Lev 23:35; Dt 15:3; 23:20; Ps 15:5; Ezek 18:4-9), regarded it as incompatible with the Christian life (Clem. of Alex., *Paed.* 1,10; *Strom.* II, 19). In the condemnation of usury, they followed a teaching more broadly present in the Jewish world to the point that *Tertullian treats it as one of the indicative aspects of the harmony between the OT and the NT (*Adv.*

Marc. IV,17; Greg. Nyss., *Epist. can.* 6: PG 45,234). *Cyprian dedicated an entire thesis of his *Testimonia* to demonstrate the illicitness of usury (*Test.* III,48). It is esp. condemned because it is contrary to the love that Christians must show to the poor: in fact, it masks, under the appearance of giving, the true reason that makes it exist, namely to impoverish one's neighbor (Commod., *Instruct.* 65; Lact., *Instit. divin.* 6,18; Hilar., *In ps.* 14,15). For *Basil of Caesarea, usury not only makes the poor even poorer, but also deprives them of freedom (*Hom. II in ps. 14*). In Basil's *Epist.* 188 (PG 32,682) important information is found pertaining to the penitential practices to be applied with respect to usurers. For *Gregory of Nyssa, usury is a sin unknown to nature because it allows one to obtain gain from inanimate things, although in nature it is only from animate things that one can derive some fruits (*Hom. IV in Eccl.;* Greg. Naz., *Or.* 16,18; Ambr., *De off.* 111,3). Likewise for Gregory of Nyssa, usury increases the number of poor people (*Hom. IV in Eccl.*), and the usurer is similar to the thief (*Contra usurarios*). *Ambrose dedicated an entire work to the theme of usury: *De Tobia*. Allowed by the imperial laws (*De Tob.* 42; John Chrysos., *Hom. LVI in Mt.*), Ambrose conceived the practice of usury as possible only in the case in which it was practice toward an enemy of war (*De Tob.* 51; it seems, however, that this concession was owed only to the interpretive difficulties contained in the text of Dt 23:20-21). But in other works, the condemnation of usury by Ambrose is absolute (*De Nabuthe* 4,15; *De bono mortis* 12,56) and is also directed at the hoarding of grain and the speculations made in time of famine on the prices of agricultural products, all of which were considered legitimate maneuvers by usurers (*De off.* III,41). The same condemnation reappears in the writings of *John Chrysostom (*Hom. 41 in Gen.; Hom. XIII in I Cor.; Hom. X in I Thess.*), *Jerome (*Com. in Ez.* 18,6), *Augustine (*Enarr. in ps. 36 serm.* 3,6; *Serm.* 38; 86; *Bapt.* 4,9), *Leo the Great (*Epist.* IV: PL 54,613; *Serm.* 17) and in can. 20 of the Council of *Elvira (Mansi 2, 9) and the first Council of *Arles (Mansi 2, 472).

DTC 15, 2316-2333; R.P. Maloney, *Early Conciliar Legislation on Usury*: RecTh 39 (1972) 145-157; R.P. Maloney, *The Teaching of the Fathers on Usury: An Historical Study on the Development of Christian Thinking*: VChr 27 (1973) 241-263; M. Giacchero, *Aspetti economici fra III e IV secolo: prestito ad interesse e commercio nel pensiero dei Padri*: Augustinianum 17 (1977) 25-37; A. Di Berardino, *La défense du pauvre: saint Augustin et l'usure*, in *Augustinus Afer*, ed. P.-Y. Fux et al., Fribourg 2003, 257-262 (with bibl.).

M.G. Mara

UZALIS. Archaeological research places Uzalis ca. 60 km (37.3 mi) N of *Carthage, 18 km (11.2 mi) NW of Utica and 19 km (11.8 mi) SE of Hippo Diarrythus (modern-day Bizerte) and the modern-day inhabited center of El Alia. *Augustine says that Uzalis was near the colony of Utica, at that time on the sea. During the episcopate of *Evodius, a fellow countryman and friend of Augustine, some of the relics of St. *Stephen the first *martyr arrived at Utica, brought by the presbyter *Orosius, coming from *Palestine, perhaps in 418 (see Aug., *Civ. Dei* 22,8,22). Through Augustine and the anonymous report of the *De *miraculis S. Stephani* from ca. 425, we know that Uzalis had become a center of pilgrimage, not only for the surrounding peoples, but also for people coming from far off (Carthage, *Cappadocia). The local population was very proud of possessing Stephen's remains and of being the center of attention. At Utica there were various Christian buildings: the urban cathedral (where Stephen's *memoria* was found), the martyrial sanctuary in the countryside, a church referred to as "of the promontory," an episcopal monastery and perhaps a convent.

A. Caserta, *Evodio di Tagaste amico e discepolo di S. Agostino*: Asprenas 3 (1956/57) 123-152; C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1981, II, 246; A. Beschaouch, *Sur la fixation à El-Alia, non loin de Utique, de l'emplacement d'Uzalis, cité d'accueil des premies reliques, en Occident, du protomartyr Étienne*: CRAI 2001, 1525-1232; T. Ghalia, *Le site d'Uzalis: recherches récentes en archéologie et en épigraphie*, in J. Meyers (ed.), *Les miracles de saint Étienne. Recherches sur le recueil pseudo-augustinien (BHL 7860-7861), avec édition critique, traduction et commentaire*, Turnhout 2006, 81-87; Y. Duval, *Les monuments du culte d'Étienne à Uzalis*, ibid., 89-100.

A. Di Berardino

V

VAGHARSHAPAT – ETCHMIADZIN. The city is found ca. 20 km (12.4 mi) W of Yerevan and would correspond to the ancient Kainepolis (i.e., new city); it was occupied in AD 163 by the Roman general Statius Priscus. Around the end of the 2nd c. it was reestablished by Vagharsh I, from whom it took its name, becoming the second city of the kingdom, after Artashat, and residence of the Arsacidans. After 301, when Christianity became the religion of the state, the city was the Christian center of *Armenia by choice of *Gregory the Illuminator, who had a vision of Christ, who indicated where and how to build a church. On account of this vision, he changed the city's name to Etchmiadzin (which means "the descent of the Only Begotten") and there ordered the construction of a cathedral in 305. It became the see of the Armenian *catholicos until 439 and then again from 1441 onward. From 1945 the name Etchmiadzin was extended to Vagharshapat. Here we find numerous relics (the lance of Longinus, the hand of Gregory the Illuminator etc.). According to the sources, the most ancient buildings of worship in Armenia were built in the city (along with those of Ashtishat), on the place of the martyrdom of the female saints Gayané (Gaiana) and Hripsimé (Ripsima), by order of the same St. Gregory the Illuminator (d. 325), respectively reconstructed in 630 and 618: these were two quadrangular buildings with a vault, whose entrance is still marked by the use of the trumpet. From the sources, moreover, we know of the existence at Vagharshapat of a fortified bishop's palace. The most significant building in terms of art history is the cathedral, whose present form, the result of numerous reconstructions, dates partly to the 7th c.; the cathedral is an architectural palimpsest, which makes it possible to identify the most ancient phases. The tetraconch form, adopted in the phase attributed to Vahan Mamikonian (end of the 5th c.), was respected in subsequent reconstructions, although it is hardly likely that the original 4th-c. building also presented an analogous layout, as Khatchatrian claims (under the modern-day building an apse belonging to the primitive phase was found). It must have been a building with three aisles divided by pillars, belonging to the type of basilica found at Qassaq. The church of Zvart'noc is a martyrium—theophanic and not a sepulchral—of St. Gregory, which simultaneously functioned as the palace church of the Armenian catholicos Nerses III (541–661); it is a tetraconch with three exedrae opened by columns, with the exception of the E exedra, surrounded by a gallery for walking and with a rectangular room jutting out to the E. The construction arose on the site in which, according to legend, the angels, in Armenian Zvart'noc, the Vigilant Forces, appeared to St. Gregory; it was completed upon the order of the catholicos Nerses III the Builder (641–661), and constitutes at the same time the point of arrival and departure of certain experiments in Armenian construction. At Vagharshapat in 491 a well-known synod was held, which officially marked the church's adherence to *monophysitism (for other buildings, *see* *Armenia).

A. Khatchatrian, RBK s.v. Etchmiadzin (with the preceding bibl.); A. Khatchatrian, *Inscriptions et histoire des églises arméniennes*, Milan 1974, 94; CE 14, 513; EC 5, 181-183; A. Zarian - A. Ter Minassian, *Vałarshapat*, Milan 1998; ODB 3, 2149; J. Ausflag, *Petit Dictionnaire de l'Orient chrétien*, Turnhout 1991, 204-205 and 462; LTK³ 4, 941-942; N. Garsoïan, *Was a Council Held at Vałaršapat in A.D. 491?*: Muséon 117 (2004) 497-506.

M. Falla Castelfranchi

VAISON, Council of. Gathered in this city of *Gaul on 13 November 442, under the honorary presidency of Bishop Auspicius but the effective presidency of *Hilary of Arles, this council completed the disciplinary work of the Council of *Orange (441).

CCL 148, 94-104; Hfl-Lecl II, 454-460; Palazzini 6, 16-17.

Ch. Munier

VALENCE, Council of. An interprovincial gather-

ing of bishops from *Gaul, held on 12 July 374. In their synod, the fathers established four disciplinary canons pertaining to admittance to holy orders, the *penance of *virgines lapsae* and the case of those who had themselves rebaptized by heretics.

CCL 148, 35-45; Hfl-Lecl I,2, 982; Palazzini 6, 18-19.

CH. MUNIER

VALENS, emperor (d. 378). Valens, appointed Augustus by his brother *Valentinian I, was emperor of the East from 364 to 378, when he was conquered and killed on 9 August at Adrianople. A follower of the *Arian creed according to the Formula of *Rimini, he was also its convinced supporter against the *homoiousians and the Nicenes, whom he persecuted (Soz., *HE* 6,7: with respect to the fate of the delegates of the assembly of *Lampsacus). In 365 he issued an edict that sent the bishops who had entered their sees under the reign of the emperor *Julian back into exile (Socr., *HE* 4,2; Soz., *HE* 6,7). In 367, the beginning of the Gothic War, he was baptized by the Arian *Eudoxius of *Constantinople, and two years later, during the occasion of the appointment the Arian *Demophilus as the successor of Eudoxius, he began a new persecution against those who did not adhere to the Arian faith (Soz., *HE* 6,14; Basil, *Ep.* 243; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 20; 25; 43). The changes that marked the religious politics of the 5th c. in the last two years of his life (the revocations of the sentences of exile inflicted on the Nicenes is from 376) had two interpretation: it was seen as a sincere change of mind (Socr., *HE* 4,35) or as a political necessity in the face of the exacerbating military situation (Ruf., *HE* 2,13). Allusions to Valens as the one responsible for the difficult situation in the empire are present in the writings of *Ambrose (*Exp. ev. Lc.* I,32; II,37; see J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise*, 334 n. 51).

L.-S. Le Nain de Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs*, V, Venezia 1732; J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain*, Paris 1933, R. Snee, *Valens' Recall of the Nicene Exiles and Anti-Arian Propaganda*, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 26 (1985) 395-419; N. Lenski, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Berkeley, CA 2002.

M.G. MARA

VALENS of Mursa and URSACIUS of Singidunum (Belgrade) (4th c.). These two important proponents of Illyrican *Arianism appear for the first time, still at a young age, at the Council of *Tyre (335) in the ranks of *Athanasius's opponents. It has been thought that their pro-Arian bent derived from direct contact with *Arius during their exile in Illyricum (326–328). Although Westerners, they were part of the anti-Nicene and anti-Athanasian Easterners at the Council of *Serdica (343), and the Western bishops criticized them for their Arianism; Valens was also charged with having sought, sometime earlier, to have himself irregularly transferred from Mursa to *Aquileia. The position of the two men, who were residing in the part of the empire governed by Constans and which was anti-Arian in belief, was not easy, and in 347, during the occasion of Athanasius's reentry at *Alexandria, they formally reconciled with him. But when Constantius II was left as the sole emperor, the influence of the two—esp. Valens, who had been very close to him during the battle of Mursa against the usurper Magnetius (351)—gradually increased, and they took part firsthand in the action aimed at aligning the Western episcopate along the anti-Athanasian and anti-Nicene line of the East. Working in close contact with *Germinius, bishop of Sirmium from 351 onward, they took part in the Council of *Milan (355), where Valens prevented the approval of the Nicene Creed proposed by his opponents, and they worked on a Second Formula of *Sirmium in 357, the most openly pro-Arian statement among those published during those years.

The success of the *homoiousian response took them by surprise, and they, obedient to Constantius's wishes, signed the anti-Arian decisions of the Council of Sirmium of 358. But at the Council of *Rimini of 359 they headed the pro-Arian minority, which, after much maneuvering and strengthened by the support of the emperor, imposed on the anti-Arian majority the Formula of Rimini. The anti-Arian action that followed the death of Constantius (362) put them in a difficult situation when they attempted to defend their position. Nevertheless, thanks to the politics of nonintervention promoted by *Valentinian I, they were able to preserve their episcopal sees and on the whole safeguard the Arian positions of Illyricum, which were considerable thanks to their own action. Around 365, Valens graciously received *Eunomius, who was passing through while heading for exile; Valens was able to have his sentence of exile revoked by interceding with the emperor of the same name. In 366 they sought to dissuade Germinius from his decision to abandon the Formula of Rimini in favor of a formula more explicitly anti-Arian, and for this reason they convoked a small Arian council at Singidunum (Belgrade), but without success. After this event, we have no information about these men.

CPL 682-684; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris 1967, 71-84; Simonetti 597; Y.-M. Duval, *L'extirpation de l'Arianisme en Italie du Nord et en Occident: Rimini (359-60) et Aquilée (381), Hilaire de Poitiers (m. 367-8) et Ambroise de Milan (m. 397)*, Aldershot 1998, p. 16 of the Index.

M. Simonetti

VALENTINIAN I (d. 375). Emperor of the West from 364 to 375, although professing the Nicene faith, his religious action was inspired by the principle of neutrality (CTh 9,16,9) not only for political reasons but also because it reaffirmed the principle that, as a layperson, it was not permissible for him to render a judgment in questions of faith (Soz., *HE* 6,7). He ratified the election of *Ambrose in 373 and reminded Valentinian II of the respect owed to ecclesiastical autonomy and the approval of his appointment (*Ep.* 21,2-5). Ambrose himself in *Ep.* 17,16 (PL 16,1006) imagined a speech that Valentinian would have given in the event that he had been informed of the presence of the *Altar of Victory in the Senate house, and, upon his death, in the funerary oration, he recalls the faith that he showed under the emperor *Julian (*De obit. Valent.* 55). A proof of the respectful distance that separated Valentinian from Ambrose is found in the silence that Ambrose maintained concerning the emperor's second marriage to *Justina after his divorce from his first wife.

W. Heering, *Kaiser Valentinian I*, Magdeburg 1927; R. Andreotti, *Incoerenza della legislazione dell'imperatore Valentiniano I*: Nuova Rivista Storica 15 (1931) 456-516; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain*, Paris 1958; R. Soraci, *L'imperatore Valentiniano I*, Catania 1971; E. Peretto, *Testo biblico e sua applicazione del De obitu Valentiniani di Ambrogio*: Vichiana: rassegna di studi filologici e storici 18 (1989) 99-170; F. Heim, *Les figures du prince idéal au IVe siècle: du type au modèle*, in *Figures de l'Ancient Testament chez les Pères*, Strasbourg 1989, 277-301; F. Pergami, *La legislazione di Valentiniano e Valente (364-375)*, Milan 1993.

M.G. Mara

VALENTINIAN II (371–392). In 375, upon the death of his father *Valentinian I, while still a young boy, Valentinian was proclaimed Augustus by the troops of Illyricum. He at first governed under the protection of his mother *Justina and, upon her death, under the *pagan Arbogastes, his minister and tutor; nor should one forget the political protection offered to him first by *Gratian, then by *Theodosius. Yet the main influence on Valentinian's religious policies was his relationship with *Ambrose, which at first was difficult because of the influence of the Arianizing Justina and her personal hostility toward the intrusiveness of the bishop (Ambr., *Ep.* 20,27), but which then became marked by filial dependence on Ambrose. When, upon the death of Valentinian's mother, Theodosius imposed upon him the pagan Arbogastes as his minister, the struggle between the young emperor, who by that point had become a fervent Catholic, and his pagan minister was inevitable, and this disagreement cost Valentinian his life. In fact, in 392, he was found dead in his palace of *Vienne (*Gaul), and scholars have yet to determine with certainty whether it was a suicide or murder by Arbogastes. Various works written by Ambrose provide information about the first and second periods of Valentinian's life. In 384 the Senate's second petition concerning the Altar of Victory led Ambrose to send him letters 17 and 18 against *Symmachus's request. Within the context of the anti-Arian controversy, Ambrose reminded Valentinian in letter 21 of the respect his father had for the church's autonomy, and in the *Sermo contra Auxentium* he explained to the faithful gathered in the basilica the real reason for his refusal to hand that autonomy over to the emperor just as he had requested. In 387, however, Valentinian himself turned to Ambrose in order to ask him to go to *Trier before *Maximus to obtain Gratian's body and esp. to dissuade him from his objective of invading *Italy (Ambr., *Ep.* 24). After the death of Justina, in 388, Ambrose lauded the return of Valentinian "to the door of faith" (*Exp. Luc.* IX,32) and exonerated him from the responsibilities of his preceding political actions (*De Joseph* 36). The decree of 391 that outlawed the pagan cult and rejected the restoration of the Altar of Victory can be credited to Valentinian's friendship with Ambrose. In 392, once the remains of the young Valentinian were covered at *Milan, Ambrose mourned his death in a letter to the emperor Theodosius (*Ep.* 53) and in a funerary oration (*De obit. Valent.*).

A. Morpurgo, *Arbogaste e l'Impero romano dal 379 al 394*, Trieste 1883; A. Solari, *La crisi dell'impero romano. II. Gli ultimi Valentiniani*, Rome 1933; J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain*, Paris 1933; R. Paribeni, *Da Diocleziano alla caduta dell'impero d'occidente*, Bologna 1941; F. Lipani, *La controversia sull' "Ara Victoriae"*: Atene e Roma 41/2-3 (1996) 75-79; F. Moroni, *Il conflitto per l'altare della Vittoria*, Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere. Scienze morali e storiche, 1996; M. Sordi, *I rapporti di Ambrogio con gli imperatori del suo tempo*, in *"Nec timeo mori."* Atti del Congr. Int. di Studi ambrosiani, Milan 1998, 107-118.

M.G. Mara

VALENTINIAN III (419-455). Son of *Constantius III and *Galla Placidia (sister of Honorius). Valen-

tinian was Roman emperor of the West 424–455. After the coronation, which occurred at *Rome in 425 when he was only six years of age, he moved to *Ravenna, where, at court, the poet *Merobaudes drew a picture of Valentinian and his family in a short poem, 23 verses of which have survived (MGH, *Auct. ant.* 14, 3). His reign, under the guidance of his mother, was marked by the last great crisis of the Western empire, namely the invasion of the *Huns. The Western empire at this time was also threatened by the *Vandals, who had appeared in North *Africa, which had been torn apart by the revolt of the two generals *Aetius and *Bonifacius. Rome owed its survival to the military valor of Aetius and the appeal of Pope *Leo the Great to *Attila the Hun. Valentinian's unwise politics, which went so far as murdering Aetius (21 September 454), and his lack of moral compass were cause for his assassination. His religious politics, which were marked by the influence of Leo the Great, resulted in a subsequent repression of paganism, prohibiting, under the death penalty, the reopening of the temples and the offering of sacrifices (CJ I, 11,7); he issued prohibitions against heretics and *Nestorians (CJ I,1,3; 5,6), *Manicheans (PL 54,622-624) and the *Pelagians of southern *Gaul (PL 48,409), thereby confirming all the privileges of the Catholic Church (CJ I, 2,12). Petitioned by Leo the Great, Valentinian repeatedly decreed in favor of the primacy of the bishop of Rome (see Leo the Great, *Epp.* 10 and 11 in the controversy with *Hilary of Arles). In *Hydatius's *Chronicle* (SC 218,162), there are frequent references to Valentinian.

G.A. Balducci, *La politica di Valentiniano III*, Bologna 1934; A. Solari, *La crisi dell'impero romano*, IV, Rome 1936; P. Stockmeier, *Leo I. des Grossen Beurteilung der kaiserlichen Religionspolitik*, Munich 1959; F. de Marini Avonzo, *La politica legislativa di Valentiniano III e Teodosio II*, Turin 1975; A.M. Musumeci, *La politica ecclesiastica di Valentiniano III*: Siculorum gymnasium 30 (1977) 431-481; M. Bianchi Fossati Vanzetti, *Le Novelle di Valentiniano III*, I, *Fonti*, Padova 1988.

M.G. Mara

VALENTINUS (d. after 416). Catholic bishop (4th–5th c.) of Baiana in *Numidia. He took part in an embassy to the imperial court (Aug., *Ep.* 88,10). He participated at the Council of *Cirta against the *Donatists (*Ep.* 141,1) and at that of Milevis (416) against the *Pelagians (*Ep.* 176). Valentinus was present at the conference of *Carthage (411) (*Coll. Carth.* I,57,99).

PCBE 1, 1130-1132.

E. Romero Pose

VALENTINUS, martyr. In the *Mart. hier.* (14 February), a martyr at Terni is mentioned whose basilica is attested to in the 8th and the 9th c. (Duchesne, *LP* 1,427; 2,154). On the same road, that is, the Via Flaminia, but at leaving *Rome, stands another basilica of Valentinus, whose construction is attributed to Pope *Julius I (337–352), but his titular church was not described as being dedicated to a particular saint (Duchesne, *LP* 2, 9). Pope *Theodore (642–649) restored it (Duchesne, *LP* 1, 333); he actually completed the work begun by Pope *Honorius (Duchesne, *LP* 1, 334, n. 10). All the itineraries mention the basilica (De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea cristiana*, I, Rome 1864, 176-177). These reliable details leave open three possibilities: (1) two distinct saints, one at Terni, the other at Rome; (2) one sole Valentinus, of Terni, buried there, whose *brandea* were taken to Rome; (3) one sole Valentinus, of Rome, whose cult spread along the Via Flaminia arriving to Terni. In favor of third hypothesis is the epigraph of the Roman basilica: an inscription dated to 318 bears witness that the cemetery was used very early, and some inscriptions from a later age use the name of St. Valentinus. There is, however, the fact that of the most ancient documents, that is, the *Mart. hier.* and the *Liberian Catal.,* the first places the martyr at Terni, although the second does not present Valentinus as a saint. For this reason, scholars propose that one can perceive in the Roman personage the one who supplied Pope Julius the funds for the construction of the suburban basilica; the Passion BHL 8450-8461 would have contributed to confusing him with the person of the same name from Terni.

Vies des SS. 2, 322-323; LTK³ 10, 998-999; BS 12, 896-899; A. Amore, *I martiri di Roma*, Rome 1975, 13-16; J.C. Poulin, *Valentin de Terni*: AB 119 (2001) 309-310.

V. Saxer

VALENTINUS the Apollinarist. *Leontius of Byzantium (*Fraud.* 104ff.) preserves several chapters of an *Apologia* which the *Apollinarist Valentinus wrote "against those who say that we maintain that the body [of Christ] is consubstantial with God." The chapters cited distance themselves from the other Apollinarists; in particular they are directed—according to the title that Leo reports—"against the doctrine of Timothy and his followers, and their teacher Polemon." *Polemon and *Timothy, in fact, took positions opposed in practice and differentiated in doctrine; however, with Valentinus we find ourselves before an explicit affirmation that Christ is the "true Son of God *sarkophoros*" (Lietzmann, p.

288, 1. 20), and that this flesh is the "clothing of the hidden mystery" (Lietzmann, p. 289, 1.13). The salvific capacity is given from the union of the Spirit (Lietzmann, p. 290, ll. 10-12). Voisin spoke of the "moderate Apollinarists" (pp. 124ff.); but one should rather say that these are elements of Antiochene Apollinarism (see Lietzmann, pp. 9, 15-16).

CPG II, 3732; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, TU 1, Tübingen 1904, 157, frag. 287-291; G. Voisin, *L'apollinarisme. Étude historique littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IV^e siècle*, Louvain 1901, 112-113; DTC 15, 2519-2520.

E. Cavalcanti

VALENTINUS the Gnostic (2nd c.). In his refutation of *gnosticism falsely so called, *Irenaeus of Lyons drew connections between the different heretical teachings that he presents by using the schema of *diadochē*, namely the succession of teachers that was typical of the philosophical schools of his time; he therefore speaks of a "Valentinian school" that dates back to a 2nd-c. teacher by the name of Valentinus. Recent studies, however, have brought to light how, in this case, it is difficult to speak of a true and proper development, by disciples, of an organic doctrinal system starting from an original nucleus that would be found already in the teaching of Valentinus, as we understand it through the testimonies that have come down to us. This phenomenon is also verified in the ancient philosophical schools, where personal succession did not always necessarily imply a continuity and development in the doctrinal elements of the instruction of a founding teacher.

According to the information provided by the heresiologists, Valentinus, perhaps of Egyptian origin (see Epiph., *Pan.* XXXI,2,3), came to the city of *Rome around 140 (see Iren., *Adv. haer.* III,4,3; Eus., *HE* 4,11,1). At a certain point he left the great church and established his own school, where he spread his teachings. From his works we possess only a few fragments preserved in the writings of the Fathers (see Clem. of Alex., *Strom.* II,36,2-4; II,114,3-6; III,59,3; IV,89,1-3; IV,89,6-90,1; VI,52,3-53,1; Ps.-Hippol., *Ref.* VI,42,2; VI,37,7; X,13,4), which are insufficient for reconstructing his thought with precision. On the basis of what has survived, an image of Valentinus emerges, a biblical theologian who has traces of Platonic influence but who is not very far from the very well-defined borders of Christian orthodoxy.

The information, however, that we possess on complex theological systems elaborated by the students of Valentinus is much more detailed; heresiologists have transmitted to us a good six distinct presentations (Iren., *Adv. haer.* I,1-8, 11-12, 13-21; Ps.-Hippol., *Ref.* VI,29-36; Tertull., *Adv. Valent.;* Clem. of Alex., *Exc. ex Theodoto;* Orig., *In Iohannem,* esp. book XIII; Epiph., *Pan.* XXXI,58; XXXV,4). These are the chief characteristics of the doctrinal Valentinian system: the divine *Pleroma is composed of 30 Aeons, joined in coupled syzygies; the first four couples are the most important and form the primordial *Ogdoad, from which originate all the other Aeons. The unity of the two elements of pairs (*syzygiae*) is presented as the model of unity which was broken by sin, symbolized by the sexual separation of *Adam from Eve, and that the spiritual human being must be reestablished by reuniting itself with his celestial partner. The first origin of sin is indicated in the vicissitudes of the last Aeon, namely Sophia, who, through her immoderate desire to know the unknowable Father, brings about the degradation of the divine element in the world, which originates precisely from the materialization of the ignorance or error of Sophia. At the same time, the process of the recovery of the fallen divine element by the heavenly Savior began. This process—which leads to various moments, an intervention of various divine beings, the activity of the Demiurge, the distinction of human beings into three types (spiritual or pneumatic, animal or psychic, and material or hylic)—would lead at last to the reintegration in the Pleroma of the divine element, stripped from the contamination with matter, and the organization of the other beings according to their nature (complete salvation and full reintegration for the pneumatics; partial, inferior salvation for the psychics; dissolution for the hylics).

The Valentinian school was divided into two branches: one Italic and the other Eastern (see Ps.-Hippol., *Ref.* VI,35). *Heracleon, *Ptolemy and *Florinus belonged to the Italic branch; *Theodotus and *Mark, to the Eastern branch.

Sources: Fragments from the writings of Valentinus have been provided in the original Greek, translated into German and analytically commented in: Ch. Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus? Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins*, Tübingen 1992 (WUNT 65); the heresiological texts pertaining to the Valentinian school, in the original and in It. trans., are found in M. Simonetti (ed.), *Testi gnostici in lingua greca e latina*, Milan 1993.

Studies: F.M. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris 1947; A. Orbe, *Estudios valentinianos*, 5 vols., Rome 1955-66; B. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I: *The School of Valentinus*, Leiden 1980; Ch. Markschies, *Alte und neue Texte und Forschungen zu Valentin und den Anfängen der "valentinianischen" Gnosis*, in A. Böhlig - Ch. Markschies, *Gnosis und Manichäismus. Forschungen und Studien zu*

Texten von Valentin und Mani sowie zu den Bibliotheken von Nag Hammadi und Medinet Madi*, Berlin 1994, 39-111; J.-D. Dubois, *Valentin, école valentinienne*: DSp 16 (1997) 146-156; Ch. Markschies, *Valentinian Gnosticism: Toward the Anatomy of a School*, in J. Turner et al. (eds.), *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years*, Leiden 1997, 401-438; N. Förster, *Marcus Magus. Kult, Lehre und Gemeindeleben einer valentinianischen Gnostikergruppe. Sammlung der Quellen und Kommentar* (WUNT 114), Tübingen 1999; F. Bermejo Rubio, *La escisión imposible. Lectura del gnosticismo valentiniano*, Salamanca 1998; A. Wucherpfennig, *Heracleon Philologus* (WUNT 142), Tübingen 2002. Bibliographic list: D.M. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948–1969*, Leiden 1971 and *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1970–1994*, Leiden 1997, and subsequent Supplementa published annually, edited by Scholer as well in the journal "Novum Testamentum"; E. Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the "Valentinians,"* Leiden 2006.

C. Gianotto

VALERIA. Province of former Pannonia Inferior, Valeria was reorganized in 293; it bordered the Danube River to the N and E, reaching to the S slightly N of the Drava River; and to the W, with Pannonia Prima, according to a N-S line that crossed the plain of *Pannonia. Toward the end of the 3rd to the beginning of the 4th c., immigrants from the E who introduced Christianity established themselves in Pannonia. The period of transition from paganism to Christianity is well documented from the tombs, primarily the *sarcophagi found at Brigetium. In one of these tombs, situated in the central position with respect to the others, archaeologists found a silver staff decorated in niello technique, which can be dated to the end of the 3rd c. The staff (*lituus*) probably belongs to an augur as a symbol of his dignity and was perhaps destined to be passed on after his death to the new priest. The fact that this object was found within his tomb perhaps indicates that he was the last city augur before the advent of Christianity.

In the formation of the religious life of Valeria, even *Judaism, in the period of transition, had an important role. At Intercisa (today near Donaújváros, in Hungary) in the 3rd c. there was a Jewish community that possessed a synagogue. The persecutions of the Christians, which are more or less documented in other provinces, have not yet been attested in Pannonia.

The administrative center and the most important diocese of the region was Sopianae (Pécs), but scholars do not know anything about other diocesan sees. The bitter confrontations between *Catholics and *Arians, which were attested in Pannonia Prima, certainly had repercussions even in the 5th c.

The most important Christian monuments came to light at Sopianae. Six funerary cells were discovered around the modern-day cathedral: no. 1 composed of a crypt, with external pilaster strips; no. 2 similar to no. 1; two others (nos. 5 and 6), of the same type, but more modest; nos. 3 and 4 in a polylobate layout, respectively trichoral (no. 3) and septichoral (no. 4). Chronologically the first, similar to that of Aquincum (Obud), is datable to the 5th c. Some of these memoriae have been painted. The most valuable have been preserved in no. 1, and although they have generic affinities with the paintings from the Roman catacombs, they reveal local characteristics. There are scenes from the OT and the NT (the adoration of the *magi, *Adam and Eve, *Jonah and the Good *Shepherd). On one wall the figures of the apostles *Peter and *Paul acclaim a *monogram of Christ among the stars; on another wall is painted a garden of *paradise. At the center of the vault a Christogram is prominent, on the sides of which are found shields with two busts of male figures with beards, and in the spaces between the shields, fountains with *peacocks or small birds. Cell 2 is also decorated with frescoes, although of a lower quality and not well preserved: in a niche a vase with grapes is painted; on the entry wall a garden of paradise. Both *memoriae* belong to the 4th c. With respect to the basilicas, at Aquincum is a twin basilica without an apse, but with a bench for the clergy of the common type in the Upper Adriatic in the 5th c. At Intercisa a three-aisled basilica with a rectilinear apse was found; at Gorsium (today the village of Tác, in Hungary), which in the 4th c. was reconstructed with the name of Herculia, two churches were discovered, both with an apse and the larger with a baptistery. Rich archaeological material was discovered in the 5th c.: vases of ceramic and glass, bronze panels with Christian scenes, fragments of architectural sculpture and many sarcophagi.

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918; T. Nagy, *A Pannoniai kereszténység története a római védörendszer összeomlásáig. Die Geschichte des Christentums in Pannonien bis zu dem Zusammenbruch des römischen Grenzschutzes*, Budapest 1939 (in Hungarian with a summary in German); F. Gerke, *Die Wandmalereien der neu gefundene Grabkammer in Pécs (Fünfkirchen). Ihre Stellung in der spätrömischen Kunstgeschichte des I. Jahrhunderts*, II. Halbband, Baden-Baden 1954, 147ff.; F. Fülep, *Early Christian Gold Glasses in the Hungarian National Museum*: Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 16 (1968) 401ff.; F. Fülep, *Scavi archeologici a Sopianae*: CCAB 16 (1969) 151ff.; Z. Kádár, *Lineamenti dell'arte della Pannonia nell'epoca dell'antichità tarda paleocristiana*: CCAB 16 (1969) 179ff.; A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London 1974; J. Fitz, *Gorsium*, Székésfehérvar 1976; *The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia*, ed. G. Radan, Budapest-Lexington 1980; F. Fülep, *Sopianae*, Budapest 1984; *Römisch-frühchristliche Denkmäler in Pécs (Ungarn)*, Würzburg 1986; D. Gáspár, *Römische Kästchen aus Pannonien*, Budapest 1986; L. Barkóczi, *Pannonische Glasfunde in Ungarn*, Budapest 1988; D. Gáspár, *Christianity in*

Roman Pannonia: An Evaluation of Early Christian Finds and Sites from Hungary, Oxford 2002.

N. Cambi

VALERIAN, emperor (ca. 193–260). Publius Licinius Valerian, Roman emperor (253–260), appointed by the legions upon the death of Trebonianus Gallus, he settled his son Gallienus on the throne, entrusting to him the defense of the W borders. Valerian was taken prisoner by the Persian *Shapur I, during a military campaign in the East, and he died shortly thereafter. At first he was favorable toward Christians, whom he received even in his own home, as attested by *Dionysius of Alexandria in the letter to Hermammon (Eus., *HE* 7,10,3); he then became hostile toward them for political reasons (under Valerian the state officially became aware of the church's existence and for the first time unleashed a general persecution). In 257 and 258 he issued two edicts against the Christians, striking them with an iron fist: among the victims of the persecution were Popes *Stephen I and *Sixtus II, *Lawrence, *Dionysius of Alexandria, *Cyprian and *Fructuosus. *Commodian likened (*Carmen apol.*, passim) the seven years of Valerian's reign to the seven years of the *Apocalypse.

J. Hearly, *The Valerian Persecution: A Study of the Relations Between Church and State in the Third Century*, London 1905; R. Rémondon, *La crisi dell'impero romano da Marco Aurelio ad Anastasio*, Milan 1975; R. McMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100-400*, New Haven CT, 1986; M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; M. Christol, *L'empire romain du III[e] siècle. Histoire politique (192-325 après J.-C.)*, Paris 1997; S. Roda, *Profilo di storia romana. Dalle origini alla caduta dell'Impero d'Occidente*, Rome 2001; R. Selinger, *The Mid-Third Century Persecution of Decius and Valerian*, Frankfurt 2002.

L. Navarra

VALERIAN of Aquileia (d. 388). After *Fortunatian had been compromised by *Arianism, St. Valerian (368?–388) succeeded on the episcopal cathedra of *Aquileia. He immediately inaugurated a more clear-cut theological and pastoral course of action in favor of the Council of *Nicaea. Under his episcopal governance, Aquileia acquired a preeminent role among the churches of N *Italy, including *Milan, where the semi-Arian *Auxentius ruled, and also among those situated between the Adriatic Sea and the Danube River. Perhaps it was also this vigorous action for orthodoxy, in addition to its geographical placement, that made Aquileia the see of a Western council in September 381. Valerian knew how to enlist a well-prepared and hard-working presbytery, which was described even by St. *Jerome as practically a *chorus beatorum*.

PCBE 2, 2237-2239; A. Scholz, *Il "Seminarium Aquileiense"*: Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi 50 (1970) 5-106; G. Cuscito, *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia e in Istria*, Trieste 1977, 177-179 (with bibl.); A. Scholz, *Fede e politica ad Aquileia. Dibattito teologico e centri di potere (secoli IV-VI)*, Udine 1987, 45-77.

G. Cuscito

VALERIAN of Calahorra (Calagurris). Bishop at the beginning of the 5th c. He is mentioned by *Prudentius (*Perist.* 11,2) and *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 111). He wrote a profession of faith that has been preserved. He probably belonged to a wealthy family from the region of *Saragossa.

CPL 558a; PLS 1, 1045; J. Madoz, *Valeriano obispo calagurritano, escritor del siglo V*: Hispania Sacra 3 (1950) 131-137; DHEE 4, 2705; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, II, Madrid 1998, 264-265.

M. Díaz y Díaz - P. Marone

VALERIAN of Cimiez (d. ca. 460). Valerian perhaps belonged to the noble family of the Valeriani; he married, then became a monk, first on the Continent, then on the isle of *Lérins. Around 439, he was elected bishop of Cimiez (Cemenelum), a suburb of Nice, and as such he participated at the Councils of *Riez in 439 and *Vaison in 442, which had been summoned to strengthen ecclesiastical discipline. He supported Archbishop *Hilary of Arles in the fight against *Leo I. In 449 he approved of the election of Ravennius, the abbot of Lérins. He signed the **Tomus ad Flavianum* (Leo the Great, *Ep.* 102) and intervened again in the Council of *Arles of 455, which settled the dispute between the bishop of Fréjus and Lérins. He died shortly after around 460. His feast day is celebrated on 23 July.

He wrote about 20 homilies, which esp. treat moral questions and the necessity of consistency in the Christian life (and he recalls theories deriving from Stoic philosophy). His doctrine of grace seems to be close to that of the teachers of Provence (*semi-Pelagians). He also wrote a *Letter to the Monks on Virtue and the Order of the Apostolic Teaching*. Riberi attributes the homily *De dedicatione ecclesiae* to him, but other scholars doubt this attribution.

Editions: see CPL 1002-1004; *Homiliae XX*, *Ep. ad monachos*: PL 52, 691-758; *Hom. de dedicatione*: PLS III, 184-188; [ed. in prep. for CCL and SC by J.-P. Weiss]; It. trans.of the 20 *Homilies* and the *Ep. ad monachos*, ed. by L. Fatica, Rome 1995, [2]2001.

Studies: DTC 14, 2520-2522; BS 12 (1970) 912-914 (bibl.); J.-P.

Weiss, *La personnalité de Valérien de Cimiez*: Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de Nice 26 (1970) 141-162; P.M. Duval, *La Gaule chrétienne jusqu'au Ve siècle*, Paris 1971, 761-762; J.-P. Weiss, *Valérien de Cimiez et Valère de Nice*: SE 21 (1972/73) 109-146; Patrologia III, 514-515; C. Tibiletti, *Valeriano di Cimiez e la teologia dei Maestri Provenzali*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 513-532; J.-P. Weiss, *La prédication paschale de Valérien de Cimiez*: Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de Nice 50 (1985) 415-422.

M. MARITANO

VALERIUS of Bierzo (d. after 691). Spanish ascetic and author of the 2nd half of the 7th c. A native of the region of Asturica (province of Léon), probably of Bierzo (the area bordering *Gallaecia). After having received the scholastic formation of his time, he entered the monastery of Complutum, which had been established by *Fructuosus of Braga, whose ascetic footsteps he followed. Obsessed by the idea of the devil and the dangers of life in the world, he always lived in solitude. He spent his life in continual penance and led some disciples and monks, who were quite numerous in Bierzo. His friend, and perhaps his disciple, was the abbot Donadeus, to whom he dedicated his writings. His intransigent asceticism detected diabolical tricks everywhere. He died after 691. His memory in that place lasted at least until the 10th c., when Bishop Gennadius of Astorga began to commemorate him along with Fructuosus of Braga as a prototype of the ascetic life in Bierzo.

Scholars know of his personality from his writings, almost all of which were written between 675 and 690. For the formation of the monks whom he led, he redacted a hagiographical compilation of approximately 50 texts, which has been preserved more or less complete in various manuscripts from the 10th to the 12th c. Among them we find *Jerome's life of *Paul, *Hilarion and Malchus; *Possidius's *Indiculus,* the lives of St. *Germanus, brief, edifying narrations chosen from the **Vitae Patrum* and the *Vita Fructuosi,* some narrations written by himself, and others of less interest. The compilation should be read with two poems (the *Epitameron*), which illustrate its objectives, describing it as a means of spiritual edification, providing an axis of orientation for monastic conversion. The short texts included in it narrate the visions of paradise that monks or *conversi* had seen; a curious passage comes under the form of a letter that summarizes for the monks of Bierzo how much Valerius had come to know of *Egeria's *Itinerarium.* He presents Egeria as a courageous heroine of faith, a woman extremely devoted to *Scripture. He also composed a treatise on the monastic life (*De genere monachorum*), only fragments of which have been preserved.

One of his books on instruction has a broader character (*Epitameron de quibusdam admonitionibus vel rogationibus*), which for the purpose of moral and spiritual edification—in part echoing *Isidore's *Sentences*—unites some sophisticated literary techniques: they are poetic compositions in places where the initial words of each verse or the entire poem begin with the same letter. It seems that Valerius was also interested in a particular genre of texts such as those of the centos of the Psalter. An extensive portion of the *De quinquageno numero psalmorum,* which is a small treatise on the *Psalms, has survived.

A lot of personal information concerning Valerius is supplied in his autobiography (*Ordo querimoniae prefati discriminis*) and in the two works that summarize it (*Replicatio sermonum a prima conversione* and *Quod de superioribus querimoniis residuum sequitur*), which were written approximately 20 years after, portraying in different perspectives themes that were already present in it. At the center of his life are spiritual battles and his resistance to temptation, which at times took on a concrete and violent form.

Moreover, some scholars have recently attributed to Valerius *De vana saeculi sapientia,* a booklet that has come down to us anonymously, which praises the Christian life, a life which is explained in the monastic context.

CPL 1276-1293; Díaz 285-303; PL 87, 421-455; R. Fernández Pousa, *San Valerio. Obras*, Madrid 1942; C.M. Aherne, *Valerio of Bierzo*, Washington, DC 1949; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *La compilación hagiográfica de Valerio del Bierzo*: Hispania Sacra 4 (1951) 3-25; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Anecdota wisigothica*. I, Salamanca 1958, 49-61, 89-116 (PLS 4, 2019-2029); M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Códices visigóticos en la monarquía leonesa*, León 1983, 117-148; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Visiones del Más Allá en Galicia durante la Alta Edad Media*, Santiago 1985, 31-61; J. Gil - B. Löfstedt, *Sprachliches zu Valerio von Bierzo*: Cuadernos de Filología Clásica 10 (1976) 271-304; U. Domínguez del Val, *Historia de la antigua literatura latina hispano-lusitana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 345-387.

M. DÍAZ Y DÍAZ - P. MARONE

VANDALS. A population of Germanic stock (although originally from Scandinavia), which in the 1st c. AD was located in the Baltic region between the Elbe and the Vistula. Pliny (*Nat. hist.* 4,99) assigns the name *Vandili* to a vast group of E Germanic tribes (*Burgodiones*, *Varinnae, Charini* and *Gutones*); also in the writings of *Tacitus (*Germ.* 2,2) one finds the form *Vandilii,* which is to be connected with the name of *Lugii* (*Germ.* 43,2), mentioned by Strabo (*Geogr.* 7,1,3) as allies of Maroboduus, and by Tacitus (*Ann.* 12,29-30) as allies of Hermunduri

against Vannius (AD 50). Having descended S to the Danubian *limes,* the Vandals were explicitly mentioned for the first time during the war led by *Marcus Aurelius against the Marcomanni and Quadi (171–173). They were divided into two groups, the Silings (Ptolemy, *Geogr.* 2,11,10)—hence the name Silesia—and the Asdings (Dio Cassius, *Hist.* 71,12). In 214, under *Caracalla, we find them in disagreement with the Marcomanni; in 270, the Vandal Asdings, having crossed into *Pannonia, were defeated by *Aurelian and pushed back beyond the Danube River; having risen again over the Danube toward the W and having forged toward the Rhine border, in 279 the Vandal Silings were defeated along with the *Burgundians in *Rhaetia by Probus. Around 335, the Vandal Asdings, when beaten by the Goths on the Danube River, obtained permission from *Constantine to reside in Pannonia, as subjected to the Romans and with the obligation of supplying military contingents. They remained here for nearly 60 years, and at the end they were forced by the pressure of the *Huns to go back to the Rhine border, where, along with the Suevi, Alani and Siling Vandals, who had already been forced W in the 3rd c., formed a large barbarian column, which, after having overcome the resistance of the *Franks (in a battle with them the Vandals lost their king Godigiselus), crossed the Rhine on 31 December 406 (with the complicity of the Vandal *Stilicho—according to the accusation reported by *Orosius, *Hist.* 7,38,3-4), invaded *Gaul and inflicted severe devastation. In the autumn of 409, the Vandals, Suevi and the Alani, supported by Gerontius (supporter in *Spain of the usurper Maximus), crossed into Spain, subjecting it to the most disastrous raids, to the point that in 411 they made a peace treaty with the emperor *Honorius, who recognized the settlement of the barbarians as *foederati:* the Asdings and the Suevi took *Gallaecia; the Silings, *Betica; the Alani, *Lusitania and *Carthaginensis. In 416, the *Visigothic king Wallia gathered under himself the entire population of the Vandals and the remnants of the Alani, with the title of "King of the Vandals and the Alani." Subsequently the Vandals descended into S Spain (from which people derive the name of Andalucia) and were able to conquer Cartegena and *Seville (425) and therefore came to the point of guaranteeing their control over all Spain. At that time the *Arian Vandals' intolerance toward the Catholics already manifested itself; their intolerance would then explode into particularly violent forms in *Africa.

In 428, Gunderic was succeeded by his brother *Genseric (428–477), who, the following year, led his people (a combination of approximately 80,000 disbanded Vandals, Alani and Visigoths who had remained in Spain) to *Africa, drawn by the richness and fertility of the region (*Italy's supply of grain depended on Africa), and favored by the disagreement between Boniface, governor of the province, and the imperial governor (but the idea that Boniface himself called the Vandals to Africa seems spurious). The Romans were soon routed and were only able to keep possession of major centers such as *Carthage and *Hippo (it was precisely during the Vandal siege that St. *Augustine died here on 28 August 430); subsequently a peace agreement was concluded on the basis of which the Romans granted the Vandals the status of *foederati* established in the consulate of *Numidia with Hippo as the capital. Thus began the African kingdom of the Vandals, which reached the apex of its power under Genseric. The Vandal reign extended progressively: on 19 October 439 (which became the first year of a new Vandal system of dating) Carthage was conquered, and in 442 a peace agreement with the Western emperor recognized the independence of the Vandal kingdom and its extension to other African regions; at the same time a very skilled Vandal fleet repeatedly struck the coasts of Sicily and Sardinia with pirate invasions. The death of the emperor *Valentinian III offered Genseric the occasion to pounce on Rome and subject it to a new sack, after the Visigothic one of 410, in June 455. (A certain moderation was observed toward the Christian churches likewise through the intervention of Pope *Leo I.) After two weeks Genseric left Rome and took back to Africa a large amount of plunder, as well as important hostages, including Valentinian's widow Eudoxia and her daughters Eudocia (who was given in marriage to *Huneric, Genseric's son) and Placidia (later released with her mother). Repeated military and diplomatic attempts to weaken and ruin Vandal power did not succeed, and in 476 the emperor of Byzantium had to officially recognize the Vandal kingdom over a vast territory: the entire province of Africa, the *Baleari, Ischia, *Corsica, *Sardinia and Sicily (which afterward, except for the city of Lilybaeum, was ceded to *Odoacer in exchange for an annual tribute).

The Vandal settlement in Africa led to serious social and religious upheavals. Particularly in the province of Proconsularis (or Zeugitana) around Carthage landholders were dispossessed and exiled or forced to remain on their former landholdings as slaves or colonists; but also in the other regions there were state confiscations and impositions of heavy taxes. Likewise, the Vandal Arians subjected

the Catholics to the harshest persecutions: countless acts of physical violence were perpetrated, orthodox worship cult was prohibited, the Catholic clergy were exiled, and the churches and the ecclesiastical properties were either torn apart or confiscated and handed over to the Arian clergy (on the shock of the first strike, see Aug., *Epist.* 228; on the situation until the end of the conquest of Carthage of 439, see a group of 12 **Sermones* attributed to the bishop *Quodvultdeus; more generally on the drama of the Catholics under the Vandal domination, see the *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* by *Victor of Vita, published ca. 488). Toward the end of the reign of Genseric, the persecution lightened, and the exiled clergy were allowed to return.

Genseric was succeeded by his son *Huneric (477–484), who, after an initial period of relative tolerance toward Catholics (in 481 a bishop of Carthage, Eugenius was reinstalled), once again undertook a fierce repression: of particular gravity was the decree on 24 January 484 that determined that all the edicts previously promulgated by the Roman emperors against the heretics should now be applied to the Catholics, with all the consequences that this entailed; among other things, all those who had worked in the army or in the public administration were forced to choose between a conversion to *Arianism or dismissal, accompanied by exile and confiscation of goods; the conference of African bishops that had opened at Carthage on the subsequent 1 February was concluded in a bloody way for the Catholic side. Under Huneric, the Mauri (Berbers) were able to withdraw from Vandal rule.

His successor Gunthamund (484–496) took a milder approach in religious affairs: the Catholic churches were reopened, and those exiled were able to return. He, moreover, repressed a revolt of the Mauri and made a futile attempt to recover possession of Sicily. He imprisoned the poet Dracontius (the chief proponent of the cultural rebirth that characterized Vandal Africa) for a poem that may have been dedicated to the emperor *Zeno. Gunthamund was succeeded by his brother Thrasamund (496–523), who established a policy of close collaboration with Theodoric, whose sister Amalafrida he married in 500, as part of a project to establish a grand alliance among Arian Germans, of whom the Ostrogothic king had to be the leader. Under Thrasamund the exile sentences against the Catholic clergy were resumed (without, however, the violence of earlier times); among the exiles was also the bishop of Ruspe, *Fulgentius, who was destined to become a figure of great prestige among the African episcopate of this time: precisely for this reason in 515 Thrasamund had him recalled to Carthage for a debate on trinitarian questions; but the attempt was brought to nothing by Fulgentius's intransigent orthodoxy, who was forced to return to exile in Cagliari.

Hilderic (523–530), the son of Huneric and Eudocia, brought about a political turning point: the Vandal king broke the preceding agreement with the Ostrogoths (he had Amalafrida arrested and slew the Goths in her entourage) and established ties with the emperor of Byzantium and the Romans and fully restored freedom of worship to the Catholics. (In 525 a council of Catholic bishops was held at Carthage.) But the pro-Roman and pro-Catholic politics of Hilderic aroused deep discontent among the Vandals, which exploded during the grave defeats he underwent at the hands of the Mauri: the king was deposed, imprisoned and replaced by Gelimer (530), Genseric's great-grandson. The emperor *Justinian then took the opportunity to send to Africa an expeditionary force (in which the historian *Procopius of Caesarea served, who provided a summary of that campaign) led by *Belisarius, who, aided by the forces of Ostrogothic support in Sicily, the rebellion of Sardinia and the favor of the African population itself, in a brief time (June 533-March 534) overthrew the kingdom of the Vandals, who thus definitively exited human history.

L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Wandalen*, Munich 1942; H. Helbling, *Goten und Wandalen. Wandlung der historischen Realität*, Zürich 1954; Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, Paris 1955; F. Giunta, *Genserico e la Sicilia*, Palermo 1958; H.J. Diesner, *Das Vandalenreich. Aufstieg und Untergang*, Stuttgart 1966; A. Morazzani, *Essai sur la puissance maritime des Vandales*: BAGB (1966) 539-561; H. Schreiber, *I Vandali*, Milan 1984; S. Lancel, *Victor de Vita et la Carthage vandale*, in *L'Africa romana*, Atti VI conv. di studio, Sassari 16-18 dicembre 1988, ed. A. Mastino, Sassari 1989, II, 649-661; A. Isola, *I cristiani dell'Africa vandalica nei* Sermones *del tempo (429-534)*, Milan 1990; A. Isola, *A proposito dell'*inscitia *dei Vandali secondo Fulg.,* ad Tras. *1, 2, 2*: RomBarb 13 (1994-95) 57-74; F.M. Clover, *The Late Roman West and the Vandals*, Aldershot 1993; Y. Modéran, *La chronologie de la Vie de saint Fulgence de Ruspe et ses incidences sur l'histoire de l'Afrique vandale*: MEFRA 105 (1993) 135-188; N. Francovich Onesti, *I Vandali. Lingua e storia*, Rome 2002.

A. Marchetta

VANNES, Council of. Having gathered in this city of *Gaul to ordain a new bishop, many bishops from the province of *Tours, under the presidency of their metropolitan *Perpetuus, promulgated 16 disciplinary canons. The precise date of this council is unknown; it can be dated between 461 and 491.

CCL 148, 150-158; Hfl-Lecl II, 2, 904-906, 1382.

Ch. Munier

VARIMADUM, Contra. Among the anti-Arian African writings of the 5th c. there appears a collection of biblical passages written by an unknown author which has been transmitted to us as the *Contra Varimadum*. Composed around 445–450, that is, between the taking of *Carthage by *Genseric in 439 and the disastrous Conference of Carthage that took place between *Arians and Catholic bishops, called by *Huneric in 484, this document presents different opportunities to better know, through the author and his antagonists, the Catholic resistance to the *Vandal persecution, anti-Arian African theology and the biblical text used in the controversy.

Published by B. Schwank under the name of Ps.-Vigilius, in the past the *Contra Varimadum* was assigned by copyists and medieval readers to *Augustine or *Athanasius, although the first editor hypothesized that the work might be that of *Hydatius. Once these patristic authors were excluded because of theological ideas, style and the time of the work, it was assigned to *Cerealis bishop of Castellum Ripense (*Mauretania Caesarensis*), the author of a book *contra Maximinum Arrianum.* But this attribution remains every bit as hypothetical as the attribution of *Contra Varimadum* to *Vigilius of Thapsus, maintained by P.F. Chifflet, whose edition was published by Migne (PL 62,351-434). However, it is likely the case that the historical figure *Varimadus* is to be identified with *Maribadus,* the deacon of that "evil heresy" against which Vigilius of Thapsus argued (*Altercatio* 2,45: PL 62,226D), or with *Marivaldus,* an Arian deacon who was esp. influential at the court of Huneric, mentioned by *Victor of Vita (*Hist. persec.* I,48: CSEL 7,21,7-9). However long the identity of the *Contra Varimadum* may continue to remain unknown, he was certainly an African, a victim of the Vandal suppression toward the Catholic communities and their bishops, who were forced to conduct their anti-Arian polemics often far from their sees in Africa. Exiled like other famous colleagues, Ps.-Vigilius was able to write the *Contra Varimadum* in *Italy, most likely at Naples, where shortly before against the same Arian deacon Varimadus he had composed another text, which has, however, been lost (*Var*, *Praef.* 1-12).

From one theological point of view, the *Contra Varimadum* does not present anything esp. original but repeats the objections to the Arian theses of the Catholic tradition (esp. from *Ambrose's *De fide ad Gratianum Augustum*). It informs us, however, on the difficult points of the controversy of Catholics with the Vandal Arians, which was resolved with recourse to many passages from *Scripture. In the *Contra Varimadum,* the accumulation of biblical texts is at times so much that the questions posed constitute a type of scriptural florilegium, subdivided by theological themes in three books. In the first is treated the unity of the *Trinity and the equality of the Son; in the second, the equality of the *Holy Spirit to the *Father, and in the third, the names that Scripture attributes to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Even though on the whole the work is a compilation of biblical passages, it is not without several theological peculiarities such as the omission of technical terms pertaining to the Trinity (e.g., *essentia* and **homoousion*) or to *Christology (*Leo the Great's *utriusquae naturae*).

Because of the rare biblical passages used, the *Contra Varimadum* turns out to be useful for the history of the *canon of Scripture and the history of *exegesis. Among them there stands out the so-called Johannine Comma (1 Jn 5:7-8), which is present in the *Vetus Latina* and which was used by African Catholics in the anti-Arian controversy (one finds it in the statement of faith set forth by the Catholic bishops at the conference debate with the Arians of 484: *Victor of Vita, *Hist. persec.* III,11: PL 58,227C; in the Ps.-Athanasian *De Trinitate: De Trin.* 43.60: PL 62,243; CCL 50,69; in *Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Contra Fabianum* 21,4; *De Trin.* 1,4; *Responsio c. Arianos* 10). In the *Contra Varimadum* it is opportunely set within the context in order to explain the Arian claims on Jn 14:28 (*Pater maior me est* ["the Father is greater than I"]). After a series of biblical verses which serve to demonstrate that the Son is less than the Father only *in adsumpti hominis forma* ("in the form of the assumed human being"), although he is equal *in deitatis naturae substantia* ("in the substance of the divine nature"), our author concludes: *Tres sunt, inquit, qui testimonium perhibent in terra: aqua, sanguis, et caro, et tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in caelo: pater, uerbum, et spiritus, et hic tres unum sunt* ("There are three, he says, who bear witness on earth: water, blood and flesh, and there are three who bear witness in heaven: Father, Word and Spirit, and these three are one") (Schwank, 20-21).

We do not know whether and to what degree the *Contra Varimadum* played a role in favor of the Catholic cause in Africa. It certainly spread in Europe, esp. in those areas in which, before the conversion of the Germanic peoples to the Catholic faith, the anti-Arian controversy remained alive. In *Gaul, *Caesarius of Arles used it extensively in his *Breuiarium aduersus haereticos* (ca. 525), and one century later in *Spain, a manuscript used it along with other passages from Scripture, modifying it, however, in many parts. In the 8th c., the *Contra Varimadum*

was present in the monastery of *Corbeia antiqua* and finally in the 9th c. the False Decretals received several portions of it (ca. 850).

CPPM II/A 1694; B. Schwank (ed.), *Pseudo-Vigilii Thapsensis opus Contra Varimadum*, CCL 90, VI-XVI; 1-134; G. Ficker, *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus*, Leipzig 1897; G. Bardy, *Vigile de Thapse*: DTC 15 (1946) 3005-3008; B. Schwank, *Zur Neuausgabe von* Contra Varimadum *nach dem Codex Paris B.N. Lat. 12 217 im Corpus Christianorum Series Latina XC*: SE 12 (1961) 112-196; M. Simonetti, *Letteratura cristiana d'Africa*, in A. Di Berardino (ed.), *Patrologia. I Padri latini*, Genoa 1996, 19-57.

V. Lombino

VATICAN

I. History and Archaeology - II. Investigations Under the Basilica of St. Peter.

I. History and Archaeology. Since ancient times, on the right bank of the Tiber River near *Rome one could find a vast territory that the literary sources defined at first as the *Ager Vaticanus* and later *Vaticanum*. This broad area was traversed by three chief roads (Triumphalis, Cornelia and Aurelia), although there are difficulties in reconstructing these roads with precision. This area was occupied by extravagant gardens and necropolises, abundant remains of which have been found many times over the centuries. The most famous of such necropolises was that along the Via Cornelia, which was excavated during the years 1940–1949 and 1953–1957 under the Vatican basilica: there one finds two rows of sepulchral buildings for the wealthy, both square and rectangular in layout, from different chronological periods extending from the age of Hadrian until the end of the 3rd c. Some of the most ancient tombs, poor earthen burials, were discovered in the area designated with the letter *P*, an area nearly 30 m² (98.4 ft.²) laid bare to open sky and close to other funerary buildings to the N of the sepulchral road. In this place set against the W wall a small funerary aedicule with two recesses placed above was found, separated by a stone table supported by two marble columns, in which one can recognize the so-called trophaeum, which according to *Gaius stood above the tomb of the apostle *Peter. The necropolis was deliberately covered with dirt and sealed off during the Constantinian age for the construction of the Christian basilica, which he placed over it: the last datable burial was that of *Trebellena Flaccilla*, in the T mausoleum, where there is a cinerary urn that contained a coin datable to the years 317/318.

The most important monumental building of the Vatican area, which corresponds to the left side of the modern-day basilica of St. Peter and almost parallel to it, was certainly the circus built by *Caligula in the *horti Agrippinae*. At the center of the circus—abandoned by the 2nd half of the 4th c.—there was, as is well known, an Egyptian monumental obelisk that had been transferred from *Alexandria on a ship specifically built for this purpose, which Pope Sixtus V had placed at the center of the St. Peter's Square. The *circus Gai et Neronis,* whose precise shape remains solely hypothetical, is also known because under the emperor *Nero the gardens that lined them received the numerous evacuees who had survived the famous fire of July 64 and, shortly thereafter, became a theater for some of the mass executions of Christians who were regarded as responsible for this incident. During this persecution the apostle *Peter was also crucified and his body buried in the place today marked by the high altar and Bernini's baldachino (canopy) in the Vatican basilica.

In the Vatican area, moreover, scholars know of the existence of an important *Phrigianum,* a sanctuary of the Phrygian goddess Cybele, but its topographical placement turns out in any case to be problematic, and well-known interpretive problems remain even for the *Gaianum*.

II. Investigations Under the Basilica of St. Peter. A deep sense of sacred respect and reverential religious fear stopped people for nearly sixteen centuries from undertaking digs under the floor of the Vatican basilica near the tomb of St. Peter. Already at the time of the construction of Bernini's canopy, during the years of the pontificate of Urban VIII (1623–1644), we know in fact of the apprehensions caused by undertaking the construction of the heavy structure and the risks that it could cause cave-ins that would definitively wipe out the traces of the apostle's tomb and the nearby places of burial of the faithful. The origin of the explorations carried out under the Petrine basilica in the mid-20th c. dates back to the year 1920, when Gustavo Giovannoni—on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of the death of the painter Raphael and with the desire of bringing to light the remains of the ancient Constantinian basilica and the church of the 16th c.—at a gathering of the Pontifical Roman Academy of Archaeology, set forth the proposition of undertaking some exploratory digs in the sacred grottoes. Benedict XV, having obtained the consent of the pontifical commission of sacred archaeology, was favorable to the careful investigations, which, however, did not begin under his patronage due to his untimely death, and the ambitious project of excavation was left untouched even during the pontificate of Pius XI

(1922–1939). It was only with his successor Pius XII (1939–1958) that the complex work of excavation began: the work carried out during the first months of his pontificate certainly contributed to rendering the Vatican grottoes more accessible; nevertheless, the central part of them, subdivided into three aisles by strong concrete pillars, provided only limited height which gave Giovannoni, a member of the Collegio degli Architetti della Fabbrica di S. Pietro, the idea of lowering its flooring ca. 80 cm (31.5 in). Shortly thereafter, on 18 January 1941, while carrying out a shallow excavation near one of the pillars of the central aisle, archaeologists discovered an elegant frame of a mausoleum (subsequently named *F* or *Caetennius Antigonus*): in this way began the second and most important and fruitful phase of the archaeological explorations under the Vatican basilica. Under the administrative and moral authority of Monsignor Ludwig Kaas—treasurer of the Reverenda Fabbrica di S. Pietro—Pius XII appointed a commission of archaeologists made up of Enrico Josi and the Jesuits Antonio Ferrua and Engelbert Kirschbaum, to whom was subsequently added the architect Bruno Maria Apollonj Ghetti, although the technical part was entrusted to the aforementioned Giovannoni, who was assisted by Enrico Galeazzi and Giuseppe Nicolosi, architects of the Fabbrica di S. Pietro. The excavations, as deep as ca. 10 m (32.8 ft) in some places, allowed the identification under the modern-day floor of the sacred grottoes—built with two different levels of walkways for the better preservation of the highest mausoleums of the lower necropolis—the tomb of St. Peter, upon which a funerary aedicule adjacent to the so-called red wall was built around the mid-2nd c.—namely, the *trophaeum* of Gaius, that is, the tomb of the apostle mentioned by *Eusebius of Caesarea in the polemical dialogue of the presbyter Gaius against the Montanist *Proclus. That first *Memoria apostolica* was later encompassed within the monument constructed by Constantine and on the same site, with deliberate continuity, the altar of *Gregory the Great, that of Callistus II (1123) and the modern-day papal altar of Clement VIII (from 1594) were built. After the official publication of the excavations in 1951, other archaeological investigations were carried out between 1953 in 1958 by Adriano Prandi, and during those same years Margherita Guarducci deciphered, not without disturbing suspicions and controversies, the graffiti under the Confession of the basilica and identified the relics of St. Peter with the "discovered bones" coming from a hollow portion of wall *g*. The results of the research carried out during the 1950s and, esp., the notice of the discovery of St. Peter's bones—confirmed by the official recognition of the church by request of Pope Paul VI—provoked a lively scientific and religious debate.

The bibl. on the Vatican is enormous. For an overview, accompanied by a rich and concise supplement, see P. Liverani, *La topografia antica del Vaticano*, Vatican City 1999, and L. Bianchi, *Ad limina Petri. Spazio e memoria della Roma cristiana*, Rome 1999.

For the explorations under the floor of the Petrine basilica, see B.M. Apollonj Ghetti - A. Ferrua - E. Josi - E. Kirschbaum, *Esplorazioni sotto la Confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano*, Vatican City 1951; A. Prandi, *La zona archeologica della Confessio Vaticana*, Vatican City 1957; M. Guarducci, *I graffiti sotto la Confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano*, I-III, Vatican City 1958; A.A. De Marco, *The Tomb of Saint Peter, A Representative and Annotated Bibliography of the Excavations*, Leiden 1964; M. Guarducci, *Le reliquie di Pietro sotto la Confessione della Basilica Vaticana*, Vatican City 1965; id., *Le chiavi sulla pietra. Studi, ricordi e documenti inediti intorno alla tomba di Pietro in Vaticano*, Casale Monf. 1995 (extensive bibl.); P. Zander, *La tomba di San Pietro e la necropoli vaticana: dalle prime esplorazioni ai recenti restauri*, in *Pietro. La storia, l'immagine, la memoria*, Milan 1999, 215-226.

M. Ghilardi

VEDASTUS, saint (d. 540). St. Vedastus (French Vaast, Gaston) was born, according to his *Vita,* at the borders between Limousin and Périgord; however, according to a recent hypothesis, he was born at *Châlus*. He became a hermit near Toul; the bishop there ordained him a priest. Taken to *Reims by *Clovis, he was perhaps his catechist. *Remigius of Reims had him appointed bishop of Arras (after 496) and subsequently of Cambrai, with the duty of returning those regions to Christianity that had become *pagan with the arrival of the Franks. Around 534 he withdrew to solitude beyond the River Crinchon. He died in 540, after 40 years of his episcopate. He was buried in the Church of Notre Dame of Arras; then by Aubert of Cambrai-Arras, one of his successors, he was translated into his cell outside the city, which became the center of the powerful Abbey of St. Vaast. His first *Vita* is owed to *Jonah of Bobbio (before 642) (BHL 8501-8505), another to Alcuin (800) (BHL 8506-8508), who also wrote a Mass (lost), inscriptions for altars and churches, and a homily (BHL 8509). There are some *libri miraculorum* from the 9th–14th c. (BHL 8510-8519). The saint's feast day falls on 6 February, the translation of his relics on 1 October (*Mart. hier.*).

BHL 8501-8519; BS 12, 965-968; LCI 8, 537-539; LMA 1, 1027-1028; 8, 1442-1443; BBKL 12, 1178; P. Leman, *Topographie chrétienne d'Arras au VI*[e] *siècle. La* Vita Vedasti *et les données de l'archéologie*: Revue du Nord - Archéologie 77 (1995) 169-184.

V. Saxer - S. Heid

VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS (ca. 535–ca. 600). A Latin Christian poet who was born around 530 at *Duplavilis* (Valdobbiadene). *Arator and the Byzantine intellectual milieu of *Ravenna had a great influence on his literary formation. His classical knowledge flourished, as is reflected in his numerous borrowings from the writings of Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, and, to a lesser extent, Horace and other poets from the Silver Age; his biblical learning can be perceived in the frequent scriptural citations, esp. from the *Psalms, Isaiah and the gospels. There is no lack of evidence of his knowledge, even though partial, of the writings of some Fathers. His writings give the impression that he had read *Sedulius, *Orosius, *Caesarius of Arles and *Hilary of Poitiers.

Healed from a serious eye disease after having been anointed with oil from the lamp that burned before the image of St. *Martin of Tours in the basilicas of Sts. *John and *Paul, he departed in 565 for *Gaul on a pilgrimage of thanksgiving to the tomb of his protector, but also perhaps to withdraw from the disturbances brought on him by the authorities of Ravenna for his nonconformist stance during the controversy of the *Three Chapters. In 566 he was at Metz at the court of the king of Austrasia Sigebert I, whose marriage with Brunhilde he celebrated in a poem, thereby obtaining for himself a prestigious position. Having completed his pilgrimage at *Tours, in 567 he took residence at *Poitiers on account of the former Queen *Radegund, who, having taken on the monastic veil along with her daughter Agnes, retired to the convent. He also remained for some time at the court of Chilperic, king of Neustria. Consecrated bishop of Poitiers in 597, he died there shortly after 600. A person of great notoriety, even though controversial, he lived through some of Gaul's darkest historical moments: the intrigues of Queens Fredegund and Brunhilde and the rivalries between Chilperic and Sigebert and Galaswinth. At times he remained silent, perhaps through prudence; at times he praised the Merovingian sovereigns, according to a literary practice that was still flourishing at that time. His lyrical effusions over Radegund and Agnes should be read in light of their spiritual transformation.

His works include eleven books of miscellanea, nearly 300 compositions mostly in verse on sacred and secular subjects; the *Vita S. Martini,* recast into hexameters, with personal references, of the biography redacted by *Sulpicius Severus; and the *Vitae* written in prose on saints Hilary, *Germanus, Albinus, *Paternus, Radegund, *Marcellus, Amantius, Médard, Leobinus and Maurilius. The religious lyrics contain Venantius's entire Christian subject matter, the meaning of death, the veneration of the cross, devotion to *Mary and guidance for human souls. His investigation into the transcendent found singular expression in his travel poetry: the pilgrim always marks the sanctuaries that he encounters or regards them as a goal, understood as points of privileged encounter with the supernatural. As a hagiographer, given the panegyrical nature of the *Vitae,* he is more interested in moral edification than in historical accuracy, even though he does not fail to emphasize at times his role as an eyewitness. In these biographies one perceives thaumaturgic and demonic elements as well as a clear propensity toward the aristocratic milieu. Venantius Fortunatus is primarily remembered for two hymns, *Vexilla regis prodeunt* and *Pange lingua gloriosi,* written in 568–569 for the solemn entry of a relic of the cross into Poitiers; these two hymns were immediately inserted into the liturgy.

CPL 1033-1052; PL 88; BS 12, 985-987; D. Tardi, *Fortunat. Étude sur un dernier représentant de la poésie latine dans la Gaule mérovingienne*, Paris 1927; J. Laporte, *Le royaume de Paris dans l'oeuvre hagiographique de Fortunat*, Poitiers 1953; K. Steinmann, *Die Gelesuintha-Elegie des Venantius Fortunatus* (*Carm. VI,5*), Zürich 1975; L. Navarra, *A proposito del "De navigio suo" di V.F. in rapporto alla "Mosella" di Ausonio e agli "Itinerari" di Ennodio*: SSR 3 (1979) 79-131; B. Brennan, *The Career of Venantius Fortunatus*: Traditio 41 (1985) 49-78; G. Palermo, *Venanzio Fortunato, Vite dei santi Ilario e Radegonda di Poitiers*, Rome 1989; S. Tamburri, *Venanzio Fortunato, La Vita di S. Martino di Tours*, Naples 1991; J.W. George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, Oxford 1992; var. aus., *Venanzio Fortunato tra Italia e Francia.* Atti del conv. int. di studi, Treviso 1993; F.E. Consolino, *L'elegia amorosa nel* De excidio Thoringiae *di Venanzio Fortunato*, in *La poesia cristiana latina in distici elegiaci.* Atti del conv. di Assisi marzo 1992, Assisi 1993, 241-254; P. Santorelli, *L'Epitaphium Eusebiae di Venanzio Fortunato* (*IV,28*), *La poesia cristiana latina in distici elegiaci*. Atti del conv. di Assisi marzo 1992, Assisi 1993, 285-294; M. Roberts, *The Description of Landscape in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus: The Moselle Poems*: Traditio 49 (1994) 1-22; M. Reydellet, *Venance Fortunat. Poèmes*, t. I. *livres I-IV*, Paris 1994; D. Fiocco, *Venanzio Fortunato: le "Vitae" dei santi e il modello episcopale*, Rome 1997; S. Di Brazzano, *Venanzio Fortunato, Opere*, 1. *Carmi*, Rome 2001; *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo*, ed. Fondazione Cassamarca, Treviso 2003; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique*, 10, Paris 2006, 59-104.

L. Navarra

VENERANDUS of Altaripa (7th c.). Belonging perhaps to a senatorial family of S *Gaul (Stroheker), Venerandus established the first Benedictine monastery of Merovingian *Gaul, at Altaripa in the diocese of Albi in Provence. The foundation dates back to the time of Fibicius of Albi, as is shown from a letter sent to Bishop Constantius (620–630), grandson and successor of Fibicius, to whom

Venerandus recounted the circumstances connected to the event.

The letter (dated between 625 and 626) is the only source that we possess on the matter and is of great importance because it contains the first mention of the Benedictine *Rule*, two centuries after the death of St. *Benedict and after the 50th anniversary of the destruction of Monte Cassino (ca. 577), and provides testimony to its spread in S France. Venerandus sent to Constantius the text of the *Rule* of St. Benedict, *abbas Romensis,* so that he might preserve it in the episcopal archives and check that it be faithfully observed in the monastery he established. The small monastery of Altaripa thus competed with Luxeuil for the primacy and merit of having imported and spread the *Rule* in France; Venerandus became the first link of a chain that saw the transmission of the *Rule,* through Constantius of Albi, a correspondent with Desiderius of Cahors, to the circles of the court (Prinz; Engelbert). All of this is in opposition to the hypothesis forwarded by de Vogüé, who instead identifies the means of spreading the *Regula* along with the writings of *Gregory the Great, the Irish *Columbanus and the Franco-Irish monastery of Luxeuil.

Traube was the one who, by analyzing the author's Latin, demonstrated that the document (which has come down to us in a 15th-c. copy) was redacted in the S of Merovingian Gaul, which could be considered the first witness to the spread of the *Rule*. Starting from the attribution *Romensis* given to Benedict, Traube himself eventually hypothesized that there was a relationship with the "interpolated" class of manuscripts of the Benedictine text.

Despite the chronological concurrences, it is unlikely that our Venerandus was the same person mentioned by Fredegarius in IV,73 (MGH, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, II, Hannoverae 1888, 158).

CPL 1305; CCL 117 (1957) 502-503 = L. Traube, *Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti*, Munich 1898, 35-37, 92-93; K.F. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantike Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, 226; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich*, Munich-Vienna 1965, 267-268; P. Engelbert, *Regeltext und Romverehung. Zur Frage der Verbreitung der Regula Benedicti im Frühmittelalter*: Römische Quartalschrift 81 (1986) 39-60; S. Pricoco, *La Regola di San Benedetto e le Regole dei Padri*, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Milan 1995, XLIV-XLVIII; Patrologia 4, 349-350 (Y. Hen).

B. Clausi

VENERIUS of Milan (d. after 406). Deacon during the episcopate of *Ambrose, he became bishop of *Milan upon the death of *Simplicianus, in 400 or 401 (Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambr*. 46; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep*. 20,3). His episcopate unfolded during the difficult years caused by the threat of the *Visigoths in N *Italy and in the surrounding areas of Milan and the spread of *Vigilantius's teachings. He found himself involved in the *Origenist controversy: Pope *Anastasius I, in a letter to *John of Jerusalem dated between the years 400 or 401 (Mansi 3,944; ACO I,5,74), claims that he had previously written to Venerius (PLS 1,791-792; CPL 1639) concerning the condemnation of *Origen. Venerius was included by *Jerome among all those who had favored Origen's condemnation (*Apol. c. Ruf.* II,22). In June 401, Venerius received from the bishops gathered in council at *Carthage a request to help with the needs of the African clergy (*Concilia Africae a. 345 - a. 525*: CC 149,194-196). In 404, *John Chrysostom turned to him, as well as to Pope *Innocent and *Chromatius of Aquileia (Pall., *Dial.* 2: SC 242, 94), in order to request support in light of the threat posed by *Theophilus of Alexandria and his own removal from office; *Palladius mentions one of Venerius's letters, along with those of the emperor *Honorius, Pope Innocent and other bishops, that was taken to the court of the emperor *Arcadius at Constantinople following a council held perhaps at *Rome before 406 in support of John Chrysostom (*Dial.* 4: SC 341,84); moreover, John Chrysostom's *Ep*. 182, written in 406, was sent to Venerius. *Ennodius dedicated one of his poems to Venerius (*Carm.* II,79).

BS 12, 1009-1011 (bibl.); PCBE 2263-2264.

A. Pollastri

VERANUS of Cavaillon (d. after 589). Bishop and saint, patron of the city and the diocese of Cavaillon, *in provincia ecclesiastica Arelatensi*. A local tradition maintained that he was born at Valchiusa (near Avignon), to a nonaristocratic family, in the 2nd decade of the 6th c.; others maintained that he was born at Javols, in the area near Mende (Lozère) or rather at Jargeau (Loiret). In any case, the saint spent part of his life at Valchiusa, leading an eremitic life at Cavaillon; there he built a chapel in honor of the Virgin (where his body was then buried in a stone *sarcophagus) and performed his most famous miracle by delivering the region from a dragon that was tormenting it. Having become bishop of Cavaillon by wish of King Sigebert I (d. 575), he governed his diocese until his death, which certainly occurred after 589. It seems that he was buried at Valchiusa in the chapel built by him, upon which a church dedicated to him was then built in the 8th c., which was subsequently rebuilt during the 11th–12th c. through

the work of the monks of the Abbey of Saint Victor of Marseille. Still existing today, the church encloses an empty sarcophagus and an altar from the Merovingian era. The remains of his body were translated to Jargeau (diocese of Orléans) at the beginning of the 11th c., but the relics were also protected in the cathedral of Cavaillon.

His cult enjoyed noteworthy fortune, which was initially limited to the region of Valchiusa, but then extended after the 11th c. to the rest of France. In Provence the saint is commemorated on 13 November, the date of his **depositio* according to the *Vita Verani* (BHL 8536: probably from the Carolingian age); at *Lyons and in the nearby diocese he is commemorated on 11 November, perhaps because he was confused with the bishop of Vence of the same name (son of *Eucherius of Lyons), whose *depositio* is remembered on 11 November in the *Hieronymian Martyrology;* in other dioceses he is commemorated on 19 October, the date of the *translatio* of the saint's body from Valchiusa to Jargeau, where the parochial church was consecrated to him in 1154.

Beyond the hagiographical tradition, Veranus was a historical figure who left many traces of himself. He was among the 64 bishops who took part in the Council of Mâcon (585), a true and proper general council of the Frankish nation (Amiet), called by King Guntram of Borgogna and the metropolitan bishop of Lyons, whose primary objective was to deliberate on a matter of ecclesiastical discipline. On this occasion it seems that they decided in favor of priestly celibacy, as shown by the *Sententia de castitate sacerdotum* (CPL 1022), a brief summary of the synodal intervention of a Bishop Veranus, for which reason Jacques Sirmond (in PL 72) also proposes the possible attribution of this text to Veranus of Lyons.

*Gregory of Tours, who knew him personally, had met him between 581 and 586 (*Mir.* II,60), recalls several important events from his life: along with Bishops Artemius of Sens and Agricius of Troyes, he was sent by Guntram to *Chlothar II to investigate the death of Bishop Praetextatus of Rouen, who was assassinated by a hired killer of Queen Fredegund (*Hist.* VIII,31); in October 587, he baptized the son of King Childebert, Theoderic (*Hist.* IX,4); he was among the nine bishops of the kingdom of Borgogna who elaborated and signed the letter of response to Bishop Gondegisilus, on the question of the revolt of the monks of the monastery of Radegund at Poitiers (*Hist.* IX,41). Gregory also alludes to Veranus's thaumaturgic attributes and the aura of sanctity that surrounded him while he was still alive: "This pontiff was . . . endowed with great virtues, to the point that, often, if he made the sign of the cross on the sick, immediately with the help of God he brought them back to health" (*Hist.* IX,4).

CPL 1022; BHL 8536; BHL *Nov. Suppl.* 8536b. *Concilia Galliae. A. 511 - A. 695*, ed. C. de Clercq, CCL 148 A (1963) 248; *Sententia de castitate sacerdotum*, PL 72, 699-702; *Vita Verani*, ASS Octobris, VIII, Brussels 1853, 452-474; Greg. Tur., *Hist.*, It. trans. of M. Oldoni, Naples 2001, II (Books VIII-IX). BS 12, 1017-1021 (R. Amiet - C. Colafranceschi); O. Pontal, *Histoire des conciles mérovingiens*, Paris 1989, 186-191; B. Jussen, *Patenschaft und Adoption im frühen Mittelalter. Künstliche Verwandtschaft als soziale Praxis*, Göttingen 1991, 206-210 (Eng. trans. Newark, DE 2002); Patrologia IV, 343-344 (Y. Hen).

B. Clausi

VERANUS of Vence (d. ca. 475). Second son of St. *Eucherius of Lyons, a *vir clarissimus,* who, around 420, retired to a private life with his wife and children, Veranus was born in the year 400 at *Lyons, and his brother *Salonius, at *Lérins. Veranus was educated by *Vincent of Lérins and by *Salvian of Marseille. His father sent him the treatise *Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae* on biblical exegesis. We find him as the bishop of Vence in 451; his brother Salonius was bishop of Geneva from 440 onward. During this age he placed his signature on the letter of the Council of *Arles to Pope *Leo the Great. He wrote with bishops Ceretius of Grenoble and Salonius to the same pope concerning his **Tomus ad Flavianum* (Leo the Great, *Ep.* 68). In the letter, he asked the pope to correct for them a copy of the *Tomus,* because such an important treatise had to be free from errors. Veranus still appears in the correspondence of Pope *Hilarus until 465 (*Epp.* 10; 12) but perhaps also in Lucidus's letter, in which case he lived until 474. Along with his brother Salonius he appears in the episcopal list of Lyons, in which they were inserted because of their father. According to the *Hieronymian Martyrology* (feast day 11 November), he was buried at Lyons.

BHL 8538; BBKL 12, 1224-1227; J. van der Straeten, *Un éloge ancien de S. Veran, fils de S. Eucher*: AnBoll 83 (1965) 81-94; R. Nouailhat, *Saints et patrons. Les premiers moines de Lérins*, Besançon 1988.

S. Samulowitz

VERECUNDUS of Iunca (d. 552). Historians know neither the place nor the date of Verecundus's birth, an African writer of the 6th c. We know with certainty that he was the bishop of Iunca in Byzacena and that he had an important role in the controversy of the *Three Chapters, during which he maintained a firm stance toward the imperial authority, so much

so that in 551 he was forced to flee along with Pope *Vigilius and take refuge at *Chalcedon, where he died in 552. The following works were certainly written by Verecundus: the *Commentarii super Cantica Ecclesiastica,* where he offers an *allegorical commentary on nine OT songs, following *Origen and *Augustine, but not without scholarly rigor and originality, and the *Carmen de satisfactione paenitentiae,* written in 212 hexameters, in which with a sincere enthusiasm, although not without some literary complacency, he confesses, as *Dracontius had done already, the sufferings of the one who, after painful experiences, places his hope in divine Mercy. Isetta, although recognizing several difficulties, attributes to Verecundus the *Carmen ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum*. The attribution of the *Excerptiones de gestis Chalcedonensis Concilii* to Verecundus, however, is doubtful; the attribution of the *Exhortatio paenitendi* and the *Lamentum paenitentiae* and the *Crisiados Libri III* (the work of a humanist author) is completely untenable.

CPL 869-871; PLS IV, 39-234; J.B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, IV, Paris 1858; R. Demeulenaere, CCL 93, Turnholt 1976; *Carmen de paenitentia*, intr., testo critico, tr. e comm. ed. M.G. Bianco, Naples 1984; H. Scheider, *Die altlateinischen biblischen Cantica*, Beuron 1938; E. Kullendorff, *Textkritische Beiträge zu Verecundus Iuncensis*, Lund 1943; O. Rousseau, *La plus ancienne liste de cantiques liturgiques tirés de l'Écriture*: RecSR 35 (1948) 120-129; M. Schuster, art. *Verecundus*: PWK 27/1, 1010-1012; A. Hudson-Williams, *Notes on Verecundus*: VChr 6 (1952) 47-51; L. Brou, *Études sur les Collectes du Psautier*, I, *La série africaine et l'évêque Verecundus de Junca*: SE 6 (1954) 73-95; C. Magazzù, *Tecnica esegetica nei "Commentarii super cantica ecclesiastica" di Verecondo di Junca*, Messina 1983; S. Isetta, *Carmen ad Flavium Felicem. Problemi di attribuzione e reminiscenze classiche*: VetChr 20 (1983) 111-140; M.G. Bianco, *Verecondo di Iunca, un poeta ancora trascurato del VI secolo*, in *Disiecti membra poetae*, I, Foggia 1984, 216-231; M.G. Bianco, *Note al Carmen de paenitentia di Verecundo di Iunca*: Augustinianum 24 (1984) 549-560; Patrologia IV, 43 and 53-54; BBKL 12, 1239-1240.

S. Costanza

VERONA. An important Roman city of N *Italy on the Adige River from which numerous remains from that period still exist. Found at the crossroads at a point of exceptional strategic importance, it was often the theater for military battles: the emperor *Decius defeated Philip the Arab there in 249; *Constantine conquered *Maxentius's army (CIL 5,3331); Stilicho defeated King *Alaric in 403; and *Theodoric routed King *Odoacer. The emperor *Gallienus (253–368) reconstructed its walls and expanded them. Theodoric built a solid palace there and also a new circuit of walls (*Anonymous Vales*. 71); in 569 it was sacked by Alboin, king of the *Longobards (Lombards). Christianity must have been organized at Verona over the course of the 3rd c., after *Aquileia, as the lists of Veronese bishops from the beginning of the 8th c. suggest (the 8th-c. *Viel of Classis* [a cloth embroidered with the images of the first 35 bishops] and the early 9th-c. *Versus de Verona* [or *De laudibus Veronae*]; see MGH, *Poet. aev. Car.* 1, 121ff.), according to which the first was a certain *Euprepius. Mention is made of the martyrs Firmus and Rusticus, perhaps under Maximilian. Nevertheless, the first bishop that historians have reliable information about is Lucilius (or Lucillus, as he was called by *Athanasius), who participated at the Council of *Serdica in 343 (Mansi 3,38; Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 50: PG 25,338; *Apol. ad Const.* 3: PG 25,599). If Lucilius appeared as sixth on the list, Euprepius must have been from the 3rd c. The eighth of the series was *Zeno, of African origin, after 356, who was also the most important pastor of the Veronese church in antiquity, to which he provided a great impetus with his commitment to evangelization and organization in an area that was still primarily *pagan but at the same time contained a strong Jewish presence in the city; at his time buildings of Christian worship were still few (see *Tract.* II,6,2: CCL 22,168). Zeno also favored the ascetic life because at Verona one of the first communities of virgins in the West arose.

Around 380 the bishop of Verona was Syagrius, to whom *Ambrose sent two letters rebuking him for the procedure taken toward the virgin Indicia (Ambrose, *Epp.* 5 and 6: PL 16,929-943). During this period, the Veronese church depended on the church of *Milan; it would subsequently depend on Aquileia. In the 5th c., we meet Bishop Petronius, the 13th of the series, to whom Lanzoni attributes two sermons, which usually go under the name of *Petronius of Bologna (CPL 210-211: PLS 3,141-143); we then know of Gaudentius. There are few Christian archaeological remains; between the 5th and the 6th c., a large basilica with one aisle was built.

During the Early Middle Ages, Verona was furnished with a scriptorium; its first known scribe was Ursicinus (517). Its Capitular Library was very rich with ancient manuscripts, many of which came from other scriptoria. The three most famous manuscripts are as follows: St. *Augustine's *De civitate Dei* (5th c.), *Hilary of Poitiers's *In Psalmos* and *De Trinitate* (5th c.), the *Purple Evangelary* (5th c.), the *Didascalia apostolica* (5th c.), the work of *Sulpicius Severus transcribed in 517 by Ursicinus, and different sacramentaries, among which was the *Sacramentarium leonianum* (see E.A. Lowe, *Codices latini*

antiquiores, IV, Oxford 1947, 32-40). For the early Christian remains of Verona, *see* *Italy.

DACL 15, 2959-2962; EC 12, 1282-1299; EAA² 5, 107-1021; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia*, Faenza 1927, 929-934; A Grazioli, *La giurisdizione di Milan a Verona all'epoca di Ambrogio*: Scuola Catt. 68 (1940) 373-379; G.B. Pighi, *Versus de Verona. Versus de Mediolano*, Bologna 1960; P.L. Zovatto, *Arte paleocristiana a Verona: il cristianesimo a Verona*, in *Verona e il suo territorio*, Verona 1960, 553-613; E. Lodi, *Le due omelie di san Petronio vescovo di Bologna*, in *Misc. Liturgica card. G. Lercaro*, II, Rome 1967, 263-301; var. aus., *Storia della cultura veneta*, I: *Dalle origini al Trecento*, Vicenza 1976 (various articles); G.B. Pighi, *Cenni storici sulla Chiesa Veronese*, I, Verona ²1980; L. Franzoni, *Immagine di Verona romana*: AAAd 28 (1986) 345-373; *Il Veneto nell'età romana*, ed. G. Cavalieri Manasse, 2 vols., Verona 1987; R. Canova dal Zio, *Le chiese delle Tre Venezie anteriori al Mille*, Padua 1986; *Teoderico il grande e i Goti d'Italia*, in Atti del XIII Congr. int. di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1993; EAM 11, 561ff.; R. Lizzi Testa, *Christianization and Conversion in Northern Italy*, in *The Origins of Christendom in the West*, ed. by A. Kreider, Edinburgh-New York 2001, 47-95, esp. 70ff.

A. Di Berardino

VERONICA. In the *Acts of Pilate* (ch. 7) Berenike is mentioned (Beronike, in Latin *Veronica*) identified with the woman with the issue of blood healed by *Jesus (Mk 5:25 and par.). According to *Eusebius of Caesarea, she must have come from Paneas, where there was a statue of the woman with the issue of blood standing before the Lord (*HE* 7,18); according to another opinion, Veronica came from *Spain. This Berenike-Veronica (also called Basilla [Basilissa?]) in the apocrypha of the *Cycle of Pilate* received the image of Christ (perhaps a reminder of the legend of *Abgar) and came to *Rome with Volusianus (*Death of Pilate, *Vindicta Salvatoris, Healing of Tiberius*). A *Libellus* (Gk. *Deesis*) *Veronicae haemorrhousae* is found in *John Malalas's *Chronographia* (PG 97,365-368). During the Middle Ages (12th c.?), this Veronica became the woman at the sixth station of the *Via Crucis*.

BHL 8549; BHG 779-780; BS 12, 1044-1050; LCIK 8, 543-545; C.W. Goodwin, *The Anglo-Saxon Legends of St. Andrew and St. Veronica*, Cambridge 1851; E. v. Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*: TU 18 (1899) 197-262.

M. Starowieyski

VERSUS DE SEX AETATIBUS ET MUNDI PRINCIPIO. The author of this short work is regarded as a certain Theo(do)fridus, bishop of Amiens (d. after 683). His name appears in the second verse of the same document: *Aspice, Deus, de supernis sedibus / Quos Theodofridus condedit versiculos*. The first verse, which begins with the words, *Ante saecula et mundi principio,* constitutes a brief profession of faith in the most Holy *Trinity: *Tu, Pater sancte, genuisti Filium, / Qui tecum regnat cum sancto Espiritu*. There follows an invocation of God by the author, who wishes to describe briefly the history of the world from the creation to the last judgment, which is divided into six periods: (1) from the creation to *Noah (vv. 3-7); (2) from the sons of Noah to the calling of *Abraham (vv. 8-9); (3) from Isaac to Saul and *David (vv. 10-16); (4) from Absalom to the deportation to Babylon (vv. 17-19); (5) from Zerubbabel to King *Herod (vv. 20-21). (6) The sixth period (vv. 21-25) begins with the birth of *Jesus Christ; the author mentions some of the Lord's most significant miracles (e.g., the resurrection of Lazarus, the multiplication of bread, the wedding at Cana); and he describes his death on the cross, resurrection and ascension to heaven. The final verse refers to the last judgment with the punishment of the wicked and the rewarding of the righteous. The individual verses end with the refrain: *Deus qui iustus semper es laudabilis* (perhaps in imitation of the *Psalms). The theology is the traditional type, which underscores the creative work of God the Father in this project of salvation which is accomplished in and by Jesus Christ; the *Holy Spirit is only mentioned in the initial invocation. This short work is characterized by a certain rhythmic beauty and provides an original vocabulary, even though this vocabulary displays various terms that are not attested to in classical Latin but by that point were present in medieval Latin (*saecula*, *espiritus*, *etas* etc.).

CPL 2301. MGH, *Poetae Latini*, 4,2, Strecker, n. 40, 559-564.

W. Turek

VERUS ISRAEL. The notion of the *Verus Israel* is evidently Christian, but it is already found in the Essene literature, discovered in the grottoes near the Dead Sea, with the objective of legitimizing the community with respect to the priesthood of *Jerusalem, which the Essenes regarded as illegitimate. For the Christians this notion expressed the conviction that, on the divine level, they were the authentic heirs of Israel of the era of the Second Temple (before 70 CE). The notion is established on a rereading of the ancient beliefs and practices according to the categories of thought more or less inherited from *Paul of Tarsus: letter and spirit; provisional and eternal; particular and universal; material and spiritual.

Along this theological line, the covenant with *Abraham, the "father of many nations," is considered as an announcement of Christ's mission: thus

in this "new covenant," destined from here onward to all humanity, circumcision, the chief sign of the covenant, prefigures the "circumcision of the heart," that is, baptism, which alone allows one to approach the "true" meaning of the *Scriptures. Moreover, the law of *Sinai, reserved for the Jewish people, now proclaims Christ, the "new law," and the "inheritance" of the Promised Land and represents in anticipation the universal gathering of the nations "on the holy mountain": the double lineage of the patriarch symbolizes Israel "according to the flesh" and Israel "according to the spirit."

The totality of the commandments, events and institutions of ancient Israel was interpreted in the messianic sense in *Jesus Christ. The concept of *Verus Israel* finds its most ancient explicit formulation in the writings of *Justin Martyr. The proximity of the two expressions shows that "true" and "spiritual" are almost understood as synonyms: "Because we are . . . the true and spiritual Israel, who, through the work of Christ crucified, have been led to God" (*Dialogue* 11,5). "We are the true Israelite race" (*Dialogue* 135,3).

The problem was fundamentally at the center of the process of separation between Christianity and *Judaism; it thus determined the representation that Christians from the beginning had of themselves in relation to the Jews and *pagans. Likewise in Justin's writings, it occupies an exceptional place that corresponds to a particular and unique period in the history of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity: previously the Christian community was not sufficiently distinct from the Jewish community so that this type of difficulty could be taken into consideration. After Justin's work—esp. when Christianity became the official religion of the empire—the new situation of the two communities made the question short-lived. The Christian claim of being Israel was no longer affirmed except in a marginal way; it finds no echo in the Jewish literature, nor even in controversial writings.

M. Simon, *Verus Israel, Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'empire romain (135-425)*, Paris 1948, [2]1964 (see HTR 92 [1999] 465-478); *Verus Israel. Nuove prospettive sul giudeocristianesimo*, ed. G. Filoramo - C. Gianotto, Brescia 2001.

S.C. Mimouni

VERUS of Orange (5th–6th c.). Verus is regularly presented as the successor and biographer of St. *Eutropius, but in effect we only know him as the author of the biography of the latter (BHL 2782). In the title of the short work, one reads: *Domino sancto papae Stephano Verus*. The "pope" Stephen in question was the bishop of *Lyons, who held that see from 501 to 515. Perhaps Verus was not a bishop. In this case Stephen was the successor of Eutropius and the predecessor of Florentius, who is attested in 517.

CPL 2099; J.-H. Albanès - U. Chevalier, *Gallia christiana novissima*, VI, Montbéliard 1916, 10-18; BS 5, 345; DHGE 16, 82.

V. Saxer - S. Samulowitz

VESPASIAN, emperor (AD 9–79). Titus Flavius Vespasian, Roman emperor from 69 to 79, the founder of the military dynasty of the Flavii (his sons *Titus and *Domitian immediately sided with him after his proclamation as emperor by the legions of *Egypt, *Syria and Judea). Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian who worked at the court of the Flavii, disapproving the violence of the intransigents against the Christians and the murder of *James (*Ant.* XX,200ff.), reveals to us the disposition that the Flavian dynasty had toward the adherents of the new religion. Two fragments from the writings of *Hegesippus, cited by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 3,12; 3,20,1-7), allude to the deliberate action taken by Vespasian and his sons against the descendents of *David in *Palestine also for the objective of determining whether the Christians constituted a threat from the political point of view. Vespasian's tolerance was owed to his observation that Christianity posed no threat and that *Judaism and Christianity differed greatly. One should note that Vespasian, a follower of the traditional Roman religion, while alive did not wish to be considered a god. He died of a fever in February 79, after having reorganized the army, completing financial reforms, and increasing judicial and legislative tasks. When his son Titus returned from the East in 71, Vespasian celebrated with him the triumph in destroying *Jerusalem.

M. Sordi, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*, Milan [2]1990; G. Jossa, *I cristiani e l'impero romano da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio*, Naples 1991; F. Jacques - J. Sheid, *Rome et l'intégration de l'Empire*, Paris 1990, (It. trans.) *Roma e il suo impero*, Rome-Bari 1992; B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, London-New York [2]1999; C. Salles, *La Rome des Flaviens: Vespasien, Titus, Domitien*, Paris 2002.

L. Navarra

VESTIARIUS (Vestararius). Custodian of the treasury and the wardrobe (*vestiarium*) of high ecclesiastical and lay dignitaries, or rather of chapters, churches and monasteries. At *Rome, starting at least from the 8th c., this name was used to refer to the official placed in charge of the Lateran patriarchate's *vestiarium,* in which, as is shown from a passage

of the *Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne LP I,328-329), in addition to the sacred garments of the Roman pontiff, the various *cymilia episcopii* were preserved, which had been gifts from emperors and high dignitaries. From the biography of Pope Stephen III (768–772) (LP I,470), we learn that the building contained an oratory dedicated to St. *Caesarius of Arles, concerning which location—and consequently that of the *vestiarium,* within the context of the Lateran Palace—nothing is known (Lauer, *Le Palais de Latran,* 96, n. 2). Among the administrative duties of the *vestiarium,* and esp. that of its leader, the *vestiarius*, was the duty of preparing, executing and recording in the appropriate books some of the papal activities such as the establishment and construction of buildings, restorations and donations. On this basis, one scholar has hypothesized (Geertman, *More veterum,* 34, 63) that the compilers of the *Liber pontificalis* did their work under the aegis of the *vestiarium*, and are to be regarded, perhaps, as employed by this administration. From the *Ordo Romanus I* (nn. 10, 22) it turns out that on the feast days the *vestiarius* had to supply, by placing his own seal on them, the sacred vessels and the evangelaries that were needed for the Mass; in the procession he rode immediately after the pope. Just one name of a *vestiarius*—a certain Baiolus, mentioned on a Roman inscription of an imprecise date and provenance (Diehl, 1325)—is known to us before the pontificate of Hadrian I (772–795), during which four individuals held this office: among these was the future Leo III, who held the post until his election as pope (LP I, 519 n. 77).

P.L. Galletti, *Del Vestarario di Santa Romana Chiesa*, Rome 1758; Duchesne LP I, pp. CLXII, CCXLIII-CCXLIV; Ph. Lauer, *Le Palais de Latran. Étude historique et archéologique*, Paris 1911; M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, II, Louvain 1948, 43, 70 and 73; H. Geertman, *More veterum. Il Liber Pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo*, Groningen 1975, 34, 63.

V. Fiocchi Nicolai

VESTMENTS, LITURGICAL. The garments worn by sacred ministers during religious functions. Although, as it seems, in the ancient religions (with special attention to *Judaism) it was a somewhat natural practice to put on special garments for particular cultic circumstances, the same thing cannot be said for the pre-Nicene church. Whether due to a spirit that sought distinction and contrast with practices and customs that recalled the ancient Jewish law, or due to the more restricted and reserved character of early Christian worship, the vestments ordinarily used in civil Greco-Roman life were also used for the liturgical office. However, it appears that the best or cleanest and, as it seems, white garments were soon reserved for the liturgical celebrations (Clem. of Alex., *Strom.* IV,22,141,4; *Canones Hipp.* 37 and then Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* I,29); it seems logical therefore to speak of garments since the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd c. which were reserved for liturgical use, although perfectly identical in form and cut with the vestments of daily living. One must turn to a statement from *Origen with caution when he asserts that "the priest uses certain garments when in the ministry of the sacrifices and others when he goes out in public" (*aliis indumentis sacerdos utitur dum est in sacrificiorum ministerio, et aliis cum procedit ad populum, In Lev. hom.* IV,6); the interpretive registers adopted here are undoubtedly twofold: one, real, referring to the OT text, the other, so to speak, moral, with respect to the path of the Pauline conception of ἐνδύειν. The same caution is also needed for one of *Jerome's statements, which very often depend on Origen; he seems to echo Origen when, choosing the word *habitus,* he maintains that "the divine religion has one attire in the ministry, another in common use and life" (*religio divina alterum habitum habet in ministerio, alterum in usu vitaque communi, In Ezech.* XIII,44,17ff.: PL 25,437). Such testimonies (see also Jer., *Ep.* 29,4 and 64,15) are therefore not specifically related, as is often claimed (see M. Righetti I,585), to specific liturgical Christian garments. Likewise unreliable, because of its well-known late composition (5th–6th c.), is a claim from the *Liber pontificalis* (XXIV,3) concerning the time of Pope *Stephen I (254–257): "He [i.e., Stephen I] established a law that priests and Levites not use sacred garments in daily use except in church" (*constituit sacerdotes et levitas ut vestes sacratas in usu cottidiano non uti, nisi in ecclesia*).

Mention is made of a ἱερὰ στολή in a revealing statement from *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*HE* 2,23: PG 82,1065), which refers to the 330s and reveals how, with the deregulation of worship and as a result of some privileges and honors obtained by the Christian religion in the 4th c., some clergy did not resist the temptation of using some precious materials in the making of their own garments to the point of enriching them often with every type of decoration and embroidery. Indeed, a certain reluctance was shown shortly thereafter by certain prominent individuals in the the church immediately after this custom spread, esp. in the West. *Augustine, e.g., who once emphasized the simplicity of his manner of dress—certainly referring to that of his liturgical ministry—not only publicly rejected such refinements but also disapproved of the tendency that fol-

lowed from them to make a distinction of clothing within the various levels of the clergy; moreover, he made it clear that every precious garment given to him with the purpose of distinction would be sold and the proceeds distributed to the poor (*Serm.* 356,13: PL 39,1579-1580 and see also *Epist.* 263,1: PL 33,1082). Pope *Celestine I also took a stance (428) against these attempts at a hieratic restoration of the priesthood, when he expressed regret for the initiative of some of the bishops of *Gaul to introduce certain distinctions in their clothing (*amicti pallio et lumbos praecincti*) that, in contrast to the customs of the Fathers, tended to give more value in the worship service to the letter and not the spirit of Sacred *Scripture (Lk 12:35). The clergy had to distinguish itself from the people "by teaching, not by garment; by way of living, not by dress; by purity of mind and not by purity of external forms of worship" (*doctrina, non veste; conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu, Epist.* 4,1,2: PL 50,430-431).

The substantial identity in the style between clothes commonly used in civil life (even by the clergy) and the garments reserved for liturgical actions seems, however, to have remained until secular fashion, esp. male, gradually changed, esp. with the impact of the barbarian manners and customs at the time of the invasions; it therefore came about that the old festal garments, then called "vestments," continued to be used by the ministers exclusively in the liturgical celebrations. All of this was because an understandable sense of the sacral inalterability which the traditions and customs tied to religion often take, and (as Theodoret and Augustine have already indirectly testified) for the same refinement with which such garments were often made and which arguably contributed to enhancing the sacredness and thus the very office of the priesthood. In fact, that at the end of the 5th c. there was already an awareness of a distinction between the two ways of dressing is deducible even from some ecclesiastical norms concerning the dress of the clergy even in civil life (see *Stat. Eccl. Ant.* 25-26: CCL 148,171), making it possible to preserve the ancient vestments. Thus, e.g., can. 5 of the Council of Mâcon (581 or 583) decrees, "Let no cleric presume to put on either worldly garment or shoes except what befits religion" (*nullus clericus sagum* [a shorter tunic] *aut vestimentum vel calceamenta saecularia, nisi quae religionem deceant induere praesumat*). Finally, it is important to remember how at the end of the 6th c. (but this must have already occurred earlier) we have indirect information of liturgical garments worn over ordinary clothes (can. 12 *Narbonne of 589).

Likewise for the East, a decree of the so-called Council of *Trullo II (691–692) explicitly prohibits the clergy from putting on unsanctioned garments (can. 27). It is, therefore, possible to conclude, in light of what has been said up to this point, that alongside what had become known as the "liturgical" vestments, the clergy were ordered to wear special clothes even in daily life. The simplicity of such dress was otherwise emphasized by the choice of rather simple material and by the prohibition of using showy colors (can. 1 of the aforementioned Council of Narbonne and can. 16 of the Second Council of *Nicaea of 787). But readers should consult, among other things, the studies written by Retzlaff and Innemée listed in the bibliography.

One should add that the more strictly liturgical vestments, along with the other insignia discussed below, because of a special symbolic meaning assigned to them by ancient (primarily early medieval) spirituality—and often inherent to their ancient use, form and *color—wound up becoming an integral part of the liturgical *actio*. Already can. 6 of the aforementioned Council of Mâcon (CCL 148A,224) orders, e.g., the archbishop not to celebrate the Mass without the pallium and, later, Amalarius (9th c.), in a more explicit way, would understand the vestments prescribed for the divine office as the *exemplum bonae conversationis* for the Christian people (*Lib. off.* II,15). It is certainly, therefore, to the "interpretation" of this symbolism perfectly understood for centuries—as elsewhere evidenced by the special orations that arose gradually during the years and repeated until 1969—that we owe, more or less, the preservation of this dress intact until our very day.

As far as the chronological limits assigned here allow, let us now discuss some of the various Western liturgical vestments, distinguishing them, as is usually done when evaluating them, between undergarments (alb and girdle, amice, cotta and rochet) and outer garments (chasuble, cope, dalmatic and tunic). Here I would include also the treatment of other vestments, classified by some as insignia, together with other specific signs of distinction among the various grades in the ecclesiastical hierarchy which are, therefore, organically a part of the liturgical wardrobe. Finally, the paraments for the Eastern rite (*Greek, *Syriac, *Armenian, *Nestorian-Chaldean and *Coptic) are less numerous than the Latin ones. More precise information, when necessary, will be given under their Western equivalent, although some iconographic references are reserved for the conclusion of this entry.

Alb. Derives from the *tunica talaris et manicata camisia* of the Romans which, broad and long, cov-

ered the entire body from the neck downward. It was also commonly called *camisia* because of its origin in the (shorter) secular garb, *alba* on account of its color (white), *linea* because of its material (linen) and also *colobium* (cut off), if the sleeves were short or completely missing. From the very beginning of Christianity it received a special meaning of purity and incorruptibility; for this reason it was put on by the faithful immediately after having received baptism (*see* "white," under *Color, Symbolism and Liturgy). As a special liturgical vestment of priests, it is mentioned in the West (398?) by can. 60 of the so-called IV Council of *Carthage (CCL 148,176), which allowed deacons to use it only *tempore oblationis . . . vel lectionis,* but also earlier in the East by *Eusebius of Caesarea (*HE* 10,4,2) with the term ποδήρης and by *John Chrysostom (*In Mt. hom.* 82,6), who instead calls it χιτωνίσκος. In the Byzantine rite, the στιχάριον, a garment put on by priests and deacons, would correspond to it.

Cingulum. The *cingulum* (ζώνη) was coupled with the alb. In ancient times it was tied around the waist when shown in public. It seems that Pope *Celestine I already alludes to one of its liturgical uses in the aforementioned letter to the bishops of *Gaul, setting forth again the traditional symbolic interpretation of Lk 12:35 (*in lumborum praecinctione castitas*). Along the same lines, see Amalarius (*Lib. off.* II,22,2).

Amice. Corresponds to the *humerale* or the *anagolaium* (see *ordo Rom.* I, 34: ed. Andrieu, II,78). In Greek one finds the terms ἀναβόλαιον, αὐάλαβος. It is a rectangular piece of material placed over the shoulders, before the alb, if done according to the Roman custom, and then made to pass under the armpits to tie the garments to the waist and allow for freer movement. At first, the privilege of the bishop of *Rome and his deacons, it extended during the Carolingian age to all clerics. With respect to its origins, various hypotheses have been proposed: some medieval liturgists such as Honorius of Autun (*Gemma animae* I,201) regarded it as deriving from the Hebrew ephod; during the modern era, it has been affirmed (O. Casel: JLW 1927, 139-141) that it came from the *amictus* of the Romans and their sacrifices or, more simply, from the *focale* or *sudarium,* which in civil life was placed around the neck to protect it from perspiration or the cold (J. Braun, *Die lit. Gew.,* 45-46). More broad and convincing testimonies have been brought forth by Callewaert (pp. 241-248) in favor of a monastic-Egyptian provenance. Amalarius (*Lib. off.* II,17), looking at the way in which the amice was worn (*collum undique cingimus*), believed that it symbolized restraint in the use of the tongue (*custodia vocis, castigatio vocis*). The same was said in Guillaume Durand's *Pontifical* (I,11,16: ed. Andrieu, 357), when the amice was placed on the head during the ordination of the subdeacon: a custom that can still be found in some ancient monastic orders.

Cotta and *rochet.* Regarded as modifications of the camisia, these are mentioned here to complete the essential framework of the undergarments, even if of a relatively late use. The cotta, which had broad and long sleeves, derived from the *superpelliceum,* a broad and comfortable alb used in liturgical functions above the everyday padded garments, esp. in the cold northern countries. Beginning as a choir garment (replacing the camisia among the lower clerics), it was gradually shortened to the knees.

The rochet (*rochetum*), mentioned for the first time in the Synod of Trier 1238 (Mansi XXIII,478), is distinguished from the cotta by narrow and shorter sleeves. It was worn directly over the cassock and was proper to prelates. It was never regarded as a liturgical vestment. Initially, hanging to the feet, it derived from the *camisia* or the *alba romana, succa* or the *subta* worn by medieval church officials as a daily garment and over which the liturgical alb was then placed.

Chasuble (φελίνιον). The outer garment that the priest uses to celebrate Mass. Historically the *planeta* or the *casula* derived from the *paenula* (φενόλιον), a heavily used overcoat in the Greco-Roman world until the 4th–5th c., designed primarily to protect the wearer from the rain or the cold or for traveling. It was a type of circular cloak into which the head was inserted through an opening from which a hood (*cucullus*) often hung. Having fallen into disuse in the civil realm, it remained in use among the clergy both in daily life and in the liturgical office. It seems initially to have appeared in this latter use under the name of *amphibalus* (see Sulp. Sev., *Dial.* I(II), 1,5ff.: CSEL 1,181).

The use of the chasuble, before the spread of the cope, does not seem to have been exclusively reserved for the Mass, and at Rome it was put on, although for different functions, by all the clerics; in the Gallican liturgy, however, its use was most likely restricted to bishops and priests (see Ps.-Germ. Par., *Exp. brevis ant. lit. gall.* II: PL 72,97). Already the object for some time of various decorative motifs and representations (generally Christ and the Virgin or the patron saint), which made it increasingly heavy, the *planeta* underwent various transformations that gradually shortened it, first only on the front side, then along the arms to become, from the 14th–15th c. until almost our own day, a type of

scapular. In the Eastern rite, it has generally preserved the ancient form.

For Amalarius (*Lib. off.* II,19,2 and 26,2) the *casula* refers to the *opera corporis pia* (*fames*, *sitis*, *vigiliae*, *nuditas*, etc.), which was proper to each member of the clergy. For other medieval authors such as Rupert of Deutz (*De div. off.* I, 22), it represented, instead, Christ's vestment, that is, the church.

Cope. According to J. Wilpert (I,84), it drew its origins, not so much from the *paenula* itself, as from the lengthening of the *lacerna* (a short summer cloak, open in front, lighter and more comfortable than the *paenula*) or from the *byrrhus* (see Aug., *Serm.* 356,13), with the hood, heavier and well-suited for winter. According to other scholars (see Callewaert, 227-228), it instead derived from the clerical and monastic *capa* or *cappa* from the 8th–9th c., worn primarily in choir when one was assisting at the lower functions or taking part in the processions. Over time, the hood was reduced to a type of shield (*clipeus*) laid out on the shoulders.

The cope seems to have been unknown until the 9th c. (Amalarius, in fact, does not mention it in his list of liturgical vestments); for one of its first symbolic meanings (= *sancta conversatio*), one must consult the work of Honorius of Autun (*Gemma animae* I,227).

Dalmatic and *tunic.* The dalmatic was a sort of cassock, with shorter and disproportionately broader sleeves, decorated with two purple perpendicular *clavi*. In ancient times, it was used as an outer garment by senators and noteworthy individuals. It came to make up part of the paraments that were proper to the pope, and subsequently it was a distinctive honorary garment granted by the Roman pontiff to his deacons, perhaps starting from the 4th c. (*LP* I,171). Gradually an object of privilege for the deacons of various churches, it began around the 9th c. to be worn by presbyters under the chasuble (see Walafrid Strabo, *De reb. eccl.* 24). It is certain, however, that in the West from the 9th c. onward the dalmatic was the outer liturgical garment of the deacon, although bishops and presbyters continued to wear it under the chasuble, adjusting it thereafter to the various colors of the chasuble.

In the investigation into the symbolic meaning of this vestment, Amalarius saw in the white dalmatic, which was intrinsic to the ministry of the deacon, the application of the biblical passage Jas 1:27, that is, *religio sancta et immaculata* and the purity in which those devoted to the *cura proximorum* are preserved (*Lib. off.* II,21 and 26,2).

One should regard the σάκκος as a type of dalmatic, a vestment used in the Greek rite. From a certain era onward, the bishops used this vestment to distinguish themselves from priests, to whom was reserved the φελόνιον.

The *tunicella* is the subdeacon's *dalmatica minor* or the *tunica stricta*. In its original form, it was without *clavi,* shorter and narrower, with long and cramped sleeves. Likewise remembered as a pontifical garment—one should interpret the *Ordo Romanus* I, n. 34 in this way, which speaks of the two dalmatics—it was the subdiaconal tunic already in the 6th c., but soon after was abolished by *Gregory the Great (*Reg. Epist.* IX,12: PL 77,956); the subdeacons, therefore, until the 9th c. put on the chasuble as a liturgical outer garment.

Both the dalmatic and the tunic, given their original white color, were always regarded as clothes of delight and, therefore, fitting for the liturgical days of joy and feast, but were prohibited during Advent and Lent, the exception being the Gaudete and Laetare Sundays.

It is fitting to consider now some other garments generally classified as distinct insignia of various levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. One of the first references to some of these is found in the writings of *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* XXIV,783ff.: CSEL 30,232-233).

Maniple. Subdiaconal insignia that derives from a type of cloth from a ceremony (*mappa*) that was very much in use at Rome. In the Roman rite it was more correctly registered under the term *mappula;* its equivalent in the Greek rite was *enchirion,* which in a way similar to the *epigonation* (a rigid rhomboid decoration that hung from the belt) was worn on the right-hand side and only by the bishop. The **Liber pontificalis* probably provides information on this parament first in the life of Pope *Sylvester (314–335), and then in that of Pope *Zosimus (417–418), when it speaks of a *pallium linostinum* that the deacons wore on the left-hand side (I,171.223). However, it did not remain for long as the prerogative of deacons alone.

Amalarius, who calls the maniple *sudarium,* discerns in it the "godly and worldly thoughts by which we wipe off the troubles of the soul from the weakness of the body" (*piae et mundae cogitationes, quibus detergimus molestias animi ex infirmitate corporis—Lib. off.* II,21,2). The 13th-c. Roman Pontifical interprets it, however, as the fruit of good works (IX,6: ed. Andrieu, p. 336).

The *epimanikia* (cuffs) which the Easterners wore at the end of each arm of the tunic resemble more the sleeves of a cotta.

Stole. According to Dix (p. 404), the stole is perhaps the most ancient insignia. It is similar to the

maniple and is a parament specific to the deacon, worn by him as in the manner of a shoulder strap; as worn by bishops and presbyters, however, it rests on the nape, with the ends hanging down in the front. The latter group, if dressed in a *camisia,* put it on crossed over the chest (can. 4 Braga from 675). The term *stola* spread greatly around the 9th c., although its original name was *orarium* (ὠράριον, ἐπιτραχίλιον), probably a sort of wrap around the mouth to protect it from the wind or something else (see Pincherle, 55) but which may have already become in civil life a distinctive sign of an office or dignity, if it is true that the Council of *Laodicea (end of 4th c.?*)* sought to prohibit the use of the *orarium* by subdeacons, lectors and cantors (can[s]. 22 and 23).

For Amalarius it is a sign that indicates humility, a virtue necessary for the deacon to complete the duties proper to his office; it represents, that is, the yoke of Christ, the gospel, *onus leve ac suave* (*Lib. off.* II,20 and 26,2).

In the East ὀθόνη is the term used by *Isidore of Pelusium; it seems to indicate the stole (*Epist.* 1,136). In describing the office of the deacon, here too the reminder is of the Lord's humility. The Greek ἐπιτραχήλιον, however, differs from the Western stole in that it has an opening through which the head passes and comes almost to the feet.

Pallium. Liturgical insignia reserved for the pope and the metropolitan *archbishops. It is made by a strip that circles like a ring around the neck, from which two short bands of equal size hung in front and in back. The use of the pallium in the Western church dates back to the 5th c. and probably derives from another liturgical insignia, the ὠμοφόριον already widespread around 400 among the bishops of the East. The once popular thesis promulgated by Th. Klauser (*Der Ursprung* . . . , 17-19.25 and nos. 23-36) that maintained that the *pallium* was derived from a secular vestment, a privilege of the dignitaries of the Byzantine court then extended to the episcopal authorities, today meets some reservations (Marinone, 95-96). It is certain, however, that at the beginning of the 5th c. Isidore of Pelusium (*Epist.* 1,136) developed its symbolic meaning and saw in it a representation of the spiritual power and the pastoral care that was proper to the bishop. In the West, the pallium, initially adopted as an exclusively papal insignia, starting from the 6th c. was a privilege that extended to the metropolitans and also some bishops.

Besides the *rationale* (*superhumerale*), a decorative collar with two appendages before and two worn over the chasuble as a sign of distinction by some bishops of Germany, France and Poland, one must keep in mind at this point some pontifical insignia: the miter, the pastoral staff, the ring, the pectoral cross, and other accessories such as gloves and shoes.

Miter (κάθαρις, *cidaris* for Jerome, *In Zach.* 1,3,1/5: CCL 76 A, 771): an ornamental hat, signifying the bishops' authority in specific ceremonies. Its origin as a liturgical insignia is uncertain. Parallels can be found in the *infula* or the *miter* (μίτρα) of the *pagan priests (see Virg., *Aen.* II,430; IX,616; X,538) or in the headgear of the Jewish priests (Ex 28:4, 40; 29:9; 39:28; Lev 8:9, 13). In the Christian world one finds the miter more often to indicate the headgear of consecrated virgins. This is the case in the writings of *Optatus of Milevis (*De schism. Don.* II,19). Jerome would subsequently speak about this (see also *Ep.* 64,3, 13, 18) and *Isidore of Seville (*Orig.* XIX, 31,4), distinguishing it from the *pileus*, which is proper to men. The ancient Mozarabic liturgy (*Lib. ord.* 23: ed. Férotin, ch[s]. 66-67) knew of the *impositio* of a *religiosa mitra* during the consecration of an *abbess. The evolution of this type of headgear as a liturgical emblem seems, however, to have occurred around the 9th c., and probably once, analogously for what occurred to other items of clothing, the liturgical *mitra* derived from the headgear, *camelaucium* (καμελαύκιον), which was very often used in ordinary life, primarily in the East, by the emperors and high officials. For the 8th c., the *Liber pontificalis* (I,390), in fact, provides information on a *camelaucium* used by the pope during solemn occasions.

Although in the West one finds a primitive wedge-shaped form, in the Eastern rite it assumed that of a crown (surmounted later by a cross) which, according to Dix (p. 407), seems to have had originated in the Persian turban.

The papal tiara (*LP* II,296,22) also seems to derive from the *camelaucium*. The *Ordo Romanus* XXXVI,55 perhaps alludes to it at the end of the 9th c., when it speaks of a *regnum,* in the form of a helmet of white cloth, which was placed on the head of the newly elected pope. It began to become differentiated from the miter probably when, with the army of the temporal papal power, a crown was added to it, gradually becoming three crowns (*triregnum*) in the 14th c.

Pastoral staff (*baculus, ferula, virga, cambuta*). Already designated by Pope *Celestine I (*Epist.* 4,1,2) as the symbol of *regimen pastorale*, can. 28 of the Synod of *Toledo of 633, the *Liber Ordinum,* 19 (ed. Férotin, cc. 59-60) and a 7th-c. penitential written by Theodore of Canterbury (PL 99,928-929) still refer to the pastoral staff with this name with respect to the consecration of an abbot. P. Radó (II,1468) believes that there was a probable Eastern

derivation of the liturgical use of the episcopal staff (ῥάβδος, βακτηρία).

With respect to its symbolic meaning, Isidore (*De eccl. off.* II,5,12) saw represented in it the episcopal authority and office. As a liturgical emblem, however, it did not enjoy a universal dissemination and, esp. at *Rome, it did not come into use until very late (Dix, 412 and n. 3).

Ring. Augustine seems to refer to an episcopal ring (*Epist.* 59[217],2: PL 33, 227). As an emblem of the bishop, however, it was mentioned for the first time in can. 28 of the IV Council of Toledo (633) at one with Isidore (*De eccl. off.* II,5,12) who explicitly represents it as a *signum pontificalis honoris*, *vel signaculum secretorum*. The use of the ring was first reserved for bishops, then passed on to the abbots. The so-called *annulus piscatoris* (fisherman's ring), however, that was used by the pope to seal the *breves* does not seem to have appeared until later (13th c.).

Pectoral cross (σταυρός). Decorated often with precious stones and with a relic inside, the pectoral cross was often worn dangling from the neck, primarily by bishops as a truly distinctive sign of their office. The first examples are rather late, and the first to speak about it was Pope Innocent III (*De sacro alt. myst.* I,53). It is only mentioned here because it has been presumed that one of its derivations was from the φυλακτήρια (as well as from the ἐγκόλπια), which was worn in ancient times by Christians on the chest (see Jerome, *In Matth.* IV,23,5) and which in different ways enclosed relics, sacred objects or even sayings from the gospels.

Gloves (*chirothecae,* χειροθήκη). Scholars likewise do not know exactly when these began to be used in the liturgy; it has been suspected by some that this occurred as early as the 6th c. (DACL 6,624-627), but it most certainly can be traced, according to the witness of some inventories, to the 9th c. The use of gloves properly speaking perhaps remained unknown in the East; in practice, however, they were replaced, as was shown, by the ἐπιμανίκια (embroidered cuffs).

Shoes. Shoes consisted of an external part, the sandal (*campagus*), and an inner part, the sock (*udo, caliga*). Already used by the upper classes, they must have been a liturgical emblem. Gregory the Great, e.g., speaks of them in the letter he sent to Bishop *John of Syracuse (*Epist.* VIII,27). At that time it was reserved for the popes and Roman deacons. They were regarded by Amalarius (*Lib. off.* II,25,1ff.) as a symbol of preaching.

Finally, for the sake of completeness, it should be remembered that among the papal paraments were included the *fada* (a broad petticoat that dragged on the ground and was buckled at the hips), the *succinctorium* (worn tied to the right of the belt) and the *fano*, an oval-shaped garment worn on the arm over the chasuble and often confused with the amice and the maniple, which were likewise called *fano, phano,* as occurred with the *velum* (see Radó II,1459-1460), upon which the celebrant offered the eucharistic bread. The aforementioned papal emblems were generally not mentioned during the Middle Ages.

With respect to the most ancient iconographic documentation, one should just note the most revealing examples (other information can be found in the bibliography). In the mosaic of S. Agnese Extra Muros at Rome (7th c.), one of the two popes is wearing the white tunic and, over it, a chasuble and pallium. St. Sixtus and St. Optatus, in the fresco of the crypt of Pope *Cornelius (6th–7th c.), in the area of the catacomb of St. *Callistus, also wore an ample chasuble on which the pallium stands out. Pope *Sylvester is also represented dressed in papal clothes in the mosaic of S. Martino ai Monti (5th c.) at Rome. In the fresco of the crypt of the "Velatio" (end of the 3rd c.), in the Roman cemetery of Priscilla, one can decipher in the left group a representation of a bishop with his deacon. The question remains, however, very controversial (see C. Carletti: VetChr 9 [1972] 124-126). In the mosaics of the basilica of S. Vitale at Ravenna (6th c.), Ecclesius and *Maximian seem to be wearing a stole rather than a pallium. Examples then of the monastic garb (8th c.) are revealed in the frescoes of the Roman monastery of St. Sabas and in the oratory connected to the basilica of S. Ermete on the Salaria Vetus. Among the numerous examples of **encolpia,* or pectoral crosses, one should note the beautiful example in the Monza cathedral sent by *Gregory the Great to Queen *Theodelinda.

In addition to consulting the various entries found in the EC, DCA (1880; repr. 1968) and in the ODC ([3]2005) and the respective entries the most recent citations, one should consult also: LMA 5 (1991) 1197-1204; DSp 16 (1994) 511-516; DIP 9 (1997) 1951-1959; Cath 15 (2000) 954-964; TRE 13, 159-167; ODB 2, 1240; Coptic Enc. 5, 1475-1479; RBK 5, 741-775; EAM 1, 39-48; for the widest treatments on the topic, the following two studies remain very useful: J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik*, Freiburg i.B. 1907; and *Die liturgische Paramente in Gegenwart und Vergangenheit*, Freiburg i.B. [2]1924, revision of his *Handbuch der Paramentik,* for which there is an Italian version, edited by G. Alliod (*I Paramenti sacri. Loro uso, storia e simbolismo*, Turin 1914). Certainly more rigorous, however, are the contributions offered by P. Batiffol and C. Cecchelli (see below). One should also note, moreover, for some historical notes: G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London [2]1945 (1975), 350, 398-416; P. Radó, *Enchiridion Liturgicum* II, Rome 1961, 1443-1479; P. Borella, *Il rito ambrosiano*, Brescia 1964,

442-445; M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia Liturgica*, Milan [3]1964, 584-642; W.J. Grisbrooke, *Vestments*, in Ch. Jones - G. Wainwright - E. Yarnold (eds.), *The Study of Liturgy*, London 1978, 488-492, although, for the more specific aspects, see: L. Eisenhofer, *Das bischöfliche Rationale. Seine Entstehung und Entwicklung*, Munich 1904; C. Callewaert, *Sacris Erudiri. Fragmenta liturgica collecta . . .* , Steenbrugge 1940, 211-250; P. Salmon, *Étude sur les insignes du pontife dans le rite romain*, Rome 1955; P. Salmon, *La "ferula," bâton pastoral de l'Évêque de Rome*: RSR 30 (1956) 313-327; P. Salmon, *Aux origines de la Crosse des Évêques*, in *Mélanges M. Andrieu*, Strasbourg 1957, 373-383; P. Salmon, *Mitra und Stab. Die Pontifikalinsignien im römischen Ritus*, Mainz 1960; Th. Klauser, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte*, in JbAC Erg. 3, Münster W. 1974, 195-211 (art. from 1949); B. Sirch, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Mitra und päpstlichen Tiara*, St. Ottilien 1975; L. Trichet, *Le costume du clergé*, Paris 1986. For the Eastern and Byzantine liturgy, in addition to E. Trenkle, *Liturgische Geräte und Gewänder der Ostkirche*, Munich 1962, and A. Papas, *Bibliografia sulle vesti religiose e liturgiche del rito bizantino*: Θεολογία 52 (1981) 754-778 (written in Greek); for a specific bibliography on various rites and for the terminological similarities of individual garments, see J. Assfalg - P. Krüger, *Kleines Wörterbuch des Christlichen Orients*, Wiesbaden 1975, s.v. *Liturgische Gewänder*. Useful, for the individuation of symbolic and eucological aspects, see R. Bornert, *Les Commentaires Byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VII[e] au XV[e] siècle*, Paris 1966.

On the correct meaning of some terms, the following works, among others, have provided an in-depth treatment: S. Bertina, Ὀθόνια *ex papyrorum testimoniis linteamenta*: Studia papyrologica 4 (1965) 27-38; A. Pincherle, *Orarium* e *Sudarium*: RSLR 9 (1973) 52-56; G.J.M. Bartelink, Φυλακτήριον*-phylacterium*: Mélanges Chr. Mohrmann, Utrecht-Amsterdam 1973, 25-69. For research on the iconographic witnesses, see in addition to G. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane*, Rome 1903, the contribution offered by P. Batiffol, *Le costume liturgique romain*: Études de Liturgie et d'Archéologie chrétienne, Paris 1919, 30-83, that of C. Cecchelli, *La vita di Roma nel Medio Evo*, I,2: *Le arti minori e il costume*, Rome 1960, 755-840 and esp. 933-1011, and for a more particular aspect, that of M. Marinone, *Un'antica testimonianza iconografica sull'uso della stola diaconale in Occidente*: EphLit 90 (1976) 88-99.

For the East, see N. Thierry, *Le costume épiscopal byzantin du IX[e] au XIII[e] s. d'après les peintures datées (miniatures, fresques)*: REByz 24 (1966) 308-315; id., *Les plus anciennes représentations cappadociennes du costume épiscopal byzantin*: REByz 34 (1976) 325-331; C. Walter, *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church*, London 1982; A. Papas, *Die Ideen des 7. Ökumenischen Konzils über die kirchliche Kunst und die Paramentenpracht des Byzantinischen Ritus*: AHC 20 (1988) 370-378; K.C. Innemée, *Ecclesiastical Dress in the Medieval Near East*, Leiden 1992. Finally, on the religious garment in general, s.v. *Abito religioso* and *Costume dei monaci e dei religiosi*: DIP I (1974), 50-79 and III (1976), 204-249; M. Augé, *L'abito religioso*, Rome 1977; G. Retzlaff, *Die äussere Erscheinung des Geistlichen im Altag*: Intern. kirchliche Zeit. 69 (1979) 46-57, 88-115, 129-208; M. Boulding, *Background to a Theology of the Monastic Habit*: The Downside Review 98 (1980) 110-123; *Liturgia*, ed. D. Sartore - A.M. Triacca - C. Cibien, Cinisello Balsamo 2001, 141-149; S. Pricoco, *Il monachesimo*, Bari 2003, 120-126.

V. Pavan

VICTOR (6th c.). African Catholic bishop of an unknown see, during the reign of the *Vandal Thrasamund (d. 523), who was sent into exile to *Sardinia, just as many other proponents among the Catholic clergy were (508/509). Over the course of his episcopate, he became interested in the theological questions pertaining to the *Acacian *schism, and between 519 and 523, he signed the letters written by *Fulgentius of Ruspe to the *Scythian monks (*Ep*. 17: CCL 91A,563-615) and the *archimandrite John of Constantinople (*Ep*. 15: CCL 91A,447-457).

PCBE 1, 1183; Y. Modéran, *La chronologie de la vie de saint Fulgence et ses incidences sur l'histoire de l'Afrique vandale*: MEFRA 105 (1993) 135-188.

P. Marone

VICTOR (Vincent), Donatist. A proponent of the Rogatist *Donatist movement who converted to Catholicism, identified by some scholars as the similarly named Catholic bishop *Victor of Cartenna (De Veer). Around 418 Victor composed a work in two books taking as his point of departure one of *Augustine's writings (*Ep*. 190: CSEL 57,137-162), which he had found in *Mauritania Caesarea in the home of a Spanish priest by the name of Peter. This work, which must have surely been dedicated to the priest Peter, has been lost, but on the basis of books 3 and 4 of the Augustine's *De natura et origine animae* (CSEL 60,359-419), which refutes it, one can say with certainty that it treated the question of the soul's origin and that in a not-so-orthodox manner it came, e.g., to maintain that souls were corporeal, preexistent and identifiable with God.

Augustine, *Retractationes* II, 56: CCL 57, 135; PCBE I, 1173-1175; A. De Veer, BA 22, 763-764; A. Zumkeller, *anima: et eius origine (De)*: Augustinus-Lexikon, I, 1986-94, 340-350.

P. Marone

VICTOR I, pope (189?–198?). With Victor the *papacy entered a new phase of its history. For the first time, the interventions of the Roman community became concretized in the person of its bishop and this in a matter of universal discipline, namely that of the celebration of *Easter (Eus., *HE* 5,23-24). With the exception of the church of *Ephesus under *Polycrates (Eus., *HE* 5,24,1-8), all the communities shared the Roman tradition of celebrating the Easter feast on Sunday, instead of 14 Nisan, although not all—e.g., *Irenaeus of Lyons (Eus., *HE* 5,24,1-18)—approved of the authoritarian procedures employed by the Roman bishop. Victor showed him-

self no less decisive in the face of adoptionism, excommunicating *Theodotus the Elder (the Tanner). Victor's writings have not been preserved. They are only mentioned by *Eusebius (*HE* 5,28,6.9) and *Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 34).

BS 12, 1281-1285; H. von Campenhausen, *Ostertermin oder Osterfasten. Zum Verständnis des Irenäusbriefes an Viktor*: VChr 28 (1974) 114-138; J.A. Fischer, *Synoden im Osterfeststreit*: AHC 8 (1976) 15-39; R. Cantalamessa, *La Pasqua nella Chiesa antica*, Turin 1978 (Ger. trans. Bern 1981); P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen*, Tübingen [2]1989, 323-341; E. dal Covolo, *Letteratura cristiana*: RSLR 29 (1991) 213-221; LTK[3] 10 767; LACL (2002) 717 (bibl.); TRE 25, 93-97.

B. Studer

VICTOR of Antioch. Presbyter (around 500), is known, mistakenly, as the author of a commentary on the gospel of *Mark; in reality, the text attributed to him is part of a **catena* whose chief sources are the homilies on *Matthew by *John Chrysostom, *Origen, *Cyril of Alexandria, *Titus of Bostra and *Theodore of Heraclea. Scholars must first clarify, however, whether the author of this compilation, who evidently uses the *catena* on Matthew in its primitive form, is the same author of the **scholia* on the OT and NT texts which, in different catenae manuscripts, go under the name of Victor. We have no information on the life of this individual.

CPG III, 6529; C.F. Matthaei, Βίκτωρος πρεσβυτέρου Ἀντιοχείας κατ' ἄλλων τινῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐξήγησις εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον, 2 vols., Moscow 1775; Commentaries on Luke in A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita*, 9, Rome 1837, 633-693. Fragments of his exegesis on Jeremiah and Jeremiah's Lamentations are found in M. Ghislerius, *In Ieremiam Prophetam Commentarii*, Leiden 1623; the individual scholia on the book of Deuteronomy, the books of the Judges and Kings, as well as the book of Daniel, are of little importance. PWK 8 A, 2066; LTK[3] 10, 791; EC 12, 1540; Altaner, *Patrologia*, 479; Beck 420-421; M. Cahill, *The Identification of the First Markan Commentary*: RBi 1001 (1994) 258-268; T. Fuhrer, *Victor von Antiochien*: LACL, 624.

J. Irmscher

VICTOR of Capua (d. 554). Victor, who died on 2 April 554, according to a funerary inscription, was bishop of *Capua for 13 years and 34 days (CIL X,4503). He was a person of learning exemplified by his knowledge of Greek, mathematics, astronomy and music, and he was well-versed in theology and exegesis as well. The Venerable *Bede writes concerning him that he was a *vir doctissimus et sanctissimus* (*De rat. temp.* 51: PL 90,502B). Victor was asked for his opinion on the Easter *computus, and he preferred that of the Alexandrians (E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, Tübingen 2, 307-308); he composed a *Libellus de cyclo paschali* on this matter (PL 68,1097-1098; PLS 4,1194-1195), a text used by Bede and also mentioned by Adonis (PL 123,108), only fragments of which have been preserved, in which one finds a discussion on this matter offered by *Victorius of Aquitaine. Other fragments are found in the writings of *John the Deacon (CPL 951) and have been collected by Pitra (*Spicilegium Sol.* 1,296-301).

Pitra published a long fragment of another work by Bishop Victor (the six fragments in reality constitute one sole passage: *Spicilegium Sol.* I,287-289; PLS 4,1194-1196), that is, the *Reticulus* (*de Arca Noe*), which in the **catena*, still unedited, by *Paul the Deacon is referred to as the *Libellus*. In this text, taking into consideration the dimensions of Noah's ark, Victor speculates on the numbers and their symbolic meaning, connecting them to Christ along the lines of preceding tradition, esp. *Augustine; he practiced arithmological/christological exegesis. Alcuin cites a passage from one of Victor's otherwise unknown works, the *Liber sponsorum* (*responsorum*) (part of which was written by Pelagius), and another by his supposed version of a work by *Cyril of Alexandria (PLS 4,1191). He certainly translated from the Greek: Pitra published Origenian passages translated from some commentaries on *Genesis and *Exodus, and other passages translated from the Greek (Pitra I,267-268; PLS 4,1191-1193). A fragment from another one of his lost works has been preserved: *Capitula de resurrectione Domini* (PLS 4,1196-1197). Paul the Deacon (*see* *John III, pope) provides, in the *catena*, other fragments from the writings of Victor of Capua (PLS 4,1197-1199).

Victor's most important work was the revision of the **Diatessaron*, *Tatian's work, which he called the *Diapente*, the continuous narration of the four gospels, and normalizes it on the basis of the Vulgate text (Victor says of this: *unum ex quatuor evangelium compositum*). In the *Praefatio in evangelicas harmonias Ammonii*, he reveals the state of his soul when faced with an unusual text and its concerns. He says that by chance that text had come into his hands, but without the author's name; *Eusebius of Caesarea came to know that it could be the work of Tatian, a heretic; for this reason he takes a precautious and circumspect stance toward the orthodoxy of the work; moreover, Victor added to it the canons of Ammonius/Eusebius, that is, the references to the four gospels, before the text and wrote the reference numbers in the margin in such a way that the reader (*studiosus lector*) could check the authenticity and

precision of the gospel text cited. The *Codex Fuldensis* contains the entire NT, lists of liturgical readings of the Pauline epistles for the different liturgical feasts and also other texts, among which was the apocryphal *Epistle to the *Laodiceans.* The transcription and revision of the work were completed in the spring of 546, and the work was revisited in 547: two signatures guarantee the dates. The manuscript, perhaps belonging to St. Boniface (d. 754), is preserved at Fulda (*Codex Fuldensis*) and is an exceptional testimony to the Vulgate. The work edited by Victor was used by translators in the ancient German. Pitra also published (*Spicilegium Sol.* 1,265-277) the *Scholia Veterum Patrum* (*Polycarp, but in actuality only *Pacatus, *Origen, *Basil, *Didymus and *Severian), which were passed down by Victor.

Morin attributes to him the letter (PL 30,501-504; see RBen 7 [1890] 416-423) addressed to Constantius of Aquino (bishop between the years 525/573). The author refers to the lectionary as *Comes* and distinguishes its two types: one destined for liturgical use and the other for instruction. Because Victor in the *Codex Fuldensis* had inserted a list of readings, it is entirely likely that he was able to compose a lectionary, concerning which the letter speaks. The lectionary, however, was revised or rather changed in subsequent times, but the accompanying explanatory letter had a separate fate.

CPL 953a-956; R. Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclés. latins de l'antiquité et du Haut Moyen Âge*, Freiburg 2007, 810; Stegmüller 1279, Suppl. 8286, 2-5; CPPM 2A, 2960/2960c; PL 68, 251-252 (*Praefatio in evangelicas armonias*); PL 90, 502; 68, 1097 (fragment from the Easter cycle); PLS 4, 1183-1199 (the fragments of all the writings); DCB 4, 1009-1010; DTC 15, 2874-2876; BS 12, 1253-1255; E. Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, Marburg and Leipziag 1868; Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des N.T. Kanons*, II,1, Erlangen-Leipzig 1890, 574ff.; L. de Bruyne, *La préface du Diatessaron latin avant Victor de Capoue*: RBen 49 (1927) 5-11; P. McGurk, *The Canon Tables in the Book of Lindisfarne and the Codex Fuldensis of Victor of Capua*: JTS 6 (1955) 192-198; F. Bolgiani, *Vittore di Capua e il Diatessaron*: Memorie Accad. Sc. Torino, Cl. Sc. Mor. 4a,2, Turin 1962 (foundational); B. Fischer, *Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters*, in *La Bibbia nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane del Centro Italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, X, Spoleto 1963, 519-600 (Victor: 545-555); T. Baarda, *Essays on the Diatessaron*, Kampen 1994; W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship*, Leiden 1994; U.B. Schmid, *In Search of Tatian's Diatessaron in the West*: VChr 57 (2003) 176-199.

A. Di Berardino

VICTOR of Cartenna. African bishop and writer of the 5th c., mentioned only by *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 77), who attributes to him the lost treatise *Adversus Arianos* dedicated to *Genseric (428–477); a book on public *penance that perhaps is to be identified with the Ps.-Ambrosian *De paenitentia,* which has come down to us in two codices under the name of Victor of Tunnuna; a consolatory work, now lost, dedicated to a certain Basil for the death of his son (the attempt to identify this work with the *De consolatione in adversis* attributed to *Basil of Caesarea is less likely: PG 31,1687-1704); and numerous homilies collected in books by the bishop's brother, which are likewise lost. The *De paenitentia* is an exhortation that emphasized the function of repentance for the remission of sins and the confidence inspired by divine mercy, which is to forgive even the person who has fallen into sin again (there is a discussion whether the treatise was referring only to divine forgiveness or also to the repetition of confession before a bishop or a priest).

CPL 854: PL 17, 971-1004 (1059-1094); DTC 15, 2876-2877; Moricca III, 1, 746-747; PCBE 1, 1175; F. Görres, *Der echte und falsche Victor von Cartenna*: ZWTh 49 (1906) 484-494; B. Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbuße im Ausgang des christlichen Altertums*, Munich 1928, 166-171; J.T. Cummings, *Jubilation or Ululation? Patristic Testimony for the Old Latin, Especially Ps. 88,16*: SP 18,1 (1985) 311-312; Patrologia 4, 21-23; LTK[3] 10, 764; BBKL 12, 1343-1344.

F. Scorza Barcellona

VICTOR of Marseille (d. 287/292). At *Marseille around 416 *John Cassian built two *monasteries outside the city in a cemeterial area: one for women (Holy Savior) and the other for men (St. Peter). The latter would become the monastery of St. Victor in memory of the martyr buried onsite. According to the 5th-6th-c. testimonies, which are greatly embellished, Victor was a soldier who refused to worship the *pagan divinities. Thrown into prison, he became a convert to Christianity. After various tortures, he and other Christians were decapitated and thrown into the sea, but they were discovered by some Christians, who buried them in the pagan cemetery near the port. Recent digs carried out in the crypt of the monastery of St. Victor revealed the existence of a martyrial Christian cult in a pagan cemetery. The archaeological testimonies confirm later traditions. Scholars have discussed whether Victor is the proper name of a martyr or rather a personalization of the Christian victory over paganism, or even the use of a known name for anonymous deceased and venerated persons onsite. The name Victor at that time was very widespread. The first testimony of a basilica dedicated to St. Victor dates to the end of the 6th c. His feast day is 21 July.

BHL 8569-8572; AASS *Iulii* 5, 135-142; BS 12, 1261-1273; Cath 13, 605-606; BBKL 21, 1510-1511; *Provinces ecclésiastiques de Vienne*

et d'Arles, ed. N. Gauthier - J.Ch. Picard, Paris 1986, 129-130; J.-C. Moulinier, *Saint Victor de Marseille: les récits de sa passion*, Vatican City [2]1995; Y. Mafart, *L'Abbaye Saint-Victor de Marseille: étude anthropologique de la nécropole des Ve et VIe siècles*, Paris 1980; J.-C. Moulinier, *Autour de la tombe de saint Victor de Marseille: textes et monuments commémoratifs d'un martyre*, Marseille 2000; M. Fixot - J.-P. Pellettier, *Saint-Victor de Marseille, de la basilique paléochrétienne à l'abbatiale médiévale*, Marseille 2004.

A. Di Berardino

VICTOR of Tunnuna (d. after 566). African bishop of the 6th c. (the name of his see is uncertain in the manuscript tradition of his work just as in *Isidore of Seville [*Vir. ill.* 49.50 and *Chron.* 1]). He was opposed to the condemnation of the *Three Chapters, and for this reason around 555 he was sent into exile in *Egypt by *Justinian. Called back in 564–565 to *Constantinople so that he might sign the condemnation, he held to his convictions and for this reason was locked in a *monastery of that city, where he died shortly after 566. He was the author of a *Chronicle* that began from the creation of the world and ended with the first year of the emperor Justinian (566). Only the part pertaining to the years 444–566 remains. The work is interesting for the religious history of the 5th–6th c. and for the information on the author's personal experiences. Until the year 443, Victor's *Chronicle* must have appealed to *Prosper of Aquitaine's *Chronicle,* as is acknowledged at the beginning of a long fragment that has survived.

CPL 2260: PL 68, 941-962; Th. Mommsen, *Chronica minora* 2 (MGH, *Auct. ant.* 11), Berlin 1894, 163-206; CCL 173A (ed. C. Cardelle de Hartmann, 2001). *Chronica: Chiesa e impero nell'età di Giustiniano*, ed. A. Placanica, Impruneta 1997; DTC 15, 2880-2881; EC 12, 1543; Moricca III, 2, 1364-1366; J. Fitton, *The Death of Theodora*: Byzantion 46 (1976) 119; S. Teillet, *Des Goths à la nation gothique. Les origines de l'idée de nation en Occident du Ve au VIIe siècle*, Paris 1984, 421-427; S. Muhlberger, *Prosper's Epitome Chronicon: Was There an Edition of 443?*: CPh 81 (1986) 240-244; A. Placanica, *Da Cartagine a Bisanzio: per la biografia di Vittore di Tunnuna*: VetChr 26 (1989) 327-336; Patrologia 4, 38-40; LTK[3] 10, 770; A. Placanica, *De epistola Vigilio supposita animadversiones in Victorem Tunnunensem* (*Chr.a. 542,1*): Latinitas 38 (1990) 25-33; C. Cardelle de Hartmann, *Victoris de Tunnuna, Consularia Caesaraugustana*: CCL 175/A (2001).

F. Scorza Barcellona

VICTOR of Vita (ca. 429–510/512). Bishop and author of a history on the *Vandal persecution in *Africa at the time of *Genseric and *Huneric. There has been much discussion on the identification of this Victor—author of the *Historia,* who was called a bishop in the manuscript tradition—with the bishop Victor Vitensis, mentioned in the *Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae* (list of African bishops from the Carthaginian council of 484) in the section reserved for the bishops of *Byzacena (*Victor Vitensis non occurrit*). This identification conflicts with the information that the author supplies about himself in the *Historia,* from which it turns out that at the time of the events narrated he was not the bishop of Vita but instead belonged to the Carthaginian clergy (see *Hist.* II,5; II,18; II,27; II,40; III,49 etc.). That he was not a bishop but a simple priest is evident, moreover, from the way in which he speaks about the bishops, referring to them always in the third person and never including himself in their number (*Hist.* II,53-55; III,2; III,5) and, from the very fact that he did not undergo with them the exile that followed the failure of the council of 484 (*Hist.* III, 15ff.). The aforementioned bit of information indicated in the manuscript tradition must not, therefore, be understood in the sense that Victor was the bishop of Vita (*episcopus Vitensis*) during the persecution, but that Vita was his city of birth (*patriae Vitensis*), and that he, a priest of *Carthage until the death of Huneric, only subsequently became bishop of Vita or of another see unknown to us. It is difficult to determine the year of Victor's birth. The fact that the events pertaining to the landing of the Vandals (429) and the reign of Genseric (*Hist.* I) are narrated in more general terms than those pertaining to the reign of Huneric (*Hist.* II-III), and the fact that for the first books the author seems to be using earlier sources, although for the reign of Huneric he appeals to his own personal testimony, leads one to suspect that in 429 Victor had not yet been born or had just been born. This conjecture is confirmed by the information that when Valerian of Abensa was banished by Genseric (after 455), Victor still did not hold the priestly office (*Hist.* I,40), which was usually assumed around 30 years of age. The date of his death is also uncertain. According to Chifflet and Liron, Victor was that bishop of Byzacena who in 507 ordained *Fulgentius of Ruspe and shortly thereafter was exiled by Thrasamund to *Sardinia, where he died around 510 or 512.

Victor's work—which in the archetype has the title of *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae temporum Geiserici et Hunerici regis Vandalorum*—begins with a prologue (the authenticity and literary unity of which has been wrongly doubted) that is a letter of dedication to an authoritative individual of the church, most likely the bishop of Carthage *Eugenius. The historical narration that follows is subdivided into three books: book 1 contains the events from the reign of Genseric from 429 (the year of the

invasion) until 477 (the death of Genseric); book 2 narrates the events of the reign of Huneric from 477 to February 484 (Council of Carthage); to this book is added the *Liber fidei catholicae,* presented to the *Arians by four delegate bishops, in order to explain the Catholic doctrine, after the failure and suspension of the council of 484, and written, as it seems, by Eugenius with the collaboration of other bishops; book 3 narrates the events from February to the summer of 484 (the last ch., 71, which narrates the death of Huneric is an addition). The work concludes with an invective against the barbarians and a call for help to both God and men (chs. 61-70). The *Historia* was written at Carthage during the persecution, before the death of Huneric. The author himself provides at the beginning explicit chronological information: "Now [this] is the sixtieth year from that time in which that cruel and savage people of the Vandal nation arrived at the pitiable borders of Africa" (*sexagesimus nunc agitur annus ex eo, quo populus ille crudelis ac saevus Vandalicae gentis Africae miserabiles attigit fines,* I,1).

The dating of the work therefore depends on the year from which this *sexagesimus* begins, that is, from 429, the year of the invasion of the Vandals, or from 430, as soon as the occupation was completed, or from 425, the time of the first raid. We would thus have the year 488, 489 or even 484. This last date is most likely, inasmuch as it would also justify the final invocation of aid directed to the Romans, which suggests an untenable situation of extreme danger, which occurred immediately after the failure of the council of February 484.

Victor's *Historia* is an account of the persecution of the Catholic African church by the Vandal Arians, produced with the passion of a man belonging to the suffering party, and therefore it is not void of sectarianism and partiality. The reason for which this text was written is indicated in the prologue, which was addressed, it seems, to Bishop Eugenius: it offers to the recipient, according to what was requested, an exposition of the deeds that had occurred in Africa after the Vandal invasion, given that the same author knows how to elaborate them suitably, providing literary value to that material that was still unpolished. It is likely that Eugenius, who came to fill the episcopal cathedra of Carthage during the persecution, had asked Victor for an account of the Vandal occupation, to report them in turn to the Roman emperor and to set forth the urgency for immediate assistance. The *Historia* was, therefore, written in order to inform the Romans beyond the sea, by means of Eugenius, about the dramatic situation in Africa and to request assistance from the Roman emperor. Despite the limits due to the apologetic intent and the partisan passion, and despite some imprecisions and contradictions (which are not such, however, as to compromise the overall reliability of the narrative), and despite the exaggerations, fancies, and the irrational interpretation of the events and, in general, the naive theological interpretation of those events, and even despite the skewed perspective that he mechanically places before the Vandals and the Romans as Arians and Catholics, Victor's work has exceptional historical value, both because it is the sole source for many of the events narrated and because it offers the modern historian important pieces of historical, political, and geographic information, and for the various documents inserted in the narrative, among which the three edicts of Huneric are esp. significant (II,3-4; II,39; III,3-14), that shed light on barbarian-Roman law.

Victor's language, although with certain popularizing tendencies of common parlance, is that of the learned Carthaginian circles of the 5th c., with all the changes that the times and social and religious conditions of Africa and the influence of the biblical and liturgical literature brought to bear on it. The writer, although at times indulging in amplification and prolixity, is an effective storyteller who knows how to intrigue and captivate his readers.

CPL 798ff.; PL 58; MGH, *Auct. ant.* 3,1, Berlin 1879; CSEL 7, Vienna 1881. *Translations:* It.: S. Costanza, Rome 1981; Eng.: J. Moorhead, Liverpool 1992.

Studies: A. Schönfelder, *De Victori Vitensi episcopo*, Breslavia 1899; G. Ghedini, *Le clausole ritmiche dell'Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae di Victor de Vita*, Milan 1927; G. Capello, *Il latino di Vittore di Vita*: Atti della XXV riun. della Soc. It. delle Scienze a Tripoli, 25 (1937) 74-108; F. Di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei papi e nei documenti della cancelleria romana dal IV al XIV sec.*, III, Rome 1946, ch. V: *Il ritmo prosaico nelle cancellerie dei regni romano-barbarici*, 49ff.; Chr. Courtois, *Victor de Vita et son oeuvre*, Alger 1954; id., *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, Paris 1955 (repr. Aalen 1964); D. Romano, *Osservazioni sul prologo alla Historia di Vittore Vitense*: AAPal ser. IV, 20 (1959-60), I, 19-36 (= *Lett. e Storia nell'età tardoromana*, Palermo 1979, 155-172); S. Costanza, *Uandali-Ariani e Romani Catholici nella Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae di Vittore di Vita*: Oikoumene. Studi paleocr. in on. del Conc. Vat. II, Catania 1964, 223-241; S. Costanza, *Considerazioni storiografiche nella Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae di Vittore di Vita*: BStudLat 6 (1976) 30-36; L. Alfonsi, *L'Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae di Vittore Vitense, ovvero il rifiuto di un ipocrita rinunciatorismo velleitario: "Romani" e "barbari"*: Sicul. Gymn. n.s. 29 (1976) 1-18; A. Roncoroni, *Vittore Vitense, Hist. III, 55-60*: Sicul. Gymn. n.s. 29 (1976), 387-395; A. Pastorino, *Osservazioni sulla "Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae" di Vittore di Vita*, in *La storiografia eccl. nella tarda antichità*, Messina 1980, 45-112; S. Costanza, *Vittore di Vita e la "Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae"*: VetChr 17 (1980) 229-268; R. Pitkäranta, *Studien zum Latein des Victor Vitensis*, Helsinki 1978 (see the review by S. Costanza: Orpheus 2 [1981]

223-232); Ph. Wynn, *Rufinus of Aquileia's Ecclesiastical History and Victor of Vita's History of the Vandal Persecution*: Classica et Mediaevalia 41 (1990) 187-198; S. Lancel, *Victor de Vita et la Carthage vandale*, in *L'Africa romana* VI/2, 649-661; A. Schwarcz, *Bedeutung und Textüberlieferung der Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae des Victor von Vita*, in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. A. Scharer - G. Scheibelreiter, Vienna 1994, 115-140; Patrologia IV, 35-38; W.E. Fahey, *History, Community, and Suffering in Victor of Vita*, in *Nova Doctrina Vetusque: Essays on Early Christianity in Honor of Fredric W Schlatter*, ed. D. Kries - C. Brown Tkacz, Bern 1999, 225.241; S. Lancel, *Victor de Vita, témoin et chroniqueur des années noires de l'Afrique romaine au Ve siècle*: CRAI (2000) 1199-1219; V. Aiello, *Vittore di Vita e la legislazione vandalica*: Atti Acc. Rom. Costant. 15 (2005) 253-283.

S. Costanza

VICTORINUS, poet (5th c.?). Dekkers (CPL 1458-1459) attributes to a *Victorinus poeta,* who lived perhaps in the 5th c., two short poems: the first, which goes by the name of *De Pascha* (var.: *De cruce* or *De ligno vitae*, which begins: *Est locus ex omni medius* . . .), wrongly attributed to *Tertullian or *Cyprian, and the other *De Iesu Christo Deo et homine*, which begins: *Verbum Christe Dei, Patris* . . . Indeed, this attribution is still disputed, and scholars have even debated the very existence of a poet named Victorinus. According to Roncoroni, it is always risky to attempt to make facile attributions to didactic compositions of the 4th and 5th c., just as to the epic-biblical poems of the same era, which have almost always come down to us as anonymous. In any case, "the attribution to a Victorinus is not documented by the manuscript tradition" (Roncoroni, 387, n. 21).

CPL 1458/1459; CPPM 2, 544; 1624; 1670; *De Iesu Christo*: PLS 3, 1135-1139; *De ligno vitae*: CSEL 3, 305-308; A. Roncoroni, *Ps. Cipriano. De ligno crucis*: RSLR 12 (1976) 380-390; C. Magazzù, *Una nota al carme De Iesu Christo Deo et homine*, in *Hestíasis, Studi offerti a S. Calderone*, V, Messina 1988 (1995) 285-293.

L. Dattrino

VICTORINUS of Petovium (Pettau) (d. 304?). We owe primarily to St. *Jerome the little we know about the person and work of Victorinus bishop of Petovium (*Vir. ill.* 74) in *Pannonia Superior (modern-day Ptuj, in Slovenia), who lived in the 2nd half of the 3rd c. and was *martyred (*Vir. ill.* 74) during the first years of the *Diocletian persecution, probably in 304. Forerunner of Latin biblical *exegesis, he dedicated the majority of his literary activity to it, as appears from the numerous documents that Jerome attributes to him. According to Jerome, Victorinus offered interpretations for the following books: *Genesis, *Exodus, Leviticus, Isaiah, *Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Ecclesiastes, *Song of Songs and—the only surviving document—the *Apocalypse (Revelation). This list is admittedly incomplete as can be seen from the expression that concludes Jerome's summary of Victorinus's work—*et multa alia*—and from the fact that Jerome himself mentions elsewhere (*Comm. Matth., praef.* [CCL 77,5,96] and *Transl. Lat. homil. Origenis in Lucam*, *prol.* [PL 26,231]) Victorinus's *Commentary on Matthew*. To this work perhaps belong the fragments that G. Mercati published from the Ambrosiana MS I 101 sup. with the title *Anonymi chiliastae in Matthaeum fragmenta*. The attribution to Victorinus would seem to be confirmed by linguistic-stylistic features in addition to those of content: *millenarism, which parallels that of the *Commentary on the Apocalypse.*

The *Commentary on the Apocalypse,* aside from what is in the original text, preserved by the 15th-c. MS Ottobonianus Lat. 3288 A, has come down to us in three subsequent recensions. For the first, upon the request of a certain Anatolius, Jerome subjected the text to a radical revision: he inserted additions (whose chief source was detected in *Tyconius's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*), made deletions and emendations, improved the diction and esp., as an unwavering opponent of millenarism, eliminated all trace of this teaching; in compliance with this last criterion, he replaced the entire conclusion, in which chs. 20 and 21 were explained mostly *ad litteram*. Of the other two recensions, the first sets forth the reelaboration of Jerome, revamping it at certain points and more extensively citing the text of the *Apocalypse; the other establishes all the preceding redactions, not without bringing emendations and transpositions. In light of the original recension, whose guidance alone is used for reconstructing the original idea of Victorinus on millenarism, one can assert that his adherence to this doctrine is neither complete nor unconditional. According to the traditional schema, his millennium is characterized by the preponderance of material goods. But alongside these, which in Victorinus's thinking are otherwise less crass than in the writings of *Papias or *Nepos or *Irenaeus of Lyons, spiritual goods also coexist: "In this kingdom those who were divested of their goods for the name of the Lord, and those who were killed with all type of iniquity and thrown in prison . . . 'will receive their consolation,' that is, celestial crowns and riches" (CSEL 49,152,16-20). Not very differently from the millenarists, Victorinus provides a fundamentally literal interpretation of Rev 20–21, but—and this is the most characteristic aspect of his millenarian kingdom—he does not hesitate to incorporate in the fabric of

his literal commentary some *allegorical explanations: e.g., spiritualizing as much as possible the heavenly Jerusalem, he sees in its "doors of pearls" the "apostles," and in its "stones different by type and color" "human beings and the very precious variety of their faith" (CSEL 49,154,12-14). In Victorinus's exegesis a spiritual disciple of *Origen can be seen; in fact, even though Victorinus distances himself from Origen by adhering to millenarism, which Origen had combated in defense of a spiritual interpretation of those biblical passages that the proponents of the millennium explained in a literal sense, he turns to him when finding allegorical meanings from the context of Rev 20–21, to which the millenarists applied a strictly literal exegesis. Jerome's multiple testimonies concerning Origen's influence become extremely important when he refers specifically to Victorinus's lost works, which the father of the church at this time was still able to read. We learn from Jerome, e.g., that in the *sex alae uni et sex alae alteri* of Is 6:2 Victorinus saw allegorically the twelve apostles (*Epist.* 18 A, 6: CSEL 54,82) and in *melior est puer pauper et sapiens quam rex senex et stultus* from Eccl 4:13 saw, following Origen's path, an allegory of Christ and the devil (*Comm. Eccl.* 4,13-16: CCL 72, 290). Victorinus's predilection for allegorical-Origenian exegesis and his millenarian tendencies clearly emerge also from the fragment of the *Tractatus de fabrica mundi,* which is attested to by MS 414 of the 9th-c. *Lambethana Bibliotheca Londinensis,* a work which could be identified with one of the "numerous others" to which Jerome alluded without providing their titles, and which has been reattributed to Victorinus on the basis of its particular language, style and thought. The author explains the seven days of creation, dwelling with subtle considerations on the number four and, esp., on the virtue of the number seven, its importance in the history of humanity and in the development of the moral life. He also bears witness to his millenarian beliefs when—on the basis of the citation of Ps 89:4 ("For a thousand years in your eyes, O Lord, are as one day" [*in oculis tuis*, *domine*, *mille anni ut dies una*]), which by then had almost become canonical—he places the seven days of creation in relation to the 7,000 years of the duration of the world, and the seventh day of rest with the thousand years of Christ's kingdom, in which the Son of God will reign over the earth in the company of his elect.

Among the works of Victorinus, Jerome also mentions a treatise titled *Against All Heresies* (*Vir. ill.* 74), which Harnack identified with the Ps.-Tertullian text bearing the same title (with a quick review of the 32 heresies, from *Dositheus to *Praxeas), attested to in many MSS as an eighth appendix of *Tertullian's *De praescriptione haereticorum*. But this identification, which over time Harnack maintained with less fervor, would seem to be opposed by considerations of style and chronology.

Jerome's negative judgment on this author, who, though recognizing his compatriot's goodwill and erudition, criticizes him many times for not possessing a full knowledge of Latin or at least of not knowing this language as well as he did Greek (*Vir. ill.* 74; *Comm. Is.*, *prol.*: CCL 73,3; *Epist.* 58,10: CSEL 54,539; *Transl. Lat. homil. Origenis in Lucam*, *prol.:* PL 26,231). And in *Epist.* 70,5 (CSEL 54,707) Jerome does not even acknowledge his erudition but only his *eruditionis voluntas*.

CPL 79ff.; PL 5, 301-344; CSEL 59 (PLS 1, 103-172); *Sur l'Apocalypse, suivi du Fragment chronologique et de La construction du monde*: SC 423; from the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* four redactions are provided.

Studies: A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der marcionitischen Kirchen*: Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theologie 19 (1875) 11ff.; J. Haussleiter, *Die Kommentare des Victorinus, Ticonius und Hieronymus zur Apokalypse*: Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben 7 (1886) 239ff.; L. Atzberger, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit*, Freiburg i.B. 1896, 566-573; G. Mercati, *Anonymi chiliastae in Matthaeum fragmenta*: RIL, serie II, 31 (1898) 1203-1208 (ST 11, 3-49: with the text of the *fragmenta*); J. Haussleiter, *Beiträge zur Würdigung der Offenbarung des Johannes und ihres ältesten lateinischen Auslegers, Victorinus von Pettau*, Greifswald 1901; W. Macholz, *Spuren binitarischer Denkweise im Abendland seit Tertullian*, Jena 1902, 16ff.; C.H. Turner, *An Exegetical Fragment of the Third Century*: JTS 5 (1904) 218-241; J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, Bonn 1941, 79-80; L. Bieler, *The "Creeds" of St. Victorinus and St. Patrick*: ThS 9 (1948) 121-124; J. Daniélou, *La typologie millénariste de la semaine dans le christianisme primitif*: VChr 2 (1948) 1-16; J. Fischer, *Die Einheit der beiden Testamente bei Laktanz, Victorin von Pettau und deren Quellen*: Münch. Theol. Zeit. 1 (1950) 96-101; J. Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, Tournai 1958, 341-346; M. Simonetti, *Il millenarismo in Oriente da Origene a Metodio*: Corona Gratiarum, I, Brugge 1975, 37ff.; C. Curti, *Il regno millenario in Vittorino di Petovio*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 419-433; F.F. Bruce, *The Earliest Latin Commentary on the Apocalypse*, in Id., *A Mind for What Matters: Collected Essays*, Grand Rapids, MI 1990, 198-212; M. Dulaey, *Jérôme "éditeur" du Commentaire sur l'Apocalypse de Victorin de Poetovio*: REAug 37 (1991) 199-236; M. Dulaey, *Victorin de Poetovio premier exégète latin*, Paris 1993; M. Dulaey, *Grégoire d'Elvire et le Commentaire sur la Genèse de Victorin de Poetovio*: Augustinianum 38 (1993) 203-219; C. Micaelli, *Tertulliano nel quarto secolo: Vittorino di Pettau e Vittricio di Rouen*: SCO 43 (1993) 251-262; M. Veronese, *Radici culturali di Vittorino di Petovio*, in *Italia e Romania. Storia Cultura Civiltà a confronto*, ed. S. Satelia, Bari 2004, 181-194.

C. Curti

VICTORIUS of Aquitaine (mid-5th c.). Native of Aquitaine, a well-learned person who lived in the

mid-5th c. *Gennadius relates that he was a *calculator scrupulosus* (*De vir ill.* 89 [88]). *Hilary, the archdeacon of *Rome and future pope, consulted him on the *Easter computus (PLS 3,380-381). Victorius's response consists of an accompanying letter and a table designed to calculate the Easter computus. It seems that he was the first to combine Meton's cycle (5th-c. BC Athenian astronomer), which equates 235 lunar months with 19 tropic solar years, with the cycle of the Sunday reiteration 7 x 4 = 28: therefore 19 x 28 = 532 Julian years, already a half century before *Dionysius Exiguus. This computus was adopted by the Council of Orléans of 541 and became widespread in *Gaul in the 7th and 8th c., until the introduction of the one made by Dionysius Exiguus. An extract exists that is attributed to the Venerable *Bede (PL 90,712 and PLS 4,2218). According to Gennadius, Victorius composed a chronological table from the creation of the world used by *Prosper of Aquitaine for his Chronicle and then by *Cassiodorus. He also composed a rudimentary *Liber calculi*. He was probably also the author of the *Prologus Paschae* (PLS 3,381).

Editions: CPL 2282-2283; PLS 3, 381-346 (*Cursus paschalis*) ed. also in MGH, *Auct. Ant.* 9, 677-735; PL 90, 677 (*Liber calculi*, ed. also made by Friedlein, Rome 1872): PLS 3, 427-441 (*Prologus Paschae*); E. Schwartz, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*, Berlin 1905, 58-103. [See also Abbo of Fleury and Ramsey, *Commentary on the Calculus of Victorius of Aquitaine*, ed. A.M. Peden, Oxford 2003].

Studies: C. Jones, *Bedae Pseudepigrapha*, Ithaca, NY 1939; DTC 16 (1951) 4371; A. Strobel, *Texte zur Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Münster 1984, 19, 74, 76, 91, 118-119, 152; N. Angermann (ed.), *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 6, Munich-Zürich 1993, 1515-1516; BBKL 12 (1997) 1358-1359.

M. Maritano

VICTRICIUS of Rouen (ca. 340–ca. 410). Born around 340 "at the borders of the empire" (see *Paulinus of Nola, *Epp.* 18 and 37), Victricius worked in the military profession; he then renounced it—as did *Martin of Tours—in order to serve Christ. Ordained a priest, he devoted himself to the evangelization of the Nervi and Morini, in what is now the modern-day territory of Flanders, Brabant and Cambrésis. In 385 he became bishop of Rouen. He increased the spiritual life of his community by building churches, being vigilant over discipline and by supporting monastic life. Around 396 he went to Great Britain in order to combat the *Arian heresy and reestablish orthodoxy. In 403 he went to *Rome, perhaps to vindicate himself from accusations (of *Apollinarism?). In 404 Pope *Innocent I sent him the decretal *Etsi tibi* (see Jaffé 286) on recruitment and the virtues of the clerics. He died around 410. His feast day is celebrated on 7 August.

Making use of his rhetorical formation and possessing a solid literary formation, he wrote the *De laude Sanctorum:* it is a speech delivered in 396, in which he crafted a work in praise of some martyrs whose relics came from *Italy.

Editions: see CPL 481; *De laude Sanctorum*: PL 20, 443-458; ed. Sauvage (publ. by A. Tougard), Paris 1895; Mulders - Demeulenaere, in CCL 54 (1985) 69-93; French trans. R. Herval, Rouen 1966.

Studies: DTC 15 (1946) 2954-2956; R. Herval, *Histoire de Rouen*. I: *Des Origines à la fin du XV[e] siècle*, Rouen 1947, 19; *Vies des SS.* 8, 121-123; J. Mulders, *Victricius van Rouaan*: Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie 17 (1956) 1-25; 18 (1957) 19-40, 270-289; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, I, Paris [2]1964, 306-310, 383-385; BS 12 (1969) 1310-1315 (bibl.); P. Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Essai sur Victrice*: Année Canonique 14 (1970) 1-23; Patrologia III, 515-516 (bibl.); J. Fontaine, *Victrice de Rouen et les origines du monachisme dans l'Ouest de la Gaule*, in L. Musset, *Aspects du Monachisme en Normandie, IV[e]-XVIII[e] s.*, Paris 1982, 9-29; BBKL 12 (1997) 1359-1362 (bibl.).

M. Maritano

VIENNE
I. City and Christianity - II. Council.

I. City and Christianity. *Colonia Julia Vienna* in Narbonensis, later *Civitas Viennensium* or *Vienna* (in the 4th c.), metropolis of *Viennensis* and for some time the capital of a civil diocese, in the 5th c., one of the residences of the *Burgundian kings, experienced a new period of prosperity in the 2nd half of the 6th c. It housed one of the first communities of *Gaul since in 177 Sanctus appears there as a deacon (Eus., *HE* 5,1,17-18), but the first bishop with reliable attestation was Verus (Council of *Arles, 314), although he was preceded by Crescens (identified with *Paul's disciple!), Zacharias and Martin in a dubious list compiled by Ado of Vienne in the 9th c. Despite its antiquity, the provincial expansion of the episcopal see was opposed by the development of Arles; after the obscure figures of Justin, Dionysius, Parocos, Florentius and Lupicinus, *Simplicius tried to assert some metropolitan rights at the end of the 4th c., at the Council of *Turin, but Pope *Zosimus (417–418) favored the objectives of *Patroclus of Arles (*Ep.* 5, *Col. Arelat.* 5). After Claudius (. . . 441/442 . . .), Nectarius and Niceta (. . . 449 . . .), Mamertus, despite his pastoral zeal (Rogations), and despite the intellectual vitality of his brother *Claudianus (CPL 983-984), was unable to expand outside the limited provincial jurisdiction allowed to his see

through the decision of Pope *Leo in 450 (*Ep.* 66; Pope Hilarus, *Ep.* 10). From the end of the 5th c., the new political geography favored Vienne for a certain time esp. after *Hesychius, under the governance of his son, the very famous *Avitus of Vienne (494–518; CPL 990-996), who was active at the court of the Burgundian king; after Julian (518/523–532) and Donninus, Pantagatus (538) and Hesychius (. . . 549–552 . . .) had performed before becoming bishops. But after Namatius (d. 559), Philip (. . . 570–573 . . .), Evantius (. . . 581–585 . . .) and Verus (586), Desiderius was unable to obtain the pallium from *Gregory the Great and was exposed to hostility from Aridius bishop of Lyons. The 7th-c. bishops Donnulus, Aetherius, Clarentius, Sindulf, Ecdicus, Coaldus, Dodolenus, Bobolinus, George, Deodatus, Blidrannus, Eocald, Eobolinus and Austrobert were not well known. Vilicarius, who received the pallium from Gregory III (731–741), was contemporaneous with the Saracen invasion (725) and in the end retired to a monastery, according to Ado, the bishop who died in 875. Despite all these difficulties, the local mission was very active in the 4th and the 5th c., as attested by inscriptions (esp. in the 6th c.) and numerous monuments: in the city one counts, in addition to the episcopal complex (dedicated to the Maccabees), the temple of *Augustus and Livia consecrated to the Christian cult (St. Mary) and two monasteries (St. André-le-Haut and St. Niceta); outside the walls, esp. on the right bank of the Rhône, stand several basilicas: the 4th-c. St. Gervasius, the 5th-c. *basilica Stephani*, St. *Peter (from the time of Mamertus) and several oratories; on the left bank is found the 5th-c. *basilica Ferreoli*.

L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, Paris 1907, I, 86-211; H. Leclercq, *Vienne*: DACL 15, 3038-3054; G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste*, (Theophaneia 16), Bonn 1964; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, Paris [2]1964, II, 146-189; 1965, III, 209-234, 323-325; F. Descombes, *La topographie chrétienne de Vienne des origines à la fin du VII[e] siècle*, in *Colloque "Les martyrs de Lyon,"* Paris 1978, 267-276; F. Descombes, *Hagiographie et topographie religieuse: l'exemple de Vienne en Dauphiné*, in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés, IV[e]-XII[e] siècles*. Actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris, 2-5 mai 1979, Paris 1981, 361-379; A. Pelletier, *Vienne antique; de la conquête romaine aux invasions alamanniques (II[e] s. av. - III[e] s. apr. J.-C.)*, Roanne 1982; F. Descombes (mise à jour par P.-A. Fevrier - N. Gauthier), *Vienne*, in *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII[e] siècle. III. Province ecclésiastique de Vienne et d'Arles* (Viennensis et Alpes Graiae et Poeninae), Paris 1986, 17-35; M. Jannet-Vallat et al., *Vienne (Isère) aux premiers temps chrétiens*, Lyon 1986.

Ch. Pietri - M. Ghilardi

II. Council. Around 471/475, Mamertus of Vienne had his Rogations accepted by his colleagues and the fasts that he had instituted for the three days that precede the *Ascension of Jesus. This custom quickly spread (Sidon. Ap., *Epp.* V,14; VII,1; Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* II,34).

CCL 148, 137; Palazzini 6, 45-46; 6, 129.

Ch. Munier

VIGIL. The *vigiliae* (*pannychis:* all-night vigil) were the four subdivisions of the night into three hours, each one in the Roman military order, with the objective of standing watch and checking that everything was peaceful. As a result, it was the act or the very fact of standing guard (*vigilias servare*). This Roman system was also widespread in *Palestine and was used by *Mark the Evangelist (6:48; 13:35). It is not clear whether *Luke used the Roman or Palestinian system when he wrote: *et si venerit in secunda vigilia et si in tertia vigilia venerit* (Lk 12:38). *Augustine testifies that *quarta vero vigilia noctis, finis est noctis: una enim vigilia tribus horis constat* (*Sermo* 75,6,7). In *Palestine, the ancient system of three nocturnal subdivisions also thrived (Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Munich 1922, I,688-692). A derivative meaning is that of remaining awake during the normal hours of sleep. In the Christian context it was a nocturnal vigil of prayer, as one finds in the Acts of the Apostles at Troas (20:7). *Pliny discovered that the Christians gathered *ante lucem* on a specific day and sang a hymn to Christ *quasi Deo* (*Ep.* 10,109). These nocturnal vigils of prayer could have a private character; the communitarian ones, however, acquired a great importance. The most important was the great Paschal vigil (*vigiliae claritas atque solemnitas:* Aug. *Sermo* 223/E,1), which extended throughout the whole night, with numerous readings, songs, prayers, lighting of the paschal candle, the blessing of the new fire, a brief exhortation (the various sermons by *Augustine on Easter night are generally brief), baptism of catechumens and concluding with the celebration of the resurrection of Christ. The Easter vigil is the *mater omnium sanctarum vigiliarum* (Aug., *Sermo* 219,1). At *Rome one observes the vigils for the feast of Pentecost and that of the Four Seasons.

The source of the nocturnal vigil is unknown, but it may have derived from the Sunday celebration *ante lucem* mentioned by Pliny. *Tertullian speaks of the *nocturnae convocationes, coetus antelucani* (*Ad uxorem* II,4,2; *De fuga* 14,1), although the Easter night was already a great vigil. *Minucius Felix also spoke of nocturnal prayers (*Octavius* 8,4). The

Christians of *Carthage stood vigil during the night in front of *Cyprian's prison door (*Pontius, *Vita Cyp*. 15,5); there were also vigils at the tombs of the *martyrs, a practice prohibited to women by the Council of *Elvira because often, under the shadow of prayer, sin was committed (can. 35: Mansi 1, 254). Over the course of the 4th c., vigils developed in some cathedrals on Sundays and also prayer vigils in monastic communities. *Athanasius attests that at *Alexandria the vigils were celebrated on special days (*Apol. de fuga* 14; *Historia Arr*. 81). *Basil of Caesarea extensively described the unfolding of a Sunday vigil at Caesarea of *Cappadocia: "Our people have the custom of awaking during the night and going to the house of prayer; the people praise God while exhausted, in repentance, tears, and after this prelude of prayer, the vigil proceeds to the singing of the *Psalms" (*Ep*. 207,3). He adds that they recited Psalms and antiphons and read readings and sang songs. *John Cassian describes the course of the night prayer in the monastic communities on Holy Friday and Saturday evening.

DACL 15, 3108-3118; C. Callewaert, *De vigiliarum origine*: Collationes Brugenses 23 (1923) 424-466; G. Marcora, *La vigilia nella liturgia. Ricerche sulle origini e sui primi sviluppi (sec. I-IV)*, Milan 1954; A. Baumstark, *Nocturna Laus, Typen frühchristlicher Vigilienfeier und ihr Fortleben vor allem im römischen und monastischen Ritus*, Münster 1957; J.M. Hanssens, *Nocturna Laus*: Gregorianum 39 (1958) 747-756; G. Penco, *Nuove luci sulla genesi dell'ufficio vigiliare*: Rivista Liturgica 47 (1960) 236-242; C. de Barros Morrais, *La Vigilia litúrgica*: Cuadernos Monásticos 17 (1982) 89-93; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, Milan [2]1955, II, 470-476; A. Martimort, *La Chiesa in preghiera*, Brescia 1983, IV, see the index; F. Manns, *"Ante lucem" dans la lettre de Pline le Jeune à Trajan* (*Ep. X, 96*): Antonianum 62 (1987) 338-343; F. Manns, *"Domine, labia mea aperies." Liturgie juive et liturgie chrétienne*: EphLit 111 (1997) 263-267.

A. Di Berardino

VIGILANTIUS (4th–5th c.). Born at Calaguris in the *civitas* of the Convenae (Saint-Martory in Comminges, Haute Garonne); see Jerome, *Contra Vigil.* I and VI; Gennadius, *De vir. ill.* 36. The priest Vigilantius completed a trip to *Palestine in 395, distributing alms and carrying a letter to *Bethlehem along with a panegyric for the emperor *Theodosius, which had been composed by *Paulinus of Nola (who was also called for this reason a *clientulus Paulini* by Jerome, *Ep.* 61,3). He lived in Bethlehem near Jerome, in harmony with him despite several esp. theological disagreements that incited the astonishment of Vigilantius, who had learned that Jerome and his friends were reading *Origen's writings (Jerome, *Ep.* 58 to Paulinus and 61 to Vigilantius). But Jerome became upset when he learned that Vigilantius, during his trip back to Nola and then to *Gaul (Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 5 to *Sulpicius Severus), had presented Jerome as an Origenist (Jerome, *Ep.* 61 to Vigilantius), which turned Jerome into his enemy. Jerome then wrote Vigilantius a letter containing accusations that offended Vigilantius concerning his theological origins, learning and capriciousness, a letter to which Vigilantius did not respond, given that he was interested in practical matters and not so much in theological questions. In 403, Riparius, a priest from the *civitas* of *Toulouse, which was near the region of Comminges, revealed to Jerome the campaign that Vigilantius was waging on the territory of his parish against the excessive cult of the martyrs (Jerome, *Ep.* 109 to Riparius) and against the thriving custom of sending alms to the monks of Palestine, which had begun probably following the consecration of the basilica at Toulouse dedicated to the bishop-martyr *Saturninus. Jerome quickly responded by stating that he was ready to engage Vigilantius in debate, who, however, had remained silent, not giving Jerome an opportunity for another invective.

In 406 the Tolosan deacon Sissinius, by order of Riparius and Desiderius, brought Vigilantius's writings (no longer extant) to Jerome, along with one of their letters (containing their accusation, which has likewise been lost); Jerome wrote a violent, polemical booklet titled *Contra Vigilantium*: according to this text, Vigilantius criticized the excessive cult of the martyrs, some liturgical customs connected to it (such as the vigils near the tombs of the martyrs with lit torches) and ecclesiastical celibacy, regarding it as heresy. He then reprimanded those who, having distributed all their goods, lived at the expense of the church. He criticized monastic life and the alms sent to the Holy Land. But one must keep in mind that these accusations are certainly not objective given Jerome's polemical style; in fact, it seems that Vigilantius's position represented that of the majority of the clergy of Gaul at the time (against, e.g., *Sulpicius Severus and *Vittricius of Rouen?), where the point of departure of the debate could consist in the difference between Jerome and Vigilantius's theological ideas: Jerome's idea, being proper to the Roman aristocracy, was mystical and outside time, well-suited for opposing religious and social life, which seemed unacceptable to Vigilantius.

According to *Gennadius, *De vir. ill.* 36, Vigilantius was a priest of *Barcelona because he had to flee from Gaul following Jerome's document. He was probably the one whom Sulpicius sent to Paulinus of Nola.

L. Lizop, *Les Convenae et les Consoranni*, Toulouse-Paris 1931, 248-258; P.-M. Duval, *La Gaule jusqu'au milieu du Ve siècle*,

Paris 1971, 674ff.; H. Crouzel, *Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains*: BLE 73 (1972) 125-146; H. Crouzel, *Un "piccolo cliente" di san Paolino di Nola: Vigilanzio di Calagurris*, in A. Ruggiero - H. Crouzel - G. Santaniello, *Paolino di Nola: momenti della sua vita e delle sue opere*, S. Paolino Diocesana 1983 (Nola Biblioteca), 199-219; M. Massie, *Vigilance de Calagurris face à la polémique hiéronymienne. Les fondements et la signification du conflit*: BLE 81 (1980) 81-108; H. Crouzel, *Un "hérétique" commingeois aux IVᵉ et Vᵉ siècles: Vigilance de Calagurris*: Mém. de l'Acad. des Sciences, Inscr. et Belles-Lettres de Toulouse 6,15 (1985) 163-174; D.G. Hunter, *Vigilantius of Calagurris and Victricius of Rouen: Ascetics, Relics, and Clerics in Late Roman Gaul*: JECS 7 (1999) 401-430.

H. Crouzel - L. Odrobina

VIGILIUS. The *Regula orientalis,* a work composed perhaps in *Gaul around 420, is attributed to Vigilius (see *Gennadius of Marseille, *De vir. ill.* 51). This monastic rule, which includes 47 chapters (33 of which use *Pachomius), is on the whole very close to the long recension of *Jerome's translation of the *Rule of Pachomius.*

CPL 1840; PL 103, 477-484 (PL 50, 373-380 and PG 34, 983-990); A. Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, Louvain 1932; C. De Clercq, *L'influence de la règle de saint Pachôme en Occident*: Mél. L. Halphen, Paris 1951, 169-176; A. Mundó, *Les anciens synodes abbatiaux et les "Regulae SS. Patrum"*: SA 44 (1959) 107-125.

S. Zincone

VIGILIUS, pope (537–555). After *Silverius had been deposed in an irregular way (537), Vigilius, of senatorial origin, had himself elected bishop of Rome. Recognized by all after the death of his predecessor, he, contrary to the promises made to the empress *Theodora I, professed the faith of the Council of *Chalcedon and Pope *Leo the Great. *Justinian I, however, who in 543/544 had condemned the so-called *Three Chapters and had forced Vigilius to present himself at *Constantinople, led him to adopt such a hesitant attitude that Vigilius lost all respect from the Western bishops, and this all the more that Vigilius in 548 explicitly condemned, in the *Iudicatum,* the Three Chapters. Vigilius protested against a new imperial edict by excommunicating the patriarch *Menas of Constantinople. In fact, he refused to participate at the synod convoked by the emperor (553), justifying his position in the *Constitutum I.* Excommunicated by the synod, he was sentenced to prison or exile. In two documents, among which was the *Constitutum II,* he revoked his refusal to condemn the Three Chapters and thus received permission to return to *Rome. He died, however, at *Syracuse, and was dishonored for a long time even in the West.

CPL 1694-1697; PL 69, 15-114; 143-178; PLS IV, 1249-1252; ACO IV,II, 15-18, 138-168; K. Baus et al., *Storia della Chiesa*, III, It. trans. Milan 1978, 37-43 (bibl.); J. Straub, *Die Verurteilung der Drei Kapitel durch Vigilius*: Kleronomia 2 (1970) 347-375; E. Zettl, *Die Bestätigung des 5. ökumenischen Konzils durch Papst Vigilius*, Bonn 1974; G. Every, *Was Vigilius a Victim or an Ally of Justinian?*: Heythrop Journal 20 (1979) 257-266; Patrologia IV, 1694-1697; C. Sotinel, *Autorité pontificale et pouvoir imperial*: MEFRA 101 (1992) 439-463; BBKL 12, 1383-1387; LTK[3] 10 787-787; EPapi 1, 512-529; G. Pilara, *La città di Roma fra Chiesa e Impero durante il conflitto gotico-bizantino*, Rome 2006.

B. Studer

VIGILIUS of Thapsus. Participated, as bishop of Thapsus (Ras Dimas, Tunisia), at the dramatic meeting between *Catholics and *Arians which the *Vandal king *Huneric convoked in February 484. Modern scholars have hypothesized that he subsequently fled to *Constantinople. Various works have been mistakenly attributed to Vigilius, among which is the Ps.-Athanasian *De Trinitate;* but the following are certainly his: *Contra Eutychetem* and the *Dialogus contra Arianos* . . . , to which one should add with all likelihood the Ps.-Augustinian *Contra Felicianum.* This brief work presents in a dialogical form the themes of the trinitarian controversy, which was current in Vandal Africa, making use only of rational arguments without recourse to scriptural citations. The same material is treated in a much more vast and complete way in the *Dialogus contra arrianos, sabellianos et photinianos* in three books, where the dialogue between a Catholic and three heretical proponents has the objective of refuting one heresy by means of another. The objective is, however, primarily anti-Arian, and in fact the work has also come down to us in an abbreviated redaction containing two interlocutors, the Catholic and the Arian. In the *Dialogus,* Vigilius mentions two of his other anti-Arian works against Maribadus and against *Palladius of Ratiaria, both of which have been lost. The treatise *Contra Eutychetem,* in five books, presents the Catholic doctrine on *Christology as an intermediate position between the opposed errors of *Nestorius and *Eutyches and defends the Chalcedonian doctrine, which identifies two natures in Christ, human and divine, coexistent, without confusion and without separation, in one sole person. Providing various written citations in the last two books of the work, Vigilius refutes two *monophysite documents against the Council of *Chalcedon and against Pope *Leo the Great, which appear to have been otherwise unknown. Perhaps they are to be identified with the two writings of Timothy Ailouros (*Timothy II).

CPL 806-812; PL 42, 1157-1172; 62, 95-238; PCBE I, 1204-1205; Moricca III/2, 764-773; M. Simonetti, *Letteratura antimonofisita d'Occidente*: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 505-522; Patrologia IV, 23-26; Vigilio di Tapso, *Contro Eutiche* (It. trans. ed. S. Petri), Brescia 2003.

M. Simonetti

VIGILIUS of Trent. Third bishop of Trent (385?–405), Vigilius received from *Ambrose, at the beginning of his ministry, a letter accompanied by pastoral instruction (*Ep*. 17: PL 16,1024-1036). According to his *Vita* (BHL 8602ff.), written in the 6th c., he was famous for his missionary activity and for the construction of numerous churches. During his episcopate, in 397, Sisinnius, Marytirius and Alexander, his coworkers, were put to death. Vigilius himself sent a letter on the martyrdom to *Simplicianus bishop of Milan, and later another to *John Chrysostom, accompanying it with some relics. Likewise according to the *Vita*, he himself was stoned by pagans, and became patron of his diocese.

CPL 212ff.; PL 13, 549-558. – ASS Iun. 7, 144-147; BS 12, 1086-1088; A. Quacquarelli - I. Rogger (ed.), *I martiri della Valle di Non e la reazione pagana alla fine del IV secolo*, Trent 1985, 151-170; R. Lizzi, *Vescovi e strutture ecclesiastiche nelle città tardoantiche*, Como 1989, 50, 96; LTK³ 10 788; PCB 2, 2296; LACL (2002) 720-721; L.F. Pizzolato, *Studi su Vigilio di Trento*, Milan 2002.

B. Studer

VINCENT, martyr (d. 22 January 304). The most ancient nonhagiographical pieces of information on Vincent come from *Paulinus of Nola (*Carm*. XIX,164), *Prudentius (*Perist*. 4,77-80, 179-180; 5), and *Augustine's *Sermons* (*Serm*. 4,274-277, *Caillou* 1,47: PLS 2). These texts present Vincent as the deacon of Bishop *Valerius of Saragossa and martyr from the *Diocletian persecution; although the bishop survived, Vincent was sentenced to death and executed at Valencia on 22 January 304.

His *Passion* is based on this information (BHL 8627-8637), which was written in an epic form before the end of the 4th c. It abounds in punishments, visions, and other characteristics of dress and institutions, which show how quickly these literary procedures were present in Spanish *hagiography. The wordplays on *Vincentius* and the Latin verb *vincere* certainly took up a traditional theme, namely that of martyrdom as victory over the devil, but it also inspired *Augustine's sermons and the *Visigothic liturgical prayers.

The cult of the saint spread onward from the 5th c. in *Spain, *Gaul and *Africa, as both the churches built in his honor and the spread of his relics attest. His feast day, 22 January, appears in the Mozarabic calendars, in the *Cal. Carth.*, in that of 6th- and 7th-c. Carmona, in the calendar of Polemius Silvius (448), and in the *Hieronymian Martyrology*.

PL 38, 1252-1268; *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, I, Rome 1930, 243-245; J. Vives, *Oracional visigótico*, I, Barcelona 1946, 157-166; *Vies des SS.* 1, 431-436; LTK³ 10, 802-803; BS 12, 1149-1155; A. Fábrega Grau, *Pasionario hispánico*, Madrid-Barcelona 1953-55, I, 92-107; II, 187-196; C. García Rodríguez, *El culto de los santos en la España romana y visigoda*, Madrid 1966, 257-278; V. Saxer, *Le culte de S. Vincent en Italie avant l'an mil*, in *Quaeritur inventus colitur. Miscellanea in onore di Padre U.M. Fasola*, Vatican City 1989, 745-761; V. Saxer, *La Passion de S. Vincent diacre dans la première moitié du Vᵉ s. Essai de reconstitution*: REA 35 (1989) 275-297; R. Soriano Sánchez, *L'édifice cultique de la prison de saint Vincent à Valence/Espagne*, in *Actes du XIᵉ Congrès Int. d'archéologie chrétienne*, III, Rome 1989, 1193-1201.

V. Saxer

VINCENT, presbyter (4th c.). Presbyter of the church of *Constantinople (Jer., *C. Ioan. Hier*. 41) but Latin in culture, known by *Jerome in *Italy and from that point onward his friend, a companion in travel (Jer., *Ep*. 61; *C. Ruf*. 3,22) and asceticism. Jerome dedicated to him the Latin translation of *Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronicle* (GCS 47,1), which he finished between 378 and 381. Vincent exhorts him to study Scripture and to translate into Latin the writings of *Origen (PL 25,583-386); he accompanied Jerome first to *Rome and then *Palestine in 385 (CCL 79,93); he then went again to Rome prior to *Rufinus of Aquileia; he was still at Rome at the time of Pope *Anastasius (399–401); he then again returned to Bethlehem.

PCBE 2, 2306-2307.

A. Di Berardino

VINCENT of Capua (4th c.). Bishop of Capua, perhaps to be identified with the Roman priest of the same name who represented Pope *Sylvester at the Council of *Nicaea (325). In 344 he was sent on a mission, along with Euphratas of Cologne, to the court of *Constantius at *Antioch to mitigate his anti-Nicene measures, without any success. Sent by Pope *Liberius in 353 to *Arles, again at the court of Constantius, in a local council he yielded to signing the condemnation of *Athanasius. In 357, Liberius, who had been exiled in *Thrace on account of his attitude toward Athanasius, also wrote to Vincent, among other church officials, so that he might work,

along with other bishops from Campania, for the revocation of his exile.

DCB 4, 1152; PCBE II/2, 2303-2305.

M. Simonetti

VINCENT of Lérins (d. before 450). Vincent lived in the 1st half of the 5th c. and is the most famous among the monks of Lérins. We gather bits of information about his life from *Gennadius (*De vir. ill.* 65 [64]) and Vincent himself (*Comm.* I,5,26-28). A native of *Gaul, he was involved in the tumultuous life of that century (and had a military career?), before retiring to the monastery of Lérins, where he was ordained a priest. Gennadius emphasizes his knowledge of the *Bible and the teachings of the church, which he probably acquired at Lérins. He had previously received a solid formation also in secular literature, as appears from his writing style. *Eucherius of Lyons presents him as a holy man, eminent for his eloquence and wisdom; he praises him as "a shining pearl of interior light" (*De laud. eremi* 42); he probably entrusted to him the education of his sons *Salonius and Veranus. He died before 450 (perhaps as early as 435). His feast day is celebrated on 24 May.

Vincent's fame is connected to his *Commonitorium* (Memorial), which was redacted around 434 with the pseudonym of *Peregrinus.* He composed, moreover, the *Excerpta,* a work mentioned in the 9th c. but discovered by Madoz in Cod. 151 of the Biblioteca comunale di Bagno a Ripoli and published in 1940: it was the first Augustinian florilegium with text pertaining to the mysteries of the *Trinity and the *incarnation, taken primarily from the *De Trinitate.* The *Obiectiones Vincentianae* have been lost. Vincent's writings are valuable because of their stylistic eloquence and clarity of thought.

The *Commonitorium,* with respect to heresiology, is the only work known to us in antiquity that treats the topic along theoretical lines, by asking what heresy is in contradistinction to orthodoxy. He provides a "treatment of method" and theology, not solely providing illustrations of it. Orthodoxy for Vincent is identified with the apostolic tradition; heresy is a distortion of it: the phrase *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* (ch. 2) is orthodox: three criteria of orthodoxy, therefore, are universality, antiquity and unanimity, which he then applies primarily to past controversies, esp. *Donatism and *Arianism.

In order to avoid the principle of tradition leading to theological immobility, Vincent also predicts a certain progress (ch[s]. 23-24): "It grows . . . and vigorously makes much progress . . . but only in its own genus, namely in the same doctrine, in the same understanding and the same notion" (*Crescat . . . et multum vehementerque proficiat . . . sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem sc. dogmate, eodem sensu, eaque sententia,* ch. 23). The criterion would then be adopted by the First Vatican Council (see DS 3018).

The influence and success of the *Commonitorium,* esp. from the 16th c. on, were relevant and long-lasting: Catholics, Protestants, Old Catholics and Anglicans took him as a point of reference in relation to theological debate: to this end, see the writings of Roberto Bellarmino, Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, John Henry Newman and Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger. Today, although observing the validity of this thousand-year-old-plus definition of the Vincentian text (orthodoxy = tradition; heresy = change), there is a tendency, esp. among scholars, not to absolutize its normative value, to regard it more in the "affirmative" then in the "exclusive" sense.

R. Demeulenaere, *Bibliographie choisie*, in CCL 64 (1985) 141-144.

Editions: see CPL 510-511; *Commonitorium:* PL 50, 637-686; R. Demeulenaere: CCL 64 (1985) 147-195; *Excerpta:* J. Madoz, Madrid 1940 = PLS 3, 23-45; R. Demeulenaere: CCL 64 (1985) 199-231. Eng. tr.: R.S. Moxon, Cambridge 1915; It. trans.: C. Colafemmina, Alba 1968, and L. Longobardo, Rome 1994; Fr. trans.: M. Meslin, Namur 1959; Spanish trans.: L.F. Mateo Seco, Pamplona 1977.

Studies: J. Madoz, *Un tratado desconocido de San Vicente de Lérins*: Gregorianum 21 (1940) 75-94; DTC 15 (1950) 3045-3055; B. Luiselli, *Sulla pseudonimia di Vincenzo di Lerino*: Atene e Rome 4 (1959) 216-222; É. Griffe, *Pro Vincentio Lerinensi*: BLE 62 (1961) 26-32; W. O'Connor, *St. Vincent of Lerins and St. Augustine: Was the Commonitorium of St. Vincent of Lerins Intended as a Polemic Treatise Against St. Augustine and His Doctrine on Predestination?*: Doctor Communis 16 (1963) 123-257 [separately: Diss. Rome 1964]; Patrologia III, 517-521; M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo, *Problemi vincenziani*: Quaderni Catanesi 5 (1983) 341-359; A. Pastorino, *Il concetto di tradizione in Giovanni Cassiano e in Vincenzo di Lerino*: Sileno 1 (1975) 37-46; J.-P. Weiss: DSp 16 (1993) 822-832; A. Milan, *Il problema della "tradizione": a proposito di Vincenzo di Lerino*: Rassegna di teologia 37 (1996) 395-406; BBKL 12 (1997) 1432-1436; A. De Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'Antiquité chrétienne.* VII. Première partie. *Le monachisme latin. L'essor de la littérature lérinienne et les écrits contemporains (410-500)*, Paris 2003.

M. Maritano

VINDICTA SALVATORIS (The Avenging of the Savior) (apocryphal). Latin text of the 9th/10th c., belonging to the cycle of Pilate, written with the objective of demonstrating the fulfillment of divine justice on the Jews, who were guilty of the death of *Jesus. In the *Vindicta Salvatoris* an account is given

of the healing and conversion of the emperors *Titus and *Tiberius (along with the *Cura santitatis Tiberii*), the destruction of *Jerusalem, the mission of *Volusianus into *Jerusalem, and the image of Christ taken to *Rome by *Veronica (it reflects the story of the image of *Abgar). In the book, one finds echoes of Flavius Josephus's *Jewish War* (probably through the Latin translation of Josephus, the so-called ps.-Hegesippus, *De bello judaico*). The book is written in faulty Latin, lacks geographical and historical knowledge, and its underlying theological message is rather primitive; nevertheless, the *Vindicta Salvatoris* was a very popular book during the Middle Ages, and even Dante made reference to it (*Par.* VI,92).

CANT 70; BHL 4221 (4218-4222); Tischendorf 471-486; Santos Otero 507-526 (Sp. tr.); version in ancient French *La vengeance du Seigneur*, ed. A.E. Ford, Toronto 1984.

Translations: Eng.: Elliott 213-216 (frag.); It.: Erbetta 1/2, 388-397; Moraldi 1, 765-776; Craveri 412-422; Pol.: Starowieyski 1, 692-703; E. von Dobschütz, *Christsbilder*, TU 18 (1899) 214-217; EApC 2, 371-398.

M. Starowieyski

VINE. Wine and grapes are found frequently in ancient symbolic language as signs of happiness, fortune, fertility, rebirth and immortality, as shown by their association with the cult of Dionysius, the god who cyclically dies and is reborn, and their representation in funerary contexts. In the OT, in *Jacob's blessings, the Messiah is described: "Binding his foal to the vine, and his donkey's colt to the choice vine, he washes his garments in wine and his robe in the blood of grapes" (Gen 49:11). The vine is also a symbol of *Israel (Is 5; Hos 10:1), who is at times described as a vine that languishes (Is 24:7) or a chosen vineyard that is now contaminated (Jer 2:21). In the NT, however, Christ is the one who is said to be the true vine, while the *Father is the vinedresser and the faithful are the branches (Jn 15:1-6). The vine then appears in the parable of the murderous tenants, the kingdom of God, which the landlord will take from the wicked and give to a people able to make it fruitful (Mt 21:33-43; Mk 12:1-11; Lk 20:9-18), although the harvest is the balance of human actions presented in the sight of God at the end of life (Rev 14:17-20). The vine is, finally, the blood of Christ, poured out as a sign of the new covenant (Mt 26:26-29; Mk 14:22-25; and Lk 22:19-20).

Among the commentators of the early centuries, *Origen refers to Adam and Christ as the vines, who are different because of the quantity and quality of the fruits they brought forth (*CRom* 1: Hammond Bammel 76, 60-66). *Ephrem the Syrian affirms that at Christmas a barren vine bore a cluster of grapes into the world (*Hymn. Nat.* 4,27: SC 459,82). Origen then develops the theme of the spiritual vineyard, which all people have in their own heart and must cultivate thoughtfully (*Hom. 36 Ps* 1,2: SC 411,68).

But the grapes and the wine in the writings of Christian authors almost always become a symbol of Christ's blood: thus the Messiah, who washes his garments in wine and his robe in the blood of grapes (Gen 49:11), is for *Justin Martyr (*I Apol.* 32,7: PTS 38, 79; *Dial. Triph.* 54,1-2: PTS 47, 158-159) and *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Demonstr.* 5: SC 406, 166) Christ, who with the blood of his passion purified the sinful church, although, for Origen, it purifies his own flesh (*Hom. Lev* IX,5: GCS Origen VI,424, 3-24). *Tertullian also reads a passage from Genesis in reference to the passion of Christ and offers a similar interpretation for Is 63:1, where one finds the image of the grape gatherer dressed in garments stained by grapes (*Adv. Marc.* IV,40,5-6: CCL I,657,18-7). *Hippolytus, however, distinguishes in Gen 49:11 two symbols, seen in the expression "he washes his garments in wine," a type of Christ's baptism, and in the "blood of grapes," a type of Christ's passion (*Ben.*: PO 27, 80-82).

Even the saints led to martyrdom are squeezed like grapes at the winepress (*Cypr., *Ep.* 37,47-53: CCL 3B,179-180; *Zeno Ver., *Tract.* I,33,25-27: CCL 22,84; *Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 83,1: CCL 39,1146).

The vineyard in the parable of the wicked tenants of Mt 21:33ff. was traditionally interpreted as the Jewish people, entrusted to the priests and scribes, the tenants in the parable. But the landowner will take it away from them for having mistreated his envoys/prophets and for having murdered his own son, Christ: this is how the parable is interpreted in the writings of Irenaeus and Tertullian, although Origen, alongside this exegesis, presents an identification of the vineyard with teaching of the *Scriptures, first entrusted to the Jewish people, now to Christians (*CMt* 17,7-8: GCS X, 602-603).

Finally, the shoot with a cluster of grapes carried by two Israelite explorers with a bar during an exploration of the land of Canaan (Num 13:23-24) was, for the Fathers, a prefiguration of the cross of Christ: thus *Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 2,2,19,3: SC 108,46-48); *Maximus of Turin (*Hom* X,2: CC 23,35) and *Isidore of Seville (*Quaest. in Vet. Test., in Num.* 15,8-11: PL 83,346-347).

TIP 306; LCI 491-496; C. Leonardi, "Ampelos." *Il simbolo della vite nell'arte pagana e paleocristiana*, Rome 1947; M. Simonetti, *I vignaioli perfidi*, in M. Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione*, Brescia 2004, 173-184.

C. Noce

VIR DEI. The category of the "divine man/man of God," which was typical of the Greco-Roman world, was frequently used during the first decades of the 20th c., due to the influence of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, to classify representations of Jesus in the NT Today this interpretation enjoys less consent among scholars, esp. because it has been noted that the characteristics of this figure change noticeably with the changing of eras and cultures. In fact, complete continuity can be identified only with the assistance of polymorphic and even polysemic concepts, such as *dynamis* (Corrington). A *status quaestionis* of scholarship on this debate is found in D. Zeller, *Mensch, göttlicher:* Neues Bibellexikon II (1995) 764-765, and, more extensively, in E. Koskenniemi, *Apollonios von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese,* Tübingen 1994, 64-164, and in D.S. du Toit, *Theios Anthropos,* Tübingen 1997, 2-39. Likewise, the concept of *theios anēr* was also supposed to have been operative even in Hellenistic *Judaism, which was regarded as the mediator between the Greek world and the NT and Christian world; subsequently, however, this foreignness of this idea both to biblical culture and also, therefore, to that of *Jewish-Hellenistic culture was seen—even where alongside the preeminent biblical roots, one cannot ignore the Hellenistic contribution. See C. Halloday, *"Theios Aner" in Hellenistic Judaism,* Missoula, MT 1977; W. Schottroff, *Gottmensch I,* in RAC 12 (1982) 155-234. From the lexical point of view, it has been observed that the term *theios* in early Christian Greek literature almost never indicates the divine nature and origin of the so-called *anēr*—it does not seem to be a technical expression during the pre-Christian age—which is true for the NT as well. D.S. du Toit, *Theios Anthropos,* 2-3, also provides similar observations, through his semantic analysis on the following terms: *theios / thespesios / daimonios anthrōpos,* from which emerges the important claim that these expressions do not indicate, ontologically, divine nature or sonship, at least in the pagan world, even if, as D. Zeller observes in ThLZ 123 (1998) 62-64, this conclusion does not seem to keep in mind the class of *theioi andres* supplied by the diviners or *prophets, the *manteis,* who are said to effectively possess a "divine nature" or *theia physis,* a topic researched by D. Zeller: *The* theia physis *of Hippocrates and Other Divine Men,* in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe,* ed. J. Fitzgerald - T. Olbricht - M. White, Leiden 2003, 49-69. It is true, however, that the testimonies, from Pindar and Plato onward, show that this initially divine *physis* did not have an ontological significance, as is present, however, in the imperial literature and in Hellenistic Judaism, with Flavius Josephus, who uses the expression *theios anēr* more often. Plutarch, e.g., used *theios* in reference to a human being at one point in an ontological sense and at another in an ethical sense. In a text from the 2nd c. AD on Hippocrates, this individual is a *theios,* an individual who comes down from the gods.

One of the most famous "divine men" of Antiquity was, in the pagan sphere, *Apollonius of Tyana, whose biography, which attributes to him divine nature and descent, was written by Philostratus at the beginning of the 3rd c. AD, long after the death of Apollonius. In particular, it was the chronological deviation—much broader than that which fell within the life of *Jesus and the production of the gospels—that led Koskenniemi, 233-235 (and id., *Apollonius of Tyana: A Typical* theios aner?: JBL 117 [1998] 455-467), to put scholars on guard when using Philostratus as a source on the *theios anēr* for the 1st c. AD, challenging the thesis put forward by H. Betz—who investigated the concept in the Greco-Roman and ancient Christian world in *Gottmensch II,* in RAC 12 (1982) 234-312—that the thaumaturgic philosophers are representative expressions of the "divine man" in the ancient period. The interpretation of the category of the *theios anēr* as indicative in general of the ancients thaumaturges endowed with a supernatural or divine state, however, is still found in the thought of various scholars such as B. Kollmann, *Jesus und die Christen als Wundertäter*, Göttingen 1996, 58-59. In the literature from the imperial age, however, *theios* often refers to the founders of a discipline or philosophical school, denoting not so much the divine nature as their superiority over the average human being. This could also express itself, in wisdom, virtue, prophecies and artistic works as well as in miracles. In various cases, the expressions of this exceptionality may be based on a *theia physis* understood in a more or less ontological sense. Particularly with regard to this concept there seems to be a measurable difference from the biblical and Christian *theios anēr,* who, possessing more than simply a divine nature, is "of God."

In the Christian world, in fact, the *theios* human being finds its model in Christ, who was endowed with the divine nature as the Son of God, but, apart from the idea of participation in the nature of God through Christ, the *theios anēr* is the human being that belongs to God and imitates him by imitating Christ, and is in the first place the saint, a figure in turn subject to developments in history, from the *martyr to the confessor to the ascetic and also the churchman. Thus, e.g., *Origen, *C. Cels.* III,28, af-

firms that the human nature becomes divine through Christ: “So that the human nature *[physis]*, thanks to its communion with what is more divine, becomes divine *[theia]*, not only in Jesus, but in all those who with faith receive the life that Jesus taught.” Similarly, *Cyril of Alexandria states, *Thes.* 4: “The one who participates in the Son shares in the divine nature *[theia physis]*.” In reference to human beings, *theios* also indicates in the writings of the Fathers the image of God impressed on our nature according to Genesis, through which Christian souls are called *theiai psychai*. The greatest frequency of the word *theios*, however, in reference to human persons is found in references to some of the saints and prophets as in *Ignatius of Antioch, *Magn.* 8,2 and the *apostles, as in Origen, *C. Cels.* VII,49; fr. 106 on Lamentations where *Paul is *ho theios apostolos;* Cyril of Alexandria, *Dial. Trin.* 1 where Paul is *theios*, just as *Moses in the *Apos. Con.* VI,24,5, *Job *Apos. Con.* V,7,21, etc. See also A. Grillmeier, *Gottmensch III* (*Patristik*), in RAC 12 (1982) 312-366. Precisely for their belonging and, therefore, closeness to God, the saints were perceived as intercessors for sinners, likewise on the model of Christ, the first intercessor, according to Origen's reflection (Ramelli).

There are numerous studies dedicated to the “divine men” or “saints” esp. in *Late Antiquity, where we find three paradigms: the pagan philosopher, the Christian ascetic and the rabbinic sage, all of whom were compared by R. Kirschner, *The Vocation of Holiness in Late Antiquity:* VChr 38 (1984) 105-124. An aspect of the *vir dei* is the ability to cure *soul and body, which also unfolds in miracles (J.M. Petersen, *Dead or Alive? The Holy Man as Healer in the Late VI Cent.:* JMedHist 9 (1983) 91-98): of great significance, therefore, is the role of “holy men,” both Christian and pagan, in the performance of miracles in pagan and Christian historiography of the 4th–6th c., a theme researched by L. Cracco Ruggini, *The Ecclesiastical Histories and the Pagan Historiography:* Athenaeum 65 (1977) 107-126. For example, the very conversion of *Rabbula, a 5th-c.bishop of *Edessa, initially a pagan son of a pagan man and a Christian woman, was owed to miracles, a sign of divine operation through human beings. Finally, the ecclesiastical ministry esp. in Late Antiquity conferred the character of *theios* on the one who acquired it: Ps.-*Dionysius the Areopagite, *EH* 1,3, defines the *hierarchēs* as *entheos* and *theios anēr*, a man of God and one inspired by God.

L. Bieler, *Theios Aner: das Bild des göttlichen Menschen in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*, Vienna 1936, repr. Darmstadt 1976; J.S. Lasso de la Vega, *Eroe greco e santo cristiano*, Brescia 1968 (orig. ed. 1962); M.S. Burrows, *On the Visibility of God in the Holy Man: The Reconsideration of the Apa in the Pachomian* Vitae: VChr 41 (1987) 11-33; P. Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, MA 1976; G. Cracco, *Uomini di Dio e uomini di chiesa nell'Alto Medioevo*: Ric. storia sociale e relig. 12 (1977) 163-202; A. Malherbe, *Ps. Heraclitus, Ep. 4: The Divinization of the Wise Man*: JbAC 21 (1978) 42-64; M. Smith, *On the History of the “Divine Man,”* in *Paganisme, judaïsme. Mélanges M. Simon*, Paris 1978, 335-345; M. Smith, *Ascesa e ruolo dei* viri Dei *nell'Italia di Gregorio Magno*, in *Hagiographie, cultures, sociétés, IVe-XIIe siècles*, Paris 1981, 283-297; G. Fawden, *The Pagan Holy Man in Late Antique Society*: JHS 102 (1982) 33-59; E. Gallagher, *Divine Man or Magician? Celsus and Origen on Jesus*, Chico, CA 1982; H. Koester, *The Divine Human Being*: HThR 78 (1985) 243-252; G. Corrington, *The “Divine Man”: His Origin and Function in Hellenistic Popular Religion*, New York 1986; G. Corrington, *Power and the Man*: Helios (USA) 13 (1986) 75-86; G. Corrington, *The Divine Woman? Propaganda and the Power of Celibacy in the NT Apocrypha*: AnglTheolRev 70 (1988) 207-220; D. Frankfurter, *Stylites and Phallobats: Pillar Religions in Late Antiquity*: VChr 44 (1990) 168-198; R. MacMullen - E.N. Lane (eds.), *Paganism and Christianity 100-425 C.E. A Sourcebook*, Minneapolis 1992; G. Anderson, *Sage, Saint and Sophist: Holy Men and Their Associates in the Early Roman Empire*, London-New York 1994; A. Pilgaard, *The Hellenistic* theios aner: *A Model for Early Christian Christology?*, in *The NT and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen - S. Giversen, Aarhus 1995, 101-122; H.J.W. Drijvers, *The Man of God of Edessa, Bishop Rabbula*: JECS 4 (1996) 235-248; R. Mathisen, *Crossing the Supernatural Frontier in Western Late Antiquity*, in *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, ed. R. Mathisen, Aldershot 1996, 309-320; J.-J. Finterman, *The Ubiquitous 'Divine Man'*: Numen 43 (1996) 82-98; J. Elsner, *Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the* Life of Apollonius of Tyana: JHS 117 (1997) 22-37; P. Brown, *The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity*: JECS 6 (1998) 353-376; E.A. Clark, *Holy Women, Holy Words*, ibid. 413-430; M. Gleason, *Visiting and News: Gossip and Reputation Management in the Desert*, ibid. 501-521; S. Harvey, *The Stylite's Liturgy: Ritual and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, ibid. 523-539; N. McLynn, *A Self-Made Holy Man: The Case of Gregory Nazianzen*, ibid. 463-483; M. Vessey, *The Demise of the Christian Writer and the Remaking of “Late Antiquity”: From H.-I. Marrou's Saint Augustine (1938) to Peter Brown's Holy Man (1983)*, ibid. 377-411; W. Cotter, *Miracles in Graeco-Roman Antiquity, A Sourcebook*, London 1999; I. Ramelli, *Philosophen und Prediger. Pagane und christliche weise Männer: der Apostel Paulus*, in E. Amato - S. Fornaro (ed.), *Dio von Prusa. Der Philosoph und seine Bild*, Gottingen 2007, ch. IV; id., *Alle origini della figura dell'intercessore in età paleocristiana*, at press.

I. Ramelli

VIRGA (iconography). In early Christian figurative art, there appears, with noteworthy frequency and since earliest times, a character—either isolated or, more often, inserted in a context—in the act of wielding a rod, which interpreters, following the path of Wilpert (Wp 41ff.), have always considered and conventionally called the *virga virtutis*.

As early as pre-Christian antiquity, the *virga* had the primary meaning of a symbolic instrument of power over animals, human beings, and things, and secondarily of didactic activity, esp. for philosophi-

cal discipline. Patristic *exegesis added such meanings as sacramental, divine power, and liberation from physical and spiritual imperfections and death (Aug., *En. in ps.* 44,17-18; *Quaest. in Num.* XXXV; Ambr., *De myst.* IX,50).

During the 3rd c. this power appears exclusively associated with the figure of Christ—in scenes of the resurrection of *Lazarus, the multiplication of bread, the miracle of Cana—and the figure of *Moses—in the miracle of the spring. From the 4th c. onward the *virga* appears to be held by both Christ and Moses-*Peter in the Petrine cycle, and *Ezekiel in the resurrection of the dry bones. In rarer occasions the *virga* is held by figures who are isolated and indefinable or generally alluding to the doctrine both in communal cemeteries (Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro,* 68) and in private hypogea, even in some of dubious Christianity or orthodoxy (Boyancé, *Aristote sur une peinture,* 107ff.; Himmelmann, *Das Hypogäum der Aurelier,* 24ff.).

At times, in the same figurative context, there appear two scenes with individuals armed with *virgae,* placed symmetrically to create a symbolic formal harmony (Van Moorsel, *Il miracolo della roccia,* 235-236).

A. Hermann, *Ägyptologische Marginalien zur spätantiken Ikonographie*: JbAC 5 (1962) 60-69; L. de Bruyne, *Les lois de l'art paléochrétien comme instrument herméneutique*: RivAC 39 (1963) 14ff.; P. Van Moorsel, *Il miracolo della roccia nella letteratura e nell'arte paleocristiana*: RivAC 40 (1964) 235-236; P. Boyancé, *Aristote sur une peinture de la voie Latine*, in *Mélanges E. Tisserant*, IV, Vatican City 1964, 107ff., M. Dulaey, *Le symbole de la baguette dans l'art paléochrétien*: REAug 19 (1973) 3-38; N. Himmelmann, *Das Hypogäum der Aurelier am Viale Manzoni*, Mainz 1975; U.M. Fasola, *Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975, 68; M. Dulaey, *"Virga virtutis tuae, virga oris tui." Le bâton du Christ dans le christianisme ancien*, in Quaeritur inventus colitur. *Miscellanea U.M. Fasola*, Vatican City 1989, 235-245; U. Utro, TIP, 300-302.

F. Bisconti

VIRGILIUS MARO, grammarian. Originally perhaps from *Gaul or *Ireland, Virgilius lived between the 6th and the 7th c. It does not seem that he can be identified with the person targeted by *Ennodius in his epigrams *De quodam stulto qui Virgilius dicebatur* (*Carm.* II,118-122). The grammarian Virgilius composed epitomes and letters; the first constitute 15 compendia on more general questions of grammar or order, although the second focus on the eight parts of speech. *Bede was among the first who knew and used the Virgilius's works.

CPL 1559; J. Huemer, *Virgilii Maronis grammatici opera*, BT, Leipzig 1886; *Virgilio Marone grammatico, Epitomi ed Epistole*, crit. ed., G. Polara, It. trans. L. Caruso and G. Polara, Naples 1979; G. Pesenti, *Frammento bobiense di Virgilio grammatico*: BollFilolClass 27 (1920-21) 49-52 (ed. of a new fragment from the *Epitoma de metris*); D. Tardi, *Les epitomae de Virgile de Toulouse. Essai de traduction critique avec une bibliographie, une introduction et des notes*, Paris 1928, D. Poli, *I frammenti di Virgilio Marone grammatico ser. n. 3762 dell'"Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek" di Vienna:* Quaderni linguistici e filologici 1982-84, 107-138 (critical ed. of the fragments and paleographic commentary); B. Löfstedt, *Zum Wortschatz des Virgilius Maro Grammaticus*: Philologus 126 (1982) 99-110.

S. Zincone

VIRGIN – VIRGINITY – VELATIO. The term "virginity" in early Christian writings (παρθενία, εὐνουχία, ἐγκράτεια, ἀγαμία, ἁγνεία) signifies a former type of ascetic life (βίος) which consists in the total renunciation of the exercise of sexuality. None of the aforementioned terms adequately expresses the reality to which it refers. Virginity leads one to think of a condition of physical integrity usually applied to females. In the case of males, mention was often made of "ascetics"; the term *singularitas* (Tertull., *Exhor. castit.* 1,1; Ps.-Cypr., *De singul. cler.*) recalls the solitary life of the one who does not have a wife. *Tertullian used the term *virginitas* to refer to a threefold physical integrity, *a nativitate* since birth; *a lavacro,* from baptism; and *a morte coniungis,* from the death of a spouse, with monogamy (*Exhor. castit.* 1,4).

Virginity had followers from the earliest days of Christianity (in the ancient world, however, nonsacral virginity was regarded as foolishness because it was contrary to the purpose of humankind: procreation). Many men and women from every type of life, following Christ since childhood, remained chaste for their whole life (Justin Martyr, *I Apol.* 15). Many Christians of both genders grew old without marrying (ἄγαμοι) (Athenag., *Legat.* 33). According to Tertullian, some live in virginal continence, remaining so even as elderly people, just as children (*senes pueri*: *Apol.* 9,19). *Eusebius of Caesarea reports the tradition of the two daughters of the apostle *Philip, who grew old remaining virgins (*HE* 5,24,2), placing it in the eschatological context of the resurrection. According to *Ambrose, the Christian virgins were so numerous that, if they were supported in the manner of the vestal virgins, the public treasury would be insufficient to meet this expense (*Ep.* 18,12).

Not unlike widows, virgins were a definite category, recognized by the church: in the liturgical gathering they had a reserved spot. They lived in the world; subsequently, the monastery became the ideal place to receive virgins and ascetics.

Virginity, inasmuch as it was a form of life, was

understood to be perpetual and not temporary, as in the case of the vestal virgins, which was not *morum pudicitia, sed annorum* (Ambr., *De virginibus* I,4,15). As with all the *Fathers, Ambrose insists on the interior and spiritual nature of Christian virginity, which is embraced for love of God. In the case of the vestal virgins it is a purely physical fact: *nulla meritorum est pietas, nulla mentis integritas,* but only *carnis virginitas* (*De virginitate* 13). Their virtue is specious because it is not free and disinterested: *illic praemiis revocantur a nuptiis . . . violentia fit, ut capiantur* (*De virginitate* 13). Nevertheless, during the era of the Christian emperors, the rules concerning Christian virgins witnessed similarities to those of the vestal virgins; although rejected by the Fathers, they seem to have drawn inspiration from them.

The idea of virginity as total consecration to God is therefore disinterested per se: just as the contemplative Christian life, of which it is an element, is not ordered by its nature to any practical end of service. "The ascetic life has only one objective: salvation" (*Basil of Caesarea); the ascetic as such is not entrusted with the care of souls (Hausherr).

According to Ambrose, the chief duty of the bishop is to cast seeds of chastity and to inspire love for virginity: *virginitatis studia provocare* (*De virginitate* 26), at times also responding to the criticisms raised against this way of life. Such negative arguments were, e.g., the extinction of humanity, although the practice of virginity, far from compromising the development of humankind, was accompanied by an increase of births (*De virginitate* 36). Another criticism could be taken from the mentality of the OT where a sign of God's blessing was a fruitful marriage: God, by giving a son to Elizabeth, took from her a cause for her shame (Lk 1:25). The Virgin *Mary herself speaks of the "lowliness" of her virginal state (Lk 1:48). This criticism was refuted through a theology of virginity that emphasized the supernatural character of this state of life, emphasizing the advantages of virginity and the disadvantages of marriage.

In the writings of Christian authors, virginity usually has a biblical rationale: it is inserted in the history of salvation from which it receives meaning. The kingdom of God is already realized in the person of Christ, a virgin: those who confess virginity place themselves in harmony with the kingdom (Mt 19:12). With Christ the last times have been inaugurated but have not yet been fulfilled. Virginity is added to the realities that are characteristic of the kingdom, at the same time present and future: it has inaugurated its kingdom, which, however, also coexists with marriage. The antithesis marriage-virginity is not of a philosophical nature but is the dialectic present-future of the history of salvation. Marriage belongs to a provisional order destined to disappear; virginity is established on the fact that we are in the last times, in which the figure of this world is passing away (1 Cor 7:29-31), and the earthly values, among which is marriage, are relativized. God thus becomes the center of asceticism: the human being is conformed to his plan of salvation. Just as present and future coexist, virginity is optional, and marriage remains permissible, precisely for the present age (or the desire of the soul for union with God can and must be reconciled also with the demands of the family: *Gregory of Nyssa, *De virg.*), although virginity is the beginning and, at the same time, awaits and prophesies of the future age. It represents a "new," "messianic" ideal, which is essential for Christianity, given that this ideal is not an exclusive property of monasticism but is universal for all Christians (Gregory of Nyssa, *De virg.*).

Almost all Christian authors, in commending virginity, had recourse to the *topos,* specific to the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, of the inconveniences and the troubles of marriage: worries about children, the humiliating condition of inferiority of a woman who has a *dominus* for a husband (Aug., *Confess.* IX, 9,19), lack of time for prayer and Bible reading (Tertull., *Ad uxorem* 1,4). With this objective, they take away eschatological meaning of 1 Cor 7:28, where emphasis is given to the troubles connected to the final time, not to those deriving from the contingencies of married life. *Methodius of Olympus, ignoring considerations of this type, places virginity in the context of the history of salvation when he excessively exalts it: virginity, conceived as the natural condition of the human being in *paradise before the Fall, indicates the way to salvation (in his thought, one must keep in mind the influence of *Platonism). Through virginity, humanity manifests its relationship with the divine and participates, according to the category of beauty, in the transcendence and holiness of God (*Banquet*). A subsequent method of promoting virginity was the interpretation of virginity as a marriage (*see *Sponsa Christi*), in which there is no death, and its spiritual fruitfulness is great (Tertull., *Ad. uxorem* I,4,4; *Resur.* 61,6; *Virg. Vel.* 16,4; *Venantius Fortunatus, *De virginitate*).

In general, one can observe that the Fathers took from the *Encratite theology great regard for virginity and continence, although setting aside the excessive elements. According to *Athenagoras, many men and women grow old in virginal life in the hope of being closer to God (*Legat.* 33). *Clement of Alexandria, on the one hand, regarded virginity as a gift

from God, to be chosen freely, but in the meantime marriage is not to be disparaged, even if per se virginity is at a higher level than marriage (*Strom.* IV,149,1), given that it leaves one free time for the service of God and for this reason likens one to the life of the angels. On the other hand, widowhood is regarded more highly than virginity because the widow knows what is being renounced (*Strom.* III,101,5; VII,76,3), and thus marriage is also greater than virginity inasmuch as the spouses resist such temptations that the virgin does not know.

Likewise according to *Origen, virginity is a gift (*Comm. in Mt.* 14,25): it is not obligatory, but it is only a form of respect owed to the evangelical precept (*Comm. in Rom.* 10,14); in this regard he delineates the difference, later established, between the evangelical order and counsel. Origen is closer to the Encratite theology in comparison to *Clement of Alexandria: the continence of males follows the example of Jesus; that of women, *Mary (*Comm. in Mt.* 10,17). By means of these, the human being becomes like a child who still does not know sexuality (*Comm. in Mt.* 13,16): sexuality makes the human being impure, even if it is carried out within marriage: for this reason the human being is born with original sin (*Hom. in Lev.* 8,3; 12,4): Clement, however, also combated this teaching of the Encratites.

In the theology of Tertullian, chastity is sanctity: the human being, the image of God, becomes similar to God with chastity (*Exh. cast.* 1,3). One of the great advantages of virginity is that it leaves time for prayer, the reading of the Scriptures; virginity makes human beings more spiritual; the one who remains a virgin becomes angelic already in the present (*Ad uxorem* 1,4). In the thought of Tertullian the *Montanist, continence ensures "a great capital of sanctity; with a renunciation of the exercise of sexual intercourse, one acquires the *Holy Spirit," and free from a woman, a man has a taste of the things of the Spirit (*Exhor. castit.* 10,11). *Cyprian followed his teacher when he stated that the virgins belonged to the angels already, the kind that we will become only after the resurrection (*De hab. virg.* 22).

*Athanasius views virginity in the context of the hundredfold reward, according to the parable of the sower (*Ep. virg.* 151,63; this parable was interpreted and exegeted first with respect to the *martyrs). *Gregory of Nyssa makes Christ come out of the corruptible state of the body and from birth through virginity (*Virg.*); in the explanation of *John Chrysostom, marriage was invented only to restrain the human state after the sin of *Adam and Eve (*Virg.* 15,2), but virginity is a gift, to be chosen freely.

*Ambrose likewise (*De virginibus*) regarded virginity as an angelic life because the virgin is the spouse of Christ: a specific attribute only possessed by the Christian religion—Ambrose naturally did not disparage marriage for this reason (*Virg.* I,6,24). Virginity is the essence of chastity, which rejects every bodily contact, whose most authentic example is Mary. According to Ambrose, it is better for the virgin to choose suicide than to suffer defloration at the hands of the persecuting pagan (*Virg.* III,7,32; Augustine was more restrained on this point: *Civ. Dei* I,26).

*Jerome was closer to the Encratite line: according to his teaching it is good if the wife lives with her husband as if he were her brother: for this reason she also acquires a masculine character (*Ep.* 71,3). *Jovinian's teaching, which maintains that marriage and virginity have the same value, was rejected by Augustine (*Virg.* 45,46), but the same Augustine defends marriage against the *Manicheans.

The great regard for virginity is therefore common in the writings of the Fathers, likewise in association with the virginal-angelic life.

The obligations for those who wished to consecrate themselves to God were very severe: it was requested that the veil of the virgin be given only to that young girl who was presented at a young age: mature in faith and virtue, reserved in conduct, protected by her mother and firm in her resolution (Ambrose, *De virginitate* 39). To accomplish this ideal, the virgin had to overcome the resistance of her relatives: *vince prius, puella, pietatem. Si vincis domum, vincis saeculum* ("Young girl, first conquer piety. If you win for yourself a home, you win the present age," Ambr., *De virginibus* I,12,64).

The virgins made a public profession of their life commitment (Ps.-Ambr., *Laps. virg.* 5,19) and received a veil: *sacro velamine tecta es* (Ps.-Ambr., *Laps. virg.* 5,20). "To take on the veil" became synonymous with making a virginal profession (Ambr., *De virginitate* 39). *Marcellina, Ambrose's sister, made her profession before Pope *Liberius in the basilica of St. *Peter, on Christmas Day perhaps in 353. The ceremony implied a change of garment and a speech for the newly professed woman (Ambr., *De virginibus* III,1,1).

The one who has professed to be a virgin must leave her house only when accompanied by her mother, and that should only happen rarely, even if it is just for going to church: the separation of virgins from society was considered a sign of modesty (*Exhor. virg.* 71). Visits even to their parents and friends were rare (*De virginitate* III, 3,9). Cyprian prohibited virgins from flaunting their wealth, abundance, adornments, participating in nuptial

banquets and from visiting baths (*De hab. virg.* 19). Tertullian demanded that virgins wear a veil, inside and outside church; if it is taken off, the Spirit remains offended. A young girl without a veil is no longer a virgin (*De virg. vel.* 3). The veil is the helmet and the shield that protects the virgin from temptations, scandals, gossip and envy (*De virg. vel.* 15). The veil must not be short like a cap but must come down covering the shoulders, just like hair let down (*De virg. vel.* 17,2).

A great problem for virgins was pride: the excellence of their state could suggest such thoughts, to which the Fathers drew attention: "If one can persevere in chastity for the glory of the Lord, let that one remain humble. If one boasts, one is lost" (Ignatius, *Polyc.* 5,2); a humble wife is worth more than a proud virgin (Aug., *Enarr. in Ps.* 75,16; 99,13; *Sermo* 354,9).

This form of Christian asceticism had value for the Fathers only if united to orthodoxy. With respect to the vestal virgins and continent pagan priests, Tertullian spoke of the chastity that led to ruin (*perditricem*)*;* only Christian chastity saves (*conservatricem*) (*Exhor. cast.* 13,2). The asceticism of *Marcion and the Encratites was regarded by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian as ungodly and blasphemous because it was an expression against the God of the OT. The chastity of these heretics was prompted by the objective of not collaborating, through marriage, in the work of the Creator God. True chastity, homage to God, cannot be separated from faith in the true God. This was also St. Augustine's teaching: one cannot call *veraciter pudicum* the one who does not practice virtue *propter Deum verum* (*Nupt. et concup.* I, 3,4).

R. Metz, *La consécration des vierges dans l'Église romaine*, Paris 1954; H. Crouzel, *Virginité et mariage selon Origène*, Paris-Bruges 1963; L. Legrand, *La dottrina biblica della verginità*, It. trans. Turin 1965; S. Frank, *Anghelikòs Bíos. Begriffsanalytische und begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum "engelgleichen Leben" im frühen Mönchtum*, Münster 1964; P.F. Beatrice, *Continenza e matrimonio nel cristianesimo primitivo* (*sec. I-II*), in var. aus., *Etica sessuale e matrimonio nel cristianesimo delle origini*, Studia Patr. Mediol. 5, Milan 1976, 3-68; C. Tibiletti, *Ascetismo e storia della salvezza nel* De habitu virginum *di Cipriano*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 431-442; C. Tibiletti, *Verginità e matrimonio in antichi scrittori cristiani*, Rome ²1983; G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Enkrateia e antropologia. Le motivazioni protologiche della continenza e della verginità nel cristianesimo dei primi secoli e nello gnosticismo* (SEA 20), Rome 1984; A. Guillaumont, *Le célibat monastique et l'idéal chrétien de la virginité ont-ils des motivations ontologiques et protologiques?*, in *La tradizione dell'enkrateia. Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche.* Atti del Colloquio int., Milan, 20-23 aprile 1982, ed. U. Bianchi, Rome 1985, 83-98; C. Tibiletti, *Matrimonio e verginità in S. Agostino*, in *Fede e sapere nella conversione di Agostino*, ed. A. Ceresa Gastaldo, Fac. di Lettere Genova 1986, 27-42; Ch. Munier, *Mariage et virginité dans l'Église ancienne* (*Ier-IIIe siècles*) (Traditio christiana 6), Frankfurt 1987; C. Tibiletti, *Metodio d'Olimpo. Verginità e platonismo*: Orpheus 8 (1987) 127-137; P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (Lectures on the hist. of religions n.s. 13), New York 1988; H. Savon, *Un modèle de sainteté à la fin du IVe siècle: la virginité dans l'oeuvre de saint Ambroise*: Problèmes d'histoire du christianisme 19 (1989) 21-31; A. Cameron, *Virginity as Metaphor: Women and the Rhetoric of Early Christianity*, in *History as Text: The Writing of the Ancient History*, ed. A. Cameron, Chapel Hill 1990, 181-205; D. Hart Mark, *Reconciliation of Body and Soul: Gregory of Nyssa's Deeper Theology of Marriage*: ThS 51 (1990) 450-478; V. Andò, *La verginità come follia: il* Peri parthenion *ippocratico*: Quaderni storici 25 (1990) 715-737; L. Desanti, *Vestali e vergini cristiane*: AARC 8, Naples 1990, 473-488; Th. Felder, *Jungfräulichkeit als Anteilnahme am Geheimnis der Kirche nach Augustinus*, Innsbruck 1991; A.-G. Hamman, *Ascèse et virginité à Carthage au IIIe siècle*, in *Memoriam sanctorum venerantes: miscellanea in onore di V. Saxer* (Studi di antichità cristiana 48), Vatican City 1992, 503-514; C. Mazzucco, *Matrimonio e verginità nei Padri tra IV e V secolo: prospettive femminili*, in *La donna nel pensiero cristiano antico*, ed. U. Mattioli, Genoa 1992, 119-153; P. Huybrechts, *Le Traité de la virginité de Grégoire de Nysse: idéal de vie monastique ou idéal de vie chrétienne?*: NRTh 115 (1993) 227-242; P. Mattei, *Deux notes sur mariage* (*divorce*) *et virginité dans Novatien*: RSLR 29 (1993) 357-365; B. Brennan, *Deathless Marriage and Spiritual Fecundity in Venantius Fortunatus's* De virginitate: *Traditio* 51 (1996) 73-97; H.F. Keroloss, *Virginity in the Early Church: The Meanings and Motives of Sexual Renunciation in the First Four Centuries*, New York 1996; V.E.F. Harrison, *Gender, Generation, and Virginity in Cappadocian Theology*: JTS 47 (1996) 38-68; Ch. Methuen, *The "Virgin Widow": A Problematic Social Role for the Early Church?*: HTR 90 (1997) 285-298; R. Lizzi, *Vergini di Dio, vergini di Vesta: il sesso negato e la sacralità*, in *L'eros difficile: amore e sessualità nell'antico cristianesimo* (Armarium. Biblioteca di storia e cultura religiosa 9), ed. S. Pricoco, Soveria Mannelli 1998, 89-132; G. Schöllgen, *Der Eros der Jungfräulichkeit: zum Konzept der sexuellen Askese in den sogenannten Thekla-Akten*, in *Im Gedächtnis der Kirche neu erwachen: Studien zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel- und Osteuropa: Festgabe für G. Adriányi* (Bonner Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte 22), Cologne-Vienna 2000, 597-606; D.G. Hunter, *The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine*: Church History 69 (2000) 281-303; RAC 19, 523-592.

C. Tibiletti - L. Odrobina

VIRGO PARENS. The *carmen *Virgo Parens*, from the codices, is mainly attributed to *Gregory the Great, but also to *Jerome and, according to the *De metris* of *Aldhelm, who cites it in v. 10, to an unknown Andrew the Orator. The dogmatic content and metrical and stylistic analysis suggest that the carmen should be dated between the 6th and 8th c. It came to light in a complete form only within the anthology inscriptions contained in the cod. Palat. Lat. 833, *olim Laureshamensis*, of the 9th c., which concluded with an ametrical poem dedicated to Pope Gregory, and in an 11th-c. miscellaneous codex of Antwerp, with a dedication to Rusticiana. Other codices have transmitted it in a fragmentary manner. The text was published for the first time at Antwerp

by Theodore Poelmann in 1560 and later by Caspar von Barth and in various epigraphic collections. The carmen contains in 24 verses some themes of a doctrinal character, esp. of a *christological nature and on the virginal maternity of *Mary. In all probablity, the carmen was used in the Advent and Christmas *liturgy and, perhaps, also in other circumstances, but its good fortune in the course of the centuries is connected to its popular recitation and singing.

C. von Barth, *Adversariorum commentariorum libri LX*, I, Frankfurt, 1624; J. Gruter, *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani*, Heidelberg 1602-1603; G. Fleetwood, *Inscriptionum antiquarum Sylloge*, London 1691, 534,1; G.B. De Rossi, ICR 2,1, Rome 1888, 36 n. 2; *Anthologia Latina*, ed. F. Buecheler-A. Riese, Leipzig 1906, I,2, 494[C]; PLS 3, 1429-1430; R.M. D'Angelo, *Natura umana e divina di Christo in Anth. Lat. 494[C] R.[2]*, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, n. F. 147 (2004) 390-407; A. Brasseur, Uirgo parens. *Le destin d'une épigramme latine des premiers siècles de notre ère*, Geneva, Droz, 2006 (Publications romanes et françaises, 240).

R. Ronzani

VIRTUES and VICES. The concept of "virtue" goes back to Greek philosophy: already mentioned by some pre-Socratic philosophers, it was primarily the Socratic tradition that used it. *Plato provided the first systematization of this concept, in the form of the four fundamental virtues (*Rep.* 427e), later called "cardinal" virtues (Ambrose, *Hom. Luc.* V,62), because these correspond to the natural human constitution, of which they manifest harmony and good moral health. *Aristotle continues this tradition, complementing it: for him, the virtues are not innate but acquired. He distinguishes between intellectual and moral virtues and inserts them within the framework of *hexis,* in Latin *habitus,* that is, the overall disposition of the human being. Virtue arises out of the exercise of human freedom and thus means excellence (which is a fundamental meaning of the term *aretē*); it is the permanent disposition of choice, which is brought about by holding oneself to the just means determined by reason (*EN* II, 6,1106b36-1107a1). Ancient *Stoicism spread Platonic thought far and wide concerning the four cardinal virtues (prudence, fortitude, wisdom and temperance); see Diog. Laer., *Vit. Philos.* VII,92.

The Platonic teaching on the virtues posed some complex problems for early Christian thinkers who were intent on distinguishing themselves from the milieu in which they lived and affirming the uniqueness of Christianity while desiring to safeguard whatever good was found in pagan teaching. The problem was complex inasmuch as in the biblical tradition one did not find a systematic theory of virtue. It was an important problem of Christian acculturation: how to move from a Semitic form of thought to a form of thinking that was dominant in the Greco-Roman world. In fact, with respect to the OT, with the exception of the late book of Wisdom, which lists the four virtues (8:7), we find, if not the precise term of "virtue," at least numerous moral behaviors that imply a relation to God that can be categorized under one virtue or another. However, it remains difficult to transfer these behaviors into the Greco-Roman world. *Philo of Alexandria reconciled the formulas of Aristotle and the Stoics with the *Bible: the virtues are planted and perfected in the soul by the power of God (*Leg. alleg.* I,52.48.49).

The NT, however, already presented an outline for the interpretation of the virtues and the Christian ideal. The only case in which one finds the term "virtue" used is Phil 4:8, where virtue is connected to everything that is true, pure and honorable. Virtue, therefore, is understood with the meaning of "excellence," ideal behavior. But at the same time *Paul emphasized the fact that following Christ led to some specifically Christian virtues, which were essentially free and a gift of God: faith, hope and charity (the most ancient citation is 1 Th 3:1; and then 1 Cor 13:13). The Fathers also composed different genealogical lists of virtues (see, e.g., *Shepherd* of *Hermas III,8,7); these lists agree inasmuch as they place faith at the beginning and charity at the end (Ign., *Eph.* 14,1).

Although the first Christian writers do not speak very much of the virtues, which in their eyes were connected to pagan morality, starting from *Clement of Alexandria the effort to integrate pagan teaching on the virtues in a specifically Christian ethical reflection became esp. emphasized. A large quantity of the Platonic and Stoic ethical teachings passed into Clement's writings on Paul. The definition of virtue (*Paed.* I,101,2; III,35,2) goes as follows: virtue is produced from a just mixing of natural inclinations, learning and exercise, as the Aristotelian school taught. Virtue is insufficient, however, by itself to obtain Christian happiness: Christian happiness does not depend on external events but only from deep-seated conviction (*Strom.* IV,52,1-2). The doctrine of the self-sufficiency of virtue had constituted an essential element of Stoic and *Middle Platonist ethics. The same idea was supported by *Justin Martyr (see *Apol.* II,11). Clement was the first Christian writer to present an organically developed doctrine of the four virtues, called "cardinal." The first is prudence, distinguishing in the Aristotelian manner between practical wisdom (that is, prudence) and in "theoretical" wisdom (*Top.* VI,3,141a

6ff.). In this definition Clement (*Strom*. VI,154,4) agrees with Alcinous (*Didask*. 153,4-6). The definition of prudence in *Strom*. II,34,4; III,84,1 etc. ("prudence prescribes what must be done and identifies what must not be done") derives from Stoicism and in harmony with that of the Middle Platonists Alcinous (*Didask*. 182,23-24) and Apuleius (*Plat.* II,228); substantially the same procedure that Clement uses—deriving the meaning from Stoicism and in harmony with the Middle Platonism that was contemporaneous to him—can also be found in the definition of the other virtues. Moreover, along with the Middle Platonists, Clement also attributes one specific virtue to a particular part of the soul: (1) *prudence* perfects the *logistikon,* the intellect; (2) *courage* is the force of the *thymoeidēs,* of the irascible appetite when it is moved against evil; (3) *temperance* resists the *epithymētikon,* which is concupiscence; (4) *justice* harmonizes in just proportion the exercise of the *preceding virtues.* One likewise finds in the writings of Clement the idea, typical of the Stoics, that the virtues are like a chain: one follows the other. By emphasizing the dynamic aspect of virtue, the Stoics saw its efficacy in the battle against the vices and the passions, which are the illnesses of the soul. Their ideal of impassibility, *apatheia,* was adopted by the Eastern Fathers but with an essentially different meaning. After Clement, teaching on virtue already constituted an essential part of the moral and ascetic teaching of Christians.

In the Latin world the first example of the use of the term "virtue" is given to us by *Tertullian, who regarded virtue primarily as patience, to which he dedicated a specific treatise (*On Patience*). The Christian's patience is not, among the virtues, the most important, given that love has the first place, as one reads both in Paul's epistles and in the corpus of Johannine writings. But Tertullian, on the one hand, wanted to demonstrate that there existed a point of contact between pagan and Christian ethics (see *Apol.* 46,2), and on the other hand, he wanted to emphasize the uniqueness and superiority of the Christian virtue of patience, and last, he could not disregard the Stoic doctrine, which during this time was the most authoritative in the ethical sphere. Patience, moreover, constituted an essential element of Roman morality: e.g., it was praised in the military sphere and the specific life of the *Quirites.* For this reason, even the Christian—who being a "soldier of Christ," according to an idea in which Tertullian draws on the ethics of Paul—had to exercise the virtue of patience both in daily life and esp. in the case of *martyrdom. The Christian was therefore the equivalent of the Roman hero and the Stoic wise man. As a result, this conception of patience derives in large measure from the Stoic idea of "impassibility" (*apatheia*), and such virtue is, in Tertullian's description, more Stoic than Christian. The author, moreover, also uses pagan concepts, and more specifically, those of Seneca (who, as is known, was often called by him "one of our own") (see *Epist. Luc.* 66,45-48; also in 67,4-5 Seneca emphasized the role played by patience in the practice of wisdom). Other reminiscences of Seneca are found in the elaboration of the gospel precept (Mt 5:39): "But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also." Tertullian analyzes the inner satisfaction that is evidence of the patient person: he shows how impassibility tires and brings down his enemy. This affirmation adopts many insights offered by Seneca, when the latter describes the disposition of those who cause offense and the reaction of those who suffer from it (see *Epist.* 53,12; *De const. sap.* 3,5; 9, 4-5; 14,2); see also the affirmation, "The gain of the one who causes offense consists in the pain of the one who undergoes it" (*De const. sap.* 17,4). Also the affirmation that the basis of Christian patience is the patience of Christ during his passion (see Tert., *On patience* 3,1ff.), or God's patience shown toward human beings (see 2,1), is closer to a pagan way of thinking. This patience, in fact, has nothing to do with the salvation brought by Christ to human beings by means of his passion. The life of the wise Stoic is an illustration of a teaching and concrete example of human perfection, while that of Christ is the foundation of human virtue and the ideal model proposed for the Christian's imitation (*On Patience* 6,1).

The great artisan of the integration between pagan and Christian virtue was *Ambrose of Milan, whose *De officiis* drew on Cicero's model, having the same title: the Ambrosian conception of virtue inaugurated the new attitude of the Christian's toward the pagan virtues. This Christianization of the virtues was then brought to completion esp. by *Augustine, who emphasized the superiority of the specifically Christian virtues, faith, hope and charity, over those pagan ones, which are simply moral, the art of living well (*Civ. Dei* XXII,24). But esp. during the anti-Pelagian controversy, Augustine energetically affirmed that virtue only comes from God (*Civ. Dei* XIX,25). Starting from Augustine, the four cardinal virtues were integrated with the Christian ("theological") virtues, and the synthesis offered by *Gregory the Great would facilitate this integration.

The struggle between virtues and vices was likewise an idea of Greek origin, shown by the exemplification of the choice that was placed before Hercules at the crossroads (Xenophon, *Mem.* II,1,22-23), according to the teaching of the Pythagorean Prodi-

cus: the hero, as a young man, sees *Aretē* and *Kakia* presenting themselves before him, each one of which set forth a choice of life. Ambrose drew inspiration from this image, explaining that in our soul, pleasure and virtue are opposed (*De Cain et Abel* I, 4,13-5,21). Tertullian (*Spect.* 29,5) and *Cyprian (*Mort.* 4) had already represented the conflict between virtues and vices. Augustine, illustrating the interior debate in which he found himself before conversion, primarily makes his "old friends" speak, that is, carnal pleasures, and then listens to the speeches of *Continentia* (*Conf.* VIII,11,25-27). During the same years *Prudentius dedicated an extensive exposition to this theme in his epic poem titled *Psychomachia* ("battle of the soul" or "battle in the soul," namely, between virtue and vice), which had a very broad echo during the Middle Ages.

Gregory the Great, commenting on Job 39:25 (*Mor.* XXXI,45,87-91), describes the combat *against the human being* waged by the entire army of vices: their leader is pride, and the commandments are the seven chief vices; he does not speak, however, of a combat of vices against virtues, because the latter are not mentioned. *Isidore of Seville (*Sent.* II,32-34: PL 83,634-644) spoke generically of a battle of the virtues against the vices.

With subtle psychological observation, the Greek fathers (and subsequently the Byzantines, esp. the hesychasts) described the birth of the passions. They begin from the conviction that wickedness does not belong to the nature of the human being; it must, therefore, come "from outside" by means of a wicked thought (*logismos*). "The source and principle of all sin are wicked thoughts," Origen had already said (*Comm. Matth.* 21: GCS 40,58). The first level of this beginning is the *prosbolē,* which is a suggestion, a sinful image. There follows the *syndiasmos,* a "conversation" with what is suggested, without any decision for or against. The *synkatathesis* is the consent given to the suggestion. The *palē* is an internal struggle, the effort to deliver oneself from wickedness. The one who consents more often falls into *aichmalōsia,* captivity of the *pathos,* passion (John of Damascus, *De virt. et vit.*: PG 95,93A). In the West, in Augustine's writings we read of three levels: *suggestus-delectatio-consensus* (*Enarr. in Ps.* 143,6). But Augustine also spoke of the combat and the *consuetudo* in wickedness.

Avoiding the first suggestions, say the ascetics, is humanly impossible. Avoiding consent is necessary. The art of the spiritual life, however, consists in knowing how to avoid even "conversations" with evil.

To immediately combat the evil thought from the outset requires discernment. To facilitate the process, *Evagrius of Pontus presents a list of eight chief vices, which then became traditional. His teaching is summarized in ch. 6 of the *Praktikos:* "In all, there are eight chief ideas that include all of wickedness: the first is that of the gluttony *[gastrimargia],* then that of fornication *[porneia],* the third of avarice *[philargyria],* the fourth of sadness *[lypē],* the fifth of anger *[orgē],* the sixth of sloth *[akēdia],* the seventh of vainglory *[kenodoxia],* the eighth of pride *[hyperēphania]*" (SC 171,506ff.).

Latin authors (*John Cassian) reduced the list to seven vices, because they united vainglory to pride; moreover, they substituted sadness with envy (which is the sadness that arises by seeing somebody else's good); likewise, the order is reversed on the basis of Sir 10:15 (*Vulg*): *Initium omnis peccati est superbia* ("The beginning of all sin is pride"). The Easterners, on the contrary, remained faithful to Evagrius's order, whose teaching yielded splendid fruits in the 7th c. with *Maximus the Confessor.

DSp 9, 955-957; DTC 15, 2739-2799; J.S. Stelzenberger, *Die Beziehungem der frühchristlichen Sittenlehre zur Ethik der Stoa*, Munich 1933, 307-354; G.E. Konstantinou, *Die Tugendlehre Gregors von Nyssa*, Würzburg 1966; W. Völker, Scala Paradisi. *Eine Studie zu Johannes Climacus und zugleich eine Vorstudie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen*, Wiesbaden 1968; A. Guillaumont, *Introduzione al* Praktikós *di Evagrio*: SC 170, 55ff.; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des pères de l'Église . . .*, Paris [2]1957, Th. Spidlík, *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*: OCA 206, Rome 1979, 255ff. (*vices*), 277ff. (*virtues*).

C. Moreschini

VISIGOTHS. Population of E Germans, belonging to the great people of the *Goths, who emigrated from the banks of the Baltic Sea into S Russia on the Dniestr River and on the Black Sea. The era in which the division of the Goths into *Ostrogoths and Visigoths occurred is uncertain. According to Jordanes, this took place after their siege in *Pontus when the Visigoths recognized the authority of the Baltungs; the Ostrogoths, on the other hand, recognized the authority of the Amali. In the 4th c. Christianity spread among them in the *Arian form preached by Bishop *Wulfila. At the same time the Visigoths were forced by the *Huns to move toward the W and to thus enter the Roman sphere.

In 376, led by Fritigern, they crossed the Danube and were obliged to defend *Thrace. On account of the Roman administrators, they rebelled and defeated the Roman forces at Marcianopolis in 377 and then inflicted on them a defeat at Hadrianopolis (9 August 378), where the emperor *Valens lost his life; the emperor had rushed to protect *Constantinople, which was threatened by the invaders. Subsequently,

the Goths, led by Athanaric, prudently agreed to become allies of the empire, taking up a stable dwelling in Moesia Inferior. After the death of *Theodosius the Great (395), *Stilicho took from Alaric, the new *dux* of the Visigoths, any hope of obtaining high Roman military dignity, although he had participated in the battles against the usurper Eugenius and had suffered heavy losses of troops in the battle near the River Frigido (5 September 394). The consequences were disastrous for the empire because Alaric with his people put *Thrace, *Macedonia and *Thessaly to the test; he entered Greece and conquered *Athens; he then crossed the isthmus of *Corinth to then dwell in the Peloponnese and finally settled in Illyricum, which he governed in the name of the emperor *Arcadius with the title of *dux* and *magister militum,* in expectance of the propitious occasion that would allow him to invade the Italian peninsula. In 400, once the Alans and the Vandals had entered Noricum and Rhetia, Stilicho had to advance toward them. Alaric therefore headed toward *Milan, but Stilicho, who had reached an agreement with those barbarians, turned back and defeated the Visigoths at Pollenza on the River Tanaro (402). Upon the death of Stilicho (408), Alaric found no resistance on his path into *Italy and was able to go straight toward *Rome.

After the first sack of Rome in 410, while there was great confusion in the Italian peninsula, which by that time had fallen to pieces, the Visigoths, the protagonists of one of the most traumatic events in the history of the city of Rome, soon found themselves without leadership because of Alaric's unforeseen disappearance. After three days of sacking Rome, Alaric came up with the idea of quickly pursuing the conquest of the rich province of *Africa, to then reenter and rule with an iron fist over the entire peninsula. His brother-in-law Ataulf succeeded him, who, intimidated by the overwhelming forces of Heraclian, the general of *Honorius, abandoned the idea of the conquest of Africa and preferred to go N toward *Gaul, where, in 412, he began a true and proper war against the Romans after having made a pact with the antiemperor *Jovinus, who had usurped the title in 411; however, the agreement between the two lasted none too long on account of Jovinus's desire to govern the entirety of Gaul without interference from anyone. Ataulf then turned to the emperor Honorius, promising the head of the usurper as well as the return of his sister *Galla Placidia, who had been taken prisoner by the Goths during the sack of Rome, in exchange for provisions of grain and an allotment of land. Honorius accepted at first but then did not keep his promise, a deed which forced Ataulf to adopt a hostile stance against the empire.

In 413 the Visigoths were able to occupy in rapid succession *Narbonne, *Toulouse and *Bordeaux, and at the beginning of 414 Ataulf, after Galla Placidia had been married a second time, radically changed his disposition from bellicose to peaceful. Nevertheless, war immediately became inevitable and, after changing events, once the situation of the Goths became desperate, Ataulf was forced to seek refuge in *Spain, where in 415 he occupied the province of Tarraco, dwelling there for a short while. Wallia, his successor, maintained his promises to the Romans, and between 416 and 418, he obtained the province of Aquitanica Secunda and some neighboring districts. That same year Wallia died. His successor *Theodoric (419–451) had the duty of establishing and executing the division of lands among the Gothic and Roman population, the latter of which was forced, to its detriment, to accept the situation. The relations between the two peoples were also difficult because the Visigoths did not seem to regard with due seriousness the value of the *foedus* that had long connected them to the empire. One simply has to think of what occurred in 422, when the Romans, who had lined up for war against the Vandals, counting on the intervention of Gothic troops, had the unfortunate surprise of being attacked from behind the back precisely from their "allies," who took the occasion to attempt to deliver themselves from the imperial yoke. The Visigoths witnessed their full sovereignty recognized over the provinces which were originally assigned to them (Aquitanica Secunda and the NW corner of Narbonensis Prima). In exchange, they were forced to restore to the empire the territories conquered until 426. The Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse was thus born. Only the danger of the *Huns threatening Rome could unite the Romans with the Visigoths against a common enemy. King Theodoric helped defeat *Attila in the Battle of the Catalaunian Plains (451), where the same courageous Gothic sovereign met his death.

After the reigns of Thurismund (451–453) and Theodoric II (453–466), it was *Euric who took the reins of the kingdom of Toulouse and was the true founder of that kingdom because the emperor Julius Nepos (475) formally recognized his sovereignty over the entire region including that territory between the Loire River, the Rhone River, the Pyrenees Mountains and the two oceans, and also Alvernia. With Euric not only the kingdom of Toulouse reached its maximal extension because a good part of the Iberian Peninsula was connected to it, but, as

Sidonius Apollinaris recalled, the court of Toulouse became a vital and living center. The border of that kingdom was in continual opposition between the Gothic Arian minority and the Catholic majority. The situation intensified with Alaric II, Euric's successor, who, as the last act of conciliation between the two populations of different religious confessions, promulgated on 2 February 506 the *Lex Romana Visigothorum,* also called the *Breviarium Alarici*. The Gallo-Romans, however, wanted to remove the Visigoths and sought assistance from the Frankish king *Clovis, who had recently converted to Catholicism (496). The Frankish king therefore attacked Alaric, who lost the battle and his life at Campus Vocladensis (modern-day Vouillé). It was the end of the kingdom of Toulouse. The Visigoths were able to survive only thanks to the intervention of Theodoric the Great, who preserved the crown for his infant grandson Amalaric (507–531). He, likewise for confessional reasons, mistreated his spouse *Clotilde, Clovis's daughter, leading Clovis to declare war on the newborn Spanish kingdom. Alaric was defeated near Narbonne in 531, and the Visigoths, unable, as in the recent past, to count any longer on Theodoric's assistance and no longer able to endure the push of the experienced, warlike people like the Franks, lost Aquitaine. Immediately after the defeat, *Alaric was slain by his own soldiers, and with his demise the royal dynasty of the Balti was extinguished; from that time onward the throne was the object of pursuit by many aristocratic families, and the induction of a new dynasty became impossible.

The emperor *Justinian sought to take advantage of the internal disagreements at the court which from Athanagild was established at *Toledo and conquered Baetica (modern-day Andalusia). The brother of Athanagild, *Leovigild (567–583), extended the rule of his kingdom of the Suevi, in *Gallaecia, and inflicted a heavy defeat on the Franks also thanks to the decisive contribution of his son *Recared. Once the internal tensions between Arians and Hispano-Catholics were resolved, Leovigild dedicated himself to fierce anti-Catholic persecutions to which even his son Ermenegild fell victim, while Recared (586–606) began the work of Romanization of the kingdom with his conversion to Catholicism and the ensuing conversion of his people, which was decided at the Third Council of *Toledo (589). The fusion was thus accelerated between the Visigoths and the Hispano-Romans and, despite the foolish attempts to bring *Arianism back to supremacy such as those carried out by Witteric (603–610), was greatly aided by developments in Visigothic legislation.

Scholars are not certain (in fact, they are in considerable disagreement) whether the aspect of personality rather than territoriality prevailed in Visigothic law, but since Recceswinth with the *Liber Iudiciorum* of 654, all the laws were gathered together, which he regarded as *antiquae,* and his own were added to these and were considered the corpus that was thus established as valid for the entire population of the kingdom. This had also as its objective reaching a definitive integration between Arians and Catholics. Characteristic, however, of the kingdom of *Sisebut (612–620) was the persecution of Jews, who, since the imperial age, lived in great numbers in *Spain and were protected by the apposite laws. In the 5th c. with the *Lex Romana Visigothorum,* Alaric II had received the Roman legislation concerning the Jews and only introduced some restrictions such as the maintenance of the separation between the races that resulted from the law that made marriage between Catholics and Jews adultery, and the prohibition for Jews of possessing Christian slaves and holding public offices. With the Third Synod of Toledo, Recared had already modified the law of Alaric II, making *baptism obligatory for the sons of mixed marriages; Sisebut went further and ordered that all Jews be baptized, with the punishment of exile and confiscation of their goods if they refused to do so. Sisebut was a leader of noteworthy stature who was not only distinguished in victorious military campaigns and in defense of Catholicism but was also a man of letters who had a significant role in the so-called renaissance of culture in Spain.

After Recared's conversion, numerous prestigious episcopal schools were developed that were aimed at the formation of the Gothic bureaucracy as well as the clergy. Alongside the episcopal schools, monastic schools were already spreading which had a foundational importance in the rediscovery and the ensuing study of the Latin classics. There were not a few Visigothic sovereigns who acquired an unusual amount of culture for the times, and Sisebut was one of these; in fact he was one of its authors. The most serious problem of the Toledan kingdom was the internal conflict at the court between those who desired to return to their Arian origins and the supporters of the Catholic Church. Moreover, there always remained the unsolved question of the succession to the throne, which remained electoral and not dynastic. A remedy to the political instability was sought, but all attempts were in vain, and the perennial infighting among the nobility caused the decline of the society. Upon the death of Wittizia, in 710, the new king Roderic

was not recognized by Wittizia's relatives, and in the meantime the Arabs, who had already besieged Spain during the reign of Wamba (672–680), took advantage of the disagreement among the Gothic aristocrats; under the leadership of Al Tarik, on 19 July 711, near Lake Janda, they obtained an important victory over the Visigothic army led by Roderic himself. In 713 the Visigothic king, once his military forces had gathered for a final and desperate attempt of defense near Segovia, underwent a decisive defeat that was the final act of Visigothic rule over the Iberian Peninsula, which from that moment would uninterruptedly remain in the hands of the Arabs for seven centuries.

Sources: Auctarium Havniense, MGH (AA) IX, 249ff.; Braulius of Saragossa, *Epistolae*, ed. Madoz, Madrid 1941; *Chronica Caesaraugustana*, MGH (AA) XI, 221ff.; *Chronica Gallica*, MGH (AA) IX, 615ff.; *Codex Euricianus*, ed. A. d'Ors. *Estudios Visigóticos II*. Cuadernos del Instituto Jurídico Español 12, Rome-Madrid 1960; *Concilia Hispaniae*, PL 84, 327-562; *Concilios Visigóticos*, ed. J. Vives, *España Cristiana*, 1, Barcelona-Madrid 1963; *Continuationes Isidorianae*, MGH (AA) IX (2), 323-388; *Epistulae Arelatenses genuinae*, MGH (Epist.); *Formulae Visigothicae*, MGH (Form.); Fredegar, *Chronicon*, MGH (SRM) II, 1-193; John of Biclaro, *Chronicon*, PL 96; Julian of Toledo, *Historia rebellionis Pauli adversus Wambam Gothorum regem*, PL 96, 759-796; Julian of Toledo, *Vita sancti Ildefonsi*, PL 96; Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ed. M. Oldoni, Vicenza 1981; Ildephonsus Leodegarius of Toledo, *Opera omnia*, PL 96; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, II, 1911; Id., *Historia de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum et Suevorum*, PL 58; Id., *Chronicon*, PL 83; Id., *De natura rerum*, ed. J. Fontaine, Bordeaux 1960; Id., *Sententiae*, PL 83; Id., *De Ecclesiae Officiis*, PL 96; Id., *De viris illustribus*, PL 83; Id., *Regula monachorum*, PL 83; Id., *Liber numerorum*, PL 83; Id., *De Veteri et Novo testamento quaestiones*, PL 83; Id., *Versus in Bibliotheca*, ed. Beeson, in *Isidor-Studien*, Munich 1913, 133-166; Jordanes, *De origine actibus Getharum*, MGH Auct. Ant. V/1, 53-138; *Laterculus regum Visigothorum*, MGH (AA) XIII, 461ff.; Leander of Seville, *Regula ad virgines*, PL 72; *Leges Visigothorum*, MGH Leges nationum Germanicarum I; *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, ed. G. Haenel, 1849 = Aalen 1962; *Liber Ordinum*, ed. Ferotin, Paris 1904; Luca Tudensis, *Chronicon mundi*, III, in R. Grosse, *Las fuentes de la época visigoda y bizantina* (*Fontes Hispaniae Antiquae IX*), Barcelona 1947; Martin of Braga, *Opera Omnia*, ed. C.W. Barlow, in *Papers and monographs of the American Academy in Rome* 12, New Haven, CT 1950; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina*, MGH (AA) VIII; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae*, MGH (AA) VIII; Sisebut, *Vita Desiderii*, MGH, SRM III; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistolae Visigothorum*, MGH, Epist. III; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmen de eclipsibus solis et lunae*, edited by J. Fontaine in the ed. of the *De natura rerum* by Isidore of Seville, Bordeaux 1960.

Studies: R. de Ureña, *La legislación gótico-hispana*, Madrid 1905; Hfl-Lecl; Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España*, t. II, 1 and 2 (*Época visigótica*), Madrid 1933; A. García Gallo, *Nacionalidad y territorialidad del derecho en la época visigoda*: AHDE 13 (1936-41) 168-264; R. Menéndez Pidal, *Historia de España*, 3 vols., Madrid 1940; Vives, *Concilios*; A. Mundò, *Il monachesimo nella penisola iberica fino al secolo VII*, in Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'Alto medioevo, IV, *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*, Spoleto 1957; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, II, Paris 1959; A. d'Ors, *El Código de Eurico: Estudios visigóticos II*, Cuaderno del Instituto Juridíco Español 12, Rome-Madrid 1960; P. Riché, *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare. VI^e-VIII^e siècles*, Paris 1962; J. Fontaine, *Conversion et culture chez les Wisigoths d'Espagne*, in *La conversione al Cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo*, Centro italiano di Studi sull'Alto medioevo (Spoleto 14-19 aprile 1966), Spoleto 1967, 87-147; G. Astuti, *Sul sistema delle fonti negli ordinamenti dei regni romano-barbarici dell'Occidente*, in *Le fonti. Età romano-barbarica*, Padova 1968, App. II, 489-508; E.A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, Oxford 1969; J. Orlandís, *El primer renacimiento eclesiástico en la España visigoda*, Madrid 1976; M. Rouche, *L'Aquitaine: Des Wisigoths aux Arabes, 418-781: Naissance d'une région*, Paris 1979; E. James (ed.), *Visigothic Spain*, Oxford 1980; H. Mitteis - H. Lieberich, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte. Ein Studienbuch*, Munich 1981; L.A. García Moreno, *Historia de la España visigoda*, Madrid 1989; H. Wolfram, *Histoire des Goths*, Paris 1990; B. Luiselli, *Storia culturale dei rapporti tra mondo romano e mondo germanico*, Rome 1992; M. Banniard, *La genesi culturale dell'Europa*, Bari 1994; M. Caravale, *Ordinamenti giuridici dell'Europa medievale*, Bologna 1994; P. Cazier, *Isidore de Séville et la naissance de l'Espagne catholique*, Paris 1994; P.C. Díaz - R.G. Salinero, *El Código de Eurico y el derecho romano vulgar*, in *Visigoti e Longobardi*, ed. J. Arce - P. Delogu, Florence 2001, 93-115; L. Montecchio, *I Visigoti e la rinascita culturale del secolo VII*, Perugia 2006.

L. Montecchio

VISIO BARONTI (ca. 679). An account of the vision of a village in the afterlife by the monk Barontius from the monastery of Lonrey (*Longoretus*), written during the 6th year of the reign of Theodoric III (678/679). The author knew both the monastery of Lonrey (Saint-Cyran, not far from Bourges) and the twin establishment of Méobeque. The protagonist recounts the vision to his brothers immediately after awakening. The *Visio Baronti* was probably written in *Gaul by a monk (Ciccarese 232). With respect to similar accounts from previous ages the vision of the afterlife is enriched with new elements pertaining to the description and the figure of the protagonist, who completes a journey in the afterlife that acquires an evermore precise geography. The language is far from classical, clearly tending toward a more colloquial style. The author is well aware of the limits of his style and apologizes for this to the reader. From the numerous citations from *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* and several references to the *Rule* of St. Benedict, the *Visio Fursei* (see Ciccarese 185ff.), the work of *Gregory of Tours and the *Bible, it seems evident that the author of the *Visio Baronti* was an erudite monk.

CPL 1313; BHL 997; PLS 4, 2125-2138; W. Levison (ed.), MGH (SRM) V, Hannover 1910, 368-394; M.P. Ciccarese, *Visioni dell'aldilà in occidente*, Florence 1987, 236-268 (with It. trans.);

J.N. Hillgarth, *Christianity and Paganism, 350-750*, Philadelphia 1986, 195-204 (Eng. trans.); DHGE 6, 882-885; P. Dinzelbacher, *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1981, 13-51; M.P. Ciccarese, *La* Visio Baronti *nella tradizione letteraria delle visioni dell'Aldilà*: RomBarb 6 (1981/82) 25-52; M.P. Ciccarese, *Le più antiche rappresentazioni del purgatorio, dalla 'Passio Perpetuae' alla fine del IX secolo*: RomBarb 7 (1982/83) 33-76; F. Brunhölzl, *Histoire de la littérature latine du Moyen Âge*, trans. H. Rochais, Turnhout 1990, 1, 140-141; A. Morgan, *Dante and the Medieval Other World*, Cambridge 1990, passim; C. Carozzi, *Le voyage de l'âme dans l'audelà d'après la littérature latine (Ve-XIIIe siècle)*, Rome 1994, 139-186 and passim; Y. Hen, *The Structure and Aims of the* Visio Baronti: JTS 47 (1996) 477-497.

Y. Hen - A. Di Berardino

VISIO FURSEI. *Visio Fursei,* written in 656 or at the beginning of 657, narrates a trip into the afterlife of a thaumaturge and Irish missionary monk Fursy (Fursa, Furseus, Fursey), founder of monasteries, concerning whom the Venerable *Bede (*HE* 3,19) makes several biographical mentions. The monk went to *England, where he had founded the monastery of Cnobheresburg, but then because of the invasions of the pagan King Panda, he was forced to flee to *Gaul, where King Clovis II (639–657) allowed him to establish a monastery. He was buried at Péronne, in Picardy. While still young, during his sickness, he received a vision of the afterlife, where he was received by two bishops, who enjoined upon him the duty of preaching for one day (that is, 12 years) and at the same time offered him an entire series of moral instructions. Last, Fursy returns to his body, awakens and sees himself surrounded by relatives, friends and church officials.

CPL 2101; BHL 3209-3210; BCLL 384; Krusch, MGH (SRM) IV, 423-440 (incomplete); DHGE 19, 476-483 (extensive bibl.); DACL 14, 383-385 (Péronne); C. Carozzi, *Le voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (Ve-XIIIe siècle)*, Rome 1994, 676-692 (text). P. Grosjean, *Notes d'hagiographie celtique*: AB 75 (1957) 373-420, esp. 389-390 n. 2 and 392-393; W.M. Newman, *Charters of St. Fursy of Péronne*, Cambridge, MA 1977; M.P. Ciccarese, *Le visioni di S. Fursa*: RomBarb 8 (1984-85) 231-303; M.P. Ciccarese, *Visioni dell'aldilá in occidente: fonti, modelli, testi*, Florence 1987, 184-229; C. Carozzi, op. cit., 99-138 and passim; D. Edel, *The Celtic West and Europe: Studies in Celtic Literature and Early Irish Church*, Bodnein 2001, 70-71; M.P. Brown, *Life of St. Fursey*, Norwich 2001 (repr. 2003); S. Hamman, *Die* Vita Fursei *als chronologische Quelle*: AB 122 (2004) 283-298.

A. Di Berardino

VISIONS (iconography)

I. Abraham's Vision at Mamre - II. Vision of Jacob at Bethel - III. Vision of Ezekiel - IV. Vision of *The Shepherd* of Hermas - V. Vision of Perpetua and Felicity.

I. Abraham's Vision at Mamre. Unique in painting, the vision of *Abraham at Mamre (Perraymond 1989; TIP) is found on a fresco from around the mid-4th c., placed in the soffit of an arcosolium of the hypogeum from the Via Dino Compagni (Ferrua 1990, n. 49), which, mindful of Gen 18:1-3, visually portrays the patriarch's meeting with the three visitors, the messengers of his future fatherhood; we see this also with the disputed cover of the so-called St. Soter sarcophagus (Perraymond 2000), which has been preserved in the catacombs of St. *Callistus and is datable to the 2nd third of the 4th c. (Deichmann 1967, n. 379).

With respect to the mosaic technique, there are two witnesses that offer a contribution, with the most complex iconographic scheme, namely the event in question, that is, a panel dating back to the 5th c., from the basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome (Wilpert - Schumacher 1976, n. 29) and the left wall of the presbytery of the basilica of San Vitale of *Ravenna, later by nearly one century (Deichmann 1958, nn. 313, 315), which, ornamentally resolving the verses from Gen 18:9-12, set forth Abraham while he is preparing to serve the plate with the calf to the three guests sitting at the prepared table, with Sarah listening in, in the first case, kneading the dough, in the second, perplexed and standing in front of the home.

One should not overlook the fact that, according to some epigrams (Mazzoleni 1989), similar artwork also decorated the basilica of St. *Ambrose of Milan (Ambr., *Hymns, Inscr., Frag.* 3, BA 22,108) and the walls of a hypothesized Spanish basilica (Pud., *Dittoch.* 4: PL 60,93; Argenio 1967; Pillinger 1980).

With respect to sculpture, two late *sarcophagi appear very specific, both of which are datable to the 5th c. and from the Gallic area, respectively preserved at *Toulouse (Caillet-Loose 1990, fig. 104) and at Lucq de Bearn (*Ws* 182, 2). These sarcophagi, unveiling a fusion between the scene of the vision of Mamre and that of the sacrifice of Isaac—in fact the figures of the three visitors appear alongside Isaac himself, still a young man, ready for sacrifice—emphasize the union between Isaac and Christ himself, as would later be made explicit by (what was for *Augustine) the homogenous and constant *exegesis that began with the apostle *Paul (Gal 3:6) and continued uninterruptedly in the thought of such authors as *Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 1,5: SC 70,150-152), *Tertullian (*Adv. Iud.* 10,6: CCL 2, 27), Ps.-*Cyprian (*De mont. Sina et Sion* 3,3: CSEL 3,3,106-107), *Melito of Sardis (*Fragm.* 11: SC 123,236), *Ambrose (*De Sacr.* 4,27: BA 17,100) and Augustine (*Sermo* 2,8: NBA 29, 20), to mention only the most significant of these writers.

At Mamre, near Hebron, upon the wish of the emperor *Constantine, a basilica was erected in memory of the venerated place (Mader 1929).

II. Vision of Jacob at Bethel. Although the iconographic prototype of the vision of Bethel, that is, "God's house" (Gen 28:10-16), and its location which, because of this event changed its primitive name of "Luz" (Perraymond 1989; TIP), is recognizable among the Jewish frescoes of the synagogue of *Dura Europos (Kraeling 1956, pl. 26), *Rome provides the sole two Christian testimonies that pertain to it: (1) The façade of a sarcophagus, from the late Constantinian period, kept in the lapidary of the catacomb of S. Sebastiano (Deichmann 1967, n. 183), in fact, shows—barely legibly—the figure of *Jacob sleeping, with his head resting on a pile of rocks and an empty ladder alongside him. (2) In a painting of the soffit of an arcosolium of the cubicle B from the hypogeum of the Via Dino Compagni, dating back to the mid-4th c., two angels ascend and descend a ladder in accord with the account of the vision and face the patriarch, who is partially reclining on a rocky bulge and who is portrayed with his eyes open (Ferrua 1990, n. 48) to emphasize the miraculous event.

Finally, to provide a complete picture we should note the presence of the solitary ladder on the lower register of the Reliquary of Brescia (var. aus. 1990, n. 5 b.li).

III. Vision of Ezekiel. Christian thought regarded the vision of Ezekiel (Ezek 37:1-10) as the unquestionable symbol of the final resurrection (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I,58: PG 6,253; *Dial.* 80: PG 6,667; Tert., *De carnis resurr.* 29-30: CSEL 47,3,67-69; Cypr., *Test. libri adv. Iud. 58*: PL 4,793; Greg. Nyss., *Anima et resurr.* 136: PG 46,135; Greg. Naz., *Monitum in orat.* 7,21: SC 405,232-236; Aug., *Genesis ad litt.* 10,5,8: NBA 9/2,508) or more generically as an expression of faith in it (Clement of Rome., *Ep. Cor.* 50,4: SC 167,182; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cath.* 18,1: PG 33,1018; Epiph., *Ancor.* 99,4-6: PG 43,196), and Ezekiel becomes the confirming witness (Hilary of Poitiers, *Tract. myst*: SC 19 bis, 83; Ambr., *De exc. Sat.* 2,69-73: CSEL 73,7,287-289; Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 31,311-326: CSEL 30,318; Rufinus, *Exp. Symb.* 42,3: CCL 20,178; Quodvult., *De prom. et praed. Dei* 2,36,82: SC 101,478-480). Although the vision already represented among the frescoes of the synagogue of *Dura Europos (Kraeling 1956, pls. 69-71), but totally ignored by Roman painting, it is documented by a discrete number of sculptural witnesses (Perraymond 1989; TIP), all belonging to the capital city, with the exception of the two sarcophagi, one of which is preserved at Capua (Dresken-Weiland 1998, n. 11) and the other at Gerona (Sotomayor 1975, pl. 1/3).

These discoveries—whose chronology is very homogenous, not lying outside the first thirty-year period of the 4th c., with the exception of a mutilated cover, discovered at *Maius* (Bisconti 1989, fig. 19) and datable between the late Gallienic period and the tetrarchy—usually focus on the image of Christ who, assisting the prophet, recomposes the "dry bones," which are identifiable in the small cadaver extended at their feet, which can appear alone or with the head supported by the skull, or rather with more skulls and figurines of "those who are about to be resurrected," which are either standing and lying down around them (Wilpert 1929-36, n. 194/9; Deichmann 1967, nn. 5, 7, 12, 14, 23, 176, 693, 807; Sotomayor 1975, pl. 1/3; Bisconti 1989; Fiocchi Nicolai 1990; Dresken-Weiland 1998, n. 11).

One must also recall a golden glass, discovered at Cologne and datable to the 4th c., where Ezekiel appears by himself intent on performing the miracle by means of the **virga* pointed toward the ground on which lie parts of human bodies which are in the process of recomposition (Klinkeberg 1906, fig. 110), and a miniature, of a very different and later schema, from the 10th c., belonging to Ms A.F. gr. 510 of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris (Omont 1902, pl. 58).

IV. Vision of *The Shepherd* of Hermas. To the 1st decades of the 3rd c. belongs the sole graphic testimony inherent to the third vision of *The Shepherd* of *Hermas (SC 23,103), which can be perceived in a fresco from the catacomb of S. Gennaro at Capodimonte (Fasola 1975, pl. 14). The graphical transliteration of the text shows three young girls proceeding to construct a tower, symbolically representing the church, making use of large, well-elaborated stones—or rather, the saints, believers and penitent sinners—tossing aside those that are imperfect and leaving them unused on the periphery.

Given that the composition's evident meaning is baptismal (in the text the tower is situated on the waters [Herm., *Vis.* 3,2; 4,9: SC 53,104, 108 and 110], but the iconographic variant can be interpreted in light of the *Similitudes* [Herm., *Sim.* 9,3: SC 53,294]) as penitential and funerary (Herm., *Sim.* 9,16,1-2: SC 53,327), it is possible to infer that the inspiring short work, from the mid-2nd c., was read publicly or that it at least enjoyed considerable esteem among the faithful at the time in which the artisan brought his work to completion (Liccardo 1987; Perraymond 1989; TIP).

V. Vision of Perpetua and Felicity. Preserved in the Burgos Museum, a sarcophagus, datable to the beginning of the 5th c. (Ripoll López 1993, fig. 2), appears to require a complex interpretation because it offers on the rearward side an unusual depiction, unique in its genre, which turns out to be decipherable only according to the first vision that *Perpetua—who had been condemned *ad bestias* (*see *damnatio ad bestias*)—had in a dream during her imprisonment (*Passio Perp. et Fel.* 4,1-10: SC 417,112-116).

Executed certainly with the objective of strengthening faith in the hope of eternal reward, the scene in question in fact reveals a ladder, stubby with piercing and sharpened blades, on which Perpetua, to reach paradise, prepares to leap, but not before having avoided a monstrous animal, after she has been brought to her feet by the support of her catechist Saturus (Perraymond 1989; TIP).

H. Omont, *Fac-similés des miniatures des plus anciens manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale du VI^e au XI^e siècle*, Paris 1902; J. Klinkenberg, *Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln*, Cologne 1906; A.E. Mader, *La basilica costantiniana di Mambre presso Hebron secondo la tradizione e gli ultimi scavi della Göress-Gesellschaft*: RivAC 6 (1929) 249-312; G. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*, Vatican City 1929-36; C.H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura Europos, The Synagogue*, New Haven, CT 1956; F.W. Deichmann, *Früchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden-Baden 1958; R. Argenio, *Il Dittocheo e l'epilogo di Prudenzio*: Rivista di Studi Classici 15 (1967) 40-77; F.W. Deichmann - G. Bovini - H. Brandenburg, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarcophäge. I. Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden 1967; M. Sotomayor, *Una posibile "ley" de la iconografía paleocristiana: la "ley" de la "subrogación"*: Archivio Español de Arqueología 45-47 (1972-74) 205-212; U.M. Fasola, *La catacomba di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte*, Rome 1975; M. Sotomayor, *Sarcófagos romano-cristianos de España. Estudio iconográfico*, Granada 1975; J. Wilpert - W.N. Schumacher, *Die römischen Mosaiken der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV.-XIII. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1976; R. Pillinger, *Die Tituli Historiarum, oder das sogenannte Dittochaeon des Prudentius*, Vienna 1980; G. Liccardo, *Alcuni aspetti della catechesi antica nella pittura ispirata al Pastore d'Erma nella catacomba di S. Gennaro a Napoli*, in *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Diligenza*, Anversa 1987, 33-42; F. Bisconti, *Un coperchio di sarcofago paleocristiano nel cimitero Maggiore*, in *"Quaeritur inventus colitur,"* Misc. in onore di padre U.M. Fasola, Vatican City 1989, 23-49; D. Mazzoleni, *Patristica ed epigrafia*, in *Complementi interdisciplinari di Patrologia*, Rome 1989, 319-365; M. Perraymond, *Sogni, visioni e profezie nell'antico cristianesimo: Abramo, Giacobbe, Ezechiele, Pastore d'Erma, Felicita e Perpetua*, in Atti del XVII Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana (Roma, 5-7 maggio 1988), Augustinianum, Rome 1989, 549-563; J.P. Caillet - H.N. Loose, *Le vie d'éternité: la sculpture funéraire dans l'Antiquité Chrétienne*, Paris-Genève 1990; A. Ferrua, *Catacombe sconosciute. Una pinacoteca del IV secolo sotto la via Latina*, Florence 1990; V. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Frammento di sarcofago cristiano da Vescovio (Forum Novum) presso Torri in Sabina*: RivAC 59 (1990) 121-140; G. Ripoll López, *Sarcófagos de la antigüedad tardía hispánica: importaciones y talleres locales*: Antiquité Tardive 1 (1993) 153-158; J. Dresken-Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage. II*, Mainz a.R. 1998; M. Perraymond, *Visioni* (s.v.): TIP 302-304; id., *Riflessioni iconografiche sul coperchio del cosiddetto coperchio di S. Sotere in Callisto*: RivAC 76 (2000) 601-620.

M. Perraymond

VISIONS of the AFTERLIFE. Human beings have always sought a response to the question of their own destiny after death: visions of the afterlife, present in every age and every religion (there are numerous examples in Classical Antiquity: Ulysses, Pythagoras and Aeneas), represent an attempt to offer some certainty to human beings who are worried about their future lot.

In ancient Christian literature, initially inserted with the objective of edification and broader contexts, visions of the afterlife gradually assumed their own peculiar physiognomy, becoming a literary genre in its own right that was expressed in increasingly complex and articulated accounts, with their own compositional structure and recurring themes and elements that are common to the different exemplars: in this context the genre would become established and develop esp. in the West between the 7th and the 8th c. AD.

First among all the visions of the afterlife was the canonical *Apocalypse (Rev 1:12-16; 4:2-8; 20:11-13; 21:1-2; 21:10-23), which constitutes the obligatory point of departure for the vision of the afterlife, offering points for subsequent amplifications. But, given the sobriety and scarcity of information, Christians also drew on other sources, esp. apocryphal texts, to establish a more concrete and definite image of the world and to represent the afterlife with the addition of ever new descriptive details. We are referring to a series of works of Jewish and Middle Eastern origin, in which eschatological visions and prophecies combined with myths and esoteric revelations to form that complex of writings called "apocalyptic," that became widespread between the 2nd c. BC and the 2nd c. AD, some of which possess a heavily Christianized character: *4 Esdras,* the *Book of Enoch,* the *Apocalypse of Peter* and the *Apocalypse of Paul.* The *Visio Pauli* enjoyed noteworthy fame, an apocryphal apocalypse written originally in Greek, for which there exist versions in various languages, esp. in Latin, reworked in various ways (*Augustine would put unsuspecting readers on guard from easily believing the fables contained in this apocalypse, a text whose authority the orthodox church did not recognize: *In Ioh* 98,8): its diffusion nourished the popular imagination, which was hoping to fill the gaps and silences of *Scripture on life in the other world. (See in this respect the famous passage from 2 Cor 12:2-4:

*Paul's reticence only stimulated the believer's curiosity and imagination, allowing one to abandon oneself to every type of conjecture!)

For specific antecedents and models in ancient Christian literature, one could cite the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis,* a vision attributed to Saturus, a prisoner awaiting *martyrdom (ch. 11), which would influence all subsequent martyrial literature, a vision that was bent on strengthening faith and the hope of the martyrs in a future reward; St. *Jerome's so-called Dream, recounted by the author to the young *Eustochium, which was important for some elements that would serve as an outline for the entire literature of visions: the unforeseen sickness, the comatose state or death, the unexpected reanimation and detailed report of the vision amid the astonishment of those present (*Ep.* 22,30); a passage from *Sulpicius Severus's *Vita Martini* (7,6), reproduced on Jerome's model for the narrative context; and the dream of a widow mentioned by *Evodius bishop of Uzalis, in a letter to St. Augustine (*Ep.* 158,3). In all these passages one can already detect motifs and elements that we will find later: paradise as a garden of boundless extension, the blessed with white garments, the angel-guides, the fragrance that grants satiety, and the celestial palace.

The vision of the afterlife which continued to mature in a fragmentary way during the first centuries became a true and proper literary genre with *Gregory the Great, the heir and the initiator of a tradition that would run the entire Middle Ages onward and would culminate in the grandiose construction of Dante's poem. The model, to which all subsequent authors make reference, is the text of the *Dialogues* IV,37-38, where Gregory, explaining to the deacon Peter the significance of those killed by accident, cites the unusual experience of some individuals (the monk Peter, the noble Stephen, an unnamed soldier struck by the plague at *Rome), all individuals who were believed to have been dead and were miraculously brought back to life, who state that they were in the otherworld and provide a description of it. All the foundational motifs of the representation of Gregory's afterlife are found almost unchanged in the literature of the visions that take their cues from it: the black smoke of hell in which souls judged guilty are tossed, the narrow bridge that hangs over it and performs the function of a *probatio* in order to separate the righteous from the unrighteous, the struggle between the angels and demons for the possession of the soul struggling between good and evil, the dwellings of the righteous, and paradise described as a marvelous garden with perfumed flowers.

Substantial analogies with Gregory the Great are present in the historical work of his contemporary *Gregory of Tours (*Historia Francorum* IV,33 and VII,1), although in the latter's account of *Salvius's vision with its detailed description of the afterlife, we are faced with a story that is far more extensive and organically structured, with an autonomous physiognomy, the schema-type of which serves to inform each subsequent composition of this literary genre.

The first link of a long chain that followed was represented by the visions of the young *Augustus recounted in the *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida* (I,1-28), a small *Visigothic work from the 1st half of the 7th c., passed down under the name of a certain *Paul, deacon of Mérida, which imitates the traditional formulation: the flourishing and perfumed garden, the blessed clothed in white, and satiety conferred by heavenly food. Passing from the continent (the *Italy of Gregory the Great, the France of Gregory of Tours, the *Spain of the author of the *Vitae sanctorum Patrum Emeretensium*) to Ireland, we find the *Vita Fursei* (**Visio Fursei*). Written in 656/657, it narrates a trip into the afterlife by an Irish monk, Fursy, the founder of monasteries, who was still young during a sickness: two bishops, Beoanus and Meldanus, impose on him the obligation of preaching for one day (= 12 years), and they offer him a series of moral instructions. The schema is that of the traditional one: the new element is established by the vision as a seal of the holiness of the protagonist, a type of reward granted in anticipation (biographical mentions and summary of the vision are found in the Venerable *Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* III,19). With the **Visio Baronti,* the first literary composition entirely dedicated to a vision of the afterlife and providing an example adopted as a clarification of a doctrinal thesis or an event to be inserted in the biography of a saint, one passes to an account of noteworthy breadth and complexity, conceived unitarily and organically structured, and composed to benefit the spiritual health of the reader. Written in 678/679 in *Gaul, the anonymous work recounts the vision of a certain Barontius, a monk from the monastery of Lonrey, according to the traditional schema, but developed and enriched: a true and proper trip into the otherworld with an extensive description of the protagonist's itinerary. In the path of this tradition, which was consolidated but notably developed, the abbot of Bierzo St. *Valerius, native of Astorga, in NW Spain, recounts three visions of the afterlife in his *Dicta ad beatum Donadeum scripta* (2nd half of the 7th c.).

A decisive contribution to the literary genre—in

the 1st half of the 8th c.—is given by the visions narrated in *Boniface's epistolary (*Ep.* 10 and 115) and in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* (V,12-14): for the first time we find affirmed, alongside hell and paradise, the existence of a place of punishment/transitory enjoyment for penitent sinners and those who are not perfectly good, what would in time become *purgatory. With this third otherworldly kingdom, the finality of vision would be enlarged to include, in addition to the personal conversion of the readers, also the stimulus to intensify the practices of piety for the deceased. An example of this organic representation of the Christian afterlife, characterized by the tripartition of hell-purgatory-paradise, is the *Visio Wettini,* dated to the year 824 in its first composition in prose and subsequently redacted in a poetic form by Walafrid Strabo.

Over the course of the 9th c. a particular type of vision of the afterlife was born and took root, a vision that was primarily political in nature and end, primarily flourishing during the Carolingian dynasty, and subject to eschatological judgment: the reward or the eternal punishment attributed to it thus became an expression of the author's political convictions (*Visio cuiusdam paupercolae mulieris, Visio Bernoldi* and the *Visio Karoli*).

By the end of the 9th c., the vision of the afterlife clearly constituted a literary genre of a consolidated tradition, as attested to by Hincmar of Reims, who, in the *Visio Bernoldi,* cites as guarantors of the veracity of his narrative the authors of preceding visions: Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, Boniface and *Visio Wettini*.

C. Fritzsche, *Die lateinischen Visionen des Mittelalters bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Rom. Forsch. 1886, II, 247-279 and III, 337-369; J.A. MacCulloch, *Early Christian Visions of the Other World*, Edinburgh 1912; A. Rüegg, *Die Jenseitsvorstellungen vor Dante*, 2 vols., Einsiedeln-Cologne 1945; F. Bar, *Les routes de l'autre monde: descentes aux enfers et voyages dans l'au-delà*, Paris 1946; H.R. Patch, *The Other World According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature*, Cambridge, MA 1950; P. Dinzelbacher, *Die Visionen des Mittelalters. Ein geschichtlicher Umriß*: ZRGG 30 (1978) 116-128; M. Aubrun, *Caractères et portée religieuse et sociale des "Visiones" en Occident du VI^e au XI^e siècle*: Cahiers de Civ. Méd. 22,2 (1980) 109-130; P. Dinzelbacher, *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1981; M.P. Ciccarese, *Alle origini della letteratura delle Visioni: il contributo di Gregorio di Tours*: SSR 5 (1981) 251-266; M.P. Ciccarese, *La* Visio Baronti *nella tradizione letteraria delle* Visiones *dell'aldilà*: RomBarb 6 (1981/82) 25-52; M.P. Ciccarese, *Le più antiche rappresentazioni del purgatorio, dalla "Passio Perpetuae" alla fine del sec. IX*: RomBarb 7 (1983) 33-76; J. Amat, *Songes et visions. L'au-delà dans la littérature latine médiévale*, Paris 1985; M.P. Ciccarese, *Le visioni di S. Fursa*: RomBarb 8 (1984/85) 5-77; M.P. Ciccarese, *Visioni dell'aldilà in Occidente*, Florence 1987; var. aus., *Sogni, visioni e profezie nel cristianesimo antico*. XXIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Augustinianum 29 (1989); C. Carozzi, *Le voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (V^e-XIII^e siècle)*, Rome 1994; Y. Hen, *The Structure and Aims of the* Visio Baronti: JTS 47 (1996) 477-497.

M.P. Ciccarese - L. Longobardo

VITA BRIGIDAE. Written in 7th-c. Ireland, the *Vita Brigidae* is a collection of miracles of Brigit of Kildar (2nd half of 5th c.–ca. 524), which, as appears from a 9th-c. manuscript of Reims, known today thanks to the transcription of Mabillon, had three redactions, respectively carried out by Ultán, Ailerán and Cogitosus. The only text that has come down to us, however, is that of Cogitosus which, although deriving directly from the first biography—perhaps the lost work of Ultán or Ailerán (Esposito)—introduces a setting of edifying reflection with recourse to biblical comparisons, which turns out, in any case, to be innovative in the context of Irish *hagiography.

CPL 2147 and 2148; BHL 1455-1456; M. Esposito, *Notes on Latin Learning and Literature in Mediaeval Ireland*: Hermathena 49 (1935) 120-165; S. Connolly, *The Authorship and Manuscript Tradition of Vita I s. Brigitae*: Manuscripta 16 (1972) 67-82; S. Connolly, *Verbal Usage in Vita Prima Brigitae and Bethu Brigte*: Peritia 1 (1982) 268-272; S. Connolly, *Some Palaeographical and Linguistic Features in Early Lives of Brigit*, in *Irland und Europa: Die Kirche im Frühmittelalter*, P. Ní Chatháin - M. Richter eds., Stuttgart 1984, 272-279; F. O'Briain, *Brigitana*: Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie 36 (1978) 112-137; R. Sharpe, *Vitae s. Brigitae: The Oldest Texts*: Peritia 1 (1982) 81-106; Patrologia IV, 475.

P. Marone

VITA COLUM CILLE (Life of Columba). Poem-prayer of Christian inspiration that was typical of Ireland, composed probably around 600, to give praise to the Prince Colum Cille (St. *Columba), a man of learning completely at the service of the church, who over the course of his life was a protector of many churches and a preacher in Britain.

P. Grosjean, *Pour la date de fondation d'Iona et celle de la mort de s. Colum Cille*: AB 78 (1960) 381-390; M. Herbert, *The Preface to Amra Colum Cille*, in *Sages, Saints and Storytellers*, in *Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney*, D.Ó. Corráin - L. Breatnach - K. McCone (eds.) (Maynooth Monographs 2), Maynooth 1989, 67-75; Patrologia IV, 475-476.

P. Marone

VITA FRUCTUOSI. Written evidently by one of *Fructuosus's followers near *Braga around 680 and for a long time attributed to *Valerius of Bierzo, the *Vita Fructuosi* is a biographical text which, nonetheless, often leaves space for hagiographical consider-

ations. Having recourse to sources of different genres, the contemplative spirit of Fructuosus (beginning of the 7th c.–665), at the level of the intellectual work of *Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636), is presented as an extraordinary example of the sanctity of *Visigothic *Spain.

CPL 1293; Díaz 261; BHL 3194; PL 77, 459ff.; F.C. Nock, *The Vita sancti Fructuosi*, Washington, DC 1946; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *La Vida de San Fructuoso de Braga*, Braga 1974; A. Maya Sánchez, *Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium*: CCL 116, Turnhout 1992, LXXXVIIXCV; Patrologia IV, 106.

P. Marone

VITAE PATRUM. After St. *Benedict of Nursia (chs. 42 and 73), the monks of the Middle Ages use this name as the title for the collections of translations of Eastern monastic writings, which were very mixed compilations corresponding to the *Gerontikon* of the Greeks or the *Paradise* of the Syrians. H. Rosweyde in 1615 published 10 books of them and an appendix. Several recent works have been redone on the manuscripts in the various languages, and it turns out that it is possible to follow the path of the translators and identify the sources. Rosweyde's books 3 and 7 (PL 73) are not at all trustworthy, and it is instead necessary to go back to the translation of *Paschasius studied by J.G. Freire, *A versão latina por Pascásio de Dume dos Apophthegmata Patrum,* I-II, Coimbra 1971, and the *Commonitiones sanctorum Patrum* Coimbra 1974. Rosweyde's books 5 and 6 are nonetheless a good translation made by the Roman deacons Pelagius and *John, from an excellent Greek collection; but Rosweyde's must be corrected according to C.M. Battle, *Die "Adhortationes sanctorum Patrum,"* Münster W. 1972.

G. Philippart, *Vitae Patrum:* AB 92 (1974) 353-365.

J. Gribomont

VITALIAN, army general (d. 520). A *Gothic official at the service of the emperor and a native of *Scythia, Vitalian took advantage of the religious agitation and the dangerous revolt of the people of *Constantinople of 512 in order to march on the city, making friends through pro-*Chalcedonian slogans. The emperor *Anastasius I, being unable to face the difficult situation any other way, appointed Vitalian as the *magister militum* and the supreme commander of all the troops in *Thrace, promising him to send the pope to a council at Heraclea to bring an end to the *Acacian schism. But the project of the council failed, and Vitalian once again attacked the capital in the autumn of 515, undergoing a terrible defeat that forced him to withdraw northward to Thrace. Upon the death of Anastasius, Vitalian was at the side of the new emperor *Justin during the phase of the expurgation of anti-Chalcedonian bishops and sought to take revenge esp. on *Severus, who, after the failure of the revolt of Antioch of 513, had publicly mocked him in his 34th *homilia cathedralis.* The relative of a Scythian monk by the name of Leontius, he became the protector of the Scythian monks and the patron of the *theopaschite-trinitarian formula at Constantinople. We know from a letter written by the papal legates on 29 June 519 that he wrote to Pope *Hormisdas in defense of the monks, but the text has not been preserved. He died in battle in 520.

V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der "skythischen Kontroversen,"* Paderborn 1935, 127-136; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Brussels 1949, 178-181; C. Capizzi, *Sul fallimento di un negoziato di pace ecclesiastica fra il papa Ormisda e l'imperatore Anastasio I*: Critica Storica 17 (1980) 23-54; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, 2/2, Brescia 1999, 405-408.

C. Dell'Osso

VITALIAN, pope (d. 672). A native of Segni; he succeeded *Eugenius I, who had died on 2 June 657, and was consecrated on 30 July. Upon his election, *Constans II's *Typos* of 648 was still in effect; it was opposed by Pope *Martin I and condemned by the Lateran Council of 649. He immediately sent a delegation to *Constantinople: he wrote to the emperor Constans (Jaffé 2085) as well as the patriarch Peter (Mansi 11,572), who received his letters favorably, and his name was reinstated into the diptychs, a practice that was excluded since the time of Pope *Honorius (d. 638). Moreover, he received Constans II with great honor at *Rome during the emperor's visit to the city during July of 663—the last emperor to visit Rome was Valentinian *III in 450—even though it ended with his sacking the city and the stripping of a great quantity of bronze from it. The emperor through his long stay in *Italy had acquired many goods in the South through his activities. Under his pontificate, Maurus of *Ravenna obtained from the emperor Constans, who had established himself in Sicily, exemption from Roman jurisdiction, drawing vociferous protests on the part of Vitalian (Jaffé 209-210) and a break between the two churches of Rome and Ravenna upon the death of Maurus in 673. Vitalian, just as his predecessors, continued to be interested in the Angles (Jaffé 2089), some of whom had also come to Rome on pilgrim-

age; moreover, he sent the Greek monk Theodore of Tarsus (668–690) to be archbishop of *Canterbury, whom he himself consecrated.

CPL 1735; Verzeichnis 576-577; PL 87, 999-1010; PLS 4, 2090; LP I, 343-344; DTC 15, 3115-3117; BS 12, 1232-1235; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei Papi del secolo VII*, Milan 1971, 456-464 (see the index); P. Felici, *San Vitaliano papa, assertore dell'unità con l'Oriente*: Oikoumenikon 12 (1972) 394-400; B. Navarra, *S. Vitaliano papa*, Rome 1972 (see RSCI 27 [1973] 759-781); V. Monachino, *I tempi e la figura del papa Vitaliano*, in *Storiografia e Storia* (Misc. E. Duprè Theseider), II, Rome 1974, 573-588; P. Corsi, *La spedizione italiana di Costante II*, Bologna 1983; EPapi 1, 606-609.

A. Di Berardino

VITALIS, Apollinarist (d. ca. 385). Around 375, the priest Vitalis, ordained by *Meletius of Antioch, appeared in *Antioch as the leader of an important group, which appealed to the teaching of *Apollinaris of Laodicea (see Soz., *HE* 6,25: PG 67,1357 B). He went to *Rome to submit his teaching to Pope *Damasus, who granted him a letter of communion, reserving, however, the final decision to *Paulinus, bishop of the anti-Meletian party of the church of Antioch, a party that was supported by Rome (see *Ep. per filium meum Vitalem*: PL 13,356-357). When, upon the death of the emperor *Valens (9 August 378), Meletius of Antioch returned from exile, in order to ascend to the see of Antioch, Vitalis as well as Meletius of Antioch and Paulinus, found themselves soon set aside (Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *HE* 54: PG 82,1203).

A fragment from Vitalis's *De fide* was transmitted by *Cyril of Alexandria in his treatise *De recta fide ad reginas* (PG 76,1216 = fr. 172 Lietzmann, 273). This brief text affirms that Christ is τέλειος θεός and τέλειος ἄνθρωπος; it anathematizes those who say that "Christ had a heavenly body, consubstantial to God according to the flesh"; but at the same time it anathematizes those who do not confess that "the flesh of the Lord is consubstantial to human beings"; and it also condemns those who say that the humanity of Christ is void of a rational soul, who say that it was the divinity of Christ that suffered, not the flesh of Christ, and who "divide" the Savior and do not confess that the Logos and the human being are one sole thing.

CPG 3705 *Suppl.* 205; H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1904, 9, 15, 152ff.; frag. 273 and E. Schwartz, ACO I, 1, 5, 67-68; F. Diekamp, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis des apollinaristischen Bischofs Vitalis von Antiochien*: Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift 86 (1904) 497-511; E. Amann, v. *Mélèce d'Antioche*: DTC 10, 527-528.

E. Cavalcanti

VITALIS and AGRICOLA, martyrs. A tradition that has now become established maintains that Vitalis and Agricola were two Bolognese martyrs—one the servant; the other, the master—who were fraternally associated by faith and religious zeal. Both were crucified during the *Diocletian persecution and buried in a Jewish cemetery; they remained there for an indeterminate amount of time, because the faithful had forgotten about them. Only the intervention of the Milanese bishop *Ambrose, who came to the knowledge of this fact through divine inspiration, permitted the discovery of their remains. The two were translated, therefore, with the great joy of the population and the disdain of the demons, because from that point onward they became dispensers of salvific miracles for the spirit and the body.

In fact, this account is nothing more than a harmonization of a number of sources (literary, liturgical, architectural, iconographic, devotional etc.) so diverse and distributed over time as to become undeniably revealed as "effective moments of veneration, . . . true and proper historical rhythms pointing toward a specific religious context" (Ropa, 2004). At the origin of this tradition are, however, some ancient documents that make it possible to trace the first phases of the successive hagiographical branches and the historical consistency of figures who were there at the beginning.

First in order of time one must consider Ambrose's testimony. He speaks of the two individuals in the *Exhort. virg.* I,1–2,10, a text in which he recasts in all likelihood a homily delivered during the dedication of a church (perhaps in 393). He therefore addresses the argument from a particular perspective. In fact, he recalls that, having found himself at Bologna while the translation of the body of a martyr was being celebrated and having subsequently and fortuitously been invited into the city where he was now speaking (Florence), the relics of the same martyr were brought with him in the manner of apophoreta, that is, as "gifts for the banquet" to which he had been invited (Serra Zanetti), relics that were then placed under the altar. Concerning the martyr in question, he provides only a few bits of information. His name was Agricola, he was a meek man, and he had been highly regarded by all people. He owned a slave named Vitalis, of whom he was also a teacher in the faith. The magistrates at first, perhaps out of respect for his person or more likely in order to lead him to apostatize, postponed his martyrdom, then sought to scare him with the punishment of his slave. Agricola, however, did not allow himself to succumb and for this reason was

crucified. Both slave and master were thus buried *in Iudaeorum solo inter ipsorum sepulcra,* the place in which they would then be rediscovered and from which, at least Agricola, would be translated, having been buried among a large number of Christians and Jews. With respect to Vitalis, nothing is known about the date, circumstances or occasion of his martyrdom; nothing is known about the punishment nor the subsequent translation of his body; nothing, last of all, on the city receiving the prestigious gift. Ambrose, of course, speaks to a specific purpose and in the context of a rhetorically well-prepared elegy in which he insists esp. on the same glory of the slave and the master; nevertheless, one has the clear impression that he himself depends on an oral tradition that was rather vague, at least with respect to the exact historical consistency and characterization of the two individuals.

Subsequent pieces of information are supplied from later sources, although it is difficult to say with what level of reliability. The *Vita Ambrosii,* redacted by the deacon *Paulinus of Milan in 411/412 or more likely in 422, clearly adds information on the origins of the cult. He specifies, in fact, that the Christian people would have remained in ignorance concerning the presence of the martyrs in the Jewish cemetery unless they had not revealed themselves to the bishop of the church of Bologna. The translation of both bodies, and no longer that of Agricola alone, then occurred amid the great joy of the faithful and the *poena demonum,* the latter group being forced to recognize the power of the martyrs. Florence was the place of the basilica dedicated by Ambrose, who, according to the testimony of his biographer, had a more prominent role in the entire event than what the autograph leads us to believe (*Vita* 29).

Two subsequent authors shortly thereafter also speak of the cult, its spread and some local characteristics. From *Victricius we in fact come to know that only the relics of the martyr Agricola had reached Rouen (*De laude sanctorum* 11), although *Paulinus recalls that in his city of Nola, the relics of both martyrs were found placed under the altar, who were joined together in death by the same punishment: crucifixion (*Carm.* XXVII, vv. 428-435). *Gregory of Tours also had information about one and the same punishment. Writing about 100 years after, Gregory probably does not depend on either Ambrose or Paulinus, but rather on local Bolognese traditions, which were gathered by pilgrims who had gone there and hence returned to their homeland with precious relics and memories. Moreover, he bears witness to the presence of the combined cult of the two martyrs in *Gaul, and precisely near the Cathedral of Clermont, whose construction was ordered around the mid-5th c. and dedicated to them (*De Gloria martyrum* 42; *Hist. Franc.* II,16).

Alongside this chief line of the cult, which seems to have been actively promoted outwardly by the Bolognese bishop *Petronius—early medieval *Verona possessed a church dedicated to the martyrs, who were also subsequently commemorated on the local calendar and preserved in a homily preached in the city of Venice, possibly owed to Petronius—one must recall a singular derivation/deviation attested at *Ravenna. There, around the mid-5th c. under the episcopate of *Peter Chrysologus (430–450), veneration for a certain martyr named Vitalis took root (which is why the extraordinary basilica still visible today was erected), who was regarded as the husband of Valeria and the father of *Gervasius and Protasius. The biographical characteristics of this original familial-hagiographical reconstruction are well delineated in a ps.-Ambrosian letter, today regarded as produced at Ravenna and datable to the mid-5th c. (BHL 3514; PL 17,743-747). Scholars have now agreed in recognizing in this second Vitalis a germination of the Bolognese martyr, and trace back the entire operation within the historical-cultural framework that was subsequently produced after the moving of the imperial court from Milan to Ravenna. One might think, moreover, that precisely this outcome of the "unowed appropriation" could have prompted as a response the redaction of two other ps.-Ambrosian letters (AASS, *Nov.* II,1, pp. 246-249), this time of Bolognese origin, probably from a different author and not easily datable, but certainly, for reasons given above, subsequent to the other (the first, perhaps dated to the beginning of the 6th c., and the second from the 8th/9th c.). During these times, with some differences, Ambrose's role was noticeably increased, to the point of being the *inventor* of the Bolognese martyrs through divine inspiration; the date of their martyrdom is specified, namely 4 November, and the circumstances were the persecutions of *Diocletian and *Maximian; praise is given to the figure of Vitalis, whose martyrdom is narrated; emphasis is placed on the atmosphere of wonder that accompanied the translation of both martyrs; and, finally, a reason is given for their burial in the Jewish cemetery, namely the persecutors' desire to hide the bodies. Above all, what Ambrose had given the church whose dedication he celebrated (see *Exhort. virg.* II,10)—namely, the martyrs and their burial—were then transferred to the Bolognese church and held sacrosanct over the centuries.

The history of the cult, its transformations and

stratifications still extended for a long time, but to follow it would lead us well beyond the limits of the patristic age.

With respect to the period that we have treated, we could say, in conclusion, that we have very little historically verifiable information about these martyrs. The antiquity of the combined cult, continually attested at Bologna, could indicate, in addition to their "Bolognese origin," a real commonality of life and probably death. The actual punishment underwent by Vitalis and the reason for which the two men were buried in a Jewish cemetery remain uncertain (A. Benati asks whether they themselves were Jews) and, esp., the circumstances of their execution. The tradition that places the event under the reign of Diocletian and Maximian is late and generic, although, as was mentioned above, the first and most ancient source in our possession is Ambrose's *Exhortatio virginitatis*. Still taking note of the restrictions imposed by the literary genre and the peculiarities of that occasion, a substantial lack of certain information comes from his text. The only certain piece of information remains the significant and variegated itinerary that this cult had, an itinerary that, as always occurs in hagiography, is neither coincidental nor void of historical meaning but expresses, on the contrary and with particular strength, the demands, feelings and pressures of the context that produced and promoted it.

Ambrose, *Exhort. virg.*: SAEMO 14/2, 197-271; Victricius of Rouen, *De laude sanctorum*, 11: CCL 64, 69-93; Paulinus of Nola *Epp.* 18 and 37: PL 61, 237-243, 352-357; Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambr.* 29, ed. Bastiaensen, 91-92; AASS *Nov.* II, 1, 233-253; BHL II, 1254-1255, nn. 8689-8696; *Mart. Hieron.*, 584-585, 623-624; 633-634 (cf. 216-218, 327-328); *Martyr. Rom.*, 496; H. Delehaye, *Trois dates du calendrier romain. Saint Vital*: AB 47 (1928) 55-59; H. Delehaye, *L'hagiographie ancienne de Ravenne*: AB 48 (1930) 9-10; H. Delehaye, *Origines du culte des martyrs*, 78, 328-329; G. Cantagalli, *I martiri bolognesi SS. Vitale e Agricola*, Bologna 1927; G. Cantagalli, *I complessi stefaniani di Bologna*, Bologna 1931; BS 12 (1969) 1225-1228; P. Serra Zanetti, *Ambrogio - Esortazione alla verginità 1-10: una proposta di lettura*, in *Vitale e Agricola. Il culto dei Protomartiri di Bologna attraverso i secoli. Nel XVI centenario della traslazione*, ed. G. Fasoli, Bologna 1993, 3-20; A.M. Orselli, *Vitale e Agricola: modelli di santità per la chiesa bolognese*, ibid., 21-25; G. Ropa, *Momenti e questioni del culto tardoantico e medievale dei martiri Vitale e Agricola*, ibid., 27-46; E. Morini, *Una presenza nascosta del martire bolognese Vitale nel Sinassario della chiesa di Costantinopoli*, ibid., 47-52; E. Lodi, *La tipologia eucologica dei Protomartiri nella celebrazione liturgica*, ibid., 53-60; A. Benati, *I martiri, il martirio e la traslatio del 393*, ibid., 61-77; *Vitale e Agricola, Sancti doctores. Città, Chiesa, Studio nei testi agiografici bolognesi del XII secolo*, ed. G. Ropa - G. Malaguti, Bologna 2001; A. Melloni, *Il martirio dei santi Vitale e Agricola dopo il Novecento*, in *Martirio di Pace. Memoria e storia del martirio nel XVII centenario di Vitale e Agricola*, ed. G. Malaguti, Bologna 2004, 9-13; G. Malaguti, *Riflessioni sulla data del martirio dei santi Vitale e Agricola*, ibid., 31-59; G. Ropa, *Momenti del culto dei martiri Vitale e Agricola: le epistole pseudoambrosiane*, ibid., 61-103; G. Zarri, *Santità martiriale, santità episcopale e chiesa cittadina: l'esempio di Bologna*, ibid., 237-256.

E. Zocca

VITALIS of Antioch (4th c.). Bishop of *Antioch in *Syria (314–ca. 320). He likely presided at the Councils of *Ancyra (314) and *Neocaesarea (ca. 317). One must not confuse him with the *Vitalis, also of Antioch, who was an Apollinarist and died in ca. 385. We know nothing else about his life.

J.A. Fischer - A. Lumpe, *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*, Paderborn 1997, 460-461, 492; S. Parvis, *Marcellus or Vitalis: Who Presided at Ancyra 314?*: SP 34 (2001) 197-203.

S. Samulowitz

VITAS SANCTORUM PATRUM EMERITENSIUM. A collection of information and extraordinary events accomplished by individuals who were related to the monastic world of Mérida and its environs, composed at *Mérida shortly before 650. To this initial nucleus was added a collection of the lives of the bishops of Mérida, among whom *Massona and Renovatus (d. 632) appear, with which the work, consisting of 21 chapters, closes. Chapters 9-20, more than half the corpus, are dedicated to Massona, metropolitan of Mérida (570–606). The author is anonymous, although the work was attributed to *Paul the Deacon. Inspired by *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues,* these *Vitas* use a hagiographical perspective to praise the virtues of the individuals considered, to which are added divine intervention and protection in their actions. On the whole they exalt the Catholic world in opposition to the *Arian circles and other radical groups or infidels, which at that time were rather strong at Mérida.

CPL 2069; BHL 2530; PL 80, 115-180; CCL 116; J.N. Garvin, *The Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium*, Washington, DC 1946; M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Index scriptorum latinorum Medii Aevi hispanorum*, Salamanca 1958, n. 214; A. Camacho, *El libro de las Vidas de los Santos Padres de Mérida*, Mérida 1988; U. Domínguez del Val, *Estudios sobre la literatura hispano-cristiana*, IV, Madrid 1998, 472-479.

A. Viciano

VIVARIUM. A monastery N of Mt. Moscius (Punta di Stalettì) on the Gulf of Squillace in Calabria. Founded by *Cassiodorus around 550, after his return from *Constantinople. With the founding of this center of study, Cassiodorus decided to com-

plete a cultural program suited to the demands of the young monks. At Vivarium a *scriptorium* flourished which remained famous because of its production of scriptural manuscripts. The evangelary (Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 9389) is a copy of an evangelary written at Vivarium in 558. The library of the Vivarium included biblical texts, *commentaries on the *Scriptures, works of history, medicine, *rhetoric, dialectic, music and agriculture. After the destruction of the library over the course of the 7th and 8th c., the works were lost and later discovered even beyond the Alps: not only at Monte Cassino, Bobbio, *Milan and Florence, but also at Luxeuil, Aquisgrana, Corbie, Leone and St. Gall. Well known in this regard was the work of Benedict Biscop, who enriched the library of Jarrow. Some manuscripts of Vivarium have been recently rediscovered by Lowe (see E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, III, Oxford 1938, nn. 391-398).

Sources: Cassiodorus, *Variae* VIII, 32 and XII, 14.

Studies: G. Radke: PWK 9A,1, 495; E. Josi, EC 12, 1564-1565; M. Cappuyns, *Cassiodore*: DHGE 11, 1349-1408; H. Leclercq, *V.*: DACL 15, 3133-3134; H. Thiele, *Cassiodor, seine Klostergründung V. und seine Nachwirkung im Mittelalter*: Studien und Mitteil. zur Gesch. des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige 50 (1932) 378-419; A. van de Vyver, *Les Institutiones de Cassiodore et sa fondation à V.*: RBen 53 (1941) 59-88; G. Bardy, *Cassiodore et la fin du monde ancienne*: Année theologique 6 (1945) 383-425; P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris ²1948, 313-388; G. Bardy, *Les origines des écoles monastiques en Occident*: Sacris Erudiri 5 (1953) 86-104; P. Courcelle, *De la Regula Magistri au corpus vivarien des Chroniques*: REA 56 (1954) 424-428; P. Courcelle, *Nouvelles recherches sur le monastère de Cassiodore*, in *Actes du Vᵉ congrès int. d'archéologie chrétienne*, Vatican City 1957, 511-539; T. Klauser, *V.*, in *Robert Böhringer. Eine Freundesgabe*, Tübingen 1957, 337-344; A.V.M. Hubrecht, *Cassiodorus Senator en het Monasterium Vivariense*: Hermeneus 30 (1959) 130-133; P. Riché, *Educazione e cultura nell'occidente barbarico dal VI all'VIII secolo*, It. trans. Rome 1966, 136-140; G. Ludwig, *Cassiodor. Über die Entstehung der abendländischen Schule*, Frankfurt a.M. 1967, 145ff.; A. Petrucci, *Scrittura e libro nell'Italia altomedievale: il sesto secolo*: Studi medievali 10 (1969) 158-213; A. Ceresa-Gastaldo, *Da Vivario a Roma: Appunti per la storia del codice Vaticano Latino 5704*: Giornale Italiano di Filologia 22 (1970) 39-46; G.L. Houghton, *Cassiodorus and Manuscript Illumination at V.*, Diss. Binghamton 1975; G. Cavallo, *La produzione di manoscritti greci in Occidente tra età tardoantica e alto medioevo*: Scrittura e Civiltà 1 (1977) 111-131; T. Klauser, *War Cassiodors V. ein Kloster oder eine Hochschule?*, in A. Lippold - N. Himmelmann (eds.), *Bonner Festgabe: Johannes Straub zum 65. Geburtstag am 18. Oktober 1977*, Bonn 1977, 413-420; M.L. Angrisani, *Materiali per uno studio della produzione libraria latina antica ed altomedievale in Italia*: Boll. del Comitato per la preparazione dell'ed. naz. dei classici gr. e lat., n.s. 24 (1976) 87-112; n.s. 26 (1978) 111-137; n.s. 27 (1979) 139-151; J.J. O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus*, Berkeley, CA 1979; L. Viscido, *Norme per la trascrizione del testo biblico a V.*: VetChr 15 (1978) 75-84; var. aus., *La cultura in Italia fra tardo antico e alto medioevo*. Atti del convegno 12-16 novembre 1979, Rome 1981; H. Hagendahl, *Cristianesimo latino e cultura classica: da Tertulliano a Cassiodoro*, It. trans. Rome 1988 (original edition Göteborg 1983), 190-209; G. Cavallo (ed.), *Libri e lettori nel medioevo. Guida storica e critica*, Bari 1983, with: A. Petrucci, *La concezione cristiana del libro fra VI e VII secolo*, 18ff.; G. Cavallo, *Aspetti della produzione libraria nell'Italia meridionale longobarda*, 106ff.; L. Vi- scido, *Studi cassiodorei*, Soveria Mannelli 1983; S. Leanza (ed.), *Atti della Settimana di studi su Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro*, Cosenza-Squillace, 19-24 settembre 1983, Soveria Mannelli 1986, with: M. Pavan, *I valori della tradizione classica nell'insegnamento del V.*, 392-405; U. Pizzani, *Cassiodoro e le discipline del quadrivio*, 49-71; S. Pricoco, *Spiritualità monastica e attività culturale nel cenobio di V.*, 357-377; G.C. Alessio et al., *Dall'eremo al cenobio. La civiltà monastica in Italia dalle origini all'età di Dante*, Milan 1987; K. Corsano, *The First Quire of the Codex Amiatinus and the Institutiones of Cassiodorus*: Scriptorium 41 (1987) 3-34; S. Leanza (ed.), *Cassiodoro: dalla corte di Ravenna al V. di Squillace*. Atti del Conv. Int. di Studi, Squillace 25-27 ottobre 1990, Soveria Mannelli 1993; E. Zinzi, *Studi sui luoghi cassiodorei in Calabria*, Soveria Mannelli 1994; W. Buergsens, *Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator: Einführung in die geistlichen und weltlichen Wissenschaften*, Bochum 1998; G.P. De Simone, *L'esperienza monastico-culturale del V.*, in var. aus., *Il monachesimo occidentale: dalle origini alla Regula Magistri*. XXVI incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 8-10 maggio 1997, Rome 1998; A. Caruso, *Cassiodoro*, Soveria Mannelli 1998; M.C. Doria, *Educazione e cultura in Cassiodoro*, in M. Rotili (ed.), *Memoria del passato, urgenza del futuro. Il mondo romano fra V e VII secolo*. Atti delle VI Giornate di studio, Naples 1999, 135-139; L. Holtz, *Insediamenti monastici e diffusione del libro*, in O. Pecere (ed.), *Il monaco il libro la biblioteca*. Atti del Conv., Cassino-Montecassino 5-8 settembre 2000, Cassino 2003, 65-83; C. Kakridi, *Cassiodorus "Variae,"* Munich 2005; L. Viscido, *Cassiodoro Senatore, Variae*, Cosenza 2005.

M.L. Angrisani Sanfilippo

VIVENTIOLUS of Lyons (d. ca. 524). Viventiolus was a very learned monk, who lived in the monastery of Condat in the Jura. *Avitus of Vienne (see *Epp.* 17, 19, 57, 59, 67, 69, 73) regarded his spiritual gifts and learning worthy of a bishop. In fact, he became the bishop of *Lyons around 515, after the death of his abbot Eugendus. In the kingdom of the *Burgundians, he was one of the most eminent leaders of the church of *Lyons, performing an important role in the councils, esp. in that of Epaon in 517. He died around 524. An epitaph discovered in the 14th c. in the church of Saint-Nizier allows us to know the date of his death: 12 July, which is also that of his feast day.

Two of his letters have survived: the first is a circular letter written to convoke the aforementioned council of 517; the second, sent to Avitus of Vienne, is an invitation to participate at the feast of St. Justus. The style of his Latin is elegant and polished.

Editions: CPL 1068-1069; *Ep. ad ep. prov.*: PL 67, 993; MGH, *Auct Ant.* 6, 2, 165; MGH, *Conc.* 1, 18-19; CCL 148A, 22-23; SC 353, 98-101; *Ep. ad Avitum*: PL 59, 272; MGH, *Auct. Ant.* 6, 2, 89.

Studies: A. Coville, *Recherches sur l'histoire de Lyon du Ve au IXe siècle (450-800)*, Paris 1928, 308-316; H.G.J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France during the Sixth Century*, Rome 1950, 12, 43, 60; BS 12 (1970) 1319; F. Martine, *Vies des Pères du Jura*: SC 142, 54-55 (bibl.); M. Heinzelman, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien*, Beihefte der Francia 5, Sigmaringen 1976, 113-129; O. Pontal, *Histoire des conciles mérovingiens*, Paris 1989, 63-65; Patrologia IV, 286-287; BBKL 12 (1997) 1533-1535.

M. Maritano

VOCONIUS. Known only through *Gennadius of Marseille, who writes that he was "bishop of Castellanum in Mauretania." (He does not say whether he was in Mauretania Caesariensis or in Mauretania Sitifensis.) Voconius wrote against the enemies of the church: Jews, *Arians and other heretics. He composed, moreover, an excellent volume on the *sacraments (*De viris ill.* 79). He preserves a long and polemical speech of African origin, which in the manuscript tradition was attributed to *Augustine and is now claimed to be the work of *Quodvultdeus (incipit: *Debitor sum, fratres, fateor*), which bears the title *Contra quinque haereses,* against, that is, the five types of the church's enemies (CCL 60, 259-309; PL 42, 1101-1116).

CPL 410; CPPM 1, 1204; PCBE 1, 1227.

A. Di Berardino

VOLUSIANUS (d. 437). R.A.A. Volusianus, son of the *pagan aristocrat and pontifex Maximus Ceionius Rufus Albinus, the prefect of *Rome in 389/381, and a Christian mother whose name is unknown (PLRE 1, 1039, n. 16). He was the uncle of *Melania the Younger. He was proconsul at *Carthage before 412, prefect of Rome (417–418) and prefect of the praetorium in the West (428–429). He was baptized on the feast of *Epiphany on his deathbed at the behest of his niece Melania, while he was at *Constantinople in 437 on an official mission to arrange the imperial marriage of *Valentinian III and *Eudoxia. While still a pagan, he combated the *Pelagians. He was in contact with *Augustine, who regarded him highly, and exhorted him to read the Christian *Scriptures and explained to him its difficulties (*Ep.* 132 in 411/412). In fact Volusianus, claiming to be open to putting himself in his school, relates to Augustine the discussions and difficulties that his circle of friends had had about the Christian religion (*Ep.* 135). *Marcellinus also asked Augustine to respond to Volusianus's difficulties (*Ep.* 137), who sent him two letters (*Ep.* 137 to Volusianus, *Ep.* 138 to Marcellinus) providing clarifications on the Christian religion and also the pagan objection that Christianity was incompatible with the empire's needs (*Ep.* 137,20).

PLRE 2, 1184-1185; Ph. Martin, *Une conversion au Ve s.: Volusien*: Revue August. 10 (1907) 145-172, A. Chastagnol, *Le sénateur Volusien et la conversion d'une famille de l'aristocratie romaine au Bas-Empire*: REA 58 (1956) 240-253; M. Moreau, *Le dossier Marcellinus dans la Correspondance de saint Augustin:* RecAug 9 (1973) 3-181; PCBE 2, 2340-2341.

A. Di Berardino

W

WAGER – BET. The entry "wager - bet," to be understood in this context as "the gambling of a sum of money in a game of dice" and therefore as "a bet or risk against fate," deserves to be treated at least in respect to the ps.-Cyprian homily titled *De aleatoribus* that was presumably composed in the 2nd half or at the end of the 3rd c. in an African context. This work is a true and proper invective which, according to its title, is primarily addressed to those who play dice, but, as it is developed, condemns all games of chance and those who practices wager money against fate, esp. if the player is a Christian and even more so if he is a bishop of the community.

The same term *alea,* which in the first meaning signifies "dice" (see the Greek term *kybos*) or "a game of dice," in a second meaning signifies "the action or condition of risk or chance"; the proper sense indicates the object, that is, the instrument of the game, although the translated sense indicates the testing of fate, fortune; in other words, the person who takes a risk (by rolling dice or in another way) challenges destiny and decides to put at risk what he possesses. A bet/wager can therefore reverse every situation and make it dangerous. For this reason a gambling table, that is, where one plays, takes a chance, and where one gambles is a place of insanity (*dementia*) and folly (*furia*), and the players are losing their mind (*insaniunt*) (see *De aleat.* 9,1-2).

As the literary and archaeological sources attest, games of chance, and dice in particular, are widely attested in the ancient world: in both Jewish and Greco-Roman society. The game of dice must have been played to such an extent that it created a lucrative business for the artisans who made them along with other accessories, such as boxes for tossing dice, as well as the table upon which one tosses dice (an inscription in Rome, CIL VI, 9927, recalls a certain Lucilius Victorinus as an *artifex artis tessalarie lusorie* [*sic*]. Moreover, the etymology of the Latin term *alea* that is read in the work of *Isidore of Seville, *Orig.* 18,60 (*alea, id est ludus tabulae, inventa a Graecis in otio Troiani belli a quodam milite nomine Alea, a quo et ars nomen accepit*) identified the discovery of the practice of the game precisely during the time of the Trojan War. Perhaps the inventor was Palamedes, the mythical son of Nauplius. But if, in all likelihood, the discovery of the game of dice (*aleae, tesserae, kuboi*) originated as merely a way to pass time, it gradually acquired the nature of a game of risk that led to wagers in money (or in other goods, even land) upon the outcome of the sum reached by throwing dice. But it was precisely the risk that incited the passion and the fierceness that led to people's ruin. Hence, the criticism of the condemnation even by non-Christian authors (see Plautus, *Curc.* 609; Horace, *Ep.* 1,18,21; Ovid, *Ars* 1,452; Quintilian, *Inst.* 6,3,72; Martial, *Epigr.* 5,54; Juvenal 1,88; 11,175-177; 14,4; Suetonius, *Claud.* 5; 39). Because of the economic damage that it caused to losing gamblers, the game of chance was declared illicit, and according to Martial, in Roman society it was only permitted during the Saturnalia (see *Epigr.* 1,84). During the time of the emperor *Justinian (527–565), the game was definitively prohibited, and because the law had a primarily moral foundation, bishops were asked to collaborate so that this legislation might be kept; one was allowed to play a game of chance only inasmuch as it did not cross over into a wager of a *solidus* and provided that one was rich (*Cod. Iust.* 3,43,1.2).

Justinian's condemnation, esp. in its ethical reasons, was not absolutely innovative but rather reiterated what had already been expressed by the Council of *Elvira held between 300 and 303 in the Spanish province of Baetica. Canon 79 prohibited the game of dice with a wager of money; the person who violated this canon was subject to *penance and would have to wait one year before receiving the *Eucharist (*si quis fidelis aleam . . . luserit nummis, placuit eum abstineri; et si emendatus cessaverit, post annum poterit communioni reconciliari*). One should note the expression *luserit nummis* ("will play with money"), that is, "he will have wagered a

sum" of money: the money wagered, the risk of the loss of capital and esp. the irrationality of tempting fate constituted, therefore, a grave concern and required disciplinary provisions that remained in effect, but not permanently. During the Middle Ages, the game of dice would again be largely practiced both among the common people and the lords and always with a wager of money (one thinks of the game of "zara," which was played with three dice and required a winning score between 4 and 7: see Dante, *Purg.* 6,1-3). Returning to the Council of Elvira, one should note that its times were not very distant from the composition of the treatise *De aleatoribus,* but were actually very close. Both the conciliar canon and the ps.-Cyprian homily, therefore, reveal the same concern and denounce the same vice: gambling and betting. But in the treatise *De aleatoribus* another reason justifies the condemnation of the game of chance and foolish wagering. They are also portrayed as an instrument of idolatry, inspired by the devil: a net in the mesh of which even Christians fall and lose their souls not just by testing fate but even by sacrificing to the one who was its inventor. The wager for victory is therefore transformed into a loss: a loss of one's own money, but esp. of the grace given by *baptism, and therefore the loss of one's *soul. Even when the player wins the wagered money, he has nonetheless lost the freedom of being a son of God and has returned to being a slave of the devil. The hand that tosses the dice is the same hand that obtains the condemnation of the gambler and the player of chance.

S.Ch. Rayment, *Roman Anti-Gambling Measures*: Classical World 43 (1950) 121-122; B. Biondi, *Il diritto romano cristiano.* II. *La giustizia - Le persone*, Milan 1952, 283-284; E. Nardi, *Monobolo & C*: Rendiconti dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna 76 (1987-1988) 5-24; M. Marin, *Citazioni bibliche e parabibliche nel* De aleatoribus *pseudociprianeo*: Annali di Storia dell'esegesi 5 (1988) 169-184; S.T. Carroll, *An Early Church Sermon Against Gambling* (*CPL 60*): The Second Century 8 (1991) 83-95; N. Purcell, *Literate Games: Roman Urban Society and the Game of Alea*: Past and Present 147 (1995) 3-37; J. Schwartz, *Gambling in Ancient Jewish Society and in the Graeco-Roman World*, in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in Greco-Roman World*, Oxford 1998, 145-165; C. Nucci (ed.), *Pseudo Cipriano, Il gioco dei dadi*, Bologna 2006 (Biblioteca patristica 43).

C. Burini De Lorenzi

WAR. In accordance with the message of Christ, which requires love for one's enemies (see Mt 5:44), the fathers of the church, as men and as Christians, have a great aversion to war and desire peace in justice, even if they recognize the fact that serious violation of rights can in extreme cases justify war: every war has its roots in sin. Christ did not have recourse to arms in order to establish the "kingdom of God," but neither did he demand that soldiers, e.g., the centurion, abandon their way of life: he urged everyone to be converted and not to sin, in whatever situation they might live. Paul uses the imagery of military armor to illustrate the battle against wicked forces and the opposition of the carnal man to the service of God (Rom 13:12; Eph 6:10-17; 1 Th 5:8; 2 Tim 2:3).

The Christians of the first centuries wanted to apply the evangelical ideal of peace to their lives (see Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* IV,34,4) and held the faith to be irreconcilable with any type of violence or killing. Further, esp. in the first three centuries, as they were not required to take responsibility in the management of the empire, they had little sense of duty to military service. (The military was formed for the most part out of volunteers and professional soldiers; it was not obligatory for the sons of soldiers. Sometimes soldiers carried out "civil" service in special forces.) Christians justified their refusal to serve in the military for two fundamental reasons (see *Passio Maximiliani;* Tertullian, *De Cor.* 1 and 11): first, the military way of life led almost necessarily to committing acts of violence and killing; second, enlistment and certain other moments in this way of life required acts of pagan worship. At the beginning of the 3rd c., if a soldier converted to Christianity he was required not to kill anyone, even if he received the order to do so, and also not to take the oath; if a member of the faithful enlisted, he was excommunicated (Hippolytus, *Trad. Ap.* 16). But there is a distinction made between *bellare* ("combat" and therefore also killing) and *militare* (serving as a soldier): the first is always prohibited, the second tolerated, provided that no morally unjust acts or acts of idolatry were carried out. Therefore positions with regard to military service vary from absolute intransigence to resigned acceptance (to earn a living) which sought to reconcile it with the Christian faith and tolerated formalities here and there: see in the *Passio Iul.* 2, the case of the veteran Julius, who was a soldier for 27 years; the Christian soldiers mentioned in the *Passio Maximiliani* 2; see also Tertullian, *De Cor.* 1,4. Christians admired the Roman military order (Clement of Rome, *Ad Cor.* 37) and professed loyalty toward the authorities (see Athenagoras, *Supplication*, 37,2), yet they were critical of war and of the life of the soldier (Tatian, *Discourse* 11,1; 19,2; 23,12; Athenagoras, *On the Resurrection of the Dead* 19). *Clement of Alexandria insists that Christians must be pacifists (cf. *Prot.* 11, 1162-4; *Strom.* IV,8,61) and emphasizes the antipedagogical function of military expenses (*Paed.* 1,12,98-99). *Origen deduces from the

preeminence of the commandment of love an absolute condemnation of every homicide (*Com. Rm* 9,31) and presents the Christians as "soldiers" dedicated to prayer in order to defeat the demons, who stir up wars (*C. Cels.* 8,73-74). *Tertullian, at first more open on the question (*Apol.* 30,4), moves to a rigorist attitude regarding evangelical coherence and prophetic radicalism (*Idol.* 19). *Cyprian denounces the spread of violence in war and its atrocities (*Ad Donat.* 6). *Lactantius, too, condemns the imperialist violence of the state (*Div. Inst.* VI,6) and rejects war because it kills (VI,20,15-17). After the conversion of *Constantine, the relation between church and state began to change: Christians became involved and were made jointly responsible in the management of public order; they elaborated the theory of "just" war, placing it under moral law. They tended to make the defense of the faith coincide with the defense of the empire; therefore, they were reinstated in the military. But they sought at the same time to influence the political situation in the direction of greater humanity and efforts toward peace.

The Council of *Arles in 314 excommunicated deserters (can. 3); *Eusebius on the one hand presents Constantine as praying before every battle and bearing the emblem of the cross in his "crusades" (*Vita Const.* II,4; IV,56) but on the other hand considers war as a calamity (*HE* 1,2 and 5, proem.). *Ambrose exalts the fortitude "which in war defends from barbarians and in peace protects the weak," provided that it be animated by justice (*Off.* I,129). *Gregory of Tours describes the battles of *Clovis which he fought in order to defeat the *Arians (*Hist. Franc.* II,35f.). Yet at the same time the church of the 4th c. recalled the persecutions undergone (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 2,87) and became conscious of a certain incompatibility which appears in the canonical texts (*Can. Hipp.* 14 and 74). *Basil advised those who kill in war or in defense of the weak to abstain from receiving Communion for three years (*Ep.* 188,13). Noble examples of nonviolence remain, as that of St. *Martin of Tours: "I am a soldier of Christ; I am not permitted to fight" (Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Mart.* 4). A small minority (clergy and monks) were dispensed from military service: an admonition to a prophetic attitude but also a sign of distinction and separation from the laity engaged in the world.

At the beginning of the 5th c., imperial decrees (of *Honorius and *Theodosius II) prescribe that only Christians can be in the military (cf. CTh 16,8,16; 5,48; 10,21). Augustine—as many Fathers—recognizes the benefits brought by the Roman Empire to the various peoples but also that "this result has been gained by many and monstrous wars, with much slaughter of men and much spilling of blood" (*Civ. Dei* 19,7). One cannot justify wars of conquest and the unbridled desire to dominate: "If justice is not respected, what are states if not great bands of robbers?" (*Civ. Dei* 4,4; cf. 4,6). The desire for peace is inscribed in the very heart of man (*Civ. Dei* 19,10-20), and paradoxically, one enters war in order to arrive at peace (*Civ. Dei* 15,4; 19,12; *Ep.* 189,6). Taking his inspiration from Cicero (*Off.* 1,34-37), he holds those wars to be "just" which are fought in response to injuries (*Quaest. In Hept.* 6,10; *Civ. Dei* 19,7; cf. also 3,10) and which have as their purpose the reestablishment of violated justice. Moreover, those who enter such a war should be constrained to do so, when all attempts at reconciliation fail (cf. *Civ. Dei* 4,15; 19,7; *Ep.* 229,2). One's conduct in war should be inspired by patience and benevolence (*Ep.* 138,14). It would be much better, however, to procure peace by means of peace rather than by war (*Ep.* 229,2).

Christians benefited from the *pax Romana* and were aware that this was acquired by war. Yet they preferred to testify to their faith by opposing every form of violence; they condemned the cruelties and slaughter connected to armed combat while recognizing the validity of military service and, in extreme cases, even the necessity of war; they affirmed that care for peace in justice should animate everyone, even the soldier.

R.H. Bainton, *The Early Church and War*: HTR 39 (1946) 189-212; E. Ryan, *The Rejection of Military Service by the Early Church*: Theological Studies 13 (1952) 1-32; S. Windass, *Le christianisme et la violence. Étude sociologique et historique de l'attitude du christianisme à l'égard de la guerre*, Paris 1966; A. Colombo, *La problematica della guerra nel pensiero politico cristiano dal I secolo al V secolo*, Milan 1970; R. Klein, *Das Frühe Christentum in Römischen Staat*, Darmstadt 1971, 187-216; H.T. Mc Elwain, *St. Augustine's Doctrine on War in Relation to Earlier Ecclesiastical Writers (A Comparative Analysis)*, Rome 1972; J. Helgeland, *Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine*: ANRW II, 23,1 (1979) 724-834 (bibl.); L.J. Swift, *War and the Christian Conscience*, I. *The Early Years*, ibid., 835-868; J.M. Hornus, *It Is Not Lawful for Me to Fight: Early Christian Attitudes Toward War, Violence and the State*, Scottdale, PA 1980 (original Fr. ed.: *Évangile et labarum*, Genève 1960); M. Toschi, *Pace e Vangelo. La tradizione cristiana di fronte alla guerra*, Brescia 1980; L.J. Swift, *The Early Fathers on War and Military Service*, Wilmington, NC 1983; P.A. Gramaglia, *Non uccidere e non violenza nel sec. IV*, in *Atti della V settimana di studi "Sangue e antropologia. Riti e culto,"* Rome 1984, 1603-1699; E. Pucciarelli (ed.), *I cristiani e il servizio militare: testimonianze dei primi tre secoli*, Florence 1987; M.F. Berrouard, s.v. *Bellum*: AL 1, 638-646 (bibl.); J. Fernández Urbiña, *Cristianos y militares: La Iglesia antigua ante el ejército y la guerra*, Granada 2000; R. Cacitti, "*Mihi non licet militare." Fondamento biblico, sacramento battesimale e istanze morali del rifiuto della guerra nel cristianesimo delle origini*, in G. Merlo (ed. by), *Lombardia monastica e religiosa.* II, Milan 2001, 11-64.

A. Hamman - M. Maritano

WARNAHARIUS (Warner) (7th c.). Presbyter of Langres (*Lingonica civitas*). In response to Caraunius of Paris, who had asked him for information about the *martyrs of the city, he wrote two texts: one concerning the three martyred brothers of Cappadocia, namely, Speusippus, Eleusippus and Meleusippus, who were put to death during *Aurelian's persecution; the other treats Desiderius bishop of Langres, who had been killed by the *Vandals as soon as they had occupied and sacked the city. The first is a legendary text, belonging to the so-called epic passions; the second is much more historically grounded and tends to emphasize the ferocity of the barbarians.

CPL 1308-1310; PL 80, 185-200; MGH, *Ep.* 3, 457; Patrologia IV, 345; BBKL 10, 976-977.

M. Simonetti

WATER. In Sacred *Scripture, water is a theologically bivalent element: bearer of life or death; sign of blessing or curse; indicator, by its abundance, of the messianic kingdom that has come, or of the kingdom of hell. Thus the water above and below the firmament of Gen 1:6 represents the angelic hierarchies and the opposing powers, respectively (Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 1,2; Basil, *Hexam.* 3,9; Jerome, *Ep.* 51,5.7), and its division indicates the discernment human beings must carry out between spiritual and carnal desires (Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 1,2). The use of water in the liturgy is already present in Scripture, and it is from Scripture that the symbolism proper to water in the Christian liturgy is derived.

While the presence of water in baptism is testified to by specific events such as those described in Acts 8:36 and 10:47, the Fathers deepened its meaning through typological interpretation, searching out its prefigurement in numerous OT and NT texts. The creative capacity of water, such as to be able to communicate new life and give birth to new creatures, is related to Gen 1:2 (Tertull., *Bapt.* 3,4; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* III,4; Ambr., *De myst.* 9; *De sacram.* 3,3; John Chrys., *Catech.* II,25), while its power to destroy the old man and sin is anticipated in the water of the flood, according to a type already present in 1 Pet 3:18-21: the water of the flood prefigures baptism because, cleansing the sins of humanity, it "baptized the world" (Tertull., *Bapt.* 8); by it the ark was "as though baptized without being submerged" (Aug., *In Io.* 7,3); it buried evil (Ambr., *De myst.* 11) and became the bearer of salvation for those entering the ark, just as the water of baptism saves only those in the church (Cypr., *Ep.* 69,2). It thus bears not only destruction but also renewal (Leo the Great, *Serm.* 60,3). The twofold function passing from the water of the flood to the baptismal water is also attributed to the latter through the typology of the water of the Red Sea, also found in the NT (1 Cor 10:2). The baptismal water, cleansing the filth of sin, generates a new person capable of singing the new song of the exodus (Orig., *Hom.* V,5 *in Ex.*). The water of the Red Sea, however, above all liberates, and it is this function that is primarily emphasized when compared with the baptismal water (Tertull., *Bapt.* 9; Orig., *Hom.*VI,4 *in Ex.*; Cypr. *Ep.* 69,15; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* III,5; XIX,3; Ambr., *De myst.* 12; Greg. Nyss., *Bapt. Chr.*; Aug., *Serm.* 353,4; Leo the Great, *Serm.* 55,5); the latter is superior to the former in that it is capable of making one rise again, while the water of the Red Sea could not prevent the Jews from dying in the desert (Ambr., *De sacr.* 1,22). The water that gushed from the rock by Moses's action (Num 20: 1-11), like those of Marah that became sweet when he threw in a stick (Ex 15:22-25), is seen as a type of the baptismal water, sanctified by Christ, the Rock (Tertull., *Bapt.* 9; Cypr., *Ep.* 63,8), or by the wood of the cross (Tertull., *Bapt.* 9; *Adv. Iud.* 13,12; Ambr., *De myst.* 14; Dyd., *Trin.* II,14)—here also the typology is already scriptural (1 Cor 10:4; Jn 19:34). Other instances of water in the OT interpreted as figures and foretastes of the baptismal water are (1) the water an angel miraculously caused Hagar and Ishmael to find when they were about to die in the desert, having used all the water in the skin (Gen 21:14), an episode that indicates the need for a divine water, given the insufficiency of the water of the synagogue (Greg. Nyss., *Bapt. Chr.*); (2) the water in which Naaman washed (2 Kgs 5:1ff.), recalled by *Ambrose (*De myst.* 17-18) and *Gregory of Nyssa (*Bapt. Chr.*); (3) the living water of Ezek 47:1-3, from which derived, esp. in the early years, the practice of baptizing in a running spring (*Didache* VII,1,3).

There are also episodes in the gospels where water is interpreted as a figure of the water of baptism: the water of the Jordan where Christ was baptized is a prototype of the water in which Christians are baptized (Hil., *In Matth.* 2,5; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* XII,15; XXI,1; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 29,20; Ambr., *In Luc.* 83; Jerome, *In Matth.* 1; John Chrys., *Hom. XII,2 in Mt.*), also called the "beginning of the gospel," as the water of creation was the "beginning of the world" (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* III,5); the water of the pool of Bethesda (Jn 5:1-9: Tertull., *Bapt.* 5; Chrom., *Serm.* 14) and the water that flowed from the side of Christ (Jn 19:34: Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* III,10; Ruf., *Symb.* 21). For Origen, the water about which Christ speaks to Nicodemus (Jn 3:5) indicates that baptism is from above, being identical to the water mentioned in Ps

148:4 (*Com. Rom.* V,8). For *Basil water is an image of death "receiving bodies like a tomb" (*De Spir.* XV,35). Besides its use in baptism, water is an indispensable material for the eucharistic celebration, and here also the meaning it acquires is taken from Scripture. *Justin calls the *Eucharist the combination of consecrated bread, wine and water (*1 Apol.* 65.67). The practice of tempering the eucharistic wine with water is testified to by *Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* V,2,3) and *Hippolytus (*Trad. Ap.* 21); *Cyprian offers scriptural proof (Pr 9:1-5 and Mt 26:28-29), giving it a symbolic interpretation based on Rev 15:15, where the water represents the peoples: thus the water united with the wine "is the people united to Christ" (*Ep.* 63,5.13). An explanation of this mixture was given even earlier: the water is the salvation brought about by the blood of Christ (Clem. Al., *Paed.* II,2). For *Augustine the presence of water in the chalice is based on Jn 19:34 (*In Io.* 120,2). For *Theodore of Mopsuestia it indicates that the Eucharist, like baptism, commemorates and causes one to participate in the death of Christ (*Hom.* XV). The water that flowed from the rock (Ex 17:1-7) is for *Ambrose a type of the water added to the eucharistic chalice, as is the water that flowed from the side of Christ (*De sacr.* V, 3,4), but for Cyprian "every time that in Sacred Scripture water is spoken of by itself, it proclaims baptism" (*Ep.* 63,8).

Beyond the sacramental typology, water offers the Fathers other reasons for symbolic comparisons, first among these being the Word (Orig., *Hom. XIII,3 in Gen.*); the water of Cana (Jn 2:1-11) is the insipid Scriptures before the coming of Christ, who explains them (Orig., *Com. Io.* XIII, 436 ff.; Aug., *In Io.* 9,3-4), or the sign of the union in Christ of humanity and divinity, with explicit redemptive value (Sedul., *A solis ortus cardine*, *N*), or finally human nature that will be changed in the glory of the resurrection (Max. Tur., *Ser.* 101,3); the water of Jacob's well (Jn 4:6) is the OT that Christ, asking it of the Samaritan woman, accepts (Orig., *Com. Io.* XIII,23-25), while the water which he gives represents what "surpasses what is written" (Orig., *Com. Io.* XIII,31-37; *Hom. III in Cant.* 2,8). The water is a sign of the Spirit (Ignat., *Rom* VII,2; Aug., *In Ps.* 103 [102], par. 2,3); of the church (Ambr., *Hex.* IV,1-3); of the Jewish people (Aug., *In Io.* 17,2); of the virginal womb that regenerates the faithful as Mary generated Christ (Leo the Great, *Serm.* XXV,5). In general, water is considered "the most beautiful among the four elements" constituting the world (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* III,5), a sign of God's providence (Theodor., *Or. de Prov.* 2) and always obedient to him (Ambr., *Hex.* IV,1,1-2). The liturgical practice of blessing the baptismal water is not scripturally based but is witnessed by tradition (Tertull., *Bapt.* 4; Hip., *Trad. Apost.* 21; Clem. Al., *Exc. Theod.* 82; Cypr., *Ep.* 70,1; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* III,3; Basil., *De Spir.* 66; Ambr., *De sacr.* I,5; Greg. Nyss., *Bapt. Chr.*; John Chrys., *Catech.* II,10). The use of blessed water outside of baptism is rather late; the similarity of this to Jewish, *pagan or syncretistic rites caused the practice to be discouraged (Tertull., *Bapt.* 5). The first forms of the blessing of water are found at the end of the 3rd c. in *Egypt (*Sacr. Serap.*), for use in exorcisms and for the curing of illness. At Antioch and throughout the East at the feast of *Epiphany, in memory of the sanctification of the water of the Jordan, water destined for the personal use of the faithful was blessed (John Chrys., *Bapt.* 2). In the West the first testimonies to the use of blessed water are found in Pope *Vigilius and pertain to the consecration of a church (*Ep.* I,4); the water called "Gregorian" was prepared for this use with salt, wine and ashes. Conversely, the use of water for washing the hands during the eucharistic rite was very early (Tertull., *Apol.* 39).

DACL 4, 1680-1690; DTC 4, 1978-1984; B. Capelle, L'"aqua exorcizata" dans les rites romains de la dédicace au VI[e] siècle: RBen 50 (1938) 306-308; A.V. Nazzaro, Simbologia e poesia dell'acqua e del mare in Ambrogio di Milan, Naples 1977; M.G. Bianco, A proposito di 'Aquae rubescunt hydriae': Augustinianum 33 (1993) 49-56.

F. Cocchini

WEDDING at CANA (iconography). The first miracle of Christ (Jn 2:2-11), mentioned by the fathers of the church as a symbol of the transformed elements of Communion (Cyp., *Ep.* 63 Hartel: PL 5,383; Cyr. of Jer., *Mystagogica* IV: PG 33,1098), is amply represented in Christian iconography. The oldest depictions of the wedding at Cana appear in funerary contexts of the mid-3rd c. The favor with which the scene was met, often accompanied as it was by the much more commonly found multiplication of the loaves, is to be explained by a desire to express figuratively the themes of faith and of the sacramental means which grant salvation to the Christian. One of the first representations seems to be a lunette of an arcosolium in the catacomb of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter: against the background of a scene of the banquet, Christ, standing, with a staff in his hand, touches the *hydriai* ("water jars"), a key element in understanding these scenes depicting the gospel miracle (Wp 57). The same scene, associated with the multiplication of the loaves, is repeated in another niche of the same catacomb, from some decades later (Wp 186,1). Much more frequent are de-

pictions in continuous friezes on *sarcophagi, containing successions of episodes with clear allusion to the saving food and to the means of salvation (Ws 8,3; 127,1-2; 157,1; 218,1; 220,2; 226,2-63). In particular we may mention the so-called dogmatic sarcophagus (Ws 96): in two scenes placed next to each other, to the right of the clypeus with the deceased, Christ with the staff touches the *hydriai* placed at his feet, and places his hands on the baskets of bread borne by the two apostles. On the cover of a sarcophagus of St. *Victor of Marseille (Ws 17,2; F. Benoit, *Sarcophages paléoc.*, pls. XLIII,2), the miracle is portrayed together with the less-known OT episode of the explorers of Canaan (Num 13:2ff.).

Outside the funerary context, the miracle of the wedding at Cana appears in the mosaic in the vault of the baptistery of Naples (J.L. Maier, *Bapt. de Naples*, pl. IV) and on the mosaic of St. Apollinare Nuovo in *Ravenna (F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna*, pl. 120). *Mary, present as the "instrument" of the miracle in the gospel, appears rarely in scenes of the banquet of Cana. Some examples are provided by the small underground basilica of Deir Abu Hennys, by an illumination in the so-called evangelary of Rabbula, and by a fresco in the church of St. Sergius at *Gaza (G.A. Wellen, *Theotokos,* 64). On the panels of the wooden doors of St. Sabina in Rome, the episode is carved next to the multiplication of the loaves (var. aus., *Age of Spirituality,* 438). In depictions on gold-glass, Christ, with or without staff, is represented in the center among the *hydriai,* which have the particularity of always possessing lids (F. Zanchi Roppo, *Vetri paleocristiami,* figs. 19-46). In the minor arts, the scene is portrayed vividly in a number of diptychs (W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten,* pls. 109, 111). On the silver casket of St. Nazarius, Christ is portrayed, on one side, on a throne among the apostles: at his feet there are five baskets of bread and six *hydriai,* an evident allusion to the gospel miracles and to the *Eucharist (var. aus., *Storia di Milan,* 682). In the 5th c. we know moreover from *Asterius of Amasea that some Christians wore very sumptuous garments, on which they had pictured episodes from the gospels, among which was the wedding at Cana (see PG 40, 166-167).

DACL 2, 1802-1821; EC 2, 479-480; LCI 2, 299-305; var. aus., *Storia di Milano*, I, Milan 1935; F. Benoit, *Sarcophages d'Arles et de Marseille*, Paris 1954; G.A. Wellen, *Theotokos. Eine ikonographische Abhandlung über das Gottesmutterbild in frühchristlicher Zeit*, Utrecht-Antwerpen 1961; J.L. Maier, *Le Baptistère de Naples et ses mosaïques*, Fribourg 1964; F. Zanchi Roppo, *Vetri paleocristiani a figure d'oro*, Bologna 1968; F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna. Haupstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes*, 11/2, Wiesbaden 1974; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz [2]1976; *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*, New York 1979; C.A. Moreora Azevedo, *O milagre de Caná na iconografia paleocristá*, Porto 1986 (cf. RivAC 63 [1987] 452-456); TIP 232-234.

A.M. Giuntella

WEEK. The Christian week is a collection of Jewish, astrological and Christian elements.

1. The Israelite-Jewish week, which consisted of seven days and with the Sabbath as the final day, remained the foundation of the Christian week. Early Christianity simply adopted it: Christianity also called the last day "Sabbath," and the second to last day *paraskeuē* (i.e., the day of preparation for the celebration of the Jewish Sabbath, that is, the eve of the Sabbath, or Friday) or the day before Sabbath, although the other days of the week were simply called day one, two, three, four and five. Sunday was therefore called "the first day of the week," before receiving the new title of the "Lord's day."

2. The Sabbath in Greco-Roman antiquity was put in parallel to the day of the god Cronus/Saturn (here perhaps the Jewish influence had a role: Flavius Josephus, *C. Apion.* II,31-32.; Tertull., *Nat.* I,13; *Apol.* 16,11). Cronus/Saturn subsequently became the first day of the "planetary week," which was called thus because every day of the week was under the dominion of one of the seven planets, which, according to the ancient perspective, revolved around the earth and positively or negatively influenced the course of the world. Strangely, the Western Christian church adopted these names that were pagan-astrological in origin: the *dies Solis* ("sun's day") became in German *Sonntag* (Eng. "Sunday"); the *dies Lunae* ("moon's day") became *lunedì* in Italian (Fr. *lundi;* Ger. *Mon[d] tag;* Eng. "Monday"); *dies Martis* ("Mars's day") became *martedì* in Italian (Fr. *mardi*; in Ger., from the god Thingus, resp. Tyr/Ziu, became *Dienstag*; Eng. "Tuesday"); *dies Mercurii* ("Mercury's day") became in Italian *mercoledì* (Fr. *mercredi*; in the northern countries it was given the name *Wotan*—cf. Eng. "Wednesday"; the Ger. term *Mittwoch* is a more recent creation); in the same way *dies Jovis* ("Jupiter's day") became in Italian *giovedì* (Fr. *jeudi;* in the northern countries the name *Donnerstag* [Ger.], "Thursday" [Eng.] is derived from the god Donar, resp. Thor); last, *dies Veneris* ("Venus's day") became in Italian *venerdì* (Fr. *vendredi;* in the northern countries *Freitag* [Ger.], "Friday" [Eng.], is the day of the goddess Fr(e)ia, the northern Venus). In the English linguistic area *dies Saturni* ("Saturn's day") became Saturday. The order of the week, however, remained that of the Jewish order (Sunday is the first day and not the second day of the week).

3. For the Christian elements connected to the week, *see* *Sabbath; *Sunday; *Fasting and Abstinence (for Wednesday and Friday).

E. Schürer, *Die siebentägige Woche im Gebrauche der christlichen Kirche der ersten Jahrhunderte*: ZNTW 6 (1905) 1-66; F.H. Colson, *The Week*, Cambridge 1926; F.J. Dölger, *Die Planetenwoche der griechisch-römischen Antike und der christliche Sonntag*: Antike und Christentum 6 (1941) 202-238; R.L. Odom, *Sunday in Roman Paganism*, Washington, DC 1944; G. Schreiber, *Die Wochentage im Erlebnis der Ostkirche und des christlichen Abendlandes*: Wissenschaft. Abh. d. Arbeitsgemeinschaft f. Forschung d. Landes Nordrhein-Westf. 11 (1959) 207-220; W. Rordorf, *Der Sonntag. Geschichte des Ruhe- und Gottesdiensttages im ältesten Christentum*: Abh. z. Theol. d. AT u. NT 43, Zürich 1962, 11-44; Id., *Le christianisme et la semaine planétaire*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 189-196; M. Klöckener, *Dies*: AugL 2, 414-419; E. Zerubavel, *The Seven Day Circle: The History and Meaning of the Week*, New York 1985; W. Witakowsky, *The Idea of Septimana Mundi and the Millenarian Typology of the Creation Week in Syriac Tradition*, in *V Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 236), ed. R. Lavenant, Rome 1990, 93-109; Ch. Pietri, *Le temps de la semaine à Rome et dans l'Italie chrétienne (IV^e-V^e siècle)*, in *Christiana respublica*, Rome 1997, pp. 201-249.

W. Rordorf

WIDOWS. In Christian antiquity the widows, because of their precarious social and economic situation, belonged to the world of the poor and those needing assistance, and were the beneficiaries of the respect and the love with which the gospel embraces the unfortunate. The needy were helped by the communities (see Acts 6; *Trad. Ap*. 50; Ign. Ant., *Smyr*. 6,2; *Polyc*. 4,1; Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 67). In particular, they were the object of the bishop's care (see *Didasc.* II,4,1; II,26,1-3). Various Fathers such as *Ambrose and *John Chrysostom, and the councils (*Carthage 418 and *Chalcedon 451) exhort the bishop to watch over and defend widows.

Facing these hardships, it is understandable that a widow, if willing and able, could enter a new marriage. In the early church the choice was made between widowhood and remarriage (see 1 Cor 7:39-40), but also, realistically, for the young widows the counsel was given to remarry (see 1 Tim 5:14). A few more rigorist thinkers—for ascetical reasons and not to appear inferior to pagan moralists—looked on remarriage with suspicion and referred to it as "a respectable adultery" (Athenag., *Leg*. 33,4), a type of bigamy (Tertull., *Monog.* 10,7). The majority of authors, however, adopted a more open and sympathetic stance (see Hermas, *Mand.* IV,4,1-2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 3,1 and 3,12; Epiph., *Haer.* I,48,9; III, 59,4-6; John Chrys., *Hom. de libello rep*. 4). They tolerated remarriage, but other subsequent marriages were frowned on (see *Const. Ap*. III,2,2-3; *Greg. Naz., *Or*. 37,8; Basil Caes., *Epp.* 160,4; 188,4). Generally speaking, although regarding remarriage with severity, seen as a concession to human weakness, the Fathers did not prohibit such marriages (see Ambr., *De viduis* 12.68; Aug., *De bono vid*., 12.15; Jer., *Contra Iovin.* I).

The term *widow* also indicates a special category of persons who have a specific position and function within the community and who must meet certain requirements: they had to be 60 years of age, married only once, borne good witness as mothers of their families, and be well known for their social concern and life of prayer (see 1 Tim 5:9-16). *Ignatius of Antioch mentions "the virgins called widows" (*Smyrn.* 13,1: perhaps assimilated to the virgins because of their chastity); *Polycarp refers to them as "altars of God" (4,3; see also *Didasc.* III,6,3 and *Const. Ap.* II,26,8). *Tertullian seems to allude to an *ordo viduarum* (see *Virg. vel.* 9,2-3; see also *Monog.* 11,1), for the possibility of the penitents having recourse to their intercession (see *Pud.* 13,7). Some were "instituted" for prayer, but they did not receive the *laying on of hands (see *Trad. Ap.* 10.23; *Didasc.* III,1,1 and III,6,2). They also performed activities within the church, in favor esp. of the women: preparing them for *baptism (*Statuta eccl. ant.* 12), being present at their baptism, anointing them with oil, covering them with a veil when they descended into the baptismal pool, visiting the sick (see *Testam. Dom.* 1,40; 2,4 and 8), but they esp. dedicated themselves to asceticism and prayer (*Didasc.* III,5,2; *Test. Dom.* 1,41; Chrysostom, *Vidua eligatur* 1): the deaconesses gradually supplanted them. Some widows gathered the virgins and the widows in their own home, dedicating themselves to the spiritual and ascetic life, as in the case of *Marcella and *Paula at *Rome (see Jer., *Epp.* 127 and 108); others had an important role in the education of their children (as did Antusa for John Chrysostom; *Monica for Augustine), and performed an active role in Christianizing society.

H. Leclerq, *Veuvage, veuve*: DACL 15 (1953) 3007-3026; B. Grillet, in the introductory portion to SC 138, Paris 1968, 21-83; G. Stählin, *Das Bild der Witwe*: JbAC 17 (1974) 5-20 (with bibl.); A. Covito, *L'"ordo viduarum" nella Chiesa antica*: La scala 43 (1989) 176-197; A. Nazzaro, *Figure di donne cristiane: la vedova*, in R. Uglione (ed.), *La donna nel mondo antico.* Atti del II conv., Turin 1989, 187-219; B. Thurston Bowman, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church*, Minneapolis 1989; R. Bruno Siola, *Viduae e coetus viduarum nella Chiesa primitiva e nella normazione dei primi imperatori cristiani*, in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana. VIII convegno internazionale*, Naples 1990, 367-426; H. Marchal, *Veuvage, veuve*: DSp 16 (1994) 522-529; J.U. Krause, *Witwen und Waisen im frühen Christentum.* I-IV, Stuttgart 1994-95; V. Recchia, *Le vedove nella letteratura istituzionale dell'antico Cristianesimo e nella tipologia biblica*: Invigilata lucernis 21 (1999) 303-332.

M. Maritano

WILFRID of York. (ca. 634–709). Born to a noble family in Northumbria around 634, during his teenage years Wilfred spent 3 years at the monastery of Lindisfarne. Afterward, he spent time at *Rome on pilgrimage and then several years in *Gaul: he derived from this trip absolute fidelity to the pope and a disregard for the lack of couth and ignorance of his fellow countrymen. Having returned to his homeland, he took part firsthand in the conquest of Roman customs over those of the Celts with respect to the observance of *Easter and the Council of Whitby (664). Appointed during the same year as bishop of *York, he left to consecrate priests in Gaul. Disliked by his fellow countrymen, including *Theodore of Canterbury, because of his haughtiness and harshness, he was forced to undergo persecutions of every sort by local rulers, who deprived him of his dignity, imprisoned him and, when facing the stance taken by Rome in his favor (twice he had to go to Rome), they sought in every way to avoid acknowledging such support. Only at a very advanced age, in 705, did he reclaim the monasteries-episcopates of Hexham and Ripon. He died in 709. The monk Stephen of Ripon (Eddius Stephanus), his companion in travel and trial, wrote an important biography about his life, which clearly possesses an apologetic tone (MGH, *Script. rer. merov.* 6, 193-263).

DCB 4, 1179-1185; BS 12, 1092-1094; H. Mayr-Harting, *Saint Wilfrid*, London 1986; W.T. Foley, *Images of Sanctity in Eddius Stephanus' Life of Bishop Wilfrid, An Early English Saint's Life*, Lewiston, NY 1992; Patrologia IV, 426-427.

M. SIMONETTI

WILLIBRORD of Utrecht (658–739). A marginal autograph annotation in the calendar of Echternach written by Willibrord himself (*Cod. Paris. Lat.* 10837), namely the one which the Venerable *Bede mentions (BHL 8395-8397; *HE* 5,13; 6,10-11,19), and some acts inserted in the *Liber aureus Epternacensis* constitute the most ancient sources on the life and activity of Willibrord. Born in 658 and an oblate in the monastery of Ripon at the age of six when his father Wilgilis retired as a hermit on the Humber estuary, he became a disciple of *Wilfrid of York, who favored the liturgical and monastic observance of *Rome. Willibrord transferred in 678 to the Irish monastery of Rathmelsigi (Cluain Melsige, modern-day Clonmelsh, Co. Carlow), where he found *Egbert of York, and departed in 690 with 11 companions in order to evangelize Friesland. He placed himself under the protection of his palace teacher Pippin II and during a visit to Rome around 692 had himself fortified with full missionary powers conferred by Pope *Sergius I (687–702), who ordained him archbishop of the Frisians (with his new name "Clemens") on 21, according to others 22, November 695. Willibrord, equipped with various liturgical books and objects of worship, established his cathedral at Utrecht and in 698 withdrew to the monastery of Echternach, to whose monks he left his martyrology-calendar (CPL 2037). The martyrology is the famous *Epternacensis,* the most ancient exemplar preserved of the *Hieronymian Martyrology* (beginning of the 8th c.). The hostility of Radbod king of the Frisians and the events surrounding Frankish politics upon the death of Pippin II explain the momentary withdrawal from the mission of Frisia. Christianity definitively conquered the terrain after the death of Radbod (719), thanks to the collaboration of Boniface. Willibrord died on 7 November 739 and was buried at Echternach (modern-day Luxembourg).

BHL 8935-8945; BS 12, 1113-1121; LCI 8, 616-623; BBKL 18, 1521-1530; F. Flaskamp, *Wilbrord-Clemens und Wynfrith-Bonifatius*: *Sankt Bonifatius, Gedenkgabe zum zwölfhundertsten Todestag*, Fulda [2]1954, 157-172; H.-J. Reischmann, *Willibrord—Apostel der Friesen. Seine Vita nach Alkuin und Thiofrid*, Sigmaringendorf 1989; G. Kiesel - J. Schroeder (eds.), *Willibrord—Apostel der Niederlande, Gründer der Abtei Echternach*, Luxembourg [2]1990; P. Bange - A.G. Weiler, *Willibrord, zijn wereld en zijn werk*, Nijmegen 1990; M.C. Ferrari et al. (eds.), *Die Abtei Echternach 698-1998*, Luxembourg 1999.

V. SAXER - S. HEID

WINE. In Jewish literature wine is an ambiguous sign; on the one hand, it is a sign of God's blessing and of joy (Gen 27:28; Ps 104:14-15; Pr 31:6-7; Eccl 10:19; Is 36:17); on the other, its dangers are noted (Gen 9:21; 19:32ff.; Is 5:11 and 22). Wine was used in offerings to God (Ex 29:40; Lev 23:13; Num 15:5); *Melchizedek offered bread and wine (Gen 14:18). In the NT, *John the Baptist did not drink wine (Lk 1:15), although *Jesus was accused of being a glutton and a drunkard (Mt 11:18; Lk 7:33). Jesus compares his blood to wine and his teaching to new wine (Mt 9:17; Mk 2:22; Lk 5:37-38).

In ancient Christian literature this term was used in four different contexts: (1) moral-pastoral, (2) liturgical, (3) sacramental and (4) exegetical.

In the moral works, the Fathers defended the modest pleasure of wine against such rigorous movements as those of the *Ebionites, *Encratites, *Marcionites and *Manicheans. *Paul advised *Timothy to drink wine as a medicine (1 Tim 5:23). The firstfruits of the wine were the prerogative of the prophet during the first centuries of the Christian church (*Didache* 13,6) and, afterward, the bishop

(*Apos. Con.* 2,34,5) and the clergy (*Apos. Con.* 7,29,3). The pleasure of wine is not evil or sinful, although intemperance and drunkenness are (John Chrys., *De stat.* 2,5); wine is God's gift, and one must use it properly (Basil, *Hom.* 14,1); *Clement of Alexandria, in an entire chapter of his *Pedagogue,* explains this point: "In what manner should one participate at banquets" (*Paed.* II,3). Many Christian authors criticized the inordinate use of wine in widespread intoxication by men and women. Such drunkenness, already condemned per se, gave place to excesses of every sort, moral dissoluteness, and physical and mental degeneration. Criticisms were also leveled against the immoderate use of wine during special occasions (*refrigeria,* martyrial feasts etc.), which being festive and communal, created a solidarity in drunkenness.

Christian texts mention it as the matter of pagan libations (*Act. Thom.* 77; Ps.-Clem. of Rome, *Hom.* 2,15). It was an important element in the rites of some extremist sects as, e.g., in the rite of *Mark the *Gnostic magician, whose description is provided by *Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* 1,13,2). It was no less important in the ritual banquets of the community of *Qumran (*Community Rule* 1QSa 2,17-22), which were very similar to the liturgical banquets of the first Christian communities. For the Eucharist, wine was an essential matter both in the orthodox and heterodox liturgy, with the exception of some rigorist sects (*see* *Aquarians). For liturgical use, the color of wine was never determined in antiquity, but there did exist some demands regarding quality (*Apos. Con.* 2); the type of use both in the liturgy and daily life was in harmony with the custom of that time, that is, normally water mixed with wine (the first testimony comes from the writings of *Justin Martyr [1 *Apol.* 65,5]), but exceptions are not lacking: e.g., can. 3 of the Synod of *Trullo from 692 condemned the Armenians who used wine not mixed with water in their eucharistic service; to drink "acratos" wine, that is, unmixed wine, was synonymous with drunkenness (John Chrys., *Hom. in Eutrop.* I,1).

The aforementioned rigorous movements prohibited the use of wine not only in daily life but also in the liturgy, in reference to the words of *Jesus in Mt 26:29 (John Chrys., *Hom. in Mt* 82,2), or simply because they considered it a diabolical work (Epiph., *Haer.* 47,1); they are thus called *aquarii, hydroparastae* and *hydrothei*. Against their belief, the following authors defended the orthodox tradition esp.: Irenaeus of Lyons (*Adv. haer.* V,1,3), *Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I,19,96,1), *Cyprian of Carthage (*Ep.* 63,5) and *Epiphanius (*Haer.* 30,16).

The wine of the Eucharist was identified with the blood of Christ at the beginning by Paul (1 Cor 10:16) and *Ignatius of Antioch (*Rom.* 7,3). Irenaeus identifies its true identity (*Adv. haer.* IV,17,5). *Cyril of Jerusalem was one of the pioneers of the teaching of the conversion of the elements (*Catech. myst.* 1,7; 2,9; 5,7).

In the exegetical field many passages of Scripture that contain the word *wine* were interpreted by the Fathers in a eucharistic context, but there are very many passages where the wine is considered a symbol of the divine teaching (Law and *Prophets), that is, the wine existing before Cana (Orig., *Comm. in Jo.*, frag. 74), or rather the very words of Christ (Orig., *Comm. in Jo.*, frag. 74); and wine frequently signifies in the metaphorical sense the *Pneuma* (Hipp., *Bened. Jacobi* 18), or the grace of the *Holy Spirit (Orig., *De princip.* I,3,7).

E.R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*, VI, New York 1956; W. Rordorf, *La vigne et le vin dans la tradition juive et chrétienne*: Ann. Univ. Neuchâtel (1969/70) 131-146 [= W. Rordorf, *Liturgie, Foi et Vie*, Paris 1986, 493-508]; J.P. Nowak, *De sobrietate et ebrietate in primaeva ecclesia*, Diss. UPS, Rome 1994; P. Laurence, *Ivresse et luxure féminines: les sources classiques de Jérôme*: Latomus 57 (1998) 885-899; *Della vite e del vino. Il succo dell'immortalità nelle lettere e nei colori*, ed. O. Longo e P. Scarpi, Milan 1999; *Vino. Tra mito e storia*, ed. M.G. Marchetti Lungarotti e M. Torelli, Milan 2006.

G. Ladocsi

WING (Flight of the Soul). In antiquity the immortal *soul, which escapes the body at death and rises to heaven, was often compared to a bird that rises in flight on its wings. In agreement with *Plato, esp. with the *Phaedrus* (many commentaries), the philosophical tradition developed the theme of the soul/bird with its wings and flight along various lines: physical death, *ascesis, the passage through the material world (Posidonius) and the contemplation of spiritual reality (Beauty). As *Philo had done previously, the Christian authors enriched the entire context with biblical passages (esp. Ps 54:7). They also Christianized it, adding various themes: sin (*Origen), the dove of the *Holy Spirit, virginity (*Methodius, *Ambrose), the virtuous life—love of neighbor, humility, chastity (*Augustine), prayer, elevation to God (*Gregory of Nyssa), the devil, who like a predator hinders the soul's flight, the death of the saints (*Gregory the Great). Esp. from the 4th c. flight was taken as a symbol for overcoming distance in the epistolary literature.

P. Courcelle, *Flügel* I: RAC 8, 29-65 (bibl.); K. Thraede, *Flügel* II (epistolary theme): RAC 8,65ff.; V. Poeschl, *Bibliographie zur antiken Bildersprache*, Heidelberg 1964, 478; S. Poque, *Le langage symbolique dans la prédication d'Augustin d'Hippone*, Paris 1984, 331-341; D. Dideberg, *Amor*: AugLex I/1-2 (1986) 294-300, esp. 298.

B. Studer

WISDOM BOOKS

I. Job - II. Solomonic books - III. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus (Sirach).

Christians distinguished the poetic books of the OT with the adjective "wisdom" because of their content; the *Jews, however, included these books in the broader category of the *Ketuvim* ("writings"). They are as follows: Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the *Song of Songs (= Solomonic books); Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus or Sirach (they were considered deuterocanonical and therefore not included in the Jewish canon). Some even included the book of *Psalms among the sapiential books, which in this encyclopedia has been treated separately.

I. Job. Citations or allusions to Job occurred already in the NT (Mt 19:26; Mk 10:27; Lk 1:52; 1 Cor 3:19; Phil 1:19; 1 Th 5:22; 2 Th 2:8; Jas 5:11; Rev 9:6), but not to the same extent in the most ancient Christian literature of the 1st and 2nd c., which seems to have not had much interest in this biblical book. Nevertheless, *Clement of Rome (*1 Cor.* 17,3-4; 26,3) and *Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 46,32; 79,4; 103,5) were exceptions. The first writer to make extensive use of the book of Job was *Clement of Alexandria (esp. in the *Stromata:* 15 explicit citations); Clement found an argument in Job for his doctrine of authentic Christian "gnosis." Shortly thereafter, the book of Job made its first appearance in Latin Christian literature in the writings of *Cyprian (*Testimonia; De op. et eleem.* 18, ecc.). The first Christian commentator on Job was *Origen, whose *exegesis, however, has mostly been lost: Greek fragments exist in the catenae (CPG I,1424; CPG IV,213-215), and Latin fragments can be found in the writings of *Hilary of Poitiers (see below) and perhaps even in the commentary of the priest *Philip or ps.-Jerome (PL 26,619-802), which, at least, certainly contains Origen's ideas (Altaner, 203-204). Origen explained the mystery of *evil, which had been debated in the book of Job and had recourse to the doctrine of the preexistence of souls and their initial fall; it is interesting that he did not see in Job a type of Christ but rather a prototype of all the martyrs. After Origen one must recall, among the Greek fathers, the commentary by *Evagrius of Pontus, from whose work numerous fragments remain in the catenae (CPG II,2458), and what has come down to us likewise in fragmentary form from *Athanasius (CPG II,2141). Hilary of Poitiers's commentary has been almost entirely lost, whose few fragments, however, are to be considered nothing more than a translation of Origen's commentary (*Tract. in Job*: PL 10,723-724; CSEL 65,229-230). *Didymus of Alexandria's commentary, which goes until Job 16:2 (ed. Henrichs - Hagedorn - Koenen, I-III, Bonn 1968-1973) has been recently discovered in the *papyri of Tura; Didymus's exegesis is known to us otherwise in a different edition through the fragments contained in the catenae, which end at Job 34:25 (CPG II,2553). Even in Didymus's work one can detect the presence of Origen's doctrine concerning the preexistence and the fall of the soul and that of the **apokatastasis.* Didymus likewise derived from Origen the interpretation of Job as a symbol of the persecuted righteous person and the one subject to temptation (and not a type of Christ). Scholars have attributed a *Commentary on Job* to a certain *Julian the Arian, who lived in the 4th c. (?) (CPG II,2075; D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Iulianus,* Berlin 1973), in which the Job-Christ typology (later adopted by *Gregory the Great) appears for the first time. From *John Chrysostom we possess a sermon on Job (PG 63,477-486) and a commentary, which has been transmitted by the catenae, whose authenticity has been questioned. Of the four spurious sermons published in PG 56, the first is for the Byzantine feast of Job (6 May); the other three belong to *Severian of Gabala. With John Chrysostom the ancient Christian exegesis on Job reached one of its supreme heights, which would then only be surpassed by *Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*. Elaborating a genuine osmosis of biblical spirituality with moral philosophy, John Chrysostom saw in Job the model and the height of all the virtues of the biblical and Greco-Roman tradition. A commentary on Job, which has not come down to us, was also composed by *Theodore of Mopsuestia, who regarded it as the work of a pagan author. Among the commentaries on Job, one must also recall, after Chrysostom, the work of *Olympiodorus (PG 93,13-469: lengthy extracts in the catena of *Niceta, and, according to the recent hypothesis, material belonging to Olympiodorus even in the Latin commentary now commonly attributed to Julian: see CPG III,7453 and below).

Among the Latin fathers, with the exception of Hilary whose work was mentioned above, the first commentator was *Ambrose, who delivered some sermons on Job that merged into the treatise titled *De interpellatione Job et David* (PL 14,793-850; CSEL 32,211-296). Augustine's *Adnotationes in Job* have a

pronounced theological tone (PL 34,825-886, see PL 32,635; CSEL 28/2,509-628); in the context of the fight against *Pelagianism, Augustine harmonized his exegesis with the well-known doctrine of the universality of sin and limited salvation through gratuitous divine choice: Job is the just man, but he was conceived and born in sin, he therefore knew that he did not merit any reward for his just conduct of life. A point of view diametrically opposed to Augustine's was expressed in the *Expositio libri Job,* which has been commonly attributed to *Julian of Eclanum after the authoritative study written by Vaccari (*Un commento a Giobbe di Giuliano di Eclano,* Rome 1915; but against Stiglmayr in ZKTh [1919] 269-288), in a work with an Antiochene mark, whose Julian authorship would seem to be validated precisely by the Pelagian interpretation, which gives the reader the complete sense of a response to Augustine's exegesis (ed. PLS 1,1573-1679; extensive bibl. in Altaner, 390-391, and DSp 8,1224-1225). One should also recall, among the Latins, the commentary of ps.-Pelagius or ps.-Jerome (PL 23,1407-1470), in addition to the aforementioned commentary of ps.-Jerome (PL 26,619-802), which is to be reattributed to the priest Philip (see the study by Ciccarese) and contains material from the writings of Origen (see above). The most extensive and best work, however, in all of patristic literature on Job is perhaps Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job,* which, being more than a work of exegesis, is a true and proper manual of moral and ascetic theology (ed. Gillet-De Gaudemaris, Paris 1952, SC 32); it was composed under the form of homilies delivered by Gregory to the monks of *Constantinople between 579 and 585 (see the dedicatory letter to *Leander of Seville). Because this entry cannot treat the rich moral and ascetic contents of this work, the reader is referred to the article in the DSp 6,876ff. and 8,1222-1223). We make note only that, from the strictly exegetical point of view, the typology established by Gregory saw in Job the type of the suffering Christ and consequently that of the church (*Praef.:* Job represents the *mystery of Christ's passion, not only for having prophesied it in his speeches but also for having portrayed it in his sufferings. And because Christ constitutes an *unum* with the church, Job, as any other saint who bears in himself the *image of Christ, is also a type of the church).

DSp 8, 1218-1225, with an extensive bibliography (1224-1225) on the Greek and Latin fathers. Further bibliographic references can be found under the various clavis numbers of the CPG mentioned above and in the work of Altaner, 390-391 (Julian of Eclanum) and 499-500 (Gregory the Great). For Didymus, see M. Simonetti, in VetChr 20 (1983) 357-363; for Theodore of Mopsuestia: L. Pirot, *L'oeuvre exégétique de Th. de Mops.*, Rome 1913, 131-134. *Isidore of Pelusium's exegesis on Job (who, however, did not compose a commentary on this biblical book) was studied by R. Maisano: Koinonia 4 (1980) 63-68. For the catenae, which are important esp. for the exegesis of John Chrysostom and Olympiodorus, from whom hundreds of fragments have been preserved for us, see CPG IV,213-215 (with further bibliography, even on certain Fathers). Other bibliography: D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian* (PTS 14), Berlin 1973; J. Ziegler, *Iob 14,4-5a als wichtigster Schriftbeweis für die These "Neminem sine sorde et sine peccato esse"* (*Cyprian, Test 3, 54*), *bei den Lateinischen christlichen Schriftstellern*, Munich 1985; H. Sorlin - L. Neyrand, *Jean Chrysostome, Commentaire sur Job.* I: (*Chapitres I-XIV*); II: (*Chapitres XV-XLII*) (SC 346, 348), Paris 1988; M.P. Ciccarese, *Una esegesi "Double Face." Introduzione alla Expositio in Iob del presbitero Filippo*: AnSE 9 (1992) 483-492; U. Hagedorn - D. Hagedorn, *Die älteren griechischen Katenen zum Buch Hiob*. I: *Einleitung, Prologe und Epiloge, Fragmente zu Hiob 1,1-8,22* (PTS 40), Berlin-New York 1994; var. aus., *Le Livre de Job chez les Pères*, Strasbourg 1996; G. Cremascoli, *L'esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno*, Brescia 2001; M. Perraymond, *La figura di Giobbe nella cultura paleocristiana tra esegesi patristica e manifestazioni iconografiche*, Vatican City 2002; *Gregorio Magno esegeta: rapporti tra Commentari e Omelie*, in *Gregorio Magno nel XIV centenario della morte*, Rome 2004, 141-152.

II. Solomonic books (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs). When collecting the data of the preceding Hebrew tradition, Christian antiquity unanimously attributed to *Solomon the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs. Starting from *Origen onward (*Prol. in Cant.:* GCS 33,75ff.), these three books were considered a unitary trilogy in which one saw the symbol and the figure of human teaching, that is, secular wisdom and its traditional tripartite division into *ethics, physics and metaphysics, and they were made to correspond, respectively: Proverbs, ethics; Ecclesiastes, physics; Song of Songs, metaphysics.

S. Leanza, *La classificazione dei libri salomonici e i suoi riflessi sulla questione dei rapporti tra Bibbia e scienze profane, da Origene agli scrittori medievali*: Augustinianum 14 (1974) 651-666; Id., *L'esegesi di Origene al libro dell'Ecclesiaste*, Reggio Calabria 1975, 25-31; M. Harl, *Les trois livres de Salomon et les trois parties de la philosophie dans les Prologues des Commentaires sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (*d'Origène aux chaînes exégétiques grecques*), in *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, ed. J. Dummer, Berlin 1987, 249-269; *Letture cristiane dei Libri sapienziali: XX incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana*, Rome 1992; C. Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, Leiden 2004, 296-310 (with information identifying the commentaries of the Fathers in the editions: 306-310).

1. Proverbs. Because of its moral content, the book of Proverbs was often cited and used by the Fathers for exhortation (the most ancient citations occur in the *Epistle of *Barnabas,* *Clement of Rome, *Ignatius of Antioch and *Polycarp); there were not, however,

many commentaries explicitly dedicated to the entire book or to individual sections. The pearl of patristic literature on Proverbs was the *Homilia in principium Proverbiorum* by *Basil the Great (see below). The book's inspiration and canonicity was never called into question; *Theodore of Mopsuestia himself did not outright deny the canonicity of Proverbs but maintained that Proverbs and Ecclesiastes were at an inferior level of inspiration (*sapientiae gratia* rather than *prophetiae gratia*: a doctrine condemned by the Second Council of Constantinople, 553). The Greek fathers' *exegesis of Proverbs has been preserved for us in large part in the *Catena of Procopius,* which is unpublished (the text attributed to Procopius in PG 87,1221-1544 is not authentic, although the partial Latin translation by Corderius in PG 87,1779-1800, which was created from a manuscript of the Procopian translation, seems plausible); the text of Polycronius was published in a Latin translation by Th. Peltanus (Antwerp 1614; other catenae, in some way connected to the translation of Procopius such as that of the *Vat. gr.* 1802, which was partially published by Angelo Mai [*Nova Patrum Biblioth.* VII/2,1-81]: all dependent, including that of Procopius, on a more ancient catena now lost), until then only partially explored and not always reliable with respect to the attributions of authorship. We possess various scholia and fragments written by *Hippolytus (CPG I,1883; PG 10,615-630; H. Achelis, GCS 1/2,155-167: a moral exegesis), Origen of Alexandria (CPG I,1430; PG 13,17-34; 17,149-160; C. Tischendorf, *Notitia editionis codicis bibliorum Sinaitici*, Leipzig 1860, 76-122: *allegorical and spiritual exegesis), *Didymus of Alexandria (CPG II,2552; PG 39,1621-1646; 95,1297B; 39,180-182: a literal explanation and spiritual application), *Evagrius of Pontus (CPG II,2456-2457; critical edition of fragments in the catenae by P. Géhin; perhaps material by Evagrius under the name of *Origen, PG 17,161-252; Syriac fragments: J. Muyldermans, *Evagriana syriaca,* 133-134 and 163-164; Evagrius deeply felt the influence of the book of Proverbs in all his work, also changing its pontificating style; see esp. the *Metrical Sentences for Monks and Virgins,* a true and proper imitation of Proverbs), *Gregory of Nazianzus (CPG II,3052,6), *Eustathius of Antioch (CPG II,3366; PG 18,675-686; Pitra, *Analecta sacra* II, p. XXXVIII; M. Spanneut, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche*, Lille 1948, 122-123, on Pr 8:22 and other texts: theological and allegorical-christological exegesis), *Eusebius of Caesarea (CPG II,3469, 7; PG 24,76-78), *Apollinaris of Laodicea (CPG II,3683; A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Biblioth.* VII/2,76-80; other fragments still unpublished), *Epiphanius of Salamis (CPG II,3761,3), *John Chrysostom (CPG II,4445-4446; fragments in PG 64,659-740 and an entire commentary in the *Cod. Patm.* 161, to be published in the CCG), *Cyril of Alexandria (CPG III,5205, 3; PG 69,1277-1278 on Proverbs 8:22: literal and theological exegesis), *Olympiodorus (CPG III,7464; PG 93, 469-478, of doubtful authenticity; a literal exegesis of a moralizing tone, but at times allegorical), and Julian the Deacon (A. Mai, op. cit., 80). Various interpretations in different contexts appear in the writings of *Isidore of Pelusium (PG 78). The entirety of a direct translation of *Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia in principium Proverbiorum* has survived to our day: on Pr 1:1-5 (CPG II,2856; PG 31,385-424), which, moreover, was cited very often in the catenae: a true jewel of the exegetical literature on Proverbs in which the author explained the initial verses of Proverbs, after having emphasized the sublime character of Proverbs, which is very useful for the education of customs, and of Ecclesiastes, which unmasks the vanity of earthly things by directing us to divine and eternal values, and after having outlined the mystical interpretation of Song of Songs.

Another homily on Pr 6:4 under the name of the same Basil has also come down to us (PG 31,1497-1508).

Among the Latin fathers, *Augustine commented on some passages from Proverbs in the *Sermones* (CPL 284): Pr 9:12 (according to the LXX) in *Serm.* 35 (PL 38,213-214); Pr 13:7-8 in *Serm.* 36 (PL 38,215-221); and Pr 31:10-31 in *Serm.* 37 (PL 38,221-235). To *Salonius of Geneva is attributed a debated commentary under the form of a dialogue on Proverbs and Ecclesiastes which, following the literary genre **quaestiones et responsiones,* addresses and solves the chief exegetical difficulties of the two books (CPL 499; *Pr*: PL 53,967-994; Eccl: PL 53,994-1012; ed. C. Curti, *Salonii Commentarii in Parabolas Salomonis et in Ecclesiasten,* Catania 1964). The exegesis of *Gregory the Great on Proverbs has been preserved by *Paterius in *Liber testimoniorum . . . ex opusculis S. Gregorii* (CPL 1718; PL 79,683ff.; on Pr: PL 79,895-906). *Bede composed an *Allegorica expositio super Parabolas Salomonis* (PL 91,937-1040), which has been incorrectly transmitted to us also among the works of *Rabanus Maurus, and in the *Libellus de muliere forti* (Pr 31: PL 91,1039-1052); moreover, his fragments on an *Allegorica interpretatio in Proverbia Salomonis,* on chapters 7, 30, 31 and 36 (PL 91,1051-1066): for all these writings, see CPL 1351-1352.

L. Bigot: DTC 13, 932; A. Barucq: DBS 8, 1469 and 1472-1473. For the catenae: CPG IV, 225-226. On Hippolytus: M. Richard, *Les fragments du Commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur les Proverbes*

de Salomon: Muséon 78 (1965) 257-290; 79 (1966) 61-94; 80 (1967) 327-364. On Origen: M. Richard, *Les fragments d'Origène sur Pr. 30,15-31*, in Epektasis. Mélanges J. Daniélou, Paris 1972, 385-394. On Evagrius: G. Mercati, *Intorno ad uno scolio creduto di Evagrio*: RBi 14 (1914) 534-542 (= *Opere minori* 3, ST 78, 393-401); H. Urs von Balthasar, *Die Hiera des Evagrius*: ZKTh 63 (1939) 86-106, 181-206; M. Richard: Muséon 79 (1966) 70-71; Quasten II, 177-178; critical edition of all the scholia, *Evagrius Ponticus Scholies aux Proverbes*, par P. Géhin, SC 340, Paris 1987; Syriac fragments: Muyldermans, *cit. supra.* On Eusthatius: M. Spanneut, *cit. supra.* On John Chrysostom: M. Richard, *Le Commentaire de S. Jean Chrysostome sur les Proverbes de Salomon*: *Συμπόσιον*. Studies on St. John Chrysostom, Thessaloniki 1973, 99-103, and Muséon 78 (1965) 257-263. On Olympiodorus: M. Faulhaber, *Hohelied-, Proverbien- und Prediger-Catenen*, Vienna 1902, 89 and 113. On Isidore of Pelusium: R. Maisano, *L'esegesi veterotestamentaria di Isidoro di Pelusio. I libri sapienziali*: Koinonia 4 (1980) 39-75. On Bede: A. Vaccari: Miscell. Geronimiana, Rome 1920, 5-7 (other bibl. in CPL 1351-1352). For the use of Proverbs and esp. 8:22-25, in the context of the Arian debate, see M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, passim, and *Studi sull'arianesimo*, Rome 1965, 9-87.

2. *Ecclesiastes*. The first patristic commentary on Ecclesiastes was that of Hippolytus, only one fragment of which remains (H. Achelis, GCS, *Hippolytus Werke* I/2, 179). We have more abundant fragments, reconstructed through various *catenae, for the exegetical work of Origen, who composed a commentary in the form of a scholia on Ecclesiastes and eight homilies (ed. S. Leanza, *L'esegesi di Origene . . . ,* and new fragments from Cod. Vindob. Theol. Gr. 147 in CCG 4, Suppl.), characterized as usual by allegorical interpretation that exercised a decisive influence on subsequent patristic exegesis. In the *Catena of Procopius* we also find fragments of Dionysius of Alexandria's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes,* which is limited to the first chapters (Feltoe's edition is not very reliable, Cambridge 1904; see A. Labate, *Il recupero del Commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Dionigi Alessandrino attraverso le catene bizantine:* Koinonia 16 [1992] 53-74; better edition in CCG 4, *Catena of Procopius,* and new fragments from the Cod. Vindob. Theol. Gr. 147 in CCG 4, Suppl.; the Dionysian authorship of the fragment on Ecclesiastes 12 edited by Bienert is subject to debate: Kleronomia 5 [1973] 308-314), with the mystical-allegorical interpretation, which is understood esp. to overcome the difficulties deriving from the "Epicurean" teaching of Ecclesiastes. We possess, however, in its entirety the *Metaphrasis in Ecclesiasten Salomonis* by *Gregory Thaumaturgus (PG 10,988-1017), which some codices erroneously attribute to *Gregory of Nazianzus: more than a commentary, it is a succinct paraphrase with a prevailing moral intent; it is noteworthy, however, because it also introduces for the first time the hermeneutical hypothesis of the *prosopopoeia* (Gk. *prosōpopoiia*; lit. "a dramatizing"; a solution that was then continually followed by subsequent interpreters), such as the alternative to the allegorical interpretation to explain the embarrassing "Epicureanisms" of Ecclesiastes. The *papyri of *Tura have also recently restored to us almost in their entirety the extensive commentary by *Didymus of Alexandria (*Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes,* ed. Binder-Liesenborghs-Gronewald, Bonn 1969ff.), whose exegesis of Ecclesiastes at first was known only through the few fragments of the catenae but which did not always correspond to the interpretation of Tura; both the commentary of Tura and the catenist fragments, however, reveal an exegesis that was primarily allegorical and tropological, with frequent ecclesiological applications. We also possess entire homilies on Ecclesiastes by Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 44 and P. Alexander, Leiden 1962), which was likewise marked by a mystical and moralizing exegesis. *Gregory of Nyssa's objective, whose interpretation had a vast resonance in later ages and was widely used in the catenae, is to demonstrate that *Solomon, far from exhorting the reader to pleasure, taught instead the disregard for sensible goods, the vanity of which he points out to the reader. The "Epicurean" passages are treated by having recourse to the theory of the *prosopopoeia,* in which there existed a hypothetical hedonist interlocutor of Solomon; or rather it is supposed that Solomon posed objections to himself and then answered them. The same apologetic intent of defending the book of Ecclesiastes from the accusation of Epicureanism stands at the basis of *Jerome's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 72), another work that had a wide influence in subsequent centuries until the end of the Middle Ages: a sober commentary, which tempers with rare equilibrium the mystical-allegorical interpretation with the philological erudition typical of Jerome's best commentaries.

The commentary attributed to Salonius (ed. C. Curti, Catania 1964) in reality depends on Alcuin and was composed under the form of a dialogue between an interlocutor who poses difficulties and the writer who resolves them, according to the method of the literature of **quaestiones et responsiones*. The *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* (PG 93, 477-628) by *Olympiodorus of Alexandria clearly has the character of a compilation, almost a catena under the guise of a commentary; this work primarily depends on Origen of Alexandria, Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus of Alexandria, *Nilus and Evagrius, and mostly develops according to mystical-allegorical exegesis. From the exegesis of Nilus and Evagrius, of whom mention has been made, we only possess fragments in the catenae and other collections of an analogous genre: their inter-

pretation was also allegorical and moral. The only commentary that has come down to us from the Antiochene school is that of ps.-Chrysostom (ed. S. Leanza, CCG 4), with a polemically nonallegorical interpretation. But also from the commentaries by the Antiochenes, with the loss of the original Greek, we possess the commentary of *Theodore of Mopsuestia in a corrupted form according to the *Syriac translation (ed. Strothmann). One must also mention Theodore's erroneous teaching on the lower level of inspiration of the books by Solomon (CCG 4,61). The following texts close the patristic period: among the Greeks, the *Explanatio super Ecclesiasten* by *Gregory of Agrigentum (PG 98,741-1181, critical edition by G.H. Ettlinger and J. Noret in CCG in 2007), along with that of Jerome which is the best patristic commentary.

The commentary on Ecclesiastes—the only work that has come down to us by Gregory of Agrigentum—reveals the author's vast cultural formation, showing that he had become well versed in both classical (*Aristotle, *Philo, Mimnermus and the Greek orators) and Christian authors (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom and the preceding commentators on Ecclesiastes), and manifests a noticeable interest in philosophical and theological problems, with particular attention to the problem of free will. From one point of view, or more specifically, the exegetical point of view, the brief prologue placed before the work was important, in which Gregory, beginning from Pr 30:33 ("press milk and you get butter") with a transparent metaphor, identifies the historical-literal sense with the milk and the spiritual sense within the butter (PG 98,741-742), according to a clear *bipartite* exegetical schema that seems to privilege the spiritual sense. In the commentary, however, the literal interpretation is then dominant, more often by itself, at times followed by the spiritual without the literal. It has no foundation, and the *tripartite* exegetical schema (literal + allegorical + anagogical interpretation) has no connection to Gregory's work, a theory suggested by Cataudella as the dominant characteristic of Gregory's commentary ("this schema—clearly distinct in its three parts—is found substantially the same in the entire commentary, which therefore gives the impression of a clear architectonic construction, which is both ordered and precise": Q. Cataudella, *Storia della Sicilia*, IV, Naples 1980, 17). In reality, Gregory did not employ any fixed exegetical scheme in a consistent and systematic manner, not even that of the bipartite division, which was theoretically articulated in the *Prologue,* but rather allows himself to guide the tenor of the biblical text, which in many cases better lends itself to the deepening of the historical-literal sense (even the extensive and intricate philosophical and theological discussions fall within this type of interpretation). At times he developed spiritual interpretations (both allegorical and tropological), without denying the literal sense. Finally, at times the text required—or at least so it seemed to Gregory—the rejection of the literal sense and the adoption of a spiritual interpretation alone, according to the well-known Alexandrianizing principle that one does not uphold the literal sense where it yields unsatisfactory results and is therefore unworthy of the majesty of the divine Word (see, e.g., *Comm. in Eccl.* 10,11: "One must understand this expression anagogically and only in this manner"; other examples can be found in S. Leanza, *Sul Commentario all'Ecclesiaste* . . .). With respect to the complex interpretation of Ecclesiastes, Gregory, at the beginning of his commentary, received from the preceding exegetical tradition and appropriated the traditional christological interpretation, which sees in *Solomon the type of Christ, who mystically spoke to the church (PG 98,745ff., which was derived from *Gregory of Nyssa's idea on the allegorical meaning of the noun Ἐκκλησιατικῆς). This typology, however, is not then exploited in the subsequent portions of the commentary, which privileges, as we said, the literal interpretation. From the preceding exegetical tradition, Gregory also derived the apologetic and moralizing character of the commentary that sought to demonstrate, in debate with those who found in the book of Ecclesiastes hedonist and Epicurean teachings, that this book in fact teaches disregard for earthly goods, inasmuch as it invites one to search for spiritual and eternal goods (PG 98,752ff., 805-809, 829, 897). Moreover, in contradistinction to preceding interpreters, Gregory did not seem excessively disturbed or preoccupied by the "Epicurean" content of the book of Ecclesiastes (for this point, see S. Leanza, *L'atteggiamento della più antica esegesi cristiana* . . .). In any case, to the traditional solution of the *prosopopoeia,* which avoided the difficulty of the most embarrassing passages by attributing the hedonistic affirmations of the book of Ecclesiastes to imaginary interlocutors of Solomon, Gregory added or substituted a more attentive and appropriate consideration of the literal sense, which allowed him to attenuate the importance of the so-called Epicurean passages and to interpret them as an acceptable invitation to a moderate use of earthly goods according to the divine plan and the necessity of nature (PG 98,833, 873, 1072-1076). Gregory of Agrigentum's strong personality, which is already evident in the

position he assumed before the Epicurean question, is manifested even more in the notable spirit of independence that he showed toward the preceding interpreters—who are continually but always anonymously called into question—and most esp. in the freedom with which he polemically challenged and refuted the exegesis of famous Fathers like *Origen of Alexandria, *Dionysius of Alexandria, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Nilus (for documentation, see S. Leanza, *Sul Commentario all'Ecclesiaste . . .*), an approach all the more noteworthy in a period in which exegesis was widely downgraded in the catena genre and only with great difficulty did commentators try to question the authority of the "venerable Fathers."

Among the Latin authors, *Gregory the Great, in *Quaestio sup. Eccl 3,18ff.* (= *Dial.* IV,3-4: PL 77,321ff.), faced the thorny passages in Ecclesiastes that assert the identity of nature and the end of the human *soul and that of beasts by resolving it with the expedient theory of the *prosopopoeia*. For other commentators of less importance or of whom we have little knowledge, see Leanza, *L'Ecclesiaste nell'interpretazione dell'antico cristianesimo* (see bibl.). Among the catenae, those of *Procopius have already been edited (CCG 4 Suppl., ed. S. Leanza) and that of the three Fathers (*Gregory of Nyssa, *Gregory Thaumaturgus and *Maximus the Confessor: ed. S. Lucà, CCG 11); the *Catena Hauniense* was recently edited by A. Labate (Turnhout 1992). Other catenae remain unpublished: *Catena Barberiniana* (Cod. Vat. Barb. gr. 388), *Catena of Polychronius;* see A. Labate, *Nuove catene esegetiche sull'Ecclesiaste*, in *ANTIDORON Hommage à M. Geerard*, Wetteren 1984, I,241-263).

Comprehensive Treatments: S. Leanza, *L'Ecclesiaste nell'interpretazione dell'antico cristianesimo*, Messina 1978; Id., *L'atteggiamento della più antica esegesi cristiana dinanzi all'epicureismo ed edonismo di Qohelet*: Orpheus n.s. 3 (1982) 73-90.

Individual studies: on Origen: S. Leanza, *L'esegesi di Origene al libro dell'Ecclesiaste*, Reggio Calabria 1975; on Dionysius of Alexandria: S. Leanza, *Il Commentario sull'Eccl. di Dionigi Aless.*, Scritti in onore di S. Pugliatti, V, Milan 1978, 399-429; on Didymus of Alexandria: S. Leanza, *Sul Commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Didimo Aless.*: SP 18 (1982) 300-316; M. Simonetti: VetChr 20 (1983) 375-385; On Nilus: S. Lucà: Sileno 1 (1977) 13-39; Biblica 60 (1979) 237-246; Augustinianum 19 (1979) 287-296; on Evagrius of Pontus: Evagrius Ponticus, *Scholies à l'Ecclésiaste*, ed., intr., tr., notes and index by P. Géhin, SC 397, Paris 1993; A. Labate, *L'esegesi di Evagrio al libro dell'Ecclesiaste*, Studi in onore di A. Ardizzoni, Rome 1978, 485-490; P. Géhin, *Un nouvel inédit d'Evagre le Pontique: son commentaire sur l'Ecclésiaste*: Byzantion 49 (1979) 188-198; on ps.-Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia: S. Leanza, in CCG 4, 53-62; On Gregory of Agrigentum: S. Gennaro, *Influssi di scrittori greci nel Comm. all'Eccl. di Gregorio di Agrigento*, Misc. di Studi di Lett. crist. ant., III, Catania 1951, 162-184; on the catenae: CPG IV, 227-228; A. Labate, *Nuove catene esegetiche sull'Ecclesiaste*, in Antidoron, Homm. à M. Geerard, I, Turnhout 1984, 137-159; for the eschatological interpretation of Ecclesiastes 12: Augustinianum 18 (1978) 191-207; G.H. Ettlinger, *The Form and Method of the Commentary on Ecclesiastes by Gregory of Agrigentum*: SP 8 (1985) 317-320; S. Leanza, *Due nuovi frammenti dionisiani sull'Ecclesiaste:* Orpheus 6 (1985) 156-161; S. Leanza, *Sul Commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Gregorio di Agrigento*, in *Il cristianesimo in Sicilia dalle origini a Gregorio Magno*, ed. V. Messana - S. Pricoco, Caltanissetta 1988, 191-220; A. Labate, *Sulla catena all'Ecclesiaste di Policronio*: SP 18/2 (1989) 21-35; D. De Gregorio, *Gli insegnamenti teologici di S. Gregorio di Agrigento nel suo "Commento all'Ecclesiaste,"* Rome 1989; S. Leanza, *L'esegesi patristica di Qohelet: da Melitone di Sardi alle compilazioni catenarie*, in *Letture cristiane dei Libri sapienziali. XX incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana*, Rome 1992, 237-250; A. Labate, *Il recupero del Commentario all'Ecclesiaste di Dionigi Alessandrino attraverso le catene bizantine*: Koinonia 16 (1992) 53-74.

3. *Song of Songs*. In the history of ancient Christian exegesis, more than any other biblical book, the Song of Songs boasts of a constant and uninterrupted interpretive tradition in the allegorical sense, which had its best expression in the commentaries of *Origen, *Gregory of Nyssa and *Gregory the Great. The sole exception to this exegetical orientation was the *naturalistic* interpretation offered by *Theodore of Mopsuestia, which was condemned at the Second Council of *Constantinople (553). Moreover, even before the book was interpreted by Christians, the Song of Songs was interpreted allegorically by the *Jews, who saw in it a nuptial allegory of the love between God (the husband) and Zion or Israel (the wife). The most ancient Christian commentary on the Song of Songs was that of *Hippolytus (which is extant in a continuous text up to 3:7 in the *Georgian translation; and in various fragments in *Greek, *Syriac, *Armenian and *Paleoslavonic; and the *Latin translation of G. Garitte [CSCO 263-264]). Hippolytus transferred the allegorical Jewish interpretation into a Christian sense by identifying Christ as the husband and the church as the wife (only rarely and sporadically does one find mention of a psychological interpretation, which would, however, be typical of Origen, who identified the human soul in the wife).

The most important commentator on the Song of Songs of all Christian antiquity, however, was Origen, whose exegesis established an obligatory point of reference for all subsequent interpreters. Origen commented on the Song of Songs in a series of homilies and in a long commentary written in ten books. The original Greek is almost entirely lost apart from a passage on Song 1:5, and the **Philocalia* and various scholia in the *Catena of Procopius*; the first two homilies remain in the *Latin translation of *Jerome, which contains the interpretation of Song 1:1–2:14

(ed. W.A. Baehrens, GCS 33,27-60), and in *Rufinus's translation, which contains the initial part of the commentary until Song 2:15 (ed. Baehrens, ibid.). Jerome considered these writings the magnum opus of this Alexandrian father (*Hom. in Cant.*, *Prol.: Origenes cum in caeteris libris omnes vicerit, in Cantico Canticorum ipse se vicit* ["Although in other books Origen outdid all other interpreters, in the Song of Songs he outdid himself"]). Origen derived the allegorical interpretation of the ecclesiological type from Hippolytus, which he primarily set forth in the homilies; but his great innovation was his *psychological* interpretation (the wife = the soul), which in Hippolytus's work was almost entirely absent and which would subsequently have, after Origen's example, an enormous influence. In the commentary he gave a threefold interpretation for every verse: literal, allegorical (= *ecclesiological) and tropological (= psychological). The chief theme of the allegorical-ecclesiological interpretation was the opposition between the OT and NT *oikonomia*: the friends of the spouse are the prophets; the daughters of Jerusalem (whom the wife addresses) are the Jewish people who have not accepted the message of Christ. For Origen the church did not begin in the NT times but existed since the creation of the world and has lived in expectation of the coming of Christ, the husband; the coming of Christ and his mystical union with the church mark the passage from the imperfection of the law to the perfection of grace. In the tropological-psychological interpretation, the wife is the perfect soul that mystically adheres to the divinity of Christ, and the little girls are the imperfect souls who adhere only to Christ incarnate. Origen's interpretation of the Song of Songs had an enormous influence not only—as was said—in the history of exegesis but also in Western *mysticism and *spirituality (St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Teresa of Avila, St. John of the Cross etc.). After Origen, one should recall the commentary on the Song of Songs by *Methodius of Olympus (which has been lost but is attested by Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 83; see, moreover, from the same Methodius, hints of exegesis on the Song of Songs in the *Symposium*), that of *Athanasius (which seems to include in a single work the interpretation of the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes: see *L'Eccl. nell'interpret. dell'ant. crist.*, op. cit., 23), from which a few fragments have survived to our day, and that of *Apollinaris of Laodicea (15 fragments in the *Catena of Procopius*: PG 87,1545ff.).

The 15 homilies on the Song of Songs by *Gregory of Nyssa deserve greater attention (the commentary goes until Song 6:8: ed. H. Langerbeck, Leiden 1960; A. Cortesi, *Le* Omelie sul Cantico dei Cantici *di Gregorio di Nissa*, Rome 2000), which alongside Origen's *Homilies* and commentary and Gregory the Great's *Expositio in Cant. Canticorum*, without a doubt make up—and not only from the patristic period—the most beautiful commentary on the Song of Songs. Gregory of Nyssa had Origen's model in mind, concerning whom he voiced much praise in the dedicatory prologue to the virgin Olympia but from whom he intentionally distanced himself. Among other things, in distinction from Origen, Gregory of Nyssa's exegesis had a noteworthy philosophical substrate (frequent allusions to Plato's *Dialogues,* a debate with Aristotle on the doctrine of the indefinite progress of the soul, dependence on *Plotinus, etc.: see Langerbeck, *ed. cit., praef.*), and reveals, however, different theological ideas (Quasten II,269). Under the more strictly exegetical profile, one can distinguish in Gregory of Nyssa's *Homilies* two types of interpretation: in the first part, he exclusively follows the tropological-psychological interpretation (wife = soul); in the second (from *Homily* VIII onward) the allegorical-ecclesiological interpretation prevails. Together, however, by overcoming Origen's equilibrium between the two interpretations, Gregory gave more importance to the psychological interpretation and to the theme of the mystical union of the soul with the Logos. The Song of Songs corresponds, for Gregory, to the highest level of the spiritual life, to the moment in which the soul, delivered from every bond, reaches the final milestone of perfection, which consists in contemplation of and the mystical union with God.

Among the Latin authors, one should mention the two commentaries by *Victorinus of Petovium and *Reticius of Autun, nothing of which has survived, but who were well known to Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 74 and 82), although Jerome himself is doubtful concerning the existence of a commentary by *Hilary of Poitiers (*De vir. ill.* 100: *aiunt quidam scripsisse eum et in Canticum Canticorum, sed a nobis hoc opus ignoratur*). Five homilies on the Song of Songs by *Gregory of Elvira have survived, which echo the exegesis of Hippolytus and Origen (ed. J. Fraipont, CCL 69). Among the Latin exegetes of the Song of Songs, one should also mention *Ambrose, who did not compose a specific commentary on this biblical book but in fact commented on it almost entirely (with the exception of 10 verses!). In his various works, but specifically in the *De virginitate,* the *Expositio Psalmi CXVIII*) and in the *De Isaac at anima* (a continuous reading of Ambrosian exegesis on the Song of Songs can be easily made from the medieval compilation of the *excerpta* of Ambrose's works made by William of Saint-Thierry: PL 15,1851-1962): his interpretation is

mystical and allegorical and is dependent on Origen and Hippolytus. *Jerome had proposed to comment on the Song of Songs in a specific work (*Prol. in Matth*: CCL 77, p. 6) that he never composed; even he, however, frequently interpreted the Song of Songs in dependence on Origen in various places of his other exegetical works and his letters.

Among the Greek fathers of the 5th and 6th c. who commented on the Song of Songs, we should mention *Philo of Carpasia, whose interpretation has come down in the ancient Latin translation of Epiphanius, which was made at the request of *Cassiodorus, while the Greek text is known to us in a redaction (the critical edition of the translation of Epiphanius by A. Ceresa Gastaldo: CP 6); *Nilus of Ancyra (a commentary that has been preserved for us primarily in the catena tradition but now also known, albeit partially, in direct transmission: PG 87,1545-1754 and S. Lucà cited in the bibl. below); *Cyril of Alexandria PG 69,1277-1293, and 87,1545-1753 [= *Catena of Procopius*]); *Theodoret of Cyrrhus (PG 81,27-214), a proponent of the Antiochene school, who nevertheless rejected the naturalistic interpretation offered by Theodore of Mopsuestia (who saw in the Song of Songs a profane love poem written by Solomon for his Egyptian wife) and accepted the allegorical-ecclesiological interpretation. It is not certain if *Theodore of Mopsuestia composed a commentary on the Song of Songs*:* nothing has come down under his name, not even in the catenae; the Second Council of Constantinople (553) condemned his interpretation of the Song of Songs on the basis of an epistle-treatise that he sent to a friend who had requested that he explain this biblical book. Likewise among the Latin writers, in the 5th and 6th c., we should mention *Aponius's commentary (PLS 1,799-1031; *In Canticum Canticorum expositio,* ed. B. de Vregille - L. Neyrand, Turnhout 1986) and that of *Justus of Urgel (*Explanatio mystica in Cant. Canticorum*: PL 67,693-994), who followed the ecclesiological interpretation but was already a forerunner of the medieval mystical interpretation. The most important commentary among those of the Latin language, however, was *Gregory the Great's exposition of the Song of Songs (*Expositio in Cant. Canticorum*)*,* which literally closed the patristic period and inaugurated the mystical monastic *exegesis of the Middle Ages (ed. P. Verbraken, CCL 144). Gregory inherited from the preceding patristic exegesis, and esp. from Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, the foundational themes of the double allegorical-ecclesiological and tropological-psychological interpretation, but privileged the latter. Even for Gregory the Great, the husband and wife of the Song of Songs represent Christ and the church, or rather the Word and the soul: the first interpretation, namely, the allegorical one, serves the doctrinal understanding of the church, although the tropological interpretation contributes to the ascetic elevation of the individual soul. Gregory's work was intended for *praedicatores* and for those who have reached the heights of the mystical experience such as *virgins: in the same way that even the Song of Songs is directed toward the perfect, to those who have already had the experience of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (Gregory takes up, though modifying it a bit, Origen and Jerome's old theme, which saw in the three Solomonic books the three levels of spiritual understanding: *incipientes*, *progredientes* and the *perfecti*).

Among the Greek *catenae, one should recall that of *Procopius (PG 87), that of the three Fathers (*Gregory of Nyssa, *Nilus and *Maximus the Confessor)—perhaps the work of the same author who compiled the catenae of three Fathers on Ecclesiastes—as well as the catena of *Polycronius and ps.-Eusebius etc. There also exists an Ethiopian catena on the Song of Songs.

Comprehensive Treatments: DSp 2, 93-101; E. Cunitz, *Histoire critique de l'interprétation du Cantique des Cantiques*, Strasbourg 1834; F. Ohly, *Hohelied-Studien. Grundzüge einer Geschichte der Hoheliedauslegung des Abendlandes bis um 1200*, Wiesbaden 1958; P. Meloni, *Il profumo dell'immortalità. L'interpretazione patristica di Cant. 1,3*, Rome 1975. For the individual bibliography on the various Fathers, see the works of Ohly and Meloni. We mention here only the bibliography for Origen: O. Rousseau, *Origène. Homélies sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, Paris 1966 (SC 37bis); J. Chênevert, *L'Église dans le Commentaire d'Origène sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, Brussels-Paris-Montréal 1969; M. Simonetti, *Origene. Commento al Cantico dei Cantici*, Rome 1976; *La colombe et la ténèbre. Textes extraits des "Homélies sur le Cantique des Cantiques" de Grégoire de Nysse*, tr. by M. Canevet, intr. and notes by J. Daniélou, Paris 1967; for Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Theodore of Mopsuestia: L. Pirot (cited in the bibliography for Job), 134-137, and J.-N. Guinot, *La christologie de Théodoret de Cyr dans son Commentaire sur le Cantique*: VChr 39 (1985) 256-272; for Theodoret and Origen: M. Simonetti, in *Letterature comparate*, Studi Paratore, Bologna 1981, 919-930; for Gregory the Great: V. Recchia, *L'esegesi di Gregorio Magno al Cantico dei Cantici*, Turin 1967; for Nilus: S. Lucà, *Il commentario al Cantico dei Cantici di Nilo di Ancira*, in *Studi bizantini e neogreci.* Atti del IV Congr. naz. di studi bizantini, ed. P.L. Leone, Galatina 1983, 111-126; Id., *La fine inedita del commento di Nilo d'Ancira al Cantico dei Cantici*: Augustinianum 22 (1982) 365-403 (contains the *Status quaestionis*, preceding bibliography, edition of the text known in direct transmission on the Song 6:8–8:14). For the catenae: CPG IV, 222-224 and S. Lucà, in Augustinianum already mentioned. *Cantico dei Cantici di Nilo di Ancira*: Studi bizantini e neogreci 174 (1983) 111-126; H. Crouzel, *La christologie d'Origène selon le Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, in *Praesentia Christi. Festschrift Johannes Betz*, Düsseldorf 1984, 421-433; A. Ceresa Gastaldo, *Nuove ricerche sulla storia del testo, le antiche versioni e l'interpretazione del Cantico dei Cantici*: AnSE 6 (1989) 31-38; G. Ravasi, *Il Cantico dei Cantici*, Bologna 1992; Gregory of

Nyssa, *Omelie sul Cantico dei Cantici*, ed. V. Bonato, Bologna 1995; E. Cattaneo, *Il "Cantico dei Cantici" nelle catechesi mistagogiche di sant' Ambrogio di Milan*: La Civiltà Cattolica (1998) III, 29-41; P. Meloni, *Risurrezione di Cristo e vita del cristiano nell'esegesi di Ambrogio al Cantico dei Cantici*, in *Nec timeo mori*. Atti del Congr. int. di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della morte di s. Ambrogio, Milan 1998, 639-648; A. Cortesi, *Le* Omelie sul Cantico dei Cantici *di Gregorio di Nissa*, Rome 2000 (with extensive bibl.); A. Genovese, *S. Agostino e il Cantico dei Cantici: tra esegesi e teologia*, Rome 2002; M.A. Barbàra, *Lezioni della tradizione catenaria alternative a lezioni della tradizione diretta delle* homiliae in Canticum canticorum *di Gregorio di Nissa*, in Ad contemplandam sapientiam, Studi in memoria di S. Lenza, Soveria Mannelli 2004, 31-46; M. Auwers, *La transmission des commentaires sur le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'Épitomé de Procope de Gaza*, in *Comunicazione e ricezione del documento cristiano in epoca tardoantica*. XXXII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Rome, 8-10 maggio 2003 (SEA 90), Rome 2004, 763-776.

III. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus (Sirach). *1. Wisdom*. We do not possess any patristic commentaries on this biblical book, which was also frequently cited by the Fathers (see *Biblia Patristica*). According to *Cassiodorus (*Inst. div. litt.* 5), *Ambrose and *Augustine delivered some homilies on Wisdom, but these have not survived, and Bellator (6th c.) composed an extensive commentary in eight books (*Expositio Sapientiae*), which has likewise not survived. Paterius (or ps.-Paterius) collected and ordered for Wisdom and Sirach the various comments on these books offered by the teacher *Gregory the Great (*Testimonia in libr. Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici*: PL 79,917-940). The first commentaries that we possess date to the early Middle Ages: Rabanus Maurus, 9th c. (PL 109,671-762), and then, in the late Middle Ages, the *Glossa ordinaria* (PL 113,1167ff.), Hugh of Saint-Cher (Opera III, Lyons 1669), etc.

L. Bigot: DTC 15, 742-743; J. Leemans, *Athanasius and the Book of Wisdom*: EThL 73 (1997) 349-369.

2. Ecclesiasticus (*Sirach*). Even more than Wisdom, Sirach was overlooked during the patristic period certainly because of its contested canonicity. One barely reads for the first time a synthesis for this book in the *Synopsis Scripture Sacrae* by ps.-Chrysostom (PG 56,375-376). As in the case for Wisdom, Paterius (or ps.-Paterius) also collected excerpts from *Gregory the Great's exegesis on Sirach (see above; for Sir: PL 79,921-940). The work of Rabanus Maurus, who commented on Wisdom, was likewise significant (9th c.); he was also one of the few to comment on Sirach (PL 109,763-1126): his interpretation, which was *allegorical, was widely used by the medieval exegetes (*Glossa ordinaria* etc.). One should also recall, for the patristic period, the Nestorian Isho'dad of Merv (9th c.), whose edition has been announced in the CSCO. R. Maisano studied the exegesis on Sirach in the collection of *Isidore of Pelusium's letters; it should be noted that he did not compose a commentary on this biblical book.

H. Duesberg: DSp 4, 61; H. Duesberg - I. Fransen, *Ecclesiastico*, Turin 1966, 19; J.M. Vosté: RBi 38 (1929) 382-395, 542-554 (Isho'dad of Merv); R. Maisano: Koinonia 4 (1980) 68-72 (Isidore of Pelusium); A. Cacciari, *Origene e il libro del Siracide*, in *Origeniana octava: Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition, Origene e la tradizione alessandrina.* Papers of the 8th International Origen Congress, Pisa, 27-31 August 2001, ed. L. Perrone et al., I (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 144), Leuven 2003, 579-592; J. Leemans, *Canon and Quotations: Athanasius' Use of Jesus Sirach*, in *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers - H.J. De Jonge (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 163), Leuven 2003, 265-277.

S. Leanza

WOMAN. Without question, Eve (*see* *Adam and Eve) and *Mary were the two biblical figures who had the greatest influence on the conception of woman formulated by the Fathers of the first centuries. For an adequate historical evaluation of this conception, however, one must take into account the weight exercised on it by the historical and cultural context in which it was formed. It is a fact that the position of women in the ancient world, whether Jewish, Hellenistic or Roman (even with significant differences), was one of inferiority with respect to men. This inferiority could be expressed either by a reduction of the spheres in which a woman was allowed to intervene without losing dignity and prestige, or in the effective consideration of their submission and existential inequality with respect to men. The tension between faithfulness to the proclamation of the novelty brought by the gospel (see R. Fabris, *La donna nel Nuovo Testamento,* in *Atti Convegno Nazionale di Studi* su *La donna nel mondo antico,* Turin 1987, 209-222), which also affected the way of thinking about women, and the influence deriving from the atmosphere from which the NT texts themselves had arisen and in which the Fathers lived, is easily recognizable in every patristic text that treats of women (it is particularly remarkable that for *Ambrosiaster, at the level of salvation, the *imago Dei* is of the woman, see K.E. Børresen, *Imago Dei, un privilège masculin? Interprétation augustinienne de Gen.* 1,27 *et 1 Cor.* 11,7: Augustinianum 25 [1985] 213-234). But it is precisely the two figures of Eve and of Mary who made it possible, in most cases, to maintain that tension in a strictly religious setting, since they constituted the two poles within which the discourse on woman took place: Eve, the representative of woman

in her existential situation of inferiority, and Mary, the goal toward which precisely this woman who was considered inferior (when not given a decisively negative connotation) inclines and with whom she is called to identify. Besides Eve and Mary, other feminine personalities in Scripture (at times even anonymous) offered material to the Fathers for drawing a portrait of a woman which was new with respect to pagan culture in faithfulness to the data of revelation. The insistent return to moral exhortation (1 Tim 2:9-10; 1 Pet 3:3-6)—which appears in Scripture and seems to limit the woman to an exclusively interior world, considering any exterior interest or care unbecoming—was itself an explicitly new proposal, aimed at differentiating the Christian woman from the pagan (Clem., *Strom.* 2,146; *Paed.* 3,56,1-2; 62-68; Jerome, *Ep.* 148,25-27; John Chrys., *Catech.* I 34.37.38; Chrom., *Serm.* 35).

The new position of woman derived from certain "firsts" attributed to her by Scripture: above all the being the first to receive news of Christ's resurrection (Orig., *Comm. in Jo.* 13,29,179; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* XIV,12; Jerome, *In Mt.* 28,9; Ambr., *In Lc.* 2,28; Aug., *In Jo.* 1; *In I Jo.* 3,2). But she is also the first to reveal the right way to approach Christ to obtain mercy (based on Mt 9:20ff.; Peter Chrysol., *Serm.* 34,3). Spiritually, woman is man's equal: both have the same Lord, the same Teacher, the same church (Clem., *Paed.* 1,10-11; Tertull., *Ad ux.* II,9). This equality was not always recognized, however: Chrysostom, who admitted it (*Hom. 10,3 in 2 Tim.*), seems in another text to deny it (*Hom.* 5,5 *in* 2 *Thess.*; see also Aug., *Gen. ad. litt.* 11,58): created as man's helper (Gen 2:28), she lost that dignity because of her sin (John Chrys., *De virg.* 46,1). The original guilt is always attributed to the woman, who is thus considered the cause of sin (Iren., *Adv. haer.* 3,22,4; Tertull., *De c. fem.* 1,1; Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 13,21; Ambr., *Hex.* 5,18; *De parad.* 14,70; Ruf., *Symb.* 21; John Chrys., *De virg.* 46,1; Aug., *In Ps.* 48,1,6): every woman bears Eve in herself, and must consequently do penance (Tertull., *De c. fem.* 1,1). It is said that woman's debt toward man, contracted by the female sex at the moment of its creation, was paid by Mary, who gave birth to Christ virginally (Cyr. of Jer., *Catech.* 12,29). Through the relationship with Christ, the situation of woman is transformed (Hilary of Poitiers, *In Mt.* 33,9; Greg. Gt., *Mor. Job* XIV, 49,57). In *allegorical interpretation, woman is evaluated in two ways in the Fathers: positively, whenever she is interpreted as the image of the church (Jerome, *In Mt.* 15,22; 26, 12-14; *In Mk.* 5,34; John Chrys., *In Mt. hom.* 51; even the feminine metaphors used in the Bible to indicate God or Christ, in patristic interpretation are applied to the church, see K.E. Børresen, *Le Madri della chiesa,* Naples 1993, 109-125); negatively, or at least subordinately to man, when she is seen as the soul, while man is the spirit (Orig., *Hom 1,15 in Gen.*); as the flesh that must follow the spirit (Orig., *Hom. 4,4 in Gen.*); as the senses while man is the mind (Ambr., *De parad.* 15,73); as a synonym of weakness (Greg. Gt., *Mor. Job* XI,49,65). In the church the prophetic function is attributed to woman (*1 Cor* 11,4-5; see S. Hauser-Borel, *Profetesse, martiri, testimoni di Cristo nella storia,* in *Profezia. Modelli e forme nell'esperienza cristiana laicale,* C. Militello [ed.], Padua 2000, 125-154), and the presence of deaconesses is widely attested (1 Tim 3:11; Rom 16:1; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 10,96,8; Clem., *Strom.* 3,6,53; Orig., *Comm. Rom.* 10,17; *Didasc. Apost.* II,26,4-6; III,12,1; 13,1). It is not clear, however, whether a woman deacon received an ordination apt to confer on her an official ministry: the Council of *Nicaea (can. 19) affirms that deaconesses belong to the lay state since they have not received the laying on of hands. The **Apostolic Constitutions* (4th-c. Syriac work), however, report the whole rite for the ordination of deaconesses, which took place through the *laying on of hands by the bishop (*Apos. Con.* VIII,20,1-2). The Fathers abundantly characterize women as *martyrs (see E. Mazzucco Zanone, *Figure di donne cristiane: la martire,* in Atti II Convegno nazionale di Studi su: *La donna nel mondo antico,* R. Uglione [ed.], Turin 1989, 167-196) and in the various states of virgin, spouse (see *Donna e matrimonio alle origini della chiesa,* E. dal Covolo [ed.], Rome 1996), mother and widow (see A.V. Nazzaro, *Figure di donne cristiane: la vedova,* in Atti II Convegno Nazionale di Studi su *La donna nel mondo antico,* cit., 167-196). In this they draw on models already known in pagan culture and on those in Scripture or those which from the first centuries were presented as new examples of woman—e.g., Monica, Nonna, Macrina, Melania, to whom reference could be made in actual contemporary situations.

DACL 5,1300-1353; DSp 5,131-151; J. Daniélou, *Le ministère des femmes dans l'Église ancienne*: LaMaisonD. 60 (1960) 70-96; R. Gryson, *Il ministero della donna nella chiesa antica*, Rome 1974; E. Giannarelli, *La tipologia femminile nella biografia e nell'autobiografia cristiana del IV secolo*: Studi Storici 127, Rome 1980; M.G. Mara, *Le funzioni della donna nella Chiesa antica*: Rivista di pastorale liturgica 19/2 (1981) 5-16; A. Fabris - W. Gozzini, *La donna nell'esperienza della prima chiesa*, Rome 1982; P.A. Gramaglia, in *Tertulliano, De virginibus velandis. La condizione femminile nelle prime comunità cristiane*, Rome 1984, 92-144; A. Pastorino, *La condizione femminile nei Padri della chiesa*, in *Sponsa, mater, virgo. La donna nel mondo biblico e patristico*, in *Atti Convegno nazionale di Studi* su *La donna nel mondo antico*, R. Uglione (ed.), Turin 1987, 223-242; C. Moreschini, *La donna nell'antica poesia cristiana*, 243-264; L. Storoni

Mazzolani, *Una donna tra mondo antico e Medio Evo: Galla Placidia*, in *La donna nel mondo antico*, R. Uglione (ed.), Turin 1987, 195-205; A. Rousselle, *Donne cristiane e fondazioni testamentarie* (*III-IV secolo*), in *Il Tardoantico alle soglie del Duemila, Diritto religione società*, G. Lanata (ed.), Pisa 2000, 141-165; F. Vera, *Los "ejemplos" femininos en San Ambrosio*: Excerpta and dissertat. in sacra Teologia (Pamplona) 44 (2003) 151ff.

M.G. MARA

WOMEN, PIOUS (iconography). The episode narrated in Mt 28:10, Mk 15:46–16:8, Lk 23:55-24:8 and Jn 20:1-18, about the finding of the empty tomb by the pious women (according to the texts, from one to three in number), has not yet been found represented in Roman cemeterial painting, but it has been found in a painting of the baptistery at *Dura Europos (before 256); in it, the pious women move from right to left toward the closed tomb, carrying ointments and torches; above the sepulcher, two stars are interpreted as the symbol of two angels. The presence of this scene for the first time in a baptistery is apparently due to its clear eschatological symbolism. In the plastic arts, the scene appears at Rome (Ws 325) and Milan (Ws 243,6), with the angel and the two Marys at the tomb, elements which are repeated in a fragment at Aix (Le Blant, *Sarc.,* n. 208); on the sarcophagus of Servanne (Ws 15,2), a third pious women is added. Only two women are depicted on two wooden panels of the church of S. Sabina at Rome (ca. 430): in the first the angel is manifested to them; in the second the risen Jesus is beside them. In the so-called minor arts, the scene is attested in the ivory diptych of Monaco (4th–5th c.) (three women, two soldiers, a wingless angel), in that of Milan (5th c.) and in another at London (two women and two soldiers). In the marble *capsella* at S. Giovanni Battista at *Ravenna (5th c.) two women are before the crucified Christ, who is about to ascend to heaven, drawn by the divine hand; this instance thus contains a fusion of two different moments in the gospel narrative. In the ampullae of Monza and of Bobbio (6th c.), two or three pious women appear with an angel with nimbus and wings. The best-known example of mural decoration is that of S. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna (early 6th c.), with two women and the angel, while in manuscripts the episode occurs in the Evangelary of Rabbula (586), at f. 13a, with three guards on the ground, the angel and two women; beside it, the same women are at Jesus's feet as he ascends to heaven.

DACL XV, 1, cols. 570-573; EC VII, col. 141; LCI II, cols. 55-57; R. Bartoccini, *La capsella marmorea di Ravenna*: RivAC 7 (1930) 299-302; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1952, n. 116, plate 35 (London diptych); F.W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Bauten und Mosaiken von Ravenna*, Baden Baden 1958, plate 206; Id., *Ravenna. Geschichte und Monumente*, Wiesbaden 1969, 187-188; A. Grabar, *La fresque des Saintes Femmes au tombeau à Doura*: CArch 8 (1956) 9-26; A. Grabar, *Ampoules de Terre Sainte*, Paris 1958, plates 11,2; 19;28; 34/39; Cecchelli, *Rabb. Gosp.*, 70-71, f. 13a; Volbach-Hirmer, *Arte*, 75, fig. 92 (diptych of Milan) 76, fig. 93 (diptych of Monaco); E. Dyggve, *Sepulcrum Domini*: Festschrift F. Gerke, Baden Baden 1962, 11-20; C.H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura Europos. II. The Christian Building*, New Haven 1967, 213 ff., plates 20; 26/28; J. Engemann, *Palästinensische Pilgerampollen im F.J. Dölger Institut in Bonn*: JbAC 6 (1973) 5-27; E. Dassmann, *Sündenvergebung durch Taufe, Busse und Martyrerfürbitte in den Zeugnissen frühchristlicher Frömmigkeit und Kunst*, Münster 1973, 43-44 and 377; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz 1976, nn. 111, 112, 176; A. Saint Claire, *Scheda n. 520*, in K. Weitzmann (ed.), *Age of Spirituality: Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century*, New York 1979; G. Jeremias, *Die Holztür der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom*, Tübingen 1980, plates 2, 10; A. Recio Vegazones, *Maria Magdalena, protagonista de la escena "Mulieres ad Sepulcrum Domini," en la iconografía sepulcral de Occidente* (*siglos IV-V*), in *"Memoriam Sanctorum Venerantes,"* Miscellanea in onore di Mons. Victor Saxer, Vatican City 1992, 667-688; M. Casadei, *Scheda n. 61*, in A. Donati (ed.), *Dalla terra alle genti. La diffusione del cristianesimo nei primi secoli*, Milan 1996; T.W. Potter, *Scheda n. 108*, in ibid.; J. Dresken-Weiland, *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarcophage. Band II*, Mainz am Rhein 1998, nn. 249; 250, 2; M. Perraymond, *Donne pie* (s.v.), in F. Bisconti (ed.) *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Vatican City 2000, 168-169.

M. PERRAYMOND

WORKS of AID and CHARITY

I. In the primitive church - II. In the Christian empire.

I. In the primitive church. From its beginnings the church recommended works of mercy and encouraged every kind of initiative in private charity; but it also organized assistance to needy brothers and sisters and mutual help among communities. The Christians thus continued a cherished tradition of the Jews of Palestine and of the Diaspora, making their own some traits of the Jewish tradition, its religious motives and the links with liturgical acts. The inspiration of Christian charity was new, however, since it was rooted in love for God and neighbor, and taught and lived out by Jesus; as such, it overcame all nationalistic, ethnic or political discrimination, reaching out to all those in need (Gal 6:10; Eus., *HE* 9, 8). Above all it changed the concept of the poor person, from someone rejected, into a person in need of help and esp. loved by God. The Christian *Minucius Felix writes "poverty is not a cause for shame, but for glory" (*Oct.* 36). Within Christianity, poverty is frequently associated with holiness: the saint is also poor. The poor person, i.e., the indigent, was rejected by Roman society or merely tolerated, as expressed in a Pompeian graffito: "I hate the poor.

If someone wants something for nothing, he is crazy. He must pay for it" (CIL 4,9839b); and Plautus writes: "One who gives a poor person something to eat does wrong: in fact what he gives him is lost, and prolongs his unhappy life" (*Trinummus* II, 2,58ff.). *Lactantius asks polemically: "Why don't [the pagans] think they have to help one who is hungry, or thirsty, or cold? . . . The only certain and genuine task of liberality consists in sustaining needy and useless persons" (*Div. Inst.* 6,11: PL 6, 72 and 76). These observations should not be overgeneralized, however, since there were always compassionate persons, esp. under the influence of Stoic morality.

The Christian tradition has preserved the memory of the church of Jerusalem, where the generosity of believers was effective in helping those in need (Acts 2:44; 4:34-37), always under the supervision of the community's leaders (Acts 4:35-36). The charitable works of the first Christian communities did not aim to respond to every need; there was always a place for private charity (Acts 9:27, 39), taken up in a particular way by Christian women, after the example of the "strong woman" of the OT (*Didasc.*, 3; Clem. Al., *Paed.* III, 49,5; 67,3; Tertull., *Ad ux.* II, 4). Like the Jewish institutions which they continued, Christian works developed along the lines of familial needs. In the first place they were directed to widows, to orphans, to the elderly without family who were unable to work and had no one to care for them, to those imprisoned for their faith, and for the ransom of prisoners. The community then intervened, according to its capacity, on behalf of the whole family, if families were unable to meet their natural obligations; they also helped, financially, young needy women to marry (Ambr., *De off.* 2,15,72: PL 16, 129), or in the education of orphans and the abandoned (*De off.* 2,15,71: PL 16, 129). There being no banking system, the church took it upon itself to look after the deposits of widows and orphans that were entrusted to it as protection against the abuses of the powerful. A particular category was lepers, who were separated both from family and from the cities: "cast out by all, they form a class unto themselves" (Greg. Nyss., *De pauperib. amandis*: PG 46, 477B). The forms of Christian solidarity were noted even by pagans; e.g., *Lucian of Samosata, the emperor *Julian and others such as *Nectarius, Augustine's correspondent, who wrote: you "take care of the afflicted, administering medicines to sick bodies; in short, you do everything so that the suffering do not feel their illness for too long" (Aug., *Ep.* 103,3: letter of Nectarius).

Another commitment of Christian solidarity regarded women forced into prostitution. *Ambrose counted prostitutes among the poor, i.e., among those most abandoned by society (*De off.* 2,15,70) and therefore most in need of Christian solidarity. Even the emperor in 428 allowed bishops to free prostitutes from *lenones* (CTh 15,8,2). Christians also gave particular attention to burial of the dead. Lactantius writes: *Ultimum illud et maximum pietatis officium est peregrinorum et pauperum sepultura* (*Div. Inst.* 6,12,25; cf. 6,12,39). Already at Jerusalem there was the communitarian commitment to the burial of foreigners. In the 2nd c. *Aristides writes that "when one of their poor leaves this world, and one of them sees it, they provide for his burial" (*Apol.* 15,7 in the Syriac text). *Tertullian tells us of the "common fund" which, besides for other works of aid, served also for *egenis humandis* (*Apol.* 39,6). The *Apostolic Tradition* (early 3rd c.), attributed to *Hippolytus, confirms this organization and its purpose; if it was written at Rome it shows us the Roman communitarian organization for burial. The emperor Julian too saw "care for the burial of the dead" as characteristic of Christians (*Ep.* 84,429D Caltabiano).

One of the most characteristic forms of ancient Christian charity was the **agapē*. It is difficult to discover the origin of this practice, of which 3rd-c. evidence allows us to grasp only the main outlines. In general, this was a meal offered to the poor of the community, either in the house of a well-off person who provided the food, or in a place belonging directly to the church. The bishop or his representative presided at the *agape*; he blessed the offerings and made sure that those who were absent also received their portion. There was also a form of *agape* open only to widows who, besides their due portion, were sometimes also given a separate distribution of foodstuffs (*Trad. Apost.* 26, 27; Tertull., *Apol.* 39, 16-19; *Didasc. syr.* 9). Despite the obvious inconvenience involved in such meetings (cf. *Trad. Apost.* 30), the *agape* helped strengthen bonds between the faithful of all levels of society (Clem. Al., *Paed.* II, 1,6-8), although their occasional character limited their importance.

To respond effectively to needy brethren, the churches had to organize other forms of assistance and establish suitable ministries. Deacons, widows, virgins and deaconesses looked after these works in the name of the communities; they exercised their ministry under the oversight of the leaders of the churches, presbyters or bishops, in some cases assisted by their counsel. The diaconal ministry, established from the last decades of the 1st c., became increasingly important (Colson; Hamman), and the institutions of deaconesses and of widows were quick to help out in numerous tasks, esp. in those

areas where the activity of women was preferable: the catechesis of women, care of the sick, comprehensive care of orphans, visits to Christians in prison, etc. To assist the poor, churches solicited gifts and offerings from the faithful. From the earliest times, free offerings, in money or in kind, composed a large part of the income; these were ordinarily collected during the liturgical assembly (Just., 1 *Apol.* 67). To offset the possibility of insufficient or uncertain revenues, many churches, following the practice of the synagogues, sought to impose a fixed, regular contribution. This practice is attested in central Syria in the early 2nd c. (*Didache* 13,3-7; *Didasc. syr.* 9; cf. *Apostolic Constitutions* II, 25-30; VIII, 30). African churches did likewise: in the early 3rd c., the community of Carthage had a common fund, replenished by monthly quotas in imitation of pagan religious and funerary *collegia* (Tertull., *Apol.* 39). A notable aspect of the charitable organization of Christian antiquity was that not all donations were accepted; those of the impious and of public sinners were ruthlessly rejected. The *Didascalia syriaca* forcefully proclaims: "Better to die of hunger than to accept the donations of the enemies of God" (18 Connolly = IV, 8,6 ed. Funk).

The mutual help of Christians was not limited to the immediate circle of the local community, but extended its concern to all the churches. Already St. Paul had taught his churches to help their needy brethren in every way they could (Rom 12:13; 15:26); he gave great importance to the collections for the "saints," since he saw in them the sign and guarantee of unity among the churches (1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:1-15). There is much evidence from the first centuries of solidarity among Christians when a particular church or region was beset by exceptional trials. The sense of organization, pragmatic realism and financial resources of the great churches (Rome, Carthage) made possible prompt and effective intervention even in the most distant countries. In around 170, *Dionysius of Corinth wrote to Pope *Soter (166–175): "From the beginning you have had the wonderful practice of doing good to all the brethren, of sending aid to many churches established in individual cities. In this way you comfort the needy, precisely through that aid, which, from the earliest times, you continue to send, administering necessities to the brethren who labor in the mines" (Eus., *HE* 4, 23,18); a century later, *Dionysius of Alexandria praises pope *Stephen (254–257) for sending "regular aid" to the churches of Syria and Arabia (Eus., *HE* 7,5,2); or, during the same period, to Cappadocia (Basil, *Ep.* 70). *Cyprian of Carthage attested no less active solicitude toward the needy of the African communities; he used large sums to ransom Christian prisoners. Finally, one of the most expressive forms of the universal dimension of Christian charity was Christian *hospitality, practiced toward all just as it was practiced within the local community—at first directly, involving all the members of the church, laity and clergy; later, from the end of the 3rd c., organized through hostelries financed by a common fund.

II. In the Christian empire. After the peace of Constantine, works of charity had to address new and increasingly burdensome responsibilities; the economic crisis and growing poverty directed ever increasing numbers towards the church's charitable services. Free offerings and the *agape* became minor things. But the church did not stop, and by this time could count on income from its assets; it multiplied construction of appropriate buildings for the various works it was engaged in (orphanages, hospices, *xenodochia*, homes for the elderly, etc.). Charitable help became better conceived and organized, e.g., with specific structures and lists of the needy: a *matricula pauperum* (Aug., *Ep.* 20,2 Divjak) and a *matricula viduarum* (Jer., *Ep.* 92,3: PL 22, 766). The poor were inscribed in a specific register to indicate those persons who regularly received help as opposed to occasional recipients or beggars.

Private initiative was encouraged more than ever, sometimes with surprising generosity (Fabiola, Pammachius: Jer., *Epp.* 66 and 77). But there was always more to do, and resources were never sufficient to satisfy all needs (Aug., *Serm.* 61,1; John Chrys., *In Mt. hom.* 66). Beginning in this era works were assumed by monastic institutions which, from that time, have never ceased to offer an example of authentic Christian charity. An important early instance of assistance was the structure created by *Basil at Caesarea, called **Basileiad*. According to the needs of society, Christian assistance was also shown in taking in, feeding and defending those who made use of the right of asylum in churches. This form developed slowly in the course of the 4th c., with notable hardship for Christian communities and bishops.

Various articles in RAC (*Almosen*, *Armenpflege*, *Humanitas*, *Hungersnot*, . . .), in DACL (*Agape*, *Infirmiers, hôpitaux*, *Hospices*, *Hôteliers*, . . .); DSp 10, 1328-1349; EAM 8, 906-922 (hospital); L. Lallemand, *Histoire de la charité*, Paris 1902; W. Liese, *Geschichte der Caritas*, I, Freiburg i.Br. 1922; H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege in vorchristl. Altertum*, Utrecht 1939; S. Giet, *Les idées et l'action sociale de s. Basile*, Paris 1941; B. Reicke, *Diakonia*, Upsala 1951; J. Colson, *La fonction diaconale aux origines de l'Église*, Paris 1960; A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique et vie sociale dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, Paris 1968; J.G.

Clayton, *The Development of Charitable Institutions in the Early Church to About AD 400*, Diss. Abst. Intern. 1972 n. 8; Ch. Munier, *L'Église dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1979, 95-105; S. Scicolone, *Basilio e la sua organizzazione dell'attività assistenziale a Cesarea*: Civiltà Classica e Cristiana 3 (1982) 353-372; T.S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*, Baltimore 1985, repr. 1998; *Caring and Curing. Health and Medicine in Western Religious Traditions*, ed. R.L. Numbers - D.W. Amundsen, New York 1986; C. Burini - E. Cavalcanti, *La spiritualità della vita quotidiana negli scritti dei Padri*, Bologna 1988; M.D. Grmek (ed.), *Storia del pensiero medico occidentale*, 1, *Antichità e Medioevo*, Rome-Bari 1993; R.J.S. Barrett-Lennard, *Christian Healing After the New Testament. Some Approaches to Illness in the Second, Third and Fourth Centuries*, Lanham-New York-London 1994; U. Falesiedi, *Le diaconie. I servizi assistenziali nella Chiesa antica*, Rome 1995; J.-U. Krause, *La prise en charge des veuves par l'église dans l'Antiquité Tardive*, in *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale*, ed. by C. Lepelley, Bari 1996, 115-126; P. Angstenberger, *Der reiche und arme Christus. Die Rezeptionsgeschichte von 2 Kor 8,9 zwischen dem zweiten und dem sechsten Jahrhundert*, Bonn 1997; C. Corsato, *I volti della carità nell'esperienza dei Padri*, Suppl. La Provvidenza n. 3, Padua 1997; U. Mattioli, *Assistenza e cura dei malati nell'antichità cristiana*, in *Cultura e promozione umana*, ed. E. dal Covolo - I. Giannetto, Rome 1998, 245-278; G. Schöllgen, *Die Anfänge der Profesionalisierung des Klerus und das kirchliche Amt in der syrischen Didaskalie*, Münster 1998; H. Avalos, *Health Care and the Rise of Christianity*, Peabody 1999; E. Rebillard, *La sépulture des pauvres dans l'Empire romain* (*I^er^-V^e^ siècles*): Antiquité tardive 7 (1999) 269-282; A. Di Berardino, *La solidarietà: forme ed organizzazione a Roma* (*secoli IV-V*), in *La comunità cristiana di Roma*, Rome 2000, 83-112; S.R. Holman, *The Hungry Are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, Oxford 2001; A. Rousselle, *Donne cristiane e fondazioni testamentarie* (*III-IV secolo*), in *Tardoantico alle soglie del duemila. Diritto religione e società*, Pisa 2002, 143-165.

CH. MUNIER - A. DI BERARDINO

WORLD. To understand the cosmology of the *Fathers, two different issues need to be clarified: that of moral character and the more strictly "scientific" study. In the realm of ethics, for *Platonism, the sensible world cannot be home to immutable truth; for the *Stoics, on the contrary, the world is permeated by the divine. For the Fathers these cosmological conceptions constitute the basis of the data of faith.

In relation to the world, Christians find themselves in the same complex situation as Christ did during his journey on this earth: to be not of the world (Jn 15:19; 19:17), but in the world (17:11), and their purpose is the salvation of the world. In a certain sense, Christian writers distinguish between two "worlds": one is the natural world which birthed our very existence and deserves our love; the other is the world of the enemy of God, and one must flee from it. Against the *gnostics, the goodness, beauty and unity of the universe is affirmed in which the *Holy Spirit, Wisdom, the Logos and Providence provide a cohesive whole. Western writers frequently praise the world for bringing life to humanity; the Greek Fathers claim that the visible world is first of all a training ground for the soul (Basil, *In Hex.* 6,1: PG 29, 117), to bring humanity to the *contemplation of God. The responsibility of human beings toward the universe derives from the fact that they are, in a certain sense, a microcosm. In the plan of the Creator, the mysterious union of the *soul with the *body has *purification of the world and its *divinization as its end.

On the other hand, the ascetic literature expresses the conviction that "the whole world lies in the power of the Evil One" (1 Jn 5:19). Hence the abandonment of the world is, for Christians, the necessary consequence of *love for God (see Theodoret, *Hist. relig.* (PG 82) 2, 1308; 3, 1324-1325).

To renounce the world is, naturally, first and foremost, an interior stance. There is an indispensable flight from the world for everyone: separation from *sin (Basil, *Reg. fus.* 7,3: PG 31, 932C), and dedicating oneself to be liberated from everything that impedes salvation. *Origen's thought could be considered the ideological precursor of flight from the world in the monastic sense, a flight that presupposes renouncing everything that can slow one's spiritual ascent. The gospels support this on some specific points: the ancient idea of the struggle between good vs. evil and the common spiritual struggle that Christians experience. In the fervor of their exhortations, the ascetics do not always worry about terminological precision. One must bear this in mind when one finds the presence of expressions regarding a radical opposition between "two worlds" appearing frequently in ascetic writers, though expressed in various dichotomies: the present world/the future world, the visible world/the invisible one, the opinions of the world/true gnosis. One has the impression that there are two radically opposed tendencies: a total oblivion toward material things characterizes the contemplative tension in *Evagrius, while *Basil in the **Hexaemeron* refers to the original project of *creation, when humanity, contemplating the universe, is nourished through the remembrance of God. Practically speaking, the *spirituality of the Fathers is not aware of two opposing "tendencies" regarding the problem of the world. The authors insist on one aspect of redemptive action now and another later: radical resignation always presupposes that those who have obtained perfection will reopen their eyes to discover the wonders of the visible world in "natural contemplation," a vision of the invisible God in the visible universe.

On the scientific front, the Christian view of the world, in its duplicity, is based, esp. during the time of the apologists, on the explanation of its origins.

When facing this problem, Christians come into contact with Platonism, taking up its cosmology. According to *Justin, in fact, God has created (or put in order) the world through the Logos, which was, then, the mediator of the divine will (2 *Apol.* 6,3). The attestations for this doctrine are found in classic passages like Jn 1:1ff.; Pr 8:22ff. and Ps 32. The creation of the world, according to Platonists, presupposes that matter is eternal and available as a substrate for the work of the Logos (see. 1 *Apol.* 10 and 59,5). In this conception, Justin certainly appropriated the Platonic ideas of his day. In the *Dialogue with Trypho* (5,2), the apologist says that if the world must be considered as created, then it must have been created by a principle: with these words Justin follows Plato's explanation, which distinguishes between eternal reality and created reality (*Timaeus* 28b). It is also significant that in 1 *Apol.* 10,2 he says that God, in his goodness, created the world from unformed matter for the sake of humanity. This interpretation of Genesis derives from *Timaeus* (29a; where we read that the demiurge is good and at 30a it says that he created the world from the preceding chaos), and consequently *Middle Platonism. Justin, then, connects the story of Genesis with the Platonic teachings of his day.

In reference to cosmology, and more precisely in the teaching of the preexistence of matter, Justin adds a notable differentiation based upon a biblical doctrine. In *Dial.* 5,4 he affirms that Plato had obscurely expressed his conviction that the world is destined to perish, given that the "birth" of the world as such implicitly contains an end. But if the world is not passing away, this must be due to the will of God. This affirmation corresponds to what Plato says in *Tim.* 41ab. The claim that the world is born, but is immortal, is held also by *Celsus (VI, 52a), by Plutarch and by *Atticus. Justin belongs, then, to this strand of Middle Platonism. He affirms, moreover, that Plato derived his cosmological notions from Moses, which is displayed in the *Timaeus* (1 *Apol.* 59,1). Unlike Plato, however, Justin never reduces the origin of evil to the creation of matter. In so far as creation is good, it was demons that introduced evil into the world. The absolute transcendence of God is not caused by a concomitant disregard for matter, as the gnostics claim.

For *Athenagoras as well, the Logos is the author of the creation of the world: to do this, the Logos puts matter in order (*Supplica* 5). But the matter constitutive of the world cannot be deprived of a beginning, like God, because in that case it would be a second principle equal to God; on the contrary, it has been created by God himself. The creation, then, came about in two stages: first God produced the substrate matter, and then the Logos transformed it in the cosmos. God produces the world from matter, that is, the *cosmos*, the order of things (10,39); the elements emerge through a "separation" (22,2). Matter, according to Middle Platonism, is said to preexist, and its origin is not an object for discussion (10,3; 15,2ff.; 22,2): this means that Christian thought had not yet made peace with the idea of *creatio ex nihilo*. The devil and fallen angels are tied to matter; their power, which at the time when they fell was opposed to God, was initially created by God himself in order to govern matter, just as the angels were created so that they might exercise providence on behalf of the world, while God possessed the general providence of everything. Not even Athenagoras says that matter is evil or caused by evil, and neither does Justin. A few years later *Tatian, and in a fuller way *Theophilus, discusses the problem of creation from nothing. Tatian does not speak of the "creation" of matter, but uses the Valentinian term *probolē*, even if one cannot be certain that he intended it as an emanation of matter from God. The second book of Theophilus's *Ad Autolycus* constitutes the most ancient Christian commentary on Genesis. In a much more concise way than Tatian, Theophilus affirms that God created everything from nothing (II, 4.10.13). Due to the clear explanation which he gives, the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, confirmed later by Irenaeus, became in the following centuries the "official" doctrine of Christianity. Even Origen asks how it is possible that eminent scholars had not understood this (*Princ.* II, 1,4); only *Clement remains faithful to Philo's explanation regarding the existence of an intelligible world. On the basis of this conception of *creatio ex nihilo*, Theophilus thoroughly criticizes the Platonic model of the world. The challenge by Theophilus substantially follows the same lines as Tatian. If, as the Platonists want, not only God but also matter is deprived of a beginning, then we cannot properly speak of God as creator of the world, and the divine "monarchy" is put at risk. God is not created, and thus incorruptible by nature; matter, if it was not created, would be incorruptible like God, and thus equal to him. In short, it would not be anything extraordinary if God had created the world from preexistent matter: in that case, God would not be any different from a human artisan that creates whatever he wants from already available materials. The passage in Gen 1:2 is interpreted in light of *creatio ex nihilo*, in so far as it presents the existence of matter as "created." In fact, it was still unformed in the first moment (that is, it would have been "created" unformed), but it would

have then received its form and shape by God to make the world (*Autol.* II, 10). It was probably due to his polemic against the heretic *Hermogenes, influenced by the cosmology of Middle Platonism, that Theophilus of Antioch was the first among the apologists to decisively arrive at the doctrine of the creation of the world out of nothing.

Even *Irenaeus has Plato in view in his doctrine of creation, by whom the gnostics, he said, would have been influenced (II, 14). This conviction led him to draw a cosmological model that certainly depends on Theophilus, but extends and surpasses it. God created the world through an act of free will and goodness (II, 1,1); he even created matter by his word, and in this affirmation Irenaeus appropriates a detail of the interpretation of Theophilus, in which the "hands" of God (the world is "the work of your hands") would be his Word and his Wisdom (I, 22,1; II, 2,4ff.; 11,1; 27,2). Consequently, matter did not exist before creation; rather, God is the Creator but only in an absolute sense. The rejection of the hypothesis that God, in his creating, followed a pattern takes place in a context in which Irenaeus discusses the Platonic teachings of the Valentinians, according to which the world would be an image of the *plerōma* (II, 7,16; II, 8).

Irenaeus decisively contrasts the Valentinian speculation about the formation of matter from Sophia against the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* due to the pure and exclusive will of the Creator (II, 10,2; 30,9). Irenaeus rejects, then, the Valentinian myth in the same way in which the apologists opposed the Middle Platonist doctrine called "the three principles," referring to origins, that is to say, god, matter and ideas.

Once the interpretation of *creatio ex nihilo* by the providence and goodness of God is in place at the end of the 2nd c., the cosmological debates take another direction, taking the form of an exegesis of the first six days of creation. Many of these writings are lost: what remains is only general notes and a few fragments in authors like *Papias of Hierapolis in Phrygia, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, *Lactantius, Basil and *Ambrose. It becomes a common conviction that the goodness and providence of God manifest themselves in creation, in the most humble of things, and the writers voluntarily affirm and describe the details of created reality to celebrate the One who is the creator of such marvelous things.

DSp 5, 1575-1605; P. Duhem, *Le système du monde. Histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic*, Paris 1914; V. Monod, *Dieu dans l'univers. Essai sur l'action exercée sur la pensée chrétienne par les grands systèmes cosmologiques depuis Aristote jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris 1933; A. Frank-Duquesne, *Cosmos et gloire. Dans quelle mesure l'univers physique a-t-il part à la chute, à la rédemption et à la gloire finales?*, Paris 1947; A.J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, Le Dieu cosmique*, Paris 1949; I. Hausherr, *L'hésychasme. Études de spiritualité*: OCP 22 (1956) 5-40, 247-285; Id., *Hésychasme et prière*, OCA 176, Rome 1966, 163-237; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des Pères de L'Église de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1957; J. Gribomont, *Le renoncement au monde dans l'idéal ascétique de saint Basile*: Irénikon 31 (1958) 282-307, 460-475; L. Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator. The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, Lund 1965; H.U. v. Balthasar, *Herrlichkeit. Eine theologische Aesthetik*, Einsiedeln 1965; A.I. Orbán, *Les dénominations du monde chez les premiers auteurs chrétiens*, Nijmegen 1970; Th. Spidlík, *Stare nel mondo o fuggire il mondo*: Vita consacrata 13 (1977) 170-177; Id., *La spiritualité de l'Orient chrétien. Manuel systématique*, OCA 206, Rome 1978, 121ff., 199ff.; C. Moreschini, *Storia della filosofia patristica*, Brescia 2004.

C. Moreschini

WRITING. For the majority of antiquity the verb "to write" meant to dictate, as in the case of the verb "to read," which meant listening to a text read by others. Cicero and *Pliny the Younger dictated their own writings. Thanks to rich patrons, *Origen and *Jerome used *stenographers (*see* *notarius; *stenography), who transcribed the dictated or even the preached text by the author. Arns affirmed that "Jerome did not write any of his works by his own hand." One simply has to examine some of Origen's and Jerome's commentaries to become aware of the fact that at times they were not heavily edited. The same can be said of the captured word and the edited text, as is evident from a comparison between the *De mysteriis* and the *De sacramentis* written by *Ambrose. Jerome confessed: "I do not dictate with the same elegance with which I write. In the second case, I have to edit and reedit my style in composing what deserves to be read; in the first case, I dictate what comes to my head" (*Ep.* 74,6,2; cf., Ambr., *Ep.* 47,1-2). Whenever it was possible, more than one *notarius* was engaged in recording the author's dictation via shorthand, and then there were correctors of the text. On occasion several *notarii* wrote the same text simultaneously, which, when not revised by the author, resulted in multiple copies that differed from one another. Thus differing editions of the text born at the origin of the composition could circulate.

J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et moyen âge*, Brussels, II-III, 1947–1949; E. Arns, *La technique du livre d'après saint Jérôme*, Paris 1953; J. Schlumberger, *'No scribo sed dicto'. Hat der Autor der Historia Augusta mit Stenographen gearbeitet?*, in *Bonner Hist. Augusta Colloquia*, ed. J. Straub, 1975; P. Petitmengin - B. Flusin, *Le livre antique et la dictée. Nouvelles recherches*, in *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière*, ed. E. Lucchesi - H.D. Saffrey, Geneva 1984, 247-266; H.C. Teitler, *Notarii and exceptores. An Inquiry*

into the Role and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire (from the Early Principate to c. 450 A.D.), Amsterdam 1985.

A. HAMMAN

WULFILA or Ulfila (ca. 311–383). Of Cappadocian origin and Christian family, born around 311, Wulfila was still a child when he, along with his parents, became a victim of a group of *Goths who carried him and his family away with them beyond the Danube River. Having retained his Christian faith, he was ordained bishop at *Constantinople in 341 by *Eusebius of Nicomedia and devoted himself to defending *Arian Christianity among the Goths. For seven years he worked N of the Danube River; then a persecution of the Goths, who were still pagan, forced him to seek refuge, along with the Goths who had become Christian in Moesia, at the borders of the empire. In 360 he participated at the Council of Constantinople and signed the *homoian (moderate Arian) formula of faith. He died in 383 during a trip to Constantinople in order to intercede in favor of *Palladius of Ratiaria.

Despite attempts to minimize his evangelizing activity among the barbarians, his work was immediately of utmost importance. To adequately support evangelization on the cultural level, Wulfila created an alphabet well-suited to that language and translated the Sacred *Scriptures into Gothic, a work that proved to be foundational not only for religion but also for culture. We know that he also wrote in Greek and Latin, but from his writings only a profession of faith has survived. Modern scholars have generally regarded him as a moderate Arian on the basis of his signing the formula of 360; but this formula only served to provide support for a radical Arianism (*anomoism), which was directly shaped on the model designed by that of *Eunomius. He transmitted this form of doctrine to Western Arianism which was active between the end of the 4th c. and the beginning of the 5th among the Germanic populations that had become Christian.

CPL 689; SC 267; PWK IXA, 512-531; Patrologia III, 88-90; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain*, Paris 1918; G. Friedrichsen, *The Gothic Version of the Gospel*, Oxford 1926; M. Simonetti, *L'arianesimo di Ulfila*: RomBarb 1 (1976) 297-323; *The Life and Work of Ulfila*, in *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, ed. by P. Heather and J. Matthews, Liverpool 1991, 133-153; B. Luiselli, *Storia culturale dei rapporti tra mondo romano e mondo germanico*, Rome 1992, 453-573; H. Sivan, *Ulfila's Own Conversion*: HTR 89 (1996) S. 373-386; B. Luiselli, *La formazione della cultura europea occidentale*, Rome 2003 (see the index).

M. SIMONETTI

X

XENODOCHIUM (Hospital). The *xenodocheion* (*xenos* = stranger) was a building where pilgrims and poor people were housed and cared for. In the ancient world, the care of the sick was often connected to the temples, e.g., in *Egypt; in the Greco-Roman world there existed some rare buildings for the care of the sick, esp. the *asclepeia,* the complexes of the temples of Asclepius (the Roman Aesculapius was the god of medicine). The *asclepeia* were made of a spring or well, surrounded by sacred woods, and by an area for the sick, called the *adyton*, where they spent the night, practicing *incubatio*; surgical interventions and administering medicine were also practiced. At Epidaurus (Greece) in AD 170, the senator Antoninus erected two establishments. *Aristides spent much time in the *asclepeion* of Pergamum. At *Rome a place was devoted to Aesculapius on the Tiberina island. Libanius, in the 4th c. BC, often consulted Asclepius for his illnesses (*Autob*. 143; *Epp*. 706-708; 1300-1301; 1483). During the imperial period, the official physicians who were paid with public money were in charge of the care of the sick. The emperor *Antoninus Pius decreed that the great cities could have ten doctors with privileges, seven for the midsized cities and five for the smallest cities (*Digest* 27,1,2, Herennius Modestinus). Doctors enjoyed various privileges in the 4th c. (CTh 13,3,2-3), and they were also obliged to aid the poor (CTh 18,3,8 of Valentinian, who decreed that in Rome 14 *archiatri* ["court physicians"] be paid by the food administration); Valentinian also decreed that the landholdings and the military encampments should have *valetudinaria* in order to assist slaves and soldiers (J.C. Wilmanns, *Der Arzt in der römischen Armee der frühen und hohen Kaiserzeit:* Clio medica 27 [1995] 171-187). They were not charitable institutions, as those would be that were of Christian inspiration. In the gospels, Christ, the true physician, often healed the sick; he said to his disciples: "Heal the sick [in whatever town you enter] and say to them, 'The kingdom of God has come near to you'" (Lk 10:9); there also existed the charism of healing: "To another faith by the same Spirit, to another the gift of healing by the one Spirit" (1 Cor 12:9). Believers in Christ "would lay hands upon the sick and they would be healed" (Mk 16:18). The Christian message is an exhortation to charity (Rom 12:13; Heb 13:2-3; Jas 2:14-15; 1 Pet 4:9).

During the first centuries there were no specific institutions, but the private and communal initiative of assisting the poor and the sick was widespread, as in the case of the plague of 252 at *Carthage (Cypr., *De mort*. 14: PL 4,591-593) and at *Alexandria in 268 (Eus., *HE* 7,12). The brothers *Cosmas and Damian, who were doctors, were known for having dedicated their lives to caring for the sick. The pagans themselves recognized that charitable work was proper to the Christians: the emperor *Julian witnessed the example of the Christians in favor of those who had been disinherited (E. Kislinger, *Kaiser Julian und die* (*christlichen*) *xenodocheia,* in *Fest. H. Hunger*, ed. W. Hoerander, Vienna 1984, 171-174). The pagan *Nectarius wrote to *Augustine: "My affirmation is demonstrated even by the very nature of your dealings with which you assist the poor, take care of the afflicted, administer medicine to sick bodies; in some, you do everything you can so that those suffering may not undergo their afflictions for a long time" (Aug., *Ep*. 103,3).

From the 4th c. onward various charitable and benevolent institutions arose with functions at times similar and with different names that characterized their purposes. Such terms from the Greek world were imported into the Latin world: *nosocomium* (for the sick), *brephotrophium* (for abandoned children), *orphanotrophium* (for orphans), *ptochium* (for the poor), *gerontochium* (for the elderly); *xenodochium* was the term most used in the West (Gk. *xenodocheion*), when the term *hospitalia* was not used (habitation for guests). The Arabic canons of the Council of *Nicaea ordered the construction of a building for pilgrims, the poor and

the sick (Mansi 2,976). The first hospital building was established by *Basil of Caesarea: a *ptōcheion* (or *ptōchotropheion*, a place for the poor; *see* Basileiad). There was also one at *Alexandria, *Egypt (A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie,* Rome 1996, 728-729). At Rome, *Fabiola, *prima omnium,* established a recovery home for the sick, in which she performed benevolent work; in fact, she even personally walked through the streets of Rome to gather the derelict (Jerome, *Ep.* 77,6: PL 22,694); *Pammachius established a *xenodochium* at Portus, the maintenance of which was very expensive, with an annexed basilica (Jer., *Ep.* 66,5: PL 22,641); for Nola we have the testimony from *Paulinus (*Carm.* 27,500ff.; 21,384ff.; *Ep.* 29,13). There was a *xenodochium* at *Hippo (Aug., *Sermo* 356,10). In 419 the emperor *Honorius granted bishops the ability to go to the prisons *ope miserationis* so that they might give medical treatment to the sick, nourish the poor, console the *insontes* (*Sirm.* 13); the deacon Dionysius, a doctor at Rome, cared for the poor without asking for money, as the barbarians who had tortured him had done (ICUR 7,12601). The prefect of Rome Glabrio Faustus built a *xenodochium* (M. Guarducci: Rend. PARA 42 [1969/70] 219-249). Historians know of various *xenodochia* from 6th-c. Rome: the *xenodochia* of the Anicii, Valeri and the Via Nova. Pope *Symmachus (498–514) built hospitals (LP 263); at the time of Pope *Vigilius (537–555), *Belisarius established a *xenodochium* on the Via Lata (LP 296). *Pelagius II (578–590) transformed his personal residence into a place of refuge for the poor and the elderly. Pope Leo III (795–816) made donations to various *xenodochia* in Rome. *Melania the Elder around 381 established at *Jerusalem a charitable institution; at *Ephesus *Bassianus built a *ptocheion* for the poor and sick containing 70 beds. At Constantinople *Pulcheria, sister of the emperor *Theodosius II, established charitable institutions (*multa publica hospitum et pauperum domicilia:* AASS, Sept. 3, 538); Samson, a slightly legendary figure, constructed a famous hospital near the Hagia Sophia (Procopius, *ædif. Justiniani* I, 2). *John Chrysostom attests to the existence of *xenodochia* at *Antioch (*Cons. ad Stag.* 3,13: PG 47, 490-491; *In Act. Apost. hom.* 45,4: PG 60,319; *Ad Matth.* 66,3: PG 58,630). In the 6th c. there were various charitable institutions in *Gaul (Council of *Orange, can. 13); in *Spain, Masona established one at Emerita (*Mérida) around 580, remains of which are still preserved.

The distinctive elements of these institutions were more in the attention given to recipients of care than in their cure, in keeping with Christian love for neighbor, esp. emphasizing *Christus medicus* as the one who heals. These institutions primarily had a benevolent and charitable characteristic, but they were not true and proper hospitals. The monastic communities would make their contribution in this direction. In the Byzantine world, a more defined development of the hospitals took place (called *xenōnes*) through the work of competent doctors. The Byzantine institutions were the true antecedents of modern hospitals.

DACL 1, 725-848; 7, 546-547; 6, 2748-2770, D.J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, New Brunswick, NJ 1968; S. Scicolone, *Basilio e la sua organizzazione dell'attività assistenziale a Cesarea*: CCC 3 (1982) 353-372; T.S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*, Baltimore 1985, 21997; *Symposium on Byzantine Medicine*, DOP, Dumbarton Oaks 38 (1985) (various articles); D. Setter, *Das europäische Hospital von der Spätantike bis 1800*, Cologne 1986; R. Jackson, *Doctors and Diseases in the Roman Empire*, British Museum, London 1988; A. Nigel, *Hospice to Hospital in the Near East: An Instance of Continuity and Change in Late Antiquity*: Bulletin of History of Medicine 64 (1990) 446-462; G. Lorenz, *Antike Krankenbehandlung in historisch-vergleichender Sicht: Studien zum konkret-anschaulichen Denken*, Heidelberg 1990; Th. Steiner, *Orientalium more secutus. Raume und Institution der Caritas des 5. bis 7. Jahrhunderts in Gallien*, Münster 1991; P. Van Minnen, *Medical Care in Late Antiquity*: Clio Medica 27 (1995) 153-169; *Cultura e promozione umana. La cura del corpo e dello spirito nell'antichità classica e nei primi secoli cristiani. Un messaggio ancora attuale?*, ed. E. dal Covolo - I. Giannetto, Troina 1998; H. Avalos, *Health Care and the Rise of Christianity*, Peabody, MA 1999; RAC 21, 826-914.

A. Di Berardino

Y

YAZDEGERD I (399–420). Persian emperor of the *Sassanid dynasty, called "the Persian Constantine." He put an end to the persecution begun by *Shapur II in the mid-4th c. and granted liberty to the church in Persia; thus, it could be reorganized, esp. with the synod of *Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 410. Yazdegerd thus maintained a good relationship both with the Roman Empire as well as with the Byzantine court, such that in 408 the emperor *Arcadius named him tutor of his son *Theodosius II.

I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Storia e cause dello scisma della Chiesa di Persia*: OCP 3 (1937) 468-475; K. Schippmann, *Grundzüge der Geschichte des sassanidischen Reichs*, Darmstadt 1990; R.C. Blockley, *East Roman Foreign Policy*, Leeds 1992, 46-59; 195-202.

S. Samulowitz

YORK. City of northeastern *England (Eburacum), it was in the 1st c. the general quarter of the *Legio IX Hispana* originating from *Pannonia and, after 123, that of the *Legio VI Victrix* originating from Novaesium. Initially only important as a military base, in the 2nd c. it ascended to the rank of a colony with the name of *Colonia Eboracensis* to then become the chief city and probably the capital of Britannia Inferior after the administrative reform carried out by *Septimius Severus, who died there in February of the year 211. Nearly 100 years later, in 306, *Constantius Chlorus died at Eburacum shortly after *Constantine I was there proclaimed emperor.

A substantial Christian community, which has, however, left no archaeologically recognizable trace, must have existed at York at least since the earliest years of the 4th c.: at the anti-*Donatist Council of *Arles, in fact, among the signatories there also appear three British bishops, and one of these, Eborius, calls himself the *episcopus de civitate Eboracensi provincia Britannia*. The Christian testimonies of York are full of lacunae until the beginning of the 7th c., where *Bede's account records, for the year 601, a letter from Pope *Gregory the Great to *Augustine of Canterbury, with whom he arranged that, once he had been appointed and after the city had embraced the Word of God, the bishop of York might have the metropolitan dignity and that he would have the power to consecrate twelve more bishops (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* I,29). Once *Paulinus had been ordained bishop of York by the hand of *Justus, archbishop of Durovernis (Canterbury) in 625, he dedicated himself with great missionary zeal to the conversion of the Northumbrians, the king of whom—Edwin—he baptized on 12 April 627 at York in a wooden church dedicated to the apostle *Peter, which was constructed on the occasion after having personally destroyed the altars of numerous remaining pagan temples (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II,13-14). Upon the death of the Christian king Edwin, who was killed on 12 October 633 by the king of the Britons Cadwallon after a 17-year reign—six of which were spent in the faith—Paulinus was forced to abandon the city, at first fleeing to Kent near King Eadbald and then at Hrofescaestir (Rochester), where he became bishop in place of the pastor Romanus, who had disappeared (*Hist. eccl. gent. angl.* II,20).

The deacon James remained at York, according to the valuable testimony of the Venerable Bede; James was "a man of a truly holy and religious spirit," but the church of York would come under the jurisdiction of the Celtic bishops of Lindisfarne for several decades. In the subsequent year, 634, Pope *Honorius I sent Paulinus a pallium in response to a request made by Edwin before his death and arranged, moreover, that each time the see of *Canterbury or York became vacant, the occupant of the other metropolitan see had to ordain a new bishop for the see lacking a pastor, and that it had supremacy over the newly ordained bishop. The episcopal see of York was restored in 664, although with much difficulty: upon the death of Tuda, bishop of Lindisfarne, the priest *Wilfrid—appointed bishop of Northumbria with a see at

York—was sent to *Gaul to be consecrated regularly (the erroneous custom of the Easter observance and the chronic absence of bishops made it impossible for them to have a regular ordination), but because he delayed in returning to his homeland, King Oswiu decided to intervene personally by having *Chad appointed bishop. Wilfrid, who had been regularly ordained bishop in Gaul according to the Roman custom, upon his return did not wish to deprive Chad, who continued to administer his diocese with great missionary zeal and exemplary behavior but, during the apostolic visit of all *England carried out by Theodore—appointed the new archbishop of Canterbury by Pope *Vitalian in place of the deceased Deusdedit—this irregularity became evident and Chad willingly and with great humility retired to the monastery of Laestingaeu, which he himself had founded (today Lastingham in Yorkshire), leaving to the legitimate bishop the leadership of his diocese. His episcopate, which was esp. animated, was interrupted by numerous disputes with the archbishops of Canterbury and with the ruler of Northumbria, who forced him to leave his see twice.

Bishops: Paulinus of York 625 (until 633); vacant from 633 to 664; Chad 664 (until 669); Wilfrid 669; Bosa 678; Wilfrid (recalled) 686; Bosa (recalled) 691; John of Beverley 705; Wilfrid II 718; *Egbert 732 or 734; Aethelbeorht 767; Eanbald I 780; Eanbald II 796.

CE 14, 1073-1075; ODC (3rd ed.) 1773-1774.

M. Ghilardi

Z

ZACCHEUS, antignostic. Bishop of a poorly identified Caesarea (2nd c.). Mentioned solely by the author of the **Praedestinatus* (I,11; I,13: PL 53,591), a 5th-c. work, as an opponent of *Valentinus and *Ptolemy and their disciples, whom he anathematized.

DCB 4, 1606.

E. Prinzivalli

ZACHARIAH, pope (741–752). Deacon of Greco-Calabrian origin, son of a certain Polychronius, Zachariah was elected by a unanimous vote on 3 December 741 and consecrated on the 10th of the same month. He succeeded *Gregory III (731–741), with respect to whom he chose a more conciliatory line with the *Longobard (Lombard) king Liutprand, obtaining from him in 742 a 20-year truce, the restitution of ecclesiastical goods previously taken, and the renunciation of any attempt to obtain *Ravenna and the exarchate. Friend and protector of the successor of Liutprand, Ratchis, Zachariah was unable, however, to halt the aggressiveness of the usurper Aistulf, who in 751 broke the truce and invaded the exarchate, holding himself back, however, from papal lands. The deposed Ratchis retired to the monastery of Monte Cassino. In the West, Zachariah began the historical politics of friendship and alliance between the Roman church and the emerging power of the Franks. Charles Martel was succeeded by Carloman (in Austrasia) and by Pepin the Short (in Neustria). In 751—after the withdrawal of Carloman to Monte Cassino—Pepin dethroned the last Merovingian descendent, Childeric III, and had himself proclaimed king by the nobles assembled at Soissons. Zachariah not only endorsed Pepin's election as legitimate but also had him anointed king with holy oil by St. *Boniface, the apostle of Germany. Previously Zachariah—with the collaboration of Bishop Boniface and the two Frankish leaders—had promised to reform the church of France, which was in advanced decay. This reform was carried out in E France with the councils of Austrasia (742) and Leptines (743) and with a synod at Rome, and in W France with the Council of Soissons (744) and a Roman council (745). Finally, the Frankish episcopate approved the results of all the assemblies in a general council (known as the *Concilium in Francia habitum*) held in 747 in the presence of Pepin, Carloman and Boniface. At *Constantinople the successor of *Leo III the Isaurian, Constantine V Copronymus, even though distracted by wars at the borders, substantially persisted in the iconoclastic positions of his predecessor. Even with him Zachariah attempted a conciliating path with little, if any, fruit; sending to him as a gift the Greek translation of *Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*. Zachariah maintained the evangelizing work of St. Boniface, communicating with him in a massive epistolary correspondence. With this pope, the construction of the abbey of Monte Cassino was completed, and he consecrated it in person. At *Rome, Zachariah restored the Lateran Palace and adorned the basilica of S. Maria Antiqua. He wisely administered the church's lands, entrusting them to efficient farm settlements (*domuscultae*).

CPL 1713; Mansi 13, 91-99 (letter to the patriarch Anastasius); MGH, Leges 1, 16-21; MGH, Epistolae III, 94; 302-307; 313-327; 336; 348-349; 356-365; 369-375; 467-468; 479-487 and 710-711; LP I, 426-439 (W. Gundlach - E. Dummler); Jaffé I, 262-270; DTC 15, 3671-3675; R.E. Sullivan, *The Papacy and Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Age*: Medieval Studies 17 (1955) 46-106; J. Hourlier, *La lettre de Zacharie*, in *Le culte et les reliques de saint Benoît et de Sainte Scholastique*, Paris 1980, 241-252; G.S. Marcou, *Zaccaria, un pontefice di origine greca*: Veltro 27 (1983) 145-153; D. De Francesco, *Considerazioni storico-topografiche a proposito delle* domuscultae *laziali*: Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria 119 (1996) 5-47; E. Marazzi, *I* patrimonia Sanctae Romanae ecclesiae *nel Lazio* (*secc. IV-V*). *Struttura amministrativa e prassi gestionali*, Rome 1998, 235-261; EPapi 1, 656-660 (P. Delogu); Patrologia IV, 188-189; LTK[3] 10, 1361-1362 (G. Rigotti).

M. Spinelli

ZACHARIAS of Jerusalem (609–ca. 628). Patriarch of Jerusalem. When the Persians conquered *Jerusalem in 614, Zacharias was taken prisoner along with the Holy Cross and numerous believers. A consolatory document to his community dates to this period, which was composed by *Modestus, abbot of the monastery of *Theodosius, who then became Zacharias's successor. The *consolatio* was also handed down in a *Georgian and Arabic version. Zacharias was inserted into the calendar of saints with a feast day of 21 February.

CPG III, 7825; PG 86, 2, 3219-3234; Georgian version: CSCO 202, 70-76 and 203, 46-50 (G. Garitte); Arabic version: 340, 49-53 and 98-101; 341, 33-35 and 66-68 (G. Garitte; one strand of the tradition); moreover 347, 143-145 and 185-188; 348, 97-98 and 126-129 (a parallel strand); LTK³ 10, 1301; BS 12, 1451-1453; Beck 448.

J. Irmscher

ZACHARIAS Scholasticus or Rhetor. Born at Maiuma of Gaza (S *Palestine), in the last third of the 5th c., to a large family (among the five brothers the figure of *Procopius of Gaza stands out). From 485 to 487 he studied at *Alexandria and solidified his friendship with *Severus, the future *monophysite patriarch of *Antioch. After having encouraged his conversion, he joined him at Berytus (Beirut) in the autumn of 487 for the study of law (487–492), leading an austere life among the monophysite ascetics. At least from 492, he worked in the profession of *scholastikos* ("lawyer") at *Constantinople, where he ascended to high offices, among which was that of juridical council of the *comes sacri palatii,* although remaining in close contact with religious circles, in fact, even living within the monastery itself of the brother priests Philip and Victor. After 512 he abandoned Severian monophysitism. Between 527 and 536 he was promoted to the metropolitan see of Mytilene (Lesbos), and in this office he intervened, in May of 536, at the Constantinopolitan synod in which the patriarch Anthimus was deposed, who was condemned along with his monophysite followers. The date of his death is unknown.

Aside from the *Ammonius,* that is, the *Debate on the Creation of the World,* which was held at Alexandria with his professor, the pagan sophist *Ammonius of Alexandria, or short treatises *Against the Manicheans* written in 527 or shortly earlier, Zacharias's literary legacy, or the one attributed to him, is of a historical character. The biographical document, *Life of Severus of Antioch*, was written around 515 and preserved in *Syriac (PO 2,7-115). Only one small fragment of the *Life of Peter the Iberian* has been passed down, and that in a Syriac version, a revision inserted as books 3-6 (from 450 to 491) of an anonymous historical compilation in 12 books which goes from the creation of the world to the year 569. *Evagrius Scholasticus depends on Zacharias's *History*. Even if abbreviated to this extent, the work remains the most important historical source for the reigns of the emperor *Marcian, *Leo I and *Zeno, whose **Henoticon* he supported.

PG 85, 1011-1178; CPG 6995-7001; M. Minniti Colonna, *Zaccaria Scolastico. Ammonio* (intr., critical text and translation and comment.), Naples 1973; B. Tatakis, *La philosophie byzantine*, Paris 1949, 34-37; DTC 15, 3676-3680; EC 12, 1761; PWK 9, A, 2, 2212-2216; P. Allen, *Zachariah Scholasticus and the* historia ecclesiastica *of Evagrius Scholasticus*: JTS n.s. 31 (1980) 471-488; Patrologia V, 262-263; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491): de l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Rome 2006, passim.

D. Stiernon

ZENO. Byzantine emperor (474–475, 476–491). Tarasis Kodisa—his original name—was born in Isauria ca. 426. Determined to free himself from the *Ostrogothic tutelage of Aspar (who was then assassinated in 471), the emperor *Leo I called the Isaurian leader to *Constantinople, entrusting him with the office of *magister militum per Orientem*. He took on the Greek name of Zeno and married the emperor's older daughter, Ariadne. The son born from this marriage ideally would have succeeded as *basileus* with the name Leo II, but while still a child died in the autumn of 474. After the premature death of this child, as regent and coemperor, Zeno became emperor. Zeno, however, was nearly ruined (January 475) by a plot that brought to the throne *Basiliscus, brother of Verina, wife of the deceased emperor, who likewise died in 474. A disastrous interregnum of 20 months followed. At the end of August 476, Zeno returned to power and was able to maintain his throne for 15 years, despite other factional disruptions and civil wars. To rid himself of the turbulent leader of the Ostrogoths who had helped him ruin Basiliscus, Zeno convinced *Theodoric the Great to head toward *Italy to combat *Odoacer, who had been previously appointed by Byzantium as *magister militum per Italiam*. *Theodoric's victory turned a new page in the history of Italy following the fall of the Western Roman empire.

In the East, the danger of disintegration was represented by *monophysitism, which distanced *Egypt and *Syria-*Palestine from Byzantium. To reestablish religious unity Zeno, who had been counseled by the patriarch *Acacius of Constantinople, in 482 during the advent of *Peter Mongus to

the Alexandrian see promulgated a document that aimed to reconcile monophysites without irritating Chalcedonians, namely, the so-called **Henoticon*. The document presented itself as an imperial letter sent "to the most reverend bishops, clerics, monks and laymen of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya and the Pentapolis," but in reality it was intended for the entire empire. The document proclaimed the profession of faith of *Nicaea-Constantinople as the sole orthodox creed, according to the very definition of the Council of *Ephesus. Upon the reiterated condemnation of *Nestorius and *Eutyches, a condemnation was added for those who at *Chalcedon or at another synod had spoken differently of the one Christ, the only Son, and it approved the Twelve Anathemas of *Cyril of Alexandria.

The imperial decree did not entirely satisfy the monophysites: Peter Mongus accepted it but not his church; Calandio of Antioch also rejected it, although *Martyrius of Jerusalem accepted it. It was esp. condemned by Pope *Felix III in the Roman synod of 28 July 484, thus beginning a schism with Byzantium that lasted until 519 (the *Acacian Schism).

Evagrius of Pontus, *HE* 3, 14; PG 86, 2620-2625; Liberatus, *Breviarium* 17; PL 68, 1022-1024; EC 5, 365-367; 12, 1792-1793; Cath 5, 605; Fliche-Martin IV, 362-373; G. Ostrogorsky, *Storia dell'impero bizantino*, Turin 1968, 54-56; PWK 10,A (1972) 149-213; Patrologia V, 40-41; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491): de l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Rome 2006, passim; R.M. Harrison, "The Emperor Zeno's Real Name," ByzZ 74, 1 (1981) 27-28.

D. Stiernon

ZENO of Verona (4th c.). *Ambrose remembers him (*Ep*. I,5,1) as the bishop of *Verona who died around 380, and the local tradition places him at the eighth spot on the list of the city's bishops. Some manuscripts, likewise derived from the local tradition, attribute to him approximately 90 homilies written after 360. This collection has come down to us in two parts: the first (I) included 62 texts, the second (II) only 30. Only 30 or so of these homilies are complete. The remainder are outlines or summaries. It seems clear that the collection was not done by the author himself but was made after his death, probably to meet liturgical demands.

Many of his homilies are exegetical, mostly dedicated to passages from the OT, and one can perceive his interest in the OT's deeds and personages even in different types of homilies, accompanied by a certain anti-Jewish tone. He offers a traditional typological interpretation, primarily in light of *Christology, through which *Jonah, *Jacob, *Job etc. are seen as *typoi* of Christ. Some homilies treat baptismal and *Easter themes; others treat morality (*de continentia, de avaritia* etc.). Few are specifically doctrinal (I,2; II,5), but these types of themes are disseminated everywhere. We can perceive a few traces of *millenarism (I,2), but he did have a notable command of Nicene trinitarian theology. Zeno often argued against the Photinians, whose epicenter was *Pannonia, not far from N *Italy. In I,3,19 he provides the ancient reason for which Christ entered *Mary through the ear, that is, by means of the angelic proclaimer's word. *Hom*. I,39 is the only one dedicated to a martyr, the African Arcadius, which, along with reminiscences of *Tertullian and *Lactantius, has led some scholars to think that Zeno was from Africa.

CPL 208-209; CCL 22; A. Bigelmair, *Zeno von Verona*, Münster 1904; var. aus., *Studi Zenoniani in occasione del XVI centenario della morte di san Zeno*, Verona 1976; Patrologia III, 117-120 (bibl.); V. Boccardi, *L'esegesi di Zenone di Verona*: Augustinianum 23 (1983) 453-485; C. Truzzi, *Zeno, Gaudenzio e Cromazio, Testi e contenuti della predicazione cristiana per le chiese di Verona e di Aquileia (360-410 ca.)*, Brescia 1985; G. Sgreva, *La teologia di Zenone di Verona: contributo per la conoscenza delle sviluppo del pensiero teologico nel Nord Italia (360-380)*, Vicenza 1989; R. Lizzi, *Ambrose's Contemporaries and the Christianization of Northern Italy*: JRS 80 (1990) 156-173; BBKL XIV, 427-430; D.J. Font I Palma, *La relación "Pascua- primavera" en Zenón de Verona, Gaudencio de Brescia y Cromacio de Aquileia*, Rome 2003.

M. Simonetti

ZENOBIA (d. after 272). Queen of *Palmyra, upon the death of her husband Odenathus (267), assumed command in the name of her son Vaballatus. Contrary to her husband, she adopted a politic of hostility toward the Roman Empire, enlarging her borders in *Syria, *Egypt and *Asia Minor, to *Ancrya in *Galatia. *Aurelian, who had committed troops elsewhere, recognized the state of affairs (270). Her Hellenistic culture led her to surround herself by such counselors as the Neoplatonist Cassius Longinus, a student of *Ammonius Saccas, and *Paul of Samosata, an administrator of the equestrian rank of the kingdom of Palmyra, bishop of *Antioch from 260, who intervened in the debate on the christological formulation and exhibited a *monarchianism of the *subordinationist type and a person whom Zenobia protected, allowing him to preserve his episcopal see even after the condemnation issued by the Synod of Antioch of 268. Led by ambition, Zenobia aimed to create an independent state and began to mint coins (271). Aurelian intervened and, at the head of his army, took control over Palmyra and imprisoned Zenobia in 272.

PWK 10, A (1972), 1-8; LTK³ 10, 1423; DNP 12/2, 730-734; J. Gagé, *La montée des Sassanides et l'heure de Palmyre*, Paris 1964, 349ff.; F. Millar, *Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian*: JRS 61 (1971) 1-17; R. Stoneman, *Palmyra and Its Empire: Zenobias's Revolt Against Rome*, Ann Arbor, MI 1992; U. Hartmann, *Das palmyrenische Teilreich*, Berlin 2000.

G. PILARA

ZENOBIUS of Zephyrium (5th c.). Bishop of Zephyrium in *Cilicia around 433. After the Council of *Ephesus, under pressure from the emperor, a conciliatory creed, compiled by *Theodoret of Cyrrhus, was approved for resolving the *Nestorian controversy. It was signed by the Antiochenes, who were represented by *John of Antioch, by the aforementioned Theodoret and by the Alexandrians, who were represented by *Cyril of Alexandria (Hfl-Lecl 2, 1, 385-419). Zenobius, however, along with other bishops of Cilicia, went over to the opposition against John of Antioch. He was therefore deposed, perhaps in 435. Exiled to Tiberias, he was able to flee from the place of his confinement. The acts of the council contain Zenobius's letter to Bishop *Alexander of Hierapolis, metropolitan of the province of the Euphrates, who likewise belonged to the opposition, in which the author informs the recipient of the sanctions adopted against Bishop *Meletius of Mopsuestia (Cilicia).

CPG III 6470; PG 84, 792-793; ACO 1, 4, p. 195; PWK 10 A, 14-15.

J. IRMSCHER

ZEPHYRINUS, pope (198–217). According to *Eusebius of Caesarea he presided over the church of *Rome for 18 years (*HE* 5,28 and 6,21,3) and, according to the *Catalogus liberianus,* he died in 217 (MGH, *Chron. min.* I, 74). The *Liber pontificalis* (I,139), according to which his episcopate lasted 20 years, adds that he issued two decrees concerning the presence of the community in the ordinations and the celebration of the Mass by the bishop with the presence of the priests. Zephyrinus was buried in the cemetery of St. *Callistus, but not underground. During his episcopate, *Origen came to Rome (Eus., *HE* 6,14,10), whom he perhaps met. Pope *Victor, Zephyrinus's predecessor, had condemned *adoptionism, which was propagated in Rome by *Theodotus of Byzantium called the Tanner; Zephyrinus renewed the condemnation and readmitted the adoptionist bishop *Natalius to communion, but as a layman; Natalius was a follower of Theodotus (Eus., *HE* 5,28,8-19), who had agreed to leave the schism for a sum of money but had returned through providential intervention (he had a dream that *Jesus rebuked him). Zephyrinus is mainly known through the document of a bitter opponent of his successor Callistus (who had been his deacon)—namely, the *Philosophumena* (or the *Èlenchos*), a text attributed to *Hippolytus in which an exposition is given of the theological debates that were current at the beginning of the 3rd c. (9,7ff.). *Epigonus and *Praxeas were spreading *monarchianism at Rome. Praxeas, according to *Tertullian, had prevented the reception of Montanist teaching by the bishop of Rome (*Adv. Praxean* 1, lines 21-33). Zephyrinus who, according to the aforementioned work, was "a simple man, unlearned and ignorant of the ecclesiastical rules and a lover of gifts and money" (*Philos.* IX,11) and at Callistus's complete mercy, followed a very ambiguous approach, all in favor of the new heresy; moreover, even his profession of faith was erroneous and ambiguous. In these weighty judgments, the hatred of the author of the *Philosophumena* toward Callistus played an important role. During the same period there lived at Rome the learned *Gaius, who praised the Roman tradition of *Peter and *Paul (Eus., *HE* 2,5,7), against the Montanist tradition of Asia (Eus., *HE* 6,20,3).

DTC 15, 3690-3691; 2, 1336-1337; BS 12, 1464-1465; Quasten I, 249-250; Fliche-Martin, see the indexes of vol. II; A. von Harnack, *Die älteste uns im Wortlaut bekannte dogmatische Erklärung eines Römisches Bischofs* (*Zephyrin bei Hippolyt*, *Ref. IX, 11*), in *Kleine Schriften zur alten Kirche*, II, Leipzig 1980, 619-625; B. Capelle, *Le cas du pape Zéphyrin*: RBen 38 (1926) 329-330; M. Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo*, Rome 1993, 183-215; R.E. Heine, *The Christology of Callistus*: JTS 49 (1998) 56-91; EPapi 1, 234-237.

A. DI BERARDINO

ZODIAC. Greek astronomers and astrologists used the term "zodiac" to refer to the zone of the ecliptic celestial sphere in which the sun, moon and chief planets turned, making way for multiple relationships. The zodiac—divided into 12 signs (ζῴδια), each one a 30-degree distance from the sun in the arc of a month (Aratus, *Phaen.* 544; Cicero, *De div.* II,42-44; *Arat.* 317; Manilius, *Astron.* I,682; Sextus Emp., *Adv. mathem.* 5; Diodorus Sic., II,30; Philo of Alexandria, *Abrah.* 69; Firmicus, *Math.* II,1; *Basil of Caesarea, *Hex.* 6,5)—corresponds to the twelve constellations (Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, Aquarius and Pisces). The Sumerians and the Babylonians seem to have been the first (14th c. BC) to name and elaborate (with a double connotation, scientific and religious) the celestial constellations as a fantastic representation of divinities and sacred animals that

have influence on future events. The “Chaldeans” divided the earth into twelve regions, each one subjected to a sign of the zodiac. According to a teaching attributed to Zoroaster and retained also by *Manicheism, souls descending from heaven leap through the circle of the twelve constellations (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* V,103). For the *Mandeans, who were opponents of Babylonian and Greek polytheism, the signs of the zodiac (and the divinities of the planets) are demons who are hostile to human beings, life and light. The teachings of the zodiac underwent great development at *Rome (Cicero translated and paraphrased Aratus), chiefly in *Mithraism and in the solar and astral beliefs. Manilius, under the emperor *Tiberius, provided a detailed treatment of the influence of the zodiac in his *Astronomica:* it was the age of the triumph of the Eastern cults and astrology. The representation of the zodiac on funerary representations or apotheoses could be an allusion to the astral immortality or could be placed alongside the twelve labors of Hercules, who was regarded by the Christians as a figure of Christ (Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 54; *Dial.* 69,3). Magic, astrology’s twin, made its success dependent on the position of the planets in the signs of the zodiac. Also, as a result of a false etymology of Stoic origin (ζωοφόρος κύκλος), every manifestation of human life was placed in relation to one or more signs of the zodiac (Varro was interested in the relationship of the signs with agriculture: *De re rust.* 1,28; 2,1,7). These signs were then used for the construction of horoscopes (a prediction of a royal marriage was made to Julia Domna, the wife of *Septimius Severus: *Historia Augusta*, *Vita Sev.* 3,8) and the determination of an individual’s future. An ancient tradition represents the human being as a microcosm in which each vital organ (and behavior) is under the influence of a sign or planets (Orig., *C. Cels.* 8,58; Basil Caes., *Hex.* 6,6; Firmicus, *Math.* II,24; III,1). Even the founding of cities and buildings was preceded by the consultation of the astrologers in order to know the most favorable moment. A 2nd-c. historian, *Charax,* explains that the hippodromes were built in such a way as to represent the world: “the twelve doors of the zodiac, which governs the land and sea and the transitory course of human life” (*FGH* 103, 34 Jacoby).

Unknown in the OT, the signs of the zodiac were known by the Jews during the Babylonian exile and translated into Hebrew by the Pharisees, who had been infected with astrology (Epiph., *Pan.* 16,2), for which the *Qumran community nourished interest (4Q186. 318). *Hellenistic-Jewish exegetes interpreted the twelve loaves of showbread (Lev 24:6) as a symbol of the signs of the zodiac and of the months of the year, and the seven branches of the menorah as a symbol of the planets and days of the week (Flavius Josephus, *De bell. Iud.* V, 5,217; *Ant. Iud.* III, 7,182.186). Palestinian synagogues were decorated with zodiacal mosaics as early as the 1st c. BC. For a long time the region of *Syria had a fascination with astrological and zodiacal ideas: *Ephrem rebuked *Bardesanes for his “assiduous reading of books on the zodiacal signs” (Nau 499), and *Isaac of Antioch (XI,242-243 Bickell) affirmed that only during his time (5th c.) were “the Chaldeans healed from their worship of the signs of the zodiac.” Under Ptolemy, Egypt became familiar with zodiacal ideas to the point that the priestly class boasted of having created them (Cicero, *De div.* I,1,2): in fact, they received stimulus and renewed importance as a representation evocative of celestial immortality on sepulchral monuments and temple walls thanks to the *Corpus Hermeticum*.

Already in the attacks of *Tatian (*Ad Graec.* 9; 17; 19), we see Christians condemning divinization, astrology and magic, along the lines of the disregard shown for the arts of Babylonia in Is 47:9-15. For Ephrem “if God is just, he could not have established birthday stars through whose power human beings by necessity become sinners” (*Carm. Nisib.* 72,16). Nevertheless, starting from the visions of Rev 12 and 21 (the virgin crowned with 12 stars; the heavenly *Jerusalem, established on 12 foundations bearing the names of the 12 *apostles and endowed with 12 doors with names of the 12 tribes of *Israel, protected by 12 angels) to the *gnostic, Manichean and *Priscillianist speculations (Augustine, *Haer.* 70), “many people” gave heed to zodiacal suggestions (Basil Caes., *Hex.* 6,7). The first Christian emperor, *Constantine, convinced of the power of the stars, had himself depicted on coins as master of the world crowned by Victory and in his right hand the zodiacal ring. He desired that statues of the 12 signs of the zodiac be placed in the Hagia Sophia of *Constantinople, the likely horoscope of the basilica’s foundation. The treatise *Mathesis* is from this era (337), the first complete didactic text of Latin prose, composed by *Firmicus Maternus before his conversion. Such bishops as *Eusebius of Emesa likewise adhered to astrological beliefs (Socrates, *HE* 2,9). The Fathers, though combating astrological fatalism (ps.-Clement, *Rec.* 9-10; Hipp., *Ref.* 4-6; Tertull., *De idol.* 9; Orig., *In Gen.* 1,14; *C. Cels.* 2,20; Meth. Olymp., *Symp.* 8; Eus. Caes., *Praep. ev.* 6; Cyr. Jerus., *Cat.* 4,18; Basil Caes., *Hex.* 6; Greg. Nyss., *C. fatum*; Aug., *Civ. Dei* 5; *Conf.* 4; *Enarr. ps.* 61; John Philoponus, *De op. mundi* 4), paid attention to the zodiac, uniting it to the scriptural symbolisms of the number 12. Al-

ready *Theodotus the Valentinian connected the 12 signs to the 12 apostles, who preside over spiritual rebirth just as those who preside over physical birth (Clem. Alex., *Exc. Theod.* 25; 71; *Strom.* V,38); the parallelism would be extended to the 12 months of the year and the 12 hours of the day (ps.-Cyprian, *De pascha comp.* 19; Ambr., *Exp. Lc.* 7,222; Aug., *Enarr. ps.* 55,5; Zeno, *Tract.* I,33,4). The *sarcophagi represent the apostles crowned by a star in relation to the 12 months and at the center shaped by the sun of Christ, as was the case later on for the astral pagan divinities (ps.-Clem. R., *Hom.* II,23). There is no lack of assimilation with the 12 patriarchs either (Philo Alex., *Quaest. Ex.* II,109.114; Orosius, *Comm.* 2). Some signs developed and multiplied as symbols (positive but also negative), esp. christological: Aries/Lamb of God, Taurus/sacrificial victim; Gemini/two Testaments, Cancer symbolizes the seven capital vices; Virgo, who precedes Libra, is a symbol of *Mary who gives birth to Christ, the restorer of divine justice; Leo is Christ, who by rising defeats Scorpio, a symbol of the *serpent from the Garden of Eden; Sagittarius and Capricorn are demoniac signs, while Pisces represents the Jews and Gentiles saved by the waters of *baptism of Aquarius/Christ. The representation of the "majesty of Christ" at the center of the celestial sphere indicates his eternal dominion over the changing of time.

A.Y. Collins, *Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature*: ANRW II.21.2, 1221-1287; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque*, Paris 1899; F. Nau, *Bardesane l'astrologue. Le Livre des lois des pays*, Paris 1899; J. Bidez, *Le traité d'astrologie cité par saint Basile dans son Hexaéméron*: Antiquité Class. 7 (1938) 19-21; D. Amand, *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'Antiquité grecque. Recherches sur la survivance de l'argumentation morale anti-fataliste de Carnéade chez les philosophes grecs et les théologiens chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles*, Louvain 1945; G. Furlani, *I pianeti e lo zodiaco nella religione dei Mandei*: MAL VIII s., II/3 (1948) 133-147; U. Riedinger, *Die Heilige Schrift im Kampf der griechischen Kirche gegen die Astrologie von Origenes bis Johannes von Damaskos*, Innsbruck 1956; J. Daniélou, *Les douze apôtres et le zodiaque*: VChr 13 (1959) 14-21; L. Koep, "Astrologia usque ad Evangelium concessa" (*Zu Tertullian*, De idololatria 9), in *Mullus*, Münster 1964, 199-208; E. Marotta, *L'ironia e altri schemi nel* Contra Fatum *di San Gregorio di Nissa*: VetChr 4 (1967) 85-105; H.G. Gundel, *Zodiakos. Der Tierkreis in der antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Munich 1972; Id., *Zodiakos. Tierkreisbilder im Altertum. Kosmische Bezüge und Jenseitsvorstellungen im antiken Alltagsleben*, Mainz 1992; J.H. Charlesworth, *Jewish Astrology in the Talmud, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Palestinian Synagogues*: HTR 70 (1977) 183-200; E. Beck, *Bardaisan und seine Schule bei Ephraem*: Muséon 91 (1978) 271-333; W.C. Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature*, Leiden 1979; W. Rordorf, *Le christianisme et la semaine planétaire*: Augustinianum 19 (1979) 189-196; J. Samsó, *Astronomica isidoriana*: Faventia 1 (1979) 167-174; B. Bagatti, *Osservazioni sullo zodiaco e le stagioni nelle sinagoghe e chiese palestinesi dei sec. V-VI*: Studia Hier. 3 (1982) 247-253; W. Hübner, *Zodiacus Christianus. Jüdisch-christliche Adaptationen des Tierkreises von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Königstein 1983; T. Gregory, *Temps astrologique et temps chrétien*, in *Le temps chrétien de la fin de l'antiquité au Moyen Âge. III^e-XIII^e siècles*, ed. J.-M. Leroux, Paris 1984, 557-579; B. Teyssèdre, *Anges, astres et cieux. Figure de la destinée et du salut*, Paris 1986; S. Feraboli, *Ricerche sulle monomoiriai di Firmico*: SIFC 7 (1989) 213-240; I. Zatelli, *Astrology and the Worship of the Stars in the Bible*: Zeitsch. f. die Alttest. Wiss. 103 (1991) 86-99; U. Pizzani, *Astrologia e astronomia nel pensiero dei Padri*, in *L'astrologia e la sua influenza nella filosofia, nella letteratura e nell'arte dall'età classica al Rinascimento*, Milan 1992, 65-85; M. Albani, *Der Zodiakos in 4Q318*: Mitteil. u. Beitr. d. kirchl. Hochschule Leipzig, Forschungsstelle Judentum 7 (1993) 3-42; B. Migotti, "*Sol iustitiae Christus est*" (*Origenes*): Diadora 16/17 (1994/95) 263-292; J.C. Greenfield - M. Sokoloff, *An Astrological Text from Qumran (4Q318) and Reflections on Some Zodiac Names*: Rev. de Qumran 16/64 (1995) 507-525; A. Panaino, *Visione della volta celeste e astrologia nel manicheismo*, in L. Cirillo - A. v. Tongerloo, *Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico*, Louvain 1997, 249-295; G. Luck (ed.), *Arcana Mundi. Magia e occulto nel mondo greco e romano* II: *Divinazione, astrologia, alchimia*, Milan 1999; K. Stuckrad, *Das Ringen um die Astrologie: jüdische und christliche Beiträge zum antiken Zeitverständnis*, Berlin 2000; A. Pérez Jiménez, *Cien años de investigación sobre la astrología antigua*: MHNH 1 (2001) 133-203; *Les Pères de l'Église et l'astrologie: Origène, Méthode, Basile, Grégoire de Nysse, Diodore, Procope de Gaza, Jean Philopon*, Paris 2003; J. Dillon, *Plotino y su tratado*, Sobre si los astros influyen (Enn. II 3): MHNH 3 (2003) 149-158; K. Stuckrad, *Geschichte der Astrologie: von der Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich 2003; A. Pérez Jiménez, *Influencias astrales en la fundación de ciudades y en las tareas de construcción*: MHNH 4 (2004) 173-196; C. Macías - M. Gonzáles, *El* Banquete *de Metodio de Olimpo y sus argumentos contra la astrología*: ibid., 5 (2005) 307-342; C. Macías Villalobos, *Ciencia de los astros y creencias astrológicas en el pensamiento de San Agustín*, Madrid 2004.

M. Girardi

ZOILUS of Alexandria (d. 551). A monk from Palestine, Zoilus was elected as patriarch of Alexandria (d. 540–541), following the deposition of Paul of Tabennesi in 540. Having been imposed upon the community of *Alexandria because he adhered to the Council of *Chalcedon as did his predecessor, he was able to dwell at Alexandria only under the protection of the army. During his patriarchate he defended and supported the Council of Chalcedon, winning for the Chalcedonian confession the monks of Enaton who were near Alexandria. In 546 because of a revolt, he was forced to flee to *Constantinople, where in 551 he was deposed for his opposition to the condemnation of the *Three Chapters. The emperor *Justinian, probably already in 540, sent "a dogmatic letter" to Zoilus in which he demonstrated his Chalcedonian faith and definitively separated himself from the *monophysites and *Severus of Antioch. This letter, which seems to have been the emperor's response to another letter by the same pa-

triarch, has only come down to us in a fragment preserved in the acts of the Council of Constantinople III (680–681). The emperor Justinian sent his edict against *Origen, which was published at *Jerusalem in February 542, to Zoilus and to the patriarch *Mena, Pope *Vigilius and patriarch *Peter of Jerusalem.

CPG 6879; ACO II, 2,1, 352-356; Justinian, *Contra Monophysitas*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, Munich 1939, 7; J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis de la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des Églises jacobites* (*518-616*), Paris 1922; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, 2/2, Brescia 1999, 474-476; Patrologia V, 69.

C. Dell'Osso

ZOORA, monk (6th c.). Anti-Chalcedonian monk, native of *Syria and former *stylite, he settled in Constantinople in the luxurious quarter of Sykai, where he administered *baptisms and celebrated liturgies, garnering numerous followers to the anti-Chalcedonian side. Although finding himself under the protection of the empress *Theodora, he drew much resistance from the Chalcedonian monks and *archimandrites of the capital, who, around 535 along with the representatives of the laurae and monasteries of *Palestine, launched an attack against him, the patriarch *Anthimus, *Severus of Antioch and *Peter of Apamea. This brought about the deposition of the patriarch Anthimus by Pope *Agapetus I in March 536 and the promulgation of a constitution against Anthimus, Severus, Peter and Zoora by the emperor *Justinian at the end of the synod called by the patriarch *Mena on 6 August 536. The monks of *Jerusalem who had intervened at the synod asked for a resolution in which a decree was made for the destruction of the Eutychian monasteries, esp. those of Zoora, who, along with Anthimus and Severus, during the fifth *actio* was exposed to every type of accusation.

ACO III, 111, 25; 112, 25ff.; 141, 15-28; 147-152; 119-123; 127-129; 169-181; R. Schieffer, *Indices*, ACO IV, 3,2,2 508a; Ch. Diehl, *Théodora impératrice de Byzance*, Paris 1904, 261-263; E. Schwartz, *Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, IV, Berlin 1960, 276-328; M. Amelotti - L. Migliardi Zingale, *Scritti teologici ed ecclesiastici di Giustiniano*, Milan 1977, II, 52 (*Costitutio contra Anthimum, Severum, Petrum et Zooram*); L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980; A. Grillmeier, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, 2/2, Brescia 1999, 440-444.

C. Dell'Osso

ZOSIMUS (6th c.). Zosimus was a native of *Phoenicia and became a monk in the laura of *Gerasimus in the Plain of Jordan; he subsequently established himself near Caesarea. According to the historian *Evagrius Scholasticus, he foresaw the earthquake of *Antioch in AD 526 (*HE* 4,7). A collection of his maxims, the *Alloquia,* have survived (CPG 7361). He used the writings of the monk *Isaiah (see L. Regnault: RAM 46 [1970] 40) and was in turn used by *Dorotheus of Gaza (L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, Brescia 1980, 310).

CPG 7361; PG 78, 1680-1701 (incomplete); A. Iordanites: Neva Siwvn 12 (1912) 697-701; 854-865; 13 (1913) 93-100 (as a separate ed.: Jerusalem 1913); K. Kunze: BS 12, 1499-1500; DSp 16 (1994) 1658-1659.

J. Gribomont

ZOSIMUS, Byzantine historian (5th–6th c.). From the *intitulatio* of his work we only know that he was a *comes* and already an *exadvocatus fisci,* a detail also passed down by *Photius (*Bibl*., cod. 98), who identifies the historian with the two similarly named Sophists Zosimus of Gaza (which is possible) and Zosimus of Ascalon (a suggestion that should not be considered). From the work itself—the *Historia nova*—one can conclude that the author, a convinced and enthusiastic *pagan, who was not bereft of literary culture, lived at least for some time at *Constantinople, where he wrote his *History* between 498 (or more precisely 502) and 518.

Starting from the Trojan War, Zosimus in the first of his six books outlines a very quick synthesis of the events of the Greek-Eastern world until the fall of the Macedonian Empire; he then briefly outlines the history of the first Roman imperial era and, starting esp. from the 4th c., gradually broadens his own narration, which is interrupted *ex abrupto* in 410, although the author had proposed to go beyond that date. The work has, therefore, remained incomplete or has come down to us in a corrupt, incomplete state.

The author of the *Historia nova* (not in the sense of modern history, but a consideration of the unusual historiographical formulation) was regarded as the Polybius of the Late Empire. His originality consists in attributing the decline of Rome first of all to the "demented presumption" of the monarchical system, and secondly to the abandonment of traditional religion, which had been sacrificed on the altar of Christianity.

He perceived his own work, therefore, as a systematic challenge to Christian *historiography, esp. the Eusebian *apologia* of the monarchical ideal and the Augustan *pax* understood as the providential

preparation for the spread and triumph of Christianity, which was consecrated by *Constantine's conversion. Aside from confusions and contradictions, Zosimus's work, which was judged harshly by Photius, still represents the last monument of ancient historiography.

Editions: L. Mendelssohn, *Zosimi comitis et exadvocati fisci Historia nova*, Leipzig 1887, repr. Hildesheim 1963. Ed. with Fr. vers.: F. Paschoud, *Zosime. Histoire nouvelle*, 6 vols., Paris 1969-89. It. trans. only: F. Conca, Milan 1977.

Studies: M.E. Colonna, *Gli storici bizantini dal IV al XV secolo*, Naples 1956; PWK X A, 797-841; W. Goffart, *Zosimus, The First Historian of Rome's Fall*: American Historical Review 76 (1971) 412-441; L. Berardo, *Struttura, lacune e struttura delle lacune nell'* Ἱστορία *νέα di Zosimo*: Athenaeum 54 (1976) 472-481; F. Paschoud, *Cinq études sur Zosime*, Paris 1975; L. Cracco Ruggini, *Zosimo, ossia il rovesciamento delle "Storie ecclesiastiche"*: Augustinianum 16 (1976) 23-36; Fl. van Ommeslaeghe, *Jean Chrysostome et le peuple de Constantinople*: AB 99 (1981) 329-349; ODB 3, 2231; R. Ridley, *Zosimus: New History*, Byzantina Australiensia 3, Sydney 1982; E.J. Owens, *Zosimus, The Roman Empire, and the End of Roman Britain*, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 8, Brussels 1997 (Coll. Latomus 239); D.F. Buck, *On Two Lacunae in Zosimus' New History*: CQ n.s. 49 (1999) 342-344.

D. Stiernon

ZOSIMUS, pope (417–418). Certainly not of Roman origin. In his ecclesiastical politics, he tried to reorganize the hierarchy in *Gaul and to resolve the Pelagian controversy. Immediately upon being elected pope, he granted *Patroclus bishop of *Arles a privileged position that made him primate of the seven provinces of Gaul; this solution, however, could not last long. In the Pelagian controversy, however, Zosimus's stance was rather ambiguous. After having readmitted *Pelagius and *Celestius into ecclesiastical communion (autumn 417), he had to cede to the unanimous and emphatic objections of the African episcopate (*Ep.* 12). Forced by the interventions of the imperial court and by a new African synod, he finally promulgated in the *Epistola Tractoria* the open condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius (DS 231), thereby provoking a schism in *Italy. His intervention in the affair of *Apiarius, a priest who had made an appeal to the apostolic see, was likewise marked by trouble. Governing for only one year, he was the first to express the Roman claim to the primacy of jurisdiction (*Ep.* 12,1) and bequeathed numerous problems to his successors.

CPL 1644-1647; PL 20, 642-686 (Coustant); 20, 693ff. (*Ep. Tractoria*); 20, 703-704; PLS I, 796-797 - BS 12, 1493-1497; G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste*, Bonn 1964, 24-52; W. Marschall, *Karthago und Rom*, Stuttgart 1971, 150-159, 166-173; O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975, 134-218 (bibl.); Id., *Das Pelagiusdossier in der Tractoria des Zosimus*: FZPhTh 26 (1979) 336-368; D. Frye, *Early Fifth Century Gaul*: JEH 42 (1991) 343-361; M. Lamberigts, *Augustine and Julian on Z.*: Aug (L) 42 (1992) 311-330; LTK[3] 10 1492; LACL (2002) 732.

J. Gribomont

Complete List of Articles for the *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*

The use of this listing may aid readers in finding articles not cross-referenced in the main text. Additional information (century/ies in which the subject lived or flourished, or date of death) has sometimes been given here to more easily identify the subject of the entries.

EADBURGA (7th–8th c.)
EAST - ORIENTATION
EASTER
EASTER HOMILIES
EBIONITES
ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS of the APOSTLES
ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION
ECCLESIOLOGY
ECONOMY
ECSTASY
EDESSA
EDICT of MILAN
EGBERT (7th–8th c.)
EGERIA (4th c.)
EGYPT
EKTHESIS MAKROSTICHOS
EKTHESIS of HERACLIUS
ELEUSIUS of Cyzicus (4th c.)
ELEUTHERUS (Eleuterus, Eleutherius), pope (2nd c.)
ELEUTHERUS (Eleuterus, Eleutherius) of Tournai (d. 531)
ELIAS of Jerusalem (5th–6th c.)
ELIGIUS of Noyon-Tournai (6th–7th c.)
ELIJAH, prophet
ELISAEUS, doctor (Ełišē Vardapet) (6th c.?)
ELKESAITES
ELPIDIUS (4th c.)
ELPIDIUS RUSTICUS (5th–6th c.)
ELVIRA, Council of
EMERENTIANA, martyr (d. 303?)
EMERITUS (d. after 418)
EMESA
ENCOLPION
ENCRATISM
ENCYCLOPEDIA
ENDELECHIUS (4th–5th c.)
ENHYPOSTASIS
ENNODIUS (5th–6th c.)
ENTERTAINMENTS
ENTRY of JESUS into JERUSALEM (iconography)
EPHESUS
EPHREM of Antioch (d. 545)
EPHREM the Syrian (4th c.)
EPICLESIS
EPICTETUS of Corinth (4th c.)
EPIGONUS
EPIGRAM
EPIGRAMMA PAULINI
EPIGRAPHIC SYLLOGES
EPIGRAPHY, Christian
EPIPHANES (2nd c.)
EPIPHANIUS, monk (8th–9th c.)
EPIPHANIUS of Constantinople (d. 535)
EPIPHANIUS of Pavia (5th c.)
EPIPHANIUS of Salamis (d. 403)
EPIPHANIUS Scholasticus (5th–6th c.)
EPIPHANIUS SYNCELLUS (d. after 431)
EPIPHANIUS the Latin (5th–6th c.)
EPIPHANY, Feast of
EPIRUS
EPISCOPAL LISTS
EPISTOLA ANNE AD SENECAM
EPISTULA APOLOGETICA
EPISTULA APOSTOLORUM
EPISTULA DE PATRIA
EPISTULA FERMETIS AD HADRIANUM
EPISTULA SCYTHARUM MONACHORUM AD EPISCOPOS
EPISTULA TITI
EPISTULAE AUSTRASICAE
EQUITIUS of Hippo Dyarrhytus (d. after 404)
ERECHTHIUS of Antioch (5th c.)
ESCHATOLOGY
ESDRAS (Ezra) (apocryphal)
ETERNITY
ETHELBERT 6th–7th c.)
ETHICS
ETHIOPIA
EUBULUS of Lystra (7th c.)
EUCHARIST
EUCHERIA (5th–6th c.)
EUCHERIUS (pseudo) (7th c.?)
EUCHERIUS Comes (5th c.)
EUCHERIUS of Lyons (5th c.)
EUCHITES. *See* *MESSALIANS
EUDOXIA (d. 404)
EUDOXIA (Eudocia, Eudokia) (ca. 400–460)
EUDOXIUS (d. 370)
EUGENIUS, monk (4th c.)
EUGENIUS I, pope (7th c.)
EUGENIUS FLAVIUS (d. 394)
EUGENIUS of Ancyra (4th c.)
EUGENIUS of Carthage (d. 505)
EUGENIUS of Seleucia (6th c.)
EUGENIUS of Toledo (d. 657)
EUGIPPIUS (5th–6th c.)
EULALIA of Barcelona, martyr (d. 303?)
EULALIA of Mérida, martyr (d. 304)
EULALIUS, antipope (4th–5th c.)
EULALIUS of Antioch (d. 331)
EULOGIA
EULOGIUS of Alexandria (d. 607/608)
EUNAPIUS of Sardis (4th–5th c.)
EUNOMIUS of Berea (4th c.)
EUNOMIUS of Cyzicus (d. ca. 394)
EUNUCHS
EUPHEMIA of Chalcedon (d. 303)
EUPHEMIUS of Constantinople (d. 515)
EUPHRATAS of Cologne (4th c.)
EUPHRONIUS of Antioch (d. after 332)
EUPLUS of Catania (d. 304)
EUPREPIUS (4th c.)
EURIC (5th c.)
EUSEBIAN CANONS
EUSEBIANS
EUSEBIUS, pope (d. 308)
EUSEBIUS GALLICANUS
EUSEBIUS of Alexandria (3rd c.)
EUSEBIUS of Alexandria (pseudo) (late 5th c.)
EUSEBIUS of Bologna (4th c.)
EUSEBIUS of Caesarea (Cappadocia) (d. 370)
EUSEBIUS of Caesarea (Palestine) (3rd–4th c.)
EUSEBIUS of Cremona (d. after 418)
EUSEBIUS of Dorylaeum (d. after 451)
EUSEBIUS of Emesa (4th c.)
EUSEBIUS of Heraclea (d. after 431)
EUSEBIUS of Laodicea (d. 270)
EUSEBIUS of Milan (d. 462?)
EUSEBIUS of Nicomedia (d. ca. 341)
EUSEBIUS of Samosata (4th c.)
EUSEBIUS of Thessalonica (6th–7th c.)
EUSEBIUS of Vercelli (d. 371)
EUSTATHIUS, monk (6th c.)